UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 97—PART 12

MARCH 15, 1951, TO MAY 21, 1951

(PAGES A1449 TO A2870)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

J
11
.R
v.97
pt.12

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
3-10-52

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82*d* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Sean MacBride's Address to the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct honor for me to attend the luncheon given by the National Press Club in honor of Sean MacBride, Minister of External Affairs for Ireland. The speech by Mr. MacBride was interesting, direct, and to the point and was extremely well received by the Cabinet members, the newspapermen, and the Members of the House and Senate in attendance.

In this particular week, preceding the celebration of St. Patrick's Day, Sean MacBride has undertaken a difficult schedule. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington will be visited by him and in all these cities, he will be at home because he will be among friends.

Ireland is to be complimented for having such an outstanding leader in these troublous times and America is grateful that, out of his busy life, he has found time to visit us and to discuss problems of mutual interest.

To Sean MacBride, we wish the greatest possible success in his efforts to solve his country's problems. We want to assure him that Ireland holds a particularly warm spot in the hearts of Americans and that we look upon him as a true exponent of the ideals which have made Ireland great down through the centuries.

ADDRESS BY SEAN MACBRIDE, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 14, 1951

The honor you have done me in asking me to be your guest here is one which gives me a very special pleasure. I have been a newspaperman myself, and I have come here today simply as a colleague who happens to be Foreign Minister of a small nation which has very strong and ancient ties with America to tell you something of how that nation stands today.

I am told that Irish names are not unknown in American journalism, and, if so, there must be among you many whose parents and grandparents came from Ireland. The land they left was vastly different from the Ireland we know today. The Ireland of the last century was, in the material sense, one of the poorest countries in Western Europe. Her population was in process of being halved by the results of a famine on a scale that had been unknown in Western Europe since the Middle Ages. Today Ireland is on the road to economic progress and development. Our wealth is reasonably well divided; we have no very great extremes of rich and poor. The rural slums, the ramshackle cabins are nearly a thing of the past, and although there are slums still in certain of our cities we shall, unless a general war or acute shortages wreck our plans with those of the rest of the world, get rid of these within about 10 years. Our population, which had been falling steadily, although at a decreasing rate, since the famine of the last century is now taking an upward turn. Work is progressing on a $120,000,000 land-development scheme, and on drainage, rural electrification, and hospital-building schemes of a similar scale. The number employed in industry, though still small, is rising steadily.

I don't know if any of you, Americans with your history which has been no less prosperous than glorious, can appreciate what that means to an Irishman. It means that a nation which was nearly killed, whose life had almost ebbed away in the course of a long and agonizing struggle, is at last on the turn. The efforts of many Irishmen have gone to make this change, and, not least, those Irishmen who worked and fought to secure for us the independence without which a nation cannot work out its own salvation. Since a measure of independence was obtained, successive governments have played their parts—that of Mr. Cosgrave, that of Mr. De Valera, and now Mr. Costello's government, of which I am a member. None of these governments has been infallible, but under all of them the work has gone ahead and is still going on. While the Ireland of today is no utopia, one finds that atmosphere of hope and confidence which is lacking in many other countries today.

Much of the progress made in the last couple of years is attributable to the Marshall plan, and in particular to the really constructive and helpful cooperation which we received from the ECA. The direct financial aid which we received was valuable but far more important in any view was the economic planning which we had to undertake in conjunction with the ECA. I have always held the view that in the long run the most permanent benefits that will accrue to Europe from the Marshall plan will be technical assistance and the system of economic analysis and cooperation resulting from a policy answered by ECA. I would like to avail of this opportunity of paying a public tribute to the far-sighted and constructive approach initiated by the ECA in Europe under the leadership of men like Paul Hoffman, Averell Harriman, and Bill Foster.

It is often suggested or implied by critics that Ireland is so preoccupied with her own affairs that she cares nothing for what goes on around her. I think it would be hard to put forward a suggestion that was more wholly misleading. It is not a question of whether the Irish people want to be internationally minded or not; they cannot help being internationally minded for they are an international people. An ordinary Kerry family may well have two uncles and an aunt in New Jersey, Chicago, and Springfield, Mass., a cousin in Montreal and another in Melbourne, and probably a son or daughter in England or Scotland as well. With most of these they regularly correspond, and I think that if some of our older people in, say Galway, were asked to draw a map of the world they might, if they were not careful, show New York as being nearer than Dublin.

The people of Irish origin, scattered throughout the world and now playing their parts as citizens of other countries, still retain many of the characteristics of the people of the mother country. They are, for the most part, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, religious folk, and they constitute a moral force and go to reinforce the stabilizing elements in the countries in which they are. They are a virile and active force within the community of free nations, the very sort of people, tainted neither with communism nor reaction, of which the west stands most in need. While they remain fondly attached to Ireland and look to Ireland for moral leadership they certainly do not look to Ireland for political leadership. They are loyal Americans, Australians, and Canadians, or citizens of the country in which they have settled. At home our wish is to play our part with them, as well as with the ancient European nations to whose sisterhood Ireland belongs, in the building and preserving of a just and free society.

What part is Ireland, in fact, playing in international affairs? I think that question is best answered by reference to the four international organizations with which we might be directly concerned: the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the OEEC, and the North Atlantic Treaty organization.

As regards the United Nations, the position is that we applied for membership several years ago, being willing to undertake the full responsibilities of such membership. We were, however, kept out by the veto of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—Russia. Ironical as it may sound, Russia says that she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country.

As regards the Council of Europe and the OEEC, we are members of both these organizations. In both of them our representatives have consistently adopted the progressive policy of favoring developments which tended toward a united Europe. In the OEEC we have favored greater liberalization

ple—How Prepared?" is simple. We certainly are not adequately prepared. The fact is that if world war III is close upon us we are not prepared in any important phase of the activities in which it is necessary to be prepared if we are to meet Russia on anything like equal terms.

The great danger of our dilemma is that if we do face world war III we dare not be unprepared because our failure may be fatal.

In ordinary living when we face life or death decisions we do not take chances. Surely in the life of a whole nation we dare not be less cautious. This is all the more true because a decision for or against world war III does not rest with the United States; it rests solely with the evil men in the Kremlin. They need appeal to no legislative body; they have no Congress to consult; they can decide in the twinkling of an eye without public discussion or approval or responsibility whether it will be peace or war. That being so, it is clear that the decision that Russia takes may be life or death for the United States, if we are unprepared. As a Nation, we dare not run that risk.

We can only be safe if we are prepared for the worst. Therefore we must be fully prepared; prepared physically, mentally, morally and spiritually. We must be so strong that Russia dare not risk the danger of war with us because of the fear of our power of annihilatory retaliation.

America was aroused to the necessity of military preparation by the sudden and unprovoked outbreak of war in Korea. But strangely enough, the longer that war lasts, the more our fears seem to subside; and this despite the fact that every analysis of the situation shows that the longer the Korean War lasts the more conclusively it proves that Russia is willing to risk world war III rather than reach a peaceful end to the war in Korea.

Surely we must soon all realize that America cannot carry on war in Korea or anywhere else, or undertake a vast preparation program, and at the same time carry on business as usual, politics as usual and ordinary pleasures as usual. The fact that we are taking the situation in Korea so casually proves beyond doubt that as a nation we have temporarily lost contact with the hopes and the fear and the aspirations of our boys in the battle line and with the threat they are there to meet. Certainly the boys who are fighting and dying for us half-way around the world have a different appraisal of how serious it is.

For one, I firmly believe that right now we do face the risk of all-out war. Consequently, the American people are confronted by the greatest crisis in our history. This being true, we are merely fooling around by our preparations to date. What we have done is unequal to the challenge because that challenge is the challenge of survival.

Certainly we must now realize that the Communists are united. They have a common purpose and a common determination. Their intention is to destroy every nation which opposes them. In the final analysis the supreme objective of today's communism is the destruction of the United States of America and everything it stands for, because we alone block the way to world domination by communism.

Our people must understand both the threat and the problem if as a nation we are to be as serious as we must be if we are to face this challenge of survival.

If Russia desides to bring on world war III, such a war will require the maximum of everything that we are and everything that we have. All the industrial, military and economic power of our people must be energized to the very maximum if we are to win through when this real test comes upon us.

Therefore, first of all, if we are to be adequately prepared we must reach a decision upon what we face. Not whether we face a war—because we are right now engaged in a war in Korea where we have already lost 50,000 men but whether we face an all-out war with Russia. That is the supremely important problem to every American.

We in America must understand both the threat and the problem. Clearly, if America is to exercise the leadership of the free people of today's world—and that leadership is ours whether we want it or not—we can only exercise it effectively by uniting the free people outside America, and to do that we must be united inside America. Division at home can only result in division abroad. Consequently, it is clear that the foreign policy of the United States must be on a bipartisan basis. If politics are to determine important matters of foreign policy, that policy cannot conceivably be successful.

A bipartisan foreign policy cannot be determined by one person or one party. It is just as important for the Democratic administration to realize that fact as it is for the Republican Party.

I also feel that at this critical hour it is a tremendous disservice to arouse distrust of our military leaders. Because the conduct of the military strategy of world war III, if it is coming up, or prevention of world war III, if it can be prevented, must in the final analysis be determined by our military leaders. If we are to have no confidence in them, if we are to treat military problems on any other than a military basis, we will not only render a great disservice to the military but we will make it impossible to prepare our people properly for the ordeal that confronts us.

Any mistrust the American people have in the foreign policy of the United States, and any impartial observer must know that many do, can only be changed and fears allayed by a fully accredited bipartisan foreign policy. And it cannot be done in any other way.

In the final analysis, the President should take the Congress more fully into the details of his confidence. When there is time for consultation there should be consultation. There is time now for the national administration to do more than it has done in the way of creating good will and confidence in the Congress. Proper procedures will render an immense service, at this critical juncture, in uniting the American people and creating thereby not only firmer support for our military leaders but also renewed confidence in our leadership of the free people everywhere.

These facts being true, and I am sure they are, it is clear that in the most essential part of our preparation, we are not ready.

The generation to which we belong has already fought the two bloodiest wars in history. In our generation more people have been killed; there has been more hatred, more bigotry, more transplanting of people out of the places where they were born to other places where they were strangers; there have been more changes of national boundary lines, more revolution of ideas, more changes of attitude with respect to world problems than in any generation in history. This is the character of the time in which we live. It is a time when it is the part of wisdom to be prepared for the worst possible contingencies.

The American people want peace. But it isn't a question of what we want. We live in a time when it is a question of what challenges we face. We have already suffered tremendous losses in Korea. We will suffer still more. As a Nation we will groan under the highest taxes we have known. We must pull in our belts and arouse ourselves to the real seriousness of the implications of the facts of the time in which we live. We will be unprepared at the critical time of our lives as a people unless we prepare ourselves now for a period of sparse and bitter living. And as of now we are not so prepared.

We want peace. Every sensible person wants peace. We must have peace because war may destroy victor and vanquished alike.

But the best hope for peace for America is a thorough preparation for war. The dictators start war only against the unprepared. The peril that faces the world today is due to the dismemberment of the armed forces of the free nations when Russia kept her armed power moving toward an increasing maximum. The hope for peace can be sustained only by a preparation that will convince aggressor nations that we are too strong to be attacked. Only if we make ourselves strong enough to discourage the Russians from attack will we avoid world war III. A strong America with strong allies in Western Europe is the one sure guaranty for world peace.

Finally we must remember there is the chance that the Russian threat may continue not for a year or 2 years, or 5 or 10, it may continue for a generation. Therefore it is imperative that we keep our Government in a sound condition financially. That means that we must cut out all fat from the budget. There must be no budgetary set-up except for the very necessities of decent living in addition to our military preparation. We must decide now the full scope of what is necessary to be done to be ready to meet this crisis. Then with no politics, with no log rolling, with no back scratching, and with a bipartisan foreign policy we must unite the American people for a united free world in order to stand united against the greatest threat to modern civilization.

As of now we are not prepared. The question for every American to answer is, What do you intend to do about it?

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," by Mr. Selig Greenberg, writer for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, published in the city of Providence, R. I.

These articles will be most interesting to the Members of the Senate in their consideration of S. 337, which is a bill to provide an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical fields.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal of March 3, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—CURBS ON MEDICAL TRAINING ARE LAID TO RESTRICTIONISM—ALTHOUGH AMA DENIES DEVICE OF SETTING EDUCATION STANDARDS TO HOLD DOWN GRADUATES, RESPONSIBLE OBSERVERS BELIEVE MOTIVE NOT DISINTERESTED

(This is the sixth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within

of trade, and we are in a position to do so since our own trade policies are among the most liberal in Europe. In the Council of Europe we have supported every measure which tended to strengthen the Assembly as against the Committee of Ministers, that is to say, every measure which represented a step on the road to a Parliament of Europe. This was the attitude which was taken up by a country which has been represented as stubbornly or narrowly nationalistic. In fact no nation has been so prompt as we have been to support the uniting of Europe and the free and voluntary merging of individual sovereignties. We are, however, quite as stubbornly nationalistic as the United States would be when it is suggested that we should surrender our rights or a portion of our sovereignty to another nation.

As regards the last organization, that of the Atlantic Pact powers, the position is this: We were asked to join and we refused. You will want to know why.

I think on this vitally important question I cannot do better than take as my point of departure the cardinal principles of your own foreign policy, as set out in an admirable document, Our Foreign Policy, issued by your State Department.

These are the three points:

"We are an independent nation and we want to keep our independence."

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom and we mean to keep our freedom."

"We are a peaceful people and we want to get rid of wars and the threat of wars."

We, in Ireland, would subscribe wholeheartedly to every one of these principles but, being historically less fortunate than you, we are forced to state them for ourselves in a somewhat different manner. This is how we have to state them:

"We are not an independent nation because a portion of it is still unfree but we want to achieve our independence.

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom but many of our people have not got that freedom.

"We are a peaceful people but part of our territory has been taken from us by war and the threat of war."

These points which, as you will surmise, refer to the fact that part of our country, the six northeastern counties, is held under British rule, may seem exaggerated to you. They do not seem exaggerated to us or to the people, the majority in the greater part of the British held territory, who want to be with us. I do not bring this problem before you because I expect that you, with the vast problems which you must debate every day, can concern yourselves with the intricacies of the methods by which this small territory, in defiance of geography, is held as part of Britain. I am not going to discuss, nor, I am sure, do you want to hear of the finesses of boundary drawing. Discrimination, gerrymandering, and political police by which the entity known as Northern Ireland was set up and is maintained, but I do want you to know that that partition is the cause of such feeling in Ireland that no Irish Government could attempt, without immediately being driven from office, to enter into a military alliance with the power which is responsible for it. This is not one of those ancient grievances which we are supposed to hug to our bosoms. It is quite modern and very real and very present. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Pact which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept the Mason and Dixon's line as an international frontier. You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden. We are, I need hardly say, fully conscious of the gravity of our decision. Indeed in our reply to the invitation to join the pact we suggested that, in the interests of the greater safety and strength of the chain of Atlantic defense, the members might discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded us from membership. Unfortunately, this suggestion was not acted on.

I wish to make it clear that there is no question of bargaining on this matter. It would be unworthy, both of the great issue involved—the future of the Atlantic community—and of the historic tradition of the Irish Nation, were we to attempt to bargain on this. We are seeking our full freedom and independence as of right and we intend to get it.

The position then, in short, is that Ireland is willing and anxious to play her full part in international affairs, that she is already making a certain contribution but is prevented from doing her full share by two outside powers, Russia and Britain. I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable. All I do say is that they are inclined to look rather alike from where we sit. Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient and, therefore, just. This was, and is, the policy of Russia in Poland. It has been the policy of Russia in Korea. In both cases the Russians found some Poles and some Koreans to support them, but in both cases the partition of a nation, a disaster in itself, leads to other disasters.

A nation is not a vague territory that can be cut up at will. It is a living, breathing thing. It is not easy to dig the grave of a nation, and when you have dug it, it is an unquiet grave. I think that you in this room who do so much to mold the policies of your great Nation, cannot do better than to reflect upon the cases of Poland, of Korea, and of Ireland, and to believe, contrary to the imperialist maxim, that what is unjust can never be expedient, since there is something in humanity which stubbornly rejects, and in the long run overthrows, an unjust solution. I think that the greatest and the most effective political leaders, those whose work has been solid and enduring, are not the showy Machiavellians, or modern totalitarian dictators, with their contempt for people, and especially for people who were militarily weak or numerically insignificant, but the leaders who, like Washington and Lincoln, believed in human freedom as a guiding principle. Those who stand for that freedom have always been reputed damnably awkward people. It is, therefore, with no shame but with pride, that I say the Irish still stand for freedom and democratic rule and, therefore, may still be portrayed to you as "damnably awkward people."

Fallacy of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Teacher Shows Fallacy of Socialism," which appeared in the Arkansas Democrat of Monday, March 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHER SHOWS FALLACY OF SOCIALISM

Socialism is one of the great delusions of our time. It is perilous because it appeals to the weakness in men—to the desire of millions of us to get along as easily as possible.

So while these millions might reject socialism in total, they are voting it into our Government by bits and pieces. They do not see that the end of continued handouts, aids, and regulations will be to bring the full, deadening grasp of socialism onto the Nation.

A New York city teacher, Thomas J. Shelley, reveals to his pupils the fallacy and the danger of socialism with a brilliant illustration. He explains:

"When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points, and give them to a student who has made only 55 points. Thus each would contribute 'according to his ability,' and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive 'according to his need.'"

Then the teacher points out the results of that policy. The higher-grading pupils would take their work easier. Why strive to make a high grade when an authority gives part of it to someone else?

And the pupils who benefited would also let down. Since they were going to get by anyway, why should they study and worry to do their best?

Then, the teacher points out, the authority would have to adopt compulsory methods, with punishments for those who lagged behind.

And that, he sums up, is just what a Socialist government must do sooner or later. It comes eventually to a living death for all except the authorities and a few of their favorite lackeys. And he adds that most of his pupils understand. They see socialism for what it is—a glittering trickery—a flowered road to an economic desert.

We'd all better be thinking hard on this subject. The fine-promising politicians will ignorantly or wilfully deliver us to socialism if we continue to follow false leaders.

Necessity for Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin Forum, held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., last Tuesday evening. The subject of my address was Our Preparedness To Meet Any Threat of War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our people—how prepared? To answer that question it is necessary to ask another. Do we face now the threat of all-out war with Russia, or can we look forward to a long period of cold war without actual fighting? If world war III is just around the corner, then the answer to the question, "Our Peo-

Dr. Cloyd H. Marvin, president of George Washington University and secretary of the commission, has been particularly outspoken in this respect. He recently accused the Association of Medical Colleges of being one of the educational groups which have permitted themselves to become dominated by professional groups for their own purposes. This, he asserted, is tending to turn professional schools into agents of the economic objectives of professional guilds and is increasingly removing these schools from control of the universities.

CAN BE USED TO RESTRICT

Dr. Samuel P. Capen, chancellor of the University of Buffalo and former president of the Association of Urban Universities, has also expressed concern over the AMA's accrediting function.

Conceding the laudability of the AMA's interest in high educational standards, he noted that accrediting can also be used "to restrict entry into a profession." By limiting enrollment, he said, "the number of professional practitioners can be regulated with almost absolute precision."

All of which raises still another important issue. Shouldn't there be some group in this country, representing not only the medical profession but also the public, whose job it would be to reassess periodically the adequacy of our supply of doctors and to regulate that supply? Spokesmen for the AMA and the medical school association deny that they are doing this now. But it is pretty clear that this is exactly what they are doing.

Dr. Thomas Parran, former Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and now dean of the Graduate School of Public Health at the University of Pittsburgh, has complained that "we are producing our annual output of doctors in this country not by plan but by happenstance," under the present set-up, this "happenstance" has not always been governed exclusively by the public interest.

The Late Honorable O. S. Warden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the news story on the passing of Montana's greatest citizen and also an editorial covering the event. The news story and the editorial are both carried in the Great Falls Tribune, which he nurtured and reared so faithfully.

A great and simple man has gone to his reward.

O. S. WARDEN, 85, PUBLISHER OF TRIBUNE, DIES AT HOME

O. S. Warden, 85, publisher of the Great Falls Tribune, Democratic national committeeman for Montana, and an active figure in the development of this State, died at 2 o'clock this morning at the family home, 500 Fourth Avenue North, following an illness of about 2 months.

The publisher's death ended a career crowded with achievement—a lifetime devoted to public service. He had remained active in his business and in the future development of Great Falls, Montana, and the West until his recent illness.

Warden saw Montana history made—from the Territorial days to the present. He witnessed the final session of the constitutional convention in 1889, and he had a major hand in the State's development for 60 years thereafter, with scarcely a day's interruption.

While he traveled frequently throughout his lifetime, nearly every trip was made in the interest of some phase of Montana development—irrigation, highways, power projects, or aviation.

Although he served from 1934 until his death as Democratic national committeeman for Montana, Warden's services to the State knew no party lines. His willingness to devote his own time and finances to the upbuilding of his adopted State was quickly recognized by leaders of both parties. For years he had been associated with city, State, regional, and national bodies in public work.

This started in 1924 with his appointment by Republican Gov. Joseph M. Dixon to the newly created Montana Highway Commission. He served for a decade, spearheading through the Tribune and by personal effort, enactment of the first referendum bill to provide State finances to match Federal-aid money to get Montana out of the mud.

Because of his interest in highways, he was vice president of the Y-G Bee Line Highway Association, then vice president and later president of the National Association of State Highway Officials.

After retirement from the State commission, Warden retained a continuing interest in the highway program to the last. As chairman of the goods roads committee of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, he waged a continuous battle for completion of the central Montana highway, the last main artery of Montana's Federal-aid system. This fight included the bitter struggle over completion of the Rogers Pass link of the road between Great Falls and Missoula. Through his efforts, the Circle-Sidney section was added to the primary system within the last year. The highway, shortest route across the State when finally completed, will be one of many lasting monuments to the memory of O. S. Warden.

In 1936 he was appointed a member of the Montana Water Conservation Board by Gov. W. E. Holt. He later was called upon to act as vice chairman and secretary of the water board by Gov. Sam C. Ford, another Republican. From being Montana director of the National Reclamation Association, he was elected president in 1934 and was reelected nine times.

He was a leader in the construction of a vast system of unrelated and interrelated water storage and irrigation projects, ranging from those which would irrigate only a few acres to the Broadwater-Missouri project in Broadwater County that diverted water near Toston for 5,000 acres and provided a supplemental supply for 10,000 acres additionally.

While he long had been interested in development of the Sun River irrigation project west of Great Falls, and in later years stressed importance of the lower Marias project, his crowning achievement in the field of reclamation was in bringing the Canyon Ferry reclamation project through the dream stage to reality.

Warden, convinced additional storage facilities must be made available on the Missouri if the reclamation possibilities above Fort Benton were to be fully utilized, prevailed with private power interests and State and Federal officials until it finally was authorized as part of the Missouri Basin development program.

In July 1949 the first blast for excavation in connection with construction of Canyon Ferry Dam, 17 miles east of Helena, occurred and Warden was chosen to set it off. Michael Straus, Reclamation Commissioner and principal speaker, declared:

"Men of vision made today possible and Mr. Warden is one. Over the years, wherever men of the West have planned to develop their water resources, I have found they have been guided by the gentle, persuasive wisdom of Mr. Warden."

W. G. Sloan, former regional director and later chairman of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, hailed Warden as the grand old man of reclamation.

Warden's first civic activity was as a member of the Great Falls Board of School Trustees, serving from 1896 to 1910. His service to the local chamber of commerce included perennial directorship and the presidency, 1920–21. He was an active member of the sugar-beet and airways committees. It was partially through his efforts that Inland Air Lines, now the Inland division of Western Air Lines, was extended from Billings to Great Falls, giving this city direct air service to Denver.

From 1933 to 1938 he was a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce, first as director at large and then as representative of the eighth district. In 1944 he served as Montana governor of the National Aeronautics Association, and was active in organizing the Great Falls chapter.

He had been a director of the Associated Press for many years, being the first director to be elected from the Rocky Mountain area for newspapers under 50,000 circulation. He maintained a continuing interest in the school of journalism at Montana State University. Warden was president of the Montana Press Association in 1924, and served as vice president of the Inland Daily Press Association.

Oliver Sherman Warden was born at North Haverhill, N. H., August 19, 1865, the only child of Alexander and Lucy Flint Warden. His middle name was derived from the popular Civil War general, William Tecumseh Sherman.

After attending elementary school at Monroe, N. H., and high school at McIndoes, Vt., Warden was graduated from St. Johnsbury Academy, St. Johnsbury, Vt. He earned his bachelor of arts degree and Phi Beta Kappa key at Dartmouth, graduating with the class of 1889. A few weeks later he arrived in Montana to accept a position on the news staff of the Great Falls Leader.

En route to Great Falls, Warden stopped in Helena, where on August 19, 1889, he watched the constitutional convention that was shaping the government of the soon-to-be born Treasure State. Montana was admitted to statehood several weeks later.

In 1895, in association with William M. Bole, another New Englander, he purchased the Great Falls Tribune and became its business manager. Bole assumed the editorship. In 1900, this newspaper was purchased by the late William A. Clark, when Clark sought election to the United States Senate. Warden remained as business manager, while Bole moved to Bozeman and purchased the Chronicle.

After Clark's election, the Tribune was sold to W. G. Conrad, who resold it to Warden and Bole in 1905. Bole returned to the editorship, a post he held until his retirement in 1927. He died at Bozeman in 1932.

The Tribune, starting with nine employees, including the two owners, developed steadily through the years. Its present building was completed in 1916. Long recognized as the stalwart of independent Montana journalism, the Tribune never has been subsidized by any person or interest. Tribune associate properties include the Great Falls Leader, the Montana Farmer-Stockman, Tribune Printing & Supply Co., and radio station KMON.

Warden's community service over a long period was as director and trustee of the YMCA, member of the North Montana State Fair board since 1931, and chairman of the Great Falls Park Board. He was a charter member of the local Rotary Club, a charter member of the Great Falls Elks Lodge, a member of Euclid Lodge 58 of the Masons, and one of the organizers and corporate members of the Meadow Lark Country Club.

the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The high cost of medical education is the major reason our facilities for training doctors have failed to keep up with the Nation's needs.

But there is ground for believing that restrictionism has also been a factor.

The American Medical Association denies using the device of setting educational standards or any other means to hold down the number of graduates and restrict competition. It insists that the medical profession's major concern has always been to protect the public.

The disinterestedness of the AMA's motives has been questioned by a number of responsible observers. Some of these have charged that the raising of standards has been used not only to train better doctors but also to curtail their number. Others have said that while restrictionism may not be deliberate, the profession's trade union motivation had certainly contributed toward its lack of vigor in pressing for expansion of medical education.

HARD TO GET AT MOTIVES

One of the loudest bombshells in this controversy was exploded last year at the annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans.

A committee named by the deans of the liberal arts colleges reported after a year's investigation that the limited opportunities for training doctors constituted "a most serious threat to the continued health and well-being of the American people" and accused the medical profession of "Petrillo economics." The reference was to James C. Petrillo, high-handed president of the A. F. of L.'s American Federation of Musicians.

It is extremely difficult to get to the bottom of this matter. It would require an exhaustive analysis of the motives, acts, and influence of each group involved in controlling entry into medicine—the AMA and its council on medical education and hospitals, the medical schools and their national association, and the State boards of medical licensure and their national federation. Even then, as one man commented, "you'd have to psychoanalyze these people to get definite proof of their motivation."

While describing the Petrillo economics charge as probably too sweeping, a number of the experts interviewed by this reporter—all of them physicians—said they were convinced that guild economics was a factor in the profession's thinking. They said they knew personally of cases where doctors had made it difficult for new practitioners to come into communities and were fairly certain that the same motivation played a part in keeping down expansion.

TENDENCY TO DISCOURAGE

One educator who had served with an AMA representative on a committee to consider the case of a 2-year basic science school which wanted to convert into a 4-year medical school, recalled that the AMA man was the only one to oppose the move.

"You run quite frequently into this sort of inside opposition," this man said. "The tendency all along has been to discourage expansion of existing schools or establishment of new ones. The same thing has happened with regard to DP doctors. The AMA hasn't made it easy for these foreign physicians to get into practice here."

"Restrictionism is probably a relatively minor factor now that most doctors have more business than they can handle," said another authority I consulted. "But it was pretty clearly in evidence during the depression."

COMMISSION REPORTED SURPLUS

This set me off on a search through the back files of the AMA Journal and the Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges. The story pieced together from those files is instructive.

In 1932 a study made by a commission of the Association of Medical Colleges reported that there was a surplus of doctors. Discussion then began to shape up within both the AMA and the medical school association that it was time to raise educational standards and cut down the number of students.

In 1933 the AMA Council on Medical Education adopted a formal resolution inviting "the active support of the Association of American Medical Colleges in bringing about a substantial reduction of their enrollment."

At the annual meeting of the Association of Medical Colleges later that year, Dr. William D. Cutler, then secretary of the AMA council, spelled this out in greater detail.

"Not everyone who aspires to a professional career," said Dr. Cutler, "has the God-given right to receive a long and highly technical training at public expense. Recently only half, or less than half, of those applying have been accepted, but the number which each school admitted was based on its own determination of the number which it could effectively teach without any regard to the needs of the profession or of the country as a whole. The time has come when we must still further limit the enrollment of our medical schools.

"The achievements of the last three decades in raising the standards of medical education are without parallel in history. But is the process complete? The time is ripe for an advance all along the line. Together we should be able to set up a new and higher standard."

A year later the AMA council reported that "seven schools have definitely stated that their enrollment will be decreased, and others have indicated adherence to the council's principles."

Between 1935 and 1938 the number of freshmen admitted by the medical schools was slashed by 841, or 13 percent. There was a drop of 1,617 in over-all enrollment between 1935 and 1940. It is true that general college enrollment also went down during the depression years. But the decline was neither as drastic nor as prolonged.

"It is certainly more than a coincidence," observed one educator, "that when the sledding got tough the doctors became interested in improving the quality of medical education."

"It was appallingly short-sighted to take the bottom of the depression as a guide for the country's future health needs," commented another prominent physician.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin of March 5, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—DOCTORS CONTROL CHANNELS LEADING TO MEDICAL CAREER—STANDARDS SUBJECT TO THEIR O. K. DETERMINE ENROLLMENT AT SCHOOLS

(This is the seventh of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The training of doctors in the United States is a monopoly tightly controlled by the medical profession.

This raises the vital question as to where the interest of the public—the 152,000,000 consumers of medical care—comes in.

In the opinion of eminent medical and lay authorities, this is an issue which far transcends in importance the question of whether the profession has misused its control of the output of physicians to limit their number.

"I don't know—and, as far as I can see, there is no means of proving it definitely one way or another—whether there has been deliberate restrictionism in keeping down the supply of doctors," said one of the men consulted by this reporter. "But the mere fact that there is a group having the power to do so points up the danger of the present situation."

"TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC"

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, concedes that "legally the practice of medicine is a monopoly in the sense that the source of supply of physicians is restricted to those institutions which are recognized for the purpose of medical licensure."

"The intent of this monopoly," Dr. Rappleye has said, "is not to create benefits for the medical profession but to protect the public."

The public has undoubtedly been protected by the establishment of high standards in the medical schools. But many observers feel that the public interest has been hurt rather than protected by the profession's lack of vigor in expanding the facilities for training doctors so as to keep up with the country's needs. They feel strongly that the consumers are entitled to have something to say about the matter.

Control of entry into medicine is now vested in three groups, all of them in the hands of the medical profession. These groups are the American Medical Association and its Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, the medical schools and their national association, and the State boards of medical licensure and their national federation.

UNUSUAL DEGREE OF AUTONOMY

Medical school standards, which among other things determine enrollment, are subject to approval by both the AMA Council on Medical Education and the Association of American Medical Colleges. Representatives of the two organizations have for years made joint inspections of the schools. The laws or licensure board regulations of virtually all States permit only graduates of schools accredited by both organizations to take examinations for admission to practice. As a rule, the licensure boards are made up exclusively of doctors appointed with the consent of the State medical societies.

In theory, the public has some representation under this set-up through the Association of Medical Colleges. Theoretically, the medical schools are the creatures of the universities with which they are affiliated and which pay their bills. But, in practice, many of the medical schools have over the years acquired an unusual degree of autonomy.

All but a handful of the medical school deans are doctors and so are members of the faculties. The AMA and the Association of Medical Colleges have been disagreeing lately with increasing frequency and have formally split on the issue of Federal subsidies for medical education. But the AMA has long exercised a powerful influence over the medical school association, particularly with regard to standards and enrollment, through what one prominent educator has described as "a variety of interlocking directorships."

ONE OF PRINCIPAL TARGETS

The influence of trade organizations in medicine and other fields of professional education through the accrediting role they have arrogated to themselves has long worried the heads of many of the universities and they are now trying to do something about it.

The Association of American Universities and several other leading educational groups last year set up the National Commission on Accrediting. This commission is investigating various professional accrediting bodies in an effort to establish whether their activities are in the public interest. The AMA's control over the medical schools and their association is obviously one of the commission's principal targets.

East, states that a study of Negro court-martial cases for 3 months of last summer indicates that most of them were largely the result of low morale induced by the segregation policies still maintained by General MacArthur. While the NAACP spokesman criticized court-martial procedure as it applied to whites as well as to Negroes, he held that Negroes had been the principal sufferers—and that segregation was at the root of much of the evil. To the extent that segregation is still practiced in the Army it surely is contradicting the principles enunciated time and again by the President of the United States.

As the President has noted, however, there are spheres in which real progress is being made. Among the most notable advances in recent weeks is the action of the Georgia Legislature in tearing masks off the Ku Klux Klan, a very great victory for progressive forces in the South. The mere fact that a stringent antilynch bill has been introduced in the South Carolina Legislature is encouraging; and steps to abolish the poll tax have just been taken in one or two more southern States. The battle for civil rights, particularly in times of stress, has to be waged on many a front.

But surely among the most important and urgent of all these fronts is, in a literal sense, the fighting front. Out there in the lonely hills and valleys of Korea courage knows nothing of segregation, and death has yet to learn a color line.

Russia Seen Waiting for Chaos in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent from the Washington Star:

RUSSIA SEEN WAITING FOR CHAOS IN UNITED STATES—WRITER SAYS OUR BANKRUPTCY WOULD BE SOVIET VICTORY

(By Frank R. Kent)

For a long time now there have been two schools of thought among men in Washington supposedly better informed than the average citizen concerning the international crisis that exists because of Russian behavior in the United Nations and elsewhere in the world.

One school firmly believes a third world war inevitable; that this will be precipitated by a new Soviet aggresison this year against Yugoslavia; that unless we and our allies are able to check this advance of the Red armies all Western Europe will be overrun and the worst conflict in history ensue. The other school contends there will be no war; that Russia has not and does not now plan an all-out war; that her strategy has never included such a thing; that on the contrary, it is exactly the thing she does not want.

It is interesting to note that while recently there have been many converts from the "war is inevitable" group to the other, we are wholeheartedly proceeding on the assumption that the first group is right. The reason is clear—we just cannot afford to take the chance. Our great trouble is utter lack of certainty about Soviet intentions.

On the other hand, Mr. Stalin and his friends do not have to have a spy system or an intelligence service here to know our plans, strength, weaknesses, and problems. All they have to do is read the newspapers and listen to the radio. They have complete certainty as contrasted with our complete uncertainty—and that is a great advantage. Being intelligent men, they know that neither the British nor curselves will fight unless war is forced upon us.

If, it may be asked, the Soviet rulers are so sure they are in no danger of attack from the free nations of the world, what then is the point of their ceaseless and violent propaganda denouncing us as warmongers and insisting that the United States is determined to bring about a third world war? Those of the second school, who hold that the Russians do not want war, provide the answer—first, that the Russians do not want war with us primarily, as Dr. Vannevar Bush says, because they know our present superiority in atomic weapons would destroy them. This is the great deterrent. If this were not so and they wanted war, it would be idiotic for them not to start the big fight now instead of waiting and watching while our mobilization gets rolling and we get stronger and stronger as the months go by.

From either their standpoint or ours, if the Soviets mean war, this waiting policy makes no sense. It only makes sense if they plan to make the whole world communistic not through military conquest but by promoting economic chaos. That explains everything the Russians do and have done. The argument is based on the axiom that out of economic chaos communism almost inevitably comes. This, it is argued, is why Soviet policy in the last 5 years has been so threatening and provocative as to force us into the expenditure of many billions, the imposition of enormous taxes, and an added strain on the Federal fiscal structure, which no one knows whether we can bear or not. On the assumption that these immense outpourings are the only way to insure peace, we cannot stop to consider the size of the debt or the depth of the deficits. In a year and a half we will be far more powerful than the Russians, but we easily may have spent ourselves into national bankruptcy, which would be a victory for them.

We would then appear to be the most gigantic suckers in all history. Still we have got to become strong enough to conquer even though we never have to fight. But if this idea of Russian strategy is sound, nothing makes sense except the taking of every possible step to guard Federal finances against collapse.

As Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Leavenworth (Kans.) Times of March 9, 1951:

AS FREEMEN

One thousand employees of the Kansas Power & Light Co., the northeast Kansas utility which supplies Leavenworth its gas and electricity, have signed a petition proclaiming their belief in God and the American way of life.

The unusual fact about the petition is that it was a spontaneous action by the employees themselves; management of the KPL had nothing to do with it until it was presented to them.

And management felt it was of sufficient significance to be reproduced. A copy of proclamation and the thousand-odd signatures are on display in the window of the local KPL office.

Art Johnson, local office manager, said today the company is not sure where the petition got started. There are many signatures of local employees on the proclamation.

The text follows:

"As freemen we proclaim—

"Our belief in the divinity of God, the dignity of man and the destiny of our country.

"Our belief in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

"Our belief that a man should live within his income and pay his honest debts, and that our Government should operate on the same sensible basis.

"Our belief that under the American way of life we always have a higher standard of living than any other governmental system has ever offered—let alone delivered.

"Our belief that as freemen, proud of our achievements and jealous of our rights, that there is no place in our midst for Communists, fellow travelers, and other cranks who by wild accusations and empty promises would lead us down the trail of political and economic slavery.

"Our belief that it is our duty as freemen to speak out in defense of our American ways of life and to go on record to that end.

"So we proclaim, with the firm conviction that 99 percent of all Americans subscribe to the above sentiments that we—the undersigned employees of the Kansas Power & Light Co.—herewith and henceforth endorse and pledge our wholehearted support to the same. May God be with us."

This started out to be a routine news story but it soon became obvious that it was more than just a bit of news. It is a concrete manifestation of faith in American Democracy by those who build and keep America strong.

As long as such citizens as these are willing and glad to go on public record as they have done this country cannot be destroyed by enemies from without or within.

Overtaxation on Wine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the economic welfare of the State of California is primarily dependent on agriculture, with 1,515,245 bearing acres of fruit, nuts, and vine products in the State.

One-third of all this acreage consists of vineyards, making grapes the largest single crop in the agricultural economy.

Primary outlet for grapes is the wine industry, operating on a year around basis and providing employment for 111,000 persons.

A proposal by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, now before the Ways and Means Committee, has created turmoil among grape growers, vintners and allied industries throughout the entire State of California.

This proposal would raise Federal excise taxes on dessert wines from the present 60 cents to $1.50 per gallon; and

Mr. Warden was married first to Etta A. Scott, of Lawrence, Mass., in 1895, the year he became co-owner of the Tribune. She died in 1919 and four of six children born to this union survive. They are Alexander and Robert D. Warden, business manager and managaging editor, respectively, of the Tribune; Mrs. G. A. Hansen, of Great Falls, and Mrs. Virginia Morrell, of Worcester, Mass.

In 1936, he was married to Eleanor G. McRae, of Helena, who survives. They have a son, Jock Finley. Other survivors include eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. Three half-brothers and two half-sisters, residing in the East, also survive.

Funeral arrangements are in charge of the W. H. George Co.

HE LEAVES HIS INDELIBLE MARK

In the waning summer of 62 years ago O. S. Warden, freshly graduated from his New England college of Dartmouth, journeyed from his home State of New Hampshire to the then territory of Montana. As he arrived in Helena the historic 1889 constitutional convention for Montana statehood was in session. Continuing to Great Falls he embarked in what was to be his whole business life, that of a working newspaper man.

When, in association with William M. Bole, he purchased the Great Falls Tribune in 1895, the Tribune's whole crew consisted of nine people, including the two owners. Throughout the years the growth of the newspaper and its related endeavors has been closely allied to the growth of this community and the Treasure State.

Throughout his many years in Great Falls he devoted constant attention and time to the advancement of his adopted community and State in many fields. His accomplishments in Montana welfare will stand as his most fitting memorial. They bear eloquent witness to an untiring zeal and an unflagging effort that bore bountiful fruit through all the years of this century.

Those who worked with him in his own business and those associated with him in wider fields can best appreciate how well he directed this course. They may now gain inspiration from his life and accomplishments, to carry on their efforts.

Use of American Troops in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from my friend, Katharine S. Eakin, superintendent of schools of Jerome County, Idaho.

As Senators will note from her letter, this fine educator is sending to me excerpts from a letter she has received from a friend of hers in France. For obvious reasons I have deleted the name of the French lady who has written to my Idaho friend her observations on our current and proposed foreign policy. I commend this letter to my colleagues for thoughtful reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEROME, IDAHO, *February 6, 1951.*

The Honorable HERMAN WELKER,
United States Senator from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WELKER: I am writing this separately as this will be a personal letter about an entirely different matter. I am writing now, concerning the sending of our boys as a land army into Central Europe, in my capacity as a citizen and a mother who lost one son in World War II and has but one remaining son, a senior at MIT, age 22 years. I agree wholeheartedly with the stand of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT that we will fulfill our obligations to our allies more successfully by using air and naval power coupled with a clear-cut and unmistakable warning that we intend to protect the territorial integrity of Central Europe with any means at our command, rather than by sending troops into Europe to be at the mercy of submarines, planes, and hordes of land soldiers, not to mention the very real danger from Communist soldiers at their sides clad in the uniforms of allies. While I have been deeply concerned over General Eisenhower's report, feeling it far too optimistic a picture of the possibility of large and loyal land forces to be raised there, I probably would not have written you about this had I not received a letter from France just while I was working on these other matters ready to write to you about them.

Before quoting from this letter, may I explain that the author is the widow of a very outstanding Evangelical minister to whom members of our church (the Presbyterian) have been sending gifts since the war. He was a chaplain in the French Army and spent a number of months in a concentration camp, where he taught many of the prisoners geology, as he had studied that in college before deciding upon the ministry. His parish in Paris is among the laboring class and, besides five children of his own, who are now in their late teens, he worked largely with French youth. While my niece and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Merwin, now of Washington, D. C., were in Paris with the United Nations they called on this family and were impressed with their intelligence and culture. The biography lately completed of him, which was sent us here, shows him to have been a man of wide knowledge and deep understanding. Although he passed away last spring, his family has remained in this same neighborhood and is in constant contact with these people. Therefore, when this letter arrived, I felt impelled to send you excerpts from it (omitting personal bits) in order that you may see how one sincere Christian woman of Paris feels concerning this situation.

Excerpts from the letter written January 30 by Mme. ———. (Please do not quote her by name, as I would not cause her any difficulty for the world.)

"We, all of them, are also very troubled by the war noises. In spite of the sayings of our statesmen, I know that there is no enthusiasm in France for another war. We suffered much, twice, for awful occupations which left us weak physically and morally. I read in statistics that the French money power in the working class and amongst industrial workmen is five times smaller than in America; our workmen are not paid enough to live properly; they are also awfully lodged (the number of our hovels is a shame for our Government)—that is why, we understand, the communism of most of them. If our Government and, first of all, the industrial employers, did sacrifices and increased sufficiently the salaries, that would be their best interest and would save France from communism. There are beautiful cases of Christian employers; but, alas, most of the employers in reality are selfish, some are black-market people who did scandalous fortunes during the war, while people hungered—that is why most of our intellectual young men are so anxious, wondering where is the truth in all the sincerity of their souls—all of them are studying social problems—all of them are condemning the church with great severity—and even if the churches are doing great efforts for comprehension and sacrifices, it seems in many ways too late, though we have many apostles.

"All this explains also the small enthusiasm of all our workers for a new war—they have suffered too much. If they fight again, I am afraid there would be first of all a civil war. Most of them would fight for a Communist government, for all of them are upset, and you know, alas, that Moscow profits by these conditions for her propaganda.

"You see how, in these conditions, the part of a pastor is simply to be an apostle, to shake the selfishness, and to help the poor—and that is complicated and how difficult."

The rest of the letter is personal, concerning some packages, etc.

Please protect her name as she has had much suffering, and I would not add one iota to her load, but I could not help but write this part of her letter to you.

Thanks for your patience. Is there any way mothers can persuade the Government to stop giving the boys beer and encouraging their use of stronger liquor while in the Armed Forces? This is a matter of deep concern to many of us. Surely there is something we can do, for it is bad enough for them to take our boys without placing about them temptations, urged on by their superior officers, which undo all that Christian homes have tried to accomplish.

Sincerely and gratefully,

KATHARINE S. EAKIN.

Equality and Equal Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "No Color Line," which appeared in the New York Times on March 4, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO COLOR LINE

President Truman restated last week his oft-expressed belief in the importance of preserving our individual liberties at the same time that we take steps to assure our national security. His words in this respect are always welcome, and will encourage all who believe in giving greater substance to the American tradition of equality and equal opportunity.

Yet it is impossible to avoid noting the disconcerting contrast between the tone of his statement and that of a commentary, made the same day, on a very vital civil-liberties question as it affects the Army in Korea. A representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, just back from a trip to the Far

The bills I am introducing today would give the Food and Drug Administration sufficient authority to require individuals who are using chemicals in the production and processing of food to furnish adequate proof that these chemicals are not harmful.

There has been a tremendous development in the field of chemistry since the war. A great many chemicals were developed during the war and are now being used. This may or may not be to the good. It may be just a step in the parade of progress. You can pick up almost any issue of a technical magazine and you will find it calling attention to certain chemicals that can be used to an advantage by the food industry.

There are a great many emulsifying agents of softeners used by the baking industry which may or may not be good for the food that gets into the blood stream. We human beings like to take a pill to relieve our ills; or vitamins, that are supposed to give us some pep. It is a trait of human nature, and we are often misled, to be interested in advertising over the radio and in the press about certain food products being better as a result of the addition of certain chemicals or vitamins. It does seem to me that there are certain loopholes in the Food and Drug Act, which ought to be plugged up in order to protect the health of the people.

Our committee will soon be proceeding with additional hearings. There is a wide field that needs to be investigated. The question of the use of hormones now being used extensively in the poultry and animal industries should be carefully considered. It is quite possible there are many evil effects of these hormones, when they get into the blood stream of the individual.

I know also that the impact upon agriculture is tremendous when we find two baking companies using some 10,000,000 pounds of softener and other substitutes which partially replace the use of eggs, milk, lard, and wheat in baking products.

I trust the committee to which these bills will be assigned will see fit to give them an early hearing. The hearings need to be extensive. These bills are of interest to all of the people who consume food.

House Cleaning Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington News:

HOUSE CLEANING NOW

Time finally came when a man who had been fired in a policy disagreement with the Truman administration was willing to tell his story (see article on p. 6). He is Dr. Alan Valentine, former Economic Stabilization Director, who was let out by President Truman on the ground that he did not move drastically enough.

Too often a man who resigns or is dismissed remains silent. He may feel a loyalty to old associates, or he may hope fortune will return him to office, or he may suspect what he has to say will impair confidence in the Government.

What Dr. Valentine has to say does impair confidence, but it was time somebody was taking the risk. He left as Stabilization Director on January 19 after having served since October 6. Yesterday, after 2 months of silence, he spoke out.

Dr. Valentine soon discovered here that he was relied upon to deliver Democratic patronage, which he wouldn't do. He told of his unpopularity with organized labor, the White House "secretariat" and the Democratic National Committee. In vivid terms he described a second government—the political organization—which functions, he said, with few scruples and little or no sense of public responsibility.

As Dr. Valentine said, only President Truman can demolish this undercover government now. When the President returns from Florida he will find this emergency waiting for him. It worsens daily in its progressive impairment of public confidence.

The people can clean up the mess eventually. But in the face of the greater international emergency the President must act at once. The decay of confidence becomes a genuine peril to the Republic.

Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have read carefully the report submitted to the President by the International Development Advisory Board, which is headed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, entitled "Partners in Progress," and I hope that all the Members of Congress will take the time to read this excellent survey.

It has to do with what is generally known as the point 4 program and by reading this document it can be readily appreciated that a very careful and exhaustive study has been made of this whole proposition. This report will provoke great discussion, not only among legislators but also among men of business, and thoughtful discussion on this subject is greatly needed so the idea may be thoroughly digested and the proposals made as practical as possible. What appeals to me as much as anything in this excellent report is the point that by helping the world help itself toward a better standard of living, the cause of peace, contentment, and appreciation of each other's neighbors' problems is promoted. If this objective can be furthered through the active interest and participation of private capital, the gospel of our American free economy will be preached throughout the world.

The report contains a recommendation in the sum of $2,000,000,000 needed for this program, and the thought of such a large amount of money in times like these makes all of us shudder, but if we really desire to promote good will on earth, we should not let the expense hinder a thorough study and exploration of this constructive plan which must be aproached on the basis that Government cannot and should not be entirely responsible for it.

The excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 14 points out one of the important conclusions of this report that "American policy must treat both tasks—defense and economic aid—as important and as interconnected." It is my opinion that that is the cornerstone of the foundation for such a program and it will take great wisdom, unselfish zeal, and tremendous nobility of character to work out the details. It is a challenge to American ingenuity, American good will, and American wisdom. The editorial follows:

DEFENSE AND DEVELOPMENT

The International Development Advisory Board appointed by President Truman last November to reappraise American policy toward the world's underdeveloped areas has finished its labors by facing up directly to our hard problem of combining a very costly and restrictive program of rearmament with one of economic aid to the many friendly countries that are poor in capital and low in living standards. The Board's most important conclusion is that American policy must treat both tasks as important and as interconnected. We must not slacken our effort to increase defensive strength. But we will not be able to advance toward a world that is secure and mutually respecting unless we support now the efforts of underdeveloped countries to overcome the bitter handicap of a late and slow start toward economic self reliance. The danger these countries now face "is that in the pressures of mobilization their need may be forgotten."

Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, whose work in this field has been outstanding, and the other members of his widely representative Board will help us not to forget. Their report amounts to a definition of issues on which important policy decisions ought to be made. Its nature is more that of an agenda, indeed, than of an articulated program such as Congress might consider in one piece of legislation. Congress may very well wish to take up individually many of the major recommendations of the Rockefeller Board. Some of them cannot be implemented without international negotiation and agreements of treaty status. So long as this is all understood, there is little danger that the report will provoke hasty judgment here or raise false hopes abroad.

But deliberate judgment and separate consideration must not be used as excuses for inaction. The Board is perfectly correct in warning that we have underestimated the importance of development aid. The group's recommendations that the forms of aid (investment, loan or grant) should be tailored to the special economic and strategic nature of development projects deserves extended application. Logic supports its call for a unification of American agencies dealing in development work. This emphasis on our need to place major financial reliance on increasing the flow of private investment could appropriately be given expression in revisions in our tax laws. Surely none of its recommendations deserves more early attention than the proposal that the needs of other countries for essential materials and equipment be considered in a systematic, organized way.

from the present 15 cents to 50 cents per gallon on table wines.

On a tonnage basis, the proposal would increase the present $24 per ton tax on table wine grapes to $80; and the present $48 tax on grapes for dessert wine to $120 per ton.

Percentagewise, this tax proposal reflects increases of 150 percent and 233⅓ percent, respectively.

Placed in the unfortunate position of being taxed out of business, are the 26,000 grape-growing farm families in California. Of 506,000 acres planted to vineyards, 167,000 acres are planted to varieties of grapes for which the only commercial outlet is wine products.

It takes 5 years to bring a grape vineyard into production and the supply cannot be adjusted to demand, except on a long-term basis. Since the end of World War II, the grape and wine industries have been in a depressed condition.

In normal years of production many varieties of grapes are readily sold for eating purposes in the fresh state and a great quantity are dried and processed for raisins. Culls also find a ready use in the production of brandy.

In 1946 withdrawal of the Government from its fruit-buying program, coupled with an extremely heavy crop, resulted in more grapes going into wine than the market could absorb. During 1947–49 this oversupply of grapes and wine depressed grower returns, they getting $29 per ton, or about 60 percent of parity. Similarly depressed were returns to vintners during those same years. The Bureau of Internal Revenue excess-profits tax listings of depressed industries classifies wine making as the only food or food-products industry that was depressed during that approximate period.

By 1950 supply and demand had been brought more into line, but only as the result of nearly 4 years of moving wine in volume at ruinously low returns to grape growers and vintners. The 1950 crop returned $61 per ton, which is still below parity, bringing the 1947–50 average returns to $37 per ton.

Tax rates become a fixed charge on the operation of converting grapes to wine and moving them to market. This is no time to change the historic tax basis for wine, it being the least stable of agricultural food products.

The wine industry must undergo further development if the grape industry is to move its surplus crops and survive. It is manifestly impossible for the wineries to carry this new load in regard to overhead and still maintain the customary returns to growers.

In order to do so, the retail price of wine would, of necessity, have to be increased to such a level that it would destroy the retail outlet. Eighty percent of the wine-consuming public are in the low- and middle-income brackets.

This proposed tax increase would make of wine a luxury product instead of keeping it on the present level or near there. Wine is a product for temperate drinking, considered more as a food necessary and common to the everyday diet of the great majority of those who consume it.

By placing the wine products out of the reach of these people, through the imposition of higher retail prices which would be necessary to meet tax demands, the grape growers would be forced into the unfortunate position of being without their outlet.

By taxing wine at this proposed high rate, families who have invested their funds and years of hard work into productive vineyards would find themselves divested of their livelihood.

As a further indication of the harmful effect this excessive tax would have upon the economy of California is the fact that in 1950 grapes had a farm value of $156,772,000. This is more than twice as large as that of the second ranking crop, oranges, which were valued at $74,585,000.

There are 383 wineries in California, dependent upon the grape growers and their ability and incentive to supply the necessary grape varieties.

Capital investment in vineyards and winery property total $500,000,000—a major factor in keeping our economy on a sound basis.

By hindering this huge industry through the medium of overtaxation, the Federal Government stands to lose revenue, rather than gaining. On a Federal basis, the industry now pays taxes at the rate of $61,600,000 annually.

It has been admitted that the imposition of this increased excise tax on wine would cut consumption by 20,000,000 gallons, which represents approximately 16 percent of all wine consumed in the country. That figure in itself represents considerable loss in revenue and it is not out of reason to assume the consumption would decline even further.

As a whole, the grape growers and the wine industry are willing to carry their fair share of the tax load. But they are protesting the Treasury Department's proposal as being ruinous, discriminatory, and completely unjustifiable. Under the present law any citizen can make and have 200 gallons of wine per year for personal use which is nontaxable. Should the proposed unreasonable tax be levied I am fearful that the practice which prevailed during prohibition days will be resorted to and open the possibility of law violations. Grape growing is not strictly a California industry but is common to most States of the Union to a more or less degree.

California's grape industry is making a very determined effort to aid itself through marketing agreements and other self-help, industry-wide devices. It is very probable that imposition of an excessive tax burden would counteract the results obtained thus far.

Being unable to meet and carry the added financial burden this tax would impose, many small businesses would be forced to curtail operations. In California, as in wine-producing sections of the United States, the great majority of vineyards are of the small farm type and most of the wineries are family operations. They would be forced out of existence by the larger concerns with financial backing in sufficient amount to carry the added burden.

Normal consumption of wine is the only way that a sound grape industry can exist. Strangle this outlet and marketing of all varieties of grapes will be damaged, leading to bankruptcy for many.

In addition to the farm families directly dependent upon a stable outlet, there are approximately 200,000 persons engaged in businesses connected with supplying the needs of the grape industry. These include such enterprises as the manufacture of crates, bottles, corks; reproduction of labels by the printing and lithography trades. Any action to curtail normal function of this segment of our agricultural economy would lead into larger problems centering around surpluses, unstable markets, and unemployment.

Being familiar with the problems of grape growers and the wine industry it is my firm belief that if enacted as currently proposed this overexcessive tax recommendation would cause irreparable harm to befall not only those immediately connected with the industry, but would adversely affect areas in which grapes are grown and would be particularly injurious to the agricultural economy as a whole.

Use of Chemicals in Food and Soap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing four bills dealing with several phases of the use of chemicals in food and soap.

I would call your attention to the fact that at present the Food and Drug Administration lacks the proper authority to bring in and question, under oath, individuals or corporations using these chemicals, particularly in the production and processing of food. I am a little scared at the harm that may come to the health of the people because some of these individuals, even though they are good men, after but a few experiments, recommend that certain chemicals be introduced into food that is widely consumed.

I would call your attention further to the fact that there are nearly 842 chemicals knocking at the door of the food industry, demanding a place at the table of the consumer. Of these nearly 428 chemicals are now being used in some part of the production, processing, and handling of food. It is my understanding there are about 70 chemicals, presently being used, which have not had sufficient analysis or experimental work, to determine their effect upon a human being.

The hearings before the Select Committee on Chemicals in Food Production, have produced a great deal of evidence that a few chemicals used in food have recently been found to be harmful to the human being and, in most cases, their use has been discontinued. There are other chemicals whose effect upon the human being, has not been entirely established.

St. Lawrence Seaway Is Not a War Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, what we need now is money for our national defense and not heavy expenditures for boondoggling projects such as the St. Lawrence seaway. We won World War I without the St. Lawrence seaway, and likewise World War II, and we can come out of this present emergency in a more solvent manner if we spend our money only for those projects that are vital to our national defense.

The editor of the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, in an editorial in the December 17, 1950, issue, said as follows:

SEAWAY NOT A WAR EMERGENCY

The war outlook and the enormous cost involved, stupendous as these reasons are, do not seem to have slowed up the St. Lawrence waterway proponents. They have come forth with new impetus to urge it as a secure route by which to bring in millions of tons of iron ore from Labrador and Quebec fields.

Regardless of what might be the ultimate usefulness of the proposed seaway, nobody can defend it successfully as an emergency war measure. It is not a must on any present item of war preparedness. In fact it could not possibly be placed in use before many years.

We need things now, in our defense program, not something we might get 5 or 10 years later.

We have only vague guesses at present as to the waterway's cost. A recent estimate of $1,200,000,000 for a 35-foot channel adaptable to modern shipping is based on most favorable conditions. Engineers have no adequate data on how much of the dredging for channels and locks would be through rock and what it would cost. The seaway project, at least, can wait its turn on our national agenda.

American Peace Crusade Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of a radio broadcast by Mr. Earl Godwin, made over the facilities of NBC on March 14:

The meanest and bitterest fake now being foisted upon so many millions of people in this whole world shapes up here as the American peace crusade. It is a shame to have to expose a peace movement as a fake and a booby trap into which we might fall. But declare peace on Communist terms and we would find out that we have been disarmed by a nation of cruel bandits who would attack us, ravish us and our country and America would be blacked out into slavery just as Czechoslovakia was and Poland too. That is difficult for us to realize, we who have been so honest and aboveboard about peace, we who have been the only Nation to put forward a practical plan for the reduction of arms and armaments, we who stuck to our program of reducing arms expenditures and were left dangerously far behind by other nations who always promised and laughed at us.

Now comes this American peace crusade which will flood Washington this week with a sugar-flavored poison. I think a striking example of what Americans should do is in the news today of how Representative MORANO of Greenwich, Conn., has rebuffed a group of his own constituents who wanted to see him and probably grease him up with their fake peace ointment.

Dr. Jerome Davis, of West Haven, Conn., had asked to lead in a group of these constituents tomorrow. MORANO said, "Nothing doing," and he pinned Jerome Davis down under the strong light of scrutiny in a reply which is now a part of the records of Congress.

"You, Mr. Davis, have been cited personally by the House Un-American Activities Committee as belonging to from 41 to 50 Communist-front organizations. Your American peace crusade has been cited as 'an organic part of the Communist peace offensive' and once again as 'organized by Communists.' Until such time that I am convinced your aims are constant with the best interests of the Nation, I must refuse to meet with you or any of your group."

The man Jerome Davis is the author of a recent book called Character Assassination in which he painted in brilliant colors the one-time Commerce Department official, William Remington, who was booted out by a loyalty board, then restored by a higher board. That is where Jerome Davis came in with the sob-sister stuff about how someone is always picking on men of a liberal mind.

The book had not been out more than a few days when this same Remington was convicted in New York for perjury in that he had sworn falsely as to his Red connections.

The phony peace crusade is all set for as much of a gigantic swoosh as possible throughout Washington tomorrow. It is time to bring out every possible expression to show that this harbinger of peace is a butcher bird in dove's clothing.

Girding for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, this excellent article written by Mr. Hickerson reveals the great contribution of Texas to the national defense effort:

GIRDING FOR DEFENSE—TEXAS SUPPLIES MORE GAS, OIL, RUBBER, AND PLANES FOR DEFENSE

(By Clayton Hickerson)

DALLAS, March 15.—The mobilization program has Texas humping, with three things most noticeable:

1. More oil, gas, and synthetic rubber are being drawn out of the fabulously rich soil.

2. A growing stream of military planes—from small liaison craft and the world's fastest jets to the giant strategic bomber, the famed B–36—is coming from Texas manufacturing plants.

3. Air Force bases are being reactivated wholesale, to turn out more trained warriors and technicians.

EMPLOYMENT AT ALL-TIME HIGH

With the employment index in Texas at an all-time high, much of the defense employment data is restricted.

But some examples are enlightening.

About 50,000 Texans are engaged in aircraft production in the Dallas-Fort Worth area alone. More than half of these are in the cavernous Consolidated Vultee plant at Forth Worth working on stepped-up B–36 bomber orders.

Two companies at Houston are building small arms. Another is building heavy artillery. Other Houston area firms opened up new tank assembly and repair shops.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS

Almost everything in the air line is being built within a 40-mile circle that includes Dallas, Fort Worth, and suburban Garland.

The Federal Government reactivated synthetic rubber plants along the Texas Gulf coast, and also encouraged farmers to plant guayule—a strange plant from which natural rubber can be processed.

Reynolds Aluminum Co. announced plans to build one of the greatest aluminum plants in the Nation near Corpus Christi. It will cost at least $80,000,000. Three or four nearby towns will have great reduction plants.

Plans for Texas' second fully integrated steel processing plant were announced by Lone Star Steel Co., which will erect it at Daingerfield in east Texas. Sheffield's plant at Houston is so far Texas' only plant which produces plate steel from raw ore.

THOUSANDS RECRUITED

Heavy chemical industries recruited several thousand new workers at Beaumont and Port Arthur. Red River ordnance plant at Texarkana added several thousand in its stepped-up ammunition production program.

Texas' great oil industry is putting heavy emphasis on high-octane aviation gasoline.

When World War II started, Texas refinery capacity was 4,956,599 barrels daily. Daily crude runs now are hitting a record of 6,600,000 barrels, compared to 5,000,000 a year ago. Refinery capacities reached a record 6,732,200 barrels daily last year, and oilmen expect to add 100,000 in 1951.

Oil production is barely holding its own at 2,800,000 barrels daily in Texas. But the industry expects the Texas Railroad Commission—which regulates the industry—to allow greater production.

REFINERIES EXPANSIONS PLANNED

Of the many refinery expansions being planned, those announced include Gulf Oil's multi-million-dollar ethylene gas plant at Port Arthur. Ethylene is used in making synthetic rubber and plastics.

Magnolia Petroleum Co., a Standard affiliate, has completed two cracking units to speed up the output of higher-valued chemicals essential to aviation fuel. Continental Oil Co. plans a $10,000,000 catalytic cracking plant (modern refinery) at nearby Lake Charles, La.

West Texas is in on the mobilization efforts as well as the industrial coast and Dallas-Fort Worth areas.

AEC MYSTERY PROJECT

On a 4,000-acre tract east of Amarillo, the Atomic Energy Commission has a mystery project. AEC has been noncommunicative about what is going on except to say it does not involve radioactive materials. The site is 17 miles from Amarillo and was Pantex Ordnance Plant in World War II. About 1,000 persons will work there.

To the south, the Midland-Odessa area has at least one order for 100,000,000 gallons of high-octane aviation gasoline.

Biggest military center is San Antonio, site of Lackland Air Force Base, Fort Sam Houston, and Randolph Air Force Base.

Lackland—where reports of overcrowding and lack of facilities for Air Force recruits drew a senatorial investigation—is handling one of the greatest floods of manpower in Air Force history. Randolph AFB, assigned a new $30,000,000 aeromedical center, will be the top military medical center in the world, according to Representative KILDAY, Democrat, of Texas.

The Air Force wants more than $50,000,000 for work at Amarillo Air Force Base. Sheppard Air Force Base at Wichita Falls is bulging with Air Force recuits rerouted there from San Antonio. Carswell Air Force Base at Fort Worth—home of the B-36—will get new space for its superbomber fleet at a cost of more than $2,000,000.

New barracks will go up at Fort Hood in central Texas. Fort Bliss in far west Texas is assigned a guided-missile center and an antiaircraft firing center. Camp Wolters at Mineral Wells is being reactivated as a training site for Air Force construction engineers.

American Enterprise Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Members of the House received an offer from an organization calling itself the American Enterprise Association, in which such organization offered its services in the digesting of legislation introduced in the Congress. Of course, Congress needs all the information on such matters as it can receive. Helpful organizations with sincere motives are to be complimented in their willingness to give aid.

However, Members of the Congress should be fully advised as to the background and interests of individuals promoting such programs. Accordingly, in order to make available to the Members of Congress such background material on the membership of the American Enterprise Association, I am having the following inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The list of officers has been taken from the stationery used by the Enterprise Association:

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 5, 1951.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
The House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: This is to advise you and your staff that the American Enterprise Association has reopened its Washington office and has resumed the services heretofore made available to, and utilized by, Members of Congress.

The offices of the association are located at 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. The telephone number of the association is Executive 8205.

The American Enterprise Association will continue to offer to Members of Congress, without charge, its bill analyses of important legislative proposals before the Congress for consideration. The bills which will be analyzed are those which the staff of the association select as most likely to be actively considered by the Congress, as indicated by current public announcements, and by the advice of the leadership and the chairman of the various committees of the Congress.

If you desire these bill analyses, or an analysis of any particular bill of special interest to you not included in our general bill analyses series, the association, within the limits of its staff facilities, will be glad upon request to make an analysis of a special bill for you.

Each bill analysis contains a synopsis, which on quick reading will give the substance of the content of the bill, a detailed analysis of the bill, section by section, and the legislative history of the bill.

The association will also make available upon specific request an interrogatory containing questions, the answers to which it is believed will bring out the fundamental issues and problems involved in the bill.

In addition to the bill analyses, the association also issues, from time to time, on general questions deemed to be of special public interest, studies prepared under the direction of its advisory board. In each instance a recognized and specialized expert in the academic or economic field is carefully selected to prepare the study. These studies are the independent works and opinions of the experts selected, and are available to you upon request.

The association also supplies Members with a spot research service, and on request, prepares for them summaries, digests, and compilations of factual and authoritative data on various subjects of current legislative interest or on any specially requested subject.

In charge of staff and research activities is Dr. Felix E. Sklagen, former Acting Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives, and assistant to the association's first Washington representative, Mr. J. Frederick Richardson.

Mr. James O'Connor Roberts has again been retained as special counsel for the association. His offices are in the Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; telephone, Executive 4822.

We are advising all Members of Congress of this resumption of our service, and of its availability to them. If, therefore, you desire to receive this service, please advise the association, addressing your communication to the association at its Washington office, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Thanking you, I am
Sincerely yours,

N. BAXTER JACKSON.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATION, INC.

CHAIRMAN

Lewis H. Brown, New York City, N. Y., chairman of the board, member executive committee and director, Johns-Manville Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Sales Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville International Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Canadian Johns-Manville Corp.; director, Asbestos & Danville Railway; director, Pacific Southwestern Railroad; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Products Corp.; director, Johns-Manville Boley, Ltd.; director, Johns-Manville Co. of Cuba; director, Johns-Manville Service Corp.; director, Asbestos Wood Co.; director, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; director, Johns-Manville Co., Ltd.; chairman of the board and director, Southern Johns-Manville Products Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Products Corp. of Massachusetts; chairman of the board and director, Johns-Manville Products Corp. of Pennsylvania; trustee and chairman of the executive committee, Tax Foundation, Inc.; director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Christopher J. Abbott, Hyannis, Nebr., cattleman and banker, president, Guardian State Bank of Alliance, Nebr.; president, Bank of Chadron, Nebr.; president, Farmers' State Bank of Winner, S. Dak.; president, Bank of Hyannis, Nebr.; president, Abbott Co.; president, Stanspie-Engel Co.; director, Northwest Bell Telephone Co.; former director and president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

John J. Hopkins, Washington, D. C., president and director, Electric Boat Co.; chairman of the board and director, Canadair, Ltd., of Montreal, Canada; director, Tide Water Associated Oil Co., New York City, N. Y.; director, Delarge Oil Co., Houston, Tex.; director, Lincoln Service Corp., Washington, D. C.; director, Dealers Credit, Ltd., Washington, D. C.; director, Manufacturers Credit Corp., Washington, D. C.

Robert L. Lund, St. Louis, Mo., industrialist, former official of the International Shoe Co.; founder and president of the Lund-Williams Co.; director, Lambert Pharmaceuticals Co.; director, St. Louis Lambert Pharmaceuticals Co.; director, Majestic Manufacturing Co.; past president, National Association of Manufacturers.

Fred A. Poor, Chicago, Ill., chairman of the board and director, Poor & Co.; chairman of the board and director, Rail Joint Reforming Co.; chairman of the board and director, Peerless Equipment Co.; chairman of the board and director, Kensington Steel Co.; director, Combustion Engineering Co., Inc.; director, J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis.

TREASURER

N. Baxter Jackson, New York City, N. Y., chairman of the board and director, Chemical Bank & Trust Co., New York; director, Chemical Safe Deposit Co.; director, North Star Insurance Co.; director, General Reinsurance Corp.; director, McCrory Stores Corp.; director, Home Life Insurance Co.; director, American Chicle Co.; director, United Stores Corp.; director, French-American Banking Corp.

TRUSTEES

C. J. Abbott, Hyannis, Nebr. (see vice presidents, above).

Henry P. Bristol, New York, N. Y., president and director, Bristol-Myers Co.; trustee, East River Savings Bank; trustee, Hamilton College; director, Irving Trust Co., New York City; director, Atlas Underwear Co.; chairman of the board and director, Bristol Laboratories; chairman of the board and director, Sun Tube Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Rubberset Co.

Lewis H. Brown, New York City, N. Y. (see chairman, above).

Fuller E. Callaway, Jr., La Grange, Ga.; president and trustee, Fuller E. Callaway Foundation; director, Cotton Textile Institute; director, American Cotton Manufacturers Association; trustee, Institute of Textile Technology; director, Cotton Manufacturers Association of Georgia; director, Georgia Hereford Association; trustee, Callaway Community Foundation; trustee, Georgia Tech Alumni Association; trustee, Callaway Education Association; trustee, Georgia Tech Research Institute.

Paul S. Clapp, New York, N. Y., former vice president, Columbia Gas & Electric Corp.; vice president, Ohio Fuel Gas Co.; vice president, Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.; vice president, Columbia Engineering Corp.; member, National Association of Manufacturers, member, Edison Electric Institute.

J. D. Stetson Coleman, Delray Beach, Fla.

John S. Coleman, Birmingham, Ala., president and director, Birmingham Trust National Bank; director, Alabama Great Southern Railroad; director, United States Cast Iron Pipe Co.; director, Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co.

Carl P. Dennett, Boston, Mass., president and director, Capital Managers, Inc.; director, Griffin Wheel Co.; director and member executive committee, First National Bank of Boston; director and member finance committee, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.; director, Florence Stove Co.; director, United-Carr Fastener Corp.; director, New

York Central Railroad System; director and member, Industrial Advisory Committee, Federal Reserve Bank (First Federal Reserve District).

Raoul E. Desvernine, Washington, D. C., partner, Pruitt, Desvernine & Coursen law firm; director and member executive committee, Washington Lawyers Trust Co.; director, Samson United Corp.; director, Doyle Manufacturing Corp.; former president, Crucible Steel Co.

Thomas Drever, Chicago, Ill., president and director, American Steel Foundries; chairman of the board and director, Griffin Wheel Co.; director, Griffin Engineering Co.; member executive committee and governing board, Railway Business Association; director, Harris Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill.; member executive committee and director, Institute of Gas Technology; chairman finance committee and trustee, Illinois Institute of Technology; director, Armour Research Foundation; member of governing body, National Industrial Conference Board, Inc.; director, Miehle Printing Press & Manufacturing Co., Chicago.

Alfred C. Fuller, Hartford, Conn., chairman of the board and director, Fuller Brush Co.

W. Harnischfeger, Milwaukee, Wis., president and director, Harnischfeger Corp.

Richard Harte, Parkersburg, W. Va., president and director, Ames Baldwin Wyoming Co.; director, Chicago, Wilmington & Franklin Coal Co.; director, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; trustee, Marietta College.

John B. Hollister, Cincinnati, Ohio, partner, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister; member executive committee and director, New York Life Insurance Co.; vice president and director, Little Miami Railroad; director, Stearns & Foster Co.; director, Lima Hamilton Corp.; director, Fifth-Third Union Trust Co.; director, Sandusky Foundry & Machine Co.; director, Virginia Hot Springs Co.; director, Charleston Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.; director, Cincinnati Equitable Insurance Co.; director, Standard Brands, Inc.; director, Union Iron & Steel Co.; director, Chatfield & Woods Co.; director, Cincinnati Realty Corp.; director, Hamilton Corp.; director, Tri-State Ignition Corp.; vice president and director, Covington-Cincinnati Bridge Co.; member executive committee and director, William Powell Co.

Charles R. Hook, Middletown, Ohio, chairman of the board, Armco Steel, Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Armco International Corp.; member of advisory board, National Industrial Conference Board; member executive committee and director, American Iron & Steel Institute; member executive committee and director, National Association of Manufacturers; director, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; director, Equitable Life Assurance Society; director, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis, Louisville & Jeffersonville Bridge and Railroad.

John J. Hopkins, Washington, D. C. (see vice presidents, above).

B. E. Hutchinson, Detroit, Mich., vice president, chairman of finance committee and director of the Chrysler Corp.; director, National Bank of Detroit.

N. Baxter Jackson, New York City, N. Y. (see treasurer, above).

Oswald W. Knauth, New York City, N. Y., director, National Bureau of Economic Research; trustee, Twentieth Century Fund.

Edward H. Little, Jersey City, N. J., president, chairman executive committee and director, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.

Robert L. Lund, St. Louis, Mo. (see vice president, above).

Hughston M. McBain, Chicago, Ill., president and director, Marshall Field & Co.; president and director, Marshall Field & Co. of New Jersey; director, First National Bank of Chicago; director, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.; trustee, Frederick & Nelson, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

Walter S. McLucas, Detroit, Mich., director, Interstate Securities, Kansas City, Mo.; director, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., Detroit, Mich.; director, Standard Accident Insurance Co.; director, Planet Insurance Co., of Detroit; director, National Cement Co., Birmingham, Ala.; director, Safe Deposit Co. of Detroit; director, Whittier Corp., Detroit; director, Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co.; director, Detroit Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; director, Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit; director, Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad; director, Bendix Aviation Corp.

Harry S. Middendorf, Boston, Mass., with Wood Struthers & Co., Boston; secretary treasurer and director, Insuranshares Certificates, Inc.

Nicholas H. Noyes, Indianapolis, Ind., chairman finance committee and director, Eli Lilly & Co.; director, Paper Package Co.; director, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago; director, Indiana Bell Telephone Co.; member executive committee, American Drug Manufacturers Association; member, Business Advisory Council, United States Department of Commerce.

Fred A. Poor, Chicago, Ill. (see vice presidents, above).

Louis Ruthenburg, Evansville, Ind., president and director, Servel, Inc.

Henry D. Sharpe, Providence, R. I., president and director, Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co.; president and director, Puritan Life Insurance Co.; director, Providence Gas Co.; director, Rhode Island Trust Co.; director, Rhode Island Hospital National Bank; director, New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; director, Providence Journal; trustee, Rhode Island School of Design; trustee and chancellor, Brown University; trustee, Providence Institution for Savings.

Wilfred Sykes, Chicago, Ill., president and director, Inland Steel Co.; chairman of the board and director, Inland Steel Products Co.; chairman of the board and director, Inland Steel Container Co.; director, Joseph T. Ryerson & Son, Inc.; director, Inland Lime and Stone Co.; director, Pullman Co.; president and director, Indiana Harbor Homes Co.

Sinclair Weeks, Boston, Mass., chairman of the board, Reed & Barton Corp.; chairman of the board, United-Carr Fastener Corp.; director, First National Bank of Boston; director, West Point Manufacturing Co. of Boston; director, Rand Avery-Gordon Taylor Inc., Boston; director, Pacific Mills, Boston; director, Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston; director, National Association of Manufacturers, New York City; director, Atlas Plywood Co.; director, Pullman Co.; trustee, Wentworth Institute, Boston.

Ernest T. Weir, Pittsburgh, Pa., chairman of the board, member executive committee and director, National Steel Corp.; chairman of the board and director, Weirton Steel Co.; chairman of the board and director, Hanna Furnace Corp., New York; chairman of the board and director, National Steel Products Co.; chairman of the board, president and director, Midwest Steel Corp.; president and director, Bank of Weirton; president and director, Peoples Bank of Hollidays Cove, W. Va.; director, Weirton Steel Co.; director, Edgewater Steel Co.; director, Great Lakes Steel Corp.; director, Hanna Iron Ore Co.; director, Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railroad; director, Fidelity Trust Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers; director, Weirton Improvement Co.; director, Oak Hill Supply Co.; director, Maurice & Laura Falk Foundation; director, American Iron and Steel Institute.

Charles M. White, Cleveland, Ohio, president and director, Republic Steel Corp.; president and director, Truscon Steel Co., Youngtown, Ohio; president and director, Union Drawn Steel Co., Ltd.; director, Fretz-Moon Tube Co., Inc., Butler, Pa.; director, James Manufacturing Co., Fort Atkinson, Wis.; director, Lake Champlain & Mariah Railroad, Cleveland; director, American Iron and Steel Institute; president and director, Republic Collieries Co., Cleveland; president and director, Susquehanna Ore Co., Cleveland.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Paul H. Perreten.

"It Is Reported That Mr. Stalin Said, 'If the Peoples Were to Learn the Truth, There Would Be No New World War'—I Certainly Agree With That Statement"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, brings another battle report from Washington to the people of these United States.

Battle Report, Washington, the teledocumentary sent out over the air on the coaxial cables of the National Broadcasting Co., every Sunday afternoon, is now becoming one of the most popular and best known of all televised news programs. I, myself, never fail to tune in on channel four to hear it through to its conclusion without realizing that it is, as its name implies, a true report with respect to the most important incidents happening on the Washington front as of that time—from the Federal Government to the citizen taxpayers of this Nation.

Last Sunday, Dr. John R. Steelman brought to the microphone Mr. Homer M. Byington, Director of the Office of European Affairs of the State Department; Brig. Gen. Donald M. Yates, Director of Research and Development of the United States Air Force; Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Deputy Chief of Staff to the Commander of the United States Naval Forces in the Far East, and Mr. Michael DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization.

Unlike the bombastic ravings done by Soviet officials—

Dr. Steelman said, in his opening statement—

these men will bring you the simple facts. It is fitting and proper and the way of freemen who live under a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, it was certainly heartening to hear Mr. Byington tell of the decline of Communist strength in Western Europe—and only today I read of the sabotage of the electric light plant in Peking—carried out in China by the anti-Communists in that communistic stronghold and capital. Certainly, Europe is witnessing an economic, but a moral, recovery of remarkable proportions—directly due to the fundamental aid and assistance afforded them by the Marshall plan.

Nevertheless, now with spring, comes the traditional rumblings of war talk from out of the Balkans—Marshall Tito

has already told of the hordes of Russian Communist soldiers and other troop movements that are seemingly directed toward Yugoslavia—and so, despite all that has been done, the world still moves toward global warfare.

Our own defenses, viewed in the light of the facts, reported by Brigadier General Yates of the United States Air Force, are particularly heartening. He told of a still newer type of aircraft—the United States Air Force B–52—announced last week by Secretary Finletter—which will provide our country with a strategic weapon of even greater capability and performance than the B–36, or any other plane now in existence. Only last week, Dr. Vannevar Bush stated it to be his opinion that the A-bomb and the ability of our Air Force to deliver it was the sole deterrent that kept the Red army from rolling at the time the Air Force started and successfully carried on the Berlin lift.

The United States Navy has no officer more distinguished, nor one with a more enviable record, than the Deputy Chief of Staff to the Commander of the United States Naval Forces in the Far East—Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke—31-knot Burke. Admiral Burke's word picture of the contribution which our Navy is making in the Far East to the Korean war was certainly a first-hand report to the people. His dramatic portrayal of naval action in Korean waters constitute one of the most dramatic highlights so far achieved on Battle Report, Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly do wish that every Member of this House would take time out to read the wonderfully clear and concise statement made by the Nation's Price Stabilizer. I know of no man under heaven that could have undertaken a more difficult task than that of pleasing every segment of this Nation's economy in his efforts to ward off or even control price inflation, than the Honorable Michael DiSalle, one of the Nation's finest public officials.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this—if for no reason other than to make it possible for my colleagues to read of the objectives sought and of the problems confronting our price stabilization activities as expressed by the Price Stabilizer himself, the Honorable Michael DiSalle, I ask the unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include in the RECORD of proceedings the twenty-eighth Battle Report, Washington.

This telecast reads as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK. As the attention of this peace-loving Nation is forced by world events upon Operation Killer across the Pacific, NBC television once again brings its cameras into focus on the Nation's Capital for another "Operation Battle Report."

Washington, where the will to see this battle through is now fast being matched by the armament with which to do it, and Korea, where news comes that our arms are helping our troops to write new successes in the mud and mountains above Hoengsong.

Today, Battle Report's cameras greet a top official of our State Department—an Air Force general, a Navy admiral—and the Nation's Price Stabilizer. All this so that you may be better informed on the struggle for freedom, not only on the battle front, but elsewhere throughout the world, and here at home. But first, the man who this week helped bring peace to the Nation's railroads. The assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. This afternoon, I want to announce publicly that I agree wholeheartedly with one of the statements Premier Stalin made in his recent interview with representatives of Pravda. It has been reported that Mr. Stalin said, I quote, "If the peoples were to learn the truth, there would be no new world war."

I certainly agree with that statement. Furthermore, practically everyone in the free world also agrees with it.

Unfortunately, however, there are many millions of persons who are not permitted to learn the truth. They are imprisoned behind the iron curtain. They are spied upon by ruthless secret police. They jeopardize their very lives if they listen to a broadcast or read a newspaper which has not been approved by the tyrants in the Kremlin. And, what sort of information do they get from their own radio stations and newspapers? Men of the free world are called criminal imperialists; we are pictured as warmongers who are planning the destruction of our fellow men, particularly those in the Soviet Union, our people are described as wretched slaves, half-starved, poorly clothed, and scourged by the lash of money-mad tyrants. Day in and day out the cowardly propaganda pours forth, teaching hatred, preying upon every human weakness, and filling the minds of men with falsehoods. Yet, Mr. Stalin is right. If the Russian people were told the truth, there would be no new world war. They would soon learn that the truth shall make them free and there is nothing a tyrant fears more than freemen.

This afternoon, we have four distinguished visitors. First, we will hear from Mr. Homer M. Byington, Director, Office of European Affairs of the Department of State. He has some encouraging news for us from Western Europe, which has just been received. Brig. Gen. Donald N. Yates, of Research and Development for the Air Force, will tell us of the progress being made in building the greatest air defense in the world. Rear Adm. Arleigh A. Burke is known to most of you as 31-knot Burke. He has just returned from the Pacific and will bring us up to date on the Navy's activities in the waters around Korea. Our fourth guest has one of the most difficult jobs in Washington. He is Mr. Michael DiSalle, Director of Office of Price Stabilization. During the past week, Mr. DiSalle has issued some very important orders and he is here to tell us what they mean to us, the consumers.

Unlike the bombastic ravings done by Soviet officials, these men will bring you the simple facts. It is fitting and proper—and the way of freemen who live under a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Continuing the UN offensive that began Wednesday, United States troops on the central front pursue the enemy beyond strategic Hoengsong and run into fierce resistance. On the flanks—the Ninth Corps in the west and the Tenth in the east—more up under fire to keep the UN line straight. The Reds we fight are not all in Korea, however. Throughout Europe in the past months—marching, demonstrating, rioting—they, like the puppets, have been acting up every time Moscow pulled the strings. These scenes are from the rehearsed spontaneous demonstrations that greeted General Eisenhower's survey of Western Europe's strength. But, much like a barking dog, it's beginning to look as if the noise they make is far out of proportion to their bite. And here to testify on that score is the State Department's Director of the Office of European Affairs, Homer M. Byington.

Mr. BYINGTON. Communist strength in Western Europe is declining. I am only able to give you estimates. These are the figures, and they speak for themselves: Belgium, 1946, 100,000—today, 35,000; Denmark, 37 percent of 1946; France, down 30 percent; Western Germany, down 34 percent; Austria, down 34 percent; Italy, the Communists admit a loss of 200,000. A reliable estimate places their loss at over half a million. Defections from the Italian Communist Party are now in the headlines; Luxemburg, down 84 percent; Netherlands, 1946, 50,000—now 33,000; Norway, down 65 percent; Sweden, down 45 percent; United Kingdom, in 1946, only 60,000 members—today, 40,000.

The followers of Stalin are losing ground despite the glitter of their false promises, strong-arm tactics, threats, and pressures of all kinds.

We are witnessing an economic and moral recovery in Western Europe of remarkable proportions. In 1945, international communism seemed ready to take over. Today, we find that the living conditions of the people have greatly improved and that democratic government, where it was once weak, has been strengthened. This is proof of the moral fiber and intelligence of these peoples and their leaders. It justifies our confidence that in the next 5 years the picture will be correspondingly better than it is today.

The part of the American people in this recovery is fundamental. With the aid of the Marshall plan, Western Europe has rebuilt its industry, made its railroads run again, and resumed its important role in the world economy.

We are now joined with them in a great military effort to confront the threat of Communist aggression. Only by achieving united moral and military strength can we hope to prevent aggression and ensure an enduring peace. Korea has shown that small free nations are no longer to be devoured one by one and that aggression does not and will not pay.

International Communists are using every propaganda trick in the book to undermine the free nations. At the same time, they hold out a completely false exaggerated picture of their own aims and way of life. The Department of State has undertaken to counter these lies with a campaign of truth through the Voice of America, overseas press, films, and libraries. Between the United States and these free nations, there is a continuing exchange of teachers, students, leaders of labor, industry, and government. These activities are a very important part of American foreign policy.

The encouraging report I bring you today is a tribute to the peoples of Western Europe who, although directly in the path of Communist aggression, nevertheless are growing stronger and better able to resist the Communist danger. It is also a tribute to you, the American people, who through the Marshall plan and North Atlantic Treaty, have had the courage and foresight to undertake the responsibility of leadership in preserving the free world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Strafing, rocketing, and dropping their napalm bombs, United States jet planes swarmed over northwest Korea this week end, smashing at enemy supplies moving forward toward the front. All along the battle line they lent close air support to our ground troops, and tangled with Russian MIG's whenever the opportunity presented itself. And they have made the Reds very wary of the famous "Tiny Tim" rockets, which they have learned to use with deadly accuracy. But Tiny Tim is less than a baby brother to this giant rocket, ready for its test somewhere in the Nation. As it zooms into the air with its promise of greater American might to meet any future challenge to our security, Battle Report turns its cameras on the Director of Research and Development for the Air Force. His subject, The Development of New Air Power. His name, Brig. Gen. Donald N. Yates.

Brigadier General YATES. Plans to authorize production of a new aircraft, the B–52, were announced last week by the Secretary

graph of anything is to take the photograph of the things that you have before you. So we picked February 24 in order to get a picture of those items that we were attempting to control. We required the retailer to list each one of those items, his cost, and his mark-up. Then we asked him to file with us his average margin or his initial mark-up on items that existed in the year prior to Korea.

That's from June 1949 to June 1950. Then we asked him to file, alongside of that, his present average margin or initial mark-ups, or whatever records he may have available. Then we have three different techniques that we think are practical in restoring pre-Korea mark-ups. First of all we feel that the retailer, rather than file with us an abnormal mark-up, will restore his mark-up to the pre-Korea period. Secondly, if he doesn't, we have the authority to do so, and we will—either by department or by store. Thirdly, if we find generally that the mark-ups are great, we can reduce by a specified percentage the entire percentage that is now permitted. And so we feel that we have an effective and enforceable means of price controls that will enable us to do a better job than if we had attempted to take some sort of phony picture that was brought in to us and we have no way of checking.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will you actually crack down on some of these people if you find they're completely out of line?

Mr. DISALLE. There isn't any question about it, Bob. We're here to do a job and we're going to do a job.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, I'd like to ask you something else, too. Do you think this is going to mean that there will be more consumer goods and legitimate business houses at legitimate prices? In other words, will there be less black markets?

Mr. DISALLE. We're definitely convinced that this type of regulation will produce that result. Already, since January 25, when we issued our general freeze, retailers were keeping off the shelf those items which they were unable to sell at a reasonable profit. This retail mark-up regulation will bring those items back out on the shelves. It will enable us to do a better enforcement job, better able to restore the ordinary course of business, and it will furnish the consumer much greater protection than some sort of a regulation that we were not able to enforce ourselves, or that would require some unusual or unnecessary work on the part of the retailer.

Mr. McCORMICK. You use that word—reasonable. Are the retailers convinced that this is a reasonable margin that you're giving them?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, we feel that since laborers complained about it and since the retailers complained about it that the public will no doubt be served properly by the regulations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Has the public complained yet?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, we've had complaints, but mostly from people who haven't taken the time to analyze the regulation or to understand its working effect.

Mr. McCORMICK. Could you tell us as a practical matter—will this mean very much in the way of roll-backs, or aren't roll-backs really desirable?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, yes; roll-backs are desirable, and we feel in most cases where there have been abnormal mark-ups, this will mean indefinite roll-backs.

Mr. McCORMICK. In other words, it is only in the places where they have been badly out of line there will be any roll-backs?

Mr. DISALLE. That's right; and that's the only place where there should be roll-backs.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, thank you very much, Mr. DiSalle. I'm sure, whether we agree or not, we now know more than we did.

Migratory Farm Workers Need Real Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted the following statement to the Committee on Agriculture. I understand it has not been included in the record of hearings held by that committee, relative to migratory farm workers. While I have been promised a hearing at a later date on H. R. 2955, I believe that the views expressed in my statement may be of interest to the Members of the House, should the Agriculture Committee report favorably on H. R. 3048 before holding hearings on H. R. 2955.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY RELATIVE TO H. R. 2955, THE DEFENSE FARM LABOR ACT OF 1951, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in order to keep the record straight, I am submitting herewith a copy of a letter addressed to me by the distinguished chairman of this committee, dated March 9, and my reply of March 12.

As stated in the correspondence, the notice to me was entirely too short to permit me to bring witnesses from California for the purpose of presenting an analysis of the farm-labor problem as we see it. Although the Governor of California was desirous of cooperating and was willing to send a representative, this could not be arranged on such short notice, and I would need at least 10 days' notice to insure attendance of California witnesses whom I think the committee should hear.

I wish to reiterate the fact that Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, rule XI (I) (g), seems to clearly require that H. R. 2955 be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Said committee has jurisdiction over wages and hours of labor, regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract, child labor, labor statistics, labor standards, and welfare of miners. It seems to me the plain wording of the act leaves no room for doubt concerning the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee over the subject matter of H. R. 2955. Furthermore, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, as set forth in that rule, does not include the subject matter of H. R. 2955. I therefore respectfully request that the committee have the bill rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor, where it clearly belongs.

The plight of the migratory farm worker, as I have seen it in my own State, is a disgrace to the Nation. These people are treated with far less consideration than farm animals, and it is particularly distressing to see the condition of children who are not receiving proper education, medical attention, or even proper nutrition, although working in the midst of the rich agricultural areas. The whole system of handling migratory labor has created nothing but misery, hostility, and social tensions. It seems unbelievable that we have delayed this long in attempting a real solution of this problem in spite of the fact that the conditions that exist today have been prevalent for many years. To say that we have been un-Christian and calloused in permitting the situation to exist is to put the matter mildly indeed. If we should deliberately set out to drive a group of people into the arms of the subversive forces who exploit class antagonisms, we could not do a more effective job than we are doing in glossing over or ignoring the human equations involved in the migratory farm labor problem.

In California last year, the Governor appointed a committee to survey the agricultural labor resources of the San Joaquin Valley. The executive director of this committee was Dr. Paul Prasow, whom I had hoped to bring here to testify relative to H. R. 2955. Dr. Prasow was very anxious to come but could not arrange to do so because of the shortness of the notice that I was able to give him. The committee, which was representative of all phases of California life, held a number of hearings in the San Joaquin Valley, and if anything was evident, it was the fact that the migratory farm labor problem must be handled on a national level because of the interstate movement of the workers. No single State can control the enticing advertisements placed in the papers of other States, such as those which appeared in some Southern States describing the "gold row" in the San Joaquin Valley of California. These advertisements do not tell the whole story. They omit the fact that the work is highly seasonal. One cannot help feel that some of the advertisements stem from a desire to have an oversupply of farm labor on hand at the farms to suit the selfish purposes of some of the employers. Obviously, this condition requires control at the national level.

The lack of protection for migratory farm workers and their children is too well known to everyone to require detailed reiteration. Farm workers are not protected by the National Labor Relations Act. Most of them are not covered by social security or State unemployment insurance systems. They are buffeted about on the economic tides without any anchor or semblance of security.

California suffers from a lack of enforcement of the immigration laws, both in the matter of the exclusion of illegal aliens and in the enforcement against employers who violate the law by knowingly harboring aliens illegally in this country. Among the so-called "wet-backs" are many who shuttle back and forth across the border as they are repeatedly apprehended and returned to Mexico, only to turn around and reenter the United States. The lax enforcement along this border permits the entry of subversive agents and is a real danger to the security of this Nation.

Among persons who have studied the migratory farm labor problem objectively, there is a growing feeling that the farm laborers desiring to settle in a locality are actually discriminated against and discouraged by employers who prefer migratory laborers not apt to become a political force in a community or to obtain the benefits of collective bargaining and union protection.

Labor contractors who recruit migratory workers must be placed under Federal control in order to correct their activities which are, in many cases, interstate in scope, and therefore partly or wholly beyond the jurisdiction of any one State.

It is my feeling that if farm labor conditions were sufficiently improved along the lines proposed in H. R. 2955, a much greater supply of farm labor could be obtained within the United States. As long as American farm workers are treated as outcasts, it is obvious that they will abandon farm labor as fast as they can possibly do so. As pointed out by Clarence J. McCormick, Undersecretary of Agriculture, in his statement to this committee, "the average cash farm wage in 1950 was about 56 cents per hour. While this was more than 3 times the average wage for the 1935–1939 period, it was still only 38 percent of the average factory wage of $1.46 an hour prevailing last year."

of the Air Force, Mr. Finletter. It is expected that the B–52 will perform an extremely important role by providing us with a strategic weapon of greater capability than any now in existence. How does it happen that such a plane is available? Is it simply the result of chance? Definitely not. Whenever you see a new airplane streaking overhead remember that plane represents about 5 years of hard work by thousands of people—designers, engineers, specialists in every field from fuels to aerodynamics.

The Air Force conducts a vigorous research and development program. This effort is directed in 10 major categories and objectives. The first of these is basic research. Nearly all great inventions have their origin in undirected investigation in the fields of pure science. For example, the atom bomb is a direct result of intensive research in the field of nuclear physics.

The second area is applied research. In working for the Air Force the applied scientist becomes both a military philosopher and strategist. Using the results of basic research, his aim is to obtain, at a minimum cost, the most effective weapons and weapons systems.

Next comes quite an obvious objective—flight at greatly increased speeds coupled with the efficient transport of heavier loads. Here aircraft design and power-plant development are the fundamental problems. We have progressed from supersonic speeds throughout the field of manned and unmanned aircraft. Our ranges are increasing along with our capacity for heavier loads.

A fourth area includes the location, recognition, and hitting of targets. In this field our principal problem involves overcoming the obstacles of bad weather and darkness.

Next come the means of target destruction. Some targets are attacked best by penetrating bombs, others by air bursts, and still others may require lateral dispersion. We are working on new types of war heads and fuses for both our bombs and guided missiles.

Our sixth objective is to be able to operate regardless of weather and darkness. Weather can't be ignored, but means can be devised to fly around, through, or over it with minimum interference. The most serious problem is still taking off and landing. The Berlin airlift stimulated considerable progress in this field. As to the prediction of weather, our geophysical-research program is endeavoring to cut down the ever-present error.

Our seventh problem is the defeat of enemy interference. An efficient retaliatory striking force must incorporate adequate defensive qualities. Fighters, rockets, and missiles can be utilized to overcome enemy interference. Development continues in these fields.

Our eighth problem is the perfection of communications. The required integration of any large-scale air operation demands the refinement of communications systems to be adequate in range, clear in reception, and to offer the opposing force a minimum prospect of successful interception.

Our ninth problem is the defense of home territory. Although a constantly modernized long-range strategic air force-in-being constitutes our hope for peace by deterring aggression, we must continue to develop our radar network, interceptor planes, guided missiles, all integrated into a more efficient air defense system.

Lastly, we are faced with the problem involving efficient utilization of human resources. Efficient use of our manpower must substitute for numerical superiority. Simplicity of operation, coupled with the right man in the job, is our aim.

In these areas I have mentioned, the Air Force, along with the Army and Navy, is working closely with science and industry. This team—science, industry, and the military forces, is concentrating today on the weapons of tomorrow, working to insure the technological superiority so essential to the defense of the Nation.

Mr. McCORMICK. Against this backdrop of destroyer activity in World War II, we bring you our next guest, a man with one of the most enviable records in the United States Navy. Former commander of the destroyer squadron known as "Little Beavers." He covered the landing at Bougainville in 1943 and, subsequently, participated in 22 separate engagements. His decorations testify to the character of service. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, Navy Cross, Legion of Merit, Presidential Unit Citation, Silver Star, Purple Heart, and commended for his "extraordinary heroism." He has just returned from Korea where his ships—as you see them here bombarding the coast—helped make life on shore decidedly unhealthy for the Communist Chinese.

For a report on the Navy in Korean waters, we proudly present the Deputy Chief of Staff to the Commander of the United States Naval Forces in the Far East, Rear Adm. Arleigh A. (31-Knot) Burke.

Real Admiral BURKE. I am glad for this chance to talk to you of the television audience about your Navy in the Far East. In Korea, the time is 5:15 in the morning. As I speak to you, Navy planes are warming up on the flight decks of carriers off Korea, preparing to take off at dawn. Guns of Navy ships offshore are blasting coastal targets.

Tomorrow morning, you will read in your paper, or hear on the radio, that Navy planes loaded with napalm and rockets flew so many sorties and destroyed so many warehouses, or killed so many enemy troops. You will read that Navy guns damaged so many bridges or dispersed so many troop concentrations.

From day to day, that is the picture you get of your Navy in action off Korea. But that is not the complete picture. We are proud of what our planes and guns have done and are doing, but they are, after all, only a part of the total Navy effort.

To control and exploit control of the seas around Korea we have a Navy and Marine force numbering more than 90,000 men. Broadly speaking, the forces afloat consist of the Seventh Fleet, commanded by Vice Admiral Struble and three major task forces—Task Force 77, 90, and 95. Task Force 77 is our main striking force—our Sunday punch. Task Force 90 is our amphibious force. Task Force 95 is our blockade and escort force. The blockade and escort force includes our mine-sweeping fleet and the ships of eight nations. The fleet is able to stay at sea day in and day out without returning to port because of another force—the service force. This is the force that serves as a giant floating supermarket, service station, department store, and ammunition depot. Then, of course, we have our sea- and land-based patrol squadrons—the eyes of the fleet.

Since seven-tenths of the earth's surface is covered by water, control of the seas will always be important. In Korea, it is particularly important because we are fighting over and on a peninsula from an island base. All but a negligible number of men and amount of equipment has been delivered in Korea by sea. The flow is unobstructed because we control the seas and are prepared to deal with any threat to that control. The sea is the main highway over which we project our military power.

From the 3d of July our carriers have roamed at will, carrying the fight to the enemy—destroying his forces and his means of waging war. Our surface forces have completely dominated the coasts of Korea, denying the enemy not only the sea but also the use of his important coastal roads and railroads. We have forced him to fight inland. We have forced him to rely on notoriously inadequate inland roads and railroads to resupply his forces. The enemy may move out of range of our guns, but he cannot move out of range of our carrier-based aircraft, which have been attacking in almost continuous close and deep support of the Ground Forces.

Control of the seas and the air over the sea made Inchon possible. Control of the seas made Hungnam possible. It was at Hungnam that, for the first time in history, an entire army, with all of its equipment, was successfully redeployed by sea in the face of enemy pressure. The Navy and Marine amphibious assault at Inchon is already regarded as a classic in the projection of military power.

The mere presence of our sea power is a threat with which the enemy must contend, and against which he must plan and deploy his forces.

You may be proud of the job the men of the Navy and Marine Corps are doing in Korea. However, I don't think any of them, regardless of how hard he fights or how long he works, feels that he is giving or doing any more than the hour demands. In the fight against communism we will always be at battle stations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Scene: Korea. In the midst of a big push trucks drive up to provide tanks with the supplies they'll need to do business, namely, fuel and ammunition. But as more war goods find their way to the right places in Korea, here at home the supply-and-demand story is just a wee bit different. Here, for example, you see huge supplies of tender cuts of meat cramming New York's meat-packing houses. Reason: Housewives, who'd love to serve some for dinner, are boycotting the butcher because of high prices. Though porterhouse and sirloin steak has fallen a nickel a pound as a consequence, the dealer's "beef" is he can't make a profit, for, while his prices have been frozen, the prices he must pay for livestock have not. Mike DiSalle, the Nation's Price Stabilizer, is here with us today. Just this week he announced new margin-type orders to put prices on a fairer and more equitable basis than the last freeze. As these orders go into effect, from coast to coast, the cash register continues to chime this all-too-familiar story.

Mr. DiSalle, I've heard an awful lot of complaints because you picked February 24 as the date—the model date—by which you judge margins. Now, why didn't you pick a pre-Korean War date? Was February 24 really very fair?

Mr. DISALLE. Well, Bob, first of all, by way of background, you remember that night not quite 5 weeks ago that I dashed into this studio just a few minutes after issuing the general freeze order? At that time, we knew that we were going to have to issue some tailored regulations to fit various segments of business. The regulation issued last week was one of those regulations. These regulations, of a highly technical nature, are very complex. You attempt to cover, in one regulation, the annual volume of business, $30,000,000,000, and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of items—they can't be very simple, and I'd like to compare those regulations with the refrigerator that you might have in your own kitchen. We know that as long as it operates you just plug it in and it works, but how it operates, very few of us know as individuals. If something goes wrong, we get a technician to fix it up. Now, the regulation is a technical regulation. We have our technicians to write them and to fix them up in case something goes wrong. Now, in attempting to achieve a fair and equitable type of regulation, the margin of control regulations for non-food retailers, we had to get an accurate picture of what we were attempting to control. A good many items just leave the market from day to day. And so, in an attempt to fix a fair margin regulation, we couldn't go back to the period prior to Korea because we couldn't get an accurate picture of what the retailer had on his shelves at that time. And so, the only way you can take a photo-

in support of H. R. 2955. Over the week end I tried to arrange to have at least one representative of California here before Wednesday. The Governor was anxious to cooperate by sending a representative who could discuss the farm-labor problem in California in a manner that I feel would be most helpful to the committee, but the Governor could not arrange to have his representative here before Monday of next week.

Although the Governor may not agree with all of the provisions of H. R. 2955, I believe he is in agreement with the need for interstate control of farm labor migration, and I think his representative would, in a general way, support the basic plan of H. R. 2955. At any rate, I am sure the committee would benefit from the testimony of the Governor's representative.

Pursuant to Public Law 601, rule XI (1) (g), 3, 5, 6, 8, and 13, it appears that H. R. 2955 should have been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and I shall appreciate the courtesy if you will ask that the bill be rereferred to said committee. If, however, you feel that you wish me to present evidence before your committee, I shall do the best I can to obtain statements for filing with the committee, although I cannot on such short notice arrange for the presence of the witnesses I had hoped to make available. The importance of the subject would seem to merit full hearings and more sufficient notice to those interested.

I fully realize the heavy amount of work your committee is called upon to do, and shall try to reciprocate your kindness in scheduling the Wednesday hearing by making the statements as brief as possible.

The President's Commission is due to report soon, and it seems quite likely that the Commission may make some suggestions that will help all of us who are concerned with the farm labor problem. I had hoped that your committee would not take final action before reviewing the recommendation of the President's Commission.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

SAM YORTY,
Member of Congress.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to several thousand citizens in the Seventeenth Ohio District. I am proud to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with major national and international problems facing Congress today. I wanted to find out how a cross section of my constituents felt on these issues.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to every citizen in the district, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of the majority of those I represent.

Question sheets were sent to almost every occupational group: Republican and Democratic committeemen and women, laborers, attorneys, barbers, housewives, public office holders and Government employees, salesmen, retired men and women, ministers, college and high school students and their instructors. Also included were those working in business and industry, newspaper, radio, and professional positions.

Approximately 3,000 blanks were mailed to individuals and reproductions of the questionnaire were published in nearly all of the 20 daily and weekly newspapers in my district.

Returns of over 3,000 completed forms, with over a third of these containing comments on the question, proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the vital issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them. I am very pleased so many took the time to write and attach letters and notes to the questionnaire enlarging upon their answers.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban residents. Nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented as well as large and small business. There are also two colleges and two universities.

It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of such an evenly divided district, but through the questionnaire method, I feel I have gained the majority opinions of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you think Communist China should be given a seat in the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services? Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Do you favor the drafting of veterans? Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Do you think the United States should put into effect a system of universal military service training for all men reaching the age of 18? Yes ☐ No ☐
5. Do you favor drafting of civilian men and women for jobs in war production in the event of an all-out war? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Do you advocate immediate "across the board" Government regulation of prices, wages and rents? Yes ☐ No ☐
7. With which one of the following advocated foreign policies do you agree:

(a) The United States should pull out of Europe and build up a Gibraltar of military strength in the Western Hemisphere? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) Europe is our first line of defense and should be defended with American weapons and manpower? Yes ☐ No ☐

(c) We should strike a medium between the above two policies by advocating full cooperation with the European nations by providing men and guns if they show they are willing to fight in their own defense and assume a proportionate share of such endeavors? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Do you favor:

(a) The removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) If the answer to the above question is "Yes," who would you suggest should take his place? _____

9. Do you think the United States should use the atomic bomb in Korea or other possible danger spots? Yes ☐ No ☐
10. Would you be willing to have your taxes increased by 30 percent in order to establish a pay-as-you-go tax plan to compensate for the proposed budget increases? Yes ☐ No ☐

Signature _____
Address _____
Occupation _____

Please write any comments you might have on the above questions and return this sheet to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1: Do you think Communist China should be given a seat in the United Nations?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 13	*Percent* 87
Attorneys	11	89
Barbers	24	76
Business, industry, salesmen	8	92
Farmers	6	94
Groups	16	84
Housewives	10	90
Labor	10	90
Ministers	33	67
Newspaper and radio	10	90
Occupation not given	15	85
Professionals	9	91
Public officeholders	8	92
Retired	4	96
School teachers	3	97

Question 2: Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 48	*Percent* 52
Attorneys	62	38
Barbers	48	52
Business, industry, salesmen	59	41
Farmers	35	65
Groups	46	54
Housewives	35	65
Labor	53	47
Ministers	50	50
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Occupation not given	45	55
Professionals	59	41
Public officeholders	57	43
Retired	37	63
School teachers	56	44

Question 3: Do you favor the drafting of veterans?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 38	*Percent* 62
Attorneys	54	46
Barbers	22	78
Business, industry, salesmen	38	62
Farmers	38	62
Groups	36	64
Housewives	35	65
Labor	30	70
Ministers	75	25
Newspaper and radio	44	56
Occupation not given	34	66
Professionals	48	52
Public officeholders	39	61
Retired	39	61
School teachers	47	53

Question 4: Do you think the United States should put into effect a system of universal military service training for all men reaching the age of 18?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 67	*Percent* 33
Attorneys	74	26
Barbers	62	38
Business, industry, salesmen	75	25
Farmers	44	56
Groups	69	31
Housewives	60	40
Labor	69	31
Ministers	44	56
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Occupation not given	73	27
Professionals	77	23
Public officeholders	76	24
Retired	56	44
School teachers	70	30

The report of our own Joint Committee on the Economic Report filed last month contains the following significant statement on page 19:

"Farm people who go into the migratory labor force do so from lack of better opportunity and then merely change to another and less secure type of underemployment. According to the survey previously mentioned, the average number of days of employment for migratory workers over the country in 1949 was 101, 70 days in farm work, 31 more in nonfarm employment.

"Three factors enter into this underemployment. First, a period of several slack months when there is little seasonal employment to be found. Second, irregular and intermittent employment during the harvest season. Some harvests are oversupplied with workers, others last for such a brief period that the amount of work obtained by a worker is small. The third factor is too large a supply of workers for the amount of work available. Migratory workers compete with local seasonal and year-round workers for employment. The latter, too, then suffer from underemployment; during 1949 they had a total of 120 days employment of which 91 days were in farm work and 29 days in nonfarm jobs.[1]

"The earnings from the 101 days of farm work which the migratory workers obtained in 1949 amounted to an average of $514.[1] The value of housing, transportation, and other perquisites amounts to $36 more.[2] At an average of two workers per family, total family incomes averaged $1,028 cash or $1,000 with perquisites. This amount had to feed, clothe, shelter, and educate a family of four.

"Underemployment and low earnings are not the only problems among migratory farm workers. Poor housing, lack of sanitation and medical care, child labor, and educational retardation of the children, all tend to make them a disadvantaged group. They have little voice either in community, State, or national affairs and are unable to make effective demands to relieve their situation.

"Although they are most essential to meet peak-season demands for gathering in the national food supply, they are explicitly excluded from national legislation which protects and advances the rights of workers. Their position is the most precarious of any in our economy. They have no definable job rights and are so far removed from the employer group that they are unable to obtain redress for grievances.

"Rather than hire seasonal and migratory workers directly and individually, it is a widespread practice among farm employers to hire in crews through labor contractors, crew chiefs, or labor recruiters. In many areas it is virtually impossible for a worker to obtain a job directly from the farm employer. As a consequence of these practices, a farm worker has to pay heavily from his already-too-low earnings for the privilege of getting work to do.

"Under Executive Order No. 10129 of June 3, 1950, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor was created and directed to inquire into problems of migratory labor and to make recommendations for action, both legislative and administrative. The report of this Commission is scheduled to appear at an early date."

The report of the President's Commission referred to above has not yet been made public. I myself was a witness before this committee at its hearing in Los Angeles. The committee showed great patience and diligence in striving to understand the migratory farm-labor problem. I am sure the Congress would be well advised to withhold final action on any migratory farm-labor bills until the Members have had the opportunity to study the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission.

It is the contention of those interested in an efficient, sound national farm-labor program that we have the available means and manpower to produce the food and fabric necessary to our defense effort. It is maintained that if there is a need for foreign farm workers, then this need should be fairly determined at public hearings.

None of the most significant differences between the present situation and that at the beginning of World War II is found in the greater inventory of farm equipment and machinery at present, and the greater potentialities that exist for substitution of machinery for labor. The prospective increase between now and this time next year in the number of the mechanical cotton harvesters may reduce the number of cotton harvesters needed during the season by about 50,000. It is during the harvesting of the greatly expanded cotton acreage that the pinch in available manpower is likely to be felt more sharply in 1951. The increase in mechanization will not be confined to cotton harvests or areas. It will be a most important factor in the farm manpower situation next year.

(NOTE.—See Statement by Lewis J. Ducoff, Labor Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, at the twenty-eighth annual Agricultural Economics Conference, Washington, D. C., November 2, 1950.)

The Sparkman committee report, referred to above, is an important document. In the words of Senator SPARKMAN, this report "points the way toward increasing our national labor force by 2,500,000 man-years. It concretely shows how a practical application can be made of point 4 know-how and show-how right here at home in many rural areas where output, productivity, and living standards are now distressingly low. In view of the critical manpower shortages likely to limit our output for defense in this emergency, I feel that practical suggestions for increasing the productivity of our rural underemployed ought to be given immediate consideration."

I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the following additional paragraphs from the said report: "There are approximately 1,200,000 male hired wage workers whose main activity is farm work. These hired wage workers were employed an average of 218 days at farm work and 14 days at nonfarm work in 1949 and earned an average of $980. Approximately half are married. (These families are in part included in the nonfarm families and are not included as a separate group in the statistical summary.)

"Underemployment among farm wage workers is a special problem. Partly because of days not worked and partly because of inefficient employment, these workers appear to be only about half as productive as workers on medium-sized commercial family farms."

I should also like to call the committee's attention to the fact that Puerto Rico has established a territorial employment service affiliated with the United States Employment Service. This move is intended to make available seventy-five to one hundred thousand surplus workers. I feel that if it is at all possible these American citizens should be utilized before noncitizens are brought into the country for farm work. The Puerto Ricans are loyal Americans, good workers, and because of the seasonal nature of the economy of their island, they are badly in need of additional employment opportunities.

The committee is no doubt familiar with the articles of Agnes Myers, of the Washington Post, printed October 6 to 12, 1947, which articles pointed out that the cost of the foreign farm-labor program to the taxpayers of the United States during the years 1943–47 was $84,000,000. According to the Farm Placement Service, foreign workers usually constitute less than 2 percent of each seasonal agricultural poll. One cannot help but feel that the same amount of money spent improving the conditions of American farm workers would constitute a better investment of taxpayers' money.

I hope the committee will see fit to act favorably on H. R. 2955, but I wish to repeat in closing that it appears from Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, that the bill should be considered by the Committee on Education and Labor.

UNITED STATES HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1951.

Hon. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: While your name did not appear on the list of witnesses handed me by the committee staff, and apparently we have not received a request from you to be heard on your bill, H. R. 2955, which you introduced on February 27, the Committee on Agriculture has held hearings yesterday and all day today on proposed legislation dealing with that subject.

Assuming that you would want to appear in behalf of your bill, I announced at the beginning of the hearings that the committee would take up for consideration not only the bill introduced by Congressman POAGE, H. R. 3048, but would also take up and consider your bill and other proposals.

We had hoped to conclude the hearings on Monday, March 12, and that it might be possible for you to be heard on Monday. I understand, however, from Mrs. Clark that it will not be possible for you to appear at that time. Hearings will not be concluded, therefore, and I am scheduling a meeting on Wednesday, March 14, at 10 a. m., at which time the committee will be very glad to hear you and such witnesses as you may desire to present.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

MARCH 12, 1951.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you very much for your letter of March 9 and your courtesy in scheduling a 1-day hearing on H. R. 2955 for Wednesday, March 14, at 10 a. m.

There evidently was some misunderstanding in connection with the hearings on this bill. It was my understanding that your committee had scheduled hearings only on the Poage bill, H. R. 3048, and my secretary was so informed by both Mr. POAGE and Mr. Parker when he appeared at your hearings on Thursday, March 8, having received a telephone call from your committee the previous day informing us that your committee would take up H. R. 2955 along with H. R. 3048.

I understand, however, that when you opened the hearing you did include H. R. 2955, although I was unable to be present due to the shortness of the notice and the necessity of my attendance at hearings by my own committee on a bill of vital concern to California.

The day following the opening of your hearings I asked my secretary to place a statement in the RECORD to clarify the situation and make it clear that we did not understand that we were expected to have people from California appear in Washington on only 1 day's notice. My secretary reported back that you informed him that we had notice from the RECORD. We have checked the RECORD and found the only reference to be to H. R. 3048.

I, of course, would need a more adequate notice in order to present effective testimony

[1] Migratory Farm Workers in 1949, Louis Ducoff, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1949.

[2] Perquisites Furnished Hired Farm Workers, Barbara B. Reagan, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1945.

New York is only one of 22 States in which stripper and secondary recovery wells would suffer from any reduction in the depletion rate. I am informed that 7,500,000,000 barrels, or nearly 25 percent of our total national petroleum reserves, are in the stripper well class. Stripper fields contain more than 313,000 wells which produced an average of 3.6 barrels a day in 1949. That production averages much less today.

Of primary importance in considering the need for the present depletion rate in operation of these marginal properties is this fact: More than four billion of the present stripper reserves can be recovered only by secondary methods. Secondary recovery actually is in its infancy. To date its results have come from the application of trial and error. It is a coming science to which many of our college engineering students will cast their lot in the future. Its importance cannot be overemphasized because of this point: all oil fields will ultimately be reduced to stripper production. Therefore, any tax legislation which would make secondary recovery an economic fool's play would discourage its application not only now, but in the future when we will be more than ever dependent upon ingenuity for recovery of a vast share of the oil with which our Nation has been so abundantly blessed.

Oil is basic to the economy of my district and throughout western New York. It employs thousands of engineers, researchers, laborers. Our stripper fields are a stimulus to the minds of those who are pioneering in new and improved methods of oil extraction. I do not need to describe to my colleagues on this committee the drastic results of any burdensome new tax legislation which would force these farsighted men to abandon the tasks which challenge their inventiveness. I emphasize again that we have barely scratched the surface in secondary recovery; we cannot afford by short-sighted taxation to dim the prospects of an activity which holds such great promise for full utilization of our great petroluem resources.

I have described to the best of my ability a great activity within the petroleum industry which would be eliminated, or drastically curtailed, by any reduction in the depletion rate. The 27½-percent rate of depletion has become as much a part of petroleum industry operations as the lease form, the drilling rig, the flow pipe. Congress has long since established it and reaffirmed it as such. It can be recognized as nothing short of the backbone of the financial structure of the industry.

Although the small stripper producers, and indeed the entire communities of my district, are vitally concerned with the Treasury's proposal, my concern goes far beyond that. In the last analysis, as I have said, the stripper fields of western New York are of no great significance. It is the discovery and availability of new oil horizons with which our Nation must necessarily concern itself in this grave period. Oil is truly our first line of defense. I have no doubt that the Russian armies would be rolling westward if our advantage over the Kremlin, oilwise, were reversed.

So, I submit to this committee that if the present rate of depletion is the deciding factor in whether or not the oil industry will venture expenses for secondary recovery of known reserves, then certainly it is a dominant factor in persuading our oil men to go out and search for new reserves with one chance in nine of being successful.

Of all the vital industries which deserves more encouragement, not less, I truly believe petroleum should head the list. I do not say this selfishly, but realistically. One of the greatest concerns of this Congress should be the building of a petroleum supply from reliable sources. In the type of conflict in which we would engage in a third world war, certainly no supply outside the United States, and possibly Canada and Mexico, would be reliable.

We are importing and using roughly a million barrels of oil a day at present, largely from South America and the Middle East. What would happen to that supply in case of open warfare is a matter for conjecture, but I dare say it could not be classed reliable. The Secretary of Interior has expressed the need for the oil industry to up its productive capacity by at least 1,000,000 barrels a day. It will require the discovery of billions of barrels of new reserves to insure this additional million barrels. Undiscovered oil cannot fill the bill.

If the Nation is to have adequate oil supplies securely available from within our own borders the domestic industry must have adequate funds with which to finance expanding exploration and development activities. The oil industry is an expanding industry. Year after year our economy requires more oil. And war after war our military machine becomes more dependent on oil which is a unique munition in that it is the sole energy source that provides the mobility of our modern war machine.

In considering Secretary Snyder's proposal to reduce the oil-depletion allowance we must face the fact that we are tampering with an industry that is vital to our way of life and to our security. We must face the fact that if we reduce the depletion allowance we will be reducing the ability of the oil industry to expand so as to meet rising consumer requirements. We must face the fact that the result will be less oil unless the industry secures the necessary financing through increased prices to the consuming public. This would be unfortunate. It would be a forced contribution to the inflationary spiral that we are endeavoring to combat.

Since percentage depletion was initiated in 1926, the price index of crude petroleum has been consistently lower than that of all other commodities. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, using 1926 as the base period, the price index for crude oil today is 136 whereas the price index for all commodities is 183.

Comparing crude prices today with those existing in 1948 the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports show that crude prices have actually decreased by 0.8 percent, whereas the average of all commodities has increased 8.2 percent. A comparison of today's prices with those existing at the beginning of the Korean war is even more emphatic. Since the Korean war crude prices have increased 0.8 percent whereas textile products have increased 34 percent, chemical products 30 percent, foods 16 percent, building materials 13 percent, and the average of all commodities 17 percent.

At the same time, the retail price of gasoline, excluding taxes, is actually less by about 20 percent than in 1918 and approximately the same as in 1926, the year that percentage depletion was adopted. In addition, although the price of gasoline has not increased, the gasoline of today is far superior to that of 1918 and 1926. It is estimated that 2 gallons of today's gasoline is equivalent to 3 gallons in these former years.

The announced purpose of the Treasury Department's proposal to reduce the depletion allowance for oil is to increase the Federal revenue. It is doubtful, however, that increased revenue would result if the Treasury's recommendations were adopted for the reason that losses of revenue from other sources would be directly caused thereby. There would be reduced activity on the part of many drilling contractors, geological and geophysical companies, and other services and operations necessary to the exploration and development of petroleum reserves. The income of thousands of lease brokers and tens of thousands of farmers and land owners in the form of reduced lease bonuses, royalties, and rentals would also result in reduced revenues from these sources, more than offsetting any probable gain that is estimated to be collected from reduced depletion allowance. The Treasury's proposal would thus be self-defeating.

There is no doubt that the Treasury has been forced to search every possible source for new revenue at this time. However, it is the responsibility of the Ways and Means Committee to examine each of these proposals in the light of their impact upon our national economy and our national security. I cannot believe that this committee, which beyond doubt has the most difficult task that ever faced a committee of the Congress, could give approval to the administration recommendations regarding depletion. To do so would be to follow a course of self-destruction in a time which requires an extremely opposite course.

Walter E. Cosgriff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I sent today to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. It is a letter in praise of Walter E. Cosgriff, a member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The letter is self-explanatory, though I would like to reemphasize that Mr. Cosgriff is a man of high reputation, a banker known for his integrity throughout the Nation. I should also like to stress again that Mr. Cosgriff has in no way been connected with the RFC activities prior to last August, around which the current hearings revolve.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 15, 1951.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I congratulate you for your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, February 26, 1951, dealing with the career of Walter E. Cosgriff, a Republican member of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

It is a fine statement about a remarkable man from your own State of Utah.

Mr. Cosgriff accepted his appointment to the RFC Board in the belief that he could help do a job on reorganization by revamping and improving the RFC. I am persuaded that Mr. Cosgriff only accepted the appointment last August when he was assured that he could throw his energies into such constructive channels. It is a most unhappy fact that his real progress has been obscured by the publicity and hullaballoo surrounding the negative and extremely unfortunate aspects of the current RFC headlines, all of which deal with events which transpired prior to Mr. Cosgriff's appointment.

Question 5: Do you favor drafting of civilian men and women for jobs in war production in the event of an all-out war?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 59	*Percent* 41
Attorneys	72	28
Barbers	75	25
Business, industry, salesmen	60	40
Farmers	56	44
Groups	55	45
Housewives	58	42
Labor	54	46
Ministers	50	50
Newspaper and radio	60	40
Occupation not given	65	35
Professionals	78	22
Public office holders	62	38
Retired	79	21
School teachers	65	25

Question 6: Do you advocate immediate across-the-board Government regulation of prices, wages, and rents?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 62	*Percent* 38
Attorneys	70	30
Barbers	80	20
Business, industry, salesmen	63	37
Farmers	36	64
Groups	68	32
Housewives	58	42
Labor	65	35
Ministers	78	22
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Occupation not given	61	39
Professionals	66	34
Public officeholders	58	42
Retired	59	41
School teachers	59	41

Question 7. With which one of the following advocated foreign policies do you agree?

(a) The United States should pull out of Europe and build up a Gibraltar of military strength in the Western Hemisphere?

(b) Europe is our first line of defense and should be defended with American weapons and manpower?

(c) We should strike a medium between the above two policies by advocating full cooperation with the European nations by providing men and guns if they show they are willing to fight in their own defense and assume a proportionate share of such endeavors?

	A	B	C
Total replies	*Percent* 13	*Percent* 10	*Percent* 77
Attorneys	17	15	68
Barbers	24	0	76
Business, industry, salesmen	19	4	77
Farmers	17	3	80
Groups	7	17	76
Housewives	22	3	75
Labor	21	5	74
Ministers	0	0	100
Newspaper and radio	0	10	90
Occupation not given	17	4	79
Professionals	10	3	87
Public officeholders	18	4	78
Retired	24	5	71
School teachers	12	6	82

Question 8-A: Do you favor the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?

		Yes	No
Total replies		*Percent* 70	*Percent* 30
Attorneys		66	34
Barbers		72	28
Business, industry, salesmen		88	12
Farmers		82	18
Groups		48	52
Housewives		84	16
Labor		79	21
Ministers		57	43
Newspaper and radio		80	20
Occupation not given		80	20
Professionals		88	12
Public officeholders		84	16
Retired		84	16
School teachers		73	27

Question 8-B: If the answer to the above question is "Yes," who would you suggest should take his place?

	No choice	Submitted name
Total replies	*Percent* 63	*Percent* 37
Attorneys	68	32
Barbers	69	31
Business, industry, salesmen	55	45
Farmers	61	39
Groups	(1)	(1)
Housewives	53	47
Labor	60	40
Ministers	25	75
Newspaper and radio	25	75
Occupation not given	41	59
Professionals	52	48
Public officeholders	50	50
Retired	52	48
School teachers	42	58

[1] No indication.

Question 9: Do you think the United States should use the atomic bomb in Korea or other possible danger spots?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 45	*Percent* 55
Attorneys	39	61
Barbers	47	53
Business, industry, salesmen	51	49
Farmers	58	42
Groups	37	63
Housewives	47	53
Labor	58	42
Ministers	13	87
Newspaper and radio	56	44
Occupation not given	51	49
Professionals	41	59
Public officeholders	60	40
Retired	57	43
School teachers	44	56

Question 10: Would you be willing to have your taxes increased by 30 percent in order to establish a pay-as-you-go tax plan to compensate for the proposed budget increases?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 36	*Percent* 64
Attorneys	69	31
Barbers	10	90
Business, industry, salesmen	37	63
Farmers	33	67
Groups	34	66
Housewives	23	77
Labor	38	62
Ministers	29	71
Newspaper and radio	44	56
Occupation not given	43	57
Professionals	53	47
Public officeholders	25	75
Retired	35	65
School teachers	54	46

Oil Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks a statement filed by me with the Ways and Means Committee relating to the proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the 27½-percent rate on oil depletion to 15 percent. Such a reduction would be ruinous to 23,000 stripper oil wells in New York State. The statement filed with the Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, due to the fact that I was necessarily absent on the occasion of the hearing on the oil and gas depletion question, I ask unanimous consent to file with the committee the following remarks on that very important subject:

As a Member of the Congress from New York I represent the Forty-fifth District, which is composed of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany Counties. These are among 21 counties of western and central New York in which the oil industry is a vital economic factor. Oil contributes greatly to the welfare of virtually all communities in my district.

I am vitally concerned with the Treasury's recommendation to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowance to 15 percent because the oil industry of New York is fighting great odds for survival even with the present 27½-percent rate. Consider the fact that New York State oil production is 100 percent in the "stripper well" class. New York has some 23,000 such wells which produce less than 12,000 barrels of oil daily. This is approximately one-half barrel per well a day.

It does not require involved mathematics to realize that such wells return a very narrow margin of profit. In our national petroleum supply picture they appear insignificant. But they produce high-grade Pennsylvania type crude from which our best lubricants are extracted. New York fields represent more than 77,000,000 barrels of reserves of this high-quality crude oil. I fear that most of this great oil reserve would never be produced if this committee followed the Treasury's proposal.

It is significant that the industry estimates only 13,000,000 barrels of oil will be recovered from New York fields by primary methods. This leaves more than 63,000,000 barrels of the total reserves to be recovered by expensive secondary recovery processes. These important secondary projects, many of them in the planning stage, would be destined for certain abandonment if producers were denied the historic incentives contained in the present depletion rate. This would not only be a death-dealing blow to hundreds whose livelihoods are dependent on the stripper production in my area but would be certain to deprive us of the use of that oil forever. I say that we are in no position to forfeit any portion of the fuel supply on which we are so vitally dependent for our very security.

Thus one can see how reactionary American policy had nothing to do with freeing the people from Hitlerism and had the sole object of destroying German and Japanese industry, which competed with the United States of America in world markets.

"A" IS FOR AIRPLANE

The Russian naval captain, A. F. Mosjaisky, was the first man in the world to fly a motor-driven airplane. He took out a patent in St. Petersburg in 1881 and flew his plane in the summer of 1882 near St. Petersburg.

This Is a Great Day for the Non-Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the day dedicated to that great patron of Ireland, St. Patrick, I am happy to extend in the RECORD the following article of interest by Hal Boyle, a staff writer for the Associated Press:

THIS IS A GREAT DAY FOR THE NON-IRISH—BUT, IF YOU'VE A SPARK OF DECENCY, FOR ST. PAT'S SAKE, TAKE A BIT OF ADVICE

(By Hal Boyle)

NEW YORK, March 17.—An open letter to all Americans whose mothers didn't come from Ireland:

"My friends, you are non-Irish—and this is a great day for the non-Irish.

"It is a great day for you to buy your groceries the previous night, lock your door, and stay in your homes. That way you won't have to deal with the problem of what to do if you meet an Irishman.

"And that is a good problem to avoid, because no Irishman today is an innocent bystander. Every Irishman is a moon-mad son of the kings of an old and wronged land. He is in no mood to be trifled with."

GREEN ELEPHANTS

"This is the day he honors St. Patrick, that great and learned man, and all America is just one big Irish stew. Yes, it's 'Erin go Bragh' everywhere—from the potato-logged coast of Maine to the colleen-covered shores of Hollywood, where 16 film studios have crowned 16 different unknown starlets as 'Miss Shamrock of 1950.'

"Long ago, my friends, most of the Nation decided it was simpler, on this day, to say they were Irish even if they weren't. It saved long-winded explanations. And arguments that started out, 'Well, why aren't you an Irishman? I am.'

"A survey made this year indicates that today, out of our population of 150,000,000, some 145,000,000 will claim to be Irish—by birth, by ancestry, by perjury, or by default.

"This leaves only 5,000,000 of you non-Irish. And that's why it's a good idea to stay indoors—the odds are 29 to 1 against you.

"But if you must go outside, friends, here are a few simple rules on how to treat any Irishman you encounter:

"1. Remember, he is moved in this hour of glory by a sense of ancient oppression, a pride in his clan too big for his heart to hold, and an old wrath. Therefore he is touchy and quick to anger. Also, he is ridden by leprechauns. Therefore he may do things poetical or foolish.

"For St. Patrick's Day isn't just a holiday to an Irishman. It is Armistice Day, pay day, Fourth of July, a bit of Easter, maybe a touch of April Fool's Day—these and something more. In one day he must himself love anew the mystic, troubled story of the Emerald Isle. He must go from an elf-haunted forest through a peat bog to a small stony farm, suffer long poverty, and cross many lost battlefields to victory, a cathedral—and peace. It is a time when he rededicates himself, worships, rejoices, sorrows over his distant dead, feasts, and asks, 'What next?' In short, it is a time to be an Irishman.

"2. The password, if you meet this Irishman, is a smiling 'begorra.' Say it and go on. But don't make a mistake and say 'Gomorrah.' You won't be able to go on.

"3. Don't greet him with a 'top o' the morning.' That's what he is determined to say to you, and if you say it first all he can say is 'howdy.' Irishmen don't like to say 'howdy' on St. Pat's Day.

"4. If you want to give him a good wish straight from the Ould Sod, say—'May the road rise with you and the wind be always behind you.' Or, 'May the devil fly off with your worries, and forever and ever God bless you.'"

BUY BOTTLE—GO HOME

"5. Should you chance to drop into a bar to purchase your mother-in-law a basin of beer, don't offer to buy an Irishman a drink. Buy him a bottle—and you go home.

"6. If you see two Irishmen discussing a subject with four flying fists, don't stop. They are probably mulling over why the six northern Irish counties stay with the British instead of joining up with Free Ireland? And it's a good quarrel to stay out of if you aren't in the family.

"7. If you see a weeping Irishman, don't pause to find the reason for his tears. It may be because St. Patrick is buried at Downpatrick and Downpatrick is in the northern area of Ireland still garrisoned by British troops. On the other hand, he may not know at all why he is crying, so why make him more miserable trying to think up a reason?

"8. Don't—even as a joke—call an Irishman a Mick. Not unless you've already slipped him three Mickey Finns."

LEAVE OUT THE PRANKS

"9. And above all don't play any pranks on him. There is a legend here that a wise-acre once tried to sell British souvenir flags to St. Patrick's Day parade crowds. Twelve mighty men from Mayo dropped out of the parade, quietly picked up the prankster and took him to the Bowery. There his head was shaved and he was tattooed with Britain's Unionjack from the soles of his feet to his skull. When the tatto artist's arm gave out, is is chronicled, the police commissioner arrived, rolled up his sleeves, took the needle, and put on the last four flags himself—then wrote "Up, Ireland" on the scoundrel's forehead, and let him go.

"10. Just remember that tomorrow the Irishman will be a normal man again. If you bump into him then, give him an aspirin and a kind word, and you'll have a friend. If you meet me, skip the kind word—just give me the aspirin.

"Thanking you in advance for your understanding, dear non-Irish friends, we wish you an Irish toast older than the nine lives of your great grandfather's grandmother's cat:

" 'Health and long life to you;
The choice of a wife to you;
A child every year to you;
Land without rent to you,
And may death come in Ireland.'

"Sincerely yours,

"HAL BOYLE.

"P. S.—In Ireland itself the doors of all saloons are closed by law on St. Patrick's Day. The front doors, that is."

Chinese Students in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Chinese Students in Country Stir Fight of United States Agencies," which appeared in the New York Times on March 9. It was written by the distinguished Washington correspondent for that paper, Mr. James Reston.

Mr. Reston points up the difficulties and hardships currently being experienced by Chinese students in this country, and also underscores the complicated legal problems involved in allowing them to remain here.

I feel we should do everything we can to make the lot of these Chinese students easier while they are with us. These estimated 3,600 Chinese students reflect a large credit of good will for our way of life which we may chalk up in our future relations with a friendlier China. I commend this article to the attention of the Congress and to the executive agencies for study and action.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE STUDENTS IN COUNTRY STIR FIGHT OF UNITED STATES AGENCIES—STATE DEPARTMENT WANTS LAW USED ALLOWING FULL-TIME JOBS—DEPORTATION IS OPPOSED

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The Chinese Communist war in Korea has produced a whole series of small interdepartmental wars in Washington, the latest between the State and Justice Departments over the future of Chinese university students in this country.

There are about 3,600 of these students here now, most of them doing graduate work at their own expense in the large State universities. They received temporary permits to remain in the United States, but to do so they had to stay in school, keep their academic work in good order, pay their bills, and go home when their courses ended.

The Chinese civil war and the Chinese Communist aggression in Korea, however, have created a number of problems.

First, most of the students were cut off from papa's monthly remittance, a slight embarrassment, as any freshman knows.

Second, the Communist conquest of the Chinese mainland changed most of the students' plans about returning home.

And now many of them are reaching the end of their student courses—more than 300 last month and about 500 more scheduled to be graduated in June.

RUN INTO DIFFICULTIES

The universities and other private and public organizations bailed a lot of them out of their financial troubles for a while, but some left their studies, or came to the end of their academic courses, and in due course ran into trouble with the Justice Department.

Public Law 535, passed last June, made provision for this situation, but it has never been put into effect by the Justice Department. That law states, among other things,

I agree that a statement such as yours in the RECORD should be made to the Senate and to the people of the United States in order to clear up any possible misunderstanding about the role Mr. Cosgriff has played in this work as a member of the RFC Board. I regret that I was not on the floor when you made the statement so that I could have, right then and there, wholeheartedly lent my support to your tribute to a man for whom I have high regard—not only a distinguished banker of Utah but of the Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate.

The Great Soviet Encyclopedia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article about the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, which appears in the March 1 issue of the Daily Express of London.

The Soviet regime undertook early in the twenties to bring out a Soviet encyclopedia. Before the work was finished the Soviet version of political, historical, and scientific truth had undergone so many changes that they decided to start all over again. This new effort, which the Daily Express calls "Stalin's last word on everything" is to be in 50 volumes.

It takes its place in Russian life as the major work of reference, an instrument of education soon to be available in the libraries to hundreds of millions—

Says the Daily Express.

These extracts printed below tell their own story of what can happen when the mind of one great area of the world cuts itself off from the rest of civilization.

The extracts are entirely from the letter "A." The violent anti-Americanism found reflected in these quotations is not, we may be sure, an alphabetical accident; from all that we have seen of Soviet propaganda the chorus of hate will be equally evident in the remaining volumes as they come out.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPRESS EXAMINES FIRST TWO VOLUMES OF THE GREAT SOVIET ENCYCLOPEDIA

Before you read below the Daily Express presents today a glimpse of Russia which tells a terrifying story, but one which is less surprising perhaps to those who have read George Orwell's famous novel of the future called 1984. In the totalitarian state Orwell describes, even history is rewritten so that all evidence of a world in any way at variance with the "party line" is completely removed. Now, in Russia, the first two volumes have been published of what is to be a vast 50-volume undertaking—the Russian parallel to the encyclopedias of the west. In a sense this publishing enterprise is Stalin's Last Word on Everything. It takes its place in Russian life as the major work of reference, an instrument of education soon to be available in the libraries to hundreds of millions. These extracts printed below tell their own story of what can happen when the "mind" of one great area of the world cuts itself off from the rest of civilization.

"A" IS FOR AGITATION

Quote No. 1 is headed Aghitazya:

The Russian Communist Party's Aghitazya (political agitation) is one of the most powerful means of educating the workers as Communists, and of heightening social consciousness.

Bolshevist propaganda is always just. Only the Communist Party has always openly spoken the truth, and the whole truth, to the people.

Every free hour and day every conscientious working man and woman must engage in political agitation. Speeches must be made at meetings, and with private individuals.

Utilizing the Russian Communist Party's experience, the People's Democracies are now agitating energetically and thus countering the dirty work of foreign agents and warmongers.

Anglo-American imperialism has worked out the ideological preparations for another aggressive world war. With the help of lies and hate of humanity, imperialist propaganda attempts to undermine the people's free will.

Communist agitation in capitalist lands plays a big part in mobilizing, organizing, and educating the international movement for the unification of the working classes.

Posters, pamphlets, and "honor cards," which help to popularize efficient workers when posted on factory walls, are also used.

"A" IS FOR ANGLISKY (ENGLISH)

Since 1750 the English have done nothing to modernize their language. Earlier the language was enriched when the English occupied Ireland and borrowed from fine old Celtic. The English also borrowed "Cayman" from America and "Kangaroo" from Australia.

But since the October revolution some Russian words have been adopted. All English Socialist words are derived from Russian.

For example: Soviet, Bolshevik, Udarnik (the earliest category of shock worker), Stakhanovist, Kolkhoz (collective farm), and abbreviations such as NKVD (secret police), and Narkom (people's commissar).

"A" IS FOR ANTIMILITARISM

The struggle for peace is directly linked with Soviet foreign policy, which has submitted concrete proposals to UNO for disarmament and an atomic ban.

During 1949–50 the Cominform gave explicit instructions to all friends of peace to be more watchful and untrusting than ever, since the final battle for peace is now staged and must continue until socialism is spread all over the world.

The battle for peace is directly connected with the world-wide victory of the proletarian revolution. As Stalin has written, "To abolish war and its causes and to establish a just peace, power must be seized from the imperialistic bourgeoisie."

Since the Soviet Union's historic victory over Hitlerism and salvation of civilization, the American imperialists have started fresh war preparations.

This peace front depends on the Soviet's unconquerable power and on freedom movements in underdeveloped colonies.

The Bolsheviks were never actually pacifists who want peace for the sake of peace.

Bolsheviks favor a decisive battle for peace, which must be waged until power has been taken from the warmongering and belligerent bourgeois class.

"A" IS FOR AMERICA

North American people speak one language but they are not one nation, as Stalin has said. Attempts by bougeois linguistic experts in the United States of America to prove that American is independent of English are just as reactionary as the modern cosmopolitan theory that there is an American language.

Any idea that American has a special quality and is more modern and lively than English is as reactionary as propaganda maintaining that English would be the best world language.

Yet, American and British experts try to prove that the construction of English entitles it to be the universal tongue.

Such reactionary and unscientific theses are symptomatic of the course of Anglo-American imperialism in raping the free peoples of Europe and elsewhere.

Bourgeois experts now hold that American will soon absorb English and that the language spoken in England will become of real American type.

NOTE.—Shakespeare's autograph is included in the encyclopedia as the sole British specimen in the Soviet collection of famous signatures.

The 50 pages devoted to North America give the final Soviet view of the United States of America and Canada pictorially. There are 19 pictures of Indians and Eskimos. The solitary photograph of white Americans depicts them pouring superfluous milk into the street.

Wall Street is contrasted on another page with a picture of washing hanging across slum streets. The only seven pictures of American industry are blurred and no bigger than some postage stamps.

"A" IS FOR AMERICAN LABOR

American Federation of Labor is an organization for the benefit of the high labor aristocracy. It is led by a clique of reactionaries who are agents of Wall Street commercialism. Its object is to prevent the unity of the working classes.

The AFL directly opposes strike campaigns and strike solidarity. It also assists the bourgeoisie to smash strikes and harbors many blacklegs.

Its leaders actively support the most reactionary bourgeois ideology such as American racial theory.

"A" IS FOR AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion is one of the greatest militarized Fascist organizations in the United States of America.

The whole country is covered by a network of local Legion posts, which function as secret police and strikebreakers. No trade-unionist can become a member of the Legion unless he is a strikebreaker or a blackleg.

Among the Legion's duties are smashing Communist newspaper offices, lynching Negroes, and agitating for war against the U. S. S. R. President Truman is a member.

"A" IS FOR AVIATION

Red air force men won the war. In 1943 the RAF made limited night raids against German military bases and supply dumps.

In 1941 and 1942 the British had attempted to conduct daylight bombing, but their machines suffered too heavy losses, although the Luftwaffe had most of its planes on the eastern front.

By 1943 the Germans were in no shape to offer any serious resistance to the Anglo-American Air Force, thanks to the German losses on the eastern front. By 1944 the Luftwaffe was no danger at all to Great Britain and much less to the United States.

Only at the end of the war was the creation of complete Anglo-American air superiority in the west established. Not until then did the British resume day bombing regularly.

A huge 180-ton, 4,000-horsepower motor on a stand in the center of the cylindrical steel and concrete building swings this arm at astonishing speeds. It can be accelerated from a dead stop to 174 miles per hour in a little under 7 seconds.

The Navy laboratory will use television and movie cameras and high-speed X-ray equipment in recording the effects on the human passenger as he is whirled around. He will be seated inside an aluminum gondola mounted at the end of a 50-foot tubular steel arm.

Not only will the centrifuge permit the study of the effects of gravity but also of altitude. The gondola, which can carry 600 pounds and can be used for testing effects on men and also equipment, is capable of simulating altitudes up to 60,000 feet and temperatures with a range from 44 to 110 degrees Fahrenheit.

The centrifuge was designed by the special devices center of the office of naval research and the McKiernan-Terry Co. of New Jersey. It is surrounded by subsidiary laboratories for physiological, biophysical, psycho-physiological and biochemical research.

As he is swirled around the edge of this circular room with solid walls, the passenger will be seated in what the Navy engineers call an oblate spheroidal gondola, mounted in a two-gimbal support. To a layman it looks like a huge bomber tire with solid sides, except for a door to permit entry and exit. The gondola is of sandwich construction with spun aluminum inner and outer layers.

Mounted in the counterweight at the center the gimbal control motors drive the gimbal rings through shafts running the length of the arm. In a turret suspended from the ceiling is the control station for the centrifuge. The operator can look out through windows in the side of this control blister and watch the arm as it picks up speed.

Inside the control room are a number of devices to record the effects of the pulls and stresses of the speed and the turns the centrifuge creates. The room has been carefully shielded to protect the delicate physiological instrumentation circuits from magnetic and electrical interference. One-sixteenth inch copper has been used in sheathing the floor, walls, and ceiling.

As head of the laboratory, the Navy has an unusually well qualified team composed of Capt. John R. Poppen, who has been in the service for 33 years, ever since his graduation from the University of Michigan in 1917; and Commander Charles F. Gell, who combines in one man the knowledge and skill of an aviator, a doctor of medicine, and an engineer.

Poppen pioneered some of the earliest research on gravity effects in aviation. In fact, during experiments 15 years ago, he hit on something so revolutionary he didn't even mention it to his colleagues. It was the fact that dogs could withstand far more gravity pull when lying down than they could in standing. Currently the services are deep in experiments on this subject, planning the day when a pilot will fly prone or supine to permit faster pull-outs and sharper turns.

One of the reasons the Navy wants to develop more information about effects of speed on equipment and materials is that at 650 miles per hour a plane can reach 70 degrees above outside temperatures due to frictional heating alone, which can be beyond the melting point of plastics used in aircraft.

It is particularly fitting that Captain Poppen should be the director of the laboratory, since he pioneered the first research in G's and developed the first anti-G blackout device for pilots.

Congress Has No Real Independence, But Is Puppet for the Military — Is This True?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the March 7, 1951, issue of the Christian Century, the leading Protestant religious weekly in America.

The facts and logic in this discussion of the American political scene, and Congress in particular, seem very convincing.

Yet, as a Member of Congress, I still cherish the hope that Congress will establish its independence and constitutional power.

However, it is hard to conceive how Congress can recover its rightful power once it passes General Marshall's demand for universal military service.

Once that instrument of power is in the hands of the military, they will almost certainly be tempted to elect or defeat Congressmen at will—because military spending programs, plus arbitrary power to grab the youth of every home in America, will give them a political weapon that cannot be effectively resisted.

The military will then have a political machine so powerful that those who seek public office will dare not seriously oppose them.

If this analysis is not correct, I challenge the advocates of UMTS to discuss this issue fairly and frankly—and to offer some creditable evidence that it is not correct.

The editorial follows:

FRUSTRATION ON THE POTOMAC

More than ever Congress in these tense days is living up to its reputation as the Nation's "cave of the winds." On and off the floors of the two Houses, Members indulge in wild words on all sorts of matters of Government policy. Little legislation has so far been enacted. An observer unfamiliar with the ways of Washington might, at this stage in the current session, conclude that with partisan passion running verbal riot as it now is doing, not much legislation ever will grind through the congressional mill. But all this violence of debate, formal and informal, really means little. It is, in fact, the way by which Members of the legislative branch of the Government seek to compensate for their sense of frustration. And the noisy proceedings on Capitol Hill will not be understood unless this frustration is taken into account.

Under the Constitution of the United States, ours is supposed to be a government of clearly divided powers, with three coordinated branches providing checks and balances for each other. The founding fathers, steeped in Aristotle, Locke, and Montesquieu, believed that they were thus providing against too great a concentration of powers in the Executive and for the subordination of the military to the civil authority. Congress was granted constitutional duties and powers which it was thought would make it forever the source of all laws and the ultimate arbiter of national policy. Senators and Representatives, important figures in their local communities, go to Washington expecting to fulfill these constitutional functions. But they soon find, after they get there, that their control over the most important measures of state is more theoretical than real. They resent being cast in a rubber-stamp role, but they quickly discover that there is not much they can do to escape it. Hence their sense of frustration, which they try to appease by noisy, though largely empty, threats of a legislative revolt.

The current hullabaloo over sending American troops to Europe is simply one more example. The Senate—and possibly to a lesser degree the House—will rant and rave over the President's assumption of authority in this vital matter. Before the session ends, however, Congress will approve whatever President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and General Eisenhower demand. It will do so because it cannot do anything else. The Senators who are now holding forth on executive invasions of the war-making powers of Congress know this. They know that when the decisive vote comes they will have to go along with the decisions which the Executive, acting on the advice of the military, has already made. In an issue of this sort Congress has no genuine independence. It takes out its sense of helplessness, therefore, in tall talk.

Equally unreal is the debate over the drafting of 18-year-olds. Congress knows the proposal is not popular. Its instinct warns that there must be something wrong about a system of selective service which cannot raise the 700,000 to 1,000,000 men required for the contemplated increase in the Army from the more than 9,000,000 in the present 19–26 draft-age pool. Its suspicions have been aroused by the speed with which the Defense Department discovered, when congressional questioning brought out the adequacy of this pool to supply the Army of 3,200,000 which President Truman said was planned, that an army more than a quarter of a million larger would be needed. Nevertheless, if General Marshall continues to insist that he must have the 18-year-olds—as he will—Congress knows that he will get them. Loud talk for the benefit of the parents back home therefore becomes its only compensation for its puppet role. But the talk will not affect the outcome.

The perfervid wrangling over executive assumptions of the Senate's treaty-making powers is more of the same. Under the Constitution, the Executive negotiates treaties but the Senate must ratify them before they can go into effect. In actuality, however, the growing practice of making executive agreements with other governments has all but emptied of meaning the Senate's participation in foreign relations. President Roosevelt carried this development to previously undreamed-of lengths during the war. The precedents which he established then are being continued in this period of at least theoretical peace. Accordingly, strident demands arise from Congress for reassurance as to what promises the Executive may have made to our allies in the North Atlantic military alliance. Before long we expect to hear as loud demands for reassurance concerning the promises made to France regarding help in Indochina. These assurances are given, but so slippery is diplomatic language that, no matter what Secretary Acheson tells his congressional inquisitors, Congress is not reassured. Yet the Senate knows it can really do nothing. As a result, more loud talk which changes the realities of the situation not at all.

Even the excited exchange over the budget is of much the same nature. True, financial measures must still originate in the House and must pass Congress before any branch of the Government can legally spend

that "the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate regulations providing that such selected citizens of China who have been admitted for the purpose of study in the United States shall be granted permission to accept employment upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization."

The State Department repeatedly has urged that this section of the law be put into force, but while the Justice Department has been reasonable about allowing the Chinese students to work after school hours and during summer vacations, it has not promulgated this section, which would enable the Chinese students to leave school and earn a living, or to take full-time jobs after graduation.

Instead, particularly since the Government was charged with being soft on Communists last year, the regional offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, particularly in Chicago, have been adopting what many university officials regard as an obsolete and harsh policy toward many of the Chinese students.

Now a Chinese student who has left school for lack of funds, or taken a job after graduation, is very likely to be served with a warrant of arrest, forced to return to his campus under the custody of some official there, and even served with a warrant of deportation.

MANY JOIN ORGANIZATIONS

This situation is greatly complicated by the fact that a great many of the Chinese students—at many universities the majority of them—have joined one or two organizations whose national leadership has been branded subversive by the Attorney General's office.

These organizations are the Chinese Students Christian Organization and the Scientific Workers Association of Engineering and Chemistry. Even those educators who criticize the Justice Department's handling of this problem agree that there has been some infiltration of these two organizations by Communists. Their complaints, however, are—

1. That the State and Justice Departments have different approaches to the problem, and

2. That all the Chinese students are being indicted as a result of the Communist sympathies of a few, and that the executive branch of the Government has let 9 months go by without putting into force a law that would enable the Chinese students to work here and avoid the consequences of returning to a Communist-controlled country.

PROFESSOR'S CONCLUSIONS

One professor who has watched the two Government departments trying to deal with these problems of employment and subversion summarizes his conclusions as follows:

1. One department tells us that so far as it is concerned no Chinese student who wishes to remain here will be forced to go back to Communist China. But the other Government department has given us the impression that all the Chinese students must prepare to return, even if they do not want to.

2. The simple theory of some of the Government officials in these parts is that since some of the Chinese students may be subversive, it would be better in the present atmosphere of suspicion and investigation to get rid of all of them.

"The answer to that, of course," he adds, "is that it is criminal to send back our friends and idiotic to send back our enemies, since all of them are highly trained. No sensible government would let any of them go near Peiping, whether they wished to go or not—and 90 percent of them definitely wish not to go."

Query

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorial comment from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald.

The editorial follows:

QUERY

Is President Truman's proposed budget as closely trimmed as it might be?

The President thinks it is. He has said so emphatically and caustically; and he has "dared" Congress to try to reduce it further.

It is always risky for a President to "dare" Congress to do anything; for Congress is quite apt to take up the challenge, not only for the merit of the action itself, but also to demonstrate to the Chief Executive that the Congress is the legislative body, and the direct representative of the American pepole.

As to what Congress will do in this particular instance must remain to be seen.

But there is no doubt as to the attitude of the congressional representation from western New York.

The views of Representative DANIEL A. REED of this forty-fifth district already have been quoted by this newspaper.

Mr. REED is convinced that billions of dollars could be lopped from the proposed budget. He has pointed out that all told the President wants $16,000,000,000 of additional revenue for the next fiscal year; and that he, Mr. REED, has not satisfied himself that, if the proper pruning is done, there will be any need to provide more than half of that colossal sum.

The views of other western New York solons may not be so well known to the people of Olean and vicinity; but here, in brief, are some of them:

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, declares that Mr. Truman again has demonstrated his habit of putting his personal feelings ahead of reason.

"The President," he says, "should welcome rather than spurn the efforts of Congress to find ways to reduce nonessential, nondefense spending. In issuing a dare to Congress to cut his budget in any respect, the President demonstrates his impetuous tendency, tragic for the country, to put personal pique ahead of reason."

On its part, added Mr. KEATING, Congress should dare the President "to put to the American people the issue of whether or not they want him to be the absolute dictator of how much shall be deducted from the pay envelopes for taxes without any participation by Congress in that decision."

Here is Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Bath:

"I can think of no dare in all my lifetime that I have accepted with more enthusiasm than this one. There are some parts of the President's budget I shall be especially happy to vote against. The Brannan farm plan, Federal aid to education, and socialized medicine are some of them."

Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn—the ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee—has this to say:

"We accept his challenge. The administration's every effort has been made to get every last possible dollar out of the Treasury, and to delude the Congress that it was needed.

"We do not intend to be sidetracked by threats from doing our duty, which is to protect the American people against the ridiculous and exorbitant demands of the bureaucrats."

There is every indication, it is gratifying to note, that Congress will trim the Presidential tax proposals to a considerable degree by the relatively simple expedient of cutting down or lopping off altogether appropriations for completely nonessential activities.

And there are many.

Besides the Brannan farm plan, socialized medicine and other schemes whose cost would run into the billions annually, there are requests in the President's budget for an increase in the amount of money devoted to "earthquake investigation," for the construction of a glove factory at Alcatraz Federal Penitentiary "to offset a reduction in convict employment at the laundry," money for five new facilities for sightseers at various national parks, funds to carry on "studies designed to increase production of potatoes in Alaska."

There are many other such requests. Congressional pruners should have quite an interesting time.

New Tool Probes Gravity's Effects for Navy's Fliers—Pilots of Tomorrow May Work Lying Down—Lessens Blackout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Lt. Comdr. Robert J. Boylan and published by the North American Newspaper Alliance on the new Aviation Medical Acceleration Laboratory at Johnsville, Pa. The article follows:

NEW TOOL PROBES GRAVITY'S EFFECTS FOR NAVY'S FLYERS—PILOTS OF TOMORROW MAY WORK LYING DOWN—LESSENS BLACKOUT

(By Lt. Comdr. Robert J. Boylan, USNR)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Sir Isaac Newton found out what he wanted to know about gravity using only an apple and a tree. But he couldn't possibly have conceived the present and increasing need to know more and more about gravity's effect on the human body as it rockets through the air at speeds approaching that of sound.

To try to come up with some of the answers the Navy is spending more than $4,000,000 on a new aviation medical acceleration laboratory at Johnsville, Pa., which will devote a lot of its time to measuring the effects of gravity at high speeds and sharp turns under a wide variety of altitudes and temperatures, artificially produced. Knowledge acquired can be used in planning military and civilian aircraft of the future.

Centerpiece of this new laboratory is the largest and newest centrifuge in the world, which has taken several years to plan, construct, and install in the laboratory. Part of the centrifuge is a long steel horizontal arm with a small enclosed passenger compartment mounted on the end of it.

analysis of Secretary Acheson's character and capacity, but primarily because I feel it is imperative that the Congress and the American people be again alerted—and again and again—to the current attacks upon our character and institutions of which Secretary Acheson has unwittingly become the supreme symbol.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make two and a half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUSADE AGAINST ACHESON

(By Elmer Davis)

I

Whatever else Mr. Herbert Hoover may or may not have accomplished by his foreign-policy speech last December, he at least changed the topic of conversation and thereby got the Republicans in Congress off of what was becoming a somewhat uncomfortable hook. Ever since the election they had been talking about nothing but the Secretary of State; and finally their party caucuses in both Houses had formally demanded that Acheson must go. Why must he go? Because, they said, he had lost the confidence of the country. Why had he lost it—if or insofar as he had? Because for months past Republican orators had been denouncing him with a virulence seldom equaled, and a shameless mendacity quite unequaled in my recollection. After the election there was little pretense that there had been any truth in these attacks. Said Senator IVES, in presenting the demand for Acheson's dismissal, "Whether or not he is responsible for the dilemma we are in has nothing to do with it." (All through the campaign the Republicans had been insisting that he was responsible; they disagreed only as to whether he was a traitor or a mere incompetent.) * * *

But Acheson did not go. The resignation he had never written was accepted by several volunteer presidents in their newspaper columns; but the elected President in the White House said that Acheson was going to stay, and the Republicans in Congress were beginning to look rather foolish till Mr. Hoover gave them a chance to talk about something else. By the time you read this the attack on Acheson may have been renewed; but if so, it may be a little less illogical than it was in December; there has been nothing quite like that in American history. Not merely because they were denouncing as a Communist (or a protector of Communists—they could never quite agree on their story) the man who had done more to check the advance of Russian aggression than any other public official we have ever had; not merely because they were demanding the dismissal of the man who, at that time, was clearly the most successful Secretary of State since Seward. (Subsequent events have somewhat tarnished the luster of his greatest achievement, the change in the constitution of the United Nations; but Acheson is not to blame for that, nor could the Republicans then have foreseen it.) But for pure irresponsibility their performance has no equal.

The parallel cited by the President—the demand of the Republican Senators, in December 1862, for the dismissal of Secretary of State Seward—fits only loosely. Those were Senators of the President's own party and they were a majority of the total membership of the Senate. What they proposed was, as the most candid of them admitted, unconstitutional—an attempt to establish something like the parliamentary form of government; with the considerable difference that the President's powers would have been transferred, not to Congress as a whole, but to the Senate. But at least they did propose to transfer the executive authority, not to nullify it; and to transfer it to a group that had a policy, an alternative to the policy of President Lincoln. Their policy would almost certainly have lost the Civil War and disrupted the Republic; still it was a policy, the majority of the Senate was behind it; granted their premises, their behavior made some sense.

No such logic informed the action of the Republicans last December. They were a minority, and would still be a minority when the new Congress came in. The demand for Acheson's removal was overwhelmingly supported in the House caucus; but only 23 of the 42 Republican Senators voted for it. Five voted against it—AIKEN, LANGER, MORSE, and the two SMITHS; 14 others had at least the courage not to vote at all. The President was called on to remove the Secretary of State to satisfy a minority of the House of Representatives and less than a fourth of the Senators, who had no alternative to offer, either of personality or of policy. It was not their business, they insisted, to say who should replace Acheson; and there were almost as many Republican foreign policies as there were Republican Senators. This was not a proposal—not even a revolutionary proposal—for a different kind of action; it was a program for organizing and institutionalizing impotence.

But at this writing (mid-January) Republican policies seem to be beginning to jell. It is not yet clear whether the party will follow Mr. Hoover in his proposal to retreat under the bed and there erect a Gibraltar of Western civilization; or Senator TAFT in any of the various ideas he offers, fresh every morning; or whether—as seems not yet beyond hope—the Dewey-Dulles Republicans may persuade their colleagues to recognize the facts of life. At any rate, if the attack on Acheson should be resumed, his enemies will probably have some alternative to offer, whatever it may be worth.

* * * * *

But why pick on Acheson? Well, last spring, before McCarthyism had conquered a party (or much of a party, for there were honorable holdouts to the last), John Duncan Miller of the London Times had interpreted it as essentially "a revolt of the primitives against intelligence." Acheson is intelligent; he also has the misfortune of being a gentleman, and what in his case proved to be the greater misfortune of being a Christian.

His origins are appallingly respectable—the son of a bishop, educated at Groton, Yale, and the Harvard Law School; an editor of the Harvard Law Review, followed by a term as secretary to Justice Brandeis before he went into the practice of law in Washington. He has, as one of his old friends remarked to me, "all the virtues that were considered estimable when you and I were boys." Also, he dresses well and speaks correct English; for which he has been sneered at by Mr. Fulton Lewis, who also can speak correct English and dresses well enough to impersonate a man of distinction in whisky advertisements. All this makes Acheson an easy target for the fascistoid elements in American society—the people from whom the Ku Klux Klan and the Christian Front were recruited, the kind of people who gave Hitler his first mass support. But for all that, you would suppose there must be something in his official record to justify the holy crusade that was waged against him.

There is not.

II

Acheson has been damned as a New Dealer by those who believe, or profess to believe, that New Dealers are Communists; yet he first became conspicuous in the news as a man who would not go along with the New Deal. A brilliant and highly successful lawyer, he gave up his practice in the spring of 1933 to become Under Secretary of the Treasury. Since Secretary Woodin was often ill, Acheson ran the department during a good part of that tumultuous year; but in November he resigned by request, because he opposed the devaluation of the dollar. Thereafter he returned to his law office, and would probably have stayed there but for Hitler's successes in 1940. Acheson then became active in the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, and early in 1941 left his practice again to become Assistant Secretary of State.

During his 4½ years in that office his duties consisted largely of liaison with Congress, and in view of his recent troubles it is worth noting that he got along with Congress remarkably well. Aside from that he dealt chiefly with economic problems; he had little to do with political policy until August 1945, when he was promoted to Under Secretary. And here appears the first muted announcement of a theme that has lately been blared on numerous Republican trumpets. He was confirmed with only one dissenting vote—that of Senator WHERRY, who accused him of insulting MacArthur. Acheson had said that MacArthur's occupation command was the instrument, not the determinant, of United States Government policy, and this statement of constitutional fact was evidently news to KENNETH WHERRY.

Acheson remained as Under Secretary till July 1947, often running the Department as Acting Secretary while his chief—first Byrnes and later Marshall—was absent at international conferences. State Department policies are usually the product of many minds, and it is hard to say just who deserves the credit. But Acheson had, as the President has noted, a great deal to do with the Greek-Turkish policy and the Truman doctrine early in 1947; still more to do with the transformation of the Truman doctrine into the Marshall plan, which became the most successful of all our postwar policies. And incidentally he was the first high American official who publicly declared that Russian policy is aggressive—a statement which, made to a Senate committee early in 1947, brought a formal and irate protest from Molotov which General Marshall brushed aside. All in all, Acheson's record as Under Secretary thoroughly justifies his later remark that not even "disinterested malevolence" could call him an appeaser. (But he had underestimated the capabilities of interested malevolence.)

His retirement to private life left him little time for his law practice, for presently he was named vice chairman of the Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization. And about the time that group finished its arduous and fruitful labors, General Marshall's health compelled his retirement, and Acheson was called back into the service as Secretary of State. Whether history will ultimately rank him right up at the top, along with John Quincy Adams and William H. Seward, cannot yet be predicted; but neither of those men, in his first 2 years in office, accomplished as much as Acheson has done. More than any other man he has created the organization by which the free nations can make most effective use of their united powers to beat back Communist imperialism.

The first of his great achievements, the North Atlantic Treaty, had been largely prepared by Marshall and Lovett; but Acheson finished the work of concluding it, and led the way in the more difficult task of persuading the Senate to approve it. He was working on long-term policies too—the policy of building up situations of strength from which we could afford to negotiate with the Kremlin with some hope of getting somewhere. And his speech at the University of California last March set forth the conditions on which other nations can safely live in the same world with Russia. They are conditions to which the Russians will

a nickel. But the budget has become a Presidential production, and Congress retains little actual control over it. Mr. Truman almost laughed in the face of Congress the other day when, in defying its Members to cut his current $72,000,000,000 figures, he reminded the Nation that we went through the same performance of an initial outcry and demands for cuts during the previous session and ended by actual additions of a billion to what the Executive had proposed. Now Congress is trying to delay its inevitable accession to the demands of the White House by dragging out action on taxes. But with the sacrosanct military and veterans' items, with the fixed charges on debt and the virtual promises already made to our allies, Congress knows that there is very little it can do. So there is nothing left for it but to get what satisfaction it can from preliminary howling, with Senators and Representatives hoping that at tax-paying and voting times the electorate will remember the howls and forget the actual outcome.

So it goes in all fields of government action. Under the Constitution, Congress remains the lawmaking branch, and therefore might be thought to be the actual governing body in Washington. Thousands of classes in the Nation's schools are still being taught that this is so. Yet in reality it is not so. The real centers of authority in Washington are three—the White House, the Pentagon and the administrative agencies. Not one of the three is to be found in the Capitol.

Aside from the check which remains in the provision that Congress must enact appropriation bills—a check which, as has been said, constantly diminishes in actuality—the White House has almost no limitations left on its exercise of power. The President, appealing to his authority as commander in chief, now claims almost unlimited warmaking powers. By executive agreements with foreign governments he continually bypasses limitations over his control of foreign policy. The Vatican embassy has given public demonstration of the way in which he can, and frequently does, ignore the constitutional provisions for Senate participation in the appointment of ambassadors. Two years ago he claimed implied powers to intervene in labor disputes by drafting striking railway workers. Even in financial matters, he now demands and receives secret funds which he disburses without congressional check. The President of the United States thus has accumulated far more power than any other head of a supposedly democratic government on earth. Once in a long while Congress tries to stand up against this current of growing executive power. The last instance came in the revolt against President Roosevelt's Supreme Court-packing plan. But such occasional revolts do not alter the general trend. That is toward investing the President with ever accumulating powers.

The Pentagon has become almost a law unto itself. Each new crisis in our international relations adds to its freedom from civilian control. In this session it is demanding astronomical sums of Congress without giving more than the haziest suggestions as to how it intends to use the money. Every Member of Congress knows, moreover, that after these enormous appropriations have been voted the Pentagon will be back, before the session ends, with demands for many more billions in supplemental appropriations. If any significant body of Congressmen dare to question the Pentagon's demands, it has only to fling out the magic word "security" and the opposition collapses. The prospect of a permanent military establishment of great size at last confronts the Republic with a permanent military caste—the very thing which the founding fathers were most determined to prevent. Not only is the defense department for the first time in our history headed by a professional military man, but the fate of Louis Johnson is a reminder of what will now happen to a civilian who tries to impose his authority on the Pentagon. From now on, civilians in the Pentagon will be tolerated only if they understand that they are there to do as the generals and admirals tell them.

As for the administrative agencies—Washington's "alphabet soup"—they proliferate endlessly and accumulate authority all the time. Whence come the laws which actually rule American life today? Businessmen have long known that they come from the tens of thousands of executive regulations which pour out of the administrative agencies. Now the rank-and-file of our citizens will be taught the same lesson. Wage and price controls will not let them forget this, and these are only a start in the flood of administrative regulations which are to be expected now that we are heading into another war crisis. Does Congress have no control over these agencies? Well, it must appropriate their running expenses, to be sure. But ask any candid Congressman how much control this is in actual practice. Ultimate power, of course, inheres in the President who sets up these agencies. To that extent, the growth of the authority of the regulatory agencies is a growth of White House authority. Working together, White House and alphabetical bodies constitute a government which is virtually independent of Congress.

What all this means is that the theory of the United States Government, as embedded in the Federal Constitution, is one thing; its actual working is something far different. As our drift into the conditions of a militarized state continues, this divergence will become ever more marked. Congress is headed toward becoming as vestigial as was the Roman Senate under the Caesars. Is there anything that can be done about it? Should the Constitution be rewritten to bring it into accord with the facts? Or should the two Houses of Congress be encouraged to stage more frequent uprisings against a White House and Pentagon grasping for power?

The first suggestion is academic; such a general rewriting of the Constitution is not politically possible. Besides, the Constitution as it stands, with its provisions for amendment, is a good constitution—as good as the Republic envisaged by the founding fathers requires. Congressional revolts can yield only sporadic and limited results; the general trend toward concentration of power in the Executive will go right on. It will go right on, we believe, because no genuine democratic control can be established over a militarized state, and that is what this Nation—driven by what we are told are ineluctable historic forces—is becoming. It is this progress toward militarization that the frustrated men on the Potomac are declaiming against on the floors of Congress, even though most of them do not realize it. Until this trend is reversed, Congress will continue to lose power, the White House and the Pentagon to gain it. And power once lost will never be regained without a terrific struggle, even should the tensions which are hastening our militarization be eased or pass away.

Wire Tap Bill Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News.

The editorial follows:

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

A teapot tempest is still raging on the question of allowing the FBI to tap telephone conversations of suspected foreign agents.

With thousands of American boys already lying in Korean graves, we think it's high time to start helping instead of hindering the FBI. But many well-meaning persons still raise the bloody shirt of martyred civil liberties at such a suggestion.

Obviously, no sane person wants to start scrapping civil liberties wholesale. From Bunker Hill to Wonju our soldiers have fought to preserve a system of government whose core is the protection of the rights of the individual.

There are inconsistencies in the objections raised to FBI wire-tapping. For example, it's permissible for a FBI man to eavesdrop on a conversation in a restaurant, but he can't eavesdrop on a telephone conversation.

Police of many States can use wiretap evidence on minor crimes, but the FBI can't use it in efforts to guard our Government against enemy espionage.

Representative KEATING has introduced a bill to remedy the situation. By making permission of a Federal judge necessary for such wire-tapping, the bill attempts to protect the public against unwarranted invasion of its rights.

This long-overdue measure should be passed quickly.

The Crusade Against Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mr. Elmer Davis in the current Harper's entitled "The Crusade Against Acheson."

In line with the customs of the Senate, and the senatorial courtesies around which these customs revolve, I have asked permission of Mr. Davis to make three deletions, a total of perhaps a hundred and fifty words, and these are indicated by asterisks.

Mr. President, America has no more distinguished journalist than Elmer Davis and few in Congress can know his handiwork, particularly his wartime handiwork with the OWI, as well as I. I congratulate him for the penetrating insight of this piece about our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. I congratulate him for taking time from his tense and busy life to do such a piece—involving much travail and little pay—because his conscience drove him to it. Mr. Davis wrote it, I am sure, to help all of us to understand the great domestic fact of the present day, that we Americans are engaged in a cold civil war testing whether our nation, "so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

I submit this article for the RECORD not merely as tribute to Mr. Davis, and not merely because I am proud to take the floor of the Senate to endorse his

happen to look it at a member of a congressional committee. It is not his fault that he looks like, and indeed is, a superior person; but that can be very annoying to Members of Congress.

Nevertheless, in his news conferences he displays more candor, and far more sense of humor, than any other Secretary of State within my recollection (which goes back 30-odd years). Once, I remember, when somebody asked him an embarrassing question, he remarked with a grin, "You wouldn't have known anything about that if I hadn't been silly enough to mention it last week." He seldom if ever takes the advice so lavishly given him by the pundits of the press, which may account for the crocodile tears which not long ago bedewed certain newspaper columns, whose writers sobbed that it was too bad—Acheson was a great statesman and a fine fellow, but he had lost the confidence of the country, so he would have to go.

Well, if you believe Dr. Gallup's not wholly infallible poll, he had lost the confidence of a majority of such citizens as had heard of him (about a third of them, in spite of all the uproar, had not); the big lie, repeated over and over, had done its work. The attack on Acheson was indeed only the major aspect of a campaign which included demands for either the resignation or the impeachment of the President; which included also the attack on General Marshall, disguised as an attack on Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, who being a woman and a Jew looked like a safe preliminary target. Just possibly, this case marked the turn of the tide. The Senate committee which heard the charges against Mrs. Rosenberg not only unanimously cleared her, but sent the evidence it had heard to the Department of Justice for investigation of the perjury which somebody had obviously committed. Moreover, the Senator who was most irate over this outrageous attack was a conservative Republican, HARRY CAIN, and Mrs. Rosenberg's most energetic and effective defender, during the investigation, was a conservative newspaperman, Frederick Woltman of the Scripps-Howard papers. So maybe the distinction between truth and falsehood is again beginning to mean something.

How much the public cares, however, is still uncertain. Last fall a man named FRANK BOW, operating through a Senator (libel-proof, in a speech on the floor), attacked both the integrity and the loyalty of the Secretary of the Interior. Bow's sworn testimony before a Senate committee was contradicted by the sworn testimony of several other people; somebody was lying, and lying on oath. Secretary Chapman was completely exonerated; Senator O'MAHONEY said that Bow's charges were an infamous libel; Senator MURRAY said that a man like Bow should not be allowed to remain at large. So what happened to FRANK BOW? He was elected to Congress from Ohio, beating a good man.

Tacitus wrote that the civil wars of A. D. 69 had "divulged the secret of the Empire, that an Emperor could be made elsewhere than at Rome." Sometimes it seems that some of the performances of this past year have divulged the secret of the Republic—that while you may not be able to fool all of the people all of the time, you can fool enough of them enough of the time to gain your end. The ethics of this sort of thing require no comment, but I should think that at least some of the men who joined in the crusade against Acheson would be concerned about its intellectual implications. They must at least be smart enough to realize that similar tactics might some day be used against them, even if they are undisturbed over what they have done to the basic principles of American public life.

They were operating on the principle that there can be no such thing as an honest difference of opinion, that whoever disagreed with them must be a traitor. In a time of great international tension they had demanded the dismissal of the Secretary of State, just as he was about to start off for an international conference where important and controversial issues were to be decided; they proposed no alternative to his policy, or to him; they had made allegations against him which were utterly, and often ludicrously false; and but for the firmness of the President they would have got away with it.

This Nation was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principle (among others) that honest men may honestly disagree on public issues; that if they all say what they think, a majority of the people will be able to distinguish truth from error; that in the competition in the market place of ideas, the sounder ideas will in the long run win out. Lately we have been engaged in a cold civil war—it was nothing less, in the year 1950—testing whether any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

Time will tell.

Some Aspects of the Veterans' Administration Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative and interesting article, Some Aspects of the Veterans' Administration Medical Program, appearing in the November 1950, issue of Harvard Public Health Alumni Bulletin, written by Dr. Francis Brian Carroll, M. D.; D. M. D., Tufts College; M. D., University of Rochester; M. P. H., Harvard University; and since his discharge after World War II, area medical director, New England States, and New York State, Veterans' Administration.

The article follows:

Since 1946 there has been marked improvement in quality of medical care in the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration.

Much has been accomplished by emulating those procedures which have proved successful in civilian medical practice in our large university hospitals.

Veterans' Administration hospitals have become affiliated with medical schools. Residency training programs have been instituted under the sponsorship of deans' committees. Leading physicians in all of the medical and surgical specialties are utilized on a part-time basis as consultants and attending physicians. There has been a resultant elevation of the professional standards in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Prior to World War II, the Veterans' Administration had considerable difficulty recruiting physicians because of the great disparity between salaries established by the Civil Service and the earnings of private practitioners in civilian life. Congress passed Public Law 293, which permitted the Veterans' Administration to hire medical personnel without reference to civil service rules and regulations. This has proved another important factor in enabling the Veterans' Administration to recruit competent medical staffs.

There has been a great increase in the amount of money spent for professional and other services, particularly for the use of diagnostic procedures and techniques requiring a large number of ancillary personnel. This has not only improved the quality of care, but has improved the efficiency of the entire program.

Individuals frequently ask why the Veterans' Administration does not contract for patient care in civilian hospitals. Actually, many veterans with service-connected disabilities are receiving care in civilian hospitals. Such an arrangement is made in emergencies when, because of the distance involved, it might be detrimental to transport the patient to a veterans' hospital.

Veterans' Administration hospitals were originally authorized because a grateful Nation recognized the debt which it owed to those who suffered disabilities in the service of their country.

At the present time there are two additional reasons why we must have so many Veterans' Administration hospitals: (1) Civilian hospitals do not have sufficient beds to handle the patient load, and (2) a large proportion of service-connected cases have disabilities which are chronic in nature and require long-term hospitalization. Private hospitals do not want this type of case.

Many people wonder why it is necessary to continue to build additional Veterans' Administration hospitals. This is readily understandable when one considers the potential load of veterans eligible for hospital benefits within the next 25 years.

A statistical summary released by the Veterans' Administration on January 31, 1950, showed there were 19,035,000 living veterans, of whom 15,313,000 served in World War II, the remainder in World War I and other wars. From this, one can appreciate the great reservoir of eligible veterans who will seek hospitalization within the next 25 years. It must also be realized that as the average age of the veteran increases, his need for hospitalization increases. Therefore, it can be safely estimated that the peak load will not be reached until after 1970. At that time one can envisage a need of 250,000 beds, by considering the demand for increasing hospitalization over the past years. The Veterans' Administration has reported that in 1930, approximately 10 years following World War I, there were 30,311 veterans hospitalized. They report the load in July 1945, just prior to the flow resulting from World War II, as 71,713. As of January 31, 1950, there were 112,332 Veterans' Administration patients in hospitals.

This situation requires long-range planning and does not lend itself to a vacillating policy of adopting each temporary expedient suggested by those well-meaning groups who are not always conversant with the facts.

Taxpayers rightfully wonder why the Veterans' Administration does not utilize Army or Navy hospitals, since they are closed, instead of building new hospitals. In some instances the Veterans' Administration has taken over these hospitals. In most instances, however, it is not feasible to do so. Many armed services hospitals are located in isolated areas where it would be impossible to arrange for an affiliation with a medical school, and it would be difficult to assemble a competent full-time professional staff. Many of these hospitals are of temporary construction, or at best, of semipermanent construction, with a resultant excessive cost for upkeep. Most of these hospitals are of the cantonment type with a horizontal layout. This type of hospital requires much more personnel to operate and, therefore, greatly increases operating expense. Thus, one can appreciate why the Veterans' Administration should studiously avoid acquiring the average Army or Navy hospital built during World War II.

It is true that the average length of patient stay in a veterans' hospital is greater than in most civilian hospitals. It must be borne

never assent except under great pressure, but unquestionably they are the only conditions that would make the world safe for anybody but Communists; they are the objectives at which American foreign policy must aim if it is to make sense.

He has been damned for omitting Korea from our defense perimeter, in a speech last spring (also Formosa, but more of that later). But the Korean Republic had then been set up by the United Nations; the consequent withdrawal of the occupation troops was approved by American military opinion, which was then thinking in terms of global war and held that Korea could not be defended against massive attack except by the commitment of more troops than Korea was worth, on a global scale. Recent events suggest that this judgment was correct. But a very different situation arose on June 25 last; here was a local aggression of the kind with which we had become familiar in the thirties, and the melancholy history of that decade had taught us that the time to stop it was the first time. Every member of the National Security Council advised the President that we must go to Korea's defense, but Acheson seems to have been the most vigorous of them all. Furthermore Acheson, working through Warren Austin at Lake Success, spurred the United Nations to back us up. Their military aid, though minor, has not been negligible; and in the situation of last June the political and moral effect of their support was immense.

But that support could be given only thanks to the accident that the Russians were then boycotting the Security Council. When they rejoined it, it was obvious that they could stop any similar action in future. The result was the greatest of Acheson's achievements—the persuading of the United Nations Assembly to declare its own competence to act when the Security Council is paralyzed by the veto. As Vishinsky correctly (and furiously) declared, this was a complete change in the character of the United Nations. For the first time it became an organization which could really do something, even if a great power wanted it to do nothing. This was the most brilliant American diplomatic victory of many decades—and the best kind of diplomatic victory, won not by pressure but by persuasion, by convincing other nations that their interest was identical with ours.

The immediate practical value of this is uncertain, at this writing. Acheson gave the Assembly machinery but he could not give it guts; when the small aggression of June was overlaid by the big aggression of November, many members of the United Nations seemed to have no further ambition except to escape notice.

Similarly the value of the Atlantic Treaty is being undermined, at this writing, by our own defeatists; Acheson could not give them guts either. But the machinery is there, if men have the spirit to use it.

III

So McCarthy calls him the Red Dean of Washington; Jenner accuses him of a pro-Communist betrayal of the American people; and * * * men, who have repeated their story so often that they have come to believe it themselves, demand his dismissal on the ground that they have persuaded the people to lose confidence in him. The attack on Acheson, said John Dewey after the election, was a victory for the Communist cause that the rulers of Russia could not have obtained by any activity of their own. Why should men who presumably want to stop the Russians have tried to destroy the man who has done more to stop the Russians than anybody else?

Not on account of what seems to me Acheson's one serious failure, the mishandling of German rearmament. Granted that he was under pressure from the military, it was his business to resist that pressure if it threatened to get us into a situation where the Germans could demand a price for defending themselves instead of clamoring for the privilege. But his enemies have not attacked him on that account; most of them are all out for German rearmament, whether or not either the French or the Germans want it.

China, however, is another matter: American policy, highly successful in Europe, failed to prevent the Communist conquest of China. Whether any American policy, after 1945, could have saved China is open to question; especially if it entailed saving Chiang Kai-shek and the men around him. But a noisy, unscrupulous, and well financed lobby insists not only that it could have been done, but that anybody who doubts that it could have been done their way is a Communist; these people ask, "Can Chiang trust the United States?" And aside from these gentlemen (whose activities deserve a more thorough investigation than they are likely to get, in the present political climate) there are others, more respectable, in Congress and elsewhere, who honestly believe that China is more important to American interest than Europe; that we can afford to let France go but we must save Formosa; that Chiang Kai-shek is more deserving of support than Clement Attlee, and that it is our fault, not his, if he was unable to beat the Communists. The Washington Post observes that Chiang seems to have lost the mandate of heaven which traditionally entitled a Chinese ruler to his people's loyalty, but that he still has his mandate from the Republicans.

To men who feel that way, failure in China naturally outweighs all our successes in Europe. But Acheson's part in making our China policy was very small indeed. The Communist victory was completed after he became Secretary of State but the policy that failed to prevent it was an inheritance from his predecessors. It had begun to take shape in the days of Stettinius; it was formulated, after Byrnes had taken over, by men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, who passed it on up to their superiors. Acheson as Under Secretary gave it approval which was not indeed perfunctory, but was no more than the judgment of a man who was not an expert on China that so far as he could see it looked all right. Secretary Byrnes did the same; but not till it had been gone over with General Marshall, who was something of an expert on China. They all approved it; but the official responsibility lay with Secretary Byrnes, and he has never tried to evade it.

Acheson, however, is now blamed for it, and for other things for which he was even less responsible. If he had been forced out of office last December it would have been, above all, because he had publicly endorsed the opinions of Jesus Christ, and because the military hero of the opposition party lost a battle. A party has often gained advantage because its favorite general won a battle; but it took political genius—or something—for the Republicans to derive as much profit from MacArthur's defeat on the Chongchon River as the Whigs derived from Zachary Taylor's victory at Buena Vista.

The crusade against Acheson had, of course, long been going on, but many people thought that the accusations of appeasement or communism were only what Thurlow Weed once called "a good enough Morgan till after election."

And they might have died down, despite the persistent proddings of the China lobby, if the situation had remained as it was on November 25, when the Nation was warm with the certainty of victory in Korea. In September MacArthur had turned disaster into triumph; when he started his end-the-war offensive everybody in Washington was still so dazzled by the brilliant success of his Inchon operation that they were sure that he could bring it off again. If he had, if the Army had pushed on to the Yalu, the United Nations would not have dogged it when it came to a Korean settlement; and the most ingenious political malevolence could hardly have longer obscured the facts.

But MacArthur's attempt to repeat the tactics of Chancellorsville, on a grander scale, unfortunately ran into a Chinese general more enterprising than Joe Hooker. Thanks to able leadership and hard fighting (by Turks, British, and Koreans, as well as Americans) the army was extricated without disaster; still we had lost a battle and perhaps a campaign, and there had to be a scapegoat for this incredible peripety. But it is a dogma of the Republican faith that MacArthur cannot lose a battle; since a battle had been lost, it must have been Acheson who lost it; it was his fault that the Chinese Communists were in Korea, or, indeed that they existed at all.

But, of course, the thing that more than anything else laid him open to attack was his famous refusal to turn his back on Alger Hiss. Let it be noted, by the way, that Hiss was never an important figure in the State Department. He was a rising young man, a useful technician; but that he ever made policy, at Yalta or anywhere else, is pure (or rather impure) myth. He was, however, a friend of Acheson, who has said that his friendship is not lightly given, and he had been convicted of a gross breach of public trust. What should a statesman say in such a case? Most men would have followed what Acheson later called "the counsels of discretion and cowardice," and taken the out of declining to comment on a case which had been appealed; but he chose not to have to remember, the rest of his life, that he had run away from "a disagreeable and dangerous decision."

What he did say meant simply that he didn't like to kick a man who was down; and if he had said just that he would have got into little trouble. Not that Acheson's enemies have any objection to kicking a man who is down; it is safer than kicking him when he is standing up; but phrased in those words, it could hardly be made popular. But Acheson made the mistake, natural perhaps to a bishop's son and a practicing Christian, of quoting some apposite but lengthy observations by the Saviour of mankind; and then they had him. He was a protector of Communists (though all the efforts of McCarthy and his gang have failed to prove that there is a single Communist in the State Department).

IV

The Hiss episode moved James Reston, of the New York Times to write that Acheson "seems to lack the gift, absolutely essential in a Secretary of State, of foreseeing how his remarks will look in tomorrow morning's newspapers." Yet they often look pretty good, if not tomorrow morning at least next week. He was denounced for insulting and misrepresenting Senator Taft in his comments on reexaminists; yet it presently turned out that what Taft meant was just about what Acheson thought he meant. (At least, what Taft means on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays; he seems to spend Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays reexamining and contradicting his own remarks of the day before.)

When Mr. Burt Shotton, who as manager of the Brooklyn Dodgers had won two pennants in 3 years and kept his team in the running till the last game in the third, was rewarded by being fired, Red Smith, of the New York Herald Tribune observed that he had made two major mistakes in public relations: he had neglected to acknowledge the superior wisdom of some inmates of the press box, and when he was asked a stupid question he yielded to the impulse to reply, "That is a stupid question." I have never heard Acheson say that, though he sometimes looks it; and to look it can be more withering—and more unfortunate, if you

Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public assistance recipients and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate March 7, 1951.

SHERWOOD G. DEGAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

India Can and Should Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in our natural and commendable impulse to help hungry people in India, we should not, I think, overlook the fact that India is rich in assets and has the ultimate capacity to pay us for the wheat we propose to send her either in money or commodities that we need. I am not concerned with the terms of such payment and would be content if they were most conveniently arranged; but pay they certainly can, and pay they certainly should.

There is grave question of our right as representatives of the people to give away their money. Our own individual and private charities are one thing, but to be charitable with the money of other people is something else.

I am including the following interesting editorial from the Bridgeton (N. J.) Evening News entitled "Let India Pay":

LET INDIA PAY

India wanted this country to give her 200,000,000 tons of wheat because she said she had a crop failure of wheat in that country last year, and there were a lot of people in this country, including Mr. Harry Truman and a lot of Government officials, who immediately jumped up and said, "Why certainly, give India the wheat she needs to keep her people from starving. We have never turned down a humanitarian call. Because India's representative in the United Nations took sides against us and spoke harshly about us is no reason for refusing aid to starving people."

That is all very true, but those people, including the President, himself, did not know all the facts in the case nor did they stop to find out before they raised the humanitarian cry.

Yes, India had a short wheat crop, not because of a wheat failure, but because India had shifted large areas of wheat land to jute and other crops that were more profitable and furnished labor to industrial workers. Neither was India unable to secure wheat because there was none near at hand. Her adjoining little republic has millions of bushels of wheat for sale, which would have filled a large part of India's needs, the transportation on which would be much cheaper than that on wheat shipped from this country. Nor was India unable to pay for at least a part of the wheat shipped from this country, for the Indian Government has money.

India has valuable deposits of minerals which we use in the manufacture of steel and the atomic bomb but of which we have none and must import, which could have been traded for wheat or at least for some of it, but no such offer was ever made, the Indian officials seeming to think that the United States was a sucker and a good subject to bleed for a good lot of wheat by the humanitarian route and perhaps they were unaware that Uncle Sam did not grow this wheat, but paid a big price for it and taxed the people's bread as well as their pocketbook to pay for it.

Be this picture as it may, the House of Representatives has taken a hard-hearted view of the application, opposing passage of the bill as at present constituted and the House Rules Committee has it bottled up refusing to permit it to reach the floor and, even though it was released, it would fall of passage by the House.

If the people of India are shown to be suffering from famine, Congress will aid them but their need must be presented in a different light from that now shown.

This country cannot carry the whole world on its shoulders even though a lot of Washington officials, including Mr. Truman, think it can.

W. E. M.

Time to Ring Down Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter. This editorial, entitled "Time To Ring Down Curtain," is indeed timely and expresses the views of the people in my district regarding the incompetence of many of the administration's appointments. They realize we cannot long survive under the bureaucratic form of Government and want the constitutional rights of Congress returned from the executive branch of the Government. They want their elected representatives to represent them at all times and not be governed by the mandates handed down by men and women appointed by the President.

TIME TO RING DOWN CURTAIN

It seemed fair to hold off conclusive judgment about the RFC until the Senate's inquiry was well advanced. That stage has now been reached. And the findings point to just one sensible course: The abolition of the RFC.

As everyone knows, Herbert Hoover created RFC as a depression emergency device to help keep tottering big business going in the dark days. It was never contemplated that the agency should go permanently into the banking business in competition with our private banking system.

But that is in fact exactly what happened. More than that, the RFC became a sort of court of last resort to which business firms appealed after all regular banks had turned a deaf ear. Many such concerns were granted loans, in defiance of what private bankers considered sound lending practice.

No doubt this greater liberality often had beneficial results, but that cannot be allowed to obscure the essential that the RFC was serving as a vast commercial bank. On several occasions, indeed, the RFC's well known liberality enabled private banks to transfer to that agency outstanding loans the banks rated as poor risks.

The private banking system is perfectly qualified, except perhaps in extreme emergencies, to meet all the credit needs of the expanding United States economy. There is no point in having the Government competing in this field.

But as it has developed in the capital, the issue goes well beyond the economic justifications for keeping or abolishing the RFC. Basically the problem has become a moral one.

What the investigation of Senator Fulbright's subcommittee has disclosed is a supreme example of the folly of government by crony—cronyism, as some have styled it.

Too often President Truman has placed in key Government office not the most fit men, nor even well-qualified men, but simply men he knew and liked. He frequently complains that he cannot attract competent men to many important posts, but the record indicates he at numerous times went out of his way to assure such jobs to his friends.

It is the thoughtful testimony of several seasoned Washington observers that Mr. Truman has thereby permitted a host of Federal commissions and bureaus to deteriorate dangerously. The Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, these are among them.

Worse than this, the President has maintained an almost fanatical loyalty to his cronies holding these jobs. Loyalty is a noble trait, and it isn't the only one the American people admire in Mr. Truman. But loyalty to incompetent men—friends or not—is misplaced. The President would do much better to be loyal to high standards of performance.

Moreover, this attitude has been aggravated by his insistence upon regarding every attack upon a subordinate as fundamentally an assault upon him as President. Thus he has tended to discount the criticisms as always political, never sincere.

Senator FULBRIGHT may not be without political motive, but the facts unearthed by his committee cannot be brushed off as campaign fantasies. The expensive mink coat given to a White House secretary, the free vacations for White House functionaries (and Senators, too, for that matter) at the expense of a Florida hotel manager who won an RFC loan, the innumerable payoffs through awards of high-salaried business jobs to former RFC men, these compound into a sordid, immoral story.

Apparently only the strongest men, administrators like Jesse Jones and Eugene Meyer, can keep a government lending agency from sinking into the morass of loans-by-political-favor. Establish an institution dealing in billions—passed out on fairly easy terms—and you have a set-up ideally suited to political machinations. Flies always collect around the honey pot.

The result is not only a weakening of the RFC itself, but a general lowering of moral behavior in many parts of the Administration, in Congress, and elsewhere.

Mr. Hoover, Jesse Jones, and others have called for RFC's demise. To abolish the agency would be to set an example, to start Government back up the road to sound moral performance.

in mind that veterans' hospitals have many more chronic patients which accounts for a greater average length of hospital stay. But the patient stay is also longer in Veterans' Administration hospitals than in civilian hospitals if one compares only the patients who remain less than 30 days. There is a simple explanation for this which is not generally appreciated by the public. In civilian practice a patient usually visits his physician's office where a careful history is taken and a physical examination made. In some instances special examinations such as chest X-rays are taken and gastrointestinal studies are performed on an outpatient basis. In many instances surgical patients have had all except the immediate preoperative studies completed prior to hospitalization for an operation. Also following an operation, the patient is discharged home at an early date for further follow-up at home by the family physician. This is not usually possible with veterans because only those with service-connected disabilities are eligible for outpatient care at Government expense.

Accordingly, when the average veteran enters the hospital, he receives a complete work-up preoperatively and remains at the hospital, in most instances, until he is fully recovered.

There is no denying the fact that a patient who is paying for his own hospitalization is anxious to be discharged as soon as possible. It is claimed that this incentive is not present in the case of the average veteran. This may be true in isolated instances but the Veterans' Administration does not concur in the belief that this is a factor of major importance. The cost of hospitalization is but one of the many factors which affect a patient while he is hospitalized. In many cases he is faced with loss of income, interruption of schooling, and separation from his family. Any one or a combination of these factors would offer an impelling reason why he would want to be discharged from the hospital at the earliest possible date.

Any assumption, based on the length of hospital stay, that it takes longer, for example, to complete a gastrointestinal series or to recover from a major operation in a Veterans' Administration hospital than in a civilian hospital is entirely erroneous.

It is well recognized that the type of medical care afforded in Veterans' Administration hospitals affiliated with medical schools is on a par with that provided in the best civilian hospitals. Veterans' Administration hospitals are not only staffed by eminent physicians, but also by experts in all the allied medical specialties. They are equipped with the finest equipment available to enable these highly specialized individuals to carry out their diversified and complicated techniques.

Once a patient has been admitted to a VA hospital, irrespective of whether the veteran has established service connection, there can be but one standard of medical care—the best possible.

Inasmuch as the greatest demand for beds is for neuropsychiatric patients, coupled with the fact that the VA has a limited number of neuropsychiatric beds available at the present time, it has been necessary to utilize these beds to the greatest advantage. To this end, mental hygiene clinics attempt to handle as many psychoneurotic and mild psychotic patients as possible, thus decreasing need for hospitalization. In VA neuropsychiatric hospitals, intensive therapy is utilized in an effort to treat effectively and discharge incumbents to make room for others needing treatment.

Applications for admission to tuberculosis hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration are far in excess of the number of beds available for tuberculosis patients. To meet this situation, the Veterans' Administration has made arrangements for hospitalization of service-connected veterans at Government expense in practically every State, county, or municipal sanatorium in this country. Building plans call for the construction of more tuberculosis hospitals. In the meantime, the Veterans' Administration is converting some general medical and surgical hospitals to tuberculosis. They are also utilizing sections in their general hospitals for tuberculosis cases. For the past 2 years, in approximately 25 of the Veterans' Administration tuberculosis hospitals throughout the country, one of the largest and best controlled studies in the use of streptomycin in the treatment of tuberculosis cases has been carried out. All tuberculosis-psychotic patients in Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospitals have been isolated and are cared for in separate buildings. Aseptic technique has been established in all of the tuberculosis hospitals. The Veterans' Administration has adopted the procedure of oiling blankets, bed linen, and floors in their tuberculosis hospitals, in order to prevent dust and hence tubercle bacilli, from circulating. The policy of giving B. C. G. vaccine to tuberculin negative doctors, nurses, and food attendants has been considered, but has not been adopted to date. Tuberculosis registers have been established and will be maintained locally in cooperation with State health departments.

Future planning calls for 1,000-bed construction projects predominantly for neuropsychiatric patients but to include separate 250-bed medical and surgical buildings. The general medical and surgical unit will take care of general medical and surgical admissions from the surrounding area, as well as the intercurrent illness of patients in the neuropsychiatric units.

Future 1,000-bed hospitals primarily for general medical and surgical patients will have neuropsychiatric units of approximately 250 beds.

Domiciliary homes are operated to care for those veterans who are able to work for a few hours a day, and who need a minimum amount of professional care. This enables the Veterans' Administration to utilize the limited number of hospital beds in their general hospitals to the greatest advantage.

Any widespread notion that the Veterans' Administration operates independently or arbitrarily without the advice and assistance of the medical profession, as a whole, is grossly erroneous.

A group of national consultants representing all of the medical and surgical specialties, meet approximately every 2 months at the Veterans' Administration central office, Washington, D. C., to review the program and recommend changes for its improvement to the Chief Medical Director and his staff. Dr. James Stevens Simmons, dean, Harvard School of Public Health, is one of the most active members of this group and has contributed a great deal toward its success.

There are six area offices located throughout the country, charged with the responsibility of supervising the operation of the medical program. In addition to a full-time staff, three area offices utilize the services of consultants in all of the medical specialties. The Boston area office has responsibility for supervision of all Veterans' Administration hospitals and out-patient medical clinics in the New England States and in New York State, where there is a total of 29 installations. There are 59 area medical consultants in the various specialties attached to the Boston area, who make periodic surveys of the activities in their respective specialties in the VA installations in this area, and make recommendations for improvement.

At VA hospitals, another group of consultant and attending physicians render direct service in the hospitals, making ward rounds, performing operations, and participating in the training of residents.

Our regional office medical clinics authorize treatment of service-connected cases by private practitioners of medicine on a fee basis. This enables the veteran to have free choice of a physician approved by the State medical society, either as a general practitioner or as a specialist.

It would be difficult to conceive of any medical program with more active participation of specialists and private practitioners in medicine, than that which now exists in the medical program of the Veterans' Administration.

Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following Senate resolution passed by the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois recommending amendments to the Social Security Act:

Whereas the Congress of United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public-assistance programs operated by the various States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern, and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the "Public Assistance Code of Illinois" which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,340,000,000 during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the

In a free world one can make no sweeping promises because people can come and go, and see for themselves. One can never claim that everything is, or will be, perfect for everybody, everywhere, at exactly the same time. But one can see with his own eyes that in most areas where true political and economic democracy is practiced, things are getting better; the direction is up. And it is the direction which counts.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

How shall we describe this system—imperfect, but always improving, and always capable of further improvement—where men move forward freely together, working together, building together, producing always more and more, and sharing together the rewards of their increased production? Capitalism is no longer the right word. In too many minds it stands for the primitive economic system of the nineteenth century when, all too often, employers were greedy and workers were oppressed. We need a new name to describe the new, expanding, and ever-self-renewing system. What shall it be? I have heard various suggestions. Here are a few of the best:

"The new capitalism; democratic capitalism; economic democracy; industrial democracy; distribution; mutualism; productivism."

All have their points. All help catch and express the idea, or parts of it. But might there be something better? Some word which will catch hold and slip automatically into the language, giving that sense of birth, hope, promise, and everlasting pushing forward which is the essence of every society of free men?

If we find the right word it will help things fall into perspective. Gradually, throughout the world, the word "communism" will sink and dwindle to its true level, standing not for progress but reaction, not freedom but slavery, not comfort but miserable and abject poverty and fear.

The fact that no new name has yet been found shows that the problem is not easy. Perhaps we must still go through more years of effort and growth before the right word emerges. But some of This Week's 10,000,000 reader-families may come up with suggestions to push us further along the road. If so, they will have played their part in the battle for the minds of men.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick was a slave in his youth and a bishop when he died, March 17, many, many years ago. St. Patrick was born in Britain around the year 380. The stories of his life state that when St. Patrick was 16, he was taken captive by a band of Irish marauders. For 6 years he worked as a slave for an Irish chieftain. While in Ireland he learned a great deal about the people—their languages, their emotions, and their character. He managed to make his escape and returned to England.

It was there that he decided to enter the church. After 14 years of study and preparation, he was ordained a priest.

In 432, St. Patrick returned to Ireland as a missionary. During his work there he founded over 350 churches, ordained many priests and baptized thousands of people. The flame which he lighted on the Hill of Tara was spread until there is a flame burning in the heart of each Irishman all over the world. When he died, sometime around 460, it is said that there was no night for 12 days.

St. Patrick was a man of very strong will power and considerable executive ability. There is no doubt about his competence as an organizer; he was a man of tireless action and enthusiasm. St. Patrick had great influence on the Irish mind and Celtic imagination—striking examples of these are the picturesque legends about his miraculous deeds which have sprung up in each locality of Ireland. One such story concerns the shamrock; it is esteemed today because St. Patrick purportedly used its three leaves on one stem to illustrate the principle of the Holy Trinity.

St. Patrick taught the Irish that God created man free, that God bestowed on every man a free will and gave each man the responsibility for the proper exercise of this free will. From this teaching, the Irish have developed an emotional trait which makes them more than ready to defend the principles of freedom and tolerance.

In the third stanza of "The Wearing of the Green" there is the following passage:

I've heard a whisper of a country
That lies beyond the sea,
Where rich and poor stand equal
In the light of freedom's day.
O Erin, must we leave you,
Driven by a tyrant's hand?
Must we ask a mother's blessing
From a strange and distant land?

Could that country have been America? At any rate, the Irish came here bringing their crafts and skills; they led in the clamor for freedom of religion, speech, and assembly. America was pleased to welcome its Irish friends and it has profited from their arrival.

The "fighting Irish" fight because they love. And as Monsignor Sheen once stated, "since an Irishman loves more than anyone else, he fights more than anyone else." Many of the Revolutionary troops were Irish—they were determined to see the fight through to its glorious end. There was Gen. Henry Knox, from New Derry, who fought in every battle of the war. He became the Secretary of War in Washington's first cabinet. Then there were Gen. Andrew Lewis, born in Donegal; Gen. Dan Morgan; Gen. Walter Stewart, from Derry; Gen. Ephraim Blaine, Washington's quartermaster; Gen. Andrew Pickens; Gen. Joseph Reid; Gen. William Maxwell; Gen. Richard Montgomery, who captured Fort John, Fort Chambly, and stormed Montreal; and many other gallant Irish fighters. Also one must not forget the "Father of the American Navy," Capt. John Barry.

The Irish helped in peaceful battles also; among the Irish signing our great Declaration of Independence were Robert Paine, Thomas McKean, Matthew Thornton, George Taylor, and Edward Rutledge. Also important in that great signing was Charles Thompson, from Maghera, who was the perpetual secretary of the Continental Congress.

For a good many years, the wandering Irish schoolteachers had most of the responsibility for the education in America.

The War of 1812 brought forth Gen. George Croghan; a monument in his honor was built in Savannah, Ga. Also participating in that war was Gen. Andrew Jackson, who later became President of these United States.

During the late unpleasantness of the 1860's the Irish, too, were often divided in their allegiance. On the Confederate side, there were Postmaster General John H. Reagan, Gen. "Pat" Cleburne, and Gen. Joseph Finnegan. On the Union side were Generals Philip Sheridan, Patrick Francis Meagher, and Philip Kearney. Michael Corcoran also supported the "Blues."

World War II heroes of Irish descent are still familiar names to us all—Capt. Colin Kelly, the hero of Pearl Harbor; the five Sullivan brothers; and Father Duffy, the fighting chaplain. It is even said that among Britain's heroes of the Second World War are two Irishmen, Pat Finucane and Viscount Montgomery.

Many more Irish names can be added to our roll of "Americans of Irish descent who have made valuable contributions to our country," Horace Greeley, the founder of the New York Tribune; the Armours of Chicago; Robert Fulton, inventor of the steamboat; Cyrus Hall McCormick; the second Chief Justice, John Rutledge; John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, Secretary of State and Vice President in 1825; Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York; Samuel Morse, the inventor of electric telegraphy; James F. Byrnes, now Governor of South Carolina; Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy. From the artistic approach, there are Augustus St. Gaudens, the sculptor; William Corcoran, who supplied Washington's Corcoran Art Gallery; James McNeill Whistler, the artist; composers such as Edward McDowell, Victor Herbert, and Stephen Foster; and poets such as James Whitcomb Riley, Joyce Kilmer, Padraic Colum, and Edna St. Vincent Millay.

Is there any wonder why the Irish celebrate so on the 17th of March? They are proud, and rightfully so, of their heritage. And America is proud of their support and contributions. We salute the Irish, not only on this day, but every day of the year.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the world needs Ireland.

March 17 is the day of celebration for the Irish. It is the day they set aside to

No Communist Can Halt My Efforts in the Interest of Home-Front Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in their insane zeal to sabotage the efforts of your Congressman, some Communists often shoot beyond their first target and hit their ultimate bullseye, that of wrecking our civilian defense.

This fifth-column operation is best described by the recent action of a floater who went all out to smear a proposal because the man he hates most made it.

I refer to the Hall measure which extends the franking privilege to New York State civilian defense authorities and makes available the use of free mail in the organization of our local defense.

No Communist wants American homes or firesides to be safe. No left-winger wants anything but chaos on the home front.

So it is a clever, if not patriotic, excuse on the part of any punk who might be passing through, yet claiming to be a constituent and thereby seeming to make himself immune, to strike out at your Congressman when he proposes something in the interest of local civilian defense.

For such a troublemaker's information, I will say the proposal was not mine, but that it was made to me by the New York State Commission of Civilian Defense.

The appearance of my name as author of a bill invariably infuriates any Commie and throws him into a double lather when he learns such a bill is in the cause of defending our Nation.

That is why your Congressman has had to bear the most inhuman, unholy, and un-American attacks in his determination to fight for the welfare of the Americans of his district.

No; this was not my idea. But it is a good one and since it will stimulate, increase, and materially assist the work of Broome County's civilian defense, as well as the whole State's, I intend to press for its passage.

I will not be deterred by the smears of any Communist in pushing such a worthy cause.

Wanted: A New Name for Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William I. Nichols, from This Week magazine:

The redefinition of just one word could help change history.

Finding a new term to express a new idea could be a decisive factor in checking the world spread of communism.

This is the report that comes back again and again from men and women who are engaged in the struggle of ideas between the free world and the Soviets.

The word is "capitalism."

It is the term used over and over by the Soviets as a smear word to describe our side; and, so far as that goes, Americans generally use it themselves when they try to describe their economic system. But in fact, and on both sides of the iron curtain, it is a misleading word because, when applied to America, it no longer fits the system it pretends to describe.

What is worse, to many people it carries negative overtones of old errors and old abuses. In no way does it imply the positive, dynamic, expanding system of today, constantly changing, but always moving toward one goal—to create more goods and greater well-being for more people.

Recently, a top official in our overseas information program put it this way: "In all propaganda broadcasts now, the two words which appear most frequently are 'communism' and 'capitalism.' I don't think we have half as much trouble with the word 'communism' as we do with 'capitalism.' It's relatively easy to expose the bad side of communism and make it stick—so much so that when you say 'communism' and 'Red fascism' most people know you're talking about one and the same thing.

"But," he went on, "it's nowhere near as easy to make the good side of our society plain by using the word 'capitalism.' That's important. We need a word to make people realize that the real source of hope, progress, and prosperity rests with us."

The same thought has been expressed again and again by America's business leaders. "We only muddle our own thinking," they say, "when we use old words to describe new ideas."

To understand the problem, let's look back a bit. The word "capitalism" came into being well over 100 years ago in the early days of the industrial revolution. At that time the basis of wealth shifted from land to money (that is, capital) invested in industrial and commercial ventures. Admittedly, during those years there were many abuses, errors, and mistakes.

If you have read the novels of Charles Dickens—written 100 years ago—or the story of America's "Robber Barons" in the 1890's, you know what they were. There is no denying that capitalism's primitive period contains many dark chapters of worker exploitation at home, and colonial expansion abroad.

WE'VE CHANGED

All those memories are contained in the word "capitalism." The Communists are clever enough to seize upon that fact. Hence their use of the word "capitalist" as a dirty name, a smear word, for every aspect of our Western civilization.

But what about us? Are we so stupid as to let them get away with it? In the face of their repressive, regressive slave system, we stand for bold and imaginative society which has changed, developed, and improved with the years. Are we imaginative enough to find a word for it?

Anyone who has eyes and looks around him knows how conditions today differ from those of 50 or 100 years ago. Here, for example, are 10 points based in large part on a listing recently prepared by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

1. Slavery, which antedates capitalism, has been abolished in all capitalist countries. In fact, and ironically, it is now practiced primarily in Communist countries, and on a wider scale than ever before in history.

2. In its early days capitalism exploited the labor of women and children. This has nearly been abolished.

3. Capitalism once imposed overlong hours. These are now short, and growing shorter.

4. The standard of living under capitalism has steadily risen. This is exactly contrary to Marx's prediction—and to the record on Communist countries.

5. Unemployment has been reduced and controlled and is now a diminishing problem.

6. The adulteration and misbranding of products have almost been eliminated.

7. Early capitalist employers cared little about the health and safety of their workers. Today industrial safety has been carried to such a point that more accidents occur in our homes than in factories, offices, and stores.

8. The slogan of capitalism once was "The public be damned." Today all progressive companies know the importance of public opinion and public relations have become an essential part of management.

9. Capitalism formerly produced crowded, unsanitary slums. Now employers know the value of better living conditions, and work for them.

10. Imperialist wars were once waged by capitalists and colonial rule imposed on foreign peoples. Now country after country has given up its colonies.

That is a pretty impressive list of differences between "then" and "now." And the process is still going on. Up to the time of emergency controls (a result of Communist aggression, by the way) company after company was developing new plans for bonuses, pensions, incentive wages, cost-of-living wage raises, profit-sharing, and other procedures.

In one form or another all these methods are designed to give more and more people an increasing share of production, whether in the form of higher wages, shorter hours, lower prices, or better goods and services.

Most of us in America know all these facts. We know what our "new capitalism" is producing for us and what it can produce anywhere if given a fair chance. But hundreds of millions of people throughout the world don't know this. We must find some way to make clear in their minds the distinction between (1) our system and the capitalism of the past and, (2) between our system and capitalism as it is practiced in some other parts of the world. Unfortunately there are still areas where capitalism operates in the old, primitive way, and a capitalist is regarded as a member of a privileged upper group who dodges taxes, exploits his workers, and overcharges his customers.

EUROPE'S VIEW

As was pointed out recently by French-American writer, Lewis Galantière, the average European "judges our capitalism in the light of what he knows about his own, and we have allowed him to remain in profound ignorance of the differences between the two."

A new name for our system would help make the distinctions clear. It would revive hope among the underprivileged. And at the same time it would be a spur toward more enlightened action by old-fashioned capitalists wherever they may be.

Up to now communism has claimed that it held out the only promise for a better future. But as soon as communism takes over, the promises are forgotten. Then the iron curtain falls, the security police move in, the gates of the slave-labor camps swing open, and another helpless nation is trapped.

RFC: Relatives, Friends, and Contributors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, relatives, friends, contributors, we will lend up to our ears. This clumsy paraphrase of the classic Shakespearian quotation attributed to the Honorable Mark Antony, himself no mean politician of the first century B. C., must have been the motto of the RFC in its dealings on private loan applications. Whatever may be the validity of the RFC as a lending agency in connection with such projects as public utility operation by local governments, the fact is that in its operations as a lender to private corporations and individuals, the RFC has become a stench in the public nostrils.

Something more is required of a public agency than the "morals of the market place." To argue that a loan is "proper" because it violates no law, when the fact is that such a loan has been influenced by personal considerations, such as family relationships, free hotel accommodations, mink coats, and maybe other things as well, is to mock at the law and its spirit.

The private lending facilities of RFC ought to be closed down at once. Anyone who wants a loan today for private ventures can obtain a loan through banks or insurance companies, if the proposal is worth a bean. If it is not, he should not be getting it from Uncle Sam either.

Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on top of the RFC business and the Mississippi job-buying charges directed against the Administration, comes another bit of shenanigans to look into.

Just how did it happen that a chap out in Salt Lake City named Walter V. Pace, a meat-market owner, manage to drop into South Carolina last November to pick up options on land which he shortly sold to our Government for hydrogen-bomb plant development at a near profit of $76,000? Mr. Pace says that it just "happened." The Governor of South Carolina says that he would regard it as somewhat "unusual" if a man in South Carolina got an option on some land in Utah the day before an announcement that an atomic-bomb plant would be built.

Big question is: Did anybody in Washington or anywhere else connected with the atomic-bomb project tip Mr. Pace or some associate off to the pending announcement, and if so, who did and who profited? So far, nobody has done much talking. But you cannot stop us from thinking.

Whose Government Is This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Government in Washington is supposed to be your Government. Is it doing what you want it to do?

Your Government, as Lincoln put it, is supposed to be "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Yet, without any action by you—the people—or by your Representatives in the Congress, your Government is at war in Korea. Your Government is making preparations for war in Europe and elsewhere.

You are told that the military campaign in Korea is a police action b, the United Nations. But you know it is war. You know that your sons, husbands, fathers—American boys—are fighting and dying in the frozen jungles of a foreign country halfway around the world. This is world war III. This world war may destroy your Government. It certainly will give you a dictatorship while it lasts and, when over, a depression the like of which this country has never experienced.

You are told that your Government's participation is necessary; that we must fight the world-wide menace of communism. But your Government is not fighting communism. The United Nations is not fighting communism.

General MacArthur, who is leading your sons in battle, is being prevented by the United Nations, and by your State Department, from fighting communism.

General MacArthur is not permitted to attack the Communist enemy wherever he may be. He may not employ intelligence or aerial reconnaissance to protect his soldiers unless the Communist enemy is actually upon him. He is forbidden to bomb Communist supply lines until it is too late. He may not employ an offensive against the Communist enemy on the enemy's territory. He is forbidden to organize for guerrilla warfare in the Communist enemy's rear.

Your Government is sending your boys to their fate blindfolded, and with one arm tied behind their backs. To all intents and purposes, in one way the United Nations is actually protecting the Communist enemy, and your State Department is backing the United Nations.

Your Seventh Fleet is protecting the Communists from attack by the Chinese anti-Communists, and it is keeping the ports of Red China open to receive matériel of war with which the Communists are killing your boys.

Your Government is spending your money to make war matériel available to its so-called friends and allies in the United Nations, who, in turn, are selling it to the Communists—in effect, trading with the enemy—your enemy. Trading with the enemy, under the laws and Constitution of the United States, is treason. We should not permit treason.

It is an outrage to pretend to fight communism in the Far East, or to prepare to fight communism in Europe, when our internal Communist problem is ignored. The place to start fighting communism is in Washington, where, during the past two administrations, Communists have been cultivated and coddled and where, even now, they are still being defended and protected. Actions speak louder than words.

The Government in Washington is supposed to be your Government. But, unless you assert yourself; unless you make your will known by writing the President, the Secretary of State, your Senators and Representatives in Congress who favor spending, sending troops to Europe, and unless you nominate and elect fearless, forthright men to run your Government, you will continue to be misrepresented; your Government may perish from the earth.

State-wide spring elections in Michigan are on Monday, April 2.

American Peace Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions, February 12, 1951, and February 26, 1951, I called the attention of the House to the current Communist phony peace offensive, under the guise of which, Communist propaganda is being spread throughout the Nation. The American press, as usual, is doing a fine public service by publicizing the fact that these Communist groups are not really interested in peace, but are, rather, interested in seeing the United States weak and Russia strong. For the benefit of the Members, I am including in the RECORD at this point, an excellent article by Mr. Ernest Brashear. The article appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News on March 9, 1951. The article follows:

(By Ernest Brashear)

The comrades are at it again.

Last time it was the Stockholm peace petition that made a phony plea for peace in the same paragraph that said America would be a war criminal if it dropped an atom bomb on Russia, even if Russia was the aggressor.

Now it's America's Peace Poll, which follows the same line—the Moscow line.

We all want peace, and when somebody walks up to us with a slip of paper and says, "Do you want to sign for peace?" you'll probably say "yes," and put down your name.

Then you'll turn in the ballot and go about your business feeling you've done a pretty good deed.

honor St. Patrick. They give thanks to God for him, for St. Patrick who brought the faith to Erin.

The conversion of Ireland to the Christian religion was one of the most dramatic and miraculous events in the history of Europe. They have "kept the faith" in the face of diabolical persecution.

Today more than ever the world needs Ireland. As an American of Irish descent I ask the people of the United States and the world to take cognizance of Irish history in the face of world crisis.

As an American I am proud of my country and more devoted to her than to Ireland, but I love and cherish Ireland for her devotion to the truth and to the faith, for her sacrifices to save principle. We Americans all need faith, not only faith in God but faith in our fellowman. We must have hope—hope in the United States. We must be a land of religion, a land of racial harmony, a land of people devoted to family life if we are to survive the aggression of godless Russia.

The United States is the last bulwark of the free world. Her destiny is at stake. She, too, needs prayer—prayer for the will, the leadership, the faith, the hope to uphold the principles of the free world.

To speak of Ireland is to call to mind the kings of Tara's Hill, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf. Shall we talk of the Book of Kells, the Cells of the Monks, and the learning of the scholars of old? A prayerful tribute could be paid to the memory of Patrick, Bridget, Malachy, and many more. All this could we do. Or shall we dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers and the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever-sounding seas about her? Or listen to her poets, her philosophers, her scholars, her men and women of wit and charm, her bards and her minstrels? Or tell anew the myths and the fancies, the tales and the Come-All-Yes, the annals of olden times, and rhapsodies of the blind walkers of the roads? Or glory in the tenacity which preserved the faith of our fathers, the holiness of martyred priest and nun, or saint, and humble laborer? And might we not join in spirit with the pilgrims wending their way to Mellray and Knock and Croagh Patrick?

What peace of mind to dwell on these thoughts, and how compelling is the desire to ponder upon them. Would that I had the pen of the Irish writers to give them their true and worthiest expression. My safest course is to tell you that I possess these beloved thoughts. They are part of my being, as they are part of yours. How better our lives, how nobler our natures, for cherishing them. Thank God we have them.

Let us not think for a moment that our riches are those of memory only. The treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of western civilization. It will never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the western world that is good, and true, and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the far-flung steppes and tundras of Russia. Its warmth is felt in a body politic shuddering in terror of the cold clammy rigor of spiritual death. And it will burn forever, because it was fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love.

We could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far-flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead.

We are Americans—first, last, and always. This is our own, our native land. Our loyalty to it has never been questioned. The nation and the world know where we stand—and we stand here immovable.

As a Member of Congress, my first consideration and my desire is the good of my country, above all other things, having in mind the dictates of my conscience and the wishes of my constituents. As a human being, and preeminently as an American, it is also my desire that truth and justice shall prevail among all men everywhere, that their rights and dignity be respected as a divine imperative; that they have the greatest freedom possible to establish the seeds of good that are within them. These desires, I grant you, struggle for realization in a most complex and disordered world society. Morally and spiritually I will continue true to them to the best of my ability before God. Intellectually and practically I recognize my limitations in the face of the vast array of problems that are thrust before me and every other Member of Congress, problems complicated by the wishes of those who would have us decide in favor of this or that side of a question, often on the basis of an intense ex parte interest or partisan affinity. The internal affairs of the Commonwealth of Australia are not the proper subject of inquiry by our Government in the ordinary course of events. If the people of Portugal want, or will tolerate a corporative form of state, that is their concern. If England favors constitutional monarchy, that is the Englishman's free choice. It is no business of ours, in fact or theory, to foist our notions of self-rule upon any other nation. While we as Americans, Americans with a tradition of freedom fostered and magnified by our Irish ancestors, would like to see all the people of Ireland free and united in one nation indivisible, such as our own, we have no right to prescribe or direct that economy for them. Nor does international law warrant our intruding. But let no one attempt to persuade us not to work and pray for the unification of Ireland, for that is our individual right as free members of a free community. In keeping with my rights, and because of my personal view of the matter, I gave evidence of my stand on the Irish partition situation, by standing up in the House of Representatives on March 29, 1950, on a division vote, and casting my vote in favor of the Fogarty amendment, which was adopted with 99 for, and 66 against; then, on March 31, 1950, again on a division vote, I was one of the 60 for the same amendment—against 220—when it was defeated.

I would like to state that never in the history of the world have men and women of good will so earnestly and so pitifully sought for a sound basis of universal peace. It is a striking fact that in an era of awful physical violence and threats of worse violence to come, the hearts and minds of mankind have leaned with anxiety and hope toward solutions in the moral order, the order of thought and ideas, as opposed to the law of the jungle.

Certainly, there will be no peace of any universality until men advance beyond practical moral considerations into the spiritual order of adjustment. It is only in the spiritual ordering of their affairs and their lives that men can come to acknowledge, in humility and fraternity, the final sanction of their actions, namely, the will of God. With a widespread spiritual awakening, the terrors that beset us all now will perish. Then the whole world, made free to enter upon an era of peace and charity, will do that which will put to shame the glories of the Renaissance from the other great ages of history.

We know that for the accomplishment of His greatest works, God has chosen the weak things of the world. In the great census of humanity, the Irish have been but few; they have been and are numerically weak. But they have, in the historical sum, a moral and a spiritual grandeur and effectiveness that is far out of proportion to their mere numbers. The impression they have made upon western civilization is a major mark. Indeed, they have helped shape the very mold of that civilization. It is devoutly to be hoped and prayed that their moral and spiritual grandeur and effectiveness will continue to be felt in the shaping of the destiny of mankind. The Irish race are a mystical people, and a people of prayer; let us pray for a rule of holiness.

We are a people of action; let us act in the defense of our beliefs. We are a loyal people; let us never lessen our loyalty to the faith of our fathers and to this great country which we love so dearly as to die for it. Let us do all we can to hasten the day when peace once more walks the ways of this world and holds us all close in a bond of understanding and brotherly love.

Approach to veterans' groups: A letter with appropriate check sheet was sent to approximately 750 American Legion posts, copy of which is attached. The pamphlet containing the statements of Commander George Craig and the resolution passed by the American Legion in its convention in Los Angeles was, of course, of considerable interest to the veterans' groups.

Approach to election commissioners: Attached you will find copy of a letter gotten out to the 98 county election commissioners in the State of Illinois in which we advise them of the many letters and phone calls received from persons about the inadequacy of voting facilities in certain areas in previous elections, and urging their cooperation in providing adequate facilities in order that voters could exercise their franchise at the polling places without loss of time.

Approach to radio stations: We prepared and had transcribed 11 announcements ranging in time from 30 seconds to 2½ minutes, and distributed the transcriptions as well as copies of the written scripts to 80 radio stations in the State of Illinois. Copy of our original letter and check sheet for give-away material are attached.

Approach to news editors and commentators: A special plea was made to news editors and commentators in all Illinois radio stations, a total of 114 persons receiving copy of our letter of October 4, which is attached, reminding their listeners of being properly registered for the November 7 election, and urging them to make sure they go to the polls and vote.

Approach to stars of stage, screen, and radio: Attached you will find copy of a letter given out to a total of 265 stars of stage, screen, and radio, in which we outlined the purposes of Americans Will Vote and asked their cooperation in mentioning Americans Will Vote to their audiences prior to election day.

Approach to oil companies: We are enclosing copy of individually typed letter to executives of 15 oil companies in the United States, outlining the purposes of Americans Will Vote and asking their cooperation in the distribution of material designed to urge Americans to vote.

Approach to companies to use postage-meter slugs: A postage-meter slug was designed and furnished, without charge, to prominent business firms in the city to use on their mail prior to election day. A list of the firms using the 36 postage-meter slugs is given a little later in this report.

DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIAL

Publicity: Three picture stories were syndicated to 2,000 daily and weekly newspapers in the State of Illinois and cities in other adjoining States within a radius of 200 miles of Chicago. Copies of the syndications are attached, which cover: (1) Picture of Elmer Layden, pointing to emblem of Americans Will Vote and outlining the purposes and objectives of the organization; (2) National Commander George Craig, of American Legion, and Frank Moran, president of the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce pledge their support to Elmer Layden as president of Americans Will Vote; (3) at rally held in Springfield, Ill., Avinere Toigo, down-State executive director of Americans Will Vote joins hands with Peter F. Rossiter, Sangamon County's Democratic Chairman, and Conrad Noll, Jr., Sangamon County's Republican chairman.

Beginning with the announcement of the organization of Americans Will Vote on September 19, 13 major news releases have been developed and released to the press. The distribution of all of these releases with the exception of release of October 3 which carried an additional mailing to the city editors of all dailies and weeklies in the United States totaling 12,280, and the several releases concerning the rallies which were distributed limited to the local area involved, were distributed as follows:

City editors, Illinois daily newspapers	67
Illinois weeklies	585
Chicago suburban newspapers	95
Chicago neighborhood newspapers	92
News directors, Illinois radio stations	100
Chicago radio commentators	14
Chicago television stations	5
Wall Street Journal	1
Chicago Journal of Commerce	1
Americans Will Vote officers and directors	13
Total	993

Copies of these releases are attached, but briefly are as follows:

September 19: Announcement story of organization of Americans Will Vote.

October 3: Statement of George Craig, national commander of the American Legion, urging Americans to vote.

October 4: Elmer Layden urges election commissioners to provide adequate facilities at the polls.

October 12: Announcement of formation of down-State committee, and plans for down-State rally in Springfield.

October 12: Announcement of American Legion passing resolution of commendation. Text of the resolution was included in give-away pamphlet.

October 13: Details of down-State rally planned for Springfield on October 19.

October 19: Announcement of preelection rally in Chicago, October 31.

October 20: Report of success of down-State rally held at Springfield, Ill.

October 26: Announcement of Irv Kupcinet, well-known newspaper columnist and television star to act as emcee of rally held in Chicago.

October 26: Announcement of final plans for rally in Chicago, with speakers George Craig, past commander of the American Legion, and Frank Moran, president of Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce, with Irv Kupcinet as master of ceremonies.

October 30: Special memo to the press, radio, and television: Announcement of the rally October 31.

October 31: Follow-up news release outlining outstanding comments in addresses made by George Craig and Frank Moran at the rally.

Description of material: Following is a listing of the various pieces of material developed, and the sources through which it was distributed prior to election day.

(a) Leaflet Election Day Is November 7: More than 4,000,000 of the 5,000,000 copies of this leaflet produced, were distributed by Curtiss Candy Co., through the inspiration of its president, Otto Schnering, by their candy salesmen as they made their calls throughout the United States.

Members of the clergy were responsible for the distribution of approximately 300,000 leaflets; American Legion posts approximately 100,000; civic clubs 52,000; Boy Scouts 36,500. Included in the miscellaneous distribution total of approximately 635,000 were such firms and individuals as 36,000 for Quaker Oats Co., 17,000 for the La Salle National Bank, 8,000 for the First National Bank of Harvey, 4,000 to Alden's Mail Order, 2,000 to National Confectioners' Association, 9,000 for First National Bank & Trust Co., Evanston, 9,000 for State Bank & Trust Co., Evanston, 8,000 for Steele-Wedeles Co., 4,500 for Elgin National Watch Co., 5,000 for International Harvester Co., etc.

In addition, cuts were supplied to Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. who wished to pay for, themselves, and distribute 500,000 copies of the leaflet.

(b) Automobile and window sticker: Over 400,000 of these stickers were produced and distributed through orders received on the check-sheets from civic clubs, American Legion posts, clergy, radio stations, Boy Scouts, and various individuals and companies' telephone calls and letters. Here also the Curtiss Candy Co. salesmen distributed approximately 250,000.

(c) Correspondent sticker: 60,000 of these small stickers were distributed and used by various companies and individuals on correspondence and envelopes.

(d) Contribution cards: 11,000 of two types of cards, one for individuals and the other for corporations, were produced and distributed in the various channels solicited by our check-sheets and letters to the groups outlined in our program.

(e) Leaflet, You Can Get 111,111 to the Polls: Over 200,000 copies of this leaflet were produced and distributed. This particular leaflet proved very popular and more copies of it could have been used if time prior to election day would have permitted.

(f) Leaflet, George Craig, Legion Head, Lists Reasons: Close to 40,000 of these leaflets were produced and distributed.

(g) Leaflet, Endorsed by American Legion Resolution: About 150,000 copies of this leaflet were processed and distributed as quickly as we were advised the American Legion had passed the resolution at the Los Angeles convention. The leaflet gives the verbatim wording of the resolution.

(h) Lapel button: Of the 722,500 lapel buttons processed, close to 600,000 were distributed through the various channels represented by the check sheets and telephone calls.

(i) Postage meter slugs: As quickly as the postage meter slugs could be made up, they were put to use by the following firms, 20 firms in all, using a total of 38 postage meter slugs on their outgoing mail until election day: United Air Lines, the Borden Co., National Standard Parts Association, Auto Parts & Gear Co., Reed Candy Co., Quaker Oats Co., Rock Island Lines, M. B. Austin Co., Illinois Bell Telephone Co., International Harvester Co., La Salle National Bank, Uhlmann Grain Co., Stevens Candy Co., James E. Bennett Co., General American Transportation Co., Steven Candy Kitchens, Inc., Inland Steel Co., Alden's, Inc., the Quaker Oats Co., Capper & Capper, and the Jos. W. Hicks Organization.

We feel that the distribution of the material, together with the great number of imprints of the Liberty Bell symbol distributed through the use of the postage meter slugs, represents a circulation of approximately 25,000,000.

(j) Door-knob hanger: 250,000 door-knob hangers were processed and distributed prior to electiton day, a large percentage of this figure being accounted for in the door-to-door work done by the Boy Scout troops and the Sunday School children of the various churches responding to our letter.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Three mass meetings or rallys were held prior to election day, one at Springfield, Ill., another at Bloomington, Ill., and the third one in Chicago at the La Salle Hotel. The meetings at Springfield and Bloomington both included remarks by the Democratic and Republican chairmen of the county, and representatives of various religious and civic local groups. In the case of the down-State rally at Springfield, the main address was given by the Honorable George D. Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois, his subject being To Vote or Not To Vote.

As previously mentioned, the Chicago meeting featured addresses by George Craig, past national commander of the American Legion, and Frank Moran, president of the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Irv Kupcinet, well-known newspaper columnist and television star, was master of ceremonies.

Personal appearances: On October 9 Elmer Layden was interviewed on the Don McNeil

Don't feel too good brother. You will have just signed up in the big new phony peace drive sponsored by some of the Nation's top Communists and Commie-liners.

What's behind all this? Why do American Communists, agents in hiding of a hostile nation with the greatest army and air force in the world, circulate peace petitions?

The answer is easy.

They do it to gain time. They do it to slow our defense effort by representing Russia as a power that never, but never, would go to war unless attacked.

Only America, they lie, could be the aggressor, so Americans must sign peace petitions to show our Government that John Doe does not support the administration's war-mongering, imperialist designs on Russia.

If they can persuade enough people to believe this, our defense program will stall in its tracks.

But do you think for a minute the U. S. S. R. will stop building planes and submarines and tanks once we stop? Don't kid yourself.

It's all part of a carefully drawn national scheme known as the American Peace Crusade, with headquarters in New York.

The big idea is for 3,000 or so crusaders to descend on Washington next March 15, with thousands of votes for peace in the so-called peace poll.

Locally, the campaign kick-off comes tonight at a dinner meeting of the Labor Conference for Peace at the Park View Manor, 2200 West Seventh Street.

Principal speaker will be Judith Boudon, who will relate some of her experiences as a delegate to the Stalinist-controlled Warsaw peace congress.

Her report will be followed by entertainment and dancing.

The serious business will consist of handing out samples of the phony peace ballot and opening a drive for members at $1 a head.

Beginning tomorrow, the Commies and their supporters will get busy talking people into X-ing the ballots in a campaign blueprinted in the New York headquarters.

Here are some of the steps listed in the national memorandum of marching orders:

"As far as possible, see that all possible groupings are represented—women, labor, youth, Negro, clergy, academic circles, nationalities—officially or unofficially.

"Select the busiest corner in town—or the two or three busiest corners—for the public launching of the poll.

"Try to get a combination of World War II vets and mothers or sisters of boys now in the Armed Forces to man these posts.

"Approach the ministers and rabbis in your area.

"Get the people to write letters to the editor.

"Ask each group to consider immediately how the poll issue can be merged with the key concerns of the group—the 18-year-old draft and universal military training for youth groups; the wage freeze and rising prices for trade-unions; the Lieutenant Gilbert case, Army discrimination for anti-discrimination groups.

"Within a few days we hope to have available attractive leaflets which most certainly should be used with the distribution of the polling sheet.

"The leaflets will be designed for distribution to specialized groups, to begin with, labor, Negro, youth."

That blueprint, mailed from New York headquarters February 2, provides a neat lesson in Communist techniques for building up support of the Commie line by tying in with groups who have a legitimate objective.

The original plan called for the big crusade to take place March 1. Several developments, among them strong opposition to the move by AFL and CIO union leaders, caused deferment of the march on the Capitol until March 15.

Why Americans Don't Vote—Americans Will Vote, Inc.'s Successful Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be useful for veterans' organizations, fraternal organizations, civic organizations, States and municipalities, and voluntary groups to study the activities of Americans Will Vote, a group of public-spirited Americans who got together for the purpose of getting out the vote and did a remarkable job in a comparatively short time. The November 1950 election brought out a million more voters in Illinois than in any one presidential year, and it is estimated that as much as 80 percent of the responsibility for this increase is attributable to the efforts of Americans Will Vote, Inc. This organization won a special award in the 1950 Nation-wide get-out-the-vote competition, sponsored by the American Heritage Foundation. Appended is their report of November 24, 1950, which detailed the activities which won for them this award:

THE JOS. W. HICKS ORGANIZATION,
Chicago, Ill., November 24, 1950.

VOTING AWARDS COMMITTEE,
AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of Americans Will Vote, Inc., a nonpartisan, nonprofit, and nonpolitical organization, I am submitting this report in my capacity as public-relations counsel to the organization, as an application for one of the awards to be made in 1950 by the American Heritage Foundation on the theme Voting Is Everybody's Job.

ORIGIN OF AMERICANS WILL VOTE

Early in September a group of Chicago businessmen at luncheon were discussing a national magazine article, in which it was pointed out that only about 51 percent of America's qualified voters took the trouble to go to the polls in 1948's national election. Unanimous in their opinion that such apathy was distressing, they decided to attempt corrective action by forming an organization incorporated under the name "Americans Will Vote." The name of the organization was suggested by Mr. Charles T. Scott, owner of the Scott Steel Co. and prominent Chicago businessman. The article of incorporation was signed by Mr. Scott; Henry F. Woulfe, vice president of a leading Chicago printing and engraving firm; and Col. Max D. Emmanuel, a retired Army officer.

At the first organization meeting Elmer F. Layden, former Notre Dame football player and coach and now associated with the General American Transportation Corp., was elected president. Henry F. Woulfe, former president of Pepsodent Corp. and now vice president of Manz Corp., was elected vice president. Frederick W. Turner, Jr., prominent Chicago lawyer, was elected secretary, and John C. Wright, president of the La Salle National Bank, was elected treasurer.

Members of the board of directors are: John C. Bowers, Chicago real-estate broker; Harold S. Russell, president of Railroad & Industrial Products Co.; Otto Schnering, president of Curtiss Candy Co.; Charles T. Scott, owner, Scott Steel Co.; and Henry F. Woulfe, vice president of Manz Corp.

Each of the foregoing officers and directors were chosen not only because of their prominence in civic life and their successful business careers, but with consideration of the fact that none of them had ever been prominently identified with any partisan political campaign.

The article of incorporation stated:

"The corporation is organized exclusively for educational purposes, particularly education of Americans to exercise their right and responsibility to vote in all elections and on all questions submitted to vote; no part of its income or property shall inure to the private benefit of its directors or officers or any individual or association of individuals or corporation; the corporation will not attempt in any manner to influence legislation through propaganda or any other effort, or take a partisan position on any issue, or assist any candidate for any office or provide aid to any political party.

"In carrying out its purpose, the corporation may use all means appropriate to the accomplishment of such purpose, including aiding such education activity by any other individual or organization in the United States, provided that such activity must conform to the purpose and limitations of the article of incorporation of this corporation."

It was agreed that the success or failure of the objectives of Americans Will Vote could be determined by any unguarded comment that any officer or director might make which could be construed by any person as being prejudiced toward the interest or promotion of any political candidate or any partisan issue. Each and every person associated with the project therefore dedicated himself to the complete objective of encouraging Americans to vote without any degree of partisanship reflected in any manner. At the outset, inasmuch as the organization was incorporated in the State of Illinois it was decided that its activities preliminary to the recent election campaign would be devoted to the confines of this State. However, the organization promotion became so widely known that cooperation was volunteered from many other States, and to that end, a substantial amount of the organization material was supplied and distributed in other States by members of the clergy, veterans' groups, Boy Scouts, and other organizations and individuals.

PLANNING THE PROGRAM

The services of the Jos. W. Hicks Organization, public relations consulting firm, were obtained to plan and direct the organization's program.

Approach to the clergy: Letters were written to all of the members of the clergy in the State of Illinois, asking them to ring their church bells or play their chimes on election day, offering them material for distribution to their congregations and seeking their cooperation in preaching Americanism and teaching Americans to vote, in their sermons. Attached is a copy of the letter sent to the clergy, together with copy of a check sheet supplied for their convenience in ordering material. The number of clergymen thus contacted totaled 2,840.

Approach to women's clubs: Letters with an appropriate check sheet enclosed for their convenience in ordering material for distribution were sent to some 400 women's clubs in the State.

Approach to civic clubs, chambers of commerce, etc.: Attached is a copy of a letter written to some 980 various civic clubs, chambers of commerce, and other community organizations, with an appropriate check sheet for ordering material for distribution, outlining the purposes of Americans Will Vote and seeking their cooperation on a State-wide basis.

Approach to Boy Scout troops: Copy of a letter written to approximately 500 Boy Scout troops in the State of Illinois is attached, together with check sheet.

Breakfast Club, well known radio program on a coast-to-coast network, at which time he outlined the purposes and objectives of Americans Will Vote.

On October 20 Mr. Layden assisted the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce in painting the first in a series of "get out the vote" signs on the sidewalk at the corner of State and Madison Streets. Representatives of all Chicago newspapers and WGN-TV news reel were present, the ceremonies being televised the next night by WGN.

On October 21 Mr. Layden was interviewed by Dennis James after the television broadcast of the Notre Dame-Michigan State football game, sponsored by Old Gold over the DuMont network. At this time also, Mr. Layden outlined the purposes and objectives of Americans Will Vote and urged all listeners to exercise their privilege at the polls on November 7.

On October 24 Mr. Layden was interviewed by Bill Evans over the latter's television show on WBKB, at which time approximately 12 minutes were devoted to the interview.

On October 24 Mr. Layden was interviewed by Austin Kiplinger during his newscast over WGN-TV at 6:15. Here again Mr. Layden emphasized to the listeners the distressing apathy that has existed by voters in the last previous national election and urged them not to repeat such a disgraceful performance.

Airplane trailer: As a way of adding emphasis to the message of Americans Will Vote to a great number of persons at one time, we arranged for an airplane to circle over Dyche Stadium in Evanston on the Saturday before election day during the time of the football game, and again on Sunday before election day over Comiskey Park during a professional football game, carrying a streamer with the wording "Americans will vote on November 7."

Special telegram: As an additional means of bringing the message of Americans Will Vote to as many persons as possible just prior to election day, a telegram was sent signed by Mr. Layden to 42 prominent newspaper columnists; press services; news editors of all radio networks in Chicago, New York, and Hollywood; the city editors of all newspapers in Los Angeles and San Francisco; and outstanding radio performers, such as Jack Benny, Edgar Bergen, Eddie Cantor, and including radio commentators Walter Winchell, Jim Hurlbut, Clifton Utley, etc. Copy of this telegram and list of recipients is attached.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Americans Will Vote cooperated with the junior chamber of commerce in supplying them with material and speakers for their programs. Americans Will Vote cooperated with the American Legion in distributing the resolution passed by the American Legion at their convention in Los Angeles. Americans Will Vote also cooperated with the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations' get-out-the-vote program, headed by Mr. J. T. Meek, by making known to members of the association the availability of Americans Will Vote material, and the fact that this campaign was being conducted on a publicity promotion level, whereas the other campaign was conducted on a paid-advertising-space level and the sale of promotional material. It was pointed out that in the case of our campaign nothing was to be sold, every piece of material was given away without any charge whatsoever.

METHOD OF FINANCING OF AMERICANS WILL VOTE CAMPAIGN

The entire financial proceeds for the Americans Will Vote campaign were obtained through individual and business firm subscriptions. Contributions ranged in size from $1 to $1,000.

There is attached, a clipping from the Chicago Tribune of November 9, indicating the election returns as they had been reported at that time. However, as of this date the official returns for the State of Illinois have not been recorded.

CONTINUING PROGRAM

The Americans Will Vote activity we describe in effect constituted about a 7-week campaign; in fact, the announcement and press conference concerning the organization was exactly 7 weeks prior to election day. All of the material described herein, of which copies are attached, was prepared, produced and released within that space of time.

Much credit has been given Americans Will Vote in news and editorial comment in the newspapers, and by commentators over radio and television, for the organization's part in helping to bring out the vote on election day. We do not believe that any single organization designed to help increase the vote can or should attempt specific credit for its efforts—however, we do believe that this organization, operating as it did and with the cooperation of all of the agencies involved, can rightly share with others the results that were so definitely indicated on election day.

The greatest evidence of the success of the campaign is that interest which has been generated wherein many persons and organizations which cooperated have indicated a desire that the activities be continued. For instance, we have letters from scout masters asking us to send them material now which they may plan to distribute and instruct their troops in distributing on the occasion of the spring elections. Practically all of the business organizations which used postage meter slugs have indicated that they will hold these slugs with the intention of using them in advance of future elections. An inventory of the material that is left over would indicate there is just about enough to use in promoting the future activities of the organization, and the requests for information and material from States across the country from Maine to Oregon will indicate that Americans Will Vote has outgrown its original state of incorporation and in its next step will be a Nation-wide undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

———— ————,
President.

Where the Money Goes; Some of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of January, our draft quota was 80,000. During the same month, military agencies hired 58,388 civilians. For every four men inducted, three others were hired to do civilian jobs connected with military service. Our total civilian personnel working for the Federal Government reached 2,245,275 when January ended. Sixteen new agencies have been set up in the last 6 months to deal with the national emergency, with an increase in the number of men and women working for Uncle Sam amounting to 219,000 since July 1, 1950.

This record of mushrooming departments and new divisions within departments helps us to understand what goes on with the taxpayer's hard-earned dollar. In the House of Representatives it was declared that our military authorities are purchasing supplies sufficient to meet the needs of a 10,000,000-man army. Such spending as the buying of Navy desks for $198 each and wooden office chairs at $78 apiece are part of this fantastic orgy of public spending.

It will not end until this administration is removed from control in Congress and the White House. Bear that in mind every time you write a check to the collector of internal revenue.

Defense Against Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, for the information of Senators, a brief resolution adopted at its founding conference by the Council Against Communist Aggression with offices at 1500 North Broad Street, Philadelphia 21, Pa., together with an article by Prof. Karl A. Wittfogel entitled "A New Policy for Asia," printed in the New Leader for February 19, 1951.

The council is a militant anti-Communist group, concentrating particularly on foreign policy in reference to the Far East. It is headed by a provisional executive group, including Marx Lewis, of the Hatters union; Bishop Welch, of the Methodist Church; Sal B. Hoffman, president of the Upholsterers union; Christopher Emmet, of Common Cause; and Arthur G. McDowell, as executive secretary.

While I am not necessarily in full agreement with all parts of the council's resolution, I am glad at its request to make the data available for the information of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Our security depends on a global system of collective security and calls for defense against Communist aggression in both Europe and Asia.

Therefore, we urge—

1. That the United States sponsor a resolution in the United Nations condemning the government of the U. S. S. R. as the instigator of and accomplice in the aggressions against the Republic of Korea and the United Nations based on evidence presented to the United Nations by Ambassador Austin.

2. That the United States sponsor a resolution calling on the United Nations to impose sanctions, including a blockade, against Communist China so as to effectively prevent the direct or indirect shipment of strategic materials to the aggressors attacking the United Nations forces in Korea.

3. That the United States should offer the National Government of China for the revitalized army on Formosa adequate arms and equipment under the supervision of top military personnel of the United States as in Greece and Turkey so that it can help the people of China to free themselves from the Communist yoke and develop political and economic democracy.

4. That the United States sponsor a resolution in the United Nations serving notice upon the U. S. S. R. that if it directly or through its satellites commits aggression upon any state whether or not it is a member of the North Atlantic Pact that the full force of all the members of the United Nations will be directed against it.

(Adopted February 10, 1951, at the founding conference of the Council Against Communist Aggression, 1500 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.)

A NEW POLICY FOR ASIA

(By Karl A. Wittfogel)

[From the New Leader of February 19, 1951]

Recent far-eastern developments have disappointed all those who expected the Chinese Communists to settle down peacefully after the full establishment of their regime and not get too deeply involved in Soviet world strategy. Today, it is clear to even the most well-disposed observer that the problem of the Chinese Communists is nothing but the problem of the Chinese sector of a huge Communist axis which stretches from Canton to the Elbe and which expands wherever opportunity permits. But many who accept this fact are reluctant to accept its consequences. Under new disguises, old illusions again rear their heads, obscuring once more the real issues in our China policy.

In the global array of Communist and non-Communist forces, the highly industrialized countries of Western Europe manifestly constitute the most precious stake. The present American efforts to prevent a Soviet victory in this zone are therefore eminently justified. But the Communist victory in China has heightened rather than lessened the importance of an active American policy in east Asia. The spread of Communist power to Formosa, Japan, and the Philippines would seriously imperil our Pacific defenses; and the fall of southeast and south Asia would catastrophically affect the situation in the Middle and Near East.

In view of this danger, which is bloodily underlined by the Korean war, it becomes difficult to plead for a gentle American policy toward Communist China on the ground of an expected Titoist development. Instead, we increasingly hear references to the intense nationalism of our potential friends, the Chinese intellectuals, whose favor we may gain by yielding Formosa and by recognizing the Peking regime. Besides being inconsistent, this argument completely misunderstands the character of a Communist state, in China or anywhere else. Where public opinion is dictatorially controlled, Nationalist sentiment can be so manipulated that the real issues may be reduced to insignificance (cf. the impact of the Soviet Union on Manchuria) and insignificant issues blown up fantastically (cf. the propaganda against American imperialism in China today).

There certainly are in China national as well as other undercurrents that defy Communist manipulation; but however important these undercurrents may become in an open crisis, at the moment they are woefully ineffective if compared with the strength of government-promoted ideas. Any American policy which disregards essential political (and strategic) considerations in order to appeal to the controlled nationalism of the Chinese intelligentsia will be the victim of an unrealistic concept of Communist power.

The only effective nationalism in Communist China today is the nationalism of its ruling party. No doubt, the Peking Politburo is fully aware that in Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria, and perhaps now also in Korea, Moscow's and Peking's aspirations clash. But some of these areas have already fallen under Soviet influence; and Manchuria is too close to Russian territory and military might to lead to open conflict.

NO TITOS IN CHINA

Such a conflict seems unlikely also for other and even more weighty reasons. The conference of the trade-unions of the countries of Asia and Australasia, held in 1949 in Peking with strong Soviet approval, placed the Chinese Communists in an outstanding position as the models and supporters of the many hoped-for Asian revolutions. The prospect that Mao and his lieutenants may rule as satraps over the majority of the agrarian countries of Asia opens up enormous vistas, not only for the Communist leaders themselves, but also for their subjects. This perspective which, with its imperialistic possibilities, surpasses all traditional Chinese Nationalist dreams, is entirely acceptable to the Moscow Politburo. The master strategists of the Kremlin are accustomed to think in geoeconomical categories. They see their hegemony for any foreseeable future guaranteed by their control over the great industrial centers of the Eurasian heartland, centers which they hope to supplement with the industries of Western Europe, while the remainder of agrarian Asia, under Chinese (and Russian) direction, is being liberated.

Thus the Chinese and Russian Communists are linked not only by similarities in their power structures, ideologies, and the corresponding vested interests of their ruling classes, but also by historical expectancies which logically emerge from their Leninist-Stalinist premises. Faced with enemies who think in global and long-range terms, we can hope to build an effective policy only if we too view the separate issues of the present far-eastern situation in a global and long-range context.

KEEP KOREA FREE

Korea: In line with previously stated intentions, we should try to establish an independent and democratic Korea within whatever limits military and political conditions permit. But neither attacks by ever-increasing masses of Chinese Communist troops, nor pseudo-conciliatory gestures should induce us to make permanent commitments in a strategically absurd position. It is obvious that the Communist Axis wants to tie down the UN forces in as many separate and disadvantageous places as possible. It is equally obvious that we must not become unwilling partners in this game.

Formosa: Our attitude toward Formosa involves military problems which the layman is not competent to solve. But if military judgment recommends the defense of the island—as it apparently does—then it would be foolish to abandon it, and this for political reasons as well. The "nationalism" argument has already been discussed in relation to the Chinese intellectuals. In its official Communist form it is an unpleasant reminder of Nazi arguments for occupying Austria.

Austria has been closely connected with Germany in a long political and cultural history; and the inhabitants of this rump area are practically all German. Nevertheless the consistent enemies of Nazi expansion were unmitigatedly opposed to having Austria added to the Reich when Germany was under the control of a blatantly totalitarian regime. Formosa is far less easily invaded and far more easily defended than Austria was in 1937—or Korea is today. In permitting the island to become the victim of a Communist "Anschluss," we would not only weaken ourselves militarily, but we would also strengthen the impression which Communist propaganda is particularly eager to give—that among other things we are abysmally stupid.

HELP AND REFORM CHIANG

And what of the Nationalist Government and army? Chiang Kai-shek's record as the leader of the defense of his country during the grim years of Japanese occupation is better than most of us today care to remember; the record of his internal policy is bad. Even so well-balanced a document as the Wedemeyer report stresses the many acts of oppression and corruption which helped to undermine Chiang's popular support. But during World War II we had a number of allies whose governments were none too savory and whose internal conditions we could not influence. If a general war breaks out shortly, we should have to accept the Nationalists, like all other allies, "as is," making the best of what we have to defend the east Asian fringe. But if the present uneasy world situation continues for some time then we shall be in a better position than ever to make the Nationalists underwrite certain basic economic and political reforms. Such reforms, if thorough and successful, will also provide new perspectives for a post-Communist China. Most probably they will raise the fighting potential of the Nationalist forces far beyond their present level.

Whatever we may do with regard to developing and equipping the Nationalist army, we should certainly not commit ourselves now to any major invasion of the mainland. Such a step would require comprehensive UN (or United States) support, and it would drag us into precisely that kind of an amorphous Asian land war which we have every reason to avoid. Of course, there are many small military operations that a strengthened Nationalist government or independent anti-Communist resistance centers might undertake. In this respect, the previous blockade of Shanghai and the present guerrilla activities on the Chinese mainland provide invaluable lessons as to what is technically advisable and what is not. But here, as in all other instances, momentary indignation must not make us lose sight of our long-range strategy. Proper balance between our European and Asian commitments remains the paramount test. And certain actions which, in a spreading military conflagration, would be extremely helpful may produce a wholly undesired effect when undertaken impulsively and without regard for the general Asian and global situation.

Diplomatic recognition of Communist China. As a matter of expediency, it seems desirable to recognize diplomatically all de facto governments that persist over time. But this rule, like others, has its exceptions. Communist China may be one of them.

The Peking invasion of Tibet was not officially branded for what it was except by the Lhasa government. The Chinese Communist aggression in Korea was eventually condemned by the UN. These two ventures are direct and, so to speak, neighboring actions. Others, less direct, have more ambitious aims. The top-ranking Peking dignitary, Liu Shao-chi, who promised his party's support for the Communist movements throughout Asia and Australasia, urged the necessity of setting up in these areas "wherever and whenever possible a national army which is led by the Communist Party."

If our Asian friends hope to tame the Chinese tiger by feeding it, we can do nothing to stop them. But we have no right to neglect the lessons gleaned from our own experiences. These lessons controvert many oft-repeated misconceptions. They show that, without recognition, a modest flow of diplomatic messages and proposals is entirely possible. They show that, without recognition, economic relations can be maintained with considerable success. (The bulk of American trade with the U. S. S. R. during certain years before recognition was greater than during any years from 1933 until the beginning of the war.) They also show that a free exchange of persons—students, journalists, businessmen—with a Communist state is a complete fiction. The apparatchik societies refuse to admit any member of the free world who is overtly critical of their

way of life, while, under cover of "exchange," they send us hand-picked and thoroughly indoctrinated Communists.

But apart from the disadvantages involved in unequal diplomatic treaties with Communist countries to which we have agreed without realizing their pitfalls, there is no justification for our recognizing now or in any near future a regime that blackmails us with threats and that openly attacks the UN (and United States) forces. Recognition under these circumstances would indeed be a reward for aggression; and the Communist camp would certainly hail it as such.

VETO REDS IN UN

Admission to the UN: As in the case of recognition, we should maintain our freedom of decision. But also, as in that case, there is no excuse for putting a premium on aggression. On the contrary, conditions being what they are, we should use every means provided by the Charter, including the veto, to prevent the seating of a Chinese Communist delegation in the United Nations.

For the Chinese people—against their Communist dictators: We have never ceased to emphasize our friendliness for the Chinese people; and in view of the present Communist hate campaign it is particularly important to unmask the claim of American imperialism in China as a new version of the big lie. The United States voluntarily dropped all unequal treaties just when the U. S. S. R. was striving to reestablish tsarist prerogatives in Manchuria. We voluntarily withdrew our troops from Korea as well as from China; and our continued pressure for the liquidation of colonialism is well known. The partial success of Communist propaganda in such countries as India in depicting us as imperialist schemers therefore constitutes a particularly serious challenge. The incessant repetition of the big lie requires that we, with equal insistence, restate our friendship for the Chinese people (as juxtaposed to their Communist dictators) and our full acceptance of the country's national independence—which is threatened not by us, but by the new Soviet treaties and the Moscow teachers of the Peking regime. We should make it unmistakably clear that our refusal of recognition is directed, not against the Chinese people, but exclusively against their aggressive and dictatorial rulers. Of course, there is no reason for righteous self-adulation, and the American who fails to see the opportunistic inconsistencies in our proliberation policy oversimplifies a good record which needs no glamorizing. But the American who brazenly denies our basic proliberation policy gives comfort to our enemies by repeating one of their most dishonest slander themes.

WELFARE AND THE PEOPLE

Our attitude toward the non-Communist population of China and the adjacent countries of Asia: Another slogan, which is thoughtless rather than vicious, is the cry for contacts with the non-Communist people of China. We certainly should do everything in our power to reach the urban as well as the rural non-Communist population in China and in other parts of Communist Asia. But besides supporting the resistance movements and spreading whatever propaganda we can, we have only limited opportunities of approaching the subjects of the new apparatchik states. The real issue, thus, lies somewhere else.

In the great majority of all Asian countries, the discontent of large strata of the rural population enables the Communists to pursue their strategy of infiltration, organization, and attack. No military and political measures on our side will prove satisfactory unless they are bulwarked by a genuine concern for the welfare of the villagers. The excellent land reform which, under American direction, was carried out in Japan has resulted in a situation in which the Japanese Communists have lost most of the support which they previously derived from the poor peasants and tenants. The second part of a land reform which was initiated in Korea in 1949 under our pressure and by vote of an assembly that did not see eye to eye with Syngman Rhee might have achieved similar results, if the Korean Government had acted faster and if the North Koreans had not attacked in June 1950. The ECA is now trying to enforce in Korea the second (and more comprehensive) part of the reform.

History will show whether the harm done by the delay can be amended; but it is vital to learn from experience and to apply the principles, which proved so effective in Japan, to other areas of east and southeast Asia immediately threatened by Communist civil war and expansion. Formosa has already been mentioned. The Philippines and Indochina also have a high priority. Any American funds which will facilitate the transfer of the land to the peasants by partially underwriting a reasonable compensation may prove decisive in demonstrating the seriousness of our attempt to show that our democratic policy concerns itself not only with the form of government, but also with the vital needs of the large underprivileged strata of the agrarian population. The implications of such a bold and focused application of our point 4 program for other parts of non-Communist Asia, such as India, Pakistan, and even the Near East, are obvious.

REFORMS AGAINST RED REVOLUTION

Our economic and social policy in Asia should not be based on the principle of me-tooism, but on entirely different considerations and aims: American policy in all these fields defeats its purpose when it insists that we are aiming at measures similar to those undertaken by the Communists, the difference being only that we proceed in a more civilized and gradual manner. Such an attitude of me-tooism is decidedly harmful. Today, no sincere political analyst has the right to speak of the Communist land distribution as a measure intended to provide the peasants with full, permanent and secure possession of the assigned land. This policy is nothing but a ruse for temporarily gaining peasant support for the seizure of political power which, once achieved, becomes the lever for destroying not only all large property, but eventually all small rural and urban property as well. Ambivalent statements spread by irresponsible authors and politicians about the first phase of the Communist land policy bulwark a propaganda myth which we have every reason to destroy. It is of the utmost importance for us to contrast the temporary and dishonest Communist revolution with the permanent and honest reforms which we promote. Together with its industrial supplement (the encouragement of a strong and independent trade-union movement) and a general policy of civil liberties and social security, these measures prepare the urban and rural population to participate democratically in the life of their commonwealth.

To be sure, our insistence on the superiority of our policy will be meaningful only to the extent to which it is accompanied by authentic acts. But these acts will become propagandistically effective only if we present them without apology, and not as if the Communists were actually, if pervertedly, doing the job better. It is high time to discard a me-tooist revolutionary phraseology which implicitly gives the Communists credit for something for which they deserve no credit whatsoever.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," by Mr. Selig Greenberg, writer for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, published in the city of Providence, R. I.

These articles will be most interesting to the Members of the Senate in their consideration of S. 337, which is a bill to provide an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical fields.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 6, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—SURVEY SHOWS UNITED STATES FACES SERIOUS DOCTOR SHORTAGE—TOTAL OF PHYSICIANS NOT ENOUGH TO FILL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY NEEDS

(This is the eighth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The issue of monopoly in medicine has been brought into particularly sharp focus by the grave financial crisis facing the medical schools and the demand for more doctors growing out of the national emergency.

The ominous and undisputed facts in the financial crisis are:

The medical schools cannot enlarge or even maintain their present enrollment unless they get a lot more money.

The same thing holds true of the standards of teaching which will determine the quality of future medical practice. Without additional funds, the schools will not only be unable to improve and expand the scope of their teaching but will be forced to let standards deteriorate.

In other words, instead of getting more and better doctors we are in danger of getting fewer and poorer ones at a time when the need may be greater than ever.

STUDY REVEALS SHORTAGE

The extent to which the national emergency and the threat of war have aggravated the shortage of doctors was recently revealed by the health resources advisory committee of the National Security Resources Board.

The committee, made up of physicians, said flatly after a 6-month study that there were not enough doctors in the United States to meet mobilization needs and afford at the same time adequate protection for the civilian population. The Nation would need 22,000 physicians over and above those in sight for 1954, it reported, to maintain the present level of civilian medical services and meet expected requirements for the Armed Forces, civil defense, and public-health services.

The committee urged immediate expansion and acceleration of medical training facilities. It warned that the threatened deficit could be averted only if medical school enrollments were increased at once by 15 per-

cent and the schools adopted again the speed-up program in effect during the last war. Under this program, the 4 years of medical training were squeezed into 3 years by giving up vacations.

All of which underscores the urgency of relieving the financial plight of the medical colleges.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ROLE

What has the American Medical Association done about it?

The preponderance of objective opinion is that the AMA has consistently pursued a policy of obstructionism.

The country's top medical educators and the presidents of some of our leading universities agree that the amount of money needed to assure the future of American medical education is so huge that it cannot be met through private philanthropy alone. They are convinced that the job can be done adequately only with Federal aid.

A bill providing for Federal subsidies was introduced in the United States Senate in 1949 under joint Democratic and Republican auspices, with Senator TAFT as one of its sponsors. The Senate passed it by unanimous vote.

The AMA then got busy and killed the measure. The bill was bottled up last year in a House committee by a single vote and never got to the floor. Qualified observers have held up this action as proof of the hollowness of the AMA's claim that it favors the training of more doctors.

THREE MAJOR ARGUMENTS

I will go into the merits of the subsidy controversy in a later article. Right now let's take a final look at the AMA line in the debate over the adequacy of our supply of physicians. The line has been based on these three major arguments:

1. We don't need any more doctors.

2. The medical schools already are expanding their enrollment to take care of additional needs.

3. Those who favor still further expansion want to lower the quality of medical training.

The first argument is no longer pressed with as much vigor as it once was. Aside from the factors cited in previous articles, the contrast with what has happened in other professions is too sharp.

GAIN IN DOCTORS LAGS

Between 1910 and 1940, when the country's population rose 43 percent, there was an increase of only 30 percent in the number of doctors as against a boost of 58 percent for lawyers, 76 percent for dentists, 85 percent for teachers and 212 percent for engineers. Last year the medical schools graduated 5,553 M. D.'s. This compared with 52,240 degrees awarded by engineering schools and 14,312 by law schools.

During the past 10 years the rise in the number of doctors—but not of private practitioners—has kept pace with the growth of population and medical school enrollment has substantially increased. Freshman admissions mounted 22 percent between 1940 and 1950 and the number of graduates rose 9 percent. But in 1940 the schools had barely begun recovering from the low point to which their enrollment had sunk during the depression.

A new medical school is being built in California and plans for new schools are under discussion in three other States. Experts maintain that this is not enough.

POOR TRAINING CHARGED

Much of the increase in the rate of production of doctors in the past decade has been the result of the opening of several new schools and of the wartime accelerated program. The AMA and the Medical School Association have expressed opposition to renewal of this program on the ground that it led to overcrowding, understaffing, and poor training.

Some of the schools affiliated with State universities expanded their intake in the postwar years under the pressure of veterans seeking to get a medical education through the GI bill of rights. But there has been little expansion in the private schools.

Those who maintain that we need more doctors deny emphatically that they are advocating lowering of standards. Dean Victor A. Rapport, of the College of Liberal Arts at Wayne University, chairman of a committee of American Conference of Academic Deans which has made a study of the subject, has described charges to that effect as "sheer twaddle designed solely to obfuscate basic issues."

Proponents of expansion realize that it will take years to turn out more doctors. They know that it will require not only many millions of dollars but careful planning to secure additional laboratory space and equipment, hospital facilities, and qualified teachers. They are, therefore, all the more concerned over the time lost because of AMA hindrance.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 7, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN RED, NEED $40,000,000 A YEAR—OTHER UNIVERSITY FUNDS HAVE TO COVER $10,000,000 ANNUAL DEFICIT

(This is the ninth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's medical schools need an additional $40,000,000 a year—a jump of about 75 percent—in operating funds to train adequately their present student body.

This was the recent conclusion of a committee of 12 doctors and medical educators after a 2-year study of medical-school finances undertaken for the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The committee was headed by Dr. Lowell J. Reed, vice president of Johns Hopkins University, and included Dr. Ernest E. Irons, former president of the American Medical Association.

BIG OPERATING DEFICITS

The 72 medical schools and 7 basic science schools in the United States now have an annual operating deficit of about $10,000,000, which is being met largely by dipping into other university funds. The $40,000,000 covers this deficit and the additional amount which the committee felt was needed to enable the schools to do a proper teaching job.

The proposed boost of 75 percent in operating expenses would take care only of the present enrollment. Enlargement of the student body, which has been urged by many authorities, would require a lot more money.

The magnitude of the financial emergency confronting medical education is indicated by these major findings of the committee:

IMPROVEMENT OF PLANTS

Aside from $40,000,000 a year in operating funds, the schools need about $330,000,000 to improve their physical plants to meet desired standards.

To increase enrollment by 22 percent, the schools would need an additional $18,000,000 a year in operating expenses and $244,000,000 more for construction purposes.

(The Health Resources Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board has warned that we will be short 22,000 doctors by 1954 unless enrollments are raised at once by 15 percent and the schools adopt again the speed-up program they ran during the last war. The combination of these two measures would mean an increased enrollment of considerably more than 22 percent.)

While medical school operating costs jumped 94 percent between 1941 and 1948, income from endowment and tuition failed to keep pace.

TUITION COSTS

Tuition now averages $550 a year and runs as high as $835. But income from tuition provides only 23 percent of operating expenses. (Brown University, where tuition is $600, gets 56 percent of its total budget from this source. The proportion of income from tuition is even higher in colleges which have no graduate schools.)

Medical school operating expenses average $2,285 a year per student. One school reported spending $8,257 per student. But these figures cover more than the cost of undergraduate training as they include expenditures for research and graduate instruction.

Lack of funds has forced 33 of the schools to limit their programs or defer important advances. Curtailments have been particularly heavy in teaching of public health and preventive medicine, two fields where there has long been a critical lag.

SUBSIDY BILL

The study committee made no direct comment on the revived medical education subsidy bill now pending in Congress. But its findings made it pretty clear that the medical schools could not hope to make up their deficits from increased revenue from private endowment or tuition or bigger grants from their parent universities which already are hard pressed for funds.

There is general agreement among educators that it would be dangerous to go on raising tuition charges and thereby limit still further the study of medicine.

A point stressed by the committee was that even if the required money were made available at once it would take years to improve and expand facilities and recruit faculty. There already is a shortage of teachers, mainly because salaries in many of the schools are too low to attract skilled men who can earn more in private practice.

Far more so than any other field the medical profession cannot be enlarged quickly.

LONG PREPARATION

To become a doctor, a student must have 3 or 4 years of college training, 4 years of medical schooling, 1 or 2 years of internship, and two or more years of hospital residency if he wants to become a specialist. It takes from 10 to 12 years from the time planning starts for a new medical school before its graduates are ready to hang out their shingles.

"Medicine," as one authority has put it, "does not lend itself to the type of expansion that can be accomplished by putting additional chairs in the back of the classroom and asking the instructor to speak a little louder." If they are to do the job properly, the schools must have more teachers and hospital and laboratory facilities before they can accept more students.

TRAINING EXPENSIVE

Medical training is the most expensive of all forms of education because it is an apprenticeship involving a continuous personal relationship between faculty, students, and patients in the teaching hospitals. It requires close personal supervision of students through an unusually high ratio of faculty. At Cornell University Medical College, for instance, there is a faculty of 658, including 123 full-time teachers, for a student body of 334.

Medical education is subdivided into two so-called preclinical years and two clinical years.

The first 2 years are devoted largely to laboratory study of the basic sciences of anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, pathology, bacteriology, and pharmacology. In the last 2 years the student's time is spent mostly in hospital wards and outpatient departments. Here he learns by watching his teachers practice and gradually being allowed to do some of the work himself under supervision. Before he can be permitted to assume responsibility for the life and death of his fellow men the prospective physician requires much training and complicated and costly facilities and equipment.

All of which underscores the fact that if we are to get more doctors it will take not only much money but years. So the time to start doing something about it is now.

The State Versus the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following speech made by Mr. Louis Bromfield, noted author and farmer, at the Cleveland freedom dinner held at the Hotel Statler in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 1, 1951:

THE STATE VERSUS THE INDIVIDUAL

(By Louis Bromfield)

I have been requested to keep what I have to say tonight outside the realms of partisan politics and I shall endeavor to do so insofar as this is possible, but in such a time and in such an age when the entire world is engaged in a struggle between two ideologies, I find it extremely difficult to make a nonpolitical speech on the subject of freedom, and the preservation of man's right to his own individuality.

I think it is quite clear by now to almost everyone that what we are witnessing is a battle between two principles—on the one hand the principle that man is and should be subject to a vague but tyrannical, impersonal machine known as the state. On the other the principle that man's most sacred right is his freedom to live, think, and develop his own character and personality within reason and that government should remain forever subject to the combined will of individual citizens and that officers and bureaucrats from President to policeman are inevitably and eternally the servants of the people.

It is only within the past 2 or 3 years that the true nature of this struggle has become apparent to what we might call the average man, the man in the street, John Q. Citizen, or what you will. Until very recently many of the rights of our citizens have been extracted, as you might say, painlessly, as a tooth might be extracted painlessly by employing the very latest in pain killers. In this process, extending over the past generation or longer, the pain killer has always been employed in the form of subsidies or offers of security in one form or other, with the ultimate in doses being Sir Albert Beveridge's "womb to tomb" state in which, by theory, all material worries would be removed from mankind in return for his giving up the right to choose what kind of work he would perform, where he would perform it, how much he would be paid, and so forth. In other words, in return for the security of the "womb to tomb" plan, he would cease to exist as an intelligent, creative, vigorous individual and become merely a kind of robot, sacrificed to an immense bureaucracy, operating with little consideration for him as an individual. In return for a theoretical security he becomes the victim of an impersonal, inhuman machine—and let me add, from the experience of every nation in which bureaucracy has continued to grow—with a waste and inefficiency that becomes an increasing material burden to the very people whom it is supposed to benefit.

This system of using bribes, subsidies, promises, and so forth as a pain killer confused many—indeed most people—for a considerable time, and it is only since we have begun to see the results in operation has it become apparent, even to the simplest fellow, that when the pain killer wears off, the pain, in terms of insecurity and material cost, is much worse than ever. We, as a Nation, have been very fortunate in having placed before us a laboratory example of how the "womb to tomb" pattern works out. With us, the menace of this false and unworkable political philosophy has crept up slowly and gradually, but in the British Isles, owing to a great number of circumstances, it was put into operation rapidly and with a high degree of completeness.

To establish this "womb to tomb" state, capital was liquidated or confiscated, industry was very largely nationalized, and every sort of assumed benefit was established for the so-called little people (incidentally a disgusting phrase invented by the "womb to tombers"). Quickly every sort of weakness in the system became apparent. The rich were wiped out almost entirely and with them the vast tax revenues which they provided. Industries were taken over and in the process another great block of vast tax revenues was destroyed. Worst of all, perhaps, was the virtual destruction of the solid middle class which built the wealth and power of the British Empire in the past and which is inevitably the very backbone, not only of Great Britain, but of any democratic government. The assumed aim of the "womb to tombers" was to level off everything and everybody, leveling up "the little people" and leveling down the rich, the middle classes and those individuals who were formerly rewarded in high earnings for their value to the state, the economy, and the general national welfare.

Essentially the process has proven to be much more one of leveling down rather than of leveling up and as this has occurred, increasing burdens, both material and of the spirit, have fallen upon the "little people" and will continue to do so with a rapidly gaining momentum.

In this process certain inevitable economic flaws developed—flaws which should have been apparent to any man who could add two and two. The "womb to tomb" theory made necessary at once a huge growth in bureaucracy to administer all the benefits of this new paradise, to pay out subsidies and benefits and police the inevitable chiselers, to collect more complicated and more burdensome taxes, to administer the nationalized industries in which the previously great tax revenues were destroyed. The cost of government increased enormously while the revenues from taxes upon capital, industry, and large incomes disappeared almost entirely. Somebody had to pay for this simultaneous increase in expense and decline in revenue. The next step was to try to pass the costs along to the middle class, a process which in an unbelievably short space of time destroyed the middle class itself, together with its revenues. So in the end everyone has to pay for "the womb to tomb" government and the burden of taxes and finances becomes levelled off and the "little people" pay more and more until it becomes apparent presently that in terms of high prices and taxes they pay in the end far more for a free set of false teeth or a dose of calomel than they would have paid under the old system. Moreover, the workingman and the miner found that there was no gain in working overtime to help national production and income because the government promptly took from him in taxes the money he was paid for the overtime. Some workers even have figured so closely the operations of the system that they have begun to practice deliberate absenteeism, because they found that taxwise they kept more money if they worked less.

These factors are, of course, only material and economic ones but they are far less important to the survival and welfare of nations and even of mankind than the other sacrifices which have been made for a bigger bureaucracy, more taxes and greater hardships. These sacrifices concern directly and inevitably the spirit and the dignity and the freedom not only of the individual but eventually of civilization itself. Let's examine some of the noneconomic sacrifices in the case of that once great nation and that once great democracy known as the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

The so-called Labor Government, let us remember, and especially when we are listening to the arguments of Walter Reuther and some of his friends. Let us remember that the Labor Government is almost entirely made up of the leaders of the trades-unions. Once these unions became the Government, the organized workingman lost the right to strike or even indeed to negotiate in a free sense. They could not strike against themselves, and we have already been treated to the spectacle of the British Labor Government ordering out troops to break strikes occurring among its own unionized Labor Party members. In Great Britain today many workers are frozen on the jobs they are doing and have lost the right to take another and better job or to move to another community. Wage raises are entirely determined by the bureaucracy. A man cannot erect a building, from chicken coop to palace, on his own land with the materials coming from his own land without a permit from the bureaucracy. There is even the absurd case of one farmer who started constructing a small building made from rammed earth coming from his own farm and was ordered to stop the construction and destroy what already existed because he did not have the necessary permit. And the farmer * * * today if a farmer does not operate his land according to the ideas and orders of a distant bureaucracy it is sold from under him and he is dispossessed and the land goes into the hands of a man more amenable to the wishes of bureaucrats in far-off London, who, often enough, know little, or nothing, about agriculture.

The average British citizen can no longer even travel freely outside his own country, since he is not allowed to spend more than the equivalent of about $40 outside the islands. The ration of meat, eggs, and other edibles is today actually lower than at the very peak of the war shortages.

But the list is endless. It explains easily enough why a recent poll showed that 37 percent of British young people would leave England today for this country or some part of the Commonwealth if they found the means of getting out. Probably that 37 percent represents the cream of the nation's youth in terms of initiative, energy, and creative ability. But what young person of ability and ambition would want to live under the "womb to tomb" government if it were possible to escape?

All these troubles have been offered to the British in return for security, and security is something that no government and no bureaucracy can either bestow or guarantee. Security comes from the economic prosperity of a nation, from the rewards which go to intelligence, energy, and initiative, from the stability of a national currency and the free-

dom to develop the resources of a nation. Administrative bureaucrats, let me add, have never been brilliant and creative men and never will be, by the very nature of their calling and by the type of man who seeks a bureaucrat's job. That is mere simple psychology.

As the pain-killer begins to wear off in this country, the aches associated with the Socialist "womb to tomb" Government are beginning to appear. As the bureaucratic costs of our Government have been increased 3 to 500 percent, the tax burden has increased steadily and, under the theory of taxing according to ability to pay has been carried out, the burden has fallen on the big corporation, the big fortunes, the big earning capacity until the point of diminishing returns has been reached and the higher the taxes the less the revenue is the result. Beyond this point lies the crisis where confiscation of capital in one way or another becomes the rule, and when that comes the vast productivity which is the source of our wealth and power as a Nation will evaporate as it has done in Great Britain. We have already reached that point where the burden of increased taxes to operate our bureaucracy will have to be spread largely over the people in the lower-income brackets. This has already begun to occur. It will not benefit this most important element of our society to increase taxes in the higher brackets until these incomes begin to disappear, nor will confiscation of capital or nationalization of industry make their situation easier. Such a process would only mean that the taxes in the lower brackets would be steadily increased as they have been in Great Britain. On the other hand if the able individual and the great efficient corporation is permitted freedom of operation, the tax revenues from both increase steadily and the burden on the smaller income becomes progressively less and less.

The operations of economic laws are fairly exact and much simpler than Lord Keynes and some of his followers would try to make us believe. That this is true, we are beginning to discover the hard way and let us hope that we shall not have to go through all the miseries of Great Britain in order to act in time.

The idea that Government or bureaucracy alone can provide security is at this very moment blowing up in our faces. As a very nearly perfect example, let us take the case of social security. At the time this manifestation of the "womb to tomb" state was set up, a certain rate of in-payments was established and in relation to it a certain pension was established which was regarded as sufficient to provide comfort for the declining years of the average citizen. And so what happens? We have a Government and a system and certain economic conditions which bring about and even encourage inflation, and suddenly the pensioner who gets his social-security payments upon retirement finds that he is being paid off in 50-cent dollars while the money which he paid into the fund for his security was largely paid in 100-cent dollars. In other words, he is getting half as much as he was guaranteed by a Government who took his money, giving him no choice in how he might invest it. And so Congress is forced to increase the amount of the security pensions by 100 percent or more and increase in-payments as well. This process could, of course, go on indefinitely for we have no assurance that inflation will not bring us within a few years to a 30-cent dollar or even a 10-cent dollar. Then where will be the retirement security promised by Government and bureaucracy? I have spent a good part of my life in Europe and I have seen what happened under these conditions in Europe. The process destroyed not only the security of people living on government or industrial pensions but the security of those who had invested in insurance annuities and government bonds. People in old age who believed themselves safe were forced to go back to work by the thousands in order to get enough to eat. The situation was worse and more cruel than anything happening here during the great depression of the thirties.

For a generation the political and social progression in this country has constantly moved toward the abominable fallacy of the "womb to tomb" philosophy. It has been variously called the New Deal, the welfare state, and by other names. That does not matter. What is serious is that the whole movement has been toward greater power in government and the gradual destruction of free will and individual determination for the citizen and the individual community. The very measure which imposes participation in social security by law is in itself a fundamental infringement upon the rights of the individual who should not be ordered where and how he is to invest any portion of his savings, much less so when an acre of land or a small house would provide for him a much greater degree of security than the currency or the bonds of a government engaged in the inflationary process.

If we had no other means of gaging the welfare of peoples and states under the "womb to tomb" philosophy, we have only to check off for comparison the nations of Europe. The greater the degree of state dominion and Socialist "womb to tomb" philosophy, the lower the living standards and the greater the hardships of the people, the lower the state of economic prosperity of the nation and the greater its peril in the world struggle for production and markets. Check off the countries one by one from Belgium or France with the lightest burdens of socialism through to Great Britain with its "womb to tomb" government of Soviet Russia and Hungary where not only are all personal liberties destroyed but the living standards are as low as any in the world. Those nations in which free enterprise was allowed to flourish made the quickest and most solid recovery. In the others, including Great Britain, the prospect of any recovery at all seems dim indeed.

What we are witnessing is the final struggle between the German ideology of the painful nineteenth century on the one hand and the French philosophy of the enlightened eighteenth century on the other, a struggle between the ideas of a disgruntled psychoneurotic called Karl Marx and the civilized and serene philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. And do not be deceived by those quibblers who insist that there is a difference between communism and socialism. Both have their roots in the brutal and primitive thinking of Marx. Socialism is merely the old Marxian fallacies watered down by the intellectuals and the so-called liberals. Those who believe that one can engage in a little socialism without arriving in the end at the full bureaucratic ruthlessness of communism are merely deceiving themselves. To quote an old chestnut, you cannot be a little Communist any more than you can be a little pregnant. The mere continuing weight of bureaucracy, of taxes, of state domination, forces more and more measures which oppress the people stil further until in the end all their liberties are destroyed.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about communism and Communists, and their infiltration into our Government. They are dangerous and subversive and their influence should be stamped out but I doubt that the influence of the direct and avowed Communist is so dangerous to our welfare and our liberties as that of the so-called liberal, the pink thinker and politician, the demi-Socialist, the demivirgin of political life. In this group some advocate the "womb to tomb" state cynically and unscrupulously because so long as the pain killer is working, it gets votes. Some advocate the paternalistic state through plain stupidity and confused thinking. Some promote it because it gives them a warm feeling in the pit of the stomach and makes them feel that they are better and more humanitarian and more sanctified than other citizens, although they are actually destroying slowly the greatest privileges man can know—the privileges of free thought and independence and the right to mold his own life.

The out-and-out Communist is easy to detect and to some extent an easy snake to scotch. Not so the demi-Communist liberal whose ideas are direct from Karl Marx and watered down. He insinuates his poison under the guise of virtue and smugness. He is the one who is used by the Communist as a front behind which the Communist can hide. Recent history goes to prove that the Communist could not have operated at all within our Government save with the cooperation and behind the shelter of the so-called liberal. Of the two I would prefer to fight the Communist. Often enough he is easier to fight because you know him as your enemy. He does not deceive himself or wrap himself in the robes of sanctity and hypocrisy as does the liberal who is often enough too stupid to understand what he is doing or that he is being used. It is through the pinkish reformer that Great Britain has arrived at her disastrous situation. In the case of every nation in Europe taken over by communism and Soviet Russia, it has always been the so-called liberal who prepared the way and held the door ajar. Once the enemy was inside the gates the liberals were liquidated in a wholesale fashion, but it was too late. The tragic damage had already been done.

You may have noticed that I have used the expression "so-called liberal." I do so advisedly because the word "liberal" has become debased both in this country and Europe. It no longer has any real meaning and for some it has even the color of opprobrium. Franklin and Jefferson were very great liberals, indeed, but who would dare suggest that they would support for an instant the freedom-destroying doctrines of many of those half-Mexicans who today call themselves liberals.

I believe that at last, as the pain killers of subsidy, bribery, promises, and humbug are wearing off, all of us are beginning to understand where lie the roots of our freedom, our strength, our prosperity, our human dignity. The recent elections, particularly in this great State of Ohio, pointed in that direction. If we have any doubts let us simply look at the record, let us look at what happens to any nation throughout history which has followed the theory that the state should rule man and not man the state. The record is as clear as the rising sun on a beautiful morning.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The RFC Should Be Abolished," published in the Baltimore Sun, an editorial entitled "Time To Ring Down Curtain on the RFC," from the Jacksonville

Journal, and an editorial entitled "Why Keep the RFC?", from the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of March 16, 1951]

THE RFC SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

No single episode in the shabby RFC story brought out by the Fulbright investigation really justifies the abolition of the RFC. And yet there is a rising demand that the RFC be abolished. Why?

The answer is implicit in the original establishment of the RFC back in the days of the depression. This organization, properly called the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was a creature of the emergency. The credit system of the United States had broken down almost completely. A pinch hitter was needed for doing what the banks and other credit institutions normally do. The RFC was the pinch-hitter, and it did what it was designed to do.

The emergency passed away. But the RFC did not. The crying need for private access to public credit disappeared. But the RFC kept right on providing private access to public credit. Government agencies have a way of lingering, and even of continuing to expand, after the need which brought them into being is gone. That is just what happened in the case of the RFC.

But when a public institution outlives its usefulness it sometimes becomes not merely useless but noxious. That also is what has happened in the case of the RFC.

For one thing, we find that, because banks and private credit institutions stand ready to lend money to sound enterprises, it is the marginal enterprises, the highly dubious credit risks, which tend to flock around the RFC. The RFC has become a "soft touch."

There is another point. When the RFC came into being, this country was in deep depression. Now conditions have been exactly reversed. This country enjoys an unexampled business activity. This country, far from being in depression, is in a period of inflation. One of the recognized methods of combating inflation is to cut down on available supplies of credit, since lending swells the supply of money.

The United States Government at the present time is supposed to be fighting inflation. In various ways it is trying to cut down on credit. And yet, while it struggles with this problem, it continues to maintain the RFC as a "soft touch" credit agency—an agency, in other words, which, by making easy loans to marginal enterprises, actually promotes inflation.

A reorganization such as Mr. Truman now proposes would wash the face, so to speak, of the RFC. But it would not correct the Government's inconsistency in maintaining an easy-credit agency in time of inflation. We do not see any justification for its continuance. There are no useful RFC functions which cannot be dealt with as readily by some other agency of the Federal Government. We believe that the RFC should be abolished, its assets liquidated, and such useful functions as it may still have transferred to other appropriate agencies.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal of March 13, 1951]

TIME TO RING DOWN CURTAIN ON THE RFC

It seemed fair to hold off conclusive judgment about the RFC until the Senate's inquiry was well advanced. That stage has now been reached. And the findings point to just one sensible course: The abolition of the RFC.

As everyone knows, Herbert Hoover created the RFC as a depression emergency device to help keep tottering big business going in the dark days. It was never contemplated that the agency should go permanently into the banking business in competition with our private banking system.

But that is in fact exactly what happened. More than that, the RFC became a sort of court of last resort to which business firms appealed after all regular banks had turned a deaf ear. Many such concerns were granted loans, in defiance of what private bankers considered sound lending practice.

No doubt this greater liberality often had beneficial results, but that cannot be allowed to obscure the essential that the RFC was serving as a vast commercial bank. On several occasions, indeed, the RFC's well-known liberality enabled private banks to transfer to that agency outstanding loans the banks rated as poor risks.

The private banking system is perfectly qualified, except perhaps in extreme emergencies, to meet all the credit needs of the expanding United States economy. There is no point in having the Government competing in this field.

But as it has developed in the Capital, the issue goes well beyond the economic justifications for keeping or abolishing the RFC. Basically, the problem has become a moral one.

What the investigation of Senator FULBRIGHT'S subcommittee has disclosed is a supreme example of the folly of Government by crony—"cronyism," as some have styled it.

Too often President Truman has placed in key Government office not the most fit men, nor even well-qualified men, but simply men he knew and liked. He frequently complains that he cannot attract competent men to many important posts, but the record indicates he at numerous times went out of his way to assure such jobs to his friends.

It is the thoughtful testimony of several seasoned Washington observers that Mr. Truman has thereby committed a host of Federal commissions and bureaus to deteriorate dangerously. The Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, these are among them.

Worse than this, the President has maintained an almost fanatical loyalty to the cronies holding these jobs. Loyalty is a noble trait, and it isn't the only one the American people admire in Mr. Truman. But loyalty to incompetent men—friends or not—is misplaced. The President would do much better to be loyal to high standards of performance.

Moreover, this attitude has been aggravated by his insistence upon regarding every attack upon a subordinate as fundamentally an assault upon him as President. Thus he has tended to discount the criticisms as always political, never sincere.

Senator FULBRIGHT may not be without political motive, but the facts unearthed by his committee cannot be brushed off as campaign fantasies. The expensive mink coat given to a White House secretary, the free vacations for White House functionaries (and Senators, too, for that matter) at the expense of a Florida hotel manager who won an RFC loan, the innumerable pay-offs through awards of high-salaried business jobs to former RFC men, these compound into a sordid, immoral story.

Apparently only the strongest men, administrators like Jesse Jones and Eugene Meyer, can keep a Government lending agency from sinking into the morass of loans by political favor. Establish an institution dealing in billions—passed out on fairly easy terms—and you have a set-up ideally suited to political machinations. Flies always collect around the honey pot.

The result is not only a weakening of the RFC itself, but a general lowering of moral behavior in many parts of the administration, in Congress, and elsewhere.

Mr. Hoover, Jesse Jones, and others have called for RFC's demise. To abolish the agency would be to set an example, to start Government back up the road to sound moral performance.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

WHY KEEP THE RFC?

If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to be kept alive, the reorganization plan advocated by the President, and which has survived a Republican attack in the House, is clearly desirable.

Under this plan, the five-man Board of Directors would be abolished and all RFC operations would be placed under a single Administrator. Senator FULBRIGHT, whose subcommittee has been letting a little light into some of the darker RFC corners, favors this change. The single Administrator system, he says, is "the best method of preventing or, at least, minimizing the conditions now being revealed in our hearings."

When this matter comes before the Senate, however, that body should give very careful consideration to the desirability of abolishing the RFC. Certainly this should be done if the reorganization would do no more than minimize the disgraceful practices which have been exposed by the Fulbright committee. And even if the change would prevent such practices, which is doubtful, it is hard to see wherein the public interest would be served by continuing, in a period of inflation, a Federal agency that was created to meet a need born of deep economic depression, and whose economic influence in these changed times probably is definitely harmful.

When Herbert Hoover asked Congress to set up the RFC on December 8, 1931, this country was in the grip of a paralyzing depression. Normal sources of credit had dried up or had been cut off. The need of Federal assistance was self-evident. Still, even so, Mr. Hoover urged that the proposed RFC "should be placed in liquidation at the end of 2 years." But the familiar pattern has been followed. Twenty years later, when cheap, easy, and abundant credit is our greatest source of economic danger, the adminstration wants to maintain as a going concern an agency which has outlived its usefulness, and which has become a kind of happy hunting ground for those who want to finance dubious ventures with public funds.

The Hoover Commission task force which studied the RFC strongly urged that it be abolished. The full Commission did not adopt this recommendation, although it frowned on many of the things the RFC had been doing. Senator BYRD has taken up the task-force proposal, however, and has served notice that he will seek the abolition of the agency, which he regards as being not only useless in these times, but which also serves as a "workshop for get-rich-quick political predators."

The most meritorious argument that can be made for continuing the RFC is that the agency, if kept alive on a stand-by basis, might serve some useful purpose if conditions should change. But experience has shown that Federal agencies, especially agencies with money to lend, do not sit quietly by waiting for a change of economic climate. If the money is there, the smart operators will be after it. And the chances are that they will always be able to get it, by one device or another, regardless of whether any public interest is served in the process. Sen-

ator FULBRIGHT's statement indicates that this is true; and, in the Star's judgment, the RFC should be liquidated as quickly as possible, unless better arguments can be made for its continuance than have been heard to this time.

Pensions for Disabled Veterans Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, compensation for totally disabled veterans is lagging so seriously behind the cost of living as to jeopardize families and family life. The Nation owes these veterans the highest obligation. The fact speaks more eloquently than argument. Their case demands correction. Appended are two letters from a constituent of mine, a totally disabled veteran, expressing this plea and the need for correction in such detail as to deserve the study of every Member. It is such testimony as this from those directly affected which should produce the needed legislation promptly:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 20, 1951.*
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a totally disabled veteran of World War I. I receive compensation of $171 per month for a service-connected disability. Considering the present-day high cost of food and medical care, I assure you that this is entirely insufficient for my wife and myself to live on decently. I don't mention the prohibitive cost of clothing, because those items are in the realm of luxury for us, even though we are sorely in need of new clothing as a sheer necessity. Every time we buy food or medicine, another item has been increased in price. My wife has been ill for several years and, not desirous of accepting charity treatment, she has foregone some necessary medical care, resulting in a detriment to her state of health. Even at this writing, my wife needs a doctor's attention, but we cannot afford to consult one. There are many other disabled veterans and their families who are forced to exist under similar conditions.

The totally disabled war veterans have no other source of income, and we are entirely dependent upon the Congress of the United States for a decent existence. I am therefore appealing to you and the collective heart of our Congress, as a humanitarian gesture, to alleviate this situation with appropriate legislation to reasonably increase the present disability compensation rates. As your views in this respect are well known to and appreciated by disabled veterans, we will be highly honored if you would cosponsor such legislation on the floor of the House. And may I further request that such legislation be favorably consummated at a very early date, so that we may enjoy the luxury of living decently as soon as possible? In the past, such matters have generally been taken up at the close of congressional sessions. But are not disabled veterans entitled to more pressing consideration, after national security?

Are we asking for too much, just to live decently? You have my utmost assurance that, were I able to work, I would not humiliate myself by writing this letter.

I assure you that such a kind act by the Congress, and by you, personally, will be sincerely appreciated by my wife and myself; by the thousands of disabled veterans, like myself, who are unable to work; and by those disabled veterans who further jeopardize their disabilities by working.

Won't you please make the waning years of an old soldier happy with a favorable reply to his appeal, and with your favorable reaction to match the reply? All disabled war veterans will be sincerely grateful to be able to finally live decently.

In these days of world crises, may our Congress and Government be guided by the wisdom of God.

Very respectfully,
PHILIP E. RICHARDS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 19, 1951.*
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate very sincerely your kind, sympathetic, and encouraging letter of February 16, in reply to mine of January 20, a copy of which I am enclosing. In these days of the entirely uncalled-for high cost of living, when the disabled veterans depend on the humane understanding of our Congress, and a prayer to God, for a decent existence for our families, it fills me with exhilarating relief to receive such a genuinely sincere and understanding letter from you.

Is there not someone in our Congress who will take the initiative to ease the burden of the disabled war veterans, and follow it thru successfully at a very early date? Since the advent of the Korean war, the cost of living has been increasing regularly every week, especially food and medicine. And even though food prices were supposedly "frozen" on January 25, the prices of these necessities of life are still increasing. And, according to the OPS, the prices of food will continue to increase until midsummer.

The great majority of organized labor has not felt this increased cost of living, having received substantial pay increases. But what about me, with a fixed income of $171 per month, as a totally disabled war veteran? What are my wife and I supposed to eat? And how am I supposed to take care of the medical needs of my sick wife? I don't like to beg all the time—it's humiliating. But, like most disabled war veterans, I am entirely dependent on the Congress for a decent existence. Am I not entitled to live decently, just like organized labor?

There are several bills, calling for increases in disability compensation rates, pending in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. In view of the tense situation in which disabled veterans find themselves in order to live decently, and as you are greatly respected as a sincere friend of disabled veterans, would it be an imposition on my part in urgently requesting that you do something to have one of these measures expedited through this committee, and then acted on favorably and expeditiously by the Rules Committee, so that it can reach the floor of the House for a vote very soon?

My wife and I will be very grateful, like all disabled veterans, for this humanitarian gesture on your part, and all of us will anxiously await early action, in this respect, by the Congress. Please favor me with some good news at your very earliest convenience.

In my humble way, permit me to hope that you may enjoy good health, happiness and Godly wisdom in the future, so that you will continue to serve our country in the same unselfish manner for many years to come.

Very respectfully,
PHILIP E. RICHARDS.

Good Forestry With Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Good Forestry With Competition," by Joe M. Crahane, of Brownsville, Oreg.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD FORESTRY WITH COMPETITION

State and United States foresters, conservationists, the Department of the Interior, together with various other public agencies and local and national organizations, have in the past few years been concerned with the depletion problems of our forests, both publicly and privately owned. There have been, likewise, scores of bills introduced in both our Congress and our State legislatures attempting to provide protection for our natural resources, so that we and future generations may have timber, that the mills may operate steadily and furnish annual employment, which will play a big part in the stabilization of our communities. A constant source of employment is very essential.

Now in view of all that had been said with respect to depleting and denuding our forests, there had been comparatively little done in way of good forestry management up until the last few years. But in the last few years, through the continual rising price of stumpage caused by the shortage and scarcity of timber, it became apparent to many that timber is a profitable crop. They have also concluded that it pays to be careful in logging not to destroy the reproduction. Many are also of the opinion that trees planted now will produce a fair crop in 60 years. Some are so strong in this belief that they are really practicing good forestry and are putting a large portion of their earnings into forestry as an investment. But it took an incentive to bring about this new thinking. It wasn't altogether the thought of the future generation. It wasn't that our public spirited people and conservationists were demanding it. It was the potential profit they could see in good forestry. Yes, if it wasn't a profitable investment no one but the Federal Government could invest in such a long-shot program. But while some are convinced that sustained yield forestry is good business many are doubtful and say the risk is too great. Personally I agree—it is a big risk. But it is worth it.

There are others, however, who will not be convinced that the policy is sound. There are too many things, political and economic, which might cause an investment to be worthless. These very people who preached conservation might help implement some deal whereby it would be a poor investment.

Some operators are definitely of the opinion that only the United States should attempt such long-range planning and they have resolved to take what timber is available and run the mill just as long as they can without attempting to conserve timber, protect the reproduction, or make an effort to restock, as well as have consideration for the economy and general stability of the community.

However, if we are allowed to continue under the new policy adopted by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the

Interior, about 2 years ago I am sure that at least one-half of the operators will fall in line with the few who are now practicing good forestry. They, too, would see that it is the only way they can hope to have a lasting—perhaps perpetual—lumbering operation.

This new policy that I refer to came into existence in 1948 and it had to do with the administration of O. & C. lands in western Oregon. This new regulation is based on the premise that all operators shall have an equal opportunity to purchase Federal timber, and that Federal timber shall be sold on bids to the highest bidder in accordance with some qualifications of the bidder pertaining to State and Federal laws, roads, marketing areas, etc.

The Bureau of Land Management is doing a splendid job of administering the public lands, opening up these timber tracts for the public to buy on auction and sealed bids, giving the mill operators a chance to compete for the purchase of the timber, and in so doing has caused the bidders to pay a good price—as much as 30 percent on an average more than the appraised values. It is true that it required good milling facilities to get the most out of the high-priced stumpage but we are pleased with the results. If the other fellow can outbid us, we are still happy. We will be happy as long as we have an equal opportunity to compete. We hope we can continue to have competition and not allocation as it would obviously be if Federal stumpage price is to remain frozen. For if stumpage is frozen it will be impossible to deal justly with the many bidders. If there are six bidders on one tract, who will have the knowledge to judge which one of the six shall get the timber? Even if there are two bidders or a dozen bidders, who can make such a decision? Shall he allocate the timber to the mill that has some timber of its own or to the operator who has done nothing to perpetuate the industry or who has done a very poor job of forestry or who has given little thought to what effect the denuded lands in his logged-over areas would have on the economic stability of the community? Will the allocator take into consideration the good forester who has been doing the job which has in the past been so strongly recommended by good forestry men and conservationists, as well as put a fair part of his earnings into this program which is so essential to perpetuate good forestry?

The Bureau of Land Management has gone a long way in good forestry in the last 2 years. It is the Bureau of Land Management and the competitive system that has caused many operators to practice better forestry. These operators believe that with the small stands of their own timber, some purchased from ranchers and others, and an opportunity to bid in Federal tracts of timber—maybe two or four million feet a year—they can operate perpetually on a small scale. These small operators will always be a source of revenue for the small towns and their employees will feel they have job security and in turn will build better homes and schools.

We must understand there is not enough Federal timber to go half way around and if we lose out on our bid for it we will have to assume that the other fellow is a better operator and has a better mill and will come to the conclusion that we will have to bring our plant up to date in order to compete with our competitor. But if the timber is allocated to certain mills, good mills as well as poor ones do not have an opportunity to bid. It will destroy the incentive for those who have tried to do the job right. Encourage the good operator by giving him an equal opportunity. Encourage the man who is doing good forestry. All he wants is an equal opportunity. He doesn't necessarily have to buy timber but he does want an equal opportunity, and especially so if he has practiced good forestry.

In order to supply a greater amount of lumber for the military requirements, it is essential that we have competition in the purchase of Federal timber. We cannot have competition with allocation, and allocation is essential with the price ceiling on stumpage. It is not necessary to put a ceiling on stumpage to keep operators from paying too much. Ceilings are created and applied to check hoarding and profiteering and are also a factor in checking inflation but it is not necessary that Uncle Sam place a ceiling on his own commodities.

Don't destroy the good system we now have for fear an operator is going to pay too much for Federal timber. They have taken care of themselves in the past and they will continue to do so. The ceiling on lumber will regulate the price of stumpage. Operators will not bid more than that which they can afford to pay. They have not done so in the past and there is no reason to believe they will in the future. Take the freeze off Federal timber and avoid discrimination. Make timber available with access roads. When timber is available it creates competition. The extra money obtained through access roads will more than pay for the roads and the lumber industry will more than meet both military and civilian requirements.

JOE M. CRAHANE.

BROWNSVILLE, OREG.

Intertie Between Bonneville Power System and Shasta Dam in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "State Master's Comments," published in the Grange News of February 24, 1951; also an editorial entitled "Mr. Chapman Has Spoken," published in the Grange News of March 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grange News of February 24, 1951]

STATE MASTER'S COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA INTERTIE

Much is being said and written these days about the proposed intertie between the Bonneville power system and Shasta Dam in California. One of the latest arguments advanced is that the intertie would save 5,000,000 barrels of oil which otherwise will be needed to operate steam plants to generate electricity for California.

This seems like a mighty flimsy excuse when we consider the huge cost of the intertie and the heavy load losses that would result from such long-distance transmission of power. This would greatly increase the power costs in this region, which has so ably demonstrated the soundness of the existing Bonneville wholesale rates.

Of the $521,000,000 that the Government has spent on these projects, the Bonneville system has in this short time returned to the Federal Treasury $170,000,000, of which $70,000,000 represented interest. In the fiscal year 1949–50 the surplus of $42,000,000 was increased to $54,000,000. In other words, the system earned more than $12,000,000 above the amount needed to retire the principal and interest due on the entire cost of the system.

Not until we have a surplus of power here will the people of the Pacific Northwest feel justified in permitting any of this power—so essential to carry on the region's industries and production—to be siphoned into other areas.

No amount of statistics and political maneuvering will ever convince the people of this region that they should stand by and submit to being robbed of their great natural heritage, the Columbia River and its power. (H. P. C.)

[From the Grange News of March 3, 1951]

MR. CHAPMAN HAS SPOKEN

Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has calmly brushed aside Pacific Northwest opposition to the "California intertie" power transmission line which would link the Bonneville system with that of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. near Shasta Dam. Although practically everybody in this region has "kicked like a steer" at the intertie proposed by his Bureau of Reclamation for the past 2 years or more, this sentiment has not ruffled a hair of Mr. Chapman's smoothly combed head. Ordinarily one would think that people living nearest to a problem would be best qualified to analyze it, but Mr. Chapman seems to know more than all of the Pacific northwesterners put together—even at a 3,000-mile distance.

There has been real basis for the fear that this power link would make an irreparable break in the breastworks of space that now protect the Northwest from raids on its Columbia River water and power supplies. Recent events lend more substance to this fear.

Without waiting for a congressional appropriation, Mr. Chapman blandly announces that the Bureau of Reclamation has started surveys of the intertie, and that construction will be completed in November 1952. Ignoring arguments challenging the feasibility of the project, its lack of defense need as compared with steam plants within this region, and the unjustifiable "profits" to be made by the Bureau of Reclamation from selling 2-mill Columbia River in California's 5-mill market, Secretary Chapman blithely reiterates that the intertie will bring 100,000 kilowatts of California power to "firm up" supplies for Northwest aluminum plants, like a dog team firming up a Great Northern freight train. In the same breath he says it would save California 730,000 barrels of oil, which indicates the real one-way nature of the plan.

Last year, on a Grange radio program here, Mr. Chapman denied any intention of permitting construction of the intertie. A verbatim transcription of his remarks shows him trying to reassure the Northwest that the intertie was "just talk." He said there had been "no request" for funds, "no authorization * * * whatsoever for any kind of these projects." "Moreover," he added, "you have got to protect your basic resources, which is cheap power. You would have to be very serious and careful before you would make an interchange of connection which would raise your cost."

But the outbreak of the Korean war 2 months later furnished Mr. Chapman an excuse for labeling the intertie a defense project, and as such it was put through the O. K. mill of the Defense Power Administration which he heads.

Now it seems that the people who opposed a Columbia Valley Administration are get-

ting a taste of what they so lovingly referred to as "efficient existing agencies." Instead of a "three-man dictatorship" we've got a one-man paternalism telling us what's best for us—from 3,000 miles distant.

If the Northwest can't stop construction of a supertransmission line which will tap its main power supply, how can it hope to prevent that line from being used to draw the lion's share of that power to a "market" that's ready, eager and waiting to take it? (B.)

Truman Administration Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People Say No" published in the Omaha World-Herald of March 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE SAY NO

Dorothy Thompson's column which appears elsewhere on this page was written before yesterday's vote by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

But that vote strongly emphasizes the truth which Miss Thompson cites, namely: That the American people, by overwhelming opinion, have rejected the foreign policies of the Truman administration.

This truth is attested to by virtually every poll that has been taken. It is emphasized by the floods of letters received by newspapers and Members of Congress. It is revealed anew by the vote of the two Senate committees, requiring that the administration gain the assent of both Houses of Congress before committing troops to the North Atlantic Command.

This was a staggering and generally unexpected reversal for the Messrs. Truman, Marshall, Acheson and Connally.

When Nebraska's Senator WHERRY first introduced the resolution which provided virtually the same restrictions as those voted by the committees yesterday, the administration leaders brought out the vitriol. This, they said, was vile isolationism. It would tie the hands of the responsible officials and give Joe Stalin a huge advantage vis-à-vis the democracies.

But yesterday the vote was 14 to 10 in favor of the Wherry stand. Three Democrats joined with the solid Republican block to reject the administration's demand.

What had happened?

Clearly, we think, the Senators had been reading the mail from home.

Since last June 25 the American people have been marched up to the very gates of the garrison state, and they do not like what they see.

They do not relish the prospect that for many years, possibly for the rest of their lives, they will be required to live in accordance with the iron whim of bureaucrats. They see little pleasure in giving a huge share of what they earn, and every year a huger share, to the tax collector.

This, they sense, is not the way to achieve true security nor is it the end to which a democratic people should aspire. Surely, they reason, there must be better ways to approach the problems of mankind than to plunge blindly down the road toward despotism and, maybe, oblivion.

It is unfortunately true that the Truman administration may be somewhat embarrassed, in its dealings with other nations, by the developments of yesterday.

But that is only an incident of the day. The embarrassment will pass. Of vastly more importance is the fact that the attitudes and convictions of the people finally have been communicated forcibly to the Congress.

At last we, the people, and our representatives are beginning to understand each other. That growing understanding, heralded by yesterday's vote, may prove to be the most significant event of 1951.

Resolutions Adopted at Chicago Conference of American Association for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions which were adopted at the Chicago Conference of the American Association for the United Nations, held on February 25–27, 1951.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT CHICAGO CONFERENCE FEBRUARY 25–27, 1951, BY AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

PREAMBLE

We the duly appointed delegates of 91 broadly representative national organizations are gathered in Chicago under the auspices of the American Association for the United Nations in an emergency conference to discuss United States responsibility for world leadership. Speaking as individuals with a sense of responsibility to the organizations which appointed us, we express the following as the consensus of our meeting.

We believe that all people are equal and united to one another in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

We are united in our support of the United Nations as the best hope of the peoples of the world to prevent war, to develop collective security, to promote negotiation among governments, to create world law, to aid the self-determination of peoples, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, and to advance economic welfare among all the peoples of the world.

We are united also in our conviction that war is not inevitable, and that the common efforts of the international community can direct the destinies of mankind.

Already the United Nations in five short years has to its credit the following impressive accomplishments:

1. It has through the Assembly resolution on uniting for peace pledged common action to resist aggression anywhere in the world and created the immediate means to do so not subject to veto.

2. It has moved through the overwhelming majority of nations to resist aggression in Korea and for the first time in history placed at the disposal of the international community the military and other aid of member nations.

3. It has aided in resolving conflicts that threatened the peace in half a dozen areas throughout the world and through its good offices brought about cease-fires, basic principles of self-determination, and peaceful settlements, notably in Indonesia and Israel.

4. It has aided the development into nationhood of subject colonial peoples and promoted the independence of non-self-governing peoples.

5. It has extended technical assistance and economic aid to underdeveloped countries, and through its many specialized agencies all over the world attacked the obstacles to world trade and economic welfare.

6. It has promoted human rights through the adoption for the first time in history of universal standards and is following them up by drafting enforceable covenants for freedom of information internationally and for economic and social rights as well as political and civil liberties. It has advanced the status of millions of women throughout the world and gained recognition for their political, educational, and economic rights. It has outlawed by international treaty the crime of genocide.

These are only the outstanding lines of achievement among a host of activities unprecedented in international action.

The United States, in conformity with the Charter's principles, is championing under its bipartisan foreign policy these efforts. Support of the United Nations Charter is the keystone of American policy. That policy, in and out of the United Nations, has buttressed the purposes of the Charter through economic aid to Europe and other parts of the world, the promotion of freer trade, and regional pacts for defense against aggression.

The United Nations is still in an early stage of development, with the prospect that its machinery will be improved as it may become necessary to make it more fully representative of the peoples of the world and with larger powers to meet their claims and needs. To strengthen it member nations should implement by their domestic action the decisions reached by United Nations organs. The leadership of the United States, for instance, in promoting the convention aganist genocide, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in 1948, cannot be convincingly maintained until the United States Senate ratifies the convention, now already in effect by the action of other nations. Nor can the moral position of our country in world councils be maintained unless at home we raise our own standards by eliminating practices of racial and religious discrimination and by observing all the rights which we champion internationally.

The United Nations will grow in influence as it is faithfully used by the member nations as the major instrument of foreign policy. Unilateral action bypassing the United Nations in the fields of its activities tends to weaken the whole structure. Membership should be universally open to all nations who adhere to the principles of the Charter, so that it may as rapidly as possible become both the forum for negotiation and the means for action for all mankind.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

We support the principle of collective security by which we mean the use of common force to protect all nations from aggression, as provided by the Charter. We reject as false the doctrine, from whatever source or spokesman, that the United States shall regard certain areas or peoples as expendable in its strategy of security. We reject such a doctrine as an inducement to aggression. We reject it as destructive of the collective strength of free peoples. We reject it as contrary to the Charter. Every member of

the United Nations has an obligation to do what it reasonably can do to promote collective security. No nation has a right to purchase its security at the expense of another.

Intervention in Korea to repel the North Korean armies was the first demonstration of collective security by the use of armed forces under the flag of the United Nations. It was action based upon the law of the Charter, authorized by the United Nations, endorsed by 53 of its members, 26 of whom have furnished or offered practical military assistance.

The principle of collective security is as sound today as when the United Nations took action to repel the aggression against the Republic of Korea on June 25. The nations must profit by experience. The experience in Korea clearly demonstrates the necessity for improvement in collective-security action.

In the first place, troops must be designated in advance for call by the Security Council or the General Assembly; an adequate United Nations military staff must plan in advance for their coordination and command. The absence of such advance designations resulted in one nation sending a disproportionately large number of forces and in the inability of the United Nations to use all national forces that were offered.

The experience in Korea also shows that the United Nations must have appropriate organs to assess the political consequences of proposed military measures. Collective security cannot be achieved by permitting smaller aggressions to grow into universal war. Careful diplomacy by the United Nations and its members should seek to localize policing actions.

The United States should urge the United Nations immediately to implement the uniting-for-peace resolution adopted by the Fifth General Assembly, which provides for the designation of forces to be available to the General Assembly or the Security Council, for a Collective Measures Committee to plan further strategy of collective security, and for a Peace Observation Commission to watch troublesome frontiers.

DISARMAMENT

We fully support President Truman's suggestion in his UN Day speech of October 24, 1950, that there be a merger of the UN Commission on Atomic Energy and the UN Commission for Conventional Armaments, and that the new commission devise a plan whereby an enforceable, general, and universal disarmament might be achieved. Certainly an enforceable plan must provide for effective UN inspection and police forces.

We believe that the United States must under present conditions continue to muster its strength until the defenses of the free world are so strong that they will deter aggression by making its price too high. But no reasonable ground must be left for anyone to regard the measures of defense as designed for any purpose other than the preservation of peace and the protection of freedom against aggression. The gains for defense of any particular measure might otherwise be balanced by its dangers in provoking countermeasures or even aggression by others.

Therefore, in building our military strength we must make clear to the world that the goal of our country is a collective system to make possible the disarmament of all nations. The United States should boldly and forthrightly advocate a UN plan for stopping the arms race through general disarmament, enforceable by the United Nations. The clear vision of this as our goal would win the hearts and minds of war-weary peoples everywhere and inspire our allies and our own people in the common struggle to resist aggression.

CONCILIATION

The United Nations Charter places the processes of negotiation and conciliation first in its program for maintaining international peace and security. The United States and other members of the United Nations should with boldness and imagination seek every practical avenue of conciliation.

We urge that the proven and diverse patterns used in Palestine, Indonesia, Iran, and Greece be applied to new areas of conflict.

We do not accept the inevitability of war. While it is necessary to strengthen regional arrangements and to develop military forces for collective use against aggression, we urge unrelenting negotiation to find areas of agreement. Negotiations involve concessions by both sides. They require of the United States a broad understanding of the views and circumstances of other nations, without appeasement of aggression or any surrender of the basic principles of the Charter.

The work of the United Nations Good Offices Committee to arrange a cease fire in Korea should be encouraged. We recommend that the United States support a resolution in the General Assembly formally recommending to the parties the pattern of the Renville principles which became a basis for the settlement of the Indonesian dispute. Essentially these principles are a cease fire, demilitarized zones, progressive withdrawal of forces, interim government, free elections, a constitutional convention, and economic rehabilitation, all under the supervision of the United Nations. These principles are applicable not only to Korea but to similar conflicts that may arise. They are basic to any fair solution in the spirit of the Charter.

Negotiations in the major world conflicts will have a far greater chance of success as the collective forces of the free world become stronger. But there is danger that in their all-out determination to develop the necessary military forces, the American people may come to assume the inevitability of war and fail to seek all practical avenues of negotiation and conciliation. We Americans must not lose the capacity for a bold initiative for peace.

COEXISTENCE OF DIVERSE SYSTEMS

More important than any specific decision is the growth of a United Nations mind with its developing parliamentary practices and sense of unity of mankind. The Soviet Union, it is true, leads a minority of Communist states in frequent opposition to the majority. We must evidently accept for an indefinite future the coexistence of diverse policies and systems of government. Adjustment to such differences is urged by the basic principle of the Charter—the sovereign equality of states. All states, whatever their forms, must now learn to live and let live under the principles of the Charter. The fact that both the dictatorships and democracies continue to take a vigorous part in United Nations debates keeps the door open for eventual adjustment of the conflicts that now divide the world. That door should never be closed. The ultimate dissolution of police states and tyrannical governments will be measured by the degree democracy succeeds in meeting the insistent demands of the world's peoples for greater freedoms, enduring peace, and rising standards of living.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF ASIA AND AFRICA

A great economic and social revolution is taking place in Asia. Hundreds of millions in that part of the world are throwing off the yoke of colonialism, and at the same time are striving for better economic and social conditions. Communism is not the moving impulse behind the revolutionary upheavals in Asia. Communism is the means by which Soviet imperialism has attempted to take advantage of the vacuum created by the failure of the Western World to understand the forces of nationalism and social revolution in Asia. The liberal policies pursued in freeing India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Indonesia have led to a spirit of cooperation and friendliness in these countries with the Western World. These newly awakened peoples in Asia have taken their place in the United Nations, and from their ranks have come some of the great statesmen of the United Nations.

The same nationalist and revolutionary forces are alive in Africa. Whether we shall see repeated there the tragedies of China and Indochina will depend on the understanding and leadership which the members of the United Nations give to the peoples of that great continent.

In finding peaceful solutions there must be greater understanding of the appalling conditions of poverty, illiteracy, and disease under which millions are living and which prevent them from responding to the appeal of our democratic society. Each people must recognize that its culture and political ideals cannot have a universal application.

HIGHER STANDARDS OF LIVING

One of the basic goals of the United Nations for an orderly world is to assure to the peoples of underdeveloped countries, numbering more than two-thirds of mankind, the opportunity to raise their living standards by developing their resources, food supplies, and industries. Only so can hungry and desperate peoples be saved from the false salvation of totalitarian promises, and participate in international efforts for universal education, human rights, and peace.

Already the United Nations through technical assistance teams is engaged in such a program. Bilateral projects by the United States are also in progress under point 4. The British Commonwealth nations have set up a regional technical assistance and aid program on a vast scale for southeast Asia. The resources of the United States devoted to such purposes should be channeled to the maximum degree practical through the United Nations, or with the advice of its agencies, in order to unify all effort under international direction. Similar aid which may be given to the British Commonwealth plan should be likewise channeled.

The deplorable disparity between arms and welfare is illustrated by the fact that the world's military budgets this year approach $100,000,000,000, but total contributions for technical assistance and aid through the United Nations, from the United States and from the British Commonwealth plan, will not exceed a tiny fraction of the military totals.

Greater boldness and imagination must be aroused in carrying forward this program on a world scale if the false promises of communism and fascism are to be discredited. Food surpluses in some nations should be used for relief in others. Mutually advantageous trade must be greatly increased. Capital investment in undeveloped areas should be encouraged. Technical assistance to enable these peoples to pool their own capital through their own agencies should be used to expand their facilities, skills, and industries.

While recognizing as we do the immediate necessity of a large rearmament program on all the fronts of the free world, we believe that the fullest development of the United Nations technical assistance program will only become possible as the disarmament goals here stated become effectual. The United States Government should take the lead in declaring its intention that with the

gradual reduction of its military appropriations that will be possible with a workable enforcement of disarmament, it will contribute correspondingly increasing sums to the United Nations fund for economic development.

At the same time, however, our Government should now give reassurances that during the present period of necessary heavy military expenditures we will maintain and expand our United States program, both governmental and private, of technical and economic assistance to the greatest extent possible within the limits of our economic capacities. For we must not relax our vigorous pursuit of the constructive task of raising the standards of living of the peoples of the world. This will demand of us all that we sacrifice for this great goal as we are sacrificing for military preparedness.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The United States, with other nations, has assumed great obligations for the advancement of human rights through the diverse efforts of the United Nations.

Despite the political conflicts which so largely mark the United Nations, practical work is steadily progressing to promote one of the major objectives of the charter: the universal protection of human rights for all men and women in the world. The universal declaration adopted at Paris in 1948 is being followed up by the drafting of a covenant, which we urge the United States to support with provisions for the right of private petition and for effective inquiry and conciliation, and for judicial review of legal issues. No reservations should be adopted which concede to state jurisdiction any exemption from the operations of international standards agreed to by the United States.

Simultaneously with the drafting of a covenant, we urge the practical implementation of the universal declaration, already recognized in principle in many situations. The Assembly resolution urging wide popular education in the principles of the declaration should be a concern of all organizations committed to promoting the United Nations.

We support the varied efforts of the United Nations in the promotion of human rights through its agencies on the status of women, freedom of information by press, radio, and newsreels, on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities, on forced labor, trade-union rights, slavery, and the greater liberties of non-self-governing peoples.

We regard all these efforts as constituting a basis for the growth of world law to promote and defend standards of rights applicable to all peoples everywhere, with increasing resort to the agencies of the international community to assure their practical application. These efforts strike at the tyrannies of the police state, whether Communist or Fascist, and also at the causes of manifold grievances and injustices which arouse strife and endanger peace. As such, they constitute one of the greatest hopes of human progress through the United Nations.

Our commitments under the Charter and the universal declaration are to principles grounded in the traditions of our own Bill of Rights. Both our own heritage and our role of world leadership make it imperative that we maintain at home in these critical days the utmost freedom of opinion, debate and dissent, and that we secure equality of all our people without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

We are running the grave risk of sacrificing the spirit and practice of independent and critical expression through fear and hysterical measures to check subversion. An apparent unity purchased at such a price would be a false front, dangerous in its effects on world estimates of the true sentiments of the American people and on the construction at home of a solid foreign policy.

The soundest defense and security of our country lie not in unity enforced by fear, but in the courageous exercise of those liberties which are both the tradition and the hope of the whole free world.

CALL TO ACTION

Recognizing that the governments of free peoples receive their mandate from their citizens, we urge Americans to accept the responsibility to carry forward into their communities and organizations the practical work of education in the policies and principles we have expressed.

We call upon all citizens to maintain contact with their elected representatives for the furtherance of these principles, so that the will of the people for peace and justice through the United Nations may be realized.

INFLATION

We believe that in the present world emergency inflation threatens to hinder the work of the United Nations.

We therefore call for immediate action by the United States Government for a firm and vigorous stabilization program that will distribute the unavoidable sacrifices with fairness and justice, and will enable the United States to discharge effectively its international responsibilities.

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Whereas the people of India are facing serious famine within the next 6 months;

Whereas there exists a surplus of food grains in the United States;

Whereas the traditional practice of the United States has been to give such emergency humanitarian aid as resources permit to peoples in distress solely on the basis of need: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Emergency Conference of the American Association for the United Nations convened in Chicago urges the Congress of the United States to adopt without delay pending legislation which would make available to India 2,000,000 tons of food grains without regard to any political conditions.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 27, 1951

Never before in the history of our Nation has there been so much need for enlightened understanding on the part of our people—of the role it can and should play in the field of international affairs.

The fact that representatives of 91 national organizations, representing practically every phase of American life, have met together for 2½ days in the city of Chicago to consider in emergency session the problem of our responsibility for world leadership, is indicative of the great desire of our people to help maintain the peace of the world at this critical juncture in history and to help bring about a universal state of affairs which would guarantee the peace for generations to come.

As representatives of a great cross-section of American public opinion, we applaud the high level of participation which brought to this conference a rare blending of representatives of public and private agencies, which together with excellent delegate participation will undoubtedly bring forth a set of findings and resolutions which will hearten and provide a spiritual lift to those forces who are so valiantly striving for peace and world understanding.

For the great service provided in making this conference possible, we take this opportunity to express to the American Association for the United Nations, its director, Clark Eichelberger, and his staff, our deep sense of gratitude and appreciation for the wisdom they have shown in conceiving and planning this conference and for the leadership they have provided in bringing together the representatives of these 91 great national organizations to explore their common interests and problems in this field.

We urge upon the American Association for the United Nations to take the leadership and help establish similar conferences on local and regional levels toward the end that a grass-roots educational program to implement the findings of this conference might go forward at the earliest possible moment. We are confident that our local and State organizations will cooperate in this endeavor in every possible manner. We firmly believe that such a program will have a great and continued impact upon the thinking of our Government and our people and will provide for continuity of the magnificent work begun here.

Confusion Peddlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, AFL publication in Reading, Pa.:

CONFUSION PEDDLERS

Headline writers, mink coat sellers, influence peddlers, sports fixers, crime commissions, and 5 percenters are having a field day. Almost hourly new revelations or charges in one field or another adds to the spectacle, and before one accusation has died out another has taken its place.

And while the merry-go-round spins wildly, the political undertones grow more and more prominent until they eventually drown out the original complaints.

The Kefauver Crime Commission which recently skyrocketed into No. 1 spot on the TV hit parade, has certainly done much to throw the spotlight on gambling and rackets in the United States. Even though the committee functions as an arm of a democratically controlled Congress, it has struck without regard for political welfare or future. Just last November ex-Senator Scott Lucas, then majority leader of the Senate, bitterly charged the Kefauver group with bringing about his defeat by training its probers on gambling in Illinois.

Right now we are witnessing the revelation of alleged irregularities in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation where mink coats battle $100,000 fees to the Republican national chairman in an effort to win headlines.

A Democratic Congressman charges that GOP National Chairman Guy Gabrielson collected a fee of $100,000 for helping his own corporation to get healthy RFC assistance.

Republicans tried to hush up this charge by calling it old stuff. They are probably correct. If the Republican techniques employed by Pennsylvania State government and State officials can be considered typical of the GOP nationally, then Gabrielson's influence peddling most certainly is old stuff. They have been doing it for years.

Actually, we don't believe the big press and the Republican-Dixiecrat outfit is too concerned about the evils of gambling as such. We believe they are more concerned

with discrediting the present administration so that the basically more important issues are drowned in confusion.

Certainly we want no truck with the goings on inside the RFC. If somebody's guilty, give 'em the right kind of medicine. But do it to both sides.

The people are the losers in this business, no matter how you look at it. In the short-range picture, the workers lose as a result of RFC losses because it's the taxpayers' money. But the workers lose a lot more when the party which stands for liberal social legislation is discredited to the point where it cannot get its bills enacted into law.

One thing's certain. Workers don't stand a chance of getting better social security, a workable health program, a higher minimum wage, a break in the Federal tax program, and other benefits as long as the Republican-Dixiecrat crowd is in control. Crime probers, worthy as they are, are sensational and take the play away from the long-range problems affecting not only a handful of gamblers or five-percenters, but every one of the 150,000,000 people in America.

Some day we'd like to see a slum probe, an old-age probe, and a minimum-wage probe in which groups of Senators and Representatives toured the United States with the same amount of publicity given the Kefauver commission. We'd like to hear the plain people of America talk about the hovels they live in and we'd like to catch their expressions on the TV screen. We'd like to hear the 7,300 families of Reading and Berks County testify as to their substandard housing and then force the owners of those properties to reveal their profits from human misery.

Or perhaps an aged couple could sit before the cameras and give a detailed budget of how they pay their rent, buy their food, buy their clothing on a social-security check of $75 a month. And then maybe a General Motors Corp. executive could tell this old couple never to fear because GM made over $800,000,000 last year and therefore everything must be right with the world.

Yes, kick out the five-percenters, the influence peddlers, and all the rest. And then put the spotlight on the real problems that face the vast majority of Americans.

American Gift Dollars Buy Strategic and Critical Materials for European Countries While American Citizens Are Denied the Right To Buy and Use These Same Items

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers who filed their income-tax returns last Thursday and made their payments as required by law ought to know that many of the dollars they now are compelled to pay into the Federal Treasury are going to pay for strategic and critical materials now in short supply in this country, which are being bought by European countries with gift dollars supplied under the so-called Marshall plan.

So far, Mr. Speaker, we have authorized total expenditures for Marshall plan aid in excess of $11,000,000,000.

It is indeed a sad commentary on the economic situation we now find this Nation to be in when it is learned that within the past 2 weeks, ECA has authorized new procurements in this country of copper, copper products, lead and lead alloys, and nickel and nickel alloys, all of which products are under strict allocation and control for our own consumers. The following are examples of recent procurement authorizations:

Mar. 8, 1951. Tin plate to French North Africa	$800,000
Mar. 7, 1951. Copper and products to United Kingdom	5,880,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Copper and products to United Kingdom	600,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Copper and products to Austria	250,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Lead and lead-base alloys to Austria	90,000
Mar. 12, 1951. Tin plate, terneplate, black plate to Belgium-Luxemburg	200,000
Mar. 14, 1951. Copper and products to Norway	350,000
Mar. 14, 1951. Nickel and nickel-base alloys to France	35,000
Mar. 14, 1951. Copper and products to France	15,000
Total	8,220,000

How Much Longer Before United States Joins Second-Front Movement Against Chinese Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of March 15, 1951:

CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE

For practical purposes, something close to a second front has been opened on the mainland of China against the Chinese Communists.

Reports from Hong Kong yesterday said the revolt against the Communist rule was growing rapidly. Hungry farmers armed with hoes and scythes are staging food riots and storming Red strongholds for arms.

Nationalist sources on Formosa have estimated that 200,000 guerrillas are active in two southern provinces and a total of 1,500,000 throughout China.

The figures may be high, but from the Communists' own admissions the Reds have their hands full with determined rebellious forces in their own backyard.

And fear of Nationalist landings across from Formosa has forced the Communists to halt their flow of southern troops toward Korea, thereby potentially if not actually relieving pressure on American forces.

But our Government is doing nothing about it. We're passing up a momentous opportunity. We're offering no aid to these anti-Communist forces who are fighting on our side, and little or none to the Nationalists on Formosa who are inspiring or directing them.

We won't even let the Nationalists airlift supplies to their own people, or bomb the common enemy. Nor, under the Truman-Acheson neutrality order, will we permit the Nationalists to throw another half million trained troops into the fight.

All we do is sit back and fervently wish the United Nations would think of something to get us off the hook in Korea. And the UN is doing nothing.

An aggressive, straight-thinking United States Government—one not mainly concerned with covering up its own mistakes and bad guesses on China—would pick up the ball at this point, and run with it.

To ignore this virtual second front that has opened in South China is criminal negligence and callous indifference to the sacrifice of American lives in Korea in the last 8½ months.

At the very least, our Government could adopt the suggestion of Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, whose ideas on China run to a high percentage of good sense. In a New York speech Tuesday night, he said:

"If the defeatist and appease bloc in the State Department is still trying more to justify its past than to win the future, let us at least demand that a mission of top-notch leaders be sent to Formosa to survey the situation."

Congress should on its own responsibility dispatch such a mission immediately. Not another Philip Jessup mission, but a group unquestionably unbiased and powerful enough to withstand any suppression of its findings.

Let them report back to us on the feasibility and possible results of unshackling Chiang Kai-shek and aiding his forces on the mainland.

Surely that much is owed to the American public now confused by State Department vacillation and squeamishness over what to do next in our war in Asia.

Northwestern's Tragic Prank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely, significant, and well-written editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal of March 13 on a subject that has touched deeply the hearts of our people in Louisiana:

NORTHWESTERN'S TRAGIC PRANK

Like many other shocking happenings, the prank which resulted in the death of a Northwestern State college student should teach an important lesson—stressing the need of suppressing any activity with violent potentialities. It should be taught in all institutions in which youths indulge in hazing and similar programs, which always are expected to be enjoyed without serious results but at times are too dangerous to be immune from fatal consequences.

Naturally, there is widespread sympathy for the family and friends of the victim of the Natchitoches escapade, and also compassion for the college officials, faculty, student body, and citizens of the hospitable community in which originated the tragic experience. But nothing now said can make the outcome of the students' prank any different. Only words of regret, sorrow, and sympathy can be spoken and written. But the terrible incident can and should result in public opinion strong enough to effectively discourage further use of possibly violent stunts, especially the prank now in

question—that of directing a youth to a "blind date" and having a mythical "irate husband" appear with shotgun. The college boy, blessed with promising future, fled precipitately in the woods as the gunblast suddenly exploded. Presumably he fell over the high Grand Ecore bluff into Red River, where several days later the body was found.

Obviously fellow students taking part in the prank had in mind only harmless amusement. They expected that the youth chosen as victim of the "irate husband" would return to the campus after his flight from the scene of the "shooting" and become the target of good natured jests. None entertained any thought that the prank would culminate contrary to their friendly wishes. Previous staging of the same "play" had resulted only in such entertainment. But, unfortunately, it ended in tragedy and in consequent sorrow, distress, and regret that can never entirely disappear. The youths who staged the stunt can never be free from the knowledge of their responsibility. That too, is a dreadful result of the fatal incident.

The victim's father, who collapsed upon learning of the death of his son, realizes that nothing can be done punitively, since the tragedy was unintentional, as judged by his comment just before leaving the college for home, including these words:

"I realize that this college prank, even though it resulted in the death of my son, could have happened anywhere. I hold no malice in my heart toward anyone involved."

Dr. H. Lee Prather, president of Northwestern, expressed himself similarly:

"The college officials at present concur with the generous opinion expressed by the distraught father—that no attempt should be made to punish the group of young college students responsible for the prank that had such a tragic result. Obviously any reasonable measures that might be taken to that end would be wholly inadequate to atone for the lamentable affair."

Foreign Policy Must Be Changed—Lippmann Points Out Lessons for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Walter Lippmann admits that a change in foreign policy is necessary, Mr. Truman and the State Department should give serious consideration to doing so. For 2 years this outstanding authority on international questions has warned that this country must not undertake commitments which we cannot fulfill. The record is clear from admissions by the Secretary of State and his policy makers that we have many commitments all over the world that these United States will be short on performance and this means a loss in honor and prestige.

Mr. Speaker, so that all Members may have the benefit of Mr. Lippmann's reasoning on this important question before the American people, I am inserting, at this point, an article of his that appeared in the February Atlantic Monthly:

LESSONS FOR SURVIVAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

As I write we find ourselves wondering whether we are facing the awful dilemma of appeasement or war—of default and surrender and the death of the soul, or of a war that would be as inconclusive as it was irreparably destructive. What, we say to one another, must we do, that the Nation, and the western society to which it belongs, may survive to fulfill their promise and to complete their destiny?

The answer that each of us makes to these questions will be determined by the conclusions he draws from his reading of the history of other societies which have risen and have flourished and have passed away. For myself, I hold with those who, like René Grousset, say that in general no civilization is destroyed from the outside unless it has already decayed from within, that no empire is conquered from abroad unless it has first destroyed itself. And so, I would say that the questions about our survival have no human and practical meaning unless we believe, as I do, that we are still the masters of our destiny and not the mere spectators of our own downfall.

If we believe that we are responsible for our own fate, and that we are still free to choose, then out of the experience of Korea, which is so bitter, we can learn the lessons for survival. The lessons deal with the elemental facts of our situation in the world. When we ignore the elemental facts, as we have done from the proclamation of the Truman doctrine to its application in Korea, we are inviting certain defeat. But if we can learn from experience and will make the truth about ourselves and our friends and our adversaries the foundation of our policies, we shall be able surely—I have no doubt at all—to make ourselves invulnerable, be it in war or in the great struggle which is neither peace nor war.

Let us set down, then, the elemental and unalterable facts of the American situation.

In this century North America has become the citadel, the main arsenal, and the central workshop of the Atlantic community—of the nations that are the bearers of the western civilization.

North America is an island—a continental island, to be sure, but in relation to all the other nations of the world an island nonetheless. Canada, the United States, and Mexico are surrounded by the three oceans and by the air above them in the Pacific and the Atlantic and the Arctic. No enemy can conquer them unless he is master of the sea and air. And unless we in North America are the masters of this sea and air, we cannot support our allies or wage war against our enemies. The first rule of our diplomacy and of our strategical doctrine is therefore that we must never forget the limitations, and that always we must take the utmost advantage of our island character.

On this continental island of ours live fewer than one-tenth of the inhabitants of the globe. We cannot prevail, or even in the end do more than survive ignominiously and miserably, unless, like all the seagoing people before us—unless, like the Athenians, the Venetians, and the English in the days of their greatness—we learn how to make up for our inferiority in numbers. Like David with Goliath, we have to learn to live by our wits and not to engage ourselves in wrestling matches with the Philistines.

We and our neighbors in North America are outnumbered. We must take this truth to heart. We must write it on the walls of our council chambers. We must never forget it. The Communist coalition can raise more soldiers than we or our allies can ever have. These soldiers have weapons which on any battlefield in Eurasia are quite deadly enough to kill. Any policy which compels us to fight them, as we are fighting them in Korea now—across an ocean, within walking distance of their own inexhaustible reserves, on terms of battle in which they are forever incalculably superior—cannot be anything but what it has turned out to be; a bloody entanglement.

Our superiority is in our technology and our productivity and in the science that has flourished and can flourish only in free societies, and in the magic of freedom to arouse the best in men. These are the sources of our strength. If they are drawn upon skillfully, we shall have forms of power, suitable to our island character, in which we excel. With them we can defend the North American citadel and arsenal and workshop. Within it we can create an offensive power that will make the cost of military aggression against the Atlantic community very nearly prohibitive, and in any event most certainly inconclusive.

But that will mean that we have fixed our military frontiers not along rivers or at mountain ranges, and certainly not on demarcation lines in the Eurasian Continent, but in the oceans of sea and air. For the defense and for the offense, for our own security and for our power to protect our friends and to deal with our enemies, we must rely on the speed and the range, on the tactical and the strategical mobility of sea and air power. Where, as the saying goes, the Infantry is the queen of battles, there the American soldier and statesman must avoid the battle.

The recognition of these elemental—though they are not self-evident—truths should lead, I contend, to a clarification of the assumptions and to a revision of the policies on which we have been acting. The cold war has been a struggle over the future of Germany and of the European Continent which Hitler occupied, and over the future of Japan and of all that large part of the Asiatic Continent which the Japanese occupied.

We have believed, rightly I am sure, that it is the purpose of the Soviet Government to become the heir of all of Hitler's and of all of Japan's possessions, including and above all Germany and Japan. We have realized that if this expansion were successful we should be confronted with an overwhelming combination of powers—by the Germans and the Japanese who nearly conquered the world themselves, allied with and not opposed by the Russians.

Our answer to this fearful menace has been an attempt to bring Germany and Japan, and as much as we could of the lands they once occupied, within the orbit of the Atlantic community. Our thesis has been that whatever is not within the military orbit of the west must fall within the orbit of the Soviets and vice versa. The policy we have founded upon this assumption has always and from the beginning been doomed to fail. For it could be enforced only if we had possessed, and had been able and willing to commit, ground forces capable of defeating the armed and armored hordes of the Soviet Union. We could never have found the Infantry to contain the masses of the Communist orbit in Eurasia.

But if we cannot permit the Soviets to become the heirs of Hitler and of the Japanese war lords, if the Atlantic community cannot, in defiance of the Soviets, bring Germany and Japan within its own military system, then there is only one tolerable course open to us. It is to base our military posture toward Germany and Japan on a decision not to make them our allies, but in all cases to deny them to the Soviets. We cannot, I believe, defend them on the ground while they rearm. We cannot, I believe, defend them at all against Soviet atomic attack. We cannot, I believe, count on their loyalty to the Atlantic community if that were to mean the sacrificial

destruction of their own countries in order that Britain and France and America should survive.

What we can do is make it equally unprofitable and intolerable for the Soviets if they take Germany and Japan into their military system. There can be no question of our military power to neutralize Germany or Japan in case of war. The Russians are as little able to defend them as we are.

Whether the Germans or the Japanese would like to be incorporated within the Soviet rule, I seriously question. But leaving that point aside, it lies within our power—our power to bomb—to make sure that no military cell within them shall swing either country into the Soviet orbit. This initiative we have always held. We hold it still and should hold it in the future.

The best, indeed the only, military course effectively open to us in Germany and Japan is in fact the counterpart of the political course which most Germans and, I imagine, most Japanese believe in. That is a policy of neutrality like that of Sweden and Switzerland, which rests not on pacifism and disarmament, but on the realization that any other course is suicidal.

The Russians must understand beyond doubt that we shall be certain to retaliate if they attempt to conquer Western Europe, and that we shall destroy the material assets which they might seek to gain by conquest.

I believe myself that we should revise our present policy—which is a corollary of the Truman doctrine and is designed to make Germany and Japan our military allies. We should espouse the policy, which corresponds to our own military capacity, and to our own military necessities, and to the real will of the German and the Japanese nations, which is to guarantee their independence, and to deny them to the Soviets.

I do not know whether we shall be at war with the Soviet Union when this paper is published. If we are not at war, the one course most likely to avert war is the acceptance by the Russians, the Germans, the British, the French, and ourselves of the conclusion that no one can now rearm the Germans and the Japanese and make them, and that is use them as, military allies or satellites. Were our diplomacy at all astute, we should make a virtue of what is in fact a necessity.

And if, God forbid, we are at war, there will not be on the Elbe that German Army which some of our military dreamers dream about, and we shall be facing the hideous question of whether we must go back and once again destroy the Ruhr. We shall then be wondering whether it was indeed wise, even sensible, to suspend diplomacy while we sought to conjure up a theoretically desirable but an imaginary German Army.

What Our Young Men Think About the Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly evident that the youths of this land have definite ideas with reference to our foreign policy. I believe that the Congress should give serious consideration to the views expressed by young men who offer their lives and their blood to their country, whether they do so voluntarily or under conscription. The future of our country is in the youths of this land of the free and the home of the brave, except those who are plunged into foreign slaughterhouses to be crippled, blinded, or liquidated.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a letter which I have received from nine servicemen now stationed in one of our military camps. These boys are all from the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent. I feel a great responsibility, not only to these boys but also to their fathers and mothers and families.

The letter reads as follows:

As our Representative in the Congress of the United States, we wish in this letter to convey to you our personal convictions on the foreign policies of this Government and the defense of our Nation.

We shall list our opinion below.

1. We believe in accordance with ex-President Herbert Hoover in regard to foreign policy and national defense—in that the dispersal of our Armed Forces about the globe can only lead to defeat, disaster, and economic ruin of our beloved country.

2. We believe that our armed invasion last fall of territory north of parallel 38 in Korea was a definite departure from democratic principles under which this Nation was founded and lived so many years in peace.

3. We believe that this invasion has cost us as a nation a terrific price in human lives—both our soldiers and also helpless South Korean civilians whose land we have devastated for what little we or they (South Korea) could ever hope to gain.

4. We believe that Russia would like nothing better than to lure our forces into scattered conflicts with her satellites throughout the world, thus creating long supply lines and leaving our hemisphere open to concentrated attack by her own untouched military might.

5. We believe that the defense of America lies in building a powerful strategic Air Force.

6. We believe that the futile hope of matching ground forces with the Communist world is not only illogical but tragic.

7. We believe that the conscription of men physically and mentally unfit and the placing of them into combat organizations has undermined the strength, efficiency, and morale of our Army Ground Forces. This to us is an obvious fact.

8. We believe that the inefficiency with which the Army classification system has dealt with draftees has caused much bitterness and loss of respect for those in charge of military administration, and has and will continue to cause needless waste of valuable skilled manpower.

9. We believe that if American blood is to be spilled on foreign soil in an attempt to save the free world from the evils of statism abroad, this blood must not be spilled in vain by allowing these evils to strangulate here in our homeland the very freedoms, economic and political, for which we fight. In short, we, as soldiers, do not wish to come home to another England.

10. We believe that, finally, unless the above-mentioned blunders are corrected as soon as possible, and a coherent, intelligent foreign policy and sound military strategy instituted, America as a free nation might go down to defeat, carrying with it the hope and future of free civilization upon this globe.

In conclusion of this letter, we would endeavor to impress upon you as our Representative in our Government that these are our views as loyal citizens and soldiers. These views are shared by many other soldiers whom we know but who are not in our congressional district.

Gwilym A. Price Analyzes Performance and Prospects of Reorganization of the United States Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp., styled "The Hoover Plan: Performance and Prospects," which deals with our progress toward putting the Hoover Commission recommendations for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government into effect.

Mr. Price points out that the Eighty-first Congress put into effect approximately 50 percent of the Hoover plan for reorganization, at a total savings of approximately $2,000,000,000 per year. However, it should be borne in mind that this half is the less controversial half.

I hope Congress will do its full duty by putting into effect such further reorganization plans as are justified during 1951.

Mr. Price's article follows:

THE HOOVER PLAN: PERFORMANCE AND PROSPECTS

(By Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.)

There is wide agreement on three steps we must take if we are to survive a long war. These do not make up a complete program; they are not a complete solution to our problems. But we cannot control inflation, keep our economy dynamic, and rearm ourselves effectively—which is the same thing as saying we cannot survive—if we do not carry out these steps.

We must improve the efficiency of our civil government. We must achieve the maximum possible efficiency in military procurement. We must reduce nonmilitary expenditures by the Government for the duration of the crisis.

The report of the Hoover Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government is directly concerned with all three of these very vital requirements.

The total Hoover plan includes suggestions for ways to save money in running the Government, but it goes beyond that into the field of creative reorganization. It recommends the consolidation of some services, the elimination of others, and the creation of still others. It calls for the abolition of some jobs and higher pay for others. In short, the Hoover Commission carried out its assignment of drawing up plans for the reorganization of big government into an effective and economical instrument of public service.

Savings possible under the report were unofficially estimated at no less than $3,000,000,000 and possibly as high as $5,000,000,000 annually. The report made some 300 specific recommendations. Every department was examined.

The great majority of the American public was solidly behind the Hoover Commission, what it was trying to do, and what it finally recommended. According to Dr. Gallup that majority was about 25 to 1. More than 12,000 editorials about the Hoover report appeared in 1949, and less than 1 percent were opposed. Some 30 organizations joined in support of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report, a nonpartisan organization

for public education in support of the report which had been formed with the encouragement of Mr. Truman and Mr. Hoover.

THE OPPOSITION

However, there has been strong opposition from some of the two million Federal employees and their friends, particularly from agency heads who felt that their empires were in danger. One Cabinet member approved that part of the plan affecting his department which raised his salary and gave him several assistants; the other recommendations, he said, would require "further study."

Opposition also came from some Congressmen who saw the Hoover plan chiefly as a force for reducing their patronage and the Federal spending in their districts. The plan for military unification brought about a tug-of-war among the three services.

Most regrettable of all, opposition came in many directions from private citizens and organizations. It came in much the same way and for much the same reasons it developed among department heads in Government. They favored the report as a whole, but (in the words of the Citizens Committee) "just wanted an exception made for some agency or bureau with which they happened to have a wel'-developed working relationship or from which they received some form of patronage, subsidy, or beneficent relation."

THE $5,000,000,000 QUESTION

As the Eighty-first Congress convened at the beginning of 1949, the $5,000,000,000 question was this: What, if anything, will be done about the Hoover Commission recommendations? Here is the record as it stood in December 1950.

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report can be put into effect in three different ways.

Administrative action: About 40 percent of the Commission's original 300 recommendations do not need changes in existing laws in order to be adopted, but can be put into effect simply by Presidential directive or administrative action from within the departments and agencies.

In order to work out plans for doing this, the President formed a President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement, consisting of 10 men who are top executives in government and private organizations. As Chairman he appointed Thomas P. Morgan, president and board chairman of the Sperry Corp.

This committee is concerned particularly with the progress being made in budgeting and accounting, development of executive staffs, reduction of operating costs, and use of supplies and facilities.

Reorganization plans: Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President can submit reorganization plans to the Congress. These automatically become effective in 60 days unless disapproved by a constitutional majority of either House of Congress.

The President submitted seven reorganization plans to the Congress in 1949 and 27 more in 1950. Of these 34 plans, 26 have become effective and are in operation.

Public laws: The balance of the Commission's recommendations must be formally approved by Congress as statutory legislation and signed by the President.

To date, 20 public laws based on the Hoover plan have been enacted. There has been considerable criticism of the way the administration proposed and carried out some of the Hoover Commission recommendations. Most of this criticism arose in connection with the 34 reorganization plans submitted to Congress. Some of it is justified.

The first plan submitted by the President in 1949 would have confined the Federal medical, education, and security programs in a department with Cabinet status. This went far beyond the recommendations of the Hoover report, was not certified by the Citizens Committee as conforming to the report, and was rejected by the Senate.

The reorganization plans for 1950 were likewise deficient in some respects. Plan No. 12, an attempt to abolish one of the offices of the National Labor Relations Board, involved a matter of policy and raised issues beyond the authority of the Hoover report. It was not certified by the Citizens Committee, and was defeated in the Senate.

Despite the suspicion cast on the rest of the reorganization plans by these two false moves however, almost all the other plans were in conformity with the basic principles laid down by the Commission. The Citizens Committee certified all 26 of the plans which passed as conforming to the report. Of the eight which were rejected, only four were so certified.

By these three methods, then—administrative action, reorganization plans, and public laws—almost 50 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations are definitely enacted and in operation. Some of these fell short of the original recommendations and some varied in details, but most of them conform to the report.

THE MAIN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Reorganization Act, under which the 26 plans mentioned above were adopted, permits the President to unsnarl some of the tangle of boards, bureaus, and agencies under him. "On the record," said the Citizens Committee, "this is the best reorganization act given any President of modern times."

A new General Service Agency, combining four previous agencies, has been created to bring a degree of common sense and efficiency to Government purchasing, storage, inventory, records management, and other housekeeping procedures. It is hoped that General Services has ended the kind of confusion whereby one agency stocked a 93-year supply of fluorescent lamps and another laid away a 247-year supply of loose-leaf binders.

By administrative action, a modern budget format was adopted by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1950–51. It is a graphic, simple, and clear document and has been praised by the Hoover Commission as the foremost advance in Federal fiscal procedure in many decades.

An Accounting Procedures Act prescribes a new, modern, and uniform system of Federal accounting. It can release several thousand Federal employees from unnecessary work. It can end an accounting system that dates back to the first Secretary of the Treasury and slows down the business operations of the whole Government, with some agencies forced to wait 12 months or more to get the results of their previous year's activities. The act is largely permissive, however, and requires firm execution if it is to do any good.

One bill, nicknamed the "President's time saver," has relieved the President of legal obligation to sign great piles of documents relating to such affairs as Osage Indian oil royalties, whale-hunting licenses, and migratory birds. It saves about 2 weeks of Presidential working time each year.

The Commission found a virtually disintegrated Labor Department, with its logical functions scattered in other agencies throughout the Government. On Commission recommendations, the Department is being rebuilt to true Cabinet stature.

Under Public Law 73, streamlining of the organizational structure of the State Department has begun. Communications have been improved within the Department, transactions have been expedited, and the Secretary's burden of paper work has been cut in two.

The Post Office accounting reform has brought a degree of reorganization to one function of the largest single Government business enterprise. The accounts of the Post Office had previously been kept by the General Accounting Office, an outside agency, under an obsolete and inadequate system. The Department normally waited a year for its official accounting figures and, therefore, it based its operating plans on estimates which it worked up itself with duplicate accounting machinery.

The Military Unification Act of August 1949 has strengthened the authority of the Secretary of Defense, introduced a performance budget system and modernized accounting, and helped to bring about real teamwork among the three military services.

The last of these nine—military unification—has been called the greatest single achievement of the Hoover Commission. Much of the value of unification lies in the field of morale and cannot easily be appraised. Specific, measurable examples of interservice cooperation and economy, however, are beginning to add up to a heartening total.

There is now being developed, for example, a common cataloging system of supplies for all services instead of the 17 different systems previously used, and it has already cut the 5,000,000 items previously listed in half.

All three services are now using unified printing plants, a single Washington telephone switchboard, a single improved method (the Navy's) of issuing uniforms, and a unified code of military justice. They are cooperating for the first time on such matters as wind tunnels, research, purchasing, and construction. More than 10,000 job classifications used by the Military Establishment in World War II have been cut to 3,000.

These, then, are the main accomplishments of reorganization to date. There have been, in addition, many lesser reforms within the framework of these nine major accomplishments. All Government transport services have been consolidated within the Department of Commerce. The management and government of the Panama Canal have been recognized and a modern business-type organization and a new tolls policy installed.

The Federal Executive Pay Act has given some 200 top Federal officials salaries somewhat more in line with those of private industry. The number of military attachés in foreign embassies has been cut 30 percent and their work consolidated. Wandering bureaus have been put where they belong; the Treasury Department no longer operates the Bureau of Federal Supply.

HOW MUCH IS IT WORTH?

How much actual savings can we expect from these reforms already enacted? The Citizens Committee estimates a total savings of around $2,000,000,000 a year, most of it arising from economies worked in military unification. I cannot, of course, judge the accuracy of this estimate. As military expenditures and the total Federal budget rise, the total of savings effected, of course, will also rise.

Some savings are clear and apparent. For example, a year ago General McNarney stopped the unnecessary operation of 30,000 military passenger vehicles and released the services of 3,500 officers and men for better use elsewhere. Last fall enough Government records and dead files were transferred to an abandoned factory outside Washington to allow office space for 10,000 employees—space which otherwise would have to be built or rented.

Other savings, unlike these mentioned, are of a less obvious nature, and still others, I presume, will take months and perhaps years to develop. Three-fifths of the Hoover laws and plans enacted, after all, were passed within the past year, many of them within the past few months.

I am inclined to think that economy is only half the story of the Hoover report, and perhaps the half that has been emphasized at the expense of other things that the report can do for us.

It is from changed policies that the greatest savings can and must come, and with these the Hoover Commission was not directly concerned. Far more than $3,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 can be saved if the Government will simply cancel, postpone, and reduce some of its nonessential, nonmilitary programs in this crisis, withdraw from competition with private industry in a score of fields, and stop handing out subsidies.

THREE WAYS TO SAVE

There is a widespread misconception about how savings in Government—or in private industry, for that matter—are made. Consolidation and reorganization do not save money in themselves. They simply provide the means by which such savings can be made. When you merge two private companies, you have the same number of people working for one firm instead of two, with a new need, probably, for additional supervisory personnel—unless you press the opportunities for savings that come with merger. The same is true of merger in Government.

There are three requirements to effect savings. The first is reorganization. The second is the technical knowledge of how to use that reorganization. The third is the will to use it.

The Hoover Commission Report is simply a plan for reorganization. If it is all put into effect tomorrow, it will save nothing unless the knowledge and the will to make savings are there, too. On the other hand, no administrator, regardless of his knowledge and will, can make appreciable savings in our Federal Government without first having reorganization to build upon.

The other half of the Hoover report story, efficiency, now seems to be growing more important every day. In order to survive the long emergency we face, we must have an efficient and effective Government as well as an economical one.

It seems apparent to me that the Hoover reforms have helped us considerably in this respect in the past 6 months. Washington is still a jungle, to be sure; but it is probably a good deal less of a jungle than it would have been if the Hoover plan had not unsnarled some of those agencies and bureaus.

IMPROVEMENTS FOR DEFENSE

There is impressive testimony from military men, including General MacArthur and Secretary of Defense Marshall, that military unification as wrought by the Hoover plan has worked well in the Korean action, both at the front and in Washington. The new single military sea transport service carried 129,000 troops and a tremendous amount of material to Korea with unparalleled speed. The military air transport service moved 35,000 persons to Korea and saved weeks of time in evacuating wounded to the United States.

It is unfortunate that there has been some confusion among our people on the relationship of the Hoover report to the amount and kind of armament and the number of men we had under arms when the war broke out in Korea.

It must be pointed out that neither the Eberstadt task force of the Hoover Commission, the Hoover Commission itself, nor the Tydings Act based on the Hoover report, ever made any recommendations, one way or the other, for cuts or increases in the amount or nature of military appropriations. That was not their job. They were concerned only with two things: Operating economies and the bringing about of unified military thinking, planning, and organization.

I think we know enough now to say positively that the Hoover plan has rewarded us well both in efficiency and economy to the extent that it has been adopted; that the remainder of the plan surely should be put to work.

A little more than 50 percent of the Hoover Plan remains to be put into effect. That is a statistical figure only. The fact is that not one Commission recommendation has been adopted that offends any major pressure group or that makes possible a major reduction in Government employees. With the exception of Military Unification, no recommendation has yet been adopted that will lead to major economies. The easier, less controversial half, emphasizing efficiency, has been adopted. The harder half, in which the greatest economies can be achieved, still lies before us.

POLITICS VERSUS ECONOMY

The remaining recommendations will certainly be fought more fiercely than anything that has gone before. And yet they must be adopted. Mr. Hoover has stated over and over that his Commission's report should be judged and accepted in its entirety. "The pattern is a unity," he said. "Any major exceptions would damage or destroy the whole." And again: "They stand or fall together. To give in at one spot, whatever the political pressures, means, almost inevitably, the collapse of the whole."

The Veterans' Administration has not yet been touched. The Department of Agriculture has not been touched. Our antique and patched-up Civil Service System has never been overhauled since it was inaugurated 67 years ago.

The Hoover Commission Task Force for Personnel Management, headed by the late John Stevenson, president of the Penn Mutual Insurance Co., made 33 recommendations on this latter subject, only a few of which have been adopted.

There must be drastic reforms in methods of hiring, promoting, firing, and paying Government employees. Such reforms would make Government service more attractive to better and younger people. They would reduce a costly turn-over that now runs to about 25 percent a year. They would increase the efficiency of two million workers by an estimated 10 percent. They would reverse the protective, negative Civil Service philosophy which is based on rights and not on ability. As Mr. Hoover has declared, "We cannot entrust the Government of today to second-rate men and women."

The Post Office Department needs the thorough overhauling slated for it in the Hoover plan. The report made 9 recommendations for this Department, and of the 6 that must be enacted by Congress, only 1 has been passed. The postal service would be decentralized into 15 regions and operated under procedures somewhat similar to those of national chain-store management.

A start was made when the President, for the first time, appointed a career official instead of a political figure as Postmaster General. He has asked the Congress to place the appointment of 22,000 postmasters on a career instead of a patronage basis. These 9 recommendations, if properly carried out, will improve morale and service and cut in half the annual three to five hundred million dollar deficit.

WASTE AND DUPLICATION

The United Medical Administration recommended to take over the Public Health Service and the military and veterans' hospitals has not been created. Five big Federal hospital systems are competing with each other, and with all other hospitals, for nurses, doctors, and technicians. Forty Government agencies are still offering medical services to various groups.

The recommendation that all Federal conservation and construction be consolidated in the Department of the Interior (renamed the National Resources Department) has not been adopted. The rivalry and duplication of work between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are still unresolved. There is no check and balance system on projects, and no review board to prevent duplication of surveys and planning. The agencies themselves are deciding whether or not their projects are economically or socially sound.

Land management functions have not been consolidated within the Department of Agriculture. The Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Bureau of Land Management are still competing with each other and duplicating work and services. Rental for grazing land varies according to which agency administers it, and if two agencies administer it, a cattleman must have two leases.

A start, but no more, has been made on the reorganization of Federal business enterprises. Certain enterprises should be incorporated in one agency and uniform budgeting, accounting, and other business procedures installed. There should be uniform corporate requirements. Hidden subsidies should be discontinued. If the Federal Government is going to continue to lend money and buy and sell mortgages, it at least should do it properly and under one roof.

THE HOOVER PLAN OF 1951

The Hoover report has not been tested until all its recommendations have been adopted. The country cannot be considered fully or effectively mobilized until they have been put in force.

To the extent that we believe this and believe in the Hoover report, we must now bear down to see that the rest of the plan is accepted—and accepted in 1951. Some of us may feel a moral obligation to do this. Certainly we will be benefited as citizens if we do so.

We can do this in the usual ways in which we would support any idea we believe in or any piece of legislation we want to see passed. To these ways, however, we can add one more: we can think twice and deeply before we speak or act against any specific Hoover report reform that works to the apparent disadvantage of us as individuals or of some group with which we are associated. We can, in other words, support the Hoover plan when and if it hurts. We can subordinate personal interest, if the occasion arises, to the interest of good government.

There is a grave and real question whether we can survive the perils of the years that lie ahead. As one of the world's great powers, we have the factories and the know-how. Our enemy has immense resources of manpower and raw materials. The factors are increasing against us as time goes on.

We must make the best possible use of everything we have. We must put our house in order and prepare for a long siege. The Hoover Commission report—all of it in effect and working—can help us to do that.

Address by Hon. Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, at Anniversary Dinner of Charitable Irish Society of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an accomplished and interesting address delivered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] at the two hundred and fourteenth anniversary dinner of the

Charitable Irish Society of Boston, held at Boston, Mass., on Saturday, March 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BRIEN MCMAHON AT THE TWO HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE CHARITABLE IRISH SOCIETY OF BOSTON, COPLEY-PLAZA HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1951

I am sure that St. Patrick must have given a special blessing to the devoted pioneers who joined together so early to plant a little bit of Irish warmth in the heart of America.

The Charitable Irish Society of Boston has more than 2 centuries of splendid traditions behind it and I am sure you will agree with me that it still stands on the very threshold of its growth. The capacity of the Irish race for expansion, especially in deeds of charity, is simply beyond the imagination of those unfortunates who lack a bit of Celtic in their make-up. In fact, growth is synonymous with the Irish character.

Other races have tall men and tall tales to grace the annals of their heroic past; but the Irish have taller men and if we don't have taller tales, we know how to supply them. We simply won't be outdone in such matters, especially on March 17.

The peculiar talent of our people, which some mistake for Celtic boasting, is nothing more than sober fancy, undistorted by fact or fiction. But I think our kindly neighbors appreciate by now that there is nothing in life more real than the delightful exuberance of Irish imagination.

This is the day we love and the saint we love because divine providence fashioned for us a heavenly patron ideally suited to the needs of the Irish temperament. The ancient chronicles tell us that Patrick was like a lion in strength and power; like a dove in gentleness and humility. In short, St. Patrick had those simple, sturdy virtues which we prize above all others.

This is a day of undisguised sentiment because sentiment is that shining power of the soul, a special gift of the Creator, which sustained and kept alive generations of Irish forebears under the harsh exactions of a cold and brutal tyranny. It was the Irishman's secret that a day of laughter and good cheer could banish the bitter misery of a winter of sorrow and heartbreak. And this lesson must never perish from our memory—the lesson that no tyrant will ever crush out the spirit of a people sustained by love and by faith in the God who made them.

We meet on this day to enjoy the present and to win fresh inspiration from the mighty deeds of those who preceded us. The inspiring story of St. Patrick is as fresh today as it was nearly 15 centuries ago when he lighted the fire on Tara's hill which still remains as the eternal symbol of Ireland's faith and Ireland's glory.

St. Patrick was a slave boy who escaped his captors to return half a century later to conquer the people who held him in bondage. But his weapons of conquest were not made of steel and they were not designed for physical destruction.

There is a striking parallel between the age in which St. Patrick lived and our own times. In the fifth century, the mighty Roman Empire was breaking up and the rule of law was fast disappearing under the steady advances of political chaos and social barbarism. The slow growth of civilization was in danger of extinction under the heavy blows of grasping despots, who knew nothing and cared nothing about the sanctity and dignity of human life. It was into this world of darkness and despair that St. Patrick brought the Christian message of hope and faith which spread its light over Ireland and eventually over the cultural and religious centers of Western Europe. I think the lesson for our time is so obvious that its significance will be lost on no one. How much has changed and how little has changed since the shepherd boy Patrick tended his flocks in the verdant pastures of ancient Ireland.

You have graciously asked me to respond to the toast "The United States of America." I think every American with a drop of Irish blood in his arteries can respond to this toast with love and reverence.

We are proud of the fact that men and women of our blood have lived and died for this land of America with fierce devotion. We are proud of the fact that a touch of Irish genius has quickened the soul of America, that Irish hands and brains have helped fashion its buildings and its political institutions. And above all, we are proud of the fact that this United States of ours is the finest symbol of justice and liberty and political fair-dealing which has ever been devised by mortal man.

Yes; this is a day of sentiment and we are a sentimental people. On St. Patrick's name day we are never afraid that emotional excess will blur the intensity of our love for this cherished land of liberty which means so much to all of us. The virtue of understatement has no appeal for the Irish.

But while we celebrate, we know deep down in our hearts that we are rekindling the fires of loyalty and patriotism because today mortal peril threatens the United States of America.

During the past 5 years, many people have charged me with excessive pessimism on the question of war and peace.

After Hiroshima, I repeatedly warned against the consoling notion that the Soviets might not achieve an atomic weapon for decades. When the President announced, in 1949, that the Kremlin had in fact produced an atomic bomb, I said that total power in the hands of total evil would confront our country with dangers such as it had never before known. Last winter, when many of my senatorial colleagues aspired toward the altogether desirable goal of balancing the national budget, I ventured to prophecy that the accelerating armaments race would mock at any such hopes—I predicted that necessary military spending would force our budget up and up and up.

Just a few weeks ago, I cautioned once more against the siren voices which take false comfort in repeating over and over that "war is not inevitable." Pious hopes do not change hard facts; slogans do not refute the lessons of history. History teaches time and again that prolonged armaments races always end in war.

If we refuse to heed this lesson, we do so at our mortal peril.

But history teaches another lesson. It shows that the destiny of men and nations does not proceed in an inevitable path. It demonstrates that intelligent and valiant action—if taken in time—can stave off looming disaster.

Only the philosophy of communism—with its historical determinism and with its denial of free will—asserts that the future is predetermined. We Americans, with our awareness that God has given man free will, know that the future is not already determined. We know that what happens in the future depends on what we do now—it depends on our present wisdom or lack thereof, on our present moral courage or moral cowardice. This is elementary Christian doctrine.

If it is downright dangerous to take unfounded comfort in the phrase "war is not inevitable," it is even more dangerous to think and act as if war is inevitable. The members of this cult of inevitability, even though they do not realize it, bespeak their lack of faith in the vitality of our own free institutions; they give the cause of communism undeserved flattery. In effect, they say that we Americans and our Allies do not have sufficient imagination and staying power to halt the onward march of Soviet power. They suggest that the Kremlin is invincible—that we can never halt Stalin in his tracks. Unwittingly, they subscribe to Stalin's own proud boast—that the Soviet Union represents the wave of the future and that our western society is decadent and slated for extinction.

As a moral people who believe in free will and in an open future, we Americans must reject this false doctrine of inevitable war.

I say that if we formulate—now—a positive peace program of splendid and compelling dimensions, we can—and will—win through to a just and lasting peace. I assert that if we now wage peace with the same fixity of purpose with which we would wage war, we have every reason to believe that a third world war can be averted.

Our program for waging peace need not start from scratch.

Over the past 5 years, let us never forget, we have recorded mighty successes in halting the spread of communism, and in leaving the door open to peace. I do not pretend for a moment that we have acted with perfect wisdom, or that we have not suffered important set-backs. Western Europe, nonetheless, whose economic and military potential is second only to that of the United States, is still in the camp of freedom. The Marshall plan has worked. Month after month, the Communist ranks in France and Italy diminish. Our military-assistance program, coupled with the growing armies of our European friends, holds forth real promise of deterring the Kremlin from all-out aggression. In Greece, communism has suffered a decisive set-back. Fortified with our aid, Turkey now stands resolute in the face of Soviet threats.

And above all, our country has created an imposing and fearsome stockpile of atomic weapons which has kept the Red armies out of Western Europe, and which now shields us and our allies while we go about the urgent task of enlarging our armies. I confess that I take no little pride in the opportunity given me, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to help make our atomic stockpile the defender of our freedoms.

Our foreign policy has properly recognized that the peace can be maintained, and the Kremlin dissuaded from aggression, only through military and economic strength. No matter how noble the principles for which they stand, troops armed with pitchforks will never deter an aggressor. It takes tanks and planes, in vast numbers, to halt modern armies and air fleets. Likewise, disease-ridden and poverty-stricken populations are natural targets for conquest and infiltration. Empty stomachs must be filled if minds are not to be victimized by evil philosophies.

It is obvious that military and economic strength must be countered in their own terms. But perhaps less obvious is this, that military and economic strength are important only when translated into human strength, into the strength of people. Tanks and guns are of no avail in defending liberty unless we have soldiers who are willing to fight, and if necessary, die. By the same token, an aggressor needs the support of vast numbers of people to carry out his designs. If the Red army refused to carry out plans for foreign conquest, Stalin would be powerless.

All military leaders have recognized that military strength must be ultimately defined in terms of human strength. General Eisenhower underlined this truth time and again when he testified on the problem of defending Western Europe; he stated that

morale was all-important. Even the Communists have paid obeisance to this principle, and have perverted it on behalf of their evil purposes. Marx and Lenin and Stalin have all declared that the struggle for the world will ultimately be decided by the morale of the opposing camps.

Now the words "morale" and "morality" sound very much alike. This is no accident of language; they are, in face, very much alike. Morale depends basically, not upon the strength of a man's weapons, but on the strength of his cause. That cause, if it is to command the allegiance of man of good will, must be the cause of justice and freedom and decency. People are incorrigibly moral. They do not really fight for boundaries or raw materials or factories; they fight for things of the spirit—for transcendent principles. Surely this is apparent to all who claim Ireland as their ancestral homeland.

I therefore put before you this simple series of propositions. Military strength ultimately rests upon human strength. Human strength rests on morale. Morale derives from a passionate belief in the justice of one's cause.

If these things are indeed true—and I am sure no one will deny them—it is clear what we must do to avert a third world war.

We must get squarely behind a moral program that will win people over to our side and away from Stalin.

We can do this only by approaching all the world's peoples—and the Russian people as well—with a positive peace program so in harmony with man's natural desires that it cannot fail to win the support of all men of good will.

In 1917, we did this. We told the world that we stood for the fourteen points. In 1940, we again declared ourselves in favor of concrete objectives of peace—the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Suppose that we had come out in favor of the fourteen points not in 1917, but in 1912—before the Kaiser sent his armies marching into Belgium and France. Suppose that the "four freedoms" had been proclaimed—not in 1940, but in 1938—before Hitler invaded Poland. I wonder if, in either case, the First and Second World Wars would have started. I wonder if the German people, whose consent was indispensable to both wars, could have been mobilized behind an aggressive policy.

Such a program, I fully believe, would accomplish what we have failed to do so far—to rally the moral and physical strength of the world's peoples as a mighty force for peace. Such a program, by mobilizing the moral strength latent in all men, would confront the Kremlin with a dynamic force far more powerful than even the free world's guns and tanks and atomic bombs.

The program I envisage would lay stress upon two things. First, that the supreme menace to world peace comes from the iron curtain. Second, that our country does in fact have a practical and realizable program for ridding the world of fear and bringing about a new community of men.

If the free peoples of Europe and Asia are presented with a cause which fulfills man's basic longings, they will be prepared to meet any armed assault. And if the peoples of Russia come not to believe in Stalin's cause, all the vaunted power of the Kremlin will be of no avail.

Our entire foreign policy must therefore be geared to this twin task—exposing Stalin's conspiracy against the truth, and approaching all the world's peoples with a constructive alternative to war.

The Russian people have passed through two dreadful wars, a bloody revolution, and incessant purges—all in a span of a generation. They long to be relieved of their crushing burden of armament expenditures. They long for the dignities which we Americans take for granted. If we can convince the Russian people that we stand for a decent and peaceful world, they will become Stalin's greatest liability and our greatest asset.

Not all the tanks rolling off Red assembly lines will help Stalin if the soldiers of the Red Army are unwilling to fight on behalf of aggression. If we can show the ordinary Russians that the Kremlin alone threatens the peace—if we can demonstrate that we stand for all the liberties and decencies which are now withheld from the Russian people—we will vastly reduce or even eliminate the chance of a third world war.

Stalin will no doubt use the iron curtain—as he has always used it in the past—to keep the Russian people from learning of our true intentions.

But let us draw hope and inspiration from the life of St. Patrick. He was a slave boy held in bondage by his captors—just as the Russian people are held in bondage now. And yet he ended as a conqueror. His only weapons were a flaming faith, an indomitable courage, and a Christian love of his fellow men.

An idea grounded in objective truth is invincible—and will win out whatever the obstacles raised against it. Against the sword of the spirit, no worldly weapon can prevail.

The Fix Pattern

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "The Fix Pattern." It discusses another tragic scandal coming to light at this time, the scandal of income-tax fixing.

The editorial asks the Attorney General what he is going to do about this. What is he doing about it? What is he going to do about it?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1951]

THE FIX PATTERN

The Post-Dispatch yesterday reported a pattern of income-tax fixes so successful, so widespread, and so costly to the Government that it should shake the national capital all the way to the top of the Washington Monument. The reverberations should be quick to reach Key West, where the White House party is spending a late winter vacation on the beach.

The first source of information about the fix pattern in income-tax prosecutions is a retired agent of the Intelligence Unit, Robert L. Sharp, who served for 25 years, some three of them in St. Louis.

How did Mr. Sharp express his protest?

He did the highly unusual thing of writing personally to a Federal judge to complain that many important cases recommended for prosecution were fixed along the way.

What form has this fix taken?

The pattern is that political lawyers, with highly placed connections, take up these prosecution cases, with the result that they are removed from prosecution channels.

How high up do these influences go?

In at least one instance, a widely known St. Louis businessman, who is a friend of President Truman and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, escaped prosecution for income-tax evasion after pressure was exerted in Washington.

Who handles these fixes?

In St. Louis, three lawyers who are highly influential in Democratic Party politics seldom fail in getting prosecutions stopped once they take a case which has been recommended by the Intelligence Unit for action by the Department of Justice.

Why do not more agents protest as Mr. Sharp has done?

Along with the fix pattern goes a pattern of intimidation. As described by Mr. Sharp, agents believe that they have no chance of advancement unless they do the will of the higher-ups.

Is this pattern confined to the lower levels of income-tax administration and prosecution?

In his highly unusual charge to the Federal grand jury now investigating this whole situation, Federal Judge Moore gave the jurors authority to take income-tax cases out of their usual channels to press prosecution. Since then, Attorney General McGrath has phoned United States Attorney Drake Watson several times to get these cases returned to their regular channels.

Officials in both St. Louis and Washington have a lot to explain. These officials include:

Collector of Internal Revenue James P. Finnegan.

United States Attorney Drake Watson.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue George J. Schoeneman.

Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder.

Attorney General J. Howard McGrath.

If no satisfactory accounting is had from any of these officials, then it will be up to President Truman, who is responsible for them all.

We Can't Put a Price Tag on Defense of Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "We Can't Put a Price Tag on Defense of Our Freedom," written by Mr. Louis Eckl, editor of the Florence (Ala.) Times, and appearing in that publication on March 13, 1951:

WE CAN'T PUT A PRICE TAG ON DEFENSE OF OUR FREEDOM

The so-called great debate on sending more United States troops to Europe still rages. Every American concern for his own and his country's future must hope it is wisely resolved on its real merits.

With that objective in view, it is possible here and now to eliminate from the argument one element that has been injected by some debaters. That is the issue of cost.

Senator TAFT and some others who oppose leaving the troops-for-Europe question to our military leaders have many reasons. And one of them is that we cannot send too many men abroad because we cannot afford it.

To say that this issue doesn't belong in the debate is not to say that we should be indifferent to the cost of our military ventures, in Europe or anywhere else. On the contrary, we should monitor the expenditure of every dollar spent for defense.

That's not the point. What is the point then? It's that the debate over troops for Europe is basically an argument over how and where we can best commit our strength for the defense of America and the whole free world.

Does a free people shrink from the cost of preserving its liberties? At what stage can you no longer afford to save freedom?

This country spent $350,000,000,000 to win World War II. Is there any American who doubts we would have put out twice that sum if it had been necessary to keep Germany or Japan or both from conquering this country?

The answer is evident to all. You can always afford the cost of guarding freedom. When you decide that you cannot, you have already yielded your liberties and succumbed to tyranny.

As we spent in World War II to snuff out the menace of Hitler and Tojo, so today we will spend to gird the free world to meet the threat of Russian global ambition. The only matter to decide is how we shall spend to do this job.

If the United States Senate, in its considered wisdom, votes to support administration proposals for the dispatch of a greater Armed Force to Europe, then there can be no hesitation about our providing the money needed. Whatever the reasonable cost, we shall have to afford it.

It would be small recompense to know we had balanced our national budget if in the pursuit of this goal we had lost our priceless heritage of freedom.

Morality in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast over WJR, Detroit, last Friday, March 16:

MORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

It is a pleasure to again appear on this Your Congress program. I am sure we are all most appreciative of WJR's efforts permitting Members of Congress to report directly to the people.

C-bombs have been exploding all over Washington during the past several weeks. The C-bomb is not a new military weapon, but it could be just as dangerous to the people of the United States. The ingredients of this bomb are crime, confusion, and corruption.

The headlines of your daily papers, the news from your radio and television correspondents, daily report new discoveries in the field of crime, confusion, corruption, and communism, implicating personalities in Washington, in our Government. No person can condone officials in public trust who utilize that trust for selfish purposes. It is true you will find your Alger Hisses and your William Remingtons; you will find your Harry Vaughans and Donald Dawsons; you will find your Pendergast machine and your syndicate crime tie-up in politics; but we must not overlook the fact that these people so implicated, who are not deserving of their trust, are a small minority of our Government officials, either appointed or elected. The vast majority of our Government officials are sincere, hard-working, conscientious, loyal Americans. But, in order to protect the vast majority of public officials from being classified as a group as being conniving parasites, we have to expose the small minority who misuse their trust. In other words, we should throw out the few rotten apples or the public will assume that the rotten apples are typical rather than exceptions.

It is disconcerting to us, who believe in good, clean, honest government to note that the President, by being petty and stubborn, refused to aid the Congress in sorting out the rotten apples from the barrel. Loyalty to friends is to be condoned if that loyalty does not harm anyone else but you. But loyalty to friends in public office who have used their friendship to the President and their public office for immoral financial or political gain cannot be condoned.

The citizens of this country are still smarting from the red-herring charges made when Alger Hiss and William Remington were investigated for Communist activities while employed by the Federal Government. These two I have mentioned served in positions of high public trust and the President rather than aiding in their investigation ridiculed the investigation as a "red herring." We are all too familiar with Mr. Truman's stubborn insistence that Major General Vaughan remain his military aide despite the fact that the general used his office in the White House to put pressure to bear upon other Government officials in order to secure benefits based upon favoritism rather than upon merit. We recall that Major General Vaughan helped his friends get perfume, molasses, race-track permits, passports, and military passes and for the use of his influence coming from the White House, Harry Vaughan was paid off with deep-freeze cabinets. Friends of General Vaughan were able to get permits to build race tracks when materials were in short supply. He endeavored to secure a permit to purchase molasses which was in direct violation of war regulations. He is quoted in testimony as interceding with a departmental official to ease the permit through saying—"We Democrats must stick together." But despite all of the unsavory actions on the part of his military aide, the President laughed off the charges and General Vaughan retains his position in the inner White House circle.

Of course, we are all familiar with the most recent investigation conducted by a Senate subcommittee, chairmaned by Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, into so-called influence exerted upon members of the FRC Board. There again the influence was traced into the White House inner circle. It was brought out time and time again that Mr. Donald Dawson, the President's assistant in charge of personnel, consistently used his influence on the RFC to secure loans. Many of these were loans which had been turned down by an examiner. Of course, one of the most flagrant cases was the one where Mr. George Sax—the punchboard king of the country who built the luxurious Saxony Hotel in Miami Beach secured a loan of $1,500,000 from the RFC. Mr. Dawson was a frequent guest at the Saxony Hotel, on a complimentary basis, while the Saxony Hotel was negotiating with RFC to secure the relaxation of certain conditions of the loan agreement. The Fulbright committee wrote Mr. Dawson asking he appear before the committee to give his side of the story. This, however, he has failed to do and the President has given no indication that he either had asked Mr. Dawson or would permit him to appear before the committee. The only assumption we can make is that the implications made by the committee—that it was Dawson who brought pressure to bear upon RFC to make the Saxony Hotel as well as other loans which were not justified—are true.

The most amazing story coming out of the Fulbright committee is of the payoff of a mink coat valued at $9,500 to a White House secretary for the influence she and her husband—who is an influence peddler—had on the RFC to secure approval of a loan to a fur company. Mrs. Young and her husband, Merl Young, came from Missouri. Eleven years ago Merl was a messenger boy receiving $1,800. His wife was Senator Truman's secretary at the time. When Mr. Truman went to the White House, he took Mrs. Young with him and she was able through her connections to get Mr. Young placed with the RFC as an examiner at a salary of $7,100 per year. He aided in securing loans for the infamous Lustron Cop. and the Jacobs Corp. of Detroit. He left RFC and took executive positions with both these companies, which gave him a total income of $46,000 per year. In his spare time he worked for the Democratic National Committee. But still the President has not seen fit to discharge the bribe-taking secretary, Mrs. Young. She is still on the Government payroll in the inner circle of the White House.

Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Mississippi were shocked to find that Federal jobs were being sold in their State of Mississippi for prices ranging from $250 to $1,500 each. These jobs were sold by the Truman Democrats in an effort to build up their organization in the State of Mississippi to undermine the so-called Dixiecrats or States-rights Democrats. Many a veteran who was entitled under law to Federal job preference had to pay a large sum in order to secure placement. It is a strange commentary that President Truman has not denied the charges and has remained completely silent on the whole affair.

Senator KEFAUVER, who is chairman of the Crime Investigating Committee has been severely chastized in private by certain powers that be for his investigations which have exposed the tie-up between syndicated crime and political machines in Missouri, Illinois, New York, and Florida. Many of these political machines in some of our large cities owe their existence to organized crime—and still, there has been no effort made by the President to purge the gangsters, slot-machine kings, and gamblers from these Democratic organizations.

I have cited these examples—which are common knowledge—for the purpose that irrespective of political party, irrespective of our personal philosophy of government neither a forthright Democrat nor Republican citizen will, or does, condone corruption.

Our way of life—our republican form of government—can be lost just as easily by immoral activities in Government as it can by outward aggression. It is my sincere hope that the investigations that have taken place—and are now in progress—will spark the fire of a moral awakening to insure that public officials will be more conscious of their public trust, that the individual voters will insist that the people who represent them are above reproach. We cannot long last as a free nation with representative government if the citizens of this country lose faith in their Government. It is tragedy of the first order for people to assume that this is politics and politics is rotten. Politics is what you make it. Politics will be rotten if we, as individual citizens, become callous and assume that all people in political life are corrupt and if you replace one corrupt man you will get another. You cannot legislate morals. You cannot legislate ethics. Public officials—elected or appointed—should be—and in the main are—responsive to the wishes and desires of the people they represent. I hope that throughout the country there will be a wave of indignation against immorality in Government. We need to live by Christian principles. We must take a greater interest and be more active in governmental affairs whether it be in your local precinct, school district, city, State, or National Government. If all citizens would actively participate in political affairs either within or without their party, we would be assured of a complete house cleaning and the morals and ethics of government in general would be greatly enhanced. But if, as individual citizens, because of apathy, lack of interest and callousness we accept corruption as a byproduct of politics your moral standard in government will sink lower and

lower. So, we as individual citizens have a solemn duty to perform. We must be as conscious of corruption as we are of communism. Either one allowed to go unchecked would mean we would lose the way of life and the form of government so dear to us.

The Roman Empire fell because of internal corruption, which was allowed to grow unchecked as a malignant cancer. Other great governments have fallen when they became arrogant, cocky, and conceited. We cannot allow corrupt practices to go unpunished.

I do not blame the people of our country for being tired and fed up with the headlines they have been reading of late as a result of the several investigations being conducted by congressional committees. Neither party has a monopoly on good government. The vast majority of Democrats and Republicans in Congress are anxious to rid our Government of unsavory practices. As a matter of fact the investigations taking place at the present time are conducted under the chairmanship of Democratic Members who believe as you and I in good government. It is not a question in many cases as to whether an action is legal or illegal. Many practices are legal but they are not moral. It is not enough to judge an action by whether it is legal or illegal. You can misuse your public trust by unethical practices that are within the law.

These are trying days indeed. Not only does the United States need a strong military arm for our defense but we must have strong moral fiber and our Government must reflect the honesty, the integrity, the character of the American people. If the Government so reflects the true character of the American people, we then will have a Government whose feet will be so well entrenched in the respect of the people that unity will exist and our people will be welded together to fight for a common cause.

Education and Agricultural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, Editor Wheeler McMillen in his column All of Us, in the March 1951 issue of the Farm Journal, makes a statement with respect to the influence of education in agricultural progress. I am in hearty agreement with what Mr. McMillen so well says and, under permission granted me by the House, submit his statement herewith:

[From the March 1951 Farm Journal]

ALL OF US

(By Wheeler McMillen)

Boys and girls get too little attention from county agents, home demonstration agents, and 4-H Club agents. That's a flat statement. I am talking about the total effort by the agricultural extension services. Only about one-third of extension work aims at youngsters; nearly two-thirds aims at adults. Some of the adult farmers will keep on learning new things anyway, and would get along without extension agents. Other adults do not learn, and time spent on them is not very productive. Young people from 10 to 20 will always learn if their interests are aroused. That's the time to pry minds open.

Every oldster can see that farming has progressed enormously these last 30 years. Why? Well, science has shown us many better methods. Invention has given us far better equipment. But do science and invention by themselves explain why one farmer today produces much more than one farmer did 30 years ago? Don't people count? Hasn't something happened to farmers, too? Our top farmers today, in most cases I believe, started differently from the ways their grandfathers started. They had 4-H and FFA experience. Their minds were opened early, and they have ever since eagerly grabbed at new ideas and new equipment.

The time to educate comes when people are young. I am sure that education deserves more credit than it has been given for agricultural progress. I am sure that this progress would continue and advance faster if less time were now spent trying to change those who are too old to learn, and the same effort were expended on the youngsters who are at the right age to learn. Plain arithmetic dictates the lesson that educating youth pays longer dividends. Teach a boy something, and he may use it for 40 years; teach a man the same thing, and he has less time to use it, just because the undertaker will get the man before he gets the boy.

Time for PMA To Face Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial written by Mr. R. Frank Frazier, executive secretary of the Virginia State Poultry Federation, intended for publication in the forthcoming issue of the Virginia Poultrymen and the Southeastern Poultryman. The latter publication circulates in 11 Southeastern States.

I should like to commend this editorial to the consideration of my colleagues from these States and elsewhere who are interested in the future of the poultry industry.

In reading Mr. Frazier's statement, and in talking with a number of prominent poultrymen I have become convinced of the urgent need for reform in the administration of Federal grading and inspection activity in poultry.

It should be abundantly clear that there is no logic in having a poultry grading and inspection program administered by the dairy branch of PMA when PMA has a functioning poultry branch familiar with the particular problems of poultrymen.

Inasmuch as the indicated adjustment has not been brought about administratively, legislative action must be taken toward achieving a more sensible arrangement.

The editorial follows:

TIME FOR PMA TO FACE FACTS

Those unfamiliar with the Washington Production and Marketing Administration set-up are shocked when they learn the dairy branch is still administering grading and inspection programs for the poultry industry. And to justify not having these programs in the poultry branch where they belong, top level PMA administrators claim that in some past years it has been necessary to take tens of thousands of dollars from dairy program fees to subsidize those for poultry. If this be true, then we are amazed that our dairy friends haven't already arisen in righteous indignation to demand their money's worth for services they were buying from PMA.

Remembering the exhorbitant fees charged for the so-called "Washington supervision" of poultry grading and inspection work, many industry leaders are at a loss to understand why the operation of these programs hadn't been on the black side of the ledger all along, if they were administered with a reasonable degree of efficiency. But now, at long last, poultry programs are self-supporting, according to John I. Thompson, Deputy Administrator of PMA. He also said, when visited recently in Washington by a delegation from your association, that he favored the transfer of these programs to the poultry branch as was being requested by your representatives. He expressed the view such a transfer should not be made until the opportune time. When pressed for clarification of this statement, his answer was general, vague, and noncommittal.

In the minds of the leaders of your association is the conviction that the opportune time for this transfer has arrived. In fact, it is long overdue, and they can find no justification for some dairy administrators continuing to supervise poultry programs which they apparently do not understand.

The record of their administrative blunders is no longer a secret among informed poultrymen. When industry leaders assist the poultry branch in developing improvements in regulations under which grading and inspection programs operate, these regulations, although approved even by the Secretary of Agriculture, have been either sabotaged or completely ignored in some instances by dairy administrators. But perhaps even more serious from the standpoint of our industry is the fact that certain ill advised dairy branch administrators kill many worth while recommendations for improvements in poultry programs even before they can become a part of the official regulations. Is this not weak administration by those who seem to be shirking their duty? Is this fair to the poultryman?

Admittedly, back in the horse and buggy days when most poultry marketing firms also handled butter, cream, cheese, nuts and hides, there may have been a degree of justification for both dairy and poultry programs being administered by the same people. But this is not true today. An immediate transfer of grading and inspection programs for poultry and poultry products to the poultry branch of PMA must be made for these programs to perform their maximum service to our industry.

Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the boxcar situation in the Middle West is becoming more desperate as time goes on. One of the primary causes of this shortage is the large percentage of western cars which are tied up on eastern lines. In a letter to Dr. W. M. W. Splawn, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Sam P. Wallingford, an ex-

tensive and prominent grain dealer in Kansas, calls attention to this situation. Because the matter is of such great and general interest, I am herewith including a copy of Mr. Wallingford's letter as a part of my remarks:

MARCH 12, 1951.

Mr. W. M. W. SPLAWN,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commisssion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPLAWN: We operate quite a large group of country elevators, and own and operate a six-million bushel public terminal elevator here in Wichita. I feel that something of a drastic nature is going to have to be done about the present boxcar shortage which we are having in the Southwest, and which threatens to be the worst situation in all of our history by the time of harvest, say from June 1 on.

The writer feels that a most serious situation confronts the southwestern lines, which can only be helped by radical action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The latest figures I have show that the Boston & Maine Railroad has on its lines today 259.1 percent of its ownership; New York Central, 122.1 percent; New York, New Haven & Hartford, 173.2 percent; the total Allegheny group, including the Pennsylvania Railroad, 107.8 percent; and the Reading Railroad, 121.1 percent. Now we'll take the western lines, with a percentage of 86.5 of ownership, and you can see the serious injustice that is being handed out, not only to the railroads, but to the shippers in the great Southwest.

I have been advised, Mr. Splawn, that if our western lines could be permitted to use 100 percent of their boxcars, that our situation would be materially improved. Cannot something be done to help this situation? I note that insufficient steel is being allotted to freight car builders, so that cars are not being built to the full capacity of these plants. What, may I ask, is more important to the commerce of America, and to the war effort, as well, than the 100 percent efficiency of the railroads. Personally, I feel that the railroads have, through efficient management, performed an almost superhuman task with the cars that they have.

I, as a shipper, would like to have you advise me what I can do, first, to help correct the improper distribution of boxcars, and, secondly, what can be done to assist in a more adequate new car building program.

I am sending a copy of this letter to our Kansas Senators and Representatives, who are fully cognizant, I am sure, of the drastic need of more cars and of their more adequate distribution.

Very truly yours,
SAM P. WALLINGFORD.

Leadership, Not St. Lawrence Seaway, Vital in Current Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 19, 1951, issue of the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Times-Leader, speaks for itself:

LEADERSHIP, NOT SEAWAY, VITAL IN CURRENT CRISIS

An Associated Press dispatch from Detroit yesterday quoted President Truman as saying that the St. Lawrence project has become a matter of very high urgency. He was, of course, referring to the seaway. His message was addressed to a group of Great Lakes labor leaders who will back the seaway for obvious reasons, with or without a Presidential appeal.

Truman lets himself wide open when he implies that all will be lost in the developing struggle without the seaway. It is absolutely untrue that the seaway is vital to our national security as he states. Franklin Roosevelt said the same thing a decade ago and history records we won the Second World War without any seaway. We shall come out on top in the current crisis, too, if we can survive the incompetency in Washington.

What the United States needs at the moment urgently is not the seaway, but leadership. What passes for that in the Nation's Capital today is pathetic. Perhaps never in the country's history have we been so impoverished in the top echelons.

When the President of the United States tells the public the St. Lawrence seaway is essential when it manifestly is not, and when it is generally known he is trying to put across this pet scheme, together with other crackpot ideas, under the guise of national defense, then it is time to call a spade a spade. Truman, the vigilant opportunist and politician, obviously is willing to gamble with American lives as well as dollars, to say nothing of liberty itself, just to advance his program. Such an attitude when Americans are being called on to sacrifice is despicable.

If the St. Lawrence seaway were as essential as Truman pretends, which it isn't, it could not be constructed in time to have any bearing on the outcome of the current controversy.

Home Folks Urged To Write Often to Boys in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of Congress and, indeed, all of the American people will be deeply interested in the attached letter which I have received from an Army sergeant now stationed in San Francisco:

I am a sergeant in the United States Army, recently returned from Korea. I am not writing this in any official capacity (but with knowledge and permission of Sixth Army PIO).

I am trying to keep a personal promise I made to my buddies in Korea and elsewhere.

I am in the Army—I've been in the Navy—I served with the Marines and Air Force. I have spent over 6 years overseas and many months in Army hospitals and I have seen too many servicemen there fighting the unnecessary extra battle against despondency, lonesomeness, and the terrible feeling of being unloved and forgotten by the folks back home.

All the attention and care of the various morale, recreational, athletic, spiritual, and special-service sections of the various components of the Armed Forces, the Red Cross and their unsurpassed Grey Ladies, the superlative entertainment of such top-notch entertainers as Bob Hope, Bing Crosby, and others cannot completely combat this melancholy and misery without the wholehearted support and cooperation of the folks back home themselves.

My request of you will clarify the entire problem and solution.

Will you please join with other radio, TV, stage, movie, magazine, newspaper, lecture, church, club, and other celebrities to urge the folks at home to please write cheery, newsy letters—often—with their latest snapshot—and some small, inexpensive gift once in a while, to their relatives, friends, acquaintances, or home-town boys overseas or in the Armed Forces' hospitals?

This is my own personal campaign for mail from home for my buddies. Will you please let me know what you sincerely and frankly think of it and what you will do to help get mail from home for the boys overseas and in our Armed Forces' hospitals?

Respectfully yours,
Sgt. WILBUR F. H. RADELINE.

P. S.—I have received some specific requests for mail from home from servicemen from many localities, races, and creeds.

Thirty-second Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a statement I am making in regard to the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

Thirty-two years ago there gathered at Paris, France, a caucus of more than a thousand of our fighting men of World War I, led by the son of our former fighting President, a hero of another war, Theodore Roosevelt. The purpose of the meeting was to start the organization of veterans of the just-ended war. They appointed an executive group to make the initial organization in the States and adopted the name, "The American Legion." The preamble of its constitution is:

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

From the million and a quarter members from World War I, its membership increased to more than 3,000,000 when its charter was amended to admit veterans of World War II. Last December Congress further amended its charter so that veterans of the present fighting will be eligible. It is now the world's largest veterans' organization and no one can estimate what its future membership will become.

Over the years this great organization has continued to serve in peace as it

served in war. This service has not been limited to service to its membership or to veterans. A great part of its time and money has been spent on activities for the welfare of the community, State, and Nation. At its 1922 convention in New Orleans it started upon a program of child welfare. Since that time it has spent over $80,000,000 on the program and is now recognized as one of the Nation's great agencies in this field.

Its other great programs of Americanism—national security, juvenile delinquency, and others—have rendered outstanding service. In my opinion, its programs for Boys' State and Girls' State are outstanding. In my own State for 1 week selected boys from our high schools are brought together at Jacksons Mill for lessons and experience in government at all levels. For another week there is the same program for girls. Here they receive instructions from officials of government. I am proud of the fact that the Legion of West Virginia established the first Negro Boys' State and the second White Boys' State in the Nation.

Ever since its organization the American Legion has fought for adequate national defense, including universal military training. Most of us have seen it assume leadership in times of floods and other local emergencies. Its work for education is well known. It is credited with the origin of American Education Week, which has been observed annually for 30 years. During this week it directs public attention to the accomplishments and needs of our public schools.

Its accomplishments in the fields of unselfish service to all of our people, not just veterans, can hardly be mentioned much less discussed in the short time at my disposal. I congratulate the American Legion on its outstanding record and express my sincere appreciation.

Eloquent Tribute to St. Patrick by Hon. John F. Shelley, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an eloquent speech made by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], at the 1951 St. Patrick's Day banquet given by the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Washington, D. C.:

SPEECH BY HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, AT ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS DINNER, ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1951

In the course of my forty-odd years I have attended a great many St. Patrick's Day celebrations—listened to a great many speeches in praise of St. Patrick in particular and the Irish, God love 'em, in general. I have even made a few myself. Looking back on them now—my own included—I think that they may have been bad speeches, although they went over big. They were pretty much the same; they recounted the glorious history of St. Patrick; followed up with accounts of the Irish heroes of history and their heroic deeds; and then the speaker sat down, with his audience emotionally charged, and cheering.

I think now that those speeches may have been bad, not because they were not oratorical masterpieces, nor because they were not true—but because they dwelt too much on the glories of the past and said nothing constructive about the future in which we and our children and their children must live. Now, I do not intend to ignore St. Patrick—he wasn't the kind of man you can ignore. Neither do I intend to forget the countless other Irish heroes, saintly, or warlike, or both. What I want to do is to place those ancestors of ours in the context of our times, and to say what I think they would say about the future of Ireland and the world, and Ireland's place in the present crisis and the future struggle.

The age in which St. Patrick lived was one in which ancient institutions were breaking down and confusion reigning in men's minds. The Roman Empire was disintegrating and with it the political structure of the civilized world. Fear and uncertainty were everywhere in that chaotic time.

Into his part of that world—into Ireland—St. Patrick brought two great and related ideas—faith and freedom. He was first and foremost an apostle of the Catholic faith. There were apparently Christians in Ireland before him, but he made the country dominantly Christian, and so thoroughly that Ireland became for the next several hundred years a center of learning and a center of missionary activity. It remained so, in fact, until the energies of the people were consumed in fighting off the attempts of their neighboring island to conquer them and they had no more left for teaching their arts and ethics to others. Up until that time Irish missionaries had gone to Scotland, to Northern and Central Europe, and Ireland was a kind of headquarters of culture and religion for Western Europe.

As well as being an apostle of faith, and quite as logically, St. Patrick was an apostle of freedom. He had been slave. He endeavored to make people free. He challenged the royal authority of the pagan chieftains, protested and opposed raids by British bands who carried Irish captives off into slavery, and raised money for the ransoming of these captives.

Ladies and gentlemen, the story of St. Patrick has peculiar relevance today, because we also live in a chaotic age when the old structures, political and otherwise, on which humanity rested are breaking down under the force of wars and history. Fear and uncertainty reign in many places and in many minds. Moreover, there is a great and powerful concerted attack on just the things for which St. Patrick stood.

The specter of Soviet communism which is stalking over the world today is the denial of religious faith, and at the same time the denial of human freedom. Communism is Godless. It is also a system of slavery based on contempt for, and oppression of the common man.

But there are weapons which will defeat Stalinism. They are the same weapons as those wielded by St. Patrick in his fight against false gods and inhuman men. On the one hand he held to his faith in God, on the other, to his faith in human freedom, and the human will to be free. These are indestructible, and while we cling to them we are indestructible too. That is the lesson of St. Patrick for this year 1951.

We know how those weapons served the Irish people—helped along, it is true, by other weapons which Irish courage saw fit to use—in the long struggle against British domination; a struggle not yet completely won. From the three O'Neills to the days of Wolfe Tone; from O'Connell and Parnell to De Valera and McSweeney, the Irish have kept their faith, their freedom of spirit, and their fists, alive to fight against religious persecution and foreign control. Though the wall built by the partitioners still casts a shadow over the island, the whole world knows that, essentially, Ireland is one, united, free, and ready to fight to remain so.

The Irish have not fought for freedom in Ireland alone. The United States can count an endless number of heroes of Irish birth or descent. Charles Carroll, founder of Maryland, was one of these, and it was in Maryland that religious freedom was really born in this country. Twelve signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irish. Eleven Irish generals of the Revolutionary armies, including a Sullivan and a Conway; the Navy's Barry and McDonough, and hundreds of other Irishmen helped to set the country free; Andrew Jackson, fighter and great defender of democracy, was of Irish descent. The list goes on through Gen. Phil Sheridan to Al Smith, and the many Irish heroes of World Wars I and II, including General McAuliffe who said "Nuts" to the Germans at Bastogne, Colin Kelly, whose heroic death in the Pacific gave us renewed courage after Pearl Harbor, and the five Sullivan brothers who gave up their lives when the cruiser *Juneau* was sunk by the Japanese in the Pacific.

Our sister republics in South America have likewise benefited from the leadership of men of Irish blood. There was Bernard O'Higgins, whose name is a byword among liberty-loving South Americans, and there were a great many others too numerous to mention. Wherever Irishmen immigrated they gave new life to the nation of their choice.

Now, the achievements of these men were remarkable, but they did not achieve what they did simply by sitting in admiration of St. Patrick. They followed the old precept of "Go thou, and do likewise." The glory of St. Patrick was reflected in their deeds, but they also infused something of their own spirit. They took the good saint's principles and they fitted them to their own hour and their own need.

There is a lesson in that for us Irish, both here in America, in Ireland, and throughout the world. Ireland, and God knows our hearts are with her, is now in what may be hoped are the last stages of the fight to end the pernicious partition and to become what Cardinal O'Donnell referred to as "Ireland, one and indivisible, though the heavens fall."

The opposition to partition—the fight for a United Ireland—are in the very best of Irish tradition. It has been a bitter war marked by British deceit and brutality, and by typical Irish patriotism and courage. It should not be forgotten, nor should it be shelved. The world today has great need for the courage and the faith in God and his principles that St. Patrick gave to the Irish. The whole world is now lined up in a cold war in which the issues are clear. The choice is between western democracy and man's right to his belief in his God on the one hand, and godless communism on the other. A world-wide conflagration may break out at any moment.

In such a situation, I have no doubt as to what St. Patrick would do or say. He would be in the vanguard of the forces of freedom and Christianity leading the drive to rid the world of the serpent of communism. St. Patrick did not do his fighting from the side lines—he led the way.

Ireland is not now a member of the United Nations. She has been kept from full participation by the vote of Soviet Russia and her satellites. Though participating in the activities of some of the associated agencies, her voice has not been heard in the General Assembly or the Security Council. For that reason, Ireland should and will work doubly hard in combating the menace of world

communism at every possible turn. By such action, and only such action, can she live up to the great tradition of St. Patrick and Brian Boru; of Commodore Barry and of General McAuliffe. Ireland is the true heir to the mantle of St. Patrick, to the principles for which he fought, and the leadership he showed. The Western World needs those principles and that leadership now as never before. Ireland must be allowed to take her place in the forefront of the battle and show the world that neither she nor her sons have forgotten how to fight the good fight, and to keep the faith.

It may be bitter for the people of Ireland and for its leaders to realize that while the United Nations, with the United States in the lead, are throwing the weight of the Western World into the battle in Korea in an effort to throw out a foreign power occupying a part of the nation, and to end the partition, if possible; Ireland herself suffers under a no less unjustifiable occupation and partition, and the rest of the world does nothing about it. England is left to work her will in the six counties—against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland.

In spite of this we of Irish blood cannot afford to ignore our obligations to the principle laid down by St. Patrick—the principle that faith and freedom must be fought for if they are to be won and held. Communism has made fewer converts in Eire than anywhere else in the civilized world in proportion to population. It is up to her to show the rest of the world how to beat down the threat which faces it. Eire must not be isolated from the community of nations when her religious faith and her matchless ability to fight for freedom are so sorely needed. Ireland alone cannot keep her freedom if the forces of communism are not destroyed. But Ireland can provide inspired leadership to the democratic peoples of the world in the common fight to preserve freedom everywhere.

Let us take a look at Ireland's recent history—and in doing so, we cannot fail to get a better appreciation of what her present-day leaders could and would do for the cause of western civilization if they were permitted.

It remained for our own day to produce some of the greatest heroes and the brightest victories, as well as the most tragic martyrs of the battle for home rule for Ireland. Most of us know—some of us may have seen for ourselves, others have heard from our brothers, our parents, or our friends and relatives—the story of the Easter rebellion of 1916. We have been thrilled by the details of the battle around Dublin Castle and the heroism of Eamon de Valera and his comrades. We have grieved over those who died in the uprising or were executed afterward. We know that though the uprising failed of its immediate purpose it lit fires in the hearts of Irishmen everywhere which have not yet been extinguished.

For 2 years thereafter the civil conflict continued with the Sinn Fein leading the Irish people in their resistance to British rule. Eventually, in December of 1918, a general election was ordered for the whole of Ireland, supposedly to settle once and for all the question of independence for Ireland. The costly attempt to maintain control by force, and the weight of world opinion as voiced in the proclamation of the right to self-determination by the victorious democracies in World War I, had forced England to this step. Despite the fact that the election was held under British law and was carried out while a British army occupied the whole island, the result was overwhelmingly in favor of national independence. Out of 105 electoral divisions 79 voted for independence and only 26 against. The popular vote was over 80 percent in favor of independence.

In response to this expression of the national will the elected representatives of the people of Ireland assembled in Dublin on January 21, 1919, declared Ireland an independent nation, and established a government and the Dail Eireann the national legislature. The English, going back on their promises, refused to recognize this action, and thus a virtual state of war again broke out between the Irish Republic and Great Britain. The British sent in their Black and Tans, imposed martial law, and tried to force Ireland to give up her independence. Ireland, of course, continued the battle. Finally, as a last resort, the British Parliament on December 23, 1920, without an Irishman voting, passed a Government of Ireland Act—the Act of Partition, whereby the six counties were cut off from the homeland.

The Irish people rightfully refused to accept this settlement. The Sinn Fein again led the war against the occupying Black and Tan army of the British, and the attempt to force acceptance of the partition was wholly unsuccessful in the greater part of Ireland. Despite the fact that a Northern Ireland government was set up in Belfast, even this was the will of England only, and was opposed by the majority in the six counties broken off.

It was during this period that the heroic hunger strikes took place and Terrence McSweeney, in giving up his life, brought world sympathy to the Irish cause.

In the partition election of May 1921, intended to put the Government of Ireland Act into effect, out of a total of 186 seats in both the north and the south Parliaments, 140 were won by the Republicans; thus, Ireland, as a whole, repudiated the act. The British again set up martial law and bitter fighting again took place. Finally, on December 6, 1921, after almost 6 months of negotiations between the leaders of the Sinn Fein and the British, a treaty was signed establishing the Irish Free State, and partition became an accomplished fact. Even with this, the English deceit was not ended, since the treaty called for revising the boundary between Northern Ireland and the free state to free some of the Irish Republicans who form a majority in four of the six counties, and this was never done. England's latest act, intended to cement her position in Northern Ireland, was to pass the so-called Ireland bill in May of 1949. In this bill they presumed to declare that Northern Ireland will never cease to be a part of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland. Incidentally, this is a fine time for England to begin to worry about obtaining the consent of her subject Parliament when questions of how they are to be ruled come up.

This Ireland bill has served to keep Ireland out of participation in the North Atlantic Defense Treaty, since one of the purposes of that treaty is to preserve the territorial integrity of the participating nations, and Ireland fears that her adherence to the pact would be interpreted as recognizing England's claim that Northern Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom.

That is where the matter stands today. Despite protest after protest, the English have refused to concede that, by any standard, Ireland should be one and united. Irishmen in either North or South consider themselves as Irish, not English or British, or anything but Irish. The population is homogeneous, the island is one geographic unit, her history and traditions are distinctively national, and even her churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, are organized on a national all-Ireland basis. Her learned bodies and her sports organizations are nationwide. Ireland is divided only in the minds of the Government of England and in the measures England has forced upon the island.

What can we here do to end this intolerable situation? It is true that our State Department has said that we should maintain a hands-off attitude; that partition is an internal problem, with which we should not be concerned. But I say that it is no more internal than the invasion of South Korea, and we are certainly involved there. It is no more right that the island of Ireland should be divided than that the Korean peninsula should be.

Fortunately, we Americans of Irish descent or birth, do have a program for putting the great moral weight of the United States behind the fight to end partition in Ireland, and to end English rule there forevermore. In April of last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives held hearings on a number of resolutions which had been introduced in the House, and which would have put the United States solidly on record as favoring unification of Ireland. Some of these resolutions provided means for our active participation in action leading to unification. Those resolutions had been introduced by Members of Congress of Irish descent, and received strong support in the hearings on the subject. Unfortunately, the Foreign Affairs Committee did not see fit to report any of them to the floor of the House. You may be sure, however, that this program will not be allowed to die, and eventually, we hope that the Congress will take action placing this country in the fight to end partition—and leading the fight, as it should. Ireland has made great contributions in culture and leadership to the United States, she has given the same strong support to democratic ideals; it is time that the United States do something to help Ireland gain her complete freedom.

We of Irish blood in Congress did something else last year to open the eyes of the English to how strong the feeling in this country in opposition to partition is. On March 29 of last year, when the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950 was under consideration by the House, an amendment was introduced by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY and was accepted. This amendment was designed to withhold assistance from the United Kingdom until partition in Ireland was ended. Although the amendment was later stricken out of the bill, it did awaken England to some consciousness of American and world feeling on the matter. As a matter of fact, there was much scurrying about the Capitol and the State Department by worried British diplomats during the period of debate on the bill. These actions have forced England to take a new look at her policy.

You may be sure that I and all the other Congressmen who have engaged in this fight will carry on until England does more than simply take a new look. We want her to take positive action and get out of Ireland, and we will not be satisfied until she does so. If Irish people everywhere get behind this program of pressure on England from the United States, we may be able to write a new page in Irish history for our grandchildren to read—the story of how the English were finally driven out of Ireland.

Knowing this history of persistent courage and remarkable leadership on the part of the Irish people, who can doubt that their full participation in the titanic world struggle now shaping up would provide inspiration for the rest of the democratic world—inspiration which might well spell the difference between victory and defeat?

I realize, however, quoting an official Irish Government memorandum, that although "Ireland is earnestly desirous of playing her full part in protecting Christian civilization and the democratic way of life * * * [she] is faced with grave difficulties from the strategic and political points of view." This is true, both because the "continued partition of Ireland is naturally and bitterly resented by the Irish people" and because without a single integrated authority either the defense or the effective utilization of the island's capacities are impossible.

I therefore, call upon our own Government to recognize that as long as the Western

World countenances the unjust partition we cannot muster our fullest strength to fight the injustice of communism. I call upon the Congress of the United States and the present administration to accept the program sponsored by the friends of Ireland in Congress and to put the full weight of the United States behind unification of Ireland and the end of partition.

To that end, may we of Irish descent or Irish birth go forward, inspired by the holiness of St. Patrick and the legions of Irish heroes through the generations, guided by Christian principles, encouraged by our knowledge of and adherence to the righteousness of our cause, thankful to Almighty God for His blessings and praying for His strengthening so that the day will come in the near future when Ireland will be one.

May God give to all of us the courage and strength of St. Patrick so that we may fight until that day, and beyond that day, until the time when the whole world is free of tyranny and oppression.

It Is Just Common Sense to Ask Why We Arrived at Our Present Positions

REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the months of hallowed memories of great Americans. February 12 is the birthday of the sublime Lincoln, whose faith in democracy and freedom was expressed in always telling the people the truth, whose noble nature was incapable of betraying free government by resorting to political subterfuge. February 22 is the birthday of George Washington, whose last words of warning to the Nation he loved was to keep away from foreign entanglements. December 29 is the birthday of Andrew Johnson, the able and fearless defender of the Constitution. April 13 is the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, who clearly foresaw disaster to the Republic if the Federal Government developed into an inquisitorial bureaucracy sustained by crushing taxes on the backs of the people.

Today the political wisdom of these great Americans is desperately needed. For many years now the people have lived under a government which has repeatedly deceived them, which has led them blindfolded into global wars that have wasted their resources and drenched the soil of far away lands with the blood of their sons. They have lived under a government which in only 17 years has grown into a bureaucratic Frankenstein which picks their pockets of vast sums to support hordes of spoil seekers. More ominous than all, however, is the fact that all this misrule has now brought the Nation to the verge of another global conflict the prospective burdens of which may be reckoned in the lives of millions of American youths and the economic exhaustion of America.

Within a few weeks Congress will probably have approved of the drafting of 18-year-old youths. A staggering budget has already been requested by the President. Across the waters we still do not know what real effort our hailed allies such as socialist England and radical France are willing to make, or how much trust we can put in foreign divisions reported to be honeycombed with Communist influence, or whether the troops we may commit to Europe will be subjected to the same vacillation and procrastination of a United Nations organization which for 7 months has been unable to take the action necessary for us to save the lives of thousands of American boys in Korea as well as our national honor. While war with Russia is still far from certain, our Socialist planners in Government are moving swiftly to utilize the emergency to clamp down authoritative controls on the life of the people in every direction—a pattern which they hope to make permanent.

Never before in our history is it so necessary for the people to think clearly about the perils which confront us. It is just common sense to ask why we arrived in our present perilous position—where we find ourselves after distributing vast largesses in the form of money and food and materials throughout the globe, comparatively alone and friendless in the world of diplomacy. This just did not happen. It has come about as the result of a series of tragic mistakes—mistakes which must be carefully examined. For it is only in the light of past performance that the Congress and the American people can judge of what they can expect in the future.

Let me go back some 30 years to World War I. That was the start of our troubles today. It was under the aggressive leadership of a Democratic President in 1917 that America first departed from the wisdom of Washington and took sides in a European war. Europe has been the great war factory of the world for centuries. Since the twelfth century there have been very few years when nations of Europe were not warring among themselves. But under President Wilson the farsightedness of Washington was abandoned and America launched on an interventionist role in Old World quarrels which has gained us nothing as a Nation but a staggering load of debt and foreign burial grounds for our youth and gained nothing for the world but the destruction of free government.

How was America lured into World War I? From the beginning international banking houses in the United States took a definitely unneutral attitude, favoring investment in the bonds of the Allied countries and discouraging or refusing investment in the paper of the Central Powers. This immediately gave us a strong financial stake in the cause of the Allies—a stake that grew larger with each year of the war. Likewise American industry became violently pro-Ally. The illegal British blockade of the Central Powers crippled our foreign trade and industry eagerly embraced the opportunity to sell to the Allies. All this made it easy for propagandists of the Allied cause to mold public opinion in America toward our participation in the war. Americans knew little about the history of Europe and they swallowed bait, line, and sinker the most unblushing and vicious propaganda. Allied propagandists shaped public opinion to believe that the Kaiser started the war for the purpose of conquering the world and in consequence the United States had to get into this struggle to "make the world safe for democracy." German militarism was represented as the taproot of European wars. This central thesis was reinforced by a collateral one that the Central Powers were moral degenerates. The American people were deluged with atrocity stories about the Germans, such as cutting off the hands of Belgian children. Little Serbia was pictured as the victim of brutal aggression by Austria, the declaration of war by Austria against Serbia having started the European conflagration. The sinking of the *Lusitania* was branded as a classic case of barbarianism. The unrestricted submarine warfare of the Germans against merchant ships was denounced to the high heavens as a barbaric violation of international law. The lofty moral propaganda of the Allies strongly influenced the American people to feel that they could not possibly keep out of the struggle without becoming unfaithful to all that was good and decent in their own manhood.

Ten years after the end of World War I the most distinguished historians in America, England, France, and Russia had amassed sickening but thoroughly convincing evidence that America had been tragically misled by foreign propaganda. Looked at coldly from the American standpoint it was all too clear we had been fooled into a war that was not worth the life of a single American mule. The facts established showed that—

First. The Kaiser did not start the war. On the contrary, he tried to stop it. The real culprits were Russia and France, the former seeking to gain possession of Constantinople—the dream of Russian foreign policy for many years—and the latter seeking to recapture Alsace-Lorraine which Germany had taken from France in 1870. The immediate cause of the war had been the order of the Russian Czar to mobilize the Russian Army on Germany's borders. This was followed by French mobilization since Russia and France had been working together for years to bring about a showdown with Germany and Austria so that their territorial ambitions could be realized. Germany caught between these two mobilizations had no choice but to strike as quickly as possible.

Second. When the German archives were finally opened to the world there was not the slightest evidence that the Kaiser had been plotting to conquer the world. German militarism was less potent than French and Russian militarism at the outbreak of the war. Germany had an army of 806,000, France, 816,000, while that of Russia was 1,284,000. Pitrim Sorokin's masterful study of the frequency of wars in Europe from the twelfth century to 1925 showed that in terms of percent of years at war Spain registered 67 percent—the highest—and Germany 28 percent—the lowest. England during 56 percent of this time period was at war and France 50 percent of the time. But the defeat of Germany did not free Europe from militarism. France became the big mili-

tary bully of Europe after World War I—so bad a bully that Woodrow Wilson before he died in the twenties said, "I would like to see France licked and I would like to tell Jusserand so to his face." In World War II the American people again set out to crush German militarism only to find that Russia took over the role of bully on a far bigger scale in European politics.

Third. The facts revealed about Serbia were particularly depressing. Serbian officials had actually organized the plot to assassinate the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Serajevo in 1914. The Prime Minister of Serbia knew all about the existence of the plot nearly a month before it was executed, but made no effort to warn the Austrian Government. Serbian officials had supplied out of Serbian arsenals the bombs and pistols used in the assassination and had even given the assassins pistol practice in the woods of Belgrade. During the war the Serbian Government fearful that its complicity in this plot might leak out liquidated Dragutin Dimitrijevitch, chief of the Intelligence Division of the Serbian General Staff, who had been the administrative brains in organizing the murder of the archduke. The weapon of assassination failing, Dimitrijevitch was condemned to death on a trumped-up charge of treason and shot at Saloniki in June 1917.

Fourth. The atrocity tales about the Germans had been faked. Belgian authorities denied them after the war. Lloyd George, of England, and Nitti, of Italy, admitted that no one had ever seen a Belgian child with its hands cut off by the Germans. Gen. J. V. Charteris, Chief of the Intelligence Division of the British Army during the war, in a speech before the National Arts Club in New York City on October 19, 1925, cheerfully told how he had faked photographs to arouse both British and American public opinion. The most nauseating evidence was uncovered showing the existence in France of photograph factories which turned out faked atrocity pictures on a mass scale.

Fifth. The *Lusitania* was an armed merchantman and carried contraband on her last voyage. More shocking she was at that time a registered auxiliary cruiser of the British Navy which automatically deprived her of any protection by international law.

Sixth. Unrestricted submarine warfare had been forced upon the Central Powers because of English violations of international law with respect to the rights of neutral shipping. These violations even included using the American flag on British ships carrying war cargo. Through its illegal blockade of Germany the people of the Central Powers were being starved out. Had America effectively protested British violations of international law Germany would not have had to resort desperately to submarine warfare. German submarine warfare was conducted without atrocities. Admiral Sims challenged anyone to produce evidence of more than one German atrocity in the period of submarine activity, and the officers guilty of this were punished by the German Government.

The idealistic professions of allied propagandists about World War I were completely discredited by the discovery of the notorious secret treaties between the Allies—treaties that embodied as sordid a program of territorial pilfering as can be found in the history of diplomacy.

Seventh. America was taken into World War I by a President who concealed his intentions from the people. In January 1916 President Wilson sent Colonel House abroad to inform Lord Grey that the United States would enter the war "as soon as he could bring American opinion to that point." A month after the departure of Colonel House, Wilson emphatically declared in a speech at Milwaukee that the United States would not intervene in the World War. In April 1916 Wilson called to the White House the Democratic leaders of Congress and asked them to aid him in throwing the country into war, but they firmly refused to support him in any such action. Yet Wilson coolly planned the campaign of 1916 to get himself reelected on a platform of that "He kept us out of war." This duplicity of Wilson is shocking enough, but under President Roosevelt political duplicity to force America into another global war was elevated into an all-out weapon against democracy.

What were the results of World War I so far as America was concerned? We took the lead in imposing on Germany a vicious and unjust peace making her solely responsible for the war and in setting up a world organization to enforce it and thereby sowed the seeds of World War II. At a tremendous cost in American lives and economic resources we handed out "freedom" to a number of newly created European states only to find that within a few years these states had gone fascist and freedom had been destroyed from within them by the people themselves. To repair the ravages of war in Europe billions of American investor's dollars were poured down a rat hole and the problem of always-at-war Europe intensified.

In between World Wars I and II public opinion in America, following the revelations of the revisionist historians, soured on America's first crusade. There was a deep national feeling of having been tricked into the First World War, or for reasons which, in retrospect, seemed inadequate to justify the expenditure of blood and treasure. In this change of sentiment a student of public opinion recorded: "American newspapers in 1921 said that the only American book supremely popular in Europe was Uncle Sam's pocketbook; in 1923 we had become a leading member of the league of donations; in 1928 that Europe counted too much on being 'Yank-ed' out of economic difficulties; in 1932 that our being expected to succor Europe suggested too strongly sucker; in 1933 that whenever an international conference met to get at the bottom of things, one of the things is Uncle Sam's pocket."

In 1937, 71 percent of the people who replied to a national public-opinion poll expressed the opinion that our participation in the First World War had been a mistake. This judgment of the people found reflection in legislation designed to remove for any future war emergency in Europe the immediate cause of America's involvement in the First World War. This immediate cause had been Wilson's assertion of America's rights on the high seas against the German submarine blockade. So it was decided to forego those rights in advance, as not worth the cost of war. On May 1, 1937, neutrality legislation, passed overwhelmingly by both Houses of Congress, was enacted. In the event of any war in Europe or elsewhere there was to be an embargo on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war to all belligerents. American citizens were forbidden to travel on belligerent ships and to buy or sell securities of warring powers.

Now how did we get into World War II after the people had had their eyes opened to the truth about World War I and after the people themselves had brought about the enactment of strong neutrality legislation?

There is no better summary of how this was accomplished than the words of Sir Oliver Lyttleton, British Minister to the American Chamber of Commerce in London June 20, 1944:

> America provoked Japan to such an extent that the Japanese were forced to attack Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty on history to say that America was forced into the war.

To millions of Americans Pearl Harbor was an attack by Japan that spoke for itself. Actually, it was the inevitable end result of a long series of political maneuvers conducted behind an iron curtain of secrecy by President Roosevelt. Behind this iron curtain—which had as much iron in it as its Russian type—Roosevelt was able to do three things:

First. To fool Congress into passing measures on the ground that they were intended to keep the Nation out of war when he intended them to put the Nation into war.

Second. To arouse the war spirit in the people by deliberate misrepresentations of military facts.

Third. To force Japan to fire the first shot which automatically put us into war.

Let me give you some examples. Lend-lease, which repealed in substance the Neutrality Act, was put forward by administrative spokesmen in Congress as a measure intended to keep America out of war. Churchill had said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job," and these spokesmen harped on the theme that in this way the United States could stay out of the war. Yet at the very time when anxious Congressmen were being assured that the lend-lease bill was designed to avoid war, important American and British staff talks were taking place in Washington in an atmosphere of extreme secrecy. Before the bill had even passed these military and naval experts had adopted a report which took for granted American participation in the war. The report read:

> The staff conference assumes that when the United States becomes involved in war with Germany.

Robert Sherwood in his book, Roosevelt and Hopkins, admits that "had the details of these plans—the staff meetings—fallen into the hands of Congress or the press, American preparation for war might have been wall-nigh wrecked and ruined." There could scarcely be a more candid admission from a Roosevelt worshiping source that America was stealthily maneuvered into war behind the backs of and without the knowledge of the elected representatives of the people.

Lend-lease contained amendments to prevent the President from using the bill as an authorization for carrying on an undeclared war. Convoying by United States naval ships was forbidden as was the entry of any American vessels into a combat area. From behind his iron curtain Roosevelt announced a patrol policy which he could secretly employ to get around the amendments to lend-lease. To the public this policy meant use of our naval vessels and planes to patrol American waters to prevent any sudden attack by Germany on our shores. Our ships and planes were directed to report the presence of any German raiders or submarines in our waters to the British Navy. The catch in this was that our ships and planes tracked down German ships and subs far beyond the limits of American waters—in fact all the way across the Atlantic—so as to protect British convoys laden with American implements of war.

As a result of his patrol policy Roosevelt did not hesitate to falsify the alleged attack on the *Greer*, an American destroyer bound for Iceland. He told the people that this ship, flying the American flag, had been wantonly attacked by a German submarine. What he concealed was the fact that the *Greer* had followed the German sub for hours reporting its position to the British Navy far beyond American waters. The sub in desperation had finally surfaced and fired at the *Greer* and had then fled.

After reporting similarly distorted incidents to the people, Roosevelt then calmly announced a shooting war in which our ships and planes would supposedly in American waters—but actually all over the North Atlantic—go after German ships and subs without continuing to report their position to the British Navy for the kill.

Thus the United States behind Roosevelt's iron curtain was actually at war with Germany more than a year before Pearl Harbor unbeknown to the American people. But in spite of all this Roosevelt could not push the Nation into war. A number of polls registered the dismaying fact that the people still did not want to get into another European war. So Roosevelt, behind his iron curtain of secret diplomacy, concentrated his efforts on Japan, and there he was successful. He was finally able to maneuver Japan into firing the first shot and to plunge the Nation into the war for which he had been working for a long time. Because of secret diplomacy the American people knew nothing of Prince Konoye's efforts when he was the Japanese Prime Minister to meet with Roosevelt at Honolulu or Alaska or that he was willing even to get Japan out of China if given a little time to save face in the Orient. They knew nothing of the fact that Secretary Hull had actually worked out a reasonable program of compromise with Japan but withdrew it because of opposition of China and England and our own Lattimore to any compromise or that thereafter there were no terms whatsoever save the impossible ones submitted in the ultimatum to Japan on November 28, a few days before Pearl Harbor. They knew nothing of plan B submitted by the Japanese Government. All they knew was what Roosevelt permitted them to be told and this information was selected to picture the United States as doing its utmost for peace with a war-lustful Japan and getting nowhere. Behind his iron curtain of secret diplomacy Roosevelt finally goaded the Japs into making the attack which put us into the war.

If our policies toward Japan were not calculated to goad her into striking first at the United States, what excuse could be given for them. Japan consists of a group of islands inhabited before the war by some 70,000,000 persons—a population that was increasing yearly at the rate of 650,000. The total arable land surface of Japan is less than the improved farmlands of New York State alone. Since the turn of the century Japan had been forced to find an outlet for the extra people at home, territory which could also supply her teeming domestic population with food. She had found such an outlet in northern Asia, in a part of the world that is very lightly populated, and which had been accustomed to such outrageous forms of government that the inhabitants could not possibly be worse off than they were ever before. Every important nation in history faced with overpopulation has acted just as Japan did, and anyone in America who might deplore this in Japan is politely requested to weep on the shoulders of our own Indians. At any rate Roosevelt suddenly became indignant at Japan's war with China, a war that had practically become a stalemate because of the geographic unconquerability of China.

If Japanese expansion had been toward the United States, toward the Philippines and Hawaii, we would have had something to complain about. But Japanese expansion was away from our interests. So Roosevelt waxed more and more indignant over noble China, the same China that today has embraced communism, and froze Japanese assets in the United States, embargoed vital products from American to Japan, punched away at her from behind his iron curtain and finally had issued an ultimatum which Japan could not accept. We then brought down in ruin the only nation of Asia that had a democratic legislature which controlled the purse strings, the only Asisatic nation that could be counted on to oppose the expansion of Communist Russia in Asia. Today, having handed over food lands in Asia to Mao, the Communist, Japan's economy is now on Uncle Sam's bounty roll.

But even more repulsive in its consequences was Roosevelt's use of his iron curtain to build Russian military strength and to make war settlements with her that reeked of barbarianism and make inevitable her present challenge to civilization.

At Tehran Roosevelt sold Yugoslavia down the river to Tito, and abandoned the heroic Mihailovic, the anti-Communist leader, to the fate of death by a firing squad of Tito's Communists. This was a crime against the people of Yugoslavia. King Peter, head of the Yugoslav government-in-exile, pleaded with Roosevelt in a letter to him that "he could not abandon Mihailovic without betraying the people of Yugoslavia" and said "I would become a traitor to my people and to my army in Yugoslavia." But Peter got the brush-off from the great Franklin who seemed so eager to please Russia.

It was at Yalta that Roosevelt sold both China and Poland down the river to Russia. His gift of China to Stalin was unbelievable in the lights of the facts now known. Two days before Roosevelt left for Yalta he had in his hands a 40-page memorandum from General MacArthur outlining overtures of the Japanese for peace. All the Japs asked for was the preservation of the Emperor, the same terms that the Japanese accepted 4 months later after the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Capt. Ellis M. Zacharias, Navy expert on Japan, asserts that intelligence reports indicating Japanese impending willingness to surrender were also available. American warships were known to be cruising along the shores of Japan bombarding at will.

Yet, at Yalta Roosevelt "bribed" Russia to get into the war against Japan by handing over to Russia Manchuria, the most industrially developed part of China as well as outer Mongolia, Sakhalin, Kuriles, Port Arthur, and North Korea. He did this, although a few weeks earlier at Cairo, Roosevelt had solemnly promised Chiang Kai-shek that Manchuria would be returned to China. During the Soviet occupation of Manchuria industrial equipment of an estimated value of two billions was looted and carried off to Russia. Ironically Russia did not get into the war with Japan until 2 days after our bombing of Hiroshima and her contribution to victory was negligible. But she was on hand in Asia to take over the guns and ammunition of Japanese forces there. These she passed out to Chinese Reds like Mao, trained in Moscow, and with this equipment plus the diversion of military supplies from American to the Red armies due to the efforts of the Red clique in our State Department the Chinese Reds under Mao beat Chiang and drove him to Formosa.

The handing over of Poland to Russia was particularly odious since England had gone to war with Germany over the latter's seizure of Polish territory.

Russia was even befriended by Roosevelt when our armies advanced on Berlin. We could have easily gotten to Berlin first. But our troops were first halted at the Elbe. They were then withdrawn from that river in wide circle—far enough westward to make Stalin a present of the great Zeiss optical and precision instrument works at Jena, the most important V–1 and V–2 rocket laboratory and production plant in Nord-

hausen, and the vital underground jet plant in Kahla. Everywhere we surrendered to the Soviets intact thousands of German planes, including great masses of jet fighters ready for assembly, as well as research centers, rocket developments, scientific personnel, and other military treasures.

When it was all over, a large part of the formidable Russian militarism of today was clearly marked "Made in America" or "donated by America from Germany." But where Roosevelt left off President Truman resumed.

At Potsdam, Truman maintaining intact Roosevelt's iron curtain of secret diplomacy played fast and loose with American honor and security. He agreed to an enlargement of the boundaries of a Poland already delivered by Roosevelt and Churchill to Russian control through addition of areas that had for centuries been occupied by Germans or people of German origin. Some 14,000,000 persons were brutally expelled from their homes with the confiscation of virtually all their property. Only 10,000,000 finally reached the American, French, and British zones of Germany. Four million mysteriously disappeared though the finger points toward Russian atrocities. Thus Truman approved one of the greatest mass deportations in history which for sheer cruelty is a dark page in the annals of history.

At Potsdam, Truman also sanctioned Russian acquisition of Eastern Germany, the food bin of that nation before the war. It then became impossible for the remaining German economy in British, French, and American hands to feed its people. Germany, like Japan, also went on our bounty rolls.

Like Roosevelt, Truman did not neglect to build up Russian military strength when his opportunity came at Potsdam. He provided her with more factories, machines, and military equipment though at the time he attended Potsdam Truman knew that through lend-lease we had already dangerously expanded Russia's military might and that, in addition, we had given the Soviets some 15,000 planes—many of them of our latest type—and 7,000 tanks.

But at Potsdam Truman gave to Russia the entire zone embracing the Elbe and Oder Rivers, excepting Hamburg which lies within the British zone. Naval experts had known from the early days of World War II that it was along these rivers and their tributaries that the Germans had set up their submarine production line. The menace which the Nazi underwater fleet constituted during World War II is still remembered by residents along the Atlantic coast who saw oil tankers, merchant ships, and even a troop transport sunk within sight of our shores. Convoy losses during the early years of the war were tremendous. And special defensive methods had to be devised by our Navy to get our supplies across the Atlantic.

But in spite of this, the President agreed at Potsdam to deliver to Russia the parts which lay in satellite plants sufficient for her to fabricate hundreds of submarines. In addition to this, he agreed to give to Russia 10 of the latest snorkel-type long-range German submarines for experimental purposes.

That is not all. The Potsdam agreement delivered to Russia the city of Koenigsburg and the adjacent area on the Baltic Sea—thus we provided the Soviets with an all-weather, year-round seaport from which her newly received submarine fleet might operate.

But Truman's generosity to Russia went even further than this. In addition to the reparations already given to Russia in the eastern zone of Germany, including the uranium mines, article 4 of section 3 of the agreement permitted Russia to take "15 percent of such usable and complete industrial capital equipment" out of the western zone in exchange for raw materials.

Then the President went one step further. Section B of the article 4 reads:

> Ten percent of such industrial capital equipment as is unnecessary for the German peace economy and should be removed from the western zones, to be transferred to the Soviet Government on reparations account without payment or exchange of any kind in return.

A time limit of 2 years was set upon this transfer. But even if this section of the agreement had been questioned, the full text was not released by the State Department until 19 months later.

Perhaps it is sufficient to note that conservative estimates place the Russian submarine fleet at more than 300 today. The chances are that it is closer to 500. It was at Potsdam that Truman provided Russia with the materials and facilities sufficient for her to become a first-class underseas naval power.

It was also at Potsdam that the President and his advisers stupidly accepted a zone of control in the city of Berlin without providing any access to it. You all remember well how when the Russians chose to close the roads and railroads to us, we embarked upon a costly airlift in order to supply our zone in Berlin.

This colossal diplomatic blunder cost the American people $265,943,000—more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

The iron curtain of secret diplomacy which Roosevelt erected and which Truman after the war has continued to use is ably commented upon by Dr. Charles Beard, the great American historian, in his book, Roosevelt and the Coming of the War:

> If the precedents set by President Roosevelt in conducting foreign affairs as reported in the records of the congressional committee on Pearl Harbor and other documents are to stand unimpeached and to be accepted henceforth as valid in law and morals then—
>
> The President of the United States in a campaign for reelection may publicly promise the people to keep the country out of war, and after victory at the polls may set out secretly on a course designed practically certain to bring war upon the country.
>
> He may secure legislation in furtherance of his secret designs, misrepresent to Congress and the people its purport and the policy he intends to pursue if and when such legislation is enacted.
>
> He may after securing such legislation publicly announce that he will pursue, as previously proposed, a policy contrary to war and yet at the same time secretly prepare plans for waging an undeclared shooting war that are in flat contradiction to his public professions.
>
> He may hold secret conferences with the premier of a foreign government and publicly declare that no new commitments have been made when, in fact, he had committed the United States to occupy, by the use of American armed forces, the territory of a third country and joining the premier in parallel threats to another government.
>
> He may make secret agreements with a foreign power more fateful in consequences to the United States than any alliance ever incorporated in a treaty to be submitted to the Senate for approval.
>
> He may publicly represent to the Congress and the people that acts of war have been committed against the United States when in reality said acts were secretly invited and even initiated by the Armed Forces of the United States under his secret direction.
>
> He may after publicly announcing one foreign policy secretly pursue the opposite and so conduct foreign and military affairs as to maneuver a designated foreign power into firing the first shot in an attack upon the United States and thus avoid the necessity of calling upon Congress in advance to exercise its constitutional power to deliberate upon a declaration of war.
>
> He may as a crowning act in arrogation of authority to himself without the consent of the Senate make a commitment to the head of a foreign government which binds the United States to police the world at least for a given time—that in the eyes of other governments and people to be policed is to dominate the world; and the American people are thereby in honor bound to provide the military, naval, and economic forces necessary to pursue, with no assurance of success, this exacting business.

As in World War I, the bogy of German world conquest was revived. The numerous deceptions and public immorality of Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy are now defended by his apologists on the ground that he had to "deceive the people into war" so as to crush Hitler before the Nazi blitzkrieg engulfed us. One recalls Mr. Roosevelt's fearsome reference to Hitler's timetable to invade Iowa, the official talk about the ease of invading the United States via Dakar and Brazil, though a movement of troops and supplies over this route would have compelled the Nazis to traverse about three times the distance from Berlin to New York City, and about the frequent discovery of secret Nazi plans for the invasion of the United States, despite the fact that the Nazis were not able to cross the less than 20 miles of the Dover Strait, when Britain was virtually helpless.

Even if Germany had had plans for world conquest that would not excuse a President of the United States from deceiving the people and manipulating them into a war behind an iron curtain of secret diplomacy. But the evidence is convincing that the Nazis had no plans for world conquest—that Hitler did not have even the most remote notion of invading the United States at any predictable period.

Gen. George C. Marshall, in his official report as Chief of Staff at the end of the war clearly stated that the Nazis had no actual plan of world domination. Marshall confirmed this in his deposition for use in the Tokyo trials. Wars in Europe have always been fought over issues that related solely to the interests of Europe, except in the case of Russia today which

does have the intention to subdue the world. But, if when Germany and Russia went to war we had forced them to fight it out there would be no crisis today. These two totalitarian powers would have bled each other white. Even President Truman when a Senator saw this—and urged that we play one off against the other until both were prostrate. Instead Roosevelt elected under cover of secret diplomacy to fight Germany and coddle Stalin—and for that secrecy we are now facing a third world war.

The record is clear that under two Democratic administrations the people were tricked or deceived into wars which from the standpoint of our own interests were fruitless in results and devastating in their sacrifice of our sons and our resources. Under Roosevelt and Truman the Presidency has been fashioned into a ruthless weapon for forcing the people into war and for pledging their resources to foreign governments without consent of the Congress. We are now under a dictatorship in foreign affairs and on the brink of another global struggle. We have been pursuing a fatal policy of "perpetual war for perpetual peace."

Fortunately, today the American people are aroused as never before. They are far ahead of their leaders. They realize at last, that the very leaders who took us into World War II have created a Frankenstein in Russia with which they are totally unable to cope. They ask, how can we depend on these same leaders who have, through blundering, failed to win the peace after the last war, to make a lasting peace now, either with, or without, world war III?

The American people today are belligerent. They are protesting the leadership which blundered us into a war in Korea. They are protesting the leadership which is sure to blunder us into another global war and finally into socialism. They already see that our casualty list, which approaches 60,000, is a needless sacrifice of American lives and with no hope for a decisive military victory. The President on his own motion does not have the constitutional power to send abroad troops in force which could lead to war.

Growing out of their experience with the autocratic European kings, our founding fathers established two fundamental principles in the Constitution: First, individual liberty; second, the right of the people through their elected representatives in the Congress to provide for their own national defense and to declare war. This right of the people and this responsibility of the Congress were never challenged until President Truman sent large forces of our boys into Korea.

They are convinced the administration's spending program will disrupt our economy and carry us over the precipice to disaster. We must provide our people with a military program which will be, first, within the limits of sound economy; second, the most effective war deterrent available; third, enable us to win should war come.

The most ardent supporters of the army for Europe have never maintained it could win a war. At best, this—so far mythical—army is to be an alleged war deterrent. Claim is made that it could delay a Red invasion and absorb the surplus ammunition of the Red army.

What Stalin fears is the atomic bomb and the long-range bombers which can deliver it from bases outside of Europe. He knows what our bombing did to Japan and Germany, and he wants to save Russia from similar destruction. Consequently, we should have an allied air force which can dominate the sky over Russia and act as a shield over all Europe, preventing Stalin from striking with his Red army.

As Winston Churchill said:

> We are still under the shield of the atomic bomb, possessed in formidable quantities by the United States alone. The use of this weapon would shake the foundations of the Soviet regime throughout the vast areas of Russia * * * and constitute an effective deterrent upon Soviet aggression.

Our planners for European aid have strangely avoided mention of enemy air power in this program of ground defense.

How do they intend to gain a final decision over Russia and her satellites? The hearings on the Wherry resolution brought out the fact that all military leaders concede Russia can be destroyed only by air power. Yet our principal expenditure for the Air Force is for combat planes to protect the ground forces in Europe.

We must provide a military program which places the principal reliance in air power supported by an adequate Army and Navy. The main expenditure for the Air Force should be for strategic bombers which can strike anywhere in Russia from bases outside Europe which we know we can hold. The American people are behind such a program. They are unwilling to sacrifice their youth, who would be hopelessly outnumbered, in bayonet fighting against the enslaved millions under Stalin. Republicans must block this ruinous policy of the Truman administration. Time is growing short. The absolute deadline is November 1952. Only a Republican victory can save us.

Beware of false propaganda. Let us not be misled.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter sent by the Reader's Digest urging its representatives to write members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee with respect to legislation increasing postal rates, together with a reply to such letter by one of its representatives:

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y., March 7, 1951.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On March 13, 1951, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will begin hearings on a bill (H. R. 2982) to increase postal rates on magazines.

On behalf of the whole magazine publishing industry, we are bringing this matter to your attention, because it may affect your well-being as a publisher's representative.

The object of H. R. 2982 is to increase postal rates on magazines 100 percent (50 percent this year, 25 percent next year, and another 25 percent the next year).

If such a postal increase should come about, it could directly and seriously affect your income because:

(1) Some publishers might be forced out of business.

(2) Others might be forced to—

(a) Increase subscription prices, and/or

(b) Increase emphasis on newsstand sales.

All of these things might affect the number of subscriptions you would sell in the future, and thus affect your income.

This letter is sent to you so that you may know what is going on, so that you may take whatever action you feel you should.

In the past we have encouraged you to sell all publications, because by so doing you could give more and better service to your community, and earn more money for yourself. We are sending you this letter in the same spirit.

If you feel that an increase in magazine subscription prices caused by increased postal rates would affect your income adversely (and you have first-hand knowledge of how resistant the public now is to increases in prices), you may wish to write to the Congressman who can be most influential on this subject. They are the members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Their names are given on the next page. The address for each is: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Democrats: TOM MURRAY, of Tennessee, chairman; JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia; JOHN ALBERT WHITAKER, of Kentucky; GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania; FRANK M. KARSTEN, of Missouri; M. G. (BURNIE) BURNSIDE, of West Virginia; JOHN LESINSKI, JR., of Michigan; JOHN JARMAN, of Oklahoma; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York; BILL LANTAFF, of Florida; FRAZIER REAMS of Ohio.

Republicans: EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas; HAROLD C. HAGEN, of Minnesota; ROBERT J. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York; ANTONI N. SADLAK, of Connecticut; USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota; GARDNER R. WITHROW, of Wisconsin; H. R. GROSS, of Iowa; JAMES S. GOLDEN, of Kentucky; WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, of New York; O. K. ARMSTRONG, of Missouri.

If you intend to write members of the committee, you should do so today, or within the next few days. Hearings are scheduled to begin on March 13 and will continue for several days.

And if you do want to write, don't feel that your letter may be inconsequential. Last year, when this same subject came up before the Senate committee, it was in large measure letters from representatives like yourself that convinced the committee that postal rates on magazines should not then be increased. This is definitely a place where your letter can have an important effect on the final decision.

Cordially,

ALLAN SCOTT.

MARCH 9, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES,
House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RHODES: On March 9, 1951, my wife received a letter from Allan Scott, director community representatives of the Reader's Digest, informing her that on March 13, 1951, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will begin hearings on a

bill (H. R. 2982) to increase postal rates on magazines. He stated that the object of the bill is to increase postal rates on magazines 100 percent (50 percent this year, 25 percent next year, and another 25 percent the following year). He suggested that should this increase come about it would directly and seriously affect your income. He also stated that some publishers might be forced out of business, and that my wife should write to the Congressman now who can be most influential on this subject, even enclosing a list of such men.

Mr. Scott neglected to inform her of the present postal rate for magazines (or even his magazine). He also neglected to call her attention to the fact that the Post Office Department is operating at a deficit, and that no kind of business can operate at a deficit for very long, even the Reader's Digest. Fortunately, for all of us, the Post Office Department is a governmental agency and we all benefit by the low cost of mail handling, even if we do make up the deficit out of taxpayer's contributions. However, neither my wife nor I feel that the Government should subsidize the Reader's Digest or any other publication, directly or indirectly, as we feel it would if it took the burden of meeting the cost of operation away from those who use the mails and place it in bulk upon the taxpayer. If we were to suggest, as Mr. Scott would have us, that the Reader's Digest and all other publications should be mailed by the millions annually at a ridiculously low unit mailing cost to the mailer, and that any deficit in the cost of operating the post office should not be placed on the user but on the general public, we would certainly be selfish, unrealistic, and definitely not a fit citizen or businessman.

Out of curiosity, I called our local branch of the post office and learned that the Reader's Digest paid not less than 1 cent per copy for mailing its magazine in the United States. This is possible because of bulk mailing. To raise the cost 100 percent would be to require 2 cents postage per magazine. I can't see any reason why neither the Reader's Digest nor any other publication should not pay the increase when mailing is a service they require and should pay for.

Both my wife and I were surprised at the inferences contained in Mr. Scott's letter. He implied the proposed postal increase would be prohibitive and would force some publishers out of business. To say that he is not being realistic is to say that the Reader's Digest needs Government funds to continue operating successfully.

My wife and I feel that there are enough lobbyists in Washington bidding for their selfish interests and we do not want to come to the aid of anyone who is selfish. We feel that under the circumstances we should support your committee on seeking an increase of postal rates on magazines.

I am enclosing Mr. Scott's letter for your perusal.

Very truly yours,

A Footnote for Historians on the Strange Case of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "A Footnote for Historians on the Strange Case of Alger Hiss," together with an article entitled "Links to Field Cited," written by Drew Pearson, and cabled by him from Frankfurt, Germany, on March 17.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FOOTNOTE FOR HISTORIANS ON THE STRANGE CASE OF ALGER HISS

Mr. President, now that the Supreme Court of the United States has denied the appeal of Alger Hiss and it appears that before this week is over the doors of a Federal penitentiary will have clanged shut on Hiss, it is appropriate that there be placed in the permanent files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any additional evidence that comes to light on the activities and associations of this badly misguided former high official of our Department of State.

As chairman of the House subcommittee that handled the investigation which led to the indictment and conviction of Alger Hiss, following our disclosure of the pumpkin papers on the farm of Whittaker Chambers, I have from time to time inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD data which I have felt historians will want to consult as they attempt to chronicle and interpret the trends of our times and the tortuous twistings of American foreign policy since the concluding days of World War II.

Clearly any attempt to record or understand our bizarre contradictions in foreign policy since the last war must take any serious-minded historian to an examination of the part played in them by Alger Hiss not only as a top-ranking policy functionary of the State Department but as a confidential participant in the Yalta Conference, in the San Francisco Conference where the basic format of United Nations procedures was prepared, and in the Bretton Woods Conference. Even more important to historians would be an analysis and report of the very significant activities of Alger Hiss at the unheralded Malta Conference, a preparatory conference for Yalta, at which Alger Hiss and a few associates conferred for many days and made significant advance determinations and studies to be taken by them to Yalta for the guidance and direction of those who represented the United States at the Yalta Conference.

In a lengthy address on the Senate floor on January 25, 1950, I discussed some of these activities under the heading, "What the Hiss trial actually means." Since then additional evidence is continuing to come to light. For example, in his release for Saturday, March 17, 1951, Drew Pearson cabled from Frankfort, Germany, a report conveying some significant information on the relationships of Alger Hiss, Laurence Duggan, and Harry Dexter White—all of whom worked contemporaneously as a clique of trusted Government employees. Drew Pearson also relates the manner in which Noel Field participated in these activities and the mysterious manner in which Field, his brother, and some of his relatives have vanished from the face of the earth. He labels this vanishing act as the No. 1 American mystery of Europe. In this dispatch Drew Pearson to be sure contradicts an earlier report on Duggan which he released on December 27, 1948, but to Pearson's credit let it be said that he is now reporting from Europe the chain of evidence that he has subsequently discovered.

No history of our times which deals with American foreign policy, the Korean War, the public personalities of the Roosevelt-Truman era, or the manner in which communism has become an insidious threat to our way of life both at home and abroad would be either accurate, authentic, or complete without an attempt to interpret and analyze the determining parts played in it by Hiss, Duggan, White, Field, Wadleigh, Marzani, Chambers, Bentley, Remington, and others in and out of Government, and in and out of prison, whose strange attachment for the Soviet cause at one time or another induced them to serve its interests rather than those of the land of their birth.

To help complete the record for the archives of history, Mr. President, I therefore place at the conclusion of these remarks the very significant dispatch which Drew Pearson cabled from Frankfort, Germany, and which appears as his syndicated column for the papers published on March 17, 1951.

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

LINKS TO FIELD MYSTERY CITED

FRANKFORT.—The No. 1 American mystery of Europe continues to be the sudden and unsolved disappearance of four Americans in the Noel Field case after Field was named by Whittaker Chambers as a member of the Communist cell in the United States State Department. This case is now being linked for the first time with another unsolved mystery in the United States—the strange death of Laurence Duggan, found in a snowbank 16 floors below his New York office. Duggan also was named in the State Department investigation, though cleared by the Justice Department.

The amazing thing is that a total of seven people have now died mysteriously or disappeared even more mysteriously following revelations in the Alger Hiss case.

The four people who have disappeared behind the iron curtain with or in the wake of Noel Field are: Field himself, who disappeared in Czechoslovakia May 10, 1949. His brother Herman vanished August 22 that same year while traveling in an airplane between Warsaw and Prague. A few days later Mrs. Noel Field disappeared while trying to find her husband in Prague. Then, 1 year later, Erica Wallachs, a friend of the Fields, went into the Russian zone of Berlin in search of them and never came back. All these disappearances occurred during about the same period of three mysterious deaths in the Hiss case. They were:

Death No. 1: Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury who reportedly died of heart failure August 16, 1948, after testifying before the congressional committee at which Elizabeth Bentley had charged White with being a member of the elite Communist group inside the Government. White's death was not announced until 1 day afterward and he was buried hastily. Later it was reported the real cause of his death was an overdose of digitalis, not heart failure.

Death No. 2: Walter Marvin Smith, Justice Department attorney found at the base of the Justice Department staircase where he had fallen or jumped October 20, 1948, shortly after the House Un-American Activities Committee had questioned him on his notarization of the transfer of title of a Ford automobile from Hiss to William Rosen, described in the congressional testimony as a Communist organizer. Hiss, according to Whittaker Chambers, insisted on turning over his car to the Communist organizer. Smith was the only actual witness to the transfer.

Death No. 3, and the most mysterious of all, was that of Laurence Duggan, the former State Department official who, "while putting on his overshoes to go home," fell through a New York skyscraper window. Duggan had been questioned a few days earlier regarding Communist spies in the State Department. Insurance investigators believed it unlikely that a man would commit suicide while putting on his overshoes and paid his widow nonsuicide death benefits.

DUGGAN-FIELD LINK

It now develops there was a personal link between Duggan and Field which may supply one small clue to this international mystery. Duggan and Field not only served in the State Department at the same time but, for one period, they shared the same house together off Judiciary Square in Washington. Duggan informed his superiors during the war that he had once attended Communist meetings in Alexandria, Va., during his early days in the State Department, but he had never joined the party and became unsympathetic with their ideas.

Field, meanwhile, had left the State Department in 1936 and joined the League of Nations secretariat. During the war he served as European director of the Unitarian Service Committee, which took him to Poland and Czechoslovakia, where he established medical centers and children's homes. He had thus become well acquainted with these two countries and, after the war, remained abroad to write a book on Poland and Czechoslovakia.

DISAPPEARANCE UNPLANNED

On May 5, 1949, Field went from Switzerland to Prague and on May 12 he failed to keep an afternoon appointment. He has not been heard of since. Apparently he did not plan to disappear because his room showed no signs of departure. He did not notify the friend with whom he had the appointment nor his wife, Herta, who planned to join him in a few weeks.

Five months later, however, when the Communists tried Hungarian Foreign Minister Laszlo Rajk, the Hungarian press reported that Rajk testified that Field had persuaded him to become "a servant of American imperialism." Later, in the fall of 1950, six East German Communists were charged with dealing with "the American spy, Noel Field."

More recently Czech refugees have reported that Field would testify in the trial of former Czech Foreign Minister Vladimir Clementis, though there has been nothing to substantiate this.

Meanwhile, Field's brother, Herman, in August 1949, decided to go to Prague to find his missing brother. He boarded a plane in Warsaw on August 22. Friends accompanied him to the airport and the American Embassy checking the plane's manifest later, found his name was on it. However, when the plane arrived at Prague, Herman Field was not on it. He has never been heard of since, either, except in one respect.

On February 25, 1950, Vilem Novy, editor of the Czech Communist newspaper, Rude Pravo, was denounced by a member of the Central Communist Commitee for having betrayed state secrets to a western espionage agent when Novy was a refugee in Krakow in 1939. Herman Field, who was then doing refugee work among Czech refugees in Krakow, knew Novy, and was apparently that alleged agent.

THEORIES ON UNSOLVED MYSTERY

Meanwhile, Mrs. Noel Field left Switzerland on August 3 to seek her husband in Prague, but she, too, disappeared from sight on August 17. A year later, with the Fields' whereabouts still unsolved, their friend, Erica Wallachs, wife of a Washington attorney, persuaded her husband to let her go to Switzerland to locate them. Mrs. Wallachs went to Berlin alone, reportedly was met by Leo Bauer, editor of the Soviet-controlled Berlin radio whom she knew. She has never been heard of since.

Several theories are given for these disappearances. One is that Field had been working with the Communists and, when the congressional investigations got too hot, he wanted to be taken into protective Communist custody. Another theory is that the Fields had worked with the Communists in their early days, knew their vital secrets, and became too dangerous for them to have on the loose. Another is that they wanted Noel Field as a witness against key figures, such as Hungarian Foreign Minister Rajk. Field not only worked with refugees during and after the war but also with the OSS in Czechoslovakia and Hungary in an effort to unseat Hitler's puppet governments.

Meanwhile, until Field and his family are heard from direct, his whereabouts remain the No. 1 unsolved mystery of Europe.

The National Fiscal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 20th day of February 1951, the New Jersey Republican State Committee adopted a resolution covering certain aspects of the present national fiscal situation and commenting on the recent budget proposal of the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll has submitted to the New Jersey Legislature a budget for the 1951–52 fiscal year which, in its demand for spartan economy at all levels of government, set a pattern for the drastic curtailment of all but the most necessary expenditures; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress a budget proposal by the President of the United States for the same period which constitutes an invitation to fiscal disaster for our country and which, unlike our own State budget, utterly fails to recognize the needs of the times: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Republican State Committee does hereby commend the Governor of New Jersey for his practical and realistic approach to the budgetary problems of our State and at the same time condemns the budget proposal of the President of the United States for the following reasons:

1. While purporting to call for expenditures of $71,500,000,000, it actually asks authorization to spend nearly $100,000,000,000.

2. Of this vast amount, the President has seen fit to itemize expenditures totaling only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 and has in effect, asked Congress for a blank check for the remainder.

3. In complete disregard of congressional responsibility, he has refused to state how many billions of dollars will be spent for defense. This committee, while fully aware of the need for high expenditures for the defense of our Nation, nevertheless believes it to be the duty of the President to confide in our elected representatives to the extent that they can make an honest examination of all proposals for defense expenditures before they are called upon to vote vast new taxes on the American people.

4. The President has claimed savings of $5,000,000,000 below last year in nondefense items. Many of these savings are not real. For example, examination shows one of these savings to be the amount expended last year for the 1950 census (a nonrecurring item). He also claims as a saving the more than $500,000,000 which the Congress forced the President to cut from the 1950–51 budget before its adoption. In other words, he is claiming savings below a nonexisting budget.

5. There are but 2 of 130 items submitted by the President in which he has claimed to have effected savings. Examination shows most of them to be based upon transfers which, in many cases, turn out to be increases and not savings.

6. Despite widespread demands for rigid economy in nondefense spending, the President, often under the guise of defense preparation, has continued to foist his Fair Deal, socialistic program on the American people. For example, he has asked:

(a) Three hundred million dollars to equalize education opportunities among the States (as a defense measure, on the grounds that the Armed Forces do not have time to teach draftees how to read and write); plus $106,000,000 for Federal aid to education in certain areas.

(b) A two-hundred-and-seventy-five-million-dollar payroll tax to set up the machinery for socialized medicine.

(c) Direct payments to producers of perishable farm products in lieu of price supports (the Brannan plan).

(d) Seven new waterways projects costing $1,500,000,000, as follows: Hell's Canyon, The Dalles, and Ice Harbor projects in the Columbia Basin; Old Hickory on the Cumberland; a steam plant for TVA; Gavins Point on the Missouri; and $20,000,000 to start the St. Lawrence seaway.

7. Although the President states that his budget totals $71,500,000,000, he has, in fact, asked for contract authorizations and appropriations of $94,500,000,000, plus an additional $4,000,000,000 to pay old bills. Inasmuch as the books of the United States Government are carried on a cash basis, the President's budget should state that he seeks a total of $98,500,000,000—or $27,000,000,000 more than he has admitted; and be it further

Resolved, That the Republican State committee calls on the Republican Members of the Senate and House from New Jersey to continue their efforts to compel the Federal Government to give the American people an honest accounting of their money, and to examine carefully all proposed expenditures, both defense and otherwise, to the end that this Nation may be saved from the fiscal disaster which will surely follow if the Federal Government is permitted to engage in the confused and illogical practices exemplified by the President's budget proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives shall bring this resolution to the attention of the Congress in the hope that the Congress shall see fit to follow the pattern established by the Governor of New Jersey in setting an example for prudent management which present circumstances demand at all levels of Government.

The Need for More Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Flu Epidemic Pointed Up Need for More Doctors To Answer House

Calls," which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of March 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLU EPIDEMIC POINTED UP NEED FOR MORE DOCTORS TO ANSWER HOUSE CALLS

The recent epidemic of influenza, now waning, directed attention to the difficulty of obtaining the services of a physician in any circumstances short of an emergency.

When it comes to turning down telephone calls for assistance there is little to choose between specialists and general practitioners.

In both categories there are physicians who are at the beck and call of the sick and ailing, who work long hours without proper rest to relieve suffering, and who sometimes pay in broken health and shortened lives the price of unstinting service.

But it is also true that in both categories there are physicians whose service is determined by monetary standards, whose desire for personal ease and comfort takes precedence over consideration for those who are ill, and who are more interested in fighting socialized medicine than in healing the sick.

EMERGENCY LIST POSTED

Emergency care is easier to obtain than the normal medical care required in less dangerous cases of illness. The Medical Society of Erie County has established an emergency referral list of doctors who will accept calls day or night. This list is posted in all police and fire stations and in all hospitals.

Physicians and attorneys alike agree that medical jurisprudence has established that a physician who has treated, or has promised to treat, a person who is ill has thereafter an obligation to fulfill his promise or to complete the treatment, as the case may be. Even the telephoned promise to come and see the patient is regarded in legal circles as an oral contract between physician and patient.

However, where no such promise has been made, either orally or de facto by the beginning of treatment, the decision on an appeal for medical assistance is an obligation which rests upon the physician in recognition of his responsibility to society, which permits him to practice medicine. The importance attached to this obligation by the physician will be determined almost entirely by his regard for his responsibilities.

ETHICS CLOSELY WATCHED

The medical society has a board of censors, which keeps watch over the ethics of the society's members, but even physicians admit that there are too many loopholes which permit avoidance of censorship.

A Buffalo physician recently told a friend about the death of one of his patients. He told how the patient had called him at 6 o'clock in the morning and had said that he did not feel well. The physician gave him certain instructions, but the patient telephoned again a short time later and said that he felt no better.

"All right," said the physician, "I'll be over about 8 or 9 o'clock."

"When I got there, he was dead," the doctor said, in recounting his experience.

"Why didn't you go when he called?" his friend asked.

"Because I just don't like night calls," was the reply. "I've got used to sleeping in the early morning."

CALL A DOCTOR

Such a case, an expert in medical jurisprudence explained, constitutes a breach of contract, in that the physician did not take all reasonable steps to insure his patient's recovery or, in this particular case, to prevent his death.

Consider the case of the young mother who telephoned a west side physician during the flu epidemic. The young woman, employed in one of the Buffalo hospitals, told the physician that she had a temperature above 103 and explained what treatment she had been taking.

"It is apparent that you need a doctor," the physician said.

"That's why I called you," she told him, and received this reply:

"I do not take patients during the week end and I am just finishing up my paper work for this week. Then I will have finished. I suggest that you call a doctor in your own neighborhood."

SOME REFUSE HOUSE CALLS

In this case, the experts explain, the doctor was entirely within his rights in refusing the case. The problem arises from the fact that too many doctors are refusing too many cases—at least that's the explanation given by some leading physicians.

Specialists have refused for many years to accept "general" cases. Now, however, many specialists are refusing to make house calls under any circumstances.

"They have many more calls than they want," a well-known physician explained, "and they can handle half a dozen office cases in the time required to make a house call."

Even the family which stints itself to provides the best possible medical care for the new baby may find itself in a desperate situation within a few months after the infant's birth. The pediatrist, or baby specialist, may be one of those who refuse house calls.

CHINESE HAD A SYSTEM

Not having established contact with a general practitioner, or family doctor, the frantic mother and father may be compelled to consult the emergency referral list, though they have already spent many dollars on specialist care for their child.

Some persons who have experienced difficulty in obtaining the ministrations of a physician are beginning to wonder if the Chinese system of medical insurance may not have something to recommend it.

Back in the days before China was liberated by the Communist hordes, a Chinese paid his physician only while his health was satisfactory. If he became ill, payments ceased. Thus, it behooved a shrewd physician to keep his patients in good health.

At worst, under such a system, there would be no truth in the assertion of a leading attorney that "only two classes get the best medical attention today—the very rich and the very poor—the former by paying high for it, the latter through the welfare department."

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article by Sydney J. Harris entitled "What Price Education as Defense?" which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of Tuesday, March 13, 1951. This article, in a few brief paragraphs, points out the significance of the legislation now pending in the Senate to provide Federal aid to the States for education.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD following the article just mentioned, a very able column written by Ysabel and Robert Rennie, dealing in some detail with the necessity of this program in the interests of national defense and the welfare of our country.

There being no objection the article and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 13, 1951]

WHAT PRICE EDUCATION AS DEFENSE?

(By Sydney J. Harris)

For the third time, Senator MURRAY of Montana has introduced a bill to set up a program for $300,000,000 a year in Federal aid to the States for education.

Twice before the Senate has passed this legislation, and twice before it has died in the House—the same House which has rapidly passed appropriations for many billions for armaments.

Yet, what we need more than anything else in America is basic education. If people don't know what to live for, they can't know what to die for. This is why—as the marine wrote to Secretary Acheson—morale is so low among our young people today.

Three hundred million dollars is an insignificant sum compared with the overwhelming cost of our defense program. But communism cannot be fought with weapons; it is an idea, and to be defeated only by another, and stronger, idea.

Education is the most neglected aspect in our society. The States and cities cannot carry the whole burden, especially in the poorer regions, where help is most needed. Teachers are scandalously underpaid, and students are shamefully undertaught.

DEMOCRACY NOT SIMPLE

The idea of democracy is not a simple one, despite the after-dinner orators. Belief in democracy must follow a knowledge of what such words as "liberty" and "justice" and "security" really mean.

A true and full education examines the meaning of these words. It tries to discover what man is, and what society ought to be like. It attempts to discover the best means of accomplishing the end, which is human happiness.

Our young people leave school today without any such firm idea. They are confused and cynical; the war is a painful riddle they do not comprehend; their loyalty is pierced by doubt and despair.

In war, the great danger is always that you may become the thing you are fighting; that the enemy will conquer you in spirit. Only in knowledge resides the strength to resist this spiritual corrosion. Only through education can we find the reason for living and the motive for dying.

[From the Washington Post, March 18, 1951]

OUR POLITICAL ECONOMY—TEACHERS HARD HIT BY INFLATION

(By Ysabel and Robert Rennie)

Now that we have climbed back aboard the escalator of inflation, certain groups are bound to be hurt. Conspicuous among these are the Nation's schoolteachers, whose incomes are slow to respond to a change in prices.

Numerically—and hence politically—they are not a strong group. They number about a million, or 1.6 percent of our labor force; but in the coming decade they may well be among the most important workers in our economy. By 1955, it is estimated, there will be some 37,000,000 young Americans in the school-age group between 5 and 17. This will be 17 percent above 1950.

Because schoolteachers are not organized, they cannot compete with such potent pressure groups as auto workers or miners. Furthermore, in times of inflation they suffer

from the fact that the sources of school revenues are rigid and inflexible.

Public school teachers depend for their salaries on the local property tax, a notably unresponsive form of revenue. Private school and college teachers depend, to a considerable extent, on endowment income, much of it in fixed-interest securities like bonds and mortgages.

The result is that there is a general exodus from the teaching field during inflation. Afterward, teaching salaries tend to catch up again; and in depression the real income of teachers rise very rapidly—when they get paid.

Let us look at the record. We have figures on teachers' salaries which go back to the beginning of the century.

From 1900 to 1949 the average salary of public school teachers rose from $311 to an estimated $2,750 a year. If adjustment is made for changes in the cost of living, real salaries (in 1935–39 dollars) rose from $591 in 1900 to $1,626 in 1949.

The increase, however, was less an upward march than a ride on the roller coaster. Statistics on the salaries of urban teachers show that between 1900 and 1920 real salaries declined by a fourth. Then in just 2 years, from 1920 to 1922, they recovered all the ground they had lost since the beginning of the century and began an upward climb which reached a high mark in 1940.

In terms of purchasing power, teachers' salaries showed a dramatic gain during the early years of the depression. As prices plummeted between 1930 and 1932, real salaries of urban teachers jumped from $1,583 to $1,872.

The trend was exactly reversed by the Second World War. From 1940 to 1944 real salaries for this group declined by nearly 10 percent.

All this tells something of how teachers have been faring in relation to their previous history. But how do they compare with other groups in the economy?

A half century ago the average schoolteacher earned less than half as much as the average factory worker and a third less than even the unskilled laborer of the period.

As late as 1920 he was still making less than half the factory wage. After that, however, he gained ground rapidly. All during the 1930's his average income was higher than that of the factory hand.

The wartime inflation represented a serious setback. Today the schoolteacher again lags well behind the wage earner in the race for a decent living. In June 1950, his disposable income was some 3 percent below that of the average factory hand, more than a sixth lower than the coal miner's or construction worker's and a full quarter below the average earnings in the automobile industry.

Considering the education and training which are expected of a teacher, these figures come as something of a shock. One offsetting factor is that most teachers are single women, with somewhat lighter-than-average family responsibilities. Another is that the school year runs for 9 months; many teachers add to their earnings in the summer

When this has been said, however, the fact remains that teaching is a low-paid profession, and that as living costs rise it is likely to drop even further behind.

The exodus from teaching jobs did not matter so much in the Second World War because school enrollment was actually declining. Today the full flood of war babies is all but overwhelming our school system. Can we continue to toss teachers the crumbs from our economic dinner table and still meet this crisis?

Ours is an increasingly complex civilization. Our teachers must know more than ever before if they are to train our children to cope with it. Yet how good can a profession be which offers fewer rewards than manual labor?

Assignment of Ground Forces To Duty in the European Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "Senate's Gobbledygook," which appeared this morning in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE'S GOBBLEDYGOOK

The so-called great debate in the Senate has narrowed down to one immediate question—will the Senate say what it means? Unanimous action by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees had settled the momentous issue of sending four American divisions to Europe before the exchange of words began on the floor. Every opponent of this bipartisan policy now knows that he is wasting his breath. Aside from giving Senators a chance to get their views on record, the debate from this point on is likely to be useful only if it saves the resolution from becoming a monument to obfuscation.

The worst of the legislative gobbledygook is concentrated in section 6. On Friday Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee refused to speculate on what it means. He referred questions on that point to Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, who wrote this notable specimen of double-talk at the behest of Senators GEORGE and BYRD. Mr. SMITH has promised the Senate an explanation today. But at best he can give only one man's opinion of the resolution's dictum that "congressional approval should be obtained of any policy requiring the assignment of American troops abroad * * * in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty"—excepting the four divisions for the Eisenhower army, which the resolution itself approves. Unless the language itself is clarified, the resolution will rise to plague any reasonable administration of a policy that is vital to our national security.

Mr. SMITH has denied that a formal act of Congress would be required under his proviso to permit the dispatch of five divisions, if needed, instead of four. What, then, would Congress have to do? The Senator spoke of setting up a "moral check" on the President. Where does he find any senatorial power to fix moral standards for the President to obey? Senator WILEY realistically pointed out that in no circumstances can the Senate alter the President's constitutional power by passing a resolution. But at the same time he asked the Senate to accept the resolution as it is—thus creating a presumption in the minds of legislators and citizens that the Senate can prevent the President from using his constitutional power by passing a negative resolution and then refusing to pass a positive one.

Aside from its obscurity section 6 is vicious because it gives the impression of interfering with the powers of the Commander in Chief, whether or not that is its purpose. This appearance of unconstitutional meddling will remain so long as the resolution calls for "congressional approval" of further troop movements. What the Senate ought to ask of the President, in our opinion, is merely consultation with its leaders and appropriate committees if the dispatch of further troops abroad is contemplated under the treaty. This would give the Senate an opportunity to advise the President of its own wishes, and, if no meeting of minds could be obtained, the Senate could then initiate legislation making it impossible for the President to carry out his project successfully. Congress always has a ready weapon against such projects—the denial of appropriations.

Such consultation is provided for in section 3 of the resolution. Up to that point no cloud is cast upon the freedom of the Commander in Chief to move troops in accord which his own concept of our national security and our treaty obligations. It is of the utmost importance that this presidential power remain unfettered even by senatorial expressions of opinion. It is not a question of leaving vital decisions as to peace and security in the hands of one man, as Senator WILEY contends. With a pattern of consultations established, Congress would always be able to check unsound executive decisions while keeping within its own constitutional role. Congress would thus be in a position to control basic policy in case of disagreement with the President, but without crippling the Commander in Chief in making strategic decisions.

It is possible that the very ambiguity of section 6 would prevent it from becoming a grave hazard to our security in time of great emergency. But the Senate ought not to take any such chance. The best course would seem to be to eliminate section 6 and give more emphasis to the consultation requirement of section 3, if the Senate is not satisfied with the present language.

Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moving Toward Strength," published in the New York Times of March 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVING TOWARD STRENGTH

The Senate has taken an important forward step in its approval of the military manpower bill. It is significant that only five votes were cast in opposition on the final balloting. Our senior lawmakers are obviously convinced that we have no alternative but to make ourselves militarily strong, and they have acted accordingly.

This measure as it stands is not, in our judgment, by any means a perfect bill. The 24-month service period actually means about 3 months less than that when time for induction and travel and for authorized leave is deducted. This is short of the most effective period. The universal training features, likewise, remain somewhat indefinite and are placed in the future instead of being incorporated into the existing military program. The concept of universal service has, therefore, been weakened. It is our view that it should be accepted in both the military and civilian spheres as a national necessity.

With these limitations, however, the measure moves some considerable way in the

right direction. It makes the required provision for a substantial manpower establishment. More than that, it puts the United States on the record before the world as being in deadly earnest about the defense of its liberties. The overwhelming vote by which it was adopted is a salutary indication that we mean business.

The necessity for this legislation is not of our own choosing. Few persons in this country, if any, like the idea of drafting 18-year-olds, or for that matter of drafting anyone at all. There is nothing pleasant about the idea of sustaining armed forces up to 4,000,000 men. There is no moral satisfaction in the conviction that every young man must undergo a period of training to enable him more skillfully to kill and more securely to avert some of the dangers of sudden and violent death if and when he is placed in the field.

Unhappily, however, we are not living in a world of our own good wishes and pleasant comforts. We have been placed in a situation in which our physical and spiritual survival is dependent upon our ability to make ourselves strong. We face an implacable adversary that knows no respect for honorable intentions unless they are backed up by unquestioned might. Under that condition we have no choice except to take the hard course upon which we have embarked.

We can take that course in honor and in confidence only if we are fully convinced of the permanent worth of the human cause that our liberties represent. We make ourselves physically strong so that we may endure for the sake of something more than physical values. Thus can our actions be justified. Only thus can the grim steps that we are taking, and must continue to take, be made conformable to our individual integrity and our national soul.

The Senate has done the right thing. The House must carry on with that program. But it is all of us, in the end, who must make that program worthy.

Restrictions on American Troop Movements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relating to proposed restrictions on American troop movements, published in the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, on March 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE ON THE DOLE?

The fight in Congress to establish congressional restrictions on American troop movements confuses millions of Americans—including perhaps some Congressmen. Pictured by proponent as a step to restore some fundamental and arbitrary prerogative of the legislative branch, it may win sentimental support by folks who do not take the trouble to think the proposition through to the actual effect of putting our national defense on the dole, by way of speaking.

In a radio address last Sunday, former War Secretary Patterson reminded his hearers that "Congress never has undertaken to say where the military forces should be stationed. In the days of troubles along the Mexican border, Congress did not pass a law that only so many soldiers should be sent to the Rio Grande. In the First World War Congress did not set a ceiling on the number of troops to be sent to France. In the Second World War Congress did not take the responsibility of deciding what divisions should be assigned to Eisenhower, what divisions to MacArthur, what divisions to Mark Clark. Those decisions were left to the military leaders." And Mr. Patterson followed with this forthright statement:

"The setting of a limit by Congress on the number of troops to be furnished to Eisenhower's army would make it impossible for him to accomplish his mission."

When, and if, the showdown were forced by a Communist attack upon Western Europe, Congress presumably would take the Nation's overseas defense off the dole and vote its buildup to requisite strength. Public opinion at home would force that saving action, in all probability. But the time required for congressional debate and action to correct its error might be costly in lives and treasure both. And that would go double if the instinctive but wholly untrained, inexperienced, and uncommissioned admirals, generals, and other military geniuses in Senate and House insisted upon ordering their own defense plans written into the new legislation.

It is fervently to be hoped, for the national interest and safety, that Congress will refuse to "ration" our defense and make any transfer of needed forces subject to its approval or veto before orders can be issued to meet an urgent need or immediate threat. We don't believe the Congress majority really wants that arbitrary authority—or the awesome responsibilities that would go with it.

The Fulbright Exchange of Persons Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received recently from Prof. J. T. Salter, of the department of political science, University of Wisconsin, at Madison.

Professor Salter, who is one of the leading political scientists in the United States, has written me in detail of his experience in the Philippines as an exchange professor. His story demonstrates the value of the exchange of persons program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., February 13, 1951.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I am happy to write to you about my year in the Orient as a Fulbright professor at the University of the Philippines, for I consider it one of the best years I have lived.

I am strongly in favor of the Fulbright program, just as I am in favor of education, world communication, and travel.

This program is a two-faceted process for peace. It inevitably helps destroy ignorance, disease, and poverty. It does this in two ways. The professor that goes to a foreign land brings facts, ideas, opinions, viewpoints, guidance, and inspiration to the students and other people that attend his classes and public meetings. The professor's own mind is enriched by the questions, attitudes, and experiences he meets in the foreign land.

I learned this at the University of the Philippines and in a dozen or more other colleges and universities that I addressed while I was in the Philippines. Everywhere I found two things—that the Filipinos love the Americans and that they are ardent about getting an education. I think that the words America and United States have a glorious sound in Filipino ears because we brought the Filipinos education, democracy in education, and education in democracy.

The United States Army transport *Thomas* reached Manila in 1901. This ship carried more than 600 school teachers. They were scattered throughout the provinces and boarded in Filipino homes. According to Mr. Pastor Sison and other writers these early teachers made friends, because they brought a new and helpful meaning to the old Spanish concept of education, a concept that was narrowing and stifling, limiting education to the very few.

The American soldier, however, was there even before the Thomasite school teachers, and the soldier was a school teacher, too. He had come to fight the insurrectos and stayed to teach reading and writing and arithmetic. Commonwealth President Sergio Osmeña, in his loyalty-day speech in 1940, said that "the Filipinos will never forget the inspiring spectacle of American soldiers leaving their guns and as emissaries of peace and good will, with book in hand, repairing to public schools to teach the Filipino children the duties of free citizenship."

From that day until this, American school teachers have taught in the Philippines and Filipinos of both high and low degree are aware of it. The want is still great, however, and more teachers are needed, especially vocational, agricultural, health, taxation, administration, and dietary teachers. (I think that there is an urgent need for pertinent teachers in other countries in the Orient, too.)

Although the want for educational help is great it is no greater than the Filipino's capacity for appreciation. This appreciation is a charming thing to find in anyone. In the Philippines it is present in people of all walks of life. I think it is a national characteristic. I will mention an example or two.

I spoke to the students and other Americans at the American school in Manila on Constitution Day. I briefly referred to the Filipinos in the introduction to my talk. Later I gave a mimeographed copy of it to Dr. Gumersindo Garcia, a regent of the University of the Philippines, an outstanding physician and surgeon, and an outstanding Christian gentleman. He wrote to me October 4, 1949. I quote in part: "I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for your generous spirit of appreciation of us Filipinos. While I may say with humility and sincerity that we do not fully deserve that high commendation because we know our own weaknesses and shortcomings, and yet because of your sincerity in saying these nice things of us, we as a people cannot help but be grateful to you and be more inspired to become fully deserving of your high regard of us.

"But if we have become as you have expressed in a magnificent way in the first page of your address, we can also frankly

and truly say that we owe it in a large measure to you, our American friends who for almost half a century have labored with us together and worked out a way of life that is basically Christian and democratic in spirit and practice. For this blessing in life that we now enjoy, we are deeply grateful to you, our friends across the sea and to God who has made America the greatest Nation in the world today—not necessarily in wealth and power but in heart. May God bless America and keep her moral and spiritual leadership ever strong and dynamic in a world that is again being rocked by confusion, chaos, hatred, strifes, and rumors of war.

"With my best personal regards to you and to the other Fulbright professors present at that pleasant fellowship after the meeting of the board of regents last Thursday afternoon."

This letter is characteristic of the Filipino rather than unique. It might stand for several dozen other fine letters that I have received. Near the end of my year in the Philippines the professors in the political science department of my university arranged for a farewell dinner at the Aristocrat Restaurant on Dewey's Boulevard. All of us, there were about 12 in our party, met at the restaurant on time. But when we started to arrange ourselves for a photograph before dinner, we found that the youthful professor, Telesforo Ramos, was absent. We waited for more than half an hour. Ramos had been there, but no one knew where he had gone. Finally he came rushing in with a smile on his face and said that dinner would be served in a few minutes.

Later I was told what had happened. Professor Ramos is my good friend; he knows that I like fish best of all and that the apahap is the fish that I like best. So when Professor Ramos found that our restaurant had no apahap, although they had earlier assured him that they had plenty of them, he set out in search for one. He searched until he found one. It was very excellent.

I mention this simple story because it illustrates the great length to which a person in the Philippines will go to please his friend. There is something charming and wonderful about a people that will pay such a tribute to personal relations. Again this one example can stand for a hundred.

I unexpectedly arrived in Legaspi City in the middle of an afternoon. One of my friends there, Mr. Luis Duka, who is supervisor of vocational education, urged me to stay overnight at his home. The next day I learned that he had slept on the porch in order for me to sleep in his bed.

While I was in Sulu a number of the people in various places and at different times told me about an American teacher and friend who had long lived among them. His name is Edward M. Kuder. He is spoken of in Sulu and in parts of Mindanao as though he were another George Washington. I later met this splendid American in Manila and I found that he feels as kindly toward these people as they do toward him.

Mr. Reyes, an engineer in Luzon at Santa Cruz in Laguna, once told me that I was the innocent ambassador. I believe that every American in a foreign land is an ambassador whether he knows it or not. Mr. Kuder is my idea of the informal or innocent ambassador par excellence.

The Filipinos love music, dancing and dances, ceremony, and good food. Giving an address there has much glory attached to it regardless of the talk itself. There is likely to be a printed program. There may be 10 items listed, music by the orchestra, opening remarks by a member of the faculty, a folk dance or a moro dance by the gifted Santanina Tillah, a song by the glee club or by some other group, the introduction of the guest speaker by Mr. Vijandre, the college president, the speech The Individual and Democracy, then discussion is apt to follow and cause the rest of the program to be modified, because there are apt to be many questions and little time left after the questions have been discussed, or there might be another folk dance, closing remarks by Dean Selina L. Sta. Romana, and finally music.

This is not all. There is most certain to be a banquet with excellent food and more talk. One may think that after having spoken twice during the day, and after having listened to questions and the expressions of a variety of viewpoints, and after having stated his own viewpoints in connection with different questions, he would not be able to talk at the banquet. But when he is at the banquet and he feels the joy and enthusiasm of the people there, and he observes their eagerness to participate in some sort of a roundtable discussion, he finds that he has much to say. He could not remain quiet if he tried.

During the days and weeks that follow the talk there is likely to be one or more interesting letters. Jose Ramirez, the principal of the Albay high school and the editor of a magazine for teachers, the Albay Educator, wrote to me following one of my talks. I quote the first two paragraphs of his communication:

"I thank you very much for your letter of December 11 in which you enclosed Hayden's essay on democracy. I have read the essay three times already and I have learned a lot. I fully subscribe to the ideas embodied therein.

"Your address during the provincial meet will come out in the December issue of the Albay Educator. In this connection I wish to inform you that your address has been the talk of the teachers and the people who heard it. I have told them that it will come out in the magazine. This will give those who have had no chance to get a copy of your address an opportunity to read it in full. I hope more men like you will come to Albay. Your address was very instructive and educational."

I think that the letter is the man and the man is the people. I therefore quote another letter. This one from Mindanao. Its author is Mr. Deogracias L. Cajigas, principal of the Misamis Academy in the city of Ozamiz. It was written to Colonel Meader of the American Education Foundation in Manila, under the date of March 15, 1950. I quote: "With joy I wish to inform you that Prof. John T. Salter visited this school yesterday and at 11 a. m. gave an informative and inspiring talk on education and democracy, in which he stressed the responsibility of every individual to a democratic government. He also expressed his strong belief in the possibility of bringing the whole world into a brotherhood for the common cause.

"The teachers and students of this school were impressed by the speech and by the man. Today the speech is going to be discussed in all classes in history and government in this school. The teachers and students of this school like Prof. Salter for his simplicity, sincerity, and humor."

I had a bad head cold while I was at the University of the Philippines. I called at the office of Dr. Josefina Ayuayo in the student infirmary. This doctor gave me the most effective and satisfactory treatment for a cold that I have ever had anywhere. In fact if I had a cold now, and if I had my choice of doctors in the world, I would call on this Filipina doctor. Dr. Ayuayo would never accept one centavo in payment although she greatly helped me. Other Fulbright professors told me that Dr. Ayuayo would never accept payment from them either.

Dr. Rodriguez is a professor of dentistry in the university dental school. He took care of my teeth for 12 months. He would never send a bill; he would never accept a peso.

These two doctors are straws in the wind; they show something of the gratitude of the Filipinos for the presence of the Fulbright professors in the Philippines.

I have written about the students and faculty at the University of the Philippines in a report I gave to the Fulbright Committee secretary, Dr. Jack Bryan, in Manila. I stated there that everyone at the university from President Gonzales and Dr. Francisco Benitez on down and around, both faculty and students, gave me the happy impression that I was welcome, that their best was never too good for me, and that I was doing necessary work. They are people of imagination; they were willing to have me accept speaking engagements beyond the limits of the university campus.

I felt very much at home in the Philippines, and never more so than when I was in the university classroom.

The university is second to none in the Philippines. It is not large, there are fewer than 6,000 students, but its standards are jealously guarded. The students that are there, a handful out of about 20,000,000 people, are invariably proud of their presence in the University of the Philippines. Those that were enrolled in my classes made me feel that they were happy to be there.

These students were interested in my lectures and discussions. They were attentive, invariably eager and responsive. I taught government and politics; we devoted part of our time to the current scene. The students had questions and they had opinions; they were articulate. More than 90 percent of them spoke English well and many speak it better than do many university students in the United States. I enjoyed nearly every hour with them.

One day I asked my American government class what they thought of Americans. I asked the students not to sign their name. They liked the assignment, wrote freely, and in more than nine-tenths of the cases, in fact, in nearly every instance, the student expressed both liking and admiration for the Americans. One said that he felt toward America as a son feels toward his mother. This simple figure expressed the thought of many students.

The next term I repeated the experiment on the first day that the class met. Again I found almost every student enthusistically in favor of the Americans. In order to give you some concrete idea of these student expressions of opinion, I shall quote a representative one exactly as it was written by the student.

"Whenever I come across the word 'American,' I come to think also of the word 'democracy.' For me, the word 'American' has a big sense of meaning. Just to hear this word, my body trembles with joy and excitement. Wherever this word can be heard, four freedoms always go with it. I have a high regard for this people of the world. I began to think of this people consciously as bearers of freedom and democracy when after the end of the Spanish-American War, President McKinley instructed the American Military Governor in the Philippines with such never dying words. Such words are as follows: We are not messengers of a conquering nation but, the bearer of the blessings of liberty. They are the people who was responsible for the growth of democracy in the world, especially in the Philippines; they are the greatest of all humans."

I must bring this communication to a close. My justification for writing at even this length, if I can have any justification, is the belief that I have written about something that I never see in print. One of the great things about being a Fulbright professor in the Orient is to find out that the Oriental is a human being of charm and dignity. The Filipinos seem like Americans living in a tropical land. They are living in an underdeveloped country, just as the United States was an underdeveloped country in the eighteenth century. Many of the people in

the Philippines, however, are the most highly and beautifully developed human beings that exist anywhere on the earth's surface.

Even though this is true you may wonder about the other side of the picture, the publicized side. You may ask, for example, about the Huks and peace and order; the problem of economic development; the education of the farmer and the modernization of agricultural processes, materials and equipment; or the need for more education—vocational, health, dietary, and grade school—in a country where half the people cannot read or write; or you may inquire about the unprotected position of labor; and finally the general feeling of insecurity.

I agree that these subjects are important. The Bell report is one approach to them. This valuable report has great possibilities for the improvement of life and conditions in the Philippines. I hope that these possibilities are realized. The Filipinos are making a courageous fight to maintain self-government in their beloved country. They have the most difficult problem: the problem of an agricultural country that has been occupied by a cruel foe, bombed by both friend and foe, largely destroyed and impoverished, and then a few months after peace with the Japanese was achieved, and because of an earlier agreement with the United States, the Filipinos became politically independent. But, of course, they could not be so quickly independent of the ruins all about them. Their late hero, President Manuel Quezon, said that it would be better to be governed like hell by the Filipinos than run like heaven by the Americans. Yet a number of Filipinos have told me that it was most unfortunate for them to become independent right at the time that all the problems of reconstruction confronted them.

Sometimes at the end of a long discussion I have got the impression that the problems of life and government are more than an individual can bear. Just now Filipinos are faced with an uphill fight. The Fulbright professor that works with these people is going to feel doubly rewarded because their appreciation is as great as their need—and their need is great.

"I shall not try to tell that in a letter, but it is a story—the Philippines' story. The Philippine story has never been told. It has not even been hinted at in American newspapers. It is so easy to write an editorial and a news story about a disaster, but how can one write good news so that it is interesting?

For instance how can one celebrate and extoll the Filipinos for their great human qualities, for the richness of their personalities? As gracious human beings they have a charm that is not often found in this world. They love music, ceremonial, and they dance with rare grace, but they fight and die like heroes in war. They have an outflowing generosity that even now months after I have gone from the Philippines, causes me to ponder on how I can do something to repay them for their many kindnesses to me.

I know that all life is not sunshine; I have been in some unpleasant experiences, but I have had some unpleasant experiences in the United States, too. The thing that impresses me most is that the impressions that live with me are happy ones. They are the ones that most need telling, too. Especially in the case of the Philippines for it is far away. The printed word has done little in presenting a rounded picture of the land and the people.

Mine is not a rounded picture either, but there is much in it that is characteristic. I write of the thing that impressed me most—the rare fascination of a brave people earning their daily bread through hard work, and never failing to look up and smile and offer the American more than half of what they have; and if they have nothing, they are likely to get something and give it away.

I think that the Philippines will in the long future, as well as in the present and immediate future, illustrate the Biblical saying that if you cast your bread on the waters it will return sevenfold unto you. I know after my 1 year in the Philippines I would like to return and work with these people again.

Faithfully yours,

J. T. SALTER.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Opposition Not Quite Unanimous," by Lowell Mellett, published in the Washington Star of last Saturday, March 17. In the article Mr. Mellett comments upon the foreign policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION NOT QUITE UNANIMOUS—CHAIRMAN GABRIELSON'S ONE DEFINITE FOREIGN POLICY TURNS OUT TO BE MANY MORE THAN ONE

(By Lowell Mellett)

What this country needs today, according to Republican Chairman Guy Gabrielson, is a definite foreign policy and, he says, his party has got it. The chairman doesn't do his party justice. It not only has one definite foreign policy; it has several. The idea seems to be that, if one definite foreign policy is good, several definite foreign policies are better.

Former President Hoover says we should send no divisions to Europe. Former candidates Dewey and Stassen say we should send as many as General Eisenhower requires. Senator SALTONSTALL goes along with that. Senators TAFT, KEM, and WHERRY say we should send no more than six divisions or 20 percent of our total or 10 percent of the European total.

Senator TAFT says the line against communism can be held without the six divisions. Mr. Hoover says it cannot be held even with the six divisions.

Senator DUFF says there should be no political interference with the military judgment. Senator TAFT says the sending of troops without congressional approval would put a dent in the Constitution. Governor Warren says Stalin would be happy to know we wouldn't send any without first debating the matter in Congress.

Senator TAFT finds General Eisenhower's first report hazy and indefinite. Senator SALTONSTALL finds it crystal clear.

Sending four more divisions over would lead to a land war with Russia and the massacre of American boys, Mr. Hoover thinks. Failing to do so (with congressional approval) would be a blow to European morale, in Senator TAFT's opinion.

Senator TAFT says a 3,000,000-man Army is big enough. Should have 100 divisions, says Governor Dewey. That's 6,000,000 men, says Speaker MARTIN.

Name calling has no place in foreign policy debate, says Senator NIXON. The crimson clique in our Government engineered the Communist victory in China and signed the death warrants of every young man who dies in Kore , says Senator MCCARTHY.

Senator TAFT says President Truman is trying to force us into a war with Russia. He also says Mr. Truman is guilty of abject appeasement of Russia. The self-selected successor to Senator VANDENBERG says on one day that he wishes we could pull out of Korea and on the next day that we should capture Pyongyang.

Senator WHERRY argues we should prepare to pulverize Russia from the air without fighting on the ground. Mr. Hoover likes the idea of a western Gibraltar protected by air and sea power. Utmost folly, says Governor Dewey, to depend solely on air and sea power.

Senator KNOWLAND says Western Europe and maybe even Great Britain would have gone Communist had it not been for our economic aid. Senator KEM condemns the Marshall plan, and Senator TAFT would abolish ECA.

We can never subscribe to a backyard defense of our country and our homes, says Senator SALTONSTALL. We can defend the United States more effectively on Cape Cod than in Europe, says Senator TAFT. Cape Cod is right in Senator SALTONSTALL's personal backyard.

So we find the loyal opposition performing its proper function, furnishing sound, constructive criticism of the administration in office and prepared, if called on, to give the country any one of a number of definite foreign policies. President Truman and the country, should be grateful.

Mike Masaoka, Loyal Japanese-American, Lobbies Without Votes, Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article about my friend, Mike Masaoka, who is lobbying in Washington for the loyal Japanese-Americans. In this day and age when almost everyone picks on lobbyists, it is refreshing to note one at least who is doing an excellent job for his people, without money.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIKE MASAOKA, LOYAL JAPANESE-AMERICAN, LOBBIES WITHOUT VOTES, MONEY

(By Arthur Edson)

WASHINGTON.—It isn't a headline-making congressional hearing. No mink coats. No deep freezes. No dancing girls. But to energetic, 35-year-old Mike Masaoka, the hearing on changes in our immigration and naturalization laws is of topflight importance. He hasn't missed a meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and he doesn't intend to.

I thought you might be interested in Mike because he doesn't fit in the picture that usually is painted of lobbyists. Like many another person working here to influence legislation, Mike has no money to throw around—and he doesn't control enough votes to swing a single congressional election.

All Mike has is his own seemingly boundless energy, a cheerful friendliness, and, he quickly points out, "a cause that is just." That may be enough.

Mike's cause may be better understood by looking first at Mike.

The Masaoka family moved from Fresno to Utah. Mike went to school there, was graduated from the University of Utah. Everything was going along nicely until December 7, 1941.

Japanese were put in detention camps. Japanese-Americans, though citizens, were suspected of treachery. Mike was jailed nine times.

He decided the best way Japanese-Americans could prove their loyalty would be to have a fighting force of their own. The Four Hundred and Forty-second Japanese American Regimental Combat Team was the result.

The first volunteer, Mike Masaoka. The second, third, fourth, and fifth volunteers: Mike's brothers.

The combat team had a terrific record. "We helped rescue the Texans," he says proudly, "and I am now a honorary citizen of Texas."

The Four Hundred and Forty-second won mecals by the bucketfull.

The cost was high. Its casualties ran higher than 300 percent, counting replacements.

The Masaokas won 30 medals. But one brother was killed, another suffered wounds that left him 100 percent disabled, another was 40 percent disabled.

Mike came home to work for the Japanese-American Citizens League and its 10,000 members.

The league has two objectives that are under consideration at the present hearing. In the order of their importance, these are:

Full naturalization rights for Japanese. No Japanese ever has been allowed to become a citizen, although, of course, his children who are born here are citizens. There are around 76,000 Japanese aliens in the United States and Hawaii.

"This means that my mother, who has been here since 1907 and who had five sons in the Army, can't become a citizen," Mike says. "I don't think that's fair."

The league wants the old Oriental Exclusion Act repealed so that Japanese can immigrate. Even if this is done, only 185 would be allowed to come in each year under the quota system.

"It isn't many," Mike says. "But it's the principle that counts. We think this law, which made the Japanese feel inferior, played a part in bringing on the last war."

Mike thinks he had one real break. He was named Masaru Masaoka, but the members of his Boy Scout troop couldn't pronounce it. So they all put names in a hat, and he drew out the one that would be his.

Mike has had the name legalized, and he feels he nailed the right to it down further when he was wounded during the war.

"I'm part Irish now," he says. "I needed a transfusion, and the blood was supplied by an Irishman."

Defense of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Diplomats and Legislators at Odds on Allied Lineup," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Sunday Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMATS AND LEGISLATORS AT ODDS ON ALLIED LINEUP—STATE DEPARTMENT WOULD LIMIT DEFENDERS TO PACT NATIONS, BRUSHING OFF OUTSIDERS

(By Constantine Brown)

The conflict between the State Department and Congress over how to defend Europe is likely to be intensified in weeks to come. So long as the cold war continues across the Atlantic, diplomatic considerations will prevail over military realities.

This was brought out sharply during the "great debate," when all military witnesses testified that they wanted badly, if political considerations can be overcome—to have the armies of Spain, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey made a part of the common defense against communism.

General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, put the idea picturesquely: "In a barroom brawl you want as many chairs at hand as possible."

In spite of public and private advice to the State Department by Members of Congress to do something to increase the defense potential of Europe, these pleas have brought no results. The State Department has given the most sympathetic consideration to this problem, but our foreign policymakers must take into account the feeling and political conditions of our Atlantic Pact allies.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

The position of the executive and legislative branches of the Government can be summed up as follows:

The State Department is intent on keeping the North Atlantic Pact as it is at present. It wants Congress to appropriate billions of dollars for strengthening that organization and pays little attention to the nations which are not members of the exclusive club. And exclusive it is, indeed.

According to the charter of that organization, the acceptance of new members must be voted unanimously. This means that each of the 12 members has a veto. If Iceland, for instance, with no military strength whatever, does not want Turkey with her 20 divisions as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, its negative vote annuls all the affirmative votes of the other member nations.

Confronted with the testimony of the outstanding military men of the United States, who will have to bear the brunt of the fighting if the cold war becomes a shooting war, the State Department hides behind this provision for unanimity in NATO.

It says to the irate Senators that there is nothing it would like better than to have these Mediterranean nations, with their large organized manpower, on our side. But what can Americans do when Britain and France oppose so sternly the inclusion of Spain and Turkey in the defense setup? What more can the United States do than it has done in the last 3 months for the inclusion of Germany? France has put up a road block against the effective alinement of Western Germany with NATO and it is not customary for our diplomats to use a blackjack on our good allies.

It will take time and infinite patience, our Congressmen are told, to iron out these difficulties which are inherent in the psychological makeup of Europe, where neighbors have been fighting each other for so many centuries. It is a miracle, which shows the persuasive skill of our diplomats, that we have been able to organize even the Western European powers into a bloc. France and Italy, for instance, have been antagonists for many years, but are honeymooning now under our benevolent eye.

But the Senate and House, where more than $7,000,000,000 will have to be voted to organize "solidly" the defense of Western Europe, are not likely to be patient. This was shown strongly recently when the mildly amended Wherry resolution concerning the dispatch of American troops to Europe was approved over the violent protests of the State Department's spokesman in the Senate, Chairman CONNALLY, of the Foreign Relations Committee.

CONGRESS IMPATIENT

The legislators' patience is growing thin. They accept the thesis that America's security will be adversely affected if Western Europe collapses under the blows of the Russian hordes. And for this reason they are willing to put no hurdles in the way of the administration, provided our foreign-policymakers follow a realistic course.

In keeping with what the representatives of the Nation have been told at open and executive sessions, they are convinced that partial defense of Europe cannot be successful. They do not believe that Europe can avoid catastrophe if her defenses are concentrated only in the west.

Moreover, they do not see any indication that the members of the North Atlantic Pact, with the possible exception of Britain, are doing anything positive to increase their defense potential. It is true that there has been a spurt of energy since former President Hoover made his first speech last December and the foreign ambassadors reported that it had been well received by the American people.

Our allies realized then that, unless they activated their military preparations in some tangible way, there was a grave risk of their being cut off from the vast sums the American taxpayer is pouring into their countries. But when assurances came from Washington that, in spite of Mr. Hoover and his henchmen in the Senate and House, the needed appropriations would be rammed through anyway, the enthusiasm to prepare cooled.

Despite all the optimism of our foreign-policy architects in the State Department and other Government agencies about the remarkable changes in western Europe, there is nothing so far to confirm the reports of such changes. Political conditions in France and other continental European countries tend to slow down any quick rearmament move, for the time being at least.

None of these western European governments actually has tapped its manpower for military service. According to factual reports from Paris, the 15 divisions which former Premier Plevin promised to have ready by 1953 will not be ready by then.

LOOPHOLE IN TREATY

Nothing concrete is expected in French armed preparations, except possibly some slow-motion rearmament, before the French elections some time this summer. Short of actual aggression by the U. S. S. R., no French politician will dare put hundreds of thousands of men into uniform until they have seen the results of the election. And when France moves slowly the smaller countries follow her lead.

Under these conditions, and because there is some danger that Moscow may decide to strike sooner than the western European political optimists expect, Congress wishes to marshal for the defense of Europe—and thereby the defense of the United States—some nations which have an organized manpower of more than 1,000,000 men, but which do not have the equipment necessary to make them a truly efficient force.

The legislators admit that the veto power of the members of NATO cannot be changed without scrapping the whole treaty. But there is nothing in that treaty to prevent the United States from extending help to

other nonmember nations. There is nothing in the Atlantic Pact to prevent this country from making mutual defense agreements with other nations.

In the past, when we stuck to the idea that this country should not enter into any entangling alliances in peacetime, such mutual-defense pacts were inadmissible. But we broke away from that American tradition when the Senate approved the Atlantic Pact, in which we became full-fledged allies of the 11 Western European countries.

There is no reason, our legislators say, why we should not help and be helped in turn by nations which do not belong to NATO, if such help is necessary to further the security of the free nations. We cannot force the British and French to accept the Spaniards as allies. But neither can our western European friends take offense if we wish to strengthen the walls against a Russian invasion.

The case of Turkey is remarkable. The Turks are receiving some assistance from us under the Truman doctrine.

TURKS SEEK ALLIANCE

According to every official and unofficial American who has visited Turkey, she has not squandered a nickel of the money given her. The Turks have today unquestionably the best army in Europe. They have made repeated requests that they be included in the North Atlantic Pact. This request, mildly supported by our Government, was turned down by the other members.

Recently the Turkish Government has suggested to Washington that a mutual-defense alliance be concluded. This proposal is receiving the usual treatment: Sympathetic consideration.

The situation of Turkey, however, is totally different from that of Spain. Turkey has had for more than a decade a mutual-assistance treaty with the French and British. They want a similar treaty with us, because they believe that in this manner the confidence of their people will be further bolstered.

Since the treaties with Britain and France are in force today, there is no reason why this country should not conclude a similar pact. Yet the State Department is reluctant to do more than give Ankara's plea sympathetic consideration. Our policy makers know that they need not expect any opposition from the Senate, which would welcome such an agreement with pleasure.

This attitude of the State Department is likely to bring a head-on clash with Congress in the near future. Our diplomats are wedded to the idea that we must do nothing to irk our allies. Being perennial optimists they still believe that something might be done to soften the men in the Kremlin, if we avoid doing anything rash. They know that our defense plans in Western Europe, as they stand today, are less irksome to Moscow than if this country entered into definite mutual-defense agreements with countries like Spain and Turkey.

The Senators take a "Missouri approach" to diplomacy. They accept the fact that we are at war with the Communists in one part of the world and almost at war in another section. They believe that only a strong defense, not limited to the atomic bomb but including all the nations which want to preserve their liberties, can be a deterrent to the power-hungry Muscovites. Hence, they say, what is the good of dilly-dallying with diplomatic formulas and approaches which have failed completely in the last 6 years? Let's arm, they say, since this is necessary, but also put our chips in other places where they will bring the best results.

Whether our Western European Allies like it or not, we should provide other nations with the means to fight. A couple of billion dollars spent on the Mediterranean nations conceivably might save us many other billions in cash and tens of thousands of lives in the future.

Reforming RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reforming RFC," from the March 12, 1951, edition of the Tampa Morning Tribune, of Tampa, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFORMING RFC

Demands for reorganizing or completely liquidating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation naturally follow the Senate subcommittee's probe of the operation of that far-reaching agency of the Federal Government. The disclosures of the exercise of undue influence, of private profit, of political chicanery, brought out in the committee hearings, has provoked Nation-wide criticism.

First definite move comes from Senator KEM, of Missouri, who introduced a joint resolution for "termination of the powers and succession" of the RFC. He termed the agency "this Royal Fruit Cake," and said that a fundamental principle of American constitutional government is that "control of the Federal purse strings should remain firmly in the hands of the elected representatives of the people in Congress."

President Truman last year proposed to transfer the RFC to the Commerce Department, but the Senate vetoed that plan. At the same time Congress allowed a second Presidential plan, to shift the Federal Mortgage Association away from RFC to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to go into effect. A new Presidential reorganization proposal, now awaiting action in Congress, would put the RFC under a single administrator.

The lending authority of RFC was extended to June 30, 1954, with two additional years for liquidation, by a bill approved May 25, 1948. Congress at that time placed a top limit of $1,500,000,000 on outstanding RFC loans and investments at any one time.

Under earlier statutes the RFC would have expired June 30, 1947. On that day, President Truman signed a bill giving the agency a 1-year extension of life, but ordering the rapid liquidation of its outstanding loans and security holdings and limiting new business to a total of two billion. The legislation provided also that no new loans could be made to foreign governments, to States, or on real estate.

What was the origin of RFC? It was originally established by Congress in 1932 to meet financial emergencies of that period.

President Hoover was mainly responsible for the birth of the agency. He intended it to function to shore up banks, railroads, other institutions which needed new capital to weather the economic collapse of 1929–33. Even advances to States for relief purposes were made as loans. In 1933 an article in the Washington Post said: "Through pouring funds into the economic organization at any legal available point, it has become a positive inflationary force."

The RFC claims that during the course of its operations 90 percent of its loans have been to small business, loans of less than $100,000, and about 51 percent to companies wanting to borrow less than $25,000. Yet, in the last 6 months of 1950, of the total of $140,987,000 lent to business, only $40,011,000 was in amounts of $100,000 or less.

The record of RFC has been spotted with questionable loans and political manipulations. In reviewing recent transactions a few days ago we contended that Congress ought to abolish it. The more we hear of it the more convinced we become on that point.

Unification of Eire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very fine and appropriate article which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Friday, March 16, 1951, by Mr. William James Conlon, of Lynn, Mass.:

LYNN MAN WRITES ON UNIFICATION OF EIRE

(With St. Patrick's Day on Saturday, William James Conlon, of 23 Breed Street, wrote the following letter to the editor of the Telegram-News, which he deemed appropriate to the season. The letter tells of the struggle of Ireland for its unification. Three bills have been filed before the Congress of the United States by sponsors, Congressmen FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; LANE, of Massachusetts, and House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Boston.)

End of the World War. France repaid for her aid to the struggling colonies. America's contributions to the Allied cause. What will be England's response? Self-determination by all nations, great and small. The only means by which permanent peace can be secured. Ireland's claims to nationhood and to the gratitude of America.

Now that the terrible struggle in Europe has drawn to a close, and America has triumphantly vindicated the justice of the cause which impelled her to war on German autocracy, it is pertinent to recall the situation at present existing in Ireland. Much has been said and properly said since the outbreak of the war, of the debt of gratitude which we owed to France because of the services rendered by that nation in the struggle for American liberty. America has well disproved the assertion that "republics are ungrateful"; the American people have not forgotten the favors that were done for them by the gallant French Nation; and in this, her hour of strength, America has well repaid the debt at the outset of the Revolution. America appealed to Ireland; and not in vain, for Ireland's sons answered the call with the same cheerful readiness that they have responded to all similar appeals in the wars in which America has been engaged, and the words of Lord Chatham in the House of Commons in 1775, that "the Irish are with the Americans to a man," are just as applicable today.

Irishmen and their descendants in every land under the sun rejoice that the light of liberty is to shine once again for the oppressed nations of Europe, and especially that this happy result has been achieved through America's participation in the war. But what of Ireland itself, one of the small nations of Europe? She contributed more fighting men to the American Revolution than even the gallant French, and America owes more to Ireland for the success of that revolution than to any other European country, for in the day when it was unfashionable and dangerous to speak of American independence the Irish immigrants and their

sons were planting the seeds of liberty on this continent. Ireland has waged the longest and most bitter struggle for human liberty and complete freedom and her people still cry out to their American friends. Will the call be heard in America as the call of the Americans was heard in Ireland 163 years ago? There is every reason to hope that it will; that the great-hearted American people will pay the debt their country owes to Ireland for the part played by her sons in the achievement of their liberties and that the American doctrine of human freedom will be consistently applied to all, including the Ireland of Sorrows, and how may that debt be paid? Our great President has solemnly declared that after this war (namely, World War I) "the small nationalities shall have the right to self-determination," and that this conference shall be settled at the peace conference and Ireland has every reason to expect that her inalienable right to self-determination shall not be excluded from this peace conference. A well-known American jurist, a serious student of this question, thus expresses himself on the present relations between England and Ireland, especially as they apply to the forthcoming peace conference, and the timeliness of his views justifies their citation here.

Surely every American and every lover of liberty and humanity throughout the world is anxious that this should be the last great war and that peace and good will among the various races of mankind shall permanently take the place of the rule of force and of the horrors of war. How can this end be attained until and unless all peoples and all nations are permitted to enjoy the right of self-determination and to select for themselves the form of government under which they are to live. We entered World War I to put an end to autocracy and to bring into existence the rule of democracy. That does not merely mean the end of German autocracy, or British autocracy, or Russian autocracy, but of all autocracy. It does not mean to bring freedom to the Poles alone, but to bring freedom to all oppressed peoples and to all downtrodden nations. And what people deserve such consideration at our hands as do the Irish?

What other land has sent us sons, who have been so numerous and so constant in our behalf, in every hour of our existence, and in every battle for our honor and our flag. Not alone were they in great numbers in our Revolutonary Armies. Not alone did they make certain the success of the Revolution, and since then render decisive aid in every war in which we have engaged, but their services in times of peace in every walk of life, in the development of our great country have been well nigh priceless to us.

And this not alone in the material things, the building of our railroads and bridges, and roads and cities, and the clearing of our forests, but even more, in the development of our ideals and of the spiritual side of our nature—that side which made us enter this gigantic war in order to bring to others that liberty which we value above all other riches. Think of their contribution to our national character; their indomitable perserverance; their indestructible optimism, the charm and vivacity of their manner; even in dark hours of gloom and storm; their inexhaustible humor and their brilliant wit; and above all, their belief in the invisible world around us in every great contest among men. We have shown the world that we are not ungrateful to France, that great country whose service to us we have now many times repaid. Can we afford to let history record that it was only to the strong that we were grateful, and that in our hour of victory and triumph, when the whole world acclaimed our power and our strength we turned a deaf ear to the call of the people whose blood has helped us so greatly to make us what we are today, and refuse to pay Ireland the debt so long owed?

Let it not be so, for in that direction, not alone, lies ingratitude—(basest of vices) but danger for the future of all mankind. While Ireland in her present mutiliated and partitioned condition, stands festering like a great cancer in the side of England, there can be no security or peace for England or for Europe.

English statesmen have tried through the centuries, every method suggested by ingenuity or force or craft, to settle this question—except the method of leaving Ireland to the Irish; and the Premier of England was forced to confess recently that the people of Ireland are now as dissatisfied with England and her rule as they were in the days of Cromwell. "It is entirely within the bounds of propriety for America to remind England of the situation as it existed in the spring of 1917 with England with her back to the wall, according to the admissions of her own generals and statesmen found herself beaten and practically at the end of her resources in which crucial moment America entered the war and brought victory and triumph to the allied cause. The former enemies became the cobelligerents of the great World War. The despised and derided colonies became through liberty and opportunity to develop their resources, the saviors in the great hour of fate.

Had Washington failed, who can say that America today would have been much more powerful than Canada or Australia, and under such conditions that would have been the fate of the Allies?

Justice demands that Ireland should have the same right accorded to her as that which is to be given to the other small nations of Europe. Experience, dearly bought by England, suggests the wisdom of turning an age-long enemy into a friendly neighbor. Gratitude and consistency call on America to help Ireland to liberty now that we have it in our power to do so.

The history of mankind and the cry of humanity which calls out for permanent peace to end all wars, both urge that only by self-determination can tyranny and war be banished from the face of the earth. A thousand selfish interests probably will cry out in England, now that her hour of peril has passed, to make no concessions to America on this question. But that extraordinary genius which has watched over England's destinies for the last three centuries and which has made her outlive trials and survive storms that seemed certain to engulf her may raise up among her sons, one who will remind her that it would be well to listen to that great country, but for which she would have gone to inevitable destruction, and to do now in her hour of triumph that act of justice which she has so long deferred.

And that act may result in building up another great and prosperous country near her shores, whose commerce would be with all mankind instead of with her alone, but the portion of state commerce which she would secure would be greater than the whole of that which she now monopolizes. It may result in bringing into existence a government in Ireland which would mean the creation of a hundred ties that would make for friendliness and neighborly kindness and of contributions to mankind in the benefits of which England would necessarily share, that would outweigh many times any losses she would sustain. It may indeed result in loosening her control of the seas, but it would remove the enmity and hostility of England's governing classes that have gone wherever the Irish or their descendants are to be found on earth—and where is it they are not to be found? And such an act will do more to remove the differences that have existed between America and England than all the other things that she can do in that it will satisfy the vast body of Americans of the sincerity of England in talking of self-determination of small nations.

Possibly England may be told by her zealous friends here that America has been won so completely from her old ideas that to all intents and purposes the separation of the two countries is a thing of the past.

But let her make no such a mistake. Never underneath the surface was the spirit of American nationality so vibrant and so strong; never was there so much pride in what our country has been able to do and is determined to do for the cause of liberty and mankind. Never so certain the reaction which will come against any failure, unselfishly to keep promises and professions, made in the hour of danger and distress. America has awakened for the first time to a realization of her wonderful strength. Not merely in resources, but in the moral leadership of the progressiveness of the world which will remain with her so long, and only so long as she is faithful to the eternal truths in that immortal document—in the common language it is well to remember of America and England—the Declaration of Independence, which startled the tyrants of mankind and started the procession of peoples toward liberty which should not and will not end until all governments on earth derive their powers from the consent of those whom they govern.

In that path lie safety and security for mankind, peace and good will among men and freedom from war with its attendant horrors, an end to the colossal armaments and preparations for war which bring in their train the overtaxation which breeds anarchy and hatred of all authority.

The United Nations and the rule of justice of which idealists all over the world are dreaming, and the permanent peace which will secure to England, as to all the rest of the world the exemption which she needs from another test of her strength in arms. May her statesmen have the courage to rise to the occasion and by their devotion to justice and the fulfillment of their pledges, help our great President at this peace conference to heal this cancerous ulcer in the side of England because a just peace will be a blessing to all mankind.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM JAMES CONLON.

LYNN, MASS.

Morano a Peace Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of March 17, 1951:

MORANO A PEACE OFFICER

When any delegation goes to Washington in the future to try to put pressure on Congressman MORANO, of our district, they'd better think twice, especially if that delegation should represent an outfit already branded by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the State Department as subversive, or a Communist-front.

A so-called peace crusade was put on in Washington and a group of these people who seem to have nothing else to do but waste their own time and annoy other people, called on Congressman MORANO. The Daily Worker had previously announced

that the delegates were to proceed straight to appointments with their Congressmen.

This gang had no appointment with Mr. MORANO. He wouldn't make one because he said, they are not a legitimate group, and Mr. MORANO does not hold conferences with groups which are—not legitimate.

So when they stormed his office, he promptly ordered the demonstrators out, and when they refused to get out, he called the cops. Great. There is absolutely no sense in trying to reason with these people, or to give them the consideration that legitimate delegations deserve. Congressman MORANO is busy, too busy to be wasting the people's time on malcontents who are devoted to Moscow.

The demonstrators belong to that same gang who circulated the alleged peace appeal which insulted the good name of Stockholm. They say they're not Communists, but we'll take the word of the State Department and a committee of Congress in place of their's any day.

The delegates got a brush-off everywhere they went in Washington. The days when people of such minds could strut around the Nation's Capital as if they were getting ready to take it over are gone. Everyone understands the Moscow interpretation of the word "peace" and this crusade, like all their other attempts to cause trouble in this country, flopped.

Mr. MORANO may not be the biggest man in Washington, physically, but he proved to be big enough to handle a gang that was trying to disturb his peace and his work as a Member of Congress. Good for him.

Farm Bureau Chief Punctures Belief Farmers Getting Rich on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the Greensburg (Ind.) Daily News of March 14, 1951:

FARM BUREAU CHIEF PUNCTURES BELIEF FARMERS GETTING RICH ON FOOD PRICES

(By Hassil E. Schenck)

Food prices are sensitive during inflationary times, just as are the prices of other items that make up our standard of living. Food comes from the farm. So, when food prices increase and everyone must have food, it is natural for consumers to assume that farmers are getting rich. It is understandable why consumers do not know about farming and farm business and reach such misleading conclusions.

Mr. and Mrs. Average Farmer got a terrific jolt when they closed 1950 accounts and began figuring their Federal income-tax reports. Latest Government figures show that Indiana farmers had a total cash gross income of 10 percent less in 1950 than in 1949, but the prices farmers paid for the many, many farm expense items jumped during the year of 1950 an average of 19 percentage points.

Government computations show that the farmer's total income is derived from only about 52 or 53 cents of the consumer's food dollar. The other 47 to 48 cents go to processors, jobbers, wholesalers, handlers, and retailers—persons operating between the farm and the grocery.

NET INCOME

Here is the way the farm business shaped up for Mr. and Mrs. Forrest M. Alexander, who rent farm land near Indianapolis. Alexander, while preparing his income-tax return not long ago, noted with satisfaction that his gross income in 1950 was $19,381—or nearly $6,000 more than the $13,831 taken in during 1949.

But imagine Alexander's depressed feeling when he learned that his net income or profit, after deducting his 1950 farm expenses, amounted to only $3,866 last year, compared to $5,891.23 in 1949—or a 40-percent reduction in net income.

This happened on a general livestock and dairy farm at the very time when the average city consumer was paying higher food prices and blaming the farmer for the rise.

What about those farm expenses? Well, here is how prices of things farmers buy for food production compared for February of 1951 with February of 1950.

A ton of 3-12-12 fertilizer is now 12.4 percent higher in price than a year ago; a bushel of alfalfa seed, 19 percent higher; a new tractor, 7 to 10 percent higher; motor oil for the tractor 12.8 percent higher; dairy feed, 23 percent higher; aluminum roofing for barns, 8 percent higher; livestock fencing, 11 percent higher; and barbed wire, 13 percent higher; and poultry feed, 18 percent higher.

Few city people know that the net income of farmers has been steadily dropping since 1947 when it was eighteen billions. The figures are $16,500,000,000 in 1948, $14,000,000,000 in 1949, and $13,000,000,000 last year.

Meanwhile, Government figures on corporate profits, after taxes, for the Nation showed: $18,500,000,000 in 1947, $20,900,000,000 in 1948, $17,000,000,000 in 1948, and $21,900,000,000 in 1950. And remember that was after taxes, too.

The national average hourly factory wage rates increased from $1.24 in 1947 to $1.46 in 1950, with the December 1950 average reaching $1.54 per hour.

When you compare or contrast income with the average of 1935 to 1939, we find: Agriculture getting two and one-half times as much as last year, labor receiving three and one-half times as much, and corporate profits amounting to more than six times as much.

Farmers have no control over the price of food. Farmers do not set the price on their farm products. But, if consumers think meat prices are unreasonable, they could correct the situation overnight simply by refusing to buy meat and turning, instead, to cheaper and equally nutritious and palatable proteins which are in abundance, such as eggs.

Consumers always have many alternatives when their favorite foods seem too high in price. That is not so with farm supplies. There is no alternative to tractors, tires for farm tools, fertilizer, and seeds and fencing. If these items appear too high in price, his only alternative as a farmer is not to buy them—and thereby reduce food production.

Forest Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following testimony which I delivered before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Friday, March 9, on the subject of forest conservation:

FOREST CONSERVATION

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure and privilege to appear before this distinguished committee a number of times in recent years in support of appropriations for forest conservation. That is my purpose again today.

STATE AND PRIVATE FOREST COOPERATION

In the past two Congresses I have cosponsored legislation that strengthened the cooperative Federal-State forestry programs. Iowa does not boast the extensive forested areas that some of the Southern and Western States enjoy, but we do have more than 2,000,000 acres of productive timberland, largely owned by farmers and other small landholders. And we in Iowa have become increasingly aware that proper management, selective tree planting, forestry education, and fire protection are essential in maintaining the productivity of our woodlands.

We now have five farm foresters employed in my State. I have followed their progress closely, and I may report that they are rendering a real service to the small woodland owners. I urge the committee to give full consideration to the splendid work of the farm foresters. By increasing the flow of forest products, they are making a significant contribution to the defense effort.

Because of the national emergency, Mr. Chairman, the protection of our timber resources against destruction by fire is especially important. The Clarke-McNary Act, as amended, contains a $15,000,000 authorization for the Federal-State cooperative fire program in the next fiscal year. In view of the steadily rising costs of fire-fighting equipment and materials, I believe the committee should give serious consideration to appropriating the full amount of the existing authorization. An adequately financed fire-control program will benefit the Nation as a whole; and certainly the State forestry departments are cooperating wholeheartedly in the program. Last year, for example, the State of Iowa spent $12,000 as compared to a Federal contribution of $9,800 in protecting State-owned and private forest lands against fire.

NATIONAL FOREST FIRE PROTECTION

Of course, fire control is just as important in our national forests as on State and private lands. Consequently, I strongly recommend an adequate appropriation to protect our national forests; and I want to direct the committee's attention to the fact that forest-fire protection is especially important in time of war because of the very serious threat of sabotage. Every time we save an acre of public timber from destruction by fire we are saving a resource that not only contributes to the defense effort but is a source of income to the Federal Treasury.

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER USE

In this connection, I should like to point out that the Federal Treasury is already benefiting to the extent of some $40,000,000 annually by the sale of timber from our national forests. And bearing in mind the urgent need for a steady flow of forest products in defense industries, it is my considered judgment that timber sales from our national forests should be maintained at the highest possible level consistent with good forest management.

FOREST-DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

As a matter of fact, lumber experts have informed me that the yearly income to the Federal Treasury from sales of public timber could be increased by $20,000,000 if roads were constructed into national-forest areas now inaccessible. The committee would do

well to explore the feasibility of providing funds for building such access roads. Money so appropriated would be an investment in America's future, and a profitable investment at that from the standpoint of the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, on other occasions I have come before the committee in support of various forestry programs. This year, in particular, I urge special attention to the budget items for farm forestry, fire control, and access roads. These are vital conservation programs in my opinion, and the wise conservation of our natural resources was never of more urgent importance to the welfare of the Nation.

Thank you for this opportunity of appearing before your committee.

Address of Gov. James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of James F. Byrnes, Governor of South Carolina, to the North Carolina Citizens Association at Raleigh, N. C., on March 14, 1951:

The people of the two Carolinas have somewhat the same ancestry and history. Throughout their history they have shown their devotion to the spirit of independence. It was the love of liberty that inspired them to fight at Kings Mountain and Fort Sumter. It is the love of liberty that today inspires their sons to deeds of heroism in Korea.

Their ancestors, the men and women who came to settle the province of Carolina, came not to establish a government. Their real motive was to escape government. Many of them had suffered from the exercise of concentrated power. In that day power was concentrated in a king. Power centered in a bureaucracy can be equally as despotic as power centered in a king.

As those early settlers increased in number, they realized some government was necessary and with great caution they distilled the experiences of mankind and adopted the Constitution with its Bill of Rights.

North Carolina did not ratify the Constitution until it included that Bill of Rights. They wanted to make certain that the liberty they sought in this New World should not be surrendered to any government.

Those early settlers did not teach their children to seek security; they taught them to look for opportunity.

They believed that liberty must be exercised by all individuals; that men cannot safely transfer their liberties to a few individuals to be held in trust for them.

They were right. In this world of ours men must assume responsibility for their own welfare or they will have only such degree of welfare as may be bestowed upon them by those temporarily in power.

Some people may be impatient with these views. They may regard them as old-fashioned. They may argue that conditions have changed. That is true, but human behavior has not changed in its fundamentals.

The failure of a man to stand on his own feet, to assume the responsibilities of a man, and to discharge the duties of a man, will weaken him now just as it did in the scorned horse and buggy days and in the early days of the Republic.

If the age of our Constitution is to be held against the soundness of its fundamental principles, then what about the age of our religion? If time invalidates truth in one field, will it not do so in other fields?

Carolinians—North and South—have believed in the fundamentals of the Christian religion and have believed, too, in the fundamentals of the Constitution of the United States. Of course, there are people in other sections who scornfully refer to the South as the backward South and the Bible Belt. As long as they couple the two, I do not seriously object, for I do not believe, after all, that a people who read the Bible and humbly try to follow in the footsteps of the Master are such a backward people.

It was only a few years ago that a Commission reported to the President of the United States that the South was economic problem No. 1. Some of the writers and politicians who then bemoaned our economic and politic plight, today are seeking legislation in their States to prevent the removal of industries to the Carolinas and other Southern States.

We have reason to be proud of our progress in the Carolinas. Less than a century ago, because we believed in the preservation of the rights and powers of the States under the Constitution, we were at war with other States of the Union. We suffered disastrous defeat.

At the end of 4 years the soldiers of the Confederacy returned to their homes having lost all save honor and spirit. They had no equipment to operate factories or to cultivate farms. They had no labor. The slaves who had previously worked our farms had been freed.

Unlike the Germans, Italians and Japanese, the defeated South received no Marshall aid. The United States Government, however, did send an occupation army, guarding the right of the carpetbagger and the freed slave to administer government. Our cry of cruelty and corruption was regarded by some in the North as the cry of poor losers, and by the other, as a fate we deserved.

But, as in all history, out of adversity there came strength. By our own efforts, we made progress even in the reconstruction period. And, to the glory of Southern women, be it said, we preserved the racial integrity of the white race.

The history of the Carolinas since the period of reconstruction is the story "From Rags to Riches." It is a Cinderella story. It is a true story.

Years ago North Carolina achieved a balanced economy. You are still progressing in industry and in agriculture. In the last 10 years the number of your manufacturing establishments increased approximately 70 percent. It is amazing to learn that last year your farmers received in cash for their crops the sum of $750,000,000.

Now what of the future? No business man can answer that question because the answer is dependent upon what Government will do. What the Government will do necessarily is dependent in great degree upon what the Soviet Government will do. But it does not depend entirely upon that.

In time of war or of great business depression, it is necessary that unusual powers be granted to the Federal Government. When there is an end to war or depression, if we are to have the form of government under which we have lived and prospered for a century and a half, those powers must be returned to the States and the people.

Experience has proved that is difficult to accomplish. Human beings love power. Seldom will they voluntarily relinquish it. A man can get drunk on alcohol and recover without suffering more than remorse and a headache but the man who gets drunk on power never recovers.

Now because of war in the Pacific and the threat of war, we are conferring extraordinary powers upon the National Government. We must do so. But every such grant should have a specified date for its termination. If at that time the necessity exists for its continuance, the Representatives of the people in the Congress can be relied upon to extend such powers.

If, however, there is no specified date of termination, I care not what political party is in power, legislation, returning such powers to the States is apt to be vetoed and would require a two-thirds vote for enactment.

I heartily favor the administration's program to increase our military power in the air and on land and sea.

In October 1945, at the very first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, I learned to my great disappointment, that the Soviets seemed more interested in expansion of their territory and power than in peace on earth.

When I moved to adjourn that meeting in London without accomplishing anything, I stated that no agreement was better than a bad agreement. I realized how my statement would disillusion the peace-loving people of the United States. I realized, too, that demobilization by the point system had already taken from our Army the men of experience so essential to a mechanized army.

From that day to this, I have urged an increase in our appropriations for military purposes and a decrease in our nonmilitary expenditures. However, others equally patriotic, but grossly mistaken, believed in spending more money for nonmilitary purposes and little money for the defense of the Nation. It took Korea to waken us to a true realization of our defenseless position.

As we read the casualty lists, we know we are not engaged in a police action in Korea. We are engaged in a war. We know, too, that we are threatened with war in Europe. We must not refuse to confer with the Soviet Republic with a view to avoiding a world war, but as we confer, we must always remember that peace depends not upon what is written in an agreement but upon what is in the minds and hearts of men. The Soviets will live up to an agreement only so long as it is to their advantage to do so. And it will be to their advantage only so long as the United States is strong militarily and economically.

From my experience with the Soviet representatives at many international conferences, I know they respect only force. Therefore, we must be strong in the air and on land and sea. Our rearmament will not provoke a war but our failure to rearm might well do so.

It is my conviction that the only reason the Soviets have not started a war in Europe is because of our supply of atomic weapons.

On one of my trips to Russia I saw the damage done by German artillery and air power to Russian cities. I saw the effect that destruction had upon the minds of Soviet leaders. They realize the much greater destruction that would be wrought by our atomic weapons. They realize, too, that if we have in Western Europe an army sufficiently strong to hold their foot soldiers in check for a time, we will have available the air bases from which to fly planes that would destroy, not only their supply bases, but their production facilities.

Of course, the Soviets might likewise destroy some of our communities where are located plants producing weapons of war. Fortunately, however, our production is being decentralized. And with the protection afforded us by our air power and our Navy, it will be a long time before the Soviets, with the air bases they presently have, could do any great damage to American production.

It is the productive power of the United States upon which the free nations of the

world rely for defense of their liberties. It is our productive power, as well as our atomic power, that will cause the Kremlin to hesitate to start a war in Europe. That is why we must remain economically strong.

We must not allow misguided or selfish people in our midst to do what Stalin cannot do—destroy our productive power. And the people of America must support those officials who are willing to tell the representatives of business and of labor that they cannot use this war situation to promote their selfish interests.

The Congress has freely granted the appropriations recommended in the President's budget for military purposes. I hope that with equal enthusiasm they will reduce the amount requested for nonmilitary programs.

In his budget message the President recommended the enactment of legislation embarking upon new activities such as socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, Federal aid for education, and the civil-rights program, including the FEPC. I hope the Congress will just forget these recommendations.

These proposals will divide the people of the country at a time when unity is essential. Some of them would involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Others threaten local self-government and threaten also the liberties of the individual.

The people of America are willing to sacrifice even life itself to defend our liberties against communistic governments. But while making such sacrifices they do not want to have their government start on the road toward socialism.

I hope, too, that the Congress will forget the administration's point 4, the objective of which is to elevate the standard of living of all the peoples of the world. It is appealing to think of helping all mankind. Our people will always respond to an appeal for help to any pepole in an emergency. But common sense tells us there is a limit to what we can do.

The taxpayers of this Nation cannot adequately provide for the defense of this country, furnish military equipment to all governments that will resist the aggression of the Soviets; discharge our obligations to our veterans, the poor and the aged, and at the same time elevate the standard of living of the peoples of all the rest of the world.

The freedom-loving people of the world must remember that we fight and sacrifice to preserve their freedom as well as ours. They must remember, and we must remember, that if we fall or stumble there is no other government to which we can turn for financial help. There is no Marshall aid for us.

We will be like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner,

"Alone, alone, all, all alone.
Alone on a wide, wide sea!
And never a saint took pity
On my soul in agony."

Our people must remember, too, that government has no money except that which comes from the pockets of the people or is borrowed, if borrowed it must be repaid either by our taxpayers or by their children, who then would be made to suffer for the folly of their fathers.

There is a vast difference between local governments borrowing to invest in schools or other improvements of permanent character and the National Government borrowing to improve the standards of living of the people of the world.

The United States Government now owes approximately $260,000,000,000. During the fiscal year beginning next July first, if we do not have full scale war, our debt will increase an additional $13,000,000,000, unless additional taxes are levied. If we have full scale war, of course, the increase will be greater.

The market price of our bonds has been preserved by the Federal Reserve Board through its control of the issuance of currency. That is inflationary. It presents a terrible problem because if the price of our bonds ever should begin to drop, the holders will start to sell and accelerate depreciation.

Facing this situation, the people who urge that we embark upon new activities costing billions of dollars should be willing to withhold their demands until we have first made secure their liberties.

Because of the Korean War and the defense program, it is essential that the Government enforce wartime controls. Last July when it became apparent that we were engaged in a war in Korea, a ceiling should have been placed on prices and wages. It was not done. Now it is a difficult task.

It was not done at the beginning of World War II. When I became Director of Economic Stabilization, 11 months after we entered the war, I had the same difficult task that today confronts Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston. Businessmen and farmers demanded increased prices. Labor demanded increased wages. Each group claimed their demands were necessary because of the increases received by the others. At my request, President Roosevelt signed the order known as the hold-the-line order.

Of course, every group complained. They howled—they threatened. All of the leaders came to see me. I had more acquaintances and fewer friends than I ever had in my life. But then, as now, if we were to halt inflation, there was but one course. That was to hold the line.

Today the Government must say what it means and mean what it says. Exceptions cannot be made. Of course, there will be inequities. Inequities are a part of war. One boy is called to fight and die in Korea while another boy may live at home and make money. In time of war, if the Nation is to endure, there must be a spirit of sacrifice instead of a spirit of selfishness.

The people who are called upon to make sacrifices are not made happy by the disclosure of disloyalty of an employee of the Atomic Energy Commission and by the shocking disclosures before the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Worse than the loss of money is the loss of confidence in the honesty of men who have occupied responsible positions in Government.

There is no excuse for the existence of the organization. Why should your Government lend public funds to manufacture automobiles and fabricated houses to build tourist hotels in Florida?

A man can borrow money from the banks and private investors provided he has character and collateral. If he does not possess them, he should not be loaned your money.

In March 1945 I expressed this view to President Roosevelt. In his administration the RFC had been wisely administered by Jesse Jones. But President Roosevelt realized the danger. He said it had served its purpose and when peace was restored it should be liquidated. He did not live to liquidate it.

Because of the war situation, it may be necessary to make loans to a few manufacturers producing weapons of war. But these can be made by Charles E. Wilson, defense mobilizer, who has the confidence of the people. The Congress should promptly enact legislation to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I want to make clear that while I disagree with the administration about some domestic policies, I am not criticizing its foreign policies. I heartily favor the defense programs. I heartily favor the administration's policy of sending troops to Europe. I think we should accept the judgment of General Eisenhower as to the number of troops we should contribute to the army of freedom. I am willing also to accept his judgment that the governments of Western Europe are showing a willingness to fight for their freedom.

I would make even further overtures to Yugoslavia and to Spain. They have armies on the field, not merely on paper. I would also accept in that army of freedom troops from Western Germany. If Stalin should determine to make war on Western Europe, that great industrial people could not remain neutral even if they wished to do so. Western Germany will be with us or with the Soviets. I want them with us.

Upon the cessation of hostilities we promptly returned the German prisoners of war. Later France and Britain returned theirs. The Soviets failed to return approximately a million German prisoners of war to their homes. Those German soldiers are working as slaves in Russia or have died while working as slaves. They constitute a million reasons why the Germans would prefer to serve in Eisenhower's army of freedom.

We must say to our friends in Western Europe that if American boys are going to risk their lives in defense of Western Europe, we want them to have the help of every soldier who is willing to fight against the Godless Communists of Russia.

I do not believe that a world war is inevitable. On the contrary, if we remain strong, militarily and economically, I believe there will be no war, certainly not for a long time to come.

We must remain strong, not only militarily and economically, but spiritually. "In God we trust" must be engraved in our hearts as well as on our coins. We must pray that the war in Korea shall come to an end. We must pray that we shall never have another world war. But, if notwithstanding our prayers and our efforts, that misfortune should come to the world, the people of the Carolinas will be found sacrificing, fighting and dying for America, the land we love.

Rewards of Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there was brought to my attention the following folder; it clearly brings out the close attention paid by our local officials to the needs of the American public. Alderman Thomas J. Corcoran was elected in 1947 receiving a vote of 2 to 1 over his opponent. Here in 1951 after attention to the duties of his office he has been returned with the same plurality.

Mr. Corcoran represents the finest type of public servant. It is by attracting men of this caliber to public office that the great strides are made in urban development and administration. His record is a standard of performance which is recognized by his community. His devotion to duty is indicative also of good work being done by so many of our local officials. Public notice should be taken in order to encourage them as well as the public.

The above-mentioned follows:

CIVIC COUNCIL OF THE EIGHTEENTH WARD

Shortly after being elected in 1948, I organized what is known as the Civic Council of the Eighteenth Ward, a representative group of practically all the improvement associations throughout the eighteenth

ward. We meet at intervals once a month and take up matters most pertinent to the interest of our community. This organization has been most cooperative and has been of fine assistance to me.

The members of the civic council are as follows: Highland Improvement Association, Englefield Improvement Association, Ashburn Civic Association, Auburn Park Improvement Association, Eighty-third and Campbell Improvement Association, Foster Park Council, North Beverly Improvement Association, Park View Civic Association, West Hamilton Park Improvement Association, Wrightwood Improvement Association; also, Highland Businessmen's Association, Gresham Businessmen's Association, Auburn Park Chamber of Commerce.

Listed below are a number of services and improvements that have taken place during my term of office:

TRANSPORTATION

Bus service extension on Eighty-seventh Street, from Western to Hamlin Avenues, to take care of the fast-developing residential district in that area.

SEVENTY-NINTH STREET

After several conferences with members of the Chicago Transit Authority and their staff, I have been promised that by July 1, 1951, the one-man streetcars on Seventy-ninth Street will be replaced by propane motorbusses. The one-man cars have been a hazard and have slowed up and delayed transportation on this busy thoroughfare. It is the tendency of the riders to stay close to the front entrance on the one-man streetcars, which is also the exit. This will be eliminated, as the new motorbusses have an entrance in front and an exit either at the center or the rear of the bus.

STREET LIGHTS

Removal of 56 gas and gasoline lamps, or lights, and have been installed 486 new street lights. This is in the area west of Western Avenue where single-family dwellings are rapidly being constructed by numerous private contractors.

TRAFFIC-CONTROL LIGHTS

To eliminate traffic hazards we have installed traffic-control lights at eight dangerous intersections, viz: Sixty-sixth and Halsted, Seventy-eighth and Halsted, Sixty-fourth and Morgan, Eighty-seventh and Racine, Seventy-sixth and Loomis, Seventy-sixth and Damen, and Seventy-ninth and Damen.

Approval also has been made to install traffic-control lights at Eighty-first Street and South Halsted Street.

SEWERS

The completion of the Wood Street sewer eliminated the flooding condition in a large area west of Ashland Avenue.

The present main sewers in the entire area south of Sixty-third Street and east of Ashland Avenue will be tied into the sanitary sewer now completed in Sangamon Street and Seventy-second Street, and numerous laterals are to be constructed which will also empty into this sanitary sewer. I have been informed by the city sewer department this work is to begin early this year and to be completed within a reasonable time.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH STREET

The construction of a median strip and new lighting system on Eighty-seventh Street from Vincennes Avenue to Damen Avenue is now nearing completion.

FOSTER PARK FIELD HOUSE

Through constant contact with the Chicago Park District construction was started some 6 months back on a field house for Foster Park, which, when completed, will service some 40,000 residents of the area, and will cost $527,245. Work is approximately 50 percent completed.

A small field house and shelter has also been erected in O'Hallaren Park at Eighty-third Street and South Wood Street.

SAFETY GATES

There have been installed within the past few months safety gates at the grade crossings of both the Grand Trunk Railroad and the Wabash Railroad west of Central Park Avenue and east of the Southwest Highway on Eighty-third Place.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

In the newly developed area west of Western Avenue I have been successful in having erected two new-type portable school buildings at Eightieth and South Talman Avenue, which services children from sixth grade down, who prior to that time had to travel a great distance and cross two main arterial streets to attend Clara Barton School at Seventy-seventh Street and South Wolcott Avenue.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Over a period of the past 2 years I have successfully opposed several tentative public-housing projects which were to be located in the eighteenth ward. In my opinion, public housing is an added burden on the taxpayers, because this type of building does not pay real-estate taxes, but the occupants receive all the services rendered by the city government.

I will continue to oppose this type of tax-free housing, not only in the eighteenth ward, but in the entire city.

REFUSE AND GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Refuse and garbage disposal as well as street maintenance has received very close attention from our ward superintendent, and he has assured me of his continued cooperation along these lines.

THOMAS J. CORCORAN.

Trans-Isthmian Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of Marine Progress an article on the Trans-Isthmian Canal appeared which was called to my attention by a former colleague, the Honorable Willis W. Bradley, of California. The subject is one which it is appropriate to keep alive particularly when we have in mind that the carrier recently proposed to be built by the Navy would not be able to traverse the Panama Canal and that larger ships of every category seem to be in prospect in the immediate future.

The article to which I refer reads as follows:

The reorganization of the Panama Canal Zone Government, providing for the separation of certain functions and also the establishment of a new base for computing tolls, has served to drop from the current shipping picture the still present problem of adequacy of the waterway in the light of future defense and economic developments.

It has been estimated that at a time no more distant than 20 years, the present Panama Canal will not be adequate, in its present form, to accommodate the shipping that is expected to use it. There need only be a brief survey of the ships that have been built since the end of the war to realize that the trend, in both tankers and dry-cargo ships is toward larger and deeper vessels, as well as ships with considerably more power and speed than has heretofore graced our merchant marine.

The new supertankers will draw up to 34 feet of water and the new 20-knot cargo ships, on which bids have just been taken, will also be deep draft vessels. These ships while providing transportation for larger amounts of cargo at higher speeds also offer their own navigational problems, particularly in narrow channels. Those that will transit the Panama Canal will have in addition, other hazards inherent in the present canal structure that will make the transiting of these large, powerful vessels a task where the closest attention to navigation must be paid. There is, of course, the dangers that the navigator finds in the relatively narrow channel of the Gaillard Cut, aggravated by the prevalence of lock surges from the Pedro Miguel Locks that sweep back through the Canal until they are dissipated in Gatun Lake. There will also be the hazards of holding these vessels in anchorage or mooring areas in case of fog and with their greater length the number of ships so moored or berthed will be less than at present, all leading to delay, if not confusion.

CONGRESSIONAL STUDIES

During the session of the Eighty-first Congress a House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee subgroup was charged with looking into the adequacy of the present canal, to determine the feasibility of changing its level and its axis to increase its capacity or whether it would be better to construct a canal at some other Isthmian location.

This subcommittee spent some time in the Canal Zone meeting with Canal officials and making a study of the actual operation of the waterway. The subcommittee, after its Canal Zone work was completed and the data evaluated, reported to the chairman of the whole committee who said:

"An evaluation of the information reported by the subcommittee makes it apparent that authorities familiar with the Panama Canal are of the opinion that the existing operation will be unable to accommodate commercial traffic by 1970. At this point it should be borne in mind that the above estimate is for normal peacetime flow. Some of our biggest naval and commercial vessels cannot now transit the Canal. The Canal at this time would be most difficult to defend against a concerted attack of enemy aircraft using the conventional type bombs. A dislocation of the lock system could render the Canal unusable for 2 years."

The committee chairman did not consider the defense of the Canal because this was not his responsibility, but his subcommittee did consider the adequacy of the waterway from a commercial viewpoint, and from its studies Chairman EDWARD J. HART made these remarks in his report, "It is granted that any Canal facility must perform the requirements of peacetime commerce in order to meet its responsibility as an important adjunct to our national defense. Because of this fact, it is the sense of the committee that the Congress, with the assistance of appropriate agencies of the Government, should give thorough consideration to our national need for a transisthmian canal and should take such steps as are prerequisite to that end. The committee further believes that the Congress should appropriate a sufficient sum which would provide for the appointment of some of the best engineering minds of our country to a committee for the purpose of studying this situation."

The question under consideration requires the minds of highly trained specialists in the engineering field if the proper answer is to be given. The committee can only approach the problem with the minds of laymen, and we feel that our duty to the Nation and to posterity necessitates the recommendation

that the study be undertaken by those with greater knowledge, skill, and training than the committee possesses. The committee further desires to impress upon the Congress the extreme value of the Canal to the defense of our country and to remind the Congress at the same time that if steps are to be taken to either build a companion waterway in the Canal Zone or to construct a new waterway in some other spot that it will be a long, tortuous process. We believe this to be one of the most important questions confronting the American people, and hope that speedy action will be taken to formulate a definite program.

With a full appreciation for the effort in formulating a program necessary for such achievement, and the knowledge that legislation authorizing any further study or construction must be followed by a minimum 3 years' work to build new locks at the present site, and a maximum of 10 years to build a sea-level route, it is strongly urged that action be taken on this question without delay.

THE POSSIBLE ROUTES

Aside from the Panama route there are two major locations where a canal could be dug. One is across Nicaragua, utilizing Lake Nicaragua for a considerable portion of the distance, and the other is at Tehuantepec, Mexico, where a break in the range of mountains provides a site for a canal.

The House subcommittee reported that after concluding its studies at the Tehuantepec site and its discussions with Mexican officials it was of the opinion that it would be difficult at this time to get permission to construct the waterway at that location.

The situation in Nicaragua is far different, however. The subcommittee was assured that there is great willingness on the part of the President of Nicaragua to grant the United States whatever is necessary to make the canal possible. The committee members made an extensive exploration of the proposed route by foot, motor, and air. They were told that such a canal would save from 1½ to 2 days on the intercoastal voyage over the Panama route.

The Nicaragua route has been an active idea for some hundreds of years. The diplomatic overtures and negotiations that have transpired since the idea was first broached have been extensive. Capt. Miles DuVal, USN, retired, has covered these thoroughly in his books on the Panama Canal, from Cadiz to Cathay and also the second volume, And the Mountains Will Move. In these works he shows the strong efforts that have been made to bring about a Nicaraguan canal and how the decisions on the ultimate location of the transisthmian waterway wavered between Panama and Nicaragua and finally settled on the present location.

In respect to current opinion on the waterway across the isthmus there is a two-faction camp in existence, inhabited by proponents of a sea-level waterway in the Canal Zone and by the proponents of the terminal lake plan which has received so much attention in recent years. This last plan is the work of Captain DuVal who proposes that a terminal lake be created between the Miraflores Locks and the entrance to Gaillard Cut and the elimination of the bottle-necking Pedro Miguel Locks as part of the plan.

This plan is seen as having distinct marine benefits since it would eliminate a number of conditions affecting the transit of ships that have been set up through the location of the locks at Pedro Miguel.

The studies made by the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee have served to keep alive the question of an adequate waterway from ocean to ocean and the recommendation that a group of experts make a full study of the problem is one that will meet with the approval of the users of the canal. What they will probably look for is adequate representation on any such commission so that the merchant marine requirements of the canal can be discussed with the engineering talent to the end that a practical waterway be built to handle the waterborne commerce which, after all is said and done, will be the major users of the canal.

The Delivered Pricing Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, for half a century it has been the practice of heavy industry in America—cement, steel, building materials, lumber, newsprint—to quote delivered prices to the buyers of their products. When the Federal Trade Commission issued an order forbidding this practice, and the Supreme Court in the well-known Cement case partially sustained the Commission's order, the result was chaos and uncertainty in all lines of American heavy industry. It threatens to dislocate and wreck our economic system.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has been crusading for many years against these long-established pricing practices, practices in which the producer absorbs the freight. The Commission proposes to substitute f. o. b. plant prices for the delivered prices. Twice the Commission has attempted to persuade Congress to pass legislation to bring about this change, but Congress has refused to do so because the Commission has failed to prove that such a change in pricing practices would be an over-all benefit to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Congress will act promptly to clear away the fog that the Federal Trade Commission edict and the court ruling have thrown around the clear intent of Congress concerning the delivered pricing system. Congress should at least make clear its policy concerning this long-established method of selling.

The following factual and logical discussion of this subject taken from the 1950 annual report of the Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co. is so concise and clear that I include it as a part of my remarks for the enlightenment of my colleagues:

THE QUESTION OF HOW TO PRICE

Current world events have tended to obscure the fact that an important piece of work in the economic field on the home front remains to be done. This job is to require the Federal Trade Commission to administer the laws as written and as clearly intended by Congress.

Under present laws anyone has the right to sell at delivered prices and to meet lower prices of competitors wherever or whenever he considers it good business to do so. But this does not accord with the economic ideas of the Federal Trade Commission; so it has set about to change the laws—not by seeking amendments, but by administrative circumvention. To make matters worse, some courts have given their approval to such conduct, and, as a consequence, the meaning and intent of the basic laws have been lost sight of by the public.

There is no consistency in the rulings of the Federal Trade Commission. In one breath it condemns the lowering of a price to secure business as unfair competition. In another breath it charges that any meeting of competitive prices establishes a conspiracy in restraint of trade. Then it indulges in meaningless press releases to the effect that not every meeting of a competitive price is unlawful, but never specifying when that condition exists.

Under such circumstances it is easy for the average businessman to lose track of the basic laws and his rights thereunder, and to follow, sheeplike, whatever seems to be least frowned upon at the moment by the FTC.

But such procedure often produces harmful effects upon the public. That is precisely what happened when a large segment of the heavy-goods industries adopted f. o. b. plant pricing following the Supreme Court opinion in the Cement case. Statistics on file with the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee show that the f. o. b. plant pricing induced by this attitude has cost the public many millions of dollars.

It should be obvious in view of all this that Congress must clarify existing laws, if for no other reason than to encourage a return to competitive pricing and thus a reduction in the cost of goods to buyers. The right to meet competitive prices has been recently reaffirmed by the Supreme Court, but there is no reason to believe that the Federal Trade Commission will respect this decision any more than it has respected the laws as written. The only way to insure correct administration is to enact new legislation making the intent of Congress so manifest that even the Trade Commission will not dare to circumvent it.

For our own part we continue to price on a delivered basis, believing that the lawfulness of independent, competitive delivered pricing has never been in doubt. By lowering our price to meet a price of a competitor in a particular market, our customer in that market is assured that he has no cost disadvantage to overcome in his competitive efforts. Thus our policies tend to benefit the ultimate consumer.

Harry Goes Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, not very many of our country editors in Iowa are being fooled by the Truman administration's insipid policies at home and abroad.

Illustrative of that is the following bit of poetry written by Charlie Gebhard for his column Nowadaze and printed in last week's issue of the Bremer County Independent, published at Waverly, Iowa.

It is a pleasure to reproduce it herewith:

The atom race is really hot;
The Commies worry us a lot;
We've lost the peace for which we fought;
In foreign intrigue we've been caught;
But Harry just goes fishing!

Inflation's storming through the door,
As billion's down the drain we pour;
Our dollars just can't shrink much more,
While taxes jump and prices soar;
But Harry just goes fishing!

The RFC is in a stew,
As graft disclosures come anew;
A mink coat brought an I O U
And many more the same way too;
But Harry just goes fishing!

The State Department's full of pinks,
Who crossed us up on Mao's Chinks,
While Dean was taking 40 winks;
We need a change there too, methinks;
But Harry just goes fishing!

The cost of beef for us each noon,
Proves that the cow jumped o'er the moon;
Our whole price structure's out of tune;
We need some roll-backs mighty soon;
But Harry just goes fishing!

In Waverly we hope and pray,
We'll get a change election day;
But that's still two full years away;
There's so much to be done today;
But Harry just goes fishing!

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., Sunday, March 18, 1951:

ACCEPTANCE OF UMT WILL INDICATE WE ARE WILLING TO BREAK DOWN OUR SYSTEM—IT WOULD BE MOST RADICAL DEPARTURE FROM OUR WAY OF LIFE SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE REPUBLIC

(By John Griffin)

Nobody knows what the next few years will bring, but apparently the advocates of compulsory military training, or universal military training, as they now call it, don't want to take any chances of universal military training being considered on its own merits, if any. They want to rush it through now, to take effect some years in the future.

And it looks very much as if they are going to succeed. The Armed Services Committees in both House and Senate have approved a bill which ties universal military training up with the draft and other matters, although they insist no actual move be made under universal military training for several years.

Why are they so anxious to rush universal military training through now when it won't become effective for several years? Obviously, they are afraid that under more normal conditions and a substantial peace situation, they wouldn't be able to put it over on an American people who have always loathed the idea.

Universal military training is the most radical departure from our way of life since the start of the Republic. It will disrupt the education of millions of American youths. It will put them under the Army training and the philosophy of the top sergeant during some of the most important years of their lives, years when the formation of character and the basis of a career are most effectively achieved.

WEIRDEST EXCUSES OFFERED

It is a system that was responsible for the emigration to America of some of the best European peoples. A good many ancestors of present Americans came to this country to avoid compulsory service.

Some of the weirdest excuses ever devised have been offered in favor of universal military training. It has been said by some people of important standing that universal military training would be good for American boys because of its educational, moral, and spiritual values in addition to the physical training it would afford.

No person devoted to the American concept and the traditional American way of life would pay any attention to such arguments if he stopped to think for a minute. The idea of turning boys over to the military for such training is abhorrent to the American idea. It always has been.

Some of the organizations that have been consistently plugging the cause of universal military training have apparently forgotten that it is a system used by European monarchies and other governments that were designed to hold the people in subjection in both body and mind.

Some of these organizations might have served the country better if they had devoted their efforts to cleaning up politics. Then the morals of the politicians would be a credit to democracy instead of a public scandal.

PROVED SOUND CITIZENSHIP

For several years, during and after World War II, some leading American figures were insisting upon universal military training for its citizenship values. One of these was Mrs. Roosevelt, whose public statements were in reality an insult to the veterans of World War II. She insisted that the youth of America needed training in civic responsibilities and the requirements of citizenship.

While she was sounding off on that subject, she was also using her influence to see that the notorious Communist, Gerhard Eisler, was admitted to this country. She was also entertaining puerile pinks at the White House.

The youth of America had just demonstrated, at the cost of several hundred thousand lives and millions of wounds, that their idea of citizenship was sounder than hers. Yet she kept right on with the proposal of UMT for citizenship training, and even went so far as to favor similar training for girls.

The worst argument of all for UMT was served up by those who insisted upon pointing to Switzerland and Sweden as examples of countries which, through UMT, had avoided war. The inference was that other nations were afraid to attack them because of their use of the UMT system.

Some people have accepted that argument without stopping to think of the absurdity involved in the suggestion that Germany, for example, was afraid of Switzerland. The facts, as far as Sweden is concerned, are that the Germans could have taken it any time they wanted, but didn't need it so long as they could use it for their own purposes.

The bulk of the iron ore that was necessary for the Hitler war machine came from Sweden, and it was to Germany's advantage to keep Sweden out of the war. It wasn't fear of the Swedish system of universal military training.

ONLY POSSIBLE REASON

A noted educator, President Charles F. Phillips, of Bates College, said the other day that if a universal military training bill is passed, it should have a definite time limit to its existence. His suggestion was 5 or 7 years, after which if the situation has improved, it could be allowed to lapse.

It is a good suggestion, but a better one is to continue the draft for a year or two and see what the situation is then. Perhaps at that time UMT would not be permitted by the people through Congress because of its breakdown of the American way of life.

The only possible excuse for UMT in a democracy is military urgency. All other arguments, the stuff about moral and spiritual and education values, about citizenship responsibilities is the bunk. And there is no military necessity for it now, and there won't be under present conditions.

The manner in which proposals that violently clash with the American way are calmly accepted nowadays makes one wonder whether the system of government and the system of living that we know, aren't being imperiled. The acceptance of UMT will indicate that we are willing to break down our own system.

The Overton Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Americans must not become entirely dependent upon colonies and other countries for their existence. A kind Providence has bestowed upon us bountiful natural wealth, which, under proper stewardship, should assure us a strong place among the great powers of the world for centuries to come. If we fail in the careful handling of these natural resources, this Nation may sink into a second or third place among the peoples of the earth, as have other nations which have risen and later fallen into obscurity. We must, therefore, so handle these resources which a benevolent Providence has placed at our disposal that they may sustain and support the economy of this Nation for many years to come.

It so happens that we now find ourselves in the wake of the most terrible military conflict of history, and we are at this hour grappling with problems which may usher in another world war. With this in mind, we must so handle the assets of our Nation that they will strengthen and renew the institutions that we may be in a proper economic and military posture when the great crisis should come.

One of the critical materials which is giving great concern at the present time is steel. Upon survey, we find that more and more our steel industry is being forced to look further and further for iron ore from which to fashion steel for use in this steel age. Since almost the birth of this Republic our heavy industry has depended upon iron ore from the Mesabi Range of mountains; but now, under the tremendous withdrawal from this area, we find that our supply of high-grade iron ore is being rapidly depleted. Industry is looking southward to South America—Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela—for rich ore; and this must be brought into the United States from remote areas. The proposal now comes to us that we open up the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the ocean, at a tremendous public expense, so that rich ore may be brought into this country from Labrador and Newfoundland to our smelting plants in the Pittsburgh area of this country. This proposal

seems to be gaining some favor, in spite of the fact that to accomplish this gigantic development we must industrially invade our neighbor on the north—the Dominion of Canada—and there construct great locks and dams so as to make navigation possible along the St. Lawrence River to the ocean. Such a program will provide water transportation by which this heavy ore may be slowly moved to the mills and factories for processing.

While the Nation is looking abroad for accessible deposits of iron ore for use in our manufacturing we are overlooking great possibilities within our own midst. In east Texas, adjacent to my own congressional district of Louisiana, are located vast quantities of rich iron ore. Already careful surveys have indicated that at least 200,000,000 tons of high-grade brown ore have been located in northeast Texas suitable for manufacturing purposes. This ore has been surveyed and tested and found available and suitable to our use. Our country badly needs this supply of iron ore, and we naturally exclaim in pleasure over the new find in east Texas. Why then is it not being used as a means of supplying our furnaces in the Pittsburgh and the Birmingham areas?

The answer is the same here as it is in the case of the Labrador and Newfoundland areas—transportation. The Texas ore is located miles from water transportation. It is about 15 miles west of Jefferson, Tex., and close to Shreveport, La. There is rail, but no water, transportation to the ore fields.

During the course of the thirties the Army engineers made surveys of this area for navigation purposes. They came up with the recommendation that a canal be built on the west side of the Red River, beginning about 5 miles south of Shreveport and roughly paralleling the Red River to its mouth far below Alexandria, La. This canal would follow Bayou Pierre from Shreveport southeasterly; then Cane River and other available streams until it opens into Red River some 30 miles above its mouth. Such a canal, they stated at that time, could be built for the sum of $42,000,000. It would, I am sure, in these inflation times cost considerably more.

Such a canal, to be called the Overton waterway, will provide canal navigation by means of a system of locks and dams. It will provide a slack water route from the region of the east Texas iron ore to the inland water routes of the Nation. Iron ore produced within a few miles of this canal would be trucked to the turnaround basin south of Shreveport, loaded upon barges, and moved to points throughout the country where needed. The Mississippi River, the Intercoastal Canal, the Tennessee, Cumberland, Ohio, Missouri, and, in fact, all of the mid-continent navigable streams will do their part in moving Texas iron ore to the markets.

Some persons there may be who may label this statement to be a "pipe dream" and nonrealistic. Such a charge should be immediately dismissed as untrue and incorrect. Already at least one large steel mill is operating in this area at the present time and is doing an excellent job. Other mills may soon become available. But real progress in the development of the ore field will occur when the Overton waterway is built. Low-priced water transportation will give the incentive to make this whole area blossom into activity, and the peoples of this country will benefit from the heavy movement of iron ore to the mills and the furnaces.

Of course, we want to utilize foreign ore within limits when it is available and thereby save our own resources for the day of real trouble when we will not be able to bring outside metals in huge quantities into this country for use in mobilizing to fight the enemy. The day may come when our merchant marine will not be able to move South American ore across the long sea lane and to our factories in the steel sections of the United States. Enemy submarines may be on the prowl and the cost in loss of tonnage and manpower may make such an operation prohibitive.

When such conditions arise, we must have readily available ore which can be moved to the steel mills along waterways far removed from the sharp swish of the enemy torpedo and along the sheltered routes which belong exclusively to our own people. Inland water development is certainly a wise and far-sighted policy for our young and vigorous Nation to pursue.

I saw some of the submarine warfare of the last war. I saw ships sunk along the Florida coast by hostile submarines—ships afire, crews jumping into the water to save their lives, and cargoes jettisoned to salvage the ship, if possible. Such scenes are not pleasant. They represent loss and waste—waste of material and of manpower. They represent waste at a time when waste could least be afforded.

A very few of such losses will more than pay the entire cost of the construction of the Overton Canal, and then, for all time, we will have an inland slack-water canal route from the rich iron-ore fields of east Texas to all parts of the Nation. Then will our people rejoice in the further development of our Nation and feel confidence in the knowledge that we are building, not only for development of the domestic front but also for the safety and security of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the construction of the Overton waterway will become a matter for the immediate attention of our Army engineers and the Budget Bureau, and before another great war shall claim our energies and efforts we may have it available for our use and our security.

American Selling Price Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter received with reference to H. R. 1535 on which no action has been taken by the Ways and Means Committee. This committee is presently considering a tax revenue raising measure pending the receipt of further reports on H. R. 1535 from interested departments. The letter, dated March 13, 1951, follows:

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.,
Naugatuck, Conn., March 13, 1951.

Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADLAK: Both labor and management involved in the manufacture and distribution of rubber footwear devoted much study last year to H. R. 8304 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), the proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1950. It was our feeling the bill proposed in general many constructive and long overdue changes in customs procedure.

We did, however, take vigorous exception to one provision in the measure. That was section 14 which, if it had been enacted, would have jettisoned the American selling price principle as a basis for computing import duties on rubber and canvas footwear. The bill would have substituted a foreign export value as the basis for computing duty. It was our contention that this involved a substantive change in the law and was not for that reason germane to a measure pointed otherwise at streamlining customs procedure.

This bill has now been reintroduced in the Eighty-second Congress, H. R. 1535. It contains the same objectionable provision (sec. 14) eliminating the American selling price principle. This section of the bill provides that the Tariff Commission shall certify to the President a rate of duty for each classification of articles "which the Commission estimates to be reasonably equivalent."

It is our contention that even if the authors of the bill sincerely intended to provide the same level of relief under the proposed revisions, they could not make good. Experts in customs matters support us in this view. The proposed bill does not outline a detailed procedure for converting the tariff protection to the same level under the proposed revision. The Tariff Commission, as far as we can learn, has not agreed on a procedure of any kind to meet the new proposed provisions, much less one that will guarantee our industry the same protection as it now has under the American selling price. We have had no information from Tariff Commission or State Department to persuade us from our opinion that no workable scheme can be devised under the new law to give us this same protection.

If we are to have the same protection as under American selling price, how would the Tariff Commission set up a schedule of tariffs which would take account of the fluctuations in the price of imported goods and the price of like or similar American goods?

When it is realized that there are hundreds of different rubber footwear items, each with its own price level, it becomes clear that there is no workable substitute for the American selling price method which will give the industry the same level of protection.

Some of the letters last year from the State Department indicated a misunderstanding of the American selling price principle and the conditions under which it was enacted into law by Congress about 25 years ago. It was implied that the United States Government, apparently upon the urging of American industry, adopted the American selling price as a "device to conceal the real amount of protection actually enjoyed by this and the other industries concerned."

Congress set the American selling price as a basis for duty valuation because other methods of valuation were not adequate; and one of the inadequacies was the inability of American officials to obtain accurate information on foreign costs. This was particularly true with reference to rubber footwear. In this respect the situation is even worse today.

The American rubber footwear industry's most serious competitor for the domestic market is Czechoslovakia. Can the Tariff Commission or the State Department get trustworthy data on costs of production in Czechoslovakia today? Does any one in our Government have accurate figures on the labor and material costs represented in a pair of rubber gaiters from a Czech factory landed in New York today?

Instead of concealing the facts about the amount of duty, the American selling price makes it easy for a foreign competitor to determine the amount of duty he has to pay in relation to his costs of production.

From whom are the facts as to the real amount of protection concealed? Not from the Czech manufacturer. Under the American selling price he is the only person who knows the actual rate of duty based on his export value or any other value. And under the American selling price usually he can determine what his duty will be even before he begins to manufacture. The only thing that would change his estimate would be a change in the selling price of the American article like or similar to the one he is producing, and the adjustment in any event would be negligible.

The American rubber footwear industry can stand no further cuts. In fact competitive footwear made in low-wage countries abroad is seriously threatening the industry under the existing duties. Labor constitutes approximately 47 percent of the factory cost of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear. This is the labor of American workmen and wages paid in this industry in this country are far higher than those in any other country. The materials used by American manufacturers of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear are, with the exception of natural rubber, American made and here again this industry is at a disadvantage as against the use of materials produced in foreign low-labor-cost countries.

The manufacture of rubber footwear is an essential part of our national economy. It is vital to our national defense. During the last war this industry furnished our Armed Forces with more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear. In the same facilities, it also made life rafts, fuel cells, raincoats, life vests and other similar war products. Without a going rubber footwear industry our national defense program would be seriously impaired.

Thirteen companies are engaged in the manufacture of rubber and canvas footwear and employ more than 20,000 men and women with sales of approximately $100,000,000.

It is one of the truly American industries—foreign manufacturers having copied its styles and methods. The low-labor rates and cheaper materials costs of foreign manufacturers, particularly Czechoslovakian and Japanese, combined with lower tariffs, would mean the loss of jobs to thousands not alone in this industry but in the factories of its suppliers and in the stores and shops in the communities which serve its workers.

It is clear that the elimination of the American selling price, through H. R. 1535 or any other measure would adversely affect the American rubber footwear industry, its stockholders, and its employees, and eventually the American public who look to this industry to supply it with essential waterproof rubber and rubber-soled canvas shoes.

We earnestly solicit your support for the elimination of this Section 14 from the bill which is now under consideration in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Very truly yours,

T. R. BEHRMAN,
Industrial Relations Manager, Naugatuck Footwear Plant.

GEORGE T. FROEHLICH,
President, Local 45, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, Plastic Workers of America, CIO.

Relief for Our Manpower Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion has been made by an outstanding and able member of the Texas Prison Board, Mr. French Robertson, of Abilene, which might give considerable relief to our manpower shortage.

Mr. Robertson states that there are at least 1,500 able-bodied young men in Texas prisons, convicted of minor offenses, who would make good soldiers if a national clemency policy was set up permitting them to join the Army.

As he points out, if there are 1,500 such prisons in Texas, then there must be 30,000 to 40,000 prisoners in the country who are potential soldier material.

In an interview with Elizabeth Carpenter, Washington correspondent for a number of papers in the Southwest, Mr. Robertson elaborates on this idea which he has since carried to top officials at the Pentagon and I understand they are now fully exploring its possibilities.

I call to the attention of Congress this interview with French Robertson which appears in the Abilene Reporter-News of March 9, and ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, March 9.—Behind Texas prison walls, there are 1,500 able-bodied young men, convicted of minor offenses, who, in the opinion of a member of the Texas Prison Board, would make good soldiers.

Not content with the "no" which he has already received from the Fourth Army Headquarters, French M. Robertson, of Abilene, a member of the board, will take his suggestion to the Pentagon Building and to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, whose preparedness subcommittee has been seeking answers to the big manpower shortage.

"A world of these boys should never have been sent to prison in the first place," said Robertson, who, as a former Air Force lieutenant colonel in World War II, adds: "I think they could serve their country well and rehabilitate themselves in uniform."

Robertson will point out to officials here if, using rough mathematics, there are 1,500 such possible draftees in Texas prisons, there must be some 30,000 throughout the United States. He will have no difficulty impressing his listeners on Capitol Hill with the significance of 30,000 more men. The past few weeks has kept more than one congressional committee busily seeking new manpower resources which might have been overlooked in the past.

The prison manpower which Robertson believes could be put to use first came to his attention last July when the Korean situation created patriotic fervor among some of the inmates. They swamped him with applications for clemency, saying they would be of much more use to their country on the front line in Korea than locked up in Huntsville.

Robertson and Prison Manager O. B. Ellis looked over the prison population of Texas—which has swelled from 3,600 in 1946 to nearly 7,000 this year—and found that there are some 1,500 young men whom they would consider good material for the Army.

Robertson called on Gov. Allan Shivers who encouraged him to take it up with the Army. But Army officers at Fort Sam Houston informed him that military regulations prevent anyone convicted of a felony from joining the Armed Forces.

Army regulations are, of course, subject to change to meet new emergencies and it is Robertson's thought that the manpower crisis might warrant exploration of prison material by the military.

By careful screening of the men permitted to join the Army, Robertson sees no difficulty in letting convicts take up a gun for Uncle Sam.

"We would set up a screening committee to check the history and record of the prisoner who was released to the Army," Robertson explained, "There would be many applicants, of course, that we would not release."

It is Robertson's belief that the young men whom he considers good soldier material could best fit into the "service end" of the Army—driving trucks, cooking, or doing the day labor in the Ordnance and Quartermaster Corps.

"Most of the 1,500 boys in Texas got into trouble because of their environment," Robertson explained, "They really never had a chance. They'd see Willie Jones taking his girl out on a date with a new suit of clothes and they'd want one. So, they'd forge a check."

Texas laws are much too strict on many offenses, according to Robertson who recalls one case he handled as a young attorney in which a 17-year-old boy was sent to prison for 3 years for forging a check for $5.

"The kid was selling magazines and he needed some money so he forged a check for $5 using the name of someone who had taken out a magazine subscription," Robertson said, "It was a forgery so the court sent him to the pen for 3 years."

It is this type of offender which Robertson believes could safely be rehabilitated into the Army and finally become a decent, useful citizen in civilian life.

"Being in the Army would restore self-confidence and self-respect," Robertson says, "the two big factors in setting a man back on the right path."

1951 Budget Made Understandable for Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New Brunswick (N. J.) Sunday Times of February 18, 1951, there appeared an article reporting on a brief analysis by Dr. Audley H. F. Stephan, chairman of the department of economics of Rutgers University, of the President's Federal Budget. The article is entitled "1951 Budget of Billions of Dollars Made Understandable for Public." I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Stephan's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE BUDGET OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS MADE UNDERSTANDABLE FOR PUBLIC

The President's demand for a new Federal budget of $71,600,000,000 to keep the United States in business in 1951 probably gives

most citizens no more than a baffling headache. Even his request to Congress for $16,500,000,000 in new 1951 taxes probably staggers more than it penetrates the minds of most people.

For billion-dollar amounts are totally beyond the comprehension of most ordinary citizens.

This $71,600,000,000 is to be spent on a business which belongs to each and every citizen in the United States, and they are going to be asked to pay the $16,500,000,000 in anticipated new taxes, reminds Dr. Audley H. F. Stephan, budget expert at Rutgers University. He believes, therefore, that average citizens should be offered the opportunity to understand their Federal budget.

MADE UNDERSTANDABLE

Dr. Stephan, who is chairman of the finance and economics department of Rutgers University College and former New Jersey budget commissioner, has translated this staggering Federal budget into layman's language as a service to his fellow citizens.

Here is his popularized presentation of the national budget, the only changes being the removal of a few ciphers to make the sums more understandable and a more simply worded explanation of the reasons for the expenditures. Characters of this dialogue are the bank loan officer, representing Congress as the representatives of the American public, and the bank customer, representing the President as the Nation's chief executive officer.

A bank customer, already owing the bank $25,700 (the national debt) on prior borrowings, goes in to the bank's loan officer and asks to borrow $1,650 (requested 1951 additional taxes). The following conversation ensues:

Loan officer: "What is the amount of your present income?"

Customer: "I was granted a substantial increase in pay 3 months ago, so my take-home pay is now $5,510 a year (anticipated receipts or earnings of United States in 1951 Federal budget)."

Loan officer: "Fine, how much of your salary do you think you can save this year?"

WON'T SAVE THIS YEAR

Customer: "Oh, I won't save any this year. You see my necessary living expenses this year will amount to $7,160 (Federal budget estimate of total operating costs of United States in 1951)."

Loan officer (amazed and gasping for breath): "Do you mean that already owing the bank about five times your new salary, you still want to spend more than you earn?"

Customer: "Oh, yes. But I'll gladly tell you what I must spend."

"First, you see I have been named defendant in a law suit which I must fight or lose everything, and the court costs and lawyers' fees will cost me $4,142. Then, since this is not my first law case, I am still paying $491 a year on past cases.

"Next, I have some neighbors who have been rather hard hit in the past to make ends meet, and they find it difficult to reduce their standard of living. So I must help them to get along and this will cost me $746 during the year.

"While I hate to mention it, the interest alone on my present debt, without any reduction of the principal, will cost me $590 this year.

"Fourth, I have a number of poor relations and old folks that I'd like to help, and so must give them $263 because they don't earn enough themselves."

RELATIONS AND FARMERS

"Also, some of my relatives are farmers and I don't think the prices they receive for their potatoes and other crops are fair. So, I'm going to give them $143 additional.

"Then, I have some ideas on brand new contraptions that, if they succeed, will be helpful to everybody and they will cost me $250 to develop.

"Upkeep of my car will amount to $169 and other living expenses, including hiring a bookkeeper to keep my accounts straight, will be $142.

"Oh, yes, I forgot I have some friends I'd like to set up in business and some others that need some financial help to keep out of the red, which will cost me $152.

"Finally, some of my children are still in school and I give them $4 a month allowance which costs me $48, and some of my working children get out of work at times and I give them $22.

"That's my story. Do I get a loan?"

The answer to the question is to be decided by the Congress in passing the appropriation bill or bills. Should Congress decide not to permit the Federal Government to go further into debt, it will be necessary to raise taxes. The taxing side of the budget might be presented in the form of an employee (the President) going in to his employer (the people of the United States represented by the Congress) and asking for a raise in his pay (sufficient to meet his added expenses).

In this case the employee's situation is that prior to World War I he made less than $100 a year (total taxes collected by the Federal Government prior to the First World War). During World War I his pay was raised to $330 a year, and following that war during the 1920's his pay went to $440 a year. The depression of the 1930's reduced his pay somewhat to $400 a year. The Second World War provided the spurt which raised his take-home pay to $2,850 a year. During the first four postwar years another increase raised his pay to $3,940 a year. Late in 1950 his employer increased his pay by 40 percent to $5,510 and now if his pay is to meet his expense he must be given a further 42-percent raise to $7,160, or in other words a total of 82 percent in take-home pay in less than a year.

The alternatives facing Congress is whether as loan officer it will grant an additional loan, or as an employer, can it give another raise. The Congress might solve its problem partly by a loan and partly by a raise in pay, but the pay-as-you-go policy will permit of no loan at all. If the raise in pay is too great, somewhere the proposed expense must be reduced.

Dr. Stephan concludes, "The little story above is not fiction. If each figure used is multiplied by 10,000,000 the result will be the federal fiscal policy for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, as set forth in the Federal budget.

It Is About Time Millions of Americans Wake Up to Communist Actions and Objectives in Asia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the postwar years when the Communists in China were seeking to undermine and discredit its government and seize control themselves, they were portrayed by the leftists, and most liberals in our country as spontaneous democratic uprising which was endeavoring to give China true freedom, and its people wider civil rights and genuine self-government.

At the same time Chiang Kai-shek and the legitimate government were denounced as Fascist aggressors, even butchers, because they apprehended some professors, students, and a few labor leaders who it has since been demonstrated were in almost every case Communist traitors seeking to overthrow the government by violence and make China a colony of the Soviet Union.

Events have proved that Chiang's error was in not being strict enough rather than in being too harsh against enemies of the state. Now the latter are in control. Their record of ruthless oppression and cruel tyranny makes any recent previous regime in China seem mild by comparison.

The American Federation of Labor is to be commended for its forthright reporting of the facts about what was to be such a benevolent Utopia in China. One can hardly blame many Chinese for being taken in by the glowing promises of the Reds. But there never was any excuse for Americans to be fooled—especially so-called intellectuals. It is a sad commentary on where the greater realism resides in America to note that many labor leaders were among the first and most courageous exposers of the Communist lies, while thousands of professors, ministers, scientists, artists, and—least excusably of all—columnists, commentators, and editors were vigorously promoting the Communist line, in most cases not knowing what they were doing.

The record needs to be compiled, because the reeducation of many is still far from finished. Under leave to extend my remarks I include two articles from the American Federationist for February 1951—one by Richard Deverall, A. F. of L. representative in Asia, and the other by Victor Riesel, well-known columnist specializing in labor matters.

THE MOSCOW-PEIPING PLOT AGAINST ASIA'S FREEDOM

(By Richard Deverall, A. F. of L. representative in Asia)

Many of us remember well the raving pages of Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf, with its blueprint for the conquest of the West. Some of us found in Mein Kampf a clear warning of Nazi intentions. Others regarded it as the work of a madman, a wild dog, a screwball. But, as we know today, Mein Kampf was a document that clearly outlined the tactics and strategy of the Nazis.

So, too, today many who have read the Collected Works of V. I. Lenin and such books as Joseph Stalin's Problems of Leninism have been plainly forewarned by the Soviet slavemasters that their objective is world domination and nothing less, that they plan to achieve conquest of the world by first conquering Asia and then using the men and raw materials of Asia to destroy the remaining portions of the free world.

Thus in one of the last articles penned by Lenin, found on page 854 of volume II of his Selected Works (Moscow, 1947), we read:

"In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, and so forth, account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism (Stalinism) is fully and absolutely assured."

There is no secret in all this. It is not Anglo-American or anti-Soviet propaganda.

Following Lenin, Stalin has himself written on countless occasions of the intentions of the Soviet geopoliticians to conquer China first, then through China conquer Asia and, with control of the land mass of Eurasia, complete the conquest of the entire world. This follows the classic formulation of Lenin:

"The road to Paris is through Peiping."

Some persons profess to see in the Communist drive a glorious and epic crusade to free the world from imperialism and colonialism. They view the literacy, electric power, and collective-farming schemes of Communist Russia as achievements of the Soviet regime. Such persons overlook the tens of millions of Soviet citizens who languish in slave-labor camps because they dare to assert their God-given humanity and their human rights. Such naive persons overlook a Yugoslavia which, if it is Communist, is not under the heel of Stalin and which therefore, in Stalin's view, must be destroyed by a Communist Russia whose concept of democracy is utter surrender to the will of the Kremlin.

The Communist geopoliticians at Yalta in 1945 wrung from President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill amazing concessions which made straight the path for the advance of Soviet imperialism in Asia. Yalta guaranteed Russian control of Manchuria, guaranteed the encirclement of a disarmed and defeated Japan by Soviet military and naval power, and guaranteed the fall of democratic Korea under the weight of Soviet pressure.

When the war ended, the honest attempt made by the West to find the road to world peace was terminated, as ever, by the Soviet butchers. They created the Cominform, pushed guerrilla activities through stooge Asian Communist parties, and most cynically used Japanese arms and the vacuum created by Japan's defeat to launch full-scale guerrilla warfare in China, in Indochina, and other Asian areas.

It must never be forgotten that so-called British imperialism has drastically retreated in Asia. British power has left India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and other areas. The Dutch have been forced to relinquish political control of rich Indonesia. Throughout Asia the greatest phenomenon of the postwar era is the end of European power in Asia.

And in the Asian countries which have found freedom and national independence, indigenous regimes have struggled with the terrible social and economic problems which resulted from the brutal and wasteful occupations of the Japanese Army. These new regimes have struggled to emancipate their people and to resurrect and refurbish their century-old cultures and century-old civilizations. Yet Moscow has attacked each and every national regime in Asia—except those subservient to Moscow—as bourgeois, antinational, rotten regimes.

In essence the Soviet aim in Asia since the end of the Pacific war has been to wreck the new-found national independence of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, Korea, and the Philippines. Stalin's actions clearly warn that Red China is the Asian base which the Kremlin is using to extend Communist domination across the map of ancient Asia. Where the British and Dutch and French have withdrawn, Moscow and its Asian stooges plan to march in. Nothing less than complete domination of Asia is the objective of the Kremlin and its Chinese Communist colony.

The Stalinist butchers use two tactics in the achievement of their aggressive strategy and warmongering.

One is the exploitation of overseas Chinese minorities in the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma to aid in the financing of Chinese Communist propaganda, penetration, and espionage. Anyone who listens to Radio Peiping broadcasts made daily to the overseas Chinese knows that the Chinese Communists are banking on use of overseas Chinese as a fifth column in free Asia.

The second tactic is use of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its stooge unions to foment civil disorder, violence, sabotage, and juncture with Communist guerrillas in the final all-out push to liquidate the Governments of Indochina, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines.

All this is a matter of the Communist record.

Early in September of 1949, Asian and Australasian Communist leaders and WFTU affiliates received invitations to attend a conference to be held in Peiping, capital of Communist China. The invitation requested "complete reports on the situation in your respective countries, progress of your organizations, your problems and the means of solving them, and the assistance you wish to obtain from the WFTU." The WFTU conference met in Peiping on the 13th of November 1949, with some 177 delegates on hand, representing 13 countries, including Communist Russia, Communist China, Communist Mongolia, North Korea, Indochina, India, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Ceylon, Malaya, Iran, and the Philippines.

The conference was formally opened by Liu Shao-chi, a vice president of the WFTU, trusted adviser to Mao Tse-tung and honorary president of the All-China Federation of Labor. With the geopolitical ambitions of world communism well in mind, Lui told the assembled delegates that over one-half of the world's population lives in the vast territories of Asia and Australasia; these territories have rich resources, industrious working peoples.

As even a blind man can see by reading Liu's speech, this was no conference of bonafide trade-union leaders promoting free trade-unionism but rather a top policy conference of military men, guerrilla tacticians and quasi-trade unionists plotting the military destruction of the hemisphere of Asia not yet under Soviet domination. Thus Liu said:

"The path which led the Chinese people [i. e., the Communists—Ed.] to victory is expressed in the following formula:

"1. The working class must unite to form a broad, nation-wide united front.

"2. This nation-wide united front must be led by the Communist Party.

"3. It is necessary to build up through patient struggle a Communist Party equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

"4. It is necessary to set up wherever and whenever possible a People's Liberation Army led by the Communist Party, an army which is powerful and skillful in fighting enemies, as well as strong points for the operations of these armies, and also to coordinate the mass struggles in the enemy-controlled areas with the armed struggle. Morever, armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the national liberation struggle in many colonies and semicolonies."

And in case anyone doubted the intent of Liu, he added:

"This is the main path followed in China by the Chinese people—i. e., the Communists—in winning their victory. This path is the path of Mao Tse-tung. It can also become the main path of the peoples of other colonial and semicolonial countries for winning emancipation where similar conditions prevail."

On November 16 the executive board members of the WFTU were tendered a banquet by Chou En-lai, premier of the Chinese Communist regime. With Chou En-lai were Gen. Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Soviet Red Army, and other top Chinese Communists and military officials. On November 21, Mao gave a huge banquet honoring the WFTU delegates.

And, as reported by the Indian Communist weekly, Crossroads:

"The delegates repeatedly toasted to the health of Stalin, leader of world working people, and Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Chinese working people."

As the smokescreen of public meetings, huge rallies and banquets proceeded, supersecret military sessions were held by the top leaders with well-known Russian agents. These secret sessions pointed up the essentially military nature of the WFTU's Peiping conference. The Russian Communist warmongers, L. Soloviev and S. Rostovsky, were present at the secret meetings. The participants in the top-level meetings discussed the 1950–51 strategy of world communism, including the planned tactical struggle in Korea to secure that geopolitical bastion for the Kremlin.

The report of Louis Saillant, general secretary of the WFTU, clearly outlined the key role of the WFTU in undermining the freedom and national independence of the Asian nations. Comrade Saillant listed the several Cominform stooge organizations which would work with the WFTU in overthrowing popular governments throughout Asia—the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and the International Committee of Intellectuals. Saillant proclaimed the world aims of the Communist imperialist warmongers when he declared:

"We are forming the grand new coalition of peoples fighting for a new world, living in peace, making socialism a living reality and laying the foundations of a new civilization on a world-wide scale."

Following Saillant, Comrade Soloviev of Russia warmly supported the recommendation of Saillant that an oriental bureau of the WFTU be set up in Peiping. He outlined the antinational and espionage role of this agency when he said it would be "responsible for the consolidation of contacts between the countries of Asia and the WFTU for the provision of mutual exchange of information, implementation of the decisions of the leading bodies of the WFTU for rendering assistance to national trade union centers of countries of Asia."

And, as Saillant noted in his closing speech, the WFTU described a three-tiered category of Asian countries:

Tier 1. China, Mongolia, and North Korea.

Tier 2. South Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Tier 3. India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan.

Obviously the tier 1 countries are those dominated by the Soviets and presently behind the Kremlin's oriental iron curtain. And if the Peiping conference considered the tier 3 countries as still difficult, the implication is clear that Moscow's plan of aggression in Asia comprehends guerrilla warfare and the overthrow of democratic regimes in the tier 2 countries—South Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Another proof of the tactics and strategy can be found in the speech of Li Li-san. He pointed out that the Chinese Communists had learned that they had to stir up agrarian unrest and promote revolutionary land reform programs, that they had to unite with the bourgeoisie in the urban areas and thus build a united front. Second, Li La-san said, guerrilla struggles, over a period of years would form the base for the people's liberation armies. Third and most fundamental, the Chinese Communist movement has always been under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which has always accepted the theoretical guidance of of Marxism-Leninism.

Clearly Li Li-san was hammering home the warmongering, death-to-liberty theme expounded at the confernce by Comrade Liu.

Significantly, Ban Se-yang of South Korea led off in presenting reports. He noted that

since October of 1946 the WFTU forces had led mounting guerrilla warfare against the Republic of Korea (South Korea). He called upon other Asian nations to boycott the United Nations. And after him came Choi Ho-min, of North Korea, who demanded that UN advisers in Korea and American troops in Japan leave at once. Each speaker underlined the activities needed to pave the way for the coming Communist aggression against South Korea.

As Indochina is the next on Stalin's timetable in Asia, it was not surprising to find that Luu Doc Pho reported in turn. Representing the Vietnam trade union movement, he emphasized guerrilla struggles and the war for emancipation. Luu Doc Pho said that such emancipation would be brought to a successful issue only if the working class of every country follows the example of China.

Next came the report of Vas Sunderachamara of Thailand who reported on the progress of the labor movement in that country. After describing the wartime role of the Anti-Japanese Volunteer Corps (the Communist wartime front) and their struggle against Japanese militarism and the Phibul Songgram clique, this Communist then told of the emergence of the Bangkok Federation of Labor and pointed out how the wartime struggle brought unification of Siamese, Chinese and workers of other nationalities. After attacking the government of Thailand, Vas ended thus:

"Long live the new democratic republic of China. Long live Mao Tse-tung. Long live Stalin."

The report of Lu Cheng of Malaya emphasized the role of the Communists in building guerrilla forces under the Japanese occupation. He told how after the war the Communists formed the Pan-Malayan Federation of Labor to launch revolutionary general strikes. Then he told the story of how after June of 1948 the Communists and their trade union allies went underground to mount the present civil war in British Malaya.

Comrade Ali Marjono reported for Indonesia. He told how the Communists formed the SOBSI in November of 1946, attacked Hatta as an "imperialist tool" and described Premier Nehru of India as leader of the "reactionaries" in southeast Asia. This Indonesian Communist let the cat out of the bag when he declared:

"The great victory of the Chinese people and its working class, guided by the Chinese Communist Party and the leader, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is a victory for our people."

Comrade Aun-Win reported for Burma. This Communist denounced the Thakin Nu government. The Communist-led unions of Burma, he said, would fight for "complete destruction of the fascist system of the Thakin Nu government."

The report from India was unsigned, but it was given in the name of the Communist-led All-India Trade Union Congress. It denounced the "bourgeois Congress government." It denounced Prime Minister Nehru. It denounced both the Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the Indian National Trade Union Congress. It also denounced the American Federation of Labor "who have spent many months (and dollars) in India training up their Indian prototypes." But for Stalin, Mao, and the WFTU it had sweet words. Them it hailed as "saviors" of Gandhi's India.

The program of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its Russian and Chinese Communist backers is crystal clear. The record speaks plainly. There can be no doubt that the criminal Communist aggression against South Korea is but the first move in the conquest of the Tier 2 countries—Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines. And once they are conquered and transformed into Kremlin colonies, then will come India's turn and the turns of Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan.

No sane person can talk of "neutrality" in the face of this clear Communist-WFTU blueprint for the conquest of Asia, which has already given evidence of its authenticity through the brutal Communist aggression against Korea.

As the Communist record shows, the Communist Party in every country mentioned is committed to the service of Stalin in the subversion of the now independent and free nations of Asia.

And in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran and Japan the WFTU-affiliated unions, by their own pronouncement, are traitorous, subversive agencies seeking to used armed guerrilla forces, pledged to serve as espionage agents for their Kremlin-Peiping masters and acting as the running dogs of world Communist imperialism—the highest stage of international Stalinist communism.

In these countries the Communist Party is not a political party but the advance military base of Soviet imperialism and the coordinator of armed terror, arson, bloodshed and unremitting guerrilla warfare. The Communist Party in every country is not a political party but, by its own frank admissions, an armed military group. So, too, the agents of the WFTU and their affiliated members throughout the world are not trade unionists but the running dogs of the Kremlin, the espionage agents for Soviet Russian imperialism, the paid puppet fomentors of bloody revolution, the precursors of totalitarian coups d'état aimed at throwing into the ashcan of history the hard-won freedom and independence of the Asian countries which have struggled, in the face of all difficulties, to extend freedom and raise living standards throughout Asia.

The blueprint for Communist aggression against all Asia outlined at the Peiping conference of November-December, 1949, is proof positive of the vast plot now unfolding throughout Asia. Asia has been warned. Let him who has ears hear.

Asia has indeed been warned. Courageous action today may secure freedom, peace and national independence tomorrow.

But action tomorrow or the day after tomorrow may be too late.

MAO, LIKE STALIN, MURDERS HONEST TRADE-UNIONISTS

(By Victor Riesel)

A nonconformist labor chief in the land where the spirit of Sun Yat-sen has sunk disappears fast. Then comes the bullet. This has happened to 800 since the Soviet took over China. I have their names, where they were killed and why.

On the night of April 30, 1950, the lights went up in the Kumsin theater, largest movie house in West Canton. Leaflets were spread calling for the celebration of a non-Communist May Day. The throwaways were found in every street, even in the mansion of Mayor Yeh Chien-yin.

Communist Kanpoo arrested 400 labor men. They were never seen again.

Yo Cheng-chi, a labor man, was killed by the secret police in Tzepo, Shantung, in February 1949; Wu Cho-ting was murdered in Tsinan, Shantung, the same day.

Hwang Ta-chung and 22 of his colleagues, men and women, were assassinated in Shanghai in July 1949. Ching Kwang-shi and 50 of his union people were slain at the Sungsin cotton mill because they stood on their human rights and in August 1949, refused to move factory machinery to go to the Soviet Union. Late in 1950, 400 were shot in Tsingtao on sabotage charges.

Wei Yung-lai, Mao Teh-kang and Shuntao were killed for calling a strike in the Wing-on cotton mill, No. 2 factory. One thousand key unionists were arrested in Shanghai, 600 in Canton, 300 in Chungking, and 200 in Hankow recently. Loh Kwan was wounded in Portuguese Macao by Red agents after escaping from glorious new China.

The August 19, 1949, labor regulations, just made available in this country by the anti-Communist underground, say that during a labor-management dispute:

"* * * employees shall not strike or engage in other activities tending to obstruct production or produce deterioration in labor discipline. Even after an arbitration decision has been made by the Bureau (of Social Affairs) * * * the right of interpretation and revision of these regulations rests with the Military Control Commission."

A let's-be-frank meeting was run by the Chinese military in every factory in every city they hold on the mainland. The workers were told: Tell your grievances.

The workers talked. The secret police took notes.

Those workers talk no more.

Small Business in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Small Business in the Defense Program by former Senator James M. Mead, now Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which was broadcast from radio station WBNY, Buffalo, N. Y., on March 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this grave international crisis with our liberties at stake, Americans are united in accepting a few basic ideas: First, that our essential freedoms, spiritual, political, and economic, are in jeopardy; second, that the preservation of these freedoms will demand the utmost use of our national skills and resources; and, third, that personal and group interests must be temporarily passed over wherever such interests are inconsistent with our maximum national effort.

As one who shares this common ground with you, I want to talk to you about the substantial contribution which small and independent business can make to the Nation's industrial mobilization program and about the danger—the avoidable danger—that small business may not be given the fullest opportunity to make this substantial contribution.

My experience in the Senate with the War Investigating and Small Business Committees tells me that our industrial mobilization for military purposes has a strong tendency to rely upon big companies more than upon small companies.

The situation does not spring from anyone's plan to bring about such results. It is the cumulative effect of many detailed decisions born from hurry and haste, and sometimes from the ill-considered self-interest shown by strategically placed large enterprises. It shows itself in a tendency toward greater concentration of economic power, in the accelerated growth of the Nation's largest corporations.

Industrial concentration is often promoted by the scarcities that accompany mobilization. Sellers are likely to serve

their own larger customers first. Vertically integrated concerns are likely to serve themselves and their subsidiaries before serving their independent customers.

Such concentration may likewise be promoted by the Government's emergency procurement because some Government officials turn readily to large enterprises with established reputations, and because such large enterprises are much more familiar with Government specifications and with the procedures for awarding Government contracts.

It is again promoted by the need for secrecy in handling strategic knowledge, since secrecy is easiest to maintain if the knowledge is available only to a few persons in a few large key enterprises.

It is further promoted by the channeling of Government funds for research purposes into a few large research organizations.

It is finally promoted by the channeling of Government loans to a few large producers who can get materials and who have Government contracts.

I should also like it to be clearly understood that I am not criticizing large companies, nor their executives, for putting themselves at the service of the Government during an emergency. Their facilities and their know-how are indispensable. I am saying that because they are important, and because they are well-known and because the use of them offers obvious advantages to a Government that is necessarily in a hurry and does not want to take unnecessary risks, they tend to be used disproportionately. This disproportionate use ultimately weakens the country during the progress of emergency and creates a concentration which weakens the country's institutions after the emergency is over.

The other side of the picture is that small business tends to be underused. Such small business concerns are likely to be cut off first when goods are scarce. They are least likely to be able to accumulate inventories in anticipation of a shortage or to find alternative sources of supply. They experience unusual difficulty in adapting their operations to the use of substitute materials, since their research facilities are typically limited. Their financial resources are often unequal to the risk of rapidly expanding their capacity, and finally they find it hard to attract new investment capital or to secure adequate credit, either private or governmental. Unable to keep close watch over the development of defense orders and unable to bid on the larger contracts, they are handicapped in obtaining Government business. They find it difficult to obtain subcontracts because they cannot offer reciprocal subcontracts. In selling to the civilian market, they encounter difficulties when goods are scarce and consumer incomes are high. Buyers who are uncertain if they can get replacements are likely to prefer known brands of large concerns to the unknown brands of small concerns. Price controls are likely to eliminate the price differentials which have offset the relative lack of prestige of the small company's products. The drafting of personnel for military service is an inconvenience to the large company, it may be a disaster to the small one.

All of us have a common interest in counteracting these tendencies. Even the large business enterprise which, at first glance, obtains a differential advantage from its size has such a common interest. When small business is not adequately utilized, a large proportion of the country's total productive capacity is prevented from contributing to the country's economic strength. This was true in the last war. In 1943, for example, a survey of unused capacity among small plants was made by the Department of Commerce. It concluded that only 13 percent of the concerns studied were using their existing facilities fully; that half of the companies could increase their output if they obtained men and materials to do so; and that a third of them could increase their output even without additional men and materials.

This underuse of the small establishment was a corollary of an excessive concentration of Government contracts. From June 1940 to September 1944 51 percent of the prime contracts went to 33 corporations and more than 67 percent to 100 corporations. Even subcontracts went mostly to the larger concerns. A study of 252 of the Nation's largest corporations made by the Smaller War-plants Corporation in 1943 showed that these large firms sublet about 34 percent of the value of their prime contracts but that only a quarter of this amount went to subcontractors with less than 500 workers.

When we overload the industrial machine at one end and underload it at the other, the inevitable result is failure to produce as much and as fast as can be produced. That is what happened in World War II. This fact appeared clearly in the unfilled order backlogs that prevailed during the latter part of the recent World War. In March 1944, the unfilled orders of large plants in the metal products industries averaged nearly a year's full production, whereas those of small plants averaged barely more than 5 months full production. While it is true that only the large company and the large plant can produce certain types of heavy military equipment, this pattern of overuse of large business and underuse of small business was not limited to such cases. Relatively simple types of metal products showed the same pattern. For metal pails, small plants had backlogs of between 4 and 5 months and large plants between 9 and 10 months. There were many other similar instances in which either the Government or the civilian market or both went unduly short or waited an unduly long time because orders had been unduly concentrated in the large companies.

The easy way of organizing industrial mobilization so that it depends chiefly upon large enterprises is not at all the efficient way of getting full production. The small companies are an important part of our national capacity. Their output is a vital part of our national strength. An equal opportunity for small business to produce is essential if we are to use all our muscle.

Thus there is harmony rather than conflict between the immediate needs of industrial mobilization and the longer run needs of a free-enterprise economy. Competitive private enterprise is regarded by all of us as one of the fundamental expressions of our freedom and one of the fundamental supports as well. While we may differ among ourselves from time to time about whether a large company has acquired monopoly power that needs to be curbed, I think most of us agree that to keep private competitive enterprise we must preserve small business along with large business. We must avoid a long run trend toward even greater concentration of economic power.

We can mobilize the maximum resources of small business if we want to do it and if we take the necessary steps soon enough. I shall not attempt to offer a complete program for this purpose. I shall merely mention a few of the more obvious means by which it can be accomplished.

We should make, and keep up to date, a study of the idle capacity available in the United States, particularly that in the hands of small business. We should also study the idle manpower that is available, particularly in the smaller communities. In the light of these studies, we should review the distribution of Government procurement, of industrial subcontracts, and of order backlogs for the sake of shifting orders from the overused to the underused facilities and from localities where labor is short to localities where it is more plentiful. We should examine the size of inventories and revise allocations of scarce materials to avoid tying up such materials in congested establishments where their turn-over will be slow. We should avoid withholding such materials from small plants which could use idle facilities and idle labor if the materials were available.

We should set up special machinery for placing Government contracts directly with small enterprises. We should use that machinery also to assure so far as possible that the subcontracts placed by large concerns shall go to small enterprises. The Smaller War Plants Corporation performed such functions fairly well during the last world war.

We should make every effort to simplify Government purchasing specifications so that they correspond as nearly as possible to ordinary commercial specifications for similar goods.

We should encourage plant expansion by small enterprises as well as by large ones. We should take steps to make available to small concerns loans and tax amortization privileges comparable to those that are extended to large companies that undertake strategically desirable plant expansion. Wherever practical we should encourage plant expansion in dispersed small units capable of being built and operated by small companies.

We should make production methods and new techniques available to small companies as fully as possible. We should consider a policy of making research grants to small companies that have appropriate research facilities. We should consider requiring that new technology that has strategic value and has been financed by the Government be made available on reasonable terms without undue restrictions to small concerns that will use it for mobilization purposes.

Steps such as these require exercise of judgment day by day in many varying situations. The first essential is a policy determination that the facilities of small business shall be fully used. But such a policy is not automatic nor self-executing. The second essential, therefore, is a specific assignment to one or more appropriate agencies to see to it that the policy is carried out.

De Seversky Calls Bigger United States Force for Europe a Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith the following brief significant article from the New York Journal-American of Sunday, March 11, by the eminent authority on air power, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky:

DE SEVERSKY CALLS BIGGER UNITED STATES FORCE FOR EUROPE A TRAP

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, internationally famous airplane designer and aviation authority)

The great military debate in Congress has been steered into a blind alley of confusion. Somehow the false impression has been created that the problem is simply whether or not to send four additional American divisions to Europe.

The average American may be forgiven if he now thinks that this is the heart of the dispute. With two divisions already in Europe, he wonders, why all the quibbling about raising this contingent to six.

Unfortunately, this is a misleading statement of the issue. If it were merely a question of a few more divisions, even the congressional witnesses opposing the scheme, the writer included, would readily go along. There are no overwhelming objections to such a trifling expansion of the American ground quota.

But the real issue is far removed from this. The four divisions are only the beginning of a process that must ultimately suck millions of our young men into a European slaughterhouse, under conditions made to order for the Kremlin.

BASIC STRATEGY

What is at stake in the debate is the nature of basic American strategy. The decision to be made is whether our industrial potentials and limited manpower shall be channeled into old-style ground warfare, in which the enemy enjoys all the advantages—or invested in air strategy, in which we can attain clean-cut supremacy both in numbers and quality.

The arguments advanced in favor of more American troops for Europe have little relation to the real problem. Indeed, they have raised a smoke screen of irrelevancies behind which the strategic core of the issue has been hidden from public view.

BOOSTING MORALE

We are told, for instance, that four more divisions will boost European morale by demonstrating America's will to fight for freedom. But in the light of our sacrifices in Korea, the American declaration of a national emergency, our vastly expanded military budgets, why should our will to oppose aggression be in doubt?

I submit that any European who still doubts it will not be convinced by the arrival of a few more divisions. Stalin has, and for years must continue to have, overwhelming superiority on the ground. To suppose that America would not fight if he slaughtered two divisions, but only if he slaughtered six, makes no sense.

Behind the beguiling talk of "only a few more divisions" is the plan—already adopted by our high command without consulting Congress and the people—which is bound to degenerate into a showdown on the ground against the Soviet and satellite armies. Though billed as "balanced forces," that plan still looks upon air power as an auxiliary to soften the enemy at home and to provide "air artillery" support for our foot soldiers.

The tragic reality is that America is being committed to an outmoded and fallacious strategy, because it is the only kind our military mentors understand. Like the French generals who staked their country on the Maginot line after 1918, our generals are making the commitment in a spirit of patriotic devotion.

We have been assured that 3,500,000 men would be enough unless the world situation deteriorated sharply. Almost at once, however, Gen. J. Lawton Collins took the stand to announce that the figure would have to be expanded within 6 months. That's the tipoff. We are preparing to fight a new war with the methods of the last, although history proves that such "frozen thinking" is fatal. More and more millions will be funneled into the hopeless attempt to match Moscow's teeming manpower on the ground.

GROUND GENERAL

The very make-up of our high command makes such strategy inevitable. Secretary of Defense Marshall is a ground general. On June 21, 1943, he declared: "Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing, but he will recover unless the knockout blow is delivered by the Army." The fact that Japan, having been knocked from the skies, surrendered with an army of 6,000,000 well-equipped men still intact, apparently made little impression on General Marshall. Only last week in his speech at Columbia University, before the Institute of Arts and Sciences, he said, "The experience of battle * * * points to the continued and decisive role of ground forces."

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, wrote last year that he is "convinced beyond any reasonable doubt" that "we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground." And the Chief of Staff of the Army, naturally, is no less sold on bayonet warfare. All of General Collins' statements revolve around his certainty that "the doughboy is the final answer."

OTHERS GO ALONG

The other two members of the high command, representing the Navy and the Air Force, are in a minority and, in the nature of a military body, bound to go along with the majority concepts. Thus while the dispute rages around irrelevant matters like those four divisions, the life-and-death issue of a correct strategy is shoved out of sight.

I am not accusing our leadership of some mischievous conspiracy. The conspiracy is of another kind—like that of a fond mother who believes that castor oil is a cure-all, and administers it to her child in ever larger doses, thinly disguised with orange juice. Her intentions are the best, but her child will die all the same if his abdominal pains are due to acute appendicitis.

We are being coaxed and threatened and argued into putting more and more of our resources and manhood into surface force, for the kind of war in which we cannot hope to win under modern conditions. Our leaders do not grasp the possibilities of air power geared to take control of the air clear around the globe, by passing the surface strength of the Soviets.

POPULATION FACTOR

The optimistic references to a population of 200 or 300 millions in the western bloc are meaningless. This represents potential troops—but the Soviet Union has huge and superbly equipped armies already in being, supported by tactical aviation as good as ours and much larger in quantity. It is childish to suppose that Moscow will allow us to create West European forces capable of crossing out her dominance of the continent, when it has the power to nip the enterprise in the bud. How an additional four divisions put into the inextricable trap will deter Soviet aggression defies explanation.

After the war, we threw away our gun. Soviet Russia held on to hers. Now we propose to stoop down and pick up the discarded weapon. Why should the Kremlin let us do this—unless we have a powerful deterrent force elsewhere to stop them from putting a bullet through our forehead?

DETERRENT FORCE

That deterrent force can only be American strategic air power, operating directly from our continent—from bases, that is to say, inaccessible to the Kremlin's land might and tactical air force. Only under this protection can European capacity for defense be revived.

But today our strategic air force does not have the magnitude to serve as a real deterrent. Though properly conceived, and armed with atom bombs, it is no more than a token force. It will remain only a token force as long as we persist in dividing our potential three ways for so-called balanced forces—instead of applying the major portion to air power on the common-sense basis that first things must come first. Only when such an American Air Force is in existence will European rearmament be at all possible.

Public Assistance Provisions of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

DEAR ———: No doubt you have been informed of the recent action of the New York State Legislature, which adopted a resolution concerning the application of certain parts of the Social Security Act to the public assistance program in the State of New York. Since copies of the resolution may have been forwarded to you, I think you will be interested in the enclosed comments, which are taken from a statement I issued to the press the day the resolution was adopted in Albany. If you would like to have any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

With warm good wishes, I am,

Cordially and sincerely,

OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator.

STATEMENT BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, MARCH 9, 1951

The resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature claims that the Federal Security Agency has threatened to withhold funds from New York for aid to dependent children, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled, unless the State acquiesced in two "arbitrary conditions."

The resolution alleges that one of these conditions "would mandate an inflexible State-wide standard of assistance requiring all persons receiving assistance under a welfare program to receive mechanically the same benefits in total disregard of individualized needs." The second condition, according to the resolution, would require the State "to depart from its long-established civil-service system and compel the adoption of special civil-service standards and procedures for employees dealing with Federal welfare programs or a general revision of our civil-service system."

The 1935 Social Security Act provided for Federal contributions to the States for needy people—under certain conditions. It provided that each State submit a State plan which had to be approved, originally by the Social Security Board and now by the Federal Security Administrator, as meeting the requirements of the Social Security Act. This State plan, the act says, "shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory upon them." Furthermore, since 1940, the act requires that all such plans include "methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis."

These are not arbitrary conditions dreamed up by me or anyone else in the Federal Security Agency. They are part of the law of the land. Congress wrote these essential provisions into the Social Security Act because it wanted to protect helpless needy persons from arbitrary and capricious action, and to make sure that they would receive humane and individual consideration wherever they live within a State.

Failure to adhere to these provisions has resulted in serious differences in the treatment of needy people throughout New York

State. People in various parts of the State receive shockingly disparate amounts of assistance in relation to their need. The law clearly calls for equitable treatment for persons in need; and persons in New York State have not been getting equitable treatment.

There has been failure on the part of local welfare districts to include basic items in the budgets of needy persons. There has been an alarming variation in the tests applied in determining who is entitled to assistance and who is not. Thus, in some welfare districts a person may be denied assistance if he has as much as $100 worth of personal property, while in a neighboring district a person may be granted assistance even though he has $1,500 or more of personal property. In my opinion, the Congress that passed the Social Security Act was out to prevent precisely this kind of discrimination.

We have not insisted on an "inflexible" standard that would require all persons to receive mechanically the same benefit without regard to individual need. Quite the contrary. What we have asked the State Department of Social Welfare to do is to establish a Statewide policy that would be simple, objective, and consistent, so that a person in need would know what he is entitled to, and would not have to depend on the whim of a local official.

The Federal Government asks for equality of treatment, not necessarily equality of dollar assistance. The Federal Government asks that New York see to it that people in equal need receive the money to secure the same standard of living. Obviously, the rent costs in a small town upstate will not be the same as in Manhattan. The equal standard requires that a needy person receive the money to purchase equivalent food, clothing, and shelter, wherever he lives within the State.

All of this is well known to the State Board of Social Welfare. As a matter of fact, since 1944 the board has paid lip service to the requirements of Federal law. In that year it issued an instruction to local districts calling for equitable treatment of persons in equal need; but this instruction was never enforced. On January 22, 1951, this board ratified an agreement which the chairman of the board and I had reached on December 29, 1950, relating to aid to the permanently and totally disabled. That agreement provides for inclusion in the State plan of assistance standards to assure equitable treatment for all needy persons.

Thus the State Board of Social Welfare recognizes that there is no basis for the accusations contained in the legislature's resolution and accordingly agrees to abide by the law of the land.

As to requirements for an adequate merit system in the administration of public assistance in New York, the Federal law is perfectly clear. Its intent is to have administration of public assistance in all States free from political pressures. The fact is that New York has some 900 welfare positions exempted from civil service—more than the number of such exempted positions in all other States put together. New York is the only State in the Union where county welfare directors are not under the merit system. Moreover, 55 deputy directors are also exempt, along with a large number of other miscellaneous jobs. This contradicts the express requirements of the Federal Security Act. The State Board of Social Welfare has now assured us that it will take any steps which may be necessary to correct any deficiencies in the carrying out of personnel standards on a merit basis in accordance with the Federal Social Security Act.

These facts reveal the inaccuracies and distortions of the resolutions better than any argumentation.

The Prince of Peace, by William Jennings Bryan

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the ninety-first anniversary of the birth of William Jennings Bryan, one of the greatest Christian leaders our country has ever produced. His lecture on the Prince of Peace is the greatest argument of its kind I have ever read or ever heard.

In this day and time when the enemies of Christianity are trying to wreck our civilization, I think it is a good time to bring to the attention of the American people the argument of this masterful man, who probably did more to promote Christianity throughout the world than any other lay leader of modern times.

Mr. Bryan's lecture reads as follows:

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

MR. BRYAN. I offer no apology for speaking upon a religious theme, for it is the most universal of all themes. If I addressed you upon the subject of law I might interest the lawyers; if I discussed the science of medicine I might interest the physicians; in like manner merchants might be interested in a talk on commerce, and farmers in a discussion on agriculture; but none of these subjects appeals to all. Even the science of government, though broader than any profession or occupation, does not embrace the whole sum of life, and those who think upon it differ so among themselves that I could not speak upon the subject so as to please a part without offending others. While to me the science of government is intensely absorbing, I recognize that the most important things in life lie outside of the realm of government and that more depends upon what the individual does for himself than upon what the government does or can do for him. Men can be miserable under the best government and they can be happy under the worst government.

Government affects but a part of the life which we live here and does not touch at all the life beyond, while religion touches the infinite circle of existence as well as the small arc of that circle which we spend on earth. No greater theme, therefore, can engage our attention.

Man is a religious being; the heart instinctively seeks for a God. Whether he worships on the banks of the Ganges, prays with his face upturned to the sun, kneels toward Mecca, or, regarding all space as a temple, communes with the Heavenly Father according to the Christian creed, man is essentially devout.

There are honest doubters whose sincerity we recognize and respect, but occasionally I find young men who think it smart to be skeptical; they talk as if it were an evidence of larger intelligence to scoff at creeds and refuse to connect themselves with churches. They call themselves "liberal," as if a Christian were narrow-minded. To these young men I desire to address myself.

Even some older people profess to regard religion as a superstition, pardonable in the ignorant, but unworthy of the educated—a mental state which one can and should outgrow. Those who hold this view look down with mild contempt upon such as give to religion a definite place in their thoughts and lives. They assume an intellectual superiority and often take little pains to conceal the assumption. Tolstoy administers to the "cultured crowd" (the words quoted are his) a severe rebuke when he declares that the religious sentiment rests not upon a superstitious fear of the invisible forces of nature, but upon man's consciousness of his finiteness amid an infinite universe and of his sinfulness; and this consciousness, the great philosopher adds, man can never outgrow. Tolstoy is right; man recognizes how limited are his own powers and how vast is the universe, and he leans upon the arm that is stronger than his. Man feels the weight of his sins and looks for One who is sinless.

Religion has been defined as the relation which man fixes between himself and his God, and morality as the outward manifestation of this relation. Every one, by the time he reaches maturity, has fixed some relation between himself and God, and no material change in this relation can take place without a revolution in the man, for this relation is the most potent influence that acts upon a human life.

Religion is the basis of morality in the individual and in the group of individuals. Materialists have attempted to build up a system of morality upon the basis of enlightened self-interest. They would have man figure out by mathematics that it pays him to abstain from wrongdoing; they would even inject an element of selfishness into altruism; but the moral system elaborated by the materialists has several defects. First, its virtues are borrowed from moral systems based upon religion; second, as it rests upon argument rather than upon authority, it does not appeal to the young, and by the time the young are able to follow their reason they have already become set in their ways. Our laws do not permit a young man to dispose of real estate until he is 21. Why this restraint? Because his reason is not mature; and yet a man's life is largely molded by the environment of his youth. Third, one never knows just how much of his decision is due to reason and how much is due to passion or to selfish interest. We recognize the bias of self-interest when we exclude from the jury every man, no matter how reasonable or upright he may be, who has a pecuniary interest in the result of the trial. And, fourth, one whose morality is based upon a nice calculation of benefits to be secured spends time figuring that he should spend in action. Those who keep a book account of their good deeds seldom do enough good to justify keeping books.

Morality is the power of endurance in man; and a religion which teaches personal responsibility to God gives strength to morality. There is a powerful restraining influence in the belief that an all-seeing eye scrutinizes every thought and word and act of the individual.

There is a wide difference between the man who is trying to conform to a standard of morality about him and the man who is endeavoring to make his life approximate to a divine standard. The former attempts to live up to the standard if it is above him and down to it if it is below him—and if he is doing right only when others are looking he is sure to find a time when he thinks he is unobserved, and then he takes a vacation and falls. One needs the inner strength which comes with the conscious presence of a personal God. If those who are thus fortified sometimes yield to temptation, how helpless and hopeless must those be who rely upon their own strength alone!

There are difficulties to be encountered in religion, but there are difficulties to be encountered everywhere. I passed through a period of skepticism when I was in college and I have been glad ever since that I became a member of the church before I left home for college, for it helped me during those trying days. The college days cover

the dangerous period in the young man's life; it is when he is just coming into possession of his powers—when he feels stronger than he ever feels afterward and thinks he knows more than he ever does know.

It was at this period that I was confused by the different theories of creation. But I examined these theories and found that they all assumed something to begin with. The nebular hypothesis, for instance, assumes that matter and force existed—matter in particles infinitely fine and each particle separated from every other particle by space infinitely great. Beginning with this assumption, force working on matter—according to this hypothesis—creates a universe. Well, I have a right to assume, and I prefer to assume a Designer back of the design—a Creator back of creation; and no matter how long you draw out the process of creation, so long as God stands back of it, you cannot shake my faith in Jehovah. In Genesis it is written that, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, and I can stand on that proposition until I find some theory of creation that goes further back than "the beginning."

I do not carry the doctrine of evolution as far as some do; I have not yet been able to convince myself that man is a lineal descendant of the lower animals. I do not mean to find fault with you if you want to accept it; all I mean to say is that while you may trace your ancestry back to the monkey if you find pleasure or pride in doing so, you shall not connect me with your family tree without more evidence than has yet been produced. It is true that man, in some physical qualities, resembles the beast, but man has a mind as well as a body and a soul as well as a mind. The mind is greater than the body and the soul is greater than the mind, and I object to having man's pedigree traced on one-third of him only—and that the lowest third. Fairbairn lays down a sound proposition when he says that it is not sufficient to explain man as an animal; it is necessary to explain man in history—and the Darwinian theory does not do this. The ape, according to this theory, is older than man, and yet he is still an ape, while man is the author of the marvelous civilization which we see about us.

One does not escape from mystery, however, by accepting this theory, for it does not explain the origin of life. When the follower of Darwin has traced the germ of life back to the lowest form in which it appears—and to follow him one must exercise more faith than religion calls for—he finds that scientists differ. Some believe that the first germ of life came from another planet and others hold that it was the result of spontaneous generation.

If I were compelled to accept one of these theories I would prefer the first, for if we can chase the germ of life off this planet and get it out into space we can guess the rest of the way and no one can contradict us; but if we accept the doctrine of spontaneous generation we cannot explain why spontaneous generation ceased to act after the first germ was created.

Go back as far as we may, we cannot escape from the creative act, and it is just as easy for me to believe that God created man as he is as to believe that, millions of years ago, He created a germ of life and endowed it with power to develop into all that we see today. But I object to the Darwinian theory until more conclusive proof is produced, because I fear we shall lose the consciousness of God's presence in our daily life, if we must assume that through all the ages no spiritual force has touched the life of man or shaped the destiny of nations. But there is another objection. The Darwinian theory represents man as reaching his present perfection by the operation of the law of hate—the merciless law by which the strong crowd out and kill off the weak. If this is the law of our development, then, if there is any logic that can bind the human mind, we shall turn backward toward the beast in proportion as we substitute the law of love. How can hatred be the law of development when nations have advanced in proportion as they have departed from that law and adopted the law of love?

But while I do not accept the Darwinian theory, I shall not quarrel with you about it; I only refer to it to remind you that it does not solve the mystery of life or explain human progress. I fear that some have accepted it in the hope of escaping from the miracle, but why should the miracle frighten us? It bothered me once, and I am inclined to think that it is one of the test questions with the Christian.

Christ cannot be separated from the miraculous; His birth, His ministrations and His resurrection, all involve the miraculous, and the change which His religion works in the human heart is a continuing miracle. Eliminate the miracles and Christ becomes merely a human being and His gospel is stripped of divine authority.

The miracle raises two questions: "Can God perform a miracle?" and, "Would He want to?" The first is easy to answer. A God who can make a world can do anything He wants to do with it. The power to perform miracles is necessarily implied in the power to create. But would God want to perform a miracle?—this is the question which has given most of the trouble. The more I have considered it the less inclined I am to answer in the negative. To say that God would not perform a miracle is to assume a more intimate knowledge of God's plans and purposes than I can claim to have. I will not deny that God does perform a miracle or may perform one merely because I do not know how or why He does it. The fact that we are constantly learning of the existence of new forces suggests the possibility that God may operate through forces yet unknown to us, and the mysteries with which we deal every day warn me that faith is as necessary as sight. Who would have credited a century ago the stories that are now told of the wonder-working electricity? For ages man had known the lightning, but only to fear it; now this invisible current is generated by a man-made machine, imprisoned in a man-made wire and made to do the bidding of man. We are even able to dispense with the wire and hurl words through space, and the X-ray has enabled us to look through substances which were supposed, until recently, to exclude all light. The miracle is not more mysterious than many of the things with which man now deals—it is simply different. The Immaculate Conception is not more mysterious than any other conception—it is simply unlike; nor is the resurrection of Christ more mysterious than the myriad resurrections which mark each annual seed-time.

It is sometimes said that God could not suspend one of His laws without stopping the universe, but do we not suspend or overcome the law of gravitation every day? Every time we move a foot or lift a weight, we temporarily interfere with the operation of the most universal of natural laws, and yet the world is not disturbed.

Science has taught us so many things that we are tempted to conclude that we know everything, but there is really a great unknown which is still unexplored, and that which we have learned ought to increase our reverence rather than our egotism. Science has disclosed some of the machinery of the universe, but science has not yet revealed to us the great secret—the secret of life. It is to be found in every blade of grass, in every insect, in every bird and in every animal, as well as in man. Six thousand years of recorded history, and yet we know no more about the secret of life than they knew in the beginning. We live, we plan; we have our hopes, our fears; and yet in a moment a change may come over any one of us and this body will become a mass of lifeless clay. What is it that, having, we live and, having not, we are as the clod? We know not; and yet the progress of the race and the civilization which we now behold are the work of men and women who have not solved the mystery of their own lives.

And our food, must we understand it before we eat it? If we refused to eat anything until we could understand the mystery of its growth, we should die of starvation. But mystery does not bother us in the dining room; it is only in the church that it is an obstacle.

I was eating a piece of watermelon some months ago and was struck with its beauty. I took some of the seeds and dried them and weighed them, and found that it would require some 5,000 seed to weigh a pound. And then I applied mathematics to that 40-pound melon. One of these seeds, put into the ground, when warmed by the sun and moistened by the rain, goes to work; it gathers from somewhere 200,000 times its own weight and, forcing this raw material through a tiny stem, constructs a watermelon. It covers the outside with a coating of green; inside of the green it puts a layer of white, and within the white a core of red, and all through the red it scatters seeds, each one capable of continuing the work of reproduction. Where did that little seed get its tremendous power? Where did it find its coloring matter? How did it collect its flavoring extract? How did it build a watermelon? Until you can explain a watermelon, do not be too sure that you can set limits to the power of the Almighty or say just what He would do or how He would do it. I cannot explain the watermelon, but I eat it and enjoy it.

Everything that grows tells a like story of infinite power. Why should I deny that a divine hand fed a multitude with a few loaves and fishes when I see hundreds of millions fed every year by a hand which converts the seeds scattered over the field into an abundant harvest? We know that food can be multiplied in a few months' time; shall we deny the power of the Creator to eliminate the element of time, when we have gone so far in eliminating the element of space?

But there is something even more wonderful still—the mysterious change that takes place in the human heart when the man begins to hate the things he loved and to love the things he hated—the marvelous transformation that takes place in the man who, before the change, would have sacrificed the world for his own advancement, but who, after the change, would give his life for a principle and esteem it a privilege to make sacrifice for his convictions. What greater miracle than this, that converts a selfish, self-centered human being into a center from which good influences flow out in every direction? And yet this miracle has been wrought in the heart of each one of us—or may be wrought—and we have seen it wrought in the hearts of those about us. No, living in the midst of mystery and miracles, I shall not allow either to deprive me of the benefits of the Christian religion.

Some of those who question the miracle also question the theory of atonement; they assert that it does not accord with their idea of justice for one to die for others. Let each one bear his own sins and the punishments due for them, they say. The doctrine of vicarious suffering is not a new one; it is as old as the race. That one should suffer for others is one of the most familiar principles, and we see the principle illustrated every day of our lives. Take the family, for instance; from the day the mother's first child is born, for twenty-five or thirty years they are scarcely out of her waking thoughts.

She sacrifices for them, she surrenders herself to them. Is it because she expects them to pay her back? Fortunate for the parent and fortunate for the child if the latter has an opportunity to repay in part the debt it owes. But no child can compensate a parent for a parent's care. In the course of nature the debt is paid, not to the parent, but to the next generation, each generation suffering and sacrificing for the one following.

Nor is this confined to the family. Every step in advance has been made possible by those who have been willing to sacrifice for posterity. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience and free government have all been won for the world by those who were willing to make sacrifices for their fellows. So well established is this doctrine that we do not regard any one as great unless he recognizes how unimportant his life is in comparison with the problems with which he deals.

I find proof that man was made in the image of his Creator in the fact that, throughout the centuries, man has been willing to die that blessings denied to him might be enjoyed by his children, his children's children and the world.

The seeming paradox: "He that saveth his life shall lose it and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it," has an application wider than that usually given to it; it is an epitome of history. Those who live only for themselves live little lives, but those who give themselves for the advancement of things greater than themselves find a larger life than the one surrendered. Wendell Phillips gave expression to the same idea when he said: "How prudently most men sink into nameless graves, while now and then a few forget themselves into immortality."

Instead of being an unnatural plan, the plan of salvation is in perfect harmony with human nature as we understand it. Sacrifice is the language of love, and Christ, in suffering for the world, adopted the only means of reaching the heart, and this can be demonstrated not only by theory, but by experience, for the story of His life, His teachings, His sufferings, and His death has been translated into every language and everywhere it has touched the heart.

But if I were going to present an argument in favor of the divinity of Christ, I would not begin with miracles or mystery or theory of atonement. I would begin as Carnegie Simpson begins in his book entitled "The Fact of Christ." Commencing with the fact that Christ lived, he points out that one cannot contemplate this undisputed fact without feeling that in some way this fact is related to those now living. He says that one can read of Alexander, of Caesar, or of Napoleon, and not feel that it is a matter of personal concern; but that when one reads how Christ lived and how He died he feels that somehow there is a chord that stretches from that life to his. As he studies the character of Christ he becomes conscious of certain virtues which stand out in bold relief—purity, humility, a forgiving spirit, and an unfathomable love. The author is correct. Christ presents an example of purity in thought and life, and man, conscious of his own imperfections and grieved over his shortcomings, finds inspiration in One who was tempted in all points like as we are, and yet without sin. I am not sure but that we can find just here a way of determining whether one possesses the true spirit of a Christian. If he finds in the sinlessness of Christ an inspiration and a stimulus to greater effort and higher living, he is indeed a follower; if, on the other hand, he resents the reproof which the purity of Christ offers, he is likely to question the divinity of Christ in order to excuse himself for not being a follower.

Humility is a rare virtue. If one is rich he is apt to be proud of his riches; if he has distinguished ancestry, he is apt to be proud of his lineage; if he is well educated, he is apt to be proud of his learning. Some one has suggested that if one becomes humble he soon becomes proud of his humility. Christ, however, possessed of all power, was the very personification of humility.

The most difficult of all the virtues to cultivate is the forgiving spirit. Revenge seems to be natural to the human heart; to want to get even with an enemy is a common sin. It has even been popular to boast of vindictiveness; it was once inscribed on a monument to a hero that he had repaid both friends and enemies more than he had received. This was not the spirit of Christ. He taught forgiveness; and in that incomparable prayer which He left as a model for our petitions He made our willingness to forgive the measure by which we may claim forgiveness. He not only taught forgiveness, but He exemplified His teachings in His life. When those who persecuted Him brought Him to the most disgraceful of all deaths, His spirit of forgiveness rose above His suffering and He prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

But love is the foundation of Christ's creed. The world had known love before; parents had loved children, and children parents; husband had loved wife, and wife husband; and friend had loved friend; but Jesus gave a new definiiton of love. His love was as boundless as the sea; its limits were so far-flung that even an enemy could not travel beyond it. Other teachers sought to regulate the lives of their followers by rule and formula, but Christ's plans was, first to purify the heart and then to leave love to direct the footsteps.

What conclusion is to be drawn from the life, the teachings and the depth of this historic figure? Reared in a carpenter shop; with no knowledge of literature, save Bible literature; with no acquaintance with philosophers living or with the writings of sages dead, this young man gathered disciples about him, promulgated a higher code of morals than the world had ever known before, and proclaimed Himself the Messiah. He taught and performed miracles for a few brief months and then was crucified; His disciples were scattered and many of them put to death; His claims were disputed, His resurrection denied and His followers persecuted, and yet from this beginning His religion has spread until millions take His name with reverence upon their lips and thousands have been willing to die rather than surrender the faith which he put into their hearts. How shall we account for Him? "What think ye of Christ?" It is easier to believe Him divine than to explain in any other way what He said and did and was. And I have greater faith even than before since I have visited the Orient and witnessed the successful contest which Christianity is waging against the religions and philosophers of the East.

I was thinking a few years ago of the Christmas which was then approaching and of Him in whose honor the day is celebrated. I recalled the message, Peace on earth, good will to men, and then my thoughts ran back to the prophecy uttered centuries before His birth, in which He was described as the Prince of Peace. To reinforce my memory I reread the prophecy and found immediately following a verse which I had forgotten—a verse which declares that of the increase of His peace and government there shall be no end, for, adds Isaiah, "He shall judge His people with justice and with judgment." Thinking of the prophecy, I have selected this theme that I may present some of the reasons which lead me to believe that Christ has fully earned the title, the Prince of Peace, and that in the years to come it will be more and more applied to Him. Faith in Him brings peace to the heart and His teachings, when applied, will bring peace between man and man. And if He can bring peace to each heart, and if His creed will bring peace throughout the earth, who will deny His right to be called the Prince of Peace?

All the world is in search of peace; every heart that ever beat has sought for peace, and many have been the methods employed to secure it. Some have thought to purchase it with riches, and they have labored to secure wealth, hoping to find peace when they were able to go where they pleased and buy what they liked. Of those who have endeavored to purchase peace with money, the large majority have failed to secure the money. But what has been the experience of those who have been successful in accumulating money? They all tell the same story—viz., that they spent the first half of their lives trying to get money from others and the last half trying to keep others from getting their money, and that they found peace in neither half. Some have even reached the point where they find difficulty in getting people to accept their money; and I know of no better indication of the ethical awakening in this country than the increasing tendency to scrutinize the methods of money making. A long step in advance will have been taken when religious, educational, and charitable institutions refuse to condone immoral methods in business and leave the possessor of ill-gotten gains to learn the loneliness of life when one prefers money to morals.

Some have sought peace in social distinction, but whether they have been within the charmed circle and fearful lest they might fall out, or outside and hopeful that they might get in, they have not found peace.

Some have thought—vain thought—to find peace in political prominence; but whether office comes by birth, as in monarchies, or by election, as in republics, it does not bring peace An office is conspicuous only when few can occupy it. Only when few in a generation can hope to enjoy an honor do we call it a great honor. I am glad that our Heavenly Father did not make the peace of the human heart depend upon the accumulation of wealth, or upon the securing of social or political distinction, for in either case but few could have enjoyed it, but when He made peace the reward of a conscience void of offense toward God and man, He put it within reach of all. The poor can secure it as easily as the rich, the social outcast as freely as the leader of society, and the humblest citizen equally with those who wield political power.

To those who have grown gray in the faith I need not speak of the peace to be found in the belief in an overruling providence. Christ taught that our lives are precious in the sight of God, and poets have taken up the theme and woven it into immortal verse. No uninspired writer has expressed the idea more beautifully than William Cullen Bryant in the Ode to a Waterfowl. After following the wanderings of the bird of passage as it seeks first its northern and then its southern home, he concludes:

"Thou'rt gone; the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form, but on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given,
And shall not soon depart.

"He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright."

Christ promoted peace by giving us assurance that a line of communication can be established between the Father above and the child below. And who will measure the consolation that has been brought to troubled hearts by the hour of prayer?

And immortality. Who will estimate the peace which a belief in a future life has brought to the sorrowing? You may talk to the young about death ending all, for life is

full and hope is strong, but preach not this doctrine to the mother who stands by the deathbed of her babe or to one who is within the shadow of a great affliction. When I was a young man I wrote to Colonel Ingersoll and asked him for his views on God and immortality. His secretary answered that the great infidel was not at home, but enclosed a copy of a speech which covered my question. I scanned it with eagerness and found that he had expressed himself about as follows: "I do not say that there is no God, I simply say I do not know. I do not say that there is no life beyond the grave, I simply say I do not know." And from that day to this I have not been able to understand how anyone could find pleasure in taking from any human heart a living faith and substituting therefor the cold and cheerless doctrine, "I do not know."

Christ gave us proof of immortality, and yet it would hardly seem necessary that one should rise from the dead to convince us that the grave is not the end. To every created thing God has given a tongue that proclaims a resurrection.

If the Father deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn and to make it burst forth from its prison walls, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man, made in the image of his Creator? If He stoops to give to the rosebush, whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze, the sweet assurance of another springtime, will He refuse the words of hope to the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the spirit of man suffer annihilation when it has paid a brief visit like a royal guest to this tenement of clay? No, I am as sure that there is another life as I am that I live today.

In Cairo I secured a few grains of wheat that had slumbered for more than 3,000 year in an Egyptian tomb. As I looked at them this thought came into my mind: If one of those grains had been planted on the banks of the Nile the year after it grew, and all its lineal descendants planted and replanted from that time until now, its progeny would today be sufficiently numerous to feed the teeming millions of the world. There is in the grain of wheat an invisible something which has power to discard the body that we see, and from earth and air fashion a new body so much like the old one that we cannot tell the one from the other. If this invisible germ of life in the grain of wheat can thus pass unimpaired through 3,000 resurrections, I shall not doubt that my soul has power to clothe itself with a body suited to its new existence when this earthly frame has crumbled into dust.

A belief in immortality not only consoles the individual, but it exerts a powerful influence in bringing peace between individuals. If one really thinks that man dies as the brute dies, he may yield to the temptation to do injustice to his neighbor when the circumstances are such as to promise security from detection. But if one really expects to meet again and live eternally with those whom he knows today, he is restrained from evil deeds by the fear of endless remorse. We do not know what rewards are in store for us or what punishments may be reserved, but if there were no other punishment it would be enough for one who deliberately and consciously wrongs another to have to live forever in the company of the person wronged and have his littleness and selfishness laid bare. I repeat, a belief in immortality must exert a powerful influence in establishing justice between men and thus laying the foundation for peace.

Again, Christ deserves to be called the Prince of Peace because He has given us a measure of greatness which promotes peace. When His disciples disputed among themselves as to which should be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven, he rebuked them and said: "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." Service is the measure of greatness; it always has been true; it is true today, and it always will be true, that he is greatest who does the most of good. And yet, what a revolution it will work in this old world when this standard becomes the standard of life. Nearly all of our controversies and combats arise from the fact that we are trying to get something from each other—there will be peace when our aim is to do something for each other. Our enmities and animosities arise from our efforts to get as much as possible out of the world—there will be peace when our endeavor is to put as much as possible into the world. Society will take an immeasurable step toward peace when it estimates a citizen by his output rather than by his income and gives the crown of its approval to the one who makes the largest contribution to the welfare of all. It is the glory of the Christian ideal that, while it is within sight of the weakest and the lowliest, it is yet so high that the best and the noblest are kept with their faces turned ever upward.

Christ has also led the way to peace by giving us a formula for the propagation of good. Not all of those who have really desired to do good have employed the Christian method—not all Christians even. In all the history of the human race but two methods have been employed. The first is the forcible method. A man has an idea which he thinks is good; he tells his neighbors about it and they do not like it. This makes him angry, and seizing a club, he attempts to make them like it. One trouble about this rule is that it works both ways; when a man starts out to compel his neighbors to think as he does, he generally finds them willing to accept the challenge, and they spend so much time in trying to coerce each other that they have no time left to be of service to each other.

The other is the Bible plan—be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. And there is no other way of overcoming evil. I am not much of a farmer—I get more credit for my farming than I deserve, and my little farm receives more advertising than it is entitled to. But I am farmer enough to know that if I cut down weeds they will spring up again, and I know that if I plant something there which has more vitality than the weeds I shall not only get rid of the constant cutting, but have the benefit of the crop besides.

In order that there might be no mistake about His plan of propagating good, Christ went into detail and laid emphasis upon the value of example—"so live that others seeing your good works may be constrained to glorify your Father which is in heaven." There is no human influence so potent for good as that which goes out from an upright life. A sermon may be answered; the arguments presented in a speech may be disputed, but no one can answer a Christian life—it is the unanswerable argument in favor of our religion.

It may be a slow process—this conversion of the world by the silent influence of a noble example, but it is the only sure one, and the doctrine applies to nations as well as to individuals. The Gospel of the Prince of Peace gives us the only hope that the world has—and it is an increasing hope—of the substitution of reason for the arbitrament of force in the settlement of international disputes.

But Christ has given us a platform more fundamental than any political party has ever written. We are interested in platforms; we attend conventions, sometimes traveling long distances; we have wordy wars over the phraseology of various planks, and then we wage earnest campaigns to secure the endorsement of these platforms at the polls. But the platform given to the world by the Nazarene is more far-reaching and more comprehensive than any platform ever written by the convention of any party in any country. When He condensed into 1 commandment those of the 10 which relate to man's duty toward his fellows and enjoined upon us the rule, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," He presented a plan for the solution of all the problems that now vex society or may hereafter arise. Other remedies may palliate or postpone the day of settlement, but this is all-sufficient and the reconciliation which it effects is a permanent one.

If I were to attempt to apply this thought to various questions which are at issue I might be accused of entering the domain of partisan politics; but I may safely apply it to two great problems. First, let us consider the question of capital and labor. This is not a transient issue or a local one. It engages the attention of the people of all countries and has appeared in every age. The immediate need in this country is arbitration, for neither side of a controversy can be trusted to deal with absolute justice, if allowed undisputed control; but arbitration, like a court, is a last resort. It would be better if the relations between employer and employee were such as to make arbitration unnecessary. Just in proportion as men recognize their kinship to each other and deal with each other in the spirit of brotherhood will friendship and harmony be secured. Both employer and employee need to cultivate the spirit which follows from obedience to the great commandment.

The second problem to which I would apply this platform of peace is that which relates to the accumulation of wealth. We cannot much longer delay consideration of the ethics of money making. That many of the enormous fortunes which have been accumulated in the last quarter of a century are now held by men who have given to society no adequate service in return for the money secured is now generally recognized. While legislation can and should protect the public from predatory wealth, a more effective remedy will be found in the cultivation of a public opinion which will substitute a higher ideal than the one which tolerates the enjoyment of unearned gains. No man who really knows what brotherly love is will desire to take advantage of his neighbor, and the conscience when not seared will admonish against injustice. My faith in the future rests upon the belief that Christ's teachings are being more studied today than ever before, and that with this larger study will come an application of those teachings to the everyday life of the world. In former times men read that Christ came to bring life and immortality to light and placed the emphasis upon immortality; now they are studying Christ's relation to human life. In former years many thought to prepare themselves for future bliss by a life of seclusion here; now they are learning that they cannot follow in the footsteps of the Master unless they go about doing good. Christ declared that He came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. The world is learning that Christ came not to narrow life but to enlarge it—to fill it with purpose, earnestness, and happiness.

But this Prince of Peace promises not only peace, but strength. Some have thought His teachings fit only for the weak and the timid and unsuited to men of vigor, energy, and ambition. Nothing could be further from the truth. Only the man of faith can be courageous. Confident that he fights on the side of Jehovah, he doubts not the success of his cause. What matters it whether he shares in the shouts of triumph? If every word spoken in behalf of truth has its influence and every deed done for the right weighs in the final account, it is immaterial to the Christian whether his eyes behold victory or whether he dies in the midst of the conflict.

"Yea, though thou lie upon the dust,
When they who helped thee flee in fear,
Die full of hope and manly trust,
Like those who fell in battle here.

"Another hand thy sword shall wield,
Another hand the standard wave,
Till from the trumpet's mouth is pealed
The blast of triumph o'er thy grave."

Only those who believe attempt the seemingly impossible, and, by attempting, prove that one with God can chase a thousand and two can put ten thousand to flight. I can imagine that the early Christians who were carried into the arena to make a spectacle for those more savage than the beasts, were entreated by their doubting companions not to endanger their lives. But, kneeling in the center of the arena, they prayed and sang until they were devoured. How helpless they seemed and, measured by every human rule, how hopeless was their cause. And yet within a few decades the power which they invoked proved mightier than the legions of the emperor, and the faith in which they died was triumphant o'er all that land. It is said that those who went to mock at their sufferings returned asking themselves, "What is it that can enter into the heart of man and make him die as these die?" They were greater conquerors in their death than they could have been had they purchased life by a surrender of their faith.

What would have been the fate of the church if the early Christians had had as little faith as many of our Christians now have? And, on the other hand, if the Christians of today had the faith of the martyrs, how long would it be before the fulfillment of the prophecy that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess?

Our faith should be even stronger than the faith of those who lived 2,000 years ago, for we see our religion spreading and supplanting the philosophies and creeds of the Orient.

As the Christian grows older, he appreciates more and more the completeness with which Christ fills the requirements of the heart and, grateful for the peace which he enjoys and for the strength which he has received, he repeats the words of the great scholar, Sir William Jones:

"Before thy mystic altar, heavenly truth,
I kneel in manhood, as I knelt in youth,
Thus let me kneel, till this dull form decay,
And life's last shade be brightened by thy ray."

Snide Sniping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of March 15, 1951. This editorial discusses the ridiculous lengths to which some people in our country are willing to go today to place partisan politics above the unity which we need in this critical period in our Nation's history.

The editorial follows:

SNIDE SNIPING

Time must hang heavy on the hands of the Republican National Committee. That august body recently issued, as a formal press release, a compilation of President Truman's travels and absences from Washington during the past year, prepared by its research division at the request of Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah. Its evident intent is to suggest to feebleminded or incorrigibly crotchety readers that Mr. Truman has been leading a carefree, gadabout existence, oblivious of his responsibilities to the American people.

A study of this remarkable piece of research reveals that the President did, indeed, take numerous week-end cruises on the Potomac, leaving Washington as a rule at noon on Saturday and returning late Sunday afternoon—he even took off Memorial Day, which happened to fall on a Tuesday last year—and that he made several short visits to Independence, Mo., to see members of his family and to rest. Most Americans, we have no doubt, will feel unreservedly glad that the President of the United States has the simple mother wit to take an occasional respite from his enormously taxing job. Many may criticize the way Mr. Truman does the job, at least in some respects, but very few, we are sure, will consider him guilty of neglecting it.

The Presidency has become, especially in recent years, a grueling test of physical endurance. Its demands are so heavy that a mere mortal can bear them only if his physician and his family make him take reasonable care of his health and indulge in a reasonable amount of relaxation. In point of fact, he owes it to the people to do this, and the people ought to require it of him. Too often a foolish fear of popular criticism has led Presidents to drive themselves irrationally—and to the detriment of their duties. Consider, for instance, this illuminating entry in Colonel House's diary for January 31, 1917:

"Mrs. Wilson spoke of golf and asked whether I thought it would look badly if the President went on the links. I thought the American people would feel that he should not do anything at such a time. The President at last suggested that we play a game of pool—at which we elderly men were absurdly inadept."

We are glad that Mr. Truman seems to have a better opinion of the common sense of the American people. The Republican National Committee appears to take it for granted that this is a Nation of fools.

Labor Is Entitled to an Equal Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article from the March 10,1951, issue of the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter, entitled "Backs United Labor Rights":

BACKS UNITED LABOR RIGHTS

The Reverend George G. Higgins, assistant director, social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, said that the United Labor Policy Committee "is doing all of us great service in insisting upon the 'right to an equal voice'" in the administration of Defense Mobilization Czar Charles E. Wilson.

Commenting on united labor's position that big business is running the national defense mobilization to the detriment of all the people, the Reverend Higgins said in his weekly column:

"In terms of the present controversy in Washington it—labor--is merely asking for the right to have a say—the right to an equal voice—in the mobilization program which is being administered at the top level by Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Electric.

"'So far,' said the official spokesman for American labor on February 16, 'virtually the entire defense mobilization program has been entrusted to the hands of a few men recruited from big business who believe they have a monopoly on experience, good ideas, and patriotism.' The Wall Street Journal replied, in effect, that labor is trying to run the show and shouldn't be allowed to get away with it.

"More moderate observers have concluded, however, that labor is perfectly justified in asking for the right to have a say. We ourselves would go so far as to maintain that American labor, far from being out of order in making such a reasonable demand, is doing all of us a great service in insisting upon the right to an equal voice in Mr. Wilson's administration.

"It is doing us the inestimable service of safeguarding certain basic democratic values in a far-reaching governmental program which otherwise could very easily—and even innocently—become a top-heavy and rather arbitrary bureaucracy.

"Mr. Wilson and his top assistants—chosen for the most part from the ranks of big business—are undoubtedly very competent and very honest. But not even the Archangel Gabriel ought to be delegated to administer the defense mobilization program on his own, as it were, without the fullest possible assistance—and surveillance—of organized labor, management, and agriculture.

"Philip Murray and William Green, as the Wall Street Journal will most certainly agree, wouldn't be qualified to administer the program on their own without the cooperation of business and agriculture. By the same token, therefore, Mr. Wilson is not qualified to go it alone without the participation of labor, on a basis of full equality with big business, in the administration of the program."

The Tragedy of Seoul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, during World War II capital cities were destroyed, ruined, and devastated like they never had been in previous history. Heading this list, and there is a question as to the order in which they should be listed, are the capital cities of Warsaw, Poland; Berlin, Germany; and Manila in the Philippines. Another capital city is now in this category; and as the Korean war continues, this capital will, no doubt, head the list of total destruction as far as capital cities are concerned. My reference, of course, is to the city of Seoul; and in this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, March 17, headed "The Tragedy of Seoul:"

THE TRAGEDY OF SEOUL

It is hard for Americans, in the security and comfort of their homes, to imagine what life in far away Seoul is like today. It is hard for war correspondents to put in words

the tragedy of a city which twice has been captured by Communist armies and twice has been liberated by United Nations troops.

One might think that the failure twice in the past to hold the South Korean capital against Red hordes would have left the miserable people of desolate Seoul resentful and sullen. Surely their faith in the defenders of their families, their homes, and their city has been put to cruel test during the past terrible months. Death, pestilence, and destruction have besieged them in frightening forms by day and by night. Their dwellings and business houses have been destroyed by blast and flame, their loved ones slaughtered or maimed, their food supplies confiscated. Only 200,000 of the once-thriving population of 1,500,000 persons remain in the rubble of what is virtually a dead city.

Yet there was no bitterness evident when American troops once more entered Seoul yesterday. On the contrary, the welcome which the GI's received was pathetically emotional. Ragged urchins cheered and tagged along beside the soldiers. Tears coursed down the cheeks of emaciated women. Men eagerly questioned the troops about the size of the liberating force. One resident voiced the question in the minds of all when he asked: "Will you stay this time?"

The demonstration left no doubt as to which type of occupation the citizens of Seoul prefer. The siege and seizure of a city by any army constitute a dreadful ordeal for the inhabitants. But if there is to be any liberating done by anyone, Seoul has made it plain that she wants it done by MacArthur's men, not Mao's. As for the question raised about the duration of this liberation, Seoul may look to the future with more confidence than at any time in recent months. At least the American troops which marched into the ravaged city were confident that this time they had come to stay. There is a good chance that they are right.

Rice Can Be a War Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Southwest Citizen, of Lake Charles, La., as follows:

RICE CAN BE A WAR WEAPON

Rice is important to more people than any food in the world. It is particularly vital in some of the world's worst trouble spots.

Ninety-five percent of the world's supply of rice is grown in the Asiatic countries. Some produce more than they need, others less. When every Asiatic rice farmer is producing and distribution channels are open, there is enough to go around.

But take Communist China. It is a deficit nation. There is not nearly enough rice to feed its people. If the conquest of Korea had been complete and quick, there is a possibility they might have received supplies from there, since Korea was a surplus producer of rice. As matters now stand, Korea will not have enough rice to supply its own needs.

General Mao thus faces more perils than the bullets of the United Nations troops. If he is not able to obtain the needed rice from some source, he will have a hungry people on his hands and hungry people are inclined to take desperate chances and to do desperate things.

Though the Communists may win occasional victories with arms while following orders of alien masters in Moscow, what will the Chinese people gain? They may come to ask this question and, as they do, the attractions of communism will grow fewer and their enthusiasm for foreign adventures in Korea, in Indochina, in Tibet, and India will grow proportionately less.

All because there is less rice, to us an ordinary item of diet.

Growers in the United States cannot of course hope to produce a sufficient amount to feed the hungry people of Asia. But if our farmers do succeed in producing another bumper crop, there may be enough surplus on hand to weigh heavily in a diplomatic trade. This is one reason why the 1951 crop, here, in Arkansas, Texas, and California may well have considerable significance in the current war we are fighting against communism.

Bradley: Big Man, Big Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article on Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which appeared in Parade in the Washington Post of March 18, 1951:

BRADLEY: BIG MAN, BIG HEART

WASHINGTON.—There's one 18-year-old secretary tucked away in a remote cubicle of the Pentagon here who'll never forget the day she met General Bradley.

She was just a little late for work—a minute or two after 8:30. She scooted up the steps at the impressive river entrance and was about to go in one of the big oaken doors when a tall man in uniform stepped up and held it open for her. She slipped through, and suddenly realized who the tall man was.

"Golly," she told her friends later, "it was General Bradley himself."

That's a typical story about Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and boss of bosses in the Nation's Armed Forces. Bradley is a forceful, determined and proven leader, but at the same time he's a warm, unassuming man who looks more like the family doctor than a top military strategist. Says a friend of the General's: "He has a humility approaching that of the late Will Rogers."

MAN WITH THREE HATS

Bradley, 58 and balding, retains these qualities even though today he bears the responsibility for the Nation's entire Military Establishment—Navy and Air Force as well as his old alma mater, the Army. Right now, he wears these three "hats" which make him one of the half-dozen most influential military men in the world.

But Bradley's high station has not changed his feeling toward the GI.

"I give you my pledge," he says, "that no weapon can ever be so sensational and no situation so critical as to receive more consideration than the welfare of our fighting men."

Chances are that when his term expires next August as head of the Joint Chiefs, President Truman will refuse to let him step down.

He's a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Military Committee, a top group which lays down broad policy for General Eisenhower. He also belongs to the Committee's "Standing Group" of three which receives reports from and issues orders directly to General Ike.

Bradley has the plain spoken quality common to many Missourians. A tense Congressman asked him recently whether an invasion of Norway by 500,000 Russians would mean we'd have to send an expeditionary force to Norway. Bradley said laconically: "You would if you wanted to get those fellows out."

He takes the same basically reasonable view of the troubled world situation.

AMERICA IN A SMALLER WORLD

"The world has shrunk to such an extent," he says, "that we must be ready to defend ourselves on very short notice.

"This is a condition familiar to the nations of Europe, but it's new to us. Yet they have existed for centuries under it—and there's no reason why we shouldn't be able to do the same."

Interestingly, Bradley has turned writer, and his A Soldier's Story will be published in June (Henry Holt & Co.). In it will be Bradley's own estimate of the men he fought with in World War II, from United States private to British field marshal.

Ireland Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over radio-television station WXEL at Cleveland, Ohio, March 17:

It is customary on an occasion like this to extol the past glories of Ireland. A St. Patrick's Day speaker is traditionally expected to recall the times when Ireland was the sole light of learning and culture shining in the Europe of the Dark Ages, to tell once again how her far-reaching missionaries brought Christianity and civilization back to people crushed by the barbarian invasions.

Or he may review the history of our own country and show how, from its very beginnings, men of Irish birth or descent have contributed to the military, political, cultural, and industrial life of the American Republic.

Tonight I propose to break with tradition and to take a look at the Ireland of our own times. This will not be a waste of time, for most people seem to know very little about modern Ireland. Indeed, to judge from stories that appear from time to time in the newspapers, any story about Ireland will be accepted at face value, provided it is queer enough or unfavorable enough. Let me give you one instance. Around Christmas of 1942, an American publisher returned from a trip to England and Ireland. In an interview he spoke of the "enormous German Legation in Dublin," implying that it was a hotbed of spies, tolerated by the Irish Government. In the first place this publisher did something that no one with any journalistic experience should ever have done; he fell for a trumped-up story that was 2½

years old. In the spring of 1940 the London Times had its Dublin correspondent look into the matter. He reported that there were about six or seven people in the German legation in Dublin. Secondly, this publisher did not ask himself how the enormous numbers could have gotten there. It would be possible, of course, to land spies from a submarine. But diplomatic personnel are a different matter. They have to come openly and to be known by the government admitting them. Now, from the beginning of the war, Ireland was cut off from direct contact with Europe. Diplomats could not have come except through Great Britain. This is just one example of the way some people will swallow any story about Ireland.

We are told, for instance, that Ireland sat out the war comfortably while other people were beating Hitler. This is not the place to go into a long discussion on Irish neutrality. Ireland, no doubt, was as fully entitled to be neutral as was Sweden or Switzerland. But Mr. Churchill himself, in a speech at the end of the war, paid tribute to the Irish who had served in the British armed forces and manned the British factories during the war. From Ireland came almost a quarter of a million people to the British munition factories and to her army, navy, and air force. Mr. Churchill's personal airplane pilot was an Irishman, Paddy Finucane. If we realize that the population of the Irish Republic is not quite 3,000,000, you will see that almost one-twelfth of its people served Britain during the war—not bad for a neutral country. If we apply the same proportions to the United States, we should have seen from ten to twelve million Americans streaming across the border into Canada to work or fight in the war effort.

But let us take a look at Ireland today. One of the big controversies in this country at the present moment revolves around private denominational schools. How does Ireland handle its school question? Ireland handles its primary schools by a combination of private initiative and state aid. It has some 5,000 primary schools attended by 450,000 children, of whom 97 percent are Catholics. The state gives grants toward the construction and maintenance of primary schools. The school manager is usually the local Catholic pastor or Protestant minister. No school may refuse a pupil entrance on grounds of religion.

No great trouble arises with the Catholic population. Since Protestants are few and scattered, they may have difficulty in founding and maintaining schools. But the state, in cases of proved hardship, stands ready to defray the whole cost of such schools; even to the extent of providing a school where an average of 10 pupils can be assured. If a particular Protestant group cannot show enough children to justify a school for them, the state will pay half the cost of transportation to the nearest Protestant school, if the number of pupils does not fall below five. All the non-Catholic denominations in the Irish Republic have repeatedly testified to the generosity with which this overwhelmingly Catholic state treats them. It is worth noting that while catholicism is the religion of the vast majority of the Irish, there is no state religion there.

It used to be said, before Ireland became independent, that the Irish were incapable of governing themselves. Let me point out that the present Irish Government, that of Mr. John Costello, is only the third since 1921. France, on the contrary, has had 10 governments since 1945, and now needs another new one. The allegedly stable-minded British have had nine prime ministers during the 30 years during which Ireland has had three. This was not due to any dictatorship in Ireland. On the contrary, there have been numerous fair and hard-fought elections.

The present Irish Government is a coalition, or as the Irish prefer to call it, an interparty government. When Mr. Costello took office in February of 1948, the wise ones said that he would never succeed in holding his cabinet together, since it represented very different parties. He is now 3 years in office, and his government shows no signs of disintegrating.

One of Ireland's biggest problems today is building up after the war. Ireland, of course, did not suffer any war destruction. But it was cut off from many sources of supply. Its industrial plant ran down. Its land needed fertilizers. Today the Irish Government is engaged on a land reconstruction project greater than any ever undertaken by a previous Irish Government. It is investing some £40,000,000 in the scheme, helped by Marshall plan aid. The ECA Administrator in Ireland has complimented the Irish Government on the constructive uses to which it has put its Marshall plan funds.

There is nothing paternalistic about the land scheme. The government offers help to the various farming communities in the way of machinery, fertilizer, seeds, and so forth. It is up to the communities themselves to take up the government's offer; millions of acres of farm land are being improved; millions of acres of submarginal land are being brought up to cultivation standards. A nation-wide scheme of reforestation is under way. Replacing on the Irish hills the extensive forests that once clothed them will prevent the flooding of lowlands by the run-off rain water—no small consideration in a country with a rainy climate like Ireland's.

Ireland has very little coal, but the Irish have under their feet, more than 3 centuries' supply of fuel in the form of peat, or turf. During the war, when coal supplies were almost completely cut off, the importance of turf became appreciated. In fact, some 5,000,000 tons of this fuel are used every year. Most of it, 80 percent or more, is dug by individual farmers. But the government maintains the turf board, which keeps up research in modern methods of winning turf, drying it, compressing it, and using the byproducts. Moreover, it is building three electric power stations adapted to be fired by turf. One of them is already in operation. There are also two hydroelectric stations—one on the river Shannon, built some 25 years ago, and a new one being built on the Erne. There will be a nice balance between water power and turf-fired power. In wet years the water-power will be abundant. In dry years, the water-power may run low, but the turf will be easer to dig and process.

The power from the electric stations is being spread as rapidly as possible into all parts of Ireland. Villages where once the only light was the oil lamp or candle and the only power the muscle power of the farmer and his wife and family are now lighted by electricity, and the farm work is done by electric motors.

Here again, the Irish Government encourages private initiative. A rural community must estimate its own needs, roughly of course, and make application to the electricity supply board to have the power lines brought in. The local officer of the board makes a more accurate survey. He can point out to overconservative farmers the advantages of electric power and its small cost. Then, if enough people want it to justify the cost and to show a reasonable income from the power used, the power lines come in.

In this, as in other things, the aim of the Irish Government is to help the people to help themselves.

It is well known, of course, that the Soviet veto has kept Ireland out the United Nations—that is to say out of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The United Nations is the poorer by that, for it could well profit by the high moral principles that Irish statesmen have shown in international relations. People may not remember that Mr. De Valera, when the Fascists invaded Abyssinia in 1935, warned the old League of Nations that this was its crucial test. If it allowed aggression against a small and defenseless country to go unpunished, its days were numbered. Mr. De Valera was not heeded. We had the Second World War, and the League is ingloriously gone.

But while excluded from United Nations membership, Ireland is cooperating with the United Nations in the ways that are open to it. Ireland is a member of many of the specialized agencies of the United Nations: For instance, the International Labor Office, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Universal Postal Union, and the International Telecommunications Union.

Ireland is also an active member of the Council of Europe. In fact Ireland's Foreign Minister, Mr. Sean MacBride is the liaison officer between the Council of Ministers and the Assembly of the Council of Europe.

One may ask, perhaps, why Ireland did not accept membership in the Atlantic Pact. Here one must step warily to avoid treading on some sensitive toes. But there are certain facts which should be known. Since the British Government holds part of northeastern Ireland, claiming it as British territory, the Irish Government says that to join the Atlantic Pact would mean that it was ratifying this forcible partition of Ireland, which it has never recognized. The pact pledges each member to guarantee the territorial integrity of all the others. And since Britain claims northeastern Ireland as British territory, the Irish Government would be put in the position of guaranteeing what it has always regarded as an unjust usurpation of Irish territory.

Now there is here much more than a mere boundary dispute. If the United States, for instance, had a boundary dispute with Canada, one might say that it was mainly a question of territory. On whichever side of the disputed boundary a man lived, he would find himself under a fair and democratic government. But in 1921 the British set up a northern government to govern the territory they claim in Ireland. Shortly after coming into existence, the northern government declared a state of emergency and passed a special powers act, suspending all the civil guarantees.

The emergency has now lasted 29 years. Let me quote you a couple of opinions from fairly unbiased sources on the northern government. In 1935 the British National Council for Civil Liberties—which included people like Lady Astor and the late Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells—had an investigation made of the northern government. It reported:

"Through the use of the special powers, individual liberty is no longer protected by law, but is at the arbitrary disposition of the executive. This abrogation of law has been so practiced as to bring the freedoms of the subject into contempt."

Writing in the New York liberal weekly, the Nation, in August 1949, a former correspondent of the London Daily Herald, Griffin Barry, described the operation of the special powers:

"A person detained under these regulations is deprived of protections that have hedged the liberty of the subject in Britain for ages. He may be held indefinitely without being charged and without trial. He is allowed no visitors and no messages. He has no access to legal advice. A curious statute deals with the examination of witnesses by a resident magistrate. * * * A witness may not be accompanied to court by a legal adviser or friend and is specifically not excused from answering questions on the grounds that 'an answer may incriminate or tend to incriminate himself.' Refusal to answer is punishable by penal servitude up to 14 years."

These are no extracts from the code of laws in a Communist so-called Peoples Democracy. They are regulations made for Irishmen in Northern Island, by a government set up and supported from London. The Irish Government recognizes that one of the objects of the Atlantic Pact is to prevent the further spread of that kind of police state over Western Europe. It could not logically sign the Atlantic Pact, which would mean ratifying the existence of a police state in Northern Ireland.

The objection may be raised that in view of the great threats of communism the Irish should waive their quarrel with England over the northern territory. To be logical, one should also urge the British Government to abolish, or at least to reform, the northern government. But the British will not even discuss the northern government. One can understand that; the northern government simply cannot stand discussion. It would seem only reasonable to urge the British to be just, before urging the Irish to be generous. For the ultimate redress of this injustice, Ireland looks not to arms, for it is a nation dedicated to peaceful settlement of international questions, but to the pressure of enlightened world opinion, especially of American opinion. God speed the day when Ireland's hopes will be realized.

In our own country the Irish have shown themselves most appreciative of the character of our American democracy. While on a night like this they foregather to revive the memories of the old country, to recall its glories and its sorrows, its perennial smile and tear, yet they have given to this Republic their unstinted loyalty and devotion. Many thousands of them in the late war gave the last supreme unanswerable testimony of loyalty—their lives. The Irish in America never forget the land of their birth or of their ancestors. But theirs is no divided allegiance; their love of Ireland has never conflicted with their loyalty to the country that has become for them a second homeland. And Americans of all creeds and classes, from all nations of the world, join with them tonight in honoring their ancestral Emerald Isle and the saint who has won and held for 1,500 years every Irish heart.

Armed Forces Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian on the subject of an Armed Forces ceiling:

ARMED FORCES CEILING

If the Nation is to have universal military training, or its immediate equivalent, selective service for 18-year-olds, we are thoroughly in accord with the Senate's determination to establish a ceiling on military manpower. The 3,500,000-man limit proposed by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, would have been adequate. The Senate compromised on 4,000,000.

Military greed in the matter of building a huge standing army, navy and air force is insatiable. But a principal argument used in bringing universal military training in by the back door of the 18-year-old draft was that creation of a large reserve pool of young men with around 2 years of military training would make it unnecessary for the Nation to support a permanent, back-breaking load of millions of men in the regular forces.

The high command pleaded for an open end on military manpower on the basis of preparedness for a national emergency. Should such an emergency—which could only be war with Russia—occur, Congress would be ready to remove the limitation without argument. There is no greater danger of war with Russia today than there has been for several years—perhaps less. The 18-draft and its possible successor, UMT, will build up a vast reserve of trained soldiers, sailors, and airmen for employment in such an emergency.

Nothing would suit the Soviet purposes better than to have the United States plunge itself into an economic collapse because of an unbearable burden of taxes, restrictions on production, and inflation. This would end more quickly than anything else our power to help free nations and our leadership in resisting Communist aggression. An unnecessarily great military force in being would contribute to such a debacle.

In voting a limitation on military manpower, Congress will be taking the Truman administration at its word in the matter of limited contribution of troops to defend Western Europe and in not attempting to garrison the entire world. It will be recognizing the validity of the concept that American strength is geared to the technical superiority of our weapons, and not to mass movement of troops. It will impress on the generals and admirals the economic necessity of making the most of their manpower—and womanpower.

Congressional surrender to the brass on this point would be a mistake which in the course of time could change American life so drastically that we would have lost a war without fighting it. If the United States cannot make its case for freedom in the world with a military force of 4,000,000 men, it might as well, as ex-President Hoover proposed, withdraw to Fortress America and await the assault of its enemies.

Workers of America Contributed Most to Its Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article appearing in the February 1951 issue of the International Chemical Worker, written by H. A. Bradley, international president of the International Chemical Workers Union, entitled "Let's Face It":

LET'S FACE IT

(By H. A. Bradley, international president, International Chemical Workers Union)

Mussolini, acting on the theory that the workers of Italy possessed only muscle and no capacity for thinking, deliberately created a program of confusion and distrust in government; and when the confusion was at its height, he seized the power of government and enslaved the Italian people, not just the workers but all of the Italian people.

Hitler was a copycat. He noted well the maneuvers of Il Duce but improved on his technique of confusing the people and even wrote a book on the subject in which he brazenly stated that if you tell a lie often enough, the lie eventually becomes accepted as a fact—and how he lied and how often. By adding a little arson and murder to his lies, he was able to create enough confusion so that he, too, became the slavemaster of not just the German workers but of all the German people.

We must retrace history briefly and again consider Mussolini. Where did he get his ideas? Well, he had been gazing with envy at the modern masters of slavery, the heads of the World Communist Party in Russia, who proclaimed that only the working people had the ability to use their brains and govern themselves; but these leaders acted always exactly the opposite way. More confusion. They were able to take advantage of the people by fully exploiting the greed and persecutions of stupid dictators who had preceded them.

Today here in the United States, we as a people and as a Nation face grave responsibilities. Our way of life and our freedom is at stake. Our resources are being destroyed and our sons are being killed; and in Washington are men who are doing their utmost to create confusion in the minds of the people and distrust in our Government—men who even now by their actions, if not their words, seem to feel that the workers of this country are incapable of exercising good judgment.

In the current crisis the workers have not been permitted one single spokesman in any capacity where the views, ability, and experience of the worker might be utilized for the full benefit of all the people. Why is this so? Why do some political leaders insist on bypassing the viewpoint and assistance of the largest segment of our population? Why do they insist that they and only they have any mental capacity? Why do they continually try to hamstring every effort of our Government to function normally and properly? Why do they always insist that only they, and no one else, know how things should be done? Why this continual attempt to confuse a nation and discredit its government? Why are they against everything they do not control?

Let's face it. Is an attempt under way to force history to repeat itself and add other names to the dictator's roster?

It seems high time that the people—all the people of this Nation, take a look under the covers and see what some of this is all about. Let us not become victims of confusion, let us not become unjust critics of our governmental processes and let us not forget that it was workers who made America great, not professional opportunists. And it was the town meeting that consolidated our views and our actions, not the secret huddle of a few grasping, professional politicians bent on having their way even at the price of American security and freedom.

Tom Dewey Gets on an Expensive Bandwagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Frank C. Hannigan, in his supplement to Human Events entitled "Not Merely Gossip," calls attention to the testimony given by the New York Governor before the joint Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate a few weeks ago. At that time

he said that we should send 100 divisions to Europe. He did not say what the cost would be. I think Tom Dewey is on the wrong bandwagon. Mr. Hannigan points out in his issue of March 14 just what 100 divisions in Europe would cost the American taxpayer. Apparently Dewey does not care what the cost will be. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the item on Governor Dewey at this point in the RECORD:

The New York Governor's demand—reiterated in his Lincoln Day address—for 100 divisions for Europe had a round-number impressiveness for the newspaper headlines. But GOP Members of Congress wonder if Dewey really understood the budgetary implications of what he was talking about. Would he have ventured to propose that over six and a half million American soldiers should be raised to defend Europe? Yet, that is the substance of his talk, whether he knew it or not.

According to military observers, this is how it is figured. On the basis of World War II experience—and obviously our command is planning to fight the next war on the basis of the last one—the military manpower necessary for 100 divisions would come to at least 6,700,000 men. It is true that we begin with a figure of 18,000 men to a division; but that is only combat troops. All the auxiliary services must be figured and the divisional slice is always far greater than the actual front-line soldiers, since it must include the demands of logistics. Next, the cost of one soldier per year, including pay, allowances, shelter, food, clothing, transport, etc., comes to an estimated $10,000. On the reasonable assumption that the Dewey 100-division army would be composed of 5 airborne, 25 armored and 70 infantry divisions, the cost of equipment alone is estimated at $25,000,000,000. In short, the Dewey program would cost $67,000,000,000 a year for the Armed Forces, plus an initial cost of $25,000,000,000 for equipment. It may be that these figures give the New York Governor no pause, but they do impress Members of Congress who participate in the great debate and who seek to raise the money for such military plans.

Democrats Clean Their Own House—Republicans Not So Zealous in Harding Administration — Maryland GOP Should Be Embarrassed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, of Thursday, March 15, 1951. It follows:

WHO DIGS IT UP

Two Senate investigating committees are writing into the record some unpleasant history of our times.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S subcommittee is looking into the operations of syndicate crime and is finding evidence of a partnership between crime and some public officials sworn to uphold and enforce the law.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT'S subcommittee is digging out the details of the manner in which influence has been exerted in the granting of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The findings of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees have been embarrassing to the Truman administration. The Kefauver committee findings have implicated various Democratic Party organizations.

The RFC investigation has reached into the White House "palace guard," the close advisers of the President.

Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT are Democrats. Neither has betrayed the least inclination to relax in investigative zeal, no matter if the chips fall for the most part on the Democratic side.

In that particular respect the Republicans, while enjoying the embarrassment of the Democrats, must remember that the scandals of the Harding administration were not unearthed by Republicans. The scandals were made known during a Republican administration, but the Senate committee chairmen and prosecutors were Senators Thomas J. Walsh and Burton K. Wheeler, both Democrats.

While Democrats may be embarrassed by the findings of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees, they do not mind at all the revelations being made by another Senate committee, an elections subcommittee headed by Senator MIKE MONRONEY. The matter in which Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, was defeated last fall deserves an airing, and if Republicans in and out of Maryland are embarrassed, they deserve to be.

Iranian Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the most alarming developments is now underway which could very likely result in a most serious problem to this country and other free nations of the world. I am fearful these happenings in the Middle East are little noticed and I call to the attention of the House the implications so evident in this explosive Middle East area.

For 50 years or more, the British have controlled the Iranian oil fields. The greatest known reserves of oil in the world are in the Middle East. The richest single pool is undoubtedly in the oil fields of Iran. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. has the largest reserves in this huge outlay. It is principally British in which the British Government owns the controlling interest, approximately 52 percent.

Great Britain has nationalized its most important industry and embarked upon national socialism. Now they are faced with the proposition that threatens their fuel pipeline.

I have been watching recently the developments of the Iranian Government repudiating their long years of control over these oil fields and following the same policies to nationalize this operation in their country. This means, of course, the Government of Iran will take over this largest of oil companies operating in that country.

The implications would, of course, be immediate. From these fields tons of fuel go to the armies, navies, and air forces of this country, Great Britain, and other western powers. For years Russia has no doubt been striving to bring about this dissension and expropriation of these rich reserves. In any war between the West and Russia this certainly would be the grand prize.

Should this action stand, it is very likely the next move would be to take over the American companies and any other operating in that area under firm agreements.

This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would be far more serious than the expropriation by Mexico in 1938.

Today there appears an editorial in the Washington Post. It is a sad commentary but yet points up some of the views and circumstances surrounding this problem and emphasizes how far reaching it might be. Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

IRANIAN OIL

The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. is a British concern in which the British Government owns a controlling interest. It is not only the largest industrial enterprise in Iran, but also the only successfully operating oil company in the country, providing about 15 percent of the Government's income in the form of royalties and taxes and more than 60 percent of its foreign-exchange receipts. More than a third of Britain's oil imports are shipped from Iran, and the company is the chief source of supply for the Royal Navy. Nevertheless, the company's relations with the Iranian Government have been unsatisfactory for a long time. The Iranians claim that their Government's income from company operations is too low; that information about its activities is inadequate; that too much foreign labor is employed; that oil distribution in Iran is not efficient; and that the educational, health, and housing needs of employees are neglected.

Efforts to revise the terms of the 60-year concession under which the company operates were started in 1948, but the Iranian Parliament—the Majilis—failed to ratify this supplementary agreement, and it was withdrawn at the end of 1950. Thereafter agitation for cancellation of the concession was intensified, and the Parliament recently voted to nationalize Anglo-Iranian. The British are largely to blame for the growing opposition that led to this crisis. For, although the supplementary agreement went part way toward meeting Iranian demands, it did not go far enough. Belatedly the British have notified the Premier of Iran that the company is prepared to discuss a proposal for an equal division of profits—a concession that should satisfy critics whose chief complaint has been that the profit-sharing arrangement is unduly favorable to the British.

Whether this tardy overture will repair the damage already done is an open question. Much depends on whether nationalist sentiment, reflected in Communist-inspired desires to emancipate Iran from dependence on foreign capital, is strong enough to outweigh the economic arguments against expropriation of British oil properties. Thinking Iranians surely know that without the aid of foreign capital and foreign know-how the income from the oil industry would dwindle and the government would be deprived of funds needed to finance developmental projects in this backward area. Obviously it is to the interest of both countries to extend the agreement.

The free world has a tremendous political stake in the outcome of this controversy. For if the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. were nationalized, oil now sold to the western powers

would no doubt eventually be diverted to Russia. Directly or indirectly, Russia would be able to gain access to one of the world's richest oil fields. As Philip Toynbee points out in an article in the New York Times magazine, Iran is a tempting prize for economic reasons but its "real and compelling attraction is its strategic position."

Even if the Senate passes the nationalization bill, as expected, and it is approved by the Shah, 2 months are allowed for study of proposals for taking over the properties. So there is still hope that a solution of the controversy can be found that will protect the interests of both the British and the Iranians and keep oil moving in the same channels as at present. If this hope should be frustrated Great Britain might feel compelled to move troops into Iran to protect her oil properties, which, she protests, the Iranian Government has no legal right to nationalize. In that case Russia would have an excuse for moving her troops across the northern frontier and a third world war might be touched off.

The Story of Wright Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the latest issue of the magazine, Dixie Business, Col. Hubert F. Lee, the editor, has written an article entitled "The Story of Wright Bryan." Mr. Bryan, the editor of the Atlanta Journal, is one of the youngest editors of any metropolitan newspaper in the Nation.

Colonel Lee's story describes the interesting career of this outstanding Atlantian, and, under leave previously granted, I insert this article herewith:

THE STORY OF WRIGHT BRYAN

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Wright Bryan, one of the South's foremost leaders, is at 46, one of the youngest editors of any metropolitan newspaper in the nation. He is a native Atlantian who not only has spent his entire life in the South but who has achieved a distinguished record of contributions to this region.

Mr. Bryan's philosophy is that no newspaper executive is worth a darn unless he likes to be a reporter. Even though he is now editor of the Atlanta Journal—a post in which he has served since August 1945—he constantly practices what he preaches by getting into action as a reporter whenever he has a chance. He is known to his associates on the Journal as an editor who would never assign a reporter to do a job he wouldn't be willing to undertake himself.

Wright Bryan was born in Atlanta on August 6, 1905, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Bryan. He graduated from Clemson College, where his distinguished father was editor of extension publications, with a B. S. degree and then attended the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

His first newspaper experience was as a reporter and sports editor on the Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont. He joined the staff of the Atlanta Journal in 1927 as a reporter, in which capacity he served until he was named city editor in 1935. In 1940, he was named managing editor, and 3 years later he had so ably demonstrated his talents that the title of associate editor was added to that of managing editor.

Mr. Bryan left his executive position in September 1942 to represent the Journal as war correspondent on the scene of action in England. Although slated to return to his post at the Journal at the end of 6 months, he asked permission to remain in the European theater of operations until D-day. And it was on D-day—June 6, 1944—that he scooped the world. And what a scoop.

He flew across the English Channel in a C–47 with the first group of planes to take American parachutists to French shores.

En route back to England, he wrote his account of the invasion, and at 3:15 a. m., Atlanta time, NBC headquarters in New York notified radio station WSB in Atlanta that Mr. Bryan would shortly be on the air—"the first man to come back from the invasion and report to the Nation by air." Wright Bryan was also an accredited correspondent for NBC.

High acclaim greeted the calm, though stirring account of the momentous events. Atlanta newspapermen, active and (like this writer, has been) inactive, were thrilled by both the big news but most because Wright Bryan was making newspaper and radio history.

President Roosevelt wired Wright Bryan his appreciation of the broadcast.

Secretary of War Stimson said the broadcast was his first news of the invasion. Mothers and fathers and sons and brothers and sisters of the men in uniform and all the Nation heard it with all the mixed emotions of wartime anxiety, hope, and prayer. It was truly a distinguished journalistic achievement.

Later on the same day, Mr. Bryan flew back across the Channel and filed an additional dispatch replete with details of the fighting.

Then, almost before he himself realized it, he was in Normandy, assigned at first to Canadian troops and a little later with the American First Army at the St. Lo breakthrough.

On September 12, 1944, he was captured by the German Army near Chaumont, France, and was sent to Oflg 64, a prisoner-of-war camp at Szubin, Poland, from which he was liberated by the Russians on January 21, 1945. He had been wounded in the leg, an injury that did not fully heal until some time after he had returned to Atlanta.

Under his editorship, the Atlanta Journal has maintained a consistently courageous editorial policy. It has never hesitated to speak out boldly for what it believed was right nor to condemn what it felt was evil. Its editorial columns are known throughout the country for the intellectual honesty of their content. The paper has long been a leader in fighting to better the economic condition of the South and its people and the awakening of a greater civic consciousness so essential to progress.

Editor Bryan has been active for years in both newspaper projects and civic work. He has served as chairman of the Georgia Press Institute and as secretary and, currently, vice president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

He has been particularly active in the American Red Cross and served as one of the three general chairmen in the Atlanta Red Cross drive in 1946. He was president of the Atlanta Social Service Index in 1943. Meanwhile, he has also found time to devote his energies to numerous other programs designed for community betterment.

When Dixie Business resumed after marking time during the war years, its fall 1945 issue reprinted what Wright Bryan wrote about the great need for Atlanta putting over the annual community and war fund drive. Our editorial note at that time said: "Our selection of the outstanding column published in a southern newspaper appeared in the September 7, 1945, issue of the Atlanta Journal. Wright Bryan, famed war correspondent and now editor of the Atlanta Journal, is an internationally famous writer. He knows from personal observation the good work done by the war agencies."

Mr. Bryan is a member of the Capital City Club, Piedmont Driving Club, Atlanta Rotary Club, and the Overseas Press Club of America. He is steward of the First Methodist Church.

On October 12, 1932, he was married to Ellen Hillyer Newell, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred C. Newell, of Atlanta. He and Mrs. Bryan have three children, Ellen Newell, Mary Lane, and William Wright Bryan, Jr.

In addition to Mr. Bryan's duties as editor of a great metropolitan daily, he somehow manages to find time for frequent radio broadcasts, sometimes interpreting the news and sometimes interviewing important personalities over WSB's Views of the News program. He also is in constant demand as a speaker for a wide variety of functions.

Collective Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an informative article by Mr. Felix Morley, an outstanding writer, which appeared in Barron's a few weeks ago. This is a thought-provoking article and I commend it to the attention of all Members of this body:

COLLECTIVE SECURITY—ACTION TO THAT END IS FAVORED BY AMERICANS IF APPLIED CONSISTENTLY

(By Felix Morley)

Condemnation of Communist China as an aggressor, by the Assembly of the United Nations, is much more than a belated international recognition of an obvious fact. It is also an endorsement of what has long been a distinctively American principle.

For over 40 years American statesmen, regardless of party, have argued that the most effective way to prevent war is to make aggression unprofitable. Theodore Roosevelt advocated this as early as 1910. After the outbreak of World War I, the principle of collective action was pressed energetically by William H. Taft, father of the present Republican leader.

In a speech at Cleveland, on May 12, 1915, former President Taft laid down four fundamental provisions for a "league of peace." The last of these four points was that in the event of aggression by one government against another, following a refusal to arbitrate the dispute, "then the remaining members of the league agree to join in the forcible defense of the member thus prematurely attacked."

The origin of the quest for security by collective action is much older, and really early American. It was first voiced by William Penn, in his Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe, written shortly after the founding of Pennsylvania.

In this essay, Penn, although a Quaker, argued persuasively for the use of force against aggression. He suggested an annual general assembly of governmental delegates empowered to consider all international disputes "that cannot be made up by private embassies before the sessions begin." If arbitration were refused or rejected then, in Penn's own words:

"All the other sovereignties, united as one strength, shall compel the submission and

performance of the sentence, with damages to the suffering party, and charges to the sovereignties that obliged their submission."

What American leadership is now trying to accomplish through the United Nations in Korea is precisely what William Penn advocated in 1688, and what William Howard Taft again advised in 1915.

It should also be recalled that even before President Taft publicly urged collective action, President Woodrow Wilson was thinking about it privately. Soon after the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914, Mr. Wilson wrote that, at the end of those hostilities, "all nations must be absorbed into some great association of nations whereby all shall guarantee the integrity of each, so that any one nation violating the agreement between all of them shall bring punishment on itself automatically."

From this reasoning the League of Nations evolved. In the upshot, though membership was strongly urged by many Americans, including the then youthful ROBERT A. TAFT, the United States did not join the League. But hostility to the theory of collective security was not the prevailing reason for that refusal.

The fundamental and logical American objection was to the joining of the League Covenant and the Versailles Treaty in a single document, so that the League was at the outset made an organization of victorious powers empowered to maintain a punitive status quo in their own behalf. Many people thought it a false start to apply the doctrine of collective action to secure a peace regarded as unjust.

The story of the failure of the League of Nations, handicapped from the beginning by United States abstention, needs no retelling. Its greatest procedural blunder, undoubtedly, was the effort to secure disarmament ahead of the preparation of machinery to enforce peace. Nevertheless, for all its mistakes and weakness, the League kept the idea of collective action alive. Indeed its final gesture, on Dec. 14, 1939, was to expel Russia from membership for refusing to accept mediation of the dispute leading to the Soviet war of aggression against Finland.

The United Nations, like the League of Nations before it, developed from a wartime alliance. Its actual origin was the declaration, signed in Washington on January 1, 1942, whereby 26 governments subscribed to the now forgotten Atlantic Charter and pledged themselves "not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

In a simultanous public statement, Secretary of State Cordell Hull emphasized the collective action aspect of the alliance. He called its declaration "a living proof that law-abiding and peacful nations can unite in using the sword when necessary to preserve liberty and justice and the fundamental values of mankind."

When the time came for writing the Charter of UN as a permanent organization, two major mistakes made in respect to the old League were avoided. The United Nations was set up without reference to any postwar settlements and without any special responsibility for enforcing such settlements when made. Furthermore, in 10 separate articles (41–50) the San Francisco Charter sought to set up definite enforcement machinery for use against aggression, which the Covenant of the League of Nations failed to do.

On the other hand, the Charter of UN made two wholly new mistakes, the less excusable because they were both identified by constructive critics before the San Francisco Conference, but were committed by the Department of State in defiance of the "more haste, less speed" adage.

One of these disastrous mistakes was the assumption, bitterly upset by events, that the five permanent members of the Council would always see eye to eye on everything. On this assumption each was given the veto power that Russia has used so lavishly. Furthermore, no provision whatever was made for the probability that a permanent member of the Council would itself sometime commit aggression. This blunder had been avoided by the League covenant, which successively defined Japan, Italy, and Russia as aggressors, even though not strong enough to take effective action.

The second major blunder of the present Charter was to put preeminent authority in the Security Council, where the veto operates, instead of in the Assembly, where action may be decided by a two-thirds vote. This stupidity contributed greatly to the delay in defining Communist China as an aggressor, and could indeed have prevented any United Nations action in Korea, except that last June Russia happened to be boycotting all UN meetings.

Moscow is not likely to be unrepresented on the Security Council at critical moments in future. And it is ironic to realize now that Russia cannot be expelled from the United Nations except on the recommendation of the Security Council—where Russia has unlimited veto privilege.

The United States still has faith in collective action against aggression. That is demonstrated both by the unending casualty lists from Korea and by the pertinacity with which, after long weeks of unhealthy recrimination, the administration has finally pushed through the UN Assembly a rather futile condemnation of the Chinese Communists.

But the history of both the League and the UN demonstrate that collective action cannot be made effective through an international parliament at its present stage of development. And for that reason the effort, as General Eisenhower is making plain, must be channeled through limited military alliances rather than through UN.

What is beyond the power of General Eisenhower to explain is why the State Department has throughout been disposed to throw potential allies to the wolves in Asia, while pouring out billions to sustain other allies in Europe. That is a strange and futile way to implement the popular will to resist aggression as such. It has created that debilitating confusion in public thinking for which the President and Secretary Acheson must take responsibility.

A Refugee From Nazi Persecution Gives His Views on Being Called Into Military Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, because I want my colleagues in the House to have the benefit of the clear thinking of a foreign-born youth who is about to be called into military service for the United States, I herewith insert in the RECORD one of the most splendid articles I have yet read on why it is necessary for America to rebuild her Armed Forces.

Charles L. Klotzer, author of this article, has been in the United States only 2 years. Of the Jewish faith, this young man was forced from his native Germany by Nazi persecution, his father having served in a concentration camp. Opposed as he is to force and violence of any nature, he quite naturally opposes war.

It is a refreshing thing to read young Klotzer's reasoning on his desire to answer his adopted country's call to military service despite his adversion to army life and his conscientious opposition to war.

Our country owes its greatness to the kind of stock Charles L. Klotzer comes from. Since the beginning of our Republic, from many nations of the world, strong, sincere, honest young men like this one have come to our shores seeking the peace and the freedom all men cherish and in return giving to our country a high type of citizenship that has made us the great Nation we are. These were the people who built our country—these were our forefathers.

I am glad that Charles Klotzer took the time to put into writing his thoughts as he leaves his position on the Troy (Ill.) Tribune, and his new-found home in that typical American community, to enter the service of his new country.

The article to which I have referred follows:

WHY I DO NOT REFUSE TO BE DRAFTED

(By Charles L. Klotzer)

Although I am neither a conscientious objector nor a pacifist, I am opposed to war. As I am opposed to war, and as the army is an instrument of war, I am consequently opposed to the army. Nevertheless, I will report for duty next Monday morning.

My princip l objection to army life is that it cancels various personal freedoms. In general, it interrupts the healthy life of a nation; in particular, it retards the normal development of youth. In its ultimate sense the purpose of an army is destructive, leading toward actual combat. Combat itself does not achieve any elimination of international conflicts, it only forces physical solutions. One country will have to obey the other, not that it wants to. More probably, future wars cannot be won at all, they will end because of mutual exhaustion.

In spite of these reasons I will obey the induction order. Am I simply afraid? Am I giving up my high-sounding principles?

When I say I oppose war, I may be misunderstood. A truly defensive war, a war to check aggression, a war to uphold the foundation of our way of life, is a war which one has to support. World War II, which temporarily reestablished the four freedoms in Europe, created something. It destroyed what was evil, nazism; it created what was good, freedom.

The defensive side of a war is the one which counts. We have no right to invade others and change their way of living. We would be as guilty as those who want to reshape our society by force. As long as our country does not become the aggressor and employs its forces maintaining what is morally right, it is my moral and legal obligation to support an army.

It is a legal obligation because the institution of the Armed Forces is a matter of law. When I refuse to obey these laws, I also cannot call upon them to protect me when I need them. American laws cover every phase of life and provide for security and progress. Only by upholding them ourselves can one ask others to abide by them as well.

A military force, especially the American Army, need not necessarily cause evil.

Armies can be a powerful factor for peace. I say that somewhat hesitantly, as history has yet to prove that increased armed force secures peace. So far the existence of armies led to their use—and the slaughtering of human beings. Due to my lack of knowledge of present international moves and motives I extend to my country the benefit of a doubt, hoping that force will restrain force.

The American Army has a very high standard of ethics. Its leadership has not thrown us into battle for spoils or for more territory. They are a positive force which has stood for what was considered right in the past.

With this background in mind and hoping for a continuation of such a policy, I cannot help but acknowledge that it reflects on everyone clothed in a soldier's outfit. Those in the service must learn a feeling of belongingness to something which under the right leadership will secure liberty and justice.

At the same time those at home must assure a wise leadership for these forces, so that their feeling of identification and pride will not be betrayed.

So far I have been talking about generalities in regard to war and the Army. At the present time, however, there are additional considerations. There is the international tension, the threat of a new war, and the need to strengthen defenses.

Pressure Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Congress-at-work section of Senior Scholastic Magazine, February 14, 1951, written by Mr. Herbert L. Marx, Jr., under the title "Pressure Groups":

PRESSURE GROUPS—THOUSANDS OF LOBBYISTS TRY TO INFLUENCE OUR LEGISLATION

One of the major industries in the United States—oddly enough—is lobbying. According to one who should know (Chairman FRANK BUCHANAN, of the House Special Committee on Lobbying Activities), lobbying today is a billion-dollar business in this country.

In American political slang, a lobby has come to mean persons (or an organization) hired by private interests to exert pressure on Congress for the passage or defeat of certain legislation.

Originally the lobbies in the Capitol building were the places where people with special causes to plead would buttonhole their Congressmen. Most lobbying today no longer takes place in the Capitol lobbies. But the name has stuck, and the people who engage in lobbying are known as lobbyists.

It should be pointed out at the very outset that there is nothing illegal about lobbying. The first amendment to the Constitution guarantees to all citizens the right "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." A petition may be a written statement with many signatures affixed to it. Or it may be expressed through an organized movement.

Many lobbies serve a useful civic purpose in bringing out facts not generally known to the public or to the legislators. The information supplied by lobbyists at times helps Congress decide what corrective legislation is needed. The danger, however, lies in the tendency of some lobbyists to assume that the public welfare coincides with their own interests.

Lobbying has become such a powerful national institution that it is sometimes referred to, jestingly, as the third House of Congress. It takes 13 columns of the Washington, D. C., telephone directory to list the names of lobbyists. Representative BUCHANAN asserts that there are no fewer than 1,500 lobbying groups and 10,000 individual lobbyists. Many lobbyists work for large national organizations representing special groups such as business, labor, farmers, real-estate owners, veterans, doctors. And there are, of course, a multitude of reformers who organize drives to champion their pet reforms.

Most lobbies make no secret of their identity and what they stand for. They appeal directly to the public through radio, newspapers, magazines, advertising, pamphlets, and movies. They present their case before congressional committees. They work for the election of candidates friendly to their cause.

Some lobbies, however, operate under cover. They keep secret who they are and what they stand for. They privately organize campaigns to send letters and telegrams to Congressmen—to give the impression that large numbers of voters support their program. They try to spread their propaganda without indicating its source.

What are some of the better-known lobbies? One of the largest lobbies represents the American Medical Association. The AMA announced that it had spent $1,225,028 in the first 9 months of 1949 to fight President Truman's national health program. Other big spenders during 1949 were the United World Federalists ($220,599), the Townsend plan backers ($285,371), the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons ($186,371), National Association of Manufacturers ($86,000). Labor unions spent a combined total of more than $200,000.

In order to keep lobbies under control and to regulate their activities, Congress passed in 1946 a special Lobbying Act. It requires the registration with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate of organized groups and their representatives who seek to influence legislation. The agent is also required to file a quarterly report of his lobbying activities and expenditures. All contributions of more than $500 must be noted. Statements are made under oath, and maximum penalties of a $5,000 fine, a year in prison, or both, are provided for violation of the act.

Three lobbyists who refused to supply the required information were cited last year for contempt of Congress. They are Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government; Joseph P. Kamp, executive vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League; and William L. Patterson, national executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress.

The House also set up its special Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. On October 21, the committee submitted its report. It revealed that 152 corporations had spent $32,124,800 between January 1, 1947, and June 1, 1950, on "activities relating to attempts to influence legislation."

The report was based on replies to questionnaires sent by the committee to 173 corporations. Of this number, 65 reported spending more than $2,000,000 in printing and distributing publications dealing with public issues; 31 reported spending $2,000,000 for advertising dealing with public issues; 21 firms refused to tell what they spent.

Chairman BUCHANAN did not, however, criticize the right of business firms to engage in lobbying. "I do not believe in curbing lobbying activity in any way," he said. "But I do believe in full disclosure. Influencing legislation is an activity that should be carried on in a goldfish bowl."

Commenting on the committee report, the New York Times declared in an editorial, "The nature of the pressure and who is paying for it ought always to be public knowledge. * * * If this can be done, lobbying can be part of the democratic process; if it can't, some new legislation may be required."

Mexican War Hide-Out for F. D. R. Rumors Persist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, here is a very interesting article by Mr. Ed Ainsworth of the Los Angeles Times about one of the mysteries of F. D. R.:

MEXICAN VILLAGE WAR HIDE-OUT BUILT FOR F. D. R., RUMORS INSIST—$6,000,000 FACILITIES IN REMOTE SPOT

(By Ed Ainsworth)

PUNTA PENASCO, SONORA, MEXICO, March 13.—Did the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, suppress the story of a multimillion-dollar war hideout for him in this remote Mexican fishing village?

The rumors are flying thick and fast here today.

They have been started anew by news dispatches from Washington speculating about possible hide-outs for President Truman and other top Government officials in the event of bombing of the capital.

IMPOSING PALACE

An imposing palace and an extensive airport and a handy harbor and a paved highway all figure in the conjectures here about the Roosevelt hiding place.

Estimates run in the neighborhood of $6,000,000 (American money) for the combined facilities built here about 1943.

The accepted version in Punta Penasco is that the "palacio" was built for a proposed meeting of President Roosevelt and President Avila Camacho of Mexico to discuss the projected Pan-American military highway down the west coast of Mexico.

READILY ACCESSIBLE

Persistent stories are circulating, however, that the real purpose of the extensive construction projects was to provide a hide-away accessible by all means of transportation—motor vehicle, warship, and airplane—for the personal safety of President Roosevelt.

The palacio which is the central structure in the fabric of rumors, is being operated now under lease by Americans as a tourist hotel. It is owned, according to information given out here, by the Mexican Government.

The fine, paved highway to this port runs about 60 miles from Sonoyta at the Mexican border. Sonoyta, a mere sleepy hamlet, is approximately 95 miles south of Gila Bend, Ariz.

SPORT-FISHING MECCA

Punta Penasco, fast becoming a sport-fishing mecca for southern Californians as well as an important shrimp center, is 550 miles from Los Angeles. The port—named

Rocky Point for the sheer headland that rises from its long, curving, white sand beaches—is on the northernmost portion of the Gulf of California, southeast of the delta of the Colorado River.

It does not even appear on many maps.

This isolation is reported to have been the determining factor in its selection for the hide-out.

It was on April 20, 1943, that President Roosevelt and President Avila Camacho met in a historic conference in Monterrey to discuss the war situation and Pan-American unity and defense.

OFFICIAL DISCLAIMERS

The presumption is that, later on, when the gravity of the war situation was even greater, the Punta Penasco hide-away was prepared as a sequel to the Monterrey meeting.

In Washington today, official disclaimers of any knowledge of the project came from various sources.

Steve Early, White House secretary under the Roosevelt administration, declared that the only precautions taken for spiriting President Roosevelt out of Washington were the construction of a tunnel out of the White House and the creation of the well-known Shangri-La retreat in Maryland.

The Mexican Embassy denied any knowledge of the project involving President Roosevelt.

NOTHING IN FILES

"It's not a fancy palacio, it's just a decent hotel, and now they wish they had built it bigger," one Embassy spokesman said.

The State Department couldn't locate anything in its files concerning the affair, according to the press section.

Comptroller General Warren's staff reviewed old accounts without coming up with anything tangible in the General Accounting Office.

Despite these blind alleys in Washington, the circumstantial evidence piled up here to bolster the account that is current throughout both Mexico and the United States—that the palacio was a hide-out.

INTERIOR ELABORATE

The palacio is an extremely well-constructed hewn stone and wood building, with many modernistic features.

It is known as the Hotel Cortez.

The interior is elaborately finished, with much paneling and fancy woodwork. A significant feature is that there is no transparent window in the main lounge on the side toward the sea—an obvious precaution for the President's safety, according to observers here.

The main apartment and kitchen are on a grand scale.

Operators of the hotel are Mr. and Mrs. Richard Hussong of southern California. They are reported to be subleasing from Senora Olodia Manriquez, a reputed kinswoman of former President Plutarco Elias Calles who in turn is said to lease from a Mr. Bermudas.

The builders are listed as Petroleos Mexicanos.

Visitors who have come to this port over the new road during the last few years have been enthusiastic over the sport fishing and the fine sandy beaches covered with beautiful sea shells.

The big airport on the edge of town is said to be capable of handling the largest planes. The airport is managed by Felipe Ulica, who welcomes an occasional small plane and some commercial ones, but who has not reported any presidents dropping in so far.

Some people say that a deep-water passage was dredged in deepest secrecy right up to the huge breakwater near the mysterious palacio, presumably to provide a channel for a warship in case the President needed to be brought in or evacuated in that manner. Nobody seems to be able to pin down this story, however.

Perhaps the puzzle will never be solved.

Washington officials say the financial accounts of the transaction might be buried forever in some obscure bookkeeping or Mexican loan item.

So Punta Penasco drowses here beside the blue water of the gulf, and sometimes the cries of the gulls circling the harbor are the only sounds heard.

The Hotel Cortez—otherwise known as the Roosevelt palacio—does a good business with tourists.

Who knows the full answer?

Perhaps we will learn manana.

Termination Dates for Education and Training Under Servicemen's Readjustment Act and Public Law 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting information contained in a fact sheet issued by the Veterans' Administration concerning termination dates for education and training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and Public Law 16. The information given in this sheet will be helpful to Members in answering inquiries from their constituents on this subject.

The material referred to follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
INFORMATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1951.

FACT SHEET—CUT-OFF DATE FOR GI BILL EDUCATION AND TRAINING AND TERMINATION DATES FOR GI BILL AND PUBLIC LAW 16 TRAINING

Ex-service men and women have been asking the Veterans' Administration questions about the approaching July 25, 1951, cut-off date for GI bill education and training. Many others have been asking about the termination dates of the GI bill and Public Law 16 programs.

This fact sheet provides the answers to questions most frequently asked.

WHEN IS THE CUT-OFF DATE?

The GI bill states that a veteran's course of education or training "shall be initiated not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later." Termination of the war for GI bill purposes was fixed at July 25, 1947, by Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress. Therefore:

1. Veterans discharged on or before July 25, 1947 (and this includes most World War II veterans), must begin GI bill training by July 25, 1951.

2. Veterans discharged after July 25, 1947, must start within 4 years from their date of discharge.

3. Veterans who enlisted or reenlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act (between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946) may count the entire period of their enlistment or reenlistment as war service for GI bill purposes. They must start training within 4 years from the end of their enlistment or reenlistment period.

IS THERE A CUT-OFF DATE FOR PUBLIC LAW 16 TRAINEES?

There is no cut-off date for starting courses under Public Law 16, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for disabled veterans.

Disabled veterans may begin Public Law 16 training at any time after discharge, but in time to complete it by the wind-up of the program. The wind-up, for World War II veterans, is July 25, 1956. For veterans disabled after fighting started in Korea, the termination is 9 years from the end of the current emergency, a date yet to be established.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "INITIATING" TRAINING?

To initiate GI bill training by the cut-off date means actually to begin. It does not mean merely to make an application for training before the deadline, with the training itself to begin sometime afterward.

Veterans actually in training by cut-off time will be allowed to continue afterward. Veterans not in training by that date may not start afterward—though there are some exceptions.

A veteran who has started his course in time, and who has continued in it, will be considered to be in training, even though he has temporarily interrupted the course for the summer vacation or for other reasons beyond his control.

Example: A veteran enrolled in the fall of 1950 for a 2-year GI bill business course. His first school year ends in June 1951, at which time summer vacation begins. The July 25 cut-off date comes during his vacation. Yet, he will be permitted to resume his training for his second year starting in the fall of 1951.

POST-CUT-OFF DATE TRAINING

A veteran continuing a GI bill course after the cut-off date will be expected to pursue his training continuously until completion, except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

Once he completes or discontinues his GI bill course after the deadline, he may not start another course.

What is a course? VA has defined a course as a "curriculum, program of study or training or combination of subjects as are prescribed by the institution as constituting a course."

For a veteran studying engineering, for example, VA would consider his over-all program of engineering as his course. A single subject within his program, such as drafting, would not be a course in itself.

Changes of course after the cut-off date: Public Law 610, which permits a veteran to make a first change of general fields of study merely by applying for it, will not be in effect after the cut-off date.

Instead, a veteran will be permitted to change his educational objective only while in training and then for reasons satisfactory to VA.

Satisfactory reasons for change are these:

1. When a veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, neglect, or lack of application.

2. When the course to which he desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent facts.

3. When the course to which he wants to change is a normal progression from his current course, and will help him attain his educational or vocational objective.

No additional changes of course will be approved, except for the most cogent reasons.

By change of course, VA means a change in the over-all program of study.

The following do not constitute a change of course:

A change of one or more subjects within an elected curriculum or program; the drop-

ping of a subject without replacing it with another; the adding of a subject; change in the sequence in which subjects are taken, or advancement from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course.

ARE THERE ANY SPECIAL RULINGS THAT APPLY IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES?

In several instances VA has made special rulings with respect to the GI bill cut-off date. The rulings have been necessary to apply the cut-off date to special circumstances.

All of VA's special rulings are consistent with the law and with VA's basic regulations on the training deadline.

Following are descriptions of the special instances:

RETURN TO ACTIVE MILITARY DUTY

Veterans who have started GI bill training and interrupt it to go back into active military or naval service will not be bound by the cut-off date.

Instead, they will be permitted to resume their training within a reasonable period following their release from active service, even though they get out after the cut-off date.

They will be subject to three requirements:

The conduct and progress in their GI bill courses must have been satisfactory; the period of training obtainable after they are released from service will be limited to their remaining GI bill entitlement, and they may not train beyond the termination of the GI bill program (July 25, 1956, for most veterans).

This cut-off date extension applies only to veterans who already had started training, and are prevented from continuing with their training by reason of their return to uniform.

Reason for the extension: VA's regulations state that a veteran actually must be in training on the cut-off date, except for an interruption for reasons beyond his control. Return to active duty, VA ruled, is such an interruption.

SERVICEMEN IN TRAINING

Many World War II veterans, now in active military service, have been taking GI bill training during their spare time.

If they are forced to interrupt their studies because of military duties or transfers, the GI bill cut-off date will not apply to them. Instead, they may resume their education within a reasonable period after their release from active duty.

In fact, when they do reenter GI bill training, they may change from the parttime courses they were taking while in uniform to fulltime studies in the same field.

These veteran-trainees also will be bound by the three requirements of satisfactory conduct and progress, training limited to remaining entitlement, and no training after the program's termination.

Reason for the extension: Here, too, VA has ruled that the interruption because of military duties or transfers is beyond the veterans' control.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

Veterans taking GI bill correspondence courses will not be permitted to switch to classroom courses after the cut-off date—even though the classroom training would be in the same field as the correspondence training.

They may, however, take more advanced work by correspondence if the advanced training is considered a normal progression toward their educational goal.

In some cases, correspondence courses are offered as supplements to residence training in schools or on-the-job. A college, for example, might make available a home-study course to supplement classroom studies. Or a course by mail might be offered as a supplement to apprenticeship or on-the-job training.

In cases like these, the basic course itself must have been initiated before the cut-off date, rather than the supplementary correspondence phase of the course.

A veteran planning to take GI bill job training, for instance, could not enroll in supplementary correspondence training now with the intention of beginning his basic job training after the cut-off date.

Reason for the ruling: VA deadline regulations state that once a veteran completes or discontinues a course after the cut-off date, he may not start another. Correspondence courses have been universally accepted as independent courses within themselves, and not as stepping-stones to resident study. Therefore, a veteran who finishes a correspondence course after the cut-off date could not, under VA's regulations, start a classroom course.

The regulations also state that a veteran may advance from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course. Hence, a veteran may take more advanced work by correspondence after the cut-off date.

MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND OSTEOPATH TRAINING

Veterans who complete premedical, predental, or preosteopath training under the GI bill but haven't yet gained admittance to medical, dental, or osteopath schools, will be permitted to start their advanced training in such schools whenever an accredited school, wherever located, has room for them—even if it is after the cut-off date.

The veterans must establish the fact that they applied for admission each year after completing their GI bill preliminary training.

This special provision applies regardless of whether a veteran's preliminary training ended before or after the cut-off date.

Reason for the extension: Under VA regulations, a veteran must be in training on the cut-off date, except for reasons beyond his control.

The period between completion of premedical, predental, or preosteopath training and the date of acceptance by an accredited medical, dental, or osteopath school will be considered by VA as a period of interruption for a reason beyond the veteran's control.

TEACHERS IN TRAINING

Veteran-teachers who take GI bill courses during succeeding summer vacations may continue to do so after the cut-off date.

They will have to meet certain qualifications. Their study must lead toward a degree; they must be continuously employed as a school teacher the rest of the year, and they may not skip any GI bill summer sessions.

Reason for the ruling: VA regulations require that a veteran be in continuous training after the cut-off date, except for reasons which normally would cause interruptions by any student.

Summer training by teachers for the purpose of obtaining a degree is a long-recognized practice of the profession. Because of the veteran-teacher's unique position, VA will consider him to be in continuous pursuit of his course—within the meaning of the regulations—so long as he takes courses each summer with the objective of getting a degree, and continues to be employed as a teacher each succeeding year.

UNDERGRADUATE TO GRADUATE TRAINING

Veterans who finish GI bill undergraduate courses and intend to go ahead with graduate training which would start after the cut-off date may do so, if they file an application for their advanced training sometime before they complete their undergraduate work.

They must meet these two requirements:

They must start their additional training at the end of their summer vacation period, and the graduate course must be a normal progression of previous studies.

A veteran who receive his bachelor of arts degree in languages in June 1951, for example, could start work on his master's degree—also in languages—in September 1951, if he applied to VA in time.

This ruling also applies to those who finish undergraduate studies after the cut-off date, and wish to continue advanced studies at the end of the vacation period.

Reason for the ruling: VA regulations state that a veteran must be in training on the cut-off date, except for reasons beyond his control such as summer vacations. They also state that a veteran may progress from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course.

A veteran who completes undergraduate studies and applies for graduate work in time is considered to have met both provisions of the regulations.

WHEN DOES THE GI BILL PROGRAM END?

The law states that no GI bill education or training shall be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of the present war.

Termination date of the war, for GI bill purposes, was July 25, 1947. Hence, the GI bill program comes to an end on July 25, 1956.

There is one exception. Veterans who enlisted or reenlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act (between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946) have 9 years from the end of that enlistment or reenlistment period in which to wind up GI bill training.

WHEN DOES THE PUBLIC LAW 16 PROGRAM END?

There are two termination dates for disabled veterans training under Public Law 16.

World War II veterans with disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, have until July 25, 1956, to complete Public Law 16 training.

Veterans disabled while on active duty on or after June 27, 1950, have 9 years from the end of the current emergency in which to finish training under Public Law 16.

To be eligible for the training, veterans in the second category must have disabilities resulting from conditions under which VA pays compensation at full wartime rates.

Assistance for Wives of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing number of young men being called in the Armed Forces there is developing a situation calling for the attention of the Congress.

Many of the prospective mothers—wives of members of the Armed Forces—find it impossible to meet the increasing costs of prenatal and postnatal care and the expenses connected with childbirth.

Everything reasonable and possible should be done by the Congress to relieve these young mothers of this worry and unnecessary hardship.

For this reason, I am introducing today the following bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That the wife of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States who on or after the date of the enactment of this act incurs expenses in connection with childbirth (including expenses of prenatal and postnatal care), and for whom the payment of such expenses is found to constitute undue financial hardship, shall upon application be entitled to receive, in payment or reimbursement of such expenses, such amount not exceeding $100 as may be necessary to alleviate such financial hardship.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall, in accordance with regulations jointly prescribed by them, make payment or reimbursement of such expenses to each person who is entitled thereto under the first section of this act.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith one of a series of articles now being published in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times exposing a group of stock promoters in Canada who transact a mail-order solicitation of American investors.

The article follows:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—When Cardigan Securities, Ltd., solicited stock sales in St. Louis last fall by mail and telephone, it told prospects it was offering them stock in Mensilvo Mines, Ltd., as a special favor to win confidence.

It did not tell them that Cardigan and its president, Horace Nelson Switzer, made 400 percent profit on every share of stock purchased, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission investigation showed.

The SEC found that the price charged by Cardigan Securities is an arbitrarily established public offering price made to hundreds of persons whose names were selected at random for mass mailing.

Mensilvo is a cobalt-silver promotion and its property is located in the cobalt area of northern Ontario. The SEC found that the promoter's statement the mine represented a safe and sound investment, sure to make money for the investor, had no basis. Instead, the promotion was—and is—highly speculative.

Cardigan also represented that money from the sale of stock would go into the Mensilvo treasury to develop the property. Actually, the SEC reported, only a small amount reaches the treasury.

"The 400 percent mark-up is divided among the promoters, vendors, optionees, underwriters, dealers, and salesmen," the SEC said.

The SEC also labeled as false Cardigan's representation that arrangements had been made to list Mensilvo stock on the Toronto Stock Exchange and that dividends would soon be declared. There was no basis for dividends, the SEC said.

Cardigan and its president, Switzer, "are conducting a scheme for obtaining money through the mails by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises," said United States Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr.

Fraud order No. 42671 was accordingly issued against this company's promoter, Cardigan Securities and Switzer, March 10, 1950.

Also, the irrepressible Switzer has been promoting Crangold Mines, Ltd., in St. Louis and vicinity. Not long ago, a St. Louis grocer bought 1,000 shares at 18 cents a share, paying Switzer $180.

According to the authoritative Canadian Mines Handbook of 1950, Crangold Mines, Ltd., has been inactive since a geophysical survey was made of the property in Senneville township, northwestern Quebec, in 1949.

Not long after he purchased the Crangold stock, the grocer was contacted by the broker-dealer and asked if he wanted to buy some more. The stock had gone up to 36 cents a share, doubled in value, he was told.

Like Mensilvo, the history of Crangold goes back about five years, during which neither property showed any particular promise.

In the case of Crangold, the records of the Ontario Securities Commission show that the stock Cardigan sold to the St. Louis grocer for 18 cents actually cost 5 cents and that the shares offered for 36 cents actually cost the promoter 7 and 7½ cents.

The promotion of Crangold and Mensilvo in St. Louis was attended not only by the usual flurry of promotional pamphlets and dodgers, but also by an impressive array of tabloid-sized newspapers pretending to be objective journals of the mining industry.

For example, the grocer received a publication entitled "East-West Commentary—Pulse of Canadian Markets," issued by John F. Burgess & Co., another licensed broker-dealer, listed at the same address as Cardigan, but in a different room.

This was shortly before last Christmas and Burgess got into the spirit of the season with the message: "Only 15 full trading days till Xmas."

Another publication which arrived at the grocer's store was Harold A. Prescott's "Mining Broadcaster."

"Our motto," said Prescott lightly, "is investigate before investing." Elsewhere in the Broadcaster Prescott's prints another motto: "Mighty oaks from little acorns Grow."

The little acorns are then described in a publication which the grocer also received called The Canadian Mining Reporter and Investment Counsellor.

Its headline was: "Make magnetic survey on Crangold" in big black type. This news seemed to be a bit old. The survey had been made in 1949 and nothing had come of it.

This publication also exploited a promotion called Marwood Mining Corp., Ltd., which it found to be a red-hot possibility.

Marwood attracted the attention of the SEC and United States Post Office, who called it a fraud.

United States Trial Examiner Haynes issued fraud order 42720 on March 17, 1950, against Cambridge Securities, Ltd. (a licensed broker-dealer) for promoting Marwood.

Cambridge's propaganda was so worded, the post office found, as to give suckers the impression that everyone should feel fortunate indeed to play a part in the development of Marwood.

The literature failed to mention, however, the fact that some of the properties Marwood intends to develop were actually producing ore in 1941–42, but not at a profitable rate and were abandoned.

Marwood is a triple threat deal. It has gold prospects in the Lightning River area of Northern Ontario and on Outpost Island of the Great Slave Lake in Northwestern Ontario. It has uranium prospects in northwestern Ontario, too, and interest in oil lands in the Maidstone area of the Lloydminster field of western Canada.

"Your opportunity," cries the Marwood promotion letters, "With three chances * * * Gold! uranium! oil!"

Marwood's claims that each of its properties is located near established gold, uranium and oil producers are so much hokum, the SEC investigation found.

"The vicious nature of this illegal promotion," said the SEC report, "can best be shown by the fact that shares of Marwood Mining Corp., Ltd., are being taken down (purchased wholesale) by the underwriter on a 'best effort' basis—that is, by option without a firm commitment, at from 10 to 15 cents per share and are being sold by the above fraudulent misrepresentations by mail into the United States at 60 cents per share."

A Chicago sucker told the SEC he bought 500 shares of Marwood at 60 cents a throw. The shares cost Cambridge 10 cents. The promoter made $250 net on one $300 stock sale.

Another promoter of Marwood, the United States Post Office found, was one W. A. Smith operating under a fictitious name as National Securities.

The postal fictitious name order No. 41077, issued July 25, 1949, also covered G. H. Corolis, operating under the name of Wellington Securities and promoting Camrose Gold & Metals, Ltd.; E. A. Manning, as Union Securities, soliciting in Dalo Oil Co., Ltd., Palermo Gold Mines, Ltd., and Karraka Gold Mines, Ltd.

George Edgar Mallen, operating as Gordon-Daly Co., selling Minoil Exploration, Ltd., and Meg Petroleum Dealers, Ltd.; and Harold George Graham and Steven Boleslav Roman, operating as Mitchell & Mitchell, selling Concord Mines, Ltd.

Trial Examiner Haynes described these enterprises as "unlawful businesses which are being conducted under fictitious names through the United States mails" despite the fact that the promoters were warned to stop selling in the United States.

But with 400-percent profits on sales of stock alone, irrespective of whether gold, silver, cobalt, uranium or what not is found, the promoters are not likely to let the United States SEC or Post Office slow them down.

Here in Toronto, the promoters can get away with it, too.

Hammond, Ind., and Rent Decontrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives extended the rent-control legislation for 3 months.

A number of cities that have decontrolled are now clamoring for recontrol, but are helpless under the present law. When I spoke on rent extension yesterday I mentioned about the housing and rental crisis in the Calumet industrial region of Indiana.

The following telegram which I received this morning from Councilman John E. O'Donnell, of Hammond, Ind., reveals the unfortunate position the tenants of Hammond, Ind., are in today. I am receiving numerous protests from Hammond every day.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR RAY: At a meeting of the Hammond City Council held February 19 an ordinance was passed calling on Tighe Woods to decontrol rent in the city of Hammond. The mayor signed the ordinance on February 24 and it was transmtted to Washington same as approved by the Housing Expediter under date of March 2. Since that time I have received numerous complaints that rentals have been increased from 15 percent to as much as 100 percent. In a 42-apartment building at 48 Waltham Street the tenants have all been notified that the rent will be increased from 40 to 63 percent. Please advise what action can be taken by the city to reestablish rent controls in Hammond.

P. S.—I did not vote for decontrol. Wire return reply via Western Union collect.

Councilman JOHN E. O'DONNELL.

The Hammond City Council, with the approval of its mayor, voted to decontrol on February 24, 1951.

I am including the telegrams which I have received this morning from citizens of Hammond, protesting the rent gouging which has been brought about by reason of decontrol:

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Rent decontrolled. Landlords hog wild. We are at their mercy. Can anything be done? Please help us if possible.

CARROLL SUMMNER.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Since rent controls were removed in Hammond our rent, 1½-room apartment, has been increased 50 percent. Unfair.

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD HOPPE.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol in Hammond I have had my rent increased 58½ percent. This is certainly unjust. I demand Federal action on rent control.

MARGARET MAXWELL.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Decontrol of rent in Hammond has raised my rent from $47.50 to $75, which I consider exorbitant.

ESTHER DUSKIN.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol our rent for 1½ rooms has increased from $50 to $75. My salary has increased 10 percent. What is to be done?

CHANDOS T. RAGON.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol in Hammond our rent has been increased 50 percent for one and a half room apartment. Something should be done immediately.

JOSEPHINE MABREY.
LAVON BUDD.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

My rent has increased 60 percent since Hammond decontrol. Federal action for rent control urgently requested.

MAX MASON.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Rents increased 40 percent since rents have been decontrolled. Landlords hungry and going hog wild. Give us your immediate assistance.

Mr. WILLIAM BRUCE.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Wish to protest rent raise of 40 percent since recent decontrol of rent in Hammond, Ind. Believe raise absolutely unreasonable and request new Federal controls.

ARTHUR C. SMITH.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

My rent has been increased 56 percent since decontrol in Hammond. Federal action to reestablish rent control is urgent.

ADDIE FAY DUGG.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

My basement apartment rent has been increased 75 percent since Hammond decontrolled rent. Federal action requested.

MAE WHITE.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Congress from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol has gone into effect in Hammond, Ind., my rent has been increased from $55 to $77.50. Seems unfair. Please investigate.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD RIPLEY.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. RAY MADDEN,
Congressman from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Since rent decontrol has gone into effect in Hammond, Ind., my rent has been increased from $42.50 for basement apartment to $70. Please check if legal.

Respectfully,
Mrs. JENNIE L. NEELAND,
Widow.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. Congressman RAY MADDEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I beseech you to act at once regarding unfair rentals. My rent is to jump 65 percent first of next month. Now I ask you in God's name, is that fair? Look to you for urgent help.

LUTHER DUES.

HAMMOND, IND., *March 20, 1951.*
Hon. R. J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Although agreeable to reasonable rent increases, have been subject to 40-percent increase as result of Hammond decontrol. Justly demand immediate action against such unfair practice.

Mr. and Mrs. T. R. BLOCKER.

Hon. Robert Lee Doughton, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday evening, March 14, in the Virginia Dare room of the Sir Walter Hotel, in the city of Raleigh, the North Carolina Citizens Association conferred its distinguished service award upon our beloved colleague, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON. The parchment, upon which appropriate language was written, was presented by North Carolina's very able and distinguished Lieutenant Governor, Hon. Hoyt Patrick Taylor. In presenting the award, Governor Taylor said:

In 1903, almost half a century ago, a successful farmer and stock raiser from one of the mountain counties in what was then North Carolina's lost province was appointed a member of the State board of agriculture. His sound counsel and hard work for agriculture, at a time when the State's farm resources were comparatively small, merited successive appointment to the board until his election to the State senate in 1908 removed him from the eligible list. The following year the State government authorities asked him to take over the direction of the State prison, a position held until 1911, when the people of this mountain district first sent ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON to Congress.

Since that date, 40 years ago, "Farmer BOB" DOUGHTON, as he is affectionately known by the people of his congressional district, has been returned to Washington regularly every 2 years. Most of the time his opposition has not been serious.

Forty years ago ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON, as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, began his preparation for national leadership during two World Wars, the intervening peace, and the present global crisis, when the free world this Nation represents is fighting the encroaching enslavement of the world to communistic dictatorship.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of this committee for a longer period of time than any other man in the Nation's history, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON has carried the burden of initiating the tax legislation that financed the United States during years when every ideal for which our colonial forefathers fought was at stake. How ably this man from Alleghany County's mountains has borne this heavy responsibility is recognized by everyone who knows anything about American history of the past half century. The name of this Alleghany County farmer is known all over America. Though not a lawyer he is an authority in the most complex field of legal practice—taxation. Though never an active banker, save as director of the system of county banks, he helped to establish to serve northwestern North Carolina, his advice is sought and respected by Treasury officials and financiers whose contacts are world-wide. Though a lover of the peaceful pursuits of a farmer and stock raiser, he has helped finance the Nation's two world wars, and now, at a time of life when most men think they have run their race, he is so

busy in formulating the Nation's fiscal policies for our defense against threatened dangers, that he came to Raleigh tonight on borrowed time. Though his independent nature and unbounded energy have never given him time to think of old-age security or retirement, he piloted through the National Congress the laws that make old age somewhat more secure for millions of Americans.

In all of those varied activities ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON has ben guided by those rock-ribbed principles of diligence, honesty, and a steadfast belief in the American ideal of individual initiative and responsibility he learned from his mountain ancestors.

When officials of the North Carolina Citizens Association asked me to perform this very pleasant task tonight, they said they were going to honor a distinguished citizen. I believe I am going to be bold enough to disagree with that version of this happy event. The Citizens Association is not honoring you, Congressman DOUGHTON. You are honoring the association. This State-wide organization of representative citizens from all over North Carolina is merely giving public recognition to honors you have earned through 50 years of public service. Personally, I consider it a great privilege and a high honor to be the instrument through which the North Carolina Citizens Association tonight awards ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON this parchment in recognition of his distinguished public service to his community, his State, his Nation, and the world. May you continue to live and serve for many more fruitful years and never get old enough to retire.

Mr. Speaker, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON is not only a beloved citizen, but he is a statesman in the truest sense and meaning of that word. He is never influenced by petty prejudices nor blinded by fond partialities. With courage and fidelity he performs all of the duties of his high position in a manner compatible with all of the fine traditions of American statesmanship. BOB DOUGHTON understands the problems of our day and generation, and he appreciates the importance of the strength of our Nation in the world in which we live. He has seen other nations go down the primrose path of paternalism, and he wants no part of such a program. He has seen the currencies of other countries collapse and the high principles of people perish under the onslaughts of inflation. He understands, perhaps better than any other man in public life today, the great importance of protecting and preserving the financial stability of this, the greatest nation in all the earth.

In the golden hour of his great life, yet with the spirit of youth, he is carrying a burden which is greater than he has ever carried before, but in magnificent fashion he is bearing the great load. BOB DOUGHTON is the most distinguished living North Carolinian and one of the greatest Americans living today. There are no inconsistencies in his life; his character is constant. By the eloquence of his actions, the exalted nobility of his soul, and the simplicity of his life he has endeared himself to all who know him. As a colleague and as one who has enjoyed his friendship, I am glad to join with other North Carolinians in doing honor to one who by his life has exemplified all of the fine virtues and tender sensibilities of true American statesmanship.

Mr. Charles A. Reap, editor of the Albemarle Enterprise, wrote a very appropriate editorial about our colleague, the text of which follows:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Few men in American history have ever served our Nation so long or ably as Congressman DOUGHTON from this district. As a lad in teens we recall going with father and others to hear him speak when he first ran for Congress in 1910. He was introduced as "Farmer BOB," and has ever carried that friendly name for the farmers. He has always been a farmer at heart and a true friend to the farmers. We recall his efforts in behalf of the farmers in the depths of the depression when he said it was almost necessary for farmers in his mountain counties to hire a lawyer to help them give away cattle.

As a public official Mr. DOUGHTON has acquired and merited the fullest confidence of the American people in all walks of life from the small farmer to the biggest business. During the early part of the war when we were assigned to make an economic study of household appliances we were sent to a number of the largest offices in New York City. While on this mission we were in the manager's office of Macy's in New York, the largest store in the world. There on the wall of the manager's office hung the picture of our own Congressman, R. L. DOUGHTON. The manager spoke very highly of Mr. DOUGHTON's ability and efforts in working out America's tax problems.

Possibly no man in American history has ever given so much time, effort and study to our never ending tax problems as has Mr. DOUGHTON. As long-time member and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the burden has been on his massive shoulders, and he has worked early and late as he did on his farm toward an equitable tax policy. He has often stated that he was not satisfied with his own efforts in this problematic field, but has ever striven to do the best he could. He has been in Congress since 1910 and this has been his chief burden, hence no man in public office has ever carried such tax burdens for forty years.

Congressman DOUGHTON has labored diligently in Congress to aid America through two World Wars. He is now laboring again in an emergency that the world fears will lead to another world war. This is why so many people urge him to enter the race again this year when he wanted to retire to his Alleghany farms. It is fortunate that his age is little handicap to his health and vigor for he can doubtless still do more work by force of habit than the average younger man will do in a shorter workweek. From a nonpartisan viewpoint people have high regard for Mr. DOUGHTON's ability, honesty and integrity. We hope to see him returned to Congress from this district with the largest vote of confidence from each county he has ever received.

Issues of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

OUR HOPES FOR PEACE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, during this Easter season it is natural for our thoughts to turn to peace.

A few days ago I received a letter which expresses very well the longing for peace which is uppermost in all our minds today. The lady who wrote me said she felt that we, as a Christian people, must exert greater efforts of love and compassion for our neighbors, our friends and other nations—and she asked me if there was not something I could give her to do, to help bring peace. To quote, she said:

> I stand ready from this day forward to give every minute of time I can find to work for peace and true democracy.

I have many letters expressing a similar longing for peace. They express concern that we are losing sight of what should be our principal objective—a world at peace.

Their fears are not hard to understand. The news of the Korean War is constantly in our thoughts. There are constant reports of preparation for war in other parts of the world, and there is a great deal more speculation on where the Communists may strike next than on peaceful methods of settling the world's problems.

COSTLY MISTAKES

Here in the United States we find that we, as a nation, have made some costly mistakes in our efforts to build peace on the foundation of victory in the last world war. Some of the mistakes date from the period when the war still was in progress.

We must not again blind our eyes to the true nature of international communism. We must not be guilty again of duplicity toward our friends, selling them out to their enemies as we did Nationalist China. We must not aid and abet unfriendly forces as we did with the notorious loans to Poland. We must not alienate potentially helpful forces as we have done in the case of Spain and certain nations of South America. All of these things have contributed to our present dilemma—war and the threat of war only 5 years after our great victory.

International communism is the principal threat to peace. With a ruthless determination and a total disregard for moral or human values it has, in five short years, brought most of Asia and some 600,000,000 people under its dictatorship. Because some of our leaders thought they could deal with the Communist dictators—or that they could outguess them—we made promises and followed programs which led to the downfall of the Chinese National Government. Because we were not sufficiently zealous in our championship of freedom elsewhere, we contributed to the Communist overthrow of democratic governments in a half dozen central European nations.

POSITIVE PROGRAMS FOR PEACE

Recognizing the mistakes of the past, what can we do to bring peace to this troubled world.

First of all, we must build our military strength. There is good reason to believe that it is the threat of atomic bombing that has kept us from a third war in Europe. We must supplement our strength in atomic weapons with similar strength in our Armed Forces. Most of us accept the principle that military weakness invites attack. We have

proved it three times in our own history, in 1812, in 1917, and in 1941. The recent boldness of the Chinese Reds is a further example.

But this is only a temporary expedient—not a permanent foundation for peace. Just because we are undertaking these military measures to avoid war through a balance of power, does not mean that we should or can afford to give second place to the positive measures that may build real peace. We have by no means exhausted the possibilities.

There is still room for diplomatic negotiations with Russia concerning the world's troubled areas. These are slim possibilities, to be sure, but they exist and they must be explored, first, because they may be helpful to a degree, and, second, because our moral position before the world demands that we continually explore every honorable means of avoiding war.

Another positive step lies in concluding peace treaties with our former enemies. A fair and equitable treaty should be signed with Japan. It should contain terms that will win for us the support of the Japanese people and the approval of others throughout Asia. Similar arrangements should be made in Germany. The mistakes of our occupation must be erased by a new policy in West Germany.

SETTLEMENT IN KOREA

The time has come when our Government should announce its terms for peace, or at least a truce, in Korea. To date we have done nothing to stop the killing. Are we justified in continuing this killing without clearly stating our military and political objectives? It is true our long-term objective is to stop communism, but winning a few more miles in North Korea will not resolve that world-wide issue. At the present time there is no basis for peace in Korea and therefore no possibility that war will end.

President Wilson's Fourteen Points in the First World War did much to shorten that struggle. Let us show our disposition toward a peaceful solution of our Korean conflict by announcing, through the United Nations if you will, the terms under which we would consider a cease-fire.

The United Nations is a possible instrument of peace. It is true that the veto in the United Nations has hampered desirable action, and it is true that the organization has not proved effective in the Korean War. But both of these are in part our fault. We agreed to the veto in the first place, although many people expressed misgivings, and in Korea our policies in large measure were responsible for encouraging the Communist attack. Certainly we are responsible for trying to make a military force out of the UN before it had the moral authority to command such force.

I realize that many Americans are enraged by the spectacle of the United Nations debating at length while Americans die in Korea. I feel the same way. But it remains a vehicle which may help bring peace. We must use it as wisely as we can, hopeful that it will fulfill in some measure the high hopes we had at the time of its creation.

THE BEST HOPE

Beyond all these things lies an even greater force for peace.

We are a great Christian nation. Most of us believe the Christian precepts of honesty, fair dealing, kindness, and love for other men. The same things may be said of the great masses of the people in other lands, whether they be Christian or Jew or members of one of the great religions of the east. Nowhere in the world, not even in Russia, do the people want war.

A group of Senators had this in mind recently when they introduced a resolution stating that the goal of the American people is, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace; that we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote all our energies to peace; and that we reaffirm our deep and abiding friendship for all other peoples, including the people of Russia. The Senators felt that such a resolution, especially if it could be communicated to the people of Russia, would be a positive force for peace. Certainly it states our true feelings.

If war can be avoided for a time, we may by words and deeds convey this message to people throughout the world, encourage them by our example, and trust that the fears and ambitions which separate nations will be overcome by the love of peace which unites all mankind. Each of us by his own example and his active interest in our Government can contribute to this end.

In this way we may fulfill the mission of the Prince of Peace whose resurrection all Christians celebrate at this season.

The Congressional Secretaries Club Had a Gala Night February 27, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to point out the pride we take in, and the appreciation we have for, the splendid work which is being done by secretaries and others, both in our congressional offices and on our committee staffs.

The Congressional Secretaries Club, as you know, is the organization made up of secretaries and clerks employed in the offices and on the committees, by the Members of both Houses of Congress.

At each of the meetings of the club, there is usually an informative address made by some top-flight public official—either a Cabinet member or other departmental head, talking on some current problem of great congressional and national interest.

On Tuesday evening, February 27, the regular meeting of the club was held in the Departmental Auditorium on Constitution Avenue. The regular business being quickly dispensed with, there was a kind of open-house meeting to which the club members had invited their immediate as well as their official families. The entertainment for the evening was provided by the Air Force Symphonic Band, accompanied by the voices of the Air Force Singing Sergeants. In addition to the musical program, all in attendance were given a preview of two films. One was actual footage of war in the air as it is being carried on in Korea as of this very hour, and disclosed the actual destruction not alone of Chinese planes but of some of the hundreds of bridges, industries, tanks, trucks, supply trains, and other war accoutrements and supports, as well as vivid candid camera account of the magnificent support accorded to the ground troops by our Air Force. The other picture depicted practically all types of aircraft in simulated battle action. This included, among others, a most realistic exhibition, done in color, of the almost indescribable damage that can be meted by a single United States Air Force intercontinental bomber B–36.

A short talk was given by Brig. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton, Director of Legislation and Liaison, who, in part, stated:

We of the Air Force are firm in the knowledge and belief that the Congress of the United States is the policy-making body of this great union of States, and, moreover, that the Congress is the true voice of the American people.

General Eaton went on to say:

From its very date of establishment, the United States Air Force has had but two purposes in mind: (1) To afford our country the greatest possible measure of defense; (2) to accomplish this defense by the most prudent and effective means and with the least expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar.

The address of the evening was by Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, speaking in behalf of Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary, due to Mr. Finletter's absence on official business in the Far East.

Because of the earnestness and the utter frankness of these gentlemen in their dealings with our secretaries and others of our official families, I am asking the unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the statements of Brig. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton and Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert:

ADDRESS OF BRIG. GEN. ROBERT E. L. EATON

Mr. Johnson, may I express my thanks for the generous words spoken with respect to the Air Force Directorate of Legislation and Liaison.

We of the Air Force are firm in the knowledge and belief that the Congress of the United States is the policy-making body of this great union of States—and, moreover, the Congress is the true voice of the American people.

We believe that when Congress speaks, the American people themselves speak.

From its very date of establishment, the United States Air Force has had but two purposes in mind:

1. To afford our country the greatest possible measure of defense.

2. To accomplish this defense by the most prudent and effective means, and with the least expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar.

Recognizing that the power to fulfill these purposes comes from the Congress that the Congress is the arm of the Government which decides the number of weapons, and all other matériel woven into the warp and the woof of the fabric that goes to make up the United States Air Force, and, acting under the Commander in Chief, we regard ourselves as servants of the people.

For this reason, we are particularly happy this evening to be permitted to address an organization made up of the official staffs and families of our Senators and Representatives of the Nation's Congress.

In a more personal way, the responsibilities which are assigned to me constitute the direct point of contact between the Congress and the Air Force. I have thoroughly enjoyed my opportunities to be of service to the Members of the Congress—but I am even more pleased to present here tonight a distinguished gentleman whose work has long since marked him as one of the great figures associated with the establishment of the United States Air Force.

I know of no other who could have brought to that task greater skill, ability, wisdom, prudence, or a more thorough training to do the job as it should be done.

An experienced Government administrator—an attorney by profesSon—he served 4 years as professor in the relations of Government and business at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

It might well be said that his scope of responsibility within the Air Force includes all human as well as physical resources. His principal contributions have been in the field of management—the application of sound business administration of the military organization, including statistical controls, the development of organizational policies, civilian and military personnel control policies, budgetary policies, and educational and training polices.

Under his direction was developed the first performance-type budget in use by a military service. This performance-type of budget has been acclaimed by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization in Government as the pattern that should be followed in all Government budgeting.

He is here tonight as the personal representative of the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, to speak to you on matters of interest, both to yourselves and to the United States Air Force.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now my distinct privilege and pleasure to present to you the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

ADDRESS OF MR. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

Mr. Johnson, members of the Secretaries' Club, and honored guests, I bring greetings to all from Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, whose trip into the Middle East precluded his being here personally to discuss with you the problems which we in the Air Force share with the office and committee staffs of the Members of the Congress.

When it was first proposed that I do this pinch-hitting for Mr. Finletter I was told that, inasmuch as we pretty much all knew one another, I could speak right off-the-cuff and without preparation. It is because of this fact that I made no effort whatever to prepare an address. In fact, I am glad that it happened just that way, and that I didn't have to make any type of address. Rather, I wish I could stand here and make answer to such questions as you would like to put to me, and perhaps, in that manner, get closer together on an even greater team made up of the legislation and liaison directorate personnel of the Air Force and all you secretaries on Capitol Hill.

I want to stress the fact that we are desirous of assisting all possible—not alone in informing you, and through you, the Members of Congress, with respect to the things with which they are concerned, but, in addition thereto, in rendering all possible assistance in doing the things your respective constituents desire in behalf of themselves and the Nation's interest.

As General Eaton so aptly pointed out, it is the fixed resolve of the Air Force to cooperate with the Congress, recognizing that they are the policy-making body.

We have made mistakes—and we realize that we will probably continue to make even more. You can be assured, however, that all possible is being done to abate these errors, if not altogether to eliminate them.

That some error will creep into such a huge organization as the Air Force is inevitable when one thinks of the tremendous turnover in personnel—the vast number of new persons to be brought into service—the numerous bases to be opened, and the never-ending planning attended by the letting of an almost endless variety of contracts in dollar values that can only be expressed in astronomical figures.

Determined not to fail, we are in no manner adverse to seeing our errors pointed out. Constructive criticism, we recognize, can only result in giving added impetus to measures that will further improve our methods and thus enable us to do the same and all other things even better.

My friends, may I take this occasion to tell you how happy we are with the results of the good work that is being done by our directorate of legislation and liaison and the equally splendid gentlemen and officers that we have in the personalities of Brig. Gen. Robert (Bob) E. L. Eaton, Col. James W. Wilson, Col. James W. Chapman, and Maj. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., who are representing us in our direct congressional liaison work.

It stirred my heart to hear the tribute paid by your gracious chairman to that self-effacing great American ace, gentlemen, and officer, Lt. Col. Johnny C. Meyer, of whom, we in the Air Force, as well as Americans everywhere, are justifiably proud. It has often been asked of me why it was that, as the greatest living Air Force ace, and after having shot down 37½ German planes in World War II, Johnny Meyer was not relieved from future combat duty. Such, however, is not the reward of airmen in your Air Force. His specialty is that of pilot in a fighter group. His experience in the Liaison Division was a routine tour of duty. It is solely because of his unique and peculiar training and experience as a fighter pilot that Johnny Meyer is now back in Korea with his fighting command. There we find him carrying on in the same tradition of the Air Force that has made him the beloved, respected officer in the field that he proved himself to be in his tour of liaison duty among you here on Capitol Hill.

It is well to remember that, on the eve of the Korean conflict, we had an Air Force of but 48 groups, with a total strength of 400,000 officers and airmen. Immediately upon entering Korea, legislation which supplemented the Air Force budget enabled us to rapidly expand the Air Force and to greatly increase its number of personnel, planes, weapons, and bases. Security precludes my telling just how large our Air Force is of this hour, but I can assure you that we are well on the way to almost doubling the number of personnel which we had last fall.

Authorization has been granted to attain a 68-wing level—and the 84-group level by January 1953. But, my friends, even these are not set goals—they may be raised once, or even several times. This altogether depends upon the critical world situation, which, I need not tell you, is changing almost daily.

Might I take this opportunity of pointing out to all that the tempo of your Air Force preparedness cannot be gaged with any accuracy upon results as they manifest themselves in Korea—nor do we make plans, day by day, based on the successes which we have achieved or the reverses met in the over-all picture as seen in Korea.

Ours is a program based upon long-range planning, and with two main considerations. The first is that we must immediately double our strength while, at the same time, we organize that expansion in such manner that we could again double and redouble the industrial and personnel mobilization should the requirement for full-scale Air Force development confront this Nation. Second only to that, and always in the forefront, is our desire to achieve the maximum of efficiency and of national defense, with the minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars.

It seems inevitable that we convert some portion of the Nation's industrial production, now devoted largely to peacetime consumers' goods, to the increased production of planes, weapons, electronic equipment, and thousands of complex technical items required to meet the demands of a modern Air Force with engines and jets geared to supersonic speeds. Moreover, these things must be accomplished during the period that your Air Force is developing an over-all expansion of existing aircraft production capacity.

In maintaining the national economic health, great care must be exercised to prevent either the unemployment or displacement of labor from their homes or families, while, at the same time, achieving the maximum result from the most efficient use of the skilled labor resources available.

As of this very hour, automobile craftsmen are producing aircraft for jet planes, working at their own lathes and benches. One plant, which had previously been devoted solely to the production of flying boxcars, will now undertake to make the B–47 stratojet bombers, while, at the same time, it gears itself to an increased production of its own specialized end product.

It could easily mean that the little manufacturing plant just down the street, in addition to maintaining some certain percentage of its regular production, will, in the near future, produce any one of more than the 100,000 component parts that enter into the construction and development of but a single one of our great international B–36 long-range bombers.

At the same time that these things are being accomplished on the production line, the training camps of the Air Force are undertaking to absorb scores of thousands of the raw youth of our Nation and build them, by the use of the present limited housing and other facilities, and with the greatest dispatch, into well-trained and equipped members of the greatest Air Force in the world.

We must train a large percent of these young men—who, prior to their induction into the Air Force, never had been in an airplane—to fly precision jet bombers with a maximum of personal safety and military efficiency—or else cement them into effectively organized combat crews, trained to man and operate the complex equipments built into our long-range, international bombers of the latest models and supersonic speeds.

As you all well know, next to the Strategic Bombing Command, the principle mission of the Air Force is to secure the defenses of these United States. Top on all priority lists is to train these youths—young women, as well as young men—to carry out vital supporting roles, not alone in combat forces, but in a veritable catalog of administrative, aeronautic, scientific, and technical fields. As one great team, we do all in order that our peoples can continue the American traditional mode of existence and the American way of life.

The Battle Against Chronic Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the battle against chronic diseases, which has been advanced by sizable congressional appropriations to the National Institutes of Health in recent years, is handicapped at the present time by a lack of precise data on the extent of these crippling illnesses. Federal, State, and local governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations have been similarly handicapped in their attempts to properly plan facilities, rehabilitation programs and research projects applicable to particular diseases. Information to the extent of chronic and disabling diseases in the United States today is so inadequate that the Congress has to rely upon data 15 years old and of doubtful accuracy in making appropriations for research in these diseases. The last survey of national health was made in 1935. Its scope was restricted to the cities and did not cover a broad enough segment of the population.

Recent military and mobilization manpower demands point up the need for a more accurate picture of the extent to which chronic illnesses have handicapped our defense effort. In terms of production today, more than one and one-half billion man-days are lost annually because of sickness and disability. Nearly 3,000,000 workers annually are prevented from working by total disability. The financial loss to the Nation is staggering—$27,000,000,000 a year. In appropriating moneys for research to cut down this enormous toll, the Congress should have, for guidance, a factual up-to-date survey of the incidence of each particular disease. It is for these reasons that I am today submitting a bill to the Congress to provide for a survey of sickness in the United States. I am convinced that the considerable advances made in the science of sampling since 1935, plus other improvements to give more diagnostic medical accuracy, would result in a more accurate and less costly survey.

I am certain that the doctors of the country will cooperate fully in this vital survey. They have supported wholeheartedly the work of the Commission on Chronic Illness, established in 1949 to spearhead a joint attack on the serious national problems raised by chronic illness. The American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Public Welfare Association, the insurance companies, labor unions, the Grange, industry, as well as State and city health and welfare departments are all represented on this commission. We can count on the assistance of the Commission on Chronic Illness in connection with the planning and operation of the survey program.

I can envision, as the result of this proposed legislation, provision for periodic estimates of the amount of chronic disease and handicapping conditions in the population. These periodic estimates will be needed by all types of public and private health agencies and organizations in the planning of programs. Many cities and rural counties which cannot afford to conduct a canvass of this sort will benefit tremendously from a periodic inventory which includes accurate, up-to-date data.

This Great Farming Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following significant editorial which summarizes the great agricultural progress being made in Madison County and the Tennessee Valley. This fine editorial was written by Mr. Reese T. Amis, editor of the Huntsville (Ala.) Times and appeared in that paper on March 12, 1951. I am glad to call this splendid article to the attention of the Members:

THIS GREAT FARMING AREA

The annual farm edition of the Times is published today. It is the largest ever published in the State of Alabama. It contains 64 pages, tabloid size, and has 75 local pictures and some 125 local news stories.

The purpose of these annual editions is to chronicle the varied agricultural progress of Madison County and the Tennessee Valley.

Up until 15 years ago, cotton and corn were the mainstays of this rich agricultural area. That is no longer so. Beginning with the soil-conservation program set up by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and aided and abetted by the extension services of the agricultural colleges, especially Auburn, the type of farming was changed.

Instead of talking about crop diversification, farmers did something about it, increasingly, each year.

If you will look carefully through this farm edition, it will be found that there is not only a cotton and corn industry in this and adjoining counties, but a cattle industry, a hog industry, a sheep industry, a grain and seed industry, a dairy industry, and a poultry industry, not to speak of some others on a smaller scale.

This is one of the premier farming sections, not only of Alabama, but of the entire Southeast. It can produce bountifully, and profitably, almost any and every kind of farm crop. Intensive cultivation gives yields that are comparable in quality and quantity to the highest raised in any State.

Best of all, the farmers of this and adjoining counties are increasing the productivity of their soil annually. There are no exact figures, but many have estimated this growth in productivity as much as 50 percent in the past 15 years.

No longer does a farmer blithely allow his soil to wash away. He has become an apostle of soil conservation, and of enlightened soil practices. He enlists the help and advice of the agents of the Soil Conservation Service.

Where little more than a decade ago, a quarter or half bale of cotton was grown to the acre, the good lands are making a bale or more, with staple an inch or better in length.

We once made 15 or 20 bushels of corn to the acre. Yields of 100 to 150 bushels to the acre now are common. On one entire farm last year, the average was more than 100 bushels to the acre.

Up until a few years ago, the livestock industry was almost nonexistent in this county. Truck peddlers bought a cow, or sheep, or hog by the head, not the pound. Some few livestock were trucked off to Nashville or Birmingham for sale at stockyards. Today, there is a stockyard at almost every county seat.

It has now been demonstrated that as good cattle, hogs, or sheep can be raised and grown here as any that the Middle West produces—and more cheaply, because the grazing season is longer.

The end of our farming progress is not yet. In fact, it is perhaps just really geting under way. These past few years have made it clear to even the most uninformed that the new way of farming is more profitable. Nearly every farmer, big or little, is joining the parade, in more or less degree.

Farming in Madison County, and its neighboring counties, is becoming an increasingly attractive way of life.

Highways, electricity, better homes and buildings, better schools—all these, and others—more and more make rural life rank with, if not exceed, the pleasure of city life.

Senator Williams Attacks Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star, a newspaper of Wilmington, Del., on Sunday, March 18, 1951, carried a news story of vital importance in these times. This news story was based upon a statement by the distinguished and able senior United States Senator from the State of Delaware, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS. The news account listed Senator WILLIAMS' suggestions to beat inflation and stabilize our economy.

This 10-point program to stabilize our economy and meet the greatest danger confronting our country, that of uncontrolled inflation, is most timely and merits the consideration of everyone interested in attacking the problem of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, which was carried in the Sunday Star of Wilmington, Del., on March 18, 1951:

TEXT OF SENATOR WILLIAMS' STATEMENT ON INFLATION

The greatest danger confronting our country today is not the menace of attack by communistic forces beyond our borders or the destrictive influences of these same forces within our own country, but it is the ever rising spiral of uncontrolled inflation which now envelops our country and seriously threatens our entire economy and American way of life.

There are those who feel that the control of inflation is simply a matter of enacting a price and wage control law. Unfortunately it is not that simple.

In order to intelligently approach the solution of this problem, we must first recognize the No. 1 cause of inflation, which is large governmental expenditures accompanied by a long series of unbalanced budgets. So long as our expenditures exceed our income, just so long will our deficit spending dilute our monetary blood stream by decreasing the purchasing value of our dollar and increase the spiral of inflation. This diabolical practice has reduced the purchasing value of the 100-cent dollar of 1900 to the 31-cent dollar of today. The further continuance of this practice will further decrease the purchasing value of our dollar and entirely destroy our economy.

The diversion of our productive capacity to wartime materials reduces the amount of civilian goods available for purchase, and unless this additional money is siphoned off by increased taxes the result is higher prices.

Upon the outbreak of war in Korea last June, Congress was confronted with a prospective increased expenditure of 30 to 40 billion dollars annually. Recognizing that all these additional expenditures would not be covered by increased taxes, Congress enacted the Defense Production Act, commonly designated as a price and wage control law.

This price and wage control law has been on the statute books since August of last year, and yet during this 7-month period our country has witnessed one of its most rapid inflationary spirals. The cost of living today has advanced 6 percent above the July 1950 level.

Why has the enactment of this so-called price- and wage-control law not deterred the upward trend of this spiral of inflation but in fact has increased the upward trend? Is it because (1) Congress has failed to take adequate steps to minimize the causes of inflation? (2) Is there something wrong with the law? (3) Is there something wrong with the administration of the law? (4) Or is it a combination of all three?

Suppose we discuss first the question, "Has Congress taken the proper steps to minimize the causes of inflation by reducing all nonessential Government expenditures to the fullest extent possible?"

Unfortunately the answer is "No." Notwithstanding all the orations which have been made on the floor of the Senate advocating economy, the net result is that we are currently spending more money on domestic programs than ever before in our history. Nor is there any program to reduce these expenditures during the next fiscal year. For instance, note the following tabulation of the budgetary requests of those nondefense agencies handling domestic programs for the next fiscal year as compared with their expenditures for the current year as compared with the preceding 10 years.

According to this chart it is apparent that no effort has been made to curtail the public works and welfare programs of our domestic departments.

[In thousands]

Year	Department of Commerce	Department of State	Department of Labor	Department of the Interior	Department of Justice
1941	$147,827	$23,955	$23,013	$169,537	$67,135
1942	445,437	31,434	24,145	286,490	84,215
1943	622,846	37,922	26,112	281,206	107,885
1944	156,200	53,190	55,034	235,424	114,940
1945	88,313	55,340	71,589	214,338	117,866
1946	108,469	102,345	82,289	248,817	106,650
1947	200,112	193,269	140,490	290,408	112,086
1948	198,372	315,595	86,590	320,603	116,024
1949	642,899	350,852	15,490	516,401	126,759
1950	688,200	300,672	58,805	646,431	135,970
1951	713,542	271,593	208,573	631,828	147,752

The next two questions raised were: Is there something wrong with the law? and Does the fault lie with its administration?

At the time the Defense Production Act was passed by the Congress I made the statement that the law could not possibly serve as a measure to control inflation if the Senate insisted upon adopting amendments providing for special exemptions to every pressure group in the country.

An exemption was provided for wage earners.

An exemption was provided for farmers.

An exemption was provided for the press, including newspapers, magazines, and periodicals.

An exemption was provided for the fees of lawyers, doctors, and all other members of the professions.

And exemptions were provided for many other groups too numerous to mention.

It is only natural that each of these groups, while having no objection to rigid controls over other groups, would want their own special group to be exempt. However, what Congress overlooked, as they did in World War II, was that there is no such thing as partial controls. You cannot expect the wage earners to accept controls over wages unless the cost of living is stabilized. You cannot expect the farmer to accept controls over his products unless labor costs are controlled, because without the stabilization of labor, his production and equipment costs inevitably soar. You cannot expect any of these groups to accept controls unless all other groups accept the same restrictions. At the same time, through increased tax rates, industry would be operating on a lower net-earning basis.

Now the question is: What can we do today to stabilize our economy and eliminate the destructive threat of uncontrolled inflation? It is later than we think; however, I believe that it is not too late if the Congress and the administration will pursue the proper course and display the necessary courage to do the job.

These are the necessary steps which I think must be taken, namely:

1. The economies recommended by the Hoover Commission should become effective immediately, thereby saving millions which are currently being lost through overlapping bureaus and through unnecessary waste. According to the best authorities our domestic, nondefense expenditures could easily be reduced by $7,000,000 000.

2. An immediate overhauling of all Government employment records and eliminating therefrom all nonessential Government employees.

3. An immediate stopping of all construction work on all Government buildings and public-works projects which are not declared essential to our national defense program.

4. An immediate ban upon the expansion of any existing or upon the enactment of any new welfare programs.

5. Increase production by increasing the numbers of working hours and the efficiency and productivity of the workers. Full production is the mortal enemy of inflation.

6. Repeal all subsidy programs including those on agriculture, labor, and industry. Practically every segment of our society is being subsidized in some manner at the expense of the taxpayer.

7. Our existing tax laws should be revised so as to eliminate many of the loopholes now existing and thereby spreading the tax load on a more equitable basis.

8. Stop the absurd policy of spending millions buying agricultural products and destroying them for the avowed purpose of creating a scarcity and then spending added millions to sustain another agency to hold prices down.

9. Adopt the Federal Reserve Board formula of more realistic interest rates, thereby discouraging loose credit. Credit should be made readily available only for those purposes which contribute to the strengthening of our national economy and our national defense.

10. After the above recommendations have become effective, we should immediately adopt a fair and equitable tax law which will balance our budget and place our economy on a pay-as-you-go basis. To charge our present-day expenditures to future generations means that we are not only shirking the responsibilities of this generation but jeopardizing the future as well.

We should at all times recognize the importance of maintaining our economic and financial strength, which is so necessary to our national security and the preservation of our form of government. We should also recognize that our greatest enemy is inflation, which, if uncontrolled, means certain economic collapse, hardships upon people living on a fixed income, a devaluation in our monetary standards, and a loss of savings to people who have labored all their lives to assure themselves of a competency in their later years.

I am thoroughly convinced that if the above 10 recommendations are put into practice we shall be able to abandon dependency on price and wage controls, which at best can only be regarded as a stopgap remedy and which should be put into effect only after all other remedies have failed.

Lenin knew the destructive force of inflation when he said in substance, "Inflation is the spark of revolution. I will print so many bonds and so much money that the capitalists will choke on them."

I agree with CIO President Murray that "inflation must be stopped. Inflation can be stopped if we meet this major problem of the home front with the same boldness, intelligence, and courage that our Armed Forces are showing in Korea."

Broadcast by Raymond Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Raymond Swing over Station WOL, Washington, D. C.:

One of the proposals the Soviet Union wants at Paris to get on the agenda of a four-power conference is a reduction of armaments. Nothing promotes Soviet interests more effectively than its ability to convince people that the Soviet Union wants to reduce armaments, and that the western world—well, look at it—is building up its arms. That is supposed to identify who it is wants peace. What the Russians mean by a reduction in armaments is a percentage reduction of standard arms after an abolition of atomic weapons. They want atomic warfare banned by international agreement first of all. Then they want other arms scaled down on the basis of existing ratios. Thus in 1948 the Soviet Union proposed to the United Nations Assembly a reduction of one-third in existing armaments. The western powers rejected this plan, so did the United Nations.

It is clear that any Russian offer will not be like the one made in the first disarmament talks of the League of Nations. At that time Mr. Litvinov proposed genuine, total disarmament. It may be doubted if he would have offered it then had there been any chance of its being accepted. But he did offer it, and it startled the world, which was not ready then to forego the unlimited sovereign right to wage a national war. The present Soviet regime is not repeating the Litvinov offer. All it offers is something that, if accepted, would leave the Soviet Union relatively stronger than its rivals. For if the atomic bomb were banned, the Soviet Union would be unchallenged in its supremacy as a land power. And if armaments were to be reduced percentagewise, the Soviet Union with its huge ground forces, still would remain on top. It is easy enough to convince Americans of the spuriousness of the Russia disarmament proposals. But it is not so easy to convince those who hear only the Russian side of the story. Nor is it easy to convince the world that the western powers are, as they say, arming for peace, since on its face this is a paradox. It happens to be a truthful paradox. Put it is not persuasive.

The Western World has ideas about disarmament of its own. But they are not worked out in detail, not carefully thought through, and not the result of consultation between the western governments. One gets it by glimpses, as when President Truman proposed to the United Nations on its anniversary in October a program of unusual disarmament under foolproof international control. At that time he asked that the study of atomic control and disarmament be merged, a step that now is being taken by the United Nations.

One gets another glimpse of it in the proposal now being discussed by the United Nations to set up an international police force. This, however, is quite meaningless in the UN as it is, for the Soviet Union sits on the Council with its veto power, and the police force would be under the control of the Security Council. So this proposal now is being supplanted by the Acheson plan for setting aside armed forces by all UN members for duty at the call, not of the Security Council but the Assembly, where the veto does not operate. This is now up for action at Lake Success, but somehow its bearing on disarmament is in the shadows. It looks much more like an effort to prepare for another Korea, by assuring the United Nations a force with which to head off an aggression.

The idea of a UN legion which can fight anywhere at any time would be a necessary part of a genuine, world-wide, total disarmament. For if nations give up their national armaments, there would have to be police to enforce the laws by which the disarmament has been effected. But a UN legion would be powerless against the Red Army and any talk about it in a world of unlimited national armaments is not realistic. So one sees in this western thinking no coherent program. It does not come to the root of the problem of war. Suppose the west gets what it now asks. Suppose the UN merges the study of atomic control with the reduction of armaments and also creates a UN force, there still is no concerted western program with the ultimate objective of a world without war. The arms race would not be stopped. No headway would be made against the Soviet campaign for its spurious kind of peace and disarmament.

The need for a genuine disarmament offer by the west is daily more apparent, for it seems to be the only way to meet the Soviet case before the world this summer. For if the four power conference is held and does not end the cold war and the arms race the west will be at a distinct disadvantage in not having a positive and genuine aim with which to match the Soviet pretense.

Just now the United States is engrossed with the job of enlarging its Armed Forces and inspiring the Western Europe countries to enlarge theirs. Probably it is against human nature to do this and talk about peace at the same time. But it is essential to know what this force we are building is for and it is important to know what it is not for.

Walter Lippmann in his column today brings this out skillfully in a recognition of the difference betwen two verbs, to deter and to compel. Our military force has only the purpose of deterring, he points out, and if we try to use it to compel it may cease to deter. "We have the power," he writes, "to cause great destruction within the Soviet Union and the satellites. Were we to allow the Russians to think that this power of ours would be used to support a policy of ultimatum and unconditional surrender in the cold war, almost certainly our whole vast military effort would cease to be a deterrent against military aggression. For the power to deter can only be effective if the nation at which it is directed has been convinced that it will not be struck if it refrains from striking." He goes on to point out that if the Russians believe we will strike them, not because of what they do, but because of what they are, they will not be influenced in what they do. In other words, the power to deter only works if there is a clear alternative to war. It works only if there can be a negotiated settlement. The power to deter, Mr. Lippmann, says, is the military complement of the doctrine that the Soviet Union and the United States can coexist, and that their coexistence can be made tolerable. This is an unanswerable way of saying that the objective of western policy must be peace. But it can only be said convincingly in terms of concrete policy. And it is not yet being said in that way. A UN legion, or a UN police force, against aggression, or a merger of the study of atomic energy control and arms reduction are not a program to offset the Russians. The western program must lead to peace, must lead if possible to the end of modern war. While it is both desirable and imperative that the west be strong enough to deter—to prevent an aggression, that is only half a program. The other half is to build peace, and to end the arms race. This is said in the knowledge that it is what President Truman wants, and what a substantial number of the ablest men in Congress want. The knowledge that sooner or later the United States must take the lead to negotiate a genuine settlement, a true peace, a real disarmament, is shared by many American and western leaders. What they differ about is timing. Thus Secretary Acheson wants no basic negotiations until the west is stronger. But without a peace objective the Soviet world may not believe the western power is intended only to deter. They may fear it is being created to compel and a constructive solution may come too late.

Senator McMAHON today suggested that Congress, on agreeing to send troops to Europe and enlarge its armed forces, should pass a resolution disavowing the desire for war with the Russian people. That is good as far as it goes. Still more persuasive would be a formula with the backing of all the western governments stating it to be the ultimate objective to end the very possibility of national wars. That is, to meet the Russian formula of arms reduction by a formula of arms elimination, under the sovereignty of the UN. I am not saying the Russians would or would not repudiate such a formula. But if the west adopted it, whatever the Russians did would decide before the whole world what chance there is to realize peace.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by His Excellency Sean MacBride, S. C., T. D., Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, to the Overseas Press Club, New York, on Monday, March 19, 1951:

The advance of democracy coupled with the development of transport and communications places an ever-increasing burden on the shoulders of our statesmen and governments. The ever-increasing tempo of international conferences, as well as the vast amount of administrative work that falls on the shoulders of ministers and governments, leaves little time for considered objective thinking.

At the beginning of our century international conferences were big and rare events. Preparations were made for them long in advance and they were held in a leisurely atmosphere. Nowadays our statesmen are snowed under by mass documentation from government agencies and from the international organizations to which they belong; they have, too, to attend international conferences with increasing frequency. As a result of this high pressure insufficient thought has so far been given by the leaders of the democratic world to the fundamental issues that are involved and to the necessary remedies. Many decisions have to be taken in the agony of a crisis and are, therefore, based on the expediency of the moment. It is difficult for the statesmen of today to look ahead and to take the long view based on objective planning.

The struggle which divides the world into two main camps reaches deeply into the foundations of our civilization; it is a conflict of ideologies which must consequently be fought out in the conscience of mankind. In the struggle against communism our attitude must be not merely a negative one of piling up defensive equipment but must also be constructive. To oppose the Communist ideology the western democracies have the fundamental beliefs which form part of their tradition and outlook, a belief in the democratic way of life and a belief in fundamental human and political rights. One of the greatest needs of the western nations is a clear enunciation of what they guarantee to their peoples. Counter materialism and physical force do not provide the necessary ideals around which the human conscience can rally. We in the democratic world must evolve a clear-cut political and economic philosophy which will enunciate clearly the principles for which we stand. These should be based upon the liberty and dignity of the human being, justice, and equality of opportunity. In the economic sphere, they must include the right to work for an adequate family wage, and the utilization of productive capacity for the welfare of the people. In the national sphere, they should include a clear enunciation of democratic principles and assert the right of nations to determine their own affairs freely, by democratic means, without outside interference.

The provision of such a banner is, in my view, a matter of urgency and of the utmost importance. It should receive from world statesmen at least as much consideration and thought as the military and economic problems that confront the world. It is essential, I believe, if democracy is to be the

force we would like it to be, that its cardinal principles should be defined, accepted, and applied by all democratic powers.

The considerations with which I have just dealt are applicable to both America and Europe and should be dealt with jointly by the democratic nations of both continents.

Even if the progress made in Europe has been agonizingly slow and subject to constant diversionary and delaying tactics, the fact that a start has been made towards a greater degree of coordination is important. Europe has hitherto been the starting point and the storm center of most wars, hence the importance of seeking to establish a system of organization that will at least reduce the likelihood of political and economic conflicts between the free nations of Europe. The creation of OEEC and the Council of Europe have been steps in the right direction and I sincerely hope that nothing will happen as a result of the present world tension to minimize or divert the efforts of these two organizations. I hope that at all stages the United States foreign policy makers will appreciate the long-term importance of the concept that underlies this attempt at European organization and not allow the United States to be made the excuse for procrastination on grounds of diplomatic or military expediency. For the first time a real effort is being made to secure active cooperation between the European democracies for purposes other than war or military defense. This in itself is of far-reaching importance and represents a new concept in European affairs. It is through the two organizations that I have just mentioned, the Council of Europe and the OEEC, that these efforts are being carried out.

The OEEC was originally set up to administer the European end of the Marshall plan; to be quite frank, it was regarded at first, in many European capitals, as a piece of "window dressing" to satisfy American congressional and public opinion. In the last 18 months, however, the value of the OEEC as a real instrument of economic cooperation and planning is coming to be more generally recognized. This position was not achieved without a considerable amount of energizing on the part of some of its members; great credit is due to the help such men as Paul Hoffman, Averill Harriman, Bill Foster, and Milton Katz gave in seeking to infuse the OEEC with a concept of integration. The rule of unanimity rendered the progress slow, as the pace was set by the slowest members of the convoy. That any progress was made is in no small measure due to the insistence on frequent meetings of the Ministers; this compelled the Ministers concerned, and their government, to take a greater degree of interest in the work of the OEEC. However, it is really in the years ahead, when Marshall aid will have ceased, that a true test of the OEEC's worth can be determined.

As I have often advocated at its Council meetings, the OEEC should be the economic nerve center of Europe, and its Council of Ministers should constitute an economic cabinet for Europe. Any attempt by a major European power to bypass the OEEC in economic matters, as has happened on a number of occasions, should be sternly frowned upon, both in Europe and in America. As far as possible all matters relating to economic affairs and trade should be canalized through the OEEC.

If the 2½ years of its life the OEEC has done much to justify its existence, and, as I have indicated, it has in the last 18 months gone beyond being merely an agency for the division of United States aid. Industrial production in the OEEC countries is now about 30 percent higher than in 1938. Agricultural production has also been on the increase and in almost all fields it is higher than prewar. The organization has done much valuable work in tackling the problem of currency restrictions and shortages which have so much bedeviled European trade since the end of the war. The two Intra-European Payments and Compensation Agreements, culminating in the establishment of the European Payments Union, have gone far to establish the smooth and efficiently operating mechanism of international payments which is essential for trading among the European nations. The liberalization of trade from quantitative restrictions has been another step; not all difficulties have been resolved here but progress has been made. In addition there has been a great deal of solid and useful work done in relation to the exchange of technical and scientific information between countries, the coordination of investment, the cooperative examination of problems arising in agriculture and in many other sectors.

OEEC, then, has by its many activities shown itself to be an organization within which the many and varied economic problems confronting all nations in Europe today can be tackled realistically. I hope that it will be regarded more and more by the United States as the medium for economic action with Europe. We have learned the lesson that by cooperation we can hope to overcome many of our problems. Unilateral and isolated action is hurtful not only to the European community as a whole but ultimately to the country responsible for such action.

We must, of course, not overlook the fact that the interests of the different member countries must be carefully attended to. Not all of the countries of Europe are equally well developed economically. Some are highly industrialized while others have had their development retarded and cannot so easily expose themselves to courses of action which highly industrialized countries may take in their stride. That is why, in particular, such arrangements as the Schuman plan and Benelux are to be commended, because, while lacking nothing of the energy and determination which must characterize our actions in this field, they pay attention to the realities of the situation and form sound bases on which more large-scale actions may be founded.

However, the OEEC is purely an intergovernmental organization and suffers from all the defects inherent in this type of organization. Such organizations are of their nature slow, cautious, ponderous, and inevitably subject to the arts of secret diplomacy. By opposition and delaying tactics governments who are not wholeheartedly in favor of closer integration can successfully block progress. Because the discussions are for the most part held in secret and are of a technical nature, public opinion has little opportunity of asserting itself. These defects have, to a certain extent, been overcome in the Council of Europe.

Unlike the League of Nations, UNO and the OEEC, the Council of Europe is not a purely intergovernmental organization. The Assembly of the Council of Europe is, in effect, the first real attempt to constitute a European parliament. True, the seat of power rests in the Committee of Foreign Ministers and not in the Assembly. Nevertheless, obstruction, secret diplomacy and power politics will lose much of their effectiveness under the searchlight of an active European Parliamentary Assembly. The Assembly has already asserted itself and will, I hope, continue to show that the Committee of Ministers and Governments must take cognizance of its views. There will also be a better informed opinion in the different European parliaments on international problems and a greater degree of mutual understanding between the members of the different parliaments. It will not, therefore, be so easy for certain governments to maintain an evasive and obstructionist attitude on questions affecting European cooperation.

There is, however, a serious danger that the conservative attitude which has been forced upon the Committee of Ministers by certain governments will further dishearten and disillusion that section of European opinion which saw in the Council of Europe a real hope of concrete progress. I hope that the Assembly and those of my colleagues in the Committee of Foreign Ministers who support the viewpoint of the Assembly will persevere with patience and determination in their attempt to give reality to the concept of a European Assembly.

One of the problems which will have to be faced in the near future is the integration of the OEEC with the Council of Europe. This will present some difficulties, as certain countries are not members of the Council of Europe while they are members of the OEEC; it is also likely that proposals in this direction will be opposed by certain governments who prefer the secrecy and unprogressive attitude of intergovernmental organizations. In any scheme for integration care will have to be taken to preserve intact the Secretariat and economic organization of the OEEC, which is highly competent.

I have tried briefly to give you a picture of the European scene. The work of these two main instruments of European cooperation does not, however, fill the lacuna for a clear statement enunciating the moral and political philosophy of the free democratic world on the lines which I indicated at the beginning of this talk. This is a task which might well be undertaken by the Council of Europe in conjunction with America. It is, I believe, a matter of urgency.

I would like before concluding to refer briefly to the only territorial dispute which exists in the North Atlantic area, namely, the infringement of the sovereignty of the Irish people by the enforced partition of Ireland by Britain. No nation in the world can claim to have more clearly defined natural boundaries than Ireland. The basis of democratic rule depends upon the right of the people of a nation to determine their own affairs freely by democratic means and without outside interference. What right, therefore, has Britain to partition our country or claim sovereignty in any portion of it against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people? This violation of the democratic principles for which the democratic world stands injures not merely Ireland but also the cause of the free world.

The Constitution, Our Palace of Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very timely address on the Constitution of the United States by Miss Ann West, of Antlers, Okla. The address follows:

THE CONSTITUTION, OUR PALACE OF LIBERTIES

Let us go back in time to the month of May, the year 1776, and to stately Independence Hall, Philadelphia. Here we see gathered together a very distinguished group of men. Their minds are keen, and their personalities as varied as you will find in any group. All of this intellect and all of these personalities are intent upon one purpose. That purpose, my friends, was to formulate a document which would proclaim the in-

dependence of these young colonies from the tyranny and exploitation of an oppressive monarchy.

The way was not to be smooth in attaining their goals, nor were they always to see eye to eye on the means of achieving the end toward which they worked. There were clashes of temper, conflicting sectional interests, jealousies, problems of finance and organization—all set against a lurid backdrop of a devastating war and its desolation. The result of their consecrated efforts was the Declaration of Independence, the foundation stone of constitutional government.

However, it was one thing to declare that we meant to be free and quite another to draw up a set of rules and regulations governing and guarding that freedom. Following that meeting in Independence Hall, there were other meetings of august and purposeful leaders, each with his own idea of what the charter of the new nation should contain. In Independence Hall in 1787, the ideals and beliefs of freedom-loving men were incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, which stands today, 164 years later, a guardian to our palace of liberties.

The architects of this palace were many and varied and each has left the imprint of his hopes and plans on the structure. Let us examine for a bit three of the master framers or builders of the Constitution and their contributions.

First, let us consider Alexander Hamilton, nicknamed the Little Lion, probably because of his perseverance in overcoming obstacles that would have thwarted a lesser man. After the Revolutionary War, Hamilton was elected to the New York Assembly from which he was appointed as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. He was the moving force of this assembly, composed of some of the most brilliant thinkers the world has ever seen. Hamilton, according to Chancelor Kent, "surpassed all of his contemporaries in his exertion to create, recommend, adopt and defend the Constitution of the United States of America." Hamilton had great visions of what this young nation could and should be, and when others were less ambitious than he, he felt the bitter pangs of disgust, but grasped hopefully at each semblance of progress. He believed fervently in a strong, centralized government with the States subordinate to the Nation. This basic principle of Hamilton's is found throughout the Constitution. It forbids several powers to the States and proclaims with authority that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. ARTHUR VANDENBERG, the venerable statesman of our own day, had this to say of Hamilton: "He was the brains in the pilot house when the ship of state set out into the perilous seas of history. The Republic is his monument."

Now let us consider James Madison, sometimes called "The father of the Constitution." At 36, he was one of the youngest members attending the Convention. Maj. William Pierce, a delegate from Georgia, describes Madison thus: "Mr. Madison is a character who has long been in public life; and what is very remarkable every person seems to acknowledge his greatness. He blends together the profound politician with the scholar. He perhaps has the most correct knowledge of the affairs of the United States of any man in the Union." Night after night, during the months that the Assembly was in session, Madison made a complete record of the proceedings of the day. From these notes, published after his death, we derive a picture of the hopes and fears of the delegates, of their attempts and successes to lead the Nation wandering blind and helpless into the light of freedom. Madison once stated that if men were angels, a government would not be needed. If angels governed men, controls on the government would not be necessary. As neither is the case, a government that controls the people but is also obliged to control itself, is the ideal form of government. Madison believed firmly in giving every free man the right to vote, and he led the fight for popular suffrage in electing our representatives. I believe Madison's chief contribution to the Constitution was his firm conviction that the will of the majority could not be far from right.

The last man whom we shall consider is Benjamin Franklin, then the most widely known man in the Colonies. Ben Franklin was old, past 80, but he still had the most farsighted vision of any delegate attending the Convention. He was physically feeble at his fourscore years, but his brilliant intellect was unimpaired. He was content to let the younger men plan the structure of the palace, giving them the benefit of his older wisdom. His common sense turned disagreeable men into cooperative ones, helped make the Constitution a reality. Franklin was firmly convinced that the people should have the controlling voice in the Government, and today the sound sense of the common people finds expression through him. His last earnest address to the delegates so influenced the assembly that, according to Francis Thorpe, the noted author and historian, "it gave us the Constitution." In this speech Franklin said that he had noticed on the back of Washington's chair a carving of the sun and its rays. He had often wondered if this portrayed the rising or setting sun, but that now, at the conclusion of their arduous labors, he was sure that it was the rising sun of a great new country. What prophetic words Ben Franklin spoke. Franklin needs no memorial of stone, for he has a living one in our Constitution.

Alexander Hamilton's idea that the Constitution must be the supreme law of the land and that in union there is strength—Madison's great democratic principle that the will of the majority is nearly always right—and Ben Franklin's conviction that the controls of the Government must remain in the hands of the governed, are all great supporting beams in the structure of the constitutional Government of today.

One cannot pick three men out of this assembly of brilliant personages and state that, beyond all doubt, they were the leaders. George Washington, the brilliant general and statesman; Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, the sagacious Yankee lawyer; Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania, the financial backbone of the Colonies; Thomas Jefferson, absent from this assembly yet making his influence count for a minimum of government and a maximum of freedom—all these men and many others, were architects of the palace. When the document was completed, some hesitated to sign the charter because it didn't meet their views in every particular, and was, as Hamilton once said, "a bundle of compromises." However, most of the men realized that this step, if not perfect, led the right way toward attaining a government that would improve with years. These men little thought that from these Colonies would come forth the greatest nation in the world, a nation dedicated to the cherished belief that all men are created equal. How much we of today owe to those stalwart men who masterminded the building of our palace of liberties.

Once a structure is built, it must be maintained carefully and must sometimes be remodeled. The Constitution provides for the remodeling of itself through amendments, but it is up to us, the American citizens of today, to maintain and defend our Constitution against any nation or theory of government which attempts to force its will on free people. It is especially up to us, the youth of this Nation, to be on guard against any encroachment on our personal liberties by a foreign ideology. It is up to all of us—regardless of race, creed, or color, to band together in a common effort to defend the great fundamentals of democracy bequeathed to us as a sacred heritage by our gallant forefathers. Even now, the Communists are battering without and working as termites within, to undermine the strength of our palace. We dare not let them succeed.

Back in 1775 that eloquent statesman, Patrick Henry, flung the challenge that we of today must accept when he asked, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased by the price of chains or slavery?" We must answer with him, "Forbid it, Almighty God." May we, too, be willing to defend to death, if need be, the Constitution, our palace of liberties.

St. Lawrence Seaway Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the old economic monstrosity, the St. Lawrence seaway, is back with us again. It may be of interest to Members of Congress to read the following article that appeared in the January 3, 1951, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

ST. LAWRENCE AGAIN

A new attempt will be made to put over on this country the discredited St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Members of the new Congress may expect a propaganda barrage urging approval of the project as a war measure. The New England States, so the propaganda line runs, need more electric power for war industries. The seaway is needed, we are told, to provide a submarine-safe passage for iron ore from Labrador to the Great Lakes.

The catch in this reasoning is that this country will have won or lost its security long before the project could be completed. In the meantime, money, material, and manpower urgently needed for mobilization would be diverted to a scheme which would ultimately benefit Canada far more than the United States.

There is nothing new about the hysteria for a St. Lawrence seaway, except the propaganda. The project has been before Congress since early in the twenties. It has been studied by congressional committees time and again—and each time has been decisively rejected. Its value as a transportation artery has been vastly overrated. Because it would be closed to navigation for at least 5 months out of the year, it has been called the world's greatest part-time transportation agency. The 27-foot channel proposed would be too shallow for 91 percent of the American merchant marine—a fact generally overlooked by those who urge its construction.

Governor Dewey, of New York, is for it—at least the power project—although it obviously would have an adverse effect upon the port of New York City. New York and the other New England States naturally would like to have the Federal Government—which includes Missouri taxpayers—finance cheap hydroelectric power for the industries of those States.

Every Congress in the last three decades has seen through the flimsy arguments for the seaway and power project. It is to be hoped the next Congress will be as wise. Certainly, it is against the national interest, as well as military security, to embark on so costly a scheme at this time.

Lenten Guideposts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fine statement by Mr. Charles Spaulding, proving that men of good will, who truly believe in God's goodness and are obedient to His will, can succeed in the United States regardless of race, creed, or color in any locality North or South:

LENTEN GUIDEPOSTS—THE LAND OF THE FREE

(By Charles Spaulding, president of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., Durham, N. C.)

My father was a slave, and I was born one of 14 children on a small cotton farm 75 years ago.

I have been president of a life insurance company that has about $140,000,000 worth of insurance in force, a bank that has $5,000,000 in resources; I have been a director of a bonding company, a building and loan association, and a fire insurance company, I have been a trustee of several universities, chairman of the board of a large hospital, and have been invited to conferences to the White House.

I recite these statistics, not to boast, but to show what can happen to a supposedly underprivileged Negro, not in Russia, but right here in America in the heart of the Southland where members of my race allegedly have the least chance to become successful.

Nothing grieves me more than to have a young man approach me with this sad attitude: "I'm nothing but a Negro. How can I ever amount to anything?"

I simply point to the successful careers of Booker T. Washington, Ralph Bunche, Jackie Robinson, Gen Benjamin O. Davis, Miss Marian Anderson, George Washington Carver, and Judge William H. Hastie.

My father, Benjamin Spaulding, taught me the most important lessons I ever learned about getting ahead in this country. He believed in the promise of America, which promise could be realized only by years of sweat, thrift, and enterprise. He never expected something for nothing.

In my youth we learned as much about living from the Bible as we did from schoolbooks. In fact, the Bible was taught in school, and I have always felt education took a great backward step when this practice was stopped. God could get along without me, I was told, but I would never amount to much without God.

I left the farm at 21 and came to Durham, N. C. where I could continue my education through the eighth grade. A full-grown man among kids, I studied my English and arithmetic while washing dishes for $10 a month in a hotel.

Soon after my graduation two men of my race—John Merrick (a barber) and A. M. Moore (a doctor)—asked me to manage an insurance company which they planned to start. They would provide the backing and policy; I the full-time hustle.

It was a bold idea, since an insurance company run by Negroes had never succeeded before, doubtless because of the inferiority complex our own people had about the executive ability of members of our race. Sales resistance was great.

We had 29 cents in assets when a make-or-break crisis occurred. One of the first men who signed up for a policy died. His widow promptly appeared and demanded the $40 due.

Mr. Merrick and Dr. Moore dug down in their pockets for the payment, determined that every claim be met instantly. It was a major moment for our firm, and the news spread like wildfire. Our credit rating soared. From then on our worst obstacles often turned out to be blessings in disguise.

In the years that followed we grew and expanded despite depressions and setbacks of every conceivable type. Mr. Merrick and Dr. Moore have long since died, but their integrity will always be a part of the organization.

Out of the growth of the business and my own growth as a man came many conclusions. One was: That for a business to realize its maximum potentialities, a combination of business and faith was needed. Every business reflects the integrity of its employees. And without faith that integrity is too often assaulted to hold up forever.

Some of my people blame the white man in the South for all their difficulties. There are always two sides to everything. In our earliest, darkest days, Washington Duke, the famed tobacco man, spent many hours giving pointers to our business; Judge W. R. Winston, the noted Carolina jurist, aided us with legal advice.

Then there was the incident in 1933 during the bank crisis. The State banking commissioner called several of Durham's leading bankers and said:

"Spaulding said he wants to open Monday morning. But what if they stage a real knockout run on him?"

Without exception the bankers replied: "Tell Spaulding that as long as we have money he will have it."

No prejudice there.

Faith helps me in my relationships with people, just as the Bible helps me in working out tough problems. My wife has always been able to say proudly: "There are no dusty Bibles in our house."

The first thing I do at work in the morning is to close the office door and open the Bible to the ninety-first Psalm. I believe in this Psalm as I believe in getting up in the morning.

Before each board meeting I stop outside the board room to ask myself this question: "Am I fit to be an executive?" This repeated check on humility always reminds me that I am an instrument of God. His ideas direct our company policy.

It doesn't make any difference where you are, God is there and can hear your prayers. I pray in what many would consider very odd places. For example, at home every time I finish taking a bath, while cleaning the tub, I say: "Lord, as I clean this tub, clean my heart." I want both to be as spotless as possible.

During the rest of my years I plan to spend time with young people in an effort to give them a vision—a conviction that the color of their skin has nothing to do with whether they are successful or not. Changing deeply planted ideas is hard, but not impossible.

It grieves me to see so many Negroes pull out of the South for the promised riches of the large northern cities. For that matter, there is often complete disillusionment and frustration for many people of all races who leave small community situations where they are doing well for the promised big-city gold.

There was the situation of the Negro farmer who lived outside of Durham. I'll call him Jeff Thomas. Jeff began to receive letters from his daughters in New York's Harlem, pleading that he sell his farm and move up with them. Jeff worked all his life for his farm; he loved every bit of it, yet finally the salesmanship of his daughters was too much.

Jeff sold his 20-acre farm for $2,000, much less than the farm was worth. Then he pulled up stakes and moved to Harlem.

What he found shocked and numbed him. His daughters, instead of living in a comfortable house, as he had been led to believe, had two rooms in a large run-down tenement. His home amounted to a small bed and bureau.

Within a year all his money was gone, and Jeff was a lonely, helpless figure amid a teeming multitude. He was a farmer in New York with not only no land to till, but hardly a tree or blade of grass within sight. It was a pitiful situation. And his case is multiplied many times today.

My credo is summed up in this prayer: "God, give me the serenity to accept what cannot be changed. * * * Give me the courage to change what can be changed. * * * And the wisdom to know one from the other."

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday morning, March 19 issue of the oldest newspaper of continuous publication in America, the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, there appeared an editorial commenting upon two public-housing situations which are causing the taxpayers to ask questions. Though these two instances may be isolated cases, it may be the forerunner of surveys and perhaps investigation amoung housing projects that may reveal other facts which have not been brought to light in connection with housing authorities. The editorial follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING REQUIRES CLOSE SCRUTINY

It becomes more evident every day that before a lot more of public money is sunk into public housing in Connecticut, somebody ought to give the whole situation a thorough going-over. In Danbury the five members of the Town Housing Authority resigned the other day. They were completely fed up with the families who, with plenty of money for television sets, were unable to keep up their rent payments. Thirty-one of the 40 families in the project were delinquent in their rent payments.

The other side of the coin is the long existing situation in Hartford. Neglect of Bellevue Square by the Hartford Housing Authority is now followed up by charges of tenants that their inquiries of local officials are met with insolence and sarcasm. The fact that Bellevue Square is now being given a thorough clean-up does not in the least change the complexion of things. Why was it permitted to get into such a state of disrepair?

Certainly it was not due to any lack of money. Figures indicate that more than $73,000 was charged off against maintenance of Bellevue Square last year. Tenants who live there might be interested to know that it is claimed that $1,400 a week has been spent there on maintaining the project. Of this more than $8,000 was spent for painting and decorating. Another $10,880 was allegedly spent on maintenance of grounds. More than $14,000 was spent for janitorial services and another $7,290 for heating labor.

The question certainly arises as to how it is possible to spend money at the rate of $1,400 a week and still, at the end of the year, to have a project that looks like an adjunct to the city dump. There is even an

item of $2,331 for the operation of motor vehicles, gas, and oil. Coming on top of the charges of responsible State officials that the Hartford Housing Authority is greatly overstaffed, it seems obvious that investigation by some responsible public authority is long overdue. Or is this a completely autonomous little empire?

The Thirty-ninth Parallel Should Be the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the UN forces advance toward the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea, the question arises as to whether or not we should stop at that imaginary line.

Last November I urged that a buffer area be created along the Manchurian-Korean frontier; that the UN troops stop short of it and that the buffer area be occupied by South Korean troops. Since that time, conditions have changed markedly. I now wish to urge that the UN forces advance as far as the thirty-eighth parallel and stop there so that the original Republic of South Korea can once again be established in its own right. I further recommend that South Korean forces be sent into the area north of the thirty-eighth parallel up to the thirty-ninth parallel so a defense line can be established which will increase the defensive strength of South Korea and establish a status quo which can be maintained. Furthermore, if and when this is done, a warning should be issued against any further attempts to disturb the situation as thereby created. A move to the thirty-ninth parallel by South Korean forces and a declaration of maintainance of the status quo will, in my opinion, be a long step toward stopping Stalin's plans to involve us in an all-out war in Asia; it will allow the UN to start rebuilding South Korea and will have served notice to the world that aggression does not pay.

It might be well to point out that recent remarks by both Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway indicate that in their minds there is no longer any serious thought of attempting to liberate all of Korea. General Ridgway has stated "if the Korean war ends at the parallel, it would still be a tremendous victory for the United Nations."

Mr. Speaker, the most important result of the Korean war to date is that not since it began have the Russians or any of their satellites launched any other act of territorial aggression. This does not mean that they will not do so but the fact remains that they have not done so. Perhaps one of the reasons for this is because not one but a number of nations have stood up and insisted that aggression be resisted. Russia, with her Communist Chinese and North Korean allies, has not been allowed to win a cheap and swift victory. It is too soon, perhaps, to say that the war in Korea has prevented a world war but it seems safe to assume that our resistance in Korea has put off a general war and has won for us time to build up our strength and to continue to work to prevent a world war. We have had to pay a high price to put down aggression in Korea but we have pointed out to the Russians that a satellite cannot commit an act of aggression with immunity. The North Koreans and the Communist Chinese have gained nothing except a frightful loss of life and prestige. While the unification of all Korea is the ultimate possibility in that part of the Far East, yet, it is of greater importance to us that we discourage the Russian bloc from further adventures which would sooner or later launch an atomic war.

Oil and Gas Tax Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to the reduction of the 27½-percent oil and gas tax depletion allowance, March 19, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, to satisfy the appetite of this administration for more taxes, the President is again asking for a reduction of the oil and gas depletion tax allowance which has worked successfully and to the benefit of this Nation for many years.

If the administration is successful, less oil and gasoline will be produced, which will cause the price to rise, and every citizen will pay more for every gallon of oil or gasoline he buys, whether it is for his car, his tractor, or fuel oil to heat his home. It will not only affect the oil producer and farmer who may have oil, it will nick the pocketbook of all of our citizens. It will weaken our national defense and will cause everyone to pay more taxes, rather than less.

The President has referred to the oil and gas depletion allowance as a tax loophole that should be plugged. I submit if there is no loophole, there is nothing to plug.

This committee and the Congress in 1926 after a thorough study of the entire problem found this percentage method was more practical to administer, was fair and just, placed all taxpayers on an equal basis, and wrote the 27½-percent depletion allowance into the law.

In the subsequent Revenue Act of 1934, this committee and the Congress reviewed carefully the experience under the percentage depletion provisions. It had proved satisfactory during the 8 years and was continued in the act unchanged.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in 1936, when the revenue act was again reviewed, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, that the Treasury Department, with regard to the depletion provisions, "would not want to see any change." Congress made no change in these provisions.

Then again in considering the Revenue Act of 1942, the depletion provisions received a most comprehensive and detailed review by your committee and the Congress. The success of these provisions in assuring adequate oil supplies for World War II was demonstrated conclusively and the provisions were continued.

Again, only a year ago the President and the Secretary of the Treasury recommended a reduction of the 27½-percent depletion allowance. Your committee held full and complete hearings which brought out all of the facts and voted to maintain the 27½-percent depletion.

Throughout the past 25 years of trial and experience this depletion allowance has proven, beyond question, to be a necessary and effective means of assuring an increasing oil supply essential to the Nation's economic progress, industrial expansion, and for our national defense.

It has proven there is no loophole to plug—no one is cheating the Government out of a dollar in taxes because of this depletion allowance.

The Congress knew it was not a tax loophole when they wrote it into the law. Their review of this provision in several subsequent tax bills has confirmed the wisdom of the members of this committee and the Congress.

The Congress, in writing this provision into the law, sought to protect the oil owner or producer from being compelled to pay an income tax on his capital investment.

The Congress also realized that this depletion allowance was necessary as an incentive for further exploration and production of oil in an expanding economy.

The question was raised before the Ways and Means Committee in the hearings last year as to whether the oil industry was spending the 27½ percent for exploration and drilling of new wells.

In response to that question Mr. R. B. Anderson, president of the Texas division of the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 14, 1950, and I quote excerpts from his testimony.

Mr. Anderson said, "a detailed survey has just been completed of a group of large oil companies including all of the so-called major companies in the industry for a 12-year period from 1936 to 1947 inclusive. The survey shows that this group of companies spent more in their effort to find new oil reserves than the total percentage depletion allowed for the same period, or $1,833,000,000 more in their efforts to find new oil than the total additional taxes they would have paid without the depletion percentage.

"The total sum expended by this group of companies during the period, including both expiration and development, was $5,541,829,000; or more than twice the percentage depletion allowed."

Continuing Mr. Anderson said: "It is the necessary incentive to the oil and gas producer whether large or small to plow back his funds in the search for new and essential reserves.

"It is also the incentive for new and risk capital from outside sources to be expended in the search for new and additional oil reserves.

"The facts shown by the survey are conclusive evidence that these provisions have done what they were intended to do and that the larger producers are as dependent upon the percentage depletion provision as are the smaller operators in their continuous search for oil."

I submit, that the foregoing statement by such an eminent authority as Mr. Anderson proves that the depletion allowance is justified, necessary, and is being used as the Congress intended, for the expansion of exploration and oil development.

OIL PAYS FULL SHARE OF TAXES

It is utterly fallacious to consider the present 27½-percent rate of depletion on oil production as unjustified or excessive. The petroleum industry has always paid its fair

share of taxes, and in my opinion is now paying more than its proportionate share.

Mr. Chairman, if this depletion allowance is reduced, it will ultimately close down hundreds of thousands of stripper wells which are at present producing over a million barrels of oil a day. Industry and national defense will lose this oil now so much needed.

More seriously than this, all of these millions of barrels of oil will be left in the ground never to be recovered.

I do not believe this committee or the Congress will allow this to happen. It will almost completely stop what is known as wildcat drilling throughout the Nation. By this I refer to the little oilmen who cannot continue to finance their drilling without this depletion allowance.

EIGHTY-TWO PERCENT DRY HOLES

It is these small producers on whom this Nation is dependent for increasing supplies of oil. They drill 75 percent of the so-called wildcat wells, which are those drilled in unexplored areas for new reserves. Eighty-two percent of the wildcat wells drilled in the United States last year were nonproductive.

ILLINOIS, SEVEN OUT OF EIGHT DRY

In Illinois alone last year the industry drilled 810 exploratory wells, of which 700, or approximately 7 out of every 8, were dry and abandoned.

A DANGEROUS GAMBLE

On a gamble to obtain $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 in taxes the administration proposal would strike a blow which would kill the incentive to explore for new oil reserves in our country. This is no time to take such a dangerous gamble.

Demand for petroleum has risen 750,000 barrels a day in the past year. Due to the present war emergency the oil industry is right now facing a gigantic task. The Petroleum Administration for Defense is asking the oil industry to further increase its production by 1,000,000 barrels daily.

WE NEED GREATER PRODUCTION

What we need is more exploring for oil, more new oil wells brought in and greater production. If this depletion allowance is reduced, we will have less oil. Then oil will join the ranks of inflation with higher prices per gallon for gasoline and oil and will cost the American taxpayers more than the $300,000,000 in taxes sought in increased prices of oil and gasoline. It will weaken the industrial power of our country, weaken the power of our military machine, and endanger the defense of all of the people.

Let us look at the remarkable record of the oil industry in World War II. It achieved miracles in supplying our Armed Forces. It did so on its own. At the same time, it was necessary that the Government subsidize many other basic and essential industries to achieve the desired production. If we tamper with the time-tested tax base as applied to petroleum, within the year we may find it necessary to subsidize the drilling of oil wells.

I should like to pose this question: Which is more important—assurance of a continued oil exploration program sufficient to meet our military and essential civilian demand in any event, or the return of a relatively few additional dollars in the public Treasury? That is the choice which now faces the Congress.

This ill-considered attack on the rate of depletion is a direct blow at our very security. But it goes beyond that. We must consider that the economic and governmental structures in some 20 States are vitally affected. The health of the oil industry influences the economic well-being in at least 12 of our major producing States.

PRICES OF OIL LOWER THAN 30 YEARS AGO

The average price of gasoline in 1949 was 20.47 cents per gallon as compared to 29.74 cents in 1920—an actual reduction of 9.27 cents while during this period the quality of petroleum products has improved manyfold. Also during this period, gasoline taxes were increased more than 10 times.

ILLINOIS OIL PRODUCTION

I have lived close to the oil industry in Illinois. In my district are thousands of independent oil producers, among whom are many operators of stripper or marginal wells. In Illinois there are thousands of such wells with a daily average production of 2½ barrels of oil a day. All will be closed down without the depletion allowance and the oil will be lost forever.

THOUSANDS OF DRY HOLES

Many people are led to believe all is profit and riches for those engaged in the oil business. The facts show a different picture. Out of 6,785 exploratory or wildcat wells drilled in Illinois from 1937 to 1950, inclusive, 6,389 were dry and only 306 produced oil.

The loss or cost in drilling the 6,389 dry wells was $95,835,000. No one gives publicity to these staggering losses of these men who are willing to risk their money, these free enterprisers who might well be referred to as the last of the vanishing rugged pioneers who are willing to struggle and sacrifice to win success by their own efforts.

Members of the committee, I would like to point out that the oil industry paid in State and Federal taxes last year $3,551,370,000. This does not include many of the taxes below the State level and does not include income taxes paid by the great body of men employed in the oil industry or probably $500,000,000 in addition.

In addition many States, through their legislatures are raising the taxes on the oil industry, and the President and the Secretary of the Treasury are asking this committee of the Congress now to increase Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 3 cents which would add an additional tax burden of over $500,000,000 a year.

I am informed that the average gasoline State tax is 6 cents a gallon. Federal and State taxes on gasoline now produce a total revenue of about $2,500,000,000. This reaches an approximate grand total of over $4,500,000,000 resulting from the oil industry. This does not include many further millions the oil and gas industry will have to pay because of the increased corporate and excess-profits taxes.

If we continue to heap unbearable taxes on the oil and gas industry, we will destroy one of the most powerful branches of our economy, slow down the industry of the Nation at a time when it is necessary to expand it, and weaken our national defense on which we are now spending countless billions of dollars to build up.

If the administration is successful in reducing this depletion allowance, it will so reduce oil production in this Nation that instead of scraping the bottom of the barrel and getting $300,000,000 more in taxes, they will probably lose $500,000,000 in taxes that would normally flow into the Treasury if the oil business is allowed to continue to expand in the future as it has in the past.

Mr. Chairman, the oil industry has made a remarkable contribution to all of the people in the Nation. It is a splendid example of competitive enterprise. Millions of people have invested billions of dollars in the oil and gas industry, making it possible to carry its services to every citizen of the Nation.

Those in directing the management of these organizations continue to spend billions of dollars each year in the further expansion of this great industry which expands our national economy and which renders the people a better service and brings employment to countless millions of them in addition to helping furnish the finest transportation in the world to our people.

Few people realize that gasoline, oil products, and natural gas and oil to power the industries of our country are being furnished to all of the people at a lesser price than they were 25 years ago.

Let me point out again that the average price of a gallon of gasoline in 1920 was 29.7 cents a gallon without any tax. Leaving off present taxes the average price of a gallon of regular gasoline on July 1, 1950, was 20.4 cents. In other words, because of the great exploration, production, and supply of oil, gasoline, and gas during the past number of years, your gasoline is delivered to you by the oil industry at about 9 cents a gallon less than 30 years ago.

It is the Government, both State and National, that adds the extra average of about 6 cents in taxes a gallon and not the oil industry.

Think what it would mean to the people if all other industries would have held the prices of their products down to the people, as the oil and gas industry has done. If they had, we would not have the ruinous inflation that is upon us today. By comparison, the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the general cost of living has gone up in this same period 44½ percent. Again, let's make a comparison. Oil produced and delivered to the filling stations of the Nation today is 9 cents a gallon less than 30 years ago, while all other commodities are up a general average of 44½ percent.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND MILES OF PIPELINE

Few people realize that throughout the days and nights, the weeks and months, that billions of barrels of oil due to the foresight and good management of those directing the oil and gasoline industry, flow underground to distribution points all over the United States through 120,000 miles of great oil pipelines—yes, delivering it at lower prices to the distributor than it cost 30 years ago.

NINETY-EIGHT THOUSAND MILES OF GAS PIPELINES

That likewise the oil and gas industry through the same business foresight has 98,000 miles of big gas pipelines which carry the gas underground to power thousands of great industries throughout the United States and to furnish heat for millions of homes. Yes, and at a lower price than was charged for gas many years ago.

WHO BENEFITS?

All the people are benefited by an adequate supply of oil and gas which keeps the price of these products at the lowest possible level. It is not a few oil men who benefit. They only get their legitimate tax rights under the Constitution. It is the 150,000 people who reap the benefits, and it is the United States Treasury that benefits in billions of dollars in taxes collected from this great industry.

CHICAGO AREA BENEFITS

All cities, industrial and farm areas benefit. By illustration, may I refer to Chicago and its trade territory. What an adequate supply means to that vast trade area.

The people of the city of Chicago use more fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline than any other city in the world.

The farm trade territory of the city of Chicago embracing seven States constitutes the largest rural market for petroleum products in the world.

The greatest saturation of automobiles, tractors, and motorized farm equipment in the world is found in this area.

The largest per capita use of petroleum products in the world is in the area of these seven States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, and Nebraska.

The petroleum and natural-gas industry has furnished these products in this great

productive locality in such abundance that the price of natural gas today is cheaper than it was 10 years ago, and the price of gasoline before Government taxes are added is 9 cents a gallon less than it was 30 years ago, and gives the consumer, through its refinement and improvement, 50 percent more power than it did 30 years ago.

Certainly, the Government should not be permitted to slow down the service to our people, and the march of progress of the great oil and gas industry.

The oil and gas industry which employs millions of men as a rule pays the highest standard wages and seldom do you ever hear of a strike in the oil and gas fields that amounts to anything worthy of mention.

It is a mistake for the Federal Government to bog down and slow down this great essential industry by tampering with the 27½-percent depletion allowance which would reduce supply of these essential products and drive them on the escalator of inflation by governmental interference.

It would be a tragic blunder if this depletion were reduced, which would weaken and endanger the national defense of our country. I feel certain that the Ways and Means Committee in its wisdom will again refuse to reduce this depletion allowance, and I feel certain the Members of the Congress will applaud such action on the part of the Ways and Means Committee.

Let us not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Let us not temporize with or endanger the security and defense of our Nation in these perilous times.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, American investors owe a debt of gratitude to the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times for the warning given in a series of articles now being published in that great newspaper.

Mr. Richard S. Lewis, Star-Times staff writer, has performed a fine public service as author of the articles which describe in detail the operations of a group who seek to funnel American capital into gold-brick promotions. Working with mailing lists of potential American investors, these promoters undoubtedly have many victims for their nefarious schemes. Thanks to the investigations of Mr. Lewis for the Star-Times, they are now being exposed and thousands of investors are being saved from loss of investment capital.

This series of articles should have the widest circulation throughout the country. I am hopeful that other newspapers will call attention to this stock-promotion racket as a result of the Star-Times exposure. The St. Louis newspaper is to be congratulated for this unusual public service. I am sure this series of articles will be listed high among the outstanding newspaper contributions for 1951.

With my remarks I include the following article which is one of the series which I have mentioned:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—This is the story of how an American fugitive from justice who jumped $40,000 bond in New York City 3 years ago masterminds gold mine and oil promotions here today.

He is Albert Edward DePalma, age 50. Thirty years ago, he sold knitted ties in St. Louis. When this venture failed, he became a waiter at Autenrieth's restaurant in Clayton. It used to be across the street from the courthouse.

From St. Louis, he went East. He sold used cars for a while in Brooklyn.

Born in Capetown, South Africa, DePalma was brought to the United States at the age of 2 by his parents and reared in Savannah, Ga. He never made much money in the United States.

Then he went to Toronto and got into the mail order stock racket. Today he is regarded as one of the wealthiest men in this city.

Like a number of other promoters here, DePalma cannot set foot in the United States without risking arrest. He jumped bail after he was indicted in Cleveland in 1947 on 14 counts of mail fraud in connection with his promotion of Novell Porcupine Gold Mines, Ltd. and Peg Tantalum Mines.

DePalma ranks high on the United States Securities and Exchange Commission's list of most wanted swindlers. The Canadian Government protects him from United States authorities by refusing extradition. Although DePalma has been denied a broker-dealer license here, his stock promotions are peddled by fronts who are licensed broker-dealers.

These broker-dealers are peddling stocks in the same gold and tantalum mine promotions which were the basis of the Cleveland mail fraud indictments in 1947, and in addition, they are handling an oil issue which the United States SEC also finds to be a phony.

They are Victor H. Waddell, suite 26, of 29 Melinda Street; Frank Shea, 221 Victoria Street, and William A. Deering, 71 King Street West, all of Toronto.

These three are currently licensed broker-dealers in good standing with the Ontario Securities Commission. They are also members of the Broker-Dealer Association, the outfit which does not like the laws of the United States.

In addition to these fronts, DePalma has been represented in the past by J. F. Wright, who was licensed as a broker-dealer in April 1949, at suite 110, 221 Victoria Street, but who is no longer a licensed broker-dealer.

Another DePalma stooge was Robert C. H. Mitchell whose license as a broker-dealer was cancelled by the Ontario Securities Commission on January 13, 1948. The Commission declared Mitchell to be a front for DePalma.

The mining ventures which led to the Cleveland indictments—Peg Tantalum Mines and Novell Porcupine Gold Mines, Ltd.—are still current. The SEC investigation shows that Novell Porcupine Gold Mines, Ltd., permitted its claims to lapse after DePalma's indictment. In May 1949 the claims were restaked on behalf of J. F. Wright and on September 23, 1949, Palamino Gold Mines, Ltd., was formed and took over Wright's claims.

Wright became the president of Palamino, according to the 1950 Canadian Mines Handbook, at the same time he was promoting its stock as a broker-dealer.

All through 1949–50 Palamino circulars were pouring into the Midwest, offering 25 shares of stock per person (no more) at $1 a share.

This is a typical DePalma promotion technique. In 1946, when DePalma was promoting Novell Porcupine by flying around the United States in his private airplane with his name printed all over it, he permitted each sucker to purchase only $10 worth of stock.

Palamino promotional circulars kept referring to the fact that a big company called Progress Diversified Minerals, Ltd., was sinking $1,000,000 in some property adjacent to the Palamino site in the Yellowknife mining district.

Progress Diversified, according to the promotion, had been working a property which Wright, himself, had purchased from an old prospector in 1944 on the basis of "striking samples" of ore.

The fact that Progress Diversified and Palamino were two angles of the same promotion is not stated in the literature, but it happens to be the case. DePalma admitted that much to me.

Not long after United States postal fraud orders began flying at Wright and Palamino, DePalma ended its career and formed a new company called Indigo Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., in which both Palamino and Progress Diversified were merged.

From Novell Porcupine to Palamino and Progress Diversified to Indigo, the SEC and the United States Post Office have kept up with DePalma all the way.

Indigo, in the opinion of SEC and postal investigators, was a device to evade the fraud order issued against Palamino, since both Shea and Waddell were asking suckers to send their remittances to Indigo.

Shea and Waddell told the suckers that stock shares, selling to the public at 70 cents, would soon sell for $5. They did not mention the fact, however, that DePalma was purchasing these shares from the mine treasury for 25 cents.

The broker-dealers also advised mailing lists that Indigo was in production and making money and that the mine adjoined the famous Noranda mine, whose vein runs into Indigo property.

Mining Engineer Benjamin Adelstein, of the SEC, reported that Indigo's mine is 1,700 miles away from Noranda, that insufficient ore has been encountered at Indigo to show a feasible commercial operation, and that there is no present reasonable basis for assuming the venture will be profitable.

Indigo appeared on the scene last year, however, as a brand-new promotion as far as St. Louisans knew. DePalma's name was not connected with it.

Indeed, this was the reason he changed the name, he told me.

The stock promotion was handled by Waddell and Shea. Both advised prospective clients that for each share of stock outstanding there was $4 of ore indicated at a depth of only 500 feet on a mere one-sixth of the company's vein structure. The SEC found these claims untrue.

Broker-Dealer William A. Deering also got into the act. His advertising literature last month represented that work on Indigo's properties had reached the stage where the ore zone would be reached last September.

According to the SEC investigation, Deering told suckers that arrangements had been made to list Indigo on the Toronto Stock Exchange at $2 a share.

In reviewing the Indigo case prior to issuing a fraud order against it November 24, 1950, Trial Examiner Daniel J. Kelly asserted that no application has ever been made to list Indigo on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

DePalma swore it was listed, but he delisted it himself. He was vague about the reason.

Examiner Kelly also made the point that Indigo's property is in an inaccessible area of the Yellowknife district, served only by airplane and tractor train in the winter.

This would create unusually high costs for operations and mill installation, he commented.

In addition to Indigo, DePalma's broker-dealer fronts were active in promoting his oil stocks in the Petromine Exploration & Finance Co., Ltd.

In Post Office fraud order No. 42707, issued March 16, 1950, Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr., said the broker-dealer concern of Waddell & Co. "is engaged in conducting a scheme for obtainng money through the United States mails by means of pretenses, representations, and promises that are knowingly false and fraudulent."

The SEC report stated that Petromine shares were peddled by long-distance telephone and mail in the United States by Waddell on such representations as—

It was the largest independent oil producer in western Canada.

It owns the richest quarter section of the Lloydminster field.

That seven Petromine wells are the finest commercial producing wells in the area.

That Petromine wells flow fairly well on their own, but to control the wells they are pumped.

The SEC reported that in truth and fact Petromine was not the largest independent producer in western Canada; that it did not own the richest quarter section in the Lloydminster field; that its seven wells are not even good commercial producing wells and that the oil has to be pumped in order to squeeze it out of the ground.

The SEC found untrue the claim that application had been made to list Petromine shares on the stock exchange here. It found untrue the claim that all funds derived from stock sales went into the company treasury to develop the well.

Instead, the SEC found the company treasury received 20 cents out of each share sold to the public for 50 to 75 cents. "This mark-up of 150 to 300 percent a share was distributed among the promoter, underwriter, dealers, and salesmen," the SEC report said.

"Waddell's representation that Petromine was a safe and sound investment is absolutely false," the SEC said.

Because of bank loans outstanding and limited production from its well, Petromine assets are likely to be taken over by creditors.

"The resultant loss to investors will be 100 percent of the purchase price of their shares," the SEC report said.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent of mine:

SUFFERN, N. Y., *March 15, 1951.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Recently the House Public Works Committee has been conducting hearings on the various resolutions proposing the completion of the perennial boondoggling St. Lawrence seaway and power project, now garbed in the cloak of a defense measure.

I am opposed to several phases of the bill, particularly that part covering the St. Lawrence seaway, as I am convinced, contrary to the blandishments of the sponsors of the bill, that the project is for defense purposes, that it will not add one iota to national defense, Governor Dewey and all the proponents to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not in reality a defense measure at all, and I am deeply concerned by this insistence to spend vast sums of money, great quantities of materials and millions of manhours, which will have to be diverted from our defense requirements and be dissipated on projects which will be detrimental rather than beneficial.

How much this part of the subject bill will cost to complete no one seems to know, even approximately. Reliable engineers 10 years ago—when the matter was under consideration and when costs were considerably lower—estimated the cost at from $800,000,000 to $1,350,000,000. If then, as is usually the case with public projects of this type, the cost of building the St. Lawrence seaway runs true to form, and in this day when the "squanderbund" is in the saddle, the final costs will reach staggering proportions. In support of this contention, I point to the final cost of the Panama Canal, the highest cost estimate of which was placed at $160,000,000 by a well-known and reliable engineer, but which actually cost the Nation $375,000,000 before it was completed, or 134 percent more than the highest estimated cost.

I am, however, in perfect accord with the building and cost of the Panama Canal, since it was actually built for and has proven to be one of the most important links in our chain of national defense.

Besides being opposed to this bill on the grounds that this is not the time for nondefense expenditures, particularly at a time when it is apparent that real defense requirements are seriously straining the economy of the people, I oppose this scheme on the grounds of being directly detrimental to the living standards of a great part of the American people, especially those living in the North Atlantic States.

That this letter may not assume too large proportions, I am attaching hereto for handy reference a list of 17 reasons why I oppose the passage of this nefarious bill and pray that you, in the interest of every American, will vote against this insidious measure when it comes before the House.

Very respectfully yours,

G. J. GARDNER.

SEVENTEEN REASONS WHY THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY SHOULD NOT BE BUILT

1. It will slow up our war efforts in Korea by directing to the project enormous quantities of steel, lumber, cement, machinery, explosives, and other materials now so urgently needed.

2. It will slow up our defense efforts by diverting manpower so vitally needed for essential industry at this time, and may prove to be disastrous.

3. In the event of invasion, and the best authorities say it is possible, it will be difficult to defend.

4. Only 5 percent of American ships of 2,000 tons or over could be operated through the seaway.

5. Only 30 percent of foreign ships of 2,000 tons or over could use the seaway.

6. Only smaller ships of our Navy could use the seaway.

7. In this time of strain upon our national finances, it will require many millions of dollars to prepare our lake ports for this type of navigation service.

8. Weather conditions will permit the use of the seaway for only 8 months or less each year.

9. Out of the money spent of our tax dollars only 6 percent would be for the benefit of American workmen and shipping.

10. It will reduce employment in many of the major industries of the United States.

11. It will tend to reduce the earnings of American marine workmen millions of dollars annually.

12. It will skyrocket the already high cost of living.

13. It will increase our taxes by untold millions of dollars each year.

14. It will subsidize foreign workmen, shipping and factories at the expense of American workmen and industries.

15. It will place American workmen in competition with cheap foreign labor.

16. It will place an intolerable burden on American workmen and industry for all time to come and without hope of benefit.

17. It will do irreparable harm to all of the North Atlantic ports established at such great cost, especially that of New York City in our own State, and make for unemployment on a huge scale, not to mention destroying the railroads within our State borders, now struggling for survival.

West Point Appointment System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a clipping from a newspaper which complains about the system of appointing candidates to the United States Military Academy at West Point.

WEST POINT APPOINTMENT SYSTEM HIT

BUFFALO, March 17.—The West Point Society of Western New York wants more enlisted men—and fewer friends of politicians—given a chance to attend the United States Military Academy.

"The number of (cadet) appointments available for enlisted men of the Armed Forces should be very materially increased," said a statement in connection with local observance today of the academy's one hundred forty-ninth anniversary.

"This increase could be immediately brought about by transferring at least 1,062, or half of the appointments now available to Senators and Representatives, to the Armed Forces."

The statement was approved by the society's board of governors. The society is an alumni group.

Having Congressmen appoint most of the West Point cadets, as at present, is "to a great extent just another form of political patronage," the statement said.

The West Point Society of Western New York believes in the appointment of more enlisted men and fewer friends of politicians. They believe the number of appointments available for enlisted men of the Armed Forces should be materially increased. I believe so, too. But I wish the West Point Society of Western New York would advise me as to the number of their members who were appointed to the Academy by their several Congressmen. It would make interesting reading, I am sure, in view of their resolution concerning appointments. But you see, my colleagues, they are out of the service, either by resignation, retirement or otherwise.

But to have this group, or any other similar group, complain that "having

Congressmen appoint most of the West Point cadets, as at present, is to a great extent just another form of political patronage" is interesting, to say the least.

The resolution of the West Point alumni could, in my humble opinion go still further with further provision that the academy be more interested in obtaining lads who desire to make the Army their life's career instead of looking for prominent football and other qualified athletes.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith one of a series of articles which have been appearing in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times, exposing the operations of a stock promotion group in Canada which has been preying upon unsuspecting American investors. The Star-Times is performing a great public service in exposing these operations.

The article follows:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—The letter we received last November 13 from Leader Securities, Ltd., of 88 Richmond Street West, fairly glowed with promise.

"We are pleased to have you with us as a participant in the promising future of Treasure Rouyn Mines, Ltd.," it said. "The response to our offering of these shares has been overwhelmingly enthusiastic. Judging by the number of reservations received, there is every indication that a substantial oversubscription will result."

Approximately 15,000 persons in the Middle Western States received the same letter we did. It was followed by a second letter urging us to immediate action in sending in our check for 500 shares of Treasure Rouyn stock at 30 cents a share.

"Substantial wealth has accrued in many fortunate individuals by the tremendous growth of Canada's mining industry," the second letter said. "We believe these profits will be more than surpassed in the future."

This, in turn, was followed by expensively prepared literature indicating how our fortune would be made by investing in an aggressive mining company exploiting the wealth of the Noranda mining district of Quebec.

Included was a small publication called Mining News and Market Digest, which featured an article on the front page headlined: "Treasure Rouyn plans completed for early start on new program."

Underneath was a picture of a gold miner drilling in a tunnel. There were other pictures, one entitled "Winter in a Mining Camp," which showed a group of miners standing around outside snow-covered log cabins.

Another showed a mining head frame under construction. None of these had anything to do with the Treasure Rouyn mine, but they were instructive.

We also received a little booklet entitled "Mine Making Portrayed." This, like the four-page Mining News and Market Digest, was sent to us with the compliments of our broker, Leader Securities, Ltd. It showed how mines are dug and gave us a brief history of the Canadian mining industry.

When we did not send in our check, we received another letter from Leader on December 11. The tone was a little different.

"Due, no doubt, to pressure of other business," it said, "you have omitted to forward your check in the amount of $150 Canadian funds, or $142.50 American funds, covering our statement of your account relative to the purchase of 500 shares of Treasure Rouyn Mines, Ltd."

It went on to say that the company was anxious to adjust our stock position, and our immediate remittance was to our own advantage.

All this we got from Leader Securities for a penny post card we sent in asking for information. We haven't received any more dunning letters asking for $150 we never agreed to put up in the first place, but we do continue to receive more propaganda. Leader is trying to sell us some cobalt now.

This is somewhat typical of the way the moose pasture promoters here besiege you with literature and attempt to make you believe you actually owe them money. We got the long-distance-telephone treatment, too. Everybody does.

Let's examine this proposition.

In the first place, Leader Securities Ltd., of which one Lionel Richmond is president, became the subject of United States postal fraud order No. 42687 on March 13, 1950—8 months before we were solicited.

The fraud order was written because of misrepresentation made in regard to the possibility of making profits out of Treasure Rouyn Mines.

The purpose of the postal fraud order is to prevent mail from the United States reaching its Toronto destination. But our postal card asking more information got through this barrier.

Maybe that's because it was addressed to "Accounts Department," suite 101 at 88 Richmond Street, west. The postal fraud order lists Leader's address as suite 305 at 88 Richmond Street, west. Leader simply switched offices in the same building to confuse and confound the United States postal authorities.

But the Post Office caught up with this maneuver on Sept. 12, 1950. It issued a supplemental fraud order covering suite 101 as well as suite 305.

Then Leader dodged again. They sent us a self-addressed envelope in feminine handwriting in which they wanted us to send our "cheque."

The address was: "Cashiers Department, suite 101, 90 Richmond Street, west."

Dodging the United States postal fraud orders here is as easy as rolling off a mail sack. There was no indication on the return envelope to indicate the address was Leader Securities.

This is not the legal address of Leader Securities. But that's where this outfit picks up much of its mail from the United States.

Having seen how Leader bamboozles the United States Post Office, let's see how they are trying to take us for a ride with their gold mine.

Without the permission of the Ontario Securities Commission, it would not be possible for Leader or any of the other broker-dealers here to pull these shenanigans.

According to the official bulletin of the Ontario Commission, an organization calling itself Baylord Securities, Ltd., agreed to purchase 250,000 of Treasure-Rouyn stock at 5 cents a share on June 27, 1949.

In February, 1950, the record shows that Baylord and the mining company agreed to cancel this agreement in favor of a new agreement. Under it, Baylord entered into the purchase of 10,000 shares at 10 cents a share and was granted options on 1,240,000 shares, of which the first 490,000 shares were to sell also at 10 cents and the rest as ascending prices ranging from 12, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 to 50 cents a share.

What Baylord agreed to do, in brief, was to sell 500,000 shares to the public and pay the mine treasury 10 cents for each share. Only the first 10,000 shares required cash on the barrelhead.

Now Baylord Securities is not a licensed broker-dealer in Ontario. It operates as an underwriter and it had to find a licensed broker-dealer to promote the stock to the public.

Accordingly in July of 1950, Baylord was granted permission by the Ontario Commission to give Leader Securities a suboption on the shares at a half-cent mark-up per share.

This agreement was modified on August 29 when Leader took options on 1,115,000 shares. It was to purchase these from the treasury at 12 cents a share for 456,000 shares and the remainder at ascending prices up to 50 cents.

What all this adds up to is that Leader was offering to sell us 500 shares at 30 cents a share—for which it paid a wholesale price of $10\frac{1}{2}$ to 12 cents per share. This was a bargain, according to the promotion ethics here.

Under the broker-dealer association code Leader could have charged 34 to 36 cents a share, and indeed advertised in the Mining News and Market Digest it was asking 34 cents.

At this point it should be explained that the Mining News and Market Digest is not an independent publication, but one of the myriad propaganda devices published by the promoters themselves to create an illusion of publicity which they cannot get in any respectable newspaper either in the United States or Canada, except through articles exposing their operations.

How is this price of 30 cents a share set?

Treasure Rouyn stock is not listed on any market. There is no trading in it. There is no bid price.

It started out at 5 cents a share wholesale when it was first promoted by Baylord. It went up to 10 cents under a new agreement alleged to have been made between Baylord and the mining company.

Then Leader got into the act and decided to see if it could get 30 cents for the stock.

The value of Treasure Rouyn today appears to exist in the minds of the promoters—and the suckers if the promoters can make them believe it.

That the promoters and the broker-dealer are the same people is evident by the fact that the executive office of the mining company is in the same suite in the same building as Leader Securities, Ltd.

The Canadian Mines Handbook, an authoritative listing of current and abandoned mining properties in Canada, lists the concern as having 32 claims in Rouyn and Beauchastel Townships, northwestern Quebec.

Development of the property, the Handbook shows, up to March 1950, consisted of a geophysical survey which was in progress at that time. This was to be followed by diamond drilling to determine if any gold is to be found in the property.

The fact that the stock-selling deal was all set up nearly a year before the geophysical survey was made or any diamond drilling got under way is made clear by the records.

The fact that the SEC and the Post Office have found this promotion to be based on fraud also is a matter of record.

But the Ontario Securities Commission makes such promotions as this legal. The result is that in defiance of United States postal fraud orders, Lionel Richmond, of Richmond St., West, Toronto, is not only promoting fraudulent stock in St. Louis through the mail, but trying to dun suckers who even indicate some curiosity in his promotion.

Government Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Western Hills Press, Cheviot, Ohio, of March 16, 1951:

GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE—COUPLE OF EXAMPLES THAT ARE NOT HEARSAY

Many stories of profligate extravagance on the part of the Federal Government are told, some so fantastic that the average housewife who diligently shops from store to store to save a few pennies to stay within an inflation-riddled budget or that the average small businessman who turns out a light in an effort to keep expenses inside of income find them hard to believe.

But occasionally, each of us comes across personal examples that cannot be denied. Thus, to the editor's desk came this week, a release from the local Navy Recruiting station. Not one copy, not two copies, not three—but 10 copies of the same release were included in the mailing. Accustomed to receive three copies of releases from military agencies (no Army or Navy form is official in less than triplicate), this set a new high.

Knowing from daily experience how increasingly difficult it has become to secure paper needed for the ordinary operations of a printing and publishing business and being familiar with the recent directive setting aside 5 percent of all mill production of certain papers for Government use, it is needless to say that this wholesale news release did not improve Navy press relations insofar as we are concerned.

Nor is this an isolated instance. The Treasury Department, in its campaign to stimulate the sale of Savings Bonds, is also generous to a fault. For instance, it has not been long since that one of our periodic shipment of mats for Savings Bond advertisements arrived with four duplications of each ad, none of which we had specifically ordered. The fact that one mat will provide casts for a half dozen plates, if that number of duplicate ads would be required by a single publication for any conceivable reason, is a matter of elementary knowledge to anyone familiar with graphic arts processes. It would doubtless be presuming too much to expect that the Treasury Department "expert" publicists would know as much.

The value of these mats on the Cincinnati market we ascertained to be $2.24; the packing and handling charge a minimum of 35 cents, and parcel post from Chicago, the point of origin, to Cincinnati, 19 cents. (Of course, these mats came under Government frank, adding to the postal deficit for which the second-class mailing rates granted to newspapers get principal credit.)

Thus, this single mailing cost the Treasury Department (which of course, is you and I) an estimated $2.78, or considerably more than twice of what it should have been had single mats been sent. Had proof sheets for editor's selection been sent, the general trade practice, the cost would have been even a smaller fraction of the actual cost. And there are over 10,000 weekly newspapers in the United States, the majority of which are doubtless on the Treasury Department's mailing list.

We also find in our mail a news release (one copy) from the Ohio Public Expenditure Council stating, Ohio's share of President Truman's proposed $71,600,000,000 budget, as submitted to Congress, amounts to $3,752,028,016.40. Hamilton County's share, alone, amounts to $341,509,129.20 or an average of $475.12 for every man, woman, and child in the county.

So what, it's only money. Your money, that is.

A. H. H.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith one of a series of articles now appearing in the St. Louis, Mo., Star-Times, exposing the operations of a stock-promotion group in Canada which has been systematically defrauding American investors. The article follows:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—There is no question about the oil boom in Alberta. It is real. Some of the greatest oil pools in North America have been discovered there.

But not by the mail-order stock promoters of Toronto's Bay Street. Tying their promotions to the legitimate boom, the Bay Street buccaneers have leased lands on the fringes of the oil areas and drilled wildcat wells as a basis for selling schemes.

According to them, they hold open the door for United States participation in Canadian western oils.

Alberta authorities have vainly warned Americans to beware of the flamboyant promotions emanating from Toronto. But their warnings have been drowned out in the torrents of promotional literature from Bay Street promising big profits overnight to investors in Canada's black gold.

The oil promotions seem to be the easiest to sell in the United States, possibly because the Horatio Alger oil millionaire is a familiar figure to Americans.

This is the kind of propaganda oil promoters are feeding St. Louisans:

"Once upon a time, only a few months ago, a farmer named Bill Mulligan and his wife and 11 children lived in a tumble-down shack with a dirt floor near Bon Accord, Alberta.

"The family was very poor. If it hadn't been for the milk from their four cows, the Mulligans would have been hungry at times.

"Then along came an oil company and drilled a hole in their cow lot. Oil gushed out of it and, lo, the Mulligans aren't on a milk diet any more.

"They are eating beefsteaks now and have just bought a new home, two new tractors, and a $4,000 sedan in which they are touring the States. All of them are riding high."

Now this rags-to-riches documentary was not invented by the promoters. It was published by the American magazine last August, in an enthusiastic article entitled "It's Easier To Get Rich in Canada," by Clarence Woodbury.

No criticism of Woodbury's article nor the facts he has assembled to show why it is easier to get rich in Canada is intended.

But reprints of this article are being mailed by Toronto's broker-dealers to St. Louisans in support of fraudulent oil stocks.

As early as November 1949 C. O. Nickle, a recognized oil authority of Calgary, Alberta, issued a public warning to beware of the wildcatters. He criticized the high-pressure selling methods used by the Bay Street buccaneers to sell western oil stocks.

At that time, most of the promotions were based on drillings in the Lloydminster area. This field is favorable at best only for efficient operators, he said, who can keep costs to a minimum, but not to operators who put two-thirds of the investors' dollar in their pockets and use one-third to look for oil.

"Chances for an investor to get his capital back, let alone realize a profit, are about comparable to a snowball in Hades," he said.

The most prevalent western Canadian oil promotions circulating in the St. Louis area are Cordasun Petroleums, Ltd., and Maidstone Oils, Ltd. Both of these have been found fraudulent by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office.

Probably the most aggressive promoter in the group of licensed broker-dealers pushing these stocks is J. D. Cullingham, of J. D. Cullingham & Co., 185 Bay Street.

Cullingham, who occupies office space on the floor below the headquarters of the notorious bail jumper, Albert E. DePalma, is the subject of postal fraud order No. 43124, issued May 5, 1950.

Also, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Michigan, Minnesota, California, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Virginia have issued cease and desist orders against Cullingham. But in spite of these efforts, he is still spreading the old oil throughout the Middle West.

By mail and over the telephone, Cullingham promised St. Louisans that he could sell them stock below the market price, when there wasn't any market to begin with; that they were sure to make money; that the stock was safe and sound, and that Cordasun Petroleums was an investment, not a speculation.

Not many of the broker-dealers go this far. Most of them admit their promotions are speculative, but, they add, nobody makes money in Canada unless he speculates.

Cullingham's pitch is rather distinctive. He tells you that Cordasun's 35-cent shares have been oversubscribed and that the offering price to the public has now risen to 50 cents. But—

"As principals we have allotted a special bloc at a preferential price of 45 cents per share—a price 5 cents under the prevailing public offering quotation of 50 cents a share."

How can anyone resist such an offer which enables you to make a nickel a share before you buy the stock at all?

It's not hard to resist when you look behind this deal. The SEC and the postal inspectors did.

They found that Cullingham received 300,000 treasury shares from Cordasun at 7½ cents, 300,000 at 10 cents, and 15,000 at 12½ cents, with options to purchase more stock at ascending prices.

This is the stock Cullingham has been offering at 35, 45, and 50 cents. What he offers it for, the SEC found, has no relation to any market value.

The postal investigation found that glowing representations were made about a Cordasun well known as Bailey-Nisku well No. 1, which was promoted as a prolific producer.

United States Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr., reported in his findings that this well had been drilled to 6,000 feet and abandoned as a nonproducer.

Analysis of the amended prospectus filed by Cordasun with the Ontario Securities Commission shows that Cordasun's holdings in seven areas are not substantial enough to warrant the promises of profit made by the promoter, according to Haynes.

In the area called Pouce Coupe (which means "Flea Bite") the prospectus shows Cordasun has only a one-eighth interest in certain acreage. In addition to this and the

well which was abandoned, the prospectus shows two gas wells on the holdings of other companies were drilled and sealed for lack of a market.

In the whole area, there has been no production as of Feb. 3, 1950, according to the examiner's report.

In the East Leduc or Nisku area, where the prospectus shows Cordasun has a 5 percent interest in certain properties, an $80,000 drilling which went down to 6,000 feet was abandoned, according to the prospectus.

In the Speedon area, where Cordasun has only a one-fifth interest in a 50 percent of a co-participant, the prospectus shows there has been little drilling near Cordasun's property, according to the trial examiner's finding.

In fact, the closest well which was drilled 5 miles away was abandoned. In the Campbell area, Cordasun has only a percent interest in the net oil produced after all expenses for drilling have been paid.

The trial examiner commented that in some areas where Cordasun has an interest there are producing wells, but they have not been pumped steadily because there is no market for the oil produced.

In a letter to the SEC dated May 27, 1949, the chairman of the Alberta Province Board of Public Utility Commissioners wrote:

"This company (Cordasun) is not registered in this province and is not entitled to sell its shares in this province.

"The whole literature is completely objectionable and would never be authorized by us for publication. It is not so much what is said but what is unsaid that makes the literature misleading.

"Perhaps I should mention that all these Ontario companies carefully avoid coming to Alberta for registration.

"The whole literature can be described as misleading, high-pressure sucker bait."

Trial Examiner Haynes concluded:

"The evidence before me in this case shows, and I find that the business conducted by J. D. Cullingham & Co., through the United States mails, is a scheme for obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises."

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Brass Industry in Naugatuck Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the year 1802 marked the founding of the brass industry, as we know it, in the United States. In this year the manufacture of buttons from sheet brass was undertaken by the firm of Abel Porter & Co. in Waterbury, Conn. Here was the first American use of the direct fusion of copper and zinc to make brass as invented by James Emerson in England in 1781. This also involved the first rolling of brass in this country.

To mark the occasion of this great event, I propose that a postage stamp commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the brass industry be issued, and am introducing today legislation to that effect. Provision is made for the sale of the postage stamp at the post office in Waterbury, Conn., 1 day preceding the general sale of these stamps.

The brass industry provides employment for an untold number of our citizens. Its production makes life more inviting for all our people. Our defense effort would shudder to a halt without the full participation of the brass industry. Throughout its 150-year history the contribution of pioneer workmen and manufacturers in the Naugatuck Valley have made possible its tremendous expansion to the industrial giant of today.

I hope that the anniversary celebration will not be marred through congressional neglect to suspend the present import tax on copper which is tying the hands of the industry in these critical times. An unprecedented effort is being made by the brass industry to cooperate in defense mobilization plans, but success is not readily attained when obstructions such as this tax are placed in the path.

It would be most appropriate for the Federal Government to acknowledge the sesquicentennial of the brass industry through the issuance of a special commemorative stamp next year.

Statement Prepared by Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, for the American Hungarian Federation in New York City, Sunday, March 11, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement prepared by me for the American Hungarian Federation which met in New York City on Sunday, March 11, 1951:

MY DEAR MR. FALUSSY: I had hoped very much to be able to speak to you in person this evening, but unfortunately unforeseen exigencies prevent me from doing so. I am extremely glad to have at least the opportunity of sending to you and the members of your organization these few words of friendly greeting and of encouragement in your useful work and purposes. I regard this occasion as especially felicitous in view of the approaching Ides of March—a truly inspiring date in Hungarian history, which marks the anniversary of the beginning in 1848 of the Hungarian war for independence under the leadership of that remarkable apostle of democracy, Louis Kossuth, against the foreign oppressors of the Hungarian people at that period.

It is a notable fact that, over the past century, hundreds of thousands of persons of Hungarian origin have come to this great land, and while not forsaking their splendid Hungarian cultural heritage, have become loyal American citizens. These good people, together with their descendants, have creatively and productively enriched American life and added to its achievements. Now, in the critical period in which we live today, I find it most satisfying and reassuring to observe that this patriotic community, as an integral segment of our people, continues with exemplary alertness and a clear sense of civic responsibility to contribute effectively to the preservation of those principles and institutions which have made this country both great and free.

I believe we are all quite aware at this juncture that in preserving our American way of life against the threat of Communist totalitarianism, we cannot remain unconcerned at the suppression of human rights and freedoms and the extinction of democratic principles elsewhere in the world. This fact has a direct application to Hungary because of the tragic situation which has befallen the liberty-loving people of that country. Theirs is a culture and a national history which extends back into the first millennium of the Christian era. Through a thousand years, amidst a sea of peoples of unrelated tongues, they have maintained their language and culture, and, while sharing fully in a common Western European civilization, have yet preserved their own essential qualities and their entity. This is a significant achievement and provides a sound historical basis for confidence—indeed, assurance—that the Hungarian people, possessed of this spirit, will never accept the domination of foreign tyrants but will continue successfully, whatever may be their temporary difficulties, to assert their independence.

The aspirations for independence, freedom, and democratic institutions, which have found clear expression in both Hungarian and American history and traditions, are lasting elements in the ties which exist between the peoples of Hungary and the United States. These firm bonds cannot be broken by the present Soviet-dominated Communist regime in Hungary despite its practice of systematic repression and its efforts to isolate the Hungarian people from friendly intercourse with the American and other western peoples. I submit that this is a fact which no amount of false Communist propaganda and forced "re-education" can alter or expunge from the hearts and minds of the Hungarian people. I also suggest to those of you whom, happily, I can address on this occasion, that you and those whom you represent are in a peculiarly advantageous position as loyal American citizens of Hungarian descent to maintain an intelligent and sympathetic interest in the plight of the Hungarian people, to give them encouragement in their spiritual and moral resistance to Communism, and to assist them, despite their present subjection to a foreign control which is exercised through a subservient Communist minority, to look and work with perserverance toward ultimate liberation and the fulfillment of their democratic aspirations within the organized community of free peoples. In these endeavors, the Hungarian people will assuredly have the greatest sympathy and support from all of the American people and from other free peoples throughout the world.

A Proposed Blueprint for Victory in 1952—Extracts From Address by Senator Mundt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address on the subject A Proposed Blueprint for Victory in 1952, delivered by our colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], before a meeting of the executive committee of the National Federation of Young Republican Clubs, as contained in a release dated February 25, 1951.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extracts from address of Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, before meeting of executive committee, National Federation of Young Republican Clubs]

A PROPOSED BLUEPRINT FOR VICTORY IN 1952

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 25.—Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, a conventional Republican from one of the strongest Republican strongholds in the country, today proposed an unconventional blueprint for victory in the Presidential elections of 1952 to a national meeting of Young Republican leaders assembling in Washington from approximately 40 States of the Union, last night. Senator MUNDT suggested, "the way to save freedom and protect individual and property rights in this country is to develop an election formula whereby the people of both political parties on each side of the Mason-Dixon line can join their forces and their votes in a great national effort to elect a President and a Congress dedicated to restoring the Federal Government to its proper sphere of activity and thus putting a permanent end to today's direful drift toward the shoals of national socialism under the banners of fair dealism."

Tracing the process by which individual freedom and private ownership has been losing ground all over the world, Senator MUNDT said, "For 20 years the areas of human freedom and the functions of free men have been growing sickeningly smaller all around the globe. Even Britain has succumbed to national socialism. In the United States we have been moving steadily and sadly in the same direction although not to the same degree as many of the European powers. Unless we can stop this drift—unless we change this direction in America, it is only a matter of time before we, too, shall be added to the casualty list of free peoples who have surrendered their individual rights, their property rights, their States' rights, and their rights of decision to the all-powerful state. Here, too, we are finding Federal politicians today pushing around more private citizens by executive action than in any era of our history. Only an informal, inadequate, and intermittent coalition of southern Democrats and northern Republicans in the Congress has protected our precious individualized and community rights from being destroyed in America. Such an unorganized and leaderless defense line cannot permanently protect this country against those whou would magnify the Central Government and minimize the rights of individual citizens and their respective State governments in this Republic."

MUNDT urged the National Federation of Young Republican leaders to "give serious study to the fruitful possibilities of saving our freedom formula in America by developing a blueprint for victory in the presidential elections of 1952 so that those who think and act alike in America—whose Senators and Congressmen vote alike—can vote victoriously for the same presidential candidate be he from the North or the South."

Reducing his theories to practical proposals for procedure, MUNDT outlined a six-step program for "harnessing together in a victorious presidential campaign those in America who place principle above partisanship and those who hold fast to the Constitutional principles which have for so long so well protected our community and individual rights."

1. The Republicans should for the first time since the turn of the century hold their National nominating convention after the Democrats rather than before them. The melancholy record of five successive Republican defeats should indicate that such a change in procedure does not represent a very dangerous Republican gamble.

2. In all likelihood, the Democratic National Convention will nominate President Truman for another term "or somebody to the left of Truman—somebody who actually believes in the programs of nationlization and socialism (medicine, health, housing, education, farming, power, banking, insurance) that Truman has rendered lip service to support." The Democratic Convention will also most certainly include planks and programs moving toward the socialization of the foregoing services—and perhaps others. This seems inevitable because in the 1936 convention when the southern Democrats lost the two-thirds rule which enabled them to direct the destinies of their party they fell off the back of the Democratic donkey and under its heels and there seems no likelihood that they can ever again wrest control of the party away from its left-wing elements, its city machine bosses, and the leaders of various pressure and propaganda groups.

3. Let the study southern Democrats who approve States' rights and abhor State socialism then "walk out and go home" as they did 4 years ago. Let them send emissaries to the Republican Convention to "talk turkey" about the desirability of nominating candidates and writing a platform acceptable to the South and consistent with its historic concepts.

4. If the Republicans will nominate such candidates (for example, TAFT, of Ohio; BYRD, of Virginia; Eisenhower, of New York; or RUSSELL, of Georgia; and others who could be suggested), our Jeffersonian democratic friends could then hold State or regional conventions to place these same candidates on the ballot as the regular democratic nominees where that is possible and as "coalition Democrats" or "States' rights Democrats" in other southern States. At the electoral college "these votes could all be merged together to elect the candidates supported by many Republican States in the North and by the Southern States delivering their votes to them as Democrats or as dissenting partisans."

5. Once such a team of candidates is elected by coalition efforts of the North and the South, the Senators and Representatives from the cooperating areas would be pooled in the Senate and the House, their seniority rights would be interwoven with each other, and committee chairmen selected from whichever group had the ranking legislator. Federal patronage could temporarily be handled on the same basis.

6. A few months after such coalition candidates had assumed office in the White House and the Congress, a National convention could be called to select a name, a symbol, and a set of principles for the coalition forces. Suppose they chose the name of Freedom Party and the Statue of Liberty as a symbol with a careful definition of the appropriate scope and function of the Federal Government as basic party doctrine. Those out of power would then be forced to form an opposition party and with two new political parties, each with a definite set of principles, we would have an honest, meaningful, party realignment in this country. Party labels would mean something again; individual voters would know what they were voting for in supporting public officials; county and State officials would change their allegiance from Republican or Democrat to one or the other of the two new parties.

MUNDT called attention to the fact, "In this country we have changed party designations several times. Each time it has been a good tonic for America and we have moved forward into a new era of progress. People have renewed their interest in Government. With such a new alignment of parties, now, it is a safe assumption that the discouragingly small number of voters now going to the polling places would sharply and continuously increase. Voters could then vote for a principle rather than a party label."

Drawing upon the experiences of Great Britain as an example, MUNDT said, "I have made a careful study of the manner in which inadequate and unworkable political alignments in Great Britain have contributed to its collapse into the pitfalls of National Socialism. Both the Conservative and the Liberal party members oppose Socialism as indicated by the vote of a fortnight ago when all Liberal and Conservative Members of Parliament voted unanimously against the nationalization of steel. What would have happened if in the last general election in Britain those voting for losing Liberal Members of Parliament had voted for the Conservative candidates? The results show their own parallel with our American predicament. Had there been no Liberal Members of Parliament candidates and had the voters voting for losing Liberal Members of Parliament voted Conservative, the Conservative Party would have gained 71 seats in the House of Commons. Added to the 272 they actually won, this would have given the Conservative Party a majority of 343 or 29 more than needed to control the House of Commons. Thus, Socialism prevails in Britain because in the last election the British people were divided by artificial barriers and unworkable political alignments just as today those in the South and North who oppose "'Big Government' are divided by historic, semantic, and artificial party labels. We can most surely avoid the fate of Britain where private ownership and individual initiative have been taken over by the palace politicians by meeting the issue head-on in America and placing behind one Presidential candidate the voters of both political parties whose legislators in Congress have joined together repeatedly to prevent Socialistic programs from being adopted here."

Using the 1948 presidential election as an example, MUNDT said, "Had we been able to merge the votes behind the men who have fought together in Congress into a great national effort to elect a President in 1948, the Fair Deal would have been routed in our last election. Add to the four States where Dixiecrat candidates won the electoral votes of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia where voters have steadfastly and emphatically supported anti-New Deal, anti-Fair Deal Senators, and Harry Truman would have received 93 less electoral votes than he did in 1948. Deduct 93 from the 303 which he received and you have 210 votes or 56 less votes than needed for election. Thus it can be seen that if those whose votes in this country have clearly demonstrated they do not want reckless extravagance, a breakdown of States' rights, complete domination by the Federal Government and a whole catalog of socialistic experiments in America had an available political formula whereby they could merge their strength and marry their votes in the electoral college a conservative, business-minded, constitutional adherent can be elected in 1952."

"Who better than our Young Republicans have the progressive spirit and the energetic vision required to breath new hope and life and strength into the cause of freedom in America?" asked Senator MUNDT in conclusion. "After all it is the youth of our land who will lose most if the present trends toward top-heavy, arrogant, socialistic government continue. It might well be the youth of America who should take the lead in

breaking with past formulas for political defeat. For too long our Republican Party has been a sectional party operating effectively in less than three-quarters of our States. Let it become the vehicle for conducting a great national drive to unite its force with those in the South who share our affinity for freedom, private enterprise, individual initiative, the dignity of the individual citizen, the protection of States' rights and the necessity to stop socialism from making further inroads in the world's last citadel of liberty, independence, and opportunity. Let it never be said that false political labels, a problem in partisan semantics, and an imaginary boundary line between the freedom-loving people of the North and South were successful in combining to bring catastrophe and collectivism to this Republic."

The Tidelands Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

House Resolution 137

Whereas the Dallas Morning News on yesterday, March 14, 1951, carried a front-page editorial straight to the point on what the tidelands fight really is; and

Whereas said editorial reads as follows:

"The tidelands fight has been defined as many things which it is not. It is high time to start describing what it really is.

"It is a fight for property rights that have existed since this Government was born.

"It is a fight for the honesty and integrity of the pledged word of the National Government against specious phrase twisting to cover legalized chicanery.

"It is a fight for the honest returns of investment in risk and commercial venture against the sure-thing speculators who would reap where others have sown.

"So far as Texas is concerned, it is a fight for the school funds and school future of the children of a State that voluntarily ceased to be an independent Nation and cast its lot with a government whose word it believed it could trust. So far as Texas is concerned it is a fight to see that no false reasoning or time-serving pretense by an inept Federal Supreme Court shall set that word aside.

"In the striking series of nine articles by Allen Duckworth concluded in the Dallas Morning News on Monday, the case of Texas and the other tideland States has been made crystal clear. You have seen official conspiracy to seize these lands for the Federal Government in defiance of a concept of ownership that was born before the Constitution and endured with it. You have seen the evidence that this is a national grab to benefit private spoilsmen.

"What the tidelands issue has never been is either an effort to assure the naval oil reserve or to benefit the people of the United States.

"It has made no difference to those responsible that they have written on the books a Supreme Court opinion that places in jeopardy every square foot of privately owned or State-owned property in this country. For the Court in its labored effort to justify its grossly unfair decision has asserted that the United States has the right in its own interest and regardless of its pledges to seize the tidelands without compensation.

"The tidelands today—your home, your business, your person tomorrow.

"An act of Congress can stay the progress of that unhallowed theory, fundamentally identical with the concepts of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

"Get Congress to act": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Dallas Morning News, be commended for its outstanding public service in publishing the plain truth about the Federal grab of Texas' tidelands under color of legalized authority delivered up by a willing United States Supreme Court; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be directed to forward copies of this resolution to each Member of the Texas delegation in Congress, House and Senate.

REUBEN E. SENTERFITT,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that house resolution 137 was adopted by the house on March 15, 1951.

[SEAL] CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the St. Louis Star-Times for the splendid series of articles it has been publishing exposing a stock-promotion group in Canada which has been systematically defrauding American investors for several years. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include one of the series which merits the gratitude of investors:

(By Richard S. Lewis)

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—"Sheer, undiluted nonsense" was the way United States Trial Examiner James C. Haynes, Jr., characterized the promotion of Bison Petroleums, Ltd., when he issued the first of four fraud orders against its promoter, A. Garfield Heyes.

Bison was literally promoted in reverse. It told suckers it was going to set up a refinery before it had struck oil. It prepared to drill for oil before making a geophysical survey to see if any oil was there, according to the investigation of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Post Office.

The trial examiner issued the first of four fraud orders against Heyes August 2, 1950. But Heyes turned out to be a slippery customer, changing his address three times. Each time, though, the Post Office nailed him.

The firm of A. Garfield Heyes, Ltd., is still doing business here. It is currently listed by the Ontario Securities Commission as a broker-dealer and it is in good standing with the Broker-Dealer Association.

Heyes, the United States probe showed, sold Bison as another get-rich-quick opportunity in the western Canada oil boom. His literature told the suckers the boom had hardly scratched the surface.

Not only did Bison Petroleum propose to give the United States citizen a chance to participate in oil product, but in refining as well. The deal simply couldn't miss, according to Heyes.

But it could when SEC investigators took a close look at it.

Canadian postal authorities advised American postal authorities that Heyes' literature was "a very obvious attempt to sell shares on the strength of Saskatchewan properties which are in nowise related to the Alberta light-crude discoveries."

"Bison Petroleums," the Canada Post Office added, "is designed to offer the investor an opportunity to participate in two profitable phases. The two can be profitable, but not with the properties and the suggested refining facilities of the company."

The Canada postal authorities said that Bison's claim it held favorably located leases and participation in the Redwater, Lac La Biche, and White Mud areas is completely deceptive.

Literature issued by Heyes speaks enthusiastically of drilling contracts signed by Bison, "with work scheduled to commence immediately."

Characteristic of this literature is the persistent word picture that the promoters use to convey the idea they are toeing the mark and ready to go. They are always "commencing" or "ready to commence" some operation which shows "favorable indications" of "rich rewards" or "interesting possibilities" of "remarkable profits."

The Bison prospectus, on file with the Ontario Securities Commission, shows that Bison closed contracts for drilling, or said it closed them, ignoring the advice of its own geologist, who recommended that a geophysical survey be made before trying to drill the wells, according to the United States trial examiner.

Bison got this advice on March 9, 1950, and executed the drilling contracts shortly afterward, according to the trial examiner.

"The evidence before me also shows that the refining plant which is to contribute so substantially to the value of Bison stock will most certainly not produce anything in the way of profit," said the trial examiner.

"The plant is to be a skimming plant. The margin of profit which can be secured from such an operation is quite narrow. To talk of building a refinery until you have an assured supply of at least 1,000 barrels a day is sheer, undiluted nonsense, and can only be deceptive."

Postal fraud order 43739, issued August 2 against A. Garfield Heyes, Ltd., did not deter the promoter from sending his literature to United States suckers. In order to bypass it, Heyes enclosed a self-addressed return envelope with the address, A. G. Heyes, 9 Adelaide East, Toronto 1, Canada.

Since the first fraud order did not cover this designation, another was issued to cover it on October 2. But this still did not stop the resourceful Heyes.

He sent a return envelope self-addressed to Heyes, Ltd., Suite 1, Bank of Toronto Building, Laird Drive and Eglinton Avenue, Leaside, Ontario.

In his letters was an explanatory postcript: "P. S.—Use the stamped, return envelope, addressed to our branch accounting office for extra prompt attention, which is enclosed for your convenience."

On November 17, a third fraud order was issued covering this dodge. But Heyes continued to operate.

His latest return envelope is inscribed with this address: A. G. Heyes, president, 7 Adelaide Street East, Toronto 1, Canada.

A fourth fraud order, covering this designation, was issued December 6. But Heyes is still operating here under other aliases and he is getting his mail delivered.

Another promotion of the same caliber of fraud is Maidstone Oils, Ltd., promoted principally by Donald F. Bryans & Co., a concern connected with another swindle called Lashburn Petroleums, Ltd.

Bryans and a colleague, William G. Chipp, sold Maidstone stock in the United States

by advertising through the mails that Maidstone holds a total of 128 well sites in the Lloydminster area, where successful wells are frequent.

Examination of Maidstone's holdings by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission geologist showed that Maidstone had only 32 well sites within 3 miles of area, and that the remaining acreage is 12 miles away.

The SEC geologist also found that Maidstone's claim its acreage was located in "proven and semiproven sectors and/or sectors deemed to offer oil- or gas-bearing possibilities" was false.

None of this acreage could reasonably be considered proven and semiproven oil land, the geologist found.

The promotion circulars also asserted that all doubt had vanished regarding the profitability of Lloydminster wells. But the evidence showed that even better wells in this area were not particularly profitable, according to the findings of United States Trial Examiner Daniel J. Kelly.

Kelly said there was no reasonable possibility that the wells in the area would produce enough oil to enable investors to secure a return of the purchase price of the stock.

Another promoter of Maidstone, Cordasun Petroleums, Ltd., and a third enterprise called Docana Oils and Mines, Ltd., is J. B. Dow & Co. of 9 Richmond Street East, Toronto. This concern is listed currently as a licensed broker-dealer and a member in good standing of the Broker-Dealer Association.

Dow represented to suckers in Minnesota that he had discovered a junior oil company with holdings in 10 areas of western Canada, but could not disclose the identity of the company lest premature publicity might result in a sudden upsurge in the market price for the shares.

The mysterious company turned out to be the old swindle, Cordasun, which has been promoted by more Bay Street pirates than almost any other oil stock in the moose pastures.

Dow, according to the United States postal investigation, represented there was an established market for Cordasun, Maidstone and Docana. There is no market, the post office reported.

Dow is subject to cease and desist orders in Missouri, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, and California, while New York and New Jersey have obtained injunctions against sale of Maidstone stock.

Still another promoter riding the crest of the Alberta boom is L. B. Scott & Co., a licensed broker-dealer here and member of the Broker-Dealer Association. Scott sold Capitol Petroleums, Ltd., and a mining promotion, Eastwebb Mines, Ltd.

Scott became the subject of a postal fraud order last April. A second fraud order was issued against this concern in December when it tried to dodge the first order by using Terminal A, Box 293, as its address here.

In his oils brochure, Scott told suckers that 87.5 percent of all wells drilled in Lloydminster field were successful. The SEC found no such percentage of success had ever been heard of in the area.

An employee of the SEC talked over the telephone with L. B. Scott & Co. and was told:

"A situation has come up that prompted telephone calls to our customers. This stock became very active owing to some news that came in on the property. They are down 1,500 feet. There is an adjoining well causing quite a lot of activity. They are drilling a deep test well now, down 1,500 feet."

The SEC man, whom the promoter took to be a sucker, asked what size was the adjoining well.

A $5,000,000 well," was the response. "The original investment was $80,000. It is considered a $5,000,000 well right now."

SEC said such statements were "inexcusably vicious, highly fraudulent and have no factual basis."

Imposition of Controls—Address by Alan H. Valentine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Controls: By Whom and for What? delivered by Alan H. Valentine at the thirty-first annual luncheon of the Associated Industries of Cleveland, at the Statler Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio, on March 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLS: BY WHOM AND FOR WHAT?

When in January your officers invited me to speak today, they thought they were going to get the Economic Stabilizer. So did I. But instead you get only a private citizen, only another Republican fired by a Democratic President. If you feel short-changed, how do you think I feel?

Actually I feel relieved. It is nice to know I have no responsibility whatever for the words and actions of the officers of Price Stabilization and of the members of the Wage Stabilization Board, if any. They have my good wishes, though not my envy. May they succeed, or at least survive.

Though relieved at my freedom, I did not seek it. I took on the job of Economic Stabilizer aware of its difficulties and dangers, and was prepared to see it through. But any man not supported by organized labor, or by the White House secretariat, or by the Democratic National Committee needs to watch his step, and I was unpopular with all three. The President gave me support for some weeks against heavy odds, and finally gave me the distinction of being Washington's finest example of what inventory accountants call "Last in, first out." My personal regard for him remains.

There is nothing more unstable than the job of an Economic Stabilizer. It is easy to talk stabilization but not to stabilize, and it is possible to appear to stabilize our economy but actually to impair it. But if one tries to act the economist and the statesman, he is moving against the crowd. Perhaps it is wiser to be like the demagog of the French Revolution, who, hearing in the small hours the noise of a riot in the street below, leapt from his bed and announced to his lady: "There go my people. I am their leader; I must follow them."

Paris has no monopoly of such leaders. In its milder form that kind of leadership is now called rolling with the punches. I am glad that some of our business leaders now serving in Washington have learned how to roll with the punches, for we need badly their continuance in the top councils of our Government. I do not know where our defense program would be without men like Charlie Wilson, Bob Lovett, and Bill Harrison. Hoping that my praise is not the kiss of death, I want you to know that in my observation one of the finest jobs of production ever done anywhere, and against heavy odds, is being done by General Harrison.

But there are issues too important to compromise; sometimes one must refuse to roll with the punches. One cannot compromise one's basic economic judgment especially when it is supported by the wisest advisers one can assemble. I have always believed that free enterprise produces best when it is most free and that its mechanism is delicate and should be adjusted only after the most careful consideration. I knew we could not in any case, for want of staff, arrest inflation for a month or two, and believed that during that period it was better to endure inflation and not risk impairing production, than to impose a regimentation which would not, in any case, hold down prices of most consumer goods about which the complaints centered. Therefore I would not impose general controls until Government took certain other deflationary steps—mostly still not taken—to help make controls workable. My judgment may have been wrong, but events since February 1 have not changed it. My judgment was not shared by most of the powers in Washington. As prices rose it became increasingly difficult for me, and for the President who supported me, to resist the pressures of those whose opinions were seldom tempered by any knowledge of the complications of price regimentation and wage regulation—to resist the sincere and vocal people who had all the popular arguments on their side—to resist those who cared more about placating the public than helping the public.

That was an economic issue, though it became a political one. But there was another. It was one I had been promised would not be allowed to impede my work, I was forced to choose between being a participant in large-scale partisan patronage or of being a victim of it. I chose the latter; forced the issue; and do not regret my choice. Perhaps it would have happened in any administration; it did happen in this one.

There are few men more boring than he who wants to tell you about his recent operation and how much it hurt. There are few figures more pathetic than the defeated football coach who spends all winter explaining how all he needed was more good material. I shall try not to be an Ancient Mariner either. What happened to me is unimportant—except to me—unless it brings some clarification to matters of greater importance. The times are too crucial to permit any of us the luxury of destructive criticism or personal tirades. Our Government needs our support. We owe support, with all the largeness of spirit and generosity of judgment we can muster, to that Government and to a President whose honesty and devotion, whose difficulties and problems, we never can belittle. Any further references to my own misadventures will be purely illustrative. I came to bury Valentine, not to praise him.

I want to give my remaining time to two considerations.

First, are Government efforts toward stabilization succeeding, and if not why not?

Second, what does that tell us about the future of our democratic Government?

If in 15 minutes I can answer either of those I shall not have died politically in vain.

Can our economy be stabilized? That depends on what we mean by stabilization.

If we mean bringing our national economy wholly under the control of Government; if we mean arresting and freezing our productive organization within some predetermined framework; then our economy cannot be stabilized, at least short of complete dictatorial socialism. Such regimentation

would reduce personal incentive and impair production; it would strait-jacket initiative and destroy free enterprise. If that be stabilization I am against it, for the essence of our economy is its flexibility; the merit of our system is its relative freedom.

But if by stabilization we mean eliminating the extremes of booms and busts; ameliorating the worst effects of inflation and deflation; and spreading more fairly the profit and the pain of our defense program—if that be stabilization it is desirable and possible. Are we on our way to it? I think we are on our way, but with more noise than efficiency, more disagreement than unity, more cooks than consistency, more contumely than courage, more politics than progress.

Whose fault is that? The fault lies in many places and has a long history. I can suggest a few factors, but I shall try to name no names.

One trouble has been an overemphasis in Government circles, in press circles, and in the public mind, upon the price-control aspects of economic stabilization. This was natural and perhaps inevitable. Prices are of immediate concern to the public; prices are news to the press, price control can provide legislators with an excuse for not voting unpopular taxes or troublesome government economies. This over-emphasis has led to too little emphasis—and too little action—upon other and more basic deflationary measures absolutely essential to stabilization.

Allied with this error was the widespread fallacy that to control prices one had only to issue a few orders. Actually price control is one of the most complicated, delicate, and difficult aspects of economic endeavor—a field really understood as a whole only by a few professional experts, and really understood in detail only by a few specialists in Government and business. Last week Walter Lippmann wrote that even Mr. Charles Wilson "seemed to accept the notion that prices could be frozen by decree without taking any serious measures to stop the inflation." If Mr. Wilson did accept that notion it was despite several hours of conversation, right up to the eve of my resignation, in which I endeavored to convince him to the contrary. Perhaps he did recognize the difficulties and dangers of the course which he then approved, but did not feel he could afford to take the risk of supporting a policy and a man so politically unacceptable. He had and has my sympathy and support.

Another fault lies in the terms of the Defense Production Act, which by various conditions makes it difficult and perhaps impossible to achieve effective price and wage control. Parity protection of agriculture is one of these hurdles, but there are others.

Then there are many areas of our economy in which controls of prices and wages are for practical reasons extremely difficult. How can one enforce price controls in many unorganized small-unit trades; how can one enforce a wage freeze among thousands of tiny groups of unorganized workers? In industries like motorcars or steel, when the units of management are large in size, few in number, law-abiding, socially responsible, and very much in the public eye, the problem of enforcement is a minor one. But there are many other industries, each with thousands of small operators, where that description does not apply, and where there is no medium for internal leadership or external control. Mr. DiSalle has yet to demonstrate that he can do—without rationing and without a Pearl Harbor psychology—what Messrs. Henderson, Bowles, and Porter could not do; control the retail price and quality of meat and men's clothing. Yet they were two of the items which both Congress and the public apparently expected any understaffed stabilizer could roll back in price by the simple issuance of an order.

But the greatest weakness in our stabilizing effort has been the failure of Government to take strong, prompt, and fundamental steps toward deflation—including Government economy, a wise and fair plan of increased tax revenue that would draw off excessive spending power, greater credit restrictions, more intelligent policies on interest rates, increased personal savings and purchase of Government bonds. Most of these remain undone, and meanwhile the ship of state drifts with the vagrant pressure-tides and stabilizers flounder.

If war becomes so near or inflation so devastating that we Americans are lifted by patriotism or by fear out of our normal selfishness and inertia—if that happens then the difficulties described will be promptly overcome. But even then we will still lack a major essential to effective stabilization—an efficient Federal Government.

That essential we do not now have. It cannot be quickly created or recruited for it is a matter of spirit and purpose as well as talent and experience.

Some 50 years ago Henry and Brooks Adams warned that American democracy might descend from mediocrity to mediocrity until it became too mediocre to survive. If they feared that in 1900, what would they think of the quality of American politics and society today? The problems which currently face our Government are more complicated and difficult than ever in our history. More than ever before we need many men of fine mind and character in Government, and an atmosphere in Government in which they can work happily and effectively. As the task of our Government has enlarged so has its size. It has multiplied in numbers, cost, and power. Has it increased proportionately in the wisdom and character of its leaders? Were our social gains of the 1930's, for example, accompanied by comparable improvements in standards of public propriety? Has the power, for example, which leaders of organized labor have gained since 1932 been balanced by an added sense of responsibility on their part for the welfare of all Americans? Indeed, do the American people any longer even expect to see Washington set an example of high-mindedness? Is our public now so inured to improprieties of public conduct that it is no longer offended by them? Are we, also, satisfied so long as our Congressmen or Federal officers do nothing actually illegal?

This brings me to my final question:

What does the current state of affairs in Washington tell us about the future of democratic government? I do not even suggest the possibility of any political corruption. I do not even suggest that many of the reported improprieties have seemed improper to the men who so acted, though that makes them doubly frightening. After all, let us gladly recognize that Washington does contain many men exceptional in ability, vision, and political integrity with whom any man should be proud to associate.

A government in which even men of Cabinet rank are advised to ingratiate themselves at regular intervals with certain members of the White House staff is an inefficient government.

A government in which thousands of Federal employees are strongly influenced by fear they will lose their jobs or their promotions if they offend the party political watchdogs in their department or agency is an inefficient government.

A government in which, in a declared emergency, top officials pursue various courses in matters of crucial financial, economic, labor, and manpower policy is an inefficient government.

A government which leaders of business and professions hesitate to join, even in a national emergency, because of the frustrations, defeats, compromises, and personal lacerations they know they must endure is an inefficient government.

A government in which leading Senators and other public servants are obliged to spend much time, in a crucial year, investigating the propriety and even the integrity of other public servants is an inefficient government.

A government in which thousands of Federal employees have forgotten that the function of government is to serve the people is an inefficient government.

It is said that democratic government must be in some respects inefficient; that that is the price of democracy. But the inefficiencies I have described do not derive from democracy; are not inherent in its working or essential to its welfare.

So I conclude that a government so inefficient is inadequate to our times.

Too mediocre to survive. Are we approaching that stage? There have always been some men of third-rate ability in our Government, and our Nation has survived them. But never, I suggest, have such third-rate standards and objectives flourished so openly or been more generally accepted and more loyally defended. This tolerance of the mediocre began long before the present administration, and Mr. Truman thus inherited a downward trend in political morality. That trend would have been difficult to reverse. It was not reversed but augmented. The moral ground on which contemporary Washington now rests is so low that mists of contagion can rise quickly and spread far.

Surely our President fails to realize how many and how large are the spots on the fabric of his Federal mantle. If he did realize, surely he would act.

The heart of this contagion is patronage whenever and wherever it can be got away with. We cannot, of course, have democratic government without political parties, and political parties cannot live without patronage. But patronage has become not a means to life but an end in itself to a political machine which has been too long at the trough. That patronage has become an excuse for the creation of a government within a government.

Our official Government is headed by an honest, well-intentioned, industrious, and likable President.

But there is a second government, nominally headed by the President but with activities of which he can be only vaguely aware. That government is largely unofficial in its standing, anonymous in its membership, undercover in its operations, undefined in its functions, and nebulous in its actual leadership, with few records, few scruples, and little or no sense of public responsibility.

Nominally a creature of the Democratic National Committee, in practice it appears to include men not officially connected with that committee, who are primarily in pursuit of personal power or personal wealth. Perhaps no single person knows all that is said and done in the name of this nameless government, but let there be no doubt of its influence. There is perhaps no complete record of its membership or of its plans, its promises, and its proscribed victims, but some of us soon learn to feel its power. I do not even hint at any illegality, for these are all, all honorable men. I merely suggest that this obscure and irresponsible power is a danger to the defense effort, and if long endured could become a menace to free government. The Fulbright commission has come upon some revealing traces and some familiar names.

Such a situation could not exist unless the leaders of our Government had become a little too tolerant of mediocre political ethics and a little too complacent about their own. How else can one explain an apparent willingness to be satisfied with public servants so long as their actions are not clearly

illegal, and to be unconcerned about actions which, though legal, are highly improper?

These factors are not remote from my discussion of stabilizing our economy, for they are major hazards which our stabilizers must overcome. Sound economics and partisan politics simply do not mix. Even a Charles Wilson cannot successfully organize our production and oversee our stabilization if he must also cope with an undercover government as well as a legally constituted one.

Only one man can repudiate and demolish this second and unofficial government. Only one man can raise the level of our political morality; only one man can drive the money lenders from his own temple. That man is the President of the United States. If I do not misjudge the American people, they know the time has come for the President to undertake a major house cleaning. They admire his loyalty to his supporters; they like his good nature. But he, who has himself declared a national emergency, must recognize this situation as one aspect of that national emergency. He must not let loyalty or good nature blind him to the fact that his loyalty is being imposed upon, his faith is being misplaced, his friendship is being betrayed by some whom he has thought to be his friends. They are no friends of his or of the Nation. In their own ways they are saboteurs of our defense program.

Only the President can act now, and by his action lift his administration from moral mediocrity. Only the President can act now. If he does not; the people can act later, if it is not too late.

Results of a Poll on Public Questions—Editorial From the Sacramento Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "So Congress Can Know," which appeared in the Sacramento Union on Sunday, March 11, 1951. This newspaper has conducted a poll on a number of questions of interest to the people of the United States, and the editorial deals with the answers received. I call this to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Union of March 11, 1951]

SO CONGRESS CAN KNOW

Last week we invited readers, in the interest of good citizenship, to express their opinions on 10 important questions before the Nation. More than 800 responded, with the following result:

1. Are you for or against our representatives taking action right now to eliminate the waste, the unnecessary jobs, inefficiency, and extravagance within each major department of our Government? For, 584; against, 10; don't know, 6.

2. Do you think our Government should stop giving and lending money and materials, other than military matériel, to foreign countries, until we can do so with a reasonable tax load, and a diminishing national deficit? For, 501; against, 52; don't know, 52.

3. Do you think our representatives should take action to correct legislation that requires our Government to buy farm products and other commodities in huge, unusable, and unsalable quantities, with taxpayers' money? For, 461; against, 31; don't know, 14.

4. Are you for or against admitting Red China to the United Nations? For, 59; against, 502; don't know, 41.

5. Are you for or against legislation that will prevent the President from ever again committing our Nation to undeclared war, or to any other unusual foreign duty, without consent of Congress or congressional committee? For, 517; against, 57; don't know, 31.

6. Do you think the UN should impose an embargo and blockade against the Chinese mainland, and encourage Chiang Kai-shek with moral and material support against Communists? For, 481; against, 51; don't know, 59.

7. Do you think our State Department needs a good overhauling, beginning at the top? For, 551; against, 30; don't know, 28.

8. Are you for or against legislation to stop all trade, direct or indirect, with Russia, and forbid entry to people, ships, and goods from Communist-dominated countries into this country? For, 517; against, 54; don't know, 33.

9. Are you for or against an immediate and all-inclusive clean-out of Communists and fellow travelers from every department of the Government, and airtight steps taken to keep them out? For, 567; against, 21; don't know, 16.

10. Are you for or against sending a large standing army to Europe? For, 81; against, 416; don't know, 115.

The information has been carefully compiled and sent not only to the two United States Senators from California, but to every Member of Congress from this State. In addition, an account of the balloting has been placed upon press association wires, so that all Members of Congress and the administration will have an idea how at least 841 northern Californians feel about important questions of the day.

Air Power Indivisible for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine—a friend who is a military man, which I am not—has called to my attention an old Training Manual of the War Department, dated December 23, 1921, in which the principles of war are listed. These principles are the principles of objective, offensive, concentration or mass, economy of force, movement, surprise, security, simplicity, and cooperation. They are the ancient principles of warfare, from the time of Alexander, and earlier; and they are the principles on which every successful general has based his campaign, right up to the present.

The same friend has called to my attention an article in the latest issue of the Air University Quarterly Review, called Air Power Indivisible. In this article two experienced Air Force officers, Col. Dale O. Smith and Maj. Gen. John DeF. Barker, apply these ancient principles of warfare to the newest form of military power—air power. Their conclusion is that the principles are still sound, and that air power, if it is to be effectively applied, must be applied with reference to them.

Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter has truly stated:

Tactical air and strategic air are merely handles which have been developed to identify different functions, each of which is indispensable and each of which fits into the over-all integrated structure of air power.

The authors of Air Force Indivisible conclude:

There should be no rigid adherence to the predetermined priorities ascribed to certain elements of air power when a crucial issue is at stake affecting the whole of national security. Then, without regard to theoretical priorities, total air power must be thrown into the gap which threatens the very structure of our civilization. This will always be the first priority.

The air organization must be designed to advance the national objectives with indivisible air power.

Using the ancient traditional principles of war as guides to strategic and tactical conduct more firmly based than conclusions drawn from incidents of the Korean struggle, General Barker and Colonel Smith have presented their case for the employment of air power in a clear, readable, and convincing fashion.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled "Air Power Indivisible" from the fall 1950 issue of the Air University Quarterly Review:

AIR POWER INDIVISIBLE

(By Col. Dale O. Smith in collaboration with Maj. Gen. John DeF. Barker)

Professional magazines have recently published several articles arguing the employment of air power in support of troops. One school of thought holds that more control of air should be vested in the ground commander who is directly affected by the kind of close air support he receives. The other school maintains that the current mode of air control, developed in World War II, permits more effective all-round air employment and, in the final analysis, better ground support.

The intellectual controversy thus stimulated is usually documented with authoritative statements from both sides and often supported by one-time incidents gleaned from the Korean struggle. Certainly there must be a firmer base upon which military thought may establish greater agreement.

The substantial acceptance of the traditional principles of war by all people wearing uniform might be one such starting base. These ancient guides to strategic and tactical conduct present a ground of basic harmony from which shoots of further military agreement might grow.

One of these principles is referred to as economy of force. It is, of course, self-explanatory. We want the most military return possible for any military force expended. When we go duck hunting we don't want to carry along a rifle in case we should run into a moose, or if we should hunt moose a shotgun would simply be a burden. On the rare occasion, however, when we want to hunt both duck and moose on the same trip, we'd

like to have both types of guns along. But at other times it would be most uneconomical to buy and carry the extra firearm. Wouldn't it be better to borrow the extra gun from a trusted friend rather than to buy it and lug it around for years with slight occasion to use it? For those who hesitate to borrow, it might be pointed out that the borrower is just as often lending his gun to help out the other fellow.

That seems to be a fair exchange. It is simply cooperation—another principle of war. Cooperation also can be considered one of the fundamental tenets of the American system and a secret of our great material and moral success. We trust our fellow man; we rely on his help. We abhor waste of any kind—even waste of time. By working together we make the most of our resources and never let them stand idle when they can be put to work in someone else's hands.

In war isolated situations or campaigns may make us forget or brush aside accepted principles which may not seem to apply at the moment. Yet a broad perspective of the whole history of warfare shows these principles standing up, again and again, under the acid test of combat. Why do we see more meaning in retrospect than in the heat of today's battle? Can it be because more of the relevant facts of the past are known than are the facts of the immediate situation? And cannot those more numerous facts be weighed and analyzed more dispassionately without our being swayed by personal involvement?

We are presently engaged in the Korean campaign, and we have yet to benefit from a comprehensive analysis of it. Our professional observers and correspondents provide separate accounts of one individual, viewing a limited number of isolated actions. Such reports often provide conflicting observations and we are prone to be emotionally affected by those we read. All these valuable experiences must be put together, with many more, and soberly evaluated for safe conclusions.

As a volume of evidence builds up, for example, the first somewhat hysterical accounts of jets being too lightly armored to be effective have been to a large extent disproved. True, jets can't be employed as well on some support missions as F–51's, but on other tasks jets have been found superior. Furthermore, had there been air opposition and accurate antiaircraft artillery, perhaps F–51's would have been knocked out of the skies.

The Air Force has maintained that a warplane must be fundamentally designed to live in the air. No matter how effective it might be under unopposed conditions, a warplane is of slight value if it fails to show up when needed. Recent engagements of our jets have discouraged enemy air attacks and have made it more possible to continue ground support. Economy of force would hardly be attained should we construct a Stuka or a Stormovik purely as airborne artillery, yet so vulnerable to air attack that another aircraft would be required to protect it. (A German and Russian experience that can hardly be ignored.) If we can, on the other hand, build an airplane which not only can protect itself but can perform adequate ground support, we have then what is tantamount to twice the force we might have had with a Stuka-escort combination. It might even be desirable to accept some slight reduction of our "air artillery" capabilities to gain this twice as large force. Fortunately this is not necessary, however, for as more reports pile up we find that jets, employing tactics to suit their unique capabilities, tend to provide an air support comparable to that of the propeller aircraft.

Had we fully accepted the first despairing and fragmentary reports regarding jets we might have gone all out for piston-driven fighters. Could that policy not have encouraged the enemy to employ his jets more vigorously? Would we now have control of the air? Surely we must consider the situation anomalous when the enemy concedes us air superiority. We cannot assume he will always react in that unusual manner. And his current reaction might have been somewhat due to the mere presence of our jets. It is possible that we are getting an economic return from our jets not readily apparent.

Whether we talk of aircraft or tanks or warships, pistols or rifles or artillery, no weapon can be considered of full value unless we employ it with economy of force. Each weapon possesses certain characteristics, singular strengths and weaknesses. We use each weapon so as to take advantage of its capabilities and allay the effects of its limitations. One of the greatest strengths of an airplane is in its flexibility (still another principle of war). The airplane can be used for many military purposes, and it has a mobility that surpasses any other man-carrying weapon. To tie this versatile instrument of war down to a few specific tasks and thus deny it other objectives which at times might be far more productive toward eventual victory would seem to be a profligate waste of force. Would it not be better to organize our forces for optimum flexibility and hence be more able to practice economy of force?

If an air force is organized to take advantage of the great material versatility inherent in the airplane, the commander can be in a position to skillfully apply all the principles of war. He can launch his force from a carrier at sea, from an airfield 20 miles behind the lines, or from a different continent, thus employing it with extreme flexibility. He can take the offensive and concentrate his force against the most critical objective with maximum economy. He can do so even though today's objective is a thousand miles from tomorrow's objective. Rapid movement of large forces over vast distances will permit surprise. Should he be attacked at home, most of his force can be quickly diverted for defense and the security of his and other military bases. Simplicity is the essence of such concentrated air actions, since the very speed of aircraft prohibits operations of excessive complication. But unless his air force is so organized and habitually trained to perform these varied functions, he will not likely be as able to follow the principles. Specific local tasks may deter a more fruitful employment.

The overwhelming advantage of flexibility provided by air power has sometimes been mitigated by an unfunctional organization which seems to divide available air strength into small parcels, each parcel tightly wrapped and labeled "For tactical (or other) use only." Paradoxically, such a piecemeal commitment of air strength is not now, nor has it ever been, a true doctrine of the Air Force.

With some justification, however, the Air Force has been accused of packaging its aviation into such mutually exclusive bundles of "strategic," "tactical," and "air defense" forces. Many airmen have too literally accepted these terms by regarding the over-all strategic picture in too narrow a light. Yet the actual employment of air forces in World War II and in the present Korean conflict should dispel any fears that Air Force policy tends toward compartmentation. Repeated evidence of the use of all air weapons against every kind of target, depending upon the immediate crucial objectives, should amply indicate the fundamental doctrine of air employment.

So-called strategic heavy bombers were employed in Europe before D-day, and after, to attack coastal gun emplacements and other front-line objectives. A quarter of a million tons of bombs were dropped on transportation targets by every type of Eighth Air Force craft, which was nearly one-third of the grand total expended. For the breakthrough at St. Lo a veritable carpet of bombs was laid in front of our lines by waves of big bombers. The tactical efficacy of this operation is attested to by comments from German commanders who asserted that it was this type of air action which was most detrimental to defending a position.

In the Pacific all kinds of aircraft were concentrated on critical objectives regardless of the terminology covering their organizational assignments. Cape Gloucester, for example, was so effectively pounded by every available aircraft that our surface invaders walked in standing up. Bombers and fighters from all sorts of air organizations were later set to interdict the water approaches to Rabaul and with cooperative surface action completed Rabaul's isolation.

Japanese air units had been built up in New Guinea at Wewak where massed Allied air struck them in August 1943. The enemy recoiled to Hollandia, but the sustained bombardment and strafing there by all types of craft wrote the ultimate end to Japanese air strength as an effective force. No piecemeal efforts were attempted in these great air offensives, but rather concentrated, massed operations were undertaken with every available airplane deployed by the theater commander. Air superiority was achieved, and from Hollandia on the possibility of our continued advance was assured.

Later, when the insane "diving wind" flyers streamed down on our invasion forces off Okinawa, B–29's were diverted from their attacks on industrial centers. Destruction of Kyusku airfields and kamikaze forces on the ground became an immediate primary objective. For 24 days kamikaze bases were bombarded, and vicious enemy reactions claimed 22 B–29's. But most kamikaze establishments were knocked out, and attacks on our invasion forces started falling off.

Recently, in Korea, the B–29's not only attacked factories, ports, depots and marshaling yards but bridges, troop concentrations, and strong points. This carpet bombing effort near Taegu was another example of the extreme flexibility of air power. Fighter-bombers and mediums poured fire on many of the selfsame targets. The objectives for the day were those felt to be most urgent at that time by the theater commander, and he was able through his flexible organization to launch his entire force, directing every available air weapon at the sensitive spots.

It has long been held as Air Force doctrine that air superiority should be the primary mission of air power. This premise has gained quick support from Army leaders who have suffered air attacks. Most Army leaders who have been harassed by enemy air would far rather have the enemy air kept off their necks than have integrally assigned aircraft for use as extended artillery. These leaders have no misconceptions about retaining, say, divisional, corps, or army aviation, in the face of superior enemy air. The fate of the German Stuka, which was ruthlessly swept from the skies when the Allies achieved air superiority, is too fresh in the memory of the experienced ground commanders.

Students of warfare are apprised, as well, of the relativeness of air superiority. It is never gained in finality, but only by degrees. The enemy may husband some air power, even though he is driven from the skies, and mount this saved force at a critical time, as the Germans did during the Ardennes offensive and the Japanese did with their kamikaze. Under such conditions we must always be prepared to concentrate and strike with overwhelming energy, even though at any one period our air superiority seems well assured.

Moreover, to achieve air superiority, we cannot hope to indulge exclusively in air combat over the front lines. If we defeat the enemy in this narrow area, we may achieve a local superiority as long as our aircraft are present. The enemy will then merely refuse to commit his air while ours stooge around, but he will strike when we leave. Since a constant air umbrella is wasteful of force, the obvious necessity is to wear down the enemy air force through attrition of every nature. Pilots, crews, planes, fuel, training establishments, aircraft manufacturing and storage center, and communications facilities which interconnect the many elements of his air power—all should be our targets. Seldom can any one element be fully destroyed. Some elements are more exposed to attack than others, and our emphasis should be influenced by those sore toes sticking out, inviting us to step on them.

Before we engage in air battle, however, we must be assured of a certain security for our own air bases, for our own communications, and for all the other elements of national strength present in our territory. Air defense is an impelling responsibility, and because it is seen at first hand by the lawmaking populace, air defense may be given inordinate stress.

As General Lee, through his threatening advances toward Washington, succeeded in immobilizing tens of thousands of Union troops in the nonproductive defense of the Capital, so did the Doolittle mission freeze much of Japan's aviation to the defense of its homeland. The battle of Britain put a premium upon air defense, and it was sometime after our fighters extended their range with drop tanks that the RAF fighters began to follow our lead and not sit at home waiting for air attacks that seldom came. In using nearly all of our aviation every flyable day, the AAF suffered some surprises and many local defeats, but the aggregate of our efforts compared with those of the enemy turned the tide of air victory. Enemy aviation was then largely pinned down to defend the homeland.

A striking example of Germany's failure to exploit the versatility of aircraft is illustrated by her air policies. Because Britain did not fall after a few months of aerial bombardment during 1940, Hitler lost faith in offensive air power. Specialized aviation, essentially under Wehrmacht domination, became the order of the day. The close-support Stuka had paid good dividends when air superiority had been easily attained. But pitted against Allied fighter bombers in Africa and elsewhere, Stukas were knocked down like tenpins. RAF bombardment put a priority on German air defense, and Stukas were left without an escort. As the AAF added its strength, home defense became Germany's No. 1 strategic consideration.

Fighter production was stepped up repeatedly at the expense of other classes of aviation, and over 70 percent of Germany's air force was earmarked exclusively for home defense. At no time was this huge force concentrated to strike offensively at Russia or to back up the retreating Wehrmacht on the eastern front. Nor did the crystal-pure mission of air defense permit the Luftwaffe to be assembled for tactical cooperation with hard-pressed Panzers at Normandy or to make concentrated strikes at overloaded Allied supply points and lines of communications. They were organized to perform but one mission and no more.

The glaring errors made by Germany in her failure to exploit the versatility of air power are apparent to all. Overstrict interpretations of specific roles and missions, particularly those of close-support and air defense, left Germany not with a true air force capable of strategic employment but with a restricted and specialized weapon of doubtful value.

On the other hand, United States Air Force doctrine from its inception has stressed the use of air as a national force capable of performing innumerable strategic missions. Air power has been organized with some specialization, but the long-range objectives have not been prostituted by the need for this specialization. For example, Tactical Air Command was organized to develop ground-support tactics, but included also in its directive was a mission for gaining and maintaining air superiority, while a third specified function of Tactical Air Command was interdiction of the battlefield.

Interdiction—the squeezing off of communication arteries to the battle zones—is merely a phase of the strategic bombing mission. In the latter, not only the battle zone is interdicted, but the whole enemy war-making potential is attacked. It is interdiction of all enemy strength. Hence the interdiction mission of tactical aviation is essentially a part of the long-range mission of strategic employment.

Keeping in mind the three primary objectives of tactical aviation (air superiority, interdiction, and front-line support) let us examine their fulfillment in the Korean War during November 1950. Our forces had driven past the thirty-eighth parallel to within a few miles of the northern border of Korea. Down from Manchuria streamed a vast army to oppose our advance. But, contrary to the concepts of orthodox warfare, we were denied the opportunity to stem this advance. The territory north of the border was declared inviolate, and our aviation could not fly across that artificial barrier. What, then, happened to our air superiority? The air superiority, for example, that we had (by default) over the Pusan pocket?

North of the border, which was just a few minutes by air in front of our ground troops, we generously granted the enemy absolute air superiority. We refused to venture beyond that arbitrary boundary, and the enemy marshalled and directed his divisions with impunity in that sanctuary. The only air superiority we retained was in that thin strip of space between our forces and the Manchurian frontier together with the area behind our lines. Our superiority thus became essentially defensive in nature, since we could not exploit it offensively. Unwarlike restrictions caused us to cede to the enemy the most fruitful harvests of air superiority.

How did these restrictions effect the interdiction mission? Hundreds of communications bottlenecks behind the frontier could not be touched. The stores, warehouses, supply dumps, and depots were safer than if they had been thousands of miles in the interior during a more orthodox war. Railroads, marshalling yards, bridges, and rolling stock were immune from our attack. Roads could be filled bumper to bumper with enemy vehicles of war, and we were even denied air reconnaissance of these myriad movements. We could block the advance only in a pitifully narrow strip of land where a finite number of supply bottlenecks could be repaired by concentrated enemy construction units, permitting his forces to sweep into the battle zones at night, relatively unhandicapped. Interdiction of the battlefield became a vain hope for our air forces under such gross limitations.

The final aim of tactical air, that of front-line support, was unhampered by the anomalous character of the Korean War. Only this last objective remained. Air could be used, like artillery, to blast enemy strong points directly in front of our troops. The decisiveness of this single employment of air was learned to be non-existent when the enemy overwhelmed our positions during the latter days of November.

The use of air strength for direct front-line support of ground forces, although necessary and valuable, can hardly be considered decisive, nor can exclusive employment in this fashion be regarded as economy of force. The most lucrative targets for air appear farther from the front, where the enemy is not holed-up, dispersed along a battlefield many miles wide, and well hidden in natural cover. The best return from air fire is gained when the enemy can be caught jammed up, behind the line, with his guard down, and when the bottlenecks over which his concentrations must move are destroyed and kept destroyed. The striking flexibility of air strength is only exploited to its fullest when its speed, range, and firepower are employed to surprise the enemy where he is most vulnerable.

It is undoubtedly true that slower propeller fighter-bombers can supply a more constant front-line cover than jets, and that their longer orbiting of front-line positions inspires the fighting troops with greater confidence. But by the same token, a battery of corps artillery would also be a comforting addition to an infantry regiment. Hard-hitting, long-range weapons like the 155-mm. guns, 8-inch guns, and 240-mm. howitzers are assigned to higher echelons, however, in order to allow them greater mobility and to permit their concentrations where most needed. The announced mission of corps and Army artillery is to reinforce division artillery and to lend depth to the battle. Only incidentally is its purpose to raise the morale of front-line troops.

Some experts would have tactical aviation assigned to the same army headquarters as is heavy artillery, for employment in a similar manner. This concept makes good sense from a restricted point of view, but a broader analysis may cast doubt upon it.

The capabilities of heavy artillery are obviously not the same as are the capabilities of tactical air. The essential role played by artillery is to further the clear objective of defeating the opposing army, and the range and mobility of artillery does not permit many other objectives. Hence it is logically assigned, in the main, to Army, corps, and division headquarters. Because it may take days to move heavy guns from one sector to another, it is logical for units as small as divisions to have some organic artillery. But the range and mobility of air force far exceeds that of artillery. Each single fighter-bomber can cruise far beyond the vital Army and corps areas in a matter of minutes and can support divisions at opposite ends of the battle line in a matter of hours. All operational fighter-bombers can be concentrated at one sector of the front in a period of time which would be unthinkable as the time required to mobilize artillery at that sector. With such physical flexibility would it not seem reasonable to assign such forces organically to the headquarters most able to exploit the advantages of the weapons? And would not this headquarters logically be the theater command?

A still further argument for assignment of aviation to the highest echelon is presented when considering the air-superiority objective. It is possible, as at Dunkirk, to achieve a local air superiority for a limited time. But such a condition is tenuous and not likely to be much more than an emergency measure to permit an isolated operation. Little hope can be held for a general offensive without a general air superiority in the theater of operations.[1] This theory is widely held by both ground and air specialists. How, then, must aviation be employed to achieve superiority?

The principles of war would be nullified by parceling out aviation to armies, corps, or divisions for their exclusive use when the air is controlled by the enemy. In the Na-

[1] When this principle appears not to hold as in Korea, it can be accounted for by the fact that air superiority is not fully exploited.

poleonic tradition the enemy would then defeat our aviation in detail. We would not be organized in such a way as to quickly assemble our air forces at the decisive time and place or to range far beyond the surface battle zones to strike enemy aviation where it would hurt most. By the same logic, if command of air were relinquished to those having paramount interest in a mere phase of air operations, such as close support, the more decisive roles of air power would doubtless be jeopardized.

For the purpose of securing air superiority, "tactical" and "strategic" aviation are employed in an identical manner. It is all one air force with one major objective. The same fighters used to support front lines are used to escort bombers which stimulate enemy air opposition. Precisely the same F-47's that escorted B-17's to Berlin were strafing the beaches at Normandy. And the next day the self-same craft were defending the communication zone by chasing buzz-bombs approaching London, or sweeping far into France and Germany to keep enemy air subdued and immobile.

Innumerable examples in World War II can be cited where "tactical," "strategic," and "defense" aircraft performed in the same struggle for air superiority. The heavy, medium, and light bombers struck at hostile air forces on the ground, inflicting severe damage to manufacturing plants, fuel production, and transportation. Our fighters caused enemy attrition in the air. Finally the air campaign won the degree of superiority which permitted our aircraft to roam over all of Europe and make possible the Normandy invasion.

For the most part our air forces were based in England, where fighters were available for air defense in periods of emergency. It would have been a gross violation of economy of force to have attempted setting up restrictive missions for separate air forces, one packaged to defend Great Britain and another to obtain control of the air over the Continent.

Combined use of all available air strength was earlier demonstrated in northwest Africa. We needed to halt the flow of German supplies to Tunisia. Heavy night bombers based in England struck at the port of Genoa, where enemy supplies were loaded. Bombers from the Middle East attacked the ports of Naples and Palermo. Others based in northwest Africa hit the same targets and added Bizerte and Tunis to the list. Fighters blasted trains and trucks en route from the ports to the front lines. All were concentrated against that objective deemed most important by the supreme commander.

It became apparent that the more sensitive the supply point we hit, the greater was the air opposition encountered, and hence the more enemy aircraft we could destroy. Thus our attacks fulfilled a twofold purpose: air superiority and interdiction. Later when Montgomery's and Eisenhower's armies began to press the Wehrmacht between its pincers, the identical aircraft used on interdiction and air superiority missions provided close ground support.

It was not possible for us to concentrate against any one objective until that job was wholly completed, then forget it and proceed to the next. In World War II it was necessary to organize so that we were able to mass our air against one objective or another as the need arose. The ability to do this was actually contingent upon the kind of organization we employed. It permitted us from time to time to concentrate on getting air superiority, to concentrate on the destruction of the means with which the Germans were carrying on the war, to concentrate maximum air strength in direct support of ground forces in periods of emergency, as at Salerno or at Leyte.

Which air operations were purely strategic? Which were tactical operations? Which were air defense operations? It becomes apparent that all such operations are conducted concurrently by all air forces. The operations have a broader scope and a more varied application than the traditional terms imply.

When a nation finds itself at war, its objective is to enforce its will on the other. This is the ultimate end product of war. To do this, a nation must force the other to quit fighting. This may be done by destroying his will to fight or by depriving him of his means to fight. Those are the significant goals of all national power, whether it is deployed on land, at sea, or in the air.

The military is essentially concerned with carrying out the shooting phase of the conflict. Always confronted with insufficient means to insure success, a Nation must rigidly compel economy of force. The United States can never afford the luxury of compartmented military services, or branches within a service, each sufficient within its own framework to carry out certain over-all roles and missions.

Without in any sense denying the need for unity of command at the top, it must be admitted that a misconceived application of the idea of unity of command has sometimes worked to the detriment of economy of force. If unity of command be carried to an extreme, the Navy would have its ground force and air force; the Army would have its own surface fleets and air force; and the Air Force would have its own navy and ground force. Each service might justify its requirements on the grounds that these additional forces would be essential to executing assigned roles and missions. Unity of command would be extolled in a general way as a necessary factor in military operations. But the need to rigidly apply economy of force prevents this. The principle of cooperation must be substituted. Fortunately the National Defense Act of 1947 and its subsequent amendments have provided the framework around which to build an effective military force with that economy which is indispensable for a Nation with finite resources.

It must be obvious that the large naval air forces operating in support of the naval mission in the Pacific during World War II would have been idle for weeks on end if used only for naval roles. As it was, they were effectively used to hit at the Philippines and Japan to supplement the tactical and strategic air force operations and to erase from the skies a large proportion of Japanese air power. It must be equally obvious that to have set up sufficient air forces to support the landing operations in Normandy would have been just as wasteful if used solely for that purpose. Nor is it possible to separate and identify all the air operations mounted exclusively for the Normandy invasion. Similarly the provision within the United States Air Force of sufficient aviation to do the long-distance job only, or the short-range Army support job only, or the air defense job only, would again violate the principle of economy of force.

Maximum air power seems possible only when air weapons are organized as one force, thus permitting air power's potential flexibility to be utilized more in accordance with the other principles of war. To those unfamiliar with the extensive communications, logistical, and other requirements for the employment of large air forces, another solution may seem simple and appropriate: Give to each army, air force, or fleet that amount of aviation needed to carry out normal missions. Then when the need arises to concentrate all forces against certain objectives, take these air forces away from their parent unit, attach them to the appropriate headquarters, and send them on their way. This solution is an oversimplification of a complex problem. The hard facts of experience have shown that it seldom works out as pat as the logic would imply.

The coordination demanded by any air operation requires an integrated, closely knit organization for communications, logistics, intelligence, and command. It must be well oiled and not allowed to get rusty during normal operations. Training in concentration, in flexibility, and in surprise types of offensive operation must be a continuing process even during combat. These massed activities of air power cannot be achieved by quickly forming a one-task organization. The degree of teamwork that permits rapid concentrations requires routine functioning with a resultant broad base of knowledge and skill. Thus can simplicity and swift movement be assured.

It can be concluded that, if the principles of war are to be most effectively applied, air power should habitually be organized as one unified force. In the words of General Vandenberg, "Tactical and strategic air power is part of the same ball of wax * * * you can't separate [it] and put [it] in neat compartments."

A recent speech by Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter epitomizes this point and leaves slight doubt about Air Force policy in this regard. "Tactical air and strategic air are merely handles," he said, "which have been developed to identify different functions, each of which is indispensable and each of which fits into the over-all integrated structure of air power."

Furthermore there should be no rigid adherence to the predetermined priorities ascribed to certain elements of air power when a crucial issue is at stake affecting the whole of national security. Then, without regard to theoretical priorities, total air power must be thrown into the gap which threatens the very structure of our civilization. This will always be the first priority.

Air power must act promptly, not in terms of weeks, but hours. Surprise demands speed and makes mandatory the tactical control by skilled air leaders of supporting operations. The air organization must be designed to advance the national objectives with indivisible air power.

Complaints About Conditions of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a Missourian to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a leading newspaper in Missouri.

This letter was printed in the issue of March 8, 1951, and was clipped from the newspaper and sent to me by Mrs. Paul Kippenberger, of St. Louis, Mo., with the remark that "this letter expresses the opinions of many." I am sure it does.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIRED OF MANY THINGS

TO the EDITOR:

As an average American citizen, I am sick of a number of things in the American picture today.

1. I'm sick of being told we must be taxed and taxed until we're broke, when our highest officials are tax-free.

2. I'm sick of picking up the newspaper day after day and reading about the scandalous dishonesty and misuse of public funds in so many Government offices and agencies. I'm for impeaching any public official found dishonest in his duties—that is, if there are enough honest men left in Government to start an impeachment.

3. I'm sick of reading about namby-pambies who are trying to establish price controls and are having a hot-foot dance to keep from stepping on any influential group's toes. By the time they get any decent controls, high prices will long since have depleted people's pocketbooks and bankbooks, so it won't matter.

4. And I'm sick and tired of the President's tenacious loyalty in his attitude of "my friends, right or wrong before our country." If my husband, for the second time in his 30 years, is expected to put his wife and children second and his country first by leaving for the service, it seems little enough to ask of our country's highest official to put his country before his friends.

More power to you and your sentiments expressed in your editorial, Immorality in Government. A crusade for a return to God, the Golden Rule, and the Biblical laws of right and wrong is sadly needed today.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Delusion," published in the Philadelphia Daily News of Thursday, March 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE DELUSION—PROJECT'S COST WOULD RUN INTO ASTRONOMICAL TOTALS, WITH VIRTUALLY NO BENEFITS

Public hearings now in progress before the House of Representatives' Public Works Committee on the feasibility of the proposed construction of a seaway along the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the sea are bringing a mass of new data to light that only accentuates the folly of this proposal. For 30 years the proponents of the seaway have been hammering periodically at Congress to enter an agreement with Canada to assist in the building of this project.

But it is now revealed that the original estimate of cost, ranging between $1,048,000,000 and $1,750,000,000, provides for only a 27-foot channel, whereas oceangoing traffic would require at least a 35-foot channel (a 40-foot channel always has been the goal of Army engineers for the Delaware River). To dredge the St. Lawrence to that depth would require at least another $1,000,000,000, competent authorities declare.

The project usually is broached in times of stress. In the early 1930's the argument was that it would provide work for many men. Now when labor is scarce, its proponents want to draw manpower from vital plants and projects to construct an improvement, the value of which is questionable in the national defense program.

Certainly, concentration of shipping in one spot, as it is proposed for this seaway, would make it particularly vulnerable in time of war to enemy bombers or submarines. During the last war, a German U-boat managed to get far up the St. Lawrence River, sink a ship and then escape.

Dispersing shipping to the Atlantic coast ports, as is done now, is a much safer method. It is hardly believable that any foe would immobilize every one of these ports at the same time, either through direct attack or sabotage. Transport by railroads, as it was shown in England and Germany during the last war, is more desirable in that railroads can be repaired quickly, or bypasses can be utilized and supplies kept moving.

But a well-placed bombing attack could knock out a project such as the St. Lawrence seaway, put its 18 locks out of commission, and make its entire 1,700 mile route a nightmare, impossible of repair for a number of years.

Diversion of freight traffic to such a seaway not only would injure the economy of the coast port cities, it would strike a heavy blow at the railroads, cost thousands of persons their jobs and generally disrupt the business in a hundred other cities that are dependent on this business.

And as far as the increased power output promised from it is concerned, the only State in the Union to benefit would be New York. In addition, the production of electricity from any hydroelectric plant along the river would be only a drop in the bucket compared with the current total produced in the United States now.

On the whole, the project is a waste of time. The money it would require could be put to far more effective use in developing concrete defensive measures and the sooner this proposal is put on the shelf again, the better it will be for the United States.

Racial Discrimination in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Complaint Against the Army," appearing in the March 9, 1951, issue of the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE ARMY

Against a background of rapidly dwindling racial discrimination in the Armed Forces, the charges just made against the Army by investigators for the Minneapolis branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People come as disturbing news. The NAACP group says that of 15 men shipped out of Fort Dix, N. J., recently, one was classified on his overseas movement orders as a Puerto Rican and one as an American Indian, and that on induction orders issued in several States Negroes are denoted by asterisks on the notation "col."

It is not yet clear whether these manifestations are to be regarded as typical of Army policy, or as representing individual evasions of President Truman's Executive order of July 26, 1948, which forbids discrimination in the Armed Forces. But it is striking that the charges are leveled only against the Army, while the Navy and Air Force are regarded by the investigators as pursuing satisfactorily the integration policies supposed to be practiced by all service branches.

Conceivably, there may be valid reasons for including all of a soldier's characteristics, physical and mental, on his basic record. But the Army has an obligation to explain why racial and similar information should be included on other documents, if this is actually being done. Segregation and discrimination die stubbornly, in the Armed Forces as elsewhere, but the task of eliminating them has progressed so far that we must be on guard against attempts to back-track. It is important that we deprive Communists throughout the world of the opportunity to manufacture propaganda ammunition by magnifying our lapses into bad practices. It is still more important that we keep faith with our own ideals.

Addresses by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, Hon. Dennis Chavez of New Mexico, and Hon. Jennings Randolph Before the American Road Builders Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the American Road Builders Association held its annual meeting at Milwaukee, Wis., last week. The Attorney General of the United States, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, former Representative Jennings Randolph, and I addressed the gathering. I ask unanimous consent that these three addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman, gentleman, I am grateful to the American Road Builders' Association for your invitation to take part in this annual convention.

My very good friend, Jennings Randolph, insisted on my coming here in spite of my great protestations of complete lack of knowledge concerning the immediate problems of your great industry. Nonetheless, I have ventured to come and speak to you about some of the common interests we have as citizens of this great Republic in whose immediate service I happen to be engaged.

We do live in the greatest country on earth. Our physical needs of food, clothing, housing, highways, and transportation are better taken care of than in any other country in the world. But, more than that, the individualism which is the cornerstone of our democratic edifice has made us great; our precious heritage of freedom has been an inspiration to the peoples of the world.

As our President pointed out in his state of the Union message delivered to a joint session of the Congress, we can be assured that our country at this critical time is in a healthy condition. We have by far the greatest productive capacity ever attained by any nation of people. Our people are

skilled and vigorous. We are a people of great technical skills and knowledge that are constantly expanding our control over the natural resources of the ground, sea, and air that God has placed in our hands.

After the most devastating of wars we have continued to maintain standards of living approximating, in many ways excelling, our prewar levels. Since World War II we have had no such unemployment as followed World War I; in fact, we have more men and women at work than ever before. Strong heads and practical minds have been behind advances in production which have made it possible to report, for the year 1950, the production of the greatest abundance of goods in our history. In the year just past, our industries have created gigantic new standards with which to measure our industrial might.

Much of the know-how which has made this record possible was learned during World War II. Consequently we are prepared to meet the most recent challenge to modern democracy—the third in the lifetime of most of us—with greater resources, more armed might, and more inflexible determination than ever before. Against the challenge of the Kremlin, the people of the United States, together with all free peoples, will be prepared to pit formidable military strength, if necessary. I join with the President and all our people in a prayer that it will not be necessary. But, if it becomes necessary, we are pledged to produce all the weapons and equipment that our increased Armed Forces will need, no matter what their ultimate active strength. That strength must be measured by the demands of our security. We must all make great personal sacrifices to achieve this goal.

I do not minimize the present serious state of world affairs, or the enormous problems which confront our United States in this latest crisis. To do so would be foolish and dangerous.

We Americans are not fools. We recognize the nature of the challenge. Earlier challenges have been answered by us with a showing that we were prepared and able to defend our country's honor and its freedoms. Let there be no mistake. Any new challenge will be met equally well.

We Americans are no fair-weather friends of liberty and democracy. We have practiced democracy, we have lived it through the decades, we have a deep awareness of its intrinsic values. No slanders, no bullying threats from Kremlin propagandists will change our faith in the future of our American promise, or of our American democratic ideal or our belief in the future of the free nations of the world.

Nor will the American people need to be goaded into the sacrifices necessary to accomplish the great tasks which are imposed by our responsibility to ourselves and to our position of world leadership. We have vast objectives which cannot be gained by Government alone. The task must be shared by the whole American people, 151,000,000 strong. We know that all-out effort and all-out measures are required. Preparedness means careful planning and careful control over essentials which will prevent the nonessential use of vital goods. We don't like controls, yet we know we must endure them.

We will have need for substantial controls to divert goods from civilian to military use. That is the reason that credit has already been tightened on many items of trade and commerce. Other restrictions are daily being found necessary. We will have to convert plants. Materials in short supply will have to be allocated. There will be shortages in certain consumer goods. The burden of the enlarged defense program must be borne by all of us, and for that we must also expect heavy tax increases.

These are sacrifices, but they are a part of the price we are willing to pay for liberty and democracy. The quality of the zeal with which we defend our freedoms is a measure of the sacrifices we are willing to endure. I know that the American people will welcome the sacrifices made necessary by our defense effort.

With foresight born of his intimate experience as a Senator, and chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate National Defense Activities during World War II, President Truman is gathering in Washington a defense mobilization organization that will be fully able to meet the difficult problems that lie ahead. The lines of authority in this organization must be clear and straight. It must be an organization that merits the full confidence and cooperation of every American. With such confidence and cooperation, I am sure that the mission of the defense mobilization organization will be successfully accomplished. At the top of his organization, the President has placed, in the post of Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, formerly the president of General Electric Co., and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board during World War II.

During World War II our role was emphasized as the arsenal of weapons to defend freedom in the world. Today, however, we are the arsenal of democracy in a much greater sense. We are not only an arsenal of material weapons; also we are an arsenal of the moral and spiritual values which are the basic elements of true democracy. By our way of life, we shall show the world that we do not give up our democracy in our mobilization effort to defend it.

In our defense effort it is important that we bear clearly in mind that there is no need for us to abandon the aspirations around which our lives center. In periods of emergency it is natural that some of the rights and privileges of peacetime must be temporarily abridged or restricted in the interest of national survival. But the restrictions should be, must be, limited to the minimum. We cannot afford, by any yardstick of wisdom, to plan a wholesale discarding of the democratic processes and institutions which this Nation has developed during its decades of experience. The maintenance of both the structure and the spirit of our civil liberties is essential to the country's well-being.

In a period of emergency such as this, the undivided loyalty of all our people to the Nation and its institutions is essential. President Truman, early in his administration, foresaw the need of assuring that no disloyal persons should be employed in the Government, and, to that end, in 1947 instituted the Government employees loyalty program. Under that program the records of well over 3,000,000 employees have been checked by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These investigations have been conducted in a manner consistent with our principles of fair play and in accordance with the provisions of the President's Executive order establishing the loyalty program; and they give us the assurance that your Government is making every effort, and successfully, to see that no disloyal person is working for it.

But many sins have been and may be committed in the name of loyalty. There are men in this country—in both private and public life—who have indicated a dangerous willingness to use this emergency as an occasion for discarding much of our carefully constructed edifice of human rights. I am frankly concerned about those who would smear every opposition sentiment with the label of communism—men who would penalize the thinking of unorthodox thoughts, or the writing of nonconformist words. Those who pose as the saviors of our Nation by seeking to abridge beyond reason our tradition of democratic freedom are as dangerous to American liberties as the Communists themselves. For, in destroying that fabric of democracy and reason, they play directly into the hands of the Kremlin's agents. In the struggle against our enemy we must be aware of the danger of losing our freedoms for the sake of victory.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress, President Truman asked the Congress for unity. But he made clear what he meant by unity. He said:

"Make no mistake about my meaning. I do not ask, or expect, unanimity. I do not ask for an end to debate. Only by debate can we arrive at decisions which are wise and which reflect the desires of the American people. We do not have dictatorship in this country, and we will never have it.

"When I request unity, what I am really asking for is a sense of responsibility on the part of every Member of this Congress. Let us debate the issues, but let every man among us weigh his words and deeds. There is a sharp difference between harmful criticism and constructive criticism. If we are truly responsible as individuals, I am sure that we will be unified as a government."

What the President requested of the Congress is just as applicable to all of the people of the country. Unity we must have. But unanimity is not expected. Responsible constructive criticism is healthy; it is not subversion or disloyalty. We must be ever alert and on guard to protect the rights of the constructive critic. We must be careful to use the words "disloyal" and "subversive" with caution. They should not be used as synonyms for "critical" and "unorthodox."

There is not any magic formula yet discovered upon which we may rely for the sure preservation of our freedoms. To the contrary, danger lurks in the recourse to catchy name calling and the easy methods of those advocates of extra-legal conduct who would justify their actions in glib phrases such as "putting down the Reds." Our best resort is to the application of common sense standards.

We have the Communist fifth column under control. We have an efficient Federal Bureau of Investigation to prevent sabotage and to keep track of Communist espionage, maneuverings, and conspiracies. But Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and I are determined that there will be no Gestapo witch hunts—that the basic civil rights of the individual will be securely protected and defended as guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land. The free America that we have inherited must be handed down in like manner to the future generations. It is, indeed, for this very reason that we are mobilizing our resources.

There is no more precious possession today than that of United States citizenship. The enslaved peoples of the world look upon our citizens as the guardians and the possessors of those moral, spiritual, political, economic, and social values which alone can bring to them the peace and freedom they so sorely need and pray for.

In the world today, where there is much chaos and confusion, we in this country have demonstrated that the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens can be respected and protected regardless of nationality, or racial or religious affiliations. It is our responsibility to recognize and meet the challenge that the free world is faced with today, for it is a real challenge.

I have never found it wise, nor will the American people find it wise, to take advice which counsels abandonment of our friends in Europe. To quote again from the President's state of the Union message: "All free nations are exposed and all are in peril. Their only security lies in banding together. No one nation can find protection in a selfish search for a safe haven from the storm * * *. If (the free nations) * * * should fall apart, the results would be fatal to human freedom

* * *. We are the most powerful single member of * * * (the community of free nations) * * * and we have a special responsibility. We must take the leadership in meeting the challenge to freedom and in helping to protect the rights of independent nations."

I have faith, our great President has faith, and the overwhelming majority of the American people have faith in their own strength, in their intelligence, and in their ideals.

As I travel about this country I gain constant faith in our people and in our institutions. I have faith particularly that we will keep our heads out of the sands of isolationism and hysteria. Alert to our problems, cherishing our great traditions, secure in the knowledge of our material and spiritual strength, Americans can face the future with quiet determination to fight the challenge of the hated dictatorships. The spectacle of our twentieth-century America is an object of pride and inspiration, and the source of spiritual strength.

To be sure, the Soviet Union has machines, and men, and mountains, and rivers; its assets, real and potential, are sizable. But no one who seeks to appraise the limits of Soviet strength can for a moment ignore what the Russian people lack, and what we have in abundance—the power of the democratic way of life, the tradition of free institutions, the respect for the individual.

We must never underestimate the power of our liberty. In the final analysis, it is the bulwark of our defense against the imperialism and brutality of communism. It is our democratic way of life that gives America the power and the inspiration of a free people. And, in this contracting world of ours, it is the example of our freedom rather than the example of our wealth which gives us a measure of spiritual and moral leadership among the people of other lands.

My friends, today our way of life is put to the test—the supreme test of whether our free country can endure—whether our people can remain free. We have met and survived other such tests—from the very first one of which our country was born—when we were only a scattered handful, but we resisted and we survived—a nation of freemen.

In the days that lie ahead we will gather our strength and mobilize our resources under the leadership of our great President. United with the community of free nations we shall be prepared to meet the challenge of any enemy, and we shall emerge once again with our heritage preserved—secure in our dignity as individual human beings.

I have tried to state briefly what I deem to be our faith and our strength, and in conclusion I wish to quote from a recent editorial comment in one of our national magazines. I believe this more clearly states the message I deliver tonight than anything I have read since the beginning of the present crisis.

"It is the aim of everyone these days to speak very distinctly. And it should be the duty of speakers and writers, at any rate, to put things in their proper place in relation to the natural world and to avoid preoccupation with sudden, dark events that are only a small part of a very great picture. A man can search his morning paper in vain for a crumb of comfort, yet no man should forget that most of the strongest assets are on our side, many of the heavist liabilities are on the Soviet Union's. The burden Russia carries is the simple burden of wishing to conquer and rule the world by guile and by strength. This is an ancient dream that has in every instance thrown the dreamer. Our own dream is not to rule the world, but to save and fortify the free men in an atmosphere of freedom. This, too, is an ancient dream, and although it has been a very costly one, it has never let anybody down yet. Even if it should now prove costly beyond all ability to pay, it is still worth following and there can never be a valid reason to deviate, to hesitate, or to compromise."

ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, UNITED STATES SENATOR, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Good afternoon, friends in the American Road Builders. I am getting to be a regular at your meetings. This is the fourth time I have attended. I have enjoyed each and every one of them.

I have a feeling that most people don't go to the convention to listen to speeches. But a Senator or a Congressman always has a few remarks to deliver. I am no exception. But the few things I have to say this afternoon do not represent a speech. I only want to talk with you, and give you some ideas of mine about public works in this accelerating defense period.

You are principally interested in roads. But construction of any kind draws your interest, too. I'll start out on roads.

I think there is one thing that must be unmistakably clear to all of us in the Government and to those charged with the highway program in the States. This is—the maintenance of the highway plant of the United States should not be confused with new construction at any time.

Roads and the contributing industries and services represent about one-seventh of the total national economy. It's big business.

When the Nation began its modern road-building program following World War I, there was continued expansion of activity. Each year, with the exception of 1923, the accomplishment was greater than in the year before. This continued through 1930. Thereafter the depression produced some slight recessions, but peak performance was reached in 1938 and a high level of performance was maintained in every year through 1941. In this period a network of main highways covering the entire country was created.

In the same period the passenger car was converted from the model T to the powerful, smooth-running car of today. The truck was developed from a light vehicle of uncertain utility to the dependable vehicle now used in every form of production. The economic and social life of the Nation was expanded and rearranged in a manner made possible only by highway transport.

By 1940 it was evident that the road building that had preceded was only a pioneer effort, that the types of road built for the volume and kind of traffic of the 1920's and early 1930's would not be adequate for the kind of highway service the Nation must have. The main highways needed strengthening, widening, and straightening to accommodate the large movement of people and goods. Conditions on the main arteries through cities had become intolerable. Accidents, congestion, and delay were resulting in costs far greater than that of providing the needed expressways and arterial routes. At the same time there was need to construct a large mileage of secondary or farm-to-market roads to give us a completely balanced system of highways in both rural and urban areas.

A highway program on a scale much larger than any that had preceded was an urgent requirement. It was recognized that the cost would be great but it was well within our means. It did not loom as an insuperable obstacle as did the cost of the Federal-aid system when it was first designated.

There was general agreement as to the character of improvements needed and that they should be built but attempts to carry out the plan have met many vicissitudes.

World War II began almost immediately and general highway construction was stopped. In the aggregate a large amount of work was done in building highways to serve war installations and to reach raw materials. A few improvements were made on main highways to keep traffic moving but the condition of the system declined. Thousands of miles of highway surface reached the end of economic life and were not replaced. At the end of the war there was the greatest accumulation in history of old surfaces that could not be maintained in use with any reasonable expenditure.

It was expected that highway construction would start in a big way at the end of the war. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 had been enacted providing $500,000,000 for each of the first three postwar fiscal years. The States were in excellent financial positions with motor vehicle revenues accumulated during the war. It was expected that men and equipment released from war operations would find employment on highway work.

Things did not work out as expected. High prices and shortages of men, equipment, and materials slowed action. Many readjustments were necessary before we could return to normal peacetime conditions.

Highway work did begin in 1946 but it gained momentum slowly. Progress was better in 1947 but nowhere near the desired pace. We have had good years in 1948, 1949, and 1950. In 1950 the State highway departments awarded contracts for 55,467 miles at a cost of $1,500,000,000. Federal-aid projects accounted for 23,429 miles at a cost of $820,000,000. Work actually completed during the year was not far below the rate at which contracts were awarded. Since the end of the war 82,000 miles of highway have been completed in the Federal-aid program.

Highway improvement has reached a high level but it has not yet grown to the size necessary to produce an adequate system within a reasonable period of years. Estimates of the cost of making all needed improvements range from $42,000,000,000 to $47,000,000,000.

If we decide to eliminate these deficiencies within a period of 15 years and also replace those highways that wear out or become obsolete within the 15 years, we shall have to make an expenditure of $3,800,000,000 each year for the 15 years. Of this amount, $1,443,000,000 would go on the Federal-aid system in rural areas, and $755,000,000 on the Federal-aid system in urban areas. An additional $732,000,000 would go on the Federal-aid secondary system, and $480,000,000 on rural highways not on the present Federal-aid systems.

The annual expenditure actually being made for highway construction is approximately $2,400,000,000, including expenditures for toll roads. Our expenditure falls short of what may be considered a minimum desired figure by $1,400,000,000.

For at least 10 years the gap between existing highways and the kind of improvements needed has continually widened. At this juncture when it appears that we may prevent further widening of the gap and possibly make some progress in closing it, a disturbed international situation brings on the prospect of checking or stopping the program through controls over equipment, materials, and manpower.

I have had close contact with highway matters for a number of years and I can see serious danger in the thought that our highway system can be kept in its present condition by what are ordinarily called maintenance methods alone.

Highway interests are likely to suffer because of the narrow scope of the work that is commonly included under the heading of maintenance. Light work of the kind that can be done by patrol crews with hand tools and small machines is all that is commonly included. If an entire surface is to

be relaid or if a 2-inch layer of bituminous mixture is to be placed, it is called construction mainly because such work is done by contractors rather than by State or county-employed maintenance gangs.

Each year a large mileage of highway reaches the end of its economic life and can no longer be kept in use by a reasonable expenditure of funds. Often a badly worn surface is associated with narrow width, sharp curves and steep grades wholly unsuited for the present volume and speed of traffic. Replacement of such surfaces is just as much maintenance as is the replacement of ballast, ties, and rails on a railroad. Also it is just as important to the country in accomplishing its main objective—war production.

The motor vehicle almost overnight changed the utility of highways from local to Nation-wide scope. The boundaries between counties and States for travel purposes disappeared. It became necessary to think of the highway system as a national problem.

Congress, when it framed the basic legislation, recognized the nature of road improvements. The following is quoted from the original Federal-Aid Road Act of July 1916:

"The term 'construction' shall be construed to include reconstruction and improvement of roads; 'properly maintained' as used herein shall be construed to mean the making of needed repairs and the preservation of a reasonably smooth surface considering the type of road, but shall not be held to include extraordinary repairs, nor reconstruction."

In 1949 our State highway departments completed 22,425 miles on primary State systems outside of cities, including the work done on the Federal-aid highway system. Of this mileage 17,288 miles was resurfacing of existing pavements. It was maintenance of such character that it had to be done by contractors. Of the remaining 5,137 miles a very large portion consisted of construction to replace worn surface where the location was so poor that it was best to abandon it and build on new location.

In reconstructing an old highway it is almost always necessary to do something more than replace the worn facility in kind. Most often a greater width of surface is required to make the highway safe. When an old bridge is about to fall down it is almost always necessary to replace it with a bridge having a wider roadway and greater strength. It would be a great mistake not to modernize as facilities are rebuilt. Our construction program for several years has been almost entirely a maintenance operation if we consider the term "maintenance" to mean the keeping of existing highways in a condition satisfactory for use.

The gravity of the international situation has increased constantly since the end of the war. No one can say with assurance what the future holds in store. The only safe assumption to make is that the necessity for a build-up of strength for defense may continue for a number of years. The degree of the build-up is unknown and unstable.

I do not consider it intelligent preparation for defense to permit highway transportation to deteriorate in any degree. The main highways are the assembly lines of a large portion of our defense plants. Raw materials move over the highways to plants. Parts for weapons and machines move from one plant to another for processing. Plants assembling airplanes, tanks, trucks, and electronic devices receive a daily flow of parts from a great number of smaller plants making parts. The highways are links in the assembly line that may extend for hundreds of miles. Speedy conversion from raw material to finished product would not be possible without these links.

We must feed, clothe, and house our war workers and all the rest of our population. Usage of highways must continue for these purposes. Recent studies show that highway usage follows very closely the trend in national income when corrected so that each dollar represents the same purchasing power. Omitting the period of war restrictions it has been found that for nearly 20 years there has been 1 mile of vehicle travel to every three and one-half to four dollars of national income expressed in dollars having the purchasing power of the dollar during the period 1935–39.

There is no question that national income will continue to be large throughout the period of defense activity however long it may last. It will be possible to check recreational travel if that becomes necessary but transport for defense production, movement of workers to and from their jobs, and supplying workers with the necessities of life must continue. It will be a serious blow to preparedness if highways are permitted to decline so that transport can be accomplished only with increasing effort.

We should not permit our highways to decline in any degree below their present condition. This will require a substantial replacement program as well as continuation of normal maintenance operations. Men, machines, and materials should be provided in sufficient quantity for this purpose.

Ordinarily, I would lean heavily toward State authority and responsibility in programs. I am a firm believer in the Federal Government being cooperative, but not dictatorial. Bureaucracy at the helm is a slow and devious path. But side by side, it is a dandy team. These are not ordinary times, however.

In the fields of roads and rivers and harbors and flood control, these activities must go on unless our struggle for freedom reaches such a pitch that it is a deadly matter of life. A third major activity of the Committee on Public Works—that of public buildings—is more in direct conflict with the war effort than roads and the activities of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Into public buildings such as office buildings, post offices, and United States courthouses or custom houses, we have to put structural steel, copper, a lot of aluminum, and we reach into the brass field. There is also the manpower situation. This is also true of any private construction of buildings. Any program of new post offices or office buildings can well be postponed. The Government can put off its work. The less we do, the more essential private industry can do. Public buildings are out for the time being.

Right now we are feeling a severe pinch in construction materials. Big slices are being diverted into defense work. I don't believe there is a good program involving the diversion. We create brand-new agencies to take over materials and work handled previously by established agencies, and it doesn't make for an orderly program.

Right now, our production of aluminum and steel and other essentials is being stepped up greatly. In the meantime, national defense production is grabbing a big cut of present output. I firmly believe that in another 12 months we will reach a balance on steel and several other items. That means more will be available for civilian needs than now.

In 2 years, at the present stage of defense preparedness, and in view of the ceilings placed on military personnel and equipment, our increased production will not only carry the defense equipment but also come back to near present-day levels on materials.

In the meantime, there is some question of whether the military ought to have blanket authority to take over material output wholesale. The military effort has needs, and these needs can be arrived at. What is left can be distributed to carry on civilian work in nearly every field. I am not arguing against cutting back what the military needs. I am saying let the military arrive at efficient needs, and then what is left we will parcel out in an orderly and sensible program.

We have criteria established by which we judge whether or not irrigation and river and harbor and flood-control work can go on. What the Congress and the President ask on each project of the Corps of Army Engineers is:

Will it develop hydroelectric power for a needed area? Will it provide a water supply in critical areas? Would stopping work on the dam or reservoir projects make them useless? Is it an important harbor or waterway? Is it to protect important industries or major food-producing areas? Can it be finished economically during the present working season? Does it involve almost entirely earth movement, and will it use critical materials? Then, of course, we always ask if it helps in the national defense directly?

There is no doubt in my mind but what Gen. Lewis Pick, of the Army Engineers, and Commissioner Thomas MacDonald of the Bureau of Public Roads know what they are doing and they know what can be done and what shouldn't be done on a national scale. General Pick has a voice through the Army and the defense needs.

I would like to see Commissioner MacDonald have a powerful voice in this materials picture and regulation. I think, after defense and certain civilian needs in other fields are determined in Washington, that share which might be used in roads should be under the direction of Mr. MacDonald. Knowing what he has, he could set up criteria, and the States could then plan and build with a solid program and a real knowledge and certain definite thinking.

The Bureau of Public Roads, looking at all States, could allot strategic materials which it has on a priority-order basis. Certain roads and certain bridges would be built. On others, the roadway would be repaired or built, but bridges might be omitted, in a stage construction program. Unless we have something like this, we are going to have costly bidding, confused authority and contractors, and a darned good mess in just a short time. I think we could avoid black markets of any kind in the construction picture, insofar as public works is concerned.

There must be some clear thinking and programing at the top level in Washington, or no one will know what he is doing in the States. If we have a sensible program, then we can go along in the States in public works as materials and manpower will allow, and we can keep going forward. As the materials picture changed, so could the program on roads and rivers and harbors. It would make sense to everyone concerned, and there would be a clear explanation. Unless we get something modeled like this, I am afraid a lot of your activity is going to stop. It would be short-sighted, and dangerous, to stop.

Some of you out there are perhaps wondering whether I am advocating Government control. Well, the Selective Service controls your young sons. There are wage freezes and price freezes, and this and that. That is controls, and they are for your benefit—our mutual benefit. I am advocating some Government controlled planning in Washington, for the defense needs and stimulated production. What is left after defense needs should be allocated. Such controls—if you want to call them controls—would be to your benefit.

Let me give you a very graphic example. During World War II, the Public Buildings Administration was engaged in erecting some office space for defense workers in Washington. One early afternoon a certain group of the military swooped down on the job waving a priority order and whisked away the cement. The carpenters and skilled workmen

were left standing there and the confusion was terrific. The military used the cement to build some sidewalks at a military installation very near Washington. A return to something like that is not only ridiculous, but intolerable.

Thanks for listening to a few ideas. It was a pleasure to talk with you. When I step down from here, I am not going away. Mrs. Chavez and I will still be around, and we will see you at the banquet tomorrow night. Thank you all.

ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, TREASURER, AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, CAPITAL AIRLINES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Americans, regardless of religious creed or political party, must be awakened to the terrible truth that communism threatens Christianity and democracy in practically every part of the world.

Time for compromise is over, if that course was ever the one to pursue, with the Red rulership of Russia. The Kremlin's orders demanded, and direct today, the aggression into South Korea. We now know that Stalin plotted the control of all of that strategic peninsula of the Pacific, even though a pretense of cooperation was being pledged within the United Nations.

With perverted propaganda and the power of armed might, the Communists have set forth on a conquest which is aimed at control of all the earth. That statement is not too drastic a one to make, for the facts prove that Red Russian leaders are determined to achieve, by whatever means necessary, the domination of the peoples of the world.

Let us look at the record, not through the eyes of partisanship, but as men and women who believe in personal freedom and the practice of Christian citizenship. The sooner all of us realize what is happening, the better for mankind. Let us devoutly resolve to end our confusion here at home, and replace appeasement policies of the past with courage and power—as we use the righteous sword to turn back the evil force bent on making slaves of men and women.

Communism, directed from Moscow, today controls 40 percent of the world's population. This tragic truth must be faced. In a little more than 11 years the bluff and the bloodshed, caused by the Red aggression, has given to communism country after country. In 1939 Russian dictatorship embraced 171,000,000 persons while today it controls at least 850,000,000 men and women across more than 11,000,000 square miles of the earth's surface.

In every direction—north, east, south, west—the Reds have been on the march. In 1939 Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania were caught in the web of communism. A year later Bessarabia and Bukovina were being absorbed. For a few years (during World War II) Russia fought to protect its own homeland and people, but in 1945 its tentacles were reaching out again. Finland fell, as did Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Prussia and the Kuriles. Into the dragnet in 1948 went Rumania and Bulgaria. Soon it was Albania and parts of Germany. Then Yugoslavia and North Korea followed, and Manchuria and China collapsed within the Red circle of communism.

Red Russia is not concerned with its own security. A carefully calculated conspiracy and conquest is under way. Americans, and free people everywhere, abhor war. But we believe that the souls of men and women are more precious than mere physical bodies. Now, not later, is the time of testing. The United States, and other free nations that stand with us, must be ready for any emergency.

In our Nation we resolutely manufacture equipment and mobilize manpower and resources in a determined drive to prevent a possible all-out world war III.

In the highway and airport fields, we can and will make an important contribution. We are here in convention assembled to merge all our efforts to the end that they will materially aid the common cause of freedom.

Postal Workers' Pay—They Receive Less Than Day Laborers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article published by the Redford Record on March 16, 1951, at Redford, a part of Detroit, Mich.

This paper has as its editor and publisher Mr. Floyd McGriff, one of the most prominent newspapermen in the entire metropolitan area of Detroit:

POSTAL WORKERS PAID LESS THAN DETROIT DAY LABORERS

With very few exceptions, there is no large group of public servants who have evidenced more loyalty to the service they represent than the postal workers. This loyalty has been maintained in the face of continually mounting adverse conditions which currently are decidedly prevalent.

The working conditions of the postal employee are continually worsening because of economy cut-backs by Executive orders, and because of failure to expand and equip post offices proportionately to the expansion of business.

His compensation has lagged far behind that provided in private industry for many years; so much so, in fact, that he is unable to live on a plane with his fellow men. If he chooses to house, clothe, feed, medicate, and insure himself and his family at a standard currently existing, he must seek outside employment, thus reducing, by long working hours, his efficiency for both employers. Inefficiency brands him as one unqualified for advancement, and his lot, and that of his family, is fixed at a standard far below par.

DON'T GET DAY-LABOR RATE

Loyalty has repeatedly been exemplified as honorable, but the loyalty of the postal worker, to the service he represents, appears to be an act of dishonorableness to his wife and kiddies.

His salary status is summed up briefly by the following: In 1944 he started at a salary of $1,700 per annum and graduated to $2,100 per annum—$40 a week—after 5 years of service. By gradual upgrading since 1944 his entrance salary is now $2,670 per annum or $51 a week (about $1.31 per hour), in 7 years. He may upgrade himself $100, or 4.9 cents per hour, each year for 10 years by diligently applying himself to his work and becoming skilled in several of the many operations connected with mail handling. This is less than common day labor wages in Detroit. These postal salaries have been, and still are, far below Detroit salaries provided in private industry, and far too low to cope with present living costs. Day labor in the building trades—helpful but unskilled—is $1.90 an hour in Detroit today.

POSTAL WORKER MUST STUDY

In but few trades or professions is it more difficult to gain perfection for advancement than in postal operation. The postal worker must qualify on two or three, and sometimes four, of the several operations of mail handling. These operations involve schemes of separation, necessitating months of study and qualifying by examination. The schemes involve separation of mail to all cities served by certain railroads and all other railroads connected therewith; separation of mail for an entire city to respective delivery stations; separation of mail for all carrier routes out of a given delivery station; and many other complicated separations. His qualifications for advancement also require a knowledge of classification of mail matter, rates of postage, amounts of fees, courteously serving the public, and assuming responsibilities of finances. The letter carrier, in addition to knowing his route thoroughly, must start his day at an early hour, and in any kind of good or miserable weather serve his patrons faithfully.

The present plight of postal workers is, and always has been, in the lap of Congress. Adjustments can only be made through legislation by our Senators and Congressmen in Washington.

UNITED STATES EXAMPLE UNWORTHY

As legislators for the greatest and wealthiest country in the world, Congress advocates and sets standards for the rest of the world to follow. When strikes occur, and when differences of opinion arise between management and labor, Government with mediation and conciliation officers often steps in and effects adjustments at standards far in excess of that provided for postal and other Government employees.

Adjustments in private industry usually result from deliberations by representatives numbering 3, 4, or 5, from each faction, with possibly some one or two representatives of Government. Postal and other Government employees have no similar bargaining rights, nor are they privileged to enter into deliberations in equal strength with Congress. They must appeal to and gain favorable support of a 24-man Post Office Civil Service Committee in the House and a 13-man committee in the Senate, in connection with legislative bills. Following this, the bills must be presented to the whole Congress, and appeals for a favorable majority vote must be made to 435 Congressmen and 96 Senators. If legislation is successful up to this point it must be signed by the President.

Many pitfalls occur in this procedure, and even though a favorable majority sentiment is manifested; parliamentary procedure, failure of committees to meet, filibusters, and many other stumbling blocks result in no action. When no action is taken and Congress adjourns, the employees concerned can only sit back for another year and wait until the next session of Congress. If Congress adjourns sine die, the proposed legislation dies with it, and the procedure must be started over again.

This has occurred over and over again, and is the principle reason why salaries of postal and other Government employees are always lagging behind that provided in private industry.

The United States mails is a service intended for business, social, and general economic purposes. Its efficient existence is an absolute necessity for the betterment of every single activity from coast to coast, and border to border. Its efficiency, however, is rapidly diminishing because of low salaries being paid to employees engaged in handling the mails.

People qualified to perform the necessary work are unobtainable because of the low salaries and lack of other inducements, and steer clear of working in the service which is the very bloodstream of our country.

Women and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on the evening of March 17 the distinguished Representative from Utah, Mrs. REVA BECK BOSONE, delivered an able and informative address to a joint meeting of five women's civic clubs in Washington, D. C. In my opinion, this address, which is entitled "Women and Civil Defense," has national significance. I therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN AND CIVIL DEFENSE

I have been asked to speak to you tonight on the place of the American women in our civil defense.

I have not given my talk a title but if I did, maybe I would adopt the newspaper style and call it "The Bomber Brings the War to the Woman." For today the front line is closer to the clothesline than at any time in our history.

Let me begin my talk by repeating a statement made at a recent meeting of a congressional committee. The witness, discussing some of the terrors of Bataan and elsewhere, said, "Among the first of our troops to cave in under the hardships and the cruelties were those who had nothing to come home to".

Now, ladies, I ask you to take that thought home with you and ponder over it. "Nothing to come home to"—"Something to come home to." There is a challenge. There is a responsibility. There is a duty. You will have other challenges, other responsibilities, other duties but you will never have a more important one than keeping America something worth "coming home to".

We on the home front are facing many situations we have never had to face before—situations which a few years ago we would have thought impossible.

But we are beset by a myriad of things which will demand answers. They cover every field of life.

There are the many problems of our organized civil defense—and those of you who take an active part in that will learn just how many.

There are the problems which are vital to civil defense but which are not listed as such.

There are the many things you patriotic women can do and will do—in addition to whatever regular duties you have.

There are so many things to do that I shall not presume to lay out any program for club women and will not attempt to set up any target at which you can aim.

Rather I will give you some of my ideas on women's responsibilities in times like these and try to point out a few of the many things which must be done.

I ask myself, "What is civil defense?"

To me "civil defense" means many things.

It is that vast program now taking form in our Federal, State, and local civil defense administration.

It is that vast program of the production line with women turning out the materials needed for peace and war.

It is that vast program of keeping our moral fiber strong and healthy under adverse conditions.

It is that vast program of nurturing our youth and preparing them for tomorrow.

It is that vast program of keeping a home a home in spite of "Hades and high water."

Yes, and even those women who go forth with their market baskets on their arms and stubbornly refuse to buy meat and thereby do more to make an effective price control than Congress has done are engaged in an important phase of civil defense.

So, with civil defense meaning all that, just where do you fit in?

Bombers might make you homeless—but you are still a woman.

The factory might call you from your kitchen or from your office—but you are still a woman.

Events may make you the top hand in the office, or might move you into the executive spot in the firm—but you are still a woman.

You might be clerk or carpenter, artist or author, laborer or legislator—but you will still be a woman. And being a woman you will have responsibilities which you could not shirk even if you would.

For that same Creator who decreed that woman would carry the child from embryo to birth also decreed that it was woman's responsibility to protect the human race and the family home against the ravages of war and pestilence—and that same Creator who heaped all that responsibility on the female of the species also gave her the strength and courage and fortitude to carry all those burdens and still have something left for times of greater emergency.

I shall touch only lightly on the part women will play in our organized civil defense program for the doors are being opened wide for you to get your knowledge along that line from experts. But I urge all of you who do ally yourself in any civil defense group to learn well the fundamentals of your job, for when crises come they come with unexpected suddenness and from unexpected angles and the good civil defense worker is the one who can quickly adapt himself to any shift in a situation.

In World War I we had no civil defense as we know it today. We did not have the problems. There was some sabotage, but that was the Army's headaches. Rolling bandages, passing out candy and cigarettes, keeping up the morale of the soldiers and sailors—those were the chief aspects of civil defense at that time. Then, too, the value of or the need for women in heavy industry was hardly even considered.

World War II saw women come to the fore in industry. And World War II saw America getting uneasy for the first time about the possibility of an enemy striking our cities and towns. Yes, World War II saw the birth of civil defense and, believe me, that baby has grown in the past 5 years.

Developments during the closing year of the war and in the years since the war indicate that America can be hit from the air. Developments of undersea craft call to mind that even with the subs of World War I, a daring German pig-boat crew crept into New York harbor and the men took turns at looking through the periscope at the harbor lights of our greatest city.

The adroitness of the present day saboteur and the many weapons with which he has to work—poison for drinking and ventilating systems, germs, plant infestations, explosives—in fact, chemical and biological material of many types and descriptions—make us aware that eternal vigilance is necessary.

The success of enemy attack, no matter what kind, will be in the inverse ratio to the efficiency of our civil and military defense.

Rather than catalog the many, many things for which the organized civil defense is responsible, let me give you a rough example. Because I am more familiar with the activity in the West, I shall use my home city of Salt Lake City and its neighbor, Los Angeles, as an illustration.

Should there be an attack on our west coast, Los Angeles and the cities in the vicinity would have, among other things, problems of exodus. Salt Lake City and Utah, on the other hand, would probably have problems of influx. Goodness knows how many people in southern California—I know several myself—who each have 20 and 30 gallons of gasoline buried in their backyards. They fear that if there is an attack, there will be a big traffic jam around filling stations and they plan on getting on their way early.

Utah believes that in case of an attack on the coast there will be literally thousands of persons who will make a hurried departure from the target area and head for high mountains. Accordingly, Utah is preparing one camp in the southwest corner of the State which will accommodate 10,000 refugees for a night or two. Then there will be at least two more camps of 10,000 capacity not far away. In the center and eastern portion of the State will be some more camps. Not only must there be plans and a considerable amount of actual material for these camps but arrangements must be made to keep the expected heavy traffic off the roads which would probably be jammed with either war or relief material. Obviously camps to house thousands of refugees who might never come cannot be fully constructed but such fundamental things as potential water supply, sanitary facilities, streets, roads, shopping centers must be far beyond the planning stage and there must be enough personnel and readily available equipment to handle such a load when and if it hits.

Should storms or road failures or some other things stop the refugees short of the regular camps, there must be preparations for field kitchens, field hospitals, field repair shops, and so on. And these things will not be of any value unless there is a communication system over which to order the proper things to the proper place and unless there is a transportation system to get them there. The age groups of the refugees, their physical and mental health, and the amount of their physical belongings will vary those problems of civil defense and woman's part in it.

Thus, while Los Angeles civil defense would be busy fighting fire, protecting health, preventing looting, guarding against sabotage, housing the homeless, allaying panic, fighting traffic jams, Utah would have a different type of problem. And if Salt Lake City and its military installations, its big copper and steel mills were to be the target, its civil defense would have to handle the problems of catastrophe and some other area would have to handle the problems of flight.

One could go on and on, thinking up not only possibilities, but probabilities. Each situation would be different and would call for a different approach. That is why I urge you who get into civil defense to learn well your task, for problems will be thrown at you from all sides.

But let us not in our discussion forget the fundamental thought of this talk—that no matter if a woman is filling a man's job, she is still a woman and has responsibilities which she will not shun.

It may be the school in your neighborhood; it may be your church; it may be the girl at the next desk, or the young fellow who is sick because he has to go to service, or the boy who is sick because he can't go; it may be the father who fears that he will lose a son, or it may be the mother who has, or it may be a girl whose hope for a home of her own and a family is out there somewhere facing only God knows what—but all around you, you will find small but important areas

of civil defense—things which are not in the book and things which you don't know just how to handle. But you'll handle them. You'll handle them because that's the woman in you.

In the years ahead you are certain to have new challenges from such things as juvenile delinquency, and I consider the successful meetings of those challenges a very definite part of civil defense, not only for our times but for our children's times.

Defects of one period have a habit of slapping us in the face in a later period. I am especially interested in the report of Senator LISTER HILL on draft rejectees. According to Senator HILL, 46 percent of the young men who have been drafted since 1948 were declared unfit for military service. These young men were in the age bracket of 19 to 25 years. Whether the malnutrition of the big depression—these boys were just babies then, many of them underfed and poorly clothed—whether their deficiencies today are traceable to their difficulties of 20 years ago, I cannot say, but I certainly believe that it might be the case.

Figures also indicate that in areas where there are good schools the number of boys found unfit for military service is much smaller than in those areas which have poor schools. That, to me, is another angle of civil defense which might be explored, for it seems to follow that those who fail in their duties during peacetime fail in their duties during war, and to me civil defense requires the best there is in all of us all of the time.

High taxes inspire demands for reduced expenditures, and it is surprising how often the suggestion is to reduce the expenditures for the most important but less tangible things we are doing for ourselves and our future. One of the places usually hit, or at least hit at, is our educational system. To me our educational system is even more important in war than in peace. For as war takes the man away from the home, and as economics force the woman to go to work, the school and the school teacher must fill some of the void in the life of the growing youngster. Maintaining our school systems at a high standard is a matter of civil defense at all times, for if we weaken our educational institutions 1 year, we shall pay for it dearly 20 years later. Today in our schools are the youngsters of the boys who fought in Asia and Europe for us, and unless we provide the best possible education for them we do a double wrong—we fail the soldier parent and the girl who makes America something to come home to and we do irreparable damage to the America of the next generation. Then there are the diseases of tension—a whole category of nervous conditions which show up in times of stress—and there is alcoholism which still defies solution and which could add to the problems of civil defense.

One of the big problems is going to be filling the jobs in the armed services that women can best perform and filling the jobs in industry that women will have to perform.

During the last war women did a magnificent job in the services and in industry. They may be called upon to duplicate that effort. But whether the job be in the armed services or in industry, the first consideration should be given to the women between 45 and 60 years old. Youth will still demand and get its own consideration. These older women have already reared their children and usually have a lot of time on their hands. My court experience has shown me that the woman between those ages is lost without her children and is hungry for something to do but exceedingly timid about going out of the home for training or to fill the position. There are many places which these women could fill admirably and I see no reason why the first call should not be for them. I am quite sure that the recognition would give them a great deal of satisfaction and happiness and would rebuild the ego of an age group that is apt to lose it.

There are seven or eight million women in this age group who are engaged in housework, and I am certain that from this reservoir a great number of capable persons could be brought into the services of industry.

The Department of Labor, which will have the responsibility of recruiting labor for industry, is already giving considerable thought to ways and means of getting women back into industry should the need arise.

Ten years ago there was a big pool of unemployed—more than 7,000,000 able-bodied men—who were ready and eager to get to work. In addition to that group was another huge pool of women workers who had not then given serious thought to getting into a job away from home. But things have changed. We have more persons employed now than ever before; our pool of unemployed labor is practically nil and the women who 10 years ago came to the rescue so to speak are either listed among the 60,000,000 who have jobs, or have passed into an older age group or have started raising a family of their own.

The problem of recruitment is going to be more serious as we get into the job of producing both guns and butter. According to reports the people in the public employment offices are already making plans to have the clubwomen of the Nation help them in some of their recruitment problems—sometimes actually filling some of the jobs, sometimes helping others fill the jobs.

But there is still another approach to job-filling which I shall pass on to you.

During World War II industry was on a 48-hour week a good bit of the time. Actually, however, the average workweek for that period was 45 hours. Just think of that! With millions and millions working in industry, an average of 3 hours a week per man was lost through absenteeism. Millions of days of production lost! This absenteeism was due to illness, accident, faulty transportation, crowding of nursery schools, time to catch up with home duties, and often just too much partying the night before.

Some of you women who want to make a real contribution to the war effort, look into that matter of absenteeism. Many of those millions of days lost might have been saved.

The problem can be approached from any number of angles. True, you can't just overnight stop accidents in industry, but you can see that you and your associates observe all the rules and regulations aimed at preventing accidents—not only on the job but in your home and in your automobile. You perhaps can't help someone from getting sick, but perhaps you can help them get better more quickly. You cannot take over the household duties for your neighbor, but maybe you can do some shopping for her or otherwise do things which will permit her to stay on that job that extra day. There are so many things, not part of your daily task, which you can do to help in the defense effort.

As I look at the educational films showing how to survive an atomic attack, I cannot believe that anything can be so fantastic and yet so real. It does not seem possible that atomic disaster—or even the disaster of a full-sized air blitz—can hit any city in this great country.

But fantastic as it might appear, such a catastrophe is entirely possible—cruelly and absolutely possible.

Somehow, awful though an attack would be, I do not fear for America. The American man has always done his job well, and the American woman will be standing right by his side sharing his tragedies, if there be any.

There is no difference between the modern American woman and her pioneer grandmother. The present-day woman may have finer clothes and softer hands but she has that same intangible thing called courage—the same urge to carry on and do her part to make America a home.

If a bomb spreads ruin, the American woman will be there to help remove the debris.

If there be sickness or accident, she will be there to nurse.

If the hand that guides the machine falls, she will step into the driver's seat and carry on.

Everywhere I look I see a task to be done and a woman moving quietly to do it. She knows a job need not seem important to be important. It need not be far away, it can be right at hand; it need not be heralded by a trumpet—it might be murmured by a heartbreak.

In this talk tonight I am not sure that I have told you anything you did not already know. I only hope that I have touched upon the things you feel. I know that each of you has already— nd in your own way—probed the field to see just where you could best fit into the task ahead. I know each of you will fill your niche and fill it well.

But if I were to presume to give you executive women advice, I would merely ask that you let your mother instinct—and what woman does not have that instinct—set your course for you. It will not steer you wrong. Let's keep America something to come home to.

Hospitals for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial, published in the February 22, 1951, issue of the Dodge County Independent, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This newspaper is published by Mr. Philip S. Duff, Jr., a very energetic and able young man in our State who has just recently been elected to the State legislature.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITALS FOR DEFENSE

A nurse in St. Paul's Ancker Hospital was quoted as follows after the recent tragic explosion at the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company plant:

"Look at the terrible confusion which this blast has caused here. What would we do in case of an air raid?"

This exclamation dramatized the need for adding to Minnesota's total of 10,000 general hospital beds, not only to better meet the peacetime needs of our people, but also to provide facilities which will be urgently needed in case of war.

The particular need, it appears to us, is for more small hospital facilities in communities throughout the rural areas of Minnesota.

Should atomic bombs fall upon Minneapolis, St. Paul, or Duluth, most hospital facil-

ities there will almost certainly be put out of action, for city hospitals tend to be located in or near the industrial areas which make prime targets for bombers. Then first-aid workers would have to fall back upon Minnesota's rural hospitals.

The Federal Hospital Construction Act is already a going concern. Several Minnesota communities have already received up to 50-percent aid under this program in the construction of small hospitals.

But appropriations for this hospital program are now awaiting congressional action, and there is some danger that these funds may be caught in the general rush to cut out nonessential domestic spending during this emergency period.

We heartily endorse this domestic economy—indeed, we believe that those governmental programs which merely allow us civilians to enjoy life a little more should be slashed to the bone—but we would think it a tragic mistake if something so essential to defense as rural hospitals should be included in this pruning operation. We commend Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and others who are endeavoring to obtain adequate grants for rural hospital construction.

Lax Security at Argonne Atomic Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the radio broadcast of Mr. Paul Harvey over the American Broadcasting System on Sunday evening, March 18, 1951, respecting the lack of security at the Argonne National Laboratory at Lemont, Ill.:

Good evening, Americans, last night I talked to a banquet of Legionnaires. Afterward, during the parade past the speaker's table, one said, "Thank God, Mr. Harvey, for your fearless defense of Americanism." For a moment I was taken aback.

For a long moment I wondered what Tom Jefferson or Dan Webster or Patrick Henry would say if they knew that in 1951 a man had to defend Americanism. And that he would be called fearless for doing it. But I know what the gentleman meant. It's not easy. But I'll tell you something, the credit is not rightly due me. The praise is not due the Harveys because it happens we have a secret weapon.

I've been attacked, smeared, and threatened by experts. They'd have silenced these broadcasts a long time ago except for one thing. It's the Harveys' secret weapon. You see, I come from a prayin' family. So we've got Stalin outmaneuvered. And, counting all my wife's prayin' relatives, we've doggone near got him outnumbered, too.

Now once before in history a lone little individual named David was underestimated, because his enemies judged his strength by the caliber of his slingshot. And a chap named Goliath ended up with a hole in the head.

I have only one voice.

But I have a rock called the truth in my slingshot. So look out, here it comes.

I have heard, unofficially, that a grand jury has been summoned for tomorrow in Chicago to weigh the evidence regarding Paul Harvey's recent midnight visit to the supersecret Argonne National Laboratory near Lemont, Ill., on last February 7.

There has never been any mystery about the purpose of my mission. But a congressional committee hearing which my friends and I have repeatedly requested has been put off and put off week after week.

I want the facts known. I was willing to do this quietly. But I want the facts made known. I'm tired of sitting on one of the biggest stories of my life and getting smeared in the process, just to keep from revealing the negligence with which our security regulations are administered.

But I can tell you this much:

Whoever gets the facts is going to learn, not just from me, but from many—I said many—witnesses—I said witnesses—how absurdly lax is the administration of those vital regulations in the hands of civilian scientists.

They're going to learn—now sit down for this—they're going to learn that one man entered the highly secret tech area, an area where not even guards are permitted without special credentials, was inside buildings in that vital area, telephoned his identity to the central switchboard to establish his presence, then after an hour left undetected.

And believe me this is just the beginning. There are those persons just waiting for me publicly to reveal secrets so they could pin my ears back and draw attention away from their own red faces. I am well aware that there are those persons who would like to see a grand-jury indictment hung over my head, then postpone indefinitely bringing the matter to trial.

They figure they can intimidate and frighten away my sponsors and my friends.

Well, let's understand each other.

It just happens that I have some of the finest sponsors you'll ever come across.

And they figure if this country is already totalitarian, then we might as well find it out now.

But we don't think so.

And another thing, this happens to be the American Broadcasting Co., where a man is innocent of wrongdoing until you prove differently.

I am satisfied that no grand jury properly apprised of all the facts will even bring an indictment in this matter, because my purpose, established with authorities in advance, was to protect our security.

Congressmen and others were apprised months ago of my plan and purpose.

But I want a congressional hearing now.

And if there is no congressional committee hearing even on the basis of what I have to say tonight, then I'm going to place this entire file in the hands of the Americanism committee of the American Legion and somebody's going to get mad.

You fellows should have learned by now that the American people can do anything, if they get mad enough.

If nothing else ever proved that, Pearl Harbor did.

It is unfortunate that in 1951 we've become so accustomed to a namby-pamby approach to everything and everybody, including our worst enemies, that when somebody comes along with a healthy circulation folks think he has a fever. Well, I think being an American is worth working at.

I didn't initiate this investigation, but I helped carry the ball, and for now I can take care of the tacklers.

And another thing—the investigator of the Office of Naval Intelligence and the guard who participated in this demonstration—when this investigation is over I want you businessmen across America who have been telling me for years that we stand for the same kind of an America to stand up and be counted, and offer these men the really good jobs they deserve.

This is not intended as a carte blanche indictment of Chicago University. I have made cash gifts to that university's school of medicine. There are many fine individuals on its faculty. But this Argonne installation operated by Chicago University scientists already has been the subject of congressional investigation when priceless uranium was misplaced out there. But that investigation got no place. Now, I have conducted an investigation of this same Argonne installation to prove security is lax and I have proved it lax.

The results of my investigation were intended only for official ears. With patriotic Members of Congress aware of my purpose, my plan, and my objective.

But if the scientists who run this laboratory want to explain this laxity in enforcing security regulations, they are welcome to use this microphone at a mutually convenient date. Here, gentlemen, you can talk to the "grandest" jury in the world—the American people. Either what you're doing in that area is secret or it is not. If it is not, then let us quit wasting taxpayers' money even going through the motions of guarding it.

But you know better. So, for now, I respectfully recommend that a military guard be placed around Argonne until we are sure this situation has been remedied and this can't happen again. Next time your midnight visitor might not be a friend.

Yes, Americans, my motive was and is to protect our security. I did enter the Argonne Laboratory. A loyal employee of that installation has been suspended because he put patriotism above his job. An investigator of the Office of Naval Intelligence has been fired because somebody's sensitive jurisdictional toes have been stepped on. Well, I risked getting shot purposely to focus attention on our insecurity. And I want something done about it. As Merlin Griffith, business agent of the guard's union, said: "If Harvey and his friends had been saboteurs, there would be no Argonne Laboratory left. Harvey should get a medal for what he did."

I neither expect nor want that. But I do want somebody to quit whitewashing and I want a congressional committee to get to the bottom of this maladministration of security regulations before we lose what few atomic secrets we have left.

I have pleaded for and waited for an investigation, by Marquis of Queensberry rules. Now let's get out into the middle of the ring where everybody can see and slug this out.

The public may have had the impression that my mission was not successful. Well, now you know differently. Now you know that one of the men with me, one of three unarmed men, spent a midnight hour inside buildings, inside the top-secret tech area—he could have carried a bomb in or secret papers out, because he left as he entered undetected.

Now you know this.

Now I'd like to give the rest of the facts, and the facts will be startling.

I want a subcommittee of the joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee to come to Chicago.

I recommend this procedure rather than a Washington hearing, because at a recent meeting of the Argonne Guards Union every guard—now get this—every single guard present voted yes, he wants to testify before a congressional committee as to laxity of security at the project.

And let's stop trying to do it quietly. Let's just do it.

Bring the whole committee if you want. Bring the whole Congress if you like.

Because, I'll tell you something: It isn't going to make any difference how many troops we send to Europe or how much budget we vote or how many more men die in Korea if our big secrets continue to slip though our fingers or our big weapons go off in our own back yard.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," by Mr. Selig Greenberg, writer for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, published in the city of Providence, R. I.

While these articles do not conclude the series, I feel that these, coupled with those previously published in the RECORD, present the high lights of the survey made by Mr. Greenberg that will be helpful to the Members of the Senate in their consideration of S. 337, which bill provides an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical fields.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin of March 8, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—PHILANTHROPISTS MADE POSSIBLE 1910–30 ADVANCES—GOLDEN AGE'S PASSING POSES PROBLEM OF FINANCING RESEARCH, EDUCATION

(This is the tenth of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

If you should mention the late John D. Rockefeller to an average group of Americans, what idea would the name evoke in their minds?

The chances are they would think of a wizened, crochety old gentleman giving away shiny new dimes to people. Probably not one of them would associate the name with the unparalleled achievements of medicine during the past few decades, with the conquest of many deadly diseases, with the remarkable application of hormones, vitamins and antibiotics to the control and treatment of illness.

And yet, many of these dramatic advances would not have been scored if it had not been for the generosity of Rockefeller and, to a lesser extent, other philanthropists. If it were not for the vision of these men of great wealth, American medical education—with all that it involves in top-notch research and practice—would not be what it is today.

UNPRECEDENTED PHILANTHROPY

A combination of unprecedented philanthropy and fundamental discoveries in the medical sciences, of money and ideas, between 1910 and 1930 gave American medicine what might be called its golden age. We are still reaping the harvest of the seeds planted during those years.

That era is now over, and its passing confronts us with a problem of the first magnitude, namely: How are we going to pay for the kind of first-rate medical education and research without which it is impossible to have high-quality medical care?

In 1910 the education of doctors was a largely self-supporting enterprise. Tuition collected from students was the main source of support of medical schools, investment in faculty and plant was small and teaching standards were low.

Then came the study of medical education by Abraham Flexner which exposed the inadequacy of most schools. Out of it emerged new patterns of medical training and of its financing through large philanthropic foundations. The succeeding 20 years constituted, as one authority has described it, "a unique and sheltered period, a kind of hiatus during which dependence upon the community dollar was reduced to practically zero."

It was lucky that realization of the need for a new level of medicine came at a time when holders of great wealth began to become conscious of their responsibility toward society. These men sought competent guidance in their philanthropy which made for selective giving.

Between 1910 and 1930, about $200,000,000—which is the equivalent of half a billion in terms of today's purchasing power—was poured into the Nation's medical schools by philanthropic foundations in endowment and gifts for construction and maintenance of plant.

USUALLY OVERSUBSCRIBED

Eighty million dollars of this was Rockefeller money. This money was given on a matching basis. The only string attached to it was that at least an equivalent amount be raised from other donors. The resulting drives for funds were usually oversubscribed. Johns Hopkins, for instance, got $8,000,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and raised $12,000,000 more.

Much of the money was given to the better schools to develop them as pace setters. This gave tremendous impetus to medical research and education. Medicine is now taught in an entirely different way than it was before John D. Rockefeller had his vision. If your sick child recovers quickly because of a dose of aureomycin, if you can be fairly sure of excellent medical care when you call a doctor, it is because Rockefeller and a few other men paid a large part of the bill.

But now we have to start thinking about paying much of the bill ourselves.

The age of fabulous wealth is over. High income, inheritance, and corporation taxes arising out of a changed economic and social philosophy now preclude the accumulation of individual wealth on a large scale. The medical schools can no longer expect many large gifts and additions to their endowment. The philanthropic foundations remain an important source of support. But they are no longer contributing toward endowment and are confining themselves instead to the financing of specialized research and of experimental teaching projects.

This development has reached its peak at a time of inflation and increasing medical school costs resulting from ever-expanding functions. It has come just when the lower interest rate on invested funds has reduced income from endowment. It has coincided with increasing obsolescence of plant and equipment.

NO SUCH GIFTS IN SIGHT

According to an exhaustive study of medical finances whose findings were reported yesterday, the schools need an additional $40,000,000 a year in operating funds and a great deal more if they increase enrollment. Forty million dollars is the annual return on an endowment of a billion dollars at an optimistic interest rate of 4 percent. There are no such private gifts in sight.

This leads to the conclusion, in the opinion of experts, that we will have to turn to the tax dollar for a large part of the bill.

What concerns many authorities are not so much the political implications of such a step as these questions:

Are the American people prepared to pay the cost of educating doctors and supporting research of the caliber which philanthropy has shown to be possible? Is it possible to finance top-flight medical education and research on a broad base requiring popular consent? Or will the transition from private to public support lead to a lowering of standards?

What many of us have failed to realize is that neither the doctors themselves nor the patients have paid the full cost of medical training. For years this function was subsidized by the largesse of multimillionaires. But now Santa Claus is gone.

American society faces a fateful decision at a time when new horizons are beckoning in medical science. We are on the threshold of great new discoveries. Major advances in chemistry, physics, biology and psychology remain to be translated into terms of medical progress. Heart disease, cancer, polio and other enemies of mankind are still to be conquered. Preventive medicine is in process of changing the whole concept of health care. Are we to go forward or backward? We will be answerable for our decision to our children and grandchildren.

[From the Providence Journal of March 10, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—UNITED STATES MEDICAL SCHOOLS LOOK TO TWO SOURCES FOR HELP—HOPE CONGRESS WILL ENACT SUBSIDY LEGISLATION DESPITE AMA OPPOSITION; EXPECT TO PRESS CAMPAIGN FOR CORPORATION GIFTS ALREADY UNDER WAY

(This is the eleventh of a series of articles on the problems of medical education within the context of the broader issues of medical care and practice.)

(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's hard-pressed medical schools are looking forward to possible financial relief from two sources.

First of all, they hope Congress will enact subsidy legislation this year, despite the opposition of the American Medical Association.

Secondly, they expect the wraps may soon be taken off a campaign for corporation gifts for medical education which has been quietly under way for nearly 2 years. This drive, sparked by President James B. Conant, of Harvard, and headed by former President Herbert Hoover as honorary chairman, aims to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually.

Top medical educators are aware of the danger of becoming overdependent on Government funds and are eager to develop untapped private sources of support. But they have reached the conclusion that philanthropy alone cannot do the job.

FIRST FORMAL SPLIT

This conclusion has led the Association of American Medical Colleges to its first formal split with the AMA, whose opposition killed the Federal aid bill last year. The measure was reintroduced early this year, and medical school deans are working vigorously for its passage.

The new bill, which recently won unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, calls for a 5-year aid program for medical, dental, and nursing schools at an annual cost of $50,000,000. Of this, $40,000,000 would be spent to help the schools maintain their present enrollment and admit additional students and $10,000,000 would go to toward the cost of construction and equipment.

The medical schools would get a subsidy of $500 a year for each student they now have and of $1,000 for every new student. Scholarships for needy students also would be provided.

ORIGINAL BILL IN 1949

The original bill was introduced in the Senate in 1949 under bipartisan auspices. Its early draft set a ceiling of 50 percent on the proportion of the budget of any school that might be met by Federal grants. AMA representatives held out for a ceiling of 30 percent, and the figure was finally reduced to 40 percent. Other changes also were made in the measure at AMA insistence before the Senate passed it by a unanimous vote.

When the legislation went to the House, its passage was generally considered assured. In December 1949, the AMA house of delegates approved a report by its council on medical education and hospitals which said that while the council was "not entirely satisfied" with the bill, it contained "safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government."

But several months later the AMA suddenly changed its tune and announced its opposition to the measure. Proponents of the legislation compromised further and gave in on the AMA's demand for a 30-percent ceiling. But this failed to mollify the AMA. As a result of its lobbying, the bill was finally tabled by a House committee by a one-vote margin and never reached the floor of the House.

SUMS UP OPPOSITION

Dr. Donald G. Anderson, secretary of the AMA Council on Medical Education, sums up AMA opposition to Federal subsidies as follows: "We do not believe the possibilities of securing adequate support from voluntary sources have been thoroughly explored. Nor are we convinced that any of the legislation so far proposed insures the freedom and independence of the schools."

Among those who strongly dispute this assertion are Dr. Alan Gregg, director of the medical sciences division of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Dr. George Packer Berry, dean of Harvard Medical School and president-elect of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Dr. Gregg told this reporter that he could see no alternative to large-scale Federal aid. "The medical schools," he said, "are on the danger list and in desperate need of a transfusion, much of which can come only from public funds."

"We now spend more than a million dollars a year in Federal funds at Harvard Medical School," said Dr. Berry, "and it has come to us without any strings attached or any effort to control us. I see no ground for apprehension if the schools maintain a proper balance between their own funds and Federal grants."

DISPUTE IS ACADEMIC

Dr. Dean F. Smiley, secretary of the Association of Medical Colleges, commented that "this whole subsidy dispute is academic, as the medical schools already are getting millions of dollars a year in Federal grants for research and teaching in certain specialized subjects which have been neglected."

Qualified observers believe that, aside from its distaste for too much competition, the AMA dreads Federal subsidies because they would establish the principle of Government responsibility in medicine and might be a stepping stone to compulsory health insurance. These observers nevertheless feel that the AMA, in view of the threatened serious shortage of doctors as a result of the national emergency, may reverse itself again and abandon its opposition.

The AMA voted last December to contribute $500,000 to help bail out the medical schools and is now urging its members to donate $100 annually for this purpose. In view of the fact that the schools have a deficit of $10,000,000 a year and would need millions more to expand, this action was described by the dean of one leading medical college as "a fancy but futile and utterly inadequate gesture."

BANKER IS DIRECTOR

Leaders of the drive for corporate gifts for medical education have withheld public announcement of the campaign because they want to satisfy themselves first that substantial amounts can be raised. It is reliably reported that many of the country's biggest corporations already have pledged sizable contributions. The list of sponsors of the appeal is studded with some of the top names in American industry and finance and also includes the presidents of the A. F. of L. and CIO.

The campaign is under the active direction of S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers Trust Co. of New York. Among the men on its board of trustees are Owen J. Roberts, Robert P. Patterson, Winthrop W. Aldrich, Albert P. Sloan, Jr., Ernest T. Weir, Thomas J. Watson, and Winthrop Rockefeller. Its prospectus, which has been sent to leading corporations throughout the country concedes the need for Federal aid and asks for private gifts to create "a balance between two great sources of support."

Pointers on Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that an editorial entitled "Pointers on Point 4," published in the Washington Post of March 13, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This is a discussion of the point 4 program as presently developed, and with emphasis upon the Rockefeller report, recognizing and pointing out the need for greater expansion of our economic assistance to underdeveloped and underprivileged areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINTERS ON POINT 4

Since the President launched his concept of point 4, the times have changed and the free world is now engrossed in an emergency calling for speedy and ramified rearmament. This of necessity governs the average man's approach to point 4. The Rockefeller report, recognizing the intervening event, would enlarge, not contract the over-all program so as to handle certain defense requirements. The defense needs scheduled to be so absorbed are highly significant. One is the encouragement of raw material exploitation for the service of our defense effort, another is the kind of preclusive buying that was done in the last war by the Board of Economic Warfare.

Some doubts will arise over this organizational plan that the Rockefeller board suggests under the aegis of an Overseas Economic Administration. We don't see how defense development could be dovetailed into the comprehensive job which the Rockefeller committee has outlined. There are several reasons for keeping apart defense and nondefense operations; for instance, the idea of point 4 might get adulterated in foreign particularly nonwestern, minds if they were lumped together. Surely defense enterprises should fall within the domain of the ECA and the military working together.

The idea of an over-all agency may have some merit in respect of nondefense work. Those who have watched with respect the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, for instance, will doubtless put up a case for separate existence. However, the central agency would have a sort of federation-like framework, providing for regional work and making provision for autonomy of the institute. Indeed, the set-up of the institute would be copied elsewhere. Another problem in respect of organization: Authority in foreign parts would doubtless come from centralization, but it would be at the expense of the good name that has been won by ECA.

On our part we would like to see criteria set up ahead of organization. With criteria fully accepted by Congress and Executive, the organization problem could easily be solved. Yet there is little attention to criteria in the Rockefeller report beyond the twin need of combating subversion and doing away with hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy. This is a millennial task, not a criterion.

First among the criteria in lifting the lot of "the 1,075,000,000 inhabitants of the so-called underdeveloped areas" should be that any specific project must be viewed in the light of what it will do to relieve population pressure. Puerto Rico is a hideous example of what "meddling with death" has done to make the inhabitants more rather than less miserable. Many of the areas put within the orbit of point 4 operations have a similar population problem. All Asia, except the Philippines, is, indeed, pullulating with breeding, and our occupation policy in Japan has accentuated the population problem in respect of Japan. Health experts have been welcome in Japan, but Mrs. Sanger, though free to visit in pre-MacArthur days, is barred. It would be the height of folly to make Asia a gigantic Puerto Rico.

On this point the emphasis on the eradication of human disease has other limits. An example will suffice. India is said to have the highest incidence of tuberculosis, but if you go to India and set up an anti-tuberculosis station in, say, Travancore, the station would be relatively worthless. For there are not the doctors in Travancore to man it.

Perhaps the second criterion may involve something of the chicken and the egg attitude. But projects of the nature outlined in this report require as a sine qua non to be politically integrated in the recipient country. It is simply making matters worse to saddle a country still in the dirt-road stage of development with the industrial equipment of modern America. All nations, to be sure, want that equipment; no country any longer thinks of itself as fit to hold its head up unless it has a steel mill. Is this, however, the way to build up a spirit of interdependence? Another consideration is the need for awareness that the burden of repayment is not crushing, as in the case of development works in being in Afghanistan and in the case of those in prospect in Iran.

Nor is there any point in making a showcase out of part of a country which is torn in civil strife. There are those, for instance, who think that the North Koreans were encouraged to fall on South Korea by the spectacle of economic improvement that the United States had introduced. By political integration, too, we mean receptive administration. In India a deadweight of superstition is basically responsible for the food deficit, and, till this is relieved, no effort of the outside world can solve the Indian problem. Elsewhere it is imprudent to put up works in a country where the administrators have been habituated to pocket the petty cash.

The attitude of mind of the affected country is all-important in this great economic

offensive. It will make the difference between success or failure—whether or not a venture will be "operation rathole" to the American taxpayer and the people aimed at. To put a premium on peculation, on reliance, on making the rich richer and the poor poorer, on economic top-heaviness, or on political strife is no business to indulge in. To be sure, the Rockefeller board recognizes this, but we should like to see some insurance by way of criteria.

Now a fine and noble idea is enshrined in point 4. It is the idea of spreading our know-how, and tendering our show-how, to other countries that want it. This country has grown rich in part upon the plants and other things that our agricultural and commercial explorers, beginning with Jefferson and his rice, have brought back to America. A reciprocal service is due now that we have grown into a great world creditor. There are a hundred ways in which our technology can benefit the world, including ourselves. Much of it lies in the files of the Department of Agriculture. The world should be encouraged to come and get it; a roster of experts should be compiled whose services the underdeveloped countries could draw upon. The central idea should be to enable underdeveloped countries to do better what they already do, and to shake themselves out of the toils of the planter economy associated with colonial development.

Enough has been done already in this respect to be impressive. We have seen what ECA has accomplished in Greece, as, for instance, in converting swamps into rice paddies, in preventing spoilage of olive oil. Technical assistance this is called, and it is technical assistance that lay at the root of the President's bold new program. It is untrue to suggest, as could be deduced from the Rockefeller report, that you need roads and medical service to install badly needed tube wells in India.

On top of defense work and point 4, the report, which almost defies absorption in a single gulp, recommends that the Overseas Economic Administration should be empowered to encourage public works and private enterprise. Here a link with the World Bank is proposed. For public works an International Development Authority would be established in a management contractual relation with the World Bank. A finance corporation is also provided for, also relation to the World Bank, and tax and other incentives to American investors are mentioned as part of this scheme to use American dollars for development. It is to be hoped that Congress will not be affrighted by this ambitious report, but will set to work and hammer out criteria and the machinery for the realization of the idea back of it.

Who, Other Than General MacArthur, Is Capable of Giving Us a Complete and Authentic Story on Asia Equal in Fullness and Authenticity With the European Story of General Eisenhower?

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, months ago I called to the attention of Congress and the American people the necessity of Gen. Douglas MacArthur returning immediately to the United States for the purpose of reporting to the Congress and the American people of our true situation in Asia. But no action has been taken in recalling the general.

In the meantime, what has happened? General MacArthur in a recent interview with American newspapermen flatly stated that in his opinion we are destined to be tied down indefinitely to a stalemate in Korea, while we continue to spend men, money, and munitions against puppet troops of the Kremlin thrown at us by Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Red leader. General MacArthur issued this warning when he said:

> This situation can wear us down and weaken us by costing Communist Russia very little.

The general pleaded in his interview for the right to fight a winning war, which is denied him by a United Nations debating society in which so-called allies who place their Asiatic trade interests above the fight against communism, outvote us, road-block us, and circumvent our diplomats.

We all know that during the next few weeks this Congress will be asked to implement national defense spending to the extent of $40,000,000,000 or more, and some say this is just the beginning. This is a huge sum of money which must come from the hard-pressed taxpayers of America. To continue to spend this money with the knowledge that we face an indefinite military stalemate in Korea would certainly indicate the imperative need of appraising the military situation in the Far East, in the same manner that we surveyed the military situation in Europe through the eyes of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

We are told that the military needs of Europe will require many American divisions, and billions of American dollars will be necessary to provide arms for the defense that Europe finally decides to establish for herself.

At the same time we read repeatedly of British, French, and other North Atlantic Pact nations letting steel, jet engines, rubber, and other vital war materials and fabricated products go behind the iron curtain.

While all this goes on in Europe, the major military strength of the United States is now tied down in Korean areas on what the President calls a police action, but which General MacArthur tells us is rapidly developing into a military stalemate which has to date cost us more than 52,000 casualties and a merely estimated cost in money and military supplies.

In other words, we are so far committed in Korea that we cannot withdraw and at the same time maintain our prestige in the Orient.

General MacArthur in his interview with representatives of the American press stated flatly that our forces cannot win a decisive victory in Korea unless they are permitted to fight an all-out war north of the Yalu River or wherever military necessity demands. At the moment General MacArthur and our forces have been refused that right and are literally fighting the Korean war with one hand tied behind their backs.

Why should not Congress and the American people be given the story of the Asiatic situation from the lips of General MacArthur just as the administration with a lot of fanfare gave us the European story through General Eisenhower.

Who, I ask, other than General MacArthur, is capable of giving us a complete and authentic story on Asia, equal in fullness and authenticity with the European story by General Eisenhower.

If General MacArthur could leave Tokyo to confer mysteriously with President Truman at Wake Island, why is he denied the opportunity to come to Washington temporarily for the purpose of telling the Congress and the American people what they are entitled to know.

How can the Congress intelligently appropriate tax-raised dollars to finance military strength or discuss the allocation of American military power without knowing the truth about what is needed in Asia as well as in Europe?

In all fairness, I ask, why does General MacArthur get only lip service from the White House whether it be in Washington or Key West, instead of the military divisions and solid effort by United States representatives in the United Nations to untie the General's hands and let him fight?

In my opinion, the administration is afraid to let General MacArthur come back because he would tell Congress under questioning what the American people want to know and what they are entitled to know.

Yes; if General MacArthur were to come back to the United States and tell Congress and the American people the true story on Asia, he would neutralize the Truman administration's concept that world war III can only be won in Europe even though it is the belief of many top-ranking military men that Russia will never attack in Europe until Asia is secure. What concept is right?

There is no doubt from General MacArthur's statement that we are being blocked and bled white in Korea.

Therefore, let General MacArthur come back here and give us a first-hand report of what our job is in Asia and what it is going to cost us in manpower and money to break this military stalemate and win a decisive victory.

Where Are Our Ships?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the March 1951 issue of the American magazine, written by Mr. Theodore Brent, president of the Delta Line. Mr. Brent has very ably reviewed the status of our merchant marine and has called

attention to the necessity of Congress taking immediate action to put it in shape for service in the event of a national emergency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE OUR SHIPS?

(By Theodore Brent, president, the Delta Line)

In recent months we Americans have watched the threat of another war grow daily more ominous. At this writing the world seems about to fall around our shoulders. Our taxes have been increased. Our credit has been curbed. Our use of certain materials has been limited. Grudgingly, but necessarily approvingly, we have watched Congress appropriate billion after billion for a war which may never come but which might strike us tomorrow.

Our billions—all from our new taxes—are going into the training of armies, the building of planes, the buying of guns, the manufacture of bombs and bullets and supplies. Belatedly, but at last, we are trying hard to catch up.

But ever since we began this new build-up one unanswered question has been nagging me: If we get our men and our planes, our guns and bombs and supplies in time, how are we going to transport them over the thousands of miles of seas to wherever our next theater of war may be?

The only answer I can come up with is this: We aren't. The Navy hasn't enough ships of the type necessary to do it. Certainly our woefully inadequate merchant marine can't do the job, although in every war in our history we have depended on our civilian ships to do it. But our Government is doing next to nothing about rebuilding our merchant marine as an essential arm of national defense. It is passing the buck and ducking its responsibilities.

Even if war were not a threat, this bumbling, unbusinesslike attitude on the part of the biggest business in the world may lead us to further tragedy, one which could tumble us from our present eminence as a world economic power, and consequently affect millions of us individually through a decrease in employment, a lowering of wages, a necessary cut-back in production because of our inability to market our surplus products at prices guaranteeing reasonable profits to those who operate under our free-enterprise economy.

America's shipping industry today is inadequate—in contrast with that of several foreign nations—for five reasons: (1) The majority of the merchant vessels operating under the American flag are too slow to outrun submarines of our potential enemies in time of war; (2) the number of ships which can compete with foreign vessels and which can serve efficiently as troop and supply transports in time of war is too small; (3) at least one-third of the life of our good merchant ships is already spent and before long they will become obsolete together; (4) the huge fleet of World War II cargo vessels now in mothballs comprises ships uneconomical to operate and therefore virtually worthless to commercial shipping companies in peacetime; and (5) any suggestion of development or expansion with the assistance of Government funds—in the manner of virtually every other nation in the world—is pooh-poohed by Government authorities as "unrealistic and unnecessary."

Twice within the past 33 years we have plunged into war without sufficient ships to transport our men and arms and supplies to the areas where they were needed. Frantically we built huge fleets of uneconomical emergency-type ships. In World War I, few, if any, were completed before the Armistice. In World War II, hundreds of them were used, but few of them were worth more than their sale price in scrap when the war was over.

Today we are following the pattern drawn after World War I. Then we depended for years solely on our war-built ships to service our merchant marine. Few new ships were constructed. Consequently, when all of them began to fall apart at once—in the early 1930's—we were caught without sufficient ships to carry our exportable goods. We're approaching again that same situation.

Every attempt to improve this situation by shipping operators has been stymied by a vacillating foreign policy, by congressional confusion, by complacency and ineptness in Federal bureaus and departments, by a lack of understanding of maritime problems, and by the lack of a well-founded and publicly stated maritime policy that would help us drag ourselves out of the minor role in foreign trade into which we may soon sink.

There are two reasons why we must have a powerful merchant marine: national defense and internal economy. The need of a fleet of transports capable of carrying our armies and their weapons and supplies is obvious. Without such ships we might just as well sit back and wait for some other power to attack us. But the effect of an inadequate merchant marine on you and me individually is a much more obscure, complex problem.

America is a power in any association or agreement of nations into which it enters, primarily because of the abundance of everything that it possesses—our abundance of manpower, of materials, of skills. America bears the greater load of the Korean War and of the occupation of Japan and Germany because we have an abundance of money, men, and machines. America's voice is powerful and respected in all international conferences on any subject or situation because of the abundance with which we can back up our diplomats. In the eyes of other nations America is affluent, fertile, generous, but—vulnerable.

Many of us, I think, don't realize that America's export and import industry is dependent not only on America's abundance, but on the respect which other countries accord us in certain international shipping conferences which set the rates for the haulage of every type of commodity from one area of the world to another. Every country engaged in carrying certain goods has a voice in the rates, but, naturally, those nations which haul the most carry the heaviest voice when it comes to a vote. If you want a voice you have to carry the goods. You can't carry the goods without ships.

If our merchant marine is permitted to deteriorate—as it seems to be now—our stake in all these conferences will be thrown overboard automatically, as it was during the First World War, when our foreign competitors increased rates on our exports as much as 1,000 percent, and those nations which can continue to operate vessels in strength will once more gain control of the shipping rates. Their votes will strike first and foremost at shipping rates on commodities exported from America, in which they are in competition with American lines and American products.

If Great Britain, for example, can sell her automobiles in South America at a price greatly under that of American machines, she has a good chance of cornering the market. If Great Britain—through superiority in ships—can control the rates on the shipping of American-made cars to South America she can increase those rates to the point where an American manufacturer will be unable to make a profit on a sale. British-made cars—shipped cheaply—could be sold at a profit for prices less than ours.

Production at Detroit factories, let us say, would have to be cut, because the market for American-made cars would be sharply reduced. The British could refuse to carry American-made cars even at prohibitive rates and could take only their own makes into South America. Employment in Detroit—in a dozen other cities which supply that city with parts and assemblies—would be cut. Wages, too, would drop. A man in Indiana who runs a lathe that makes a part that is used in a certain sedan could be laid off because there would not be enough demand for that part.

It's complicated. But it's logical. A dwindling, inadequate merchant marine could hurt us individually and on a national scale as much as a strike in major industry affects a single city.

As an example of Government interference in industry's attempt to rebuild an adequate merchant fleet let me tell you about a ship which the company that I represent—the Delta Line—wanted to build in 1947. Delta operates cruise-cargo ships between New Orleans and South American east coast ports, runs on routes which the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 designated as "essential" and, therefore, to be served at regular intervals in the best interests of the United States.

Our ship, as we planned her, would carry plenty of cargo along with about 250 passengers and would make 16 or 17 knots. We asked the Federal Maritime Commission for approval of the plans—necessary because she would be built and operated under Government subsidy. The Commission approved these plans. In fact, we were ordered by contract to build the ship because she would provide an essential service as determined by law.

Then the Navy stepped in. Twenty knots, said the Navy. Two feet wider to improve damage stability. Two more bulkheads. Increased size of auxiliary machinery. With these and a few other alterations the Navy could convert our ship into a fast attack-transport capable of carrying 4,000 troops, their munitions and supplies, anywhere in the world, and sustain them for 30 days. The Navy was looking ahead.

We didn't object. In fact, the whole idea was great. The new ship would fill a gap in our service and provide a superb weapon of offense and supply if the threat of war should materialize.

We went ahead and spent $250,000 for plans, secured construction bids, quietly cheered when Congress appropriated $16,000,000 for her. It looked as if the American merchant marine might finally come back into its own, that we would play an active part in the renaissance.

The keel of our ship has never been laid. She is still only a dream. The $16,000,000 has been allowed to lapse, and there is little prospect that we or the Navy will soon get the ship which could mean so much to our national economy and to our national defense in these critical days.

The fact that this ship isn't available today can largely be attributed to the General Accounting Office and its penchant for assuming the right to make policy decisions. While we were going through the always prolonged preliminary throes of trying to start building our ship, the GAO questioned the amount of construction subsidy authorized for two other ships already being built by another line. GAO demanded an investigation. GAO got it, both of subsidies and of the Maritime Commission. The almost immediate result was the complete cessation of new construction of any ships under Federal subsidy, including ours.

These subsidies, controversial and misunderstood as most subsidies are, are necessary to the life of our merchant marine.

Only once, in time of peace, has any attempt been made to assure the American people that they would be served by an adequate merchant marine on a par with the needs of the Nation. That was following

1936, when the Merchant Marine Act was passed.

Two of its important provisions involved subsidies—one for construction, one for the operation, of ships. It was logical and, as I see it, necessary. For many, many years it has been possible to build a ship in Europe, for example, much more cheaply than in the United States, due primarily to lower labor costs. Under the 1936 act the Federal Government would pay the shipyard the difference between the cost of construction of a similar vessel in a foreign yard and the actual cost in an American yard. The buyer of the ship received none of the subsidy, simply contracted to buy the ship at the price based on foreign costs and operate it on an essential line for at least 20 years under the American flag. At the end of that time he would have repaid his mortgage to the Government.

American seamen live in the finest crew's quarters afloat. They are fed the best food. They are the best paid. In contrast, those of other countries are little better off than their predecessors of a half-century ago. So the 1936 act also provided that an operating subsidy be paid to ship operators who would run their ships on government-declared essential routes on predetermined schedules. The subsidy would amount to the difference between American and foreign costs in wages, subsistence, cost of stores, equipment, insurance, and repairs not compensated for by insurance.

No profit was guaranteed the operating line. In fact, any amount earned annually by the line over 10 percent was placed in a fund which, at the end of 10 years, was divided equally between the Government and the company, with the object of repaying, so far as possible, the subsidy to the Government. During the first 10 years, after 1936, of the operation of these essential routes, over 75 percent of the entire operating subsidy was paid back to the Government. Not a penny of the millions of dollars paid out annually in agriculture and other production subsidies is ever returned to the Government.

Another shipping line just recently rebid to charter three Government-owned vessels which it has been operating on a specific run. In accepting, the Maritime Commission said, "Fine, that's acceptable. But if you operate those three ships you must build two more 23-knot cargo-liners carrying 700 passengers each for the same route. Otherwise, no deal."

These new ships will have to receive both kinds of subsidy—construction and operation. But, in the present state of confusion, it is unlikely that any subsidy will be approved for some time.

The current mess, started by the General Accounting Office, was accentuated when Congress, at the urging of the administration and a report by the Hoover Commission, abolished last year the Maritime Commission, which had operated since 1936 and was under congressional rather than administration control, and replaced it with a three-man Federal Maritime Board reporting to the Secretary of Commerce. A 90-day temporary board was appointed. The appointees, not knowing if they would remain as such, did nothing. After their tenure, a new board of able men was gradually named. So far it has done nothing but batter its head against varied opposition from every other Federal department concerned.

As this article is concluded, the new Congress has made a beginning by reintroducing the enabling bills for the long-range program and has authorized a start on the construction of part of the proposed defense cargo-ship program.

Boiled down, the situation amounts to this: Every attempt since World War II by the shipping operators to expand, replace, or improve their fleets through new construction has been stymied by a vacillating foreign policy and by a lack of respect for the law which in 1936 authorized a shipbuilding and operating subsidy program, and by the lack of a well-founded and publicly stated maritime policy.

This, despite a law passed 15 years ago which definitely states:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

That's the law. But our operating merchant marine is no more capable of handling the requirements of a major war than it was in 1917 or 1941. At the time of Pearl Harbor we had little more than 1,100 cargo, tanker, and passenger vessels. Today we have about 1,150—plus 150 or so uneconomical Victory ships which were hauled out of mothballs for the Korean action. With few exceptions they are incapable of outrunning the fast submarines reportedly being built today by our potential enemies. (A recent survey estimated Russia's undersea fleet will number more than 1,000 by the end of 1951.)

I maintain that this course—our present governmental attitude toward our merchant marine—can lead only to disaster. If we are to consider the great number of vessels which we have tied up in mothballs, plus 80 Liberty ships which we loaned to Russia, we possess numerically the greatest merchant fleet in the world. But in actual fact the United States operates only 8 percent of the 13,000 merchant vessels in the world. England has in operation many more than double what we have. Norway, Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Russia, and Panama all operate fleets which may soon outstrip us in size and regularity of service and which eventually can take from us the relatively small percentage of our own export and import business which we now handle.

Since World War II the United States Government has sold 1,113 ships to foreign nations. Only 700 have been sold to companies operating under the American flag. Yet we spent something like $15,000,000,000 to build all our wartime merchant fleet and we have received or been promised less than $3,000,000,000 in return.

Most of our wartime merchant fleet of vessels probably will remain tied up, beam-to-beam—more than 2,000 ships—in the rivers and harbors of New York, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Texas, California, Oregon, and Washington. There they have been coated with preservatives, are inspected frequently by maintenance crews, and are running up an annual bill of $8,000,000 to no purpose. Most of these vessels are slow, uneconomical Liberty ships built in the rush and confusion of the last war, ships that could more profitably be sold for scrap than stored as costly reminders of our last unreadiness. Yet this is the fleet on which we must depend in war.

Unless we begin immediately to build up our merchant fleet, by the end of the present decade all of our ships will be approaching obsolescence. They will be too slow to compete with foreign vessels. They will need increasingly more costly repairs. They will be impossible to operate at a reasonable profit. Then we shall be forced to turn over the transportation of our exports and imports to foreign ships.

Today the United States has the greatest export-import business in the world. We export huge quantities of raw materials and manufactured goods resulting from the excellence of our industrial system. Fifteen to 25 percent of all goods manufactured in the United States are exported.

Several ship operators, including my own company, would like to keep this business and, consequently, our merchant marine alive by acquiring many new ships for use on essential routes as the nucleus of a fast, efficient transport fleet in time of war. But, as I have already outlined, we are being thwarted by the fumbling of our Federal Government.

If it were within my power to implement a workable program for the reestablishment of our merchant marine as a world power essential to both our national defense and our national economy I would recommend the following steps:

The executive branch of the Government—preferably through the President—should definitely state that we need a strong merchant fleet capable of fulfilling our needs in peace and war as contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and that its construction and operation should be subsidized with Federal funds where necessary.

We should embark on a 10-year construction program of defense cargo ships costing approximately $8,000,000 each. At least 50 of these vessels should be started each year under a Government subsidy program. This program would cost approximately $400,000,000 a year—a mere nothing compared with our other defense expenditures—and from past experience there is an almost certain guaranty that half of that amount—$200,000,000 annually—will be returned by the operators through purchase.

We should immediately start the construction of at least 15 cargo-passenger ships which would incorporate features recommended by the Navy for their conversion into attack transports. At present, when a shipping line takes over a vessel built under Federal subsidy the 20-year mortgage applies to every ship owned by the company. In the case of passenger-transport ships—because of their high cost—the mortgage should apply only to that individual ship, so that if the operator lost money on it, he could return it to the Government with the loss of only his 25 percent down payment, plus any interim payments he had made, and the Government would get back a virtually new and valuable ship.

An American, whether he operates under a Government subsidy or not, should be permitted to build a Government-approved ship with a construction subsidy, provided he agrees to operate it under the American flag for 20 years. At present, only those lines which contract to serve essential routes are permitted construction subsidies.

Today any vessel must be operated by the shipping company for a minimum of 17 years before it can be turned in on a new subsidized ship. To reduce the danger of multiple obsolescence of many ships at once, the period should be reduced to 12 years.

The Maritime Board, at an appropriate time, should be returned to its status as a separate agency operating under the Congress from the Department of Commerce. Thus it would be less subject to political and department interference at or below Cabinet levels.

Once before—from 1932 to 1936—American martime authority was vested in a board

under the Commerce Department. It failed, hampered and harassed by politics and external argument. Little or nothing was done to improve the merchant marine.

We should scrap the Liberty-ship fleet tied up in our rivers and use the money from the sale of the steel as the partial basis of a new ship-construction program.

We should urge our Senators and Representatives to a greater understanding of the vital import of a strong merchant marine, and should demand from Congress a constructive program if the executive branch of the Government continues it uninterested policy.

We should reestablish, without delay, a program of fair and adequate construction and operating subsidies, so that we may compete on an equal footing with foreign shipyards and foreign operators.

We should, in other words, build up a merchant marine that will serve us as effectively as is necessary to our continuing advancement as the greatest and strongest Nation truly representative of democracy on the face of the earth.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. In the midst of world-wide worry and tension, Mr. Speaker, many of us were privileged yesterday to enjoy a genuinely thrilling few hours. The foreign minister of a sovereign nation of Europe discussed the state of the nation he represents—both on domestic matters and international relations. Later in the afternoon he presented to the Library of Congress a reproduction of the world's most beautiful manuscript, the Book of Kells.

This manuscript is to go on display today. I hope all my colleagues will take advantage of the opportunity to examine it. When they do I hope they will have in mind the fact that the proud little Republic of Ireland took occasion to present this great work, which is the story of the life and death of Christ as told in the four gospels, at an hour in the world's history when all men need the inspiration—the renewed faith and confidence—which can come only from Divine Providence. We can be proud of this wonderful gesture of friendship. The world will have wiped out the cause of 95 percent of its woes when all nations can enjoy the kind of foreign relations which were exemplified here yesterday.

I include in the RECORD the address of Hon. Sean MacBride, Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of Ireland, delivered at the National Press Club luncheon, and his remarks at the Library of Congress when he presented the reproduction of the Book of Kells.

I include, also, the Washington Post account of the Irish Foreign Minister's address.

ADDRESS BY SEAN MACBRIDE, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 14, 1951

The honor you have done me in asking me to be your guest here is one which gives me a very special pleasure. I have been a newspaperman myself and I have come here today simply as a colleague who happens to be Foreign Minister of a small nation which has very strong and ancient ties with America, to tell you something of how that nation stands today.

I am told that Irish names are not unknown in American journalism and, if so, there must be among you many whose parents and grandparents came from Ireland. The land they left was vastly different from the Ireland we know today. The Ireland of the last century was, in the material sense, one of the poorest countries in Western Europe. Her population was in process of being halved by the results of a famine on a scale that had been unknown to Western Europe since the Middle Ages. Today, Ireland is on the road to economic progress and development. Our wealth is reasonably well divided: we have no very great extremes of rich and poor. The rural slums, the ramshackle cabins, are nearly a thing of the past, and although there are slums still in certain of our cities, we shall, unless a general war or acute shortages wreck our plans with those of the rest of the world, get rid of these within about 10 years. Our population, which had been falling steadily, although at a decreasing rate, since the famine of the last century, is now taking an upward turn. Work is progressing on a $120,000,000 land development scheme and on drainage, rural electrification and hospital building schemes of a similar scale. The number employed in industry, though still small, is rising steadily.

I don't know if any of you, Americans with your history which has been no less prosperous than glorious, can appreciate what that means to an Irishman. It means that a nation which was nearly killed, whose life had almost ebbed away in the course of a long and agonizing struggle, is at last on the turn. The efforts of many Irishmen have gone to make this change and, not least, those Irishmen who worked and fought to secure for us the independence without which a nation cannot work out its own salvation. Since a measure of independence was obtained, successive governments have played their parts—that of Mr. Cosgrave, that of Mr. de Valera, and now Mr. Costello's government, of which I am a member. None of these governments has been infallible, but under all of them the work has gone ahead and is still going on. While the Ireland of today is no Utopia, one finds that atmosphere of hope and confidence which is lacking in many other countries today.

Much of the progress made in the last couple of years is attributable to the Marshall plan and in particular to the really constructive and helpful cooperation which we received from the ECA. The direct financial aid which we received was valuable but far more important in any view was the economic planning which we had to undertake in conjunction with the ECA. I have always held the view that in the long run the most permanent benefits that will accrue to Europe from the Marshall plan will be technical assistance and the system of economic analysis and cooperation resulting from a policy answered by ECA. I would like to avail of this opportunity of paying a public tribute to the far-sighted and constructive approach initiated by the ECA in Europe under the leadership of men like Paul Hoffman, Averell Harriman, and Bill Foster.

It is often suggested or implied by critics that Ireland is so preoccupied with her own affairs that she cares nothing for what goes on around her. I think it would be hard to put forward a suggestion that was more wholly misleading. It is not a question of whether the Irish people want to be internationally-minded or not; they cannot help being internationally-minded for they are an international people. An ordinary Kerry family may well have two uncles and an aunt in New Jersey, Chicago, and Springfield, Mass., a cousin in Montreal and another in Melbourne and probably a son or daughter in England or Scotland as well. With most of these they regularly correspond and I think that if some of our older people in, say Galway, were asked to draw a map of the world they might if they were not careful, show New York as being nearer than Dublin.

The people of Irish origin, scattered throughout the world and now playing their parts as citizens of other countries, still retain many of the characteristics of the people of the mother country. They are, for the most part, whether they be Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, religious folk, and they constitute a moral force and go to reinforce the stabilizing elements in the countries in which they are. They are a virile and active force within the community of free nations—the very sort of people, tainted neither with communism nor reaction, of which the west stands most in need. While they remain fondly attached to Ireland and look to Ireland for moral leadership they certainly do not look to Ireland for political leadership. They are loyal Americans, Australians, and Canadians, or citizens of the country in which they have settled. At home our wish is to play our part with them, as well as with the ancient European nations to whose sisterhood Ireland belongs, in the building and preserving of a just and free society.

What part is Ireland, in fact, playing in international affairs? I think that question is best answered by reference to the four international organizations with which we might be directly concerned: The United Nations, the Council of Europe, the OEEC, and the North Atlantic Treaty organization.

As regards the United Nations the position is that we applied for the membership several years ago, being willing to undertake the full responsibilities of such membership. We were, however, kept out by the veto of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—Russia. Ironical as it may sound, Russia says that she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country.

As regards the Council of Europe and the OEEC, we are members of both these organizations. In both of them our representatives have consistently adopted the progressive policy of favoring developments which tended toward a united Europe. In the OEEC we have favored greater liberalization of trade, and we are in a position to do so since our own trade policies are among the most liberal in Europe. In the Council of Europe we have supported every measure which tended to strengthen the Assembly as against the Committee of Ministers, that is to say, every measure which represented a step on the road to a parliament of Europe. This was the attitude which was taken up by a country which has been represented as stubbornly or narrowly nationalistic. In fact no nation has been so prompt as we have been to support the uniting of Europe and the free and voluntary merging of individual sovereignties. We are however quite as stubbornly nationalistic as the United States would be when it is suggested that we should surrender our rights or a portion of our sovereignty to another nation.

As regards the last organization, that of the Atlantic Pact powers, the position is

eign name, Corno di Bassetto, and then emerged as George Bernard Shaw. Miss Horniman and the Abbey Theater players have brought delight to thousands in our stalls. Our poets have sought beauty by frank, unblushing trespass on the realms which Yeats made his. From James Stephens we have taken up the chase of leprechauns. A generation of my fellow citizens learned political science and political suspicion from the works of a great philosopher, Mr. Dooley. Don Byrne has interpreted for us the magic that is in your soil and on your tongues and of your hearts.

But there are modern instances. The Book of Kells stands for something else. In sharp contrast, its antiquity stands for ancient, rooted, friendships, its presence here, for the commonality of freedom seeking and freedom winning, its text for those ideals and energies and high resolves which hold the fairest promise of survival and a future. Itself a blend of supreme art and consummate craftsmanship it has neither counterpart nor counterfeit among the medieval manuscripts which destructive time has spared to us. Curiously, it inspires no argument but only firm agreement. It is by consent and honor the finest product of that unparalleled efflorescence of Irish achievement which set the fine example for Western Europe in the centuries following the fall of Rome. In the Middle Ages it was at once model and goad and challenge for the perfection of calligraphy, the eloquence of illumination, and the nobility of striving. It is a testament worthy of the testaments it contains. Today, after a millenium and more, it evokes the same wonder and enlists the same devotion that brought it into being.

And so, Mr. Minister, please say to them who dwell in County Meath, and to the officers and fellows of Trinity, and to all the men and women of your green land, that your magnificent message of many meanings has reached one who is, at least by marriage, Irish. That may be their comforting assurance that the Book of Kells is inalienable and safe and somehow still at home. And for the people of these States, in whose name I am allowed to speak, convey to your constituency a profound and sturdy gratitude.

[From the Washington Post of March 15, 1951]

IRISH FOREIGN MINISTER COMPARES BRITAIN TO RUSSIA

Sean MacBride, Ireland's 47-year-old Minister for External Affairs, said yesterday that his country wanted to play a full part in international affairs, but was prevented from doing so by two powers—Russia and Britain.

"I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable," MacBride said. "All I do say is that they are inclined to look rather alike from where we sit.

"Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient, and, therefore, just."

Minister MacBride spoke at a luncheon of the National Press Club, and evoked a good deal of applause and laughter with his eloquence and wit. The main dish at the luncheon was Irish stew.

The Irish cabinet officer said that Ireland had been kept out of the United Nations by the veto of Russia.

"Ironical as it may sound," he said, "Russia says she cannot regard us as a democratic or peace-loving country."

He said that Ireland was asked to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but refused because the six northeastern counties of Ireland are held under British rule. He pointed out that any Irish Government would be driven from office if it attempted to enter into a military alliance with a power that is responsible for the partitioning of Ireland.

"This is not one of those ancient grievances which we are supposed to hug to our bosoms," MacBride said, "It is quite modern and very real and very present. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Treaty which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept the Mason and Dixon's line as an international frontier.

"You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden."

Minister MacBride, in answering questions at the conclusion of his prepared talk, said there was no question that Ireland ought to be in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"Whatever else you may say about Ireland," he said, amidst laughter, "she is plump in the middle of the North Atlantic Treaty territory."

He said that the time Ireland was invited to join the Atlantic Pact, in the interests of greater safety and strength, she suggested that the members discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded membership. This suggestion, he said, was not acted on.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I shall deliver over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, March 26, 1951:

These days we hear a lot of talk about inflation, price control, wage freeze, communism, hidden taxes, and "where do we go from here."

Now most of the problems are very real, but in a strange way that we cannot see and come to grips with. They bother us because we fear the unknown.

For a change, suppose we take a subject that is familiar to every American. And its name will be the Average City in the United States. In colonial times, most people lived in the country. In 1951 most of them live in communities. New York City alone has a population greater than forty-odd individual States. Each city has a transient number of people who work here or visit it frequently. Therefore, it may be said that all Americans are city folk either on a full- or part-time basis.

With the vast network of railroads and highways and airlines and with tens of millions of cars and trucks one would expect to find us getting away from urban concentrations. But these vast transportation facilities lead from city to city to city. We have seen the growth of suburban areas, but they are so close to the major cities that it is hard to tell the difference.

The average American community is the nerve center of our civilization.

Each is the focus of trade or industry.

The organization of city life is a big job.

To protect the life and health and property of its cliff dwellers is an elemental problem. There are others more complex and difficult.

So much so that we have had to create a new profession called city management to save our municipalities from a breakdown.

The traffic war alone in Boston or Los Angeles is a nightmare in itself. And a new one that didn't exist 30 years ago. Pollution of air and water is another modern plague that endangers our overcrowded centers of population.

Add to these physical troubles the old moral sores of crime and corruption, and we can understand how hard it is to control our mushrooming cities.

It is a major domestic challenge in time of peace.

And one that would be magnified a thousand times if we had to contend with sabotage, germ warfare, or death from the skies.

Imaginary?

Look back 1 year.

Whoever dreamed on February 26, 1950, that we would have been deeply committed in Korea and would have suffered more than 50,000 casualties 1 year later?

No one, at least not in the United States.

With hindsight it is easy to say now that we could have avoided some of this cost if we had been prepared.

The grim truth is that we were not prepared then.

From that lesson we are learning to have a little foresight and to protect ourselves against further shocks by taking out a little insurance in advance.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, has testified that even with the best of interception a majority of enemy bombers would be able to get through and press home the attack on our industrial cities.

This is not a pleasant fact.

It is a realistic one.

What do we do then?

If we are organized and prepared to meet such a threat, the loss of life and the damage can be held to a minimum. The enemy will have lost his greatest opportunity, for our strategic bombers will be able to retaliate in force, sustained by our productive capacity that has been hurt but not destroyed.

If we fail to take these precautions, we shall be victims of the last Pearl Harbor, the last because we will never have a chance to recover from our defenseless, shattered, and defeated cities.

Our people's will to resist would be numbed by an overwhelming disaster.

Under the present circumstances, I cannot understand how anyone either in the United States or abroad can object if we set up defenses for our own cities.

Even the Communist propaganda machine, clever as it is in twisting the facts, could never call preparations for the civilian defense of Detroit or St. Louis as an aggression against the people of Budapest or Leningrad.

In normal times, it is our duty as citizens to pay out some money and not enough responsibility to protect our cities from germs, fire, crime, and ignorance.

In the present national emergency, declared because we are under pressure from an enemy who might blast our cities with fearful weapons, the ordinary safeguards would provide us with no defense.

Evidently we need something more.

I believe that volunteer service for civilian defense is both necessary and good. It will help to save our families, our homes, and our standard of living. And it will give us a greater knowledge of and respect for our communities and our fellow citizens that will improve the life of every city after we have survived these anxious years.

On Friday, January 21, 1951, the President signed H. R. 9798, which provides for a 3-year, three billion, one hundred million civil defense program. It extends Federal aid for the construction of air-raid shelters, for the stockpiling of blood plasma, and other special equipment, and sets up a Civil Defense Agency with authority—

1. To mobilize all Federal agencies for the aid of a stricken or threatened area.

this: We were asked to join and we refused. You will want to know why.

I think on this vitally important question I cannot do better than take as my point of departure the cardinal principles of your own foreign policy, as set out in an admirable document, Our Foreign Policy, issued by your State Department.

These are the three points:

"We are an independent nation and we want to keep our independence;

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom and we mean to keep our freedom;

"We are a peaceful people and we want to get rid of wars and the threat of wars."

We, in Ireland, would subscribe wholeheartedly to every one of these principles but, being historically less fortunate than you, we are forced to state them for ourselves in a somewhat different manner. This is how we have to state them:

"We are not an independent nation because a portion of it is still unfree but we want to achieve our independence;

"We attach the highest importance to individual freedom but many of our people have not got that freedom;

"We are a peaceful people but part of our territory has been taken from us by war and the threat of war."

These points which, as you will surmise, refer to the fact that part of our country, the six northeastern counties, is held under British rule, may seem exaggerated to you. They do not seem exaggerated to us or to the people, the majority in the greatest part of the British held territory, who want to be with us. I do not bring this problem before you because I expect that you, with the vast problems which you must debate every day, can concern yourselves with the intricacies of the methods by which this small territory, in defiance of geography, is held as part of Britain. I am not going to discuss, nor, I am sure, do you want to hear of the finesses of boundary drawing. Discrimination, gerrymandering and political police by which the entity known as Northern Ireland was set up and is maintained, but I do want you to know that that partition is the cause of such feeling in Ireland that no Irish Government could attempt, without immediately being driven from office, to enter into a military alliance with the power which is responsible for it. This is not one of those ancient grievances which we are supposed to hug to our bosoms. It is quite modern and very real and very present. It would be as impossible for an Irish Government to accept the article of the Atlantic Pact which binds each participant to respect the territorial integrity of the others as it would have been for Abraham Lincoln to accept the Mason and Dixon line as an international frontier. You do not accept the territorial integrity of a neighbor who is encamped in your garden. We are, I need hardly say, fully conscious of the gravity of our decision. Indeed, in our reply to the invitation to join the pact we suggested that, in the interests of the greater safety and strength of the chain of Atlantic defense, the members might discuss ways and means of solving the problem which precluded us from membership. Unfortunately, this suggestion was not acted on.

I wish to make it clear that there is no question of bargaining on this matter. It would be unworthy, both of the great issue involved—the future of the Atlantic community—and of the historic tradition of the Irish nation, were we to attempt to bargain on this. We are seeking our full freedom and independence as of right and we intend to get it.

The position then, in short, is that Ireland is willing and anxious to play her full part in international affairs, that she is already making a certain contribution but is prevented from doing her full share by two outside powers: Russia and Britain. I do not say that the policies or actions of these two powers are the same, or even comparable. All I do say is that they are inclined to look rather alike from where we sit. Both are powers with imperial traditions and to imperial powers the partitioning of small nations has always seemed expedient and, therefore, just. This was, and is, the policy of Russia in Poland. It has been the policy of Russia in Korea. In both cases the Russians found some Poles and some Koreans to support them, but in both cases the partition of a nation, a disaster in itself, leads to other disasters.

A nation is not a vague territory that can be cut up at will. It is a living, breathing thing. It is not easy to dig the grave of a nation, and when you have dug it, it is an unquiet grave. I think that you in this room who do so much to mold the policies of your great Nation, cannot do better than to reflect upon the cases of Poland, of Korea, and of Ireland, and to believe, contrary to the imperialistic maxim, that what is unjust can never be expedient, since there is something in humanity which stubbornly rejects, and in the long run overthrows, an unjust solution. I think that the greatest and the most effective political leaders, those whose work has been solid and enduring, are not the showy Machiavellians, or modern totalitarian dictators, with their contempt for people, and especially for people who were militarily weak or numerically insignificant, but the leaders who, like Washington and Lincoln, believed in human freedom as a guiding principle. Those who stand for that freedom have always been reputed damnably awkward people. It is, therefore, with no shame, but with pride, that I say that the Irish, still, stand for freedom and democratic rule and therefore may still be portrayed to you as damnably awkward people.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE SEAN MACBRIDE, MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND, AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, MARCH 14, 1951

Whether the Book of Kells—known of old as "the Gospel of Columcille"—was inscribed and illuminated in the ancient town of Kells is a question which has not yet been solved. The last few pages of the manuscript, which might have enlightened us on this point, have been missing for many centuries. But it is now generally accepted that the book was produced at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century.

We know from an entry in the Annals of Ulster that the book was preserved in Kells in 1006. In that year the Annals record that "the great Gospel of Columcille was wickedly stolen by night out of the western sacristy of the large stone church of Kells. The Gospel was found after two months and twenty nights its gold having been taken off, and a sod over it".

For the next three centuries the famous manuscript continued to survive in the Monastery of Kells, now threatened by the violence and destruction of the Anglo-Norman invaders. Its association with Kells was finally broken in 1539, the year in which all surviving Irish monasteries were dissolved by order of Henry VIII. The manuscript was handed over to the care of one Henry Plunkett, probably a relative of the last abbot of Kells. A marginal note by Plunkett shows that some of the pages were missing in his day.

In 1661 the book became the property of Trinity College, Dublin, where it has remained ever since. Three hundred and thirty-nine pages long, it contains the Four Gospels in Latin, illustrated by pictures of the Evangelists and scenes from the life of our Lord. It is remarkable for the beauty of the writing, for the great variety of the capital letters, for the size of the initials on the monogram pages. It is the most elaborate Irish manuscript extant and the delicacy and beauty of the design are such that in the words of one observer "they might have been drawn in Paradise." Not without reason has the Book of Kells become known as one of the world's most beautiful books.

Now, after the lapse of 1200 years Swiss experts and Irish scholars, aided by modern color photography, have combined to produce this copy of the Book of Kells. It was, I understand, a slow and difficult task. There were more than 650 distinct shades in the book. Each page was photographed in Dublin, the photograph taken to Berne for technical treatment and printing then the proof returned to Dublin to be compared color by color, line by line with the original. Some pages went through more than 25 printings before the experts were satisfied.

One day, I understand, someone suggested that this was a needlessly complicated arrangement. Wouldn't it be better if the Book of Kells was flown to Switzerland? The Swiss expert scrutinizing print and original looked up from his task. "You can always replace an airplane," he remarked laconically—and that was that. The Book of Kells stayed in Dublin.

It is not without significance that this presentation takes place in the United States of America the greatest free federation of states which the world has ever known. The skilled reproduction which we see before us is largely the work of Swiss experts, men from the confederation of freedom-loving self-governing cantons which the outside world has grown to love and respect as Switzerland. The original Book of Kells was produced some 1200 years ago in an Ireland in which the individual tuatha, grouped into five kingdoms, presided over by one High King while sharing the same language, the same Brehon code of laws, the same rich folklore and literature, the same social life and customs, yet possessed a large measure of local autonomy and in fact formed a United States of Ireland.

On behalf of the people and Government of Ireland I am honored to have the privilege of presenting this copy to the Library of the Congress of the United States which has always given us its sympathy in our struggle to regain our liberty and to maintain the civilization and culture of which this book is an example.

REMARKS OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, LUTHER HARRIS EVANS, ON THE PRESENTATION OF THE BOOK OF KELLS, COOLIDGE AUDITORIUM, MARCH 14, 1951

You Irish have a saying: "Glory be to God; it's the fine day that's in it." I use it now (employing a Texas accent) for you have made a fine day in this. But my pleasure in this afternoon is more than pleasure in a gift. The Library of Congress has—or had until a few minutes ago when last I looked—a book. No such book, to be sure as that of Kells, which, legend holds, was penned by Columba himself almost a millenium before Columbus provided the possibility of this repository for that magnificent reproduction you have entrusted to my care. No, our gratitude for your generosity is not confined to tangibles, but spreads beyond an obvious cupidity and a lamentable sense of proprietorship to the very race which makes it. Specifically, our gratitude goes out to the island people and their government, who have so lavishly enriched our collections. In sharing with us the greatest of your cultural monuments you continue a great tradition.

You have delighted the American audience with the luminous loveliness of Synge and the wit and daring of a vegetarian-musicologist who once called himself by a for-

of the kind and magnitude that will drain off excess spending power, and of coordinated fiscal and monetary policies to restrain inflationary pressures, as discussed in the subsequent articles in this letter.

ESSENTIALS OF INFLATION CONTROL

In this brief record of 1 month's developments can be seen the basic reasons why the program to curb inflation is working badly. With respect to price and wage controls, the weaknesses in part are inherent. A freeze in either prices or wages destroys the flexibility which in normal times is relied upon to keep the economy in balance. It freezes inequities and impracticable relationships and for that reason checks production and trade, unless relief is given. But relief or exceptions in any direction raise demands for compensating relief or exceptions elsewhere. Meanwhile powerful political groups use their power to protect themselves against sacrifice, at the expense of requiring greater sacrifice from others. To exert pressure for this purpose, labor union leaders walked out of the Wage Stabilization Board, resigned from all positions in the defense effort, and denounced Mr. C. E. Wilson, whose offense seems to be that as Defense Mobilization Administrator he is determined to get his job done effectively and with regard to the general interest above special interests. Fortunately Mr. Wilson continues to enjoy the confidence of the country.

The United States Treasury seeks exemption from any increase in borrowing costs that might be caused by desirable anti-inflationary policies. The Congressional hearings on taxation become a cockpit of conflicting representations by groups intent on protecting themselves, culminating in the proposal of a labor union economist that exemptions from the personal income tax be raised to $2,500 for a married couple; this of course would free more billions of dollars of income from taxation and leave it to exert its inflationary powers in the markets. While this goes on the rise in incomes and spending power continues, and well designed anti-inflationary measures such as Regulations W and X, limiting consumer and housing credit respectively, fail to have the anticipated effects because people can pay cash or meet larger down payments without the expected difficulty.

This list could be extended. The evil is that if the politically powerful groups obtain exceptions the inflationary pressures will not be contained, and all will suffer. The problem of leadership, if the objective of establishing an effective price and wage stabilization in the next few months is to be reached, is to get people to think and act in terms of the general interest, and resolutely to place the welfare of the whole country ahead of group interests in the hard decisions now in the making.

The National Health Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address I made before the Midwood Jewish Center in Brooklyn on the subject of the national health insurance program:

THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Before I begin the discussion of a national health insurance program I believe it is high time that it was made clear what we are talking about. The misleading tag that has been placed on this program, namely, socialized medicine, has done more to confuse the issue than any other factor. You will forgive my bluntness, I am sure, when I say that this was and still is a deliberate campaign to becloud the real meaning and benefits of such a program.

This must be made absolutely clear: The national health insurance program is not socialized medicine. I have yet to see any bit of propaganda against this program making any attempts to analyze the bills. What I have seen is vague ill-denied use of such words as "socialism," "bureaucracy," "Government controlled," and so on. If the opponents of a national health insurance program have read the administration bills they certainly take the greatest pains to conceal that fact; and if they have not read the administration bills, then most certainly the public trust and confidence have been clearly abused.

The national health insurance program is exactly what it says it is—it is insurance. The purpose is to enable the American people to pay for good medical and hospital care by requiring them to put a small percentage of their income into a national insurance fund which would be used to provide such services. It is based on the exact same principle as unemployment insurance, and social security. It is based on the exact same principle as private insurance. In other words, periodic payments are made at a time when ability to pay is present to provide for future needs. As in social-security payments, unemployment compensation, and private insurance, moneys are paid into a common fund out of which fund, benefits will be derived when conditions demand it. If this be socialism, then make the most of it.

It has been charged that the right of the citizen to pick his own doctor will be wiped out. I would like to quote a section—a direct quote, if you please—from my bill, H. R. 27, section 203: "Every individual eligible for personal health services available under this title may freely select the physician, dentist, nurse, medical group, hospital, or other person of his choice to render such services, and may change such selection."

It has been charged that such a program makes mere political pawns of doctors, dentists, and nurses. Nonsense. The bill assures professional freedom to doctors. Their medical work is not to be subject to lay direction. Doctors are represented on all commissions and advisory councils. All purely medical matters are to be settled only by doctors.

Doctors and other health personnel are free to participate full-time, part-time, or not at all as they choose. Let me read from section 220 headed "Professional rights and responsibilities":

"(b) Every physician, dentist, or nurse agreeing to render services as benefits under this title shall be free to practice his profession in the locality of his own choosing, consistent with the requirements of the laws of the States.

"(c) Every physician, dentist, nurse, hospital, or other person entering into an agreement under this part shall be free to the extent consistent with applicable State law and customary professional ethics to accept or reject as a patient any individual requesting his services."

Now let me read subsection (d) to you:

"No supervision or control over the details of administration or operation, or over the selection, tenure, or compensation of personnel, shall be exercised under the authority of this title over any hospital which has agreed to furnish personal health services as benefits."

Now let's look a little bit at the pay. A national health insurance fund would be set up in the United States Treasury and would consist of an annual sum equal to 3 percent of earnings up to $3,600. Workers would contribute a small regular sum, amounting to 1½ percent of their earnings up to $3,600 a year (a maximum of $54 a year). This would be matched by equal contributions from their employers.

Physicians and dentists could choose any of the following methods by which to be paid: on a fee-for-service basis, as is now the most common method; so much per year per person; on a salary basis; or by a combination of methods. The bill provides that the payment must adequately remunerate for the services rendered and that is determined by the advice of the professional people participating in the administration of the program.

Now let it be noted that major administrative responsibility would be placed in the hands of the people where the services are rendered and received. Each State government would be able to administer the program in its area. Each State would name its own agency to administer the program and its own advisory council. The Federal Board would administer the program within a State only if a State did not accept the responsibility.

In addition to health insurance, the bill grants to nonprofit institutions and agencies aid for medical education and medical research up to $10,000,000 in the first year and $15,000,000 the second year; thereafter up to 2 percent of the amount spent for benefits in the preceding year.

Grants to States are authorized for a comprehensive program of basic State and local health services, for maternal and child health, crippled children, chronic disease, industrial hygiene and related services, and for training of personnel.

It provides Federal funds for the construction of needed hospitals, clinics, and health centers.

Perhaps you are asking yourself why this program is necessary at all. Why can't we continue the way we have continued heretofore—a man is sick, a man, woman, or child is ill; he goes to the doctor; gets his treatment; pays his money? But is it really of question of "leave well enough alone"?

Four fears attend the average person through his life—the fear of unemployment, the fear of accident, the fear of old age, and the fear of sickness. It is a common enough, though tragic, story of life savings being wiped out by an illness. Doctor bills, hospital bills, and dental bills have, in many instances, mortgaged many lives. Is it not logical that unavoidable illnesses be paid for when the ability to pay is still with us? Or shall we wait until the dread attacks us and then draw upon our limited savings?

That is what all insurance is—a compulsory savings to meet a need when it arises. The whole program, to my mind, is a prudent, practical, American way to insure the very best for its people, self-paid for by the people out of their earnings. It is confined to people who make no more than $3,600 a year, thereby covering those people whose savings at best barely cover when the tragedy of illness overcomes them either as breadwinners or as heads of families. Lost wages and lost production come to $27,000,000,000 a year.

Over 40 percent of America's young men were not able to pass wartime draft standards. One out of every six rejected had remedial or preventive diseases or defects.

2. To spend unlimited funds to aid stricken area.

3. To requisition equipment and property from any source.

The States and cities would have to match the Federal contributions.

Last June there were less than six full-time State directors of civilian defense. Now there is one for every State and Territory.

Detailed plans have been worked out on local, State, and regional levels, but these blueprints mean little unless we have the supplies and the trained volunteers to give us some measure of real protection within a matter of minutes.

The people working on the problem at Chicago have figured that we couldn't expect more than 8 minutes warning before an atomic-bomb attack.

But how many Americans know what they should do in the next 8 minutes?

What would you do now—sitting in the easy chair before your radio or washing the dishes in the kitchen? Has anyone told you? Have you read up anything about it? The children in your home would look to you for emergency protection because the civilian-defense people at their posts or on their way to them would have their hands full battling fire and confusion and ministering to the wounded.

It is a question for sober thought and answer in terms of immediate and personal responsibility.

The average American city is a structure of many buildings, laced together by streets, in which thousands of human beings move and function with a minimum of friction. Your civilian defense agency has to protect the city first and you secondarily. It is a group effort.

Red Russia has a stockpile of 50 or more A-bombs.

Perhaps your city is designated to receive one of these, or you live within 100 miles of a major target city and must be prepared to offer refuge to its evacuees.

How much progress has your community made in preparing for such an emergency?

Luckily, most cities have done something on their own initiative without waiting for the State and Federal Governments to catch up with the realities of 1951.

Norfolk, Va., and San Mateo, Calif., report that they are almost completely ready to handle any disaster. Uniontown, Pa., has lined up its beauty shops as first-aid stations, and San Antonio, Tex., has given its taxicab drivers and its bus systems a basic training in the technique of moving the population from a hard-hit area.

Schenectady, N. Y., has figured out bridge loads and clearances in case of a mass emergency exit and is recruiting volunteer stretcher bearers; Revere, Mass., is using television to explain civilian defense to the people at home.

A disaster manual, written in plain words and with pictures to show what each individual should do to protect himself and others, ought to be in the possession of every school child and every grown-up in this Nation. A few cities and States are putting out their own manuals, but this isn't enough. The source of such vital information—the Federal Government—is so bogged down with red tape that it can't seem to get out these prescriptions for safety to the people it is supposed to serve. Maybe if the first Russian A-bomb is dropped on Washington and burns up the suffocating mass of bureaucratic waste paper, the way will be cleared for direct communication and effective teamwork between the Government and the public.

Our present stockpile of A-bombs won't do us much good as long as we are wide open to attack. And the Soviet Union is far ahead of us in protective measures. Much of its industrial power has been dispersed, and its citizens have been well trained in civil defense. Sooner than we think, the Soviet Union will be able to direct simultaneous A-bomb attacks against many of our harbors and industrial centers. To absorb this without crippling damage we must scatter our industries and decentralize our Federal Government, and set up an effective warning and interception system.

The only power in the world that the Soviet planners fear is the power of American production. In fact, a complete civilian-defense program that actually protects our industries, our people and their ability to work, will discourage a Soviet attack. They will not strike if they know that we are ready to take it and strike back in turn.

And our readiness will be based upon our ability to keep American cities going as producers of military supplies.

We can defend ourselves against atomic attack, but we cannot buy absolute protection. England survived because it was able to take and rally from the fury of repeated enemy air attacks. And make note of the fact that England started to prepare its civilian defense in 1936, 3 years before the outbreak of war.

In the light of all this, what shall we do?

Sign up as volunteers for local defense.

Help in the work of planning dispersal and for the setting up of decontamination facilities. Each city needs emergency hospitals, mobile first-aid units, fire-fighting units, emergency feeding and housing accommodations, and other programs for the relief of target areas.

I feel that the American people should know of the dangers that face them. I do not hold with those who say "Don't tell them the truth for they will give way to fear and hysteria."

Rich or poor, great or humble, we're all in the same house as far as this threat to our security is concerned. Given the details, we can accept them and learn to live with danger and not try to shield ourselves with helpless and pathetic innocence.

Only preparedness can possibly ward off an attack.

There is no other way.

As one of your public servants, I consider it my duty to give you a few of the facts in the time at my disposal. I do this so that you will demand a genuine program for your community, that you will become a part of it, so that our combined efforts will build an alert and strong America that will warn the aggressor not to attack, because he will fail against the strength of our civilian defense.

Price Stabilization—An Economic View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an analysis of the price stabilization situation from the March monthly letter on economic conditions and Government finance of the National City Bank of New York. It emphasizes that the welfare of the whole country must stand ahead of group interests and calls attention to the hard decisions which must be made in the public interest when the Defense Production Act of 1950 is extended this year:

PRESENT RELATION OF WAGES AND LIVING COSTS

The accompanying chart [not printed] sets forth as of latest available dates the relation of wage rates in the manufacturing industries to the cost of living calculated on the base period January 1950, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics data. It shows that in November average straight time wage rates (excluding overtime premiums) were almost exactly in line with the cost of living. Later figures unfortunately are not available. To reach the allowable 10 percent increase, a rise of nearly 5 percent above the average November rates could take place, even without the good-sized loopholes asked by Mr. Johnston.

The chart also shows that the straight time rate understates factory workers' income, because earnings are made up not only of straight time rates but of overtime and other premiums. Another line in the chart shows actual hourly earnings, averaging overtime premiums over the workweek. This line rose above the cost of living line in September and has maintained a good lead since. Finally, average weekly earnings are given. Reflecting the influence of longer hours, they show a steady gain in real purchasing power.

The margin between contractual straight time rates and actual hourly earnings is almost certain to widen as the familiar "upgrading" and shifting of jobs, which inevitably develop in tight labor markets, makes its appearance. Thus the rise in hourly earnings under the formula can obviously exceed 10 percent, and by a substantial margin if all the loopholes asked by Mr. JOHNSTON are provided. What the cost of living may be by June 30—the date when revision is promised—remains to be seen. But the probability indicated by the respective lines on the chart is that factory workers under the formula will enjoy a rise of real income on an hourly basis—in other words in real earnings per unit of work—even without the further increase in working hours which in many industries is desirable.

INFLATIONARY EFFECTS

If this is the outcome the influence of the wage formula will not be to establish equity, but to create inequity. The purchasing power of factory workers will keep ahead of the cost of living increase, and the added buying power (unless nullified by greater taxes and savings) will come into the markets as enlarged demand for goods. In a time of declining supplies of consumer goods an increase in the real purchasing power of any group must be at the expense of other elements of the population. This is the pertinent point as to the equity of the formula. As to its inflationary effect, further wage increases unless offset by greater productivity will raise industrial costs, and the increased money income also will exert its upward push on the price level.

The position of the farmer under the stabilization program is equally privileged, by reason of the statutory exemptions already referred to. As higher wages force up industrial costs, and the increases work their way into the prices farmers pay, the farm parity price—the level at which ceilings are permitted—will rise. This in turn will interact on the cost of living, and so around the circle. The farm parity price computation itself includes a substantial percentage of farm commodities such as foods and purchased feed; this permits the parity index in effect to spiral within itself when farm prices are rising, even though manufactured goods prices remain unchanged.

On behalf of increases in compensation for special groups, it will be argued that incentives to work and production must be preserved. But if the decision of the stabilization agencies is that preservation of incentives makes it necessary to accept inflationary mechanisms, the need to adopt offsetting counter-inflationary policies becomes all the more urgent. This brings the discussion back to the point at which it inevitably arrives, namely, the need for taxes

be needed only after the organized units were called into active service. The call, therefore, which resulted in bringing almost a million of these men, together with the National Guard, into active service found the inactive Reserve unprepared both mentally and by virtue of his environment for such a call.

As I understand the feeling of these men, it is that they feel that organized units with equipment, uniforms, training, drill pay and a definite rating as to efficiency would be called before the inactive Reserve would be called into service. He was prepared to go in the event of an all-out world-wide war; but he did expect, and felt like the armed services had led him to believe, that he would not be called upon to shoulder the burden of national defense as a first-line reservist. This, I think, presents strongly the views of the men whose letter is set forth above.

The bill which has just been approved by the House Armed Services Committee contains a provision which will release inactive and volunteer reservists after 12 months of active duty, provided it is in the interest of national security. Considering all the circumstances, I feel that this man with veteran status should be treated as a veteran and should be released as soon as practicable, regardless of the 12-month period, in the event it can be done without jeopardizing our national safety.

I strongly believe in rotation. It is a great morale builder. The fact that the Marine Corps has already put into active operation rotation from the Far East theater of operations is a further argument showing the wisdom of this program. I hope that the other branches of the armed services will immediately put into effect a very liberal rotation policy and that those men who have long periods of service in Korea and in the Far East will be given a reasonable opportunity to come home and stay for a while in the United States of America with their friends and family. The sooner this program is put into operation the better will be the morale effect on our troops overseas.

We have tremendous problems in providing this country with an adequate national defense. These problems must be met; but in meeting them we should not overlook equity and fair dealing in our attitude and our program to those who faithfully served the military needs of this country in critical times.

Budget Cuts Hurt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it was encouraging to observe the action of the House today in passing by comfortable margins amendments to effect substantial reductions in the first three items of the first appropriation bill to come before us. Yet the total of these cuts is less than $1,000,000.

Commendable as this action was, therefore, it also demonstrates that the only way we will accomplish large economies is by eliminating entirely services, activities, and functions of government which cannot properly be termed essential.

In the accomplishment of this objective, it is my considered judgment that the re-creation of the Hoover Commission would be a great step forward. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union backing such a proposal.

The editorial follows:

BUDGET CUTS HURT

President Truman has described his $71,600,000,000 budget as "tight." If this year is like others the budget will rock along that way until the congressional committees get all wadded up in figures and confusion. Then out of sheer discouragement at the magnitude of the task, somebody will pipe up and demand to know how budget cutting can be done.

Senator BYRD has shown how $9,000,000,000 can be cut. Now comes the Roswell Magill committee on Federal tax policy with proposals of $10,000,000,000 cuts outside defense expenditures.

Of course these cuts hurt. But so will the new taxes hurt. Magill and his associates would make deep cuts in public works, drastic reductions in grants and subsidies, and an end to Federal buying of farm commodities and business loans.

The budget can be cut but it can't be cut painlessly. That is why Representative KENNETH KEATING's proposal to call back the Hoover Commission to designate unnecessary or postponable drains on the public till is a practical approach.

KEATING has now been joined by Senator DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois), who will press the proposition in the Senate. Until this is done, any claim that the budget can't be cut is pure defeatism.

Asleep at the Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, excerpts from Paul Harvey's news broadcast of American Broadcasting Co., of January 21, 1951. I believe that Mr. Harvey has correctly called attention to the situation as it exists in this country for the last decade. The American people have been asleep at the switch.

The above-mentioned excerpts follow:

Now something to slumber on.

The Pilgrim Fathers of the United States were Communists.

The self-government which they established in Massachusetts was communistic.

All that they owned and all the crops which they grew became the common property of all. A man's task was assigned him by central authority. Food was rationed. At first a quarter-pound of bread a day to each person.

But some of the Pilgrims complained that they were too weak from want of food to tend the crops as they should.

There was increasing absenteeism.

"So," writes Governor Bradford, "the colonists began to think how they might raise as much corn as they could and obtain a better crop than they had done."

And at last, in 1623, after much debate of things, the governor, with the advice of the chiefest of the colonists, decided upon a new system whereby each man should plant his own corn. Each would therefore have to trust himself for the food for his family.

So each family was assigned a parcel of land. And I quote Governor Bradford, "This had a very good success, for it made all hands very industrious so as much more corn was planted."

They now went willingly into the field and took their little ones with them to set corn. Before, they would have alleged weakness and inability to work. To have compelled them to work would have been tyranny. But now they worked willingly. By the time the next harvest had come, instead of famine there was plenty. The effect of the private planting was apparent to all. Some of the more industrious had to spare, and to sell to others. "So," writes Governor Bradford, "any general want or famine has not been amongst them to this day."

The Communist experiment in America—as with all Communist experiments past, present, and future—was foredoomed to failure, because it considered man to be an economic rather than a human being. And so was conceived here a new system of government. It was based on I Corinthians 3: 8: "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." And in but a few years freemen raised themselves and their society to a pinnacle of progress unapproached in all the ages.

Then in 1916 something happened. And the people of the United States became the first in the history of the world ever voluntarily to surrender their rights of property. It was done in an hour of foreign entanglement, with a carelessly worded constitutional amendment. It said, "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on income from whatever source. * * *" It placed no limit on the amount of those taxes. Conceivably the people could be taxed out of all private property. Income taxes were not new. The first income tax was written on a rock by the hand of Divinity and given to Moses at the top of Mount Sinai. It was at the flat rate of 10 percent. And, remember this, it promised the wrath of God on anyone who violated that law.

At Runnymede the Magna Carta was handed to King John on the end of a sword * * * denying to royalty the right of unlimited taxation. But, as I say, it was for the American people to become the first ever voluntarily to return that tyrannical power to government.

Then, in 1932, the next big step backward. What had been a government of, by, and for the people * * * became instead a government of executive directors and bureaus; by appointees having the power to make rules with the force of law. The power to construe those rules and to enforce them. All the powers any king in history ever had * * * were handed to men not even duly elected. Such was called a "new deal." Though Emperor Diocletian long before had tried to rescue the Roman Empire by destroying the power of the senate and delegating that power to many government bureaus. The result was the Dark Ages, lasting a thousand years.

Finally, in January 1951, the United States prepared once more in the pattern of the first confused, frightened Pilgrims to ration food, to allocate farm crops by decree, to regulate what could be sold and to whom and for how much; to regulate where a man

Twenty-seven million have doctors' services in a hospital plus hospitalization. Twenty-seven million more have hospitalization insurance only. Three and one-half million have comprehensive protection including preventive medicine. Eighty-six million Americans have no health protection at all.

True, voluntary plans such as the Blue Cross and the Blue Shield are all right as far as they go, but very few of these approved plans offer any preventive medicine or accept patients with chronic diseases. Very often in maternity cases extra fees are justifiably asked for. Under the national health program adequate medical care would be a right, not a charity.

Now I do not for a moment pretend that the administration bills covering the national health insurance program are letter perfect, but I do know that the resistors to any national insurance program have made no effort to cooperate so that a fully acceptable bill could be worked out. As I pointed out before the only cry that they put up is that of "socialism," disregarding the hopes and the futures of millions of Americans. The AMA—the American Medical Association—has disseminated a good bit of material about the national health insurance program full of hazy writing and half-truth.

I would like to quote a bit from Mr. Bernard DeVoto, who in a recent issue of Harper's magazine wrote a Letter to a Family Doctor. He bluntly states: "I will not help pay for the $25 assessment you sent to the AMA to run these ads and print these pamphlets. I will not help you finance distortion and demagoguery. In an envelope that has your name and degree on it you tell me by way of Dr. Henderson that 'all infectious diseases have been brought under effective methods of prevention, control, and treatment.' I am to have no more colds, then, and my friend's daughter need not have died of poliomyelitis last summer. Cure guaranteed, Dr. Henderson's ad says in effect, and it was only through inadvertence that he did not mention the great increase in chronic diseases, especially among the elderly, and that he did not point out how our increased longevity makes more medical service necessary, not less."

Several proposals, as you know, have been made. The administration bill outlines a compulsory health-insurance system based on a contributory payroll tax. Other bills have called for grants-in-aid to States to underwrite and expand existing State and local programs for the "medically indigent." The Flanders-Ives bill proposes Federal subsidies, furnished through the States, to help develop a national system of private voluntary prepayment group-insurance plans. In the first and third plans mentioned here, there is considerable merit. It may well be that a system of private voluntary prepayment group-insurance plans may be a partial answer. The legislation is continually under examination. What I ask mainly is that there be an intelligent approach to the subject, taking into consideration both our needs and our facilities. What I object so strenuously to is this attitude of what was good enough for grandfather is good enough for me.

There was a time when the American Medical Association bitterly attacked voluntary-group plans, going even to the extent of dismissing able physicians from the society because of their participation in such groups. Now experiencing a change of heart, it embraces these groups, trying to show how noble and how public-minded the AMA really is.

If there is a basic evil in a national health insurance program, its opponents have yet failed to point it out. Enough of this double-talk. Let's have straight talk. Yet the AMA has offered no adequate substitute for this tested insurance plan of pooling resources to meet a common risk. If they fear reduction in earnings, let them say so, though nobody has yet proved how the doctors will suffer financially because of such a program. Nor has yet anybody proved how medical services therein will be decreased in quality.

What I object to is not the objections to the program—for honest men may disagree among themselves—but I object to the manner and methods of objection.

If there is a better way of improving the Nation's health—and it cannot be denied that the Nation's health needs improving—then let's face the issue squarely in earnest cooperation and not in a spirit of tantrums and the manufacturing of ghosts.

Enlisted Reservists in Korea Score Congress for Indecision

EXTENSION OF REMARK
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have just clipped an article from the March 8, 1951, edition of the Shreveport Journal, a daily newspaper published in Shreveport, La., which article contains a joint letter signed by 33 members of the Armed Forces Reserves who are now on active service in Korea. This letter sets forth strongly the position of these Reserves who are now fighting in the Far East and who are serving the Nation there and elsewhere. It is obvious that these Reserves feel that they have not been treated fairly.

For the information of the Congress I set forth this article in full below:

CLAIM UNFAIR BURDEN—ENLISTED RESERVISTS IN KOREA SCORE CONGRESS FOR INDECISION

Shreveport enlisted Reserve servicemen now on duty with the Eighth Army in Korea blame congressional indecision for what they consider an unfair burden on veteran reservists.

"It seems that the Armed Forces reason * * * that they had better milk us dry while we are still under thumb, for once the Reserves are released, they will never again allow themselves in position for another rape," the Shreveport Journal was told today, in a letter signed by 34 enlisted reservists in Korea.

THIRTY-FOUR SIGN LETTER

The letter, signed by Corp. Clarence D. Ellington and 33 other men, was written February 25.

"Congress would have heard little complaint even this time," the men wrote, "if a just recall system had been effected."

An investigation of reported inequities in the reverse recall program was launched by the House Armed Services Committee several months ago, shortly after the Journal printed a complaint from Ellington and other reservists prior to their shipment overseas.

The letter received today from Korea follows:

"Enlisted Reserve personnel in this theater have received word through letters from home—we get little first-hand news—that an attempt is being made by the Defense Department to extend our present compulsory tour of active duty beyond 21 months.

"Are the Armed Forces trying to cope with the present crisis by the exclusive use of veteran reservists? Such would seem to be the case.

"Reservists in Korea had already given 3 years or more of their lives even before the present police action. Congress would have heard little complaint even this time if a just recall system had been effected.

"Be that as it may, these reservists are now filling manpower gaps in Korea, fighting with the Regulars, and awaiting congressional consideration on mistakes which have been made.

"Our civilian lives have been interrupted for a second time. How are we later to compete with men who have seen little or no service?

"We have heard of endless talk and hesitation on the draft of 18-year-olds and married nonveterans.

"Why have these men acquired the privilege of living their lives with impunity when, during the last war, they would have long since been overseas? Experience, not age, determines the efficiency of a soldier in or out of battle.

"It appears that someone at home is suffering from delusions of grandeur if they believe a large military force can be built without this sizable segment of available manpower. Volunteer 17-year-olds were permitted to fight in 1941 and are fighting now, yet there is still doubt over the ability of 18-year-olds to do likewise.

"The reservists await completion of present debate over rotation plans, but, judging from treatment afforded us thus far, precious little in our favor is expected. It seems that the Armed Forces reason, and with accuracy, that they had better milk us dry while we are still under thumb, for once the reserves are released, they will never again allow themselves in position for another rape.

"The following signatures indicate agreement with this letter and request publication of same." Names and serial numbers on the signature list:

Clarence D. Ellington, 18231041; Russell Wieser, 18332880; Selby E. Copeland, 38587769; Carl Nolon, 44008472; Salvatore Polizzi, 12027024; Clifton H. Matthews, 38540238; Robert F. Ingraham, 57308138; Leroy J. Gelhausen, 35727939; Lendon Turpen, 35715312; Albert M. Stocks, 16229246; Guy W. Owens, 38343964.

C. R. Rogers, 16287538; S. R. Lombardo, 57209510; W. G. Wilson, 37721832; Carl E. Rawls, 34926006; Carvel L. Knafe, 38549136; William D. Towler, 18286663; Roy M. Ogoto, 46043812; Richard N. Robey, 38786778; M. L. Hall, 18139843; John A. Essner, 55006083.

Arthur A. Laiselle, 57109126; Frank R. Hanson, 16250005; Clarence F. Bryans, 16204547; Myron M. Bokski, 16300287; Lucien C. Latulippe, 57109168; Earl J. Vickers, 18284695; Joe R. Reeder, 18100027; William A. Boyd, 34599298; Clyde W. Abea, Jr., 14332242; Roy G. Lee, 34509823; Frank S. Danca, 37804707; Carl E. Peterson, 57143757; Kieth Mizell, 38236479.

Mr. Speaker, the inactive reservist in a large percentage of the cases is a veteran with a long period of service in the Second World War. It is true that he entered the Reserves voluntarily, but after electing to go into the Reserves, he was placed in an inactive status as an inactive reservist. As such, he was denied position in an organized unit. He was given no equipment, no drill, and no drill pay. He received no training and no instruction; and in most instances, no effort was made whatsoever to keep in contact with him. In many instances he changed his civilian occupation and certainly changed his marital status and the Armed Forces knew nothing about his efforts to improve himself and his position in life. When an inactive reservist was denied a position in an organized unit, he obtained the impression, if not the information direct, that he would

rather than toward the heavens for that help all mankind needs.

How tragically true the events of the past year have proved the President's prediction. More and more evident it becomes that the current separation of mankind into differing camps is essentially a moral cleavage involving two irreconcilable concepts of the importance of the human being. In the Communist view the individual—like a cow or a horse—is a chattel of the state, just that and nothing more. In the eyes of the democratic world the individual is recognized as the most important thing on the face of the globe because that individual possesses an immortal soul. You and I are truly free, because you and I have certain inherent, natural rights—rights derived from our creation by God—from our equal creation by God.

Few generations have lived in such uncertain, confused and dangerous conditions as those in which we will probably spend the rest of our lives. On all hands people cry out "What can we do to help?" One clear and obvious answer to that question is for all Americans to strive in their daily lives to fulfill in our blessed America that perfection of the democratic processes, that real equality that was envisaged for all Americans by our founding fathers. Much remains to be done by all of us before that is accomplished, and it cannot be accomplished merely by a 7-day observance of Brotherhood Week.

Believing in a spiritual interpretation of the universe, and deriving its inspiration therefrom, the national conference exists to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Jews, and Catholics. We seek to analyze, moderate, and ultimately eliminate intergroup prejudices which disfigure and distort religious, business, social, and political relations. We strive to establish a social order in which the religious ideals of brotherhood and justice shall become the standards of human relationships, and we work at it 365 days in the year.

Goethe once observed that it is easier to perceive error than to find truth, for the former lies on the surface and is easily seen, while the latter lies in the depths where few are willing to search for it. From day to day and from week to week we must augment our forces with men and women who are willing to make some sacrifice to seek out the causes of intolerance and bigotry and to root them out of our system.

In the 22 years since this conference was organized, very great progress has been made. Encouraged by that progress thousands of American men and women who realize that the job is far from done and who appreciate the tremendous importance of this work are devoting a great deal of their time and their efforts in this cause.

Why is this so important? That I shall attempt to answer this evening.

Whether or not we like it, America has been invested with the leadership of the free world and the task of defending western civilization. The success of that defense will determine the survival of our way of life and the maintenance of the dignity of man. Until and unless bigotry, prejudice and intolerance among intercreedal and interracial groups have disappeared from the American scene, the success of that leadership and of that defense will be in jeopardy.

Until we have achieved a practical day-to-day implementation of the principles of brotherhood, we cannot be sure that our American democracy is secure, and we cannot have too great confidence in our efforts to bring democracy to other parts of the world. But once we have attained throughout this fair land a unity which comes from an understanding of group by group; an appreciation of culture, group by group; and respect of racial, religious differences, group by group, American democracy will have a much firmer foundation.

The times in which we have lived have seen fantastic progress in most fields of human endeavor. Within our lifetime science has contributed more to medicine, to communication, to transportation, to agriculture, and to many of the other things that affect our daily lives than it has contributed in many centuries. In giving us the radio and the airplane it furnished the peoples of the world with those devices they needed to draw closer together, to understand and respect each other. It is the tragedy of our age, that these two inventions were aborted from their proper purposes. In the hands of power-crazed egoists in the late 1930's one was diverted to the purposes of hate-fostering and war-breeding propaganda, and the other into a lethal weapon of international blackmail. These two inventions which had given such promise of forestalling future wars contributed to the events that produced the most costly war in world history.

Since the end of World War II, science has made further great strides—in every field of human endeavor except the one in which we most need progress. That is the field of human relationships. It is to this objective that the National Conference of Christians and Jews addresses its entire efforts.

In this country, differences in background and culture are sometimes overemphasized, and the broad areas of common purposes and objectives that unite all of the people of the United States are too frequently forgotten. So it is that throughout the length and breadth of our land we ask Americans to reexamine from time to time the community of purpose of all Americans, and to explore various new approaches for devising formulas that will lead to even greater trust, confidence, and respect among our different groups. We hope that there will be no lessening of anyone's loyalty to one's own faith or race. We seek a strong, purposeful movement toward the realization of unity in diversity. Our objective is not to abolish differences but to learn to respect them. The pride and the strength of America are to be found in the amazing diversity of its people drawn from every race and culture on this globe. That diversity of talents and skills and personalities—urged of the toxin of misunderstanding and distrust—can constitute a greatness and a strength that no other nation can ever achieve.

We know that today the biggest question for the entire world is whether the human spirit is to remain free, or is to be swallowed up by totalitarianism. We agree with the late Justice Wiley Rutledge that if we are to be free we must deserve to be free; if we are to survive we must deserve to survive.

There is no doubt in the mind of any real American that here on this continent our forefathers established a system of government and a way of life which has proved to be the world's greatest contribution to human freedom and the dignity of man. No thoughtful person can question that our system of government and our way of life is in greater jeopardy today from outside influences than it has been since the birth of the Republic.

We Americans have come to regard democracy as an established, dominant fact in this world. Yet, neither in terms of duration (as judged by the perspective of history) nor in numbers of adherents, has democracy permanently or universally established itself, although we know it is the best form of government yet devised.

There are in the world some 2,400,000,000 humans. Of this number only 600,000,000 derive their culture and their philosophy, their religious ideals, and their way of life from the same sources that gave us our civilization—Western Europe. These peoples of Europe, the British Isles, Australia, North and South America, parts of Africa, and those in the Southwest Pacific who have embraced democracy, together with ourselves, constitute the bulk of those who believe in democracy or who have been able to give it stable life in their native lands. Two hundred and fifty million of these people exist today in Western Europe under the guns of a colossus that says that communism and democracy cannot live in the same world.

It has never been the policy of our Government to attempt to drive the Soviet system from its birthplace. Our Government has never taken the position that it cannot live in a world where communism exists. However, the Communists view with alarm every manifestation of freedom, and repeatedly proclaim that communism and what we call democracy cannot exist together. Particularly do they proclaim the impossibility of the coexistence of communism and religious principles of any sort or type. They reject such virtues as meekness, humility, charity, love of neighbor, and the Golden Rule. The trials of Cardinal Mindszenty and the Protestant clergy of Bulgaria and the present antireligious activity in Czechoslovakia are among the most brazen and ruthless attacks upon God and upon religion that have been witnessed in many centuries.

Now all thinking Americans know deep in their hearts that the surest and most effective countermeasures we can take in this country to combat the godless propaganda of the Communists is to create here upon our shores the fullest and finest flowering of true democracy and real equality. We know that if people are free they are equal, but that without equality there can be no true freedom. That applies to all—Protestants, Jews, and Catholics; Nordics and Latins; Negroes and Orientals.

The members of this conference are not unduly alarmed about interracial and intercreedal conditions in the United States today. We recognize the very great progress that is being made toward understanding and mutual respect. We believe, however, that through public diligence and public awareness of its importance the progress now being made can be accelerated.

There is a new attitude on the American scene about which I would like to speak for a few moments—one that truly disturbs me. And that is the attitude of defeatism about America's military and economic posture, an attitude that must give very great solace and comfort to the men in the Kremlin.

In government, self-criticism, and I mean public self-criticism, is the mark of a dynamic, progressive democracy, the real antidote for political dry rot or inefficiency. Today in Washington, a great deal is being done to question, examine, and perhaps to improve our public affairs. Such examination is welcomed by every public servant worth his salt. However, I call to your attention the very great difference between self-criticism that seeks for improvement and blind pessimism that looks at only one side of the ledger.

There is some talk and feeling in this country today that seems almost foreign.

What is the faith of an American? It varies from man to man, and from woman to woman, and with each man and every woman, it varies from time to time.

With some, it is faith in our manhood. With some, it is faith in our moral or political leadership. With some, it is faith in our industrial potential. With some, it is a faith in God coupled with a belief in free democratic institutions and actions.

But whatever that faith is, wherever it comes from, whatever its basis, it is the hallmark of every real American. An American is the one person in the world who is distinctly out of character when he dons the black robes of defeatism and hastens civilization on its rush to ruin.

Of course, we face a formidable challenge from a power that holds in thrall the largest organized group of manpower in the world. Yet, the entire history of the development of the freedom of the individual and the creation of what is now the Western World has

should work and at what wage; and to remove further limitless amounts from his wage in taxes.

Let them not alter the label on the poison bottle. Let them call it "necessary," but let them not call it "new." Let them call it "expedient," but let them not call it "progress." Let them say we no longer deserve the right to think and act for ourselves, but let them not say this is to preserve our "freedom."

Could it be?

Is it yet possible that history might be altered?

That the American people will awaken in their comfortable parlor-car seats, look out the window, and realize in time that somewhere back there the Freedom Train got off the track.

That we switched off the main line and turned left.

And kept turning left until we're headed back to where we came from.

Could it be that we may yet shake off the leg iron someone locked on while we slept, and seek out the engineer?

And demand—with the courage of barehanded men—that he get us back on the high road. Now.

That if any bandits think they can stop this train, they can come shootin', but we're not going to be wrecked or returned to serfdom by our own frock-coated crew.

And I'll tell you something.

If we all left the parlor car and got back to competing to see who could shovel the most coal—nobody could even catch, much less wreck—this train.

Then the American historians of some distant tomorrow might write, as Governor Bradford wrote, "Any general want or famine has not been amongst them to this day."

Could it be?

No.

Free men—free to do anything—are also free to do nothing.

And apparently that is our choice.

We said we no longer wanted opportunity.

We wanted security.

And they gave us chains.

And we were secure.

So, when some future Gibbon writes, "The Decline and Fall of the American Empire," let him be honest.

Let him say the great new system of government called free competitive American capitalism brought forth such bountiful harvest of all good things, that the people, grown fat—grew lazy.

And their leaders, instead of destroying their enemies, copied them.

And history's shining hour came to an end.

The Book of Kells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Sunday Star, March 18, 1951:

THE BOOK OF KELLS

One of the most beautiful things in the world made by human hands is the ancient Book of Kells. Created by the brothers of an Irish monastery about the eighth century after Christ, it now is the principal treasure of Trinity College in Dublin. Thousands of pilgrims have gone there to gaze upon its delicately illuminated pages. The text is the four Gospels of the Vulgate. It was lettered and decorated with a precision unexcelled in any similar work at any place or any time. The geometrical symmetry of the entire volume has been compared to a single breath of celestial song. Examining its loveliness, one takes pride in sharing the devoted humanity of the unrecorded artists. Their names are lost, but they were men to make all men glad to be men.

Kells was called Ceanannus a thousand years ago. The retreat where the book was put together was pledged to Saint Columba. It was founded in 550, and it drew scholars like the proverbial magnet through 30 generations. How great was the wisdom of the friars is proved by the variety of their subject material. Their learning embraced everything—all classes and conditions of people, a vast menagerie of animals and birds, flowers, inanimate forms of reality, and much that simply was imagined with rare poetic artistry. The 678 pages the monks compiled are an encyclopaedia of the universe. Their faith was an ardent force, reaching from the dust to the stars, conceding no barrier to the power of their love for the Master Artist.

The brothers were deliberately all-inclusive. Their work shuts nothing out. Within it all forms are interlaced. The book assembled at Kells is as closely knit as a good tapestry or a good carpet. Some hint of distant Byzantium may be discovered in the designs, yet they are as Irish as Ireland. Their colors are as brilliant as the rainbow even now after a whole millenium. Perhaps it was because of the challenge of this circumstance that all early attempts to copy the volume fell short. The version produced by the Urs Graf-Verlag in Berne, Switzerland, in recent months represents the best skill available in Europe in our day. An example of this edition is the gift of the Government of Eire to the Library of Congress. Sean MacBride, Irish Minister of External Affairs, made the presentation. Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian, received the precious offering and expressed the gratitude of the American community for it. The book is a tie of a sort between three as yet free nations—Ireland, Switzerland, and the United States.

Address of the Honorable John L. Sullivan, Former Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, February 27, 1951, to be exact, the Honorable John L. Sullivan, former Secretary of the Navy, delivered an address in Shreveport, La., at a luncheon held under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Mr. Sullivan said so many things in that address that should command the approval of all of us that I have asked leave to include his remarks in the RECORD.

John Sullivan was known to Members of Congress as one of the most capable, efficient, and patriotic Secretaries who ever directed the Department of the Navy. He was a strong man and commanded universal respect in that position as well as in other Government positions which he held in many years of public service.

His endeavors outside the Government add to the high respect we have for him. He has been intensely active with the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He has been outstanding among Americans because of his contribution to the most worthy movement to implement the principles of brotherhood.

I hope my colleagues in the House will read carefully the message on brotherhood which John Sullivan left with those who attended the luncheon in Shreveport. His address follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN L. SULLIVAN AT THE LUNCHEON UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS AT THE WASHINGTON-YOUREE HOTEL, SHREVEPORT, LA.

I want to tell you how delighted I am to have this opportunity to visit your dynamic, growing city of Shreveport and to meet with so many outstanding citizens of this great city.

The work you have done in the advancement of intergroup relations is known far outside the confines of this State. For your progress in this mission, I extend my congratulations not only to you but to Centenary College and its president, Joe Mickle, who have rendered such valuable assistance in this endeavor.

Here in Shreveport with your oil and gas, your agriculture, your cattle, and your lumber, you have a sound and diversified basis for a continuing prosperity. Together with the fine Barksdale Air Base at Bossier all contribute to the stability and zest of living in this most pleasant city.

The only thing about my visit here today which I regret is the absence of my good friend, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS. I have known Congressman BROOKS ever since 1939, and during my years in the Treasury and Navy Departments I have had a first-hand opportunity to watch him work and to evaluate the contribution he is making to the affairs of our Federal Government. I know that all of you know him and like him. I can assure you that if you had had my opportunity to work with him closely in Washington, you would be even prouder of him than you are now.

I talked with Congressman BROOKS just before leaving Washington, and I am very happy to extend to you, as he requested me to do, his very warm and cordial greetings to all of you here today.

We meet here under the auspices of a truly great organization, an organization which last year afforded me the opportunity of engaging in the most rewarding work I have ever known. I am convinced that there is no peacetime work in which civilians can engaged that contributes so much to the present welfare and future security of our country as the implementation of the principles of brotherhood.

My activity in this work started at a luncheon in Washington on Armistice Day, 1949. That day we heard a stirring address by the President of the United States. He started by saying, "I have just come from the National Cemetery at Arlington where I have laid a wreath on the grave of an American hero, the unknown soldier. I do not know, and no real American cares, whether that man was a Protestant, a Jew, or a Catholic, whether he was black or red, yellow, or white." Later in this address the President warned us that the issue of our times would lie between those who believe in a Divine Being and who look upward for guidance, and those who—denying God—worship materialism, and look downward to the earth for the things which it produces

been achieved against seemingly overwhelmingly powerful tyrannies. If the odds against the free world are today greater than ever, you must remember that so, too, are our means of resisting and our will to resist.

Why, then, do so many of our fellow citizens adopt the helpless and hopeless point of view?

The focal point of the world's troubles today is Korea. But it is merely a happenstance that it is Korea and not any one of a half dozen other places. Realizing what Korea is costing us in the lives of fine young men and the disruption of our economy, some people are today questioning the wisdom of our decision to resist aggression in Korea. Regardless of the outcome of the Korean campaign, there will never be any question in my mind but what the United States made the only decision it could have made under those circumstances.

It so happened that I was in Europe at the time of the crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel by the North Koreans. Within a period of 6 days I was in Rome, Paris, Frankfort and London. You will recall that following the invasion there was a hiatus of 48 hours during which our Government very properly went through the procedures of the last-resort provision of the United Nations Charter. During those 2 days you could see the confidence of Western Europeans in America melt like butter in the noonday sun. On all sides they said: "Here we go again. After World War I your President Wilson conceived the League of Nations. We all joined it in an effort to secure a just and enduring peace. Then, after we had gotten in, America turned her back on us and left us holding the bag. It is only 5 years since you started the United Nations, and here, when the first real test comes, when there is a clear and cruel case of aggression, you don't fight, you don't even make a statement." I can tell you that things looked pretty grim, and I am sure that had that continued for another week or 10 days Western Europe would be lost to America for generations and that the cooperation we are now receiving from the Atlantic Pact Nations could never have been achieved.

However, 2 days after the invasion of Korea the President of the United States announced our resistance to aggression in such clear and unmistakable terms that the peoples all over Western Europe were lifted from the depths of despondency. Never have I seen such a change come over large numbers of people. You could see it in the face of every man and woman you passed on the street.

It must be remembered that at no time since the death of Napoleon has there been a catalyst to unite all peoples of Europe in a common front against a common foe. I am not at all sure that the Communist action in Korea is not serving as that catalyst. I believe that there exists today a greater potential opportunity to weld the peoples and governments of Western Europe into a stanch bloc of defenders of democracy and freedom than has existed in the last 125 years.

We started to fight in Korea as we had to. Our forces were greatly outnumbered and in fact there were few combat troops in that area. But once we became organized and landed at Inchon, things took on an entirely different aspect. Then came the disastrous defeat and retreat of late November. That is when the second guessers went to work. That is when a great many Americans forgot that the United States of America is at the peak of its power, the strongest country in the world. They began to exalt our enemies as superdemons and to discount and downgrade the finest fighting men in the world—the American soldiers. What a spectacle this must have been for the United Nations representatives of the other countries of the world. Just think of what it must have done to their confidence in America when they saw that Americans were forgetting their own potential power and the majesty of our mission, and thinking only of the price it was costing us.

I would like to go on record here and now as affirming my complete confidence in the professional soldiers and sailors who are today guiding the destinies of our Army, our Air Force, and our Navy.

Throughout my life I have been particularly fortunate in my associations with my fellow men, in college and law school, in the practice of law, in business, and in the Government. However, for 4 years I had the opportunity of working very closely with the officers of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, and I want to tell you I never met a better group of men in my life.

We have heard a great deal of criticism since VJ-day about the graduates of West Point and Annapolis. I tell you that, in my opinion, if the alumni of West Point and Annapolis as a group were compared with all of the alumni of any college or university in this land, the comparison would be far from favorable to us civilian alumni. In like manner, I believe that if we were to compare all of the regular officers of the Army, Air Force, and Navy with all of the civilians in any given profession or line of endeavor, the results would be equally startling.

With the sole exception of those who have consecrated their lives to spiritual leadership, I know of no group of men who lead such dedicated lives or make such sacrifices in their profession as the regular officers of the armed services. I think we should all thank God that the future security of our country is in the hands of these men. They are the best I have ever met.

Fighting under their command and backed by the production of the greatest industrial power in the world is the youth of the Nation, young men who know the value of that for which they fight. Victor Hugo once said: "Nothing in this world is so powerful as an idea whose time has come." The youth of America know the full value of democracy and freedom, and they know that now our hour has come, and that we must stop every effort to spread communism further by forceful means, or we will be isolated and left to fight, and perhaps lose, alone.

Science has made great contributions to American armies and military proficiency. Yet, neither radar nor the proximity fuse, the atomic bomb or the guided missile is America's secret weapon. I know that every commander in the armed services agrees with me that the secret weapon with which America won World Wars I and II and the greatest weapon we have today is millions of the finest young men this world has ever known.

They are the best because they have seen democracy at work and they know that after enjoying the freedoms and the equality of America, life for them under any other system would not be worth the living. Those men on the battle lines in Korea have seen democracy and brotherhood at work, and they know it is worth fighting and dying for. In these crucial times when men as well as nations are being tried for size, the least we civilians can do is to acquire a faith to match that of our men in combat.

In no way do I try to minimize the seriousness of the situation. But America has survived a great many crises in the last 176 years. I think we will survive this one.

In the words of the poet, Stephen Vincent Benet:

"We made this thing, this dream.
This land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will,
This peaceless vision, groping for the stars,
Not as a huge devouring machine
Rolling and clanking with remorseless force
Over submitted bodies and the dead,
But as live earth where anything could grow
We made it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

Not Illegal, but Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President does not reflect the thinking of the vast majority of the American people when he intimates that legality should be the sole test in determining the faithfulness or faithlessness of a public servant. He should clean house at once in his official family in the light of the shocking disclosures which have been made in congressional hearings. If he does not act promptly, Congress should move without any regard to the question as to whose toes are stepped on.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and one from the Rochester Times-Union.

The editorials follow:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

NOT ILLEGAL, BUT WRONG

"Why," asks a correspondent of this newspaper, "is it up to Congress to ferret out the crooks, parasites, and subversives in the executive branch of the Government? Have you noticed that most of the sensational proceedings against such offenders have resulted from congressional action? Congress uncovered the Garsson brothers, Andy May, Benny Meyers, John Maragon, Alger (Red Herring) Hiss, and William Remington."

It is a good question, given more point by the current interest in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation investigation. The revelation of misused influence, of mink coats and luxury room hotels speaks loudly of a Government owning an easy morality and a great complaisance toward wrongdoing that stops short of violating a law. It is easy to believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a Government agency, knows of many such violations of moral codes. Yet, operating under the Department of Justice, it is not a prosecuting agency. The Department of Justice, headed by a political appointee, has shown little concern over much wrongdoing which is just short of illegality.

Here lies the harm: It is the official contentment with behavior which is improper, but cannot be branded specifically as illegal. It is behavior which any man, unless utterly devoid of conscience, would recognize as wrong. It is the sort of behavior which would end quickly any employee's usefulness to a business concern. It is the sort of behavior which would make a man a neighbor to be avoided. It is the sort of behavior which cannot be tolerated in a government, supposedly acting for the good of all citizens.

If the Presidency will not act to rid itself of bad characters, if the Department of Justice is prevented from clearing them out, then we hope Congress, much maligned Congress, will continue to rout the unfit in

its own slow, expensive way. Let it keep on the trail of the RFC, and then let it go after some other agencies which offer promises of easy money for the unmoral.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

VALENTINE DISCLOSURES SHOULD STIR COUNTRY

The usually mild-mannered Dr. Alan Valentine let loose in Cleveland with some blunt truths about affairs at Washington that must have relieved his own soul and ought to have a tonic effect on the conscience of the country. What he said ought to be published across the Nation, studied in every home. For he pictured, more plainly and bluntly than anyone else has yet, a steadily deteriorating moral climate in Washington that is spreading contagion and actually creating a threat to free government.

In an adjoining column we print excerpts from this notable address.

As economic stabilizer in the early days of the defense mobilization program, during which he butted his head against walls of confusion and recklessness, Dr. Valentine got a close view of the whole stewing mess. He reports now on the patronage, favoritism, pushing and jostling that have created "a government within a government," and as such is almost beyond the control of President Truman and other top men. "Patronage," he said, "has become not a means of life but an end in itself to a political machine which has been too long at the trough."

Never in the Nation's history, said Dr. Valentine, "have such third-rate standards and objectives flourished so openly or been more generally accepted and more loyally defended."

This tolerance of the mediocre "began long before the present administration, and Mr. Truman has inherited a downward trend in political morality."

There are signs that the public is awakening to the seriousness of a state of affairs that has been likened by one Senator to the Teapot Dome scandals. The disclosures about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation alone are enough to disgust any ordinary conscience. Among the sheen of mink coats and of White House favorites controlling millions of dollars in loans, of lawyers getting $21,000 fees for having the inside track with the RFC, of the unbelievable favors granted to individuals with the right contacts, and so on and so on, the level of morality has sunk to the gutter level. It is no better because most of the deals were technically legal.

Never before did influence-peddling flourish so openly and with such complete tolerance by high Government officials. President Truman, personally honest and well-intentioned has scarcely lifted a finger to stop a downward cycle that is slowly but surely dragging his administration to disgrace. Except to discount the reports of those who know what is going on, he has shown almost no interest. Yet, says Dr. Valentine, "only President Truman can demolish this second and unofficial government * * * and drive the money lenders from his own temple."

This government within a government, made up of patronage and favoritism and plain graft, is playing fast and loose with the people's money. It is nullifying the efforts of Chief Stabilizer Charles Wilson and Director of Controls Eric Johnston to stop the dangerous inflation that is making the dollar smaller and smaller. It is sticking a knife into the heart of our whole defense program.

If Alan Valentine's warning is heeded, if the message can be spread, he will have performed a greater service to the country than he could have done in his recent public office. By this speech he has gained stature.

[From the Rochester Times-Union]

PRESIDENT CAN CLEAN UP MESS

It was only 18 months ago that the Nation was being regaled by tales of deep freezers distributed among the elect, including the President's wife, by Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, the President's blustering military aide.

There has been scarcely enough time to get a minor character in that influence-peddling cast into jail for his perjuries. John Maragon, the Kansas City bootblack who rose to influence and wealth as a hanger-on in Vaughan's entourage, has finally lost his appeal and will serve 8 to 20 months.

Now the Fulbright committee has found a bigger swarm of flies gathered around a larger barrel of spilled sugar.

Senator FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas), didn't start out to send anybody to jail. His committee, composed of Senators of extraordinary competence, had looked into the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years and decided it needed drastic shake-up and overhauling. The President remarked that the committee's report was asinine. All the reconvened committee hoped to do was to show that it wasn't.

What started out to be merely a demonstration that an influence web wove back and forth from the White House to the RFC and thence to marginal characters in need of Government money, turned into a sickening revelation of the deterioration of moral standards in public service.

The details need not be repeated here. But they involve directors of the RFC, men whose nod can dispense public funds, and at least two employees of the White House, one, Donald Dawson, the personnel adviser to the President, whose wife is custodian of RFC files.

After a week of this, Senator FULBRIGHT is beginning to want some fresh air. "I never heard," he says, "so much lying in my life."

But a few more sentences for perjury aren't enough. What deeply moves Senator FULBRIGHT are the doubts his investigation have raised about the general moral level of government. He proposes a broader inquiry of the whole executive branch.

It may come to this, but it need not. The President can clean up this mess himself. He could have done so 18 months ago when the preposterous Vaughan was explaining his Missouri morals to a congressional committee.

The standards demanded in public service and the moral tone of any administration are set by the President himself. You don't get higher standards by riding along with a favorite poker companion no matter what he does outside poker hours.

We are entering a period when larger sacrifices will be asked of everybody and when more and more people will be going to Washington to ask exceptions to general rules. The people have a right to expect that these decisions be made on their merits, without favoritism, influence rings or payoffs.

The President can give them that assurance by acting on his own—now. He is still the boss. He should know what to do.

What Americanism Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the junior chamber of commerce at Itasca, Tex., has sponsored a very praiseworthy contest for the high-school students of their city which has resulted in these young people thinking and writing about Americanism. The JayCees, the teachers as well as the parents who encouraged the students to participate in the contest, and the newspapers in the area who publicized the contest are to be commended for their efforts.

Miss Pat Brown, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. G. C. Brown, wrote the winning essay entitled "What Americanism Means to me," and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this essay as I sincerely believe that this young lady has experienced what Americanism really is:

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(By Pat Brown)

Just what does Americanism mean to me? It means the American way of life. What is the American way of life? It is the Sunday funnies, hot dogs, and cokes at a ball game, a democratic government, our own desires, and our own ways of expressing them, the hills, plains, crops, farms, lakes, rivers, oceans, the blue of the heavens that seem a little bluer because it is America, the cars and the intricate web of our highways, the flag and what it means to me, our homes, parents, and our God.

In the words of the song, "America," we get a clear picture of what America meant to its author.

"My country 'tis of Thee"—even in those five small words we detect the real reason America was founded. The yearning for real freedom of worship brought the Pilgrim fathers to the shores of our paramount nation. Religion or their beliefs in the Almighty God enabled them to withstand the horrors of hunger, pain, fear, homesickness, and countless other disastrous events that mapped out that first, history-writing winter. As always the magnetism of God's almighty love brought them through. It was part of this life-giving love that encouraged them to make friends with the Indians, who in turn taught them the first principles of agriculture. All of these supreme sacrifices were made and met with the supreme love of our Almighty God in their hearts. His love for them brought them through this so-called "valley of the shadow of death." So, first of all, our country was founded on a firm, stable belief in God. Thus, Americanism means Christianity, love, faith, hope, all of these being achieved through God's love for us and our love for Him.

"Sweet land of liberty"—how many times do we think of the sweet, poignant liberty that our country provides? Where else can you get the things that our gigantic way of life provides? Yes, the serenity of the gently rolling foothills of our own community reflect a sweet, peaceful feeling. It is here for us to enjoy, here to appreciate, here for food for thought. It is a part of our own land, a land surrounded by countless advantages and pleasures if we would only heed them. Even here in Texas, only a part of our vast Nation, the land and liberties are endless, ever rolling in ceaseless splendor. Yes, Americanism exemplifies a "sweet land of liberty."

"Land where my fathers died." Why have so many gallant American men, and yes, women, too, given their lives so unselfishly for the United States of America? A life is not something easily gained, but it is easily lost. I never have been called on to sacrifice my life for anyone or anything, yet, but if I had my choice as to why I should give my life, I would choose the portrayal of Americanism as have so many countless others. I would gladly die to preserve the American way of life or to even impress its immense qualities on the mind of some unfortunate person, who has not enjoyed its advantage as I have. Yes, Americanism must

be something pretty big to affect countless millions of men and women like that.

"Land of the pilgrims' pride." Pride, it is a small word to have such a very great meaning. Our pilgrim forefathers had a never-wavering pride for this, then unborn Nation. So, why should not we, as present-day Americans, not fairly burst with pride for America, Americanism, our way of life?

"From every mountain side, let freedom ring." That has been the cry for many centuries, end upon end. Here in America, ever since the first group of colonists came over and settled on the shores of our Nation, the cry has been "freedom." It was heard at Lexington, Concord, Valley Forge, San Jacinto, the Alamo, and in countless countries of the world where the Americans raised their flag in liberty for the embonded, maltreated people of the world. On the beachheads of both World Wars I and II the cries of our gallant soldiers were heard and some of them were stifled; but still the intense burning in the breasts of people everywhere echo the cry of "freedom."

What does Americanism mean to me? It means the right to worship my God; the origin of our country and how that reflects on us, even today; liberty, the right to sing praises of whomever or whatever I see fit; a land that would merit the sacrificing of one's life for it; my pride and the pride of countless millions; and most of all my freedom. Freedom from want, from fear, religious beliefs, press, and many other freedoms compromise the long, practically endless line of freedoms enjoyed and provided by all Americans, regardless of color, race religious beliefs, or station in life.

This to me equals Americanism.

Economies Before Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Ed Coman in the Woodburn (Oreg.) Independent of March 8, 1951:

ECONOMIES BEFORE TAXES

The recent request of President Truman that Congress increase postal rates by $287,000,000 in the next fiscal year appears to be another evidence of the peculiar reasoning of the administration. He continues to ignore the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to save some $140,000,000 a year by taking the Post Office Department out of politics, modernizing its organization, methods and equipment and providing greater freedom and flexibility of management. Instead he makes a considerable issue of the second-class mailing rates charged newspapers and other publications—a policy established long ago as a public service to encourage the dissemination of news and knowledge—a policy that has resulted in the American people being the best informed in the world concerning their National, State, city, and other government bodies.

Some adjustment of the second-class mailing rates are justified, but President Truman's suggestion of doubling the rates appears unreasonable. This is particularly true in the light of his recent budget and tax messages to Congress in which he seeks to continue further expansion of his experimental Fair Deal program of extending unemployment insurance, establishing socialized medicine, extension of Federal power projects, governmental housing and nonessential public works, and a substantial increase in Federal aid to public schools. This in almost the same breath with his call to the public to practice the most rigid economies in personal and family affairs to meet the huge increase in taxation required for the military budget.

We believe it is high time that the administration begin studying the economies that can be applied to governmental operations before it looks for more ways to spend the public's money. Before it approves any of the President's recommended tax and postal increases, it would be well for Congress to dust off the Hoover report and put the more important of its recommendations into practice. Then Congress should call a halt to the "spending binge" of the administration, appropriating not one single dollar that is not absolutely necessary for defense and essential services.

We face a grim era in our history and we cannot continue to supinely accept politics and governmental business as usual. We must insist that the opportunity of the American citizen to be fully informed must not be curtailed by short-sighted policies. We must demand efficiency and frugality of all governmental activities, appropriating funds on the basis of necessity rather than desirability. The time to call a halt to the "spending binge" is now.

Elimination of Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF POLLUTION FROM THE RIVERS, STREAMS, INLAND AND TIDAL WATERS OF THE COMMONWEALTH

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith legislation appropriating money to be spent in conjunction with funds of the Commonwealth or any of its political subdivisions for the elimination of pollution from the rivers, streams, inland and tidal waters of the Commonwealth; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

In house of representatives, adopted March 7, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 13, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, representatives of the shipping and other industries of the port of Baltimore were privileged last week to hear an able discourse from the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], relative to the United States merchant marine.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington has made a most valuable contribution to the future security and progress of our country by his consistent and able efforts on behalf of United States shipping and shipbuilding.

It has been most gratifying to me to have had the opportunity to work with the distinguished Senator and I can assert most emphatically that the people of Maryland, as well as those in the great States of the west coast, are aware of and are deeply appreciative of the splendid fight which the Senator from Washington has led in the Senate to acquaint the country with the problems facing American shipping and the need for constructive action looking toward the rehabilitation of this industry which has ever meant so much to the economy of this great Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from Washington, to which I have referred, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last fall your national organization held its annual convention in Baltimore. Because of the press of other business—a reelection campaign—I was unable to attend. So when your distinguished Senator and neighbor, HERBERT O'CONOR, invited me to address your club, I was happy to accept.

We in Congress are fortunate you send HERB O'CONOR to the Senate. In addition to ably representing you, he has a keen regard for the national welfare. This is particularly true on maritime matters. His outstanding service as a member of the subcommittee on merchant marine and maritime matters of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee gives an excellent example of his fine work. I am certain his expert knowledge of maritime affairs was learned along your waterfront in rubbing elbows with shipping men, both labor and management. He could not have picked a better home port for his schooling. Your city is one of the world's outstanding shipping and shipbuilding centers. Many of you contributed time and energy in developing such a fine port. You have every right to be proud of the excellent results.

Last year our maritime subcommittee investigated and studied the problems of the American merchant marine. I believe I

can state that we were objective in our approach. We wanted facts that would help in solving the many complex problems. We were not interested only in destructive criticism. Thanks to the cooperation of labor, management, Government, and the representatives of industry and civic organizations interested in a strong American merchant marine, such as your group, I am able to report progress in both the administrative and legislative fields.

Under Reorganization Plan 21, 1950, the old Maritime Commission was abolished. Conforming to the recommendations of the Hoover Report, the President's reorganization has brought a new spirit to the administration of our maritime laws. Admiral Cochrane, as Maritime Administrator and Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, Albert Gatov, and your fellow Baltimorean, A. J. Williams, have made fine progress in their new work. Given a reasonable opportunity to work out the problems, I believe they can succeed in erasing many of the mistakes of the past.

Perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation is the provision requiring that 50 percent of Government aid cargoes be transported in American-flag bottoms. During the doldrums in shipping, the requirement was invaluable in assuring cargoes for vessels. Needless to say the adoption of the provision was vigorously opposed by foreign shipping interests supported by certain Government agencies. That opposition still exists. We must be vigilant if we are to retain the principle in future legislation. With the pattern of world trade changing from day to day, we cannot afford to relax. Less than 9 months ago cargoes were short. Today they are abundant. No one knows what tomorrow will bring. You may be assured that I will do everything within my power to have the provision included in the India aid bill and any other similar type of legislation I know that Senator O'CONOR agrees with me.

We were also able to pass legislation establishing a permanent policy for the charter of vessels in the reserve fleet. In prohibiting the charter of Government ships except at times when American flag vessels are not available at reasonable rate and under reasonable conditions, the act assures the shipowner and labor of the maximum employment of the privately owned fleet and fully protects the public interest.

The bill also terminated the authority of the Government to sell ships under the Ship Sales Act of 1946. In the 2 weeks preceding the January 15, 1951, termination date, private operators purchased 131 ships. It is gratifying to realize the purchasers had sufficient confidence in the future of the privately owned American merchant marine to invest their funds in ships. If a further extension of the sales authority were to again result in such substantial additions to the American privately owned fleet, it might be advisable to reopen it for a very limited time. This is a matter it might be well to seriously consider.

The long fight for a more equitable formula in the tolls structure of the Panama Canal also came to a conclusion during the last Congress. The amendments to the Panama Canal Act provide a more realistic and businesslike formula for computing tolls. While the full effect of the formula on the toll structure has not been determined, there is no doubt that the legislation removes many of the discriminatory administrative and accounting procedures which forced shipping to pay an inordinate share of the costs of the canal.

On the west coast certain labor contracts contained provisions for seamen's welfare and pension plans. They could not be put in force because the Federal law prohibited deductions from seamen's pay for that purpose. We are successful in passing a bill to validate the plans.

The greatest deficiency in the Government's handling of maritime affairs is the lack of long-range planning. In an effort to correct the condition, Senator O'CONOR and I introduced and succeeded in having the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably report to the Senate, the long-range shipping bill. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee also reported the bill with a do-pass recommendation. Unfortunately, because of the time factor and preoccupation with problems arising out of the Korean conflict, we were unable to get a vote in either body.

Senator O'CONOR and I are still convinced of the merits of the legislation. We have reintroduced the bill as reported to the Senate.

Further hearings appear to be unnecessary. The subject was exhaustively covered in the last session. Many of the Treasury Department's objections to certain of the taxing provisions were met. This time, in the interest of resolving remaining objections, I have asked Treasury for a bill of particulars detailing the points at issue. It is due to be received any day. I am hopeful that as a result of this procedure, we can resolve any differences, at the same time retaining the principal objectives of the act. If this can be done positive action during this session is possible.

In the last two World Wars the intrinsic value of a privately owned American merchant marine was conclusively demonstrated. The facts show that in World War II, 95.7 percent of the arms, ammunition, and supplies for our Armed Forces moved in ships operated by private shipping companies acting as agents for the Government. The other 4.3 percent was carried by the military. The cargoes were delivered directly to the beachheads and supply ports and in many instances transferred at sea. The privately operated civilian-manned ships did everything the military-controlled and manned ships were able to do. They did it with substantially less manpower per ship and at a lower cost. The comparative manning scales for a Liberty ship amply illustrate my point.

The scale on a commercial Liberty including the gun crew was 70, on a civilian-manned Army Transport Liberty 79, while on a Navy military-manned Liberty the crew was 167. The comparative wage costs on a monthly basis were: commercial, $18,471; Army, civilian-manned, $22,097; and Navy, $25,516. The picture has not changed under Military Sea Transport Service operations. For example, a privately owned T-2 tanker operates with a crew of 43, an MSTS tanker, civilian-manned has 48, and a military manned 129, or 300 percent above the commercial vessel. Our subcommittee files reflect other comparable examples.

The World War II pattern continues to hold true in the present conflict. Figures released by MSTS show that for a 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1950, 5,500,000 measurement tons of cargo were carried trans-Pacific. Of this tonnage, 3,250,000 tons were carried to Korea and Japan; 2,250,000 tons moved to the South Pacific and interisland. Eighty-six percent of the cargoes were carried in privately operated, American-flag vessels, 14 percent in MSTS, other naval vessels, and a small number of foreign-flag ships. Again, the privately operated ships stood off the beaches at Inchon and Hungnam alongside their military counterparts, doing the same work.

Our greatest problem is scarcity of manpower. We cannot afford to waste it. The people rightfully demand that our military planners do everything to conserve this valuable asset. Necessity dictates the closest integration of civilian skills with military operations. Where, as in the case of shipping, the record conclusively evidences that civilian agencies can efficiently fulfill military logistic requirements at a saving in manpower and cost, the course we must follow is clear.

My position as to the operation by the military of a merchant fleet in peacetime should be well known. I am opposed. Such operations are a definite threat to the basic principle of private enterprise. We must plan now to prevent the occurrence of such an event. We cannot wait until the end of the present emergency. Entrenched power is difficult to displace. If a solution to the question indicates the necessity for legislative action to remove this type of Government competition, I will introduce the required legislation. With realistic planning this should not be necessary. I hope the military will cooperate with me in a program to insure a strong peacetime, privately operated, merchant marine. Knowing many of them as I do, I believe they will.

Our present active merchant fleet plus the mothball ships in reserve are considered by some to be sufficient for defense. This conclusion is not supported by the facts. We have a total active and inactive fleet of approximately 2,700 ships. In World War II we had 5,000 and could have used more. Also the greater percentage of the fleet has an effective speed of not more than 10 knots. Considering the speed of a modern submarine, this is much too slow. All informed persons admit that speed is an important factor.

Of equal importance is the alarming shortage of passenger ships available as troop carriers. In this category we have less than one-half of the tonnage we had prior to the last war. The deficiency has all been well documented. In 1947 the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine recognized it. More recently the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the several congressional committees considering the problem reached the same conclusion. Here again we have been deficient in long-range planning. But in spite of the uncertainties inherent in passenger ship operations, some companies have had the courage to build new passenger ships. They are to be congratulated for their optimism. That passenger vessels are highly important to our military potential is clearly pointed out by the fact that three out of six new passenger ships have already been requisitioned.

A short time ago I had a very instructive and interesting conversation with a leading British authority on shipping. He pointed out the need for more ships in the event of war with imperialist Russia. He made the point that if the Suez Canal were "knocked out," and this is well within the realm of probability, our situation would be desperate. Access to the Middle and Far East would be extremely difficult. The longer routes around Africa would require more ships. Until enough ships were built India and neighboring countries would be effectively cut off from contact with the West. The present fleets could not supply the tonnage to move equipment and troops to those vital areas. Nor are there enough ships to bring the necessary strategic materials so urgently needed for our industries or those of our allies.

No review, however brief, would be complete without mentioning shipbuilding. The status of shipbuilding has improved in the last 6 months. With the building of the 50 class mariner-type ships by the Maritime Administration and increased activity in naval building, many of the yards on the East and Gulf coasts will be able to maintain a reasonable nucleus of skilled workmen. This is not

was transferred to Fort Knox, Ky., then transferred to Camp Custer, Mich. The same year he left for Iceland where he served for 23 months. He was then transferred to England for a short period and then to Northern Ireland where he remained until the invasion at Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944. During the invasion he was cited for the Bronze Star for meritorious service. He was assistant divisional chaplain of the Third Army, Fifth Infantry. He took part in all the engagements of that division in the liberation of France, Luxemburg, and so forth. After the liberation of Metz he took part in the ceremonials of the return of the Bishop of Metz in which he spoke to the liberated people in French and English; also took part in many outstanding activities in Luxemburg and in other cities of Germany.

At the capitulation of Germany on VE-day, May 8, he was stationed in Vienna, Austria, where he and many of his fellow officers and enlisted men received their orders to return to the United States, arriving on May 29, 1945.

Father Prudell has been awarded the Croix de Guerre and possesses the Purple Heart, European Theater Ribbon with five battle stars, the Bronze Star for meritorious service, and several other ribbons for similar bravery.

Upon his return from the European theater Father Prudell was assigned to the Chief of Chaplains' Office at Washington, D. C., after which he was assigned to the Army staff job at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., to prepare the new weekly Army publication entitled "The Chaplains' Hour." This publication was for the purpose of supplying lecture material for the Army's weekly nonsectarian lectures to all troops on morality and citizenship.

Father Prudell's approach to the problem of combating an alarming increase in the venereal-disease rate differed radically from the conventional attack used heretofore by the armed services.

An excerpt from a letter to his father, dated January 9, 1948, states:

A medical doctor and I rewrote the Army's policy and attitude which was signed by Secretary of War Robert Patterson. This directive on discipline and venereal disease became the accepted policy of the Army. In this directive I inserted the clause that chaplains would deliver citizenship-morality lectures as prepared by the Office of Chief of Chaplains. As this policy was implemented throughout the Army, venereal-disease rates went down and attitudes and morale improved.

My contention all along has been that it is not the duty of the Army to change a man after he has received the majority of his training in civil life, but it does have the responsibility not to lower his ideals, and, if possible, to give him continued inducements for better conduct as a good citizen.

Since the unification of the Armed Forces, it is of interest to know that the above program is being rewritten so as to become a policy, not only for the Army but the Navy and Air Forces as well.

After this work was completed, Father Prudell was assigned with a group of 10 Army officers on an Army mission to the far north, which included a tour of Alaskan military installations, Fort Churchill, Canada, Newfoundland, Greenland, and Labrador. This mission was under the leadership of Lt. Col. Hallett D. Edson, of Fort Monroe, Va. The mission was by plane and covered approximately 17,000 miles. Chaplain Prudell was instrumental in bringing about the revision of the Army health program. Emphasis was placed on morality instead of the old scare system. This new system was adopted by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff of the Army, after it had been given a thorough work-out at Fort Knox.

Chaplain Prudell is also a graduate of the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth. He served with the Planning and Training Division Office, Chief of Chaplains, Washington, D. C., and also was post chaplain at Fort Eustis, Va., where he received orders to proceed to Korea.

He was first stationed in Tokyo, Japan, and was titled "The Flying Chaplain of Japan." He said mass at Camp Drake, flew 80 miles to Camp McNair and said mass and then returned to Camp Drake for the rosary, and so forth.

Chaplain Prudell was recently appointed as chaplain of the First Cavalry Division near Tokyo, which was recently announced by Maj. Gen. Robert Gay.

On December 23, 1950, Father Prudell received the announcement that he had been promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel as of December 5, 1950.

Father Prudell's work on the Korean battle fronts continues to be over and above the call of duty as is evidenced by the excerpts from letters of commendation:

In rendering services so faithfully to our wounded and our dying you have not only brought comfort to those who need it, but have brought credit upon yourself and to the division and have been in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service.

HOBART R. GAY,
Major General, United States Army,
Commanding Officer, First Cavalry Division.

During the dark days of Taegu, the chaplain was present at the hospital until late into the night, covering both this hospital and the Fifteenth Clearing Company, again at Kaesong he was present when the wounded arrived from the front. Whenever he had a few spare moments he held services for the Catholic personnel of the hospital.

Chaplain Prudell has accomplished his duties faithfully, a job well done, for which the officers and men of this organization humbly thank him.

ISSAC J. TENDER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Marine Corps.

Address of Robert E. Sherwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon, March 6, in New York, representatives of the publishers, booksellers, book manufacturers, book reviewers, and others associated with the book trade met for the presentation of the second annual national book awards. The national book award, sponsored by the American Book Publishers Council, the American Booksellers Association, and the Book Manufacturers Institute, is the first award to have the sponsorship of the entire book industry. It was established in 1950 to honor the most distinguished books of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry written by American authors.

Gold medals were presented to the winning authors at a ceremony attended by over 500 authors, critics, librarians, and members of the book industry from all over the country. Edward A. Weeks, editor of the Atlantic Monthly, presided over the award ceremony. The speaker for the event was Robert E. Sherwood, four-time Pulitzer prize winner.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to be able to place in the RECORD the following excerpts from Mr. Sherwood's address:

Last summer I made a speech at the opening of the PEN Congress in Edinburgh, and my remarks provoked quite a bit of controversy at the time and subsequently. I was frequently interrupted. One gentleman jumped to his feet and shouted that he had come there to listen to a discussion of the drama and not a lot of dirty American propaganda against the Soviet Union.

Among those present was the distinguished Scottish dramatist, the late and lamented James Bridie. I am afraid that Mr. Bridie—distracted perhaps by the heckling—did not pay very strict attention to what I said, for he later quoted me as having stated that all writers should write nothing but propaganda.

Now, I can say stupid things as well as the next one, but I could not possibly have said anything quite as stupid as that.

What I did say is that no sensitive writer of today can be unaware of the dreadful circumstances of the surrounding world. It is only natural for writers, like other people, to yearn for escape. But now we can find no ivory tower that is sufficiently strong and sufficiently remote to provide a safe refuge.

In this connection I should like to quote from one of the finest speeches I have ever read—the speech delivered by Bill Faulkner in Stockholm 2 months ago when he received the award of the Nobel prize. Mr. Faulkner said:

"Our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it. There are no longer problems of the spirit. There is only the question: When will I be blown up? Because of this, the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good writing because only that is worth writing about, worth the agony and the sweat."

Incidentally, if there is anyone here who has not read all of Mr. Faulkner's short speech, I urge you to do so. It is required reading for anyone who is interested in writing or the publication thereof. The speech was printed in the New York Herald Tribune book review section of January 14 and in Bennett Cerf's department in the Saturday Review of Literature, the February 3 issue.

I do not agree with Mr. Faulkner that "the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself."

true of the Pacific coast. If we are to have a well-balanced program on a sound national basis, we cannot afford to overlook the importance of shipbuilding in the West. The nature of modern warfare dictates that industries be dispersed throughout the country. Nor can we close our eyes to the lessons of World War II when our country was the prime supplier of merchant shipping to all our allies. This came about through an agreement between those two wartime leaders, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. The conditions motivating the agreement are set forth in a letter from the Administrator of War Shipping Administration to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee on July 27, 1943. I quote:

"After Pearl Harbor, one of the general arrangements made by the President with the Prime Minister was that we, the United States, would be the merchant shipbuilder for our cause, while the British yards would be devoted largely to the construction of naval vessels. In accordance with this scheme, the British merchant-ship program was very substantially reduced. A number of persuasive and compelling considerations dictated this arrangement: First, we had the raw materials; second, we had the manpower; third, we had developed a technique which enabled us to produce in mass and with unbelievable speed a vast tonnage of merchant ships; fourth, the cargo was here in the United States to be moved to the various theaters of war."

The same economic and military factors exist today with greater force. We cannot dissipate any of our shipbuilding potential.

Just a few months ago there was a surplus of world tonnage. Due in large part to the Korean situation, the extension of our military and civilian aid programs and stockpiling of strategic materials, a shortage of tonnage has developed. It has become necessary to use the ships of the reserve fleet. The shortages are most acutely reflected in the skyrocketing rates for the transportation of full cargoes of bulk commodities. Liner rates have remained fairly constant. Considering rising costs, the liner rates may even be at a point where they are no longer compensatory.

To alleviate the shortage of ships available to transport the increased movements of Government cargoes, the Maritime Administration, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, is seriously considering operating ships on a general agency plan. To do this a National Shipping Authority has been set up. It is contemplated that the new agency will break out vessels of the reserve fleet and allocate them to private steamship companies for operation as agents for the Government. The program will be similar to that followed during World War II.

The facts which I have called to your attention appear to warrant a general agency operation provided that the operation is limited to Government-owned vessels. I am in accord with the thinking of those charged with administering our maritime laws, there is no necessity to include the privately owned fleet under general agency operations. Such a step would require requisitioning of the ships for charter or for hire. In my opinion it would be justified only in the event of a world conflagration. In the light of our past and present experience, I believe we can all agree that the Maritime Administration is the logical department to operate Government owned or controlled merchant type ships under a limited or unlimited general agency plan.

A Government general agency operation, even though limited in scope, will inevitably interfere with normal shipping operations. If it is not equitably administered there is grave danger the entire industry will be disrupted.

The policies governing agency operations in World War II worked well. Conditions then and today are materially similar. I am advised the Maritime Administrator contemplates adopting similar policies. In any event I am convinced that in allocating vessels or cargoes priority must be given to those companies which are engaged in operating only American flag vessels. Most of the responsible shipping representatives and unions will agree with me that such companies should take precedence over those which also operate vessels under foreign flags. This is particularly applicable under limited agency operations. Further, the integrity of existing services must be protected, particularly the subsidized and unsubsidized berth operators serving the essential trade routes. It would be ruinous to the future of the American merchant marine, if as the result of Government operations, regular berth line services were destroyed. Most informed persons agree with me that as soon as the privately owned American fleet is able to transport the emergency cargoes the Government's operation of merchant vessels must end. I have full confidence the administration will follow this course.

With the rapidly expanding need for shipping, a shortage of skilled seamen is developing. Some ships destined for Korea have been delayed because of the nonavailability of seamen in a particular area. The availability of manpower is generally considered as a local problem. Prior war experiences have conclusively proved that this reasoning cannot be applied to the maritime industry. Skilled seamen comprise a national pool. A national policy for deferment of skilled men is necessary if our defense needs are to be met. It is highly important that uniform procedures be set up and that local boards be informed of the facts.

In developing a long-range maritime policy consideration must be given to technological advances. One that may have a revolutionary import is rapidly shaping up in the atomic field. Our scientists report that a submarine engine using atomic energy will be completed within the year. The speed of a submarine with atomic propulsion is theoretically limited only by its construction features. This being so, ship speed as a defense factor is greatly minimized. We may have to convoy every ship if Russian scientists keep pace with ours. Of greater import will be the ultimate effect on the design of ships following the adaptation of atomic propulsion to surface ships. The step from subs to ships is short. I do not wish to hold out the hope the development is just around the corner. But good sense dictates we keep in mind all possibilities. A merchant fleet is costly and expensive. It lasts a long time. Planning ahead is necessary.

On the whole the outlook in maritime matters is brighter. The Federal Maritime Board and Administrator report progress in formulating methods and procedures for calculating construction and operating subsidies. A new spirit of cooperation with the GAO and other interested Government agencies is developing. The new keynote of constructive criticism augurs well for the future of shipping. But a lot of work remains to be done. A well-planned long-range program is a must. We are a great commercial Nation. Shipping is one of the principal cornerstones of our greatness. We must protect it. The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, recognizes the precept this can be best accomplished by a privately owned and operated merchant fleet. It expresses the sound national policy in keeping with our concept of life as a free people. We must strongly resist the encroachment of Government competition in shipping be it civilian or military.

You know the outstanding job the privately owned American merchant marine has done and can do in peacetime or in any emergency that may arise. It is incumbent on you as an individual, as a member of this club and as a patriotic citizen to tell the story. With your help and assistance we can build up a strong merchant marine—the fourth arm of defense.

Father Prudell, Chaplain in Korea, Fights for Men's Souls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives and the American people the outstanding record of a fighting man in Korea, a fellow Milwaukeean of mine, who fights not with guns against a material enemy on the battle fronts but rather against the enemies of the soul.

I am speaking of Chaplain Harold O. Prudell, recently promoted to lieutenant colonel, chaplain, United States Army. Under unanimous consent, I include an account of Father Prudell's outstanding work in the RECORD.

Father Prudell, the son of Capt. and Mrs. J. A. Prudell, Veterans' Administration, Wood, Wis., was born in Manila, Philippine Islands, August 1, 1912. Upon his return to this country in 1915, his father was given a post at the Soldier's Home and he has lived there ever since.

He attended St. Florian's grade school and was graduated from St. John's Cathedral School. He attended Marquette University High School, graduating in 1931. After graduation he entered St. Francis Seminary and was awarded the bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees. He was ordained to the holy priesthood by Archbishop Stritch on June 3, 1939, in St. Anne's Church. His first solemn mass was celebrated at the Soldier's Home chapel on June 11, 1939.

During his vacation periods, while attending Marquette University High School and St. Francis Seminary, he attended the citizen's military training camp at Fort Sheridan—red, white, and blue course—from which he was graduated with high honors and was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry in 1937. This rank he carried until his ordination to the holy priesthood.

In 1940, at the age of 28, he was the youngest chaplain in the United States Army, and the first Catholic priest of the Milwaukee archdiocese to enter the service with the rank of first lieutenant. He was promoted to the rank of captain on August 12, 1943, and later promoted to the rank of major in 1944.

His tour of service in the United States Army began at Camp McCoy, Wis. He

If Congress and the United Nations will definitely recommend that The Perpetual Calendar be universally adopted beginning with 1956, there should be plenty of time between now and then to prepare the American Ephemeris and other advance publications.

There is no valid objection to the adoption of The Perpetual Calendar, and nothing is accomplished by defending or cherishing our present irrational calendar. We make progress through adopting better methods, and if human inertia and natural resistance to change can be overcome, we may all be able to enjoy the time- and money-saving convenience of having a more useful calendar.

Reprinting The Perpetual Calendar itself creates reader interest and provides a clearer understanding of it. People always like to look at it to see on what day of the week their birthdays and other anniversaries will always fall. It is freely offered for the use of all nations and races, and no permission is necessary in order to reproduce it.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that The Perpetual Calendar be reproduced at this point in the RECORD.

The Perpetual Calendar is as follows:

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR

*New Year's Day (a day apart from any week or month) is the first day of each year, a holiday, followed by the 364-day fixed calendar shown below:

January							February							March						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						26	27	28	29	30			25	26	27	28	29	30	31

April							May							June						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						26	27	28	29	30			25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*Leap-Year Day (a second day apart) is observed only during leap years between June 31 and July 1 as the first day of the second half-year, a holiday.

July							August							September						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						26	27	28	29	30			25	26	27	28	29	30	31

October							November							December						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						26	27	28	29	30			25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*These two year-days are definitely named and have a definite purpose. When considered apart from any week, they allow the calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

The Democracies Must Unite to Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include herewith the following text of an address delivered recently before the Washington Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee by the well-known motion-picture actor, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.:

THE DEMOCRACIES MUST UNITE TO SURVIVE

Today the free world in general, and the United States in particular, are indulging themselves in the luxury of a great debate, a vast discussion involving the very survival of those privileges upon which the life of our society depends. These privileges are so fundamental in our philosophy that we call them rights, but as such a large part of humanity either denies them as rights or has never heard of them, it is perhaps more realistic to call them privileges. The arguments stem from a common agreement on the need to preserve—and even enlarge upon—these privileges. One of our biggest current handicaps in deciding what and how is of having to advertise in advance every possible line of national action to our potential enemies. When, say, we decide to resist at one point but give way at another, when we decide how many we will requisition for our defense forces and where and how we will deploy them, when we decide what the limits of our economy are, these and other vital military and political statistics are publicly analyzed down to the last decimal point and presented to the rest of the world on a platter. So-called secret conferences and off-the-record briefings of officials, presumably concerned with the Nation's welfare, find their way, all or in part, to someone's favorite column. To make matters worse, divergencies between friendly powers on matters of emphasis and procedure provide our enemies with a good hint as to where allied weaknesses can be exploited. We will certainly agree that these charges against the privileges we enjoy can be written off. They are deductible. We would not, if we could, curtail any one of our freedoms. Decisions arrived at via responsible public and parliamentary argument is still the soundest method of providing an intelligent community with the means of determining, and then supporting, its policy.

Though taking our own habits for granted it must be confusing to less blessed lands, immovably placed in the shadow of a militant tyranny; yet listening to our great debate from afar, to know whose voice means business, on whom to depend, on which side of them lies consistency and purpose. This confusion is, of course, abetted by our enemies. We have seen how the Soviets sneer at our achievements and seek to disillusion the well-founded hopes of friends. Our Puritan conscience obliges us to pause from time to time, take stock of ourselves, and, as at a public confessional, openly acknowledge our own weaknesses and assume a defensive stance.

Surely, we can sympathize with those of our friends who during the great debate hear of proposals to assign what is left of their bodies to a loose fraternity of nations whose strongest member speaks with many mouths, first proposing to stand with them, then behind them, then to withdraw (in the hope of being a "last fortress"), then (the other extreme) to disperse its forces on any front where trouble may start. Promises of eventual success are apt to sound ephemeral and less immediately tempting than peace and a loaf of bread.

If a modern Rip van Winkle were to awake from a 20-year sleep on the banks of the Hudson today, he would undoubtedly be as shocked as was the old Van Winkle of a century and a half ago. He would not, I think, be so shocked by the screaming headlines, the blaring radio, or the publicity seekers. "These," he would say nostalgically, "are but the old methods with new trimmings." What would disturb him is the apparent substitution of American faith and purpose with self-queries of whether democracy's destiny is indeed manifest. He would ask: "What happened? Was a great war lost? Has the productivity of the free world lessened? Are the masses of people restive and worse off? Have the hopes for a fear-free world been dashed for a lack of a champion, for lack of incentive? Whence comes this apprehension at home, this trepidation abroad? Where has the great revolutionary vigor of Magna Carta days, of Puritan days, or the eighteenth century, gone? What has become of the great sense of mission which united the people of the world in the idea of freedom? Why do so many either embrace an old, reactionary idea like Russian communism or are paralyzed by the fear of it?"

Surely our reply to old Rip would be plain: First, we could assure him that insofar as America's resistance is concerned the people are not divided on anything but method, that they are fearful because they know that no one nation or system can stand alone for long and survive, that the American community is more a system than a nation, and that until we are more seriously articulate about our objectives we cannot rekindle that flame in men's hearts which makes for greatness and without which our survival is questionable. Second, we could point out the poignant dilemma faced by other friendly communities, severely bled and weakened by war, which see their homes as prospective battlegrounds for giants—one giant, disciplined and dedicated, forcefully imposing regimented order in dynamic terms, while the other giant, prosperous, content, fearful of discipline and unsure of its goal, proposes more obligations and sacrifices as the road to an unspelled-out freedom. Third, we could remind him that each community, understandably, views threats to its accustomed, or desired, ways of life primarily from the vantage-point of its own interests. These interests are rarely appreciated by its neighbors and friends. On an international scale, the British, for example, look to the security of their home islands and commonwealth; Hong Kong and the Mid-East are as important to them as Panama and Hawaii are to us. The French, for their part, are rightfully concerned about internal insecurity, about welcoming an ancient enemy as an ally against a new one and about their tremendous military investments halfway around the world. The numerically weak but gallant Dutch have global problems vital to their very existence. Each one of us has problems peculiar to his own life and tends to put these first things first, considering his friend's problems only afterward.

These, then, are some of the reasons for our doubts and fears. To understand them is at least a step toward coping with them. We are obliged to recognize the frailties and humanisms of the world of independent nations which are attempting to meet the challenge of a great and ambitious power whose objectives and philosophy are well known. This power and its bonded associates receive direction from a single source and no means are too sinister, too pitiless, to distract its attention from its ends. The forces resisting it are, (a) the United States—also a great power, but whose potential strength is weakened by a deficiency of clearly stated objectives, and (b) the rest of the free world—some strong, some weak, though, as a whole, rich in manpower and resources and culture, but uncoordinated and uninspired. Both (a) and (b) are together far stronger than the combination which threatens them. But our modern Van Winkle would never believe it by the way all these people are kept separated and disunited, internally and externally. He would remember Thomas Jefferson's admonition that a civilization's real greatness depend not on statistics but on the

The dilemma of all writers, young or old, is in reconciling those problems of the human heart with a world state of mind that appears to become increasingly inhuman.

Some of the brutal, barbaric censorship which is imposed on writers and artists of all kinds in the Soviet Union is imposed on writers everywhere. There is certainly plenty of it in this country. It is imposed not by law, not by any arbitrary theoreticians in the White House or the Pentagon Building or even by Senator McCARTHY; it is imposed by inward fear.

It is not necessarily fear that at any moment we may all be fissioned.

It is fear that all of our highest hopes and our deepest convictions may be subject to change without notice.

I believe it is no exaggeration to say that those of us who have lived through the first half of the twentieth century have seen more violent changes on the face of this earth than there were in all of the preceding 50 centuries of recorded history. The only pattern that we have known is a pattern of unmitigated and unpredictable instability and turbulence.

The writer who is old enough has distant memories of tranquillity, of the calm afterglow of the Victorian era, the calm that was forever shattered by the shots fired at Sarajevo.

The young writer may have memories of the apparent tranquillity of the 1920's, but he now knows how utterly phony and deceptive and ultimately disillusioning that was.

As Mr. Faulkner has said, we have known this fear—this instability, this awful uncertainty as to what the morrow may bring—we have known it so long that we can bear it.

Mr. Faulkner's career, and the high honors that he has won and earned, prove that we can do more than bear it, we can eventually conquer it and end it.

Just as we have been sorely tried in this age, we have been greatly tested. I think that the way in which the human race has met that test is sufficient proof of its durability.

In a play that I wrote 11 years ago, at the outbreak of the Second World War, I quoted some words from the Epistles of St. Paul, and I should like to quote those words now: "We glory in tribulation; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope."

I think that is sufficient text for any writer in the free world today.

The Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proposing in a bill that I have introduced today the adoption on New Year's Day, 1956, of The Perpetual Calendar devised by Willard E. Edwards, an electrical engineer of Honolulu.

Mr. Edwards has devoted many years to the study of calendar reform. He was born at Chatham, Mass., in 1903. He attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Oklahoma where he received his degree in engineering. He later was a graduate student at the University of Southern California. He was called into the service of the Navy during World War II and attained the rank of lieutenant commander. He has had extensive flying and aeronautical experience, and is an expert in radio and telephone communications. He now makes his home in Honolulu.

The Perpetual Calendar of 12 months and equal quarters is regarded by Mr. Edwards as the logical successor to the 13-month calendar proposed 20 years ago by George Eastman of the Eastman Kodak Co. At that time Mr. Eastman was actively engaged in furthering the adoption of a 13-month calendar to replace our present irrational one. He regarded this movement as a natural evolution in modern life and succeeded in getting more than 100 corporations to adopt the 13-period calendar for their internal accounting purposes.

But auditing, inventories, production, dividends, taxes, etc., are largely and increasingly being accounted for on a quarterly basis, and most of these concerns have now returned to the customary calendar system. Thirteen cannot be split into quarters, and a double system of bookkeeping proved too costly and inconvenient in most cases.

Moreover, to the average individual, 13 identical months of 4 weeks each is exceedingly monotonous, and the fact that there are 13 Fridays-the-13th in the 13-month calendar is very unattractive from a popular viewpoint. Also, with the 1st and 15th always on Sundays, this would cause many monthly and semimonthly payments to be postponed or advanced and would often cause needless expense, confusion, and embarrassment.

The Edwards Perpetual Calendar is described by its supporters as the simplest, the most practical, the easiest to use and to remember of any equal-quarter calendar yet offered for adoption.

The Perpetual Calendar has regularity without monotony, contains 26 working days (plus Sundays) in each month, and allows holidays and anniversaries to fall always on the same day of the week, year after year. This is accomplished by the simple operation of removing 1 day out of 365 from the regular count of the week after its adoption.

To begin with, New Year's Day, an already well-known and internationally celebrated holiday, is proposed not as January 1 but as a "day apart." This is like the "extra day" we now have on crossing the date line from west to east, where two succeeding days of the week occur with the same name. This system has been successfully employed at the one hundred and eightieth meridian, for our convenience in reckoning days, ever since 1884 without any apparent hardship occurring to anyone.

This "day apart" in The Perpetual Calendar is thus taken care of painlessly at the beginning of each year, allowing the remaining 364 days to be divided exactly into 52 weeks and into 4 quarters of 91 days each. It also becomes the 3d day of a 3-day week end, since it follows a Saturday and Sunday (December 30 and 31), and it will not interfere with church attendance. This is more practical than having the "day apart" at the end of the year, since such an arrangement would interfere with Sunday observance and cause a 4-day holiday which would be too disruptive to business.

The second day of the new year, a Monday in The Perpetual Calendar, thus becomes January 1 and will always be the first business or working day of the new year.

In fact, Monday is shown in this calendar as the first day of every week, with Saturday and Sunday at the end, where a "week end" belongs. Three arguments for this are that it is a real and natural need of human nature to rest after a period of work, the seventh day was the Biblical day of rest, and in actual business practice the week is already considered as beginning on Monday. However, for those who prefer it that way, The Perpetual Calendar may be readily printed with Sunday as the first day.

In this up-to-date calendar, the month lengths fall into the easily remembered pattern of 30–30–31, and the starting days into the well-known sequence of Monday-Wednesday-Friday, days on which many weekly events regularly occur. The day of the week for any day in the year can be easily figured in a few seconds by remembering "30, 30, 31; Monday, Wednesday, Friday." No other rhyme or "jingle" is necessary to compute any future date.

The first and the fifteenth, important monthly and semimonthly payroll, bill-paying and accounting days, always fall on weekdays in The Perpetual Calendar. This plan thus becomes the most practical one for a new fixed up-to-date international civil calendar.

There is no unlucky Friday the 13th, or Black Friday, in The Perpetual Calendar to worry the superstitious or to deter them from business sales and the signing of contracts. The elimination of this ancient bugaboo will actually help in many businesses. Executives know that a great many people are not willing to sign contracts, buy insurance or transact business on a Friday the 13th. The elimination of all Fridays the 13th on this calendar has been favorably noted and commented on by thousands of people. This is important to businessmen. Even though they themselves are not superstitious, their customers often are.

Leap-Year Day in leap years comes between June 31 and July 1, and is a second day apart, the first day of the second half-year. It is proposed as a new international summer holiday but may also be considered as a second Sunday. This is a great advantage, for if 2 days apart are to occur in any fixed calendar, it is better for them to be rest days than to be working days, both for workers and for business accounting purposes.

The Perpetual Calendar is offered to the United Nations for international adoption as the simplest and the most practical of any 12-month fixed calendar yet proposed. It is an up-to-date civil calendar, entirely suitable for everyday business, social, judicial, governmental, and school use. It has the main advantages of other proposals, but not their inherent disadvantages.

quality of human being it produces. Yet even this commodity is vouchsafed the Western World in overwhelming abundance.

The United States has done a great deal to promote the general welfare—its own and others—and to throw light onto dark corners. To help heal the wounds of two wars and to reinvigorate ourselves and our friends, the American people wholeheartedly supported vast international economic projects, and, in large part, they have succeeded in their purpose. The Marshall plan halted and, in places, hurled back the rapid epidemic spread of the Soviet virus. An increase in material welfare and moral self-respect were pitted against Marxist dialectic. Also, after years of hampering world trade by selling a lot but buying only a little, we made a wise though tentative beginning sometime back toward a lowering of tariffs. We have spurred postwar foreign reconstruction and rehabilitation, encouraged a military alliance in the form of the Atlantic Pact and put ourselves in the vanguard of those who, despite all, will fight for a principle. But, as the potency of today's threat to our survival is unprecedented, as the power and will alined against the things we are pledged to is relentless and as the test to our nerves and patience is wracking, what we have done so far is clearly not enough. Somehow, our program needs greater and more positive definition.

This deadly germ of the Soviet ideology works its way into the blood stream of the free world's body politic. Like crime, it is not enough to punish or suppress it. We must do more than merely contain the Marxist disease. We must eliminate its causes. Only by a positive policy of set objectives, executed by concerted community action, can we hope to succeed. But how can we and our friends take any initiative unless we know, within limits, what we want?

Obviously, everyone prefers a life of opportunity to one of resignation to direction—to be independent and not dependent. Less obviously, do we realize that successful independence requires the cooperation of the other fellow. It is by mutual indulgence and consideration that individual independence can peacefully be practiced. Independence is a proud and heady brew and is difficult to achieve and maintain. It must be based on common interests, exercised by a common authority, commonly supported. Only in that way can the potential of any free fraternity be realized.

Full and comprehensive agreement appears to be a long way off. We have not yet agreed even between ourselves on where or how or how much to resist; nor do we know quite where we are heading for should our resistance prove successful. What are our long-range, future plans? Are we to recreate the past, withdraw to our arbitrary, man-made borders, let dog eat dog? Are the nations of the world again to vie for trade privileges and jockey for economic advantages?

I wonder if we could, perhaps, hope to ease world problems in a way similar to the method we have evolved on this continent, where, for instance, a Texas cattleman has a stake in the prosperity of a Michigan car manufacturer who is, in turn, dependent on the Pennsylvania coal miner who helps support the Ohio farmer? Would it be too farfetched to dream of a time when a Lancashire cotton spinner will share his vote with a steel worker in the Saar, whose efforts somehow relieve an Italian farmer's bad harvest? As the Californian and Arizonian resolve their local differences on, say, water supply when voting on purely Federal matters, would not the free world's welfare be enhanced if Parisians, Romans, and New Yorkers were also to pool their hopes and interests? Could not, to bring the conjecture down to earth, General Eisenhower's burden be considerably eased if he were able to report to one body capable of issuing precise directives with the speed which the situation will require? Could not western diplomats speak and act for one group, with one set of objectives, or is unity of interest and purpose only for members of the Soviet Empire?

Of course, no proud community wishes to be absorbed by any alien one. Our own Colonies, after uniting in revolution, were some time deciding that their interests lay in federation. Though I venture to say that most men now believe in union—at least in theory—they hesitate today when even wider union is proposed. It is less surprising that this should be so abroad than it is here, in the United States.

There is a curious apprehension of exploring and exploiting a basic element of our own greatness, the greatness inherent in our national motto: "E Pluribus Unum." We know our strength lies in unity—our kind of unity, a voluntary, self-imposed and supported unity. Furthermore, circumstances oblige us, however reluctantly, to recognize that only by unity with Western Europe can we achieve the necesary balance of power to restrain the Soviet combination.

Who, then, argues against binding ourselves in all necessary respects to each other? The American? The European? Americans do not ask for empire. We do not seek to impose the American or any other form of government on anyone. It is proposed to create some compatible form of union—a union of basic and common interests. Better yet, it is proposed that, within the Charter of the United Nations, a convention of democratic and like-minded associates investigate the feasibility of setting up an authority which can speak for its peoples with one voice. It need not and it should not, at this time, dot every "i" and cross every "t." It could, as I see it, begin on a purely provisional and limited basis. It would concern itself for a moment merely with exploring the potential advantage and efficiency which such an authority could achieve. Without something of the sort, we can be sure that no amount of national military power or economic sustenance can or will avail us. Without the double-edged weapon of basic common interests and a spiritual urge, we cannot hope to sustain ourselves.

We have seen how the Soviets identify themselves and their cause with the international workingman. Taking the world at large, this has been a fertile field, because when the international workingman's concern is to exist, he sometimes finds it hard to enthuse over a promise of free votes and free speech. We know, by instinct and experience, that there is at once both a subtler and a more dynamic key to the mutual identification of mankind's fate. We must somehow identify our fate with the fate of others, theirs with ours. It is our own lack of emphasis on such motives for policy that affords the Marxist sloganeers such a widely receptive audience.

When we are asked what America is for, let us say that our first concern is for all peoples to live according to their own needs and desires, not as mere numbers in a soulless, totalitarian state. Let us say that we are for a standard of moral decency and behavior for and between all men and nations, not for a life of spying on our families and the distortion of truths in order that the unholy holy state shall survive. Though famously abjuring the use of violence or the threat of it to obtain our ends, we should make it unmistakably clear that should we or our friends be threatened by violence, in any form, we will reciprocate in kind. Let us say that we are for the further extension of economic freedom and opportunity, and for the system by which every man's right to live his life, enjoy his liberties and, armed with basic security, to pursue happiness as he sees it, protected and encouraged by laws of his consent. Let us then trumpet those ideas around the world till they echo and reecho. Then let us expose the great lie which makes slavery and terror appear to be the only hope, the only security and salvation. Let others from far places assert the same theme in their own tongue and take up the cry in a spirit of fanaticism and revolt against the great conspiracy against mankind. After all, this theme is not an American idea. It is as old as humanity itself. It is as old as sin. Man has always fought for one and against the other.

Having well and truly stated what we are for, we should indicate the way permanently to establish it. My own view is that we need a roof under which all men can find shelter. Once having taken into account ancient prides and prejudices, we should take the first step in proposing to the free world the creed of union by which we live. Let us by all means move cautiously. Everyone else will, you may be sure, do likewise. We must first explore what should be done and then what could be done—then do it.

As I see it, members of an international democratic union would, in the common interest, surrender only those facets of national decision required to make the union a recognizable and effective force. To spell it out, the proposers for Atlantic Union ask now only for a convention of the sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact (and any other free countries that the group wishes to invite) to explore together the extent to which they might apply among themselves the principles of a limited federation, all within the framework of the United Nations Organization. The convention would then report back its findings and recommendations to the governments and peoples represented. The union could be established only after those recommendations had been accepted, which, in our country, would require an amendment of the Constitution.

It is important to point out that this convention would not interfere with the efforts we are already making to meet the present emergency. In no wise do I see it is a substitute for existing diplomatic machinery, be it that of the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations, or any other. It would merely investigate the possibility of finding a stronger "situation of strength" in federation by law than in alliance by treaty.

It is true that many deeply ingrained national interests appear at variance. Britain hesitates to commit her precious resources to a continental plan, because she fears an association from which, if it doesn't succeed, she might not be able to extricate herself. France finds it difficult to lead a movement toward European commonality without Britain. America treads gently on the feelings of Latin-America, yet scolds wounded Europe for not seeing all international problems through our eyes. Union is difficult to achieve, but once established it would provide the tangible machinery of pooling these problems on the basis of common interests. The convention I speak of would study the means by which the differences on procedure and emphasis could be reconciled; it would recommend the method by which the democratic peoples can integrate their strength; it would provide the spiritual inspiration for which the mind and soul of the world hunger. We, in the United States, can give the lead. We shall require patience, wisdom, imagination, and courage. We shall have to persevere without hatred or malice. What are we afraid of? Ourselves? The Soviet Empire? Our friends? No, of course not. Then let us take the initiative on all fronts; not only in armaments and economic aid, not only in military leadership, but in concrete proposals

for a better life for ourselves and for mankind than any which the Comintern can supply. Let us propose the revolution of all individuals against tyranny of some, let us propose the oneness of mankind, the spirit and the fact of a real and workable association of peoples. The time has come when we must provide these peoples of the world with a vested interest in freedom.

If we are for international decency, let us state it. If we are for the dignity of man, let us profess it. If we are for honest and direct dealings, let us proclaim it. If we are for strength and an ever fuller life through unity, let us build it. If we are for our faith, faith in our God and our fellow men, let us fight for it.

An Attempt To Come to Agreement With the Masters of the Kremlin Abandons Their Victims, the Peoples of the Soviet Union and of Satellite Nations, Who Want To Get Rid of Those Masters Who Now Enslave Them

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit a series of articles which were published in the Milwaukee Sentinel February 26, 27, and 28 on the Russian underground movement aimed at the overthrow of Soviet tyranny. These articles show how the Russian underground could be developed to the extent that it may be possible for the Russians to overthrow their Communist oppressors:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 26, 1951]

TRIDENT SPREADS WORD TO RUSS OF REBELLION AGAINST RULERS—KERSTEN SEEKS UNITED STATES AID IN MOVE TO OVERTHROW REDS

(By Edward P. Halline)

The Communist land of the hammer and sickle is now seeing the sign of the trident in public places everywhere.

The trident is the sign with which the growing underground resistance in Soviet Russia is showing an oppressed people that there is a revolt in the making, that there is hope they can be rid of the bloody tyranny that has ruled them for 30 years.

An American policy which would take advantage of that revolutionary movement and encourage the Russian people to fight to regain their liberties is being urged by Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Republican, of Milwaukee's Fifth District.

KERSTEN has been in communication with anti Communist Russians in this country and has in his possession samples of anti-Communist underground literature which has been circulated behind the iron curtain by every kind of trick and wile.

The desperate efforts of the secret police have not availed to keep these bitter attacks on Stalin and his tyrannical regime from getting into the hands of the people of Russia.

KERSTEN said:

"In the past 30 years the Communist regime has murdered 40,000,000 Russians. It has put another 15,000,000 in slave-labor camps. There is hardly a family that has not felt the whip or the club of this police state."

REVOLT LOGICAL

To KERSTEN, to many other Congressmen, to the Russians here in touch with the revolutionary movement, the only policy that makes sense is the policy that will help the Russian people overthrow their oppressors.

The vast potential of hatred built among the Russian people by 30 years of suffering hasn't yet been tapped. It must be if America and the Western World are going to win the cold war, say Kersten, Constantine W. Boldyreff, professor of Russian at Georgetown University, Washington, and Prof. Vladimir N. Petrov, Yale.

SEEKS CONGRESS ACTION

So KERSTEN is going to propose that Congress go on record to express its sympathy with the oppressed people of Russia and satellite countries, to say that the governments that rule them are not legitimate governments and to offer every possible assistance to the movement for freedom.

Congress currently has before it a resolution, on Russian relations, introduced by Senator MCMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and other Senators of both parties, including Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin.

REAFFIRMS FRIENDSHIP

This reaffirms the friendship of the American people for all other peoples including the people of the Soviet Union, regrets the artificial barrier that separates them from those peoples and says America desires "neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war."

But then comes a declaration which KERSTEN says will antagonize the great mass of Russians who long for freedom. Here is the wording of the McMahon resolution:

"Although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences between them and the Soviet government."

SEEN AS VAIN HOPE

To the Russians yearning to be rid of the Red tyranny, that is nothing more than an expression of a vain hope for friendship with a regime relentlessly determined to extend its tyranny over the whole world.

Would KERSTEN's substitute for the McMahon resolution provoke the Communist government into a full-scale war?

"No," says KERSTEN. "Russia would march today if the Communists thought they could win a war."

In last November's Reader's Digest, Professor Boldyreff wrote:

"World war III can be prevented by an immediate and vigorous psychological attack aimed at the enemy's weakest spot—smoldering opposition of the Russian people against their oppressors in the Kremlin. The masters of the Kremlin dread most a movement that will show their victims how to shake off Communist control."

(Future articles will tell how the underground functions behind the iron curtain, how hope is being instilled into the victims of the Red tyranny, how the fighters for freedom are strengthening their cause while waiting for the strategic day to strike off their chains.)

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 27, 1951]

HOW ANTI-RED RUSS UNDERGROUND OUTSMARTS SOVIET OFFICIALS—KERSTEN REVEALS REVOLT TRICKS

(By Edward P. Halline)

In Leningrad a few weeks ago a slightly tipsy worker boarded a streetcar in the central part of the city. He started talking to the guard stationed on board and gave him a drink from a bottle of vodka.

The guard quickly warmed up and a friendly conversation was proceeding when the worker suddenly handed him a package of cookies to have with the drinks. Then the worker got off the car as fast as he could.

The guard, immediately suspicious, shouted an order for his new acquaintance to stop. But the man vanished in the crowd on the street.

Then the guard opened the package. The contents exploded all over the car and out into the street. They were anti-Red, anti-Stalin leaflets put out by NTS (initials of the Russian name, variously translated as National Toilers' Society and National Alliance of Russian Solidarists).

The worker was an NTS agent, and this was just one of the tricks by which the underground makes Soviet officials themselves the unwitting allies in the distribution of anti-Communist literature, said Representative KERSTEN in telling of the revolutionary movement behind the iron curtain.

Most of the literature is printed outside the iron curtain. It is smuggled into Russia and the satellite countries and distributed by every means that will avoid detection.

Copies of the Posev, the Russian anti-Communist paper printed in West Berlin, have been circulated all through Russia, sometimes by use of balloons and rockets. (Posev translates to "sowing" or "seeding time.")

Rockets can be fired about 2 miles. When they land leaflets are scattered. Balloons, too, are loaded with anti-Communist literature and usually they land where the literature will be found.

Plenty of Russians are naturally afraid to pick up or read the underground leaflets, especially in public places, said KERSTEN.

But the fact that such literature gets through shows the people the secret police are far from invincible. This raises hopes of even the most fearful and, at the same time, helps undermine the morale of the police and the Communist officials.

That is the reason for marking the sign of the trident in public places. It is the way a Russian publicly shows his allegiance to the cause without exposing himself to the vengeance of the Communists.

Other Russians may not know who put the sign there, but they know there is another patriot pledged to join the uprising when the time comes to act.

As the sign of the trident spreads over Russia and the satellite countries the psychological effect increases in intensity, KERSTEN has been told by Russian leaders in the movement.

Behind the iron curtain KERSTEN said, the underground is not yet organized in cells or groups. NTS leaders are waiting until the time is ripe for concerted action.

It still is too dangerous to act in groups or even meet in secret. One member, if arrested, can be tortured by the secret police into revealing names and plans. So even the fighters in the underground are not told the names. Their instructions come from the anti-Communist paper printed in Berlin and from the leaflets scattered everywhere.

LEAFLET MESSAGE TRANSLATED

Here is the translation of the instructions to prospective workers in the anti-Communist underground:

"Comrade, friends, if you will read everything written here, and read it again, honestly and sincerely, will think it over, and will decide to take part in the struggle for truth among the people, you are already halfway to victory. The main thing: you will decide to cross the line of lies and hypnotism of Stalin propaganda. If you succeed in doing it, you are already a freeman. Free at this moment within yourself, free in heart and soul. You will see the world about you

peace and recognized the hard fact that power can be matched only with power, and that only a strong nation can speak with authority. At the council table as well as in the field "God is on the side of the big battalions." He had no patience with those idealists who closed their eyes to realities and whose rhetorical ecstasies would have and, in part did, strip us of our armed strength. He did not associate weakness with righteousness and saw no reason why the strong cannot entertain and defend high ideals as well as the weak.

Great as were his mental endowments they were fully matched by his political and moral courage. It is doubtful if any Member of either Chamber in Congress during the last 20 years has stood up for his convictions at the peril of his political life as often as has Virgil Chapman. It can be truthfully said of him that he never betrayed a conviction or a friend for the sake of expediency or gain. This firmness and courage attracted and held the thousands of devoted friends who loyally followed him to the end. He had justified their faith in him. This was expressed by one of them on hearing of his death in an old expression of the mountains: "You can swim the river and ride the mountain with old Virgil," the ultimate tribute to his dependability.

A great Kentuckian, a great American, a great human being sleeps in that newly made grave at Paris. May his slumbers be as sweet as the memories he leaves behind him.

PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Paris, Ky.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Virgil M. Chapman was, up until the time of his death, a valued and esteemed Senator of the United States Senate and a tenacious defender of the political principles in which we all believe; and

Whereas for many years Virgil M. Chapman contributed freely of his time and energy for the betterment of Kentucky farmers as well as farmers in other parts of the Nation, and contributed freely of his time in the interest of all of his constituents; and

Whereas although Virgil M. Chapman was serving his first term in the United States Senate, he had gained a reputation among his fellow colleagues as a man of rugged honesty, high integrity, and intense loyalty; and

Whereas Virgil M. Chapman's associates on the Senate Armed Services Committee and Public Service Committee have lost a man of great intellect and a strong advocate of sound legislation; and

Whereas the city of Paris and Bourbon County have benefited greatly by his lofty purpose and sterling character; and

Whereas the people of the city of Paris and Bourbon County have received an irreparable loss to their community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Paris Chamber of Commerce does hereby in this manner take official notice of the important facts hereinbefore set forth; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the faithful wife and family of Virgil M. Chapman; and that a copy hereof be published in each of the newspapers of general circulation in this city; and that a copy be transmitted to the United States Senate.

This resolution passed this 10th day of March 1951.

MILES M. DAVIS,
President.

Attest:

LOUIS ELMORE,
Secretary.

Committee on resolutions: Miles M. Davis, Clay H. Sutherland, Sam Milner.

[From the Radio program Americans, Speak Up, March 11, 1951]

Each Sunday afternoon at this time, Associated Industries of Kentucky brings you these interviews by Bill Slater with prominent and loyal Americans in the interest of defending and strengthening our American heritage of freedom.

Death came Thursday to the senior Senator from Kentucky, Virgil Chapman, of Paris. All of us may not have agreed with Senator Chapman's views and opinions on the pressing problems of our time. But Senator Chapman was a loyal American and Kentuckian who had the courage of his convictions. He was a man who would stand up and be counted for the things he thought were right. And he did not hesitate to put the good of his country before his political party.

Associated Industries regrets deeply the tragic and untimely death of a man of this kind. Perhaps as never before, America needs men who stand for principle, men who believe that the welfare of our Nation must not be substituted for political expediency; men who believe that our Constitution and our Bill of Rights are sacred to the American heritage of freedom and liberty.

Jewish Persecution Increasing Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Jewish persecution is increasing under the Communist rule behind the iron curtain, according to many reports in the press recently. This is in accord with what might be expected under the Communist creed which demands that there be no other gods but communism. Communism is determined to crush all expression of religious and national feelings.

Lenin, in the gobbledygook of Communist phraseology, expressed his hatred of the Jews as follows:

The idea of a Jewish nationality is contrary to the interests of the Jewish workers and engenders in them a feelirg of hostility toward assimilation.

And in 1937 Stalin expressed his hatred more plainly when he remarked to the German writer, Feuchtwanger:

You Jews have created one eternally true legend—that of Judas.

I wish to include herewith recent news items which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor and the New York Times:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 3, 1951]

ANTI-SEMITISM REPORTED MOUNTING INSIDE RUSSIA

(By J. L. Teller)

For the first time in Soviet history persons of Jewish faith are apparently in physical danger from anti-Semitic violence.

According to reports from inside the Soviet Union and reaching Jewish leaders in both Israel and the United States, anti-Semitic outbreaks have assumed the size of minor riots in some of the smaller towns in the Ukraine.

Even more disturbing, there have been assaults on individual Jews in such large cities as Moscow, with its 300,000 Jews, and Odessa, with its 100,000 Jews.

COMPLAINTS DISREGARDED?

Soviet officials are reported reliably to have shown indifference to the complaints of the Jewish victims and to have taken no steps to curb the mounting frequency of these incidents, notwithstanding the formal ban on anti-Semitism in the Soviet Constitution.

Benjamin West, writing in Israel's best-informed newspaper, Davar, says there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of reports that Jews have been deported from Russian frontier areas. Since, however, figures on these deportations are not available, reports of mass deportations may be exaggerated.

There also have been new round-ups of Zionists and since Zionism has been illegal in the Soviet Union for more than three decades, the arrested men are not youngsters.

They are judged to be mainly veterans of penal servitude, who were released after 10 to 20 years at hard labor in Siberia, but were rearrested when the Moscow radio and the newspaper Pravda began their attacks, just about a year ago, on Ben-Gurion's Marshall plan government.

KIN TOLD NOT TO WRITE

Israeli residents have received letters from their kin in the Soviet Union advising that they no longer wished to receive correspondence from overseas. The Kremlin had encouraged correspondence with overseas relatives during the war years and immediately following the Soviet delegation's support of the United Nation's General Assembly's Palestine partition resolution, under which the State of Israel came into being.

Israeli newspapers report also that Jewish lay representatives and rabbis are no longer to be seen at official Soviet functions, although it is government practice to invite representatives of all ethnic groups residing in the Soviet Union, and to encourage all clergy, both Christian and Moslem, to attend in clerical garb.

Jewish leaders disagree, however, in defining these phenomena of Soviet behavior toward Jews. Some charge that the Soviet authorities have embarked on an outright anti-Semitic policy, tacitly encouraging every form of persecution against persons of the Jewish faith.

Others are somewhat less drastic in their appraisal. One Jewish leader, sharing the second view, asserted this week in an open letter to the Soviet Ambassador to the United States that while the individual Jew still may be physically secure in Russia, the Soviet Union is apparently determined on spiritual genocide of the Jewish group.

SPIRITUAL GENOCIDE CHARGED

The genocide charge has been leveled by Hayim Greenberg in an open-letter article in Der Yiddisher Kemfer, official organ of the Labor Zionist Organization of America, of which he is editor. Mr. Greenberg is also a member of the executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and head of its culture department, and his opinion is highly valued by Israel's top government leaders.

Asserting that he was writing only in his own name, as an American Jew with Russian background, and not in the name of any organization, Mr. Greenberg listed the following evidence of spiritual genocide against Soviet Jewry:

There is not a single Yiddish publication left in the Soviet Union (the former Israel Ambassador to Russia, Mordecai Namid, said there was a Yiddish publication in Birobidjan).

in an entirely different light—as it is, and not as presented to you by that incessant and agonizing 'toothache'—government propaganda.

"If in your soul you surmount that propaganda, you are no longer a slave of Stalin's, but a free fighter in the cause of liberation for your motherland.

"If you decide to take a personal oath to your conscience, when alone think and feel each word of this:

" THE OATH

"'As a true and honest son of Russia, I give my word, and swear truly and truthfully to serve the cause of freedom for my people in the National Toilers Society. I swear in all my actions to be guided by the honor and welfare of my country, sparing no effort during the revolutionary struggle to fulfill the instructions of the revolutionary staff of the Pitchfork (Trident) NTS (The Sign).'

"Then, if you are a believer, make the sign of the cross. If not, go into the field and kiss the earth that gave you life, the earth that is drenched with the blood of our martyrs and our heroes, the earth which you must free. From this moment you are a charter member of this association of the free.

"What are you to do when you set out on the road to fight for liberty?

"The revolutionary staff is sending throughout the country these first battle instructions:

"1. With all means available to you, spread the word of the fight for liberation. Multiply our pamphlets and articles from our news-sheets; compose revolutionary tracts yourself; copy them by hand—using printed letters so that your handiwork will not be recognized; and carefully, so as not to be discovered, leave them where they are sure to attract someone's attention later—in the cars of the trains, in the streetcars and metros (subways); on the tables of eating houses; in offices; and on the work benches in factories. Pin or paste them on the walls of houses and on fences. If you are abroad in the army of occupation, send pamphlets to your motherland. Already thousands of fighters spread our word of liberation in these ways.

"2. Whenever you can, without risk of discovery, draw with chalk, pencil, or lime—or paint—the recognized sign of our association, the sign of our unity—the Pitchfork (Trident) of the people's anger; or draw the letters NTS (which also mean: 'We bring death to tyrants; and: we carry freedom to the toilers).' Do one, or the other, or both. Repeat it. Be not disturbed if at first results are not immediately apparent; sooner or later you will find at the same place, beside your sign or letter, additional signs or letters drawn by other hands. They are your unknown confederates letting you know of their presence. If walking in the street, you see our fighting sign, look to see if no passersby are close, and extend your greetings to your friends by drawing a sign yourself. In order to appraise the significance of this step, remember how such acknowledgment will encourage him, knowing that he is not alone.

"In our motherland, even now in many cities our friends signal, one to another. The 'power,' while it can, conceals all information about the fight against it; but soon it will be able to conceal no longer. Soon throughout the entire land will blink and twinkle the lights of our cause, our struggle for liberation. Soon the fighters will force the 'power' to reckon with us, and then to retreat before the revolutionary force. That day will be the beginning of the end of Bolshevik tyranny. Limit your action, for the time, to limited deeds; but know that from millions of limited actions, great deeds spring."

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 28, 1951]

ANTI-RED UNDERGROUND SPREADS TO RUSS ARMY

(By Edward P. Halline)

Copies of the Russian anti-Communist paper, Possev, printed in the western zone of Berlin, get to millions of Soviet officers and soldiers in Russia, and in Russian-occupied countries.

The Russian secret police, more than anyone else, would like to know how it's done.

The underground edition of Possev has the same format as the Red army newspaper, Sovietskaya Armiya. So once the contraband sheet got into the distribution channels, it wasn't too hard for countless copies to slip through to the soldiers.

STILL BEING DONE

That was first reported last summer and it is still being done in the face of the most desperate efforts by the Reds to stop it, said Representative KERSTEN.

When Soviet officials ordered a Government stamp on all copies of the Army newspaper, the underground issues carried the stamp, too. This certainly is an indication that plenty of Russian Army officers and men are agents of NTS, the Russian underground organization, or at least are sympathizers.

Leaflets going to Russian officers and soldiers in the Soviet-occupied zones of Austria and Germany stress the questions those men must be forever asking themselves.

Why do the conquered peoples live better than the Russians at home? Why are the Russian soldiers not allowed out of their barracks? Why are they forbidden to fraternize with the Austrians and Germans?

LEAFLET SHOWS MAP

An Austrian leaflet in Representative KERSTEN's possession has a map for the benefit of sympathizers in danger of discovery and arrest. It shows the Soviet and western zones of Vienna, the Danube River, and also portions of Czechoslovakia and Austria.

But it tells the anti-Communist Russians not to escape unless it is necessary to save themselves.

"The fighters for freedom in the army and in the motherland are needed more there than abroad," the leaflet says.

That is the type of propaganda the underground is carrying on and with little money or technical facilities, Representative KERSTEN said.

With such a revolutionary group at work, with the great majority of Russians opposed to the red regime, the American Government cannot afford not to profess its friendship for the Russian people and give them every assistance possible, he declared.

WILL UPSET STALIN PLAN

The increasing strength of the underground will upset Stalin's military plans and prevent world war III, KERSTEN said.

A letter from Russian-born Vladimir N. Petrov, Yale professor, told KERSTEN that Stalin probably fears his own people more than the A-bomb. Another Russian, Prof. Constantine W. Boldyreff, who helped organize the underground in 1930, said in the Reader's Digest last November that Stalin fears a revolt more than American rearmament.

Revolt is brewing in Red China, where the peasants who were promised land are facing collectivization, KERSTEN said. And in Russia a new collectivization drive is planned that will uproot 12,000,000 peasant families. Now is the time, he said, for the Western World to take advantage of rising tide of hatred for communism in Communist lands.

The Late Honorable Virgil M. Chapman, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some statements made relative to my good friend and deceased colleague, Virgil M. Chapman. The first is an editorial by Mr. Charles Finnell, writing for the Cynthiana Democrat, published at Cynthiana, Ky. Second is a resolution of the Paris Chamber of Commerce, Paris, Ky., and the third an introduction to a radio program sponsored by the Associated Industries of Kentucky, given on March 11, 1951, shortly after the funeral services at Paris, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial, resolution, and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

(By Charles Fennell)

The death of Senator Virgil M. Chapman was tragic and untimely. He had entered upon a career in the Senate which gave fuller scope to his powers and in which he was fast winning the admiration, respect, and confidence of his colleagues and the country. Had his services continued he would have added his name to the top five or six greatest men that Kentucky has contributed to the public life of America.

He had the finest mind of any man we have known. The scope of his intellectual interests was wide and scholarly. His knowledge of history and of literature was amazing. He could quote from the classics by the hour.

The basic political principal of his life can be summed up in one word—balance. To him the general welfare and happiness of our country depends upon achieving and maintaining a practical balance among the great segments of our economy—agriculture, labor, industry, commerce, and finance. When viewed in this light his political career has the unity and singleness of purpose of a drama. At its beginning in 1924 the industrial, commercial, and financial interest had achieved a domination of the national economy. This had destroyed its balance and had left agriculture a sick economy as President Coolidge called it. Among the victims of this imbalance none were harder hit than the tobacco growers of his district and State whose champion he became.

A life-long friend of labor as another victim of the imbalance, he refused to go along with the dictatorship of the labor bosses when they sought domination of the economy as he had previously fought other such attempts by industry and finance. He knew that their success would be ruinous to all including our laborers. In this he was a truer friend of the laborer than these power crazy bosses. He would have opposed any similar attempt at domination by agriculture for the same reason.

His long-time advocacy of military and naval preparedness sprang from the same principle. He knew that a balance of power among nations is necessary to international

genocide now being practiced by Communist dictatorship in its drive to destroy physically, culturally and spiritually the Jewish people, who internationally constitute the most active anti-Communist racial minority.

"This Communist drive to exterminate Jews as a people within the U. S. S. R. and its satellites foreshadows an effort to liquidate other political, racial and cultural minorities."

Harry N. Rosenfield, a member of the Displaced Persons Commission, reported that under the Displaced Persons Act, 220,000 DP's had arrived in this country since October 30, 1948, or were on the way, and that thousands of others were departing daily.

He gave the following distribution on the basis of religious affiliations: Catholics, 98,400, or 45 percent of the total; Protestants, 74,500, or 34 percent; Jews, 44,300, or 20 percent; others, 2,800, or 1 percent.

"In American foreign policy," he said, "the displaced persons program is the symbol of American determination to stand by fighters for freedom; in domestic affairs, the displaced persons program adds to our sinews of strength for arming ourselves and our allies to protect and preserve the peace."

Adolph Held of New York was re-elected national chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee, a post he has had since 1938. Also renamed were Joseph Baskin, secretary; David Dubinsky, treasurer; Jacob Pat, executive secretary; Nathan Chanin, chairman of the administrative committee, and Benjamin Tabachinsky, national campaign director. All are from New York.

The Death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Calvary of the Great," by N. E. Nicoladies, printed in the June issue of the Voice of KEPA, commenting on the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—THE CALVARY OF THE GREAT

It is the fate of the great to ascend their Calvary wearing a crown of thorns.

It is the fate of the great, who were born to lead humanity forward, never to enjoy the fruit of their labors. The same fate was destined for our great friend, the helper of those who suffer, the man who loved humanity more than himself, our great and beloved of the people, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He worked and toiled; blood was the sweat of his brow, his only compensation having been that he did his duty. He ascended calmly his Calvary, the place destined for all those who work and suffer for us, for our liberties, for the morrow, for the future generations.

The whole of humanity, all right-thinking people, those who suffer from pain and privations, who are struggling and distressed, turn their eyes toward the fresh grave of the great humanitarian.

No tears, sobs, or words are adequate to express our pain for the loss of this great man.

The extinct personality of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the paragon of all virtue and goodness, kindness and love, of every healthy thought. Since the day he became conscious of life, his concern was how to secure a better life for the future generations of humanity. His whole life was expended in all directions in the struggle for the success of this idea. And, fatally wounded in this struggle, he fell on the eve of the day that the crown of laurel, the only crown that was fit for him, was ready to adorn his work.

His teaching, the beautiful teaching of love and peaceful coexistence of all peoples under one great, homogenous democracy, springing from the people, existing for the people, and working for the people, shall predominate throughout the ages as the most radiant ray of light on earth and as an eternal memorial of the man who taught it. His teaching shall become the axis around which shall move from now on the nations and the communities of the earth which is inhabited by us, whom he aspired to lead to the safest haven of life, the haven of equality and justice.

This lucid intellect, endowed with an enormous strength of tolerance, foresight, perspicacity, and absolute and unblemished justice, was the intellect for which the masses of mortals were waiting for thousands of years.

Rest in peace, our great President. Rest not only from your labors and toil for us, but rest also in the thought that it is no longer possible for those who rule today, and those who will come tomorrow, to overlook the righteousness, the goodness, and the divinity of the direction toward which you guided us, holding us by the hand like a great father of the whole humanity.

You were the greatest warrior of the ages and you fell more than heroically on the eve of the day when the great battle for true civilization, in which you were the protagonist, was to be crowned with the eternal crown of victory and glory.

But the crown of thorns on your brow has deeply wounded you during these years and you succumbed, but not before you laid down the unshaken foundations of the edifice you wished to build. The first cornerstones of the edifice, in which humanity will dwell in the future, shall bear your traces—the traces and the seal of your great personality as a guaranty that this edifice of yours will last forever.

You have been the great statesman, the best head of family, the great philanthropist, our friend, and greatest fellowman. You have been the father of all humanity—of the poor, the suffering, the workers, the orphans, the weak and the meek in spirit—and for them you lived and worked and toiled and gave your life.

Your sermons are destined to live throughout the ages—engraved in gold letters on the metope of the earth.

No words in poetry or prose, in speech or writing, can adequately praise your deeds.

No voice can express precisely what you have done for us. Only the combined voice of humanity—only this united voice—is able to express in two words to you, Oh, great and unforgettable President, something fitting: We thank, we thank you for everything you have done for us, for the peoples of this earth, for those who hunger and thirst for liberty, for the fatigued and the unfortunate, the distressed and the oppressed.

Rest in peace forever, our great President. Your spirit will be our guide from now on. Rest, our great President. A grateful humanity is supporting the load of earth that covers you for everything you have done for it. Hail, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. You have not died. You live and will live as long as the earth on which you were born.

It is your deeds that have carved your immortality.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in recent times there has been a considerable amount of unfair criticism in the press as to alleged profiteering on the part of the farmer. In some instances we know that there has been considerable income in the case of large scale farming by a few very wealthy individuals in agriculture. However, that refers to only a very small minority. In the case of the small family type farm which still comprises the great bulk of farms throughout the Nation and in my own State, there is certainly no justification for any allegation that the farmer is profiteering or is gouging the consumer or is getting a disproportionate share of income. On the contrary, the same milk that sells on my farm, for example, for around 7 cents per quart has tripled in price by the time it reaches the consumer. So, obviously the farmer is hardly benefiting from that tremendous price spread; middlemen all along the line are getting the lion's share.

I have in my hands a very illuminating editorial published in the March 15 issue of the Glenwood City Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that its text be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRY REPORT—CRITICS CONTINUE TO BLAME FARMERS FOR INFLATION

Anyone who reads the large metropolitan dailies and many of the nationally circulated magazines cannot help but gain the impression that farmers are the root of the inflation evil. Every boost in food prices is played up big, and the consumers gain the impression that farmers are waxing rich at the expense of further inflation.

No one can deny that the farmers are receiving slightly higher prices for their products, but who is responsible? Meat prices are high because consumers are eating more meat than ever before and are bidding the price up high. The unfortunate thing is that farmers seldom receive anywhere near as large a part of food price increases as do the processors and the people who work for the processors.

Unless agriculture is to suffer some pretty bad black eyes, there must be started very soon a program to educate consumers. Agriculture is merely beginning to catch up with the boom that never ended for other branches of the economy. Since 1948, the peak year for agriculture, net farm income has dropped, but profits of industry and wages of industrial workers have continued to climb to new peaks in that period.

In other words, farmers' prices have been dropping while the cost of goods farmers must buy has been increasing as a result of higher wages and higher profits in industry. Now that consumer demand, again affected by higher wages is putting upward pressure on farm prices, farmers are being blamed for the inflationary spiral. Labor and industry want to freeze food prices just as those prices are beginning to bring agriculture near other branches of the economy in buying power.

Nothing has been heard, in nearly 2 years, from any of the Yiddish writers in the Soviet Union. Assuming there is no longer an audience for Yiddish publications, surely there must be sufficient interest among Soviet Jews to warrant publication of at least one Russian-language magazine dealing with Jewish affairs for the nearly 2,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union.

SILENCE IMPLIES GUILT

Mr. Greenberg notes that the Yiddish theater has received no mention recently in the columns of the Soviet press. He asks, furthermore, what has happened to the Jewish schools in Russia, and notes that these questions have been addressed many times in the past to the Soviet ambassadors in various countries, but no answer has been received to date. Their silence must be regarded as implied confession of the charge of spiritual genocide.

The American Jewish Committee has prepared a memorandum on the persecution of religious Jews in Russia. According to this memorandum and testimony from other sources, the few synagogues functioning in Moscow are administered by persons of dubious rabbinical status and by sextons that are party agents. Performance of certain religious rites brands individuals as suspect in the eyes of the party, and instruction in Hebrew is given clandestinely because use of the language is illegal.

The amazing thing is that these clandestine schools, where instruction is largely from memory rather than books, which are unavailable, have produced some brilliant Talmudic scholars, according to wartime orthodox Jewish refugees from Poland who have come out of Russia since the end of the war. Because Soviet workers are granted days off on a rotating basis, orothodox Jews find it impossible to observe the Sabbath.

[From the New York Times of January 11 1951]

HUNGARY TO DEPORT JEWS—COUNCIL MEMBER HERE SAYS ANTI-SEMITIC DRIVE IS STEPPED UP

Dr. Bela Fabian, member of the Hungarian National Council, disclosed yesterday that he had received news from the Hungarian underground that the anti-Semitic campaign had been stepped up in Hungary and that preparations were being made by the Communist dictatorship to deport 20,000 persons, many of them Jews, to Soviet forced-labor camps.

Dr. Fabian also made public an article that he will publish in the current issue of the New Leader, liberal weekly, in which he gives details on the ground for fears by members of the council that the anti-Semitic campaign is the prelude to wholesale deportation of Hungarian Jews.

The Hungarian underground reported that it had received news of wholesale deportations to eastern Siberia of "almost the entire Jewish population of the Ukraine, White Russia, and the Crimea," Dr. Fabian said.

[From the New York Times of February 17, 1951]

PURGING OF JEWS IN SOVIET LANDS DECRIED IN PLEA FOR ACTION BY UN

ATLANTIC CITY, February 16.—The national executive board of the Jewish Labor Committee called here tonight for a thorough inquiry by the United Nations of the cultural and spiritual destruction of Jewish life in Russia and other Soviet-dominated countries behind the iron curtain.

The action was taken by 250 members of the board at their annual conference here after they had heard a detailed report showing that no sign of Jewish life remains in the Soviet Union today and that the spiritual liquidation of the Jewish people in the satellite countries goes on at a rapid pace.

The board, representing half a million persons, adopted a resolution authorizing the administrative committee to the Jewish Labor Committee to present before the Commission of Human Rights of the United Nations all known facts concerning the situation.

Adolph Held, national chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee; Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, CIO; and David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, A. F. of L., were appointed to present the matter to the United Nations.

The report on Jewish life behind the iron curtain and in Western Europe, made by Nathan Chanin, of the labor committee's administrative committee and educational director of the Workmen's Circle, contained the following findings:

Russia: No trace is left of Jewish culture. All Jewish schools have been closed; Yiddish newspapers and periodicals silenced; Yiddish writers have been liquidated; Biro-Bidjan, proclaimed an autonomous Jewish republic in 1926, no longer exists in a true sense.

Rumania: The Rumanian Communist Party is almost completely purged of its Jewish members—68,000 being expelled when the party was consolidated early in 1950. A stop has been put to the emigration of Jews to Israel. Antisemitism has not died in Rumania, nor has the Communist government considered it necessary to conduct a fight against it. In the past 2 years all Jewish schools, synagogues, and newspapers have been closed down.

Poland: There are no more than 50,000 Jews left in Poland. Emigration to Israel has been banned. Zionism is regarded as a crime and treason, and Israel is a hated country, regarded as ideologically bound with the United States and Great Britain. The Jewish community, its cultural institutions, and its religious activities have been placed under the supervision of Jewish Communists.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia: Life is no better for the Jews in these countries than it is in Rumania or Poland.

In contrast, it was reported that the conditions of the Jews in Western Europe were more secure and that there were great expectations that of all the Western European Jewish communities, France would remain the largest. Nearly 250,000 Jews are now in France.

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1951]

UNDERGROUND BUSY BEHIND CURTAIN—MACHINERY THAT AIDED JEWS IN ESCAPING HITLER AGAIN HELPS OPPRESSED TO ESCAPE

ATLANTIC CITY, February 17.—More than 1,000 endangered Jews, including former labor and governmental officials, have been rescued from countries behind the iron curtain by members of an underground operated by the Jewish Labor Committee, it was reported here today.

Jacob Pat, of New York, executive secretary, told members of the committee's national executive board at their annual conference here that its agents both in the United States and Europe were arranging the escape of many thousands more—all under the noses of the Soviet-dominated secret police.

He emphasized that Jewish agents are risking their lives to rescue victims of Polish, Rumanian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Czechoslovak communism and help them to freedom.

"Outstanding among the activities of the Jewish Labor Committee during 1950 were the efforts to rescue endangered persons from countries behind the iron curtain," Mr. Pat said. "Once again we have been forced to set up our underground machinery in Europe."

1940 WORK REPORTED

"In 1940, just 10 years ago, we set up an underground operation that rescued thousands of important fighters for freedom from Hitler's slave Europe, and today we are again working and saving the lives of democratic opponents of Stalin's tyranny.

Mr. Pat said, "The underground agents rescue those Jews who are refused clearance by the Soviet-dominated Government to emigrate to Israel.

"Many of these people, and there are thousands of them, have been active in the free labor movement, in civil groups and social welfare work," he noted. "For these Jews a hopeless future existence in Soviet land is the price demanded by the Communists."

Mr. Pat emphasized that tightened lines and Soviet-commanded reinforced border patrols make it virtually impossible to successfully find a rear exit to the dungeon-like bleakness of Sovietland.

"The emphasis in escaping Stalin's inferno as of November 1950, had turned to extensive use of misleading identification papers to smuggle these Jews, and their families in many cases, to a friendly neighboring European country and then to Israel and permanent freedom," he declared.

COST OF CREDENTIALS

Illegal credentials sell for approximately $100 each on the black market and elsewhere in certain Soviet-controlled states, it was explained, but as agents work inward toward the Soviet itself, the price for such credentials becomes even costlier, the existence of such escape papers more scarce.

Mr. Pat said that in Russia itself the Jewish underground is not operating its rescue network because, among other reasons, it is felt that there would be very few trustworthy agents to help with the work.

Head of the Jewish underground is an unidentified man in his late fifties who handled the underground operations against Hitler, Mr. Pat said. He works out of the committee headquarters in New York City.

Several of the European agents of the underground have been imprisoned or simply disappeared, it was revealed.

The executive board adopted a resolution calling upon the United States Government and other democratic nations joined by the Atlantic Pact not to rearm Germany and to hold firmly to the oath they took at the end of the war to liquidate all of Germany's armed forces.

[From the New York Times of February 19, 1951]

VOICE IS INVOKED IN ABUSE OF JEWS—LABOR COMMITTEE ASKS STRESS ON THE PLIGHT OF MINORITIES IN THE SOVIET'S DOMAINS

ATLANTIC CITY, February 18.—The Jewish Labor Committee, representing 500,000 persons, urged here today that Voice of America broadcasts give greater emphasis to the mistreatment of Jews and other minorities within the Soviet sphere.

The action was taken in a resolution approved unanimously by the 250 members of the committee's national executive board at the final session of a 3-day annual conference.

Observing that the thousands of refugees who have sought asylum in the West agree that the Voice of America is doing an essential and increasingly effective job, the resolution continued:

"The policies, attitude toward and treatment of minorities—racial, cultural and political—by any government is the acid test of whether it is genuinely democratic and civilized.

"Just as the conscience of the civilized world was aroused by the Hitlerite policy of genocide, so also the conscience of everyone who believes in decency, justice and the dignity of man must be aroused against the

The temptation to bring back wartime subsidies is great for the politicians who think they can go on forever fooling the people into believing that when you pay part of the bill in taxes you pay nothing. Somebody must tell the consumer that subsidies are more expensive than paying their bills in the market place, for the simple reason that you cannot dish out subsidies without a huge administrative cost.

There is a big job to be done, too, in waking up Mrs. America to the fact that eating must remain as the primary expense in any family budget. That food costs have not been out of line is proved by the figures: In 1950 American families spent only 19 percent of the family income for food, as compared with an average of 23 percent in the 1935-39 period.

Farmers are being made the scapegoats in the present inflationary spiral. Farm prices have increased in recent months, but they have increased from a previous drop during which industrial prices and wages were constantly going up. Farmers are the only major economic group who suffered a decline in income since the end of World War II. The public, however, is not being told the entire story, and farmers are suffering very adverse criticism as a result.

The Late Honorable Virgil M. Chapman, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Paris, Ky., newspaper, the Paris Kentuckian-Citizen, and also one from the Oldham Era, of La Grange, Ky., relative to my good friend and deceased colleague Virgil M. Chapman:

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paris Kentuckian-Citizen]

WE SHALL NEVER SEE HIS LIKE AGAIN

The sad news of the death of Senator Virgil Chapman in Washington Thursday morning was received in his home community of Bourbon County a short while later as a shock which has been, perhaps, without parallel in the history of the county.

The impact of the almost unbelievable loss has been such that expression is still difficult under the stunning realization that his eloquent voice has been finally stilled, that his stout heart no longer beats and that his strong hand has been removed from the shoulders of his beloved people.

Through the untimely death of Virgil Chapman, we are sure that a great statesman has been lost to the Nation in a trying hour. We know that the people of Kentucky have lost a great advocate. The people of his home community have lost, indeed, a great friend.

The Kentuckian-Citizen, his home-town newspaper, leaves the larger tributes the hour seems to demand to other associates of Senator Chapman, hoping to remain, rather, on the plane of simplicity reserved for his old-time friends and neighbors. We who knew him best here at home knew him for traits of sterling character which will be the truest measure of his worth—for his rugged honesty, for his high integrity, for his intense loyalty, and for his lofty purpose. We remember him through many years since first he enlisted his services under the banner of exalted principle—a banner which fluttered to the ground Thursday on what seems to us to have been the very threshold of an even greater stewardship, unsullied still by the sacrifice of a single conviction.

His fine virtues far transcended his faults, to a degree only recording of the scroll will reveal eventually. He was our friend, tried and true. Our hearts are heavy today here in Bourbon County because of his death.

[From the Oldham (Ky.) Era of March 16, 1951]

A NOBLEMAN STRICKEN FROM THE SENATE ROLLS

The untimely death of Senator Virgil M. Chapman is not only a loss to Kentucky but to the United States Senate and to the Nation. After a long and distinguished service in the House of Representatives he brought to the Senate that wealth of legislative experience, sound judgment, and wise counsel so necessary to fulfill prudently the obligations of a Senator and he was daily growing in political stature.

One had to know him to appreciate what he really was and to appraise his true character. The people have had few servants more honest, more conscientious, more loyal and dependable. It is difficult to find a deeper student of the history of our colonial ancestors who were responsible for the birth of this Nation.

His first visits to Oldham County were in the days of the organization of the Burley Tobacco Cooperative Association. He made friends among the farmers and businessmen of this country and they were his friends forever. When Oldham County was a part of the district he so ably represented his visits were frequent and he continued to add friends.

Virgil Chapman was an experienced, illustrious statesman, a peerless orator, and a great patriot who knew no dictator but his conscience, no guide but his judgment and no purpose but to serve his country. While on the mountaintop of success, in the very heyday of manhood, while all the tides of life and joy and hope were flowing full and fair, from an environment of prosperity, comfort, love and peace he was abruptly summoned to take his journey to that mysterious country from which no traveler ever returns. With courage and hope he went from the restless land of the living into the silent land of the dead.

He was a man who thought clearly, who considered questions logically, and who possessed the virtue of thinking straight. He arrived at decisions quickly, and once having arrived at a decision as to what was right, he could not be changed. He would not tolerate what he believed to be wrong.

During his legislative experience his fine character, intellectual integrity, far-seeing statesmanship, and wise counsel were outstanding. He loved his country and realized its great power and influence in world affairs.

There was nothing narrow about his vision. He saw with uncanny accuracy the likely unfolding of world events and threw his great vision and statesmanship into the struggle to bring his countrymen and men and women everywhere a chance for peace and prosperity on a world-wide scale.

His convictions were founded on deep thought. Compromises were not a part of his nature. He began and ended his career with the same basic philosophy of government. The illustrious son of a great State, beloved by all who knew him, he left footprints that will endure for all time. The legislative annals of the Nation have been enriched by the eloquence, the persuasion, and the logic of his oratory.

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Confirmation of Nomination of Thomas Fairchild To Be United States Attorney for Western District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the confirmation of the nomination of Hon. Thomas Fairchild to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, together with certain correspondence on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night the Senate confirmed the nomination of the Honorable Thomas E. Fairchild to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

This nomination was of interest to the people of Wisconsin because last November, our people rejected the political philosophy of Mr. Fairchild when they returned me, as his opponent, to another term in the United States Senate.

This is the fourth such occasion in which I have entered no objection to those who were either candidates against me in an election or were previously active participants in such opposition. The first such occasion was the nomination of the Honorable F. Ryan Duffy to a United States district judgeship. Judge Duffy had, as the Senatorial incumbent, opposed me in the November 1938 elections and was defeated. Later he was elevated to the appellate judgeship without any objection on my part.

The third such occasion was the nomination to a Federal judgeship of the Honorable Robert Tehan, Democratic national committeeman for the State of Wisconsin.

The fourth was the nomination of Thomas E. Fairchild for this United States attorneyship.

Some folks in the State of Wisconsin have wondered at what might seem to them the peculiar sight of a Republican Senator not objecting to the nomination to important posts of his former opponents. I, however, feel that no Senator, including this Senator, should hold a man personally obnoxious to him, merely because in good faith he happens to have opposed the Senator in a political campaign.

When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the Republican Eightieth Congress, I set up three standards—ability, integrity, and Americanism—for screening all nominees. I insisted, moreover, that no nomination be considered by our committee

until the nomination had been taken up prior to submittal to us with the State Bar Association and the American Bar Association for clearance. We thus succeeded in securing the nomination, after several alternatives had been submitted to and rejected by the New York State bar, of a great Federal judge, the Honorable Harold Medina.

Prior to the Judiciary Committee's consideration of Mr. Fairchild, I corresponded with him, asking if he would faithfully apply the laws of the United States, even a law such as the Taft-Hartley statute which was a crucial issue in the 1950 campaign in that he had urged its repeal whereas I had supported its continuation. Mr. Fairchild wrote back, stating that as a faithful public servant, he would fully carry out his legal responsibilities.

I felt that on that basis there was no substantial basis for me to seek rejection of his nomination. To be sure, I would have hoped that the President might have seen fit to nominate a man of more conservative viewpoint. I have pointed out on a number of occasions on the floor of the Senate that the Federal bench is literally packed with individuals of one particular political belief, namely, the left wing of the Democratic Party. If the President feels that he has to appoint practically exclusively Democrats, let him at least appoint some members within that sizable branch of his own party who are conservative in their approach.

Back in 1947 and 1948, if we Republicans had been of a mind to do so during the Eightieth Congress, we could have voted down every single Democratic nomination sent to us. But we did not take the partisan approach then, and I, for one, do not propose that we take the partisan approach now.

The American Bar Association has in the past enthusiastically endorsed the viewpoint which I have expressed on the imperative necessity of security a greater balance in the Federal courts; a balance between parties, a balance within the Democratic Party. I, for one, pledge my continued efforts along this line. It is my judgment that there would be a tremendous shot in the arm to American unity if President Truman, during this national emergency, were to abandon his purely partisan approach to this matter of judicial and quasi-judicial nominations.

I want the people of the United States to have complete and unreserved faith in the Federal courts and in United States attorneys. I want them to feel that when they go before a United States attorney or a judge, they are going to be assured complete justice, regardless of their own particular political background. I do not see how individuals can have such complete faith and confidence so long as the courts continue to be packed with such a complete unbalance in personnel.

There follows now the complete text of my correspondence exchange with Mr. Fairchild. As will be noted, I have commended him for his very constructive answer to my inquiry. It was an answer worthy of the name Fairchild which through previous generations has come to denote integrity and sound leadership in our State.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
March 1, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS FAIRCHILD,
Verona, Wis.

DEAR MR. FAIRCHILD: I have seen a number of the endorsements sent by your friends to the Judiciary Committee in connection with your nomination. On the other hand, I have a number of letters from very distinguished attorneys in the State and others, who have personally talked to me on one particular issue about which they and I are in doubt and which they and I think is very important.

You will remember that during the campaign you were very outspoken for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I was wondering therefore, if your nomination for United States attorney should be confirmed, whether in view of your expressed attitude and in view of your affiliation with those who have made the Taft-Hartley law a political issue—whether you believe you could faithfully prosecute any and all violations of the Taft-Hartley statute.

The letters in your favor on file generally speak of your good character and your ability, but do not cover the answer to this question. I should appreciate hearing from you on it.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

VERONA, WIS., *March 6, 1951.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of March 1. You refer to the fact that during my campaign for election to the Senate I said I would vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and you ask whether I believe that as United States attorney I could faithfully prosecute violations of that law.

I can assure you that I will faithfully perform the duties of United States attorney arising under any law of the United States, without exception. When I take my oath to do so, it will be without reservation of any kind. If circumstances should occur under which it is my duty to take some action under the Taft-Hartley law, I would perform that duty just as I would if it arose under the Criminal Code, the Internal Revenue Code, the Defense Production Act, or any other statute of the United States.

You have served as district attorney. I am sure you will agree that the prosecutor's personal opinion that a law is a bad law would not justify his failure to enforce it. Under our American system of separation of powers, it often happens that a judge decides a case in a certain way solely because that result is required by a statute with which he disagrees. He would vote to repeal or change the law if he were a legislator, but as a judge he is bound to give effect to it. An officer in the executive department often performs a duty required by a law he would vote to repeal or amend if he had the chance.

When a Senator casts a vote, he necessarily decides whether a law is wise and desirable. But a United States attorney who withholds action under a particular law because of his belief that the law is unwise would be trespassing on the legislative function.

You note in your letter that I am affiliated with those who have advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Had I been elected a Senator, I would have voted for repeal. No affiliation, however, could influence me to attempt, as United States attorney, to nullify a law by failure to perform a duty.

I hope that I have satisfactorily answered your question. I very much appreciate your giving me the opportunity to do so.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS E. FAIRCHILD.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
March 8, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS FAIRCHILD,
Verona, Wis.

MY DEAR MR. FAIRCHILD: Thank you for your letter of March 6 responding to my inquiry.

I think that your reply is very reasonable and commendable. While I obviously do not share your basic political thinking, I do believe that you have approached the problem of fulfilling the duties of your future office in a very judicious way.

I shall, therefore, not offer any objection in the Senate Judiciary Committee to your nomination, and I shall seek to expedite it to the greatest extent possible.

I am sure that you share my feeling of gratitude that you and I live in a blessed country where former political foes, however wide they are apart in their basic thinking, can agree as to essentials of what constitutes the duty of a public official.

There is one basic fact that, as you know, concerns me and that is the practical monopoly of appointments to United States attorneyships, to the office of United States Marshall, and most important, to the position of Federal judge, which have gone to one wing of one political party in the last 17 years.

I think that such a situation is most regrettable and that it would be infinitely preferable: (a) to secure a balance in such appointments among both parties—getting men of ability, integrity and Americanism, and, (b) getting a balance of appointments within the Democratic Party so that faithful members of conservative philosophy are represented.

While I shall continue to point out the necessity for such dual balance in appointments, I do not feel that it would justify opposition to your confirmation. In this respect, therefore, I shall continue the policy that I have laid down previously in voting for confirmation of the nominations of Judge Duffy and Judge Tehan, as well as of other members of the Wisconsin Democratic Party.

The President makes the nominations, we in the Senate can only confirm or reject, but I trust that some day, the President will see the wisdom in a more equitable basis for those nominations.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

VERONA, WIS., *March 12, 1951.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of March 8.

Needless to say, I am happy to learn that you see fit to make no objection to my nomination as United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

I look forward to this new work with a great deal of interest.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS E. FAIRCHILD.

The Record of the Second Division in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a private in the Army from the State of Maine who is now serving in Korea, regarding the record of the Second Division.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHUNGJU, KOREA, *January 23, 1951.*

DEAR MR. BREWSTER: I sure hope that this letter gets to you.

My name is William N. Young, Jr., and I was born in Mexico, Maine, and I have lived in Rumford all my life.

I am writing to you because you are a Representative from the State I am from.

I would like to call to your attention a recent column by Drew Pearson. I don't have the date of the column but the heading was "Calculated Retreat" taken from Drew Pearson's Washington Merry Go Round. With reference to the above-mentioned article, Mr. Pearson referred to the "Panic Stricken Second Infantry Division" which I am a member of.

My buddies and I are in the Twenty-third Infantry Regiment, a member of the Second Division.

Now, Mr. BREWSTER, I am primarily concerned with the exploits of the Twenty-third Infantry Regiment, a part of the Second Infantry Division as referred to in Mr. Pearson's column pertaining to the withdrawal from Kunuri.

The records will show that the Twenty-third Infantry fought a delaying action for 4 days after the other UN elements had withdrawn. Does that look like a panic-stricken rout?

During the battle of Kunuri the Second Division suffered between four and six thousand casualties.

It doesn't seem probable that those men were injured by falling off trucks whenever they saw the enemy.

Korea is a very miserable place and it doesn't boost the morale of the fighting troops to read articles as written by Mr. Pearson which we who were there know that the report is erroneous.

Very truly yours,

Private First Class YOUNG.

Resolutions Adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Glen Rock, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I present for printing the resolutions adopted on March 13 by the Chamber of Commerce of Glen Rock, N. J.:

First. Resolution having to do with the recent Supreme Court decision declaring the State of Wisconsin anti-strike law unconstitutional.

Second. Resolution opposing levying of taxes by the State of New York on income earned in New York by New Jersey residents.

Earlier in the day, in the course of the proceedings of the Senate, the resolutions were submitted and were ordered to be printed in the Appendix.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 6–3 decision has declared that a utility antistrike law in the State of Wisconsin conflicts with the Taft-Hartley Law and, therefore, the Wisconsin law may not be used in disputes affecting interstate commerce; and

Whereas the National Labor Relations Board in October 1950, arbitrarily decided, as a matter of general policy, to assume jurisdiction over all public utility and transit systems; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, N. J., senses an immediate danger to the citizens of the State of New Jersey should existing legislation prohibiting strikes in public utilities in the State of New Jersey be voided or otherwise limited in effectiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the considered opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, N. J., that the right to work and to enjoy the fruits of one's labor is paramount to the right to strike; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the considered opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, N. J., that the best public interest would be served by the prohibition of strikes in industries which are essential to the public health, safety or convenience, under penalty of immediate and permanent dismissal from employment in any and all such industries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, to our Representatives in Congress, to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Department of Taxation and Finance of the State of New York imposes an income tax upon that portion of the earnings of residents of the State of New Jersey derived from employment within the State of New York; and

Whereas the said residents of the State of New Jersey who pay taxes to the State of New York are denied the right of franchise in elections held in the State of New York; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, that such taxation and denial of the right of franchise constitutes taxation without representation, which is the identical principle upon which our revolutionary forefathers sought and gained our freedom from a tyrannical monarch: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Glen Rock, declares it is in opposition to the practice of the State of New York in imposing income taxes upon the residents of the State of New Jersey; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, to our Representatives in Congress, to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Tennessee Pays Tribute to Native Son, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Commandant of United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of Tennessee in a joint resolution recently paid fitting and deserved tribute and homage to that distinguished general—now serving as Commandant of the United States Marine Corps—Clifton Bledsoe Cates.

The entire State of Tennessee, which so proudly has given to the Nation many another great and distinguished personage, joins with our representatives in the general assembly in this act of tribute.

General Cates is a native son of Tennessee. He ascended through the ranks of the Marine Corps to the rank of full general and his service to his country includes World War I, in which he was twice wounded, through the grueling campaigns of the Pacific in World War II. He commanded the gallant and intrepid irst Marine Regiment at Guadalcanal, Solomons Islands, in that harrowing and unparalleled campaign which will never be forgotten in the annals of our country. He led in the Saipan and Tinian invasions; and also Iwo Jima. Truly he is one of our distinguished and valorous Americans to whom we owe a great measure of gratitude.

As a Tennessean, I proudly salute General Cates—a military genius and a great man.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks an editorial from the March 14, 1951, issue of the Nashville Banner entitled "Tennessee's General Cates."

The editorial is as follows:

TENNESSEE'S GENERAL CATES

That joint resolution by the general assembly in praise and recognition of Gen. Clifton B. Cates expresses the esteem of all Tennessee for this distinguished native son. Through it, an honor is accorded one richly deserving it; and to him we would convey, as well, his State's regard for the United States Marine Corps, which he commands.

Our compliments to a great general—stalwart defender of his country in two world wars, whose career embodies the proud motto of his service unit, "Semper Fidelis."

We could not overlook, in a discussion of the Marine Corps or its commanding officer, the propriety of that urgent demand—still before Congress—that the Marine Commandant be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thus giving this unit direct representation there; and that the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be rotated on a fixed schedule to alternate that key office between the services.

In reality, Tennessee's esteem is expressive of the Nation's esteem; and Senate bill 677, providing this Joint Chiefs of Staff representation, has the popular support to demand enactment if Congress will heed it.

Why Americans Don't Vote—A Helpful Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole country is being aroused about the fact that 40 percent of our country's eligible voters failed to vote in 1950, particularly at this time of crises for democracy. In

connection with my sponsorship of House Resolution 89 seeking the establishment of a special House committee to investigate why Americans do not vote, I have received a considerable number of suggestions about what the Federal Government can do to help with the problem. I found one of these suggestions as part of a radio broadcast script—radio talk by Alfred Nilson, Station WOR, New York City—and considered it so highly that I am today introducing a bill to carry it out.

The bill requires each postmaster to make available in his post office equal facilites for equal-sized pictures, biographical and other descriptive information regarding the State Governor, each Senator, each Representative in Congress, each representative in the several houses of the State legislature and each mayor or equivalent municipal chief executive from the area within which such post office is located together with maps and descriptions of the areas which they represent respectively. It provides also that each postmaster shall maintain and post on the bulletin board information on the laws regarding voting and the places for registration and voting within such area. These regulations are entirely practical and are designed to bring the voter and prospective voter in closer touch with public officials and to establish a central and convenient place where voting information can be available.

The bill seeks to reach the two reasons assigned by a majority—62 percent—of nonvoters for their failure to vote in the surveys which I have made on this subject. These reasons are the alleged lack of reliable information on candidates—37 percent—and the fact that nonvoters feel they have little choice in selecting the candidates—25 percent. These disadvantages are, it is true, entirely within the power of any voter to correct today for reliable information can be secured from the press and the radio and the voter in the great majority of the States can freely participate in primary elections, but measures must be taken to deal with these problems just the same as they are so widely considered a reason or excuse for not voting.

The President has been much interested in the situation as shown by his letter to me of February 14 on this subject and his request to the American Political Science Association of December 25 last to investigate the question.

Priesthood of Believers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a sermon delivered by the United States Ambassador to Uruguay, Christian M. Ravndal, at the Emmanuel Methodist Church, Montevideo, July 23, 1950. The sermon is entitled "Priesthood of Believers." I hope that especially the membership of the House will take time to read this most excellent sermon. It is gratifying to know that we have men like Ambassador Ravndal representing our Government in international relationships:

PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS

Some 2,000 years ago Christ Jesus brought into being the most adventurous, the most dynamic, the most enlightened idea ever to seize the mind of man—the idea of man's inherent dignity and importance as an individual. From it sprang the ideas of freedom, individuality and tolerance. Freedom—freedom to achieve a larger and fuller life through government of the people, by the people, for the people. Individuality—the right to be different as we inevitably will be if we may think and act as our conscience, reason, and circumstances dictate. And, finally, a feeling of tolerance—tolerance of faith, of color, of race—and tolerance of the fact that many people simply do not think and act the way we do. These three great concepts—freedom, individuality and tolerance have been the dynamic force in our whole development. They, together with the basic concept underlying them, the Golden Rule (the doctrine of love, of brotherhood, of the good neighbor) have given us the way of life we believe in as fundamentally as we believe anything in this world.

Today we are celebrating a laymen's Sunday for the purpose of bringing to the forefront the fact of the priesthood of all believers. What does priesthood mean? It means the office of a priest, his function, his mission. How does that concern us? In the New Testament all Christians are designated priests.

Today, also, the way of life which is our heritage and our responsibility to protect is in desperate danger. It is threatened by the cancerous evil of totalitarianism—something which now is clothed as Soviet communism—something which denies every premise we hold valid—something which turns the face of man away from God—something which is unremitting terror against religion, and ethics, and morality.

Let us not fool ourselves. Let us not pretend that the situation is not critical. Let us not be lulled into thinking the danger is not to us and that we have no responsibility in this struggle.

We are in fact in the midst of a crucial struggle for the continued existence of our way of life. And we are in this condition because we have been indifferent. We have not cared to understand the signs—we have been a tepid people, negligent in our priesthood. The time has come when we may well ask ourselves whether we are losing our heritage by default—whether we are in fact Christians. For clearly we are not utilizing our total resources toward winning this struggle. And our responsibility, the obligation inherent in the priesthood of Christian believers, is to do everything we possibly can to further the way of our Lord, God Almighty.

What can we do that we are not doing? Let us see first what we are up against.

We are up against a deadly serious adversary, one who is playing for keeps. We are up against an enemy whose mechanism of threats, lies, infiltration, planned chaos, despair, and confusion is terrible beyond belief, and one, further, whose use of informers, secret police, thugs, and gunmen represents the deadliest weapon ever brought against freedom.

This adversary (Soviet communism) holds in it the denial of every premise we hold valid. It denies the sovereignty of God. It denies freedom, individuality, tolerance—the Golden Rule. Freedom, the Communists say, is an evil thing. And as for individuality—all people must be alike. The state is supreme—the lot of the people, servility.

Soviet spokesmen claim a monopoly of the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong for human beings. They maintain the pretense that they are the interpreters of the aspirations of all peoples. They would speak for great masses of human beings whose opinions they have never solicited—and who have never selected them as their spokesmen. They arrogate to themselves powers and pretenses which you and I are willing to concede only to the infinite wisdom and compassion of Almighty God. They use the great resources of modern science (particularly those that have to do with an understanding of the human mind) to pervert the human mind. They resort to every trick, to every insidious and brutal device to destroy what we think is essential—the self-respect of the individual, the itegrity of his mind and of his spirit. And if someone should exercise freedom of thought, should dare to depart from the doctrine laid down in the Kremlin, he is a criminal—and must be placed behind bars or put to death.

Let us not forget that the objective of Soviet communism—a force which controls a great world power and many satellites—which wields authority over hundreds of millions of people—a major industrial empire, the greatest armed strength in the world today, and a force which has the fanatical devotion of fifth columnists in every country not yet within its terrible orbit, let us not forget that the objective of Soviet communism is to make all the world's people subservient to the Soviet regime. Soviet communism has devoted a major portion of its energies and resources to the attempt to impose its system on other people. And since under its thesis the end justifies the means, we are fighting an unbelievably evil force to which all methods of achieving its objectives are permissible.

What can we do about it? As President Truman said recently, there are many things we can do and two things we cannot do. We cannot compromise our principles and we cannot withdraw from the world.

We can, together with other nations of the free world, clearly demonstrate the superiority of the ideals of freedom over the iron hand of tyranny. We can make clear that democracy and freedom, which have evolved from the teachings of Christ, bring to each individual each day more of what he wants than any other system. The free world has the resources to demonstrate both moral and material superiority. It has the tremendous advantage that always adheres to the cause of justice, liberty and respect for human dignity. With leadership, with unity, with steadfastness, that demonstration of moral and material superiority can be made. And as the strength and effectiveness of the system of freedom are made clear over the globe—as the people who now stand in doubt turn to our way of life—the danger of Communist domination will dwindle and finally disappear. The struggle for peace, security and stability in world affairs can be won. But only if each Christian is productive in his priesthood.

The threat is to our kind of civilization. Each one of us is an ambassador of that civilization. And therefore each of us has a part to play in what our Secretary of State Dean Acheson has called total diplomacy. There is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions. They are all parts of the same question. When we consider any matter, whether it is the size of the budget or the amount of taxes we pay, or the regulation of our commerce—or the regulation of immigration—or military policy—or foreign aid—it is all part of the same thing. Each one of these things is a part of the problem of our safety—and every part of the problem is serious.

We need to take a greater personal interest in government. In the past, except in national emergencies, we have never taken governmental activities as seriously as we should. We have regarded them as someone else's responsibility and have shrugged our shoulders over their shortcomings and faults, saying, "Well, politics is politics." As a result, our representation has not always been as clean, as wise, and as efficient as it might have been. If each one of us will take a genuine, abiding, intelligent interest in how and by whom we are represented, we shall strengthen our defenses against Soviet Communist encroachment. And if we have the dynamic faith, the strong convictions, the sense of mission envisaged by Lincoln, we will give reality to his dream of government of the people, by the people, for the people.

I know that you and I want to do something constructive about the basic wants of man. There is a tremendous and spontaneous pressure within us to help men everywhere in the world satisfy basic social and economic needs. The urge is there. All of us are conscious of the fact that one of the most pleasant feelings we are privileged to enjoy is to meet a person (whether friend, acquaintance, or stranger), knowing that we have done him no wrong and that we wish him well. We feel so good we want to be helpful, if possible. We want to share his troubles and to better the situation, if he will let us. As I have said, the urge is there. The challenge of Soviet communism merely increases that urge. And the feeling of the individual becomes that of the family; that of the family, the community; and that of the community—the State.

Actually the basic wants are about the same for every individual. For one thing, we want a sense of security—we don't want to live in a society where the fear of bandits (local or international), has to be uppermost in our minds. Secondly, we want a sense of productive achievement, for man must feel that he is performing somewhere near the top of the range of his capabilities. Thirdly, we want a sense of equity or justice, particularly as regards our standard of living. Fourthly, we want a sense of participation, some degree of control over the decisions that directly affect our own living and our own destiny. And I should add what Gen. George Marshall has described as the most important need for the world today—"a spiritual regeneration which would restore a feeling of good faith and good will among men generally."

Discouraged people are sorely in need of the inspiration of great principles. Such inspiration, such leadership can be the rallying point against intolerance, against distrust, and against that fatal insecurity that leads to war. I hope that you and I may participate in providing that leadership. But we shall have to get back to first principles if we are to speak with a voice that will kindle the imagination and rouse the spirit. We must present our way of life as a force holding within itself the seeds of unlimited progress for the human race. We must make clear that it is a means to a beter way of life within nations and to a better understanding among nations.

However, it is not enough that one should have faith and should make that faith articulate. It is also essential that we, and those who think like us, should have the power to make safe the area in which we carry that faith into action. And beyond faith and preachment and defense there lies the necessity of translating all of these into terms of the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people who live in this free world of ours.

We must create those economic, political, social, and psychological conditions that strengthen and create confidence in our way of life. One obstacle to the realization of the kind of world in which we can live in peace, is that great areas of the world are breeding grounds of conflict simply because their people lack the means of a tolerable existence. It is hard for us to realize just how bad economic conditions are for many peoples of the world. Famine, disease, and poverty are the scourge of vast areas. Hundreds of millions of people have a life expectancy of 30 years or less and many of these people live on inadequate diets, unable to perform the tasks necessary to earn even their daily bread. Animal plagues and plant pests carry away their livestock and their crops. Misuse of natural resources exposes their land to flood and drought. Conditions such as these are the seedbeds of political unrest and instability. And it is in areas where these conditions exist that Soviet communism makes its greatest inroads. In such areas, Soviet Communists are attempting to turn people's honest dissatisfaction with their present conditions into support for Communist efforts to dominate their nations. Because of their hopelessness, people turn to the false promises of dictators—anything promises better than the miserable existence they endure. Let us not fool ourselves, democratic principles do not flourish easily on empty stomachs.

And so we must work to bring about better living conditions in the free nations. We must help them to help themselves. We must help them to make progress in agriculture, in industry, in health, and in the education of their children. Our missionary groups—our philanthropic and charitable agencies must continue the efforts they have been making over the years for the improvement of conditions. Our young people can find careers in the pioneering work of bringing technical assistance to needy countries. Trade-unions and business organizations might profitably enlarge their contacts and bring the benefits of their experience to others.

If we fail to give material help now we run the risk of losing to Soviet communism by default hundreds of millions of people who look to us for help in their struggle against hunger and despair. The so-called point 4 program could demonstrate that capitalism is energetic, intelligent, and humane.

Summing up, there are several things we can do to meet the threat of Soviet communism. No one of them will be the answer, because there is no answer. There is no quick or easy way to subdue an evil force. It will be with us until Christ comes again. But we can and must contain it. And here our individual, our personal responsibility, the priesthood of the Christian believer comes into play.

Let us dedicate ourselves to the business of total displomacy. Let us see to it that we get the right people to represent us in government. Let us jealously guard the implementation of the great concepts that underlie the whole development of our civilization: freedom, individuality, tolerance, the Golden Rule. Let us help people to help themselves. Let us build a world society that possesses the richness of individuality. That concept will attract a following great enough to put to rout those who seek a world of servility. Let us not forget that if the free world is to be big enough and strong enough to survive the inevitable thrusts of those who believe in a totalitarian world, the free world must be built upon a foundation of tolerance of difference rather than imposition of conformity. Let us make our free world a safe area in which to practice our faith. Let us thus be prepared for any eventuality. Let us be ready at all times for war, if necessary. War is better than appeasement of aggression—because appeasing encourages the very aggression it seeks to prevent. And it is far better than submission to tyranny, because without freedom and respect for human dignity life would not be worth living. Let us be constructively productive in our Christian priesthood.

We want a peaceful world, but our conception of peace is not the kind of condition one finds in the still and terrifying center of a hurricane. We do not want peace at any price, for we know that peace cannot be bought at the price of freedom.

Let us work for an evermore effective United Nations. That organization symbolizes one of mankind's highest aspirations—an international house of democracy, a true brotherhood of the nations.

Let us preach the inherent dignity and importance of the individual—the dynamic idea we have from Christ Jesus. Our strength will be invincible with the voluntary adherence of free men and free minds to the great concepts of our civilization. And in the end, tyranny must fall back before the tremendous moral strength of the gospel of freedom and self-respect, the gospel we have from Christ Jesus, our Lord.

Let us pray. O Lord in Thine infinite wisdom Thou has determined that good and evil shall exist concurrently in the whole reach of human life; that they shall exist within every individual, within every nation and within every human group; that the struggle between them cannot be confined to governments, but must go on, as it always has, in the wider theater of the human spirit itself.

Enable us to understand that this is so and that we who want to qualify as Christians must accept and discharge the responsibilities inherent in the priesthood of Christianity.

Forgive us O Lord that because of our indifference, our negligence, our hypocrisy many people less fortunate than we have strayed from Thy way. Give us a passionate desire to serve. Give us a burning, dynamic feeling of our mission. Give us the strength to withstand and defeat the onslaught of evil, the force that is constantly probing our resistance. Let us at all times, like Thy Son's parable of the talents, be careful about multiplying the good of our heritage. Make the meaning of our priesthood a clear and living thing. O Lord, in the name of Jesus Christ we pray. Amen.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Is as Unsound as Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from the State of Alabama comes the following editorial taken from the December 26, 1950, issue of the Mobile Register in which it points out that proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are trying to sell America something that does not have the merit to justify the investment.

The editorial follows:

MORE TALK FOR ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BUT PROJECT IS AS UNSOUND AS EVER

Lately, United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, and United States Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, have invited attention to renewed arguments for construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, the route which would extend from the Great Lakes region to the Atlantic Ocean via Canada.

We take it for granted that the active manner in which the St. Lawrence project is being talked up again is the forerunner of another congressional move to commit the United States to the expenditure of untold millions of dollars for its construction.

The important point, and the point which should be borne in mind in Congress, is that arguments offered today for the St. Lawrence seaway are just as unconvincing as the arguments which have been offered heretofore.

We observe that one article on the subject says the project first came before Congress about a half century ago. It has been brought before Congress time after time since then. In fact it has become sort of a perennial question.

Yet never once has a convincing case been made for the project during the long and persistent fight which has been carried on for it.

There is good reason why no convincing case has ever been made for the St. Lawrence seaway project. The good reason is that no convincing case can be made for it.

Plain irrefutable fact is that the project was unsound when first thought up, has remained unsound ever since and will still be unsound the next time it is placed before Congress. Proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway simply are trying to sell something which does not have the merit to justify the investment.

It would seem that eventually the proponents of the project would wake up to the lack of market for the costly white elephant they have to offer. But apparently not. Apparently the St. Lawrence seaway project is on the way to another session of Congress, and will return to still other sessions.

It is unfortunate that so much congressional time must be spent on this unsound St. Lawrence seaway project when much that is worthy needs more congressional attention than is given.

Thoughts by the Printer's Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Isanti (Minn.) News:

THOUGHTS BY THE PRINTER'S WIFE

ISANTI, MINN., *March 12, 1951.*

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
Third Congressional District of Minnesota, Washington, D. C.:

During my limited experience in correspondence I have written letters to Sears, Roebuck & Co., my Aunt Florence, the Minneapolis Tribune, and the county attorney, all of which were promptly answered to my satisfaction. This is my first letter to a Congressman and I am writing it in the faith that all Congressmen take seriously the matters brought to their notice through the mail.

Our society reporter has called it to my attention that there is a movement in Congress to abolish the penny post card. Now, whether she got this information from the women on her calling list (who also are your constituents) or if she read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I did not take time to ask. I was so thoroughly alarmed I made straight for the typewriter to take up this matter with someone who could do something about it. If the letter is not ready by mail time I will flag the train so as to get it off this evening.

Mr. WIER, as far as I can estimate, there are only two bargains left; one is the penny post card and the other is a subscription to this newspaper. The way things are going it looks like we might have to raise the price of the subscription so let's keep the penny post card privilege for present and future economy.

The penny postcard is so necessary to my personal activities. I have a choir about whom I feel like a mother hen feels about her chicks. Sometimes during the week I must send messages to the members. Take for instance that as I ponder over the anthem for Sunday, I suddenly reconsider the second movement and decide it should be done pianissimo instead of fortissimo. I couldn't afford to spend 3 cents for mailing out the one-line messages but somehow 1 cent seems entirely within my circumstances. As publicity chairman for the PTA, I may want to send notices to all the members, "Please come to the next meeting to hear Mr. Morgenthau speak on the Penny Postcard Must Live Forever. The activities I promote do not allow me an expense account—this makes the penny postcard an absolute necessity.

I honestly feel that it is perfectly all right for Congress to receive suggestions on budgets and appropriations from women because through money management on a small scale, housewives have learned foresightedness. A quick example of this comes to my mind. When Dr. and Mrs. Hedenstrom were a young couple and the children were tots, every time the doctor set out to buy a new business suit, Mrs. Hedenstrom would remind him, "Be sure, dear, to choose a pattern that can be suitably made over for Phil after you are through wearing it."

Of course I wouldn't be able to offer any suggestions as to making money go farther in the military department but if you need any ideas, Mr. Hoover has lots of them written down in his reports. However, I will come right out and say a couple of things about the Government printing department.

For instance, in direct competition to my husband's business, the Government Office prints stamped envelopes with a return card in the upper left-hand corner. I have seen printing so crooked on these envelopes which have been ordered locally that I have been embarrassed lest people might think they came from our shop. I believe that some good printing authority has figured that these are printed at a ridiculous loss per order. If I am wrong, be sure to correct me, because I find this envelope business particularly interesting.

Oh yes, far be it from me to make suggestions but I thought maybe a few of the bulletins and leaflets printed for free distribution might be eliminated from your list which I have read very carefully. For instance, leaflet 1852 on Lespedeza Culture and Utilization, I wouldn't imagine would be too popular inasmuch as neither my dictionaries nor encyclopedia columns list lespedezias. Oh, I do assume they are important inasmuch as there are publications about them. I find listed some booklets which sound extremely useful but I do think the "ABC's of mending" is sort of silly. If a woman can't patch instinctively, she isn't going to bother to learn from a book.

Of course, as I said, I am entirely unable to offer any suggestions in big-time finances because I am so busy with my household budget but it is just on account of this budget that I can't get along without a 1-cent postcard.

I know a war is very expensive—it must take a mint of money. But, if our fighting men need more supplies and equipment, go ahead and raise our taxes but please, let us keep the penny postcard!

Yours respectfully,

THE PRINTER'S WIFE.

Labor Should Be Given Real Voice in Formulation of Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following statement issued by the United Labor Policy Committee on February 28, 1951, which appeared in the March issue of the American Federationist:

THE PLAIN PEOPLE GET A RAW DEAL

The United Labor Policy Committee decided unanimously today that all labor representatives of our respective organizations serving on existing defense mobilization agencies shall resign immediately.

We fully realize the gravity of this decision. It was arrived at only after exhaustive exploration of all the facts and after almost continuous conferences with the leaders of our Government and of the defense program during the past 2 weeks.

We have come to the conclusion that in no other way can we effectively impress upon the American people the great wrongs being perpetrated against them.

On February 16 we announced that we had become thoroughly disillusioned with the conduct of the defense mobilization program. We made the deliberate charge that big business was dominating the program, that the interests of the plain people of this country were being ignored and that the basic principles of equality of sacrifice in the national effort to protect freedom against Communist aggression had been abandoned.

Since then we have spelled out our indictment in detail to the President of the United States and to the heads of agencies under him. We have talked and we have listened. After full and complete exchanges of information, our original convictions have been more than confirmed.

We are today confronted with a price order which amounts to legalized robbery of every American consumer, together with a wage order which denies justice and fair play to every American who works for wages. The door has been slammed in our faces on the vital problem of manpower, which directly affects the workers we represent. We are offered the lame excuse that on other important policies the decisions must be made by a Congress which is not cooperating with the administration. There has been no affirmative action to meet our basic position—that equality of sacrifice must be the guiding and indispensable principle in the defense program in order to obtain full cooperation and maximum results.

We have also arrived at the inescapable conclusion that such representation which already has been accorded to labor in defense agencies and such further representation as is now offered are merely for the purpose of window dressing. There is absolutely no desire on the part of Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson to give labor a real voice in the formulation of defense policy.

Under these circumstances, we have decided that to continue to serve on defense agencies would bring about no constructive results and would merely delude the public and the wage earners we represent into believing that labor acquiesces in what is being done.

In the interests of our country and the cause of international peace and freedom to which it is committed, we stand ready to meet with responsible representatives of our

Government to continue to seek a remedy for the insupportable conditions facing us.

WAGES

The Director of Economic Stabilization has signed a wage order which we know to be unfair, unworkable, and unjust. Wages and salaries of all Americans are now bound under the most rigid controls in the history of our country.

Wage Order No. 6 has been given the force of law by Mr. Eric Johnston's signature. Yet, even as he did so, he admitted that this order requires fundamental revision and improvement to correct some of the grave inequities apparent on its face.

Mr. Johnston's suggestions for correcting these grave injustices are inadequate. They do not meet the needs of American workers. Mr. Johnston's recommendations freeze injustice by denying less privileged workers the right to obtain through collective bargaining the benefits enjoyed in substantial segments of industry.

Labor's representatives cannot in good conscience return to the Wage Stabilization Board which voted Order No. 6, nor can we acquiesce in the unfair wage policy enunciated by Mr. Johnston.

We have, however, publicly stated, and we now reiterate, that we are prepared to participate in a reconstituted tripartite wage stabilization and disputes board which would administer a fair and equitable wage policy.

PRICES

While wages and salaries are being brought under strict control, the price freeze has been revoked. The Price Stabilization Administrator, with the full approval of the Director of Economic Stabilization, has issued a price order under which 200,000 stores will establish their own price ceilings on the basis of their own bookkeeping and on the basis of their past margin of profit on each item sold.

By officially validating the margin of profit in effect on February 24, the order legalizes every illegal price mark-up since the January 25 freeze order. Higher and higher prices are built into the price formula by its reliance on margin of profit for computing the legal price.

For example, the wholesale cost of a workshirt to the retailer was $2 and has now gone to $2.50. The retailer's price to the consumer was $3. Under the price order, the new ceiling price will be $3.75. In other words, an extra 25 cents of profit not reflected by cost has been added by the retailer with official sanction.

No customer will be able to check whether the retailer is selling his product at a price based on the regulation. There will be no such thing as a dollar-and-cent price ceiling for any commodity, except the price which the retailer sets. There will be no posting of ceiling prices. Enforcement is obviously impossible, even if it were intended.

At a time when fixed formulas are being applied to wages, business is being allowed to write its own ceiling prices. Wages are frozen. Nothing else in the economy has been frozen.

MANPOWER

During the past 2 weeks we have been unable to achieve an iota of progress toward the establishment of administrative machinery and policies on manpower that would most effectively help the Nation's defense effort.

Control of manpower was seized several weeks ago by Mr. Charles E. Wilson and centralized in his already-powerful Office of Defense Mobilization, without ever discussing the matter with his labor advisory committee. Both by correspondence and by several hours of discussion, we have sought to show Mr. Wilson that manpower policies would best be formulated in the Department of Labor. We pointed out that a labor-management committee in the Department of Labor had been functioning harmoniously and satisfactorily on manpower problems until its effectiveness was arbitrarily and suddenly ended by Mr. Wilson's action.

Speaking for millions of wage earners who will be most directly affected as our manpower problems increase, we asked Mr. Wilson to reconsider that decision. He refused flatly and finally, and without atempting to offer any logical reasons for his refusal.

The United Labor Policy Committee is deeply concerned at Mr. Wilson's arrogant seizure of control over manpower and by his equally arrogant refusal to give more than the most superficial consideration to our plea for reversal of his action. So long as the control of manpower rests in the Office of Defense Mobilization, no American wage or salary earner may feel safe that the big business clique in control of that agency may not suddenly seek to achieve a compulsory draft of the Nation's workers. Such an action, under big business control and supervision, would endanger our traditional concepts of free labor and voluntary cooperation. We do not believe that free Americans want civilian labor to be conscripted.

LABOR PARTICIPATION AT ODM

Our conferences and correspondence with Charles E. Wilson have demonstrated that he has little understanding of the needs of the plain folks throughout America. Mr. Wilson has clearly failed to recognize that voluntary cooperation among the various groups in our population has always been attainable in times of national emergency, and that such cooperation has been a foundation of our national strength. To the contrary, Mr. Wilson has demonstrated time and again that he considers the mobilization program his private preserve, in which he may order directives and ukases without consideration of the public need or the public wishes.

But our America is not a private corporation. Authority in our America does not flow down from the front office. It rises from the great common sense and deep patriotism of all the people. The Office of Defense Mobilization, however, is staffed at its top level exclusively with men from the executive offices of big business.

To give voice to the needs of the public, including all workers—on whom our defense production depends—we have asked Mr. Wilson for an opportunity for labor to participate at the top policy level of the ODM. That request was not voiced merely in order to provide a job for a leader of labor; it was advanced in the hope that labor's experience, skill, and viewpoint could help to advance the interests of the total defense effort.

Mr. Wilson has made it clear by his actions that he wants no such broadening of the ODM structure. He does not want suggestions or advice from outside the ranks of big business. It is amply clear to the United Labor Policy Committee that Mr. Wilson does not want labor participation in the mobilization program; he now would accept window dressing, supplied by labor, to cover the backroom activities of the leaders of industry who staff the ODM. He will get no such window dressing from the men and women of American labor. Under these circumstances, his belated offer to appoint a man from labor on his staff is meaningless.

CONCLUSION

Two weeks ago the United Labor Policy Committee voiced alarm over the crisis in our defense program. The crisis has not lessened; it has become more acute.

The road is greased for higher prices. The present wage formula will act like a vise on the aspirations of Americans for decent living standards and equality of sacrifice in the defense effort. Rents are climbing steadily upward, while effective rent-control legislation lags in Congress. An unbalanced tax program, which would place its heaviest burdens on the lower income groups, is in the process of enactment.

Nowhere in the defense mobilization program is there evidence of enlightened and militant leadership to meet these problems, act upon them and help the country develop the strength necessary to met the threat of Communist aggression.

We of the United Labor Policy Committee have voiced these criticisms not to impair our defense program but to improve it. We seek, actively and earnestly, an effective mobilization program which is imperatively required for the defense of our free institutions and of our great democratic traditions.

We shall continue, with all the strength and persuasion at our command, to work toward our goal—the preservation of human liberty throughout the democratic world. We believe that in that American effort the aims and aspirations of free labor—which has never faltered in its opposition to Communist aggression—can play a major, constructive part.

A Veterans' Administration Domiciliary Facility Is Needed in Massachusetts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1951, I introduced H. R. 3147, to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There is a very definite and pressing need for such a facility in Massachusetts. Our veteran population in New England is greater than many other sections of the country and suffers from the lack of a domiciliary home of this nature. Veterans who are eligible for such care are obliged to enter facilities far from their families and friends, with the resultant breaking of home ties and the usual feeling of loneliness occasioned thereby.

I have received a letter from the commandant of the Soldiers' Home, at Chelsea, which is maintained by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It gives pertinent information concerning the need for such a facility, and I include it herein:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: It was with considerable pleasure that I read of your having introduced a bill to the House calling for the construction of a domiciliary home here in Massachusetts.

I feel that there is no question but what the New England area, and Massachusetts particularly, is far worse off than any other section in the entire country with reference to domiciliary units.

For your information, there are 26 States which operate soldiers' homes in this country, or an average of almost one soldiers' home for every two States. Here in New England, we have every State, with the exception of Maine, operating a soldiers' home, so that our average is five out of six States; and I think the Veterans' Administration has not aided this problem by the construction of even one Federal domiciliary home here in New England. The nearest domiciliary facility, as you know, is at Bath, N. Y.

The waiting list for admission is approximately 18 months.

The States here in New England were forced into the maintaining of soldiers' homes for the care of their veterans since the Federal Government failed in this respect. It would, indeed, be a pleasure for me to appear in support of this very worthwhile measure which you have introduced. Once again, you have taken the leadership in seeking a practical solution to one of the more vexing problems of our veterans, particularly those of World War I and the Spanish-American War.

With very best regards to you, I remain,

Yours very truly,

JOHN L. QUIGLEY,
Commandant, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Soldiers' Home, Chelsea.

Martin College, Pulaski, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean Sunday magazine there appeared a most excellent article written by Mrs. Helen P. Abernathy, outstanding writer and journalist, of Pulaski, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent. Mrs. Abernathy's fine article was on the history of Martin College, in Pulaski, one of the finest of our educational institutions and a source of inspiration to thousands of students over the course of 5 generations.

Because of the excellence of this article and because of the widespread interest in Martin College of Pulaski, I desire to have the text of this article included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

THOMAS MARTIN'S COLLEGE

(By Helen P. Abernathy)

Pulaski, Tenn., is a town of 6,500 inhabitants, but there is not one of its native-born citizens who considers it strange that there should once have lived there a man who flatly rejected the offer of President James K. Polk to make him Secretary of the Treasury, and became town mayor instead.

The gentleman, they will tell you, was only exhibiting his extremely good sense in preferring to handle the hearthstone politics of a purring municipality instead of the purse-strings of a Nation, especially in a period plagued with the expansive notions of the aggressive Polk administration.

Whether or not Thomas Martin forfeited national fame for himself, his name has continued to be a familiar one throughout Tennessee, and, at least in Pulaski, no one has challenged his leadership as a financial power, cotton merchant, banker, railroad president, church worker and founder of Martin College.

It was to carry out the wish of his daughter, Virginia, who died at the age of 20 that he bequeathed $30,000 in State bonds for the establishment of a school for girls. Although at the time of its debut, the school was indeed "the answer to a maiden's prayer," it has perhaps become even more so in later years, for since 1937 young men have been admitted also, and Faith chapel has become the scene of many a wedding planned on proper strolls about the campus.

Since the advent of coeducation, male students, too, have learned to appreciate the independent ability of Thomas Martin. It is not recorded, however, that any student, male or female, with present-day campus financial worries, has ever been deterred from writing home for money by having read of the college founder that: "He never cost his father a cent after he reached the age of 15, clerked in a store until he was 18, and at 25, had accumulated $150,000. He died worth more than a million—his unusual success the result of fine judgment, foresight and splendid integrity."

The first high school for girls in Giles County began its existence under the name of "The Martin Female College" in the basement of the Methodist Church, one block north of the public square in a building now occupied by the Church of Christ. The first president, according to the records, was a teacher of wide experience and a Christian gentleman, Prof. William K. Jones. When he left to head a school in Texas, Dr. R. H. Rivers of Louisville, Ky., became president for a five-year period, until Professor Jones resumed the presidency of Martin for several more years. However, in 1884, Professor Jones again was prevailed upon to go to Dallas, Tex., as head of a school there, and the college records of this incident are notably doleful as the board members gave their consent to his leaving.

The purchase of the Gov. John C. Brown property, an ornate colonial-style residence on a seven-acre plot, was acomplished in 1874, and under the beautiful magnolias shading the box-bordered flowerbeds, girls of all ages were taught the importance of being gentle ladies as well as intelligent scholars.

In 1876 uniforms for all boarding students were adopted. The board, whose president at that time was Governor Brown, voted the measure in order to prevent extravagance and promote economy, and recommended that "exercises of this school shall hereafter be conducted in uniform, calico or lawn for summer, and some cheap worsted goods for winter, or something equally inexpensive, the uniform to be adopted by Mrs. Menefee and Mrs. Nathan Adams subject to the ratification of this board. This rule may be modified as to permit the graduating class to dress otherwise by the consent of parents."

Mrs. Adams, one of the eminent educators of her day, had operated a private school of her own in her home, and when she became associated with Martin College as a teacher, brought with her 20 young women who were her patrons. In good weather, all boarding pupils went for long walks, and the uniformed line, two by two, was chaperoned by a member of the faculty.

In 1885 the Misses Ida E. Hood and Susan L. Heron, of Philadelphia and Boston, later of Belmont and Ward-Belmont College fame, took over the principalship of Martin College. According to the contract, they were to pay as rental for said college building, grounds, and furniture, the sum of $500 per annum.

When the Misses Hood and Heron, in 1887, asked for and received a renewal of their lease for another term, the church, through her presiding elder, brought suit to invalidate the contract between the trustees and these copresidents. Their contention was that the board had no right to elect anyone but Methodists as head of the school, and that the right of choice was implicit in the official board of the Methodist church. (Miss Hood was a Quaker, and Miss Heron a Presbyterian.)

The board minutes reveal the members as being pleased with the management of said principals, feel satisfied it would be to the best interests of the school that it be released to them. John S. Wilkes, then president of the trustees, a skilled lawyer, and afterward member of the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, defended the case. The chancelor in Pulaski ruled in favor of the trustees, that Martin College is not a denominational school, as did the Supreme Court when the church appealed the case.

To this day Martin opens her doors to all denominations, and while her students and faculty are predominantly Methodist, many visit and worship in eight other churches.

In 1888 Martin received a threat to her continuance when Mrs. Spofford, daughter of Thomas Martin, sought to recover to her father's estate the 30 State bonds, claiming it was his purpose to do this when they matured, with only the interest to go to Martin. That suit also was successfully fought by the college in the lower courts and the Supreme Court, and to the present time, the corpus of the bonds has been kept intact, with only the interest, as stipulated in the donor's will, being used for expenses of the school.

Ten years later, Judge John S. Wilkes voiced the courage of Martin's trustees at the cornerstone laying of the $25,000 new pressed-brick building. "Many have said to me, 'You are building too much; you can never fill it up. This is the same song I have heard ever since Prof. William Jones moved from the basement of the Methodist church to this location. The same doubters have been predicting disaster with every change in principals and faculty. No, Martin College will never die."

The new building boasted broad stairways, wide corridors, fire escapes, freight elevator, covered galleries, city water, water closets, bathrooms, and floral-patterned carpeting in the huge, ornately furnished parlors. According to the catalog of 1900, the climate is mild, free from the rigors of northern winters and the debilitating influences of southern summers. The dormitories are amply supplied with ventiducts, transoms, and windows; there is an abundance of pure, fresh air, so essential to healthy growth and action; the building is comfortably heated, the bedrooms having open grates with wire protectors. The place is entirely free from all malarial influences.

Disaster visited the school the first in January 1900, when a slight case of smallpox caused the closing of the school for several months. A second catastrophe came when fire destroyed the building on October 16, 1904.

Martin became a junior college when one of the best dormitories in the State was ready for occupancy in 1914, and Prof. W. T. Wynn was the school's president. Five years before the Tennessee Conference of the Methodist Church had taken over the college, and it remains today under that organization's leadership.

Today, the college is headed by the Reverend Joseph D. Quillian, Jr., who assumed his duties September 1, succeeding E. H. Elam, who was its president for 5 years.

It has an enrollment of approximately 180 students.

The campus is alive presently with crew haircuts, checkered shirts, abbreviated tennis shorts, bobbed curls and socks. Such activities as big-, little-sister-and-brother parties, Sadie Hawkins days, and recreational gymnasium parties vie with the cultural offerings of the art, music, and dramatics departments.

Contrasted with these interests are the restrictions of another day at Martin, when the college catalog stated: "Parents are requested to furnish the president with a list of correspondents of their daughter. Excessive letter writing should be discouraged. Each boarding pupil must provide herself with rubbers, and an umbrella or gossamer, and in winter with a black wrap. Friday afternoon and night, the lace-curtained parlors are open for teachers and pupils to receive their friends, but at no other time. No one, teachers, family, or pupils entertains company on the Sabbath. Boarding pupils are expected to wear a plain black uniform

when they go out from the college in winter and plain white for summer. This discourages extravagant dressing."

Tiny Faith Chapel is the spiritual hub of Martin College. Concerning the chapel, a bulletin board in the college hall states, "Someone prays in Faith Chapel every night at 10 o'clock." The shrine was effected through the late Dr. Franklin H. Clapp and Mrs. Clapp, former teachers at the school.

Of the college, Pedro Sota of Cuba, a student, remarked: "After being at Martin for 1 month, my first month in the United States, I am finding this college, though small, a wonderful place. In its homelike, friendly, and Christian atmosphere, I know, indeed, there is something here."

It is doubtful if Thomas Martin, founder of "a school for girls," could have wished his bequest to accomplish more.

Why Labor Resigned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appearing in the March issue of the American Federationist entitled "Why Labor Resigned." The editorial follows:

WHY LABOR RESIGNED

In our present emergency, which is the result of Stalin's refusal to respect the rights of other peoples, and when our whole Nation is called upon to make sacrifices to maintain human freedom against the military and psychological moves of the Kremlin for world domination, it is fitting and natural that national groups whose functions are essential to national life should want to participate equally with other groups.

Labor was one of the first groups in this country to realize the ruthless nature of the organization that seized power in Russia in 1917 and to realize the menace it presented to free people everywhere.

When the President of the United States asked for authority to meet open defiance of law and order in world relations, the American Federation of Labor supported his proposal wholeheartedly and stood ready to cooperate.

Organization for the defense of the Nation and our national institutions means the temporary subordination of the goals of individual progress to the national program. Labor, with the experience of all-out cooperation in two World Wars, wants to put that experience at the service of the Nation. Conscious of the fact that divisions in the ranks of workers had resulted in unwieldy organization in World War II, representatives of the principal groups organized a committee through which to handle the collective interests of trade-union organizations.

Labor realizes the menace which inflation holds. Workers have watched the dwindling purchasing value of dollars earned and have had only one way by which they could protect standards of living in their homes—increased wage rates to compensate for increased prices. Wage rate increases, however, only reflected inflation and were not a primary cause.

We knew that the expansion of our economy, as manifested in increased national production and national income, increases in exports, increased employment, and greater stability of employment, were inflationary in nature, stimulating price rises and larger profits. Sustained high-level production, with high levels of employment, provided the funds for Government expenditure unparalleled during peace. High national indebtedness due to World War II in the form of bonds at low interest rates became a ready source of credit expansion, adding to the flood of volume of money. Taxes, already at peak with only wartime precedents, were increased to meet defense needs and to serve as an inflation brake.

Taxation alone cannot check inflation or restore normal relationships within our economy. Only the coordinated, sustained, and purposeful cooperation of all whose acts affect the economy can check the flood of inflation and restore the value of our dollars.

We were moving toward organized cooperation until the President reorganized the defense administration under the Office of Defense Mobilization. The President selected a Director of Defense Mobilization and delegated to him powers second only to his own, along with responsibility for the weapons of defense. Big business, with its peak profits, was in a position to send its experts to Washington on a loan basis to put their management experience at the service of the Government as it took over duties and responsibilities formerly performed by competitive enterprise and other private agencies. Labor logically expected an opportunity to supply representatives of experience to aid in developing the policies and regulations for defense production and to contribute its experience in mobilizing and assuring the cooperation of workers who transform work orders into needed products. Power, tools, materials, blueprints, and work orders get into operation through hands skilled by work experience and directed by judgment evolved in production.

When labor saw defense manpower shifted from administration by an agency whose basic function is the promotion of the welfare of human beings to an agency where manpower is subordinated to production, and policies conditioning our standard of living entrusted to an agency in which we had but a minority voice, our first responsibility was to secure adequate and competent representation and to assure justice in defense production.

Without waiting to determine all problems of functions and operation, the Economic Stabilization Agency initiated its program with a price and wage freeze. The wage freeze was to be succeeded on March 15 by a permanent wage formula. The public and the employer members of the Wage Stabilization Board agreed together upon a wage formula as follows: To limit wage increases to 10 percent of the wage of January 15, 1950. It included within this permitted wage range pensions, health and welfare funds, vacations with pay, paid holidays, etc.

Welfare and pension plans are clearly noninflationary. Their current value cannot be estimated. Therefore they should not be blanketed into the 10 percent.

The old formula had provided an adjustment on the basis of the April 1951 consumers' price index, while the new regulation merely provides a review in the light of a rising index. There is no provision for time inequities or for those due to industrial change and growth. Neither was there provision for determining disputes over interpretation or application of the formula.

This formula was proposed as a substitute for collective bargaining which deals with all phases of work relationships in changing and developing industries. It would result in freezing workers' compensation for work done. This proposal to penalize labor, while the prices of articles included in workers' living costs continued to soar and while agricultural prices were uncurbed, was so flagrantly unjust that labor representatives refused to stay on the Board and be a party to it. Their resignation was a protest against injustice which they were powerless to correct.

Labor expects to do its share for national defense and to bear its share of the burden of controlling inflation. Everyone knows increases in wages are not a primary cause of inflation. Until the Government attacks primary causes and gives equitable and effective machinery to compensate for the loss of effective freedom of contract, it may expect our protests against arbitrary determination of workers' pay. Freedom of contract is the instrumentality that maintains that delicate balance within our intricate and interrelated production system. Outside tampering with that freedom creates injustices which destroy balance and injure individuals.

As the representatives of organized labor told the Director of Defense Mobilization in the beginning:

No wage stabilization should be imposed or can succeed unless an over-all system of anti-inflation controls is simultaneously imposed—on the basis of the principle of equality of sacrifice.

Wage stabilization must be a supplement to, not a substitute for, collective bargaining.

Practically continuous conferences failed to result in proposals to assure workers rights necessary for equality of sacrifice and for wholehearted participation in defense of the Nation and our American way of life. We then withdrew the few representatives labor did have from the defense mobilization agencies.

The American Federation of Labor will continue to work for the preservation of human liberty and democratic institutions throughout the world.

LABOR REPRESENTATION

American wage-earners have learned the lesson that the price of liberty, opportunity and justice is "eternal vigilance." The master key is the right and the fact of representation in decisions on matters affecting the welfare of persons concerned. Wage-earners have given their tears, blood, and even lives to secure recognition in work relationships of their right to representation through agents of their own choosing. Congress finally stripped employers of the power to use injunctions against workers seeking better standards of life and work, and employers were told they must not interfere with workers' right to representation.

Under the emergency situation the government has set up administrative bureaus to perform some of the functions normally performed by private individuals or agencies. Since the emergency takes from workers not only freedom of contract but also of decision on policies to promote their future welfare, labor naturally expected representation of its own choosing at the top level to keep the Office of Defense Mobilization mindful of the working people's interests and welfare as over-all policies were determined. Such representation at the top level, to supplement representation in specialized agencies, would assure wage-earners a degree of justice in the defense emergency.

The emergency itself is a changing situation of unknown duration, subject to modification by changes in world diplomacy and international strategy. It commits our Nation to a way of life necessary for preparedness for national defense in a possible atomic war.

Workers as well as citizens in other walks of life realize that national interests and welfare must take precedence over individual

welfare. However, those principles and institutions necessary for individual integrity must remain operative. The most fundamental of these principles is representation. Upon this principle our Nation set up a government charged with assuring every person inalienable and equal rights which give dignity and purpose to human life. Under such a government, tyranny has no place.

THE CONSPIRATORS

Because the international conspiratorial organization which the Kremlin has built up is a military body controlled from Moscow, it represents a threat which no country can safely disregard. It operates in the economic, social and political fields. It employs the methods of organized violence.

Regardless of the place of operation, the Kremlin's method is always the same: centralized authority with orders to constituent bodies with detailed procedures for enforcing them. Plans are developed at the GHQ and carried by agents to the groups selected to execute them. Plans are based on central intelligence built up by Communist agents all over the world.

The Kremlin plans to seize control over all peoples who do not "peacefully" yield. In all fields these plans follow the strategy of armed forces and are directed at gaining control over strategic industries, strategic groups of people, strategic powers of government, and strategic informational and cultural agencies.

With such termites following over-all orders busily battling their way into so many institutions and with the warning of the growing list of nations that have succumbed to termite traitors, the United States has been trying to develop greater legal protection against the treachery of United States Communists as well as the Soviet agents who direct them to carry out Stalin's purposes.

In the economic field our trade-unions were battling the philosophy of communism when it was advocating national socialism as developed by Karl Marx. Our democratic unions knew that labor alone did not create all wealth and that our most constructive policy was to concentrate on getting a fairer share of the returns from the production to which we contributed. We fought and defeated the Marxian advocates, so that we could have American trade-unions to serve us in getting higher standards of living in our democratic society.

When Lenin, the heir of Marxian socialism, molded it into a military organization to battle competitive enterprise, we recognized a deadly enemy in this International Communist Party called the Comintern. We turned against Communists who had infiltrated some strategic unions and drove them out. We insistently and repeatedly urged our Government not to establish diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R., pointing out that the Communist Party, although posing as a political organization, was in reality not a political party at all but an organization seeking conquest by treachery, subversion, and force, that it was not an honest institution but an agency of the Kremlin rulers seeking to delude our citizens into substituting dictatorship for freedom.

The position of the American Federation of Labor has been justified by events of the past two decades. All efforts of the free nations to cooperate with the Communist Government of Russia, in World War II and in the United Nations, have been regarded by the Kremlin as merely opportunities to advance Communist control in order to establish the reactionary despotism of past ages. It is difficult to legislate against communism without impairing our own freedoms. We can, however, deal with it as an illegal conspiracy and outlaw the tactics of conspirators. We shall have to develop the machinery for necessary security and see to it that our judges learn the facts of the Communist way of life.

The shock of finding Communists in the executive branch of our own Government and the trial of a confidential assistant to a President of the United States have resulted in checks on civil-service employees to establish their loyalty, and in some agencies to establish that employees are not security risks. The President in 1947, by Executive order, set up a Loyalty Board of Review to assure Government employees protection against arbitrary action.

Last year Congress enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950, which sought to outlaw subversive activities. This law requires Communist organizations and fronts to register as agents of a foreign government and to make regular reports on their activities. The names of party members must also be registered. Registered organizations can use the mails only by labeling their documents as disseminated by a Communist organization. The President was directed to appoint a Subversive Activities Control Board of five members to enforce this law against conspiratorial acts.

This law also denies passports to Communists and denies admission to Communist immigrants. There are other provisions in the act which have aroused controversy.

The President, by Executive order, has recently established a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights to study the problem of providing for internal security while conserving individual rights and freedoms, to examine present loyalty and security programs, and to report its findings and conclusions.

More protection and security should result from these various efforts so that our national defense may proceed more effectively both in cold and in hot wars.

Report of Tariff Committee of the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I present for printing the report of the tariff committee of the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association, which during the course of the Senate proceedings today was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Appendix.

The report is as follows:

REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE TARIFF COMMITTEE OF THE NEW JERSEY BLUEBERRY FARMERS ASSOCIATION

(The following report is submitted by the tariff committee on the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association, the policy organization for the New Jersey cultivated blueberry industry, for the purpose of expressing its opposition to the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. A careful reading of this report will convey to you and your distinguished colleagues the extreme hardship that threatens our welfare because of the existing low tariffs on our products.)

With the mounting stress of mobilization, it seems mandatory to both Government and citizens to maintain every branch of American business enterprise at the peak of health and vigor so that the national effort shall not want for needed revenue. In this respect the cultivated blueberry farming enterprise of my State is one of the hundreds of small consumer industries which our Government hopes will prosper greatly so that it will be able to assume more of the sharply increased tax burden.

As we know, steel, aircraft, and related war industries working on a cost-plus basis will have to be fed colossal rations of tax dollars to arm the Western World. It is up to industries like this one from my State which will have to contribute more dollars to the tax purse in order to pay these munitions industries as well as maintain normal cost of Government. Unfortunately, industries like this will be unable to share directly in any Government expenditures, yet it will be expected to increase its production and revenue in the steadily restricted buying sphere of the American consumer. There is no doubt but that is going to be a mighty strenuous schedule—more dollar revenue without sharing in the Government largess.

Another thing to be considered is the fact that the blueberry industry has built up its unique and valuable contribution to our farm economy without any Government assistance such as farm subsidies and stabilized parity prices. It is totally dependent upon the whims of the greatly fluctuating produce market. Here, I might point out, the blueberry grower is one of a category of several million farmers in this Nation who have never cashed a fat subsidy check in one shape or another to swell his normal farm earnings. These are the people who produce the perishable crops of fruits and vegetables. Since the completion of World War II, these farmers, with unsupported prices, have frequently suffered a very rough time. Speaking of the blueberry industry, I am able to say that in recent years the margin of profit has been so narrow that there now exists a state of alarm among its growers. As if domestic problems were not enough, this industry is now threatened by a sizable invasion of their markets from several foreign quarters at prices which they are unable to meet without courting bankruptcy. Gentlemen, if this condition is allowed to continue unabated, do not count on the blueberry industry to supply any fat to the sinews of war. We think it is relevant to give you a brief history of this industry in order to impress upon you its modest value in the American economy.

Twenty-five years ago this food did not exist in American commerce. In the wooded pine barrens of New Jersey it has converted thousands of acres of land, long considered unworthy of dollar valuation, into profitable farm ground valued at more than $5,000,000 at present and recently producing an annual crop worth $2,500,000. To emphasize this accomplishment in a short quarter century, I give you the recent report of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture: The cultivated blueberry has replaced the cranberry as New Jersey's first-ranking small fruit. In fact, the value of the State's cultivated blueberry crop exceeded the value of all other berry crops in New Jersey in 1950.

Where once nothing but deer and rabbits roamed, prosperous communities are growing and thousands earn good wages harvesting and maintaining the plantations. More hundreds profit through the processing of this new fruit in canneries and freezers. From this enterprise in three counties of south Jersey has sprung rapidly growing industries in the States of Michigan, North Carolina, Maryland, Washington, and Oregon—offsprings that are bringing greatly appreciated revenue of additional millions to the former waste lands of those States. It has been a promising effort until now.

These people have created something that is new and valuable to American farming, and we in New Jersey are proud of their efforts. But as they stand at this moment they do not have much more reward than pride. Theirs is a costly industry. It defies

partial mechanization. To maintain quality nearly every operation demands human labor. The bulk of the plantations are small family enterprises. This is necessitated by the heavy capitalization and the need for constant personal supervision to maintain the crop at peak efficiency. The day when this fruit was considered a rich man's luxury is past. They now have to supply the increasing demand of the average man for this fruit at a price he can afford to pay. The fixed costs which amount to two-thirds of their sales revenue have relentlessly mounted while competition has forced them to lower their prices. The end result is that few in this industry last year earned enough after a year's work to pay Uncle Sam more than a token income tax. The average blueberry farmer made less on his investment of thousands of dollars per farm than an ordinary worker in a munitions plant. Yet today he has to pay farm labor $1 per hour, and his pickers won't come to the field unless they are assured of from $8 to $10 per day for harvesting, plus their transportation. Every item of production needed to market one pint of blueberries has sharply increased in cost.

There is, however, a note of brightness. There is no optimist quite like the farmer. When a workman finds his job is unprofitable, he quits; when a businessman finds his business is unprofitable, he liquidates; when a farmer finds the crop unprofitable, he goes right back and takes another swat at it.

The blueberry farmers, I can assure you, are not afraid of their domestic problems. They figure that they will have to organize more cooperatively, build up wider markets, strive to control their distribution and improve their already fine product. That is a man-sized job, but they figure that they can do it; eat and still pay those taxes. What has them worried is a threat from a different quarter and they are powerless to meet that one on equal terms. But the United States Government can. Their problem is this:

One of the reasons they have been able to expand has been the development of what is called "bulk" sales as a companion to the sales of fresh fruit, limited to two short months of the summer season. Gradually they have encouraged the processors to can the product, freeze it for the family table and also freeze it in larger quantities for the bakery and allied industries. This represents several millions of pounds of business each year that formerly did not exist. The public likes it and is going more for this high-quality product each season. For this market, growers of cultivated blueberries have had competition from the harvesters of huckleberries, a similar wild fruit abundant in a few sections of the United States where this enterprise is carried on commercially. But there has always been room for both of them. Unfortunately, the wild huckleberry grows prolifically in Canada and nearly every country of North Europe.

We have been informed that the Government of Norway has assisted one of the Norwegian import companies to process its abundant harvest of wild huckleberries with the idea of entering the American market. Norwegian agronomists came to America to study our markets and industry. They obtained the most modern blast freezing equipment, installing it in a modern plant and are now set up in business to go for our markets. According to our information, they planned last year to start with a modest 500 long tons of frozen fruit, packed in tin, to be made available to the American consumer at the rate of 21 cents per pound delivered. This first plant has a maximum capacity of 2,000 long tons, or 4,500,000 pounds, which they anticipate shipping to us by 1952. That about equals the amount of the present bulk sales from Jersey. Recently we learned that the Swedish canning industry is now making available for the American market canned Swedish huckleberries at a price of $2.50 per dozen to the retailer.

These are only the most recent invasions of our markets. For some time now the Canadians have shipped several millions of pounds of fresh fruit annually across the border to compete against the native product at a delivered price below that which the American farmer can profitably produce the cultivated variety.

In this uneven contest some of the elements the American grower has had to fight are these: It costs a thousand dollars to bring an acre of cultivated blueberries into production; the foreign competitor gets his free from nature. We pay high American wages to gather, process, maintain insect control, package and transport our product; the foreign competition does this at labor costs far below ours.

This is tough enough competition but the straw that breaks the camel's back is the fact that the tariff established some years ago to protect the blueberry and huckleberry industries has been slashed from a sound 35 percent to 10 percent since 1930. There is a move on now by our foreign competitors to whittle it to 8¾ percent.

Since the completion of World War II the blueberry grower, like many of his fellows in the perishable-foods line, has been fighting a losing battle with the processor who insists each year that he must have the product cheaper. In 1945 they were paid 28 cents per pound for cultivated "blues." Last year they were paid 20 cents and were warned to expect a farm price of 18 cents for the coming year. The club which the processor sometimes uses is something called competitive price—meaning that he must buy the article cheap enough to assure himself ample profit, plus mark-ups of the wholesaler and retailer, and then deliver it to the consumer at an attractive price. There has been hope up to now that the blueberry farmer could meet with the processor and convince him that there is still room for a few cents more per pound to the farmer without jeopardizing the attractive price for the consumer. Inflationary prices in food, the realization that our costs will jump at least 2 cents more per pound for the coming season, the reasonable assumption that the spread between the farmer and the consumer can be reduced—these have been factors which encouraged the farmers to believe that they might obtain a better break from the processing industry.

These hopes seem pretty dim now with sizable importations of Norwegian blueberries available at 21 cents per pound and canned Swedish berries at $2.50 per dozen. On a 20-cent per pound basis, the processing trade has made bulk frozen berries available to the retail trade at 28 cents per pound. The canning trade has made available its product to the retail trade at from $2.65 per dozen to $3.00 per dozen. The blueberry farmer fears that processors and jobbers are going to be mighty tough when they are faced with competition that undersells the frozen product by 7 cents per pound and the canned product by at least 15 percent per dozen below what is considered an irreducible minimum.

With this situation the blueberry farmers feel they are with their backs to the wall. They cannot afford to give any more ground on price and stay in business. I am informed that an accurate cost accounting of one of the big plantations—a small group of about 25 of these producing 200,000 or more pounds annually—revealed that it had cost the grower 19.2 cents per pound to get the fruit off the bush and to the buyer. This was done on a 20-cent sales price. You can see that margin of profit if you look closely on a very clear day. Several smaller growers toted up their bush-to-market costs and they came out with a 16-cent cost per pound The 4-cent per pound profit does not add up to much when one considers that the small-type plantations produced only from 50,000 to 75,000 pounds last year. Remember, these figures do not include capitalization costs such as new plantings, new machinery and new buildings.

In the face of the Norwegian importations being introduced last year they lost and expect to lose a lot more business. The importers and jobbers report they plan to increase sharply their use of Norwegian fruit this coming year, while active canvassing is under way for the Swedish product expected for the coming season.

Canada, which has already established itself in the American market, has been reported as expecting to ship a bumper crop across the border. I might add that growing of the cultivated American blueberry is going apace in northern Germany and Holland, and that there are several hundred acres under cultivation already. We understand that this endeavor is also aimed eventually at the attractive low-tariff American market.

In the coming years we gather you want this industry to grow in the United States, expand and produce more revenue so that the blueberry farmers can provide for and pay the taxes necessary for the increased mobilization. To do this they will have to have more than a line-holding operation by the Government on tariffs. It is essential that the tariff be raised back to its original level of 35 percent.

There is no desire by this industry to totally exclude competition, either foreign or domestic. The American, I think, is adult enough now to realize that such aims in the long run produce more harm than good. However, the blueberry grower—knowing that science, nature and good farming techniques have endowed him with a superior product—merely wants to fight for his own markets under the Marquis of Queensberry rules. The 35 percent tariff will enable him to meet the foreign frozen fruit on the basis of 26½ cents as compared to 21 cents. The canned fruit entering the country would have to be sold at a comparative price which would bring it within range of the lowest production price of the processors. This does not improve the meager profits of 20-cent fruit but it does allow us to tackle our domestic problems without being sandbagged from abroad.

In presenting their plea, I have shown you a rendering rather than a blueprint—a picture with over-all color and perspective that graphically shows how important it is to protect a struggling, average American farm industry in these trying times. Further statistics are available from the more detailed documents which we presented with sympathetic reception before the Reciprocity Commission some months ago.

JOHN GOODMAN,
Secretary, New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association.

Amalgamation of the State Department and Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs for the State Department, made

a reply to my speeches in the House of Representatives on Wednesday and Thursday of last week. I regret that I was not present at the time he made his remarks, but that was entirely my fault. He had taken the trouble to notify my office that he intended to make such a reply. We had under discussion the appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury Departments and I had to return to my office to meet with some people. His time for special orders came 2 hours sooner than either of us anticipated, in view of the fact that the committee rose and the members having the time which would consume 1 hour of special orders prior to Mr. CHATHAM did not use it.

I do not propose to make a complete comment on Mr. CHATHAM's remarks at this time as I am about to catch a plane for Chicago to keep an appointment with the district attorney in the hope that I may be permitted to appear before the grand jury tomorrow afternoon in connection with a situation in which I am intensely interested. I shall ask for permission for a special order to make a detailed analysis of Mr. CHATHAM's remarks immediately following the Easter recess.

Briefly, I would like to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for a very good summary of my fears. I wish everyone in the country could read and digest it because, in my opinion, it substantiates exactly what I was fearful would happen. The important thing accomplished by my speeches is that the State Department agreed to withhold the effective date of the amalgamation of the State Department and the Foreign Service until such time as appropriate committees of Congress can thoroughly study its effects.

I am making a formal request today of Mr. CHATHAM, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs for the Department of State, for permission to appear before his committee as a witness. I am also directing a request to Chairman DAWSON, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to appear as a witness if the reorganization comes before his committee for consideration.

The American Selling-Price Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being asked to consider legislation which would overhaul customs procedures to conform more nearly to standard practices. This is a worthy objective and should result in the lessening of injustices and confusion.

However, section 14 of H. R. 1535 eliminates the American selling-price principle, which has afforded some measure of protection to domestic rubber-footwear producers. Should this provision remain in the bill, it will grant to slave-labor employees in Czechoslovakia concessions which will allow the unrestrained importation of foreign-made rubber footwear.

If this repealer section should become the law of the land, the State Department will have accomplished what they failed to do in the Torquay Conference last September. The rubber-footwear industry will be injured through congressional enactment, after public outcry staved off tariff concessions at Torquay.

I warned against the evils of this legislative language in the Eighty-first Congress, and now forewarn those who are interested in the maintenance of a strong, virile, American rubber-footwear industry.

There follows a letter on this subject voicing the concern of industry and labor officials intimately associated with the problem:

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.,
Naugatuck, Conn., March 13, 1951.
The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Both labor and management involved in the manufacture and distribution of rubber footwear devoted much study last year to H. R. 8304 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), the proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1950. It was our feeling the bill proposed in general many constructive and long overdue changes in customs procedures.

We did, however, take vigorous exception to one provision in the measure. That was section 14 which, if it had been enacted, would have jettisoned the American selling price principle as a basis for computing import duties on rubber and canvas footwear. The bill would have substituted a foreign export value as the basis for computing duty. It was our contention that this involved a substantive change in the law and was not for that reason germane to a measure pointed otherwise at streamlining customs procedure.

This bill has now been reintroduced in the Eighty-second Congress, H. R. 1535. It contains the same objectionable provision (sec. 14), eliminating the American selling price principle. This section of the bill provides that the Tariff Commission shall certify to the President a rate of duty for each classification of articles "which the Commission estimates to be reasonably equivalent."

It is our contention that even if the authors of the bill sincerely intended to provide the same level of relief under the proposed revisions, they could not make good. Experts in customs matters support us in this view. The proposed bill does not outline a detailed procedure for converting the tariff protection to the same level under the proposed revision. The Tariff Commission, as far as we can learn, has not agreed on a procedure of any kind to meet the new proposed provisions, much less one that will guarantee our industry the same protection as it now has under the American selling price. We have had no information from Tariff Commission or State Department to persuade us from our opinion that no workable scheme can be devised under the new law to give us this same protection.

If we are to have the same protection as under American selling price, how would the Tariff Commission set up a schedule of tariffs which would take account of the fluctuations in the price of imported goods and the price of like or similar American goods?

When it is realized that there are hundreds of different rubber footwear items, each with its own price level, it becomes clear that there is no workable substitute for the American selling-price method which will give the industry the same level of protection.

Some of the letters last year from the State Department indicated a misunderstanding of the American selling price principle and the conditions under which it was enacted into law by Congress about 25 years ago. It was implied that the United States Government, apparently upon the urging of American industry, adopted the American selling price as a "device to conceal the real amount of protection actually enjoyed by this and the other industries concerned."

Congress set the American selling price as a basis for duty valuation because other methods of valuation were not adequate; and one of the inadequacies was the inability of American officials to obtain accurate information on foreign costs. This was particularly true with reference to rubber footwear. In this respect the situation is even worse today.

The American rubber footwear industry's most serious competitor for the domestic market is Czechoslovakia. Can the Tariff Commission or the State Department get trustworthy data on costs of production in Czechoslovakia today? Does any one in our Government have accurate figures on the labor and material costs represented in a pair of rubber gaiters from a Czech factory landed in New York today?

Instead of "concealing" the facts about the amount of duty, the American selling price makes it easy for a foreign competitor to determine the amount of duty he has to pay in relation to his costs of production.

From whom are the facts as to the "real amount of protection" concealed? Not from the Czech manufacturer. Under the American selling price he is the only person who knows the actual rate of duty based on his export value or any other value. And under the American selling price usually he can determine what his duty will be even before he begins to manufacture. The only thing that would change his estimate would be a change in the selling price of the American article like or similar to the one he is producing, and the adjustment in any event would be negligible.

The American rubber footwear industry can stand no further cuts. In fact competitive footwear made in low-wage countries abroad is seriously threatening the industry under the existing duties. Labor constitutes approximately 47 percent of the factory cost of canvas and waterproof footwear. This is the labor of American workmen and wages paid in this industry in this country are far higher than those in any other country. The materials used by American manufacturers of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear are, with the exception of natural rubber, American made and here again this industry is at a disadvantage as against the use of materials produced in foreign low-labor-cost countries.

The manufacture of rubber footwear is an essential part of our national economy. It is vital to our national defense. During the last war this industry furnished our Armed Forces with more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear. In the same facilities, it also made life rafts, fuel cells, raincoats, life vests, and other similar war products. Without a going rubber-footwear industry our national defense program would be seriously impaired.

Thirteen companies are engaged in the manufacture of rubber and canvas footwear and employ more than 20,000 men and women with sales of approximately $100,000,000.

It is one of the truly American industries, foreign manufacturers having copied its styles and methods. The low-labor rates

and cheaper materials costs of foreign manufacturers, particularly Czechoslovakian and Japanese, combined with lower tariffs, would mean the loss of jobs to thousands, not alone in this industry, but in the factories of its suppliers and in the stores and shops in the communities which serve its workers.

It is clear that the elimination of the American selling price, through H. R. 1535 or any other measure, would adversely affect the American rubber footwear industry, its stockholders and its employees, and eventually the American public who look to this industry to supply it with essential waterproof rubber and rubber-soled canvas shoes.

We earnestly solicit your support for the elimination of this section 14 from the bill which is now under consideration in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Very truly yours,

T. R. BEHRMAN,
Industrial Relations Manager, Naugatuck Footwear Plant.

GEORGE T. FROEHLICH,
President, Local 45, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, Plastic Workers of America, CIO.

Pennsylvania's Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on a very personal matter, because as a Pennsylvanian I am, naturally, tremendously proud of Pennsylvania's long and honored history.

What I consider to be a lamentable understatement in our Commonwealth's history has been corrected by a new book which was published on Monday entitled "Shelter for His Excellency" and written by Le Roy Greene, veteran Philadelphia newspaperman, author, and historian.

The book makes the point that Pennsylvania, which had its beginnings of colonization in 1624, has had in the line of historic sequence a total of one hundred governors.

Among other colonial States there may well be others which have had one hundred chief executives since their history began, but I believe Pennsylvania is the first State to have had them recorded and accounted for in a single book.

It has been the unfortunate tendency, as we inaugurate each Governor to the State Capitol at Harrisburg every 4 years, as we did with Governor John S. Fine this year, to refer to the Governor as the such-and-such number since the constitution of 1750.

This habit has grown upon us, for reasons which are apocryphal, with the result, for example, that our incumbent Governor Fine was described as Pennsylvania's thirty-fifth Governor since the constitution. The fact of the matter is that Governor Fine is the one hundredth Governor since the beginnings of our Commonwealth.

As a result, this unhappy custom of referring to governors only since the second constitution, almost wipes out in a stroke the long line of great men, among them the founders of our Nation, who were the chief executives of Pennsylvania long before there was such an instrument as a constitution.

Under such reasoning we have ignored such intellectual giants as Benjamin Franklin, David Rittenhouse, and William Penn, who were the Governors of Pennsylvania during the provincial and Revolutionary times.

So, too, we have ignored such established historical colonial figures as Peter Minuit, Peter Stuyvesant, and Johan Printz who were also Governors of Pennsylvania.

This new book, which has already become a best seller, sets all this straight and starts at the very beginning of Pennsylvania. That is where the start should be made, and that is why this book makes such an important contribution and why I want to spread it upon the record of this session.

It has also been a tendency in the past to number persons and dates in Pennsylvania, in addition to using the constitution of 1790 as a milestone, from the Revolution, or from the proprietorship of William Penn, or from the rule of Sweden.

The beginnings of Pennsylvania history are with the Dutch colonization which preceded them all. The colonies on the Delaware River and the Hudson River were encompassed in the area then known as the New Netherlands. Hence, the early history of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Delaware are naturally tied in together. The early Dutch Governors ruled the land of all of these future States together, with some of them even appointing resident governors in each of the areas while they themselves assumed a master control from wherever they established their own capital in the new land. Every school child knows of Peter Minuit's purchase of the island of Manhattan for $24. Now, as a result of this new book our Pennsylvania school children will have an opportunity to learn also that Peter Minuit made an equally sensational purchase when he bought all of the land along the west bank of the Delaware from Delaware clear up to Trenton, N. J., for an almost equally ridiculous sum. Minuit's fame is well established as a foremost New Yorker when he was also Pennsylvania's third Governor. We see again reestablished the fact that for a time the capital of all New Netherlands, well known to have been in New York, was also for a time in Pennsylvania.

I, for one, am delighted that all of this history has been brought together in a single book. I am especially happy that the job was not intended to be a dry, dull history reference book, which it is not, but is what it was intended to be—a fascinating, colorful, exciting story for general reader interest and aimed at the average citizen who has neither the time nor the inclination to pull out reference books to learn the history of our State. It is the usual thing for books like this to be reference books, which keeps them out of the hands of all those except scholars, but fortunately that is not the case here.

How this book came to be written is almost as interesting as the book itself. The author, Le Roy Greene, was a young but already veteran newspaperman on the Philadelphia Public Ledger and Evening Public Ledger when he was summoned to Harrisburg by Governor Arthur H. James to be press secretary to the Governor. Greene accepted the summons and took a 4-year leave of absence from his newspaper where he had been a reporter, rewriteman, and editor on assignments which took him over a good part of the world.

He had been with Governor James but a short time in 1939, when Governor James asked him about the history of the executive mansion on Harrisburg's Front Street, at the bend of the Susquehanna, which had been the home of the State's chief executives since the great Civil War governor, Andrew Curtin.

Greene went looking for the history and found that nothing had ever been written except in newspaper stories reporting the day-by-day activities. Nothing had ever been compiled. Shortly thereafter Governor James inquired of Greene as to what number governor he was in the line of historic sequence and Greene found that nothing had been done on that subject since the mid-1800's and that even so, the line of succession had never been established. Greene expressed the thought at the time that if anyone was entitled to know how many governors there had been, that person should certainly be the Governor of Pennsylvania.

With the insatiable curiosity for ferreting out facts which is typical of qualified and trained newspapermen, Greene undertook the job which he was to finish some 12 years later. During those years, however, he was in the Army for more than four, serving in the Philippines as a lieutenant colonel in the infantry.

I quote from a recent review of his book, published in newspapers, in which the reviewer said: "It is the story of a great State told by the State's best storyteller in his finest reportorial style."

I could go on at some length about the stories of our great governors and their altogether human idiosyncrasies, including the one who kicked a Supreme Court Justice in the seat of the pants, the one who inadvertently drank a jug of water which had been sent to the State Capitol to be tested for typhoid fever; the one who was only 21 years of age; the one who was one of America's great baseball players; the one who drove a committee of the General Assembly from his door; or even the one who kept a pet skunk named Charlie in the executive mansion at Harrisburg; but those are the human touches which make this book so fascinating. But what I want to do before closing these remarks is to point out two more historical inaccuracies which have been corrected in this book. The eighth Governor of Pennsylvania has gone down in history as Peter Hollender, whereas actually his name is Peter Hollender Ridder. One governor has been overlooked entirely in history but Greene puts him in his rightful place. He was Derck Smidt, of Holland, who ruled Pennsylvania during the year 1655.

Letter From Rev. Lawrence L. Lacour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Lawrence L. Lacour, of Oskaloosa, Iowa, in the district which I have the honor to represent, and a man who served with distinction as a chaplain in the Navy during the late war, had an opportunity to observe at close hand the moral conditions in Japan, and recently has written me a very enlightening letter.

Members may recall that our colleague, Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, the gentleman from Minnesota, in 1945, inserted in the RECORD a letter from the Reverend Lawrence L. Lacour, written from Japan in which he described an unspeakable moral breakdown, and the letter commanded attention in all parts of the United States. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the letter from the Reverend Lawrence L. Lacour setting forth his conclusions after careful study and close observation.

The letter is as follows:

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA,
February 26, 1951.

The Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: It was most thoughtful of you to send your favor of February 2. Many times I have wanted to thank you for the support you gave our moral crusade project when I was a chaplain in the Navy. The action in Washington brought immediate response in Japan with a personal order from the Secretary of the Navy making all houses of prostitution out of bounds. After that order of November 1 the incidence of venereal disease began to decline.

It was also most gracious of you to recommend that I be honored by the Legion of Merit. It is most understandable why such a recommendation was never passed since I would have been decorated for attacking a situation that had been accepted as a part of the Navy policy.

As you may know, our group recently concluded a 5½-month tour of Japan. This tour took us to every prefecture of Japan where we appeared before over a half million people in 130 different cities. In many of these cities we were entertained by both the mayors and governors of the prefectures. All of these contacts gave us some feel of the pulse in Japan. Some of these observations may be of help to you.

First, there is a deep-seated resentment among the intellectuals toward our talk of rearming Japan. According to the new constitution the Japanese people accepted the terms that they would never again return to military power as a means of settling international disputes, or even for the cause of self-defense. It is a feeling of many of these people that either the original terms of the surrender must be changed, or we must allow the people to make this decision for themselves. Otherwise, they see no consistency in our theories of democracy.

Although General MacArthur has been criticized severely by some sources, his overall policy is commendable. Yet the Japanese feel they cannot openly criticize administrative policies administered by GHQ. This inability of General MacArthur to accept criticism has caused him again and again to be betrayed on administrative matters, and has made it impossible for him to get the total picture. We conducted services for a number of encampments of Japanese police reserves. Among many of these men there was the feeling that they had been recruited under false pretenses. They had agreed to become police reserves but are now undergoing basic infantry training. Such inconsistencies do not help the cause of democracy.

Naturally, no occupation, or any other government for that matter, can be completely void of corruption and abuses. However, there were two phases of the local administrative policies that have not created good will. First, the Army has taken over the finest buildings in the cities where our men are billeting. We have enlisted men over there who enjoy a standard of living beyond anything they could know in America. With servants often more highly educated than themselves, they have found it easy to take a very superior attitude to the Japanese. More recently the Army established more equitable rents for these dwellings, but considerable local resentment has been created by these policies.

The second factor concerns morality. There is no particular problem concerning prostitution any longer in Japan. The Army has solved it in its own way. Many of the men (of course it is impossible to produce statistics for this observation) have taken over Japanese girls and are living with them. These girls are examined to determine freedom from venereal disease and then the men proceed to live with them. Before the Korean incident the situation was so common as to have become accepted as regular occupation routine. This has not created good will with the Japanese people. Nor are all of the girls who have cooperated in this project prostitutes. Many of them are girls from good families, and in some cases exceptionally high-type girls who, being void of any standard of Christian ethics, are attracted by the possibilities of American citizenship and a general good time in the company of the American fellows, who most certainly excel the Japanese men in their treatment of women. So common was this practice among our young men that I strongly oppose the drafting of our 18-year-olds, or the use of our younger men in an army of occupation. If this must be the conduct of the career soldier, we can only plug along through the processes of education and religion for a reform; but in the cases of our younger men who eventually expect to return to civilian status, we have a responsibility at the point of those factors which determine their fitness to be good husbands and substantial citizens.

Kindest personal regards and success to you in your great work.

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE L. LACOUR.

Ninety-seventh Birthday Anniversary of Andrew Furuseth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered at the celebration of the ninety-seventh birthday anniversary of Andrew Furuseth, on March 12, 1951. The speech was delivered by Mr. Einar Johansen, representative of the Norwegian Seamen's Unions in the United States and was broadcast by courtesy of WNYS, the municipal broadcasting system of the city of New York.

In addition to this address, there was also broadcast a tribute to Mr. Furuseth, written by Mr. George W. Blakeley, a licensed marine engineer and intimate friend of Mr. Furuseth, which was read by Mr. Peter Gravina, a station announcer. The speech and the tribute follow:

On the occasion of Andrew Furuseth's ninety-seventh birthday, I feel greatly honored to be chosen to pay tribute to the grand old man of the sea, and one of the foremost in American labor movement. The memory of "Andy" as he affectionately was called by all who knew him, will remain forever among all seamen, regardless of nationality.

Andrew Furuseth has been called the Abraham Lincoln of the sea, and greater truth has never been spoken. Andrew was born on a small farm at Romedal, Telemark in Norway, the fourth of eight children. Due to poverty in the family, he had to work for his keep from the age of eight. Coming from a seafaring nation, he went to sea at an early age in 1873. At that time the seaman's lot, at the best, could be called a hard one. For years Andrew Furuseth was trained in the hard school of the sea, sailing in ships belonging to five different nations, until he arrived at the Pacific coast on an English ship from Calcutta in 1881. Like thousands of other seamen at that time, he came to America to find freedom, but unlike other men, he dedicated his life to the task of freeing others.

His achievements and what he accomplished in Congress is an old story and should be known to all of you. Before and after the year of 1887, when he was elected secretary of the Pacific Coast Seamen's Union, later the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, he fought a long hard fight to make all men sailing the seven seas, equal to any man ashore. Fighting relentlessly throughout the years, he was the victor in many amendments to the Seamen's Act of 1872. His long uphill fight for freedom, integrity, and better living conditions for the seamen was rewarded on March 4, 1915, when the Seamen's Act of the same date was signed by President Woodrow Wilson. Signature of the bill was witnessed by Andrew Furuseth, on bent knees and with hands lifted in prayers. Thus were destroyed conditions, which at many times were worse than slavery.

It is because of men like Andrew Furuseth and the seafarers trade-unions, that the shackles were removed from men who go down to sea in ships.

It was not due to birth or heritage, Andrew Furuseth succeeded, but by using his long experience at sea, and above all by self-education. He was a student of maritime laws, both ancient and those existing in his time. He was eager to learn from reading history, classics, and other books, helping him to understand people and relationship between them. His life was in itself an example for others.

Whenever he lost a fight, and you could always be sure he made it a good one, he used to say: "Tomorrow is also a day." He was a lonely man, but may be greater because of it. He never asked anything for himself, and often declared that a labor leader to be successful, useful, and efficient should have nothing of his own, and want nothing for himself. He never accepted more in wages than to cover necessities and when traveling, mostly shipped before the mast.

Due to these characteristics, his keen sense of duty and devotion to the seamen's cause, he could not fail. He was truly a great man. He lived only to benefit others. His sincerity and motives could never be questioned, even by those who did not agree with his line of thought.

When Andrew Furuseth passed away in Washington on January 22, 1938, he was laid in state in the Department of Labor Building, an honor never accorded any other labor leader in the United States. According to his wish his ashes were scattered on the ocean as far from land as possible. He came from a seafaring nation, suffered and fought, as freemen always will when necessary.

I have a feeling that wherever ships float old Andy is still with his beloved seamen in their fight for peace, security, and freedom.

Since Andrew Furuseth's time, material achievements have brought changes in international relations and have created new and wonderful opportunities for further progress and welfare of humanity. The seafarers, having gained freedom through him, are well fitted to promote universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all human beings without distinction of race, language, or religion. They contact all kinds of people and for the seamen, this world of ours is really one.

In their opinion material achievements should be followed by better international understanding and cooperation.

Mankind's capacity for creative work, should be more displayed in the organization of international life, so that freedom and peace may prevail. This must be done, because today, as in Andrew Furuseth's time, the longing for freedom and security is still the predominant desire of all people.

Many years of war and strife between nations has taught us how precious freedom really is and how easy it can be lost. We have realized that life cannot be lived without freedom. That is why the seafarers and their trade-unions always have been partisans of world progress and emancipation, and why they cannot tolerate concentration camp regimes. There is something greater than peace, and we must be ready to fight for it as men like Furuseth did before us.

We have seen destruction of free trade-unions behind the iron curtain, where freedom is nothing more than a memory. Existing conditions impose strict duties on all free labor. A choice must be made between freedom and servitude. Free labor all around the world has made that choice. The Norwegian Seamen's union together with all other affiliations of the International Transportworkers Federation have taken measures to ensure safe delivery of arms under the Atlantic Treaty, without delay and sabotage. The action of the United Nations in Korea has full support. The ideals and principles for which the United Nations are fighting will not be surrendered. The International Transportworkers Federation and all its affiliates are determined to fight all plans to misuse the seafarers for political ends, and are prepared to take counteraction against all subversive activities and all attempts to destroy free trade-unions.

Andrew Furuseth recognized that background knowledge was essential for those who wanted to build wisely for the future. Much can be learned from reading the history of great men, their achievements and what they fought and often died for. The memory of men like Andrew Furuseth will inspire to give greater and better services to mankind. If he had lived today I am quite certain that he would have been a leader among freedom loving people, because of all men that have dedicated themselves to the welfare of humanity, the name of Andrew Furuseth will always be among the first. He would no doubt be as confident in victory today as he was before, because he would know that he was on the right side and fighting a just cause.

I like to think about Furuseth as a teacher and great humanitarian. His teaching has shown that peace, together with economic and social freedom and security can be won, as long as men are willing to fight for it. I don't say this can be done overnight, but it can and will be done through cooperation between all freedom loving nations and through unity of labor, national as well as international.

Andrew Furuseth has in many ways shown us how to fight and what to fight for. He has given us great hopes and great claims, but we have also inherited his fight for freedom and prosperity. It is because of Andrew Furuseth and men like him that we believe in ourselves, in the future and the cause we are fighting for.

Mr. GRAVINA. In conclusion, I have been asked to read a tribute to Mr. Andrew Furuseth by Mr. George W. Blakeley, licensed marine engineer and intimate friend of Mr. Furuseth:

"It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to say a few words in honor of Mr. Andrew Furuseth, one of the world's greatest men. He was a giant in crusading for human rights through a social justice that would be void of communistic or of other dictatorial elements, whether of the red, the brown, or the black variety.

"I first met Mr. Furuseth in 1919, during the seamen's strike in New Orleans, and as the years rolled by I came to realize his greatness. He gave of himself without thought of self-gain or egotism, so that his fellow men could enjoy some of the blessings of life that I am sure our good Lord so intended.

"He was indeed a rare jewel in unionism, and in explaining a union to me, he once said, and I quote, 'A union has three important duties to fulfill:

"'1. It must be fair to the employer,

"'2. It must be fair to the employee,

"'3. It must be fair to the employer's customers, the consumers of either merchandise or services.'

"A union must stand for cooperation and fairness, and for the greatest good of all concerned. For this kind of union, Andrew Furuseth devoted his life.

"Today, in a world that is worshiping materialism, in a world of mass murder, and in a world that is forgetting God, our country and the entire world are in dire need of men like Andrew Furuseth who could lead men back to justice for their fellow man through God. Even as I speak, the world seems bent on a complete catastrophe by atheists who will exert every effort to enslave all people, or to bring the world around them down in chaos.

"Andrew Furuseth began a crusade against human enslavers back in 1887, and never once relented his energies in that crusade.

"We are very unfortunate that we did not heed his advice many years ago in guarding against human enslavers."

A Tribute to the Soil of the State of Iowa by Arthur Orr, One of Its Native Sons

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my notice a very fervent tribute to the soil of my State which I believe is worthy to be permanently inscrolled in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is the work of one who has been an employee of this House of Representatives for more than 30 years. I refer to Arthur Orr, who, in point of length of service, is the senior clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations. He is well known by a very large number of the Members because for upward of 25 years he was assigned to the subcommittee in charge of the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

His tribute to the soil of the great State of Iowa is contained in a letter written more than 15 years ago to his niece, then Miss Margaret Holler, of Van Horne, Iowa. It is my privilege to insert a copy of that letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

Mr. Orr was born in Woodbury County, Iowa, but spent much of his boyhood in my district on a farm near the town of Thurman in Fremont County, where he attended the Thurman public school. He grew up "between the Iowa corn rows," and he knows whereof he speaks of the soil of his native State. Mr. Orr has performed his very responsible duties here as a servant of the people with honor and distinction. He is a fine example of a true Iowan. I am sure his old friends and schoolmates of Thurman, Iowa, will be happy to know that Arthur Orr is in good health and has not forgotten Iowa, his native State. The letter to his niece follows:

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 16, 1934.*

Miss MARGARET HOLLER,

Van Horne, Iowa.

DEAR NIECE: Several months ago I received from you a small package which you had sent me through the mail. Upon opening the package, I discovered a toy truck, the body of which was occupied by a small burlap bag filled with soil.

I then recalled that during your visit with us the winter before I had told you about the poor qualities of the soil here in Arlington County, Va., and of the difficulties and bitter disappointment experienced by one who had grown up between the Iowa corn rows, and who later in life took up his residence in the Old Dominion State and undertook to do a bit of gardening in the back yard or innocently planted a shrub in the front yard with the expectation that, without other measures, the plants would flourish. I think I told you how often I have longed for a truckload of good, old Iowa soil, which requires no amendment or improvement, and which was endowed by Providence at the time the world was created with all the qualities necessary to produce plant life in boundless abundance.

It is not my purpose to cast any aspersions upon the State of Virgina because, perchance, it is not blessed with soil of the unsurpassing degree of fertility which characterizes that of the States in the Mississippi Valley. Aside from being the Mother of States and the Mother of Presidents, Virginia enjoys a still greater distinction in my esteem because it is the birthplace of my father. That fact alone is sufficient to endear it to me forever.

When I opened the package and discovered its contents, I recalled what I had said to you on this subject during your visit and I realized that my eyes were beholding once more the soil of my native State. I cannot adequately describe the emotions stirred within my breast by your thoughtful act. It was but a small amount of earth, less than a teacupful, and yet the very sight of it recalled the happiest days of my life. In fancy, I lived again the joyous days of childhood and the romantic and glamorous years of youth and early manhood.

It was on that soil my mother gave me birth. It was that soil, untouched as yet by plowshare or other implement of civilized man, which my father, in the bright morning of his early manhood, tilled and sowed and reaped in the providence of God. On that soil he laid the foundations of the humble home, the memory of which is dearer to me than all else besides. In that home, at the knees of a God-fearing mother and a devout father, neither schooled in the learning of man-made institutions, but both richly endowed by providence with the inherent wisdom of the ages, I learned the fundamental precepts which are the essentials of an abundant life.

In that home, and on the soil upon which it rested, they labored and toiled and sacrificed to the end that their children might have better advantages in life than had been theirs. In that home I was blessed with the companionship of brothers and sisters as dear and sweet as has ever been vouchsafed to any human being.

On that soil, stood the little red school house where we spent the happiest days of our childhood, learned to sit at the feet of wisdom. On that soil, I came to manhood's full estate and consummated the rendezvous with life. On that soil, I found the dear, sweet girl who has made the past quarter century the sweetest period of my whole existence and without whom life would be a barren and dreary waste.

From that soil, the vicissitudes of fate decreed, almost two decades ago, I should depart; and, although I dearly love my present abiding place, the State of my birth shall ever remain the Mecca of my fancy and affections.

I am deeply indebted to you for the priceless souvenir of my genesis which came that day in the little toy truck. The truck has enriched the life of my young son whose vivid imagination wields a sorcery whereby it is translated into a real, 10-ton juggernaut of the public highway. But that little bit of soil which came in the truck now reposes in an urn and graces the mantelpiece. It is the most precious item in the lares et penates of the Orr domicile.

How often do I gaze upon it, as upon a crystal, wherein I can see the billowing fields of corn, the cattle on a thousand hills, and the myriad cities and towns where dwell the favorites of a beneficent providence. How often does its pleasing contemplation bring vividly to mind the inspired words of the poet:

Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
"This is my own, my native land!"

With eternal gratitude to my dear niece for the little act which has so enriched my life and so measurably enhanced its felicity, I remain, with great affection,

Your uncle,

ARTHUR ORR.

Taxation of Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I append herewith an address recently delivered by Mr. Edwin B. Hock, director, Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, State of New Jersey, and president of the National Conference of State Liquor Administrators, to the annual dinner of the Hudson-Bergen County Retail Liquor Stores Association, at the Hotel Astor, New York City.

The address follows:

The last time I had the pleasure of addressing your association was at the annual banquet a year ago at the Waldorf-Astoria. Most of those in attendance tonight will recall that your yearbook on that occasion was devoted to the theme of sincerity on fair trade and mark-up. At that time liquor administrators and the liquor industry were deeply concerned with the problem of the orderly distribution of an abundance of merchandise in the face of an increasingly competitive market and a trend toward deflationary price adjustment in commodities other than alcoholic beverages. It was feared that the heavy impost of taxes on alcoholic beverages might well place your industry in a most disadvantageous position.

Many events have occurred during the last year, however, and tonight our Nation is again faced with a national emergency. In effect, the field has been reversed. Whereas a year ago we were concerned with a trend toward deflationary economy, today we are witnessing one of the most inflationary periods in our Nation's history and are faced with a proposed across-the-board increase in alcoholic beverage taxes.

It is of this problem of an increase in taxes that I will speak briefly tonight. It is to be clearly understood that what I say here reflects only my own personal views and does not purport to represent the opinion or attitude of the National Conference of State Liquor Administrators, of which I am president, or its members.

Alcoholic-beverage laws are both permissive and prohibitive. Licensing laws are permissive in that certain persons are permitted to manufacture, distribute, and sell alcoholic beverages at designated places and are prohibitive in that they deny all others the right to traffic in liquor. Prohibition laws are, of course, supposed to prohibit. In the face of these laws, however, Licensed Beverage Industries released, only a week ago, a special study of illegal distilling in the United States high-lighting two very startling conclusions: (1) That the producing capacity of illegal stills seized by Federal, State, and local enforcement officials during 1949 amounted to almost 120,000 gallons more per day than the daily new whisky produced in that year by the legal, taxpaying, distilled-spirits industry; and (2) that illegal distilling is becoming an increasingly big business in this country.

Why does the illicit manufacture of liquor persist 17 years after repeal, and why are we now threatened with an even greater increase in this illegal activity. The answer has to do with the heavy taxes upon alcoholic beverages. In this connection, it is interesting to review the Federal tax picture on distilled spirits since December 6, 1933. On that date the Federal tax on a proof gallon of distilled spirits was $1.10. Thereafter the tax was increased to amounts as follows: January 12, 1934, $2; January 1, 1938, $2.25; January 1, 1940, $3; October 1, 1941; $4; November 1, 1942, $6; and April 1, 1944, $9. When taking into consideration other levies such as Federal occupational and rectification taxes and State and local taxes and license fees, the burden totals today nearly $12 per gallon and, if the proposed $3 increase were to be adopted, the tax burden would become almost $15 per gallon. And, of course, this does not include the costs of production, aging, bottling, blending, rectifying, and of distributing to wholesaler, retailer, and consumer.

It is generally accepted that illegal liquor can be produced and distributed to the consumer under current conditions for $1 a gallon or even less. Obviously this wide differential presents an open invitation to violation and evasion of the law. In this connection it is reported that Governor Driscoll, our former State commissioner of alcoholic beverage control, told the Association of Chosen Freeholders at its annual dinner on February 5 that a sharp increase in alcoholic beverage taxes would certainly result in more bootlegging with a resultant tax loss to the States and an increase in the cost of law enforcement.

It is interesting to note that as early as February 1935 the late Commissioner Burnett recommended, in his annual report to the Governor and Legislature of the State of New Jersey, that Congress be memorialized to reduce radically the Federal tax. In making such recommendation the Commissioner said:

"As it stands, it is a protective tariff for the bootlegger * * * As was said in the inaugural message: 'The constant demand will therefore be automatically diverted into legitimate channels, and will prove again the time-tested truth that a lower tax, widely distributed, produces more revenue than a high tax the incidence of which falls solely upon a special class.'"

This recommendation was made at a time when the Federal tax was a mere $2 per proof gallon. It may be wondered what Commissioner Burnett would think today about a proposed Federal tax of $12 per proof gallon.

In the light of our past and present experiences it is reasonable to assume that any further increase would encourage a greater increase in the illegal manufacture of distilled spirits. Obviously, both Federal and State governments would be harassed by illegal manufacturing and distribution of alcoholic beverages on an even wider scale. A natural result would be an increase in the costs of law enforcement which could bring about a need for greater tax revenues to the Federal Government and the States.

It is heartening to note that Federal officials are showing an awareness to the dangers of further increase in alcoholic beverage taxes. An Associated Press release from Washington, published in the Newark Evening News on February 19, reports Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee as stating, "Heavier liquor taxes may very likely make collections much more difficult to enforce. I think it will depend on how closely we can keep after the moonshiners. It may be that we will have to have a great many more enforcement officers."

Mr. DOUGHTON's observation is well taken. A further increase in taxes would necessarily result in higher prices to the consumer. With more and more consumers resorting to illegal sources for their alcoholic beverages the Government's revenue would not expand; it would shrink. Enactment of the proposed tax increase would not repeal the law of diminishing returns.

I believe that serious consideration should be given to the financial burden placed upon the liquor industry, particularly the small retailer. An additional increase of $3 on distilled spirits would mean that every licensee would need approximately 25 percent more money to finance his business. Obviously this would place an onerous load upon thousands of small licensees throughout the Nation and would probably force many of them to go out of business.

Substantially every State where the sale of alcoholic beverages is legalized has in its law a provision that one of the primary duties of its liquor administration is the "promotion of temperance." I am convinced that liquor administration can best carry out this duty where there is an orderly distribution of alcoholic beverages to members of the public who wish to purchase this commodity and where the licit beverages are made available at a reasonable cost. Our years under prohibition were the most intemperate in our history. Inordinately high taxes do not have the sound of prohibition but I feel

sure that a further increase in Federal taxes would not result in greater temperance.

I do not believe that members of the liquor industry are lacking in patriotism. We all realize that an emergency such as our country faces today requires increased revenue to meet military needs. It does not follow, however, that a lion's share of increased revenue must fall upon an industry which already carries so heavy a tax burden. In my opinion, even greater revenue than is anticipated by the presently proposed increase could be obtained by providing greater facilities for the enforcement of collection of present taxes and by imposing more severe penalties against violators. The problem will not be solved by merely increasing the tax on a commodity when more than 50 percent of the available supply escapes without tax.

Stalin's Slave System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article entitled "Stalin's Slave System" appearing in the March issue of the American Federationist, written by Johannes Mihkelson, taken from the International Free Trade Union News. Johannes Mihkelson was a leading figure in the trade-union and political movements of Estonia. He went into exile when his country was grabbed by the Kremlin.

The article follows:

STALIN'S SLAVE SYSTEM

(By Johannes Mihkelson)

The truth about the Soviet system of forced labor is gradually spreading throughout the world. No longer is it possible to conceal the fact that, among the many millions of Soviet slave laborers, over 10,000,000 persons at Koloma, Vorkuta, and other educational establishments in the Soviet Arctic are slowly but surely being starved and worked to death. The absence of medical attention is only hastening that process.

All this is part of the Soviet system, which could not exist without slave labor. Communist state capitalism ends in the one-way street of terrorism which seeks its victims even among persons in leading positions.

The tempo of work in the Soviet Union is stepped up through Stakhanovite methods and incessant Socialist competitions. There is always some reason for such competitions—celebrating the October revolution, marking Red army or Red navy day, hailing the Stalinist railroad workers. But whatever the reason, the purpose is always the same—to increase per capita output at any cost.

Of late a new slogan has been forced on the Soviet people—the Stockholm "peace appeal." Over and over again, all Soviet speakers and papers refer to this appeal and call upon the whole nation to safeguard "peace."

What all this emphasis actually represents is nothing more than a summons for one and all to work still harder in increasing their production. Propaganda meetings throughout the country underscore the Soviet people's obligation to build enormous power stations at such places as Stalingrad and Kuibishev.

All Estonian metal works have received strict orders to have material for the construction of these Russian power stations. The metal works of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania must provide the new stations with technical equipment, and other plants must contribute to the goal by fulfilling their production targets 2 months ahead of schedule. Under this program, fishermen must catch more fish, collective-farm peasants must produce more fodder for livestock, workers in stocking factories must turn out more hosiery.

Moscow is being transformed into a port connected with five seas. The Kuibishev project is making the upper reaches of the Volga navigable, while at Stalingrad dikes are under construction to do the same thing for the Volga's central portions. The schedule for these undertakings calls for their completion in 1955–56. The Volga-Don Canal must be finished in 1952.

The power stations at Stalingrad, Turkmenia and Kuibishev—with the latter aimed to be the largest in the world—are intended to solve the problem of transportation and of power supply at the same time. It should be borne in mind that, because of the shortage of electric power, the Soviet Union cannot produce the most highly modernized weapons. It is therefore pertinent to ask whether the new giant construction projects will be devoted exclusively to "peaceful ends."

The Soviet actions for safeguarding peace have assumed some strange forms. At Karula in Estonia, for instance, 40 brooms and 3 wooden spades were produced, according to their makers, "in honor of peace." In another town a Russian officer of the last war proclaimed that his answer to "the imperialist warmongers" would be to finish the whitewashing of the school building "before the day of the October revolution."

The Russian-language Sovyetskaya Estonya has castigated the Estonian workers for laziness harmful to the Russian economy and rebuked the Estonian-language Communist papers for being remiss in "safeguarding peace" and in unmasking the secret plans of "the American imperialists." It has demanded that the Communist Party tighten its controls over all Estonian publications.

The Soviet "love of peace" is exemplified in Estonia by establishment of the army's voluntary auxiliary corps, a country-wide body which has been assigned the task of organization and training Estonian youth in marksmanship, motor maintenance and transportation, radio and telephone mechanics, and other auxiliary services.

In addition to labor exacted for "safeguarding peace," the Soviet workers are confronted with another vast job—that of clearing up the ruins of the war-devastated cities. This work is without remuneration and is done on Sundays or holidays and after regular working hours during the week.

As a rule, such efforts are voluntary, but it is unnecessary to explain that no workers would dare to stay at home when the personnel of his plant or enterprise is collectively ordered out for clearance work.

In Estonia alone last year 4,700,000 unremunerated hours of this kind were worked, resulting in the clearance of 76,700 cubic meters of ruins and 525,400 square meters of surface.

Another form of unremunerated work among Soviet workers is that of the "chiefdom." This is an "honor" conferred on each major factory enterprise, making it the head of a kolkhoz (collective farm), thus imposing on its employees the obligation of assisting that particular kolkhoz. Usually the workers are taken out to their kolkhoz on Sundays or holidays by trucks to help in harvesting or other types of agricultural labor. Since all this work is "voluntary," there is, of course, no compensation for the workers so "honored."

It need not be pointed out that in democratic countries collective bargaining agreements contain detailed provisions concerning payment of workers for overtime, shift work and night work. It would be unthinkable for a worker in a democracy to be ordered out for unpaid labor at any time. In the Soviet Union, however, such proceedings take place in quite a normal way since Soviet trade unions have no influence in protecting the interests of Russian workers.

The Soviet trade unions can only help in propagandizing those actions which are ordered and organized by the Communist Party leadership. Collective agreements in Russia stipulate more duties than rights for the workers.

The Stockholm "peace appeal" is essentially a propaganda campaign to accelerate the tempo of work and to improve the output of the Soviet heavy armament industries. The fine slogans and public declarations to the Russian masses are only a disguise for the completely different purposes harbored by the Soviet dictators.

The American Merchant Marine, Life Line of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD the following very illuminating address delivered at the San Francisco Bay Area Ports and Transportation Conference, recently held in San Francisco, by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, United States Navy, retired, Federal Wartime Administrator:

Gentlemen, it is well known that only a poor mechanic quarrels with his tools; and that it is only a poor speaker who refuses to face up to his assigned subject. There are, of course, two lines of escape for these poor speakers. One course is to change the subject to suit one's own fancy, but the second avenue is more effective, if less artistic; namely, to ignore it entirely.

To be doubly sure I plan to use both methods.

As you see by the program, I am scheduled to speak on The American Merchant Marine—Life Line of American Port Commerce.

I'll stand on the American Merchant Marine part of that title, but I want to shorten the second half from Lifeline of American Port Commerce by scratching the final n on American and scratching the last words completely, thus, the American Merchant Marine, Life Line of America.

I know that I am speaking at a Bay Area Ports and Transportation Conference, and I am all for better ports and better port facilities, and more business for San Francisco. As a matter of fact, I saw on Monday afternoon two of the finest pier developments I have seen in this country. But, gentlemen, if the debate today is on the subject Resolved That the Merchant Marine Is for the Benefit of Ports, I am on deck to take the negative side.

The merchant marine is for the benefit not only of our own great Nation but for western civilization, and I will grant that the ports are an indispensable link between the ships and the nations which they serve.

It is inspiring to see so many organizations and so many people here today devoting themselves to the development of the ports of the bay area. I regret that it has not been possible for me to attend all of these sessions for yours is a subject of critical

and increasing importance if we are to get the most from our ships. Days in port are lost days in the earning year of a ship. As ship speed increases, turn-around times should be shortened if the real benefit of sea speed is to accrue.

Our ports for several reasons are not as efficient as they might be—but it is not my intention to dwell on that score today. You are far better qualified in that field than I.

It is always pleasant for me to return to California, my native heath. It is doubly pleasant to come here to look at ships and shipyards and to talk to shipping men and to shipbuilders, for my whole life has been spent in that association.

I had retired from active duty in the Navy in 1947, to be sure, but not because of loss of interest in ships. I admit very frankly, too, that I resisted with full earnestness being drawn back to Washington to become Maritime Administrator. I came finally only after I became fully convinced that our country faces a threat more serious than any it has faced before in its history.

I am not one who holds the situation to be hopeless by any means. It is crystal clear to me, however, that unless we establish ourselves in such strength that the Commies will not risk an attack and unless we make it so clear to them that we are taking no more nonsense on the fringes, they will continue to whittle at the edges of western strength until it is exhausted.

It must, also, be held continuously in mind that it is not enough merely to fend off military attack from outside our borders. We must so husband our economy that our way of doing business outlasts theirs; for clearly, if our economy breaks down, they could win the war without firing a shot.

But what has this to do with ships and ports? Ships are truly the life line not only of America but of democracy. We are not sufficient unto ourselves. Nothing could be more dangerous to us than an attempt to withdraw into a shell like a giant hermit crab.

We need the raw materials of the world. We need markets for our products and outlets for the talents, ingenuity, and enterprise of the generations of young Americans who are coming behind us. Those seem like trite truisms, but I am confronted today with the possibility of having to see that bulk cargoes to the volume of over 15,000,000 tons are moved at sea.

This over-all job of development of America must be better done than the British did their job over the last 100 years. It is shocking to contemplate that in winning two world wars, with help, to be sure—but still winning them—Great Britain has lost an empire. They relied upon the hypotheses that history repeats itself—that they could continue to muddle through, that they could continue to knock off for tea each afternoon at 4. We are breaking ships out of the Reserve Fleets today to move shiploads of coal to England. They awakened during the war to discover that their technology had not kept pace—to find our ships out-steaming, out-shooting, out-maneuvering theirs—to find their factories not adequate to handle the war demands. They still have courage and ingenuity and I agree with Winnie Churchill that we cannot discard them. My point is solely that complacency has even less place in a nation in 1951. No more in the United States than anywhere else.

Our position in the world—a position forced upon us, to be sure, by circumstances, demands courage. It requires progress. We have staggering world responsibilities. We cannot desert the Western European nations from whence the American family has sprung. No more could we survive without ocean transport to the outposts of the world than we could survive were all the means of land traffic between the States and cities obliterated. The recent "sickness" of the switchmen on eastern railroads has given us a clear picture of the mess which would result.

The more progress is made in developing the resources of the backward areas of the world, the better off both they and we are—but only if the development is wisely done. Exploitation will react adversely. Wise assistance will bring untold dividends.

Ships are the backbone of this traffic of development. Air lanes are essential, too. We learned how essential the ships are in 1914–18 (World War I). We taught this lesson to South America during World War II. They are today demanding support for their ships in various schemes. One had difficulty in quarreling with their desires when we ourselves were forced into building so heavily in 1914 to 1918, and again in 1939 to 1945. Surely, in all of this, we must be convinced, even if a few of our countrymen are not, that America must continue to own and operate its lifeline of ships.

Since this is my first visit here since the establishment of the two new maritime agencies to replace the Maritime Commission, I want to give you a brief report on what's been done during that 6-month period.

You will recall that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21 did away with the five-man Maritime Commission and transferred its duties to the Secretary of Commerce. Under him two new agencies have been established, the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, to which the maritime functions have been delegated.

This arrangement is working exceedingly well. The jobs of these two agencies are those of the old Maritime Commission—the administration of the basic shipping laws. The new set-up is, however, better geared for action.

You must remember that the Maritime Commission had a chance to function under favorable conditions. Administration by committee has been tried many times. It has, so far as I can recall, never continued to run when the first blush of enthusiasm has faded.

After the honeymoon period of scarcely 2 years in 1937–38, during which action was being taken to lay down a modern merchant fleet, along came the war in Europe, abruptly changing the emphasis. From that time on through VJ-day the old commission's job under "Jerry" Land was to help win a war. Joining hands with the shipbuilding and ship-operating industries, that mission was accomplished with typical Jerry Land-Howard Vickery success.

Then the Maritime Commission settled down to face the painful postwar complexities of cutting back a major arm of warfare to peacetime size through a period of postwar uncertainties from which you gentlemen have in many cases not yet been freed.

Even a well-thought-out organization would have its hands full. Gentlemen, the old Maritime Commission had my sympathy, and I speak from an intimate knowledge of both its achievements and its shortcomings. To a member of the President's Advisory Committee, appointed to look into the Nation's merchant marine problems in 1947, it was very apparent that such an organization could have no assurance of continued success.

The Chairman of the old Commission had responsibility without authority, and even the simplest administrative problems were pitched on the table for discussion when action was the need. On matters of review, the clear-headed deliberations of a quasi-judicial board are vital. But in the day-to-day operations of a big business corporation, the board of directors cannot usurp the duties of its president. The wonder is that the Maritime Commission accomplished as much as it did—and I should like to take off my hat (my two hats) to many of its accomplishments.

On the Federal Maritime Board we now have three members. Under the new rules, we are able to have men who know something about ships and shipping.

Right here let me say that one of the great contributions the west coast has made to the American Merchant Marine was in providing the Government with Al Gatov, so well known to all of you here as the recent president of the Pacific American Steamship Association.

His very practical and thorough knowledge of shipping has supplied a sound base for many important decisions made by the Federal Maritime Board, and on the theory that if I could wear two hats, he could too, he has agreed to serve also as a special assistant to the Maritime Administrator. His advice and counsel have gone into every phase of our planning for a National Shipping Authority, of which more later.

The second member of the Board also contributes greatly toward a balanced team. He is Mr. Robert W. Williams, of Baltimore. Bob Williams is a widely known and highly respected admiralty lawyer. You can well imagine the value of such a gentleman to the Board.

The third member can at least speak in a vocabulary understandable to shipbuilders, in strength as well as in technical phraseology.

While the Federal Maritime Board is charged with the regulatory powers of the old Maritime Commission, plus the sensitive and debated responsibility of determining the subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Maritime Administration inherited the administrative tasks, the housekeeping chores of its predecessor.

We have had a thorough reorganization. But we have retained the valuable men of the old Maritime Commission staff, and are striving to provide them a better environment in which to work. Some new faces have been added, and I am happy to say that the whole staff is responding. They have made great progress.

I am proud of our accomplishments in 6 months' time.

I came to Washington under no great desire of my own. The academic life at MIT, watching the development of these youngsters who are the very future of this country, was completely satisfying to me. But the call to duty was too much for an old fire horse to resist.

My immediate and temporary predecessor, John Koehler, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, had been putting the new machinery together, and even before I arrived in Washington we had to use it, not for the long-haul peacetime program, but for breaking out ships for the Korean emergency.

As you know, we have maintained the pattern of private operation to handle this job, and have added to the privately operated fleet a total now of 130 Victory ships under bareboat charter to the industry for use by the MSTS.

I am proud of the fact that never, since the show started, has MSTS been delayed by the lack of a ship on berth which they had requested from us. As a matter of fact, we have them ready in advance of their needs many times, and are in that situation today.

Over the last 6 months we have added to our troopship capacity. The construction of new passenger ships has eased somewhat the immediate need for troopships. Other troopers are already in service under the MSTS; still others are in the reserve fleets. There is a bank of passenger ships now in operation under the American flag and under the flags of the other nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Right at this point, I imagine no San Francisco audience could fail to surmise, "What about the *Mariposa* and *Monterey* leaning up against the docks in Alameda?"

I looked over those ships yesterday, and may say at this moment that we are well aware of their value as troopships. The Navy has requested us to requisition them, but there are several matters—each with a dollar sign in front of it—that must be resolved before they can return to sea again.

Now we come to the third, and a most important, activity in which we have been engaged during the past 6 months; new ships.

With the rapid break-out of vessels for the Korean campaign, it became crystal clear to me that we needed more and faster ships behind the reserve supply of Libertys in the laid-up fleets.

I had the privilege of serving, while at MIT, in company with a number of scientists, at the request of the Navy, on research work dealing with the effect of new weapons upon seapower. I break no confidence when I say that atom missiles, modern subs, new torpedoes and new bomber planes force a reevaluation of the chances of survival of the slow-moving convoys used in the last wars.

Some Americans—those who look at numbers and not at facts—believe that we have plenty of ships. But even a cursory analysis of these ships shows that they are today entirely inadequate to carry critical cargoes of men and munitions into the forward areas in time of war because they are too slow and too vulnerable.

Even the Victory's are not fast enough, and we have been reactivating them at such a pace that we can see the last of them going into service very shortly. This will leave us with only the 10-knot Liberty's, and that just will not do. Out of this the new Mariner class grew, and just 6 months to the day after I took the oath of office contracts to build the first 25 of them were awarded. They will be fine ships and will put us in the lead in the dry-cargo type.

Twenty-five is not a large number—but the interest of our congressional leaders and those within the administration has been heartening indeed. We are on our way.

No; the west coast yards did not get any of this first block. For this I make no apologies, for I know that with a little reflection, you will understand why none were allocated to the west coast yards. In the first place, we are not yet allocating ships for construction. In the second place, prospective west coast bidders were not sharpening pencils quite enough to meet the competition.

I can understand the disappointment of your municipalities, your labor organizations, your shipbuilders—but if you are disheartened, you are not the kind of people I am sure you are.

The west coast can, and did, build good ships and plenty of them, and they can, and will, I hope, build them again. But it must, in the last analysis, be you, out here, who will find the way. We will help to the best of our ability, but in the end it will be capital and labor working together out here who will decide to get into this pilot program leading the way to a real shipbuilding effort in this country.

We want west coast shipbuilding; I am confident that we shall have it.

More has been happening. We are well advanced in our mobilization planning of the American merchant marine to ready it for possible war service.

In spite of the fact that American boys are dying in Korea by enemy bullets, the Nation has not had the psychological kick—the Pearl Harbor attack—to jolt us out of a peacetime economy into a wartime operation. We don't know our own strength. We have been conducting this affair overseas, and at the same time maintaining the greatest peacetime production the world has ever seen. This fact is recognized and we have very able men led by Charles Wilson steering our enormous industrial potential into a new area. In the merchant marine, we are meeting the demands of the Defense Department for shipping, but at the same time handling an expanding commercial activity.

But much of that expansion is in a category not entirely disconnected from our national defense, for it is concerned with the welfare of friendly countries, with partners in a free community of nations which must battle the common enemy. This, plus the obvious probability of increased military demands, calls for the organization of the United States merchant marine to fill its proper role in our security effort.

In other words, we had to put together the over-all organization that would enable the merchant marine to function as the fourth arm of national defense, in company with the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In World War II, this was called the War Shipping Administration, which after its duties were discharged, was disbanded. The agency now being readied is the NSA—the National Shipping Authority.

The merchant marine, unlike the Armed Forces, does not have an organized reserve. For its manpower we must rely upon the maritime industry—management and labor. We met with both groups, and based upon the nucleus of manpower within the Maritime Administration, have put together the names of many of those qualified men who will serve when needed. I have selected a highly qualified member of our own staff, Charles H. McGuire, to head the NSA when it goes into active operation.

Already, one vital segment of the merchant marine is organized and operating during this transition period to provide essential service to the Armed Forces. A voluntary tanker group composed of practically every tanker operator in the industry has pooled its qualified tonnage. This group, headed by an able tankerman, Mr. William Dunning, can and will easily gear into the NSA operation when needed.

One big task in particular is just over the horizon which may start typical NSA-type operations in a matter of days—that of carrying grain to India, and returning with cargoes of essential ores. All the programs will apparently call for activating 30 to 40 ships a month for a considerable period. For this purpose we intend to use the Liberty ships in the reserve fleets. This, I do not need to remind you, will bring more activity to the ship repair yards. The chances are that we will operate these ships on general agency agreements, utilizing American shipping companies as Government agents.

The National Production Authority has listened very attentively to our needs, and has approved the provision of approximately 9,000 tons of steel products monthly during the second quarter of this year to shipyards for the repair and conversion of seagoing vessels.

I am tempted to go further with a list of the activity now taking place back in Washington, but we must be running out of time. I do want to say that we haven't forgotten in the rush of mobilization needs the all-important job of administering the subsidy laws and regulatory responsibilities with which we of the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Board are charged.

This is the type of work, gentlemen, which those of us in Washington know all too well makes no headlines, but generates headaches. Nevertheless, it is the unhappy foundation for building a merchant marine under the American flag in many routes. I don't have to remind you of the troubled waters in which the old Maritime Commission found itself. We have got to pilot the new agencies through those waters, and I can report that our charts show increasingly improved navigation.

The new world situation, our manifest leadership in world affairs, combine to make evident the need for wise and sound administration of existing laws, and some deep and constructive thought on the need for modification of these laws. I believe that I can report progress in making more realistic our calculations of both steamship-operating subsidies and construction subsidies, and in overcoming the criticisms leveled in the past at the methods of administering these all-important subsidies.

Gentlemen, I want to wind up this talk with a very simple message. The times in which we live are very complex; but their complexity is based upon the grave responsibilities thrust upon us as a nation—the responsibility of leadership. We must not—and with God's help we will not—lose confidence in ourselves to meet them. We have production potentials greater than we can imagine. We have the climate of freedom and of great conviction in which that production can flourish.

In terms we of the American merchant marine can understand, we have the ships, and the means of producing more ships, and we have the men to sail these ships. We are better prepared than our enemies may suppose. With courage and confidence we can point today to a maritime strength which, I believe, need yield nothing to the readiness in any other field.

I am proud to be associated with it, to be even a single fiber in the life line of America.

Veterans' Administration Payments of Benefits to Recipients in Satellite Countries Frozen Pending Proof Payees Will Receive Full Value

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is of interest to know that the Secretary of the Treasury is now withholding in the Treasury proceeds of United States Government checks payable to claimants who live in the satellite countries behind the iron curtain. The Treasury Department is to be commended for taking this step.

During a trip to Europe last fall a congressional group, of which I was a member, found evidence indicating that through exchange manipulations and certain actions by Communist regimes, recipients of benefit payments from the Veterans' Administration were actually getting but a portion of the actual value of their checks. On February 20, 1951, I called this to the attention of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. A week later, on February 27, the Secretary of the Treasury ordered all such checks to be withheld pending a determination of "a reasonable assurance that the payees will actually receive such check or warrant and be able to negotiate the same for full value."

The letter from Hon. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, giving information on this subject, follows:

MARCH 2, 1951.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. FISHER: In response to your inquiry of February 20, 1951, I have had prepared the attached tables showing in some

detail the number and amount of check certifications by the Veterans' Administration for payment to beneficiaries residing in Russia and the satellite countries during the calendar years 1948, 1949, and 1950. Certain observations on the information included may be helpful to you.

In the first place, the countries included in the list are those commonly regarded as satellite countries, except that the Russian zone of Germany, including the Russian sector of Berlin, has been omitted. Our records do not differentiate between addresses in Germany, but it may be assumed that any payments in the Russian zone would be negligible, since they may not be made to German citizens or nationals residing there. No attempt has been made to determine when the individual countries became, or ceased to be, satellite countries. Accordingly, China and Yugoslavia are included in the summary for the entire 3-year period.

Our information is derived from records of check certifications, which do not always reflect actual payments. You will recall that Public Law 828, Seventy-sixth Congress, authorizes the withholding in the Treasury of proceeds of United States Government checks "in any case in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that postal, transportation, or banking facilities in general, or local conditions in the country to which such check or warrant is to be delivered, are such that there is not a reasonable assurance that the payee will actually receive such check or warrant and be able to negotiate the same for full value." In such cases, payments continue to be certified by the Veterans' Administration, but the proceeds of the checks issued are deposited in a special account in the Treasury. At different times during the past 3 years, some check proceeds have been so withheld, as indicated in the summary at the end of this letter.

I am sure that you will also be interested to note that the Secretary of the Treasury has just made such a determination for prospective application to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Russian zone of occupation of Germany, and the Russian sector of occupation of Berlin, Germany. This determination is incorporated in supplement 7 to Treasury Department Circular 655, and may be found on pages 1818 and 1819 of the Federal Register, volume 16, No. 39, dated February 27, 1951.

In answer to your question about the procedure followed in the payment of such benefits, the Treasury checks are delivered to the Department of State, where they are dispatched by pouch to the United States Embassy, Legation, or consulate serving the area in which the payee resides. Our consular officials in turn forward the checks to the individual payees, or, if circumstances warrant, and the request is a reasonable one, they may ask the individual payee to come to our consular office to receive the check in person. This entire procedure has, however, been varied in some cases. Reports that beneficiaries were forced to convert dollar checks to foreign currencies at artificial rates of exchange in some countries, have led the Treasury occasionally to follow a different disbursement procedure. I am advised that disbursement vouchers certified by the Veterans' Administration for payment to beneficiaries in some satellite countries, have been forwarded to our Embassy disbursing officers abroad where checks have been drawn in the currency of the country for the equivalent of the dollars due, computed at the official rate of exchange. Full information on the extent to which this procedure has been utilized should, of course, come from the Treasury Department whose responsibility it is to make disbursements upon proper certification.

In your perusal of the attached tables, you will note that the average payments in 1948 were in general much larger than in 1950. This is due primarily to the settlement of accrued amounts due many beneficiaries in the earlier year, following the withholding of check proceeds during World War II under Public Law 828. (In the case of Russia, such settlements were still being made in 1949 and 1950 in sufficient numbers to keep the average payments relatively high.)

An important factor in the decline of the total number of payments in 1950 was an action necessarily taken by the Veterans' Administration. As you know, it is required that we obtain information from time to time bearing on the continued eligibility of the beneficiary to receive payments (e. g., reports of physical examination, reports of income, etc.). As might be expected, it has become increasingly difficult for the United States Foreign Service to conduct investigations and obtain such necessary information in Russia and the satellite countries. It has therefore been made a matter of established policy that in any case where the Department of State has been prevented from obtaining information requested by the Veterans' Administration, the award is terminated.

The data you requested are set forth in detail in the attached tables. You may find convenient, however, this simple summary of the information for the 3-year period 1948 through 1950:

Total certifications all foreign countries:

Number	2,593,095
Amount	$191,812,261.11

Total certifications U. S. S. R. and satellites:

Number	30,849
Amount	$3,265,116.54

The amount actually paid to benficiaries in Russia and the satellite countries is less than the total certifications would indicate, since the proceeds of checks to Albania have been withheld in the Treasury since October 7, 1948 and of checks to Bulgaria since March 1, 1950. Furthermore, the difficulties leading to the finding of the Secretary of the Treasury published on February 27 have resulted in a considerable number of checks being now on file in the Treasury. I am advised that the total actually paid during the 3-year period in these countries is probably nearer to $3,000,000 than to the $3,265,116.54 shown by our certifications.

I hope that you will find this information adequate. It comes to you with my personal best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

Soviet Officials in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and tabulations:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1951.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: Reference is made to your letter of March 1, 1951, acknowledged by telephone on March 9, 1951, forwarding for the Department's comment a copy of the remarks which you made in the House of Representatives on March 1. In these remarks you recommend that the official personnel which the Soviet Government sends to the United States and the travel of this personnel in the United States be placed on a reciprocal basis with regard to the number of official personnel of the United States in the Soviet Union and the travel privileges of American official personnel in that country.

Your remarks refer to two important questions concerning United States-Soviet relations which are under continual consideration in the Department. The comments of the Department with regard to these matters are presented in the following paragraphs.

The exchange of official representatives between two governments is rarely susceptible to treatment on a numerical parity basis. In almost every instance one country or the other will require a larger official establishment. Actually the variety of functions which the American Foreign Service is expected to perform, including complex visa and passport services and a wide range of reporting on political and economic subjects, is so great that the diplomatic and consular offices of the United States in any foreign country tend to be larger than that country's official representation in the United States.

An analysis of the number of Soviet officials in the United States reported to the Department of State by the Soviet Embassy up to March 5, 1951, and comparable American personnel in the Soviet Union as of the same date indicates that Soviet and United States official representation is practically on a parity basis. This analysis includes Embassy officials, correspondents, and commercial representatives of the two countries. It excludes Soviet representation to international organizations in the United States which have no counterpart in the Soviet Union.

There are enclosed two sheets which present United States official personnel in the Soviet Union and Soviet personnel in the United States as of March 5, 1951. You will note that the Soviet list carries a comparative list of Soviet personnel in the United States as of July 1, 1950. While on the face of these lists there appears to be a numerical disparity in representation in favor of the Soviet Union, an analysis of the figures gives a different picture. On March 5 the United States Government had official personnel numbering 101 with 16 dependents assigned to the American Embassy in Moscow. The Soviet counterpart of this figure is official Soviet personnel numbering 83, with 125 dependents (70 wives and 55 children) assigned to the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Thus, the United States has 13 more official employees in the American Embassy in Moscow than the Soviet Government has in the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Since no international organization of which the United States is a member has its headquarters in the Soviet Union, there can be no United States personnel in the Soviet Union comparable to the Soviet personnel assigned to the United Nations; namely, 121 (52 official employees, 38 wives, 31 children). If from the 381 total Soviet official personnel in the United States, there is subtracted 121, which is the Soviet representation, including dependents, to the United Nations, and 153 which represents Soviet dependents in the United States other than dependents of Soviet United Nations employees, the total Soviet official employees in the United States would amount to 107, 6 more than the 101 United States official employees in the Soviet Union, minus dependents.

With regard to Soviet restrictions on the travel of foreigners, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is divided into "free" and prohibited areas for diplomatic and consular personnel of foreign nations in the Soviet Union. Foreign officials on duty in Moscow may not travel more than 50 kilometers from the city limits with the exception of three points of historic interest to which foreigners may travel after appropriate notification to the foreign office. In general, all border areas and all of the central

Asian republics, the Caucausus with the exception of Tbilisi, the Baltic States, and the western areas of the Ukraine and Belorussia including the capital cities of Kiev and Minsk are within the zones prohibited to foreign officials. Although most of the Siberian areas is technically "free," in practice it is greatly restricted owing to the fact that the important cities are forbidden areas. In order to travel to "free" areas foreign missions must notify the foreign office in advance of the name and the itinerary of the traveler. Under this procedure, members of the Embassy's staff in Moscow have been able to make frequent trips to "free" areas during the past 2 years.

The question of applying travel control measures to Soviet official personnel in the United States is under constant review by the United States Government agencies concerned. Restrictions upon the travel of Soviet officials will be imposed whenever it is evident that such action is in the over-all interest of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosures: (1) Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union as of March 5, 1951; (2) total Soviet officials in the United States as of March 5, 1951.)

Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union, Mar. 5, 1951

Embassy:	
State Department	64
Navy attaché staff	13
Army attaché staff	18
Air Force attaché staff	6
Dependents	16
Total	117
UNITED STATES NONOFFICIAL PERSONNEL IN THE SOVIET UNION	
Clergymen	1
Newspaper correspondents	6
Businessmen (composed at present of fur buyers—an approximation)	2
Total	9
Grand total	126

Breakdown of figures used in the compilation "Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union March 5, 1951," attached hereto:

State Department:	
Male employees including Ambassador:	
Foreign Service officer	15
Foreign Service Reserve officer	1
Foreign service staff personnel	25
Female employees, unmarried (Foreign Service staff)	8
Working wives (Foreign Service staff)	15
Total working personnel	64
Dependents (nonworking—includes 2 wives and 9 children)	11
Total State Department	75
Navy Department:	
Naval officers	5
Enlisted men	8
Total	13
Dependents (2 wives included in "working wives" above and 1 daughter included in "female employees, unmarried" above—1 dependent child)	4
Total Navy Department	14
Department of the Army:	
Officers	5
Warrant officers	1
Enlisted men	12
Total	18
Dependents (2 wives included in "working wives" above; 2 dependent wives)	4
Total Army	20
Air Force:	
Officers	3
Enlisted men	3
Total	6
Dependents (1 wife included in "working wives" above; 1 wife and 1 dependent child)	3
Total for Air Force	8
Grand total	117

Soviet officials in United States[1]

	Comparative figures	
	Mar. 5, 1951[2]	July 1, 1950
SUMMARY		
Embassy personnel	88	[3] 86
International organizations	52	59
Purchasing Commission	2	2
Tass	7	7
Pravda correspondents	2	2
Amtorg	7	17
Correspondents of All-Union Radio Committee of U. S. S. R.	1	1
Wives	124	132
Children	98	103
Dependent relative	0	1
Grand total[3]	381	410
BREAKDOWN		
Embassy of the U. S. S. R.:		
Accredited officers of Embassy	40	39
Employees of Embassy	48	47
Subtotal	88	86
Wives of Embassy officers	32	31
Wives of Embassy employees	38	38
Subtotal	70	69
Children of Embassy officers	23	24
Children of Embassy employees	32	28
Subtotal	55	52
Dependent relative of Embassy personnel	0	1
Total Embassy	213	208
United Nations:		
U. S. S. R. representation to UN	49	55
Wives of U. S. S. R. representatives	35	39
Children	30	37
Subtotal	114	131
U. S. S. R. members Military Staff Committee	3	4
Wives of members of Military Staff Committee	3	4
Children	1	2
Subtotal	7	10
Total United Nations	121	141

[1] Figures based on note 8 of Jan. 27, 1951, from Soviet Embassy reporting Soviet citizens, employees of Soviet State institutions, Soviet missions, and other organizations to be found in the United States as of Jan. 1, 1951, and note 7 of Jan. 24, 1951, and note 11 of Feb. 7, 1951, which showed further personnel changes.

[2] Soviet officials in United States as of July 1, 1950. Figures based on note No. 113 of July 13, 1950. Soviet Embassy reporting Soviet citizens, employees, and other organizations in the United States as of July 1, 1950.

[3] In addition to this total, there are 12 Soviet citizens employed by the Secretariat of the United Nations who are accompanied by 12 wives and 6 children (total 30).

Soviet officials in United States—Continued

	Comparative figures	
	Mar. 5, 1951	July 1, 1950
Government organizations:		
Purchasing Commission	2	2
Wives of members	2	2
Children	2	2
Subtotal	6	6
Tass employees	7	7
Wives	6	6
Children	5	3
Subtotal	18	16
Pravda correspondents	2	2
Wives	2	1
Children	1	0
Subtotal	5	3
All-Union Radio Committee Correspondents	1	1
Wives	1	1
Children	2	1
Subtotal	4	3
Amtorg employees	7	17
Wives	5	10
Children	2	6
Subtotal	14	33
Total governmental organizations	47	61
Grand total	[3] 381	410

American Aid to Yugoslavia Is Achieving Its Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter I recently received from an American official in Yugoslavia relative to the distribution of American food under the Yugoslav aid program. It will be recalled that during the debate on the bill some Members were apprehensive that there would be faulty distribution and that many recipients would not be informed where the aid came from. The information contained in this letter should, therefore, be welcome:

As I see it, the Tito government is the only government Yugoslavia has got and under present conditions if that government were permitted to fall, the most likely alternative would be a government set up by the Kremlin. * * *

By way of informal information, I can tell you up to this point that the American observers-supervisors operating in the country are receiving every facility and cooperation from the Yugoslav Government. These men are spotting around in key centers throughout the country from which they radiate by jeep to outlying areas. Their individual and independent reports to date indicate without exception that the Yugoslav officials at all levels are fully cooperative, that the receipt and distribution of American food stuffs is being carried out with a high degree of expedition and efficiency with no

apparent evidences of discrimination. Favorable publicity continues to flow in substantial volume. I am confident that every Yugoslav knows that they are receiving American food through the generosity of the American people, and that they understand, at the same time, that this donation of food is not intended to saddle more firmly a Communist regime on their backs. * * *

A quick check this morning shows that something over 138,000 tons of American-supplied foodstuffs have entered Yugoslavia up to February 1. The bulk of this, 91,000 tons, is flour from Italy and Germany, with the balance of 19,000 of this item to arrive within the next week or 10 days. Other items that have arrived are: Beans, 16,800; Mexican canned meat, 900; powdered eggs, 3,300; corn, 8,500; barley, 9,000; lard, 8,500. We anticipate that the remaining 110,000 tons of stop-gap aid will arrive during February, with the congressional part of the program filling in closely behind.

All in all, it appears that the relief program is accomplishing its purpose up to this time. As recognized from the outset, however, the critical period will likely be the spring months when they begin to scrape the bottom of the barrel of domestically produced foodstuffs and before new crop food becomes available in any substantial quantity. One essential factor that we must bear in mind is that roughly one-third of the entire crop area of Yugoslavia is customarily planted to corn which is not harvested until late September and early October. Moreover, two-thirds of the potato crop is late planted, and like cabbage and onions, is usually not available for consumption until August and later. It is quite clear, therefore, that while our food supply program will likely have been completed by early May, the Yugoslavs will not be out of the woods until autumn, assuming a good crop year.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed in recent days that Yugoslavia has been blessed with normal rainfall during recent weeks and that the prospects for a return to normal crop yields over there appear good for this year. Normally, Yugoslavia is an exporter of food and other agricultural products. The American aid from our surpluses appears to be accomplishing what was intended, stop-gap assistance to help tide those people over during the worst crop failure and drought that has occurred there in 50 years.

Location of Defense Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 19, 1951, an article appeared in the Cumberland Evening Times, Cumberland, Md., by the columnist Peter Edson, in which he stated:

Plant location. There is today no area in which a new defense plant can be put to draw on surplus labor. Every new site selected in the future will have to be determined by a shift of labor from nonessential industry, as well as by availability of power, transportation, raw material, and housing. Projections. So far there have been no tables prepared on how many men will be needed for defense production, when and where. Projecting the employment and draft curves to show total manpower requirements is a first job of Government agencies operating under Dr. Flemming's directives.

If the Department of Defense is considering areas where there is surplus unemployment, I would like to call their attention to the present situation in Cumberland and Allegany County, Md., where there are approximately 5,000 unemployed persons at this time. In this total there are skilled, semiskilled and unskilled workers such as machinists, carpenters, chemists and chemical laboratory technicians. When these people apply to the Unemployment Compensation Division they are advised to go to other areas to seek employment. This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is not good either for the community or for the worker himself because 90 percent of these unemployed own their homes and naturally when they leave the local community their homes will be unoccupied and they will create a housing problem in industrial areas.

Cumberland and Allegany County are ideally situated for the establishment of a defense plant. Not only do we have ample labor but we are located on the main line of the Baltimore and Ohio and the Western Maryland Railroads with an adequate water supply from the Potomac River and the North Branch of the Potomac River and many ideal factory sites are available.

I think it would be well for the Department of Defense and the Real Estate Divisions of the Army and Navy to look into the availability of this community which is approximately 150 miles from the Nation's Capital and close to the Atlantic Seaboard.

Ethics of Public Life Seem To Be Lacking in RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of March 14, 1951:

ETHICS OF PUBLIC LIFE SEEM TO BE LACKING IN RFC

One thing in all walks of public life is above the law. That is ethics, the ability to tell the good from the bad, right from wrong. Nothing exactly illegal, it is said, has yet been proved in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation investigation. Maybe not, but there is abundant evidence that men—and women—used positions of public service to which they had been appointed for the sake of personal profit.

Private advantage has no place at all in the handling of the people's business. Those who find themselves so placed as to see in their responsibility for governmental operations incidental opportunity for self-enrichment have only two alternatives. The first is to lean over backward not to avail themselves of such opportunity, however innocent it seems on the surface, and to pursue the sole purpose for which they were entrusted with power—the greatest good of the greatest number.

The second alternative is to resign, recognizing that self-seeking motives may be overpowering and that their interests may be properly pursued in private life. In the latter alternative, the incumbents must forego the honor and confidence implied by acceptance of public service.

There is no law to control the inner recesses of the human conscience. There is no law that says, in so many words, the right hand should know what the left is doing. But where the law in its methodical and sometimes slow process of following society's interests leaves off, something higher which we are wont to call ethics carries on.

Personal profit is not, according to our code of ethics, consistent with governmental obligation. Do we want to see a blunting of democratic standards on which the country was founded until we expose it to the nicking and hacking of every private, selfish gain? Integrity that is rock-ribbed to the point of self-denial is the cornerstone of American political life.

Enthusiastic Milwaukee Girl Scout Leaders Doing a Great Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last Monday was the thirty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts. It is well known what a worth-while work the Girl Scouts are engaged in. Today the total Girl Scout membership of the United States totals about 1,500,000 girls, ages ranging from 7 to 17.

The Girl Scouts of Milwaukee County are a particularly active council and this year again, as in the past, their entire membership of 14,000 girls—4,459 brownies, 5,911 intermediates, and 517 seniors—is busy selling Girl Scout cookies from March 10 to March 16. This year's funds will be used to equip a camp site located at Saukville, Wis., and to help finance 9 days of primitive camping for 80 senior Scouts at a site near Escanaba, Mich. Adult membership of the Milwaukee County Girl Scouts is well over 3,500 and includes leaders, assistant leaders, troop committee members, council members, district and functional members, associate scouts, and the professional staff. That so many women take part in this work indicates the excellent value of Girl Scout activities is well recognized in Milwaukee. I should like to include here an article from the Milwaukee Journal of March 1, 1951, telling of the experiences of some of the Milwaukee Girl Scout leaders:

GIRL SCOUT LEADERS FIND RESULTS WORTH THE TIME—UNDERSTANDING FAMILY SEEMS TO BE AMONG PREREQUISITES FOR A GOOD TROOP CHIEF

Daughters and an understanding husband are among prerequisites for a Girl Scout

troop leader, the example of six volunteers seems to indicate.

They are among the 1,200 leaders and assistants who organize and direct troop activity for some 10,000 Girl Scouts in Milwaukee County. On the average, the little-known planners give 4 to 10 hours a week to the job.

Mrs Weikko Leppanen, 1921 North Thirty-second Street, says she owes her start in scouting to one of her three daughters. About 3 years ago Patricia, now 17, was ready to "fly up" from Brownie to intermediate status. Patricia discovered, however, that there was no intermediate troop in the neighborhood in which she could enroll.

TWO ORGANIZE TROOP

Long interested in scouting, Mrs. Leppanen decided it was time she "got in the swim" herself. She and another woman took the 16-hour course in group leadership necessary for Girl Scout leaders. Then they organized an intermediate troop.

Since that time Mrs. Leppanen has had another daughter, Jean, 15, in her intermediate and senior troops. She now has Susan, 9, in the Brownie troop, No. 141, that she supervises at St. Thomas Aquinas' church.

Mrs. Leppanen says that each age level offers a particular challenge. "I miss my big girls now because they're so full of the dickens," she relates. "But I love the Brownies. They are so loyal and you don't have to give them 50 good reasons for one move."

The charm of intermediates is that they are beginning to assume responsibilities, according to Mrs. Leppanen. "They learn to think for themselves and work toward a self-realization."

Scout leadership has been her college education, Mrs. Leppanen said. "I've taken so many courses that I could paper a room with my qualifying cards. It's been a satisfying job."

CALLS IT RECREATION

In addition to leading the Brownie troop, Mrs. Leppanen is neighborhood scout chairman and serves as a counselor at a summer Girl Scout day camp.

How many hours does she give to all her scout duties? "My husband would say every hour," she retorts. She believes that the scout organization should initiate a "husband appreciation night."

For Mrs. George Graetz, 618 Hawthorne Avenue, South Milwaukee, who grew up in scouting, leadership of an intermediate troop in South Milwaukee is recreation. Her oldest daughter, Susan, 10, is in her troop.

Her other daughters are Mary, 8, who is a Brownie, and Sally, 4. "Even Sally has had some scouting experience," Mrs. Graetz tells. "With the rest of the family she went to Girl Scout day camp last summer. But she stayed in the nursery."

TAUGHT PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Before she was married, Mrs. Graetz was an instructor of physical education. She entered scouting when she was 12 and became a leader in 1930 in Duluth, Minn. She droped out to raise a family after her marriage in 1938. She resumed troop leadership in 1944.

Mrs. Graetz feels that Girl Scouting has drawn her closer to her daughters. "It's a deep common love," she said. Her husband declares he has decided that she will be in scouting the rest of her life.

DEVOTES 8 HOURS WEEKLY

Five daughters, a seven-room house and an ambitious schedule of community volunteer work have not discouraged Mrs. Charles Rupp, 2376 South Seventy-sixth Street, West Allis, from troop leadership. She has an intermediate troop at Jefferson school.

Her family includes Darlene, 13; Renee, 11; Bonnie and Vicki, 8-year-old twins, and Jenee, 4. All except the youngest are in scouting. Mrs. Rupp says that her daughters got her interested in the movement.

"Scouting has taught me to organize my own family," she says. "We all have duties and work on a kind of alarm-clock system."

She spends at least 8 hours a week on leadership duties. Also, she does volunteer work for the West Allis health department, is a neighborhood chairman for the Girl Scouts and solicits funds for the March of Dimes.

"I couldn't do any of it without a cooperative husband," she said.

For Mrs. Melvin Petrie, Girl Scout leadership filled a lonely hollow caused by moving from Minneapolis 10 months ago. She had lived there for 25 years. She now is at 1040 South Thirtieth Street.

"My youngsters and I felt right at home when we heard the familiar scout songs," she declares. "It was like coming home."

LIKES LITTLE FOLKS

Her youngsters are Marie, 8, a Brownie, and Maja Lisa, 11, an intermediate scout. Mrs. Petrie has been working with a Brownie troop at Doerfler school and now is helping to organize an intermediate group.

In Minneapolis she worked with a Brownie troop for 2½ years. She likes the little folks because "I can give attention to children who don't get enough of it at home."

She says her husband is a tremendous help. "He does carpentry work when we need it for a play or a troop investiture," Mrs. Petrie said. "And best of all, he doesn't complain about late meals."

Troop leadership is the hobby of Mrs. Smith N. Brickhouse, Jr., 2608 South Shore Drive. She got into the work because her children seemed to enjoy Scouting so much.

ORGANIZED MARINER TROOP

Her daughters, Beth, 12, and Barbara, 11, are both intermediates, and a son, Smith, is a Cub Scout. She never has had her daughters in a troop because, she says, "They get enough of my ideas at home."

Mrs. Brickhouse has charge of Brownie Troop, No. 245, at the Trowbridge Street School. She also is a neighborhood chairman in the South Shore district.

She spends about 10 hours a week on Scouting duties. "My husband enjoys having me do it," she says.

Living smack on the ocean at Marblehead, Mass., gave Mrs. Kenneth Johnston, 3265 North Summit Avenue, an early love for the sea and sailing. She put this love and scouting together by becoming a Mariner Scout.

Last year Mrs. Johnston organized the second mariner Girl Scout troop in Milwaukee. The group now is busy learning to tie knots, chart sea courses, identify parts of a boat, and pass required swimming badges.

Mrs. Johnston, 24, is one of the younger adult leaders. She has a daughter, Deborah, 16 months old. She was graduated in 1948 from the University of Wisconsin, where she majored in political science.

She believes that all women should have some activity outside the home. And her husband agrees. In addition to her scout leadership, Mrs. Johnston does volunteer work at the junior league blood center.

Jewish Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, March 23–30, 1951, has been designated as Jewish Youth Week in the United States by the National Jewish Youth Conference. The conference is a permanent Nation-wide body which represents over 300 local Jewish and young adult councils, regional youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations. The conference is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board. The purpose of Jewish Youth Week is to focus the attention of the entire community on the activities of its young people.

"Learning through Jewish living," the theme of this year's Jewish Youth Week, reveals significantly the fact that American Jewish youth has learned the art of working together around areas of common interest for a healthier, happier, more positive community. Through youth and young adult councils—which in most cases are representative of all organized Jewish youth in the community—they have been able to develop constructive programs.

Clearly reflected in the theme is the recognition by Jewish youth of its role in the growth and development of the American Jewish community. Across the Nation, young people have taken their seats on boards of Jewish community centers, Jewish community councils, and Jewish welfare organizations such as the National Jewish Welfare Board.

During Jewish Youth Week the searchlight of the communities will be focused on the major advances which Jewish young men and women have been able to make by working together. Through such events as cultural festivals, youth Sabbath services, exhibits, rallies, conferences, forums, institutes, pageants, athletic and social events, radio and television programs, Jewish youth will demonstrate its abilities, accomplishments, role and responsibilities and needs. They will demonstrate during this week the fruitful results of concentrated efforts to build a better community and Nation.

Our Jewish young men and women have willingly accepted their responsibility of citizenship and service and have given generously of their time and efforts in working for deserving projects. On a national level, for example, the National Jewish Youth Conference served as an active member of the advisory council on youth participation of the recent Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. The conference played an important role in stimulating the participation of youth and young adult councils in the work of the State and local White House Conference committees throughout the United States.

Youths of all faiths are needed for the future leadership of America. The splendid achievements of our Jewish youth in the past warrants a hopeful prediction that they will more than measure up to the responsibilities that will face them in the crucial days ahead.

The theme of Jewish Youth Week is described in an article written by Mr. Arnulf M. Pins:

WE LEARN THROUGH JEWISH LIVING

(By Arnulf M. Pins)

The theme of Jewish Youth Week, March 23–30, 1951, is Learning Through Jewish Liv-

ing. Jewish Youth Week, conducted annually by the National Jewish Youth conference, aims to focus attention on the activities, hopes, abilities, and plans of Jewish young people today.

The National Jewish Youth Conference, which is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board, can serve as an excellent example of "learning through Jewish living." It reflects the aspirations, hopes, and plans of American Jewish youth in the critical days through which we are living.

The National Jewish Youth Conference was set up as a permanent body in 1948, "to provide a self-governing representative body of organized Jewish youth which can develop a service for meeting the needs of American Jewish young people." Local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils, some 300 in number, and most of the national Jewish youth organizations are members of the NJYC.

The purposes of the National Jewish Youth Conference are: To exchange experiences and program ideas on the youth and young adult levels; to initiate programs nationally which could aid local communities; to act as a sounding board of youth needs; to stimulate and aid in the development of youth and young adult councils; to facilitate relationships with other cultural and ethnic groups; to serve as an instrument for cooperation between Jewish youth in America and youth all over the world; to stimulate means of cooperation and exchange among American youth and Israel; to provide opportunity for development of leadership through actual experience; to provide a medium for democratic representation from youth and young adult councils on a national and international youth serving bodies and to develop a medium of cooperation between national Jewish youth organizations and the local youth and young adult councils.

In the 2 years the NJYC has done much to carry out these objectives. Through its annual assemblies, quarterly meetings of the executive committee and work of its standing committees, the NJYC has begun to meet the needs of local youth councils and national organizations and has begun to be a unifying force in American Jewish youth life. It has been an experience of youth accepting its responsibilities and working for a better, more meaningful, and creative American Jewish community. It has been an example of youth serving youth.

In order to acquaint more people with the purposes and activities of the various national Jewish youth organizations, the conference published a directory of these organizations, as well as a listing of nonfee organizational speakers who are available for talks, forums, and lecture programs. The NJYC is also preparing a radio script which will explain in dramatic form the objectives of the various Jewish youth organizations in this country.

The National Jewish Youth Conference has been in close contact with youth in Israel. It has distributed magazines, articles, and other publications published by the Jewish Agency, Jewish National Fund, and the Keren Hayesod. The NJYC published and distributed widely a complete listing of all the different youth "Tours to Israel" which were held during this past year. A "reciprocal adoption project" between local youth councils and settlements in Israel has been undertaken for the current year.

In order to enhance the exchange between youth councils, a directory of Jewish youth and young adult councils has been published; a directory of Jewish youth-council newspapers is now in preparation. Special bulletins of program suggestions for youth councils are sent periodically to the councils throughout the country. They have covered such subjects as Youth Conferences on Israel, Social Action, and others.

A Jewish-youth lecture service has recently been established by the conference. It lists youth speakers throughout the country who are able to speak before youth and adult audiences on specific topics. The conference also publishes a paper called the National Jewish Youth Review. The conference also publishes a news service, which gives items about and of interest to Jewish youth for use by local and national youth and community newspapers.

The conference cooperates with other agencies to encourage the celebration and to prepare and distribute materials for Jewish Book Month, Jewish Music Festival, Jewish History Week, Hebrew Month, and United Nations Day. The National Jewish Youth Conference has also stimulated special programs such as career conferences, youth sabbaths, join a jewish youth group campaigns, and others.

The conference's week-long annual assemblies held during each summer provide a setting where young people get together to consider matters of concern to Jewish youth, learn new skills, and get new ideas for their local programs, and have the opportunity to participate, in a democratic fashion, in deciding the future services and activities of the National Jewish Youth Conference.

The National Jewish Youth Conference represents Jewish youth in the Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly, a national coordinating body of all the major youth organizations in this country, and through it has actively participated in the work of the World Assembly of Youth, UNESCO, and other international agencies. The conference also took an active part in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth recently held in Washington, D. C.

These are but a few of the concrete and visible things the National Jewish Youth Conference has accomplished during the first 2 years of its existence. However, some of the accomplishments of the conference, of equal importance, are of a different nature. For example, the National Jewish Youth Conference has given many individuals an invaluable experience in working with people of different backgrounds and varying interests as well as getting new insights into the needs of the American Jewish community. Through their participation in the work of the conference young people have gained a community outlook, they have learned that there can be unity without uniformity. In other words they have begun to prepare themselves, through actual experience, for their future responsibilities as adults.

The efforts of the National Jewish Youth Conference in the past 2 years are more than mere activities, projects, meetings, or publications. There is deep underlying purpose and direction to all the work of the National Jewish Youth Conference. The National Jewish Youth Conference is working toward an American Jewish community which will be positive in attitude, democratic in structure and creative in its program, by preparing young people for their future responsibilities in Jewish life in America and Israel. To achieve this goal, youth must gain the knowledge, understanding, and experience in Jewish affairs, and must learn to work together, to share views and develop necessary skills.

In reality, the National Jewish Youth Conference has been and will continue to be training for community leadership. Jewish youth is learning through doing; the conference is a good example, of learning through Jewish living.

Post Office Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to find in the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee items which will permit the extension of the research and development program which was inaugurated by the Post Office Department pursuant to Public Law 231, Eighty-first Congress. I introduced the bill which became Public Law 231 following a visit to one of the large post offices in the United States in connection with a study made by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1948.

It was clear that the postal service was being impaired by a lack of funds and a lack of a coordinated program for research and development in items that are peculiar to the postal service.

It is virtually impossible to get private organizations to conduct research of this type for the postal service because in the event they might develop some item which would be of benefit, the Department must then ask for bids in which all manufacturing organizations can participate without regard to whether they participated in the development period or not.

I note that this bill carries an item of $250,000 for original research and development on new machines, procedures, and methods. There is also an additional item of $500,000 for improvements on existing equipment that has already passed through the initial experimental stage.

The Post Office Department has reported with regard to the research and development program, and I believe the Members of this House would like to know that a wide field for improvement in the postal service is being developed. Already under the authority of the research and development law the Department has made many advances. The work incident to the establishment of the new money-order system which is expected to go into effect on July 1, 1951, is well advanced. This new money-order system proposes to replace the present postal note and money order by a machine record card prepunched to expedite the accounting procedures. The Postmaster General testified before our committee that he expected the savings in this new system to virtually eliminate the deficit the Department is now experiencing in handling money orders which amounts to approximately $30,000,000 annually.

The Department has installed improved garage equipment and experimented with highway post-office vehicles. These latter vehicles, incidentally, are proving a good substitute for the hundreds of branch lines that the railroads have found necessary to discontinue because of reduced revenues.

The Department is negotiating for research into parcel-post packaging. This will be of benefit not only to the postal service but to all of those using the facilities of the post office. I might mention that during our study of the postal service it was developed that in San Francisco alone 20 full-time employees were required for rewrapping packages that were broken in handling on the parcel-post conveyor equipment. You see, it is not only a question of adding mechanical equipment to handle parcel post, but the addition of mechanical equipment creates new problems such as the packaging problem I have just mentioned.

The Department is improving the unit-cost system and proposes to institute a unit-factor system which will have a material effect on the management of such offices taking into consideration the units of work produced.

Much has been accomplished under this program in research into sorting equipment for letter mail. The Department is also experimenting with and intends to install in some of the larger post offices a simplified sorting system similar to the one developed in the Dallas, Tex., post office.

Mail distributing machines have been constructed and a study has been initiated into the development of a machine for facing mail prior to cancellation.

The Department is also conducting research in payroll machines, postmarking machines, stackers, improved hand-postmarking devices, portable conveyors, electric tractors, small motor vehicles for city carriers, city carrier carts, magnesium hand trucks for parcel-post carriers, plastic carrier satchels, microfilm, labels for packages and sacks of mail, check signers, magnetic counting devices, twine, and coin-handling machines.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, is currently holding hearings on postal rates. These hearings have developed the very serious need for a more constructive approach to the manner in which postal rates are set. The postal rate structure is one of the most complicated sets of rates, and has a more far-reaching effect than virtually any other single transportation rate structure. Yet the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is expected to examine into the rate structure and come up with recommendations to the Congress which will be fair in all respects. This is a most difficult task and the net result in revisions are seldom accomplished.

Under the research and development program, a Division of Rates is being set up. This Division will conduct continuous studies into the postal rate problem and will be able to provide more complete data with regard to the necessary postal rate revisions, and possibly will result in recommendations with regard to revised rate-making procedures that will be workable and acceptable to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say I am gratified that the research and development program is recognized and is being continued by means of appropriations contained in this bill.

Proposed Increases in Federal Automotive Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include by request at this point in the RECORD the following resolution on proposed increases in Federal automotive excise taxes:

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED INCREASES IN FEDERAL AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAXES

Whereas Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has proposed that the 7 percent manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles be jumped to 20 percent, and the Federal gasoline tax from 1½ cents to 3 cents, in addition to the nearly $1,500,000,000 which highway users are now paying annually in Federal automotive excise taxes; and

Whereas this doubling of the Federal gasoline tax and tripling of the tax on new automobiles will add, according to the Secretary's estimate, about $1,265,000,000 in additional Federal automotive excise taxes which would result in highway users paying almost 42 percent of the total revenue expected from all new excise tax increases; and

Whereas Federal automotive excises are discriminatory and unfair because, (1) they select one type of transportation for general tax purposes (only highway transportation is singled out for such taxes); (2) they are imposed upon products essential to modern transportation; (3) they bear heavily on the small income groups; and (4) they result in multiple taxation; and

Whereas in addition to these Federal automotive excise taxes, motor-vehicle owners contribute their fair share of all general taxes in the support of Government and pay special imposts to the States and localities for use of the highways at an annual rate in excess of $2,500,000,000, thereby building and maintaining the road network which is indispensable to the Nation's defense; and

Whereas passenger cars are no longer a luxury to be taxed as such but instead are used daily by farmers, workers, professional, and business men in the pursuits of their livelihood which are essential to a strong supporting civilian economy for our defense effort; and

Whereas the proposed increase in gasoline tax excises alone would not only increase the cost of operating passenger cars and privately owned commercial vehicles essential to the defense effort, but would add so much to the cost of bus and truck operation that higher fares and rates would result in ultimate higher prices to the consumer; and

Whereas there is pending in the Congress a bill known as H. R. 1652 to impose Federal registration fees on motor vehicles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That while the undersigned organizations, members of the Massachusetts Highway Users Conference, stand ready to make the contributions and sacrifices necessary in the defense effort as demonstrated by the withdrawal of our demands for repeal of present Federal automotive excise taxes when the first shot in Korea was fired, we are nevertheless unalterably opposed to any proposals to further increase or add to these taxes for the forestated reasons; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to our congressional delegation.

American Automobile Association, Robert S. Kretschmar, Executive Secretary; Automobile Legal Association, Sidney S. von Loesecke, Assistant Manager; The Asphalt Institute, E. M. Howard, District Engineer; Automotive Booster Club, E. E. Graves, Legislative Committee; Bancroft Automobile Club, John H. Brooks, Sr., President; Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, J. B. Wells, Executive Director; Lawrence Automobile Club, James N. Keefe, Manager; Mack Motor Truck Co., Walter E. McLean, New England Manager; Massachusetts Farm Bureau, Walter E. Brigham, Director; Massachusetts Highway Users Conference, Richard F. Paul, Secretary; Massachusetts Motor Truck Association, Myles W. Illingworth, General Manager; Massachusetts Rural Letter Carriers Association, Woodworth J. Rice, Legislative Committee; Massachusetts State Automobile Dealers Association, William A. Plunkett, Executive Vice President; Massachusetts State Grange, Charles H. Brown, Master; New England Bakers Association, James W. Mackey, Assistant Executive Secretary; R. S. Robie-U-Dryvit Auto Rental Co., Charles A. Higgins, Jr., Sales Manager.

Amendment of Internal Revenue Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today similar to H. R. 3168, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

During this period of high taxes and with the possibility of even higher taxes in the offing, it is of the utmost importance that the Congress be alert to correct inequities which arise under our complicated tax laws.

The bill which I am introducing is one of a number of corrections which should be made in our tax laws.

In 1932 the Treasury Department requested an amendment to the internal revenue laws to provide that the basis of property should be reduced not only by any depreciation properly allowable but also by any depreciation allowed if it exceeded the amount allowable. The sole purpose was to prevent injustice to the revenue by the restoration to bases of excessive depreciation claimed where taxes had been reduced by the excessive deductions and the statute of limitations had run against the collection of the taxes properly due.

Instead of using the section only to protect the revenue against injustice the Commissioner with the sanction of a 5-to-4 decision of the Supreme Court, has used the statute to inflict the grossest injustice upon innocent taxpayers. This should not be permitted. Nowhere else in the tax laws is a taxpayer bound, in computing income in future years, by an error in a prior return which did not affect tax liability. It is only simple justice that an innocent and harmless error should not increase tax liability.

Congress, in amending the basis provisions in 1932, intended no exception.

My bill does not open any statute of limitations. Closed years are left closed. But it does in all open years permit computation of basis by the deduction only of depreciation allowable, except where depreciation in excess of that allowable has reduced tax liability and the statute of limitations has barred collection of the taxes properly due.

Altoona, Pa., Local of the American Federation of Labor Opposes the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor representing the shopmen employed by the Pennsylvania Railroad at Altoona, Pa., are against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project.

There is no community in the United States that depends more upon coal and railroading for its economy than does the city of Altoona. Destroy this economy as the St. Lawrence seaway will and you will destroy the jobs of the many thousands of good Americans employed in Altoona by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The resolution recently adopted by the local federation of the American Federation of Labor, Altoona, Pa., follows:

Be it resolved, That the local federation of the American Federation of Labor, Altoona, is opposed to the bill approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada, providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes.

1. That this proposal at the present time is a threat to the economy of the entire northeastern part of the United States and would reduce the tonnage of both the merchant marine and the railroads.

2. That the project would cover 2,687 miles of which 345 miles would be in this country and 2,342 in Canada.

3. The proposal would cost between $800,000,000 and $1,350,000,000 and yearly operation would cost approximately $20,000,000 and adequate defense would probably come to another billion.

4. Vital materials for the war effort would be used and could not be spared at the present time.

5. The project would take at least 4 to 7 years to complete and could be crippled by one bomb, rendering it useless.

6. The St. Lawrence River is icebound for virtually 5 months out of the year and during the spring and fall, and even in summer is blanketed by fog.

7. Only 9 percent of the merchant marine vessels could use the seaway, and smaller vessels would have the advantage.

8. It is estimated that the international section alone would take 140,235,000 manhours when manpower is so vital to the national defense.

Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday March 15, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the existing Italian Peace Treaty is today completely outmoded and sadly in need of revision. The conditions which existed at the time the treaty was written no longer hold true and the situation has so changed that immediate action appears to be called for. Today, while we in the Congress, are debating the various proposals and methods by which a real and lasting peace can be secured, and while we are attempting to best implement the Atlantic Pact, we are overlooking a decided and impelling force toward such a peace by continuing in effect the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947.

This treaty imposed drastic limitations on the Italian army, navy, and air force and greatly curtailed military training in that country. Because of these restrictions Italy is now prohibited from fulfilling her obligation under the Atlantic Pact. She is denied the right to contribute to the full extent of her capability to the defense of Western Europe. At the same time it forces the United States to carry an undue burden in supplying additional combat manpower to make up for that loss.

It seems evident to me that for our own best interests, we here in America should immediately negotiate a new treaty of peace with Italy and permit her to assume her responsibilities among the free nations of the world. For these reasons I have today submitted a bill to the Congress which would authorize the negotiation of such a new treaty.

Conservation and Development of Forest Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to submit for the consideration of the Congress the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Forest Farmers Association, with headquarters at Valdosta, Ga., during their tenth annual meeting recently completed:

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO FEDERAL PROGRAMS CONCERNING THE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF FOREST RESOURCES

Whereas forest farming is dependent on the same biological sciences as other agricultural crops; and

Whereas the biological scientists, concentrated in the Department of Agriculture and working on problems in the growing of cultivated crops, grasses, and trees, have associations and facilities there that are mutually helpful and advantageous to the country; and

Whereas a large proportion of the forest land of the South and of the Nation is in farm woodlands; and

Whereas the United States Forest Service, as the Federal agency responsible for the forest program, has for many years worked successfully with the other agencies in the Department of Agriculture in developing the science and art of forest farming, and in disseminating information to forest farmers and other woodland owners: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Forest Farmers Association go on record as recommending to the President of the United States and to Congress that the Federal programs concerning the conservation and development of the forest resources be concentrated in the United States Department of Agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the stirring address made by His Excellency Sean MacBride, S. C., T. D., Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, to the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of the City of Philadelphia on Saturday, March 17, 1951, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Mr. President and gentlemen, you will know how honored and happy I was to receive the invitation sent to me some months ago to be the guest on this occasion of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick of the City of Philadelphia. In the midst of heavy duties I considered that this was an invitation I must accept. All the more so because your society is celebrating this year an anniversary which recalls, in a very special way, the closeness of its association with the historic origin and the political development of this great Republic. It happened, Mr. President, that the Society of the Friendly Sons was founded in this city in the year in which the last monarch to rule in this part of North America ascended the British throne. The American frontier was still ablaze. Mason and Dixon had not yet been employed to fix the boundary between the Colonies which were to become the States of Pennsylvania and Maryland. From that early time, members of your society have been closely associated with the history of your country. They stood sponsors at the birth of the Republic; they financed the War of Independence; they sat amongst the founding fathers; they marched with Washington from Philadelphia down to victory at Yorktown. They signed the Declaration; they framed the Constitution of the United States. They were the first to proclaim and promulgate the sacred documents of the new predestined Nation which, in an interval almost precisely coterminous with the life of this society itself, was to become the leader of the world. And through all the years between, they have been the stanchest supporters of the principles and ideals which have motivated the

peoples of the United States and of Ireland in their struggle for unity and liberty.

Therefore on this one hundred and eightieth foundation anniversary I heartily congratulate you on the story which is so closely woven into the history of America. And I congratulate you also because it was here in Pennsylvania that the first attempt was made in North America to frame an instrument of practical government under which the human rights of religious liberty and of equal citizenship were safeguarded, and made basic in its law. It was the spirit of that daring and seemingly futile experiment which, when freedom finally came, gave its character, its directives and, to some extent its form, to the Constitution of the United States. At the outbreak of the Revolution there was nowhere in America a legislative body more democratic and more firmly opposed to the tyrannical exercise of royal prerogatives than the Assembly of Pennsylvania. No other part of this great country can claim so fully as this to have been the inspiration of the events through which your emancipation was achieved. But there is yet one other feature which is of vital import. I am referring, Mr. President, to the part played by the State of Pennsylvania when the unity of this Nation was imperiled and the integrity of its territory sought to be destroyed by Civil War. Six days after the bombardment of Fort Sumter two regiments of Pennsylvanian troops marched into Washington—the very first to arrive—in defense of the national capital and of national unity. Only twice during the Civil War was your State raided. But, nonetheless, it was the high tide of the Confederacy which rolled into the Cumberland Valley in that July of 1863, the second famous July in your calendar, to be stopped and turned back at Gettysburg.

I wish here to pay my tribute to the members of your Society who played so great a part in providing the most striking proof in all modern history that freedom and unity are essential to the life and ordered progress of Nations, new or old. In this connection the history of the United States shows two other things very clearly. It shows that national freedom, however powerfully challenged, can always be won and secured by an enlightened and determined people. At one stage in American history there was a proposal that an actual union should be formed between Ireland and America. If the plan of Benjamin Franklin had been followed Ireland would have become a partner in the confederation. In July 1775 Benjamin Franklin proposed to the Continental Congress draft Articles of Confederation by which Ireland could join. Of the hundred members of the Annual Congress which was to govern this confederation, forty were to be assigned to the representatives of Ireland. The proposal was not acted upon but it is an indication of the closeness of the ties which existed between our two nations.

In those early days when the people of Ireland and the people of America first began their struggles for the establishment of democracy and liberty in their respective countries, Republics were few and far between; democratic principles as we know them today were then practically unknown. Our respective peoples were not only fighting for the freedom of their countries but they were struggling also for the establishment of democracy and the assertion of fundamental human rights. The ebb and flow of this battle has not been an even one. You in the United States won your battle long before us. Indeed we have not yet won ours fully, for a portion of Ireland still remains cut away from the rest of the country against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people.

As on St. Patrick's Day our thoughts naturally turn towards Ireland you will probably expect to hear from me on account of how Ireland is faring. It is nearly 30 years ago since we obtained control of three-quarters of our country. The task which faced the successive Irish Governments was a tremendous one because it involved, in effect, the complete reconstruction of our economy. Under favorable circumstances and in normal times this would have been a difficult task; but circumstances were very far from normal.

In the first place, the industrial area in the country, the northeast, was retained by Britain; this created an unbalance in our economy. In the second place the civil war retarded progress; apart from the material damage which resulted, the divisions set up prevented, for a long period of time, the objective planning which was so necessary. Following upon the civil war we had to fight an economic war with our neighboring island which lasted practically until the outbreak of World War II.

Despite these difficulties considerable progress has been made in every field of economic activity, particularly in recent years, and I would like to pay tribute to the work of the Government that preceded the present one for the part it played in the task of national reconstruction. The task of reconstruction involved three different fields of activity:

Firstly, the utilization and development of our land resources. This involved: land division of big estates that had been owned by the absentee landlords, improved farming and agricultural methods, and better organization of marketing facilities. Apart from farming and agriculture proper, vast schemes for land drainage, for afforestation and for turf utilization have been undertaken. Vast areas that hitherto were unproductive will thus be utilized for production of food, timber, or fuel. Generating stations are being built in the center of the large bog areas for conversion of turf into electricity, so as to reduce our dependence on imported fuel; when the peat has been cut away and utilized, the land that lies beneath it is being reclaimed and will become available for agricultural purposes.

The second field of activity concerned the creation of industries. While agriculture is the basic industry of the country, it is essential to develop industries to provide employment for our people at home, to supply the needs of our population and, if possible, to produce an exportable surplus. The number of new industries created is increasing daily and industrial employment and production are rising steadily. The year 1950 has been a record year of progress in our economy. This improvement in our economic position has been reflected by the fall in unemployment and emigration and the increase in our national income.

The third main task which had to be undertaken was that of reorganizing the practically nonexistent Sicla services which we took over. New hospitals, sanitation schemes, houses had to be constructed. Within the next 5 years we are confident that these tasks will have been practically completed. At present, measures for a comprehensive social-security scheme and health service are being considered by our Parliament.

From this brief account you will realize that considerable progress has been made. Equally important is the atmosphere of hope and confidence which exists in our population.

In the political field, too, much progress has been made. There is now, since passage of the Republic of Ireland Act, complete unity regarding all questions affecting our national sovereignty and concerning the unification of our national territory. We may differ on many matters of internal policy and administration but where the question of Ireland's sovereignty or unity is involved the leaders and members of all parties stand shoulder to shoulder together.

In the field of international affairs Ireland has been playing an active part. In the Council of Europe and in the OEEC (the European Economic Organization) our policy has been to further the concept of closer cooperation and unity among European states. We have approached these questions not from any narrow, nationalistic, or insular viewpoint but, on the contrary, we have been prepared, far more readily than many other nations to make our contribution toward the unification of Europe which we believe to be essential for the economic and political survival of our civilization. While we are prepared to surrender portions of our sovereignty on a basis of reciprocity with other European nations we are not prepared to submit to the domination or exploitation of one nation.

As regards international organizations we have been precluded by Russia from becoming a member of the United Nations on the grounds, if you please, that we are not a democratic and peace-loving nation. [Laughter.]

As regards the North Atlantic Pact organization we indicated clearly our agreement with its objectives but could not enter into a military alliance with the power which, in effect, was claiming and enforcing jurisdiction within our shores. Furthermore, we pointed out that the defense of a small island such as Ireland can be undertaken effectively only by a single central authority having at its back the firm support of a decisive majority of the people. There is, of course, a natural resentment among our people against the continued denial of the application of the democratic principles in the case of Ireland. In our view the continued partition of Ireland against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people is an example of the very type of evil which it is the object of the Atlantic Pact to oppose and prevent.

Our attitude in this matter is in no way activated by feelings of hostility toward Britain based on past wrongs. On the contrary we are most anxious to develop genuinely friendly relations with Britain. Such friendly relations would be in the interest of both countries and once partition is removed it is inconceivable that Ireland should ever constitute a source of embarrassment to Britain in time of war. Indeed the very contrary would be the case. A friendly and united Ireland on Britain's western approaches is in the interest not merely of Britain and Ireland but of all the countries concerned with the security of the North Atlantic area. Constructive and sincere statesmanship would point to the necessity of the withdrawal of Britain's territorial claims in our island. By so doing Britain would be making a contribution toward strengthening the internal harmony and cohesion of the nations concerned with the security of the North Atlantic area. She would, too, relieve herself of the charge of violating the principles upon which democracy rests.

If we are proud of the part our people have played in the building of your great Nation, we are also very grateful for the sympathy and help which you have given us in the course of our struggle. Not least are we grateful for the message which George Washington sent to us in 1796 which it seems only proper that I should quote in this historic city:

"Patriots of Ireland. Champions of liberty in all lands. Your cause is identical with mine. You are calumniated in your day. I was misrepresented by the loyalists of my day. Had I failed the scaffold would have been my doom. But now my enemies pay me honor. Had I failed I would have

deserved the same honor. I stood true to my cause even when victory had fled. In that I merited success. You must act likewise."

We have acted likewise and will continue to so act until Ireland is free from shore to shore.

Admiral Morton D. Willcutts

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time out of order to call to the attention of the House a news report which appeared in the newspapers this morning announcing that on April 1 Admiral Morton D. Willcutts, the head of the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md., will retire from active duty, after having served his country and all humanity ably and well for 34 long years.

Many of the Members of the House know Admiral Willcutts and appreciate his fine qualities and his great ability as a surgeon and as a physician, and the exceptionally remarkable services he has rendered this Nation as an officer in the Navy of the United States. I believe all Members of the House will join me in paying tribute to this great American and outstanding naval officer. I am sure we all wish Admiral Willcutts well upon his retirement to private life. It is our hope he may enjoy many years of good health and pleasant days in the future. Of him we can well say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

We've Missed the Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent given me by the House, I am including an editorial from the Wichita Eagle, of Wichita, Kans., entitled "We've Missed the Goal." The editorial is one that contains a considerable amount of food for thought. It is worthy of the consideration of not only the Members of the House but of the American people as well:

WE'VE MISSED THE GOAL

As an average citizen you must be concerned over the state of the world, and just how your own country will emerge from the present situation which is often referred to as a crisis. As the average citizen you can see only one solution of the problem. Without world peace there can be no security for the United States or any other nation. Continued rumors of war, while not as costly perhaps as actual conflict, will prevent this Nation from achieving its destiny, and continue as the citadel of freedom. If our thoughts and efforts are to be centered on war it will mean neglect of the better things which can come only with peace.

Peace, then, is the prime necessity. That admission alone seems to have done little to bring it about. There is no general agreement among our own leaders on how to attain peace. On one hand we are being urged to make the United States so strong in a military way that none will attack. Others hold to the theory that we should do just the opposite, withdraw to our own shores, and forget the other free peoples, leaving them to their own fate.

Before becoming too critical of either method ask yourself this question: Do you have a solution of your own? If the job of solving the situation was left to your own devices would you tackle it with any assurance that your way would be effective? The point, then, is that no one seems to know what to do. The state of concern over the future is no greater than the doubt that is in every heart. That mankind in general has somewhere along the way missed the goal which could have been his ultimate destiny—peace on earth, good will to all men.

The Case for Western Democracy Against Russian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Virgil M. Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, before the American Association of Junior Colleges, Des Moines, Iowa, March 6, 1951:

THE CASE FOR WESTERN DEMOCRACY AGAINST RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

(By Virgil M. Hancher)

I trust that you will forgive me if I invite you on this occasion to participate in the most unpleasant task that one citizen can invite another to share. I invite you to think.

Someone has observed that when we believe ourselves to be engaged in thinking, more often than not we are merely engaged in rearranging our prejudices. I can illustrate that point. We are met in the Middle West. During two World Wars this part of the United States was remote from the scenes of conflict. Therefore, many people residing here believe that we shall be remote from the scenes of conflict if there is a third world war. Is this true? If we fight Russia, must the attack come through Germany and Europe and across the Atlantic, or through Korea and Japan and across the Pacific? If Russia decides to fight, it will be because she believes she can destroy our strategic areas and defenses just as we can destroy hers. If she attacks us, where will the attack be made? Detroit, Chicago, Pittsburgh, New York, Washington seem obvious possibilities. Are they the only ones? I doubt it. The men in the Kremlin can be incredibly stupid and incredibly wise, but it is never safe for us to count on stupidity; and unless they are incredibly stupid, the possibility that they will make other strategic attacks is obvious. Such attacks might call for the destruction of the bridges across the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and the immobilization of transcontinental and local rail and truck transportation which would result.

Notwithstanding the ominous silence about it, or perhaps because of that very silence, other attacks might call for biological warfare to be waged against humans, animals, and crops in this, the richest and most highly concentrated agricultural area in the world. If Detroit invites attack because of its automotive industry, surely Iowa invites attack because of its agricultural production. The rise of air power has put the northern United States on the new frontier, but this is an exceedingly unpleasant prospect, and, therefore, instead of thinking about it and planning for it, we tend to rearrange our prejudices and ignore it as much as possible.

So it has been in our consideration of communism. For more than 30 years we have avoided thinking communism and have merely rearranged our prejudices. We have assumed that because we did not like communism, it must necessarily fail. Perhaps it will, but no longer can we afford the luxury of error. If western democracy has a case against communism, we should know what it is. I invite you to think about this subject during the remainder of my remarks.

No task could be more congenial to me than that of presenting the case for western democracy against communism in response to the invitation extended to me by your executive director some months ago. I do this with the greater willingness because I believe that we are often in error; first, in our estimates of the strengths and weaknesses of communism; and next, in our understanding of our own civilization and way of life.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the attitude of the western nations toward communism since the Russian revolution of November 1917 has been their sincere and utter belief that it could not endure. Yet a movement which has lasted for 32 years is no passing fancy, especially when it appears to be stronger at the close of that period than at any other time during the period.

What have been the factors contributing to our disbelief in the capacity of communism to endure? The first and most obvious was pointed out by John Maynard Keynes more than a quarter of a century ago. It is that we mistook the Russian revolution for an economic movement, and because we deemed its economic basis fallacious we thought that the movement must fail. This was an error. To evaluate communism, especially the communism of the U. S. S. R. in terms of economics alone, is to misjudge it fundamentally. As Keynes pointed out with insight and clarity, the bad economics of primitive Christianity did not cause that movement to fail. On the contrary, the zeal and faith of its adherents permitted it to exist and grow despite its bad economics. So it has been with communism. The zeal of its devotees has enabled it to exist and grow in defiance of its economic doctrines. Those who looked for its early collapse on this ground were doomed to disappointment. Unless we are prepared to see in it more resemblances to a religious than to an economic movement, we are in error of misjudging communism as completely and as tragically today as we have misjudged it every year since 1917.

Up to this time we have misjudged the staying power of Russian communism. In part we have done so because we have gaged its acceptance in the U. S. S. R. by western

rather than by Russian standards. If anything is demonstrably clear, it is that Russian communism has not produced as high a standard of material well-being for the people of the U. S. S. R. as is enjoyed by the people of the United States or even by the people of Western Europe. Because of this, we have expected the Russian people to be dissatisfied and to revolt. But here again we have deceived ourselves. By the devices of the iron curtain and of nternal propaganda, the party has been able to control the information received by the Russian people concerning conditions outside the Soviet orbit, and to a very considerable degree to control their thinking on the information they have received.

But in another respect we have overlooked the fact that for the masses in Russia, communism probably represents an advance from the economic conditions prevailing under the Czars. The Russian standard of living may be grossly inferior to that of Western Europe and America, but the better-informed opinion seems to be that it has improved in relation to the only standards which the Russian people have ever known. The whole propaganda technique of the Kremlin is directed to this fact, to the fact that communism is the wave of the future, and that, once the enemies of communism have been destroyed, the proletariat will come into his own. I once asked an English friend of mine, who had lived through the revolution in St. Petersburg, why the Russian people accepted the revolutionary regime. His answer was, "Why not? What did they have to lose?" Is it not clear, then, that in considering the acceptability of the Russian regime to the Russian people, we must not think of the problem in our own terms and according to our own standards, but rather in terms of the background, experience, and expectations of the Russian people? The more we divorce ourselves from our own peculiar outlook on life and on the world, the less we shall expect an early dissolution of Russian power from within.

One of the major handicaps to international understanding is the assumption on the part of almost every nation, people, or race that its particular religion, philosophy, culture, or way of life is superior to that of every other. This lay at the bottom of the Chinese dislike for foreigners, the seclusion of the Japanese, the racial theories of German extremists, the alleged or real arrogance of the British, and our own conviction that we live in God's country and somehow are under a special dispensation. This common national shortcoming is a barrier to true international understanding. In this respect we are no more guilty than many other nations, and perhaps we are no less guilty. There is nothing about it that should make us desire to give up Coca-Cola, automobiles, television, our standard of living, or any other part of the material basis of our culture. At the same time, we stand in a peculiar relation to the non-Communist world, and that relation places upon us a fearful responsibility to assess correctly the power and the durability of the Russians and their satellites and allies. In that assessment we must not assume that, because we loathe the tyrannical practices of communism, other peoples will necessarily share the loathing.

We should remember that the Russian people, in common with all the peoples of Asia, lack the traditions of freedom and justice and democracy that we possess. In his book, I Write as I Please, Walter Duranty tells a story to illustrate the difference between the psychology of the Russians (many of whom are basically oriental) and of Western Europeans and Americans. During one of the periods of food shortage in Russia in the 1920's, there was a surplus of wheat in one part of Russia and many people starving in another part. Although orders had been given for the surplus wheat to be shipped, it somehow failed to pass through a bottleneck in a certain junction town, and shipments were held up interminably at that point. A high Soviet official from Moscow went to a nearby city to investigate. Telegrams to the junction were sent out. There were no replies. Others were sent and still there were no replies. Finally the official himself went to the junction town. Finding the minor official who, in obedience to a stupid rule, had filed the telegrams without reply, he caused the man and his two superior officers to be taken forthwith to the courtyard of the railway office and shot. There was no trial, but the procedure was effective. The railway employees knew what was wanted. They knew that the shipments of wheat were to be expedited and that there was to be no more delay. To a Western European or an American, nothing could have been more unjust than the shooting of those men. But to the Russians, it was an action that they understood. They knew that Moscow meant business. Thereafter the wheat came through without delay and without fail.

But, perhaps our gravest error in evaluating the strength of communism has been our failure to realize that the Marxist philosophy undertakes to give a complete account of the origin of the universe and of the development and destiny of human society and of man. Marx, Engels, and Lenin all sought an ultimate reality, something on which to base a philosophy that would account for everything in the universe. In seeking this goal, they developed the theory of a universe springing from ceaseless motion and chance, first quantitative, then qualitative, until the earth and finally man himself was created. Marxist acknowledged that in olden times men had to use the hypothesis of God in order to understand the universe, but today they reject this attitude and regard religion merely as the persistence of a prescientific attitude in the minds of the people. They regard belief in God as a kind of cultural lag, characteristic of backward and unscientific persons.

Paul B. Anderson, a member of the International Committee of the YMCA, and a long-time student of Russian ideology and tactics, has pointed out that:

"There are four cornerstones in the Marxist structure: First, a philosophy of reality in which motion, change, is the central idea; second, a body of men integrated into and directing this process of change; third, the relegation of God and religion to the status of an anachronism; and fourth, the view that man becomes a real man only after he has consciously identified himself with the Communist interpretation of the creative process." [1]

On these four cornerstones rests the Communist ideology, a kind of godless theology (contradictory as that may seem which presents to the satisfaction of the Communists a complete account of the origin and existence of the universe and of man and of all past and contemporary phenomena. It even has its counterpart of those who are "saved"—that is, workers and others related to the creative process—and those who are "damned"—that is, capitalists and functionaries of capitalism who are outside the creative process. Apparently it also had its organizational counterpart of those who are nominal members of the church, that is, the rank and file of the party, and of those who are "the elect," that is, those who regulate the stream of motion which is our universe and have it within their power to dominate the creative process. These elect are the Politburo, the political bureau of the party.

Now we may deplore the vicious aspects of the class struggle and the emasculation of religion which restricts it exclusively to the experience of man's relationship to his God; we may deplore the oppression, the tyranny, and the slavery practiced by the dominant political group; but the fact remains that the most striking feature of the Marxist ideology is its resemblance to a religion without God. It has its dogmas; it has its organization and its hierarchy; it has its devotees and its communicants; it has its martyrs and its saints; it has its missionaries. It, too, has obeyed an injunction to go into all the world and preach the gospel—to preach, as some say, sacrilegiously perhaps, the gospel according to "St. Marx."

Unless one accepts Marxism in these terms, as in effect a religion without God, how does one account for Fuchs and Gold and many other self-confessed believers in and tools of communism whose conduct seems as eccentric and inexplicable to us as the conduct of the Christian martyrs must have seemed to the solid citizenry of imperial Rome? The faith of the Marxists that their ideology presents a world view, that it is the wave of the future, that ultimately it must and will prevail, constitutes the gravest threat that communism has to offer to our way of life, a threat more grave than atom bombs or hydrogen bombs or dark and treacherous conspiracy, because it is a threat in the realm of the spirit, and in the realm of the spirit ideas can be dangerous to the established order, as Christianity has proved in more than one of the last 20 centuries.

Finally, it must be remembered that to millions, even hundred of millions, of people who have never known the standard of living enjoyed by the poorest 10 percent of the population of the United States, communism offers hope. In Russia, in China, in southeast Asia, its appeal is one of hope for the future, for a more abundant life under the dictatorship of the proletariat, for a part in that world revolution which, according to Marxist dogma, will inevitably overthrow the kingdoms of this capitalistic world and usher in the utopia of the classless society. To those who have lived without hope, the appeal of the Marxist dogma must be enormous. What have we offered, what can we offer, to the hungry millions of distant lands to offset the appeal of the Communists?

II

As I take up the affirmative task of presenting the challenge of western democracy to imperialistic communism, it seems appropriate to delimit the task by a definition of terms. I take it that the term "western democracy," as it is used in the title of these remarks, refers not so much to politics and political organization as to the total political, economic, social, and cultural organization and way of life of the people of the United States; for, notwithstanding the great traditions of freedom and justice and the dignity of man, which are common to the cultures of Western Europe and America, there are other differences which are broad and deep. I need cite only two. In an article in the Atlantic Monthly for March 1951, Dr. Perry Miller points out fundamental differences in the academic traditions of Western Europe and America that grow out of the concept of education for a cultural elite on the one hand and the concept of education for a free and open society on the other. Moreover, European capitalism, like capitalism in all parts of the world outside the United States, is dominated by the concept of a closed market wherein the capitalistic enterprise, through monopoly or cartels, seeks to eliminate competition in order to increase profits without recognizing any corresponding obligation to increase the wages of labor and hereby enlarge the

[1] Anderson, Paul B., Can Marxism Make Room for Religion? The Living Church, January 29, 1950, p. 10. See also, Communism and Christian Education, World Christian Education, vol. V, No. 2, p. 56 (1950).

market and create a greater number of potential buyers of goods. In these and other respects, the differences between European and American thought and practice are so fundamental that they cannot be treated within the limits of this address; and, therefore, the points which I shall make should be tested for their truth or falsity by consideration of the American scene, with a full awareness on my part that they may not be equally applicable, or that they may not be applicable at all, to the nations of Western Europe.

Now in presenting affirmatively the challenge of western democracy against imperialistic communism, I am impressed by the fact that far too often we have failed to understand our own society and way of life. As we stand in this time of testing and trial, we must be clear about our own society and way of life. Without clarity of understanding in ourselves, we cannot communicate its distinctive features to others. The writings of Henry Steel Commager, of Gerald W. Johnson and of many others are clear evidence of our struggle toward such an understanding. Perhaps one of the most significant efforts—because it came from a quarter in which it might not have been anticipated—appears in the February 1951 issue of Fortune magazine, whose entire contents are given over to an interpretation of our way of life under the heading "U. S. A.—The Permanent Revolution." This spokesman for the rich and powerful, for the leaders of finance and industry, reminds us of what is often forgotten by the foundering sons of the founding fathers—that our independence was won as the result of a revolution, that we are the descendants of revolutionaries, and that our progress and development have depended upon revolutionary departures from traditional modes of thought and action, from the establishment of a republic rather than a monarchy in our earliest days to the adoption of the techniques of mass production and high wages for labor in our later days. This freshness of outlook, this creativeness of mind, this unwillingness to accept any problem as insoluble, this indomitableness of spirit, in short the American Revolution itself, constitutes our first, and one of our very greatest, challenges to communism.

In the field of politics and political institutions, not only are we the heirs of the great tradition of freedom and justice and the dignity of man, but we have translated those great concepts into the practical realities of representative government, of the federal principle in governmental organization, and of the right of judicial review as a protection against the tyranny of man over man and the tyranny of government itself over the liberties of the citizen. In our enthusiasm over these great accomplishments, we must not claim perfection for ourselves. We, too, have sinned and fallen short of our goals. Does anyone suppose that the democracy of Chicago in the Capone era, of Kansas City under Pendergast, of Pennsylvania under Penrose and Vare, and of New York under Tammany offers a challenge to communism that would appeal to the peoples of India, China, or Russia? Would the nullification of representative government, by the disregard of constitutional provisions for reapportionment, from Connecticut to Oregon, constitute an appeal? Will the introduction into government of those old-fashioned principles of industrial organization that call for the centralization of power and authority constitute such an appeal? We must remember that freedom and justice and the dignity of man are not the product of the centralization of power and authority. On the contrary, they are nourished and protected by a kind of "pluralism" unique to our society—a kind of pluralism which makes it possible to have clubs and associations, charities and foundations, churches and schools, colleges and universities, manufacturers' associations and labor unions existing under every form of organization and sponsored by every kind of group interest. Some are wise. Some are foolish. Some are pernicious. But, on balance, the contribution which they make to the understanding, the variety, and the stability of our way of life is beyond price. And, likewise, on balance the weakness as well as the strength, the alleged inefficiency as well as the efficiency of our political institutions are not only safeguards of freedom and justice and the dignity of man; they are as well a challenge to the tyranny of communism.

Another revolutionary departure from traditional modes of thought and action occurs in one of the least understood features of our way of life—the unique nature of our industrial order. There is no apt word to describe it. More often than not it is referred to as capitalism, but every student of capitalism knows that our industrial order has features that distinguish it from capitalism elsewhere in the world. As I have pointed out above, capitalism in Europe means monopoly and cartels and a closed and limited market. In Asia it means exploitation. In Asia it means the exploitation of labor, the exploitation of natural resources, and the siphoning off of wealth so that the native populations remain poor and enslaved in order that the few may live in luxury.

Throughout the nations of Asia, capitalism shares the stigma of the "white man's burden." Both suggest the dominance of the foreigner and the subservience of the native. The revolt of native Asian populations against foreign political domination carries with it a revolt against foreign exploitive capitalism as well. This explains the strong movement of many Asiatic nations toward socialism or even communism. It is a reaction, a revulsion, from the exploitative capitalism to which the Asiatics have been subjected for many decades. Thus the description of our system as capitalistic plays directly into the propaganda schemes of the Communists and adds fuel to the flames of hatred against America so carefully fanned in Asia by Communist propaganda. To be sure our system is capitalistic, and in my judgment should remain so, but to describe it as capitalistic is to miss the point that it is unlike the capitalism of Asia and even unlike the capitalism of Europe. It is to miss the point that our system has certain unique characteristics that distinguish it from capitalism elsewhere in the world. It is to miss the point that the distinctive characteristics of our economy are the mass production of goods and services in industry and agriculture and high wages and high living standards for the people as a whole.

Obviously one of the great appeals of communism has been the purely materialistic promise of a higher standard of living. It is an appeal to the exploited and downtrodden. "Arise ye slaves who know starvation. Shake off the curse that binds the earth," says the "Internationale," the international anthem of the Communists. It is an appeal to the hungry, the homeless, and the foresaken. The promise of communism is the promise that the proletariat shall come into its own, that the hungry shall have food, that the homeless shall have shelter, and that the downtrodden shall be raised up.

So far this promise of communism has not been fulfilled in any part of the world. Only in the countries of Western Europe and America has it been demonstrated that the elimination of hunger and poverty is not a fanciful dream of the philosophers. We have come close enough to the fact to know that, for us at least it can be done. And we have come to that point by mass production and by the distribution of the results of that mass production into a high standard of living. What more powerful appeal could we make to the hungry, the sick, and the homeless all over the world than the promise that what we have done may be adapted to help in the solution of their problems? If ever their hunger and poverty and distress are to be relieved, here are instruments to their need. But too much of the time this powerful challenge to communism is kept carefully wrapped in silence, while we invite the resistance and ill-will of Asiatic peoples by praise of a capitalism which to them means exploitation or slavery.

The continuance of our material well-being is impossible without mass production and high wages. It is impossible without gigantic aggregations of capital and labor. We cannot have the one without the other. Yet in peace our people seek to fetter the genius of our industrial organization, and in war or danger beg it to bring its knowledge and resources to our defense. How can we present our way of life to our allies, to the non-Communist world, or to the peoples behind the iron curtain, unless we understand it and believe in it ourselves? Here we have at hand a powerful weapon in the war against communism, but it will never serve us unless we ourselves comprehend its unique characteristics and learn to use it as a weapon.

Another revolutionary departure from traditional modes of thought and action, another challenge which our western democracy offers to Russian communism, lies in the challenge of a free and open society. True enough, this is a goal that we have never completely achieved. True enough, discriminatory practices and race segregation are flatly contradictory to our goals. But who would dare to say that our intolerances, however great, are to be compared with the intolerances of the Russian regime in its mass trials, its purges, and its enslavement of millions of people in prison camps and Siberian wastes? What shall it profit a man to escape a penalty for the color of his skin, only to incur a penalty for the color of his views? Each is wrong, but who shall say that the first wrong is greater than the second?

Only a free and open society can be tolerant. Its frontiers are open to the free interchange of ideas. Its occupations are so diversified and complex that everyone, whatever the nature or the limitation of his talent, can find a useful and satisfying calling. As W. H. Auden has said:

"Such a community would be tolerant because it found every kind of person useful, and its members socially responsible because conscious of being needed."[2]

Thus everyone who functions effectively at the level of his capacity will be needed and respected. He will be deemed a worthy member of society whether he be street sweeper or president.

Implicit in the concept of such a society is the idea of universal education. Again this must be at the level of the capacity of the individual. Not equality, but equality of opportunity is the goal; and there can be no equality of opportunity unless the doors and windows of the mind are thrown open to the light of knowledge. Universal education has not been achieved. Admittedly it is a goal. But it is an indispensable goal if we, with inferior numbers, are to stand firm and secure against the hosts of communism. In his Farewell Address upon leaving the presidency, Washington said: "Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened." Universal education is an indispensable goal if we are to present a free and open society as a challenge to the closed and stratified society of the Communists, if each individual is to

[2] Auden, W. H., "Criticism in a Mass Society," in the Intent of the Critic, p. 131.

develop in response to his desires and capacities rather than in response to the needs and the politics of the state. Never in our history has it been so important that our schools and colleges and universities be dedicated to freedom—in order that truth may be discovered and may prevail, to justice—in order that it may be our "set and constant purpose to render to every man his due," [3] and to the dignity of man—in order that man made in the image of God may tread the earth without fear.

Another revolutionary departure from traditional modes of thought and action, another challenge to imperialistic communism, lies in the incorporation and commingling of the spiritual values of the Jewish and Christian tradition into the very fabric of our daily lives. The Jews have been called a "God-intoxicated people." The Old Testament is the record of their long, long search for the one true God and for a knowledge of His law. Both Jews and Christians among us cry out in their hearts for righteousness. Nevertheless, we have been called a materialistic people. Our civilization has been called a materialistic civilization. To the extent that the accumulation of money has become the sole or even the predominant goal of individual members of our society, to that extent we are a materialistic people. To conclude from this point, however, that our civilization is devoid of spiritual values is a superficial judgment. It is true that we talk about money and material values, oftentimes to the distress of our friends in other parts of the world, but to assert that we place greater value on them than do Europeans or Asians is to close our eyes to obvious facts. Nowhere in the world can one see a more fixed determination of the poor to become rich or of the rich to stay rich than can be seen throughout the Orient. And it is often suspected that the privileges of party leaders in Russia are the equivalent of great wealth.

To call our civilization materialistic and money-minded is to leave unaccounted for the endowment of great hospitals and foundations, of schools and colleges and universities, of churches and charities, and of a hundred and one other things that bring to our common life a kindly and humanitarian spirit unprecedented in the long history of mankind. If our people are not visibly moved in their daily lives by a burning religious zeal, at least they live in an afterglow of a religious faith, that commands them to love their neighbors as themselves. Both Jews and Christians among us hearken to the commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Much that we do falls short of the perfection called for by these commandments, but no one can understand us who does not know that the spiritual values implicit in these commandments are woven into the very texture of our being and permeate both the form and the direction of our society.

Perhaps in this respect we do not even understand ourselves. Perhaps we do not understand the forces of our own American Revolution. Our actions are permeated with wisdom and goodness, but we may have lost sight of the fact that wisdom and goodness are the goals of living. If that be true, we must seek once more to know what wisdom and goodness are. Contrary to our accepted beliefs, the most deadly challenge of communism lies in the fact that it presents a philosophy. Life has a goal. Life makes sense. To its adherents, the Marxist philosophy gives meaning to life. We can meet this only with a greater challenge. We can meet this with a world view which gives a meaning to life transcending the materialism that stands at the heart of communism. We are the heirs of a tradition possessing such a meaning. We must seek to apprehend that tradition anew, because our political, economic, and social structures and actions, permeated, enlightened, and strengthened by the highest spiritual values of western man constitute our last and mightiest challenge to the theories and forces of communism.

Shall we stand in terror before the challenges of communism or shall we, possessing a giant's strength and conscious of that strength, be strong and of good courage?

The choice is ours. The challange is before us. Upon our wisdom and faith and courage may depend the course of civilization for a thousand years. In this crucial hour we must not fail.

[3] The Institutes of Justinian.

Economy in Military Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, the following letter:

We all are cognizant of the great importance of the defense effort and the necessity of building up an adequate military organization. However, in doing this it is necessary that the economy of our country be maintained on a strong level because it is just as important that we remain economically strong as it is that we become militarily strong and remain so. Both must be correlated if we are to accomplish the purpose of the program that we believe will serve to maintain the peace in the world today.

In these trying times, and especially in view of the tax burden already on our people as well as the huge additional tax burden contemplated to be added shortly, it seems to me that now as never before it is necessary that we have economy in the use of our military manpower as well as financial economy.

The general feeling among those people whom I have contacted appears to be that the several branches of the Armed Forces are more or less in a race to build up their strength without due and adequate consideration being given to proper utilization of this strength in the so-called housekeeping or office work of the various branches. We all realize that a certain amount of office work must be done by the personnel of the several branches of the service. It would appear, however, that a great amount of this type of work could be done by civilians at considerable savings in military manpower as well as monetary.

It seems to me that a searching survey should be made by the Defense Department, going into all phases of this important matter so that wherever possible those members of the Armed Forces who are physically fit and trained may be utilized as such rather than to have them doing work that civilians or limited-service personnel could do just as well.

Recently the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, of which committee I am a member, went fully into the manpower situation as it affects agriculture and related industries. Apparently this vital phase of our economy is or will be shortly facing a serious manpower shortage for several reasons. Many workers are being drawn into high-paying defense projects and, of course, many of these workers are being taken into the Armed Forces. Other industries apparently also will be facing critical shortages in the near future.

Necessarily, potential military manpower is relatively scarce due to the high standards set by the Armed Forces and the comparatively small group which they have to choose from. With this in mind, it seems to me that a reevaluation of the situation should be made by the Defense Department. Lower standards wherever possible should be adopted as to mental capacity, and certainly some of our manpower in the approved group with minor deficiencies could be used in the so-called housekeeping work of the Department, thus allowing able-bodied, physically fit, and well-trained personnel of the Armed Forces to be counted among the field forces.

I have heard it said, unofficially, of course, and not from an authoritative source, that the military has more personnel in the Pentagon today than it had at the height of World War II. If it will not give aid and comfort to the enemy or adversely affect the defense effort, I would like very much to have a comparison between the present military strength at the Pentagon and as it was at the height of World War II. I would also like to know the exact number of officers and men who are members of the Armed Forces now on duty at the Pentagon, by rank. I am wondering if there aren't a number of physically fit and trained personnel being used there and elsewhere as chauffeurs, office workers, and handy men, more or less, and if these positions could not be filled by the women of our country or men who are not physically fit for full military duties.

I would appreciate hearing from you in regard to these matters.

Since writing this letter my investigation, which, of course, was very cursory, convinces me that the armed services, in many instances, are operating in utter disregard of proper utilization of manpower, as well as financial economy. I believe it is going to be necessary to have a searching inquiry on the part of Congress into this matter before adequate relief can be expected. After the Easter recess it is my present intention to initiate such a proposal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter that I have recently received from a young man who is a member of the armed services and whom I have known all of his life. He is a splendid young man, well educated and entirely reliable. The letter is as follows:

As this diatribe progresses, I hope you will not think I've taken the term "servant of the people" too seriously. My many letters to you are a result of my confidence in your ability and personal integrity.

Today I went back to work for the Army and worked about 4 hours for which I was paid a little over $7, plus quarters for my family, my food, and clothing, and a form of security. Now I realize that some of us are paid for experience and ability and that higher pay is an inducement to greater effort and, in fact, the pay would be well earned, if our time were well used. What I am trying to say is: Why curbs, shortages, and restrictions in civilian life while we waste time, material, and manpower? Today the Army cries for all of these, yet I would estimate that considerably less than a majority of these is put to a good use.

Sometime ago there was a great clamor to economize—brought to a halt by the Korean incident, but why not save while economy is a greater virtue than ever? Why not make the Armed Forces and other Government services live within their budgets instead of letting them spend more and more per unit, even in time of comparative peace?

Since the channel is being put to more uses and more fantastic results are being accomplished, why not budget small units on the channel plan? Small units cause the expense; and here is a typical example: This morning five trucks took about 50 of us about 8 miles for a class in wire installation. Equipment needed consisted of wire, pliers, and tape. Any locale that contains trees, which abound 20 feet from the barracks is suitable, but we went to a special location, consuming 50 man-hours per hour for 3 hours, the equipment and the wear and tear on vehicles. This venture, I estimate, cost the taxpayer about $80.83, while the same could have been accomplished for about $33 and would have released 50 men for the 2 hours consumed in travel.

Well, now you have an idea of what I mean and why I wonder when I hear talk of another billion or so here and there.

As I mentioned, an individual is a voice in the wilderness, but since free speech prevails and since the combined voices of the citizens of our country determine our actions—let us hope.

Venereal Disease Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Dr. E. Gurney Clark, of Columbia University, reporting the present status of venereal disease control in our country:

IS VENEREAL DISEASE NO LONGER A PROBLEM?[1]

(By E. Gurney Clark, M. D.[2])

A wave of optimism pervades medical and public health circles in respect to the status of venereal disease control. "Penicillin, the panacea, is at hand. Venereal disease control is imminent." In accordance with one of our objectives, "to disseminate authoritative information," this hypothesis should be critically examined by the American Venereal Disease Association to determine if the optimism is warranted, or is possibly premature.

To this end the following questions are raised:

(1) Is venereal disease now a problem? If so, why, to whom, and to what extent is it a problem?

(2) Is venereal disease control imminent?

(3) If so, how can control be maintained?

1. Is venereal disease now a problem? Yes, syphilis is a problem because of the character of the causative agent, because of certain human characteristics, the nature of the disease, and the character of the environment in which people live. The organism is one that requires moisture to live and is thus associated with the moisture of intimate contact and thus is linked with sex and sex attitudes, with the result that infected persons hide their infections. It is a problem because of certain human characteristics: lack of interest in health, lack of knowledge, and willingness to take chances with mild, painless lesions. It is a problem because of the nature of the disease itself: the interaction between the host and the parasitic agent, symptomless infection, evanescence of early signs. It is a problem because of environment, particularly the social and biologic environment, differences in educational attainment, standards of living, cost and availability of medical services. Gonorrhea is a problem because it is caused by an organism with similar biologic requirements and is thus related to sex. It is a problem because in women the disease frequently goes symptomless for many years. Yes, venereal disease is now a problem.

To whom is venereal disease a problem?

(a) To the patient? No, provided there is early discovery and adequate treatment. However, according to estimates, syphilis is a problem to more than half of the people who acquire it, since more than half the cases are undiscovered during the primary and secondary stages.

(b) Is it a problem to the physician in practice? Not from the standpoint of treatment, despite the fact that we cannot define "adequate" treatment for each individual case. There is no problem provided the patient remains under observation. Yet, until the many unknowns about this disease are solved, it will be a scientific problem as long as a case remains. The causative organism of syphilis has not yet been cultivated. We have no vaccine. We know very little about the natural history of the untreated infection; the duration of infectiousness; the mechanism of immunity; the mechanism of infection in utero; the selectivity of the disease for certain tissues; the nature of reagin upon which our nonspecific serologic tests are based. These gaps in our medical knowledge make syphilis a definite problem to the physician.

(c) Is it a problem to the health officer and the community? This can be answered by quoting from remarks made by Dr. W. H. Aufranc, of the Venereal Disease Division, United States Public Health Service, at a recent meeting devoted to the subject: Are Venereal Diseases Disappearing? He pointed out that in 1949 syphilis: (1) infected 150,000 persons in the United States, 80,000 of which cases went undiscovered; (2) sent 6,000 persons to mental institutions; (3) infected prenatally 14,000 innocent children; (4) killed 13,000 people. He also stated that it has been estimated that if the population of the United States were tested today, 3,000,000 people would be found to have positive serologic tests for syphilis. It is, then, a definite problem to the health officer and the community.

2. Is venereal disease control imminent? Eighteen years ago Parran said, "Syphilis can never be controlled while more than one-half of the cases are not recognized for more than a year after onset." What is the situation now? There has been an encouraging decline in the numbers of cases of primary and secondary syphilis reported by States and Territories from 1946 to the present. More recently, a slight decline has been noted in reported cases of early latent, but none in late and late latent and congenital syphilis. These latter facts are discouraging and disturbing. The diagnosis of early latent, late, and late latent syphilis means the diagnosis of cases which were not recognized during the first year, or indeed the first several years, of infection. These represent our failures in case finding at a most critical time in the course of the disease. A rough estimate of the extent of the failure may be made by allocating a portion of reported cases of early latent syphilis in any one year to previous years when, as primary and secondary, they were not discovered. This approximation reveals that in only 1 year, 1947, did the discovered cases of primary and secondary syphilis exceed those not discovered. Furthermore, approximately 120,000 late and late latent and 16,000 cases of congenital syphilis are reported each year. These must be added to our failures. It is an old epidemiologic principle that successful control of communicable disease depends upon the recognition and the elimination of sources of infection. We are still missing more than we recognize. It can be stated without question that at the present, 18 years after Parran's statement, still more than one-half of the cases are not recognized for more than a year after onset.

3. If control is at hand, how can it be maintained? There are and have been areas of so-called low prevalence in the United States and in other parts of the world. By critical analysis of the maintenance methods used in these areas, we should be able to apply immediately the most effective ones so as to insure safety from the venereal diseases forever. Have we studied critically these methods? Do we know what to do? The first step should be to test the assumption of low prevalence by thorough use of all case-finding methods, reaching as many people as possible in the population in question. If the low-prevalence assumption is correct, then we can test certain hypotheses as to maintenance programs. If not, a careful analysis of the data will yield information to assist in defining areas of true low prevalence.

There is additional information needed to plan an effective maintenance program. What to include in such a program will depend upon the effectiveness of measures previously used. What do we know about these measures individually? Have we evaluated them sufficiently to know which measures are responsible for our present accomplishment?

Any program of syphilis control or maintenance must take into account the biologic characteristics of this particular agent-host relationship. These characteristics make it impossible: (1) to eliminate the organism in the physical environment; (2) to eliminate contact; (3) to immunize; and (4) to practice mass quarantine except by treatment. Therefore, maintenance efforts must be directed toward methods which continue the reduction of effective exposures to the treponema pallidum such as: (1) a continued reduction of total exposures by decreasing promiscuity; (2) prophylaxis; (3) maintenance of adequate treatment and follow-up requirements; and (4) a further reduction of periods of infectiousness by early recognition of infection. This latter means case finding. Those methods of case finding which will best serve a maintenance program remain to be found.

SUMMARY

1. The venereal diseases, particularly syphilis and gonorrhea, are still public health problems of the first magnitude.

2. Considerable progress has been made in their control, but from present criteria control is not imminent.

3. Information relating to adequate low-level maintenance measures is lacking.

CONCLUSION

The present optimism in respect to the immediate control of the venereal diseases in the United States as a whole cannot be substantiated in fact.

[1] Presidential address, twelfth annual meeting, American Venereal Disease Association, Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

[2] Professor of epidemiology, School of Public Health of the Faculty of Medicine, Columbia University.

Civil-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association:

CHAPTER CONTACT

One of the greatest services members of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association remaining at home can render to the Nation at the present time is active participation in the civil-defense effort of the community in which we reside.

The training experience you have gained as officers in the Marine Corps has qualified you to render excellent service to the Nation in the Civil Defense Corps.

Civil defense can no longer be looked upon as a fad, hobby, or as a social gathering. America for the first time in her history faces the probability of attack, by an enemy nation, of her industrial areas and population centers.

It is no longer sufficient to build up the Nation's military strength and war production. Attacks by the enemy with modern weapons will be aimed not only at destroying our war production but also designed to break the morale of the American public.

We must organize to protect our home front, to minimize destruction and casualties, to learn all about the effects of atomic weapons in order to dispel the fear that breeds from the unknown and the resultant panic and hysteria which may cause as many casualties as the enemy attack itself. We must all learn the safety measures that can be taken to insure our own personal safety and we must pass these on to others.

This organizing and training must of necessity be voluntary. There is neither money or manpower to organize a paid civil-defense effort. The very principles of civil defense are self-help, both individual and community; mutual aid or help from others when disaster is so great that the community cannot cope with it.

Teaching this "self-help" and organizing the civil-defense program will require considerable sacrifice. It is comparatively simple to go out and enroll volunteers—that is, to get the names. Providing the organization which will direct the efforts of these volunteers and establishing a training program to make their services more effective will require considerably more effort and sacrifice of time.

This is where the men and women of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association can be utilized to the best effect. Your previous training has emphasized the need for instruction and leadership. Your experience has provided you with these qualifications.

You say "Nothing will ever happen to my community." Perhaps you do not live in a critical target area—that does not mean that your community has no part in the civil defense effort. It merely indicates the type of planning and organization you must undertake to assist other communities which are in critical target areas in furnishing mobile civil defense support and mutual aid. We all hope and pray that there never may be any occasion for using the civil defense organization but we can't afford to take the chance of being unprepared.

A trained organization ready to meet emergencies will save thousands of American lives and may spell the difference between victory and defeat should war come. The word "survival" has become almost synonymous with civil defense. Whether we survive may actually depend upon the efficiency of the home front preparations and our readiness in the event of disaster.

Considerable study has been made of all phases of civil defense. A number of official pamphlets and books have been published. Among these are United States Civil Defense, which outlines the problems which must be met and serves as a guide for organization to meet these problems; Survival Under Atomic Attack, which outlines what everyone should know relative to safety measures; Health Services and Special Weapons Defense; The Medical Aspects of Atomic Weapons, and many others. These booklets all give authentic information on the subject of civil defense and are available either through your local civil-defense authorities or from the Government Printing Office.

Civil-defense organization will differ with the requirements of the community. It may be that your community can use your entire chapter in one activity—your community plan on the other hand may be such that it can only employ the individuals within your chapter in several activities. Whatever the requirements are you owe it to yourself and your community to render whatever service you can.

Remember that an attack if it comes is directed against the people of the United States and the people must be prepared to meet it. It cannot be met if we "let George do it."

We hear much about lack of funds for this and that. It is true that civil-defense operations will eventually require considerable money. However there is a great deal of work to be done in organizing and training prior to the actual need for money. Marines have always known how to operate on a shoestring so this will be no new problem to conquer for you.

Every chapter is urged to immediately contact the civil-defense authority in your own community and offer the services of the membership in whatever phase of the civil-defense effort they can be most effectively employed, or in the event no civil-defense organization has been established, to take the necessary steps to organize one under the constituted authorities.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

JACKSON CITY BANK & TRUST CO.,
Jackson, Mich., March 14, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: I have read in the press in the past few days that there is a movement to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I, for one, should very much dislike seeing this brought about. Notwithstanding the fact that a lot of unfavorable publicity has come out during the current investigation, I feel that the RFC, over-all, has done a very good job and should be continued.

This bank has handled more RFC loans, I understand, than any other bank in Michigan, and there has never been a loss.

The banks in the large cities have been prime movers for abolishing the RFC, saying that there is no longer a need for it and that they are capable of handling all applications. However, if we take an application to a large city bank and ask them to participate with us in a loan which would run for a term of years and wherein there is real estate and other collateral involved, they quickly step aside and say that they are not interested. If we take to them an application from a company which shows a wonderful financial statement and perhaps wants to borrow money for from 3 to 6 months, they will, of course, be very glad to handle all or any part of such a loan.

I feel that there is a distinct need for the RFC, especially for the small business which needs term money for fixed assets.

Very truly yours,

C. F. SPAETH,
President.

MARCH 19, 1951.

CARL F. SPAETH,
President, Jackson City Bank & Trust Co., Jackson, Mich.

DEAR CARL: Thank you very much for your letter of March 14, expressing your views on the present need for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The work I did with the Fulbright Committee—before resigning last August to run for Congress—led me to the tentative conclusion that long-term loans on fixed assets for small businesses did not seem to be available from private credit sources, except at extremely high interest rates. It was my hope that the study of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would lead to the development of sound practices for processing applications for loans of this type and servicing them, which might lead the way to the development of an attractive field in private financing which now seems to be neglected. I am somewhat familiar with the benefits to small enterprises, arising from Reconstruction Finance Corporation financing, wholly aside from the financial relief granted.

Frequently small-business men neglect to give attention to accounting and planning, to the extent they ought to for their own good. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its processing of applications and subsequent servicing of loans, frequently helps such small concerns to establish more businesslike procedures. Banking institutions, generally, cannot afford to maintain the staff of engineers, examiners, etc., through which consulting and advisory functions are performed, and through which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in my judgment, has been able to modify and reconstruct the business operations of an applicant so that a loan to him is a safe business risk.

Therefore, it is my feeling, which is contrary to the position of the Republican policy committee of both the House and the Senate, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation ought not to be abolished until the problem of providing financial assistance to small-business enterprises has been dealt with more effectively than it has up to the present time. I appreciate that the relief afforded through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation falls far short of equalizing opportunities for expansion as between small and large concerns. However, what little relief there is to the small concern ought not to be taken away until something has been found to substitute for it. Furthermore, a period of conversion to defense production, on which we are now entering, will inevitably cause dislocation intensifying the need for financial aid. This will be most difficult for the small concerns. Our procurement program seems to be founded upon huge prime contracts with large business. Small business gets only the defense crumbs that fall from the table of large business, as an overflow, before any appreciable volume of defense work is subcontracted to small business. Therefore, there will inevitably be a time lag of several months. If no financial aid is available to small business during this period of conversion to defense production, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is able to provide, the business failures and the impact on our economy through unemployment will be far more serious than it needs to be.

I was very glad to have your letter for another reason. I had been shown letters from banks all over the country which were answers to a questionnaire supplied by the American Banking Association, in which all

but a very few expressed the opinion that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was wholly unnecessary, since any loan applicant entitled to credit could obtain all the money it needed from private banks, and that larger loans could be handled through participation with correspondent banks.

I am convinced that Congress needs to go much more deeply into this problem before taking drastic action.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

The Real Victim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the loose morals of the New Deal administration are now coming to a head. The American people who have been taken in by the New Deal propaganda can now see the price which they have to pay when they become indifferent to the affairs of their Government.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which appears in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1951, with reference to a few, and only a few, of the high-handed rackets within the Government and without the Government:

THE REAL VICTIM

In dark days of March 1933 the leaders of the Federal Government were in a bustling hurry. The slogan was, "Act now and worry about the legality later." Out of that attitude came the bank holiday and after a while the NRA, the old AAA, and a host of other acts that skirted the law for expediency.

In the same days there crept in another philosophy, that the Public Treasury belongs to him who gets there first. Probably at no time in our history was there such a wild scramble to get up projects to be paid for out of the public till. Out of that attitude toward the public moneys came finally another slogan, "Spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

This March the days of 1933 seem dark again in retrospect, although for a different reason. This March beholds the spectacle of wholesale investigations into the conduct of people who also believe, in a different way, in acting first and considering the legality later and of people who believe that the Public Treasury is there for them to tap.

The progress from March 1933 to March 1951 has been a slow one. In 1933 there was no lack of personal probity among trusted public officials. They did not skirt the law for personal gain nor did they dip into the Treasury to put money in their own or in their friends' pockets.

But it was there that there was sown, subtle and insidious, the general disregard for the statute books and the orderly processes of law that have brought public morality to its present state. It was there that was sown the philosophy that since the Treasury is being touched anyway "we might as well get ours."

If this seems to be too heavy an indictment of public morality, consider for a moment who it is that is really being exposed in this parade of investigations.

In Washington one investigation is making considerable scandal of five-percenters, lobbyists, negotiators, and fixers who have taken the RFC for millions not yet counted. But however evil their machinations, the larceny—if that is the word for it—would have been impossible if the morality of the officials had been such that they were unapproachable.

The interesting fact is that whole investigation is that so far no criminal act has been disclosed. What has outraged the public sense of propriety has been nothing more than the acceptance of deep-freezes and the doing of favors for cronies—it only seems more startling here, and less comic, because bigger sums are involved.

It seemed funny when one official got a deep-freeze and offered only friendly favors in return. It isn't funny when another official accepts a luxurious week-end in Florida and the quid pro quo is a million-dollar loan. But one grows from another. If the first is viewed jovially in high places, why should there not be hurt surprise at the indignation over the second?

In Chicago, in Kansas City, in New York there proceeds another investigation, this time into the activities of the underworld. To no one's great surprise this investigation discloses that there is an underworld. There are gangsters, gamblers, racketeers, and murderers in the world after all.

What has caused the surprise, and the indignation, is the disclosure of the size and organization of their operations and the clear suggestion that they could not operate so without at least the tacit consent of those holding public office.

The gangsters—the intended victims—have hardly been touched by the probe except for side malfeasances, such as concealment and lying. The real victim is public morality.

The spotlight of this investigation has touched sheriffs in Louisiana, political bosses in Missouri, police officials in Illinois, a mayor in New York, a dead governor, and a live diplomat. They in their turn have raised suspicion that the lines of connection go farther and higher.

The progression seems to us not a surprising one. A President skirts the law from the noblest of motives, but once the idea of skirting is morally accepted the evil grows too familiar. Who should expect more scrupulous regard for it from ward leaders and policemen than from Presidents?

Public moneys are used for the noblest of purposes. Since they are to be spent anyway it seems a small matter to weigh their spending so as incidentally to help and get votes from large pressure groups. Soon it is a little matter also to spread it through friends and in return for favors.

Favors are accepted from shady characters, shadows between the world and the underworld, for the noblest of objectives. After all, a politician must be elected before he can do good. You do not inquire too closely into your city machine supporters, and soon they are not inquiring at all into the little favors done for the cop on the beat. You begin with the virtue of loyalty to your friends and pretty soon friendship becomes the greatest of virtues.

Between the beginning and the end there is, of course, a wide difference. But once there is a loosening of the attitude toward the public treasury and the public laws, no one should be surprised when a rot sets in. If public officials dismiss with a wave of the hand so grave a charge as treason to one's country, who should be surprised that lesser officials go unmoved by slot machines and $2 bets on the horses?

The beginning of all this is the thought that one need not be too scrupulous in the protection of the public moneys or in the observance of the law so long as the purpose is to do good. The progression is disregard for the law and no regard for money. The end, if it goes that far, is the end of public morality.

Brooklyn's Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jeanne Toomey from the Brooklyn Eagle of March 18, 1951:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—BOSS OF ARMY BASE HERE CALLS BOROUGH "TOPS FOR LIVING"

(By Jeanne Toomey)

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo, commander of the New York port of embarkation, including the Brooklyn Army Base, has seen the world, but he still ranks Brooklyn tops as a place to live.

Ask why he was selected for West Point from the New Jersey National Guard in July of 1918, he will answer mildly, "On the basis of service."

"Hard work, not romance," is the way he sums up 34 years of military duty.

A handsome, quiet-spoken man of 53, General Lastayo lives at Fort Hamilton with his wife, the former Virginia H. Dillard of Chattanooga, Tenn. He has two married daughters—Ann, whose husband, Lt. John D. Howard, is serving with the Third Division in Korea, and Virginia, wife of Shane Riordan of Dobbs Ferry, a former infantry sergeant.

BOSSES ATC'S BIGGEST BASE

Head of the largest United States installation of the Army's Transportation Corps, General Lastayo describes himself as "not a combat soldier," and has no recollection of any "exciting moments" in his career.

Tracing his life, however, shows this statement to be dictated by reserve rather than accuracy.

He transferred from the Field Artillery in 1942 after 22 years with that branch and left with an invasion convoy for his Transportation Corps assignment in England. From May to October of that year he commanded the third port at the Bristol channel ports, England. In November he left for North Africa.

"We took over the port of Oran and operated it until March 1943," he said in his office at the Army base the other day. General Lastayo commanded the port during that period. Later he was transportation officer for both the Mediterranean and Peninsula Base Sections. Charged with the loading of invasion forces and the landing and transporting of men, equipment and supplies as Chief of Transportation of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations, the Army chief had an unparalleled opportunity to study and appraise American youth.

His conclusion? "I think that, on an average, the boys of today are the same as the boys I was with in 1917 and 1918."

With this attitude, the general is understandably popular with his subordinates at the Army base.

LOADED ANZIO INVADERS

While in Italy he supervised the loading of forces, both American and British, who made the Anzio landing. In September 1944, he was charged with the responsibility of loading the Seventh Army for the invasion of southern France from Naples. In June 1945, he returned to the United States.

In the field of transportation, the port of embarkation head believes that the LST and LCT may be the greatest contributions made during World War II because they enable

troops with equipment to debark directly from the vessel to the beach.

Prior to World War II, while with the Field Artillery, he served in Kentucky, the Philippines, Virginia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Florida, Maryland, and Texas.

"I saw so much heat I got used to it," he commented.

In all his Army career he spent only a few months in his native New Jersey while with the Sixth Field Artillery at Camp Dix, from August 1921 to January 1922.

He was born in West Hoboken, October 4, 1897.

TAUGHT ROTC AT CORNELL

From 1925 to 1929 he taught physics and astronomy at West Point and in 1939 and 1940, as a major, was an instructor in ROTC at Cornell.

Of his own career as a student at the Point he is characteristically modest.

Asked whether he had any favorite subjects, he replied, "Like most boys I took the course of study because I had to."

He was not an athlete and did not participate in sports. Among his classmates were Gen. Ewart Gladstone Plank, who commanded the New York port of embarkation from June 1946 to May 1949, and Maj. Gen. Clovis E. Byers, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, who was wounded in New Guinea in 1942 carrying a tommygun in the attack on Buna Village.

General Lastayo has great affection for the Point and plans to attend the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary ceremonies there July 4, 1952.

After his return to this country the transportation officer was Chief of the Highway Division, Office of Chief of Transportation, in Washington. From February 1946 to June 1949, as deputy port commander and chief of staff of the New York port of embarkation, he first fell in love with Brooklyn.

PRO-BROOKLYN JERSEY MAN

"I like Brooklyn," he declared. "I was a Jersey boy, and you never hear any good about Brooklyn in Jersey. I disagree with the Jersey view. I like Brooklyn extremely well and think it is a fine place to live."

His younger daughter, Ann, was graduated from Fort Hamilton High School in 1948 while her father was stationed here.

A year intervened between that hitch in Brooklyn and his present assignment here. From June 1949 to August 1950 he was Assistant Chief of Transportation in Washington.

As boss of the largest American installation, he looks out his window from the administration building of the Brooklyn Army base at a scene of bustling activity, but security prevents his discussing his present task and responsibilities.

However, he will talk about his two granddaughters like any proud grandpa. One was born only a few Sundays ago.

His own father was not in the Army and the family "seems to run to girls," but General Lastayo still has hopes for a future general.

Patriot Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer group of patriots in our country than the devoted Americans who are today serving in the thankless role of membership on their local draft boards.

Without compensation, and too often with no sign of public appreciation, they perform a vital task in the mobilization of our defense. The United States owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to these fine citizens.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

PATRIOT WANTED

We are indebted to one of our readers for an interesting advertisement clipped from the Dickson County (Tenn.) Herald. "Wanted," says the ad, "one draft board member." Then it lists the requirements for the job. Among them are these: "He must sign two or more waivers of pay or compensation; he must be prepared to take plenty of cussing with a smile, both publicly and privately; he must not have too much sense, because, if he does, he will not take the job." The salary offered is set forth as follows: "All compensation paid for duties in this position is exempt from income taxes for the reason this position pays no salary, wages or compensation." "Reasons for taking job," the ad goes on: "Somebody has to do it under the present law and whoever does it has the satisfaction of knowing that he is doing his patriotic duty, and the further satisfaction of knowing that all registrants registered with his board will be treated alike under like conditions."

We have no doubt that the Dickson County Draft Board will fill its vacancy. It will find some devoted American who, like the 39,340 other volunteers now working without compensation in the Selective Service System all over the country, will find satisfaction in the knowledge that "he is doing his patriotic duty." The response that free men make to a call of this kind is a measure of their sense of responsibility and of the vitality of their society. The United States has always been able to count on a full and generous response.

Membership on a draft board is an onerous and exacting assignment. It is not easy to make the decision that requires the son of a friend or a neighbor or a business associate to go into military service. It requires often the judgment of a Solomon and the patience of a Job to weigh the claims of conscience, the considerations of family hardship, the pleas for deferment to finish a course of education that are presented in an infinite variety of forms by the young men called up for induction. The work demands long hours, and it imposes on the men who perform it a sternness—in the national interest—that necessarily sets them apart, in some degree, from their fellow men. Some draft board members have been doing the job steadily for a decade. They have won small acclaim. But they deserve the warm gratitude of all Americans for an indispensable public service well and faithfully and selflessly performed.

Peanut Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, last fall the House passed and sent to the other body a bill dealing with peanut marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This was a good bill. It sought to do equity and to alleviate a situation that exists in Alabama and Texas, and to a lesser degree in several other States. The Eighty-first Congress adjourned without any action being taken by the Senate. I am not here to censure any group or any individual for failure to take action, although I know some action should have been taken. By reason of this failure the House several weeks ago again passed similar legislation. Monday of this week the Senate amended the House bill by striking out everything in our bill and inserting a new amendment. This amendment reduced the 79,000 acreage increase to 34,900 acres. Senator HOEY, who was handling the bill, had this to say, and I quote:

In the House bill there was a provision for 79,000 acres increase for Texas and Alabama to correct an injustice heretofore existing. The Senate bill reduces to 34,900.

The Senator also said, and I quote:

Furthermore, I may say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry decided that this was as far as they wish to go, and therefore it is not desired or intended to ask for the appointment of conferees but to let the matter rest on the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee.

I do not censure the Senator for his action. He did this in good faith in an effort to bring out some legislation. He approved of the legislation as enacted by the House. However, on handling it on the Senate floor, he was necessarily bound by the action of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

This is an unprecedented action to think of one body of this Congress saying to the other: "We refuse to sit down with any conferees that the House might name and work out a bill. Yes; we know that an inequity and injustice does exist, and we will make a half correction."

It is a tragedy that we who know the justice of our case are barred from even being allowed to talk the matter over with representatives of the other body. This is not conducive to good legislation. It is a departure from the good relations that have heretofore existed between the Senate and the House, and especially between the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is setting a bad precedent.

As much as I regret to admit it, it is a fact that we are caught between the "devil and the deep blue sea." The Senate by its action has refused to do anything further and has passed the ball back to the House.

I am convinced that if objection is made to agree to the Senate amendment that the farmers of my State will be further penalized. Certainly a half loaf is better than none at all, and I am, therefore, withholding my objection to the passage of this bill with the hope that a more equitable bill can be worked out at a later date.

The farmers of my section are about ready to plant. Action on this bill has already been too long delayed. We cannot afford to wait any longer. I know that Senator HOEY and the Senators of my State have done everything that they

could to have their body adopt the House bill. I am sure that they will continue their efforts toward securing the enactment of just and equitable legislation.

Tribute to Coach of Indian Basketball Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the papers have been filled with stories of bribery and poor sportsmanship in basketball. It is most heartening to look at the other side of the ledger and to praise those who follow the game in a spirit of honesty and clean play.

One of the finest examples of how fine the game may be is offered by a high-school team in my district. The Red Lake team, coached by Russ Smith, is composed of Indian boys from the Red Lake Indian Reservation. I think the following article, written by Charles Johnson of the Minneapolis Star in its issue of March 6, is well worth the attention of all the Members of the House:

CHARLES JOHNSON'S LOW-DOWN ON SPORTS

By the end of this week when the eight participants in the Minnesota State high-school basketball tournament are known, we'll hear this statement not once but many times:

"I can pick eight teams that aren't coming to Minneapolis that could beat the eight that will participate."

This cry goes up every year when strong combinations that have played brilliantly all season are edged out of the tournament because of off nights or bad breaks.

There undoubtedly is some justification for such claims, but there isn't any way to change the situation.

We agree that the teams that are playing the best basketball at tournament time—district or regional—usually earn the right to battle for State honors.

Up in the north country unprejudiced basketball fans are singing the praises of the Red Lake team, coached by Russ Smith. This fine aggregation was nosed out in the district meet 59–54, by Bemidji which has won that event for the last 14 years for some sort of a record.

Red Lake is a tiny spot with a limited high-school enrollment and many Indian students.

Everyone in that district, even those in Bemidji, are talking about the Red Lake team and its coach.

"If Red Lake had been able to nose out Bemidji, which also has a well-coached team under Bun Fortie, it would have been the sweetheart outfit of this or any other tournament," one admirer writes.

"I think coach Smith has done the greatest coaching job at Red Lake this season I have seen in this area in a long time.

"First, Smith has a well-coached, smart, and clean-cut group of Indian boys. They are outstanding young men who show it by their dress, conduct, and appearance on and off the floor. They are good students, too.

"On a recent visit to the reservation I saw basketball backboards everywhere. They are all talking the sport. The townsfolks are backing the team to the limit.

"Coach Smith has gone into the homes of the boys, talked to the parents and dined with them to create a new spirit and interest which has been lacking in the past.

"They used to blame the Red Lake Indians for fights, brawls, and arguments at games that drove spectators away. No longer do you hear them accused of damaging cars or responsibility for other pranks that don't set too well with the residents and certainly don't help sports.

"Russ Smith has made the community so proud of its high-school athletes that women arrange dinners for them after the games. They have increased interest of the public in their activities, and Smith has made them better boys and that means better citizens when they grow up.

"Smith has taught the Indians good sportsmanship. That goes for the players as well as the spectators. He had a clever little Indian princess, dressed in beaded buckskin outfit with tribal headdress as the cheer leader," our Bemidji informant went on.

That's the kind of a story we love to hear about our amateur athletics. Coach Smith apparently is a man who is using our fine competitive sports to make better citizens, a stronger community and sound leaders for the future.

That should be the No. 1 aim of every coach. Accomplishments of this type are much more important than championships or victories of any kind.

VA Backdown on Regional Office for Brooklyn Recognizes Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of March 18, 1951:

VA BACKDOWN ON REGIONAL OFFICE FOR BROOKLYN RECOGNIZES INJUSTICE

Only 3 days after the Veterans' Administration announced that parts of the Brooklyn regional office would be transferred to Manhattan mounting criticism here has brought a change of opinion on the part of Administrator Carl R. Gray. This followed his receipt of information that sufficient space is available in Brooklyn to house the complete regional activity. Orders have been issued to secure that space at once.

This comes as welcome news throughout the borough, but particularly to the major veterans' organizations, which with the members of the Brooklyn congressional delegation and the Brooklyn Eagle, have been fighting to block this move which would have caused such great inconvenience to large numbers of veterans seeking information and guidance.

Despite the fact that three of the nine floors in the building would have remained available for the veterans office, the removal of the records to Manhattan would have seriously impaired service here.

In a wire sent to Administrator Gray just before he changed his mind the local congressional delegation stated that "we refuse to let Brooklyn become the stepchild of the VA."

We are glad to see that our Representatives did not hesitate to use the very descriptive word "stepchild." If Washington, Albany, and City Hall were to have their way on some occasions, that is just what Brooklyn would become. We have used the word recently in describing the effect of the treatment accorded some of our local projects by the city administration—and City Hall didn't like it. But it is a word that tells a story and we intend to use it, as our Congressmen did, whenever it fits a situation.

We are informed that there are 427,000 veterans in this borough. A large proportion of them find it necessary to go to the regional office on Ryerson Street occasionally. Some of them have been wounded or otherwise disabled. It seems to us thoughtless and inexcusable on the part of the Veterans' Administration that it was willing to force these men to take a long trip to Manhattan when there was no compelling reason for them to suffer such inconvenience.

But favorable action has now been taken and Brooklyn's regional VA office will be retained here. We trust that there will be no further change of mind at Washington.

Inflation and Government Rubber Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Mr. Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, from Mr. John L. Collyer, president, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio:

THE B. F. GOODRICH CO.,
Akron, Ohio, March 3, 1951.

Subject: Inflation and Government rubber policies.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSTON,
Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Following is an extract from the Economic Stabilization Agency's General Ceiling Price Regulation dated January 26, 1951, which was signed by you and with which I am in complete accord:

"Since June 1950 the country has been in the throes of a mounting inflation. What is most alarming is the violence and rapidity with which prices are rising throughout the economy. Since the outbreak in Korea, basic commodity prices have risen almost 50 percent, farm prices about 16 percent, wholesale food prices 12 percent, and industrial prices about 14 percent. Wholesale textile prices have advanced over 30 percent, chemicals over 25 percent, building materials and metals and metal products about 10 percent.

"The cost of living is now at an all-time high and is rising sharply.

"These increases in prices have added billions to the cost of the defense program and many more billions to the cost of living of the general public."

The inflation in prices of raw materials used by the rubber industry has been far greater than the percentages quoted above. And the inflation will continue indefinitely if our Government should enter into a rubber price cartel with the crude rubber growing areas or into fixed-price contracts with private crude rubber producers.

Rubbers are by far the major item of cost in the rubber manufacturing industry. Today, the Government bears almost total responsibility for the price of rubbers—both for the American rubbers produced in Government-owned facilities and for the crude rubber imported into this country. The future price of all of these rubbers is dependent almost entirely upon governmental policies.

By May 1, when all plants are operating at capacity, over 90 percent of the American rubbers will be produced in Government-owned plants retained by Government under the Rubber Act of 1950. On December 7, 1950, the Government increased the selling price to industry of its general purpose American rubber 32½ percent, or from 18½ cents a pound to 24½ cents a pound.

The greatest price increase has been in crude rubber. The delivered price in New York for No. 1 ribbed smoke sheets advanced from 18¼ cents a pound at the beginning of 1950 to a high of 90 cents a pound during the year. The present world market price is about 80 cents, an increase since January 1, 1950, of almost 340 percent.

Our Government became the sole importer of crude rubber for this country on December 29, 1950, at which time the price was 70 cents a pound. The stated purpose was to obtain a materially lower price by eliminating competitive buying between private companies for consumption and our Government for stockpiling. There has been no decrease in the world price of crude rubber since then; instead, the price has increased about 15 percent.

The total cost of crude rubber produced by reasonably efficient growers is about 10 cents a pound delivered in the United States. The average total cost of all producers of crude rubber is probably not in excess of 16 cents a pound.

The rubber position of the United States at present reflects the serious supply problems which we have faced in both the crude rubber and American rubbers, resulting from the unprecedented levels of demand for rubber for current consumption, the scare buying following Korea, the acceleration of buying for strategic stockpiling purposes, both by our Government and by other nations, failure of the Government to maintain the output of American rubbers at the levels recommended in 1948, and the Government's delay in reopening the American rubber facilities which had been placed in mothballs.

During the last year the American people as consumers and as taxpayers for the defense program have paids tens of millions of dollars more for rubber products than would have been the case if our Government had followed the recommendations of the B. F. Goodrich Co. and the rubber industry for sound policies in rubber.

In a letter addressed to Mr. C. E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, dated December 30, 1950, we said:

"Proper perspective on the problem of supply requires that we go back to October 1948 when the rubber industry made a report to Government recommending steps that should be taken to safeguard the rubber security interests of the Nation. The industry report, completely documented statistically, recommended a crude rubber stockpiling program by Government which could have resulted in a combined Government and industry stockpile of almost 900,000 long tons by June 1950, when the Korean War broke out. It further recommended that production of general purpose synthetic rubber by Government should not be permitted to fall below 34,000 long tons a month, and that any excess of production over current synthetic rubber consumption be stockpiled by Government in order to conserve crude rubber in the early stages of any national emergency that might arise.

"None of these recommendations was followed. Crude rubber stockpiling took place at a considerably lower rate than that recommended. No stockpiling of general purpose synthetic rubber was attempted. The production rate of general purpose synthetic rubber was allowed to decline to a postwar low of only 18,100 long tons in January 1950, and working inventories were kept low.

"Alarmed over this precarious supply position, the B. F. Goodrich Co. and the rubber industry early in 1950 urged a rapid step-up in the rate of synthetic rubber production and in the rate of crude rubber stockpile accumulation. Later, on May 8, 1950, the B. F. Goodrich Co. recommenced the immediate reopening of one additional GR–S plant, and shortly thereafter, the reopening of all stand-by GR–S plants. It was not until after the outbreak of the Korean War—in July, actually—that reactivation of one synthetic plant was authorized, and not until September that the remaining stand-by plants were directed to be reopened. To the present time, little substantial relief has resulted from the reactivation of these facilities and it is now estimated that full scale production cannot be attained before April 1951."

It is our conviction that if our Government had carried out the recommendations made in 1948 and those made early in 1950 by the B. F. Goodrich Co., the rubber-supply position of the United States and of the world would now be such that the price of crude rubber would be far more realistic in relation to production costs than the prices prevailing during the last 9 months.

Our company has frequently commented on the exorbitant cost to the American taxpayer of previous cartels in crude rubber organized by foreign governments, which have always resulted in extortionate prices to the consuming countries, of which the United States is by far the largest. Long-time experience dictates that our Government should not participate in any rubber price cartel or fixed-price arrangement.

It is our conviction that the world rubber-supply situation is not nearly so serious as has been publicized and is improving so rapidly that a much lower price for crude rubber will result within the next few months, provided that—

(a) Our country is not involved in a war with Russia;

(b) Our Government does not enter into price cartels with crude-producing nations or into fixed-price arrangements with private producers; and that—

(c) The adequacy of the crude-rubber stockpile already accumulated is realized.

Great progress toward the solution of the rubber-supply situation has already been made. American rubber policy must give full weight to this progress and to its future effects.

Proper evaluation of the facts and estimates stated below will bring policy changes that are needed.

1. THE SUPPLY-DEMAND OUTLOOK FOR 1951

Here are our estimates of world supply and demand for rubbers in 1951. (See table.) These estimates show a world surplus of over 600,000 long tons of rubber this year, after all consumptive needs for both military and civilian products have been filled. Because the United States stocks are already adequate, the indicated surplus should be more than sufficient to supply the possible stockpile requirements of foreign countries.

Estimated world new-rubber supply and consumption, January to December 1951

[Long tons]

	Supply			Consumption [1]			Available for stocks and stockpiling
	Crude	Man-made	Total	United States	Rest of world	Total	
1951							
January	150,000	63,000	213,000	100,000	82,500	182,500	30,500
February	140,000	61,000	201,000	92,000	82,500	174,500	26,500
March	151,000	69,000	220,000	93,500	82,500	176,000	44,000
First quarter	441,000	193,000	634,000	285,500	247,500	533,000	101,000
April	155,000	72,000	227,000	94,500	82,500	177,000	50,000
May	155,000	79,000	234,000	98,000	82,500	180,500	53,500
June	158,000	76,000	234,000	99,000	82,500	181,500	52,500
Second quarter	468,000	227,000	695,000	291,500	247,500	539,000	156,000
July	158,000	80,000	238,000	100,000	80,000	180,000	58,000
August	167,000	80,000	247,000	101,500	80,000	181,500	65,500
September	167,000	80,000	247,000	103,000	80,000	183,000	64,000
Third quarter	492,000	240,000	732,000	304,500	240,000	544,500	187,500
October	167,000	80,000	247,000	104,500	80,000	184,500	62,500
November	166,000	80,000	246,000	106,000	80,000	186,000	60,000
December	166,000	80,000	246,000	108,000	80,000	188,000	58,000
Fourth quarter	499,000	240,000	739,000	318,500	240,000	558,500	180,500
Year 1951	1,900,000	900,000	2,800,000	1,200,000	975,000	2,175,000	625,000

[1] Includes rubber estimated to be consumed in 1951 in the manufacture of military as well as civilian products.

NOTE.—The final disposition of the 625,000 tons apparent excess of world supply over world consumption requirements will depend upon the stockpiling policies pursued by individuals and governments.

These estimates are made on the assumption that war or other events will not interfere with crude rubber production in 1951.

2. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CRUDE RUBBER STOCKPILE OBJECTIVE

The stockpile objective is the keystone of United States of America rubber policy. This objective should now be materially reduced in the light of changed conditions, which differ greatly from the conditions existing when the present objective was established.

These factors are constantly working to make us less dependent on crude rubber.

(a) The present objective includes a provision for sufficient crude rubber to meet consumption requirements during the period when the American rubber plants were being taken out of mothballs. Now that the American rubber facilities are achieving capacity production, this provision is no longer necessary.

(b) Rubber now being converted into finished military products is not being withdrawn from the stockpile but is being supplied from current imports. We estimate that in 1951 there will be 150,000 tons of all types of rubbers used in military products for the defense effort, most of which will not be put into service. That matériel represents a stockpile in being and its rubber content should be included in stockpile totals.

(c) The performance of products made from American-made rubbers is constantly

being improved. New types have been developed. "Cold rubber" is now in mass production and usage. New compounding materials have been discovered. New components are available. New techniques have been tested. The result is that American-made rubbers can now replace crude rubber much more effectively than during World War II. This statement can readily be confirmed by a review of industry and Government test results.

2. INCREASE IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICAN-MADE RUBBER CAPACITY

Our company has already recommended that our American-made rubber capacity be increased by 200,000 tons a year. This increase might be obtainable from existing facilities more quickly and with less expense than if new plants were built. This desirable safety factor would give us protection against bombing and could, during a war, give us capacity to supply the needs of our allies, many of whom have been stockpiling crude rubber.

In summary, the 1951 world supply of new rubber will be by far the largest in history—2,800,000 tons. World consumption needs for both military and essential civilian rubber products in 1951 of 2,175,000 long tons are well within the limits of supply. The great current inflationary force in the crude-rubber market is that of fear-buying of stocks, mainly for strategic purposes, as nations bid against each other for the 625,000 tons surplus. So far as the United States is concerned, such strategic stock accumulation above present stockpile levels is largely based on outdated premises. A realistic current appraisal of strategic stockpile needs, and the provision of a 200-000-ton safety factor in American rubber capacity, would permit natural market forces to eliminate much of the costly inflation now present in the crude-rubber market.

It is for these reasons that the United States should by all means avoid entanglement in a rubber price cartel with the crude-rubber-growing areas or in fixed-price arrangements with private crude-rubber producers. Such arrangements would simply legalize and perpetuate much of the gross inflation now present in the crude-rubber market structure to the continuing detriment of consumers, manufacturers, and defense production, not only in the United States, but throughout the free world.

This problem is of such immediate importance to our entire defense mobilization and economic stabilization programs that prompt understanding and action are essential. We suggest that a meeting be called by you before March 14 in which informed Government and business people may join to consider the facts, to appraise them realistically, and to stimulate action along the lines indicated herein. Copies of this letter are being sent to other interested persons.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN L. COLLYER.

Legislative Program of Regular Veterans Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to the legislative program of the Regular Veterans Association of the United States. This program was adopted by the annual convention of the association last September. There are many points in this program which deserve careful consideration as their enactment would react to the greater benefit of the people of this Nation.

The program follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ADOPTED BY ITS 1950 NATIONAL CONVENTION, SEPTEMBER 23, 1950

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. The immediate enactment of a universal military training law.

2. Mobilization of all material resources for war.

3. Legislation to effectively curb war inflation during the present emergency.

4. An effective national organization for civil defense.

5. Creation of a national committee for the conservation of natural resources.

6. Issuance, by the United States, of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.

7. Issuance, by the United Nations of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.

8. Appropriate United Nations rank for the present commandant of the United Nations forces in Korea.

9. Relentless war on Communist aggression.

10. Extension of all provisions of the GI bill of rights to all veterans of the Korean campaign.

11. Federal income-tax exemptions, the same as was extended to Armed Forces personnel during World War II, for all personnel engaged in the present Korean campaign—said exemptions to be retroactive to the beginning of hostilities and to continue for 1 year after they shall have ended.

12. Free postage for all service personnel during the present Korean campaign

13. Immediate restoration of the World War II allotment system for the dependents of all service personnel.

14. Legislation prohibiting strikes, or mass work stoppages, in time of war or during military campaigns such as the Korean campaign.

15. Extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance coverage to all members of the Armed Forces, drafted for service, with the Federal Government paying the contributions.

16. All commissaries, exchanges, and ship's service stores to be operated strictly on a nonprofit basis and all merchandise sold in them to be exempt from Federal and State tax.

17. National service life insurance to be supplanted with a flat $10,000 death gratuity.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. Continued support of the United Nations.

2. Vigorous fulfillment of our international commitments and agreements.

3. Restricted and screened immigration.

4. Continued cooperation with all nations for the promotion of international peace and the development of backward areas.

AMERICANISM

1. Legislation outlawing the Communist Party, and all other groups who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

2. Unequivocal denial of the right to vote and to hold public office, or to enjoy public employment, to those who are known to oppose our form of government.

3. A stronger Voice of America program and greater efforts to penetrate the iron curtain by educational means.

4. Deportation of all known alien and foreign-born Communists.

5. Praise and continued support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its effective war on communism and subversive groups.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

1. Parity in pensions and disability compensation for all persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States at any time and parity in all widows pensions—and in all pension payments to the dependents of deceased disabled veterans. (S. 727 and H. R. 303.)

2. Service pensions for all veterans who were engaged in hostilities against the hostile natives in the Moro Province and in the islands of Leyte and Samar from July 4, 1902, to January 1, 1914. (S. 432 and H. R. 368.)

3. Vocational rehabilitation for all honorably discharged disabled veterans of the Armed Forces regardless of when the service was performed.

4. Civil service preference, United States Employment Service preference, and preference on relief projects—when they exist—for all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishment.

5. A uniform law and uniform regulations applicable to all disabled tubercular veterans regardless of the date of service. (H. R. 1038, 77th Cong.)

6. Legislation to reduce to 10 percent the disability requirement for entitlement to additional compensation for dependents of veterans.

7. Service pensions for veterans of World War I, and World War II at age 55, in the amount of $55 a month with an increase of $2 a month for each year thereafter.

8. Legislation to increase pension income limitation to $2,000 for veterans, or widow without dependents, and to $3,000 for veteran or widow with dependents.

9. Legislation to exclude commercial insurance payments from consideration as income in determining eligibility for non-service-connected death pensions.

10. Legislation, or an executive directive by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, requiring the Veterans' Administration to accept as evidence, for rating purposes, examinations made at any hospital approved by the American Hospital Association.

11. A substantial raise in pay to VA hospital attendants, especially to those in mental hospitals and contagious disease wards in VA hospitals.

12. Opposing any plan to take from the Veterans' Administration, or its immediate jurisdiction and control, any function of government having to do with veterans.

13. Continued hospitalization, in VA hospitals, for non-service-connected disabilities when facilities are available.

14. Out-patient treatment and medication for veterans receiving part III benefits at VA hospitals.

15. An identification card and lapel button to be furnished all service-connected disabled veterans by the Veterans' Administration.

16. Rescission of VA Circular 25, March 7, 1947, prohibiting VA employees from taking part in veterans' organizations.

17. Legislation requiring the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue explicit instructions that each and every decision of the VA in its agencies of original and appellate jurisdiction be supported by an adequately detailed recitation of the basis of finding of fact and to contain a statement that the policy of resolution of reasonable doubt has been considered.

18. A rating of permanent and total disability for all veterans who have a lung removed.

19. Amendment of R. & P. R. 2676 (b) 4 to permit acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria.

20. The establishment of a VA hospital, for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va., the birthplace of Booker T. Washington.

21. A minimum of 2 prosthetic appliances a year to eligible veterans.

22. A national cemetery in each of the 48 States.

23. Adapted housing for helpless disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment.

24. Adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II, and the present Korean campaign, in the amount of $5 a day for foreign service and $3 a day for home service.

25. Legislation authorizing official representatives of veterans' organizations, accredited by the Veterans Administration, to appear before any unit of the Federal Government on behalf of any veteran when properly empowered by the veteran to do so.

26. Maintenance of the United States soldier's and naval homes in their present locations.

27. First priority for Philippine veterans and their dependents in the settlement of all World War II claims.

28. Compensation and pension for service-connected disabilities are rights and not gratuities. The Regular Veterans' Association of the United States, therefore, urges the immediate enactment of legislation to subject all decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Federal court review.

FRANK E. MCCLERNAN,
National Commander.

Postal Workers Find Themselves in Economic Strait-Jacket: Pay Adjustments and Service Restoration Should Have Immediate Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter I received from Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and an article appearing in the March edition of the Postal Record, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers, written by Mr. James J. Doran, former chief post office inspector, who calls for restoration of postal service curtailed last year.

The letter and article follow:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1951.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: There is herewith attached a reprint of an article appearing in the March edition of the Postal Record, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers. You will note that it is written by Mr. James J. Doran, the recently retired postal executive who succeeded the present Postmaster General in the office of the chief post office inspector. In the light of existing conditions, Mr. Doran's article is both thought-provoking and timely. He clearly indicates in the article that the postal-curtailment orders issued under date of April 17, 1950, were unnecessary and that a report in the hands of the Postmaster General 1 month prior to that date (March 15, 1950) "contradicts the assertions that savings could only be made through curtailments."

On March 6 and 7, 1951, Postmaster General Donaldson appeared before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of the pending rate bill, H. R. 2982, which is designed to increase postal revenues by $163,000,000 annually. When interrogated by committee members as to whether the increase in rates would permit the restoration of postal services to the high standard which prevailed on April 17, 1950, the Postmaster General answered in the negative. He was also queried at considerable length as to whether the rate increases contemplated granting much-needed upward wage revision to the 500,000 postal workers in the field service. Once again his answer was in the negative. In fact, he made the positive statement that neither the requested increase in postage rates nor his budgetary estimates included any provisions for service restoration or pay increases to postal workers.

In view of the foregoing, it is quite apparent that the only hope for restoring the postal service rests with Congress. Accordingly, this association firmly believes that H. R. 2982 and S. 1046 should be amended so as to provide specific instruction to the Postmaster General which would give to the American people the type of postal service to which they have been accustomed over the years.

It is a well-known fact that on December 4, 1950, the Interstate Commerce Commission approved a compromise agreement between the rail carriers and the Post Office Department which amounted to $312,000,000 (ICC Docket No. 9200), covering the period February 19, 1947, through December 31, 1950. That huge sum of money must come from postal revenues which presently fall short of equaling postal expenditures by approximately $500,000,000 each year. We have been reliably informed that public hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission have just been concluded and that additional rate increases will undoubtedly be granted covering the period subsequent to January 1, 1951. Additionally, the Nation's airlines have pending requests before the Civil Aeronautics Board which aggregate in excess of $2,250,000 for transporting United States mails by air. This item, too, if approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, will be charged against the revenue of the Post Office Department and will greatly increase the alleged operating deficit.

Meanwhile, postal workers everywhere find themselves in an economic strait-jacket because of the fact that those in authority, particularly in the Post Office Department, have made no provisions for upward wage adjustments to meet the ever-expanding cost of living. This association firmly believes that both service restoration and pay adjustments must be given immediate consideration. Reports reaching this office almost daily clearly indicate that the personnel turn-over in the field postal service is higher than at any time in history. In Detroit, Mich., alone, 732 employees, or 12 percent of the total personnel, have left the postal service since July 1, 1950. This does not include 104 Detroit postal workers who have entered the military service. Similar conditions prevail in practically all parts of the country.

We implore you to give serious consideration to taking whatever action deemed necessary to provide a complete service restoration and an upward wage adjustment for letter carriers and other postal people. Favorable action on your part will be deeply appreciated.

With every good wish, we are,
Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
D. R. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

OUR PRESENT POSTAL SERVICE

(By James J. Doran)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
January 18, 1951.

MR. JAMES J. DORAN,
Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR MR. DORAN: You are undoubtedly familiar with the present postal curtailment program and the existing controversy resulting from the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950. As one who has spent a lifetime in the United States Postal Service, I am convinced beyond words that a statement from you would be of great importance at this particular time.

I am in a position to publish whatever statement you care to make in the monthly organ of this association, the Postal Record. It goes without saying that whatever your approach to the postal problem, this association will publish your views verbatim.

It is my firm conviction that you will be rendering a great public service by making known your views on the present-day postal system.

With kind regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *February 11, 1951.*

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOHERTY: I have given a great deal of consideration to your letter of January 18, 1951, in which you invite me to make a statement on our present-day postal service to be published in your official organ, the Postal Record. I note that you have agreed that anything I might offer in the way of an article will be published verbatim.

I have decided to accept your offer and I do so in the hope that some part of the article which I will submit may in a small measure lead to a settlement of the present-day postal controversy. Some of my friends will perhaps think that it was unwise on my part to become involved in this controversy, but to those who would form such an opinion, I call their attention to the possibility that any dispute, disagreement, or controversy stands a better chance of being adjusted and settled equitably if all of the truth is known and understood and not just a part of the truth. I believe that I have in my possession and I am setting forth, in the article certain features of the rate situation and the postal curtailment matter that have not been given very much publicity in the past.

I thank you for your offer.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DORAN.

Until shortly after World War II the average American, and in fact all Americans, took our Postal Service for granted. It was looked upon with confidence and faith in its honesty and efficiency. Its rank and file could, if they so desired, boast of a fidelity not easily equalled and never surpassed. If its laws were broken or violated its inspec-

tion service went into action and stayed at it until the law breakers were in custody and punished. It could match its performance with any of its fellows in the National Government and do so without apology or explanation.

It was generally credited with doing a fine job during the war and was praised highly for contributing a great deal to our fighting men's morale by its prompt and efficient handling of the military mail. It did all this in spite of the absence of thousands of its best employees who were in the war. After the war rising costs of operation brought on staggering deficits which aroused Congress and brought considerable criticism from a variety of sources. This made a strange and not easily understood picture—with a less experienced force during the war we were praised; with our experienced and efficient men and women back at work, we were being charged with waste and inefficiency.

There had to be a reason for this change and the reason was not hard to find. The Department wanted a raise in postal rates and the publishers and heavy mail users said, "No. It was not justified. Cut your costs. Put in up-to-date methods. Avoid your duplication. Dispose of useless records," and on and on. The deficit had grown steadily until in each of the fiscal years of 1949 and 1950 it exceeded $550,000,000. All concerned became postal deficit conscious.

The Department and other parts of the Federal Government had been investigated by the Hoover Commission. After the task force that spent the greater part of a year in its work on the Postal Service made its report a claim arose that a yearly savings of more than 200,000,000 was possible if up-to-date methods were used and modern mechanical equipment bought for the field service. This was just the kind of charge the opponents of the increased postal rate bill wanted and they used it to the best of their ability and capacity.

Just about the time it seemed nothing more could happen to or be said about the Postal Service that would add to its worries and troubles, the Post Office Department, yes the Department itself, decided otherwise. The Department reached the conclusion it had to curtail and eliminate Postal Service throughout the country.

Accordingly on April 18, 1950, there appeared in the Postal Bulletin one of the most drastic orders ever written by a Postmaster General. You are familiar with the order which has been properly labeled the curtailment order.

Now for the reasons for the order. The Postmaster General said Congress and the Bureau of Budget have reduced his requests for appropriation by such amounts as to compel a curtailment in postal service all over the Nation. He explained there was no other way in which to meet the situation and the order was placed in effect despite the opposition of Congress, the public, business and the labor unions of postal employees. There had been substantial reduction in the amounts asked by the Department by the House of Representatives, and the Postmaster General took the viewpoint the Department would not be allowed to proceed on a deficit spending basis. The Senate had not yet acted on the appropriation bill.

If I or any other person were to say the order was a mistake, that there were other means of reducing the over-all costs of operating the postal service, and failed to produce evidence to support and substantiate such a contention, you the reader would promptly and properly proceed to the conclusion my views and opinions were worthless. In place of setting my views and opinions on whether the order was a mistake, I am going to place before you facts, clear undisputed facts, all of which have been published by the Department at one time or another. All that is contained in this article is public property and a matter of public record. If perchance some of these public documents conflict with or contradict the efforts and representations of the Department in its fight for higher postal rates, then the Department must truly accept the responsibility so created. And if these public papers or some of them cast an element of doubt on the validity of the Department's case before Congress and the people, then the Department can blame itself for a not too carefully prepared and presented line of evidence to establish the proof that higher rates and service curtailment were absolutely necessary.

Your organization contends the postal establishment is a public service and the need for a balanced postal budget is not as vital as the Department claims. You have called attention to other departments of the National Government that produce little or no revenue and yet obtain their appropriations without apparently too much trouble. All Americans use the postal service. Therefore it is a public service. As to the value of the contention that it should be supported by congressional appropriation regardless of the disparity between income and expense, that at first glance seems a wide departure from what might be considered the good old-fashioned "earn your own keep" American methods. But if we look into the history of the postal service right down to the present moment we find considerable support for that very theory. Yes; the records of the Department will show that more than 39,000 of the more than 41,000 post offices of the country could not operate without what is truly a postal subsidy.

These 39,000 offices are of the second, third, and fourth class and are called district offices. At none of them are the receipts more than $40,000 a year and many have annual revenue of only a few hundred dollars. But they are necessary and perform good service, a service that our people could not and would not be expected to give up. Far from being self-supporting they cause an annual deficit of about $130,000,000 and this does not include the cost of mail transportation to and from these offices. The Department says its mail transportation costs amount to over $420,000,000 a year. It would be difficult to apportion the exact amount of the total transportation charges to these district offices but recalling they are located in 39,000 different places in all 48 States and our possessions, an estimate of $50,000,000, which is slightly over 10 percent of the whole cost, would certainly not seem too high. At any rate a very substantial deficit is to be expected year after year and it can only be met by congressional appropriation.

Suppose the Department got a 20-percent increase in rates, the added revenue at these district offices would amount to probably not more than $10,000,000 unless the rate on first-class matter were raised. All the efforts of the Department up to the recent curtailment order were for increases on everything except first-class mail. Congress can never be expected to hike postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit in these district offices and it should not attempt to do so.

The Postmaster General and other officials of the Department have stated on many occasions that the cost of free postal services to other Government departments and agencies, free-in-county newspaper handling, etc., amounts to $150,000,000 a year. Add this to the annual deficit at the district offices and you have $280,000,000, or more than one-half of the entire postal deficit. And if we add the $50,000,000 (estimated) for mail transportation to these 39,000 offices we have a total of $330,000,000. This amount we will agree takes quite a slice out of the total postal deficit of $570,000,000. And if you add to that the subsidies given the air lines and other carriers of mail, you have accounted for at least four hundred million of the deficit. Subsidies should be recognized and labeled as such, and there is no justification for the postal service being saddled with them. If Congress decides to reduce the amount of postal subsidies given, it can do so by increasing postal rates, but it cannot wipe out either now or in the future the subsidy it is giving to support the district offices.

The 39,000 represents 94 percent of all the offices in our postal service. The other 6 percent make a profit, and they, the 6 percent, were the ones most affected by the curtailment order. If a postal-rate increase is granted it is their profits which will be increased. But it is a fair arrangement to expect the larger offices to produce enough revenue to wipe out the deficit, excluding the $150,000,000, which is the cost of the free services? Any increase in postal rates will be effective at all offices, but unless the Department changes its stand and asks for an increase on letter-mail postage—on which it claims to make a profit—the added revenue at the district offices will be slight compared to that of the 6 percent now more than earning their expenses. Until this subsidy to the postal service is recognized and treated as such and not placed on the mail users at the profit-making offices, there can be little or no hope of proceeding in a fair and equitable manner in this matter of rates. Certain rates should be raised, particularly those on second and fourth class, but all concerned should be certain of the equity involved in the increases requested.

The Department's basis for asking for increase in postal rates is to be found in its cost ascertainment figures and statistics. Cost ascertainment is a time, weight, and count study on all the mail handling and special service operations made at more than 500 offices of all 4 classes located in various parts of the country. From this study the Department puts forth the information that certain specified losses are incurred in handling second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, and all the special services excepting Postal Savings. The opposition to the rate increases, and this opposition is numerous and forceful, says the cost figures are not accurate; that the Department does not know what its costs are, and furthermore it cannot be expected to find out what it costs with relation to each operation are under its present system of cost ascertainment.

Congress has a real interest in the postal service. True it has not passed the rate bill; probably because the Department said we lose so much on each operation and each class of mail except first, but it apparently did not produce enough proof to satisfy Congress on that issue.

The postal service should pay its personnel good wages, better than at present, and improve working conditions where possible; and the personnel owes it to itself, the Department and the people to do the best job possible. Postal employees have a great investment in the service. The best and greatest investment possible. It is themselves as people and their future, and it is upon them that the country must depend for an efficient service. The employee, like the Department must be realistic and recognize conditions and facts as they exist. If they can be changed for the better, well and good. If not, they must be faced. And one of the important facts to face is the cost of operation in the largest offices.

Cost ascertainment figures show there is a difference in cost, a great difference; and, until it is wiped out or plainly explained and accounted for the entire service is on weak

ground in trying to convince anyone, especially Congress and the publishers, that an appreciable boost in rates is justified.

The Department has accepted cost ascertainment figures and bases its efforts for increased rates on these figures. The Department claimed it could not continue to give the country the postal service that was in existence on April 17, 1950, and for some time prior thereto, because it was not getting the money needed for that service and curtailment was the answer to the problem created by reduced appropriations. The head of the Department said he disliked to curtail the service but as the entire postal service was operated economically there was nothing else to do. Savings were not possible in any other way. Sounds reasonable, doesn't it? A frank statement made about a frank and drastic order.

Now, no one who knows the officials and those holding high places in the Cost Ascertainment Division as I do, would charge these officials and employees with a desire to work against the Postmaster General. On the contrary, they are loyal honest people. Their responsibility is to put the data and statistics together in the form of reports of costs on different postal activities. These figures are gathered in the field. Under date of March 15, 1950, such a report was prepared and it was issued about the time of the April 18 bulletin—perhaps a few days later. This particular report contradicts the assertions that savings could only be made through curtailment. Yes (if the report is accurate, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary it should be accepted as accurate), this particular report dealt with the cost of operation in the 20 largest offices of the country. On one item, the cost of handling first-class mail, one office showed a cost of 133 percent more than the one that operated at the least cost. The average cost for the 20 offices was almost double that of the best office. Just imagine spending $5 for a piece of work in one office and getting that same piece of work done in another for $2.75.

Would it seem that savings could be made with such conditions existing? Yes, if the report accurately portrays present conditions and costs in the 20 offices in question, a savings of over $45,000,000 a year could be made in the handling of first-class mail alone. There was no explanation why such difference in operations cost should exist. There are bound to be some differences in costs of many postal activities but any report which showed such glaring disparity costs should be most carefully examined and analyzed before being made public. There were other differences of costs in other operations at these same 20 offices, but I might be considered as trying to build up a case if I offered additional detail. The report in question is not a secret. I am quite sure the congressional committee got copies of it and your organization may also have one.

The question will naturally arise in the minds of men of good sense—was this condition known to the officials of the Department, and, if known, what, if any, action was taken? Let us again look at the record. The report of March 15, 1950, was not the first of its kind to be printed and issued. Others in years and months passed had been distributed and showed similar conditions existing at the time specified on each report. The Department officials were aware of this disparagement in costs for the same kinds of work, and in some of the reports discussions were had on what was termed variables. Variables were introduced to offer some reasons why a difference might justifiably exist. But what kind of a variable it is that permits one office to spend the $5 for the same amount and kind of work and another only $2.75.

Could it be that the over-all management was satisfied to obtain and print cost figures and their related data and then go on to something else? Is it possible that the present postal management considered it had adequately and competently discharged its duties and responsibilities by gathering and publishing these ver detailed reports on the operation costs in the 20 largest offices and then ignored the very conditions its own reports brought to light? If so, the conclusion is and must be there is something wrong in that kind of management.

Each and every matter I have discussed in this article I brought to the attention (in writing) of the present postal management at one time or another. Only two of my memoranda were acknowledged. I felt I owed it to the postal officials to call to their attention the conditions, some of which at least, were in strong contrast to the representations that savings could only be made through curtailment of service. I have always considered it disloyal to keep from my superiors any information which had a bearing on any of their policies or programs. It was a duty to call attention to the unpleasant and contradictory conditions—and one I tried to carry out under all conditions. There may be some who disagree with such procedure.

Don't Send Your Daughter to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 19 I introduced in the House H. R. 2766, a bill to create a Federal corporation for organized recreation of Government employees, with special attention to the metropolitan areas. The same or similar bills were introduced at the same time by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], and in another House by Senators LANGER, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, and MORSE.

Mr. Speaker, it took little persuasion to convince us of the merit—nay, the necessity—of such legislation.

Not even the busy day of a Member of Congress is impervious to the parade of human tragedies running through the daily newspapers of Washington, and of other large cities with heavy concentrations of Federal employees, such as my own city of New York.

CRITICISMS OUTWEIGHED

So far as I am concerned, I believe I am fully aware of the valid criticisms of such a program, and in the balance I find the arguments in its favor far, far outweigh those against.

To my amusement and amazement, I have received some torrid mail, however, opposing the proposal with a violence hardly justified by the earnest good will of the bill's sponsors.

It seems to me fitting that some of the evidence on the side of an authorized, organized, self-sustaining recreation program should be set forth in the RECORD, and I am, accordingly, inserting a straightforward, factual piece of reporting from Liberty magazine, written by Sam Stavisky, veterans' affairs editor of the Washington Post, with whom many of us are personally acquainted:

Two youthful sailors strolling through a downtown Washington park spotted a couple of good-looking girls, exchanged glances, and quickly made a pickup.

In the ensuing conversational byplay, it developed that the girls were fresh out of high school, had come to Washington only a few weeks before from a small town in the Midwest, and had been recruited by the Federal Government to work in Washington as typists. The sailors had been in the Navy for nearly a year, and, so they said, were due to be shipped overseas in a couple of days.

The girls said they had to get back to work, but promised to meet the sailors that night.

"Don't forget," said one of the boys, "This may be your last chance to do something nice for a couple of sailors going off to war, so don't stand us up."

Both girls giggled, and one of them answered: "Don't worry. We'll be here. We'd like some fun too."

This casual incident, which occurred some weeks after the outbreak of the Korean war, was witnessed by a tall, distinguished man who was snatching a few minutes' midday sun on a nearby park bench. He shrugged sorrowfully, then slowly walked to his office across the park.

The pickup incident was related to me several days later by that man, Ray H. Everett, executive secretary of the Washington Social Hygiene Society.

"Maybe nothing more than an evening's innocent fun came out of that pickup," Everett said. "I have no way of knowing.

"I do know that pickup dates are becoming more and more common here as Uncle Sam once again starts to bring thousands of young girls into Washington to work for the mushrooming emergency agencies. And that means more trouble."

Everett knows a little something about trouble. He has devoted half of his 63 years to crusading for intelligent sex education. He has helped more than 20,000 young men and women who have gotten into trouble over sex and marriage. Hundreds of unmarried mothers have come to him in despair to find kindly help and wise guidance.

"During World War II Washington attained the unsavory reputation of being a paradise for pickups, especially for the 40,000 to 50,000 servicemen who poured into the Nation's Capital on week-end leave," Everett said.

"As a result Washington became something of a boomtown for unwed mothers. It still is—with every indication that the tragic situation will get worse."

Ray Everett is an outspoken fellow. But a check-up with officials dealing with maternity and child-welfare problems in the Federal agencies, municipal departments, and private helping-hand organizations leaves no doubt that they also are worried about the shape of things to come.

Why?

Because right now it appears that Uncle Sam has already started to repeat the mistakes of World War II. Already eager-beaver agents from the Department of Defense and the State Department are racing around the countryside pell-mell recruiting a new civilian army of Government girls. Already the young recruits, many enlisted from the high schools, are marching into Washington—and trouble.

It's an ugly fact that the tremendous influx of "G-girls" into Washington during World War II, together with wartime conditions and tensions there, combined to make Washington the Nation's No. 1 boomtown for unwed mothers in 1944.

The records of the National Office of Vital Statistics give evidence that the Nation's

Capital has held on to that unenviable record ever since.

In 1945 Washington's illegitimate babies numbered 105 out of every 1,000 live births; in 1946 there were 98 out of 1,000; in 1947 there were 94 out of 1,000. In every one of those years Washington's illegitimacy ratio has been more than double the national average. The Federal statistics don't go beyond 1947, but the local statistics for the first half of 1950, as collected by the District of Columbia Health Department, indicate that the unmarried mother boom is hitting an all-time high.

Even as the boom expands, approximately 100,000 more G-girls will be herded into Washington—as the mobilization effort intensifies through 1951—to pound the endless rows of typewriters and to cultivate the endless columns of files in ever-burgeoning defense agencies.

These recruits are trooping into a city short of decent housing and short of adequate recreational facilities. They are crowding into a city in which—according to a 1947 Census Bureau survey of Metropolitan Washington—there are five women for every four men 14 to 44 years of age, four women to three men in the 20-to-24 age bracket. The combined shortages—housing, recreational facilities, eligible men—provide a fertile ground for giving another spurt to the boom in unwed mothers.

The same combination of shortages was discovered in Washington by G-girls of World War II, who flocked to the Nation's Capital to do their part. Poor, sometimes vile housing, insufficient recreational outlets, and desperate competition for the available men broke down the unstable girls, mentally and emotionally. Some got in trouble through unwed pregnancy; some with venereal disease. (Oh, yes, the Nation's Capital also has a thriving boom in VD.)

What's in store for Washington—unless corrective measures are taken—can be glimpsed in the report of the Committee on Unmarried Parenthood, D. C. Council of Social Agencies, made late in 1944. It read in part:

"Individual agencies all reported an increase in the number of unmarried mothers coming to them, particularly the young pregnant girl. One agency which had in 1938 accepted for care 16 unmarried mothers and pregnant girls, in 1943 accepted 128. * * * This increase does not allow for those cases which might have been accepted if there had been adequate staff and facilities to meet all requests.

"Most agencies have been experiencing an increase in applications among unmarried mothers who are new settlers in the community, many of these being young Government employees who plan to resume work in the District of Columbia after the birth of their babies and prefer not to return to the place of their legal residence."

The report pointed out that the local agencies, already overburdened with the requests for help from legally resident unwed mothers, were generally unable to assume responsibility for the newcomers. As a result, some of the unwed mothers had to be thrust, along with their illegitimate offspring, back into the community from which they came—and into social ostracism. Because of the legal red tape, lack of funds by the municipal government, indifference and apathy of the Federal Government, the nonresident unmarried mother—the report observed—"is frequently cut adrift from all normal human relationships through which she might receive help."

The situation hasn't changed much since that report was read. The municipal and local Community Chest agencies are still understaffed, overworked, and lacking in funds. And Uncle Sam is still pretty much indifferent to the problem.

Along with illegitimacy, the venereal disease rate also boomed during the war and postwar years in Washington. By 1948, VD was claiming six times as many victims in the District of Columbia as in 1941, with 13,000 cases reported, and 25,000 more cases unreported but suspected by health officials. By 1948, Washington's gonorrhea rate was five and one-half times the national average, with three to four times the number of cases than in cities of comparable population—such as Baltimore, Cleveland, and St. Louis.

Back in 1941 the local Health Department reported that 93 percent of the VD-infected soldiers at Fort Belvoir, Va., and 43 percent of the infected draftees at Fort Meade, Md., blamed Washington girls for their trouble.

Two years later—in 1943—Washington was accused by the Army of infecting twice as many soldiers with VD as any other city.

Now, who do you suppose was blamed for this situation? Street-walkers? Camp-followers? Prostitutes? Not at all. Washington police did a commendable job in cleaning up and eliminating the Capital's bawdy houses.

But the police found themselves helpless in attempting to cope with the "victory-girls," with the "cuddle-bunnies."

Efforts at controlling the amateur boom in illicit sexual relations made little headway. In 1945, the last year of the war, more than 65 percent of GI's infected with VD could blame their disease on amateur carriers. Twenty-four cases of GI gonorrhea were traced to one nice girl, whose promiscuity made her as dangerous to our troops as a full battalion of enemy soldiers on the front line.

The Washington Federation of Churches investigated the problem during the war and came up with the conclusion that 80 percent of infections among GI's were attributable to the young innocent-type of girl. The local Criminal Justice Association found that the sharp increase in juvenile delinquency was due to the uniform-happy girls who feel they can't say "No" to a soldier.

Several times during the Second World War, congressional committees took a hurried glance into the shameful conditions, but did little or nothing about it. Testimony before these committees, however, demonstrated that Uncle Sam was largely to blame.

There's no question but that Uncle Sam needed woman-power to run the vast network of records-and-red-tape mills in Washington during the war. But in its rush to bring the girls into the Nation's capital, Uncle Sam took a callous attitude toward his employees. The Federal agencies and their recruiters made no attempt to screen the girls, but instead hired anyone who could distinguish a filing cabinet from a typewriter.

In at least two cases, according to the Women's Bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, female inmates of mental institutions, who had written war agencies for jobs, were wired to report for work in Washington.

Testimony before congressional committees, presented by Dr. Winifred Overholser, superintendent of famed St. Elizabeths mental hospital, made it clear that Uncle Sam's indiscriminate hiring program during World War II brought hundreds of mentally and emotionally unstable girls into Washington at a time when the economic and social tensions were at their worst.

"Too many of the girls brought here were young adolescents not very well adjusted, who found the excitement of wartime Washington conducive to recklessness," observes Miss Patricia Morss, license officer of the District Public Welfare Department.

Instead of glamour, the girls discovered Washington was a place where the abnormally high cost of living nullified what looked to them like high salaries. Decent quarters were hard to obtain, and even poor quarters were expensive. The files of the Community Chest agencies and municipal welfare units abound with instances of a half dozen or more Government girls being jammed into a single cellar or attic room at $25 or more a month for each girl.

When the situation got desperate, the Federal Government was panicked into throwing up dormitories for the girls. By the end of the war, some 11,000 girls were living in the dorms. Some of the units, like Arlington Farms, with a capacity of 4,200 residents, also provided excellent, if isolated, recreational facilities for the girls.

Now, however, Uncle Sam is back where he started on the housing problem. Housing facilities for G-girls have been sold to private interests, converted into office space for blossoming "cold war" agencies, or given over to the rapidly expanding Armed Forces. Along with the housing went some of the best recreational facilities. So, with the new crop of G-girls streaming in, the housing situation is just about where it was before World War II broke out.

Dorothea Andrews, social welfare writer for the Washington Post, in a 1949 study of unmarried parenthood in the Nation's Capital, points up the fact that Washington adds its own factor to unwed motherhood—loneliness.

"In a town where there is a preponderance of women over men, a woman is in heavier competition for a social life," commented Miss Andrews. "If the newcomer doesn't get the opportunity to meet single men, she may become involved with a married man."

The Andrews study disclosed that of those girls in trouble who came to local agencies for help, 50 percent were Government girls. Social workers agree, Miss Andrews said, that the girls seeking help were coming from an increasingly higher intelligence-level group, and that in most cases, promiscuity was the exception rather than the rule.

Of course, it is true that good housing, adequate recreational facilities, and the opportunity to meet single men won't stop girls from getting into trouble. But as Capt. Rhoda Milliken, of the Women's Bureau, points out, these three things will help prevent a number of individual tragedies.

Miss Milliken, who has spent a good part of her life dealing with so-called bad girls, urged the Federal Government in the pre-World War II days to screen G-girl recruits in order to weed out many of these mentally and emotionally unstable. The reply from the war agencies then was that the suggestion was "impractical."

Recently, Ray Everett, of the Social Hygiene Society, issued a strong statement warning the Federal agencies that their recruiting drives were duplicating the ballyhoo and repeating the take-one, take-all mistakes of World War II. "There were too many needless home-front casualties," he said.

Reaction of the Federal agencies to the renewed suggestions for screening girl recruits ranged from indifference to apathy. I asked the personnel chief of a major agency what he thought of the screening suggestion. The personnel director laughed at the idea.

"Look," he said, "our recruiters are given 2 or 3 weeks training before they're sent into the field. They're supposed to evaluate the girls when they interview them. * * * You certainly don't expect each girl to be examined by a psychiatrist, do you? * * * Why, we don't know which of the girls will crack up until they get here. Besides, how do we know she didn't get into trouble back at home. * * * Social hygiene education? That's a waste of time. Most of the girls know where babies come from."

Proponents of screening argue that the idea is not at all impractical. They point

out that draftees are given quickie mental-stability tests prior to induction, and that only the borderline cases have to be sent to a psychiatrist. They point out, too, that checks on mental and emotional stability for the girl recruits can be made—if the recruiters will put in the time—through the girls' teachers and ministers, through the social-service agencies in her community.

A check with the Civil Service Commission and the agencies which do their own hiring indicates that, arguments or not, screening of the G-girls is not planned. A check of the Federal housing agencies indicates that provision for good, inexpensive housing for the G-girls is not planned. Ditto on recreation. At this writing, there's nothing in the works to prevent the extra troubles most everybody expects.

Right now it's a sure bet that Washington will not only retain its scandalous title as the Nation's No. 1 boom town for unwed mothers, but will even establish a more disgraceful record in the war-scare months to come.

Fair Employment Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject Fair Employment Practices, the Essential Ingredient of Democracy, delivered at Indianapolis, Ind., by Mrs. Mahala Ashley Dickerson, an attorney of Montgomery, Ala.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES, THE ESSENTIAL INGREDIENTS OF DEMOCRACY

The founding fathers of this country entered upon a way of life with unbounded frontiers. There was always a new wide open space in which one could sow his seeds and watch his plants grow; set his traps and lift from them their game. The prior inhabitants of this land were pushed further and further back if their presence proved, in any way, thwarting to the pattern of the pioneers.

The framers of the Constitution of this country framed it for a civilization with much wide open space—space where the individual could do much as he pleased as long as he regarded the rights of others to do almost the same thing. That was freedom.

This very latitude in the early development of this country permitted the gradual crystallization of much injustice; for example, almost the extinction of a race once holding it completely, and the enslaving of another brought to it in chains, to help to build its dynasties, which were considered a part of that individual freedom, inherent in the rights of the pioneer.

This country, allegedly founded to perpetuate and enlarge Christendom, in the process of its maturity, has, bit by bit, revised its laws and constitutions to make for "a more perfect union * * * insure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity."

Yes; by constitutional enactments and judicial decisions, many inequities in the eyes of the law have been removed. Our shores have become havens of refuge for the oppressed of all lands. Fundamentally, there survives much of the early American sprit of "America, the land of opportunity." However, one fundamental ingredient, which held a place of equal dignity, with "the right to worship God as we please," is missing, that is: "the right to work."

Unfortunately, the days of homesteading on the physical frontiers are over. This country is controlled by an intricate economic system—a system which hums to the tune of corporations, stock, bonds, debentures, mines, minerals, farms, and the like. In addition, we recognize the fact that the Federal Government conducts a momentous business and that each State has a full force of employees, as had each municipality.

Unfortunately, the geographical location of the corporations, mines, minerals, farms, yes, even the State, Federal, or municipal agency, is largely determinative of whether or not all United States citizens are allowed to work there, or, if allowed, in what capacity. Yet, all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States, and of the State in which they reside. If a citizen, though competent to perform a task, is deprived of the opportunity because of race, religion, or parental origin, this fundamental ingredient of democracy has been suppressed.

The victims of willful rejection and deprivation, this disinherited group, may be followed into the various frustrated channels of all society. Many are in the prisons; many are in the sanitariums; yes, many are in our Armed Forces, not because they liked army life or were drafted, but because they could not find a job at home. Many, after the particular crisis, which prompted the enlistment ended, never returned home, or for that matter, to this country. They preferred anonymity in a strange land to the embarrassing experience of job seeking, and the endless shakes of the head which they knew were prompted solely because of race, religion, or parental origin.

Yet, these same citizens are expected to pledge and maintain the same allegiance to this country's flag, contribute to its same organized charities, which often do not permit a member of the rejected group to hold a job on their staffs, pay State and Federal taxes to help support the offices from which they are excluded. A loyalty built on such an uncertain basis would appear easily shaken. The more men suffer the more they think. Perhaps the failure of mass rebellion of the disinherited groups has resulted from only slight suffering here and there or an inability to think in a logical manner because of not having once had a spark or hint of anything different or better.

Today, the world is in a turmoil. The world will decide before too many years have passed whether or not the two major forms of government battling each other can survive side by side or will have one engulfed by the other. Whether integrity, loyalty, patriotism, and the like can survive rejection and discrimination becomes a problem. Yet, more pressing is the problem of whether these concepts can survive hunger, perpetual want, and other vital deprivations arising naturally from the denial of the right to work. Whether this denial comes from a Federal agency, a State agency, a municipal agency, or private enterprise, operating by virtue of a franchise emitting from one of the afore-mentioned, it is nevertheless an un-American act, destructive of a democratic way of life.

The mills of the gods grind slowly and our own country is now playing a crucial role in the upward or downward trend of the infiltration of various sentiments into the hearts and minds of its citizens. Never before has the United States had such an opportunity through its citizens to win so completely a world-wide victory; by making democracy work at home, by insuring one fundamental right to all of its very own—a right which they could all, despite inability to comprehend a nebulous foreign policy, understand—the right to work.

Ability knows no color line, as was recently demonstrated by the Crispus Attucks Tigers. At this time they are the standard bearers for all the high schools of this great city. The American spirit of fair play, so aptly asserting itself in the world of sports, should not be suppressed in our economic system. Here, too, the basis should be merit, and merit alone.

Plight of Small-Business Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the plight of many small-business men is very serious today. Inability to obtain highly needed materials is bringing many of them to the verge of ruin. One of them has written to me as follows:

It is difficult to preserve any faith in the present administrators of government in the face of the shameful publicity coming out of Washington and the utter lack of evidence that a unified, realistic, well-organized approach is being made toward solving the internal affairs of our country.

This gentleman has sent me two articles by Denny Allen which relate to the question of material shortages as it affects the small-business men. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAPE STRANGULATION, STEEL STARVATION KILL QUINCY MAN'S BOILER BUSINESS

(By Denny Allen)

The squeeze is on—and getting tighter—for the small-business man.

He's being swamped, his business imperiled, by a wave of Government controls, red tape and scarcity of raw materials, all created by the defense economy. He's a victim of the Nation's transition from civilian to war production.

FALLING BY WAYSIDE

At a time when business could be thriving in an expanding market, small-scale manufacturers along the South Shore are finding themselves up to their necks in a struggle to keep going. Some are beginning to succumb to the undertow.

Especially hard hit are the small companies which use steel and other metals as a basic production item. They can't get raw materials for civilian production and are caught in a time lag in which they can only hope for future subcontracts on defense projects.

One such case—and it's a drastic one—is that of the Arc-Way Steel Boiler Co., owned by F. Ray Robinson, of 128 Spring Street, Quincy. The squeeze is driving him right out of the business which he spent years in developing.

Robinson's plant is at 20 Ericsson Street in Neponset, a building he purchased from

the old Lawley shipyard when it closed down after the war. He manufactures (when he can get materials) some 40 types of oil-fed and gas-fed steel boilers and a comparatively new product, a poultry cremator for which there is a national demand.

TO BE SOLD AT AUCTION

But he's going out of busin .s. His plant and machinery are to be sold at public auction next week in a complete liquidation of the company.

Robinson's problem is the same as all small manufacturers. Production has been reduced to a trickle because metals aren't available. What's more, defense subcontracts are still several months off. Anticipating them in a highly competitive field is a risky proposition.

For 5 months, the company has been at work, filling out forms and making contacts in hopes of getting some defense work, but there hasn't been any given out in the steel prefabricating line. It probably will be June or after before the situation breaks.

Even if defense orders were available, the present system of allocation carries no guaranty that a manufacturer could get raw materials. True, he would have a defense order (DO), but mills and warehouses are selling available materials to the first fellow who comes with a DO. Later arrivals are out of luck.

By summer, the Government hopes to set up a controlled materials plan which would establish necessary priorities, but that will be too late for Robinson and others like him.

MILLS WON'T TAKE ORDERS

Big business, with its resources, connections and wherewithal, may be able to hang on, but the sag in civilian production is killing the Arc-Way Steel Boiler Co.

"We can't get the materials. The mills won't even take our orders," he said.

"The black market? Yes, we can get all the steel we want at black market prices, but then we couldn't sell our product because the cost to the consumer would be too high."

For example, he explained, the maximum price his company can pay for steel boiler plate is 7.5 cents a pound. The black market boys are asking from 10 to 20 cents a pound.

Robinson is proud of his products—the steel boilers which he says are about half the size, yet close to three times as efficient as the old-type cast-iron boilers. He could build them at the rate of one every 20 minutes if he had the materials.

ORDERS FOR 200

The poultry cremator, invented by a New Hampshire man with Robinson aiding the development, is something new with great promise. It is for use around poultry farms and hatcheries where the disposal of dead poultry and refuse has always been a health problem.

"We've sold 50 already and have orders for 200 more. The orders would go on indefinitely but we can't get the steel," said Robinson. Of the 200 on order, he hopes to complete 20. The plant, even at present, could turn out 10 a day—again if materials were obtainable.

But they're not, so the Arc-Way Steel Boiler Co is going on the auction block on February 28 at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The building, land, machinery, and everything else will be offered for sale.

"It would be an excellent opportunity for someone," said Robinson. "The right people with the right connections could have a fine business."

But for Robinson, the end of his career as a manufacturer is at hand. How many more small businesses will follow suit in the "big squeeze" remains to be seen.

DEFENSE MUDDLE HITS BRAINTREE TOOL PLANT

(By Denny Allen)

"Us little fellows are really getting booted around. Those people in Washington do not care what happens to us."

TOUGH SITUATION

Thus spoke today another of the small-scale manufacturers along the South Shore who are facing extinction in the Nation's jerky jump from civilian to defense production.

"It is a tough and nasty situation," mourned Frank Albertassi, an official of the Corey Tool & Machine Co., of 21 Granite Street, Braintree.

"I have got 17 men I do not know what to do with when we finish the work now on hand. We cannot get the materials or the machines to do our own work and there is not too much defense work around yet."

Pessimistic about the future, Albertassi voiced a lament that is common with little-business men today, especially those who need a steady flow of steel and other materials to stay in business.

Since the Government began cutbacks in civilian production to bolster the defense program, a time lag before defense contracts appear has pushed many manufacturers into an enforced business slump.

Production has dropped off because materials are not available and the jobs of employees are being either wiped out or seriously jeopardized.

NATIONAL CONCERN

The situation is one of national concern. Manufacturers by the thousands are facing an uncertain future that may bring idle plants and a serious unemployment problem.

As a result, Washington officials are under heavy pressure to reduce the stockpiling of materials and lessen the severity of the time lag until defense contracts are placed in sufficient volume.

"Even at that we have been luckier than some," said Albertassi, whose company makes special tools for such customers as the Pneumatic Scale Corp. in North Quincy and the Armstrong Cork Co. plant in South Braintree. Albertassi is a partner in the Corey concern with his son James and William Bemis, also of Braintree.

"We saw it coming 4 or 5 months ago and stocked up, but it is all gone now," he said. "It is really getting bad."

Getting materials today, he explained, amounts to a scramble, picking up 100 pounds or so wherever it can be found.

"It is a funny thing," he said. "Three months ago we used to have salesmen coming in here trying to sell us stainless steel. Now we cannot buy it, yet there are not many defense contracts around, so where is the steel going?"

GREY MARKET

One of the answers, he agreed, is the so-called grey market where a manufacturer can buy just about any type of metal he wants at double the normal price.

How about the prospect of defense work?

"We really do not know because we have not been out looking," said Albertassi. "We have been very busy with our own work for 2 or 3 years. But from what I can see, there is not too much defense work around for companies like ours."

During World War II, the Corey Co. did much work for the Army and Navy on the manufacture of special tools. But the prospects of returning to that work are not very bright.

"Practically all of the skilled personnel we had in those days are gone now," Albertassi decalred. "Only one of them is still with us.

"You can quote me. It is a tough and nasty situation."

Underemployment of Rural Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farm Unemployment," published in the Washington Post, March 19, 1951. This editorial discusses materials prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee's staff and published as a committee print February 2, 1951, under the title "Underemployment of Rural Families." I understand that the committee still has available a few copies, which will be distributed on an individual basis as long as the supply lasts.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the findings of this staff study. I wish to state that this report grew out of the recommendations for further study of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families, under my chairmanship. This study is not to be considered a report of the committee. It does not represent the conclusions of the committee or any of its members, but simply attempts to present a factual review of available material on the important economic problem of rural low-income families. The study was prepared by Dr. Walter W. Wilcox, on loan from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and Dr. W. E. Hendrix, on leave from the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station. Other members of the committee's staff have subjected it to close scrutiny.

There being no objection, the editorial and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 19, 1951]

FARM UNDEREMPLOYMENT

A report prepared for the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report states that 2,000,000 small-farm families, or more than a third of all farm families, are underemployed. Workers on these small farms produce less than half as much as those operating medium-sized family farms. Another million and a half nonfarm workers living in the country or in small towns are only 60 percent as productive as workers in the average rural nonfarm family. If all these underemployed workers had jobs enabling them to produce as much as the average worker on medium-sized family farms or the average rural nonfarm worker, the investigators conclude that the increase in output would in effect add 2,500,000 workers to the country's labor force.

This rural underemployment is Nationwide. Evidence gathered by the committee from all parts of the country is a salutary reminder that we need a point 4 program of our own to make more efficient use of our manpower resources. Although Federal educational and credit programs aid some of these low-income underemployed farm families, the report points out that there is "no clearly defined (national) policy for dealing

specifically with rural underemployment and the low-income problem in agriculture on a comprehensive basis including both farm and nonfarm adjustments."

The investigators stress in particular the need for a vigorous farm enlargement program. That is of major importance since inadequate acreage accounts for a great deal of the prevailing underemployment. However, the job is considered too large an undertaking for the Government alone. The report advocates integration of educational programs carried on by the Government with a farm-enlargement loan program carried on by private agencies.

Loans are needed, too, to improve farm practices and help underemployed farmers to obtain employment elsewhere. Of course, these proposals would entail considerable outlays by lending agencies, but expenditures would be spread over a long period of time and would yield dividends through an increase in the earning capacity of several million Americans. A country that has spent billions of dollars to further recovery (i. e., increase the productivity) of Western European workers has no excuse for ignoring the exigent needs of the underprivileged at home.

SUMMARY OF UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF RURAL FAMILIES

(Prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee staff)

Two million of nearly six million farm operator families are now producing less than $1,800 each per year in farm products, including products used in the home. In addition to these farm families, there are 3,531,000 rural nonfarm families, 1,500,000 of whom had annual incomes of less than $2,000 in 1948. The staff study, which is an outgrowth of studies conducted by the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families last year, shows how the welfare of these 3,530,000 rural families may be improved while at the same time adding the equivalent of nearly 2,500,000 workers to our national labor force.

The report presents new information on the extent of underemployment among rural families, what existing governmental programs are now doing to improve the lot of the underemployed farm family, and lists the results of questions directed to technicians in various States as to the extent, causes and remedies for underemployment of farm families in their areas. The Nationwide character of the problem of rural underemployment is demonstrated by the fact that the subcommittee received replies from respondents in 37 States.

The report points out that there are four general areas for improvement of the underemployed rural worker:

1. Increase the productivity per worker on existing farms: On small, inadequate farming units crop yields are lower and milk production per cow and egg production per hen are lower than on the nearby larger farms. Families on these farming units are usually hard-pressed for money to spend for seeds, fertilizers, foundation livestock, and supplies for disease and insect control. Lacking alternative means for employment these families, instead of moving, adjust themselves to the limited resources at hand.

2. Increase the size of the farm: Even with the adoption of improved practices, if existing units are not enlarged workers can only increase their productivity by 50 to 100 percent. These small-scale units would have to increase their output by an average of 300 percent to equal the modest level of output on medium-sized commercial family farms. To reach that level fully 60 percent of the present small farm units must be increased in size or consolidated with other farms.

3. Assist families who desire farm or nonfarm employment outside their home communities: In spite of substantial outward migration the reduction in population pressure in communities of low-income underemployed rural families has been only about 10 percent in the last decade. Although in some instances new industries have been established nearby, opportunities for off-farm employment are only a small fraction of the number needed to provide full employment for the available able-bodied manpower of working age.

4. Increase employment opportunities for low-income part-time farmers, rural nonfarm families, and hired farm workers: The 1,900,000 part-time farm and rural nonfarm families where the head of the family is able-bodied and of working age, either underemployed or employed on low-productivity jobs, exceeds the number of full-time farm families who are underemployed.

The study goes on to give a number of specific suggestions to carry out the recommendations listed above, including:

(a) A cooperative State and Federal program of substantial assistance to counties having high proportions of underemployed rural families to provide: (1) Special technical assistance on more efficient farming practices; (2) Technical assistance to help people in these communities determine alternative employment opportunities and to provide them with skills to take advantage of these opportunities.

(b) Plans for stimulating increased private credit for improved farming practices, including farm enlargement.

(c) Proposals, in the light of current manpower shortages, to provide substantial defense credit and grants to supplement private credit for improved farming practices, for farm enlargement, and for moving costs of families desiring employment in other communities.

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Union," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC UNION

When the friends and supporters of a Federal union of the Atlantic Pact nations gathered last week to promote their cause, they could point to a general tide moving in their direction. The Atlantic Pact contains many hints of an ultimate union; and Russia's continued intransigence has given these a new emphasis. General Eisenhower represents a unified military policy, while a federation of Western European states continues to develop on functional lines. The Schuman plan is the boldest initiative of this kind; and the efforts of American officials to secure its adoption indicate the extent to which we are bound up in a wide community of interests.

Ex-Secretary of War Patterson, Senators Kefauver and Gillette, and other speakers at the impressive annual dinner could draw upon recent events to fortify their case. The successes and the set-backs in Korea, the immense efforts and the considerable difficulties of General Eisenhower's mission, all can be taken to illustrate the need for some form of closer political ties. A resolution calling for an international convention to discuss implementation of this need has received substantial support in both Houses of Congress. For the moment, however, there undoubtedly is a desire among many world-minded statesmen to focus attention on reinforcing General Eisenhower's command rather than to raise other far-reaching and controversial questions. The immediate task is to prove that there exists among the people a widespread and profound desire for a larger union; and this the Atlantic Union Committee is prepared to undertake. It is a great task worthy of the efforts of the best men.

Back to the Day of the Serf and Peasant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Americans, we are told, have fought two wars to preserve civilization, prevent a return to the Dark Ages.

As your sons, husbands, and fathers, some who have served before, are marching off to world war III, should we not be told where they will be required to fight, for what purpose, what battles they must win before the war is over?

Are we back in the days when the feudal lords decided when a war—either for gain or just for the pleasure of fighting—should be fought by their serfs?

Those serfs neither knew why they were fighting, where they were to fight, nor when the war would end. They were a little worse off than are our conscripted men of today, for they were required, to some extent, to equip themselves for the fighting. Our conscripted men are a little better off, for munitions of war, their food, clothing, and transportation, are provided by the taxpayers. But they have little, if any, more knowledge of where they are going or why—or when the war will be over for those who survive—than did those who fought 600 years ago.

The men of those days did, however, at least know that they were fighting for and under the command of their feudal lord. The soldiers of old followed their lord and master and his flag into battle. Our men, as they leave their home shores, sail out under the Stars and Stripes, the flag which for more than 160 years has, to the people of all the world, been the symbol of liberty, identifying the land of freedom and opportunity.

But, under the present procedure, when they leave the homeland and become a part of world war III they will find themselves serving under the flag of United Nations, in a force whose commander is a general or an admiral who takes his orders either from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or United Nations. The soldier of 600 years ago was subject to the orders of his lord. The American boy of today, when he reaches the battleground where he must

fight—perhaps die—will go forward, will withdraw—on the orders of United Nations.

United Nations is a group made up of representatives of 59 nations, with a Security Council of 11 members—a Security Council which dictates when and where our men shall fight and for what purpose.

Do you realize that there is a plan which will authorize the drafting of every physically and mentally fit American male, as he reaches the age of 18½ years, for a period of 26 months, with a further obligation to serve in the active or reserve forces for an additional 6 years—a total of 8 years and 2 months in military service?

Do you realize that Mr. Truman proposes to create an army of at least 4,000,000 men? That he contemplates sending as many million of our men to Korea and to Europe as the Security Council—not Congress—thinks may be necessary to accomplish its purpose—whatever that may be? That they will serve under the command and flag of the United Nations?

When our forefathers were fighting for their liberty George III of England, who wished to prevent the establishment of our Republic, hired the Hessians—trained mercenary soldiers—to fight for him in the Revolutionary War. King George paid the landgraves, princes, and dukes of the German states for the services of those Hessians in an effort to throttle liberty.

Today, Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson are sending American men to fight for United Nations. The administration is not paid for the services of these men who fight and die abroad—they fight, suffer, and some die, not for home, fireside, or country, but for United Nations. The administration has the effrontery to tell us that these wars are necessary for our own protection.

But never yet has Mr. Truman, Mr. Acheson, nor anyone else told those who are paying the cost, doing the fighting, just what it is that these men, sent abroad to fight under the orders of United Nations, must do, which, having done, the war will end, peace will be established and those who survive may come home—live their own lives in their own way.

Are not the American people entitled to an answer to that question before more of their men are conscripted, march off to fight in world war III?

State Legislative Program of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the New York State legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, adopted December 20, 1950:

STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK, FOR 1951

1. Rent control: Every housewife and every tenant knows that our people are the victims of inflation at home. The two enemies that must be defeated are inflation and communism. The rising cost of living must be held in check, and a major factor in the cost of living is rents. A first order of business of the new legislature should be the enactment of a fair rent-control law to prohibit the imposition of unfair rent increases by landlords.

We have repeatedly pointed out that residents of the city of New York have been the subject of fantastic increases in garage rentals, in some cases amounting to 315 percent. The legislature has repeatedly refused to plug this hole in the rent control laws. We urge again that the rent control laws be amended so as to control specifically garage rentals, and thus put an end to this abuse on automobile owners.

2. Increased aid to municipalities: The legislature should enact laws giving a fair share of the taxes collected by the State paid by the residents of the city of New York and other cities to those municipalities.

3. Public schools: In terms of per capita expenditure, and facilities available to the total population, New York State ranks far below its proper place. Our cities lack adequate and modern public schools, and existing schools are overcrowded. The salaries paid to public school teachers are far below what is needed by them to maintain a fair standard of living. A broad program of legislation should be adopted to give all communities in the State adequate and modern schools and to insure a decent standard of living for our teachers. The incoming legislature should remain in session until such a program has been adopted.

4. Primaries: Under existing law candidates for nomination to offices filled by a State-wide election are nominated by State conventions. It is notorious that such conventions are controlled conventions and that the candidates for election to such offices as Governor, United States Senator, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, and Comptroller are selected by a handful of party bosses. Few of the candidates nominated at such conventions in recent years would have been nominated by party primaries of either party. To us such a system is not in accord with our concept of the democratic way of life. We urge that, as in many other States, a direct primary law be enacted so that the candidates for offices to be filled by a State-wide election will be selected by State-wide primaries. Only this way can the right of the people to select their officers be insured.

5. Boards of election: The election law at the present time provides that the board of elections in the city of New York shall be selected by the Democratic and Republican County Committees of New York County and Kings County. For years the people of the counties of Bronx, Richmond, and Queens have been thus deprived of representation in the board of elections, and appointments to that board have become party plums to be distributed by political bosses. The board of elections, charged with maintaining the integrity of our elective processes, is truly the watchdog of our liberties. We urge that the election law be amended so as to provide for the election of members of the board of elections by city-wide primary elections of the two major parties.

6. Eighteen-year-old ballot: With the drafting of 18-year-old boys to fight in Korea, emphasis is again laid upon the inequity of our present law which says that citizens who are old enough to fight are not old enough to vote. New York should follow the lead of other States and enact legislation conferring the ballot at the age of 18.

7. Divorce law revision: We have for many years called attention to the scandal of our present divorce laws which breed perjury and rampant fraud. The so-called strict divorce law of New York has actually resulted in New York becoming one of the easiest of divorce States, and has seriously weakened the integrity of our system of justice. New York needs new laws relating to the family, marriage, and divorce under which our courts will be given adequate staffs to permit them to ascertain the causes of family difficulties and to work out solutions which will permit the court to effect reconciliations and save marriages. We again urge the creation by the legislature of a commission composed of representatives of the three principal faiths of the State, of doctors, sociologists, women, bench and bar to evolve for New York State a model family law including divorce, separation, annulment, marriage, and related matters. We urge the enactment by New York of the Uniform Divorce Recognition Act to put an end to fraudulent out-of-State divorces.

8. Family court: Today there is confusion in the courts as to family matters. The supreme court has jurisdiction in divorce, separation, and annulment matters, and is not equipped with the staff to permit it to discharge its responsibilities adequately. The surrogates have jurisdiction in adoption matters. The so-called domestic relations court handles primarily support cases, and juvenile problems. Still other family matters are handled elsewhere. Paternity cases are handled in the court of special sessions, and other matters in the magistrates courts. All of these matters should be handled and centered in a single family court, and we urge the enactment of laws to that end.

9. Court unification and simplification: In other matters too we are afflicted with an ancient and unwieldy court structure. The Supreme Court of the State is congested with many more cases than can possibly be handled by its judges, and justice is frustrated by delays of years in between the commencement of an action and the time that it comes to trial. Other courts such as the city court, the municipal court, and the court of general sessions do not today have a sufficient volume of business to keep their judges busy, and those judges are not now permitted to serve in other courts where they are needed. Our entire court structure should be overhauled so as to provide for a better utilization of our judge power, and to furnish the people with a more efficient administration of justice.

10. Judges and political office: The State constitution today effectively prohibits judges of the court of appeals and justices of the supreme court from running for political office without resigning from the bench. Such a rule is consistent with the canons of judicial ethics which are aimed at preventing judges from using their judicial office for political purposes. Yet judges of other courts of the State are, under existing law, free to run for political office without resigning from the bench and many have returned to judicial duties after active political campaigns and defeats at the polls. To keep politics out of our courts, the constitutional prohibitions should be extended to all judges of all courts of record in the State.

11. Unemployment insurance: The benefits of the unemployment insurance law should be extended to classes not now covered by it, and should also be made available to the sick.

12. Reapportionment: The incoming legislature is charged with responsibility for a reapportionment of the State's congressional districts. This becomes a heavy responsibility since New York's representation in the Eighty-third Congress is to be reduced. Congressional reapportionment should be done

on a nonpartisan basis and with the purpose of insuring that each of the State's 43 congressional districts will contain an equal population. Gerrymandering should be avoided.

Reapportionment of the State legislature is also a pressing problem. For many years restrictive laws have prevented the people of the cities of the State, including the city of New York, from having fair and equal representation in the legislature. A new law should be enacted to provide that all sections of the State will be represented in the legislature on the basis of population in accord with the basic principles of democratic government.

13. Motor vehicles: We are opposed to the use of revenues obtained from gasoline taxes and automobile license fees for purposes other than the development and maintenance of an adequate system of highways. We advocate the abolition of toll roads and the issuance of permanent automobile license plates. We urge that the discriminatory gasoline tax in favor of nonautomotive users of gasoline be abolished, and that industrial users of gasoline be subjected to the same tax as motorists. We oppose a use tax on automobiles.

14. Recognition of women voters: Although they constitute more than half of the electorate, there are few major State, city, or county offices which are held by women. We advocate the nomination, appointment, and election of qualified women to a fair share of city, State, and county offices, and we call upon Democratic leaders in the State to give such representation to women wherever possible.

15. Narcotics: We favor the enactment of a law providing for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts by State agencies, and the taking of all necessary steps by the State to eliminate the traffic in narcotics.

16. Little Hoover Commission: Enactment of a bill for a little Hoover Commission, to be patterned after the Federal Hoover Commission, is recommended.

17. Permanent personal registration: It is urgent that legislation be enacted to provide for permanent personal registration throughout the State.

18. Refusal to waive immunity: We urge that the present laws which provide that a Government official or employee who refuses to testify in any proceeding on the ground that his testimony will incriminate him shall thereafter be barred from public employment, shall be extended to retired Government officials or employees, and that the pension rights of all such retired Government officials or employees shall terminate upon such refusal to testify.

19. Communism: We abhor communism in all its manifestations, and we urge that all steps be taken by the legislature necessary to root it out and expell it from our State. We are opposed to the employment of Communists in our National, State, or local Governments. The danger to our democratic way of life does not come only from abroad. There are some misguided citizens and resident aliens who call themselves Americans who have lent themselves and their energies to foreign doctrine and to foreign aggressors who seek to stamp out democracy in our country. We cannot afford to have an American Gottwald or an American Quisling, and we must take all steps that our Constitution permits to make sure that we do not have one. At the same time, we must apply traditional American methods in ferreting out and removing such persons. It is clear to us that the members, both open and concealed, of the American Communist Party are, in fact, the willing agents of a foreign government committed to interfere with and disrupt our domestic affairs. We must deal with them as such.

20. United Nations: We again support to the fullest extent the United Nations, and advocate strengthening it so that it may make and enforce wise judgments and keep the peace of the world. We endorse the flying on the public buildings of our States the United Nations flag, to the left of our own American flag, as a symbol of our Nation's support of the United Nations and its objectives. We urge that our teachers training colleges give courses qualifying their graduates to impart to their students in our public schools the principles of sound Americanism and of the United Nations Charter.

21. St. Lawrence seaway: Once again we endorse the program for a St. Lawrence seaway, and full development by New York State under public ownership of the waterpower facilities thereby provided. Too long has this important project been neglected. In connection therewith, we favor the preservation and development of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls.

22. Public health: The inadequacies of our State public health system should be speedily removed, and new public hospitals throughout the State should be completed and constructed. The intolerable conditions in some of our State hospitals, whereby children are forced to sleep on the floor, should be corrected at once.

23. Public housing: Our program of public housing should be accelerated and projects brought to completion so that the existing shortage of homes can be remedied. Our goal should be to have provided homes for all veterans of World War II before the veterans of Korea come home.

24. Regents: The present method of electing regents of the University of the State of New York is unfair and should be changed. Those in charge of the educational system of the State should be selected on a nonpolitical basis, and with a view to giving representation to all sections of the State.

25. Securities dealers: It is ironical that although our laws provide that barbers, plumbers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, real estate brokers, and insurance brokers must take examinations and demonstrate their qualifications before they can commence their profession, no similar laws apply to persons handling other people's money as securities dealers and brokers. We do not believe that merely the possession of funds necessary to purchase a seat on the New York Stock Exchange or the New York Curb Exchange should qualify a person to engage in the securities business. We support the enactment of a State law providing for the licensing, by a system of examination, of all persons engaging in the securities business in this State.

26. Civilian defense: We support full appropriations for the development of a civilian defense system in this State.

27. Practice of electrolysis: To amend the general business law in relation to providing for the examination, licensing, and regulations of persons engaged in the practice of electrolysis.

Expenditure Control and Defense Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a copy of a policy recommendation adopted by the national affairs committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce on February 8 on the subject of control of nonessential expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, indicating, I believe, reactions which are shared by countless people of my State on the vital subject of conserving funds, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENDITURE CONTROL AND DEFENSE LEGISLATION

Recommended a minimum reduction of $4,500,000,000 in the budget for fiscal 1952. In the light of present conditions this reduction can be effected without hampering the defense effort. Even with such a reduction, Federal civilian expenditures would still be $2,000,000,000 more than they were in 1945, and nearly $3,000,000,000 more than in 1946.

The President's new budget of $71,600,000,000 for fiscal 1952 leaves much to be desired if the Federal Government is to do a real belt-tightening job in nondefense spending. This is by far the largest peacetime budget that has ever been submitted to the American people. The previous all-time high of $44,000,000,000 was collected by the Federal Government in 1945. It will cost the taxpayers of Milwaukee County $587,919,000, and those of the State $1,489,155,000 as their share of the budget.

In his state of the Union message the President said, "The Government must practice rigid economy in nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed." A close look at this budget message, however, shows that 1952 expenditures will be higher than 1951 in almost every major spending item. The budget message proposes an enactment of virtually all of the Fair Deal legislative program. For many of these items the budget does not include expenditure estimates. He did, however, specifically add $290,000,000 in Federal aid to education and $35,000,000 for his proposed health-insurance program. In the time of sharply rising taxes these proposals seem remarkable, to say the least.

While some cuts have been made (totaling $3,800,000,000), they are somewhat misleading, since many of them are balanced by increases in nondefense spending under other headings such as health insurance and Federal aid to education.

In general, the budget appears to be extremely liberal toward nonmilitary expenditures which, in one way or another, can be tied in with defense. In the strictly nondefense areas some relative small cuts have been made, but by and large, the policy seems to be hold the line of 1951 expenditures in these areas rather than to make cuts in them.

The President expressed every intention of restoring, when possible, cuts he did make, and in many cases recommendations were made that these nondefense activities be greatly expanded when possible.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), on December 22, 1950, in a letter to the President suggested reductions in nonessential spending totaling $7,600,000,000, based largely on estimated expenditures during the present fiscal year. When the President submitted his budget on January 15 for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, recommending domestic civilian expenditures totaling more than $1,000,000,000 in excess of the estimates for this fiscal year, Senator BYRD revised his proposal to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures by $9,100,000,000 in comparison with the President's budget requests for next year.

Reductions in less essential spending will not only make it easier for the Nation to bear the enlarged burden of military preparation, but will also be a powerful force in the fight against inflation.

The Present Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very good letter on the present situation, written by the Honorable G. Albert Stewart, a most outstanding newspaperman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEARFIELD, PA., *March 20, 1951.*
EDITOR, THE INQUIRER:

Monday's Inquirer tells us of an Easter program beamed to Eastern Europe by our multi-million-dollar propaganda outfit, the Voice, wherein Joe Stalin was likened to a cuckoo.

How nauseating to think that the voice of a great Christian nation could do no better than produce a cheap vaudevillian skit as a means of combating communism and portraying the American way of life.

How much better and more appropriate would it have been to beam the story of the risen Christ which communism seeks to put down but which millions of middle age and aged Russians surely remember and would like to hear again.

How much better to have beamed some glorious and soul-lifting Easter music which surely would have fallen on receptive ears no longer treated to anything but the militaristic music exalting statism.

How much better to have told of the millions of free Americans singing praises to God rather than to dictators and political philosophies, and of all the millions of free Americans who gathered in their chosen places of worship in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience.

Aside from the ridiculousness of such a broadcast our multi-million-dollar Voice is supposed to be staffed by experts in human relations, among them psychologists who should know that the surest way to encourage support of a man by his friends and associates is to ridicule him. These experts must know that Stalin has his friends in Eastern Europe, that there is a generous streak of nationalism in every man and that such silly ridicule is resented.

Many of us Americans are not admirers of our President, Mr. Truman. We cuss him aplenty. But all of us would resent ridicule and caricature of him by Russia or by the propaganda machine of any other nation, and, motivated by our nationalistic impulses, basic American unity and, yes, patriotism if you like, would rush to his support.

Finally, if Joe Stalin is what our President and our State Department says he is, his name should be referred to with disdain and he described as something unspeakable, not likened to a cuckoo or any other member of the feathered kingdom.

And, above all, our Voice should realize the seriousness of the job it has to do and not be playing around with such juvenilian ideas as skits in gay mood as reported by the United Press, especially on a day affording the finest opportunity to portray our joyous American way of life.

The Voice has given ample evidence of its unfitness on this and other occasions. Why do we continue to spend millions on such cuckoo business?

G. ALBERT STEWART,
Ex-editor, Clearfield (Pa.) Progress.

Claims of Jewish People for Nazi Murder, Spoliation, and Robbery—Shall the Murderers Become the Heirs of Their Victims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the Ambassador of Israel to the Secretary of State on the question of Israel's claim against Germany:

The Ambassador of Israel presents his compliments to the honorable the Secretary of State and, under instructions from the Government of Israel, has the honor to submit the following communication on the question of Israel's claim against Germany.

2. In the note which the Ambassador of Israel had the honor to address to the Secretary of State on January 16, 1951, he stated that the Government of Israel reserved to itself the right to deal in a separate note with such claims in respect of Jewish losses for which Germany must be held accountable as did not fall within the scope of the existing laws providing for individual restitution and indemnification. It is proposed in the present note to state the basis and nature of these claims and submit proposals for their satisfaction.

3. The case of the Jewish people against Germany is without precedent. There is no record in history of such gigantic slaughter and rapine as that perpetrated by the German people against the Jews of Europe. In the course of a few years entire communities, whose history went back over a millennium, were wiped out by a process of systematic extermination. Over 6,000,000 Jews were done to death by torture, starvation, mass execution, and asphyxiation; many of them were burned and buried alive. Neither old nor young were spared. Children were torn from the arms of their mothers and flung into the furnaces. Old men and women were hunted down and sent to the death camps. In Poland and the occupied zone of Russia alone, over 4,000,000 Jews perished. From Germany itself and from every part of Europe which fell under German domination—from Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria—trainloads of Jews were sent month after month to the extermination centers. Their destruction forms one of the most harrowing stories in the annals of the human race.

4. Murder was accompanied by robbery on a vast scale. According to conservative estimates,[1] Jewish property to the value of over $6,000,000,000 was seized by the Nazis in Germany and the other European countries that fell under their sway. This includes a collective fine of 1,000,000,000 marks imposed on the Jews in Germany in the wake of the Government-organized pogrom of November 1938, as well as other fines, seizures, and discriminatory taxes imposed by the Nazi authorities on German Jews in regard to which the Government of the German Federal Republic appears to have assumed a liability by acknowledging itself recently a successor power to the Third Reich.

[1] Indemnification and Reparations, by N. Robinson (published by the Institute of Jewish Affairs, New York, 1944), p. 83.

5. This colossal campaign of genocide and spoliation represented the climax of a process of persecution which began on the day when the National-Socialist Government came into power. The judgment in the Nuremberg trial of German major war criminals described it as "a record of consistent and systematic inhumanity on the greatest scale." The following extracts from the judgment may serve to illustrate the progress of Jewish persecution from the establishment of the Nazi regime until the end of World War II:

"With the seizure of power, the persecution of the Jews was intensified. A series of discriminatory laws were passed, which limited the offices and professions permitted to Jews; and restrictions were placed on their family life and their rights of citizenship. By the autumn of 1938, the Nazi policy toward the Jews had reached the stage where it was directed toward the complete exclusion of Jews from German life. Pogroms were organized, which included the burning and demolishing of synagogues, the looting of Jewish businesses, and the arrest of prominent Jewish businessmen. A collective fine of 1,000,000,000 marks was imposed on the Jews, the seizure of Jewish assets was authorized, and the movement of Jews was restricted by regulations to certain specified districts and hours. The creation of ghettoes was carried out on an extensive scale, and by an order of the security police Jews were compelled to wear a yellow star to be worn on the breast and back. * * * The imposition of a fine of 1,000,000,000 marks was made, and the confiscation of the financial holdings of the Jews was decreed, at a time when German armament expenditure had put the German treasury in difficulties, and when the reduction of expenditure on armaments was being considered. * * *

"The Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany before the war, severe and repressive as it was, cannot compare, however, with the policy pursued during the war in the occupied territories. Originally the policy was similar to that which had been in force inside Germany. Jews were required to register, were forced to live in ghettoes, to wear the yellow star, and were used as slave laborers. In the summer of 1941, however, plans were made for the final solution of the Jewish question in all of Europe. The final solution meant the extermination of the Jews, which early in 1939 Hitler had threatened would be one of the consequences of an outbreak of war, and a special section in the Gestapo under Adolf Eichmann, as head of section B4 of the Gestapo, was formed to carry out the policy.

"The plan for exterminating the Jews was developed shortly after the attack on the Soviet Union. Einsatzgruppen of the security police and SD, formed for the purpose of breaking the resistance of the population of the areas lying behind the German armies in the East, were given the duty of exterminating the Jews in these areas. The effectiveness of the work of the Einsatzgruppen is shown by the fact that in February 1942, Heydrich was able to report that Estonia had already been cleared of Jews and that in Riga the number of Jews had been reduced from 29,500 to 2,500. Altogether the Einsatzgruppen operating in the occupied Baltic States killed over 135,000 Jews in 3 months. Nor did these special units operate completely independently of the German armed forces. There is clear evidence that leaders of the Einsatzgruppen obtained the cooperation of army commanders. * * *

"These atrocities were all part and parcel of the policy inaugurated in 1941. Part of the 'final solution' was the gathering of Jews from all German-occupied Europe in concentration camps. * * * All who were fit to work were used as slave laborers in the concentration camps; all who were not fit to work were destroyed in gas chambers

and their bodies burned. Certain concentration camps such as Treblinka and Auschwitz were set aside for this main purpose. With regard to Auschwitz, the tribunal heard the evidence of Hoess, the commandant of the camp from May 1, 1940, to December 1, 1943. He estimated that in the camp of Auschwitz alone in that time 2,500,000 persons were exterminated, and that a further 500,000 died from disease and starvation. Hoess described the screening for extermination by stating in evidence:

"'Those who were fit for work were sent into the camp. Others were sent immediately to the extermination plants. Children of tender years were invariably exterminated. * * * Very frequently women would hide their children under their clothes, but of course when we found them we would send the children to be exterminated.'

"He described the actual killing by stating:

"'It took from 3 to 15 minutes to kill the people in the death chamber, depending upon climatic conditions. We knew when the people were dead because their screaming stopped. We usually waited about one-half hour before we opened the doors and removed the bodies. After the bodies were removed our special commandos took off the rings and extracted the gold from the teeth of the corpses.'

"Beating, starvation, torture, and killing were general. The inmates were subjected to cruel experiments at Dachau in August 1942, victims were immersed in cold water until their body temperatures were reduced to 28 degrees centigrade, when they died immediately. Other experiments included high-altitude experiments in pressure chambers, experiments to determine how long human beings could survive in freezing water, experiments with poison bullets, experiments with contagious diseases, and experiments dealing with sterilization of men and women by X-rays and other methods.

"Evidence was given of the treatment of the inmates before and after their extermination. There was testimony that the hair of women victims was cut off before they were killed, and shipped to Germany, there to be used in the manufacture of mattresses. The clothes, money and valuables of the inmates were also salvaged and sent to the appropriate agencies for disposition. After the extermination the gold teeth and fillings were taken from the heads of the corpses and sent to the Reichsbank.

"After cremation the ashes were used for fertilizer, and in some instances attempts were made to utilize the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap. Special groups traveled through Europe to find Jews and subject them to the 'final solution.' German missions were sent to such satellite countries as Hungary and Bulgaria, to arrange for the shipment of Jews to extermination camps and it is known that by the end of 1944, 400,000 Jews from Hungary had been murdered at Auschwitz. Evidence has also been given of the evacuation of 110,000 Jews from part of Rumania for 'liquidation.' Adolph Eichmann, who had been put in charge of this program by Hitler, has estimated that the policy pursued resulted in the killing of 6,000,000 Jews, of which 4,000,000 were killed in the extermination institutions."

6. A crime of such vast and fearful dimensions cannot be expiated by any measure of material reparation. The Jewish people has lost a third of its numbers. The bulk of European Jewry has been annihilated; out of every four Jews in Europe three were killed. No indemnity, however large, can make good the loss of human life and cultural values or atone for the suffering and agonies of the men, women and children put to death by every inhuman device. As Frank, one of the principal defendants in the Nuremberg Trial, admitted: "A thousand years will pass and this guilt of Germany will still not be erased." All that can be done is to secure the indemnification of the heirs of the victims and the rehabilitation of the survivors. The Jews have been killed, but the German people continue to enjoy the fruits of the carnage and plunder perpetrated by their erstwhile leaders. In the Biblical phrase, they have "killed and also taken possession." The dead cannot be revived. Their torment cannot be undone. This much, however, can be demanded: that the German people be required to restore the stolen Jewish property and to pay for the rehabilitation of those who have survived.

7. In the absorption and rehabilitation of these survivors Israel has from the start played a major part. When the Nazi persecution began in Germany in the spring of 1933, the Jews of Palestine, as it then was, immediately came to the rescue. An ever increasing stream of German Jews—swollen after the rape of Austria and Czechoslovakia by Jews from these countries—found its way to Palestine. During the period between the establishment of the Nazi regime in Germany and the outbreak of the Second World War, over 75,000 refugees from the Nazi-controlled countries of Central Europe settled in Palestine. Even during the war years, despite the limitations imposed, Jewish immigration from Europe never ceased. Tireless efforts were made to bring out Jews from the countries threatened or engulfed by the Nazi invasion. When the war ended, the Jews of Palestine risked their all to bring to safety those who had survived the great slaughter. When in the end the State of Israel was established, its first step was to open its gates to the Jewish Displaced Persons from the areas of the former concentration camps. Between the years 1939 and 1950, nearly 380,000 Jews were brought over in this way from the Nazi-conquered territories. If to these are added the Jews who immigrated from Central Europe during the prewar years of the Nazi persecution, the total amounts to over 450,000.

8. Most of the newcomers brought with them little more than their weakened bodies. Their belongings had long been taken from them. Many of them were hard-core cases, men and women whose health was broken beyond repair, and whom no country but Israel was prepared to accept. Unlike other immigration countries where new arrivals can easily be absorbed into a fully developed economic system, Israel has had to make special efforts by large-scale allocation of public funds for investment and maintenance to create openings for the newcomers. The whole economic regime of the new state was from its first hour made to serve this overriding task. Though substantial financial support has come from Jews abroad, the bulk of the expenditure involved in the reception and rehabilitation of the immigrants has been borne by the people of Israel. Heavy taxation and a strict regime of economic austerity have had to be imposed and have been willingly accepted by the people of the country in order to provide homes and a livelihood for these immigrants. It is surely no exaggerated claim to demand that the German people, who were responsible for all this misery and who continue in possession of the economic assets taken from the Jews, dead and alive, should be required to make reparation for the benefit of the survivors.

9. When the victorious Allies at the end of the war allocated the reparations due from Germany, the Jewish people had as yet no locus standi in the community of sovereign nations. As a result, its claims, though morally perhaps stronger than those of any other people that had suffered at the hands of the Nazis, went by default. The time has come to rectify this omission. Israel is the only state which can speak on behalf of the Jewish people—the people, membership of which was the cause of the death of the 6,000,000. Israel has been built up for the specific purpose of providing a refuge for all persecuted and homeless Jews. That responsibility has throughout been conceived in active terms; in the war against Nazi Germany, Israel's sons and daughters fought in national formations among the Allied forces. A Jewish brigade group took part in the final overthrow of the enemy and played an active role in the rescue and relief of Jewish survivors in various parts of Europe. The recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to the reestablishment of its commonwealth was seen as an act of reparation for the wrongs endured by them throughout history, culminating in the Nazi campaign of extermination. Having thus arisen, Israel has made itself responsible for the absorption and rehabilitation of the survivors of that catastrophe. For all these reasons, the state of Israel regards itself as entitled to claim reparations from Germany by way of indemnity to the Jewish people.

10. The amount to be claimed must be related, on the one hand, to the losses suffered by the Jewish people at the hands of the Germans, and on the other, to the financial cost involved in the rehabilitation in Israel of those who escaped or survived the Nazi regime. The Government of Israel is not in a position to procure and submit full data of the Jewish property confiscated and plundered by the Germans, which, as previously stated, is authoritatively estimated to aggregate over $6,000,000,000. It can base its claim only on the expenditure incurred and anticipated in connection with the resettlement of the Jewish immigrants from the countries formerly under Nazi control. Their number is estimated at about 500,000 which would involve an over-all expenditure of $1,500,000,000. This figure corresponds approximately to the value of exports from Western Germany alone in 1950, which, in view of Germany's economic recovery, is likely to increase considerably during 1951. If spread over a period of years and transferred partly in the form of goods, a reparation payment of this total would not be beyond the capacity of the German people. No settlement of German reparations can be regarded as equitable on moral or legal grounds which would not meet this minimum claim on behalf of the major sufferers of the Nazi regime. Nor can there be any approach to the rehabilitation of Germany among the community of nations until this basic measure of reparation has been effected.

11. The Government of Israel trusts that the Government of the United States will accept the justice of its claim. It would urgently request that the occupying powers should not hand over full powers to any German government without express reservations having been made for the payment of reparations to Israel. It would welcome an early expression of the views of the Government of the United States concerning the practical steps which might most effectively be taken toward implementing the proposals outlined in this note.

MARCH 12, 1951.

Resolution Adopted by the American Legion of Freemont, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I include a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the American Legion, of Freemont, Ohio, and request that the House

Committee on Ways and Means consider the matter:

RESOLUTION

Whereas it was the custom during World War II that members of the Armed Forces should not have to pay income tax on service pay because of the sacrifices they were making for the good of their country; and

Whereas the members of our Armed Forces are now paying the regular income tax on their income received as members of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas it is felt by the members of Thurston-Zwir Post, No. 121, Inc., the American Legion, of Ohio, that members of the Armed Forces are being taxed sufficiently by virtue of their service to their country: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That all regulations governing the collection of withholding tax and income tax on service pay from members of our Armed Forces be rescinded until such time as the present emergency is declared officially at an end; and be it further

Resolved, That, effective January 1, 1951, all withholding tax on service pay be returned to the members of our Armed Forces who have paid same; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Representatives of Ohio, to the commander of the fifth district, the American Legion of Ohio, and to the commander of the American Legion of Ohio for action by their respective committees to put this into effect.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the post at its regular meeting on Monday, February 19, 1951.

HARRY A. BRUNTHAVER,
Adjutant.

What Do They Teach at Roosevelt College?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of March 17, 1951:

WHAT DO THEY TEACH AT ROOSEVELT COLLEGE?

Hearings on the Broyles-Young antisubversive bill continued this week in the State senate. It was a similar bill which brought rioting Communist students to Springfield 3 years ago from Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago.

One of the witnesses appearing to testify against the bill Wednesday was a student of Roosevelt College of Chicago. Her name was Mrs. Violet Finney. She testified that it was her belief that the Broyles-Young bill constituted an infringement upon personal freedom.

"What rights are you denied in the bill?" asked Senator Clyde Trager, of Peoria.

"The right to belong to a subversive organization," replied Mrs. Finney. (She was forthright to say the least.)

"Do you want to belong to a subversive organization?" asked Senator Trager.

"No," answered Mrs. Finney, "but I do not like to be denied the right."

If the witness had carefully read the Broyles-Young bill—and we doubt if she had—she would have found that it contained the following definition of "subversive organization."

"Subversive organization means any organization which engages in or advocates, abets, advises, or teaches, or a purpose of which is to engage in or advocate, abet, advise, or teach activities intended to overthrow, destroy, or alter, or to assist in the overthrow, destruction, or alteration of, the constitutional form of government of the United States, or of the State of Illinois, or of any political subdivision of either of them, by revolution, force, violence, or other unlawful means."

Subversion, as defined in the Broyles-Young bill, is already a felony and will continue to be so whether this bill becomes a law or not. Purpose of the Broyles-Young bill is to give the State of Illinois a better legal weapon to deal with persons who are engaged in subversive activities.

What the Roosevelt College student confessed was that she wanted the privilege of joining others in unlawful means of attempting to overthrow the constitutional Government of the United States. She might as well have said that she did not want to commit murder, but she did not like to be denied the right to do it; or that she had no intention of robbing a bank, but that she didn't like the Government to tell her that she couldn't do so if she chose.

Roosevelt College is only a name to us. We have no reason to believe that Mrs. Finney's thoughts reflect those of the faculty or the student body. But the student riot of 1949 and this testimony of a student raises the question, What influence at Roosevelt College fosters or permits such irresponsible action and such distorted thinking among some of the students?

Mr. Speaker, we believe the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been asked to look into some midwestern universities for evidence of subversive teaching. Perhaps the House committee could learn what they teach at Roosevelt College.

A Tale of Two Valleys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to find articles about what is wrong with America and to hear constant criticism of all phases of our national life, that it is refreshing to read a report which calls attention to Americanism and what it really is. I am proud to call attention to a book written by a former Member of this House, the Honorable Conrad G. Selvig, who represented a district in the great State of Minnesota. Mr. Selvig is now enjoying a well earned rest and has taken advantage of the time to put into a book his thoughts on good old-fashioned Americanism.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a review of the book taken from the Los Angeles Mirror, a review which is also a stirring tribute to our former colleague. The review was reprinted by the Crookston (Minn.) Daily Times. It follows:

SELVIG'S BOOK BRINGS TRIBUTE

From far-off California comes a stirring tribute to Conrad G. Selvig and incidentally our Red River Valley with which Mr. Selvig had so much to do in developing.

The tribute is a clipping from the Los Angeles Mirror and mailed to the Times office by Harry J. Crompe, a former Crookston man and himself a valley booster.

In the Mirror's Florabel Muir Reporting column the columnist reviews Mr. Selvig's book, a Tale of Two Valleys, which she uses as the basis for an editorial on the American way of life.

But read the Los Angeles paper's comments in full:

"Perhaps at this time a small sermon setting forth the solidity and strength of good old-fashioned Americanism may be in order.

"I found this sermon in a plain, unadorned book, the autobiography of Conrad G. Selvig, once a Congressman from Minnesota, now rounding out a full and useful life in Santa Monica.

"He shows how the real wealth of our great country is created and developed. He shows what makes us great—and it isn't Wall Street manipulations, stock issues, skinny undressed chits in magazine ads, Hollywood starlets, or television.

"Before Selvig went to Congress he was head of the Minnesota Agricultural College at Northwest Station, Crookston, Minn.

"In 1924, experimenting, they planted a 28-acre field to sweet clover, intending to pasture 32 cows on it. They figured they would require about one acre per head.

"The clover kept growing and they kept cutting down the proportion. By midsummer they had cut the pasturage for those 32 cattle down to 7 acres and had fenced off the remaining 21 for a hay crop.

"Does that sound like small potatoes? I say that what Selvig accomplished, multiplied 10,000-fold and more through the Nation, represents the basis impregnable potency of America.

"Selvig saw the Minnesota farmers taking the short end, due largely to slipshod and unfair farm marketing methods. He got himself elected to Congress and battled like a steer at bay to right those wrongs.

"Today we all know about the farm bloc. Nobody gets far fighting it. In fact the farmers is the Nation's legislative pet, too much pampered.

"I like Selvig's book, the plain record of a plain American, the son of Norwegian immigrant parents. Under our American Republic he won distinction, gave sons and daughters to the Nation in war. Now in his seventies, he has earned the boon of a rich contentment.

"Don't look for literary brilliance in A Tale of Two Valleys. It's a simple narrative as earthy as Gray's Elegy, not too far removed from that classic in theme—the conquest of the 'stubborn glebe.'

"But if our America is great today and is to be greater tomorrow, we can thank the plodders like Conrad Selvig who learned early that there is richer wealth both for the spirit and for the pocketbook in a clod of fertile black soil than in a shining nugget of gold."

The President's Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial, appearing in the Detroit News of March 12, 1951, might well be interpreted as a gentle but well-deserved rebuke to the sadists and perverted partisans and some well-intentioned but

grossly ignorant critics who just cannot understand the tremendous problems of state which rest upon our American Presidents generally, and upon those who, like Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, have been called upon to carry an emergency load during a most critical time in our national existence. Ignorance even in this enlightened day, although it is inexcusable, can be forgiven. But a line must be drawn somewhere and men must be held responsible for their slanderous abuse of a man simply because he is the President of the United States and therefore considered a fair political target for anyone in disagreement with his policies or who belongs to the opposition party.

HE NEEDS A REST

The President's first Key West holiday in a year invites the usual criticism that he has ducked out in a time of crisis. Yet, if one reads the current Saturday Evening Post series on how he puts in his Washington day, the wonder is that he or any President can stand up with so little relief.

From 5:30 a. m. until 8 at night, Mr. Truman's time is as rigidly scheduled as that of a limited train. In the working day he must regularly meet aides and advisers, the Cabinet, the press, carry on a voluminous correspondence, and sit through 100 15-minute appointments a week with visitors.

From 8 p. m. until an early bedtime he is busy drawing up memoranda, making notes on working papers, often consulting with others on public statements.

No doubt many readers of the Post articles, like ourselves, are appalled anew at the lack in such a program of any time for that reflection out of which great decisions could be expected to issue.

Hardly an hour in the 24 is Mr. Truman's own. Nor can he delegate any considerable part of his burden to others. He has tried this, and the performances of these aids and confidants constitute some of the sorrier episodes in his administration.

Other Presidents in other times have supported the burden, but it was a different burden. In Coolidge's day, for example, the country scarcely owned a foreign policy as we now understand it. The Executive could consider a course for months, where in the present day of multiple agencies he must improvise policy, often in a matter of days, and make or subscribe to decisions out of hand.

Woodrow Wilson brought to the White House the fruit of years of study of government, and many convictions born of long ruminating on its principles and practices.

As preparation for the same post, Mr. Truman brought little of this; only courage, intelligence rather than intellectual capacity, and endurance. These and such counsel as he feels he can rely on have seen him through an ordeal which few Americans could have survived.

We believe he needs more, not fewer holidays, if his own and the country's welfare are to be at all considered.

Europe Cuts Its National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Walter W. R. May in the Oregon City (Oreg.) Enterprise-Courier:

EUROPE CUTS ITS NATIONAL DEBT

The European nations which have been receiving Marshall-plan aid from the United States have cut their national debts a total of $1,202,000,000, while the United States national debt has steadily gone up to $255,902,000,000 in 19 years, with only one reduction, a $6,000,000,000 cut made by the Republican Eightieth Congress the President so shamefully misrepresented in the 1948 campaign.

From the Economic Cooperation Agency which dispenses Marshall-plan aid provided by the United States taxpayers, we learn the following European nations have reduced their debts as follows:

Norway, $73,500,000; Denmark, $88,300,000; Austria, $85,000,000; France, $171,400,000; and Great Britain, $784,100,000.

This all adds up to $1,202,300,000 with no good signs that the United States will do anything but increase its debt.

Can the Communists Conquer Religion?—Beran, Powerless in Banishment, Has Greater Influence on the Minds of Men Than Powerful Stalin in the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, someday Stalin may realize that he cannot conquer God. Archbishop Beran, prior to his persecution by Stalin, was little known outside of his native Czechoslovakia. Now he has become a world figure. So also, have the Protestant and Jewish representatives of religion who have been martyrs to Stalin.

Before his persecution, Archbishop Beran, as the duly constituted moral authority of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia, was an inspiration to the people of his diocese. Now, after his persecution by the Communists, stripped of all power to exercise control of the religious affairs of his diocese and banished from his native land, Archbishop Beran is an even greater inspiration to his fellow countrymen in Czechoslovakia. Not only that but Archbishop Beran's influence has so grown that he is now an inspiration to people all over the world. What chagrin this must cause the master plotters of the Kremlin.

I include here an excellent editorial in tribute to Archbishop Beran which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 13, 1951:

MOSCOW VERSUS ROME

In waging war on the Vatican the puppet Communist regime of Czechoslovakia apparently is trying to be less crude and more cautious than its counterpart in Hungary. At any rate, the indications are that Archbishop Beran, the Roman Catholic primate of the country, is not going to be tried and imprisoned on trumped-up charges of treason, as in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. Instead, it seems that he is merely to be banished from Prague—and fined—for taking a negative attitude toward the church laws that the Kremlin's stooges have decreed to make clear to the devout that Stalin is next to godliness and that one had better pay attention to him, not to the Pope, on matters of faith and morals.

Archbishop Beran's offense, of course, is that he has refused to sell his soul to the Communists and let them profane and defile his church by making it a tool of the atheistic Kremlin. He has sought to keep them from interfering with the worship of God and from contaminating the hallowed precincts of religion with their peculiarly unholy brand of irreligion. So they have "banished" him and named in his place a "patriotic and democratic" parish priest who seems willing to play their game—an obscure Catholic clergyman who presumably can be counted upon not to upset efforts to undermine the Vatican in Czechoslovakia for the greater honor and glory of the Soviet Union.

Thus the war between Moscow and Rome goes on, with Moscow resorting to any and every means to destroy the one thing that must be obliterated if totalitarian materialism is to survive and if the Kremlin is to win mastery of the world. That one thing is man's belief in God—the religious force of the ages, the spirit that exalts the individual over the state, the spark and fire of faith in the proposition that people do not begin or end here but are creatures with immortal souls and with a high eternal destiny that is governed not by bipeds like Stalin but by an all-wise, all-just, all-powerful, all-infinite Supreme Being beyond the comprehension of our finite minds. The Soviet Communists cannot live with such a doctrine, and hence the effort to wipe it out.

Archbishop Beran—like Cardinal Mindszenty, and like a number of Protestant and Jewish leaders as well—has come to grief behind the iron curtain not because of himself but because he represents in his person a faith that is absolutely irreconcilable with, and repugnant to, what the Soviet tryanny stands for. The war on the Vatican, the war on religion in general, is an inevitable and basic part of the Soviet war on the free world. For man, as long as he believes in God, cannot be conquered or enslaved by the godless. The battle has just begun, and the Kremlin—which is waging it cautiously in Czechoslovakia because Catholicism is predominant there—is as doomed to failure in it as was Lucifer when he stormed the gates of heaven against Michael the Archangel.

Reminiscences by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the University of Missouri Alumni Association of Washington, at its monthly meeting at the Congressional Hotel March 16, had as its principal speaker a worthy and distinguished alumnus of our great university, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. The junior Senator from Missouri was privileged to introduce his colleague to the alumni.

The Honorable John T. Barker, a former attorney general of the State of

Missouri, and now a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, presided at the meeting. Senator KEM'S interesting reminiscences of his student days, and his fine tribute to the university, were so eloquently presented that I ask unanimous consent to have this fine address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the opening day of the present session of the Congress my distinguished colleague told me that we had this in common: his mother went to school to my mother. And since that time I have discovered that we have many other things in common. Now that we have got our hands on Tom Hennings, I think we should proceed to initiate him. I would like to have the privilege of proposing him as an honorary member of the University of Missouri Alumni Association of Washington.

When I first went to the university, the able and genial president of our society was the speaker of the house of representatives of the general assembly. In my freshman year, the Federal Government turned over to the State of Missouri a considerable sum of money in settlement of certain Civil War claims. The university asked that this money be appropriated to build a memorial library. It was suggested to the students that they see their representatives in the legislature (of course, no one here understands what it means to approach a legislator for anything he wants)—and so I went to see John Barker as the representative from my home county of Macon. He treated me with great consideration—with the courtesy that I now know is instinctive and characteristic. He heard my story out although he had probably heard the story 25 times before. A friendship was begun that has been the source of pleasure and satisfaction to me in the many years that have followed.

When I entered the university in 1906, the white campus existed only on the drawing boards. When we spoke of the campus, we meant the quadrangle set off by its fabulous jewel, the columns of ever-cherished memory. The old brick buildings may not be exactly cathedrals of learning, but as James Russell Lowell said, "They have many crevices for the tentacles of affection." It was a small college but there were those who loved it.

When I first went to the university, Richard Henry Jesse was the president. We called him "Uncle Dick" with no little affection. Soon he was succeeded as president by Dr. A. Ross Hill. Dr. Hill was an able and accomplished administrator. I always liked him—while he was president and after he became a resident of Kansas City, where I came to know him quite well.

Along about 1908, the school of journalism as founded by Walter Williams. The late Charlie Ross—familiarly known as "Doodles" Ross—was a leading member of the faculty of the school of journalism. He remained genial and delightful to the end.

There was Dr. Max Meyer, German-born professor of psychology, who was slanderously described as a man who could tell you what everybody knew in language that nobody could understand.

There was Dr. Isadore Loeb, whom the university funny paper, the Oven, insisted on referring to as "Was-a-Dore" after he ceased to be a member of the athletic committee, showing the extent to which his stock had fallen in undergraduate opinion.

In football the Tigers suffered a long and dispiriting series of defeats at the hands of Kansas. Then came the fall of 1909 when William W. Roper, who had been a star at Princeton and was a practicing lawyer in Philadelphia, came as head football coach. From the day of his arrival there was a new spirit on Rollins Field, and he gave us a glorious victory over Kansas.

At the first mass meeting Roper attended he was introduced as "Big Bill." He said he didn't mind being called "Big Bill" in Missouri, but as a practicing lawyer in Philadelphia he didn't like it very much. Being called "Big Bill" Roper didn't help his budding law practice one bit. I would like to talk about other faculty members whose names crowd into my mind for recognition.

It is often said that at college we learn more from our fellow students than from members of the faculty.

One of the first organizations that I joined when I reached the university was the Athenaean Debating Society. The presiding genius in those days was Mac Anderson—B. M. Anderson, Jr. The brilliance of his mind and his amazing accumulation of accurate information made a lasting impression on all who knew him. He became one of the leading economists of the United States. For years he was the head economist for the Chase National Bank in New York and the editor of their bulletin. Afterward he was professor of economics at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Merrill Otis, who was to be a distinguished Federal Judge at Kansas City, was in his heyday. What a grand person he was—truly one of nature's noblemen. How he used to thrill us at the mass meetings with his sonorous voice and rounded periods. Not infrequently a student speaker was heckled by someone calling out "louder and funnier." But never Merrill Otis. He held us speechless. There was one exception to the usual order that I remember well. At one of the mass meetings some prominent speaker failed to appear on time. The chairman of the meeting (it was either Ozark Wright or Raymond Lee) scribbled a little note to Otis asking him to come up to the rostrum to speak until the VIP arrived. Merrill started out by saying "I have just received a message asking me to come up and say something funny." Someone in the back of the auditorium called out: "You'll tell us when you say it, won't you?" To which Merrill gave an instant reply—"I'll tell you, the rest will know."

The year I entered as a freshman, Forrest Donnell left the university in a blaze of glory. He had graduated at the head of his class both in the college and the law school. Forrest with his passion for the truth and nothing but the truth has always insisted he didn't know me at the university. But I knew him. When I came to Washington our unilateral friendship became mutual. I love him dearly.

Then there was Lee Miller who had the unusual distinction of being captain of the football team 2 years in succession. Big, generous, and awkward—we always called him, "Cow." After he found a sweetheart at the Kappa House, he didn't like the name cow. He became a leading surgeon in Kansas City until his untimely death a few years ago.

The pioneers who founded the university in 1839 were a strong and self reliant breed. The chief among them, James S. Rollins, had ridden his horse back and forth from central Missouri to Kentucky to get a college education. His grandson and namesake, James Sidney Rollins, whom most of us know as "Sid" is now a prominent lawyer in Columbia. Back in the days when Frederick D. Gardner was Governor of Missouri the governor came to Columbia to deliver an address. Sid, who had just launched himself in the practice of law at the Columbia bar, was the presiding officer at the meeting. He started out by paying a glowing tribute to the governor and then wound up with this peroration: "My friends, I have the honor and privilege to present to you Missouri's great Gardner, the honorable Frederick D. Governor."

In the days when the university came into being, people put their faith in education. The famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had declared: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." From the very first settlement in Missouri, schools, colleges, and universities have been the subject of public largess and private benefaction. The people were tremendously interested in the public school system, of which the university was the crowning apex. In their dreams it was to be more than its finest flower—it was to be the nourishing mother. I think the founders of the university must have had in mind certain definite purposes and objectives.

I am sure the founders of the University of Missouri had very keenly in mind that Americans were then and meant to continue to be, for all time to come, a self-governing people. They established an institution of higher learning in order to help make self government work. James S. Rollins and those of his generation were sons of fathers who had marched and suffered and triumphed with Washington and Lafayette. The Revolution was close to their generation in point of time—it was even closer in their thinking. To them independence had a very real meaning. It was something that had been bought and paid for by blood and tears. With independence the problem of self government became urgent. They and Americans of their generation realized that in order to make this experiment in self government a success, there must be developed an enlightened citizenship with the knowledge and the will to carry on. They pledged their faith to education as the best means to this cherished end.

In the second place, I think the founders of the university were very much interested in creating in the State a spirit of national unity. The State of Missouri came into the Union as a result of the Missouri Compromise of 1820. A deep cleavage existed between the North and the South. The first settlers of Missouri came up the great rivers from Virginia and Kentucky. They settled in the rich alluvial lands along the Missouri and Mississippi. Many of them brought with them their "peculiar institution." But there were other important streams of immigration. People from Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois settled in counties of the northwestern part of the State. And then into the Ozark country came a steady stream from the hill country of western North Carolina and east Tennessee, who knew nothing about the institution of slavery, and cared nothing, except to despise it.

The third task which the founders imposed upon the university was what we call Americanization.

"God sifted the whole world that He might send choice grain over to the wilderness." Before the Louisiana purchase the French came into Missouri—Ste. Genevieve was the first settlement by white men west of the Mississippi. In 1803, at the time of the Louisiana purchase, St. Louis was the largest town in what was then the West. In the decade following the founding of the university the Germans came in large numbers, and continued to do so for several decades thereafter. Then the Irish, the Scotch, the Welsh, and others in smaller numbers added a leaven to the melting pot.

No other people absorbed more racial stocks so rapidly and completely. This was the job of the public-school system from the university down. In the classrooms the sons and daughters of every racial stock were subjected to the same educational processes and the same disciplines.

The roster of foreign names on our football teams shows what I mean. Who can

doubt that the cause of unity is served when it is Glorioso, Fuchs, Marusic, Christman, Orf, Keller, Ackermann, Klein, Ghnouly, Cone, Kadlec, Carras, Stuber, that the cheering stands applaud.

Our early Missourians knew a lot about authoritarian governments. Across the seas in the old countries their close ancestors, and in many cases they themselves, had lived under such government. They knew about it—and they didn't like it.

They knew nothing of the modern form of totalitarianism, socialism, or communism. In 1839, when the university was founded, Karl Marx had not yet met Frederick Engels, so Marx had not yet become a Socialist.

The early Missourians were devoted to the idea of maintaining Missouri as part and parcel of a great liberal republic. They wanted none of either monarchy or collectivism. They were individualists to the core. They believed that individuality was the aim of political liberty. They wished to leave to the citizen as much freedom of action as was consistent with order and the rights of others. The ideal was that so far as possible the citizen should be left to pursue his means of happiness in his way and according to his own lights. In the best sense the University of Missouri has always been a center of liberalism. Harlow Shapley and Thorstein Veblen came, but they also went. They never set the pattern. The founders believed that work and thrift would bring a just reward. They believed in free enterprise to the soul of their beings.

The State of Missouri was a bud just opening its petals. It offered a field of fruitful activity for millions of busy bees.

To make the most of this great opportunity the State needed individuals trained to be specialists. It needed trained agriculturists, trained teachers, lawyers, doctors, civil, electrical, mechanical, chemical, and mining engineers to develop and to conserve its resources. With the exception of the field of medicine (where the failure can perhaps be explained), the university has fulfilled this function in an abundant measure. It has given the State a steady stream of specialists adequately trained for their respective tasks. As an example, four out of the seven judges presently sitting on the highest court of our State are University of Missouri men. For over a century the University of Missouri has served and strengthened the Commonwealth. It has made a substantial contribution toward providing a citizenry as enlightened as any on earth. It has justified and vindicated the faith of its founders. It has met the challenge.

And what about the future? We can have every assurance that the university will meet the changing problems of our time. An optimist in the atomic age has been defined as one who believes the future is uncertain. The typical Missourian of 1839 had no qualms about the future. He knew what he wanted, and he had an unabashed confidence in his ability to get it. He didn't know about sanitary plumbing, or airplanes, or motorcars, or nylon stockings, but he believed Missouri was the center of the bread basket of the world. He thought it was the best place in all the world to live and have his being.

Shall we of this generation be of little faith? Shall we worry too much about whether we shall reinforce nationalism or inspire internationalism?

Our answer is: Let us carry on in the faith of our fathers. Let us take comfort in the old Scotch ballad:

"I am hurt, Sir Barton said.
I am hurt, but I am not slain,
I'll lie me down and bleed awhile
And then I'll fight again."

America and the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, on the twentieth anniversary of Chicago Round Table, a special pamphlet was published consisting of selections from round-table discussions in which Mr. Hutchins has participated. Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, after 21 years at the university, has recently resigned to become associate director of the Ford Foundation.

I concede I speak with some prejudice, out of my friendship with Chancellor Hutchins which dates back to our days as Yale classmates, and out of my association with the University of Chicago, first as a part-time vice president and now as a trustee.

Increasingly, with each passing year, there are fewer and fewer to deny that Chancellor Hutchins has been the leading voice in the field of higher education in this country. But his influence is far wider than merely that of an educator. Only this week, growing out of the Kefauver hearings in New York, I recalled to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] Chancellor Hutchins' speeches over the last two decades about the great issues of our times, in which he has repeatedly called for a moral, spiritual, and intellectual revolution. Dr. Hutchins' talent for leadership, as well as his great insight into the crucial issues facing the peoples of the world, are again pointed up by these selections from extemporaneous broadcasts in which he has participated. I ask the readers of these selections to note particularly the dates of the broadcasts.

Mr. President, this opportunity to insert these selections into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD provides me with the chance to tell my colleagues of the Senate that in my judgment the Ford Foundation promises to be the greatest private undertaking of all time. The reason why this is true is not merely because of the fabulous potential extent of its philanthropic gifts, which can be anticipated over the next decade, but more particularly because of the talented and inspired leadership which can be expected from Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, the Ford Foundation's director, and from Chancellor Hutchins and Mr. Chester Davis, his two associate directors.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make six and one-half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $533. However, there is no more important subject engaging our attention than that covered by the discussions reproduced in the pamphlet, and that is why I feel warranted in asking unanimous consent that this remarkable group of selections be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the selections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND THE ATOMIC AGE

THE CRISIS OF OUR TIME

(Broadcast December 24, 1944, with William E. Hocking, professor of philosophy, Harvard University; Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of Christian ethics, Union Theological Seminary; Robert Redfield, professor of anthropology, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Statement by Mr. Hutchins

A theologian, a philosopher, and a scientist have shown that the crisis of our time is a moral crisis. They have shown that, unless we can surmount this crisis, such civilization as we have will fall apart, for civilization is a moral fabric. They have shown that the defeat of our enemies in this war, though it may be an indispensable means to the preservation of our civilization, in no sense guarantees its preservation. Peace without good will cannot be durable, because it cannot be just. And technology is not a substitute for justice. Our machines seem, in fact, on the point of wiping us off the face of the earth. They are, moreover, so expensive that we cannot afford to let them stand idle. We must fight for the oil to feed them. We must die that our machines may live. So a distinguished educator said before Pearl Harbor that we should have to go to war with Japan to get rubber for our tires.

The speakers who have preceded me on this program have emphasized that the underlying problem is one of ends, goals, and ideals. With the tremendous resources which science has placed in our hands we should be able to reach almost any conceivable human goal. But if we have the wrong ideals, or if we fail to live up to good ones, the great scientific accomplishments of modern man will end in suicide.

The testimony of the educator is the same as that of the theologian, the philosopher, and the scientist. The educational system of a country is a reflection of what the country thinks it wants. What is honored in a country will be cultivated there. If we look at the educational system of the United States, we get the same impression we got from the speeches in the last campaign—what the American people want is not peace and good will, but peace and a good job. The ideal of the full dinner pail and a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage has been attenuated to the mere possession of a job, any kind of job that will sustain life. It is not surprising, therefore, that although it has never been possible to obtain Federal appropriations for education for citizenship, a representative of the United States Office of Education has lately advocated a Federal appropriation of $300,000,000 for vocational training. It is not surprising that every suggestion affecting our youth is considered in terms of the labor market. It has been proposed in high quarters that men ought to be kept in the Army if jobs cannot be found for them after the war. One of the current arguments for universal military training is that it would give at least a million young men a year something to do.

Now certainly there is no use talking about the aims of life to those who are starving to death. Mass unemployment is a menace to any society. But are we to work merely to exist? Is a job a good thing just because it is a job, no matter how trivial and degrading the occupation? Jobs are means, not ends; and our problem is: What are we working for and what are we living for? If the answer is that we are living merely to live, the whole process loses its meaning. We are in search of values, and there are no values here.

Insofar as we have a definite goal, then, it appears to be a goal of success interpreted in material terms. Though material goods are goods, there are other goods beyond them;

for in the order of goods, materials goods do not stand high. The passionate pursuit of material goods disrupts human relations—as when a prominent labor leader was asked whether, now that China was our ally, we should not repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, and he replied, "A Chinaman is still a Chinaman."

The passionate pursuit of material goods disrupts the common good, for our Government is now the sport of pressure groups—each seeking its material advantage. The passionate pursuit of material goods impairs the hope of world organization and necessarily substitutes security for good will. For each country, even if it does not want territory for itself, must grab territory in order to keep other nations from grabbing it.

America is the strongest and richest Nation on earth. Since we are not under the material pressure to which other nations are subject, since we are not in danger of starvation or invasion, we have no excuse for failing to offer the world what it needs most—moral leadership and a moral example. For the sake of suffering humanity everywhere the people of this country must rediscover the ends of human life and of organized society; they must base their own lives and their own society upon these foundations. As Santayana said of the United States long ago: "This soil is propitious to every seed, and tares must needs grow in it. But why should it not also breed clear thinking, honest judgment, and rational happiness? These things are indeed not necessary to existence, and without them America might long remain rich and populous, like many a barbarous land in the past. But in that case its existence will be hounded, like theirs, by falsity and remorse. May heaven avert the omen, and make the new world a better world than the old."

There is a slight trace of selfishness in Santayana's prayer. Let us change it to read, "May the new world help to make the whole world new."

ATOMIC FORCE: ITS MEANING FOR MANKIND

(Broadcast August 12, 1945 (5 days after Hiroshima), with Reuben Gustavson, chancelor, University of Nebraska; William F. Ogburn, professor of sociology, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Discussion by Mr. Gustavson, Mr. Ogburn, and Mr. Hutchins

Mr. HUTCHINS. Gentlemen, is the atomic bomb good or bad for the world?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. On the day that the first atomic bomb was dropped, I met the director of the university laboratory which helped to develop it. His first words to me were: "This is a very sad day for us. Let us hope that we've not placed dynamite in the hands of children."

Mr. HUTCHINS. Was it wise to use this bomb against Japan?

Mr. OGBURN. By ending the war, it saved more lives than were lost at Hiroshima.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Was the war not going to end anyway?

Mr. OGBURN. But when? The Japanese Minister to Sweden has said that the atomic bomb brought the plea for peace. We cannot have peace or progress without paying the costs, as Charles Darwin showed.

Mr. HUTCHINS. This is the kind of weapon, I believe, which should be used, if at all, only as a last resort in self-defense. At the time that this bomb was dropped the American authorities knew that Russia was going to enter the war. It was said that Japan was blockaded and that its cities were burned out. All the evidence points to the fact that the use of this bomb was unnecessary. Therefore, the United States has lost its moral prestige.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. At the very least we might have used another method. We might have demonstrated the effectiveness of the bomb by calling our shot in advance and by giving the Japanese an opportunity to watch us drop a bomb on an uninhabited part of Japan and then calling upon Japan to surrender.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Perhaps the future is more important than the past. Ogburn, as a social forecaster, what seems most important to you about the atomic bomb?

Mr. OGBURN. This may well be one of the most important inventions of all time. The explosive energy in the atomic bomb, in my opinion, undoubtedly brightens the prospect for abolishing war, but, if, in addition, atomic energy is harnessed, we will usher in the "atomic age" and may produce sweeping changes comparable to those of the industrial revolution, which was brought in by steam. The industrial revolution, we all know, created our cities, made nations bigger, shifted world power, weakened the family, revolutionized agriculture, built an enormous industry, and led to the creation of powerful central government—more powerful than the world had ever known.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Gustavson, you are a scientist. What do you say?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. I would say that the bomb teaches us the value of fundamental research. The work done by Professor Fermi and others on the effect of the neutron on the uranium atom was research carried on out of curiosity and for the general purpose of increasing human understanding. There was no specific purpose of producing atomic energy—certainly no intention of producing world-shattering bombs. The basic work was an attempt to find out about the universe in which we live. To me that is the important lesson; and that is the way all really important discoveries are made.

Mr. HUTCHINS. My own conviction is that the moral burden which this discovery places upon the peoples of the earth and the necessity of a world organization to control this force are most important. Let us take up in order the social and industrial consequences, the implications for research, and the impact of this discovery upon war, peace, and world organization.

Mr. OGBURN. Let us first see what we are talking about. If we are talking about the explosive capacities of uranium—which is the only thing that is known definitely and publicly now—that is one thing; if we are talking about harnessing power from uranium and regulating its flow through machin.s—which is something I have not yet heard whether we can do—then the social consequences, of course, will be much greater; but if we are talking about releasing atomic energy not from uranium alone but from other and more abundant materials—such as for instance, clay or water—and of this I am skeptical as well as uninformed—then, in my judgment, no human imagination can encompass the consequences.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. This is the most important discovery that has been made since the discovery of fire. It is more important than all the inventions since the industrial revolution combined. This discovery is the answer to the dream of the alchemist. We are dealing here with the transmutation of elements, the destruction of matter, and the liberation of tremendous quantities of energy—energy the intensity of which defies description. For example, when dynamite explodes, there is an intensity represented by about 4 volts. We are now talking about something of the order of 200,000,000 volts.

Mr. OGBURN. This is very impressive, but inventions are nearly always overpromised. Ninety-five percent of them never materialize at all. Take, for instance, the singing wire or the talking book, which were invented in the 1890's. They have not been put to public use yet. Or take another invention—that of gas warfare—which put fear in our hearts and which was certainly overpromised 25 years ago at the end of the First World War. It has never materalized up to its promises. My calculations show that it takes, on the average, about 35 years for an invention to materialize, and sometimes it takes 200 or 300 years or longer. All inventions of the past which I have studied have been resisted. Let us look at the example of prefabricated housing, for instance. We could have had it 50 years ago, but instead it has been resisted by the building trades, certain real estate interests, and, of course, the mortgage companies. They do not want it.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. It seems to me that the trend today, however, is away from resistance and toward too-ready acceptance of new things. As a people, we are credulous and volatile rather than skeptical and slow to change. Take vitamins and nylon, for example.

Mr. OGBURN. We must not allow ourselves to begin talking like Jules Verne.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Maybe this time Jules is justified.

Mr. OGBURN. If Jules Verne were sitting around the round table this morning, he would be using the atomic bomb for organizing a war on Mars.

But there are many, many forces which slow up change. Civilization is merely a complicated mass of interrelationships, like a huge piece of machinery. We cannot change one part without changing many parts. To bring in a regulated atomic power means, for instance, changing railroads, electric-power systems, banks, factories, and many other types of social organizations. All this takes time. We do not get inventions adopted overnight.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. We may not get inventions adopted overnight, but we do know certain things about this discovery. We do know that we get out of it incredible heat, incredible power, incredible radioactivity, and new elements.

Mr. OGBURN. But there is a third factor, it seems to me, which slows up the use of inventions. An invention will not be used if it costs too much. President Truman told us that atomic energy cannot compete, in terms of costs, with coal or electricity at this stage. The first two atomic bombs cost, it is reported, $1,000,000,000 apiece. One cannot pick up a piece of U-235 as cheaply as one can pick up a piece of coal and put it in the furnace. The question still is whether it will be brought down cheap enough, and this we certainly do not know yet.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Then let us assume that we have a fundamental discovery, but that it is in a very early stage. What are the social consequences, Ogburn, that you as a social scientist can reasonably foresee, even at this stage?

Mr. OGBURN. I have been trying to argue that we need not get a case of the jitters and that inventions, though they disturb our sense of security, have a way of developing slowly. They develop against social inertia and in the face of resistances arising from the complicated nature of our society, and they come with the handicap of high costs. But to answer your question. If we cannot abolish war, we can pretty well count on a considerable effect on the layout of our cities and on city planning. The cities have already been dispersed by the automobile and more recently by the bomber. If explosives of this kind can reach them, our cities will be further dispersed and spread outward. Thus, this is a tendency which is already under way.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Can we look forward to more leisure

Mr. OGBURN. Any great new use of energy has the potentialities of reducing and, I may say, even abolishing physical toil. We might, if we look forward into the future,

even have factories without any laborers in them at all, but, of course, this will all come slowly.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Could we not have technological unemployment on a scale of which we have never dreamed?

Mr. OGBURN. We could, if the inventions came quickly enough, but most inventions produce technological unemployment only temporarily. Unemployment, in the main, is really caused by the business cycle, fluctuations, and by population changes. I have calculated, for instance, that during the depressions of the 1930's only 15 percent of it was technological.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Remember, this is a fundamental discovery of very fundamental character. It could affect our whole industrial civilization.

Mr. HUTCHINS. What about the effect on the standard of living?

Mr. OGBURN. It will make the atomic age an age of abundance. I am particularly excited, though, about the possibilities for transportation, which I have been studying recently. If atomic energy could be put in a rocket—and that does not seem to be very difficult—and if these rockets could be kept cool and slowed near their destination, it would be perfectly possible, I think, to travel 3,000 miles an hour. This would mean that we could leave New York one day and arrive in China the day before.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Who is talking like Jules Verne now?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Let us not forget that the bomb is the end product of a series of discoveries. In all probability the liberation of atomic power, in a fashion that can be controlled for industry, will likely be much simpler than the making of the bomb.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I am interested in the suggestion that this discovery will favor the big industries—at least in its present stage where we have relatively rare materials and a relatively expensive process. How do you gentlemen feel about public versus private control of this material and this process?

Mr. OGBURN. Let me give some illustrations on this point. Most of our power inventions which we have now have developed big industries of the public utility type—electricity, railroads, aviation. These are certainly not the industries for small businesses. I suspect that the development of atomic energy will be in this class. It will tend to strengthen the big industries. It is very likely, by the way, to speed us further on the "road to serfdom," as the term is now used. It will tend to reinforce movements toward monopoly and toward cartels if, of course, we do not do something about it. But if it can be used in very small packages, then it may, of course, not accentuate this tendency. Most probably, however, it will put tremendous power in the hands of large industrial units. That brings us to the question of what we are going to do about it.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. It seems to me that it will go about the way the development of power in general has gone. We have seen the Government step into the power problem to control the great water resources for the development of electrical power. We are increasingly coming to the conclusion, I believe, that anything so fundamental to our economic structure as electricity, or power in general, has to be something that is Government controlled. The Government would logically have a lot to say about the development and distribution of atomic power.

Mr. OGBURN. I agree. Military reasons, of course, are added to the economic reasons in this case

Mr. HUTCHINS. You both thus feel that on the military side there is no question but that the Government will have to continue in control of this process and the materials used in it. But if large industries are the only ones which are in a position to develop the process or exploit the material at the present time, then we shall have to have governmental regulation of those industries.

What are the implications of this discovery for medicine and for health and for biology?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. They are tremendous, of course. The radioactivity associated with all this work has great possibilities for good and for harm—industrial hazards, for example, in the new industries—the exposure of workingmen to dangers which we never suspected before. We are going to use these radioactive materials, too, in the study of disease processes. We are going to use them in attempting to follow the fundamental researches in biology. The implications for public health, as I said, probably cannot be overstated.

Mr. HUTCHINS. You think that we may have as great a revolution in medical treatment and in biological investigation as we can see ahead of us in the physical sciences and in technology, is that correct?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. There is no question about it.

Mr. HUTCHINS. We have now come to the second main point of discussion on this round table. If the Government has succeeded in creating a notable curse with $2,000,000,000 and the concentrated effort of thousands of scientists over 4 or 5 years, why could we not ask that the Government devote the same money and effort to the elimination of some of the already existing curses such as cancer, influenza, venereal disease, unemployment at home, or starvation abroad?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. The important point here is that while it is relatively easy to get large sums of money to study the cancer problem which you have suggested, it is by no means easy to get large sums of money to study the fundamental properties of living matter. In the last analysis, solution of the cancer problem will be a byproduct of fundamental research on how the cell divides, why it divides, and so forth. We should remember that the nucleus of the cell is just as important in biology as the nucleus of the atom is to nuclear physics. We should remember, as I said before, that, when Professor Fermi did some of the fundamental work leading to the atomic bomb, bombs were the furthest thing away from his thinking. Similarly, the cure for cancer will come indirectly. It will probably come out of fundamental research and not out of the study of cancer.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But does this not mean that such researches would have to be centered in universities rather than in industry or under the auspices of Government?

Mr. OGBURN. The history of research has shown that industry is interested in applied research and that Government is interested, in the main, in contemporary applications. The only fundamental research of any significance has been done at the universities. Take, for instance, radio broadcasting and radar. They were dependent upon the discovery through pure research and science of Hertzian waves.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. After all, where did the Government turn in its hour of great fear? It did not turn to industry, and it did not turn to itself; it turned to the universities.

Mr. OGBURN. The atomic bomb has now put to the universities the biggest challenge which they ever faced, in my judgment. We have to know what to do with the dangerous weapon which we have created. Without liberal education and spiritual education it may become our master and our destroyer. What the natural scientists do is to unloose these new inventions which cause a reorganization of society, a reorganization of our economic institutions and of our social institutions, and always, what should not be forgotten, a revaluation of our ideologies. But here we are, sitting around trying to give the answers in a half hour on this round table, when it canont be done. It took $2,000,000,000 and 3 years, so we are told, to produce an atomic bomb. If the various social scientists had $2,000,000,000 and 3 years of research, maybe we could give better answers, but I think maybe that we ought to consider declaring a moratorium an all pure-science and natural-science development until we social scientists can catch up.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I understand that you are not seriously suggesting a moratorium. You are suggesting that Gustavson and I should get out and raise $2,000,000,000 for the support of social science research. We will be glad to do that.

Mr. OGBURN. That is chicken feed, Hutchins, mere chicken feed. We need much more than that.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I would like to consider whether, even if we had $2,000,000,000 for social-science research, we could have any effect upon society if society were not educated enough to accept the results.

Mr. OGBURN. That, of course, is the basic problem.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I want to ask whether it is not necessary, therefore—and whether this is not another of the responsibilities of the university—to develop liberal education for all.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Quite right. Even Harvard and Yale and the University of Colorado, my former institution, have at last decided to devote themselves to general education as a preliminary to specialization. It would seem to me that this must be the trend and that it must be tremendously accelerated.

Mr. HUTCHINS. If we are going to have a society which knows what to do with these constant surprises from the physical scientists, we are going to have an entirely different level of general intelligence in the community from the one which we have been used to in the past.

Mr. OGBURN. That, Hutchins, is really the challenge of the atomic bomb. The bomb produced a sort of paralysis in Japan, but also, we would like to note that the first week in the atomic-bomb age has given the rest of the world a very bad state of jitters, to say the least. What we really fear, I think, is not the bomb so much as the unknown. But we need not fear it if we can control the development and control the knowledge and use it consciously and confidently for good and not for evil.

Mr. HUTCHINS. That brings us, does it not, to our last point, which is the military and political significance of atomic force?

Mr. OGBURN. It is an interesting fact that nations in the past, throughout the long history of mankind, have risen and fallen pretty much on the basis of inventions. England dominated the world during the nineteenth century. She did it, because the harnessing of the first mechanical power—steam—brought the Industrial Revolution to England 50 years before it did to any country on the Continent. Prior to that, France and other West European countries displaced the Mediterranean countries, because agricultural inventions made the river valleys of France such powerful forces. Before that, the Mediterranean powers rose because of another invention—the boat. Now, along comes a still more important development—atomic energy. Will there be a realinement of international powers?

Mr. HUTCHINS. What I get out of what you have been saying is that the United States is going to dominate the world, because the United States is sitting on this secret.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. If the United States tries to sit on this secret, it will make itself the most hated power on earth. But we cannot sit on this secret. If the history of science shows anything, it shows that discoveries are made practically simultaneously in several parts of the world and that no single nation develops an idea of this kind. As you well know, Hutchins, the men who are going to work on nuclear physics at the University of Chicago, come from Italy, from Hungary, from England, from Canada, from the United

States. This bomb was a composite that grew out of the efforts of many people. If any one nation attempted to isolate itself scientifically, it would soon be outstripped by the others which would not be parties to the secrecy.

Mr. OGBURN. Brains, in a hereditary sense, as the biologists know, are pretty well generally distributed over the world. The thing which we have to look out for, though, is what the distribution of the natural resources is, for this new source of power. Where do we find uranium? In Colorado, Utah, and Canada, but it also exists in Czechoslovakia, in Africa, and in Russia. That puts it in the hands of what we call the "peace-loving nations." May I say that I hope that they will continue to love peace.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Your implication that the release of atomic energy is limited to uranium is open to question. In all probability we shall learn to apply the process to other more abundant elements. It seems to me that this discovery really equalizes the nations by placing atomic power, with all its potentialities, into the hands of all small nations. What we have done is the equivalent of placing a slingshot in the hands of a David.

Mr. OGBURN. Not yet; not yet. The chances are strong that the difference between the big nations and the small nations will be increased rather than diminished. That is what happened with the tank and the bomber. They practically killed off the small nations as effective factors in the distribution of power. The atomic bomb will very likely strengthen the big nation, because, whatever the little one can do, the big can do better and quicker.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. But your assumption is that it takes tremendous industry and a lot of airplanes to do this sort of job. It is altogether possible that relatively small numbers of workers in a small country, such as Denmark, could develop all the facilities which are necessary without a single bomber. With only a runway, a rocket, and an atomic bomb a man in Copenhagen might be able to destroy Berlin.

Mr. OGBURN. The big nation could still produce bigger, better, and quicker results. What do you think, Hutchins?

Mr. HUTCHINS. The first thing that I think is that peacetime military training in the United States now becomes an irrelevant issue. We do not need a big Army to operate an atomic bomb; we do not need much of an Air Force. Peacetime conscription is a soporific. We should not rely upon large masses of half-trained men; we should pin our faith upon scientific research.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. At the present stage uranium is known to be distributed only in certain places. Manpower and industrial strength related to its use are important. The issue is whether, as scientific research proceeds, it will not result in a further redistribution of power which might bring the smaller nations back on the same level. But the upshot in any case is that the atomic bomb cannot be suppressed. Ogburn, by talking about the abolition of war, did you mean that something like the United Nations Organization might abolish war by agreement now that the atomic bomb has fallen?

Mr. OGBURN. It is the best chance to banish war which we have had since the League of Nations—at least to banish it for a time—a very long time.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I do not follow you at all. After the last war it was said that the airplane and the TNT bomb were going to be so horrible that nobody would ever fight again. And Hitler began to fight as soon as he saw that he had industrial resources and a political position adequate to give him a good chance of success. Is that not always going to be the case? We are not going to abolish war merely by making it horrible.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. People are going to fight for whatever they think that they can win. They always have, and they always will.

Mr. OGBURN. The Japanese apparently thought that it was too horrible. But do not misunderstand me, I am not saying that we can banish war forever. All that we can foresee is about 20 or 25 years ahead. The problem is practically, to make war much more difficult. If the atomic bomb has all these destructive capacities, it may be our golden opportunity.

Mr. HUTCHINS. We have always had this chance.

Mr. OGBURN. But we did not have the atomic bomb.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The whole question is: What is at stake and what are our chances? If a man has a chance to dominate the world through the control of atomic energy, that is a very large stake. And if he has, through the advances made by the scientists in his country, an opportunity to use this atomic force in such a way as to justify him in thinking that he has the edge on his enemies, he will take advantage of his situation and start another international conflagration. How are we going to prevent this? Did I understand you to say that you thought that we could have an international agreement which would either stop scientific progress in weapons or make every nation feel that it should never take advantage of such progress?

Mr. OGBURN. Such an agreement is not impossible, certainly.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The question is not whether it is impossible but whether it would be effective. Up to last Monday I must confess that I did not have much hope for a world state. I have believed that no moral basis for it existed and that we had no world conscience and no sense of world community sufficient to keep a world state together. But the alternatives now seem clear. One is world suicide; another is agreement among sovereign states to abstain from using the bomb. This will not be effective. The only hope, therefore, of abolishing war is through the monopoly of atomic force by a world organization.

Mr. OGBURN. But that is a thousand years off.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Remember that Leon Bloy, the French philosopher, referred to the good news of damnation, doubtless on the theory that none of us would be Christians if we were not afraid of perpetual hell-fire. It may be that the atomic bomb is the good news of damnation, that it may frighten us into that Christian character and those righteous actions and those positive political steps necessary to the creation of a world society, not a thousand or 500 years hence, but now.

PEACE AND THE ATOM BOMB

(Broadcast November 11, 1945, with Reuben Gustavson, chancellor, University of Nebraska; Robert Redfield, professor of anthropology, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Discussion by Mr. Gustavson, Mr. Redfield, and Mr. Hutchins

Mr. HUTCHINS. This Armistice Day the world is blessed with peace, except in China, Java, Palestine, and a few other places. We are also blessed with the atomic bomb. This is a good time to ask whether America, which gave the world the atomic bomb, has a foreign policy which makes for peace.

It seems to me that the American people now realize that the United States, for the first time, is vulnerable from every quarter of the globe. Americans are striking out in all directions under the impact of the discovery of atomic energy, striving, first of all, for what they think is national security.

Mr. REDFIELD. I agree that this is a new and a terrible fear and that we are acting under the influence of that fear. Many of the actions which we are taking are therefore unreasonable actions. It is not surprising, I believe, that we turn first to the new military strength which has just won us victory. But we hide behind it blindly. The question for us to consider here is whether this military strength is really the protection which we like to think it is.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. In addition, we are also reorganizing our whole domestic life in the light of this fear which has come over us. We are now talking about putting scientific research in atomic energy in the United States under the cloak of secrecy. This will hamper and delay the developments in the field of biology, in the field of medicine, and in the field of atomic power for industry. The end result of this policy is that we deny ourselves the very things which will make future wars less likely.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In short, the official policy of the United States is a policy of force. We find it manifested in all kinds of different ways, in almost everything that comes out of Washington. We hear that we are going to keep the so-called secret of the atomic bomb; that we are going to have the largest navy in the world. At the moment when we are the most powerful nation on earth, we are going to introduce the innovation of universal military training. We are going to put atomic energy under a dictatorship. We are going to get island bases to protect us. We are going to have the largest espionage service in the world.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Even when we go about fostering science through a proposed National Research Foundation, we do it in the name of military strength.

Mr. HUTCHINS. One of the most distressing aspects of this policy is the air of moral superiority with which we state it. Mr. Truman hints that we are entitled to world domination because we are devoted to the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule. But it is a little difficult to see how dropping atomic bombs, without warning, upon the men, women, and children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki could have been suggested to us by either the Ten Commandments or the Golden Rule.

But perhaps we have not time to discuss our alleged moral superiority. Let us ask, instead, whether the policy of force which our Government is following makes sense.

Mr. REDFIELD. It must make only one kind of sense to people in other countries. To them it must seem that we are preparing to dominate the world by force. The policy would at least be one which could be carried out if America were, in fact, determined to dominate the world, but I do not believe that 130,000,000 Americans are. So the first thing to be said about the Government policy is that it is confused. It threatens while we do not really mean the threat.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Our policy is complete confusion. Let us take, for example, the policy of keeping the secret of the atomic bomb. Every scientist who has said anything about this problem has said that in terms of fundamental principles there is no secret; that our secrets (such as they are) consist in industrial know-how. We should remember that Germany, even though she was bombed almost continuously, made great progress toward the liberation of atomic energy. This simply means that any country which is capable of making a great industrial effort can have atomic bombs, just as any country which wants automobiles can have them.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In addition to England and Canada, scientists at least in France and Denmark are familiar with this whole development.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. That is true. We simply have to contemplate a world in which every nation which is capable of making the effort can have atomic bombs in 5 years; and there

are a number of them—some are small, and some are large—who are capable of making that effort.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But do I not understand Einstein to say that this atomic bomb is not a very serious weapon after all?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Yes, when asked if all the people would be killed in the next atomic-power war, he said, "No, only two-thirds of them," if that is any consolation.

Mr. REDFIELD. In other words as a friend of mine put it, there is nothing to worry about. We have nothing to lose but our lives and our property.

J. R. Oppenheimer, an atom-bomb scientist, who should know something about this, was a little more conservative. He gave his opinion that 40,000,000 Americans might be killed in one night.

Mr. HUTCHINS. What you gentlemen are saying, I take it, is that the atomic bomb is a new threat to civilization—a threat which will be fatal unless something is done to control it. You are also saying that our effort to control it by preserving the secret is absurd. That policy will fail.

Mr. REDFIELD. The evidence of confusion in this policy is also present in other matters. I do not think that the question as to armament, in terms of the ordinary army and navy, has been frankly faced in terms of the atom bomb.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. If we are to have a large army, we should know what we are to do with it—if we destroy the cities of our enemy or if the enemy destroys our cities.

Mr. REDFIELD. The Secretary of War said last week that universal military training is needed so that trained men will be available to restore public utilities after our cities have been atom-bombed. Perhaps the Army will teach them to connect the sewers and the electric-light wires. The Japanese certainly had universal military training, but did they connect the plumbing after Hiroshima? They did not; they gave up. Moreover, I ask, what is to support the Army after all the cities have been destroyed?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. In spite of all which has been written, the American people still fail to realize the tremendous power, even at its present state of development, in one atomic bomb, to say nothing of what the future might bring.

For comparison, let us look at the Fifth and Eighth Air Forces. They dropped a million tons of bombs on Europe during the war, and we have some faint notion of the terrible destruction which was accomplished. One atomic bomb is equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT, which to carry requires five freight trains of 80 cars each. Fifty atomic bombs carried by 50 planes could carry the equivalent of all the TNT bombs dropped on Europe. Obviously, if this is the case, for what do we want a large Navy?

Mr. REDFIELD. Similar difficulty can be found with the suggestion that naval bases must be maintained and defended. As General Arnold tells us, these bombs can today be carried by nonstop airplanes to any part of the world. We know that even if some of the planes were intercepted, enough are sure to get through to destroy the industrial base of an enemy or of ourselves. Why, then, do you need naval bases? What kind of a navy do you need if one can destroy an enemy's industrial foundations in a few hours from one's own home country?

Mr. HUTCHINS. What kind of air force do we need if we are going to fire atomic bombs by rockets, or if we are going to send agents into potential enemy countries who will plant bombs which will be detonated when war is decided upon?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. The answer which the professional military people make is that we must have a large army to occupy a defeated country.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Yes; we may need a relatively small army of occupation if we insist upon occupying a defeated country after its cities have been devastated. In order to get this small army of occupation to the defeated country, we may need an air force and a navy, not for combat but for transport. But this means a much smaller number of ships and airplanes and an entirely different kind of ship and airplane than is being proposed.

But this policy of force, which is exemplified by a policy of secrecy in regard to the atomic bomb, is not merely confused, is it, gentlemen? It is dangerous, also, because if we claim to have a secret when there is no secret and if we keep telling the people that we are going to protect them by keeping a secret that does not exist, then we lull them into a false sense of security.

Mr. REDFIELD. The pretense that we are protected, then, works us a double injury. In the first place, relying upon a protection which is really not a protection in the long run, we fail to take the steps to build international confidence which might save us. In the second place, it greatly enhances the fear and suspicion which are directed against us, and so brings war nearer.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. That is very obvious in the recent attitude which Russia has expressed in her failure to attend conferences and in her maintaining an attitude of almost complete silence on the whole problem of the military bomb.

The Russians, for example, recently celebrated the two hundred and twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Russian Academy of Science. As a part of that celebration, they invited scientists from all over the world to join them, including the outstanding scientists in America. Pressure was brought to bear upon our scientists to prevent them from attending, presumably for fear that they might give up some of our so-called secrets. In other words, we have gotten to the place where we do not even trust our own people. We seem headed in the same general direction as Germany was headed when she tried to build a Nazi science. We are trying to build a highly nationalistic American science.

Mr. REDFIELD. When scientists want to talk things over with other scientists, they are not traitors. Scientists have to be internationalists, for no nation can go it alone in science and not lag behind in scientific progress.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Let us put ourselves wholeheartedly to the task of feeding the world: to clothing the world; to housing it. Let us pool our resources against disease. We have the know-how; let us go to work. Let us get our mind off the military problem and put it back on the fundamental problem of making a decent world.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But all the discussions in the American Congress about atomic energy have been conducted on the assumption that what we are dealing with here is a weapon.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. It is interesting, of course, to contrast the attitude of our own Government, as reflected in our press, with what we can read in papers such as the London Times. In England, industrialists are gathering a fund of something like a half a billion dollars—that is a fourth of the money we spent on the atomic bomb—for the investigation of the peacetime uses of atomic energy. In our own country there has been practically no discussion along that line. In fact, all our legislation is headed in the direction of using this entirely as a military weapon.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Take the May-Johnson bill, for example. The May-Johnson bill attempts to control all atomic research. It maintains that secrecy is necessary in order that the research may succeed. This can be true only if one is thinking in military terms. The bill places the administration of atomic research in the hands of an independent, practically irresponsible agency, exercising a kind of control which can be justified—if it can be justified at all—only on military grounds. In fact, there is reason to believe that the bill contemplates placing a military officer in charge of atomic research in this country.

Mr. REDFIELD. Again in contrast with our own obsession with the control of the discovery for warfare is the tenor of Molotov's speech made last week. You will remember that he promised the Russians an early development of atomic energy in their own country. But all his emphasis was upon the development of that energy in the building-up of the country.

On the other hand, in our own country, the Army has tried to hurry through Congress a strait-jacket for scientific research—the May-Johnson bill, which Hutchins just mentioned. If the bill should pass, the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will be hampered. Indeed, under such a law, research for military purposes would be hampered.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. As I recall it, Molotov scarcely referred to the military use of atomic energy in Russia. It is the United States which seems to be beginning an armament race in atomic armaments. History suggests that any armament race ends in very serious consequences; and an atomic-bomb armament race, as we have learned from the statements of Einstein and Oppenheimer, is something too frightening to contemplate.

Mr. HUTCHINS. If we go into an atomic-bomb armament race, can we hope to win it?

Mr. REDFIELD. I say that this is a kind of race which nobody can really win. Such an arms race would end in an explosion which would be a catastrophe. A victory would mean only that more Americans would be left than citizens of the enemy country. This is a race toward just one goal—world suicide.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Suppose that Mr. Truman suddenly decides to reveal the so-called secrets of the atomic bomb to all the nations of the world. What kind of policy have we then?

Mr. REDFIELD. We have considerable improvement, but essentially we still have the same policy; have we not? We have a policy which emphasizes military domination by our country. If everybody had bombs, nevertheless, the various measures which you have listed, Hutchins, would add up to the same desperate and ultimately suicidal armaments race.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In this discussion it becomes clear that the policy of the United States is based on force. It is a policy which will seem to other countries a policy directed toward world domination. The policy is confused, contradictory, and incoherent. It is a bad means to a bad end. The general tendency of the policy, moreover, is to increase enormously the difficulty of developing confidence among peoples; to exaggerate the tensions leading to war; and to create a world which must live in perpetual fear.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. In other words, here we are with all the technical skills to produce all the food we need, all the clothing we need, and, what is more wonderful, new tools which grow out of atomic-energy research for fighting disease, all the necessary skills for housing the world. Yet we are chained to the psychology of war.

Mr. HUTCHINS. We take the substance of the people and devote it to a fruitless armament race.

Mr. REDFIELD. We take the substance, and we corrupt the spirit. The current policy would make exaggerated military power a main basis of national life. This is to make the people accept force as a principle of living. The hope lies in extending common understandings to make a world community, but we now frustrate that hope by accepting force as our principle.

Mr. HUTCHINS. This is the doctrine of power politics.

Mr. REDFIELD. That doctrine may now become not merely a public policy but also a mode of life.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. And it is a question whether any of us want to live under it. I am reminded of Lord Acton, when he said, "Power always corrupts; and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Mr. HUTCHINS. That is, we would say that this policy is suicidal; but, what is much more important, it is degrading. Even if we survive, we ought not to want to.

The situation is all the more menacing because the world which is emerging seems to be a world of two major powers—Russia and the United States. By constantly building up our military strength, we are daily threatening the other major power in the world—namely, Russia.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. Suppose that Russia had the atomic bomb and suppose that Russia were building the largest navy in the world and suppose she were keeping her army at its present great strength and suppose she were legislating for her science so that everything would go down a military channel, would we look upon that as a threat to world peace?

Mr. REDFIELD. Of course we would. I would answer that argument by saying that I think that we would be seriously mistaken if we should attempt to justify the present policy in this country on the ground that the Russians, if they were in our shoes, would do the same things. Maybe they would; but if they would make the mistake we are making, that is no reason why we should make it.

Here the atom bomb comes in again. Before its advent, people had a chance to dominate the world without destroying themselves. The Nazis had that chance. But, today, although through fear or desperation men may nevertheless make the attempt, the ruin of all will be the result.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The Russians are human, and conceivably they might be as stupid if they were in our position. But there is no reason why we should be stupid just because we think somebody else might be under the same circumstances.

But I understand that Mr. Truman has telegraphed congratulations to Russia on the anniversary of the revolution and has expressed hopes for lasting cooperation. So, perhaps, we do not have to worry about the problem of Russian relations.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. I know all about that. But when someone holds out his right hand to shake hands with somebody and, at the same time, puts his left hand on his gun, there results a situation where mutual confidence is impossible.

Mr. HUTCHINS. What you are saying is that if these policies are calculated to convince the Russians that we are proposing to attack them, what is needed now is not fair words but a repudiation of the policy.

That leads to the next question for our consideration. What specific steps can be taken now, independently of other nations, which will turn our foreign policy into a policy which makes for peace?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. First, we can disclose the so-called secrets of the atomic bomb. There is no scientific secret. There are no mechanical secrets which cannot be worked out by foreign engineers just as our engineers worked them out. We are not giving away anything when we give away these so-called secrets. But what we are doing, and this is most important, is making a friendly gesture.

Mr. REDFIELD. We agree here that there is no long-run security in a policy of military force, but would not the revelation of the know-how of the atomic bomb endanger the short-run, immediate security of the United States?

Mr. GUSTAVSON. No, because the time which it will take other nations to make atomic bombs will not be materially shortened. The difference would probably be only a matter of months, or perhaps a year at most. What takes time is the mobilization of industrial power, the men and the machines, to make the bombs. Even if other nations knew today all that we know about the manufacturing process, they would have a hard pull ahead of them before they could come out with a finished product.

Mr. HUTCHINS. A second specific step toward peace to be taken independently by the United States, without endangering the security of the country, would be to withdraw the May-Johnson bill for the control of atomic energy. This proposed act, which treats atomic energy chiefly as a weapon, gives other countries the impression that we propose to develop atomic energy chiefly for hostile purposes. What we need now is a bill which looks upon atomic power as a potential benefit to mankind and which frees industrial and scientific development. That would do much to reassure the world.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. A third specific step which can be taken independently by the United States without endangering its security is the abandonment of the proposal for universal military training. We have seen that this proposal is a military absurdity in an atomic age. We actually strengthen ourselves by abandoning it, for we avoid the waste of our resources and the self-deception which it involves.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Then, these three steps—the disclosure of the secrets of the atomic bomb, the passage of a bill on atomic energy which would emphasize the peaceful possibilities of this discovery for mankind, and the abandonment of universal military training—can all be safely taken by us alone and taken now; and all of them will make for peace. Other steps may require the collaboration of other nations and may take longer.

Mr. REDFIELD. But these other steps are even more important. And in one of them we can take the initiative now. We can call a conference of the United Nations, at which the United States would offer to disclose all its military secrets of every kind and to reduce all its armaments of every kind, provided every nation would do the same. The same invitation, I submit, should propose that the conference exchange all scientific information which might be useful in the cooperative reconstruction of the world. If other nations refused, the United States would at least have made it clear that it had no desire to dominate the world by force. If other nations accepted, we might again have some hope for the survival of civilization.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. But the ultimate hope for civilization in the atomic age cannot rest on interim measures like these, important as they are. The important hope lies in world unity, in a world state, in a world government.

Mr. HUTCHINS. But that is a long way off. If a world state and a world government are to last and not to be disrupted by an atomic civil war, a world state and a world government must be supported by and must reflect a world community. This world community requires world communication; world understanding; a common tradition; a common stock of ideas and ideals which are shared by the peoples of the earth. People can be frightened into a world government, but they cannot develop communication, understanding, tradition, ideas, and ideals overnight. And if they do not develop them, the world government into which they have been frightened cannot last.

Mr. REDFIELD. I agree that they cannot develop them overnight, but they can do something to bring them about. The mere discussion of a world constitution and, still more, of course, the adoption of one would do more than any other single thing to promote the formation of a true world community, just as our own Constitution, which reflects the principles which unite us, helps to make the United States a community.

We should therefore call a world constitutional convention to consider how the world may be held together during the atomic age. If it failed, we should call another. Every interchange among the nations must be encouraged, and discussions of the possible constitution of a world state should be the most fruitful of all.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. After all, an atomic civil war, if it should take place in a world state, would be no worse for us or for the world than the atomic international war toward which we are speeding.

Mr. HUTCHINS. In the meantime, the possibilities of the United Nations Organization should not be overlooked.

Mr. GUSTAVSON. That organization is far from perfect. In its present form it cannot prevent war, for example. It is an organization of independent sovereign states, dominated by a few great powers.

Mr. REDFIELD. But the important point is that it is an international organization and the only one which we have. It must be used. The more it is used, the more useful it will become. Meanwhile, we can consider whether it should be supplanted by a stronger organization or whether it may not itself, drastically revised, grow into world government.

Mr. HUTCHINS. The next war will be, in a very gruesome sense, a war to end war. When the next war is over, there will be nobody left to fight another. If we are to avert the next war, we must immediately change the direction of American foreign policy.

On this round-table discussion we have listed five measures which might avert the next war: (1) The disclosure of the so-called "secrets" of the atomic bomb; (2) a law governing atomic energy, which would release science and industry to give the world the goods and leisure which atomic energy promises; (3) the abandonment of universal military training; (4) an international conference in which we propose to disclose all military secrets and reduce all armaments if other nations will do the same; and (5) the calling of a world constitutional convention.

Simultaneously, we must develop the United Nations Organization to the maximum by using it to the maximum. If the American people want peace, they must recognize the folly of trying to build it on force. That policy is immoral and suicidal. It is a policy adequately described by the historian Tacitus. He said, when force was the policy of the Romans, "They make a desolation, and they call it peace."

THE THIRD YEAR OF THE ATOMIC AGE: WHAT SHOULD WE DO NOW?

(Broadcast August 24, 1947, with G. A. Borgese, secretary of the Committee To Frame a World Constitution; Richard J. Finnegan, editor, Chicago Sun-Times; Carl A. Hatch, United States district judge, New Mexico; Harold C. Urey, atomic scientist, University of Chicago; Robert M. Hutchins)

Statement by Mr. Hutchins

Two years ago, the Sunday after the bomb dropped, the University of Chicago Round Table discussed Atomic Force—Its Meaning for Mankind.

The University of Chicago had been one of the principal centers of research on the bomb. The first chain reaction took place on its campus on December 2, 1942.

The university, even before the round table of 2 years ago, had determined to do what it could to maintain the leadership of the United States in atomic studies and to hold together some of the members of the group which had produced the bomb.

For this purpose it had already created three new research institutes. The university representatives on the round table had therefore some qualifications to speak on the subject, and the institution they represented was deeply involved in whatever atomic energy might mean for mankind.

The fundamental facts about the atomic bomb today are those which the round table emphasized 2 years ago. There is no secret. There is no defense. Since there is no secret, other nations will have the bomb almost any day. Since there is no defense, military preparations to defend ourselves against the bomb are a waste of time.

In another war the atomic bomb will be used. International agreements for the control of atomic energy will simply mean that the next war will end with atomic bombs instead of beginning with them. The minute that war breaks out, every nation that knows how will start making atomic bombs.

It is generally thought that another nation will be able to make atomic bombs within 5 years from the day on which we dropped the first bomb on Japan. If this is so, we have already frittered away 40 percent of the time we had to organize ourselves to preserve mankind.

The New York Times, in its editorial on the second anniversary of the bomb, says that the ultimate protection against it can only be the abolition of war itself. The Times suggests that the final success of efforts to abolish war can be realized only in an ultimate world government.

I do not understand the use of the word "ultimate" in this connection. We have now arrived at the ultimate stage in history. We cannot do something intermediate now and ultimately do something ultimate. What is ultimately required of us is required of us now. If what is ultimately required of us is the abolition of war through a world government, then we had better set about trying to get war abolished through world government now.

Any proposal for a world atomic authority is a proposal for world government. Such an authority must have a monopoly of atomic bombs, which means that every nation would be at its mercy, and it must have the right to enter, inspect, and destroy atomic installations anywhere in the world. No nation could call itself sovereign in any usual sense under such conditions.

The major premise of all discussions looking toward agreements for the control of atomic energy has been that the nations retain their sovereignty. Hence, these discussions have not succeeded and cannot succeed. Either we have world federal government and real atomic control, or we have no agreements, or agreements that are meaningless, and eventually atomic war.

It will be said, of course, that if nations will not collaborate in an alliance or debating society like the United Nations, they cannot be expected to come together or stay together in a world state. The American States could not or would not collaborate under the Articles of Confederation before 1787, but they did come together, and with the exception of one period, they stayed together under the Constitution.

It may be admitted that there were ties which united them which do not unite the nations today. On the other hand, we should not forget that many differences deeply divided the American States, so much so that, 3 months before the Constitutional Convention, Madison wrote that "he trembled for the issue."

Mr. Hooker has lately shown in the magazine Common Cause how serious the divisions among the States in the Confederation were. Virginia had twelve times as many people as Delaware. Georgia claimed a hundred times as many square miles as Rhode Island. There were so many Germans in Pennsylvania that Franklin feared they might make German the language of the State. It was impossible to get along in some sections in New York without knowing Dutch. The trip from Boston to New York, which now takes less than an hour, took four days to a week along the finest road, or longer than it takes now to go around the world.

Gouverneur Morris thought that a Federal tax was impossible because of the extent of the country; and one member of the Convention asked, How can it be supposed that this vast country, including the western territory, will, 150 years hence, remain one Nation?

When Washington took charge of the armies surrounding Boston, he wrote that the New Englanders were an exceedingly dirty and nasty people. On the other hand, Ephraim Paine, of Vermont, complained that the southern members of Congress regarded themselves as a superior order of animals. Tithes were levied by New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland on the goods of other States; and New Jersey taxed the New York lighthouse on Sandy Hook. New York, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts quarreled about Vermont, and Pennsylvanians battled Virginians on the Upper Ohio. It is no wonder that, when the Constitution was completed by the Convention, the principal attack upon it was that it was utopian—a visionary project, an indigestible panacea.

And it barely was accepted. In the convention in the critical States it just squeaked through. In Massachusetts it carried by 29 votes; in Virginia, by 10; and in New York by only three.

To borrow a phrase from Mr. Borgese, world government is necessary and therefore possible. Of course, the world government can mean much, little, or nothing. An effort to find out what a free and federal world constitution would be like is now proceeding in the Committee To Frame a World Constitution. Whether this effort succeeds or fails, it will at least serve to clarify the issues and to focus the thought of the world on the method of forming a federal union which shall embrace all men.

It is very late. Perhaps nothing can save us. But the handwriting on the wall is plain enough. It says to the peoples of the earth, "Unite or die."

THE PROBLEM OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

(Broadcast April 4, 1948, with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India; V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador from China in the United States; Robert M. Hutchins)

Statement by Mr. Hutchins

We come now to the practical and immediate bearing upon American foreign policy of the two eloquent statements which you have heard.

The official American policy is to frighten Russia out of her alleged intention to establish world government, on the Russian plan, by force and fraud. According to present indications, the American elections next autumn can make little change in this policy; for each candidate for the Republican nomination is seeking favor on the ground that his principles and personality will frighten the Russians more than those of any of his rivals. Many Americans want to go farther still. They see that a policy of frightening Russia will merely postpone the war which is to decide whether we have world government on the Russian plan or world government on the American plan. Therefore, they want to fight Russia now while we are overwhelmingly stronger than she. They are calling for a preventive war.

Talk of a preventive war is vicious and perverted. If we seriously entertain the idea of a preventive war, we ought first to make our apologies to the Nazis we hanged at Nuremberg. Talk of any war, now or later, is not much better. The best that can be said for it is that it is recklessly frivolous. This is, we often hear, a Christian country; and the message of Christ calls us to good will, to the love of our neighbor, to the renunciation of the goods of this world, to humility, and to the forgiveness, not the slaughter, of our enemies. To say that we must kill Communists because they are atheists and we are Christians is a strange distortion of Christianity.

Those who believe in preventive war have one point on their side. They are correct in holding that a policy of frightening Russia cannot permanently succeed. Some day Russia will have the atomic bomb. Some day Russia will feel strong enough to prefer fighting to being frightened. Then the next war will come, and after it will come world government for such world as we have left. World government will come by conquest, instead of by orderly constitutional procedure.

Have we forgotten what the scientists have told us about the next war? If it comes when both sides have the atomic bomb, the cities of both sides will be destroyed. I do not care about architecture. The men, women, and children in our cities will be blown to bits. The atomic bomb is a weapon directed against civilians. If we go to war before the Russians have the atomic bomb, we may expect the horrors of bacteriological warfare. We may expect the death of millions of innocent people. We may expect the disruption of our own economy and of our own form of government. We shall lay Europe waste—Europe, our ancestral homeland; Europe, for the sake of which we are now preparing for war. And when the war is over, if it ever is, we shall have the task of imposing our will by force for centuries on the peoples we have defeated. World government by the conquest of the world means perpetual war.

That we can lightheartedly discuss such a program not 3 years after the death of Hitler suggests that Hitler has triumphed after all. He was the symbol of brute force in our time. He was defeated, but we, his conquerors, are now preparing to bow down before the idol which he worshiped.

There is a good deal of hypocrisy about our attitude toward Russia. We do not believe that Russia is ready to attack us. We cannot seriously think that all Russians are bloodthirsty villains and that all the actions of the American Government through history have the pure, angelic quality which we ascribe to them. Have we forgotten how we got the Panama Canal? Have we forgotten our continual interference, often for no better reason than the protection of our investments, in the internal affairs of Latin America? The Russians have behaved stupidly. Our own consciences cannot be altogether clear. We might ask ourselves how we should feel if the Russian Secretary for Air were to say of us what our Secretary for Air said of Russia a week or so ago, when he stated publicly that our planes could now drop bombs on Russian cities and return to their bases in America.

The peoples of the earth want freedom and justice. They do not want to be individuals without duties or automatons without rights. Communism denies them freedom. The critical spirit of man works against communism. Differences among individuals work against communism, for it holds that all men are identical. The European tradition of free expression, a free press, and political parties works against communism. Invention in the arts, discovery in the sciences, carelessness, restlessness, humor, rational skepticism, and religious faith work against it.

What works for it? Nothing but injustice, which appears to millions today in the prospect of endless starvation and exploitation. The people of Europe do not want and will not long tolerate Communist justice at the expense of freedom. But the people of Europe cannot be permanently intimidated, and they cannot be permanently bought. They must have before their eyes some positive idea, some positive program which offers them both freedom and justice.

The stop-Russia program does not meet these requirements. The time is one for imagination, invention, for the effort to raise ourselves by our own bootstraps into a different spiritual world. This effort is harder than a policy of vast military preparations and resounding threats. But it has the merit of relieving us from condemnation by our own moral code. It has the merit of offering hope to mankind. Another war will mean the end of all hopes whatever.

We should strain our minds and imaginations to invent a political structure which may unite the world in freedom and justice. The aim is unity, which comes by agreement, not unification, which is imposed by force. The aim is a world state which rests not on the uneasy, impermanent, and unjust foundation of conquest but on the durable basis of the consent of the governed.

Such a world state must be a federal government, for only a federal government can create peace and safeguard liberty while preserving order. Such a world government must be a government, and not, like the United Nations, a league of independent, sovereign states, perpetuating the malady of nationalism. Such a world government must protect freedom; and it must be founded on justice, for men will fight until they get their rights.

Can such a world constitution be invented? I think so, for the Committee To Frame a World Constitution, established at Chicago 2½ years ago at the initiative of G. A. Borgese, has just published a draft of a possible world constitution which contains these elements.

Can such a world constitution be adopted? Nobody knows. But such a world constitution offers a positive idea. Hence it has a chance of gaining the adherence of mankind.

Can such a constitution guarantee that there will never be another war? Of course not. But it offers a hope that there will not be another war—and the only hope which we have. If a constitution proposing freedom and justice is accepted by most of the world, with the exception of Russia and her satellites, then there may be war. But it will be a war in which we cannot be accused of seeking our own aggrandizement, the submission of others to our will, or the domination of the world. A war, if it comes then, will be one in which the issues will be far plainer, in which our allies will be far more numerous and more loyal, and in which our sense of righteousness and high purpose will be far stronger than they can be today.

But the main point of contrast is this: the foreign policy of the United States means that war is inevitable. World government founded on freedom and justice means that war, though still possible, is no longer inevitable. If war is inevitable, civilization has no future.

All Americans who hope for a future for their children, all Americans who want one good world, all Americans who believe in the brotherhood of man, should call upon the President and upon Congress to initiate a world constitutional convention.

The mission of America is not to dominate the world but to transform it.

A National Policy for Timberlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in the present emergency we realize more and more the importance of our natural resources, especially those represented in the forest lands of the United States. In times when there is no stress we ruthlessly exploit our timberlands and dispoil our forests without thought of the future, without regard to the huge loss of construction material and the waste of our land.

Some interesting information is contained in a speech on a national policy for timber lands, which was recently delivered by Mr. E. L. Demmon, director, Lake States Forest Experiment Station at St. Paul, Minn. The speech was made before the North American Wildlife Conference at Milwaukee, Wis. I recommend careful consideration of Mr. Demmon's remarks:

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR TIMBERLANDS[1]
(By E. L. Demmon, director, Lake States Forest Experiment Station[2])

Today forest resources are more important than ever to the security and prosperity of the United States. We have been blessed with an abundance of forest land, which has contributed immeasurably to building up this country and helping us to world leadership. But, until recent years, most of our forests were exploited with little or no thought to the future. We cannot afford this luxury again. Faced with the possibilities of a continuing emergency, common sense demands that we care for and use wisely this great resource so essential not only to a high standard of living but to our national defense. Under such a policy of wise use present timber growth could be increased, and our requirements for a multitude of essential commodities could be met without detriment to the watershed, wildlife, range, or recreational values of the forest.

With population on the increase and an expanded national defense effort now under way, emergency requirements for construction material, crating and boxing, paper, and many other products of the forest can be expected to mount. It is timely, therefore, that we take a fresh look at our position with regard to our forests and work toward a realistic and coordinated policy, easily understood and generally acceptable.

In World War II we cut deeply into our forest resources; it was part of the price of victory. For example, we put 25,000,000,000 board feet of lumber per year, or over half of the total national production, into military uses, compared to only about 300,000,000 board feet, or less than 2 percent as much, in normal times. In the days ahead when undoubtedly we shall again have to expand the use of forest resources to help defend our way of life, let us do so as efficiently as possible, and with a look to the future.

In the past half century we have learned much about reproducing and growing crops of trees and forage, and how to use their products more economically and efficiently. We have also learned much about managing watersheds, the range, and wildlife habitat. How to get this knowledge more generally applied is a real challenge. Certainly a strong and prosperous nation will require an abundance of forest products. Conversely, waste and inefficiency in the handling of these forest resources can invite disaster. It takes many years to grow a forest, but only a few minutes to destroy one.

What is our forest situation today? We need to know this to plan intelligently. Originally covering about half of the land surface of the United States, forests now occupy only about one-third of the total land area. Although we can anticipate minor shifts of some forest to cropland, it probably will be about offset by abandonment of cropland, so we need expect no great change in total forest area. Only about two-thirds of these forest lands can produce commercial crops of timber; the balance consists of areas which are too remote to be utilized, are chiefly valuable for soil and watershed protection, hunting, fishing, and other recreational use, and are inherently unproductive of timber, or are devoted exclusively to park purposes. We will concern ourselves here only with the commercial forests which cover 460,000,000 acres of land.

What do these forests mean to us? Foremost, they provide us with cellulose or wood—a material with thousands of uses—so essential to everyday life. Recent estimates show that about 55 percent of the timber harvested each year goes into lumber, 18 percent into fuel wood, 11 percent into pulpwood, and the balance into veneer logs, hewn railroad ties, round mine timbers, fence posts, cooperage, shingles, poles, and a multitude of other items. The value of these wood products—their harvesting, manufacture, transportation, and sale—puts several billions of dollars annually into the channels of commerce and provides a source of livelihood for more than 3,000,000 people. Many a community receives its major support from forest enterprises. In addition, the livestock products from the forest ranges, the enormous wildlife and recreational values, and the priceless protection which forests afford soils and watersheds represent an asset almost beyond computation.

Who owns the forests? Three-fourths of all commercial forest land belongs to more than 4,000,000 private owners, many of them farmers. In general, these are the more productive lands. Presently about 90 percent of the Nation's forest production comes from these private lands. The Nation, therefore, must look to private forests for most of its present and future supplies of forest products. The remaining one-fourth of the commercial forest is in National, State, county, municipal, and school forests, on Indian lands, or on the public domain.

There is a growing realization nowadays that ownership of a national resource carries with it a responsibility as well as a privilege. Forest owners have a major responsibility in properly caring for their forests. On the other hand, every American shares the responsibility for making possible the continued productiveness of these vitally important resources which are basic to our well-being. Thus, the general public should encourage and assist private owners to keep their timberlands productive. The Forest Service believes in building up our forest resources through individual initiative and cooperative endeavor under reasonable rules adopted through democratic processes. It believes that such rules are as necessary to resource management as they are to transportation, communication, and other enterprises that affect the public welfare.

What is the condition of the forests? A Forest Service appraisal made a few years ago showed the American forests are growing at a rate far below their productive capacity. This is due mainly to past treatment—as a rule, forests were overcut, burned, and generally uncared for. As a matter of fact, for many years it was believed that most of the cut-over land would be suited to and needed for farming—often, however, this did not prove to be the case. After the original old-growth forest was harvested, mostly during the last century, nature reclothed some of the land with a new timber stand, although many tracts were entirely denuded. However, unaided, natural restocking could not keep pace with cutting

[1] Paper delivered at the Sixteenth North American Wildlife Conference at Milwaukee, Wis., March 6, 1951.

[2] Maintained by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, university farm, St. Paul, Minn.

and fires. At present, less than 50 percent of our commercial forest land bears saw-timber stands.

Foresters tell us that we are still cutting saw timber faster than it is being replaced through growth, although the over-all cubic volume of annual forest growth and drain is almost in balance. Our softwood stands in particular are continuing to shrink, whereas the amount of lesser used and lesser valued hardwoods is on the increase. It is estimated that we have at least 50,000,000 acres of understocked or deforested but potentially productive lands that can be rehabilitated only by planting. (At present rates, it would take more than 100 years to complete this task.) About 70,000,000 acres of forest and watershed lands do not yet have organized fire protection, although a first principle of good forestry demands such protection. An urgent reason for 100-percent fire protection now is its importance to the country's defense activities. Protection from harmful diseases and insects is often more important than protection from fire and gives a continuing battle to forestry agencies. Many miles of new roads are needed to make possible the orderly harvesting of inaccessible old-growth timber on public lands in the West before it becomes decadent. Many western forest ranges have deteriorated due to overgrazing, and many woodland areas in the East need protection from livestock for maximum productiveness. Locally, deer and other wildlife species have become overabundant and destroyed tree reproduction. Evidence of excessive soil erosion on forest lands is commonplace. All this should dispel any complacency we might have as to the adequacy of present forestry practices. Also, let us not forget that forestry is a long-time undertaking—a tree planted today may not be harvested for 40 to 100 years?

Not until the early part of this century was a real start made toward the practice of forestry in this country. During the last 50 years, through trial and research, much has been learned about how best to care for forests to make them renewable and productive, and how to get maximum utilization from each tree harvested. The national forests, which make up 16 percent of the nation's commercial forest area, have been organized and placed under management. Last fiscal year (ending June 30, 1950) they yielded a total revenue of almost $34,000,000 (timber—3,500,000,000 board feet worth $29,379,217; grazing—1,100,000 cattle and horses, and 3,100,000 sheep and goats, $3,385,004; and miscellaneous receipts, $380,393); and this year the total promises to go much higher. (During the last 6 months of 1950, national forest receipts totaled $27,000,000.) A good share of this (25 percent) is returned to the States to be expended for the benefit of public schools and public roads within the counties where the national forests are located.

This group is, of course, interested primarily in wildlife. It is probably superfluous to mention to you, then, that the national forests constitute a hunting and fishing ground equivalent to about one-tenth of the total land area of the United States. As you know, the States make and enforce the laws necessary to protect and utilize these wildlife resources; the Forest Service gives primary attention to maintaining a habitat suited to wildlife. (It is estimated that 2,440,000 head of big game animals find shelter and food within the national forests.) Close cooperative relations between the States and the Forest Service have helped promote good hunting and fishing consistent with the protection and development of all the resources. Although wildlife in the national forests is often one of the major resource values, the Forest Service has in recent years been handicapped in habitat management work because of curtailment in regular funds for this purpose.

State forestry work, including the organized protection of State and private forests from fire, has made good progress in the last quarter century. A program of public aid in providing technical forestry assistance to small owners is now well under way. In the last 10 years industry has sponsored campaigns for better forestry, such as the tree farm and keep green programs. Here in Wisconsin there is an excellent example of industry leadership for better forestry in the work of Trees for Tomorrow, an organization sponsored by several pulp and paper companies to stimulate tree planting and better forestry on private lands. Management of privately owned forests to keep them continuously productive has increased greatly, particularly during the last decade. These private owners have a wonderful incentive to forestry practice—they have found that it pays good dividends and that it lessens transportation and other costs. Above all, however, it assures a future supply of raw materials, without which this industry cannot exist. Many private operators are actively buying land in the vicinity of their plants.

Although many notable gains have been made in both public and private forestry, we are still a long way from a satisfactory forest economy in this country. As an example of the timber situation in a single region, let us take a look at the Lake States (Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota), where we are meeting today. From 1875 to 1900, this region led the Nation in lumber production, turning out from one-fourth to one-third of all the lumber cut, and much of it was shipped throughout the country. Today, Lake States mills account for only 3 to 4 percent of national lumber production, which does not begin to take care of the region's own needs; almost two-thirds of the lumber used here has to be imported, much of it from the Pacific coast, at a very high cost in freight alone.

The decline in lumbering has been offset in recent years by the growth of the pulp and paper industry. The Lake States region now produces more than 3,000,000 tons of paper and board annually, or about one-sixth of the output of the Nation. With good forestry practices and over a period of time, this trend can be reversed—not only can the Lake States region grow all the forest raw materials it needs, it can also have a balance for export.

There is little to be gained in placing the blame for mistakes of the past, although we do want to be assured that the same thing will not happen again. It is of more value now to take stock of our situation and decide how we can work together constructively for the future. This requires a broad plan or policy on which the majority can agree and within the framework of which we can strive toward an improved forest situation commensurate with our national needs. To build up the nation's forest resources so as to meet anticipated future demands and to place forestry on a sound business basis, a 3-point program has often been recommended by the Forest Service. This includes (1) an expanded program of public aid and service to private forest owners, including (a) more technical assistance to improve tree growth and obtain better use of wood, (b) additional help for nurseries and planting, (c) setting up a forest credit and insurance system, (d) improving tax laws where needed, (e) providing all State and private forest land with an adequate cooperative program of protection from fire, insects, and diseases, and (f) a strengthening of forest research; (2) a system of public regulation of cutting and other forest practices that will keep forest lands reasonably productive, recognizing that such legislation or Government direction will fail without full understanding and backing of the public at large (States that have made notable headway in this direction include Washington, Oregon, California, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, and Virginia among others); and (3) expansion and intensified protection and management of all public forests, many of which are at present inaccessible or too thinly manned to yield their potential forestry values.

The present strength and future security of our Nation depend in part on the abundance and productiveness of its forests. The values at stake concern industry, labor, the tax base, and the perpetuation of our free institutions. They must, therefore, be of concern to every citizen. To build these forests to full strength, to keep them abundantly productive, and to utilize them in full measure for human progress will require real partnership of effort, with public agencies, landowners, forest industries, labor, and the public at large all working together. Here is an opportunity to show the world an example of progress under the democratic way of life. Let's make this a better forested country for future generations in which to live and work.

Jurisdiction Over the Airspace Above Federal Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post stressing the need for early passage of corrective legislation to confer jurisdiction on Federal courts to punish those who commit crimes in aircraft over Federal territory. We should not wait to take action on this important matter until some shocking crime has been perpetrated which goes unpunished on a technicality. The Post editorial follows:

Mr. Truman may be a bit chagrined to discover that the officer who forbade him to jump at Fort Bragg might have been assuming an authority that he really did not possess. The embarrassing truth seems to be that when an airplane is aloft over Federal territory or over the high seas, nobody posseses any authority over anybody. Each occupant of the plane is a law unto himself, as the saying goes, since something like the pure anarchic state of nature, as described by Tom Hobbes, appears to prevail. We confess we did not realize this ourselves until the point was brought up by Representative KEATING, of New York. According to Mr. KEATING, you can get away with almost anything, including murder and sabotage, in an airplane once it is off the ground, simply because the Federal authority has now no legal power to punish any crimes committed up there; so that if you feel like beating your wife, for example, all you need do is to charter a plane and entice her aboard; and if the pilot intervenes, you can beat him too—if you think you are strong enough. Mr. KEATING thinks that this inadequacy in the Federal statutes needs to be corrected at once and we heartily agree.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a speech delivered by me through the facilities of radio station WJR, Detroit, on Friday, March 9, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The atmosphere of world conditions forces a reorientation of our thinking on the St. Lawrence seaway. Now, more than ever before, the principal value of the seaway lies in its importance to the national defense, because industrial production is by far the most important single aspect of the strength we must have to preserve the peace of the world or to defend ourselves in case of attack.

In this speech, which was made a part of the Your Congress series of programs by station WJR, I have pointed out the reasons why the St. Lawrence seaway affects every American citizen in every corner of the Nation.

The speech is as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I deeply appreciate the invitation of radio station WJR to participate in the series of programs entitled "Your Congress." WJR performs a distinct public service through these programs and deserves the commendation of all its listeners.

If you have been following the developments in Washington for the past few weeks you know that there is once again before the Congress the proposal for approving the agreement between this country and Canada relating to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. To most Midwesterners, this subject has become a familiar one in the 24 years since it was first proposed, and most of us are well acquainted with the arguments that have been advanced in support of the seaway. We have a deep personal interest in the project because our lives are deeply involved in the manufacturing activity of this region. We know that if our industries move elsewhere in conformity with the hard and fast rules of economic life, the Midwest will be transformed into one huge ghost town. The decline of Lake Superior iron ore foretells the disappearance of large-scale industrial activity in the Midwest, unless the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed to provide easy access to the one most promising new source of ore in Labrador.

There are reams of arguments, surveys, reports, analyses, charts, maps, and so forth that bear out these facts. The law of nature is inexorable, "either grow or die" and we know that the seaway is the key to our growth in the years ahead.

As important as it is that the people of the Midwest avoid this economic nightmare, there is yet one overreaching consideration which should win the approval of every American citizen in every corner of the Nation—namely—the intimate relation of the seaway to our national defense. The seaway is vital to Americans—as Americans—and sectional interests are narrow and short-sighted in comparison.

Let us put the case in one-two order.

Using Labrador ore, a new industrial pattern will be built around the east coast ports of Philadelphia and Baltimore as the unloading and transshipment depots. The National Security Resources Board estimates that the cost of this route to the steel industry centered in and around Pittsburgh, will not differ materially from the cost of shipping from Labrador to Pittsburgh via the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

It is quite a different story, however, with regard to the steel manufacturing centers with ports on Lake Erie. Shipping costs via the seaway to Lorain, Ohio, and east, including Cleveland and Buffalo, would approximate $2.15, assuming a 50-cent toll per ton. The cost via any ocean and rail transportation route would be about 75 cents higher, so that the seaway represents a saving of about 26 percent on every ton of ore brought into the country.

This consideration of savings in the cost of ore, steel, and products made from steel is vital to America at this time. Soaring defense costs since the outbreak of the Korean War are startling evidence of the staggering burden any full-scale military production effort would place upon the economy. Viewed in this light, the seaway is actually a cost-reducing investment.

Top defense officials—the Joint Chiefs of Staff included—endorse the seaway for more than mere economic reasons. The St. Lawrence seaway has a prominent place in the strategy of those entrusted with the defense of the Nation.

The ocean route from Labrador to Philadelphia covers 1,390 miles of open sea—sea lanes which in wartime would be infested with long-range, snorkel-type submarines, forcing a constant patrol by our naval forces at an added expense in money, ships, and men. Ore carriers are prime targets for enemy submarines as was proved by our experience in World War II. Bethlehem Steel lost five of the seven ships it had in service transporting ore from Chile to Sparrows Point, Md. For understandable reasons, the company withdrew the other two ships from service and we thus lost an important source of ore for emergency steel production.

The seaway, while vulnerable to some extent from sabotage, could be defended and patrolled at a much lower cost to the military than could this route over some of the worst water in the Atlantic ocean, and with a much lower risk of loss.

No military commander ever knowingly exposes or over-extends his lines of supply so as to make them vulnerable to enemy attack. No military commander establishes his supply dumps within the range of enemy artillery. Yet this is precisely the set-up when the terminal points for iron ore imports are the east-coast ports and the industries have moved closer to these points, driven there by inexorable economic reasons.

In other words, the military axiom, protect your lines of supply, is an imperative rule of action for the United States, dictating the construction of the seaway.

There is yet another factor which begs our consideration. We all know that our industrial activity is in a period of technological development. Nuclear fission is in the process of revolutionizing the art of manufacturing. But behind the glittering success story of atomic energy development there is the modern commonplace of hydroelectric power. We built the Oak Ridge atomic development plant close to the source of TVA electrical energy, and this same electric power figures strongly in other phases of the production side of modern warfare. Aluminum is a prime example in this regard.

The St. Lawrence power project will develop more of this vitally needed power than the TVA plants, and its enormous output will allow for expanding industrial development and rehabilitation in the New York-New England region where manufacturers now pay the highest power rates in the country.

It is significant to note at this point what is going on in the rest of the world with regard to inland waterways and power-development projects.

Throughout the Communist world the Soviet publicity organs are beating the drums in the approved Bolshevik style, announcing the expected completion in 1952, 2 years ahead of schedule, of a vast canal system linking the Black, Caspian, Baltic, and White Seas. The great inland plains of Russia will then be served by five oceans, according to the Red press agents. This will facilitate the transfer of ships from one major area to another. It gives them transportation routes for coal and construction materials which cannot be reached by any other naval power.

Perhaps more ominous than this far-flung canal system are the two enormous hydroelectric projects, one at Kuibyshev, the other at Stalingrad, lower down the Volga River. Between them they will generate 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, and the plant at Kuibyshev will be the most powerful hydroelectric plant in the world.

Despite the peaceful purposes for the power described by the Russians, it is significant that the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union has directed the transmission of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually to a single point 500 to 625 miles distant from the source. Within that radius lie the Ural Mountains with their large deposits of uranium ore and the industrial center of Magnitogorsk, the arsenal of the Red army.

Tying all these ideas together, I believe we see with startling clarity the advantages of a secure and economical traffic artery for our iron ore and the development of powerful new sources of electric energy. And if we face the facts of international life we realize that these advantages may mean our survival as a free Nation.

The masters of the Kremlin, of course, do not have to put up with powerful lobbyists; they do not have to pacify selfish local interests and the costs of slave labor are never prohibitive. In the United States, however, we are hampered, in a sense, by the demands of the democratic process.

We have had nothing but foot-dragging on the part of Congress in getting ahead with the job. Endorsement by every President since Coolidge has been ineffective and meanwhile the American people wait.

Despite this, ladies and gentlemen, it is a blunt, hard, and obvious fact that we can no longer afford to drag our feet. We must begin at once, through the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to serve and safeguard our national interest.

We must begin at once a job that too long has been pushed aside, a job that has taken on life and death significance for every American citizen.

Personal Appearance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on March 20, 1951:

PERSONAL APPEARANCE?

Senator HARRY CAIN selects a poor time to suggest that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be

ordered before Congress to tell it just what is needed to win victory and peace in Korea.

CAIN claims MacArthur is as tragic a figure as is to be found in all history, because he is required to send his men out to die in Korea without being able to offer them the prospect of eventual victory.

Thus the Washington State Republican relegates himself to the ranks of other Americans who have from time to time attempted to have MacArthur brought back to the United States. Most of us would welcome his homecoming in order to accord him the ovation he earned during World War II, and has enhanced in Korea. Others, such as Senator CAIN, have less wholesome reasons.

General MacArthur has not been home since 1937. He did come as far as Hawaii in August 1944, when he conferred with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And last year, he met with President Truman in similar conference on a Pacific island.

He had planned a visit to the United States in 1948, but after learning the proposed return was being seized upon for political purposes, he deferred that visit. In peacetime, he reiterated that duty held him to his post in Japan. With the commencement of hostilities in Korea, the reason for his stay is obvious.

Senator CAIN, then, wants a MacArthur report to Congress, but it would appear he is skipping a few channels of command in his thoughtless suggestion. General MacArthur is a soldier; responsible only to the President, the Commander in Chief; and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has no obligation of Congress. If his military superiors feel Congress needs more information, it is their privilege to appear before its Members. These superiors get frequent reports from MacArthur—how many and what they contain we cannot know for security reasons—and MacArthur himself is liberal with statements to the American press in Tokyo.

A MacArthur appearance before Congress would be an exciting show, one Senator Cain and his colleagues could enjoy, but it is doubtful whether the general would get any sound advice from the Members nor whether he could tell them anything they could not now learn. General MacArthur is in the middle of a job, and we can reserve the festivities for later.

Vast Possibilities Before Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling attention to an editorial written by Mr. Sanford Martin in the Journal and Sentinel of Winston-Salem, N. C., on March 19, 1951, in which reference is made to our distinguished colleague, Congressman THURMOND CHATHAM:

VAST POSSIBILITIES BEFORE US

(From editorial columns of the High Point Enterprise, March 19, 1951)

Representative THURMOND CHATHAM has strong faith in the possibilities and the future of northwest North Carolina. He has manifested this faith in many ways which have included action as well as words. Therefore, the 1,200 farmers and businessmen who heard him speak at the ninth annual Farmers' Day observance in Elkin this week were convinced of his complete sincerity when he said:

"Either for agriculture or industry, I do not believe there is a better location in the world today than our area, from the mountains to the coastal plains. We have the climate. We have the soil. We are close to markets. We have transportation and communications—and, most important of all, we have the right kind of people."

In this statement Mr. CHATHAM listed five assets, which if exploited to the fullest should make the economy of this section among the most prosperous in the Nation. By exploiting our climate, soil, marketing possibilities and transportation and communications advantages intelligently and going forward with the program of educating and training our people both in the academic and vocational sense, we can expand our agriculture, our tourist business, our mechanical industry, make the most of our dairying, fruit growing and mining possibilities, and develop the type of agrarian and urban leadership essential to an ever forward movement of progress.

In recent decades the northwest section of North Carolina has made remarkable progress in almost all these fields. But any competent observer is cognizant that up to now the surface has merely been scratched. In the light of the truly amazing natural resources and potentialities of our section of the State and Nation, our progress thus far indeed seems very slight.

As we enter the new era which has been opened up by great advance in the development of electric power and the discovery of atomic energy, northwest North Carolina faces the most inviting opportunity of its history to apply its native energy, its growing vision, and its increasing knowledge and skills to the upbuilding of the most promising section of the South's "most progressive State." (Winston-Salem Journal.)

A Loophole To Be Plugged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, there can be no justification for continuing the tax-free allowance to the President, Vice President, Speaker, and Members of Congress. They should be required to itemize and justify the expenses connected with the conduct of their offices in just the same way any other taxpayer has to do.

The working man or woman quite properly wonders what there is fair about a deal whereby he cannot even deduct his bus or streetcar fare to work as a necessary expense when the President of the United States on top of his salary is given $50,000 tax-free to spend as he sees fit without any accounting.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials on this subject from the Portland (Maine) Evening Express and Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union:

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of February 7, 1951]

TAX-FREE FAIR DEALERS

Taxpayers may possibly derive some joy, in these gray days, from the recollection that the Fair Deal Seventy-ninth Congress voted to each of its Members a $2,500 tax-free expense account, not subject to any accounting.

Taxpayers may further cheer themselves by remembering that Harry S. Truman's salary as President was increased from $75,000 to $100,000 a year by the Fair Deal Eighty-first Congress, and that, at the same time, that Democratic Congress gave the President a $50,000 tax-free expense account for which he is not required to make any accounting.

The Democrats in the Eighty-first Congress also thought it well to increase Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY'S salary to $30,000 and to favor him with a $10,000 tax-free expense account. And they very thoughtfully also awarded a $10,000 allowance to Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, for which no accounting is required.

New York's Republican Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, who observes pointedly that "everyone incurs such expenses in connection with his work, for which he is denied any tax exemption," now proposes that the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives be held accountable for tax purposes—just as all other Americans are held accountable—for those items in the income of each described under the heading, "Expenses."

All of us have to pay bus fare, or have to pay the bills for owning, licensing, insuring, and maintaining some kind of an automobile, in order to get from home to work and from work to home; but our expenditures for such necessary expense are not tax free. Had you noticed? Mr. KEATING thinks the expenses of the President and Congressmen likewise should be taxed.

Accordingly, this New York Republican has introduced a bill to amend the pertinent statutes relating to compensation, to provide that those expense accounts which the Democrats have made tax-free in recent congressional sessions shall be added, henceforth, to the salaries of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House, and Members of Congress, "so that the total compensation will be subject to income tax."

This being the Fair Deal, and all of its adherents—from the President down—being devoted to the principle of sharing the wealth, we lowly taxpayers may of course assume that all of these, "our leaders," will now heap gladsome praises upon Representative KEATING for having thus brought to their attention a method whereby each may share more fully with us in the matter of paying taxes.

We "little people," who cannot deduct bus fare as a legitimate expense when figuring our income-tax returns can, of course, expect Mr. Truman to leap at the opportunity to have his $50,000-a-year expense account lumped with his $100,000 salary for tax purposes.

Actually, to be sure, the President's expense account—for which he has not been held accountable—amounts to $90,000 over and above his salary. He had a $40,000 expense allowance before the Democrats voted him the additional $50,000 in 1949.

Moreover, in addition to the $100,000 salary and the $90,000 tax-free expense allowance which, in our crude way, we shall call his take-home pay, our leader is granted the use—at the expense of all taxpayers—of various luxurious airplanes, 35 White House automobiles, the yacht Williamsburg (even the millionaire Roosevelt got along nicely with a relatively tiny minesweeper, for his week-end seafaring), a private pullman car, a vacation retreat at Key West, Fla., and another "Shangri-La" in Maryland. The estimated annual cost of the staff and upkeep for these items, Representative KEATING finds, is about $1,500,000. That's all over and above the actual take-home pay.

"I know of no group of our people who need more to be reminded that their compensation is subject to tax," says Representative KEATING, "than do the President and Members of Congress."

KENNETH B. KEATING, we love you. Carry on.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

Special tax privileges for officeholders do not sit well with ordinary taxpaying citizens at any time. When ordinary taxes go to the height they will—and should—this year, special privileges become causes for downright complaint.

Congress was unwise some years ago when it voted itself and top members of the executive branch a tax-free raise in salary disguised as an expense account. The President pays no tax on $50,000 he receives in addition to his $100,000 salary. Nor do the Vice President and Speaker of the House pay on $10,000 expense receipts. Congressmen get $2,500 which is untaxed.

Representative KENNETH KEATING has introduced a bill to remove the tax exemptions on these items. This is the honest thing to do. It eliminates subterfuge and special privilege. It may be, as some Congressmen argue, that the bill will not add to revenues because the money goes for expenses that are deductible. But the ordinary taxpayer, struggling with his own tax bill, will thank KEATING for this bill. It ought to pass in the interest of taxpayer morale.

We Should Speed Up the Construction of Rural Hospitals Under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will soon be time to again appropriate money for hospital and health-center construction under the Hill-Burton hospital program.

This program was, in my judgment, unnecessarily delayed during this fiscal year when the Bureau of the Budget last year arbitrarily cut the appropriation for Federal contributions to hospital and health-center construction projects by 50 percent, reducing the amount available from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000, to which $13,000,000 was later added by a supplemental appropriation.

The Korean War has created an emergency in our way of life, and we as a nation are faced with the possibility of seeing our cities and industrial centers, and their hospitals, destroyed by enemy bombs.

Therefore, the rural hospital assumes a new significance, over and above its peacetime importance, as an evacuation facility to care for those who might be injured by enemy bombing of our cities.

Latest figures show that we need an additional 1,000,000 hospital beds to fulfill peacetime requirements. A large proportion of these beds are needed in rural America.

As a part of my remarks, I include an address by Dr. John W. Cronin, Chief, Division of Hospital Facilities, United States Public Health Service, delivered at the American Hospital Association convention in Atlantic City, N. J., September 20, 1950, and entitled "Are We Building Too Many Small Hospitals?":

ARE WE BUILDING TOO MANY SMALL HOSPITALS?

Exactly 3 years ago (in September 1947) the first project was initially approved for Federal aid under the Hill-Burton program. This was for a new 50-bed general hospital to be located in a southern town of under 2,000 people. The nearest general hospital—a 40-bed facility—was 30 miles away; the nearest sizable hospital—one with 255 beds—was twice that far. The new hospital project was sponsored by the county, a fairly poor county compared with most others in the State.

My reason for mentioning this bit of history is to show that, from the very beginning, the program has done its best to carry out its aim of building hospitals where they are needed the most—in places where hospital care has not been within easy reach, where the area is rural, and where income is low.

In the 3 years which have passed since approval of this project, nearly 1,500 others have been initially approved. Through these, more than 65,000 hospital beds are to be provided. Total construction costs for all projects have now reached the one billion mark with the Federal Government contributing about one-third of this amount. Final approval has now been given to more than 1,000 projects, that is, blueprints and specifications have been approved, sites have been acquired and building preparations begun. But more important, as of today 200 projects have been completed and are now providing community hospital or public health services.

WHAT ARE WE BUILDING?

Of all projects approved so far, more than three-fourths are for general hospital construction. When we talk of hospital construction projects we mean not only the building of an entirely new facility, but also the building of an addition or the remodeling of an already existing hospital. Next in order of number are public health centers—about 16 percent of all projects. Then follow mental hospital projects—about 5 percent of the total; tuberculosis projects—3 percent; and chronic-disease projects—less than 1 percent.

As for construction costs, general hospitals again account for the major share—85 percent—of the total, and for a like percentage of the Federal share of the costs. Public health centers, while holding second place in number of projects, take last place in the share of construction costs, largely because of their relatively low cost per project.

So far, then, most of the emphasis in the program has been on general hospital facilities. How, exactly what do we know about these projects? Just what are they, where are they, and how large are they?

First of all, about one-half of the general hospital projects are for completely new hospitals. The balance is made up of projects for the replacement of old buildings or for additions or alterations to existing ones. Most of the new hospitals are being built in small towns and in the smaller cities; at least 70 percent of the new general projects are located in places with populations below 5,000. Only 12 percent are in communities of more than 10,000.

As we might expect, the projects for replacing, altering, or adding to already-existing hospitals are generally from the larger cities; only one-fourth are from towns with less than 5,000 population.

Now, as to the size of new general hospitals being built under this program, two-thirds will have less than 50 beds. Only 1 out of 10 will have 100 beds or more. On the other hand, most of the hospitals which are being replaced, or are having additions or alterations to their present buildings, are medium-sized or larger hospitals.

We can now see the evolving general pattern of this program. General hospital projects predominate; half of these are for completely new facilities which, for the most part, are located in small towns. As a rule, the new facilities will have less than 50 beds.

For the moment, let us define these hospitals of less than 50 beds as the small hospitals. This is quite usual, I believe, if we limit our thinking to the number of beds a facility contains. Some of the details about these so-called small hospital projects, I feel sure, will interest you.

Nearly two-thirds of the new small facilities will have from 20 to 35 beds. Some of the even smaller projects with 10 to 15 beds, probably should be called community clinics rather than general hospitals. Nevertheless, they do meet specifications for a hospital in that they will provide 24-hour service.

Practically none of these new small hospitals are being built in the large population centers. Two-thirds of the new projects calling for less than 50 beds are in towns of less than 2,500 people. Nearly all are in towns of less than 5,000.

While the small hospital predominates among all new general hospital projects, we find a somewhat different story when we look at the distribution of Federal construction funds. Here we see that little more than one-third of the Federal money being used for all new general hospital projects is for small facilities, that is, for those with less than 50 beds. Actually, this is to be expected since we are well aware that the larger institution, because of its more elaborate and more complete facilities, costs more per bed than the small institution.

In this brief review one fact stands out—the small general hospital (small, that is, in number of beds) is occupying a prominent place in the hospital construction program. Is this right, or are we building too many of these small facilities?

WHY BUILD SMALL HOSPITALS?

In answering this question, let us first find out why we spend any time and money in building 25-, 30-, or 40-bed hospitals. It is true that they are not utilized as fully as larger facilities, because the small hospital does not have the flexibility of use that is found in the larger hospital. It is also true that they do not provide the variety of service that can be given in the larger hospitals. What, then, makes them necessary?

In every State there are some communities, in fact whole areas, where no hospital facilities of any kind exist. Most of these are small towns and rural areas. The nearest hospital may be from 30 to 50 miles away. Yet the people in these communities are just as likely to need hospital care as the people in a larger city where the hospital may be only a few blocks away. Don't forget that last year, 1 out of every 8 persons in the United States was hospitalized. During every hour that we are sitting in these meeting, 900 people are being admitted to hospitals throughout the country. These are people of all kinds, from every occupation, with high and with low incomes. They come from cities, and they also come from small towns and rural communities. Many are traveling an hour—probably longer—to the nearest hospital because their home town has no facility available.

Under the Hill-Burton program, each of the States has investigated its hospital-facilities situation. Each has outlined hospital-service areas where general-hospital facilities should be available to the areas' residents.

Each has given high-construction priority to those areas where facilities are needed but are completely inadequate or entirely lacking. The majority of these are small rural localities. As a result of the incentive given under the Hill-Burton program, communities in many of these service-needy areas have raised funds and submitted approved plans for local hospitals. Generally speaking, the hospitals planned are small; usually because the expected immediate demand for hospital care does not warrant a larger facility. In some instances community funds have placed a limit on the size of the facility that can be built.

Here are some facts that will interest you. So far, a total of 350 small general hospital projects (that is, projects calling for hospitals with less than 50 beds) have been approved. Well over one-fourth of these are being located in service areas which heretofore had no general hospital; another one-fourth are being located in areas that have no facilities which meet the State standards for an acceptable hospital. The remainder are in areas where some facilities exist but where they are completely inadequate to meet the need for hospital care. Nearly all of these are in rural areas, according to the States' classification.

You will also be interested in a recent study of the distance of these new small general hospitals from the nearest other facility. The study included new hospitals with 25 beds or less and covered about 20 States. As a rule, the next nearest facility was about 25 miles distant. Frequently, this was found to be a nonacceptable institution, according to State standards. The range in distance, as we would expect, was wide. Some of the new hospitals are being built in communities where another facility already exists, but others were found to be anywhere from 100 to 150 miles from another general hospital, regardless of its size or its acceptability. When distance was measured to the nearest facility of 50 beds or larger, the average distance was found to be about 45 miles. Again, of course, the range in distance was wide.

Many small hospitals are being built, that is true. But they are bringing or will soon bring some hospital service to areas where the need has been critical. These small hospitals have the potentiality of growing into more effective-sized institutions when demand for service increases or when additional funds for expansion become available. Our data from the State plans and from the project applications show that, in general, this is the case. On the average, the approved new hospitals of less than 50 beds will meet only about half the number of beds needed in their areas.

For many years we have been talking about the shortage of physicians in our smaller towns and rural areas. We all know why this shortage exists. Physicians naturally locate in communities where they can make the best use of their medical training. Modern medical training puts heavy emphasis on the use of instruments of precision in diagnostic and treatment facilities. What chance has a small community, without any type of hospital or clinical facility, to attract and keep a doctor? Few physicians willingly settle in small towns, away from the hospital equipment they need and depend upon and cut off from other medical connection. Few are willing to accept medical isolation. Recently, however, we have been given a good demonstration of how doctors can be attracted to practice in a rural State. Perhaps all of you are familiar with the Kansas program. Under the leadership of Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, dean of the University of Kansas medical center, the State has embarked on a three-point campaign: First, the provision of clinics and hospitals in rural communities; second, expansion of medical training facilities in the State; and third, the development of intensive training and refresher courses for the rural physician. This plan and similar ones in other States have been meeting with great success. In Kansas, rural communities have launched fund drives for the building of clinics and hospitals. With the prospect of up-to-date working facilities at hand, young physicians are being encouraged to take up practice in previously doctorless areas. The medical center is being expanded with grants approved by the State legislature. Traveling lecture teams are keeping the country doctor up-to-date on medical and surgical topics. The citizens of the community derive the benefits of this type of modern medical care. Health maintenance is becoming more possible day by day.

There is a psychological factor in the building of a small local hospital that we must not overlook. Sick people want to be near their own homes, their families and friends. When hospitalization becomes necessary, but local facilities are lacking, the sick person has no choice but to seek hospital care in another community where the needed service is available. As I have pointed out before, this other community may be 30, 40, or 50 miles distant—often too far for frequent visits from friends and relatives. Experience has shown that loneliness and worry over families can delay recovery for many patients.

PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL HOSPITAL

The small local hospitals, while filling definite needs in many communities, are nevertheless faced with serious problems.

The small hospital, obviously, cannot afford to provide many of the services needed by the people in the community. Consequently, it loses many patients to the larger city hospitals where more complete services are available. The result has been that the average small general hospital can count on being used to a lesser percent of its capacity than the larger hospital because of its lack of flexibility of use.

Low occupancy rates in small hospitals can also be traced to the economic resources of the community. In general, small communities have a greater concentration of low- than of high-income families. Experience has shown a definite relationship between the demand for hospital care and the ability to pay for it; the lower the financial resources of a community, the lower the use of hospital beds.

Because of the relatively low income in small towns and rural communities, charges for hospital care must be kept comparatively low. As a result, the small hospital in the small community has found it difficult to hold aside sufficient funds for the purchase and maintenance of modern equipment, or for the employment of specialized personnel.

This leads us to an additional problem—the temptation given to the small-hospital staff to perform services beyond their skills. The less common surgical problems may be undertaken by the local physician who lacks the special skill required. X-ray and other specialized apparatus may be used by physicians or other hospital personnel who are inadequately trained in their use. The results, too frequently, may bring harm to the patient.

These are a few of the problems which the small hospital faces. We know that there is a real need for the small facility in many small communities and rural areas. Let me make clear, at this point, that we do not believe in the indiscriminate building of small hospitals in all rural areas. There are many rural sections where sparsity of population, low income, transportation, and geographical factors make the provision of any type of hospital facility impractical. We do believe in providing such facilities where they can effectively serve their purpose of bringing needed medical service to the popuation. To make certain that a facility is needed—that it can be used effectively—requires careful study and sound community planning.

Where the situation clearly demonstrates the need for the small hospital we believe necessary aid should be given for its provision. But our efforts must not stop there. If so, we would merely be encouraging the growth of additional facilities which face the prospect of low efficiency, high operating costs, inadequate support, and the provision of a low quality of care.

COORDINATION IS THE ANSWER

Under the Hill-Burton program our goal is the provision of better hospital care for all people. One step toward this goal is the construction of the necessary physical facilities. This we are now doing. But of greater importance is assuring that these facilities provide efficient and effective service. This can best be accomplished, we believe, by bringing about greater coordination and cooperation among hospitals. We have good evidence that the small hospital cannot hope, by itself, to provide many of the services needed by the people it serves. The solution is to develop relationships among hospitals whereby the larger and more completely equipped and staffed facilities can provide smaller hospitals with the needed services. Our concept of a regional coordination system includes many lines of affiliation among hospitals. For example, we envision the exchange of knowledge related to modern hospital practices and services; provision of interm or resident service on a rotating basis to hospitals which otherwise would not have the advantage of such services; the provision of consultation and part-time specialist services, including radiology and pathology, to small institutions; clinical conferences in small community hospitals; continuation courses for all classes of hospital personnel; postgraduate training of physicians from small communities; stimulation and exchange of information on improved hospital administrative methods; joint planning of hospital and public-health programs; and the formation of regional hospital councils.

Such cooperation can be without loss to the hospital of its individuality, initiative, and local responsibility. Rather, it would act as a stimulus to enlarged responsibility, toward retention of professional personnel in rural areas, and to improved patient care. Participation in the program should be completely voluntary. Any group of hospitals should be free to form a council or not as they wished, and any hospital within a region should be free to join or not join the council, as it saw fit.

The experience of a few regionalization programs has given good evidence of the benefits that result. We can look to the program of the Bingham Associates, in New England, to see the great advantages which have accrued to the small rural communities served. Regional programs in Michigan, Virginia, and in the Rochester region in New York likewise demonstrate the benefits which are gained through coordination of hospital services.

Under the Hill-Burton program, each State has outlined a proposed program of coordination among hospitals within hospital service regions. However, in all except a very few places, these plans exist on paper only. Encouragement for the real development of such programs came with the passage of an amendment to the Hospital Construction Act which provides for grants for experiments in

regional coordination. When funds provided by this amendment become available, these paper plans can develop into reality.

Let me emphasize that we are not building small hospitals with the intent that they should stand alone. We are thinking of these hospitals as a necessary link in a coordinated system. The small hospital has a real and distinct place in the provision of medical service in its own community, for it is ultimately the community hospital which will be a determining factor whether good or poor medicine is to be practiced in the community. In the future, the smallness of a hospital will no longer be determined by its size, but rather in terms of the service which it makes available to its patients. Under a system which coordinates and integrates the services of its affiliated hospitals, the services which the 50-bed facility can provide are as broad as those of the largest medical center.

It would be a serious omission to conclude this address without a look at the future. The international situation is disturbing to all of us. Our cultural pattern, our way of life, definitely changed on June 25, 1950, with the Korean incident. Our international, national, and personal tranquility has been thrown out of balance.

Those of us who deal with services to our fellow men in time of illness during peace have an even greater responsibility during the preparations for defense of our country against an aggressor. No one can dispute the fact that we need at present more, better, and serviceable health facilities—hospitals, health centers, and community clinics. The State plans show a minimum need of 900,000 additional beds in all categories. We must achieve that goal for even a peacetime existence.

Those State plans in arriving at that minimum did not take into consideration atomic warfare, bacteriological warfare, or radiological warfare. Today we are face to face with those factors as part of our everyday life.

In preparing to meet such a way of life, we must consider industrial mobilization, agricultural mobilization and in fact the mobilization of all our resources directed at supporting our combat forces and also supporting our civil defense plans against an aggressor approaching our Nation by air, by land, by sea, or from within our borders.

The hospital survey and construction program must be attuned to the cultural pattern of today, not the one that existed before Korea became the percussion cap in the explosion of our struggle for democracy versus communism. The Federal Government and the States, through the machinery of the Hill-Burton program, can work together in defining the need for and methods of acquiring hospitals and related health facilities in and on the periphery of the critical areas of possible attack and of industrial mobilization. This may mean, at the proper time, new factors in the formula of establishing priorities for construction and even, in some instances, types of hospital construction. The degree of population shifts incident to the fracture of our society brought about by war with its various economic, social, and financial aspects all must and will be considered. Adequate plans must be made not in the months and years to come but now. The development of these plans is already under way. Coordination and cooperation are the keys to its success. I feel certain that we in the hospital and health field in Government and in all our States will make our contribution at the proper time, in an adequate proportion, and supported by the conviction that a nation with good health resources, properly organized, is a strong and prepared nation for any eventuality.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during these hectic days when everybody seems under fire for one reason or another, we are prone to overlook the great good accomplished by some of our governmental agencies while we exaggerate their faults and weaknesses. Of course, we should strive for perfection in all things in and out of Government. But let us proceed cautiously when we contemplate the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because it has served well the purpose for which it was established. This despite the outcropping of human weakness which comes to the surface from time to time but which on the whole is rare. Reconstruction Finance Corporation was scarcely launched when the first big scandal broke and almost wrecked its reputation and effectiveness. I recall the Charley Dawes move when he as head of this very agency now under fire used the credit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to bail out his foundering banks in Chicago, then resigned leaving the portfolio of the agency stuffed with worthless Insull paper, which to this day, so far as I am able to learn, has never been revitalized or made to be worth anything. Just from memory I recall that the worthless loan amounted to $92,000,000 and was never repaid. It was a total loss. Despite this early jolt the Reconstruction Finance Corporation survived and served for the most part thereafter the interests of small business, and as I want to point out, has shown an over-all profit to the Government of the United States.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation needs no defense at my hands, a fur coat or a 5 percent commission in evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. I submit that an agency which in 19 years of its existence made and serviced 631,351 business loans totaling $16,000,000,000 with losses of only $134,000,000 and withal had shown a net profit of $600,000,000 is not a corrupt or loosely run enterprise. The record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is doubly commendable when we take into consideration the fact that for the most part, if not altogether, the loans were made during depressed or emergency times upon such applications as were rejected by the local banks throughout the Nation. Under the law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is compelled to examine applications of clients and consider loans that have been rejected by banks because of a potential risk. Many loans made by RFC are rejected by commercial banks for reasons of their own or are prohibited by banking laws. If it were not so these applications for loans would be be grabbed up by the local banks. Thus Reconstruction Finance Corporation gets the milk after the cream has been skimmed.

I am confronted with a bit of favorable evidence in the news article by the well known and able Martin S. Hayden of the Detroit News staff and syndicated through the North American Newspapers Alliance which appeared in the Sunday Star of March 18, 1951, which cannot be refuted. Mr. Hayden merely reports upon the facts as a newspaperman, he does not editorialize or color his interview with Walter E. Cosgriff, director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, who properly indicts the privately owned national banking system for failing in its job and the proof is in the article which I submit herewith. More such bold counterattacks should be delivered by the directors and other officials of the agency whenever they have the facts and the performance on their side.

The unfortunately sordid and seamy side of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's operations has been exaggerated and overemphasized out of all proportion while the wholesome and productive story in its favor has been suppressed or ignored.

DIRECTOR COSGRIFF DEFENDS RFC AS ESSENTIAL TO UNITED STATES ECONOMY—ASSAILS PRIVATE BANKS AS UNWILLING TO MEET NATIONAL CREDIT NEEDS

(By Martin S. Hayden)

Assailing the privately owned national banking system for failing in its job, Reconstruction Finance Corporation Director Walter E. Cosgriff yesterday called for a housecleaning of those who have abused authority. He urged the continuance of RFC as an essential to American economy.

The former president of a 16-unit western banking chain and the only RFC director so far untouched by Fulbright committee criticism, Mr. Cosgriff answered in an interview those calling for abolition of the loan agency.

"No one called for abolition of the Army when Maj. Gen. Benny Meyers went to jail," Mr. Cosgriff protested.

The 19-year-old RFC must continue, he contends, because the Nation's private banking system is either unable or unwilling to meet national credit needs.

SAYS AGENCY MUST CONTINUE

"If both long-term loans and the financing of such large new enterprises as the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. were available in the regular credit market, I would favor abolishing RFC even if Abraham Lincoln were its single administrator," Mr. Cosgriff said. "But private banks are not doing the job and, for that reason, I as a Republican, believe the abusers of authority—including myself, if I'm guilty—should be turned out and the agency continued."

To document his charge of banking failure, the 37-year-old Salt Lake City banker who became an RFC director last August, cited key RFC statistics: 631,351 business loans totaling $16,000,000,000 made over 19 years with only $134,000,000 of bad loans and a $600,000,000 net profit to the Federal Government.

"With all the scandal, the influence and the favoritism," he said, "the RFC has a loss record of about 1 percent on more than 600,000 loans. Each of these loans was made after the applicant produced certifications from the bank with which he does business,

and from one other, that credit was unavailable. That our bank 'reject loans' pay cut 99 percent seems sufficient evidence that banks are not servicing legitimate credit needs."

PRIVATE BANKS SHUN RISK

Mr. Cosgriff says American bankers fail in today's obligations because Government-backed bonds and guaranteed home loans lead them to shun business risks.

"Businesses that could have got private credit in 1910 are today denied it," he said. "Kaiser-Frazer is an example. Kaiser came to the RFC for $66,000,000, first because big banks that could have made the loan listened to his competitors who did not want it made and secondly, because it was simpler and safer for them to put their cash in Government sure things.

"This typifies a fundamental change in a banking system which, until the 1930s lived off the interest from business loans. In the last 20 years bank deposits have multiplied and, simultaneously, Government bond issues and guaranteed mortgages have offered profitable and sure investments.

"The result," said Mr. Cosgriff, "is that American bankers have turned their backs on the business loans with which America was built.

"I am against wild banking," he insisted, "but the pendulum has now swung too far to the conservative side."

The RFC director agrees with the Hoover Commission that Government guaranties of business loans, similar to FHA insurance of home loans, would be better than direct Federal advances to private borrowers. But he added:

BANKERS' GROUPS KILL PLAN

"Every time a definite business-loan-guaranty plan is advanced," he said, "the American Bankers Association and other powerful groups kill it in congressional committee."

Since its 1932 birthday, the average RFC loan has been for $35,000, and 19 out of every 20 loans made have been for less than $100,000, he said.

"The Commerce Department counts 3,000,000 so-called small businesses. Our record of 500,000 small loans means we have helped one out of every six of them at some time or other."

Why Penalize Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 2757 on February 19, 1951, I did so with the understanding that it would help the manpower problem during this period of emergency and at the same time assist in destroying the fallacy that retired persons have outlived their usefulness.

I also had in mind that those retired under social security today were being asked to live on fixed income while the cost of living skyrockets to unheard of heights.

The March 21, 1951, issue of the Washington Daily News carried the following editorial in support of my bill, H. R. 2757:

WHY PENALIZE WORK?

The Social Security System's average old-age insurance payment is now less than $44 a month.

It was far less than that until last year, when Congress adjusted payments upward to compensate those who get them for the increased cost of living since the system was adopted.

But the cost of living has continued to rise sharply, and the buying power of the larger old-age insurance payments is again falling behind.

Under the law, a person aged 65 or more can get no payment at all for any month in which, by continuing to work, he earns as much as $50.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT (Republican, Pennsylvania) has introduced a bill which would change the law so as to permit persons aged 65 or more to earn as much as $100 a month without forfeiting old-age insurance benefits.

Why not? In fact, if a person has been otherwise qualified for such benefits by deductions from his pay and contributions from his employer during the years before he reached 65, why should he be compelled to accept any limit on his continued earning power in order to get those benefits?

The notion that he should was a product of the depression and unemployment psychology prevalent when the Social Security System was set up almost 15 years ago.

Many people then thought there would never be enough jobs for younger workers unless elderly ones were forced to retire.

But now conditions are altogether different. This country urgently needs the continued productive efforts of elderly persons who are able and willing to work—needs those efforts to support the national defense program and keep the national standard of living from falling too low.

It seems foolish and unfair to penalize such persons, by depriving them of old-age insurance checks; if they do work productively enough to earn $50 a month, $100 a month, or any larger amount.

Suppose all limits on permissible monthly earnings were removed. The Social Security System then might have to pay more money than it otherwise would to persons thus encouraged to keep on working and at the same time to get old-age insurance benefits.

However, most of those persons would pay from their earnings into Social Security, and so would their employers. Many of them also would pay income taxes into the Treasury. It appears unlikely that there would be any large net loss to the Government, and highly probable that there would be a very important net gain to the country.

Words to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of distinct pride that I call attention to the achievements of a young man from Cincinnati, Ohio—Mr. Jimmie Dodd—who has been signally honored this week, for his prize winning song, Washington.

I feel that Mr. Dodd is a fine example of American youth who is proud of his country and proud of his Government. He started his career in radio, television, and musical composition in Cincinnati, and went on to win, this week, over thousands of entrants, from every State in the Union and many foreign countries, first prize in a Nation-wide contest to select a song for our Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been given unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD the words of that patriotic song, Washington, and a proclamation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia honoring Mr. Dodd:

WORDS TO WASHINGTON

(First prize winner Motorola song for Washington contest, by Jimmie Dodd)

Washington, the fairest city in the greatest land of all.
Named for one, our country's Father, who first answered freedom's call.
God bless our White House, our Capitol, too,
And keep ever flying the Red, White, and Blue,
Grandest spot beneath the sun is Washington.

(Patter)

Cherry blossoms bring a lot of joy each spring;
And the statue of Abe Lincoln greets your eye.
When parades pass in revue down Pennsylvania Avenue
All the people lift their voices to the sky.

(Second chorus)

Washington—the land of mem'ries,
Of the great men of the past;
Jefferson and Patrick Henry,
Who for liberty stood fast.
Ole Stonewall Jackson, and Franklin and Clay
All march side by side through mem'ries today.
Give us strength to carry on for Washington.

(Third chorus)

Washington—the good Lord keep you
With your banner high, unfurled;
Washington—the light of freedom,
Let it shine throughout the world.
May all we people be able to see
How grand is our life in the land of the free.
Freedom's hope beneath the sun is Washington.

PROCLAMATION

MARCH 16, 1951.

Whereas the District of Columbia heretofore has not had a song which could be considered the song of the District of Columbia;

Whereas in order to select a song which could be considered the song of the District of Columbia a committee of distinguished musicians consisting of Howard Mitchell, Sigmund Romberg, Maj. William F. Santelmann, Dr. Sigmund Spaeth, and Gordon Jenkins has considered a great number of songs submitted in connection with a recent song for Washington contest; and

Whereas the committee aforesaid has selected the song Washington by James W. Dodd as the most worthy of all the songs so submitted:

Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in order to encourage the adoption by the citizens of the District of Columbia of a song they may call their own, and in order to inculcate a spirit of civic pride among the citizens of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim Monday, March 19, 1951, as Song for Washington Day, and do urge and recommend to the citizens of the District of Columbia that they adopt the prize-winning song Washington as the song of the District of Columbia.

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
F. JOSEPH DONOHUE,
GORDON R. YOUNG,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Televising Proceedings of Committees of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a tremendous interest throughout the country on the subject of the televising of congressional committee hearings. Last night two witnesses before the crime committee refused to testify before TV and thus started what is certain to be a historic test of this issue in the courts.

Last Wednesday I issued a release on this over-all TV subject, pointing out the need for a voluntary committee code of self-regulation, so as to prevent abuses of this great medium insofar as Congress is concerned and so as to explore some of the legal ramifications insofar as that is possible at this stage.

On Sunday I issued another statement on this subject, pointing out that it was my intention to prepare a bill so that the Senate Rules Committee would make a complete study of the implications of television to the Congress.

I referred, for example, to the fact that television might some day be utilized in the event of an atomic emergency for decentralizing functions of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, the text of the initial Associated Press news story written on my approach by Mr. Richard Powers on Wednesday, March 21, to be followed thereafter by the text of my release to the press of last Sunday.

There being no objection, the news story and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of March 22, 1951]

WILEY URGES CODE TO HANDLE TELEVISING OF WITNESSES

WASHINGTON.—Congressional committees should adopt a voluntary code to handle the touchy problem of whether or not to permit televising of witnesses, Senator WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, said Wednesday.

WILEY is a member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee which has had that question tossed in its face.

In its current quiz in New York, the committee agreed to the plea by Frank Costello, the kingpin gambler, that his face be excluded from the range of the television cameras.

However, in a previous session in Missouri, the same committee insisted that James Carroll, a betting commissioner, testify in front of a TV camera. Carroll declined to do so. The committee has voted to cite him for contempt. Chairman KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, said he would press for Senate approval of the citation.

USGES FLEXIBILITY

WILEY said in an interview that any such code as he suggested must be flexible to meet different situations.

"I have no criticism whatsoever against the rulings made by Chairman KEFAUVER or the crime investigating staff," WILEY said. "They have been models of fairness.

"The point I make is that television of congressional hearings is a relatively new problem thrust upon the committees to handle.

"Television can be the greatest constructive force for public education that has been achieved in this century. It can bring Congress closer to the American people than any other medium.

"However, television of live congressional committee hearings can also become a monster which can destroy innocent individuals, whole corporations, political parties, and entire administrations."

PROPAGANDA MEDIUM

"Think of the possibility of a witness in front of a TV camera unleashing a barrage of unfounded accusations against an individual, business corporation, a political opponent, or someone else he wants to 'get.'

"Or they can make those hearings degenerate into a three-ring carnival of horse play, ham acting and everything but constructive seeking of truth."

As an example, WILEY said, an avowed Communist at a televised hearing "could in a few minutes time reach 10,000,000, 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 viewers with propaganda, sabotage instructions or for some other Red purpose which he could not possibly achieve in any other way."

SUGGESTS CODE

WILEY said a voluntary code by congressional committees might include procedure such as:

(1) Preceding all open hearings by an intensive closed session to explore as many of the issues as possible, which will come up in the public hearings.

(2) Advise wherever possible all individuals, corporations and others whose names will be mentioned that charges or adverse testimony may be presented and they will be given full opportunity to reply.

(3) Careful advice to witnesses beforehand of their tremendous responsibility for fairness and for documentation of their charges rather than talking loosely on the basis of hearsay or other unfounded basis.

(4) A careful check to see that televising of the proceedings would not impair the health or clear reasoning of any individual by subjecting him or her to TV spotlights if they cannot testify properly under such difficult circumstances.

(5) Be particularly careful to assure fair bipartisan representation so that both parties may serve as a check and balance on one another.

WILEY said television of committee hearings "merely accentuates the need of fairness on the part of the committee members."

WILEY SUBMITS A RESOLUTION FOR SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF TELEVISING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

I am introducing a resolution to have the Senate Rules Committee make a thorough study of the various problems which have arisen, or which might arise, in connection with past or proposed televising or radio broadcasting or motion picture or other photographing, of proceedings of the Congress and its respective Houses and committees. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its study, together with its recommendations.

Such a study should be made so that we carefully think out how the great medium of television can most constructively serve the interests of the Congress and of our people in this technological age.

I hope the Senate Rules Committee will act on this resolution rather than have the Congress just allow this new development to grow up like Topsy in every which direction.

VOLUNTARY SELF-REGULATION NEEDED TO PREVENT CIRCUSES

I think that the committee could come up with helpful suggestions—not laws—which could serve as a basis for voluntary self-regulation by congressional committees of their TV and related processes. Congress' committees would be put on notice that televising of hearings should not be allowed to degenerate into a three-ring circus, a fourth-rate stage production with hamming and phony theatrics, an unjust inquisition of people under klieg lights, particularly people who might not be able to testify properly under such conditions because of health reasons.

What is needed are common-sense standards of good taste and restraint. Such standards would in no way be prejudicial to the great television industry.

I trust that the Rules Committee will secure the best judgment of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and of the finest minds in the television industry, because it is quite clear that we are going to have to reckon with television in the future work of the Congress.

As a matter of fact, it is obvious to every American that television is going to assume an ever-larger role in the entire political, economic, and social life of our Nation. It may become the most powerful single medium during the 1952 presidential and congressional elections.

IN AN EMERGENCY WE MAY LEGISLATE BY TELEVISION

In the past, I have suggested that television may prove a vital instrument in future national emergencies. If our country were under attack, it might be necessary for Members of the Senate and House at widely dispersed points to legislate by television. They could not possibly assemble at any one single point because they would become subject to enemy sabotage and attack. Yet the Congress as such would have to continue functioning, even though atomic bombs and guided missiles, were raining down on our country.

I approach television, therefore, with a great admiration and respect for its tremendous potentialities, but I also recognize some of the intrinsic dangers in Congress' use of it.

The televising of the crime committee hearings, particularly in New York, have shown TV's tremendous wallop. A vast audience saw real-life prototypes of what Hollywood has been portraying for years in gangster pictures. Moreover, the average man in the street who by and large doesn't get much of a view of his public officials except usually from a distance, was seeing them at close hand and often seeing them squirm. There was conflict; there was drama; there was tremendous human interest in that New York television spectacle.

GREAT DANGERS IN TELEVISING

But any thoughtful individual could shudder at the harm that could have been wrought by such televising to the innocent, not just to the guilty—to innocent persons, political parties, companies, and to governmental administrations.

With a fair committee chairman like ESTES KEFAUVER, with a conscientious committee membership and staff like that of the crime committee, I have less concern than if this powerful medium were in other hands.

A MAN COULD BE "MURDERED" ON TELEVISION

But it is obvious that when a committee calls men who are reported to be murderers, racketeers, goons, etc., it is giving those witnesses a tremendous power for evil. If a man can assassinate another with bullets, how much easier it is for him to assassinate another man with words. He can call his enemy every name in the books; he could attribute all sorts of sins and evils to him; he could smear him, ruin his reputation.

Of course, later on, the accused could come back and try to answer the charges, but he might be doing so probably at a different time of the day, before a different viewing audience. He might not be as good a performer as his accuser; and although his facts might amply refute the charges, he might never escape the cloud that was placed over him. Which man in politics does not have at least one enemy who would be happy to crucify him on television before 20,000,000 viewers?

Let me point out, too, the possibilities for lewd gestures being screened, for profanity, and for other undesirable demonstrations suddenly occurring.

I want us to recognize that there is a point beyond which the exchange of conflicting opinion could become a mere exchange of unfounded smears.

There is a point beyond which the search for corruption could conceivably become an unnecessary dwelling in sordidness and peddling in filth, which is hardly fit subject for televising before a public audience.

SOME HEARINGS ARE ON ISSUES, OTHERS ON PERSONALITIES

We should differentiate between a congressional committee which hears expert individuals testifying on issues, and a hearing in which questionable individuals testify mainly on personalities and alleged misdeeds. Of course, issues and personalities often become intertwined. But our people will understand the point I am making when they consider, for example, how constructive it is for the Nation's television audiences to view someone like former President Herbert Hoover, testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee as compared with someone like Frank Costello.

Now obviously there is usually not the conflict, there is not the dramatic bitterness in a foreign-relations type hearing as in a crime-busting session. The former may make for comparatively duller television presentation. But whereas there are very few people who will doubt the constructive nature of the one type of hearing being televised, there are many of us who have serious doubts about the other type of hearing being continually televised. I say "continually," because I feel that many sessions should be executive, that is, closed, and some sessions should be open. Wherever possible, executive sessions should go over the ground before hearings are thrown open to the public.

THREE STANDARDS FOR CONSIDERING OPEN HEARINGS

We must never forget that the primary aim of congressional committees in making investigations is basically to find the facts on the basis of which to prepare constructive legislation.

Another aim is to enlighten Members of Congress as to their approach on forthcoming issues and votes and reflect by word and deed sound public opinion.

A third aim is to inform the American citizenry of the problems facing the Congress so that they in turn can come to sound decisions on issues and individuals.

It seems to me that all hearings, before being televised, should be evaluated as to whether or not they actually fulfill one of those functions.

PRACTICE OF TELEVISING HEARINGS COULD DEVELOP WILDLY

Now, the usual history of some such development as this TV baby is that the medium becomes more and more used, more and more wildly, with less and less restraint until some dramatic instance comes up in which, say, an innocent man's reputation is completely ruined. Then, the people strike back at the monster they have created by passing repressive rules. I want us to anticipate this danger and prevent it from occurring in the first place. I want us to put on our best thinking caps right now.

I don't want Congress to usurp the powers of courts and of grand juries. Our function is legislative, not judicial. Nor do I want us to ever forget that a television camera is a two-edged sword which can wound the innocent as well as the guilty. Every performer at a congressional hearing—be he Congressman, staff aide or witness—has a terrific responsibility.

TV HEARING COULD BE FULL OF PUBLICITY PLUGS

Lastly, think of the fact that a witness at a TV hearing has a tremendous power to reap commercial publicity for some product or person, to put in a plug which might otherwise cost thousands of dollars if commercial time were bought.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the News-Press of Nebraska City, Nebr., on February 21, 1951. It reflects the high esteem Mid-Westerners hold for the thinking of the very able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. It is an honor to have the privilege of asking that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY CHATTER

The other day Senator JAMES P. KEM of our neighboring Missouri came home to talk to Republican editors. Of course, he talked politics, tearing into the Truman administration.

A lot of what he said makes sense.

For example: "Since the end of World War II more than $45,000,000,000 has been sent by the administration to some 80 countries. Practically every country on the globe has received aid in some form from the United States."

KEM figured that 18 percent of all the taxes collected from the American people has been sent abroad.

KEM said the Truman doctrine is this: "The United States must resist aggression wherever it appears in the world. The United States will strike down aggression wherever it raises its head."

An expensive and bloody assignment.

Korea is just one tiny spot on the map.

The Marshall plan, said KEM, was to be insurance against war. "Our foreign gifts have not brought us any friends," he declared. "We have fewer friends than we had at the end of World War II."

Even Britain has recognized Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Red dictator who is killing Americans in Korea.

Have our friends helped us in Korea?

Said KEM: "Our fair-weather friends on the bench talk a good game and like to coach. They want us to provide the uniforms, do all the blocking, carry the ball, and collect all the headaches and almost all the bloody noses. We need friends with cool heads, not cold feet."

The Senator recalled that Wilson was elected to keep us out of war, Roosevelt promised in 1940 not to send American boys into a foreign war, and Truman ran on this slogan: "Peace and prosperity—vote Democrat."

"Three wars in 33 years," said KEM. "What have we to show for our foreign adventures carried out under the auspices of the Democratic Party? Some of the best manhood killed or wounded; a public debt of astronomical proportions; the danger of uncontrolled inflation; the threatened ruin of our economic system, and a world in turmoil."

Continuance of Kefauver and Fulbright Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Committees Must Not Die," referring to the Kefauver and Fulbright committees, published in this morning's issue of the Ohio State Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMITTEES MUST NOT DIE

Unless the Senate acts this week, the life of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime, better known as the Kefauver committee, will expire on Saturday. Senator TOBEY, Republican of New Hampshire, a member of the committee, has said that the Senate will be asked to continue the investigation for another 60 days. Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, the chairman, has taken the stand that the committee has turned up enough evidence to show the Senate what needs to be done in the way of new or strengthened laws.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote that the chief use of the power of Congress to make investigations is the enlightenment of the people. Very few men are unequal to a danger when they see and understand. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.

More people have seen (thanks to television) and read about the conditions of organized crime in the United States as a result of the Kefauver committee's hearings than ever before. We believe the people are beginning to understand the menace of organized gambling and its ramifications which include corruption of public officials, participation in political campaigns, and the whole gamut of crimes, including murder, as they have never understood it before. The informing function of Congress is therefore operating potently. It must not be allowed to languish.

The end of March also is the time originally marked for conclusion of the work of the Fulbright committee which has been investigating influence peddling in Washington, with particular emphasis on the chicanery, recklessness, and immorality of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Senator FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas) has been willing to drop the inquiry. The other committee members have overridden him and

have said the investigation will go on. Those committee members, backed by the Senate and the American people, must see to it that it really does go on.

The facts revealed and publicized by these two committees are symptomatic of the decline of moral standards in our country and particularly in its officialdom in Washington, in some of the large cities, and in some of the States. Congressman at Large BENDER (Republican, Ohio) stated the case succinctly when he said: "The facts brought out by the committee make it evident that too many people are looking for a 'fast buck' and they don't care how they get it, just as long as they don't have to work for it. We have created a good many conditions which encourage this attitude, and it's high time we reversed the trend. We don't reverse it by pulling an iron curtain over the whole mess in an effort to pretend that it doesn't smell."

While the public is aroused the job must be carried to its conclusion—new laws, strengthened laws, grand jury investigations as to whether existing laws have been violated, trials for perjury and other crimes if it is believed they have been committed.

The Kefauver and Fulbright committees must not be permitted to die. If they perish, the criminal and immoral elements will have the green light to proceed with greater speed and to the greater endangerment of the Nation.

The Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Sunday, March 25, there appeared in the Washington Star an extremely wise and well-written editorial about the congressional investigations which have been in progress recently. Because I believe my colleagues and the country should have an opportunity to read the editorial, and since it expresses so well my own thoughts on the subject, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO STUDY THE NEXT MOVE

The skillful conduct and the genuine productiveness of both the RFC and the organized crime investigations have produced a strong demand that they be continued. There is a general feeling in the public mind that only the surface has been scratched and that the digging should go deeper.

But partly for personal reasons, the able chairmen of these two investigating committees—Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas—want to quit. Neither wishes to confine promising Senate careers to a single specialty, especially when the time consumed by that specialty excludes almost everything else.

There are other considerations, however, outside the personal desires of the two Senators most involved. One is that the only valid justification for such investigations is to determine the need for corrective legislation and the form it should take. In the case of the RFC, the form of the legislation for its reorganization has been approved by the House and is now under study in the Senate, with a possibility that instead of reorganizing it Congress may vote to abolish it. As a result of its investigation, the Kefauver committee has uncovered a pattern of organized crime in this country which is to be made the basis for a series of legislative proposals, as yet unrevealed. Both committee chairmen, therefore, believe that their committee missions have been accomplished.

There is another very practical consideration that the public may overlook. One of the reasons that these two investigations have been productive is the careful work of preparation, extending over many months, by excellent investigating staffs. In the case of the Fulbright committee, the public hearings have now covered and extended beyond the ground explored in advance by the investigating staff. If the committee keeps going, its investigations could deteriorate into a hopeful fishing expedition without real objective. Something of the same condition applies in the case of the Kefauver investigation, which was to wind up by the end of this month. If it is to continue its work indefinitely, and beyond the tying up of some loose ends remaining, the staff of investigators must be given the opportunity to explore in advance.

This would be a logical time to conclude the investigations for the time being and to begin the serious consideration of the legislation, for which the investigations were designed in the first place. For the discussion of that legislation in Congress would provide the most appropriate opportunity to decide whether further investigation is desirable, the direction it should take and how it is to be conducted.

Both Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT favor creation of commissions, to continue what they have begun. Mr. KEFAUVER would entrust to his commission a continuing study of the ramifications of organized crime, with continuing emphasis upon the responsibility of elected officials at the local level. Mr. FULBRIGHT would like to see a commission of eminent men assigned to a study of the level of morality in Government and desirable ethical standards for men in public life.

Such commissions, under the direction and control of Congress, might accomplish something of value. But no commission has the standing, in public estimation, possessed by a carefully directed congressional investigating committee. Perhaps the sensible thing to do is to consider the work of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees as the end of the beginning, but to pause now and give careful study to the next move, which is to consider legislation to deal with conditions exposed by investigation.

It would be unfortunate to see the excellent work so far of the two committees undermined by a disposition to plunge ahead with further investigation, merely because the incidental glamor of public hearings and colorful testimony are temporarily popular.

Tribute to the Late Senator Virgil M. Chapman by John W. Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was so impressed by the remarks made by Mr. John W. Jones, president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, and intimate and long-time friend of the late Senator Chapman, at a gathering in Lexington, Ky., on the sad occasion of the funeral of Senator Chapman, that I asked Mr. Jones to reduce his impromptu eulogy to writing in order that it might be inserted in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the afore-mentioned remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

There are so many distinguished gentlemen around this table, Senators, Governors, Members of the National House of Representatives, judges, lawyers, and others of outstanding success in their chosen occupations, that in beginning I will simply say: Gentlemen, you are guests this evening of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, and though the occasion that brings many of you to Kentucky is a sad one, we are pleased to have you as our guests, and we personally appreciate and desire to thank the colleagues of Senator Chapman for the deserved honor they pay our dear friend in escorting his remains to Paris, Ky. Kentucky mourns the tragic and untimely death of Senator Chapman; as yet we have not recovered from the shock. Kentucky loves him, the farm folk of Kentucky love him dearly, and I love him far beyond the love usual for one man to bear another.

He was a true patriot, an outstanding statesman, a loyal friend, great of mind, warm of heart, honest personally, and honest intellectually, always modest and humble. He was a great historian, and I will never cease to wonder at the great amount of exact information he carried in his mind.

His office in Washington was my home when in that city, and how rich the experience when I would sit with him in his office, and also in Kentucky and listen as he talked of international and national affairs, and of constitutional government. Frequently the conversation would turn to outstanding leaders of other days—Jefferson, and the sage of Monticello would come alive and would be in our company, as Virgil spoke of him as familiarly and intimately as if he were present. And then Jackson and the courageous soul of the Hermitage would stand out in all the rugged strength of his unusual character. If still in the mood it would be that matchless Southerner, General Lee. Virgil's voice would be loving and gentle as he described the distinguished service of this Christian gentleman to his people not only in war, but in peace, as he sought to bind up the wound and hurt of war and unite a divided Nation in peace. How blessed to me was such an experience, and how rich such a fellowship. I believe in immortality, personal immortality, and perhaps already there has been a meeting of these great souls. Virgil would need no introduction for he has known them through the years.

Virgil and I started together in making schoolhouse speeches in our effort to form the organization that is your host this evening. Virgil went on to greatness. The Burley organization serves directly one-third of the population of Kentucky, and indirectly every man, woman, and child within its boundary. Virgil Chapman has advocated, and urged, and with the votes of many of you present, has passed the farm legislation that has blessed our people. Better farms, better homes, better living conditions for the farmer's family have been the result of better prices. The farm folk of Kentucky will not forget. A granite shaft will, perhaps, be erected at Paris, Ky., to mark his resting

place, but the things that he has done to bless so many of the people of Kentucky, whom he loved, will be his real memorial as children and the children of children hear from the lips of fathers and mothers of his untiring and successful efforts in bringing to them the better things of life. An automobile accident took his life, yet the wear, tear, and exhaustion of an unselfish service for his people had gone far to weaken a strong constitution. I personally know this.

We join in sorrow with you gentlemen from Washington. I am sure Virgil's spirit is near us this evening. We meet with you here because we love him. When my earthly pilgrimage is over, I will find Virgil and there in some sequestered spot in that eternal country I will sit in his company, and listen in as he talks with those who have been the great of all the earth.

Speakers at Temple Ohabei Shalom, Brookline, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Army Secretary Pace at Brookline Temple," written by Bill Schofield, and published in the Boston Traveler of March 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE YOU HEARD
(By Bill Schofield)
ARMY SECRETARY PACE AT BROOKLINE TEMPLE

Ever since the drive shaft of the Berlin-Tokyo-Axis broke down, this land of ours has heard a lot of talk about service unification. It even has seen certain good theories along that line converted into action.

And now, for a fresh example of unity, let's turn for a bow toward the banquet hall of Temple Ohabei Shalom in Brookline.

There, when the gavel hits the table next Tuesday night, Army Secretary Frank Pace, Jr., will rise on his toes to deliver a speech of national significance.

When he returns to his seat, acknowledging the applause of the crowd, the temple group will have completed the unique feat of entertaining within three successive years the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Army.

Not a word has been relayed about it yet, but this alinement suggests that on a March night next year the master of ceremonies will be saying "Ladies and gentlemen, your principal speaker of the evening, Secretary of Defense * * *."

That would round out the cycle, and would be typical of the way Temple Ohabei Shalom has been doing things with its annual Armed Forces and veterans' night dinner.

This unusual sequence of speakers began on March 1, 1949, when W. Stuart Symington returned to his home State as Secretary of the Air Force and spoke to the temple brotherhood. Nobody would have been too greatly surprised if the Amherst-born Cabinet officer had failed to reach Boston that night.

For one thing, it was blowing a gale of snow and his chances of getting here by plane were as dark and confused as the clouds that blackened the city. For another thing, it was his twenty-fifth wedding anniversary and any man could be excused for wishing to stay home with a few close friends on such a night.

Nevertheless, Symington arrived with Mrs. Symington at his side, and graciously accepted a Paul Revere silver bowl as a gift from his friends of the temple.

Last year, it was Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews' turn to take the stage. He came at a time when the subject of unification was touchy and delicate. Admiral Louis E. Denfeld had left office as Chief of Naval Operations just a few months earlier, and a coast-to-coast audience was bending a critical ear toward any word of departmental policy.

Matthews that night assured the Nation that Navy discipline and Navy order were taut and shipshape. He characterized the leadership of Admiral Forrest Sherman as brilliant. He left a good feeling in the hearts of 1,000 listeners in the dining hall, and millions on the radio.

And now on Tuesday night, when President Frank Brooks calls the meeting to order, the temple hosts and their guests will rise to greet the third member of the Nation's triangular defense team.

The 38-year-old Pace is not of this part of the country, but neither is he a stranger here. He came originally from Little Rock, Ark., but he grew well acquainted with Boston during his days as a student at Harvard Law School. He'll have words of immediate interest to offer, not only on Korea but also on potential military volcanoes in other parts of the planet.

Col. Elliott A. Niles, in charge of arranging the dinner, has lined up a guest list containing names that would be labeled box office in the parlance of show business. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director of Selective Service, will be guest of honor. Speakers will include Omer W. Clark, Deputy National Administrator of Veterans' Administration; Harold Russell, national commander of AMVETS; and Roy E. Johnson, coordinator, military and veterans' liaison, American National Red Cross.

Also attending will be Rear Adm. Hewlett Thebaud, commandant of the First Naval District; Maj. Gen. C. G. Helmick, commanding general New England subarea; Maj. Gen. James W. Spry, of the Air Force; Rear Adm. Harold G. Bradbury, of the Coast Guard; Brig. Gen. William J. Blake, of the Veterans' Administration—and the list runs on through the dozens.

Most of these guests will be honored before dinner at a reception in the Niles home in Brookline. And if the conversation gets around to American unification—as it's bound to do in time—the name of Temple Ohabei Shalom is sure to win applause.

Three services with one goal—it's a program worthy of praise.

Assistance for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention of the Senate to the column Sounding Off, by J. M. Hazlitt, of the Pauls Valley Democrat, Pauls Valley, Okla., adjudged by the Disabled American Veterans' organization as being the best article in their newspaper column contest aiding the cause of the disabled veterans.

Out of the 3 years the DAV has conducted this contest, this is the second consecutive year Mr. Hazlitt, of Pauls Valley, has been adjudged the winner. At a time when additional thousands of disabled veterans are being discharged from service hospitals to seek gainful employment and resume their civilian pursuits, Mr. Hazlitt's column was deemed by the judges to be particularly significant.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUNDING OFF
(By J. M. Hazlitt, Pauls Valley (Okla.) Daily Democrat)

The great factory is in production again. After a lull in manufacturing its own special product, the process is going again, and the products are being scattered across the land.

For a scant 5 years the wheels and spikes of war ceased the output of broken bodies, torn flesh, and scarred minds. But now the pipelines are full again, and the stream of wrecked lives swells daily.

The process from healthy civilian to trained fighter is a relatively short one. The actual creation of a disabled veteran takes only a second or two of time. A machine gun burst, an angry grenade, a sudden and sickening eruption of a land mine, the rending and tearing of a torpedo, a quick flash of fire, a crashed plane, or the longer and slower process of numbing the mind with horror, are all the tools of the factory which makes the individuals of the long parade of disabled veterans.

When life hangs on by a slender thread, when consciousness returns, if it does, then begins the longest travel, the most endless journey, the steepest trail ever traveled by men. That is the road back to recovery of what is left of life and after that the rough and bumpy road back into the life of the community and Nation.

Only those who travel that road—only those who are products of that hellish manufacturing process—can know what it means to look at our complex economy from the depths of the pit of incapacity.

Of course there is that time of quick and ready sympathy, sometimes developing into sweetly sickening pity. For a time there is an honest desire on the part of most people to be helpful. Then comes the realization that the world moves on and hasn't time for the man who can't keep up in the race.

Of course there is an attempt on the part of Government to bridge the gap between what a man was and that to which he is reduced. But even that comes into question quickly. Pensions and compensation soon become easy money in the eyes of the public and the disabled veteran cashes his checks in a surreptitious manner, bordering on apology.

Of course time brings its compensations and adaptations. The man survives and learns better to overcome and minimize the handicap under which he must labor to carry his own load in the economy of the most complex Nation on earth.

All these matters are part of the pattern. All these things come about in an orderly manner and each takes its toll. Through it all the veteran is glad that he isn't confined in a hospital and his sympathy runs to those

whose bodies and minds won't heal and who face days and years in the walls of the forgotten, in the backwash of war, in the storage rooms of the factory of death and near death.

If people could just understand—if the general public could just be aware—that all the veteran asks, all he wants, and all he hopes for, is a chance to care for himself in dignity and decency.

The records of a thousand employers prove that the disabled have discarded the prefix to disability and meet the world on the basis of ability itself. The record proves that disabled men with all degrees of disability can and do hold jobs with greater fidelity and skill than their whole compatriots.

It may require some minor adjustments in routine, some special arrangements of various kinds, to accommodate the handicap of the man coming back along that trail, but the truth is, that he will pay it all back and return a profit.

They come from new places now, strange, oriental names designate the points on the map where the trail starts, Tarawa, Iwo, the Bulge, Kasserine, Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, Guadalcanal, now have such names as Pusan, Taejon, Seoul, Kaesong, and Inchon added to them, but the story and the problem are the same.

You can help, it is up to you to help. Your attitude can make or break the disabled veteran. Don't cry over him, give him a chance.

That's all for today. No color will cheer up a hospital room as much as the color in your face.

Democracy in Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Democracy in Turkey," by Mr. Farnsworth Fowle. Mr. Fowle is at the present time a correspondent for the New York Times in Frankfort, Germany. His article is based largely upon his experience as correspondent for the same paper in Istanbul from 1949 until recently.

It gives me great pleasure to see the recognition, so well deserved, which our friends the Turkish people are receiving. I wish to congratulate them for the wisdom and dignity with which they conduct their public affairs. I have had occasion in the past to refer to their outstanding contribution to the fighting in Korea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Oxonian of April 1951]

DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY

(By Farnsworth Fowle)

This timely article, showing that the cold war has stimulated democracy in one of Russia's neighbors, comes from a foreign correspondent of the New York Times. Fowle has served as war correspondent to Great Britain and to the United States Armed Forces; as a correspondent for the New York Times in Istanbul, 1949–51; and now represents the same newspaper in Frankfurt.

The Turks are an exceptional people. Generalizations about them have a way of breaking down. Attempts to classify them with their Balkan neighbors or their Moslem coreligionists, or with other familiar types of Asian or European nationalism, are more often wrong than right.

In his early days as president of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal (as he then was, before he decided that Turks should have surnames and took for himself the style of Ancestral-Turk or Ataturk) was once asked if the new regime was like the Fascists or the Communists. His answer, "We resemble ourselves!" may have seemed a proud man's denial of obvious similarities at the time. Turkey's evolution in the past 20 years suggests that he was right; the more they change, the more they resemble themselves.

The Turks have maintained their political independence in their Anatolian heartland for just under 5½ centuries—ever since Tamerlane's Central Asiatic empire turned out to be a flash in the pan. Behind borrowed plumes of various colors and ages, the Turkish national character can best be described in terms of a pragmatic genius for survival. A record of this sort in one of the most strategic corners of Eurasia can scarcely be ascribed to luck. The Turks have shown not only the will to survive but the skill.

It is all the more flattering to the democracies that in the present world crisis, in spite of their exposed position, the Turks have chosen—with the same courage as the Greeks but with greater unanimity—to throw in their lot with us, in their internal policy no less than in diplomacy, which, after all, has always produced strange bed fellows.

There is nothing new and nothing imposed about the westernization of Turkey. Characteristically, it was in military matters that the Ottoman sultans first decided to learn from the patently superior techniques of the European powers. In 1826, a generation after the first attempt to introduce army reform ended in the assassination of his ruling uncle Selim by the Janissary Corps Mahmoud II abruptly liquidated this obsolete Praetorian Guard and started rebuilding his army from scratch on western models under French and Prussian advisers. As the nineteenth century progressed, more of these western techniques in engineering, medicine, and administration were introduced along with the new military organization. They took root wherever their practical superiority was proved—and where they did not present an outright challenge to the obsolescent Islamic structure of state and society.

The harsh surgery of the First World War and its aftermath virtually eliminated the non-Turkish lands and peoples from Ottoman rule. The further partition of Turkey, prescribed by the Allied Powers at the Paris Peace Conference, was prevented by a 3-year war of national resistance led by Mustafa Kemal.

As an authentic national hero he always had the great majority of the Turkish people behind him, sometimes enthusiastically, sometimes—as in the case of his determined campaign against the conservative power of the Moslem clergy—grudgingly. During the 16 years from his military victory in 1922 to his death in 1938, he used his extraordinary prestige to eliminate the sultanate and the caliphate and to complete the westernization of the state structure, the educational system, and—as much as he could—the modes of social behavior.

Kemal Ataturk's methods were dictatorial: the National Assembly, which had represented many shades of opinion during the unifying war of independence, became after 1925 a rubber stamp for his dramatic moves. In 1930 he ordered several of his most trusted friends to organize a Liberal Party in opposition to the monopolistic People's Party. The experiment lasted only 100 days; long before the election stage was reached, Ataturk permitted the Liberals to drop the whole matter. They believed that Prime Minister Ismet Inonu was terrified by the popular response to the opposition group, and convinced his chief that the foundations of the Republic were threatened.

As time went on, the People's Party was dressed up to look more and more like a dynamic totalitarian movement. Dubious theories of race, language, and history, designed to reassure the Turkish people as to their central position in human civilization, received official sponsorship. In foreign policy, paradoxically, the growing Axis threat to the status quo had impelled Turkey, like the Soviet Union, to join the League of Nations in a belated effort to achieve collective security. Even before Ataturk's death and Inonu's succession to the presidency in 1938, the foundations were laid for a supplementary defensive alliance with Britain and France, which was concluded just after the outbreak of war in 1939.

The war years, with every country on Turkey's frontiers sooner or later involved in the struggle, were scarcely a time for liberal experiment. In 1945, the emergence of an expansionist Soviet Union as the only surviving great power in Eastern Europe brought about a reexamination of policy at home and abroad.

Inonu's achievement in staying out of the war while maintaining alliance and friendship with the western wing of the victorious coalition was almost universally applauded in Turkey. On both counts it was a conspicuous improvement over Turkey's status at the end of the First World War. Internally, there was no compelling reason for a change.

In view of Moscow's territorial claims advanced in June 1945, the urgent need for obtaining the support of the West shed a different light on the matter. Britain and France, Turkey's two formal allies, were no longer in a position to form a counterweight to Russian interest in the Straits, Kars, Artvin, and Ardahan. As viewed by the classical school of Turkish diplomacy, American policy was not committed to back Turkey and was even more subject than Britain and France to the moods of public opinion. Turkey's wartime neutrality might be regarded as both correct and useful by western diplomatists, but it did not inspire anything like the popular sympathy won by the Russians as fighting allies.

It was at this stage in the fall of 1945 that a former Prime Minister, Celal Bayar, a silent back-bencher in the National Assembly ever since Inonu became president, issued a call for reform within the ranks of the People's Party. Instead, he was expelled along with three other dissidents—Refik Koraltan, a veteran public prosecutor; Fuad Koprulu, Turkey's best-known historian, and a prosperous landowner; Adnan Menderes, who takes his name from the still-meandering river of his home in the rich Aegean coastal region. The four rebels proclaimed the foundation of the Demokrat Partisi.

In spite of the precedent of Ataturk and the Liberals of 1930, the Democrats certainly did not begin as a gleam in the eye of Inonu. If the President had decided to appoint an opposition leader, he would have selected a more congenial figure. The experiment having been thrust upon him, he decided to accept it; suppression would have been doubly embarrassing to Turkey's prestige in the west. Preparations were made for the republic's first direct elections to the National Assembly in July 1946.

Bayar's plea for more political and economic freedom was taken up by most of the big metropolitan newspapers of Istanbul, weary after years of heavy-handed control and suppression. The patriotic character of the opposition was assured when Turkey's only field marshal, Fevzi Cakmak, agreed to emerge from retirement and run as an "independent" on the Democrats' list.

The election was marred by intimidation of the voters and administrative perversion of the results in many cases: the Democrats should have received many more seats than the one in six they were awarded after much embarrassing delay in declaring the results. A new bitterness entered the relations between government and opposition.

In the People's Party, nervous politicians of the old school wanted to go back to the good old days when nobody crossed the government. President Inonu, however, looked instead to younger men like Nihat Erim and Kasim Gulek to give a more democratic tone to the party.

The Democrats were always in danger of becoming a mere voice of uninhibited denunciation, rather than an organization preparting to offer the people an alternative government. One wing, finding Bayar's policy of patiently building a nation-wide organization too tame, split off to form a third, or Nation, party, led or at least fronted by the august Marshal Cakmak. In the long run, this probably helped the Democrats by drawing off the hotheads, and, with them, the attention of the government, always tempted to strike in anger.

In the years that followed the 1946 election, Russia remained just as unfriendly and America showed increasingly active sympathy and support for Turkey's stand. Truman aid in 1947 and Marshall aid the next year opened new perspectives for Turkey's military and economic strength. Most Turks saw that it would be inexpedient to abandon the democratic experiment on the one hand, or for party rivalries to boil over and create internal weakness on the other. This peculiar international situation produced a hothouse atmosphere favorable to the growth of transplanted western democracy.

A year before the 1950 election its prospects were far from brilliant. Both opposition parties were still boycotting local elections and byelections because the Government had not yet met their demand for a fair election law. Political debate was frequently centered on hair-splitting questions that were significant only because they seemed to show that the Government might be looking for grounds to suppress the opposition. The press, however, was increasingly free and increasingly independent of all three parties, to the considerable disgust of the Democrats. This fact helped to raise the tone of the debate.

Finally the Government incorporated most of the Democrats' suggestions in the new election law, and the Democrats agreed to run. Grave doubts remained as to whether the parties, the administrative machine, and the general public could make it work. In a land where the literacy rate is still extremely low, where bipartisan poll management was unprecedented, and where the law's complicated appeal mechanism could hold up the results almost indefiniately, many things could go wrong.

The consensus was that at least in the cities of Ankara, Istanbul, and Izmir an honest election was possible and even likely. Here the Democrats were well organized, literacy and political interest were both relatively high, and a repetition of the 1946 scandal would have been a conspicuous national disgrace.

As for the smaller towns and the 35,000 villages of Anatolia, many doubted whether the peasant, even if he dared to trust the secrecy of the poll, would care very much which politicians ruled in Ankara. Above all, in the eastern provinces between the Euphrates and the Caucasus frontier, so much more backward than the rest of the country and so tightly under the administrative and military thumb of the Government, it was easy to believe that the People's Party would pick up enough seats to produce a comfortable national majority. A solid east seemed in prospect. If the peasants were somehow persuaded to vote for the Government, this would mean a clean sweep for the People's Party in every election district except the province of Istanbul, the only one in which city dwellers outnumbered country folk. The most generous prelection nonparty estimate I heard was two seats out of five for the Democrats.

To my surprise, a swing through central and eastern Turkey a month before the election showed a picture scarcely distinguishable from that in the cities. In spite of alleged campaign outrages played up in the metropolitan and provincial press, the temper of the country was nowhere near the boiling point. People were interested in what the parties were saying but not demonstratively enthusiastic. A common remark was: "I don't know how the province will go, but this village will probably vote for the Demirkirat Party." Slightly twisted, democrat means iron-breaker in Turkish. Even more significant, the rural and provincial Democrats had few complaints to make about administrative obstruction. Not at all like 1946, they said.

Celal Bayar went east for the final week of the campaign. In Elazig he proclaimed: "If you are satisfied with your present condition, vote for the People's Party. If not, vote for us."

On a rainy election Sunday, May 14, every polling station I visited inside and outside Ankara presented the same sceen of decorum, approaching solemnity. The police and gendarmes kept their distance, and there were no disorders anyway. Silently men and women waited their turn to complete the complicated paper work and make their private choice. They sensed the historic responsibility before them, and some inner discipline told them to accept it with calmness and dignity.

That night at the Democrats' modest national headquarters on Inonu Boulevard they kept their excitement under firm control as the returns began coming in. Bayar read us a list of telegrams from many provincial centers reporting an orderly poll and a lead in the count. He cautioned us against jumping at conclusions: there was still no word at all from the east. While he was talking, another blue telegram was brought in and he opened it. It was from Mus, one of the most remote districts of the doubtful area. There was no change in his voice as he read to us: "We are ahead."

Next morning, when the outlines of an overwhelming Democratic landslide became clear, it only remained for the People's Party to scotch rumors of an army coup d'état by announcing that they were preparing to turn over the reins of government in an orderly way. On a Monday afternoon a week later, the new National Assembly met to elect Bayar president of the republic, with Menderes as Prime Minister and Koprulu as Foreign Minister.

The election was an expression of dissatisfaction, but it was more than that. For the first time the Turkish people were given a chance to show that they were the master of the government—so they quietly but firmly asserted themselves. The article in the constitution of the republic which reads, "Sovereignty belongs to the people, without limitation or restriction," had come to life.

The new government made few sweeping changes. They listened to business interests more sympathetically, and brought a more critical eye to bear on the entrenched military bureaucracy. In foreign affairs, however, the Democrats showed more energy and initiative than Inonu's cautious waiting game. They were the first United Nations government to offer unconditionally ground reinforcements for the American troops in Korea last summer. The Turkish brigade has since distinguished itself in the stubborn defensive bayonet warfare of their tradition.

Turkey has even offered to throw away its loophole to neutrality by assuming the obligations of membership in the Atlantic Pact. This comes from a reasoned calculation that they do not want to be space to be sold against time in the event of all-out war; they want to be assured of a place within the main line of defense of the West. The Pentagon apparently was not ready to extend its commitments, and consultative machinery was as far as the Atlantic Powers accordingly agreed to go at this stage.

The cold war continues to provide a hothouse atmosphere favorable to the growth of Turkish democracy. Already it is clear that the plant is putting out genuine roots of its own in Turkish soil. If democracy is not discredited by its eccentricities in the United States and its timidities in Western Europe, if its Turkish practitioners prove reasonably effective, it stands a good chance of surviving and flourishing at the very frontier of Soviet absolutism.

Comments by Walter Winchell On Responsibility for Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me this morning's column by Mr. Walter Winchell on the subject of the real source of responsibility for interState gambling. Mr. Winchell, who fought communism, cancer, and crime long before it became fashionable to do so, has written another of his hard-hitting columns—punching straight from the shoulder.

His remarks will, I believe, raise blood pressures, lift eyebrows, but most important, elevate the sights of a lot of people so that they can see exactly what one very keen observer feels is really involved in the multi-billion-dollar gambling syndicate. Whether or not one agrees entirely with Mr. Winchell—and there will be some heated differences—I doubt very much that there will be many folks who do not respect his frank approach on this subject of hypocrisy and gambling. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MR. AND MRS. UNITED STATES: The Kefauver committee has done a good job of showing up the American underworld with its political tie-ups. But never in history has the sinful life been given the effective—and misleading—advertising it got from the Senate hear-

ings in the last few weeks. When the average hard-working, debt-ridden citizen heard that a Frank Costello can swing elections and keep $50,000 in cash around the house for spending money—his first reaction was not apt to be indignation as much as envy.

But that's one of the limitations of this modern world. Television can give a picture, but only the mind can give a view. For every so-called successful Costello there are 5,000 misled kids in reform schools and 10,000 men behind prison bars. Frank Costello, on the surface, was a winner. But the losers in the criminal game—the prisoners in the penitentiary—could have testified that all of Costello's money isn't worth the right of a freeman to take a walk in the spring.

When the chic Virginia Hill unfolded her amazing life story (contributing nothing to the committee's knowledge of crime—after her tardy arrival was excused by Senator KEFAUVER with the explanation "ladies from my part of the country are traditionally late") many a young girl must have wondered: Who really knows best? Mother or Virginia Hill? After doing all the things called wrong, there she was on top of the world, with a beautiful home in Miami Beach and a handsome husband and baby.

But it is a very hard life for any women to receive more attention than affection—and even harder to receive more affection than respect. The life of Virginia Hill sounds glamorous to the uninitiated. But as Damon Runyon said: "It reads a whole lot better than it lives." Most women would gladly trade every fur coat or Miami mansion they might own to avoid having the man they love shot between the eyes with a rifle—or the thousand tortured hours spent waiting for it. And, of course, for every girl like Virginia Hill who hit the highlights of the shadow circuit, there are 10,000 pitifully dependent upon the whim of a criminal's twisted mind for their next meal. Television could not tell anyone of their stories—not only because it is too gruesome—but because there is nothing more boring than repeated sordidness.

The Senators have proven that the underworld is based on one principal source of revenue: Gambling, and 90 percent of that horse gambling. But some eminent psychologists would tell you the reason public interest and indignation are so high was not because the spotlight was on Frank Costello—but because America was holding the mirror up to itself. Frank Costello, sitting in the witness chair, was not the average citizen's $2 bet come home to win—but come home to roost.

Whether or not the average citizen likes to believe it, it is just as immoral for him to place an illegal bet with the gamblers as it is for the gamblers to bribe public officials. The gamblers do not use their own money to bribe public officials; they haven't enough. They must use the public's. Anyone born before noon today knows that part of his $2 bet goes to the crooked combine between criminals and politicians. Under the common law, knowing that makes him an accessory before the fact—and an accessory before the fact is a principal to the crime. Accordingly, Mr. and Mrs. Betting America, take a good look at Frank Costello, because more than he was your enemy—he was your agent.

What the television pictures lacked was a "montage." They should have had plenty of background shots; in fact, they left out the main character, which was Mr. and Mrs. Millions of Betting Public. They should have shown background shots of the crowds swarming up to the betting windows; the busy horse rooms around the country serviced by the eminently respectable A. T. & T., and the conservative newspapers with the racing results. And, of course, the delegation of happy United States Senators being received by the Governor of Kentucky at last year's Kentucky Derby. Or, to make it more timely, the horde of Washington politicians skipping the Kefauver hearings to swarm out to the opening of Laurel last Good Friday.

This is no defense of gambling or official bribing, but it is an attack on hypocrisy. Under his constitutional rights, Frank Costello need not confess to anything on the witness stand. On the other hand, Costello is perfectly satisfied with the gambling situation. Mr. and Mrs. America and the United States Senate are not. They want to do something about it. But, unfortunately, it is a first rule of the law they say they seek to uphold that the applicant come in with clean hands. Well, Mr. and Mrs. America, at least half of you haven't got them. The hands of half the adult population are soiled by the billions of dollars they have paid out in $2 bets—the tiny little raindrops out of which comes the torrent of corruption. Mr. and Mrs. Two Dollar Bettor, you can stop speculating on who is the man higher up. Not very surprisingly—to those who know how the system works—Mr. and Mrs. Two Dollar Bettor—it is you.

Vice alone does not make a hypocrite. A hypocrite is a man who denies his own vices while he seeks to punish his own failings in others. Whatever the betting laws may say, betting on horse races is an ancient American tradition, a long-fixed habit, and a time-honored institution. Once this is admitted, the public won't need the underworld as its broker any more than it now needs a rum runner to deliver its $8,000,000,000 annual intake of alcoholic liquors. Sure gambling is bad for you, but overeating kills 1,000 times more breadwinners yearly than all the roulette wheels combined.

Gambling is as broad as the Nation and not as narrow as the televised pictures of the witness stand. What people are—and what people should be—is as old a story as the Garden of Eden. As Lincoln Steffens said of that: "It wasn't Adam's fault and it wasn't Eve's fault. It wasn't the serpent's fault, either. It was the fault of the apple they wanted."

Again this is no defense of gambling. But it does charge that the aristocratic bluebloods of the Jockey Club, who stage the races, and Frank Costello, the common gambler, are more than brothers under the skin. They are brothers under the table.

Why Americans Do Not Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, pursuing further the inquiry represented by my House Resolution 89 for a special committee to investigate why Americans do not vote there is appended an interesting article on British experience in the same field entitled "Why the British Vote" contrasting the 84 percent who voted in Britain in the 1950 general election with the 43 percent of the Americans of voting age who voted in our 1950 election. The article is reprinted from the Progressive, a magazine founded by Robert M. La Follette, Sr., in 1909, and not to be confused with the political party which bore this name in the 1948 and 1950 election campaigns:

WHY THE BRITISH VOTE

LONDON.—Some British people did not like the results of the 1950 American elections, others did. But all agreed in deploring the low vote in a contest which could so greatly affect the future of the free world. Only 43 percent of Americans of voting age took the trouble to cast their ballots, as compared with 84 percent in Britain in the 1950 general election.

The British envy Americans their know-how in industrial productivity, and have sent many worker-management teams to the United States in recent years to learn what they can about the most up-to-date techniques. Perhaps Americans should return the compliment, and see what can be done to remedy the distressing political apathy of many United States citizens.

Such a team would have to begin by observing that political alertness, like high productivity, is not a matter of techniques alone. Millions of Americans have somehow acquired the conviction that high productivity is good in itself, while viewing politics as a rather shabby affair, and not something in which the best people willingly take part. The businessman has never had the prestige in Britain that he enjoys in the United States; this is one big reason why he is less alert and enterprising. Politics, on the other hand, is held in very high esteem, and attracts some of the ablest and most public-spirited young people in each generation.

On the negative side, British politics is almost entirely free of the aura of petty corruption which hangs about so much of the American political scene. In part, this is due to the fact that Britain is a more homogeneous and self-disciplined community. The law is greatly respected, and firmly—even harshly—enforced. Nothing arouses so much indignation as an attack upon a policeman.

But in part it is because Britain imposes less of a strain on the morality of politicians. Reading the accounts of the Kefauver committee, the British have been puzzled to learn that one of the main activities of the political underworld is the protection of gambling; most forms of it are perfectly legal in Britain, widely popular, and a source of considerable tax income for the state. Americans pay a high price for pretending to be more strait-laced than they are.

The result is that the British voter usually has honest and reasonably able candidates for whom to vote. Even if he is unlucky in this respect, he knows at least that the strictness of party discipline is such that one weak member of Parliament cannot cause the nation any great harm. There is little excuse for being too proud or too self-righteous to vote. On the contrary, the parties generally vie with one another in putting forward the best candidates they can.

They are also interested in getting out the highest possible vote. One cannot have industrial productivity without wanting it. Americans dislike a manufacturer who wants to keep his output low and his prices high. Yet they find little shocking in politicians speculating upon, or even seeking to insure, a low vote. It must be many years since any British politician has done so. From beginning to end, the whole election apparatus is geared to get out the fullest possible vote.

It begins with registration. Application forms are delivered by local government officials at every doorstep in Britain once each year (it used to be twice a year, and will be again when Britain can afford it). The only effort required of the citizen is to fill out the form for himself and his family and drop it, free of postage, in the nearest mailbox.

Since it is a matter of pride with each local government unit to achieve maximum

registration, the officials often go further than this. They check the returns against the last registration, and where people have dropped off they send canvassers to check up on them. Here again the shortage of money and manpower is something of an obstacle, and the party machines may have to do more of this work in the future.

Every opportunity is given them to do so. The lists of registered voters are posted in each precinct some time before they are closed. Party workers check them against their records, and send people around to bring in the missing names. This, in fact, used to be the main responsibility of the party "election agent," called in earlier years the "registration agent."

II

These election agents are the top sergeants of the British political battle. Each party tries to have one or more of them in as many constituencies as it can afford. It has become a recognized profession. People qualify for it by taking courses in election law and practices given by the party of their choice, and passing a thorough examination. For full-time agents it is a year-round, lifetime job; each party has established a system of retirement pensions for its agents. Precautions are taken to insure that they do not employ their strategic positions to become candidates for Parliament themselves.

Registration nowadays is only the beginning of the agent's job. The more important work comes after the registration lists are completed and closed. They are then arranged by streets and numbers and printed by local governments. Several bound copies are distributed to each party agent. He and his voluntary helpers cut out the pages and paste them on stout cardboard. They provide the basis for the thorough house-to-house canvass which then begins. Each voter is visited, and rated by the canvasser as "Labor," "Conservative," "Liberal," or "Doubtful." The "Doubtful" people are canvassed a second and even a third time, to win their definite support.

Since he cannot know the date of a Parliamentary election very far in advance (that is decided by the Prime Minister), the agent must maintain a constant state of preparedness. Local elections come at regular dates, as in America, and provide trial runs. But Parliamentary campaigning never comes to a full stop. The sitting Member of Parliament is constantly visiting his constituency; many of them have "clinics" every week, when their constituents, whatever their politics, may come to them for advice and help.

The opposition candidate is usually chosen well in advance, and is also constantly active "nursing" the constituency. Incidentally, it is not required in Britain that a candidate reside in the constituency, and many, in fact, are chosen from outside.

When the date of a general election is announced, the agents and candidates simply shift their smooth-running machines into high gear. Each candidate has the right to have his "election address" delivered to every voter at public expense. From then on, he pays his own way, and his expenditures are limited by law.

He spends the day meeting as many people at their doorsteps as possble, and crowds three or four public meetings into every evening. If the contest is an important one, national leaders, from the Prime Minister and Mr. Churchill down, come to the constituency to speak for him and for their party. Headquarters are set up in each voting district, and manned by volunteers, many of them with experience of several previous elections. They see every voter, not once but several times, in the course of the campaign. So thorough is the canvass that an experienced agent can predict the vote within 1 percent well before election day.

III

It is on that day that the most strenuous action takes place. By then, the agent knows where every one of his party's supporters is to be found. His watchers at the polls note down every person who has voted. Runners bring the names to the neighborhood headquarters, and they are checked off on the printed registration pages. In midafternoon the work of checking up on the laggards commences. This is done street by street, and no possible supporter is left unsummoned. Only those who are determined not to vote, or are utterly indifferent, succeed in evading their civic duty.

Until recent years, the Labor Party election machine, with its many volunteer workers, had an edge on the Conservatives in effectiveness. By last year Lord Woolton, head of the Conservative Party organization, had turned the tables. He had large funds, and was able to hire many energetic people, particularly ex-World War II officers, to do the work. No political machine in British history has ever functioned so effectively as his did last year.

Had the Republicans done half so good a job, Governor Dewey would be President today. The way in which the Tories took advantage of the provisions for voting by mail was particularly impressive. At one constituency after another they turned up a postal vote over the thousand mark, while Labor stuck low in the hundreds. As the party machines square off for the next round, this is a point to which Labor agents are giving earnest attention.

Obviously, even in Britain it is easier to get out a high vote in constituencies where the contest is reasonably close. But all parties do their best even in safe Labor or Conservative seats. They emphasize the importance of the total national vote for each party, as well as the place it wins in Parliament. The candidate who is certain of victory takes pride in exceeding any previous majority. The candidate whose cause is hopeless works hard to improve his party's position. It is a matter of direct personal interest to him, as well.

Many ambitious people begin their pilgrimage to Parliament by taking on a constituency they cannot win. They hope and strive to make good enough showings so that their case for a better constituency at the next election will be improved. Here the British system, by which candidates can shop around for constituencies rather than be restricted to the one in which they live, serves to keep up the minority party's interest even in rock-ribbed Labor or Conservative strongholds.

All these traditions and practices contribute to the large-scale turn-out of British voters. It could, of course, be made even greater. Although the polling hours, from seven in the morning until nine in the evening, are generous, there might be an advantage in holding elections on a Sunday or a holiday, as in places on the Continent. Or voting might be made compulsory, as it is in Australia and Belgium. But most party officials feel that they have done very well as it is, and can do even better in the future.

After looking at the American election results, more than one observer has asked: "If the voice of the people is the voice of God, whose voice is the silence of the people?"

American politicians must sometimes wonder what sort of a nation the 57 percent of the United States electorate who did not vote last November really wanted. British political leaders derive pride and confidence from the fact that they have been put in power by the verdict, freely recorded, of the overwhelming majority of adult Britishers. Some British traditions and techniques may not be suited to America. But they are worth considering.

It is a poor advertisement of American democracy if more than half the people are not enough interested in it to take the trouble to vote.

Gorgas, Ala., Coal Mine Leads the Way to Greater Coal Production, Lowered Costs, and Increased Safety by Adopting Additional Progressive and Efficient Mining Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Dr. Milton H. Fies, styled "Greater Coal Production at Gorgas Mine by Roof Bolting and Continuous Miner." This article was originally published in the December 1950 issue of Mining Engineering, a publication of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

This article shows how the Gorgas, Ala., coal mine is leading the way to greater coal production, lowered costs, and increased safety by adopting additional progressive and efficient mining methods.

The article follows:

GREATER COAL PRODUCTION AT GORGAS MINE BY ROOF BOLTING AND CONTINUOUS MINER

(By Milton H. Fies, manager, coal operations, Alabama Power Co., and consulting engineer)

The Alabama Power Co. operates its Gorgas mine in Walker County, Ala., immediately adjacent to its steam plant. The coal mine property consists of some 19,000 acres of fee and mineral ownership lands, and all of the production from the mine—approximately 2,500 tons per day—is utilized at the company's adjoining steam plant. The company is presently considering the purchase of additional acreage adjoining its present holdings which acquisition will almost double its reserves. The coal is transported from the mine over a short railroad spur in the company's own equipment, either directly to one of the large plants at Gorgas or to a storage pile. The longest haul is about 1¼ miles.

The mine produces 2,500 tons of washed coal per day of two shifts. The preparation of the coal, resulting in a uniform 3 by 0 inch size product, is obtained by passing the coal through a Bradford breaker, thence to two Jeffrey diaphragm jigs, thence over dewatering screens to a 1,000-ton capacity coal bin for further dewatering and transshipment to the power plants. Flow sheet A indicates the travel of the coal from mine car to railroad bin.

The coal property has been thoroughly drilled and otherwise prospected and contains some 85,000,000 tons of proven recoverable coal in three coal beds. These coal beds, beginning at the surface, are the Pratt, and at an interval of 40 to 70 feet below, the American, and then at an interval of 400 feet, the Mary Lee. Coal is being mined only from the American bed, but resumption of mining from the Pratt bed is planned for 1952.

The data presented relate to the operation of one Joy continuous miner, which began to

produce coal regularly in March 1950, and to the application of roof bolting throughout the entire mine, which began at the same time.

The American seam at Gorgas averages about 54 inches in thickness.

The rooms are 25 feet wide, driven 250 feet deep, and the pillars between rooms are 20 feet across. Since the American workings are in advance of the Pratt, no pillars are pulled. The width of the rooms compared to that of pillars is increased with the continuous miner and the percentage of recovery appreciably improved.

The larger portion of the production of the mine other than that obtained with the continuous miner is procured with mobile loading machines, Joy 12 BU, loading onto conveyors. These conveyors load either onto belts in the cross entries, or directly into Sanford-Day 6-ton drop-bottom mine cars. The main line track is laid with 70-pound rail, a part of which is thermite welded, with plans for eventually welding the entire track. This track is slag ballasted, and treated ties are used. Main line locomotives are 15 tons, gathering locomotives 6 to 10 tons.

The bottom below the coal is fire clay, which is fairly soft in its consistency. Directly above the coal in varying degrees of hardness and thickness there are two draw rocks. The first draw rock, which is the most difficult to hold, is from 2 to 6 inches thick, and, above, the other draw rock varies from 10 to 20 inches in thickness. In most sections of the mine only the first draw commonly falls with the coal as it is undercut and shot. Occasionally the second draw comes down, but it is only in rare instances that both draw rocks, which might total 30 inches, cannot be supported. The rock above these draw rocks is a hard, sandy shale, ideal for anchoring roof bolts.

During a period of from 6 to 8 months in 1949 roof bolting was applied to a set of three places where a Joy mobile loading unit was in operation. Then the practice was extended to some three or four additional units. The adaptability of the system to the conditions as they exist at Gorgas was definitely proved before the bolting was applied to the entire mine. Before any definite decision was reached, many tests were made in various sections of the mine and in other operations in the district. The results obtained were helpful in the final decision to adopt the system throughout the entire mine.

Experience demonstrated that one of the most important factors in securing satisfactory roof bolting was to obtain a fixed anchorage for the bolts in the roof stratum. Where the wedge-type bolt is used, the nature of the rock stratum in which the anchor is located, the design of the wedge, the method employed in slitting the bolt end, and the hardness of the bolt steel itself are all factors affecting the holding power or strength of the anchor.

It is recommended that each individual mine using the wedge-type anchor do a certain amount of experimenting and testing in order to determine that the anchorage is sufficient to support the amount of rock required.

Tests made in pulling roof bolts at Gorgas and other mines, using a Continental Gin roof-bolt tester, with gage calibrated to register tension pull directly in tons, gave some interesting results. For example, at Gorgas a 1-inch cut thread, burned-slot bolt was originally used with a ¾ by ¾ by 5½-inch wedge in a 1⅜-inch drill hole. This bolt installation provided anchorage (at 8-ton ram pressure) sufficient to break bolts in all tests. Later, in an effort to reduce the cost of the roof bolts (approximately 13,000 were installed per month at this mine) it was decided to use a 1-inch rolled-thread bolt with a sheared slot. The shank diameter of this sheared-slot bolt is approximately 29/32 inch, and its cost is 12½ cents less than the cut thread with burned slot.

When this latter type bolt was first installed on a trial installation, a ¾ by ¾ by 5½-inch burned wedge was used in a 1⅜-inch drill hole, the same as has been used with the 1-inch cut thread with burned slot. These bolts, however, would pull out at around 5-ton tension, irrespective of the method used in driving the bolt into the roof hole (hydraulic ram, stoper, and hand driving was tried). It was found that by anchoring them in a 1¼-inch hole and using a larger wedge, ⅝ by ¾ by 6-inch burned wedge, and 8-ton ram pressure, the bolt would break before pulling out. It was further found that by using a wedge designed so that the bolt could be rammed to the extreme depth of the hole at approximately 8 to 9 tons pressure, maximum holding was obtained.

At a second mine a number of tests were made with various types of wedges, and the only wedge-type bolt that could be made to hold over 10 tons was a high-grade carbon steel bolt.

In some cases better anchorage can be obtained by increasing the length of the bolt and anchoring it in more suitable stratum. Experience indicates that the expanding shell-type anchor is not affected by the variations in rock strata as much as are the wedge type; and where it is difficult to secure anchorage with the wedge-type bolt, the expanding wedge shell may offer the best solution even though the installation time and expense may be greater.

The roof bolt pull-test data presented herein, table 1, were compiled from a test made at the Gorgas mine to determine the holding strength of various type bolts under varying methods of installation—wedge design and ram pressure. The roof holes were drilled with a rotary electric drill, and the bolts installed with a hydraulic ram.

It soon became obvious that this method of roof suspension offered so many decided advantages over the older system of room props with cross collars that, after all possible checks had been made as to the safety for the men, the system was adopted. It was found, for example, that because of the added maneuverability of machines (such as the boom on the loading machine or the cutting machines working across the face) the efficiency of loading units was increased from 20 to 25 percent. The contrast in the two systems of roof support is emphasized by the pictures heading this article. One shows the method of supporting the roof with props the cross collars, and the other by roof bolting.

It is extremely difficult to support the second draw in most of the working places in the mine by means of props and cross collars because of the consistency of the underlying fire clay. When the timbering in the mine was done by cross collars and props, the props would sink into the bottom as weight came on, and there was continuous trouble. Idle periods, at times only from Friday night to Monday morning, often resulted in reduced production on Monday due to falls in the working places, which required time to clean up before loading could begin. During longer idle periods it was always necessary to send crews into the mine to remove the falls of rock, and often to reset cross collars. Entries and air courses driven in advance of rooms required additional cleaning when the equipment was moved forward. Experience demonstrated that it was particularly troublesome for the face crews to carry props and 3- by 8- by 16-inch cross collars for timbering to the face in such medium thickness coal, and the time lost was appreciable. This work was made much less laborious with the new system where it is required to carry only the lighter materials consisting of bolts, nuts, and small size T-boards.

Roof support by means of bolts has no dependence on the nature of the floor of a mine, and that gain is important where the bottom is soft.

It has been demonstrated that the ability of bolts to support the roof is greater than the strength of props and cross collars, but it has been decided to place the bolts on the same centers as the props, that is 4-foot squares. The maximum draw rock encountered had reached 30 inches, and bolts were fixed at a 40-inch length, which would give an 8-inch penetration into the permanent stratum when the maximum thickness of draw rock was encountered.

While expansion bolts and other types have been tried, the bolt adopted thus far has been the split bolt with a wedge. Table 1 indicates the resistance of these bolts to pull, which emphasizes the supporting strength of the bolt. The factor of safety of the roof bolting, assuming that the rock to be supported is 4 by 4 feet by a maximum of 2½ feet thick, is much greater than that attained in the use of timbers. And since both draw rocks in the mine average less than 18 inches, the factor of safety is high.

Since in the advanced workings of this mine the supporting rock is shaly sandstone, which has become so hard that it is difficult to drill, and since the draw rock in this area has not exceeded 18 inches, the length of the roof bolt has been reduced to 30 inches. When the bolts were first installed in rooms it was decided to use wooden T-boards against the roof just inside of the washer and nut of the bolt. These were originally 3 by 8 inches by 3 feet, and were used only in rooms. Experience has justified the reduction in the size of the T-boards to 3 by 6 inches by 2 feet. In the entries or haulageways where roof bolts are used, timber is not employed directly under the roof, but only the metal plate washers, 6 by 6 by one-quarter inches thick.

Prior to the adoption of roof bolting throughout the entire mine and during the preliminary stages of the work, it was felt that if an effective, flexible method of drilling the roof could be devised, one that would not involve such costly initial expenditure as is required for portable air compressor, jack hammer, and impact wrench and piping, approval to adopt the system throughout the entire mine could be more readily obtained. Each loading unit would require the air equipment mentioned, and at Gorgas there were a maximum of nine such units. It was believed also that a rotary electric drill would release less fine rock dust in the drilling operation and that vibration caused by pneumatic stopers, which have a tendency to loosen the roof, would be eliminated by the use of the drill ram.

A light, compact, self-propelling drill rig was designed by Paul E. Glaze, assistant superintendent and chief electrician at the Gorgas operation. These machines have proved very effective. The number of holes per day has averaged 50, and at times the total has reached as high as 80. The men who drill the holes and insert the bolts also perform other duties.

Also included is the new type self-propelled unit for roof drilling. At present these drill rigs are being built by the Continental Gin Co. under the trade name of Drillram. The rotary drill is so mounted on a hydraulic cylinder that upon completion of the drilling operation this drill can be swung out of position, the roof bolt inserted in the hole just drilled, and the hydraulic ram swung into position to set the split bolt with wedge, without relocating the machine itself.

The contribution which the roof bolting has made in the safe operation of the mine has been significant. Roof bolting, when used in conjunction with the continuous

miner type of machine, where no explosives are required, will greatly minimize roof falls, the greatest hazard in coal mining. The United States Bureau of Mines during the years has been outstanding in its contribution to coal mining, but it may well be that in its long history no single accomplishment exceeds that of roof bolting in mines.

The cost of roof bolting at Gorgas mine is greater by approximately 10 cents per ton than that by the use of wooden supports, but this difference is small as compared to the added efficiency of the machines, the increased tonnage obtained, and the increased safety of the men.

TABLE 1.—*Roof bolt pull test data Gorgas Mine—American seam, June 2, 1950*

Item No.	Hole No.	3, 1 inch diameter	4, 1 inch diameter	5, 1 inch diameter	6, ¾ inch diameter	7, 27/32 inch diameter	8, 27/32 inch diameter	9, 27/32 inch diameter	10, 27/32 inch diameter	11, 1 inch diameter	12, 1 inch diameter	13, ¾ inch diameter
1	Rod type	BS-CT	BS-CT	BS-CT	ES-CT	SS-RT	SS-RT	SS-RT (1)	SS-RT	BS-CT (1)	BS-CT	ES-CT
2	Length, inches	40	40	39 3/16	40 1/16	40 5/16	40 1/4	40	40 3/8	39 7/8	40 1/16	40 1/16
3	Thread length, do	4 1/2	4 1/2	4 9/16	4 3/8 2 3/16	4 13/16	4 13/16	4 13/16	5 1/16	4 7/8	4 7/8	4 7/16 2 1/4
4	Slot length, do	6	6	6 1/4		9 3/8	9 1/2	9 1/16	9 7/16	6 1/16	6 1/16	
5	Bolt diameter	1.008	1.007	0.992	0.756	0.914	0.907	0.912	0.912	0.986	0.983	0.760
6	Projection at initial anchorage, inches	5 3/4	4 7/8	4 13/16	2 3/4	5 1/8	6 3/16	4 7/8	5 3/16	4 1/4	4 3/16	2 1/16
7	Projection after push, do	4 5/16	3 3/16	4		4 1/4	4 7/16	4 1/4	3 3/4	2 5/8	3 1/8	
8	Push pressure, pounds	16,000	12,000	8,000	None	12,000	16,000	16,000	19,000	12,000	16,000	None
9	Pull pressure—maximum	19T	19T	9T	14T	4T	14T	1T	14T	19T	19T	14T
10	Result	Broke in thread	Broke in thread	Slipped at 9T	Broke in bottom threads	Slipped at 4T [1]	Bolt bent [2]	Slipped [3]	Bolt stretched or slipped	Broke in threads in hole	Broke in threads	Broke in lower threads
11	Diameter after pull	0.993	0.991	0.992	0.744		0.880		0.885	Not available	0.963	0.743
12	Thread length after pull	5 1/4	5 5/16	4 9/16	4 13/16		4 13/16		5 1/16	5 5/16	5 1/2	5 1/4
13	Projection after pull	6 5/8	5 1/8		6 1/2		8 1/2		7 11/16	5 1/2	6 1/4	6 1/2

Explanation of symbols: BS, burned slot; SS, sheared slot; CT, cut thread; RT, rolled thread; ES, expansion shell; (1), special notch. Holes 1 and 2 not used for pull test.
Remarks: [1] Driven in with sledge to 3 1/8 inches projection after slip. Broke at 14T. [2] Roof irregularity at hole caused bolt to be pulled out of line, causing bend at a point 3 1/8 inches above threads. Bolt diameter immediately above threads. [3] Driven up with sledge to 3 7/8 inches projection, no additional data available.

The continuous miner, purchased from the Joy Manufacturing Co., of the type 3-JCM, maximum height 39 inches, produced some coal during a few shifts in the month of January 1950. It was not, however, until after the mines resumed operation on March 6, following a period of idleness due to a Nation-wide strike, that the work of the miner became regular. Only one continuous miner is employed in the mine at Gorgas at the present time. It operates on two shifts and largely in rooms 17 feet wide, which have a 10-foot pillar between. It will be noted in this connection that this compares with the 25-foot rooms and 20-foot pillars employed in the conventional method of mining, and that the percentage of recovery is markedly increased.

When the machine was first installed, an attempt was made to operate it with one operator, one helper, one car trimmer, and one shuttle car operator, using the intermediate shuttle car, operated by push button on the miner, as a surge. This is not practical in coal 52 to 54 inches thick, for the reason that the operator of the miner does not have sufficient height over the surge shuttle car to properly gage its loading. After the first few shifts a second shuttle car operator was added. The crew then consisted of the machine operator, the helper, two shuttle car operators, and a car trimmer, who loaded the mine car.

Coal was mined at the face, conveyed by the shuttle car to a belt on the cross entry, and from the belt the coal was loaded into a 5½-ton mine car on the main entry. This method of operation was continued through March 1950. Time studies were made on each shift, and it was soon definitely determined that the idle period when the machine was standing was due entirely to the inability of the two shuttle cars to effectively serve it. It was then that one of the assistant superintendents of the mine, John Davis, conceived the idea of utilizing an additional mobile loader, a small 12 BU, between the continuous miner and the intermediate shuttle car. The bottom of the mine acts as the surge. The continuous miner, as it produces the coal, deposits it on the floor and the 12 BU picks it up and loads it into the intermediate shuttle car. It has been the experience at Gorgas that the miner is thus made continuous.

Table 2 shows the cost per ton, separated as to day and night shifts, of coal produced by the continuous miner from January 1, 1950, through August 1950, delivered in the mine car on the main haulage entry. The intermediate Joy mobile loader began operation during April 1950. It will be noted how the tons per man-day have increased with the proportionate decrease in the cost per ton. The figures indicated are raw coal, but tests reveal that the tons of washed coal per ton of raw coal with the continuous miner is 85 percent; whereas, in the conventional method of mining, using undercutting machines, explosives, and mobile loaders, the washed coal is only 72 percent of the raw coal produced on the same basis.

It has been estimated that on a washed coal basis the cost of producing coal with a continuous miner in the mine car on the main entry is about one-third of the cost of producing washed coal with the conventional mobile loaders.

The crew now consists of one continuous miner operator, one helper, one Joy operator, two shuttle car operators, one car trimmer, and one foreman. The average number of tons produced since March per shift has been 297.5 of raw coal, with an average 55 percent wash coal recovery. The greatest advance in solid coal in one shift has been 156 feet, and the largest tonnage per shift has been 443 tons of raw coal.

The savings in explosives cost amounted to about 8 cents per ton.

The noticeable improvement in the condition of the roof in the places where the continuous miner has operated has been most marked. Ribs of pillars are not shattered and accordingly are capable of supporting more weight. Likewise, the hazard of falling rib coal is greatly minimized. Draw rock which formerly came down as the coal was shot, now stands up in places after the supports are withdrawn for as long as 3 months. The 17-foot rooms are timbered with cross collars with 6-foot centers supported by light jacks. These rooms are timbered by the operator and helper as the places advance. After each room is driven to its boundary, which is on an average of every two shifts, the cross collars and jacks are withdrawn to the nearest crosscut and are there available as the adjoining inby rooms interesect these crosscuts. In the entries and air course the roof is supported by bolts.

The use of the continuous miner at Gorgas has convincingly demonstrated that: (1) This method of winning coal from the face is dependable; (2) the use of the machine greatly reduces the hazard of mining (a) by the elimination of explosives, (b) by reducing roof exposure, (c) by reducing man-hours of exposure per ton of coal mined, (d) by concentration of rock dust, (e) by removing the worker from the face (the operator of the machine performs his task at a minimum of 10 feet from the face), (f) by eliminating the shattering of ribs of pillars and thus avoiding falls of pillar coal; (3) the cost of producing coal is greatly reduced.

The matter of the size of the coal produced is of no moment at a mine like Gorgas where the coal is produced for steam purposes only, and this likewise would be true at mines producing metallurgical coal. Sizing tests shown in tables 3 and 4 over a period of a week indicate the difference between sizes of the coal with a conventional mobile loader and undercutting machine as compared to the continuous miner. No noticeable effect has been observed in the quality of the washed coal due to the use of this machine, producing about one-quarter of the total production.

The results thus obtained in the use of this one continuous miner warranted the recent purchase by the Alabama Power Co. of two additional miners. If such results continue, the mine should be completely equipped with these machines.

The writer feels a deep sense of obligation to the following members of the mining staff of Alabama Power Co. for their criticism and suggestions in the preparation of this paper: Harry M. Johnstone, manager of Gorgas Mine; J. W. Shealy, senior engineer; W. O. Hodgkin, mining engineer; and E. W. Booker, superintendent.

TABLE 2.—*Cost per ton of coal produced at face with continuous miner, Jan. 1, 1950, to Aug. 31, 1950*

Date	Number of men-shifts	Number of shifts	Total tons	Tons per man	Amount	Cost per ton
January	58	11	1,714	29.6	$805.52	0.47
February [1]						
March	250	36	7,390	29.6	3,557.62	.48
April	301	40	11,352	37.7	4,313.01	.38
May	335	46	12,629	37.7	4,809.98	.39
June	304	44	14,089	46.3	4,306.44	.31
July	216	32	9,413	43.6	3,147.65	.33
August	323	45	14,190	43.8	4,614.55	.32
Total	1,787	254	70,777	[2]39.6	25,705.37	[3]0.36

[1] Mine idle this month due to strike.
[2] Deduct 15 percent to obtain tons of washed coal per man-day.
[3] Divide by 0.85 to obtain cost per ton of washed coal.

TABLE 3.—*Sample screen analysis of coal taken from continuous miner*

Date	+6 in.	−6 in. +3 in.	−3 in. +1½ in.	−1½ in. +¾ in.	−¾ in. +½ in.	−½ in. +⅜ in.	−⅜ in. +8M	−8M +0	Total
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
June 12, 1950	0	4.2	7.3	19.75	10.2	17.88	17.6	23.1	100.03
June 13, 1950	3.98	6.28	10.26	19.29	9.80	15.93	15.64	18.3	99.5
June 14, 1950	6.71	6.54	10.91	19.80	9.89	13.93	14.76	17.4	99.94
June 15, 1950	3.6	4.3	10.8	20.9	11.3	14.4	16.4	18.3	100.0
June 16, 1950	4.2	5.5	11.7	20.7	10.1	14.1	15.0	18.6	99.9
Average	4.6	5.4	10.2	20.09	10.26	15.25	15.9	19.1	100.8

TABLE 4.—*Sample screen analysis of coal from joy loaders*

Date	−6 in.	−6 in. +3 in.	−3 in. +1½ in.	−1½ in. +¾ in.	−¾ in. +½ in.	−½ in. +⅜ in.	−⅜ in. +8M	−8M +0 in.	Total
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
June 12, 1950	4.4	7.7	11.8	21.6	10.1	12.7	15.6	16.0	99.9
June 13, 1950	11.2	11.5	17.8	23.9	7.0	9.8	9.6	9.1	99.9
June 14, 1950	8.28	10.51	15.44	21.48	7.83	10.96	12.37	13.1	100.0
June 15, 1950	3.3	8.6	18.0	24.1	8.8	11.1	12.0	14.0	99.9
June 16, 1950	5.3	12.6	21.1	25.5	6.7	9.1	9.8	9.8	99.9
Average	6.5	10.2	16.8	23.3	8.1	10.7	11.9	12.4	99.9

Address of Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio, at Memorial Program for Thomas G. Masaryk, First President of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I made at a special memorial program for Thomas G. Masaryk, first President of Czechoslovakia. This address was made under the auspices of the American Committee To Fight Communism:

Millions of people throughout the world—the millions who are shackled in their own homes—cannot celebrate, cannot talk or even breathe the name "Masaryk." Red tyrants cannot tolerate the name of this great liberator, but I know that these freedom-loving people abroad are offering a silent prayer in memory of this great statesman and humanitarian.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk will be remembered for centuries. History will place him as a leader who was born on the threshold of the nineteenth-twentieth century, and who, at the ripe age of 65 years, went in exile to forge and found a new republic which for 20 years was a model of democracy in central Europe.

Thomas Masaryk was more than a liberator to his own people. He is remembered as a world statesman and world leader in the finest sense of Christianity. Born in Moravia, of humble origin, Masaryk married into an old American family. During their entire married life, his wife was a constant co-worker and a great spiritual guidance in his long struggle as a professor and congressman in the old Austro-Hungary Parliament. Their family union was complete.

In the words of Masaryk himself, "When I came back to Prague in 1918, I could hardly wait to be beside her."

Masaryk was a great scholar. He stressed the importance of Christianity in education, I shall quote his own words:

"I cannot picture a human being in our world growing up without knowing of Christ and His teaching; and of course the Old Testament is part of the fundamental cultural background of every European. Anyone not knowing what Christianity stands for would really be a stranger in our cultural domain; and how could anyone understand European history and the system running through it, if he had not been taught about the reality and development of the church? But the difficulty is how to teach it, from what standpoint to appraise the historical facts—a hard problem for the schools.

"I myself am always repeating and emphasizing the fact that religion is the essential element of spiritual life and culture, and for that reason not only religious instruction and instruction about religion in general, but also religious practice is for me a great and unsolved question of school policy."

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk believed in true democracy founded on love and respect for one's neighbor, and toward all neighbors, as the realization of the rule of God on earth. Let me quote him again:

"Democracy is not only a form of government, it is not only what is written in constitutions; democracy is a view of life, rests on faith in men, in humanity, and in human nature, and there is no love without faith. I said once that democracy is a discussion. But real discussion is only possible where men trust one another, and honestly seek the truth. Democracy is a conversation among equals, the thinking of free people open to complete publicity—the word 'parliament' has a fine meaning, if only we could give it body.

"I said among equals. I know that men are not equal; nowhere on the earth or in nature is there equality—there is variety; only as immortal souls are we really equivalent. Liberé, egalité fraternité—even the French Revolution de facto accepted Jesus' commandment, the commandment of love toward one's neighbor. It sounds like a paradox, but it is true: the French revolutionaries were theocrats, even if they had God merely as a highest being.

"The democratic ideal is not only political, it is social and economic. Communism I vigorously reject. Without individualism, without gifted and inventive individuals, without capable leaders, without geniuses society cannot be reasonably and justly organized.

"Democracy on its social side means the abolition of degrading misery; in a republic, in a democracy, it must not be possible for individuals or ranks to exploit their cocitizens—in a democracy man to man must not be merely a means. No organization of men is possible without superiors and subordinates, but it must just be an organization, and not a privilege, not aristocratic coercion but mutual service. Democracy needs leaders, not masters."

Masaryk defended his concept of democracy against protagonists of totalitarian systems of any color.

"I defend democracy, moreover, against dictatorial absolutism, whether the right to dictate be claimed by the proletariate, the state, or the church. I know the argument that dictatorship is justified, since conscience and right, reason and science, are absolute; and I am not unfamiliar with talk about the dictatorship 'of the heart.' Logic, mathematics, and some moral maxims may be absolute, that is to say, not relative as they would be if all countries, parties, and individuals had a special morality, mathematics, and logic of their own; but there is a difference between absolutism of theory, and practical, political absolutism. The most scientific policy depends upon experience and induction. It can claim no infallibility. It offers no eternal truths and can form no warrant for absolutism."

Masaryk, even in his years after World War I, didn't trust, didn't believe in communism. It was he who coined the phrase that "Russian bolshevism is a pathological scum."

Today Masaryk's ideas of democracy, of humanitarianism, and of liberalism and those associated before the name of "Thomas Masaryk" are brutally suppressed in his native land. Even his works are banned, but the remaining free world bows deeply in memory of a statesman who left the greatest impression on his people and free people everywhere.

I know that Czechoslovakia will arise again. I know that the Red plague will be removed. And after victory of democracy, which must come with spiritual weapons, the Red plague will be forgotten, but, the name of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk will live forever.

In conclusion, I want to say on this broadcast, which will be heard not only in our United States but also behind the iron curtain, that my country, the great United States of America, is and will be always the torch and bastion for all who are surpressed, abused, and enslaved. Thank you.

Public Assistance Provisions of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable confusion and misunderstanding created by some sources as to the administration in New York State of the Social Security Act. It is my opinion that there is a deliberate effort being made by the Republican officeholders of New York State to hide their own wrongdoing by an unwarranted attack upon the Federal administration.

The following statement, issued March 9, 1951, by the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, is an unanswerable refutation of the

misstatements emanating from New York:

STATEMENT BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature claims that the Federal Security Agency has threatened to withhold funds from New York for aid to dependent children, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled, unless the State acquiesced in two arbitrary conditions.

The resolution alleges that one of these conditions "would mandate an inflexible State-wide standard of assistance requiring all persons receiving assistance under a welfare program to receive mechanically the same benefits in total disregard of individualized needs." The second condition, according to the resolution, would require the State "to depart from its long-established civil-service system and compel the adoption of special civil-service standards and procedures for employees dealing with Federal welfare programs or a general revision of our civil-service system."

The 1935 Social Security Act provided for Federal contributions to the States for needy people—under certain conditions. It provided that each State submit a State plan which had to be approved, originally by the Social Security Board and now by the Federal Security Administrator, as meeting the requirements of the Social Security Act. This State plan, the act says, "shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory upon them." Furthermore, since 1940, the act requires that all such plans include "methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis."

These are not arbitrary conditions dreamed up by me or anyone else in the Federal Security Agency. They are part of the law of the land. Congress wrote these essential provisions into the Social Security Act because it wanted to protect helpless needy persons from arbitrary and capricious action, and to make sure that they would receive humane and individual consideration wherever they live within a State.

Failure to adhere to these provisions has resulted in serious differences in the treatment of needy people throughout New York State. People in various parts of the State receive shockingly disparate amounts of assistance in relation to their need. The law clearly calls for equitable treatment for persons in need; and persons in New York State have not been getting equitable treatment.

There has been failure on the part of local welfare districts to include basic items in the budgets of needy persons. There has been an alarming variation in the tests applied in determining who is entitled to assistance and who is not. Thus, in some welfare districts a person may be denied assistance if he has as much as $100 worth of personal property, while in a neighboring district a person may be granted assistance even though he has $1,500 or more of personal property. In my opinion, the Congress that passed the Social Security Act was out to prevent precisely this kind of discrimination.

We have not insisted on an inflexible standard that would require all persons to receive mechanically the same benefit without regard to individual need. Quite the contrary. What we have asked the State department of social welfare to do is to establish a State-wide policy that would be simple, objective, and consistent, so that a person in need would know what he is entitled to, and would not have to depend on the whim of a local official.

The Federal Government asks for equality of treatment, not necessarily equality of dollar assistance. The Federal Government asks that New York see to it that people in equal need receive the money to secure the same standard of living. Obviously, the rent costs in a small town upstate will not be the same as in Manhattan. The equal standard requires that a needy person receive the money to purchase equivalent food, clothing, and shelter, wherever he lives within the State.

All of this is well known to the State board of social welfare. As a matter of fact, since 1944 the board has paid lip service to the requirements of Federal law. In that year it issued an instruction to local districts calling for equitable treatment of persons in equal need; but this instruction was never enforced. On January 22, 1951, this board ratified an agreement which the chairman of the board and I had reached on December 29, 1950, relating to aid to the permanently and totally disabled. That agreement provides for inclusion in the State plan of assistance standards to assure equitable treatment for all needy persons.

Thus the State board of social welfare recognizes that there is no basis for the accusations contained in the legislature's resolution and accordingly agrees to abide by the law of the land.

As to requirements for an adequate merit system in the administration of public assistance in New York, the Federal law is perfectly clear. Its intent is to have administration of public assistance in all States free from political pressures. The fact is that New York has some 900 welfare positions exempted from civil service—more than the number of such exempted positions in all other States put together. New York is the only State in the Union where county welfare directors are not under the merit system. Moreover, 55 deputy directors are also exempt, along with a large number of other miscellaneous jobs. This contradicts the express requirements of the Federal Social Security Act. The State board of social welfare has now assured us that it will take the necessary steps to correct any deficiencies which may be necessary in the carrying out of personnel standards on a merit basis in accordance with the Federal Social Security Act."

These facts reveal the inaccuracies and distortions of the resolutions better than any argumentation.

Connections Between Criminals and Law-Enforcement Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent statement made by former Ambassador Spruille Braden, chairman, New York City Anticrime Committee, at the session of the United States Senate Crime Investigating Committee in the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, on Tuesday, March 20, 1951.

This anticrime committee has been recently created upon recommendation of the King's County grand jury. Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz and District Attorney Miles McDonald especially deserve recognition and credit for this effective movement for better law enforcement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FORMER AMBASSADOR SPRUILLE BRADEN, CHAIRMAN, NEW YORK CITY ANTICRIME COMMITTEE, AT TUESDAY'S (MARCH 20, 1951) SESSION OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE CRIME INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, FOLEY SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY

Both as chairman of the New York City Anticrime Committee and as a citizen, I appreciate the honor of being invited last week to sit with this distinguished committee and to make this statement today.

Your committee, Senator KEFAUVER, merits the gratitude of all decent Americans for exposing to the light of public opinion the shameful connections between criminals and the law-enforcement officers throughout this country.

Your committee has helped the average man in the street to realize that the apparently innocent placing of a $2 bet with a bookmaker, when multiplied by the thousands who do it daily, is in fact supplying organized crime with huge additional revenues wherewith to corrupt law-enforcement officers, to buy immunity from punishment for all manner of offenses, to make drug addicts of our children and generally to pollute society.

I have watched this committee bit by bit extract from witnesses sordid stories of corruption in this city. My emotions have been mixed, but I am confident that they are typical of all those who by television, radio, and the press have followed events in this courtroom. We plain citizens have resented the arrogance and impertinence shown before this committee. We have been shocked to hear a city commissioner admit to hobnobbing with gangsters and receiving in his office such loathsome creatures as the so-called policy king. We have drawn the only implications that can be drawn from these evil associations between the hoodlums and high officials of this great city. Momentarily we have, perhaps, felt a certain measure of frustration that swift and severe punishment is not meted out both to the gangsters and to the venal officials. We are increasingly angered—in a cold reasoning rage—because self-evidently these racketeers could not have grown rich and powerful, as they have, if they had not been in complicity with law-enforcement officers. Were it not for this complicity, we realize that these criminals never could have accumulated wealth and influence to a point where they must be consulted on the reorganization of Tammany Hall or as to who should or should not be a supreme court justice or even a candidate for mayor of New York City. We know that crime cannot exist on a major scale or on organized or syndicated bases unless there is something rotten in city hall. Finally, we plain citizens are determined to put an end to these outrageous conditions. We are awake at last.

This Senate committee has contributed to this awakening. Its activities should be continued. I voice the ardent wish of thousands of citizens in New York City that it be continued after March 31.

Also I wish to pass on to this committee and to the television companies the desire expressed in many messages I have received, that the more important scenes in these hearings be repeated extensively at night over television, for the benefit of those whose

occupations prevented their watching during the working hours of the last week.

I have said that the citizens of New York are determined to eradicate corruption. More, we are already under way. On January 31, 1951, the December 1949 grand jury in Kings County handed up a presentment stating that—

"The history of past investigations reveals a sudden relaxation of the public temper, when the headlined activities of the malefactor have been filed away in forgetfulness. That public apathy is the fertilizer that nurtures the soil for unbridled graft and corruption."

The grand jury, with the vigorous support of Judge Samuel Leibowitz and District Attorney Miles McDonald therefore "urged the immediate establishment of an entirely new and permanent city-wide crime commission to be supported by public contributions. * * * This body under no circumstances to undertake the business of law enforcement itself. Rather it must concentrate on purposeful systematic observation of those who are duly entrusted with the conduct of our law enforcement, and on keeping the community informed of the results of this observation."

To these ends, within a few hours on that same day, the New York City Anticrime Committee was formed by a group of prominent citizens from Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond Counties. On the committee are men and women of different creeds, color, and racial origins. They are leaders of industry, labor, education, social organizations, banking, and other callings. Our membership is absolutely nonpolitical and contains no one ambitious for public office.

Our group, as a watchdog committee, will give every support to those law-enforcement officers who are performing honestly and efficiently. If through the meticulous observation by our staff of investigators we find proven cases of ineptitude or worse in the courts, the district attorneys' offices, or parole boards, the police, or elsewhere, the facts will be presented to the appropriate authorities in order for them to take prompt remedial action. Should they fail to do so, the committee will then go to the public with these facts. In short, the purposes of the New York City Anticrime Committee, as expressed in its certificate of incorporation, are as follows:

(a) To keep continually before all the people of the city of New York the principle that no lasting happiness or prosperity can be established without due respect for law and order, and that crime and vice can be suppressed only by the firm determination of the people and consistent action by law-enforcement officers and their superiors.

(b) To give aid to law-enforcement agencies in the proper discharge of their duties.

(c) To keep the public continually informed as to conditions showing criminal activities and to promote vigilance in the suppression thereof.

(d) To receive private voluntary contributions to be used solely to effectuate the foregoing purposes.

The New York City Anticrime Committee has established offices at 270 Park Avenue, where information respecting crime conditions in this city will be welcomed, treated confidentially, and investigated by an expert staff.

The New York City Anticrime Committee in zeal and effectiveness will outmatch the crooks and conniving law-enforcement officers. We are in this fight to the finish. We demand and will see to it that there are honest and competent law-enforcement officers throughout the five boroughs.

Senator TOBEY, like everyone else who heard you, I was profoundly moved last Wednesday by your eloquent and impassioned plea for a spiritual and religious revival in this country if crime and corruption are to be exterminated.

So much do I agree with you that for many years I have at every opportunity in public addresses and otherwise declared that the greatest single problem confronting humanity today is the breakdown in morality everywhere, but especially in government. Basically it is precisely this lack of morality which is responsible for communism, aggression, and Russian expansionism along with all the many other political ills that afflict us in domestic as well as in world affairs. Unless our citizenry, and in particular every one of those who govern and who are charged with law enforcement, get back to morality and common honesty, our other efforts and struggles will be sterile. We will be attacking symptoms rather than the disease itself.

This leads me to another aspect of the crime and corruption situation on which heretofore—so far as I know—there has been little or no comment. I refer to its repercussions on our foreign relations.

Irrespective of whether we want it or not, the mantle of world leadership rests on our shoulders. On how well we wear it depends not merely the fate of these United States but of civilization itself.

We can only exercise that leadership successfully if we have self-respect and are respected by and enjoy the confidence of other peoples. For respect there must be complete integrity and confidence in that integrity by the authorities and peoples on both sides.

I regret to say that we have been losing that respect and confidence of other nations which we formerly held.

Through the years I have been proud when repeatedly my foreign friends have remarked, "Of course, you have some crime and corruption in the United States, but you keep it at a minimum because you have sanctions; the punishment is swift and sure."

In contrast to these statements, of late years these same friends, pointing to the revolting conditions disclosed by this committee, the Brooklyn grand jury, and other investigations, have commented sadly on our moral deterioration.

One of the outstanding statesmen of this hemisphere, a former Ambassador and President of his country, in effect, told me only a few weeks ago:

"The scandalous connivance of the police disclosed by the Brooklyn grand jury is known throughout Latin America. It destroys overnight your efforts to win the minds and hearts of our people. If dishonesty amongst your officials continues, you might as well forget about the Voice of America and other efforts to keep us on your side. The millions of dollars you are spending for these purposes will go down the drain unless you get back to your old system of integrity in public life."

Just as the people, and particularly the youth, of a country are prone to imitate their leaders, so a great and powerful country such as ours sets the tempo for others. Thus, the bad example set by some of our public officials will be followed elsewhere. In any event, we cannot rationally protest against corruption abroad ruining our investments when there is such blatant corruption right at home.

This means that as corruption spreads, capital will not dare venture into other lands, and the point 4 program, which in large part must depend upon private investment, will fail.

Just as Caesar's wife must be above suspicion, so any official directly or indirectly having to do with law enforcement, must not only be good but must appear good. This is imperative from the aspect of our foreign relations. Here, at home, we may judge the corrupt or indiscreet official as an individual, but to foreigners he represents and typifies the United States, and so this Nation's reputation for integrity may stand or fall by what he does or seems to do.

The loss of moral prestige by the United States and its repercussions on others was vividly demonstrated last October, when a report issued by an official of a friendly government stated that the "bankruptcy and corruption" existing in his country, "have an intimate relation to the American example in racketeering."

One of the phenomena accompanying the breakdown in morality, to which I referred, may be stated practically as a law of nature: just as dictatorships almost always become corrupt, so conversely corruption often leads to dictatorship. This happens because either the crooks and dishonest officials become dictators in order to continue stealing, or there is an armed revolution to throw them out. In the latter case the resultant chaos and exercise of force in turn lead to dictatorship. This vicious circle has destroyed the Roman and other civilizations and could do the same to ours, if we do not take preventive measures.

In other words, either we must wipe out these mobsters and their political partners or we will lose our way of life.

Joe Stalin, if he had planned it that way, could not find a speedier and surer way to defeat the democracies than by subsidizing these gangsters and foul politicians. Actually, as I have seen in other countries how closely the gangsters and Communists work together, I sometimes wonder if the Soviet is not, at least in some measure, inciting these vermin to defile our system of law and order.

But whether or not this be so, of one thing we can be sure, the Costellos, Adonises, and the rest of this scum and still more the miserably corrupted law-enforcement officers, are among the Kremlin's best allies. Perhaps, in a sense, they are even more dangerous than the spies convicted of stealing our atomic and military secrets. After all, by ingenuity and hard work we can compensate for and replace these thefts, but the loss of morality in government will cause us to lose our self-respect and the respect and confidence of other peoples. From such a catastrophe no nation has ever recovered.

A most important result of the Senate investigating committee's work is that it is demonstrating to the entire world that our democracy is essentially sound and honest, because a bipartisan group of legislators without fear or hesitation, free from political bias, letting the chips fall where they may, are exposing to the purifying light of public opinion the crime, graft, and bribery which has existed in this and other communities.

The importance of your work, Senator KEFAUVER, from a purely domestic viewpoint, cannot be exaggerated, but I dare to say that in restoring and fortifying our country's position of respected leadership in the world you and your associates, and such bodies as the Brooklyn grand jury, can strike one of the most vital blows required for our defense and the preservation of the confidence in and friendship for us of other nations.

Our citizens are aroused, and an aroused citizenry is irresistible. They will relentlessly demand honest and competent officials, who will drive the criminals into prison, out of the country, or into the electric chair.

The New York City Anticrime Committee was formed to help in this work. You may be assured it is at your service at all times, and we hope to join with other crime commissions throughout the country to make this a great national campaign, an unremitting crusade.

H. R. 1 Provides $10,000 of Free Insurance for Every Member of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1951, the United States House of Representatives passed a free insurance bill for members of the Armed Forces by a vote of 390 to 0.

This bill, when and if it becomes law, will have the great advantage of providing every member of the Armed Forces with $10,000 of insurance during the period of his military service and for at least 90 days after his discharge, without cost to the serviceman.

Thus, we can be assured of universal insurance coverage of all members of the Armed Forces, a result which we were never able to attain in World War I or World War II.

Experience has heretofore been that the dependents of deceased servicemen who did not have either national service life insurance or Government life insurance, were generally among those who needed the benefits of insurance most. Universal coverage of all who serve in our military forces is a much-to-be-desired ideal. The bill, H. R. 1, will, for the first time in the military history of this country, enable us to attain that ideal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by James Marlow entitled "Free Insurance Bill Covers Servicemen Killed Since June 27" from the Wednesday, February 21, 1951, edition of the Evening Star:

FREE INSURANCE BILL COVERS SERVICEMEN KILLED SINCE JUNE 27

(By James Marlow)

Veterans with national service life insurance may be puzzled about a move in Congress to set up a new kind of GI insurance.

Up to now, men in service could get this national service life insurance, insuring themselves up to $10,000. They had to pay for it, but no one had to buy it. Roughly 20 percent of the men now in service, with dependents, don't have the insurance.

If a serviceman bought it, he could drop it when he was discharged, and that would end it. But if he wanted to, he could keep it to cover him in civilian life.

If he kept it, he could have the cheapest kind, called term insurance, or convert it to a more expensive permanent policy. In either case, he'd have to keep on paying for it. Only about 4,000,000 World War II veterans have kept the national service life insurance they had while in service.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

That's the way the story has been and is now. But a week ago the House Veterans Committee approved a new kind of GI insurance.

If it goes through as approved, this is the way it will work:

Every serviceman will be insured for $10,000 by the Government for as long as he's in service and for 90 days afterward. He won't have to pay for it. At the end of those 90 days, the insurance stops.

If he comes out of the service disabled he can keep the insurance—it is called "H" policy—but he'll have to pay for it then. The maximum "H" policy is $10,000.

If he comes out of the service totally disabled, then he gets this same "H" policy free for the whole period of his total disability. The "H" policy in that case is a flat $10,000.

RETROACTIVE IN DEATHS

And this new law would take care of the survivors of men who died in service since June 27, 1950, if they were not protected at the time of their death by the present national service life insurance.

For example: John Jones was killed in Korea in July but had no national service life insurance. Still, he had dependents. The new law would provide $10,000 for them.

Or, Tom Smith was killed in Korea. He had dependents, too, but only $5,000 national service life insurance. Under the new law those dependents would get an additional $5,000, to make the total insurance payment to them $10,000.

But what of those 4,000,000 World War II veterans who kept national service life insurance after being discharged and have been paying on it ever since? The new law wouldn't affect them or their policy in any way. They'd continue to pay on their national service life insurance policy.

BACK-IN-SERVICE CASE

But suppose a veteran with this old national service life insurance is called back into service now and this House committee bill becomes a law. He'd get a break.

Once back in service, he'd be covered free with the new $10,000 policy. He could give up his old national service life insurance policy.

If he had a permanent national service life insurance policy, he'd get back from the Government, when he gave it up, the policy's cash surrender value.

If he had the cheaper national service life insurance term policy, he'd get nothing back when he gave it up after returning to the service.

But what happens when this veteran—who went back into service and gave up his national service life insurance policy—is discharged later on? As noted above, the protection of the $10,000-for-free policy under the new law would end 90 days after his discharge. Is he then left without any insurance?

COULD GET IT BACK

No. Once discharged, he could get back his old national service life insurance policy:

1. If he had the permanent kind, he can get it back by returning all the money he had received when he gave it up, plus a sum slightly less than what he would have paid on it from the time he gave it up until he wanted it back again. And he could get this back without a physical examination.

2. If he had the national service life insurance term insurance, he could get it back simply by paying a sum equal to two monthly premiums. But he'd have to take a physical examination.

If he was disabled and couldn't pass the term insurance examination he'd get the "H" insurance mentioned before, up to $10,000 and pay for it month by month.

If he was totally disabled, he'd get a full $10,000 "H" policy for free for the whole period of his total disability.

Posthumous Award of Congressional Medal of Honor to Sgt. William Russell Jecelin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Congressional Medal of Honor is the supreme tribute which our Nation can pay to the valor of one of its fighting men. Its recipients have always been held, and rightly so, in a specially exalted classification among all the heroes of our Armed Forces.

It is with a sense of pride, therefore, that I bring to the attention of the Senate the posthumous award of this decoration to Sgt. William Russell Jecelin, of Baltimore, for incredible courage in saving the members of his platoon by covering with his body an exploding hand grenade after he had led and rallied his men to storm and capture an enemy ridge in Korea.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The account of the award and the reasons therefor will be, I am sure, an inspiration to all the countrymen of this gallant young man, and I ask unanimous consent that the story of the award and of the heroism which merited it, as published in the Baltimore Sun of March 27, together with an editorial from the same paper this morning, be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 27, 1951]

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR ANNOUNCED FOR BALTIMORE HERO—SERGEANT JECELIN THREW HIMSELF ON GRENADE IN KOREAN FIGHT TO SAVE MEN

The Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest military decoration, has been awarded posthumously to a young Baltimore soldier who threw himself on an exploding hand grenade in Korea and saved his comrades from almost certain death.

"This incredible courage" of Sgt. William Russell Jecelin, who lived at 228 Henneman Avenue before entering the Army, climaxed his company's direct frontal attack on a strongly defended enemy ridge which was blocking the advance of United Nations troops.

BRADLEY TO GIVE MEDAL

The action took place September 19 near Saga during the first United Nations advance up the Korean peninsula.

The blue-ribboned medal, the sixth to be awarded in the present conflict, will be presented to the sergeant's father, John Jecelin, Jr., at 2:30 p. m. next Tuesday by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The ceremony will be held in the Pentagon in Washington.

TEXT OF CITATION

The citation reads as follows:

"Sgt. William R. Jecelin, Company C, Thirty-fifth Infantry Regiment, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Saga, Korea, on September 19, 1950. His company was ordered to secure a prominent, saw-toothed ridge from a well entrenched and heavily armed enemy force.

"Unable to capture the objective in the first attempt, a frontal and flanking assault was launched. He led his platoon through heavy enemy fire and bursting shells, across rice fields and rocky terrain, in direct frontal attack on the ridge in order to draw fire away from the flanks.

"The unit advanced to the base of the cliff, where intense, accurate hostile fire stopped the attack.

"Realizing that an assault was the only solution, Sergeant Jecelin rose from his position firing his rifle and throwing grenades as he called on his men to follow him. Despite the intense enemy fire this attack carried to the crest of the ridge, where the men were forced to take cover.

"Again he rallied his men and stormed the enemy strongpoint. With fixed bayonets they charged into the face of antitank fire and engaged the enemy in hand-to-hand combat. After clubbing and clashing this force into submission the platoon was forced to take cover from indirect frontal fire of a self-propelled gun.

SAVE THOSE AROUND HIM

"Refusing to be stopped he leaped to his feet and through sheer personal courage and fierce determination led his men in a new attack. At this instance a well-camouflaged enemy soldier threw a grenade at the remaining members of the platoon. He immediately lunged and covered the grenade with his body, absorbing the full force of the explosion to save those around him.

"This incredible courage and willingness to sacrifice himself for his comrades so imbued them with fury that they completely eliminated the enemy force. Sergeant Jecelin's heroic leadership and outstanding gallantry reflect the highest credit upon himself and uphold the esteemed traditions of the military service."

General MacArthur has sent a letter to Sergeant Jecelin's sister, Mrs. Marie De Vaux, expressing his regret at the "untimely and tragic loss of your brother." Sergeant Jecelin had named Mrs. De Vaux as the relative to be notified should he be killed or injured.

"I am confident," wrote the commander of the United Nations armies, "that his devotion to duty, at the cost of all he held dear, will hasten the day when ruthless aggression shall disappear from the face of the earth and freemen everywhere will live together in peace and harmony."

SINGING ALL THE TIME

Mrs. De Vaux, who lives at 8106 Walnut Avenue, Rosedale, described her brother yesterday as a quiet, soft-spoken boy "who seemed to be singing all the time."

"He was real lively," she said, "and liked to listen to jazz music and go to football games.

"One thing about him, though, he couldn't stand an argument. In fact, if some people were arguing in the room, he would walk out till it was over. He always did that."

Sergeant Jecelin lived with his sister several years before enlisting.

PARACHUTE DIDN'T OPEN

His father, who lives at 2107 East Chase Street, has been a trackman for the Baltimore Transit Co. for the past 21 years. His mother, Mrs. Bertha Killmeyer Jecelin, died a few years after he was born.

Mrs. De Vaux recalled yesterday that her brother wanted to be a paratrooper when he first entered the Army. He trained at Camp Breckinridge, Ky., when an incident occurred which led to the heroic Korean episode.

"He had already made one jump in a parachute," Mrs. De Vaux said, "when, the next time up, he saw a friend of his jump out of the plane, but the parachute didn't open.

"RIGHT IN THE THICK OF IT

"He told them, after that, that he didn't want to jump any more. They said he would have to finish the training or else go overseas. He told them he would rather go overseas."

Sergeant Jecelin left for Japan March 11, 1949. He had enlisted November 21, 1948. He entered Korea with the Twenty-fourth Division soon after the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel.

"He was right in the thick of it" until the day he was killed, Mrs. De Vaux said.

THIRD OF FOUR CHILDREN

Sergeant Jecelin was born May 24, 1930, at 1002 North Chester Street. He was the third of four children of the Jecelins, all born at that address. He has an older brother, George, 31, now ill in the Maryland General Hospital, and two sisters, Mrs. De Vaux, 28, and Miss Agnes Novena Jecelin, 17.

The family moved later to 1514 North Chapel Street and were there about a year when Mrs. Jecelin died after a fall down their cellar steps.

Mr. Jecelin married again and with his children moved to 2107 East Chase Street. Sergeant Jecelin attended Elementary School No. 2, Chase and McDonald Streets. He left school after the sixth grade.

SAVED $2,000

"He never was one for school," Mrs. De Vaux said. "He got a job with a dairy and drove a milk truck for them. He worked at that for three years and then enlisted.

"He really seemed to enjoy his work. He worked the night shift, from 12 to 8, and when he came home he usually would sit around and listen to the radio or else go out and meet some of his friends.

"He worked hard, though, and saved his money. When he went in the service he had $2,000 saved up."

His family said he was a baseball fan.

SENT MONEY FOR NEW HOME

Mrs. De Vaux said that he sent regular allotments home and had invested most of his money in a new house in Rosedale. Most of the family live there now and Mr. Jecelin usually visits them on week ends, she said.

Sergeant Jecelin's last letter home, written to his brother, George, was dated August 29, 1950. After describing a hand-to-hand fight with a North Korean unit, he ended by writing:

"Well, George, that's about all for now so drop me a few lines soon. There go some B-29's over to raise some hell further up the line. Well, George, I think I will catch a couple hours' sleep while there is nothing doing.

"P. S.—Tell Dad to take it easy and not to worry too much, because I will be home soon.

"BROTHER BILL."

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 28, 1951]

A NEW AMERICAN HERO, SGT. WILLIAM R. JECELIN

Bill Jecelin was not the kind of boy who believes the world owes him a living. He left school at 15 and went to work for a milk company, in Baltimore, from midnight until 8 a. m. By the time he enlisted in the Army at the age of 18 he had saved $2,000, which he invested in a house for his brother and sisters. He hated arguments, liked jazz music and football games, and seemed to be singing all the time.

By the time Bill Jecelin was 20 years 3 months and 26 days old, he was dead. He was dead on top of a saw-toothed ridge in Korea which he, a platoon sergeant, was responsible for capturing in repeated charges against seemingly overwhelming enemy fire. He was dead on top of a grendate which he had covered with his body in a successful effort to shield his men from the ensuing blast. He was dead, but his complete and devastating devotion to duty continued to lead his men to further victories.

Nobody has ever successfully answered the question: What makes a hero? Certainly Bill Jecelin, the youngster behind the wheel of a milk truck, could not have been singled out as likely to become the sixth American among many thousands of Americans in Korea to win the highest military award this country has to offer. Certainly the boy who always left the room to avoid a family argument and who balked at making a second jump as a paratrooper was not likely to become the man who rose up again and again in the fury of concentrated enemy fire and led his platoon into hand-to-hand combat.

All we know is that when the military situation called for heroic action, it was Bill Jecelin who stood up and met the challenge. In losing his life he truly saved it, because the name of Baltimore's Bill Jecelin will surely live long on the American roll of honor.

America's No. 1 Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America's No. 1 Farm Problem," written by Lauren Soth and published in the current March issue of Successful Farming. This article, in popular language, discusses the problem of underemployment of rural families, and is based upon a staff report to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report prepared at the request of this committee's Subcommittee on Low-Income Families, of which I am chairman. At my request there was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of March 22, 1951, at page A1656, a summary of the staff report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S NO. 1 FARM PROBLEM

(By Lauren Soth)

America's No. 1 farm problem today is not fair prices for farmers. Neither is it adjustment of production, soil conservation, nor any of the other perplexing questions which have bothered farmers and the Government in recent years.

It is manpower.

We are beginning a vast expansion in our military strength, to meet the threat of world communism. For the indefinite future, we shall have to maintain a high degree of

armed readiness. This takes men for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. More important, it takes men away from producing civilian goods, and puts them to work on military airplanes, tanks, cannon, ammunition, and so forth. National defense comes first.

In certain industries, manpower already is scarce. By the end of 1951, when defense production gets into full swing, nearly all factory managers will be pleading for more workmen. By that time, also, many farmers in the commercial agriculture regions will be short of help.

This will mean a drastic reduction in the output of many civilian goods, including some farm products, unless we can find ways to add new workers to the labor force—or use our present labor force more efficiently. The degree to which we maintain our present high living standards will depend in large part on our success in this manpower job.

Where can we get additional manpower?

Several sources come to mind quickly:

We can reduce the number of unemployed. But of a labor force of 65,000,000, only a little over 2,000,000 are out of work at present. This is about normal for a full employment period. In a free economy—where people are changing jobs often—some slack must be maintained. Even in the stress of World War II the unemployed figure never dropped below one million.

Factory workers can work longer hours. Already, the average number of hours per week has gone up; it will increase further.

More women, young people, and older people ready for retirement will go to work.

These things will help. But the biggest source of new manpower is the underemployed. These people are working full time, but are so inefficient they add little to the Nation's output. A large block of these underemployed persons are in farming.

So the manpower problem is a farm problem from two angles: Commercial agriculture needs more labor, and another section of agriculture has a surplus of usable labor.

A committee of Congress, under Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, has just completed a searching inquiry into the facts about underemployment in farming. Some of the figures will surprise you. They show that our vaunted efficiency in American farming has some holes in it.

They show that while most of United States' agriculture has been moving forward—using more machinery, better seed, better fertilizer, and so on—a very large group of farm people has been standing still. These farmers still are using the methods of their grandfathers. They have not caught up with the industrial age.

Here are the Sparkman committee findings:

1. About 1,600,000 farm families produce less than $2,500 worth of products a year, based on 1945 prices. At present prices, this figure might be $3,000. That's total, gross value—including all products sold and used at home.

Of these 1,600,000 families, 1,000,000 produced less than $1,500 worth of crops and livestock in 1945.

You can estimate for yourself how much net income was left after paying expenses—and how dire is the poverty in which these people live.

2. The Sparkman committee found another 400,000 part-time farm families, who had total earnings of $2,000 or less in 1945.

It is estimated that of the Nation's total of 5,700,000 farm families, 2,000,000 (1,600,000 full-time farmers and 400,000 part-time) produced less than half as much as the families on medium-sized, commercial family farms. (In computing these figures, the Sparkman committee eliminated all families where the head of the family was under 25 or over 65. Thus, these are farmers of working age.)

In other words, more than one-third of the farm families of this country are less than half as productive as the average family on a commercial farm.

3. In addition, says the Sparkman report, there are about 1,500,000 nonfarm families, living in rural areas, who had family incomes of $2,000 or less in 1945. Here again, these are able-bodied people of working age—not the very young or very old.

And, finally, there are about 1,000,000 hired wage workers, who work part time or full time on farms, who earned an average of only $530 in cash in 1945. They worked an average of only 158 days in that year. To a large extent, these wage workers are included in the nonfarm families mentioned above.

"If the workers in these three groups," says the Sparkman committee, "could be employed at jobs where they would produce as much as the average worker on the medium-sized commercial family farm it would be the equivalent of adding 2,500,000 workers to the labor force."

Where do these people live? The greater share of them are in the South. But some are in the cut-over lands of the Great Lakes States and the far Northwest, and in some of the isolated mountain areas of the West. Some are in the southern, hilly fringe of the rich Corn Belt States.

Are these farmers mostly tenants and sharecroppers? No; about 57 percent of those who had a gross of less than $1,500 in 1945 owned the small acreages they farmed.

What are their farms like? Well, here's a typical Piedmont region farm in North Carolina: It is a 45-acre place run by an owner-operator. The farmer has 19 acres of woodland and wasteland, 2 acres of pasture land, and 24 acres of crops. He has small fields of cotton, tobacco, corn, wheat, oats, and lespedeza; 2 cows, 2 hogs, and 40 chickens. The farm takes only 180 man-days of labor per year.

Here's a typical southern Appalachian farm: The farmer-owner has 24 acres to work with, of which 10½ acres are cropland. He grows a little tobacco, has 4 acres in corn, and about 6 acres in other crops. He has 1 cow, 2 hogs, and 20 chickens. The business takes 120 days of man labor.

A southern Illinois owner-operator of 120 acres has 23 acres in crops. The farmer raises 7 acres of cotton and 16 of lespedeza. He handles 2 dairy cows, has 6 beef animals, 7 hogs, and 60 chickens. The farm is operated with 120 days of man labor.

The net cash income in all three of these cases, which were selected as representative of their areas by the Department of Agriculture, was less than $500 at the 1945 level of prices (or about $550 at 1950 prices). The farm families got about as much income in the form of food consumed at home as in cash.

This is real poverty. It is tragedy. But the effects of this poverty on the farm families themselves—the lack of education for the children, the poor nutrition, the ill health—need not concern us here. In this article let's look at the problem from the standpoint of the rest of us, from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole.

Clearly, the goods we all have to consume, including the goods we need to be militarily strong, come from what we all produce. The failure of 2,000,000 farm families to produce more than one-half their share is a heavy burden on the Nation. It seriously cuts down on our ability to maintain the national standard of living during a time of great military expense.

The underemployed farm families are a burden on the rest of us in other ways. Their health is poorer on the average. So more of them require public aid for health services and fewer of the young men are eligible for military duty. Many of these people have to go on relief when they are too old to work.

Their children aren't as well educated because local schools are poorly financed. So we are seriously considering a Federal aid program which would improve educational standards in the poor farm areas. We cannot afford to have a large group of young people so poorly educated that they are a liability instead of an asset to democratic government.

But all this welfare and relief, which costs lots of money, doesn't get at the root of the problem: underemployment or lack of productivity. How much wiser it would be to undertake a national program to raise these people up to the American standard of productivity. Then they could take care of themselves in good, old-fashioned, independent American style.

It is an easy "out" for us to say that these poor farmers are shiftless, lazy, and incapable of doing more. It is easy to say, "Well, this is a free country. Why don't they move to bigger farms or move to the cities?"

But that simply bypasses the issue. The facts are that most of the poor people on poor farms stay there. In spite of the great wave of prosperity in the last 10 years, we still have 2,000,000 families, according to the Sparkman study, who seem anchored to their pitifully unproductive farms.

Ordinary price and wage incentives do not seem to be enough to pull many of the underemployed farm people out of their ruts. In the current emergency, we cannot count on this problem solving itself—at least not fast enough to help the defense effort.

What can be done, then?

The first step is to improve practices and methods on present small farms. You would think that with all the extra labor time they have, the operators of these small farms would have high crop yields per acre and high production per unit of livestock. But they do not. They need to learn how to farm by modern methods—to use fertilizer, improved varieties of seeds, and more productive livestock.

Can they, or will they, learn? Experiences of the extension services in the Southern States, and of the Farmers Home Administration are encouraging. Once they are given the chance, plus financial help to get started, many of these so-called backward farmers prove to be very good producers. We need to place much greater emphasis on FHA and extension educational programs for the poorest farmers.

The next step is to provide larger farming units for those who demonstrate capacity to handle them. This means more credit facilities for this group of farmers. It may require a land-purchase and recombination program by the Federal Government. FHA needs additional authority from Congress to do this.

Hand in hand with this program to improve methods and expand the size of farms goes the need for machinery. During the next several years, it would pay the country to give high priority to southern agriculture on farm machinery.

If we are to make full use of manpower from southern farms, we must make machinery available to replace it.

A set-up of efficiency in the poor farming areas will not by itself solve the manpower problem. Displaced labor from these areas must be helped to find work elsewhere—in factories and in commercial farming areas. The Federal-State employment services need to expand their informational and guidance activities in the poor-farm areas. At present they have few offices, and no special information programs in such places.

Probably the most important single action that could improve the productivity of southern people would be more industrial development. Private business already has

done much to encourage new factories in the South. But it is obviously impossible to locate enough factories close to surplus labor areas to give everybody a job without moving from home.

During the last war one of the chief obstacles to getting jobs for southern farm people was the difficulty of moving. Maybe we need to give some thought to providing Government funds for buying up farms of people who want to move to other farms or nonfarm work. These pieces of land could be resold to other families in the neighborhood who need bigger units.

Clearly, this problem of making fuller use of manpower on farms is many-sided. No one cure-all is possible. At several different points, however, we can make our system of free choice work better. We can remove some of the obstacles that prevent the exercise of free choice.

The heavy pressure of work which the world crisis has placed upon us demands that we make every ounce of manpower as effective as possible. Making fuller use of manpower now available on farms is the most important task for the Department of Agriculture in the immediate future.

The United States Department of Agriculture might well shift some emphasis away from price supports and other programs for commercial farmers in order to concentrate on manpower. These other programs are not needed now, anyway, because prices and incomes of commercial agriculture are certain to remain high during the defense period.

An effort to overcome the stagnation in our poor farming areas will not only help the defense effort, but it will give us a better balanced and more profitable agriculture for the long-run future.

CARE Completes 5 Years of Significant Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the fifth annual report of that great American organization known as CARE, under the splendid leadership of Paul Comly French, the executive director. In the 5 years in which this private organization has been active in relief and rehabilitation, it has assembled and distributed to needy people throughout the world 10,000,000 packages of food and textiles. As the report suggests, here are 10,000,000 ambassadors of good will. Mr. French, his able staff members, and the rank and file workers throughout America, utilizing our church and benevolent institutions, have given the most tangible evidence of our concern for the victims of war and other disasters. The report carries words of appreciation from the heads of government in Europe and Asia whose peoples have been helped by this activity. Included also is a fine appraisal of its significance by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The American people can be proud of CARE's magnificent record.

Walter P. Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two excerpts from the magazine Newsweek. The first is from the magazine's issue of February 26, 1951, and is a telegram from the Honorable Francis Biddle, distinguished former Attorney General of the United States and now national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. The second excerpt is from the magazine's March 5, 1951, issue and is a letter from Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO. These items are pertinent for the RECORD in order to be read together with an insertion made on Wednesday, March 14, by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The three insertions read together will, I am confident, leave no doubt in the minds of reasonable people as to what the facts are. Mr. Reuther's opposition to communism is irrefutable. His record of militant, practical, and successful opposition to communism is well known.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of February 26, 1951]

IN BEHALF OF REUTHER

As national chairman and presiding officer at last ADA national board meeting, statement attributed to Walter Reuther in Moley article February 12 issue of Newsweek totally inaccurate. Reuther's positive program of attack on communism within trade-union movement and at national and world level is outstanding and has long spoken for itself. Public distortion of his vigorous and effective stand against Communist doctrine as well as Communist military aggression serves only totalitarian propaganda ends.

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

(The questioned statement was picked up from Victor Riesel, labor columnist, who is standing by what he was told by his source.)

[From Newsweek of March 5, 1951]

REUTHER'S REBUTTAL

My fight against communism of all varieties, including world communism, is sufficiently on record as to need no defense or explanation. However, I would like to keep the record straight.

I was supposed to have said, according to a quotation used by Raymond Moley in his column (Newsweek, February 12): "I am not interested in fighting world communism. I am only interested in fighting Communist imperialism. I draw a distinction between world communism and Communist imperialism. I'm willing to leave the fight against world communism to MCCARTHY and the Republicans."

I believe I have clearly demonstrated in work and action (a) I am against world communism, (b) I regard imperialism as only one of the many ugly sides of communism, (c) I do not draw any distinction between world communism and Communist imperialism, and that (d) I most certainly am not willing to leave the fight against world communism to the McCarthys because McCarthyism cannot win the fight against communism.

What I actually said at the ADA meeting to which Moley referred was this: "I am not interested in a purely negative fight against communism, because a negative fight will not succeed. I will leave that kind of fighting to the McCarthys. I am for a positive fight against communism, because that is the only way to win.

"We must build military strength to resist aggression on the battle front, and at the same time, fight against poverty and hunger on the economic and social front because poverty and hunger are the sources of Communist power."

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, UAW-CIO.

DETROIT, MICH.

Use of Television by Congress and Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an interesting editorial on the subject of a proposed voluntary code to be worked out so as to make sure that television is constructively used by Congress and its committees. This was the substance of the suggestion I made in my public statements on this subject which were reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD on Tuesday, March 27, 1951.

The Washington Post suggests that the Subcommittee on Congr ssional Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be the group to handle this issue. I personally feel that it might better come within the purview of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which might concentrate on this particular subject rather than become involved in a great mass of other congressional reorganization details. Whoever does the job, however, I trust that it will be done promptly and in the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Post editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Prior to the Washington Post editorial, however, I should like to have included in the RECORD a copy of a Tuesday, March 27, editorial that appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on this same issue. I think that this is one of the most stimulating editorials which has been published to date regarding the new TV "baby." This editorial very kindly commends my suggestion to the effect that we should not allow TV to be used recklessly and without careful thought. The editorial points out in a

very sensible fashion the fact that in other hands the televising of congressional hearings could become a very dangerous instrument. The fact that our subcommittee has been conscientious in its handling of the hearings does not detract from the fact that some other committee might not exercise such high standards.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun]

THE TV "BABY"

Many thoughtful citizens are uneasy about television's spectacular role in the hearings of Senator KEFAUVER's crime investigating committee.

They concede the tremendous popularity of the fascinating show provided for millions of people throughout the country.

They aren't concerned for the tender sensibilities of underworld big shots who complain of "fear psychology" when required to testify under the glaring lights, even though not in direct range of the TV cameras.

And they agreed that Senator KEFAUVER and his colleagues have sought commendably to conduct the hearings with dignity and restraint.

But they are apprehensive about what could develop now that the precedent has been established.

All congressional investigations, unfortunately, are not inspired by motives as good as those of the Kefauver committee. Some have been—as some may be hereafter—conducted by men ruthlessly bent on smearing honorable persons whose political or economic views differed from their own.

There is nothing fanciful in the fear that innocent witnesses, subjected to ordeal by television before future Senate or House committees, may suffer ruin of their reputations if their rights are not carefully protected.

Senator WILEY, a Wisconsin Republican and a member of the Kefauver committee, is one who sees this danger plainly.

He has proposed a thorough study of television's part in hearings and other congressional proceedings, with a view to establishing definite standards and preventing abuses. He says:

"The usual history of developments such as this TV 'baby' is that the medium becomes more and more used, more and more wildly, with less and less restraint, until in some dramatic instance, say, an innocent man's reputation, is destroyed. Then the people strike back at the 'monster' they have created by passing restrictive rules."

The Kefauver committee's hearings have made such a hit on TV that public demand for more like them is sure to be strong. And congressional desire to meet that demand also is certain.

Now, therefore, is the time for Congress to act on Senator WILEY's excellent suggestion. Unless its committees are required to observe common-sense standards of good taste and restraint, he says, correctly:

"Televised hearings will degenerate into three-ring circuses, fourth-rate stage productions with hamming and phony theatrics or unjust inquisitions under klieg lights."

Other mediums of public information—the press, the news cameramen, the radio, the newsreels—also should not object to fair and sensible standards for their coverage of congressional hearings and proceedings.

[From the Washington Post of March 29, 1951]

CODE ON USE OF TV

The grinding of television and motion picture cameras and the flashing of newspaper photographers' bulbs were probably only a convenient excuse seized upon by Morris Kleinman and Louis Rothkopf to cover up their unwillingness to testify before the Kefauver committee. Both had been dodging subpenas for 3½ months. They were brought before the committee under arrest. If no cameramen had been present, the pair would probably have sought some other excuse for not testifying. Nevertheless, their refusal to talk with the television audience looking on will furnish an interesting test of whether Congress may compel testimony under these circumstances. We hope the case will be ably and thoroughly presented to the courts.

At the outset it should be understood, however, that the courts cannot settle the larger issue that has been raised. Presumably the decision of the courts in this case will tell Congress only whether or not it may compel a witness to talk directly to the country as well as to itself. Beyond this question of legal rights lie momentous questions of policy: To what extent should television and motion pictures be utilized in congressional investigations when witnesses do not object? To what extent should their objections be overridden if the courts decided to sustain contempt convictions for refusal to talk for TV? Decision of the legal issues will not relieve Congress of the necessity of adopting a policy of its own.

It is a timely moment for Congress to be thinking about a code for the guidance of its investigators—a code that would include other rules of fair investigative practice aside from the use of television. With expert assistance, the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is currently studying ways and means of improving the performance of Congress and its committees. One of its primary tasks might well be the writing of a code of fair procedure for congressional investigators, with special emphasis on this new problem that Congress has not yet had time to think about.

Congressional Probers Again Prove Their Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congressional Probers Again Prove Their Value," by Leslie Gould. The article appeared in the March 22, 1951, issue of the New York Journal-American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL PROBERS AGAIN PROVE THEIR VALUE

(By Leslie Gould)

The value of congressional committee investigations has again been proved.

Eighteen years ago, a congressional committee showed up the racketeering in finance and some lines of business. The things exposed were known, but had never been gathered together in one shocking package.

More recently, a congressional committee turned up the Communist infiltration into Government and caught in the net Alger Hiss.

If it hadn't been for the congressional committee, Hiss would never have been exposed. He was one of the darlings of the New Deal and part of the conspiracy that sold the country out to the Russians and killed the peace won by the blood, sweat and tears of World War II.

A congressional committee turned up Andy May—the double dealing Congressman who had headed the powerful Military Affairs Committee—and the Garsson brothers.

Currently the racketeering in Government is being exposed, with the RFC bowing to influence in making unsound, political loans. The influence trail to the RFC leads right into the White House.

The links between the most vicious gambling and criminal elements in the country, going back to the dark days of prohibition, to important figures in local, State and National Government are being revealed in all their disgusting detail.

The investigations of 18 years ago brought a long overdue clean-up of the financial markets, but they also have brought along powerful Government interference with private business and some of this influence is crooked.

The pendulum has swung now far to the left. Criminal elements are political powers. They control many of the unions, particularly those along the water fronts.

If the shocking revelations of the Kefauver committee and the Fulbright committee bring the long overdue clean-up, the public will be the gainer. But if just one or two figures are sacrificed and the matter ends there, with the same thing continuing only under new names, the investigations will mean nothing.

The investigations have hardly more than scratched the surface. This is particularly true of the Fulbright inquiry into the RFC. This is only one agency. Many of the other agencies in Washington are similarly operated.

Behind the whole stinking mess are lawyers peddling influence, hiding behind their cloak of immunity of lawyer-client privilege. A real housecleaning is needed in the legal profession.

Politics and the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Stockton Legionnaire, which I wish every American could read. The American Legion has often been charged with politics and with inordinate selfishness.

From its inception the Legion determined to keep out of partisan politics and as far as the American Legion in California is concerned, which is the only one of which I have intimate knowledge, they have done exactly that. This has been one of the strong characteristics of the American Legion. The Legion supports principles, community activities and institutions but, very wisely, it does not support candidates for political office.

Also, the Legion has consistently and persistently taken a strong stand against

subversive activities against our Government. There has been no deviation in its course in this regard. Furthermore, it has consistently taken a strong and vigorous stand on national defense. From the beginning it has many times affirmed that it believes universal military training is the one way to make and keep America strong. It has been my privilege to hear some of the men who represent the Legion speak before the House Armed Services Committee. Some of the best presentations of the need for and the utility of universal military training have been made by Legionnaires. The one that I remember more vividly than all others is the presentation made by Perry Brown, of Texas, who is one of the Legion's past national commanders.

This article referred to was printed in the Stockton Legionnaire, the Post paper of Karl Ross Post No. 16, my Post in my home town of Stockton, Calif.

I believe I can truthfully say that Karl Ross Post is one of the great legion posts in the entire United States. The main reason it has been such a constructive force in our city is that there has been practically complete harmony among the post members. No matter what the members' political differences might be—or differences on other matters—when they come into the legion meeting they pull and work together. The post has done a great many fine things for the city of Stockton and for its people and has contributed many thousands of dollars toward public improvements. It has carried on a vigorous program in support of our public schools and in disseminating wholesome information regarding the benefits of the American political and social system. There is a comradeship in Karl Ross Post that I have never found in any other group and I can truthfully say that, of all the other organizations that I belong to, I cherish my membership in Karl Ross Post more than my membership in any other group. I am very proud of the fact that I once served as the commander of this post.

Following is the article:

POLITICS AND THE AMERICAN LEGION

The formation of war veterans into peacetime organizations seems to be one of the invariable results of modern demobilization. These organizations have been many, and varied in general plan and purpose. Some seek only to promote the selfish interests of their members, while others seek to render public service in peace as well as in war. It is perhaps natural that the American Legion, originally formed by veterans of a war to make the world safe for democracy, should fall into the latter class. The preamble of our Constitution, one of the greatest dedications to high patriotism ever written, discloses a determination to be ever militant in the defense of the ideas our comrades died to save.

Recognizing that the military struggles of the last decade are but a renewal of the battle for democracy—a battle that will continue until the people learn to turn from their pacifists and demagogs long enough to make good, in peacetime, the victories for democracy won by the blood of their sons in war—membership in the Legion was opened to the veterans of later wars.

To keep the organization on as high a level as possible, for as long as possible, the constitution provided that it should be nonpolitical, in the sense that it would not be used to promote the candidacy for public office of any person, or to advance the cause of any political party. Our determination, as previously suggested, was to be militant in defending the Constitution of the United States of America, a 100-percent Americanism, combating the autocracy of the classes and the masses, making right the master of might, promoting peace and good will on earth, and perpetuating the principles of justice, freedom, democracy. It was never suspected at that time that such a program would conflict with the programs of persons in public office. But the people forgot that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and hundreds of those who would destroy what we fought to save wormed their way into high places in our National Government. For a while the Legion was practically alone in warning the American people that termites had invaded the foundations of our national structure, and were becoming ever more effective in their program of destruction.

Our work was, of course, very obnoxious to certain groups, and they set out to destroy us. The rumor of a meeting on perhaps the most prominent lawn in Washington, D. C., one hot summer afternoon during World War II, for the purpose of planning the formation of an organization to put the American Legion out of business, is well founded. The plan failed, and the organization that was to wipe us out has fallen into disrepute.

But the battle continues, and as usual in such cases, one of the weapons is to try to shake the confidence of its members in the organization. So they began asserting and repeating that the American Legion is too much in politics. Some of the more or less gullible members began repeating it, and some even went so far as to assert that eligibles were declining to join because of the activity of the organization in party politics. Of course no one ever actually refused to join because of that false statement, but it is not to be denied that many who have other reasons may find satisfaction in advancing that excuse for declining. It sounds pure and holy, and we ourselves have often not been too skillful in calling attention to the Stalin philosophy that a lie, repeated often enough, is bound ultimately to be believed by someone.

It is natural, therefore, that many of the founders of the organization viewed with alarm the introduction, some months ago, of a resolution which, if adopted on a national scale, would completely disarm the organization, and subject us to just criticism of having shrunk into a simple treasury-raiding outfit. The backers of the resolution were of undoubted sincerety and loyalty. But they lost sight of our main objectives. Fortunately the proposal for this self-emasculation was caught in time, and the resolution amended so as to call for no weakening of our past policy or practice.

Tell me that the American Legion has failed to sign up 2,000,000 members because we are not sufficiently active in the support of our high purposes, and I will believe you. I frequently hear the criticism, "You talk about these things, but you don't do anything about them." For instance, it is not easy to explain why when surveys showed 80 percent of the people of the United States behind our military training program, we did not actively engage in the defeat of two Congresses, one Republican, one Democratic, which refused to do anything about it.

But look well into the background of someone who repeats, parrotlike, the assertion that the American Legion is too much in politics, as an excuse for not joining. Read him the preamble, and ask him if he believes in the same things we do. Maybe he is not going our way.

If we are to remain true to our principles, it is our duty to do all in our power to combat the infiltration of communism and communistic influence in our Goverment, as well as to combat the childish stupidity that gave Stalin half of the world on a platter, a situation that will cost millions of lives to correct, if indeed it can ever be corrected. The American Legion is a truly democratic organization, and as such it has not always been free from the faults of democracy. But to our everlasting credit it must be said that, while often blundering in our methods and inconsistent in our acts, we gave the Nation the only leadership it had, for a long period of time, in the battle against the fifth column. If we force ourselves to withdraw from the fight now, on the ground that we are treading on some politician's toes, then next time we meet, let's not forget to bring along our knitting. We won't be good for anything else.

CHAS. H. EPPERSON,
Chairman Americanism.

The Final Chapter of the Alger Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in one place, under the title "The Final Chapter of the Alger Hiss Case," three newspaper clippings, being editorials or articles. The first one is an editorial entitled "Final Chapter in Alger Hiss Case," from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; the second is an editorial entitled "Hiss Is Lucky," taken from the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind.; and the third is a news article entitled "Alger Hiss Is Taken to Lewisburg Prison," from the front page of the Washington Times-Herald for March 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader]

FINAL CHAPTER IN ALGER HISS CASE

The United States Supreme Court this week wrote what is perhaps the final chapter in the case of Alger Hiss when it refused to review his conviction on a perjury charge.

Thus goes into the archives one of the most extraordinary episodes in American history—not extraordinary solely because Hiss betrayed his Government but also because he rallied to his support so many men in high places.

TRUSTED BY MANY

Hiss was one of the top aides in the Department of State at the time of his violation of public trust. He was a trusted adviser of President Roosevelt—one of his primary helpers at Yalta. He helped frame the basic set-up of the United Nations at San Francisco, acting as a chief agent of the United States.

When charges were first voiced against him, an angry outcry was heard in Washington. It was, his friends and supporters said, a horrible case of "character assassination." It was tragic, indeed, they contended, that such a fine and noble man as Hiss should be subjected to such shocking abuse.

President Truman joined in the chorus. Two Justices of the United States Supreme

Court appeared as character witnesses at his trial. Even after he had been convicted, Secretary Dean Acheson of the Department of State made the almost incredible statement that he wouldn't turn his back on him.

TOUGH GOING

We recall the early developments in this case. At that time Senator KARL MUNDT was a Member of the United States House of Representatives and an active leader in the House Un-American Activities Committee. As events unfolded he became more and more convinced, he told us, that Hiss was not the innocent character depicted by his associates. But his committee encountered difficulty in getting the proper assistance to ferret out the facts. President Truman virtually commanded the Department of Justice, including the FBI, to leave the case alone. So the committee had to function as best it could without benefit of the Government's established agencies. Because Hiss had so many friends of unusual influence, the going was tough. Not only was there opposition from the President, but various columnists and others sought to belittle the committee at every opportunity. In consequence a considerable degree of public sympathy was lost.

But the committee was so certain that it was proceeding along a good trail that it didn't desist. MUNDT took the leadership in the probe and it was his adroit and vigorous questioning that eventually played a prominent part in the developments resulting in the arrest and subsequent conviction of Hiss.

HOW MANY OTHERS?

Now this episode is over. But it is tremendously disturbing to realize that a man who was virtually a spy for another country could work himself into such a high position and command the respect of so many important officials.

The worrisome question today concerns how many others like Hiss are in the Government. The matter is particularly aggravating in view of the apparent unwillingness of President Truman as well as Secretary Acheson to promote a really thorough investigation.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of March 23, 1951]

HISS IS LUCKY

What many, perhaps most, Americans had not expected to come to pass became a reality Thursday when Alger Hiss surrendered to begin serving a prison term for perjury. Two trials in Federal court and much litigation in the appellate area were necessary to bring this about. Even when he was found guilty by a jury in New York City on January 21, 1950, many observers were skeptical about his ultimate imprisonment.

Hiss, the "one-time bright young star of President Roosevelt's New Deal," actually is lucky as he becomes a convict. The perjury conviction means that he has been found guilty, in net effect, of betraying the United States for the benefit of the Communist conspirators in the Kremlin. As Russia was not officially an enemy of the United States when Hiss thus degraded himself he was not subject to indictment and trial as a traitor. So he is under a 5-year sentence ostensibly for perjury, but actually for what was essentially a crime that has spelled death for so many other wrongdoers in the history of the human race.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of March 29, 1951]

ALGER HISS IS TAKEN TO LEWISBURG PRISON

Alger Hiss, former high State Department official convicted of perjury, was taken yesterday from New York to the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., to serve his 5-year term.

Letters From GI Who Has Recently Returned From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there has come to me a request from one of our recently returned GI's from Korea. He has asked me to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a plea he is making in the interest of his buddies who are still fighting and suffering and dying and winning far from home and kin. He tells of the meaning to these brave fellows of mail from home, and his plea is that we give them more and more of this comfort and joy. It is a fine, straight-forward appeal, and I ask that Sgt. Wilbur F. H. Radeline's letter to me and his appeal to the people of this country be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FELLOW AMERICANS: I am Sgt. Wilbur F. H. Radeline, of the United States Army, recently returned from Korea and now stationed at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.

I am not writing this in any official capacity.

I do not expect, nor do I think I merit any special consideration, commendation, or privileges for what I am doing. I am simply trying to keep a promise I made to my buddies in Korea.

Some time ago my good friend, Don Blanding, wrote a dramatic, true poem about a certain Private Willie who, when the ever-welcome mail call came, and after the names of the Zylowskies, the Perkins, Van de Veers, and others had been called, would linger awhile, outside the circle, his name uncalled. Then, with a look of deep, hurt loneliness in his eyes, would turn away, forgotten, heartsick, and forlorn.

Today, over in Korea, in Japan, Okinawa, and, yes, even right here in the United States, especially in our Armed Forces hospitals, Private Willie is present and disappointed at too many mail calls.

Oh, his name isn't always Willie. It might be John, Rastus, Richard, Max, or even your own boy's name, but he is there, his name uncalled, forgotten.

I, myself, have spent over 6 years overseas, and months in Army hospitals, and I know the worth and value of mail from home. I also know the heartache and misery when you are forgotten.

I have seen many men and boys, of all races, creeds, and ages, in Korea and elsewhere, who receive little or no mail from home, and no matter what their position in life was before they entered the service this failure to write on the part of the folks back home makes these men believe and feel as though they were forgotten and their efforts unappreciated. I promised to them that I would prove to them that this was not so, but only you can make this promise come true. How? By writing a cheery, newsy letter, with your latest snapshot, to some relative, friend, or acquaintance overseas. Or, better still, why not send him a small package containing some inexpensive gift?

If you do not have anyone of your own overseas and still want to help bring cheer and happiness to our men overseas, you can do so by sending your mail to me, with forwarding postage if possible, and I will forward it for you. I have the names of many men in our Armed Forces overseas who receive little or no mail, as well as promises from chaplains and the Pacific Stars and Stripes—the servicemen's newspaper—to help me pass on your mail to where it will do the most good.

Now I've told you my story, and it's up to you.

Are you going to sit still and do nothing and let those fellows over there continue to believe that their suffering, their struggle, and their pain is unappreciated and in vain? Are you going to make these men wage an additional battle against lonesomeness as well as against the enemy? Or are you going to prove to them with your letters and packages that you do appreciate what they are doing for you and not let them down?

I assure you they will not let you down. I thank you.

Sgt. WILBUR F. H. RADELINE.
PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

PRESIDIO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Hon. Mr. MILLER: I really haven't any legitimate excuse for not thanking you before for everything you have done for my wife and myself, but I am humbly saying "thank you" now. But at the same time I am also saying "please" again.

Since I have returned I have taken a furlough and on my own time and at my own expense I have gone to Hollywood and talked to executives, producers, writers, and actors at both independent radio stations and networks about a campaign for mail from home for men overseas. Their cooperation has been wonderful and not only have they had me appear on programs but many other programs are "plugging" my campaign. Magazine editors have also promised me their help.

Then the Pacific Stars and Stripes has given my campaign write-ups, and when the men found out about it they started writing me, begging me for mail from home. They believe in what I am doing and are asking for mail from their home States and towns. I honestly and sincerely believe that I can do much to build up morale and happiness if I can do what they want. And I also am convinced that as long as I continue to do this personally and without any official ties-ins the real concrete belief in and response will be better. Oh, I hasten to tell you that although I am doing this personally and unofficially, I have cleared with and received the permission to do so from the Sixth Army PIO (Public Information Office), as long as I do not obligate or embarrass the Government or the Defense Department or do not bring discredit upon the military service.

So this brings me to my request for help from you. Could or would you, after you are convinced yourself that you would be doing the most good for the most people, read the inclosed copy into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No; wait a minute, sir; it is not for the purpose of self aggrandizement or for desire of publicity for myself. It is for the purpose of getting as many people in the United States as possible to read and cooperate in my appeal and thus help the many thousands of men in the service by writing to them. I feel sure that if you could do this, and then call the press gallery's attention to it, their papers might pick up our appeal and reprint it in their columns. Then you and I could honestly feel that we had done something worth while for those GIs over there in a really unselfish manner. I'll forward the mail.

The reason I am appealing to you to do this is this: In the past as soon as I would receive a request from a serviceman overseas for mail from any particular section of the country I would write out the copy I am enclosing in this letter and mail it to the

newspaper in his home town (but not mention his name, in order to avoid embarrassment to himself or his family), and then when or if mail from there came in I'd restamp it and forward it overseas. This has gotten to be too big and too expensive a procedure and thus I am appealing to you. And I honestly feel as though this concerns everyone, not just any one section or faction, in our country, and maybe they will wake up and stop forgetting the boys overseas and send them that all-important mail from home. Thank you and God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

SGT. WILBUR F. H. RADELINE.

How Good Is the Voice of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of a recent broadcast in which I participated on the subject of How Good Is the Voice of America?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTER'S ROUND-UP: HOW GOOD IS THE VOICE OF AMERICA?

(Mutual Broadcasting System, March 15, 1951)

Guest speaker: Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota.

Moderator: Everett Holles.

Reporters: Frank R. Kent, Jr., Robert E. Burns, and Earl H. Richard.

Mr. RICHARD. Do you agree with the sentiment expressed by some Senators that control of the Voice of America should be taken from the State Department?

Senator MUNDT. No, I do not, Mr. Richard. What is meant—and I presume it is—that we should make that change at this time; but it seems to me, actually, this is about the poorest time that could be selected for taking the Voice of America program away from the State Department because that would necessitate the establishment of a new agency at once, the staffing of it, the manning and training of it and leave this country without any effective foreign information program for a hietus of perhaps 90 or 120 days. What I have suggested in S. 731, now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is that we establish a sort of Hoover Commission to study the entire foreign information program, a commission of 12 outstanding Americans, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats, to make findings and, on the basis of those recommendations, we would then make some changes in the Voice of America programs.

Mr. RICHARD. You would leave the Voice in the State Department until your commission would report.

Senator MUNDT. That's correct, and then I would be governed in large part by the findings of these 12 American experts.

Mr. RICHARD. Do you think the State Department's doing a good job with the Voice now?

Senator MUNDT. I think it is doing a good job. I don't think it's doing the best job that's possible. I think it's doing a considerably better job than it was 12 months ago, and an infinitely better job than it was 24 months ago.

Mr. RICHARD. To whom do you attribute that?

Senator MUNDT. I think largely to the fact that—and this is a point a great many of the public fail to understand—that it's not being run now simply as a sort of an adjunct of the State Department, but is actually run by a general manager, Charley Hulten, who, operating under the general authority of the Assistant Secretary of State, Ed Barrett, runs the thing administratively as a general manager precisely as it would have to be run if it were in any other department of the Government or handled by some private agency.

Mr. KENT. Senator, I've heard the argument made that if the Voice were taken out of the State Department much higher type, higher caliber men, could be attracted to the Voice as an independent agency than as would be within the State Department, where opportunities are much more limited.

Senator MUNDT. I've heard that argument, too, Mr. Kent, but I think it presupposes that if we take it away from the State Department you're going to turn it over to some private radio company, where, of course, in private industry salaries are higher than they are in Government. But no matter what agency you were going to give it to within the Government, the salary schedule would be precisely the same as that in the State Department, so I don't see how it could attract men of any higher caliber than they can attract them now under the guidance of the Department of State.

Mr. KENT. I've heard the ECA—the European—Economic Cooperation Administration—cited as an example of the men of high ability in business who have been attracted because of its independence as an agency.

Senator MUNDT. I think they have been attracted, not so much because of its independence but because of the hope that it's a temporary program, and you can get, as you know, fine people down here at a dollar a year for 1 or 2 or 3 years, but when it becomes a career proposition I don't think there would be any difference, regardless of which division of Government happened to manage the Voice of America program.

Mr. BURNS. Senator, you said the Voice of America is doing a better job than it did a few months ago. How do we know that? What evidence of it?

Senator MUNDT. We have some pretty concrete evidence, and let me quote you just one excerpt which I think is rather interesting, and that's no later than February 15, 1951. You know we monitor the programs of foreign radio stations, and that's one way we get some idea of the reaction foreign countries have to the Voice of America program. So, speaking over the Czechoslovakian radio on February 15, President Clement Gottwald said this—and I quote him—he said: "It is grievous that there are sons and daughters of Czech mothers who have staked their fortune on United States cards. Let me now warn all those who rather than listen to the voice of their hearts listen to the Voice of America."

Mr. BURNS. But, Senator, not many American taxpayers listen to the Czech radio. Isn't it on the part of the Voice of America that the American taxpayer doesn't know that?

Senator MUNDT. Well, you would never get from this particular Republican Senator a complaint that a Government agency has failed to have enough public relations officials to keep the taxpayers acquainted with what they're doing. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNS. Isn't this rather a bipartisanship?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; it should be, but I rather congratulate the Department of State, at least the Voice of America section of the Department of State, on the fact that it is not spending a lot of money to tell Americans what they're doing overseas.

REPORTER. Do you know whether the Voice of America is effective in our allied friendly countries? What we see in the newspapers is mostly the stories of anti-American feeling, in Britain, for example, the last week or so.

Senator MUNDT. Well, I might suggest the fact that I talked to a traveler who had just come back from Turkey last week, and he said that all over Turkey the name of Marshall was much better known that the name of either Truman or Acheson. I said, How does that happen? Well, he said, they keep on hearing the Voice of America program about the Marshall plan, so apparently they are doing a pretty good job of telling the Turks, at least, and, I think, the people of other countries the fact that this Marshall plan aid does come from the United States, and that's part of the deal that we have in connection with the publicity program of this country—to make the foreign nations aware of the fact that when we contribute something to them for free, that it actually comes from the United States.

REPORTER. Wouldn't it be easier for you, as a Senator, and for the other Members of Congress, though, if the ordinary taxpayer got some concrete evidence along with his breakfast coffee that this program did have some effect?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; I think so, and I believe that, by and large, the newspaper and radio fraternity of this country—on their own, good private enterprise activities—have been telling the country what's been done by the Voice of America program. Certainly it's getting a much better press, and radio commentators are treating it more kindly than was true either 1 or 2 years ago. I would just hate to see the Department of State spending any of the taxpayers' money telling the taxpayers what a good job they think they're doing with the Voice of America program.

Mr. HOLLES. Senator MUNDT, I would like to get down to one of the real fundamentals of this thing. Just what are we trying to do with the Voice of America? Are we primarily trying to stir the Russian people to revolt?

Senator MUNDT. No, I think not, Mr. Holles. I think that insofar as we've broadcast behind the iron curtain, especially into Russia, we do it with the intent in mind of making the Russian people realize that our quarrel is with their leaders, and not with the people of Russia; that we recognize that many of the people of Russia are not Communists; that many of the people of Russia would like to own their own farms instead of work on collectivized farms; and that here, in America, when they listen to the Russian broadcasts talking about how we are constantly quarreling with Russia, that that quarrel is with a group of 14 men in the Kremlin in Moscow—the high command of the Communist Party—and not with the people of Russia.

Mr. HOLLES. Well what do we expect those Russian listeners to do about that situation though?

Senator MUNDT. We expect them to do a great many things which they can do. One of them very definitely is not to revolt at this time, but we do expect them to sort of soldier on the job, to slow down in the defense activities, to fail to respond to 5-year programs which would step up production on the farm and in the factories. We expect them, on occasion, as they have, to pull out of Russia and to escape to a free country and to come here so that we can learn from Russians who know what kind of defense establishments they're building behind the Urals and in the defense centers of Russia.

Mr. HOLLES. You say, Senator, that we're not asking them to revolt. But are we coming right out and asking them in plain and simple language to—well, that is, loaf on the job—to slow down.

Senator MUNDT. No, I think what our job primarily, Mr. Holles, is to drive a wedge of suspicion between the ordinary Russian mujik, the peasant, the workman, the shopkeeper, and the government gauleiter who goes around as one of the Communist high command, and if we can constantly keep in the minds of—say—a hundred and ninety of the hundred and ninety-five million Russians, a big suspicion that their politicians over there are not doing right by them—they'll think of their own ways of trying to get even with the Kremlin and the Communist command.

Mr. HOLLES. How are we going to impart that suspicion, though? Isn't it reasonable to believe that the Russians will have the same attitude toward our propaganda broadcast that we would have—say—in this country toward Russian propaganda?

Senator MUNDT. Not if we continue our present policy, which is to keep the broadcasts factual. What we try to do is to tell the truth about America in the conviction that the truth about America is better than any fiction that a Communist storybook writer could write about Russia, and if we establish credibility in the minds of the Russians, I think we have achieved a great deal. Now the reason it's easier to develop this suspicion on the part of the ordinary Russian against his government than it would be for the Russians to develop that kind of suspicion in our country is that here, after all, the people elect the Government, they elect the President, they elect the Senators and the Representatives; but over there every Russian knows in his heart that when the Voice of America broadcast says to him, Look Ivan, you didn't have a chance to elect your officials and explain that to them, they'll say, "We were given a ballot with just one name on it. You had to either vote for that fellow or no one." They know we're telling them the truth, and that creates a suspicion in their minds.

Mr. RICHARD. Well, Senator, we're not telling them that in the broadcasts, are we?

Senator MUNDT. I don't know as to that particular statement, but we are talking directly to Ivan, we're talking directly to Tara, we're talking directly to the Russian people, and that kind of convinced the Communist leaders, of course, to change their particular political propaganda line.

Mr. RICHARD. Well, what concrete evidence, Senator, do we have that the program's getting through to the heart of the iron curtain, Russia, itself; do we have any?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; we have evidence just like I gave you from Czechoslovakia. We have, for example, the tangible evidence which comes from our monitoring stations, where we have discovered that the Russians are today devoting twice the number of man-hours toward jamming our programs and keeping them out of Russia as compared to the amount of man-hours we're devoting to put the programs into Russia, and the Russians wouldn't be doing that if it were not for the fact that without trying to jam them, too many Russians would be hearing too many Voice of America programs.

Mr. BURNS. Senator, Gen. Bedell Smith, the former Ambassador to Moscow, testified last summer before a subcommittee here that he thought the best way to approach the Russians was through the satellite countries and through the Russians who were stationed there. As I understood his testimony, he did not think the broadcast to Russia, itself, was the most effective way of reaching the Russian people.

Senator MUNDT. Well, I think we should all keep in mind, Mr. Burns, that when we're talking about the State Department foreign information program the Voice of America is just one litle segment of the program. As you know, I was the author of the so-called Voice of America Act, and I quite agree that radio is not necessarily the most important part. I think that if you can make contacts through information libraries, if you can make contacts by sending friendly people behind the iron curtain, and all of those contribute considerably to the goal which we have in mind, and all of those are part of this whole State Department information program—I am not trying to point out that radio alone is solely the best way to proceed. For that very reason I put all these other devices in my original legislation. They are there today.

Mr. BURNS. As I understood General Smith's testimony, though, it related entirely to radio in that respect. He did not, as I recall it, mention movies or information libraries or the other things.

Senator MUNDT. If his testimony is to the effect that it's easier to convince people in the satellite countries that the Politburo in Moscow is a bunch of rascals, I think that probably is true.

Mr. BURNS. That was one of his points. As I remember, he said, 50 percent of them knew about freedom.

Senator MUNDT. That's right. They've had some experience with freedom, whereas the people of Russia, generally, have had no experience in freedom at any time in their lives.

Mr. KENT. Senator, there has been some talk about a so-called Marshall plan of ideas in the propaganda field. What do you think about that?

Senator MUNDT. I think we have it. I think in the Voice of America program you have what is equivalent to a Marshall plan of ideas because we have good cooperative working conditions with BBC in Great Britain. We get splendid cooperation from Radio Luxemburg in Luxemburg. We have some cooperation, in varying degrees, from Italy and France. The Republic of Turkey is actually sending messages behind the iron curtain, which are much more to the point, and, I think, doing a better job than the Voice of America.

REPORTER. How?

Senator MUNDT. The Republic of Turkey has constant access to people who are freshly across the border, and frequently, they put them on the microphone. They broadcast in the Russian language to their Russian neighbors, but there is always quite a time lag, of course, between the time a Russian leaves Russia and gets over to this country so he can broadcast.

REPORTER. Is that financed by Turkey, itself, or by the Marshall plan?

Senator MUNDT. Well, like most European expenditures it's financed by the Government after they get the money from us! [Laughter.]

REPORTER. Isn't it true that we are largely on the defensive on the Voice of America? Russia makes the big lie, and then we come through and deny it and say its the big lie, and then we try to put the facts straight; but we are really on the defensive, aren't we, all the time?

Senator MUNDT. I think there is a lot of validity to that criticism, and it's one of the things I mentioned in my speech on the Senate floor when I suggested we establish a Hoover Commission to study the product of the Voice of America. Certainly, I would like to have them become much more positive and get off the defensive. I quote a few words here from the editorial in the New York Times of today, for example, which says—its heading is "Strengthening the Voice"—and the concluding paragraph is this: "But reputation by itself is not enough. The Voice of America must be an enthusiastic spokesman for the traditionally American way of life." I agree completely; we should get over on the positive to the greatest extent possible. On the other hand, we must never stop answering the slanderous falsehoods that the propagandists of Moscow continuously drill into the unsuspecting ears of the people of Europe.

REPORTER. Well, that's all very well, Senator. You speak of taking the offensive and getting off the defensive; but just how do you take the offensive? What do you tell them?

Senator MUNDT. You tell them the truth about America. You tell them what it means to have trial by jury. You tell them what it means to have freedom of religion and freedom of speech. You tell them what it means when you go to a polling place to have a choice between two or three or four candidates. You tell them what private ownership means, and the thrill that you get from farming your own piece of soil instead of the state's piece of soil. That's what I mean about getting on the affirmative.

REPORTER. Ah, that seems to me like that's still defensive. You're not a part of the Russian system, which, after all they're living under, when you're doing that.

Senator MUNDT. Well, that's what I would say instead of being positive would be a program of offense, and certainly I don't object to doing that. I think that you do that, however, more successfully if there's some subtlety in connection with it. I think if it becomes too obviously propaganda that you're not nearly as successful as if you plant these seeds of doubt and suspicion in the hearts of the people behind the iron curtain as against their government, giving them a sort of a feeling of homesickness for the days when they did have a chance to go to church, when they did have a chance for private ownership, when they did have a chance for freedom of speech. I think those in the long run are more effective than to simply engage in a cantankerous argument against the philosophical and theoretical practice of communism.

Mr. BURNS. Senator, this survey commission you're proposing, does that look to making the State Department information services a permanent agency?

Senator MUNDT. It is a completely objective study. I would select the 12 best Americans available to make that study—6 of them Democrats, 6 of them Republicans; 6 of them selected from public life in the executive and legislative branch of Government, 6 from private life in the field of radio and education and newspapers. And then I would tell them to make a complete analysis of what has been done, of the needs that we must supply, and to bring back recommendations as to where they think this instrumentality should best be housed, in the State Department or some place else.

REPORTER. You spoke a moment ago disparagingly of propaganda. How would you make an agency like this—or how would you keep an agency like this from becoming—a propaganda bureau?

Senator MUNDT. Simply by making it a showcase through which the rest of the world can look and see what's happening in America, without trying to color the truth or to gild the lily; simply letting them see us as we are.

Mr. RICHARD. Senator, before this program gets over I wanted to ask you, How do the people back in your home State of South Dakota regard the Voice of America program and your interest in it?

Senator MUNDT. Well, as you know, I was the author of the Voice of America bill when it passed the House—and it was during the Eightieth Congress—and cochairman of the committee along with Senator SMITH of New Jersey that took a group of Senators and Congressmen to Europe to study the needs for it over there, so that the legislation bears

the name the Smith-Mundt Act. People back home certainly know of my interest in it, and I would say that, by and large, regardless of party affiliation, the people of South Dakota, and the Midwest generally, are supporters of the whole Voice of America and the conviction that the best way to attain peace is to cultivate and capture the minds of men in the countries of the world who might otherwise become our enemies.

REPORTER. Now, is your thinking on this typical of Republican thinking, particularly Midwest Republican thinking?

Senator MUNDT. I think so. I think it's typical of Midwest Republican thinking and pretty much typical of Midwest Democratic thinking, too; that midwesterners are generally inclined to believe that the spoken word is mightier than the sword, and that if we engage in an intelligent foreign policy, if we engage in the fine art of trying to win friends abroad, we're not as likely going to have a war and to kill each other off in a conflict.

Mr. KENT. Senator, a moment ago you spoke of propaganda. I gather that you would not like to see the Voice of America become an agency such as the British Broadcasting Co. that is in liaison with the Foreign Office but acts independently of them and I think is acknowledged to be one of the better propaganda instruments in the Western World.

Senator MUNDT. That's right. In the first place I don't want to see radio in this country run by the Government. I don't like the idea of the BBC situation because the whole radio network over there is a socialistic enterprise. In the second place, I believe that the State Department has acted wisely in bringing in as many private enterprises as they have who work in liaison with the State Department, preparing programs and writing scripts and helping to set up different kinds of programs. I think, from the standpoint of propaganda, that so long as we're not in a shooting war against a country we should continue to tell the truth. Once you're involved in a war, then you get into the field of psychological warfare, where anything goes that helps to win the conflict.

Mr. HOLLES. Senator MUNDT, you spoke a moment ago of the fact that our Voice of America broadcasts should be rather subtle. Russia has been rather successful in her propaganda around the world, particularly in the Far East, has she not?

Senator MUNDT. On the contrary, Russia has failed to take over a single country of the world by the volition of the people in that country——

REPORTER'S VOICE. That's not by any means subtle, is it?

Senator MUNDT. No; she has made her conquest by conspiracy, by intrigue, and by aggression. What we're trying to do is appeal to the minds of men, and I don't want it [Voice program] to develop a degree of subtlety so that the fellow of average intelligence can't understand it; but neither do I want it to become so blunt that anybody up and down the highway will recognize that as obviously being western propaganda.

MODERATOR. Thank you, gentlemen. Three prize-winning questions from the listening audience are to be selected. Senator MUNDT will answer the three questions.

Question from Oliver V. Kessler, of Stroudsburg, Va.: The Voice of America recently devoted a 15-minute program to dog cemeteries in the United States, telling of $500 funerals and $1,000 tombstones for dogs. Is that the way to sell democracy?

Senator MUNDT. I wouldn't think that would be the best way to sell democracy, Mr. Holles, but I don't see anything particularly wrong with letting the rest of the world know that over here we do consider that a man's best friend is his dog, and that we are willing to pay some tribute to the dog. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLES. From Joseph K. Kidder, of La Crosse, Wis.: If the Voice of America used Senator MCCARTHY'S charges against the State Department on its broadcasts, would it raise or lower this country's prestige with the people whom we're trying to influence?

Senator MUNDT. I think that would depend in part, of course, upon the auditors in the country that we're trying to influence. I am confident, however, that it would raise the prestige of the Voice of America programs from the standpoint of their credibility because they would recognize that the State Department was willing to broadcast information which obviously was unpleasant to the members of the State Department.

Mr. HOLLES. From David E. Ferrin, of Johnstown, R. I.: It's been said that one of the Voice of America's main faults is that it overemphasizes the material wealth of America. Is this true?

Senator MUNDT. I think that that is a pretty valid criticism, and that frequently in the past we have tended to place too much emphasis upon the fact that every American can be riding in an automobile at the same time, and that a great many Americans have electrical refrigeration in their kitchens and have central heat in their homes, and there's constantly the necessity of analyzing and appraising these programs to gear them down to the type of civilization in which our listeners are living—talking about conveniences and comforts which they may some day hope to have right in their own locality and in their own foreign cities.

Tribute to the Late Edgar Rickard by Belgian American Educational Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 21st day of January last, there died in San Francisco one of America's leading citizens. Mr. Edgar Rickard, who was closely identified with former President Hoover during Mr. Hoover's entire life and public career, and was a symbol of cooperative action that meant much to the United States at the time of World War I and the periods between World War I and World War II.

As one of the originators, with Mr. Hoover, of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, which saved the Belgian people in World War I, Mr. Rickard continued to be the rallying voice for all the important educational and relief work that followed World War I in Belgium and other countries of Europe. During his entire life Mr. Rickard had a devoted group of friends, many of whom have been active since World War I in public life.

As Edgar Rickard's principal activity was the Belgian American Educational Foundation, which was set up after the close of World War I, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the minutes of that Foundation on the occasion of Mr. Rickard's death, and the resolution adopted at a special meeting held in New York City on January 23.

There being no objection, the minutes and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Belgian American Educational Foundation announced the death of its chairman, Edgar Rickard, in San Francisco on January 21, 1951. Mr. Rickard had been an original incorporator in 1920, and successively secretary, vice president, president, and chairman of the foundation.

Mr. Rickard was a retired mining engineer who had practiced his profession in the United States, Alaska, Tasmania, and Mexico from 1896 to 1905, when he became a publisher of mining journals in San Francisco and in London.

With the outbreak of World War I he joined with his fellow Californian, Herbert Hoover, in the organization and management of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, which continued until the end of active operations in 1919. This Commission was the first large-scale relief effort in wartime, and its operations set a standard for later relief work in subsequent years and in many countries.

With the entry of the United States into the war in 1917 Mr. Rickard joined the newly organized United States Food Administration, serving as Assistant Administrator in 1918 and Acting Food Administrator in 1918–19. He was active in the work of the American Relief Administration during the armistice and postwar periods and was a member of the Purchasing Commission for Russian Relief in 1921–22 by appointment of the President. This Commission purchased wheat, corn, and other grains valued at over $18,000,000 in this country for use in the Russian famine areas where the distribution was supervised by the American Relief Administration.

Mr. Rickard was active in a number of postwar relief and welfare organizations in association with Mr. Hoover, but he held no official Government office during Mr. Hoover's years of public service other than that mentioned above.

A special meeting of the Belgian American Educational Foundation was called on January 23, 1951, to take appropriate action. At the meeting were Herbert Hoover, honorary chairman; Perrin C. Galpin, president; Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission; John L. Simpson, financier; W. Hallam Tuck, formerly Director of International Refugee Organization; Maurice Pate, Director of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; Sidney A. Mitchell, former associate in the Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government; Scott Turner, mining engineer; Edwin P. Shattuck, attorney; and Clark Stillman, secretary of the foundation. Absent due to official duties was United States Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

The resolution adopted at that special meeting was as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON EDGAR RICKARD

"*Resolved*, That the members of the executive and finance committees of the Belgian American Educational Foundation, assembled in a special joint meeting in New York City on January 23, 1951, hereby record their deep sense of loss at the death of Edgar Rickard, chairman of the board of directors, on January 21, 1951, in San Francisco, Calif.

"At this meeting the following minute was approved and entered on the permanent records of the foundation:

"A member of the Commission for Relief in Belgium from its inception in October

1914, our friend and associate, Edgar Rickard, gave continuous devoted and loyal service to the work of the Commission and its successor organization, the Belgian American Educational Foundation, during more than 36 years until his death. In addition Mr. Rickard served as Mr. Hoover's chief aide and assistant in the United States Food Administration and the American Relief Administration during World War I and all the overseas and war service organizations and their successor associations that followed. No one gave greater fullness of devotion to his chief and to the operations of these service organizations—no one gave more of himself to aid his friends and to help young men and women advance to positions of trust and responsibility. He gave such inspiration to men and women that his associates responded with their best efforts to further any undertaking with which they were concerned. His sound practical judgment and his true modesty combined with his personal charm made him a delightful companion and a valued friend.

"Devoted to his country, to his profession, to his friends, he lived a full life and his passing will be mourned by all whose paths crossed him during his active and rewarding life."

Overloading of Commercial Trucks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Interstate Commerce Commissioner James K. Knudson, the head of the Defense Transportation Administration, shocked the Nation 2 weeks ago when he invited State officials to approve the overloading of commercial trucks in the name of national defense. Just how many crimes are to be committed in the sacred name of national defense?

Every schoolboy knows that overloaded trucks traveling at high speeds are destroying American highways faster than we can build them. The State highway departments are bleeding the passenger-car motorists white to get money to build good highways. The motorists do not object to these high taxes, because they know that building good highways is directly in the interest of national defense in a very important degree. But it is pretty discouraging to them to build good highways for Mr. Knudson to destroy by arbitrary and unwarranted bureaucratic orders from his Ivory Dome Room in Washington.

I hope the States will resist this selfish conspiracy to destroy our greatest national defense asset. Surely truck lines do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs for them. No one should be more active in protecting the highways than they.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by James Daniel which appeared in the Washington Daily News today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO LET'S CHANGE THE RULES—DTA CONSULTANT'S FIRM VIOLATED LAW 665 TIMES

(By James Daniel)

John L. Fraley, adviser to James K. Knudson, head of the Defense Transportation Administration (DTA), is on leave from a trucking firm which has been caught in 665 violations of Virginia's truck weight laws.

Mr. Fraley was assistant to the president of the Carolina Freight Carriers Corp. of Cherryville, N. C. Now he is "consultant on street and highway maintenance" to Mr. Knudson.

And Mr. Knudson, as head of the DTA, recently wrote to all State governors urging, for the sake of national defense, that they ease up on their truck weigut laws in order to speed up the movement of truck cargo.

Mr. Fraley was one of three DTA officials present when the letter was discussed. The others were Mr. Knudson and Joseph E. Keller, an attorney who is advising Mr. Knudson on removal of "trade barriers."

DISCUSSED LETTER

Mr. Keller said that he wrote the letter and discussed it in his home with Mr. Knudson and Mr. Fraley.

J. A. Anderson, chief of the Virginia highway department, said Mr. Fraley's company had been caught 665 times since 1940 with trucks loaded above the legal limits.

Violations since the war accounted for 486 of the offenses.

ONLY A FRACTION

Mr. Anderson said since only a fraction of the trucks passing through Virginia in that period were stopped and weighed, so the total of 665 overloads may not have been all.

Mr. Fraley came to work in Washington in January.

He said his title as consultant on street and highway maintenance had been misunderstood. "I just deal with the maintenance of vehicles using the streets and highways," he said. "I advise Mr. Knudson on things he wants to be advised on."

Mr. Fraley said he met his Government boss last September while serving as his host at a North Carolina truckers convention. About that time Mr. Knudson, an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, was appointed to perform the transportation duties arising from the Defense Production Act. By his own decree, Mr. Knudson then created the Defense Transportation Administration, with himself as head.

KEPT HIM COMFORTABLE

The head of the company for which Mr. Fraley worked was also president of the North Carolina Truckers Association.

"Four or five of us were assigned to kind of keep Mr. Knudson comfortable," Mr. Fraley recalled.

Mr. Fraley said the next thing he knew, he was invited to come join Mr. Knudson's staff. "I didn't ask for the job," he said.

Mr. Fraley, who is 30, rose from a private to captain in World War II and later started a knitwear business in North Carolina. He gave that up and went to Germany to manage a hotel for the occupation forces. In 1949 he joined the trucking firm as a salesman and traffic generator.

BASED IN STATE

Many big east coast trucking firms are headquartered in North Carolina, which has milder truck laws than some other States. Recently a move in the North Carolina Legislature to bring the State's code into line with Virginia's and the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials was stalled by a telegram from Mr. Knudson.

Virginia Highway Director Anderson is currently head of the American Association of State Highway Officials, which is leading a fight against the DTA. The highway officials say the DTA is trying to break down the enforcement of State truck laws. Mr. Anderson said he now has round-the-clock weighing stations on four of the five main north-south routes and occasional weighing stations at 40 other Virginia points.

PRIVATE CARS WATCH

He said the truckers have private cars traveling the State highways at all times spotting the weighing points and werning truck drivers up and down the line. Many filling stations and roadside restaurant operators also warn truckers of weighing operations. Not long ago a State highway employee was suspected of being bribed to give out weighing schedules a week in advance. He was dismissed.

Mr. Anderson said individual truck drivers now are assisting the enforcement program. He said his department recently was telephoned by a driver for a Carolina concern that he was coming in with a 72,000-pound load (Virginia maximum for a four-axle truck is 50,000) and was tired of being told to travel back roads at night. The driver spilled the employing company's entire plan of operations, producing a fresh haul of violators.

Common Sense Versus Legalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that most of my colleagues are familiar with the excellent work performed by the Washington staff of the Christian Science Monitor, a great international daily newspaper. Day after day this bureau, like its counterparts elsewhere, reports clearly and quite objectively on the great events of our Nation's Capital.

There may be times when we disagree with specific editorial views of the Monitor, but I doubt that there is any Senator who questions the refreshing, constructive approach which this newspaper takes in both domestic and foreign affairs.

At times the Monitor has disagreed with me personally, at times it has agreed, but throughout my entire period in the Congress I have always read it with respect and with tremendous interest.

I have a copy of an article entitled "Common Sense Versus Legalism," written in the Tuesday, March 20, issue, by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington bureau. This article endorses my interpretation of the basic questions at stake in the present foreign-policy debate.

I am grateful for that endorsement, not so much because it relates to me personally, but rather because I think it helps focus attention, as many of us have sought to do, on the actual points at issue.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harsch's article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

COMMON SENSE VERSUS LEGALISM

WASHINGTON.—One of our quieter and less talkative Senators, ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, deserves credit, I think, for listening to others present their dialectical points through long weeks of debate over the troops-to-Europe issue and coming out finally with a reduction of the problem to common sense.

The legal issue, he points out, is not over whether the President has power to send troops to Europe. It is, rather, over whether the President has the power under the North Atlantic Treaty to put American forces into an international army under an international commander without the consent of the Congress.

The issue goes back to article 3 of the treaty. The article pledges that the United States and other signatories "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."

Under the Constitution, Senator WILEY points out, a treaty is binding on the United States as law. It takes precedence over domestic laws. The North Atlantic Treaty has been ratified by the Senate. It is, therefore, the law of the land.

If article 3 had obligated the United States specifically to commit its troops to an international army to be set up under the treaty, then the President would have not only the right but the obligation to send American troops to such an army. However, the treaty was not explicit as to details of implementation. The furthest it goes is to "require" the signatories to "develop" their "collective capacity to resist armed attack."

Some supporters of the President contend that this requirement to develop "collective capacity to resist armed attack" is in itself sufficient not only to permit but even to require the President to send more troops to Europe. However, this is a matter of interpretation

And it is a fact that in the debates over the treaty spokesmen for the administration declared that the sending of United States ground troops to Europe was not contemplated. Therefore, the decision to increase the number of United States troops in Europe and to put them under an international command goes beyond what Congress contemplated at the time it ratified the treaty.

There is no doubt about the constitutional power of the President to send United States Armed Forces outside the United States. Senator WILEY pointed out that not once in the entire debate has anyone criticized the President for sending United States naval and Air Forces to many places outside the United States. He makes the point also that if the President ordered American ground troops to Germany to implement the occupation there could not be the slightest basis for legal protests.

As Commander in Chief, the President can send American Armed Forces anywhere he chooses. However, Congress also has the power to strangulate such a policy by withholding appropriations.

The nub of the question, therefore, is untouched either by the constitutional power of the President to send troops where he deems it necessary, or of the Congress to check the President by withholding appropriations if it disagrees with the President's action. It is touched by the question of duties under the Atlantic treaty.

Without that treaty there could be no legal or valid North Atlantic army under General Eisenhower's command. The only valid legal question is over the President's right to commit American forces to that command. Doubt about that question will be removed if the Senate approves the pending resolutions. Those resolutions will not have the force of law. But they will express congressional approval of what the President intends to do.

What emerges from the debate, therefore, will not be an agreement between President and Congress on respective authority. It rather will be Congress challenging the right of the President to act alone, but approving what he is doing; while the President will be denying the right of Congress to interfere, but happily accepting a resolution approving what he is doing.

There will be no resolution of the irresolvable constitutional issue. There will be agreement, in effect, on the course to be taken.

Regulation of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent statement submitted by the American Jewish Congress to the Joint Committee on Immigration in regard to two pending omnibus bills under consideration by the joint committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS ON THE MCCARRAN-WALTER OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION PILLS (S. 716 AND H. R. 2379) SUBMITTED TO JOINT SENATE-HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The American Jewish Congress is an association of American Jews committed to the preservation and extension of the democratic way of life and to the assurance of the fundamental freedoms of man through the elimination of all forms of political, social, and economic discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. Our concern with the nature of the immigration laws of this country is rooted both in our general concern with the quality of American democracy and the nature of our organization.

The immigration laws of any society both reflect and shape its fundamental character. Freedom of movement, both of emigration and immigration, have long been recognized as among the most fundamental of human freedoms; it is the hallmark of totalitarianism that it seeks rigidly to limit the free movement of people. It seeks to deny its own subjects the freedom to live elsewhere. It seeks to deny to others access to its soil or any contact with its peoples. Conversely, it is the very essence of democracy that people should be free to choose where they wish to live or those with whom they prefer to associate.

Immigration laws crystallize and express a society's basic human values, for they deal with our relationship to people other than our immediate neighbors. Such laws affirm the degree of our acceptance or rejection of the essential equality of all human beings. They codify our prejudices or our freedom from prejudice. They reveal the measure of correspondence between our professed ideals and our actual practices. Because the American Jewish Congress is profoundly concerned with the maintenance and reaffirmation of our democratic heritage, we are inevitably concerned with the character of our immigration legislation.

Our concern, however, is rooted as well in the particular character of our organization. The American Jewish Congress was founded more than 30 years ago by men who, like the late Stephen Wise, were born in lands other than the United States or who, like the late Justice Louis Brandeis were the descendants of immigrants to these shores. We take deep pride in the contributions which such men have made to the enrichment of American life and freedom; we are gratified that our movement has steadfastly and, we believe, significantly, served and helped to fashion America's highest ideals. That unique and intimate experience has strengthened our adherence to, and enables us to testify to the validity of, the most fundamental of American tenets: that a person's loyalty and service to America and its principles are measured by his character and ideals rather than determined by his biological or geographic origin.

The American Jewish Congress regards it as highly desirable that the proposed codification of our basic immigration laws set forth in the McCarran-Walter bills should be made the occasion for a comprehensive revaluation of our immigration laws. Indeed, such revaluation is long overdue. There has been no systematic consideration of our basic immigration policies since 1911 when the Immigration Commission created by Congress concluded its 4-year study (S. Doc. 758, 61st Cong., 3d sess.). A great deal has happened in America and the world since that time. We have learned that democracy cannot remain static and maintain its vitality. We have come to understand the subtle and devious methods through which democracy can be corrupted and undermined, even unwittingly. We have acquired new responsibilities in a world of nations. It is therefore mandatory that we examine the concepts at the heart of our immigration policies for the past quarter of a century to see whether they adequately express the democratic principles it is the duty of this country to affirm and to practice and to ascertain whether the proposed legislation conforms to such principles.

What has been our basic immigration policy? That policy, enacted in 1924, has become known as the national origins quota system. Under its provisions, a total of about 150,000 people was to be admitted to this country each year, with a maximum quota fixed for each country. Exceptions were made of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, to which no numerical limitations were attached and most Asiatic countries whose inhabitants were in effect completely barred from admission. Quotas were to range from 100 to 65,000 (the latter the quota for Great Britain) and each country's quota was based on the percentage of persons of that national origin resident in the United States in 1920.

That formula was no legislative accident. It was deliberately designed to limit the number of immigrants from South and East Europe and to encourage the immigration of Englishmen, Irishmen, and Germans. The theory on which it rested was compounded of bigotry and ignorance—that people from certain lands, particularly Great Britain and Germany, possessed hereditary qualities which made them highly desirable additions to our population, while others were less desirable because they were likely because of their national origin to prove less assimilable.

There was thus enacted into American law a racist concept based on what the minority report of the Immigration Commission at that time correctly termed "an unfounded anthropological concept."

No scientific evidence worthy of consideration was introduced at the time to support that racist theory. It was clear then, and men like Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes and Rabbi Stephen Wise emphasized the fact, that the racist concept which was elevated to the status of law, flagrantly violated the fundamental principles of American democracy. America's most distinctive and creative contribution to the world has not been the automobile or the radio, the atom bomb, or even the television screen. It has been the affirmation of the basic equality of all human beings, an affirmation whose increasing translation into law and public practice has constituted America's greatness. The eloquent affirmation of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" was never intended to be translated as "all Americans" or "all Anglo-Saxons." It expressed the cardinal democratic belief that all persons were to be regarded as equally capable of intelligence, freedom, and social usefulness, that every individual could claim the right to be judged on his own merits. The immigration policy enacted in 1924 was a repudiation of that doctrine, for it asserted that persons in quest of the opportunity to live in this land were to be judged according to breed like cattle at a country fair and not on the basis of their character, fitness, or capacity.

Scientific study and social experience have surely withered those racist fictions with the finality of an atomic blast. The findings of science must force even the most prejudiced among us to accept as unqualifiedly as we do the law of gravity that intelligence, morality, and character bear no relationship whatever to geography or place of birth. Mental or moral characteristics cannot be associated with race, however broadly or narrowly that dubious concept is interpreted, or with national origin. It is highly paradoxical, to say the least, that America, which prides itself on its loyalty to the dictates of scientific knowledge and discovery, should continue to base so significant a portion of its legal and legislative structure on foundations thoroughly and irrevocably corroded by scientific finding.

Social experience, no less than scientific study, reinforces that conclusion. The experience of two wars has amply demonstrated that no national group can claim a monopoly on loyalty to America and to its ideals; people of all national origins have contributed inspiringly to its defense and to its enrichment. Indeed, time has made nonsense out of that 1924 policy, even in its own terms. It may not be without interest to remind ourselves that a land whose inhabitants were in 1924 regarded as among the most desirable acquisitions to America ushered in the most devastating war in human history, murdered millions of people in fulfillment of its own racist doctrine, and sought to wipe democracy and human freedom off the face of the globe.

The laboratory which is this Nation itself has offered the most persuasive rebuttal of the 1924 doctrine. America's richness has not been merely our material resources, amply endowed though we are. It has been, even more, our diversity of peoples and cultures and our unique ability to fashion a creative national unity out of that diversity. That has proved to be our strength as well as our richness. Totalitarianism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction through the mechanical uniformity it seeks to impose, for imposed uniformity must ultimately result in social and human degeneration. Uniformity can emerge not only from legal or physical coercion, but as a result of rigidly limiting the human resources on which we should be free to draw. The "American type" has not been nourished at a single fount; it has drawn from many springs, and it must continue to draw from many springs if it is to be enriched—indeed, if it is to remain healthy.

Our knowledge and experience, as well as our historic traditions, therefore should have long made mandatory the abrogation of the national origins system as the basis of our immigration policy. Both the moral imperative and the practical necessity of bringing our national practices into conformity with our democratic professions should have required the formulation of an alternative approach such as we shall later suggest.

Unfortunately, neither the McCarran bill (S. 716) nor the Walter bill (H. R. 2379) make any such effort. Both measures merely tinker with the application of the 1924 doctrine. But they accept that doctrine wholly and unreservedly and would leave untouched in our law a racial anachronism that blemishes our national record. They would, in effect, reaffirm the 1924 repudiation of our fundamental democratic concept. They would reveal that we have learned nothing in a quarter of a century, that our prejudices have remained untarnished by the light of knowledge. They would retain the qualifications which the act of 1924 introduced into the Declaration of Independence.

Such action, under any circumstances, would scarcely do this country credit. Under present conditions, the enactment of such measures will gravely impair the national effort we are putting forth. For we are engaged in a war for the minds and hearts of men. The free nations of the world look to us not only for material aid and armed might. They turn to us for moral and spiritual reinforcement at a time when the faith which moves men is as important as the force they wield. Our responsibilities of world leadership require us not to reassert our moral errors but to expunge them. We seek to embrace the world in a companionship of free peoples, demanding as a qualification nothing more than a common abhorrence of authoritarianism. We cannot expect such companionship to be freely and eagerly given if we announce that we continue to repudiate more than half the human race, as we repudiated it in 1924, on no grounds other than geography and national origin.

These bills, however, go beyond even the retention of the national origins system. They continue to base the national quotas on the 1920 census, ignoring any changes since that date in the composition of the American population. They thus affirm, with emphasis, the spurious anthropology and the genuine prejudice of the 1924 act.

Even within these limitations, they would more rigorously limit entry to this country by the provisions they embody. Both propose a restrictive system of priorities for the distribution of visas to prospective immigrants. The McCarran bill provides that 50 percent of the visas under any national quota be allocated to persons whose technological proficiency or special skills are urgently needed in the United States, while the Walter bill suggests an allocation of 30 percent to such persons. Thus, for a very substantial number of persons who might enter this country, there is added to the existing qualification of national origin, a new qualification, that of exceptional skill. The basic motivation of our immigration system is thus transformed from its life-giving and life-saving quality into a device for extracting maximum industrial benefit from our immigrant potential. It is, of course, unchallengeable that such skilled persons will constitute a valuable addition to our population. But it is difficult to escape the conviction that restriction of entry rather than the entry of skilled persons is the dominant purpose, certainly of the McCarran bill. For, if the 50-percent quota allocated to skilled personnel is not used, those visas cannot be used for other immigrants, even of the same national origin.

While there are other restrictive provisions in these measures, we do not intend to dwell on them in detail. We do, however, wish emphatically to point out that certain sections of S. 716 and H. R. 2379 embody, in addition to the quota provisions, racist features repugnant to our traditions of equality. Under section 202 (a) of both bills, an alien born within the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle and an alien born outside that triangle but attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle is chargeable to the quota of the country of his ancestry or, if no such quota exists, to the special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 whose establishment is proposed. This section represents a slight measure of advance in that it extends quota visas, however limited in number, to Asiatic countries for the first time. The advance is more than cancelled out, however, by the fact that the section applies a far harsher test to those who originate from the triangle. Here eligibility is required to be determined not by place of birth but by blood and ancestry. We are thus in effect announcing to the millions of inhabitants of that area that we are continuing arbitrarily to attach an onus to their racial identity and that, as far as this country is concerned, they will never escape that onus, no matter to what ends of the earth they or their children may migrate. That section canonizes a primitive and irrational belief that character and capacity are functions of blood and ancestry. At a time when Asia has become the battleground on which democracy and communism vie for the loyalties of millions of men, the enactment of such a discriminatory and primitivist measure would represent for us a defeat more calamitous than a reversal on the field of battle. That defeat would not be rendered more endurable or less catastrophic because it would have been self-invited and self-inflicted.

In addition to these racist provisions, both measures reflect a hostility, unconscious or otherwise, toward immigrants and naturalized citizens, a grudging reluctance to accept the alien as a full-fledged member of the American community and an inclination to interpose barriers in the path of his total and ultimate acceptance. That attitude is clearly revealed in section 312 of the proposed bills which, unlike earlier immigration laws, provides that petitioners for naturalization must be able to read and write as well as to speak the English language. In the light of the successful naturalization of hundreds of thousands of immigrants who were admitted to citizenship on showing that they understood English without being required to demonstrate their ability to read or write it, this section becomes an arbitrary and unnecessary withholding of the privilege of citizenship from deserving residents. For many, if not the majority of, immigrants are adults, relatively advanced in years, and it has long been acknowledged that writing, particularly, is a skill difficult to acquire in adulthood. Nor can such a provision be defended as serving the best interests of this country. The media of mass communication, the multilanguage press of this country make it fully possible for anyone to familiarize himself with our political and social problems without requiring the ability to write. The provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 requiring as qualifications for naturalization only the ability to understand and to speak English are fully adequate.

Sections 103 and 104 of the McCarran bill, requiring that the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Administrator of the Bureau of Passports.

Visas, Security, and Consular Affairs shall be native-born citizens of the United States are gratuitously insulting and offensive not only to all naturalized citizens, but to all Americans who recognize no gradations in citizenship or any automatic category of unreliables. This provision introduces a concept of second-class citizenship abhorrent to American tradition and principle. H. R. 2379 contains no comparable provision.

One other provision of both bills similiarly attempts to relegate naturalized citizens to an inferior status by depriving them of rights accorded native citizens. Section 352 (a) (2) continues the discriminatory expatriation clause of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 which makes mandatory loss of nationality by a naturalized citizen who resides continuously for 5 years in any foreign state, although native-born citizens may reside anywhere for any length of time without penalty. This section, as the American Jewish Congress pointed out in a brief in the case of *Lapides* v. *Clark*, submitted to the United States Supreme Court, derives directly from a bureaucratic antagonism to American Jews supporting the Zionist ideal of the rebuilding of a Jewish homeland. Testimony by Government officials at the hearings on the section which ultimately became section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act made it clear that the provision stemmed from a desire to dissuade naturalized American Jews from subscribing to a deeply held ideal which some officials in contravention of American policy regarded as undesirable rather than from an effort to deter or punish the commission of fraudulent or illegal acts. To the extent that this statute is directed at narrowing freedoms belonging to American citizens, it constitutes an unwarranted invasion of those rights which indisputably belong to all citizens, whether native born or naturalized. It should be repealed.

The American Jewish Congress, therefore, urges the rejection of the omnibus bills under consideration because they retain the national origins system of 1924, based then on prejudice and ignorance and based today, in defiance of all scientific knowledge, on prejudice alone. We further urge their rejection because they incorporate provisions restrictive even within the national-origins system, because they introduce new concepts of racism and because they seek, in certain respects, to deny to naturalized Americans the full rights and privileges of citizenship.

This public reexamination of our immigration policies will render useful service to America if it prevents the enactment of the two measures now being considered. But we should regard it as an error, possibly less serious than the enactment of these measures but scarcely less lamentable, if this reexamination failed to result in the formulation of a new immigration policy superseding the national origins quota system.

It has long been our view that such a system can be formulated which is in full conformity with our democratic principles and which is politically and administratively practicable. Nor are we advocating, whatever our views on present numerical limitations on entry into this country, the reestablishment of the earlier American practice of free and unrestricted admission. A system consonant with democratic traditions can be established within the framework of whatever numerical limits may at any time govern the rate of entry. Thus, for example, existing laws provide for an annual issuance of slightly more than 150,000 visas per year. Assuming the maintenance of that limitation for the present time, full and adequate safeguards exist to prevent the kind of abuse which it is sometimes suggested would follow the abolition of the national origins system. The laws provide minimum conditions for admission with regard to the health, financial support, loyalty, and moral qualifications of the prospective immigrants. These laws provide ample assurance that persons mentally, politically, or morally unfit would not be permitted to enter.

We can therefore find no substantial reason for refusal to adopt a plan which would make the total number of visas apportionable to all quota countries available to immigrants in order of their applications without distinction as to place of birth, subject to their ability to satisfy all other eligibility requirements. Such a plan would constitute the most direct and effective method of expunging from our immigration laws the inequities, implied prejudices, and racial connotations of the national origins system. Individual character, need, and merit, rather than geography or biology, would once again become the factors governing admission to this country. The result, as we have indicated, need not necessarily be a greater volume of immigration, but it would certainly produce more equitable immigration.

Nor would this system present any insuperable administrative difficulties. The present British quota, for example, is 65,000 per year. Within that quota, nonpreference visas are issued on the basis of priority in filing, and there have obviously been no insurmountable difficulties in the administration of that quota. There is no reason why it should not be equally feasible to administer a system based on priority of application for a total number of visas slightly more than twice the size of the British quota.

Within such a system, it is equally feasible to establish certain limited preferences and priorities for such categories as near relatives of citizens or legal residents of the United States and victims of racial, religious, or political persecution, preferences whose purpose and effect would not be restrictive but, on the contrary, would constitute a fulfillment of the humanitarian character of immigration. To give even greater flexibility to the program, emergency situations could be handled by Executive order creating special priorities within the nonpreference classes.

We are not naive enough to believe that abolition of the national origins system will prove an easy task. Its acceptance as an integral part of our national pattern is reflected by the fact that none of the legislation under consideration suggests its modification, let alone its elimination. On the contrary, these measures seek to impose further rigidities and inequities in its operation. Thus, vital legislation rooted deeply in antidemocratic concepts and prejudice can become deeply embedded in our national consciousness, affecting not only the areas of social concern it is intended to regulate but corrupting thought and practice over widening areas of our national life.

During the course of these hearings, certain suggestions will be made by spokesmen for major national Jewish organizations for the amelioration of some of the harshest consequences of the national origins system. While, in our view, those suggestions leave the heart of the problem untouched, we fully associate ourselves with them. One of the most unfortunate aspects of the existing system is that visas assigned to a particular country which are unused by the end of the year cannot be utilized for any other persons. Thus, a staggering number of quota places theoretically available for immigrants have been unused and lost each year. While only 836,085 quota immigrants were admitted to this country between 1930–49, it is estimated that 2,240,169 quota members supposedly available during that period were lost. (S. Rept. No. 1515, p. 890.) That has occurred not because of a dearth of qualified immigrant applicants throughout the world but because the national origins plan, through its own system of gerrymandering, provided the largest quotas for countries with the least pressure for migration.

We therefore fully endorse the proposal that a pooling system be established whereby unused quota numbers will be distributed on a nonnational basis, either in accordance with priority of filing or some secondary system of priorities. While this pooling system would fail to erase the racist overtones of the national origins plan, it would help relax some of its most objectionable effects and introduce, in somewhat limited form, the allocation of visas without reference to national origin or place of birth.

Under a pooling arrangement, preferred status might be granted, as we have suggested earlier, to victims of persecution, close relatives of citizens or residents or persons with special occupational qualifications. A bill incorporating these suggestions was introduced in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress (S. 3950). That measure provided for the pooling of unused national quota visas and the allocation of 25 percent to skilled specialists, 25 percent for the purpose of reuniting families, 25 percent for persecutees, and 25 percent for a nonpreference class in order of the registration of applicants. Enactment of such a measure is surely the least which any body reexamining our immigration policies and procedures may reasonably be expected to recommend.

The growth of the American ideal has been the record of the triumph of great ideas over small men. At various times in our history, men of limited vision have sought to interpose barriers in the path of the fulfillment of the promise of American democracy. Occasionally, they have had momentary victories. But they have proved unable to withstand, for any appreciable period of time, the dynamic of the idea that is America. Probably no success they have achieved, however, has been more fateful or long-lived than the enactment of the national origins quota system in 1924 when bigotry replaced knowledge and the justice of humanitarianism gave way to the expediency of prejudice in a significant area of American life and law.

The acceptance of American leadership throughout the world during the past few decades has been a tribute not to the growth of American might; other powerful nations have failed to win such leadership. It has been, rather, a tribute to the strength of the American idea. Impairment of that idea will inevitably mean impairment of our capacity, if not limitation of our right, to give such moral leadership. Such impairment is serious enough when it occurs in any aspect of our national life. But it becomes critical when, as in the present instance, it affects our relationship and expresses our attitude to our fellow human beings throughout the world. The national origins system of 1924 was such an impairment. Its continuance for a quarter of a century has sharpened, rather than dulled, its impact. Its reaffirmation today would be more than an impairment; it would constitute a political and moral catastrophe.

Today, we seek to rally nations of the world to the cause of democracy and freedom through the Voice of America. We firmly believe that the soul of America would serve to rally the peoples of the world more spontaneously and effectively. And nothing could more dramatically reveal the genuine soul of America than the abrogation of the national origins quota system of 1924, so offensive to millions of the people whose partnership and cooperation we are seeking in order to maintain inviolate the ideals on which this country has been built.

Boss of Army Base Here Calls Borough Tops for Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Brooklyn has proudly proclaimed the accomplishments of many of its native sons. We are just as proud when we can proclaim the accomplishments of men who have come to Brooklyn from other places.

On March 18, 1951, the Brooklyn Eagle chose Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo as "Brooklyn's man of the week." It was an excellent choice. General Lastayo has done a remarkable job at the New York Port of Embarkation in Brooklyn. He is highly respected by all who have come in contact with him.

As he says, he likes Brooklyn; on behalf of Brooklyn, I am glad to say that Brooklyn likes him.

The following is the article about him as it appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle.

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—BOSS OF ARMY BASE HERE CALLS BOROUGH TOPS FOR LIVING

(By Jeanne Toomey)

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Lastayo, commander of the New York Port of Embarkation, including the Brooklyn Army Base, has seen the world, but he still ranks Brooklyn tops as a place to live.

Ask why he was selected for West Point from the New Jersey National Guard in July of 1918, he will answer mildly, "On the basis of service."

"Hard work, not romance," is the way he sums up 34 years of military duty.

A handsome, quiet-spoken man of 53, General Lastayo lives at Fort Hamilton with his wife, the former Virginia H. Dillard, of Chattanooga, Tenn. He has two married daughters—Ann, whose husband, Lt. John D. Howard, is serving with the Third Division in Korea, and Virginia, wife of Shane Riordan, of Dobbs Ferry, a former infantry sergeant.

BOSSES ATC'S BIGGEST BASE

Head of the largest United States installation of the Army's Transportation Corps, General Lastayo describes himself as "not a combat soldier," and has no recollection of any "exciting moments" in his career.

Tracing his life, however, shows this statement to be dictated by reserve rather accuracy.

He transferred from the Field Artillery in 1942 after 22 years with that branch and left with an invasion convey for his Transportation Corps assignment in England. From May to October of that year he commanded the Third Port at the Bristol Channel Ports, England. In November he left for north Africa.

"We took over the port of Oran and operated it until March 1943," he said in his office at the Army base the other day. General Lastayo commanded the port during that period. Later he was transportation officer for both the Mediterranean and Peninsula base sections. Charged with the loading of invasion forces and the landing and transporting of men, equipment and supplies as chief of transportation of the Mediterranean theater of operations, the Army chief had an unparalleled opportunity to study and appraise American youth.

His conclusion? "I think that, on an average, the boys of today are the same as the boys I was with in 1917 and 1918."

With this attitude, the General is understandably popular with his subordinates at the Army base.

LOADED ANZIO INVADERS

While in Italy he supervised the loading of forces, both American and British, who made the Anzio landing. In September 1944 he was charged with the responsibility of loading the Seventh Army for the invasion of southern France from Naples. In June 1945 he returned to the United States.

In the field of transportation, the port of embarkation head believes that the LST and LCT may be the greatest contributions made during World War II because "they enable troops with equipment to debark directly from the vessel to the beach."

Prior to World War II, while with the Field Artillery, he served in Kentucky, the Philippines, Virginia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Florida, Maryland, and Texas.

"I saw so much heat I got used to it," he commented.

In all his Army career he spent only a few months in his native New Jersey while with the Sixth Field Artillery at Camp Dix, from August 1921 to January 1922.

He was born in West Hoboken on October 4, 1897.

TAUGHT ROTC AT CORNELL

From 1925 to 1929 he taught physics and astronomy at West Point and in 1939 and 1940, as a major, was an instructor in ROTC at Cornell.

Of his own career as a student at the Point he is characteristically modest.

Asked whether he had any favorite subjects, he replied, "Like most boys I took the course of study because I had to."

He was not an athlete and did not participate in sports. Among his classmates were Gen. Ewart Gladstone Plank, who commanded the New York port of embarkation from June 1946 to May 1949, and Maj. Gen. Clovis E. Byers, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, who was wounded in New Guinea in 1942 carrying a tommygun in the attack on Buna Village.

General Lastayo has great affection for the Point and plans to attend the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary ceremonies there July 4, 1952.

After his return to this country, the transportation officer was Chief of the Highway Division, Office of Chief of Transportation, in Washington. From February 1946 to June 1949, as deputy port commander and chief of staff of the New York Port of embarkation, he first fell in love with Brooklyn.

PRO-BROOKLYN JERSEY MAN

"I like Brooklyn," he declared. "I was a Jersey boy, and you never heard any good about Brooklyn in Jersey. I disagree with the Jersey view. I like Brooklyn extremely well and think it is a fine place to live."

His younger daughter, Ann, was graduated from Fort Hamilton High School in 1948 while her father was stationed here.

A year intervened between that hitch in Brooklyn and his present assignment here. From June 1949 to August 1950 he was Assistant Chief of Transportation in Washington.

As boss of the largest American installation, he looks out his window from the administration building of the Brooklyn Army Base at a scene of bustling activity, but security prevents his discussing his present task and responsibilities.

However, he will talk about his two granddaughters like any proud grandpa. One was born only a few Sundays ago.

His own father was not in the Army and the family "seems to run to girls," but General Lastayo still has hopes for a future general.

Medical Policies of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the March 25 issue of the New York Times relative to the investigation of medical policies of the Veterans' Administration being conducted under the able chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. This article by Dr. Howard Rusk analyzes the hearings that have been held, and comments upon them.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED PROSPECTS SEEN FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL SERVICES—LAY ADMINISTRATOR'S PROMISED RELIANCE UPON DOCTOR'S DIRECTION IS HAILED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

A special Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, recently completed hearings on the medical policies of the Veterans' Administration. As the investigations were prompted by the summary dismissal of Dr. Paul Magnuson, former VA medical director, by Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, this investigation, like other current congressional hearings, could have become highly sensational. Fortunately, it did not, and the hearings were confined to the issue of medical versus lay direction of the administration's huge medical service rather than personalities.

Second in size only to that of the Soviet Union, the VA medical service prior to 1945 frequently was termed "the backwash of American medicine." Within a remarkably short time after Gen. Omar N. Bradley became Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Dr. Paul R. Hawley his medical director, the situation reversed itself, and the VA medical service became second to none.

This great improvement resulted primarily from the close relationship of veterans' hospitals to civilian teaching hospitals and medical schools, and the utilization of outstanding civilian physicians as consultants, both clinically and in determining VA medical policies and procedures.

Equally important and essential to this tie-in with civilian medicine was the fact that General Bradley, an able administrator, gave the full responsibility for the VA medical program to Dr. Hawley. When General Bradley returned to military service and Dr. Hawley resigned, the outlook for continued high-quality medical care remained high, for Dr. Hawley's successor, Dr. Magnuson, is a capable medical leader. As Dr. Hawley's assistant, he had largely been responsible for the development of the dean's committee system under which the VA program is integrally related to the teaching programs of 71 hospitals and 59 medical schools.

The close relationship based on confidence rather than directive that existed between Bradley and Hawley was lacking, however, between Gray and Magnuson. This resulted in a progressive tightening of the administrative reins on the medical director. Under this restrictive action, he and many physi-

cians associated with him felt that the medical service could not operate adequately. The result was continuing and increasing friction, which culminated with Dr. Magnuson's dismissal.

Although most of the veterans' organizations sided with General Gray in their testimony before Senator HUMPHREY's committee, other witnesses insisted that the determination of medical policies must remain under direct medical supervision.

Both the committee hearings and in later statements to medical advisory groups of the VA and the American Legion, Administrator Gray has said emphatically that he would give full support to Dr. Joel T. Boone, Dr. Magnuson's successor, and has agreed to administrative changes in the VA that would make hospital managers responsible to him through Dr. Boone.

Although influenced by the personalities, the Gray-Magnuson clash was based on a fundamental difference of opinion on where administrative authority for the VA medical services should rest. It was this difference that jeopardized the continued relationship of civilian medical schools, hospitals, and physicians with the VA program.

If the medical services rendered to the individual veteran are to be more than routine and are to include an interest in his emotional and social problems, his rehabilitation and finally his return to the community as a useful, self-respecting citizen, it is imperative that these relationships be kept intact. This cannot be done by administrative fiat alone; they must embody a spirit based on mutual confidence and an encompassing philosophy of medical responsibility.

Senator HUMPHREY and his colleagues are to be commended that their hearings have dealt with issues and policies rather than personalities. Administrator Gray has promised to give Dr. Boone the authority necessary to carry out his mission. It is to be hoped that this basic policy is scrupulously observed, for upon it lies the basis for continued high standards of medical care for our veterans.

Universal Military Training and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Fred I. Cairns on the subject UMT and Freedom, broadcast by him from station WIBA in Madison, Wis., on March 18, 1951. A copy of this address was sent to me by the First Unitarian Society, of Madison, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UMT AND FREEDOM

The Unitarian religious philosophy is related to the need for progress, and the techniques through which it may be achieved. We have said frequently that progress cannot come without change. This morning, I want to clarify this idea and point out that progress does not necessarily follow every change. There are two kinds of change possible. One is advance, where the people move toward their goals. This is progress. The other is retreat, where the people move away from their goals. This is not progress.

Freedom has been the goal of our democracy during the entire history of this Nation. We have cherished it, fought for it, tried over and again to arrange our laws consistently with it. We have been happiest when we were surest that we were moving in the direction of freedom; we have been concerned most when it seemed that our trends were away from it. When we fight wars which we say are to secure freedom, we apologize profusely because certain liberties have to be denied our citizens. When we imposed discriminatory restrictions upon American citizens of Japanese origin during the last war, we argued that the imposition to which they submitted was in fact a contribution by them to the larger picture of freedom. But the human mind is more logical than it is honest, and when we say, for selfish reasons, that occasions arise when freedom must be denied for the sake of freedom, our logical thoughts rebel against such an inconsistency.

Today I am worried about freedom in America. It is difficult to reconcile our traditions with loyalty boards and thought control, and un-American activity investigations and turn-coat testimony to convict citizens. These practices strike deep fear in our hearts, for while we want America to move, to change, we want her to change for the better. We are not convinced that the present mood of America is progressive. We are disheartened because those who have been so long reactionary are today in positions of power, and many who, but a short time ago were supporters of the most progressive administration this Nation has ever had, are today being investigated and otherwise suspected of disloyalty.

Beneath all that disquiets us is the constant expansion of military influence over the life of our land. This, I believe, can hardly be defended in terms of progress. Militarism is as old as organized society. The hope of every new social technique for the past millenium has been that somehow the influence and the need for militarism would be reduced. Men have never been quite sure they could dispense entirely with military power, but they have always hoped, and only the worst governments have oppressed those who insistently demanded the implementation of such ideals as disarmament. Pacifism has never been a popular theory, but neither have civilized peoples ever been willing to abandon the idea entirely. And each time war becomes a reality, we face again the question of what we shall do with those who refuse to participate because of their adverse convictions. Never have we answered the question to anyone's satisfaction, for the pacifists frequently prefer jail to the alternative offered, and military minds are sure that pacifists are pampered and should be dealt with more forcefully. Sincere citizens, of neither pacifist nor military persuasion are invariably troubled.

The one fact which all but the blindest military prejudice have observed is that there could be no greater tragedy than the complete elimination of the pacifist hope. Let the time come when every pacifist and every portion of his philosophy shall have been destroyed, and the darkness will be complete. When war clouds are blackest, honest people, knowing they must live in the dark for a season, are still cheered by the single star which breaks the complete night; that star is the hope that one day men will learn to live without violence. The brighter the star, the more hopeful men become, and the surer that they are moving toward their noblest goals.

Universal military training, should it become actually universal as far as this country is concerned, is the final removal of that star from the blackest cloud of our darkest night. Universal military training is the antithesis of all that this Nation has sought throughout its existence. It is the opposite of that which has for so long attracted the best minds of the world to our shores, and many other minds which, if not of the genius variety, were yet clear enough to believe in peace, and a nonmilitary society, and to desire a country where the life and energy of the people are devoted to constructive living instead of military preparation. We need go back but a short distance in our history to observe the determination that this land should never come under military control. Our fathers established a government which provided that the Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces should be a civilian—the President. This was never intended to make the President a soldier—it was felt that the President's position was large enough to overshadow the false glamor of military authority, and it was made clear that he should be in control of the military as a safeguard for civilian life, and not in order to permit him or any portion of his Cabinet to think of themselves as soldiers. It is hard to believe that these founding fathers could have foreseen the time when the President would himself advocate universal military training.

For some time now efforts have been made to get a bill through Congress that would bring about the domination of all life by military discipline, a bill which decrees that every male citizen of this land, before he shall have reached the voting age, shall be conditioned to the program of the armed services. I wonder if we understand this clearly—all young men, before they are permitted to take any responsibility in our national life, before they cast their first vote, must submit to a training period which will give most of them, forever, a sense of the propriety of violence. A school for death, we might call this program, and with compulsory attendance. Before our children can complete their civil education they will be inducted into army training, and this, we may be sure, will alter the educational emphasis of many of them. It is not a hopeful thought and it is not like Americans to sit by idly while the Government completes this plan under the questionable pronouncement of necessity. But we have been so frightened by war scares, by the fact that good citizens are convicted of treason, by investigations and accusations, that we will now give our sons to march by compulsion in the military parade and not lift a finger to prevent it. And the worst is that those who have most enthusiastically and successfully raised the war cry, and most wantonly hurled the accusations, have slandered decent citizens without regard for truth, defied the rules of honesty in government and have shown themselves over and again to be enemies of progress and untrustworthy in public responsibility. These are not the men who should give leadership to our land.

I want to read a portion of a news report covering the passage of the UMT bill in the Senate. It comes from the New York Times, not a newspaper usually flippant in its attitude, and not one most widely known for its radical or false reporting. The New York Times, whether rightly or not, is considered to be the newspaper of America. It tells us that before the vote on the military bill was taken, Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, proposed an amendment. But let me quote, "By this time it was apparent that the Armed Services Committee had enough voting strength behind it to beat down all amendments, and the members merely laughed when Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, offered amendments to fix a surtax of 100 percent on all incomes in excess of $25,000 a year, and to impose an excess-profits tax of 100 percent." Do you understand what this means? It is the same story of willingness on the part of comfortable people to remain comfortable at the

cost of everything democracy stands for. It is the old story of protecting wealth with human life. How can we keep down indignation when the military purposes are so clearly put, and interest in human life is shown to be secondary to the well-being of particular groups. If a young man must serve in the Armed Forces before he is allowed to vote, why should any man be allowed to profit by it, or any corporation? This proposal was not original with Senator LANGER—it was offered by President Roosevelt when he began to prepare for the last war, but it was turned down as contemptuously then as now.

I'm afraid I take life too seriously. I can see little reason to laugh at such a proposal, and I can find little comfort when it is reported that Senators laughed because they were so sure it would have no chance of acceptance. I have little hope for a society that consents to military planning simply because those who plan insist that there is something worse in store if we do not accept what they propose. I don't see how anything can be worse than the total loss of freedom, and if I must lose mine, I'd prefer that it be taken from me by an enemy than that I should release it willingly to those who are supposed to help me keep it. Universal military training is as near as anything I can imagine to the total loss of freedom for the average citizen.

Let me tell you of what is happening in Madison. On the university campus here, there is a group known as the Student Committee for Conscientious Objectors to War. This committee has posted notices on campus bulletin boards to inform others of their existence and purpose. Their notice reads, "A group of persons having deep convictions against participation in war have formed a committee for the purpose of giving information, legal assistance, and opportunities for sympathetic discussion and fellowship to students who are weighing the problems of personal participation in war. The committee can be contacted through F. D. Hole, J. E. Olsen, or A. L. Christensen." Telephone numbers are given with the names. The notices are legal within the life of the campus. The committee is a registered student organization, recognized by the student life and interests committee and the student board.

Of the three whose names appear on the notices, one is a professor and a Quaker, another a Methodist minister, and the third, a student, is a Unitarian. This diversity of faith suggests at least a sincerity of purpose. A significant fact about the notices is that while ordinarily about 30 or 40 posters will cover the campus, for this particular notice some six hundred have been needed. This is not because the student committee has been careless, but because, as fast as they put up their notices, someone tears them off the boards.

In addition to tearing down the notices, they who would destroy the efforts of the Committee for Conscientious Objectors have made anonymous telephone calls to those whose names appear on the notices. Not just ordinary phone calls, but calls at 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning. Those who make the calls, in spite of their determination to support the military program against any pacifist intrusion, have not yet found sufficient courage to identify themselves. Perhaps they imagine that their acts must conform to standards of military secrecy, but what is more likely is that they are victims of the mood of America today, victims of a psychosis that is eating away our freedom. Perhaps they believe that what they are doing is courageous, and what the objectors to war are doing is contemptuous. They may honestly hope that a universal military program will provide the freedoms that America has sought so long. Or perhaps they are just confused, as most of America is confused about this whole subject, and lacking understanding because of the hysterical mood which has come over us all, they are not aware of their inconsistency, just as most of us are not aware of ours.

The supposition that peace can be won through violence is a false one. Religion is not alone in declaring this; every reasonable psychological premise asserts its falsity, and every observation of both individual and international life proclaims its folly. The hope of democracy rests with the alertness of its citizens, and their refusal to permit any group of leaders, regardless of party or purpose, to impose upon our free land a military code that is a compulsory conditioning for coming generations.

Relations Between the United States and India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I had prepared for delivery today regarding an article by Robert Trumbull entitled "India Parley Links Food and Freedom," published in the New York Times on March 29, 1951, together with a dispatch from Calcutta relating to the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Yesterday's newspapers printed some very disturbing reports with regard to our Nation's reception in India and our country's reputation with the people of India. I refer to an article by Mr. Robert Trumbull in the New York Times of March 29 reporting on the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom, a meeting representing anti-Communist cultural leaders from all over the world. The proof is again clear, Mr. President, that all of our statements for democracy and liberty will fall on closed ears in Asia unless we act in accordance with the principles of human dignity and brotherhood. It is indeed true that the world cannot hear what we say because what we do keeps dinning in their ears.

The people of Asia face starvation. Freedom loses its meaning if it is without bread. Our Nation, if it is to be effective in the struggle against communism, must respond to the appeal for food from the underprivileged masses of Asia, Africa, and other undeveloped areas. The most effective way to oppose communism and fascism is to eliminate the causes of those malignant diseases. We must attack poverty in the world.

I bring attention to Mr. Trumbull's article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks. I also bring attention to a telegram which was sent to the American Congress by the American delegation to the Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom. The telegram reads:

"While American Congress delays legislation famine threatens millions in Bihar. Prompt dispatch of wheat imperative for America's good name in Asia."

That telegram is signed by Mr. James Burnham, Mr. Harry Goldberg, Mr. W. H. Auden, Mr. J. J. Miller (the Nobel-prize-winning American geneticist), Mr. Max Yergen, and Mr. Norman Thomas.

An ominous note to me is another dispatch in the same day's issue of the New York Times headed "Left gains in Calcutta," indicating the Communist movement is gaining in strength at the expense of the Congress Party. The time for us to assist the democratic forces in India is now. Every humanitarian consideration, every political consideration, every religious consideration, and every consideration of our national self-interest calls for the Congress to act immediately in support of legislation for an immediate grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grain for the people of India.

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1951]

INDIA PARLEY LINKS FOOD AND FREEDOM—CULTURAL CONGRESS SPEAKERS SAY DEMOCRACIES LAG IN FIGHT ON COMMUNISM IN ASIA

(By Robert Trumbull)

BOMBAY, INDIA, March 28.—The Indian Congress for Cultural Freedom opened here today on an unexpected undertone of dissatisfaction with the practical job that the free democracies are doing to combat communism where it has its most potent appeal, that is, among the underprivileged masses of Asia, Africa, and other underdeveloped areas.

About 30 Indian intellectuals, political leaders and business men, and 9 foreign delegates are attending the 4-day session. After several eloquent and loudly applauded attacks upon the Stalinist iron curtain, two delegates of notable standing wanted to know what meaning "cultural freedom" had to men without bread.

Stephen Spender, British poet, summed up this divergent train of thought with his remark that the intellectuals congregated here "should not study so much why we are opposed to communism as the just reasons that make those people Communists who should be on our side."

Jai Prakash Narain, Wisconsin-educated leader of the Indian Socialist Party, who acted as chairman, said that to talk of cultural freedom among India's hungry villagers "seems" comic. He suggested that if the anti-Communist crusade was to succeed with the masses of Asia it must be accompanied by an effective attack upon poverty.

The delegates here made it clear that they were unanimously opposed to communism or totalitarianism in any form and it seemed safe to assume that the audience was mainly of the same mind.

Among other speakers Denis de Rougemont, Swiss writer, characterized the Communist suppression of culture as the avenue to human slavery.

Dr. Max Yergan, an American Negro educator, spoke of the advance of the Negro's status in the United States as evidence of that country's depth of soul and innate spirituality.

Salvador de Madariaga, exiled Spanish writer, delivered a subtle and witty attack upon another Indian tendency, which is to equate the political freedom that the Indians have with the economic independence that they do not have.

The Indian Government caused the Congress of Cultural Freedom to be shifted from New Delhi to Bombay, apparently through some sort of idea of neutrality. Nevertheless India's Food and Agricultural Minister, K. M. Munshi, delivered the inaugural address and gave at least a semiofficial tone to the opening meeting.

Mr. Munshi remarked upon the appropriateness of holding this congress in Bombay where Indian communism was born. He spoke of the devious record of the Indian Communist Party from personal experience as one-time Home Minister of the Bombay Presidency.

M. de Rougemont, in an apparent oblique attack upon India's neutral foreign policy, contrasted neutrality, which he said, might be defensible, with the neutralism, which he declared was not. He told a fable that by implication compared the present Indian neutrality with that of the lamb that is neutral between the wolf and the shepherd.

Mr. Narain, in his later speech, took the same fable and turned it to account in his argument that the democracies had been lacking in their consideration for underprivileged peoples. He pointed out that the shepherd, having saved the lamb from the wolf, then shears the lamb and possibly eats it.

LEFT GAINS IN CALCUTTA—CONGRESS PARTY SUFFERS FIRST MAJOR LOCAL DEFEAT

CALCUTTA, INDIA, March 28.—The governing Congress Party, which had hitherto dominated the municipal administration in Calcutta, suffered its first major defeat in the municipal elections that concluded yesterday.

Formerly the Congress Party held all 30 seats in the local administration. Only 14 Congress Party candidates were returned. Fifteen seats went to a new leftist combination called the United Progressive Bloc, which is a loose coalition of the Revolutionary Communist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Forward Bloc, and the Communist Party.

This is the first time that the leftists, including the Communists, have combined against the Congress Party in West Bengal and have entered the municipal administration in large numbers through constitutional means.

A Report From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent issues of the Minneapolis Star, there appeared a series of articles entitled "A Report From Europe," which were prepared by Mr. John Cowles, publisher of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Mr. Cowles is intimately acquainted with the economic and political problems of Europe, having visited the European countries on many occasions and for extended periods of time. His observations are particularly pertinent at this period in our history. It is interesting to observe that Mr. Cowles agrees with the position recently taken by our Secretary of Defense, the Honorable George Marshall. He, too, advises after touring Europe that the year 1951 is still a year of danger.

Mr. Cowles also seems to be in agreement with the attitude expressed by General Eisenhower as to the West European will to resist a Russian attack.

I think it is particularly important to note the observations of Mr. Cowles on the spirit and morale to be found in western Berlin, a fortress of freedom behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles entitled "War Peril Fades, But 1951 Still Is Year of Danger," "Will To Resist a Russ Attack Found Mounting," and "Morale Higher in West Berlin Than in Paris."

There being no objection, the three articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PERIL FADES, BUT 1951 STILL IS YEAR OF DANGER

War with Russia in the near future now seems less likely than it appeared a few months ago.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one is, however, still a year of danger.

Despite our present enormous superiority in atomic bombs and our ability to deliver them with devastating effects upon Russia, Stalin may decide to attack this year for four reasons:

1. Stalin may conclude that he can no longer continue to tolerate Tito's open defiance of the Kremlin. The Yugoslav dictator's independence is stimulating the idea of "nationalist deviation" among Communist Party members in Italy, France, and Germany, as well as in the satellite states.

2. Stalin may conclude that the likelihood of our bringing the western Germans into the North Atlantic Pact organization and of effectively rearming them during the coming year is a risk he cannot afford to run. The Russians' fear of the Germans as fighters is deep.

3. Stalin may conclude that in another 18 months the forces which General Eisenhower is putting together may be sufficient to prevent any quick and easy Russian occupation of Western Europe and seizure of the Ruhr. The huge war-making potential of the Ruhr industries is, of course, the top military prize in Europe.

4. Stalin, who is approaching 72, may feel that his time is running short. Like other dictators, he may have an irresistible ambition to try to add more laurels to his fame as a conqueror before history turns his page.

If Stalin should conclude to attack Western Europe in 1951 it would probably come in late August or September, after most of the crops are in. Those months are certain, in any event, to be full of tension.

The Russians are planning to bring a total of 2,000,000 German Communist youths to East Berlin during the first week of August—a maximum of 800,000 a day—for demonstrations. Things then might get out of hand.

Of course, Stalin may calculate that he can attack Tito, destroy his regime, and occupy most of Yugoslavia this spring without precipitating a general world war. The Kremlin recently instructed the Bulgarian Government to promulgate a new law under which Russians could acquire Bulgarian citizenship after only 24 hours' residence. Stalin could thus claim to the United Nations that the Russian divisions invading Yugoslavia were simply "Bulgarian volunteers."

The Yugoslavs are desperately short of food and supplies. They lack almost everything except an indomitable will to resist invasion and maintain their country's independence. Although some United States aid has been promised them, only a trickle has yet arrived.

No observer thinks that satellite armies, without Russian support, could conquer Yugoslavia. Many of the Rumanian troops, and possibly some of the Hungarians, would presumably desert if they were ordered to attack.

If the Russians strike at Yugoslavia, Tito's forces, tough but badly equipped, will probably be compelled to retreat to the mountains for semiguerrilla fighting. If the Russians are able to occupy most of Yugoslavia they will be on the shores of the Mediterranean, and both Italy and Greece will be outflanked.

The most effective way of deterring the Russians from attacking Yugoslavia would be for the United States and Great Britain to make it crystal clear that we would immediately go to Tito's aid. The sooner we get food, gasoline, and explosives, as well as aircraft and weapons, to Yugoslavia, the better. Every week counts.

Probably Stalin will conclude (or he may have already concluded) not to make all-out war in Europe in 1951. Diplomats report that in those areas adjacent to Moscow which they are permitted to visit there are no outward signs that war in the near future is expected. There is no visible evidence that the Russians are building underground shelters, radar warning nets, antiaircraft emplacements, etc., which presumably they would be doing in Moscow if war were imminent.

Unless Stalin is more badly informed than most experts believe, he must realize that any Soviet aggression in Europe will result in prompt retaliatory atomic bomb attacks on Moscow along with a dozen other Russian targets.

Perhaps Stalin will move in Europe this year, but the preponderance of competent opinion abroad is that he won't. A basic tenet of the Lenin-Communist creed is to do nothing that might jeopardize the party's continuance as the ruling regime in Russia. Even though the Soviet armies could occupy Western Europe relatively easily this year, our present enormous superiority in atomic bombs will probably continue to deter them.

Perhaps a temporary new Russian "peace" offensive is more likely in 1951 than war, even though Russia's ultimate ambitions for world domination remain unchanged.

WILL TO RESIST A RUSS ATTACK FOUND MOUNTING

If the Russians, because of our great superiority in A-bombs and the planes to deliver them, do not start armed aggression in Europe this year, what will be the west's chance of stopping them if they do try it in 1952 or 1953?

First of all, many qualified observers in Europe believe that the American public has an exaggerated idea of Russia's military power.

Soviet divisions are much smaller numerically than full strength American divisions and have only 50 to 60 percent of their fire power. The Russians also have far less mobility.

American and British military experts, moreover, heavily discount the value to Russia of the Soviet satellite forces. They say that the Rumanians, for example, are of negligible worth.

In the event of war between Russia and the west, many of our top officers question both the effectiveness and the reliability of the Soviet satellite forces.

One high-ranking military man expressed the view that of the 80 divisions (excluding satellites) that he said Russia now has in the west, 20 would be required for occupation purposes in her own and satellite areas, leaving 60 available for a possible attack on Western Europe.

Of these, 27 Russian divisions now are in Germany and 8 more just over the Polish border adjacent to Germany. The Russians have stored gasoline and munitions throughout the Soviet zone of Germany. Once they start on spring field maneuvers, they could invade Western Germany with no advance notice.

If Stalin decides to move this year, no one contends that the Russians could be stopped before they had occupied all of Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark.

But if Stalin, because of fear that if he moves this year we can and will obliterate

Russian cities with A-bombs, postpones any move in Western Europe until late 1952 or 1953, the story may be quite different. Some American observers feel sure that the Russians won't go to war until they are much further along with atomic development than they are believed to be now, and until they have installed many more radar defenses against raids by our Air Force.

Western Europe's morale and will to resist are higher than they were even a few months ago and appear to be growing.

General Eisenhower's appointment as commander of the international army, and the way he has started out on his enormously difficult military and political and diplomatic task, have had a profound effect throughout Europe.

Even in France, much the weakest and most defeatist of the important western nations, public sentiment seems to be changing. A year ago many influential Frenchmen held the view that occupation, while terribly bad, would be at least bearable while war would be intolerable. Many of them have lost that defeatism. The chances now appear at least even that France will have a reasonable number of effective divisions in Eisenhower's army within 18 months.

If Russia moves in Western Europe, there is not the slightest doubt that Great Britain would instantly join the United States in going to war. There would be no enthusiasm for it in Britain, just quiet resignation, but an almost unanimous determination.

Holland and Belgium will provide relatively little in the way of armed forces for Western Europe's defense until they are convinced that Germany also is to be rearmed.

Both Norway and Denmark are cooperating with General Eisenhower within the limits of their capacity.

Dr. Adenauer, the Chancelor of Western Germany, last month declared that the neutralization of Germany would be a disaster for Europe and a disaster for the German people. There is no doubt that the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of the German people lie with the west. The Germans are, however, tired of war, just as are the British and French.

The Communist propaganda for German peace, unity, and neutrality has had and is having considerable success in Germany. The persuasiveness of that appeal should not be underestimated.

Probably it was a mistake for the United States to announce when it did that Germany was to be rearmed. Probably it would have been wiser to wait until after Western Germany had been given a wider measure of self-government. Perhaps it would have been better to have postponed any discussion of arming the Germans until a relatively sovereign Western German Government applied for admission into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and requested that military equipment be provided so that Western Germany could play its part in defending itself against a possible Russian attack.

Americans sometimes forget how terrifically beaten the Germans were in the last war. To see the ruins even now in any German industrial city is to understand why pacifism is widespread.

Even though most Germans hate the Russians and look forward to economic and political integration with Western Europe, they naturally have no desire to rearm and then be slaughtered by the Russians if the western powers are going to "retreat behind the Pyrenees" if war comes.

Western Europe is, I am increasingly convinced, a cornerstone of America's own freedom. Were we voluntarily to abandon it to the Russians it would be a momentous military, political, and economic disaster. It might, I fear, be the beginning of the end for the American Republic.

If we handle the problem firmly but diplomatically, I believe that the majority of the western Germans, after they have been given a larger measure of self-government and sovereignty a few months from now, will come to agree with the statement by Chancellor Adenauer quoted above.

That would mean there would be a good chance that Western Europe would build fairly quickly its own defenses to a point where Stalin, unless he attacks within the next year, would not think it profitable to launch war.

No one, either American or European, with whom I talked expressed the view that it would require more than the four additional American divisions which General Marshall has announced will be sent to supplement the two United States divisions now in Germany, provided European morale continues to improve the way it has in recent months.

If the western Europeans organize the forces which most American observers abroad now think that there is a better than 50–50 chance that they will, we might then even be able safely to reduce the number of United States divisions in Europe.

And if our development of atomic artillery shells as a tactical weapon progresses rapidly, that might prove decisive, and enable even a relatively small defense force to hold Western Europe against an attempted Russian invasion.

Morale Higher in West Berlin Than in Paris

Berlin today is one of the most inspiring and at the same time depressing cities in the world.

Square miles of rubble. Ghost buildings whose walls look as if they would collapse under a high wind. Although it is nearly 6 years since the fighting stopped, the human and material wreckage of war is visible everywhere.

In the western sectors of Berlin, under American, British, and French control, live nearly 2,250,000 Germans, many of them existing with five or six persons to a room.

Although the Russians occupy not only the eastern sector of Berlin but all the surrounding area of East Germany, there is higher morale and less defeatism in West Berlin than there is in Paris.

The Berliners have seen Russian occupation at close range. Most of them are determined to fight to the death, if necessary, against being engulfed by the Soviet terrorism.

No visible iron curtain separates East, or Soviet Berlin from the western sectors—simply a city street. People can pass from one sector to the other at will. Some prominent West Germans and most foreigners go into the Russian sector only warily, and rarely after dark.

A number have disappeared there, perhaps to become the recipients of a one-way ticket to the uranium mines.

As one drives through the Russian sector, which has a population of 1,200,000, many differences from West Berlin are apparent. There's much less rebuilding. The shops are drab, the people poorly dressed. Except for essential food, which is rationed in the Russian sector, the East German (Soviet) mark will buy only about one-fifth as much as a Western German mark. An East Berlin worker has about the same standard of living as an unemployed person on relief in West Berlin.

Communist propaganda is evident everywhere in the Soviet sector of Berlin and in the Soviet zone outside.

Russian war memorials express "sympathy" for the German people who, they say, had been enslaved by the Nazi. The Russians "liberated" them.

Fresh flowers are placed by the Russians on ruined buildings with sympathetic signs saying that here on some specific date in 1944 or 1945 the American fascist air force dropped bombs that murdered so many hundred peace-loving Germans.

Signs everywhere promote "Communist democracy and peace."

While Communist propaganda is making almost no progress in Berlin, where the contrast between the Russian occupation and that of the western powers is apparent to everyone, the Russians are making headway in Eastern Germany.

Boys are required to attend school for 6 days a week, instead of 5, unless they join the Communist youth organization. Boys cannot get fishing licenses unless they are members.

Consequently a substantial portion of the East German youths has enrolled, and participate in frequent Communist parades and athletic spectacles as they did under Hitler's national socialism.

Partially offsetting the Russian Communist propaganda in East Germany is an extraordinary effective Berlin radio station RIAS, controlled by the United States but using Germans exclusively as announcers, commentators and actors.

That RIAS is influencing a big listening audience is proved by the violent and constant vituperation which is heaped on it by the Soviet German newspapers and Soviet radio stations.

With 100,000 watts of power, RIAS is on the air 20 hours a day, warning its listeners that Herr Schmidt, a butcher in a certain German town, or Herr Wagner, a baker in another, is now a secret Soviet agent and to be wary of him.

RIAS won a great following by tipping off the Germans that the Russians intended to confiscate all the wheat above a small minimum amount in a certain area the following day, so that the listeners were able to hide their supplies.

Polls show that 95 percent of the West Berlin radio audience tunes to RIAS, and there is widespread evidence that RIAS, despite constant efforts by the Russians to prevent listening, has an enormous following throughout the entire Russian zone.

Some of the most popular RIAS programs are those kidding the Russians, with a moronic comedian spouting the Soviet propaganda line.

RIAS deliberately avoids using any unusual sound effects or loud broadcasts which could enable an eavesdropper to identify the station to which his neighbor was listening as the forbidden RIAS.

In Berlin the central telephone exchange is in the western sector. Any Berliner can dial the RIAS telephone number at any hour and hear 3 minutes of late news over the phone. The Russians have no way of stopping this or of ascertaining who may be phoning RIAS to get the news. As many as 18,000 phone calls have been received in a day, half from the Russian sector.

Both in Berlin and throughout our zone in Germany there are, in addition to our Armed Forces, hundreds of American civilians working in all phases of military government and economic rehabilitation. Many are doing excellent jobs.

Few persons in the United States appreciate the enormous complexities and difficulties of the task which our American High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, has faced for nearly 2 years. Probably the High Commission set-up will be terminated this fall and Western Germany be given pretty complete self-government powers, except as to Allied military occupation and security.

That will be a welcome day for Commissioner McCloy and his wife, who, by visiting hospitals and schools and explaining to Ger-

man women how American democracy actually functions, is working as hard as her husband.

It will mean an end to the constant stream of abuse, from both Americans and Germans, which comes in a torrent whenever the High Commissioner, after reviewing all the evidence, pardons or commutes the sentence of some German war criminal or, equally, refuses to do so.

And it also will mean an end to living in a home whose grounds must constantly be patrolled by soldiers, all floodlighted at night, because of threats against the High Commissioner, his wife, and their children.

Veterans' Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the provisions and effects of the gratuitous indemnity bill, H. R. 1, which I introduced and which passed the House in early January by a roll call vote of 390 to 0, and has been sent to conference, drastically amended, in the Senate.

Perhaps it is well to point out here, in regard to the present insurance program, that the Veterans' Administration has presented to the Bureau of the Budget a claim for $117,000,000 to pay for approximately 13,600 deaths resulting from the fighting in Korea—claims which are being paid entirely by the Government, regardless of the amount of premiums paid by the policyholder, or the length of time which the policy was held. It can readily be seen from this that H. R. 1 would constitute no new departure from the present program, as far as payment for service-connected deaths are concerned. The financial savings resulting from the elimination of administrative expenses would be great, and most desirable.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a very excellent article written on the subject of H. R. 1 which appeared in the April 1951 issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, and which was prepared by Hon. Omar B. Ketchum, the national legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This article states the issue very clearly, and I am sure the Members will find it most informative.

The article referred to follows:

THE INSURANCE ISSUE—HOUSE AND SENATE DIVIDED ON TWO BILLS DEALING WITH INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR VETERANS IN THE FUTURE

(By Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director, VFW)

Shall national service life insurance for members of the Armed Forces, with its inequities, excessive costs, and administrative red tape be continued or shall the Congress adopt a new insurance approach through a gratuitous indemnity of $10,000 which would automatically cover all active service personnel with a minimum of red tape and no premium payments?

This question has developed into a major controversy between the United States Senate and House of Representatives with a division of opinion between veteran organizations and some outsiders taking out a stack of chips one way or another.

In the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress the House of Representatives, after months of study and investigation, approved a bill identified as H. R. 9911 which would set up a gratuitous indemnity insurance program as a future substitute for national service life insurance. The Senate failed to take action and the House bill died with the close of the Eighty-first Congress.

When the Eighty-second Congress convened the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs immediately took up reconsideration of the gratuitous indemnity insurance in a bill identified as H. R. 1. After making some changes the new bill was reported unanimously by the Veterans' Committee. On January 24 the House of Representatives, by a unanimous vote of 390 to 0, approved H. R. 1. The following day the Senate Committee on Finance under the leadership of Senator WALTER GEORGE, Georgia, opened hearings on several insurance bills, including H. R. 1, which had just come over with the approval of the House.

Among the insurance bills considered by the Senate Finance Committee was a bill by Senator GEORGE identified as Senate bill 84. This bill is an amendment to the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide a gratuitous insurance payment of $10,000 to the immediate families or estates of those servicemen who had been killed or who had died, without insurance coverage, subsequent to June 27, 1950, and would provide gratuitous insurance protection for all active service personnel, not covered by insurance, up to 120 days after final passage of the bill. H. R. 1, approved by the House, also provided gratuitous payments of $10,000 for servicemen who had died, without insurance protection, subsequent to June 27, 1950.

After 2 days of open hearings and a few executive committee sessions, the Senate Finance Committee on February 14 reported H. R. 1 favorably with some amendments. The first paragraph of the report of the Senate Finance Committee on February 14, 1951, reads as follows:

"The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass."

On Monday, February 26, H. R. 1, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, came up for consideration on the floor of the Senate. Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Finance Committee, which reported H. R. 1 and recommended its passage, moved to substitute S. 84 in lieu of H. R. 1. Only a handful of Senators were present on the Senate floor and after a limited discussion an aye-and-nay vote was taken. Witnesses in the Senate gallery reported there were three ayes and two nays and Senator GEORGE's motion was declared adopted. The Senate was officially on record as bypassing H. R. 1 and adopting instead, as a substitute, S. 84.

Senator BYRD, Virginia, and Senator JOHNSON, Colorado, both members of the Senate Finance Committee, were the two Senators who voted in the negative against Senator GEORGE's motion. Senator BYRD submitted a spirited but brief argument in support of H. R. 1 and pointed out that the Senate Finance Committee had favorably reported H. R. 1 and recommended its passage on February 14. BYRD also read into the RECORD the history of the lengthy hearings held by the House on the gratuitous indemnity proposal and many of the reasons why H. R. 1 was a sound approach to insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces. Senator GEORGE was supported by Senator TAFT, Ohio, who said he favored GEORGE's motion because the American Legion was opposed to H. R. 1.

As this article is written the two insurance bills, one by the House and one by the Senate, have been sent to conference. Seven Members of the Senate, headed by Senator GEORGE, and seven Members of the House, headed by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, will attempt to resolve the differences between the House and Senate. A long and bitter struggle between the conferees is predicted, and unless two or more of the House conferees surrender it is not likely the House will accept the Senate version. It is predicted that Senators BYRD and JOHNSON, of the Senate conferees, will support the House bill, H. R. 1, while opponents of the House bill will endeavor to win over two or three of the House conferees in support of the Senate bill.

H. R. 1, as approved by the House of Representatives and reported by the Senate Finance Committee, had the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President. It is opposed by the American Legion and a radio commentator, Frank Edwards. Edwards, although not a veteran, has been vigorously denouncing H. R. 1 in his broadcasts.

What is the real issue before the Congress on insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces? Why has a new approach to insurance coverage been proposed, and is it designed to take something away from our veterans? Here are the facts as viewed by the VFW and based on a long and exhaustive investigation of the entire insurance problem:

In December 1948 an Advisory Commission on Service Pay, commonly referred to as the Hook Commission, after a long and exhaustive study, filed a report on career compensation for uniformed forces with the Secretary of Defense. Included in that report was a recommendation, with justification, to discontinue national service life insurance and substitute an automatic gratuitous indemnity coverage of $10,000 for all members of the Armed Forces.

The Hook Commission report went into detail, pointing out that national service life insurance was inequitable, excessive in costs, and a "white elephant" in administration. The report further pointed out that gratuitous indemnity coverage would be equitable in its coverage and effect savings in paper work, manpower, and costs.

In May 1950 a subcommittee of the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, headed by Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia, conducted a long and intensive study and hearings on the question of life-insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces. Government officials, insurance experts, representatives of veteran organizations, and representatives of the Armed Forces were invited to express their views on insurance before this committee. Following the study and hearings, the committee submitted a lengthy report, commonly referred to as the Hardy committee report, in which it pointed out the inequities, excessive costs, and administrative red tape of the national service life insurance program and proposed as a substitute a gratuitous indemnity insurance coverage for all members of the Armed Forces. Insurance representatives of the VFW sat in and followed closely the study and hearings by the Hardy committee.

Following the Hardy committee report the staff of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs was directed to continue the insurance study and several bills incorporating suggestions of the Hook Commission and the Hardy committee were introduced. The Veterans' Committee staff invited persons interested in service insurance to consult with it in relation to the various bills which had been introduced. At the conclusion of the staff study a subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs opened hearings on a series of insurance bills, including national service life insurance, a mutual insurance program, a group insurance program and a gratuitous indemnity program. When the hearing was completed the subcommittee recommended to the full committee a bill which would establish a uniform gratuitous indemnity coverage of $10,000 for each person on active duty in the Armed Forces.

The full House committee adopted the recommendation of the subcommittee and a bill identified as H. R. 9911 was reported favorably to the House with a recommendation that it be passed. The bill had the support of the VFW, the DAV, and the AMVETS. It was later approved by the House and sent to the Senate where no action was taken and the bill died. When the Eighty-second Congress convened, Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN reintroduced the insurance bill as H. R. 1 with a few improving changes. The bill, again with the support of the VFW, the DAV, and the AMVETS, was unanimously approved by the House on January 24, 1951. That is the history of the gratuitous indemnity proposal up to the time it ran into trouble in the United States Senate.

H. R. 1 would:

1. Provide automatic, uniform coverage of $10,000 gratuitous indemnity on the lives of all active service personnel, with no solicitation, no premium payment, and a minimum of administration, retroactive to June 27, 1950.

2. Provide the free insurance coverage for 120 days after discharge or release from active duty.

3. Provide continuing free insurance coverage for those who become totally and permanently disabled during service.

4. Provide privilege of purchasing Government insurance after release from active duty for those who become uninsurable by reason of their service.

5. Preserves the World Wars I and II insurance rights of those who had insurance contracts or previously eligible for said insurance.

6. End sale of subsidized Government insurance in the future, except to those mentioned in items 4 and 5, and would eventually get the Government out of the insurance business.

7. Save millions of man-hours in administrative work and millions of dollars in cost to Federal taxpayers. The United States General Accounting Office estimates that a savings of approximately $600,000,000 would have been made had this program been in effect during World War II.

Senate 84, which was substituted for House Resolution 1 in the Senate, would:

1. Provide free insurance protection from June 27, 1950, up until 120 days from the passage of the act to all service men who are not covered by national life insurance.

2. Require all servicemen to buy national service life insurance after the 120 days' grace period or have no insurance protection for their families.

3. Give no consideration to the serviceman who becomes disabled by reason of service.

4. Discriminate between servicemen who are paying premiums on policies and those who are not paying premiums on policies.

5. Perpetuate national service life insurance with its inequities, excessive costs and administrative red tape.

The principal arguments advanced against House Resolution 1 are (a) would deny Korean veterans the privilege of carrying subsidized Government insurance after discharge, and (b) would take from future veterans the privilege of carrying low-cost Government insurance after discharge.

The answer to those arguments are (a) approximately 84 percent of all servicemen involved in the Korean campaign and elsewhere are already covered with national service life insurance contracts and would be privileged under House Resolution 1 to continue their insurance after discharge if desired; and (b) out of the millions of policies issued during World Wars I and II approximately 75 percent have dropped their policies.

The benefits under House Resolution 1 far outweigh any theoretical loss of the privilege of carrying subsidized Government insurance after discharge or release from active service. It's up to Congress to make the decision.

Inciting Racial Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in Il Progresso Italo-Americano on March 28, 1951:

INCITING RACIAL HATRED

Last Saturday, at the Kefauver committee hearing held in Washington, Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, with a touch of cutting satisfaction, read a telegram from an aged self-styled Italian who had long ago become an American citizen, in which he insinuated that Americans of Italian origin are more inclined to be criminals and crooks than those of any other racial segment of the United States population.

The gratuitous self-defamation is completely extraneous to the investigation which the Senate committee is conducting. This was not a specific accusation against particular individuals who might have violated the law or participated in the spreading corruption or promoted alliances of crime and politics. It was a ridiculous statement designed to inflict the stigma of an imaginary criminality on an ethnic segment of our population whose worthiness is beyond reproach.

It should not be necessary to dwell in detail on this subject to prove how much iniquity and slander there is in this vulgar message. All right thinking people are convinced, as we are, that this is a deliberate lie and an arbitrary falsification of the truth which should never have been brought up in an official inquiry. After all, the purpose of the investigation is to ascertain facts and fix specific responsibilities and not to go afield in absurd generalities which contribute solely to accentuate prejudices and foment discrimination and race hatred.

By reading the message Senator TOBEY voluntarily made himself a party to an unworthy action which was all the more deplorable because the unjust accusation was made by an alleged member of the racial group against which an attempt is being made to hold it up to public scorn.

Senator TOBEY well knows that the millions of Italo-Americans, naturalized or not, who live in the United States, have no reason to envy the other ethnic elements of our population for honesty, loyalty, and respect for our laws.

If the Senator, with ill-advised haste, seized upon the sadistic self-defamation of a despicable slanderer of his own blood, he did so with the malicious intention of giving a greater semblance of reliability to the insult.

THE INEXISTENCE OF AN INFAMOUS LEGEND

Criminal statistics fortunately belie the libelous statement. The presumed criminal inclination of the Italian element in our society is an infamous legend. Instincts of degeneracy are not in the nature of the race, which for thousands of years has been in the forefront in its contributions to civilization and progress.

Wherever Italians have migrated they have brought the fruitfulness of their genius and their labor. No people, as much as the Italian, has furnished greater numbers to the army of immigrants and no immigrant has contributed more than the Italian of his blood and sweat to the welfare of the countries in which he settled.

The history of Italian immigration to the United States is replete with glorious pages which sing the praises of its achievements. There is not an industry, a field of endeavor, private or public, in which Italians have not distinguished themselves for loyalty, tirelessness, and spirit of initiative. Their names are closely linked with all the great accomplishments which have made our great Republic the foremost nation in the world. Their honor roll cannot be contaminated by the defamatory drivel of scoundrels who resort to self-degradation in order to stir up nonexistent prejudices. Unfortunately there are among Italian immigrants and their children some degenerate elements who have sunk into the dregs of vice. Their misdeeds, however, should not in any way cast a sinister light on the entire group of upright people. Crime has no nationality or country of origin. It is an evil plant which grows in every clime. It is a social disease which afflicts all countries. Any attempt to attribute the instinct of degeneracy to a particular nationality is a deplorable evasion of the responsibility to suppress crime which is incumbent on legislators and law enforcement agencies.

AN EXAMPLE WHICH HAS NOT BEEN FOLLOWED

Il Progresso Italo-Americano has repeatedly launched courageous campaigns to combat discrimination and racial prejudice in the interest of all the racial groups which comprise the American people. We have frequently appealed to legislators and public officials to promote social rehabilitation with wise legislation aimed at removing the causes which encourage delinquency. We have no knowledge that Senator TOBEY—who seems so eager to popularize insults against Americans of Italian origin—has ever harkened to our appeals. He evidently seems more interested in persecution rather than in the prevention of crime. The fact that he played on sensationalism publicized by television and radio is a clear indication that there is something mysterious and personal which guides his actions in the committee of which he is a member.

The public assiduously follows the investigation conducted by the committee in the hope that the inquiry will bring about the desired results. Unfortunately, if the fatal germ of prejudice and personal rancor is injected in the investigation—as Senator TOBEY is doing—the objective will never be reached. Only a disastrous disintegration of national unity will result, a unity which America needs more urgently and imperatively today.

Representative Believes RFC Should Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE MAGEE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview given by Representative PHIL J. WELCH to the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press under date of March 23, 1951:

WELCH FEELS RFC SHOULD BE ABOLISHED—DIVERTED FROM ORIGINAL PURPOSE, HE SAYS

Congressman PHIL J. WELCH said today he would vote to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency in which he once served as an assistant area manager.

"The RFC was a good thing when organized," the Third District Congressman said. "Its purpose was to help the small-business man. But somewhere along the line it was diverted into a set-up that gave its aid to big business."

The Democratic Congressman, home for the Easter vacation, served the RFC for about a year and a half as assistant manager for the area that included western Missouri and all of Kansas. He resigned when he became a candidate for Congress in 1948.

FAVORS DISASTER RELIEF

He emphatically declared himself as favoring the retaining of one section of the RFC under some other administrative set-up, however.

That is the disaster-relief loan section with which Mr. WELCH was closely associated during his tenure with the RFC.

"Many persons hard hit by flood and other disaster were aided by that section of the RFC," he said. "I recall particularly the victims of the Worth, Mo., tornado and many who suffered heavy losses when the Missouri River overflowed. These loans, the RFC figures will show, are repaid almost 100 percent.

"By all means a disaster relief set-up should be retained under some other agency if the RFC is abolished."

TO SPEAK AT ST. LOUIS

Mr. WELCH, who was accompanied home by his wife, will remain here about 2 weeks. On his way back to Washington he will stop at St. Louis, where on April 7 he will give the keynote address at the State convention of Young Democrats.

He said that as far as he knows the Office of Price Stabilization does not intend to have an office in St. Joseph; that it will operate for the entire territory out of its Kansas City office. James P. Hull, St. Joseph lawyer named as OPS enforcement attorney yesterday, will work out of the Kansas City office, the Congressman said.

Congressman WELCH said he did not believe President Harry S. Truman is "being given a fair break by some people."

SAW VIVIAN TRUMAN

"Much of the criticism he has received is unjustified," Mr. WELCH said. "Some of it is far more bitter and derisive than should ever be directed at the Chief Executive of our Nation.

"Remember this: Harry Truman has the toughest job in the world. The man would be superhuman if he didn't make mistakes. He is doing his best and will accomplish the objective sought, although, like everyone else, he may make some errors while proceeding."

The Congressman was at Kansas City yesterday. Among those with whom he conferred there was Vivian Truman, brother of the President.

Student Impressions of Congress of Industry—Bucknell Student Cites Educational Value of Sessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the January edition of the monthly bulletin of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association there appeared the following article written by Harvey H. Bush, a resident of New Castle, Pa., and a member of the senior class of Bucknell University, at Lewisburg, Pa.

College students from every State in the Union attended the fifty-fifth annual congress of American industry at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

Pennsylvania had three representatives. Mr. Bush was sponsored by the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and gives his impressions of his visit to New York in this article.

STUDENT IMPRESSIONS OF CONGRESS OF INDUSTRY—BUCKNELL STUDENT CITES EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF SESSIONS

(By Harvey Bush)

Our American way of life—the free-enterprise system—industrial mobilization—national emergency—these were the phrases that dominated sessions of the fifty-fifth annual congress of American industry. It was my privilege to be a guest of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association at the congress and thus take part in the program established by the education department of NAM. As a student delegate it is difficult for me to convey with precise enthusiasm how valuable this experience was to me. It would not be an exaggeration to say that I learned more about the field of industry and its relations to management, labor, and government in that 1 week than I could have learned in one semester of economics, history, or political science.

WARM-UP SESSION HELD

Prior to the opening of the congress the education department of NAM put its guests through a program of orientation. Organization of NAM was explained. Representatives from various departments outlined the functions of their group. We were given the opportunity to ask questions. Soon we had an excellent picture of the structure of NAM. Those of us who had known very little about NAM were ready to sit in on the sessions of the congress with clearer understanding of the organization.

Sessions began Wednesday morning and continued until Friday evening. There were four sessions each day—morning, luncheon, afternoon and evening. Our hosts had not required us to attend every session, but they had hoped that we would attend as many as possible. However, no urging was necessary. From the inspiring opening session to the banquet Friday night, interest in the congress seemed to increase. We heard discussions of such topics as America and World Crisis, Production for Freedom, Conservation of Our Resources, Inflation and Security, and America Tomorrow. We were privileged to hear such excellent speakers as Gen. George Marshall, Senator Wallace Bennett, Cyrus Ching, Claude Putnam, Earl Bunting, and Robert Montgomery, just to name a few. It was from such men that we received the picture of American industry today and the problems it faces.

When I first heard that NAM was going to bring college students to their Congress of American Industry as guest delegates, I was a bit skeptical. It looked like a free week at the Waldorf for some lucky group of students. At the very beginning of the week, however, we realized we had been invited to see this typically American voluntary association in action and to observe at first hand industry's thinking and philosophy. It was a week of education in which I learned what the NAM is doing now and hopes to do in the future.

The week, however, was not only informative and educational, but enjoyable also. It was not a week devoted entirely to speeches. We saw dramatic skits, heard excellent musical programs of soloists and choral groups, and saw interesting films. We also had the opportunity to meet and talk with some of the speakers and other men and women who were attending the congress. The students were assigned different tables at the luncheons, thus making it possible for us to meet many of the delegates. I was amazed at the genuine hospitality extended. We learned that NAM is definitely not composed of stuffed-shirted industrialists. It was a wonderful experience to be able to sit down and talk informally with these men and women. The student delegates also had opportunity to visit the United Nations. This was the first trip to Flushing for many of us who will always remember it.

As the convention adjourned Friday night it was hard to believe that the week was over. As we left New York Saturday for our college campuses throughout the Nation, we each knew that we had experienced a most enjoyable week. I think that the education department of NAM has a wonderful program which brings to the congress students, educators, and apprentices. As was stated at the convention, it would be nice to take a postgraduate course in their program. It was a week I shall never forget.

Issues Involved in Assignment of Troops to an International Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I desire to place in the RECORD certain statements which I have prepared this afternoon, in preparation for a pro and con program for the National Broadcasting Co. tonight, on the issues involved in the pending resolutions.

The statements are in the form of answers to questions to be asked by Mr. Frank Burkholser, of the National Broadcasting Co.

So Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD, so as to include the statements I shall make tonight over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the Senator's request that the statements shall appear in the RECORD as a speech or simply as a statement by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. Whichever way is more agreeable to the Senator and the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is to appear as a statement, I have no objection; but I shall object to having speeches placed in the RECORD under such circumstances, because we have never done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that if his request is to have his own speech printed in the Appendix, he should ask consent that it be printed as a statement by him.

Mr. CASE. That is entirely agreeable to me. I asked that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator requesting to have his own remarks or a separate matter printed?

Mr. CASE. They are my own remarks. I have no objection to having them appear in the RECORD as a statement. I asked that they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that in the Appendix of the RECORD they may appear as my own words.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall have no objection to having that done, if the statement bears a heading which shows that it is a statement by the Senator.

Mr. CASE. I shall present it in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE GREAT DEBATE RE TROOPS ABROAD BY FRANK BURKHOLSER, OF NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, AND FRANCIS CASE, UNITED STATES SENATOR, SOUTH DAKOTA, MARCH 30, 1951

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Senator CASE, what exactly is the question involved in the foreign-policy matter now before the Senate?

Senator CASE. Mr. Burkholser, the question is whether the Senate, and possibly the Congress, shall approve President Truman's announced plan to send four additional divisions of ground troops to Europe to be part of an international army but say that we want a voice in deciding whether any additional troops shall be sent.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. How did the matter come up?

Senator CASE. The question arises out of our membership in the North Atlantic Treaty organization under a treaty ratified by the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress. Article 3 of that treaty provided for mutual aid in maintaining the security of the North Atlantic area.

At the time the treaty was considered in the Senate, assurances were given that Congress would be consulted and have a voice in determining how the treaty would be carried out. That is, that Congress would have a right to say in what way and to what extent the United States would contribute to implementing the pact.

Shortly afterward, Congress considered and passed a bill to provide military equipment to other countries in the North Atlantic Treaty organization. At the time, no provision was made for creating an international army. Each member nation was setting up its own army or its own navy if it had one. The United States, by the military aid law, authorized help to these other countries in arming and equipping their forces.

Now, however, the President has said that he intended to send some United States troops to Europe to be part of an international army under an international command.

In January, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, made a motion that the Senate express itself as opposed to such action until the Congress had considered and formulated a policy with respect to sending troops into an international army. That motion was referred to a joint committee of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. After hearings, they reported the resolutions now before the Senate.

In brief, these resolutions say that the Senate or Congress, as the case may be, approves the President's plan to send four divisions of ground troops to the international army but that we think we, or at least certain committees, should be consulted before any more troops are sent, beyond these four divisions and their supporting troops.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. By the way, Senator CASE, you were not a Member of the Senate when the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified but you were a Member of the House of Representatives when the military-aid law was passed, under which, as you say, military equipment for these other member nations was provided. What was your position on that bill?

Senator CASE. I am glad you asked that question, Mr. Burkholser, for it will help to clarify the issues in this matter as I see them.

I voted for that military aid bill.

I did it on this ground: the Senate had already ratified the North Atlantic Treaty. Rightly or wrongly, we were committed to a pledge of assistance by that body of the Congress which, under the Constitution ratifies treaties. If it meant anything, it meant that we would help them to arm so as to restore a balance of power in Europe and the North Atlantic area. We had persuaded these nations to say they would oppose aggression in that area; we had said we would help them in some way; we could hardly expect them to stand against aggression with their naked fists.

That was the phrase I used in the debate in the House. We could not expect them to stand up against an aggressor with their naked fists.

So, I voted for the measure to provide them with some arms for their own troops. Now, however, the question is whether we shall say it is all right with us that the President has promised land troops of the United States to an international army under an international command, but that hereafter we would please like to have him ask us about it.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Will the resolution now pending require the President to consult Congress hereafter?

Senator CASE. No; it says in effect that we hope he will. That is one of the questions to be decided.

The pending resolutions are simple expressions of the Senate or of the Congress if the concurrent resolution is adopted.

Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, however proposes to make a motion that the matter be sent back to the committees with an instruction to report the subject matter back in the form of a regular bill which would have to be passed by both House and Senate and either signed or vetoed by the President. If signed, of course, it would have the effect of law.

Many Senators—Senator CAIN, of Washington, and Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, for example—oppose the pending resolutions principally because they are only resolutions and they think would only hoodwink the people since they would be merely a pious hope and not have the force of law.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Well, Senator CASE, do you think Congress should have a voice in sending troops to be part of an international army under an international command?

Senator CASE. Indeed, I do, Mr. Burkholser. The Constitution gave Congress the power to declare war.

The Constitution also says that Congress "shall have the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, to raise and support armies and to provide for the organizing of the Militia—which is the National Guard—and for governing them when employed in the service of the United States."

So, I certainly think Congress should say whether it is raising armies for an international command and whether the National Guard when called into Federal service shall be made part of an international army in peacetime, and without either a declaration of war or an attack upon territory of the United States.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. But Senator CASE, does not the Constitution also say that the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and of the Militia when it is called into service of the United States?

Senator CASE. That is true, Mr. Burkholser. He is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. It may be questioned, however, whether the fathers of the country and the Constitution ever contemplated that any President would delegate that power to an international commander in time of peace.

Certainly George Washington never expected any successor to do so. But, regardless of whether the President technically can order our troops into an international army in time of peace, without getting prior approval of the Congress, certainly it is poor policy for him to do so.

A lot of precedents have been cited where Presidents have sent troops into foreign countries to protect American lives or property without first getting approval of Congress, and generally with the consent or by the invitation of the host country—but never before in time of peace have they been put under an international command. I have not heard of one such instance.

I strongly question whether the laws under which the National Guard of the several States can be called into the Federal service authorize the President to send them out of this country in time of peace and to place them under the command of officers who are not officers of the United States.

If they permit it technically, at least I can say that I believe such an act was far beyond the intent of any Congress that ever authorized federalizing the militias of the several States.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Senator CASE, have you considered offering an amendment to prevent the militia units from being sent into an international army?

Senator CASE. Not exactly, Mr. Burkholser, because I do not think such an amendment should be needed.

I doubt if there is authority in law for the State militias to be made part of an international army simply by an order of the President.

And I have been amazed that Senators from certain States who say they are strong for States' rights should claim that the President, as Commander in Chief, can take the State militias out of the country in time of peace and turn them over to an international

army and place them under the command of officers who are not even officers of the United States.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. But you have proposed an amendment to the pending resolutions, two of them in fact, I understand.

Senator CASE. That is correct, Mr. Burkholser.

The first amendment I have proposed would say that soldiers sent to this international army should be at least 20 years of age. This would prevent sending 18- and 19-year-olds into the international army.

We had a children's crusade back in the thirteenth century. It was one of the last of the crusades for the rescue of the Holy Land. The graves and the bones of the children were scattered all the way from France to Jerusalem.

General Eisenhower, you will recall, has written his memoirs of World War II under the title "Crusade in Europe"; well, I don't want this new crusade to be a "children's crusade."

Boys of 18 and 19 are not used for policemen even at home—they should not be used for an international police under the command of officers we do not and cannot control and under environments and conditions we cannot influence.

If any one thing was learned in our occupation of Germany and Japan, it was, I thought, that young boys should not be used for occupation troops, even when under the command of our own officers and under camp conditions and leave regulations that we could determine. But now, unless a restriction such as I have proposed is adopted, 18- and 19-year-old boys can be drafted and sent into an international army where the duties, conditions, and influences will be those of foreign officers whose ideals and standards, whether better or worse, will be beyond our control.

I simply do not think this new crusade should be a children's crusade.

Therefore, I have offered my amendment, and unless it is adopted, on that score alone, I would vote against endorsing the President's plan.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Well, Senator CASE, I see you feel very strongly on that point.

Senator CASE. I do.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. And I was wanting to ask you about your other proposed amendment, the one on enlisting volunteers in Germany. I understand that has attracted considerable interest in England and in Europe generally.

Senator CASE. It has attracted considerable interest over there. Several foreign newspapers have sent queries about it. I think the people of England and Europe, generally, have a better realization than we do of the tremendous capacity for production that exists in Germany. They also know by experience that the Germans are good fighters.

And, instinctively, the people of the North Atlantic area, on that side of the Atlantic, would like to have the production of German industry and the manpower of Germany on our side if war should come. And they know, too, that the German people are naturally on the side of religion and of private property against the tenets of communism.

My amendment seeks to make possible the recruitment of matériel and manpower from the capacity that is Germany's. I have tried to draw the amendment in such a way as to open the door to the Germans without compelling them and, at the same time, to avoid the fears that a remilitarized Germany might create in France, or in Russia, too, for that matter. It reads:

"It is the sense of the Senate that the people of Germany should be permitted to share in their own defense and the collective security of the North Atlantic area by contributing such supplies and equipment as the several states of Germany may agree to furnish; and that a special corps shall be created for the voluntary enlistment of German nationals: Provided, that the training and command of such soldiers shall be under the direction of the Commander in Chief, NATO."

As you will see, that opens the door to voluntary contributions of supplies and equipment by the German states; it opens the door for the voluntary enlistment of German soldiers in the international army to be under the NATO commander in chief and does not create a German army as such.

It is designed to permit the people with the largest industrial capacity of Europe, which we once destroyed and have now largely built back, to help in its own defense. It lets German youth and trained veterans enlist in the defense of their own homes.

Unless we are willing to let these people help defend themselves, why should we put up the money and men to do it? That is my position.

Mr. BURKHOLSER. Thank you, Senator CASE.

Idaho Adopts a Webfoot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of our outstanding citizens who has made a name for himself in our State of Oregon has moved on to fields in our neighboring State of Idaho and has recently been elected to the highest office of that State.

I am including as part of these remarks an article which appeared in the Old Oregon magazine for February 1951 by Anita Holmes, entitled "Idaho Adopts a Webfoot," which tells of the rise of Oregon-born Len Jordan to the governorship of Idaho. The article follows:

IDAHO ADOPTS A WEBFOOT—LEN JORDAN, UNIVERSITY GRADUATE OF 1923 AND GRANGEVILLE COUNTY RANCHER, BECOMES THE NEW GOVERNOR OF IDAHO

(By Anita Holmes)

When an Idahoan talks of his State's new Governor, he may say something like, "Len Jordan—auto dealer and rancher from the Grangeville country—never heard much of him in politics before—Republican."

But an Oregonian identifies Governor Jordan as "University of Oregon graduate in the class of '23—played varsity football and made Phi Beta at the same time—married Grace Edgington, class of '16."

The economics and business studied by Jordan at Oregon will be indispensable during his 4 years in the Idaho statehouse. His first legislature is now underway. It should be a productive one with the governor and the majorities in the two houses of the same party.

A soon as the ballot boxes were put away in November, Jordan announced some of his plans for this and the next three legislatures:

"Action toward a long-range highway program in the State, personal supervision over the purse strings of the State to cut down unnecessary expenses.

"Something's got to be done about the driver's license law, and we need a motor pool to cut down duplication of traveling in State vehicles.

"We'll follow the same principles we use in business to conduct State affairs."

And if Jordan can pin his business principles to State government, Idaho should become a national leader. Every business he has touched has succeeded. All, that is, but one.

This single failure came in the early days of the depression, when countless good managers saw their profits eclipsed by a broken bank.

After Jordan had been graduated from Oregon he headed back to the sheep country in central Oregon. As the son of county judge in Enterprise he had grown up with the currents of the Snake River and had no desire for a desk job in the city.

Only Grace Edgington could bring him to the city of Portland, and she did. But after a few years of marriage and two children, the Jordans turned to new horizons in Wallowa County. To go in this direction the young accountant had to make a bank loan, lease a farm, and buy a band of sheep.

They lost all but $990 in the depression.

However, this loss didn't send Jordan to the Government for security. He believes today that the only place where there is security is in a Federal penitentiary where you have lost all your freedoms.

Idahoans who elected Governor Jordan have often heard him say, "I cannot see why the Government owes anybody a living except in rare instances, such as the destitute, the blind, the crippled, the child of the broken home.

"No one would deny that modern society must consider such obligations. But under the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the welfare state, thrift on a national scale and at the family level has been made to seem stupid, old-fashioned.

"We must go back to the day when people could save for their old age and know their savings would still buy what they would need; to the day when young people felt a responsibility to the parents who bore them."

There was never a chance in the Jordan background for him or his family to become soft. After losing everything in the depression he rode into the sheep country looking for a job. It was then that he entered Idaho, where he eventually became owner of a sheep ranch in Hells Canyon, about 85 miles from Lewiston.

Life in Hells Canyon was rugged, especially for a woman, but Grace Jordan was equal to it. At one stretch she didn't see another woman for 4 months. She became the "best barber along the Snake," and during 1 month entertained some 78 wayfarers. She also gave the younger Jordan generation their basic education.

In the early 1940's the family moved from the canyon ranch to Grangeville; in 1944 they sold the ranch and put the money into a 320-acre farm and an insurance and real-estate business.

The business subsequently was sold and the Oregon graduate began operating a farmer-owned string of warehouses and a pea-processing plant besides running his own farm. Success with this led to an additional 400 acres of farm land, a farm-implement business, and the Ford-Mercury dealership in Grangeville.

When Len Jordan first announced that he was running for the nomination, at least one would-be political expert in Idaho just smiled and remarked that "some car dealer in Grangeville is running on a ticket of highway improvement."

At that, probably no man in the State was more qualified to run on a platform including such a plank. Jordan had been more than auto dealer and rancher for the 2 years before his election as Governor. He had been representative from Idaho County to the State legislature and in turn had been chairman of the committee appointed to study highway-user taxation.

As chairman of this committee, he helped Idaho move into its present sound financial status. The inland State is high among the few solvent States in the Nation.

The governor at that time, who also helped bring that solvency, didn't face a full Republican legislature as Jordan is doing. Last session C. A. Robins worked with both houses under Democratic control.

Robins was Idaho's twelfth, and Jordan the thirteenth Republican governor. All but one man, the secretary of state, in the statehouse with Jordan is a Republican.

One Idahoan who was a State official but won't be returning this session is Cal Wright—Democratic candidate who was defeated by Jordan. A popular man throughout Idaho, Wright was justly feared by Republican Party leaders, but he early conceded the election to the man from Grangeville.

After the election was over and the governorship won, Jordan was uneasy over the difficult job of pulling together Idaho's divergent interests. He feared that 50 percent of the people would hate him at the end of 4 years—and he might be correct. It's not easy to win strong support from both the leading religious factions and the gambling interests in a State like Idaho.

But if Jordan history repeats—his years at Oregon, then ranching and other business ventures—this political newcomer from the Oregon side of the Snake will soon be a success as Governor of Idaho.

A New Birth of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A New Birth of Freedom." This address was delivered by Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., on Friday, July 28, 1950, at Lake Success, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM

All progress in the world comes slowly, and at a price. It is well to keep this in mind when the turn of events seems to make us unhappy with the United Nations. We would be realists if we think of the United Nations today as a gawky boy in the most awkward, most difficult period of life.

You and I have seen plenty of such boys. Looking at one of them, in his years of frustration and self doubt, even his parents are sometimes worried about his future. No relative or friend is wise enough to predict how that lad will turn out.

He may turn out to be a total failure. All of us have seen boys who did fail in spite of all that well wishers could offer in the way of counsel and support.

On the other hand, he may develop talents and power so vast, and aptitudes which have been unknown as to make him an influence for good not merely in his own community but in the whole country and even the whole world.

One such unpromising youngster was born in the humblest sort of home in Kentucky 141 years ago. His father was a failure, judged by the world's standards; his mother had been a servant. Neither they nor he had more than a few months' formal schooling.

The boy was tall, homely, and most unimpressive. He showed no special talent. He had few successes. He served for a few weeks as a volunteer in the Black Hawk War, but without distinction. He worked for farmers in Indiana and Illinois. He split rails for a few cents an hour. He was for a little while a partner in a crossroads grocery store which went bankrupt. He got himself admitted to the bar and elected to the Illinois Legislature. His youthful speeches did not attract much attention. Nobody—not even his best friends and well wishers—could think of him as anything more than just another small-town lawyer-politician.

Yet, all the time something deep and strong and powerful was going on inside him. Something that was one day to make his name known in the farthest corners of the world; something that still lives in the heart of every man and woman who seeks—as he did—to make sure that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." The United Nations may be as futile and as little known in the years to come as some of the boys who grew up with Abraham Lincoln. That is a possibility, though I do not believe a likely one. Or the United Nations may go on to write in even broader terms the goal proclaimed almost a century ago by the backwoods lawyer who became our President when he said: "* * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom." It can well be, through the United Nations organization, that this world under God shall have a new birth of freedom.

Yes, the United Nations can be, with God's help and our own faith and devotion, the greatest agency for good that has come into the world in 1900 years.

Toward that goal of international good, and peace and well-being, let us work, and believe, and hope.

We—the people of America—have been elected by fate to occupy an important position in the United Nations. For the moment we have to carry more than our share. We may not like it. We cannot expect to be thanked. We will often be criticized. But we are elected. We cannot resign. We cannot duck. We cannot run. It is a great chance for the people if their strength of purpose, their tolerance, and their bigness hold out. I am one of those who believe we will hold out and win.

Increased Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial carries some very constructive views regarding increased postal rates. While I have always felt that this great Government service should in a large way be self-sustaining, we must not overlook the fact that the service serves all of the people and therefore the Hoover Commission reports should be studied extensively and their recommendations put into effect at once before any large increases are made in these rates at this time. The following editorial appeared in the West Bend News, of West Bend, Wis.:

INCREASED POSTAL RATES

Strenuous effort is now being made by the Post Office Department of the Federal Government and by President Truman to rush legislation through Congress that will double second-class postal rates. Companion bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress, and both bills call for a 100-percent increase in second-class rates in 3 years—50 percent the first year, 25 the second, and 25 the third year.

In urging an increase in his message to Congress in February, President Truman made certain statements which we believe do not present the situation fairly to either the Congress or the public. The figures used by the President are based upon post office cost-accounting figures. We believe those figures to be erroneous because the fundamental realities of proper cost accounting methods are ignored.

Post-office cost accounting is determined on a weight and per-piece basis, without consideration of public-service factors or priorities. However, these factors are basic and paramount in the operation of the post office, because the post office is not a business, but is a service to all the American people, and hence cost figures determined as they would be in competitive business are of little value for setting rates.

For example, according to the post office's own records, there are some 39,000 of the present 41,000 post offices in this country which do not take in sufficient money to pay their own expenses. Some 94 percent of all post offices are in this category. We believe that this only serves to prove that the Post Office Department is created primarily for service to American citizens and not as a business proposition. How many chain stores, we ask, could continue to exist if 94 percent of their stores did not take in sufficient funds to pay their expenses?

The idea that the post office should serve all the American public on a business basis is not in agreement with the handling of other governmental departments. For in 1950, there were differences between income and outgo in the Interior Department, which operated with a deficit of about $460,000,000; in the Commerce Department, with a deficit of about $668,000,000, and in the Department of Agriculture, which showed a deficit of about $475,000,000. Each of these serves mere segments of the population. The post office serves everyone. The President, in his message of February, gives the estimated net postal deficit for 1952 as $361,000,000, which is less than any of those just mentioned.

The President mentions that publications made a contribution to the spread of information and education among all citizens. He does not mention, however, the very valuable effect of these publications, particularly in times like this, in carrying information concerning the national defense effort both to the people of this country and also to the millions of readers throughout the world. Nor does he mention the great contribution of advertising to defense bond sales, to the maintenance of steady employment, to Red Cross recruiting, and a host of other services.

The President points out that the matter of postal rates should be subject to very thorough study. We can agree with him wholeheartedly. We believe that such a study will prove conclusively that the post office is a service agency of the Government; that cost accounting charges should fundamentally be divided into two groups, "Government service" and "business handling"; that the first class should be paid for wholly by the Government, as are the deficits in the Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments, and that the costs in the second

group should be reflected in the rate structure of the postal service.

For the reasons indicated, it is urged that the enactment of the rate increases at this time either be deferred, or kept at a very low level, and that the survey which the President suggests should be completed before any substantial rate increases are attempted. It is urged very strongly that this thorough survey of the whole subject of postal rates be undertaken by an independent body similar in type to the Hoover Commission or the committees who in the past have made studies and recommendations in connection with social security.

Postal Rate Problem Needs Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Cadiz Republican, Cadiz, Ohio. The thinking of Mr. Milton Ronsheim, the editor of this outstanding eastern Ohio weekly, closely coincides with my own on the matter of postal rates:

POSTAL RATE PROBLEM NEEDS STUDY

Once again the Post Office Department, with the backing of President Truman, is making its bid in Congress to substantially increase rates on various classes of postage. We believe the post-office deficit has not been properly presented and that the proposed rate increase would be another unnecessary expense upon a harassed public.

In the first place, the Post Office Department, in spite of its reluctance to adopt any economy measures except to give poorer mail delivery to its patrons, comes nearer to making itself pay than any other governmental agency.

It is not a business but a service to the public. Rural routes were never expected to pay their own way; they were instituted as a "free delivery" to persons unable to go to a post office daily. The service is one of "delivery" and not of "sending" mail and should be so considered in counting its cost.

The post office is likewise one of the Government's own service organization. A huge quantity of mail sent by Government agents and agencies is handled free and given no place on the credit side of the ledger. Here, for example, the mail of such agencies as the county extension agents, Production and Marketing Administration, draft board, conservation office, Weather Bureau, FBI, health department, the post office, and others pay no postage. Incoming free mail is also very heavy. It is estimated that half of the post-office deficit comes from franked mail.

Additional postage on newspapers would be another added cost of production to a large number of increased expenses. By their very nature, newspapers give a constant, free public service, both to government and community. The current issue of the Republican, for example, carries the following: A long explanation of new social-security benefits and what applicants should do; the weekly news of extension agents; draft board news; civilian defense news and a plea for first-aid instructors; about a church fund drive and efforts to secure a doctor for Cadiz; an editorial on fire safety; announcement of a civil-service examination for the post office itself for a rural route carrier, and so on. These services are of considerable value to good government—and are given free as a routine job.

We believe Congress should go into the entire post-office problem before changing its postal rates. The issue is broader than just raising rates to meet a deficit. Certainly an over-all survey will show where many economies may be effected, that millions of dollars listed as deficits should be listed as free services and that the post office is a service organization, after all.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier Journal:

GRAIN FOR INDIA HAS NOW BECOME AN UGLY BARTER

If your neighbor was hungry, would you give him a piece of bread? Of course you would, and whatever else your refrigerator could afford. India is our neighbor in this world grown strangely small. And if for no other reason than that of human compassion we should be touched by India's plight. Droughts, floods, and earthquakes have ravaged that teeming land. It faces a famine catastrophic even in a country where pain and privation are familiar visitors. For grain is the factor between life and death for India, and the season's crops are ruined.

India asked the United States to sell 2,000,000 tons of wheat on long-term credit. After talks in which Herbert Hoover, Senator TAFT, and other Republicans agreed with President Truman, the President asked Congress in February to give the grain to India. Congress has not yet acted, and what should have been a simple act of decency has become a haggle over human lives and souls.

Why this delay? The Indian Government refused to join the United Nations' condemnation of Red China as the aggressor in Korea. India has tried, even though with ineffectual good will, to find some means to end the conflict in Korea. And there are still men in Congress who cannot see that in this fateful time free men must keep their brothers if they themselves stay free.

Instead of a plain act of kindness, the wheat transaction has become a cynical contest between Soviet Communist and western freedom. Red China has offered India 1,000,000 tons of rice and corn in barter, and the Soviet Union is ready to supply 50,000 more tons. This, you may say, should not influence us in a matter which morality should decide alone. Just the same, it must. The United States cannot buy Indian understanding of our loyalties and our independence with 2,000,000 tons of grain. But here is a nation just emerging from colonialism. If, faced with disaster, it finds strength in the blandishments of communism and deadly inaction in us who boast of the world's most vital resources, then what may we expect? Millions more Indians will hurry toward the mirage of Soviet totalitarianism. We will have failed to lead them to the journey's end of freedom and self-respect. And this wide domain of all we cherish will one day become a refuge and a lonely land.

Taxes on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans realize that it takes taxes to support Government and to supply necessary Government services. They also know that taxes assessed at the local level return more in Government services than Federal assessments. That is why I am opposed to the taxing of municipal securities. The following editorial in the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter expresses the sincere opinions of taxpayers in my district:

TAXES ON TAXES

The Federal Government, at the suggestion of Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, proposes to tax the interest which municipalities pay on the general obligation bonds which they issue.

Municipalities the Nation over are having a tough time finding sources of taxation through which to raise funds to meet general service obligations which have been saddled on them by law. Larger and larger portions of the taxes to which the local communities rightfully should be entitled are now going into State and national treasuries.

The irony of the whole thing is that at the same time State and National governments continue to boast about the huge sums they are returning to the local communities as aids.

Aids? That's just another word to confuse and make the local taxpayer feel good and to give the politicians an opportunity to brag about all the money they are getting out of Washington and Madison for their constituents. Actually it's much like someone blackjacking an individual, taking $50 out of his wallet, giving him $5 back and pretending to be a good fellow.

The bill to tax interest on municipal indebtedness, the bright idea of Secretary Snyder, is now pending in the House Ways and Means Committee. It is hoped that the members will have enough sense either to recommend its rejection or forget all about reporting it out.

If the Snyder proposal is enacted into law it will be a tough blow for Fond du Lac and all other cities who in the future try to float bond issues to finance necessary municipal improvement. If the interest rates on municipal bonds are taxed by the Federal Government, it is certain that prospective buyers will be reluctant to purchase them without a compensatory increase in the rate of interest. Increase the interest rate and the cost of municipal government will increase substantially.

Let's take Berlin in a neighboring county because most everyone is acquainted with this up and coming community. If Berlin wanted to build a new sewage plant the cost probably would be increased by more than $200,000 because the tax would probably double the interest rate paid on the bonds. And who would pay that extra $200,000 in interest charges over the years? Certainly not the people who buy them. Certainly not the Federal Government. Well, there's always the poor taxpayer.

But let's bring it closer to home. In the Fond du Lac budget for this year there are $18,368 set aside for bond interest. If the tax were enacted by the Federal Government actually that interest would mount to

nearly $37,000. The interest, without the tax, is going to be more in future years. Over a period of years the increase by reason of a Federal tax would mount into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It is quite evident that Fond du Lac, as well as many other communities, could not absorb that additional burden and many municipal improvements, necessary as they might be, would have to left undone.

If you are opposed to unwarranted increases in local taxes write or wire your Representatives in Congress—Representative WILLIAM K. VAN PELT and Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY.

Rustle of Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bernie Yudain from the Greenwich Time, of Greenwich, Conn.:

THE RAMBLER

(By Bernie Yudain)

RUSTLE OF SPRING

As long as I've lived in the country, I can't tell you what kind of bird I heard whistling a sweet madrigal the other morning as I left for work. It was a strong voice, and a melodic one. My unseen diva seemed happy.

Nights now, you hear the peepers, too. Their incessant sing-song cheeping is the familiar pizzicato in the Spring Song. The squirrels are darting to and fro and up and down the elms and poplars and I suppose out in the fields where, alas, I am not wont to trod these busy days, there is considerable bustling.

The first red flush of budlets can be seen on the branches and some proud golden splashes of the hearty forsythia brighten the suburban streets.

The winter-jaded observer, submerged in routine, occupied with the headlines, concerned over the future, pauses and realizes that spring is here. Soon the pale green puffs will adorn the trees, and winter-weary lawns will take on a green freshness—a new lease on life.

This, then, is the season of hope, and these natural stirrings are its myriad heralds.

Whether Easter comes early or late, the spring is God's promise to His children—to all the harried, disillusioned people who have lost their shiny dreams in a miasma of war, threats of war, scandal, violence, corruption, deceit, chicanery, and nearly universal callousness.

Now comes the reminder—right outside our window, along the neighborhood streets, in the meadows and woods—that nothing really has changed, except us.

There's a sweetness and a soothing balm in the air and the bright sun lights up the darkened corners of our lives, its warm rays melting some of the tenseness and rudeness of our ways.

Here nature seems to be offering us the Grail—not even demanding we go forth and find it. But we're a busy people in this frenetic age of speed and atoms and electronics. Perhaps one day or another during the vernal season we'll stop to take a deep breath of the clear air and observe that spring is wonderful, but then we'll get right back on the treadmill for another interminable race with whatever it is we're racing.

The chipmunks and the larks, alas, seem to give forth better music when "heaven tries the earth if it be in tune."

Living a Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many people talk about religion and what to do about it, but not enough of us really live it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a column from the New York Times of Sunday, April 1, which in eloquently simple prose retells a story known to every Ohioan. This oft-told tale shines like a beacon light in these troubled times:

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

MAN NAMED CHAPMAN

A hundred and fifty years ago this April a stranger turned up in Licking Spring, Ohio. Strangers were scarce in Licking Spring. The only white man living there looked closely at this one. He was 26, tall, thin, black-eyed. He wore homemade frontier-style clothing. His name, he said, was Jonathan Chapman and he had come West from Massachusetts by way of Pittsburgh. What he did at Licking Spring must have baffled its only resident. Instead of staking off a piece of land for himself, Chapman hunted until he found a small clearing. He took apple seeds from a loaded burlap bag and planted them. He put a rough fence around the plot and left Licking Spring as noiselessly as he had come.

That was the first appearance in American history of Johnny Appleseed, a man more tenderly remembered in the years to follow then any river-boat load of assorted politicians, generals, and statesmen.

MUSKINGUM WHITE WOMAN KOKOSING

A few years later Johnny was seen on the Ohio with two boats filled with apple seeds from the cider presses in Pitsburgh. Thereafter his trail is not easy to follow. He paddled his boat up White Woman Creek, up the Licking River, the Muskingum, the Mohican and the Kokosing. He set out his orchards at Steubenville and a half hundred other places in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan. Wherever apples bloomed fresh in the wilderness a man could say for sure that Johnny had been there. Sometimes he returned to his planting for seedlings to set elsewhere; as often, he did not. He left his nurseries behind in the hope that the settlers might realize what beauty and riches he had planted for them and care for them as he did.

LIVING A RELIGION

A hundred small towns knew him, but they knew as little of his coming and going as of the birds of spring and autumn. They knew him as a religious zealot but one who lived his religion far more than he talked it. The main drive of his life was selflessness; he had set out to plant apples because, back East, he had heard that Ohio apples were dying and he felt called to replant them, that the settlers might eat the fruit and be spared the scurvy. His way of life and his work made him a legend among the simple people of his day and long before he died. In a land that was hard and where life was hard, his disinterest in the things that concerned most men brought him the great love that outlasted his life. He died in 1845, near Fort Wayne, Ind., after catching cold while inspecting one of his nurseries.

THE LEGENDS GROW

After his death the legends about him grew like one of his own trees. Men told of his ways with the Indians, of their friendship for him and their trust and of the times Johnny had dealt with them alone and unafraid. Another man told how he had seen Johnny playing with bear cubs while the mother bear watched without concern; few humans have walked this earth who could do that. Others told how Johnny would eat no meat, carry no gun, how he would give the clothes from his back to any man who needed them, how he would walk the winter woods barefoot, how he would ask a simple meal at a cabin door and pay for it with apple trees, how he asked to sleep the night on a cabin floor and was gone long before his hosts awoke.

THE HARDER AIM

The men of his day who sought and gained wealth, power, and prestige are long forgotten. Still remembered, as fresh as Ohio apple blossoms, is the simple man who took no care for the things of the morrow as he walked through early American history and brushed close to people's hearts. Perhaps it was because, after all, wealth and power and prestige may not be so hard to achieve; many a man gets them. Johnny Appleseed aimed at something much tougher: to leave the world a more neighborly place than he found it.

Congress Itself Gives Away Its Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have seen so many articles and heard so many speeches deploring the fact that the bureaus and the President are fast taking away the powers of Congress. Some Congressmen have made similar statements. The public, through radio addresses and letters, have generally importuned Congress to make an effort to reclaim its powers under the Constitution. I think this should be done, but it is so easy to accomplish that few will accept my recipe for doing it.

Under the Constitution, the House of Representatives and the Senate can, by joint resolution, reduce the powers which have been delegated to any executive bureau, and prevent further delegation. The reason why executive bureaus today make rules and regulations with the force of law is not because these bureaus have usurped the power of Congress, but because Congress has, by law, delegated these powers to the various executive agencies. Congress could have withheld such powers from the bureaus, but it declined to do so and through poor and inattentive legislation has passed on to these bureaus the power that Congress itself should be exercising.

A fair example of this wholesale delegation of powers of Congress is found in the Treasury Department. This department makes rules and regulations

sometimes not only daily but hourly and these regulations have the force of law. The only way for an individual citizen to know what the law is, is to read the Federal Register which comes out every day. What was lawful yesterday is unlawful today. As soon as these regulations are published and they are published every night in the Government Printing Office, they become the law of the land. Who gave the Treasury Department any such complete and arrogant legislative powers? It was Congress and no one else. The Treasury Department has not in any way usurped this power but merely exercises its right under the authority of Congress. The authority, in many cases, is a positive command to exercise this power and to stay within the duties and obligations of its office, the Treasury is officially enjoined to make these laws.

Congress itself cannot complain because the various executive departments are actively engaged in making laws and doing what Congress itself should do. There is a grave question, too, whether Congress has the right to delegate general legislative powers.

Further delegation of these powers could be stopped at once if Congress would do so. The public should not condemn these autocratic bureaus—they should condemn Congress for creating such a situation.

The next complaint which is generally heard is that the Executive has assumed dictatorial powers. There is nothing about this situation that Congress cannot control any time it wants to. Bills are constantly coming before Congress to enlarge the powers of the President, and if Congress is not in accord, it can say "No." Suppose the President assumed powers he does not have, such as the engaging in war without the consent of Congress. What can be done to prevent it? How can the Chief Executive be stopped in this matter?

The framers of the Government had had a very sad experience with arbitrary power in Great Britain and threw off the yoke of this autocratic power so that when they themselves came to organize their own government, after a bloody revolution, they made sure that the people would never find themselves under the rule of autocracy.

The framers of our Government placed the great responsibility of preserving the people's government in the hands of those Members of the lower House of Congress by giving that body the complete control of the purse strings of the Nation. The framers put this trust in this body because they were nearest to the people and had to go before the people every 2 years to give an account of their stewardship. On this matter the Constitution reads:

Section 7, article I: All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Section 9, article I provides: No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement of accounts and receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

The primary responsibility of checking the Executive or any other division of the executive branch rests, therefore, on the House of Representatives. Suppose the President, for example, should disobey constitutional limitations and engage in an activity which never had the approval of Congress, directly or indirectly? Even in that case, the President would be powerless to engage in the undertaking unless Congress appropriated the money, and if the House refused to pass such an appropriation, the Executive could be checked and stopped. This power the House of Representatives has and it is the strongest power belonging to any department of government. The responsibility for the maintenance of a free government is lodged in the lower House nearest to the people.

All the complaints written and heard about the powers that the President has taken away from Congress cannot be maintained. If that situation has developed whose fault is it? It is not the fault of the executive department. It is the fault of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. As Members of Congress we cannot with good grace join in this public clamor against the usurpation of powers by the President. We are at fault and no other body. If this lower House would stand up on its own feet and exercise the power which the Constitution gives it, no such charge of Executive usurpation could or would be made. We represent the people and the people expect us to protect them with this great power which has come down to us since the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787.

Too much fault cannot, however, be found with the Members of the House of Representatives if extra powers are granted almost every day—especially those powers asked by the President. In a state of war or a condition bordering on all-out war the President, as Commander in Chief of the Nation, must have reasonable authority to act in the interest of the country and when war is actually here, democracy does not function in a normal manner. What we have a right to do in peacetime we have no right to do in time of war. We can do nothing that in any way interferes with the war effort, and the judge of that situation is the Commander in Chief. Members of the House, as a usual rule, vote just about the way that suits the people who elected them and if the real cause of stripping Congress of its constitutional powers is finally run down it will be found that the voters themselves are to blame. It is very infrequent that a Member of Congress will defy the will of the voters back home.

Applying this doctrine to the present situation, I can show how the powers of Congress are taken over. At the present moment, the President insists that we put an army into Western Europe without the consent of Congress. When that is done and a war actually starts, we are engaged in war which the Constitution says cannot be engaged in without the authority of Congress.

If I make a stand against the President's action and say we must obey the Constitution, what happens? Thousands of letters and telegrams come pouring in from North Dakota to support the President in anything he wants. These communications say, in substance, "No matter if the President is overriding the powers of Congress, the situation is grave and therefore support the President." What am I to do as a Representative of the people? If I follow my own judgment, I will not be a party to giving away those powers. I vote "No," and then the fur flies. I am branded in the papers as a misrepresentative of the people and the chances are good that I would be kicked out of Congress body and breeches at the next election. The average Congressman likes to stay in Congress, for what particular reason I do not know, and to stay in he follows the wishes of the people who bombard him with letters and messages. The powers are therefore taken away from Congress and turned over to the President, and who did it? The people did it. That is the reason why so many Congressmen vote away the powers of Congress—they are afraid not to—they are afraid of what the voters will do to them.

Those Members who do not feel that being in Congress is the most important thing in life, and that in some way they can eke out a meager existence outside Congress, stand up and vote their convictions. They refuse to turn over the powers of Congress to the Executive or anyone else. They defend the Constitution which they are sworn to do. They are not swerved by war hysteria or any other hysteria. These men may be censured, may be removed from office, and shunned as a citizen, but it is men of this stamp who have preserved our Government. These men can retire to private life with the full consciousness that they have done the right thing while in office and, after all, peace of mind and a clear conscience are more to be desired than anything the voters can offer.

Election of Governor of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a collection of editorials from Alaska newspapers endorsing the proposal I have made that Alaska be granted the right to elect its own Governor. They include an editorial from the Ketchikan Daily News of December 19, 1950, entitled "Why Not Election of Governor?"; an editorial from the Daily Alaska Empire of January 4, 1951, entitled "Elected Alaska Governor"; a column of comment from the Petersburg Press of January 5, 1951; and an editorial from the Sitka Sentinel of December 5,

1950. All of these newspapers are dailies except the Petersburg Press.

I call attention to the fact that all the daily newspapers in the Territiory, with the exception of two, have endorsed this proposal.

Along the same line, the Territorial House of Alaska has just adopted a memorial calling for enactment of my bill or similiar legislation. I do not yet have the text of this legislative memorial, but I have here a newspaper clipping from the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, for March 21, 1951, entitled "Elective Governor Approved," which announces final approval of this memorial.

In view of this wide-spread support within the Territory for the principle embodied in my bill, S. 105, I strongly believe that this Congress should take speedy action on it.

I might say that I understand that the Alaska House also feels that the Governor's successor, the Lieutenant Governor, or secretary, should likewise be made elective, and I would personally be glad to incorporate that change in my bill.

It is noteworthy, Mr. President, that the Alaska House while strongly endorsing this proposal for an elected Governor, specifically declined some weeks ago to go on record in favor of immediate approval of Alaska statehood.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ketchikan Daily News of December 19, 1950]

WHY NOT ELECTION OF GOVERNOR?

We understand that Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has announced his intention of opposing any bill which would give Alaskans the right to elect their own Governor on the grounds that it would interfere with Alaska's chances for immediate statehood.

Try as we will we cannot go along with this line of reasoning. In the first place our Delegate over 2 years ago pledged his unqualified support to such a bill only to pull strings to have it shelved at the first opportunity. If that bill had been acted on at that time Alaska today would have been working with a Governor elected by the people of the Territory and one who had their absolute trust and support. We do not believe that Delegate BARTLETT was working for the best interests of the people who elected him when he sabotaged the bill.

Now with the proposed statehood bill falling by its own weight and the bungling of those who claimed to be all out for it we find our duly elected Delegate again going all out to attempt to scuttle a bill giving us a chance to elect our own Governor on the grounds that such a measure would hurt our chances for statehood. We feel that Delegate BARTLETT is deliberately abandoning his obligation to the people of the Territory in order to keep Federal Appointee Ernest Gruening on the job. The results of the last election bear out the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike repudiated Governor Gruening for working against the best interests of Alaska and we predict that they will eventually repudiate BARTLETT for the same reasons if he continues on his present course.

In the first place the bill giving us the right to elect our Governor would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in any manner. Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a state constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished.

In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our own Governor, this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust. There would be nothing about the bill to prevent Ernest Gruening from filing as a candidate and giving the voters an opportunity to express an opinion about him, but we feel that they would reject him by a larger majority than any man has ever been rejected in Alaska's history. This is probably the reason why BOB BARTLETT is attempting to sabotage the bill.

Federally appointed Gov. Ernest Gruening in his long tenure in office has failed to lead Alaska forward to the position she should hold today. He has proven himself an adept politician and has created a powerful political machine at the expense of the taxpayers, but his attitudes and actions have strangled the industrial development of the Territory and divided its people.

There are men here in Alaska who have been here many years and who understand the problems of the country and have the ability to meet them in a forthright manner. Such men have the faith and confidence of the people, and voters should have the absolute right to choose one of them as governor.

BOB BARTLETT is aware of this fact, for he has told us so. We sympathize with his present position, for he is at the crossroads where he must choose between his loyalty to Gruening or his obligations to the people who voted him into office. We are sure that Alaskans will be watching his choice with interest, for they have a great deal at stake.

This much is certain: If BOB BARTLETT has legitimate reasons for opposing a bill granting Alaska the right to elect its own governor, the people will give him a close and a fair hearing. On the other hand they are not in the mood to accept the weak-kneed reasoning which was shown in the professional lobbying deal. We sincerely hope that Mr. BARTLETT continues to place the welfare of the people of Alaska above all other interests.

[From the Daily Alaska Empire of January 4, 1951]

ELECTED ALASKA GOVERNOR

United States Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, will reintroduce his bill in Congress amending the organic act to permit the election of the Governor in Alaska. A bill was introduced in the last Congress, but there was no opportunity for its being heard before the wind-up of the Eighty-first congressional session. Already there is heard in Alaska reports that this bill, the election of an Alaska Governor, will be fought by statehood supporters.

In regard to this important legislation Sid D. Charles, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan Daily News, editorially said, under the caption of "Why not election of governor," the following:

"We understand that Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has announced his intention of opposing any bill which would give Alaskans the right to elect their own Governor on the grounds that it would interfere with Alaska's chances for immediate statehood.

"Try as we will, we cannot go along with this line of reasoning. In the first place, our Delegate over 2 years ago pledged his unqualified support to such a bill only to pull strings to have it shelved at the first opportunity. If that bill had been acted on at that time, Alaska today would have been working with a Governor elected by the people of the Territory and one who had their absolute trust and support. We do not believe that Delegate BARTLETT was working for the best interests of the people who elected him when he sabotaged the bill.

"Now with the proposed statehood bill failing by its own weight and the bungling of those who claimed to be all out for it, we find our duly elected Delegate again going all out to attempt to scuttle a bill giving us a chance to elect our own Governor on the grounds that such a measure would "hurt" our chances for statehood. We feel that Delegate BARTLETT is deliberately abandoning his obligation to the people of the Territory in order to keep Federal Appointee Ernest Gruening on the job. The results of the last election bear out the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike repudiated Governor Gruening for working against the best interests of Alaska and we predict that they will eventually repudiate BARTLETT for the same reasons if he continues on his present course.

"In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our Governor, it would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in any manner. Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January, it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a State constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished.

"In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our own Governor, this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust. There would be nothing about the bill to prevent Ernest Gruening from filing as a candidate and giving the voters an opportunity to express an opinion about him—but we feel that they would reject him by a larger majority than any man has ever been rejected in Alaska's history. This is probably the reason why BOB BARTLETT is attempting to sabotage the bill.

"Federally appointed Gov. Ernest Gruening in his long tenure in office has failed to lead Alaska forward to the position she should hold today. He has proven himself an adept politician and has created a powerful political machine at the expense of the taxpayers, but his attitudes and actions have strangled the industrial development of the Territory and divided its people.

"There are men here in Alaska who have been here many years and who understand the problems of the country and have the ability to meet them in a forthright manner. Such men have the faith and confidence of the people, and the voters should have the absolute right to choose one of them as Governor.

"BOB BARTLETT is aware of this fact, for he has told us so. We sympathize with his present position, for he is at the cross roads where he must choose between his loyalty to Gruening or his obligations to the people who voted him into office. We are sure that Alaskans will be watching his choice with interest, for they have a great deal at stake.

"This much is certain: If BOB BARTLETT has legitimate reasons for opposing a bill granting Alaska the right to elect its own Governor, the people will give him a close and a fair hearing. On the other hand, they are not in the mood to accept the weak-kneed reasoning which was shown in the professional lobbying deal. We sincerely hope that Mr. BARTLETT continues to place the welfare of the people of Alaska above all other interests."

[From the Petersburg Press of January 5, 1951]

With the new Eighty-second Congress now in session, the question of statehood for Alaska is again a live issue.

Much has been said about the advantages of statehood, some of it true, some of it distinctly untrue and still more conjecture.

The most ridiculous statements have been made up from the latter two categories. There have been slightly veiled threats made that if Alaskans are not given statehood they will "secede" from the United States. This is so obviously silly that no one up here even gives it a second thought. It is possible, however, that it might give concern to those Senators who are sincere in thinking it is dangerous to give statehood to "furriners" like us Alaskans. Incidentally, we've just been reading some early American history and find a remarkable parallel in the thinking of eighteenth century New England statesmen who believed honestly that the Union would be destroyed by the admission of the ignorant and illiterate outlanders from Kentucky and Tennessee.

In the category of conjecture is some of the argument we have heard that Alaska would contribute more to the defense of our country if it were a State. Some pretty silly propositions are being tied onto the tail of national defense kite. But we believe it is unjust to the loyal Alaskans who make up 99.44 percent of our population to claim they would love their country one bit more or defend it one whit more willingly if we were a State than if we are a Territory. Nor do we believe, despite a recent editorial we read to the contrary, that our country will toss us off the sleigh to the pursuing Russian wolves if the going gets bad. The North American continent is in this thing together and self-preservation of us all depends on mutual defense.

Statehood as an ideal is good. We hope it comes at such a time and in such a manner that we can afford it.

Meanwhile, we suggest that Congress get busy and give to us the right which even Puerto Rico has, to elect our own Governor. That would be a good beginning.

[From the Sitka Sentinel of December 5, 1950]

With the withdrawal yesterday of Senator Lucas' motion that the statehood bill for Alaska be considered by the Senate it would almost be a miracle if this question comes up again at this short session of Congress. Groundwork has been laid in both the House and Senate for its introduction when the next Congress convenes but after seeing its treatment by the Dixie Democrats there is little likelihood of either Alaska or Hawaii becoming states in the immediate future.

Puerto Rico was granted the right several years ago to elect its own Governor and more or less conducted its affair without interference from the Department of the Interior. Two years ago, Delegate E. L. BARTLETT promised to introduce a similar bill along with statehood, so that in the event statehood was defeated, Alaskans might have a chance at a greater measure of self-government.

Nothing has been heard concerning the fate of this measure but it appears certain it would receive support in the Territory both from those who favor statehood and those who oppose it. We believe such a measure should be introduced in the short session and pushed vigorously so that irrespective of what happens to any statehood bills in the future, Alaskans may have the privilege of selecting their own governor.

As many Alaskans felt the present statehood bill was deficient in a number of respects, retaining control of too large a portion of land and natural resources to the Government, the bypassing of the measure by the present Congress is something of a blessing. To those ardent adherents of statehood at any price, it is a serious blow.

If the Territory is granted the right to elect its own governor it would appear we might then have a chance to prove to the Doubting Thomases in Congress that Alaska is ready, politically, to assume its place in the Union.

[From the Daily Alaska Empire of March 21, 1951]

ELECTIVE GOVERNOR APPROVED—HOUSE MEMORIAL SEEKING ACTION BY CONGRESS, PASSED 14 TO 10

(By Bob De Armond)

Hotly contested House Memorial 36, seeking action by Congress to allow Alaskans to elect their governor, won final approval last evening. The vote on passage of the memorial was 14 to 10.

When the memorial goes to Congress it will, at the request of Representative McCutcheon, carry a letter giving the vote on its passage. And at the request of other members of the house, the letter will give also the name, party affiliation, and the division represented, as well as the vote on the memorial of each member of the house.

Only one of many amendments offered from the floor was adopted. The amendment deleted from the memorial a reference to an elective governor bill now before Congress. Opponents of the memorial objected to the reference because a bill was introduced by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, whom they had labeled the greatest foe of statehood.

Democratic members of the house who had said earlier that they would probably vote for the memorial changed their position when Representative McCutcheon read a letter from Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, addressed to Curtis Shattuck, of Juneau.

"This memorial would be a mortal blow to statehood," the Bartlett letter said.

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT

In the final vote, the memorial was approved by all 10 Republican members of the house—Representatives Barnes, Johnson, Locken, Hendrickson, and MacKinnon from the first division; Laws from the second division; and Gasser, Miscovich, Stepovich, and Wilbur from the fourth division; and by all of the Democrats from the second and fourth divisions—Representatives Degnan, Franklin, Madsen, and Wells.

Voting against the memorial were the third division members of the house—Representatives Carlson, Conright, Egan, Kay, McCutcheon, Pollard, and Scavenius; and three members from the first division—Representatives Gundersen, Hope, and Metcalfe. All are Democrats.

VETO SUSTAINED

After hearing from Attorney General J. Gerald Williams, former Attorney General Henry Roden, and Attorney William L. Paul, Jr., in support of the Governor's veto of house bill 63, and Attorney Robert Boochever, and Banker Marshall Crutcher in support of the bill, the house sustained the veto.

The vote on passage of the bill notwithstanding the Governor's veto was 9 to 13, 7 short of the required two-thirds. Representative Stanley McCutcheon led the opposition to the veto in the house, as did his brother, Senator Steve McCutcheon, in the senate.

"I am sorry to find myself on the other side from the Governor," said Representative McCutcheon. "I very seldom get over on that side of the fence, but I fear the Governor has been misled by a letter written to him by William L. Paul, Jr. I find that much of the language of the veto message is similar to the language of the letter."

OTHER VETOES

Two other veto messages were received by the house during the evening, both on bills having to do with banking matters. Although the senate had voted to override both vetoes, house action on them was postponed until today.

The house voted 13 to 11 to table a senate bill providing for a salary increase for the commissioner of veterans' affairs. It also tabled by a 14-to-9 vote a senate bill setting up a Territorial department of lands under the department of taxation. Tax Commissioner M. P. Mullaney appeared before the house regarding the bill but was unable to convince a majority of the members that the department would be worth the $150,000 to $200,000 he estimated it would cost to operate it during the biennium.

SCHOOL CLOSURE

Passed by unanimous vote was senate bill 93, authorizing the board of education to close certain rural schools that the board feels could be partly supported locally. Dr. James Ryan, commissioner of education, told the house that several schools, including those at Homer, Dillingham, Bethel, and Wasilla, are larger than many schools in places that have incorporated and so assumed a part of the financial burden.

Another school bill, providing for the automatic creation of an independent school district when a municipality is incorporated within an incorporated school district was also passed unanimously.

Other senate bills approved by the house provide that the Alaska income tax will not be computed on Federal excess-profits taxes, enable the department of public welfare to extend its program to include aid to the blind and amend the law relating to suits brought by minority stockholders.

Also approved was a new senate bill making it mandatory that employees of the Territory, municipalities, and other subdivisions be covered by social security.

The house completed its work at midnight, having cleared its calendar of all except memorials and revenue and appropriation measures, which can be considered today and tomorrow.

Thomas B. McCabe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to express appreciation of the public service of Thomas B. McCabe, whose resignation as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System became effective at the end of March. He now again leaves the service of this Government with the respect and affection of all those who have been associated with him, and particularly those who have worked with him from day to day. He has made a significant contribution to the economic well-being of the Nation. I think it is well summed up in an editorial tribute which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on March 17. The editorial said:

Because of its highly technical nature, Mr. McCabe's service to the Nation has been of a sort that could hardly be expected to attract wide public notice. Nevertheless,

all of us will benefit from his contributions to a stable economy.

My personal regard and affection for Tom McCabe was nurtured nearly a decade ago when a small group of businessmen became convinced of the need for careful and intelligent planning to meet the economic problems which would arise after World War II. Some way had to be found to tap the vast storehouse of vitality, foresight, and experience of the business leaders of this country, and to weld together a constructive force to work cooperatively with the Government. Out of the discussions evolved the formation of the Committee for Economic Development. I was privileged to serve as vice chairman of the original Board of Trustees, of which Mr. McCabe was a member. With the exception of Paul Hoffman, Committee for Economic Development's great chairman whose distinguished record with the Economic Cooperation Administration has contributed so much to the moral and economic strength of our allies, no man contributed more to the formation and success of the Committee for Economic Development than Thomas B. McCabe.

Now Mr. McCabe joins Mr. Hoffman in returning to private life. The contribution of these two men, who worked with complete disregard for their personal interest, and who have devoted their energies to the national welfare during this postwar period, is deserving of the gratitude of the American public. Mr. McCabe served here in Washington during the war, as well, in varying roles. He administered the difficult lend-lease program, among other assignments. When I served in the State Department at the end of the war he patriotically assumed the responsibility of the disposal of surplus property, and surely there has been no more thankless job during the war or since.

After nearly 10 years as chairman of the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 3 years or so ago, Tom McCabe answered the call of the President to serve as chairman of the board here in Washington. He brought to a difficult task a fresh approach to the problems and operations of the Federal Reserve System. His broad background of successful business experience—and he is one of the most respected men of the business community—and his previous experiences in responsible governmental positions enabled him to have an exceptional perspective both in national and international affairs. He had developed also his innate talents as a conciliator and peacemaker—a role that is difficult to play in public service. It was particularly fortunate that he possessed these atttributes and skill in negotiation in dealing with the particular problems of relationships between the Federal Reserve, with its responsibility for monetary and credit policy, and the Treasury, with its equally great responsibilities in the field of debt management. Tom McCabe's approach is to appraise objectively every problem in its true perspective and then to seek common and widespread agreement on the need for finding a satisfactory solution. He has that range of perspective which encompasses the horizons of the community as a whole, and not merely the immediate implications of the problem at hand.

Once having agreed on an ultimate objective, Tom McCabe has worked diligently and earnestly day in and day out, week after week, with a measure of patience and fortitude with which only few are endowed, to seek fair and reasonable compromise and agreement, to seek unity and harmony, and to find grounds for mutual accord, respecting the principles and objectives of each side.

The accord which was recently reached between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve exemplifies the success of this patient search for common ground in solving difficult problems. This was not a victory of one side over the other. It was a triumph of good sense on both sides—of statesmanship in its best meaning. Of this accord the March 10 issue of Business Week said:

> The announcement that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have reached a full accord in their long-standing disagreement over how to reconcile a tighter credit policy with management of the public debt is exceedingly good news. Secretary Snyder and Federal Reserve Board Chairman McCabe are to be congratulated for their patience and persistence in trying to work out a reasonable solution of this difficult problem.

After pointing out that this accord obviated in large part, and perhaps entirely, the need for more drastic types of credit controls, the editorial added:

> Secretary Snyder and Chairman McCabe have had the statesmanship and good sense to save the financial system from that. It will remain for the financial community in general and the banking community in particular to give every encouragement to the working out of this new Treasury-Federal Reserve accord.

Under his direction and leadership, the Federal Reserve System, with its network of banks and branches reaching into every commercial area in the country, has continued to fulfill the mission and to serve the national interest as envisioned by Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass who more than all others were responsible for the creation of this institution.

His role in the fight against inflation has been recognized throughout the country. He has emphasized again and again the dangers that threatened to engulf the Nation on the economic front. Time after time he warned that "you cannot maintain a defense program without a sound dollar." Conscious as he was of the way in which inflation destroys the value of the savings of the people, he has done all in his power to protect the integrity of the people's dollar at a time when its value was in peril. He is entitled to the gratitude of every man who has a savings account, a savings bond, a life insurance policy, or a stake in some retirement program. Yes; the American people. The American people are once more deeply in his debt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a series of editorials which recognize the great work accomplished by Tom McCabe in this, the most recent chapter in his great and continuing career as one of America's most eminent public servants. When tough and difficult jobs are again to be done, I predict that Tom McCabe will once more be found in the saddle.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 18, 1951]

MR. MCCABE AND SUCCESSOR

The resignation of Thomas B. McCabe as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has come as something of a surprise. This probably is not justified, since Mr. McCabe has wanted for some time to return to private life. However, this resignation and the announcement that Assistant Secretary of the Treasury William McChesney Martin has been chosen to succeed him follow closely upon the compromise settlement of the dispute between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. It is natural, therefore, that some people should wonder whether the Treasury point of view is to be imposed on the Federal Reserve through a change of Chairmen.

It is the Star's belief that there is no basis for such an apprehension. The Treasury-Reserve dispute, centering around the question of the extent to which the price (and interest rate) of Government bonds should be supported through the operations of the Open Market Committee, has been resolved on a reasonably satisfactory basis. The Federal Reserve view, in the main, has prevailed. It is true that Mr. Martin represented the Treasury in the negotiations, and presumably he was at least in general sympathy with the position that had been taken by Secretary Snyder. But there is no reason to suppose that he will attempt to reverse what has been accomplished if and when he assumes the chairmanship of the Board.

One reason for this belief is that Mr. Martin was wholeheartedly supported for the chairmanship by Mr. McCabe, and the latter certainly would not have given that support had he entertained any misgivings. Another reason lies in Mr. Martin's own integrity and competency. He will, of course, have to satisfy the Senate as to his philosophy with respect to credit policy. But if experience means anything, Mr. Martin is the right man for the job.

He has been president of the New York Stock Exchange, head of the Export-Import Bank and executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. More importantly, he would bring to his new post both an extensive background of experience in the Treasury and a thorough understanding of the operations of the Federal Reserve. It is very doubtful that the President could have picked any man who is better equipped to carry on the fine work than Mr. McCabe has been doing.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 16, 1951]

RESIGNATION WITH HONORS

The resignation of Thomas B. McCabe as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at this time carries far more significance than it normally might.

For months he had been engaged in a tug of war with Secretary of the Treasury Snyder over Government fiscal policies. Mr. McCabe insistently upheld the independence of the Reserve Board and the responsibility with which it is charged by Congress to regulate the country's credit. In this he was fighting a desperate battle against inflation. An agreement finally was reached only 2 weeks ago on terms that were a victory for the chairman.

The agreement was widely interpreted as meaning that the administration belatedly realized that inflation must be stopped.

Heretofore it has dallied, and at times taken action which accelerated rather than put the brakes on inflationary pressures.

The extent of Mr. McCabe's victory is all the more apparent through the choice of his successor. Mr. Martin was recommended to the President by Mr. McCabe himself, and though he has been an assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has supported the Reserve Board's independence of Treasury domination.

Mr. McCabe has wanted for months to leave the exacting duties of Chairman and return to Chester as head of Scott Paper Co. But every time he made up his mind, a new crisis popped up. Now, with his position vindicated, he feels free to leave.

The country is deeply indebted to him for his services.

[From the Herald Tribune of March 17, 1951]

PEACE BY APPOINTMENT?

The contest between the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury for undisputed leadership in national credit policy enters a fascinating new phase with the resignation of Mr. Thomas B. McCabe from the Board's chairmanship and the appointment in his place of Mr. William McChesney Martin Jr., brought over by Mr. Truman from a position as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The fact that Mr. McCabe has been replaced by a Treasury official naturally raises as many questions about the implications of the change for the Nation's credit policy as it does about Mr. McCabe's stewardship or Mr. Martin's qualifications for his new post. But credit policy cannot be considered apart from the men who make it, so interpretations of the policy implications of the present change must be based upon impressions of Mr. McCabe's record and Mr. Martin's qualifications.

It seems to us that the country has reason to be very grateful to Mr. McCabe for the meritorious service he has rendered as Board chairman and that it may take strong assurance in the appointment of Mr. Martin as his successor. Mr. McCabe deserves a large measure of personal credit for the fact that during the last long inflationary months of his tenure, the Federal Reserve Board has stood virtually alone among Federal agencies as one that understood the need for a consistent anti-inflation policy and was willing to take the initiative in attempting to enforce it. Again, Mr. McCabe can take satisfaction in having eased the conflict with the Treasury over interest-rate policy through his devotion to the methods of conciliation and rejection of tests of strength.

Mr. Martin is highly qualified for his new and difficult post. His intensive experience on both the private and public sides of financial operations is a matter of familiar record. In these matters he has acted as close student, operating participant, and administrator. He is credited with having played the leading role in the forging of the recent agreement under which the Treasury and the Reserve are now working. Under his chairmanship the Board should not only consolidate its authority in the field of credit control but should also, leading from this position of strength, be able to work constructively with the Treasury in the fulfillment of debt management needs. Such a prediction would appear to be much more reasonable than any more pessimistic one based simply on the fact of the new Board chairman's having come from the Treasury.

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1951]

MR. MCCABE RESIGNS

In tendering his resignation to the President Chairman McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board made it very clear that his resignation was not due to the feud between the Board and the Treasury. On the contrary, it is known that he has long wanted to return to his post as president of the Scott Paper Co., but was unwilling to quit until an agreement had been reached with the Treasury. Mr. McCabe has consistently emphasized the close relationship between monetary policy and debt management and the necessity of harmonizing those policies through constant cooperation between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. His advocacy of consultation on a voluntary basis to settle, or rather prevent, disputes has undoubtedly been largely responsible for the recently announced accord. To be sure, many of the problems confronting the two agencies remain to be solved, but, given the will to cooperate, the differences can be settled through compromise.

The President says that Mr. McCabe may feel "justly proud" of his successful efforts to settle the dispute with the Treasury. He may. It should be added that Mr. McCabe will return to business with the good wishes of the host of friends he has made in Washington. He is a public-spirited citizen, selfless and dedicated, and he has the respect of all who have come in contact with him. To many who knew him well affection is united to respect.

William McChesney Martin, Jr., a former president of the New York Stock Exchange and the Export-Import Bank, now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has been nominated by the President to succeed Mr. McCabe. He is a worthy successor, admirably qualified for this important post because of his experience as an officeholder in close contact with financial groups and his reputation as a keen student of monetary and financial problems. The fact that he was one of the Treasury's principal representatives in the negotiation of the recent Federal Reserve-Treasury accord, and that his nomination was suggested by Mr. McCabe indicates that Mr. Martin can be relied upon to recognize the Board's responsibility for controlling an inflationary expansion of credit as well as its obligation to assist the Government in financing the defense effort. Assuming his nomination is confirmed, there is good reason to believe that the satisfactory relationships between the Board and the Treasury will continue to prevail.

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1951]

MR. MARTIN'S APPOINTMENT

Ever since 1949, but especially since the first of this year, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have been locked in controversy over the basic question of whether fiscal convenience should be the overriding consideration in the determination of credit policy, or whether it should be subordinated to the general requirements of the Nation's monetary and economic stability. A fortnight ago, faced with the possibility of a congressional directive providing that all such disputes be resolved in favor of the Federal Reserve, the Treasury agreed to a truce on terms which represented at least a 75 percent victory for its adversary. Now comes the unexpected announcement that Thomas B. McCabe, chairman of the Reserve Board, is resigning and that President Truman has named as his successor an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, William McChesney Martin.

In view of the fact that in the recent past Mr. Truman had mistakenly, if perhaps understandably, identified himself with the cause of the Treasury in this dispute, it would be easy to construe the present move as an overt act on the part of the White House and as a violation of the 2-week-old truce. But such an interpretation would, in our opinion, be decidedly superficial. The nomination may have represented a mischievous thrust at those congressional leaders who had thrown their support behind the Reserve Board, but hardly a malicious one. For, while Mr. Martin would go to the Reserve Board as a graduate of the Treasury Department, his background in the field of finance is a broad one and, for the man of 44, a deep one. As a matter of fact, long before he earned the title of "boy wonder" of finance by ascending to the presidency of the New York Stock Exchange at the tender age of 31, young Martin, had already been steeped in the lore of central banking, for his father had been one of the original governors of the Nation's 12 Regional Reserve banks when the System began operations. Since leaving New York's financial district, and an excellent record as head of the Nation's largest securities market, Mr. Martin has continued to carve out a successful career in Washington in such key posts as head of the Export-Import Bank and, more recently, executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Moreover, his present nomination has the complete approval of Mr. McCabe, outgoing chairman of the Reserve Board.

Needles to say, Mr. Martin's qualifications do not exempt him from the obligation to satisfy Congress as to his philosophy regarding Federal Reserve-Treasury relationships. Moreover, assuming—as we do—that he will more than adequately meet this test, we wish to repeat what we have said before. Neither that fact nor anything else that has occurred to date lessens the desirability or importance of congressional action to the Douglas resolution clearly defining the powers of the Reserve and the Treasury.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 17, 1951]

MR. MCCABE'S OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE COUNTRY

The country owes a great debt to Thomas B. McCabe, who has resigned as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, effective at the end of this month.

Mr. McCabe has been a leader of those on the Board who have insisted, despite contrary pressure from the President and the Treasury, that the interest rate on Government securities be increased as a means of reducing credit inflation. Most economists have supported this position.

The dispute, which has persisted for months, finally has been resolved in a compromise which Mr. McCabe believes satisfactory. Having accomplished that, he has decided to fulfill a long-standing desire to return to private business.

Because of its highly technical nature, Mr. McCabe's service to the Nation has been of a sort that could hardly be expected to attract wide public notice. Nevertheless, all of us will benefit from his contributions to a stable economy. We join in wishing him well on his well-earned retirement from public life.

A Code for Conduct of Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a thoughtful article by Walter Lippmann, as it appeared in the Washington Post of April 2, 1951. Mr. Lippmann discusses the need of a code for the conduct of congressional investigating committees, especially in view of the emergence of television as a new and

remarkable medium of public information.

The code should not only contain rules with reference to the use of television, radio, and news reels, but should contain provisions relative to appearance of counsel with witnesses, cross-examination of witnesses, and allowing anyone whose name has been brought out in a hearing to refute, explain, or enlarge upon the testimony referring to him.

I do not agree with Mr. Lippmann's view that television should be ruled out until it has proven itself. I think it has done this already. But in any event, many problems relative to its use need to be considered.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has submitted a resolution for such a study. This resolution should have our early consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ON THE TELEVISION PROBLEM

Senator KEFAUVER is, no doubt, well aware that the work of his committee is likely to be remembered the longest because the hearings were broadcast by television.

Suddenly many questions about television and public affairs, which before that had been regarded as theoretical, have become practical and urgent. These questions will now be threshed out in the courts, in Congress, and in other legislatures. They will be studied in the universities. They will be reported and discussed in the press and on the radio and the television networks themselves.

Long after only the oldest reporters can still remember who Frank Costello was, or even Virginia Hill, Senator KEFAUVER'S name may remain connected, like Lord Sandwich's and a quick lunch, with the grandeur and the miseries of conducting public affairs in front of the television audience. The Senator can, however, avert this dreadful fate.

He has only to recognize publicly and thoroughly what I cannot but assume he feels—that the passionate interest of such an immense audience is not in itself the answer to any problem, like lawbreaking, and that in fact it poses problems which may be just as dangerous in a free society as the lawbreaking which his committee has exposed. Mr. KEFAUVER can do what few other men in Congress are so well qualified to do. He can take the leading part in getting Congress to adopt Senator WILEY'S resolution and then in defining and debating the great issues of public policy which television is raising.

These questions are subtle, complex, and elusive. Our whole experience with television is limited. The development of television is difficult to forecast. Nothing can and nothing will be decided finally now. Nonetheless decisions, however provisional, have to be taken now. They are unavoidable. If Congress, for example, let matters drift, allowing each committee to decide for itself whether it wished its hearings televised, and when and by what company and under what commercial sponsor, that would in effect be a decision of policy which could easily have, and would tend to invite, the gravest abuses. If the television company were reluctant, perhaps because it did not think that 20,000,000 people would be interested in that particular hearing, the temptation would be strong to make the hearing interesting to an audience of 20,000,000.

Since only so small a part of the whole work of any committee, and only an infinitesimal part of the work of all of the committees, can be broadcast, the selection of what is to be televised invites the exercise of a power over what the people shall know that no editor of a free newspaper could, or would dream of, exercising.

In a newspaper there is of course a selection of the news by the editor and of what importance is to be given to different kinds of news. But much is printed each day that not every reader reads. Because this can be done, it is a violation of the professional standards of journalism not to publish at all, even obscurely, the news which is necessary to a fair judgment. But with television an event is broadcast or it is ignored: either it is in enormous headlines or it is nowhere at all. This power to choose what the great mass of the people shall see and what they shall not see of public affairs is altogether too great to be left to the judgment of a few television companies and to private arrangements made by committees and commercial sponsors and the companies.

It will be said, and I would agree, that Congress and the rest of us do not yet know enough to formulate a policy and to lay down a code of rules. What then ought we to wish to see done now, in this interim, when television is technically and economically prepared to do much broadcasting of public affairs but when on all the questions of law and policy and morals we are quite unprepared?

We must make up our minds. We can let her rip and see what comes of the enterprise of the broadcasting of politicians who like to be televised and the reaction of the audiences. Or we can take a position which, I admit, is at the other extreme—though I believe it to be the wisest. That is to prohibit for the time being the broadcasting of any of the hearings of Congress which have to do with investigation, and should therefore be judicial in character, or with the making of policy, and should therefore be deliberative in character.

No one, presumably, is going to ask that the proceedings of courts or the sessions of Congress be opened now to television, that is to say, to being broadcast when and only when they provide a good show. Is there any good reason why the same rule should not apply to committees when they are debating grave issues of national policy and when they should be thinking of their responsibility and not acting to an audience? And should not the rule apply to committees even more obviously when they are acting as a tribunal, and exercising the power to make or break men, as in a grand jury, or in a trial court or an appellate court?

I would not argue that this rule is the last word on the subject but only that it is better than the anarchy which is now ahead of us if we take no position at all. We shall have to work out a public policy. In the meantime the best thing to do is to put the burden of proof on the newcomer, and to make him do what all useful innovators have always had to do, that is to say, to prove that he has earned his rights because he has defined and established his duties.

A Report From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently Mr. John Cowles, publisher of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, made an extended tour of Europe, and has prepared a series of articles entitled "A Report From Europe." These articles appeared in recent March issues of the Minneapolis Star. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the articles entitled "Red Imperialism, Not Communism, Is Basic Threat"; "Aid to Franco? Yes; If Needed To Resist Reds"; and "'Unified' Set-up in Our Foreign Affairs Urged."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED IMPERIALISM, NOT COMMUNISM, IS BASIC THREAT

American security is threatened, it seems to me, not by communism as such but by Russian Communist imperialism. That is, I believe, a distinction of importance.

The present Russian aggression is the bastard child of traditional, expansionist Pan Slavism, sired by a dynamic revolutionary movement.

The basic threat is Russian imperialism. It uses foreign Communist dupes as a fifth column for subversion. Communism as a political philosophy or religion has been so appealing to many of its converts that they have been willing to act as traitors. They have deluded themselves that they were thereby helping bring about an eventual social utopia.

Actually by betraying their country they were simply aiding Russia in its imperialistic attempt to conquer the world. But it is Russia, not communism as such, that is the real menace.

If we will come to accept and recognize this distinction, the course that we should follow in dealing both with Russian imperialism and with communism elsewhere will be much clearer. Our foreign policy will be more effective.

The chance that we can win the struggle without having to fight world war III will be infinitely greater.

Of paramount importance in Europe today is the fact that Tito, who insists that he is as good a Communist as, or even a better one, than Stalin, has recognized that the Kremlin has been using world communism as a mask to conceal Russian imperialism. Tito, as a nationalistic Yugoslav, has defiantly revolted against the concept that Russian imperialism should rule the globe.

Tito's precepts and example are opening the eyes of the Communists in other countries. "Deviationism"—the refusal to let the Kremlin lay down the line which every Communist must unquestioningly accept—is spreading everywhere.

The recent revolt of the two Italian Communist intellectual leaders may prove to be worth more to the free world in its fight to save Western Europe than the two additional American divisions for General Eisenhower's army would be.

There are many signs that Communist deviation is developing in France and Germany. That means that the Communist parties in those countries may gradually cease to serve blindly as a fifth column for Russian imperialism.

The current purge in Czechoslovakia demonstrates that even behind the iron curtain there is serious deviationism. Intelligence reports also indicate that the Kremlin is having similar trouble in other satellite countries.

Since Russian imperialism—not communism as a political philosophy—is the immediate threat to the free world, it seems clear to me that our foreign policy should be directed toward actively strengthening those, whether Communist or not, who are resisting the Kremlin.

That should mean prompt and liberal aid, food and gasoline, military supplies and planes for Tito's Yugoslavia.

Although Yugoslavia is a ruthless dictatorship, Tito and his Cabinet have recently, however, done various things that are at least gestures in the general direction of constitutional parliamentarism and civil liberties.

A few months ago the British Ambassador gave each member of Tito's cabinet a copy of George Orwell's novel, 1984. Several, after reading it, but without referring to similar conditions that existed in Yugoslavia, commented that it was like Russia.

Shortly thereafter the Yugoslav Government issued edicts reducing the length of time that a prisoner could be held without a formal trial, and expunging from the list of crimes that of having treasonable thoughts.

The British are currently serializing Orwell's novel, 1984, in their newspaper in Vienna. The book has already been reprinted in various other middle European papers and is said to have had a wide effect on public opinion toward Russia.

As Americans come to realize that it is Russian imperialism that is the immediate threat to the Western World, and that communism as such is a grave danger to our way of life here in America only to the extent that its disciples are used by the Kremlin as Russian agents or as a subversive fifth column, the answer to the question as to how we should deal with communism in Asia also becomes clearer.

In Europe, no country has gone Communist except Russia, until after it had first been occupied by the Russian Army.

In southeast Asia, although Communist agents have played a part, most of the uprisings and revolutions have sprung from the grass roots. They have been largely indigenous. The rule of the white man had broken down in Asia.

Over the past generation the Asiatics, through increased education, have come to realize that the people of the Western World have a far higher standard of living than theirs.

They have also come to believe that European colonialism—foreign exploitation—was largely responsible for the poverty and misery in which they existed. They have learned from us the idea of national self-determination and the concept of social justice.

Hundreds of millions of Asiatics aspired to a better life and felt they could get it only by revolution. Communist agents exploited these Asiatic grass roots revolts and told the people that what they wanted was communism.

Instead of assuming that we must use armed force everywhere in southeast Asia to try to suppress genuine grass roots revolutions regardless of whether or not they are nominally called Communist, we should rather, it seems to me, through ECA and point 4 aid attempt to lead the southeast Asiatics away from the Kremlin's control and to increase their friendship for America.

Aid To Franco?—Yes: If Needed To Resist Reds

Last month both the United States and Britain sent Ambassadors to Spain, their first in nearly 5 years.

Although General Franco's regime is not quite as harsh as it was when we originally withdrew our Ambassadors, Spain remains as totalitarian a state as ever. The change in American and British policy stems solely from the fact that in the supreme struggle with Russian Communist imperialism, we want such help as Spain may be able and willing to give.

A glance at the map of Europe and North Africa shows that Spain's geographic position is of extraordinary strategic importance.

If the Russians should overrun Western Germany, the Low Countries, and France, it might be possible to stop them at the Pyrenees, the high mountain range which constitutes Spain's northern border.

That possibility cannot be officially discussed, however, without its doing serious harm to our efforts to instill self-confidence and a determination to resist in the French, Belgians, Dutch, and even the West Germans.

If they should get the idea that American strategy was based on, or contemplated, a retreat behind the Pyrenees, it would be impossible to inspire them to make the military effort that is necessary for the successful defense of Western Europe.

So far our negotiations with General Franco have been tentative and exploratory. No one questions that the Spaniards would fight with intense bravery if the Russians should overrun France and attempt to invade Spain.

But it is more than doubtful that Franco would join the North Atlantic Pact if an invitation were conditioned on Spain's sending some troops to Western Germany, for example, as a contingent in the international defense force General Eisenhower is organizing.

Today Spain, with a population of 29,000,000, has the largest standing army in Western Europe. Estimates as to its size range from 15 to 22 divisions. It is tough and well-trained but extremely badly equipped. If weapons could be provided, the Spanish Army could be doubled or tripled in size.

But unless Franco should prove willing to send some divisions out of Spain, common sense would seem to dictate that most of whatever military equipment the United States can give others in the next year or two had better be devoted to arming those forces that would be in immediate battle if the Russians started west.

Spain is extremely poor. The Economic Commission for Europe recently estimated that it takes almost 50 percent more hours of work for the average Spaniard to earn food for his family than is the case even in impoverished Italy. The average Spaniard's standard of living is about half what it was before the Spanish civil war.

While the Spaniards would welcome economic aid from the United States, they are an extraordinarily proud and stubborn and isolated people and might even reject gifts to which any conditions whatsoever were attached.

Recently the Export-Import Bank advanced Spain $12,500,000 to build a large fertilizer plant, but according to reports in Madrid an additional credit of $50,000,000 has not been made available because Franco has declined to agree that he will spend it in ways which the Washington authorities think would prove of permanent benefit to Spain's economy. (On March 16, the Export-Import Bank announced a $5,000,000 credit to Spain for the purchase of wheat because of a temporary shortage prior to the Spanish harvest.)

Now that Stanton Griffis has been sent to Madrid as American Ambassador, perhaps the two countries will become mutually more understanding.

Spain is still a complete dictatorship, but that fact alone should not prevent us from furnishing the Spaniards aid if it seems militarily advisable, any more than should the fact that Yugoslavia is a Communist dictatorship deter us from helping Tito resist Russia.

At the end of the Spanish civil war, Franco shot thousands of the Republican troops and sentenced to long prison terms most of the others, including some boys aged 12, who could not prove that they had been forced to join the Republican armed forces. Almost all of them, some 250,000, have now been conditionally released, but with a few exceptions they cannot vote, hold office, practice a profession, or hold most jobs above that of common labor.

For any offense they can be reimprisoned without trial to serve the remainder of their original military sentences.

Although there is undoubtedly widespread hostility and bitterness toward the Franco regime throughout Spain, there is no way of determining its extent. Several thousand labor leaders are in jail, and no opposition of any kind to Franco is permitted. Some observers think that there is a sizable underground Communist organization, but most say that the great majority of the people—even though they may detest Franco's regime—much prefer it to a new civil war.

The Spanish peseta has been steadily declining in value. Just as the French are doing in Morocco, rich Spaniards are investing in new office buildings and apartment houses in Madrid as a hedge against inflation.

Spanish railroads are in bad shape, both as to road bed and equipment. Many of the highways would have to be improved and bridges strengthened before heavy military equipment could be moved across Spain.

Perhaps it would be wise for the United States to give Spain some military equipment of the type that would be most valuable in stopping a Russian land invasion if worst came to worse and the Soviets should overrun Western Germany and France. Presumably the only places where any ground forces could hope successfully to invade Spain would be at the two ends of the Pyrenees, near the sea. They are limited in area and with modern weapons would appear to be relatively easy to defend.

It may be advisable to give Spain artillery and equipment for that purpose, and funds for the construction of additional, and the lengthening of present, air strips in Spain, so that part of our Air Force could, on short notice, if necessary, be based in Spain. That would also involve constructing port installations and making transportation improvements, so that gasoline and supplies could be got to our fliers without delay.

But at this stage of the cold war, the United States has neither the billions of dollars that would be required to rehabilitate Spain's whole economy nor the spare military equipment with which to modernize the entire Spanish Army, if it is to be kept permanently in Spain, nearly 1,000 miles from where the Russians would presumably first attack.

"Unified" Set-up in Our Foreign Affairs Urged

The United States has a real chance of winning the struggle with Communist Russia without an all-out war, but doing it will for many years require perserverance and wisdom as well as courage.

In addition to maintaining our own armed defenses in a state of alert and adequate preparedness, and helping see to it that the rest of the free world does the same, we will have to spend billions of dollars in the next decade in backward parts of the globe to reduce the likelihood of their falling under the Kremlin's control.

Our Government is not now properly set up to deal with international problems of the kind we must face. Our foreign economic affairs are being dealt with by a dozen uncoordinated separate governmental departments and agencies. Sometimes they even work at cross purposes.

Our operations in the foreign field consequently are far less effective and much more expensive than they need to be.

Even with an efficient Government set-up, we are going to have to spend such large amounts abroad that at best we will have difficulty in avoiding income-tax rates so high that incentives are stifled.

One big improvement would be relatively simple. Congress should reorganize the State Department set-up so that a new division of it would have full responsibility for all

governmental foreign economic operations. There should be three separate divisions in the State Department with the Secretary of State, the Undersecretary, and several Assistant Secretaries having jurisdiction over all three.

These three subdivisions should be, first, a Department of Foreign Political Affairs; second, a Department of Foreign Economic Operations; and, third, a Department of Foreign Information.

The first subdivision, or Department of Foreign Political Affairs, should have the same function as the present Department of State has traditionally performed.

The second subdivision, or Department of Foreign Economic Operations, should have direct responsibility for and full authority over all of the Government's international economic negotiations and over all economic operations abroad.

We now have a dozen different departments or agencies dealing with foreign governments, with little or no coordination. As a result, hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted. We are accomplishing much less than would be possible were all our foreign economic programs unified.

Even though all State Department cables sent abroad go out under the signature of the Secretary of State and all incoming cables bear the signature of the American Ambassador, no Secretary or Ambassador can personally read even a small fraction of them.

An aggressive underling representing, say, the Department of Agriculture or Interior or Treasury may now frequently be able to persuade the State Department to transmit to an Embassy abroad a message written by him, but bearing the Secretary of State's name, even though it may put far more emphasis on some minor point than the subject conceivably merits, while far more vital matters may receive little attention.

Representatives of various other Government departments also themselves go abroad, negotiate with foreign governments, and carry on economic operations without the State Department controlling their activities.

The range of economic matters which our current international activities cover is enormous. ECA in South Asia. Oil in the Middle East. Arms and supplies for the North Atlantic Pact countries. Tin in Malaya. Economic aid for Yugoslavia. Food for India. Point 4 development of backward areas. Wool purchases in Australia. Air bases. Broadcasting stations. Import-Export Bank loans. Shipping and aviation. Preclusive buying. Purchase of critical materials. International allocations of things in short supply.

These and hundreds of operations like them should all be coordinated through one division of the State Department, that of Foreign Economic Operations, where the relative importance of each could be ascertained and relative priorities as to attention and degree of pressure be given.

The information and advice of the specialists and experts in the other Government departments and agencies should, of course, continue to be used, but operations should be coordinated and funneled through a new State Department subdivision.

There may be, for example, 200 different things that we want Great Britain or its colonies to do for us. They may have 200 other things that they would like us to do for them. All our requests and theirs should be coordinated, where they could be handled more quickly and their relative importance weighed.

The third subdivision of the reorganized State Department should be the Department of Foreign Information, combining the Voice of America and all our many different foreign informational and propaganda activities.

Billions of dollars will be saved because of the enactment by Congress a couple of years ago of the law unifying the armed services. Instead of a completely separate Army, Navy, and Air Force, we now have one coordinated Defense Establishment. In addition to the monetary savings, our present new national Defense Establishment set-up has increased the effectiveness of our over-all security.

We need a similar reorganization of the Department of State, so that it, through a new Department of Foreign Economic Operations, will have direct responsibility for and control of all of the Government's international economic operations.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on January 30, 1951, at Cleveland, Ohio, at the annual convention of the National Rural Electrification Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, President Clark, my good friend Walter Harrison, Clyde Ellis, distinguished officers, directors, and friends, our good friend Claude Wickard, and my fellow Americans. It is a privilege to be presented to you by my fellow Oklahoman, Clark McWhorter. There is no one here any more aware than I of my unworthiness of the wonderful things that he said about me, but, Clark, I want to assure you that there is no one here that would have been any worse disappointed than I, had you not said them.

It is a pleasure to be here with this fireball, Clyde Ellis. It is not a great deal of credit to a man in the Congress from the southwestern part of the United States to be for rural electrification. If he wasn't, Clyde Ellis would make the place where he sits down so warm that he'd soon get so tired that he'd be willing to go along with Clyde and do what he wanted to do just to get a little rest once in a while.

I certainly was thrilled at the sight of those lovely young ladies that were queens and near queens, and I understand now, Clark, why it was you told me that you were making arrangements to serve another year. Of course, I am not surprised that you have increased the number of your queens.

I remember the story of the American soldier in England who fell in love with and asked a lovely English girl to marry him. And he did such a splendid job of it, she was trying to express her appreciation at the same time she was telling him "Yes," and finally she said to him, "I wish you'd explain to me how it is you American boys are so courteous and so considerate of women, seeing that in America you have no queens."

"Ah," he said, "You don't understand." He said, "Here in England, you have one queen—but in my country every woman is a queen."

I did notice this though, Clyde, those young ladies probably are not old enough to vote for me—but I guess I will still be running when they are.

I ought to pay my tribute to the women who are here and say like these other men, "I, too, am on your side." They do have a vote in your convention, don't they, Clark? I have never seen a convention yet but what they were the majority whether they had a legal vote or not. You know, I learned a long time ago what some fellows don't learn until they are too old to do them any good.

An old fellow went to see his grandson, a kid about 8 years old, and the kid, who hadn't seen him in a long time, didn't recognise him; and it nearly broke the old fellow's heart.

"Why," he said, "But, don't you know me?"

The kid said, "No, I don't."

"Why," he said "I'm your granddad."

"Now," said the boy, "That's funny. There has been a fellow around here all my life that I have called 'Granddad'," he said, "but it wasn't you." And he said, "They never told me that granddads come in pairs."

"Well," said the old fellow, "But, it's this way. You see, I am your granddad on your father's side."

"Oh," the boy said, "it's that way. But if you aim to stay here and do well, you'll have to get on the other side."

He was like the old fellow that had the experience of marrying and losing his wife and then falling in love with another fine woman. He proposed to her, and she accepted him, and he said, "Now, I want to make a request of you." He said, "You know I was married before."

She said, "Yes."

He said, "That is over and gone, but I have a very sentimental heart." And he said, "I can never fail to remember with some affection the one who is gone, and with your permission I have her hat that I loved the best, and I'd like to put it up here on the shelf in this closet in our room and just keep it as a memento of other days."

And she said that was all right and they got along fine, but in a few years she, too, passed away, and before too long he went through the same experience with another lovely lady and after she had responded with an affirmative reply to his request that she marry him, he told her the same thing.

He said, "You know, I'd like to keep here on this shelf as a memento of that second wonderful woman who blessed me by being my wife this lovely hat of hers, and as I look upon it, it will freshen my memory and restore my sentiments."

And so that fine lady agreed, but in due course of time she, too, passed away, and he went through the same identical experience and the same identical speech with number three. But I'll tell you right now she had learned more than the others.

She said, "All right, big boy, you can put that hat up there with the other two if you want to. But I want to tell you right now that the next hat that goes on that shelf will be a derby."

You know I was thinking, Clark, as I was sitting here at this great convention of rural electrification, what a magnificent crowd this is, what a fine looking bunch of men and women are here in this great assembly that has seen so many wonderful assemblages. I want to tell you, though, it is something, as you think about other assemblages that have been here. I understand in this very hall Republican national conventions have chosen their nominees for President. But as you look out over this crowd tonight, Claude, can you see that they look any less prosperous or any less handsome even than a Republican national convention? And I want to assure you that they are a dog-gone sight smarter, and it just proves that in this wonderful age of rural electrification that folks are as good as people, or anybody else.

And I want to say this, as I think about this great setting here: The only thing that I know of that would improve it, Clark, would be if we could just fix it so that the electricity were furnished by the Southwestern Electric Cooperative, of Tipton, Okla., or maybe the Kiamichi Electric Cooperative,

from over in eastern Oklahoma. I believe the lights would be a little brighter.

And I want to say that I am grateful to my fellow Oklahomans who are here and who have been so very, very wonderfully kind, and as I think about this great convention I wonder if there is anybody here who ever had an experience similar to the good woman down at Nevada, Mo. The rural-electrification program was completed, the houses were wired, the equipment purchased, and the current was turned on late one afternoon. Then after a while some of the good women got together and they were talking about their experience and what it was that impressed them the most about the coming of electricity to their homes.

One of the women said, "I'll tell you right now, when I cooked on my new electric stove it was the most wonderful experience that I had ever had."

Another one said, "Now, I'll just tell you right now, it was the washing machine that I enjoyed the most." She said, "It was the first time the clothes were ever cleaned at my house that I didn't do it with that old up-and-down motion on the washboard."

Another one said, "Well, the thing I love about it is the electric ice box. Imagine keeping the food so fresh and so fine for so many days."

Finally, one good lady, a little old lady, who hadn't said a word, spoke up and she said, "Well, I'll tell you I liked the ice box and the washing machine and all that. But," she said, "the greatest thrill I had was just sitting there that evening and looking at pa." She said, "I hadn't seen him after dark for years."

You know, as we think about the progress of our country, it is not difficult to find the secret. Our country belongs to the people. The country's progress is the people's progress, and the people's progress is the country's progress. As we think about the things that we do—as we think about the effort that is required—we are thankful that we live in an age when there is power, when there are agencies, when there are elements available to us that do work in addition to what we can do with our hands. One man plus electricity may do the work of 10 men, or a hundred, or a thousand, and I say this to you—that one of the great differences between this magnificent country of ours and others is that we have available the means of accomplishing and working with other than just the hands and the physical power of our people.

I say to you that many things contributed to this Nation's emerging victorious from World War I and World War II, but I know of nothing that made a greater contribution than the abundant power—electric power—available in our country. Yes; power in the factories and the mills; but just as important, and maybe more so, was the power on the farm. We have seen the amazing transformation of a mighty nation, where once 7 of 10 families lived on the farm, until today less than 2 out of 10 of the families live on the farms. And yet the production is greater because of the progress, the scientific development, and the increase in the amount that each unit of manpower can produce.

And one of the great contributing factors to that amazing development is electric power—electric power—and it is so marvelous when we think about how short a period of time has seen so much of this development. I don't see any women here old enough to remember when there wasn't power available on the farms, but I see a lot of men who are, and if you want to know the difference, you talk to these men and they'll tell you how it was. Why, it has been but short time ago that public power was unknown in this land. When you think about it—development of public power in so brief a time, and the contribution it had made to the peacetime development and the wartime strength of a mighty nation, truly we pause in awe and wonder and also to give our silent thanks that such a great blessing has come to our people.

I say this to you, that rural electrification has been more of an emancipation proclamation for the farm women of America than Lincoln's proclamation back yonder more than 80 years ago was to the slave population of the South. And America will not have come into her own until electrification has been taken to every farm home in the land, not only the poles and the lines up to the doors of the farm homes, but an abundance of cheap power available through those lines.

I could not go further without pausing a moment. I was impressed by the tribute paid here a little while ago to the great man whose picture we see there. I am aware of the contribution made by so many of you, here tonight, and by the countless thousands across the length and breadth of our land in this great program. But I am reminded that today at noon a new record was established by the man serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives. As the noon hour passed, SAM RAYBURN had served as Speaker of the House of Representatives for a longer period of time than any other man in the history of the Nation, and I know of no man who has made a greater contribution to rural electrification. And so far as I am concerned he can continue to serve there the rest of a very long and useful life.

Man versus the forces that he has had to fight has brought into dramatic picturization the value of the utilization of power—the value of the team of man plus power. Man plus power has played a great part in building the richest, the most powerful nation on the earth. Man plus power has had a vital role in bringing this mighty Nation victorious through two World Wars.

And I want to say this to you tonight, my fellow Americans, man plus power, plus the unquenchable, unconquerable spirit of America, is winning the present world-wide struggle against the powers of darkness. As you and I think about the history of our Nation—as we think of that day back yonder nearly 200 years ago when a little group of 3,000,000 people banded themselves together under the provisions of a document that says, "We the people of the United States of America"—when that limited number had the courage to look the world in the face and declare themselves a free and independent government—when they had the courage to look their own sons and daughters in the face and say, "We are launching here an experiment to the success of which we are dedicating our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." When we think of what they did—with their limited resources—we are impressed by the fact that they had a vast abundance of faith, of undying courage.

Well, if those 3,000,000 with their limited means, with their meager resources, with the wilderness beyond the mountains to their backs and with almost an unknown sea to their front, could lift the flag of freedom and set their feet on the pathway that led to liberty and justice, I want to ask you tonight of what should 153,000,000 Americans be afraid?

When we think of the vast material wealth and power—when we realize tonight that ours is the greatest, the strongest, the richest, the most highly productive Nation on the earth, when we know that here in our land man has reached his greatest zenith of production and progress, scientific development and knowledge, freedom, liberty, and justice, of what should this mighty Nation be afraid?

Ah, there are many things that gird us with undying courage—but high on the rank is the knowledge of the vast and abundant quantity of electric power, and the knowledge that as the decades come, we will add to it manyfold. We are grateful for vast deposits of coal; we are grateful for the great abundance of oil and gas, those amazing fuels and sources of power; but I would remind you that when the last ton of coal shall have been mined and burned—when the last barrel of oil shall have been pumped and consumed—when the last cubic foot of gas shall have been produced and used—this Nation may still have a never-ceasing source of heat and light and power from the development of its hydroelectric possibilities.

When your forebears and mine started westward across this Nation, they were looking, yes, for a home, for security, for the opportunity to develop themselves and their families. The means with which they accomplished those results, they referred to as "Land and wood and water." Well, when this young lad right here is an old man, his grandchildren will be looking for land and wood and water. We have the land in vast abundance, in the most productive quantities, and the finest climate on the earth if we will conserve and rebuild and utilize it. We have the water in blessed abundance if we will conserve and use it. As we do we produce that which serves the function that our forebears wanted the wood for most—the heat and the light. Yes, we have been abundantly blessed. We have seen the proper use of the great development of our blessings. We have seen our country grow; become stronger and prosper.

You here tonight know better than any other group the blessings of public power. I believe I see the dawn of a day in which all producers of power have a higher respect and regard for all other producers. I am grateful for the fact that yonder in the Southwest, representatives of public power—the Southwestern Power Administration, guided by Douglas Wright, one of the greatest of the men who have developed this program—the Oklahoma power producing authority—and private utilities have joined hands in a cooperative contract that has produced the finest grid of electric power available in this Nation outside only of the great Northwest with its unlimited hydroelectric power.

They have seen that whatever estimate is made for the consumption of power is inadequate. They have seen that no matter how much the utilities produce or the State produces or the Government produces, that there cannot be too much electric power. And so they have joined hands in what I believe will be a model contract for others in like positions across the land. They guarantee power that is not only cheap, but available and abundant, for our cities and towns and our farms.

As we look ahead, we are aware of the grave danger which our country is confronted with, but, as we know the danger and analyze it, the great knowledge comes to us that we can meet it and we can overcome it. I say this to you tonight—and I don't know when the darkest hour has been, or is, or will be—but it will be the hour before the dawn. There is no nation on this earth, or available group of nations, that can defeat or subjugate or conquer free, united America.

You know, our enemies in this world-wide struggle have spent a lot of money and gone to a lot of trouble in an effort to find out how strong America is. They have their subversive agents. They have their accredited experts studying what they can find of our productive capacity and power of our military machines, of our military equipment. Ah, they are trying to find out what the latest guided missile may be. They are trying to find out what the latest improvement in our air power might be. Yes, we know that their submarines have come to the surface in close proximity to our shores in many places, seeking to find out what the power and strength of our fortifications are.

We know they have shot down our airplanes yonder, seeking to find the secret of America's military might. Well, I want to say this to them in defiance and to you in reassurance—they are looking in the wrong place to find how strong America is.

Nearly a year ago, I was invited to a little community in Oklahoma called Limestone Gap. It was a rural school, with an eighth grade graduating class of five members. I accepted that invitation, along with a number of others in Oklahoma, to go and visit those young people in their hours of graduation. The great press in Oklahoma chided me a little bit that I had come from Washington to Limestone Gap to make a graduation speech. I told them that I was honored to go to Limestone Gap—that, in the first place, I was invited, and that politicians are like business, they go where invited and stay where well treated.

In the second place, Limestone Gap was very near to the farm where I was born. It was just such a school as I had attended. I was happy to meet friends there and make new acquaintances. But over and above all that, I went to Limestone Gap to find at first hand what was in the hearts and minds of the people at Limestone Gap—because there is the secret of how strong America is. Oh, we are proud of our planes and our ships and our tanks and our guns, but they are not the accurate measure of the strength of the Nation, as are the will power and the dedication and the spirit to strengthen the moral fiber in the hearts of the people.

And I want to say this to you, when you go to the Limestone Gaps or to the great conventions—when you go to the crossroads of the great cities—you stand in amazement at the rugged devotion and strength of the people of this mighty Nation—and that is the secret which a totalitarian nation can never know; that is a spirit which no despot can ever conquer; that is a strength which no arrogant aggressor can ever analyze or overcome.

I sat this morning with a group of Future Farmers of America yonder in Washington, a group of United States Senators and a group of farm boys. We gave the boys the floor. We asked them to talk to us and tell us of their projects and their work, and I want to say to you that our hearts were lifted as we heard these young men recite the stories of their accomplishments. We heard them tell the reasons why they arrived at the conclusion that they love the land and all over this blessed country the people love their land.

Yes, whether it is on the farm or in the cities—what a country—when the people are so dedicated to it and when their hearts are so filled with love and affection for it—and what a country, with its whole source of opportunities to its youth.

One of my associates and I a little while ago went to one of the great engineering schools in this country to interview some of the graduates in a certain phase of scientific education. We asked for the opportunity to interview the members of the graduating class. We did—and we found some that we liked especially and who were interested in our work, and we made arrangements to employ some two or three. We then went to the dean of this great engineering school and we said we would like to have one man a little further along in scientific research than any of these. "Do you have some that have gone even farther in the field in which we are interested?"

"Why," he said, "yes, we have three men here who are finishing their doctorate degrees, but," he said, "they'll come pretty high."

Well, we asked him if it would be expensive to interview them, and he told us no. So we visited with them and we found one that we liked especially and who seemed to kind of harmonize with us, and we told him we'd like to have him, and he said he'd like to come. And we sat with him and I said, "I'd like for you to tell me a little bit about your family, and about your background and where you come from."

He said, "My father was an immigrant from a country now behind the iron curtain. My mother was a nurse. They saw me through high school. I received a fellowship to a great university and that, together with the work I was able to do, saw me through that school. Then I received a scholarship here and that, together with the meager help my father and mother could do for me, has seen me through here."

He said, "I want to go to work for you, but first I want to go yonder to a State far away from here to visit my father and mother. My mother is no longer able to work. My father is still a waiter yonder in a great hotel."

I said, "What a country that the son of an immigrant could work his way through schools and come to the point where he could graduate from the toughest engineering school on the earth with the highest honors in his class. What a country—and what a strength—and what a power—in a united America."

The people in the cities and towns, the people at the crossroads, the people on the farms, have had the opportunity to develop their resources and their opportunity and their security. All over the world, men and women envy you and me. They watch us as we go to work unhampered by any fears—as we come home to a happy family meal, as we go to our schools and our churches, as we drive our cars down any road, or play the radio, watch the television, or go to the movies. But to these people all over the world, there comes from the Kremlin the constant warning to them that our way of life—the American way of life—won't work. It can't last, they say. It will either be destroyed or destroy itself.

You know, some actually think that what we have in this blessed land is too good to be true. I say to you that it is good enough to be true. The Russian war dogs shout forebodings of doom for our American way of life. They do this, trying to build confidence among their own people. They do it, trying to undermine the confidence that others have in us or that we have in ourselves. From that whited sepulcher of men's hopes wherein their evil designs are incubated and from whence they are spewed out to curse and blight the free world, the war lords in the Kremlin shout that western civilization will destroy itself.

I say that western civilization is stronger today than it has ever been. It is becoming more powerful each day. It will become strong enough, and very soon, to either prevent world war III or win such a war if a stupid and cruel foe provokes it.

Western civilization, our civilization, will also be wise enough and strong enough to safeguard our freedom and our liberty while we are safeguarding the security of our country. This power is physical, yes—but this power is also moral and spiritual. Thus while we either prevent the starting of world war by Russia's mad rulers or while we defeat them, if they force war upon us, we will at the same time seek to persuade people around the world—yes, even those behind the iron curtain—to find and claim human freedom and spiritual liberty for themselves.

To accomplish these ends, which are the minimum, we must match and surpass Russia's military power.

We must then compel those monsters in the Kremlin to come before the bar of world opinion and human justice. They must be held accountable for their terrible sins. They must be compelled to accept peace—real peace—with adequate guaranties that freedom and liberty and justice will not perish, but will prosper and flourish in the earth.

The rural electric co-ops march in the front ranks of a united and determined America. Through cooperation and unity you have come thus far, and you have found it good. Through cooperation and unity among yourselves you will continue to go forward toward your goal of abundant power for abundant living for every farm home. Through cooperation and unity 153,000,000 Americans are marching with irresistible tread toward their most cherished goals of freedom, prosperity, and security at home and peace around the world.

The Democratic Party, a Progressive Party That Has Never Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, last Saturday evening the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] delivered an eloquent and powerful address at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner, in Detroit, Mich. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, A PROGRESSIVE PARTY THAT HAS NEVER DIED

(Address of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

No member of the United States Senate could come to Michigan to make a political speech and, at the same time, refrain from paying his tribute of highly deserved honor, respect, and admiration to the great statesman who has represented this State in the Senate of the United States since early in 1928. By curious coincidence, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States on March 31, 1928, exactly 23 years ago today.

As a Democrat and as an American I honor both my party and myself when, on this notable anniversary, I say that ARTHUR VANDENBERG ranks among the greatest statesmen of this country. His character, his courage, his ability, and, above all, his loyal Americanism have won for him a secure position in the history of this Government and in the history of the world. He is the type of ideal statesman who places country above party. The people of Michigan have recognized these great qualities in him, and, as one who has served with him for more than 17 years, I thank the people of Michigan who have made all of the people of the United States their debtors by returning him to the Senate in election after election regardless of the temporary trend of the political tides.

It is appropriate that I should make this reference to the services and the character of Senator VANDENBERG on this occasion because there never was a time when it should be more clearly understood by all of the people and particularly by those of us who occupy positions of leadership in the public affairs of the Nation that a political party has no reason for existence except to serve the best interests of all the people. Partisanship which becomes only factionalism and which is motivated only by the aspiration to hold political office performs no public service, and the party which operates on that basis is doomed to failure as the political history of this country amply proves. Good govern-

ment in the interest of all is always the best politics.

We have assembled at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner to honor two of the outstanding statesmen of this country from whom Democrats have always drawn their heritage of political principle. It should never be forgotten that we who gather as Democrats year after year throughout the Nation to draw renewed devotion to the principles for which these men stood, are the members of the only party the life of which is coequal with the life of the Nation itself. Jefferson was the founder of the Democratic Party, but more important than that, he was one of the principal founders of our Nation and no man in all history more clearly outlined than did he the obligation of political organization to serve the welfare of all the people.

THE UNDYING VITALITY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

We are members of a party which has never died because it has drawn undying vitality from the fact that its members and its leaders have recognized that its primary function is to promote popular government and to advocate policies best calculated to preserve the opportunity of the masses to enjoy the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which Jefferson so eloquently defended in writing the Declaration of Independence.

It is no mere chance that from Jefferson to Truman the Democratic Party has preserved throughout the history of this country an unbroken record of devotion to progressive principles save only for a brief time in the last century when its leaders yielded temporarily to defend the vested interests of the slave power. Let no Democrat forget, however:

First, that Jefferson himself advocated the abolition of slavery;

Second, that Martin Van Buren, beloved friend, lieutenant, and successor of Andrew Jackson as President, became, in 1848, the first Presidential candidate to advocate free soil;

Third, that when Abraham Lincoln and his colleagues joined, in the middle of the last century, with supporters of Van Buren to form a new party to oppose the extension of slavery, they went back to Jefferson for a name; and

Finally, that when in the middle of the Civil War Lincoln ran for reelection his running mate was the military governor of Tennessee, the former Democratic United States Senator from that State, Andrew Johnson, whose administration as the successor of Lincoln after the latter's martyrdom was ruined by Republican leadership in Congress because he sought to carry out the liberal program of Abraham Lincoln.

The party Thomas Jefferson founded was called the Democratic-Republican Party. Under Jackson it became known as the Democratic Party and in the middle of the nineteenth century it was only natural that the new advocates of human rights should have chosen to be known as Republicans just as Jefferson was known as a Republican, though sneeringly called a "Jacobin" by the reactionaries of that time, just as we are now called Socialists and Communists by the reactionaries of our time.

LINCOLN ON THE LEGITIMATE OBJECT OF GOVERNMENT

It is not surprising, therefore, that when the Lincoln papers were opened in the Library of Congress on July 1947, there was found among them a fragment of writing in Lincoln's own hand which ought to be committed to memory by every American citizen and particularly by those who, in the current political scene, are constantly denouncing the Democratic Party on the charge that it has given too much power to government. These are the words of Abraham Lincoln, follower of Jefferson, advocate of freedom, defender of government of the people, by the people, for the people. Listen:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves the Government not to interfere."

In our time we have seen private central economic power establish arbitrary control over the lives of the people. It was the failure of the Republican Party to put an end to private economic exploitation of the masses that made possible the victories of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. They were advocating the principles of the welfare state so well defined by Lincoln, when he said that it is the legitimate object of government to do for the people what they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves.

Contrast the history of this democratic vitality from the days of Jefferson to the days of Truman with the history of the parties which have opposed us. Washington, the first President, was the choice of all the people. He was the unanimous choice of the Presidential electors, both in 1788 and in 1792, but in his Cabinet Jefferson became the leader of the party of the people and Hamilton the leader of the party of the vested interests. Hamilton became the leader of the Federalists, a political party which in 1796 gave the United States one and only one President, John Adams. Jefferson followed in 1800 and not until 24 years had elapsed was the Jeffersonian succession broken. In 1824, though Andrew Jackson had the largest vote, he lacked a majority in the electoral college and John Quincy Adams, under whom the Whigs came into existence, was elected President by the House of Representatives. He served only a single term and was succeeded by Andrew Jackson. There followed under Jackson and Van Buren 12 years of progressive government in defense of the people against the vested interests.

HOW THE WHIGS DIED OF A STRADDLE

In 1840 the Whigs came back to power for a single term. It is significant that they campaigned without a political platform of well-defined principle, just as it is significant that in 1848 the Whig Party achieved its last national success when instead of meeting the issue of the time, the slavery issue, it nominated Zachary Taylor, a candidate satisfactory to the proslavery interests, for President and Millard Fillmore, an antislavery man, for Vice President. That straddle, that failure to meet the issue, killed the Whig Party. It died 100 years ago for lack of political principle, a disease which no party can survive.

Now, the Republican Party of our time, which, curiously enough, has been distinguished like the Whigs before it for the preponderance of single-term Presidents it has elected, is quite obviously making ready to wage the campaign of 1952 without a clear-cut platform of political principle. It is preparing in 1952 to die of a straddle just as the Whigs in 1852 vanished forever from the political stage.

Let us not forget that the election of 1948 was won by Harry Truman when most political observers were of the opinion that he was doomed to defeat. His success was based upon the simple fact that he had a platform and the courage to maintain it whereas he was opposed by a party which was trying, like the Whigs before it, to pussyfoot into power.

The Democrats of Michigan are making their campaign now to the people of this State, to the independents and to the Republicans who believe in straightforward, courageous, and positive government for the benefit of the people. You have a Democratic Governor, the only Democrat in 36 years to have been reelected chief executive, a triumph which came to Governor Williams because he is a leader with a program as well as a leader of personality and of principle.

You can go into this campaign in every county and in every city of this State and successfully challenge your opponents to say precisely where the Republican Party, as a party, stands upon the great issues of our time.

You may invite the voters of Michigan to join you because you have a party with a positive program and a positive record. And if any opposing political leader should cherish the hope that a Presidential campaign in 1952 can be won by name-calling or finger pointing, just tell them that KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT are Democrats. If the cry of socialism and communism should be raised, just tell them that the Truman program has contained communism at the borders of Greece and Turkey while the Marshall plan has turned communism back in Italy and in France and has rehabilitated all Western Europe and made it once again the forum of freemen.

WHERE DOES THE GOP STAND ON MODERN ISSUES?

This is the record that no one can deny, but where does the Republican Party stand as a party on either domestic or international issues?

Does it still adhere to the claims of Landon and Willkie and Dewey that it should be given power because it possesses a better capacity than the Democratic Party to make effective the political reforms conceived and enacted by the Democrats?

Does the Republican Party pledge itself to continue the present policy of our Government to win international peace by collective security through the United Nations, or does it propose, by returning to a bankrupt isolationism, to invite a third world war and thereby risk the destruction of human freedom everywhere—freedom to the preservation of which this Nation has been dedicated since its very inception?

No man tonight can tell where the Republican Party stands upon these issues, domestic or international. No man can doubt where the Democratic Party stands.

When, at the beginning of this century, the Republican leadership failed to meet the domestic policies of that time, the people turned to Woodrow Wilson. The reforms of his two administrations enacted in the face of persistent and desperate Republican opposition have never been repealed.

When Republican leadership in the twenties again failed to meet the domestic issues, the people again turned to the Democratic Party. The reforms which have been enacted since 1933 under Democratic leadership in the White House and in the Congress still stand unchallenged except for the indirect attack which is made upon them by reactionary Republican leaders who indulge themselves in general charges of socialism and communism, but who do not dare to advocate the repeal of the progressive legislation enacted under Roosevelt and Truman.

The independent voter knows these things. The independent voter knows that your party gave agricultural relief where the opposition failed. The independent voter knows that the Democratic Party stands for social justice, that it is opposed to the economic exploitation of the masses, that it is the advocate of opportunity for the individual and that it has been so successful in carrying out these purposes that in the 5 years since the war America has enjoyed the most prosperous era in all history.

EXTRAORDINARY PROSPERITY OF LAST 5 YEARS

A Democratic Congress passed and President Truman signed the Employment Act of

1946 which brought to the people of this country, instead of a depression following the end of World War II, the greatest prosperity that any people have enjoyed anywhere on the face of the globe. Some 20,000,000 motor vehicles have been built and purchased in the United States in the last 5 years. More petroleum has been produced, refined, and consumed during these 5 years than during the war itself with all the staggering military consumption of the conflict. New homes have been built all over the United States. Slums have been abolished, rural electrification has made markets out of the most distant farms and ranches. Corporate profits have reached new highs never before experienced. Every daily paper in the United States, day after day and week after week during the past 5 years has been recording the development of this prosperity. From 1945 to 1951 the people of the United States in every county and in every community from coast to coast and from north to south has achieved new records of progress and plenty. Wages are higher than ever before and salaries are higher than ever before. More than 60,000,000 people are employed and no one can deny the record. It stands for all to see.

Tell the independent citizen of Michigan, tell the new voter who has never lived under a Republican administration what happened when Herbert Hoover was President. Ask them if they are willing to trust the future of this country to the reactionary leaders who fought all these progressive steps while they were being enacted and who denounce us now as Socialists because we enacted them. Ask the Republican leaders whether they propose to abandon the me-too platforms of their past four Presidential campaigns or whether they have the courage to demand the repeal of this legislation.

You know what the answer will be. The reforms brought about by the Democrats were so long overdue that they cannot be abandoned, but if the direction of this Government were to be handed back to the opponents of progress, the fruits of Democratic success would be rapidly dissipated and the whole struggle for the reestablishment of social justice would have to begin again. So much for the domestic scene.

How about the international program? Modern science has made isolationism an impossibility. Nay, more than that, American inventive skill, American scientific progress has so improved the means of transportation and communication in the modern world that we have no choice but to march courageously down the path the great Senator VANDENBERG so firmly treads.

TIMID STATESMEN CANNOT LEAD AMERICANS

American long-range airplanes have triumphed over mountains and oceans. There is no geographical barrier behind which a timid people could be safely led by a timid statesman. We cannot follow Mr. Hoover with any hope of salvation to retire behind imagined barriers while abandoning the natural resources and industrial potentialities of Europe and Asia and Africa to the Communists. To turn our backs upon the free people of Western Europe would be to surrender the resources and the skills of the whole Eastern Hemisphere to communism. To condemn the people through whom we received the religious doctrines of Christianity and the political doctrines of freedom to totalitarian slavery would be a surrender of principle that would dishonor the memory of all the great founders of this Republic. It would profit us nothing. We would surrender two-thirds of the world's resources. We would surrender the aspirations of hundreds of millions of people who want peace and freedom and we would condemn ourselves to the loss of our own essential liberties by years of fearful waiting for the atomic attack the Soviets would be bound to launch.

We have no alternative but to remain loyal and steadfast and courageous in defense of the principles of freedom. The whole genius of our people has been that of courageous and confident self-government. Our political creed is that of popular government. It faces its greatest threat now at the hands of the Communist dictators who are waiting for us to yield to timidity and defeatism.

That is not the spirit of America. Americans are free. They know that there is no materialistic force capable of matching strength with the power of a free soul. We know that the people of the world do not want war, that they are driven to war only through the folly or the stupidity of leaders without faith in God or man.

THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA IS THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM AND PEACE

We know that war settles nothing, that every successive war is more appalling than its predecessor. Surely we know that a third world war would plunge all the world into a new era of darkness and tyranny, but we know that if we have the courage to live as our predecessors on this continent have lived, freely, courageously, and devotedly in the knowledge that the spiritual power of man can never be permanently overthrown by the evil of materialism, then it will be our glory to have been the Nation that shall have led the world to permanent peace.

The Democratic Party is the party that has never died because it has been a progressive party. It served the people in the time of Jefferson and Jackson. It served the people under Wilson and under Roosevelt. It's serving the people now under President Truman. It has a program, a progressive program which Republican leaders resist but dare not attack.

The Republican Party on the other hand is a party without a nationally recognized program on either the home front or the international front. Not until the Republican Convention is held in 1952 will it be possible for the people to know to what extent it will try to lead the country into the past, but all the signs of the times indicate that in 1952 it will turn back into the same paths of indecision and futility in which its predecessors, the Federalists and the Whigs, perished.

Opportunity in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 1, 1951:

OPPORTUNITY IN INDIA

The famine in India has shown no signs of abating; the bill to provide American wheat for the hungry has been stalled in Congress. A quick decision is imperative, both from the standpoint of humanity and as a matter of practical politics. The primary purpose of dispatching wheat to India is to alleviate distress, a step which is in accord with a great American tradition. But against the background of the differences between the United States and India on matters of foreign policy, there are some in this country who would make the wheat shipments conditional on some change in India's attitude, and there are many Indians who suspect that the grain, whether given as a gift or a loan would have political strings attached. Delay only fosters this unhappy condition and creates an atmosphere of asperity around the whole project.

The House Rules Committee has been brooding over the bill, chiefly because the Indian Government had originally asked to be allowed to purchase 2,000,000 tons of wheat on a long-term loan, and some committeemen believe that the whole project should be considered on this basis. Mr. Truman suggests that 1,000,000 tons be sent immediately as a gift and the disposition of the rest be discussed later. There is good sense in this proposal; it would meet the most urgent needs of India without further parley, while allowing debate on terms of payment for the remainder of the wheat. But in any case, some decision should be reached speedily. The United States has an opportunity to prove to the Indian people that their welfare is a matter of concern to this country; that Americans do not always think, as some of the more excitable Indian publicists like to charge, in terms of weapons and power politics. The wheat would be a very eloquent ambassador to India, and the less haggling and obstructionism that accompany it the better.

The Struggle Between Russia and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me to bring to the attention of the Senate a series of three articles by Prof. Herbert McClosky which appeared in the Minneapolis Star for February 27 and 28 and March 1, dealing with the conflict which exists today between the free and democratic countries of the world and the Soviet Union and her satellites. Not only is Professor McCloskey a personal friend of mine, but he is a respected member of the University of Minnesota teaching staff, and one of the leading young political scientists in the country. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of February 27, 1951]

WHAT HAS BROUGHT US TO THE BRINK OF WAR?

(By Herbert McCloskey)

No conflict faced by modern man has been more important for the future of freedom and culture than the present struggle between the Soviet world and the West.

What is the meaning of this conflict? Is it merely a struggle between hostile economic systems? Is it a struggle for territory? Is it, as Soviet leaders claim, caused by Wall Street or by American foreign policy?

The conflict before us is so fundamental that if the Soviets win, we shall lose not only our freedom but many other qualities upon which civilization rests. It is, therefore, vital that we understand what it is about, that

we do not indulge in fanciful myths about the nature of the enemy that confronts us.

The very scope of the present conflict and our profound hope that it will not need to be resolved by war sometimes leads us into confusion concerning its nature and causes.

This belief is advanced mainly by Soviet Communists. Yet Soviet leaders consider Britain no less an enemy than the United States, despite the fact that Britain has partly abandoned capitalism in favor of socialism. Still we have no serious conflict with Britain. And the number of Americans who would be willing to risk war with Russia over differences in the economies is ridiculously small.

Related to this is the Communist charge that the present conflict results from the manipulations of a rather vague demon known as Wall Street.

But Wall Street (or more accurately, American businessmen) is not always more influential than other power groups in determining our foreign policy.

Following World War II, many businessmen were friendly toward the Soviet Union and eager to enlarge their trade relations with the U. S. S. R. Even today business-minded leaders are by no means always in the forefront of the struggle against Soviet power. Men like Taft, Hoover, and Joseph B. Kennedy, for example, are the champions of the least provocative policies toward the U. S. S. R.

Furthermore, businessmen differ among themselves in many of their attitudes and opinions. To assume that they form a single segment of opinion and influence is to torture the facts.

It is sometimes thought the conflict is essentially about competing territorial aspirations. It is manifestly clear, however, that the Western Powers now possess few such aspirations.

The Soviet Union, for its part, protests its innocence on this score, and while, in the light of the enormous territorial expansion of the U. S. S. R. since 1945, we may reasonably question this innocence, it does not appear that the mere addition of territory is what the Soviet Union most needs or wants.

The struggle to influence territories, especially in central Europe and the Far East, has, of course, sharpened the conflict, but this appears to be a derivative rather than a primary factor.

It is also thought by some that the fault lies mainly with American politics and foreign policy. Are we blameless? Have we contributed in no way to the present world difficulties? It would be rash indeed to assume so.

We have failed in a most vital internal area—race relations—and this has reflected itself in world affairs. We are known throughout Europe and, more important, throughout Asia, as a nation that treats Negroes shabbily, confines them to second-class citizenship, and holds peculiar notions about white supremacy.

It is more difficult than we usually imagine to present ourselves and be accepted as the friends of the non-Caucasian peoples of the world when we are so obviously vulnerable on this score.

Another shortcoming is our inexperience in international politics. We often lack finesse and refinement in our international dealings. We are sometimes wanting in the patience and subtle wisdom that a more experienced people might have developed.

We have sometimes been rash, and have antagonized sensitive Europeans and Asiatics. We have exhibited sometimes an excess of pride, and even arrogance, in our attitudes toward other nations.

We have committed sins in the past by joining with other Western Powers in imperialist ventures. We grow increasingly more free from this, but our past sins nevertheless continue to plague us.

Factors of this sort have contributed to the present conflict, but none of them is decisive, and none of them compares in significance with the behavior of the Soviet Union in provoking the conflict.

It may be said, of course, that we contribute now by our policy of resistance and rearmament, and there is a sense in which this may be true. For it is possible that these policies will have a provocative effect on the Soviet regime.

[From the Minneapolis Star of February 23, 1951]

COMMUNIST RELIGION SOWS SEEDS OF WAR

(By Herbert McClosky)

The major responsibility for the present world conflict belongs to the Communist regime of Russia. At least four characteristics of Soviet communism must be examined to understand why this is so: (1) Its ideology; (2) its dictatorial government; (3) its distorted sense of reality; and (4) its irrational anxieties and fears.

Soviet communism is no ordinary political movement. It is a political religion, dogmatic, consecrated, fanatical, and with a view of history that regards the ultimate victory of communism as a certainty.

The driving force which, according to Bolshevik ideology, motivates history to this end is the class struggle. The doctrine of class struggle is a central myth of Communist theology. This struggle, say Soviet Communists, has now been transferred to the international realm where it will some day produce a final Armageddon in favor of communism.

Soviet leaders apparently believe, therefore, that a world conflict is inevitable, and have, in fact, said so on numerous occasions. Capitalism in crisis, they argue, will seek to start a war in order to survive. So long as there is a division of the classes in the world, the struggle will remain.

So the U. S. S. R. prepares for war. It did so even when other nations were preparing for peace. It maintains the largest army, the most continuous flood of military preparations, the most aggressive foreign policy, the most persistent tendency to expand, the most uncooperative policy of all nations in its international dealings.

There is, however, more to the story. Nothing is plainer about the Soviet system than that it is a dictatorship of the most extreme and concentrated sort.

As a doctrinaire dictatorship, it tends always to read the motives of others in conspiratorial terms. It cannot be persuaded of the good will of those it has marked as enemies. It is essentially irrational and beyond the reaches of reason. Neither logic nor facts can readily prevail against it. It is a closed system, ideologically and politically, and it cannot easily be appealed to.

In a society that cannot conceive of honest intellectual disagreements and that places no reliance on the free play of ideas, distortions crowd out reality and ultimately forbid it. The Soviet regime has forbidden itself from learning the truth, for it has not only closed its mind, but has also closed the channels by which the truth might emerge.

Where the price of error is arrest or death, do even its agents dare to report the truth when it contradicts the dogma?

To deal with a regime of this sort, is to deal with a phenomenon so fundamentalist that it will have the world only on its own terms; a phenomenon in whose given word no faith can be placed; that refuses to understand the simplest and plainest language; and that twists and perverts whatever argument it touches.

It knows little or nothing of compromise, though it respects power, and will on occasion yield to it.

Soviet leaders respect no other man's opinions and values, because they hold themselves to have divined the final truth about man and the universe. They regard tolerance as a sign of weakness, and disagreement as a sign of depravity. They regard all means as permissible to them, for they believe and have said that there is no morality except revolutionary, class morality.

The Soviet dictatorship is, furthermore, like all dictatorships, psychologically insecure, for its sense of reality is so distorted that it is subject to exaggerated fears and anxieties of its own making. It is partly this and partly its messianic ideology that drives the regime to expand and to extend its rule over others.

This expansion, in turn, deepens the conflict, for it is then thought by others, and with justification, that the Soviet dictatorship will never be satisfied until it controls the entire world.

[From the Minneapolis Star of March 1, 1951]

WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO RESIST

(By Herbert McClosky)

Facing a growing conflict with the Soviet Union, what choices do we have? Four possible courses seem open to us: (1) The policy of the third camp; (2) pacifism; (3) submission; (4) resistance even at the risk of war.

The third camp idea expressed by a number of European intellectuals holds that Soviet communism and capitalist America are two giant ogres, both bad. It regards the choice between them as imperfect, and therefore chooses neither.

The basic assumption of this view is erroneous, and the view itself is perfectionist and utopian. It bewails the imperfect choice that faces it, and wants to have the struggle on its own terms or not at all.

Most of us cannot hold with this view. We have no right to assume that because the struggle is imperfect, we have no responsibility toward it. The life that has been built out of the democratic tradition may be less than perfect, but it is nevertheless worth choosing, worth preserving, and worth defending.

Nor, for most of us, is pacifism a realistic alternative. The motivations of pacifism are extraordinarily noble. It demands of us, however, that we be more than human, or perhaps less than human.

For the pacifist asks of us that for the sake of the pure principle we must be prepared, if necessary, to sacrifice friendship, love, loyalties, liberties, and perhaps our lives. This is more than most of us who are merely human are willing or able to pay.

If Soviet leaders were the sort of people who might respect pacifism, this alternative might be meaningful. But Soviet pacifists are in concentration camps or dead.

We come now to the alternatives of submission or resistance.

It is hard to believe that men who value freedom could hold with submission. For to submit is to give ourselves up to a way of life that could destroy the vitalities of civilization.

The Soviet regime has imposed on its own people and would impose on others, if it could, a ruthless dictatorship, unlimited in power and largely lacking in moral sensibility. It exercises on its own people and those it has conquered the methods of deceit, violence, and terror. It persecutes its scientists, its scholars, its artists for even the most modest deviations from dogma, and it imposes upon the great mass of men a despotism as great as any the world has ever known.

Against this, there exists in the west and in America, a democratic conviction that is still, despite shortcomings, of considerable vitality.

Let no one tell us that political freedom is of no consequence, that it means only the freedom to starve or to suffer. Among many other things, our freedom makes possible the correction of our shortcomings, a searching out of our deficiencies.

It gives to all of us some opportunity to initiate the course of our own lives. We have the hope of realizing, through freedom, our best qualities, and we can correct error.

This is no trivial matter. Where there is no possibility of correcting error, the entire culture becomes warped and distorted. It is regulated and ground down by those who assume their own infallibility.

If the present conflict should unfortunately come to final issue, let us at least be clear-headed concerning its meaning. For no matter what causes it, it will be a conflict over the survival of the humanistic tradition. We will have to choose between freedom and despotism.

Is the RFC Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert in the appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial, brought to my attention by Mr. W. C. Erkert, director of purchases, Keystone Steel & Wire Co., of Peoria, Ill., entitled "Is the RFC Necessary," and appearing in the March 26 issue of the American Metal Market:

IS THE RFC NECESSARY?

The scandals that have been exposed in the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the Senate Banking Subcommittee headed by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT have captured the newspaper headlines and have become the butt of jokes on radio and television, obscuring to some extent a basic issue: Is the RFC really necessary?

Questions of public morality and political influence as brought to light recently in the nearly 15 months' old probing of RFC affairs are serious enough, but the question of the economic justification for Government lending on a large scale in present circumstances of excessive availability of credit is one that should have the closest scrutiny by the Congress of the United States.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has introduced a bill (S. 1116) in the Senate to abolish the lending activities of the RFC, to liquidate its holdings and use the proceeds for a reduction of the Federal debt. So enthusiastic was the response to Senator BYRD's proposal that fellow members immediately wanted to climb on the bandwagon and appear as cosponsors of the measure.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was a depression-born instrument created in the Hoover administration and as such it has in the past served a useful purpose. In its early days it saved some distressed banks, kept some railroads out of receivership, and extended agricultural credit in worthy cases. Today many in Congress of both parties favor its abolition as a political grab bag.

Jesse Jones, its former able administrator, is among those who would do away with it entirely. Former President Herbert Hoover, whose Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended more than 2 years ago the liquidation of RFC and the taking over of its duties of guaranteeing loans by the Treasury Department, has recently emphasized his earlier findings in a letter to a Member of Congress. "That agency," says Mr. Hoover, "was created as a result of my recommendations to the Congress in 1931 to meet the credit collapse at that time. It was set up as a purely emergency agency, with stringent restrictions on the type of loans and their security. These restrictions were subsequently relaxed and the agency continued in nonemergency periods."

In its report to Congress the Hoover Commission stated its objections to the manner in which RFC has been conducted in recent years in the following paragraph, which of course was written long before the current investigation was begun:

"Direct lending by the Government to persons or enterprises opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or enterprises. It invites political and private pressure, or even corruption. Emergencies may arise in depression, war, national defense, or disaster which must be met in this way. But direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

In submitting his bill for liquidation of the RFC and the transfer of some of its most useful functions to the Office of Defense Mobilization, Senator BYRD said:

"The history of the RFC shows that it has done a good job when it was really needed but, as might have been expected, its access to the financial resources of the United States has been too great a temptation for political camp followers in periods when it did not have a job to do."

During its nearly 20 years of existence, the RFC has made more than 30,000 direct business loans totaling approximately a billion dollars and more than 5,000 business loans with banks participating of nearly $200,000,000. These are exclusive of defense loans, bank loans, railroad loans, exclusive of loans to political subdivisions and the mortgage-loan program. Many of these loans have been written off as uncollectible, according to Senator BYRD, though claims have been made that the RFC has operated at a profit. Of the uncollectible loans, a majority were made, it is charged, in periods when there was neither war nor depression in sight.

Many of the RFC loans have been subject to criticism other than those given the spotlight during the Fulbright committee hearings. Besides the Texmass, Lustron, Gunther, Jaeckel and Miami Beach hotel cases, there have been such loans as $34,000,000 to the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. to build automobiles and another $10,000,000 for the establishment of a selling organization, the $1,500,000 granted to the Hal Roach movie studios when the RFC itself found turmoil in the moving-picture industry, and $2,705,000 granted to a gold-mining company in Alaska which was in trouble largely because of Government restrictions on equipment and supplies.

"Such loans," declared Senator BYRD, "do not promote the public welfare. They provide easy credit which is not needed in inflationary periods. At this time they may provide employment, but in competition with vital defense requirements. Under current circumstances, it is competition by the Federal Government with private banking enterprise and a step toward the nationalization of banking."

The Government's investment in Federal lending corporations is $20,000,00,000, according to the Federal Reserve Bulletin, or nearly 10 percent of the Federal debt. But beyond this, the credit that is available to Government lending agencies totals $55,000,000,000, of which there are charges in the form of loans and guaranties of nearly $45,000,000,000. Those who favor the liquidation of the RFC charge that this is one of the primary causes of inflation. New commitments for Federal credit listed in the 1952 budget total $13,300,000,000, of which more than $10,000,000,000 is for housing and agriculture. These are exclusive of short-term loans such as the commodity credit program.

There are 73 Federal corporations which are concerned in one way or another with loans. Among the more important are the Public Housing Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Export-Import Bank, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration.

But despite the adherents that Senator BYRD's bill for abolition of the RFC will attract, there is by no means anything like unanimity in Congress that the RFC should be completely done away with. Senator FULBRIGHT, whose committee has brought to light sordid stories of its dealings, does not believe this course is either feasible or desirable, declaring that the RFC has a number of important duties in the present emergency. Only last year, he has stated, Congress provided additional duties for the RFC in connection with the Defense Production Act. His remedy for the conditions which have prevailed in the administration of the RFC is embodied in Senate bill S. 514 which he has introduced and which would provide for a single Administrator or Governor and a loan policy board.

"To defeat the reorganization plan, on the grounds that the RFC should be abolished, would merely prolong the present conditions," he declares, "without any assurance either that the RFC would be abolished, or that it would be restored to a position of independence and integrity."

Another sponsor of the plan to continue RFC is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of TEXAS, who has become known as the friend of small business. Declaring that there is very little risk capital available from banking and private sources, Representative PATMAN says that "a vote against RFC is a vote against independent business in this country."

So the battle for and against the RFC may emerge as one of the outstanding issues of the Eighty-second Congress in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle. It is an issue in which party lines will be split and which may carry over into the political campaign of 1952.

United States World Aims and Hopes for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written for the Foreign Policy Bulletin by my colleague from Connecticut in the House, Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, of Hartford. The article appeared in the March 9, 1951, issue of the Bulletin. It deals with the need for this Nation to clarify its world aims and its hopes for world peace.

Representative RIBICOFF's article is the second time in as many months that he has issued an important statement on foreign policy which has contributed to the current "great debate." Earlier, on March 21, 1951, he delivered one of the main talks at the Hollins College, Virginia, convocation exercises. Titled "We Shall Prevail," the speech by this distin-

guished member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee stressed the need for moral leadership in today's crisis.

Mr. President, those who know Representative RIBICOFF admire him for the wholehearted manner in which, during his service in the House, he has brought his great ability and intelligence to bear on his work as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. His article in the Foreign Policy Bulletin, and his recent talk at Hollins College which already has been inserted in a previous edition of the RECORD, should be studied by all the Members of Congress and by the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIBICOFF URGES RECAPTURE OF POLITICAL INITIATIVE

For the first time in history one nation has strayed into a position of leadership without wanting it. Yet nevertheless the whole free world, economically and militarily, depends on the United States. It is this brutal fact that increases our frustration and our soul searching. "Why, oh God," we cry, "just we?" If we do not lead, no other free nation can take our place. If we do not lead, Soviet Russia will rush into the vacuum created by our abdication.

OUR NEW WORLD ROLE

The implications of our changed international status have been slow to sink into the national consciousness. Yet we do not sufficiently realize that everything we do affects other nations. Nor have we learned that we ourselves can now be subjected to new pressure and new kinds of attacks that cou'd never have touched us before. It is our country's task to determine whether freedom or slavery is the principle to survive for the next centuries.

Although the United States is the nucleus of the non-Communist world, there is no central control, no compelling unifying idea. Korea dramatically opened our eyes to the dangers that confront us and revealed the weakness of ourselves and our allies. Consequently, one fact overshadows all others. Our present policy is bigger than our present means. We should multiply our means to cope with our commitments.

We no longer live in the carefree times when we could ignore the rest of the planet. What we announce we will not defend, the other side automatically takes. Moreover, no portion of the non-Communist world is without importance to the defense of the whole. Because of our geographic position and interests, we must keep in balance our policies as to Europe, Asia, and the Americas. We cannot separate our world relations and responsibilities and treat them separately from one another. Our commitments in one area must not be permitted to endanger our capacity to act in others.

CORRECTIONS OF POLICY NEEDED

There must be some corrections in our short-term foreign policy.

1. Outside the United States we must try to create a single automatic military alliance, embracing all countries willing to join, concentrating on Western Europe as the most valuable, but not overlooking other areas. Although we might be forced out of one area or another, if war comes, we must not voluntarily renounce any important region of the world.

2. We should create local centers of strength able to deal with second-degree aggression, beginning with a far eastern pact—not unlike the North Atlantic Pact—and a Mediterranean pact, for if this second-degree aggression cannot be handled chiefly by local forces, we must either have to submit to it or else fritter away our strength. An example of local defense is the Greek-Yugoslav-Turkish combined force, which could probably handle aggression from the captive countries of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

3. We cannot unilaterally promise each nation and each segment of the globe that we will defend it without getting in return its promise to help us when necessary. Since defense, moreover, is global in scale, we must have commitments from those with whom we are allied to help us in other areas of the world.

4. We need allies as much as they need us. We have interests in common. We must find a common policy with our friends and then follow it together.

5. By appropriate organs we should try to weld our camp into an effective instrument to make it as solid as that of our opponents. For example, we may point to the pooling of military components under General Eisenhower in Europe and the proposal to pool European economic interests under the Schuman plan.

Although terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to rearm, we must never forget that war is the last push that topples civilization. We must press the campaign on the front of peace making, and not only on the front of armed opposition. We must recapture from the Communists the political, social, economic, and spiritual factors without which military strength usually fails. Spiritual power is the ultimate key to the world's ills. We must contribute ideas as well as dollars and soldiers.

LONG-RANGE POLICY GOALS

The following should be the basis for our long-range foreign policy:

1. We must proclaim that our goals for the world are similar to the goals of this Nation from its founding. Paraphrasing the Constitution of the United States, they are: A more perfect world, common security, the establishment of justice, universal tranquility, the securing of peace in our own land and throughout the world, general welfare of all peoples, the securing of the blessings of liberty for all peoples and for posterity.

2. We must proclaim that we are for universal disarmament and international control of weapons.

3. We must proclaim that American wealth, American resources, America itself, are not the ends but the means to an end. The Creator did not endow this Nation with all its vast potential merely that Americans might luxuriate in the midst of a depleted, dismayed, and disheartened world. We should tell the world that once we eliminate the scourge of war we are willing to adopt a peace budget instead of a military budget. Under an international program similar to point 4 we shall help to raise the underdeveloped peoples of this world out of ignorance, poverty, and disease.

4. The McMahon-Ribicoff resolution, recently introduced in Congress, has its place in this program. This resolution is a declaration of friendship of the American people for all other peoples of the world. It emphasizes the desire of the American people for peace, friendship, and brotherhood with all men throughout the world, including those of the Soviet Union.

5. We must take the lead in transforming the United Nations into a world organization able to enact, administer, and enforce world law. This will require fundamental revisions in the United Nations Charter. These changes can be limited and confined to matters relating to the prevention of war.

For our generation and all mankind one question overshadows all others. Are we going to be able to work out the problems that arose out of World War II, or will world war III follow?

All this is a tremendous task. But it is not beyond our capacity. If we have the will to lead, we shall prevail.

A. A. RIBICOFF.

(This arficle was specially prepared for the Foreign Policy Bulletin by Representative RIBICOFF, Democrat of Connecticut, who is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.)

The Bitter Wheat of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 1, 1951:

THE BITTER WHEAT OF INDIA—UNITED STATES, IN DELAYING GRAIN, IS RISKING THE LOSS OF A FRIEND

(By Margaret Parton)

NEW DELHI.—Recent news that India will exchange raw jute for 50,000 tons of Russian wheat as she recently exchanged jute goods for 50,000 tons of Chinese rice is considered here further indication of India's determination to keep food imports free of political implications and obtain food for her undernourished people wherever it may be found.

American observers here also regard the news of the Russian deal as another signal to Washington that in Indian eyes the time for discussion of merits of the 2,000,000-ton wheat gift is fast running out.

A month ago, when it appeared India would receive the grain without undue delay, most Indians were already half convinced that the gift was a spontaneous humanitarian gesture, as they had so often been told in preliminary publicity. Now they are beginning to change their minds, and the new mood is a bitter one.

A recent cartoon in a normally pro-American newspaper here showed a large blond labeled "United States" leaning possessively on a pie marked "Food for India." To an emaciated Indian at the other end of the table she was murmuring: "First tell me you love me, honey."

The view represented in this cartoon is spreading fast. If the offer of wheat to India is really a humanitarian gesture, Indians ask, why then must it be debated at such length? A recent spate of touring American private citizens who flatly tell Indians in public and private that they must sign up with America or else has aggravated opinion. Such an attempt at a straight-from-the-shoulder approach never does any good in India and in this case it merely confirms growing Indian suspicion of American motives.

American observers in India are also uneasy at the way this matter is being delayed in Washington. Many Americans here feel that in Indian eyes the wheat gift has come to symbolize the potential goodness of America, just as the atom bomb symbolizes evil. Since symbols are all-powerful in India, the possibility is that denial of the wheat will have a disastrous effect on Indian public opinion of America and on India's reaction to American policy in general. While America may not win India with wheat, America may well lose India without the wheat.

Proposals that a loan rather than a gift should be made seem here to be equally unfortunate. While such proposals might have been justified before, Indians were so generally led to believe that the gift would be

forthcoming that they now appear in Indian eyes to turn Uncle Sam into Shylock. Economic experts also point out that a long-term loan would tie up India's economy for years and might prevent her from getting loans elsewhere for nation-building projects.

Meanwhile, India's struggle to avert widespread famine continues, and although the Government is importing shiploads of grain every day (against payment) from America, Canada, and elsewhere, many thousands of peasants are facing semistarvation this summer.

In North Bihar, for instance, such limited foodstocks as are available are sufficient to feed the population on a meager scale for only 2 or 3 weeks more. After that the Government will probably be forced to declare North Bihar a famine-stricken area and divert to it dwindling supplies of grain which are already desperately needed in other provinces.

From this distance it appears that the time for questions and debate in Washington is now past, both in regard to acute human hunger and also to America's relations with India. While it is true the grain will certainly help in relieving starvation in a hard-pressed country, even this consideration may count for less in the long run than restoring India's fast-vanishing faith in the sincerity of America's humanitarianism.

Assignment of Ground Forces to Duty in the European Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have expressed the conviction, with regard to sending American troops to fight on foreign soil in times of peace, that this is a matter of policy on which the Congress should be consulted in advance and not merely asked to approve decisions already made.

In this connection, I call to the attention of the Senate a statement by the Committee on the Present Danger, a national group comprised of distinguished representatives of the professions, the educational world, and of business, in which there is set forth the considered conviction that such action as is proposed must be the joint responsibility of the Congress and the Chief Executive, and asking that it be expressed as the sense of the Senate that the Congress be consulted in advance, through its appropriate committees, as to any new long-range policy requiring the stationing of large numbers of additional United States forces in Europe in support of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Committee on the Present Danger be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

The Senate is about to vote on a resolution concerning sending troops to Europe in support of the North Atlantic Treaty. The importance of this subject to the safety of our country can hardly be overstated.

In the hope that it may serve to clarify the issues, this committee ventures its comment.

The real question is how best to defend the United States. This is a military problem. We must look to our responsible military leaders, who must conduct our defense if war comes, to plan the strategy they will employ. It is their unanimous, professional judgment that the defense of the United States should be laid in Europe jointly with our allies under the North Atlantic Treaty; that we must contribute our fair share of the ground forces of the joint army being created under General Eisenhower; that supply of munitions and contributions of sea and air power are not enough; that flexibility as to future decisions for deployment of our troops is an imperative necessity in a future no man can predict.

There is danger that these real issues may be obscured by an unnecessary question as to the respective constitutional powers of the President and the Congress. The Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. This carries with it the powers implicit in command as to deployment of existing forces. But the Constitution also provides that it shall be the function of the Congress "to raise and support armies." In addition, of course, Congress has the power over the purse.

Stationing a relatively large United States force in Europe to support the North Atlantic Treaty will involve the functions of command, of raising and supporting armies, and of making appropriations. It must be the joint responsibility of the Congress and the Chief Executive to continue to provide the requisite forces, to pass the laws to create them and the funds to pay for them.

The press recently attributed to General Eisenhower the statement that he might as well be sent to the middle of the Atlantic Ocean unless he is to have in this task the support of the President, of the Congress, and of the public.

The true issues then are not constitutional questions, but whether this country is ready with unity to carry out, the spirit as well as the letter of the North Atlantic Treaty; whether it will give its wholehearted support to General Eisenhower's mission; whether it will abide by the considered judgment of its responsible military leaders as to how best to defend the United States.

Secretary Marshall has just stated that the danger is greater now even than last November.

Accordingly this committee urges with deep conviction—

A renewed spirit of national urgency, and of unity of action in this matter between the President and the Congress.

To this end, that the Senate express—as is proposed in section 2 of the joint committees' resolution now pending before it—"that the threat to the security of the United States and our North Atlantic Treaty partners makes it necessary for the United States to station abroad such units of our Armed Forces as may be necessary and appropriate to contribute our fair share of the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area."

That it be expressed as the sense of the Senate that the Congress be consulted in advance, through its appropriate committees, as to any new long range policy requiring the stationing of any large number of additional United States forces in Europe in support of the North Atlantic Treaty.

That assurance of such consultation be given by the President.

That the above not be done in a way which might tend to cast any uncertainty or cloud upon the power of the Commander in Chief to take instant action wherever necessary, as emergencies may arise or threaten, to deploy existing forces—a power more urgently requisite for the safety of all of us in today's world of sudden mass-destruction weapons than it has ever been before.

Committee on the Present Danger: Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, Dillon Anderson, William Douglas Arant, James Phinney Baxter III, Laird Bell, Barry Bingham, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, Robert Cutler, R. Ammi Cutter, Mrs. Dwight Davis, Harold W. Dodds, E. L. Degolyer, Charles Dollard, William J. Donovan, Goldthwaite H. Dorr, David Dubinsky, Leonard K. Firestone, Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Miss Meta Glass, Arthur J. Goldberg, Samuel Goldwyn, Edward S. Greenbaum, Paul G. Hoffman, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, Stanley Marcus, William C. Menninger, Frederick A. Middlebush, James L. Morrill, Edward R. Murrow, John Lord O'Brien, Floyd B. Odlum, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Daniel A. Poling, Stanley Rosen, Samuel I. Rosenman, Theodore W. Schultz, Robert E. Sherwood, Edgar W. Smith, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Stearns, Tracy S. Voorhees, Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., W. W. Waymack, Henry M. Wriston, J. D. Zellerbach.

Come Clean, Mr. Welles; Name Those Who Confused President Roosevelt on China Policy and at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day goes by that some former Democratic policy maker does not publish a book in an effort to protect himself or his benefactor against historical judgment that is certain to follow. Today we have the sorry spectacle of Sumner Welles offering his excuses for the dismissal foreign policies of the New Deal when he was a high spokesman for the State Department from 1933 to 1943. His confessions appear in his book, Seven Decisions That Shaped History.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely article by Mr. George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald today. This outstanding writer puts Mr. Welles on the spot. Congress will await an answer to the Sokolsky demand that he "come clean" and name those who "confused" the late President Roosevelt in our foreign affairs.

The article follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Sumner Welles returns to public controversy after a prolonged illness attending the curious circumstances of his departure from the State Department. His resurrection is ushered in by a book, "Seven Decisions That Shaped History," and by the chairmanship of a letterhead organization "Freedom International."

The book is extraordinarily controversal, attacking Cordell Hull, Herbert Hoover, Gen. George Marshall and about everything else, except Franklin D. Roosevelt and Sumner Welles, who were never wrong.

But as I read the book, I could not help recalling that Sumner Welles was in the State Department in extremely important positions from 1933 to 1943 and that he did not speak up at the time to alert the American people. He has waited until 1951 to tell us what we should have known when the mistakes were being made by his own State Department.

For instance, he says:

"In China the Nationalist Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek remained in power. There was good reason to assume that with the pledged support of the Soviet Union and of the United States it would gradually overcome the opposition of the Chinese Communists and consolidate its authority over a united nation."

That, of course, is absolute nonsense and is written only to defend, by implication, the shameless conduct of Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta. Welles knows that Chiang broke with the Communists in 1927 in such a manner that no peace between them could ever be possible.

Writing of Roosevelt's troubles with Chiang Kai-shek, Sumner Welles says:

"The repeated—and, it must be admitted, bungling—efforts of several of President Roosevelt's representatives in China to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to comply with the demands of the Chinese Communists were producive of misunderstanding, and damaged the prestige and authority of the Nationalist Government.

"Likewise, the profund ignorance of China, and the lack of Far Eastern experience, of certain of the President's representatives there served him in ill stead. These envoys spent much of their time quarreling with each other, or with their subordinates; and, while I know of no instance where they did not try to carry out the President's instructions to further the establishment of a strong postwar China, their erroneous judgment and the wide diversity of their recommendations made it impossible for him to obtain any accurate over-all estimate of the situation."

This is important evidence and has often appeared, in one form or another, in this column, but from Sumner Welles, it is of greater value because he was running the State Department when many of the mistakes were made. And he gives no names, no facts, no details.

Wo are these advisers? Is one of them, perchance, Owen Lattimore or Lauchlin Currie?

Roosevelt, according to Welles, was not only confused by his advisers concerning his China policy, but by Gen. George Marshall concerning the over-all war strategy, Marshall being, according to Welles, incorrect in his information and his decisions.

Welles does not give details as to who it is that made these mistakes. Are we still being governed by the men who were, in his opinion, all wrong? They have, to date, cost us 60,000 casualties. Are they still determining our policy.

If you look at the dates, Gen. George Marshall and Dean Acheson made the worst mistakes, but Sumner Welles does not say who advised them regarding Far Eastern affairs.

Again Sumner Welles, defending Roosevelt, says:

"At the Cairo conferences with the Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, the President had at his side no expert adviser on Far Eastern affairs. At Yalta also such advice was lacking.

"If the President had had with him at those two conferences so authoritative and keen-minded an expert on Far Eastern affairs, for example, as Dr. Stanley Hornbeck, who had for many years been the State Department's political adviser on the Far East, a number of defects in the Cairo and Yalta agreements on Asia might well have been avoided."

This is a correct view but incomplete. Roosevelt did have advisers at Cairo and certainly at Yalta. Gen. George Marshall was at Cairo as was General Wedemeyer.

At Yalta, President Roosevelt's expert on Far Eastern affairs was Alger Hiss.

What we need to know from Sumner Welles is, who confused President Roosevelt, who appointed the quarrelsome, contending people who gave him, as Welles says, bad advice?

We want names, we want responsibility. Who appointed Hiss? Now that Sumner Welles has written this confession, let him come clean.

Ukrainians a Potent Ally Against the Stalin Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people can be a potent ally of the United States in the fight against the Stalin Communist regime. These people who have been so oppressed by Stalin have been yearning for their freedom. Not only are they subject to the usual Soviet terrorism, but in addition they suffer as a minority group trod upon by the aggressive and imperialistic policies of Soviet Russia. With more than 40,000,000 Ukrainian people living in the Soviet Union, this group constitutes no small prickly thorn in the side of Stalin, but rather a tremendous national group which if properly led and supported may well prove the downfall of the Stalinist regime. I believe that the American people should support the Ukrainian resistance to Communist tyranny.

I include herewith two articles—one from the March 1951 issue of the Sign, and the other from the March 24, 1951, issue of the Brooklyn Tablet. These articles tell in greater detail the possibilities for revolution existing among the Ukrainian people. They follow:

[From the Sign for March 1951]

WEAPON AGAINST RUSSIA—NOT A SUPER ATOM BOMB NOR A POWERFUL JET PLANE, BUT THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR MISCALLED RUSSIANS IS THE WEAPON TO BEAT THE KREMLIN

(By Leonard J. Snow)

The United States has available today a weapon which can beat the evil men in the Kremlin to their knees, save the world from the menace of Red imperialism, and bring political and spiritual freedom to the slave population of the Soviet Empire itself. Best of all, use of this weapon may very well bring all these blessings without precipitating the horrors of a third world war.

For this weapon is neither a super atom bomb nor a powerful jet plane of new design. In fact, it is not a weapon of mass destruction at all but a long overlooked principle of simple justice which, properly applied, can be of immense benefit, not alone to this country and its allies, but also to the inhabitants of the Soviet Union.

The weapon is the principle of national self-determination which gives each distinctive people in the world the right to live as a free nation, under a government of its own choice, and within the territory it inhabits. If self-determination were applied to the crazy-quilt pattern of different races and nations which make up the population of the Soviet Union, at least two dozen, perhaps more, independent states would replace the single giant Communist slave empire that exists today.

The "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" and "Russia" are neither synonyms nor equivalent terms, although most Americans use them interchangeably. Actually, of course, the Soviet Union, as the name indicates, is a federation of many nations and peoples, of which the group known as the Russians is the largest. But one basic fact that the name does not indicate is that the federation is an involuntary one, produced by Russian conquest over a period of hundreds of years, and not by the free choice of the federated peoples. As a matter of fact about half of the present population of the Soviet Union—that half of the 200,000,000 inhabitants who are ethnologically non-Russian—is anxious to cast off its connection with Moscow.

Among these non-Russians are from thirty-five to forty million Ukrainians and about 10,000,000 Byelorussians, who are related to the Russians to about the same degree that the Dutch or the Swedes are related to the Germans. There are fifty or more million other people in Stalin's empire—among them Tartars, Buryat Mongols, Armenians, Turkestanians, and Finns—who differ from the Russians as greatly as the Chinese do from the French.

If the United States, which has always firmly refused to recognize territorial changes produced by aggression and conquest, comes out bluntly as an advocate of self-determination for these minorities in the Soviet Union, it will gain their sympathy in the cold war. If the cold war becomes a shooting war, this country will gain the active cooperation of hundreds of thousands of desperate representatives of these minorities who will regard war between the Soviet Union and the West as a golden opportunity to launch their own fight for freedom from Moscow's chains.

These statements are neither speculation nor wishful thinking. They are based on the studies of hardheaded policy-making officials in Washington who have the benefit of access to our intelligence files.

These men are convinced that the minorities incorporated into the Soviet Union's huge population are straining at the bonds which tie them to the ruthless Communist dictatorship. Knowledge that the United States recognizes their right to independence and a national existence of their own will cause these people to hamstring Moscow's war plans by sabotage, large-scale desertions from the Red army, and even open revolt against the Communists. It is possible that by these actions alone Stalin's empire can be broken up from within. But, even if Stalin is foolish enough to resort to war in the face of these domestic difficulties, sponsorship and active encouragement of self-determination will give the United States and its allies the assurance that they will have an easier war to fight and win.

The immediate consequence of a breakup of the Communist empire will be to lift the shadow of fear from this planet because most of the new states which would emerge will desire nothing better than to live in complete friendship and harmony with the rest of the world. Even if the Communists retain control of one of the new states, their power to do harm through conquest and aggression, which today comes from the extent of the empire they hold and its enormous human and industrial resources, will

be eliminated. Under self-determination, the most the Communists may manage to keep for themselves—and that is doubtful—is a Russian state of about 90,000,000 people centering around Moscow.

There is a tendency to forget that Soviet expansion and conquest is not a new phenomenon but a continuation of the savage Russian imperialism which was the order of the day under the Czarist empire. For instance, the Caucasus region has belonged to Moscow for less than 100 years. Bringing the Caucasus into the Russian fold was not a peaceful process of bringing civilization to a savage area. It was a deliberately planned policy of conquest in which the preponderant military strength of semibarbaric Moscow crushed the ancient Christian kingdom of Georgia and in so doing left behind wounds which have never healed.

Just after the end of World War II, one of the Soviet attaches on duty at the Red Embassy in Washington was an admiral of Georgian extraction. He must remain anonymous because he has since returned to the Soviet Union. This man told his American friends that the spirit of nationalism and the desire for independence from Moscow have never disappeared in his homeland of Georgia. The people of Georgia, he said, were biding their time and waiting for their chance to achieve freedom. They will welcome, with undying gratitude, the knowledge that their aspirations were looked on with sympathy by the West and they will co-operate fully in any feasible plan to bring the Red slave empire to an end.

The Communists have been slightly more subtle in following the Czarist Russian policy of imperialism. Ostensibly they have encouraged minority cultures but, by placing Muscovite gauleiters at the helm in each minority area, they have attained the same net effect as the Czarists: The minorities have been allowed autonomy in unimportant affairs but are tied to Moscow's apron strings in matters that count. Like the Czarists, the Communists bleed the minority areas white of their produce and raw materials for the benefit of the majority Russians.

The attitude of the minorities toward their Russian masters is best illustrated by their immediate response to the fall of the Russian Czar in March 1917. When that happened, most of the minority peoples, living on the periphery of the Czarist Empire, in the west, the east, and to the south, declared their independence and established free and usually republican governments. In other words, the minorities took advantage without delay of the collapse of Moscow's power to free themselves from any connection with the Russians although the democratic successors to the Czarist state promised them sympathetic treatment and a large measure of autonomy under locally chosen governments.

In November 1917, when Lenin and his Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional Kerensky government, despite the difficulties caused by the German occupation of considerable Russian territory, literally dozens of independent states had replaced the old empire. In Eastern Europe there was a free Ukrain and a free White Russia. In the Caucasus, and along the shores of the Caspian Sea, the Georgians, the Armenians, and half a dozen other races, declared their independence. In the Crimea, a Tartar state was formed. Siberia was the location of no less than five free states. The far-off Asiatic possessions of the Czar reverted to their former independent status. The Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—joined Finland in asserting their independence.

Nothing was left of the despotically ruled empire but those territories inhabited by the Russians themselves.

The Communist masters of Russia, although they gave lip service to the principle of self-determination, were then, as now, shrewd men who realized that reconquest of the old Czarist empire would give them a fine start on their plan to conquer the world for Marxism. They also realized that world opinion would not give much support to the new states because the West, not having learned to differentiate between the various distinctive ethnological groups living in the former territories of the Czar, lumped them together as Russian and looked on their wars as so many domestic quarrels.

So Lenin and his Bolsheviks sent their armies against one new state after another and reannexed their territory, this time as part of a Communist empire.

By 1925 the last of the independent states was crushed and the capitals of Europe were crowded with political refugees from the ruthless vengeance of the new Communist empire.

It is these political refugees—and those who joined them in exile during and after the Second World War—who have kept alive the idea that the way to root out Bolshevism is to offer the hope of freedom to the minorities of the Soviet Union. Between the wars, these exiles learned to recognize that it was their own weakness, caused by their inability to work together against the Communists, rather than the Bolshevik power which destroyed their opportunity for freedom. Many of the exiles decided that only through the close cooperation of all the minorities could they hope to regain their precious independence. They organized political associations which cut across national lines, included representatives from all or nearly all minorities, and set as their goal the restoration of freedom to all.

In Warsaw, for instance, Prof. Roman Smal Stocki, a famous Ukrainian scholar who now teaches at Marquette University, organized the Promethean League with delegates from a baker's dozen of the minorities. Between the wars, the Promethean League disseminated independence propaganda from outside the Soviet Union and fostered a secret underground movement within the Communist empire. The league was shattered by the Second World War, but Prof. Smal Stocki has now reorganized it in this country.

Similar in purpose to the Promethean League is the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, organized in the Ukraine in 1943 by underground representatives of the minorities who were then fighting against both the Nazi invaders and the Soviet partisan bands. The ABN now maintains its headquarters in Edinburgh.

The existence of such organizations among the thousands of exiles from the Soviet Union, plus information brought to Washington from inside the Soviet Union by agents of our various official intelligence services, has convinced many American Government officials that a strong demand for freedom exists among the Soviet minorities. There are available on-the-spot reports which reveal that Soviet treatment of its Central Asian minorities, for example, is extremely brutal, and that, as a result, a major part of the population of this area is especially anxious to cast off the Soviet yoke.

Although the constitution of the Soviet Union, the so-called Stalin constitution of 1936, provides for self-government in minority areas of the country, our officials know that in every case the majority of highly placed administrators are Russian carpetbaggers. Only the lowest posts in the administrative echelons are open to the minority representatives.

In the western areas of the Soviet Union, particularly in the Ukraine and in the former Baltic States, Soviet brutality has caused the extermination of a large part of the population and the wholesale transference of other millions to the slave labor camps. These facts are well known to newspaper readers from the charges brought against the Bolsheviks before the United Nations by exiles from these regions. Secret information in the possession of the United States Government confirms these charges in every respect.

If there is further doubt that the minorities of the Soviet Union are eager for freedom, two postwar acts of Stalin's government should serve to dispel the notion. When the United Nations was organized, Stalin thought it necessary to make concessions to minority feelings by insisting that the Soviet Ukraine and the Soviet White Russian Republic should have their own representatives in the General Assembly as well as their own foreign ministers and separate armies. Of course, by placing Communists in charge of these important posts, Stalin has assured himself that whatever autonomy these states have gained has been on paper only.

In its second action, the Soviet Government deliberately destroyed several of the minorities which had enjoyed a slight degree of autonomy under the watchful eyes of Russian overseers. Among these victims were three autonomous republics—two Tatar and one German—located in the Crimea. The population of these regions was shipped to the slave labor camps of the Arctic and their territory was transferred to other minorities on the pretext that these people had cooperated with the Nazis during the war.

Doubtless this was partly true. Most of the minority peoples in the areas occupied by the Germans early in the war did cooperate with the invaders. But they did this not because they favored Hitler's cause, but because they looked upon the war as a God-given opportunity for them to gain their freedom from the men in the Kremlin. Students of Eastern European affairs agree that if the Nazis had properly and decently treated the people of the Soviet Union in the areas occupied by the German Army, Stalin would have lost the war. When the Germans first came in they were welcomed because anything seemed better to these slaves of the Communists than the system under which they had been living. But when the minorities understood that the Germans were coming in as masters rather than as liberators, they turned against them.

Knowing these facts, many responsible Washington officials are convinced that it would be a strategically wise move for this country to announce to the minorities that we look with approval on their aspirations for freedom and will do all in our power to help them achieve it. Such a proclamation, which would pay back the Communists in their own coin because they are constantly urging the people of the West to revolt against their governments, would cause so much strife and dissension within the Soviet Union, as the minorities regained their hope of freedom, that Stalin would be kept too busy to think of foreign adventures.

The Red army would be needed to strengthen local garrisons and quell domestic insurrections instead of for foreign conquest. But since the proportion of minority troops in the Red army is the same as in the general population, it would not be long before Stalin's troops began to join the civilian population in the quest for freedom. When that happens, the break-up of the Soviet state, founded as it is on military power and not the will of the people, will follow inevitably.

Thus there is a good chance that if this country comes out for self-determination and proclaims it by every propaganda means we possess—by radio, leaflet, and word of mouth—we will never have to fight a war with the Communists, who bear within them the seeds of their own destruction. The minority exiles in this country and in Western Europe are the means by which we can carry these propaganda messages to the enslaved people of the Soviet Union. They understand the aspirations of their fellow countrymen at home. Their very presence in the West is proof that the minorities

enthralled to the Russian Communists are anxious for the opportunity to throw off the Soviet yoke. Certainly we will pay a cheaper price in blood and treasure for the destruction of Red Russia's imperialism if we give these men the chance they seek to sow the seeds of liberty in the heart of the Soviet Union.

If we decide to use this plan, there is always the possibility that war with the Communists will come before it can be put into effect and bear its fruit. If that is the case, we will find that advocacy of self-determination will create a pro-United States climate of opinion in the minority areas of the Soviet Union. We will be fighting the Soviets with one will and one determination; they will be fighting us with a divided and unhappy people.

Washington knows these facts but hesitates to take the necessary steps because it is not sure the American people are sufficiently acquainted with Russian history to understand that the break-up of the Soviet Empire would be an act of historical justice. If the people of this country show that they understand and support self-determination for Soviet minorities, Washington will fall in line.

[From the Brooklyn Tablet of March 24, 1951]

UKRAINIANS URGE MORE "VOICE" AID—SESSIONS HERE ALSO ASK HELP TO UNDERGROUND FORCES IN EUROPE

The all-out and unqualified support to the United States Government in its ever-increasing efforts to oppose the aggressive and imperialistic policies of Soviet Russia, whose ultimate and decisive aim is the imposition of slavery upon this country, was pledged by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at the conclusion of its 2-day annual meeting at the Hotel Statler, Manhattan, Sunday.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, representing over a million citizens of Ukrainian birth or origin and having branches in three quarters of the United States, has been vigorously campaigning against Soviet Russia's enslavement of Ukrainia and other non-Russian countries of Eastern Europe, and advocating the application of the principles of self-determination to all peoples subjugated by the Kremlin.

The main feature of the meeting was the report of the president of the organization, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Dobriansky stated that one of the most gratifying effects of the work of the committee was the growing realization in both governmental and congressional circles, of the urgent need of relying on the subjugated peoples, such as the Ukrainians who, fighting for the liberation of their country from Soviet Russia, are in a true sense allies of western freedom.

URGE JOINING ANTIRED FORCES

A series of resolutions was voted by the meeting. One of them called for the intensification of efforts in disseminating vital data on developments inside the Soviet Union, which data the committee is receiving from various Ukrainian organizations both inside and outside the iron curtain and imparting as invaluable advance information to our Government, while another called upon similar organizations to unite for an over-all coordination of anti-Communist efforts.

Another resolution deplored the inefficacy of the Voice of America in making genuine appeals to the peoples of the Soviet Union, whose predominant aspirations for liberation from the Russian imperialistic yoke is potentially the most powerful and effective weapon against the Soviet aggressor.

It was emphasized that the Ukrainian Congress Committee, guided by a sense of Christian charity and compassion, observes a well grounded distinction between a historically undemocratic Russian leadership, now in the form of Soviet communism, and the perennially victimized common Russian people; another part of the same resolution castigated those irresponsible anti-Communist Russian political leaders for whom the conservation of the Russian territorial empire is more important than the defeat of Soviet communism.

Finally, the committee called for American aid of every description for the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which is the vanguard of the anti-Communist forces behind the iron curtain, and which collaborates intimately with the known Slovak, Lithuanian, and Polish underground resistance systems, thus creating a vast reservoir of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist forces behind the iron curtain.

The committee also called for the application of the basic American principle in foreign policy, namely, the principle of national self-determination, to be applied to all peoples, large and small, as consistent with our democratic beliefs and the principles of international justice, and endorsed the recent policy proposed by Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, who advocated the complete and true sovereignty and independence of nine eastern European countries, now in Soviet slavery, among which in the first place was Ukraine, the longest and most fiercely oppressed victim of Soviet Russia.

"Washington in a State of Unparalleled Confusion" Says Mr. Felix Morley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Felix Morley is an outstanding journalist and author. Writing in Barron's for March 19, he calls attention to Washington scandals and says they are the country's peril. And indeed they are, Mr. Speaker, for the people are alarmed about present conditions which President Truman ignores. Recently he was bold enough to say that he is surrounded by "honorable men."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. Morley's article:

"ALL HONORABLE MEN"—THE WASHINGTON SCANDALS ARE THE COUNTRY'S PERIL

(By Felix Morley)

Under the English system, a vote like that in the House last week on the RFC would probably have brought on a general election.

By the narrow margin of 200 to 197, with 36 absentees, the Representatives favored a Republican resolution to reject President Truman's plan for reorganizing this now unsavory lending agency. It was a clear vote of no confidence. The resolution said, in effect, that reorganization of the RFC should be tabled because the national interest demands its complete abolition; the sooner, the better.

Because the Reorganization Act, under which the vote was taken, requires a majority of the entire House membership, the resolution failed. But that was only because 18 Republicans were absent when the vote was taken. If the fate of the administration had actually been at stake, the GOP whips would have had those absentees in line. Then, with the defections from the Democratic side, the RFC would have been on the way out. It may be, anyway, if the Senate approves the Byrd resolution condemning this agency's "sordid record of fiscal vandalism."

The failure of last week's congressional attack on the RFC is important because it emphasizes that Congress is relatively powerless against entrenched corruption. The inflexible term of executive office is a weakness, as well as a strength, in our governmental system. Short of the process of impeachment, there is no way in which the Truman administration can be ousted prior to November 1952. It is close to 2 years before another President can take office. Until then the Nation must put up with what it has.

When Mr. Truman returns, next week, from his March vacation at Key West he will find Washington in a state of unparalleled confusion. On every sector of the mobilization front matters are definitely getting out of control.

The problems of the Economic Stabilization Agency, boycotted by organized labor, increase daily. Its able publicity director sadly admits that he is too busy releasing the kaleidoscopic regulations to know whether or not they are observed, or even understood, by those on whom they are so prolifically showered.

The issue of military assistance to our European allies is still far from settled. At best it will be some weeks before General Eisenhower has any more American troops under his command, unless they are sent without congressional approval. In spite of protracted hearings, neither House has as yet approved the administration request for a free hand in this matter. And indications are strong that the free hand will not be granted.

The Senate has acted to extend the draft and inaugurate UMT. But the House is only now completing committee consideration of this legislation, rendered urgent by the fact that the present draft law has less than 3 months to run.

Although Seoul is again happily in our hands, the Department of State has revealed no plan for ending the Korean war. In a military sense this has been going as well as could be hoped, but General MacArthur has given public warning that stalemate is the best he can achieve within the present policy setup. Meantime, the UN seems to have washed its hands of its Korean problem child. The only current news from UN is that the windows in the new Secretariat building will have to be weatherstripped to keep out New York's soot and grime.

Weatherstripping, however, will not avail to exclude the dirt that has been sifting into so many Government agencies here in Washington. The current revelations of official connivance in racketeering of many kinds are appalling to honorable leaders in both political parties.

It is a Democratic Senator, FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, who seriously suggests "a general investigation of the moral level" of the Federal Government. And since this suggestion we have had, inter alia, the testimony of the official who said last week that nothing but friendship prompted him to support a highly dubious RFC loan: "Maybe I'm naive or something but that doesn't seem wrong to me."

The revelations brought out by the RFC and crime investigations, and in both there is much still to come, are highly disturbing because, in the words of Senator NIXON they "show a complete lack of understanding of what is morally right and proper for a Government employee."

From the domestic viewpoint the scandals are causing a mistrust of government which,

while perhaps fundamentally healthy, is materially hampering the conduct of emergency business.

The Fulbright committee reports that its "hearings have not been successful in establishing the real reasons why RFC loans were made." And the suspicion thus engendered carries over into other fields. It has already led to the charge that the administration wants four more divisions for Europe just as a first installment. The feeling grows that all the administration policies are devious and that Congress should therefore block rather than cooperate.

The results is obstruction of policies that are wise as well as those that have been demonstrably shameful.

Obstruction means delay—in matters that demand action as well as in those where inaction is desirable. Tax legislation is a case in point. Clearly the defense effort demands fundamental reexamination of the tax structure and it had been expected that the Congress would have come to grips with this problem before Easter. The present state of the calendar indicates that it will be May, or even later, before any new tax legislation can be cleared by the House.

The picture is equally unhealthy from the viewpoint of American prestige abroad. President Truman says that his foreign policy aims to insure that people everywhere have the things that are necessary to make life worth while and that they live by the moral code in which they believe.

In the light of the mink coat and other revelations these words have an ambiguous ring, and lead to cynical interpretation. Yet the defense effort depends, before anything else, on vital faith and conviction in regard to the values we mobilize to defend.

After 19 years of uninterrupted power the Dmocratic administration has not merely lost its spiritual elan, but is more and more giving evidence of clinging to power primarily for its fruits, corrupt or otherwise. That would be serious if we had not assumed a position of world leadership. It is doubly serious when the future of civilization depends on a consistency between what we say and what we do.

Fortunately, the real Voice of America does not emanate from Washington. It speaks most clearly in the countless communities where men and women meet their daily tasks with no thought other than doing the job at hand as well as possible. The symbolic significance of Easter was never more important to the American people than this year, when the prospects of an improvement in direction from the center of political power are distinctly dim.

Proposed Virgin Islands Organic Act—Address By Gov. Morris de Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, while in the Virgin Islands on official business for the Committee on Appropriations on March 27, 1951, I heard Gov. Morris F. de Castro, of the Virgin Islands, deliver an address on the radio. He expressed his views on the subject of a proposed new organic act dealing with the governing and financing of the Virgin Islands. I believe the views he expressed may be of interest to Members and others. I wish to make it clear that my inclusion here of the Governor's speech is not to be construed as endorsement or approval by me of his views, but under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith as a matter of public interest a copy of Governor de Castro's radio address:

Fellow citizens of the Virgin Islands, tonight I am going to discuss the proposed organic act for the Virgin Islands, as introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman MURDOCK on February 14 this year, and give you my views, simply and clearly, on the essential provisions which I believe should be given consideration in any change which may be made in our basic law. In accordance with my determination to declare my position on any public question, I shall face the issues here squarely and factually. I sincerely hope that those who may not agree with me will recognize that it is my right and duty to state my views, however controversial they may be.

Let me preface my remarks by saying that the Congress of the United States will decide finally what form of constitution will be provided for the people of the Virgin Islands. This is so because Congress has the supreme right of legislation and of government for the insular possessions of the United States. This is so, also, because whatever form of government we get will directly affect the relationships between these islands and their sovereign, the United States of America. Members of Congress will listen respectfully to the proposals which will be submittted by our legislative assembly, by the Governor, and by various citizens of the islands but, in the final analysis, the decision will be theirs, not ours. We shall hope that the final decisions of Congress will embody our desires and our aspirations.

It is necessary, therefore, that the people of the islands should think these problems through calmly, carefully, and deliberately. We should make every effort to present a united front at the congressional hearings which will undoubtedly be held here in the islands later this year. We should not let such disturbing or vexing questions as to who might lose office in the executive or legislative branches of the government by a new organic act color our thinking or confuse our facts. We must deal with principles, not with personalities. We should bear in mind that the fewer problems we indicate, the fewer differences we present, the better will be the opportunity to convince Members of Congress of what our real needs are and just what are our true aspirations.

Let us begin then with the premise that the people of the Virgin Islands, under the Organic Act of 1936, have enjoyed and are still enjoying a good measure of autonomy. With the exception of the right to elect our own Governor and to vote in national elections, our people have all the benefits and the privileges of American citizens. We have a bill of rights roughly equivalent to that of the Federal Constitution, including freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of worship. We have universal franchise through which our own legislatures, with very broad legislative powers, are elected. A generous National Government has helped us provide a reasonable degree of freedom from want.

What, then, shall we seek in our new organic act? In answering this question, it is important to observe that what we seek is not the ultimate answer. The new organic act will undoubtedly be a composite of the things we seek in order to grant us greater autonomy and the things which the National Government will require in order to make us more self-supporting, more economical of operation, and more responsible and effective in our relationships with the United States. There are a great many details which go into the preparation of a new organic act which need not concern us here. These are the details of draftsmanship which must be left to legal technicians. We need concern ourselves only with a few basic considerations. After these shall have been determined, the rest is easy. I should now like to compare these basic points contained in the proposed organic act now before Congress with our present organic act, analyze them, and give you my own views upon each of them.

Here they are: The Murdock bill proposed:

1. An elected governor in 1953. We have an appointed governor now.

2. A single legislature in 1951. We have three legislatures now. Legislative sessions of 60 days in each year with compensation to be paid during sessions only. We have continuous sessions with annual salaries for our legislators now. Election of members of the single legislature from each island constituting a district with five members at large from all islands. We have now specified numbers of members from town and country districts and specified members at large in each municipality.

3. Abolition of the President's prerogative to act upon local legislation after it has been passed over the Governor's veto. At the present time, the President decides when a bill is passed over the Governor's veto, and the Governor still refuses to approve it.

4. Confirmation of department heads only by the legislature. At present the councils have to confirm all appointees.

5. Return of the internal revenue taxes and no more Federal appropriations. We now receive annual appropriations but not the internal revenue taxes.

6. A single treasury. We have two separate treasuries now, and finally

7. A resident commissioner in 1953. We have none now.

These seven basic principles require serious consideration so that our people may be made fully aware of their many complications and ramifications without which awareness we cannot intelligently make up our minds. Let me now discuss each of these issues.

First and foremost, there is the question of an elective or an appointive governor. I realize that this is perhaps the issue which is the most difficult for me to discuss because I am an appointed governor. It is difficult, also, for the reason that my motives may be so easily impugned. Nevertheless, these times call for honest and courageous leadership and for expressions of honest convictions. I shall, therefore, not hesitate to state my opinion. I am in favor of the ultimate objective of an elective governor. An elective governor is the highest political benefit which the people of these islands may ever hope or expect to achieve. Certainly we cannot hope for statehood or commonwealth status. When Puerto Rico was granted the right to elect its own governor, nearly 50 years after its annexation by the United States, the party system had been well established. Here in the Virgin Islands, 33 years after the purchase of the islands by the United States, only 14 years after universal suffrage was extended here, we have not yet developed the party system of government. In St. Croix last year 30 candidates ran independently for 9 seats in the Council. In a situation such as this an elected governor under present conditions might well not have any party representation in the legislature, resulting in a stalemate in government. I am strongly of the opinion that, before we elect our governor, we need first to develop the party system fully. We need to be more nearly self-supporting. We need to shoulder greater responsibilities in government. In my opin-

ion, our new organic act should provide for an elective governor in a few years when we shall have developed more political maturity and better statesmanship, which we shall need to carry out our responsibilities under a more liberal constitution.

Second, there is the question of a single legislature or of three legislatures, how they shall be elected, and how its members shall be compensated. Here, too, I face a difficult issue because it is so closely connected with incumbents who may question my sincerity of purpose. Yet I must state my opinion candidly. I am in favor of a single legislature, meeting for a stated period each year, and compensated on a per diem basis while in session. I am in favor of election of members to represent each of the three islands, rather than districts within each island. I am in favor of a small board of island commissioners, on an honorary basis, elected from each island, to meet once a month to handle purely local problems. No one can gainsay the fact that three separate legislative bodies, such as we now have, all with full legislative powers, provide a top-heavy, burdensome, and most expensive legislative machinery for 26,000 people. This system has resulted in a per capita legislative cost which is far greater than in any other American community. There is absolutely no need for our legislatures to be in continuous sessions throughout the year. Many States with populations far greater than these islands have legislative sessions every 2 years, with extraordinary sessions at the call of the governor. With due respect to the members of our legislative bodies, I respectfully submit that legislation for 26,000 people can well be enacted during a regular session each year, with such special sessions as emergencies may dictate. We would need to project our budget better. We would need to have a program for the islands. But the legislative participation in such program and in the budget need not provide for active participation in administrative affairs. There must be a clear line of demarcation between the powers of the executive and the powers of the legislature. I am in favor of an adequate per diem for legislators during sessions. This is the method of compensation provided in the new organic act for Guam, just passed by Congress. And we will be deceiving ourselves if we think that we are going to get different treatment. The salaries we pay to our legislators far exceed what is paid in many States. Alabama, with 3,000,000 people, pays its legislators $10 per day during sessions. Arizona pays $8 per day for 60 days, and Arizona's population is 745,000. Connecticut pays $600 every 2 years. Florida pays $10 per day during sessions. Missouri, with a population of 4,000,000, pays $125 per month. Alaska pays $15 per day, and Alaska's population is 105,000. West Virginia pays $500 annually.

I believe that it is unnecessary to continue the system of electing representatives for the town and country districts separately and members at large in each island. These Virgin Islands should constitute a strong and unified political entity. It is fallacious to hold that any responsible citizen of St. Croix, for example, may not adequately represent Christiansted and Frederiksted and the country districts as well. It is fallacious to hold that any responsible leader in St. Thomas may not represent adequately the town and the country districts of the island of St. Thomas. Let us get away from the horse-and-buggy days. Let us advance our thinking as the times have advanced. In my opinion, nothing would solidify our islands more than election of members of the legislature on an island-wide basis. We should have proportional representation in our legislature, namely, one member for so many thousand population. However, to give St. Croix the same number of members as St. Thomas, we might for the present compromise with four members to be elected from St. Croix, four from St. Thomas, one from St. John, and six members at large, with the provision that not more than three of the members at large shall be from any one island.

Third is the issue of full legislative right to override executive vetoes. At present there is the provision that if any bill is passed over the Governor's veto, the Governor may send it to the President for final action. Incidentally, this still remains in Puerto Rico's constitution. I am in favor of allowing bills passed over the Governor's veto to become law by reason of the overriding of the veto. When members of the legislature have this power, which they do not have now, they will have to exercise more mature judgment and greater political skill. This is a step to provide political maturity which should be taken now.

Fourth is confirmation of officials and employees by the legislature. I am in favor of limiting legislative confirmation to policy-making officials. The present system whereby all executive appointments, from custodial to policy-making employees, must be confirmed by the legislature is a vicious one. It must be changed, for it defeats the very objectives of a true merit system. It exists in no other American community. It is an effective bar to good government. It brings politics into our civil service. I agree that all department heads, when we pay their salaries, and all policy-making officials should be confirmed, but certainly not the members of the custodial, clerical, and professional services.

Fifth is the return of the internal revenue taxes. I am in favor of the return of these taxes to the Virgin Islands treasury. I am also in favor of a reduced central administration to be paid from annual Federal appropriations. I am certain that the only way we will get this great benefit, and I believe we can get it this year, is for us all to agree that the Congress should for the time being provide reasonable limitations as to the broad use of the funds so returned to the Virgin Islands. I agree with the provisions of the Murdock bill that the internal revenue taxes may be expended under the supervision of the legislature after the broad purposes and objects of expenditure shall have been approved annually by the President. In other words, the President would say that so much of these funds would be spent each year for operating expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands, so much of the funds for capital improvements, and so much for reserve funds. Thereafter, the legislature would budget the funds and provide for the details of their expenditure but circumscribed by the broad purposes fixed by the President.

Sixth is the question of a single treasury. I am in favor of a single treasury. In a new form of government, this would be academic. It is elementary that in a government for the islands as a whole, funds raised in one island may be expended for the benefit and government of the entire group of islands. This change requires no further justification or explanation. It is bound to come.

And, finally, is the provision for a Resident Commissioner. I am, of course, in favor of the creation of a Resident Commissioner for the islands. We urgently need such representation in Washington. However, we also know that in the recently enacted Organic Act for Guam, Congress deleted the provision for a Resident Commissioner. We should ask for this great benefit, and justify it as strongly as possible.

I have given you my views on the most important provisions of a new constitution. Let me conclude by stating that I believe we have the best opportunity we have ever had of getting the internal-revenue taxes—millions of dollars annually returned to us for the benefit and government of our islands if we can agree on the main provisions of a new organic act which will satisfy Congress and at the same time give us a better governmental structure. And these main provisions, I repeat, should be a single legislature, with specified annual sessions, to be elected in 1952; representation by islands instead of by districts within islands; an honorary board of commissioners sitting once a month to pass on purely local matters; confirmation of policy-making employees only; a single treasury effective immediately; and ultimately the election of the Governor, when we shall have developed a responsive and responsible elective system and achieved the necessary political maturity to provide for a fully autonomous government.

I most earnestly urge that we set aside all sectional and provincial differences and present a united and intelligent as well as forward-looking approach to the Congressmen who will preside over the organic act hearings. This is a year, my fellow citizens, of possible great achievements for the people of the Virgin Islands. My considered judgment is that if we unite on a program such as I have outlined, we shall have an excellent opportunity of making a significant political and economic gain before the close of the year. May I leave with you this thought: "Wisdom in self-government develops slowly, with exercise." I thank you.

Sheer Wastage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including herein a letter from William R. Spear, editor of the Fort Myers News-Press, a daily paper printed in my district. I also include an editorial entitled "Sheer Wastage" which points out very forcefully the waste of the taxpayers' money in addition to the unnecessary waste of newspaper prints which is causing a paper shortage. Certainly the committee of the Congress having jurisdiction over this subject matter should look carefully into the complaint made by Editor Spear, and perhaps the newsprint and paper situation could be relieved so as to permit the newspapers of this Nation to obtain the newsprint they need. I desire to recommend this editorial to your careful reading and to commend Editor Spear for this constructive criticism:

FORT MYERS NEWS-PRESS,
Fort Myers, Fla., March 9, 1951.

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DWIGHT: I wish you'd take a look at the enclosed material and the envelopes it was mailed in.

Every few days I get one of these releases in one of these expensive manila envelopes, which, of course, go into the wastebasket. While you may not be a newspaperman, you can readily see that it is of no news value whatever. Since it comes to the News-Press,

I assume it is sent to all the other papers of the United States too, and I will guarantee you that no paper, not even the New York Times, prints it.

Today, in one single mail, I received these three separate envelopes, containing the releases I enclose, and I just couldn't refrain from squawking to my Congressman about it.

In these times when newspapers are desperately hard up for enough newsprint to print their papers on, and some have even had to curtail their service to their readers because of the shortage, it seems outrageous to me for the Government to waste expensive paper in this manner—and pure waste is what it is—not to mention the expense.

Sincerely yours,

BILL SPEAR.

SHEER WASTAGE

Would you like to read a speech on forced labor that runs 14 legal-size pages of single-spaced typing which some man named Walter Kotschnig delivered before the United Nations Economic and Social Council in Santiago, Chile, March 15? Would you like the paper to leave out the news about the school board and the city council, the society personals, and some of the sports to make room for printing this 14-page speech for you?

You wouldn't? Why, that's amazing—to the Government, that is. The Government apparently thought you would, for it has mimeographed this speech and mailed it to the News-Press and also, presumably, to the 1,771 other daily papers in the United States. It was mailed, moreover, in a heavy kraft envelope of the finest quality made, a big envelope 10 by 15 inches (1 foot 3 inches long). These envelopes, even when bought in lots of 10,000, are listed in the printing catalog at about 1½ cents apiece, not counting the cost of the printing on it. It would cost a private individual 9 cents for the postage alone, but the Government, of course, mails it "free"—meaning at the taxpayers' expense. Counting in the cost of mimeographing and handling, it cost considerable for the Government to send this to the News-Press, where it wound up in the wastebasket, and to all the other papers which, you can be certain, treated it similarly.

This material was mailed out by the United States mission to the United Nations, and, if you think that's wasteful, read on. This was but one such mailing from this outfit. Every few days others arrived—all equally worthless. In one single mail the other day three separate releases of this nature were received—all separately mailed in three of those huge, expensive kraft envelopes.

This is just from the United States mission to the United Nations—one single Government agency. There are scores of other Government agencies and most of them bombard the newspapers of the country with propaganda and press releases that have no value whatever. The flood is so heavy that actually it takes a good deal of time by somebody on the staff of the paper just to open all this mail and see what it is.

Aside from the sheer waste of the taxpayers' money which this involves, there are two other aspects of the matter that make it outrageous. One is the postal deficit. If all this worthless postage-free material with which the Government bureaus flood the mails were eliminated, it seems quite likely that the Post Office Department could operate in the black without the new increase in postage rates which President Truman has now proposed. The second is the paper shortage. Newspapers are desperately hard up for newsprint. Some have had to ration circulation and advertising. Every paper, including the News-Press, feels the pinch. Yet the Government finds plenty of paper to waste in this manner.

Not Just a Bunch of Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Robert Letts Jones in the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, which further expresses the viewpoint of that community in the pending CAB-West Coast Airlines case:

NOT JUST A BUNCH OF FIGURES

For a company that wants to serve Salem, West Coast Airlines shows a peculiar attitude.

In the case before the Civil Aeronautics Board that has been going on for almost 2 years, West Coast Airlines goes along with the CAB suggestion that the feeder-line service quit serving McMinnville and move operations to Salem instead. But in putting Oregon's capital on its route West Coast would push United Air Lines out.

In summing up its position West Coast admits that passenger traffic into and out of McMinnville for last year "obviously would not begin" to cover costs of maintaining a station. There is no written consideration given the people of the city as far as expenses of McMinnville in providing an airport. The feeder line assumes that if passengers of that city want air service those passengers can travel either to Portland or to Salem, if West Coast is permitted here.

When it comes to the advantages of coming to Salem, West Coast Airline considers the 1948 figures of United Air Lines serving the capital. Instead of the 1948 figures, those of 1950 in relation to 4 or 5 years ago should be considered if the city's welfare and future are to be given any consideration at all. For instance, air cargo or air freight originated on United Air Lines out of or into Salem in 1946 was 6,621 pounds. In contrast to this, poundage figures for the year 1950 were over 420,000 pounds. The total revenue for United service in Salem shows the same growth. In 1945 the airline took in $37,000. By 1950 the revenue figure was $300,000.

West Coast's position is that it, as a feeder line, should be permitted to be the only service for the capital because it has other stations in Oregon. But so does United. Futhermore, West Coast claims the traffic potential of Salem is not very substantial. If Salem doesn't look attractive to West Coast, why does that feeder line want to come into Oregon's capital and second city in size as the only air transport service? West Coast should have asked to come in as a supplementary service, not as the only one.

Salem's position is the same as it has repeatedly been: This city needs United Air Lines main-line service. The figures of passengers, revenue, and air cargo and freight show how this city has used United. Is the fact that the Salem station rates as seventh of all cities, regardless of size, served by United west of the Rockies in handling of air freight to be ignored, for instance?

It is hoped the Civil Aeronautics Board will give consideration to the people of this community who would be affected adversely if United sevice were suspended here. The airport with its new developments has been based economically on United service.

It is unfortunate that West Coast treats a city it would like to have on its route as a bunch of outdated figures—with no feeling for wishes in this case.

The Rubber Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, inquiries have been coming from my constituents regarding the acute shortage of rubber. Rubber is essential in many of our industrial plants, to say nothing of its more general use in the manufacture of automobile tires and accessories. We are, from all accounts, approaching further restrictions on the use of rubber, as evidenced by the announcement that new automobiles will be equipped with only four tires, whereas, in the past, they were equipped with five tires. There is considerable controversy and confusion among our people regarding the statement recently made by President William O'Neil of the General Tire and Rubber Co. that he had perfected a system whereby the synthetic rubber output could be greatly increased. It was said that this system would almost immediately increase the synthetic rubber supply by 22 percent and that presently the increase in the supply could be easily raised to some 40 percent. By reason of the confusion, red tape, and apparently unnecessary delays on the part of the Government, this producer is now operating in Canada. Surely there is some intelligent, logical approach to this problem, and I urge that immediate action be taken.

Relief for Meat Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. LIND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter which was sent to me by Mr. Ross L. Bell, chairman of the York County Meat Dealers' Association's board of governors, and which concerns relief for meat dealers now caught in the price squeeze:

YORK, PA., *March 31, 1951.*

The Honorable JAMES F. LIND,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LIND: While I was in Washington this week on March 27 and 28 I was amazed to find that meetings were still being held with cattlemen and livestock growers discussing the future program on controls. In other words the action and discussions were still in the formative stage.

Even the retail meat advisory committee release dated March 20 was the first meeting of that particular group to discuss dollar and cents prices to be established on beef, veal, lamb, pork, etc.

We had been led to believe that some of these prices were to be released March 16 and 23. This will hardly take place soon while plans for action are still in discussion.

Why then was it necessary to freeze one group on prices so far ahead unless it was done to quiet the clamor of the housewife, or general public at the expense of the retailer, even more so the independent slaughterer, or even the packer.

We were all led to believe that within a month or so something would be forthcoming that would regulate prices at the retail level and also some kind of control this time on the sale of the live animal and its fair distribution.

After it was found to be a much larger task than expected, Mr. DiSalle ignored all requests to unfreeze prices until his program was ready. At all costs he would hold the line and get out prices as soon as possible.

I had a personal interview with Mr. Arval Erickson, Assistant Director, Food Division, Office of Price Stabilization, on Tuesday, March 27, just 25 days after he had written to me promising action. The letter was an answer to a telegram sent to Mr. DiSalle on February 19 stating that we were then feeling the effects of a price squeeze. Pressure was put on packers and wholesalers to roll back increased prices. This did not eliminate the chief headache, namely, the ever-increasing cost of cattle.

Up to the present time nothing has been done about the cattle situation and Mr. Erickson said another 15 days or even another month could pass before this picture could be changed.

I am sorry to say at that rate of slow motion activity, the very law that was enacted to protect the licensed, legitimate meat man will have succeeded in forcing him to the wall. If we continue to operate under freeze prices we are bound to lose more money. In a recent check with some of the men the losses run from $500 to $5,000 over a period of about 30 to 60 days. The only other alternative we have to remain honorable is to close our doors completely. This will be our second experience in doing this. The last time we did this when we found ourselves out of compliance with the second OPA law, we were forced to close down for 30 days before we could get any action from the Government.

At that time we merely asked for a reasonable law so that we might operate with a fair profit. We did not insist upon abolishment of the law, but those in power evidently realized what a messy business the whole thing was and threw it out completely.

With regards to the losses, I can substantiate my claims along this line and they will stand up under investigation. These figures will be taken directly from the book records of some of our members during the past 60 days.

To quote Mr. Charles Bauer, our worthy president of the Retail Meat and Food Dealers, a statement made at Chicago, January 23: "The meat dealer has been and is in a real squeeze, and is tired of being the whipping boy of the entire livestock and meat industry, when the truth is that he is making less money then he did before the inflationary factions took effect."

Several factors enter into this picture to change the volume of business and consequently the over-all profits. I will merely mention some of these and can go into detail later if necessary:

Increased prices on wrapping paper and paper bags.

Increased prices on hog and sheep casings, etc.

Increased rates on all mechanical repair work, etc.

Increased costs on equipment for replacement, new or second-hand.

Increased taxes, social security, unemployment, etc.

We have already taken a 3-cent decrease in fats and oils.

We have already taken a cut of $3.50 on hides.

Wages have been increased in many instances to keep the trained employees from leaving to go into defense work at much higher rates.

Last but not least, as I mentioned before the ever-increasing prices of cattle.

The membership has been very patient and in spite of noticeable increases by others who either in ignorance of the law or in direct disobedience continue to pass on to the customer increased costs. The group have been striving despite losses to abide by the ceiling but they cannot be expected to continue to do this indefinitely. In fact they have now reached the breaking point.

As hard as it would have been for regional office to thoroughly check into violations on price it does seem that at least some measure of protection at this late date could have been given the sincere merchant. However, a release dated March 26 shows the power of enforcement now to be through Washington. For further details read the release on this matter of the above date.

Valuable information was secured back in September and November of 1950. The title known as Utilization of Farm Crops-Meat Products—the Subcommittee on Senate Resolution 36 headed by the Honorable Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, chairman.

The witnesses gave some very valuable information, opinions, and advice based on years of experience in the meat industry or other industry closely related and allied with the meat industry.

In my contacts and through conversation with various members of OPS, I am convinced this valuable information was hardly if ever used to formulate a system of fair and equitable control of meats.

I would like it known here and now I personally am in no position to point a finger at any person or group and judge them responsible for existing conditions either through sins of omission or sins of commission. Rather would I take the position of humility and ask of God's guidance through prayer and humble thought to point the way to lead us out of the ungodly mess.

With a Nation as blessed as ours we should hang our heads in shame that we cannot live together and produce God's gifts in abundance and share them with our fellow men, having no other controls than the law of nature, supply, and demand and the will of God to protect us from unseen dangers.

May God help you to help us.

Very sincerely,

ROSS L. BELL.

House Joint Resolution 180

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a report contained in the New York Times of Sunday, March 4. This relates to House Joint Resolution 180, which provides a method for removal of the President and the compelling of a general election in great emergencies. I submit it for the thoughtful consideration of Members of Congress and the public:

COUDERT PROPOSES REIN ON PRESIDENT—SEEKS AMENDMENT TO COMPEL HIS RESIGNATION IF CONGRESS VOTES "NO CONFIDENCE"

WASHINGTON, March 3.—A resolution for a constitutional amendment that would require the resignation of the President upon a two-thirds vote of lack of confidence will be introduced next week by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., Republican, of New York, his office announced today.

Mr. COUDERT's bill would authorize the Congress, by a concurrent resolution and on a two-thirds vote of lack of confidence to the President, to compel either the resignation of the President or force a national election for President, Vice President, and Senators and Representatives within 40 days.

Congress would be authorized in a joint session to elect a successor to the President upon his resignation or upon his failure either to resign or call for a national election, according to the terms of Mr. COUDERT's resolution. For this purpose, three-fourths of the Members of both Houses would constitute a quorum, and a majority of the quorum would elect.

In the event of a general election, the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives in office when the concurrent resolution was adopted would continue to serve until 14 days after the election. Their successors would then take office. The amendment would not apply to the person holding the office of President at the time of the proposed Coudert amendment.

Thus, if a President, following a no-confidence vote, refused either to resign or call an election, Congress would elect a successor who would serve out his unexpired time. Should he call an election, however, he, the Vice President, and Members of Congress would remain in office until 14 days after the election of their successors, unless reelected.

Under Mr. COUDERT's plan the President would have 10 days from the time of the passing of the concurrent resolution in which to decide on a course of action. Should he call for the new election, it would be held on the seventh Tuesday following the passage of the resolution.

Mr. COUDERT's resolution would have to be approved by a two-thirds vote of each Chamber of Congress. It would then go before the States, and if passed by three-fourths of the State legislatures it would become part of the Constitution.

Speaking of the proposed amendment, Mr. COUDERT said: "I offer this drastic revision of our constitutional system only with the greatest reluctance and in response to the existence of conditions which the founding fathers certainly could not have contemplated.

"Some such action as this is made necessary by the enormous growth of the power of the Presidency over recent years and the corresponding decline of the Congress. This has resulted in a dangerous distortion in our constitutional structure that threatens the security of the United States and the continued existence of free representative government."

SEES PRESIDENT'S ROLE CHANGED

He pointed out that at the beginning of the Korean fighting he had first voiced the need of such legislation. In a speech from the floor, he had charged that if we had had a parliamentary system resembling Great Britain's, the administration "would be out of office overnight."

The British system was discussed at length during the writing of our Constitution, Mr. COUDERT said, but was rejected.

"The situation has changed drastically since that time," he asserted. "At that time

the central figure in our governmental set-up was the legislature. The President was to have been an honest-to-goodness executive.

"Now, however, the power of the President has become so strong that Congress cannot do a good job of legislating."

The proposed amendment would be based on the British system "as far as applicable," Mr. COUDERT said. "The principle would be the same. It would give the elected legislature an opportunity to effect a change of government in a great emergency without having to resort to the hopelessly fumbling method of impeachment."

Mr. COUDERT pointed out that under his plan the legislature itself would act as its own control in the use of its "recall" machinery, as Parliament did in England.

"Not many Congressmen would like to face the task of going out to campaign for office again before their terms expired," he explained. "The legislation would not be used much; only in a very great emergency. It would be a weapon we should have in our governmental closet."

Donaldson Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the attached official notice that the air base in my home town, formerly known as the Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C., has been redesignated as Donaldson Air Force Base. The naming of this splendid air base for Capt. John O. Donaldson was suggested by local citizens. Attached hereto are certain records regarding young Captain Donaldson's distinguished service:

[From the Department of Defense, Office of Public Information, Washington, D. C., April 3, 1951]

AIR FORCE RENAMES GREENVILLE, S. C., BASE

The redesignation of Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C., as Donaldson Air Force Base in honor of a World War I ace, has been approved by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

At present the base is being used as a basic pilot training school for USAF pilots.

Capt. John O. Donaldson was credited with bringing down eight enemy airplanes in the First World War. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross (British), and World War I Victory Medal with the Aisne-Marne, Somme Offensive, Ypres-Lys, and Defensive Sector Battle Clasps.

Captain Donaldson was born on May 14, 1897, at Fort Yates, N. Dak. He received his primary- and high-school education in Greenville. He also attended Furman University in Greenville before taking his ground-school training at Cornell University.

He was selected as one of the winners of the Mackay trophy for 1919 for a round-trip transcontinental flight. Lt. Belvin N. Maynard was cowinner of the trophy.

Following his discharge in 1920, Captain Donaldson spent the next 10 years in commercial aviation. He met his death while stunt flying at an air show held at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 7, 1930.

Dedication ceremonies will be held in the near future. His widow, Mrs. John O. Donaldson, of Atlanta, Ga., is expected to participate in those ceremonies.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of September 8, 1930]

JOHN O. DONALDSON, NOTED ACE, DIES AS HIS PLANE CRASHES

PHILADELPHIA, PA., September 7.—Capt. John O. Donaldson, one of the most distinguished and skillful aviators in the World War fell with his plane from an altitude of 1,800 feet late today over municipal airport and suffered injuries which resulted in his death in Mercy Hospital an hour and a half later. Donaldson shot down nine enemy planes and two balloons during the war. Forty thousand persons, gathered for the American Legion air races, saw Captain Donaldson's plane go out of commission and crash.

Captain Donaldson was officially credited with nine planes and two balloons during the World War and his heroism was recognized by the decorations he received from five nations. These included the Distinguished Service Cross, the Belgian Croix de Guerre, the British Flying Cross from the Prince of Wales.

WELL KNOWN HERE

Captain Donaldson who was fatally injured in a plane accident yesterday in Philadelphia was a member of a prominent Greenville family. He spent most of his boyhood days here with an aunt, Mrs. N. D. Furman, attending Greenville High School and later Furman University. After leaving Furman he entered Cornell University, quitting his studies to join the Air Forces during the World War. Twice during the war he was shot down behind enemy lines and taken prisoner. Both times he managed to escape and return to his fighting unit. He was said to be the fourth ranking American ace.

Captain Donaldson was associated with the aviation industry most of the time since the war. In 1919 he won first place in the SE-5 class, Transcontinental Air Races. He served as commanding officer of several United States Army training schools in this country and abroad.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont of September 8, 1930]

JOHN O. DONALDSON

John O. Donaldson died as he lived in an airplane. Countless flying hours and one of the Nation's most distinguished aviation records were behind this Greenville native when he met his death so tragically Sunday in Philadelphia.

As a youth he left Cornell to answer his country's call to arms, choosing aviation and making a name for himself in that field scarcely equaled by any other airman in any army. He was officially credited with bringing down nine German planes and two balloons, and five Allied nations decorated him. Friends said he accomplished more than he was credited with.

John Donaldson died young which added to the tragedy of his death, but into his 34 years was crowded a great deal of achievement, both in military service and in civilian life. He will long be remembered.

[Introduction by editors of Harpers magazine to article in Harpers magazine for July 1919]

MY CAPTURE AND ESCAPE

(By John O. Donaldson)

The following account of the capture by the Germans of a young American aviator, his escape from prison, his recapture and second escape, constitutes one of those extraordinary narratives in which luck, misfortune, and persistent daring have been so artfully ordered by fate as to seem almost increditable. The author, who is the son of Gen. T. Q. Donaldson, of the Inspector General Department at Tours, France, received his instruction in flying at the Ground School, Cornell University, then with the Royal Flying Corps at Toronto, with subsequent gunnery practice in Texas. In June 1918 as a member of the Thirty-second Royal Flying Corps he was sent to France. During the following 2 months he brought down nine German planes, of which he was officially credited with five (i. e., witnessed by four observers). Then Lieutenant Donaldson was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross by Field Marshal Haig and has received two citations by General Pershing. He has been recommended for the Distinguished Service Cross. The following, given in Lieutenant Donaldson's own words without attempt at embellishment describes his last flight and capture and the extraordinary sequence of subsequent adventures and misadventures culminating in his escape through the electric-wire barrier into Holland.

[Excerpts from the New York Times of October 22, 1919]

MAYNARD'S RECORD BEATEN 11 MINUTES—REVIEW OF ACTUAL FLYING TIME MAY GIVE FIRST PLACE TO CAPTAIN DONALDSON

Although 2 days behind Lt. Belvin Maynard in finishing his second transcontinental flight at Mineola, Captain Donaldson may be the winner of the Army's 5,400-mile airplane reliability contest on the technical point of actual flying time.

The performace of these two men, who are far ahead of their 60 competitors on all points of competition, represent superiority in two methods of flying that differ radically. Maynard flies entirely by compass and pays little attention to any but the important landmarks. Donaldson flies near the ground and finds his path entirely by reference to his map and the landmarks.

Captain Donaldson also set a record for a single day's flight with a little scout plane by flying 823 miles from Rock Island to Binghamton.

Captain Donaldson and Lieutenant Maynard will be the guests of the Flying Club today and they, with other winners in the competition, will receive their trophies at an armistice dinner of the Flying Club in the Hotel Commodore on November 11.

JOHN O. DONALDSON

Father: Maj. Gen. T. Q. Donaldson (deceased), 42 years active service, United States Army.

Brothers: Col. T. Q. Donaldson, 30 years' service, United States Army, active; Commander A. H. Donaldson, United States Navy, retired.

Brother-in-law: Brig. Gen. Casper B. Rucker (deceased), 40 years' active service, United States Army.

Nephews: Capt. T. Q. Donaldson, Jr., now in active service, United States Army abroad; Capt. John Donaldson, now in active service, United States Army abroad; Lt. David Donaldson, killed VJ-day in service in Pacific.

Nieces: Wife of Maj. Albert Shulz, now in active service abroad, United States Army; wife of Lt. David Mallett, now in active service abroad, United States Army.

Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following fine editorial that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., April 1, 1951, concerning our colleague, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

Once again House majority leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, proves conclusively that he is one of our great national leaders. In a statesmanlike address delivered this week to the Boston University Law School Alumni Association, Congressman MCCORMACK said that the United States should enter at once into a military alliance with Spain, and that Spain should then become a member of the North Atlantic Pact.

Leader MCCORMACK hinted very strongly that negotiations to that end are already in progress. His position was unequivocal on the point that "differences in form of government should not be permitted to interfere with those steps being taken which are in the national interest of such countries."

With Congressman MCCORMACK's position, we are in hearty accord. All logic, common sense, history, economics, and military strategy dictate that Spain is a natural ally of the United States.

The United States is a member of the United Nations. Spain is not, because of the veto power exercised by Soviet Russia. A communistic, atheistic, totalitarian government such as Soviet Russia can be in the United Nations. A monarchy such as Great Britain with its hereditary line of Kings and Queens can also belong. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, and other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations can become members of the U. N., but Spain is outside because the Communists do not like her form of government. Isn't that just too bad? We should placate our enemies and dump our friends.

It couldn't be that this hostility to Spain stems from the fact that Spain is a great Catholic country where communism has made no headway and where communism suffered such a sharp defeat in the Spanish Civil War? The lunatic fringe, the so-called Loyalist Front, has never forgiven Spain for driving out Communist doctrines.

In any European war with Soviet Russia the United States must have Spain as an ally if it is to be in a position to knock out Russia. Anti-Communist Spain lies athwart the gateway to the Mediterranean at Gibraltar. A friendly and stable Spain is necessary to any war operations in that area.

Spain has vital and essential minerals, such as manganese, nickel, beryllium, etc., and it also possesses the Pyrenees, which General Franco and his well-trained troops can hold against any Soviet attack. Behind the Pyrenees lie most vital airfields from which American-based planes and bombers can operate at will.

Spain is the mother country of most of the Latin-American countries. In Latin America there are 158,000,000 persons with whom we do a great business. American investments in Latin America total $4,800,000,000, as compared with $2,100,000,000 in all Europe. Each year the United States buys from Latin America a total of $2,777,000,000 worth of goods, which include $219,000,000 worth of copper and many millions of lead and other vital strategic minerals.

Yes; Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK is again talking directly to the American people, and in his characteristic, forceful manner he is showing the logical way for America to move in this critical period. We most heartily agree with the concluding remarks of Congressman MCCORMACK's Boston University address:

"With the Communist threat the road to security and peace is through strength. It is by America using its great strength affirmatively and effectively, with the moral forces of the world leading the way, that the probability of another world war in our lifetime might be averted.

"If this is accomplished, the chances for peace for a long period of time faces the world of today and tomorrow."

Address of Mr. Charles K. Finch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD portions of a speech delivered by the president of the Queens County Bar Association, Charles K. Finch, at the association's annual dinner in New York in February:

The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence were the founders of our country; and just as you or your client, in founding a new corporation, would have the privilege of selecting and decreeing the purposes of your new corporation, so too, did the founders of this country have those same privileges; and it is very interesting today, when most people have forgotten the Declaration of Independence, and when most people in this, and other countries are wandering about aimlessly, not knowing where we are going and not even knowing where we are supposed to go, for us to reflect upon it.

To be brief, those who are partially well informed, and all who desire to admit the truth, know, despite all the camouflage and flowery and disputatious speeches rendered daily at the U. N., at Washington, and other similar places, that the struggle, which exists throughout the world today, is between materialistic atheism, more commonly known to some as communism, and the believers in a God. Where did the founders of this country stand on this question of a deity? They, who had the right to tell us our position in said regard—since they drew our Charter and named our purposes—made four significant references to it in the Declaration of Independence, in order not only to teach us their creed, but to set the course which they expected us to follow. In order to underline fundamental truths, which they feared others might discard, they wove into the Declaration of Independence four significant sentences, two at the beginning and two at the end. Each specifically affirms the dependence of every human being on God:

1. The first reads: "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to assume the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitled them." Here, our forefathers emphasized that the natural law itself depends on God.

2. The second is equally positive: "We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

3. Toward the end of the document the authors appeal "to the Supreme Judge of the World" for the rectitude of their intentions.

4. The Declaration closes "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Thereafter, a very good American by the name of George Washington said, referring to freedom of religion, "Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Diety according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Another great American by the name of Abraham Lincoln said in one of his famous speeches, "I am responsible to the American people, to the Christian world, to history, and on my final account to God." In his immortal Gettysburg address, he said: "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth." He also stated: "We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these things were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us."

Lest it be thought that similar statements are not made by men of our day, I would ask your further indulgence, while I quote from Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, who, on November 22, 1945, the first postwar Thanksgiving, said: "Oh, God, our Father, today we give Thee thanks for the things which we take for granted, for freedom, for security of life, for food and shelter and the presence of loved ones. * * * In gratitude for all those who paid the price of victory, we now ask Thy guidance and we dedicate ourselves to that cause for which they gave their last whole measure of devotion—Lord of Hosts be with us yet, lest we forget."

On Armistice Day in Boston, the distinguished Gen. Omar Bradley warned: "With the monstrous weapons man already has, humanity is in danger of being trapped in this world by its moral adolescents. Our knowledge of science has clearly outstripped our capacity to control it. We have many men of science, but too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. Man is stumbling blindly through a spiritual darkness while toying with the precarious secrets of life and death. The world has brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace, more about killing than we know about living. This is our twentieth century's claim to distinction and to progress."

I would ask, in conclusion, that, if you ever have occasion to remember me, you do so by recalling that Lincoln, in his famous Gettysburg address, said, "This Nation, under God."

Let us, as sworn defenders of these United States of America, read and reread the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Let us listen to and follow the mandate of the founders of this country. Gentlemen, let us advocate the return, and let us return to God."

CHARLES K. FINCH,
President.

Why Are We Staying in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

by Hon. Alf M. Landon at the FFA banquet, Washburn Rural High School, Thursday evening, March 29, 1951:

WHY ARE WE STAYING IN KOREA?

Why are we staying in Korea? What's the shooting all about? I don't know of any question that is of more interest to you and your parents than our foreign situation.

Incidents these days in little, far-off Iran or Albania may affect the life of every American.

Right now, the daily news from Iran is of great significance because it is in Iran that the Dictator Stalin must seek the oil he desperately needs for war. But even if he does get control of the Iranian crude petroleum—that is a long, long way from having the refined product where he must have it for war.

By staying in Korea, every American will have a much different future. That does not mean that we can ease down in our military operations. However, if we had left Korea—part of the free world would not have survived the shock. Free people's governments would have been unbalanced. Some would have been overthrown. By staying in Korea we gave the free governments of the world a needed shot in the arm.

In Korea, we are fighting what may well be another of civilization's decisive battles—because of its effect in the rest of the world.

In modern total warfare, there are no more single decisive battles like Hastings or Tours where the French stopped the Moslem's invasion of Europe.

If Islam had won, there would be no Christian civilization as we know it today—with its conscience to bother us about its defects.

Tours was a battle between the Moslem and Christian ideologies.

Hastings was a battle of one gang of feudal tyrants against another gang. It was nothing but gang war although called one of the decisive battles because it blended the Norman blood with the Saxon.

Probably the most apt historical comparison with Korea is Lignica—the battle where the Poles stopped the army of Genghis Khan and his Mongols invasion of Western Europe. It was a battle of pure brute force on the one side—without any ideologies—against western civilization.

There is no Communist ideologies involved in the Korean War because there is no communism in Russia. There is nothing in Marx and Engels that justifies the brutal slave state of the Soviet.

The warm humanity of Marx and Engels would have revolted at a communism based on the concentration camp—assassination—and wholesale murder.

They would have flayed Stalin the Terrible as one of cruelest tyrants of all time.

No; the Korean War is not between the Communist and Christian ideologies—there is nothing left in Russia of the real communism of Trotsky. There is only a typical tyranny of a few Mongols and Asiatics, masquerading as Communists. They seek to grind the free peoples of the world under their bloody heel—just as they have ground the Russian masses. They use communism for propaganda purposes just as they use foreign minister conferences and the United Nations. It's the dictator of all Russia's biggest lie. It was remarkably successful for a long time in blinding some people to the plain overwhelming evidence of the basic contradiction between the true cooperative society that Marx and the murdered Trotsky envisaged and the barbaric brutality and cruelty of the Kremlin.

Therefore, we are not battling in Korea so much for our social and economic beliefs as we are for political and religious freedom of all peoples—including the Russians themselves.

The issue is government based on just consent of the governed and government based on sheer naked power—on terror of torture and the sword. It is barbarism versus civilization.

It is ironical that the battle for freedom of conscience and the Bill of Rights is being fought in Korea that has known so little of both.

It is being fought in that country—so poor in natural resources and manpower—and without any great strategic value—because it is there the Soviet first chose to tackle in open war the armies of the free peoples of the world.

In Korea, Dictator Stalin sent up a trial balloon to find out what America really would do if he challenged the cold war into a shooting war.

He got a swift and probably surprising answer—in view of previous statements by our President and Secretary of State that Korea lay outside our defense perimeter.

If we had ducked Stalin's challenge, Asiatic terrorism today would be on the march throughout the world under the fake label of communism. Instead, the Korean War is turning out bad for the tyrants of the Kremlin. Resistance to their cruel and oppressive rule is increasing. Purges are taking place among all their satellites. But worst of all for the Kremlin rulers was the disillusionment among so many of their followers in other countries. The Korean aggression was the final blow to many who in spite of everything still clung to their faith in the peaceful intentions of the Kremlin.

Our dramatic change of policy on Korea overnight spurred our own country—and other countries—to prepare their military establishments to fight for survival.

Stalin the Cruel reached his high point the day President Truman announced his Turko-Grecian policy. Of course, that policy also was a complete reversal of our previous policies favoring Soviet expansion everywhere.

Taking advantage of the weakness of the military defenses of the free governments—the lack of unity both at home and between each other—the intense desire for peace—the tyrants of the Kremlin have been running the most colossal bluff in all history.

Just as they have used the fake label of communism for propaganda purposes, they have been clever in creating a false impression of Russia's might and a corresponding disbelief among the free people's governments in their own strength.

We have been too much inclined to see only Russia's strength—and overlook her great weaknesses. We have been seeing only the hole in the doughnut. Stalin might have the manpower, but he certainly lacks the fire power to be another Genghis Khan.

Russia lacks natural resources vital to a successful war—the productive capacity vital to a successful war—and the Kremlin rulers also lack the vital confidence and faith of their own people. Millions of Russians greeted the German Army as a liberator.

The record shows: (1) Actually the Communists did not win by themselves a single major battle against the Germans. The defense of Moscow was won by old man weather and the stupid brutality of the Nazis that alienated the Russians; (2) several hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers enlisted in the German Army. Germany was able to form about 25 divisions from deserters and residents of occupied territories.

Fear feeds on fear. The most fearful man in all history is the one who reached his goal through terror and violence, murder and assassination.

Only a little more than a hundred years ago, ships of the British Navy did not dare to give their crews shore leave in foreign countries because those crews would desert wholesale.

The tyrants of Russia are now in the same situation as the tyrants of England were then.

The tyrants of Russia fear to send their own troops into battles outside their country. They have not been able to successfully indoctrinate the youth of their satellite countries—except in North Korea.

Of all Russia's satellite countries, North Korea had the lowest level of existence.

Therefore, it was easy to take some three or four hundred thousand Korean boys—by feeding and clothing them better than they had ever known—indoctrinate them in the Soviet's army.

If the Soviet challenge in Korea had worked—then several million Chinese boys would have been indoctrinated the same way—and the dictator of all Russia at that time would have had an army he could depend upon for conquest of the world.

Sounds fantastic you say. Well, no more fantastic than America betraying our own allies to the Kremlin after World War II. We handed the dictator, Stalin, control from the Far East to almost the center of Europe, before we reversed our policy with the Turkish-Grecian loan. By our foreign policy at Yalta we encouraged Stalin's dream of world conquest.

World conditions are ripe for seizure of power by force.

In many countries of the world there is a loss of confidence in government and loss of faith in the religion of our fathers. As a result of two World Wars in rapid succession, explosive forces are at work in all countries.

American civic consciousness is reaching a new low level. Topeka may not have its pastel mink coat but it is a matter of common knowledge that slot machines are operating all over our State in violation of the laws of Kansas. Where that condition exists, public corruption exists. In the legislative session just ended, our State administration evaded its duty to strengthen the arm of our law-enforcement officers.

Just before the collapse of the golden age of Greece, it was possible for an Athenian citizen to eke out an existence without working—through government aid. That same situation exists in America today. Yet more and more Government aid is being adopted in one way or another by both parties not only in Washington but in State capitals as well.

What is the difference between the members of a country club, or some other social organization, who favors slot machines because they mean cheaper food and lower dues and the man who is willing to eke out an existence without any effort of his own on the public dole? Both are living off the other fellow.

Fortunately, the old American spirit of push ahead has not been entirely corroded yet.

Today we face either the climax of civilization as we have heretofore known it or one of those interludes by which humanity is compelled to pause and gain breath for a new push onward and upward.

Vice President BARKLEY said on his recent visit that America has a responsibility to European countries.

I emphatically disagree. The only responsibility we have is to save our own hides. It is my belief we are doing just that in Korea. If ever an army stood at the gate and battled for a free and peaceful world, it is the United Nations forces in Korea.

In the meantime we are strengthening our own forces and bolstering the defenses of Western Europe. We are preparing to meet Asiatic force with force—if necessary. Or we are prepared to live and let live.

If other nations in the world are not willing to join us in a fight to maintain their own democratic processes and their own individual freedom we are the one nation that can retire to an impregnable armed camp on this Western Hemisphere.

I believe, and said so at the time, that the talk of a German expeditionary force based on the port of Dakar in Africa invading South America at the point of the Brazilian bulge as a reason for us entering World War II was a lot of hog wash.

But I believe our own republican form of government would be bound to suffer if we retired to life in our own armed camp.

By the same token, it will suffer if we take in too much territory. In fact, victory in the end for a free world depends on America keeping our financial base strong and equal to the job. So far Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Spain, and Italy have not been able to cooperate in an adequate collective organization for either mutual defense or trade agreements for a better economic system.

Our foreign commitments must be determined by what our foreign allies are doing—in the way of starting to repair their tragically weak defenses—and what our own economic system can stand. For many years I have been stressing the dangers inherent in our unsound fiscal policy and the state of our national defense.

America is rapidly mobilizing our military strength. But we are lagging dangerously in a constructive, affirmative foreign policy.

1. The United Nations should implement its resolution branding Red China as the aggressor by imposing economic sanctions. Two courses of action were adopted at that time. One called for continued efforts to attain a peaceful settlement—the other for study of possible sanctions against the Reds. Sufficient time has passed to make it plain that the Chinese Communists do not intend to seek a settlement on any reasonable terms. Therefore, it is timely to raise the alternative issue of economic sanctions.

Our allies continue to sell too much strategic material to our mutual enemies.

2. The treaty of peace with Italy must be immediately revised.

3. A peace treaty with Japan is long overdue.

4. Both Germany and Spain have much to contribute and should have been incorporated a long time ago in the defense of a free world.

5. We need friends wherever we can find them. The failure to use the forces of the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek demands a better explanation than has yet been given to the American people.

6. We must strengthen our relations with our neighbors to the south.

Therefore, with faith in the righteousness of our cause—the courage, the devotion, and efficiency of our fighting forces—and backed by the greatest productive capacity of any nation in the world—we face with confidence the battles to preserve our life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Undoubtedly all of you boys will be called by your country to arms. Possibly some of you boys here tonight may make the supreme sacrifice in that holy cause.

You have a right to demand that there be no relaxation on the part of every civilian in doing everything he can to back you up.

You have the right to demand that your public officials fulfill their responsibilities and duties in the same lofty spirit of patriotism that you will fulfill yours in the armed services of your country.

And let Mr. Truman be ever conscious that as our leader, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

Third Anniversary of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago today the United States embarked on one of the most far-seeing, and at the same time most controversial programs in its history—the European recovery program, or as it has been more popularly known, the Marshall plan.

In those 3 years, the Marshall plan has recorded remarkable accomplishments in helping war-torn Europe regain her economic stability and productiveness. A continent that was suffering actual physical hunger 3 years ago now has brought its agricultural production back to prewar levels. A continent whose factories had been smashed by the bombs and shells of a major war, and whose economic organization had been completely disrupted by a conqueror's occupation, now sees its industrial production not only back to prewar levels, but some 40 percent above them.

The physical accomplishments in relieving hunger and reviving production and trade are significant, but they pale beside the importance of the Marshall plan's accomplishments in the field of international politics.

Three years ago Europe appeared to be a potentially easy victim for expanding Communist imperialism. Today, the possibility that communism could take over by default has disappeared, as the misery and disorganization on which it feeds have given way to prosperity and order.

Now, entering its fourth year, ECA is embarking on a new phase of operations—designed to help Western Europe provide itself not only with bread, but with the means for its self-defense as well.

The United States can be justly proud of the part it has played in helping Western Europe. In aiding our free neighbors overseas, we also have helped ourselves—by creating new sources of strength for use in the world-wide fight against Communist expansion.

The results of 3 years operation of the Marshall plan are at once a rebuke to those who fought its creation and functioning so bitterly—and glowing evidence that this great Nation is, in a mature manner, accepting its leadership in the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

On this third anniversary, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you who have carried out so well the aims of the European recovery program.

When General Marshall first made his proposal, the shadow of economic collapse, with its attendant evils of unemployment, of hunger, and political unrest, hung over the countries of Western Europe. The great question in 1947 was whether free institutions could survive.

Today, thanks primarily to their own efforts, the people of Western Europe, together with our help, have rebuilt the economies of their countries and have developed a new spirit of confidence in themselves and in their free institutions. To my mind, this spirit, this rising confidence in the hearts of the people, is one of the greatest sources of strength in the free world.

By working together, economic recovery has been substantially achieved. However, with the present threat to world peace, new tasks have been imposed upon us. The free nations are now combining to convert their resources into military strength to preserve the peace and defend our freedoms.

The splendid organization which has been developed under the Economic Cooperation Administration can make an important contributon in helping develop this strength. Accordingly, I intend to recommend to the Congress that ECA be maintained on a continuing basis to help carry out the programs essential to the security of the free world.

There is much to be done in Europe, in Asia, and in other parts of the world, to help the free countries build their military, economic, and spiritual defenses against aggression from without and subversion from within. One of our essential objectives is to develop, in cooperation with other free nations, an expanding world economy, the benefits of which can be shared by us all.

On this anniversary I extend to all of you my sincere thanks for what you have done. I am confident that in its new tasks the ECA will continue to make a vital contribution in helping to build the strength of the free world upon which security and freedom rest.

REMARKS BY MR. HARRIMAN

It is a great satisfaction for me to be here today with my old colleagues of the ECA. You men and women and your associates abroad have contributed so greatly to the success of the Marshall plan.

It is good to have with us Paul Hoffman, who gave us all such inspired leadership. And we are especially fortunate in the presence of the Foreign Minister of France, M. Robert Schuman. With his broad vision and human understanding, he has given effective leadership to the cause of European unity.

The Marshall plan will go down in history as a great accomplishment in cooperation among free nations and free men. On the material side, there have been outstanding achievements. But of even greater importance has been the development of the sense that men of many nations can work together for common purpose—for common welfare. I think it is no exaggeration to say that the strong bonds which today unite the nations of the North Atlantic community, would not exist had it not been for the successful experience of working together during these last 3 years under the European recovery program. This unity, this sense of interdependence in the North Atlantic community, is one of the greatest assets of the free world as a whole in its present struggle.

You men and women can take great satisfaction in the part that you have played in these events.

Suppression of the Newspaper La Prensa in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch sent a member of its staff, Mr. Donald Grant, to Buenos Aires 2 weeks ago for the purpose of getting at first hand the story of the ruthless suppression of the great newspaper La Prensa. In a most notable instance of journalistic endeavor and high purpose, Mr. Grant went on to Montevideo and obtained an exclusive interview with Alberto Gainza Paz, editor of La Prensa. The interview was published in the Post-Dispatch on Sunday, April 1, and in the same issue there was an editorial which eloquently points up

this breach of the freedom of the press as a test of freedom for everyone throughout our hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, in today's Washington Post, there is an editorial taking note of this work by the Post-Dispatch as a champion of freedom, and because of its parallel interest, I ask unanimous consent that it also be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 1, 1951]

A TEST FOR EVERYONE

A free press versus a gagged press.

The free way of life versus the slave way.

Freemen under their own consciences versus fear-stricken serfs under a tyrant's rule.

Editor Alberto Gainza Paz and the brave "little people" of Argentina versus Dictator Juan Domingo Perón and his ruthless police, thugs, and Fascist henchmen.

These are the issues in the struggle over the great Argentine newspaper, La Prensa, which the Post-Dispatch tells in full detail today in a report from Donald Grant at Montevideo.

They are issues of deep concern for everyone—whether he lives in Buenos Aires or in Washington or in St. Louis; issues for the United States Congress as well as for the Argentine Congress, for our State Department and for the conference of hemispheric foreign ministers now assembled in Washington.

Why does the suppression of a newspaper 5,000 miles to the south make all this difference in Washington and in St. Louis?

Because what happens to freedom in one nation among the Americas happens inevitably also to freedom in some measure in all American nations.

Because when liberty of the press is killed in Buenos Aires it is threatened in a hundred other places.

Because when the lights are extinguished in Argentina, it grows darker where those lights no longer spread their rays.

That is why the suppression of La Prensa makes a difference to us all.

The suppression of Argentina's great newspaper did not occur overnight. It has been coming on ever since Perón took power. Indeed, in 1945, when he was still Minister of War, he said: "The Government will not permit the opposition of the Argentine press."

And now a statement, which Peron is reliably reported to have written says: "The preparation of public opinion of a sovereign country is a part of the sovereignty that government exercises."

That is Peronism, naked and unashamed. It is one with Hitler's nazism, Mussolini's fascism, Franco's falangism, Stalin's communism.

Opposed to Peronism now stands little more than Gainza Paz's brave conviction that Argentineans will never give up their rights and that La Prensa must reappear, strengthened by the support of a people who love liberty and condemn injustice.

The United States is a land whose people remember John Peter Zenger's triumph over attempted suppression of the press in 1735, whose people count Elijah P. Lovejoy's assassination in 1837 a sacrifice on the altar of a free press.

A land with these historic traditions of a free press can no longer be content with the undue deference shown Peron by the State Department.

It is time to be as plain with Peron as he is ruthless with freedom. The executioner of La Prensa should have not another red cent of help from Washington so long as he continues his regime of dictatorial suppression. He should be cut off, and he should be told why.

As for the Conference of American Foreign Ministers in Washington—from Mexico and Brazil and Peru, from Cuba and Honduras and Chile and some 15 other nations—the issue of La Prensa is on their agenda whether they formally list it or not. They may try to ignore the issue, but they cannot strike it off. For it is written in first place and with ink that will not erase.

If the conferees from the Americas go home without coming to grips with this struggle between freedom and slavery, then it would have been better had they not come at all.

La Prensa, bound and gagged, its voice stopped, its editor in exile, raises high throughout the hemisphere a test of freedom for everyone.

The world is watching to see what we do.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1951]

LA PRENSA'S FUTURE

It was in the best traditions of a free press that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a exemplar of freedom in North America, sent a reporter, Donald Grant, to interview Alberto Gainza Paz, editor of La Prensa, a now beleaguered exemplar of the same freedom in South America. They talked of the ordeal through which Señor Gainza Paz and his great newspaper have passed under the ruthless dictatorship of Juan Peron. La Prensa is temporarily in eclipse. It defied the dictator in a land where now, as Mr. Crant reports, there is no law save that dictator's will.

But they talked also of La Prensa's future. "The Argentine people," said Gainza Paz, "are fully conscious of their rights to have truthful and complete information about events inside or outside the country, and to read the newspaper of their choice. * * * I have the conviction that Argentineans will never give up those rights or relinquish those principles and that La Prensa must reappear, strengthened by the support of a people who love liberty and condemn injustice."

This is, of course, the real meaning of freedom of the press—that it involves not a publisher's privilege but the right of the people to read. It is a right which may be overridden; but it can never be extinguished. All men who have faith in human freedom must share Gainza Paz's conviction that La Prensa will have a future as free and as devoted to the rights of Argentineans as its past has been.

Rabbi Henry A. Landes and Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from a recent issue of the Revere Journal, Revere, Mass.:

HONOR TO RABBI AND WIFE

In a testimonal reception, Revere Jewry very properly and rightfully honors this Sunday its venerable spiritual leader, Rabbi Henry A. Landes, and his devoted wife, upon the completion of 30 years in the rabbinate. They unquestionably deserve the position of respect and affection they have in the hearts of their coreligionists here.

This tall, straight, and dignified figure, Rabbi Landes, familiar to everyone in the city for three decades, whose favorite recreation is taking long walks from his home to Lynn and back, can be seen daily talking to young or old in a democratic fashion on the highways, or he can always be relied upon to deliver the invocation or benediction at a public function in an impressive and significant manner. He is truly an integral part of this community, a builder of good will every day of the year.

Sacred Jewish writings relate that the Torah or Holy Law, is like a golden vessel, the more you scour and polish, the more it will glisten and reflect the face of him who looks at it. So with the words of the Torah, whenever you repeat them, they glisten and illumine one's face.

Rabbi Landes, eminent scholar and Talmudist, is so steeped in the knowledge of Jewish theology that he has won recognition in this field. His brilliant and enlightening Sabbath and holiday discourses are but a reflection of the many arduous years he has devoted to learning and mastering Hebrew sacred scripture. To him, the altar is not a pulpit to devote talks on plays or to give book reviews, it is a holy tabernacle where reverence to God is paid and from where truth about His goodness and mercy emanates.

There are thousands who have known this kindly gentleman as the minister who officiated at their wedding, who consoled them in the dark hour of bereavement, who led them in prayer at the synagogue, who taught them the Talmud or who interpreted Jewish canon law for them. They have watched him spend thirty fruitful years in Revere, commanding their respect and winning their affection because of his wisdom, learning and humaneness. He has always taken an interest in civic affairs and the entire city, regardless of race or religion, admires and respects him as a good and useful citizen. He has consistently maintained a fine relationship with the Catholic and Protestant clergy of Revere, and whenever cooperation was required of him on any civic or patriotic matter, he unhesitatingly gave it gladly.

His has always been the life of a holy man, since Rabbi Landes never had high ambitions of material gain and never sought the compensation of worldly aspirations. He consecrated his life to the service of God and to do His work among his people—the good shepherd tending to his faithful flock. A pleasant reward too is to see his son following in his footsteps as a rabbi.

Therefore, congratulations are extended to Rabbi Henry A. Landes and his good wife. As the Book of Proverbs states and is repeated in Jewish homes on the Sabbath eve, "A woman of valor, who can find? For her price is far above rubies." The good rabbi is fortunate indeed that his wife is the ideal helpmate, a gracious and charming lady, active in various local auxiliaries and a true mother and daughter in Israel.

May both of them enjoy future happiness and good health and continue their service to God, their congregation, their family of splendid children and country. May the messages of felicitation inspire Rabbi Landes to go on in his spiritual labors and receive God's blessings, praise and grace for divine work well done as a teacher and preacher in Israel. "Mazel Tov," Rabbi and Mrs. Landes.

Extracts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Convention, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, at York, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address delivered by me at the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor at York, Pa., on Wednesday, March 28, 1951.

There being no objection, the extracts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America today is sitting on a volcano. No one knows when the eruption will come or if it will come, but with the international situation as it is today, certainly we face possible disaster unless as a nation there is an immediate realization of the dangers ahead. Surely this is no time for complacence and disinterest either in high places in Washington or anywhere among our citizens. We are confronted by a challenge for our survival as a Nation. To accept that challenge and to win the fight that that challenge implies we must have unity of purpose in America, the cooperation of labor and industry, the help of the farmer, the businessman and the workingman.

This struggle we are engaged in today on a world-wide basis is not the fight of big business, of labor, of small business, of the farmer, or of any individual or group. It is America's fight and we are all part of America. And to be effective against a relentless, godless foe we must be united instead of pulling in every conceivable direction.

We have to be prepared and we have to be prepared immediately and if we don't get prepared immediately we may be destroyed before we make up our minds that we are even willing to get ready. With the situation as it is, everyone of us ought to ask ourselves—what do we propose to do about it? This is a question that should be asked by every American, not on the basis of what is good for any part of American life, but on the basis of what is necessary to be done by every part of American life in order to preserve the way of life that we know as the American way and the way that is challenged today as it has never been challenged before.

With our country facing the most serious crisis in its history, many of our people are approaching the problem as if it could be debated leisurely and without urgency as to time. If Russia decides to attack, all this time will be lost that could have been used in preparation. Meanwhile, growing daily are the fears and apprehensions of our friends and allies abroad.

To meet the threat that faces us, nothing less than the best we all have to give, will be necessary. This means that every segment of America must make a contribution to the struggle against domination by communism.

Do we dare be lulled into the dangerous assumption that Russia won't attack? Can we afford to guess about Russia's plans? Do we want to be gobbled up by the black bear while we sleep?

Communism's ultimate goal is domination of the world. Not just Korea, not just Indochina, not just other peril points, but the whole world—the United States included.

For what purpose has Russia week by week, month by month, and year by year, since the end of World War II, regularly and systematically built up her army and navy and air force? And, at whom is this immensely great and vastly growing armed might of Russia aimed?

Russia, in her military preparedness, and without any further increase of her armed power, is already enormously ahead of all the free people of the world put together. That takes in the United States too.

Despite the tremendous disparity between Russian power on the one hand and the power of all the free people on the other hand, Russia still continues to build and build and build. The Russian budget for military expenditures for this year, 1951, has again reached another new high.

Certainly this mighty Russian military machine was not created as a result of fear by Russia of any of her immediate neighbors. Russia has already destroyed the governments of her close neighbors and dragged them back of the iron curtain. Surely this immense build-up of military power does not arise from fear of the immense hordes of Chinese to Russia's east. Red China has already joined the aims of Red Russia and is acting as the stooge and puppet of Russia right now against the United Nations in Korea.

This tremendous military might of Russia could not have been built from fear of her ancient foe, Germany. Because Eastern Germany has been completely sovietized by Russia since World War II and Western Germany is weak and divided. Furthermore, the Red Russian Army right now stands poised ready to strike in the very middle of Europe.

As for the rest of Western Europe, France, Italy, and England are mere pygmies compared with the giant size of Russian arms.

Thus in the 6 years intervening since World War II, Russia has brought all Asia to her side and has completely dominated more than half of Europe.

As the result of this tremendous realinement of forces by Russia, the United States stands today as the last great barrier against the domination of the whole world by Russian communism and Russian aims for world empire.

Therefore, it must be clear to everyone willing to stop, look, and listen that the express-train advance of the vast Russian military juggernaut is aimed right at the United States. No other conclusion makes sense.

All this being so, what will we do about it? It seems clear that it is imperative that we realize that we will have to go through a period of sparse and bitter living here in America. That to me is far better than another world holocaust, another war with its horrible destruction of life and property.

On the home front, no longer can there be the question of whether capital and labor can get together for the common good. They must get together. Every segment of our life must make its contribution.

If materials are to be allocated, if wages are to be fixed, if prices are to be frozen, the same thing must happen to profits. In other words, there is no part of our life that possibly can be freed from the necessity of making the contribution that is vitally necessary to build up our production and our preparation to the place where Russia will not dare attack us.

Then the administration must come to its senses on the Federal budget. This is no time to monkey around with costly experiments, with nonsensical expenditures, and with waste and boondoggling.

If we don't cut items of expenditures, other than defense, to the bone, the expenses are going to paralyze our whole productive mechanism. The Government now is taking a terrific wallop out of all income for taxes. The time has come to call a halt to wild, unnecessary spending. The time is here to eliminate all tax loopholes in the tax laws before new and heavier taxes are imposed.

The time has come for America to tighten its belt and to decide right now where we go from here.

If it is the purpose of Russia to attack us immediately, then we can forget about the argument for drafting 18-year-olds and for universal military training because everybody will be in the fight, since every able-bodied person will be necessary.

On the other hand, it may be the purpose of Russia to continue further the cold war which she has been carrying on for the past 5 years. It may be her purpose to put America to the enormous expense of getting ready for a fight which may not come for years. But whatever Russia's purpose is, the United States must be ready because Russia right now has a gun pointed at our head.

If the purpose of Russia is to carry on this cold war over a period of years, it is clear that America must protect herself by tightening up her economic policy and by a preparation program that is realistic for a long-term cold war on the part of Russia. The only possible solution to a cold war by Russia over a period of years is for universal military training.

The figures show that it cost Russia only $7 a year for the pay for a private in the Russian Army. The lowest grade pay in the American Army is $1,080 per year and it costs the United States $10,000 a year for every man that is fully equipped and actually in service in the field. With this tremendous difference between what it costs Russia and what it costs America, it is clear that this country cannot afford a standing army over a 5-, 10-, or 15-year period at $10,000 per soldier per year. Universal military training, and the reserve that such training makes possible, is the only answer, on an economic basis, for survival by America against the continuing cold war threat that Russia may continue over the next 20 years or even for a generation.

The problem is not whether America is to be a military nation; but whether we are to be prepared and to be prepared by a method that the economy of this country can sustain over a period of years.

This is a problem to which we must have the right answer. There can be no quibbling and no misunderstanding. We must be prepared and we must be prepared by methods that will not destroy our economy at the same time that it provides a preparation against attack.

Let us not forget that the productive capacity of America was as essential as our armed might in winning World War II. Our productive capacity as well as our armed might well be necessary to prevent world war III. I am sure that Stalin fears the productive capacity of this country more than he fears our atomic bombs. But to have that productive capacity we must have a sound economy. And we cannot have that sound economy by continuing preparation for war over a long number of years unless we have universal military training. That is something about which there is no doubt and there is no alternative. It isn't a question of whether or not we want universal military training. It is a matter that universal military training is an imperative necessity that confronts us.

The time is gone when we can pussyfoot or fool about the things that must be done. It is up to us to get down to brass tacks in all these problems. There are certain necessary and vital things that have to be done for the survival of this Nation. Everybody must understand what they are and everybody must make a contribution to the result. Communism is united. America must be united if we are to unite the free peoples elsewhere. And unless the free peoples of the world stand together, they will fall together, because it will take everything that we all have to defeat the tremendous power that communism has built in the endeavor to destroy the free peoples of today's world. That is how plain it is. No one has any excuse for failing to understand the seriousness of the challenge that faces us.

Oregon Senate Joint Memorial 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks Senate Joint Memorial 1 recently adopted by the Oregon Legislature memorializing the President and the Secretary of State, in any negotiations with reference to a peace treaty between the United States and Japan, to make adequate provision positively to insure that no Japanese fishermen or fishing vessels be permitted to enter or interfere with the fisheries of this Pacific coast which have been fished and developed by the fishermen of the United States.

Senate Joint Memorial 1

To the HONORABLE HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas grave disaster to the coastal fisheries of the State of Oregon as well as to the coastal fisheries of the entire Pacific coast of the United States and Canada would result if the Department of State of the United States should again allow Japanese nationals to enter North American fisheries as they had begun to do before World War II, and to permit the Japanese to do this would constitute one of the greatest threats to peaceful relations between Japan and the United States; and

Whereas fisheries constitute one of the basic industries of this State, and not only give employment to many thousands of fishermen and workers in shore plants but also contribute to other industries such as shipyards, supply houses, banks, insurance companies, and many other concerns; and

Whereas fisheries furnish to the people of the Northwest, as well as to millions of other people, great quantities of wholesome and palatable food and constitute an immense food resource which, by proper management, can be made to yield a constant supply of food in the future; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States be memorialized to direct the Secretary of State, in any negotiations with reference to a peace treaty between the United States and Japan, to make adequate provision positively to insure that no Japanese fishermen or fishing vessels be permitted to enter or interfere with the fisheries of this Pacific coast which have been fished and developed by the fishermen of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send this joint memorial to the President of the United States, and to send copies thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President and the clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress elected or appointed from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the senate January 18, 1951.
ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
P. L. PATTERSON,
President of the Senate.
Adopted by the house March 9, 1951.
JOHN F. STEELHAMMER,
Speaker of the House.

The Forest of the Six Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the annals of history have recorded few parallels to the savagery practiced by the Nazi government on the defenseless and innocent Jewish men, women, and children of Europe. When the Second World War broke out in the fall of 1939, there were 9,000,000 Jews on the continent of Europe; when the war ended in 1945, there were 3,000,000 left. Six million Jews were tortured and done to death in the Nazi concentration camps and crematoria. No greater cruelty has been heaped on any people on the face of the earth within the memory of civilized men.

The world has recently shown a tendency to forget the German atrocities perpetrated upon the peoples of Europe and the 6,000,000 martyred Jews. Instead, the slogan has been given currency: "Let bygones be bygones." We have even forgotten what the Krupps and others did to convert Europe into a shambles. The Jewish people alone have not forgotten.

Out of Jerusalem comes a news story, so packed with drama as to thrill us all. It proves that there are still people on God's green earth who are determined to make sure that the memory of the 6,000,000 and what they fought for shall not perish from the land. To this end, they have established a living memorial which in its grandeur and eternity, may be said to approach closely the vastness of the world's and the Jewish people's tragedy in the loss of the 6,000,000. Here is the news item:

JERUSALEM, March 8.—An extraordinary ceremony, accompanied by tears and punctuated by lamentations, took place yesterday on the mountains overlooking Jerusalem, when the Jewish National Fund, in the presence of 10,000 men and women from the Jewish capital and of representatives of the Israel Government, the Jewish Agency, and 14 Jewish communities of Europe, Morocco and Yemen, planted the first trees of the Forest of Six Million which will occupy both sides of the 40-mile stretch of the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv corridor. The forest, when completed, will have 6,000,000 trees and will be known as the Forest of the Six Million, in commemoration of the 6,000,000 Jews who were done to death by Hitler.

The vast crowd that assembled on the mountain slopes at Kisarom in the Jerusalem corridor, broke into a loud lamentation when Joseph Weitz, representative of the Jewish National Fund, planted the first cypress saplings while the cantor intoned the El Mole Rachamim, invoking the mercy of God on the souls of the departed martyrs. Thousands of men, women and children, many of them close relatives of the martyred six million, wept hysterically as Chief Rabbi Isaac Halevi Herzog, following the cantor, pronounced the Kadish, the prayer for the dead, and David Ramaz, speaking in behalf of the Israel Government, raised his right hand, swearing that the State of Israel will never forget the six million and what was done to them and the whole Jewish people during the last World War. Berl Locker, in the name of the World Zionist Organization, took a similar oath. Isaac Gruenbaum, who for many years was Polish Jewry's outstanding Zionist leader and chief spokesman in the Polish Parliament, delivered the eulogy. He was forced to interrupt his address several times because his throat and voice were choked with tears.

Throughout the whole ceremony Israel airplanes circled high over the mountains and the Israel flag hung at half mast in front of the specially constructed speakers platform on the mountain slope.

The forest will be divided into 14 sections, each commemorating a Jewish community that was wiped out in the great mass murder that cost the lives of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe. The forest will be specially guarded by chosen representatives of the Yemenite Jewish community which is regarded as the oldest Jewish community in the world.

Dr. Harris J. Levine, president of the Jewish National Fund of America, in a message to the memorial assembly, expressed the deep feeling of solidarity with world Jewry, which animates the 5,000,000 Jews of the United States, and pledged that a special effort will be made to help in the establishment of the living memorial in Israel that will forever keep green the memory of our martyred six million.

Mr. Speaker, the Jewish National Fund of America, with offices at 41 East Forty-second Street, New York City, in response to the call from Jerusalem, has undertaken to have 5,000,000 trees planted by the 5,000,000 Jews of the United States in the Forest of the Six Million. It will endeavor to have each Jew in America plant at least one tree in the Forest of Six Million. The motto will be: "Plant a living tree for each martyred dead" and "We build as we mourn." Thus, through the forest, there will be built a living memorial to the 6,000,000—a green mansion in which shall dwell forever the spirits of the departed, giving life, health, and inspiration to all succeeding generations who will be building the land while gratefully and reverently remembering those who lived and worked and died for it.

The roots of the trees we plant will hold back rushing waters and will help erect land terraces. Its timbers will go

into building of homes, barns, and factories; into making of chairs, sills, furniture, ships, railroad cars, vehicles, plows, boxes, and tools. The wood pulp will make newsprint and paper for books and fiber for textiles. In other words, they will revere the departed and the past and enrich the present and the future.

Extracts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Dinner of the Amen Corner, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address delivered by me at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Saturday evening, March 31, 1951.

There being no objection, the extracts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The events of this new year, 1951, and particularly of the month of March ending today, have a startling significance for every American.

During the current week three American citizens have been found guilty of being traitors to the United States. Their treason was in exposing the secrets of atomic energy to Russia. Their treasonable act put the women and children of America on the firing line in the event of world war III, and in that event undoubtedly meant the loss of the lives of millions of their fellow American citizens.

Earlier this month a British jet bomber flew nonstop from an airfield in Ireland to an airfield in Canada in only 4 hours and 37 minutes. That flight was almost as meaningful to America as the discovery of this land by Columbus. It opened up America to contact with Europe in only half the time required for a fast express train to cross from one end of Pennsylvania to the other. However little we may relish the idea, it meant that whatever happens in Western Europe affects us here in the United States almost as if it happened in one of our adjoining States. Had we been at war with a nation controlling Western Europe, that jet bomber could have carried an atomic bomb to blast any of the cities on the eastern seaboard of the United States.

It is, therefore, clear that unless Western Europe is denied to the Russians the whole of the eastern United States is open to atomic bombing whenever world war III comes up. It also seems clear that it is not possible for the United States to abandon Western Europe and to retire within an impregnable fortress here in America, because that fortress would no longer be free from atomic bombing which is the most dangerous and devastating invention of human ingenuity.

The further significance to us here in America of these tremendous events is that the overwhelming proportion of the productive enterprise of the United States is located in a group of Eastern States immediately vulnerable to atomic attack from Western Europe. A Western Europe less than 5 hours away makes Western Europe our next door neighbor so far as concerns vast contact and liability to attack by atomic weapons.

During the past week the doors of a Federal prison closed upon Alger Hiss—an American who had acted as one of the chief advisers of the President of the United States at a conference with Russia and other diplomats at Yalta. It therefore appears that at a momentous conference with Russia, our own President had as one of his confidential advisers a prominent American who in fact at that very time was in league with the most vicious enemy this country ever had, because Alger Hiss was imprisoned after conviction of perjury for having denied under oath that he had ever been a Communist whereas it was proved that he was.

It is also clear therefore that Russia has penetrated successfully into the very highest secret circle of confidence in our Government and has carried away for her own use the secret of atomic energy—thereby not only shattering confidence and assurance of peace in the world, but also giving Russia the secret of the means of conquering the whole world unless we here in America arouse ourselves to the seriousness of our present danger.

The unparalleled productive capacity of the United States has largely developed as a result of the concentration of our industry in large units where production and assembly lines have completely revolutionized and fabulously increased all previous ideas of quantity and quality of production. Our ability to produce has made the United States the leader of the world of today. So long as our great concentration of industry were not open to attack by our enemies we were indeed invulnerable. But as the result of traitors making known to Russia our secrets of atomic energy, they have thereby sown the seeds of our own destruction. Atomic bombing can destroy our industry unless as a Nation we become fully and adequately prepared to defend ourselves.

Many Americans are saying frankly or indicating by their action that there is no need of urgency in our plans. They seem to mean: What is the use of being too serious until war actually starts? Of them it may be asked: What do they call what goes on in Korea? Latest official figures show that our losses in Korea now exceed 57,000. That is greater by more than 10,000 than all the losses of both the Northern and Southern armies in the Gettysburg campaign in the Civil War, which was the bloodiest campaign in American history on this continent.

General MacArthur this week called upon the Communist leader in Korea for a meeting to arrange for ending that war.

The reply dictated from Moscow was a scornful refusal. So that bloody fight goes on with no prospect of its termination. Everyone knows that the whole communistic campaign in Korea is directed by and through Russia. The fact is that Russia shows daily by her activities in Korea that she is willing to risk world war III right now.

Communism is united world-wide. The free nations of the world are not united either in aims or preparation.

The accumulation of events, particularly such as we have witnessed so far this week make it increasingly evident that communism as led by Russian imperialism means to dominate the whole world.

Only determined and united effort, with a common purpose and a common determination by the free people of today's world, can possibly stop this vast expansion of Russian power. It is up to all who believe in freedom to stand together. Unless we do and until we do there is no reason to believe that separately the free people of the world can successfully resist the constantly growing might of Russian military power.

The Stabilization Program Is Not Working for Wage Earners and White-Collar Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting a resolution on the failure of the stabilization program, under the inadequate National Production Act which we passed last year, to work for the benefit of the Americans who already are carrying the chief burden of the defense effort, as adopted by the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York.

Text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL POLICY ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATED CONFERENCE OF THE TRADE UNION COUNCIL OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

In the present world crisis, the United States must forge a national unity to give strength and leadership to the free world.

This unity must be based on equality of sacrifice and an equal voice for all sections of the national economy who are called upon to make these sacrifices.

The use of our present national crisis to depress labor's standard of living while stepping up profits, to place the heaviest burdens of taxation on labor's shoulders, to deprive labor of an active voice in our economic affairs, is to weaken the entire fabric of our national unity.

So far, our national policy has failed to map a program that will protect labor's standards of work and living, that will tax those best able to pay, that will recognize labor's contributions by giving labor a proper voice.

Since the onset of fighting in Korea, the cost of living has gone up 8 percent in retail prices, according to BLS figures. Wholesale prices have gone up twice as much. Each day, these higher wholesale rates are translated into retail costs.

Wages, lagging behind prices even before the outbreak of the Korean fighting, have lagged even further in the subsequent months.

The stabilization program has, so far, stabilized wages only.

The most decisive item in the worker's budget, food, has escaped control. Those items selling below parity continue to rise because they are exempt by law. Those items selling above parity are controlled at the store but not at the farm, thereby making inevitable future price rises. This free item, food, constitutes 40 percent of the wage earning family budget.

In the over-all ceilings, the point where the freeze was established was the highest point in American history.

This conference of labor delegates believes that the present stabilization program is viciously discriminatory against all wage and salaried groups. It is not really a stabilization program at all. It is a wage freeze and a price rise.

This conference calls upon our National Government to take immediate steps:

1. To roll back prices to June 1950.

2. To place a tight ceiling on the prices of all items of popular consumption, including food.

3. To establish strong, effective rent control which will fully protect the tenants in our Nation.

4. To guide its policies by an effort to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar prior to Korea.

In the light of the foregoing, a tax program that falls most heavily on the wage-earning groups is adding insult to injury. At present, families earning $5,000 a year or less are paying the same taxes as they paid during World War II, while families earning $500,000 a year are paying $40,000 less in taxes.

This conference goes on record for a more equitable tax program.

We oppose any proposals for a national sales tax since it falls most heavily upon the lower income groups whose earnings are spent almost entirely on consumer goods.

We favor a program of taxation that will plug the present loopholes in the tax program, including measures to raise the excess-profits tax and to cover railroads, utilities, natural gas companies; to tighten the estate and gift tax; to tighten the tax on interest and dividends.

To speed our national production, to prevent new inequities in the distribution of our national income, to protect labor's rights in the allocation of manpower, to block black-marketing practices, to keep down the cost of living, this conference calls upon our national administration to give labor a voice in the top councils of our planning and administrative agencies. The present policy of manning such top agencies almost solely with representatives of big business not only threatens the living standards of millions of American families, but weakens the confidence of these same millions whose maximum efforts are required for our great national effort.

Labor's voice at the policy level is the first and greatest stem toward a multiplication of labor's power at the productive level.

RESOLUTION ON STATE RENT CONTROL ADOPTED AT THE SAME CONFERENCE

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party go on record to the following effect:

1. We insist that the State legislature immediately pass legislation amending the State rent-control law (a) to eliminate all provisions for rent increase on any ground except actual, proven out-of-pocket losses; (b) to grant no certificate of eviction except on the ground of a life or health hazard declared by a local government agency, or for the purpose of occupancy by the landlord himself, and then only after livable accommodations at a similar rental have been provided for the tenant; (c) to place under control all rental housing regardless of when built or converted.

2. Since the Liberal Party rent-control bill, introduced in this session of the legislature by Senator Mahoney and Assemblyman Roman anticipated the present situation with respect to the rent-control plan and provided in advance for making the objectionable features of the plan inoperative, we recommend passage of the Liberal Party bill.

3. We pledge ourselves to fight from tonight on until adjournment of this legislature to have the State rent-control law amended to give it teeth on behalf of tenant protection.

4. Unless the State rent-control law is amended by the current legislature to make it a completely effective rent-control statute which will fully protect the tenants of this State, we deem it necessary, as soon as Federal legislation has been passed establishing effective rent control for the Nation, that the Federal Government reassume control of rents in this State.

Inciting Racial Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disturbed to learn that a distinguished Member of the Senate inserted a telegram containing disparaging insinuations against Americans of Italian origin, in the record of a hearing. I think this was a grave error. The wire in question visited the sins of the few upon the many.

Italian-Americans need no defense from me or from anybody else. In my book one race is as good as another. We have no creed of superior or inferior races in America. Hitler tried to spread the doctrine of Herrenvolk—superior—and Slavenvolk—inferror or slave—and it took much sacrifice of blood and tragedy to nullify it. Unfortunately, there lingers in the minds of some that some races are superior to others, and in our immigration statutes, we do find a national-origin theory whereby preference is given to immigrants who are Aryan, thereby causing discrimination against the Latins and the Slavic peoples. This prejudice which makes it difficult for Italians seeking entry into this country, is the same kind of prejudice which animated the telegram in question.

I feel certain that when the matter is brought to the attention of the distinguished Senator, he will rectify his mistake. I have great respect for the Senator in question. I am sure he did not mean to imply any immoral conduct to the Italian people as a whole or to the Italian-Americans as a whole. However, I think it was most ill-advised to have inserted such remarks into the record of the hearings, and I take this opportunity to say so.

I should like to compliment the newspaper, Il Progresso Italo-Americano, for its stirring editorial which appeared in its March 28, 1951, issue. My esteemed colleague, Representative JOHN ROONEY, inserted this editorial in the April 2 issue of the RECORD.

Oregon Senate Joint Memorial 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks Senate Joint Memorial 4 recently adopted by the Oregon Legislature providing for memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States of America for the construction of timber access roads to and in public forests:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the United States, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, manages 58 percent of the total forest land of the State of Oregon, which carries 70 percent of the currently merchantable timber; and

Whereas the allowable cut under sustained yield forest management on the public forests has by no means been reached; and

Whereas 87,000 citizens of Oregon are directly employed in the forest industries; and

Whereas the State of Oregon currently furnishes the people of the United States with more than a quarter of their annual lumber requirements, as well as important quantities of wood pulp, plywood, doors, shingles, and other forest products; and

Whereas if the present national emergency demands a high production of essential timber products for military use, the public forests in many instances are the only ones which can supply these needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to consider the merits of the proposal for the authorization of the construction of timber access roads to and in the public forests of the United States as outlined in House Joint Resolution 28 which has been introduced in the Eighty-second Congress, first session; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the senate be and she hereby is directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Oregon in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate February 28, 1951.
ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
P. L. PATTERSON,
President of the Senate.
Adopted by the house March 5, 1951.
JOHN F. STEELHAMMER,
Speaker of the House.

Let's Stop Playing Into the Hands of Russia by Delaying Our Wheat to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD two editorials from the New York Post and a signed column by Dr. Frank Kingdon from the same great newspaper.

All of these insertions say, in effect, that our delay in acting favorably on the

authorization to furnish wheat to the starving millions of India is helpful to the propaganda war of the Soviet nations; and it is a brutal death sentence on thousands of helpless human beings whose only sin is in living in a country incapable of feeding all its people.

I hope sincerely that the administration will soon be able to send food to India out of our own wonderful bounty.

Text of the editorials follows:

[From the New York Post of March 12, 1951]

DEATH SENTENCE

Each day that the House Rules Committee delays action on emergency aid to famine-stricken India means the death of more helpless people whom our help could have saved.

[From the New York Post of March 22, 1951]

DANGER: MEN STARVING

A farmer's almanac of global crop conditions would provide ironic contrasts. Starving India reports that hurricanes have followed droughts in razing the subcontinent's maize and wheat fields. At the same moment the already overflowing wheat bowl of the American southwest offers predictions of a bumper crop. In the midst of this almost embarrassing United States plenty, Congress is indulging in sterile filibusters against the proposed $190,000,000 gift of grain to India. The House Rules Committee has shelved the emergency measure with a perverse conviction that starving stomachs can wait. The harrowing truth is that our legislators are talking both the grain measures and Indians to death. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, flatly denounces that at least one million of his countrymen will die from disease or starvation unless Congress swiftly approves the grant. Emergency help will do more than all the diplomatic maneuvers on record to win friends and influence nations in the Far East. Reports that United States inaction has driven a desperate New Delhi to ask Russia for grain emphasizes the folly of further delay. Are we actually waiting for the Kremlin to lead the way?

[From the New York Post of March 18, 1951]

TO BE FRANK

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

No more decisive test of our genuine faith in democracy has recently come to us than the question of sending food to India. The only argument against it is that Nehru does not slavishly follow our international policy. To starve a people for its government's independence is a denial of democratic principle. Every time we indulge in this kind of undemocratic arrogance we hand Russia and communism a diplomatic victory.

Our policy in Asia, apart from humanitarian considerations, should have one objective—to separate Asia from Moscow. Nobody would recognize this from our actions. We seem determined to drive the Asians into the arms of the Kremlin.

A few years ago some of us were advocating a $5,000,000,000 world-rehabilitation fund to feed and revive China, India, and other lands then suffering from want and ripe for development. We were lampooned as fabulous visionaries with the lunatic touch. Those $5,000,000,000 could have kept China away from Russia. The price we are now paying for not spending them is $40,000,000,000 as the minor item and the lives of American men as the major one.

We still seem to be in the hands of men determined to drive China more and more to Moscow. Nobody seems to be working at driving a wedge between the Chinese and Soviet Governments, which seems to me the obvious point at which to breach the Communist bloc. Maybe this is because officially we have written China off, or perhaps have decided the time is not ripe.

The one thing on which we can all agree is that we do not want to reproduce in India what occurred in China. Yet here we are on the verge of setting the same forces in motion. We are as good as saying that we are indifferent to India's need except as we can turn it into an instrument to dominate Indian policy. In the light of past experience and India's present mood this can result only in alienating India.

What I am now advocating has nothing to do with approval of Nehru's policies. I am not declaiming them. I am merely saying that we should go out of the business of recruiting Asians for Russia, and turn to the happier business of winning them to our side. It is not a difficult business. It simply requires that we sell democracy by practicing it.

As is always the case with democracy, the more hard-headed we are about serving it, the more humanitarian our action turns out to be. It is pleasantly humane to send aid to India; it is equally sound policy. The audience that will tensely watch and ardently judge our action will be not only India but all the Asian peoples recently freed from the servitude of colonies and now deciding with which half of the world their true interests lie. Insofar as we discover to them a way of life so rooted in human dignity that policy and ethics are naturally united, we shall appeal to both their practical sense and their unique spiritual genius.

It is unfortunate that mankind reserves for courage in military planning an admiration it does not accord boldness in pursuit of peace, but we have here an opportunity to demonstrate that a mature, free people dares to trust its own belief in the freedom of all peoples.

Barbarous Iraqi Action Against Jews Calls for State Department and United Nations Intervention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter sent by me to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State:

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 10 in secret session, the Iraqi Majles (Chamber of Deputies) passed a decree with the approval of the Regency Council providing that all Jews who left Iraq for any reason whatsoever since 1948 must return within 60 days under penalty of confiscation of all their property. This decree applies equally to any and all Jews who left Iraq, temporarily or permanently, with or without passports. There are American citizens who are drastically affected by this decree. Property of American citizens who were nationals of Iraq will be forfeited to the state unless the owners return to Iraq by May 10. A custodian general has been appointed to be in control of all property of Jews who left Iraq. The new decree calls upon all officials in banks and other institutions to furnish the custodian general with information concerning the assets of all Jews affected.

This decree is a culmination of many others. An earlier decree provided that all Jews registered for immigration to Israel be denationalized. That decree was followed by another which froze the property of Jews scheduled for entrance into Israel. The latter decree, however, was made applicable to any Jew outside of Iraq and even Jews resident in the United States. In other words, it was applied to the property of Jews whether or not they went to Israel, United States, or any other country.

In the meanwhile, there are great disturbances in Bagdad and other cities in which Jews live, threatening their lives and property. Anti-Jewish feeling is again being whipped up to a fever point. The position of Jews in Iraq today is not unlike that of the Jews in Germany during the early days of Nazi control. The Government of Israel has protested, but to no avail.

A total of 104,000 Iraqi Jews had registered for transfer to Israel. Forty thousand have already been transferred, leaving 64,000 Iraqi Jews in a precarious state in Iraq. Those Jews who have managed to leave Iraq have been allowed to take with them just 90 cents. Many Iraqi Jews en route to Israel are consequently faced with starvation.

The decree of March 10 has placed the Jews who have left Iraq, some of them, as I have stated before, are in the United States, in a most precarious position. If they go back to Iraq within 60 days they face persecution or worse. If they do not go back they face absolute confiscation of their property.

Iraq is the recipient of United States aid. The Export-Import Bank allotted credits to her in the amount of $12,000,000 for agriculture and irrigation purposes. If this credit has not been completely drawn upon, I ask that any balances be canceled. Any country guilty of such barbarism should not be recipient of either our credit or our confidence. All point 4 aid should likewise be immediately withdrawn. The annulment of these harsh decrees should be the condition precedent for the reinstatement of these benefits from the United States.

The example set by Iraq might be followed by other Arab countries. The precedent is dangerous because the Jews are a helpless minority. They are that much more easily victimized. They cannot fight back. Hence the need for vigorous and summary action.

Moreover, the situation in Iraq concerning the treatment of Jews directly relates to articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article 56 states: "All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

Article 55 states that "United Nations shall promote (c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The situation in Iraq with respect to Jews is likewise violative of the convention on genocide and a denial of the resolution adopted by the United Nations on its universal declaration of human rights.

Thus, I believe, it is imperative that this information be imparted to our representatives to the United Nations so that they in turn set this crucial matter before the entire United Nations.

These developments in Iraq must not be permitted to be dismissed as an internal affair only.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

A First-Hand Report About "The Men Russia Fears Most" and "The Greatest Single Deterrent to the Reds Starting a World War"—By Corey Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday supplement to the Washington Star of last week carried an article, datelined "London," written by the internationally known writer on a veritable catalog of miscellaneous subjects, and aviator in World War II—Mr. Corey Ford.

This Week magazine, a Washington Star supplement, has the largest circulation of any Sunday supplement published. The editors of that magazine presented this article by Mr. Ford as a first-hand report on what they declared to be "The greatest single deterrent to the Reds starting another world war."

Mr. Ford's observations are both illuminating and thought-provoking. They have largely to do with the wonderful achievements of the United States Strategic Air Command. He quotes General Johnson as saying:

I wish the families could know the job that these men are doing, and I wish someone would tell them back home just how important it is.

Well, General Johnson, I want you to know that I and every other Member of the House of Representatives are alive to and thrill at the thought of the marvelous works that the Air Force Strategic Command is accomplishing in confining the Russian Bear to his lair. God bless you, General Johnson, and every member of your command, as well as all others who, in following our flag, are preserving—not alone the peace and security of our own country, but the peace and security of the world.

These few words are to tell you and your men that every true American is with them in spirit at each moment of every night and day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to tell the folks back home the wonderful works that our Air Force is doing abroad—by way of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a copy of which daily finds its way into the smallest hamlets of this land, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert Corey Ford's article entitled "The Men That Russia Fears Most," into the RECORD.

That article is as follows:

THE MEN RUSSIA FEARS MOST—A FIRST-HAND REPORT ON OUR A-BOMB AIR CREWS—"THE GREATEST SINGLE DETERRENT" TO THE REDS' STARTING A WORLD WAR

(By Corey Ford)

LONDON.—I've recently come back from a visit to the men who hold the world in equilibrium today. The threat of their loaded bomb bays—so Winston Churchill has said—is the greatest single deterrent to a Russian advance over Europe.

They are the pilots who fly the big long-range bombers which are capable of delivering the atomic weapon against the enemy. Their picked unit of the United States Strategic Air Command, sent to Britain on what has been announced as a routine training mission, is maintaining the balance between a cold and a hot war.

You haven't heard much about them. Their planes are parked at isolated RAF fields in East Anglia, gassed and ready. While the great debate goes on at home, while some of our leaders demand that we withdraw to our own shores, and others insist that we fight everywhere at once, the pilots sit at the controls of their bombers, aware that the powerful retaliatory blow they could deliver is what keeps Stalin in check.

MOST POTENT THREAT OF ALL

That word "retaliatory" is important, basic to our strategy. The enemy knows that if he hits us, the Air Force will return the blow with interest; and thus he hesitates because he fears that most potent of all threats, an atomic counterattack by air.

You can spot the huge metal tails a mile away, as you drive north through the pleasant East Anglia countryside. They tower above the hawthorn hedges, above the distant barns and thatched cottages. Their curving silhouettes, against the English sky, are disturbingly reminiscent of a decade ago.

Things haven't changed much in Britain since you were here before. Our men still live in RAF billets, which are no more luxurious than they were back in 1943 and 1944. Austerity, plus an innate British distrust of modern heating, combine to keep the buildings icy cold. A lump of coal smoulders sullenly in the grate of the reading room, and airmen shiver in overcoats as they try to translate the English newspapers into English.

GAME OF DARTS AND A MOVIE

Winters are as miserable as ever. Snow and sleet glaze the runaways, and it's worth your life to ride a bicycle down to the line. There isn't much to do for recreation; a game of darts; a movie, maybe; an occasional train ride into London.

England hasn't changed, but the men have. Today's air force is older, for one thing. These are experienced veterans, with battle stars from Europe, Africa, the Pacific. They are sober, serious, disciplined, highly competent. Flying is their job; they've been doing it for years, and they are professionals now. Their conversation is as technical as a seminar at MIT. You guess that the people of this advance unit—hand-picked from Lt. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay's crack Strategic Air Command—are as effecient a group of trained airmen as exists in the world. "We're the cream of the crop," one of them told me. It's a good feeling for Americans to have about themselves, in times like these.

Week-ends in London are few and far between. Most of the pilots are married; family men. The pin-up girls that used to decorate their walls have been replaced by photographs of Junior. They save their money and send it home to their wives, still living at the group base back in California. "It's tough being a SAC wife," they reflect. "The gals never knew when we'll take off and be away for months." When the men were told, at the last moment, that they would not be home for Christmas, there was no time to mail their presents. Maj. Gen. Leon W. Johnson, hero of Ploesti and Congressional Medal of Honor winner, who is boss of the bombers in England, set up a special airplane to fly their gifts back to the States.

They are frankly homesick, but they are just as glad their families are not over here right now. They don't talk much about the war—a habit of men in combat theaters everywhere—but they all believe that it is coming. They have their own ideas of how it should be fought, of course. "We can't lick them on the ground. We'll have to rely on airpower—where the United States is strongest—rather than on manpower, where the enemy is sure to outnumber us."

They believe in airpower; they wouldn't be pilots if they didn't. Many of them personally saw Japan and Germany crumble under air attack, and they know the effectiveness of aerial bombardment. "We'll lose if we meet them on their own terms. We'll win if we use the technical skill in which America is unbeatable."

The toughest thing over here is the waiting, waiting for the somber English weather to clear. "I missed summer last year," is a sardonic crack, "I went to a double-feature that afternoon." Waiting to run another routine training flight, a prescribed 10-hour course that is as familiar by now as the way to bed. Waiting to get a letter from someone at home. Waiting to learn how much longer they're going to have to wait.

FIRST FLIGHT

There was a little excitement down around the maintainence hangar the day that we arrived. A group of pilots were sweating out an airplane that was making its first flight; their shouts of advice rose above the angry whine of the engine as it climbed. "Ease her back." "Hold that right rudder." "More back pressure, Joe."

We stepped into the hangar. A foot-long model plane was darting erratically right and left overhead, guided by the long wire control lines held in its owner's hand. Its nose rose higher, its air speed fell off until it seemed to hang on the prop, the snarl of the toy motor reached fever-pitch. Then the left wing stalled out, and the tiny ship dropped into a sharp turn.

"Forward, Joe." "Chop the gun and pull up." A mighty groan, as the airplane plunged toward the concrete floor. "Oh, no-o-o-o!"

MOCK SYMPATHY

The owner ran forward to pick up the wreck, ruefully examining the shattered prop and the split plastic wing. "Clobbered." The group shook their heads in mock sympathy. "Wonder what's the penalty for Class Twenty-Sixing an aircraft?" "I'm going to recommend to the Evaluation Board that they consider this one a case of pilot error."

"Ah, I can fix this thing up in an hour with a little Scotch tape," the owner shrugged. "You guys wait here."

"After all," he added as he headed for the ready room, "you got nothing else to do around here but wait."

And wait and wait. Morale is high, but waiting can eat into morale. Waiting is just as hard back home; the letters from their wives show that. General Johnson appreciates the problem. "I wish their families could know the job these men are doing," he said. "I wish somebody could tell them back there how important it is."

Well, this is to tell them. These bomber crews who wait in England are keeping the enemy waiting in Russia. At this moment in history, the threat of the terrible counterpunch they could throw from these East Anglia bases is what holds this teetering globe of ours in balance.

Famine (in India) Will Not Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, attached is an editorial from the New York Times of March 22, 1951, forcefully drawing

attention to the fact that although the Foreign Affairs Committee favorably reported out the bill for food aid to India on March 5, it has not yet received the rule or been scheduled for consideration. The vital national interests of the United States which are involved in the enactment of this bill demand that it be debated and considered immediately after the House is through with the pending Selective Service Act. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

FAMINE WILL NOT WAIT

The danger of famine in India is approaching its critical stage. The most serious situation is in Bihar state, where winter crops have failed, but other areas are also threatened. The Indian Government is doing what it can, but is seriously limited by the basic food deficit in the country. It must look abroad for aid if the problem is to be met.

It is against this background that our own reaction to India's need for grain must be appraised. More than 5 weeks ago President Truman sent a specific message to Congress asking for immediate action on legislation to provide part of the food required if widespread famine is to be averted. Though bills to this effect were introduced, both in the House of Representatives and the Senate, little legislative progress has been made to date and only the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has taken action. With Congress now about to begin its Easter recess, passage of the needed legislation cannot be expected before early April, if then.

Here surely is a record of procrastination in the face of great need. Whether the matter is viewed from the humanitarian point of view or from the need of India's friendship in the present great world struggle, the record to date is not one of which we can be proud. In view of the steady worsening of the situation, it may well be that American aid, if it is ever forthcoming, will be too late to avoid great suffering and substantial loss of life. The Indian Government has asked the Soviet Union for aid, too, but, so far, no reply has been received. It is not inconceivable that the Kremlin, ever sensitive to propaganda opportunities, will take the initiative and provide some grain before we ourselves get around to acting. In any case, the need for the prompt action is indisputable. Famine will not wait.

"Just as Sure as the Sun Rises in the East, Some Day the Poor Wretches Behind the Iron Curtain Will Demand Freedom, and They Will Find Freemen Everywhere Extending Them the Right Hand of Good Fellowship"—Dr. John R. Steelman

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President of the United States, has presented to the Nation's television audience several high Government officials in order to have them make report to the people of the United States on matters of deep concern and which are subject, to a greater or lesser degree, to the control of those appearing on the National Broadcasting Co.'s Sunday afternoon television program Battle Report, Washington.

Chief among these on this program were Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris, Chief of Research and Development for the United States Army; the Honorable John Sherman Cooper, consultant to the Secretary of State; Mr. C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., officer in charge of Iranian affairs; Capt. Thomas U. Sisson, commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Leyte*; and Under Secretary of the Navy the Honorable Dan A. Kimball.

Mr. Speaker, each Sunday for more than 6 months past, Dr. Steelman has appeared in person, acting as a sort of monitor in selecting and presenting individuals whose current activities as Government officials make their individual reports of public interest.

On Sunday last, however, Dr. Steelman was not in the studio in person. He was with the President's party at Key West, Fla., assisting the President in the discharge of the many tasks that follow our Chief Executive wherever in the world he might go and for whatever reason that brought him there.

In this week's talk—by the use of audio and motion picture film—Dr. Steelman told briefly of what the Soviet radio has been recently saying about us. "Among the lies," he observes, "the Kremlin is spreading about our country, is one about our streets being filled with starving people, while a small group of so-called rulers live in luxury. The power-drunk despots in the Kremlin," Mr. Steelman went on to say, "are afraid to tell the truth—afraid to let their subject enjoy the freedom to live their own lives and think their own thoughts."

In his report to the people, General Maris told of the work of research and development of the United States Army, and spoke briefly of the tremendous improvements that have recently been wrought in the production of tanks, of antitank weapons, of defenses against hostile attacks from the air, and of the work that is being done in the development of guided missiles. "While," General Maris explained, "there is no guaranty of pushbutton warfare being just around the corner, it can be said that gratifying progress is being made in providing powerful and practical atomic weapons for tactical use by the ground forces."

Mr. Cooper, State Department adviser and consultant to the Secretary of State, talked briefly of the benefits that would accrue to our Nation if Congress were to enact legislation which would enable the dispatch of more troops to Europe, while C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., painted a graphic picture of the fantastic murder of the Premier of Iran, long distinguished by his friendship with the United States.

Mr. Ferguson detailed the importance of the friendship of Iran to the people of the United States, as well as the strategic value of that country to our own Armed Forces in the event of global warfare. He graphically pointed out our good fortune in having such freedom-loving people, as are the Iranians, on the front line of those who are battling against communistic forces of the world.

Capt. Thomas Sisson, of the United States Navy, told of the work of the United States Carrier *Leyte* and of the splendid record of its performance in Korean waters, while Under Secretary Dan C. Kimball high-lighted the story of the exploits of the *Leyte*, and spoke of the forthcoming documentary presentation of combat films now being made of naval operations during the second war period.

Mr. Speaker, the receipt in my office of more than 1,000 letters evidence the public interest in the splendid television program, Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers, one of NBC's ace producers, and carried out over the air on the coaxials each Sunday afternoon. It is because of that interest that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include this program in the records of this day's proceedings.

What follows is the audio portion of Battle Report, Washington, delivered on the network of the National Broadcasting Co., on March 11, under the auspices of Dr. John R. Steelman.

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. BRINKLEY. As the enemy—losing 24,000 men in 3 days—reels before the new onslaught of our allied troops, NBC television again turns its cameras on the Nation's Capital for another film-documented battle report.

Washington, where the Senate this week—its eyes on the struggle between East and West—voted the 13-year-old draft and universal military training, while in Korea, where the struggle is hot, American jets spark an aerial offensive that sweeps the front as our troops surge across the Han River.

This is Dave Brinkley, filling in for your narrator, Bob McCormick, who yesterday left for a first-hand examination of the trouble zones of Europe in behalf of Battle Report—standing by to report to you today. Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris, Chief of Research and Development for the Army; Adviser to the Secretary of State, John Sherman Cooper, just back from Western Europe; C. Vaughan Ferguson, the State's Department officer in charge of Iranian affairs; Capt. Thomas U. Sisson, commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Leyte*, and the Under Secretary of the Navy, Dan Kimball. Usually on Battle Report in person, but this week with President Truman at Key West, Fla., is Dr. John R. Steelman, helping the President with the work he must carry with him. Today, he reaches you by way of sound-on-film. The Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. During the past few days I have been getting reports upon what the Soviet radio is saying about us and about themselves. It is the same old story every day. The Soviet Union is pictured as a land of plenty, filled with happy, laughing people. The men in the Kremlin have appointed themselves as champions of peace. We, on the other hand, are called warmongers. Our streets are supposed to be filled with starving people, while a small group of so-called rulers live in luxury.

Obviously, the broadcasters make no effort to tell the truth. It cannot be because they do not know the facts, because they are available to all. Free nations do not operate behind an iron curtain.

There can be but one reason why these falsehoods are preached to the pitiable people who have been ensnared in the tyrants'

the Mohammedan Bible—a mosque is a sacred ground and sanctuary from all acts of violence. But as the crowd closed in behind the Premier, a young man rushed forward, whipped a pistol from his coat, and fired point blank at Premier Ali Razmara. The Premier, a friend of the United States, was killed instantly. The murderer was a fanatic, with no Communist connections. There have been some demonstrations and signs of unrest. The situation is serious, but the Persians have been in trouble before.

A glance at the map shows why Iran is always in the thick of trouble. The country is a triangular area wedged in between the Arabian peninsula, southern Asia, and Russia on the north. It is almost two and a half times the size of the State of Texas. It has a thousand-mile border along the iron curtain. It lies across the ancient land and sea routes from Europe to the Far East. It possesses some of the world's richest oil fields.

During the last war Iran was occupied by Russia. British and American supply troops came in later. Billions of dollars of war equipment were shipped into Russia via Iran. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin held an important conference in Tehran, the capital of Iran, in 1943.

After the war the Russians refused to live up to their agreements and leave the country. They established an independent regime in Azerbaijan, the rich northwestern province along the Russian border. Iranian officials were arrested. Landowners were killed. Banks were nationalized. However, Iranians do not scare easily. They have been fighting the Russians off and on for 200 years. They appealed for help to the United Nations. World opinion rallied behind the UN. Iran ordered her troops into the northern provinces. Russia backed down. Since then Iran has turned more and more to the United States for help.

In 1949 the Shah paid a formal visit to the United States. Recently most of our newspapers carried pictures and stories of the Shah's wedding. On Wednesday the Premier was assassinated. The Shah immediately appointed one of his elder advisers as Acting Premier. He and the Shah face many problems. First, of course, are the Russians. In recent months the Russians have changed their policy toward Iran. They have ceased their efforts at intimidation. They profess to be friendly to the Iranians.

Second, Iran is trying to raise the living standards of its people. The country is potentially rich but underdeveloped. The United States is helping with this development program. The first point 4 program in the world was signed with Iran. We have extended loans for agricultural development and road building. We have sent military aid. We have offered to provide technicians and to train Iranian students in our own schools and colleges. We will continue to support the Shah and his Government in every practical way.

Much depends on the people of Iran. They are hard working; they are individuals; they abhor the Communist doctrine; they have been invaded many times since the days of Cyrus the Great. But they have never been subjugated. We are fortunate in having such freedom-loving people on the front line of the non-Communist world.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Norfolk, Va., where the Navy takes out of mothballs and puts into service again another 45,000 tons of sea power—the U. S. S. *Wisconsin*. In retirement since 1948 and the third battleship of its class now in operation, the *Wisconsin* will soon stand ready to add its weight to the enviable record the Navy is blasting almost daily off the Korean shore. Here, as seen by our cameramen, is the Navy in thundering action there.

First carrier back from Korean waters is the famed U. S. S. *Leyte*, shown arriving at San Diego. To tell you of her dramatic dash from the Mediterranean in time for the battle of the Yalu River—as well as something of her other engagements—we focus our cameras now on the *Leyte's* commander, Capt. Thomas U. Sisson.

Captain SISSON. In April of last year it was my privilege to be ordered as commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Leyte*. Shortly afterward we sailed for the Mediterranean. Our air group of over 80 planes consisted of Grumman Panther jet fighters, Vought Corsair fighters, and Douglas Skyraider dive bombers.

We continued intensive training to bring ourselves to maximum combat readiness.

We were in Italy when the Korean War began. We then visited France, Greece, and Turkey and saw first-hand the depressing effect the early Korean reverses had upon the morale of those countries.

Another carrier relieved us while at Beirut, Lebanon, and we received dispatch orders to proceed at best speed to Korea. The 18,500 miles from the eastern end of the Mediterranean through the Panama Canal to Korea were covered at an average speed of 23 knots. This is a record sustained high-speed run for any ship. We arrived in Korea shortly after the Inchon landing. Our air group then aided in covering the advance to the Yalu, bombed the Yalu River bridges, covered the marines in their magnificent fighting from Chosin Reservoir to the sea at Hungnam and continued to cover the Army in their resistance to the Chinese invaders through the beginning of the present skillful offensive.

Although we in the *Leyte* are glad that it is our turn to come home, we feel the important thing is to win the war in Korea, as everything we hold sacred is at stake there. We feel that we are winning that bitter war by the spirit and determination of the men in the fighting, and we know their spirit will be matched by equal determination at home not to yield. We must give them the moral and material support they need to finish the war quickly. It can be done. We do not want the sacrifice of the four fine officers that our Air Group lost to have been made in vain, and I want to pay tribute to them now. Lt. Cmdr. Ralph M. Bagwell, of South Carolina, shot down and captured; Lt. (Junior grade) Ronald R. Batson, of New Jersey, shot down and missing; Ensign Jesse L. Brown, of Mississippi; and Ensign George W. Wagner, of Indiana, both killed in action. I am happy to state that we lost no enlisted men in the Korean operation.

The military lesson in Korea is a reemphasis on the importance of balanced forces working together, the kind of unity that is provided only by the will to work together to a common worthy end. The *Leyte* is proud to have been able to come from the Mediterranean on the other side of the world and contribute her share in that effort.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Here with some more pertinent facts on the *Leyte*, as well as an announcement of importance concerning a new and exciting series on the Navy you'll be seeing on NBC television in the future, is the Under Secretary of the Navy, Dan A. Kimball.

Mr. KIMBALL. I'm glad to have the opportunity to add a line or two to the *Leyte* story. Captain Sisson has spoken with the usual modesty which I have come to regard as the characteristic of the professional naval officer. There are some additional facts which I think you all should know.

During 4 months in Korean waters, the *Leyte* was in port only 2 weeks. Of the time she spent at sea, there were only 4 days when the *Leyte* did not conduct combat operations. During the combat period, there were more than 4,000 operational take-offs from her flight deck. These figures, and the pictures you have just seen, speak for themselves.

Leyte was but one of the vessels flying the flags of United Nations members in Korean waters. These ships are engaged in a great combined naval operation in support of the free world's resistance to Communist aggression and expansion. On the sea, just as on the land, the United Nations defense is a united effort.

Daily in Korea, just as they did during the Second World War, combat photographers risk their lives to bring to the American public action pictures such as you have seen this afternoon. In the months to come, the television audience is going to have an unparalleled chance to see a great documentary presentation of combat films made of naval operations during the second-war period.

The Navy is happy to cooperate with NBC in the preparation of this naval history. Navy and NBC technicians are preparing to screen literally hundreds of thousands of feet of Navy and Marine Corps combat film to pick out the very best for incorporation into this series. Much of our film for various reasons, including security, has never before been shown.

I want to commend the National Broadcasting Co., on behalf of the Navy, for the enterprise they have shown in planning this series.

Peace in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me one of the major addresses of recent times made by a distinguished spokesman on American foreign policy. I refer to an address delivered by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, in Los Angeles, Calif., last Saturday, March 31, at the fiftieth anniversary dinner of Whittier College.

Mr. Dulles addressed himself to one of the major issues coming up in the near future—the peace treaty with the Japanese Government. No man who has reviewed the tremendous economic, political, and social problems tied up with that treaty, for example, the single issue of reparations alone, can fail to appreciate the tremendous primary job which has been done by our former colleague in the Senate, Mr. Dulles. I believe that the features which he indicated he feels should be in the treaty will be of interest to my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to Whittier College for giving me this opportunity to make a progress report on Peace in the Pacific. That subject is, I suppose, of particular interest to

web. It is cowardice. The power-drunk despots in the Kremlin are afraid to tell the truth—they are afraid to let their subjects enjoy the freedom to live their own lives and think their own thoughts.

But history teaches us that men cannot be enslaved forever. In the mind of every man is the desire to seek happiness in his own way. Without freedom he cannot do it. Propaganda is no substitute. Just as sure as the sun rises in the east, some day the poor wretches behind the iron curtain will demand freedom—and they will find freemen everywhere extending them the right hand of good fellowship.

Mr. BRINKLEY. An army may move on its stomach, as someone once said, but how fast and how successfully it moves depends a great deal upon the equipment with which it fights. Guns, tanks, trucks, jeeps, bombs, bazookas, mortars—these and other fighting stuff like them, go a long way toward fixing an army's pace, its fire-power and Sunday punch. Thus, not only in men, but in machines—war machines—must the strength of a nation be measured. Behind the steadily increasing variety of war equipment with which our soldiers are armed—equipment ranked the best in the world—is a story of constant research and the testing of new weapons. To tell us how it looks from the inside, we bring you now the Chief of Research and Development for the Army, Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris.

Major General MARIS. History abounds with magic and simple recipes for insuring national security or victory in warfare. To one Civil War general, it was just a matter of "gittin' thar fustest with the mostest men." A dozen years ago, it was the Maginot line. Nineteen hundred and forty-five produced "atom-bomb-itis"—the assured conviction that the atom bomb, supplemented by a vast complex of mysterious pushbutton devices, is all that would be needed.

Failure to achieve a quick and easy victory over the Communist armies in Korea has been a severe shock to the adherents of this sublime faith in a single key to victory.

Also, questions have been raised: What is wrong with American weapons and equipment? Has the Army made any improvements?

When World War II ended, there existed a vast supply of the then current weapons and equipment. We know that this material was of proven effectiveness; but we also knew that improvements and revolutionary developments could, and indeed must, be accomplished.

On the recommendation of our scientific advisers, the limited funds available to the Army for research and development were devoted to a balanced plan which included: First, basic research over a period of years to replenish the reservoir of good ideas which had been used up by our wartime agencies, such as the Office of Scientific Research and Development; second, correction of known deficiencies in existing equipment and improvement of its design; third, development of components for completely new facilities of weapons and equipment; and finally, development of unconventional items of warfare, the majority of which were necessarily on a long-term basis because of their complexity and high cost.

From this research and development program, came a steady stream of advances. In many cases models of new items have existed for months. Placing these models into mass production, however, could not be started until money became available with which to pay for them.

Only during the last few months, under the impetus of a shooting war, have we been given funds to start mass production. It is primarily for this reason—rather than lack of research and development—that the Army has been forced to rely largely on World War II material.

I would like nothing better than to be able to give you the details of the hundreds of active research and development projects, but I know you will understand why I can mention only a few.

Antitank weapons: The key here is ammunition, for it is ammunition that kills the tank. With many outstanding developments in this field already or soon to be available, the infantryman, the tanker, and the artilleryman, will have the means to stop and kill any known enemy tank.

Tanks: Here we have developed a family of tanks for all possible missions. After World War II, because of limited funds, development in this costly field was devoted to component parts, such as engines, transmissions, and fire control. The valuable fruits of this decision are now being realized in the greatly superior characteristics and performance of our new tanks. The Walker Bulldog, our new light-gun tank now in production, mounts a gun with greater armor penetration than the 85-millimeter gun of the Russian T34 medium tank. Our new heavy-gun tank incorporates radical innovations in design and will mount a weapon which will destroy any known enemy tank at combat ranges. The first models of our Patton medium-gun tank family have creditably undergone their baptism of fire in Korea. Later models will be much improved.

Here is another payoff in our postwar research program: Now in production for distribution to our combat divisions is a complete new signal communications system, embodying all of the latest advances in the electronics field.

For defense against hostile air, great improvements have been made in fire control which will enable our antiaircraft to engage modern high-speed airplanes.

Further means of increasing our effectiveness against hostile air will be provided by guided missiles, which are being pushed on an all-out basis.

Other guided missiles are also being developed for tactical use by front-line commanders against ground targets.

With no guarantee of pushbutton warfare being around the corner it can be said that gratifying progress is being made in providing powerful and practical atomic weapons for tactical use by the ground forces.

All this effort, of which I have mentioned only a small part, is pointed to just one thing—the best possible support for the combat soldier—the man who finally wins the war.

Mr. BRINKLEY. To remind those of us who need reminding that the defense of freedom in Korea is a joint enterprise which we carry on with our UN allies, here are scenes of a British brigade in action somewhere along the Korean front. Fighting side by side with Turk mountain fighters, Greek Evizones, Aussies and Anzacs from Australia and New Zealand, they are daily throwing themselves into battle with the same courage that marked their victories in World War II.

Far from the sound of battle, however—though very much related to it—are the talks of the Big Four deputies that continue in Paris. It is from the Europe with which they are primarily concerned—Western Europe—that our next guest has but recently returned. Here to report to you on what he saw and heard there is the former Senator from Kentucky and former United States delegate to the U. N., John Sherman Cooper, consultant to the Secretary of State.

Mr. COOPER. A great debate is now taking place in the Nation and in Congress upon the question of sending additional troops to Europe. It may be a debate much larger than that single issue—it may decide how important we think the defense of Western Europe is to the defense of the United States.

I am sure that the opposition to sending troops to Europe is based upon the fear that our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty organization will not do their full share in the defense of Western Europe, or, as it has been bluntly said, they do not possess the will to fight. It is to these ends that I want to talk briefly, basing my remarks and conclusions upon my observations and conversations with many people upon a recent trip to Western Europe. Twice last year upon returning from Europe I had to report that, in my opinion, the efforts that were being made by our partners were inadequate and timorous and led to the conclusion that they did not have confidence that Western Europe could be defended.

At the conclusion of this trip I was happy to report that you could see there a growing determination and effort, which could lead into adequate defense for Europe. You may ask me for my facts upon which I base that conclusion. First, I am certain that the governments of Europe have made a decision that Europe can be defended and that their countries must participate fully in that defense. A year ago that was not true—they still believed then that it was possible to carry on their domestic programs without diminutions. Today, as our country has made the decision, their governments have made the decision that defense is prior.

Second, they are taking action to carry that decision into effect in terms of money, men, and production. In the United Kingdom the defense budget has been increased three times since Korea; in France by 50 percent, and in Italy by 50 percent. In all of those countries and in all the countries in Europe forces are being increased, are being trained, and are being equipped. Production is not yet enough, but at least in the United Kingdom an adequate program is under way. Most important, it is easy to note there the growing confidence of the people of Europe that Europe must be defended, that it can be defended, and that they must support the efforts of their government.

I would like to say this—that the indispensable element in the building of a defense in Western Europe is the confidence of the people that it can be built, and the requisite of that confidence, the most important requisite, is their belief that the United States will participate fully in that defense, not only in the air or on the sea but also upon the ground. Unless that effort is made, it is possible that this movement which is now taking place and growing in Europe could and would fail.

Mr. BRINKLEY. In Iran—so recently jubilant over the wedding of their Shah Mohammed Pahlevi—this has been a week of sorry bloodshed. Premier Ali Razamara, friend of the west, was brutally assassinated, and only the day before yesterday, leaflets threatening the life of the Shah himself were distributed throughout Tehran, as crowds of leftist peace-partisans—apparently Communist inspired—demonstrated before the United States Embassy with cries of "Death to MacArthur."

As a tanker refuels a naval vessel on the Mediterranean with Iranian oil, facts now begin to reveal that behind the trouble lies the question of the nationalization of the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which controls oil resources vital to the west and coveted by Russia. For a full report on this situation, we turn now to the State Department's officer in charge of Iranian affairs, C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr.

Mr. FERGUSON. One morning last week the Premier of Iran or Persia entered the courtyard of a mosque in Tehran to attend a funeral service. According to the Koran—

Since the arrangements for peace and security in the Pacific will in part be outside of the peace treaty and since the whole problem is not yet fully explored, we consider that any presently suggested treaty provisions are to be supplemented in the light of the outcome of the promising exchanges of views which are now taking place, and to which we attach the utmost importance. No one should assume that the United States takes this problem lightly or that we shall accept a solution that will be illusory.

REPARATIONS

As regards reparations, the United States does not question the inherent justice of the proposition that Japan should make good the damage done to others by its aggression. Reparation is, however, not merely a matter of what is just, but of what is economically practicable, without disastrous consequences. We have closely examined this problem. Considerable industrial machinery has already been removed from Japan and given to countries having reparation claims. Also, there is substantial Japanese property within allied countries which, as indicated, should be applicable to the satisfaction of claims. It is, however, not easy to see the possibility of Japan's providing future reparation out of her remaining capital assets or as a surplus from her current economic activity over coming years.

One of the gravest problems which confronts Japan, and it equally concerns the reparation creditors, is whether Japan, deprived of its formerly-owned sources of raw material and with a population of eighty-five million on four relatively small and barren islands, can maintain the standard of living and employment necessary to prevent widespread social unrest. This, if it occurred, would inevitably give rise to dangerous expansionist and explosive tendencies, which Japan's Communist neighbors would joyously exploit.

The United States, to prevent social and economic unrest within Japan since the occupation began, has advanced about $2,000,000,000 for relief and economic assistance. That is a realistic measure of how seriously the United States views this problem and its responsibility as principal occupying power. However, the United States is not prepared, after the occupation ends, to continue indefinitely such economic relief. Neither is it willing in effect to pay Japanese reparations by putting into Japan what reparation creditors would take out. The United States considers indeed that its postwar advances have a certain priority status.

We doubt that it is practicable to get the essential over-all and long-range results which are sought if the treaty also seeks to extract reparation payments other than in terms of the Japanese assets already received from Japan or within the territory of the Allied Powers. However, the United States has not closed its mind on this subject, and it is, with an open mind, actively exchanging views with countries which were most grievously damaged by Japanese aggression.

ECONOMIC DISABILITIES

Some suggestions have been made as to imposing upon the Japanese economic disabilities, as, for example, requiring a dismantling of a part of Japan's industrial plant, particularly her shipbuilding capacity. As experience in Germany has shown, such provisions cannot be carried out without arousing great public bitterness. If the peace treaty required the first postwar Japanese Government physically to decimate Japan's industrial equipment, it would impose an almost inhuman burden, and the consequences would almost surely be against the best interests of the Allied Powers.

FISHERIES

It has been suggested, particularly along the Pacific coast, that the treaty of peace might itself attempt permanently to regulate the problem of Japanese participation in high-seas fisheries. To attempt that would almost surely postpone indefinitely both the conclusion of peace and the obtaining of the results which are desired.

There is, I believe, a considerable possibility of agreement between the United States and Japanese fishing interests. However, the treaty of peace is not a treaty merely between the United States and Japan; it is a treaty which we hope will be signed by all of the 53 Allies. Most of these nations have their own fishing problems and their own theories of solution, which differ widely. No quick results can be won by attempting to make the peace treaty into a universal convention on high-seas fishing.

When I was in Japan, the Prime Minister advised me that the Japanese Government stood ready to negotiate fisheries agreements as soon as peace restores to Japan the possibility of independent sovereign action. He said that in the meantime the Japanese Government would prohibit Japanese nationals and Japanese vessels from going into conserved fisheries in all waters, and he mentioned specifically those off the coasts of the United States, Canada, and Alaska.

The Japanese now see the importance of avoiding practices which in the past brought Japan much ill will, and if we can hold to our tentative timetable, there can, I believe, be an early and equitable settlement of this thorny problem.

A PEACE OF RECONCILIATION

From the foregoing it can be seen that the Japanese peace settlement we seek, while it would confirm the cut-back of Japan's territory to her home islands, would contemplate that Japan would be a sovereign and sustaining member of the free world. She would contribute in due course to collective security in accordance with her means, but without developing armament which could be an offensive threat. Also, from an economic standpoint, Japan would be expected to get along without such subsidies as the United States has been providing during the occupation. On the other hand, Japan would be restored to a position of equality, free of burdensome and discriminatory conditions. In essence, the peace would be one of reconciliation.

That is not the kind of a peace which victors usually grant to a vanquished nation which has committed armed aggression on a vast scale. It is not surprising that some, made bitter and distrusting by Japan's past conduct, would like to impose upon Japan continuing burdens and restrictions. Some of these, taken separately, seem to have justification and perhaps no one of them alone would be of decisive historical significance. In the aggregate, however, they would fundamentally change the character of the peace settlement.

The major objective of any Japanese peace treaty is to bring the Japanese people hereafter to live with others as good neighbors. That does not require that the Japanese people should be pampered. It does mean that the victors should not take advantage of Japan's present helpless state to impose, for the future, unequal condition. It means that the peace settlement should restore the vanquished to a position of dignity and equality among the nations.

The peace would be a peace of trust, not because the past justifies trust, but because the act of extending trust usually evokes an effort to merit trust. It would be a peace of opportunity, in that it would afford the Japanese people the same opportunity to develop peacefully their domestic economy and their international relations as are enjoyed by most of the other free nations of the world.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY

In proposing that kind of a peace, the United States assumes a serious responsibility, for the results cannot be guaranteed. We have, however, a duty to exercise our best judgment as to the kind of peace which will endure. Circumstances have made our duty inescapable.

In the great war in the Pacific, we had valiant allies who, through long, hard years, poured out life and treasure according to their means. But the United States possessed most of the means required for victory in the Pacific. The United States has carried the responsibility of occupation, and the accomplishments of General MacArthur as Supreme Commander represent a moral investment to which his countrymen cannot honorably be indifferent. The United States has contributed the economic aid which has prevented the post-war misery which would have exposed Japan to capture by communism. The United States is the member of the free world which possesses large present and prospective military power in the western Pacific, and today we are the principal contributor to the United Nations effort in Korea, which fends off danger to Japan, to our Pacific allies, as well as to ourselves.

These are some of the circumstances which require the United States to exercise an initiative for peace; to do so while there is still time, and to shape that initiative with all of the wisdom and all of the vision that is available. For a misjudgment as to timing or as to substance, can bring incalculable disaster to all mankind.

The United States does not consider that it has any monopoly of responsibility, nor any monopoly of experience, wisdom and enlightenment that are required. We have no desire to "go it alone" nor have we the slightest thought of dictating. We continuously have sought and shall seek the views of others and, indeed, our present suggestions are a composite, not deriving from any single source. They reflect the ideas of many, and the United Kingdom and Australia are two important sources of actual language that we accept. However, in the last analysis, the United States cannot, in justice to our own people, or indeed to others, become cosponsor of a peace settlement which in our judgment, made after ample consideration without arrogance and in humbleness of spirit, would throw unnecessary and intolerable burdens of a military or economic character upon the United States, and jeopardize the lasting peace that the war was fought to win.

NO VETO

Happily, the exchange of views which have taken place have, with one exception, been altogether cordial and no basic disagreements have developed. The Government of the Soviet Union is, perhaps, an exception. For three months its representative joined with us in full and frank discussions. But now that a peace treaty with Japan seems actually to be in the offing, the Soviet leaders seem to have taken fright. The Soviet government has publicly announced that it will not resume discussions with us.

When peace is far off, the Russian leaders speak lovingly of peace. But when peace comes near, they shun peace like the plague.

We continue to hope that the Soviet leaders will join in a treaty of peace which would cost them nothing and which would start a relaxing of tensions which would be felt all around the globe. We are ready to give scrupulously full consideration to any views they may express. We shall steadily urge that they join in the Japanese peace.

Fortunately, however, Soviet participation is not indispensable. The Soviet Union has no legal power to veto. It has no moral due-bills, for its vast takings in Manchuria, Port Arthur, Dairen, Sakhalin, and the

Americans who live on our west coast. Actually, peace in the Pacific is equally important to all of us, for danger and effort can no longer be localized.

Two principal postwar goals of the Soviet Communists are Japan and Germany. If Russia's rulers could exploit the industrial and human potential of either Japan or Germany, it would be a sad day for peace. That would involve such a shift in the balance of world power that these new imperialists might calculate that they could start a general war with good prospect of success. They know that Japan, even alone, was able seriously to menace the free world in the Pacific and they imagine vast possibilities out of a combination, under their direction, of the Asiatic power of Russia, China, and Japan.

Fortunately, the Japanese people do not want that combination, which would make them the front line of a new aggression which in the end would mean disaster far greater than that which they have already suffered. They are in a mood to reject militarism in all of its aspects, and they want fellowship with the nations which genuinely seek peace through collective security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations. Thus there is the opportunity to make a Japanese peace which will not only end the old war, but give new strength and hope to those who strive to prevent another war.

To achieve that kind of peace is the President's mandate to the Mission which I have the honor to head and President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Secretary Marshall are each of them giving this effort their close personal attention, to the end that this great goal shall be achieved.

Since our mission was established last January we have had a busy time. All or some of us have been to Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and England. We have consulted in Washington with ambassadors of other nations and also with the many in the executive and legislative branches of our Government whose wisdom, judgment, and special knowledge can be helpful. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, its Far Eastern Subcommittee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House have extended the utmost cooperation. As a result of all this we have seen the possibility of formulating peace terms which should command general support here at home, which should involve no insoluble differences with our allies, and which should be acceptable to Japan, which we consider has now earned the right to be consulted.

So, this week, we have begun to discuss, with our allies principally concerned in the Pacific war, actual texts which might be incorporated in an eventual treaty. These texts are still working papers, tentative and suggestive only.

We contemplate a simple document, limited to the essentials of peace.

PREAMBLE

Our present thought is to have a preamble to the treaty which would afford the Japanese people the opportunity to express their intentions as to matters which are important, but which for one reason or another do not lend themselves to absolute contractual undertakings.

For example, Japan might indicate its intention to apply for membership in the United Nations. There is no doubt about the reality of that intention, but we think that Japan's application for membership, when it comes, should bear the unmistakable imprint of Japan's own desire, without the slightest taint of external compulsion. Similarly, the Japanese may want to express their intention to carry forward the new ideals as to human rights and like matters which are largely embodied in Japanese legislation under the occupation and which are the subject of the United Nationals Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They may want to declare their intention, in public and private trade and commerce, to conform to internationally accepted fair practices.

Japan's intentions in these respects are vitally important and go to the heart of our future relations. But except as these matters have already been spelled out in international conventions which Japan could and would adopt, they do not lend themselves to peace treaty obligations, which should only be such as can be precisely formulated so that the parties will clearly know just what are their right and duties.

TERRITORY

The treaty proper would prescribe the territory over which the Japanese will hereafter be sovereign. It is contemplated, generally speaking, that Japan's sovereignty should be limited in accordance with the agreed surrender terms. That would mean sovereignty over the 4 home islands and minor adjacent islands. There would be a renunciation by Japan of all rights, titles, and claims to Korea, Formosa, the Pescadores and the Antarctic area. Also the treaty might contemplate that in the Ryukyu and Bonin Islands there could be United Nations trusteeship and continuing United States administrative responsibility.

The South Sakhalin and Kurile Islands were allotted to Russia at Yalta and are actually in Russian possession. Any peace treaty validation of Russia's title should, we suggest, be dependent upon Russia's becoming a party to that treaty.

SECURITY

The security of Japan itself should, we think, be worked out through individual and collective self-defense arrangements authorized by the United Nations Charter. Thus the peace treaty itself need only affirm that, upon the coming into force of the peace, Japan would in fact possess what the Charter of the United Nations refers to as the inherent right of sovereign nations in these respects.

COMMERCIAL

As regards commercial arrangements, we do not think that the treaty of peace should itself attempt to define what should be the future permanent relations between the Allies and Japan. These might better be left for subsequent negotiation between a free Japan and other friendly nations. However, to prevent confusion and to minimize discrimination immediately following the coming into force of the treaty, Japan might, for such a period as 3 years, agree to accord most-favored-nation treatment to the Allied Powers, except that Japan would not, in any matter, be required to extend more favorable treatment than is accorded it. Similarly, as regards civil air-traffic rights, Japan might for 3 years, and pending the conclusion of civil air-transport agreements, grant the Allied Powers not less favorable conditions than those prevailing at the time of the coming into force of the treaty.

PROPERTY AND CLAIMS

With respect to property and claims, the treaty of peace might give the Allied Powers the right generally to vest, retain, and dispose of Japanese property within their territory, while Japan should return prewar allied property in Japan and validate prewar claims belonging to Allied Powers and their nationals.

The foregoing matters can, we believe, now be dealt with with considerable precision. There are others which are still subject to exploration and development.

JAPAN'S SECURITY

Since Japan is now thoroughly disarmed and materially and legally unable now to maintain armed forces, there is need for provisional security measures. Accordingly, with the authority of the President, and following conversations with committees of Congress, I stated publicly in Japan that, if the Japanese wanted it, the United States would sympathetically consider the retention of United States Armed Forces in and about Japan, so that the coming into force of a treaty of peace would not leave Japan a vacuum of power and, as such, an easy prey to such aggression as has already shown itself in nearby Korea. This suggestion of mine was warmly welcomed by the Japanese Government and the people generally, so that it is now in order to study the implementation of such an arrangement.

Since Japan is an island, its security is strongly influenced by sea and air power, power which the United States is in a position to exercise in the Pacific. The defense of Japan need not require, either now from the United States or ultimately from Japan, as large ground forces as might be thought to be necessary if Japan had common land boundaries with militaristic powers.

PACIFIC SECURITY

Bound up with the problem of Japan's security is the broader problem of security in the Pacific. Japan should hereafter make some contribution of its own to security, but this should never be the pretext for militarism that could be an aggressive threat. Thus, the problem has a dual aspect.

No nation able to make a dependable contribution to security should get a free ride. In our Senate the Vandenberg resolution has laid down, for the United States, the basic proposition that collective security arrangements should be based upon "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid." The United Nations Charter also establishes that all peace-loving states should stand ready to contribute armed forces, assistance, and facilities for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. That is one aspect of the problem. The other side of the problem is that Japan should never again develop armament which could be an offensive threat or serve other than to promote peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The peace we seek is one which will for all time liberate Japan's neighbors and indeed the Japanese people from the nightmare of militarism.

When we were in Canberra, Australia, our mission had significant discussions on this subject with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand. They made convincingly clear the attitude of their peoples on this subject. Now we are working actively to find the ways to secure the desired results.

We believe that out of our discussions, which are now well advanced, there will emerge a series of arrangements which on the one hand will enable the Japanese to make their own indispensable contribution to preventing their nation's being forced into the service of the new imperialism that ominously threatens from the mainland, and which on the other hand will effectively assure that there will be no unbridled rearmament which could become an offensive threat.

The United States is able, and daily growing more able, to exert a mighty influence for peace and to make peace in the Pacific more secure than it has ever been before. We can see the way to remove the pall of fear which results from Japan's past conduct and from the present Communist menace. But that is not a task which we would or should undertake single-handed and alone. In the Pacific, as elsewhere, security is a cooperative enterprise. Those who wish to cooperate for security can share the protection of immense deterrent power which, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "shall not be used; save in the common interest."

Kuriles repay it a thousandfold for its 6 days of nominal belligerency. Japan, unlike Germany and Austria, is not divided by zones of occupation.

In relation to Japan there is the opportunity to show which of the Allies of World War II now have the genuine will for peace. There is the opportunity for them to make a peace so righteous that the example will hearten and uplift men everywhere. That is the opportunity; and to its challenge we are determined worthily to respond.

Memorandum on Acceleration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorandum on acceleration prepared by President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale University; also President Griswold's lead article in the current Atlantic Monthly, dealing with the same subject.

I should like to point out the special emphasis which Dr. Griswold puts on the need for political and cultural leaders, as well as military leaders, engineers, doctors and other scientifically trained personnel. He is wholly right in stressing that the defense effort is as much political and cultural as it is military, and I am pleased that he has seen fit to quote General Bradley in this area, an area in which I have personally been greatly interested over a long period of years. Dr. Griswold sounds an important warning when he stresses that "high standards and fundamental values should not be sacrificed, but invoked and applied more vigorously than ever in all fields of learning".

Mr. President, I commend these important papers to the Congress and to the administrative officers in the Defense Department and elsewhere who are now responsible for the development of policies on our manpower and its most productive utilization for the long term as well as the short term interests of the American people.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the memorandum and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON ACCELERATION

(By A. Whitney Griswold, president, Yale University)

I. BASIC ASSUMPTION

A prolonged period of warfare with ever-present danger of global war, creating exceptional demands for trained manpower of all kinds and requiring a sustained effort to meet those demands.

II. OBJECTIVES

1. Engineers, doctors, and other scientifically trained personnel sufficient in number and quality to satisfy both our civilian and our military needs.

2. Political, cultural, and military leaders sufficient in number and quality to ensure the success of our defense effort and the continued progress of our civilization.

3. This twofold objective is implicit in a defense effort which is as much political and cultural as it is military, and of which General Bradley recently said, "Fundamentally, the United States is competing at this time for the hearts and minds of men in Europe and Asia." If this effort is to succeed we must give the fullest possible scope and the most effective possible representation to our free culture and our free society.

III. MEANS

1. The principal means of accomplishing these objectives is higher education; hence our colleges and universities have an essential mission to perform in the national interest—

(a) They must carry on the scientific research that may hold our security and our lives in the balance.

(b) They must maintain the flow of doctors, engineers, scientists, and officers essential to the Armed Forces.

(c) They must plant the seeds of higher education for a free society in the minds of young men at whatever time and in whatever circumstances the colleges may have them in their charge.[1]

2. These considerations call for the most effective possible utilization of our higher educational resources. High standards and fundamental values should not be sacrificed but invoked and applied more vigorously than ever in all fields of learning.

IV. METHODS

1. To accommodate both groups of students, that is, (a) those who elect to take a year of college before military service, then return to college; and, (b) those who prefer to render their military service before entering college, some form of acceleration is indicated. Young men having to budget 4 years for college plus 2 or 3 to military service before entering upon (or, in the case of professional candidates, even beginning to prepare for) their chosen careers, should be given the opportunity to shorten the duration of their studies and apprenticeship commensurately (a) with the educational standards cited above, and (b) with their own ability.

2. Acceleration in the form of a continuous cycle of 48-week academic years consisting of three 16-week terms each (permitting four normal academic years to be crammed into 28 months) is not consistent with the above standards and does not serve the essential purposes set forth in this memorandum. We tried this scheme in the last war and found it a failure. It exhausted the faculty and fed the students knowledge faster than they could absorb it. It resulted in an all around lowering of standards and cheapening of products. Education, particularly at the college level, is as much a process of maturing as it is of learning. Centuries of experience have proved that this process, applied to the basic arts and sciences of our liberal-arts curriculum, cannot be hurried. A bachelor of arts awarded for four normal academic years crammed into 28 months is a bachelor of arts awarded for quantitative achievement or servitude. It is like awarding a prize to the artist who paints the most pictures instead of the artist who paints the best.

Periodic breaks in the routine of teaching and learning are absolutely essential to both teacher and student. The teacher needs freedom from the classroom to carry on the research and writing that sustain his teaching. The student needs the same freedom to digest what he has absorbed in lectures and discussions; to do the independent work essential to the learning process; to perform the outside labors that—in an ever increasing majority of cases—help pay his way through college; to recruit his intellectual energies. These breaks in routine are as vital to the educational process as any other integral part of it.

3. The only kind of acceleration consistent with the standards, purposes, and conception of the national interest herein set forth is acceleration in the sense of economy, discipline, and qualitative improvements. Both the example of British and European secondary schools and the experience of our own colleges and universities indicate the 8 years consumed in secondary school and college might be reduced to 7 without impairing standards. Acceleration in this form calls for—

(1) Elimination of waste motion all along the line.

(2) Strengthening the secondary-school curricula in both substance and discipline.

(3) Eliminating redundancy, jargon, "gut courses," and excessive extra-curricular activities from the colleges.

V. CONCLUSION

1. As things stand a college student normally spends 44 months (from October of his freshman year to June of his senior year) in acquiring a bachelor of arts or equivalent degree.

2. If the above procedures were set in motion this period could be reduced to 32 months, as follows:

(a) three normal academic years of two 16-week (approximate) semesters each plus,

(b) 2 summer terms (at the end of freshman and sophomore years, respectively) of 8 weeks each, with the possible addition of an optional 8-week summer term for entering freshmen.[2]

3. The 8-week summer terms should be used for intensive work in such subjects (e. g. foreign languages, elementary mathematics[3]) as—

(a) Lend themselves to intensive treatment; and

(b) Afford a contrast with the regular term's work.

4. Acceleration of this type would result in educational improvements of immediate benefits to our defense effort and of lasting value to our society.

[From the Atlantic Monthly]

SURVIVAL IS NOT ENOUGH

(By Whitney Griswold)

I

Communist aggression in Asia has scored one tactical success not commonly recognized as such. It has struck a body blow at American higher education. Barely recovered from the disruptions of the Second World War, our colleges and universities are once more called upon to sacrifice their students, faculties, and curricula to military necessity. No one knows how great these sacrifices may be: The colleges may be confronted with the worst financial crisis in their history. If the lives of many private institutions be threatened, our public institutions will suffer and our whole educa-

[1] It is assumed here that even with an 18-year draft, many younger men will enter college before being called up; that this will remain a matter of individual choice; and that the colleges will therefore find themselves responsible for a preinduction as well as a postservice undergraduate program.

[2] Colleges operating on the quarter system could accomplish approximately the same results in three full-length and one short quarters.

[3] They might also be used by ROTC units for intensive work, especially outdoor training, which they have to conduct at reduced pace during the regular academic terms.

tional system will be the poorer. If the long-run objective of communism is to destroy our free society at its source, the farther we go toward stripping our colleges of students, dismissing their teachers, and accelerating their curricula, the nearer the Communists will have got to achieving that objective.

Such desperate measures can be justified in the name of national survival. We will fight to survive, and we will fight before our backs are to the wall, for our security and our principles. All this is clear in our history, our character, and our present actions. Our college students and professors share this destiny with their countrymen in every walk of life. They could not escape it if they wished to, and they do not wish to. But they have a mission in society, and the question is how much of that mission they can sacrifice without again losing the peace and perhaps even losing the war.

In the emergency, we talk of college education as a nonessential and an expendable. While we lavish our ingenuity and resources on the weapons of war, we neglect and even handicap the men who will use them. This is a high price to pay for survival. And what price survival if we become a headless monster?

Our colleges and universities are not ivory towers. They are wellsprings of humanistic and scientific learning and of the spirit that puts that learning to use in the cause of freedom. Their long-run value to our arts and sciences, to our whole ideal of a free society and a free culture, is hardly open to question.

And in the emergency? Never in the whole history of warfare has the strength of armies depended to such on their soldiers—especially their officers—articles of faith as it does today. What else has transformed the sleeping peasantry of Russia and China into great military machines? What has muffled the Voice of America and inhibited our efforts to preserve world peace, but the impression we have given other people that, for all our wealth, generosity, and efficiency, we are "light half-believers in our casual creeds"? Cromwell's maxim, in obedience to which he made himself one of the world's great military geniuses, should be engraved on the walls of the Pentagon: "I had rather have a plain russet-coated captain who knows what he fights for and loves what he knows than what you call 'a gentleman' and is nothing else." The greatest source—greater than any other in our society and greater than all others put together—of American captains who know what they fight for and love what they know is our colleges and universities. The greatest, indeed, the exclusive, source of scientific learning and personnel necessary to sustain those captains in modern warfare is our colleges and universities. We tamper with that source at our peril. There is more identity between our long-run cultural interests and our short-run military interest than there is conflict.

II

How short will the run be? Local Korean wars may continue indefinitely. The first frightful spasm of global war may resolve itself into an interminable war of the worlds. This is not a situation we can dispose of by dropping everything for the duration and picking up where we left off, as though we were knocking off for lunch. The only safe assumption is a long pull, and the only proper goal at the end of it is victory, not survival. We seek neither triumph nor conquest but a fulfillment of the moral purposes that moved us to make the effort in the first place. This must be a sustained effort. It cannot even begin if it counts the days and gambles on the duration. The very nature of the effort places the highest premium we have ever placed on our educational system. It rules out education as usual, not for the reasons usually given, but because education as usual is not good enough. It calls on us to educate not fewer citizens but more, not less well but better.

This is the greatest irony of all: That the circumstances calling for the greatest educational effort in our history should be so hostile to that effort. Just 3 years ago, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education, declaring that "the future of our civilization depends on the direction education takes, not just in the distant future, but in the days immediately ahead," fixed our goal at a college population of 4,600,000 by 1960. This would have meant 2,500,000 men and women enrolled in the thirteenth and fourteenth grades, 1,500,000 in the fifteenth and sixteenth, and 600,000 above the sixteenth. Based on an inventory of our needs, resources, and native ability as reflected in Army general classification tests, this figure was given as the minimum necessary to fulfill our social ideals and maintain our economic and cultural progress. In addition to this quantitative responsibility, the commission charged our colleges and universities with qualitative improvements of all kinds, particularly those which will make clear the ethical values and the concept of human relations upon which our political system rests.

The report of the commission makes wistful reading today. Out of a total college population of around 2,300,000, we now have about 1,500,000 men in our colleges and universities—grades 13 through 16. Of these we expect to graduate approximately 380,000 this June. As these words are written, we are debating a military service law that would reduce the total male enrollment to 950,000 next year, 665,000 the year after, and 643,000 in 1954–55. If the law should be enacted, our graduating classes would drop proportionately from 380,000 this year to 81,000 in 1955. If the ratio of college men to women that obtained in 1940 be applied to the Truman Commission's goal, it would give us a total male enrollment (grades 13 through 16) in 1960 of 2,400,000. The total predicted for 1960 if the present bill is passed is 732,000. The needs of our society are to this measure as 24 is to 7.

In the long run, if this ratio is maintained, it means a staggering setback to our cultural development—to our arts, our sciences, and our polity. Among the tables published by the Truman Commission there is a column of figures entitled "Lost Leadership." The figures represent the men and women who have the capacity for higher education, and from whom our society urgently needs the benefits of higher education, yet who, for one reason or another, do not receive it. In 1947 the commission put our wastage of these precious human resources at 2,383,000, a figure it expected to decline to 1,296,000 by 1960 if prevailing trends continued, and to zero, or thereabouts, if the commission's recommendations were put into practice.

Think of the wastage if we pursue our present plans. And think of the consequences. We are not, at the moment, producing enough doctors for the Armed Forces or enough engineers for industry. Yet in Russia, if we can credit the evidence offered by the director of the office of scientific personnel of the National Research Council in his recent testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, medical, scientific, and technological institutes are full and their enrollment is increasing. The same is true of the Russian pedagogical institutions, where the Soviet version of knowledge is propounded. From 1943 to 1948 Russia is said to have graduated 150,000 engineers and 350,000 engineering assistants of the technical institute grade, and these numbers are on the increase; while our own estimated total for the next 5 years is only 118,000. Numbers deceive, and Russian statistics are unreliable. We have Allied engineers to swell our total, while Russia must provide for her satellites. Russia's pedagogical institutes can be outmatched by an honest—and a thriving—program of the liberal arts. An army which knows that its leaders dare to trust it with the truth holds an advantage for which no dialectical substitute has yet been found. But this is not the point. The point is that the Communist dictatorship, the military colossus now threatening to bestride the world, appears to be making use of higher education as a strategic asset, while the democratic leader of the free world does not.

III

What can be done to redress the balance in our favor? So many plans, involving such complicated arithmetic, have been proposed to Congress that it is impossible to predict which one, or which combination, will prevail. All fall and most of the winter these plans have kept our colleges in confusion and students in suspense. At the moment of writing, the debate between the advocates of an 18-year and a 19-year draft seems to be heading for the compromise of an 18½-year draft, a compromise that makes little sense save as a compromise.

As indicated by other nations' military service laws, it seems universally accepted that the best fighting years of a man's life come between the ages of 18 and 26; and, as indicated by the ages of our outstanding amateur and professional athletes, splitting the difference by 6 months one way or the other is specious. One thing seems certain. Before these words appear in print we shall have adopted a policy—whether universal military service and training, or a new application of selective service, or both—that will require some form of military duty of all young men; that will cause serious reductions in our college population for the next few years; and that will interrupt the normal process of higher education for an indefinite time to come. This is the prospect we must bank on and try to make the most of in the light of the emergency and in the light of the world we hope to live in when the emergency is over.

As to the first point, that all young men be held responsible for some form of military duty, there can be little argument. A policy that spells out this biological fact does no more than make specific and regular what has always been implicit. The Yale News has spoken forcefully on the subject. In a recent editorial it pointed out that just about everybody had testified at the universal military service and training hearings "except the very people whose futures are being decided." As for the latter:

We would submit that the vast majority of 18-year-olds would answer more or less as follows:

1. They are prepared to serve their country in the Armed Forces.

2. They can see no major importance in the age differential between men 18 and those 19.

3. They bitterly resent their mothers' pleas that they are to young to serve.

4. They would prefer to have it definite that they serve right after high school rather than go to college uncertain of their stay there.

The obligation of military service is accepted. The overwhelming desire of the men who will do the fighting is not deferment but a uniform policy on which they can all count and make plans.

But how and when shall that obligation be discharged? It is here that we run into the debate that has occupied so much of our educators' and military experts' time during the past few months. The debate has been at least temporarily resolved by the new

law. But as long as our young men retain any freedom of choice as to when they will enter the armed forces whether immediately upon completion of high school or later, after a year or two of college—and until we have repaired the deficits of educated manpower previously cited, we shall still face unfinished business and unanswered questions. We must answer these questions scrupulously from the standpoint of the national interest. What would be the purely educational consequences—to the students themselves and to their teachers—if everyone signed up for military service before entering college?

I can think of at least three good ones. First, it would promise us more mature students when they eventually entered college; and as every teacher knows, and our returning veterans proved, education is as much a process of maturation as it is of learning and instruction. Second, it would send us students free of indentures, able to lay their plans and choose their courses without the distraction of military or specialized training requirements. Third, after the initial two or 3 year gap had been closed, it would restore our student enrollment to its normal level. This last argument is the weakest because it assumes that as many men would enter college after military service as would have done so directly from high school. This assumption rests on two others: namely, that military circumstances will permit them to return, and that their desire to do so will not have diminished. Given a favorable military situation, a liberal plan of tuition scholarships, and our experience with the veterans of the last war, this whole set of assumptions is tenable.

Opposing precollege service are two serious considerations. The first is the interruption in the flow of doctors, engineers, and other scientific personnel, which many experts in these fields believe would be disastrous. This can be prevented by selecting students and assigning them to specialized college training after 3 or 4 months of basic military training. A more serious consideration is the maturity of high-school graduates as compared with men who have completed at least 1 year of college. If the Cromwellian maxim is sound, the odds are in favor of the college men as against an army of schoolboys. The former should be a more stable, more resourceful, and more purposeful fighting force both in action and in training.

If the American high school took its students as far as its British or European counterparts, we might dismiss this consideration. But it does not. On the contrary, the graduate of a British public school or a French lycée is ready to enter our college sophomore year, and I have known some to enter our junior year. It may be that the intellectual apparatus of these young men—particularly the Europeans—has been developed beyond their years. Nevertheless, they have had better discipline and, by definition, more higher education than our high-school graduates. The Russian military service law now in force defers high-school students until they graduate or reach the age of 20—the level of our college sophomores. The basic assumption underlying this whole discussion is that we are in for a long pull, in which we stand to win or lose, not only as soldiers but as representatives of a particular civilization. To send our young men abroad in either capacity before they fully comprehend that mission is to neglect one of the most essential phases of their training.

IV

On the whole, with more than a million men becoming 18 each year, I think we can leave the choice of military service before or after entering college with those whose ages permit them to exercise it. Some will prefer to get it over with at once, others to take a year of college. The more freedom of choice we can preserve in these Spartan times the better. But we have no choice whatsoever in what we must do for these young men. Whether they are called at 18 or 18½ or 19, as high-school graduates or as college freshmen, we must give them the richest educational experience of which we are capable before they go, and the greatest educational opportunities of which we are capable when they come back. Only thus can we put in the field an army that knows what it fights for and loves what it knows, the present soldiers and the future scholars.

This is the prime responsibility of American higher education in the emergency. Apart from preserving the higher learning that for 2,000 years has instructed and illuminated western civilization, apart from the scientific research that may hold our lives and our national security in the balance, alone and distinct and urgent, is the intellectual and spiritual fate of the men of fighting age today who will be tomorrow's philosophers and statesmen. They are our best hope of survival. What do we propose to do for them?

One of the first answers on everyone's lips is "acceleration." In the terms in which it is generally understood, I think this is a poor answer. These terms contemplate a round-the-clock, three-term cycle that crowds four normal academic years into less than three calendar years and keeps on revolving until the faculty collapses, the students revolt, or the emergency ends, with the odds favoring the demise of the faculty. Here we have another expression of our naïveté as to the nature and purpose of education. Our colleges and universities may be driven to accelerate by financial necessity, by the terms of our military service law, by ROTC contracts, or some other force majeure. I do not know a single member of the teaching profession who has anything good to say for it on its merits. Our purpose is not to save our students from the draft or salvage their tuitions or get them as far as we can up the 4-year ladder before they are called to duty. Our purpose is to give them a sense of what they are fighting for, a mature introduction to the higher learning of their civilization in the fullness of its humanistic wisdom and scientific genius, and a desire that will survive the drudgery of military service to come back and carry that civilization forward.

We cannot accomplish this purpose by accelerating. I think we would come nearer to it if we gave our students fewer courses and let them take their time with their studies. When I described acceleration recently to a distinguished French colleague, a member of the Collège de France whose ancestors have been teachers since the eighteenth century, he shook his head sadly and said: "Knowledge without culture. Knowledge without pleasure. Absorption without digestion." "Followed by regurgitation," I prompted. "I hope so," he replied; "that at least would show that the students were healthy." To keep our fields fertile we practice crop rotation. Shall we do less for our minds? To speed up our basic courses in the arts and sciences for this long-drawn time of trouble promises nothing but intellectual erosion and academic dust bowls. No one suggests that we take our summers off to loaf. Our faculties need them for the research and writing that sustains their teaching through the academic year. To our self-supporting students (a great majority in the Nation) they are an economic necessity. Our ROTC units might use them to intensify both the course work and outdoor training which they have to conduct at a minimum during the academic year. Students deferred for specialized nonmilitary training could make similar use of them. For these two groups, for students not yet called up, and ultimately for those returning from service, I would be willing to compromise on an 8-week summer term of intensive work in such subjects (for example, foreign languages or elementary mathematics) as lend themselves to intensive treatment and afford a contrast with the regular term's work. But as a matter of principle, I would far rather award a BA degree for three rich, unhurried years than for four lean ones run off against a stop watch.

In the long run it may be necessary to shorten the time consumed in the eight grades of high school and college. If students have to budget 2 or more years to military service they may very well become impatient with the 4-year college curriculum. I do not see why we should not make it possible for them to earn their B. A. degrees in 3 years, whether consecutive or interrupted by military service. But there is one fundamental condition precedent. To accomplish this purpose, without cheapening the B. A., means jacking up our standards of secondary education. We cannot give a 3-year B. A. to students who are inadequately prepared for it. Even with the 4-year degree, as every college admissions office knows, our secondary-school performance is very uneven in this respect. At the best our secondary schools are as good as any in the world, and with a few curricular extensions and revisions could easily carry their students as far as any. At the worst their students are ill-prepared for a 4-year B. A., and the worst greatly depresses the average. The result is that the best-trained students mark time as college freshmen while their less-favored classmates catch up, and they all enter sophomore year from scratch. To "accelerate" by eliminating this redundancy and waste motion would accomplish an educational reform long overdue in the United States. The emergency gives us a powerful incentive to attempt it.

The only reason why the worst American secondary schools should not be as good as the best is our indifference, our failure to comprehend the purpose of education. This is what tolerates the politics, incompetence, and miserably inadequate teachers' salaries that prolong the adolescence of the American youth and send him off to college with a child's mind in a man's body. Here is an area of war effort in which our colleges and universities could cooperate with our secondary schools to the mutual advantage of both and the incalculable advantage of the Nation. Here, conceivably, is a mission for our college teachers temporarily unemployed by military service legislation. Matching grants of public and private funds in support of this mission, properly defined and administered, would be a direct investment in the future of our political institutions and our culture.

V

There are many things our colleges and universities might do to improve the educational advantages of the men going off to war and the opportunities awaiting them on their return. They could run pilot plants to test and perfect the curricula of our twelfth and thirteenth grades, an experiment that might offer immediate benefits to the students and colleges concerned and have far-reaching consequences for our entire educational system. It would almost surely reveal more effective methods of accelerating—that is, by eliminating waste and treating boys like men instead of men like boys—than trying to pour 4 quarts into a 3-quart bottle. They, the colleges and universities—both on their own and in cooperation with

the United States Armed Forces Institute—might offer extension courses for men on military service. This might have many advantages. It would keep track of students who had left after a year of college. It would help sustain their momentum. It might enable them to anticipate a course or two. At the very least it would offer an improvement on the Army's educational comics. Both projects—the pilot plants and the extension courses—would have the practical advantages of providing employment for the faculty and income for the college.

This is a time for self-inspection and self-improvement, for which opportunities exist on every campus. Far be it from me to say what others should do: I am too busy with the mote in my own eye. But I seem to see a country which wants better of its educational system, and deserves better of it, than it gets. Wherefore the discrepancy? Because, and here I return to my theme, we do not understand its purpose. We still think of it as a luxury and a privilege, when in reality it is a necessity and an obligation. We still (too often and too many of us) confuse it with other things, with politics, with business, with athletic sports. Once we see it clearly, how it all hangs together, from the primary school to the graduate school, and serves its purpose, in Jefferson's phrase, as "the most legitimate engine of government," I am convinced that we will speedily find ways for higher education to serve us in the emergency. We will find ways to rescue our colleges and universities from their financial difficulties and enlist them in the common cause. To doubt our ability to afford this is to doubt our reason. In 1947, the year of the Truman Commission's Report, we spent $1,005,000,000 on higher education in the United States. Last year we spent slightly over $1,000,000,000 on television sets. Five years ago nobody owned a television set. This is brand-new money, spent on a new toy, having nothing to do with the emergency, our security, or our survival, but only with our pleasure. It tends to prove—does it not?—that we can always find the money for what we want if we want it badly enough.

I would argue from this that we can easily afford to finance our mixed system of public and private higher education as an essential industry in the emergency and an essential key to the survival and progress of our civilization. But the will must precede the plans. That is why I would say to the planners and accelerators what Thoreau urged his preacher to say to his well-intentioned, nervous, action-starved, news-hungry neighbors: "Pause! Avast! Why so seeming fast, but deadly slow?"

Saving Taxpayers' Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union in editorial comment has hit the nail squarely on the head as to what we must do in Congress in order to effect really extensive budget reductions and increase the take-home pay for wage earners. We can make cuts here and there in appropriation bills and, of course, should do so where extravagances stick out like a sore thumb. But the only way a sufficient reduction will be brought about which will really hit pay dirt is through the elimination of services, activities, and functions which cannot measure up to the test of essentiality in these times of necessarily increased defense expenditures.

We have endeavored to point the way to at least one method by which this problem can be approached systematically and courageously. Those of us who have sponsored the bill to breathe life into the Hoover Commission have no particular pride of authorship. But we do urge, I believe justifiably, that if anyone has a better plan to meet this extremely urgent problem, they should come up with it. The important thing is not how the job is done, but that it be done.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union. The editorials follow:

SAVING TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer at a recent meeting of the Ohio Newspaper Association asked the help of newspaper publishers on what he called a troublesome problem—"the problem of saving money, specifically the taxpayers' money."

He pointed out that trimming here and there is not enough, that real economy must rest on dropping functions and services that the Federal Government now performs. This is certainly true.

Then the Secretary suggests that instead of making general statements about Government economy, the publishers might draw up a list of specific activities which they think could be eliminated.

"The President," he said, "on several occasions has asked for specific recommendations of activities which can be eliminated."

We cannot believe that Secretary Sawyer has kept very close to the problem of economy in Government or has watched very closely the President's attitude toward cutting Government down to size. The problem hasn't been troublesome enough in the right quarters.

The fact is that any number of carefully considered lists of nonessential activities of Government have been made.

A year ago the Committee for Economic Development, of which Marion Folsom, of Rochester, is chairman, carried out a thorough research project and came up with a list of specific proposals for balancing the budget. Nothing happened.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, also prepared a list.

Senator BYRD, who as head of the joint committee on executive expenditures has watched Federal spending more closely than any other man, had a list last year and has a new one this year.

Representative KENNETH KEATING and 10 other Members of the House have bills to recall the Hoover Commission to point out what activities, in view of our new world situation and the gigantic increase in defense spending, are nonessential.

Instead of going around the country asking for suggestions, it would seem more appropriate to get to work on the sound suggestions that have already been made.

CUTTING AGAIN

The House is back at a familiar point. It is tweeking the noses of "those bureaucrats downtown" by slicing a bit here and there off appropriation bills.

The first three items in the Treasury and Post Office bill each took cuts totaling $898,000, with deeper cuts pending.

Readers of this newspaper will know that these and even deeper cuts will be applauded here.

But the fact is that they don't mean a thing.

So long as the Treasury and Post Office—or other departments—are required by Congress to perform certain functions and services, they will be performed no matter what cost Congress sets in the appropriation bills. If the cost is greater than the allowance in the bill, the department will come back for a deficiency appropriation—and get it.

Congress can make real cuts in appropriations only by trimming the functions and services. It cannot win a reputation for economy by merely whittling appropriations now and passing deficiency appropriations later.

Representatives KENNETH KEATING and 10 other Representatives have a bill before the House to recall the Hoover Commission to guide Congress in listing the functions and services that in this emergency are nonessential.

This is the way to wipe the slate clean. Support of this bill and compliance with the Commission's recommendations will separate the sheep from the goats on the economy issue. Until then, shaving a little here and there is sound and fury, signifying practically nothing.

Senate Concurrent Resolution, General Assembly, State of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, as adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa on March 16, 1951:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has by arbitrary abuse of authority forced on the potato growers of northern Iowa unwanted marketing agreements by the use of an illegal if not fraudulent referendum reminiscent of the methods of dictator governments; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan in the administration of the notorious and infamous potato program is seeking to act as a potato czar in 12 Iowa counties and to govern the marketing practices of northern Iowa farmers without their consent or approval; and

"Whereas this purpose has been shown specifically in the case of Harold McKinley, of St. Ansgar, Iowa, and is threatened in relation to the other potato growers of 12 Iowa counties; and

"Whereas Brannan is trying to force these Iowa growers to market only those potatoes which meet his approval under regulations against which the Iowa growers voted overwhelmingly, 24 to 1; and

"Whereas Brannan then overcame this overwhelming and disapproving majority by blanketing the Iowa counties into a voting area which contained four other States and part of a fifth; and

"Whereas the resulting district was a political sham and a shameless example of gerrymandering which destroyed the right of Iowa farmers to determine how they shall be governed and how they shall market their own produce; and

"Whereas they were forced into an area where they were subjected to the domination of the would-be potato czar and must accept his choices as their representatives and must observe his regulations over their business; and

"Whereas he has created discrimination between these growers and their neighbors outside the artificial boundaries which he set; and

"Whereas he will cause them severe business losses as well as the sacrifice of their liberties unless corrective action is taken; and

"Whereas the methods of coercion employed by the United States Secretary of Agriculture in the above instance can be applied to the growers of other agricultural products and can also be used to curb free competition in industry; and

"Whereas the practice of government by administrative directives if unchecked can result in loss of opportunity and the basic freedoms on which this country was founded; and

"Whereas just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the house concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States give serious consideration to the passage of appropriate legislation specifically limiting the Secretary of Agriculture in the use of directives; be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress give earnest consideration to the proposition that the lawmaking power is constitutionally an exclusive prerogative of legislative bodies and Congress should take immediate steps to thwart every encroachment on that power; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House in Congress, and to each Member of the Iowa delegations in the Congress of the United States, under seal of his office.

"X. T. PRENTIS."

We, W. H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Rebuke Should Hit Higher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York World Telegram. The editorial follows:

REBUKE SHOULD HIT HIGHER

Natural and proper aftermath of the Hiss trial and conviction, which the United States Supreme Court refused to review, is the bill introduced again by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING of this State which would forbid the appearance of Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses.

The public was shocked by seeing Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed take the stand for Alger Hiss at his first trial. It also became more evident than ever that judges who let themselves act as character witnesses in a given case risk impairing their judicial dignity.

Congress would do well to extend the prohibition to cover all Federal judges. States could and should follow the example in their own courts.

However, in the case of Hiss who stands convicted as a conspicuous liar, not to say sly, it's a pity prohibition or rebuke can't rise even higher than mere judges to reach President Truman, who pooh-poohed the Hiss affair as only a "red herring," also to reach Secretary of State Acheson who still says he will "never turn his back on Hiss."

National and International Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter from a very dear friend whose comments refer to a questionnaire which she filled out with intelligence and foresight. Her letter expresses deep concern about our national and international problems which is shared by thinking people in Jefferson County and all over our country. The completed questionnaire illustrates how constructive and helpful housewives can be in world affairs today.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *March 21, 1951.*

DEAR LAURIE: Far be it from me to know all the answers to the world's problems. These questions are certainly "scorchers." I can understand now why it takes so long for our Government to decide on a problem, with so many in it and for all of them to make up their minds, and arrive at one definite solution.

I will bet I have worried over these questions and given them more serious thought and consideration than the President himself, and the paper has not been stuck back in a drawer somewhere either. I have had it out in plain view; so, every time I passed by it, I would give the subjects more thought.

We have talked and argued them among ourselves, and when we had company we would discuss them. When I go out I discuss them with friends, but this poor, feeble mind of mine gets more puzzled and complicated to arrive at definite answers or put my opinions down in the form of yes or no.

I realize we think we know all the answers about how to run a government, in bickering back and forth at home among ourselves, but when it comes to the test of our opinion being used in the final decision of such strategic values as you are required to make, my over-all knowledge is quite limited and I have only a meager conception of all the issues involved.

For example, who am I to say whether 18-year olds should be drafted, or veterans, or fathers, with a flat yes or no and no "if's" or "and's" or "but's"?

Laurie, we leave it up to you. Paul and I feel you can properly handle the situation. No matter what the question, we have full confidence in you and much sympathy for you. We feel that you are doing a fine job.

That was a wonderful speech. Best regards to the family and office personnel.

Sincerely,

LULU SMITH.
Mrs. Paul V. Smith.

Minks and Winks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, an editorial writer from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press has offered an explanation, reasonable though perhaps inaccurate, why the Secretary of Agriculture was recently disturbed by the insertion in a Washington newspaper of an advertisement announcing the recovery of a natural pastel mink coat.

If the lady in the pink mink has been the cause of sounding the death knell of the Brannan plan for regimenting the farmers and socializing agriculture, perhaps her $9,500 mink coat has not been as expensive for the taxpayers as was originally assumed when the shocking revelation about her adornment was made before a Senate committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include below the comments of the editorial writer in question:

MINKS AND WINKS

Everything is confusion between Washington and Key West. New York Congressman KEATING says on the radio that the President has fired the now famous Lady in the Pink Mink (a swell title for a musical). The President, at Key West, angrily denies it. KEATING answers that she was, too, fired but the President got mad because it became known and reestablished her as the confidential secretary of his confidential secretary, which makes it very confidential indeed.

Dropping the gal with the royal pastel mink ($8,450) has never been considered, Key West says. The charge is that this coat was paid for by Joe Rosenbaum, fast moving lobbyist and lawyer, along with commissions, to obtain White House influence on questionable RFC loans.

It is easy to understand Mr. Truman's embarrassing position. If he fires her he confesses to error; and others must follow, like the toppling of a row of dominoes. If he makes no such move to clean house (White House) the stench continues.

Worst of all, practical jokers are moving in on the affair. In Saturday's Washington Star a liner ad advertised as found—Natural pastel mink coat, recovered at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.—the White House. The telephone number of Secretary of Agri-

culture Charles Brannan was used. He denounces it as the work of a cruel, sadistic, damned fool.

But you can never tell about these things. Maybe the liner was inserted by a disgusted taxpayer who thinks all wasteful spending comes under some Brannan plan.

Letter From J. D. Garrard, of Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a letter from Mr. J. D. Garrard, of Birmingham, Ala. As Mr. Garrard points out, he is one of the many taxpayers who are carrying the load which is getting heavier and heavier. I am calling his letter to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives at this time, as he has requested me to do.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *March 12, 1951.*
Congressman LAURIE BATTLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAURIE: I've written you many times, but I get so mad before I finish the letters that I burn them.

The utter disregard that the Congress as well as the White House has for the taxpayers' money, the pampering of labor leaders, the planned high cost of living by the so-called wise men in the White House, the potato, butter, and eggs mess, higher and higher taxes to be spent more and more freely are a few of the things that make me mad.

In yesterday's paper I saw a little item that said the refurnishing of the House of Representatives cost $2,667,000. I paid more tax this year than I ever have before, but it would take me more than 3,000 years to pay the refurnishing bill for a place for you to sit in. Are the halls paved in gold? How could that much money be honestly spent just for refurnishing this building? How much of it bought mink coats or deep freezers, etc.? You know somebody got filthy rich on that deal. Why don't you investigate before instead of after the money is wasted? I can't have anything to compare with this House of Representatives' furnishings and there are millions of taxpayers in the same fix, and although they may not write and tell you, I bet they don't like it any more than I do.

I think the elected Representatives of the people should be more careful how they spend the taxpayers' money than they are of their own, and I am darn tired of the Congress giving billions of dollars to every nation that asks for it. You know it's my money that you are giving away, and my vote for you doesn't give you the right to give Britain billions of dollars to become a Socialist form of government or to keep Franco in power in Spain. I am not an isolationist. I am a taxpayer and I'm getting tired of being pushed around by Mr. Atlee or some other foreigner with his hand out.

If you don't get this, you can say "Well he burned that one, too."

Sincerely,
J. D. GARRARD.

P. S.—Please read this on the House floor.

Letter From a GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a grateful GI who is thanking our Government for helping him. His constructive approach to the solution of our difficult problems is commendable.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *February 28, 1951.*
Congressman LAURIE C. BATTLE,
Federal Building,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. BATTLE: I want to first thank the Government through you for my education on the GI bill. I think that this benefit was the best that could have been given a veteran.

As a very scared but uninformed citizen I would like to add my opinions to the many you undoubtedly already received.

It seems to me that we stand to lose to Russia by either of two ways, military invasion or economic disorder.

The present draft laws should take care of the next couple of years, but I've heard the experts are worrying about the next 10 years. It is my understanding that the present draftee is released to the Reserves when he finishes his duty. Maybe this would be a good time to set up a system similar to that of the Swiss. They stayed out of two world wars. I have heard that all physically qualified men are required to serve in a form of active reserve without pay. Of course, any such system for this country would require a lot of modification but the basic idea ought to be sound. Think of all the available manpower and brains that would be on tap for such occasions as the present. Also the interest of the general public would tend to keep the military in better shape during peacetime. Yes, I'm in the active Reserves (Navy) and I still think it's a good idea.

As for economics I know very little about it. We spend a powerful lot of money both at home and abroad and have little to show for it. The national debt can hardly be written on one sheet of paper. We pay the farmers to keep prices up and have price control to keep them down. Advocate competition and pay the airlines and others to keep them in business. Try to regulate or "antitrust" large firms out of business. Something is wrong but I don't know the answer, either.

Looks like we might do with more and better publicity for the United States in Europe and also on this side of the world. We need all the friends we can get.

I'm also against any Firearms Registration Act and for the statehood of Alaska and Hawaii.

Yours very truly,
MAFUS R. BIRD.

Radio Network Monopoly Suppresses Broadcasting of Kefauver Crime Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on several previous occasions I have pointed out to this Congress the monopolistic and restraint of trade practices which the four major broadcasting networks—the National Broadcasting Co., the American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Mutual Broadcasting System—are conducting in the important field of radio broadcasting and the serious effect of these practices on the economy of the radio industry and, most of all, the serious effect on the radio listening public.

Last week the American Broadcasting Co. saw fit to prevent hundreds of thousands of listeners from hearing the most important public service broadcast in some time, that of the Kefauver crime committee hearings.

I believe the best way to explain this situation is to read an announcement made over radio station WSAY in Rochester, N. Y., relative to this station's effort to bring to the thousands of Rochester radio listeners the broadcast of these crime hearings, and the refusal of the American Broadcasting Co. to allow this station to broadcast them.

In addition to this announcement, I wish to submit, as reported to me, the telephone conversations between Gordon P. Brown, the owner of WSAY in Rochester, N. Y., and the officials of the American Broadcasting Co., telephone conversations of Mr. Brown and his sales manager, Mr. Kelley, with the local ABC radio station outlet, copy of a complaint filed by Mr. Brown with the Federal Communications Commission regarding this serious situation, and copy of rebroadcast permission as requested of these networks by Mr. Brown's radio station WSAY:

WSAY ANNOUNCEMENT

WSAY wishes to bring you, the Rochester radio listeners, this important message. On March 21 the only available broadcast of the Kefauver crime committee hearings which Rochesterians could hear were those which were broadcast on television. WSAY on this date requested permission of the ABC network to rebroadcast these important hearings so that the hundreds of thousands of radio listeners in the city could hear these vital broadcasts. On this date the ABC network refused WSAY permission to rebroadcast these hearings and promptly arranged with the local ABC outlet to broadcast them by delayed recording. Yet, in spite of this, some of the most important portions of these hearings were lost to the Rochester listeners, particularly all of that portion of the hearings broadcast in New York City. Because of ABC's refusal to allow WSAY to rebroadcast important radio programs and

to rebroadcast the Kefauver crime committee hearings, the Rochester radio listeners have been deprived of many vital portions of these hearings, as well as other important radio programs. WSAY for years has made it a point to attempt to bring to its listeners many of the important radio programs broadcast but has been thwarted throughout these years by the refusal of the networks to allow this station to do so. WSAY believes that it is high time that such restraint of broadcasting be stopped and is making formal complaint to the FCC regarding this practice of the networks, which has gone on over a period of years. WSAY suggests that you, the listeners, immediately send a postal card or letter to Senator TOBEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. I am sure that when the Senators are informed of this situation they will take immediate steps to correct the further restraint of radio programing, by the radio networks, to the Rochester listeners. Don't forget, write Senator TOBEY today, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. Tell him you want him to look into the withholding of important radio programs from the Rochester listeners by the various networks.

Remember, WSAY is exclusively Rochester owned and operated, and is not in any way controlled by the networks or owned by interests outside of Rochester.

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN GORDON P. BROWN, OF RADIO STATION WSAY, AND DON SHAW, OF ABC, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

Mr. BROWN. This is Mr. Brown at radio station WSAY. We have been checking on television broadcasts of hearings in New York and find no AM station is broadcasting it.

Mr. SHAW. I know just what you are going to ask me, and before you ask me I am going to say that the answer is "No!"

We have had this come up in several cases. [Mr. Shaw stated that in all these cases the requests could not be granted as it could not be granted to WSAY because "our own station in Rochester would be in our hair in 5 minutes. This would be violating the territorial rights of our own stations."]

Mr. BROWN. How come you're not putting it on your AM network?

Mr. SHAW. We have had so many problems. [Mr. Shaw continued to explain the problems arising during the broadcasting by TV of the Senate hearing.] Our TV station in Columbus had requests from two stations. [Mr. Shaw continued to explain that carrying the audio portion of these hearings by the AM stations on their network "would lose too much commercial time. In television we did not have this problem."]

(Mr. Brown asked if this was then the complete situation.) I will ask our director of AM stations and get a final answer.

(Mr. Brown asked if he could hold on while Mr. Shaw got a definite answer.)

(Mr. Shaw replied that yes, the AM station's relation man was with him.)

(There was a pause of 3 minutes while they apparently discussed the situation together in New York before answering us on the phone.)

Mr. WEILEY. This is Mr. Weiley. We are limited in offering you the audio feed of the Senate investigations primarily for two reasons; our own stations would have priority rights on it; second, we might run into A. T. & T. trouble over franchises, and that would involve legal complications. It is a very interesting subject and one which should be delved into more thoroughly.

(At this point the conversation was concluded.)

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN FRED RIPLEY, OF WARC, AND ROBERT KELLEY, OF WSAY, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

Mr. KELLEY. Bob Kelley speaking. I want to find out are you duplicating any of this Kefauver committee thing on AM?

Mr. RIPLEY. No.

Mr. KELLEY. You're not, huh?

Mr. RIPLEY. No.

Mr. KELLEY. I was just wondering if it was going out on AM.

Mr. RIPLEY. I think if it were we would carry it. However, we haven't been offered any yet. We would certainly carry it. They have got an awful ride on TV. We haven't been offered any, but if we are, I think we will carry it.

Mr. KELLEY. Have you asked for it at all?

Mr. RIPLEY. The network has been trying to line up something, but they haven't been successful as yet.

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN FRED RIPLEY, OF WARC, AND CORDON P. BROWN, OF WSAY, MARCH 22, 1951

Mr. BROWN. Are you people going to carry the Kefauver committee hearings?

Mr. RIPLEY. There is no doubt we will if it comes through.

Mr. BROWN. Naturally you have first choice on them. You can broadcast them off of WHAM-TV. If you are going to do this, naturally we won't.

Mr. RIPLEY. We haven't even considered rebroadcasting them off WHAM-TV.

Mr. BROWN. There is a chance that the network itself would do something. As I understand, they aren't going to offer it because their commercial schedule is rather high. We want to give you first opportunity, but if you don't want it——

Mr. RIPLEY. Give me a chance to talk to Sam.

Mr. BROWN. I talked to them and they said the first chance was up to you.

Mr. RIPLEY. We have been trying to get an O. K. on the network. I think we are going to get permission, and if we can, we are going to carry it. I expect clearances by tomorrow. Going right to headquarters, they haven't given anybody in the country permission for doing it yet.

Mr. BROWN. If you can get permission, you are going to do it? We wanted to check; how can they refuse you permission?

Mr. RIPLEY. I think they will O. K. it.

SUPPLEMENT TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND SETTING ASIDE OF FCC ACTION

Re license renewal of ABC owned and operated Stations WENR, WENR-TV, Chicago; KA-4442, KA-4443, area, Chicago; KGO, KGO FM, San Francisco; KA-441, area, San Francisco; WJZ and Auk, New York; KA-4444, KA-4445, area, New York, N. Y.; KA-4180, KA-4440, area, Los Angeles; WXYZ-TV, Detroit, KA-4865, KA-3136, area, Detroit. FCC Public Release No. 60781, March 27, 1951.)

As supplement to my request for reconsideration in setting aside the F. C. C. action regarding the renewal of the ABC owned and operated stations, I submit the following additional objection herewith:

Rochester, N. Y., has four network affiliated AM stations, my independent station WSAY, and one daytime independent station, also one television station WHAM-TV. A great deal of interest has developed in the broadcast of the Kefauver committee crime hearings in New York City. We desired to broadcast the audio portion of these hearings so that people without television sets in the Rochester area could hear them. We requested permission of ABC to rebroadcast the audio portion of the TV broadcast of these hearings, and we telephoned Mr. Donald Shaw of TV station relations of ABC in New York City. He referred me to Mr. Weiley of AM station relations of ABC in New York City. I learned from Mr. Shaw that several other requests have been made throughout the United States to rebroadcast these hearings on AM stations, but all were refused.

Mr. Shaw stated that the AM ABC network and affiliated stations could not carry these broadcasts because of their large amount of commercial programs. Mr. Shaw turned me over to Mr. Weiley who gave the following excuses for being unable to allow me permission to rebroadcast the Government hearings. We quote Mr. Weiley: "This is Mr. Weiley. We are limited in offering you the audio feed of the Senate investigations primarily for two reasons; our own stations would have priority rights on it; second we might run into A. T. & T. trouble over franchises, and that would involve legal complications. It is a very interesting subject and one which should be delved into more thoroughly."

Because the local ABC AM outlet was not broadcasting the audio portion of the TV broadcast of these hearings, the majority of the people of Rochester who own only AM sets were unable to hear this most important broadcast of Mr. Kefauver and Mr. Tobey's investigating committee, particularly the part most interesting to Rochester listeners, that portion conducted in New York City.

After being refused permission to rebroadcast these programs by ABC in New York City, I telephoned the local ABC outlet, WARC, in Rochester, N. Y., who advised me according to the enclosed transcript of my conversation with WARC's manager, Mr. Fred Ripley. It is quite apparent from this conversation that WARC had not intended to rebroadcast the audio portion of the TV broadcast of these programs, but they were waiting for the ABC audio network to place it on the regular AM lines.

If WSAY had had blanket permission to rebroadcast these Government hearings, the listeners of Rochester, N. Y., would not have been deprived of the most important part of the testimony that which was conducted in New York City. There is no doubt that the fact that WSAY, in an aggressive effort to bring this Kefauver program to the Rochester listeners on AM radio, finally forced ABC to feed the program to its affiliate, WARC, in Rochester. The rebroadcast of the audio portion of the TV program of the Kefauver committee crime hearings would have been picked up from WHAM-TV.

WSAY has consistently requested permission (per attached mimeographed request) of the ABC owned and operated stations whose licenses are involved in this proceeding. Attached hereto in addition to the copies of my conversation with WARC's manager Mr. Fred Ripley, are copies of my telephone conversation with the officials of the ABC network.

It is imperative that the ABC license renewals involved herein not be granted until such time as the ABC network realizes that blanket permission to rebroadcast must be given in instances where they do not own the property rights of the programs to be rebroadcast.

I am confident that further investigation by the FCC in this matter will disclose the fact that many communities throughout the United States were deprived of this important broadcast because of the undue restrictions and misinterpretations of the rebroadcast rule by the ABC network. This is quite apparent from the conversation which I had with the ABC officials.

I urgently request that your Commission consider this as a supplement to my request for reconsideration in setting aside of FCC action, filed with you on March 13 regarding

the license renewal of ABC owned and operated stations; and that your Commission give careful study to the problems involved and request that the ABC network cease such misinterpretation of the rebroadcast rule, as well as such restraint of rebroadcasting, and that your Commission not renew the licenses of the ABC owned and operated stations until such a time as they discontinue the practices mentioned above.

GORDON P. BROWN,
Radio Station WSAY, Rochester, N. Y.
MARCH 29, 1951.

REBROADCAST PERMISSION AS IT PERTAINS TO FCC RULE 3.191 (d)

We hereby grant blanket permission to Station WSAY to rebroadcast the programs of those sponsors desiring them so rebroadcast by WSAY; and which sponsors are using Station ——— as the originating station for their programs. It is expressly understood that the above blanket permission for rebroadcasting is only for the purpose as it may apply to section 3.191 (d) of the FCC rules and regulations as quoted below; and that nothing in this blanket permission to rebroadcast shall give permission to radio station WSAY for such rebroadcasting as it shall pertain to any program, talent, or any other rights of the program which ——— does not control; nor shall WSAY rebroadcast the program without the express authority and permission of the sponsors, which originate their programs over Station ———.

SECTION 3.191 (D) OF THE FCC RULES AND REGULATIONS

"No licensee of a standard or high-frequency broadcast station shall rebroadcast the program of any other class of United States radio station without written authority having first been obtained from the Commission upon application accompanied by written consent or certification of consent of the licensee of the station originating the program."

Mr. Speaker, it is irony personified that the Senate of these United States entrusted the proceedings of its chambers and gave permission to the American Broadcasting Co. to broadcast these most important crime committee hearings only to find that this radio chain violated this trust of free speech given it by the Senate by suppressing the free broacasting of the public Senate hearings in many communities of this country; and not only this, but the American Broacasting Co. proceeded to make a commercial radio program out of the public hearings of the Senate investigators and their witnesses.

Mind you, my fellow Congressmen, not only did the American Broadcasting Co. withhold the free broacast of this hearing to radio listeners, but this network made a commercial program of these hearings and sold the proceedings of these Government public hearings to Time magazine for its sponsorship. I quote a paragraph from an article titled "Kefauvercasts Prove a Real Tele Bargain," from page 15 of the March 31 issue of the trade paper Billboard, carrying a date line New York, March 24:

ABC-TV PANS OUT

The one outfit to come out ahead on the hearings was ABC–TV which sold the proceedings to Time magazine. The only cancellations suffered by ABC-TV were spot announcements, since the one night the hearings were carried by ABC-TV fell into open time. ABC-TV isn't revealing the deal it made with Time, but it's known that the magazine bought the event at bargain rates.

The American Broadcasting Co. has violated the confidence and trust of the Senate. As licensee of numerous radio broadcasting and TV stations, it has violated its public trust and service obligations and, further, this radio chain has violated the requirement under the licenses which it holds to be "a public interest, convenience, and necessity."

It is high time that the practices of restraint of trade, the restriction of broadcasting and rebroadcasting of radio programs be stopped by these radio chains; and I wish to ask that the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission take immediate action against these radio chains to protect the free radio of this country, and, also, that this Congress favorably consider H. R. 73 and H. R. 10, bills designed to prevent such suppression of radio broadcasting.

A New Direction to World Peace—Help the Russians Get Rid of Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a resolution introduced by me yesterday, the purpose of which is to give a new direction to our foreign policy: an alliance between the American people and the Russian people and other peoples of the Russian Union to help their liberation from their present Communist enslavement. The resolution recently introduced in the Senate and in the House known as the McMahon reso'ution, in my opinion, is defective, faulty, and dangerous inasmuch as it seeks to have us enter into an agreement with Stalin. Agreements with Stalin abandons the peoples he has enslaved. Herewith is the text of the resolution introduced by me yesterday:

Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 in the following words: "* * * that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men,—deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."; and

Whereas the American people believe these principles are universal and apply to all men, everywhere, at all times and under all forms of government; and

Whereas these principles flow from certain essential truths, among which are—

That the Creator is the Author of every human being and the Source of his rights and that neither the state nor any other human agency has jurisdiction to exploit any human being or violate his rights;

That the state is a servant to mankind and not its master and may not pervert its administrative and police powers so as to make of them a weapon to violate human rights or to terrorize the people;

That there is a brotherhood of all men but only under the Fatherhood of God; and

Whereas communism wears a humanitarian cloak and poses as the messiah of social justice but in reality has given rise to the most reactionary regime of our time based on barbarism and slavery as a result of its immoral doctrine founded in malice setting man against man, class against class, and all men against God; and

Whereas communism thrusts itself beyond civil government and political philosophy, claiming the whole man, denying all spiritual values, denying his inalienable rights, and seeking to transform all human beings created by God in His Image into soulless biolcgical units, to be fitted into a military and economic machine designed for world revolution; and

Whereas communism, although not native to Russia, was adopted by a small, ruthless Bolshevik minority which by treachery, deceit, brutal force, and terror subverted and destroyed the freedom gained by the Russian people and other peoples within the former Russian Empire in their democratic revolution of February 1917; and

Whereas communism after coming to power in Russia succeeded until recently by means of false propaganda, deceit, police-state methods, and hermetically sealed frontiers, in keeping the non-Soviet world largely ignorant of the plight of the peoples within the Soviet Union and, in turn, keeping the peoples within the Soviet Union in ignorance of the true nature of conditions existing outside its borders and particularly of conditions in the democratic world; and

Whereas communism has taken the lives of tens of millions of human beings in the Soviet Union, including a vast number of the members of its own armed forces (other than in the late war), and has enslaved the peoples by robbing peasants of their farms and transforming them into landless agricultural robots; by chaining workers to their factories and transforming them into homeless industrial robots; by depriving intellectuals of freedom of creative work and thought and transforming them into voiceless ideological robots; by submitting vast numbers from all classes, both men and women; old and young, workers (industrial and white collar), peasants, and intellectuals, to the subhuman conditions of concentration camps in uninhabitable areas and transforming them into a nameless host of more than 15,000,000 state slaves; by the uprooting and dispersal of minority groups; by practicing genocide upon national groups within the Soviet Union and making of the Soviet Union a burial ground of nations; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying the institution of the family in the Soviet Union by an enforced collective way of life, by inordinate control and indoctrination of the children, and by setting members of the same family against one another through fear and terror; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying religion in the Soviet Union by fostering atheism, by ridiculing and persecuting the sincere religious expression of the people, by perverting religious instincts in the hearts of the young, by murdering the

representatives of religion, by destruction of places of worship and the abolition of religious institutions, by tolerating only religious services subservient to the state, and by deifying the leader of the Red regime; and

Whereas communism by force and deceit has transformed into a tool of international aggression, the Soviet Army, conscripted of peace-loving peasants, workers, and intellectuals whose true anti-Communist sentiment has been demonstrated by numerous revolts (such as: 1921—the revolt of the Baltic Fleet at Kronstadt led by Petritchenko; 1937—the plan to overthrow the Communist regime led by Marshal Tukhachevsky, head of all the Soviet armed forces, resulting in the "purge" of four of the five Soviet Army marshals, 390 generals, and over 30,000 other Soviet Army officers; 1943-45—movement involving an anti-Communist army of liberation of over 800,000 soldiers led by General Vlassov), the same army whose patriotic spirit was manifested in the victorious march from Stalingrad to Berlin in the gallant defense of their homeland; and

Whereas communism by making false and appealing promises, in an atmosphere of ideological black-out in the Soviet Union, perverts the patriotic fervor of a certain number of young idealists, who have a genuine desire to serve their people, and exploits it for an antihuman conspiracy; and

Whereas communism in order to extend still further its tyranny concentrates its efforts on promoting artificial hostile feelings between the friendly and peace-loving peoples within the Soviet Union and the people of the United States and of other free nations whose basic aspirations as human beings are identical, and who have no real conflicting interests; and

Whereas communism not satisfied with the exploitation of millions of people in the Soviet Union has already forced Marxist-Stalinist tyranny on the once free and independent nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and also parts of Germany and Austria, and initially on Yugoslavia which still follows the Communist ideology, and in the words of the United States Supreme Court Justice Jackson in the recent case of *American Communication Association* v. *Douds* (339 U. S. at p. 429), "The international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'état, and terrorism and assassination."; and communism has conquered China and is in the process of attempting to subjugate Korea, Tibet, Indochina, and Malaya, and seeks eventually to enslave freemen everywhere; and

Whereas agreements made by any one or more of the free nations with the Communist regime that now enslaves the peoples within the Soviet Union strengthen materially and morally the position of said regime, weaken the resistance to Communist tyranny, and dim the hopes of the people for liberation; such agreements with said regime being used by it only to its advantage for the purposes of accumulating additional strength and to the disadvantage of every other country seeking honorably to compose differences with it; it being one of the prime techniques of communism to disregard truth and honor and to ignore agreements whenever opportune; and

Whereas, in contrast to the treacherous fifth column that operate in the free countries of the world to enslave them to international communism, there exists in Russia a potential force for freedom composed of the great majority of the peoples of Russia who yearn for liberty, which force, if activated by the encouragement and positive aid of the free peoples of the world, will enable them to liberate themselves and overthrow the Communist tyranny and help place mankind on the path of peace instead of plunging it into the holocaust of a third world war; and

Whereas past tragic mistakes in the policies of certain of the free nations, including that of the United States, toward the Communist regime in the Soviet Union and a failure fully to understand the true nature, extent, and the enormity of its aggressive designs have substantially contributed toward placing said Communist regime in a position where it now is a clear and present danger to world peace and the free progress of mankind compelling the United States and other free nations again to undertake a vast program of armament expenditures; and

Whereas, while we rearm with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peace, we are determined to defend our freedom; and

Whereas rearmament alone coupled with an attempt to compose differences with the Communist regime by treaties and agreements leaving undisturbed said regime and its present enormous conquests of aggression will over a period of years, place a crushing burden of armaments upon the free world that eventually could well, of itself, destroy freedom; and such agreements and treaties would tend to stabilize said regime in its conquests and give a benediction to a way of life that has declared war on all human nature under its control; and

Whereas the world cannot long continue to exist half slave and half free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people with the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union between whom there are innumerable ties of kinship and concerning whose mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice there has always been an alliance. That alliance was symbolized in 1917, when the Russian people and other peoples of the Russian Empire had freed themselves from the autocracy of the czars but before they were enslaved by the Bolsheviks, by the words of President Wilson in behalf of the American people to the peoples of Russia: "Here is a fit partner for a league of honor."

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, solemnly pledges that the common struggle against communism in which this Nation, together with other free nations, is now engaged, is not directed against those who have been misled by communism through no fault of their own but against those who have misled them; that those who have unwittingly served the small clique in control of the Communist regime or in countries captive to it should not fear vengeance, provided they break off with communism; and that the American people recognize the right of the peoples of Russia and of the countries now held captive by said Communist regime to bring to justice their oppressors who are leading them into another world war that will mean the destruction of many more millions of lives and of many cities, homes, and the countryside within the Soviet Union.

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress of the United States hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the peoples within the Soviet Union have the right of self-determination (including the right of any of the nations within the Soviet Union to choose its own form of government and also the right to form a free federation) based on the free expression of popular will, namely, that no nation can be deprived of territory by force and that no nation can keep territory by force, and, by free election, to be governed by their own consent.

(b) It is further expressed to be the firm conviction of the American people that the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which in World War II they together with other people, shed their blood, among which freedoms are—

(1) the right of peasants to their own land, to work it as they see fit, and to dispose of the fruits of their labor as they see fit;

(2) the right of workers to select freely the type and place of their employment, and to obtain equitable wages and decent working hours and conditions through the organization of their own truly independent trade-unions;

(3) the right of intellectuals to freedom of scientific and artistic creation, to freedom of cultural intercourse with the whole world, and to establishment of educational, scientific, and cultural institutions, independent of State control;

(4) the right of political prisoners of all classes to immediate liberation and aid in rehabilitation;

(5) the freedom of religion, of speech, of thought, and of the press, and freedom of each national group to use its own language;

(6) the right of the people peaceably to assemble, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures;

(7) the right of the people to life, liberty, and private ownership of property; the right of an accused to a speedy and public trial in accordance with principles of law and justice;

(8) the freedom of movement within the country and of travel abroad and upon the high seas, together with the freedom to engage in commerce and pursuits of private enterprise and in all peaceful activities;

(9) the freedom of families from the Communist way of life and from undue state interference and control, and of parents to the education of their own children;

(10) the freedom of the Armed Forces to defend the legitimate interests of the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union, the right and obligation of the Armed Forces to protect the people from the Communist tyranny, and the freedom of the Armed Forces from being used and augmented by the Communist tyranny into an aggressive force both against its own people and against peaceful nations.

SEC. 4. To give meaning to their historic friendship for the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for an early liberation of the Russian people and the other peoples within the Soviet Union from their 33-year-long Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing about that liberation at the earliest possible date, the President of the United States is hereby requested—

(1) to make no further agreement and no commitments to the present Soviet regime that would tend in any way to maintain, stabilize, or further extend its power over the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union;

(2) to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which, among other things, recognizes the essentially evil nature of the Communist regime bent on the destruction of the United States and of the free world and distinguished between said regime and the Russian people and other peoples of the Soviet Union;

(3) to explore the methods whereby our representatives in the United Nations may urge that body to assist the Russian people and other peoples within the Soviet Union to obtain liberation from their present enslavement and exchange for their present representation in the United Nations a true repre-

sentation that can work for, rather than obstruct and undermine the efforts of all peoples of the world, for the first time in human history, effectively to lay down a true foundation for lasting peace and the undisturbed permanent coexistence of peoples;

(4) to explore the methods whereby the American people through their Government, and by private means with Government assistance and otherwise may offer material aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Russian people and other peoples within the Soviet Union and people in other Communist-dominated countries.

Anniversary of the North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact here in Washington by the ministers of the 12 original members.

The signing of this pact was a high light in the struggle of the free nations against the forces of slavery.

It is appropriate that we should be discussing here on this floor the question of the draft and universal military training while we celebrate this important anniversary.

The United States is a key nation in the pact. Our strength or weakness may well make or break the pact. An integral part of our strength will be the provisions for a strong draft bill accompanied by a program to provide universal military training.

The free nations took heart when the North Atlantic Pact was brought into being. They saw our Nation take its place on the battle line against possible Communist aggression.

They are now celebrating this anniversary in the free capitals in Europe. During their celebration they will have their eyes on our capital. They will be watching the outcome of our debate on strengthening our Nation.

Will we turn our back on the free nations on this anniversary? Will we make this anniversary a period of rejoicing, a period in which to reflect on the meaning of the strength and solidarity of the free nations, or will we leave the celebration to the masters of the Kremlin and turn our backs on our friends and allies? The answer is ours to make by writing a strong draft and universal military training program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the President on the occasion of the second anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

On the second birthday of the North Atlantic Treaty it is appropriate that we take stock of our progress.

The most encouraging fact which stands out today is that Europe is stronger and in a better position to defend itself than it was a year ago.

This stems from the determination of the free peoples of Europe to help themselves. Their determination as well as their strength has been increased by the assistance which we have been able to give them. Even more important, our joint efforts have acquired greater effectiveness through the establishment of General Eisenhower's unified command. For the first time in history there exists in peace an integrated international force whose object is to maintain peace through strength. Six years ago General Eisenhower led such a force to victory, but we devoutly pray that our present course of action will succeed and maintain peace without war.

The armed forces of the North Atlantic Treaty countries will grow more rapidly in the future as stepped-up training and production programs begin to bear fruit. An enormous military production program is under way in the United States, and our allies, despite limited facilities and resources, have already more than doubled their rate of military production.

Just as important as the forces which we are building together is the spirit of cooperation and joint effort which has been greatly strengthened. This is a solid achievement which will bring rewards of happiness and prosperity to our peoples long after the passing of the present emergency.

The events of the past 2 years have proved beyond question the wisdom of the course we adopted in signing the North Atlantic Treaty. Developments since the war have made it more clear than ever before that no nation can find safety behind its own frontiers—that the only security lies in collective security.

While we have reason to take pride in our accomplishments, we cannot forget that the road ahead is still long and hard. The people of the United States and the people of Europe must accept heavy burdens, with both determination and patience. I am confident that we will march forward together, with speed and vigor. Above all, I feel certain that we will not relax the great effort which is now under way.

Hon. Adolph J. Sabath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, has today attained the venerable age of four score and five. Few mortal men are privileged to reach this advanced age, and fewer still have attained such an incomparable record of achievement and service to our Nation as did our colleague whom we are honoring today.

His long and distinguished service in Congress, his inspiring leadership, and his courageous efforts to serve the best interests of our country and the American people have unquestionably earned for him the recognition as an elder statesman in the best and most noble tradition. He is a man of deep convictions and a great believer in human rights and humanitarian principles. Throughout his long service in this House, which extends over a period of nearly four and a half decades, he has constantly championed and supported all liberal and constructive legislation.

On this occasion, it is worth while recalling that Judge SABATH came to this country as an immigrant boy from Bohemia—present-day Czechoslovakia—and that largely by hard work and his own ability reached great heights as a national figure and an outstanding American. Today, he is almost an institution in himself, well-beloved by the people and revered by his colleagues in Congress.

It is my fervent wish, as we extend our congratulations and affection to ADOLPH SABATH on this day, that the good Lord will continue to spare him and to give him many long years so that our country may have the benefit of his wisdom and leadership.

Hon. John A. O'Donnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

I am pleased to have an opportunity to place into this permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a simple statement of praise for my friend, neighbor, and able Commissioner, the Honorable John A. O'Donnell, just retiring as Commissioner of the Philippine War Damage Commission by reason of the termination of the Commission according to law and upon the completion of its functions.

John A. O'Donnell, formerly of Scranton, Pa., and now of Washington, D. C., has served this particular Commission with distinction, and it is my privilege to so note the same in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to add that his work has not in any manner deviated from his background of work as a young man, as that career throughout his life to this point had every indication of ability and clean success.

I am happy to note that this Commission concluded its affairs most successfully and returned to the Treasury over $1,600,000 out of its administrative funds. This respect for Federal funds and careful use of the same indicates a serious regard for his trust and speaks more than words for his ability as an administrator.

For a man in his middle forties, educated at the University of Scranton, Harvard, and Georgetown, John O'Donnell has had progressively important assignments. Labor adviser at NRA, serious responsibility at ICC in the Division of Motor Carriers, private in the Army to

the rank of major in World War II. Important work with General Erskine in the reemployment agency after the war and in the function responsible for the return of our men to their work after the victory of War II. Then his assignment to the Philippine Commission.

Handling $400,000,000 for claims with but two other associates and in a far-away country, and doing the same with the complete praise of all concerned is an accomplishment. Receiving claims and making awards is difficult work, and when it is done in the aftermath of war and in a foreign country, and done with praise, seem to call for reiteration of the praise.

I am pleased to learn and note that in the presentation of the materials for appropriations before our appropriate Committee on Appropriations during the past year that the same committee was expressive in its commendations of the work of the Commission and its high regard for the purposes for which this Congress allotted taxpayers' money.

That the Commission completed its work a month earlier than its allotted terms seems to but accumulate praise for this Commission and this Commissioner.

The people from my district, the Tenth District of Pennsylvania, I am certain, join with me in wishing John A. O'Donnell Godspeed along the path of his fine career.

Much Distortion in Look Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Molyneaux from the Dallas Morning News:

MUCH DISTORTION IN LOOK ARTICLE
(By Peter Molyneaux)

In the current issue of Look magazine, there is a deliberately slanted distortion of the truth about Mexican-Americans in Texas. It occupies eight of the magazine's large pages and is illustrated with 26 photographs, many of which obviously were specially posed. It is headed "Texas' forgotten people: A million and a half Mexican-Americans live on little more than hope." And it opens with the following paragraphs:

"Texas tub thumpers enjoy shouting about the State's bumper crop of millionaires. But there is an awkward silence where conversation veers to the subject of the million and a half Texans of Mexican descent who comprise the Mexican problem. The silence becomes eloquent when the facts of the Mexican problem are known. The truth is simply this: Nowhere else in America is a group of people so downtrodden and defenseless, and nowhere are human dignity and life held in such low regard.

"This charge carries the crushing authority of Texas' own health statistics:

"Each year, 31 out of every 100,000 Anglo-American Texans die of tuberculosis; during the same year, 209 out of every 100,000 Latins (the Texan name for Mexican-Americans) die of the disease."

This lead gives a fair idea of the whole article, of its viciously biased tone, its bogus holier-than-thou indignation, and its facts.

The first fact it cites, the crushing authority of which is supposed to support its sensational charges, simply isn't a fact at all.

It just isn't true that 209 out of every 100,000 Mexican-Americans in Texas die of tuberculosis every year.

If it were true it would mean that every year 3,135 Mexican-Americans in Texas die of tuberculosis. If there are a million and a half Mexican-Americans in the State, that's 15 units of 100,000, and 15 times 209 is 3,135.

There are not 3,135 deaths from tuberculosis among Mexican-Americans in Texas in a year.

There are not 3,135 deaths from tuberculosis in a year among all of the 7,700,000 people in Texas, Anglo-Americans, and Negroes included.

If the figures of the Look article were correct, and if we assumed that the rate of 31 in 100,000 applied to Negroes as well as Anglo-Americans, the total of deaths from tuberculosis in Texas in a year would be more than 5,000. The actual annual average is about 2,700.

If Look's figures were correct, the death rate from tuberculosis in Texas would be about 65.6 to the 100,000. The 1948 report of the United States Public Health Service shows that the real rate was 35.7 per 100,000.

This isn't something to brag about, but the actual rate is much lower than in many other States and lower than the rate in New York, where Look's editorial offices are located.

In this connection, it is pertinent to point out that Texans do not have to apologize for either the State's present death rate generally or the progress they have made in lowering it. The magazine Look is published in Des Moines, Iowa, and a comparison of the death rates of Iowa and Texas has some point here.

In 1937, for example, the death rate from all causes in Iowa was 10.4 per 1,000 population, while that of Texas was 10.6 per 1,000. There were then 12 States in the Union having lower death rates than Iowa and 16 States with lower rates than Texas.

In 1947 the death rate in Iowa was 10.2 per 1,000, but that of Texas had been reduced to 8.8 per 1,000. The number of States with lower death rates than Iowa increased from 12 in 1937 to 27 in 1948, whereas the number of States with lower death rates than Texas had declined from 16 in 1937 to only 3 in 1947.

But the point to all this is that the first fact on which the sensational charges of the Look article is based is such a groundless and outrageous exaggeration and such a deliberate distortion of the truth that it completely discredits the whole article.

The very title of the article is untrue. Far from the Mexican-Americans in Texas being a forgotten people, they are a people very much on the mind of the State's leaders, and for some time they have been the concern of the State government itself. The good-neighbor commission, created by the Texas Legislature several years ago, and of which Neville G. Penrose, Fort Worth oilman, is chairman, is making genuine progress in improving their lot and opportunities and in bringing about better relations between them and the Anglo-American population. And last year, under the forthright leadership of Gov. Allan Shivers, a council for the study of human relations was established for the express purpose of determining ways and means of improving the relationship between the English-speaking and Spanish-speaking peoples of Texas."

Chairman Penrose puts it this way: "The people of Texas, working hand in hand with our closest neighbors, south of the Rio Grande, are rapidly curing a series of conditions which none of us in this generation had a hand in creating. We inherited them. Intelligent leadership and an enlightened people are determined that posterity will live in a cordial, hospitable atmosphere as neighbors and friends."

End of a Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 2, 1951:

END OF A DEBATE

After weeks of debate the Senate gets down to cases today on the issue of troops to Europe. Under a unanimous-consent agreement, entered into March 21, the Chamber will remain in continuous session until it has disposed of Senate Resolution 99 and all the complicated amendments and counter proposals that go with it.

This action comes none too soon. What began as the great debate has degenerated into a rather pointless family squabble. The public has become bored and our allies in Europe have become restless and confused.

It is considered a foregone conclusion that the Senate will end by giving its approval both to General Eisenhower's appointment as NATO supreme commander and to the assignment of American troops which has already been made to that command. The great question mark is whether it will insist on including some language implying the obligation of the President to consult Congress on future troop commitments.

We sincerely hope that the resolution which finally emerges will be the minimum one affirming Senate backing for the commitments already made. That will have the optimum effect abroad. And it is seriously to be doubted whether any action the Senate takes now will sway domestic thinking on the constitutional questions involved.

The vital thing at the moment is to demonstrate that, whatever our differences at home, we are united in our determination to oppose Communist aggression wherever it may threaten.

With all due respect to the advocates of a tough resolution, it has sometimes looked as if they had forgotten that fact. They have seemed to hold the cold war between Russia and the west as of less importance than the cold war between the White House and Capitol Hill.

In their embittered attacks on the President they have accused him of usurping congressional functions through an enlargement of his constitutional duties as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. To the outside observer, however, it has been no less apparent that they were attempting to read into their own constitutional powers of providing for the common defense and of declaring war most of the command functions of the President.

The Constitution deliberately provided for a division of the defense function between the Executive and the legislature. And the function can be effectively carried out only as a collaboration. We believe the President is exercising his proper authority in allo-

cating troops to Europe under the Atlantic Treaty and that Congress would make a fatal error if it attempted by law to claim the function.

This is by no means to say that the President has acted intelligently in antagonizing Congress and failing to keep it informed. Indeed, one of the important goods the great debate can still achieve is to convince both Congress and the President of the need for a better working partnership on all defense matters.

But no resolution the Senate passes today can compel this cooperation. The need is to show a united front abroad—and then quietly build on it at home.

Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, President of Mount Mary College, Speaks Eloquently of the Firm Basis for Human Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the political philosophy set forth in the American Declaration of Independence and our constitutional Bill of Rights that is based on that philosophy together with the whole Constitution of the United States itself should not be changed or altered by means other than those provided in the Constitution. Particularly, they should not be altered or changed in any way because of treaties or by virtue of our association with other nations in the UN or by Senate action upon the proposed UN Covenant for Human Rights.

Human rights have a divine origin and they therefore are unassailable by human agency. They have not a governmental or treaty origin. If they did have a governmental or treaty origin they would be subject to change with change in government or treaty. I wish to include in my remarks the very eloquent speech on human rights recently given by Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president of Mount Mary College of Milwaukee before the National Catholic Educational Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on March 30 last:

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EDUCATION

(By Edward A. Fitzpatrick)

I

Human rights are words to conjure with. It is a term heard everywhere. It has too often the magic of unthinking acceptance and wide circulation. It has become a shibboleth, a kind of password among some of the vocal and articulate persons in public discussion, which somehow sheds a beneficence over everything else they say. It is used to sharpen tensions as well as to point the way to better human relations. In the contemporary discussion it is chameleon in character serving the evil purposes of many who pharasaically enough invoke it in destroying human rights and at times to the accompaniment of noisy tom-toms, it becomes a kind of political incantation.

The constitution of the U. S. S. R.

To take only one example: The constitution of the United Soviet Socialist Republics promises to its people many rights, including a right to rest and leisure. It guarantees in article 125 the rights of free speech, of a free press, freedom of assembly, including the holding of mass meetings, and freedom of street processions and demonstrations, and then the remarkable provision is added:

"These civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communication facilities, and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights."

One did not know that the paradisal highway to Siberia was so broad. Nor will we fail to find similar chameleon double talk in our own country in respectable educational association. The real repository of human rights is not the constitution of the state but the daily life of the people.

II

Human rights in the Declaration of Independence

An American discussion will naturally start from the statement of the Declaration of Independence and we should never tire of repeating the memorable phrases of the Declaration:

"We declare these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Nor should we overlook the right declared immediately after this:

"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government laying its foundation on such principle and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall most likely effect their safety and happiness."

The Constitution of the United States was submitted to the people for ratification without a Bill of Rights. The argument that the document was an over-all protection was not acceptable, hence the insistence in many States for a specific statement of rights, constitute the Bill of Rights of the first 10 amendments.

The French declaration of human rights

During the French Revolution the words of our Declaration resounded and were studied. The French, too, wanted to formulate the rights of man, so in the early 1790's there were two formulations by the National Assembly and one by Robespierre that are similar on some points in our own Declaration. The 1791 National Assembly made a declaration of rights of man and citizen:

"Considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man are the sole causes of the public miseries and of the corruption of governments, have resolved to set forth in a solemn declaration the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of man, in order that this declaration, being ever present to all the members of the social body, may unceasingly remind them of their rights and their duties." (Great Expressions of Human Rights, R. M. MacIver, p. 255.)

The first two declarations made as all of them were, as the document states, "in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being," are:

"1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions can be based only upon public utility.

"2. The aim of every political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible (note the word) rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression" (p. 255).

In the constitution of 1793 this is repeated. We shall add here an interesting definition of liberty:

"Liberty is the power that belongs to man to do whatever is not injurious to the rights of others; it has nature for its principle, justice for its rule, law for its defense; its moral limit is in this maxim: 'Do not do to another that which you do not wish should be done to you'" (p. 263).

The nature of human rights

As stated in our own Declaration these rights are part of the very nature of man—they are his nature, stamped as it were in his mind and heart and conscience. They are not man-made, nor conferred by governments, but from the Great Lawgiver, the Maker of the universe and all that is in it, the Creator of man, God Himself. This is the meaning of the Declaration that these human rights are endowed by the Creator. The French very properly call them sacred.

Eternal vigilance needed

The French definition of these rights as imprescriptible as well as inalienable gives special emphasis to another idea that these rights are "independent of law or custom" and cannot be "justly taken away." This is in addition to the fact that the individual cannot give up these rights. And they cannot be surrendered or lost so as to deny them to posterity. But governments which are so often made the guarantors and protectors of these natural, sacred, imprescriptible, and inalienable rights of man are often the instrument of their restriction, their denial, even their destruction. Eternal vigilance is always the price of liberty.

One of the things we ought to be on our guard against is a confusion of these broad human rights—inherent, imprescriptible, inalienable—belonging to man because of his existence, his dignity, his place in the Creation, whatever sanction confirms them; and political and civil, and even social and economic rights which grow out of the particular human conventions, social contracts, constitutions which give form to a political or economic society. The former are rights which are inviolable by absolute monarch, fuehrer, or other dictator or democratic majority. The latter are matters of agreements among men—deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

III

Definition of rights and duties

Unfortunately the whole discussion is a strange confusion of rights and obligations, without any clear distinction between rights and correlative obligations, nor is there any clear conception of duty or duties. A right, as Cahill says, is defined as a "moral power which a person has and which other persons are bound to respect, to do something to retain something, or exact something from another."

A duty is "a moral obligation of doing or not doing something."

Surely there should be no confusion as to rights and duties, but there is, and a good deal of the contemporary moral topsy turviness and the spiritual chaos is due to that confusion.

Education as right and duty

Education is not in the area of rights, it is in the area of duty. It is in the area of free will which man may or may not do to achieve his purpose, ultimate and mundane. It is in the area of compulsion which the state says the individual must have in the interest of the common welfare; and beyond it an area of social opportunities. There is a minimum, too, of knowledge which the church says is necessary for salvation. Education is in the area of parental obligation and decision both in the natural law, in the civil law, and in the canon law to determine

what education the child shall receive and what use will be made of the social opportunities, including those of the church and state, to help the child secure an education. There is an education that is regimentation and indoctrination, but the only genuine education is self-education utilizing self-activity by means of self direction for the supreme end of life in Heaven and of life on the earth.

United States Senate should reject covenant of human rights

May I digress to say that declarations or covenants of human rights should always remain as statements of aspiration and not presented as treaties. While the proposed covenant to be considered by the United States Senate does not include all the universal declaration of rights, omitting the social and economic, it should nevertheless be rejected by the Senate even if it be, in large part, a statement of rights that are protected in the United States now. This is not the method of making laws or constitutional changes for the American people. If there is any possibility of its passage a rider such as this should be attached:

"No provision of this agreement (not a treaty) shall in any way affect or change the laws of the United States or of any State or the Constitution of the United States or of any State unless each specific proposal has followed the regular procedure for making laws or amending the Constitution of the United States or of the States. Such declaration shall have no force or effect in any court of law or equity in the United States in any suit whatever."[1]

IV

The foundation of human rights

But many people even in our own Nation do not accept the religious and metaphysical basis and sanction of human rights and we know that the belief in the natural law has fluctuated during the centuries. In the history of man's struggle for liberty, we have a common basis of agreement. Those who do not accept the religious sanction must substitute a sanction of social expediency—a not too secure basis, or it becomes as in Russia, a right conferred by the state, not proclaimed or declared by the people, and consequently as insecure and fluctuating as governments themselves—with its not infrequent usurping executive, subservient legislature, and spineless judiciary. This while the human rights may be defined in the same language their foundation may be as in one case, the rock, and in the other case, sand. Though the protection of such rights in constitutions of states as well is a little more secure than statutory provisions; they may be denied or destroyed and are not inalienable, imprescriptible, or sacred. But they will be determined for individuals in a particular social order, however, by some combination of the constitution, the laws, the police powers and equity as interpreted by judicial opinion.

Human rights and the nature of man

Closely related to these rights will be the process of making them real, the process of not merely having them, but enjoying them. Consequently education, not public education, not private education, but education of the individual, helping him to realize the source, sanction, and content of these rights is essential if these rights are to be enjoyed. In other words, the opportunity and the means for the development of the whole man—physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual—for a fullness and abundance of life worthy of his higher potentialities, the individual there must have education. But education is not a right; it is useful, if the right kind, to enable man to save these rights and to achieve their purpose in helping man achieve his humanity.

V

Education as a right (U. S. S. R.)

Education as a right is discussed in the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; in chapter 10 we read:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to education.

"This right is insured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language, and by the organization in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms of free vocational, technical, and agronomic training for the working people." (Article 121, Constitution of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, p. 103.)

Education in universal declaration of human rights

A somewhat similar statement on the relation of education and human rights is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. In article 26, we read:

"(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

"(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

"(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children."

A Catholic declaration of human rights

The NCWC submitted a draft of a declaration of human rights to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations. These included many rights. Those relating to education included among the rights of human persons the right to religious formation through education and association; the right to education suitable for the maintenance and development of man's dignity as a human person.

Under the rights of the family was the right to educate the children.

And under the domestic rights of states the right to require that its people receive an education suitable for citizenship.

The rights listed above are in no sense human rights in the basic sense, nor are they rights that can be made secure by government except the parental right stated. Besides this confusion as to the meaning of the word rights, the so-called rights themselves are too vague—unenforceable in law or binding on others because of this vagueness. The rights of parents (rather than of the family) should have been more broadly stated in view of the incompetence, unwillingness, impracticability of parents to carry on the actual education of their children, or their readiness to delegate it.

VI

Learning about human rights

Educational facilities at every level within the capacity of the student must provide opportunity to learn the truths about human rights.

The widest diffusion of the knowledge of the existence of such rights, a fuller meaning of them than the repetition of the phrases of the declaration should be a part of all education in the United States whether publicly or privately supported.

The character of the Government

A clear inference from this point is that we must teach the essential character of government rather than the numerous inert facts about it so often taught in schools. The basic truths we should teach about government will be indicated shortly. We must emphasize it as a means, not an end in itself. The social aims of the preamble to the Constitution must be emphasized. They are the direct objectives of our political life and they are phases of man's effort to achieve the conditions of the fulfillment and enrichment of man's nature and his destiny. This is the purpose of all social machinery including government, and of all social structures as well.

We do not need to go abroad to see government become a Frankenstein. We have only to look at our own country in the last quarter of a century. And if we see, or want to see, how easy it is done we should note in World War II the nonchalance with which the Congress of the United States voted extraordinary war powers to the President. This was practically an abdication of legislative power. We have not learned certain basic lessons of political life.

1. Government exists for the welfare of the governed.

A government of laws rather than a government of men.

3. A really independent judiciary (no packed supreme courts) with a high sense of their function as protectors of individual rights.

4. The greater safeguards are in decentralization rather than in centralization, with control of power kept near the point where it is exercised.

5. Greater emphasis on legislatures rather than executive branch of the Government which on the national level would make Tehrans, Yaltas, and Potsdams impossible without legislative approval.

6. Maintenance of greater independence and sharper separation of governmental powers: executive, judicial, and legislative.

7. Public administration devoted exclusively to a faithful execution of the laws.

8. That governmental power is in its nature, limited—not totalitarian—not despotic—not tyrannical.

9. The revolutionary right when government becomes destructive of its proper ends, to alter or abolish it and institute a new government, laying its new foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

10. Public officials are public servants.

This statement emphasizes the importance of the eternal vigilance needed if human rights are not only to be possessed but to be enjoyed and it points to our first relation of human rights to education. They are a continual challenge and opportunity to education.

If a right, what kind of education?

The grave problem that exists where education is declared to be a right is what education? In the United States as defined by the United States Supreme Court, basing its decision on the natural law, this education is not necessarily an education taught by public teachers, an education which stand-

[1] Inspired by the approval of the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution of the United States another amendment should be formulated embodying the substance of this statement. It should also delete in article VI of the Constitution of the United States the phrase, "and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States."

ardizes the children. The high duty of defining this education is in those who nurture him and direct his destiny. The language of the Oregon decision is as follows:

"As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competency of the State. The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

The kind of education implied in human rights

Education itself is not a right. It cannot be conferred, nor can it be taken away from an individual, nor can it be claimed. All that society or government can do is to provide the opportunities for education, create what Lester Ward called an educational environment. Then the spirit listing where it will may get an education. There is in the old meaning of the word a mystery of education. Different people in the same situation react in widely different ways. For some a situation may be a matter of indifference, for others it may cataclysmically affect their whole life by giving it new direction. Regimentation and uniformity are no parts of effective education. Education for totalitarian regimes, even if some were beneficent would be an evil; only in the freedom of the human spirit can there be real education. Therefore in our schools if education recognizing the existence of human right will conform to certain conditions:

1. It will emphasize learning instead of teaching.
2. It will provide the opportunity for self-activity, self-direction, and self-control.
3. It will provide for diversity of talent, interest, and experience.
4. It will recognize a moral order of the universe of which the school is a part.
5. In Catholic schools it will recognize the giver of human rights, Creator, Father, and the providence of God. In other schools they will give expression to the faith that is in them regarding the universe.
6. It will recognize the dignity of each person without any adjective and make available all educational facilities to each person according to his capacity, his preparation, and training.

Human rights and a liberal education

In the conception of human rights of man, independent of government—inherent, inalienable, imprescriptible, and sacred, we have a basis for a liberal education which has only been rarely averted to, if at all. It is this dignity of man, maker of governments and of school systems, that a liberal education takes account of as its central object and to the fulfillment of whose purposes it is principally concerned. It is the human being achieving his humanity in the community with other human beings by self-mastery, self-direction and self-control that makes education liberal. This is anterior and superior to all his vocations and activities in which he participates in the community. Even these are judged by the degrees to which they enrich human personality by this self activity.

VII

Political and civil rights

There are certain other rights—called political and civil rights—which grow out of the nature of our society and Government, both man-made. They are reinforcements of the basic human rights and grow out of a recognition of the dignity of man. They differ in their scope and their protection in different societies and basing their just powers on the consent of the governed. In our contemporary education three issues are closely related to these political and civic rights. They relate to so-called student rights, to discrimination and to academic freedom.

The school and social responsibility

One of the most significant characteristics of education, particularly in colleges, is a new self-consciousness on the part of students, a new assertion of their rights or what they conceive to be their rights, and a desire to participate in administration, helping to decide the condition of their educational destiny.

There is increasing recognition on the part of education administrators and of teachers of the central place of students in the educational process, and a consequent new emphasis on learning in place of the old emphasis on teaching.

Students on the college level have proposed a student bill of rights. Intrinsically this is a good thing, but instead of being merely imitative of the great documents of political liberty and repeating loudly the weasel words of contemporary discussion they should study the purposes of the institution of which they are a part, and relate these rights to the purposes of the organization. Some will be intrinsic, others will be granted as experience shows the students ready for them. I have elsewhere given my conception of a student bill of rights so will not say more at this time.

Discrimination in schools

I fear a good deal of the discussion of discrimination in education was evilly inspired and was designed to promote tension rather than to alleviate it. There is no justification for discrimination against human beings on any of the grounds so prevalent in our society. The remedy must come as an educative process rather than by social mandate or legislative act. We must learn to live together by living together—as the thoughts of men are widened with the processes of the sun. We know, however, that the inevitable progress of nineteenth century social science was self-deception. A secure progress will be secured only by positive teaching based on the great doctrine of religion, the fatherhood of God, the communion of saints, and the mystical body of Christ, as living faith in the actual social community.

Academic freedom

The other problem is academic freedom. A full discussion would take us too far afield so we state the problem briefly. Academic freedom is as essential in the school as freedom of speech and press is in the general social life. It is interesting to note in the French statements on this subject that the right is stated with the limitation subject to responsibility for the abuse of this freedom.

"The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man; every citizen then can freely speak, write, and print, subject to responsibility for the abuse of this freedom in the cases determined by law" (p. 256).

In university research it is of the essence. In teaching it is weighted with certain responsibilities to the student, the responsibility of conforming to the standards of scholarship and to avoid merely idiosyncratic teaching taking advantage of the immaturity of the student. The ideal, particularly in the research area, was stated in the famous 1910 statement of Wisconsin which was made to encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found.

The teacher and academic freedom

And dealing with a current problem the President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has put the case well regarding a fact often overlooked—the factor of competent teachers.

"The institute also wishes to make it clear that it believes that the teacher, as a teacher, must be free of doctrinaire control originating outside of his own mind. He must be free to be critical and objective in his own way, and above all he must work in the clear daylight without hidden allegiances or obligations which require him to distort his research or teaching in accord with dictates from without. If a teacher were found to be subject to improper outside control in his teaching, the institute would regard him as incompetent" (p. 4, Primer of Intellectual Freedom, Howard Mumford Jones).

And the statement regarding teaching is thus put by the Pope:

A norm of a just freedom

"This norm of a just freedom in things scientific, serves also as an inviolable norm of a just freedom in things didactic, or for rightly understood liberty in teaching; it should be observed therefore in whatever instruction is imparted to others. Its obligation is all the more binding in justice when there is question of instructing youth. For in this work the teacher, whether public or private, has no absolute right of his own, but only such as has been communicated to him by others. Besides every Christian child or youth has a strict right to instruction in harmony with the teaching of the church, the pillar and ground of truth. And whoever disturbs the pupil's faith in any way, does him grave wrong, inasmuch as he abuses the trust which children place in their teachers, and takes unfair advantage of their inexperience and of their natural craving for unrestrained liberty, at once illusory and false (readings in the Philosophy of Education, p. 427).

Conflicts of science and religion

And a word must be said about the conflict between science and religion in this connection. Following the summary fashion we are using, we quote Cardinal Newman's solution:

"(The Catholic) is sure, and nothing shall make him doubt, that if anything seems to be proved by astronomer, or geologist, or chronologist, or antiquarian, or ethnologist, in contradiction to the dogmas of faith, that point will eventually turn out, first, not to be proved, or secondly, not contradictory, or thirdly, not contradictory to anything really revealed, but to something which has been confused with revelation" (Idea of a University, pp. 466–7).

EPILOGUE

There is, in short, vital meaning for education in human rights, but it is not found in the ballyhoo for human rights lumping it with democracy, peace, justice, and every worthy abstract noun. It is more than a catch phrase but it requires thought and reflection. Its real meaning goes deep to the very nature of man and to a destiny worthy of his origin, and it has rich suggestion. It is the man with human rights, inalienable, imprescriptible, sacred, as well as rights growing out of the social order, that through self activity and self direction will be revealed to himself in education fulfilling the potential dynamism of his nature in full measure—to the measure of the fullness of the stature of Christ.

World Defense in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "World Defense in the Pacific," delivered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at Brown University, Providence, R. I., on March 30, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD DEFENSE IN THE PACIFIC

(Address by United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN)

Fellow Brown men, most of last December I spent on a hurried trip which took me around the globe. The purpose of my trip was to take part, along with Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, as representatives of the American Senate in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting in Canberra, Australia. The subject was one of especial present interest to all the nations represented, namely, International Relations and Defense.

In speaking to you today on the problems which American foreign policy must face in the vast and troubled areas of southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific, I refer to this trip because it made it possible for us not only to learn the views of the eight nations representing the British Commonwealth, but also to make brief stop-overs in most of the nations within that region and discuss this subject with them also.

After crossing the Pacific by air, we stopped first in New Zealand, then at several places in Australia. From Australia we flew north to Djakartac, capital of the newly founded Indonesian Republic, from there to Singapore, in British Malaya, and thence on to Bangkok, in Thailand. In the new republic of India, we visited Calcutta and New Delhi and our last stop in that area was at Karachi in the new Republic of Pakistan.

It was possible for us, in practically every instance, to talk at length with the leading officials of the governments we visited. We conferred also with the top American diplomats in the area, with members of the press, and many nationals of the various countries.

Let me make it clear that I do not regard this experience as making me an expert on the affairs of the Far East. On the other hand, I did feel able to capture the pervading sense of urgency which surrounds many of the problems in that region. To a large extent, I could see at first hand, and hear from the words of the leaders best informed, the documentation underlying the many reports which as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations I have studied over the past years.

I assure you that if you have the kind of mind which responds to the challenge of a difficult problem, you would return from a visit to those countries tremendously stimulated with a determination to act in solving the problems existing there. To the pessimist, I am certain that the difficulties appear almost insurmountable. Even to the optimist they seem very difficult, indeed, and time will be needed to devise any successful solution and much more time to carry into effect a program of action. But for us, as free people, the stakes involved are so great that we cannot afford to take the pessimist's view.

Let me paint for you, in outline at least, a picture of this region. With the exception of the predominantly white populations of New Zealand and Australia, most of the brown, black, and yellow people of the region live under conditions which are almost impossible for an American to comprehend. In terms of food supplies, the diet standards are 20 percent below the levels required to meet minimum subsistence, and much of what food there is is badly distributed. India, as a result of a serious drought and trade and political difficulties with Pakistan which have cut off the surplus produced by that Moslem state, is faced with a food shortage of great proportions. There and elsewhere throughout the region the diet standards are so low that the people lack the energy and will to work. Agricultural methods are most primitive, and tilled land produces much smaller yields than it might be made capable of turning out. Other land, which, with irrigation, could be turned to food production lies unused.

Most of the people who farm the land do so as peasants on vast estates. For them there are few incentives to produce more. They lack what might otherwise be a pride of ownership in the land, and they lack a will to produce for profit because any profit will flow into hands other than their own.

Other multitudes live out short lives as unproductive beggars, many packed in cities of indescribable squalor. Still others work for what food they get as laborers on rubber plantations, mining tin or manganese, or otherwise in the production of raw materials for export which produce what revenues these countries get for purchase of manufactured goods from the developed areas of Europe and America.

Moreover, in country after country, the peoples are divided along deep religious or racial cleavages. For example, the Chinese minorities scattered through Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and the Malay States feel the oppression of native majorities and turn toward a China now Communist for support and protection.

Then, too, the long-established practices of colonial powers have made them bitter against the white populations, who lived under democracy at home but refused to adopt it in their colonies. These have left a residual fear, distrust, and even hatred, of white men. The most moving force there is the determination to achieve independence, and the next most moving force is to attain a domestic government which will achieve economic reforms, especially land reforms.

In differing degrees these conditions exert tremendous pressures which cause unrest and instability throughout the region. It can truly be said that the non-Communist governments both colonial and native of these areas are today on trial. And it must be added that the Communists are everywhere actively at work exploiting this dissension and unrest.

This internal Communist activity manifests itself in countless ways. It plays upon the failure of local leaders to overcome starvation. It tries to shout down efforts to enlarge defense forces with cries that the governments must fear the all-powerful Mao of China. It seeks to intimidate people into joining the Communist movement now in order to avoid turning their countries into battlefields of destruction such as—to use their phrase—the American imperialists have done to Korea. Efforts by the United States and other members of the U. N. to furnish military and economic assistance to the countries are condemned as thinly disguised moves to reestablish imperialism. And when last year the Congress cut the funds for technical assistance under the point 4 program to a level below that recommended, this was heralded by the Communists as proof that the United States did not really intend to help the underdeveloped areas.

Black as much of this picture appears to be, there are some bright spots which light the way to effective, affirmative solutions for bringing these people into full partnership in the community of free nations.

But before going into the steps we can take, let me first digress for a moment to answer any of you who may be wondering why we should undertake any responsibility for what happens in far-away areas confronted with so many grave problems.

Firstly, we have a selfish and very important interest in the huge quantities of critical raw materials upon which we primarily depend upon this area to furnish. Assured of a steady and increasing supply of these materials we can maintain and expand the production we so vitally need for the critical period ahead. If these raw materials are lost to us, it will be impossible to develop other supplies or substitutes without first experiencing a serious, perhaps fatal, decline in our own productive output.

Secondly, a matter of fundamental principle is involved. It is the principle of creating a collective strength in the free world. Few people seriously contend that we Americans can best assure our own freedom by facing a hostile world alone. Almost unanimously, we are convinced that with allies beside us, and with unity among these allies, we possess substantial assurance of enduring peace in a free world.

When the democracies of Europe backed down at Munich, fear and despair sapped the morale of free people the world over. And we must not forget that lesson today. Aggression, regardless of where it occurs, affects the whole world. And the loss of a nation to communism by the internal overthrow of its government is nonetheless a loss to the entire community of free nations. Either event strengthens the Kremlin's hand and correspondingly weakens the morale and determination of the non-Communist world.

For us as freemen, there is no acceptable alternative to action, responsible action, on our part to work cooperatively with those who seek to resist the forces of despotism and tyranny. We must reject appeasement in all its forms.

In turning now to the course of action required to bring stability to the Far East, I think we should at the outset recognize the principle that we should work through the United Nations to the maximum degree possible. For one thing, the participation of many nations—large and small—will largely do away with the argument that the white democracies are cooperating for the purpose of fostering imperialism. Particularly with smaller nations in the picture, their participation in, and guidance of, the programs will make it difficult indeed for the Communists to exploit distrust of this motive.

We must also recognize that it is far simpler to chart in theory what should be done than it is to carry this out in actuality. For one thing, the present leadership in some of these countries has shown little real regard for improving the lot of the people. In some cases the anti-Communist attitude of the governments is dictated by little more than the selfish desire to retain their own despotic control over the people. Popular support and loyalty of the people in these instances is slim indeed.

Thus, any assistance going into these countries will have to be conditioned by the insistence that certain basic reforms are expected of the governments in return for the help given them. On the other hand, any

attempt to tell a country what it must do arouses sensitivities and is open to the charge of meddling in purely national matters. Obviously, for any program to succeed, it will be necessary to steer a delicately balanced course between hurt feelings on the one side, and demands for improvement on the other.

With these qualifications in mind, let us examine some of the things which can be done. Take the all-important question of starvation. In the short run, we can, and must, see to it that certain countries need immediate help in meeting their famine conditions. But such help is little more than first-aid to tide them over and does not solve the problem of a food shortage. Agricultural scientists know what is needed to improve farming methods. Putting the methods to work is, however, another question. We can furnish agricultural technicians who in turn can train native farm agents to work with the people and show them and encourage them to adopt new methods. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs has enjoyed considerable success with a similar program in Latin America for more than 8 years.

Adoption of land reforms which will give the people an opportunity to own, and retain their tenure, on the land will be of unparalleled value in giving the farmers real incentive to produce. The United Nations has already done a great deal through its studies to develop workable systems of land reform, and throughout Asia this is a crying need.

Similarly, the eradication of disease, improved public health services, greatly expanded educational facilities, present problems which can be solved by assistance, coupled with more readily available long-term loans and direct money grants.

The governments of these countries must get assistance in making plans for such needed public works as highways, irrigation and power projects, schools, hospitals—and they will undoubtedly need material help in obtaining funds for the construction of these projects.

Let me make it clear, however, that I do not regard such economic-aid programs as I have suggested as hand-out programs which we are called upon to finance. All such projects must be authorized only after they are shown to be part of a planned program for the sound development of a country and a region. It would indeed be pouring money down a rat hole to finance projects which were not realistically related to need and properly designed to improve the economic, social, and political stability of the country.

There is also a great need for technical assistance to enable each country to determine which of its resources are best suited for encouraging the expansion of private industry. What I have in mind here is not the development of productive capacity through some socialistic plan which we are asked to finance. Quite the contrary. You have, I am sure, seen the advertisements in magazines and newspapers extolling the virtues of New England or Pennsylvania or Texas or California as fine places to locate new industries. While I take no position on the effectiveness of this as a method for attracting new capital for industrial expansion, I merely wish to point out that the underdeveloped countries have a similar but much more urgent problem of the same kind. The backward regions are, for the most part, rich in natural resources and poor, indeed, in industrial capacity. By surveying and planning for private industrial development, these countries can do a great deal to attract private capital.

The recent report of the Rockefeller board suggests that Congress can double the rate of private investment in the backward areas for industrial development by establishing a program of loan insurance comparable to the FHA home-loan insurance, and by modification of tax laws which will provide added incentive to invest abroad. On the other hand, we should be most careful to see that we do not give the private investors a license to exploit the countries in which they choose to invest. Any such program underwriting private investment should necessarily be limited to projects which fit in with a sound program for the development of the country involved.

By contrast with the costs of any military program, enormous results can be obtained for relatively small expenditures through foreign economic assistance programs. The Rockefeller report, for example, recommended that the United States spend half a billion dollars a year for foreign economic development over the next few years. The report pointed out that this amount, coupled with proper inducements to private investors and more liberal lending policies by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, could produce a total of $4,500,000,000 annually which would flow into the backward countries for economic development purposes.

Not only could such a program result in greatly strengthening the individual countries, making them more secure against the internal threat of communism by providing better living standards and hope for the people, but in addition, it would provide us with 50 percent more critically needed raw materials, and could furnish the basis for a much larger volume of world trade in the future.

In promoting political, economic, and social stability in the backward areas, we would be meeting communism at its first line of attack, which is the use of internal means to stir up disunity and strife leading to overthrow of the existing non-Communist governments.

But important as economic aid is, we must also now work toward a real build-up of military strength in order to ward off actual aggression itself. Certainly a minimum requirement here is the creation of much stronger national forces in the underdeveloped areas. At the moment, many of them are scarcely capable of maintaining civil order in their own countries. We can scarcely expect these countries to build forces sufficient to meet and repel the combined might of Soviet Russia and all the Soviet satellites too. But we can assist them in creating a combined strength which will be adequate to meet an attack upon any one of them by any such satellite.

Everywhere I went in southeast Asia last December, I heard the Korean war discussed. There were almost as many views as there were people to discuss it. While I can say there is no real unanimity as to what is the best course of action to be taken in a military sense, it is also true to say that the leaders of every country I visited made it clear that they would defend their own countries if attacked. Deep-seated national jealousies and religious differences qualified the view many of them took as to giving military assistance to a neighboring country in the event it was set upon.

However, I am firmly convinced that these national, religious, and racial differences are steadily being submerged as a result of the growing realization that the Kremlin is simply using the people of its satellites to do its work of gradual world conquest. They have all become acutely aware of the Chinese Communist government and the forces at its command. In the minds of some—perhaps it is more accurate to say many—that I talked with—the Communist Mao was little if any worse than Chiang Kai-shek. The belief is widespread that Chiang was not beaten by the Communists whose armies his own greatly outnumbered in men and equipment. The belief is, instead, that the Chinese people had simply rejected the Nationalist Government after 20 years of mismanagement and corruption, because it had failed to advance the interests of the people. Mao's more recent actions—both in his decision to enter the Korean war, and later to launch aggression against Tibet—have, I believe, changed in Asia a great many of the earlier estimates of the Chinese Communists. The fear that Communist China will not be content to keep its forces within its own borders is awakening the realization that the free nations of Asia must stand together, or fall separately.

The leaders of non-Communist Asia are watching developments under the North Atlantic Pact with greatly increased interest. I heard talk in many places of a corresponding Pacific pact. There is not yet the full willingness to smother the long-smoldering antagonisms between brown men and yellow men and white men and black men to the extent that will be necessary for the kind of close cooperation and mutual support required to make a defense effort like that General Eisenhower is now undertaking a success.

But the necessity for such a collective security system is daily becoming apparent to more of the leaders of non-Communist Asia and the oceanic nations of the southwest Pacific. The initiative for such a plan must necessarily come from them. We cannot compel them to work together; we cannot compel them to cooperate if they continue their distrust of one another. But the exigencies of the present situation are bringing them together.

While war has brought terrible destruction and hardship to the people of Korea, and this is not lost upon the other people of the Far East, the decision by the United Nations not only to denounce aggression, as the League of Nations did, but also to implement that denunciation by acts, as the League of Nations failed to do, is a long step forward in the establishment of world peace. Whatever the final outcome may be this action has given encouragement to those nations who long for peace. The fact that the United Nations has undertaken to defend the integrity of a free nation when its independence is at stake, has had a telling effect upon all of the Far East.

Every non-Communist country has the perfectly understandable desire to avoid involvement in all-out war. Yet each country of the Far East sees in Korea the sickening possibility that its time may some day come. The people of the Far East need, above all, the assurance that the governments under which they live will lead them to peace and to the kind of life in which disease, starvation, poverty, and despair will be minimized. Such assurance is now difficult to find in most of those countries.

We here in the United States have the grave responsibility to assist these people in gaining the assurance they so desperately need. Many of them are taught daily to distrust us and hate us and fear us. Many of them are too sick, too hungry, too uneducated to care what happens. But despite all this, I am convinced that in most of them there is a latent will to rally to leadership which can bring them freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to live in the dignity to which man's spirit entitles him.

We Americans know in our own hearts that it is peace, not war, which we seek. But we are being lied about, our motives are being attacked, and our countrymen are dying today in Korea because a force bent upon the conquest of the world is at large. We must

make no deals with that force; we must accept no appeasement of it; and we will ultimately succeed in turning it back to die of its own internal evil.

But we can do this only through resolute acceptance of the great duties ahead of us, with a willingness to sacrifice if necessary everything but principle. I have no doubt as to our success in the long pull.

Is the St. Lawrence Seaway Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project are again making a desperate effort to revive it despite the fact that for over 50 years frenzied attempts have been made to sell such a discredited scheme to the American people.

Fortunately for the taxpayers of America, Congress has consistently refused to sanction construction of such an economic monstrosity, yet proponents of such a perennial legislative proposal persist in their specious arguments hoping that the American people will be lulled to sleep with their persuasive efforts, and succumb from sheer exhaustion.

It was my pleasure to accept the invitation of the Mutual Broadcasting System to make a Nation-wide broadcast on March 29, 1951, regarding the St. Lawrence project. My address follows:

IS THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY NECESSARY?

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful to the Mutual Broadcasting System for the privilege of talking to you on the subject Is the St. Lawrence Seaway Necessary?

As a matter of information, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which has been before the American people since 1895 should be considered in two parts—first, as a seaway which contemplates the establishment of a 27-foot channel from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 1,677 miles. To complete the proposed seaway it will be necessary to construct a series of channels, canals and large dams.

The second part of the St. Lawrence project involves the construction of a large hydroelectric-power dam estimated to produce for the American side 570,000 kilowatt hours of firm electric current.

The project which is commonly known as the St. Lawrence project has been before the Congress of the United States time and time again and not once have its advocates been able to justify the investment because it is as unsound today as it has been in the past.

At the moment there is pending, before both branches of Congress, legislation on the subject and it is interesting to note that there is nothing new to the age-old arguments advanced by its advocates, except that we are told now that the seaway is needed to provide a water route from Seven Islands, Quebec, for the transportation of iron ore from Labrador to Great Lakes ports. It is said that this Labrador ore is vitally needed because of the dwindling supply of ore in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota. We are told also that there is a shortage of electric power in the northeastern section of the United States and particularly in New York State and that this shortage of power is a threat to our national defense. In other words, the advocates of the St. Lawrence project have again tried to label it as necessary to our national security.

The truth of the matter is that this Nation will have won or lost its security long before this project could be completed because it is the opinion of expert engineers that it will require from 5 to 7 years to complete its construction. Meanwhile, money, materials, and manpower, urgently needed for mobilization to meet the emergency we are now confronted with, would be diverted to a scheme that will ultimately benefit Canada more than the United States where only 15 percent of our population would receive any benefits.

If you will read the congressional hearings spread over a period of years containing the arguments for and against the project you will find that Congress rejected the proposal based on the following reasons:

1. The St. Lawrence seaway's value as a transportation artery has been vastly overrated mostly because it would be closed to navigation for at least 5 months or more each year when the St. Lawrence River is ice-bound. In addition, one must consider that the proposed St. Lawrence route will include tortuous, rock-bottomed channels that will be blanketed in fog not only during the fall and spring, but frequently during the summer.

2. The proposed 27-foot channel would be too shallow for 90 percent of the vessels of our own merchant marine, in which the American people have invested $19,000,000,000. Our merchant vessels require channels with a depth of at least 30 feet. On the other hand, vessels of foreign countries, which are smaller in size and manned by cheap labor, would enjoy a field day in dumping cheaply manufactured foreign products on the American market, such as coal, ore, foreign steel and steel products. Nor can we forget that it will bring the Midwest farmer face to face with competition from the agricultural production of foreign countries.

In short, the St. Lawrence seaway will not be a one-way street for the exportation of American goods but in fact will open the way for foreign competition at the expense of the American wage earner.

3. The Nation would lose by spending huge sums of money to establish a costly form of transportation which could exist only because the already overburdened taxpayer would provide and support it. It would disrupt long-established and satisfactory methods of transportation such as trucks and busses on our highways, railroads, airlines, as well as water carriers. The St. Lawrence seaway would compete unfairly with the present-day methods of transportation since it would be Government subsidized and tax free.

For example, at the present time American railroads employ millions of American citizens and long trains carry millions of tons of freight to and from seaboard ports. Should the St. Lawrence seaway become a reality foreign steamers, manned by cheaply paid crews, will deprive the railroads of this freight traffic to such a degree that American railroads will suffer annually a loss in freight revenue of from one hundred to two hundred and fifty million dollars. For every thousand tons of freight taken from the railroads by these foreign steamers, one freight train is eliminated, and when you remove freight trains you destroy the jobs of railroaders and others.

Furthermore, the freight diverted from the American railroads to foreign ships would adversely affect all ports, especially those in New York, Boston, Buffalo, and New Orleans. The effect would also extend to public and private investments in docks, warehouses, terminals, and grain elevators with a consequent reduction in employment. Thus you have foreign seamen on these tramp steamers benefiting at the expense of American workmen. In simple language, the St. Lawrence seaway which has been labeled as a method of cheap transportation would cost the American taxpayers many more dollars than it would save them.

These are only a few of the many reasons why Congress has rejected the flimsy arguments for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

As already mentioned the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway now come forth with the proposal that its construction is necessary to provide a water route from Seven Islands, Quebec for the transportation of iron ore from the Labrador-Quebec area to Great Lakes ports. The amount to be brought in annually over this proposed route is only 10,000,000 tons as compared with our annual need of over 100,000,000 tons.

Mind you, this argument is presented during this critical period in world affairs when our country is on the brink of world war III and at a time when the American taxpayer is paying for tax purposes about 35 cents out of every dollar he earns.

The need for Labrador ores is based on the argument that such ores are indispensable to our own national security because of an impending shortage of high-grade ore principally from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota.

While there have been conflicting statements regarding the remaining deposits of ore in the Mesabi Range, the fact remains that from 1917 to 1949 new ore reserves have been located. It is true that the ore shipped to date is in excess of the reserves, yet we cannot ignore this fact that huge deposits of taconite—a lower grade of ore—have been located in Minnesota and that a process is being perfected that will permit taconite concentrate to compete favorably with the high grade of ore of the Mesabi Range. This fact is confirmed by experts.

In addition to the high- and low-grade ore reserves of the Mesabi Range, there exists on the north shore of Lake Superior at a site known as Steep Rock Lake in Ontario, a source of high-grade ore that, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, may amount to no less than a billion tons. Transportation for this ore deposit is already available by utilizing existing railroad facilities from Steep Rock Lake to Port Arthur where iron-ore vessels now plying the Great Lakes can carry it to its destination.

In addition to iron-ore deposits in Minnesota and Ontario we cannot ignore the huge deposits of iron ore in Venezuela and Chile, that recently started to arrive in this country.

Just a few days ago the Bethlehem Steel Corp. announced that large iron-ore deposits have been located in western Pennsylvania and that already $34,000,000 have been allocated to develop the project. Thus, today we have five principal sources of iron ore, namely, Minnesota, Ontario, Venezuela, Chile, and western Pennsylvania, all of which have been or are being developed in the spirit of free enterprise with adequate transportation facilities available to transport the ore to the mills.

Back of the argument that the St. Lawrence seaway is necessary to transport ore from the Labrador-Quebec area is the fact that a half dozen small Midwest steel companies are promoting the Labrador-Quebec project and they see in the St. Lawrence seaway the opportunity to subsidize the cost of bringing the ore to their mills. Such a subsidy would affect favorably the price of the Labrador-Quebec ore and put it in competition with the ores from Minnesota, Ontario, Venezuela, Chile, and western Pennsylvania which is being mined in the spirit of free enterprise.

In other words, six small Midwest steel companies have invested in the Labrador-Quebec project and they are asking the

American people, now burdened by high taxes, to finance the St. Lawrence seaway so that they can get cheaper transportation rates for every ton of ore they transport to their mills, an advantage they would enjoy over their competitors.

While these Midwest steel companies are feathering their own nests at the expense of the American taxpayers, very little is being said about the over-all cost of the St. Lawrence seaway project. We are being told today that the seaway project will only cost the American taxpayers a half a billion dollars—but let me leave this thought with you—should the steam shovels start digging the St. Lawrence seaway there will be American tax dollars in every bucketful of earth—for this project, plus the necessary deepening of lake harbors, together with defending and maintaining it—is expected to cost better than a billion dollars before it is completed with two-thirds of this amount to be sweated out of American taxpayers when in the same breath we are being asked to tighten our belts.

Worse still, a billion dollars is only the estimate of what the project will cost. As a rule estimates are usually way out of line, especially in projects of this nature. For example, the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River cost nearly twice as much as estimated; the Suez Canal cost two and one-half times, and the Chicago drainage canal three and one-half times as much as the engineers estimated. The original cost of the Panama Canal at the time construction started was estimated to be $140,000,000 with the notation that in no case would it exceed $160,000,000. Yet the total cost of the Panama Canal was $375,000,000.

We are hearing a lot today about the cost of the St. Lawrence project being liquidated over a period of 50 years as the result of collecting toll charges. In the first place, the pending legislation contains only suggestions about self-liquidating tolls. It provides only for further negotiations about tolls after construction is under way. As we all know, any negotiations between the United States and Canada regarding the collection of tolls should be definitely settled before construction is begun, and not left to wrangling discussions after the project is completed.

In responsible Canadian quarters the conviction is expressed that Canada will never agree to tolls, because it would be a radical departure from traditional policy. This is further evidence that Uncle Sam and the American people would be left holding the bag.

Turning to the hydroelectric plant, which is the second part and the power phase of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, we are told that it is necessary to erect in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, this hydroelectric project in order to overcome a general power shortage in New England and New York State.

There is no general power shortage in New England or New York State in the accepted sense. I will admit that there have been some postwar difficulties of a very local or temporary character, but new construction of more quickly built types of steam generating plants is the means of solving the problem.

If the people in the northeastern section of the United States are waiting for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, they are going to have to wait at least from 5 to 7 years for its completion.

What is to be done in the meantime regarding the alleged power shortage if it is related in any manner to the needs of our national defense? It is obvious that the speedy construction by free enterprise of steam-generating plants in various locations, which can be erected within a period of 2 years, is the sane and sensible approach to the problem. It is not difficult to recognize that the hydroelectric phase of the St. Lawrence project is being promoted with enthusiasm by the public-power group, composed of Socialist-minded bureaucrats.

Nothing has been mentioned by the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway concerning the mammoth task of defending it against enemy air attack. During the extensive congressional hearings held over a period of years, Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, United States Army (retired) was asked this question: Can the project with its 40 locks more or less and its proposed dams and powerhouses be defended against enemy air attack? He answered, "Categorically no," and continued by saying an enemy with access to the polar route could and definitely would destroy the project's locks, dams, and powerhouses, and sink ships in the narrow canals in the St. Lawrence seaway.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have again tried to label the project as necessary to our national security, despite the fact that we have won two World Wars without it, and that it will require from 5 to 7 years to complete its construction. Meanwhile, money, materials, and manpower urgently needed for the present defense effort would be diverted to a scheme that would ultimately benefit Canada more than the United States.

Finally, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will cost the American people millions of dollars to build, millions of dollars to defend, and millions of dollars to maintain. In addition thousands of Americans would lose their jobs and the rest of us would face lifelong taxes that would reduce our already dwindling purchasing power due to high living costs.

The average American citizen, in my opinion, is tired of being fooled with subsidy schemes and with the resultant high taxes that follow them. The American people will certainly be fooled if the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should ever become a reality.

Selective Universality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald:

SELECTIVE UNIVERSALITY

If the President's new Executive order on student draft deferment is intended to carry over into the universal military service and training program currently under consideration by Congress, it should be viewed with grave misgiving by all friends of the legislation.

For the exceptions therein granted and implied would make the universal program infinitely more selective than selective service has been to date and would seem to open the way for a complete breakdown of the equality of sacrifice principle.

America's strength, as General Hershey pointed out in announcing the new deferment plan, lies not in raw manpower but in scientific and technical know how. We must therefore continue to cultivate specialists as we build up our Armed Forces. Even the strongest advocates of universal military service and training do not suggest now that the educational pipelines be allowed to dry up completely while the military training program is being put into effect.

But there are specialists and specialists. In time of emergency we cannot spare nuclear physicists, perhaps, for basic military training, but it is hard to argue that we cannot spare specialists in English literature or household arts. And the new deferment plan selects, not by specialty, but by marks and aptitude regardless of field.

The President's plan, despite its obvious constructive intent, goes far toward creating that aristocracy of education and wealth which the Defense Department has set itself to prevent in manpower procurement. Congress should continue to emphasize the universal in universal military service and training and seek for a less discriminatory way to protect our colleges and their specialist products.

"Mr. Red Cross"—A Name Justly Earned After Years of Service by Alf Carter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, A. B. Carter, county court clerk of Crittenden County, Ark., is an affable, able, and courteous public official. He is a tireless worker. He is happiest when he is serving his fellow man. I know of no man who excels "Alf" Carter in accommodating the people he serves.

The Crittenden County Times carried an excellent article about the services performed by Mr. Carter to his community, county, and State. I include the full text of this editorial, which reflects the esteem and admiration of a grateful people for a job well done:

"MR. RED CROSS"—A NAME JUSTLY EARNED AFTER YEARS OF SERVICE BY ALF CARTER—COUNTY COURT CLERK HAS BEEN HOME SERVICE CHAIRMAN SO LONG HE CANNOT REMEMBER WHEN HE STARTED

In Crittenden County the names Alf Carter and Red Cross are synonomous.

Mr. Carter, who makes a living by being county court clerk, has worked with the Red Cross for so long that he can't remember when he got started or how it happened that the major burden of work for that organization fell on his shoulders.

He thinks it was several years prior to World War II.

Officially, Mr. Carter is home service chairman for the county organizaiton, but to the majority who come looking for aid of various kinds he is "Mr. Red Cross" or the "Red Cross man."

Under normal set-ups, the home service chairman acts as a sort of go-between man for servicemen and their families. In this capacity, the Crittenden chairman has successfully obtained emergency leaves and furloughs for many a Crittenden soldier, sailor, or airman.

The families of these men require a lot of attention too for sometimes the serviceman doesn't want to do his duty by those back home. It's up to the Red Cross home service chairman to see that some aid is given to deserted families or try to get the serviceman to help.

Mr. Carter tells this story about one of his clients. There was a fellow in service who suddenly came home and told his wife he had been discharged. They moved out on a farm, made a crop and then military police came for him. He wasn't discharged, but deserted. The Red Cross helped his wife and

three children to get along until help was available elsewhere.

Although he isn't emergency chairman, Mr. Carter does most of the processing of requests for emergency aid. He's got his own collection of clothing in the basement of the courthouse for distribution to burned-out families and others who might need something to wear. And incidentally, he says he could use a few more donations for that supply.

Last year through his efforts, Red Cross workers came into the county and set up headquarters at West Memphis to provide aid for flood victims—the job being just too big for one man.

Despite all the free service he gives to help others, Mr. Carter gives financially to help boost the annual Red Cross funds.

And that's the reason for this story—to give credit to a man who gives unselfishly of his time to help others and impress upon you the need for you to give unselfishly of your money to help provide the money needed to make this humanitarian program possible.

Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, long-awaited action by Congress to suspend the import tax on copper now seems to be a reality.

Realism demands that we augment the domestic supply of copper with that mined in Chile. The burden of mobilizing industry cannot be carried without additional copper supplies free of this onerous tax.

I am extremely pleased to note that the news letter of the Mining Association of Montana, in its current issue, carries the text of a resolution adopted by the Utah Mining Association and a statement calling for repeal of the import tax on copper. Their patriotic recognition will aid immeasurably in the smooth passage by Congress of suspension legislation.

The news letter follows:

COPPER TARIFF

Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts, on March 1 introduced into Congress Senate Joint Resolution 41, providing that the import tax of 2 cents per pound now imposed on foreign imported copper be eliminated during the period beginning January 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1952.

The Utah Mining Association, in a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting in Salt Lake City on March 5, urged the suspension of the present import tax on copper. Full text of the resolution is:

"Whereas the supply of copper now available in the United States from all sources is so short of essential demands that fabricators of metal, for civilian and military uses, have been seriously curtailed and restricted in their efforts to supply requirements; and

"Whereas it is clear that our requirements of copper for essential uses are increasing so rapidly that domestic production of the metal is grossly inadequate to maintain our standard of living; in fact, for the first 10 months of 1950, adding all primary domestic copper production to secondary and import copper available, we were approximately 176,000 tons short of our domestic requirements; and

"Whereas it is essential to the success of our mobilization program and to our domestic economy that an adequate supply of copper be obtained by supplementing our domestic production from accessible foreign sources; and

"Whereas unless supplies of available copper are supplemented from foreign sources, inferior substitutes which are more costly and less efficient will have to be used, thus adding to the cost of our emergency program and our cost of living, and ultimately seriously damaging our domestic industry; and

"Whereas although we generally favor protection of our domestic metal industry from foreign competition, it is obvious, and has been well demonstrated, that the import tax imposed on copper is a hindrance and an obstacle to obtaining our essential requirements of this metal and that said tax serves no useful purpose under the present circumstances whatsoever: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That for our national defense and well-being, to maintain our economy and way of life and to preserve and maintain a healthy, adequate domestic copper industry from mine to consumer, the Utah Mining Association, representing the mining industry in this State, earnestly urges that the present import tax on copper be suspended forthwith and that such tax or any tax on imported copper not be imposed unless and until it is demonstrated that our domestic copper industry is injured or is in jeopardy from foreign competition: provided further, however, that if the domestic price of copper falls to a point where our domestic copper industry is injured or is in jeopardy, that the copper import tax shall automatically be reinstituted on a sliding scale basis commensurate with the maintenance of a healthy domestic copper industry."

We understand that the Nevada Mine Operators' Association and some of the local unions of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers have taken action similar to the action of the Utah Mining Association. During the summer of 1949 (when there was no duty on copper) the executive committee of the Mining Association of Montana adopted a resolution that "the copper tariff be not reimposed", and since the tariff was reimposed, our Association has been very active in urging that the tariff be suspended or abolished; the basis of this request being somewhat the same as outlined in the Utah resolution.

Southerners in Congress Might Save World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a magnificent editorial by Dr. Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, in which he discusses the possibilities of southerners in Congress being able to save world peace. I especially commend the reading of this editorial to all of the Members of Congress, but more especially to the Senators and Representatives from the Southern States, since it is directed primarily to them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERNERS IN CONGRESS MIGHT SAVE WORLD PEACE

To Our Southern Senators and Representatives in Congress:

DEAR FRIENDS: First of all, let me pay a deserved tribute to you gentlemen who now represent our Southern States in Washington. As a careful student of both Houses of Congress for many years I can sincerely say this:

Beginning with the distinguished and veteran Kentuckian who presides over the Senate, the distinguished Texan who presides over the House, the equally distinguished Texan who so largely directs American foreign policy, and on down through our newest Members of Congress, I believe the South has never had an abler, worthier, or more distinguished representation than in 1950–51—or one more fully commanding the respect and confidence not only of our own people but of our whole Nation.

And because this is true I know that you can have all the greater influence in shaping the destinies of America—and the world—at this critical time. It is a time, indeed, when the scales between world peace and world war are so evenly balanced that a relatively few highly placed men in a country so powerful as the United States may tip the balance either one way or the other.

In fact, it is my belief that not improbably you 28 southerners now in the United States Senate and you 128 now in our National House of Representatives have enough ability, enough power, and enough prestige to swing the future destiny of mankind to the side of peace, progress, and human brotherhood—if you but have two things: (1) The faith and vision to realize your own possibilities and responsibilities in this hour, and (2) the wisdom to band yourselves together in one continuing determination to render this service to mankind. Whether you will it or not, and however much you might wish to avoid it, you now have a "rendezvous with destiny."

Why do I thus single out you 156 Representatives of our southern people in Congress? Do not all Senators and Representatives in Congress have equally great opportunities and equally great responsibility? No; they do not—and for some very obvious reasons.

First, I have already referred to the fact that southern prestige and position in Congress—as represented by the Speakership of both Houses and the chairmanship of powerful committees—have never been higher than now. But this is not all. You southerners in Congress also have a tremendous advantage in that you are not split into two violently opposing political parties, nor even (in spite of your many proper differences of viewpoint) into two bitterly opposing factions. No other great section of America—North, East, or West—has half such solidarity or half so great an opportunity for working together like brothers in a supreme effort to save our Nation and our world in the present crisis.

Furthermore, no part of America has a greater economic stake in world peace or will suffer so seriously from world impoverishment by war as the South. For our South is still a predominantly agricultural section, and our two greatest money crops—cotton and tobacco—are incomparably the greatest export products of American farms. Every man who cultivates an acre of southern land has a stake in the peace and prosperity of Europe and Asia.

Furthermore—and this may be most important of all—our section, the South, is the only section of America—North, South,

East, and West—that knows from experience what a tragic, devastating, and long-enduring disaster any people may suffer by plunging into any war that patience and diplomacy and statesmanship might somehow have avoided. The South knows. The rest of America does not. And because the South knows, do not our southern Senators and Representatives owe a high duty not only to the South but to all America to save us from such a possible disaster? As General Marshall says, "There are no victors in modern warfare." Or as Gen. Omar Bradley says:

"The victorious power in another war will stand amidst its own ruins * * * in a shattered and impoverished world."

What can you do to save world peace? I certainly don't know all the answers. No one of us knows. But I do know this—that if you should resolve singly and as a group (1) to seek all possible truth and (2) to use all possible wisdom that you might win, then I have no doubt but that your final policy and action will be wise. Benjamin Franklin was certainly never an overly religious man. Yet in an hour of national peril and darkness he saw no safe light for the path ahead except that which comes from asking a Higher Power for a wisdom and courage greater than man can find in any other way. On a recent trip to Washington nothing encouraged me more than my accidental discovery that one morning each week during these trying times a group of Senators meets in a quiet prayer service all by themselves to seek a wisdom greater than their own.

HOW TO USE YOUR KINGLY POWERS

In the foregoing paragraphs I have not said much about the specific policies that you southerners in Congress should follow to save humanity from the disaster and devastation of war. On this page last month I discussed that question at some length. But my supreme purpose will have been achieved if I have only succeeded in helping you Senators and Representatives in Congress realize these facts:

1. Our southerners in Congress now have greater prestige, power, and responsibility for service to all America and the world than they have ever had before. It is indeed a power and a responsibility greater than most kings ever exercised in preceding centuries.

2. The South's economic conditions give it a greater stake in world peace and progress than any other section has. Southern farm people especially depend on you to safeguard our future welfare and happiness.

3. The history of the South enables us to realize, as other sections can never realize, how tragic may be the consequences of any war which patience, wisdom, statesmanship, and diplomacy might have avoided.

4. We are in a time when, in my considered opinion, no solution is possible if it does not go beyond America's own safety, self-interest, or future economic or military advantage. Whether we wish it or not, the only plain common-sense thing to do is to "try Christianity—now." I favor all the military preparedness Generals Eisenhower and Marshall ask to meet the menace of enemy governments—but all this may be worthless unless we also have a truly Christian world program to win the hearts of men and women in all lands.

5. Two things at least I believe we must do: First, we must take a patient and a not-too-arrogant, not-too-dictatorial position in the United Nations and try to work out solutions with weaker and more endangered peoples. Second, because of the far greater riches, power, and property we in America have—not by our own effort but by our gifts from the Almighty, the rich natural resources of a virgin continent—we must make a greater contribution than any other nation to a world program of reconstruction and development. We need some such program not of charity, but a program of stimulated and encouraged self-help. We need not merely to live and let live but "live and help live"—such a program as is embodied in the point 4 and International Development Advisory Board proposals. And perhaps the soundest of all such programs is that advocated by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON and his cosponsors substantially as follows:

1. That all nations reduce armaments and spend two-thirds of their most recent war budgets for a world program of reconstruction, irrigation, education, health, industrial progress, and human welfare.

2. That if other nations agree to do this, the United States would itself give ten billion a year for 5 years for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor, The Progressive Farmer.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "St. Lawrence Waterway Gains Support," by Richard L. Strout, published in the Christian Science Monitor on March 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY GAINS SUPPORT—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The proposal to build the St. Lawrence waterway is being taken very seriously in Washington, and after 50 years of delay it may now be approved by Congress. The irony is that if done now it will be at a time of major shortages in steel and cement. If it had been done when first proposed it might have been of inestimable value in World Wars I and II. Also, of course, such an undertaking as this would have put many of the unemployed men to work in the thirties who finally ended up on made-work projects like raking leaves.

Nobody knows the acute shortage of present-day steel better than Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization. Yet he appeared before the House Committee on Public Works the other day to recommend immediate construction of the St. Lawrence project, even though it would add to the demand for steel. Secretary of Defense George Marshall appeared likewise, though he wants precious iron and steel for munitions and tanks. Both admitted that starting now would complicate the economic and raw-material problem. Both nevertheless backed the seaway, and they are joined by other men of like prominence.

What has made the difference? Primarily the fact that the supply of iron ore from the fabulous Mesabi Range is nearing depletion. We have exhausted what seemed once to be an inexhaustible supply. To replace the Mesabi Range, the prospectors have found huge new supplies of iron ore in Labrador and in Venezuela. If there is a through-water highway to the center of the United States industrial life, these new supplies of ore can be brought in cheaply. They will feed the steel mills in the Great Lakes area.

The need for such a highway is urgent, advocates say. The seaway, it is estimated, can be finished in 9 years if started now. By 1960, Mr. Wilson explained, the prospective 130,000,000 ton ingot steel industry will annually need 160,000,000 gross tons of high-grade ore. If we are really going to have an expansion like that, we can't start building the ore highway for it too quickly. Mr. Wilson has weighed the pros and cons and gives the verdict, "Go ahead."

The waterway will produce enormous amounts of electric power. This will be available all over eastern Canada, New York, and New England. The amount likely for the American side is estimated at 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. American Presidents have vainly appealed for the waterway since the time of Woodrow Wilson. The pressure against the program has heretofore been strong, but now the switch of the big inland steel industry to support of the waterway may well swing the balance of power.

It is curious to note that in the current issue of John L. Lewis' Mine Workers' Journal there is a bitter attack on the St. Lawrence waterway. Why? So far as the detached observer can see, it is because the miners identify themselves with coal rather than hydroelectric power and with railroads using coal rather than with waterways.

Some of the other groups that have objected to the waterway are spokesmen for seaports of the east coast and representatives of power combinations that saw their position compromised by possible new competition. Of course, the Congressmen from Lakes ports favored the scheme which involves deepening present inadequate channels to 27 feet. This would make a submarine-free inland waterway available for most of the world's cargo commerce. One stock phrase is that it would bring Duluth "1,000 miles nearer to London."

The world seems just on the point of beginning to get power from a new source, uranium. It may be that 10 years from now the first big atomic power plant will be available as the St. Lawrence nexus of dams begins liberating electric current throughout eastern North America. It is comforting to feel that as one source of supply in nature tends to be exhausted others generally come in sight. But what the United States is going to do for cheap iron ore to replace the Mesabi Range unless the waterway is built is difficult to say.

The Danger Point in Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to my attention by Rudolph C. Larson, of Hartford, Conn., a most interesting article on the effect of taxation upon inflation.

Vivid examples of the disaster which engulfed other nations where taxes became too great in proportion to the national income are contained in this reprint from Harper's magazine.

I commend it to the attention of all Members, and with particular emphasis to those serving on the Committee on Ways and Means, who are currently

considering sources of increased revenue:

THE DANGER POINT IN TAXES

(By Colin Clark)

I

How high can taxes rise without economic trouble? The question is timely. People have always grumbled about taxes, but during the past three or four decades—as a result of two hot wars and the high defense costs of the cold war, to say nothing of the gradually rising expense of Government services of many sorts—most of us have watched our taxes climb to such unprecedented heights that we must have sincerely wondered what the effective limit was; and in the United States today, with new war costs mounting and new tax increases being debated, the question presses with special urgency. Is there a discoverable point where the burden of taxes becomes insupportable—or supportable only by such dubious means as inflation?

We have learned, from the experience of many countries, what happens when taxes mount too high. Many people don't find it worth their while to work hard and efficiently. Production doesn't expand as fast as it should. There is a shortage of goods, followed by an inflationary rise in prices. The government then usually makes a countermove—attempting by price controls, wage controls, and rationing to suppress the inflation that is developing, hoping that in due course production and the real national income will grow enough to carry the burden without controls. But this, experience shows, usually takes too long; and there is then a quick escape into uncontrolled inflation—which benefits some people, but does great harm to the great majority, including especially those lower-paid wage-earners who generally keep their savings in the form of money rather than real property.

All this is familiar to us as a sequence of events that has been repeated over and over again in the experience of many countries. Yet the part that excessively high taxes play in causing inflation is still not fully appreciated. It is very widely understood that if a government incurs very heavy expenditures, and these are not covered by taxation, and the government runs at a deficit, the automatic result will be an inflationary trend. It is not so generally understood that if a government incurs very heavy expenditures, and these are covered by taxation, so that the budget is balanced, the trend—while it may be deflationary for a time—will in the long run be toward inflation if the rate of taxation is too high to be borne. The long run, in this case, is probably a period of 2 or 3 years, though this may depend on the nature of the emergency; in wartime it may be longer.

The question I am raising is, how high is too high? What is the danger point? How much of the national income can be taken in taxes before this uncomfortable sequence of events gets under way? Can we, by reviewing the experience of various nations during the past quarter century, fix the point where the danger signals begin to fly? I believe we can.

The foundations of our knowledge on this subject were laid by Lord Keynes in a flash of brilliant insight in 1922. In that year, it may be remembered, inflation was proceeding apace in France and the exchange rate of the franc was falling rapidly. French official opinion hoped to bring it back to its 1914 parity by restoring the balance of trade, and the first step toward this objective was to have been the military occupation of the Ruhr coal field. Meanwhile the French press was claiming that British and American speculation was the cause of the falling exchange rate. Keynes' insight, however, told him that the French inflation would continue. In attempting to pay a high rate of interest on a huge mass of national debt (rentes), the Finance Minister was imposing an intolerable burden of public expenditure, amounting to 34 percent of the current national income.

Keynes remarked: "The level of the franc is going to be settled in the long run, not by speculation or the balance of trade, or even the outcome of the Ruhr adventure, but by the proportion of his earned income which the French taxpayer will permit to be taken from him to pay the claims of the French rentier [bondholder]."

In other words, inflation was the only way out of the financial impasse, and the inflation continued rapidly. Prices increased much faster than government expenditure and by 1926 the latter was only a little over 20 percent of the national income. Then the inflation was checked and a measure of deflation followed. From 1927 onward prices were stabilized. But the interesting thing is that this period of economic and political stability was reached with the level of government expenditure almost exactly 25 percent of the national income. (Lord Keynes commented in 1928: "The French budget balances with the burden of the rentes on the taxpayer bearable at the present level.")

A second relevant prophecy in the period between World War I and World War II also concerned French finances. It was made in 1934 by the Swedish economist, Prof. Bertil Ohlin. He pointed out that French public expenditure by that date had again become such an excessive proportion of the national income (nearly 34 percent) that further devaluation of the franc was unavoidable. The devaluation which he predicted actually occurred in 1936 and French prices went on rising until 1938, by which time the proportion of government expenditure to national income had again been reduced almost exactly to 25 percent.

During the 1920's there were moderate deflations in Britain and Italy and a severe deflation in Norway. Each was carried to the point where it raised the proportion of taxation to national income somewhere between 23 and 25 percent, beyond which it was not carried further. This demonstrates my point in reverse, so to speak.

During the period 1934–35 I prepared a Fabian pamphlet which examined in detail all the taxes then in force in the United Kingdom, estimating by rough commonsense methods the maximum additional revenue which could be obtained from them. (In making this study, I assumed that the British economy was brought to full employment, out of the heavy unemployment then prevailing.) The interesting thing is that the conclusion reached by this method was also that the maximum feasible taxation was almost exactly 25 percent of the national income.

Although this evidence is far from conclusive it certainly suggests that the critical level of taxation beyond which inflationary forces come into play (and deflationary forces suffer a political check) is around 25 percent of the national income.

II

In 1944 I wrote for the Economic Journal an article—eventually published in December 1945—in which I put forward the figure of 25 percent as the measure of taxable capacity. Lord Keynes, who was editing the Journal, wrote me in May 1944 that "in Great Britain after the war I should guess that your figure of 25 percent as the maximum tolerable proportion of taxation may be exceedingly near to the truth," and added that he would not be at all surprised if postwar experience confirmed it.

Now what has been the actual history of the matter since the end of World War II? In the United States, taxation did not pass the critical limit until 1943, and even in the worst years of the war it rose no higher than 29 percent of the national income. Suppressed inflation (rationing and price controls) ended in 1946; whereupon open inflation continued at a moderate rate until 1948, bringing taxes down to almost exactly the 25-percent level.

In a number of countries open inflation was in full swing before the war actually ended. Belgium avoided excessive debt and other burdens on the budget and was fortunate in escaping serious damage to her productive capacity. Her price level by 1946 had risen threefold or fourfold above prewar and this rise sufficed to reduce the burden of Government expenditure to 22 percent of the national income. At this point price stabilization became possible. In France at the same time, however, Government expenditure was one-third of the national income and inflation continued rapidly. It went on to the end of 1948, when a price level 20 times prewar was reached. At that point the budget could be balanced at some 25 percent of the national income.

In Italy inflation proceeded more rapidly, to over 50 times the prewar price level in 1947, when it was suddenly checked. The budget is now balanced with public expenditure at 22 percent of national income, plus 7 percent of national income in social insurance charges (the incidence of which is uncertain).

In Japan there was a hundredfold inflation up to 1949, when prices were stabilized. Taxation is now 30 percent of the national income; but our rule is not violated, for some measure of rationing and price control has continued to be necessary. No doubt the authorities expect that in the next year or so a rapid rise in production, without any further rise in prices being necessary, will raise the national income and thereby lower the tax ratio considerably.

Countries suffering severe suppressed inflation are Britain, Norway, and perhaps the Netherlands. Sweden has moderate suppressed inflation. Australia and New Zealand have suppressed inflation now in the process of becoming open. What are the significant facts about them?

Britain started the war with a figure of 26 percent (including social insurance) of national income going to taxes. The figure rose to 42 percent in 1945. There was a slight reduction in the next 2 years and then the figure started rising again to the appalling level of 43.7 percent for 1949, well above the highest wartime ratio. Although Britain has made a great show of decontrolling a certain number of minor items, the main mass of controls is as rigid as ever, particularly over housing and most articles of food. Last year's devaluation is unlikely to make much difference because it has not been allowed to raise British wages and prices except to a minor degree. It seems inevitable that Britain's suppressed inflation, after a longer or shorter interval, will break out into open inflation, probably on a catastrophic scale. (Incidentally, Hugh Dalton who, when Chancelor of the Exchequer, had a lot to do with boosting British tax rates up to current levels, thought my proposed tax rate of 25 percent of the national income was far too high when I put it forward in the prewar Fabian pamphlet mentioned above. It seemed to him a dangerously radical proposal. After the war he set a 40-percent figure. When I criticized it, he accused me of being a dangerous reactionary.)

The Netherlands figure is now 30 percent. In Norway, which also suffers severe suppressed inflation, a ratio of some 40 percent prevails. Sweden, which has a mild form of suppressed inflation, has a ratio of just over 25 percent. Australia and New Zealand are also at about the 25-percent level and are today emerging from suppressed into open inflation.

All these facts seem to support the conclusion—which is further reinforced by the re-

cent experience of Finland, Switzerland, and Denmark—that the safe political and economic limit of taxation is somewhere near 25 percent of the national income. In this figure all forms of taxation are included: direct and indirect, Federal, State, and local. The figure doesn't tell what proportion of your individual income can legitimately be taken in taxation; it simply indicates how large a proportion of the national income can safely be taken. If the experience of the 1940's, on top of that of the twenties and thirties, doesn't convince you that the 25-percent figure is pretty nearly correct, then I don't know what will.

Proposed Deferment of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the analysis by Hanson W. Baldwin, in the New York Times of April 4, 1951, of the President's very dangerous plan for the Government to choose our college students, and set up an intellectual elite, while the American Armed Forces are deprived of men with first-rate intelligence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFERMENT IDEA FAULTY—ORDER TO KEEP BEST STUDENTS FROM DRAFT IGNORES CHARACTER AND LEADERSHIP VALUE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's Executive order authorizing a new category of draft deferment—"deferment by brains"—is likely to be one of the subjects of debate in the House of Representatives' discussion of the military manpower bill, which that Chamber took up yesterday.

The arguments for such a deferment procedure, which, will, in effect, keep those college students with the highest marks out of military service, are strong and persuasive. Yet the procedure and the principle have some grave disadvantages that are certain to be exposed by Congress.

The deferments are dictated by the obvious need of the Nation for engineers, scientists, doctors, dentists, trained technicians, and well-educated men. The interruption and damage to the educational system of the Nation during the last war was a serious one. The United States, unlike some of the other warring powers, allowed the immediate emergency of military demands to imperil the future welfare of the Nation not only by reducing greatly the college population but by eliminating or reducing the flow of highly trained scientists and engineers into national life.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS SERIOUS

Partially as a result of mistaken draft policies in World War II, there is a serious shortage today of scientists, engineers, and technically trained personnel. Government statistics indicated that there are only about 575,000 engineers and scientists in the Nation, and less than 10 percent of these hold doctorate degrees. Yet the present shortage will become worse if our defense program expands. The new deferment procedures are intended to remedy the present shortage and prepare an adequate flow of students for future needs.

Yet, cogent as this reasoning is, an "oligarchy of brains" does not fit well into the democratic concept. The deferment procedures mean that students with the best marks (supplemented by aptitude tests) will be allowed to continue college careers, while those with marks not quite so good will go into the services.

But there are two sides to this coin. In the first place, this procedure means that, except for those few who volunteer, the "brightest" students (judged by marks and tests) will be denied to the services. In the second place, it means that marks and "book learning"—not character or leadership qualifications—are to be the principal criteria by which a student is to be assessed worthy or unworthy of further educational opportunity. Yet certainly the services need brains and certainly the home front needs leaders and men of character.

This is not to say that brains, character, and leadership are incompatible. They are not; sometimes they are all found in one man and he is what might be called the optimum man. But the difficulty with the new deferment procedure is that it is based solely, or largely, on only one of these three important criteria.

Yet the Fuchs case and other spy trials, and the revelations of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees demonstrated that men of brains, in or out of Government, can be traitors and parasites unless they are also men of character and men who will assume the grave responsibility of leadership for the national good.

Indeed, the new deferment procedures illustrate perhaps more graphically than many words what has been wrong with our educational system—it stresses the mind but not the man. There has been too little emphasis on character and leadership development. Yet these two elements of the optimum man are of fundamental importance, not alone to the military service but to the Nation. They are just as likely to be found in the bottom half of a class as in the top half. And they are just as much needed in the services as they are on the home front. Brains, alone, are not enough.

Controversy Between Organized Labor and Defense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement published as an advertisement entitled "These Are the Issues," relating to the general subject of collective bargaining, signed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, by Herschel C. Adkinson, president, and printed in the Washington Star of April 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE ARE THE ISSUES

It is necessary that an attempt be made to present to the American people the issues involved in the quarrel between the representatives of organized labor and the defense agencies in Washington and what the position of business is on those matters. From the time that the labor representatives walked out of the advisory committees to the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Economic Stabilization Agency, the Office of Defense Manpower, Department of Labor, the Defense Production Administration, and left their posts as special assistants to Eric Johnston, Anna Rosenberg, and William H. Harrison, numerous statements have been issued and many speeches have been made.

It is doubtful that the public has been enlightened by this debate. Yet, on the correct determination of the issues in dispute depend not only the success of the country's defense program, but the future welfare of our economic and political system. The debate is not and should not be a private dispute, for basic policies are at stake which will affect this country for many years to come. It is because we recognize the gravity of the situation and the urgent need for understanding and cooperation among all elements of the population that we undertake to state our views concerning the few underlying questions as we see them.

THE CRUX OF THE ISSUE

There is, first, the matter of wage stabilization. On this we have a wealth of experience the world over and for almost any period of recorded history. This record shows many things. But one thing it shows is undeniable. If costs of production are raised and if income is increased in the face of a reduced and declining volume of goods and services, it is impossible to hold prices in check. This is the conditions this country and other countries faced in World War I and II, and the condition it faces now and in the next years as our industry is required to turn out an increasing volume of military products and a shrinking volume of civilian products. This is the crux of the wage issue in times like these. It is a problem that cannot be evaded or argued away. Nor can it be blamed on anybody. The blame, if any, can only be put on a public policy which calls for military mobilization on a large and increasing scale. This policy the American people are committed to.

Under these conditions, wages must assume a part of the burden of restraint, mainly because wages are by all odds the largest part of the costs of business. They run consistently at more than 60 percent of the national income and currently at more than $125,000,000,000 a year. Raising this wage bill will inevitably raise costs and income at a time when the stern necessities of an anti-inflationary policy require that they be stopped from going up. This, too, is nobody's fault. It is an accounting fact. Any reasonable person would expect that 50,000,000 wage and salary employees would take the lion's share of the country's income. This being so, it is futile to look for price stability without wage stability.

IT'S YOUR PAY

The second issue has to do with how wage stabilization, if that is what we want, is to be administered. This sounds like a technical question and has been made to seem so in much of the discussion about it. But it is far from that. It goes to the heart of labor relations. Stated as simply as possible, the question is whether the jurisdiction of a Federal board should be restricted to fixing the principles, rules, and regulations of wage stabilization or should be expanded to include, also, the settlement of labor disputes and strikes. In a communication dated March 13 to Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator, the representatives of several business organizations agreed to granting the Board jurisdiction over disputes of a monetary or economic character, directly related to and affecting stabilization, involving all forms of remuneration to employees. There they drew the line. There, in our

reasoned judgment, the line should be drawn in the interest of sound and workable labor relations in American industry.

A REACTIONARY STEP

On this question, the representatives of organized labor take an opposite position. They want a board to be granted jurisdiction over all disputes of whatever nature, including all wages, even those that don't conflict with the regulations, and such issues as seniority, discipline, union security, management functions, operating procedures and the like. To accede to this demand would be a long reactionary step in the policies and practices of collective bargaining and would set back labor relations many decades.

Everybody knows how much this country went through since the middle thirties in efforts to establish collective bargaining in this country. Today organized labor claims 15,000,000 members and continues daily to grow. Our major industries are unionized and negotiate constantly with the representatives of organized employees. Once a Federal board is granted jurisdiction over all labor disputes, the incentive to bargain and settle things locally would be progressively weakened. Washington and its policies would become the center of labor relations.

An increasing number of labor representatives would hope to get more from a busy Government board than through their own negotiations. Instead of settling disputes promptly and on the spot, they would soon acquire the habit of submitting them to Washington or to a regional board. This is not speculation; it is experience. No sure and more effective means of shirking the responsibility, which is so essential to the successful practice of collective bargaining, could be found.

LOOK AT THE RAILROADS

Long experience in the United States and in other countries demonstrates how fatal to free collective bargaining the entry of Government into labor relations becomes. We have had a succession of examples of such unfortunate consequences in what has happened on the railroads since 1840. The Railway Labor Act, once considered a model Federal labor statute, has become a dead letter. Direct negotiations between the roads and the unions are steadily declining in importance. Increasing numbers of the decisions by statutory emergency boards are disregarded. More and more disputes are brought to Washington. Strikes have increased. It has become a frequent occurrence for the Federal Government to seize the railroads in order to assure or restore the vital transportation services of the Nation.

EXISTING MACHINERY AVAILABLE

This experience is a bad precedent for the balance of American industry and labor. It is clear to us, as we think it should be to all employees, that there are grave risks in making the problems of labor relations the football of politics. As matters now stand there is ample established machinery in this country, Federal and local, to assist employers and labor in adjusting their differences. To add a new superboard will promote and not discourage trouble and will consequently harm and not serve the national interest in these difficult times.

COOPERATION BY ALL, EXPLOITATION BY NONE

Behind these particular issues lies the gravest threat of all. This is the use of an international and domestic emergency as the occasion for acquiring power over Government and over industry. The task before American business from now on is an arduous and exacting one. As the results of the performance during World War II plainly show, a task of heroic proportions was then accomplished. If industry is to discharge its responsibilities now, as it did then, it can only do so with the wholehearted cooperation of Government and labor. In our society all citizens have the right—indeed, the duty—to protect and advance their legitimate interests, but this does not mean that any group is under a mandate to turn a critical situation to its own selfish advantage, to violate the spirit of our political institutions, and to seek to take over the management and functions of business and industry.

COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
HERSCHEL C. ATKINSON, *President.*

Will Red China's Hate of United States Mean Stalemate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Will Red China's Hate of United States Mean Stalemate?" written by Carrol Binder, and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 1, 1951. This is a very splendid, thought-provoking article, and for that reason I have asked that it appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL RED CHINA'S HATE OF UNITED STATES MEAN STALEMATE?

(By Carroll Binder)

Does Red China's scornful rejection of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's bid for battlefield negotiations foreshadow renewed Communist attempts to drive United Nations forces out of Korea? Or may more tactful approaches bring an end to hostilities which neither the Chinese Communists nor the 14 nations with troops fighting under the UN banner have anything to gain by prolonging at this stage?

Very little light on these questions trickles through the bamboo curtain which separates the Red Chinese from the free world. There are no free journalists reporting from Red China. The few free diplomats in China have only limited access to the top Chinese leadership. Their reports are kept relatively secret.

If one takes Red Chinese propaganda literally one could hardly help feeling extremely gloomy about the future of the struggle on the Asiatic mainland.

The Red Chinese radio distorted MacArthur's unfortunately phrased remarks about UN ability to hit Red China hard into a declaration that "the United States and Britain are preparing to directly invade China."

This gave great impetus to Red Chinese propaganda efforts to persuade the soldiers and people of China that they must support the war in Korea in order to defend the Chinese homeland from "American imperialists."

For many months Communist propaganda has represented the UN effort in Korea as the first phase of a United States effort to conquer China. The war in Korea is presented to the Chinese people as a "sacred campaign to resist America, aid Korea, protect our homes, safeguard our country and world peace."

This thesis is being stressed in radio broadcasts, by public speakers, "current affairs discussion groups," posters, shop window displays, and letter-writing projects. It is reinforced by witch hunts against Chinese suspected of entertaining friendly thoughts for Americans because of religious, educational or business associations in the past.

These latter are characterized as "counter-revolutionary elements" or "those who work with imperialism against the fatherland." "Imperialism" in the Communist vocabulary applies to United States relations with China but not to Russia's.

A century of American medical, educational, and other philanthropic aid to the Chinese people is counteracted with this sort of propaganda:

"Through their economic exploitation the United States sucked the blood and sweat of the Chinese people and then hoped to buy them off with a small portion of what the United States imperialists had squeezed from their toil. They made big investments to subsidize religious, cultural, and relief bodies in China. But the United States imperialists are completely mistaken in thinking that they can really buy the hearts of the Chinese people with a few of their dirty, blood-stained dollars."

The Reds announce discoveries of "American underground organizations" as a prelude to terroristic arrests, show trials and mass executions. Shih Liang, Red China's woman minister of justice, has ordered Communist courts to refuse mercy to anyone even suspected of opposing the Peiping regime and "to let heads roll." Courts now can order a prisoner shot for "intentions," with the courts deciding what the intentions may have been.

Mayor Peng Chen, of Peiping (who also is deputy chairman of Red China's highest administrative body) has instituted a new technique for "suppressing the wolves of America and Chiang Kai-shek." He arraigned 25 persons accused of being "arch counterrevolutionary criminals" before 5,500 people's representatives on March 24.

"What are you going to do with these important special agents, bandit leaders, despots, and leaders of secret religious societies?" Mayor Peng asked his mob of judges, according to the Communist news agency.

Shoot them, the audience replied, according to the agency. Peng promised execution sentences tomorrow since all of you demand suppression. And the next day, Easter Sunday, thousands of people turned out to watch the firing squad dispose of the condemned, according to a subsequent dispatch.

Thousands are estimated to have been executed in the current purges, not all for being pro-American. Some just stood in the way of the "new China." And some, as in all such blood baths, just had the misfortune to have their intentions misconstrued by the purgers.

Such purges should not be construed as evidence that the Red regime is faced with serious threat of overthrow by would-be revolters. They are rather a means of making sure that the regime meets with no serious opposition when it calls up new contingents for the armed forces, collects heavier levies from the peasants, or confiscates what it desires from urbanites.

The purges are accompanied by systematic campaigns to speed up industrial and agricultural production to help the war effort in Korea. The rejection of MacArthur's proposal was accompanied by fresh references to Formosa, which the Reds vow to take this year. They also vowed to take it last year.

The best time for an operation against Formosa would be between April and midsummer. Vice Admiral Struble, on the eve of relinquishing command of the United States Seventh Fleet, said it is now strong enough to prevent any Chinese Communist invasion of Formosa. He also said the fleet

is strong enough to blockade the long coastline of Red China.

Struble's successor, Vice Admiral Martin, added that any attempt by Chinese Nationalists on Formosa to invade the mainland of China will be blocked by the United States Navy. That is in accordance with President Truman's directive of last summer which aimed at localizing the war in Korea.

United States and United Nations policy still aims at localizing hostilities and bringing them to the earliest possible acceptable conclusion.

Unless Russia gives Red China a large amount of air support (which up to now it has shown no disposition to give) there is no possibility of Red China driving U. N. forces out of Korea, as it repeated its intention of doing on March 29. The U. N. forces are sufficiently strong to withstand whatever ground forces Red China may throw against them in a fresh attempt to preserve world peace by fighting the Americans.

United Nations forces are not strong enough, however, to defeat Red China if its leaders choose to sacrifice all prospects for rural reconstruction and industrial development in a desperate attempt to vindicate their theories about the United States.

The efforts to reach an honorable settlement mentioned here last week are based on the hope that the Red Chinese will not subject their low-grade economy and their far from war-minded nation to the hazards of a long drawn out major war. Peiping unfortunately shows no inclination to such realistic thinking.

Investigation of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is the Place," relating to the recent investigation of crime in the United States, published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of Saturday, March 31, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE PLACE

The story is told of Brigham Young, after he had led his Mormon followers across hundreds of miles of desert, a trip which took courage and fortitude, coming at last to a certain pass in a mountain range and, after looking out over a broad valley which contained Great Salt Lake, turning to his ragged and worn followers and saying, "This is the place."

And now, many years after, and in another era, may we not also say this is the place.

Shown the way by the Senate Crime Investigation Committee, should not we all make up our minds that this is indeed the place and the time to see to it that these sleazy, working-in-the-hours-of-darkness racketeers and gangsters be once and for all put in their places. That applies to every village and hamlet in the country, as well as to the largest cities, and should serve as notice to any politician, selling his country down the river for a few dirty dollars, that an aroused public will be riding herd on him to see that he carries out his oath of office and works for the people who elected him, rather than for the mobster who backed his candidacy.

We are entitled to good government and we, if we make up our minds to it, can get it—and what a welcome change it will be—if we recognize the danger that is in the course we are pursuing today.

We are entitled to ask our officeholders why these leeches on the body politic are allowed to exist and grow fat and insolent, while those who fall under their spell grow poor because of the money they have thrown away.

We are entitled to ask and to get the answer as to why the vast majority of us living honestly and trying to deal fairly with our fellowman and, above all, making correct returns on our income-tax statements, are hounded if we make what appears to be an error, while these overlords of the underworld are allowed to get away with millions of dollars without fear of being punished.

We are entitled to ask and get an answer to the question as to why these shady characters were not hauled up short many years ago and kept in durance vile, when we have seen how comparatively easy it has been for an investigating committee to haul them before the public gaze and show them in their true colors—colors predominantly yellow.

We are entitled to ask and certainly an answer should be forthcoming as to why men who hold responsible posts, who should be above reproach, suddenly accept bribes and close their eyes to what is going on and shut their hearts to the welfare of their fellow citizens.

We are entitled to all these things and we have the power to get them.

Today the Nation is forced along on a death march, led and guarded by a small group of men not reared in and caring nothing about the American tradition. In that direction lies final ruin, because millions of people will find themselves governed by a small but vicious and yet spineless gang and nowhere in the great tradition of this country has there been room for such a situation.

So now, today, not tomorrow or the day after, is the place and the time to correct these evils which have been weakening our moral structure and making us vulnerable from all sides.

We have been shown the way and have been brought to the pass in the mountain where we may look on the wide valley that can be made fertile by hard work. It is up to us to make the most of it and in the process to be true to ourselves.

Yes; this is the place—and the time.

Marble Plaques of Great Lawgivers of the Past and Lawmakers Who Had Had the Greatest Influence on the American Legal System, Adorning the Walls of the Hall of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the beautifully reconstructed and redecorated Hall of the House of Representatives, no feature has attracted more attention and inquiry than the marble plaques of great lawgivers and lawmakers of the past adorning its walls.

The historical background and the accomplishments of the individuals who are represented by these marble plaques constitute the basis of an extremely interesting and informative article written by Roy L. Whitman, of Washington, D. C., an Official Reporter of Debates in the House of Representatives. The article, as published in the March 1951 issue of the National Shorthand Reporter, and, by unanimous consent of the House, made a part of my remarks is entitled "Marble Plaques of Destiny." The article gives unmistakable evidence of widespread reading and study upon the part of the author, and, reflects the culture and ability that characterizes him in many activities. Mr. Whitman has performed a worth-while service in preparing this authentic and interesting account of the great lawgivers of the past and lawmakers who had had the greatest influence on the American legal system.

I am certain that there is a keen sense of indebtedness felt by the membership of the House for the splendid cultural contribution that has been made by Mr. Whitman in his article, reading as follows:

MARBLE PLAQUES OF DESTINY

(Roy L. Whitman)

"The God of nature has written His existence on all His works, and His law in the heart of man. To restore the knowledge of the one and the practice of the other has been the real or pretended aim of the prophets of every age" (Gibbon).

"All implements of civilization are spiritual in origin; when conceived they are called ideas; when materially embodied they are called implements; when instituted for general use they are called patterns; when wrought into the everyday life of all the people they marvel at them and call them the work of the gods" (Confucius).

"Our prenationalized, medieval ancestors had a larger concept of history than we. For them history did not mean the history of one's own parochial community; it means the history of Arabia, Greece, Rome. Even if they were mistaken in believing that the world began some 4,000 years before Christ, it is better to look that far back than only to the Declaration of Independence or the voyage of the *Mayflower*" (Toynbee).

When the Hall of the House of Representatives was redecorated this past summer instructions were given to a commission of learned and eminently qualified men to suggest great lawgivers of the past and the lawmakers who had had the greatest influence on the American legal system. From this list 23 were to be chosen as subjects of marble plaques, 1 to be placed above each gallery door, the twenty-fourth space to contain an inscription from Daniel Webster. Twenty-two of the plaques were to carry profile heads carved in bas relief; one was to be full face. The 22 were divided into 11 right profiles and 11 left profiles, the starting point being at the full-face figure in the center of the north wall, the ending point at the Webster inscription at the center of the south wall.

The subjects of the plaques were jointly chosen by a group from the University of Pennsylvania and the Columbia Historical Society of Washington, D. C. The committee list was submitted to and approved by members of the staff of the Library of Congress, final choice resting with the Architect of the Capitol and his associates. Of the 23 subjects chosen 13 appear on the University of Pennsylvania list and 16 on the Columbia Historical Society list; 8 are on both; only 2 (Papinian and Suleiman) do not appear on either.

The sculptured heads in right profile beginning with the full-face plaque of Moses, and on the north, west, and south walls are: Moses, Hammurabi, Lycurgus, Tribonian, Justinian, St. Louis (Louis X of France), Gregory, Alphonso, Edward the First, Colbert, Pothier, and Mason, then the Webster inscription.

The left profile heads beginning with Moses, and on the north, east, and south walls are: Solon, Papinian, Gaius, Maimonides, Suleiman, Innocent 3d, De Montfort, Grotius, Blackstone, Napoleon, Jefferson, and the Webster inscription.

The Webster inscription reads:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Thus we see that the plaques have two bases: great lawgivers of history, and those who influenced the American legal system, omitting those who came after its establishment, with the exception of Blackstone.

America inherited from England a developed legal system. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1722 laid it down as a rule of English law:

"That if there be a new and uninhabited country found out by English subjects as the law is the birthright of every subject, so wherever they go they carry that law with them, and hence such new-found country is to be governed by the laws of England." (Law: Origin and Development, Huston.)

The first Continental Congress in its fifth and sixth resolves declared:

"That the respective colonies are entitled to the common law of England * * * and to the benefit of such of the English statutes as existed at the time of the colonization. * * *"

The American legal system is a dual system of laws with the jurisdiction of each sovereignty clearly defined, the laws of each sovereignty enacted by a bicamaral legislative assembly of representatives elected by the people, and a veto power lying in the Executive. The system includes inferior and superior courts, trial and appellate; a careful system of reports of all decided cases, all designed to elevate the dignity of man, protect his property rights, preserve the sanctity of contract, encourage personal responsibility; and, in the criminal law, to fit the punishment to the crime.

To appreciate the significance of the plaques and understand their import, let us briefly establish a few points of reference, for to weigh justly the merits of a man one must know his position in world history and something of the time and country in which he lived. This is a very large order to fill within the confines of a short article.

The time and historical elements involved cover almost 5,000 years and may be divided into certain very definite epochs: Ancient history, covering Arabia and Egypt; the epoch of the Grecian and Roman civilizations, extending over a period of a thousand years, equally divided by the birth of Christ; the Middle Ages, also called the Dark Ages, from the fall of the Roman Empire in A. D. 476 until the Renaissance in 1453; and the modern Anglo-Saxon world.

The philosophy behind the plaques is that these men are those who influenced the American legal system. As we shall see later, however, three men absolutely dominate the group: Moses, Hammurabi, and Justinian; in fact, the law student could well dispose of the group of 22 by voting that Hammurabi and Justinian represent them all, for the codes established by these two men have influenced all mankind, the former for nearly, 5,000 years and the latter for 1,500. Each of them set up a complete legal system, a body of laws and courts to administer them. But when the average man sees all these heads he is not satisfied with thinking just that they represent a system, but he wants to know the part they played in influencing the system and the times in which they lived. The average citizen thinks not of the cold structure of the system but of its content: He thinks of union on a basis of equality and how his own country survived a tragic war through this principle; he thinks of freedom of the seas and our suppression of the Barbary pirates to establish that principle firmly; he thinks of the four freedoms: of the intellect, of the press, of speech, of the person; of the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; and he wonders how these principles are squared with the heads on the plaques, heads that do not speak, yet, embedded in the wall in enduring whiteness, influence American statesmen by the memories they evoke. The mere presence of these plaques is an invitation to look into the lives of the men they portray. Let us now proceed to do just this.

The onward march of civilization is thus recorded in these plaques:

Arabia, Hammurabi.

Egypt and Israel: Moses and Maimonides.

Greece: Solon, Lycurgus.

Rome: Gaius, Justinian, Tribonian, and Papinian.

Turkey: Suleiman.

Italy, Innocent III and Gregory IX.

France, St. Louis, Pothier, Colbert, and Napoleon.

Holland: Grotius.

Spain: Alfonso X.

England: de Montfort, Edward I, and Blackstone.

America: Jefferson and Mason.

Let us consider the men and their times as related to the landmarks of popular government found in the American system.

Union on a basis of equality—Rome.

"One of the most potent influences in the growth of Rome was the habit of association engendered by her peculiar location. The settlements on neighboring hills, originally separate towns and cities, were too near together to permit independence except at the cost of perpetual war and mutually destructive warfare. The only alternative, that of union on a basis of equality of rights was adopted. That at an early day broke down the political and religious exclusiveness characteristic of the Italian cantons and of all primitive communities and gave to the Romans a liberality of mind and an adaptability which was one of the chief elements of their success in dealing with other peoples. Rome thus absorbed other communities instead of destroying them." (Theodore Mommsen.)

The mighty empire of law of government and of things practical—and it still exerts its influence—was born on the seven hills where Rome rose from the banks of the Tiber: The forum, the senate, the popular assemblies of Rome. These were adequate for city government but not for empire.

The late Senator James Hamilton Lewis in his Two Great Republics, Rome and the United States says: "The invention and development of such representative assemblies has been the greatest contribution which the Anglo-Saxon race has made to the political progress of the world."

Let us pursue this matter of individual liberty and representative government a little further. Prof. Charles A. Huston, supra, says:

"In its main body the Anglo-American law is almost purely Germanic. Of any direct influence of the aboriginal Celtic stock, or of even the Roman occupation of Britain, no perceptible trace remains. Our law begins with the English, the Teutonic conquerors of England from the Britons."

It may be mentioned in passing that the Romans withdrew from Britain in A. D. 410, and in 449 the Anglo-Saxons began to take possession of the island.

It was the rude barbarians of Germany, says Guizot in his History of Civilization in Europe, who introduced into European civilization the sentiment of personal independence, the love of liberty. It was unknown among the Romans; it was unknown in the Christian church; it was unknown in nearly all the civilizations of antiquity. The liberty which we meet in ancient civilizations is political liberty; it is the liberty of the citizen. It was not about his personal liberty that man troubled himself; it was his liberty as a citizen. He formed part of an association, and to this alone he was devoted. The case was the same in the Christian church. This feeling of personal liberty and independence was unknown to the Romans and to the Christians. It has played so considerable a part and has produced such lasting and beneficial results that Guizot feels it must be regarded as one of the fundamental principles of European civilization.

Stubbs in his Constitutional History of England states:

"The influence of at least two of the political ideas or institutions of the Germans has been especially marked in our later civilization. These two are the elective monarchy based on the right exercised by the freemen of the German tribes to elect their ruler or king, and the public or popular assembly, in which the freemen met for legislative and judicial purposes."

The problem of the Middle Ages was to settle whether all former civilization should be overturned by the German or the German people should be Romanized and Christianized. Modern civilization is the result of the interplay of these forces.

By the eighth century all remains of Roman civilization had disappeared, even its very language.

Freedom of the Mind, and Democracy—Athens.

The antithesis of union occurred in ancient Greece. There we see Athens, the seat and mother city of one of the world's greatest cultures, defeated, humiliated, and practically destroyed by her neighbor to the south, Sparta. There we find also the most enlightened of the early democracies destroyed by the ruthless uncultured people of the most absolute police state that ever existed, Sparta. Athens, fertile field of mental developments; Sparta, peopled by poor, rude, rough inhabitants, where men sought the camp on the battlefield to escape the horrors of peace, so severe was the regimented life of the people (Professor Oman of Oxford)—whence comes the phrase, Spartan severity, Spartan discipline.

But it was in the Greek commonwealth that the political and intellectual life of the world began.

When we think of Greece we think of Athens.

The empire of Greece was that of the intellect, of art, philosophy, of literature, love of the beautiful, and love of freedom.

Solon of Athens (600 B. C.)

Lycurgus of Sparta (900 B. C.)

Solon, the law giver, who wrought so great a reform in the constitution of Athens, so improved the lot of the poor, so balanced the power of the various classes of Athenian society, so regulated her coinage, that he saved the state from collapse and civil war, rebuilt her commerce. Solon, whose new constitution for Athens was so successful that when the first code of laws was drawn up for Rome, the famous Twelve Tables, a commission was sent from Rome to study them and a number of the provisions of Solon's laws were incorporated in the Twelve Tables.

Lycurgus! So modern an historian as Toynbee states the consensus of latter-day research to be that Lycurgus was a god and not a human being, a purely mythical character. So ancient an historian as Herodotus

states that there is so much doubt about Lycurgus that the place of his birth is unknown, and the date of his birth cannot be fixed within 300 years. Even the thumbnail biography assigned to him by the Architect of the Capitol reads only: "Legendary lawgiver of Sparta." Some historians ascribe to him the constitution of Sparta under which the people, the comitia, had a voice in government. But what kind of voice? When the king wanted approval of a proposal the comitia would be assembled and allowed to vote yes or no; a judge was hidden whose duty it was to weigh the volume of the vote.

Athens rose phoenix-like from the ashes of her defeat by Sparta to establish the wonderful Hellenic culture, and Sparta takes an inferior position in history. Democracy triumphed over the police state. Why not let Solon represent Greece and replace Lycurgus with another law giver or a good American?

EARLY CODIFIED LAW, THE CODES OF ANTIQUITY

When we think of the legal system and the courts we think of that inscription over the entrance to the Supreme Court: "Equal Justice Under Law"; and we think of the United States Code, of codified law. Throughout the ages the cry of the common people has been "Make known unto us the laws by which we are judged, engrave them where all may see."

For the two famous codes of antiquity we go to Arabia and Egypt, referred by the plaques to the Code of Hammurabi and the Decalog of Moses. Though Moses occupies the central position with his majestic face in full relief let us keep the chronology in proper sequence, for the Code of Hammurabi precedes the Decalog by a thousand years.

Who was Hammurabi? (Circa 2800 B. C.) What was his code? He was the man who rebuilt Babylon from the ruin of the empire of Sargon, rebuilt Babylon to rule as the undisputed queen city of the world for 2,000 years, the man who—whether he responded to the plea of the multitude or from his own innate ability as a great administrator—had engraved in imperishable stone in cuneiform characters the laws of the Sumerians and Akkadians, a thousand years before the Code of Moses, the laws governing his people. Three thousand lines of these laws of Hammurabi have been recovered and of this quantity more than the half have been deciphered. They deal with divorce and alimony; with master and servant; with profit on sales transactions, establishing twice the value as the proper asking price in beginning a transaction; establishing public right in irrigation ditches and canals as paramount to those of the owner whose lands they traversed; they dealt with crime and punishment and incorporated the principle that education, wealth, and knowledge carried with them greater responsibility of obedience to the law.

One of the most important items of the code was that of personal responsibility. The builder of a home was responsible for its soundness.

It placed emphasis on reducing contracts and agreements to writing and having them signed and witnessed.

Rightly then is Hammurabi placed side by side with Moses.

Further back than this in history the plaques do not go, although the cuneiform inscriptions of that Eden where meet the four rivers of Paradise affirm that the history of the land extends 432,000 years before the Flood.

Moses: (Circa 1800? 1400? B. C.) Great hero of Israel, first of the great prophets, whose name implies "He who was saved from the water" frequently likened to and coupled with Solon and Lycurgus. What does he appear to be in the outward events of history? What did he become in the beliefs of his people? He stands at the very beginning of the united life of Israel and established its fundamental principles. His distinctive characteristic, surmounting all intellectual qualities, was his realization that only through obedience to spiritual and moral laws could the new people accomplish a national task and achieve a world destiny (Funk & Wagnalls Bible Dictionary). He is credited with the creation of the religion of Israel.

No other people of the ancient world ever exerted upon our civilization influences comparable to that of the Hebrews through a literature containing the highest idealism the world has ever known.

We come next to the Roman law and the Roman codes, but we must remember that the legal system of the empire (not the Holy Roman Empire of Frederick Barbarosa) did not include representative government.

From the time of Diocletian onward the making of law was exclusively in the hands of the emperors. The Senate still existed, but shorn of all its old functions, alike of government and legislation.

The first three centuries of the Roman Empire contain the perfection of Roman jurisprudence and the commencement of its decline.

Before taking up the codifiers let us pay our respects to Papinian.

It is said that under Papinian (211 A. D.) Roman law reached the highest point in its development. Papinian was a noted lawyer who carried on the government of Rome while the Emperor Severus waged his wars.

But now to consider the Roman codes.

Gaius (130–180 A. D.) stands as the pioneer in this field. His Institutes were received as text books of the law before the general revision of the Roman law.

Justinian (483–565 A. D.): There were others who made codes of Roman law besides Gaius, Tribonian and Justinian—there were, for instance, the Gregorian, Homogenian, and Theodosian codes—but they are all made obsolete by the code which bears Justinian's name.

In his Code, Pandects, and Institutes, we find condensed the legal wisdom of the Romans.

The able and learned Tribonian headed the commission which carried out this work. All obsolete, erroneous, or superfluous laws were eliminated from existing codes; they preserved only the wise and salutary laws. In the Pandects they set out the true spirit of the decisions of the judges. The Institutes contain the essential elements of Roman law.

"The code was signed by Justinian, and the Code, the Pandects, and the Institutes were declared by him to be the only legitimate system of legal jurisprudence. This the last will and testament of Roman jurisprudence was preserved through the Dark Ages and forms the basis of the systems of jurisprudence in most of the continental European states of today. It is one of the most important contributions of Rome to modern civilization." (Guizot, History of Civilization in Europe.)

The code is the facet of Justinian's reign that touches our legal system, but his plaque brings the memory, as Freeman tells us, that "during his reign calamities which human prudence is unable to resist seemed to combine against the Romans as if to compel them to expiate their ancient glory, so that the period which gave birth to so many moments of greatness may be looked back upon with horror as that of the widest dissolution and mortality."

Hodgkins in his Italy and Her Invaders tells us that Justinian projected an expedition against the Goths, but in retaliation Rome was so despoiled by Totila the Goth that the city remained an unpeopled solitude for 40 days.

Law in the Middle Ages: Innocent III and Gregory IX

Separation of temporal from spiritual power in the Christian church occurred in the sixth century, when the church not being able to restore the absolute power of the Roman Empire, in self-defense against the barbarians adopted the principle. "The spiritual order is completely separated from the physical, you have no right to interfere with it" (Guizot, History of Civilization in Europe).

By the eighth century, as we have noted, all remains of Roman civilization had disappeared, even its very language.

"Belief was in the Middle Ages not a matter of choice or of conviction, but of duty. The individual had no rights in the matter, but must submit himself without question to the dictates of the church" (Emerton, Medieval Europe).

The church of the Middle Ages was the only organized force of its period. It was the repository of the knowledge and learning of the time. In the spiritual field the church led the individual from the cradle to the grave, and the spiritual realm had none of its modern limitations. It fulfilled many functions now partly or wholly secular. The church in those centuries buttressed its faith with the most complete and adequate philosophical system the world has ever known. Also it achieved a social system in which the efforts of the individual were subjected to the greater good of the whole.

Innocent III (1198–1226) and Gregory IX (1227–41) were contemporaries of Edward I and de Montfort of England—the fathers of the parliamentary system; of St. Louis (Louis X of France), and Frederick II of Germany, both men of great strength of will and both ardent supporters of the independence of the crown from the church; of Alphonso X; of Maimonides—the great Jewish philosopher who exercised a world-wide influence on Jewry through his beautiful writings and teachings; of John of England, against whom Innocent won a signal victory.

It was a turbulent epoch when the little man did not know individual liberty as we know it, when he had no representative body to make his laws, when he found himself caught in a swirling cauldron that stopped boiling only with the dawn of Renaissance two centuries later.

These two great popes lived in rugged days. Gregory was past 80 when elevated to the papacy and lived to be almost a hundred. It was an age of constant struggle for supremacy between temporal and spiritual power, between emperors and kings and popes. Kings challenged popes and popes hurled the thunderbolts of excommunication and anathema at will; an age when a king walked barefoot in the snow to the Pope's palace to seek removal of the ban of excommunication (motivated, however, by political necessity); an age of secret intrigues and of promises broken as expediency demanded; an age when Gregory IX called Frederick II "this pestilential king * * * that beast of Revelations which came out of the sea"; and the king addressed the Pope in equally vitriolic and sulfurous language.

But both of these popes were men of great intelligence, of fearless courage, devoted to their principles, acknowledged authorities in the field of canon and ecclesiastical law, which in that epoch of the Middle Ages was the great body of law.

The Encyclopedia Britannica has this to say of them:

"Innocent III was an eminent jurist and canonist and never ceased using his great power in the service of the law. A great part of his life was passed in hearing pleadings and pronouncing judgments. Few sovereigns have ever worked so industriously or shown such solicitude for the impartial exercise of their judicial functions.

"Gregory was famed for his learning and eloquence, his blameless life and strength of character."

Freedom of the Seas: Hugo Grotius.

Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) brought order out of chaos in Dutch law, established the doctrine of freedom of the seas. He was the first to attempt to establish a principle of right and a basis for society and government outside of church or Bible, to draw a distinction between religion on the one hand and law and morality on the other.

Parliamentary government is traced to Simon de Montfort, of England (1200–65), and Edward I (1239–1307). The former was one of the godfathers of the latter, and both were contemporaneous figures in the struggle to limit the powers and prerogatives of the sovereign, the one instigating, the other yielding.

De Montfort (1200–1265) established parliamentary control over the executive. To this parliament must be traced the germ of the modern governing system, although the constitution he promulgated was premature and failed.

It was Edward the First who convoked the Model Parliament in 1295 to meet a crisis in the kingdom. His writ of summons to the three estates contained this memorable sentence: "What touches all should be approved by all. * * * Common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common." The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of Edward's action. Edward is called the Justinian of the English.

The following are good men, 'tis true, but to me, a layman, their influence on the American legal system seems remote and collateral at best: St. Louis, Alphonso, Suleiman, Maimonides.

St. Louis stands in history as the ideal king of the Middle Ages. An accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, of imperious temperament, unyielding when sure of the justness of his cause, energetic and firm, he was every inch a king.

He built hospitals between the two crusades he led. He visited and tended the sick and himself gave charity to many people daily.

He was strenuous and vigorous in upholding the independence of the king in temporal affairs and in the right to supervise ecclesiastical matters in France.

Alphonso X of Spain (1252–84) known as Alphonso, El Sabio (the Wise). The short architect's sketch assigns as reason for his inclusion the authorship of two codes, the Fuero Real and the Siete Partidas.

The Encyclopedia Britannica states that the Fuero Real was formed by combining the best parts of existing charters and was accepted only by towns and districts not already chartered. The three parts of Spain, Castile, Leon, and Aragon were not united and did not have a common court until long after Alphonso's death.

This authority states:

"The famous Siete Partidas (the seven divisions), drawn up about 1260, is often spoken of as a code of laws. It was never so treated till it was promulgated at the Cortes of Alcala in 1338 in the reign of his great grandson Alphonso XI. Even then it was provided that it was not to prevail against any fuero or the Fuero Real."

To further his personal ambitions he debased the coinage and then endeavored to prevent a rise in prices by the application of an arbitrary tariff. The trade of his dominions was ruined. He died leaving his country a legacy of civil war.

Suleiman the Magnificent of Turkey (1494-1566). In his own country distinguished as The Law Giver, but known in European history as The Magnificent. His claim to renown as a legislator rests mainly on his organization of the clerical class, his reform and improvement of the administration of the country, both civil and military, and his inauguration of a new and improved system of feudal tenure. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame.

Maimonides (Moses Ben Maimon) (1135–1204). Jewish philosopher, born in Cordova, Spain, driven from Spain by the Inquisition, and likewise from Fez, Morocco; finally established himself in Egypt where by his eminent writings and dominant personality he exercised almost worldwide influence over Jewry. He was a great exponent of reason in faith, and toleration of theology.

The exception, Blackstone:

Blackstone (1723–80), jurist and annotator of English law. His lasting fame is founded on his commentaries of the laws of England. He did for English law what Gaius and Tribonian did for Roman law. Blackstone distilled out the technical treaties, clear and readable expositions of the doctrine of English law. For a century his Commentaries were the foundation of all legal education in this country.

The only Americans included: Jefferson and Mason.

Jefferson, Thomas (1743–1826): Third President of the United States. American statesman, great democratic champion of the rights of the common people; had a large part in drafting the Declaration of Independence. His career of public service lasted 40 years. He was the moving spirit behind the abolition in Virginia of the laws of entail and primogeniture; he secured the separation of church and state in Virginia, established religious freedom. He was largely responsible for a revision of the code that modified a great many of the severe penalties for minor offenses. From an early age he was against the principle that aristocracy only should be privileged and saw that the success of America would depend on the education that the average man possessed.

Mason, George (1725–92): American statesman, author of the Declaration of Rights and the Constitution of Virginia; member of the Constitutional Convention of the United States.

Pothier, Robert Joseph (1699–1772) of France, was an authority on Roman law and wrote a famous digest of the Pandects of Justinian. He also wrote many articles on French law. When the Code Civil of France was ordered drafted by the Convention, much of Pothier's work was embodied textually in the code.

And lastly, what of Napoleon, a Frenchman of a later day (1769–1821)?

The Architect says: "In choosing the subjects, they (the committee) limited the choice to makers of law, rather than judges or writers on the law, and to those who influenced the American legal system—omitting those who came after its establishment."

When the American Constitution was ratified in 1788, Napoleon was but a junior lieutenant in Corsica. When the Code Civil of 1804 was again promulgated as the Code Napoleon in 1807, our legal system had been established for 20 years.

The Code of course is inseparably linked with Napoleon's name and is why his profile is included. He had actually very little to do with the preparation of the Code. Other incidents flood the mind that overshadow a code coming so long after our own legal system was established.

Modern European history begins not with Napoleon but 14 years after the Little Corporal began his career during which he so badly scrambled European affairs that the Congress of Vienna of 1815 had to be called, as Toynbee says: "To piece together the broken fragments of the mosaic of city states which strewed the face of Europe." We cannot forget that he overthrew the First Republic of France, established himself emperor and sought to name his successor—the antithesis of democracy.

While Mignet says of Napoleon:

"Of his government it is said that the country annexed to France or even merely brought under the influence of France found its gain in being better governed."

Larned says of him:

"As a heartless warrior, which was the level of his character and genius, Napoleon was unrivaled. * * * A prodigy such as Napoleon is rarely permitted to be born for the affliction of mankind."

Why not replace the Corsican with a good American of the colonial period who helped frame our legal system at Philadelphia?

"Because my people hath forgotten me, they have burned incense to vanity." (Jeremiah 18:15.)

Address by President Truman at Church Cornerstone Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 4, 1951:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TODAY AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE NEW YORK AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THIS CITY

It is a great privilege for me to be able to take part in this service. The New York Avenue Presbyterian Church has played an important part in the history of Washington. For almost 150 years a Presbyterian congregation has worshiped on or near this spot. During all that period this church has preached the Christian message to this busy Capital City.

This new building demonstrates that you are still going forward in the same spirit which moved those early worshipers who first came to the swamps and woodland of this National Capital a century and a half ago. May you long continue in that same missionary spirit.

The essential mission of the church is to teach the moral law. We look to our churches, above all other agencies, to teach us the highest moral standards of right and wrong. We rely on the churches particularly to instill into our young people those moral ideals which are the basis of our free institutions.

Religion is not an easy thing. It is not simply a comfort to those in trouble or a means of escaping from present difficulties, as some people today would have us believe.

Moreover, religion is not a negative thing. It is not merely a series of prohibitions against certain actions because they are wicked.

RELIGION HAS A BROAD VISTA

Our religion includes these elements. But it also includes much more. It is a positive force that impels us to affirmative action. We are under divine orders, not only to refrain from doing evil, but also to do good and to make this world a better place to live in.

Everyone of us should measure the actions of his daily life against this moral code which our religion gives to us. Everyone of us, according to the strength and wisdom God gives to him, should try his best every day to live up to these religious teachings.

More than this, religion should establish moral standards for the conduct of our whole Nation, at home and abroad. We should judge our achievements, as a nation, in the scales of right and wrong.

The democracy we cherish, and our free institutions, depend upon the observance of the moral code, in private and in public life. Selfishness and greed can tear this Nation apart, just as they have torn apart other great nations in the past. Our only defense against them is to follow those moral principles which have been handed down to us by our forefathers and which are enshrined today in churches such as this one.

We talk a lot these days about freedom, freedom for the individual and freedom among nations. Freedom for the human soul is, indeed, the most important principle of our civilization. We must always remember, however, that the freedom we are talking about is freedom based upon moral principles. Without a firm moral foundation, freedom degenerates quickly into selfishness and license.

FREEDOM SETS OBLIGATIONS

Unless men exercise their freedom in a just and honest way, within moral restraints, a free society can degenerate into anarchy. Then there will be freedom only for the rapacious and those, who are stronger and more unscrupulous than the rank and file of the people.

If we neglect these truths, our whole society suffers.

This is readily apparent in the case of some of the evils that continually confront us. For example, when organized crime and vice run loose and are accepted and patronized by the people, they threaten our free institutions and debase our national life. These evils are clearly moral issues and our religious beliefs command us to fight against them.

It is not so readily apparent that moral issues are involved in some of the other evils we have been fighting against in this country. But it is nevertheless true that the evils of the sweatshop and the slum, the evils of needless disease and poverty, and the evils of social injustice are, at bottom, moral issues. Such conditions arise because men have neglected the moral law. They arise because men do not actually live up to the religious principles they profess to believe in.

When we move to correct these evils, through our personal conduct, through community action, or through the Government, we are responding to the Divine command—to the Golden Rule—which requires us to do good to others.

Of course, this is a struggle that is never finally won. There are many injustices in our country that need correction today, and need them badly. We must continue to weigh our national life in the scales of justice, and keep on striving to improve it.

In the world at large, as well as in our domestic affairs, we must apply moral standards to our national conduct. At the present time our Nation is engaged in a great effort to maintain justice and peace in the world. An essential feature of this effort is our program to build up the defenses of our country.

There has never been a greater cause. There has never been a cause which had a stronger moral claim on all of us.

MORAL BASIS OF LIFE AT STAKE

We are defending the religious principles upon which our Nation and our whole way of life are founded. We are defending the right to worship God, each as he sees fit according to his own conscience. We are defending the right to follow the precepts and the example which God has set for us. We are defending the right of people to gather together, all across our land, in churches such as this one.

For the danger that threatens us in the world today is utterly and totally opposed to all these things. The international Communist movement is based on a fierce and terrible fanaticism. It denies the existence of God, and, wherever it can, it stamps out the worship of God.

Our religious faith gives us the answer to the false beliefs of communism. Our faith shows us the way to create a society where man can find his greatest happiness under God. Surely we can follow that faith with the same devotion and determination the Communists give to their godless creed.

This is what we must do. Our religion must live in our hearts, not as a set of dull rules learned by rote, but as a burning faith. Only such a faith—only a living allegiance to such a faith—can carry this country through the trials which are ahead of it.

This is a matter that comes home to everyone of us. We have many different jobs to do and different parts to play in our country's defense of its freedom and its beliefs.

If each of us, wherever he may be—in a factory or a mine, on a farm or in an office, or in the home—if each of us does his best to help—we need have no fear of the outcome.

We should continually ask ourselves whether we are responding to this cause with the moral conviction and the faith which it demands.

DAILY SACRIFICES RECORDED

Every day our newspapers tell us about the fighting in Korea. Our men there are making heroic sacrifices. They are fighting and suffering in an effort to prevent the tide of aggression from sweeping across the world. They are fighting to prevent the much greater sacrifice and suffering which all of us would endure if another world war comes.

Although we read about these sacrifices in our newspapers every day, we have a tendency to think of the defense effort only in selfish terms—in terms of avoiding personal inconvenience or making some personal gain. Our young men are offering their lives for us in the hills of Korea—and yet too many of us are chiefly concerned over whether or not we can buy a television set next week, or make the profit we expect to make this year, or how we can turn the situation to our advantage.

This is a failure to understand the moral principles upon which our own Nation is founded. This is a faltering in our allegiance to the moral faith we have inherited from our fathers.

If we truly believe in God, we ought to ask ourselves what He may be thinking of our present attitude and our present conduct. Considering all the advantages that God has given us as a nation and all the mercies that He has shown to us from our very beginnings, we ought to ask ourselves whether we today are worthy of all that He has done for us. We ought to ask ourselves whether we, as a people, are doing our part; whether we are carrying out our moral obligations.

I do not think that anyone can study the history of this Nation of ours—study it deeply and earnestly—without becoming convinced that divine providence has played a great part in it. I have the feeling that God has created us and brought us to our present position of power and strength for some great purpose.

THE TASK IS NOT AN EASY ONE

It is not given to us now to know fully what that purpose is. But I think we may be sure of one thing. And that is that our country is intended to do all it can, in cooperation with other nations, to help create peace and preserve peace in the world. It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.

This is a hard task. It is not one that we have asked for. At times, we would like to lay it down. And, as we go on with it, we see that it is full of uncertainties and sacrifices.

But we need not be afraid, if we have faith.

There is a lesson for us in the passage from the Bible which has just been read here. That part of the Book of Ezra describes the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem after the long captivity in Babylon. You remember how the writer describes the people shouting with a great shout when the foundation of the new temple was laid. And then the author goes on to point out that some of those in the crowd, particularly the old men, did not shout. They wept when they saw the foundation stones set in place.

These were the men who remembered all the sacrifices—all the suffering—their people had undergone during the captivity. They knew that these sacrifices had not been in vain. They realized that, in spite of all their troubles, and in the face of overwhelming odds, their faith had prevailed. And so they were too deeply moved to shout; they wept for joy.

They gave thanks to God "because He is good, for His mercy endureth forever."

If we hold true to our faith, as they did, I am sure that we will be able to offer, on some future day, the same heartfelt prayer of thanksgiving and joy. We, too, will be able to give God the glory for the victory of freedom and justice and peace for which we are striving today.

We, too, shall say: "He is good, for His mercy endureth forever."

Opposition to Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful statement published in the Freeman for November 13, 1950, relating to the fundamental American opposition to compulsory military or civilian service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANIA FOR COMPULSION

Good citizens ought to defend their country. Good citizens ought to vote. But should they be compelled by law to do either?

In the Anglo-Saxon world, at least, the answer to such a question used to be no. It was part and parcel of the traditional English feeling about liberty that free men could always be counted on to volunteer in sufficient numbers both to serve the state and to see to it that rascals would be thrown out of office. Since 1914, however, the traditional English conception of liberty has had a hard time of it. To meet the levée en masse imposed by the authoritarian and dictator states of continental Europe in two world wars, the Anglo-Saxon world has felt itself compelled to resort to conscription to raise its armies. And now there is more and more talk about the necessity of making voting compulsory by law.

The mania for compulsion afflicts people of all political persuasions. For example, the

eminently conservative Representative WADSWORTH of New York joins with President Harry Truman in advocating, not merely a temporary draft for the Armed Forces, but universal military training virtually in perpetuity. The New York Times is properly appalled when the Left advocates seizure of a person's property, but it looks with approval upon universal military training, which is seizure of a man's body for a term of involuntary servitude. (The fact that universal military training and slavery can be described functionally in the same terms ought to give anyone pause.)

In opposing UMT, we realize that we are treading on boggy ground, at least from the narrowly pragmatic point of view. With Soviet Russia herding millions of its slave citizens into a gigantic mass army, and into a gigantic industry designed solely to support that army, just how is the West to meet the threat without resorting to compulsion on its own? Given a modicum of sense in our diplomacy over the past decade, the job of checking Russia could have been done without resort to the spending of billions and the compulsory uprooting of thousands of young men from schools, homes, jobs and careers. But our diplomacy has let us down. We have lost millions of allies in China, and in eastern and central Europe, because of the frivolities (and worse) of our State Department. So we are faced with the necessity of the draft.

Or are we? There is a school of military thought which says that we can still beat Russia without violating basic libertarian principles. A Major de Seversky, a General Bonner Fellers, even (perhaps) a Douglas MacArthur, would argue that the United States should concentrate on air power, on the industrial production of fast mobile weapons, and on guided missiles and the super-explosives. Properly handled, these might be the equivalent to us of the nineteenth-century British Navy, which was successfully manned by volunteers. Not being military experts, we hesitate to give unqualified endorsement to the Seversky idea. But at least it is worth more talk than it is getting.

Talk or not, however, the draft is with us for the time being. It will probably be with us for some time to come. Since it is rooted in a history of diplomatic mistakes that can not be conjured away, we accept it as an inevitable concommitant of the next 5 years. But acceptance of the draft as a temporary measure and acceptance of universal military training as a permanent warp in the fabric of American life are quite different things.

The proponents of universal military training claim that it will do wonders for the young. It will make them healthy, increase their self-reliance, and so on. Having visited Army camps during World War II, and having listened to the GI tell stories that have never yet appeared in Kinsey, we doubt that a baptism in venereal disease or in spree drinking does much to improve a young man's health. As for the self-reliance, when did force applied to those over the age of 15 ever contribute to such? To use contemporary psychiatric jargon, nobody ever becomes "inner-directed" by living an "other-directed" life. Jumping to the bark of the drill sergeant does not constitute a self-disciplined regimen.

From 1870 on, the countries of Europe went in for universal military training. They also went in for romantic youth movements aimed at substituting a barrack-room life for the blandishments of bourgeois society. The end result was fascism—or the triumph of the principle that a man's body can be seized at any time by the state for the state's uses. Nobody, to our knowledge, has ever bothered to explore the nature of the all-togetherness of events in Europe from 1870 to 1950. But we do not doubt the connection between universal military training and the triumph of the idea that the human being has no right to a life apart from the aims and needs of the state.

The United States has won two great wars within the span of a couple of generations. It has done so without interim universal military training. Is it not reasonable to assume that it has been able to win precisely because it has had a society that left the individual free to experiment, to learn, to produce, on his own? Particularly in the individual's plastic years, from 17 to 21?

The assumption is not only reasonable, it is incontrovertible. A boy of 16 or 17 has just reached the stage of adolescence which poses the internal necessity of getting along on his own. He is ready to cut loose from strict parental supervision. At 16 and 17, the self-reliant youth looks for a summer job away from home. He begins to thumb the college catalogs to see what courses most appeal to him. He is beginning to mature. When a war comes, the properly matured youth is ready to use his ingenuity, his genuine self-reliance, in battle. He may need basic training in the elements of fighting (a training which can be provided in the period when the economy is tooling up to produce military supplies), but he will be a more resourceful aviator, a cannier tank-driver, if he has been left alone in his formative years to tinker with auto engines, or to run a tractor in summer months on a farm. And he will have a better conception of military tactics and strategy if he has quarterbacked a college football team or learned to execute the hit-and-run in baseball.

Under a system of compulsory universal military training, the state rudely interferes with the natural processes of late adolescence. It jerks a boy from the area of experiment, of self-exploration and a fledgling approach to inner-directedness, and plunks him down into an atmosphere of coercion. The sergeant-image replaces the father-image in his mind. He may be physically active in executing a thousand orders, he may even reach a point in the hierarchical army set-up where he gives commands in addition to receiving them. But for all the activity of the military life, the boy is forced into psychological passivity. Things are done to him, or for him; he does not do things out of free choice for himself.

When the inductee goes back to civilian life, where he must learn to get along on his own, he is necessarily bewildered. The bewilderment disappears in time, but only because the atmosphere of civilian life in America is still incredibly free. A generation of UMT would change that atmosphere beyond recognition.

As we have said, a temporary draft may be necessary. But at best it is an acceptance of a lesser evil, something which should be watched carefully and rejected as soon as is possible. Keep the draft for the time being if no better way of opposing Russia can be found. But don't let us make the mistake of thinking that the values of Athens can be maintained by changing our society into a Sparta for all time.

To return to the matter of compulsory voting. Sometimes, when the two parties, Democratic and Republican, are both recreant to their trust, and there is no respectable third party in the field, the only honorable thing a citizen can do is to boycott the polls. By refraining from voting, he serves notice on the old-line politicians that he is a menace to be reckoned with when he returns to voting in the future. He is ready to follow a new leader, to vote for an entirely different program than any the old-line politician has seen fit to propose. Simply because the abstaining voter is an incalculable element in the political picture, the old-line politician must tread warily in his presence.

Not voting, then, can be as positive an act of citizenship as voting. And political freedom implies, of course, the freedom to refrain.

We do not advocate political indifference. We hope that more and more American citizens will choose voluntarily to vote when there is something to vote about. But a compulsory vote is a distasteful thing. It is almost as bad as a compulsory one-party slate.

Let's have done with the mania for compulsion. In a free society it doesn't solve a thing.

We Must Have an Over-All Natural Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a challenging speech by Mr. E. H. Taylor, associate editor of the Country Gentleman, on the subject of our lack of a sound national policy for the conservation of our renewable natural resources:

Mr. Chairman, members of the conference, a newspaper cartoon that must have caused some wry laughs appeared not long back. It depicted a man in a toy store showing a puzzle to a mother and her young hopeful with the remark: "This will help to adjust him to the conditions of modern life. No matter how he tries to put it together, it will always come out wrong."

The cartoon, with its frustrating puzzle, unhappily fits many of the distractions of the time. It has no bearing, however, on our mistakes in the management of the renewable natural resources of the Nation. We are failing to insure the conservation, sustained use, and potential values of these basic resources for other reasons than the want of any possible solution.

The failure is due mainly to a disregard of two realities. One is the critical importance of these renewable resources to the life of the Nation. The other is the unity, the indivisible relationship of these resources to one another. We have many policies dealing with them separately, but we have no national policy which comprehends and meets the whole requirements.

There is grave danger that this attitude will continue to prevail. The attention and energies of the Nation are centered upon the struggle for survival in the present world conflict. Other interests are being subordinated or set aside until this struggle is resolved.

But we cannot afford to defer the proper care of our renewable natural resources to some indefinite future. They, too, are requisites of survival. Food is one of the three essentials of war. Our food-producing resources suffered a severe drain during and after the recent conflict. The further pressure now being put upon them may last 5, 10, or 15 years, perhaps a generation.

Only a foresighted and resolute conservation of these basic resources will enable them to stand up under such a prolonged strain.

But there is another compelling reason why we must safeguard our capital stock of renewable resources through this emergency. We want to emerge from it with the same kind of America—an America of widespread opportunity, of an advancing standard of living and a vigorous national economy. This will be possible only if our food-producing resources are capable of supporting these advantages.

Food is the primary necessity of life. People spend their money for it first. What is left over is the total fund available for other economic and social uses. Because we have always had plenty of food at a moderate cost a large balance of personal income has been left over for the other satisfactions of life. It is this broad margin of spendable income that has made possible our flourishing industrial system, large-scale employment at high wage levels, and all the variety of professions and services found in this country.

This wealth of food-producing resources has had a reciprocal effect. It has released more and more people for the production of other goods and the amenities of life. These in turn have supplied the improved machines and tools and scientific research which have multiplied the capacity of those remaining on the land. Thus we have the paradox of an increasing food production at the same time that our soil and water resources are deteriorating. It can lead us into one of the most dangerous illusions in our history.

We will, of course, win the struggle with world communism. But while winning it will we neglect and permanently weaken the resources which nourish the American form of society? The answer depends on the public and official understanding of this danger on the home front, and their will to do something about it.

When I stress the necessity of conserving our food-producing resources it is with no thought of singling them out for attention. This would be but to perpetuate the error that has been pursued in the past and present. Soil and water are but parts of what Morris L. Cooke has described as the great complex we call nature. Indivisibly included in it also are forests, grass, fish, and wildlife. All of these elements are interdependent. They are every one members one of another as truly as that other body of which St. Paul spoke.

The uses of land in accord with its needs and capabilities, uses that hold moisture where it falls or slow down its runoff, are necessary to conserve the tilth, the topsoil, and the organic materials that make land fertile and productive. But also, without such conservation of our land resources, we cannot clean up, control, and develop the potential values of our rivers and other water resources. The forest areas are of critical importance to the protection of our watersheds and the water supplies of thousands of communities. Grass is the great healer of land that has been abused. And finally, though I have no need to tell you, fish require healthy stream beds and wildlife the food, cover, and natural habitat that only a provident use of land will afford.

All of these resources are indispensable to our economy, our social structure, and to a full and satisfactory life for the American people. All of them are inextricably bound up together. Any policy that preserves and builds upon this heritage of resources must be an integrated policy, fully recognizing their fixed association and interaction upon one another.

We have nothing resembling such a policy now. Instead we have numerous separate, fragmented and sometimes conflicting policies and programs. These disconnected efforts are being carried on by various agencies, each naturally intent upon its own specialty. It is as though the Air Force, the infantry, the artillery, and the armored units were each to follow its own plan of battle with only accidental coordination with the others. The results are the same in either case. As the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission said in this understatement:

"Our Federal programs have not brought the situation under control. In fact, there are no current programs adequate to meet our urgent need for the preservation of these renewable resources. All targets fall far short of that mark."

It is time to end this haphazard and losing course. The public interest requires that we now come to grips with the task in an intelligent and effective way. This requirement can be met only by a policy that views these resources as an entirety, and not as separate problems. In short, we must have a national policy for our renewable natural resources which comprehends both their involved relationship and their vital importance to the welfare of the Nation.

Such a policy should establish the conservation, sound use, and development of our renewable natural resources as a basic purpose of the Government and require all other present and future policies and programs to be adjusted to it.

This policy should be long-range in perspective, with an emphasis on permanency in results. It should clearly define the objectives to be sought with each of our renewable natural resources. In brief, these objectives should represent the maximum public benefits that can be achieved by their proper use and management. In conformity with their interrelated nature, the policy should require that all resource programs and projects shall be correlated to produce the fullest possible multipurpose effects.

A national policy, shaped along some such lines, must precede any orderly and successful management of the renewable natural resources of the Nation.

Its long-time importance is equaled by its urgency. Unless such a policy is enacted soon there is a distinct danger that these resources will be neglected and allowed to deteriorate further during the defense emergency. A natural resources policy would be the most effective, perhaps the only effective check to this danger. It would direct public and official attention to the immediate need of using and conserving these resources in a manner to insure their permanency and it would add efficiency to the present resource activities.

The failure to provide a natural resources policy is an omission in the security program that Congress should repair at the earliest possible time.

Even at best, we cannot expect quick action. For not only must a resource policy be well thought out but it must be geared to do the job. This involves decisions as to how it will operate and be administered. I shall offer my own ideas.

For practical purposes most of our future resource programs should be organized on a watershed basis. Except for a few of the outsize rivers, such as the Mississippi and the Missouri, the watershed or river basin is a natural operational unit. It presents a workable aggregate of renewable resources as well as the problems they involve. This fact adapts it to an integrated program, in which the efforts of the various resourse agencies can be marshaled most efficiently.

The great number of small watersheds in this country makes such a plan of operation all the more practicable. Unless they are well managed the problems of the big streams they feed will remain beyond solution. Their resource development offers a large measure of public benefits, as the Muskingum Conservancy District so well demonstrates. Moreover, what has happily been called the community watershed is the unit in which can best be enlisted the initiative and active participation of local people, for they can see its connection with their own interests. This is an asset not to be disregarded.

The democratic principle of local and regional planning should be one of the fundamentals of a national resources policy. In the administration of that policy a middle way between the present irresponsibility and some kind of centralized control is both possible and preferable. It will remain possible, however, only if action is taken before the condition of these resources reaches a critical stage.

The paramount need is for the American people and their elected officials to see the issue in its real terms. It is not simply a matter of saving soil fertility, of controlling wasted waters, of growing enough timber or of producing more game to hunt and fish to catch. These are highly desirable in themselves. But the issue is larger than any of them.

It is a question of whether we shall have at our command the basic natural resources required for continuing growth, for the satisfactions of living and for the security of the American experiment in human freedom. This is the proposition in its real dimensions. Surely it is reason enough for a national policy that will conserve and increase the renewable natural resources of the Nation.

Lawyers and the Present-Day Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the occasion of the annual banquet of the Boston University Law School Alumni Association, held in Boston the evening of March 27, 1951:

LAWYERS AND THE PRESENT-DAY CRISIS

In appraising the position of the lawyer of today in the present crisis it is well, I think, to recall the days when our Nation faced its first and greatest of crises.

In the stirring days between 1775 and 1789, the predominant question and the great concern was the preservation of what the liberty-loving colonists conceived as the only form of government consistent with the dignity of free men.

Today, the strengthening and perpetuation of that same form of government against a more insidious enemy is again the principal problem of free Americans who have inherited the spirit of the founding fathers.

In the days of the birth-pains of the Republic, it was not without reason that the people of a fledgling Nation looked to the men of law to lay the foundations upon which the structure of liberty should be built.

At the end of the eighteenth century, the ancient Judiac-Christian conception of the natural law linked western civilization with the infant Republic.

It was natural, therefore, that the only technically qualified moulders of the American constitutional system were recruited from the profession whose members were schooled in the philosophy that all man-made laws must conform to the law of God.

Thus it was that 34 of the 55 members who comprised the Constitutional Convention were practicing members of the legal profession or had been indoctrinated in the current jurisprudence of their day.

With the adoption of the Constitution, the lawyers became its interpreters and defenders. As the practical political scientists of their day, they espoused and advanced the case of federalism until it became the model and the wonder of government throughout the world.

Today, after a century and a half, the structure which they devised and built still stands. It has survived because of steadfast adherence to the principles of the philosophy from which its architecture was drafted.

The danger today is a tendency to overlook the fact that the enemy of democracy—atheistic, materialistic, imperialistic, international communism—is in reality an expression of a vicious creed which is the antithesis of the natural-law philosophy embodied in our Declaration and our Bill of Rights. As in the days of the founding fathers, then, the battle is cast in the realm of ideas.

It is our task as Americans and as lawyers to help mightily in order that the truth shall prevail.

Wielded in the hands of Bracton, Coke, Fortescue, Blackstone, and Pollock, this natural law which is our heritage broke the power of the "divine right of kings."

Thundered forth in the preachments of Otis, Henry, Wilson, Adams, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison, it received immortal enshrinement in our own charters of liberty and established representative government as the protector, and not the creator, of inalienable rights in man.

The lawyers and judges of today are the spiritual descendants of the Coke who defied the King and of Jefferson who penned the Declaration.

Their tasks and duty are no less noble and no more burdensome.

The task is to pit their knowledge, their skill, and all their energies against the philosophy of force which would enslave the world in the paralyzing grip of modern totalitarianism.

As in the times of crisis in the past, the lawyers of today must become the practical political scientists.

The traditions of our law must be reinvigorated and modernized for use—practical use—in the battle of ideologies which rages about us today.

Our principles and precedents are the raw materials—a veritable arsenal of ideas—out of which we can fashion the weapons to capture the minds of men and wean them away from the delusive hope and the false faith which blind them to the baseness of all totalitarian "isms."

The members of our profession must go into the market place of ideas and there preach the basic elements of the doctrine of human freedom.

This means constant reiteration of the principles upon which this Nation was founded, the same principles without which liberty and justice are impossible.

In order to preserve freedom and to secure justice, the nature of man as the repository of those virtues must be evaluated in the light of the natural law.

The medieval teaching which came down to us in the process of the development of the common law must be rediscovered and emphasis again given to the fact that natural law is antecedent to the law of the state.

Believing this and preaching it, we have the answer to the false prophets of today, and their fallacious doctrines shall wither in the wind of truth if we but have the courage to preach and act and live by what we believe.

One of the most significant expressions of my thought is found in a quotation from an address by Chief Judge Lehman, of the New York Court of Appeals in 1941:

"Statesman, prelate and judge, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, are united in the conviction that the inalienable rights of the individual, formulated and assured by our law, rest upon a foundation eternal and immutable because it is Divine. There lies America's unity."

The lawyer of the present day can do much to spread that conviction.

Today as in the past the spirit of the legal profession generates unquenchable patriotism. Some of the younger members of the bar are now engaged in active combat in Korea. Many others are serving in the various branches of the armed services. Still others, are holding important civil posts in the Federal, State, and local governments.

The very environment surrounding the training of a young man for admission to the bar reflects a respect for law and order. He has been made to believe that juridical order is the essential element of a peaceful society. He can easily understand that this juridical order and good government go hand in hand; that no government can long exist except upon the consent of the governed; that there must be a peaceful adjustment of political affairs and the settlement of disputes by rule of law rather than strength of arms. For "when law ceases, tyranny starts."

But no matter how much he believes in all these things, history teaches him that wars are recurring. No actual solution toward an enduring peace has yet been found.

Yet when war does come, as was the case in World War II and our previous wars, we find the legal profession well trained and experienced to render great public service.

This manifests itself in many ways; adjustment of management-labor disputes so essential to our productive capacity; in the making of Government contracts for defense production; in the field of administrative law; in the forming and enforcement of policies to control inflation; in case of shortages to assure equitable allocation; in the administration of the Selective Service System; in the field of military justice; and many other activities too numerous to mention.

We find the lawyer in time of emergency or of war always responding to the call for active service.

With his training, his ability, his experience, his well schooled mind, particularly in fundamentals, as a leader in his community the lawyer helps mold sound public opinion on important issues of the day.

By virtue of his education, training and experience, he is uniquely qualified and does to a marked extent form and interpret our Government's position on foreign and domestic fields.

Giving full credit to the contributions made by those engaged in other fields of human activity, the influence of the lawyer in the sphere of government is tremendous, and properly so. His education and training equips him to make a marked contribution in the science and operation of government. He has, he is, he will continue to do so.

Because of our changed economic conditions, the large volume of legislation, the necessity and pressure for action, the real work in the Congress is done in committee. It therefore follows on the national legislative level, for all practical purposes, congressional government has essentially turned into committee government.

This means that greater importance must be and is attached to the legislative drafting office of the Senate and House in the Congress, composed of lawyers, who also invariably sit in when committees are considering a bill. Therefore the staffs of committees with the prominence of the lawyer thereon, are all-important. In the executive branch of government, the lawyer as adviser, renders valuable assistance to the President, and department heads.

In the field of preserving the constitutional guaranties relating to the liberties of our people and the American way of life, and at the same time preventing or controlling subversive efforts aimed at the destruction of our Government the lawyer, either as a legislator, as an active practitioner, as a prosecuting attorney, or as a judge, plays the primary part.

Our country—as all of you know—is engaged today in the largest program of military expansion we have ever undertaken short of involvement in full-scale war.

This build-up of military strength is far more than the bald proposition that might makes right. We seek the establishment of a firmly grounded system of international law and order among the family of nations. And to this end, the creation now of powerful military forces within the community of free nations is essential.

We look to the creation of a common policy, directed to a common purpose, and guided by a common body of law among nations. It is the logical end-point of this view that all nations of the world work out together, and ultimately accept, the same policy with respect to dealings among themselves.

Certainly, within the framework of western society we have managed largely to abate the conditions in which the individual takes the law in his own hands. The individual who breaches the law of the community today does so at the peril of sanctions which the community may impose upon him.

But this has not always been the case. The story of civilization is the story of man's continuing battle to enlarge liberty and security of the community at large—always at the expense of the unrestrained activities of the individual. And it is equally the story of resistance by the powerful individual to any new restraints upon his ability to plunder.

With such a heritage, it is indeed difficult for me to understand why any American would challenge the general principle that the collective liberty of all stands above any license that would permit one individual to deprive others of their liberty.

Just as law and order based upon morality have been slow to develop within nations themselves, they have been slower still in emerging among nations. The earlier development of order and stability within nations has evidently received great assistance where there has been a common racial, religious, and environmental background, and achievement of national unity has almost invariably been retarded under conditions in which racial, religious, or environmental differences have divided the people.

While we are a people, not a nation, fortunately we have had no such intense or long-disturbing differences among our people.

The revolution in communications, largely within the past century, has for perhaps the first time in history made unity among nations a practicable—and, I hope, foreseeable—possibility.

We cannot close our eyes to the magnitude of the job. Traditional national jealousies gravely aggravate the task. Great differences in living standards, cultural heritage, political experience, and a thousand other factors give rise to misunderstandings and keep suspicions alive.

The difficulties are great. Yet I firmly believe most Americans accept the fact that it is in our national interest to overcome the difficulties. We can expect no miracle overnight that will bring about the brotherhood of man and world-wide understanding. But with equal truth we can say that only by trying can the job be done. One thing seems to me to be certain; we cannot expect success by default.

The first task of our foreign policy has been—and to a large extent still is—to weld the free nations into a unified community simply as a matter of self-preservation. Division and disunity among the free nations can only result in having them picked off one at a time. The dangers of such division and disunity are at once evident. Every loss to us is a gain to the forces of world communism—a long-term increase in their resources at the expense of ours.

Now if we could assume that world communism would expand no further than it has today, the United States could, perhaps, confine its attention to building up its own defenses without any regard for what happens elsewhere in the world. But there is no basis whatever for believing that the Kremlin is content with what it has already

taken. Indeed, the ceaseless activity of world communism belies any intention to be satisfied with what it already has. And when we look out upon the terrible internal weakness within so many of the non-Communist nations, it is perfectly clear that they do not possess the strength individually to protect themselves. Only by uniting their efforts can there be any realistic hope that their freedom can be maintained, and this directly concerns our own country.

If the Kremlin is to be denied world conquest, the answer is to be found in creating situations of strength to replace the areas of weakness which now threaten so many of the nations outside the Red orbit. And it has been toward the creation of these situations of strength that our foreign policy has been directed.

We have sought to accomplish this through policies mutually adopted by ourselves and other nations. The programs have been designed with the realization that their success is measured by the degree of cooperation, mutual trust and common purpose which they generate among the nations participating in them. The more nearly they succeed in breaking down suspicions and national jealousies, the more closely they approach the kind of unity upon which a lasting system of law and order can be built.

I should like now to examine our major foreign policy programs of the postwar years with an eye to testing their contribution to our ultimate goal of peace and stability throughout the family of nations.

Our participation in the United Nations was—and is—predicated upon the assumption that an international institution, participated in by all nations, is a fundamental requirement of a system of law and order. This, in particular, is a challenge to the legal mind. The United Nations furnished a great meeting place of nations in which international questions could be presented, discussed, and understanding of them broadened. The United Nations Charter incorporated more areas of agreement between nations than had ever before been put on paper. But it was not a perfect instrument, and from the first it was recognized that the mainspring of its initial success would be provided by national good faith, rather than legally foolproof sanctions. It was, nonetheless, a tremendous step forward when you consider that it did succeed in bringing together all but a small handful of nations.

Obstruction and bad faith by the Kremlin and its satellites has served to hamper what direct enforcement powers the United Nations did possess. On the other hand, the United Nations has done a fine job of promoting greater understanding among nations. Nations of the free world have sat in ringside seats as evidences of Soviet bad faith have continued to pile up. Without question this factor has been of primary importance in uniting the free world.

I should also like to point out that last fall the General Assembly enacted a provision which now permits it to impose sanctions free of the veto. Back in October, Secretary of State Acheson proposed the uniting-for-peace resolution, giving the Assembly power to act when the Security Council was hamstrung by the veto. And the Assembly accepted the resolution, with only the Soviets and their satellites voting against it. This adds a significant new strength to the UN, and is a real victory for forces seeking an effective system of law and order.

But the United Nations is young, and it is just now beginning to cut its teeth. It still lacks the strength necessary to assure world peace under all circumstances. And thus it is that American foreign policy has directed its attention in part to regional programs designed to strengthen the security of the non-Communist world.

Along in 1946, guerrilla warfare, directed and supplied from the Kremlin, broke out in Greece. The weak and economically wrecked Government of Greece had too recently emerged from Nazi occupation to possess sufficient strength to beat down the threat. And about the same time, the Soviet Union was making exploratory moves in the direction of Turkey.

It was evident that these countries were too weak to save themselves without help. America's answer to this threat was the Truman doctrine, under which we furnished arms and economic assistance. With this aid, both Greece and Turkey were able to strengthen themselves sufficiently that the threat to their security was overcome. And out of the Truman doctrine has grown a new friendship and a greatly stronger desire by both these countries to work in close cooperation with other nations. Both the Greeks and Turks have forces fighting now in Korea, despite the fact that each country borders the Soviet empire, and is fully aware of the opposing military forces across their borders.

Furthermore, both the Greeks and Turks have won the growing respect of the western European nations, and the prospects for their ultimate participation in the Atlantic Pact are now quite encouraging.

As the Soviets took over the countries of Eastern Europe, the rest of Europe was terribly threatened. Chaotic economic conditions produced an almost mushroomlike growth of internal Communist activity and the overthrow of many non-Communist governments seemed imminent. American Marshall-plan aid cut off that threat, and enabled the countries of Western Europe to re-create a situation of economic stability by restoring industrial and agricultural production to points well above prewar levels.

A major feature of the Marshall plan was the emphasis placed upon carrying out the economic recovery program as part of an over-all plan for Western Europe, rather than attempting it piecemeal, country by country. Thus, the governments of the Marshall plan countries sat down together to work out their problems. Considerable headway was made in cutting down the age-old tariff barriers, and in eliminating uneconomic competition. And efforts to further this are still being made.

As an adventure in international cooperation, the Marshall plan has been a striking success. Without it, the defense of Western Europe today would be impossible.

The situation of economic strength created in Europe by the Marshall plan eradicated the internal threat of communism there. Militarily, however, the threat of possible aggression was very real, and any realistic thinking necessarily had to consider that the Kremlin might seek the conquest of Western Europe by force if efforts at internal subversion and economic collapse failed.

It was to meet this threat of aggression that the North Atlantic Pact was adopted in 1949.

The North Atlantic Pact, born of necessity, consists of 12 nations, including our own country, to stand together for common defense. It is in our national interest. It is in the national interest of the other pact member nations.

Its purpose is twofold:

1. To build collective military strength within the Atlantic community with the will not only to prepare but to fight, if necessary, and powerful enough to prevent any attack from coming.

2. In case of attack, to stand together in common defense and resistance against the aggressor.

It is recognized the only factor the Kremlin respects is that which it fears, and that is strength and power greater than that possessed by the Soviet Union.

The Atlantic Pact, created by voluntary entry of its member nations, is based upon a mutuality and trust for a common purpose—unity and strength to prevent aggression, preserve independence and liberty, and as an instrument of peace.

By the Mutual Defense Act of 1949, we implement the North Atlantic Pact to build up military forces in Europe, speed military equipment to our treaty allies, recognizing, as Congress did, that only by an integrated defense force could maximum benefits be obtained by a minimum cost.

In rendering assistance to other treaty nations we are not disregarding our own national defenses.

The policy of the Kremlin prior to Korea was for Communist forces within a country, with the assistance of the Soviet Union, through any means possible, to take over country after country, and as this resulted, to become satellites of the Soviet Union.

The Greek-Turk assistance, and the Marshall plan in other free European countries, has stopped that policy of internal subversion, the overthrow of the existing government, and thereafter Communist domination.

Stalin and his associates had to turn to a policy of open aggression through satellites.

The attack on South Korea by the North Korean Communists, and the follow-up by Red China was the first act of open aggression.

We had witnessed the act of open aggression by the Japs in Manchuria in 1930; by Mussolini in Ethiopia in 1937; and later by Hitler in the Ruhr, followed by Czechoslavakia, Austria, Hungary, with Great Britain following the policy of appeasement, and with the attack on Poland, the Second World War followed.

It is the first open act of aggression that does the damage, and based on our own experiences, its natural and probably consequences, when appeased or permitted, has been war.

Successful open aggression in Korea would have been rapidly followed elsewhere by further aggression against other nations.

For our country to sit back and protest diplomatically, in other words to follow the dangerous policy of appeasement, would have lost for us the confidence and respect of all countries of the world outside the Red orbit, and countless of millions of persons behind the iron curtain who are looking for their day of deliverance.

We would have destroyed respect for our word and our solemn obligations, we would have failed in our trust.

In all probabilities, we would have compelled every non-Communist country to turn through necessity, but with fear to make the best deal possible with the Kremlin, and that would be but the beginning of the end.

Western Europe, with its know-how, with its productive capacity and its 200,000,000 inhabitants, would sooner or later be lost to us. Frankly, this is too great a risk to place our country in. I shall do everything within my power to prevent it.

In order to prevent that happening we might in our own defense and our national interest be compelled to resort to armed conflict with the Soviet Union.

President Truman saw the danger, made his decision and acted quickly with courage.

The aggression in Korea has awakened our people to the danger that exists. Our Navy, our Air Forces, and our land forces have been greatly increased and strengthened. Our Armed Forces now exceed 2,900,000 men and women, having doubled since the outbreak of the Korean aggression on June 25. Our production for defense has greatly increased, with our productive capacity geared to total production, if necessary.

Our resistance to the Korean aggression has increased the morale, the military strength, and production of non-Communist countries.

If another world conflict is averted, it is my firm opinion that Korea, with the armed

resistance to the first open act of aggression that took place in that country, will be a main factor in this desired result.

The next step for peace by stopping open aggression was the formation of the defense forces of the North Atlantic Pact nations through the recent appointment of General Eisenhower as the over-all military commander in chief.

The success of the Atlantic Pact is in the national interest of the United States. It is also in the national interest of the other 11 member nations.

I expect that Greece and Turkey will soon be members of the pact.

I hope that Spain will be a member in the near future.

The directing of policies concerning the national interest of a nation calls for cool, calm, rational thinking, with emotional thoughts, impulses, or reactions eliminated as far as is humanly possible.

It is my opinion, which I have advocated for a long time, that it would be for our interest and in the interest of a future period of peace for our country to enter into a military agreement or a military alliance with the Government of Spain; also, that as soon as possible thereafter Spain should become a member of the North Atlantic Pact.

Where the national interest of two or more countries are involved, differences in form of government should not be permitted to interfere with those steps being taken which are in the national interest of such countries.

I would be greatly surprised if some such talks or negotiations with Spain are not now under way.

From our outlook, and I include the non-Communist world, conditions are decidedly better than they were 1, 2, or 3 years ago.

In case of sudden attack or war, we are now in a much better position than we were when Pearl Harbor took place. We are growing stronger.

With the Communist threat, the road to security and peace is through strength.

If I am to err, I intend to err on the side of strength and security rather than on the side of weakness and insecurity.

This is not the time when we can take any calculated risks on the side of weakness. Such risks must be on the side of strength.

I introduced on December 8, 1941, one resolution declaring war. I do not want to introduce another one. But I shall if necessary.

It is by America using its great strength affirmatively and effectively, with the moral forces of the world leading the way that the probability of another world war in our lifetime might be averted.

If this is accomplished, the chances for peace for a long period of time faces the world of today and tomorrow.

The lawyers of past generations were leaders in the onward march of mankind toward the establishment of representative government, and of personal liberty.

The lawyers of yesterday were leaders in the establishment and building of the American Republic. A great challenge for leadership presents itself to the lawyers of today.

It is a challenge for leadership which particularly addresses itself to the legal mind, and which will require ability, vision, patience, and courage to meet.

I have every confidence that the lawyers of today will meet the test, and particularly if war is averted, they will make their marked contributions toward the establishment of an international law and order and machinery which will extend justice to all nations and assure world peace for countless of generations to come.

With the direct responsibility that rests upon me, recognizing as I do the gravity and sensitivity of the world situation as it exists, the moral values and strength of men and women who want to be free, and the material strength of our country and our allies whose objective is peace and international law and order, I view the outcome with optimism and with confidence.

We Now Have a Poor Man's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the recent Executive order deferring super-duper college students from call under selective service, in my mind, is ill-advised and poorly timed. It comes while the House of Representatives is considering legislation in which this matter is being dealt with. The President should withdraw this order pending the outcome of the congressional debate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Robert C. Ruark which appeared today in leading newspapers of the country. I agree with Mr. Ruark's observations regarding the deferment of the "bright young men" in college from the draft. The article follows:

WE NOW HAVE A POOR MAN'S WAR
(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK.—It seems we have now seen everything. Lo, behold, and forsooth, we now have a poor man's war, a draft in which the college man is mainly exempt from exposure to the military, and a brand-new caste system in the country.

Our President, in his wisdom, has ordered deferment from military service for young men who are passing their work in college, and shortly will subject other young men to special aptitude tests with an eye to deferment if they are smart enough to make a certain grade, as yet unannounced.

Of course, if a man is too poor to entertain the idea of college, or not spiritually attuned to higher education, he is still draft meat. Fall in, bum, you're in the Army now. We draft the Al Smiths, in other words, and exempt the Alger Hisses.

This, finally, seems to be as gross a violation of individual rights as has come down the pike lately. To choose a soldier on a basis of educational opportunity is almost, if not quite, as unfair a proposition as drafting only red-headed, blue-eyed boys with a strawberry mark on their right shoulders, while everybody else goes free.

It is admitted that education is important, but a great many successful people never went to college, and a great many bums did attend the better seminaries. But this is really beside the point.

The point is that the draft, like death and taxes, should be democratic in its administration. If there is a war stirring, and if a draft is necessary, then the obligation belongs to everybody. The load is shareable by all—not just a few.

It would, per se, be foolish to make a foot soldier out of a budding doctor, or throw a carbine at a brilliant physicist or engineer who is winding up his studies. But most of the men affected by the new draft order are not special cases. They are just youngsters taking general courses.

It is a human oddity that nobody cares to be drafted, and very few sane folks are eager to die. When a man is ordered by his government to conform to one or both penalties against personal freedom, he sort of likes to think that everybody is getting the same deal. A man without a college education is just as dear to his family and friends as a double dome with a triple degree in botany. And it is hard to tell, by looking at a dead GI, whether or not he was fortunate enough to get the full dose of school-housing.

To make a privileged class of any massive group of healthy young men is a downright insult to every candidate for the press gang. It would be of small comfort to a young man unfreezing his feet in Korea to reflect that his friend Bill, who could afford to go to college, was at the moment chasing a coed around the drinking room in a fraternity house at dear old Bless U.

The other angle is that your college man is highly usable in the Armed Forces, because if he can pass his courses the chances are he can think. Thinkers make great noncoms and officers. What do we seek here, a military composed strictly of fools, disgruntled poor boys, and morons?

If the great brains in Washington wish to really louse up the morale of their handcuff volunteers, this is a gorgeous way to do it. I still say the thing is to draft everybody within the limits of age, physical qualifications, and dependency, and then sort 'em out according to their best use from a military standpoint. This block deferment of students and smart guys is an insult to every cross at Anzio and to every civilian who presently wears the uniform of his country.

The Senate Kefauver Crime Investigation Committee Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to insert into the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram that I have received from Mr. J. C. Phillips, editor and manager, Borger News-Herald, of Borger, Tex. This telegram is most timely and most pertinent. It is a concise expression of what should be in the minds of all American citizens at this time. Character is the foundation of a sound government and a sound civilization, and for which there is no substitute.

BORGER, TEX., *March 28, 1951.*
Representative WALTER ROGERS,
House of Representatives:

Cities controlled by organized crime have no more chance of escape from this evil control than anti-Communist Russians have of escaping slavery to the Kremlin. The Senate Kefauver crime investigation committee should be continued until an aroused and indignant public starts effective local clean-ups. It seems that corruption in public office has become quite honorable just so long as it is not exposed. The ability to get rich quick, honestly or otherwise, has become too much a part of the American character. Unless we place more emphasis on individual character, in the home, in the school, in civil life, and in public offices, all of the decent and good things of civilization are apt to be lost to us. Dishonest government leads to dictatorship. It is a sorry thing that we sometimes hear, good men will not run for public office because of corruption inherent in politics. Obviously we have good men and courageous

men in public office and these are the men who must lead us back to a higher standard of individual and national character. Even in small cities organized crime in public office is hard to eliminate and we know that when gambling and prostitution are flagrant in any city, regardless of size, some public official is getting a payoff. To eliminate this evil, the good people throughout the land must have the continuation of the newly organized Kefauver crime investigation.

J. C. PHILLIPS.

Soldiers and Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by the well-known and highly regarded writer, Hamilton Butler, which appeared in the Detroit Free-Press Sunday, April 1. I commend it to all Members of Congress:

SOLDIERS AND POLITICIANS

(By Hamilton Butler)

Among General MacArthur's many abilities is that of putting his foot in the mouths of double-talking diplomatists to their great annoyance.

The latest exhibition of this feat was his offer to meet the Chinese Communist commander in the field and discuss a military truce.

What was wrong with that?

As commander in chief of the UN forces fighting a war forced upon them by the Chinese Communists, General MacArthur was clearly within his rights in employing this tactical device.

The State Department, though, and the nervous Nellies at Lake Success shrieked that he had made a political decision and endangered their negotiations with Peiping for a cease-fire.

The arrant nonsense of this charge appears from the text of his March 24 statement:

"Apart from the military area of the problem, where the issues are resolved in the course of combat, the fundamental questions continue to be political in nature and must find their answer in the diplomatic sphere.

"Within the area of my authority as military commander, however, it should be needless to say I stand ready at any time to confer in the field with the commander in chief of the enemy forces in an earnest effort to find any military means whereby the realization of the political objectives of the United Nations in Korea, to which no nation may justly take exceptions, might be accomplished without further bloodshed."

As will be noted, General MacArthur emphasized the line dividing the sphere of military authority from that of political authority and carefully kept on his own side of it.

The unpardonable sin General MacArthur committed was in suggesting the possibility that he might obtain by a conference with the Chinese Communist commander the cease-fire that the diplomats have vainly sought for 4 months to win by appeasement.

The politicians will never forgive him for that.

While General MacArthur has sedulously avoided the area of political decisions, the politicians have invaded the area of military decisions and hamstrung him with limitations unparalleled in the history of warfare.

The interdict they imposed on carrying the war beyond the Yalu even after the Chinese Red hordes had crossed that river and attacked the UN forces in full strength created an inviolable sanctuary for the enemy.

The inability of the UN air arm to strike at their communications and bases in Manchuria was worth a dozen divisions to the Communists.

Also it has cost thousands of American lives.

The politicians told General MacArthur to clear Korea of Communist forces in order that it might become a free and united country.

Then they tied his hands.

As a soldier, and an American, General MacArthur wants to get this wretched business over with before the Korean people are further crucified and his troops suffer more senseless casualties.

The effect of his cease-fire statement was to expose what has been going on at Lake Success, where UN committees have been trying since December to interest Peiping in a truce, without any success at all. They have gotten a brushoff. The Commie foreign office won't even talk to them.

The air has been cleared.

Navy Research Promotes Safer Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Navy's Aviation Matériel Center's Research Promotes Safer Aviation; Jet Speeds Bringing Many Problems," by Lt. Comdr. Robert J. Boylan, United States Naval Reserve, which was published by the North American Newspaper Alliance. It describes some of the activities of the Naval Aviation Matériel Center at Philadelphia, Pa.:

NAVY'S AVIATION MATÉRIEL CENTER'S RESEARCH PROMOTES SAFER AVIATION; JET SPEEDS BRINGING MANY PROBLEMS

(By Robert J. Boylan)

PHILADELPHIA, March 24.—A flat-chested Mae West? Sounds incredible, unlikely, and maybe heretical. But that's what the Navy is developing to replace the life preserver that proudly wore the name of Mae throughout World War II.

The 1951 Mae's flatter surfaces make for less bulk and easier movement and should be a handier preserver that does a better job of saving lives, particularly of wounded airmen. Its nylon netting not only reduces weight but produces a correct floating posture.

The new life preserver is only one of many developments coming out of the Navy's aviation matériel center here which devotes thousands of man hours a week to making aviation safer.

One of the problems the center's engineers are licking is crash helmets for pilots using the seat ejector. First the center did a lot of work on the ejector itself, which shoots a pilot out of a plane when the craft runs into trouble serious enough to make this necessary. Then they designed a crash helmet that could withstand the pressure that develops when a pilot is suddenly fired out of a plane skimming along at 500 or more miles per hour.

For this problem the Navy called on the United Carr Fastener Co. for help. The company, after extensive research with the center, came up with a special pull the dot fastener. Not only does this fastener keep a helmet on securely but under pressure it locks even tighter, thus saving many a pilot's head from being snapped off.

Many NAMC problems arose with the coming of near-sonic jet speeds. For instance, cockpit lighting and the exterior lighting of aircraft. In a jet plane booming along at speeds of 8 or 9 miles a minute a pilot has to be able to read his instruments fast and accurately. And when he sees an approaching plane in the night sky the closing speed is about a mile in 3 seconds, which doesn't give any chance for second guessing on an instrument reading or in sighting wing-tip lights.

For this huge and complex lighting problem the Navy has built its own stellarium in a corner of one of the large NAMC buildings. There a pilot is put into a cockpit, all other lights are turned out, leaving only the man, his instrument lights, simulated approaching aircraft, and a starlit sky.

He is shown a total of 15 aircraft approaching and leaving from various angles. It is up to the pilot to take proper moves to avoid a collision course. Pressing one lever records his recognition of the aircraft and a second lever records his actions, if any, to avoid collision.

So far NAMC has tested more than 300 pilots. As part of the test they are given an elaborate questionnaire designed to produce a pattern of answers rather than a subjective "yes" or "no." What the Navy wants to find out from the pilots is how difficult it is to read instruments at night and how hard it is to spot approaching aircraft.

One of the experiments works like this: A pilot is put into a darkened cockpit. A series of four instruments, located at 12, 3, 6, and 9 o'clock on a panel, flash on and off in a clockwise movement. After a few revolutions a pilot cannot tell which of the four instruments is lighted or which will be next to flash on. This proved to the NAMC engineers that a point of reference was necessary and that supplementary floodlighting should be installed in cockpits.

Many of the problems tossed to NAMC develop because of the constant feud between fuel and rubber—two items that always go together on aircraft. The center maintains a laboratory that devotes all its time to research and development of plastic and rubber products.

One of the products, usable where fuel and rubber come together, is a rubber diaphragm built up like a Dagwood sandwich: a layer of special synthetic rubber with excellent resistance to fuel; a nylon center and a nylon barrier to prevent seepage of fuel; and another layer of a synthetic rubber with a good resistance to low temperatures. Fuel has a tendency to extract from rubber the materials that make it resistant to it.

Also on the long list of successful NAMC accomplishments is a simple tab that may save many a pilot's life. Now part of a new oxygen mask, it prevents air from seeping in as a pilot's head is thrown back in using the ejection seat or in making a parachute jump. Old type masks without the tab slipped open just enough to cause death or serious injury from breathing rarefied air at high altitudes.

Waterproof clothing that "breathes" is another NAMC success. Pressure suits made

of a rubber-coated cloth achieve this improvement. On a project such as this, engineers have as their ideal developing a cloth that simulates human skin and its ability to "breathe" through the pores.

The NAMC experts believe that in orlon they have found the most nearly perfect cloth for the suits. It seems to be best because it resists both mildew and sunlight. Nylon is stronger, they say, but doesn't have orlon's other qualities.

Many of the products mentioned were developed in the aeronautical medical equipment laboratory of the Naval Air Matériel Center, which was dedicated only 2 years ago. The laboratory has two divisions: Human engineering, which deals with the physiological phases of aeronautical medicine, and the development division, dealing with the study of scientific engineering problems relating to safety devices and protective equipment.

But the goal of both divisions and of the entire center can be summed up in two words: safer aviation.

Rudolph Halley, Chief Counsel of the Kefauver Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincerest wishes for a speedy recovery to my good friend Rudolph Halley, the chief counsel for the Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime. Halley has done a wonderful job in connection with the work of the Kefauver committee in helping to uncover the crime and gambling evils in this country. Millions of people have had the opportunity to watch him over television during the recent hearings in New York and Washington, and have come to respect and admire him for his ability and the manner in which he interrogated witnesses.

Hard-working, energetic Rudolph Halley is only 37 years old. He was born in Harrison, N. Y., on June 19, 1913, and received his preparatory education at Columbia University in New York, where he obtained a bachelor of arts degree in 1932 and a bachelor of laws degree in 1934. He was editor of the Columbia Law Review from 1932 to 1934, which denotes a significant honor and achievement. In 1935 he was admitted to the bar in New York and in 1946 he became a member of the District of Columbia bar.

Halley began his legal career as law secretary to the Honorable William Bondy, United States district judge for the southern district of New York, with whom he was associated from 1934 to 1937. He then became assistant United States attorney for the southern district of New York, in which capacity he served until 1942. When the Truman war investigating committee was established, he was named assistant counsel and in 1944 became the committee's chief counsel. In recent years he was associated with the law firm of Fulton, Walter & Halley in New York.

When the Kefauver committee undertook its crime investigations in the spring of 1950, Mr. Halley was appointed chief counsel, heading an investigative staff of 25 men. His working day often extended until 2 in the morning, he got along on 6 hours sleep, and was back on the job the next day full of his usual vitality. Men like Rudolph Halley are sorely needed now in Government service. I hope he will soon return, well and strengthened, to complete the task he has undertaken and in which he distinguished himself so much.

In conclusion, I want to insert in the RECORD a brief item on Rudolph Halley published in the April 2 issue of Life magazine. It is as follows:

HALLEY WAS A COMET ACROSS TV NETWORKS

As its main interrogator, the chief counsel for the Kefauver committee often had to draw unwilling testimony from men who, as policemen or prosecutors (O'Dwyer had been both), were themselves skilled at tenacious examination and verbal entrapment. Rudolph Halley's success at this was due to extraordinarily hard work, to his prodigious memory (he used no notes during the hearings), and to his ability—which showed brilliantly on television—to press question after relentless question in his flat, metallic voice.

Halley is a stocky, good-humored, 37-year-old New York lawyer, who has enormous energy and a respect for law and order as ingrained, if not as flamboyant, as Senator TOBEY'S. Born in Harrison, N. Y., he graduated from Columbia Law School at the age of 20, has since divided his time between Government work and a lucrative civil practice. During the 10 months of the Kefauver hearings he usually worked 16-hour days, 7-day weeks, compiled some 2,000,000 words of testimony and bested most of the major underworld figures in the United States. For this he would receive less than $7,000.

This week he could start writing his report. His boss wanted to end the hearings and begin drafting remedial legislation to curb some of the evils the committee had uncovered.

Sixteenth Annual Patriotic Award Dinner of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two addresses delivered at the sixteenth annual patriotic award dinner given by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of Chicago, Ill., on March 3, 1951. The society's Award of Merit for 1950 on that date was conferred upon Dr. Percy L. Julian.

The thought-provoking speeches reprinted below were given by Mr. Carl B. Sussman, president of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, and Mr. Roy I. Levinson, past president:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME DELIVERED BY CARL B. SUSSMAN, PRESIDENT, THE DECALOGUE SOCIETY OF LAWYERS

Distinguished guests of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, ladies, and gentlemen, in welcoming you on this festive occasion I do so in a solemn spirit. We live in uneasy times, when values we hold dear and precious are threatened from without in a measure civilization has not known before. It is good, however, that we, a free people, give constant testimony of our confidence and strength to defend a way of life and a system of government that made us, American citizens, outstanding among all nations on earth. And it is to celebrate the right to project our unity with the noble institutions of our country that the Decalogue Society of Lawyers rededicates itself tonight to a restatement of its principles and completeness with the American way of life.

It would seem that, today, secure in its achievements, its ever-growing abundance, this great land of ours would continue to persist unmolested, its moral leadership unchallenged and supreme.

Yet, such is not the case. The world is in a turmoil. Dark forces are at work to nullify our tremendous gains in the orderly forms of government and there is an endeavor abroad to repeal in substance concepts of civilization we cherish in our own land. Science has made tremendous strides; its accomplishments have added dignity and stature to the human being, and it has lifted crushing burdens from the brows of mankind. But that almost to no avail, for no permanent peace or security is yet in sight for the millions on all continents in the world. Is this, the atomic age, to go down in history as the beginning of another Dark Age? The challenge is urgent; the issues are clear.

We lawyers, members of a bar association, all descendants of immigrants who came here a generation or two ago, Americans all, are beneficiaries of a heritage left us by the founders of this country. Violence and deadly strife, untold sacrifices in blood and tears were conditions precedent that had to be met and overcome to establish at last in all its glories this great Republic, this model democracy. We pledge that this sacred legacy shall be inviolate in our keeping and no unclean hands shall trifle with our trust.

Jews are no longer a homeless people. After 20 centuries of wandering and exile our coreligionists are the proud citizens of the youngest Republic in the world. Yet the scars of yesterday are too fresh and deep to forget that prejudice and ignorance needs the vigilant ministrations of the decent people of the world.

Mankind shares the shame for the unspeakable decade that saw incinerators reduce human beings to dust and ashes and the excesses of that era have placed a lien upon the conscience of humanity to guarantee that the outrage never reoccur. We believe that this assurance and covenant extend and unconditionally include all those with sorrow laden, black or white, all minority groups whom the lash of prejudice and discrimination reduce to second-class citizenship.

We hold it vital to reiterate the truth that all men are created equal. That security from the enemy beyond our border is unsure if there lurks in our midst a contempt for a just application of the blessings of our Constitution. We believe that as lawyers we need exercise our special skills, talents, and learnings to defend the weak and to enlighten the confused. We hold that as a society we need be missionary in practicing what we preach. We need living demonstrations of the sincerity and the integrity of our profession of faith that democracy works.

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, in the spirit of true democracy, is giving you such a demonstration.

Conscious of the truth that the struggle for human liberty is ceaseless and exacting and that only in a just world will all peoples find justice for themselves, we seek to sup-

port such ideals which promote progress for all.

So this day, as in former years, we bestow an award of merit upon a citizen for distinguished service to humanity, believing that our award serves as an inspiration for the common good.

We are proud to salute in the person of our choice for the decalog award not only recognized achievement and proved merit but also a fellow American the son of a people who have yet to wrest their complete recognition from our laws and institutions. In this we pledge them and all minorities our unstinted aid in our march toward the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

ADDRESS OF ROY I. LEVINSON, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE DECALOGUE SOCIETY OF LAWYERS

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, with warmth and sincerity, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers tonight honors itself in presenting our award of merit to Dr. Percy L. Julian, as a recognition of his own preeminent talent and achievements and his invaluable service to our beloved country, and to humanity.

It is also a tribute of our admiration, gratitude, and respect for more than 15,000,000 Americans, whom Dr. Percy Julian so worthily represents. Their emancipation, humility, loyalty, and patriotism have profoundly influenced us. Their dignity and industry have served as an inspiration to free men everywhere.

In the world's history, never before was the future of so many nations, of so many continents, of so many individuals at home and abroad, so closely shrouded in dark clouds of uncertainty, pregnant with storm. As one looks around there is little light, save when dazzling flashes write a great interrogation on the murky background.

Whither are we drifting? Everywhere civilization is at the crossroads. Can this change and disaster which impends, be harnessed for the welfare of man, as the great soybean chemist has harnessed the forces of nature?

In the life and works of Dr. Julian will we not find answer to the eternal question: What of the future? Bright or dark? From his resistless philosophy why not look at the duty of us all, to one another, from the first stirring of civilization? What of the other man?

Look into your own mind.

As the wrought iron must be melted and tortured in the crucible of fire and flame and then pounded into its beautiful and useful shape, are not those people who have been tortured by the fires of hate and bigotry, and tempered by the process, the worthiest of consideration and admiration?

Dr. Percy Julian graduated at the head of his class at the Alabama State Normal College. He was a classmate of David E. Lilienthal at DePauw University, in Green Castle, Ind., where Dr. Julian slept in the attic of a fraternity house and waited on tables for his meals. At the end of the 4-year course he was Phi Beta Kappa orator and valedictorian of his class in 1920. The winner of several succeeding fellowships carried him through his courses at Harvard University.

His memorable research of the soybean began at the University of Vienna, where he won his doctor of science degree and returned to head the chemistry department at Howard University, where he had previously been a chemistry teacher. Then he gladly accepted the invitation of his old friend, Dean William M. Blanchard, to teach at his old alma mater—DePauw—where a laboratory was built for him. It was here at the DePauw laboratory, in 1933, that Dr. Julian launched the first original creative work in pure chemistry ever published by a Negro in the history of America.

An official of Glidden, a leading Chicago chemical company, heard of his discoveries and offered Dr. Julian a position as research director of their soybean division.

His first job there was to improve a sizing for paper and cold water. This he did, turning a $35,000 a year loss into a $135,000 annual profit.

The same soybean product is used in his Aero-Foam, the fire extinguisher. In the desperate days of our naval war in the Pacific Dr. Julian's soy protein has done and is doing its work against the enemy. They found it put a blanket—impenetrable to oxygen—over gasoline and oil fire, dousing them like magic. It was Aero-Foam, affectionately called bean soup in the Navy, that saved the lives of thousands of our sailors and airmen and many of our warships.

With long-talked-about wars, and rumors of wars, a grim reality and occurring with such frequency and mounting fury that they kill off the youth of each generation, the world has been forced to look to older men for more energy and manpower.

Dr. Julian's experiments with the soybean has produced unlimited quantities of synthetic testosterones (male hormones) which give old men the mental verve, the muscular vigor, and the virility to carry on in industry and at home.

Dr. Julian has a staff of 65 brilliant research chemists now under his direction, a melting pot of the genius of many races and creeds. He has patented over 40 important discoveries.

Most prominent of his synthetic bean products are: Fisostigmine, used in curing the eye disease, glaucoma; prostigmine, used as a postoperative and also in the treatment of paralysis; synthetic ephedrine, an element used in cold medicine; synthetic male and female hormones credited with saving the lives of countless unborn babies by protecting expectant mothers from miscarriage, and cortisone, a hormone compound which is making cure possible for thousands of arthritic sufferers.

Dr. Julian is now working hard on pregneen-olone to combat fatigue and amino acids for the treatment of infection and starvation, two new life-giving chemicals.

Dr. Percy L. Julian was selected Chicagoan of the year in 1950 by a city-wide poll conducted by Irv Kupcinet, columnist of the Chicago Sun-Times. In 1947 he received from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People its Spingarn Medal award, and an honorary doctor of science from his alma mater, DePauw University. His accomplished and delightful wife is a research sociologist with a doctor of philosophy and Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Pennsylvania.

Does not the inspiring life of Doctor Julian confirm this old Hebrew Talmud philosophy? "As the grapes which are pressed the hardest, yield the sweetest wine, so this grandson of a slave we honor tonight is one of the most brilliant minds, one of the most compassionate hearts on the world's scene."

At the very time some scientists evolved the atom bomb, Dr. Julian, tranquil and calm, in the midst of life's frustrations and turmoil, worked realistically and sympathetically to save human lives and prolong them.

He has become an apostle of construction, rather than of destruction. We feel keenly his strength and high purpose, the integrity and ability with which he grapples with a succession of difficult problems. He never spares himself, whatever the issue. We know the depth of character and sincerity which motivate his every thought and word. But whither goes the world?

He has asked himself that question all his conscious years. He has read many books, some that men would call sacred. He has tried to understand anatomy, embryology, and chemistry, in the widest meanings of those terms. He has studied comparative religion and found comfort in his own and good in all the others.

I believe there is a great purpose running through all his strivings, which is more than of him. It is above him. The end to which his purpose moves may be hidden at times from mortal eyes, but the direction in which he has moved is not hidden, but clear.

His brain has been demonstrated a thing of marvel. The high thoughts and promptings of his, beam from spiritual lighthouses for the guidance of his earthly voyage.

He finds, in delving into books, and in his work in the research laboratories, that the one book and the one laboratory that contains the resistless truth is the human heart.

In the warm, palpitating book of the heart he has read that each of us had a desire inborn and instinct for beauty, a yearning to serve his fellows and to know the truth.

We honor one who has dug deep into the hidden meanings and implications of the spiritual longings for light.

Prejudice and truth are enemies. Truth, in life as in the laboratory, has no finer task than that which it duly performs: of destroying prejudice. Were I to distill Dr. Julian's philosophy from his life and works in one sentence, he has proved in the laboratory of life that, where prejudice is, truth is excluded, for no judgment where given in advance of known truth is either sound or safe.

So he has not only devoted long hours to his science but also has given unselfishly of himself and his funds to numerous civic and welfare organizations, for the betterment of human relations.

Currently he is a member of the advisory board of Mandel Clinic of Michael Reese Hospital, of Roosevelt College board of trustees, of the board of world service of the First Congregational Church of Oak Park, of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, of the Phoenix (Ariz.) Council for Civic Unity, where there is a public school named in his honor, and other organizations. Until his health demanded curtailment, Dr. Julian also was very active on the board of trustees of Provident Hospital, the Round Table of Christians and Jews, the Chicago Urban League, and the Chicago Welfare.

With this background the Decalogue Society of Lawyers is honored to present to you, Dr. Julian, its award of merit for the year 1950 for your distinguished service to your country as patriot and scientist; for your outstanding creative achievements in the interest of the common good; for the boon and blessings your scientific learning and discoveries have bestowed upon man; for your unparalleled devotion to the needs of humanity, the cause of decency, and the progress of free America.

Freewheeling Down Inflation Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 22, 1951, entitled "Freewheeling Down Inflation Hill."

Personally, I am alarmed at the present situation and the failure of the

efforts of the administration to halt, or even slow to any great extent, the progress of inflation. It is just as dangerous to our American way of life and our freedom as the Russian threat. In fact, it is Stalin's belief that we cannot prevent a continuation of the present inflation and the disastrous depression that will follow if it is not soon controlled.

I urge that more drastic steps be taken immediately to halt the vicious spiral of wage and price increases. If the law is not at present strong enough to halt it, then by all means we should at once take steps to strengthen the law.

The present situation makes it clearer day by day, how right we were who urged that prices, wages, and rents be frozen at the pre-Korean level before inflation had had time to begin its fatal work. Again I warn the House of the danger and express my displeasure at the apparent apathy of its Members toward this menace that grows greater day by day.

The editorial follows:

FREEWHEELING DOWN INFLATION HILL

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—Charles Wilson, Eric Johnston, and Mike DiSalle, the three men entrusted with the gigantic task of keeping the American economy on an even keel, have been reading the riot act through the corridors of Washington.

They have told every top member of the Truman administration from the President down that inflation pressures to date are nothing compared to those to come; that unless Congress will vote tougher controls and the administration will use those controls far more sternly than it has used the present temporary powers, we are in for a day of reckoning. If that day comes, they say, we will be jolted out of our present complacency so hard out teeth will rattle.

Here is their line of reasoning:

We have bad inflation already. Today the Army pays $7.85 for a pair of shoes which cost $4.15 before the war. The rise in costs of things the Government buys already has consumed the whole of the income from last year's new taxes. These are just two illustrations of where the inflation stands at the moment. Any housewife can add yards of examples to the list.

But there is little justification for this present degree of inflation. The Federal budget still is on a pay-as-we-go basis. There is a $3,000,000,000 cash surplus in this year's budget. Merchants' shelves are loaded with consumer goods. There are no shortages of consumer goods sufficient to justify such price increases.

The only important causes of our present inflation are: (a) speculation, (b) fear buying, and (c) purchasing practices of the armed services. Since Korea, commercial bank credits have gone up by $9,000,000,000. Most of this has gone into inventories—that is, speculation. The public has done a lot of fear buying. Defense contracts are awarded on a negotiated basis which amounts in effect to a cost plus 6 percent formula. The rise in wages and prices has been strongest in the defense industries.

Thus, in a period when reasons for inflation were relatively slight we have had massive inflation.

We are headed for a period when there will be real justification for inflation. Even if Congress votes stiff new taxes, there will be some deficit financing.

The time has been reached when the volume of defense contracts is expanding swiftly. The value of contracts awarded by the Army during the first 20 days of January exceeded the total of awards during the previous 6 months. The rate of contract awards by all armed services now has reached $5,000,000,000 a month. The rate is climbing. During the next year, the defense program will involve spending some $50,000,000,000 on capital goods.

The great question is how we are going to hold a line against those powerful inflation influences when we have done such a puny and ineffective job against minor inflation factors.

The problem facing the trio of our economy stabilizers is how to rouse both Congress and the administration to a realization of the dangers.

Right now the politicians seem more eager to please special interests than to protect the economy. The Department of Agriculture sympathizes with farmers who want the lid off farm products. The Department of Commerce sympathizes with the big profits for corporations. The Federal Reserve Board protects the freedom of banks to make commercial loans. The Department of Defense beats against every price or wage ceiling which tends to slow up defense orders.

A remark heard here more and more frequently these days is: "Bernie Baruch was right. We should have gone in for hard controls and a real wage and price freeze. We should have done it long ago."

But Congress has not been roused to any sense of urgency about economic matters. The departments of Government still tend to protect their special interests. The lobbies increase their pressures. The war contracts roll out. Rising prices make labor increasingly restive. There is no effective machinery to prevent angry disputes between labor and management.

We are freewheeling downhill. Messrs. Wilson, Johnston, and DiSalle see a blind corner ahead and shout for brakes.

The three who must carry the load hope we can avoid trouble, but suspect that it may take a jolt of sad experience. They have given their warning. Now it's up to Congress and the administration.

Send a Food Ship to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following very compelling editorial which appeared in the April 2, 1951, issue of the New Leader magazine:

SEND INDIA A FOOD SHIP

The stark hand of a famine worse than India's has gripped the heart of Congress, a famine of pity and mercy. For the bill to send 1,000,000 tons of grain to India has been choked to death—even as countless Indians are daily dying of starvation—by a House Rules Committee clique.

The situation would have been deplorable enough had the bill come to the floor of Congress and been passed—it had been subjected to so much needless scrutiny that procrastination was beginning to produce a bad taste in the mouth of its proud beneficiary. Already, in fact, Peiping has agreed to barter 50,000 tons of rice in exchange for Indian products, and Moscow is almost certain to conclude a similar transaction. The propaganda value of these arrangements will far outweigh, of course, whatever expense Moscow and Peiping might incur, as anyone but a Dixiecrat or a midwestern Republican can see. The United States, to which has been transferred much of Asia's old resentment against British imperialism, will henceforth be all the more realistically caricatured as the conventional bloated and top-hatted Mr. Moneybags smugly contemplating a mountain of withered brown bodies. The expense to us for helping perpetuate this caricature will, in the end, vastly exceed the $190,000,000 it would have cost to send food grains to India.

This is so serious an issue that other means must be found to resolve it at once. It is useless to talk, as so many of us are, of making huge appropriations for "truth" campaigns when the truth is that we constantly undermine our prestige—even as we are seeking, by artificial means, to increase it—by substituting words for deeds, or by permitting deeds to contradict words. It may still be possible to recover a tithe of the standing we lost when the aid-to-India bill was lost in committee, but to do so will require action of an unusual sort, posthaste, on the part of the people themselves.

Since a congressional minority has succeeded in frustrating the will of Congress by a parliamentary maneuver, it is now up to the American people to demonstrate that this minority in no way represents their feeling toward the Indian people and that we are still a humanitarian Nation. This can be done, in a symbolic way at least, by raising through popular subscription sufficient funds to send to India as many shiploads of grain as can be managed. We fully realize that the quantity of grain which may thus reach India can scarcely alleviate the mass suffering there; but if one or more shiploads can be sent promptly, in the name of the American people, that may possibly undo some of the psychological damage that has been done.

We propose, concretely, that a committee of citizens representing all faiths, classes, parties, races, etc., be formed at once; that it be headed by a man of unquestioned humanitarianism and organizing ability; and that it launch a Nation-wide appeal for subscriptions to send a food ship to India. The New Leader hereby offers its own modest resources to the furtherance of this project. Are there any takers?

Filippo Mazzei, the Obstetrician of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, Dr. Leopold S. Vaccaro, a consulting surgeon in Philadelphia, has written an article entitled "Filippo Mazzei, the Obstetrician of the American Revolution and the Defender of the Colonies Here and Abroad," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILIPPO MAZZEI, THE OBSTETRICIAN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE DEFENDER OF THE COLONIES HERE AND ABROAD

(By Leopold S. Vaccaro [1])

Filippo Mazzei is not so well known as his compatriots, Christopher Coumbus, John and Sebastian Cabot, Americus Vespucci, Verrazzano, and other illustrious sons of Italy who, working under foreign potentates, have given the world a new world. Our interest in this roving Florentine physician was stimulated following a recent visit to Monticello, the home of the pen of the Revolution, and Ash Lawn, the humble residence of James Monroe.

Our great admiration for Virginia has been well founded by such illustrious sons as Washington, the sword of the Revolution; Patrick Henry, the tongue of that stupendous historical event; James Madison, the father of the Constitution; James Monroe, who kept the foreign aggressors from our shores; and John Marshall, who, by his learning and understanding, raised the prestige of the Supreme Court to the highest peak in his 32 years of service on that high tribunal. However, we were very slightly familiar with Dr. Filippo Mazzei.

Between Monticello and Ash Lawn there is a hill named "colle," which is the Italian translation for hill. On this hill, Mazzei built a home, which, modernized, is now occupied by Stanley Woodward, our American Ambassador to Canada. When we decided to visit this shrine, four domestics tried to chase us from this private property, but we soon gained their confidence and were shown the place without further opposition. In his Memoirs, Dr. Mazzei states: [2] "Mr. Jefferson took me to the home of a man who owned a cabin and about 400 acres of land boarding on his own. * * * I decided to purchase this 'colle.' Mr. Jefferson's estate was adjacent to this property. He said he would give me a tract of 2,000 acres." Jefferson was then 32 years of age, Mazzei 43, and Monroe the junior of Jefferson. These three great personages in the history of the world signaled to one another from their respective hills when they did not visit each other. A bond of sincere and lasting friendship and affection existed among the three of them. In these critical days, when democracy, liberty, and the dignity of man are seriously menaced by militant communism, we are determined that these principles shall not perish from the face of the earth. Filippo Mazzei assisted at their birth in Virginia.

It is very strange indeed that Providence brought this great man to America. Again in his memoirs he states: [3] "I struck up a friendship with Franklin and through him with various other persons from the Colonies. One of these persons was Thomas Adams, who, being a close friend of Jefferson, made it possible for Mr. Jefferson and me to know a great deal about each other some years before we actually met."

While in London, Dr. Mazzei, in company with Franklin, ransacked the whole city looking for, of all things, the famous stove that Franklin had invented. It was in that metropolis that he formed some hopeful ideas about the North American Colonies. Once, in Virginia, he said: [4] "We lived in Jefferson's house pending the construction of my house. Jefferson understood the Italian language (Tuscan) very well, but had never heard it spoken. Nevertheless, he could converse with my men in their native tongue, and they were so pleased that I was deeply touched."

At Williamsburg, soon after his arrival, Mazzei had lunch with Jefferson. Washington dropped in during the afternoon. Although he never passed beyond a formal acquaintance with the father of what Mazzei came to call his adopted country, he enjoyed a lifelong friendship with Jefferson and was closely associated with two other young Virginians, James Madison and James Monroe. He gave John Adams, to his face, some rather needed lessons in the theory and practice of democracy.[5]

Before Mazzei had been in this country 8 months, he had become an active pamphleteer and was elected to a local office. He was proud to be called "after Jefferson, the best leader in the country." The following observations, published by Mazzei under the pseudonym "Furioso" in John Pinckney's Virginia Gazette during 1774–75,[6] illustrate his ideas:

"To attain our goal, it is necessary, my dear fellow-citizens, to discuss the natural rights of man, and the foundations of a free government. * * * All men are by nature equally free and independent. This equality is essential to the establishment of a free government. Every individual must be equal to every other in his natural rights. The division of society into the ranks has always been and will always continue to be a serious obstacle to the attainment of this end. I repeat that a truly republican form of government cannot exist except where all men, from the very rich to the very poor, are perfectly equal in their natural rights. Fortunately, we are free on this continent. * * * Now when certain privileges are exercised by a portion of the inhabitants and denied to others, it is vain to hope for the establishment of a liberal and permanent government, unless the favored citizens are willing to relinquish their privileges and stand on a footing of perfect equality with the rest of the inhabitants. Discrimination inevitably arouses envy and ill feeling. * * * Therefore, liberty will always be insecure and finally doomed to collapse. * * * Democracy, I mean representative democracy, which embraces all individuals in one simple body, without any distinction whatsoever, is certainly the only form of government under which a true and enduring liberty may be enjoyed. Unfortunately for mankind, this form of government has never existed. The sacred name of democracy has been abused by tumultuous governments built on false and unstable principles."

The reflective mind will discover, in these ideas expressed by Mazzei, the impact on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. He was the true obstetrician of the American Revolution.

Mazzei refers to one of the many conversations and disputations with Jefferson, which they must have carried on very frequently. He says: [7] "Jefferson was amazed at the defects of the English form of government when I pointed them out to him, saying that they had not even occurred to him. 'There are several reasons for that,' I said, 'Ever since childhood you have heard that it was the best possible type of government; you could see that it was such in comparison with other governments in Europe; you must have read English authors who proved that it is far better than that of the Roman Republic; finally, never dreaming of having to change it, you lacked the incentive to examine it in detail, except when provoked by the insolent way the English express themselves about other nations. They are 400 years behind the times. I have examined it carefully and have noted the essential defects I described to you.' It was agreed that I should write another article, bringing these defects to the attention of everyone."

These exchanges of ideas must have profoundly impressed Jefferson who later in his letters quoted England as a "harlot." [8] Dr. Mazzei, as a continental European and Italian, was always suspicious of England and her schemes. He was really responsible for the formation of volunteers in all counties to fight England. In defense of the Colonies, he states: [9]

"The most cunning policy adopted by the Cabinet of St. James to subjugate the Colonies was well known as one of divide et impera and to attack each separately. * * * To protect his position, the Governor of Virginia enforced the views of the Cabinet. * * * On my return to Monticello I communicated to Jefferson the information I had obtained from the Governor and expressed my opinion as to the probable cause of events. We agreed to announce through the newspapers the publication of a periodical by which we aimed to show the people the true state of affairs, and the necessity of preparing ourselves so as not to be caught unaware in case of attack. As I know the views of the Cabinet of the Court of St. James, and particularly of the persons involved, I was to write the articles in my native tongue, and he would translate them into English.

"Our warnings gave rise to the formation of companies of volunteers in all the counties which call themselves companies. Later, a meeting of the people's representatives was held under the name of conventions."

Filippo Mazzei was not only engaged in economics, history, and finances, but also in agriculture. As a matter of fact he introduced vines and crops in Virginia with his friend Bellini. A special corn called maize is an abbreviation of Mazzei. A lot could be written of Mazzei's contribution to agriculture in this country.

For a period he turned over his agricultural enterprise to his assistant, Bellini, and installed the first chair of modern languages at William and Mary College in Williamsburg, Va. He was eminently successful on the farm, in the shop, in the Council Chamber, in local politics, in newspaper writing and as a historian, which we will see later. He was one of the first to predict the coming struggle between England and the Colonies on the belief that each would not fight the other, and that each would therefore advance to positions from which there would be no escape but to fight, having learned the dangers of monetary inflation and of excessive radicalism.

While he was a sharp observer in 1788, during the French Revolution, he strove to keep that revolution close to the American model. Ciampini says: "Dr. Mazzei has assisted at two of the greatest revolutions of modern times." R. C. Garlick [10] writes of Mazzei as follows: "Mazzei has understood from the beginning the character and the importance of the French Revolution. * * *

---

[1] Dr. Leopold S. Vaccaro, '16 M. C., a consulting surgeon in Philadelphia, make a hobby of his interest in American history and in the contributions of Italians. He studied medicine in Rome, and has been decorated by the King for his services in the cause of international understanding.

[2] Memoria della Vita e delle peregrinazioni del Fiorentino Filippo Mazzei—Tipografia della Svizzera Italiana, 1845–46, p. 192.

[3] Ibid., p. 165.

[4] Ibid., p. 194.

[5] Memoirs of the Life of M., introductory remarks—Marraro, H. R., Columbia University Press, 1942.

[6] Ibid., Preface.

[7] Memoria, p. 204.

[8] R. C. Garlick, F. M., His Life and Letters.

[9] Memoria, p. 198.

[10] R. C. Garlick, F. M., Friend of Jefferson, His Life and Letters.

During 3 years, two and three times a week he writes a lengthy letter to the King of Poland. Nothing escapes his sagacity, his attention, or his curiosity. He is not an inactive agent to register only what comes to him directly or indirectly. He chases after news, swift, and indefatigable, neglecting nothing. He searches above all for the cause and demonstrates more than the vivacity of a chronist the dignity and conscience of a historian. Since the first days he has understood the enormous importance for the present and for the future of what was happening before his eyes and had the sudden intuition of possible developments. And it was natural because he has assisted in another Revolution. He had known well Jefferson and Franklin. He had seen Washington in action. He had engaged in history, economics, finances, commerce, and agriculture. He had seen people and countries. He had been a politician and a planter—a man of the first order."

Who was this great Italian genius who assisted at the birth of the American Democracy and about whom so little has been written? The historic books on America are systematically numb regarding him. The following are some of the authentic data:[11]

Filippo Mazzei was born on a familiar day, one on which another immortal physician was born, Jesus Christ. It was on Christmas Day in 1730 when Mazzei was born at Poggio a Caiano, Florence. He studied medicine at the hospital of Santa Maria Nuova in Florence and from youth practiced his profession successfully.

In 1752 he visited Asia Minor with Dr. Salinas, and remained there until 1755. On March 3, 1756, he went to London, where he relinquished surgery and taught Italian. He was engaged in commerce and imported Italian products. It was in this city that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin and other prominent representatives of the North American Colonies, who induced him to form a company for the introduction in America of the silk worm, vines, and olives.

On September 2, 1773, Dr. Mazzei sailed from Leghorn and landed in Virginia toward the end of November. We have already mentioned how he was a guest at Jefferson's home for a certain period of time and how Jefferson was instrumental in the acquisition of land and the building of a residence for Mazzei on "Colle." We have mentioned how before the Revolution, under the pseudonym "Furioso" he was laying the foundation for that memorable explosion. Later on, with his good friend Jefferson, he joined a company of the militia in Albemarle County.

In 1779 Mazzei was sent by the State of Virginia as an agent to Europe to obtain a loan in gold and silver and to procure supplies in Italy for the Revolutionary soldiers. However, the ship whereon he was traveling was captured by English pirates. Mazzei knew he had been betrayed by his own captain, a Scotchman. Therefore he threw the portfolio which contains his credentials and instructions from the State of Virginia into the sea. After many vicissitudes he reached La Rochelle in France, but lacking credentials and money, he was unable to deal with the Government or private firms officially. He finally went to Italy, where he remained 2 years (1781 and 1782), residing in Tuscany. During this period, with articles and lectures, he advocated commercial relationships between Tuscany and America, but the Grand Duke of Tuscany, who ardently believed in the final victory of England, was irrevocably diffident to Mazzei.

Mazzei next returned to Paris where he became the champion of the American cause. Here he engaged in debates with the enemies of the American Colonies. In his Memoirs we find these excerpts: [12]

"Before I had been given my commission by the State of Virginia I heard there of a book by Abbot Raynal, which was creating great furore. * * * I deemed it proper to expose him * * * decided to publish in a single volume the refutation of both Abbot Raynal and Mably. * * *

"I consulted Jefferson on this project and he agreed. * * *

"In 4 weeks I had sketched about one-fourth of my Recherches Historiques et Politiques. As soon as I landed in Virginia in 1773, I began to learn about the history of my new country, beginning with the first European settlements. At that time my memory was very good. * * *

"Once back in Europe I refuted Mably's observations in all seriousness. * * * I added some notes which were intended to inform Europeans of things which I thought might not have come to their attention.

"After the establishment of the American Republic, many wished to see a complete and impartial description of that interesting country—and yet no one had written of it deserving to be taken seriously."

He again returned to Virginia in 178. giving Jefferson a minute account of what had happened. Again in 1785 he went to Europe and brilliantly defended the Colonies. He ably refuted the censure of the French writers against the American Constitution.[13] In this he was strongly backed by Jefferson who had succeeded Franklin as American Ambassador to France. He held many private conferences and exchanged ideas, and planned a very effective counteroffensive.

In 1788 he was commissioned by the King of Poland to deal with his affairs in the French capital. It was during this period that he deserved the fine tribute of R. C. Garlick in his book, Philip Mazzei, Friend of Jefferson, His Life and Letters, already alluded to.

Although in the service of the King of Poland, while in Paris he was active in spreading the knowledge of the American Revolution and the American ideals of his adopted country, as he states in his Memoirs. He was very well known to the French public men, having been presented to the French Court previously by Franklin.

With du Pont de Nemours he founded the famous Club of 1789 [14] made up of 32 persons, half of them members of the National Assembly, in opposition to the Club Jacobins. The Jacobins attempted to reduce everything to confusion. Each club had a foreign correspondent, and Mazzei was chosen as the foreign correspondent of the Club of 1789. The letters that Mazzei wrote to the King of Poland have been compiled by Raffaele Ciampini.[15]

In December 1791, Mazzei went to Warsaw and stayed until July 1792, returning to Italy and settling in Pisa. While in his retirement in Pisa his old friend Thomas Jefferson, who had by now become President of the United States, gave him another commission for the planning of Government buildings and the beautification of the Capital. Mazzei has this to say:

"I received a letter from the United States Superintendent of public buildings, in which, by order of President Jefferson, he requested me to find one or two sculptors to serve the United States in the erection of public buildings in the Capital, and especially the Capitol itself * * * to ask Canova whether he would undertake to make a statue of liberty in white marble, 7 feet high, in a sitting position; what the cost would be and when he would agree to deliver it." [16]

"I saw two Carrara sculptors, one named Andrei, 36 years of age; the other Franzoni, 28, highly skilled. * * *

"I remembered that a good marble quarry had been discovered not far from the Capital, and was convinced that Franzoni would be well able to make the statue in America.

"I wrote all of this to Jefferson. * * * I gave the letter to the sculptor and 2 years later Jefferson wrote me: 'The sculptors are here, well in health, well employed and greatly esteemed.'"

Having completed his work for his adopted country, Filippo Mazzei died in Pisa, Italy, on March 19, 1816. He requested that the date of his death be inserted at the end of his memoirs.

Jefferson never forgot his old friend, and on April 24, 1796 [17] he wrote the famous letter to Mazzei wherein Jefferson attacked the leading Federalists as having monarchist tendencies. Mazzei translated this letter and published it in an Italian paper. It was translated into French and then again retranslated into English by the French from the French text, reaching America where it was printed in May 1797, soon after the induction of Jefferson as Vice President of the United States.

It is worthy of note that during that political campaign, in which animosities reigned supreme, the spirit of Jefferson's original letter had been greatly changed to suit the purposes of the Federalists.

Dr. Mazzei was a most prolific writer of articles and pamphlets. He was a very eloquent public speaker and spoke all the Romance languages. He also mastered the English language. His monumental works are: Récherches Historiques e Politiques sur les Etats Unis de l'Amérique Septentrionale (four volumes, Paris, 1788) and Le Memorie della Vita e delle Peregrinazioni del fiorention Filippo Mazzei (Lugano, 1845-46, two volumes).

Mazzei was a profound student of the French prerevolutionary writers and thinkers, such as Molière, Boileau, La Fontine, and, particularly, Voltaire. During my visit at Monticello I saw the bust of Voltaire (Jean Francois Marie Arouett) and I have no doubt that the philosophic novels Zadis, Candide, L'Ingénue, Siècle de Louis XIV, Historie de Charles XII, and A. Sermon de Cinquante must have formed the library of Thomas Jefferson. I have no doubt that when these two intellectual giants, Mazzei and Jefferson, met either at Colle or at Monticello, that their discussions revolved on the ideas and the interpretation of the ideals significant of the Revolution: [18] That all men are born equal and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, such as life, and the pursuit of liberty and happiness; that the governments have been instituted so that men may reach these ends and that those who govern derive their power from the consent of the governed; and that when the government does not accomplish these ends, the people have a right to destroy it and replace it with another government. All discussions must have revolved on this doctrinal background. It was the thought of these two great men that the American Revolution was not only a reaction against the abusers of the English Government, not even a secession from it, but a revindication of the rights of men; an affirmation of the popular sovereignty—a regime of the people.

---

[11] Inciclopedia Treccani.

[12] Memoria, pp. 295–297.

[13] Recherches Historiques et Politiques sur Etats Unis de L'Amerique Septentrionale—1788. Library of Congress, Rare Books Division.

[14] Memoria, p. 277.

[15] Un Osservatore Italiano della Rivoluziona Francese. Firenze, Rinascimento del Libro, 1934.

[16] Memoria, pp. 409–413.

[17] The Four Letters of Jefferson to Mazzei, Marraro, H. R., Columbia University Press.

[18] Philosophy expressed in debates as recorded in Recherches Historiques, etc.

Hamilton and Adams did not have in mind such a democratic interpretation of the Revolution, and Mazzei did not hesitate to express his views freely to Adams to his face. From the ideas of the Revolution the United States was bound to lay the foundation of a new social political order of democracy.

These two sages had arrived at these conclusions, not only on theoretical grounds, but on profound historical reasons. They had a profound conviction of the capacity of the masses to govern themselves and the conviction that in the United States the historical conditions should be crystallized wherein a government by the people could be definitely established. It is quoted that Mazzei had said:

"Unfortunately for mankind, this form of government has never existed. The sacred name of democracy has been abused by the tumultuous governments built on false and unstable principles." [19]

This government was finally to be realized in the United States of America. We hope and pray that the principles established by the founding fathers after untold sacrifices and struggles, may become the torch of mankind for the establishment of free people and good will toward all men.

[19] John Pinckney's Virginia Gazette, 1774–75.

A Quiet, but Fruitful Easter Recess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes lucky to be considered unimportant by newspapermen because you have a much wider latitude of activity than some goldfish they keep track of by watching him swim in a crystal bowl.

They long ago relegated me to the anonymous brigade when it came to embellishing one with unduly favorable comment.

Thus, during the Easter recess, I was at considerable advantage in my roving center strategy of visiting unnoticed through outlying counties which threaten to be part of the new congressional district now being fashioned for me by the boys from Knickerbocker.

My tour took me to places adjacent to but not included in my present bailiwick. I went to the east and the west of the great Hall fortress of Broome.

Thanks to my former secretary, Merlin Casterlin, I found the groundwork well laid. I paid calls on dozens of Americans in every walk of life but the political.

I was well received. It will be fun to go back, especially since a couple of large meetings are now being organized in my behalf at key centers, and there will be new opportunities to make friends.

Our people need help today more than ever before. The growing weight of top-heavy bureaucracy in Washington falls heavily on them because they must foot the bills which high-salaried, do-nothing Government appointees cost the taxpayers.

The folks back home are expected to pay the shot for every new batch of fifteen to twenty thousand dollar executives added to the swivel chair corps. This long list of fakers can be found among the pages of the Federal Register, an imposing volume because of its great length. The five-figure salary of each little giant appears opposite his name. Such a book affords laborious but interesting reading.

Of course, I told the truth and did not step out of cast, when I mentioned to the home folks my objections to the presence of so many well-paid fatcats on the Federal payroll. I insisted they do not earn their money, and the people I talked to agreed with me.

They added that it is futile to fight the handful of Commies who rule the Kremlin, if we are going to permit the building of the same type of Commissariat to supersede Congress they have in Moscow to grind down their millions of subjects. I should hate to see the American people meet any such fate.

But an equally noteworthy fight for freedom ought to be waged on the home front. Citizens of New York State should have the right to know what congressional districts they will vote in next year.

For instance, one loyal albeit newly made friend in the counties I visited demanded that I give him the green signal to start work in my behalf for the 1952 primary. The answer I made was unsatisfactory for I had to tell him I just did not know whether I would be running in his section or a hundred miles away.

My friend's enthusiasm did not die with that, however. He threatened to move into my home territory so he will be able to vote for me in 1952.

"That is most kind of you," I answered him, "but I can hold my own in Broome County because the Americans there far outnumber the Communists."

I suggested to him that he stay where he is, do what many others are offering to do, and organize "Keep HALL in Congress" clubs so we can fight off attacks of the fifth column no matter from whence they come.

Today's Challenge to Our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting address on the subject Today's Challenge to Our Freedoms, delivered by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] before the Amen Corner Club of Pittsburgh last Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO OUR FREEDOMS

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to address the business and professional leaders of the great American city of Pittsburgh. I have frequently, on past occasions, been privileged to address groups of your citizens, but tonight this great aggregation of civic leaders brings before me the greatest opportunity I have ever had in Pittsburgh to discuss the mutual problems which confront us all.

For nearly 20 years the areas of human freedom and the functions of free men throughout the world—with the sole exception of the Republic of Turkey—have been growing steadily and startlingly smaller. We in America are threatened by these same trends toward totalitarianism.

Tonight, I come before you to challenge you business, professional, and political leaders of western Pennsylvania to dedicate yourselves to the active defense of our free way of life with as much courage, as much conviction, and as much cash-on-the-barrelhead as the Communist conspirators within our midst are devoting to the defeat and betrayal of our peerless way of life and our free institutions.

In my capacity as acting chairman of the House committee that discovered the so-called pumpkin papers on the Maryland farm of Whittaker Chambers that led to the disclosure, indictment, conviction, and imprisonment of Alger Hiss, and in my long years of service on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have learned that the Communists in this country count upon the apathy and indifference of the good people of America to protect the treachery and indecency in which the Communists conspire. Were it not for the indifference and the actual, although usually inadvertent, cooperation and support of the American colony of private businessmen—especially in our larger corporate structures—communism in this country would have long ago been crushed and we would not today be reading of its successful conspiratorial operations through its combination with big-city criminal syndicates, through its infiltration of high Government positions, through its network of atomic and other espionage agents, and through its great host of front organizations, fellow travelers, breast-beating liberals, and just plain, ordinary, garden-variety intellectual suckers.

I have had many an actual and former Communist tell me that were it not for the financial and moral support—direct and indirect—that the Communists receive from sleepy-minded and careless capitalists, college presidents, religious leaders, and other patriotic "push-overs," who enjoy the benefits of private enterprise but never do anything effective to defend it, the American Communist conspiracy would today be inoperative and impotent. Instead, as all who dare to look can see, American communism is injecting its dupes and its advocates, today in this tragic era of history, into virtually every respectable activity in the field of education, religion, business, labor, and Government.

The Communists rely upon the easy-to-fool, the slow-to-alarm, and the it-can't-happen-here daydreamers who comprise easy targets in our respectable society to supply the protection, the indirect financial support, the respectable facades, and the motive power with which they operate to maintain the numerous cells of disloyal agents that they have in every State for the purpose of eventual sabotage and treachery and with immediate assignments to carry on attacks against religion, human decency, law enforcement, private enterprise, State's rights,

and any educational or legislative program to expose and condemn the treacherous tyranny imbedded in the practices and purposes of every Communist. So successful has been their strategy and propaganda that you can count on the fingers of your hands the public-supported educational institutions in America today demonstrating the necessary courage to train their students specifically in the values and virtues of our economic and political system and exposing directly the consummate evil and wickedness in all that smacks of communism.

Communism is a Godless way of life that holds that the entire economic fabric of the country plus all of its social, political, educational, religious, fraternal, labor, and other organizations together with all media of information shall be controlled by a selected group of politicians in the Capital City of the land. These political overlords in turn permit no organized opposition and they associate themselves with like-minded people in other countries to operate a continuing international conspiracy aimed at the establishment of a world-wide Communist dictatorship operated out of Moscow, Russia.

Any on-the-ground study of communism today will find the Communists following the rule of controlling everything from what they term the "center" and every American Communist can be depended upon to support every conceivable move to concentrate additional power in Washington and to support every nondefense spending project by the Federal Government. Communists know from their world-wide experience that when non-Communist stage hands have set the stage sufficiently well with concentrated power and excessive tax demands in the hands of a small group of politicians in any country, they then have only to change the actors on the stage to actual Communists put there either by deception, infiltration, or a coups de tas of force or happen-chance to take over even so great a country as ours before 90 percent of the citizens know that the hour of decision is upon them. Thus it was done in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and thus it can be done here unless a courageous and effective counterattack against communism and all its teachings and supporters can be developed out of the individual towns and cities of America. Our Republic is desperately crying for that type of leadership today in more than 2,500 important communities. Unless it comes to the colors of freedom, all of the agents of the FBI and all of the investigating committees of a dozen Congresses cannot save freedom for those who fail to rise to the defense of their own liberties.

In the United States, we have two great defense lines against communism which many European countries lacked, but they will not give us security against political tyranny unless we man them with courageous contenders and maintain them sufficiently strong so they can operate effectively. These defenses are provided by our American opportunity system of private ownership and by our unique political conception and tradition of State's rights which gives the Federal Government ("the center") only those authorities which are specifically delegated to it. I believe if we lose either of these defense positions, we shall inevitably also lose the other. Neither is strong enough alone to protect us in our cherished and matchless way of life. Both are under constant pitiless, and vicious attack by every Communist in the land and by every dupe or fellow traveler the Communists are able to confuse or to control. In recent years, both defense positions have frequently been deserted by fair-weather friends, or by ambitious politicians seeking temporary political preferment for themselves.

Courageous local leadership rising up from among our private citizens safeguard our freedoms against the Communist attack and the kindred creeds of centralized political power, State socialism, and pilot-plant nationalization which it supports.

In conclusion, let me suggest three possible courses of action which enlightened business and political leadership such as we have here tonight might well undertake right here in western Pennsylvania as a counterattack against the forces of collectivism which are threatening your homes, your businesses and your very way of life.

1. Those who support States rights and decry unnecessary encroachments of the Federal Government are today divided by completely artificial political lines. Thus many times southern Democrats and northern Republicans vote in concert more frequently and freely than do combinations made up of either southern and northern Democrats or urban and rural Republicans. Voters who either favor or oppose the all-powerful State should have an opportunity to join their forces in a presidential election. In my opinion, any political formula or realinement for achieving this would find the vast majority of Americans voting to strengthen rather than weaken both States' rights and private ownership. I commend to you your serious consideration of the tremendous barrier against collectivism in America which can be created if we demonstrate enough intelligence in the field of political engineering to bring about a working alliance between like-minded Americans so that they can vote for the same candidate for President regardless of the State or the area in which they live.

2. Local citizens in and out of patriotic and veterans' organizations should undertake a study of the basic needs of an educational system geared to meet the challenges of communism. In cooperation with patriotic and progressive educational leaders, educational programs should be developed which would (a) positively bar all Communists and their "kept companions" from teaching in a public institution—either grade school, secondary school, college or university; (b) provide factual courses to praise and perpetuate those things "Which are right with America" in the field of economics and politics and thus provide students with an understanding of what must be saved to stay free so they can withstand the lures of the Socialist and the Communist state; (c) provide equally factual courses showing specifically how communism and socialism operate to glorify and magnify the privileged politician and to minimize and degrade the importance of the common citizen.

3. Business and professional leaders—and their wives—should make certain that corporations in which they hold an ownership interest and that institutions which they endow or help to finance are neither directly or indirectly giving aid and comfort to the cause of communism. This is an individual, patriotic responsibility which every right-minded American citizen must assume. For a corporation to employ radio, television, motion picture, or advertising talent which is disloyal and which uses the money thus earned to advance the cause of communism is to help betray America as effectively as though a remittance order were being mailed directly to Stalin in the Kremlin. To endow a college or a cause without making sure that no part of that gift is being used—or can be used—to pay the salaries of those who would destroy the way of life that made possible the accumulated wealth making your gift possible is to imperil the freedom of us all in the same manner as a sentry who falls asleep at a post of duty.

Gentlemen, we have heard many times freedom is everybody's job. It is. And freedom is not free. Let us also remember, however, that security is also everybody's job in America in 1951 and unless we make the effort and pay the price, we in this Republic can quickly lose both our cherished freedoms and our security against the foreign forces of collectivism.

Disclosures of the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee Should Provide Every American Citizen With Food for Thought

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the recent hearings on organized crime conducted by the Kefauver committee were eagerly followed by the American people through the facilities of the press, radio, and television. It is conceded that no other public hearings were given such widespread coverage nor elicited such intense interest on the part of millions of American citizens. Radio and television programs were changed to permit carrying into American homes the shocking disclosures revealed through the testimony of witnesses as to the extent organized gambling has become a daily routine on the part of many citizens.

There have been millions of words printed in describing the testimony and newspapers and magazines have joined in exposing the workings of various forms of gambling enterprises that take an annual toll of millions of dollars from the gambling public.

The following thought-provoking editorial appeared in the March 31, 1951, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, and since it is a timely discussion of the efforts of the Kefauver committee to awaken the American people I am inserting it at this point so that it may be read by my colleagues and all other citizens interested in curbing organized crime:

KEFAUVER LESSON

The really important disclosures of the Kefauver committee investigation should attract the attention of the average voter. The committee has shown a very definite connection between organized crime and corrupt political organizations which exert a great deal of power in our local, State, and National life.

We are asking our boys to stand fast in Korea. We have disrupted millions of lives and imposed a number of hardships on the youth of the land to protect our way of life, our Government. We have a duty to perform and that is to see to it that our Government on every level is worthy of the sacrifices we are asking them to make.

The committee investigations should make it clear to every thinking man and woman that big crime has its grass roots in almost every sizable American community. The only way to destroy objectionable plants effectively is to destroy the roots that feed them. That is where the average man can play a great part in helping rid America of this objectionable system of semigovernment that has had the effrontery to shove its way into the high places.

To stamp out this evil is going to require a great deal of courage and a great deal of thoughtful effort.

It is doubtful if some of the lesser lights in the vast organization that has spread its slimy tentacles across America and penetrated into the sacred places of American life have realized before now the part they

were taking in helping to destroy our beloved Republic. It is extremely doubtful if the man who sells a numbers ticket thinks of himself as one who ranks with a Communist in helping to destroy America. The man who buys the ticket certainly would protest vehemently such an indictment. The greatest weapons the Communists have is not the atom bomb. It is capable of destroying cities and men, but it cannot destroy a people's faith in the fundamental principles of democracy. This slimy monster that has been exposed to full public view by the Kefauver committee can destroy that faith that is so essential to a government "of the people, by the people, for the people."

This power of aliens who have obtained their citizenship by fraud must be destroyed. The simple way to destroy it is to root it out in every local community where it has obtained a sinister foothold.

You and I probably have never given this much thought. Perhaps we, too, have been guilty of buying the tickets that are part and parcel of this great crime racket. If we are normally alert citizens, we probably know the names of those in each village and town where tickets are sold, of those who sell them, and of those who are supposed to head up the organization in the district. We also are aware of the fact that our local public officials who are charged with the responsibility of enforcing the law are not dumb, or deaf or blind, and it is reasonable to suppose that they, too, have heard of these things.

Knowing something by rumor and proving it in a court of law are, of course, two different shades of horse. However, we do believe that with due effort and vigilance something could be done to suppress the racket in every local community across the face of the land. It can be stopped and it must be stopped or how are we to face those whose blood has been shed, whose bodies have been crippled, and the parents, widows, and orphans of those who will not return?

It may be a little rough, as the youth of today express it, to make public examples of men who have given liberally to community efforts and who have been liberal with other worth-while enterprises.

It must be remembered, however, that they are being liberal with other people's money, just as some of their political brethren are liberal. The money they donate is but part of the take they get through their illegal enterprises. A larger part goes to the bosses in outside communities and is part of the fund they use to buy influence and, with that influence, jeopardize our American system of government.

We have a right as citizens to demand that our law-enforcement officers break up these gambling rings right here in Altoona and in Blair County. Yes, we have more than a right; we have a sacred duty to see that it is done. Maybe it would be but fair to give a little warning to those engaged in this type of business to tell them to get out of it and to go to work at some productive type of labor or to go to jail and work on the rock pile.

We must not put all the blame on our public officials, however, as each of us has an individual responsibility in good government. We can break up this vicious circle without outside help if we all refrain from buying the wares of the mobsters. What harm is there in the purchase of a 50-cent treasury ticket? What heartbreak is there for the widow of the slain policeman, murdered by a mobster in the hire of Murder, Inc.?

What harm is there in a bet on a horse? Who is being harmed except the bettor? What about the crooked wire, and the man who fixed it, the fixed race and the doped horse? What harm is there in a murder along a lonely stretch of road as three holdup men flee with ill-gotten gains? What power or powers confined that punishment to a term in prison for one man? Why have murder charges never been brought? What harm is there in gambling? Is it not one of the feeder roots on which these murderers have been drawing for nourishment?

The racket men say gambling is instinctive. They say it cannot be legislated out of existence. They do not say that gambling as it has been organized is no longer a simple game of chance and wits. They do not point with pride to the back rooms where the fix is made. They run like rats when the heat is on. Their racket is holding America and the American way of life up to public scorn. They are harming our standing with the other nations of the world at the time when we need the respect of the rest of our world.

Let us resolve now to tear up this evil vine that is strangling the Nation. Let us tear it out by the roots. Those that grow in Altoona and Blair County are our responsibility. Let them be destroyed.

What the Constitution Means to Me—Winning Essay in Illinois American Legion Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the winning oration written by Miss Barbara Miller, a resident of my congressional district at 1116 North Fifteenth Street, East St. Louis, Ill., in the Department of Illinois American Legion oratorical contest. Miss Miller, 17 years old and a student at St. Theresa's Academy in East St. Louis, was awarded a 4-year scholarship to the University of Illinois.

I feel that Miss Miller's oration, entitled "The Preamble and What the Constitution Means to Me," will be enthusiastically received. The oration follows:

THE PREAMBLE AND WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO ME

I speak for my Constitution. I am only 16 and yet I can speak for my Constitution. I can speak of that heritage that my forefathers won for me by signing that memorable document on September 17, 1789. It was written on that day but it was fought and hoped for through years of struggle and strife.

Have you ever taken anything for granted? Like coming home to read your evening paper, or going to church on Sundays with your family. Everyone has at sometime or another. And yet there is one thing that is taken for granted above all else: Our freedom and the document that gives it to us, the Constitution of the United States of America.

Before I started to write this speech, the Constitution was just something I had studied in grade school. I had never really thought about it, perhaps, never really understood it. But now I realize it to be the foundation upon which the founding fathers built all the ideals that they so clearly set forth in the Preamble of the Constitution.

"We the people of the United States"—That's how it begins with the words that have included several billions of people. Little did these men who drew up my Constitution ever dream of how much freedom they have given so many people by so few words: "We the people of the United States."

And yet they were thinking of many others than themselves when they were doing all these things. They were thinking of the Pilgrims who started the whole affair. If they hadn't wanted a better place for their children to worship, they would never have left merry England. If they hadn't had this idea in mind they would never have made their perilous journey over the rough water of the mighty Atlantic. If they had not been thinking of others they would never have stayed on this completely unknown and unexplored continent. If it had not been for such brave men as Daniel Boone, Father Marquette, Lewis and Clark, Isaac Jogue, we would probably not be where we are today. You see, they were the men who went out deeper and deeper into this wilderness of ours, to search, to explore, to civilize, to convert.

"We the people of the United States"—But these are only the opening words of our Constitution. What of all the other phrases of our preamble?

"In order to form a more perfect union"—Men fought and died for this part of our Constitution. Yes; men fought and died at the Battles of Bunker Hill, Princeton, Brandywine. Other men fought during the Civil War at Bull Run, Gettysburg, and Richmond. Men are fighting now in Korea. Many men have had to sacrifice their lives to keep this statement true and alive, but because of their efforts, it still stands as a part of my Constitution.

"To establish justice"— Justice and peace was established by this document. It gave no taxation without representation, abolition of the slave market, and provided for amendment to this Constitution, some of which are known as our Bill of Rights. These 10 amendments are almost as important as the whole document itself, for they safeguard the rights of the people by securing the freedom of religion, of speech, of the person and of property. It also secured trial by jury, the right of petition, and the right of assembly. It reserved to the States all powers not delegated to the United States itself.

"To insure domestic tranquility"—

This new Government by the people, of the people, and for the people, foresaw into the future that there was needed something to keep its peoples at peace with themselves. This was done in article I, section 1, of our Constitution, which states that "All legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress, which shall be composed of a Senate and a House of Representatives." The people now had the power to elect their representatives, and through them pass all bills that would be for the common good of all the people. Also in the second article of our Bill of Rights, these words are phrased: "A well-regulated militia, being for the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and to bear arms, shall not be infringed."

"To provide for the common defense"—Our safety and well-being was taken care of in article 1, section 8, in the powers granted to Congress. Some of these powers are: To raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to provide for calling forth of a militia, and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining this said militia.

"To promote the general welfare"— Have you stopped to think just what our country did for us when they signed this part of our document? They promised to promote our general welfare. How have they done this? They placed a tariff on all foreign trade to protect our own home manufacturing, they opened the Erie Canal to revolutionize the carrying trade by reducing the price of transportation of a ton of goods between Albany and New York, from $120 to $14. Then to prevent New York from securing all the traffic to the West, Pennsylvania built a system of canals from Philadelphia westward. Yes, our welfare

was greatly taken care of by this document. It also states that the majority of the people do not rule. The minority have a voice in everything. This was apparent and made clear in the Civil War. The majority of the people thought that slavery was all right. But the minority came forth and the minority won the Civil War, thus proving that if the majority had won our welfare would have suffered.

"And to secure the blessings of liberty"—God looked down on our land, on our freedom, and our liberty and He must have repeated the words that seem to sum up all of this. The words of the book of Genesis: "And God looked down on all that He had created, and saw that it was good."

"To ourselves and our posterity"— This document promulgates the fact that it pertains to you. John Doe, a reporter who writes the news as he sees it; to you Reverend Dulin, as you preach a sermon that makes your whole congregation sit up and take notice; to you Mrs. Smith, as you put your daughter to sleep without fear or worry; to myself, for I know I shall never want for love or affection.

"Do ordain and establish"— We have now christened and proclaimed our heritage to be known and to be held in the hearts of men forever as the Constitution of the United States of America.

The preamble was finished. It was not only finished but my freedom, my heritage, now had its firm footing not only in the hearts of these few men, but in the hearts of all who call themselves free.

Yes; I speak for my Constitution. Even as such great men as George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, and all the others who put their expression of their democracy down into this document, I, too, have the power to express my deep feeling of pride and affection. I have a feeling of sharing, sharing in the greatest government this world has ever known.

And now when I stop and think of my Constitution, many things come to my mind. I can see Valley Forge, the ride of Paul Revere, the leadership of the great man, Washington, the solemn signing of this paper that begins—

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Yes; I speak for my Constitution. No, not I, it is my ideals that speak for me.

The Judge and His God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands excerpts from a very fine address delivered by a very great jurist. These excerpts are from the talk given by Judge Harold R. Medina before the Church Club of New York, as reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor.

During the Eightieth Congress, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, it was my privilege to be instrumental in the nomination and confirmation of Judge Medina, after the names of other less-qualified attorneys had been submitted. I had always insisted that the Senate committee should not confirm any proposed judge unless he fulfilled the highest standards of ability, integrity, and devotion to the American system, and unless he had received prior clearance from the State Bar Association and the American bar. Other names were first submitted to us, but by insisting on the highest possible standards and by insisting on bar clearance—incidentally for the first time in such confirmation procedure—we finally secured the nomination of Judge Medina.

The judge's address, entitled "The Judge and His God," will, I believe, be of interest to all church-going Americans, I should like to read a few excerpts from the address, because in this critical period in the world's history it is well to know that men of his stature sit on the Federal bench of this great Nation.

We all remember the picture which was drawn in the press, of him presiding over the Communist trial. He says:

I found myself to be a small, indeed a very small and insignificant particle in the scheme of things. It has been an extraordinary experience.

Fortunately for me, I was taught to pray from so early a time that I cannot remember going to bed at night without saying my prayers.

* * * * *

I suddenly found myself in the midst of that trial of the Communists. It took me a long time to realize what they were trying to do to me. But as I got weaker and weaker and found the burden difficult to bear, I sought strength from the One Source that never fails.

Then he tells about the trial. Among other things, he says:

And I tell you, as I stand here, that my unguided will alone and such self-control as I possess were unequal to this test. If ever a man felt the presence of Someone beside him, strengthening his will and giving him aid and comfort, it was I on that day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts referred to be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDGE AND HIS GOD

(By Judge Harold R. Medina)

While there is much in the Bible about judges, I do not recall any occasion on which a judge has been called upon to discuss the impact of religion upon the performance of the judicial function. Perhaps this is because this is an intimate matter—thoughts about which one is likely to keep to one's self. In any event, I have chosen as my subject here tonight, "The Judge and His God."

I suppose I am a more or less typical American. From boyhood I have had an implicit and unquestioning faith, which I got when I attended the classes in the Episcopal Church at Ossining, N. Y., in preparation for my confirmation when I was a boy at preparatory school. Like most other people I know, I wanted to be a better Christian but, as I look back over the years, I find that I did comparatively little to put this wishful thinking into effect.

As a law student and as a lawyer, I fought hard for what I thought was right, and I had a deep and almost passionate interest in the rules of law and the history of their development. They were the tools of my trade and I worked hard with them.

It was not long after I became a judge that I began to feel a new sense of responsibility. It is something very difficult to explain. It was not simply that I wanted to be right and that I took my duties seriously. There came a feeling that everything I did, even the decision of nice questions of interpretation of mere rules of procedure, was in some way becoming a part of a huge fabric which on the whole was part and parcel of the moral law governing mankind and which must of necessity be divine origin.

As I passed upon the credibility of witnesses and as I wrote my opinions and formulated my judgments, I gradually came to realize that I was weaving my small part of this huge fabric; and I knew that I would not perform my task aright unless I was constantly mindful of the fact that all these matters, large and small, would be mere futility unless I tried to make each one fit into its proper place in the moral law which governed all.

Right here is the part that is difficult to explain. I was still reasoning as a lawyer. The fundamental principles of law were the same. I was still manipulating the techniques of my profession as before. But there was some subtle force, the impact of which was new to me, which was spiritual in quality. It was as though someone were always watching me and telling me to make very sure that my rulings and my decisions were fundamentally right and just.

You know we judges are the servants of the people, as are all Government officials in our particular type of democracy. But I think it will not be difficult for you to see from the things I have been telling you about that it didn't take me very long to perceive that we judges are the servants of someone else too.

Years ago I often heard Chief Judge Benjamin N. Cardozo, before he became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and while he was still chief judge of our New York State Court of Appeals speak about humility. He was, indeed, a humble man. One could not fail to observe that. But the full effect of what he had to say about humility was not felt by me until I was myself a judge, and found myself struggling with forces too great and too complicated for me to fathom. I saw in a new light the difficulties which beset one in the search for truth and justice.

This was particularly true when I suddenly found myself in the vortex of the trial of the Communists, in the midst of the play of great forces upon which, for all I know, the destiny of the human race may hang. Later it suddenly dawned upon me that some queer turn in the wheel of fate had singled me out, for the moment, to feel the impact of America's love of justice. And the result was what must be inevitable under the circumstances, that I found myself to be a small, indeed a very small, and insignificant particle in the scheme of things. It has been an extraordinary experience.

Fortunately for me, I was taught to pray from so early a time that I cannot remember going to bed at night without saying my prayers. * * *

As I mentioned, * * * I suddenly found myself in the midst of that trial of the Communists. It took me a long time to realize what they were trying to do to me. But as I got weaker and weaker, and found the burden difficult to bear, I sought strength from the one source that never fails.

Let me be specific. There came a time when, doubtless due to previous planning

one of the defendants was on the stand and he refused to answer a question, pleading a supposed constitutional privilege which obviously had no application. I gave him time to consult with his counsel about it; I held the matter in abeyance overnight to make sure that I was making no misapplication of the law, and then the next day, Friday, June 3, of the year 1949, I sentenced him to prison for 30 days, unless he should sooner purge himself of contempt by answering the question.

Pandemonium broke loose. The other 10 defendants and their lawyers, and many of the spectators, rose to their feet; there was a great shouting and hullabaloo, and several of the defendants started toward the bench.

In all that excitement I felt just as calm as I do now when I speak to you; I did not raise my voice over the tone which you hear me use now; and I singled out several of those men, identified the language they were using, got it on the record, and sentenced each of them to imprisonment for the balance of the trial.

And I tell you, as I stand here, that my unguided will alone and such self-control as I possess were unequal to this test. If ever a man felt the presence of Someone beside him, strengthening his will and giving him aid and comfort, it was I on that day.

And so it was later and toward the end of August, when I finally left the courtroom one day and went to lie down, thinking that perhaps I should never go back. But, after 10 or 15 minutes, I was refreshed and I did go back; and I gained in strength from that moment on to the end.

Perhaps someone will think it wrong for me to tell you these things. But I could not come to this gathering prepared to discuss the ordinary platitudes, or to hold forth on philosophy or international affairs, about which I know nothing. It seemed better, particularly in these trying, difficult times, when each of us is worried, and each of us is troubled over this great country of ours that we love so well, to sound a note of comfort.

After all is said and done, it is not we who pull the strings; we are not the masters, but the servants of our Master's will; and it is well that we should know it to be so.

Gift by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, to the University of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS SMITH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has recently made a gift to the University of North Carolina which is referred to in a letter of appreciation from the President of the university, Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, to Mr. Earle Gluck, of radio station WSCC, in Charlotte, N. C., dated March 31, 1951. A copy of the letter has come to my attention, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSOLIDATED UNIVERSITY
OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Chapel Hill, March 31, 1951.

Mr. EARLE GLUCK,
Radio Station WSOC,
Charlotte, N. C.

DEAR MR. GLUCK: Recently the University of North Carolina has received a gift from Senator WILLIAM BENTON, which I feel that all North Carolina broadcasters should know about. I am writing to you as president of the North Carolina Association of Broadcasters with the request that you inform your membership about Senator BENTON'S generosity, which will, I think, mean a great deal to broadcasting in the State, as well as to the University of North Carolina.

Senator BENTON'S gift to the university consists of a complete associated program service, which includes:

(a) Two thousand two hundred musical selections in the fields of popular light concert, concert, band, sacred music, and opera, and in the minor categories of Latin-American, Hawaiian, and hillbilly.

(b) Cabinets and other physical aids for efficient use of the service.

(c) A card index of all selections cataloged according to title and composer.

(d) Monthly releases of new recorded selections and continuity for 12 hours of programing each week.

(e) A special promotion and sales service.

For the service the university is paying a token amount of $15 monthly to the associated program service.

I know that the broadcasters of the State will be aware of the great value of this gift and, along with the university, would want me to express their collective gratitude to Senator BENTON.

Would you be good enough, through whatever means may be at your disposal, to communicate this information to the broadcasting community of our State.

Sincerely,

GORDON GRAY, *President.*

Famine in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "While Human Beings Starve," by Anne O'Hare McCormick, which appeared in the New York Times and was reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp. in the Washington Post on April 5, 1951.

This article points out that the human problem of India's need for food must not be treated as a mere political issue if we are to save lives and gain friends in our moral battle with communism. In reprinting this article, the International Latex Corp. has again called to the attention of the American public some clear thinking on an issue of major importance to our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE HUMAN BEINGS STARVE

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

When Congress reconvenes today it will be under great pressure to get the India food bill out of cold storage, where it has been shelved for many weeks while famine draws nearer to millions of people in the drought-stricken provinces. It will soon be too late to save the population of the State of Bihar, where the ration is far below the reduced Indian norm of 9 ounces a day. This is not enough to sustain life for long; unless relief comes quickly, there will be widespread chaos, disease, and death.

The bill has been held up in the House Rules Committee on the issue of whether the 2,000,000 tons of grain India asks for shall be a gift or paid for in strategic raw materials. Actually India plans to buy for cash 4,000,000 tons this year, nearly half in the United States, but does not have dollars to pay for the additional supplies. Meantime, Communist China has offered to provide rice and corn for India, and Soviet Russia proposes to exchange wheat for jute. These are effective political gestures, designed to point the contrast between Communist governments and the niggardly attitude of the United States, but they will not feed the starving; the hard fact is that only this country has grain enough to do that.

MAKING THE SAME MISTAKE

President Truman made a second plea last week for immediate action. David E. Lilienthal, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, who has recently returned from India, warned yesterday that the United States is beginning to make in India the same mistakes which paved the way for the Communist victory in China. "If a good many millions of Indians starve to death while our storehouses are bulging with grain," he said, "I don't believe that is going to lay the foundation for making us feel better about ourselves or making the Indians believe what we say we are."

India's policy on China has undoubtedly had much to do with congressional failure to report the relief bill out of committee. The President asked for authorization for the grant February 12. Bills were introduced into Congress with strong bipartisan support and were passed by the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees by March 5. Since then nothing has been done. Congress will not take the responsibility of voting against the bill because such a vote is tantamount to a vote against the American tradition. The measure has wide popular backing, besides, despite the irritation Americans feel over India's refusal to support the UN and the United States fight in Korea by labeling Communist China an aggressor. But a good many Congressmen are like the four Republican Senators who opposed the bill in the Foreign Relations Committee. They are willing to leave India on the anxious seat while the lesson of the present crisis sinks in.

The Kashmir dispute also plays its part in hardening sentiment against India. On Saturday the UN Security Council adopted the latest of many formulas for solving the deadlock on this issue. Of all the knotty problems that disturb the peace in Asia, none has roused more passion than the conflict between India and Pakistan for possession of the fertile valleys and green forests of the beautiful land that lies between Afghanistan and Tibet. The UN has been trying for a peaceful settlement since 1948, and the present plan, sponsored by Britain and the United States, provides for another

study on the scene and another effort to demilitarize the Province in preparation for a free and impartial plebiscite. But Prime Minister Nehru is not expected to be more receptive to the new proposals than to previous plans. He has a special feeling for the Vale of Kashmir, the homeland of his family, and has repeatedly declared that he will never surrender to Pakistan. His uncompromising attitude, together with Pakistan's campaign on this issue, has had considerable effect in Washington. It is not true, however, as has been charged, that if the two countries were on good terms Pakistan could supply India with the grain she needs. Floods have so damaged Pakistan's crops that the Government at Karachi announced last October that it was unable to export wheat anywhere.

A WAY TO LOSE A BATTLE

The point is that India's policy toward China or her feud with Pakistan over Kashmir is completely irrelevant to her desperate need of food or our obligation to use our surplus to save people from famine. India is a young and harassed nation learning that national independence is not merely a matter of throwing off foreign rule. The conflict over Kashmir adds to her dangers, but in her position next door to two pushing Communist empires she has to steer a dangerous course in any event, and if her ideas of how to save Asia were 10 times more opposed to ours than they are this divergence should not for a moment influence our action as a great power with the means and responsibility to deal with a great human emergency.

We have already deliberately lost a lot of time the Indian people will pay for—and the American people, too, if the hungry millions of Asia who have not yet succumbed to Communist promises are driven to choose bread instead of freedom. We have lost half the value of our aid in delay and questions and haggling over terms when we might have dramatized it in a swift and generous gesture. More, if we do not move so that the grain reaches India this spring, before it is too late to save lives, we shall have lost a great battle in a war that will be decided in the end on the moral front.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter addressed by Mayor John J. Tyrell, of Plattsburg, N. Y., to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and an official notification of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Plattsburg, urging the favorable consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Plattsburg, N. Y., March 26, 1951.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: At the last regular meeting of our common council held March 22, 1951, a resolution was adopted wherein I was requested to write your committee, expressing the sentiments of the members of the council, and myself, concerning legislation now before Congress in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project. This matter, we understand, will shortly come before your committee for hearings.

This is to inform you that not only at this time, but for some years previous, at the time of my former administration in 1946 and 1947, and even during the administration of my predecessor in office, we have strongly and consistently endorsed any and all legislation pertaining to the development of this most important project.

Knowing as I do that your committee has all the material facts before you for consideration, it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to inform you on any phase thereof. However, realizing the genuine interest the members of your committee have in assisting in any way you can to develop for the benefit of the greatest number of our citizens the wonderful natural resources of our great country, I am sure you will give most serious consideration to this all-important matter.

Assuring you of our appreciation of what we hope will be your favorable reaction to the evidence to be submitted by the proponents of this measure, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. TYRELL,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Plattsburg, N. Y., March 27, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. TYRELL,
Mayor of Plattsburg, Plattsburg, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the Common Council of the City of Plattsburg, N. Y., held March 22, 1951, the following resolution was adopted:

By Alderman Slattery; seconded by Alderman Holland:

"*Resolved*, That the mayor be and he is hereby requested to write to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee informing him of the full support and endorsement of the common council of the St. Lawrence seaway project and urging the approval of legislation for its early development not only as a defense measure, but for the return in increased prosperity in industry and agriculture, as well as benefits to be received from lower rates for power and transportation."

On roll call, Aldermen Holland, LeClair, Villoni, Slattery, and Cardi voted in the affirmative; no one in the negative; carried.

Certified a true copy.

GEORGE E. MILLER,
City Clerk.

Christ's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate four or more years ago I found an institution of which I had not heard, and which I have come to value very highly. It is the Wednesday morning breakfast of Senators who profess the Christian religion and wish to apply it to their duties in the Senate. A similar breakfast is held every Tuesday morning in the House. The two breakfasts have been stimulated by the International Council for Christian Leadership, which recently held its annual meeting. To that meeting the dowager Queen of the Netherlands, who styles herself Princess Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, sent a message. I ask unanimous consent that the message may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, whenever our thoughts dwell upon the near future, it seems of vital importance to explore what lies at the bottom of all troubles. In this message I would like to express to you my thoughts about this future, which after all depends to a certain extent on ourselves in as far as we place ourselves under Christ's leadership.

When we read about Christ's teaching in the Gospel of St. John, not in a superficial and traditional way, but with our whole heart and soul, keen on solving this problem and in unconditional surrender to the living Christ and His teaching, we cannot but be deeply impressed by the sequence of His instructions therein, and its actuality so strikingly befitting these times of increasing danger for mankind. Because in the Gospel of St. John we find His program for this moment, setting the rules for the abolishment of discord and for the regeneration of man.

Christ first emphasizes love and brotherhood of a very high order and unbounded intensity; then He teaches unity between Him and God and us, and harmony amongst ourselves. And should this be fulfilled, He promises peace; not a peace ruled by man alone, not a peace standing by itself and with no other background than man made treaties and conditions, but a peace ruled by Christ through men reunited and renewed in Christ.

In the midst of an overpowering crisis in which the world finds itself today, this teaching stands out as an undeniable and inevitable truth; because at the very roots of this crisis we find primarily weakening of the spirit.

Every other reasoning, doctrine, or ideology, when faced with the truth of Christ's teaching, proves itself false; so let this truth dominate the world.

For it is clear that we are on the eve of a new era, a new world order, and if this is to be the better world we are all longing for, it never can be realized without Jesus Christ; on no other foundation as on His teaching can it rest.

A better world is not thinkable and cannot be built, before this spiritual foundation has been laid, before brotherhood and unison under Christ's leadership work effectively.

Only then His peace will flourish.

Now is the time for inspired men and women of all races, all classes, and all continents to start a world-wide effort in daring and unflinching faith for this purpose.

Surely all who are of good will can join and be ready to cooperate with us, as the better world under His leadership is a thing we can, we must, we shall make true.

Few as yet realize the magnitude of power which Christ bestowes on us in this very moment of supreme crisis, His rescuing power which He focusses on our present world, and is available to all who thirst for this living water.

An indication of this, one may find in the same inspired spiritual language used nowadays all over the world in speeches and publications dealing with the problems of

mankind. This undoubtedly may be taken as proof of a renewed inspiration of the Holy Ghost, preparing the way for the oncoming unity amongst men.

That power to strive and work for a better world, Christ makes attainable to all who open themselves to Him. This need not only be in hours of prayer or meditation, but can just as well be carried out in daily life, by anyone who wants to stand for the undeniable truth of Christ and His teaching.

Those who have experienced something of this rescuing power, know the elevating joy and comforting bliss of participating in it; for those no obstacle exists any more, nor can anything stop their indomitable impetus, as they know that to strive for a better world, is the example set to mankind by Jesus Christ.

And, as we read in the Lord's Prayer: "Thy will be done," we know Christ's victory to be near. Now, and in this world.

Letter From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Al Spiers, editor of the Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch, under date of March 27, 1951:

YOU SEE, IT'S LIKE THIS

(By Al Spiers)

A letter came this morning from far-off Pusan, Korea. It's blunt and sometimes bitter. You may not like it.

But Corp. Walter R. Case, who wrote it, certainly intended the letter to be published. There are some things he wants the folks at home to know.

This is what he wrote:

"Myself and a few thousand other GI's would like to know the answers to several questions.

"The biggest question at present is just why we are over here. The Army has tried to answer that for some time now, but I have yet to hear anyone say he is convinced we ought to be fighting.

"The Korean people certainly are not glad to have us. I've seen that with my own eyes.

"You'll notice that I said the people, and not the politicians. After all, it's the people of the world who we are trying to satisfy, even though the scales show otherwise.

"Another good question is where will it all end, and to what advantage? Also, do the people back home realize how disgusted the reservists are at the quick shuffle they've gotten? I've never seen morale of troops so low before."

Why? Just read on:

"When we signed up after the last war we were led to believe we wouldn't be called until a national emergency existed. Most of us were called before the emergency was declared. To us, it was a kind of low blow, dealt by what we once called a democratic nation. It's rough to be lied to by your own Government.

"This may sound harsh, but it's not half as harsh as most of us feel."

There are other things piled atop this original bitterness that fan its flames. Like this:

"Why is it that our PX shelves are bare when the black market thrives to such an extent that the streets are lined with shops selling American cigarettes, candy, toilet articles, stationery, and every item of GI clothing—not used but brand new?

"Why is it that our engineer battalions have to drive trucks and equipment made in Japan when the Koreans use United States equipment and tear it up in a month?

"Why is it that British soldiers, from the nation which claims to have the best tailors in the world, are seen wearing GI field coats and carrying M-1 rifles as they stroll through the PX buying up our scarce items?

"Why, too, are Korean police, civilians, and soldiers wearing our GI uniform? How is an American soldier supposed to respect his uniform when it's being worn by everyone in the world?

"Why is it that British, Dutch, and other European legations are housed in imposing edifices when the nation that foots the bill for the whole show is in a dump by comparison?"

It just about all boils down to this: How is a man going to fight or give his all when he can't see anything worth while behind it? You try and answer these questions. We, the expendible GI's, can't.

"Should this be published, it would give the folks back home the true questions which are in every GI's mind who is over here in Korea."

I think we can answer Corporal Case's grim questions, but it will take courageous soul-searching and confession to find and speak the true answers.

Isn't practically everything that has embittered this soldier the product of nincompoops in Government and the military?

And aren't nincompoops in Government and the military the inevitable products of citizen neglect of the responsibilities that go hand-in-hand with the treasured privileges of our system?

Cozy, comfortable neglect of these deep responsibilities is a luxury that can scarcely be afforded in calm prosperous times. It is a deadly luxury when carried in today's grim, desperate era.

Let's write to Corporal Case. Let's honestly confess our guilt, but simultaneously tell him that a new spirit is beginning to flame at home in America today. It is a spirit that will not rest until we have driven the peanut politicians and nincompoops from places that produce the snafus which such grave, sacrificing men as Corporal Case must endure.

Let's tell him—and let's do it.

His address: Corp. Walter R. Case, ER, 45016051, Three Hundred and Seventy-eighth EUD, APO 59, care of postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

A Student's View of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a prize-winning editorial having significant value in these days of ever-increasing tensions and world crisis. I recommend the reading of this editorial not because it was written in some marble hall of a great newspaper of our time, but rather because it was written by a high-school student of today, a member of the generation which will take over control tomorrow. It is this future generation which must bear much of the impact of decisions which have been and are being made today. The Denver Post, of Denver, Colo., recently conducted a scholastic writing awards contest for Colorado students and this, a first-prize-winning editorial, was written for it by Miss Sally White, of the Palisade High School, in Palisade, Colo.

Miss White shows a mature evaluating ability as she writes down her thinking on the world in which she lives and the world in which her generation must find its place. For her and those of her age there has been little of normalcy, all too little time to see how the world might look if peace were a reality instead of an idealistic institution being used by an evil and expansionistic power as a propaganda weapon. I recommend the reading of her editorial, A Student's View of War, to the Members as a fine example of a fresh and inquiring mind undulled by years of battering against the indifferent wall of human opinion—an opinion far too often dedicated to the preservation of the status quo in which peoples have all too much of a material interest, and are all too often unimpressed by the need to move forward as new means arise for the solution of human problems.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

A STUDENT'S VIEW OF WAR

We've just come in from telling them goodbye—my girl friend and I—her brother and his friend have left to join the paratroopers. It's strangely quiet in the house now, more quiet than I have ever known this house to be. But outside the world goes on about its business just as though a piece of peoples lives hadn't been lost. All over the United States, all over the world, families are kissing their loved ones goodbye. Sons, sweethearts, brothers, are leaving some to come back, some to stay to fight for freedom again.

We've lost quite a few even in our small town, and it doesn't seem right to us that the boys who only yesterday laughed with us, who danced with us at the last dance, so carefree and full of fun, still just kids, should be going away to learn how to use weapons which destroy mankind, to learn what it means to kill or be killed.

And it isn't right but there is more to it than losing a friend, a sweetheart, a companion or even a brother. We're losing a piece of dream, which I think is experienced by all the so-called little people all over the world. That 's the dream of peace and prosperity for everyone. I wasn't very old when the last war broke out, not old enough to realize just what it meant beyond the rationing of certain things I wanted and the fact that many of my relatives left for a long period of time. But I did truly believe the things they told us—that when the war was over there would be no more suffering and strife; that everyone would lead a happy normal life again. I know now this wasn't so.

Maybe I don't know much about war except the fact that it destroys the things that God put up on this earth. Maybe I don't know what starts wars but I do know this: it wasn't us, the youth of the world that got us into this new mess. (And I can't believe that the youth of Russia, of Korea, or of any other country relish the thought of sending their loved ones off to war any more than we do.) It was the political big-wigs, the heads of the countries. But it won't be those men who will pick up guns and go to

the front lines; no, they will have to stay home and run rationing boards and decide what prices should go up and what must remain the same. No, it will be the youth of the world. We'll go, reluctantly some of us, but we won't admit it. Some of us only sit and wait till we're old enough to try to do our part. We'll go, we'll fight someone else's war and we'll do a good job; some of us won't come home, some that do will be maimed and crippled, but we will do a good job. Then I wonder, will the world settle down to try and live together peacefully, happily, or will we again see how many atom bombs and hydrogen bombs we can perfect to destroy more of humanity? Will our children's children and their children, too, have to fight the wars that a few start and millions pay for? Will this be their heritage? I can only pray to God that our generation will see a way out of this vicious, never-ending cycle? No normal couple would want to bring children into such a world as that for we would know then that the Bible adage that man will some day destroy himself is true.

Outside the water runs on and the world goes on about its business.

SALLY WHITE.

Setback for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 18, 1951:

SETBACK FOR HOUSING

With the rejection by the House of Representatives of consideration of the Administration's defense housing bill this week the nation defense program is set back in its effort to assure decent housing and community facilities in areas affected by the development of defense production facilities and military installations. As Charles E. Wilson pointed out, "our production program can suffer serious and crippling delays" due to the lack of housing and community facilities.

To get any defense program under way it is necessary to act with dispatch to eliminate the known pitfalls that can mar its progress. The greatest of these is the lack of adequate housing and facilities such as streets, sewers, waterworks, schools and libraries. People who wish to make the sacrifice of moving to new areas in the interest of national defense are loath to do so unless decent housing and facilities are available to make their lives and the lives of their families livable in an alien area. As a prominent New York builder pointed out recently, there is no necessity to build potential slums to house defense workers when decently planned, livable communities can be built at much the same cost.

It is unrealistic to charge the bill with being a form of "creeping socialism" when experiences during the Second World War showed that in certain areas it will be necessary for the Federal Government to provide housing and community facilities if defense projects are to get under way in time to be of use to the national defense effort. It may be true that there are some "bugs" in the bill, but in the light of the country's present needs and the speed with which the bill was reported out of committee, H. R. 2988 was entitled to consideration and acceptance.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed to Citizens of First Congressional District of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 24 I mailed 32,000 questionnaires to my congressional district. There were 56 questions based upon the President's four messages to the Eighty-second Congress on the State of the Union, economic report, budget, and taxation. I distributed the questionnaires to every fifth householder—both town and country—using rural directories for each county, and city directories for each city having them available. I sent the questionnaire also to all who have ordered farm bulletins the past 4 years and to the parents of all babies born in the First Congressional District during the past 4 years. No other names were added and none of the names on the above list was deleted. I wrote no letter to accompany the questionnaire except the statement printed on the questionnaire itself. After delivery of the questionnaire in the district we received special requests for approximately 50 questionnaires and we mailed these additional copies when requested. The post offices returned about 2,200 questionnaires that could not be delivered to the addressees.

In response to the 29,800 questionnaires delivered we have received up to and including April 2, 1951, a total of 3,465 replies. Replies are still coming in at a fair rate, but inasmuch as the ratio between yes and no answers has remained constant from the time we passed the 2,000 mark I have decided to present the summary of returns without waiting for the complete response. The return of 11.6 percent to date is very gratifying as the percentage of returns is already considerably higher than Dr. George Gallup's estimate of total expected returns from such a mailing.

I placed a space on the questionnaire for the person answering it to indicate his occupation, and I am gratified with the listing of occupations by 3,312 of the 3,465 who answered the questionnaire. The occupations listed were as follows:

Farmer	982
Business	592
Professional	661
Labor	798
Housewife	223
Student	56

We have received more than 2,000 special letters with the answered questionnaires and the discussions in these letters are very interesting and informative.

The replies have been rather evenly spread throughout the past 5 weeks, and in my opinion they reflect rather accurately the thinking of the people of the First Congressional District during the month of March 1951. On some of these questions changes in world-wide or domestic events can and will, of course, affect the opinions of those who have replied, but the true grass roots opinions as reflected in the following report are of special value just now when the first session of the Eighty-second Congress is entering the period of final consideration of many of these issues:

Questionnaire

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor:		
(a) Withdrawal of American troops from Korea?	1,180	2,115
(b) Occupation of South Korea?	1,732	1,157
(c) Occupation of all Korea?	1,090	1,909
(d) Bombing of bases and supply lines in Manchuria?	1,889	1,148
(e) Use of atomic bomb against Chinese Red forces and supply bases?	1,094	1,952
(f) Support of invasion of China by Chinese Nationalist forces?	1,999	1,080
(g) Sending American armed forces to Europe?	1,999	1,155
(h) Use of atomic bomb against Russia if Russian war develops?	2,900	349
(i) Continued arms aid to foreign countries?	2,321	800
(j) Rearming Japan?	2,106	995
(k) Rearming Germany?	2,069	987
2. Do you approve the Truman administration foreign policy?	607	2,384
3. Do you favor all-out mobilization by the United States at this time?	1,457	1,839
4. Do you favor universal military training?	2,353	982
5. Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services?	1,896	1,432
6. Do you favor the drafting of World War II veterans?	869	2,197
7. Do you favor congressional control of sending armed forces to Europe through restrictions placed in appropriation bills?	2,172	994
8. Assuming President Truman has constitutional power to send American armed forces to Europe unless Congress forbids, do you favor his doing so without congressional approval?	636	2,693
9. Do you advocate immediate "across the board" Government regulation of prices, wages, and rents?	1,928	1,298
10. Do you favor heavy Federal taxes as an anti-inflation device?	1,228	1,977
11. Would you be willing to have your taxes increased by 30 percent in order to establish a "pay-as-you-go" tax plan to meet the proposed budget increases?	1,269	1,943
12. Do you favor:		
(a) Increasing corporate income taxes?	2,366	794
(b) Increasing personal income taxes?	1,286	1,896
(c) Increasing excise taxes?	2,100	1,060
(d) Adding a Federal sales tax?	1,294	1,923
(e) Increasing postal rates?	2,304	973
13. Do you favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?	617	2,525
14. Do you favor socialized medicine?	344	3,019
15. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	1,874	1,384
16. Are you in favor of the Brannan plan for agriculture?	445	2,629
17. Do you favor development of the St. Lawrence waterway?	1,689	1,109
18. Do you favor cutting down Federal spending?	3,237	73
If so, on which of the following items:		
(a) Veterans' benefits	1,160	------
(b) National defense	310	------
(c) Foreign aid to civilians	1,946	------
(d) Foreign arms aid	1,064	------
(e) Farm subsidies	2,478	------
(f) Social welfare, health, and social security	1,153	------
(g) Grants to States for health services	1,252	------
(h) Federal housing	1,673	------
(i) Dams	1,620	------
(j) Airports	1,033	------
(k) Roads	509	------
(l) Federal buildings	2,349	------
(m) Other public works	1,816	------
(n) General expense of government	3,059	------

Questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
19. Regardless of your approval or disapproval of the policies of the Truman administration, please check the five issues you think most important today:		
(a) Government spending and higher taxes	(1)	2,346
(b) American foreign policy	(2)	2,292
(c) Government controls on prices, wages, and rents		1,552
(d) Government welfare programs of the New Deal and Fair Deal		568
(e) The threat of socialism in this country		1,544
(f) Korean War policy		1,394
(g) American Armed Forces to Europe		1,098
(h) Defense and war preparedness	(3)	2,269
(i) Communists in America	(5)	1,747
(j) Labor policies and strikes	(4)	1,884

Famine in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD, a very excellent and timely editorial entitled "While Famine Stalks," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE FAMINE STALKS

It is not pretty to watch Congress dawdle while the specter of famine hovers over India. Even if legislators act with all possible speed to approve the bill giving India 2,000,000 tons of grain, it will be a close race. The grain must be sent to ports, and ships must be broken out of storage; it has been impossible to keep them ready on a standby basis. Yet, unless grain is in Indian hands by June, a breakdown in the rationing system is likely; already the people are on a 9-ounce minimum ration, and even this is not available in some areas. President Truman, in his request to Congress in February, put April 1 as the deadline for delivery of the first million tons.

The depressing part of the affair is that it has become confused with all sorts of side issues. First, objections were cited to Prime Minister Nehru's attitude on Korea; then there was talk of making the grain a loan, although India is in no shape to repay it; then India's embargo on certain strategic materials—monazite and beryl—became a stumbling block. This newspaper believes, as respects the latter point, that the American position on access to strategic materials ought to be made quite plain. But none of these factors is reason to deny or delay the grain. It is not in the American tradition, when a stricken person asks for food, to demand to know first how he voted in the last election.

As the Washington Federation of Churches has pointed out in a letter to Speaker RAYBURN, indifference to starvation is "an evil not to be tolerated by Christian conscience." Help now would be "a merciful weapon in our struggle against communism" and would "do much to heal the widening rift between this country and India." Yet while Congress dallies, Russia has made propaganda by offering to sell India 50,000 tons of wheat, and Communist China—itself faced with starvation in many areas—has capitalized on the American delay by offering a million tons of rice. They are doubtless phony offers, both of them; but they make good propaganda, and are pathetic illustrations of India's desperation.

There is reason to believe that the House Rules Committee, which has been sitting on the bill, will report it out when Speaker RAYBURN believes he has the votes to pass it. The test cannot be put off longer, and we cannot believe that if the issue is placed squarely before House Members, they will turn it down. This country would be harmed as much as India if Congress should turn its back on both a moral obligation to humanity and the opportunity to strike a blow in behalf of stability in India.

"Crum-Bums"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March issue of the bulletin of the St. Louis Medical Society:

"CRUM-BUMS"

The daily press is reporting, with increasing frequency, the incidence of narcotic addiction among mere children. To find a name for a character so contemptible that he would peddle dope to kids we must turn to the lexicon of the kids. To them, the lowest form of human life is a "crum-bum." Much worse than an ordinary bum, more despicable than any other type of crook, much more dangerous than the small-time hoodlum—the narcotic peddler who trafficks with the teen-ager is the worst "crum-bum" of the lot. His rank in the genus homo is comparable only to that of the slimy, crawling things that inhabit the undersurface of rocks in the remainder of the animal world. A creature so completely bankrupt of moral principles that he would encourage narcotic addiction in children, to the end that they must steal, lie, cheat, and prostitute themselves in order to purchase the stuff, has sacrificed his right to live among decent people.

What place does this diatribe have in a medical publication, you ask? Simply this: Only the doctor knows, better than anyone, the mental and physical agony that the addict endures. The doctor has seen, more than anyone else, the abject misery and the stripping-away of conscience, virtue, morality, and standards of human relationships engendered by the craving for narcotics. It is fitting and proper, therefore, that the physician—who bears the same responsibility to community health that the lawyer does to community law and order—raise his voice in protest against this horrible and revolting development in our modern society.

We quote a headline from a recent newspaper story: "Couple gets 5 years for dope peddling." Five years. And they may be free in 2, or 2½, or 3 years. Free to go back to where they cached the $270,000 they made in 6 months selling heroin. What "crum-bum"—or for that matter, a higher order of bum—would not be willing to spend 3 or even 5 years in the pokey for that kind of money? The same edition stated that Al Capone's brother faced 16 years for tax evasion; a writer of rubber checks was sentenced to 6 years in another story in the same edition. But for a couple who had murdered the souls and minds and futures of kids; who had helped rob them of the opportunity to grow into healthy, happy, ambitious citizens of a community where they could walk proudly with their fellows—5 years.

This is in no sense an indictment of the judge who pronounced sentence, for—again we quote—this was "the maximum time the court could impose." If 5 years constitute the maximum time that a judge is permitted to put away these termites of our social structure, then it is high time that the lawmakers reexamine relative values. If spies, saboteurs, and other traitors to our country can be given life sentences, then those who would sabotage the children upon whom the Nation's future depends should be given life sentences. If a murderer can be given the electric chair, then those who would create thieves, murderers, and prostitutes deserve no less. Something drastic should be done to protect these kids.

Let Them Find Sites Less Sacred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I include the significant editorial written by Arthur L. Crookham, which appeared in the Oregon Journal on March 18, 1951, entitled "Let Them Find Sites Less Sacred," on the proposal in carrying out the dispersal program to select as one of the sites the Civil War battlefield, Bull Run:

LET THEM FIND SITES LESS SACRED

Looks to us as if the third battle of Bull Run is shaping up.

What do you mean, third battle?

Well, in Washington, a committee of Congress is considering erecting one of the proposed dispersed Government office buildings on the magnificent Civil War battlefield, where not one, but two bitter engagements were fought at the outskirts of the National Capital.

Of course, the land is owned by the Government—which means a saving in costs. To this beautifully landscaped area tens of thousands of visitors go each year to see the first great battlefield of the Civil War, where Thomas Jonathan Jackson won the name of Stonewall and where a few months later the braggart Union General Pope was defeated by Longstreet and the self-same Stonewall. It seems that the 1,600-acre tract has caught the congressional eye since it is 28 miles from the White House, nicely outside the range of any A-bomb that might demolish the White House.

What do we mean by third battle of Bull Run? Well, before this national shrine is torn up by bull dozers for some unsightly office building, a lot of fireworks will be shot off by students of the Civil War, historians, and antiquarians. There must be plenty of land in other directions from Washington available for such a building.

Once we start digging up long-preserved national parks for man-made structures, who will say when to stop? We're a-getting out our musket and we'll be tenting tonight at Bull Run. Look out, you Congressmen. History tells us a lot of your fellow Members ran away from their sightseeing at first Bull Run. History can repeat.

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by George Rothwell Brown, which could well be entitled "When You Cannot Justify Your Position in an Argument, Walk Out On It":

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The great debate, involving the integrity of the Constitution from Presidential encroachment, and the defense of the country in possible war with Communist Russia, was brought to a tragic conclusion before packed galleries, and row upon row of empty Senate seats.

In view of the basic fundamental issues involved, the attempted usurpation by President Truman of congressional control of the armed services of the Union, and the hazardous adventure in sending inadequate ground forces to Western Europe, this discussion in the Senate took place in the face of a shameful Democratic absenteeism.

The debate was boycotted by virtually the whole Democratic side of the Senate.

On the afternoon upon which Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, made an analysis of remarkable forcefulness of the constitutional power of Congress to determine how and when an Army of the United States might be employed, for several hours the entire Democratic side of the Senate was empty.

Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose mind was already made up, for a little while sat alone amidst a sea of vacant Democratic seats.

There was a look of contemptuous boredom on his face.

The speeches that were being made on the Republican side, the cross-fire of interrogations which brought out the facts, went in one CONNALLY ear and out the other.

He made no attempt to participate in the argument, but as silent as a clam in its shell scorned to answer any of the statements by the opposition, which completely riddled President Truman's impudent assumption of dictatorial powers, as Commander in Chief, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

Presently even Chairman CONNALLY got up and walked out of the Chamber, leaving a committee clerk at the adjacent desk.

For quite some time this lone individual was the only person on the Democratic side of the Senate.

Why was this great debate—in view of the consequences for weal or woe of the headstrong Truman-Acheson-Marshall policies perhaps the most important to have been heard in the Senate since the Civil War—deliberately boycotted by the Democratic leadership?

It was apparent as Republican crossfire ruthlessly exposed Truman's attempt to seize a power denied him by the Constitution of the United States, that the Democrats could not answer the constitutional arguments of the opposition.

They could not deny. They would not listen.

The Truman Democrats had no facts—all they had was the votes to jam through a couple of resolutions, having no force in law, and merely begging the President to consult Congress in any future use of troops in Europe, beyond the four extra divisions which are to be sent with the virtual unanimous consent of Congress.

But the votes the majority leaders calculated upon having were admittedly barely enough to win a victory for the Presidency at the expense of Congress and the Constitution.

In the voting to take place this week, the margin would almost certainly be slim, one way or another.

The outcome would depend in part upon how many independent conservative Democrats would vote to send the pending resolutions back to committee to be redrafted in the form of a "joint resolution," which would require action by the House of Representatives.

It would depend in part also upon how many New Deal Republicans would desert their party, and sacrifice on the altar of Roosevelt-Truman internationalism, the constitutional safeguards against Executive usurpation bequeathed to the American people by the founders of the Republic.

It was Easter time. Day after day the Senate galleries were packed with American men and women.

How disillusioned they must have been.

On one side of the magnificent new Senate Chamber WHERRY, TAFT, BRICKER, KEM, WATKINS, DIRKSEN, valiantly defending the ancient rights of Congress.

On the other a vast expanse of empty seats, expressive of the utter contempt in which the Democrats, with a few splendid exceptions, like BYRD, of Virginia, and MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, held the whole great debate.

Dispersion Boys Seek a Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting editorial written by Royce Brier entitled "Dispersion Boys Seek a Site," which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, March 8, 1951:

DISPERSION BOYS SEEK A SITE

(By Royce Brier)

At the various important battlefields of the Civil War national parks have long been established. They are strewn with bronze markers set up by a historical society, naming formations and describing the action, and with monuments erected by States and patriotic organizations, North and South.

Cemeteries are also situated in the parks (it was a cemetery dedication which occasioned the Gettysburg Address). Millions of Americans visit these battlefields annually, studying the battles or seeking their family names, which are often to be found, a granite immortality for some boy of eighteen. Among the favorites are, of course, Gettysburg and Bull Run, scene of the small first battle, July 21, 1861, and a big battle a year later. It is but 25 miles from Washington.

There is a plan to disperse Government buildings due to the atom-bomb hazard. The planners are looking around for sites not too far from Washington, and have their eyes on some of the battlefield parks. They might save a few million bucks that way.

The Washington Post last week described one of these exploration trips. A House Public Works Subcommittee went out to Bull Run, and members indicated they were impressed with its possibilities as a building site. As you shall see, it isn't the first time Congressmen have sashayed out to Bull Run, and if you'll tolerate a prejudice, this second visit is as dubious as the first.

Efficiency is splendid and Government thrift is admirable, but it is possible to go overboard. One of the tendencies of our day is to wonder if the national shrines and parks cannot be put to some more utilitarian use. No doubt there are gents in crowded Washington who would set up a clerical section in Mount Vernon if they could get away with it.

The weeks of July were hot and nerve wracking in the rolling land of Virginia. Beauregard, the elegant and learned fellow who had fired on Sumter, was sent to command a rag-tag army of fire-eaters assembling north of Richmond to protect that new capital of the Confederacy.

Lincoln was trying to get together a ragtag army of greenhorns (excepting a small nucleus of Regulars) to protect Washington from seizure, which would be almost fatal to the Union at that juncture—the Europeans had their tongues hanging out for it. A Brig. Gen. Irvin McDowell commanded this force under Fuss and Feathers Scott, who was too old and fat to get into the field. Good man in his day, though.

Beauregard showed some of the traits later displayed by McClellan, one overestimating his enemy. He insisted McDowell had a magnificent fifty thousand, whereas McDowell had thirty thousand, and thousands had never heard a musket go bang.

So McDowell moved out from Arlington. It was the biggest army ever seen in America; its ubiquity awed Congressmen and other Washington red-hots, who drove out in carriages of a Sunday morning to see the rebels trounced and brought back tied up with ropes. Boy, it was a day.

So the battle began about 10 a. m. Some of the best generalship and some of the worst was displayed in the next few hours of dust and heat. The Confederate General Bee said: "There stands Jackson like a stone wall." Colonel Sherman was there, but not Colonel Grant. Neither McDowell nor Beauregard knew what went on or what to do. Each got but 18,000 of their roughly 30,000 troops into combat.

Late in the afternoon Beauregard and the rest of them thought they were licked. Their luck was McDowell and his men also decided they'd had it, and did something about it. They disengaged, brigade by brigade, and it went from retreat, to rout, to panic. The Congressmen and other sightseers got mixed in this fantastic melee, and pushed into the ditches. Beauregard didn't pursue. He and Jeff Davis had a big row about it afterward. Jeff Davis never captured Washington, and he might have Monday.

One cannot describe this first disaster to the northern arms in such stunning terms as it has been described:

"The defeated troops commenced pouring into Washington over the Long Bridge * * * The sun rises, but shines not * * * The men appear, they come in disorderly mobs, queer looking objects, strange eyes and faces, drenched and fearfully worn,

hungry, haggard, blistered in the feet * * * Amid the deep excitement, crowds and motion, and desperate eagerness, it seems strange to see many, very many, of the soldiers sleeping—in the midst of all sleeping. They drop down anywhere, on the steps of houses, on the sidewalk, and deeply sleep * * * some in squads, comrades, brothers, close together—and on them as they lay, sulkily drips the rain * * * The hour, the day, the night passed, and whatever returns, an hour, a day, a night like that can never return again."

Those are the words of Walt Whitman, who was there, and to air a prejudice a little further, it would seem that when an hour, a day, a night can never return to America it would be well to leave the field where that travail began as it is, for quiet and memory, and not plaster it with neo-Greek architecture and octopi motor-parks.

Pacific Coast Shipbuilding, a Low Ebb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions during the past 30 years the Pacific coast shipyards have been called upon to contribute to the bridge of ships which have supplied our forces in foreign wars. During World War II the San Francisco Bay area was one of our largest shipbuilding centers and many thousands of men were employed in this activity.

It should be remembered however that prior to 1939 the shipbuilding skills and organizations had been practically lost on the west coast through long disuse. A start was made in 1939 with the building of two ships in an Oakland yard. It required 4 years to build up the industry to the full capacity required. It did not reach its maximum production until 1943. Ultimately, the west coast produced about half of the wartime tonnage even though the war was half over before its full ability could be brought into use.

Once more history is repeating itself. On the San Francisco Bay shores there are three major shipyards operated by private industry. The Todd shipyard in Alameda, on March 26, 1951, was employing only 128 skilled men. The Bethlehem yard in San Francisco was employing only 200 men, the lowest number in its history. The Moore drydock yard in Oakland was employing approximately 350 men, but all on repair work, most of which has probably already been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of these remarks the letter, dated March 26, 1951, from Mr. Mario Grossetti, business manager of Local 9, Shipfitters and Helpers of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers. Similar information has reached me from other sources. Mr. Grossetti's letter is as follows:

I am writing to give you a report of the conditions in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry in the San Francisco Bay area.

At present, you, like anyone else, are hearing the cry that there is a labor shortage of skilled mechanics in the private shipyards and navy yards. This talk is all false, as there are plenty of unemployed journeymen in the metal trades-unions.

As of this writing, I will quote you some figures of some of the shipyards:

Todd Shipyard, Alameda, is now at its lowest, with 128 men. Very bad.

Bethlehem, San Francisco, lowest it has ever been—200 men.

Then there is Moore Drydock, which is employing a little more than the above figure, but it is only repair work, and the men will probably be off by the time you receive this letter.

The reason for it being so slow is that the Government has not seen fit to supply the west-coast shipyards with any ship construction or any amount of repair work.

The navy yards are doing all the Navy work and trying to use up the manpower in the area. There is a demand for skilled mechanics at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard, also the Mare Island Navy Yard, Vallejo. But why is there a shortage in the navy yards?

1. They do not pay the prevailing rate in the area, which is $1.93 per hour. The navy yards will not hire you for this rate, but will at $1.81 per hour. It is true they have two other rates of $1.89 and $1.97, but they tell us you must hire in at the minimum rate, which is $1.81 per hour.

At present there is an order for 100 shipfitters at the San Francisco naval shipyard. I could fill that order and still have men available, if something could be done about getting at least the union scale in the navy yards. I have been trying to get my people to go into the navy yards, but they are refusing to go in at the minimum rate, especially when they have 10 or 20 years experience behind them. They figure they are mechanics, and should be entitled to more than the minimum rate.

2. When you hire in at the navy yards, they give you a strict physical examination, which is eliminating many good mechanics. I say this is unjust because the people they are hiring in are only temporary employees, and anyone who worked around the shipyards is bound to have a little high blood pressure, or some other minor ailment.

3. President Truman and the administration a few months back told private industry they should try to place as many handicapped people to work as possible. The Government should practice what they preach, and employ handicapped workers in the navy yards.

4. After you are O.K.'d for work, it takes you from 3 to 4 weeks to go through a security test. By that time you are disgusted or broke; so you pick a job some other place.

Now, I have outlined some of the difficulties which one has to go through in order to work in the navy yards. I hope that something can be done to make it easier to get employment in navy yards. I know that the navy yards come under the civil service, and that there is procedure that one must follow, but on temporary employees I say if it is possible, something should be done to eliminate all this for temporary employees.

One other thing, while I am writing, which I would like to call to your attention, is that I have seen a news release stating that the Japanese Finance Ministry agreed today to lease the shipbuilding facilities at the former Japanese naval yard at Kure to the American National Bulk Carrier Co. The firm was understood planning to build tankers in Kure. I think a little investigation should be made to find out why so many American companies are going foreign to perform their work. If it keeps up, it would seem to me that the Americans may have to migrate to foreign countries for employment.

Penalties for Violation of the Narcotics Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the most frightening social problem facing this country at the present time is the rising incidents of narcotic-drug habits among the young school children of both sexes as reported in so many large cities. As a rule, both school officials and the police find themselves without means to check the growth of this evil and face an impossibility in their attempts to eradicate it. There is reason to believe that the spread of this most horrible of vices, believed by some medical authorities to be incurable, is being deliberately fostered for purposes of profit.

The Federal Narcotics Bureau has reported that illegal traffic in narcotics has advanced at such a stepped-up rate that peddlers have even stooped to giving teen-agers free shots to start them on the road to addiction. The United States Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., reported last November that in the first 10 months of 1950 it had received 203 addicts under the age of 20 years as compared to 13 in 1948. The Lexington Hospital is the only public one convenient to the larger centers of drug addiction and is indicative of the trend now existing.

One of the worst aspects of the problem is that the drug habit leads very quickly and almost inevitably into crime. The craving for the drug soon surpasses the possibility of satisfying it, and thus the girls resort to prostitution and the boys to various forms of crime, including robbery and hold-ups, in order to secure money with which to procure additional supplies. Or of equal gravity they become purveyors of the drug and are used as the means of recruiting new victims.

A perusal of newspapers from most cities in this country shows that the problem is just about universal in scope. Attempts have been made and are continuing to be made to combat this vicious evil but with little permanent effect. A major enforcement hitch is that narcotics laws carry light sentences. Persons convicted of narcotics offenses are fined relatively small amounts of money and if imprisoned are sentenced for short periods of time. In this respect the penalty for conviction is certainly not a deterrent to continuing violation and court records indicate that probation is often granted the violator which permits him to carry on his filthy operations.

It has been proved that in those areas where a realistic approach to the problem has been made through heavy fines and long terms of imprisonment, violations have amazingly decreased. Apparently the only language which these villainous and foul traders in human misery understand is fear of actual, effective punishment.

With this thought in mind, I have today submitted a bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating the narcotic laws. This bill would provide heavy mandatory fines and compulsory minimum sentences greatly in excess of those authorized in the present law. A mandatory life imprisonment is called for upon conclusive evidence that the offense is the third conviction of the offender.

While this may seem to be quite drastic it still does not actually make the punishment fit the crime. Those of us who have had the misfortune to have seen, at first hand, the ravages of dope addiction well realize this. There could be no punishment which would adequately compensate for the human suffering and misery caused by this affliction worse than death itself.

I am convinced that if this bill should be enacted into law it will check and greatly reduce the present widespread violations of the narcotics laws. It will certainly give our enforcement officials an effective and much-needed weapon with which to combat that vicious and fiendish industry.

Importance and Responsibility—Bureau of Ordnance, Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. I had the very special privilege of being present and hearing an interesting, forthright, and outstanding speech of Rear Adm. M. F. Shoeffel, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, United States Navy, before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce at Camden, Ark., on Tuesday evening, March 27, 1951.

There were some 800 people who attended this annual dinner meeting and heard Admiral Schoeffel discuss the duties, responsibilities, and the importance of the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy Department. On this occasion the Navy was honored with special emphasis on the naval ammunition depot at Shumaker, which is near Camden, Ark.

I was very much impressed as were those who had the privilege of hearing the Chief of the Naval Ordnance, in that the reactivation of this depot as a vital part of our ordnance program is of such great importance to our national defense and mobilization program, our future security, and our efforts toward a real and lasting peace.

I am sure the admiral's discussion would be of real interest to every Member of this Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD:

The reason for being of the Bureau of Ordnance is to furnish the firepower which enables our Navy to be a potent member of the team dedicated to the preservation of a free world.

The responsibility of the Bureau includes research and development, manufacture, procurement, maintenance, storage, and issue of all offensive and defensive arms and armament of the Navy—air, surface, and submarine—plus a considerable responsibility for the arms of the Marine Corps.

In discharging these responsibilities the Bureau depends partly upon its own stations, partly upon our friends in khaki or in Air Force blue, partly upon universities, and partly upon industry. The facilities outside the Navy have always played an important part in the program of the Bureau in connection with our requirements for certain types of ordnance—and when we must go to mass production in times of emergency. But to discharge every phase of its responsibility effectively, the Bureau must maintain the hard core of its own ordnance shore establishment, including its research laboratories, ordnance plants, and ammunition depots.

The Bureau's own part of its research program is conducted principally at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md., and the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif. Our center for research, development, and design of rockets is at Inyokern, Calif., which covers over 1,000 square miles in the Mojave Desert, and is actually a town in itself. As I develop my subject you will see why rockets are of particular interest to you here in Camden. The Naval Gun Factory in Washington, D. C., is our principal manufacturing plant for hardware. Aviation fire-control equipment and bombsights are made at Naval Ordnance Plant, Indianapolis, Ind.; torpedoes at Naval Ordnance Plant, Forest Park, Ill.; and the Naval Powder Factory at Indian Head, Md., produces the most advanced types of explosives. Much of this equipment is tested and proved at the Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.

Naval ammunition depots, located at strategic points throughout the United States, comprise the largest part of the ordnance shore establishment. The principal functions of these depots are to load, store, repair and issue all types of ammunition. The importance of the repair and storage functions cannot be overemphasized. Our experience during World War I and in the initial phases of World War II, when this country had serious deficiencies in both armament and ammunition, has illustrated most forcefully the mistake of throwing away prematurely any ammunition that can be salvaged.

VJ-day came while most of our Navy was in the far western Pacific area preparing for what might have been the greatest campaign of the entire war. As a result of preparing for that operation, very large stocks of ammunition remained on hand in September 1945. It is to the everlasting credit of the responsible people in the Bureau and at its ammunition depots that a large part of these stocks was available for use within a few hours after President Truman ordered United States forces to meet the Communist threat in Korea. In spite of budget limitations, in spite of higher priorities for research and development of new weapons and ammunition, and in spite of the necessity for expenditures of new types of ammunition for training, the Bureau was able to keep reserve stocks, totaling approximately $2,500,000,000 in value, in serviceable condition. The genuine saving to the taxpayers has afforded all of us justifiable satisfaction. Since 1945, nearly 500,000 tons of rockets, bombs, projectiles, and related items which make up the fire power of your Navy, have been reconditioned annually, at a cost of approximately 3 percent of the replacement value.

The Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, Ark., participated significantly in that far-reaching reconditioning and storage program until 1949, when national economy measures necessitated a severe cutback in all of our ordnance stations. Many of our depots, including Shumaker, were placed in maintenance or inactive status at that time.

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea last June changed the picture overnight. "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition" became more than just a forgotten melody. Coastal ammunition depots and overseas bases worked practically around the clock loading the ammunition for our fighting forces. To keep pace with the tremendous expansion in expenditures and replacement requirements, reactivation and expansion of the ordnance shore establishment was given No. 1 priority. After a survey made in August 1950, it was decided to reactivate the Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, as the Nation's primary facility for the production of rockets.

As you know, one of the most effective and spectacular weapons in the Korean fighting to date has been the rocket. Carrier-based Navy and Marine planes have been blasting away with rockets at enemy installations, including railroad bridges, ammunition dumps, trains, trucks, and the like, and in close support of the troops. The "Tiny Tim," the Navy's largest and most powerful rocket, which was developed toward the end of World War II and produced at Shumaker, for use against enemy shipping, is being used with telling effects against land targets in the Korean War. The Navy is also supplying rockets to the Air Force for its vital role in beating down the Communist threat. In the surprise Inchon landing rockets loaded at the Shumaker depot contributed materially to the success of the operation. These included both aircraft rockets and rockets launched from amphibious fire support ships.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the plant at Shumaker came into being during the latter part of World War II, to meet the lack of production facilities for all types of rockets. It was named after the late Capt. Samuel Robert Shumaker, United States Navy, who, as head of the Research Division of the Bureau of Ordnance, had contributed in a great measure to the development of the modern Navy rocket. The site for the plant, near Camden, Ark., was selected by a special board appointed for the purpose as the most favorable of a number under consideration and investigation.

The original plans for the Shumaker plant called for an expenditure of approximately $200,000,000. A little over $100,000,000 had been expended by the time VJ-day arrived, and construction was suspended. The first rockets were produced on April 25, 1945, just 5 months and 4 days after work on the plant was initiated. The shooting phases of that war ended before the full benefit of the plant's productive capacity could be realized, and operations were necessarily drastically curtailed in the fall of 1945.

Upon the reactivation of your naval ammunition depot here last September, $33,000,000 was made available mainly for the construction of the following additional facilities:

1. Completion of three production lines.
2. Expanded electric battery charging buildings.
3. Construction of 120 magazines.
4. Construction of 23 storehouses.
5. Completion of cafeteria of 1,000 capacity.
6. Construction of bachelor civilian quarters.

In addition to the bachelor civilian quarters, the Bureau is now seeking approval for the construction of a number of family housing units.

In order to test rockets at greater distances—a distinct advantage in the utilization of these weapons—we are extending the test range approximately 7 miles beyond its present limits. There are obvious advantages and economies in having test ranges located at the loading plant.

When the construction here is completed a thumbnail sketch of the situation will

be that rockets developed at Inyokern will be assembled here. From every lot produced here a number will be tested on the ranges across the river. Employment for the current construction work will probably reach a peak of about 3,000 employees very shortly, and should hold that figure for several months. Additional funds are being requested for the purpose of continuing the necessary expansion of the facilities to keep pace with our planned requirements.

The deactivation of Shumaker in 1949, brought about by sharp national economy measures, necessarily entailed a corresponding large-scale cut-back in the Navy payroll of this community. The low point was reached on June 30, 1950, when only 141 people were employed. This employment represented an approximate monthly payroll of $36,000. Employment increased rapidly upon the reactivation of the station and by March 1, 1951, the number of workers had increased to 1,155, with a monthly payroll of about $300,000. The estimated employment figure for June 30 of this year is 2,250, with a corresponding approximate increase in payroll to $825,000. The tentative plans of the Bureau include even more expansion in the following year and a payroll that may exceed a million dollars a month. We have studied the labor market in this area and are confident that with the help and cooperation of all concerned we will be able to reach the higher employment level. It has been particularly interesting to me to learn recently that your retail sales in Camden for the entire year of 1950 amounted to about a million and a half dollars. You can see that in a few months the Navy payroll alone should equal that figure every 6 or 8 weeks.

The personnel figures that I have just outlined are based on the requirements necessary for the depot to accomplish its assigned mission. I repeat that the mission most importantly includes: The preparation, loading, storage, and issuing of rocket-type ammunition and the reconditioning and preservation of rockets and related ammunition parts.

I am sure that all of you have a sympathetic understanding of the tremendous problems which are bound to arise when facilities and production must be increased at such a rapid pace. I know that I speak for Captain Cullen and his staff, as well as for the Bureau of Ordnance, when I assure you that everything possible will be done to accomplish the objectives necessary to discharge our obligations, with the least possible disruption to the community. After all, the plant is an integral part of your community. Many of the employees are relatives and neighbors of yours. I feel confident that all of you, together with the many other loyal citizens which make up this fine community, will bear with us in our growing pains in the creation of this great American arsenal.

Even when the present emergency shall have passed, the naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, will occupy an important place in the permanent ordnance establishment of the Navy as its principal rocket-assembly facility.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1951.*
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request by cable from Rome to forward following message from National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., to you:

"Recent tour of Korean battle front and American installations elsewhere in Asia and Europe confirms belief universal military training would have prevented untold casualties, saved many American lives, and will strengthen our future defense against communism. The American Legion urges support for universal military training and is strongly opposed to any amendment that would defer it or separate it from present bill."

Granville S. Ridley, Edward A. Hayes, Perry Brown, Warren H. Atherton, B. W. Gearhart, Fred Alger, George N. Craig, Ray O. Garber, Bruce Henderson, American Legion Security Training Committee.

Address of Edward T. T. Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an address delivered by Edward T. T. Williams before the meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, November 29, 1950:

I am sure all of you are somewhat sober as the result of the news that has come from Korea. I know I am. We are somewhat like the man who carried a case of chronic appendicitis around with him for 6 or 7 months, and then because of acute pain was forced to consult a surgeon. The surgeon, after examination, said in effect: "Yes, you're going to have to go into the hospital immediately for an appendectomy; and while you're there and so long as you will be under a general anesthetic anway, perhaps I'd better remove those two growths that you have—one on each eye. They seem to be at least 5 years old each."

As we look at the international scene, we can readily see that Russia has a purpose, a single-minded purpose. We know that Russia is growing stronger, that Russia is ruthless and that Russia is realistic; and when I say Russia, I mean international communism.

It must be equally apparent to you, as you have watched the domestic scene, that we lack purpose, unless you want to call self-defense a purpose. We have engaged in a curiously inconsistent form of idealism. Certainly we have lacked reality.

Our people talk about the fact that western civilization is threatened by communism. Most Americans don't know what is meant by western civilization. Try it on some of your friends. Ask them what they mean when they say western civilization. You'll get all sorts of answers.

Some will tell you it started with the Greeks. Some will tell you it is Christianity, which is absurd because there are many Jews in western civilization. Some will tell you it is a standard of living. Some will say it is democracy. To me western civilization as we live it and practice it today is less than 400 years old.

The line of demarcation between medievalism and western civilization occurred with the establishment of the Dutch Republic. Garet Garrett selected the significant date as being February 15, 1568. On that day Philip II of Spain condemned the Dutch to die as a nation of Bible readers and heretics. For 10 years there had been religious conflict in the Netherlands. Philip was determined to convert the Dutch to Catholicism. The stubborn Dutch were equally determined not to be converted. And the Dutch fought with a bitter resistance. They fought as individuals, they were not effectively organized. It was a very personal thing and they fought personally.

Philip sent Alva to the Netherlands to enforce his edict. The Dutch were tortured. They were put to the rack. They were condemned to die. They were executed. And as the condemned were carted through the streets in the early morning, they would scream at the men and women who would come out in the early morning to watch them going to be killed. They would exhort the watchers not to succumb to the Spaniards. And when men talk under those circumstances what they have to say carries weight.

As a matter of fact, what they said carried so much weight in the Dutch resistance and it became so bitter that the Spaniards put steel rings over the tongues of the men and women who were being led to be executed, and they had the foresight to heat those steel rings first so they would sear the tongues of the men and women in the carts and they could not talk.

When Alva notified Philip that right after holy week in 1568 he was going to execute 800 Dutchmen, it was quite apparent that mass murder was being practiced. That condition went on for approximately 49 years. Forty-nine years is a lifetime, and it was a long lifetime in those days. It wasn't a question of who was right and who was wrong; it was a question of survival.

When the Prince of Orange finally put into words and phrases some of the theories of natural law, that men do have inalienable rights with respect to religion and the opportunity to pursue both their economic and religious ends, and when Queen Elizabeth sent over 4,000 soldiers the Dutch became free. The Dutch Republic rose on the ashes of its martyrs and became in a short period of time the economic schoolmaster of Europe, because for the first time the great liberals of the day had achieved their purpose. They had freed the individual from a bureaucratic system of administrative control and law as practiced at that time by crown and church.

Well, when the British looked across the channel at this sudden rise of the Dutch, this dynamic upsurge, they were a bit puzzled, because even though Elizabeth had helped the Dutch, she didn't do it because she liked the Dutch; she did it because she hated Philip. Philip was trying to put Mary Stuart on the throne of England and Elizabeth didn't like that.

In England at the time, curiously enough, the prevailing religious philosophy had it that an English gentleman could not work and go to heaven—less than 400 years ago. He could pawn his wife's jewels and go to heaven, but he couldn't lend money. The Jews became the moneylenders of England because of that. It wasn't until the Puritans incorporated in their religious philosophy the fact that a man's work was his calling and that a man could have a moral tone in his business which paralleled the moral tone of his personal life that it was accepted practice in England that a gentleman could work and go to heaven.

When the Puritans threw out the hereditary rulers of England and ended the feudal system in England, they drew the line of demarcation between medievalism and western civilization as we know it, because they, too, freed the individual from a bureaucratic system of administrative control under

which he was helpless to pursue his religious and economic ends.

Well, it was only natural, when the Colonists came to this country—and, as you may recall, many of them went from England to Holland and then came here—that they should carry along that philosophy, the philosophy of western civilization in which the individual was to be free to pursue his religious and economic ends and in which he and his fellows, collectively, were in control of the economic stability of the state through the control of taxation and through the control of the monetary system.

Now, all through the upward surge of western civilization as we know it in these last 400 years, as the French Revolution made its contribution, as France and England and Holland and the United States made their contribution to what I am describing, the hammer in the forge of western civilization was made up of the men and women who worked and saved and put their substance to work, to productive use; the men and the women who worked harder or studied harder or strove harder to make a larger-than-usual contribution in order to receive a larger-than-usual reward.

Well, here we are in the United States today facing a crisis. Five years ago we were the most powerful Nation on earth. We were so strong that we were stronger than any possible coalition of two or three nations. We were so efficient that we could turn out more and better goods than any two or three nations on earth. We were so patriotic that our sons, almost barehanded, fought the Japanese until they received material support. And here we are, looking at Russia, and we are a bit apprehensive. What has happened?

A Swiss historical philosopher by the name of Burckhardt once said a very profound thing. He said, in effect "National civilizations persist not in relation to their power or their patriotism or their efficiency, but in direct relationship to the extent to which they learn and apply the lessons of their own history."

If power 5 years ago hasn't sufficed to make us strong today and if efficiency doesn't leave us too confident and if patriotism may not be enough, where along the line have we failed? Why is it that we are a bit apprehensive? What has happened to change the pattern? Where did we fail to learn and apply the lessons of our own history?

Well, we broke the pattern in England and the United States when we introduced the theory of direct taxation. When William Howard Taft signed the Federal income-tax law, it is reported that he said something like this: "I feel this is unconstitutional, but I am going to sign it because I don't think it will ever exceed 4 percent."

Lenin once wrote a note to the Communist organizers in Switzerland. He said, in effect, "If you can persuade the Swiss to adopt a federal system of direct taxation, that will be the shortest road to socialism and communism." Lenin knew what he was talking about.

We might have gotten by with a system of direct taxation if limits had been established, but when, on September 30, 1930, the British went off the gold standard and when, 2 years later, we followed, we separated, you might say, the other half of this broken pattern. We broke it twice.

Let us see what happened. Let us assume now that in New York or Chicago or your home town, whatever it may be, the city council were to meet tomorrow and pass a resolution and submit that resolution to the voters for approval. A resolution which read to the effect that all of the voters of that city, all of the citizens of that city, would relinquish to the city council the unlimited right to take any or all of the income of the citizens of that town. Do you think that resolution would be adopted? You know as well as I do that if that were presented to any group of citizens by any city council in the United States it would be voted down, possibly 100 to 1. And yet, the citizens of the United States have given that power to another group of men who might just as well be called a city council, because they are no different. They just happen to be called Congressmen and Senators. They have that power, and when they have that power in an unredeemable currency, as has been the case now for almost 20 years, they can abuse the power without penalty.

In other words, prior to that combination, if a government made fiscal mistakes it had to pay penalties. It had to pay higher interest rates on borrowed money. Perhaps it could not borrow money. Everyone, including the taxpayers and the citizens, became aware of the fiscal failures of the party in power. But since we put that combination together, the prevailing British Government or our Government can waste $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 without penalty. They can hide $1,000,000,000 and we can hardly find it.

When there was given to succeeding groups of legislators in England and the United States this right of direct taxation in a nonredeemable currency, we made it possible for them, through unlimited control of the financial substance of the people, to establish bureaucratic systems of administrative law. Operating under the popular and painless analgesic of social reform, so dear to the heart of politicians hoping to perpetuate themselves in office, it was a simple matter to mask the symptoms of economic and political rot which grew insidiously under the surface. The unlimited power to collect money from the people brought with it the unlimited power to distribute money. Control over the economic life of the individual was the result.

And so, as we look at this picture, we discover that the wheel has turned. At the time of the Dutch Republic, the great liberals were the men who wanted to separate and free the individual from a system of bureaucratic control. They wanted to free him from the state, to pursue his religious and economic ends. The great reactionaries were those who wanted to impose bureaucratic controls upon him through the state or the church. Through the cleverness of words, the meaning has changed, and today the great liberals are those who argue for state control, for bureaucratic controls. They argue in opposition to the freedom of the individual, and the great reactionaries are those who are talking as I am talking today to you.

As that wheel has turned, the Catholic Church has turned with it. The Catholic Church, philosophically wise in the ways of history, has made the complete turn of the wheel and is today the arch opponent of international communism. It understands the deep, underlying problem.

Many intelligent people have made the turn of the wheel, too, but not too fortunately for them. You remember that I told you that the hammer in the forge of western civilization was the group of people who worked harder, who saved and who put their substance to productive use; also the people who tried to excel in the profession, sciences and arts, and in business, because out of it might come a greater reward. They were the hammer. But in the last 20 years, during which period the taxes in England went to 40 percent and England was broke, and the taxes in this country went to 30 percent and we were struggling against inflation, during that period these same men and women who were the hammer of western civilization became the anvil. They were hammered from below by pressure groups and they were hammered from above by political manipulators.

There is a political economist in England by the name of M. J. Bonn. He teaches. He made a statement last winter, I believe, and he phrased it in the form of a question. He answered his question by the manner of his asking it. He said, "Is what we have in England today socialism, really, or is it a return to medievalism?" He knew what he was talking about.

He knew that by these combinations of circumstances, changing groups of politicians, conservative, liberal, or labor, were given power over the economic life of the citizenry, which was dangerous, bureaucratic controls through administrative law. And what do we find in this country? Oh, yes; we have a few Democrats and we have a few Republicans who have moral integrity and courage, but by and large the words, "Democrat" and "Republican," give only lip service to this broad, deep concept that we are discussing.

In other words, what have they narrowed it down to? They have narrowed it down to the fact that the great goal of democratic government is to provide economic security for the individual. Under the guise of social reform, under the guise of the beneficent state caring for its people, they have narrowed the philosophy down to that single thought, and we have been talking about pensions, social security, and the protection of the individual personally. Economic security—that is what is has narrowed down to.

Meanwhile, time has proved that the security of the individual is not of paramount importance at all, because, through a combination of ignorance and political greed, political inepitude and group selfishness, we have created such a hodge-podge of economic confusion, mixing the good with the bad, mixing social reforms (some of which were good) with many other things that were bad, that we have threatened the economic security of the state itself. No longer is the security of the individual our paramount problem.

Our paramount problem is to consider what needs to be done to strengthen this country. Just as depositors in a bank cannot regard their five or ten thousand dollars as part of their economic security if the bank collapses, so must the citizens of a republic relinquish their personal security if the State collapses. Today, the principal question that we have to face is the political and economic stability of this country.

You see, what we are facing is an odd test. The test is not whether our civilization is better than communism. The test is not whether our people have a higher standard of living or whether, under our philosophy, people have a better opportunity to fulfill their aspirations. That is not the test at all. It is a much more startling, realistic test than that. The test for the immediate future is simply this: Which civilization is going to survive?

Oh, yes; over long periods of time, the good always wins out. But the Dark Ages lasted for hundreds of years. The Dutch suffered for 49 years. I am sure none of us wants to have the good win out after a 10-, 20-, 30-, or 40-year interlude.

We are therefore facing a test of survival, and when you examine the civilizations of history—and 20 of them have already failed—you become conscious of the fact that one civilization does not conquer another. That never happens. The old civilization collapses. It breaks down from within, because it has lost its political and economic stability.

Now, let's look at the Russian picture quickly. The Russians are dealing in hard

labor and hard money. They work on a piecework system. If you want to get more pay and more food, you make more goods. Often they deal in gold because they have to, or they deal in barter because they have to. It is a rugged economic school in which they are operating.

And what are we doing? We are dealing in soft labor and soft money. We have created a soft Government which tries to provide a soft future for all of our citizens. And in the process of doing it, through subsidy and through direct employment, we have created literally millions of economic parasites.

There was once an Englishman by the name of Lord Melbourne who said: "What the wise men promised has not come to pass, but what all the damn fools said would happen has happened." Our so-called wise men have promised much for a long time. They have become professional promisers. Meanwhile, we and others like us throughout this country of ours are the damn fools that Melbourne was talking about. We saw the things that were wrong. We disagreed with many of the things that were done. Often, we went along for superficial reasons. We knew the truth. We talked about it. We watched the moral and economic tone of this country go down, as expenditures and ambitions for social reform went up.

Social reform is good when it can be digested in the political and economic scheme. Social reform is bad when it cannot be digested.

Now, our business happens to be closely related to the sciences and the professions. Often scientific men and professional men and men who follow the arts think that they are apart from the economic scheme. But we know that the scientific, professional, and cultural horizon is completely circumscribed by the political and economic horizon.

Witness what happened in this country. How much science and culture and art did we have here until we achieved political and economic stability? And so, among scientists and professional men and those who follow the arts, these same apprehensive conversations took place.

Woodrow Wilson once said, "Some men grow up and some men swell up." We have watched our country in the last few years swell up and we have watched some of our politicians swell up. It takes a salary of $19,800 today to give a man essentially the same as a salary of $10,000 in 1940. We have heard politicians talk, sometimes boastingly talk, of the increase in our national product in terms of dollars. When we discuss these gains in terms of dollars, you know and I know that much of what we claim as gain is just economic bloat. That is all that it is—economic bloat.

Why is this subject of significance to a group like this on a day like this, at the end of a meeting? Well, in my book it is important because one of the greatest defaults that has occurred in history has been the default of the intelligent American citizen—his default from his own responsibilities as a citizen. We, Melbourne's damn fools, who knew what was going on, stood off to one side. We weren't organized the way the unions were. We weren't in politics the way the politicians were. And, by and large, we were too lazy, too complacent, too self-satisfied and, in all, too gutless to take this issue and make a personal issue out of it and do something about it.

Whom else would you expect to follow this pattern, examine the facts and be helpful? Certainly, you couldn't expect the first or second generation of immigrants or labor unions to come up with it. You couldn't expect self-indulgent politicians to come up with it. You know as well as I do that with but few exceptions most of our politicians are not leaders. They follow a sort of Gallup-poll technique. They use investigators to find out what the people want and then try to beat them to the punch by giving it to them.

We, representing the intelligent segment of the American population, many millions of us, defaulted, because, unlike the Dutch who were willing to fight personally and unlike the colonists who did the same thing, we left often to lesser men in politics the responsibilities for what was going to happen to this country.

Now, as we look at the present situation, we say, "Well, after all, it looks as though we may be going into another war and, you know, all the rules are off in a war." Yes, that is quite true; many of the rules are all off. But, if another war comes, who will many of the great patriots be? Won't they come from this same group that I am talking about? Haven't they come from this same group for 150 years? Isn't it in our blood to be patriotic? Won't we all go to Washington? Won't our sons fight? Won't our daughters get into it? Hasn't it always happened and won't it happen again?

Of course it will, but I am here to say to you that if we do get into heavy preparations for a war and if we do have to go through the travail and misery of it, if we do have to go through this fight once again, let's learn a lesson from the past. Today all classes of our people—labor, farmers, professional men and businessmen—are confused and anxious. They know something has happened and is happening to our economic stability and they don't like it. Soon they will learn that our entire defense program is dependent upon our civilian economic stability. Soon they will learn that the continuous subsidy of voters of many classes with public money tends inevitably to higher costs, greater subsidies and more inflation. Even the pressure groups who benefit are beginning to worry.

If, during this difficult, trying period, the intelligent thoughtful citizen of the United States isn't willing, savagely and bitterly, if necessary, to make a personal fight out of the issue of protecting our country from the political and economic self-indulgence that has arisen because of the breaking of the historically successful economic pattern, he will make another default. He will default on his own account, as he has done for the last 10 or 20 years, and he will also default on account of his children and his children's children, because they will not live as free men and women.

The Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19 (legislative day of Friday, March 16), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the well-known economist, James P. Warburg, on March 10, 1951, entitled "Let Us Debate the Real Issue."

While Mr. Warburg's views are obviously controversial and will not necessarily meet with general agreement, they are thoughful and very interesting. I believe they merit the consideration of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TALK ABOUT THE REAL ISSUE

(By James P. Warburg)

The great debate, which has been filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the front pages, and the airwaves, seems to me almost wholly irrelevant. The question of sending troops to Europe prior to the outbreak of war should have been debated 2 years ago when the Atlantic security program was proposed to Congress and to the people in a regrettably misleading manner. This program actually involved two commitments, only one of which was frankly disclosed when the treaty was placed before the Senate.

It was made clear that the treaty committed us to go to war with an aggressor against the European signatories. It was not made clear that the administration intended to go beyond the treaty and commit the United States to fight the aggressor along the line of the Elbe River in central Germany.

In urging the Senate to make clear, when it ratified the treaty, that we were not undertaking to defend our allies by necessarily holding any particular line or frontier, I ventured to point out the dangers which seemed to me inherent in any such additional commitment. These were: first, that we should thereby commit ourselves to a preannounced strategy in a possible war with Russia; second, that a commitment to hold up a Russian invasion in central Germany involved building up a force, which as yet did not exist, precisely where it would be most likely to provoke rather than to deter attack; and, third, that to build up such a force we should either have to double our then existing combat strength and send most of it to Germany, or else rearm the Germans themselves.

Senators CONNALLY, VANDENBERG, and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee replied that the suggested clarification was not necessary, since no such second commitment was contemplated. They relied upon the unequivocal assurances of the administration witnesses that no substantial American forces would be sent abroad in advance of war and that the United States would in no circumstances permit the rearming of Germany.

Shortly after the treaty had been ratified, the administration sent up its military aid bill and, in urging this measure, stated that its purpose was to prevent Europe from being overrun, in the event that an invasion should be undertaken. To accomplish this purpose, the bill provided merely a paltry $1,000,000,000.

This was the time when the great debate should have taken place. This was the time to make up our minds whether or not we could and should undertake the commitment, and, if so, to recognize clearly that it meant raising and equipping a powerful new combat force for European garrison duty. This was the time to ventilate the misgivings which are now belatedly expressed after we have committed ourselves to the military defense of Western Europe's frontiers. The issue of sending troops to Europe is no longer debatable except in terms of whether or not the United States shall go back on a solemnly given promise. That is why I say that the current great debate is irrelevant.

There is, however, a much more important issue before us which, so far, has not been debated at all. There is an opportunity before us—perhaps our last—to extricate ourselves with honor from the stultifying position in which we now find ourselves. This opportunity will arise at the meeting of the

Council of Foreign Ministers, for which the deputies are even now preparing the agenda.

The issue we shall face at that meeting—the issue we should be debating now—is whether we want a peace settlement in Europe or the continuation of the arms race and the cold war.

Unless I misread the signs, this impending meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers will either signal the beginning of a process which leads to the reunification of Germany, the healing of the great scar across the face of Europe, and the ultimate making of a European peace settlement, or else it will finalize the partition of Germany, the partition of Europe, and the probability of eventual conflict.

The outcome lies very largely in our hands. It will be decided at least as much by the President and the Secretary of State, before Mr. Acheson goes to the conference, as by what happens at the conference itself.

* * * * *

The Council of Foreign Ministers is not about to resume its function because we desired a meeting. Quite the contrary is the case. The Council is about to meet because the Russians stated last October that they would not tolerate the contemplated rearming of Western Germany and demanded a meeting of the Council to discuss a renewal of the Potsdam pledge against remilitarization and the carrying out of the Potsdam Agreement for the creation of a peaceful and united German nation. Our first inclination was to rebuff this proposal as a piece of effrontery. The French inclination was to welcome a meeting. The official British reaction was indecisive. Since October there has been a voluminous exchange of diplomatic notes, in which the western powers have tried to broaden the agenda for the meeting so as to include all the various existing causes of tension, while the Russians have sought to confine the discussions as closely as possible to Germany. The Russian notes have been couched in the now familiar language of distortion, vilification, and assumed Kremlin infallibility. The western replies, particularly those drafted in Washington, have borne the equally familiar hallmark of weary patience maintained with increasing difficulty. They have breathed an atmosphere of "We'll go through it all again, if we must, but, of course, no good will come of it."

This atmosphere must be changed before our Secretary of State goes to a meeting which may well open or close for good the door that leads to a peaceful settlement. Certainly nothing can be expected of the conference, if we go to it without an affirmative plan of our own. If we go simply in order to defeat the Russian plan, whatever it may be, we shall continue along the present road to disaster.

As a matter of fact, we know what the Russian plan is. The Russians told us all about it last October. Strangely enough, the Russian plan looks very much like our own plan for a German settlement before we abandoned hope of reaching a settlement, in 1947.

The Russians have proposed the unification of Germany. This was our aim from 1945 to 1947. At that time two obstacles stood in the way: Reparations and disagreement as to the terms of unification.

But, last October, the Russians proposed—and I quote their language—"the removal of all hindrances to the development of a peaceful German economy." Now, if this phrase means anything at all, it means that the Russians are willing to forego further reparations, probably because they think they have extracted about everything they can extract from their puppet state. If true, this removes one of the two barriers that stopped us at Moscow 4 years ago.

The Russians have also indicated—less clearly, because this is obviously a bargaining point—that they may be ready to permit free elections and the maintenance of the political freedoms in the whole of a unified Germany. This could be true if, from the Russian point of view, a democratic Germany (in the western sense) appears as less of an evil than a rearmed Western Germany. The hypothesis makes sense to me because the Politburo, while perhaps not too sincerely alarmed over the inclusion of 250,000 Germans in a western defense force, may in fact be very much alarmed over the possibility that, once rearmed, the Germans might slip out from under NATO control and go off on military adventures of their own. In this respect Russian fear of Germany is rather similar to French apprehension. Neither is, in my judgment, unfounded.

Be this as it may, it is, to say the least, possible that the second great obstacle encountered at Moscow may also now be removed.

Why, then, has our Government been so reluctant?

It has been reluctant because the attainment of its own aims in Germany now runs counter to its program of pursuing the cold war until it has built the much-discussed situations of strength from which it wishes to negotiate. The truth is that our Government is caught between two contradictory policies, one of which it must give up or change. It wants to make Western Europe defensible against Russian invasion before it negotiates a peace settlement. To do this, our Government thinks it must rearm Western Germany. On the other hand, our Government wants to arrive at a peace settlement based upon a unified, peaceful, and democratic Germany. This is irreconcilable with seeking to integrate the rearmed half of Germany—two-thirds would be more accurate—in an anti-Soviet coalition.

The solution seems to me quite simple. More by accident than design, we have now maneuvered the Russians into a position where they are apparently willing to unify Germany on our political terms, to give up reparations, to sign a peace treaty, to end the occupation and withdraw occupation forces. In other words, the threat of German rearmament has apparently given us the very situation of strength we needed to attain our ends. Then why not negotiate and find out whether this is true? And, if it is true, why not give up German rearmament in order to obtain the kind of peace settlement we have vainly sought for 5 years?

As I see it, by foregoing German rearmament, we should not be giving up anything of real value to us in any case. Rearming Western Germany would not add to the strength of a West European defense, because the conditions on which West Germany might fight for the west would be precisely those conditions which would make France unwilling to fight. This has become abundantly clear in recent months. Furthermore, rearming Germany would actually add to Russian military strength, because it would make willing allies out of such presently unenthusiastic satellites as Poland and Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, rearming Germany would almost certainly eliminate what hope remains of helping the Germans to become a peace-loving people; it would utterly destroy what little value there may have been in our democratic teaching. And, finally, rearming Germany and building up a huge army along the Elbe River would be the most provocative thing we could do—the one course most likely to bring on a Russian invasion before we were ready to meet it. It did not take General Eisenhower long to come to these conclusions.

Because our proposal to rearm Germany was, in itself, a foolish proposal—for the reasons just stated—I said, a moment ago, that we have attained our ends more by luck than good management. Shall we now be so unwise, so stubborn, so concerned with saving face as not to take advantage of this stroke of good fortune?

Shall we now pursue the cold war as an end in itself, forgetting that we reluctantly embarked upon it only as a means toward reaching a peaceful settlement?

I submit that the No. 1 item of the President's instructions to Mr. Acheson, when he goes to the conference, should read:

"You are authorized to make it clear that, if a settlement of the German question can be reached under which a freely elected all-German Government will be enabled to guarantee the political freedoms to all German citizens, under which a just and honorable peace treaty may be negotiated, demilitarization assured, and occupation forces gradually withdrawn, then the United States will gladly withdraw its suggestion for the inclusion of German forces in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

If our Secretary of State were to begin the discussions with a statement of that sort, defining precisely what we mean by political freedoms, the Council would at once buckle down to the problem which lies at the heart of its assignment. If real progress were made toward reaching agreement on Germany, the Council would then find it infinitely easier to move forward on the question of the long-delayed Austrian Treaty. This, in turn, would open the way to a discussion of the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria; and, finally, to a general discussion of the gradual reduction of all armed establishments.

If, on the other hand, Mr. Acheson follows the past pattern of the peripheral approach—seeking to begin with a discussion of the Austrian Treaty or the troops maintained by or in the Soviet satellites, and leaving the initiative, so far as Germany is concerned, to Mr. Vyshinsky—then I should say that the chances of a constructive outcome will be slim. We shall then, in all probability, witness merely another sorry spectacle of procedural wrangling and propaganda speeches, in which the relatively polite rebuttals of the west will be no less indicative of moral and intellectual bankruptcy than the slanderous vituperations of Andrei Vyshinsky.

The objection may be raised that a German peace settlement at this time, which would in effect "neutralize" Germany in the cold war, would "lay the great workshop of Europe wide open to Soviet aggression or subversion."

So far as military aggression is concerned, I am not suggesting that we abandon our commitment to defend Western Europe. As an alternative to German rearmament, I proposed some months ago that we and the British agree to maintain—not in Germany, but in France and the Low Countries—an Anglo-American garrison of at least 20 divisions, provided that this force would be at least matched by our Continental Allies. This army would be no further from the Rhine than the Russian Army would be from the Oder. It would be a far more reliable force than one which included Germans. It would be far less provocative because it would not include Germans, and because it would not be built up, as is now contemplated, right up against a Russian Army across the Elbe River.

As for political subversion of a neutralized Germany, why should we fear that Russian influence would be stronger than that of the west? Wendell Willkie once remarked that he could not understand why so many Americans made the assumption that, where democracy and communism come into contact, communism is likely to win. Why should we assume that a truly free German people—by which I mean a

people freed not only from foreign coercion but from renascent native reaction—should be susceptible to Communist conspiracy? This danger will be real only if a free Germany becomes a land in which the masses are discontented, which means, if the Government pursues policies that allow the rich to become richer while the poor grow poorer. If western influence is directed toward true democracy, why should we fear that the German people will fall for the false promises of the east?

The assumption that a "neutral" Germany will necessarily fall prey to the Kremlin is defeatism of the most dangerous variety.

Let me make certain that I have made my major point unequivocally clear.

No matter what the Russians have done or failed to do in the past—no matter how untruthful their often-repeated allegations as to our motives and actions—no matter how churlish the behavior of their negotiators—there is now apparently—and I repeat, apparently—a real chance that a German peace settlement can be achieved.

A German peace settlement is fundamental to a peace settlement in Europe. A European peace settlement is a prerequisite for the establishment of enduring peace throughout the world.

Even if a kindly history should absolve us of all blame for what has happened up to this moment, history will not forgive us if we fail—through stubbornness, or pride, or stupidity—to make the most of this opportunity.

May it be given to those harassed and overburdened men, in whose hands rests not only our future but the future of all mankind, to seize upon this moment and to make it the turning point toward peace.

The Puyallup Valley Daffodil Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday the House and Senate restaurants, abloom with bright yellow daffodils, brought to the Nation's Capitol a bit of spring from my home State, the great and beautiful evergreen State of Washington. This came about through the generosity of the Puyallup Valley Daffodil Festival, Inc., of my own Pierce County, to Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, from Tacoma, and to the junior Senator from the State of Washington. This corporation, each year, stages a colorful flower festival, the highlight of which is a parade of beautiful floats, for which over a million daffodil blooms are used each year. Festivities during the 3 days of the daffodil festival take place in Puyallup and Sumner, in the fertile Puyallup River Valley near Tacoma, and in Tacoma itself.

This year the festival will be held on April 6, 7, and 8. Out home we have come to regard this annual festival, of which this is to be the eighteenth, as a sort of official recognition of the coming of spring.

The April issue of Nation's Business carries a well-illustrated article They're Daffy Over Daffodils on this now nationally famous festival and industry. The author is Mr. William L. Worden, a close friend of mine, who, when he isn't traveling over the world pursuing his profession as a writer, lives in Tacoma. Many of my colleagues, I am sure, have read and enjoyed his articles written from Korea and Japan, which have been recently appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

Because Mr. Worden's article in Nation's Business tells the story of the daffodil bulb industry of the Puyallup Valley so colorfully, I am sure that the Senators will enjoy reading it, especially after having seen the blooms in the Senate restaurant, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY'RE DAFFY OVER DAFFODILS

(By William L. Worden)

The road was narrow and the ruts were deep. Cumbersome Marmon sedans risked muddy shoulders to let model-T Fords and four-cylinder Chevrolets get by. Ladies with cloches down over their ears snapped pictures with box cameras, and transplanted Dutch farmers patrolled fences to keep small boys from trampling all over rows of yellow daffodils. The farmers did not care about the daffodil blooms but perspired for the bulbs below them. Tempers and radiators boiled over.

It was a mess, and also a very typical April week-end scene on the byroads of Washington State's Puyallup Valley in 1927.

On an early Saturday in April 1951, the highways of the Puyallup Valley—wider now, and paved—will be lined with 30,000 or 40,000 people, and the streets of Tacoma, Puyallup, and Sumner will hold another 100,000, while floats, bands, and marching organizations pass in a parade featuring 1,000,000 daffodil blossoms. At the same time a field house will be filled with thousands of flowers—rare varieties and floral arrangements by professionals and amateurs. The following day ski races in the nearby mountains and a yacht parade on Puget Sound will also feature daffodils, as prizes and decorations, respectively.

This is an eye-filling show and has a mouth-filling name—the eighteenth annual Puyallup Valley Daffodil Festival. A visitor may wonder at the spectacle of four communities going into a week-end business paralysis over flowers; but he is not likely to suspect either that this celebration grew out of a rural traffic jam, or that it has been thriving for 18 years just because people like yellow flowers.

Daffodils don't sound like much of an industry, but they are. The valley is a 15-mile-long, 3-mile-wide strip of rich soil along the banks of the Puyallup River between Mount Rainier's glaciers and Puget Sound. It had been a hop-growing center since settlement days in the 1880's, but was reeling in the early 1920's under the twin blows of prohibition and a hop-killing insect pest. A United States Department of Agriculture expert happened on the scene during a search for an area in which an American bulb industry could be started to compete with the centuries-old Dutch monopoly on daffodils, tulips, irises, and lilies. Here he found suitable soil and landowners who were looking for a new crop.

It was a happy marriage, from the start. Bulbs grew disease-free, larger than the Holland imports and, most important, a full 2 weeks ahead of the Dutch season. Dutch immigrants supplied knowledge of bulb culture and their Yankee neighbors built machinery—bulb planters, diggers, and sorters—to get away from the tedious handwork which always had been part of the industry. Almost immediately bulb growing provided a profitable side line for a farmer with an acre or two to spare. Later, it proved even more practical as a large-scale, industrialized farm operation.

In the Puyallup Valley and half a dozen similar areas in Washington, Oregon, and Michigan, growers specialized from the first in supplying big, fat bulbs to florists and greenhouses. These were forced by the buyers—hence the importance of the 2-week seasonal advantage—and the blooms sold in January or February at high winter prices. A bulb with the unlovely name of the Double-nosed King Alfred became the premium product because it would produce two big and spectacular blooms.

The bulbs were good enough to capture a share of the American market immediately; and with World War II, the capture became complete. Machine methods, accurate grading, disease-free guaranties, and competitive prices have kept the American bulbs abreast of imports in the postwar years.

As an industry, daffodil growing is firmly established on nearly a thousand Puyallup acres, producing 8,000,000 bulbs for sale annually. Washington State as a whole sells 15,000,000. Bulb fields and sorting sheds provide jobs for laborers, school youngsters, and housewives during the season; and the industry maintains skilled farm labor the year around—including men who can look down a row of thousands of daffodils in bloom, pick out two or three of the wrong variety and transplant them, still keeping their eyesight.

Forty acres of daffodils in full bloom, with a snow-capped mountain in the background, form a beautiful picture; but the blossoms have only about the same connection with the final product as tassels do to a field of corn. Careful bulb growers leave blossoms in the field until they begin to wither, then send crews in to top them, collecting the withered flowers as insurance against providing havens for pests but throwing them away once they are out of the field. To cut blooms before they start to wither reduces bulb size as much as 15 percent.

Growers never had any commercial interest in the crowds who drove out to see the fields in the twenties. The market was in New York, Chicago, or St. Louis, but not in the western Washington area where daffodils grow so readily that everybody has them in his own garden. The few flowers the grower might permit his children to sell from a roadside stand did not begin to equal losses caused by careless amateur photographers and sightseers who ruined the back roads and trampled the bulbs.

However, it's hard to stop somebody who really wants to look at flowers. After a few abortive attempts, the growers decided it was easier to bring the flowers to the lookers.

The town of Sumner started with a budget of $25 and a small parade at the height of the blossoming season. Trucks and wagons were decorated with a few thousand discarded daffodil heads. Simultaneously, a few of the major growers displayed a collection of their choice daffodils in a corner of the town's high school gymnasium.

Some Tacoma and Seattle newspaper photographers showed up to take pictures—and the festival was launched. The town of Puyallup joined the celebration on another spring, and then Tacoma followed. The parade acquired bands, more floats, and the inevitable festival queen.

Today, the festival includes the tiny town of Orting among the celebrants. A board of

directors representing chambers of commerce, business and growers works throughout the year without pay. Ski and yacht clubs cooperate by arranging their specialties in conjunction with the main show; and professional growers team with women's garden club members to stage the flower exhibition.

The daffodil festival is a big show—but you'd never guess it from the budget.

Five thousand dollars is the most the directors ever have had—obtained through the sale of 50-cent daffodil buttons and through contributions.

Daffodil growers actually make the largest contribution. Since the war, the industry has begun shipping thousands of cut flowers by air freight direct to city markets, thus short-cutting part of the old bulb-forcing system. But at the height of the cut-flower season, they deliver 1,000,000 flowers to the parade—selling them last year for $3.50 a thousand at a time when the going price was $14.

In the Puyallup Valley, a festival means that a couple of hundred businesses and businessmen, a farm industry, a majority of the area's feminine gardeners, and the representatives of one city and three country towns do a lot of work together. They brave uncertain weather, blister themselves arranging flowers and bang their fingers building floats, putting together one of the country's most beautiful shows.

There really isn't any reason—except that they all like daffodils.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1951, by Gilbert A. Robinson, 48–13 One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Street, Flushing, N. Y. The writer is a young man, now 23 years of age, who left college at the age of 18 to voluntarily serve in the Armed Forces. He believed in universal military training.

I commend this to the reading of my colleagues because it gives a different and a refreshing point of view from much we have heard here on the floor in recent days:

YOUTH CONSIDERS UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(By Gilbert A. Robinson)

(Our author, having entered the armed services at the age of 18, spent some time in the Aleutians. He evaluates the defense effort from the points of view of many young men in the services, high-school and university students, as well as his own, and has based his article on these observations.)

There is strife in the American home today. The shoes have switched feet. Youth is attempting to educate its parents. But parents seem harder to educate than they claim their youngsters once were. Paradoxical? Yes, but true.

In many homes we have the strange situation of youth trying to reorient their parents' thinking along lines which will be most conducive to the over-all good of the Nation—namely, legislation for universal military training and the 18-year-old draft.

The pros and cons of these issues seem to strike right at the home itself. Many homes are finding that there is a rift in the thinking of the parents and their children. Many mothers, either from maternal or other views, do not wish their sons to go. On the other hand, the sons desire to do what they deem is in the best interest for the country as a whole.

Parents, as voters, are exercising their constitutional prerogative of writing to their Congressmen about the 18-year-old draft and UMT legislation now pending in Congress. The elder statesmen, military men, educators, and organized groups have all voiced their opinions, but, up to now, youth has been reticent.

From my conversation with students, veterans, servicemen, and those who are working, I feel that youth seems forcefully to recognize that the United States must be strong; to be strong we must maintain a well-trained military force; and that, last but not least, they constitute this force.

We agree, youth says, that we need an army; we agree it is youth's responsibility. Why, then, all the complications and debate? youth is asking today. All we ask is that the system be a fair one, with equitable distribution in length of service.

Many of those in the high schools and colleges in the 18-to-20 age bracket, looking ahead, feel that they are capable of taking on the responsibilities that military service incurs. Those to whom I have spoken who have already served look back and, speaking with more authority, generally agree that no undue hardships were sustained by virtue of service alone. They clearly recognize that there are temptations to which young men entering military service must remain alert, but that mere watchful consideration of these principles should not deter us from using those who can serve best.

Some feel that life in an army camp is not at all conducive to the higher things in life. On the other side, there are sentiments expressed by one college graduate, considered an adept student of history, who pointed to another line of thinking. He thought that we should have had universal military training 30 years ago, and that perhaps we would have spared ourselves much.

He pointed out that all other major powers by 1938, except Great Britain and the United States, had UMT. In 1938 the British adopted it, and now we stand alone. He believes we should not adopt it solely because we stand alone but by its proved merits. In view of the fact that we want a North Atlantic agreement with teeth in it, he poses this question: Why should not we as leaders catch up to our allies in this one field, so we could keep astride of our leadership?

Youth appears not only to be thinking of direct military service but also to be tying together the lessons they are learning, or have learned, about the world's past mistakes. Many students speak in ordinary conversational terms of the mistakes in not deterring aggression in Manchuria in 1931, in Ethiopia in 1936, and in Poland in 1939, and they point to the lesson of the man with the umbrella.

The majority seem to recognize the signs and see a direct approach to stopping aggression wherever it may occur by being prepared. Therefore youth, I feel, is agreeing with the UMT provisions. Not only do many graduates, veterans, and students consider it an essential step to maintain peace and cooperate with the UN, but think it is an essential part of the draft. They reason that any selective service system without UMT to keep a growing trained reserve would naturally increase the length of time each draftee would have to serve.

Congressman HILLINGS, of California, himself only 28 years of age, the youngest Representative in Congress, reflected the opinion of youth when he said: "UMT is an essential realistic approach to peace. Military service alone is not detrimental, but in effect gives an individual a more balanced perspective of and tolerance for the beliefs of people with whom he associates."

The second youngest Representative, Congressman BENTSEN, of Texas, substantiated the views of youth by reference to his own experience as an enlisted man. It was his observation that men in the service matured more rapidly but were not altered in their moral standards.

Both Congressmen were of the opinion that their colleagues feel substantially that UMT and the 18-year-old draft are very advisable under the circumstances. It is quite significant to note that over 50 percent of the Members of both Houses of Congress (59 out of 96 Senators and 224 out of 435 Representatives) have seen military service.

These same Congressmen feel that the preponderance of mail against UMT and the 18-year-old draft is coming from mothers who have sons who would be directly affected by the pending legislation. And these adult views, constituting votes, count quite heavily with Congressmen. They also feel that hearing directly from youth itself could produce a wholesome effect on Congress.

It could be that while youth is trying to educate their elders they might very well take a lesson from them in forcefully making their views part of public opinion.

As a Defense Project the St. Lawrence Seaway Is Substantially Worthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 15, 1951, issue of the Springfield (Mass.) Union reveals that as a defense instrument the St. Lawrence project is substantially worthless from the point of view of both power and navigation.

The editorial follows:

THE DEFENSE LABEL

Among other things, the President advocates an immediate start on construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. He says the navigation features and the power capacity of the St. Lawrence project are necessary for the national defense.

It seems that all one has to do to justify increased taxes, swollen national debt, and usurpation of enterprise by bureaucracy is to talk of the necessity for national defense. As a defense instrument the St. Lawrence development is substantially worthless, from the point of view of both power and navigation.

The 570,000 kilowatts of firm power which could be developed on the American side of the river would be scarcely a drop in the bucket; certainly not the indispensable thing for national defense that has been pictured by the more ardent of the advocates. Again, there's no need to point out that, small though the St. Lawrence development would be in the total picture, it would, nevertheless, represent an ideal objective of aerial warfare, particularly when combined with the bottleneck features of transportation to and from the Great Lakes Basin.

The St. Lawrence proponents cheerfully pass up the hundreds of millions of dollars

and the many thousands of defense personnel necessary to guard this concentrated facility against attack from the air and from the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It may be trite to note that one well-placed bomb would wreck the entire project. Army engineers have stated that one bomb could destroy the Panama Canal. The St. Lawrence is a more accessible target.

There is only one way to provide power capacity for national defense, beyond what would be created by the natural operation of economic process. That way is to create the capacity and hold it idle against the day when more power may be needed than can be dug up by conversion of industry and by operation on a three-shift basis.

As a hard-headed, practical matter, if we must have idle capacity in preparation for war, the best way to have it is as extra reserve capacity in the diversified power plants scattered throughout the country, reasonably close to the munition industries. Even the advocates of the St. Lawrence seem to recognize the fact that the project would not create idle power capacity, since, in their enthusiasm for a really good story, they envisage a managed economy whereunder industry would be brought to the region from less subsidized parts of the country, and all the capacity utilized right up to the hilt under a preferential process of definitely socialistic character; and this quite regardless of defense needs.

We have then an interesting device whereby, in the guise of equipping us to fight a war for freedom, an additional collectivist undertaking is advanced.

No nation, not even ours, has a fund of resources beyond its needs. What we squander must come out of what we should usefully employ. What we waste on a fictitious defense must be at the expense of our real ability to take care of ourselves or must mean adoption of a lower standard of living. Every capital expenditure put into the hands of Government is, with the personnel related to it, just so much of our strength frozen into the rigidity of superorganization.

It is regrettable that the President has lent his ear to the public power gang. They are bent on complete collectivization of electric power supply and they are confident they can get it. Only the votes of the citizens of this country can stop them. Only public respect for enterprises that are competent, only public appreciation of the superior services private companies render, self-supporting taxpayers, and public disfavors for agencies that waste public resources in unjustifiable projects can produce those votes.

Saving Money for the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the press a news article dealing with the suggestion of an 8-year-old boy of Mobile, Ala., which has enabled the Post Office Department to effect a considerable saving.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, together with a brief editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington News, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEA OF MOBILE YOUNGSTER TO SAVE POST OFFICE SOME MONEY

WASHINGTON, March 28.—An 8-year-old down in Mobile, Ala., has brought about a money-saving change in the stamping of air mail.

He is Gregg Buckalaw, post office box 1378, Mobile.

He recently wrote to Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson suggesting that the "via" be dropped from the phrase "via air mail" which post offices everywhere rubber-stamp on items for plane delivery. "Via" is Latin for "by way of."

Donaldson has advised Gregg that his suggestion is good and is being promptly adopted.

The youngster wrote, with an accompanying illustration:

"You can save a lot of money by doing this. You can save by taking the via off the air-mail letters. You can save almost a third of rubber and it is a critical war material besides.

"Yours truly,

"GREGG BUCKALAW."

The Postmaster General replied:

"The postal service belongs to all the people and serves all the people, and one of the reasons why the Post Office Department can give so much service for so little is that people like you are interested and take time to write letters to me, suggesting ways for improving the service and reducing expenses.

"I am issuing instructions that hereafter all rubber stamps purchased by the Post Office Department for endorsing letters and parcels to be sent by air will read "air mail," omitting the word "via," which after all is entirely unnecessary.

"Sincerely yours,

"JESSE M. DONALDSON."

SAVING NOT ESTIMATED

Donaldson made no estimate of how much money will be saved.

At Mobile, Gregg told reporters he came across the idea by curiosity.

A few weeks ago he received an air-mail letter from his brother Vardy, a student at the University of North Carolina.

His attention centered on the marking "via air mail."

"What does the 'via' mean?" he asked his father, who is an accountant.

Buckalaw explained the Latin meaning.

"Why don't they just say 'air mail'?" young Gregg wanted to know.

The father explained that the stamp was a standard procedure set up by the Post Office Department.

"Can't they change it? They could save a lot of money by leaving off one word," Gregg continued.

It wasn't such a bad idea at that, his father decided. He suggested Gregg write Donaldson.

Two days later he presented his penciled letter for his parent's approval.

It began: "Let me tell you how the post office can save a lot of money and help the war effort * * *."

Gregg, a third-grader, said he was proud his suggestion had been approved and he was exceptionally happy over his personal letter from the Postmaster General.

[From the Washington Daily News]

IT'S THAT EASY

Sometimes, saving the people's money is so simple that an 8-year-old boy can grasp it.

In fact, one did. Gregg Buckalaw, of Mobile, Ala., wrote United States Postmaster General Donaldson suggesting that the "via" be dropped from "via air mail" stamped on items for plane delivery.

"You can save almost a third of the rubber," Gregg pointed out, "and rubber is a critical war material besides." Gregg's right. Lord knows how many thousands of hand stamps were to be bought for the country's post offices next year with that wholly needless word.

The Post Office Department is going to adopt the idea, and Gregg got a nice letter. He ought to be fetched to Washington and turned loose with a nice, shiny new Boy Scout ax.

Assignment of Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Troops to Europe," which appeared in the Boston Post on April 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROOPS TO EUROPE

In expressing a belief that President Truman should consult the Congress before sending more than four divisions of troops to Europe the Senate did not expressly set that limit, but served notice on the President that appropriations for a larger force would be difficult to get if as Commander in Chief the President flouted the wishes of the Senate.

This somewhat cautious action effectively ties the President's hands in dealing with any sudden emergency which may arise in Europe, and is characteristic of the thinking which prevails in the Senate when it is obsessed with an approaching national election.

A coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats put over the handcuffed measure even as the President of France, Vincent Auriol, warned a joint session of Congress that right without might is powerless and that isolation is death. Neutralism, the Frenchman declared, is a moral absurdity and geographical and historical nonsense.

President Auriol spoke from a full heart and bitter experience as the Senate was ready to vote on the handcuff measure that would limit our contribution to article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty to four divisions.

Votes, however, are not found in the exposed marches of Western Europe where the full fury of the Red hordes may one day burst upon the Western World with the fury of barbarism. Votes are here in the United States, in the caucus rooms of the Congress and in the delusive yearnings for peace without present risk.

The Soviet Union has existed in a state of total mobilization through all its existence. Readiness for war is the foundation of its whole economy. In two more years the United States will be in a position to stand forth as a mighty nation fearless of the threat of war constantly brandished by the Soviet Union.

The handcuff resolution in the Senate is a tragic example of expediency. At the moment we haven't got four divisions to send to Europe, nor will such a force be available

for many months. Yet, to serve public notice on the Soviet Union, that four divisions is the limit of our contribution to the common defense is like presenting them with a prefabricated plan of operation on how many divisions they will need to overwhelm the forces in Western Europe.

It is the case of Guam all over again. Back in the days when Guam was the anchor of our strategic position in the Pacific the Congress refused to fortify the island and strengthen it as a Gibraltar of the western Pacific. After Pearl Harbor the monstrous mistake was conveniently forgotten, smothered under the rush of war plans. It can be the same sort of ghastly error of judgment on troops to Europe.

Why and What Are We Fighting For in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Huntsville (Ala.) Times-Sun a full page advertisement inserted by the local post of the American Legion. It is entitled "Why and What Are We Fighting For in Korea?" I think it is a very fine statement. In it is included an article written by Hal Boyle, of the Associated Press, dealing with the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the advertisement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAL BOYLE, OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, GIVES THE ANSWER, IN OUR OPINION, AS TO WHY AND WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR IN KOREA?

We believe these truths to be self-evident:

1. That communism seeks the overthrow of all democratic governments.

2. That the Kremlin seeks world domination.

3. That Kremlin communism is and has been actively working within our own borders for the destruction of our form of government.

4. That Kremlin communism is and has been waging an all-out underground war cleverly designed to achieve world domination without a shooting war.

5. That the Kremlin Communists are preparing, as rapidly as possible, for an all-out shooting war with the objective of world domination.

6. That the time for all freedom-loving people to take a stand against the Kremlin is now.

7. That the place where this stand is to be taken must be determined by the United Nations to which we must remain loyal.

8. That our forefathers purchased and paid for their freedom with their own personal sacrifices and efforts.

9. That the freedom we inherited from our forefathers can be maintained only by our own personal sacrifices and efforts.

Our young men of this great Tennessee Valley are again being called upon to devote their efforts and make personal sacrifices in order that we may continue to enjoy our cherished freedom. As many of them had done before, and, as the young men of many generations before them, they have responded willingly and have done and are doing a fine job of upholding the high standards which the world has come to recognize as "made in America." We are always justly proud of our young men, but we are especially proud of our young men now serving under the United Nations colors against the most vicious enemy and under the most difficult circumstances known to our history.

Comrades, we of Post 37, American Legion, salute you, and we salute your families you have left behind—for the truly American spirit and courage they have shown in recognizing and resisting the efforts of local propagandists to spread dissatisfaction and dissension among them with false and misleading statements in regard to the Korean war. We appreciate that "they also serve who sit and wait."

HAL BOYLE SAYS

(Reprinted from Huntsville Times of Friday, March 23)

"NEW YORK.—Somewhere in Korea 3 weeks ago an American soldier picked up an enemy propaganda leaflet.

"Even since then the questions it raised have haunted him and members of his infantry squad.

"The faded leaflet—it is on my desk now—is a greeting from 'The Chinese People's Army Volunteer Forces' to the American troops. It wished them a merry Christmas and a peaceful New Year and asked:

" 'Why are you slaughtering the Korean people and burning their homes down—freezing and dying 5,000 miles from home where you belong with your families? Why aren't you enjoying a turkey dinner like the Wall Street financiers who sent you here to fight for their profits?

" 'We do not want to fight you, and we bear you no ill-will, knowing that you, like us, are ordinary laboring people and that you have been duped by American warmongers and their Wall Street bosses.

" 'We only want you to go home, so that we Korean and Chinese people can build the lives we want and live in peace.'

"Somewhere in Korea Sgt. Donald Caine of the Eighth Cavalry Regiment sat down and wrote a letter in pencil. He put the leaflet in the envelope and mailed it to me.

" 'We realize that enemy propaganda is one of their greatest weapons,' he wrote. 'But in our position how can we help but believe parts of this? So we'd like for you to help us get an answer to some of these questions.'

"I don't feel I'm the one to give the answers. But here is my reply to Sergeant Caine and the boys in the Fourth Squad of the First Platoon of the First Battalion of the Eighth Regiment of the First United States Cavalry Division, fighting somewhere in Korea since last July.

" 'That leaflet would trouble any honest man if it were true. But it isn't true. And it isn't simply an earnest plea for peace, written by one soldier to a soldier on the other side.

" 'It is the effort of a skilled propagandist. He wants to confuse you, to make you homesick, to make you doubt your cause and feel your sacrifices are useless and unnecessary.

" 'If he should succeed in making a majority of American soldiers feel this way, we will have to pull out of Korea entirely. And, in time, I think that means we will have to fight a third world war in our own homeland—and our own families will become the refugees.

" 'You aren't fighting for the profits of Wall Street financiers—or just to save Seoul or Taegu. You're fighting for a chance to keep war forever away from your own town—Main Street, United States of America.

" 'Of course, it is true the average Chinese soldier doesn't in his heart bear you any real ill will. You probably don't bear him individually any ill will either. Soldiers in any war rarely hate each other on a personal basis.

" 'I know the word "freedom" may sound ponderous and hollow in ears filled with the noise of crunching mortars. But it is a basic word—basic as hunger and fear. And freedom is your goal. Eventual freedom in the world from war and fear and hunger.

" 'You came into Korea under a blue and white flag of the United Nations, pledged to bring unity and freedom to that country. Why is the Chinese so-called volunteer there? He came under the Red flag of real slaughter—the slaughter of the long dream of Korean independence.

" 'And if he wins there, it won't be just Korean independence that will disappear. Step by step the Red armies of China and Russia will march across other countries unable to defend themselves alone, and gradually swallow the world piecemeal.

" 'That would be quite all right, too, if it meant a better life finally for us all. But communism hasn't been able to do that anywhere. Freedom has always brought more happiness than has slavery. And it is better to fight for a free world than a slave one.

" 'It is a lie that the Korean people want you to go home. They want you to stay and help them win a real peace. They dread the Chinese, and you know it.

" 'The truth is you are a military pioneer, fighting for the first time on a barricade defending all mankind's yearning for a final world peace. It's always lonely on a barricade, but no soldiers ever fought to hold a higher wall of hope.

" 'And if you hold it, the race of man will honor you forever.' "

AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, MADISON COUNTY POST, NO. 37, AMERICAN LEGION, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Toledo Blade of March 19, 1951, on the subject, Wheat for India:

WHEAT FOR INDIA

Both President Truman and former President Herbert Hoover have urged that Congress lay aside all question of the international politics involved and sanction the gift of some 2,000,000 bushels of wheat to relieve famine in India. Yet Congress continues to put off action, and in so doing lends substance to suspicion abroad that America's vaunted humanitarianism applies only to countries whose governments dance to the political tune we call. In this instance congressional indifference to the India wheat bill will be attributed to pique caused by the Nehru government's opposition to our Korean policy in the United Nations.

India first made overtures in January, suggesting proudly—but unrealistically considering the state of its pocketbook—that a wheat shipment be financed by a long-term loan. The President placed his recommendations before Congress in early February. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not even scheduled a hearing yet. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has approved the shipment, but its bill is bottled up in the Rules Committee.

America has always prided itself on its generosity in relieving the distress caused by natural disasters—earthquake, flood, and famine—in other lands. These actions, prompted by no thought of gain, political or otherwise, have been responsible for storing up a vast reservoir of good will toward the United States which the most violent propaganda of our enemies has been unable to exhaust.

The longer Congress delays favorable action on wheat for India the more it gives the appearance of putting a price tag on American benevolence. The longer it delays the less will be the gratitude with which seemingly reluctant help is received. If it delays much longer, it will perhaps be necessary to label our gift "Not to be opened until the next famine."

Friendship for Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Friendship for Russians," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIENDSHIP FOR RUSSIANS

A number of distinguished Americans—distinguished, among other things, for their realism about the Soviet Union and their unrelenting opposition to American Communists—have formed an organization to promote friendship with the Russian people "over the heads of the Kremlin regime." Calling themselves "Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom," they set forth two objectives—to mobilize American support for anti-Communist elements inside Russia and to provide material aid for refugees from that land and for Red army deserters. Behind these purposes lies the same sound impulse that led Senator BRIEN MCMAHON recently to propose a Senate resolution (which Secretary Acheson the other day commended most heartily) expressing the friendship of this country for the Russian people as distinct from their despotic and aggressive government.

There is need for expressions of this sort both for the clarification of American thinking on the subject and for a rectification of America's position as interpreted by the rest of the free world. The notion has become current abroad—fanned energetically by Soviet propaganda—that we are implacable foes of everything Russian and likely to embark upon a war as a result of our unreasoning hatred. We have no doubt that this is very far from the feeling of most Americans. As a people we have an abhorrence of all forms of tyranny—in part because we know that dictatorship, whether of the so-called right or the so-called left, degrades the human spirit; in part because we know, too, that dictatorships are made inevitably dangerous to free peoples by reason of the inner tensions that compel them to seek expansion.

But love of liberty is a universal human attribute. The fatal weakness of dictatorships is that, however rigid their rule, men living under them will always seek an opportunity to escape or to revolt. Many are doubtless seeking such an opportunity behind the iron curtain today. There is ample evidence of it from those who have been able to cross the line and seek asylum among freemen. (You find few men going the other way.) They deserve asylum when their good faith can be established; they deserve the friendship of the free; they deserve a helping hand and a word of hope—not alone for their sake but for our own as well. The enmity of America is toward oppression—not toward the victims of oppression.

Farmers Will Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful and informative article entitled "Farmers Will Stop Communism," by Charles Morrow Wilson, which appeared in the April issue of the Progressive Farmer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printe ! in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS WILL STOP COMMUNISM

(By Charles Morrow Wilson)

My acquaintance with Soviet Russia began on a September morning in 1923 down in Conway, Ark. I was a junior at the State university, and I had been working that summer for a south Arkansas cotton planter who was also a cotton buyer. On this particular morning the boss sent me to meet the early train at Conway and a stranger who would be on the train, a foreign cotton buyer.

When the train pulled in, one passenger got off. He was a blocky little man who wore a black derby hat and a blue serge suit several sizes too big for him, and walked with a noticeable limp. When I introduced myself, he lifted his derby and waved it at me, then shoved a leather dufflebag at me, meanwhile holding his briefcase.

I asked him where he wanted to go first. "To luck at de gotten." He replaced his hat and added, "And tuck vid gotten farmers." It was easy to translate this. He wanted to see the cotton and talk with cotton farmers.

I began learning something about my unusual guest. His name was Alex Gumberg. He was then head of the original Soviet Russian trading organization, Amtorg. He had come to buy American cotton for supplying the first set-up of Soviet state textile mills. As of that time, he was the No. 1 cotton buyer of all creation; in 1 year he had bought 27,000,000 bales in five countries. Interestingly he had accepted no commission.

By very gradual degrees the Russian told me he had been one of the original 1917 Revolutionaries. He had been first an assistant to Kerensky, the great liberal who tried unsuccessfully to make Russia a democracy, and then of Lenin, one of the fathers of statism. But Gumberg believed in democracy and for that reason had already set out to become an American citizen.

HE SAW COMMUNISM'S WEAK SPOT

He was born in the wheat-growing Ukraine, the son of a country school teacher. Thereafter his family moved to Georgia, Russia's far south province. I asked him why Russia could not produce its own cotton in this great and fertile south province. He answered very frankly that the revolutionaries were unable to control the farmers; that they had already shot or liquidated too many of the good farmers of the potential Soviet cotton belt and couldn't get the limited acreages already grown to the state mills. He confided another opinion I have never forgotten—he believed the Soviets' inability to get along with the capable farmers would turn out to be the downfall of the whole Soviet experiment.

My friendship with Alex lasted for 16 years, or until his death in 1939. After this one-time revolutionary had made a world-respected agency of Amtorg, he helped found the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce. Next the Chase National Bank made Gumberg head of its pioneering department in Russian trade. After that, Alex became one of the principal brain trusters and executive employees of the Atlas Corp., the renowned investment corporation which during the 1930's owned and operated virtually every namable type of property from turkey or apricot farms to sugar-beet mills, plane factories, city hotels, and Madison Square Garden. Alex Gumberg became an American citizen and a very loyal one. Franklin D. Roosevelt mentioned him as one of the "most enlightened minds of the century."

GUMBERG A GOOD AND JUST BOSS

When I went to work for the Atlas Corp. Alex was my boss, and he was a good and just boss. We used to talk over his earlier cotton-buying adventures in Dixie, and Alex kept hoping that Soviet Russia would eventually find and prove its place as a principal farming nation.

Meanwhile his relations with the high moguls of Sovietdom remained friendly. He was an honor guest at the social shindigs which marked America's formal recognition of Soviet Russia and Stalin sent him special Christmas greetings and occasionally a keg of caviar.

One Christmas Eve Alex inveigled me into serving as a Russian-style Santa Claus, because at the time I was the only one momentarily available and thin enough to slip into the gold furred elaborately bemedaled costume and the high shiny boots of the Russian St. Nicholas. After the toasts and vodkas that night, Gumberg joined me for a glass of water. He remarked that every high-ranking U. S. S. R. man at the party was "a city slicker"; that the great danger and the ruinous weakness of the Soviet still lay in the Kremlin's failure to understand and get along with the three-fourths of Russians who are country folks. He predicted flatly that farmers would trip Stalin and stop communism, since the best Russian farmers still saw the Kremlin gangs as "just another wave of imperialism."

This comment impressed me. At the time, 1936, the most brilliant Soviet employee in the United States was Jean Ahrens, the U. S. S. R.'s consul general to New York. Ahrens, a handsome Paris-educated son of a former Moscow banker, had already made a brilliant record as a Stalin industralist. He had established and managed one of the earlier Soviet show factories. For this he had won promotion to consul general to our greatest city where he was seeking to build trade for the U. S. S. R. in the United States.

DEVOTED TO STALIN CAUSE

Unlike Alex Gumberg, who had never really approved Stalin and the red czars of the Kremlin, Ahrens was a devoted Stalin man. One day Ahrens asked me to his palatial New York office for tea and set out to convert me. Under cross questioning he admitted, like Alex Gumberg, that lack of know-how in getting along with the farmers was the most serious danger to Kremlin futures. "For that reason," Ahrens continued, "and as a friend, I want you to show me something about farmers in the United States—how and why they click."

Plainly that was a big assignment. But my boss in the Atlas Corp. approved, and in the spring of 1936 Ahrens and I made an

extensive auto junket together, beginning in upstate New York. The first day we visited a gathering of county agricultural agents. Ahrens liked and admired the group immensely. "We need men like that back in Russia," he explained. "We need them here, too," I answered.

Next day we visited some nearby seed farms. Ahrens admired the work and the accomplishments but insisted that improving plants and distributing them is a job for the Government. A seed farm proprietor explained that as an American businessman he produces and sells superior seeds at a fair profit, thereby placing them in the line of public good.

Ahrens seemed confused. The seed farmer added that the United States nursery and seed industries, respected and relied on throughout the world, have grown great and endure by private enterprise and competitive marketing; this while respecting science and respecting governments. Ahrens scratched his head and began jotting notes on the back of a pocket calendar.

Later that day we visited a prominent vegetable farm near Utica. The farmer was a highly vocal anti-New Dealer. He spoke precisely what he thought. Ahrens commented that in Russia farmers are liquidated for saying less than that about their government.

"Maybe that's another reason why the Kremlin can't get along with farmers," I suggested.

Ahrens was thoughtful. We went back to a village hotel and as we ate supper the Kremlin man began writing a report to his superiors. Maybe he wrote too much. Three days later a "secretary" who looked more like a paid gunman, overtook us in western Ohio and hauled Ahrens back to New York and Washington. The following week the consul general war returned to the U. S. S. R.

RUSSIAN FARMERS DISSATISFIED

Early the following year I went into Soviet Russia's Ukraine on a business trip and was permitted to get a quick glimpse of the "collective farms." The latter were doing badly. Soviet food, even in the favored "political" restaurants, was deplorable. Party workers were permitted to speak of "faulty distribution." But even a tourist could see what the real reason was—it was obviously bad farming and worse leadership of farmers.

At that time (1936) the Kremlin reported that in all the U. S. S. R. there were about 11,000 major state farms which employed about 2,400,000 men and women. Far greater in total were the 240,000 artels or collective farms on which lived about 18,000,000 farm families. As of 1938, the Kremlin boasted that 99 percent of all Russian agriculture had been sovietized.

NINE MAJOR FAMINES

Then as now the U. S. S. R. was trumpeting that supplying food is an obligation of the state. But the state had not fulfilled that obligation. The Kremlin had officially admitted nine major famines during the 1930's. We know that the founding of collective farms at gun's point brought vast blood purges and tragic declines in food production.

Only recently one of Stalin's least censored spokesmen, Dr. H. E. Sigerist, gave me this information:

"During the 1930's and again after World War II, the U. S. S. R. was obliged to employ force in founding or reorganizing the collective farms. Even after the terrific effort of the first 5-year plan, the country still faced a very serious food emergency. Party members sent out over the entire countryside employed every known medium of propaganda to educate the peasant and convince him of the superiority of the new agricultural system. Yet, then as before and since, a regular war had to be fought with these peasants who openly sabotaged the state's farm program. They preferred to feed their grain to the animals and to slaughter the cattle and hogs rather than deliver them to the collectives."

FIVE MILLION "ERASED"?

There is no way of finding out exactly how many Russian farmers have been executed, murdered or otherwise erased for failing to toe all the furrows laid out by the Kremlin Party planners. One respected Associated Press correspondent has estimated the total as 5,000,000 prior to 1950. The Kremlin has officially reported at least seven mass purges of Russian farming people during the past 15 years and has boasted that the soukhozes, one time champion farmers of the Russians, are now wiped out.

Kremlin propagandists still bellow the praises of the bewhiskered little German college professor named Karl Marx, though they change or "reinterpret" what the latter wrote—more or less at will.

Even so, Kremlin pundits cannot get around the fact that Marx neither knew nor cared about farming. He played on industrialism as the major revolution of his times and its many errors and injustices in a profit-greedy, amateur era of new factories and newly rich people before labor gained any of the rights it enjoys today. Marx preached revolution against an industrial revolution. But the little man with long whiskers failed to consider the agricultural backgrounds of industrialism.

The Soviet revolution was distinctly a city man's brain storm which grew in and spread from the three principal cities of that huge, disjointed nation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But the Kremlin has kept on holding gun butts and leveled sights over its great rural provinces.

COMMANDS IN 117 TONGUES

The Kremlin still publishes or broadcasts its commands and propagandas in 117 different languages and dialects, in order to be understood by all or most of the Russians. Meanwhile Russian farmers have never had any real voice in government.

In the latening 1930's, while United States tourists, I among them, were being permitted to catch brief and carefully supervised glimpses inside Soviet Russia, the Kremlin, while admitting that the collective farms were having serious trouble feeding their own people and villages, much less exporting foods, were flooding the propaganda mills with stories about perennial wheat, rubber-bearing dandelions, air transport of breeding livestock, and other great attainments of Soviet agriculture. No doubt some of those stories were reliable. But on the whole the U. S. S. R. bread baskets were not.

COULDN'T WIN OWN PEOPLE

Ironically Kremlin propagandists were working hard, expensively, and in some part brilliantly to win friends among other farmers when they couldn't win their own. Actually they never really succeeded in winning farm friends or influencing farm people beyond U. S. S. R. boundaries.

Too Much Interference and Help From the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Kemper County Messenger, a weekly newspaper, is edited and published in my home town of DeKalb, Kemper County, Miss., by Mr. Lamar Sledge, who is ably assisted by his wife, Mrs. Frances Sledge. In the March 22, 1951, issue of this grass-roots rural newspaper, Mrs. Sledge has a column of special value which I think most aptly and clearly states some of the cardinal virtues of sound Americanism, whose practice made our Nation great, and without which we cannot continue on a sound basis. I should like to have the entire membership of the Congress read her column, and should also like to have it shared by all the people of the Nation. I therefore ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am interested in some old-fashioned Americanism because for some time I have been alarmed to see our people and our free enterprise hampered by too much interference and help from the Government. I am like an old hen. I don't believe in helping chicks out of their shell. I want an opportunity for my boy and girls to attain a place in this world of ours by their own industry and ability, and not on a subsidy from a Government that can tell them what to teach in school, how to conduct their business or what church to belong to, as long as they respect the God-given code of moral conduct.

Too much help from anyone: parents, friends, government, is a curse to the recipient.

Our people seem to pride themselves on an illusion of poverty, afraid to admit to having material possessions earned by their honest labor, for fear a new tax might take it away. * * *

That is what has happened to us since WPA, etc. made it profitable to be too poor or too trifling to support your family. I'm sick of it. I'm glad I have never seen my children hungry or cold, and would be ashamed to have to have help to support them as long as I have health and average intelligence.

Thirty-third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held in the auditorium of the South Boston High School on February 18, 1951, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council, Boston chapter, approximately 2,000 American Lithuanians of Boston and vicinity being present to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and to protest against the despotism, tyranny, and genocide being practiced in and upon Lithuania and its people by barbarous Soviet Russia:

Whereas the Soviet Union, by deception, fraud, and Machiavellian politics, desecrated and profaned as well as crushed Lithuania

as a government and as a nation, perfidiously undermining its right to existence and to be free and independent in the family of nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, in its bloodthirsty zeal to subject the entire world to the dictates of international communism, is extirpating the Lithuanian nation by heretofore unheard of atrocities; and

Whereas these bolshevik acts of abnominable and outrageous cruelty have not been curbed up to now, nor cognizance taken thereof in international fora, and the concomitant genocide goes unchallenged; and

Whereas about 1,000,000 Lithuanians have been taken from their homes and have been either annihilated or cast into the wild wastes of Siberia to perish;

Now, therefore, we here assembled to rededicate ourselves in espousal of a free and independent Lithuania, certify our recognition of the benefits unbounded of the liberty which we enjoy in this great bulwark of freedom, the United States of America, and hereby resolve:

1. That our emphatic and unmitigated protest be recorded in connection with the unwarranted subjugation of Lithuania and unjustified enslavement of its people and progressive extermination of its race.

2. That the President of the United States and its Congress be entreated to induce all international comity and authority to terminate as soon as possible the awful transgressions being engaged in by the Bolsheviks against the sovereignty and people of Lithuania and to compel the withdrawal of the Communist hordes from the territory of Lithuania, simultaneously reestablishing Lithuania as an independent nation with Vilna as its capital.

3. That the prevailing lethargy concerning the genocide going on in Lithuania be rent asunder and that the United Nations and the civilized world as a whole intercede to lend support for the eradication of this barbarity and toward reestablishment of an independent Lithuania.

4. That the American people as well as all other freedom-loving peoples be enlisted in the ranks against the Asiatic barbarians and their savage bolshevism wherever they establish their ramparts, to the end that all nations, including Lithuania, be free and rid of Bolshevik enslavement.

5. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to all Members of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United Nations, to the Papal Delegate, and to the representatives in the United States of the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Belgium, Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and to the American press.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
BOSTON CHAPTER,
JOHN L. KAS, *Chairman.*
ALEXANDER IVASKA, *Secretary.*

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, there have been statements made on this floor regarding the position of the American Legion on selective service and universal military training.

To make that organization perfectly clear, I include the following telegram in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1951.*
Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House Office Building, Washington D. C.:

Request by cable from Rome to forward following message from National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., to you: "Recent tour of Korean battlefront and American installations elsewhere in Asia and Europe confirms belief universal military training would have prevented untold casualties, saved many American lives, and will strengthen our future defense against communism. The American Legion urges support for universal military training and is strongly opposed to any amendment that would defer it or separate it from present bill."

Granville S. Ridley, Edward A. Hayes, Perry Brown, Warren H. Atherton, B. W. Gearhart, Fred Alger, George N. Craig, Ray O. Garber, Bruce Henderson, American Legion Security Training Committee.

Elements of Soviet Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 5 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part 1 of an article on elements of Soviet labor law, which appeared in the Monthly Labor Review for March 1951. This analysis well describes the iron rule of the Communist state which lies behind the facade of union organization and collective agreements in Russia. It is a helpful study of the wide differences between Soviet labor laws and industrial procedure, and those of our own free society. I ask for its insertion in order that the facts therein set forth may be available to all those who carry on the war of ideas and truth against the outlandish claims of apologists for Communist tyranny.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELEMENTS OF SOVIET LABOR LAW—PART I

"Soviet Russia does not know of any 'free' contract of employment, nor of any legal relations usually connected with the concept of the employment contract * * * In Soviet Russia labor duty is the basis of labor relations."[1]

Thus did a contemporary Soviet authority on labor law characterize the situation in 1920. He was not referring to forced labor, so widely used in Soviet Russia, especially after 1930, but to the Soviet equivalent of "free" labor, the subject of the present article.

Generally speaking the concept put forward in the quotation is largely held today by the Soviet state; it governs to a great extent the functions of the trade unions and reflects the attitude of the Communist Party. Over the years it resulted in separate labor laws which are punitive rather than protective.

True, in 1920, private enterprise had been effectively barred under the policy known as militant communism. This was superseded in 1922 by the so-called new economic policy (NEP),[2] under which private enterprise, within certain limits, was readmitted and freedom of the employment contract was accorded some recognition. But this policy came to an end about 1929 with the inauguration of the first 5-year plan, which, according to Stalin, had been framed and executed to eliminate capitalist elements and to create an economic basis for a Socialist society.[3] Since then private enterprise has been banned.

THE NATURE OF SOVIET ENTERPRISE

When private enterprise finally disappeared in Russia the great majority of persons engaged in industry and commerce—from top executives to manual laborers—became employees of a single owner—the government.[4] In that sense there is no contrast between capital and labor in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government claims that there is a "unity between the interests of the toilers of the Soviet Union and those of the Soviet Socialist State," as an official textbook on labor law stated in 1946.[5] However, such unity can hardly be demonstrated in reality. Soviet industrial organization shows that the fixed relationship between labor and state management took the place of the free relationships between labor and capital in capitalist countries.

Government-owned industry and commerce now operate on a different basis from that of the first years of the Soviet regime (1918–21). At that time, private enterprise and profit-making were outlawed without offering a substitute for satisfaction of personal ambition or an opportunity for extra earning.

In contrast, the policy adopted after the drive began for total socialization was popularly called "whips and cookies." On the one hand, concessions are made to the ever emerging personal ambition; but on the other, criminal law is put into operation in an effort to check the inefficiency of the entire economic system.

Government agencies engaged in business operate on a "commercial" basis (Khozialstvenny raschet) and enjoy a degree of formal independence and enter into contracts with each other and with private persons. Although they are government agencies they are supposed to act with the competitive vigor of a private enterprise (the principle of "Socialist competition"). This "independence" should not be overrated. As a Soviet text puts it: "The commercial basis is merely a special method of management of the national economy."[6] Planned assignments of higher bureaus set definite limits to their independence, to say nothing of continuous supervisory control by various government agencies and political control by the secret police and Communist Party.

[1] Z. Tettenborn, Soviet Legislation on Labor (in Russian, 1920) p. 16.

[2] For description and analysis of major stages of the Soviet policies and their expression in law see Gsovski, Soviet Civil Law, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, vol. 1 (1948) pp. 10 et seq., 791, et seq., vol. 2 (1949) p. 537 et seq.

[3] Stalin, Problems of Leninism, English edition, Moscow (1940) p. 409.

[4] Members of the so-called productive cooperatives are in fact paid for their work and not according to their shares. See Gsovski op. cit. vol. 1, p. 411, et seq.

[5] Aleksandrov and Genkin, Soviet Labor Law (in Russian, 1946), p. 312.

[6] Evtikhiev and Vlasov, Administrative Law (in Russian, 1946), p. 36. See also Gsovski op. cit. supra note 2, vol. 1 at 382 et seq.

Nevertheless, the management of a Soviet quasi corporation is as interested in obtaining the lowest unit labor cost as its capitalist prototype. A single executive is appointed by the head of the bureau under whose authority the enterprise (called "trust" in industry and "torg" in commerce) operates. He hires and fires, allocates wages, imposes penalties, and grants bonuses. Bonuses are paid from a special director's fund based on a percentage of the profits or savings. His own bonus also depends upon the efficiency of the enterprise. In case the output falls below standard quantity or quality, he is liable to imprisonment up to 8 years.

THE SOVIET WAGE PRACTICE

Private profit making is barred and the earnings of the bulk of the population are practically limited to wages and salaries. But the governmental scale of compensation for work, whether in money or comfort, aims to offer a substitute for profit making to stimulate efficiency. A system of wages and salaries is designed to allow wide latitude for differentials in wage, salary, and bonus payments. To this end the principles of piecework and bonuses for efficiency, without any guaranteed minimum wage, constitute the basis of compensation for work in Government industry, in collective farming, and in cooperatives.

Regardless of whether the employee is paid by time or by piece, he must attain a standard of output established by the management. If he fails to do so through his fault he is paid according to the quality and quantity of his output.[7] Progressive scales of piecework and bonuses for extra efficiency are issued by the government for individual industries and industry groups.

Numerous honorary titles—"Hero of Labor," and others—and medals carry with them distinct material benefit, such as tax exemption, right to extra housing space, etc. There are also personal salaries and personal pensions awarded without reference to any scale, and Stalin prizes amounting to as much as 300,000 rubles in a lump sum.

All this affords professional, managerial, and skilled labor remuneration in money and comfort greatly exceeding that given to the ordinary laborer. For example, a scale of salaries and wages for electrical-power plants, established in 1942 and still in force as late as 1946, ranged from 115 to 175 rubles monthly for janitorial services, to 1,000 to 3,000 rubles for a director.[8]

In 1934, Stalin frankly declared the underlying philosophy of his policy as follows: "Equalization in the sphere of demands and personal life is reactionary, petty bourgeois nonsense, worthy of a primitive ascetic sect and not of a socialist society organized in a Marxian way." [9]

However, material benefits thus promised evidently proved to be insufficient stimuli for good work.

Heavy responsibility is imposed upon both workers and management. Inefficiency involves not only loss of material benefits and possible loss of job, but prosecution in court as well. Workers are subject to penalties imposed by managers for loafing on the job and to court action for absenteeism and unauthorized quitting of the job. From 10 to 25 years in a forced labor camp,[10] with or without confiscation of property, can be imposed for "misappropriation, embezzlement, or any kind of theft" of the property of the principal employers, the government, or public bodies. Prior to 1946 the death penalty could be invoked.[11] In case of damage to or loss of property of the employer—tools, raw materials, fuel, even work clothes—if due to employee negligence can result in deductions from wages, in some instances in an amount 10 times the value of the property.[12]

MANAGERIAL PRESSURES

A series of laws penalize inefficient management for such things as poor quality or small volume of output, failure to penalize workers for absenteeism, and other violations of labor discipline.[13]

A potent incentive to the efficiency of the individual establishment is the principle that earnings depend in part upon the efficiency of the whole enterprise (principle of check by ruble). Business success brings definite individual profit; business failure incurs heavy punishment for those holding administrative posts. Although the total amount of regular wages to be paid in an individual enterprise is established by central government bureaus (wages funds), bonuses are dependent upon the profits or savings of an individual enterprise.

THE ROLE OF TRADE-UNIONS

Under such an arrangement there is no less reason for the rise of labor conflicts than under capitalism. But under the Soviet system labor is deprived of the main effective devices by which it may protect itself in a labor dispute in the capitalist world. Neither the constitution nor any law or decree mentions the right to strike and the strike is tacitly outlawed.

In general, all the channels through which labor can pursue its objectives in the capitalist world—legislation, courts, administrative agencies, the press, and trade unions—are in Soviet Russia agencies of the principal employer of industrial labor—the state.

For a time when private enterprise was tolerated under NEP (1922–28) the Soviet leaders visualized the protection of the interests of labor in this conflict through trade-unions. But the unions were regarded as an arm of government and of the Communist Party rather than as an independent force. Still they were to be an arm specialized in protection of labor. As the drive for socialization progressed, this special protective quality of the unions was pushed to the background. Instead, the notion of the identity of interests of the workers and the Soviet state was put forward and the primary function of Soviet labor unions is to serve the interests of the State.

THE PROMISE OF 1922

The eleventh congress of the Communist Party in 1922, when the NEP was inaugurated, recognized that if government enterprise operates on a commercial basis "inevitably certain conflicts of interests on the issue of labor conditions in the enterprises, are created between the working masses and the directors, managers of the government enterprises, or the government bureaus to which the enterprises are subordinated." Consequently the resolution "imposed upon the trade-unions the duty to protect the interests of the working people." [14]

Thus, the labor code of 1922, then enacted, relegated to the collective agreements between management and trade-unions the settlement of all the basic working conditions, including wage rates, standard of output, shop rules, etc.

Nevertheless, even then, both before and after this period, the trade-unions were not considered as a force independent from the Communist Party or the Soviet Government. The ninth congress of the party (1920) had stated that the tasks of trade-unions lie primarily in the province of economic organization and education. The trade-unions must perform these tasks not in the capacity of an independent, separately organized force but in the capacity of one of the principal branches of the Government machinery guided by the Communist Party.[15] The tenth congress went further and in 1921 passed the resolution, drafted by Lenin, and stressing the role of the trade-unions in Soviet Russia as a school of communism.[16] The fifteenth congress in 1925 stressed that trade-unions were created and built up by our [Communist] Party.[17]

"The most important task of the trade-unions," says the official textbook on civil law of 1944, "is the political education of the toiling masses, their mobilization for building up socialism, and the defense of their economic interests and cultural needs."[18]

"Formally," says the official textbook on administrative law of 1940, "the trade-unions are not a party organization but, in fact, they are carrying out the directives of the party. All leading organs of the trade-unions consist primarily of Communists who execute the party line in the entire work of the trade-unions." [19]

THE REALITY AFTER 30 YEARS

Thus the trade-unions were transformed from a labor-protecting arm into an arm for execution of government policy, and achievement of production goals. According to Soviet jurists, "the Socialist industrialization of the country required that labor law * * * serve the successful struggle for productivity of labor and strengthening of labor discipline.[20]

Such transformation of the trade-unions into a government arm, enforcing official economic policy, began soon after the onset of the first 5-year plan. Accordingly, the sixteenth congress of the Communist Party directed in 1930 that the trade-unions, striving in collective agreements for improvement of the standard of living of the workers, must take into account the financial status of the enterprise with which the agreement was made and the interests of the national economy. In making the agreement, the resolution insisted, each party must undertake definite obligations in carrying out the financial and production plan of the enterprise. The unions in particular were obligated to guarantee, on behalf of the workers, the productivity of labor contemplated by the plan.[21]

---

[7] Soviet Labor Code, sec. 57 as amended in 1934. "If an employee at a governmental, public, or cooperative enterprise, institution, or business fails through his own fault to attain the standard of output prescribed for him, he shall be paid according to the quantity and quality of his output but shall not be guaranteed any minimum wage. In other enterprises and businesses (private enterprises including those under a concession) such an employee shall be paid not less than two-thirds of his scheduled rate."

[8] Handbook of Wages in Electrical Power Plants (in Russian, 1946), pp. 8–12, 25.

[9] Stalin, speech at the 17th Congress of the Communist Party (1934, quoted from his Problems of Leninism (10th Russian edition, 1938), p. 583.

[10] Statute of June 4, 1947, concerning the crimes against government and public property, Vedomosti 1947, No. 19.

[11] Law of August 7, 1932. For its translation and discussion see Gsovski op. cit. supra note 2, vol. 1, pp. 562, 726.

[12] Soviet Labor Code, secs. 833–834 (as amended), act of June 20, 1942, sec. 12; Instruction of the People's Commissar for Labor of June 1, 1932, secs. 1–3. For further citations see Gsovski op. cit. vol. 1, pp. 823–825.

[13] Act of December 28, 1938; edict of July 10, 1940, id. p. 821.

[14] All-Union Communist Party on Trade-Unions, Collection of Resolutions (in Russian, 1930), p. 55.

[15] Ibid., p. 35.

[16] Ibid., p. 36.

[17] Ibid., p. 87.

[18] Agarkov and others, Civil Law (in Russian, 1944), vol. I, p. 190; Civil Law Textbook (in Russian, 1938), vol. I, pp. 108–109.

[19] Denisov, Soviet Administrative Law (in Russian, 1940), p. 60.

[20] Op. cit., supra, note 5, p. 90.

[21] Ibid, p. 88.

The central agency of all the Soviet trade-unions—their central council—was granted the status of a government department in 1933. It officially took the place of the People's Commissariat for Labor, which was then abolished, and the Council was also charged with administration of social insurance. But then the Central Council of Trade Unions lost the character of a representative body of trade-unions even in terms of the Soviet democracy. Under law this council must be elected by the Congress of Trade Unions which is designated as "the supreme authority of the trade-unions of the Soviet Union." Nevertheless, since the ninth congress in 1932 no such congresses were convoked for 17 years, during which the whole Soviet social order and the position of labor were radically changed.

When the tenth congress convened in 1949, no explanation was asked or offered for the delay. The congress adopted a new statute which reaffirmed the total control of the Communist Party over the trade-unions:

"The Soviet trade-unions conduct their entire work under the direction of the Communist Party—the organizing and directing force of the Soviet society. The trade-unions of the U. S. S. R. rally the working masses behind the party of Lenin-Stalin." [22]

Among numerous tasks assigned by the new statute to the trade-unions the generalized political objectives are described in the first place at great length. For example, the trade-unions "strive to enhance in every way the Socialist order in society and State, the moral-political unity of the Soviet people, the brotherly cooperation and friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union. They actively participate in the election of the agencies of governmentl power. They organize workers and clerical employees for the struggle for the steady development of the national economy."

In contrast, "the duty to protect the interests of the working people" which had been emphasized by the party congress in 1922 is not expressly stated. It may have been considered unnecessary because the statute assumes that "in the conditions of the Soviet Socialist order the state protects the rights of the working people." But in any event the labor-protection tasks of the unions are couched in cautious language.

At the very end of the above quoted passage it is mentioned that the unions "look after (zabotiatsia) the further rise of the material well-being and the full satisfaction of the cultural needs of the toilers." At another place the unions' monopoly to represent the workers is stated with a hardly accidental lack of specificity: "[Unions should] act on behalf of workers and clerical employees before the governmental and social bodies in matters concerning labor, culture, and workers' everyday life."

Collective bargaining, provided for in the labor code of 1922, was discontinued in 1933. As the official soviet text on labor law explained in 1946: "The collective agreements as a special form of legal regulation of labor relations of manual and clerical employees has outlived itself. Detailed regulation of all sides of these relations by mandatory acts of governmental power does not leave any room for any contractual agreement concerning one labor condition or another." [23]

In plain English, this means that the Soviet leaders chose to abandon the last vestige of contract in relations between labor, even as represented by party-controlled trade-unions on the one hand and State management on the other, for the sake of outright government regimentation. Capitalist free collective bargaining was frankly declared unfit in the Socialist surroundings of the Soviet Union.

However, in 1947 a campaign for making new collective agreements suddenly was ordered after a lapse of 14 years.

AGREEMENTS WITHOUT BARGAINING

Collective agreements were declared the most important measure "to achieve and exceed the production plan, to secure further growth of the productivity of labor, improvement of the organization of labor, and the increase of responsibility of management and trade organizations for the material condition of living of the employees and cultural services rendered to them." [24] Nevertheless, the new policy is far from introducing free collective bargaining. Certain matters are definitely excluded from any negotiation and agreement and are reserved for government regulation.

The new rules positively require that "the rates of wages, of piecework, progressive piecework, and bonuses as approved by the government must be indicated" in the agreement. It is expressly forbidden to include any rates not approved by the government. In other words, wage rates are excluded from bargaining, but if included in the agreement are no more than applications of the governmental schedule to the establishment for which the collective agreement is drawn. This is true, to a large measure, of other points covered, particularly standards of output. The official act and the jurisprudential writings insist that the primary purpose of such agreements is to translate the abstract terms of the general plan for economic development into specific assignments and obligations within each particular establishment. They appear to be merely a form in which the orders of the government are made more precise.

A Soviet writer of authority comments:

"It is understood that the present-day collective agreements could not but be different by content from collective agreements which were made at the time when the rates of wages and some other conditions of labor were not established by the law and government decrees.

"The purpose of the present-day collective agreement is to make concrete the duties of the management, shop committees, workers, technical, engineering, and clerical personnel toward the fulfillment of the production plans and production over and above the plan as well as to raise the responsibility of business agencies and trade unions for improvement of material living conditions of workers and cultural services rendered to them." [25]

As before, the new regulations are based on the assumption that the interest of the workers are the same as the interests of production in a Socialist state and that the collective agreements are designed to be the juridical form of expression of this unity.[26] Accordingly, a model agreement is drafted by each ministry upon consultation with the central offices of the appropriate trade-unions. Then the model agreement is sent as a fait accompli to the establishments concerned.

While such collective agreements are not the result of collective bargaining, it may be observed that when the Soviet Government faced the task of postwar rehabilitation of its economy, it preferred to give decreed labor conditions the appearance of an agreement.

THE DOCTRINE OF NORMATIVE ACTS

Negotiation and mutual agreement are in fact proscribed in the Soviet Union in many important respects. Government regulation of wages and other basic conditions of labor took their place. However, it does not mean that labor is thus protected by law as we understand it. True, a Code of Labor Laws still exists on the statute books of the republics of the Soviet Union. But it was enacted in 1922 when private enterprise was within some limits tolerated and the Government was not the sole employer in industry and commerce. At that time the code sought to regulate labor relations on the basis of free contract and protect labor by methods resembling advanced democratic labor legislation.

However, these provisions of the code were either repealed or for the most part became inoperative being superseded without a formal repeal by various laws and decrees.

Under the totalitarian concept of government power, the accepted relationships of the administrative and legislative branches of the government do not apply. Although the terms "constitution," "legislative act," and "administrative decree" are used in Soviet law, the authority attached to each of these sources of law in the Soviet Union is different from that associated with these terms in the democratic countries. A constitutional provision may be set aside by an administrative decree and the newly enacted rule is incorporated into the constitution only at a later date. For example, the 7-hour working day was provided for in the 1936 constitution (sec. 119).

However, on June 26, 1940, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, an executive body in terms of the constitution, decreed the 8-hour normal working day. This edict became operative immediately. It was ratified by the Supreme Soviet in August 1940, but without following the procedure prescribed for constitutional amendment. Not until 7 years later was section 119 constitutionally amended.

The Soviet jurists are fully aware of such practices. In discussing the sources of Soviet labor law in the treatises on this subject, they seek to blur the distinction between the authority of a constitutional provision, a legislative enactment, and an administrative decree or directive. In a recent (1949) standard treatise,[27] designed for use in university law schools, a doctrine of "normative acts" (rule making) as the source of Soviet labor law is promulgated. Normative acts are in general terms defined as "acts by which the will of the ruling class is 'elevated to law.'" This not too clear definition is fortunately followed by an enumeration of the specific acts issued by Soviet authorities which, according to the author fall under the definition. These are "laws" enacted by the Supreme Soviet (Soviet equivalent to legislature), "edicts" by its presidium (a body of 47 members constituting the Soviet collective President), "normative resolutions" (i. e, rule-making resolutions) of the Council of Ministers (cabinet), joint resolutions of the Council of Ministers and the Central Committee of the Communist Party, regulations issued by individual ministers and by the Central Council of the Trade-Unions.

In other words, any decree or order by any of the central governmental authorities is law. No matter what it is called and by what body it is issued, it prevails until the action of another authority supersedes it.

---

[22] Trud (in Russian), May 11, 1949. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, Notes on Labor Abroad, No. 11, May 1949, pp. 39–40.

[23] Op. cit., supra, note 5, p. 106. Italics in the original.

[24] Resolution of the Presidium of the Central Council of the Trade-Union, approved by the Council of Ministers, Preamble, Trud (in Russian), April 18, 1947. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, Notes on Labor Abroad, No. 2, June 1947, p. 28, and No. 13, December 1949, p. 36.

[25] Aleksandrov and other compilers, Goliakov, editor, Legislation Concerning Labor (in Russian, 1947), p. 15.

[26] Moskalenko, "Legal Problems Involved in Collective Agreements" in Trade-Unions (in Russian, 1947), No. 8, p. 16 et seq.; Trud (in Russian), April 18, 1947, editorial.

[27] Aleksandrov, editor, Soviet Labor Law (in Russian, 1949), p. 53.

The survey of recent trends in the Soviet legislation thus far made suggests the conclusion that the disappearance of private enterprise from the Soviet economy has not been followed by the increase of rights of labor in labor law. If compared with the time when private enterprise was tolerated, the legal status of labor has worsened. Another striking feature of the Soviet regulations on labor are the numerous penal provisions.

VLADIMIR GSOVSKI,
Chief, Foreign Law Section,
Law Library, Library of Congress.

Congress Fails the Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, given the authority to direct the destiny of our Nation, concededly the most prosperous and, from a productive and military standpoint, the most powerful in all the world, Congress has permitted the executive department to impose upon the people policies which have resulted in three world wars, none of which has contributed either to our happiness, prosperity, or security.

The youth of the land in ever-increasing numbers are thinking along the lines of a letter received this morning, which reads as follows:

MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASH.,
March 29, 1951.

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In June 1941 I was drafted for a year's training in the military forces of the United States. That year ended in January 1946. Those of my friends who did not serve in the Armed Forces made good money, got themselves a home, good positions in life, and are getting along well.

After getting out of the service I reenlisted in the Reserves with the thought in mind that in case of an all-out war I would be called back in the branch of service I had received training in. Meanwhile, I tried to get a job and get a much-delayed start in life at the age of 27.

In September 1950, I enrolled in a correspondence course to better myself in my job. The day after my first lesson came my orders calling me to active duty for 1 year were received. Naturally I was a bit put out, but figured I would study while I was in the service and then go to work when I got out.

Now the majority of the rumors have it we are to be extended for another year's duty. I am now 32. If I get another year's delay it is going to put me seriously behind. This also applies to practically every 12-month recall reservist, I've talked to. We can't understand why we are being held in the service contrary to orders which evidently don't amount to anything more than to get one in the service. Getting out is different. Yet there are several thousand involuntary reservists who were not called up. If we are extended, it is going to reduce our faith in the word of the President as well as our desire to get the job done. I don't mind telling you, if I am forced to spend another year on active duty the Government won't get its money's worth out of me. It's not that I dislike work, it's the principle of the thing.

If I had wanted to make the service my career, then I would be in the Regulars. Since I would like to live my life as a civilian, I feel that I ought to be able to, barring an all-out war, which we certainly aren't engaged in at the present. If we were, then all Reserves ought to be called in as well as veterans, not in the Reserve category.

Speaking for the 4,000 airmen on 12-month recalls, which I am sure the service could get along without by September, anything you can see clear to do toward assisting legislation in our favor would be most gratefully appreciated.

Your past record of achievements and fairness is of the highest, and I am confident you will do what is just.

Sincerely yours.

New Plan May Tap Oil Field in Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, before the Federal Government saw fit to expropriate the submerged oil-bearing lands lying within the seaward boundaries of the State of California, our State had fostered orderly and scientific development of the oil resources beneath these lands. Since the attempted grab by the Federal Government of this area, which the Federal Government conceded that we owned from the time of our admission into the Union until a few years ago, development has been hindered by legal confusion.

The Federal Government's suit in the Federal Government's Supreme Court against the State of California is still pending because, even though it has authorized the Federal grab, the Supreme Court has been unable to determine the boundary lines of the expropriated area. If our State leasing agency were permitted to proceed in the public interest without Federal interference, it could foster additional development likely to add to our known petroleum reserves.

The attached article, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on April 2, 1951, demonstrates the type of development that is being hindered by the Federal Government's stubborn persistence in defying the will of Congress in an attempt to hang onto the expropriated area. The article will, I am sure, prove of interest to the Members, and I am asking that it be included in our RECORD:

NEW PLAN MAY TAP OIL FIELD IN OCEAN—SHAFT-TUNNEL-CAISSON SYSTEM PROPOSED FOR RICH RESERVOIR

A revolutionary method of extracting petroleum from bay and tideland areas may be used in developing the giant oil field which geologists say is located directly off the Long Beach shoreline.

The vast petroleum deposit lies roughly between the beach city's strand and the outer harbor breakwater which parallels the shoreline at a distance of 3 miles.

Geological data indicate the oil-field reserve to be in the neighborhood of 500,000,000 barrels.

VAST STOREHOUSE

Geologists say the great storehouse of black gold is, in truth, an easterly extension of the rich Wilmington-Long Beach Harbor field which currently is tapped by some 2,000 producing wells, all drilled from dry land and harbor fills.

The unprecedented method of developing oil fields which lie beneath water involves use of a technique familiar to mining engineers. It has been worked out by Hillman A. Hansen, 52, Long Beach engineer-geologist.

The plan envisions sinking of a vertical shaft into the earth to a depth of 400 feet below the bottom of the bay. From this depth a network of tunnels would be driven laterally. These tunnels would conform to a predetermined pattern.

SUBTERRANEAN NETWORK

When completed the subterranean network would, in effect, be a subway system which engineers would put to good use.

Drifting out from each side of the subway tunnels would be short-access tunnels leading into caissons of steel and concrete.

The caissons, 34 feet in diameter and 120 feet high, would provide room for installation of standard oil-well drilling equipment.

It would be within these cylindrical caissons that the oil wells would be drilled.

Each caisson, according to plans, would accommodate the drilling of 20 wells in an adjacent 100 acres of "field," as projected downward from the surface of the Harbor waters.

WELLS WHIPSTOCKED

The wells would be whipstocked (an oil-field term for directional drilling) so that each would draw upon 5 acres of the projected producing area.

The master plan envisages construction of 50 or more of the subterranean caissons.

The underground network of tunnels and caissons would be air-conditioned. Electric power would motivate the drilling equipment.

Technological developments, such as the modern shut-off valves and sparkproof electric motors like those used on seagoing tankers, make the tunnel-and-caisson method of oil-field development both safe and practical, engineers claim.

ECONOMICAL METHOD

"It would be economical, too," Hansen said, "the cost actually figuring out to be less than any other method which has been advanced for developing this oil field."

The recently announced intention of the Iranian Government to nationalize its oil fields and petroleum reserves has been cause for concern among the United States, British, and Dutch interests which have led the way in developing the petroleum storehouse of the Middle East.

Some have interpreted the Iranian move with an eye to Russia and its known thirst for oil. The Iranian repercussions echo loudly in this country and etch sharply the question of United States domestic oil reserves.

Addressing a gathering of geologists here a week ago, Dr. Kenneth O. Emery, of southern California, estimated that 40,000,000,000 barrels of oil lie beneath waters adjacent to the southern California coast line. He pointed up the urgent need for a method to extract this oil.

OTHER METHODS ADVANCED

The tunnel-and-caisson method has awakened great interest in engineering circles and is considered possibly the best approach to the problem yet devised.

Two other suggested methods of drilling the Long Beach offshore field have been advanced. These are (1) constructing a series

of concrete islands which would dot the bay with drill sites, and (2) attaching so-called blisters (drill sites) to the existing offshore breakwater.

In 1947 the city of Long Beach investigated the island-platform proposal thoroughly. A report to the city council at that time outlined need for 70 concrete islands, each costing an estimated $1,000,000.

OBJECTIONS CITED

While the proposed island-platform plan would meet the engineering needs of the drilling problem, it was pointed out that the plan would be prohibited by State law on the grounds that it would constitute obstructions to commerce and navigation within the port.

Experts agree that the outer harbor breakwater would be a suitable base for anchoring drill sites, but point out that it would permit too limited development of the oil field and result in the loss of millions of barrels of oil.

"All you could do by drilling from the breakwater," an engineer explained, "would be to effect development of a narrow band along the southerly flank of the field. Geologically speaking, it is axiomatic that drilling an oil field along one side or flank alone throws the entire pressure system of the field out of balance.

"In this instance it would result in the loss of millions of barrels of oil through salt-water encroachment."

AREA EXTENDS TO SEA

The bulk of the oil produced in the Wilmington-Long Beach field comes from sands at an average depth of 3,100 feet. Geologists say they have every reason to believe that this same oil-rich level extends throughout the field directly off Long Beach.

Military experts have studied Hansen's tunnel-and-caisson method and have expressed pleasure with its bombproof aspects.

Conversely, the same military men consider the island-platform and breakwater drill sites as highly vulnerable to attack and see them as being capable of converting the entire Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area into a sea of flaming oil and contaminating the air with billions of cubic feet of noxious gas.

Meanwhile, Hansen continues his 10-year study into the problem of drilling bay and tideland oil fields. He firmly believes that he has come up with the logical answer in tunnels and caissons.

The legal and political barriers obstructing development of this great offshore field will be resolved shortly, he believes, by the urgency of national defense.

Resurrection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in these times when peace must be the prayer of all of us, we should recognize the vital need to live according to our highest standards. The future of the country will depend ultimately more upon the virtues of our citizens than upon the sins of our enemies. For our aspiration, Easter day brings home to us the ideals of character such as I have tried to convey in the accompanying poem, which I am glad to submit to you for inclusion in the RECORD, composed by James Patrick McGovern, a long-time member of the District of Columbia bar and a captain of the American Expeditionary Forces in the First World War:

RESURRECTION

Deep in the currents of the heart there flows
A fervent, dauntless quest of all mankind,
Like life in death when conquering Christ arose—
The mortal and immortal intertwined.
Today, however dark and dull the spring
Of hope and faith through thoughts and deeds impure,
Masking sins with words of hollow ring,
Corrupting men by bribe and sinecure,
New seasons flower and warm hearts aspire,
The true and beautiful glow by their worth,
And virtue's self is such a cleansing fire
These powers shall create our land's rebirth
Of brotherhood, with peace eternal given
By Him to come to us on earth from heaven.
—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Resolution Against Compulsory Health Insurance Adopted by the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I want to present for the earnest consideration of my colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., at their regular meeting on March 19, 1951:

RESOLUTION AGAINST COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

At a regular meeting, March 19, 1951, the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., adopted the following resolution proposed by Mr. Dean P. Kimball, as chairman of a special committee on the subject:

"*Resolved*, That this association oppose the enactment of H. R. 54, the so-called national health insurance bill, for the following reasons:

"1. It will destroy the close personal relationship between patient and doctor. In this connection it should be pointed out that in time it will practically destroy the private practice of medicine. All doctors will, in practical effect, if not technically, become mere employees of the Federal Government.

"2. It will result in poor medical service as compared to that we now have. The compensation of the doctor may depend on the number of treatments or visits for which a set fee will be charged or the number of patients on his list. Treatment on a mass-production basis with too little time for each patient will be the result.

"3. It will cost the average family far more than it pays for medical service now and will add thousands of employees to the Federal Government and millions of dollars to the cost of Government. While the present bill calls for 3 percent of salaries to $4,800, some have estimated that it will eventually cost 12 percent of the first $4,800 of a person's earnings, or $576 a year to meet the costs of the plan. It may go even higher.

"4. It is not limited, as has been claimed by its supporters, to caring for cases requiring costly and extended medical or hospital treatment, but purports to take care of every minor illness. It is socialism at its worst, concerning as it does one of the most intimate and personal aspects of life, that of doctor and patient.

"5. There is now available insurance and other forms of mutual or group aid at moderate cost to cover costly hospital and medical service.

"6. It removes one of the spurs or incentives to sober, careful, and prudent living by offering medical care for every type of ailment whether willfully brought on by misconduct or a disregard of the rules of health."

I hereby certify that the undersigned is the secretary of the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., and as such verify and attest to the above resolution having been adopted by the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., at its regular meeting held in the Chevy Chase Community Center, March 19, 1951, and having been included in the minutes of said meeting.

Attest:

HENRY HALLAM,
Secretary, the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1951.*

Home Folks Are Not Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that the people who elected us are becoming aware of what has been happening here in Washington during the past few years is apparent from a letter from a housewife which reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: After reading your paper, The People's Opportunity, I have decided to put a few of the things down on paper that we in our family have been thinking about and discussing in recent years.

1. Mr. Truman said recently that we are in an emergency. I agree, but think that we were thrown into it at the time the idea was advanced that the world owes everyone a living—without first earning it. The CCC, PWA, WPA, and all the other jobs that were created, as well as the relief set-up that was used, really wrecked our economy. It spoiled a lot of workers who had been willing to earn their living before. We personally have not been able to hire farm labor that was worth their board, let alone wages, since then. People on relief would not let their children pick beans or cucumbers, even when we offered 25 cents a bushel for pickers. They could afford to increase their families, while people who earned their living and paid taxes to keep them could not afford larger families. It takes some people 15 or 20 years to wake up, apparently.

2. Old-age benefits: It used to be that people started saving for their old age when they were young. The ones who did not went to the county farm when they could no longer keep themselves. I notice we still have county farms, but people do not try to save; they plan on being kept after they are 65. I don't mean all of them—there are still some who refuse to become parasites—but in increasing numbers we have watched it happen. Many of those people would be a lot better off if they were working. All they have to do is sit around and try to figure out how they can get more for less. Also, at one time we knew of eight in one county who were getting paid to pass out the checks. One person who was alive could do that for a county.

3. The AAA or PMA or whatever it is now called is another big laugh. The fertilizer they furnished for farmers wouldn't go through the drills. It took three times as long to spread it as it would decent fertilizer. The marl they got was so bad it looked like gravel. They brought a load here; we refused it. We would rather get our own gravel. Their office force gets in each other's way, too. Last fall the township worker told us they now tested soil, for 20 cents a sample. The conservation group has been doing it free for years. Why can't they hire an efficiency expert and stop having four or five agencies trying to do the same thing and getting in each other's way? Judging from the waste in our county, it certainly must be monumental when it gets to Washington.

The people who suffered and started this country certainly would be sick and disgusted to see it now. Where has government, for the people, of the people, and by the people gone? I have heard many farmers say they want no subsidies or price supports. Supply and demand have worked before, certainly one man, or group of men, cannot order Old Mother Nature, or human nature, either. During the last war several string butchers, who raised no stock themselves, but spread several stock diseases all over got subsidies enough to buy three or four farms, while the farmers who did the work took the risks and had large amounts of money invested got no subsidies.

4. Their basketball scandal is another thing. Everyone has known for years that schools and colleges have paid athletes to go to their schools. One that we know of was later hired to coach and teach in a high school. He admitted himself, that the students knew more than he did. What can we expect of our children, when such things go on all the time? What has happened to our schools? When my mother started teaching, she had gone through the eighth grade, then took teachers' examinations. Now when children get through the eighth grade, how much do they really know? We should have trade schools to find and develop their talents, so that they will be self-supporting and self-respecting as they grow older. We certainly have people enough that we won't have to import workers if we can get back to the idea that we owe ourselves and our country an honest day's work for a day's pay.

5. We are getting tired of taxes, too, when it is just thrown away. We, in our household work, plan, and save for things we really need. All the money that has been used to build roads in the jungle, given to England when she is still trading with Russia and Communist China is worse than wasted. It is working against us and our boys in Korea. Both of our sons, 20 and 21, enlisted more than a year ago. They are both in Korea, wondering, with all the other boys there, why they are there. What can our young people have respect for, believe in, or build their lives on?

All we have to do is go back in history. Why did the Pilgrims come over here? Who paid the Indians bounties on American scaps? Who hired Hessians to fight us? Who sent arms, money, and ships to the South during the Civil War? They boast that their policy never changes—apparently it has not, and will not as long as we are spineless, jellyfish, and turn our pockets inside out for them. They have it over on us—they can change their government and policy by a "vote of confidence." What would happen here, if we had the same set-up?

I think we have had weak Presidents ever since Teddy Roosevelt. If we had had his "Speak softly and carry a big stick" we wouldn't be in the mess we are in now.

Personally, I wouldn't hire anyone to work for me who had been a failure before. I doubt if any good businessman would, either. Let's get an efficiency expert, open all the doors and windows, have a good job of spring housecleaning, and then start over.

6. The Communists have been turned free. I am enclosing 25 cents to start a fund to buy gasoline to load them on a plane (after they have paid back to the Government what their trials cost) and unload them in North Korea. Since that is the kind of government they want, it is cruel to keep them here in this country. I am sure there are enough people who feel as I do. They will gladly contribute to such a cause.

7. I am enclosing some material which we have collected from recent papers and magazines. People really are waking up to the dangers we have been harboring for quite some time. I think Congress and the other elected Members would do well to think a little farther ahead than the ends of their noses.

Mrs. W. R. Rowe.

Mr. Speaker, in my reply to the foregoing, among other things the following was written:

Am sending back the 25 cents, as I know of no practical way of putting it to use. If it was $25,000,000, it is just possible we might counteract the propaganda paid for by British money.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 14, 1951]

HUNGER DOESN'T WAIT

Three months ago Madame Pandit, Ambassador of India to the United States, presented to the State Department a request by her Government to buy 2,000,000 tons of grain in the United States on long-term credit in order to relieve imminent famine.

This was transmitted to Congress, and 1 month ago, after endorsement of the idea by former President Hoover, President Truman supported the request with a special message. He recommended, however, since there was doubt of the ability of India to assume such a debt and since it clearly could not pay in cash, that an immediate grant be made of the first 1,000,000 tons and terms then be studied for meeting the remainder of the need.

The House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee reported a bill about 10 days ago to authorize appropriations up to $190,000,000 for the full amount of grain if need be. But apparently there is serious question whether the House will get an opportunity to act on this measure with the promptness that a subject involving human survival deserves.

Placing of the bill on the House calendar rests with the House Rules Committee, which early this session was given renewed power of blocking legislation it did not favor. Some persons then were doubtful of the desirability of concentrating that authority in a few members. If the Rules Committee now should prove willing to "play politics with human misery," even misery on the opposite side of the globe, the effects on international friendship for the United States in a crucial area could become very, very injurious and costly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1951]

THAT GRAIN FOR INDIA

Question quite naturally has been raised, "If India was willing to buy the 2,000,000 tons of wheat it has requested from the United States, why does the administration propose instead to make an outright gift of the grain?"

India is buying 4,000,000 tons of grain from the United States, Canada, Australia, Argentina, and other countries at market prices. In doing this and paying the ocean freight the Indian Government is using up all the foreign exchange it can safely spare. Its balances are not in dollars but in sterling, which Britain cannot convert. And India still is importing slightly more goods than it finds it possible to pay for by exports.

In these circumstances would it be hard-headed to bind that country to a schedule of payments for grain it cannot buy with cash? President Truman has recommended that 1,000,000 tons of wheat be authorized immediately as a grant to India, after which Congress could look into whether the entire second 1,000,000 tons is needed, whether it can be obtained elsewhere, whether it or part of it could be paid for, and whether stipulations should be attached to that part of the deal.

There are questions legitimately to be asked of the Indian Government. One is whether trade jealousy toward neighboring Pakistan is partly responsible for India's food plight. In 1949–50 India could have obtained 600,000 tons of surplus wheat from Pakistan. This year, though, Pakistan has none to spare and only a small surplus in prospect this spring. India also is criticized for devoting land to jute or cotton which might raise grain.

If study should show that India eventually can pay for part of the presently needed grain, then by all means the second half of the wheat program from the United States should be made partly or all on a loan basis. Stipulations might be added that India should obtain all available grain from nearby sources and should direct its agricultural program toward food rather than non-food crops.

But the need of many million Indians for food this month and next is urgent. The initial grant from America's great surplus of wheat should be voted by Congress with all possible dispatch.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 24, 1951]

TIME IS NO ALLY HERE

Recently this page mentioned that action on the bill for authorization of aid to India in the form of grain waits on the willingness of the Rules Committee to place that bill on the calendar of the House of Representatives.

The proposal, with some details left to further legislation, has been approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It is backed by the administration, by former President Hoover, by bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress, and by most editorial opinion expressed on the subject.

It takes about 6 weeks to load a ship, sail to India, and unload. And some of the ships to be used are coming out of "moth balls." Meanwhile India has had to cut its ration for 125,000,000 people from 12 ounces to 9 ounces a day, and can fill the ration quotas only as ships arrive. Approximately 45,000,000 persons depend solely on the grain ration. How much hunger do the gentlemen of the House Rules Committee want to take the responsibility for?

Aid to Blind Person in Securing Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Government Employees' Exchange of March 14, 1951, and which gives a graphic account of the progress made by the Civil Service Commission in its efforts to aid blind persons in securing Government employment. I commend this article to my colleagues for their information:

TRANSCRIBERS, REPORTERS EXAMS FOR BLIND MARK PROGRESS FOR CSC

A dictating machine transcriber exam for the blind only and a shorthand reporter exam for which the blind may apply are two of the latest steps in the two-pronged handicap program of Dr. Verne K. Harvey, noted Medical Director of the Civil Service Commission.

Dr. Harvey's program, based on a realistic evaluation of physical requirements, is keyed to give the handicapped person a chance to do a job and at the same time help ease the Government personnel shortage.

The dictating machine transcribers will transcribe on a typewriter. The exam opened February 7 and closed March 2. As of February 27, with still a few days to go, 74 persons had applied for the exams, Dr. Harvey told a Government employees' exchange reporter.

Dr. Harvey explained that the exam has two parts: a performance test and a general abilities. For the performance test the applicant will transcribe from a record dictated by the Civil Service Commission and will be rated on accuracy and speed. The applicant must type at least 40 words a minute with a maximum of nine mistakes. Requirements are flexible so that if greater speed is attained more errors will be allowed.

On the general abilities test questions will be read to the applicant and recorded by a sighted person. The entire examination will take about 2 hours.

Some vacancies are open in these jobs, Dr. Harvey told the Exchange, and as the typist shortage becomes critical, agencies are expected to use up the register. A dictating machine is actually a time-saving device for the administrator, Dr. Harvey noted.

BLIND REPORTER

For the shorthand-reporter examination, for which a sighted person ordinarily uses shorthand or a stenograph machine, any machine that noiselessly records the voice of the shorthand reporter is acceptable. The blind use a machine with a cover that goes over the nose and mouth and a strap that goes around the head. A flexible tube leads to the recording device. The facepiece fits snug so no sound gets in but the reporter's voice. The reporter must take 5 minutes' dictation at 175 words a minute for the test. One hour is allowed for transcribing. The jobs are from grade 6 to 9, paying from $3,450 to $4,600 annually.

The blind reporter speaks in natural English, records the name of the speaker and everything said. Simply recording a meeting is not feasible, Dr. Harvey said, since people forget to state their name, and at important moments all talk at once and the recording becomes a babble.

Dr. Harvey emphasized that on these tests the blind have the same standard of accuracy as a sighted person. Much of the philosophy behind his widely praised handicap program came out in his statement: "To have a sound handicap program you must expect the same performance out of the handicapped as the nonhandicapped. The alternate is an aid program which is a type of welfare work. I don't believe these handicapped people are looking for that in working for the Government. They want to prove that they can do the job."

Blind employees gainfully employed were first used on a large scale by the Government in World War II, Dr. Harvey said. Before that the only openings were special jobs at FSA set aside by law for the blind. When Dr. Harvey first introduced the use of blind employees, some personnel chiefs were skeptical. Personnel men came by the dozens to see the work of the blind girl, Miss Caroline Hastings (now Mrs. McNichols), working as a transcriber at CSC. They went away convinced that the blind could do the job.

There are at least 30 to 35 blind people employed by the Government in Washington at present. Fifteen of these are in the special blind service section at the Library of Congress. VA employs eight in its central office and four in its regional office. Others are: Bureau of the Budget, one; CSC, fourth regional office, one; ICC, one; Immigration and Naturalization Service, one; Agriculture, one; and FSA, one or two. Most of these are typists, the Bureau of the Budget has a blind analyst.

United States Must First Win the Subversive War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, we all know that this Congress has a tendency to reflect the immediate moods of the people. We therefore find ourselves rushing defense legislation during each crisis, and relaxing into complacency whenever the immediate threat to our security seems slightly lessened. That this tendency is not new is demonstrated by the excellent editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, of Los Angeles, which I should like to call to the attention of the House:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of March 30, 1951]

UNITED STATES MUST FIRST WIN THE SUBVERSIVE WAR

Recently over a national radio network Gen. William J. Donovan, former Director of the Office of Strategic Services, and now a working member of the Committee on the Present Danger, went back 2,000 years to wise old Demosthenes, the Greek orator, who thus delivered himself to the people of fourth century B. C., Athens:

"Shame on you Athenians * * * for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow oneself to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. You Athenians are the strongest of all the Greeks, in ships, cavalry, infantry, and revenue, and you do not make the best of them.

"You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles—if he suffers a blow, he immediately puts his hand to it. If he is struck again, he puts his hand there too; but he has not the skill or does not think of parrying the blow aimed at him or of evading his antagonist. You, likewise, if you hear tell that Philip has attacked the Chaeronea, you send help there; if he is at Thermopylae, you run there; and if he turns aside, you follow him, to right or left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan, never any precautions: you wait for bad news before you act."

IRAN IS PERFECT EXAMPLE

General Donovan points to recent developments in Iran as a perfect example of how communism is waging its war of aggression.

"A news article of March 15," he says, "states that the Soviet Union has been courting Iranian officials for 6 months with presents, such as release of captured Iranian border guards and the signing of a $20,000,000 barter treaty.

"Iran produces 6 percent of the world's oil. It is the most valuable of the non-American supply sources which serve the western nations. It is a vital strategic area and therefore a sought-after military price. There has been open speculation on the possibility of a Stalin invasion and what we should do in that event.

"But why should Stalin run the risk of a shooting war? Instead he called up Tudeh, the Soviet-controlled political party, to lead a movement in the Iranian lower house to nationalize the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., despite the fact that it is 53 percent British owned and is operated under a concession that does not expire until 1993.

"Watch the succeeding steps. Moscow has already paved the way to obtain a trade agreement, an agreement which could give her use and control of these British wells and refineries. If this cold war tactic proves successful, Stalin will have out-maneuvered us again, without the necessity of taking over the Government, let alone a military invasion. * * *

"We have only just begun to grasp the special nature of Communist organization and methods," continues General Donovan. "The real strength of the Soviets lies in their world-wide organization, highly developed techniques and communications, and in the discipline of leaders especially trained in the Lenin school in Moscow."

CANNOT LOWER OUR GUARD

"All of this should teach us that we are faced by an enemy against whom we cannot lower our guard—a foe that is always alert—and ruthless—and tenacious. Against such a foe we must exercise sustained effort, perhaps for many years. Soviet tactics may change even to the point of temporary retreat, but the objective is always the same—a world empire.

"Only by our understanding of the manner in which the fight will be carried to us will we be able to deal with it. We can't sit back and hope to be let alone. There is no place for complacency, or indifference, or fear—we can't buy our way out or dream our way out, nor should we be misled by seeming successes until we have totaled the score on a global scale.

"We must win this subversive war. It is necessary to win it because in winning it we would have the edge in the shooting war, if that war should ever come. It is essential to win it because in the winning we may make a shooting war impossible. Therefore, we must be strong enough to compel the peace."

For a long time General Donovan has been urging a "fight fire with fire" policy. Instead of waiting for the Reds to start new trouble in Indochina or Iran or Berlin or

Malaya to keep the Western Powers off balance and in a state of continuous confusion, he thinks our side should do a little "behind the curtain" work and keep the Kremlin guessing.

Well—that's the kind of global war we are in, and even though we are prepared to fight an old-fashioned shooting war, we may very well find that the "new" technique—about which old Demosthenes orated 2,000 years ago—will continue to be the main characteristic of continuing warfare.

Cut the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, after President Truman presented us with a staggering $71,000,000,000 budget and then had the effrontery to dare Congress to cut it, I called upon my colleagues to join me in accepting this challenge by voting for rigid economy in nondefense spending. I pointed out that Mr. Truman was asking the American people to make sacrifices in their daily living, through increased taxes, but that he himself was refusing to make political sacrifices by suspending his give-away schemes for socializing America. I called attention to the estimate of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, that at least $7,000,000,000 could be trimmed from the budget without impairing the defense effort in any way. And I promised the taxpayers of the Third Indiana District that I, for one, would not vote to increase taxes a single penny until every bit of fat had been trimmed from the President's budget.

My remarks on this subject were subsequently printed in several newspapers in northern Indiana, including the Michigan City News-Dispatch. A few days later I was pleasantly surprised to see an article in that newspaper which I quote in full herewith:

HIGH TAXES IRK YOU?—HE DOES SOMETHING ABOUT IT, WILL YOU?

Everyone talks about high taxes but few do anything about it. Few, except William Welk, that is.

Welk, a prison guard who lives at 219 East Eleventh, read with approval in his February 28 News-Dispatch that third district Congressman SHEP CRUMPACKER was urging his colleagues to accept President Truman's dare and cut the $71,000,000,000 budget. The story gave Welk an idea.

Carefully he typed the story neatly on several sheets of paper and beneath it a note to the Congressman telling him that the persons whose names and addresses appear on subsequent sheets agree with his stand. Then Welk began getting signatures in his free time.

In 1 week, more than 700 persons signed the sheets with their names and addresses.

"There are Democrats and Republicans alike on these lists of names," he said.

Now he has received some help to add at least that many more signatures before sending the lists to Washington. Blank lists for signing have been placed at the News-Dispatch and chamber of commerce offices for anyone who feels the same way to sign.

Mr. Speaker, the document referred to in the above article is now in my possession. It is beautifully bound and is inscribed as a "testimonial of confidence and appreciation" extended to me for my stand in support of Government economy. It bears the signatures of more than 1,500 citizens of Michigan City, including many leaders in civic affairs.

My purpose in calling this incident to the attention of Congress is to emphasize a simple fact that many of us here may be inclined to overlook. That fact is that there is a tremendous ground swell of feeling in this country against the spendthrift policies of the Truman administration. There is a great popular demand for a program of rigid Government economy of the kind proposed by Senator BYRD in the Senate and by Republican leaders in the House. The people are aware that the distinguished Senator from Virginia spoke the truth when he said recently:

> The 5 years that have passed since World War II ended may well go down in history as the most irresponsible 5 years of the great American Republic. • • •
>
> In those 5 years has been squandered the greatest prosperity ever to come to any nation; the Federal Government has collected far more taxes than ever before; it has spent far more money on purely domestic-civilian programs than ever before; it has spent far more money abroad than ever before; it has spent far more money for defense than ever before without achieving preparedness; and it has failed to curtail the greatest public debt any nation has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, it is futile to look to President Truman for leadership in this fight to restore a sound American economy. Mr. Truman is committed to a program of more and more spending, and higher and higher taxes. The leadership must come from Congress. The people are looking to us to do more than pay mere lip service to economy. They are expecting us to work for it and to vote for it.

At the time Mr. Truman presented his record budget to Congress I pointed out that there were vast opportunities for savings in nearly every civilian-domestic item. Several of the President's proposals were designed to initiate pet projects of the administration and fulfill political, vote-buying promises made to various pressure groups. Good illustrations of this type are proposed appropriations to socialize farming and medicine. These appropriations, in my opinion, should be rejected outright.

A second step we must take is to serve notice on our military leaders that unnecessary waste, duplication, and inefficiency in the defense program will not be tolerated. Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force are not sacred. They must be carefully scrutinized. Their actual expenditures, reaching astronomical figures, must be the subject of continuing and constructively critical review.

No one for a moment wants to deny our fighting men the best in training, equipment and care. No one wants to scrimp on weapons or ammunition or on any of the essential items which comprise the framework of a sound defense structure. But anyone who has ever served in the Armed Forces knows that military supply officials are not noted for their financial prudence. They need to have applied to them the firm hand of those whose responsibility it is to total up the bill which is to be submitted to the people.

Without intending to imply any criticism of our Nation's military leaders, I am convinced that substantial savings could be effected in the defense effort without in any way impairing the soundness of our defense effort.

For example, with millions of pounds of Government-owned butter and eggs stored in caves around the country, it recently was disclosed that the Quartermaster General has been contracting to buy butter and eggs on the open market at current high prices. There was no effort at cooperation between the Army and the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has been selling these same foodstuffs at a nominal sum or, in some cases, giving them away. Proper liaison between Government agencies would have prevented this inexcusable waste of public funds.

I appreciate the fact that mistakes are bound to occur when mobilization preparations are hurried as they are at this time. My only point is that the constant vigilance of Congress could do much in this field to protect the public purse.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that Congress should have as its goal a reduction of at least $7,000,000,000 in Federal spending. This reduction, in my opinion, should have priority over any new or additional taxes in our effort to obtain a balanced budget.

As further evidence that demands for Government economy are widespread, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point, a petition from another county in my district, Elkhart County, which I believe eloquently expresses the majority viewpoint of the American people:

ELKHART, IND.

HON. SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRUMPACKER: The undersigned, all residents and voters of Elkhart County, Ind., desire that you be advised of our reactions to the recent proposed Federal tax increases.

No one of us desires to evade or avoid our just share of the tax burden. That is a price we must all pay for the privilege of citizenship in this wonderful country. However, we cannot, and we will not, tolerate any increase in taxes at the present time for any other reason than to rearm this country and our allies to meet aggression.

The proposed budget of the President contains, as you know, many provisions for increases in the allotments for the President's social reforms, or shall we say, socialistic program. We are definitely opposed to the expenditure of any more funds to increase the scope of Federal control in this country.

The economic stability of this country has been shaken and disturbed and is in danger of being completely disrupted. You appreciate, better than we, that such a result would throw us to our knees before Russia without even having had an opportunity to defend ourselves.

We appeal to you, and we advise you as our elected representative, to do all in your power to curb these foolhardy proposals, and to guard every dollar that must be expended. The future of our country is at

stake. We will need every dollar our economy can raise to succeed in the conflict ahead. We expect you to do all you can to conserve the tax dollars we must all sacrifice.

Forget the Dams and Give the Triple Cities Flood Walls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, probably the most disgraceful exhibition of cheap politics on record has been displayed for the past 4 or 5 years in the valleys of Chenango and Susquehanna in New York's Southern Tier.

A continuous, deliberate campaign of misinformation and deceit against the wishes of the people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and Vestal in regard to adequate flood control has been and is still being waged by undercover agents of sabotage.

It all started as an attempt in certain high places back home and in Washington to discredit the Hall proposal of flood-wall protection for the greater Endicott-Vestal area of the Susquehanna River.

No sooner would I make a public utterance of what everybody in Broome County knows to be true, namely, that these walls are the first line of defense against floods, than a hue and cry would be raised by sundry experts that the only possible solution was the building of dams miles up the Susquehanna and Chenango above Binghamton.

This campaign of rule or ruin has accomplished the blocking of my proposal and has already caused damage to a billion dollars' worth of public and private and industrial properties in our neighborhood in the 1948 flood.

It is apparent that the saboteurs of the Hall plan preferred the satisfaction of defeating this logical flood-wall project rather than saving the triple cities from floods.

These same smart alecks are now gleefully jubiliant over the prospect of local flood works being shelved with preference directed to our national defense program.

They grin and grimace at my suggestion to call our flood walls a defense priority when I demand that the Army engineers build them anyway.

Not content in wrecking proper safeguards in the interest of our Triple Cities population, they have extended their campaign of harassment to the rural folk of Chenango, Delaware, Otsego Counties.

The tremendous torrent of protesting letters I am now receiving from committees and people in the areas of Mount Upton, South New Berlin, Rockdale, Afton, Unadilla, and other nearby communities, tells me the enemies of proper flood control are on the march.

There is no reason why the rural areas of Unadilla, Butternuts, or any other point in the Susquehanna and Chenango watersheds should be destroyed by a massive dam-construction program in place of the erection of our Triple Cities flood walls.

You can put me down as standing solidly on the side of the citizens of both the metropolitan and rural areas in this fight against the hypocrites and monekywrench throwers trying to build these mighty dams ahead of the Hall floodwall projects.

I say to these finaglers, leave the rural people alone, do not ruin their lands, their homes, their properties just because you are determined to deprive the Triple Cities of flood walls.

Is there more gravy in juicy contracts for building dams than for the flood walls? You know there is, and so do I.

Be patriotic Americans for a change. Forget the profits, the dollars you will line your pockets with if the dams are built.

Forget the dams and get busy on our flood walls, which ought to reach solidly clear from Conklin and Kirkwood away down past West Endicott and Vestal, nearly to the Tioga County line.

You people up there in Chenango, Otsego, and Delaware Counties can rest assured I will fight these birds to the finish. I will not take this dam building lying down. My preference is floodwall construction down where the trouble is in the Triple Cities, and I do not believe in wrecking your houses either.

Korean Policy and Our Diplomatic Relations in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Johr C. Caldwell, former Embassy attaché at Seoul, Korea, gave an address Tuesday afternoon in Derby, Conn., to the Sarah Riggs Humphreys Chapter, DAR, an account of which was carried in Wednesday's edition of the Ansonia Sentinel.

His remarks, which were confined to Korean policy as promulgated by the State Department and our diplomatic relations in the Far East, merit far greater circulation than given by their printing in a local newspaper.

Mr. Caldwell, a first-hand observer, related astonishing tales of our failure to recognize the basic differences in oriental and occidental behavior. One portion of his address relates to the obvious incompetency of embassy personnel and to the tragic failure of State Department intelligence in foreseeing the invasion of South Korea.

This is the most forthright account I have yet encountered of the complete inability of the State Department to represent the people of the Unitd States in its foreign policy.

The story is one of shame—it cries out for corrective action.

The news account follows:

CALDWELL SAYS SNOBS, INCOMPETENTS, ALCOHOLICS REPRESENTED UNITED STATES AT SEOUL; TELLS OF GRAVE MISTAKE MADE AT YALTA

Diplomatic mistakes caused us to fail in spreading the principles of democracy in Korea, John C. Caldwell, former United States Embassy Attaché at Seoul, Korea, told a large gathering of members of Sarah Riggs Humphreys Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the meeting held Tuesday afternoon in Library Hall.

"We had a wonderful opportunity to teach the people what democracy was," he said, "but we left the people confused. Part of our failure is a matter of personnel," the speaker declared. "I don't believe there are many Communists in the State Department despite what Senator MCCARTHY says, but there are people who are not doing a good job of selling America to the people of the world," averred the former United States Embassy attach'.

"Today people are of tremendous importance, especially the people who represent us abroad. The Voice of America employs 10,650 people, and the President wants to raise this to 13,000."

WRONG PERSONNEL

"Unfortunately, alcoholics, incompetent people, and people who believe in the Gook philosophy are representing us. A person who has a Gook philosophy is a person who believes that people who live differently or not as well as he does are a low-class people. Our representatives in Seoul showed in their everyday actions that they disliked the people with whom they worked. Half of our people detested the Koreans and showed it. They knew nothing of the people, their habits or customs. The Communists in their propaganda say we are snobs and we live up to their propaganda."

NO TRAINING

Mr. Caldwell went on to say that the United States Government gives no training to the people attached to the State Department.

"There is no way of testing aptitudes. We send them to Washington, D. C., for 3 weeks to learn State Department protocol. They learn how to correctly address the Ambassador and how to drop their calling cards in order of importance. We teach them nothing about the country to which they are going, the customs or the people. A salesman is not a good salesman unless he is interested in his prospect. Incalculable damage has been done by sending incompetent personnel as America's representatives in foreign lands."

CHRONIC ALCOHOLIC

He told of a man in the State Department at Seoul who was third in importance. This man was a chronic alcoholic, the speaker averred, who was treated for alcoholism and released, readmitted for treatment and again released. He attempted suicide, was again treated and released and is still on duty representing you in Korea.

Mr. Caldwell, born in China of missionary parents, said he came to this country for the first time when he entered college. He declared that Korea was the big story of 1950 and the side show of 1951. Korea will continue to be of great interest to America and Russia. The latter, he said, thought it could win a large part of the geography of the world with America doing nothing to stop her. He continued that he was afraid that Korea will continue as a danger spot for a good many years.

He wondered if we would learn a lesson from our mistakes in Korea—diplomatic mistakes which cost the Americans 60,000 in casualties and a total of 1,000,000 casualties of all nations.

AN OLD COUNTRY

Korea is an old country, the speaker said, with a history that goes back 4,235 years. It has been fought over and grasped at by neighboring countries for a long time. In the nineteenth century, Japan, China, and Russia fought for its control, with the Japanese winning out early in the twentieth century. Russia has always been interested in Korea, with both Stalin and Lenin expounding the theory that if the billion and a half people of the Far East could be indoctrinated in communism these people could provide the raw manpower to completely control the western capitalistic nations.

YALTA MISTAKE

The greatest mistake America made was made when we gave entry to the Far East to Russia at Yalta. We were anxious for Russia to get into the Asiatic war, he declared. Our Intelligence Department was not operating very well at the time. Japan was near defeat. We did not need Russia, Mr. Caldwell pointed out.

The idea at Yalta was that we would enter South Korea to disarm the Japanese and Russia would do the same in North Korea, so the thirty-eighth parallel came into being simply because it was a line which more or less divided Korea in half. But no thought was given to the fact that two-thirds of the population lives in the south, which is almost completely agricultural, and one-third the population resides in the north, which is where all the industries are located.

DISARM JAPAN

The thirty-eighth parallel was to be in existence only until the Japanese had been disarmed. A United States-U. S. S. R. commission was set up to agree on a government for Korea, but Russia would not agree to anything proposed. Finally, in 1948, the United Nations sent a commission which tried to work with Russia, but was denied the right to go north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

GOVERNMENT

Finally it was decided to elect a government in the American zone, and in May 1948 an election was held, Mr. Caldwell informed his listeners which was a free election, more democratic than in my home State, Tennessee. Dr. Syngman Rhee became President. The South Koreans had more freedom in 1948–50 than ever before. More than 2,000,000 refugees came in from North Korea, over mountain passes at night, under great risk, to get into South Korea.

The military government, established in 1945 and continuing until 1948, left as soon as the South Korean Government was established despite the interest and demands of the Korean people. Our Department of State took over all operations in South Korea, and it is the Department of State which can keep us out of war, or, by a bad job, get us into war, the speaker emphasized.

LARGE ESTABLISHMENT

"As soon as our troops left in the summer of 1948 we built a very large diplomatic establishment, the largest ever maintained overseas. Larger than in great capitals of the world. In Seoul we had an establishment of 1,800 Americans. There were 11 hotels, 10 bars, a beauty parlor, barber shop, taxis, and liquor store. The United States Government owned 375 homes. Good salaries were paid, with 100 employees getting $10,000 per year, plus a house, rent free, plus two servants paid for by the State Department, plus free utilities and fuel. Still, Seoul was considered a hardship post, and we were paid 25 percent extra for having to live in a hardship post."

Mr. Caldwell said that he believed State Department employees should be comfortable, but I think when we have luxury then we create a chasm between ourselves and the people we are supposed to serve. The Koreans have a very low standard of living, and the Communist tries to capitalize on the needs of the people. The Communists always point to America as rich, imperialistic America, and how we lived created a wonderful Communist line. And how they used it. They told the people we were only interested in making money and more money. There should be some lessons we should learn on how to develop diplomatic relations in the future.

FAULTY INTELLIGENCE

"On June 25 we heard that the invasion had started. We had joked about the time when the Communists would invade, take us all prisoners, and send us to Siberia. State Department intelligence had reported that the Communist morale was low, that there was no connection between the Korean Communists and Moscow, that the North Koreans had not good military equipment, and that the South Korean Army was so strong it could stop any invasion." He pointed out that this information was received through our intelligence despite the fact that Seoul was only 25 air miles from the thirty-eighth parallel and that the North Koreans had evacuated whole villages, widened highways so that tanks could get by, strengthened buildings."

INCREDULOUS AMBASSADOR

"Our Ambassador at Seoul refused to believe the story of the invasion for hour after hour and refused to allow the evacuation of our women and children. He would not allow American planes to evacuate our women and children because he feared it might provoke an incident. Finally he ordered the evacuation and there was only one boat in the harbor at Inchon, a boat with a capacity for 12 people and it carried 682 women and children to Japan. Many had to be taken off the boat on stretchers—all the result of faulty intelligence. In this battle against communism we must have honest intelligence in State Department operations," the speaker declared.

SIX KNEW

He continued that although we had not believed the invasion rumors, the British, with a staff of only six people, had sent out evacuation orders 3 weeks before. The South Korean Government had warned us of the coming invasion as had the government of Chiang Kai-shek. "We were so full of wishful thinking, so hopeful that the North Koreans would believe we were their friends instead of the Russians being their friends, that we believed that there would be no trouble.

"I was in the State Department for 8 years and have heard top officials declaim on the merits of Chinese Communists, declaring that we would find no real tie between the Chinese Communists and Russia. The North Korean or Chinese Communist in the Far East is part of international communism. This trouble in Korea started at Russia's direction. Our whole history for the last 5 years in dealing with communism has failed miserably."

ONE LOCATION

Mr. Caldwell told of the Voice of America, whose purpose it is through radio, newspapers, motion pictures, and information centers to sell our point of view. He said that 33 persons were engaged in Korea simply selling our point of view, to teach the Koreans about democracy and American aims. Our first mistake was that the 33 engaged in various phases of selling America to the Koreans all were located in Seoul. The Koreans are largely agrarian. They live on farms and very few get to Seoul. Yet no real effort was made to reach the millions of people on the farms.

The people are illiterate but intelligent, Mr. Caldwell said. He told of the library of 16,000 volumes maintained at Seoul and of the 200 periodicals received every month, among which were Vogue and Harper's Bazaar. He said we were trying to teach democracy to a people who couldn't read English.

One of the unfortunate things is, the speaker said, that the State Department operates the same no matter where it is, in Norway, England, Iran, or Korea. So inflexible is the list of reading material that the list for London, England, is the same as it is for Seoul, Korea.

EXHIBIT

He told of a group of students who asked him if he could get an exhibit of public housing to show in Korea because of the desperate housing shortage. A "magnificent exhibit" of Peter Stuyvesant Village in New York City was flown to Korea, all fine brick buildings. The people become frustrated, he said, when they see this sort of exhibit when they have only straw and mud to work with. The students came to Mr. Caldwell and told him that the exhibit was fine, and that, perhaps, in a hundred years something like that might be built in Korea, but could something be brought in which would be of help today.

He told of asking for a motion picture on college life, expecting a film on a small college. Instead a documentary film on the University of California was sent to be shown to students who have no textbooks and who must study in frame buildings without heat.

COMMUNISTS WORK FOR US

Mr. Caldwell said that we failed in our intelligence and we failed to sell the people our aims and what democracy really means but, he continued, "I don't think all is lost. Where we have failed the Communists have won it for us." The occupation of southern Korea by the Communists has caused the Koreans to be violently against communism. He said that in letters from friends in China he is informed that the anti-Communist feeling is greater than ever before. They know that the economic and farm reforms do not work.

EVANGELICAL ZEAL

In conclusion Mr. Caldwell said that he hoped that from our mistakes we can learn how to reach the people and that now is the time to win or lose the people of the Far East. He said what is needed is the evangelical zeal which marked the work of the missionaries. He told of his father who 51 years ago went to China as a missionary and of his wife's father who went to Korea as a missionary 40 years ago, when conditions were bad and living arrangements poor. He declared that those missionaries had succeeded because they believed in what they were selling, Christianity. They learned to like the people. Mr. Caldwell emphasized that if we could get the State Department to believe in what we are attempting to sell and to use the evangelical zeal that marked the missionaries "then we can win this great fight against communism."

Safe Alternative to a Big Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the House to the following thoughtful statement relative to universal military training

which appeared as an editorial in the Evening Star yesterday:

SAFE ALTERNATIVE TO A BIG ARMY

Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, is right. This country cannot afford either the economic or military consequence of being without universal military training in the threatening era which stretches ahead into the indefinite future. A military training system is a necessary adjunct of a strong and ready Reserve program to back up the standing army. With such a system we can run the calculated risk of maintaining a small Regular Defense Establishment, knowing that in an emergency there will be trained manpower instantly available to augment the standing Armed Forces.

Without an adequate trained Reserve the only safe plan would be to build up a much larger Regular Army than is currently planned. There is a limit, however, to the defense burden which our economy can support.

The bill before the House differs from the Senate-approved bill in several minor respects and one major one. The House version would reduce the present draft age of 19 to 18½, while the Senate bill would lower it to 18. Draft service is lengthened from 21 to 26 months, as compared with the Senate requirement for 24 months' service. The House bill has no limit on the number of men who could be inducted, whereas the Senate placed a 4,000,000 limit on military manpower. A major difference between the bills is that the House measure places a definite 3-year limit on the drafting of men for actual service. The Senate defeated a somewhat similar limitation proposed by Senator TAFT.

While the 3-year time limit would be restricted by the language of the House bill to only that part of selective service which channeled men into the Regular Armed Forces, leaving UMT unaffected. The Star believes it would be a mistake to raise any legal barrier to further induction of men in this unsettled period. Since the program contemplated under the legislation would involve a tapering off of inductions for active service, it is not clear what is to be gained by setting a deadline on further inductions. If, as is hoped, conditions grow no worse than they are today, or if they improve, inductions for actual service will have reached a minimum by 1954 or before, making statutory restrictions more or less academic. If, on the other hand, the world situation worsens before 1954, it would be foolhardy to place the induction system under the handicap of a deadline.

In any event, the House should take care to see that any time limit which may be adopted does not apply to universal military training. UMT is a long-view security program that should be set up on a permanent basis. It should continue to supply a reservoir of trained manpower in time of peace as well as during emergency periods. The very existence of such a reservoir would help to keep the peace.

In the True Tradition of the Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a statement from Senator CHARLES TOBEY, of New Hampshire, elicited by Mr. Fortune Pope, editor of the Il Progresso, national newspaper serving the Italian-American population of the Nation.

To me, unity among the various minority groups that form our population is a cherished and desired state. Therefore, I was pleased at the action of Mr. Pope in clearing up a serious misunderstanding concerning Italo-Americans, which arose from the Senate crime investigation hearings in New York. I say serious because at this time, while the Nation is girded to stepping up preparations for full mobilization, unity is of the utmost necessity.

Fortune Pope, as a spokesman for the Americans of Italian origin, performed a public service in keeping with the best traditions of the great free press, in traveling to Washington to meet with Senator TOBEY to clarify certain points made by the Senator on radio and television, regarding Italian immigrants to this country.

In eliciting the following statement from Senator TOBEY, Mr. Pope has done a distinct service to Americans of Italian origin whose exemplary citizenship has contributed greatly to America's growth, and to the American people as a whole:

RADIO STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES TOBEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the light of certain misunderstandings which have arisen from the recent crime investigation hearings in New York, I am grateful to WHOM and the Progresso for this opportunity to clarify those misunderstandings.

Issue has been made about a letter which I read into the record at one of the recent television sessions of the crime committee hearings.

I read that letter to convey the thought that the overwhelming majority of the Italian-American citizens are good men, such as the writer of that letter, and just because a small percentage of these people have done wrong, it casts no reflection on the many honest, hard-working, patriotic Americans of Italian extraction who have contributed their talent and industry to make our country strong and great. My sole purpose in reading this letter was to pay tribute to those fine Americans who—in contrast to a small minority—have given their best to the arts and industries and civic life of these United States.

I felt the spirit of that letter conveyed these thoughts and that it did not need to be clarified by any statement from me. However, if it was misunderstood, I am glad to clarify the point that I was trying to make. I count many Americans of Italian extraction among my close and intimate friends.

The last thing I would have in mind or do would be to cast aspersions on any racial group. I would consider that entirely un-American.

The strength of our country lies in the fact that here are woven into the fabric of American citizenship the blood of all nations, blended into our national life, making for strength and unity.

Good Italian-American citizens, as well as the good citizens of other minority segments of our population, have not had their good record damaged by the handful of evildoers who were called to testify before our committee. I know that I speak for all the members of the committee in assuring you of the heartfelt sincerity with which I say this.

Topics of Concern to the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the current draft extension and universal military training measure, there have been occasional references to the United States Marine Corps. Things which I have heard have been uniformly complimentary. Of particular and timely interest has been the comment on the excellent job done by the civilian component—the Reserve of the United States Marines.

In this, I take particular pride because of my long association with the Reserve and because during the closing phase of World War II and for some months thereafter I was director of the Reserve. As such I had a part in the planning of the organization which has functioned so magnificently and with such telling effect during the Korean troubles.

Every since I became a marine in 1917 I have asked myself the question which so many others have asked and are still asking: Why do marines fight they way they do? I have just read a letter sent by the Commandant of the Marine Corps under date of February 7, 1951, to all general and commanding officers in the corps. It is an exceptional document and should be read by everyone in any way connected with the armed services. It would also be of value to everyone who is in a position of authority or leadership over others.

In this letter of the Commandant to his officers, we may have found an important key to the question: Why do marines fight the way they do?

The Commandant's letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS,
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1951.

From: Commandant of the Marine Corps.
To: Distribution List.
Subject: Topics of concern to the Marine Corps.

1. Since it is obviously impracticable to hold the Commandant's annual conference of general officers under the current circumstances, the medium of this letter is employed to acquaint all Marine Corps general officers and other commanding officers with the Commandant's views on a number of matters of concern to the entire Marine Corps.

2. This, unquestionably, is one of the most critical periods in the history of the Marine Corps. Following demobilization and further progressive administrative reduction from 1945 to June 1950, we have again embarked on a program of expansion in a new period of national emergency. The First Marine Division and the First Marine Aircraft Wing have already demonstrated in Korea that marines of today can equal the outstanding performance of their predecessors. The actions of the Marine Corps in the months and years ahead may very possibly have some measure of influence on the destiny of the country. These actions, beyond question, will determine the future of the Marine Corps.

3. The reputation of the Corps—the manner in which it is looked upon by the American people whom it serves—is a priceless asset. It was established by faithful and unswerving service rendered with a high order of professional competency at all times. A great part of it was due to success of marines in battle. A significant fraction comes, however, from the fact that habitually marines discharge any job assigned in a satisfactory manner. The public has come to associate competence and efficiency with the Marine Corps and it is a responsibility of every marine to uphold this reputation. The Marine Corps will never become so large or impersonal as to be indifferent to the activities of the individual marine. The success of the Corps in the past has been the result of the collective efforts of many individuals. Success in the future will be attained by the same type of effort.

4. Attitude: In any period of expansion, it is difficult to retain a personal, individual approach to the men. To do so requires extraordinary effort on the part of every officer and noncommissioned officer. It is expected that whatever effort is necessary will be made; whatever measures are required will be taken. Should the time ever arrive when the individual marine becomes—or is permitted to believe that he has become—only a number of an MOS, then the Marine Corps will, in fact, have commenced to decline. In the 6 months from July 1950 to January 1951, the Marine Corps doubled its strength. With expansion of that order, it is far from simple to instill in every marine the proper sense of responsibility and pride in the Corps. Nevertheless, it is a job that must be done.

5. Interservice relations: As a military service of this Nation, the Marine Corps has certain clearly defined functions. The Marine Corps' justification is dependent entirely on the manner in which these functions are carried out. An implied responsibility is that of complete and wholehearted cooperation with the other services. The American people definitely, and quite properly, expect this to be done. Neither that nor any other worthwhile purpose is served by interservice controversy. Accordingly, it is expected that every possible measure will be taken to work in harmony with the other services. The emergency facing this country will require work and sacrifice on the part of every American. The immediate task of the Marine Corps in this emergency is to develop and maintain combat forces in being. This requires the complete and undivided effort of every marine. Perfecting and maintaining the proficiency of the Marine Corps is our full-time job. Relations with other services can and will be conducted on a basis of mutual cooperation and without sacrifice or compromise of Marine Corps principles. Marine participation in interservice controversy in any form acts to the detriment of the Marine Corps and to the entire national defense structure, and is a disservice to both.

6. Economy: The extensive program of expansion on which the services have embarked is by no means to be interpreted as indicating that previous measures of economy can be relaxed. While it is true that there will be more money, more men, and more matériel in the coming months, it is also true that the need to do the most with the least is far greater than it has ever been before. In order to realize the greatest possible return, it will be necessary to adhere to the most rigid measures of economy. Assignment of personnel to noncombatant units will continue to be on a basis of strict austerity. Every allocation of funds, personnel, and matériel to supporting functions must be carefully and continually screened to insure that it is made on the basis of minimum needs. The past efforts of the Marine Corps to make the most of its available means have been uniformly successful. The need for these efforts is even more pressing today than it was in the past. The immediate goal is to develop, in the shortest possible time, formations within the Fleet Marine Forces with the personnel, matériel, and training required to permit them to carry out Marine Corps combat missions. The urgency is such as to prohibit diversion of any of our limited resources to less essential tasks. Every noncombat activity must carry its full share of the burden required to place our maximum effort in the Fleet Marine Forces. Adherence to this policy is a command responsibility.

7. Success in combat can be attributed in great measure to leadership, training, and discipline. In its efforts to produce and maintain combat forces in being, the Marine Corps must direct its attention to these important factors.

(a) Leadership: The development of troop leaders is a continuing process. In a period of expansion such as this, there must be continual screening for men who can be trained to make good leaders. They must be trained with meticulous care. There is no better training device than that of constant demonstration of good leadership practices. There are indications that at least some junior officers and noncommissioned officers are either unaware of or completely indifferent to many of their fundamental responsibilities.

One of the most significant of these is the binding obligation to employ the authority of their rank solely for its intended purpose. There have been instances in which this authority has been so perverted as to result in the physical mistreatment of individual marines. Abuse of authority can undermine and eventually destroy a military organization. In such circumstances, the fault is not alone with the officer or noncommissioned officer concerned. It is clearly indicative of failure on the part of more senior officers, particularly in the matters of leadership and supervision.

(b) Training: Training is, of course, preparation for battle. Thus, it is the most important function of troops not engaged in combat. It is important that the men understand that the training is designed not only to improve their individual performance in combat but also to enable them to function effectively as members of teams in combat wherein malperformance by one individual may endanger all others. While training in the Fleet Marine Forces obviously provides the most direct benefits, nevertheless training conducted at posts and stations is vitally important. It must be properly planned, energetically pursued, and carefully supervised. It must not be considered merely as a perfunctory duty. Every marine is available for assignment to the Fleet Marine Forces and he must be trained continually to permit him to carry out such an assignment. General Order No. 10 (shortly to be superseded by General Order No. 83) outlines a sound course of training to accomplish this purpose.

(c) Discipline: The validity of the Marine Corps standards of discipline has been repeatedly demonstrated. These standards are not to be relaxed or qualified during this period of expansion.

(d) Appearance: In the circumstances such as those currently existing, there is often a tendency to relax normal standards in the personal appearance of individual marines. This same tendency is noted in the appearance of equipment (particularly motor transport) and in the general maintenance of buildings, grounds, and facilities. This deterioration of standards must be avoided. The remedy lies in additional effort on the part of every officer and noncommissioned officer.

8. Recruiting: The Marine Corps expansion to date has been accomplished by using Reserves and voluntary enlistments. The great majority of the Reserves have now been mobilized. It is to the best interest of the Marine Corps to continue to make maximum use of voluntary enlistments as long as it is possible to do so. Every Marine Corps activity can assist the recruiting program by encouraging voluntary enlistment by every practicable means.

9. Inquiries addressed to the Commandant from Members of Congress and from parents and interested friends of marines have, of course, increased tremendously since July. The general pattern established by these inquiries is, in a measure, indicative of the manner in which various command responsibilities are being discharged. Some of the most often mentioned topics are listed below in order that all commanders may insure that the conditions referred to do not exist in their commands.

(a) Food: The fact that at least some complaints about food are received under almost all circumstances does not justify complacency. In spite of the high cost of food there is no reason why entirely adequate messes cannot be maintained. The problem of units in the combat area is, of course, a special circumstance. In other situations, an adequate mess can be provided if the commander gives to it a sufficient amount of his personal attention and supervision. The manner in which food is prepared and served usually determines whether the mess is good or bad. This is the area which requires the greatest attention and supervision and which shows the greatest results of such effort. It is worth noting that at least one complaint was received which stated that one mess was preparing far too much food with a resulting extravagant waste.

(b) Mail: In the question of mail, the problems faced by units in the combat area are of a special nature and not within the purview of these remarks. The morale value of mail is readily recognizable. For all units within the continental United States there is no apparent reason why mail should not be distributed rapidly and regularly though reports to the contrary have been received.

(c) Reserves:

(1) There have been many reports that some reserves are dissatisfied and disgruntled. This seems to be due to a lack of understanding of why they were mobilized and due also to the confusion incident to the large-scale mobilization last fall. There are repeated reports that the reservists, even now, are not receiving proper training. There are other reports which clearly indicate that the reservists do not understand their rights and privileges regarding insurance, family allotments, and other administrative procedures.

(2) While it was reasonable to expect that at least some of these problems would exist during the first few weeks of mobilization, their existence at this date would appear to be inexcusable. Measures should be taken immediately to clarify problems of this kind. Commands which have already carried out orientation courses should institute an immediate recheck to insure that there is no misunderstanding. It must be recognized that these men left their civilian pursuits, their families, and their homes on very short notice. If they are to serve properly as marines, it is necessary that they have an understanding of why they were called to active duty. The importance of their work as marines must be made clear.

(3) The authority under which the reserves were mobilized provided that they would serve for a period of 21 months. Under the terms of the Naval Reserve Act and the National Security Act, the Secretary of the Navy has the authority to extend this period of duty for the duration of the emergency. If the international situation should worsen, this authority would probably be invoked. It most certainly would be in the event of a declaration of war. At the present

time, Marine Corps personnel plans are predicated on the assumption that all reservists who so desire, will be released at the end of their 21-months tour. As indicated above, this is, of course, subject to change. As soon as it is practicable to establish a definite program for the return of reservists to inactive duty, all commands will be informed.

(4) It would seem quite obvious that a reservist could scarcely be expected to believe that he is providing an important service to his country on active duty unless he is actually receiving thorough training, and unless, after he is trained, he receives an assignment commensurate with his rank.

(5) It is a basic responsibility of commanders to insure that every marine is fully conversant with his rights, privileges, and responsibilities relating to pay, insurance, and family allotments.

(d) Commercial enterprises: Several reports have been received regarding the improper activities of commercial enterprises on posts and stations. Regulations covering this matter are quite explicit. The presence of large groups of men presents a possible sales opportunity which energetic representatives of commercial enterprises are not likely to overlook. Every possible precaution must be taken to insure that the Marine Corps is not, even by inference, a party to commercial enterprises except through the medium of post exchanges, and that no such enterprise operate on a Marine Corps post or station except as provided by current regulations.

10. The Marine Corps has an important job to do in the future. We can well be proud of our past accomplishments, but that record, no matter how bright, will not serve as future justification for the Marine Corps. By our actions now and in the future we must demonstrate that we are worthy of our status as a military service in this Nation's defense structure.

C. B. CATES.

The National Grange Believes Selective Service Is Meeting Fully Emergency Defense Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Grange believes that the selective service is meeting fully and to spare the emergency defense needs of the Nation; and the military concedes this. We have faith in our people, in democracy, and in Congress to support selective service to the fullest necessary extent as long as danger threatens; and we wish the armed services had this faith and would not try to pass peacetime UMT under the cloak of the present grave danger.

House bill 3364 meets our officially declared stand on this profoundly vital problem in that—

1. It discards universal military training and calls for the fullest necessary use of selective service, with lowered physical and mental tests if needed;

2. Calls for induction at age 19 instead of 18, and for maximum of 24 months' service, or of not over 2 years of a boy's school life, and for release to reserve status if national safety requires it;

3. Provides that Congress by concurrent resolution can change service requirements or suspend the draft when the danger is passed, and for a preservation of selective service machinery but a definite termination date for the draft which automatically gives you as an individual Congressman the right to review your present stand;

4. And provides for a democratically and economically sound occupational deferment based on obtaining maximum national service in the field in which each man is best fitted to serve his country.

The National Grange has no official stand on the provision of House bill 3364 for service in racially segregated units.

We sincerely hope, for the sake of adequate provision for the present emergency, and for the preservation of democracy and the right of Congress to reflect that democracy, that you will support a bill carrying the four numbered items mentioned above.

We sincerely hope and pray also that every Member of the Congress will put forth all possible efforts to bring about a safe and sound reduction of armaments for all nations alike, for a strengthening of law and order and a Christian peace for the world.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. SAUNDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

Proposed Luxury Tax on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a plan to place a luxury tax on meat in order to force the low-income group to eat grain instead of meat was quietly launched through the professional staff—not the committee members—of the Joint Committee on the January 1951 Economic Report of the President.

Such a plan is un-American and demonstrates how callous a bureaucracy can become toward the wage earners of our country. This report bases the feasibility of this plan principally on the studies and testimony of J. Kenneth Galbraith, professor at Harvard University, who has also held many high positions with various Government commissions and agencies having to do with the control of American living, and the testimony of Harold B. Rowe, of Brookings Institute, also a prominent figure in the Washington control bureaucracy for many years.

In order that there can be no misunderstanding as to the intent of this group, I will quote briefly from the report and the hearings before the committee. On page 365 of the hearings, Mr. Rowe, mentioning Mr. Galbraith's statement, said:

A justification could be made for the use of a sales tax upon meat to restrain the competitive demand that moves toward that product as incomes increase, particularly among the lower-income groups.

The report itself, on page 52, says:

This means that taxes on certain luxury foods might not be amiss. * * * Meat, it has often been pointed out, is in reality a luxury food.

This plan to prevent the wage-earning group in America from having meat, points out that they can get their calories by eating the grains. The low-income groups are specifically mentioned. The meat then can be consumed by those who can afford to pay the tax.

This clearly demonstrates the depth to which a regimented bureaucracy will go. Yes; the low-income group can eat mush and live, but that is not the diet or philosophy of living that has made America great. In the late days of the last war bureaucratic muddling made meat almost unobtainable in a land of plenty. Production in industries where great physical stamina was needed, such as mining, suffered sharply because workmen could not get the meat needed for a wholesome diet.

In England the socialized regimentation of business and labor has by devious means kept the wage earner from having a wholesome, balanced diet, including meat, so that now they have not the strength and will to resent the regimentation of their lives by the bureaucrats.

The British socialized government now pays their butchers not to sell meat. The Attlee government has cut the British meat ration down to about 1 pound a month.

The butchers under this program cannot make a living, so the Socialist government has put them on the payroll to be supported by public taxes.

It is quite possible that America might some day find itself in a similar condition. If this plan to put a luxury tax on meat is put into effect, fewer and fewer people can buy meat. Less and less meat will be produced and we will enter into an era of economic scarcity where only the wealthy can eat meat. That may be the goal of those who would regiment our lives. An economy of abundance has made America the greatest country on earth. We must keep it that way. To do otherwise will destroy our high standard of living.

If communism comes to America, it will because of economic, social, and moral decay from within, not by conquest from abroad.

Iron Ore and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given in recent years to the dwindling deposit of high-grade iron ore in Minnesota's Mesabi Range.

The Troy (N. Y.) Record on December 18, 1950, answers the propaganda

of advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway in the following editorial:

IRON ORE AND THE SEAWAY

Much attention has been given in recent years to the dwindling deposit of high-grade iron ore in Minnesota's Mesabi Range. The situation has caused concern because the Minnesota deposit, one of the greatest in the world, has been the country's principal supply for iron ore.

The last few years have brought a widespread hunt for new iron-ore deposits, a hunt which has taken representatives of our steel companies to many foreign countries. Relatively early explorations brought the developments of big mining operations in Chile. More recently have been the still bigger operations in Venezuela.

Recently there has been considerable comment on the big Labrador deposits. Since then public attention has been drawn to a comparable project—Steep Rock—in the Province of Ontario above Lake Superior. Each of these operations involves the extraction of high-grade ore in huge quantities.

The Labrador and Steep Rock projects could be competitive. The ore from Steep Rock could readily reach our inland steel mills by ship through the Great Lakes and the Welland Canal. The ore from Labrador could do likewise, if the St. Lawrence waterway were ever built.

The ore from Chile had been brought to the east coast. The ore from Venezuela will also come to the east coast.

Despite all this activity the Mesabi Range must not be ruled out of the picture prematurely. The Mesabi Range people have known for years that their high-grade ore would give out eventually. They have known, too, that they have "uncounted billions of tons" of taconite which has a low iron-bearing content. They have been devoting much time and effort in trying to find an economical method of extracting iron ore from taconite.

A news story from Duluth indicates that a method has been found. Details are not disclosed. But the dispatch says that the outlook "staggers the imagination of even a people accustomed to miracles in mining." All of this is doubly good news at this time. Stiff competition among iron ore producers could bring a downward trend in steel prices. The possibility of continuing to meet most, if not all, of this country's iron ore demands from continental sources in these unsettled times is reassuring. Also, it should bring to an end the dispute over the St. Lawrence seaway for which the Labrador deposit was the only legitimate argument.

Point 4 Without the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of March 20, 1951:

POINT 4 WITHOUT THE TAXPAYERS

Point 4 never dies. President Truman proposed this switch on the give-away program in his inaugural address in 1949, and since that time all the global planners have been conning the atlases, finding far places where the American taxpayers' money may be spent for the greater glory of one thing and another.

Of course, all this spending of public funds is supposed to help the United States; the appeal is always to our enlightened self-interest. The more we spend abroad, the stronger our position. The seventeenth century barber-surgeon operated on the same principle; he bled his patients nearly white to cure them of all their ills, from pox to flux.

BLEEDING THE PATIENTS

The latest program for activating point 4 was produced under official auspices. The President has received it from Nelson D. Rockefeller, who headed the board that drew it up. It is big, both in outlook and in money. Without looking very deep one can find $950,000,000 in proposed appropriations.

The Rockefeller board first of all would consolidate our international charities, following the logic of a local Community Chest, in an organization called the Overseas Economic Administration. This OEC would absorb the Marshall plan (ECA) and a score of other give-away programs administered by various United States agencies. The OEC would spend $500,000,000 on railroads, harbors, irrigation projects, and on health and training programs. The board also proposes a United States contribution of $200,000,000 (to a fund of $500,000,000) for the construction of public works by an international development authority.

GUARANTY ON LOSSES

The board wants private enterprise to join it in building a better world, and to get American businessmen interested it proposed to guarantee them against losses in countries whose currencies are even shakier than our own. As a hedge against the vagaries of foreign currencies it would establish a $100,000,000 authority in the Import-Export Bank to take the risk out of foreign investment, and would toss another $150,000,000 into a $400,000,000 international finance corporation, which would be a department of the bank, to make loans to private enterprise for businesses abroad.

Other guaranties would be made to induce American business to go abroad in larger amount—largely against the predatory tax policies of the "friendly" countries which our tax money and our private enterprisers would be aiding.

The first question that occurs is how long would private, more or less free, enterprise remain so under this Government protection? The scheme might increase American investment abroad; indeed, it ought to, for the American investor would be shielded from almost all losses. His would not be risk capital, which is what keeps private enterprise progressing. He would take no more risk than he would in buying a United States Government bond; the American taxpayers would assume all the risk.

The second question is, How much private enterprise or initiative or imagination would adhere to such a scheme? The Government, taking all the risks, would tend to direct the foreign investment. Private businesses would be Government concessions, which Government would give or refuse. Who would want to take a chance with a strictly private enterprise abroad when he could get into something which the Government would guarantee—if, of course, the Government had planned it?

All this global planning would seem more reasonable if there were no alternative which did not depend on the American taxpayer. But there is one, and it works.

EXAMPLE OF ARAMCO

Lorania K. Francis has been reporting in the Times from Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, about the operations of Aramco, the great American oil-producing corporation. Aramco is doing in Saudi Arabia all the things that can be dreamed of under point 4 except to make the Saudi Arabians clients of the American taxpayers. As a result of Aramco's self-interested ministrations Arabs are healthier, wealthier, and wiser, the last in the sense that they are learning American technology by working at jobs where it is applied.

Aramco's guaranty is that oil can always be sold at a profit. It needs no point 4 subsidy. Its risk lies in its relationship with the Government of Saudi Arabia. It was willing to take that risk. It has established better relations with the Arabs, officially and unofficially, than our army of bureaucrats has been able to do with any of the peoples on whom they pour ECA money.

In Arabia point 4 is operating without the American taxpayers. Why not give some thought to creating the political climate which will allow more of the same to develop?

Statement of Motion Picture Industry Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

MARCH 27, 1951.

Hon. JOHN S. WOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Motion Picture Industry Council has instructed me to convey to you the enclosed resolution expressing support of the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee, confident that the hearings will be distinguished by their fairness and objective inquiry.

The council, as can be noted from this letterhead, is composed of the key management, guild, and union groups in the production branch of the motion-picture industry.

We hope that this expression of support will contribute to the work undertaken by the committee and the objective which we all share—the exposure and destruction of the international Communist conspiracy.

Respectfully,

ART ARTHUR,
Executive Secretary.

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY COUNCIL REGARDING HEARINGS OF THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE, MARCH 21, 1951

The Motion Picture Industry Council reaffirms its consistent opposition to communism, its works, its members, its methods. It wants to emphasize that, with the overwhelming majority of the American people, it believes that a clear and present danger to our Nation exists. The MPIC offers its strength and support to any legally constituted body that has as its object the exposure and destruction of the International Communist Party conspiracy.

Today, in Washington, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has begun hearings to determine the extent and effect of Communist infiltration in the motion-picture business. The MPIC supports this investigation.

But MPIC would be derelict in its duty if it did not point out that the public has been given an exaggerated and distorted impression of the degree of this Communist infiltration.

The MPIC hopes that all members of this industry who have been subpenaed will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It deplores those who stand on constitutional privileges to hide that truth.

or those who refuse to recognize the authority of the Congress.

To those men and women of this industry who are former members of the Communist Party or of any other subversive or Communist-controlled organization, and who openly admit such membership or association, and who conclusively prove that they have repudiated utterly and forever that relationship, the MPIC offers its commendation and encouragement.

When the whole history of the Communist movement in this country is written, it will establish beyond doubt that in every walk of life and in many sections of America there were otherwise honorable and well-intentioned persons who were taken in and used by the Communist Party.

It is not enough for such persons to repudiate their previous actions or associations. They best can prove the sincerity of their repudiation by joining their fellow Americans in the fight for freedom, secure in the knowledge that it is in the historical American tradition to judge a man by his acts and his acts alone.

The Motion Picture Industry Council for Association of Motion Picture Producers, Hollywood AFL Film Council, Independent Motion Picture Producers Association, Independent Office Workers, Screen Actors' Guild, Screen Directors' Guild, Screen Producers' Guild, Screen Writers' Guild, Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, Society of Motion Picture Art Directors.

Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times:

MAN ON THE DOORSTEP

President Truman has asked Congress to move quickly on India's urgent plea for wheat to avoid famine. He has suggested that the House and Senate immediately approve the grant of 1,000,000 tons of wheat to India. After that grant the legislators can, if they insist, settle down to debate or delay over the second 1,000,000-ton grant that is needed.

But the men in Congress seem completely unmoved by the appeal.

It is difficult to understand the congressional reasoning.

In the realms of high policy and of intricate ideology the problem is complicated, of course. One must carefully weigh the fact that Prime Minister Nehru has been an outspoken critic of the United States policy toward Communist-ridden China. One must consider at length the fact that the United States cannot afford to subsidize the whole world by grain grants; at the end of such a path of open-handedness lies bankruptcy, for not even this Nation's resources are inexhaustible.

But on the level of the thing called humaneness the problem seems essentially simple. There's a man at the door, asking for a bit of food. It's possible to argue with oneself that the man is perhaps a Socialist and should not be encouraged in his political convictions. It's possible to argue that, if he gets a meal here, he will take the next 50 cents he happens upon to buy whisky. It's possible to suggest that the family can't be handing out food to every panhandling passerby, or the family will soon be down to an empty refrigerator. And still the man will be standing there, hungry, asking for just a little food.

The man at the door is India. India's food supply has been depleted by drought. Never mind the political consequences of that depletion; never mind the probability that Nehru's government, if it fell because of famine, would be replaced by a Communist regime. The simple fact, the important fact is that people are starving in India—starving while this Nation sits tight on a surplus of wheat available to avoid starvation.

Shall we turn the starving man away from the door? Shall we stand pat on the statement that we have given quite enough through organized charity and can't be contributing to every supplicant on the stoop? Shall we condemn thousands of fellow human beings to the horrible death that comes with starvation and content ourselves with counting over the millions of bushels of grain we have in storage?

India is the man on the doorstep.

Iowan Analyzes Commercial Rentals in Connection With Proposed Rent-Control Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. Russell C. Cowin, owner and operator of several commercial properties in Waterloo, Iowa.

I believe Members of Congress will find Mr. Cowin's detailed analysis of the problems of those owning rental properties most informative, especially in view of the fact that rent-control legislation will likely be presented within the next few weeks.

The letter follows:

WATERLOO, IOWA, *March 30, 1951.*

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Representative, Third District of Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel that if the Congress is called upon to contemplate provisions for the control of rentals on commercial properties, any bill offered for their consideration by Tighe Woods or his legal or advisory department should be subjected to the severest scrutiny. We understand that Mr. Woods claims an increase of 78 percent in rentals in the last decade. Let me assure you that the taxes and maintenance costs have far exceeded that figure. Enclosed you will find a comparative tax assessment on some local commercial property, which figures can be verified by tax receipts in our possession.

The inequities and the injustices of the residential rent-control laws have been most enlightening and, to my mind, can be summed up very briefly and pointedly. Had the same rules, procedures, and controls been applied to the renting of a horse instead of a house, every humane society in the United States would have caused the lessee to be thrown in jail. Very briefly, you cannot give another party control of your property under rules which force you into the courts to prove the obvious abuse of that property and still make it worth owning.

This feature, however, would become of secondary importance in the case of commercial property.

In the first place, it has been many years since any enterprise was forced into bankruptcy because of the rent they paid. As our retailing system is now conducted, the major portion of commercial rentals are based directly on the volume of sales secured by the tenant. For many years there has been no other basis to negotiate a lease. We have been faced with rising costs and rising taxes and anticipated further rising costs and taxes from year to year for over a decade, and no owner could be advised as to any other way of writing a lease that was fair also to the tenant, except to base it on sales. With only one exception that I know of, every major lessee in the country has been willing to enter into and negotiate leases on this basis. That exception is the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., who do negotiate on 1 percent per month on investment. In that connection, let me call your attention to the fact that the maximum percentage lease on supermarket locations, at least in your congressional district, is based on 1 percent of gross sales. Now follow this closely: The building, the parking lot, the local taxes, the structural and owner's liability insurance, the special assessments, and the structural maintenance on what is considered to be a satisfactory leasing agreement from the owner's point of view in this particular line of enterprise all come out of 1 cent on $1 in sales. Could Mr. Woods save the housewife anything on her grocery bill with that. Other lines of endeavor require a larger portion up to 2½ percent, 5 percent, and even in some types of enterprise, 10 percent; but in every case, the distribution is based on our retail experience and recovery needs.

If Mr. Woods is willing to investigate the history of office building returns, the information is available to him to show that the cross-section of office buildings in the country in the last 50 years have not netted 4 percent on the investment. As far as warehousing goes, let me say that the history is fairly good on it, but here, too, unless the owner were tied in with the operation, the history of profit from this enterprise does not indicate a favorable return. As far as factory or production-type structures is concerned, the history is indeed depressing.

In my experience, the most generous, careless, easily outmaneuvered tenant for any type of space has been various departments of the United States Government, and that only in recent years.

Now the major question at hand in most of the 48 States in relation to the control of commercial rentals is the problem of the taxing bodies up to and including the State level. In Waterloo, Iowa, 50 percent of the property tax is drained off by the local school board. An interesting sidelight on this particular matter is that they anticipate a 2½-mill increase in their levy under a special legislative provision. As every Congressman should know, the city administrations throughout the country are bankrupt because of the inadequacy of their share of the tax slice to provide for their obligations to the community. The point I am making is that, like the policy of our local assessor, who is of exceptional caliber, most tax assessments are based on the return of the property. The worth of the ground and the structure, of course, enter in, but his final assessments are, in every case, made on the return from the property. I am inclined to think, in all fairness, that this is entirely proper, although it is not at this time provided for in the statutes, but I sincerely believe that if the Federal Government jeopardized this last source of local taxing sources, our last hope of avoiding a breakdown will disappear.

Conceivably, the large chains would be behind Mr. Woods in his hope of expanding his bureaucratic powers, and from these sources

may come the pressure on the Congress. Frankly, I haven't analyzed the position that large banking and insurance institutions might take, but, offhand, it would appear that they would be much opposed to jeopardizing their financial positions where the safety of a major portion of their investments was involved.

In summarizing, there are two simple, essential facts: The first is the interference with the final hope of the local taxing bodies, and the second is the fact that the gentleman from the rent control bureau would not save the eventual purchaser a penny on his grocery bill or his fair-traded clothing item or hardware item, but he would very probably concentrate the difference in the hands of the big businesses and the big-volume organizations located beyond the reach of the government of the State in which they sell their merchandise.

The undersigned is in the commercial and industrial rent field and, as far as your congressional district is concerned, feels adequately qualified to discuss and analyze the commercial rental situation as it now exists and has existed, at least in that district.

Respectfully submitted.

RUSSELL C. COWIN.

What Aims in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the questions propounded in the Freeman of April 9, 1951, for Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson to answer are timely, and the American people should have a forthright answer to each question.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the article, which contains the questions from the Freeman of April 9, 1951, as a part of my remarks:

WHAT AIMS IN KOREA?

In our last issue we commented on a long letter which Dean Acheson had written for publication in answer to a young marine's suggestion that our foreign policy was a bit fouled up. Since what the young man chiefly objected to was our involvement in Korea, his letter provided the Secretary of State with an excellent opportunity to define the specific objectives—if any—which Mr. Acheson and the President hope to attain through the fighting in that area. It was high time, indeed; for neither the President nor Mr. Acheson had as yet taken the country into his confidence on that question.

Mr. Acheson ignored this opportunity, and contented himself merely with repeating a few high-sounding generalities. The major questions in the minds of the American people, of our men in Korea, and of their families, remain unanswered. Because both Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson act as if they were completely unaware of what these questions are, we list some of them here. The people who are doing the fighting, and those who are paying for it by their sacrifices, are entitled to prompt, precise, and forthright answers.

1. Are we fighting to push the Chinese Communist forces in Korea back to the thirty-eighth parallel, and to stop there regardless of whether or not that is an advantageous strategic line?

If so, why did we sacrifice thousands of our troops in driving the North Koreans to the Manchurian border? And why should we seek to hold an arbitrary geographical line which from a military standpoint may or may not be defensible?

2. Are we fighting to establish whatever line in Korea, short of the Manchurian border, is in the opinion of the competent military authorities strategically most defensible?

3. Are we fighting to drive the Chinese Communist forces out of Korea and across the Manchurian border, in order that the whole of Korea may be placed under United Nations authority?

If that is the objective, how can it be attained so long as our forces, on instructions from the Department of State, may not pursue the enemy into Manchuria, but must wait inactive at the border while he regroups, reequips and reinforces his armies, without fear of attack or observation, until he is strong enough for another offensive?

That is precisely what happened when our troops chased the fleeing North Koreans to the Manchurian border. The enemy was permitted to regroup, rearm and obtain reenforcements from Communist China; preparations which our Army was not even allowed to find out about because, under State Department instructions, it was not permitted to send reconnaissance planes over the border to observe enemy troop concentrations. Nor were our fighter planes flying along the Manchurian border, under fire from Chinese Communist antiaircraft batteries on the other side of the river, even permitted to attack those batteries.

Thus rendered immune by State Department orders from molestation or observation by our forces, the enemy built up a formidable army which erupted into Korea and nearly drove our troops into the sea, with heavy casualties.

4. Are we fighting merely to maintain a military stalemate in Korea?

The maintenance of a military stalemate would mean that we should attain no military objective. We should merely maintain a tenuous and dangerous hold in Korea, which would continue to cost several thousand lives each month. The only conceivable advantage of maintaining a military stalemate in Korea would be to preserve the remaining shreds of our diplomatic and military prestige in the Far East and to provide time for negotiations with the declared aggressor, Red China, with a view to some compromise—probably involving admittance of Red China to the UN, and in any case probably involving a betrayal of our troops who have fought and died in Korea.

5. Are we fighting to destroy the enemy forces?

Communist China has openly admitted intervention on a large scale—estimated at 300,000 to 500,000 troops—in support of North Korean Communist forces. The bulk of the Communist armies which nearly drove our troops into the sea consisted of Chinese Communist soldiers equipped by Soviet Russia.

Red China's armies have been estimated at 4,000,000 men. Their equipment is limited only by Soviet Russia's ability and willingness to supply them. When Chinese Communist troops are hard-pressed, all they have to do is to withdraw into the "privileged sanctuary" of Manchuria, there to regroup and rearm in the safety insured them by our State Department and the UN. Under these circumstances, how could the limited number of troops we can make available for the Korean operation wage a successful war of manpower attrition against Red China backed by Soviet Russia?

Furthermore, while some 300,000 to 500,000 Chinese troops are engaged in killing our boys in Korea, our Government is using the Seventh Fleet to protect the Chinese mainland against diversionary attacks from Formosa by the Free Chinese, which would relieve the pressure on our troops. In other words, the Seventh Fleet is being used to protect the Chinese Communist flank, and to enable the Chinese Red generals to concentrate on killing American boys in Korea.

Why should we not use our fleet to blockade our Chinese Communist enemy, and our air power to destroy military and industrial objectives and transportation facilities in Red China and Manchuria? Why should we not allow Free Chinese forces to make diversionary attacks on the mainland, thus reducing the capacity of Red China to kill our troops in Korea? This would have the added advantage of preventing the Communists from consolidating their hold over all of China so that when the Korean action is finished they can throw all of their weight against Southeast Asia, which Dean Acheson and Dr. Jessup insist we must hold at all costs.

6. What are the intentions of the United Nations?

The United Nations in June 1950 declared the North Koreans guilty of aggression and authorized General MacArthur to organize and lead a United Nations force against them. It also called upon all member nations to aid the United Nations forces in every way possible and to refrain from aiding the aggressor. As a result of this action, an international force was organized to defend South Korea. So far the United States has furnished about 90 percent of the UN troops and suffered about 90 percent of the casualties.

Although the UN, 106 days after the Chinese Communists openly entered the Korean War, at last declared that they had "engaged in aggression," it has still not authorized effective action against Red China. Also, despite the fact that all member nations were called upon to refrain from aiding the aggressor, Soviet Russia (still a member in good standing) has supported the North Koreans and Red China with supplies and equipment, particularly jet planes, tanks and other items which they could not conceivably have procured from any other source.

No war against aggression can be carried on successfully so long as the UN, on whose authority it is being conducted, spends months in discussing what, if anything, should be done about the aggressor, while refusing to allow UN troops to fight him on equal terms.

7. Who is to pay for reconstruction?

Both North and South Korea, particularly South Korea, have suffered vast destruction in consequence of Communist aggression. This destruction and the surging tides of battle have rendered millions of Koreans homeless and destitute. Does the UN intend merely to push the aggressors back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then condone the aggression and leave the nations of the free world—primarily the United States—to shoulder the burden of reconstruction while the aggressors escape any penalty for the devastation they have wrought? If this is so, if nonaggressor nations are to be expected to pay for the damage caused by aggressors, then the basic purpose of the UN is made a mockery, and a premium is placed on aggression.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson cannot escape responsibility for our losses in Korea. Having allowed the UN ample opportunity to declare a workable policy with respect to the open aggression of Communist China, and having failed to elicit any clear-cut authorization to meet the military issue, they were under a solemn obligation to serve notice on the UN that if it did not, by a fixed date, allow its forces to attack Communist China as a declared aggressor, the United States would reserve the right either to take such action as it might deem necessary in order to protect its own troops, or to withdraw them from the UN forces in Korea.

It is the failure of Truman and Acheson to define our own objectives in Korea, and their instructions hamstringing our troops there, which have caused our unnecessarily heavy casualties. Truman and Acheson will continue to be responsible for the cruel and senseless waste of American lives and treasure until they either permit our land forces there to defend themselves effectively, or admit the ghastly failure of their Asiatic policy by withdrawing our land forces from that theater of war.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman had his way in the Korean misadventure which, up to this date, has cost 57,000 casualties among our fighting forces. Now, then, what would have happened had there been no Congress? I am inserting an article which appeared in the Republic Bulletin on March 26, 1951:

IF WE HAD NO CONGRESS

If Truman had his way, this country today would be under a complete system of socialized medicine, like Russia and England.

If Truman had his way, every farm in America today would be under the quotas and allocations of the Brannan plan—socialized agriculture.

If Truman had his way, there would be no Federal legislation on the books today to imprison Communist spies, traitors, and saboteurs in the Government departments.

If Truman had his way, Red China today would be a member of the United Nations, to vote with Russia and her iron curtain prisoners on every ballot against world peace.

If Truman had his way, under the Government reorganization scheme last year, this country would be saddled today with a Cabinet department of health and welfare under that great medical genius, lawyer Oscar Ewing.

If Truman had his way, all America's secrets in atomic energy would have been traded freely with our allies.

If Truman had his way, every nation in the world would have direct call on the United States Treasury for technical assistance and economic development loans, under his point 4 program.

If Truman had his way, there would be no Taft-Hartley provision today requiring the official registration of Communists in labor unions. He vetoed one.

If Truman had his way, every major river in America today would be a part of some new TVA, with State and local government submerged by Federal bureaucrats.

If Truman had his way, every school in America today would be under direct daily supervision of the Washington do-good bureaucracy—socialized education.

If Truman had his way, housing and home building today would be a complete Government monopoly, with subsidies for socialized housing.

If Truman had his way, there would have been no investigation of communism in the State Department and other Federal agencies. His "red herring" statement of August 1948 would have ended the Alger Hiss case.

If Truman had his way, total Federal spending since 1946 would have been about $75,000,000,000 more than it has been to date. That is the accumulative cost of all the new programs proposed, but turned down by Congress.

These are the things Congress saved us from during the last 5 years. Had it not been for the defenders of constitutional government in the House and Senate, Truman would have had his way in all these things. He urged each of these programs at least once, some several times. In other cases he vetoed acts of Congress, which promptly were enacted over his veto. How much we owe Congress.

In one major decision President Truman had his secret way—without consulting Congress. He, by his own decision, plunged our boys into war with the Mongolian hordes in Korea. He now seeks blanket authority to send American boys to new wars the world around, at will.

Today only Congress stands between that program and the American people.

Our prayers should be with Congress.

Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say a few words about Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who presided at the first atomic-spy trial recently concluded in New York. Generally described by courtroom attachés as a "tough judge," Judge Kaufman has conducted the trial in a most exemplary manner.

It goes without saying that this case will go down in the annals of American history because of its nature, importance, and historical value. Judge Kaufman ably summed it up when, following the jury's verdict of guilty against three American citizens who conspired to steal atom secrets, he said:

I must say that, as an individual, I can't be happy because it is a sad day for America when citizens lend themselves to the destruction of our country by the most destructive weapon the world has known. I cannot find words to describe this loathsome offense.

Judge Kaufman is a fraternity brother of mine in Tau Epsilon Phi fraternity. During the years that I have had the pleasure to know him, I found that he has a keen and analytical mind. He is always fair and judicial, and has made a wonderful record since he has been on the bench.

Born in New York City in 1910, Judge Kaufman received his preparatory education at Fordham University and his LL. B. from Fordham Law School. For a period of 5 years until 1940 he was an assistant United States attorney for the southern district of New York, then entered private law practice as a member of the firm Noonan, Kaufman & Eagan. In 1947 he became special assistant to the United States Attorney General, in charge of lobbying investigation, and served in this position until October 1949, when he was appointed to the southern New York Federal court. His appointment was subsequently confirmed by the United States Senate.

He has served with great distinction. We of New York are very proud of him, his record, and the role he played during the recent trial.

History-making as the decision handed down by Judge Kaufman may be, it was a most difficult and responsible decision which required a great deal of forethought, deliberation and soul-searching. I am not surprised to learn that the jurist, who is a deeply religious man, went to his synagogue several times during the past few days to seek spiritual guidance in final formulation of his epochal decision.

The statement which he has prepared in conjunction with the sentence he has imposed will, likewise, be of great historical importance. I am, therefore, placing in the RECORD the full statement of Judge Kaufman as published in the New York Times on April 6, 1951, and a news item on the jurist also published in the same issue. I commend these to the attention of the Members of this House. They are as follows:

JUDGE KAUFMAN'S STATEMENT ON SENTENCING BOMB SPIES

In view of the importance of the sentence I am about to impose, I believe it is my duty to give some explanation respecting them.

At the outset, I would like to say a few words about the law under which these defendants are about to be sentenced.

THE LAW

It provides for the following punishment: If the espionage or the conspiracy to commit espionage is committed during time of war, the punishment might be death or imprisment for not more than 30 years. If the espionage or conspiracy to commit espionage is committed at any other time the maximum punishment is imprisonment for not more than 20 years.

This section, under which the defendants were prosecuted and convicted, was enacted in 1917, at which time the Russian international spy ring did not present the threat to all of us which it does now. Today, it is a well organized, well directed ring, with tentacles which reach into the most vital places.

The incongruent penal provisions of the statute are spotlighted by the 20-year maximum imprisonment provision for commission of the offense of espionage during peacetime. I ask that some thought be given to that for a moment, for it most likely means that even if spies are successful in the year 1951 in delivering to Russia or any foreign power our secrets concerning the newer type atom bombs, or even the H-bomb, the maximum punishment that any court could impose in that situation would be 20 years.

I, therefore, say that it is time for Congress to reexamine the penal provisions of the espionage statute.

In the case before me, the conspiracy as alleged and proven commenced on or about June 6, 1944, at which time the country was at war. Overt acts were committed during the period of actual hostilities. Therefore, the maximum penalty is death or imprisonment for not more than 30 years.

Espionage, as viewed here today, does not reflect the courage of a Nathan Hale, risking his life in the service of his own country. It is rather a sordid, dirty work—however idealistic are the rationalizations of the persons who engaged in it—with but one paramount theme, the betrayal of one's own country.

SEES SPIES UNDER NO DELUSIONS

Citizens of this country who betray their fellow countrymen can be under none of the delusions about the benignity of Soviet power that they might have been prior to World War II. The nature of Russian terrorism is now self-evident. Idealism as a rationale dissolves.

The issue of punishment in this case is presented in a unique framework of history. It is so difficult to make people realize that this country is engaged in a life and death struggle with a completely different system. This struggle is not only manifested externally between these two great forces, but this case indicates quite clearly that it also involves the employment by the enemy of secret as

well as overt outspoken forces among our own people. All of our democratic institutions are, therefore, directly involved in this great conflict. I believe that never at any time in our history were we ever confronted to the same degree that we are today with such a challenge to our very existence. The atom bomb was unknown when the espionage statute was drafted. I emphasize this because we must realize that we are dealing with missiles of destruction which can wipe out millions of Americans.

The competitive advantage held by the United States in super weapons has put a premium on the services of a new school of spies—the homegrown variety that places allegiance to a foreign power before loyalty to the United States. The punishment to be meted out in this case must therefore serve the maximum interest for the preservation of our society against these traitors in our midst.

SENTENCE OF JULIUS AND ETHEL ROSENBERG

It is ironic that the very country which these defendants betrayed and sought to destroy placed every safeguard around them for obtaining a fair and impartial trial, a trial which consumed 3 weeks in this court. I recall the defendant Julius Rosenberg testifying that our American system of jurisprudence met with his approval and was preferred over Russian justice. Even the defendants realize—by this admission—that this type of trial would not have been afforded to them in Russia. Certainly, to a Russian national accused of a conspiracy to destroy Russia not 1 day would have been consumed in a trial. Yet, they made a choice of devoting themselves to the Russian ideology of denial of God, denial of the sanctity of the individual and aggression against free men everywhere instead of serving the cause of liberty and freedom.

Your crime is worse than murder. Plain deliberate contemplated murder is dwarfed in magnitude by comparison with the crime you have committed. In committing the act of murder, the criminal kills only his victim. The immediate family is brought to grief and when justice is meted out the chapter is closed. But in your case, I believe your conduct in putting into the hands of the Russians the A-bomb years before our best scientists predicted Russia would perfect the bomb has already caused the Communist aggression in Korea with the resultant casualties exceeding 50,000 Americans and who knows but that millions more of innocent people may pay the price of your treason. Indeed, by your betrayal you undoubtedly have altered the course of history to the disadvantage of our country. No one can say that we do not live in a constant state of tension. We have evidence of your treachery all around us every day—for the civilian defense activities throughout the Nation are aimed at preparing us for an atom bomb attack.

Nor can it be said in mitigation of the offense that the power which set the conspiracy in motion and profited from it was not openly hostile to the United States at the time of the conspiracy. If this was your excuse then the error of your ways in setting yourselves above our properly constituted authorities and the decision of those authorities not to share the information with Russia must now be obvious.

The defendants are American citizens who profited from our system of free higher education. I additionally must assume that the basic Marxist goal of world revolution and the destruction of capitalism was well known to the defendants, if, in fact, not subscribed to by them, when they passed what they knew was this Nation's most deadly and closely guarded secret weapon to Soviet agents.

NATION MUST BE SECURE

In the light of this, I can only conclude that the defandants entered into this most serious conspiracy against their country with full realization of its implications. The statute of which the defendants at the bar stand convicted is clear. I have previously stated my view that the verdict of guilty was amply justified by the evidence. In the light of the circumstances, I feel that I must pass such sentence upon the principals in this diabolical conspiracy to destroy a God-fearing nation, which will demonstrate with finality that this Nation's security must remain inviolate; that traffic in military secrets, whether promoted by slavish devotion to a foreign ideology or by a desire for monetary gains, must cease.

The evidence indicated quite clearly that Julius Rosenberg was the prime mover in this conspiracy. However, let no mistake be made about the role which his wife, Ethel Rosenberg, played in this conspiracy. Instead of deterring him from pursuing his ignoble cause, she encouraged and assisted the cause. She was a mature woman—almost 3 years older than her husband and almost 7 years older than her younger brother. She was a full-fledged partner in this crime.

Indeed the defendants Julius and Ethel Rosenberg placed their devotion to their cause above their own personal safety and were conscious that they were sacrificing their own children, should their misdeeds be detected—all of which did not deter them from pursuing their course. Love for their cause dominated their lives. It was even greater than their love for their children.

What I am about to do is not easy for me. I have deliberated for hours, days, and nights. I have carefully weighed the evidence. Every nerve, every fiber of my body has been taxed. I am just as human as are the people who have given me the power to impose sentence. I am convinced beyond any doubt of your guilt. I have searched the records, I have searched my conscience, to find some reason for mercy, for it is only human to be merciful, and it is natural to try to spare lives. I am convinced, however, that I would violate the solemn and sacred trust that the people of this land have placed in my hands, were I to show leniency to the defendants Rosenberg.

It is not in my power, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, to forgive you. Only the Lord can find mercy for what you have done.

The sentence of the court upon Julius and Ethel Rosenberg is that for their crime they are sentenced to death. The sentence will be executed according to law in the week beginning on Monday, May 21.

SENTENCE OF MORTON SOBELL

While I have not the slightest sympathy for you or any of your associates, I must, as a judge, be objective in the examination of the evidence in this case. I do not for a moment doubt that you were engaged in espionage activities however, the evidence in the case did not point to any activity on your part in connection with the atom-bomb project. I cannot be moved by hysteria or motivated by a desire to do the popular thing. I must do justice according to the evidence in this case. There is no doubt about your guilt, but I must recognize the lesser degree of your implication in this offense. I, therefore, sentence you to the maximum prison term provided by statute, to wit, 30 years.

While it might be gratuitous on my part, I also note at this point my recommendation against parole for this defendant.

KAUFMAN REFUSED TO LET REDS TOUR—YOUNGEST FEDERAL JUDGE HERE, EX-PROSECUTOR, DENIED PLEA IN FIRST MAJOR DECISION

Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman, mild-mannered, soft-spoken but sharp in detecting legal trickery by attorneys, is the youngest jurist in the Southern District of New York.

Shortly after he took the oath of office November 1, 1949, the 40-year-old jurist decided his first major bench problem. He denied a motion by the 11 convicted Communist leaders to enlarge the jurisdiction of their bail. The defendants wanted to barnstorm the country.

Several months ago Judge Kaufman presided at the trial of Abraham Brothman and Miriam Moskowitz for conspiracy to obstruct justice. This was an offshoot of a Federal grand jury's espionage investigation. The jury found the two guilty and Judge Kaufman imposed the maximum punishment.

The judge was born here June 24, 1910. He has two brothers, one a doctor and the other a dentist, and two sisters. The youngest student to enter Fordham University at the age of 16, he was graduated from the university's law school at 21 and admitted to the bar in June 1932.

Two and a half years later he was appointed a special assistant to the United States Attorney in this district. In June 1936, he became an assistant United States Attorney. He prosecuted many publicized cases, including the McKesson & Robbins case.

He resigned from the United States Attorney's office in 1940 to enter private practice with Gregory F. Noonan, who was appointed a Federal judge the same time as Judge Kaufman was, and Col Edward P. F. Eagan, now chairman of the State athletic commission.

Judge Kaufman was assigned along with Federal Judge Harold R. Medina, before the latter's appointment to the bench, by the Association of the Bar of the city of New York to investigate, with a view toward disbarment, Magistrate Thomas A. Aurelio's nomination for the Supreme Court after it was made public that Frank Costello, gambler, had backed Mr. Aurelio's candidacy.

In October 1947, Judge Kaufman was appointed a special assistant to the Attorney General to set up and head a lobbying investigation under the Federal Regulations and Lobbying Act. He resigned this position in August 1948.

Occasionally Judge Kaufman has been confused in public with Federal Judge Samuel H. Kaufman, who presided at the first perjury trial of Alger Hiss, which ended in a hung jury.

Judge Irving Kaufman is married to the former Helen Rosenberg. They have three sons, Robert, 12, and James and Richard, 9-year-old twins.

Draft Exemptions on Basis of Scholarship Wrong in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in one of Michigan's leading newspapers, the Escanaba Daily Press, on March 29, 1951:

DRAFT EXEMPTIONS ON BASIS OF SCHOLARSHIP WRONG IN PRINCIPLE

The proposal of Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the Nation's draft director, that top-ranking students in high schools and colleges be exempt from military training is drawing a mounting tide of resentment around the country, as well it should.

The general's theory presumably is that the Nation's best brains, as measured in terms of scholastic rankings in the high schools and colleges, should not be subjected to the hazards of military life.

The proposal, of course, is a slur on the American armed services by conveying the idea that only second-rate brain power should be drafted for military service.

The plan is wrong in principle and wrong in application. It is contrary to American principles of democracy that a segment of our draft-age people should be exempted from service in the country's Armed Forces because of scholastic attainment. And it is wrong to assume that the bright boys of the classroom are necessarily the only hope of the Nation for leadership in the future. An examination of American history will reveal that a large percentage of leaders in every field of endeavor have come from the ranks of average scholastic attainment. Leadership and success require more than the ability to absorb textbook knowledge.

It has been expressed by military experts time and again that American successes on the battlefield have developed because American soldiers are intelligent, that they possess the ability to think quickly in emergencies without waiting for directions to filter down from the high command.

If the future of America and the safety of our people is dependent upon the protection that the armed services can give us, it surely is essential that we build our Army, Navy, and Air Force with the best manpower that we have available. We can hardly afford to place our lives and our heritage in the hands of those who have been chosen for service because they could not reach scholastically the upper one-third or one-fourth of their class.

Cost of Experimental Unit of Universal Military Training at Fort Knox, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1948, after obtaining unanimous consent, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD of that date an article entitled "Cost of Experimental Unit of Universal Military Training at Fort Knox, Ky."

Purely as a matter of information, I thought it might be interesting to the membership of the House to know the cost of the experimental unit of universal military training at Fort Knox, Ky., as reported in a letter to me from the then Army Comptroller, dated January 21, 1948.

Therefore I am inserting, by leave of the House, the insertion which I placed in the Appendix on January 30, 1948. The basis of cost may have changed, and doubtless has, since these figures were furnished me by the Comptroller of the Army more than 3 years ago. Just how much the cost has increased due to inflated values on everything, I am unable to state.

My former insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1948, follows:

COST OF EXPERIMENTAL UNIT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AT FORT KNOX, KY.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I think all are aware that an experimental program of universal military training is being conducted at Fort Knox, Ky. Various opinions have been voiced as to the cost of the training which has been envisioned and advocated by President Truman. The Department of the Army has set up a model universal military unit at Fort Knox, Ky., and I have had several inquiries as to the cost of this experimental unit. On December 8, 1947, I asked for the figures, and I am happy to give my colleagues the benefit of the information which I received.

The following is a copy of a letter addressed to me under date of January 21, 1948, by Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, the Army Comptroller, Department of the Army, which I think needs no explanation, but speaks for itself and gives us the information on the cost of the experimental unit of universal military training at Fort Knox, Ky.:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ARMY COMPTROLLER,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Reference your letter of December 4, 1947, relative to the operating cost of the universal military training unit at Fort Knox, Ky., and my interim reply of December 8, 1947, I now have additional information in this regard to transmit to you.

On January 16, 1948, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, sent a letter to the chairmen of the Armed Forces Committees concerning the cost of the Fort Knox universal military training unit. Mr. Royall's letter covers the question you asked in such a comprehensive manner I feel you would be interested in its entire contents. I am therefore quoting to you the Secretary's letter in its entirety:

"I have been asked for certain specific information regarding the universal military training experimental unit at Fort Knox. As similar inquiries have reached me from other sources, or have been addressed severally to various Army addresses, I am including in this letter all of the information presently available with respect to the size and cost of the project.

"The UMT experimental unit was organized for two purposes:

"1. To obtain experience of value in a universal military training system covering a special age group, on a national scale, if authorized by Congress as recommended by the President, the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, and the armed services.

"2. To obtain experience of value to the armed services in revising and modernizing their own training programs in the light of the Doolittle committee's recommendations.

"In pursuance of these purposes, a new training formula has been introduced at the experimental unit, with greater emphasis on education, moral controls, broader concepts of discipline, and close supervision of off-duty as well as on-duty activities of trainees.

"In computing the cost of the UMT experimental unit, no attempt has been made to separate the cost of training the 646 enlisted men in the experimental training battalion from the total cost of the unit, nor is such a separation possible. The figures which follow therefore represent a break-down of the over-all cost of an experiment undertaken for the purposes indicated. The figure given as the cost per trainee is likewise the pro rata cost of the unit as a whole, as applied to the men in the UMT training battalion, and not the cost of training these men alone.

"SIZE OF UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

"Two cycles of training were completed by the Army Ground Force experimental unit on December 20, 1947. The first cycle extended from January to July 1947, the second from July to December 1947, inclusive. During this time the following personnel were involved:

"(a) Average number of trainees (privates, Regular Army battalion strength), per cycle, 646. For 2 cycles, approximately 1,292.

"(b) Average constant training cadre (military personnel):

Number of officer-instructors	77
Number of enlisted personnel	495
Total	572

"(c) Approximately 21 civilians were employed during the two cycles as members of the training staff, all but four on a part-time basis. For the second cycle an estimated 17 part-time instructors were required in teaching auto mechanics, radio, typewriting, Spanish, and bookkeeping. Of the four full-time civilian employees, one was an educational counselor, one an assistant educational counselor, and two were stenographers for the Educational Center.

"Cost of universal military training experimental unit, second cycle, July–December 1947, inclusive

1. DIRECT COSTS

Pay and allowances of trainees (Army pay rate)	$383,167
Pay and allowances of trainers (officers and enlisted men)	472,098
Costs of subsistence (enlisted men)	196,975
Costs of clothing (enlisted men)	73,311
Costs of transportation	52,320
Equipment replacement	171,182
Total	1,349,053

2. INDIRECT COSTS

Transportation	73,680
Repairs and utilities	24,705
Medical care	70,340
Supplies	230,532
Equipment maintenance	43,866
Administrative overhead and supervisory personnel	60,733
Total	503,256

3. ADDITIONAL INDIRECT COSTS NOT PROPERLY CHARGEABLE TO UNIVERSAL MILITARY EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Appropriated funds for rehabilitation of post facilities for universal military training experimental unit, but not included in universal military training costs because available for other purposes later	200,000
Grand total, universal military training costs, second cycle (1 and 2 above)	1,852,309

Average over-all per 6 months enlisted trainee (at Army pay rate and including all other unit costs), $1,852,309 divided by 646 equals $2,867.

COST FACTORS IN UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Because of the nature of the experiment, and the fact that cadre training and orientation courses for officers and enlisted men of the several branches of the Regular Army, not connected with the experimental UMT unit, have been conducted contemporaneously with the training of the experimental battalion of 18-year-old recruits, the administrative and instructor personnel of the unit were larger than would be required for training either an ordinary tactical unit or a prospective UMT unit.

The ratio of trainees to trainers in the larger system, for example, would be more than double that indicated in the figures for the experimental unit. At Fort Knox the military personnel necessarily included all elements of a division staff, although only a single battalion of men were being trained for 6 months by the experimental UMT formula. In the first training cycle all arms and technical services were represented. Each training company had to be organized

differently. The Information and Education and Special Services staffs were organized on approximately a regimental level. There were two chaplains. The personnel of the unit, in short, was organized to perform a multiple function, and not simply to train 646 enlisted men assigned to it for this purpose. As with any experiment, whether conducted by the military services or in industry, the cost of the pilot model is always higher than the cost of the subsequent product.

Since the trainees were all enlisted men of the Regular Army, and receiving an average of approximately $100 a month in pay and allowances, the cost also reflects this pay rate rather than the $25 a month recommended by the Compton Commission or the $30 a month provided for in H. R. 4278 for the pay of UMT trainees in the proposed national system. The pay differential alone represents an added cost per trainee of at least $70 a month, or $420 for the 6-month training period, while the other factors add substantially to the total cost of the unit.

For these reasons the cost figures given cannot be considered as in any sense a criterion of the per capita cost of training large numbers of men at a very much lower pay rate under a national plan. The Army estimates the cost of training 618,000 men by the UMT formula on a national basis, once the program is standardized to eliminate the added expense of current experimentation, at approximately $1,000,000,000 annually.

AUTHORITY AND COSTS OF BRINGING VISITORS TO FORT KNOX

It has been asked by what authority visitors were flown to Fort Knox, the amount and source of funds used for this purpose.

The few groups representing the press and national organizations, invited by the former Secretary of War as a matter of broad public interest to visit the UMT experimental unit at Fort Knox, were transported by Army aircraft pursuant to authority contained in paragraph 1C (1), Army Regulations 95-90, published on April 28, 1947, which provides: "Upon approval by the Commanding General, Army Air Forces * * * personnel of the following categories may be permitted to ride as passengers in aircraft * * *

"(1) Any individual, without reimbursement, when the flight is on matters of concern to the Armed Forces."

Acting under authority of section 5 of the National Defense Act (10 U. S. C. 34), making it the specific responsibility of the War Department to plan for the national defense, and appropriate Army regulations with reference to the maintenance of public relations, the Department of the Army as a matter of broad public interest continuously attempts to inform the Nation of planning developments relating to universal military training as well as all other Army operations.

In inviting individuals and groups to visit the UMT experimental unit we hoped to obtain and did obtain helpful suggestions from outside sources. We cannot obtain public reaction to our programs unless we take the people into our confidence.

TRAINING PROGRAM OF UMT EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

All trainees in the UMT experimental unit are enlisted men in the Regular Army. Every Regular Army enlistee is given 13 weeks of basic training. The additional training given in the experimental unit, and which is contemplated in the national plan, if authorized by Congress, is intended to qualify the trainee as a specialist in some arm of the service. It will be obvious that no matter whether the soldier receives the training in the experimental unit or in a tactical unit, it must be accomplished in any case. While not a characteristic training unit of the Army as now constituted, the UMT experimental unit by no means involves expenditures incurred for other than normal service requirements.

In addition to training the experimental battalion of 646 men (average constant enrollment), the UMT training cadre is currently required to instruct 480 potential UMT training cadre personnel each month. This instruction covers all the positions from platoon sergeant to division commander, and results in a peak load of 200. For the period August 11, 1947, to December 20, 1947, approximately 2,565 students were given such cadre instruction.

It is estimated for planning purposes that of the 1,200,000 men annually reaching the age of 18 years, a total of 850,000, or approximately 70 percent of this figure would be found physically fit and inducted for training under a universal military training system. Of the latter number, an estimated 618,000 would be trained by the Army and Air Force and the remainder by the Navy, under the plan currently recommended by the three services. By carrying on this cadre training now, we shall have made a substantial start in building the organization that would be necessary to train the larger load of trainees later should the universal training program be authorized by Congress.

ARMY PROFITING FROM UMT EXPERIMENT

Regardless of the final action on the proposed national universal military training program, all of this instruction and indoctrination at Fort Knox is of great benefit to the Army and already is being translated into training doctrine for the Regular Establishment. It is finding its way into replacement training centers and has been adopted as the training formula for the Third Armored Division at Fort Knox on a division level.

The modification of disciplinary training through the adoption of a special code of conduct for this special age group, built around a demerit and trainee-court system, is only one of the new methods whose usefulness has been demonstrated in the experimental program. Sound discipline is the first principle of military effectiveness, since without it any military organization would be little more than a mob. It is believed that under the UMT formula, subject to further testing, discipline can be improved, rather than weakened, by giving the trainee and in fact, all elements of the Army, a better understanding of its meaning and importance.

Thus the UMT experimental unit has served and is serving as a laboratory test of training methods and doctrines which will prove of increasing value to the military service as time goes on. It has permitted close study of the problems inherent in training men of the 18-year or minimum-age group not previously explored in any prior training. In fact, I know of no other single experiment in this field which has been so richly productive of constructive results.

I feel sure Secretary Royall's letter will give you the information you desire. However, if you need additional information, I will be glad to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. RICHARDS,
Major General, the Army Comptroller.

United States Marines Should Help Plan Wars They Must Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated that the United States Marine Corps be represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was the subject that I wrote President Truman on, which prompted his now famous reply to me last August in which he stated that the United States marines were the "police force of the Navy" and that they would remain just that as long as he was President. He further stated that they were represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Navy.

The marines did not agree with him, neither did most of the people in the Nation.

Many Congressmen have introduced bills to place the United States Marines on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including myself.

I am submitting herewith a recent editorial from the Saturday Evening Post which urges that the United States Marines be so recognized which I am certain many Members of the House will be interested in reading:

MARINES SHOULD HELP PLAN WARS THEY MUST FIGHT

In their valuable and compendious volume, The United States Marines and Amphibious War (Princeton University Press), Jeter A. Isely and Philip A. Crowl start the proceedings with this wartime quotation from Gen. George Marshall:

"My military education and experience in the First World War has all been based on roads, rivers, and railroads. During the last 2 years, however, I have been acquiring an education based on oceans and I've had to learn all over again. Prior to the present war I had never heard of any landing craft except a rubber boat. Now I think about little else."

As Messrs. Isely and Crowl make convincingly plain, much of General Marshall's education was provided by the United States Marine Corps, which had been thinking of, and experimenting with, landing craft for 20 years before the war. "That the United States Army was so quickly able to train troops for crossing beaches held by hostile nations is attributable to its own flexibility and leadership and, equally important, to the availability for its guidance of a sound body of amphibious doctrine previously drawn up by the United States Navy and the Marine Corps." The hard work put in by the Marine Corps, often, according to General Vandegrift, in the face of uninterested or doubting military orthodoxy, paid off all the way from Guadalcanal to the beaches of Normandy.

This contribution to what turned out to be one of the basic concepts upon which Allied victory rests might be expected to earn for the Marine Corps better recognition than it has received from the other services. Leaving aside Mr. Truman's contemptuous and politically careless dismissal of the Marines as "the Navy's police force," the present mobilization plan provides for less expansion of the Marine Corps than its esprit de corps, competent planning and fighting record would justify. The brilliant use which the Marines have made of their own air units to support ground fighting in Korea is another testimonial to the hard-hitting efficiency and excellent coordination of this elite outfit. As the news from Korea makes plain, it is upon the Marine Corps that the country depends for immediate offensive strength in time of emergency or hastily conceived "police actions." As long as we prefer to keep wars at a distance from American soil, so long will skill in amphibious warfare be basic to our security.

Despite its remarkable record, the Marine Corps is not represented at all in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is a startling ommission in view of the debt which Army planning owes to Marine military concepts and experimentation, not to mention fighting spirit and thorough train-

ing which have always distinguished the USMC. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a Marine veteran himself, has introduced a bill to correct this defect by placing the Commandant of the corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The present Commandant, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, who has a distinguished combat record through all ranks, would undoubtedly add solid military experience to the deliberations of the JCS. It should not take a "propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's" to convince people that the Marine Corps will continue to provide leaders whose advice on military planning would be worth having. At any rate, the past service of the Marines is a reason to think so.

Farm Bureau and Grange Oppose UMT Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as public understanding of the issues involved in the UMT proposal increases, there is also an increase in the expressions of grave concern and of desire to divorce this proposal from the needed draft-extension legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letters from the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange which came to my desk today urging support of H. R. 3364, the Barden bill, for separation of the two proposals:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951.
To all Members of the House of Representatives:

The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing 1,449,000 farm families, is vitally concerned over the provisions of S. 1, already passed by the United States Senate, and H. R. 2811, now being considered by the House of Representatives. At the thirty-second annual convention of this organization, the voting delegates passed the following resolutions with regard to universal military training and selective service:

"We of the American Farm Bureau Federation believe that to add universal military training to the selective-service program would result in ineffective and inefficient use of manpower. However, with the need for strong military preparedness, we suggest consideration of expanded and improved military training in secondary schools and colleges."

We believe that the amendments proposed in H. R. 3364 (Barden bill) conform to the expressed wishes of the farmers of the United States, and we urgently recommend that the language in H. R. 3364 be substituted for the language in the bill now being considered by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN C. LYNN,
Associate Director, Washington Office.

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Grange believes that the selective service is meeting fully and to spare the emergency defense needs of the Nation; and the military concedes this. We have faith in our people, in democracy, and in Congress to support selective service to the fullest necessary extent as long as danger threatens; and we wish the armed services had this faith and would not try to pass peacetime UMT under the cloak of the present grave danger.

H. R. 3364 meets our officially declared stand on this profoundly vital problem in that:

1. It discards universal military training and calls for the fullest necessary use of selective service, with lowered physical and mental tests if needed;

2. Calls for induction at age 19 instead of 18, and for maximum of 24 months' service, or of not over 2 years of a boy's school life, and for release to Reserve status if national safety requires it;

3. Provides that Congress by concurrent resolution can change service requirements or suspend the draft when the danger is passed, and for a preservation of selective service machinery but a definite termination date for the draft which automatically gives you as an individual Congressman the right to review your present stand;

4. And provides for a democratically and economically sound occupational deferment based on obtaining maximum national service in the field in which each man is best fitted to serve his country.

The National Grange has no official stand on the provision of H. R. 3564 for services in racially segregated units.

We sincerely hope, for the sake of adequate provision for the present emergency, and for the preservation of democracy and the right of Congress to reflect that democracy, that you will support a bill carrying the four numbered items mentioned above.

We sincerely hope and pray also that every Member of the Congress, will put forth all possible efforts to bring about a safe and sound reduction of armaments for all nations alike, for a strengthening of law and order and a Christian peace for the world.

Sincerely yours,
J. T. SAUNDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

America in Her Hour of Test and Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, at the recent conference of the International Christian Leadership, Inc., a group sponsoring the breakfast clubs, our Director of Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, presented an eloquent statement on the basis of the faith of the American people in the ideal of freedom and justice which distinguishes the free nations from the philosophy of government known as communism. I am sure that the Members of the House will be impressed by this document.

The statement follows:

We are a part of America—Christian men and women drawn from government, from business, from labor, from the professions, from agriculture—from diverse backgrounds, but united in humbly seeking the mind of Christ for America and for us as citizens of America in this hour of her testing and decision. What follows has been hammered out of our experience; it has come to us as we have prayed. We share it with you, not that we are sure we have the answers, but that we have tried, with God's help, to find them. We hope and pray that each of you will search your own heart also; that you and we together may keep faith with our Christian heritage; that we may be steadfast in the days and years that lie ahead.

We hold these truths to be self-evident.

Two ways of life are struggling for mastery today.

1. The Christian way sees the universe as God's handiwork. The Communist way sees it as blind mechanism, neither coming from anywhere, nor with any destiny save an ultimate oblivion.

2. The Christian way sees man a child of God with the gift of immortality. The Communist way makes him one with a mechanistic universe, and death the inevitable end.

3. The Christian way sees government the servant of man, an instrument designed to establish the great freedoms, whose policies are aimed at releasing man's inner powers. The Communist way has established the state as man's master, and in the name of man's well-being has created a regime of fear that stultifies the creative and withers the spirit.

4. The Christian way would establish world peace on a foundation of righteousness and the brotherhood of all peoples. The Communist way extends the false peace of terror and death wherever it prevails; toward those peoples who would remain free, it holds out the threat of aggression, sabotage, and war.

5. The Christian way recognizes the dignity of work and the function of industry, both in an atmosphere of freedom. The Communist way enslaves its millions in work camps; and forces its scores of millions to conform to a regimentation, the end of which is the perpetuation in power of its overlords.

6. The Christian way believes in political imperialism only as a temporary trusteeship, with freedom for all peoples—an urgent as well as ultimate goal—a freedom already the proud possession of India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and many another nation formerly in political tutelage. The Communist way, behind a false facade of words, would extend the ruthless imperialism of Moscow to every nation it subverts or conquers.

7. The Christian way holds all men brothers, regardless of race, alike entitled to live a life of freedom, of dignity, of service to humanity. The Communist way would seize these so-called colored races at the very moment they are achieving both freedom and creative nationalism; and would drag them into a world of terror under the control of an oligarchy far more ruthless than they have known in the worst days of colonial rule.

8. The Christian way believes in the sacredness of marriage and the family, husband and wife, parent and child. The Communist way claims the child for the state; it makes of marriage a thing of convenience.

9. The Christian way holds science the handmaiden of integrity. The Communist way bends science to propaganda; it substitutes party line for truth.

These are the ways of life that are struggling for mastery. This is the struggle which is the greatest single fact in the world today. In such a world, we call upon all individuals—

(a) To deepen their faith in God and His purposes for man.

(b) To deepen their faith in man and man's possibilities as end and not as means.

(c) To deepen their own personalities by prayer; by contact with the great and sacred things in literature, music, and art; by humility before the testing that lies ahead.

(d) To dedicate themselves to bringing about in our America better understanding and mutual help between groups, races, classes, and creeds.

(e) To see to it that their sense of obligation to serve others, their country, and their world, overrides any concern for their own selfish interests.

(f) To recognize their interdependence upon each other and upon those all over the world whose values include freedom, the dignity of the individual, his obligation to serve.

In such a world, we call upon our country as a unit—

1. To keep faith with Christ and its Christian heritage. Into our Nation and people have been built the prayers and struggles and selfless service of millions of Christian men and women. To them we owe much of our belief in freedom, much of our American dream of equality of opportunity, much of our constitutionalism with its responsibility of the governors to the governed. If these religious springs of actions wither, the days of our national strength are numbered. We gladly recognize the contribution to this same end of other faiths, notably that of Israel, who share with Christians the view of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man.

2. To rise to its responsibilities of leadership. So much of the world is terribly weak; so much is groping for new gods with its old gods in the dust; so much is under a cloud of terror. However reluctant we are to assume it; God has called America to leadership in this our day. May we answer the call.

3. To use its power only to serve. Our Nation finds itself with a material and economic strength unparalleled in all history. Power tempts to arrogance; the siren of self-centeredness beckons. May America be humble in this day; and know the inner meaning of the words of the Master of us all, "He that is greatest among you, let him be the servant of all."

Before concluding, we want to make a few other things clear.

(a) With the Russian people we have no quarrel. They like so many others are exploited and deceived by their masters.

(b) We favor military and economic strength as necessary, but believe that the final outcome of the struggle lies not with them, but rather in the field of men's loyalties; in the intensity and enthusiasm with which they believe in their way of life.

(c) We recognize the sacrifices already made by the free in other lands, and salute them as comrades in the great battle. So we conclude:

"God has sounded forth a trumpet that shall never call retreat
He is sifting out the souls of men before His judgment seat
Be swift, my soul, to answer Him, be jubilant, my feet.
Our God is marching on."

San Carlos Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, on a recent visit to Phoenix, Ariz., I had the opportunity of visiting the Pima Indian Reservation in company with my colleague, Congressman HARRISON, of Wyoming. This visit was in connection with the existing water conditions in Arizona.

We discovered that the Indians on this reservation had received a formal notice that their water allotment for the calendar year of 1951 would be only one-half acre-foot per acre for the entire San Carlos project. This meant, according to the letter of notification from the superintendent, Mr. A. E. Robinson, that they would only be able to plant from one-eighth to one-tenth of the acreage on the reservation and, as the letter stated, that any operator who planted more than 20 acres of cotton out of his 160 acres would not have sufficient water to even irrigate that 20 acres.

Now naturally this is a very serious condition when we consider that this land is exceedingly fertile and classed among the most tillable land in the San Carlos area. Added to this problem was the fact that the superintendent told us that the Indians had to haul in all of their domestic and drinking water. One of the Indian escorts stated that it took 1 day out of each Indian's week to hitch up the horses and haul sufficient water back for the week's use. They claimed that this shortage was due to the fact that the water level had dropped below the depth of their wells.

They then told us that this was largely due to the fact that the white men were drilling wells immediately adjacent to the reservation at a greater depth and drawing out the water to irrigate their cotton acreage.

When I asked the superintendent what they could do about it he stated there was not anything they could do because this was the responsibility of the State of Arizona.

While this area was declared a critical area, the present wells can still continue to draw water from this area for the cotton acreage of the white man at the expense of the original American, the Indian. The Indian, because he is directly under our wardship and is dependent upon us for money because we have made him that way, cannot get the money to drill his wells deeper and, therefore, the white man takes all of the water away.

To add to this tragedy we discovered that the man who drove us back to our destination was one of the men who has been practicing this artifice and taking water that rightfully belongs to the Indians, and has been working in Washington in an attempt to get the Government to expend a billion dollars to rescue him and others by bringing in Colorado River water to bring up these water tables.

The question I raise is, What are we going to do for the Indians? We turn around and tie their hands through our wardship and then allow the white man to steal the very thing which we supposedly are giving them.

PIMA INDIAN AGENCY,
Sacaton, Ariz., March 8, 1951.

To Indian Irrigation Committee and Indian Farmers:

This letter is being addressed to you so that you will all be fully advised of the present irrigation water supply. Under date of January 22, 1951, Mr. Warnock, project engineer, recommended to the office a first apportionment of one-half acre-foot per acre for the San Carlos Project for the calendar year of 1951. We have delayed writing this letter to you until this apportionment was approved in Washington. We have received this approval dated February 23, 1951.

At the present time there is no water stored behind the Coolidge Dam and the latest snow surveys show that there is little possibility of receiving any run-off from the upper watersheds. Therefore, for the present it appears that the only water which will be available will be the one-half acre-foot apportionment which of course will be made up entirely of water pumped from our irrigation wells. Those farmers who have planted wheat and barley crops have already or will shortly use up their first apportionment.

We are attaching hereto a copy of a letter dated February 21, 1951, that has been addressed to the farmers in the White District as to just what they can expect as far as planting is concerned and the conditions set forth in that letter will also apply to the Indian farmers, namely, that only one-eighth to one-tenth of the acreage on the Reservation can be planted.

The office is now working in Washington endeavoring to raise a sum of $150,000 for irrigation well rehabilitation. At the present time we are advised that the prospects for the approval of this appropriation seem favorable and with the receipt of this money there is a possibility that a small additional apportionment may be made at a later date, but not in time for cotton acreage.

You will be kept fully advised from time to time as to the water situation. But at the present time it would appear that we are facing the most critical water situation since the project was placed in operation.

Yours very truly,

A. E. ROBINSON,
Superintendent.

SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION AND
DRAINAGE DISTRICT,
Coolidge, Ariz., February 21, 1951.

To District Landowners and Water Users:

On January 11, 1951, we wrote district owners and operators advising with respect to the outlook for irrigation water supply for the year 1951. The outlook was then critical.

This letter to you has been delayed in the hope that precipitation would occur during January and February which would give promise of some substantial run-off. Up to this time no such rain or snow has fallen on the upper watershed. Therefore we can report no improvement. Based on prevailing conditions the Gila River is expected to deliver less water during 1951 than in any previous year of record.

There is no usable storage in San Carlos Reservoir. At present we can expect to have no dependable supply except what can be delivered by pumping from project wells.

It is expected that the apportionment will shortly be made in the amount of one-half acre-foot per acre. No further apportionment can be expected. The delivery of this water will be limited to the amount which pumps can deliver during each day and will be limited further to lands which can be reached with such pumped water. Under these conditions the water supply appears to be sufficient for about one-eighth to one-tenth of the acreage of district lands.

It is our opinion that under the present outlook for water, the operator who plants more than 20 acres of cotton out of each 160 acres, cannot expect water enough to properly mature his crop. Between now and planting time there may be a change in the weather to bring some improvement. It is doubtful that change will come at this late date. Should there be substantial improvement in water supply prospects during February or March, we shall report the same promptly.

Yours very truly,

C. A. ANDERSON,
District Engineer.

Baskets of Groceries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, five Members of the House recently appeared on the floor with baskets of groceries and in a graphic and dramatic demonstration called attention to the increased cost of food and the small amount of groceries $5 buys today in comparison with what it would buy in 1919.

While no direct charges of farm profiteering are made, the inference is that farm prices are too high and the consumer is paying more for food than his meager income justifies. This widespread impression so generally accepted and so industriously disseminated, is being emphasized by determined campaigns to roll back farm prices and fix farm price ceilings below parity and below comparative incomes of all other industries.

Mr. Speaker, there are two glaring fallacies in this food-basket demonstration and in these covert drives to reduce the wages of farmers and the dividends on investments in farm lands and stock and equipment below the wages and dividends paid other workers and on other investments.

In the first place the farmer receives only a small part of the $5 paid by the consumer for that basket of food. A 16-cent can of tomatoes brings the grower 3 cents. A can of corn selling for 19 cents brings the farmer 2¾ cents. For a pound of onions selling at 6 cents the truck gardener received a penny. Wheat in a 16-cent loaf of bread sells for 2⅔ cents at the elevator. Milk doubles in price after leaving the farm. And while there were no shirts in these baskets, the price the planter receives for the cotton in a shirt is an infinitesimal part of the cost of the garment. So do not hold the farmer exclusively responsible for the cost of the baskets exhibited here on the floor of the House.

But the most specious sophistry, the greatest fallacy in the wood pile, is the fact that the yardstick is money when it should be income—dollars and cents when it should be dividends on investments and wages for a day's labor.

The real question is not how much food $5 bought in 1919 and will buy today but how much food annual dividends and a day's pay bought in 1919 and will buy today. Judged by that criterion—measured by that yardstick, farm products are today cheaper than they were in 1919 or 1929 or 1939.

Compare dividends. Sears, Roebuck & Co., a firm with a large farm clientele reports a net profit for the year ending January 31 last of $143,654,981, equal to $6.08 a share of common stock as compared with a net of $108,206,718 or $4.58 per share in 1949. But let us go back with the baskets to 1919. Here is a tabulation from the Department of Commerce:

Net income after taxes, selected large corporations in the United States, 1919 and 1950

[Thousands of dollars]

Firm name	Net income after taxes	
	1919	1950
United States Steel Corp.	76,795	215,338
General Motors	60,518	834,044
Standard Oil (Indiana)	34,604	123,581
Du Pont de Nemours	15,058	307,602
General Electric	25,078	173,424
Bethehem Steel Corp.	25,357	122,976
Anaconda Copper Mining	5,103	27,253
International Harvester Co.	12,609	65,715
American Tobacco Co.	15,996	41,733
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	18,059	77,923
Kennecott Copper Corp.	447	88,161
Republic Iron & Steel Corp.	2,141	65,795
Reynolds, R. J.	11,272	40,258
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	23,277	35,140
Liggett & Myers Tobacco	5,949	29,058
Phillips Petroleum	−413	51,557
Eastman Kodak	18,326	61,850
Firestone Tire & Rubber	9,307	33,208
Atlantic Refining Co.	8,871	40,852
American Telephone & Telegraph	44,396	286,802

And here are comparative tables on wages of other workers than farm workers for an 8-hour day prepared by the United States Department of Labor and the United States Civil Service Commission:

Occupation	Average daily rate	
	1919	Jan. 2, 1951
Bricklayers	$7.08	$23.12
Carpenters	6.20	19.68
Electricians (inside wiremen)	6.36	21.28
Painters	6.12	18.64
Plumbers and gas fitters	6.60	21.20
Automobile workers (Michigan)	4.90	14.24
Federal employees (Washington)	1,928.00	3,938.00

[1] Per annum.

In order to get a cross section of the increase in the pay of Federal employees under civil service in the country at large, it is to be noted that the average annual salary of all postal employees during fiscal year 1919 was $1,175 and in fiscal year 1950 it was $3,488.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer believes these wages are fully justified. If anything they are not high enough. No one believes more firmly than the farmer that the laborer is worthy of his hire, and with the cost of living at its present peak workers and their families could not reasonably subsist on less. The only point on which the farmer insists is that he and his family are also entitled to a living wage and an American standard of living.

But it is evident that it requires less investments and less dividends and less working time, by far, to buy the baskets of food displayed here in the House the other day. The American consumer has never been fed so sumptuously at such small comparative cost as today.

And this does not take into consideration the vastly increased costs of production on the American farm.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that the prices of farm machinery in 1919 compared with the latest prices are as follows:

Twelve-tube grain drill: 1919, $149; September 1950, $426.

Five-foot mower: 1919, $34.50; June 1950, $197.

Disk harrow, 7-foot single section: 1919, $56.60; September 1950, $123.

Corn planter: 1919, $76; March 1950, $202.

And the cost of fertilizers, insecticides, and all other costs of production have advanced in proportion.

In the face of these added costs and the constantly advancing prices received by everybody else in the last few months farm prices have dropped. Wheat sold for $2.81 a bushel in 1943. On January 15 of this year it was $2.09 a bushel. Corn in 1948 brought $2.46 a bushel. On January 15 of this year it brought $1.54. Hogs, on the same basis of price comparison, were $27.40 and have dropped to $20 per hundredweight. Eggs are lower. So is butterfat. Though the typical diet of one person increased in cost from $112 in 1939 to $252 in 1950, 1950 consumers could buy for 17 percent of their personal income the same quantity and quality of food which cost 22 percent of that same 1939 income.

Yet there are those who want to push the farmer still further down and roll his income still further back by freezing his prices below parity levels.

The situation is admirably summarized by a statement issued April 4, 1951, by the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association:

CEILINGS ON FARM PRICES AT PARITY LEVELS

The farmer's economic position does not justify the agitation in Washington by some people for Congress to fix farm price ceilings below parity levels. If ceilings are placed on farm products, the lowest ceiling which could be imposed should be that which would give farmers purchasing power high enough to warrant a high level of farm production and adequate food supplies.

Income received by farmers is not abnormally high and is not likely to be even under present inflationary conditions. It is not likely that the 1951 net farm income will exceed $17,000,000,000. This would be below the 1947 net income which was almost $18,000,000,000. The net farm income dropped to around $16,500,000,000 in 1948 and to about $14,000,000,000 in 1949. In 1950 the net farm income, even after a period of increasing farm prices the last half of the year, was only $13,000,000,000. In 1947 the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, interest, taxes, and wage rates was 259, in January 1951 the index stood at 272 or 14 percent higher than the 1947 level. Therefore, in 1951 the net income of farmers will buy considerably less than it did in 1947.

Although the farmer's price level is supposed to be 13 percent above parity, the farmer is far from parity so far as his income is concerned. In 1947 the income per capita of the farm population was $847 compared with $1,409 for the nonfarm population. In 1951, the income of the farm population probably will amount to around $825 per person while the income of the nonfarm population probably will exceed $1,600. Consequently, the farmer now is receiving only about one-half as much income per capita as the nonfarm population.

In comparison with corporate profits the farmer is still in an unfavorable position. Corporate profits have risen from $18,500,000,000 in 1947 to a record peak of $21,900,000,000 in 1950 after taxes. At the same time as the farmer's income was dropping from nearly $18,000,000,000 to $13,000,000,000, the

incomes of corporations were rising from $18,500,000,000 to nearly $22,000,000,000.

Another indication of the disparity so far as farmers' incomes are concerned is the fact that the farm population is 18.8 percent of the total population, while the farmer in 1949 received only 7.8 percent of the total national income. In 1947 farmers received 10.1 percent of the national income while providing 19.3 percent of the total population.

Although food prices are high in terms of dollars, it must be remembered that they are not high in terms of purchasing power of wages. As of December, 1950, the latest date for which figures are available, prices of farm products averaged 8 percent above parity. In that same month the market basket of food, representing the typical purchases of a 3-person family for 1 year would have cost $681. The average rate was $1.54 an hour, which means that the city wage earner could have purchased that market basket with only 440 hours of labor. In comparison that market basket of food would have taken 461 hours of labor in 1949, 527 hours in 1947, 479 hours in 1942 and 609 hours in 1933. The 1933 figures are interesting because the market basket at that time would have cost only $277, but would have required 609 hours of labor or nearly 40 percent more than at present.

The recent publicity in some of the slick magazines has attempted to point out the exceptionally large incomes of so-called "typical farmers." According to available statistics these so-called "typical farmers" are considerably above average so far as incomes are concerned. In 1945 farm prices stood at 206 percent of the 1910–14 level, or about two-thirds of the present level, but the purchasing power of farm products at that time was only 9 percent above normal. In that same year, farmers were receiving only $685 of income per capita compared with $1,284 for the nonfarm population. According to census figures, less than 12 percent of the farms in the United States were returning their owners as much as $3,000 of net farm income during that year. It must be remembered that the farmer is not only a worker but a capitalist and consequently his net income must include a return for the capital which he has invested as well as for his own labor. In a year when prices were supposed to have been favorable from a purchasing power standpoint, the facts show that 88 percent of the farmers were receiving less than $3,000 a year as returns for their labor, capital and management and average incomes were much lower. In that same year wage earners in the manufacturing industry were averaging $2300 per year for their labor only.

If price ceilings are set on farm products, the parity level is one basis for making certain that farm prices are increased as costs of farming increase. Although rigid ceilings were in effect during World War II, it must be remembered that the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities used in production and living increased from a level of 152 in 1942 to 167 in 1943, 176 in 1944, and 180 in 1945. Thus, prices paid by farmers increased 12 percent during the 3 years from 1942 to 1945, or 4 percent per year. Unless farm prices had been permitted to rise the farmer would have been caught between rising costs and rigid price ceilings which would have forced many of them out of production.

The use of the parity price level as the lowest possible ceiling is one means of keeping farmers from being crushed between these two forces, as well as a means of insuring the adequate production of food.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I append statements on the subject by the Secretary of Agriculture during a recent hearing before the Committee on Appropriations:

POSITION OF FARMER

Mr. CANNON. The farmers are in a much better position to cooperate in winning the war this time than they were at the beginning of the last war?

Secretary BRANNAN. They are, Mr. Chairman. On the other hand they are more dependent on things which must move to them from outside their farms than they were at the beginning of World War II.

As you go back to earlier in our history, the farmer was more and more self-sufficient. He did not use large quantities of fertilizer. He did not need complicated machinery and machinery parts. He did not need gasoline, rubber, and a lot of other things of that character. He did not have to go elsewhere for his hybrid seed each year.

Now the farmer is dependent upon the movement of all of these things to his farm each year. In one sense he is better equipped to produce for the emergency, but at the same time he is more dependent upon the balance of the economy to be able to carry out his job than he was in earlier history.

COST OF PRODUCTION

Mr. CANNON. Even though his productive capacity has increased, this change has increased his cost of production disproportionately to what it was in 1940?

Secretary BRANNAN. Very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. The cost of production per unit is today greater than it ever was before on the American farm.

Secretary BRANNAN. Greater than it was at any time in all our history, and it is continuing to advance by the year and by the month.

PROFITS OF FARMS

Mr. CANNON. Are the farmers' returns or profits increasing in proportion as his costs of production increase?

Secretary BRANNAN. No, Mr. Chairman. From 1948, when farm operators realized incomes reached their peak, in net terms around $18,000,000,000, their net incomes have gone down until toward the end of 1950—it went from about $18,000,000,000 in 1947 to around $13,000,000,000 for 1950. It is just now turning back up again as a result of the improved price situation arising incident to the emergency.

COMPARISON WITH INDUSTRY

Mr. CANNON. How does that decrease in income compare with the income of industry, commerce, labor, transportation, banking, and so on?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the nonagricultural income in this country, profits, margins, and all the rest of the major economic factors, have been on an uptrend since before the Second World War. It is still on an uptrend at this very moment.

During the period from 1948, when farm prices and farm incomes were failing off drastically, both wages and other forms of nonfarm income were going up. You will note on the charts in 1949 there was a small drop-off in corporate profits, but that was all regained and the graph goes right on up from then on.

Mr. CANNON. While the farmer is producing more for the Nation's economy every year he is being paid proportionately less or comparatively less for his services?

Secretary BRANNAN. Certainly, by comparison with other segments of the economy, that is true.

OBJECTIVE

Mr. CANNON. You mentioned the cost of formulating and carrying out programs. In what respect does your goal or objective at this time differ from what your goal or objective was at the beginning of the Second World War?

Secretary BRANNAN. The goal then was all-out production. The goal now is all-out production. The goal then was all-out production within the pattern of special needs. It is still so at this time. In other words, it is not an all-out production of everything.

If you will observe our production guides for this year, we suggested a little less emphasis on soybeans and greater emphasis on corn, because we are going to need increasing supplies of corn for increasing the livestock population, and the production of livestock products, which is the one good way, if not probably the only successful way, we will ever be able to reduce meat prices to the consumer at the market place.

Mr. CANNON. Really, the only available remedy for high meat prices is to increase the supply?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. To more nearly meet the demand?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right.

As the economy ceases to produce some of the other semidurable and soft goods, as we cease to produce as many automobiles, as a result of the cut-back orders of Mr. Wilson, and perhaps fewer radios and perhaps less of all other durable types of goods, and families have more money in their hands, they are going to spend more of it for food.

The very striking example comes to our minds each time we talk about this, when you remember that in 1946–47, when meat prices went up so rapidly, the per capita consumption was also close to the highest in our history. People simply did not have anything else to spend their money for. They were competing for meat. They were driving the price up, and all of them were eating more meat. Even the increased supply could not match the increased demand as a result of the shift of purchasing power from the durables into the food items.

HEALTH OF PEOPLE

Mr. CANNON. Would you say that that increase in the consumption of meat and of vital foods was reflected in increased health and efficiency of the people of the country as a whole?

Secretary BRANNAN. It certainly was, Mr. Chairman. There is world of evidence of that fact.

PROGRAM FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. CANNON. In the event of an all-out war, Mr. Secretary, which we trust will not materialize, what increase would be made in food production and how would it have to be applied?

Secretary BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that a great deal higher volumes of commodities would be required than we are shooting for this year. As a matter of fact we are asking the farmer to plant more acres this year than we really should from the standpoint of conservation.

Mr. CANNON. And to produce more hogs and cattle?

Secretary BRANNAN. And to produce more hogs and cattle. We are not asking them for more than we have previously asked. In other words we have requested higher acreages and production than we had last year; this year's request is higher.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, you are asking the limit?

Secretary BRANNAN. We are asking the limit. The problem which would come, in the event of an outbreak of all-out hostilities of some type, would be a shifting between the various commodities. Perhaps there would be less of one and more of another.

That will be true, anyway, Mr. Chairman. I referred to soybeans a little while ago. We very fortunately last year had the greatest soybean crop in our history, and I say very fortunately because soybean oil is a substitute for or concomitant to cottonseed oil. Last year we had one of the smallest cottonseed crops in our history. The slack in the oil market was absorbed by the very large supply of soybeans.

There will be, perhaps, a shift back and forth among those kinds of commodities, and

a shift in other directions, as the defense effort indicates.

You will recall that at one time during World War II an all-out effort was made to secure flaxseed because we could not import flaxseed oil or linseed oil from the Argentine or other sources. To that end we used the price-support mechanism and placed a price support of $6 a bushel under flaxseed to get the amount needed.

We are now changing our emphasis very materially to get the fiber crops. We have been doing a considerable amount of work on that this past year or so, both research-wise and stimulating production through educational programs running out to the farmers.

ALL-OUT PRODUCTION OF FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. CANNON. You are asking for the all-out production of food products; you are appealing to the farmers to produce to the limit, to the utmost. What would happen in the event that all-out war does not materialize, and you have this surplus thrown on a peacetime market? You are asking the farmer now to produce more than is required for normal consumption or domestic consumption, and the farmer is responding, as he always does, and is providing more than is required by the domestic consumption. Now, if there is no war, if there is no wartime demand, what effect will this have on the farmer's economy when all of this surplus food that you are appealing to him to produce must be consumed at home in the normal channels of trade?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, you have touched on a point that has been a very worrisome point for us. I am not so much concerned about the fact that our production is geared to the possibilities of all-out hostilities as about the fact that our production has been geared to a very high level of economic activity in this country which is putting purchasing power in the hands of many, many millions of people, very adequate purchasing power. If, for example, there was a very drastic cut-back in the production program as now outlined by Mr. Wilson, and people began to be laid off, and I certainly do not anticipate anything like it, but if that were to happen, probably then we would have some troubles in agriculture, Mr. Chairman, but our troubles in agriculture would not be any more severe, I am sure, than the troubles which would come in the other parts of the economy, too.

Mr. CANNON. Just there, Mr. Secretary, you do not mean that we are also producing automobiles, tractors, and fertilizer at a rate which would be embarrassing in that it would produce a surplus which would be thrown upon the market in case of permanent peace?

Secretary BRANNAN. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, I was referring to a cut-back in the production of tanks, guns, and things of that character.

Mr. CANNON. They do not affect other industries as adversely as a surplus of food would affect the farmer's market.

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right. If we curtail the production program for tanks, guns, and the rest of the things that are now scheduled, as a result of which there is a very high level of employment, then there might not be such strong competition for the American farmer's products in the market place, and he would stand to suffer some price depreciation and, except for the very fine price-support program which the Congress has provided—I mean the very fundamentally sound theory of price supports which this Congress has continued to provide—the American farmer might start into a tail spin that would be comparable to the one he led the whole country into and which resulted in the situation we had in 1929–32.

Mr. CANNON. Then, the national program is subjecting the farmer to a danger to his postwar price structures, such as you very aptly say, produced devastating results in previous agricultural depressions, notably 1920 and 1921. No other industry or class of business in the United States is being asked to assume a similar risk, is being asked to accelerate its production program to a point that would depress its price structure following the days of war. The farmer alone is being singled out to run that risk.

Secretary BRANNAN. That is correct, sir.

In the event of a very substantial decrease in purchasing power in the United States, there would be some commodities which would be adversely affected pricewise. Our price-support programs would then come into play, and perhaps some of these commodities could be utilized in the implementation of our foreign-program objectives. We now have facilities for storing a good quantity of the grain and to keep a considerable quantity out of the market place and relieve its depressing pressures, but it would certainly be foolhardy to say that we would not be faced with some new and serious problems. Of course, we would be faced with some problems in the way of the perishable commodities, just as we were a short time ago.

STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. CANNON. What provision are you making for storage facilities to take care of this expected surplus?

Secretary BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman, we have built approximately 550,000,000 bushels of grain storage in 1949, and it is now out there, dispersed over the country, and it is available to carry some of our large stocks. Simultaneously we have encouraged private trade to increase its storage capacity, and there have been increases and approved facilities in the hands of the private trade.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. CANNON. What is the food-rationing outlook at this time, the prospect that supplies will have to be curtailed at the market place, such as was done in the last war?

Secretary BRANNAN. Mr. Chairman, we do not contemplate an early application of any kind of rationing program. We certainly are not talking about it, and we are bending every effort in the opposite direction, attempting to put enough on the market that no rationing program will be necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Would you have authority to establish ceiling price below the legal rates, the legal prices under the law supporting the price of farm products which fall below parity?

Secretary BRANNAN. I think not, Mr. Chairman. I hope that problem never arises, and the probability that it will arise is pretty remote, because, as you recall, the Defense Production Act sets the legal minimums at 100 percent of parity or the prices prevailing during 30 days prior to Korea, whichever is higher. We might get into a situation in which there would be conflict between a desire to set ceilings at the legal minimum, which is 100 percent of parity or pre-Korea, if the Department decided that in order to stimulate production we would need to increase or maintain prices above the parity or pre-Korea level.

If we said, for example, that we wanted to set the support level at 110 percent of parity, and the legal minimum would be 100 percent of parity, and Mr. DiSalle insisted on the price being at the minimum of 100 percent of parity, there would be a 10-percent overlapping there which might give us trouble; but I am reasonably sure, Mr. Chairman, if we ever had a situation in which we had to do something extraordinary to stimulate production in this country, there would be little tendency to try to fix the minimum price below our support level.

Mr. CANNON. Your statutory support level?

Secretary BRANNAN. No; the support level designed to induce production. We do have the authority to use support prices above the fixed statutory levels under certain circumstances, where it is in the national interest.

DEFINITION OF PARITY

Mr. CANNON. What is the Department's interpretation of the term "parity"; what is parity?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, there are many definitions, Mr. Chairman.

Parity, in one word, is equality for farmers; in an effort to achieve economic equality for farmers.

A little more extended definition is that parity represents the relationship between the cost of the things that farmers have to buy, for production and family living, and the prices which they get for their commodities in the market place. It is tied to a base period which was established as 1910–14 and is then projected down to date. For example, the parity price for a bushel of wheat today is enough to allow the farmer to buy the same amount of goods as would have exchanged for a bushel of wheat in 1910–14.

Mr. CANNON. In brief, parity means equality, the farmer's equality with other industries?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Summarizing it still more briefly, parity is fair? It is equity.

Secretary BRANNAN. That's right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Whenever you reduce the farmer's price below parity, you are not being fair to the farmer. Then you are giving him an unfair price?

Secretary BRANNAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. CANNON. You are favoring other industries at his expense?

Secretary BRANNAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

I am also including an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. DiSalle, the Director of Price Stabilization:

Mr. CANNON. You have additional livestock regulations in contemplation?

Mr. DISALLE. Yes, sir. We have a beef regulation being written and a pork regulation.

Mr. CANNON. Does that apply at the counter, in the market place, on the farm, or at the point of distribution?

Mr. DISALLE. It will apply from the point of production to the point of sale.

OBSERVANCE OF PARITY IN DETERMINING PRICES

Mr. CANNON. Every effort will be made to arrive at an equitable price, and you will observe parity in determining prices being imposed?

Mr. DISALLE. Yes. Beef is at 141 percent of parity right now.

Mr. CANNON. What about hogs?

Mr. DISALLE. They are right about parity. They have been below parity most of the time. It keeps fluctuating back and forth.

Mr. CANNON. It is axiomatic, Mr. Director, that in an inflation the farmers' prices rise last and fall first. That was true in the last war and in recent wartime developments. Since 1945 industrial prices, dividends, freight rates, price of farm machinery, fertilizer, wages of all classes of labor, especially farm labor, and the national income and the Federal revenue have reached peaks never before attained. I suppose you might say they are now at the highest point of many years.

Mr. DISALLE. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. With one exception, however. The price of hogs has been dropping until recently. It went up above $30 and went down to below $18.

Mr. DISALLE. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. Well, while everything else was going up together including the cost of producing the hog, the price was falling. You will take that into consideration so no step will be taken to place it lower than parity?

Mr. DISALLE. Under the law we are bound to observe parity.

Address Delivered by Dr. Percy L. Julian at Sixteenth Annual Patriotic Award Dinner of the Chicago Decalogue Society of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, each year the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, one of the distinguished bar associations in the city of Chicago, commendably presents its coveted award of merit to an individual who, in the opinion of the society, has done most to advance the cause of humanity and democracy in our community.

This year the award was appropriately given to one of Chicagoland's most civic-minded citizens, the world renowned chemical scientist, Dr. Percy L. Julian. More than 1,300 people, including numerous dignitaries, crowded the grand ballroom of the Palmer House on March 3, 1951, to pay tribute to Dr. Julian on the occasion of his receiving the award.

Dr. Julian, as is known, is the discoverer of numerous life-giving drugs arising from his research on the soya bean. Among them are cortisone, the hormone compound used in the treatment of arthritis; physostigmine, used in the cure of the eye disease, glaucoma; prostigmine, used in the treatment of paralysis; synthetic male and female hormones credited with saving the lives of countless unborn babies by protecting expectant mothers from miscarriage, and others.

From the soya bean, Dr. Julian also discovered the use of aero-foam, the fire extinguisher which saved so many lives aboard ships during our naval war in the Pacific.

At the present time, he is working hard on pregnenolone to combat fatigue and amino acids for the treatment of infection and starvation.

By his brilliant discoveries in the field of chemical research, Dr. Julian has demonstrated unusual service to mankind and dynamic leadership in his chosen field. The award of merit given him by the Decalogue Society takes cognizance of the fact, moreover, that Dr. Julian is also unselfishly and continuously at work on the critical problem of improving the science of human relationships which exist between man and man, group and group, and for his avowed championing of the cause of decency and the progress of a free America.

Reprinted below are the remarks made by Dr. Julian after acceptance of the award:

THE IMAGE OF OUR NATIONAL CHARACTER

Mr. Chairman, friends of the Decalogue Society, distinguished guests, I would not be a realist at all if I failed to appreciate the inspiring and typical American flavor of this occasion. For my children I must honestly record that this testimonial transcends anything that has to do with the feeble efforts of their father to be a good American citizen; it is rather a part of the traditional and finest American spirit—that we are never too coldly critical in our appraisal, that we never set our standards of worth so high, that we cannot pause and extend our love, our generosity and our food to the spirit of the humble who need it, that their spirits may be rekindled and their faith deepened. And my children will remember the spiritual of their forefathers, "Let us cheer the weary traveler." I can only say with deep humility that I shall strive someday to be worthy of only a small part of your outpouring, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this symbol to my children of the ties that bind them to the hearts of their fellow Americans.

You who have gathered together at this feast of love and human generosity represent the custodians of an image which hundreds of millions of people in this hour are attempting to bring into focus to discern clearly its real and basic outline. It is an image around which the ferments of an entire world are today seething. With mingling feelings of fear, of trembling, of yearning, of futility, of resignation, of despair, and of hope, the millions of surging humanity, standing upon the brink of a new age, are seeking a view of this image. For you are the custodians of the image of our national character. Honest recognition of its inescapable fact, with deep humility, involves at the same time an acceptance or a rejection of significant and history-making responsibilities. Whether we, as custodians of this image, can be entrusted and will be entrusted by the gracious God of human destiny to lead humanity with intelligent humility and understanding into the promised land of beauty of which the prophets have prayed and the angels have sung—or whether mass hysteria, fed upon the love of confusion, which is the essence of satanic glee, shall make of the struggles of humanity nothing other than the Shakespearean cynicism that "day by day we ripe and ripe, and day by day we rot and rot, and thereby hangs the tale"—this is the basic issue of civilization's conflict today. Is so-called human progress a delusion? Is human history to be considered as horses moving in a theatre but getting nowhere? The answer to these questions depends, to no little extent, upon the basic outline of the image of our national character, as that image emerges into the focus of the gaze of the trembling children of this earth.

No nation in world history ever had a more peculiar and strategic rendezvous with the gracious God of human destiny. A Nation that has gathered itself by its own bootstraps from the sea-level of the jungle to the amazing elevation of unparalleled order, beauty, and power; a Nation that juts above the tableland of world morality as a massive peak; a Nation that has dared to keep the flame of freedom burning within the breast of the lowliest child of this earth; a Nation whose tortuous struggles toward articulation of this freedom have involved it in a maze of paradoxes, but has nevertheless stolidly maintained its determination to replace uncertainty by certainty, vagueness by definiteness, and confusion by order; a Nation that approaches its present historical rendezvous as a crown in the nobility of the ages. To such a nobility must its great debate in this historical hour address itself, and the greatest treason that its thinking citizenry could commit in this dark hour of uncertainty would be to approach its challenge with anything but unflinching honesty.

Sometime perhaps in the thirtieth century A. D. a world historian is going to write a chapter entitled "The Age of Approaching Honesty." A part of that chapter may be devoted to an apparently trivial portion of the American scene and may read as follows:

"And it came to pass that one day in this approaching millennium, a wise city father listened with patience but with determination to the angry protests of a few of his assembled councilmen. 'Sir, you bring ruin upon our beloved city with your unrealistic policies. These enterprising men of wealth and holdings will bring millions to the coffers of our fair city if you will but let them do so; there will be jobs for thousands; parks and terraces of untold beauty shall blend with the matchless beauty of our metropolis; no city of our land may boast of more beautiful homes for its citizens. All they ask is that in making land available to them for this glorious crowning feat of free enterprise, you give them the freedom to reserve these institutions of beauty for those whom they consider bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Without this freedom, we fear they may take their capital elsewhere for investment.' And the city father answered them, saying 'It is not freedom these men covet, it is license. The concept of freedom is too precious to every American to be subjected to such idle mockery. My message which you will take to your clients is clear and unequivocal. Tell them to take their money and go elsewhere, for I do not intend to preside over a city whose social citadels do not point always to the impregnable battlements of a city of God.' And the remaining councilmen stood up in one body of acclaim for their wise leader, and assemblies of freedom-loving men the world over burst forth in thunderous applause. Perhaps the heavens smiled and the angels sang, for had not Glaucon said to Socrates ages ago: 'Socrates, I do not believe that there is such a city of God anywhere on earth.' Socrates replied, 'Whether such a city exists in heaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order'."

Now our most intimate concern, Mr. Chairman, is with the dream of this city of God in the evolution of the image of our national character. It seems appropriate that we consider for a moment the peculiar identity of the roles which science and the law share in this evolution. These two, apparently distinct, and apparently unrelated intellectual disciplines have a remarkably similar operating base, for the cardinal essence of the approach of each of these disciplines at its best is the use of the human imagination. We speak here of imagination not in terms of the nostalgic and mystic beauty of Alice in Wonderland. We speak rather of imagination, as Walter Kerr recently expressed it, as the power to construct images of truth and goodness that render the truth and concomitant goodness more intense—that make truth and goodness more identical with reality in its broadest sense. The imagination of an Alice in Wonderland is not imagination at all; it is rather invention—"the invention of hypothetical states beyond and even contrary to any reality or any truth we have ever known." In the history, both of our disciplines, the products of such invention have unfortunately posed as truth and as reality, and if, indeed, the image of our national character is in this moment in any wise blurred, the confusion resulting from the substitution of invented pictures for reality itself, bears a large part of the blame. There is grave danger that the contagion of such a confusion will sap the vitality and robustness of our national character in a manner that will lead to disaster. Dr. Fred Hoskins told an intriguing story a few days ago, which aptly illustrates how prone is the human mind to accept invention as a substitute for reality and truth.

A little boy was running along the street as fast as his feet would carry him and came upon a woman who stopped him, saying "Now, my lad, where do you think you are going in such haste?" "Why, I'm going to fetch a doctor for Granddaddy; he is very ill." "Oh, your Grandfather is not ill at all; he only thinks he's ill, and you just go back home and tell him so." Whereupon the lad did as he was told. A few days later he met the same woman again. "Oh, how is your Granddaddy, my young man?" "Oh, he's fine; he thinks he's dead and we're burying him on Saturday." Now, the imagination which we identify with the core and cardinal essence of these two disciplines to which you and I are devoted—science and the law—strives to keep before us a vitalizing and impelling picture of ultimate truth—yea of eternal verity.

Now I am perfectly aware that the down to bedrock, pragmatic intellect will object to the introduction of such resilience in what to him is a comfortably static discipline of conveniently fixed reference points. He will complain that only chaos can result from a confusion of the isness of the law with its inevitable oughtness. And he will take pride in recalling for you the story of the student who allegedly cried out to Dean Pound, "But, professor, that is not justice," whereupon the learned Dean is reputed to have replied, "My boy, we are teaching the law; if you want justice, go to the divinity school." Now most of us believe that Dean Pound was libeled by his story. Certainly, however, when mature devotees of legal discipline are impressed by this reduction to absurdity it is a blot upon the high calling of your profession and another contribution to the blurring of the image of our national character. For, if justice is consistent with truth in an ordered world, there can be in the long run no basic conflict between justice and the law.

If then, such is the essence of legal objectives, then the first and most sacred duty of the judiciary, and its high calling, is to seek at all times the synonymity between the intent of the law and an image of eternal verity. And beyond this comes the determination to expand the law so as to bring it into consonance with such an image. Enslavement to custom, enticement by the opportunism of the moment; fever psychology should then be considered a disease by an enlightened judiciary and should never thwart the emergence of the true imaginative force. A beloved man of the Chicago bench, in supporting the validity of restrictive covenants some years ago is known to have said "Though my decision runs directly counter to my personal convictions as a Christian and contrary to the basic concepts of our American democratic faith, I can make no other decision for such is the law." Here on the part of a good man is a striking illustration of this disease of enslavement to custom of which I have spoken. As a Nation we are beginning to feel the effects of this all-too-prevalent reluctance to apply the true imaginative force to our social problems, this reluctance to travel in the valley of the shadows beyond the calloused husk that hides the force of inevitable truth. And yet nothing is more imperative to us at this crisis in world history than that we accelerate this very process. Indeed the stern lessons of history teach us that nothing is more tragic than the reluctance of mortal man to face the stark realism of cumulative truth. That Newton's revelations were like an earthquake to the foundations of the intellectual world of the eighteenth century is well-known history; it is equally well-known history, however, that Newton's victory was inevitable. For Newton has attempted the construction of an image of cosmic order in applying his laws of gravitation to the apparently wayward movements of the shooting stars. The victory of the ordered over the wayward; the victory of reality over the apparent—just had to prevail. Likewise the struggles of Galileo with the church over the truth or falsity of his heliocentric doctrine is an historical tragedy which none of us likes to recall.

Now what does all of this have to do with the evolution of the image of our national character? To begin with, whether we will it or not, we have come to the point in world history where we are literally expected to be the torch-bearers of world morality. The image of our national character must be consistent with the dreams and aspirations of mankind down the ages for an ordered world. It matters not how comfortable may be the concept of our geographical position as that of an island arsenal; the stark truth is that we are just as harnessed to the remainder of the world today, as the wayward planets of Newton were harnessed to one another by his universal laws of gravitation. The social forces of a dawning new age are constituting a geocentric system as inevitable as the planetary system of the physical world. To assume anything to the contrary is sheer, nonsensical invention. And the great debate needs more than anything else the application of that genuine imaginative force that constitutes the essence of the disciplines of science and the law, the willingness to identify our concepts of the future with the reality revealed by the cumulative lessons of human history.

Perhaps the most explosive paradox in world affairs today is the danger that the American Nation may take an excursion away from the cumulative historical realism of the past few centuries, and thus inadvertently attempt to stop the clock of human progress. Paradoxical because for centuries the dominating force in the image of our national character has been a vigorous frontier motif—aggressive and progressive change—ceaseless, restless, disturbing change. The world has come to recognize these positive elements of our national character as healthy elements in social, economic, and political progress. Now all of a sudden when the social forces of the world need badly a unifying or regulating concept, when the wayward movements of these social forces threaten the scheme of things to which we have become accustomed, we do not present a calm faith in the identity of our structure with history's long cherished aspirations. We develop instead an hysteria that spends much of its energies in thought control movements—in the feverish efforts to convince ourselves that we are all right just as we are. Few men in public life today dare a candid examination of these facets of hysteria that blur the image of our national character. We are jittery; we are frantic with fear, and we want no part of anything new. It is not a healthy, courageous, positive faith which we offer the world today; it is an uncertain and jittery negativism. Indeed some of us would go so far as to suggest that in the realm of interacting social forces, we have made all the discoveries; we are paragons of virtue—there are no more frontiers ahead of us.

To such a thesis no scientist can subscribe despite his pride in the historical greatness of our Nation. Our present American tendency toward smug refuge in omniscience and a sense of physical power is the direst disease that ever set upon our spirits as a people. We cannot be reminded too often of the scientist of something more than a hundred years ago who voiced the opinion that all of the great fundamental discoveries of science had been made, that it only remained for future generations to polish them, refine them, and adapt them to our practical needs. That man had reached the zenith of his capability for exploring the fundamental unknown.

Almost as if God, Himself, had been angered by such arrogant skepticism there descended upon this pronouncement an avalache of the most glorious discoveries that have ever been credited to the human intellect. For shortly thereafter Michael Faraday drew a living spark from the lifeless magnet. And Daniel, Grove, and Bunsen, following close on the heels of Faraday's discovery, gave us an enduring source of electrodynamic power. And Ohm in Germany taught us how to measure such a power when obtained. Yes, hardly had the ink dried upon this pronouncement when Bessel detected the parallaxes of the fixed stars, and Adams and Leverrier threw their grapples out into space and felt the influence of unseen planets trembling along the delicate lines of their analyses. Draper, Daguerre, and Talbot revealed the wonders of actinism and gave us the new science of photography. Yes, in another field, almost bordering on the aesthetic, Agassiz in Italy rode down the Alps upon the backs of the glaciers and proved their steady flow. And Darwin lifted the veil from the mysteries of organic development.

I like to think of Stokes as he stood one afternoon in the English countryside gazing at a rainbow—and as he looked from the red to the violet end, he wondered what became of yonder violet as it faded into the invisible. And lo. Stokes with this dream had discovered for us the ultraviolet—beyond the violet—and blessed us unwittingly with vitamin D, the sunshine vitamin, so that today our children need not grow up with the crooked bones of rickets. So that today we have thrust deep at the heart of arthritis or rheumatism. And so today, they tell us, a hen that used to lay you 150 eggs a year now lays you 300 eggs a year because du Pont's deisterol. All because Stokes gazed at a rainbow and had the courage to dream of good things yet to come.

And in our own country Edison discovered that hot bodies give off electricity—fast-moving electrons. And with this discovery he had written the first—even if relatively insignificant—chapter in the history of the atomic bomb. And when Roentgen in Germany read of Edison's discovery, he decided to place a piece of tungsten metal in the path of these electrons. And when did, he noticed new types of penetrating rays emitted from the tungsten target. And lo and behold. Roentgen had discovered for us the X-day enabling our eye to see where hitherto we had not dreamed it would.

And when Becquerel in France read of Roentgen's discovery he decided to look at his uranium from a new point of view. Yes; Becquerel's uranium from the pitchblends of mountain Austria, known to man partly because a poor Russian, Mendeleef, had struggled through the university and, out of the brilliance of his intellect, harnessed the wayward masses of the atoms into a system of periodicity, leaving a blank space which one day a metal, uranium, was to occupy. And now Becquerel had it; he wrapped a photographic plate up in a piece of black paper and laid it near a piece of uranium. And when he opened up the paper a short time later the photographic plate was as black as if it had been exposed to the direct rays of the sun. And Becquerel had written a second and very significant chapter in the history of the atomic bomb.

And when Pierre and Marie Curie read of Becquerel's discovery, they knew where to look for radium, and they went straight to that pitchblende from mountain Austria, and there they found it, and gave to humanity not only the first concrete remedy against the malady of cancer but to us a new image of a whole new science of rapidly moving particles charged with electricity—electrons, protons, and alpha particles. And a third

and most significant chapter had been written in the history of the atomic bomb.

And when Rutherford in England read of the Curies' work, he bombarded an atom of nitrogen with their alpha particles and converted the atom of nitrogen into an atom of hydrogen and an atom of oxygen. And Rutherford had written a fourth and vital chapter in the history of the atomic bomb.

And the years pass on with increasing perfection of the image of ultimate truth. When Marie's daughter, Irene Curie, working with Joliot, learned of Rutherford's work, she reexamined the beloved uranium of her mother, and there she found something that her mother's eyes had not seen, that there were other fast-moving particles emitted, not charged with electricity, not susceptible, therefore, to deflection in the electromagnetic fields of Faraday and Daniel, Grove and Bunsen, but fast-moving particles which went straight to their target. And a fifth and crucial chapter had been written in the history of the atomic bomb. And these workers had brought us close to the basic building stones—and some say the obliterating stones—of our material existence, ever closer and closer to reality, to ultimate truth.

This chronology of genius at work is but a striking illustration of history's summary rejection of any attempt to bottle up cumulative wisdom into a fixed and static formula of human behavior. I have often recalled a story told by Harry Emerson Fosdick of a minister who went into his study and found his little daughter busily sketching something on paper. "Why, Anne, what are you drawing?" he asked. "Oh, Daddy, I'm drawing a picture of God." "But, Anne, no one knows what God looks like." "Well, they will when I'm through."

We need gravely to ask ourselves whether we are tending toward a people with the mentality of Anne. Have we become so smugly satisfied with ourselves as we are that we reject any picture that we cannot reconcile with our man-sized God? Shall we allow the image of our national character with a devotion to the mere husks and rinds of good?

And Socrates replied "Whether such a city of God exists in Leaven or ever will exist on earth, the wise man will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other, and in so looking upon it, will set his own house in order." We cannot escape our historical destiny. Our house must be so set in order that the image of our national character will be identified with the image of order and truth for which noble men have bled and died down the ages.

I would be faithless to my strongest convictions as an American citizen did I not tell you that the image of our national character is severely blurred for the rest of the civilized world by the miserable eighteenth and nineteenth century European-like ghettos which choke the honor and human decency out of nearly every major metropolis of this Nation. It is symptomatic of our smugness that we expect to weld Americans together in a unity of purpose, while we subject the spirits of 15,000,000 of Americans to the horrors of a Dachau and Buchenwald psychology. In the sense of the Thracian maiden's evaluation of Thales of Miletus, some of us have been so busy studying the stars of freedom that we have literally fallen into the wells of spiritual degradation at our feet. We cannot hold the garment of God in our right hand and raise it to our lips while a left hand behind our back is clasped firmly in the grip of Satan, and expect a world of people to discern a coveted image of our national character. I warn my fellow citizens that no true patriotism can emanate from the American ghetto. It has only served to create a house bitterly divided against itself, and though the house may stand, its strength and fiber are vitiated. Someday someone will write a dramatic story for the rest of the civilized world of the detailed horrors of the American ghetto and the peculiar helplessness of its innocent victims. I say unto you now that the forces which have fought to maintain American Negro ghettos must be destroyed. Foremost among these forces is that section of the real-estate group which spreads the doctrine that if a Negro moves next to you no matter who he is, the value of your property goes down. This insidious propaganda and incidentally, this vicious lie, has ceased to carry the flavor of privileged speech. It has become vile slander, incitement to arson, to murder, and to the wildest forms of mob violence. But for a half hour delay, by the grace of God, I would today be a mute victim of this propaganda. The time has come when Federal and city statutes may well be necessary to insure citizens against first degree or premeditated murder by these members of the real-estate clan. I have never witnessed a more subtly generated hysteria than that created daily in the mind of the American property owner by the so-called respectable real-estate dealer. A few months ago one of my coworkers went with her husband to Elmhurst to look for a piece of property. Anxious to get the best for their youthful and sacrificial savings, they were told, as the first of their assets, by the real-estate dealer, "You need never have any fear of any Negroes living in Elmhurst!" One is prone to ask how long must decent Americans die in Korea and still be the subject of such slander?

It is not worthy of citizens of a great nation like this to make an already sorely harassed minority the scapegoat in vital issues that affect the image of our national character. For example, the issue of public versus private housing has degenerated into unreasonable slander of the Negro minority. We cannot in this city apparently meet squarely and honestly the issue as to whether public housing is consistent with the spirit of our free-enterprise system and our American desire for beauty in our cities, simply because demagogs insist upon keeping before the public the invention that public housing is designed primarily for the Negro population. It is almost inconceivable that a great people like ourselves should allow such a discussion to degrade into spurious logical sequences such as "You are for some public housing, eh?" "Then you are against free enterprise." "Then you are for the Negro." "Then you are for the destruction of white neighborhoods." "Then you are a Communist."

It is to the great credit of our mayor that he is reputed to have stated last year in the fever of this hysteria, "There is no such thing as a white neighborhood in the city of Chicago." I hope, and there are thousands who hope with me, that we may have that statement repeated by our mayor. It is a good statement, and if the image of our national character is to be a real world force it is a patriotic statement. We certainly cannot weld together a nation of one people by reminding 15,000,000 Americans constantly of white neighborhoods any more than by asking them to die for a white country. Such behavior is unworthy of the nobility of our Nation and blurs the image of our national character.

And, speaking of dying in Korea, let me quote you from a recent segment of the American Negro Press: "Meanwhile, a news story broke which was given scant editorial attention in the daily press, but was a matter of considerable concern in the Negro press: South Koreans were being integrated into white units of the American Army. Robert Bennyhoff, UP correspondent wrote, 'They are being incorporated into American platoons and squads on an equal basis with American soldiers. The Koreans wear American uniforms, live and eat with the GI's, and get the same treatment.' The order came from MacArthur; it was, according to the general, 'in keeping with the true concept of a United Nations army.' Meanwhile the Twenty-fourth Infantry regiment was listening to the following words from its commander, 'You people have a history of running from battle. You ran in the Ninety-second in the last war. Now you are the frightened Twenty-fourth Infantry regiment. I intend to change that to the fighting Twenty-fourth.' And the Twenty-fourth remains a Jim Crow outfit while the Pittsburgh Courier writes to 15,000,000 Negro Americans, 'This is an insult which burns deep into the soul of every black American.'"

Whether all of this represents moral indifference, ignorance, or downright moral turpitude, we who are gathered here this evening must, of necessity, be determined to erase these elements of disgrace from our national character. The image of that character must stand unblemished as a beacon light of hope to a confused world. It has been too hard earned and is too precious to be tampered with. I fervently hope, Mr. Chairman, that I may record for my children that you have done me this great honor because we share in common these concepts of the sacred mission of our respective disciplines to which we have alluded. That the ideals implied in these concepts are those by which we live and for the defense of which we would gladly die. And that one and all here this evening we share this coveted image of our national character as the most precious heritage for our children. That we are assembled here to pray that that image may blossom forth in a new birth of freedom, a unity of purpose, a dauntless faith, so that the peoples of this earth may see that we have no fear, for that which we seek is the kingdom of God.

Migratory Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor has now filed its report, and I should like to include in our RECORD an article published in the New York Times yesterday explaining said report. I should also like to direct the attention of the membership to an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Migrant Farm Labor."

The recommendations of the President's Commission are strikingly similar to those made by a California commission appointed by Gov. Earl Warren. In view of the fact that all impartial and nonpartisan agencies which investigate the problem tend to arrive at the same conclusions and to make the same recommendations, it is difficult for me to understand why our own Committee on Agriculture seems blind to the obvious facts, and has brought forth no comprehensive legislation aimed at a satisfac-

tory solution of the migrant farm labor problem.

Of course, the reference of bills dealing with migratory labor is made to the Agriculture Committee in obvious disregard of the law, as set forth in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The whole subject matter legally and rightfully belongs in the Committee on Labor and Education.

[From the New York Times]

TOP FEDERAL AGENCY URGED FOR MIGRANT FARM WORKERS

(By Louis Stark)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—The President's Commission on Migratory Labor reported today that the industrialization of agriculture had brought with it all the social evils that accompanied the earlier industrial revolution. In an 80,000-word report to the White House the Commission pointed out that while workers in industry had derived benefit from the rapid increase of productivity in mine, mill, and factory, similar strides in production on the farm had, on the contrary, thrown the farm and migratory workers backward.

The Commission's principal suggestion for corrective action centered about its proposal for an entirely new Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor.

This group, as recommended in the report, would coordinate all Federal activities concerning itinerant farm workers. The body, to be named by the President, is not intended to be a permanent new agency, but rather a top functionary unit to unify all the efforts of Federal agencies that have to do with the itinerant problem. The ultimate goal of the new set-up would be complete elimination of farm-labor migrancy by gradual steps.

Current approaches to the problem, according to the Commission's findings, have been to deprive the migrant of the benefits of farm mechanization and the advances in social legislation. Some of the migrants, it was stated, live in a state of "virtual peonage."

TRUMAN SEES ULTIMATE BENEFIT

On receiving the report President Truman issued a statement in which he said that it "makes an impressive contribution to a subject which should be of serious concern to us all."

Mr. Truman thanked the members of the Commission for their efforts and said that "their contribution will assist greatly in developing fair and practical solutions to what is admittedly a complicated problem."

The Chairman of the Commission is Maurice T. Van Hecke, professor of law, University of North Carolina. The other members are Noble Clark, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin; William N. Lieserson, economist, Washington; the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio; and Peter H. Odegard, professor of political science, University of California, at Berkeley.

The report deals with the plight of 1,000,000 migratory farm workers, of whom half are domestic migrants. The other half is made up of 400,000 illegal Mexican "wetbacks" (persons who cross the border by swimming or wading or just walking) and 100,000 Mexicans legally here under contract and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans.

BLAME IS WIDELY SPREAD

Some of the evils which the commission says it found during its eight months' investigation were pinned on the large industrial growers, many of whom deal with so-called contractor and crew leaders. These last-named bear no direct responsibility to the migratory workers.

The commission, too, discovered an anomaly in the employment conditions of migratory farm workers. Alien workers, such as those who come here from Mexico, for example, are, by intergovernmental treaty, guaranteed employment, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, medical care, housing, and sanitation standards. But domestic migrants not only have no protection through collective bargaining but employers refuse to accord to them the guaranties they extend to imported alien farm workers.

This leads the commission to conclude that the importation of foreign contract labor be undertaken only on the basis of intergovernmental agreements which should be uniform for all foreign governments.

This recommendation is based partly on the fact that from some regions, notably the West Indies, alien farm workers arrive "on whatever terms these foreign governments were able to secure in negotiation with private employers of the United States." In these cases this country has "given no official scrutiny to the terms of the work contracts or their enforcement."

PROBLEM NOT A SMALL MAN'S ONE

It was emphasized by the commission that the problems under study were not primarily those of "the poor little farmer" but were largely confined to conditions on about 125,000 farms which "amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products."

While governmental agencies do not escape criticism in the report, the commission finds that, primarily, the failure of Federal and State agencies to remedy conditions affecting migratory farm workers is traceable to the fact that virtually all social legislation exempts agricultural workers on the assumption that they are employed on small family farms.

The commission submitted a series of specific recommendations for raising the standards of life among the migrant farm workers.

FINAL CHANGE OF POLICY ADVOCATED

It is suggested that dependence on foreign labor for farm work be reduced until this source is no longer required. When it is necessary to import labor, first preference should be given to United States citizens from Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

The conclusion that it is not necessary to import aliens in large numbers during the present emergency is supported broadly by this argument:

Estimated farm output for 1951 is 3.6 percent above 1949. If this additional output were to require an equal percentage increase in man-hours then we would need about 700,000,000 additional manhours to produce the 1951 output. These additional manhours could be supplied by the present domestic labor force, including farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ more days per year. And, even at that, they would be working 3 days fewer per year than in 1945. The average hired farm worker who in 1949 was getting only 90 days of farm work—23 fewer than in wartime—would be willing, if given the opportunity, to contribute this amount and more.

In a chapter on alien contract labor the report refers to the difficulty of negotiating the intergovernmental agreement for farm labor importation from Mexico.

Mexico and the United States do not approach the negotiations with equal freedom for bargaining, according to the Commission. This is so because Mexico prescribes minimum standards for nationals leaving the country for employment abroad, while we prescribe no minimum standards for domestic farm workers.

STATE DEPARTMENT HINDERED

Then, too, the Commission notes, the State Department is handicapped in negotiating the treaty with Mexico by not being able to consult all interested groups. Farm employers who are well organized and articulate are consulted, but farm workers with virtually no organization, are not in a position to set forth their views.

The Commission heard a sizable volume of testimony which indicated that imported Mexican labor in the southwest encroached on domestic labor, while illegal wetbacks and also the legalized worker of the same category further depressed already low standards.

So vast was the wetback invasion by Mexican nationals from 1947 onward, that the Republic south of the border opposed the recruitment of workers from its interior regions when large numbers of its nationals already were illegally in the United States.

To meet this condition, the United States agreed to legalize wetbacks in 1947, 1949, and 1950. These illegals received identification papers from the United States immigration service, after which they stepped over the border as a token deportation, then stepped back and were permitted to become contract workers.

From 1947 to 1950, according to the Commission, Texas, with a large supply of wetback and contract labor, reduced its wages 11 percent; California, with little contract labor and relatively smaller wetback saturation, raised its wages 15 percent.

The conclusion is drawn from these and other figures that the Government agencies responsible for importing and contracting foreign labor have not protected domestic farm labor from detrimental effects of imported, contract alien labor.

The report describes what the Commission considers the inadequacies in the method of ascertaining whether a farm labor shortage exists.

The farmers, it was pointed out, meet at the beginning of the season and decide unilaterally what the prevailing wage is to be. The rate is usually low before the season begins, and so, the report finds, it is possible that insufficient domestic labor is attracted. Therefore a labor shortage can be said to exist at that price.

Since foreign workers cannot be imported until the United States Employment Service certifies that a shortage exists, this apparent lack of applicants becomes the basis for the necessary certification.

HOW TO CERTIFY A SHORTAGE

To safeguard the interests of domestic farm labor and to avoid, so far as possible, discrimination that favors imported alien contract labor, the Commission proposes that no certification of shortage of domestic labor should be made unless and until continental domestic labor has been offered the same terms and conditions of employment as are offered to foreign workers.

The official vigilance during World War II that provided for temporary admission of alien farm workers was abandoned in the postwar years, the report points out.

Since then, responsible Government administrative agencies have ceased putting forth efforts to preserve national immigration policy, the report continues.

The Commission, in fact, found that the importation of alien farm workers since the war had been on a larger scale than during the war.

The result is that temporary foreign laborers have come to furnish the very competition to American labor that it is the purpose of the immigration law to prevent.

The responsibility for organizing an orderly and expeditious movement of farm workers to successive jobs with minimum loss of time between work opportunities is the responsibility of the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service. But the report offers the opinion that hardly a dent has been made in the disorder that accompanies the migration of domestic farm workers across the country, and [that] the Farm Placement Service has made little progress toward its goal.

SMOOTH SYSTEM NOT DEVISED

While the normal procedure of public employment offices in placing industrial and commercial workers is to have employers file applications for the personnel they seek, the Commission notes that the Farm Placement Division believes it impractical to devise a system for taking employment applications from migratory workers and orders from employers for seasonal or migratory laborers.

But the Farm Placement Division, according to the Commission, is more successful in winning the confidence and cooperation of employers than of the migratory workers.

"This seems to be due to the fact that in practice the service places greater emphasis on its function as a recruiting agency for farm employers than it does on the equally important function of a work-finding agency for the migratory farm laborers," the Commission points out.

In some areas migratory workers who apply at the public placement offices of the Farm Placement Division are actually referred to crew leaders and other types of labor solicitors, according to the report.

These practices have convinced the Commission that the employment service conceives its functions as rather narrow and limited. Moreover, its activities are marked by a certain one-sidedness in favor of corralling supplies of migratory farm workers to meet growers' labor demand regardless of the effect on the workers.

The general attitude of the Farm Placement Division which impressed the Commission as one-sided was that although Congress, in establishing the United States Employment Service, provided for a Federal Advisory Council representing workers, employers, and the public, the Farm Placement Service (a part of the Federal Employment Service) has disregarded this tripartite principle. Instead, it has organized and depended for advice on a special farm labor committee, composed wholly of farm employers and their representatives.

The Commission, however, softened these strictures by absolving the Placement Service of sole responsibility for present unsatisfactory labor-placement practices. It points out that while the Government has been responsible for two decades for labor placement, administrative transfers of the Emipoyment Service to various Government departments in those years may have interferred with the development of a well-rounded placement program.

ONLY TWO LABOR PACTS UNCOVERED

Only two instances of farm employees being covered by collective-bargaining contracts were found during the Commission's study.

The Commission said it was convinced that balanced organization and effective collective bargaining would be of great assistance not only to farm workers but that it would also contribute to more orderly management of labor. Adoption of the system would, for instance, eliminate the labor contractor and middleman and the "sweatshop conditions that are frequently associated with them," the report said.

As a result, it was recommended that the Taft-Hartley Act be amended to cover employees on farms having a specified minimum employment.

A widening inequity between wages paid to migratory farm workers in nonagricultural employment, was noted by the Commission.

Comparing the hourly earnings of farm laborers and factory workers the Commission reported that during 1910–14, the period designated by Congress as the base for the farm parity price system, farm wages were two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are a little more than one-third.

Actual average hourly earnings of farm workers in 1950 was 55 cents and those of factory workers $1.45. In 1910–14 the comparable figures were 14 and 21 cents.

Notwithstanding perquisites furnished by employers such as housing and transportation, the Commission finds that farm workers' annual earnings, compared with the pay of factory workers, are even worse than is suggested by relative wage rates because factory employees get more work than farm employees.

Whereas average cash earnings of factory workers in 1949 were $2,600, average earnings for both migratory and nonmigratory farm workers were only slightly more than $500.

Thus, while average factory workers' wages were two and a half times the average pay on farms, the average annual factory earnings were five times the average farm earnings.

The Commission condemned most of the on-the-job housing offered to migratory farm workers as "below minimum standards of decency." As to the so-called permanent housing in which the migrants live for the 6 to 8 months of the year when they are not working on the crops, the Commission characterizes them as "among the most deplorable in the Nation."

The Government, according to the report, does not assume any responsibilities concerning conditions of work for which it recruits farm labor.

This was emphasized to the Commission again and again by officials of the United States Employment Service.

HEALTH CONDITIONS NOT AT ALL GOOD

The summary found, too, that migratory workers were more subject to sickness and had a higher death rate than most other segments of the population.

The diet of migrant farm laborers was described as insufficient to maintain health.

Also, the growing trend toward mechanization of agriculture, according to the report, has substantially increased the risk of injury in farm employment.

The use of tractors and other machines, of mechanized blades and other cutting tools, and of noxious gases in fumigation, as well as the truck transportation of farm workers, all have contributed to make the accident rate in agriculture one of the highest in the United States.

With this in view, the Commission proposes that the United States Departments of Labor and of Agriculture lay the foundation for a safety program in agriculture.

In this connection it was pointed out that safety programs and workmen's compensation legislation have proved of benefit to employers and employees in industry and that no responsible spokesman for either group would question their value or seek their repeal. Most State workmen's compensation laws exclude farm workers, the report showed.

While child labor has all but disappeared from American industry, the Commission found, nevertheless, that it still was a serious problem in agriculture.

The Commission found evidence, too, that some employers had put pressure on school authorities to permit children to work in the fields.

Following the President's directive to inquire into the educational conditions among migratory workers, the Commission reports that "migrant children are among those with lowest educational attainments found in the United States. * * * Nor are they likely to get educational opportunities so long as they work during school hours and move from place to place with their parents in search of employment."

At the same time the Commission also found that children of migrants suffer from the discrimination and social stigma which excludes them from full participation in the community.

After describing a few educational experiments for migrant children in New Jersey, Michigan, and California, the Commission proposes joint educational programs by the Federal and State Governments for migrants and their children.

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Following is the text of a statement issued today by President Truman on receiving the report of his Commission on Migratory Labor:

"I have today received the report of the Commission on Migratory Labor which I appointed in June 1950. I asked this Commission to investigate the whole range of problems associated with the use of migratory labor to meet agricultural labor needs.

"This report makes an impressive contribution to a subject which should be of serious concern to all of us. It will be useful to Government officials and the general public alike.

"The report contains a careful and painstaking collection of the basic facts about social, economic, health, and educational conditions among migratory workers. It analyzes in detail the forces which have caused increasing use of migrants, particularly foreign workers, in agriculture. It deals systematically with basic public policy issues.

"The report suggests that primary reliance must be placed on the use—and better use—of our domestic farm labor force. The report makes a number of suggestions and recommendations for Federal and State legislative and administrative action.

"The report represents diligent and careful work on the part of the Commission and deserves the careful consideration of all of us—of the Congress, the executive agencies, and the general public.

"I want to thank the members of this Commission for their efforts. Their contribution will assist greatly in developing fair and practical solutions to what is admittedly a complicated problem."

SUMMARY OF MIGRANT RECOMMENDATIONS

BASIC PREMISES

1. That agriculture, like industry, is capable of providing decent jobs.

2. That the recurrent shortage of manpower for seasonal agricultural work is basically a problem of job standards.

WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS COVER

A coordinated public program, the emergency, alien contract labor, "wetback" labor, recruitment of farm workers, labor relations, minimum wages, housing, unemployment compensation, health and welfare, child labor and education.

A COORDINATED PUBLIC PROGRAM

A Federal Committee on Migratory Farm Labor, to be named by the President for the purpose of coordinating and stimulating the activities of the Federal Government relat-

ing to migratory farm workers and to coordinate programs undertaken by the States and private groups.

The committee to consist of eight members—three public members and one each from the Departments of State, of Agriculture and of Labor, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Security Agency.

THE EMERGENCY

1. More effective use of the domestic labor force is necessary.

2. Number of contract alien workers should not be increased to more than the 1950 figures, and all efforts be made to end dependence on foreign labor.

3. Where importation of labor is necessary, preference be given to citizens from Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

ALIEN CONTRACT LABOR

Foreign contract labor be imported only on the basis of intergovernmental agreements which should be uniform for all foreign governments. This aims to avoid lowering of standards by competition of foreign governments to get their laborers into this country. The United States Employment Service should certify the existence of farm labor shortages and administrative responsibility for their importation should be the sole function of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"WETBACK" LABOR

There is no legal penalty for employing or harboring an illegal immigrant. Legislative measures making it unlawful to employ such aliens should be adopted. The Immigration and Naturalization Service should have the right to enter places of agricultural employment to search for illegal aliens and penalties should be provided for harboring, concealing, or transporting them.

The present practice of legalizing aliens who entered this country in defiance of the law should be forbidden.

RECRUITMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Adoption by the United States Employment Service of safeguards in public recruitment of farm workers. These safeguards to include written terms of employment so that growers will advise the employment service what they will pay, what housing they have, and other employment conditions.

Federal legislation to ban the interstate recruitment of farm workers except under license by Department of Labor. This is designed to regulate so-called crew leases and contractors and to avoid sweatshop conditions for migratory farm workers.

LABOR RELATIONS

Farm workers should have legal assurance of their right to organize by extension of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (the Taft-Hartley law) to employees on farms having a specified minimum number of workers.

MINIMUM WAGES AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Minimum wage and unemployment compensation codes should be extended, through legislative measures, to migratory farm workers.

HOUSING

No foreign farm workers should be imported nor domestic farm workers be sent by the Federal Employment Service from one State to another until the State in which employment is offered has established minimum housing standards which meet those prescribed by the Federal committee.

The Department of Agriculture should extend grants-in-aid to States for establishing labor camps in areas of large and sustained seasonal labor demand.

Development by the Public Housing Administration of a rural nonfarm housing program for migrants during period of the year when they are not on the road.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Amendment to the Social Security and Public Health Service Acts to provide matching grants to States for (1) general assistance including medical care, provided that no needy person be excluded for lack of legal-residence status, and (2) health programs and clinics for migratory labor to be conducted under the supervision of the Surgeon General.

CHILD LABOR

Retention and vigorous enforcement of the 1949 child labor amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act and further amendment to restrict employment of children younger than 14 years outside of school hours.

EDUCATION

Development of an adequate program of education for migratory workers and their children, to be undertaken by the Federal committee through cooperation of public and private agencies. A study to be made of how interstate provisions can be formulated for education of migrant children since educational authority is necessarily local.

[From the Washington Post of April 9, 1951]

MIGRANT FARM LABOR

The exhaustive survey of social, economic, health, and educational conditions of farm migrants made by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor is a shocking exposé of official neglect and private exploitation—a story about men and women living in insanitary camps without community ties and usually beyond the reach of local school, health, and welfare authorities. There are at least a million of these migrants, about half of whom are domestic workers. The other half is made up of approximately 100,000 Mexicans legally under contract, 400,000 so-called Mexican wetbacks who have illegally entered the country by slipping across the land border or wading or swimming across the Rio Grande, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans. These migratory workers supply only 3 to 4 percent of the man-days of work used to produce the Nation's farm output. The great majority are employed on some 125,000 large farms producing cotton, fruits, vegetables, and sugar beets. Nevertheless, they make important contributions to farm output and are in great demand at critical periods of crop production.

Since more farm labor will be needed this year to replace men entering the military services and to harvest an extended acreage, pressure for increased importation of foreign labor, chiefly Mexican, is mounting. However, the Commission concludes that no special measures should be taken to increase the number of alien contract laborers beyond the number admitted last year and that legalization for employment purposes of aliens illegally in the United States should be discontinued. "We are convinced," it declares, "that by better recruitment and placement of domestic labor we would have eliminated most, if not all, of the occasion for the certifications of labor shortage during the years 1947–50."

In that connection the report sharply criticizes the practice of legalizing the status of wetbacks and giving them employment in preference to workers who have not violated our immigration laws. It charges, too, that field officers of the Immigration Service have been under pressure from Washington to go easy on deportations until crops have been harvested. It further implies that if the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service had done a more effective recruitment and placement job at home there would not have been a labor shortage requiring the importation of large numbers of aliens. As a matter of fact, the Commission received evidence that last year some American workers were actually dismissed to make way for contract Mexican labor.

Numerous recommendations are made by the Commission designed to raise the living standards of migrant farm labor, such as minimum-wage legislation, establishment of Federal and State minimum housing standards, grants to the States to conduct health programs among migratory workers, and vigorous enforcement of child-labor laws. These recommendations, which cover both alien and domestic migrants, provide evidence, if any were required, of shameful neglect of this group.

The problem growing out of our dependence on alien labor is only one aspect of the general problem of migratory labor, but it is an important one. For cheap foreign labor creates the very scarcities that lead to an influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards. We agree with the Commission that our efforts in future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

Dragon by the Tail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, just how long is the Congress of the United States going to suffer and permit through its inaction the hands of General MacArthur to be tied where he can neither advance nor retreat?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article in the RECORD which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 4, 1951, entitled "Dragon by the Tail."

If Secretary Acheson were tied to this dragon's tail for the rest of his life that would be one thing, but instead our boys are tied to the dragon's tail, the consequence of which is that thousands of our boys are being either injured or killed every week.

DRAGON BY THE TAIL—LIMITED WARFARE IN KOREA PLACES MILITARY STRATEGISTS IN UNEASY POSITION; THEY CAN'T ADVANCE OR RETREAT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The stern, commanding voice of General MacArthur has been no more successful than the mild pleading voice of Sir Benegal Rau and other would-be United Nations mediators in bringing about a cessation of hostilities in Korea. Yet MacArthur's proposal for a conference with the Chinese commander in the field with a view to arranging a Korean cease-fire without discussing such questions as a seat for Red China in the UN or the disposition of Formosa was worth while, for several reasons.

It is a new intimation, and from the man who is most prominently identified in public opinion with a tough, unyielding policy, of willingness to stop the present fighting on reasonable terms. And it has again focused attention, in the United States and abroad, on the question of what aims are being pursued in Korea, and what is the prospect of realizing these aims.

TWO UNDESIRABLE EXTREMES

Exasperating and frustrating as it is, the kind of limited warfare which General MacArthur's forces are waging in Korea today is the only visible alternative to two undesired extremes. One of these alternatives would be an evacuation of Korea lock, stock, and barrel. Objection to this is that the spectacle of a United Nations army with heavy modern equipment taking to its heels before a Chinese Army very inferior in firepower and without substantial air and sea power would be a terrific blow to western prestige. It might well be the prelude to the conquest by Mao Tse-tung of French Indochina and the lands of southeastern Asia, rich in tin, rubber, and other strategic materials. It could set in motion the process of crumbling that would bring down the prowestern or neutral governments in Japan, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

The other alternative—all-out war against the Chinese mainland—is apparently ruled out both by the limitation of American military power and by the fears and inhibitions of the countries with which America is associated in the United Nations. It is one of the many illogical aspects of the present situation that the UN vote to condemn Red China as an aggressor was apparently obtained only on the condition that no sanctions should be imposed.

ANOTHER INCONSISTENCY

Still another inconsistency is that, although most members of the United Nations have given very lukewarm support to American action in Korea, the maximum ideal of the Korean campaign, the creation of a unified, independent, and democratic government of Korea is based on a United Nations resolution. It would be only fair if the critics of General MacArthur, who have been especially vocal in Great Britain, would bear in mind that the United Nations vote on the issue of crossing the thirty-eighth parallel was 47 in favor (including Great Britain and France), 5 against (the Soviet bloc), and 7 abstentions, including India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia.

So long as the Chinese refuse to show the slightest inclination to talk peace, strategic, rather than political, considerations should determine whether and how far the parallel should be crossed. Under General Ridgway's leadership, at once aggressive and careful, the UN Army has been clearly outfighting the Chinese and the North Koreans and inflicting disproportionately heavy casualties during the last 3 months.

If it were possible to establish a strong defense line along the thirty-eighth parallel there would be a good case for stopping the advance there, digging in and helping the South Koreans to carry out elementary reconstruction and build up an army strong enough to defend themselves against future attacks. There may also be convincing military arguments for moving northward approximately to the thirty-ninth parallel, taking in the important cities of Pyongyang and Wonsan and fortifying the narrow waist of the Korean Peninsula.

NORTHERN FRONTIER

There would seem to be little advantage in launching another drive for the Yalu River. Korea broadens out in its northern reaches and in the type of war which is now being fought the army with the longest communication lines is at a disadvantage. Even if all Korea could be cleared of Chinese and North Korean troops, the prospect of holding a long northern frontier with Manchuria and Siberia would not be inviting.

It seems reasonable that considerations of military security should decide how far the recent slow, grinding advance should be pressed. It would be a good thing if voices of timidity and division could be muted; these are only calculated to encourage the Mao Tse-tung regime to prolong the struggle, even though it now seems that a decisive victory is beyond its grasp.

Meanwhile several political lessons may be drawn from the Korean experience. First, the United Nations has proved itself an extremely weak reed on which to lean, and the worst possible agency for conducting a war. The campaign in Korea is much more justifiable as a defense of American strategic interests in Japan and in the Pacific area generally than as a crusade for United Nations ideals.

ENLIST ASIATIC ALLIES

Second, situations of regional strength are far more valuable than UN resolutions, however imposing, which lack the backing of armed force. It is high time that we consider the more effective utilization of those forces in the Far East which are on our side, even if they are not on our side for what we might consider the right reasons. There is something wrong and unnatural about a situation in which Americans, with a sprinkling of Europeans, constitute the main striking power of an army in an Asiatic theater. There would seem to be a case for reexamining the decisions that have led to rejecting the aid of the Chinese Nationalists and to disregard the large pool of trained military manpower in Japan. In the long run, it must be Asiatics who will defend Asia against Communist aggression.

Finally, we may as well recognize that we are in the awkward position of having caught a dragon by the tail. Our associates are unwilling to cooperate in trying to give the dragon a knock-out blow. But if we let him go there is no reason to expect that he will be any friendlier than a dragon normally is.

Make Assaults on United States Soldiers a Federal Offense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, at an appropriate time, during the further consideration of Senate bill 1, authorizing universal military training and service and the extension of selective service, I shall present the following amendment:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE BILL 1

Whoever forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any member of the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Whoever in the commission of any such acts uses a deadly or dangerous weapon shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Whoever kills any member of the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of his official duties shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of title 18, United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is obvious. It would make it a Federal offense to assault or murder a member of the armed services. At present, members of the Coast Guard have this protection in law, but members of the other branches of the armed services do not. If a member of any of these other branches of the armed services is beaten or killed by civilians or local peace officers, and the local community does nothing about it, no action can be taken to punish the guilty party.

The problem is one of long standing, and the Department of National Defense and the Department of Justice have been officially on record for nearly a decade in support of legislation to provide protection for all members of the armed services against such felonious assaults. Under existing law, it has long been a Federal offense for any person to kill or assault any Federal officer, such as a United States marshal, members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service agents, post office inspectors, personnel of the Coast Guard, and other similar officers.

I attach hereto a letter addressed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate on November 8, 1943, by the then Attorney General Francis Biddle, stating that such legislation as is here proposed would be in the interest of protecting military personnel:

NOVEMBER 8, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges the letter dated November 1, from F. J. Mattice, Esq., clerk of your committee, concerning a bill (S. 1227) to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers.

It is my understanding that this bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of War.

Under the existing law, it is a Federal offense for any person to kill or assault any Federal officer belonging to one of specifically enumerated groups ,while engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of official duties (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 253, 154). Generally, the enumeration consists of law enforcement officers such as United States marshals, personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service agents, post office inspectors, personnel of the Coast Guard, and other similar officers.

It is the purpose of the statute to protect Federal law enforcement officers in the performance of their duties and, thereby, enable a more effective enforcement of the law than might otherwise be the case.

In response to a question contained in the foregoing letter, I desire to say that this law applies throughout the United States being an act of Congress, is not dependent on State legislation, and does not vary with State laws.

The bill under consideration would add persons in the Armed Forces to the enumeration contained in the existing statute. The result would be that to kill or assault a person in the Armed Forces of the United States while he is engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of the performance of his official duties would be a Federal offense.

The question is propounded in the foregoing letter, "Why this legislation was desired when the Military Establishment could usually handle a situation of the kind itself without going into the civil courts."

In reply I desire to call your attention to the fact that, while the Military Establishment could handle itself without going into the civil courts any offense committed by a

member of the military personnel, it has no jurisdiction over offenses committed by a civilian against a member of the military personnel. A civilian in such a case would be tried in the civil courts. Under existing law, if the murder or assault was committed in an area other than on a Federal reservation, the appropriate State court would have jurisdiction over the offense. If the abovementioned bill is enacted, the Federal courts would have cognizance of the matter.

As the Secretary of War deems that this legislation is desirable in the interest of protecting military personnel, I find no objection to its enactment. I suggest, however, that there be deleted from the bill the following words: "Any member of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States." It is understood that the auxiliary military police as distinguished from the regular military police is composed of plant guards who are paid by owners of plants and not by the Federal Government. This Department is of the opinion that the proposed legislation should not include any person whose compensation is not paid by the United States.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I also attach a letter dated June 10, 1943, addressed to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate by the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, reading as follows:

JUNE 10, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is enclosed herewith draft of a bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers, which the War Department recommends be enacted into law.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the scope of section 1 of the act of May 18, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 780; 54 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 253), so as to include officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States, while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of their official duties.

The mentioned section as it now exists, provides punishment for any person who kills, forcibly resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates or interferes with certain Federal officers, including United States marshals, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, post-office inspectors, Secret Service operatives, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, and so forth, while engaged in the performance of official duties, or any person who kills or assaults any such officer on account of the performance of his official duties. It appears that there is at this time no appropriate Federal statute providing punishment in the case of such an act against an officer or enlisted person of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or a member of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States, while engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties. It seems manifest that similar punishment should be provided in case of such attacks against personnel of the military and naval establishments.

Although section 1 provides only for the offense of killing, it is believed that the suggested amendment to that section would also have the effect of extending the scope of section 2 of the act of May 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 781; 18 U. S. C. 254), to cover officers and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and members of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States in the case of resisting, interfering with, or assaulting such personnel while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of official duties, as section 2 by reference relates to assaults on all persons of the categories named in section 1, of the act.

The proposed amendment if enacted, will result in little if any, increased cost to the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members of the House that the Department of Defense is now in favor of the principle of this proposed amendment.

Nearly 3,300 Residents of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania Take Part in Newspaper Poll of Public Opinion on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, 3,285 residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, comprising the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, participated in the newspaper poll conducted by the daily newspapers in that area.

A breakdown of the questionnaires by counties reveals that 933 residents of Blair County, 654 of Clearfield County, and 1,698 of Centre County participated in the poll of public opinion.

The tabulation of the 10 questions representing the views of 3,285 residents of this area follows:

	Yes	No
1. Should we withdraw from Korea immediately?	897	1,998
2. Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on Russia doing likewise?	579	2,142
3. Should we release the Chinese Nationalist Army and allow Chiang Kai-shek to wage war on the mainland against the Chinese Reds?	2,259	540
4. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	405	2,880
5. Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of the United Nations armed forces?	2,190	588
6. Should we send American troops to Europe?	1,717	1,452
7. Should we defend our outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home	1,725	1,164
8. If necessary, should we draft 18-year-olds?	2,220	960
9. Should we have stiff price and wage controls applied at the same time?	2,265	357
10. Should the President's budget of $71,600,000,000 be drastically cut, even if it means the cancellation of local nondefense projects?	2,805	408

NOTE.—Many participants did not answer all questions giving as their reason a lack of sufficient information on the subject to vote intelligently.

A study of the questionnaires discloses that about 25 percent of them were accompanied by explanatory letters either qualifying the vote on the various questions or discussing other subjects of national importance. Many stated that this was the first time they had ever written to their Congressman, and some said they had never realized that their opinions would be welcomed.

A large number of the questionnaires that were accompanied by letters revealed that the conclusions reached followed a family conference or a discussion of the subjects with neighbors. A great many residents voiced their concern over the seriousness of world conditions and their effect on our standard of living, and our future as a nation.

It is significant that not a single letter or questionnaire revealed a belligerent attitude on the part of newspaper readers. While there was constructive criticism expressed regarding some Government departments and individuals, yet the general feeling was to be helpful in our efforts to meet the present crisis.

In thanking all those who returned the questionnaires, and especially the newspapers for their splendid cooperation which made the poll possible, I call attention to the fact that last year in the first poll conducted 1,876 residents took part, compared with 3,285 who participated in this year's poll of public opinion. Such an increase of interest by the readers of the daily papers in this congressional district in the second annual poll is very gratifying.

Parity Is Not a Fair Guide as to What the Farmer Should Get for His Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I note those officials in charge of economic stabilization and price control are advocating that parity be frozen so as not to reflect increased costs which are being added to the sale price of what the farmers must buy. Some advocate forcing back to parity farm prices that exceed parity and freezing other farm prices before they reach parity. They would make a sad mistake to undertake any such action. In the first place, parity is not and has never been a definition of a fair price. It was worked out by the Congress as a means of setting a floor or support price on agricultural products to prevent depression and a breakdown in the national economy. The 90 percent of parity which is the support price for basic commodities may well be compared with the minimum wage which at 75 cents per hour is not considered by labor to be a fair price at all but a floor or minimum.

Parity theoretically is supposed to give to the farmers the same comparative purchasing power as they had in the base period 1909 to 1914 but if that be true and if it does give him the same comparative purchasing power with other

segments of population such as they had in the base period of 1909 to 1914, at that time the farmer did not have sufficient purchasing power to provide himself with electricity or ordinary conveniences that others had. He did not have the automobiles that other segments of our population had. As a group the average farmer did not have purchasing power with which to provide himself with a home of equal convenience, including even indoor bath facilities to the extent that others had. During the base period it was the exception for the farmer to be able to send his boy or girl to college. Also, in the base period 1909 to 1914 land constituted the farmer's chief investment and in fact was about 70 percent of the value of the farm. If he had his land, he did not need to buy much else in order to farm.

Now, however, the value of the farm shown by recent surveys is about 45 percent land and 55 percent improvements including machinery which must be purchased at a high rate of cost, and in most cases, of short life. In the base period the farmer did not have to buy the very expensive farm equipment now necessary, such as tractors, threshing machines, combines, fertilizer distributors, and the thousand and one things which are absolutely necessary to operate a farm under present conditions, and, with the present labor shortage, such equipment is absolutely essential if he is to maintain his production, much less increase it. In other words, during the base period 1909 to 1914 the farmer did not have to buy these things which must be paid for from the prices he receives and as a matter of fact, on a comparative purchasing basis, at that time he was unable to buy these things which are now more than 50 percent of his investment in the farm. In 1907, shortly before the base period, it would take about 9.7 years for the cost of operations of the average farm to equal the farmer's investment in the farm. Under present conditions, however, it takes only 2.6 years for the annual cost of operations to equal the investment in the farm. In other words his cost of operation can cause him to lose his farm three times as fast now as in the base period. It is true that from the period 1907 to 1947 prices for agricultural products increased nine times, but during the same period the cost of operations increased 14 times. This is shown by surveys.

The point of all this is that if parity would give to the farmer comparative purchasing power with other segments of our population, equal to that on a comparative basis which he had in the base period 1909 to 1914, it would not enable him to in any way meet on the whole the increased demands on such purchasing power which the operation of his farm in our day requires.

All of this is to show that the word "parity" and the basis on which it is set up in no way is a fair guide as to what the farmer should be permitted to get for his products in the market place. In fact 90 percent of parity as has been stated is approximately equivalent to the 75-cent minimum wage. The average wage is around $1.25 an hour and on the same basis farm products to be on a comparative basis would have to be much higher than so-called parity. Some consumer groups may not agree with that. However, the facts that absolutely cannot be overlooked by the Government and those interested in keeping a sound basis for Government operation of balancing supply with demand and to provide a sufficient supply of food is the fact that parity does not include or recognize costs of production. Those fixing parity do not have to, nor do they, take into consideration the farmer's cost. It is also true that those in charge of price control can fix prices without regard to the farmer's cost of production. That does not mean, however, that the farmer is not going to take into consideration such cost. If he is going to hold his farm and avoid bankruptcy he has to consider costs. If he cannot make cost plus a reasonable profit on any given commodity he will turn to another or limit his cultivation to that which is least expensive. There is no need for Government leaders to fool themselves into believing that he will be able to maintain normal production, much less increase his production, because to increase his production beyond his normal production, with present labor shortages and high costs, is to increase the unit cost, especially in view of the present requirements of expensive fertilizers and other materials. Not only does he increase his per-unit cost but he depletes his soil or his farm plant. If, as the price-control authorities are threatening to do, they set out to let the costs of other things go up but prohibit such increased cost being reflected in increased parity or prices received, if they freeze parity they will in effect reduce production when we need increased production.

They can do that under the present law, but they cannot require the farmer to continue to produce at the present level, much less at a higher one.

If there is no money to be made in dairying, many of the dairy herds will be sold and the milk supply will get shorter and shorter. We have seen that in times past. Already it is hard to find labor to do this exacting work, which must be done at all hours of the day and part of the night, 7 days a week. If there is no money to be made in buying feeder cattle and feeding them corn and thereby increasing the supply of beef, the people in the Midwest will quit buying feeder cattle so as to increase the supply of beef or even to maintain it. It is difficult to get sufficient labor to chop and pick the present cotton acreage, and costs are terrific. How are the farmers to increase cotton production? Thus it goes throughout the whole field of farm production. The pressure is already great on the individual farmer to reduce his production because of the shortage of labor, machinery, and fertilizer. In his patriotic desire to meet his obligation the average farmer is trying to not only maintain but increase his production. But there is a limit as to how far he will or can go. He will pull in his production before he will lose money and eventually his farm.

The trouble is that with the increased demands for food for the Army, with the tremendous expenditures of money in national defense, which is giving increased purchasing power to some segments of our Nation, an unusual demand is being made on supplies of foodstuffs.

There is just more demand than there is food, notwithstanding the fact that on the over-all there is a greater production of agricultural products than ever before. This is working a real hardship on people with fixed income. The answer, however, is not to cut down production, which certainly would result from increasing the farmer's cost, but freezing his prices received at a level which would prevent such increased costs being reflected in his market price. The price-control people are given lots of authority under the law. They do not have to recognize cost in fixing price ceilings, but the farmer recognizes it. He is forced to recognize it, and the price-control people are merely sticking their heads in the sand if they do not recognize that fact.

This is no threat that I describe here, but a recognition of realities. I have the honor of serving as chairman of the subcommittee for appropriations handling agricultural appropriations in the House of Representatives. We deal with all agriculture. I am very much interested in agriculture and in the farmers but I, together with many others, felt that we would have all been better off had we frozen everything across the board at the time of the attack in Korea. Prices, wages, rents. We could not get the Congress to take such action. Since this was not done, however, there just is not any way for the Government to let costs of productoin go up, but freeze the price of farm products at a level which prevents taking into consideration such increased cost and then get increased production. If they do that they will reduce production and make a bad situation worse.

The Nation in this instance faces a fact and not a theory. Under our system of free enterprise we have provided by law the authority to freeze prices, but if costs go up, but the selling price stays the same, you will not have the same production, much less the increased production which after all is the only cure for our present difficulties. You may say, "Ration the supplies." That is easier said than done and supplies under that system dwindle rather than increase.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been assigned the task of getting increased farm production. If the Secretary would render real service to the consumers, including you and me, by increasing agricultural production, he must urge recognition of these facts by the stabilization and price-control authorities, and if possible prevent them from taking any such unfortunate action as to let costs go up but not be reflected in the price received.

We cannot have our cake and eat it too. At least, if the price received does not reflect increased cost of production there will be even less cake, and staple groceries as well.

Unity Comes the Hard Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the March 17 issue of Collier's magazine there appeared an editorial entitled "Unity Comes the Hard Way." I recommend that it be read by all who are interested in our Nation making a maximum military effort.

The editorial reads as follows:

UNITY COMES THE HARD WAY

It seems a long time ago, but actually it is less than a year and a half since the bitter, intemperate dispute which had rocked the Defense Department for months reached its climax with the firing of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations. This was the signal that the fancy Dans, as Gen. Omar Bradley christened the supporters of balanced naval power, had lost the theoretical argument over how the next war should be fought. Henceforth, the country's main defense was to be entrusted to strategic bombers.

Well, the next war began on June 25, 1950. It forced the unified armed services to relearn unity the hard way. It brought the military strategists back from theory to reality. And, at the sobering cost of thousands of casualties, it taught them some valuable lessons.

It showed, first of all, that no military group can predict what sort of a war a next war will be unless, perhaps, their government starts it. And the United States does not start wars.

It showed that a country cannot base its military planning on the hope of a quick, easy, one-weapon, one-shot victory. UN air power has been almost unopposed in Korea, yet air power has not won the war. There have been times when, to the embarrassment of neat theory, the UN forces were winning the war in the air and losing it on the ground.

The next war has also demonstrated something that the air-power enthusiasts were inclined to forget: That the moral and political consequences of using atomic weapons can outweigh the strategic value of those weapons.

The champions of strategic bombing criticized the Navy for an exaggerated insistence on the importance of close air support of ground troops. They saw the need of only a convoy Navy to haul men and supplies with Air Force protection. And they favored cutting the Marine Corps to a point near extinction.

The Korean War, and the Inchon invasion in particular, showed the error of that thinking. Even the flush-deck supercarrier, which was scoffed out of its first promise of existence, has been justified and authorized.

In saying this, Collier's in not trying to revive any old arguments. We are not minimizing the great importance of air power or ground power. We are not slighting the brilliance and bravery of the men who have employed those powers in Korea. But we are glad to recall that this magazine opened its pages last year to men like Admiral Denfeld, Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, and Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson of the Marines, when their voices were officially silenced. We are glad to have published such articles as We Need Carriers and the B-36, by Richard Tregaskis, at a time when reasonable compromise was not a distinguishing feature of the "Battle of the Pentagon." And we are particularly happy, as all Americans must be, that the disagreements among the high brass had not wrecked the services' morale or seriously damaged their fighting efficiency when the unexpected crisis developed.

Now, in the light of Korea, it seems to us that, as one Marine Corps officer put it, the "fancy Dans" were right. And it might well mean the salvation of freedom that this was found out in time. We would not be so cold-blooded as to call the Korean War a breathing spell. Yet since the threat of general war remains, it is fortunate that our military leaders discovered in a limited war that a flexible, balanced, well-rounded armed force is still needed.

If further fighting breaks out, the aggressor and not the defenders of freedom will again have first choice of where and how it starts. So the free world must do more than exploit its great latent strength over the long haul. It must be ready to meet fresh attacks with versatility and adaptability as well as with power.

Let us hope that these facts, which have been established at such high cost of lives, will not be forgotten by well-meaning but stubborn men in another series of Pentagon squabbles.

Give MacArthur a Free Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this news item which contains a report of Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, in connection with the freeing of MacArthur's hands, is very pertinent today. It is time to let a military leader fight the war and not a bunch of international politicians:

THE EDITOR VISITS FRONT IN KOREA—PAUL C. SMITH SAYS MACARTHUR CAN WIN IF HE IS GIVEN FREEDOM TO FIGHT

(By Earnest Hoberecht)

TOKYO, April 4.—Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, said today (Wednesday) in an interview that the United Nations forces in Korea can win the war if permitted to attack across the Yalu River into China.

"I think the present forces in Korea can win the war against the Chinese Armies in Korea if they are permitted to liquidate the present military handicaps which result from those directives which prevent them from operating on the other side of the Yalu River," said Smith, who visited North Korea with Gen. Douglas MacArthur Tuesday.

Smith gave his views on the Korean situation after he returned from Korea, where he flew Tuesday with MacArthur. He jeeped 15 miles into North Korea on the east coast with the United Nations commander in chief.

WAR EXPERIENCE

In World War II, Smith served in both the Marines and the Navy. He was a commander in the Navy at the time of the Japanese surrender.

"With our forces in the Orient," he said, "all we need is freedom to conduct a sound military operation."

He explained that this means that "when and if necessary, we knock out the supply lines of the Communist sources of power in Korea by air and sea.

"This means a sea blockade of China and air attacks where required," he pointed out.

"I admit," he said, "there is a calculated risk involved with the possibility of yet another intervention by Russia, but in view of China's repeatedly stated determination to drive us from Korea, it seems to me that anything short of acceptance of that risk will just result in no net gain for the anti-Communist forces of the world.

FREEDOM TO FIGHT

"These anti-Communist forces, of which the UN units in Korea are both the spearhead and the main body must be given freedom to fight as sound military leadership would normally fight or they are being sent to die for a lip service cause with their hands tied behind them."

Smith said he was deeply impressed with General MacArthur, whom he had never met previously.

"General MacArthur suffers only from two things," said Smith. He listed these as his fair-weather friends and his very petty detractors.

Smith said MacArthur suffered less at the hands of his petty detractors "because they really can't touch him much."

Smith said General MacArthur possesses one of the "greatest vocabularies that I have ever encountered."

"And," said Smith, "he impresses me as having even the greater distinction of knowing what every word means."

He expressed complete confidence in MacArthur's leadership.

He paid tribute to the field forces serving under MacArthur.

Smith said that in view of what MacArthur and his fighting men in the field have had to work with, the American people can be grateful as hell to this leader and his men.

Smith said after studying the situation and seeing considerable background material on the situation he was convinced that there has never been at any time a retreat.

TOUGH TERRAIN

He said that sometimes the United Nations forces were outnumbered as high as 20 to 1 and had to fight their way out but they were only fighting in a different direction, as Marine Maj. Gen. O. P. Smith had stated.

"The terrain in Korea is as rotten and rough as I have ever seen," the San Francisco editor said.

He said he was greatly impressed with the evidence of complete unification of the Armed Forces under General MacArthur. He said he had observed this at both the top level and the working level.

"The services work well together and understand each other's problems," he said. "Every unit has done a hell of a job."

Smith said he was convinced that the only thing General MacArthur needs—and which he should have fast—is clarification of the mission in Korea as well as Asia as a whole.

"If our mission is unification of Korea, then the thirty-eighth parallel is not a proper political question and it is a tactically improper military line."

Smith said, "One of the main jobs of the American people, who are 7,000 to 10,000 miles from the scene of the showdown, is to see that the outfits here from MacArthur to the newest recruit, have the wholehearted support of the Nation and those allied with them in the United Nations."

"It is difficult for anybody to keep his eye on the enemy at the front if he has to spend most of his time and energy pulling political stilettos out of his back," Smith said.

He said he fully understood that there are political questions which can be decided only at the highest levels in the United Nations.

He said he was convinced that this point is well understood by General MacArthur.

But he said he was not convinced that some of those in high political quarters understand the urgency of General MacArthur's position as a field commander.

"As a field commander," Smith said, "he has every right to point up the urgency of the situation and to meet the situation on the strength of his own resources when there is pussyfooting or quibbling and his over-all directives are inadequate or confusing."

Smith said he has been interested here in running down some of the so-called expert criticism of General MacArthur and his staff members.

For example, he said, he had been interested in the charges that some of MacArthur's staff had been with him too long.

On the basis of his experience here, he said he found this criticism completely invalid.

"I have been impressed with the exceptional competence of MacArthur's staff," Smith said. "This exceptional competence stems from the fact that they have been working together through thick and thin for a decade.

"Any idea that such experience and understanding within a top staff is bad rather than good is to me contrary to practical sense."

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the New York Times on April 7, 1951, concerning the position of His Holiness Pope Pius XII on world government. The Pope stated that world government was in keeping with the traditional objectives of Roman Catholic doctrine which strives for peace. As a Catholic and supporter of the World Federation resolution in Congress, I am pleased at the Pope's position on this issue:

POPE BACKS PLAN FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT; SEES IT AS A MEANS TO ESTABLISH PEACE

ROME, April 6.—Pope Pius XII praised today the principle of world government as a means to establish peace and bring about collaboration among all the nations for the common good of mankind.

The papal thoughts on that subject were expressed in a speech to delegates from 22 countries, including the United States, attending the fourth annual congress of the World Federal Government Movement in Rome. Lord Boyd Orr of Britain is head of the movement, which has an estimated 150,000 members in Europe.

World government was in keeping with the traditional objectives of Roman Catholic doctrine, which strives for peace, the Pope said. A political organization of that nature is all the more necessary today "if only to end the armaments race that for tens of years has been ruining the nations and exhausting their resources with nothing to show for it," the Pope declared.

He warned, however, that world government must not be based on what he called "mechanical unitarianism" but on the broader and more humane principles that take into consideration and seek to safeguard and promote the welfare of the individual within society.

Although the Pontiff did not give a definition of what he meant by "mechanical unitarianism," it was clear from the contents of his speech that he was opposed to a federal organization that would regard individuals merely as voters and not as people in need of both spiritual and material aid, which should be first and foremost the concern of a world authority.

As illustration of his thoughts, the Pope deplored the fact that "in the national and constitutional field everywhere today the life of nations is disintegrated by the blind cult of numerical value."

He then added: "The citizen is a voter. But as such he is in reality no more than a unit whereof the total adds up to a majority or a minority, which the shifting of some votes, even only one, suffices to upset. The voter does not count if he is only a voter. Of his position and his task in the family and in his profession no heed is taken."

The Pope implied that present systems of government, based as they were on the "numerical" principle, had proved inadequate to cope with the problems of society and that a world organization should therefore "depart from the beaten track" and by taking advantage of the experience of history should be guided by "healthy social philosophy."

Harvard Offers Happy Hunting Grounds for Pinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, with thousands of our fine young men suffering and dying in distant Korea it is little short of terrible for us to give shelter to many thousands whose principal purpose seems to be to find fault with our country and our Government.

The following article which appears in one of our leading newspapers on April 8, 1951, is very enlightening:

HARVARD OFFERS HAPPY HUNTING GROUNDS FOR REDS AND PINKS—RADICAL PROFESSORS GIVEN FREE REIN UNDER CLOAK OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

(By William Fulton)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 7.—Harvard University, going into the fourth century of operation as a brains factory this year, is a happy hunting grounds for Communists, doctrinaire pinks, and radicals of all hues. Many of the professors are leftists who subtly instill their propaganda into the budding brains of the students.

Under the protective umbrella of academic freedom the fomenting of subversive alien theories is allowed to go on unmolested. President James Bryan Conant, a red-hot interventionist and globalist, has refused to curb radicalism on the grounds his pedagogs should have freedom to search for the truth.

SPY TRIAL RECALLED

In the opinion of local law-enforcement officers and members of the legislature, the matter goes far beyond a mere question of academic discussion among radical professors and credulous students.

Recalling the various spy trials, investigators point out Cambridge is a focal point for subversive activity because of the many atomic energy specialists here and work going forward on atomic energy projects. The projects are under way not only at Harvard but also at the neighboring Massachusetts Institute of Technology which has its share of fellow travelers.

In their assessment of the dangers involved local investigators have not forgotten Alger Hiss, former top State Department official and Roosevelt adviser, went through Harvard Law School. Hiss is now serving a 5-year sentence for perjury, in which his clandestine peddling of war secrets to a Soviet spy ring was involved.

LAW SCHOOL UNDER FIRE

It is the law school that is particularly under fire today. Samuel P. Sears, an alumnus of both the law school and Harvard College, now president of the Massachusetts Bar Association, recently said he thought it about time Harvard cleaned house and stopped encouraging and playing host to the Communist Party.

Sears is not the only Harvard alumnus hot under the collar over the way affairs are conducted back on the campus, or "yard," as they call it here. There is increasing criticism, particularly among Harvard men who have sons fighting against communism in Korea while the Red doctrine is allowed to flourish back at the old alma mater.

ALUMNI REFUSE DONATIONS

Alumni have refused to make donations because of their strong feeling over the situation at Harvard.

Undergraduates in Harvard College with whom this correspondent talked admitted they knew of Communists among their fellow students but were inclined to minimize the danger. They parroted their professors' phrases about "academic freedom," "search for truth," "liberalism," and the like.

One student said when a leftist professor's subject was remote from the political field, as for example geology, the pedagogue carried on his propaganda at "bull sessions" outside the classroom or by other activities, such as getting youths to attend meetings for some cause or other.

This corroborated the findings of City Councilman John D. Lynch, banker and former mayor of Cambridge.

"I've talked with students," he said. "They tell me about professors inviting them to left-wing meetings, and then the first thing you know they are filled up with this evil stuff."

Lynch, who says the city of Cambridge is controlled by Harvard influence, vainly attempted last fall to force the registration of all Communists in the vicinity. He did, however, succeed in having a copy of the dossier, "Red-ucators at Harvard University," placed on file for public perusal at the city clerk's office a few months ago.

"Red-ucators at Harvard," an exposé of the Communist-front affiliations and connections of 76 faculty members, was compiled by the National Council for American Education, with offices at 3 Maiden Lane, New York City. It shows affiliation with Stalinoid movements during recent years, principally since the end of World War II.

The "Red-ucators" list was checked against the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, printed on March 3 of this year under the auspices of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. The Guide lists various organizations deemed to be "outright Communist or Communist-front enterprises."

Harvard faculty members showed up with affiliations with 124 Communist fronts.

The check against the congressional list revealed 64 on the "Red-ucators" roster of Harvard were identified with Red facade groups. Some have retired as "emeritus" since the canvass was made but carried on the front activities while working full time in the classroom and are still carried in the university catalog.

NAMES AND FRONTS

These 64 and the number of Communist fronts with which they have been affiliated are as follows:

Comfort A. Adams, professor of electrical engineering, 12 Red-front connections.

Douglas P. Adams, visiting lecturer on engineering sciences and applied physics, two.

Gordon W. Allport, professor of psychology, 12.

Leona Baumgartner, visiting lecturer on maternal and child health, two.

Francis Birch, professor of geology, two.

Garrett Birkhoff, professor of mathematics, one.

Brand Blanshard, lecturer, one.

Bart Jan Bok, professor of applied astronomy, eight.

Edwin G. Boring, professor psychology, three.

Percy W. Bridgman, one.

HISTORY PROFESSOR NAMED

Clarence C. Brinton, professor ancient and modern history, two.

Charles F. Brooks, professor of meteorology, five.

Jerome S. Bruner, associate professor of social psychology, one.

William H. Burton, lecturer on the principles of teaching, two.

Allan M. Butler, professor of pediatrics, eight.

Hugh Cabot, lecturer on human relations, six.

Zechariah Chaffee, jr., professor of law, five.

Halvor N. Christensen, assistant professor of biological chemistry, one.

John Ciardi, assistant professor of English composition, two.

Stanley Cobb, professor of neuropathology, one.

Thomas C. Cochran, visiting lecturer on entrepreneurial history, four.

Albert S. Coolidge, lecturer on chemistry, 12.

William J. Crozier, professor of general physiology, two.

Edwin M. Dodd, professor of law, two.

Frederick M. Eliot, preacher, 14.

Kendall Emerson, associate in medicine, two.

John K. Fairbank, professor of history, one.

Alexander Forbes, professor of physiology, one.

Carl J. Friedrich, professor of government, two.

Wendell H. Furry, associate professor of physics, nine.

James L. Gamble, professor of pediatrics, one.

Sergei I. Gaposchkin, astronomer in the Harvard College observatory, two.

Sheldon Glueck, professor of criminology, three.

Avram S. Goldstein, instructor in pharmacology, one.

Walter Gropius, professor of architecture, two.

Alice Hamilton, assistant professor of industrial medicine, emeritus, 22.

LINKED TO EIGHT FRONTS

William E. Hocking, professor of natural religion, moral philosophy, and civil policy, emeritus, eight.

Arthur N. Holcombe, professor of the science of government, two.

Bruce C. Hopper, associate professor of government, three.

Mark de Wolfe Howe, professor of law, three.

Josepf Hudnut, professor of architecture, three.

Leland Hamilton Jenks, visiting lecturer on entrepreneurial history, one.

Howard M. Jones, professor of English, four.

Edward C. Kemble, professor of physics, one.

Robert P. Lane, visiting lecturer on sociology, three.

Samuel A. Levine, professor of medicine, two.

Karl N. Llewellyn, visiting professor of law, three.

Sidney Lovett, preacher, four.

Charles H. McIlwain, professor of the science of government, emeritus, one.

James A. McLaughlin, professor of law, two.

Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology, 38.

THIRTY-NINE FRONTS LISTED

Francis O. Matthiessen, professor of history and literature, 34.

George R. Minot, professor of medicine (deceased), four.

Samuel E. Morison, professor of American history, one.

Kenneth B. Murdock, professor of English literature, one.

Gardner Murphy, fellow, 10.

Dean Peabody, professor of architecture, one.

Ralph B. Perry, professor of philosophy, emeritus, 13.

Walter Piston, professor of music, two.

Roscoe Pound, former law school dean, two.

George Sarton, professor of the history of science, 10.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor of history, 10.

Harlow Shapely, professor of practical astronomy, 20.

Pitirim Sorokin, professor of sociology, 10.

Randall Thompson, professor of music, two.

Hassler Whitney, professor of mathematics, one.

John Wild, professor of philosophy, one.

Payson Wild, Jr., professor of government, one.

Arizona Reclamation Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the article entitled "Arizona Reclamation Muddle," by Oliver Carlson, a very able writer. It should speak for itself:

ARIZONA RECLAMATION MUDDLE

(By Oliver Carlson)

Reclamation is a sacred word to the people of the water-hungry States of the Far West. Ever since the days of Brigham Young in Utah a hundred years ago, Westerners have been reclaiming arid lands and turning them into fertile farms and orchards. Slowly and painfully they have learned how to impound the water from melting snows, from the occasional rains, and from mighty rivers such as the Colorado and the Columbia. The great urban and industrial centers of southern California would be nonexistent but for the genius of reclamation engineers. The careful husbanding and scientific distribution of the impounded water have increased the well-being of farmers and city folk alike throughout the entire West.

Every Westerner knows this. That is why reclamation is a sacred word to him. That is why reclamation has become a potent factor in western politics. In recent years almost every ambitious politician, no matter what his party label, has promised his constituents more water through greater and ever greater reclamation projects.

For the past 3 years Congress has been considering the most fantastic reclamation project—as to scope, cost, and amount of land to be reclaimed—ever to be conceived by the United States Bureau of Reclamation. Known as the central Arizona project, this amazing irrigation plan was approved by the Senate of the United States last year and may very well have been passed by the Senate again by the time this article is in print.

The overwhelming mass of Americans have never heard or read about the central Arizona project. Most of those who have heard about it think of it primarily as a battle between the States of California and Arizona for the use of Colorado River water—with big, prosperous California seeking to deny little, underpopulated Arizona its just share of this water. Public sympathy, therefore, quite naturally goes to the underdog—to Arizona. The propagandists and lobbyists for this project have succeeded in keeping public attention focused on the have-versus-have-not aspect of the controversy rather than on whether it is economically justifiable or financially sound. What does the central Arizona project propose to do? Its primary purpose is to rescue approximately 150,000 acres of Arizona desert land which were put under cultivation during the war-boom days of the early 1940's, and to supply water for a possible additional 100,000 acres.

To achieve this rescue it is proposed (1) to build a mighty dam on the Colorado River above Hoover Dam; (2) to build, below Parker Dam, 4 pump lifts which would raise 1,200,000 acre-feet of irrigation water to a height of almost a thousand feet; and (3) a network of aqueducts and canals for transporting this water over 315 miles across Arizona where it finally would be used to grow ordinary field crops.

Here, indeed, is an engineer's dream. Here is to be erected a mighty Niagara in reverse, with 10,000,000,000 pounds of water being lifted to a height of 985 feet every 24 hours. The amount of electric power needed just to lift this water from Lake Havasu to the top of the ridge would be more than ample to power a thousand large factories or to meet the domestic needs of a city of half a million population.

The cost of this amazing project was estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation at $738,000,000 in 1948. In view of the Bureau's long record of underestimating costs, plus the increased costs for both labor and materials since 1948, it is a safe assumption that original costs on the central Arizona project would exceed a billion dollars today. This is five times the cost of the Hoover Dam, many times the cost of the Panama Canal, much more than the cost of developing the TVA, and far greater than the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The area to be benefited is all within the State of Arizona, and the project would directly benefit only about 25,000 farmers. Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and his Reclamation Bureau's report admitted that there are only about 6,000 farms within the project area and that, of these, 420 farms contain 55 percent of the land to be irrigated. In other words, the project would give benefits of more than $550,000 to each of these 420 large landholders, and of tens of thousands of dollars to each of the other 5,600 farm owners.

If the people of Arizona wish to make such magnificent gifts to a few of their farmers, we in the other 47 States have nothing to say about it. But when the entire billion-dollar cost of this project is to be borne by the taxpayers of the Nation, for the benefit of a handful of land speculators in Arizona, then the matter is very much our concern. And that is precisely what the central Arizona project proposes.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Reclamation insists that the Arizona farmers who are to receive the water can afford to pay only $4.50 per acre foot for it. But, on the basis of the 50-year repayment period proposed, the cost of delivering this water would amount to $18 per acre foot annually—or approximately four times the charge estimated by the Bureau. Here again the burden of cost would fall upon the taxpayers from Maine

to Washington, and from Minnesota to Mississippi.

Former Senator Downey, of California, testified last year:

"Central Arizona land is worth at most $300 per acre * * * but at $300 per acre, the whole irrigated area of central Arizona, less than 600,000 acres, could be bought for $180,000,000, and the 150,000 acres at stake could be bought for $45,000,000."

I find that the United States Agricultural Census for 1945 lists the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the State of Arizona at $287,000,000. The original expenditures for the central Arizona project would be almost three times that figure.

There are times and conditions under which we cannot count the dollars-and-cents expenditures for a project. Could it be that the products to be grown on the rescued land are so vital to our national existence that we must not count the cost? They are potatoes, wheat, corn, cotton, barley, oats, and sorghum. Are these scarce products? Quite the contrary—they are precisely the ones which have been in oversupply year after year. They are the ones for which the American taxpayer has paid out hundreds of millions of dollars for price-support programs precisely because they were a drug on the market. To spend an additional billion dollars in Arizona to keep these surplus crops on the market appears to be the height of economic stupidity.

At this point readers may well ask themselves how such a fantastic project can receive serious consideration by Congress or be seriously proposed by the Department of the Interior and its Reclamation Bureau.

First and foremost, this billion-dollar project has vast political implications. The project, it has been estimated, would take from 8 to 12 years to complete. A working force of from ten to twenty thousand people would be constantly employed within the State. The number of Federal patronage jobs would be very great, and the spending of a billion dollars in a State with a population of approximately 750,000 would give the party in power a complete stranglehold over the people of the State. To land speculators, contractors, jobbers, liquor dealers, gamblers, and union bosses, it should prove a bonanza of fabulous dimensions. And a grab-bag pattern would have been set, which politicians and land speculators in other Western States would rapidly seek to follow. For there are still millions of potential irrigable acres in the West. The Bureau of Reclamation has already worked out plans for projects which would cost nearly $19,000,000,000, and it has on its drawing boards an additional set of projects with an estimated cost of $29,000,000,000.

Here indeed are projects to gladden the heart of every believer in the continued expansion of big government. But it is a frightening prospect to all others.

Bernard DeVoto, who was born in the West and knows it well, called this development "A state of mind * * * that could produce a national disaster.

"The engineering projects in the West (he wrote) amount to an American 5-year plan, 50-year plan, and 100-year plan rolled up together. They are going to be carried through as far as the credit of the United States will permit. The western bloc in Congress will see to it that they are, and Senator DOUGLAS' superb and wholly futile attack on the last pork bill shows what the technique is. What President Truman said about these projects on his western tour amounted to just this: I bought the West 2 years ago and I'm here to assure you that there is enough money so that you'll be happy to stay bought. There is no party line in these matters, the only answer a Republican candidate would bother to make out West would be a promise to pay still more.

"Meanwhile the 5-50-100-year plan calls for by far the largest expenditure the United States has ever made for internal improvements, by far the largest it has ever made for anything except war and defense. Ninety percent of its objectives, at this stage, are entirely hypothetical. An undetermined part of them are also fantasy, guess, mirage, dream, vision, hope; some part of them will fail; some part of them may turn out to be fairly large-scale disasters."

It is high time that the people of the Western States look more closely at the reclamation projects offered to them by the Bureau of Reclamation and power-hungry politicians. No land should be reclaimed and irrigated at excessive cost, or to produce crops of which we already have a surplus or which can be produced cheaper elsewhere. There are tens of millions of acres of cultivatable land in the Midwest, the deep South, and the East which can be reclaimed at a fraction of the cost of western lands. In these areas the problem is simple—that of draining swamp lands and of building dykes and levees.

A group of experts at Stanford University who have been working on a water resources policy for the United States declared in their group report that "agricultural production in excess of its present output must increasingly rely on the area of the Nation which has a net surplus of precipitation, i. e., the eastern half." And they warned: "If irrigation to expand farm production in the West should be given priority, the transfer of population westward would have to stop far short of what it otherwise might be * * * therefore, the use of water for agricultural irrigation should by no means have priority when it would curtail the desirable expansion of homes or industry."

These experts further insisted: "In our view there is no longer (if there ever was) any economic or social justification for subsidizing Federal irrigation projects, whether by charging no interest on allocated costs, leniency in levying interest-free charges on users of irrigation water, or by transfer of either surplus power revenues or interest collected on the power investment. These practices have been the source of waste of Federal funds, which will presumably be multiplied many times if the practices are continued."

Arizona has in Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND (majority leader of the Senate) and Senator CARL HAYDEN two astute and powerful champions of the fantastic central Arizona project. By political logrolling, trading, and through their key positions on the Rules and Appropriations Committees, these Senators were able to get their measure passed by a vote of 55 to 28.

The present national emergency may give pause to many Senators and Congressmen before they vote for this measure again in 1951. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that politicians will attempt to tie it in with national emergency measures.

Making Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the April 4 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. If the United States is to assist India at this time, action must be taken by the Congress without delay. I hope the legislation will come before the House so the entire membership can work its will on this vital problem.

The editorial reads as follows:

MAKING COMMUNISTS

Some Members of Congress who, on paper, are most passionate anti-Communists have found an extremely effective way of making Communists. It is to let 100,000,000 people in India go hungry while Americans sit tightly and comfortably on a stored surplus of wheat amounting to several times the famine need in that land.

Congress has had before it since February 12 a recommendation to give India a needed 2,000,000 tons of grain besides the roughly 2,000,000 tons that nation is buying in the United States and 2,000,000 tons it is buying elsewhere.

Meanwhile, a great deal is said in many quarters about convincing the rest of the world of the advantages of democracy and free enterprise, about selling capitalism instead of communism.

In the state of Bihar in India the grain ration has been reduced below 9 ounces a day and is considered less than enough to assure survival for long of those who depend on the ration alone. Relief of such conditions takes weeks even after shipment of grain is authorized and other provinces are approaching similar distress.

In such circumstances discussion of ideologies becomes academic, but Communist incitement and agitation thrive. So great an American as Senator Borah, an authority on the United States Constitution and its importance, said in 1934, "The people can't eat the Constitution."

The people of India cannot satisfyingly fill their stomachs with preachments on freedom and opportunity if they have not the opportunity to eat. It rests with the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to put on the legislative calendar a bill which would give them a little nourishing evidence of the free world's efficiency and its interest in their fate.

Now It's Meat Tax To Control Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John C. Davis, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 7, 1951:

NOW IT'S MEAT TAX TO CONTROL INFLATION

(By John C. Davis)

According to a United Press dispatch from Washington on April 2, the House-Senate Economic Committee has just released its annual statement. Attached to this document is a report of suggestions compiled by the committee's staff of economic experts and advisers. It contains a suggestion that the committee recommend a luxury tax upon meat as a means of controlling inflation.

Just how a tax that would increase the already high price of meat would help to hold down inflation is a bit obscure. It becomes more confusing when the average citizen recalls that another Government agency, the Office of Price Stabilization, is busy thinking of ways and means to bring prices down, notably that of meat, to control inflation.

PAPA KNOWS BEST

Doubtless in due time, our present paternalistic administration that would have us view things not as they are but as we are told they are by "papa" will get around to

explaining it all. Our proper function in this socialistic scheme of things is just to pay and pay but never question why. But the idiocy of one governmental body recommending taxes that will raise prices to control inflation while another attempts to hold prices down to control inflation is not the most startling piece of misinformation in this report.

Justifying its reasoning for a luxury meat tax, the report explains that "from the sheer standpoint of production, meat, it has often been pointed out, is in reality a luxury food."

Such a statement coming from a supposedly responsible Government advisory staff is not only amazing; it is incredible in the ignorance expressed of this Nation's agricultural pattern and the influence of that pattern upon our American way of life.

WHAT PAPA DOESN'T KNOW

Meat and meat products—pork, beef, milk, cheese, butter, and eggs—are the chief income producers that give our farmers the highest standard of living of any similar group on earth. Any governmental tax that would raise consumer prices of these would curtail consumption and lower farm income, already below parity with other branches of our economy.

If the clammy hand of taxation, which incidentally is the power to destroy a free economy, were to fasten upon these items and grow strong enough to force farmers to change our pattern of agriculture, it could be a national calamity. As matters stand, we grow crops, feed them through livestock and eat the livestock instead of eating the crops directly from the land, as do the less-favored peoples of the world.

It is our diet of high protein, carbohydrates, vitamins, and mineral meat products that gives us the drive and energy that is the envy of the rest of the world. Even in countries with living standards above those of the peoples who eat directly from the land, only the upper classes enjoy an animal diet comparable to our average. It is one of the reasons those favored few are the upper classes since what you eat determines in large measure what you are.

CRONY FEEDING

A change in our agricultural pattern that would produce a change in our eating habits might produce a class society here. Such a change would have fat political bureaucrats munching upon filet mignons while the rest of us eat mush.

Aside from its effect upon our diet a change in our agricultural pattern would have far-reaching effect upon our entire industrial system. Consider that almost the entire refrigeration industry is based upon animal agriculture. You do not need much refrigeration if the diet is raw corn, wheat, oats, and potatoes. Four million of the eight million trucks in the Nation are engaged primarily in transporting meat and meat products from farm to processor to market and our tables.

The above are just a few illustrations of why meat is not a luxury but a necessity in our American way of life. The staff of economic advisers that advised the House-Senate economic committee otherwise must have been kidding—let's hope.

Amendment to S. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday, in the consideration of S. 1, I stated that at the proper time I would offer an amendment in connection with the Executive order providing for examinations of college students as a basis for deferment. At that time I submitted tentative language of that amendment. After further consideration I have decided to revise the language of the amendment. The revision does not change the purpose of the amendment. Should the amendment be adopted, local boards will pass upon educational deferments as has been the case in the past. That the language of the revision may be available to the membership prior to the consideration of the bill, I include the same, as follows:

Page 46, line 13, add the following:

"Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board of the selective-service system shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government."

"The Chips Are Down—the World Is Now in a Fight—Unless Every Man in This Room Stands Solidly Behind Our Nation's Defense Mobilizer, Charlie Wilson, and Helps Him Save Our Country, There Will Be No Country Left for Us To Save"—Frank W. Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, the Members of this House witnessed a scene depicting the ever-increasing costs of food—a problem which concerns every housewife in these United States. I have reference to five of our very distinguished women colleagues, who carried in food baskets containing the amount of food that could have been bought, in 1909, with a $5 bill, as contrasted with what was bought in 1919, 1929, 1939, and in 1950.

Picturesque as was that presentation, the American people have, as yet, seen nothing that even approximates true inflation of our own money or price structure, as compared with what has happened in many, many other countries. Drastic as we have found the increased costs of food stuff and other necessities and goods, I doubt if much of the increase in prices that we Americans experienced, prior to 1950, should be classed as true inflation.

Personally, I incline to the belief that the costs which previously so adversely characterized our price structure in the past 20 years were an increasing high level of prices, which were bound to follow in the wake of the higher standards of living, of higher wages, shorter work hours, and other factors that make up the American way of life which our people have enjoyed.

In other words, I think that, up until last June, we were merely living in a high-price era, rather than in what others have come to know as an inflationary period.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of inflation, I do not have in mind an uncontrolled inflation—wrecking the price structure of a nation by debauching its currency to such a low value that it takes an astronomical sum to make even the most meager purchase. I know that our people here in the United States can feel inflation, and feel it badly, when prices rise and get out of line as little as from 2 percent to 10 percent.

I am, however, reminded of what a friend who, upon his return from Greece, told me but a year or so ago. He said that, in 1937, the drachma had a value of 111 to the American dollar—that, in 1947, the same drachma had dropped to a point where it took 8,000 drachmas to buy one American dollar—but that, in 1950, and despite all the acknowledged benefits that the Marshall plan has brought to that little democracy, its internal monetary system is debased to a point where there are now from 15,000 to 20,000 drachmas to the dollar.

To express it still another way—think of figuring your daily wages in "the millions per day," and you will have some idea of the conditions that developed in Greece. There, a package of cigarettes now cost anywhere from 25,000 to 37,500 drachmas—and a pair of shoes costs from 350,000 to 600,000 drachmas—while a suit of medium-grade clothes costs well up in the millions of drachmas.

More particularly, when I think of inflation as it might come to us in America, I am reminded of what happened in Germany, subsequent to World War II, when it required half a million German marks, which had been previously worth as much as 100,000 dollars in American money, to buy a single copy of a daily newspaper.

In that never-to-be-forgotten period of German inflation, German paper money became so cheap that it had greater value when it was packed into bales, shipped across the ocean, and sold as scrap paper in the markets of the United States * * * than it did as currency in Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I need not point out to you that it is that very type of inflation that now threatens these United States. Neither must I stress the fact that it was the threat of that kind of inflation which caused President Truman, some ninety-odd days ago, to ask the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, then president of the General Electric Co., to come to Washington to direct the Office of Defense Mobilization—the most important office in the United States of America, outside of the Presidency itself.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is charged, by Congress, with doing any and all things necessary to secure the peace and defenses of this Nation. Among

these are the establishment of fair, equitable, and effective controls over wages, prices, materials, and production.

Mr. Speaker, no man in the history of this world, either in peace or in war, has been burdened with a more difficult task than that now confronting Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization.

By the same token, I doubt if in the history of this Nation a more representative and disinterested group of Americans ever sat down to break bread together than was that group assembled in the Speaker's private dining room Tuesday, March 13, at midday.

The roster of the men assembled included not alone Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of these United States, but Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force together with the heads of other executive departments of Government, and a score or more of Representatives and Senators—all members of House and Senate committees.

They were assembled at the invitation of the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, and, acting as cohost was the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, Representative to Congress from South Carolina.

All had come to do honor to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, and the resounding acclaim which his name brought forth gave greater evidence than word can express of the respect and esteem in which he is held by every man present.

Mr. Speaker, your own generous, tribute and evaluation of the worth and merit of C. E. Wilson to his country in this crisis was second not even to the gracious and generous tribute paid him by FRANK BOYKIN.

Congressman BOYKIN told of conditions which face not alone this Nation but the whole world in this present hour of tension and darkness.

He pulled no punches, either in describing the situation which confronts us as a Nation nor in describing the backbiting and vituperation currently being leveled at the heads of Government doing their very best to bring us out of the depths of despondency and despair and lead us again into the valley of peace and national security.

In telling his guests of Charles Wilson, FRANK BOYKIN described an incident that occurred at a dinner which he gave some years ago. President Roosevelt, who was scheduled to make an address, phoned to say that due to his personal fatigue at that moment, he begged to be excused from attending the dinner. He asked FRANK if he could send Charlie Wilson, "the great president of the General Electric Co., instead of coming myself." The President, however, told of how tired he was, and stated that "You couldn't get my chair up there without making a lot of preparation," and so Charlie Wilson came over alone. "And it was at that time," Mr. BOYKIN said, "that I first got acquainted with him."

Mr. Speaker, there are few men that have ever walked across the pages of American history whose experience has been more peculiar, unique, and extraordinary, or more American than has been that of Charles Edward Wilson, who was president of the General Electric Co. from January 1, 1940, until he resigned on December 16, 1950.

Here is a man who spent his entire business career, except for such times as he served his country, with one single employer—at a time that saw the ever-expanding electrical industry develop in the United States.

It was in 1899, at the tender age of 12, that Charles Wilson entered the employ of the Sprague Electric Co. of New York—one of the organizations which later went to make up the corporate structure of the General Electric Co. Since that time, he served in practically every function of that great business and industry—and on September 1, 1949, completed 50 years of service with the General Electric family.

Mr. Speaker, these 50 years have seen not alone the electrification of American industry and the home but they have, at the same time, seen the rise of the United States to a great industrial nation and a place of undisputed supremacy.

Power, lighting, communications, telegraphy, telephone, and radio, entertainment, industrial and electrochemical processes, the Nation's transportation, its heating and refrigeration, have all been transformed during the very time that Charlie Wilson has worked in the industry. There is hardly an article of daily life that had not, in some wise, been touched by the great magic of electric power. These are inclusive of all things from newspapers to carpets, hydroelectric dams and electric blankets, the Nation's skyscrapers as well as its morning coffee.

Due, in no small measure, to the generation and transmission of electrical energy came the rising standard of living which we now enjoy and the American way of life. During the first half of the twentieth century, the workweek has been cut from 61 hours in 1900 to a mere 40 hours per week as of today.

Mr. Speaker, the saga of Charlie E. Wilson is not the story of a man concerned, per se, solely with a great business concern, but rather with an era that characterized the entire expansion and diversification of American industry as well as with the forces that have made this country the greatest on the face of the earth.

The General Electric Co., as is true of a great many business houses have long since ceased to exist as merely manufacturers and sellers. Today many of these concerns are the driving forces in government and in social progress.

Mr. Speaker, our Government today has within its power the ability to influence the course and the character of all private enterprise, and that is, indeed, a heavy responsibility because it reaches into every land and into every level of society. What industry does today may be of historic significance whether it concerns atomic power at one end of the scale or the betterment of human relations at the other.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie Wilson attended the elementary schools of New York City, and, at the age of 12, started his career as an office boy in the Sprague Electric Co. At Sprague Electric, he moved from position to position, and took the advice of his factory superintendent "look forward and equip yourself for the next job."

At night school, he learned cost accounting, general accounting, and enrolled in correspondence courses, one upon another, in practically all phases of engineering. The cost of these courses he paid by tutoring backward students in physics, mathematics, and other courses that he himself had previously completed.

Through these years of hard work he equipped himself with the physical fitness necessary to meet every requirement demanded of those who, having built empires, now watched, with the sun at their backs, Charlie Wilson advance across the horizon.

He was named assistant to the vice president at about the time that President Hoover was elected to office in 1928. Mr. Wilson's efforts were then primarily devoted, however, to the multitudinous problems of manufacture. In 1930 he was elected vice president of the company and a member of the newly formed appliance sales committee.

It was not until he was elected executive vice president that he moved his offices from Schenectady to New York City. Two years later, in 1939, the board of directors of the great General Electric Co. elected Charlie Wilson the fourth president of the company—into whose employment he had entered 40 years before. He had, indeed, proven a worthy successor to such men as Charles A. Coffin, Edwin W. Rice, Jr., and Gerard Swope—as well as a coworker with the world-renowned Owen D. Young, long general counsel and chairman of the board.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to recapitulate to you the tremendous labor pains suffered by this Nation in its attempt to give birth to increased industrial production in the prewar period of World War II.

Time after time all efforts failed, and every board superimposed upon all others to bring up the Nation's productivity—one after the other—bogged down.

September of 1942 found this Nation in a death struggle to increase our national production of war material. It was then that Charlie Wilson resigned all business connections, came to Washington, and, at the request of President Roosevelt, became the Executive Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, armed with complete authority over all war production.

As wartime boss of the United States production effort Charlie Wilson achieved spectacular successes—and particularly so in the construction of aircraft, shipbuilding, munitions production, and in all other war accoutrement programs. These began to reach unprecedented heights when subject to the magic wand built of the experience in direction and production abilities of the new production boss.

When war ended his resignation was finally accepted by President Roosevelt—and, like Cincinnatus, Charles Wilson, returning to his plow, was again elected president of the General Electric Co. on September 8, 1944.

Long distinguished among his colleagues for his creative ability in industrial production as well as his demonstrated interest in expanding the distribution of goods to absorb unemployment and promote higher living and working standards for all, he stands today—preeminent in the field of humanities as well as of industries.

Congressman BOYKIN stated that "The chips are down and the world now is in a tight place." He challenged every man in that room "To get behind Charlie Wilson," and, as he put it "Help this man save our country—or else there will be no country left to us to save."

Mr. Wilson's response was modest, simple, and direct!

He told his audience that he has, on more than one occasion, been accused of being "big business." But, no one ever thought of Charlie Wilson as anything but a little fellow when he started in with Sprague, 52 years ago today. He saw General Electric Co. grow as this Nation grew—from the period that marked the horseless carriage to the present age of the atom bomb, high-frequency circuits, television, guided missiles, and supersonic speeds.

In his boyhood, this America of ours was not even a first-class power. The world powers were Russia, Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, France, and the British Empire. No one ever thought to invite the representatives of the United States to sit down at any round table discussion of world affairs. But, Mr. Speaker, America has traveled far—and it has traveled fast, and today we are classed as first in the family of nations.

The last time our now Chief of Defense Mobilization came to Washington, he came down here to do a job, and then return to his work. But, this time, he has made public announcement that he has retired from General Electric, and has come down here to do a job that was so stupendous that he himself doesn't know whether he can do it or not. But the American people know he can.

He has intimated that he has no misgivings whatever as to the ability of our Nation to produce all the physical goods that we need to secure our peace and our defenses, and that this Nation, will be reasonably mighty by the end of this year—and that in another 2 years, it will be so mighty that neither Russia, nor any other nation in this world, will even bother us.

Mr. Wilson, in his report to the Nation made it clear that our potential productivity is so great, that we can ultimately impose our military production on top of our civilian economy, and, without so much as affecting our normal life.

He has, however, given full warning that inflation is the thing that could destroy our great might. It is to that end that we must hold down all prices, labor, agricultural, and all others, and, at the same time, keep all costs and prices in balance.

It is Charlie Wilson's faith that the dignity of man and of labor was born into the bone and the sinew of every American. He would be untrue to his own character if he should fail in any position which he might hold—to sit down and discuss fairly and justly all labor grievances with any representatives of organized labor that the rank and file saw fit to nominate to discuss that question with him.

Charles Wilson was a laborer and a member of a labor union—and is proud of it. And I am happy to learn that some of the differences that precipitated a sharp controversy between the mobilization director and labor representatives apparently have been resolved.

When at President Truman's request, Mr. Wilson left General Electric to take over the Office of Defense Mobilization, he, and those associated with him in the defense effort, approached the job—not as leaders of industry or of agriculture—not as lawyers—not as doctors—not as engineers or as economists. They approached all problems which confronted them first, and last, as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, next to the Russian Comintern, the greatest enemy of this country is inflation for, like a prairie fire, it will inevitably consume every last thing that lies in its path. Millions of wage earners today are asking themselves the question, "How can I provide food for the table in my home and pay for the other necessities of life in the face of the ever-increasing and rising costs that confront us each succeeding day?"

Mr. Speaker, let me point out, as Mr. Wilson has, that the Nation's budget this year is in the round sum of $71,000,000,000. These appropriations could be dissipated in the form of higher prices without adding one iota to the defense of this Nation.

Take the price of a pair of combat boots. Prior to Korea, they sold at $5.72, yet these same boots today cost our defense services $11.61—or an increase of nearly 100 percent. Twelve-ounce twill serge, which was bought for uniforms in May of 1950, for $3.54 a yard, is today costing $6.69 per yard—or an increase of 88½ percent—while cotton twill has jumped from 46.8 cents per yard to nearly 86 cents per yard.

During the same period, Garand rifles, which 9 months ago, cost a mere $41 each are currently quoted at $64—while Bailey bridges have jumped from $37,000 to $55,000 per unit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention here that all the taxes that we in the Congress have been asked to levy, if inflation is not controlled, would not even be able to meet the cost of providing for the Nation's defenses, to say nothing of all other services.

Now of course it is unnecessary to tell you that all of these increases in price are not attributable altogether either to the cost of raw materials or the labor necessary to the production thereof. But if and when labor costs are increased, material costs are likewise increased—distribution costs are increased—and the ultimate prices to the consumers are increased. It is the ultimate consumer—be he a farmer, an industrial worker, or the Government itself, who buys the goods and pays the bill.

Were we to make an extensive grant or generally increase wages or costs in any line whatever, be it agricultural, manufacture, transportation, or distribution—increased selling costs would follow, just as surely as night follows day.

Then, with newer and still higher prices prevailing in the consumer market, immediate outcry would be heard—and justifiably so—for further wage increases all across the board and a still newer price spiral generated.

When control of prices across the board is established, the responsible officials acknowledged that was not the ideal procedure to follow with respect to certain groups of labor and certain commodities. But they had to start somewhere to establish a cut-off point—and time has already proven that what they did was the wise thing.

Of course, the Office of Wage Stabilization, within the Defense Mobilization set-up, was faced with an accomplished fact when they agreed to grant a 22-percent increase to the United Mine Workers of America. That contract had been signed, sealed, and delivered, and it was not in their power to abate the same.

If the price of automobiles and trucks are advanced, the cost of all Army motor vehicles go up in proportion and Federal taxes will have to be raised still higher in order to get the money with which to procure them for our armed services.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember, at all times, that our armed services use many articles and goods that are used in everyday civilian economy—motor, oil, gasoline, hardware, metal goods, motor vehicles, clothing, shoes, and other items.

Uncontrolled and sharp competition between civilian use and defense needs could only result in higher prices, and hence, in higher taxes.

It is because of these facts, that we must control inflation by the application of price and wage controls, and the allocation of materials. The policies established to carry out these controls cannot be arrived at by any committee gathered around a table, each man representing some special interest or some special group.

They must be determined altogether with a view to what is best for our Nation and its future security.

These controls must be determined fairly, equitably, and dispassionately, or else we shall find ourselves engulfed in an economic chaos, from which, to my mind, there can be no other but a tortuous escape. I believe this is what Charles Wilson and his associates are trying to do. Let us support them in doing it.

Mr. Speaker, this job has got to be done—that it is a tremendous task and can be done only by someone like Charles E. Wilson, whose leadership, broad vision, and wealth of experience, when translated into action, programs will be carried out in behalf of the conservation of the taxpayers' dollars, the Nation's security, and the peace of the world.

Probe of United States Gold Policy Would Outdraw Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., which appeared in the Grand Rapids Press, has created considerable interest in and criticism of such Government policies among citizens in western Michigan. So far I have been unable to find any logical answer or explanation.

Mr. Lewis' article is as follows:

PROBE OF UNITED STATES GOLD POLICY WOULD OUTDRAW KEFAUVER

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Judging from the mail response to my comments in this space on the Government's silly policy of selling gold to foreigners for $35 an ounce, a public hearing on Federal monetary policies might even outdraw Senator KEFAUVER.

I pointed out that foreign governments and individuals can buy United States gold at $35 an ounce and resell it in Europe and elsewhere at $57 an ounce. I have since found that I was slightly out of step with fiscal realities. United States Treasury Department losses, as noted herein previously, were about $1,000,000,000 annually. I figured low on all counts.

EUROPE BUYS FOR $35, THEN SELLS FOR $70

Refined gold can be bought for $35 an ounce from the Treasury, but instead of being purchased at the rate of a billion dollars annually, foreign buyers are gobbling it up at the rate of two billion. As for resale value overseas, $57 an ounce is merely the bargaining price. Experts say the normal overseas asking price for an ounce of gold is probably closer to $70 an ounce and that if you find someone who is really greedy, you can get more than $100 an ounce. In fact, the British Government, which buys large quantities from our Treasury Department, has set a monetary value of $101.17 an ounce, according to United States Mint figures.

If you have a pot of gold—and you are breaking the law if you have—the thing to do, if you want to make a neat profit, is trot over to France and sell it. Even better, set up a dummy corporation with offices overseas and then you can buy and sell gold legally. Smuggling gold out of this country is on the increase, but customs officials are alerted to examine anyone wandering around the docks looking as if he had lead in his pants.

ALL DEMAND AMERICA MAKE PAYMENT IN GOLD

Some countries, including Russia, demand gold when we buy anything from them—and that is where you and I, as taxpayers, take a beating from the low evaluation of gold. For instance, less than a year ago an ounce of gold would have bought 60 pounds of tin. Today it will buy 15 pounds. The same applies to raw rubber and other industrial materials purchased overseas. If the Treasury Department hiked up the value per ounce of United States gold to somewhere near the world market, we wouldn't be taking such a beating from foreign traders, but with United States gold stabilized at $35 an ounce foreign traders can continue to hike the price of their goods and we must continue to shell out more gold to pay for it.

Current shipments of gold per week out of the country average almost as much gold as is now produced in the United States in a year. Back in 1933 the British abandoned the gold standard. Gold was worth $20.67 an ounce then. We shelled out so much of it to the British that in May of 1933 Congress passed a law nationalizing gold trading and making it a crime for a private United States citizen to trade in gold.

BUYING OR SELLING, WE END UP ON SHORT END

In view of current headlines, it is interesting to note that at that time the RFC started buying back, at $35 an ounce, most of the gold we had sold to the British for $20.67, which may account for some of the weird fiscal policies still practiced there today.

Only gold-backed currency rates high in the world today. This is even more true when war threatens. Everybody wants gold. In the United States there is the general feeling that most of the gold in the world is buried at Fort Knox, Ky.

Here are the facts: Our total supply of gold on the basis of the $35-an-ounce price would pay for less than one-third of the 1952 budget now before Congress. In fact, gold buried in Fort Knox and elsewhere backs up less than 10 percent of the money in circulation today, and this does not include the billions of dollars worth of Government bonds extant.

Everybody but us taxpayers makes money from our low gold price. India, Britain, Russia, France, and other nations sell us goods for gold at $35 an ounce. At the same time we ship Marshall-plan countries goods and machinery paid for with American dollars. Then the Marshall-plan countries sell the goods and machinery to Russia and to one another for gold that brings over $100 an ounce. While they build up their gold reserves, ours are depleted.

Since the British devalued the pound some 15 months ago—a step similar, in result, to going off the gold standard in 1933—the United States has lost the equivalent of 30 percent of all the gold produced in the United States in the last 150 years. If the British can hold off for another 20 years, maybe we can get more gold mines operating in the United States so we can build up our supplies again for another raid on Fort Knox.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Philip W. Porter, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 7, 1951:

PORTER ON PRICE CONTROL—WAILS AND MOANS FROM ALL SIDES INDICATE THAT IT SHOULD END SOON—IF NOT SOONER

(By Philip W. Porter)

The attempt at price control was expected to end in a farce, but it has reached that stage even sooner than anticipated. Already, though all the red tape, gobble-dygook and snooping jobs haven't even been filled, the signs of disintegration are evident. And long before the law expires June 30 you'll begin to hear cries from many quarters that it ought to be scrapped. Speed the day!

One particularly poignant wail is already coming from the union bosses, who were long the principal advocates of price control. What they really wanted was price control without wage control; they also hoped to call the signals in the top office. However, wage control is in the law, and Charles Wilson, whom they can't intimidate, is in the top office, so they are now yipping their heads off.

Another groan is coming from the cotton bloc, which resented its ceilings bitterly and you can bet it won't be long before the Congressmen from the cattle raising States will also be moaning, for OPS has already nicely loused up the meat growing and slaughtering business, just as did its predecessors, OPA.

Farmers are not delivering as many cattle to be slaughtered. Signs of skirting the law are appearing in upgrading of poor quality meats and insistence on tie-ins with scarce items. Packing-house managers are going crazy with the silly and useless bookkeeping required to fix profit margins and it won't be long before OPS will be discovering there is a black market. It couldn't be otherwise.

WINS UNPOPULARITY CONTEST

If ever there was a piece of unpopular legislative nonsense, this is it. A recent Gallup poll showed that 75 percent were dissatisfied with it and 65 percent expected prices to go higher. Most of them had the silly notion, cultivated by politicians who flaunted the magic word "controls" before the voters, that all we needed to reduce prices was for Congress to pass a new law. They found out differently. Congress can't repeal or amend the law of supply and demand.

The afore-mentioned groups are opposed to the price-wage control law for special selfish reasons. But you don't need any better reason than this: Prices can't be fixed except in a slave state, with a policeman watching every family, or a docile country where everybody obeys without thought of self or resistance. Since we are adequately supplied with selfishness and signs of resistance are many, price-fixing has already degenerated into just a roost for more job holders and paper-pushers. People generally are either ignoring it or just plain confused as to what it's all about. Who can make any sense out of the mumbo-jumbo?

PRICE INDEXES DROP

Meanwhile, the most ironic possible thing is happening. Weekly and monthly price indexes are dropping. Retailers are suddenly getting inventory-happy and starting to advertise some big price cuts. The television industry is already knocking prices down in large chunks and big electrical appliances are also going begging. There are ample signs that buyers have zipped up their pocketbooks after the scare splurges of several months ago. It's similar to what happened in early 1949. The folks who helped accelerate the inflation by buying too much all at once are already helping produce a slowdown in business. They've already bought and are now paying.

This noticeable slowdown, widely commented on by business analysts, hasn't shown up yet as much as it will soon in all the indexes, but is noticeable even now in food. The Dun & Bradstreet index is down for the third week, the lowest since the controls were applied. And don't forget that most food was not controlled. It started down without artificial wand-waving, of its own accord, because the demand was less. Simple, isn't it?

RAT RACE OF CONFUSION

So, while Mike DiSalle's operatives are just getting into high gear with nonunderstandable directives, mark-ups, mark-downs, and all-out rat race of confusion, designed in theory to keep prices from going up, prices on plenty of items are sliding down fast, and others are likely to drop in the future. How silly can you get in Government? We need

this expensive price-control machinery, complete with new job holders, as much as a hole in the head.

All we need right now is allocations of scarce metals and other materials used in production of war goods. Yet OPS is fretting around about the price of potato chips, parking lot fees and flowers. Such stuff is peanuts, merely an annoyance. How could it affect the general price level?

Well, I suppose the boys drawing Federal checks, putting new titles after their names and writing letters to each other, have to do something to look busy.

American Air Power in a Struggle With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky entitled "Reds Can't Shift Base Once War Has Started," which appeared in the New York Journal-American March 25, 1951. I believe Major de Seversky's comments deserve national attention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS CAN'T SHIFT BASE ONCE WAR HAS STARTED

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

American air power of the right kind and the right size could knock out the war-making industry of Soviet Russia. That much is conceded even by most military men who are skeptical about all-out aerial strategy.

But what good will it do to disarm the Soviets in Russia, they ask, if Stalin can occupy Western Europe, organize its industrial potential, and continue aggression from the new base?

The picture that our top military men are trying to sell to the American people is roughly this: After our atomic attack, Soviet industry in ruins at home, but the Soviet regime still supreme, resting on economic strength beyond its own frontiers. It will function even better, some of them warn, from its new industrial citadel.

SAME OLD STORY

This argument has a familiar ring. We heard it in the final stages of our war with Japan. As the industrial set-up on the Mikado's home islands crumbled to ashes under the concentrated B-29 offensive, our old-style strategists refused to see the possibility of victory.

Japan, they pointed out, still had a great industrial base and some 6,000,000 fresh and well-equipped soldiers in Manchuria. Its war machine would simply be moved to Manchuria, and the struggle would go on for years.

Events quickly showed how grotesque was this concept. Having been thoroughly disarmed at home, Japan gave up, though its Manchurian potential was still intact. With the homeland reduced to impotence, it became politically and psychologically impossible to continue the contest from an alien base.

PAID THROUGH NOSE

It was because of this fallacious concept and the archaic belief that a war cannot be won without a show-down bayonet battle that our leadership was so anxious to draw Stalin into the Pacific war.

To buy Stalin's entry, we paid through the nose with vast concessions to the Soviets in Manchuria. We are still paying through the nose by the appalling casualties in Korea. Let it be remembered that Chinese Communist victories and our present desperate position in Korea are the direct result of those concessions.

Yet the very military men who were so tragically wrong 6 years ago are urging the selfsame fallacy today. They insist that Soviet Russia, though knocked out at home, could maintain the struggle from Western Europe. That is what I deny.

They forget that a regimented dictatorship cannot survive once its aura of invincibility at home is destroyed. Even in normal times the Kremlin needs huge armed forces, a colossal secret police system, a great empire of concentration camps to hold its subjects in line.

WILL NEED HOME ARMIES

How long will it hold them once its industries are wrecked, communications smashed, all normal life disrupted, while American air forces cruise at will in the Russian skies? How long will the restive satellite peoples of Eastern Europe continue to obey their hated Communist masters under those conditions?

With industry halted and life paralyzed by punishment from the air, Russia will be rocked by explosive discontents and perhaps revolutions. The Kremlin will need its best armies for domestic use. It could not possibly sustain the fighting spirit of its troops abroad in any case, each soldier knowing that his loved ones at home are caught in a maelstrom of disorder, hunger, and violence.

We know that Moscow today is obliged to use drastic measures to isolate its occupation forces in Germany and Austria from the local population and to stop the epidemics of desertion. If this is true in relative peacetime, with the Kremlin's prestige higher than ever before, how will it control its occupation forces under continuous air attack, the home base destroyed and the regime's pretensions of unbeatable power discredited?

FINAL BLOW FROM AIR

When the Soviet octopus has been struck in its heart, its tentacles around other countries will fall limp. Only superior strategic air power can deliver that blow.

Our military spokesmen insist that the Russian army, after its own country has been devastated, can pick up its stockpiles, shift bodily to Europe, impose itself on western civilization and live happily ever after.

More than that, they insist that the invaders can then proceed to transform Europe's industries into an industrial power superior to that of the United States. If the Russian soldier-peasants can perform such a miracle, then there is some magic in communism after all, and the free world is doomed anyhow.

But no such miracle would transpire. Stripped of prestige and productive capacity at home by our Air Force, the Soviet regime would cease to be a military treat. Its efforts to create a new industrial base could readily be canceled out by selective bombing.

Its transport and communications could be cut faster than they could be rebuilt. Life would in effect be brought to a standstill by such aerial siege. Stalin's armies would then be open to leisurely and systematic suffocation from overhead and would deteriorate into a helpless mob of displaced persons.

True, air siege means a certain amount of destruction by bombing. But how about the "slow retreat" by inadequate American and Allied ground forces? We need only look at devastated Korea to realize what this would do to Europe. Yet this is the only alternative offered.

COULD WRECK EUROPE

Admittedly such forces would not be enough to hold Europe against the overwhelming might of the Red armies. But they would perhaps slow up the conquest, retreating slowly, and thus chew up the Kremlin's stockpiles of weapons and fuel. Further, if worse comes to worst and we are pushed off the continent, we would destroy the European industrial potential to prevent it from falling into Russian hands.

By some strange quirk of logic, our military mentors look calmly at the prospect of total annihilation of West European civilization in a mile-by-mile scorched earth struggle from the Elbe to the Atlantic. But they shrink in horror from limited and highly selective destruction from the air. Somehow the brand of destruction with which they are more familiar seems to them more acceptable.

Ground forces sufficient to stop the Soviet armies might land and ultimately take the offensive are another matter. But we do not have them. With our limited manpower we can never have them. Those who are trying to stampede the United States into the rearming of Europe—which means war—on the assumption that Russia is already cowed by our atomic stockpile, are courting disaster.

RUSSIANS KNOW

Russian experts have studied the results of bombardment in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and were invited to the atomic tests at Bikini. From information published they know the capabilities of our Air Force.

Having similar information, being acquainted with the nature of Russian targets and estimating their air defenses, I fear that should we attack Russia today with our present skeleton strategic Air Force we would invite a Pearl Harbor in reverse.

We would sacrifice the precious nucleus of our strategic air power, squander our atomic bombs by inflicting only indecisive damage, and then we, like the Japanese after the battle of Midway, would have nothing left with which to follow up to a decision.

Let's have a big stick first, then we can do what we please.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent Executive order providing for a blanket deferment policy for college students has brought about a critical situation in Kent County, Mich. The Grand Rapids Herald and the Grand Rapids Press have written editorials in which I concur. In addition, I include in my remarks a column on the same general problem by Lowell Mellett.

The three newspaper comments follow:

[From the Grand Rapids Herald]

IN A "CLASSLESS" SOCIETY

Kent County Draft Board No. 43 acted patriotically and in the best interest of the Nation it serves when it formally protested the President's order granting deferments

to hundreds of thousands of college students, with no specific obligation to serve later.

This board and others like it, together with other protesting citizens, will have saved the Selective Service System from the worst of possible mistakes if it brings about the reexamination and correction of this policy.

For this is class legislation in a historically classless society.

It sets apart a whole group, not because as individuals they may be able to contribute more to the national defense as civilians than as soldiers but only because they are enrolled in colleges or can in the future get under the wire before they reach draft age and manage to keep up their grades.

An aptitude test is being set up, but this, be it noted, is secondary. Only students already enrolled are eligible to take it. Such a test in no way sorts out the geniuses and the brilliant men whose continued technical training conceivably might be in the national interest. The nonstudent is barred. The apprentice in a shop doesn't get a chance at it.

Rather it harks back to the iniquitous Civil War practice of buying draft substitutes. The youth whose only advantage is parents with money enough to keep him in school can be deferred. The youth who must go to work, or who simply prefers to learn on the job, gets no such break.

In his speech here Tuesday night, President Otto A. Seyferth of the United States Chamber of Commerce said that "for the first time in our history, we have begun to set class against class. Under the political leadership of men who cared more for votes than for the good of their country, we have been led to forget the essentially classless character of our society."

He wasn't talking about the draft policy, but here it is again. The college class is set against the noncollege class.

Mr. Seyferth also said, speaking of controls, that they can succeed only to the extent that the people accept them willingly. That applies with equal force to any law, including the draft law.

There lies the great danger. We need the draft. We must have it in this period of peril. We cannot afford resistance to it or even nonacceptance of its fairness, and this singling out of a whole group of young men is manifestly unfair.

Members of Board No. 43 are indignant over the discrimination. They are not alone.

Such wholesale deferments as are contemplated cannot be justified on any ground.

We have been talking about universal military training. The first word is the key to its success—universal. There should be no blanket exceptions.

It would be regrettable if able members of draft boards were to find it necessary to resign because of their objections, as of course they must do if they cannot conscientiously comply with what they consider to be an obnoxious rule. It would be equally regrettable if they were to be removed by higher authority because of their protests.

It would, indeed, be most unfortunate—and most dangerous—to allow discrimination in favor of one large group of men merely because they managed to get into college before being drafted.

[From the Grand Rapids Press]

DEFERRING COLLEGE STUDENTS

President Truman's draft deferment plan for college students has provoked loud protests. The plan's critics are opposed to determining whether a young men shall or shall not be drafted on the basis of intelligence and aptitude tests. They contend that this would set up a standard for military service that is both undemocratic and unfair. Grand Rapids draft board members have been among the first to complain.

These objections hardly can be ignored. While it is true that persons with money could buy their way out of the Union Army in Civil War days, this Nation otherwise never has made money, intelligence, or anything of the sort the deciding factor in raising an army. The rich and poor alike are expected to serve. And up to now the genius and the average man have been also.

Under the President's plan, however, about half of the men now in college could be expected to score high enough to stay in school. The other half would have to don uniforms. One grave question raised by this setup is whether deferment wouldn't actually amount to exemption from military service. If so, it would come dangerously close to creating an elite corps, which is something that we could expect the majority of Americans to oppose violently. Nor would it be a kindness to the supposedly favored group.

For it we look ahead down the lifetime of these exempted students, it will be a poor service to them and their children to mark them in this way, as having sought and received exemption for scholarship only—as against other citizens who stood ready to fight when the Nation needed its citizens to stand up for its very life. If a large number of these potential scientists, doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., are actually needed for continuity of research and development in the war effort, why not have them drafted and assigned to these specific war training purposes, with nominal pay as Reservists so long as they proceed with their education, but with transfer to the Armed Forces if they should fail to meet the grade? On graduation they would be assigned to definite scientific war projects or as doctors, judge advocates, Army or Navy dentists, etc., to the extent required at the time.

To exempt all students on a sole basis of scholarship, aptitude, and intelligence, without considering whether their courses would be of any military use or any war industry benefit, seems fundamentally wrong. It may excuse itself for colleges desperately in need of students and funds—but not on the far more important basis of justice both to the pupils involved and to the millions who could not claim exemption.

The Grand Rapids draft board protest is in advance of actual receipt of the cards to be mailed in by students, and far ahead of the examinations which are supposed to screen out and protect the brightest half of the million male college students in America. It is a protest on the whole principle involved. We believe it will be widely echoed.

BRIGHT BOYS POSE A PROBLEM—BUT SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM'S APPROACH CARRIES TOO MANY UNPLEASANT IMPLICATIONS

(By Lowell Mellett)

One wonders if our Selective Service System isn't in danger of becoming too selective.

Heretofore it has operated to exclude from the armed services a certain percentage of our boys on the ground that they are too dumb to fight or, at least, too lacking in education. Now it is proposed to exclude, or defer for the time being, a certain percentage on the ground that they are too bright to fight. We are to have a military machine manned by men who are neither too dumb nor too bright; just right.

It may not work out exactly that way, to be sure. The bright boys won't actually be excluded because they are bright. They are only to be deferred if they desire to be and many, without doubt, will prefer to fight.

This state of affairs appears to be the result of 2 years of heavy thinking on the part of some of the Nation's leading educators, who undertook the task at the request of the Government. It is an answer to the problem that comes up in every major war; how to prevent the interruption of the education of the boys in college or on their way to college. That's a serious problem for the boys involved and for the parents who are making it possible for them to achieve an education. Just as serious as the problem of the boys whose parents cannot send them to college, including the boys who must work to help support their families and who are getting their education in the form of the trade or the business they may be learning. Just as serious, but no more so.

But, it is said, there is another and even higher purpose in this proposed separation of the sheep and the goats. It is necessary, it is said, to develop, through education, the brain power that will enable our country to compete on better than even terms with the rest of the world in this educated age. That is a way of saying that this country must have an intellectual elite, a group to do our thinking for us while others do the fighting. Modern war, it is said, requires that.

But going to college and learning to think are not precisely the same thing. The pages of history have been brightened by the names of boys who never got to college, but became great thinkers nevertheless. Abraham Lincoln for one. Jesus Christ for another.

The day may come, and it will be a great day if it does, when every child will be able to obtain all the education he can hold. But in this rich country we haven't yet made certain that every child shall have even the beginning of an education. For some there are literally no schools. The schools are only for the fortunate. Now we propose to double the good fortune of the fortunate.

It doesn't seem to conform to the ideal of democracy we are voicing to the world. It is about as democratic as the draft system that operated in the North during the Civil War. Then the parents of a boy who had been drafted could buy a substitute for him, if they had $150. Now they can obtain his deferment by sending him to college. They can if he is just reasonably bright.

The bald fact is that this country must either be a democracy or something else.

The new system of selection revised for our fighting forces seems perfectly designed to make it something else.

Service of the Forty-fifth Division, and Comment on General MacArthur

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release I issued yesterday regarding the use of the personnel of the Forty-fifth Division, and also commenting on General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary of the Army Pace has assured me that there is no plan to use the personnel of the Forty-fifth Division for combat relief in the Army rotation program just announced for Korea.

With Oklahoma's National Guard bound for Japan, I have received a good many queries as to whether their possible movement to Korea might be hastened by the

new rotation system which will bring home a good many of our fighting men. The answer is "No," according to Secretary Pace.

Replacements for that program will come in the future, as in the past, from training centers in this country. Secretary Pace is very much aware that divisional morale and tradition has far too great a value to be damaged by breaking up the Forty-fifth in any way.

Secretary Pace reiterates that the division will first complete its training. If and when it does move, the entire division will go together. No units or individuals will be withdrawn for replacements or other uses, it was stated.

The Secretary of the Army tells me again that there is still no plan to use the Forty-fifth for other than occupational purposes in Japan. However, any plan is always subject to change upon the decision of the theater commander, who is ———? Who is ———? Oh, yes; his name is MacArthur.

And speaking of General MacArthur, I should like to add his name to my list of letter writers who need the writer's cramps.

As the big chief in the Far East, General MacArthur is said to wear many hats to represent his many titles. But he isn't satisfied with all that big brass on his head. Now he is trying to grab the high silk topper of the diplomat. I must say it looks inappropriate with his military uniform.

With our Oklahoma boys assigned to the Far East, I have an added concern for what is happening out there. How can our general welfare be served by General MacArthur's open disregard of superior authority, his failure to cooperate with his own Government or promote harmony with our allies?

I'm not denying that he is still MacArthur the Magnificent, but I think the prolonged performance of his one-man act is wearing the patience of the rest of the team mighty thin.

In fact, it is getting about as threadbare as the general's much-touted oriental prestige. The time may be nearer than we think when the over-all cost of keeping MacArthur as the theater commander will be greater than the value of his position with the Asiatics.

Sometimes I fear that parts of what MacArthur is doing could get us deeper into war instead of successfully ending the one we are already in.

There seems to be a new wave of argument and confusion as to our specific purposes in Korea. The answer is very definite and very simple: Our aim wherever we are and in whatever we do is peace. We do not seek to go beyond that. Under no circumstances can we afford to stop short of it.

While we are conducting the Korean campaign on its present basis, it would be nothing short of insanity to take any action that might provoke an all-out conflagration. Our efforts must continue to limit the conflict in every possible way in the hope of achieving peace at the earliest possible moment.

Again, I repeat, our aim is more peace and less war.

Appropriation for Federal Civil Defense Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished and alarmed by the severe slashing of more than 75 percent from the first appropriation for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as reported in the third supplemental appropriations bill of the House for 1951.

There is no question that this action of the Appropriations Committee will have grave, if not fatal, consequences to the civil-defense program throughout the Nation, as well as to our entire security program. This action by the House committee will set the civil-defense program back at least 6 months even if all the funds are restored. The States and the cities and their people have been waiting to see if this Congress lives up to the serious responsibilities which it laid down for itself in the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. Now we have solidified public apathy by our own actions.

In the States, governors have been urging their legislatures to provide funds and machinery to take advantage of such Federal aid as might become available under our law, as well as for their own administration of civil defense. With one eye on the apparently healthy Korean situation of the past few weeks, most of these State legislatures have held off waiting to see what we were going to do. As of today, 28 of them are still in session and must be dismayed and disgusted with the news they received from Washington last Friday.

This Nation and this Congress willingly spend billions of dollars for munitions in the military services and yet the Congress refuses to provide even a token protection of the home front which makes a military war effort possible.

This Appropriations Committee report reduces the Civil Defense Agency to a small advisory group, with no real means of helping States and cities get ready to help themselves, except by training some trainers and distributing a few pamphlets. This action negates the whole principle of civil defense, as it was thoroughly understood by the House Armed Services Subcommittee last December, and as it was understood by the full committee.

The Federal responsibility in civil defense goes far beyond the distribution of educational material and the training of State and local training supervisors, plus a meager amount for equipment and shelter facilities. One of the fundamental principles is that the Federal Government shall assist the States by contributions to build up their ability to meet enemy attack, and keep the production line going, to the end that our military forces may continue to receive the support they need in the prosecution of a war.

In the early spring of 1950 the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of both Houses began exhaustive executive hearings on the civil defense problem. The record of that testimony shows that the National Security Resources Board, then in charge of civil defense by Executive order, was making realistic progress in preparing a program to protect the lives and property and production of 150,000,000 American people.

The reports of the joint committee hearings and those which followed in the Senate and House Armed Services Committee are grim records of the realities of civil defense.

Because civil defense was recognized as a key of our security program, members of the Eighty-first Congress reacted in a sound and wise fashion by passing with one dissenting vote, Public Law 920—the Civil Defense Act of 1950.

In the declaration of policy for that act it says flatly "it is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a plan of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack." The remainder of that act, which grants widespread powers and delegations of authority to the civil defense authorities at the Federal, State, and local levels, is a tribute to the Congress because it met the vast civil-defense problem by significant action.

Now, I must point out that we are ridiculing the policies of this Congress and hoodwinking the American people by this ruthless elimination of funds for a soundly conceived program to protect our entire home front.

Fundamentally, what the action of the House Appropriations Committee does is tell the Civil Defense Administration that it can plan for a disaster but that it can have virtually no means to prepare for that emergency.

I ask you to give serious consideration to the program activities which are wiped out by the action of the Appropriations Committee.

The entire civil defense research and development program in a field which the Appropriations Committee admits is full of unanswered problems, has been completely eliminated.

A. The entire program for blood plasma and blood substitute research has been wiped out.

B. The committee action grants the Civil Defense Agency $75,000,000 for shelter construction. Then the committee denies its own statement that the answers have not been found to the shelter problem by refusing to grant any money to the administration for shelter research, both on existing structures and on actual tests of American-type shelters which must be made under atomic blasts.

C. The action of the House committee effectively eliminates further progress in our defenses against biological warfare.

D. Funds have also been eliminated for the development of a badly needed hospital mobilization and operation plan for wartime disasters.

E. One of the major responsibilities of the Federal Government as set forth in Public Law 920 is the provision of substantial stockpiles of civil defense emergency materials to be used in the case of disaster by the States and cities. Principal among these materials for Federal stockpiling, as recognized by the Eighty-first Congress, were a large number of medical supplies, including first aid items, first-aid station supplies, medical and surgical instruments for emergency treatment of casualties, mobile laboratories for detection purposes, vaccines for immunization against biological warfare, blood-transfusion equipment, blood substitutes and blood plasma, Geiger counters and other radiological

safety instruments, and a number of other such crucial items.

Without these items in adequate stockpile in advance of attack the Congress recognized in Public Law 920 that the casualty rate in event of attack on our cities would be severely higher. Yet the committee eliminated all funds for such stockpiling.

I will not take the time of the House to discuss in detail the various reductions which have been made by the Appropriations Committee. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks for the RECORD and by such means will comment upon the committee report point by point. Some of the statements made in this report are manifestly unfair.

I am mystified to note in the report by the House Appropriations Committee that "the committee is rather amazed at the approach the Civil Defense Administration appears to be taking with reference to these activities." A little more study of the problem would have indicated that nothing could have been a more contrary statement of fact.

I particularly want to take issue with the so-called nebulous nature of the civil-defense warning system which the committee said had been coordinated "only slightly" with the military forces.

Contrary to the committee report, the Defense Department, and particularly the Air Force, have testified repeatedly that there is absolutely not "a wholly adequate and efficient civilian attack warning system" in the Air Force or anywhere else. The Air Force testified before the Armed Services Committees that it desired that civil defense take over the public warning phase of the Nationwide warning system. The fact has been widely known and understood in the Congress for many months. The Air Force has flatly testified that it has not the personnel nor the funds, nor does it seek the responsibility of handling the civil air-raid-warning program. In this connection, may I also comment that the recognition by the Appropriations Committee to the Defense Department that it make every effort to expand the present radar system is a sound one. May I point out, however, that radar does not alert the public. No matter how well the Defense Department improved its radar system it would be absolutely useless for public warning unless there is established now, under the Civil Defense Administration, in coordination with the Air Force, a wholly adequate public warning system.

During the past year, whenever the headlines in Korea took a turn for the worse, the States and the cities and the public and the press exerted a great deal of pressure on the Congress and on the executive department to do something about civil defense. That "doing something about civil defense" was meant in the sense of doing something honest and concrete and in the magnitude of the problem. No token gesture was called for. But I must say that the action of the House Appropriations Committee is literally and psychologically not even a token gesture for the protection of the home front through the civil-defense program.

We learned from bitter experience in World War II, and then from Korea, that preparedness and mobilization are not faucets that can be turned on and off at the whim of any morning's headline. Despite the fact that we should have learned that lesson we are acting entirely contrary to it in this rash handling of the civil defense program.

I ask you not to be misled by the fact that the total suggested appropriation is $186,000,000; $100,000,000 of that is locked up by a provision of the bill which provides that it can be used only when a civil defense emergency is declared. In terms of modern warfare, that means after the bombs have fallen—when it will be of no value.

If the remainder of 1951 is our period of greatest danger from enemy action, as the committee report states, we are saying in effect to the American people that nothing can be done for you right now. After the bombs fall and there are casualties by the hundreds of thousands we will be very pleased to furnish $100,000,000 in cash as substitutes for blood and blood plasma, for monitoring instruments, and for innoculations against biological and chemical warfare. I am certain it will provide a great deal of comfort to the public to know that instead of the things they will need immediately for those who survive an enemy attack, our Congress will be happy to provide them with dollar bills instead of bandages and blood.

We have been accused for the past several years of "government by crisis." Certainly the history of civil defense in the past year shows just that. We have blown hot and cold on it in direct proportion to the criticality of the international situation. If this big enemy push that is being predicted should come to pass with all the forces that we are told are massed in North Korea and Manchuria, you will be hearing from home again on the subject of "Why didn't you do something about civil defense?"

I urge that we stop this backing and filling and make up our minds that we were right last January when we authorized an all out civil defense program for this country. As long as there is the faintest threat of war we will need a strong and well organized home front defense. We will not get it by starving it to death while it is just getting started.

The public impact of this action by the House Appropriations Committee can hardly be retrieved by any action of the Congress. Looking back on our past history I can believe that it is precisely in the pattern that an enemy would ask of this Nation—the graver the crisis, the more inadequate the action by the Federal Government. I feel certain that such an action by the Appropriations Committee and by this Congress is aid and comfort to the enemy of the highest order.

Summary of House action

Program	Original request	House action
Fire-fighting services	$6,840,000	----------
Warden service	2,773,000	----------
Engineering services	11,330,000	----------
Transportation services	1,500,000	----------
Rescue service	500,000	----------
Warning and communications system:		
Organizational equipment	5,521,000	[1] [2] $110,000
Operating costs	237,000	
Reserve supply operations	2,058,000	----------
Medical services:		
Organizational equipment	13,850,000	----------
Stockpile	61,761,000	----------
Operating costs	27,000	----------
Welfare service	15,426,000	----------
Training and education	787,000	[3] 890,000
Research and development	3,875,000	0
Executive direction	1,515,000	750,000
Shelter and protective facilities	250,000,000	[1] 80,000,000
Procurement fund	25,000,000	5,000,000
Emergency fund	0	100,000,000
Total	403,000,000	186,750,000

[1] Organizational equipment for communications provided in "Shelters and protective facilities" in the amount of $5,000,000.
[2] Equipment only.
[3] An increase of $103,000.

Status of State civil defense appropriations

1951 LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS

States:	
Now meeting	28
Adjourned	15
Meets next in 1952	5
Total	48

APPROPRIATIONS MADE—TOTALS

Administration	$3,892,485
Matching funds	29,769,600
Other: Stockpiling, emergency, and contingency	94,863,700
Total	128,525,785

APPROPRIATIONS PENDING—TOTALS

Administration	$8,378,085
Matching funds	21,614,185
Other: Stockpiling, emergency, and contingency	43,725,000
Total	73,717,270

TOTAL—APPROPRIATIONS MADE AND PENDING

Administration	$12,270,570
Matching funds	51,383,785
Other: Stockpiling, emergency, and contingency	138,588,700
Total	202,243,055

Government of Petroleum, by Petroleum, for Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, in Cleveland, Ohio, February 24, 1951, at the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make two and one-third pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HAROLD L. ICKES, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, FEBRUARY 24, 1951

GOVERNMENT OF PETROLEUM, BY PETROLEUM, FOR PETROLEUM

I appreciate this opportunity to speak before this convention of Americans for Democratic Action. Every citizen who is concerned that laws in the interest of the public welfare should be passed by the Congress and enforced by the executive and judicial branches of the Government knows pretty generally what the ADA has stood for in the past and he knows that it is good. He knows that he can have confidence that, if the ADA continues along the course that it has so far followed, it will be, in the future, as it is now, one of the greatest influences in the country in encouraging our Government to put the welfare and peaceful security of the people above all other considerations, especially personal, political considerations.

We have great problems to solve, not only internationally, as I need not tell you, but in the domestic field. We cannot afford, because of our concern and anxiety over what may happen in Europe, or what is happening today in Asia, to be indifferent to what is happening at home. Just as a pickpocket can employ his skill to the best advantage and with the greatest immunity to himself in a crowd whose necks are straining in an effort to see some curiously exciting object, so does a political crook know that he is safest in plying his even more obnoxious trade at home when the attention of the people is monopolized in the direction of Russia or China or Korea where American troops are fighting or may be called upon to fight.

With this in mind, I shall discuss with you today the subject of oil—off-shore oil, tidelands oil—federally owned oil that has already been discovered in vast quantities and rich quality off the shores of California, Texas, and Louisiana, with prospects of finding more along the seacoasts of other States. In addition, there is an almost certainty of discovering, on the Continental Shelf, lying seaward of the Pacific Coast, unpredictable quantities after the technicians have developed ways and means for discovering and capturing it. The considerations have persuaded me in considering what to talk about today to fall back on the subject of oil, upon which I have had something to say in the past, and as to which I may have more to say in the future. One inducement to talk about oil is the fact that, as was expected, there has been introduced in the Eighty-second Congress a Senate joint resolution which seems to consider, first, the interests of the private oil industry, and, second, the coastline States.

In the apparent nature of an afterthought, there is a suggestion that perhaps the people of the United States who own these offshore oil lands, according to the United States Supreme Court, may also have an interest which should be given some recognition. I have been referring to Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, introduced on January 18 by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, for himself and Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a resolution upon which hearings have already been held by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Then, on the morning of February 15, when I was reading, at the breakfast table, my copy of the Washington Post, which I am sure you will agree with me is one of the outstanding and most reliable newspapers in the United States, my eye was struck by a headline on the front page: "Army Studies Lower Draft Standards." The article itself was under the byline of Sam Stavisky, with whose name in connection with responsible stories, readers of the Post have become accustomed. The subhead was to the effect that "two new methods would be applied to those who flunk intelligence tests." The first paragraph of the lead announced: "The Army has under study two plans for lowering induction standards for draft-age men who fail the mental qualification test, it was learned yesterday."

"One approach would permit the induction of a percentage of substandard selectees, as fixed or suggested by Congress."

"The other approach would allow the induction of virtually any physically-fit man who knew his right hand from his left."

Omitting several intervening paragraphs, I came to the concluding one: "In World War II, mental standards for induction were progressively lowered. After failing the standard test, the draftee was given a literary examination, a test by pantomime (whatever that may mean), and then an individual psychiatrical test before being rejected as useless to the Army. The wartime bottom-of-the-barrel mental rejection rate was 8 to 9 percent, or one out of four of all draftees rejected."

I confess that there was nothing in this article to make me thrust out my chest in my pride at being an American. However, I did feel that I would like to do something to help in a distressing and almost unbelievable situation. So I began to look up other facts and figures. I discovered, what you probably already know, and that is that the percentage of our total adult population, of less than 4 years of schooling in the United States, amounts to 13.5 percent. This percentage ranges from 8.3 percent in the West to 22.9 percent in the South and 10.1 percent in the North. Glancing down the lists of the States, one discovers a 4.1 percent illiteracy in Iowa, which jumps and dodges to a high of 35.7 percent in Louisiana. It appears that 4 years of school, or less, is generally considered the jumping-off place of literacy by the armed services.

Considering the percentages of adult illiteracy in the population of various countries, we find that Finland is the most literate of all, with an average of illiteracy of only one-tenth of 1 percent. It could well be that the intellectual qualities of the Finns have had something to do with their willingness to fight for their liberty even against that monster that dwells in the Kremlin as well as their knowledge of how most effectively to do this.

The United States measures literacy by asking a person if he is literate. This might be regarded as self-serving testimony in connection with which I suggest that there might properly be a preliminary question which would be, "Do you know what literate means?" My guess would be that such a question would cause confusion in the minds of at least some who are ready to vouch for their own literacy. The illiteracy of the United States, which I have quoted as being 13.5 percent of the adult population, really means the percentage of that population with less than 4 years of schooling. In truth, in these days in the United States, an adult with less than 4 years of schooling would hardly rate as literate by any realistic standard.

It cannot be determined by statistics whether a man can be a brave and intelligent soldier, whether literate or illiterate. There have been fine soldiers who could not read or write, just as there have been highly educated ones who do better in the classroom than on a battlefield. However, there is nothing for Americans to be proud of in the fact that the percentage of our adult population with less than 4 years of schooling, amounts to 13.5 percent. No one could deny that even a good soldier might be a better one if he had a better education. He would have a better opportunity to know what he is fighting for. Least of all, can we be proud of our too high a degree of illiteracy when we consider that a citizen in a country that is self-governing needs, above all other things, intelligence based upon an adequate education in order to qualify him to be the kind of a citizen that we can depend upon to understand our institutions and be willing to fight for them.

The trouble with our educational system is that we have allowed it to become run down at the heel. We have money to spend for other things, and we spend it, in large measure, at the expense of our children. Of course, no child can go from an underprivileged home where he does not have enough to eat or wear or enough heat to keep him warm and expect him to compete on an equal basis with children from homes where such conditions do not prevail. At the very least, we ought to give underprivileged children the chance to acquire an education, because that is the surest way of eventually improving the economic and social conditions of our down-at-the-heel residential areas, both urban and rural. We are willing to tax ourselves for roads. We are willing to buy automobiles even when we cannot afford them and the gasoline at the continuously rising prices with which to operate them. Why read if one can go to a movie? Why pick up a book or a serious magazine when it takes time from comic strips? We have money to spend lavishly on war which is the greatest waste of money conceivable. We even have money to pour into the "operation rat hole" operated by Chiang Kai-shek, whether hiding out on Formosa or not. We are finding money to hand out to the Fascist dictator of Spain, Franco. His impoverished and half-starved country does not have sufficient credit to borrow from private sources, the money that he wants to squander on his spoon-fed army, but there in the background is the United States Treasury, out of which, not only he, but his fellow dictator—Salazar of Portugal—have received, and still expect to receive, millions upon millions of dollars, not for education, but to maintain themselves in power and to keep satisfied greedy and corrupt retainers who make it possible for the dictators to use their ill-begotten power to oppress the people and deny them any semblance to liberty.

There is wealth enough in this country to educate every child up to the limit of his capacity to acquire and use that education. Beyond that point, I would not go, even if I had all the money in the world. But we have been as careless with our wealth as we have about the education and welfare of our underprivileged children and even of those children who come from middle-class homes and who have to depend, for their primary education at least, upon schools built and maintained by the taxpayers. Recently, the Supreme Court told us on six separate occasions that the offshore oil lands, especially those off of the coast of California, Texas, and Louisiana, belong to all of the people. Until the decision in the case of the United States of America against California which was orginally instituted by your outstanding national chairman, Francis Biddle, when he was Attorney General, we suddenly found ourselves in possession of mineral wealth in the form of petroleum, the value of which can hardly be estimated. Dr. E. L. De Golyer, of Dallas, Tex., probably the most outstanding petroleum geologist of the United States or even

of the world, wrote an article for Life, a little over a year ago, in which he estimated that there might be ten and a half billion barrels of oil along the Texas and Louisiana coasts alone. This figure did not include California, Mississippi, Florida, or any other coast-line State along which oil has been or may be discovered. Other estimates are lower than that of Dr. De Golyer, but, on the contrary, there is one that holds out the hope that there may be perhaps one thousand billion barrels under the 10,000,000 square miles of ocean bottom that constitutes the various Continental Shelves of the world.

It is interesting to know that the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, which, generally speaking, is conservative in its estimates, thinks that there may be 13,000,000,000 barrels on the Continental Shelf adjoining Texas and Louisiana, with an additional 2,000,000,000 barrels lying seaward of the coast of California. This would make 15,000,000,000 barrels within the projected boundaries of the United States, rather than the De Golyer estimate of 10,500,000,000 barrels. Let us regard the Geological Survey estimate of 15,000,000,000 barrels along the Texas, Louisiana, and California coasts and ignore all other estimates or possibilities. After all speculation on the basis of 1,000,000,000,000 barrels, or even of one-tenth of that number, might be so fantastic as to be confusing, to the average mind.

The average price of crude oil today is $2.56 a barrel. On the basis of this price, the 15,000,000,000 barrels of the Geological Survey would reach the enormous sum of $38,400,000,000. This is better than a tidy sum, and it might grow beyond imagination if a greater quantity of oil should ultimately be discovered or if the price, as the result of increased demand, should go even higher. Those of you who have to buy food and clothing and shelter should be grateful for the bargain prices that you pay due to the prompt action of the Government in cutting them back; or have Washington officials only promised to cut them back sometime, somehow? In any event, the cost of petroleum and its products is continuing to rise along with an increasing demand that has become so large that it cannot now be satisfied by the crude oil produced domestically. As I predicted in a magazine article some years ago, considerably before the event, we are now, on balance, an importing nation as to petroleum, and therefore no longer an exporting nation.

If this wealth belongs to the United States, why should not all of the States share it in proportion to population and need? New Mexico has an illiteracy rate, according to the Army standards, of 27.3 percent, yet we find the junior Senator from that State joining forces with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, which has a more fortunate illiteracy rate, to enrich the oil companies, as well as the Coastal States, and give as little as possible to the United States, including the State of New Mexico.

South Carolina, with a 34.7 percent illiteracy rate, to say nothing of Mississippi, which is 30.2 percent illiterate, certainly need more money for their schools. We cannot develop evenly as a nation, or even regard each other with that degree of affection and respect that makes for a homogeneous citizenship, if such a large proportion in some States are in the classification of "poor relation" as compared with others in the more fortunate States of Oregon, Idaho, Maine, and Minnesota.

Or, if we don't want to spend any part of this money on education, why not hold it in reserve for the use of our Armed Forces? Compare our fortunate situation, with respect to oil, with that of Russia. Some of us look under the bed every night before turning in in the full expectation of finding at least one Russian Communist armed to the beard. We spend much valuable time, that could be put to better use, wondering, not whether Stalin is going to strike, but when. In doing so, we overlook entirely the fact that a modern war cannot be waged without oil and there is not sufficient oil within the vast domains of the Russian empire to justify the risk of going to war when the United States would be the principal opponent. What defeated Hitler and Mussolini, particularly, and to a lesser degree, Japan, in the last war, was their lack of oil as compared with our comparative plentitude. So there is much to be said for setting up an Armed Forces reserve out of these oil-rich lands of which we find ourselves the fortunate possessors.

Or, there is the matter of the national debt. The gross public debt today stands at $255,900,000,000. Rather, this was the figure as of February 12, 1951. My suspicion is that, without even having taken a good long breath, the public debt is going to begin to grow again. Astronomical figures could beget astronomical figures. How about applying some of the wealth that will accrue to us from our oil to reducing the public debt? Certainly, those American citizens who were persuaded by their patriotic enthusiasm to buy E bonds would like to see something done to restore the dollar at least to the value approximating what it was when they bought these bonds.

Here are two other alternatives that can be proposed for giving ourselves the benefits that we are entitled to have from our ownership of petroleum. However, I come back again to the thesis that the best use to which we could put this money would be for education. A democracy needs education, as the human body does air and a good circulation. Without an education, which, after all, must be paid for, we are defrauding our children of their very birthright, their most valuable possible asset. I have suggested in the past, and I propose again, that the Federal Government create a trust out of these offshore oil lands modeled on the Rockefeller Foundation which, by comparison with the Federal investment, would become a dwarf. Here would be a huge sum of money increased as probable new discoveries of oil would be made that would be beyond the budget and would not have to be supported by Federal taxation. If wisely administered by competent officials under carefully drawn legislation, this would supply the people with the education that is particularly essential if our form of government is to endure.

The National Education Association, basing its estimate upon recent birthrate figures, has warned that by 1955, only 4 years away, the number of children waiting for admission to our public schools will be larger by seven millions than it was a year ago. Understandably, it asks, "How will this 30 percent increase—over the enrollment of 24,373,000 in 1948 to an estimated 31,393,000 in 1955—affect the already complicated problems of school finance and teacher supply?" Already there is a drastic shortage of teachers. According to an article some time ago in the New York Times, "Every State in the Union needs more qualified teachers." We can't get teachers, especially qualified teachers, for our children without paying them. We all know that inflation has hit those of our citizens who have to depend upon a fixed income, such as the teacher does upon his salary, even more than people who are in business and can raise prices to keep pace with the advance in costs. We have to have money to build new schools, as well as to maintain and improve old ones. Only money can buy the supplies necessary to educate our children and only money can pay for the lunches that are so essential, especially to undernourished children who have to sustain their bodies if they are to improve their minds.

One would have thought that the discovery of this vast new wealth would have inspired some degree of statesmanship in the Congress. One might have expected an enlightened and patriotic competition among statesmen to see what could be done with this unexpected and greatly appreciated wealth to advance the welfare of the people. Fortunately, there are some Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who are not willing to use this money for the further enrichment of those who already have more than is good for them, either as citizens or as Members of Congress. Instead of seriously considering how best to use this unexpected wealth to promote the public welfare, many Members of Congress act as if it were not income to be used for the benefit of the people but swag to be divided among freebooters.

One would expect a man like Senator MCCARRAN to deny benefits to the people of Nevada who have mistakenly elected him to the Senate time after time, but it is a surprising role in which Senator O'MAHONEY has cast himself. The Kerr gas bill of the last session of Congress was bad enough. Here was an unholy effort by greedy and selfish rich men, their lawyers and lobbyists, and others wholly subservient to the oil and gas interest to increase the price of natural gas. But even higher prices for natural gas would not have been nearly so bad for the Nation as that money that should accrue to the Federal Treasury for the equitable benefit of all of our citizens should be diverted to States that have already profited inequitably out of public property to the detriment of people in less fortunately situated States and to grasping, selfish, and not always too scrupulous oil interests with which to increase their own emoluments and give larger dividends to their stockholders.

I challenge anyone to show at any point along the long corridor of history such improvidence, waste, and outright thievery as can be read in the bold-face type in which the chronicle of the ruthless development and use of American oil has been written. American oil companies, generally speaking, have no feeling of deference for their Government and show no consideration to the American people. It is a case of grabbing while the grabbing is good. When it comes to foreign countries these interests do act with some degree of consideration, but that is because they have to. Four American companies, to cite only one example, Standard of California, Standard of New Jersey, Socony Vacuum, and Texas, operating as the Arabian-American Oil Co., pay into the Treasury of King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia 50 percent of the net profits after making allowance for customs duties and taxes. Compare this return with the paltry royalties exacted in this company by the States or Nation from oil companies operating under concessions. To be sure, King Ibn-Saud is only an ill-educated absolute monarch in a desert land where his downtrodden subjects are little better than serfs. But he knows how to bring the powerful and arrogant American oil companies to heel while our policy is to try to smother them with favors and add to their fat, perhaps in the hope that they may die of their own obesity. We simply do not have the heart to refuse them extra helpings of dessert while throwing a thin dry crust to the underprivileged people of America, some of whom have the absurd idea that, to some degree at least, our natural resources, and especially petroleum, should be so managed that our institutions may receive a greater benefit from them than they have been vouchsafed in the past. If Saudi Arabia had such an intelligent government as the United States, the oil companies that I have mentioned would receive more lenient treatment. They would be

allowed by King Ibn-Saud to live in the manner to which they are accustomed in the United States. They would be required to be satisfied to pay more meager royalties. Least of all, would they be expected to pay such meager royalties. Least of all, would they be expected to share their profits in any percentage, let alone on a practically 50-percent basis. On the contrary, they would exact of the King a generous allowance for depletion because, after all, he cannot guarantee for all time to come to renew his oil resources so that the lessee companies may continue to accrue more and more profits.

There may be instances when Members of Congress, who have investments in oil or who represent oil interests, either as lawyers or in some other capacity, who have been able to consider objectively, and from the point of view of the public interest, bills introduced in Congress for the benefit of the oil industry. However, at the moment, I cannot call the name of any such Member. The oil companies are the most favored among American industries. When they operate on public lands, they pay an average royalty per barrel of about 12½ percent. Of this, 37½ percent goes to the State in which the oil is produced, 52½ percent into the reclamation fund, while a bare 10 percent dribbles into the Federal Treasury. On some State-owned lands, such as in California, they pay higher royalties, but in no instance do they pay as much as they do to King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia. While taking the riches out of the earth that were put there by the Creator for the benefit of all, the oil interests demand that the United States Treasury make them a depletion allowance in their income-tax returns of a mere 27½ percent. President Truman has pointed out the iniquity of such a tax and it is indeed iniquitous. It amounts to a subsidy paid out of the United States Treasury to the oil interests that we already are allowing to exploit, for private profit, this great natural wealth. It is a charge collected from the Government to pay the expenses of the companies in exploring for more petroleum to exploit for their own private profit. It would require a Gilbert and Sullivan to do justice to a cynical situation that has in it more sadness than humor.

What is the answer to the question, "Why do the oil companies have such potent influence in Congress?" That is indeed an easy one. The answer is campaign contributions; newspaper and magazine display advertising running into the millions of dollars every year; high retainers paid to influential lawyers; and funds supplied heedlessly for expensive and far-flung lobbies. In connection with the stupendous sums paid for advertising by the oil companies, it should be borne in mind (1) that little, if any, advertising is required to stimulate a market of eager buyers; (2) that probably we are on the verge of a scarcity of gasoline which may require rationing and which already has required a reduction in quality; (3) that the companies charge their advertising as expenses of doing business so that in reality they are paid, if not in whole, at least in large part, by the United States Treasury. We taxpayers are making allowances to the oil interests out of their income taxes which they use to build up public favor with the press in return for which, as a whole, the newspapers of the United States today are so little critical of the oil interests that they will not even print the news if it is regarded as being even slightly adverse. They go further and lower soundproof curtains around any man who insists that further favors be denied this already greatly pampered private interest.

One is tempted to paraphrase the great utterance of Abraham Lincoln's, "Ours is a Government of petroleum, by petroleum, for petroleum."

Grazing Problems of Blackfeet Indians of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, during the past few months a situation has arisen on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana which has been a source of great concern to me. The members of the Blackfeet Tribe had protested action by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in issuing grazing permits for the use of some Indian land over the objections of the Blackfeet Tribal Council. This council had adopted several resolutions—all by unanimous votes—withholding consent to such sales of grazing permits. The Indians contended that the action of the Bureau was in defiance of the Federal laws requiring the "consent of the tribe" before such transactions could be effected.

Adding to the friction between the Blackfeet Tribe and the Indian Bureau were several other points of contention, one of which was a proposed increase by the Indian Bureau in the minimum grazing fees for allotted Indian lands, which would have been very injurious to the Indians who engaged in the raising of livestock on a limited scale. This proposed increase, while it might not have been disadvantageous to large-scale livestock men, could easily have made it impossible for many Indians to bid on grazing permits because of the prohibitive fees.

On these issues, an appeal was recently submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for a determination on all questions. I am happy to say that a final decision favorable to the Indians has just been made, and it is indeed gratifying to me to know that the Indian Bureau will no longer lease Blackfeet tribal lands without tribal consent, and that hereafter Blackfeet Indian range users will be exempt from all restrictions not applied to non-Indians.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an unusually well-informed comment on the Blackfeet problem which appeared recently in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

BLACKFEET ON THE WARPATH

It has been many a year since the Blackfeet Indians of Montana have been in the news. In the newspapers of a hundred years ago and less they were in them all too frequently, as all who ran up against them agreed. What brings them back into the news today is no exploring party wiped out, no wagon train waylaid, no Army fort attacked, but a simple and chronic quarrel between Indians and whites, over the use of Indian lands for grazing. That's the very place where many a good western movie has begun. The Indian Bureau, so the Blackfeet tribal council says, is violating the law by issuing grazing permits for the use of Indian land without tribal consent. The chairman of the council further adds that the Indian Bureau "is doing its best to stir up an old-fashioned cowboy and Indian war."

BLACKFEET FOR BUFFALO

A century ago the Blackfeet were one of the leading plains tribes of Indians. They and their fathers before them camped and hunted from the north Saskatchewan to the headwaters of the Missouri, over thousands of miles of land, pitching their circular tents wherever the buffalo might be, as unrooted as the wind of the prairies. They were a warlike people and famous for their horsemanship. By their own folklore they were an ancient people; the sun had been their mentor. It was the sun who told one ancestor how he might best catch buffalo, by rubbing his feet with a black medicine. From that prescription came the tribal name.

THE ROAD WEST

The Blackfeet could defend their range, far up into Canada and as far south as the Great Salt Lake, against invasion by other tribes, and they tried to defend it against the invasion of the white man. They were one of the hazards to any exploration of the Northwest. Time and again the explorers' chronicles of a century ago include the line, "• • • then we were attacked by the Blackfeet." They might hold their range against the Crow and the Assiniboine, but they lost out against the white man. In 1855 they were pushed onto a reservation that ran from the Continental Divide to the Dakotas. Once cornered there, the white man used two lethal weapons against them—the whisky bottle and control over food supplies as the number of buffalo decreased. During the winter of 1883, when Government rations to the Blackfeet were reduced, more than 600 died.

TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE SQUARE MILES

Today the few thousand remaining Blackfeet live on their reservation in the northwest corner of the State, by the little town of Browning. The whole tribe owns 2,343 square miles of land, much of it of little value; the average family has about 400 acres. The Blackfeet garden a bit and raise a few cattle. Many of them have gone to Indian schools and speak much better English than the passing tourist who believes that the one universal phrase among all Indians is "Heap big chief, ugh." Over the years their huge reservation has been whittled away from them—often, to be sure, at a price. They were eventually paid $450,000 for land taken from them by Executive orders of Presidents Grant and Hayes. They got another $1,500,000 for the eastern part of Glacier National Park, which was cut out of their reservation. Some of that money went for irrigation, the rest for avocation. Today they receive some income as royalty payments from nearby oil wells.

A NEW WEAPON

Times change. Faced with what they considered encroachment on their lands a century ago, they would have come riding in silently on the usurpers by night. The rosy dawn would have shown not one live Indian for miles around, nor one live usurper. Today it is different. The chairman of the Blackfeet Tribal Council tells reporters of the wrongs he feels being done to his people. "The Indian Bureau," he says, "is fooling some cattlemen and sheepmen by telling them that the Blackfeet Council has consented to grazing permits, when, in fact, the council has adopted several resolutions, all by unanimous vote, withholding consent."

Resolutions? Unanimous vote? Withholding consent? Instead of answering with arrow, tomahawk, or Winchester stolen from an Army fort on the upper Big Horn, the Blackfeet today do battle armed with Robert's Rules of Order.

The Visit of the President of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by one of our great journalists, Anne O'Hare McCormick, printed in the New York Times of April 4. There are many who feel that Mrs. McCormick's columns show more insight into the problems of our foreign policy than those of any other journalist. This column appeals to me not merely because I was so deeply impressed and emotionally moved by President Auriol's speech to the joint session of Congress, but also because my father spent most of his life as a professor of romance languages and a teacher of French, and Mrs. McCormick reminds me of my boyhood when my father and mother gave me undying respect for the French people and the great and unrivalled traditions of French culture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABROAD—THE STARS AND STRIPES AND THE TRICOLOR

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

This week New York rolled out the red carpet and waved the flags for the visit of the President of the French Republic. It was not a perfunctory welcome. New Yorkers like to see the Tricolor and the Stars and Stripes flying side by side in the windy canyons of our town. The red, white and blues make a different pattern, but they have a special kinship, evoking memories of the time when the oldest existing great republics were young together, and stirred by the same revolutionary dream.

New York liked the glimpses it had of the smiling face of the President and the tone of the speeches he made on so many occasions. They were variations of the same theme, but a theme developed with deep sincerity, with a delightfully Gallic blend of wit and seriousness, and with such feeling that, though he spoke in French, listeners who did not know the language understood what he meant.

Nor was M. Auriol a perfunctory visitor. Overworked as he was in days crowded with receptions, dinners, functions of all kinds, he appeared to enjoy the whirl he was given. He was as enthusiastic and exclamatory about New York, "the audacious, the organizer, the generous, the ever-changing," as if he had not come from the city that all Frenchmen, and most other people, regard as the matchless mistress of all cities.

INSTABILITY VERSUS CHANGE

He seemed to like being here, in short. So did Mme. Auriol, and the response to this show of pleasure in our company demonstrated a rather touching fact about the United States. It shows that we feel the need to be assured that we have friends as much as other people—perhaps more, for it is doubtful if any great power before us cared so much for the opinion of others. We are so rich and self-sufficient that it is hard for allies to understand that we yearn to be loved, too. It is true, nevertheless. In bringing the two countries closer together M. Auriol gave as much as he received.

Certainly he labored hard, and successfully, to make France better understood. Before he left Paris he spent weary days and nights patching up a political crisis, and he goes back to face another. The present Government was formed to prepare for elections that cannot be postponed much longer, but for this reason it is peculiarly vulnerable to the jockeying for position of the various parties as well as to the pressure of the mounting inflation that shakes every other government. Yet M. Auriol has been at pains to point out that the constant shifts of administration that mark the course of the Fourth Republic—and the Third, for that matter—are not as significant as its continuity of policy. In his address at the mayor's dinner at the Waldorf he quoted a French writer to the effect that "under the appearances of instability there are no changes in our country, whereas in certain other countries under the appearance of stability there are changes."

It is true that under a succession of weak and precarious governments France has managed to find and maintain a middle-of-the-road course since the war. The Communists have been kept out of power and the balance between right and left has somehow been preserved. Only two Ministers, Georges Bidault and Robert Schuman, both of the same party, have directed foreign policy, with the result that it has followed a firmer and more consistent line than our own. In his attitude toward Germany, M. Schuman has not been diverted by the divagations of the United States and Britain. He has stuck stoutly to the thesis that the Schuman plan for pooling coal and steel—which means putting under joint direction the war potential of France and Germany—is the precondition to any discussion of armament. The French can be accused of obstinacy or obstructionism in international affairs but not of changing their policy with changes of government.

CONTRASTING SYSTEMS

It is true also that Britain has staged a revolution since the war under the appearance of stability. Probably no other country in history has carried out so drastic an economic and social upheaval without a sign of disorder. For 6 years the Labor Government has been the steadiest in Europe; and while it cannot function much longer on a hairline margin, there will be no violent upset if it falls. But the contrast between the political habits and behavior of France and Britain does not alter the fact that the rotating teams at the top have not interrupted the remarkable progress of French recovery or altered the direction of policy. By some dangerous legerdemain (which they enjoy) the French manage to govern without government.

M. Auriol is the head of the state. Yet in spite of the President's clear and cogent explanations of a system in which he is the one sign of continuity, it is not political France that he suggests as he moves among us. Rather he is the typical "bonhomme" of a nation which has always been stronger than its government. He is the citizen whose language we understand without translation because he speaks the "lingua franca" of free men. When he says that this France can never be neutral in a battle for freedom we believe him because he expresses something that the excesses and corruptions of democracy cannot smother, something that echoes in our own minds and hearts. This is the bedrock of the enduring understanding between America and France; we are children of the same half-forgotten revolution, and M. Auriol has done much to reestablish the kinship.

What of Congress in Atomic War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of the atomic age is to anticipate the destruction of key Government officials through an atomic attack and to devise a means by which the Government can continue to operate effectively with as many constitutional safeguards as is possible. A thoughtful and provocative study on this subject has been made by Clinton Rossiter, of Cornell University, which I commend to the consideration of those who are concerned with this matter. Mr. Rossiter's article is as follows:

WHAT OF CONGRESS IN ATOMIC WAR?

(By Clinton Rossiter, Cornell University)

The people of the United States are bracing themselves reluctantly for the shock of atomic war. Within the limiting framework of American political and economic freedom, preparations are being made institutionally and psychologically for a catastrophe beyond imagination. Although the pace of preparation goes on more haltingly than this country's wisest heads would like, the Korean incident has speeded up noticeably the tempo of active (military) and passive (civil) defense.

I

It does not take too extravagant an imagination to outline the probable shape of the National Government in the event of atomic war—or, more specifically, in the event of an atomic attack upon the American continent at least as devastating as 15 or 20 Hiroshimas though not so devastating as to leave no cities to salvage or people to save. A look at our present institutions of government and a review of past national emergencies (especially the first weeks of the Civil War) should result in these hard but inevitable predictions:

1. The focus of government, to which all executive and military officials will look for authority, will be the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief. The first President, or acting President, to face atomic war will be a Lincoln 10 times over.

2. The top governing agencies—President, department heads, Chiefs of Staff, area commanders—will operate under a Nation-wide declaration of martial law.

3. The governors of the 48 States and their executive-military subordinates—National Guard commanders, mayors, county executives, chiefs of police—will likewise govern strongly, in cooperation with Federal officials.

4. If in the next few years permanent, effective organizations of civil defense are developed at the several levels of government, these too will join in the great emergency effort.

One way or another, government will be almost completely an executive-military affair, with the accent on law and order rather than on liberty and justice. The absolute weapon will have brought absolute government. These are dismal predictions that will stick in the throat of any free citizen of this Republic, but the facts of atomic war must be faced and must be called by their right names.

II

So much for the executive branch and its key office, the Presidency. But what of our other great political institution, the Congress of the United States? Where does the National Legislature fit into this pattern of strong and arbitrary government? Before answering this question properly, one even more challenging problem must be taken into consideration: Is there a place for Congress in all-out emergency government? Indeed, is it at all desirable to have a Congress in atomic war?

The answer should be an unhesitating yes—unless Americans are to despair of the vitality of constitutional government. The uses of a legislature in periods of extreme national emergency are almost inestimable, as the British House of Commons proved in 1940–41, and as we must believe the United States Congress would prove with similar force in a similar state of affairs.

If it is the President's special duty to make emergency government effective and powerful, it is the duty of the Congress to make such government responsible and constitutional. The great functions of Congress in time of peace—legislation, appropriation, criticism, control, investigation, education—are modified, but not rendered inoperative, in time of war, even atomic war. Most important, Congress is the only institution with the residual authority to break up the emergency concentration of powers in the executive branch.

The leading arguments of those who would dispense with Congress altogether in severe crises—that unity of purpose and performance must be achieved at all costs, and that Congress would be the fly in the ointment of harmony—were exploded quite convincingly in the first weeks of the Korean emergency. In time of unmistakable national danger Congress stands as ready as the President to forget politics, personalities, and the antipathies inherent in the American system of independent executive and legislative branches.

It is a difficult role that the legislature has to play in modern crisis government, but it is one that the stage managers of democracy will dispense with at their peril. The fact that the mark of constitutional democracy at peace is a robust legislative assembly is prima facie evidence that it ought to be maintained as far as practical in time of war. Congress should not carelessly be discarded as unfit for emergency service. There may be conditions of transient crisis when it can do no more than watch and wait, but watching and waiting has saved more than one free people from destruction. And certainly in any protracted emergency the dictates of constitutional government would seem to make imperative the continuous session of the Nation's representatives.

III

A major dilemma arises if the above-mentioned premises are accepted. On one hand, it is agreed that Congress has important, even indispensable, functions in the Government which will meet atomic attack. On the other hand, the probability must be faced that Congress will be prevented physically—that is, by atomic destruction—from sitting at Washington. It is an extremely difficult affair for a deliberative, multimembered group with an established place of doing business to move to another location under emergency conditions and continue to function effectively, or even legitimately. Perhaps more important—if one can imagine Congress meeting in Mammoth Cave, Sun Valley, or Senator BYRD's apple orchard—it is altogether possible that neither House could muster a quorum, thanks to several well-placed hits and the difficulties (under State legislation) of filling vacancies in Congress, especially in the House of Representatives. The United States might well be left for a considerable length of time without a legislature meeting the requirements of the Constitution.

The solution of this dilemma is as simple as it is unusual: the statutory creation of a joint interim committee of 15 or 20 leading Members of both Houses and parties. In time of acute national emergency this committee would come into existence automatically whenever Congress could not sit, and would go out of existence just as automatically when the two Houses were able to convene. This interim committee would be given a standing mandate to act for the whole Congress in the former situation and to report to the whole Congress in the latter. Although such a committee could not be constitutionally empowered to legislate in place of Congress, it could be granted both contingent authority to declare emergency laws in or out of effect and full powers of investigation and criticism.

This supercommittee would do away with the manifest inexpediency and confusion of 10 or 12 standing committees and 30 or 40 of their subcommittees looking for trouble all over the stricken Nation. With its relations to the President and the Department of Defense carefully blocked out, as an entire body and through subcommittees of its own it could attach itself to the agencies prosecuting the emergency government. Like Walter Gagehot's famous queen, the committee would assert "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn." Most important, it could recommend officially to the President the termination of martial law or of any other extraordinary emergency activity.

IV

Fifteen or 20 members of this committee would seem to be the largest number that could move around in a body and meet in one small room (or cave), the smallest number that would represent all important groups and interests in the American community and thus lend the Government the coalition character so essential in democratic emergency government. The personnel would have to be selected with excessive care. At least half the members would probably be ex-officio appointments—the Vice President (who could serve as chairman), the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the majority and minority floor leaders, and perhaps the ranking Members of the important standing committees. The remaining places would best be filled by a group of young, strong, able men of varying political and sectional backgrounds. Were such a committee of 20 being set up now, it might include Barkley, McKellar, Lucas, McMahon, Tydings, Taft, Vandenberg, Lodge, Wiley, Rayburn, McCormack, Vinson, Monroney, Kennedy, Martin, Case of New Jersey, Halleck, and three other outstanding younger Members of the House. Or perhaps some of the older men—such as Senators MCKELLAR and VANDENBERG—would have to give way to juniors with less prestige but more stamina. A line of succession 8 or 10 deep could be staked out for each place on the committee.

Obviously, this committee would be moving on untrodden ground. There is nothing in American, and less in European or Latin-American, experience to assure that an interim committee with virtually unlimited authority would operate successfully in so delicate a situation. The mere proposal of such a departure from our ancient ways presents perplexing constitutional, political, and moral difficulties. Yet, in the event of a novel type of national emergency the American political genius and the American constitutional system should both be sufficiently flexible to permit the erection of an equally novel legislative institution.

V

This proposal has been made in the most general terms, for it is a scheme that would have to be worked out with great deliberation and good will by the leaders of Congress and the President. The suggested interim committee, or something much like it, would be the one alternative to no Congress at all, and Americans would commit a serious mistake not to consider every feasible substitute before dispensing altogether with congressional authority in atomic war. With the bonds of civilized society loosened and unraveled, the President and his chief commanders may be forced to wield the most naked sort of power to hold the country together. In such an event, a tough-minded, able, independent committee not beholden to the President for continued existence would help mightily to keep his feet in the paths of democracy. Such an autonomous council would provide both the restraint and the support the President would find helpful in making his emergency regime effective and responsible.

Since it is to the particular interest of Congress to make its own authority felt in the event of atomic attack, it is plainly up to Congress to take the first step in this direction. The possibility of a joint interim emergency committee should be thoroughly explored in the Eighty-second Congress.

Proposed Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the proposed deferment of college students, recently published in the Port Washington Herald, of Port Washington, Wis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: AN ANSWER

"President Truman in a sweeping order Saturday authorized draft deferments for hundreds of thousands of college boys whose grades are good or who pass a special aptitude test."

Why?

To provide future leaders of this Nation? There is no doubt but what this country could stand some trained men at the helm. And neither is there any doubt but what college training is necessary for that task.

But is it fair to defer men who have an opportunity to attend college while those less privileged are to be drafted?

The argument is offered that the test is based on aptitude. If that is true, why can't these youths, who purportedly are the future leaders of the Nation, serve as all other men must do? And if these youths have this alleged superior ability, couldn't they resume their studies after their term of

service as was done after the second blood draining contest?

Or is it possible that life is so much more dear for these elite than for those of the common herd that it must be preserved?

The sweeping order is an ill concealed attempt to save the skins of those who have the financial opportunities to attend a university. It is a scheme whereby a youth, who is not a complete moron, can purchase immunity from service in the Armed Forces. What provision is made for the student, who through working for funds to finance his education, is forced to drop out one semester to build up his backlog. Regardless of his academic standing, he becomes eligible for induction.

If ever a violation of the Constitution was flaunted in the face of the American public, this order is that instance.

If money can protect some Americans, why not hire the Hessians and protect them all?

Why?

This question will be sent to Senators A. WILEY and J. MCCARTHY and Congressman VAN PELT.

Live Safely, Live Happily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, John G. Decker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Woodrow Decker, of Milo, Maine, the winner of the national speaking contest sponsored by an Omaha insurance company, came to Washington Thursday, April 5, to receive an award as the winner of the contest. He was accompanied by his coach, Mrs. Pauline Kelleher, a Milo high-school teacher of English and Latin, who as a hobby attempts to interest her students in entering all writing and speaking contests. She modestly said that was the first national contest any of her students ever won.

John Decker started this whirlwind contest in February of this year by winning at his own high-school contest with the delivery of the self-written address which I hold in my hand. He then went on to the State of Maine finals in Bangor, Maine, and as the winner of the Maine contest journeyed to New Hampshire, again to defeat the two other entries in the northern New England region. The next stop for the young orator was New York City, to compete with the finalists from the eight other United States regions. The happy ending is that John Decker won the national speaking contest, and as the winner receives a $1,000 scholarship to any college of his choice, and since John is a high-school senior, this scholarship is most opportune. His high school also receives a $1,000 award. The brief Washington visit was terminated Thursday afternoon at 3:30 as Vice President BARKLEY extended his congratulations.

With such talent and such financial assurance of his future, John Decker is a very lucky young man. I extend to him my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. Decker's oration makes very good reading, and I believe the Members of this body would enjoy it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVE SAFELY, LIVE HAPPILY

(By John G. Decker)

In my fancy, I have created the pleasant, average American town of Smithville, United States of America. It could be in California or Tennessee, or it could be in Maine. Children romp in the pleasant streets. Their merry shouts fill the crisp, autumn air. There is a flash of a careening car, a shriek of brakes and the car comes to a jerking stop—but too late. As the quickly gathered crowd raises the broken body of a child there arises a solemn and often heard murmur; "He was speeding."

It is a bright summer's day. On the shores of Lake Windermere, England's knight of speed, Sir Henry Seagrave, steps into his powerful twin-engined speed craft. He is strapped into the seat and the engines start. Out across the placid waters shoots the powerful craft. He deftly makes the circuit once, twice, then suddenly, as he speeds by the third time, the powerful motors literally rip the boat apart. Tragedy reigns, and Mercury, the God of Speed, has taken another life. Comes the echo; "He was speeding."

The night is dark, the moon has flitted behind a cloud, the engineer of a great streamlined train speeding across the continent wants to get home to his wife and children. He opens the throttle just a little wider. The great iron monster shudders as it rounds the last turns on the road home, and with a violent snap flicks off the tracks.

Speed again has taken its toll. It has once again deprived many of their desire to live safely, to live happily.

These incidents are typical of the cost we pay for speed and more speed. Each year these incidents and many like them are multiplied many thousands of times, in our homes, on our highways, and in our factories.

Our mania for speed is characteristic of our everyday life. We begin our day in our factory or school where the highest virtue is speed. After a half day spent in this atmosphere we rush across the streets barely missing onrushing cars with their drivers also bent on speed. We eat a quick lunch and repeat the same performance for the afternoon. At night we probably dance to a speedy, fast jazz band, finally going to bed to take a quick sleep to wake the next morning to start the new day in a world with too much speed. We are living to the tune of hurrying feet and the hum and buzz of speed in general.

Speed is a wonderful thing. It has enabled us to rise to a great Nation, in fact, the greatest of all nations both commercially and economically, but it has also pushed us towards attaining the high accident and death rate that we now have. Our fire trucks and fighter planes need to be swift and speedy, and our doctor's hands need to be fast and sure, but it is the misapplication of this type of speed that is costing us thousands of lives each year. We who have made speed our slave are now letting it backfire and become our master. Speed must not be allowed to take the driver's seats in our cars, our planes, and our lives in order for Americans to live safely, to live happily.

America is looking through eyes that see not: they do not see that child playing in the road; they do not see that car coming at them as they stop from the sidewalk; they do not see that the faster you go does not necessarily mean you will reach your destination quicker. Their mind is possessed with one word—speed. Our cemeteries are full of people who looked through eyes that did not see. Americans must make a choice; whether to be speed demons or to stop, look, and listen once in a while and live a little safer and a lot longer.

A man, sometimes young, sometimes middle-aged or older, takes a drink or two on the way home from the club in the late evening. Not a great deal, but just a little; anyway, just a little drink couldn't hurt anybody. As he nears the suburbs the smooth concrete just seems to roll away under his vision and he presses a little harder on the accelerator. "Joe Smith only got 80 miles an hour out of his car on this stretch, but I know I can beat that without even trying." He is beating Joe Smith's record, too, even though he doesn't see that car coming from the side road with his best friend, Tom Brown, in it. His name was in the headlines the next day—not for breaking Joe Smith's record but for putting his best friend in the hospital for weeks and demolishing his new car. Just a little drink—but it helped no one to live more happily. Speeding and its devastating effects cannot be confined to the highway alone, either. It harbors itself in the home when Dad trips on Junior's toys, at school when we trip on the stairs, and in the workshop when the worker loses a finger trying to be just a little more efficient and, above all, a little speedier. Safety devices help but many are not foolproof.

In the fall of the year, in our State of Maine, thousands of hunters take to the woods in search of deer and other game. But last year and in previous years this army took the lives of more than a score of their buddies. Why? Because some of them were after just one thing and didn't care how they got it. They shot and looked later. They were in too much of a hurry to let others live safely—live happily.

There are many other types of accidents and one of the most disastrous of these is fires. Yet, one of these tragedies takes place every 20 seconds. Ninety percent of these are caused by pure carelessness. Why do people gamble with so many lives and homes at stake? The odds are against them and they know it, but they continue every 20 seconds to break a home, burn a building, and destroy the happiness of many.

These types of accidents are no respecter of persons; they strike in all places and against all colors and creeds, in the home, at the individual and at the masses.

An incident that illustrates this happened not many weeks ago. Over the Yankee network flashed the news bulletin of the crash of a troop train near Wilkes-Barre, Pa. More than a score of American soldiers on their way to fight for a great cause were killed in this tragedy. During the mass funeral the tolling of the great bells of every church, Catholic and Protestant alike, filled the great Wyoming Valley.

Yes, the effects of accidents are no respecter of persons and we encounter them wherever we go—from the man in the office who would always make a fast buck if he could, but would gamble his life away in trying to get across the road a little faster, to the boy in the home who is just too busy to take care of his toys.

America is often called the melting pot of nations because of the many races and creeds of which it is made up. But no race or creed has escaped the ravages of speed and accidents in the United States.

All have suffered, and all will continue to suffer until the people of America come to the realization that man is not invincible, and that he's rapidly losing his dominion over speed and machines.

A week ago yesterday the newspapers carried a striking headline "61 killed in railroad wreck." A jam-packed Pennsylvania commuter train was speeding along and suddenly derailed. The cars telescoped into a mass of sharp, deadly metal wreckage killing 61 passengers instantly. The cause? One pas-

senger who was lucky enough to escape injury said, "I noticed the engineer trying to stop her. He was doing his level best to hold her back. He was trying to stop her." But a little push on the throttle turned this train into a raging monster.

Engines and machines can be rebuilt, and new parts substituted for old, but the human body is not so constructed. A pair of eyes once gone is gone forever. A life once taken can never be restored. Americans of today don't seem to realize this. They're continually letting machines, the slaves, speed, the slave, become the masters, the captains of our lives. America must examine herself and come to the realization that we're headed down the wrong road and we're going too fast. We must stop, look, and listen in order to live safely—to live happily.

No Wonder the Senator Wept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Mirror on Monday, March 19, 1951. This editorial is another discussion of the sad plight of our Government as a result of the present low level of ethics now prevailing.

Mr. T. B. Cosgrove, an attorney and a prominent civic leader in Los Angeles, has directed my attention to this editorial. I believe that every Member of the House will find it worthy of consideration. It follows:

NO WONDER THE SENATOR WEPT

The picture of aging Senator TOBEY of New Hampshire weeping for a return to moral and ethical values in the United States made a dramatic moment in the Kefauver crime investigation hearings.

Well might the Senators weep, and honest Americans with them.

No one can read the headlines from Washington for the past 6 months without a deep feeling that the United States is suffering from moral atrophy and ethical dry rot.

While American kids are dying in Korea, smart operators with White House connections are getting theirs in ways which are shady, if not illegal.

Fast buck boys with an in are placed in fat jobs with companies beholden to the RFC for loans made with tax money, at the behest of Bill Boyle, the national chairman of the Democratic Party. (RFC Director Walter Lee Dunham testified that Boyle and Donald Dawson, a White House employee, had pressured him to find places for their pets in such companies.)

A White House stenographer gets a $9,450 mink coat, charged to the account of a lawyer operating with unusual success before the RFC. Her husband gets an $18,000-a-year job with Lustron, Inc., obligated to RFC for a $37,500,000 loan, and does no work for his $1,500-a-month salary. He had an "in." He worked for Boyle as advance man for several Presidential tours.

A former Congressman testified that a syndicate of Washington smarties engineered a deal to buy surplus tankers. They put up only $100,000 capital, and cut up a $5,000,000 profit melon. They knew the right people.

Gen. Harry Vaughan, the President's pal, pressured Government officials to cut corners in sugar allocations for his political playmates, and was all messed up in the deep freeze "gifts" to top brass.

This week's latest scandal, which passes almost unnoticed, is the disclosure that the Coast Guard is providing a safe draft dodgers' paradise for the young sons and nephews of Washington "insiders."

The Coast Guard is at full strength, but they are enlisting around 40 recruits a week, almost all of the them from Washington, most of them draft eligible who are kinfolks of VIPs. There have been instances where these favored relatives have been driven to the USCG recruiting offices in Government limousines.

A special port brigade has been set up in Washington by the USCG, a happy billet for draft evaders. They only have to report for a drill once a week, but it makes them draft-proof.

This country and our way of life are gravely threatened by the vicious march of communism in the world. That is not the only threat to this country, however. The threat of rot and corruption and special privilege is serious.

By the strict letter of the law, these shady Washington deals may not be penal offenses, but they are moral offenses. Enrichment of insiders by favoritism is not less wrong in 1951 Washington than it was in Rome of 50 B. C. or Marie Antoinette's Paris.

It was heart-rot that caused the collapse of Rome and France, the atrophy of public morals, the greed of smart operators with an "in."

It could happen here.

Senator TOBEY wept openly at disclosures that the whole fabric of Government is shot through with "fixes" and "ins." It may be the tragedy of our time that so few men weep, or even pay much attention, as the tradition of clean Government grows daily more smirched.

The Burden of Taxation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a front-page editorial entitled "Down the Road to Disaster," published in the Philadelphia Dispatch of April 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN THE ROAD TO DISASTER

Taxation in the United States is now approaching a point where a citizen is practically working for the Government.

With Federal, State, and city taxes growing by leaps and bounds, the people are now asking just when and where this tax octopus is going to stop. Taxes just can't rise forever.

The time is not far away when the Government will take most of the earned dollar from the pocket of the taxpayer. With three forms of Government taking a bite from the dollar, just what will the taxpayer have left?

Already the flow of new capital into private business has been slackened because the Government gets an increasing slice of profits. Incentive of the individual has been crippled.

Responsible officials who continue to find the easiest way out by imposing new taxes should take time out and read the history of the world to see what happens to nations which have bled the taxpayers white.

The Townsend Clubs Are Here To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, whenever a red-hot issue of the Binghamton Press which directly or indirectly concerns your Congressman comes off the rollers, somebody manages to waylay the issue which comes to my Washington desk. This has happened on a number of occasions, so I realize there is collusion somewhere.

Therefore I did not see the vicious attack upon the Townsend organization of Broome County in last Friday's issue. The Press issues of Thursday, Saturday, and Sunday had reached me, but I was still curious about what happened Friday.

I found out soon enough; and, for their information, all I have to do is obtain a copy from the Library of Congress. I will doubtless continue to see the missing Press issues through this medium as I do not think they will dare hold up the copy that the Library receives.

Friday's Press carried what I thought it would, a scathing affront upon the whole Townsend movement by the mayor of Binghamton.

It is well known that some of the wealthy advertisers of local newspapers have sworn to get the Townsendites because they allow free speech in their meetings. Not being able to control their leaders or members, the bosses are determined the Townsend clubs must go.

They chose the mayor of Binghamton to sound off their initial blast, because he has been presented to the public by the Binghamton Press in a simon-pure role without a flaw or a word ever having been said against him.

I am predicting that he will neither scare the Townsend clubs out of existence in the Triple Cities nor weaken their position as the strongest political group in the southern tier.

In 1940, the present mayor of Binghamton ran against your Congressman and was supported by the press, the old guard, and every other pompous antagonist I ever had in Broome County. The record shows that the greatest plurality ever amassed by any candidate in our section was given to me, not because I was especially outstanding, but because the people had absolutely no use for the type of opposition they lined up against me.

The same gang is now dedicated to breaking up the Townsend organization, once and for all and they will go to gangster lengths to accomplish it. I might add this mob is nonpartisan.

But they can count on my getting into this fight on the side of the Americans in the Townsend movement. They can be sure that I will not stand idly by and let them ruin the painstaking work of so many years put forth by the Townsendites.

If they should succeed, because of their widespread real-estate holdings, to deprive Townsend clubs of places to assemble, thus violating the United States Constitution and further presecuting the Americans of my district, I will personally see to it that fitting places are provided in the Triple Cities for the Townsend clubs to meet.

The mayor may be all-powerful, with the weight of the press behind him, the force of radio, and the might of financial wizards as backers, but he cannot blot out the Townsend clubs from the valley of opportunity.

They are there to stay.

Necessity of an American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the question has been raised more than once, in connection with proposed legislation to aid the United States merchant marine, Why a merchant marine?

An article in the Mooremack News for March 1951, entitled "Korean Epic," and an editorial entitled "Why a Merchant Marine?" give very persuasive answers to the question as to the need of maintaining and supporting a merchant marine whose first loyalty and efforts will be devoted to the interests of the United States in war as well as in peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mooremack News of March 1951]

KOREAN EPIC

In the past few weeks stories have drifted back from Korea, through letters and news dispatches, feature pieces in the newspapers, and official Washington statements, telling of the tremendous role played by American merchant ships in the difficult tasks faced by the United Nations forces in the Pacific war.

Moore-McCormack Lines has been honored by the participation of several of its ships in the operation, including the most fantastic incident of all, involving the vessel *Meredith Victory* which, late in December, evacuated more than 14,000 persons from Hungnam, Korea, to Pusan, a nightmarish voyage that lasted three terrible days.

Both the *Mormacmoon* and the *Hunter Victory* which, along with the *Meredith Victory*, have been under charter by Mooremack to the Military Sea Transportation Service, also have written chapters in this newest record of achievement and have been accorded formal acknowledgment by the Governmen*.

The *Meredith Victory* story, however, tops everything else in sheer drama. Indeed, when the first reports came in, officials of Military Sea Transportation Service and Mooremack expressed disbelief that this ship, built to carry 12 passengers, commanded by Capt. L. P. LaRue, of Philadelphia, had actually carried 14,000. But quick checks supported the first report, and letters from men who were aboard.

Hardly were the fear-driven passengers aboard the ship after a desperate flight across the country, according to Dino S. Savastio, the ship's mate, than calls came to help with the delivery of mothers, five of whom gave birth within the first 24 hours. "There I stood with babies all around and something doing every minute," he wrote his parents in Franklin Square, Long Island, as reported by the Nassau County paper Newsday.

The Philadelphia Bulletin, reporting the *Meredith Victory* story with special relish since her master, Capt. L. P. LaRue, is a native of that city, said that the crew had loaded the 14,000 Koreans by using booms and makeshift elevators and when the ship was loaded, she shoved off. One picture, reproduced on this page, shows a makeshift elevator in operation.

Formal naval commendation for their work came to all of the Mooremack ships and to those of other operators as well. Vice Admiral C. T. Joy, USN, of the Far East command, sent this message to Captain LaRue:

"My most sincere congratulations on a job well done. Your performance throughout the Korean campaign has always been notable. In the successful redeployment of ground forces from northeast Korea your initiative and your enthusiastic and prompt response to all demands indicate that your organization is at its best when the chips are down. The merchant mariners who performed for you did so silently but their accomplishment speaks loudly. I find it comforting to work with such teammates."

Capt. A. F. Junker, USN, Deputy Commander of the MSTS, Western Pacific, transmitting Admiral Joy's message, added this on his own: "The cooperation and assistance of the merchant marine in the above-mentioned operation adds but one more page of glory to merchant-marine history, and I desire to add my own congratulations to those of Admiral Joy."

Charles Regal, editor of the column, Down the Hatch, for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, wrote:

"Man of the year in this, man of the year in that. How about the ship of the year? As far as Down the Hatch is concerned, 1950's outstanding merchant ship was the steamship *Meredith Victory*, the ship that on December 22 evacuated 14,000 South Korean refugees in one load."

Mr. Regal quoted Capt. Raymond Fosse of the transport *Sergeant Truman Kimbro*, as follows, describing his thought when he saw the *Meredith Victory* approach Pusan:

"When we first saw that Victory ship we couldn't figure out what in the world it had on deck. From a distance it was simply a dark, solid mass. As the ship came nearer we could see it was human beings. They were packed so close you wondered how they could breathe. And there wasn't a sound from them. They just stood there, silently, waiting. Even the babies and children were strangely quiet. Unless you saw it, you couldn't believe it."

Mr. Regal said of the *Meredith Victory's* 14,000: "That surely was the largest number of persons ever taken aboard a freighter, of any size, and it may be the largest load ever taken by any ship. The *Queen Mary* (81,235 gross tons) reportedly averaged ten to twelve thousands troops during the war. (The *Meredith Victory* is listed at 7,607 tons)." Inquiry at the New York offices of the Cunard White Star Line revealed that the largest passenger load ever carried by either of the Queen ships during the war was 15,000. The *Queen Elizabeth* in peacetime can carry 2,200 passengers, the *Queen Mary*, 2,000, as against the *Meredith Victory's* 14,000. The feat of the latter at Korea becomes the more striking on the basis of comparison.

The *Mormacmoon*, too, found drama when she was assigned to the Hungnam operation to pick up 2,800 evacuees. The Koreans, carrying rations of fish and rice, were sent to the ship's hold where many of them climbed into trucks and, despite orders from the ship's officers, proceeded to run truck motors to offset the cold. Fifty Koreans were overcome by the fumes, and their lives were saved only because the ship's officers carried them to the deck and worked on them. This detail of the story, also carried by Newsday, was reported in a letter by James G. Wilkerson, her second mate, of Bellerose, Long Island, to his parents.

The effort of the *Hunter Victory* in this operation may be gaged by the following letter to the president of Moore-McCormack Lines, sent from Pusan by the Reverend Father P. H. Cleary, a chaplain, a member of the Maryknoll order of priests:

"Permit me to convey to you an expression of congratulations and sincere thanks for the splendid conduct of the officers and crew of your ship *Hunter Victory* in its recent evacuation operation of our forces from Hungnam to Pusan.

"The group with which I came out, Tenth Corps, loaded Saturday night, December 16, left Hungnam early Sunday morning, the 17th, arrived Pusan Tuesday the 19th.

"As we neared Pusan, I have never heard of any ship's personnel from all sides such acclamations of praise as came spontaneously from the officers of the Tenth Corps for the officers and crew of the *Hunter Victory*. The way they had gone all out to take care of us and make us as comfortable as possible at the cost of innumerable privations and actual hardships to themselves was the general topic of conversation among the groups of Army men wherever they gathered about the ship. The gratitude of all was sincere and deep. Personally, the officer whom I wish to commend most highly is the chief steward, Mr. John J. McGee. He went all out, performed a difficult job with unfailing courtesy and good humor successfully and to the delight of all aboard.

"I know that several of the Tenth Corps officers intended to write you to express their thanks and appreciation. The press of present circumstances of war and the crowded conditions here at the port may prevent their doing so. As the Catholic chaplain aboard, I wish to perform the very pleasant duty of addressing you in their behalf. Only the conditions I have just referred to have prevented me from doing so more promptly.

"With every assurance of grateful respect for you and your worthy representatives on the *Hunter Victory*."

A. V. Moore, president of the company, replying to Father Cleary, expressed his appreciation and that of the company, advised Father Cleary that he was sending a copy of the letter to Captain Preusch and Chief Steward McGee, and added:

"I know all the officers and crew of the *Hunter Victory* will indeed be most pleased to see that their efforts to serve under extremely difficult conditions were so well received. Yes, indeed, all of us admire the

courage of all those engaged in this present crisis in Korea. May the prayers of those at home help to speed a just peace and end this worldly unrest."

Capt. Philip W. Atkinson, of the *Mormacmoon*, is a veteran Mooremack skipper. A native of Fitchburg, Mass., he worked up to chief officer through several of the company's ships, including the *Saquache*, the *Carplaka*, *Argosy*, *Scanmail*, *Scanpenn*, *Scanstates*, *Scanyork*, and others, and got his first command in 1936, the *Cliffwood*.

Captain LaRue won promotions through chief officer and became master of the *Smith Thompson* in 1944, then the *George B. McClellan*, and the *Whittier Victory*. He served 6 months as first officer of the *Uruguay*, commanded the *Deborah Gannett* and the *Mormacwren* before taking command of the *Meredith Victory* in July of 1950.

Capt. Charles H. Preusch, of the *Hunter Victory*, was born in Elmhurst, went to sea after his high-school work, as an assistant purser, then studied at City College, worked as a clerk and mechanic until he entered the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point in 1942. He was graduated in 1944, worked up from cadet through chief mate on several ships and obtained his first command, the *Hunter Victory*, in August of 1950.

[From the Mooremack News of March 1951]

WHY A MERCHANT MARINE?

Every so often the question is raised—Why a merchant marine? The fact that it has been answered a thousand times seems not to matter; again and again the facts must be presented in reply to the arguments that you can build a ship at lower cost in a foreign yard, and man her much more cheaply with non-Americans. So why not build our ships in foreign yards? And why not man them with foreigners and operate them under another flag? Why not, indeed?

Of course, anyone who knows the story of the merchant fleet in the recent war does not ask these questions. The men who served in the war and saw our ships in action as transports of men and matériél, especially those high officers of Army and Navy who have openly and gladly conceded that their branches of our Armed Forces could never have achieved their wartime records without the help of merchant ships, are not likely to ask, either. But unfortunately such folk appear to be in the minority.

Something of a new type of answer may be found on pages 4 and 5 of this issue of the Mooremack News, in the stories of the *Mormacmoon*, the *Meredith Victory*, and the *Hunter Victory*. When reading that story, remember that the United States is not now at war, that we as a Nation are merely participating in Korea as a unit of the United Nations.

But these American merchant ships have served, nevertheless, as part of our Nation's contribution to the great cause that involves the democratic peoples of the world. Because we have merchant ships we were able to send them to help with such tasks as that article describes.

Imagine a ship built to accommodate 12 passengers, and in an emergency moving 14,000 panic-stricken souls from the scene of their peril, the young officers burdened with problems beyond anything they had ever imagined in their days of training. That is the *Meredith Victory's* story. Yet she was only one of more than 300 ships, merchant ships, at work on the Korean assignment.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Koehler, addressing the Propeller Club of the Port of New York, in January, described the Hungnam evacuation, the operation in which the *Meredith Victory* achieved her almost unbelievable feat. He said that "in the face of greatest possible odds, despite the handicaps of terrain and worse weather, and regardless of enemy assaults, the Navy safely loaded aboard ship and evacuated 105,000 fighting men, 100,000 civilians, 17,500 vehicles and 350,000 measurement tons of material."

Quoting Vice Admiral Struble, who was present at the operation, he said that for the first time in history, "an entire army with all its supplies and equipment has been successfully deployed by sea in the face of emergency pressure." Then Mr. Koehler added, as his own words, the following very significant and very gallant expression of the sentiments of the Navy:

"While this is no time for self-adulation, to suppress a surge of pride at this accomplishment would be somewhat less than human. Nor should I fail to point out to you that it would obviously have been a physical impossibility to carry out this staggering task without the ships and crews of the American merchant marine who were a vital component of this operation.

"Not only at Hungnam, but at Pusan, Inchon, and other Korean ports these merchant vessesl have played vital roles in every operation since hostilities began. Consequently, our traditional 'Well done' goes equally to the American merchant marine and to the Navy."

If additional figures are needed, here are a few. In a 4-month period following the outbreak of the Korean hostilities nearly 4,000,000 tons of cargo, exclusive of petroleum products, were moved from the continental United States to the Pacific theater in support of the United Nations forces. Of this, more than 80 percent moved in privately owned American flag ships. In addition, 185,000 military passengers were moved to the fighting front.

Any sound student of national defense or national economy will explain quickly enough that the merchant marine stands abreast the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the waging of war, an essential peacetime protection to our foreign trade in the fierce competition that exists for markets throughout the world. They will point out, too, that millions of dollars spent in labor and materials in the construction of a ship and then in operating her, are part of our national income. They would not be if the ship were built abroad and manned by foreign crews.

The distressing feature of all this is that the lesson seems never really to be absorbed. There must be other Hungnams, other *Meredith Victories*. And even then we will find ourselves facing that question: Why a merchant marine?

Overseas Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted on February 8, 1951, at the regular session of American Legion Post No. 519 of Mineral City, Ohio:

Inasmuch as we are in an undeclared war, or police action, in Korea, and our boys have not been told why they are fighting, and our casualties are mounting higher, and none of our leaders can give us any information as to what we expect to gain; we hereby request that our troops be withdrawn from Korea and returned home, and furthermore we urge that no more troops be sent overseas to fight the battle of the world unless it is on a voluntary basis. Several States have already passed the same resolution and the issue is being pressed by some of the biggest men in the Nation.

We do not believe that it is just or right that a boy born in America must face years of military service for the sake of a foreign entanglement and we further resolve that the power to wage an undeclared war or police action rest solely in the hands of Congress, who are the sole representatives of the people, that we may not be involved in any more Koreas.

We believe these measures are in the best interest of our beloved country, that it may serve the purpose of saving our economy, our resources, and our youth.

R. M. GAY, *Commander.*
OTIS A. FINLEY, *Adjutant.*

A Second Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of April 6, 1951:

A SECOND FRONT

A second front on the Chinese mainland has been proposed by General MacArthur in a letter to Congressman MARTIN of Massachusetts, minority leader in the House.

The commander in Asia believes the time has come when the United States and the United Nations must take a realistic view of the position of the Chinese Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, and without too much delay agree that this Chinese force, poised for action when given the word, must enter the campaign in Asia.

General MacArthur wants a second front on the Chinese mainland with Chiang's armies, reinforced by American equipment and military strategists, leading the campaign against the Chinese Communists. That, of course, would immediately relieve pressure in Korea; it would mean that the Chinese Reds would be caught in a great pincer movement. It is doubtful that they could escape, unless given help from the Soviets.

Up to this point, the arguments against using Chinese Nationalists have been based primarily on the opinion that by giving the green light to Chiang, the Russian Reds would immediately become active belligerents and world war III would be started.

Russia, however, is not so devoted to the Chinese that it is going to enter a "do or die" campaign in China. A second front, added to the present retreat of the Chinese Reds in Korea, would be enough to convince the war lords in Moscow that this is no time to jump into a losing cause.

General MacArthur has no doubt weighed all the possibilities of his proposal to use the Chinese Nationalists before sending them on to Washington. He is certainly not anxious to advocate any arrangement which will automatically touch off the big guns of world war III.

Meanwhile, however, we again repeat that this would be an excellent time for General MacArthur to come back to the United States to have a few direct talks with both the President and Congress. Letter-writing

serves a purpose, but direct contact would be much more beneficial in unpredictable situations such as we are now in. Moreover, we believe that if the able commander in Korea should come to Washington for but a flying visit and should place all of his ideas on the congressional table—making certain allowances for military security—he would be given complete sanction to move ahead in his own capable way. He might not have any difficulty in convincing this Government of the advantages of a second front with the Chinese Nationalist forces in the front ranks.

Illegal Mexican Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of five articles by Gladwin Hill, dealing with the illegal Mexican immigration into Southwest United States, which appeared in the New York Times March 25 to 29. Notwithstanding the estimated cost of printing these articles is $430.50, it is most timely that the economic and sociological problems analyzed in them be now brought to the attention of Senators and Representatives. The Nation's manpower needs are becoming acute. The agreement with Mexico is up for renewal. Legislation is about to be reported out in the House and Senate. The report of the President's Commission on Migrant Farm Labor has just emphasized again the grave consequences of our neglect of this situation. And the so-called wet-back traffic affords alarming opportunities for the entry of Communist spies and saboteurs.

The New York Times has again performed a significant public service in arranging for this survey and printing its findings on this problem.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 25, 1951]

MILLION A YEAR FLEE MEXICO ONLY TO FIND PEONAGE HERE—ILLEGAL MIGRATION ACROSS 1,600-MILE BORDER BY SEASONAL SLAVE LABOR DEPRESSES LATIN AND UNITED STATES LEVELS ALIKE

(By Gladwin Hill)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., March 24.—A visitor to the Southwest today has to make a double mental adjustment to comprehend the conditions he finds.

First, he has to think back 20 years to prohibition days, when wholesale violation of the laws of the United States was being ignored, tacitly sanctioned or overtly encouraged by a large cross-section of the population.

Second, he has to project himself in imagination back a full century to the days of slavery, when the systematic exploitation of an underprivileged class of humanity as cheap labor was an accepted part of the American social and economic order.

Then the observer has to compound mentally these two diverse anomalies and conceive of their existence in 1951.

For that, in effect, is the situation today in the Southwest, and in parts of the deep South and the far West as well, arising from the ceaseless and steadily increasing tide of illegal immigration from Mexico into the United States.

This illegal immigration now amounts to more than 1,000,000 individuals a year. They sneak across the thinly patrolled 1,600-mile border between Brownsville, Tex., and San Diego, Calif., in an unending hegira from Mexican unemployment and wage levels as low as 40 cents a day, seeking farm work and any other labor available in this country.

Some 500,000 of these wetbacks—so-called because of those who swim the Rio Grande, the Texas-Mexico boundary—were caught by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services' border patrol last year and put back across the international line.

The estimate of a total traffic of 1,000,000 is conservative, based on the surmise that for every one caught there is one who isn't caught. Most immigration officers would concede a more likely average of 5 or 10 to 1, and for some areas responsible estimates go as high as 100 to 1; in such a reckoning many of the total would be not different individuals, but repeaters who recross after having been deported.

There are fewer than 900 border patrol officers to guard the whole 1,600 miles of boundary, and sometimes the deportees get back into the United States before the deporting officers do. Some Mexicans have been deported as many as 20 times, only to return again and again.

SOME RETURN, SOME STAY

A large number of wetbacks regularly slip back into Mexico after seasonal farm work ends. But tens of thousands of others have remained in the United States, managing to settle down in semihiding in hundreds of communities along the border, or becoming transient laborers and filtering northward over the western half of the country all the way to the Canadian border.

Technically every one of these wetbacks is an illegal alien, the same as a foreigner who slipped through the paradoxically tight immigration patrols at Ellis Island—a violator of the Federal law, subject to imprisonment.

But because the bulk of this immigration is tidal, advancing and receding with the regularity of the seasons, it has come to be taken for granted, both by the United States border population and the Nation at large.

Superficially, the wetback traffic is just a picturesque cat-and-mouse game on a grand scale between a mass of amiable Latins and an overwhelmed border patrol.

In actuality, however, a year's study of the situation by this correspondent, ending in a recent 5,000-mile tour of the border area, shows it to be a phenomenon whose real economic and social implications should shock the average American when fully known and comprehended.

PEONAGE AND SLAVERY

The impression is widespread that these Mexicans simply come over as a regular essential and harmless supplement to the domestic harvest forces.

The fact is that they are attracted by the glittering prospect of high American wages, and in many cases actively recruited by large-scale ranchers or their representatives, only to work for wages that have been described by United States immigration officers as tantamount to peonage and under conditions compared on the same authority to antebellum slavery.

"This traffic in contraband labor actually is worse in its elements than either prohibition or slavery," a nationally prominent figure in the Southwest commented a few days ago. "Prohibition involved only traffic in alcohol. This is traffic in human beings. And in slavery some responsibility, at least, was acknowledged for the release of the slaves. Here there is none."

The wetback, a penniless fugitive, has to take whatever wages are offered, which, because of the multitude of wetbacks available, usually are at a bare existence level or below it. His traditional housing is the crudest form of shack or hovel, wherever he can find it, or just the open air. His status denies him access to regular community legal and welfare agencies. If he doesn't like his situation he can go back where he came from. There are thousands of other hopefuls south of the border ready to take his place.

AMERICAN LEVELS DEPRESSED

Aside from the abuses to which these Mexicans themselves are subject, the traffic in wetbacks has manifestly baneful effects on the citizenry with which they mingle.

In many sections of Texas, Arizona, California and other areas they depress the general standards of wages and working conditions below the accepted American levels. Instead of supplementing the domestic labor force they undercut it, taking jobs from tens of thousands of native citizens, farm and urban workers alike.

In the agricultural field, particularly, the resulting native displaced persons have to join the great stream of migrant labor that fans out annually northward all the way from New York to Oregon, working a good deal of the time for substandard wages and working conditions and, in turn, taking jobs from resident local workers.

From a sociological standpoint, the wetback traffic has obliterated the border completely, transforming the 3,000,000 Spanish-American citizens of the Southwest—many of whose families have been in the area for centuries—into a cultural peninsula of Mexico, retarding their assimilation, in the opinion of experts, by a generation or more, and perpetuating and aggravating some of the worst conditions of health, education and social, economic and political unintegration that can be found in the country.

Finally, the wetback traffic has engendered, in somewhat the way prohibition did, an atmosphere of amorality and warped thinking which demonstrably extends from the farmer exploiters of wetback labor through their communities and local and State officials, to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

IT'S OUT IN THE OPEN

Although this may sound sensational, the remarkable thing is that there is no secrecy about the situation. Despite an elaborate legendry that has grown up to screen it, and occasional efforts to dissimulate the facts, most of the details are matters of formal public record or common knowledge in the region.

The main problem in inquiring into it is to preserve one's sense of proportion and avoid entanglement in the falsework of rationalization that has grown up over the years to justify the system and maintain it.

The wetback situation is of particular pertinence at this time. The defense emergency has evoked official proposals for the importation of hundreds of thousands of workers from outside the continental United States.

Before Congress is a draft extension of the 1949 agreement between the United States and Mexico, which expires in June, governing the so-called "importation" of Mexican farm workers under contracts which in actuality have degenerated into the legalization of wetbacks.

Before President Truman is the initial report of the special lay commission he appointed last summer to investigate the prob-

lems of migrant farm labor and the wetback evil.

Also, it has lately been realized that the wetback traffic offers a wide-open avenue for Communist spies to enter the country. There is no public record of any having been caught lately. But immigration officers acknowledge that every year at least a handful of Europeans, some of them with Communist backgrounds, are netted among the wetbacks, and that in cold fact Joseph Stalin might adopt a perfunctory disguise and walk into the country this way.

Legal immigration into the United States from Mexico—on which there is no quota limit—involves such complications as fees, literacy standards, job assurance, and consular approval. It is much easier to sail, wade, or swim the Rio Grande, seldom more than 100 yards wide, or just to walk across the largely unfenced dry sections of the border.

Such an illegal crossing is a misdemeanor the first time and a felony after an initial deportation, subject to 2 years' imprisonment and $1,000 fine. But the wetbacks numbers largely defy prosecution.

Detention facilities and court dockets are so crowded that anything beyond quick deportation of first offenders has had to be abandoned. The latest authoritative analysis indicates that only about 25 of every 10,000 caught are prosecuted.

So the influx has snowballed. In the San Antonio immigration district, the largest of three covering the border, the number of apprehensions—generally conceded to be in direct proportion to the total traffic—has jumped from 43,000 in 1945 to 215,000 last year.

In the Los Angeles district, covering California and western Arizona, they jumped from 4,000 in 1943 to 230,000 last year. And the traffic is mounting steadily. The Los Angeles district's apprehensions in January and February of last year totaled 19,500; for the same period this year they were 33,800.

The wetback traffic dwarfs the legal contracting of Mexican labor under the international agreement, and has become almost inextricably enmeshed with it. At the moment, according to the United States Employment Service, there are about 28,000 contract Mexicans in the country. Most of them were not imported at all, but are exwetbacks who were rounded up north of the border, processed at border immigration and consular stations, and given legal work permits under guaranties of somewhat better conditions than those accorded wetbacks.

Once across the line, the wetback passes himself off as one of the 3,000,000 citizen Mexican-Americans. The main centers of wetback labor are the large-scale cotton, citrus, and vegetable ranching areas of Arizona, and the Imperial and San Joaquin Valleys of California.

In lesser numbers wetbacks can be found seasonally on farms in Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and other parts of the West, and over in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri. Every week or two a planeload is shipped from Chicago back to the border.

Employment of wetbacks, although from a realistic standpoint tantamount to harboring a fugitive, has been held by the Federal courts to be not a punishable offense because of the omission in the 1917 version of the immigration laws of any specific penalty.

[From the New York Times of March 26, 1951]

PEONS NET FARMER A FABULOUS PROFIT—ILLEGAL MIGRANTS FROM MEXICO WORKING RICH SOIL OF WEST, A BONANZA TO EXPLOITERS—PAY 15 TO 25 CENTS A DAY, AND MANY RECEIVE FOOD ALONE, WHILE SHELTER IS A HUT, A THATCH, OR THE STARS

(By Gladwin Hill)

BROWNSVILLE, TEX., March 25.—The lower Rio Grande Valley is the heart of the 1,600-mile wide border belt stretching from Texas to California into which more than 1,000,000 Mexicans annually infiltrate illegally in quest of work.

Here, amid such towns as Waslaco, Donna, Harlingen, and McAllen are some of the most fertile and productive cotton, citrus, and vegetable lands in the country.

The lower Rio Grande Valley comprises principally three counties, Cameron, Hidalgo, and Willacy, with 300,000 population. Their only fractionally cultivated gross area of 3,000 square miles, although constituting only 2 percent of the total area of the State, yields some 15 percent of its farm income.

In this relatively small area on an average day during last year's harvest peak, according to a careful study by two leading southwestern sociologists, about 100,000 wetbacks were working. A check of 14 farms taken at random by Dr. Lyle Saunders of the University of New Mexico and Dr. Olen Leonard of Vanderbilt University, disclosed that 93 out of every 100 workers were illegal Mexican aliens.

THROUGHOUT WHOLE AREA

In lesser concentrations as the distance from the border increases, but still in swarms of thousands, other wetbacks can be found in the harvesting and thinning seasons in the Salt River Valley of Arizona, the Imperial and San Joaquin Valleys of California, and many other sections of the West and South—legally fugitives from justice, but beneficiaries—or victims—of skimpy border protection, grasping farmers and an apathetic public.

Over the whole area there are many farmers and farm associations that, because of special circumstances or plain scruples, do not use "wetbacks"; but for the average farmer such a course means bucking an entrenched cheap-labor system.

In contrast to visions of affluence conjured up by the wide disparity in United States and Mexican living standards, the "wetback" finds himself under a system of wages governed entirely by what the traffic will bear.

Farmers acknowledged to the President's Commission on Migratory Labor last summer that they paid field hands as low as 15 cents an hour. According to the Saunders-Leonard study, the prevailing hourly wage for "wetbacks" in this valley last year was 25 cents an hour.

TWENTY-SIX-DOLLAR COTTON PICKERS

Although cotton was selling at exceptionally high prices, the cotton picking rate in the valley was at its lowest in some time, $1.25 a hundred pounds—at which, it was calculated, the average picker might earn a maximum of about $26 for a 7-day week.

Hourly rates like 25 cents do not necessarily indicate the real wage level in a particular situation, because they may be replaced by piecework rates that are less, or by day rates based on a theoretical 8 hours that in practice may stretch out to 10 or 11 hours.

Gross wages, moreover, are often subject to deductions for meals, commissary purchases, and special assessments, such as the common practice of charging workers for binding wire for vegetables, a practice obviously implying either a paring of the nominal wage or profiteering on the wire.

Two cases reported last summer at McAllen were a father, mother, and two children who had worked 4 days for a net of $6.50 and an inexperienced cotton picker who after 3 days' work was told he had just earned the food he had eaten.

SOME GET NO CASH

It is not extraordinary for "wetbacks" to report having worked for weeks only to be told that there was no cash due them. In such a circumstance the "wetback" has little scope for argument; the farmer can just turn him into the immigration authorities for deportation.

A few days ago I talked with a "wetback" named Felix Moreno who had come into El Centro, Calif., to get help in collecting $47 he said a nearby farmer owed him for 10 days of carrot-bundling. He was 1 of 50 "wetbacks" in a crew of 65. A typical "wetback" in many respects, Moreno was 24 years old and had a wife and year-old child back in Mexico.

Last fall he had taken more than a month's Mexican wages to buy a train ticket from Santiago, Guanajuato, 800 miles south of the border. He had walked across the line in the desert and worked intermittently in cotton and vegetables in the 6 months since. In his pocket he had 20 cents.

Aside from wages, the "wetback" gets nothing. His lodging is seldom better than an irrigation ditch-bank or hut improvised from junk or thatch. The worker housing situation in Lower Rio Grande Valley ranches was tersely summarized in a report published by the University of Texas last December:

"No housing facilities exist."

Southwestern farmers have two principal explanations for the wholesale resort to labor that is contraband but the employment of which, because of legal technicalities, is not subject to prosecution.

One is that "local labor is not available."

It is true that, under present arrangements, peak harvest labor requirements often exceed the immediate local supply. The University of Texas survey, made by Prof. Eastin Nelson and Prof. Frederic Meyers, found, for instance, that in the Lower Rio Grande Valley seasonal cotton labor needs fluctuated from 5,000 to 125,000 against a permanent total labor force of only 38,000.

However, the same study found that an adequate supply might well be drawn from within the State of Texas if adequate monetary and other considerations were offered.

Observing that "much of the agricultural labor in the valley is performed by illegal entrants from Mexico," and tactfully skirting the question of wages with the notation that they were "low" even in comparison with other parts of Texas, the Nelson-Meyers report continued:

"The valley has an opportunity almost unique in a largely agricultural area of providing steady year-around jobs for a permanent resident labor force * * * (but) no such stable and desirable conditions exist, and the reasons for their lack lie plainly in the instability created by the continuous traffic back and forth across the Rio Grande.

FACILITIES UNNECESSARY

"The living standards which Mexican nationals are willing to tolerate, and the fact that so many of them are only temporary residents, have made it unnecessary for valley farmers to provide housing, sanitary facilities and other nonwage perquisites adequate to retain a permanent resident farm population."

During the last few years while the "wetback" traffic has been increasing at a rate of 50 percent or more a year, there has been more or less constant farm unemployment in the Southwest.

In the face of purported shortages of labor in Texas, every year around 100,000 residents of the State take to the road, joining the migrant farm-labor stream to the States north, west and east, where lessened "wetback" competition brings more adequate compensation.

Granting the possible occasional need for foreign labor, there is machinery under the United States-Mexico agreement of 1949 for the legal importation of workers under contract. But the farmers do not like this, because contracting involves minimum wages—ranging currently from 40 cents an hour for Texas to 60 cents for California—and guaranties of housing, insurance, and other conditions that make it far more expensive than "wetbacks." Consequently, legal contracting has remained minute in comparison with "wetback" employment.

Although wetback employment is such an established institution that Rio Grande Valley newspapers refer to it baldly as "cheap labor," farmers often argue that any greater labor costs would put them out of business.

CAN BE DONE

There is telling evidence in contradiction of this contention. For virtually every case where a crop is being produced with wetback labor, instances can be found of the same crop's being produced competitively—often in less favorable areas—with legal Mexican contract labor or domestic labor.

At the time farmers in the lower Rio Grande Valley were paying $1.25 for cotton picking, farmers in California's San Joaquin Valley—300 miles north of the border—were paying $3—and making impressive profits. Similar differentials customarily exist in citrus and vegetable production, despite California's more costly distance from eastern markets.

Even within Texas, at a time when daily wages for cotton chopping (thinning) in the valley were about $2.25 the Nelson-Meyers report said, "in the northeast Sandy Lands of Texas they were $3, in Corpus Christi and the coast prairie areas they were $4, in the rolling plains $5, and in the high plains $5.25."

The Saunders-Leonard study indicated that valley farmers were able to realize upwards of $5,000,000 extra profit on their cotton crop last summer by their illegal-labor wage rates. This comfortable differential possibly throws light on the fact that during 1949, when the farm income of the State as a whole was declining 8 percent, according to statistics of the State Department of Agriculture, valley farmers were able to increase their income by 7 percent.

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1951]

PEONS IN THE WEST LOWERING CULTURE—ILLEGAL MIGRANTS FROM MEXICO FORM VAST UNASSIMILABLE BLOC OF POPULATION—ALL STANDARDS DECLINE—HEALTH, EDUCATION, DEMOCRACY IN AREAS WHERE WETBACKS WORK ARE DEPLORABLE

(By Gladwin Hill)

EL PASO, TEX., March 26.—The annual invasion of the United States by more than 1,000,000 illegal Mexican border-jumpers, long regarded by some as merely a quaint regional phenomenon of the Southwest, is emerging as a prime factor in some of the worst economic and social conditions in the Nation.

It is a matter of extensive public record that the 3,000,000 Mexican-American citizens of the Southwest are one of the most underprivileged segments of the population, in earnings, health, education, and equality of treatment.

The wetbacks, whose influx in its present proportions is a development of recent years, did not originate these conditions. In the opinion of a large number of expert observers, however, their presence has done much to perpetuate and aggravate them.

"From a cultural standpoint," states Dr. George Sanchez, head of the department of history and philosophy of education at the University of Texas, and probably the foremost student of regional interracial affairs, "the influx of a million or more wetbacks a year transforms the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest from an ethnic group which might be assimilated with reasonable facility into what I call a 'culturally indigestible' peninsula of Mexico.

NULLIFIES INTEGRATION

"The wetback migration tends to nullify processes of social integration going back 300 or 350 years, and I would say at the present time has set the whole assimilation process back at least 20 or 30 years."

It is the Mexican-American citizens whom, primarily, the wetback cheap-labor invasion deprives of jobs and, through broad economic pressures, pulls down to its own primitive living standards.

It is the wetbacks, as parties to an informal system of peonage, who inexorably tend to set the level of the far from frictionless relations between the Mexican-Americans and the Anglos.

"No citizen who wants to live in even a minimum of comfort and decency can compete with the wetback wage scale," Dr. Sanchez and Dr. Lyle Saunders, of the University of New Mexico, said in a recent report of the University of Texas' continuing study of the Spanish-speaking peoples, a project of the Rockefeller Foundation's general education board.

"With an oversupply of cheap, unprotected labor always present, organization of workers is impossible, individual bargaining is futile.

"There are only two choices: work for what the wetback works for and live as he lives, or leave the area. Many accept the former alternative. Those who can, choose the second and become displaced persons. Either choice results in undesirable conditions for the individual and social problems for the community."

IN THE WAKE OF POVERTY

"For those who stay and attempt to compete, there is poverty and all the evils associated with it: disease, ignorance, child labor, crime and delinquency, lack of concern with civic affairs, slum conditions, and always the weight of a deadened, passive, apathetic population to be carried on the shoulders of other elements of the community.

"For those who leave, there are similar problems of health, education, welfare, and housing—problems that affect those migrating and those in the communities to which they go."

The second alternative is exemplified in the annual migration of around 100,000 Texans, along with thousands of farm workers resident in other wetback States, to other harvest areas of the Nation in quest of remunerative work.

It is possibly more than coincidence that the number of migrant farm workers who course the Nation annually has been independently estimated at 1,000,000—on the order of a conservative estimate of the number of wetbacks who annually breach the border.

The sources of this migration vary in many cases in direct proportion to the presence of wetbacks. In the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, the heart of wetbackland, where as many as 100,000 wetbacks may be working at one time during the harvest peak, a recent survey showed that of 15,000 families, 8,000 had hit the migrant trail during a 2-year period.

NOT MERELY AGRICULTURE

The dislocations are not confined to the agricultural field. Wetbacks filter into every occupation from culinary work to the building trades. Practically any labor union in the 1,600-mile border zone from Texas to California can cite local instances of wetback competition in its field.

An analysis of a group of 160 supposedly agrarian wetbacks picked at random from among a summer's deportations by Dr. Saunders disclosed nine bricklayers, seven truck drivers, three miners, two factory workers, two welders, two weavers, a painter, a barber, a blacksmith, a butcher, a shoemaker, and a policeman.

A check of a single residential block in El Paso, Tex., one day last summer turned up three wetbacks doing craft work—a painter, a carpenter, and a carpenter's helper—working at rates from 57 cents an hour down to 37 cents.

In southwest Texas, wetback competition is so strong that even such nationally powerful unions as the teamsters' and the building trades' are only sketchily organized. An organizer for the American Federation of Labor in the area acknowledged sadly that even loyal union members had got in the habit of working on jobs beside wetbacks without protest.

The approximately 1,250,000 Mexican-Americans in Texas comprise one-sixth of the State's population. In many parts of southwest Texas they are predominant in the population.

COMPARATIVE DEATH RATES

Among the Anglo-American population, the 1946 death rate from diphtheria was 1.81 per 100,000 population; for the Spanish-speaking people, a synonym for Mexican-Americans, it was 6.47; the Anglo-American whooping cough rate was .64, the Mexican-American 5.73; the tuberculosis death rate was 25.4 for Anglo-Americans, 159 for Mexican-Americans.

In San Antonio, the largest city of southern Texas, the tuberculosis death rate among Anglo-Americans is 40, among Negroes 50, and among Mexican-Americans 150.

General conditions worsen as you progress into the wetback country. In Hidalgo County, one of three that make up the lower Rio Grande Valley, a United States Public Health Service survey of 3,103 resident Spanish-speaking families comprising 16,782 persons, disclosed that in 1947–48, 9.8 percent had annual incomes below $500, 41.6 percent below $1,000, 68.3 percent below $1,500, and 82.9 percent below $2,000.

In Hidalgo County in 1949, the infant death rate among Spanish-speaking people was nearly five times that among the non-Spanish speaking. In 1949, Hidalgo and adjacent Cameron County, although containing only one-thirtieth of the State's population, accounted for one-fifteenth of all the State's meningitis, one-twelfth of its typhoid and diphtheria, one-seventh of its dysentery, and one-fifth of its malaria.

EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES

Comparable educational deficiencies characterize the region. The farm-worker migration from Texas customarily starts in the early spring, months before the school year ends, and the workers do not return until fall, after the school year has started.

Among families who do not migrate, and who are faced with making livings under the competition of wetback wages, child labor is so common that in some parts of west Texas the public schools remain closed for an extra month while the fall harvest is on. They remain open an extra month at the end of the year, but this evidently is a minor compensatory factor. In the three valley counties, a recent University of Texas study disclosed, in the age bracket 6 to 17, more than 40 percent of the children were absent from school on a given day.

"It seems perfectly plain from the figures that a fairly large percentage of the scholastics belong to the labor force in some degree * * * and that a fairly large percentage of (children above 14) belong regularly to the labor force."

The United States Public Health Service survey of 3,103 Hidalgo County Spanish-speaking families disclosed that 53 percent of their members had no formal schooling, 75 percent had less than 3 years, only 15 percent had from 3 to 6 years, only 1 percent had completed high school, and only 1 out of 1,000 had attended college.

Of those persons over 21, 45 percent had no schooling, only 2 percent had completed high school, and only 2 out of 1,000 had attended college. Sixty-seven percent could not speak English, and 39 percent were illiterate even in Spanish. For comparison, the latest available State statistics on education among the over-all population of the same county show that 54.6 percent had completed five grades or more, and that 20.6 percent had completed high school.

The retarded assimilation of the Spanish-speaking people, the University of Texas re-

port stated, is revealed in second and third generation citizens who do not speak or who are not fluent in the language of their country, in poor school attendance records and low educational attainments, in abnormally high concentrations in unskilled occupations, in the persistence of separate, segregated institutions, and in subjective outgroup feelings toward non-Spanish-speaking citizens.

Despite all the problems of assimilation, Dr. Saunders concluded from a recent study of the valley, it is conceivable that a mutually satisfactory adjustment involving a considerable cultural and perhaps even biological blending of both groups might have been reached had it not been for the continual inflow of large numbers of wetbacks.

"For the wetback embodies most of the elements necessary to reinforce the stereotyped notions of the Anglo through which he sees or fancies he sees undesirable characteristics in the Spanish-speaking group, and tends to assign to all Spanish-speaking people the characteristics he thinks he sees in the wetbacks. * * * poor, uneducated, unskilled, underfed and frequently unclean.

DISCRIMINATION RAMPANT

Although the Texas courts have held that Mexican-Americans are white and therefore not subject to the same level of segregation as Negroes, they are still subject to extensive discrimination—both organized as in certain public housing projects, and informally. A typical example reported by Dr. Saunders is that where Anglo-American stenographers get between $150 and $250 a month, and average about $167, the standard scale for Mexican-Americans, despite their convenient bilinguality, is $100 to $150.

Although constituting some 16 percent of the population of Texas, Mexican-Americans account for only 2 percent of the enrollment in the State's 4-year colleges and universities.

Consonant conditions obtain, in varying degrees, throughout the Southwest.

Possible illumination of the correlation between the status of the wetbacks and that of the Mexican-Americans is provided by a comparison of their role in public affairs, in the States of Texas, New Mexico, and California. In all three States, Spanish-speaking populations have been established for more than a century. In New Mexico, the Spanish-speaking people constitute a larger proportion of the over-all population than in the other States—about half—but from a governmental standpoint their concentration is no greater in various areas than in important sections of Texas and California.

In the latter two States, prime termini of the wetback influx, you can search the rosters of State, county and local legislative and administrative personnel through hundreds of names without encountering one that is Spanish.

In New Mexico, which has only 100 miles of border contiguous to Mexico and where there is relatively little farming to draw wetbacks for practically every Anglo-American in public office—including the State's representation in Congress—you can find a person of Latin extraction.

[From the New York Times of March 28, 1951]

SOUTHWEST WINKS AT WETBACK JOBS—ETHICS CAST ASIDE AS GROWERS ACCEPT PEONAGE IDEA AND BRIDLE AT INTERFERENCE—FEDERAL SANCTION NOTED—BORDER PATROL OFFICERS REPORT PRESSURES FROM WASHINGTON TO "GO EASY" IN RAIDS

(By Gladwin Hill)

EL PASO, TEX., March 27.—The rise in illegal border-crossing by Mexican wetbacks to a current rate of more than 1,000,000 cases a year has been accompanied by a curious relaxation in ethical standards extending all the way from the farmer-exploiters of this contraband labor to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Although wetbacks are fugitives from justice, southwestern cotton, citrus, and vegetable growers have come to the fixed view that there is nothing wrong in employing them, harboring them or even in actively recruiting them across the international boundary.

Further, they have come to feel they have a vested right in the traffic. Any more than the normal token interference with it by the Immigration Service's skimpy border patrol—with less than 900 officers for the 1,600-mile expanse from Texas to the Pacific Ocean—brings an outraged hue and cry from communities thoroughly indoctrinated with the farmers' attitude.

A year ago, in a special drive, border-patrol officers were concentrated temporarily along the Rio Grande and in 1 month increased their apprehensions from 16,490 to 24,415.

GESTAPO TACTICS CHARGED

Newspapers of the lower Rio Grande Valley immediately accused the Immigration Service editorially of "siding with Mexico" and described valley farmers as "justifiably resentful" at having their scheme of things thus disrupted.

A barrage of feature articles followed, describing in emotional verbiage the purported separation of families by the deportation of border jumpers (an exigency specifically exempted in the immigration laws); and dire conditions allegedly created on the Mexican side of the border by the congestion of deportees (which Mexican officials promptly denied).

The border patrol, long known for its anomalously amicable relations with both the farmers whose fields it periodically raids and the Mexicans it deports, was accused of almost as heinous a roster of outrages as was laid to the Nazi Government, in headlines such as: "Says border patrol uses Gestapo methods." * * * "Illegal search and seizure is issue" * * * "Valley Legion scores acts of border patrol." * * * "Crime against humanity."

Representative LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., Democrat, of Texas, member of a prominent valley farming family, took the floor of Congress to demand a full-dress investigation of a report that border patrolmen called at a house in Mission and questioned the occupants "without a search warrant."

SOCIAL SECURITY CARDS ISSUED

Communities have become so accustomed to "wetbackism" that in the leading "wetback" areas of Texas, Dr. Lyle Saunders, University of New Mexico sociologist, recently reported after extensive first-hand study of conditions, "almost anyone who needs help of any kind will hire a wetback—farmers, contractors, businessmen, housewives, city governments, county governments, and even the International Boundary Commission." In this, Texas does not differ substantially from the wetback areas of Arizona, California, and other Western States.

On the hallowed bureaucratic principle of the left hand's not knowing what the right hand is doing, while the Immigration Service struggles with the wetback influx, the Social Security Administration freely issues cards to wetbacks on which they have little chance of collecting benefits, but which are handy for pseudo-identification. Wetbacks get draft board cards for the same purpose, giving worthless addresses. State employment offices in many places—quasi-Federal agencies—refer wetbacks to employment opportunities right along with citizens.

A leading California labor contractor, asked by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor where he located the wetbacks in which he admittedly trafficked, replied blandly: "From the State employment service."

The notion that wetback labor is both proper and indispensable has become so firmly implanted in southwestern communities that its accompanying evils are taken as a matter of course.

WETBACKS LINKED TO CRIME

The (Lower Rio Grande) Valley Express last March quoted District Attorney Jack Ross, of Edinburg, Tex., as saying that in the previous year as much as 75 percent of the convictions in certain major crime categories had been against wetbacks and that since the stepped-up drive against them crime generally had dropped off 50 percent. The newspaper added, without comment, that local police in several valley cities reported such petty crime as pilfering and drunkenness had dropped sharply.

About the same time the San Benito (Tex.) News reported blandly: "It was quite a weekend in San Benito. Only a few habitual drunks got into jail. The round-up of wetbacks may worry San Benito district farmers and cut down receipts of beer joints, but it is a blessing to local police. 'No petty thefts, few fights, no burglaries, and everything peaceful with most of the wetbacks gone, at least for a time, is the police view."

Sheriff Robert Ware, of Imperial County, California's leading wetback area, asked by this correspondent if wetbacks constituted any particular law-enforcement problem, said, "No, they don't give us much trouble. They're mostly quiet, law-abiding people who just want work." A few minutes later he acknowledged that of 185 inmates in the county jail, he estimated 25 percent were wetbacks.

The public record offers extensive evidence of tacit or active Federal sanction of the wetback traffic all the way from the border patrol to the White House level.

ARREST TRENDS ANALYZED

Some responsible regional observers have noted a curious inverse correlation between the rate of the border patrol's apprehensions, which vary widely seasonally, and local demands for wetback labor. One way or another, these sources suggest, the border patrol functions less as a law-enforcement agency than a checkvalve, restricting illegal immigration to the level of active public alarm. No corruption of border-patrol officers is implied. It is just, these observers explain, that after apprehension activities have gone so far, as in last year's special Rio Grande campaign, pressures, public and private, build up to damped the border patrol's ardor.

Some immigration officers deny this, contending that they consistently and conscientiously do as well as they can with their skimpy resources to stem the wetback tide, and that fluctuating apprehensions simply reflect fluctuations in the over-all wetback migration rate.

Other officers differ. One after another testified before the President's Commission on Migratory Labor that the border patrol was subject constantly to invisible but emphatic pressure exerted from farm quarters through Washington and relayed through Immigration Service channels, to go easy on the wetback round-up.

This was epitomized in the testimony of the late Grover C. Wilmoth, veteran director of the El Paso Immigration District. He said:

"All we need is a go-ahead signal and we can enforce the law 90 to 95 percent. With a little additional men and equipment we could do an efficient enforcement job. It's a disgrace to this country that her laws are openly flouted and evaded. The farmers once were ashamed of using wetbacks. Now they have come to the point where they believe they have a vested right in these illegal workers. They go to their Senators,

their Congressmen, the Attorney General, or the President to complain."

It was in Mr. Wilmoth's district, during the 1948 Presidential campaign, that there occurred the notorious "El Paso tea party." The supply of Mexican labor had not been sufficient to satisfy farmers of the area.

As reported by Art Leibson of the El Paso Times, "When President Truman came to El Paso for a campaign address, the problem was laid before him by cotton men and by Texas and New Mexico Congressmen. Soon after his train moved east through Texas, there was a meeting of top immigration officials at El Paso." What went on behind the scenes is still a matter of equivocal explanation by immigration officials. What happened openly was that—in outright violation of United States commitments, according to the subsequent protest of the Mexican Government—border-patrol officers turned their backs for 48 hours while some 7,500 wetbacks streamed across the river unhindered to fill the farmers' wants.

A similarly questionable incident occurred only a month ago in California. Some ranchers rounded up one hundred-odd wetbacks some 30 miles north of the border and took them in chartered buses to the immigration station at Calexico. The ranchers and the border patrol were in the midst of a still mysterious proceeding evidently aimed at legitimizing these workers for transportation to ranches in the north, when representatives of the National Farm Labor Union, AFL, intervened and protested to the local Mexican consul that the law was being violated. Although the district headquarters of the Immigration Service still contends that the proceeding was in full compliance with regulations, the union's protest had sufficient validity so that the operation was halted and the wetbacks returned to Mexico.

AGREEMENT CALLED A TRAVESTY

The most conspicuous official hypocrisy regarding wetbacks has been that surrounding the United States-Mexico farm labor agreement of 1949, one of the periodical extensions of which is now before Congress. The professed aim of this agreement was to eliminate the wetback traffic by providing for the recruitment of Mexican farm labor below the border and its orderly importation into the United States for maximum work periods of 1 year where real shortages of domestic labor were duly certified by the United States Employment Service.

After 18 months of its operation, however, many close observers feel that the agreement manifestly has worked out as a travesty on this intent.

The agreement opened with a solemn declaration of representatives of the United States State Department and the Mexican Foreign Ministry deploring the wetback traffic of Mexican workers, which has mounted steadily and no appreciable steps have been taken to reinforce the border patrol.

The agreement then offered an incentive to border jumping by providing that wetbacks should have preference in hiring under the contract system. Such priority was limited to wetbacks in the United States at that time, but this deadline for absolution from law violation has been extended over and over. Last summer the legalization of wetbacks in the United States before July 26 was authorized. When this did not produce enough cheap Mexican labor, the preference was extended to all wetbacks in the country before October 20.

CROSS BORDER IN RITUAL

Of the first 98,000 laborers contracted under the agreement in the fall of 1949, 78,000, by acknowledgment of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security, were wetbacks who were legalized.

Nominally this legalization process consists of the wetbacks voluntarily surrendering and returning to Mexico for subsequent recruiting.

As it works out in practice, the wetbacks are rounded up in the United States and taken to legalization centers on the border, where as part of their processing they go through the formality of momentarily crossing the Mexican line—a ritual that has become known as "walking around the statue."

Of 28,000 Mexican contract laborers now in the United States, virtually all were wetbacks legitimized in this way.

Article 6 of the agreement affirmed that Mexican nationals should not be contracted to work "in localities where Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or race." They have been put to work in such localities.

Subsequent articles said Mexican contract labor should be paid the prevailing wage rates for a given area, that this should not be promised on wetback-wage scales, and that the contract labor should not displace domestic citizen labor.

These stipulations, if complied with, observers agree, would virtually have precluded contracting, since farm wages in key areas of the Southwest are geared to the wetbacks' minimal compensation to such a degree that domestic citizen workers by the hundred thousand are frozen out of the market. This was circumstantially corroborated when contract minimums of 40 cents and 60 cents an hour were adopted under the agreement, respectively, for Texas and California, for identical work—reflecting accurately the differing concentrations of wetbacks in the two areas.

The final irony of the agreement was a stipulation that contract workers should not be provided to employers of wetbacks, and that any employer found to have wetbacks should have his contracting privileges withdrawn.

This again, if complied with, virtually would have eliminated key areas of the region, wetback employment is so prevalent.

In one day recently the farm-labor union supplied United States and Mexican officials a list of eight large vegetable ranches in the immediate area of El Centro, Calif., employing wetbacks, the most prominent being the firm of O'Dwyer & Mets, headed by Frank O'Dwyer, brother of William O'Dwyer, United States Ambassador to Mexico. Immigration officers seized 300 wetbacks on that ranch. The union demanded that its contracting right be withdrawn.

Six weeks have elapsed, and as this was written the regional office of the United States Bureau of Employment Security in San Francisco acknowledged that no action had been taken. It said an inquiry was under way. The first step in the inquiry was a so-called hearing at El Centro of parties in the case.

The hearing was an unannounced private conference on a Sunday night between a lawyer from the Employment Security Bureau and representatives of O'Dwyer & Mets.

When this correspondent sought to interview Mr. O'Dwyer, the latter referred him to Mr. Mets. Asked where Mr. Mets could be seen, Mr. O'Dwyer said, "He's in Washington."

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1951]

INTERESTS CONFLICT ON WETBACK CURE—EVEN BORDER POLICE DISAGREE ON MEASURES TO STEM FLOOD OF MEXICAN LABORERS—NATIONS' PACT IN DISPUTE—UNIONS SEE A MOVE TO CUT PAY BY FARMERS WHO OPPOSE UNITED STATES RULE ON CONTRACTS

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, March 2.—Almost every segment of the Nation's population interested in the wetback problem has a simple straightaway solution for it.

The trouble is that because of conflicting interests, no group's solution is very satisfactory to anyone else.

Even experienced officers of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Services, targets of a mounting barrage of criticism as illegal crossings of the Mexican border have mounted, are in wide disagreement about the most effective measures.

Some contend that simply augmenting the border patrol's present skimpy facilities—with a nucleus of less than 900 men to guard the 1,600 miles from Texas to the Pacific coast—might largely stem the tide of upward of 1,000,000 Mexicans who annually cross the line to work for minimal wages and who depress both economic and social standards in the Southwest.

Others contend that it would take a large standing army to make the border impregnable, and that the problem should be tackled from another angle.

Most concur that stiffening the present penalties for illegal entry—up to a year's imprisonment for the first offense and 2 years for a repetition—would be useless against the horde of amiable wetbacks who, by their numbers, overwhelm the facilities for apprehension and prosecution.

THE POLITICAL FACTOR IS CITED

Some think that if the immigration laws could be fixed up logically to make it an offense to employ wetbacks, who are technically fugitives from justice, it would eliminate their chances of getting jobs, and along with that the incentive for sneaking into the country.

Here again immigration officers disagree about the political practicality of such proposals. Some think that Southwestern farmers, with their vested interest in cheap wetback labor and their influential lobbies, would surely try to scuttle such steps. One immigration officer of exceptionally long experience, however, said: "They wouldn't dare to oppose it, because that would focus public attention on their system."

Members of Congress, whipsawed between the constant farm pressure for alien labor and the obvious need to do something about the wetback traffic, ratified the 1949 agreement between this Nation and Mexico for the importation of Mexicans under contract. A periodical extension of this agreement is now before Congress.

This agreement has not pleased anybody particularly. By providing for preference in job recruiting to wetbacks already in the United States, it has probably acted as an incentive to border-jumping, which has increased at a rapid rate ever since the agreement became effective.

FARMERS DISLIKE THE PACT

Farmers dislike it for many reasons. Requests for labor to be imported have to be filed 60 days in advance. With the principal Southwestern crops of cotton, citrus, and vegetables, it is often difficult to predict precisely so far ahead just how many hands are going to be needed, when and for how long.

Also, minimum wages—ranging from 40 cents an hour in Texas to 60 cents in California—and housing, insurance, transportation, bonds, and other requirements under the contract system, raise the cost of this labor. In some cases, farmers have averred, actually above the cost of domestic citizen labor.

Farmer objections to transportation costs and complications have brought about the virtual scrapping of the original concept of recruiting labor in the interior of Mexico, where there was a dearth of local employment opportunities, in favor of recruitment right at the border through the legalization of wetbacks.

A return to recruiting south of the border is one of the principal proposals in connection with extending the international agreement, now under debate. Another is for resumption of active participation by the United States Government—as during World War II—in the transportation and allocation of the imported labor and in the handling of certain of the moneys involved.

This is objected to as quasi socialism. There is also palpable concern in farm circles that Government management of alien labor would soon extend to allocation of domestic labor. Such a step, it may be noted, might nullify the traditional contention that domestic labor is not available, a contention that farmers use to justify the employment of alien labor, legal and illegal.

In contrast to such proposals, influential farm quarters long have been advocating what they habitually refer to as a simple crossing-card system, but which critics call simply legalized wetbackism.

Under this system, Mexicans would receive border passes to circulate in the United States, confined in theory to areas of farm labor shortages, and to work without any of the burdensome guaranties of minimum wages, housing, insurance, and transportation required under the present contracting system.

Organized labor in the United States, as expressed in repeated declarations particularly of the American Federation of Labor and its affiliates, would approach the problem from the other end.

It contends that the agitation in the United States since World War II about obtaining alien labor generally has been an oblique effort to undercut American workers, predicated on illusory shortages of domestic labor. These shortages are said to result from a refusal to offer adequate wages.

This contention is at least partially corroborated by a recent study at the University of Texas, previously cited in these articles, which concluded that the labor needs of certain key farm areas could, with adequate inducements, be filled entirely from within the State. This is contrasted to the present situation in which wetbacks pour in by the hundred thousands, while domestic workers leave the State regularly in similar numbers to seek more adequate wages elsewhere.

The National Farm Labor Union, the A. F. of L.'s principal affiliate in the field, contends that domestic labor shortages should be established by public hearings in the areas in question instead of by the present unilateral certification by Federal-State employment offices, whose personnel may be subject to local pressure from farmers.

Secondly, the union advocates on the question of what is the prevailing wage for given work in a given area—a critical factor in considerations both of the availability of domestic labor and of the terms that should be accorded alien labor—that this wage be similarly arrived at in open hearing rather than as now, in the uncertain realm of administrative decisions.

If these two conditions were met, labor maintains, many of the current problems would be dispelled because underlying them is a simple reluctance to pay adequate wages.

With these conditions met, it is contended, domestic citizen labor would be forthcoming; and even on the condition, quite foreseeable in the current war emergency, that alien labor were needed, a frank approach to wage and cost economics would eliminate the present haggling and complications that attend the contract system.

From labor and independent observers of the wetback problem, including educators, economists, sociologists, and welfare and church agencies, the suggestion also has come that the wage chiseling that underlies the wetback influx might be obliterated by applying Federal minimum wages to agriculture, at least in cotton, which is a Government-subsidized crop around which much of the wetback traffic revolves.

Farmers have long contended that minimum wages in agriculture are unworkable. But a minimum wage has long been in effect under an exceptional Federal law for the sugar-beet crop.

Radio Spot Announcements on Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the truly great organizations in this Nation is the American Heritage Foundation located at 25 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y. The purpose of this organization is clearly indicated in its title itself. It is designed to encourage our citizens to respect and maintain the great values that comprise our magnificent heritage.

One of the important elements of its work is the forwarding to some 1,700 cooperating radio stations each month of a series of spot announcements which can be broadcast in between programs and at other convenient times and which contribute tremendously to an awareness of the American heritage. I can think of few more constructive uses of America's great media of communications.

Some of the forthcoming radio spots are devoted to focusing attention on supplementing the job which has been performed by the Senate Commission Investigating Interstate Crime.

I have been delighted to read these spot announcements because it has been my deep conviction that only when John Q. Public at the grass roots of the 48 States really gets hold of this issue and starts to clean up his own town, his own county, and his own State, can we say that the forces of lawlessness will really be on the run.

Each of these announcements is simple, clear-cut, wisely directed to the average citizen. By the repetition of the important theme of cooperating with law-enforcement officials, the announcements drive home a message which cannot be overemphasized nor repeated too often. By reference to past incidents in history, the announcements draw attention to the relevance of past experiences to our present and future.

I ask unanimous consent therefore that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following items:

(a) A list of the distinguished officers of the Foundation—a list which is a hallmark of some of the finest leaders in all phase of American life who devote their valuable time selflessly in the public interest.

(b) A list of the members of the great board of trustees of the Foundation.

(c) The text of several of these spot announcements on the crime problem.

I conclude with the keynote of the Foundation: "Freedom is everybody's job."

There being no objection, the lists of names and the text of the spot announcements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION

OFFICERS

Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board; William Green, vice chairman; Philip Murray, vice chairman; Robert G. Sproul, vice chairman; Thomas D'A. Brophy, president; Louis A. Novins, executive vice president; Edwin L. Weisl, secretary; James G. Blaine, treasurer.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Winthrop W. Aldrich, William D. Askren, Barney Balaban, Chester I. Barnard, Don Belding, James G. Blaine, Thomas D'A. Brophy, Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, Norman Chandler, Henry Corbett, William W. Crocker, John Cowles, C. Donald Dallas, John W. Davis, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Francis P. Gaines, William Green, Walter Head, Clifford Hood, Eric A. Johnston, Harry T. Kendall, Robert H. Lehman, Henry R. Luce, Charles Luckman, Gen. Timothy A. McInery, Harvey Mudd, Philip Murray, Reinhold Niebuhr, Louis A. Novins, Irving S. Olds, Fred D. Patterson, Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, Samuel F. Pryor, Andrew W. Robertson, Edward L. Ryerson, Gen. David Sarnoff, Paul Scott, McGregor Smith, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Thornton, DeWitt Wallace, Thomas J. Watson, Edwin L. Weisl, Charles E. Wilson, Robert E. Wilson, Thomas E. Wilson, James W. Young.

A TIME FOR RALLYING TO THE LAW

These are days of a double danger.

War threatens our heritage of freedom from abroad, and widespread lawlessness threatens it here at home.

Can we, you and I, as citizens, help against lawlessness?

Well, millions of Americans, who are "good citizens"—active and positive in their citizenship—are helping in the fight against lawlessness right now.

These millions resent being pushed around by contemptible crooks such as those exposed by the Kefauver investigation.

These millions are righteously angry against the arrogant criminals who look on them, mistakenly, as slaves. So these millions now help wage the war against crime by cooperating, however, wherever, and whenever they can, with public officials and with the courts.

This fighting spirit, this righteous anger, on the part of millions of awakened American citizens—including yourself no doubt—will be a triumphant weapon against the tyranny of crime, and for the preservation of freedom—that priceless freedom which is everybody's job.

In these days when our heritage of freedom is threatened by criminals both abroad and at home, these words of Woodrow Wilson are reassuring:

"If I did not believe that the moral judgment would be the last judgment, the final judgment, in the minds of men as well as the tribunal of God," Mr. Wilson said, "I could not believe in popular government. But I do believe these things."

It is the moral judgment of millions of our people that inspires our defiance of communism. And it is the moral judgment of

these same millions of Americans that inspires the present Nation-wide drive against immorality, against criminals and their crimes.

Many, many millions who believe in morals are in the fight, and in it to win. A "good citizen" obeys all laws himself, of course, but he goes much further: He helps public officials and the courts to bring criminals to justice and to prevent further lawlessness.

Yes, it is the moral judgment of these millions—you among them, of course—that freedom is everybody's job.

The University of Illinois has a professor of law by the name of Dr. George Washington Goble. And this famous authority wrote in his book The Design for Democracy, these challenging lines:

"If there is to be liberty there must be order, and if there is to be order there must be law."

So wrote Dr. Goble. And if we may rearrange that challenge, putting it loosely yet truthfully in reverse, we would say it this way: When laws are violated on a wide scale, how can there be order? And where there is no order, what happens to our most priceless possession—our heritage of freedom?

You know from a mass of shocking evidence that laws have been and are being violated on a large scale. But fortunately an aroused America, with its millions of good citizens, is doing something about that.

They are—and this "they" includes you, of course—they are not merely obeying every single law themselves, but they are assisting public officials in preventing crime. They are saying—and again that "they" includes you—they are saying that the law shall prevail, and that there shall be order, so that there shall continue to be freedom. They are emphasizing this familiar challenge: That freedom is everybody's job.

In 1830, one of our leading public enemies was the pirate, Charles Gibbs.

This buccaneer had compelled scores of innocent men and women to walk the plank before he was taken captive on Long Island, and presently hanged.

Now the person who discovered the clues that led to his capture was a plain every day citizen, known simply as Leonard. But he was surely a good citizen, this Leonard. For in addition to respecting the law himself, he helped public officials to arrest a law breaker, and so helped prevent lawlessness.

And just good citizenship is the obligation of us all today. Now as never before it is our responsibility to be vigilant, and help our public officials to prevent lawlessness whenever, wherever, and however we can.

For as lawlessness is a dangerous threat to freedom in peacetime, it is a more dangerous threat to freedom in wartime, and as every good citizen agrees, freedom is everybody's job.

You keep up with the news. So you know about the lawlessness that is horrifying the country.

Well, how do you like it? How do you like to be annoyed or even pushed around by cheap crooks in these tense busy days of mobilization?

How do you like it when these luxury-loving gangsters mock and sneer at plain everyday citizens and eminent officials just as Russian commissars sneer at their slaves?

And now for the big question:

As a "good citizen," what are you doing about these small contemptible men who steal and lie and cheat and even murder? Who may have taken property from you somehow, and would as readily take your life?

Well, you obey and respect the law, of course. But "good citizenship" demands more. It demands that we all cooperate, however we can, with public officials in the enforcement of the laws, and so help stop criminals, help prevent lawlessness.

When we do this—keeping constantly vigilant with a righteous anger in us—we illustrate once more the hard blunt fact that freedom is everybody's job.

Do you know what General Lafayette said about liberty? About freedom?

David Loth quotes Lafayette in Mr. Loth's new book about him entitled "The People's General."

"Anyone who ostensibly struck a blow for freedom could count upon the backing of his speeches in parliament," writes the Mr. Loth. "One day early in 1834 the chamber heard him at his favorite oratorical task of defining the aims for which he strove: 'Liberty must always be a living thing, never laid away in the archives."

This conviction of Lafayette's about liberty, about freedom, takes on special meaning today when our freedom is threatened by war abroad and by lawlessness at home. And surely Lafayette would say that in order to keep freedom a "living thing," every good citizen must respect the law, and also must vigilantly cooperate with public officials and courts for the prevention of lawlessness.

Or in other words, freedom is everybody's job.

A voice of long ago spoke words of special significance for today when our freedom is threatened by two dangers: War abroad, and lawlessness at home.

The voice was that of James Bryce, who said with blunt emphasis: "Patriotism consists not in waving the flag, but in striving that our country shall be righteous, as well as strong."

Mr. Bryce probably would be well pleased could he look in on America now.

For while we are gradually but surely mobilizing to meet whatever enemy may attack from abroad, we are also mobilizing by country, States, communities, and individuals against lawlessness at home.

Our people who love freedom, millions of good citizens, have come awake with righteous anger against this lawlessness. They are determined that America shall be righteous as well as strong and free. So they obey and respect the laws, and also cooperate with law officers vigilantly and fearlessly, however they can, in the fight against lawlessness.

That's what you're doing, and your neighbors as well, of course. For you know—as everybody knows now—that freedom is everybody's job.

Do you know who captured Maj. John André, the famous enemy spy, in the War of the American Revolution?

Well, our histories say he was stopped by "three militiamen." They quizzed him, examined his papers, and took him prisoner. Three militiamen. Not professional soldiers, not trained intelligence officers, but three plain everyday American citizens in uniform. And they were surely good citizens, those three. For by stopping this dangerous spy, they helped prevent dangerous espionage.

And just such good citizenship is the obligation of us all today. Not that we'll have an opportunity to catch spies. But now as never before it is our responsibility to be on the lookout for enemies of our freedom, and help our public officials to prevent lawlessness whenever, wherever, and however we can.

For as lawlessness is a dangerous threat to freedom in peacetime, it is a more dangerous threat to freedom in wartime. And as every good citizen agrees, freedom is everybody's job.

In his book entitled "Modern Arms and Free Men," Dr. Vannevar Bush declares that "the strength of democracy lies in the manifold blessings of freedom."

Well, if ever it was important that democracy be strong, the time is now.

The time is now, when the blessings of freedom are threatened not alone by war abroad, but by widespread and perhaps increasing lawlessness at home.

While we make ready to meet any danger from enemies abroad, we must at the same time triumph successfully over high crime and low criminals here among us.

We can do all that and more.

We can do all that by seizing our opportunities as "good citizens," especially the opportunity not only to obey and respect the law, but also to cooperate with officials in enforcing laws, in preventing crimes.

Millions of Americans, now righteously aroused, are vigilant to help however they can. For the strength of democracy does lie in freedom. And what we are saying by our cooperation against crime is just this: "Freedom is everybody's job."

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, public enemy No. 1 was Billy the Kid.

This smart-aleck gangster-on-horseback reviled his victims before he murdered them. But Sheriff Pat Garrett killed Billy quite dead in Billy's final gunfight.

Now a plain everyday citizen, known to us as a Mr. Brazil, wrote the letter that tipped off Sheriff Garrett as to where Billy could be found. And he was surely a "good citizen," this Mr. Brazil. For he not only respected the law, but by helping a law officer to catch a lawbreaker, he helped prevent lawlessness.

And just such "good citizenship" is the obligation of us all today. Now as never before it is our responsibility to be vigilant, and help our public officials to prevent lawlessness whenever, wherever, and however we can.

For as lawlessness is a dangerous threat to freedom in peacetime, it is a more dangerous threat to freedom in wartime. And as every good citizen agrees, freedom is everybody's job.

In his farewell address as President of the United States, Andrew Jackson made a blunt statement to his listeners.

"Providence has showered on this blessed land, blessings without number," he said. Then came the blunt statement: "Providence has chosen you," he said, "as the guardians of freedom."

Well, wouldn't Old Hickory say the same thing to our listeners today? To you?

Of course. And he probably would be quite solemn, too, observing that our freedom is now threatened by criminals both abroad and at home.

But we could reassure him. For as we become better prepared day by day to guard freedom from criminals abroad, millions upon millions of Americans—righteously angered—commit themselves also to the fight against lawlessness in America. This includes you, probably. For surely you who respect the laws yourself, help public officials, however you can, to prevent crime.

Old Hickory would like that. Fearless and honorable himself, he would be proud of you, proud of everybody who says by positive citizenship, that freedom is everybody's job.

The late Wendell Willkie stated in his book, One World, that the best answer to communism is a living, vibrant, fearless democracy.

But as Mr. Willkie would surely agree, a living, vibrant, fearless democracy cannot endure, freedom can't endure, in the face of widespread increasing crime.

It seems that crime is widespread and perhaps increasing in our own democratic Republic. And if we are successfully to meet the threat of communism, every citizen must be faithful to our laws.

Being faithful means to obey the law and to respect the law, of course, but that's not all by a long shot. Truly good citizenship, active citizenship, demands also that we assist public officials in preventing crime and the courts in giving evidence.

Now, of course, you are doing what you can to help prevent crime. Surely you are one of the millions of aroused citizens who will keep this democracy living, vibrant, and fearless. For you, like other millions, are dedicated to the proposition that freedom is everybody's job.

In these days good citizens are urged to be specially careful to support the law.

That's because there is much evidence today that lawlessness is active in some quarters—shamefully active at the critical moment when we are mobilizing to be able to meet any dangers from abroad.

Well, since the days of the Mayflower compact, days of the Virginia bill of rights, days of the Orangetown resolutions, and other early documents in the behalf of freedom, many eloquent Americans have paid high tributes to the law—such tributes as to make us more proud than ever to support it.

Dr. John W. Burgess paid it such a tribute when he said that the source of law is the national consciousness of truth and right.

Truth and right, they are the worthy qualities that we support when we obey the law, respect the law, and help our officials and courts however we can to enforce it.

And remember, only because we have law, do we have freedom. So surely freedom is everybody's job.

As we have been told all our lives, our Government is a government not of men but of laws.

Today when it's more than ever important that we all rally to the support of the law, lest lawlessness destroy our freedom, it is refreshing to read these lines that the late Mr. Justice Cardozo quoted from the Harvard Law Review:

"Code is followed by commentary, and commentary by revision, and so the task is never done."

So it is a living thing, the law that we must diligently and faithfully uphold.

In these tense days war threatens from abroad, and lawlessness threatens in America. So it is our obligation not only to respect and obey the law ourselves, but also to be energetically cooperative with officials and courts in enforcing the law.

It is our law. It came from us. It is alive. It is the one thing that keeps freedom alive. Naturally we are loyal to it. Everybody must be loyal to it. For freedom is everybody's job.

It's written down with finality, though with brevity, in the dictionary.

Citizenship is the status of being a citizen, we read. And a citizen is a person who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to reciprocal protection from it.

Surely everybody agrees with that definition. Surely everybody agrees that he, as a citizen, owes allegiance to his government.

Well, as we've been told from childhood, ours is a Government not of men, but of laws.

So we owe our allegiance to our laws. And while there is evidence of widespread lawlessness in these days of international tensions, all but a few of us, comparatively, are faithful to our laws. All but a few of us obey and respect them, and cooperate with officials and courts in upholding them.

Yes, there has been evidence recently of lawlessness in the country. It makes a man righteously angry, of course, because he knows that lawlessness has been known to destroy freedom. It won't destroy ours as long as all of us, but a disloyal handful, agree on this point: That freedom is everybody's job.

A devoted servant of the people and President of our country, Grover Cleveland, had this to say of fellow citizens who became careless about their obligations as good citizens.

"The abandonment of our country's watchtower by those who should be on guard," President Cleveland said, "and the slumber of the sentinels who should never sleep, directly invite the stealthy approach and the pillage and loot, by forces of selfishness and greed."

Well, Mr. Cleveland would probably be proud of his country today.

For today all but a shameful handful of the 150,000,000 Americans are vigilantly within the country's "watchtower"—wide awake instead of sleeping—readying themselves to protect our freedom from the forces of selfishness and greed, whether these forces be enemies abroad or lawbreakers in America.

Yes, while our good citizens mobilize to meet any danger from abroad, they obey and respect the law, and also, they help officials in preventing lawlessness, and the courts in giving true evidence.

And in these ways they help preserve our freedoms. Surely you are among them? For freedom is everybody's job.

Assignment of Ground Forces to Duty in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials having to do with the proposal to send troops to Europe. The first is entitled "Troops for Europe," and appeared in the New York Times of April 5, 1951. The second is entitled "The Bridges Are Burned," and appeared in the Evening Star of the same day.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1951]

TROOPS FOR EUROPE

On the second anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact, the Senate has approved by a large majority a resolution which constitutes another historic landmark in the development of American foreign policy. With this resolution the Senate reasserts the vital principle, long evidenced by the events, that the security of the United States and its citizens is directly dependent upon the security of its partners under the North Atlantic Treaty, and that the commitments of that treaty are therefore an essential part of our foreign policy.

In keeping with this principle, it specifically approves the appointment of General Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander of the unified defense forces now being created under that treaty. Furthermore, it declares that American security requires us to station abroad such units of our Armed Forces as may be necessary and appropriate to contribute our fair share to the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area, and for that purpose formally approves the earliest possible dispatch of four additional divisions to bring our total ground force strength in Europe to six divisions.

The impact of this resolution should be all the greater because it was adopted by a final vote of 69 to 21—a better than two-thirds majority—which should help erase the more dubious aspects of the long debate. This is a solid achievement and a long swing of the pendulum from the Neutrality Act of the mid-thirties. In a decade and a half American opinion has swung from an almost unquestioning faith in isolation to a judgment completely contrary. Not only have we thrown off all pretense of neutrality, not only have we come out of isolation to associate ourselves with a world organization for the maintenance of peace, and not only have we broken the traditions of a century and a half by entering into a binding defensive alliance with certain European powers, we now also recognize that the security of these powers so directly involves our own security that we are prepared to draw the first line of our defense across Europe and to station along that line six divisions, or all that can be provided at the present time.

This achievement must not be obscured, either here or abroad, by the commotion caused by the McClellan amendment advising the President to obtain further congressional approval before sending additional ground troops to Europe beyond the four divisions specified. That amendment, a product primarily of domestic politics, like the concurrent resolution inviting the House to repeat the debate, is regrettable because it might raise new doubts about the earnestness of our intentions and might even be exploited to precipitate new quarrels over the dispatch of troops needed to complete the task.

In that respect it is not exactly a testimonial to the Senate's statesmanship or certainty of its own mind. But it need not be the disaster it is represented to be. In fact, together with the McCarthy amendment regarding Germany and Spain, it might even do some good if it prods European nations into even greater efforts, both in respect to their own rearmament and the inclusion of a German and possibly Spanish contribution to western defense.

What must not be overlooked is that, in the final analysis, the McClellan amendment merely makes more imperative what is already demanded by the gravity of the measures we have taken, and what to some extent was also provided in the original resolution text—namely, that there must be consultation and agreement between the President and Congress on the policy involved. Furthermore, the language of the resolution clearly implies that, though specific approval is given only for four divisions, it is also the sense of the Senate that we must subsequently supply such additional divisions as may be necessary and appropriate both to contribute our fair share and to guarantee the validity of the North Atlantic Treaty. The Senate cannot very well go back on this pledge without repudiating the policy it has just approved, or proclaiming the six divisions in Europe to be just expendables.

Even with its amendments, therefore, the adoption of the resolution should provide Western Europe with new confidence to go full steam ahead with the defense programs

agreed upon. For this resolution notifies Soviet Russia that we intend to fight in Western Europe if Western Europe is threatened with aggression. Twice, on the eve of the two most calamitous wars in history, we notified the potential aggressor that we intended to follow a hands-off policy in the event of aggression. We seek now to prevent a third world war by telling the aggressor that if he goes to war he will find us in the center of the fighting.

[From the Evening Star of April 5, 1951]

THE BRIDGES ARE BURNED

Now that the "great debate" has ended, one tremendously significant fact has been put upon the record for all the world, and the Kremlin in particular, to see.

The United States is finally and irrevocably committed to fight on land, on the sea, and in the air if Western Europe should be attacked.

Nothing in the debate or in the resolutions finally adopted by the Senate can destroy or seriously impair the overriding importance of this plain declaration of our intentions. It is regrettable that the Senate adopted the amendment calling upon the President to obtain congressional approval before sending any troops to Europe in addition to the four divisions now scheduled for overseas duty. The practical effect of this may not be great. It is unfortunate, however, in that it implies, or may be interpreted as implying, a certain unwillingness on our part to do all of the things that may have to be done if the Communist threat is to be successfully met.

Actually, such an inference would not be warranted. Of the 21 votes finally cast against the troops-for-Europe resolution, only 19 came from Senators who oppose such a commitment. They constitute the hard core of what is left of isolationism in the Senate, and there is very little prospect that their thinking will ever prevail. Most of the support for the limiting amendment came from Senators whose grievance grew out of a constitutional difference with the President. Mr. Truman has a large responsibility for this conflict. Had he shown more wisdom and better judgment, the issue might have been avoided entirely. In any event, he could have done much more than he did to compose the difference amicably, once it had developed.

This water, however, has passed over the dam. Nothing is to be gained now by stirring the ashes of that conflict.

The thing that really counts, the thing that history will record as one of the most significant developments of our generation, is that the Senate has given its approval to the stationing in Europe, in peacetime, of a total of six divisions of American troops as a garrison force. The Senate has done this in explicit recognition of the fact that "the threat to the security of the United States and to our North Atlantic Treaty partners" makes it necessary to station United States armed units abroad so as to "contribute our fair share of the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area."

If the full meaning of this is obscure to any of our own people, it will not be obscure to the Russians. They will understand that we have put them on notice that an attack on any member of the North Atlantic Pact means war—instant and total war—with the United States. We may well hope that this, of itself, will prevent war—that the Russian masters will not be insane enough to unloose on themselves the terrible destruction that will follow an attack by them. We may also have hope that this evidence of our good faith and firm intention will expedite the organization, under General Eisenhower's command, of the projected international army in the west, so that if war should come the free nations will not be devoid of means to fight and win it.

Colonialism: United States Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the February 1951 issue of the Progressive, published at Madison, Wis., entitled "Colonialism: United States Style," and written by Mr. Felix S. Cohen, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Cohen served as an associate solicitor in the Interior Department, and is the author of the Handbook of Federal Indian Law. He teaches jurisprudence at Yale Law School, and philosophy at the City College of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONIALISM: UNITED STATES STYLE

(By Felix S. Cohen)

It was on a late spring afternoon in 1950 that the seven councilors of the Omaha Tribe gathered with their "nephews and nieces" on a little fragment of what was once their great cornland empire to plan defenses against white aggression. There is not much left of the 6,000,000 acres or more that was once their own, along the Nebraska bank of the Missouri River, but what is left, with its deep black soil and its bursting corncribs, its heavy mud and its fat horses, these Indians love, as they love the little fragments of self-government they still enjoy.

They were deeply disturbed over schemes hatched in high places to dispose of the remaining fragments of their age-old homeland. From long experience these Indians knew that the process of turning their land over to white men always began with an attack on the honesty, intelligence, or competence of Omaha Indians. Such attacks, inside and outside the Indian Bureau, had reached a new high intensity in recent months. Obviously there was danger in the air.

Suddenly, down the center aisle of the meetinghouse, walked the young wife of the council chairman, carrying an airmail special-delivery letter from Washington. The letter was opened and read circumspectly, as men of other races might read a letter from an archangel or a commissar. Dark eyes widened as the reader intoned the words of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs himself. He had carefully considered the plea of the Omaha Indians "that the Government give the tribe entire control of its own affairs, without the interference or expense of an agent or of agency employees."

II

He thought this request reasonable and in line with his own policy of encouraging Indians "to take care of themselves." Instructions had therefore been issued, according to the Commissioner's statement, "to turn over to the Omaha councilmen, in trust for the tribe, the mills, shops, dwellings, school houses, livestock, and all public property on the Omaha Reservation." All of the agency employees except those engaged in medical and educational work were being relieved of their posts.

The mounting delight that showed in Indian eyes suddenly blurred and the anxious brows of the two Government observers relaxed. The date of the Commissioner's statement was read. The date of the statement was 1884. It had been dug out of musty archives and mailed to the tribe by a friend in Washington. The next Omaha play would have to start 66 years behind the line of scrimmage.

The policy of cutting down Bureau controls and encouraging our Indian citizens to assume full responsibility for their own affairs has been vigorously proclaimed by every Commissioner since 1884. And yet these Omaha Indians, like many other tribes, have far less control over their own affairs than they had in 1884, and less in 1950 than in 1949. How come?

Back in 1854 the Omaha chiefs were invited to the White House. The tide of western migration had reached the wide Missouri, and the Great White Father wanted to buy 5,000,000 acres of the fat Omaha land, at about 15 cents an acre, to sell to white settlers at $1.25 an acre. Reluctantly the Indians agreed, but only on one condition. They insisted that the 15 cents be paid to them and not to Indian agents.

At the end of the conference President Pierce agreed that no Indian agent would handle the Indians' money. The great Omaha orator, Chief Joseph La Flesche, had used a silver dime to illustrate the plea of his people for the right to handle their own finances. The silver dime was brought to the Omaha reservation and was cherished as a symbol of a great victory in the Indians' struggle for freedom.

Ninety-six years have passed, all Indians are now citizens, and yet today no Indian on the Omaha Reservation is allowed to lease his own land and handle his rental income without the interposing of Bureau fingers. And during this entire 96-year period the Indian Bureau has been reporting to Congress on the steady progress that it is making in turning over to Indians an increasing responsibility for the managing of their own affairs and in cutting down controls which the Bureau still exercises over Indian life.

III

In 1885, the Commissioner reported:

"More than a year ago the Omahas felt themselves competent to do their own work and attend to their own affairs. At their request all their employees were discharged and they were left to themselves. The result, which then seemed doubtful, has shown the wisdom of their choice. They have attended to their own business and paid for their own work and are more independent and manly than before because of the consciousness that they are becoming men."

Similar reports were made by the Commissioner in 1886 and 1887. When and how and why the Indian Bureau crept back and took over control of Indian fields, buildings, and funds does not appear in any Commissioner's reports to the President or to Congress. Nor is much reporting done today on current Bureau activities which are depriving Indian tribes of the right to hold local elections without Bureau interference, the right to employ their own lawyers and technicians, and other rights that were guaranteed to them under the Roosevelt-Ickes-Collier administration.

The Omaha case is not unique. Most Indian tribes in the United States can report similar experiences. Federal promises that the Indians would be allowed to assume control of their own affairs go back at least to the 1830's. Usually but not always, there is a time qualification to the promise. Before the Indians can be trusted to take over complete responsibility for their own affairs, we are told, there must be a period of preparation during which the Indian Bureau will help to civilize—the current term is rehabilitate—the Indians.

IV

Back in the 1830's the transition period was generally fixed at 10, 15, or 25 years.

In the latest Indian Bureau drafts of tribal "rehabilitation bills" the date 1994 is generally fixed as the point at which Bureau supervision over Indian finances can safely be terminated for the more progressive tribes.

There is no tribe that has more control over its own affairs today than it had a year ago or a hundred years ago. There are few tribes that have as much control over their own affairs as they had in 1884. And yet during this period Commissioners of Indian Affairs have inaugurated more than 500 programs for liquidating Bureau activities. Most of these programs were directed to particular reservations or States, but several were of national scope.

During this period of intensive "liquidation" the annual Indian Bureau budget has increased from less than $6,000,000 to approximately $80,000,000. Some of the "rehabilitation" bills recently put forward by the Indian Bureau, often over the protest of the alleged Indian beneficiaries, would triple or quadruple Bureau expenditures for the more progressive tribes, in the expectation that by 1994 these Indians might safely be allowed to take care of themselves.

How a Bureau's efforts to "work itself out of a job" can produce these results presents a fascinating puzzle for white men as well as Indians, and for students of law and government of all colors and political faiths. The puzzle is particularly baffling because we Americans have had so little direct experience with colonialism.

Having started our existence as a Nation by repudiating colonial status, and having repudiated the role of empire with equal vigor, at least during the first 122 years of our national existence, we are not accustomed to the high moral talk by which great empires "aid" and "protect" backward peoples out of their independence, and impose a dependent status and a dependent psychology upon people who once managed their own affairs in a self-reliant way. Only in obscure places in the Indian country, in Alaska, and in a few small Pacific islands can we see what happens to our own Government experts when they are not responsible to the people they are governing or aiding.

The simplest explanation of the gap between Commissioners' programs and Bureau performance is the "devil theory," according to which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is a satanic hypocrite, who makes fine promises merely to fool Indians and Congressmen. According to the adherents of this popular view, the only good Indian Commissioner is a dead Indian Commissioner.

Unfortunately, life is not so simple. The harm that good commissioners do is often greater than the harm bad commissioners do. All but 3 or 4 of the 36 Commissioners of Indian Affairs who have served during the past 118 years have been honest, sincere, hard-working men who wanted to help the Indian and wanted also to work themselves out of the world's worst job.

Something more than a "devil theory" is needed to locate the source of the Indian Bureau's drive for expansion and aggrandizement and to understand the mental makeup of the men who carry on this drive while they think and talk (quite sincerely) of "liquidating" their Bureau. Perhaps if we understood the psychology of such officials more clearly we could see more plainly what is happening in other parts of the world where "liquidation" and the "withering away of the state" go hand in hand with a tremendous increase in bureau controls over individual freedom.

The Indian Bureau itself has a ready explanation for the discrepancies between proclaimed Federal policy and actual practice. Those Bureau officials who are most active in breaking down Indian self-government have their own "devil theory" to explain their failure to carry out the Bureau's public promises and policies. According to this theory, Indians are inefficient, dishonest, wasteful, ignorant, selfish, impatient, and generally drunk, or, at least, not so efficient, honest, economical, wise, public-spirited, patient, and sober as their Indian Bureau tutors.

Moreover, any white man outside the Bureau who seeks to help Indians is either a crank or a grafter or a paid agitator—a grafter if the Indians pay him for his help, a paid agitator if white sympathizers pay him, and a crank if nobody pays him. It is, of course, the duty of loyal Bureau employees to protect Indians from all cranks, grafters, and paid agitators. Accordingly, it is the unshirkable duty of the Indian Bureau to carry on its shoulders the "white man's burden" of telling the Indians what to do.

Essentially this is the philosophy of colonial administration in all parts of the world. It is instructive to see how this philosophy works out in day-by-day Indian administration.

V

The most plausible argument against local self-government, Indian or white, is the argument of inefficiency. Obviously, it is more efficient to have one official make decisions than to have 450,000 individual Indians scattered all around the United States and Alaska making different decisions for themselves as to how they will earn their livings, spend their money, use their land, litigate their grievances, or educate their children.

We see the most recent example of this efficiency drive in the latest Indian Bureau orders transferring authority over 200 reservations from the reservations to half a dozen so-called area offices. (These were originally called regional offices, but when Congress, in response to Indian appeals, refused money for such offices, they were rechristened "district" offices, and when district offices were forthwith abolished by Congress they were renamed "area" offices.)

Decisions that are made on the reservation cannot be very efficient because they are made in the presence of Indians, who like to participate in such decisions and require time for thinking, which is not as necessary for loyal Bureau employees. Decisions in Washington are made under congressional scrutiny, and, since many Indians are voters, this scrutiny interferes with speed and efficiency. But when decisions are made in Billings or Portland, most of the Indians affected are hundreds of miles away and their Congressmen are thousands of miles away. It is thus possible for such decisions to be highly efficient, that is, to disregard all the human desires and intangibles that do not show up in efficiency reports. The cult of efficiency thus makes it possible to recite all the proper phrases about liquidating the Indian Bureau while, at the same time, upholding every extension of Indian Bureau power over Indian lives on the ground that a poor (or rich) Indian cannot possibly be as efficient as an $80,000,000-a-year Indian Bureau.

VI

The argument of Indian inefficiency has one serious inconvenience. Any Bureau employee who uses it invites attention to his own inefficiencies. If they are notorious, he will find it safer to pitch his arguments on a plane of high morality. When the Federal courts held that the New Mexico Pueblos were not under Indian Bureau control, the Indian Bureau produced reams of gossip as to the immorality of various Pueblo Indian customs and ceremonials, and the Federal courts then backed down and admitted the necessity of Indian Bureau supervision.

Inexperienced freshman Congressmen sometimes think that Indian bureaucracy can be cut down by trimming appropriations. This is a naive view. To the experienced bureaucrat a cut in funds is always the best possible reason for centralizing power, which means transferring authority from people to agencies, or from local agencies to area offices or Washington officials. In fact, every expansion of a Bureau function is customarily justified on the ground that it will bring economy in the long run. Unfortunately, as Keynes has noted, in the long run we are all dead.

Once grant that expert government is better than self-government and there is no stopping the expansion of the Indian Bureau, or any other bureau, until it fills the whole space of the individual's life.

Back in 1834 the Congress decided that the time had come to wind up the fast-growing Bureau of Indian Affairs and that one of the best ways to do this was to allocate Indian Bureau positions to the Indians themselves. Every 30 or 40 years since then Congress has passed a new law to the same effect and several such bills have recently been introduced with much fanfare. These laws have great popular appeal because they conform with the American creed that self-government is better than expert government and that men and children learn by doing. None of us would ever learn to walk in childhood if the job of walking were assigned in each family to the expert walkers, as the theories of colonialism and Indian bureaucracy would require.

The Bureau never has carried out these acts of Congress, which have remained largely dead letters. The Indian Bureau never has given a general employment preference to Indians outside of ditch-digging and similar inferior or temporary jobs that whites were reluctant to tackle.

In the special vocabulary of Indian Bureau gobbledegook, policy decisions made by Indians for themselves are "politics" while decisions made for Indians by the Bureau are "sound administration." If elected Indian councilmen select friends and supporters for tribal jobs, this is described as "nepotism" and proves that Indians cannot be trusted with self-government. But if a Democratic President picks a Democratic Indian commissioner, if such a commissioner appoints old friends to high posts, and if an Indian superintendent has his wife appointed to a job in an institution financed by his Indians, this is accepted as a part of the democratic process.

Every now and then a Commissioner reveals the large number of dishonest officials that held jobs under a prior administration. But the real corruption of the Indian Bureau is institutional, not personal. It is like the corruption of prisons, insane asylums, concentration camps, Fascist and Communist states, and other societies in which men cannot talk back to officials. It is what Lord Acton had clearly in mind when he pointed out that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

VII

Thousands of solutions have been proposed in the last 450 years for the Indian problem. And this is as it should be, for thousands of Indians have thousands of problems, just as white men do.

The great thing about American democracy is that most of us have an unprecedented power to shape our own lives, make our own mistakes, and attain new understanding and strength from the mistakes we make. To extend such democracy to Indians—to let Indians spend their own money, run their own schools, use or lease their own lands, and hire their own lawyers to defend their rights, just as neighboring white communities do, would not establish utopias on our 200 Indian reservations, but at least it would remove from our democratic professions, in our dealings with nonwhite peoples, the taint of hypocrisy.

If to this simple measure of justice were added a full and prompt settlement of all Federal debts to our Indian fellow citizens, we would have no need to worry about how they would fare under the self-determination we have so long promised and so long withheld.

While You Read This, a Child May Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a powerful article by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, as reprinted in a full-page paid advertisement in the New York Times dated April 6, 1951.

This House must take action. I cannot understand the delay on the measure to authorize emergency food-grain shipments to India in the face of this terrible urgency.

I am receiving scores of letters from the people of my congressional district. For the most part, the people who live in the Nineteenth Congressional District never achieve any economic security; most of them have known hunger—actual gnawing physical hunger—in their own lives, and will know it in the future.

Yet I have not received a single letter opposing the India relief bill. This article by Mr. Cousins was sent to me by Mrs. John E. Scanlan, of 223 East Fifth Street, accompanied by an urgent letter to act at once.

Mr. Speaker, we must have action.

WHILE YOU READ THIS, A CHILD MAY DIE—AMERICA CAN HELP AVERT A FAMINE IN INDIA THAT MAY CLAIM 14,000,000 LIVES THIS YEAR

NEW DELHI.—Once you have seen the look of hunger on the face of a man it is difficult to put it out of your mind. I have seen the look of hunger on the faces of thousands of men, and I know I shall never forget it.

I first saw the hungry in a jail on the island of Ceylon. They were illegal immigrants fleeing the famine in the south of India, and the Government of Ceylon was detaining them in a prison in Jaffna until arrangements could be worked out for their return to India. They had come by small boat, landing during the night on the north coast of Ceylon, where some of them had been picked up by the police. No one knew how many Indians had fled to Ceylon in this summer.

In the jail at Jaffna I spoke to a woman of 55 who looked closer to 90. I doubt that she weighed 80 pounds. Her face was little more than a bare skull out of which small eyes glowed feverishly. She had come to Ceylon to join her married daughter, who had escaped successfully 2 months earlier. This much she was willing to tell, but she would not tell the police where her daughter might be found, even though it meant she herself would be returned to India alone.

I next saw the hungry in the south of India, where the suffering is most acute. I saw them against a background of parched and browned fields, with pale stubbles where rich rice paddies should have been. The reason for it was that the rains never came this year. They didn't come last year either or the year before that or the year before that.

"Four years, no monsoon," one of the elders in a village 40 miles from Madras told me. "The older people have thought hard but they do not remember when before the fields have been so dry. The wells are very low."

He looked up at the scudding clouds. "Clouds like this used to bring rain. Now they go out to sea and drop their rain where there is no need of it. The old people can eat little. If they are thin it is no great harm. Gandhi was thin. But the children are thin and they become sick quickly. Smallpox has killed many of them. Thirty had smallpox in this village. Sixteen died.

"We send men into the cities to work so they can buy rice to bring back to the village. But there is so little rice and the rations have been cut again, and what they bring back cannot fill the bowls of many persons. We eat what we can—bananas and some coconuts—but very many people here are starving."

I next saw the faces of the hungry on the streets of Calcutta. Many of them were homeless. They had lost their homes during the partition of India when Pakistan was created. They were Hindus who feared the Moslems, and they had abandoned their homes in Pakistan and crossed over into India. In India there are perhaps eight or ten million such refugees—it might be millions more; no one knows exactly how many. Thousands of them came into Calcutta, the world's largest city, looking for food and homes. They slept in the streets. Wherever you went at night, on the main thoroughfares or in the alleys or in the hallways, you could see the human forms huddled together against the cool night. During the day they waited in lines for Government food or they begged.

Near the luxurious Grand Hotel in Calcutta was a child of 8 or 9, with not enough clothes to conceal the bloated, empty belly of hunger. He was looking in the streets for scraps of food. Nearby was a young woman of about 20, her body covered by the rags of what once must have been a handsome sari. A child of two was on her hip. The child was badly undernourished, and his head rested on his mother's shoulder. His face was empty and expressionless. I also saw the hungry of Bangalore. They sat against the walls of buildings and waited.

Then I saw them in Delhi. There are more of the hungry and homeless in Delhi than in any other city in the world. As in Calcutta, many of them are refugees—maybe 500,000 or 600,000—and they have crowded into the city, setting up crude wood-and-straw shelters, most of them closet size. And every day the dead are carried out by men who are little more than half alive themselves. I stood on the corner of a busy street in Delhi and watched the refugees as they passed. Out of the thousands who passed by only two would be considered plump by American standards.

The Indians are reluctant to talk about themselves or about their hardships. I was able, however, to win the confidence of the attendant assigned to my room. He told me about his 6-year-old son, the one with tuberculosis. He said his son had been praying a great deal recently, much more than usual, and he had asked his son what he had been praying for. "My son was praying that he might die. He wanted to die and he wanted God to make him into a crow. I had told him about the crows that fly into the open windows of the hotel rooms and pick up food on the tables and then carry the food off. My son said he wanted to be a crow so he could fly wherever there was food and bring it back to our family."

Then the attendant, whose name was Arun, turned away from me and knelt down to fix the fire. "India has been hungry for many months," he said. "They are saying that America has known about this need and that America has not wished to send us food."

I replied that what he had been told was not true. What had happened was that we had been too slow in responding to India's need, and that was bad enough. Americans had to operate through their Government, and often democratic government is slow in doing what has to be done promptly. I asked him to believe that millions of Americans were deeply concerned and were prodding our Government to action.

Then he mentioned the report he had read in the newspapers about the American Senators who wanted to punish India, because India did not agree with the United States in the United Nations.

"It is true, is it not, sir, that we may not get the food because we do not say what you wish us to say?"

I had to think a little while before replying, because I wasn't too sure that what he had feared might not turn out to be true. Should I have told him that it might take many days before the wheat bill might pass during which time he would have to watch his youngsters continue to eat out of partially filled bowls?

Finally, I told him that there was no real answer to his question, except to say that we would do our best, our very best, and that the American people would be angry if any attempt were made to deprive other people of food because we might disagree with their leaders.

Arun finished making the fire and left. It occurred to me that what ought to be done was to take Arun to the United States on the very next plane and bring him before the Senate of the United States.

If the Congressmen don't want to give wheat to Arun and countless millions of his countrymen, then they ought to tell it to Arun directly. Let them answer Arun's questions—if they can. Let them hear about Arun's children and then tell him exactly why a nation which has a surplus of wheat does not feel that it wants to put politics to one side when peoples are starving.

Then, after telling Arun why he will get no wheat, let us finish the job. Let us recall the appropriation for the Voice of America and for all our information services abroad. Let us shut down all our efforts to combat Communist propaganda against us. There is no point telling our story to the world if there is nothing for us to say. All the Voice of America can do is to try to provide a real, true account of what is happening in America. What we say can and should be a reflection of what we do.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to speak to peoples and not only to governments. The most powerful language in the world today is food. It is clearly understood. It builds bridges mightier by far than radio broadcasts or published material, especially when people have no radios or cannot read.

My purpose in coming to India was to try to tell the Indian people about America and to try to answer the many lies being told about us. Those lies are aimed at splitting America off from the rest of the world. Yet there is nothing Soviet propaganda can say about us that can do nearly the harm that we can do to ourselves if we should turn our back today not only on India but on the meaning of America itself.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue to avoid entanglement in a global war we must take full advantage

of the manpower available to us. Universal military training should have been passed in 1945. If it had been enacted at that time the manpower situation now would not be so precarious. It would not have been necessary to call 800,000 reservists to serve at this time.

If universal military training is passed, most of these reservists will be free to come home to their wives and children.

In answer to critics who charge that universal military training in France and other European countries tended to weaken those nations, the same does not apply to the United States because of its geographic position.

Universal military training would be an indispensable contribution to the avoidance of a global war and would be an indispensable need if such a war were forced upon us.

John W. Gibson, Chairman of the DP Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of our younger and most able executives in the Federal Government is the present Chairman of the Displaced Persons Commission, Mr. John W. Gibson, a very dear friend of mine. Both by character and experience he is admirably fitted to serve our Nation in unusual and difficult posts.

The son of a coal miner who came to this country from Durham County, England, John Gibson himself entered the pits as a boy of 16. For several years he alternated working in the coal mines and in mastering arc welding in the automobile shops of Detroit. It was at this time that he became interested in workers' welfare and took special university courses in labor relations. For a time he was a union official for the United Dairy Workers Union, and later became secretary-treasurer of the Michigan CIO.

Between 1941 and 1943, Gibson was chairman of the Michigan State Department of Labor and Industry, appointed first by a Democratic Governor and reappointed later by a Republican Governor. After dealing with labor problems in various capacities during the war, he entered service with the Department of Labor in 1945, and became an Assistant Secretary of Labor in the following year.

John Gibson has had considerable success in conciliation work and often likes to refer to himself as a labor trouble-shooter.

He has shown much interest in the displaced persons problem since the end of the war and has often spoken publicly on the issues involved. He brings to his present task a rich store of knowledge and experience on the subject, which should enable him to make a worth-while contribution in the months ahead toward the solution of the DP problem.

I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of March 11, which already stresses a notable contribution by Mr. Gibson. It reads as follows:

TRAGIC PARADOX

This country is indebted to John W. Gibson, Chairman of the Government's Displaced Persons Commission, for removing the obscurity from the question of the impact of the Internal Security Act of 1950 upon the flow of displaced persons to this country. According to Mr. Gibson, there are approximately 100,000 persons now in Europe who wish to come here and who are otherwise eligible to do so but who are barred by the McCarran Act. They are barred because they belonged to civic, fraternal, labor union, military, or other organizations dominated by Nazi, Fascist, Falangist, or Communist movements, though their membership was only nominal or was forced.

Somewhat less than half of these 100,000 persons belonged to Nazi, Fascist, or Falangist dominated groups. Their problem would be solved and the barriers before them removed if the present Walter bill, passed by the House and pending before the Senate, were to be passed. Roughly 55,000 persons, however, Mr. Gibson estimated, are refugees from the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries who have fled their homelands, often at great personal risk, because of their opposition to communism. These persons are specifically excluded from relief by the Walter bill and there is no present prospect for lifting the barriers that keep them out.

Here is surely a tragic paradox. Many of those whom the Walter bill would admit fought against us in the Italian or the German Army during World War II or otherwise aided the enemy war effort. Yet in this period when we are contending with communism, seeking to fan dissension in Communist-dominated countries, and hoping for defections from those countries, the Walter bill proposes to institute a discriminatory barrier which will assure that the great majority of those who have defected from the Soviet Union, for example, can never come here. It is difficult to think of how we could do more to discourage defection if we were to set about doing so deliberately.

Security and proper screening of would-be immigrants to this country are, of course, essential, but the discriminatory type of situation that will exist if the Walter bill becomes law can only hurt our friends and give comfort to our enemies. We should treat all anti-Communists at least as well as we do persons who helped the fight against us in World War II.

UMT and Draft Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following telegram be printed in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The following national organizations urge your support of Senate bill No. 1, as amended by House Armed Services Committee, including UMT and extension of draft in one bill.

National Guard Association of the United States, by Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, President; Reserve Officers Association, by E. A. Evans, Executive Director; Military Order of the World Wars, by Milton G. Baker, Commander in Chief; Adjutant Generals Association of the United States, by Maj. Gen. W. H. Harrison, Jr., President; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, by Charles C. Ralls, Commander in Chief; The American Legion, by Miles D. Kennedy, National Legislative Director; Disabled American Veterans, by Boniface R. Maile, National Commander; AMVETS, by Harold Russell, National Commander.

Unconventional Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker under permission to extend my remarks, I include an important address made on Sunday, March 18, 1951, over the Mutual Broadcasting System network by Gen. William J. Donovan, former Director of the Office of Strategic Services, for the Committee on the Present Danger of which he is a member.

These views of General Donovan should be read as widely as possible:

UNCONVENTIONAL DEFENSE

(By William J. Donovan)

Fellow citizens, I am speaking as a member of the Committee on the Present Danger, under whose auspices weekly Sunday evening broadcasts are being given on the peril that faces the American people and on how it can be met.

This committee is a bipartisan, nongovernmental group of citizens who have organized to work together as the Nation prepares to safeguard freedom.

The first broadcast 2 weeks ago was that of Dr. Vannevar Bush, a scientist of world reputation, and the second was that of former Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson. Others will follow this broadcast.

On March 4 over this network Dr. Bush told us (and now I quote his words): "We wish to avoid war * * * we wish to preserve our freedom and the free way of life. In a world where aggressive dictators are still at large, there is but one way to achieve these ends. That way is to be strong. * * *"

"The key to the matter is the A-bomb. The deterrent effect of our A-bombs is real, but we cannot count on its remaining fully effective forever. I trust we have time—time to prepare the defenses and avert war * * * but we do not have time to waste."

Last week Judge Patterson, speaking from his broad experience in high office during and after World War II, explained that the time will come when Soviet defenses against atom bombing will be more effective and a Russian stockpile of atom bombs will tend to neutralize ours.

For that reason he said our Nation's defense line must be in Europe. He stressed the imperative need of giving united support to General Eisenhower and told us that the unanimous judgment of our military leaders was, that only by joining with the free

nations of Europe can be build a sound defense.

Generally, nations make use of two methods for reaching the goal of their policies. These are: (1) The employment of skill in diplomacy; or (2) the use of violence by shooting in conventional warfare.

Both Dr. Bush and Secretary Patterson were speaking of defense by orthodox methods. Americans are accustomed to think of war in these terms. They picture traditional and organized forces with planes, marching troops, ships, guns, bombs, grenades, and guided missiles.

There is, however, a phase of war which is not shooting. It is irregular and unconventional. It uses weapons other than those of the military and its methods are as diverse as the situation requires. This is called subversive war and it has been waged and is being waged against the United States by the Soviet Union at least since 1945.

This kind of war may be defined as a war of maneuver by subversive means, short of involvement in open hostilities. In varying degrees this kind of war has been used through the centuries. Hitler and Mussolini took it, modernized the propaganda and fifth column activities, and used them in support of conventional operations. Stalin improved upon this by holding his Red Army as a threat, and employing his subversive maneuvers on the main field of attack.

The Soviet fifth column is different from the Nazi fifth column as we saw it in World War II. The Nazis had only small groups of adherents in the democratic countries and their espionage operations were limited. On the contrary, the Soviets make use of the fifth column and the Communist Party as an army of occupation. The Communists stress the tactical importance of the channels of public information, the infiltration into radio, movies, music, and other arts, and special effort is made to obtain Communist control of labor in key industries in order to disrupt a nation's economy.

The pattern of this program is found in its purges in southeastern Europe; its pressure even today upon France, Italy, and Germany; its activities in Africa and the Middle East; its masked guerrilla war in Greece; and its full-scale military operation in Korea.

In each target country, operations are directed by Moscow-trained leaders with a small but strategically well placed hard core Communist minority, ready to engage in sabotage and in partisan warfare.

To visualize the interplay of that kind of war, there is no primer where it is more simply described than in the White Book recently issued by Yugoslavia on the aggressive activities of the Kremlin against Tito. You will see there in detail the political forms of aggressive pressure all the way from breach of treaties to Soviet organization of Yugoslav deserters and terrorists to undermine the internal security of the country. You will see economic aggression in the obstruction of free navigation to Yugoslav vessels in the Danube and in the stoppage of railway traffic and postal service. You will see the pressure of espionage and terrorist action by the smuggling of spies and saboteurs, and finally military pressure by provoking border incidents and massing Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian armies on the Yugoslav frontier.

We have only just begun to grasp the special nature of Communist organization and methods. The real strength of the Soviets lies in their world-wide organization, highly developed techniques and communications and in the discipline of leaders especially trained in the Lenin School in Moscow.

All of this should teach us that we are faced by an enemy against whom we cannot lower our guard—a foe that is always alert—and ruthless—and tenacious. Against such a foe we must exercise sustained effort, perhaps for many years. Soviet tactics may change even to the point of temporary retreat, but the objective is always the same—a world empire.

Only by our understanding of the manner in which the fight will be carried to us will we be able to deal with it. We can't sit back and hope to be let alone. There is no place for complacency, or indifference, or fear—we can't buy our way out or dream our way out, nor should we be misled by seeming successes until we have totaled the score on a global scale.

We must win this subversive war. It is necessary to win it because in winning it we would have the edge in the shooting war, if that war should ever come. It is essential to win it because in winning we may make a shooting war impossible. Therefore, we must be strong enough to compel the peace.

For a period of many months to come we will be building up our military forces and turning out armament. During that period unless we take positive and affirmative action in countermeasures, the free nations can lose strategic areas and strong points needed for defense against military operations by the Soviet Union.

Let us see how one of these areas is already endangered:

An AP article March 15 states that the Soviet Union has been courting Iranian officials for 6 months with presents such as release of captured Iranian border guards and the signing of a $20,000,000 barter treaty.

Iran produces 6 percent of the world's oil. It is the most valuable of the non-American supply sources which serve the western nations. It is a vital strategic area and therefore a sought-after military prize. There has been open speculation on the possibility of a Stalin invasion and what we should do in that event. But why should Stalin run the risk of a shooting war? Instead he called upon Tudeh, the Soviet-controlled political party to lead a movement in the Iranian Lower House to nationalize the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., despite the fact that it is 53 percent British-owned and is operated under a concession that does not expire until 1993.

Watch the succeeding steps. Moscow has already paved the way to obtain a trade agreement, an agreement which could give her use and control of these British wells and refineries. If this cold-war tactic proves successful, Stalin will have outmaneuvered us again, without the necessity of taking over the Government, let alone of a military invasion.

Victories like this should teach us that it is nearly past the time to integrate our unorthodox resources as we have unified our conventional services. Economic political and psychological countermeasures, pulled together under centralized direction, with a well-conceived strategic concept and the recruitment of the best brains and most courageous spirits can be of great assistance as a counteroffensive in this war, whether we call it hot or cold.

Today the way to prevent a war is to put aside our own fear and create fear in the minds of our enemy. Dr. Bush has told us that Stalin can be deterred from waging a total war by his fear of the atom bomb. Stalin might be equally deterred by the fear that he cannot determine in advance the loyalty of his own people. For no dictator dare move if uncertain of his safety at home. It is well to keep in mind that our greatest ally can be the Russian people.

More than 2,000 years before either the atom or the hydrogen bomb was known, Demosthenes wrote the following:

"Shame on you Athenians * * * for not wishing to understand that in war one must not allow oneself to be at the command of events, but to forestall them. You Athenians are the strongest of all the Greeks, in ships, cavalry, infantry, and revenue, and you do not make the best of them.

"You make war against Philip like a barbarian when he wrestles—if he suffers a blow, he immediately puts his hand to it. If he is struck again he puts his hand there too; but he has not the skill or does not think of parrying the blow aimed at him or of evading his antagonist. You, likewise, if you hear tell that Philip has attacked the Chaeronea, you send help there; if he is at Thermopylae, you run there; and if he turns aside you follow him, to right or left, as if you were acting on his orders. Never a fixed plan, never any precautions: you wait for bad news before you act."

Thus Demosthenes, the Greek orator, in the fourth century B. C. speaks from Athens to the people of America in 1951 this message of warning we so much need today—that we, in our present danger, must not wait for the bad news of enemy action against us before we act to defend ourselves.

Genocide in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years occasional reports have been filtering through from behind the iron curtain of the mistreatment of Jews in Soviet Russia, the annihilation of Jewish cultural life and religious activities, the closing down of Jewish schools and the press, and so forth. It seems that every trace of organized Jewish life in Russia has been wiped out, and this concerns a community of several million souls.

A very prominent Jewish national organization in the United States, the Jewish Labor Committee, has now brought this matter to the attention of the United Commission on Human Rights as a case involving spiritual and cultural genocide. The fate of the Jews in Russia is assuming alarming proportions, the more so since it is almost impossible to ascertain what is actually taking place in that unhappy land and whether the Communist persecution of a minority is limited only to cultural and religious matters or also extends to physical extermination of the Jews.

As for those who are hasty in their judgment of a whole people because of the misdeeds of a few individuals, I can refer them to the current treatment of the Jews in Russia. No better commentary or reply is necessary.

In this connection, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the Jewish Advocate, of Boston, March 29, 1951, which reads:

WHAT OF SOVIET JEWRY?

The question of what has become of the Jews in Soviet and satellite countries was brought officially before the international tribunal of the United Nations Human Rights Commission last week. A delegation of the Jewish Labor Committee, consisting of top leaders of the labor movement, including David Dubinsky, president of the

International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union; Joseph Baskin, general secretary of the Workmen's Circle; and Adolph Held, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee, presented a memorandum on the spiritual and cultural "genocide" suffered by the Jewish people in the Soviet Union and its satellite states.

The memorandum, a bulky document based on evidence collected by agents of the Jewish Labor Committee in Communist countries, made certain definite charges and asked specific questions.

According to official Soviet reports, there were 3,000,000 Jews in Soviet Russia in 1939 and some 2,000,000 more were added since World War II. What has become of all these Jews physically and culturally? asks the memorandum. Not a word has filtered through from behind the iron curtain about them for nearly 2 years. It is true that little is known about most other national minorities in the Soviet Union, except what is contained in the official Communist press, but Soviet Jews now lack even this official mention for there is not a single Yiddish newspaper in the whole of Soviet Russia; not a single Yiddish book has been published during the last few years, and not a single act of cultural, literary, religious or artistic activity has been reported on in the Communist press, indicating the existence of any kind of a Jewish group life in the entire country. It is as if the entire 5,000,000 Jews have disappeared culturally and spiritually.

This, the committee rightly considers, is very disturbing, suspicious and even alarming. For until 2 years ago, it was a prominent feature of Soviet propaganda to stress and even to boast of its Yiddish schools, theaters, books, writers, and cultural activities. The committee, therefore, asks: What has become of the network of 1,500 Yiddish schools of which the Soviet press boasted until recently; of the Yiddish Art Theaters, whose fame resounded throughout the world? Where are the newspapers, books, clubs, and social institutions which make up a cultural life? Above all, where are the people who for years had conducted these activities? Where is the group of fine Yiddish novelists, poets, dramatists, and writers whose names have become classics in Yiddish literature and who used to figure so prominently in all Soviet propaganda? And what has become of the famous Crimean colonies; of the so-called Jewish Republic of Biro-Bidjan and of the other specific Jewish social, political and cultural efforts of more than a generation of Jewish life in Soviet Russia?

From these questions the committee easily passed to charges and accusations of spiritual and cultural annihilation of the entire Jewish group in Soviet Russia and made a specific demand of the United Nations to start an investigation, with public hearings similar to those on slave labor, in order to unravel one of the great mysteries of the period and to ascertain with more or less certainty what actually happened to these Jews.

The Jewish Labor Committee, while raising the problem of Soviet mistreatment of the Jews to an international level, also limits it to cultural and spiritual persecution and discrimination, which makes the charges more plausible, more specific and more certain of the sympathy of the entire civilized world, including even parts of the pro-Communist world. It would be futile and it would recoil against the initiators of the effort, if this new move against the Jews were to be compared with the Nazi genocide attempt to exterminate the Jews physically; but a type of genocide effort it nevertheless is, one which seems to work all too effectively, and the Jewish Labor Committee is fully justified in trying to draw the attention of the world to it.

Senate Bill 1, an Act To Provide for the Common Defense, History of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the present bill before us, S. 1, has two main purposes. The first purpose is that of providing for an extension of selective service and to this purpose there is no real opposition at the present time. The second fundamental purpose is to provide for universal training and service, and to this purpose there is strong and active opposition.

Of course, the history of draft legislation is well known to all of us. The first draft bill in modern times passed by the Congress, was the draft act of the First World War. Again in the course of the Second World War, the draft was put into active operation, but the first peacetime passage of a draft law in this country was immediately before the Second World War when the House Military Affairs Committee reported to the Congress a bill invoking selective service in anticipation of the military needs of the country as we approached the obvious eminence of war.

Universal military training in this country is not a matter of recent origin or discussion. Shortly after the end of the First World War, patriotic and service organizations and leading exponents of a strong national defense, urged the early adoption of a system of military training to give our country a strong military posture. It was not, however, until the establishment of the Woodrum committee, headed by that able former colleague of ours now gone to his reward, Cliff Woodrum, of Virginia, that Congress took official recognition of an argument which had been waged in this country through more than two decades. I was a member of the Woodrum committee and I attended most of its sessions which ran for 3 or 4 months daily, hearing arguments and assembling information as to universal military training. Its report is available to Members of Congress at the present time.

Following the end of the Woodrum committee hearings, the old House Military Affairs Committee held one or more extensive hearings on the same subject and as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I sat through these hearings also. In fact, the House Military Affairs Committee voted out a bill which, however, was never favorably approved by the House of Representatives.

The present bill, S. 1, represents the result of extensive hearings of both House and Senate. These hearings have extended over a period of many weeks when military leaders and civilians were heard either for or against the present measure. Heretofore the House has taken the lead in handling this type of legislation, but in this instance the Senate has acted upon universal military training and sent the measure to us for our consideration. Our Committee on Armed Services reported the measure favorably with only three opposition votes to it.

MANPOWER IS OUR GREAT PROBLEM

Mr. Speaker, manpower today is our great problem. National defense requires the service of many, many persons. As national defense is set up today, it in effect requires the full response of a Nation in time of crisis or of war. This has produced a strong need of manpower. The anomalous situation is that 10 years ago this country had a population of 132,000,000 people and an unemployment load of 15,000,000 persons. There were those at that time who were loud in proclaiming that this country had reached the saturation point in population and that there would always be a surplus of persons in our midst.

In a few short years, our population has increased to 153,000,000 people and in the same time the employment situation has completely reversed itself. At the present time, there is an extreme shortage of manpower. This shortage has gone into the labor market to bring into use women in employment and many jobs heretofore jealously guarded by the male segment of our population are now made available to trained women personnel so badly needed by this country in crisis. The shortage in agriculture workers has reached the point where we are extending our program of bringing hundreds of thousands of Mexican laborers into this country for the purpose of helping grow and harvest our farm crops. I saw official figures given by the government recently to show that at present over 63,000,000 persons are employed in the United States, an all time record for employment. Yet all of this is not enough. It does not relieve all of our present problems.

We are in a world crisis and in this crisis we are seeking by this legislation to put our defense house back in order. From a position of military preeminence in 1945, we fell quickly into a position of military impotence. A great machine put together for the successful waging of World War II, disintegrated so rapidly as soon as fighting ceased as to cause the Nation to rub its eyes in wonderment as to whether it could be so rapid and so complete. We are now engaged in the difficult job of providing the Nation with a well-balanced Military Establishment of 3,500,000 persons and at the same time, we are engaged in a program of reinforcing our Army, Navy, and Air Force with needed implements and machines for the conducting of modern war. We, therefore, find our machine shops, lathes, and factories competing with the armed services in their efforts to obtain the needed personnel.

Because of this, our committee presents to you a program for the extension for 3 years of the program for the drafting of military personnel by selective-service means. There is no alternative to this if we are to make an honest and faithful effort to give to our country reasonable national security.

It is a sad chapter in our national defense history to read of the failure to develop a proper Reserve program. George Washington, our first Commander in Chief, warned that the duties of defense fall upon the militia, meaning all able-bodied men of the Nation. In spite of repeated warning from the birth of this Republic to the present day, our Reserve program has been sadly neglected. For the first time this bill will provide the fundamentals for the organization of such a program.

Under the terms of the bill men from 18 years 6 months to 26 are subject to induction and service, not to exceed 26 months. Under the terms of this measure these men are subject to a total of 6 years active and reserve service. When a period of active training and service is completed, these men are referred to the Reserves. They may go into the National Guard or into the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard Reserves. They will then no doubt be placed in organizations and assigned definite duties depending upon their previous training, education, aptitude, and locality. The program will then have to determine what part of these men will be put in organized units and Congress will have to provide the money for them.

I personally believe that out of 1,100,000 men reaching the age of 18 years 6 months, some 550,000 or 600,000 will be immediately available for training under the provisions of the National Security Training Corps. The difference is represented by those who are weeded out due to mental or physical deficiencies and disabilities, by those deferred for educational and occupational reasons or who are granted hardship deferments or discharges. Many of these men will subsequently come into training and service as reasons for the deferments are eliminated. While the Security Training Corps may begin with 550,000, in time it may reach a peak of 700,000 or 750,000, and in the overall set-up there should in time be 3,000,000 men in the Reserves. If the number becomes greater than Congress wishes to provide the funds for, under regulations, those furthest removed from training and service can be discharged from the active Reserve. This can be done by regulations.

During the course of this debate already universal training has been repeatedly referred to as an alien philosophy by those who would defeat this proposal in this bill. They refer to this as an alien doctrine imported from the Old World into the New.

These people who would wreck the UMT proposal fail to heed the history of this country and the facts of this case. It was General Washington, the Father of our Country, who suggested many years ago that the burden of defense of a country falls properly upon all of the militia, meaning all of the male citizens of this country. Through the years our leaders interested in our security have urged the need for an extensive program of national defense based upon the use of a militia, both organized and unorganized, and in recent years, since the organized militia has been turned into the National Guard, they have urged universal military training. Leaders, such as Dr. Connant whose reputation as patriotic Americans and educators of international reputation, after making most careful studies of the proposal of universal military training, have repeatedly urged the adoption of such proposals.

More than that, every patriotic organization in the country has gone on record in favor of UMT, which the opponents have dubbed "alien philosophy." If it is an alien philosophy to follow the recommendations of great patriotic organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, then I am willing to rest my case on these recommendations from them. On the contrary, rather than being an alien philosophy, a system of providing for universal training is more nearly democratic than that system which provides for selection of only a limited number of people upon whom the whole burden of defense may fall.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

The fundamental question which must be resolved by this House is whether or not we are to have a universal military training and service program? I think it is most appropriate that this matter should finally, at long last, come before the House for a vote. The country has waited many years for us to stand up and be counted on a controversy which involves the safety of the Nation.

Years ago I become interested in a program of universal military training. In fact, I introduced several universal military training bills at the request of the American Legion. I became interested in the universal military training program because of my deep and abiding interest in the Reserve program. I believe also that the burden of defense of the Nation should not rest upon a selected group of individuals called upon to carry the full burden of defense responsibility. I have always entertained the view that the obligation of national security should rest as far as possible uniformly upon all members of the male segment of our population within certain active ages. I, therefore, have supported, and do now without reservation support, S. 1, and especially the provision relating to universal training and service.

I have devoted much of my time while in Congress to work on the Reserve program. In my judgment, it has never been what one would call an adequate or a satisfactory program. The Navy Reserve program has been fairly satisfactory in the past and at least there has not been the friction observable in the Navy Reserve program as has obtained in the Army Reserve program. The Air Reserve program is of short history and during the time when it has been in operation it has been changed and reorganized one or more times because of difficulties and objections to the prevailing program.

The coming of the First World War found us without any Reserve program whatsoever. We had to start from scratch, enlisting first by voluntary means the needed manpower for our Army and Navy. We followed this belatedly with a selective-service law which was in full operation before the war ended.

The coming of the Second World War found us with a makeshift Reserve program. Even before that many of us had urged that a more adequate Reserve program be built up to implement the provisions of the National Defense Act relating to the Reserve Establishment. In spite of this fact, when the Second World War came, we found that we had a National Guard in varying states of readiness numbering 350,000 men and had a Reserve wholly inadequate and without personnel, training, or equipment necessary. In fact, the Reserve program, outside of the National Guard, consisted largely of Reserve officers, and when the War Department called all of the Reserve officers to active duty, it found that this call produced only 110,000 available, physically fit officers of the proper age. This call of 110,000 completed the activation of the War Department Reserve program.

With the coming of the crisis in Korea, we found ourselves with a Reserve program numbering roughly two and one-half million persons. This Reserve included the Army, National Guard, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Of this two and one-half million persons, only 900,000 were on a pay status. The others were largely inactive or volunteer Reserves serving without pay and without regular training. The Congress began at that time to appropriate roughly $1,000,000,000 per annum for the Reserve program, but this money included the ROTC as well as the other parts of our Reserve program. To date roughly 30 percent of our total National Guard has been called into service, consisting of about 80 percent of the Air National Guard, and four divisions of the Ground Guard, plus two regimental combat teams of the National Guard. At the time Korea broke upon a peaceful world, the Navy had the largest active Reserve Establishment which totaled 1,200,000 persons. At the present time almost the entire Marine Reserve and almost the entire Enlisted Reserve of the Army has been called into service.

Mr. Speaker, during the time that I have remained in the House of Representatives, I have always exhibited a real, active interest in our Reserve establishment. As a result of this fact, I believe more than any other person, I have received criticisms, suggestions, and advices as to the handling of the recall of our Reserves into active service. I have literally received thousands of letters from Reserves from all over the country, protesting induction into service and asking that the burden of defense be made more universal. Many of these men are veterans with years of active war service. Thousands are men with families who have for the second time within a short period left their homes, their families, and their businesses to fight for the security of this country.

Many of these men are Organized Reserves; but they feel in many cases that others upon whom the burden of na-

tional defense has not yet fallen should be called upon to do their part. Many of them are men with hardship cases; and they have gone patriotically to do their duty the second time for their country within a few years. Thousands of these men are what are called inactive Reserves; and they are men without training as Reserves, without uniform, without organization, and without pay as Reserves. They were certainly led to believe that they would be called to the colors only after the Organized Reserves; and they feel that they should be used again only in the case of an all-out war. Not a mail comes to my office which does not bring new appeals from these men, many of whom are in far-off Korea.

I believe firmly in rotation. I believe in liberalization of the burden of defense. I believe in equity and fair treatment. I believe that these men have a case; and that they are entitled to come home after a reasonable service. The provision of this bill as written will give these men hope of an early return to their homes and their families. I submit these men have a right to life and home just as much as others who have not carried the full burden of American citizenship. We cannot have a satisfactory rotation policy without legislation. We must have this bill.

Under the terms of this bill, our men upon reaching the age of 18½ years would enter the Military Establishment. They would then replace those who are presently serving with long tours of duty in the present Korean war and during the Second World War. They would then do their part in the defense of this country. There would then be equity and fair treatment in the handling of the military burden.

Heretofore, our theory of the duty of the Reserve was to be available for call out in the case of an all-out war. Few of them contemplated, as they year by year worked actively in the Reserve program, that they would be called to Korea or to other parts of the world in times such as this. They were willing to go when the all-out needs of the country demanded. They were willing to grow older, acquire responsibilities, businesses, and families under these conditions. They are not going now to stay in this program.

Many of these men tell me that they will not continue in the Reserve program once they are out of service. They tell me that they are not satisfied to carry the entire program. In fact, I have not heard of a single one who has said that he will continue voluntarily in the Reserves after he serves a second time in the active establishment.

We here in the Congress are going to wake up some morning and find that we have no Reserve personnel. We are going to find that the program upon which we have spent so much time and to which we have given so much lip service has dissipated as a mirage in summer. We are then going to look around and find ourselves stripped of our national defense except the Regular Establishment filled with cadres from the Reserves with long years of service, and with men from selective service.

Our Reserve defenses are getting into bad shape, and our hope of bringing them up to par again is to work out a new Reserve program, one which will bring new blood into the program and which will be fair to those who participate in it. This bill holds out these hopes for the future.

Here we are in the midst of a world crisis. We are face to face with Communist aggression; we are beset with troubles in the Far East and in Europe. Every few months, a new crisis appears, threatening to engulf the world again in war. Sinister and sadist influences fan out from the Kremlin; and seek to enslave the world. I doubt that any more loathesome and despicable doctrines have ever been carried on the winds of propaganda which sweep the world than those which emanate out of the Kremlin, and at this moment we find our reserve defenses in a wretched condition.

Oh, you may try to place the blame for this condition on first one cause or the other; but regardless of who or what brought this about, we are dealing with a fact—an accomplished fact—and only by treating with the existing condition can we hope to meet this situation.

We must establish a sound program of building up and maintaining a sound reserve. We can do this by establishing universal military training, which will be the vehicle for supplying the men for this strong reserve.

But if we choose to defeat UMT—then we must depend upon our veterans; or we must continue to induct men for service, followed by required service in the Reserve.

In that respect, I must say that I am somewhat amused by some of the arguments that I have heard against UMT. I have heard that it will destroy democracy; I have heard that it will corrupt the morals of our youth; I have heard that this proposed bill is an unholy alliance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the bill before us today is an unholy alliance, then the Selective Service Act of 1940 was a Judas kiss, and the 1948 act is the ethereal spirit of Benedict Arnold, because it will come as an awful shock to some people to learn that we had substantially this program by a different name on the statute books twice since 1940. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the 1940 act inducted men for service and then provided that they be put into the Reserves for 10 years; and the 1948 act inducts men for service and provides that they serve in the Reserves for 5 years.

And, in both the 1940 act and the 1948 act, this so-called awful military bastille, the Pentagon, retained complete control over the training and the Reserve assignment.

It is time the opponents of this bill realized that the provisions of this bill provide for civilian control of the universal military training features of the bill.

And, if we do not adopt this bill, we will have to continue drafting men for service for the indefinite future. For those who distrust the men we have selected to lead our Armed Forces, I say this, the bill before you today places universal military training in the hands of civilians; but if we compel the drafting of men for service for an indefinite period by defeating this bill, we will be forcing the Nation to maintain a large military force under the complete control of the military leaders, and at a tremendous cost to the Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about this—the American people will not permit this Nation to become weak during these perilous times. They will demand protection, as they have the right to demand, and that protection will either be a large standing Army, or an adequate, well-trained Reserve. We propose the creation of a strong Reserve—constantly maintained by freshly trained men who have completed a period of 6 months of universal military training. Our proposal provides security. It provides security at far less cost than the maintenance of a large standing force. And it provides security with far less disruption of American lives. Which do you prefer: Keeping our World War II veterans on active duty and drafting men for 26 months of service; or a system by which young men can be trained for a short period of time and then returned to their communities for normal peacetime pursuits and a reasonable Reserve obligation?

I suppose it is natural for a general and an admiral to want to command more and more men. I have even known Congressmen who have wanted to enlarge their constituency. But it seems to me that we ought to pause here for a moment and consider just what UMT means to the generals and the admirals.

As the size of our Reserve increases, the size of our standing forces will decrease. That is the economic justification for UMT. And, let us give credit where credit is due. As the size of our standing forces decrease, the need for general officers and increased rank decreases proportionately. No, Mr. Chairman; instead of criticizing our military leaders for favoring UMT, I think it is time we gave them the credit that is their due.

UMT has also been called a foreign ideology. I never knew that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other patriotic organizations sponsored un-American ideas. It is the first time I have ever heard Dr. Conant called un-American. It has surprised me to hear that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison embraced a foreign philosophy. And, contrary to all of the laurels that have been heaped upon him, it is the first time I ever heard George Marshall accused of favoring the destruction of democracy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people are thinking far ahead of some of the opponents of this bill. I believe the American people, being realists, want preparedness. I believe they want universal military training. And I, for one, will support this measure without reservation. If it is undemocratic to favor national security, then I answer the charge of being undemocratic; if it is un-American to favor UMT, then I answer the charge of being un-American; if the proposed bill is a shotgun marriage, then I can think of

no better honor than to be the best man; if this bill is an unholy alliance, then the preservation of freedom and liberty is grim mockery.

Let those who oppose preparedness now, as they did in 1940, and again in 1948, explain their actions to posterity. For me the course is clear—preparedness now or disaster later.

India's Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Washington Post of April 2 contained a very fine editorial urging the Congress to act and to act now on the proposal to extend emergency food aid to India. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA'S FOOD CRISIS

Congress ought to stop dilly-dallying with the President's February 12 request for emergency action to cope with the mounting food crisis in India. The longer the necessary legislation is delayed, the more acute will grow the threat of famine. By the same token, the easier it will be for subversive Communist forces to capitalize on the accompanying unrest in the great Asian subcontinent.

As pointed out by the President in his February message, India's 1950 food crop has been sharply reduced by earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locust plagues, with the result that 6,000,000 tons of grain must be imported this year. The Nehru government has arranged for the cash purchase of four million from Canada, the United States, Australia, and several other countries. It is hard put, however, to finance the remaining two million, which apparently can be procured only from us.

To meet this critical situation, the President has recommended to Congress that it promptly authorize shipments to cover the 2,000,000-ton deficiency, but that it appropriate—in the form of an outright grant—funds to cover just half of the total, with India paying all the ocean freight charges. As for the question of financing and supplying the remaining 1,000,000 tons, action would be deferred pending additional study. Further, as far as conditions are concerned, the Nehru government would undertake to distribute our aid fairly, keep the public fully informed as to its source, and employ the proceeds from its sale to help improve the Indian economy with the assistance of a special mission from our Economic Cooperation Administration.

But the President's request—which he has just described as urgent in a new appeal for congressional action—has bogged down in the House. Although approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, it has run into a road block in the Rules Committee. Some members are opposed to the idea of a grant. Others want the proposed aid conditioned on a raw-materials agreement with India. And more than a few are inclined to be hostile because Prime Minister Nehru—whose efforts to walk a neutrality tightrope between the free West and the Soviet Union have led him to make some pretty muddled statements—is in disagreement with the United States over Red China and how best to stop aggression in Asia.

But while Congress hems and haws over issues of this kind—and while Moscow and Peiping reportedly are making good propaganda for themselves with offers to send small supplies of food—the specter of hunger looms larger and larger for many millions of Indian men, women, and children. Famine does not wait on legislation. As the President has pointed out, prompt action is vital. It is vital because summer will bring the monsoon season to India, and many roads will then become impassable for grain shipments to remote parts of the country.

Thus, from now on, every day that Congress fails to deal with this matter will increase the difficulty of heading off starvation conditions in India. The House and the Senate, if they are going to act favorably at all—and it seems inconceivable that they will not do so—ought to act now. Our humanitarian traditions, the simple rules of Christianity, demand as much. Beyond that, our own self-interest is directly involved, for the consequences of an Indian famine could gravely affect the security of this Nation and the entire free world.

Pity the Poor Retailers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing from retailers and their organizations as to the hardship and complications incurred by the new pricing regulations.

One of the newspapers in my district, the Edison-Norwood Review, covered some of the retailer's trials and tribulations in their editorial of Friday, March 30, which follows:

Washington has again hit the small-business man with a new price regulation order called ceiling price regulation No. 7. This instrument is designed to establish fair mark-ups and in its way, curb inflation.

The new regulation will need a Philadelphia lawyer to interpret its meaning and figure out how it is to be compiled. A local merchant has had a qualified man working full time for 2 weeks compiling the data for his store. The man has spent over 100 hours and is now half done.

Another merchant stated that he would have to close his store in order to fill out the regulation on time.

Meetings have been held in Park Ridge and many local merchants have attended them in order to acquaint themselves with the requirements. After three meetings they stated they didn't understand it any more fully.

Why does a Government agency have to be so complicated, why are things made so hard that the people for whom they are intended can't understand them? Most retailers want to do a good job and follow the regulation.

If the Government continues to make ceiling-price regulations so difficult that they are not understood, then they will not be followed.

It can be summed up from a quote from another small-town paper:

Jefferson (Ky.) Jeffersonian: "Pity the poor retailers as they tackle the tape that ties together the big bundle of price-control regulations. O, simplicity, thou art a jewel."

The Responsibility of the United States in Building a Stable World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "To Regain the Peace Initiative," written by me and published in the New York Times magazine of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO REGAIN THE PEACE INITIATIVE

(By HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.)

After an American writes an article or makes a speech or persuades a group to adopt a resolution, he feels that he has accomplished something real—and rightly so, because we live in a country in which words are important. Words matter in America because ours is a government in which public opinion underlies all our public-policy decisions. Words matter also because ours is a government of laws in which due process, and not the whim of an individual dictator, counts.

Perhaps this American faith in words explains the fact that our most frequent error in foreign relations throughout the years has been our tendency to believe we have accomplished something in international affairs merely by uttering words and then proclaiming our agreement with them. The ineffectiveness of such proclamations becomes painfully clear when we reflect that the most powerful nation outside of the United States is not moved by public opinion, and authority in that nation rests on the whim of the dictator rather than the due process of impartial law.

This overreliance on words has in many vital international undertakings caused us to put the cart before the horse. In the United Nations Charter, for instance, we subscribed to an all-embracing commitment to repel aggression wherever, whenever, and under whatever conditions it might occur, regardless of the lack of military force without which aggression could not be repelled, let alone prevented.

This is undoubtedly the rock on which the United Nations is most likely to founder—and the aggression in Korea very nearly did wreck it. Should another aggression occur and should once again the rank and file of member states of the United Nations fail to put up military manpower in proportion to their populations, the faith of the American people in the United Nations will fall to a new low.

We read of "victories" at Lake Success for the American viewpoint, but it is not much of a "victory" for the United Nations to vote 54 to 5 in favor of our position when the only result of the vote is to permit us—and a few other stalwart nations—to expand

our own manpower. As a United States delegate to the United Nations, I was frequently reminded that it was only fair for the United States to make a large financial contribution to the United Nations because we had more dollars per capita than any other nation. To this truth must be added the far more poignant truth that our manpower per capita is no greater than that of the other nations of the world.

When, therefore, we consider the world role of the United States, we would be wise to ask, "What can we do?" before we ask "What should we do?" Such an attitude would at least mean that whatever decision was finally made would be a valid decision with a practical hope of success. In conformity with unhappy tradition, many of us still argue foreign policy by trying to divide the American people into globalists, internationalists, and interventionists on the one hand and retreatists, nationalists, and isolationists on the other. Actually it would be far more fruitful to argue on the basis of what we can or cannot do. If our potential is clear, our course will no longer be obscure.

When we think of the world role of the United States, there comes to mind the picture of a great powerhouse from which huge cables extend to engines in distant parts of the world. The force of the current flowing through these cables, the very length of the cables themselves, and the size of the engines in foreign lands all depend on the amount of power which the United States powerhouse can generate.

National power is not a fixed quantity. A nation, like a man in a rowboat on a river in front of a float, is either going backward or forward; he is never standing still. Nor can national power be measured like so many yards of cloth; there is too much stretch to it. It certainly cannot be measured by population, since people in some countries are much more productive than they are in others. It cannot be measured by natural resources—whether agricultural or mineral—because these have to be converted into usable goods. The best measure of national power is production. The trump card of our national defense in World War II was our productive power. Thus the first requirement for a successful American role in the world is big production.

This is, in truth, the lifeblood of our economic influence abroad. But this is not all. Without big production, we cannot have other forms of national power such as scientific development, which is of such great international importance, notably in atomic and medical fields. Without it we cannot have military power, which gears itself to industrial production and thus to the economic strength of the entire civilian community.

Without it we would lose our ideas of political freedom, which can only exist in a climate created by a competitive and productive economy. These are the ideas which give life to the whole system and, in essence, are that for which we fight. While military power cannot exist without big production and cannot exist without men, the basic truth is that men will not be effective fighters without an affirmative and enthusiastic faith in their country's institutions. This they will not have if the pressing social problems which our competitive economic system in some instances is not able to handle effectively are not solved by public action.

The world role of the United States, therefore, regardless of social justice or of ordinary liberal or conservative political philosophy, requires policies which stimulate production. These may take the form of tax laws which encourage the little man with the bright idea who is fundamentally the source of new jobs and new wealth, or keeping the dollar constant and requiring economy and efficiency in Government, which will maintain economic health and make production attractive.

And this same American role equally calls for social action that meets whatever pressing problems are not solved by our competitive, free-enterprise system. There must thus be certain standards of living—of health, of security, of housing, and of civil rights—so that the young men who come out of American homes will be enthusiastic for American life as they actually know it. On no other basis can American Armed Forces be constructed. American political leadership must thus demonstrate by deeds that our society has dynamic purpose, which, in the words of the Constitution, is "to establish justice"; and that we really believe the words which we all learn in school, "that all men are created equal."

These are some of the things which make a strong American potential, which provide the energy for the American powerhouse. If America is not strong, she cannot have an effective world role. Without an effective American world role, the free world is in danger.

Let us assume a powerful America and face the questions of how to use our potential and how to determine our responsibilities as a member of the family of nations. The aim of American foreign policy, which must also be the aim of the free world, is: To preserve peace, and if the struggle against communism should turn to war, to have effective partners.

We, therefore, should help to build a stable world. This does not mean a static world. Ideally speaking, it connotes rapid yet orderly progress. It requires a multipurpose effort and before we can really set about it we must first regain the initiative which we lost in 1945, when we so imprudently disintegrated our Armed Forces which had won us the victory, and lost the chance to create a lasting peace.

The first step is to build military strength both at home and abroad, which we have started to do. Secondly, based on our productive power, we must build economic strength abroad. We must also, in the third place, conduct a really effective campaign of information which not only gives the truth about America and the free world but which will be part of whatever promising counterrevolution for freedom there may be. Underlying these programs is the one rule in foreign policy which applies without exception—that all programs be on the basis of "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid." These words, taken from the North Atlantic Pact, are "the law and the prophets."

1. In the military field this obviously means: A maximum effort in the most efficacious manner by our allies in the Atlantic Pact; by the former neutrals and former enemies of World War II; and by the stateless men in all parts of the world who wish to make their military contribution to the defense against Communist imperialism.

Perhaps our greatest military weakness as a Nation is in the quantity of our manpower; due to the requirements of production only a comparatively small residue is left for the armed services; of this residue a large part goes to highly mechanized branches, such as the Navy and Air Force, leaving a relatively small number for combat troops. In this regard we ourselves must always do our full part and never accept foreign help as a substitute for our own effort. But obviously we must welcome any supplement to that effort, whether it comes from allies in their own uniform and under their own flag or from aliens who fight as individual allies in our uniform and under the Stars and Stripes.

2. In the economic field the Marshall plan shows what great things can be accomplished when the principle of complete self-help and mutual aid is applied. We cannot stop economic aid now. A revolution is under way in the world, particularly in the East. Less-favored nations will not stand still and be content with the low living standards of the past. The agents of communism have their greatest success in countries in which poverty and disease prevail.

These conditions cannot be met with military power—or with propaganda. The young American doctor, with his capacity to cure diseases, and the young engineer, with his knowledge of irrigation and electric power, can discharge a vital American responsibility, which will pay immense dividends in peace for ourselves and the world.

As General Eisenhower said:

"Communism inspires and enables its militant preachers to exploit injustices * * * among men. This ideology appeals not to the Italian or Frenchman or South American as such but to men as human beings who become desperate in the attempt to satisfy common human needs. Therein it possesses a profound power for expansion. Wherever popular discontent is founded on group oppression or mass poverty or the hunger of children, there communism may stage an offensive that arms cannot counter. Discontent can be fanned into revolution, and revolution into social chaos. The sequel is dictatorial rule. Against such tactics exclusive reliance and military might is vain. The areas in which freedom flourishes will continue to shrink unless the supporters of democracy match Communist fanaticism with clear and common understanding that the freedom of men is at stake; meet Communist-regimented unity with the voluntary unity of common purpose, even though this may mean a sacrifice of some measure of nationalistic pretensions; and, above all, annul Communist appeals to the hungry, the poor, the oppressed, with practical measures untiringly prosecuted for the elimination of social and economic evils that set men against men."

Much can also be done by an overhaul of our own economic policies to end the present economic dependence of foreign governments on the United States Treasury. In this respect it is easier to say what is wrong than to point unhesitatingly to what should be done. But the following observations are perhaps useful: the old system of congressional tariff-making was dangerous and evil and must not be revived; the present system is based on a conception of reciprocity which does not actually exist; there are probably foreign goods which could be admitted without danger to American industry; the new overhaul should be truly national in scope and must not result in a few industries carrying a destructive and unduly heavy burden caused by tariff changes.

As an integral part of this overhaul, our agricultural policy should certainly be revised so that farm prices are not kept so unrealistically high as to push overseas farmers into uneconomic planting of such crops as cotton and wheat, thus reducing United States export of these items.

Paul Hoffman shows that agricultural products have comprised 24½ percent of all United States foreign trade and entire areas in the Southwest Cotton Belt and various wheat States depend largely on foreign customers. He adds that if we believe—as we should—that the mainspring of free enterprise is to expand production by means of high-volume output at low unit cost, we must be troubled by the deadening effect on American agriculture which comes from reversing this process. The Commodity Credit Corporation in 1950 held billions of dollars' worth of surplus grains, eggs, butter, soybeans, and other products which it is either forced to continue to hold or to dump—a procedure which angers the foreign farmers and causes their governments to retaliate.

The harmful effect of such policies on the American consumer is all to clear.

3. We seem to lag behind in the campaign of information and the total political campaign of counterrevolution of which this campaign should be a part. Perhaps one reason we lag is that we have not seen it in its true perspective. When we speak of the "war of ideas," we tend to think in terms of radio broadcasts, printed matter, and the exchange of students. These are all obviously very good things and should be done intelligently and, if done intelligently, should receive adequate funds.

But there are undoubtedly many millions of people in the world whose ideas are much more influenced by being cured of hookworm or by receiving some much-needed food or by converting some desert into land from which they can live. There are undoubtedly many more millions whose ideas will be much more effectively influenced if we can end their fear that either military strength or political guile will make them satellite peoples. There are still many more millions, who are now behind the iron curtain, who will be much more influenced by help in organizing an efficient underground, either in the form of parachuted radio sets, of actual individual helpers, or of any other concrete activities necessary to advance a real counterrevolution for freedom.

Certainly no counterrevolution was ever successfully fomented from outside of a country solely by the use of a broadcasting station. This last is perhaps another example of our reliance on the power of words.

These activities will, if successful, regain the initiative for peace which we lost in 1945. We are justified in believing that, without fighting a war, the Soviet leaders, confronted with such force, will agree to the organization of the peace based on justice which they now spurn. But, of course, if war should come, the policies herein outlined will help us to win the war.

It is natural and human, when we are so clearly on the defensive, to think solely in terms of that defense and to refuse to discuss the day when the arrow of strength points from us to them. But we must, none the less, start planning now the broad policies which we and our partners will favor once we have regained the initiative. We must not be caught once again with a victory on our hands and no mature idea of how we intend to use it. Some broad aims to be achieved after we have regained the initiative are:

1. To establish a reliable program of international inspection and control of atomic activities and conventional armaments on which real disarmament must be based.

2. After halting the present lawless aggression of the strong against the weak, to encourage the freedom-loving elements in all the satellite countries to become members of the free world on an equal basis.

3. To pursue every effective means to give greater strength to the United Nations, urging a special session of the General Assembly to amend the United Nations Charter, as proposed in the Vandenberg resolution of 1948, so that we may actually profit by the bitter experiences which we have recently had, and thus build a truly effective world organization which is based on realities and which cannot be paralyzed by members who actually want to destroy it.

4. The complex of military, economic, and political policies herein described should result in an improvement in the standard of living in the poverty-stricken and disease-ridden areas of the world, notably the East, which will eventually free them both from the suspicion which they now have of the motives of the United States and from the Communist clutches.

5. It should result in the creation of a really strong complex of European peoples—a regional organism which can function efficiently in its own defense, even though it may not be a full-blown United States of Europe.

With the help of providence and an effort which is both vigorously sustained and intelligently led, we might see the sharply defined shape of these five broad aims within 10 years—and without a war.

Thus will be ended the present highly dangerous condition in which there is no balance of power in the world and the United States must carry such an undue part of the load of preserving world peace.

Thus can we start looking for the growth of a common sense of justice on which closer collaboration between peoples can be based.

Thus will we, inspired by the dreams of our founding fathers and doing our share, of course, to keep the peace, be free once again to pursue our own American ideals because there will at least be other strong people to carry a major part of the load.

Thus will an advancing world be able to benefit by our American Revolution, which Lincoln called the "germ which has vegetated and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind."

Moral Disarmament and the Propaganda of Chinese Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, last year in the Senate I compared the propaganda war now raging throughout the world with a vast political campaign. I was therefore particularly interested in an editorial titled "Moral Disarmament" in the March 24 London Economist. This editorial says:

No local politician, however inexperienced, is so foolish as to think that he stands a chance at the polls without the aid of an active party machine. There is no reason why foreign ministers should be more optimistic in the international contest that is now on. A permanent machine for western political warfare should be created, and, once in action, it must be used for firing incessantly into the enemy's ranks.

The editorial concludes along lines recommended in a resolution I submitted to the Senate last year, on which hearings were held by the Foreign Relations Committee. The editorial calls for a North Atlantic political warfare executive, and points out that in political warfare the western nations have, in freedom and truth, two potent weapons which the Communists cannot copy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this penetrating editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a column from the same issue of the Economist entitled "The Propaganda of Chinese Communism." This column shows what we are now up against in China. It was Russian propaganda which softened the Chinese peoples for the marching Communist armies. It is propaganda today which is being used to keep the Chinese people whipped up to the task set for them by their new Red rulers. This column points out how the Communist speakers of China "proudly proclaim that the most concrete and best contribution China could offer to universal peace at this time is in fighting against American aggression in Korea." I think the Congress will be interested in other illustrations in this column, which parallel the policy pattern set forth in Moscow for Communist propaganda activities throughout the world.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORAL DISARMAMENT

Napoleon's maxim that in war the moral is to the material as three to one has been overquoted and overrated. But it has sane truth, and even in the midst of material preparations for self-defense, the moral campaign should not be forgotten. For a period of time, the length of which no one can foresee, both the free nations and the Soviet Empire face a test of the morale of their citizens. A continuous struggle will be waged for the minds of men, which will range across the frontiers between the two worlds. Political warfare will seek to weaken the resistance of the opponent as well as to strengthen the staying power of friendly populations.

Perhaps these phrases seem overdramatic when applied to Great Britain. Morale to an Englishman is something that only foreigners have—some of them have good morale, some bad. It is true that Great Britain's psychological defenses against political warfare are perhaps the strongest in the world. There are few Communists here, and even in the trade-unions, as an article last week pointed out, their influence, though by no means negligible, is small. But even in England Soviet political warfare should not be written off; the last 6 months have shown how many people will dance to a tune composed in Moscow who would be horrified to know that they are helping the Soviets win the cold war. And in other countries, with livelier imaginations and less fortunate pasts, political warfare can be all-important.

In this campaign the Russians have already secured the initial advantages that come to the party that is both organized and unscrupulous. They have in the World Peace Council, the body which directs the Soviet peace propaganda, an instrument for the moral disarmament of the West which is worth serious attention on account of the part which it plays in Russian strategy. There is some danger of underestimating the council, which recently held a conference in the Soviet sector of Berlin to deal in particular with the question of German and Japanese rearmament. On the face of it, the Berlin conference seemed to be just another gathering, under the sign of Picasso's preposterous bird, at which insults were hurled at America by the stage army of Signor Nenni, the Red dean from Canterbury, Mr. Kuo Mo-jo from Peking, a Soviet woman agronomist, a black African student, German proletarian poets, and Professor Joliot-Curie, in absentia because he had once again been refused a visa. Moreover, the council had mournfully to record that none of its previous demands to the United Nations had been considered by that body. And its latest set a resolutions look on the surface turgid and pretentious.

The council decided to send a last warning to UNO and to present itself as an alternative where the "people"—especially the people of the colonial territories—can air their grievances; it decided to organize regional conferences in France to oppose German rearmament, in India to oppose Japanese rearmament, in Mexico to oppose "Truman imperialism" in Latin America. It will seek joint action with pacifist societies, the Quakers and others, it will canvass the support of the churches, it will set up a propa-

ganda office, start its own newspaper with M. Pierre Cot as editor, and award peace prizes worth 15,000,000 francs through a jury on which the Dean of Canterbury will sit. On the whole, it seemed the council might be dismissed as a talking shop.

There are, however, a number of reasons why such a judgment would be wrong. The first concerns the nature of propaganda in general. Mere reiterated talk with the object of hammering in one simple lesson is the basic method of all effective methods of influencing the minds of men en masse. Once external circumstances appear to accord with the propaganda, the simple slogans that have so often been half-consciously heard become an explanation of events and a guide to behavior. Specifically, the sudden threat of American action against China to counter Chinese intervention in Korea for the first time made large members of Europeans almost automatically conclude that the United States was a potential danger to world peace. At that moment, the Russian campaign scored a victory.

In the second place, the World Peace Council is relatively potent in comparison with western propagandists because it constitutes a branch of an organization. Lenin laid down, and Stalin has adopted the principle, that organization is vital, that once the "correct" policy has been decided upon by the party leaders, everything stands or falls by the extent to which a disciplined organization is in existence to carry it out. The peace campaign is no exception. Policy is laid down by the Cominform, which represents, in the language of capitalism, a holding company with two principal operating subsidiaries—the World Peace Council with the intelligentsia as its "market" and the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) to corner the labor world. In each case the directing brains are provided by the parent company working through the local Communist parties of the world.

All the Cominform branches have a special task allotted to them. The WFTU and subversive agents everywhere must create civil wars, strikes, mutinies, sabotage, and rebellion, and the World Peace Council must see that western governments do nothing about them. The basic aim of all is to bring about "revolutionary situations" in the western camp, following the Leninist tactic whereby the Communist elite preserves itself as a general staff, directing the masses into the front line without exposing itself to disastrous reprisals. Behind the peace campaign are the same revolutionaries who seized power in Russia after mutinies of the masses against an imperialist war, following years of underground subversive work. It is, indeed, one of the most disquieting features of the present situation that so much evidence offers itself to prove that the minds of Russia's aging rulers dwell so much on the experience of their early careers. They appear to be seized with a mortal terror lest any Communist at home or abroad should think that history is not precisely repeating itself down to the last dot of Marxist-Leninist theory and Stalinist practice.

The aim of the peace movement is, then, to aid subversion, not mere pacifism. Quakers and neutralists will be used, but Stalin demands positive actions. The World Peace Council met in Berlin with a directive from the Kremlin, conveyed in Stalin's recent interview with Pravda. It was to take action because, although war is "not yet inevitable," it can only be avoided if "the people's will" makes itself felt. To aid this process, the World Peace Council has two main tasks: The first is to prevent the United Nations from supporting the western powers if they take action to resist aggression, to subdue rebellions, or to arm the Germans and Japanese. The second, related to the first, is to foment the very actions which the western powers are to be hindered from resisting. A resolution at the Berlin conference revealed very clearly the importance which Moscow attaches to unrest in the colonial territories. It was also explained recently by a propagandist speaking to the Russian people. America, he said, would find it hard to start a war until the colonial revolts had been suppressed. In other words, the native rebels are to act as cannon fodder in order to give Russia time to complete its rearmament. This, according to Moscow, is the era of colonial liberation—of the attack on the "rear of the capitalist camp."

The democracies, therefore, are faced with the problem of combating a much more insidious attack than one launched openly by Communists for communism. They must meet an appeal not to do something unpleasant but—far more seductive—to do nothing. How should they best tackle the task? It is clear from the outset that no success can come of trying to overwhelm an organized campaign designed to win the educated masses of the world by an occasional address from an individual to individuals. Western statesmen, foreign offices and broadcasting services must rid themselves of the idea that to make an admirable, weighty rejoinder to Moscow's charges, and to make it once, is enough. If they find it difficult to grasp what is required of them, let them imagine themselves involved in a permanent international general election. No local politician, however inexperienced, is so foolish as to think that he stands a chance at the polls without the aid of an active party machine. There is no reason why foreign ministers should be more optimistic in the international contest that is now on. A permanent machine for western political warfare should be created, and, once in action, it must be used for firing incessantly into the enemy's ranks.

Next to the organization comes the policy. Successful propaganda needs a consistent theme, to be plugged on every occasion. And the theme, if it is to be really effective, must not be defensive. It is true that the Communist accusations of warmongering cannot be left completely unanswered. But much the best defense is attack, unceasing attack against the crimes of the Soviet imperialists. There should be a full-scale onslaught on the fraudulent, sinister peace campaign of the Soviet Union's rulers and their cynical misuse of the workers and colonial peoples. An unremitting attack should be made on Russian imperialism, with exposures of the inner contradictions (to borrow a Marxist phrase) of the neo-czarist camp. The point should be made over and over again that communism means economic exploitation, that its first victims are truth and decency, that it is a device for depressing the living standards of the workers.

In such propaganda there is no need to go beyond the truth—indeed, it would be both wrong and foolish to do so. There is plenty of perfectly truthful material to hand. The peace campaign itself has created difficulties for Moscow which offer many opportunities for exploitation. To take only one example from recent weeks, when Signor Togliatti, on his return from the Kremlin, announces that the Communist Party of Italy will drop its opposition if the Italian Government will only change its foreign policy, he provides an opening which should be seized at once until neither a patriot nor a Socialist can remain in the party with an easy conscience.

In material rearmament it is possible only to have larger numbers than the enemy of the same weapons as are in his hands. In political warfare the western nations have, in freedom and truth, two most potent weapons which the Communists cannot copy. But, like all other weapons, they need to be mounted, ranged, and fired at the enemy to produce any effect. That is the task to which a North Atlantic political warfare executive should be addressing itself.

THE PROPAGANDA OF CHINESE COMMUNISM

The propaganda of communism everywhere conforms to a pattern determined by basic Communist doctrine and theory of revolutionary method. A few essential themes are ceaselessly reiterated, though with a great variety of application, and the definiteness of the Communist objective, combined with the Communist exclusion of dissenting opinion, insures that there is always an effective concentration of publicity forces for a psychological offensive at any time, even though there may occasionally be moments of confusion when one of the notorious somersaults of party policy is taking place in Moscow. These general characteristics of Communist propaganda are evident today in China no less than in European Communist-ruled countries, but the Chinese propaganda output has some features of its own which deserve study.

The dominant theme is the task of preserving world peace by fighting the Americans, as laid down at the Second World Peace Conference in Warsaw, which was attended by a strong delegation of 65 members from China. The head of the delegation, the writer Kuo Mo-jo, thus reported to the Central People's Government Council:

"What were the circumstances under which the Second World Peace Congress was held? On the one hand, we have the aggression clique led by United States imperialism madly engaging itself in an armament program, intensifying its war propaganda, continuously threatening the world with atomic weapons and actively rearming Germany and Japan. * * * On the other hand, we have the invincible world peace camp led by the great Soviet Union, its strength greatly surpassing that of the aggression clique. * * * As was described by Chairman Joliot-Curie, the Congress was truly a real international council of the broad masses of the peoples of the various countries * * * the Congress tried its best to dissuade some of the 'pacifists at all costs' in order to achieve complete unanimity among the delegates on the over-all principle that 'to safeguard world peace, aggression must be opposed.' * * * We Chinese people are now engaged with great vigor in the sacred campaign to resist America, aid Korea, protect our homes and safeguard our country. This is what the Chinese people have done to carry out most faithfully and effectively the decisions of the Second World Peace Congress."

The war in Korea is thus presented as a struggle in defense of peace, in which China has not only the support of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies but also the backing of the World Peace Congress representing all the peoples of the world—in contrast to the United Nations, which is dominated by the American imperialists. Great efforts have been made to build up the Peace Congress in Chinese publicity as the true parliament of mankind. In the principal cities of Manchuria mass meetings were held and addressed by the delegates on their way back from Warsaw to Peking, and at the capital they were welcomed by General Chu Teh, the commander in chief of the People's Liberation Army:

"Speaker after speaker urged that a wide campaign be launched immediately to spread the message of the Congress throughout the length and breadth of People's China. They proudly proclaimed that the most concrete and best contribution China could offer to universal peace at this time was in fighting against American aggression in Korea."

Combined with this propaganda of the international struggle for peace is the anti-American hate campaign which lives up to the best standards of Communist invective:

"The American and Syngman Rhee butchers carried out a policy as utterly blood curdling as the worst perpetrated by the Hitlerite

Fascists. The war as exemplified by the MacArthur cavemen in Korea is not a war between nations. It is a war between men and beasts in human form."

For those Chinese who still remember American philanthropic activities in China in the medical and educational fields, a special propaganda line is adopted:

"Through their economic exploitation the United States sucked the blood and sweat of the Chinese people and then hoped to buy off the Chinese people with a small portion of what they had squeezed from their toil. The United States imperialists specially intensified their cultural aggression against China with a view to spiritually benumbing the Chinese people. They made big investments to subsidize religious, cultural, and relief bodies in China. * * * But the United States imperialists are completely mistaken in thinking that they can really buy the hearts of the Chinese people with a few of their dirty, blood-stained dollars."

Although America is the principal target, British iniquity is not forgotten. A spokesman of the foreign ministry asserted 2 months ago that the "concentration camps" of Malaya were "filled with innocent overseas Chinese," that many Chinese had been "killed and tortured to death" in these camps, and that 400,000 had been made homeless. He demanded that the British Government "immediately put an end to the policy of persecuting and deporting overseas Chinese," release all those detained and pay them compensation for losses suffered. These demands were adopted in resolutions by youth, labor, and other federations.

Fortunately the people's government is able to assure the people that it has nothing to fear from the imperialist instigators of war. In the words of People's China:

"Efficient and brutal in killing peaceful civilians, levelling homes, devastating cities, burning, looting, and raping, the American troops have proved themselves impotent and even imbecile on the battlefield when pitted against patriots and democrats. * * * Alarm and despondency spreads among the American satellites. * * * Mistrust grows in the thieves' kitchen, and particularly mistrust between the United States and Britain and France."

The Chinese people, according to the argument, have for several thousand years been "in the front rank of world culture," but for the past century they were "ruthlessly oppressed" by the capitalist imperialist nations. But Chinese patriots "found the truth of Marxism-Leninism as a weapon to free the Chinese people." This has enabled China "to surpass the western capitalist nations ideologically, politically, and even militarily." With its Russian alliance China is now invincible:

"The alliance of the victorious Chinese people and the Soviet people is not only the alliance of the countries of the largest populations and territories in Asia and Europe; it is also the alliance of the most advanced and most consolidated countries. Therefore, such an alliance is matchless."

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Edward Menhennett, 389 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *March 19, 1951.*
Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I wish to thank you very much for all the legislation which you have introduced in the Congress of the United States.

I feel free to express my feelings concerning my friendship for you because you support the desires of your constituents who have placed their trust in you as their Congressman we all know.

This is true, you supported the Townsend bill in Congress, and may the good Lord bless you and that we may always keep you in Congress as long as you wish to stay.

I remain,
Most respectfully,
EDWARD MENHENNETT.

Another Marine Speaks His Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, another Marine speaks his thoughts as follows:

FORT WAYNE MARINE SAYS KOREAN WAR IS "USELESS"

FORT WAYNE, IND., March 29.—President Truman has received a letter from a Fort Wayne Marine lieutenant, serving in Korea, denouncing the Korean War as useless.

The letter was received by the editor of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel from Marine Lt. Gale C. Buuck, of E Company, Second Battalion, Seventh Marines, First Marine Division, who has been in Korea since January. The letter said:

"Will you please relay the following question to Harry S. Truman?

"How many years are you going to let American manpower, materials, and money drain into this Korean sewer? How many more of my men must die on account of your stubborn refusal to pull out of Korea? The undersigned dares you to take the following issue to the people:

"Shall we pull out of Korea?

"Some day you shall answer for this sell-out of American manpower and materials. Unfortunately, on account of you and your administration, most of the boys over here won't be alive to register their righteous wrath against this sell-out.

"Again the question, Mr. Truman, how long must we stay here in this God-forsaken hole of Korea?"

Lieutenant Buuck also sent the following note to the editor:

"I believe that you stand a better chance of getting this message to H. S. T. than I do. Do what you will with it but I had to sound off.

"I could write 20 pages on the utter uselessness of this war in Korea. All my men hope for two purple hearts, or a wound severe enough, which will make them eligible to return home.

"Two days ago, I lost over 50 percent of my men taking one hill—and for what? None of us know why we are here and none of us can understand why we stay.

"Never have American men fought in a more useless war. (At least, that's the way they feel about it.)

"Surely, someone back home ought to wake up Congress or somebody and get us out of here."

The News-Sentinel announced it had forwarded the letter to President Truman.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what he thinks of the sending home of 123,000 South Koreans and how many here at home are in doubt as to the cause of this war—its objectives—the things which our fighting men must accomplish before it is over.

Europe Sells Our Steel Back to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, press reports reveal that America has shipped to Europe more steel than certain countries can use. This is a strange anomaly, especially in view of the shortage which many manufacturers are experiencing. Some of the steel which we have shipped to Europe is pouring back into this country at exorbitant prices, a Government agency has admitted. Other steel of an inferior quality is being shipped to America from Marshall-plan countries which have found they can get a better grade of steel free from this country and sell their inferior products to us.

The Economic Cooperation Administration is authority for the statement that the Netherlands has been selling in America large quantities of steel given them under the foreign aid program. That country has been given so much steel that it has been able to invade the American market in which our own manufacturers have been unable to buy the specified steel at any price.

The ECA admits that other countries which are receiving steel under the ECA are not only selling some of it in American markets—they may be selling it to the iron curtain countries. A spokesman for the ECA explained that much of the steel sent to foreign countries had been sold to private operators who had stored it instead of using it for reconstruction purposes. Some of this steel had been stored since lend-lease days.

This situation was first called to the attention of the ECA when an Atchison, Kans., manufacturer paid premium prices for steel and then discovered it was stamped "Lend-Lease from U. S. A."

It seems strange that in our rush to distribute our resources all over the world, we should not find time to study the problems of other countries and place our gifts where they are needed, and where they will be used for the purposes for which they are intended. The merits of lend-lease and Marshall aid may raise debatable questions in the minds of some people. There is no argument, however, in favor of grants of

aid to countries which do not need the materials furnished them and which by subterfuge attempt to gouge American firms through the sale of our products back to us at exorbitant prices. Some effective manner of preventing such injustice is the responsibility of those who administer our foreign-aid program.

Curbing Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach (Calif.)—my home town—Press-Telegram is a daily paper.

Its headline editorials for January 12, 1951, January 15, 1951, and February 28, 1951, are ones which I feel pleased to call to your attention and to that of all of my distinguished colleagues in this Congress.

They are as follows:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of January 12, 1951]

NEW CONGRESS FACES CHALLENGE OF CURBING DANGEROUS INFLATION

Inflation faces the Eighty-second Congress with a challenging problem.

Immensely larger military outlays will be necessary. They may rise about $75,000,000,000 in the 12 months starting next July. Congress will not stint these appropriations. But authorizing heavy expenditures is easy. Financing them by methods that won't eat away the buying power of money that people receive for their labor is what will put political courage to the acid test.

The frightening fact about inflation is that it has occurred because the people thought it was inevitable.

Applied in time, price and wage controls could have stopped the spiral. But the authority Congress voted last August is defective. It actually forbids effective controls of farm and food prices. And only now is the Government setting up the machinery necessary for enforcing controls at all.

In 1951 inflation has gained alarming headway even before the forces that set it off in 1941 really have begun to operate again. But this year will witness a rapid acceleration of those forces. Government spending for rearmament must be vastly increased. That, inevitably, despite our tremendous productive capacity, must mean fewer goods and services for the civilian market.

For whereas the defense program of 10 years ago started from a depression, this one starts amid a great boom. The labor force is almost fully employed. Most industries are operating at or near their plants' capacities. The national income in 1951 is expected to be more than two and one-half times what it was in 1941.

This country cannot produce enough guns to insure its safety in a threatened world, and at the same time, enough butter to increase, or even maintain, its people's present living standards. If a swelling supply of dollars chases a shrinking supply of things the people can spend them for, disastrous inflation will result. They are quite right who say that price-wage controls alone cannot prevent it. Nothing can prevent it unless other stern measures counteract the tendency of huge defense spending to increase the already vast supply of consumer cash and credit.

Chief of the weapons that should be used is taxation. Still higher tax rates on individuals and corporate incomes; taxes on purchases; taxes enough to pay as you go the costs of the defense program and of Government.

Restrictions have been imposed on consumer and business credit. They should be further tightened to keep income not yet earned from joining money already circulating in the competition for scarce goods.

A companion weapon is rigorous economy in Government, an economy that will slash drastically spending on all ordinary projects and activities, cuts that will fully match the sacrifices demanded of the people.

Taking such steps is the duty that confronts the new Congress and challenges its courage.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of January 15, 1951]

WHO SHOULD FOOT DEFENSE COSTS?—INCOME STATISTICS SAY EVERYONE

President Truman's request for $140,000,000,000 for lending and spending in the 2 years ending June 30, 1952, emphasizes the gravity of the international problem and this country's relation to it. The request also raises the question of how the costs of this program will be divided.

Notwithstanding passage of two tax measures and imminence of a third, Washington has not yet faced up to the question of who will pay for rearmament, just as it has avoided making many another hard decision since last June. Yet it is clear that if a slow, protracted erosion of United States currency is to be prevented, the cost must be wrung out of today's toil. As 1951 wears on, the piper will grow increasingly importunate. He must be paid. Experiences during World War II and afterward have shown he had best be paid promptly.

Who is to foot the bill? One good measure of ability to pay is the statistical record of national income. From that single gigantic purse must be taken the bulk of the taxes needed each year to defray Federal expenses. In the September quarter of 1950, the United States was earning at the rate of $240,000,000,000 a year (before taxes), or roughly $4,600,000,000 a week. Of this amount, $145,000,000,000 was wages and salaries. Individual proprietors, such as small-business men, professional people, landlords, and farmers, gathered in $45,000,000,000. Corporate earnings retained totaled $25,000,000,000. Dividends were $9,000,000,000 and interest $5,000,000,000.

These figures speak volumes. They prove that business alone, even if it were to sacrifice every penny of profit, could not begin to support rearmament. Military spending in the coming 2 years is apt to be around $70,000,000,000 a year. The most business could contribute to this is $34,000,000,000. And, in that unhappy event, what would become of the unprecedented program of industrial expansion mapped out for 1951, most of which will be financed by retained earnings?

More than this, the figures reveal unmistakably that the heaviest part of the load will have to fall on wage earners, salary holders, and individual proprietors. Together, these groups receive more than three-fourths of the annual national income. Inevitably, they face the necessity of bigger income and excise taxes, and stiffer credit controls, if the United States is to pay as it goes.

Support for this thesis has come from the Council of Economic Advisers which in its fifth annual report to the President, noted: "The total amount of wages available for spending cannot, in real terms, rise in accordance with cost of living and annual improvement formulas. It certainly is not too much to ask that wage earners in general forego efforts to increase their living standards at a time when the economy simply cannot produce more civilian goods and also carry the heavy burden of rapid rearmament."

The curbing of farm prices is one thing which the wage earner regards as necessary if he himself is to make comparative sacrifices, and this should be done by Congress immediately. The wage earner regards the cost of food as the unerring barometer of his well-being. He will not supinely watch it rise—still less will be inclined to sacrifice—when his grocery bills are racing skyward.

If the economy of this country is to stand up under the cost of rearmament, every American—and there can be no exception—must make sacrifices of money and luxuries.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of February 28, 1951]

EACH STAGE OF INFLATION CYCLE CREATES PRESSURE FOR CONTROLS

Necessity for widespread military preparedness to protect this Nation and for assisting the peoples of other countries to build their own defences against the threat of a Communist Russian dominated world is hardly open to question.

But unless these objectives can be accomplished in a way that preserves the financial integrity of this country and basic incentives of its free enterprise system, the United States will as surely have lost its American heritage as if it had been taken from us by military defeat.

Some indication of the extent of inflationary developments in recent years is provided by the fact that today the dollar will buy only 59 percent as much as it would in 1939. The burden of this depreciation in the dollar is unevenly distributed.

Obviously, those whose incomes have remained more or less stationary in dollar terms have suffered severely from the inflation of prices.

Inflation penalizes the traditional American practice of individual savings which have provided the capital to finance development of the Nation's resources. Billions upon billions of dollars in savings have had their purchasing power whittled away by inflation in recent years. Since 1938 the sum of the annual savings laid aside from year to year by the American people in form of private insurance, United States savings bonds, savings and time deposits, and other forms of liquid savings is approximately $180,000,000,000.

However, if each year's savings were discounted to allow for the depreciation that has occurred since they were set aside, total loss in their purchasing power would amount to roughly $44,000,000,000. Similarly, since 1938, the investors in the United States savings bonds alone have suffered an erosion in purchasing power of $13,000,000,000 out of $49,000,000,000 of principal and accrued interest they accumulated in this medium of savings.

From time to time the Government has justified its policies of holding interest rates at artificially low levels because of the importance it attributes to keeping the cost of interest on its tremendous debt at a low level. It has, of course, been frequently pointed out that it is only by inflationary credit policies that low interest rates have been maintained. In this connection, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that what the Government has saved on interest it has lost many times over, due to inflation.

The Government is paying a terrific toll in higher cost of its functions. For example, during the years 1947 through 1950, the Federal Government will have spent a total of $161,000,000,000 in cash payments. Of this sum roughly $92,000,000,000 will have been spent for purchase of goods and services in

which the element of price inflation can be identified clearly. If it had been possible for the Government to buy the goods and services represented by these $92,000,000,000 of expenditures at the average prices prevailing in 1946 instead of those prevailing in the years of actual disbursement, the Government would have saved approximately $16,500,000,000.

The relationship between inflation and socialism is closer than is generally appreciated. At every step in the inflationary process new distortions arise and new pressures are created for Government to "step in" with a new set of controls designed to rectify the difficulties, real or imagined, in which one group or another of the economic body finds itself.

Thus the risk of inflation may be used for an excuse for assumption by the Government of responsibilities beyond its capacity to discharge, except by diffusing and obscuring the real causes through further inflation.

Kentucky Baptists Oppose Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. W. O. Carver of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville, Ky.:

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Louisville, Ky., April 7, 1951.

The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHORT: I am writing especially to express appreciation of your leadership in the effort to prevent the use of the present emergency in the conflict between the United States and Russia as leaders of the opposing forces in the tragic division of human life today, to bring about the further solidifying of the movement toward military domination of our country. The emergency is being used, as you well know, to try to fasten on us permanent universal military training for our youth. Current developments make it entirely clear that no such universal conscription is necessary even for the emergency, to say nothing of establishing UMT as a permanent policy in American life. We are in imminent danger of having the entire Nation put in subjection to a military hierarchy, to employ a very apt phrase found in an editorial of the Courier Journal recently.

I am in position to appraise with a good deal of accuracy the feeling in my own section. I can say quite positively that relatively few of our people realize that the bill now under consideration does involve setting up a permanent policy and not merely meeting an emergency which we hope may be resolved within a few years.

No matter what the promoters of this program may think about it, its success would inevitably move definitely toward totalitarian control; toward the militarizing of the thinking of our people; and toward the destruction of that individual freedom which is the basic principle and factor in the American ideal.

You are rendering a great service to our ideals, our history, and our future in the leadership which you are now providing. May the efforts which you and others are making be rewarded with success.

Sincerely yours,

W. O. CARVER.

Let Us Not Kill Incentive—27½ Percent Depletion Allowance Should Not Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is under consideration now a reduction in the 27½ percent yearly depletion rate allowed for income from oil-producing properties as provided under the present Internal Revenue Code.

This reduction would seriously curb the oil industry and discourage experimental drilling for the purpose of developing new sources of oil at a time when we need to increase our supply of oil for the defense program. The maintenance of the oil resources of this Nation is vital to our national security, and we should recognize this fact when considering any proposed reduction in the present depletion allowance for the oil industry.

The provision for depletion allowance was originally provided by act of Congress some 25 years ago in recognition of the fact that, to assure an adequate supply of oil for this Nation, for each barrel of oil produced another must be found, and drilling for oil is a hazardous business undertaking which involves financial risk.

At the present time the oil industry accounts for 3 percent of the national income, but produces 7 percent of all taxes, which indicates that the oil industry is already paying more than its portion to taxes.

From the facts there can be no sound reason for decreasing the depletion allowance for the oil industry at this time. We need all the oil we can produce in view of the critical world situation, and we must encourage the development of our oil resources to the maximum.

The California State Legislature recently passed the following resolution urging the Congress to refrain from any action which would reduce the present depletion allowance on oil-producing properties, and I fully agree with this resolution:

Assembly Joint Resolution 22

Assembly joint resolution relative to continuing the 27½ percentage depletion rate for oil-producing properties in the Internal Revenue Code

Whereas committees of the Congress are considering a reduction of the 27½ percentage yearly depletion rate allowed for income from oil-producing properties as provided by the Internal Revenue Code, section 114 (b) (3); and

Whereas any reduction would decrease incentive for oil exploration, reduce reserves at time of emergency, cause shutdown of marginal wells with a consequent irrecoverable loss of oil, and cripple the program for expanded emergency production; and

Whereas a percentage depletion is the only just method of avoiding a tax on return of capital which is expended on experimental drilling (60 percent of which proves unprofitable); and

Whereas the present income-tax laws penalize a taxpayer who produces oil from a well, in that tax advantages would result if he sold the well immediately after discovery, or held it for over 6 months, the tax on the gains being respectively limited to 30 percent and 25 percent; and

Whereas the percentage depletion of 27½ percent does not fully make up for this vice; and

Whereas the depletion over the years can never exceed the actual amount of capital expended by a taxpayer; and

Whereas the oil industry accounts for 3 percent of the national income but produces 7 percent of all taxes, and any reduction in depletion allowances would further burden an industry paying more than its portion to taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to refrain from any action which would reduce the present depletion allowance on oil-producing properties; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California.

Missouri Farmers Oppose Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mr. H. E. Slusher, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

This is a great organization, and though we differ at times on public issues I am happy that they have approved my position on the present draft and UMT bill.

The letter follows:

MISSOURI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 6, 1951.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHORT: If the House and Senate have not definitely made final disposition of S. 1, which provides for universal military training, and H. R. 2811, I hope you will give careful consideration to the plans as outlined in H. R. 3364 (BARDEN, of North Carolina). This new bill certainly conforms more nearly to the policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation and that of our Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

This bill provides (1) for the elimination of universal military training provision, which we feel at the present time is both unnecessary under the present draft law and would entail an enormously high cost for administration; (2) it raises the age limit

to 19 years; (3) there would be only 24 months of service required; and (4) the ceiling on the number of troops would be left to the discretion of the selective-service program. Furthermore, it shows a definite date of termination to the operation of the law, which to us seems rather fundamental if we are to keep this Nation from becoming a militaristic nation.

We recognize that it is very difficult at a time like this to escape the impact of an emotional appeal which will be brought upon us as a result of the present Korean situation. I sincerely urge that you consider the question from the standpoint of what is best for the United States over a 10-, 15-, or 20-year period.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. SLUSHER,
President.

P. S.—Thanks for all the good work you have done on this question.

H. E. S.

Letter of Clayton C. Edwards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said in the debate regarding universal military training as to the position of the rank and file of members of the American Legion. I have recently received a communication from Clayton C. Edwards, commander of the American Legion, of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, which I feel would be of interest to the membership of this House. I am therefore inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Commander Edward's letter, which reads as follows:

APRIL 1, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: I was very happy to read accounts of your stand on domestic and foreign policy, and I wish to say I have talked to hundreds of people on these questions and I will say that 98 percent are agreed on the following:

No American troops to Europe, or only on a voluntary basis, believing that an American youth is entitled to have the right to say whether his life should be given in defense of Europe or in defense of America, and we do not associate Europe's defense with the safety of America in spite of the warmongers and their propaganda.

I am in favor of air and sea power aid to those of Europe who are willing to defend their own land and who wish our help.

Not in favor of the 18-year-old draft or a huge land army.

Do not favor any increase in taxes, but in favor of cutting down Government bureaus and using this money for the defense of America.

In favor of impeachment of Truman and resignation of Dean Acheson.

We think George Marshall has passed the time of usefulness to our Nation and his judgment is not being based on the best interest of the people of America.

His errors being too costly and following too closely the dictates of an unseen Government; as an example, his appointment of Anna Rosenberg, whom we do not have any faith in, regardless of the clean bill given by the Senate committee.

I am the county commander of the American Legion of Tuscarawas County, and these questions have been discussed in our meetings.

Now a big question now being discussed is Korea. Knowing the administration has no desire of establishing peace in Korea, as that would diminish the size of the emergency club being held over the American people, for the purpose of extracting huge sums of money to build up their huge political machine and further their socialistic plans. Who can the people look to for peace? It looks more and more that the people themselves will have to take that matter in their own hands and see that their will is carried out by those who are supposed to represent them. The administration so far has seen fit to ignore the people's wishes, and we feel they will continue to do so unless we stop it.

Yours truly,

CLAYTON C. EDWARDS,
Tuscarawas County Commander of the American Legion.

Those Unfilled Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in further support of the data I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, last, outlining the deplorable situation that has developed in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, due to the shortage of medical, dental, and nursing staff, I would like at this time to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Roanoke (Va.) World News of April 6, 1951, under the caption "Those unfilled veterans' hospitals."

THOSE UNFILLED VETERANS' HOSPITALS

According to Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia, there are six Veterans' Administration hospitals completed and equipped that have no doctors and no patients. They are standing idle at vast cost to the taxpayers, with no benefit whatever to veterans.

Congressman BAILEY should know. One of these hospitals, gradually coming into use after months of idleness, is located in his home town of Clarksburg. Another is not too far away, in Beckley.

As Mr. BAILEY tells it, they had a field day in Clarksburg last December when Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., dedicated the Clarksburg Hospital. He had dedicated the Beckley institution the day before. Each had cost about $6,000,000. Thousands of people viewed the 200 patient beds, the 900 rooms, the latest medical instruments, and the spotless operating rooms. A month or so later there were only two things missing: They had no doctors and no patients. A month later there were two doctors at the Beckley Hospital but still no patients. The two hospitals cost about $12,000,000. Maintenance comes to about a million dollars a year.

Congressman BAILEY told the House of Representatives recently that the 140 veterans' hospitals in operation at the present time, there is a shortage of 384 members of the medical staffs—that 6 completely equipped hospitals had no medical staff and cannot be opened for the benefit of veterans. Several months after completion, the Clarksburg Hospital had about 150 employees—none of them doctors—and the Beckley Hospital, a staff of 160 with 2 doctors.

The Veterans' Administration has indicated that hospitals will not be opened for patients, even for emergency cases, until each has at least 8 full-time doctors. It would prefer not to operate until there are 12 doctors available.

William J. Barnhard, writing in Tax Outlook, says the Nation's taxpayers have never been niggardly in their treatment of veterans. Even veterans with no service-connected disability have been well cared for in veterans' hospitals. In fact, according to the record, over two-thirds of all veterans' hospital bed patients have been treated as non-service-connected cases.

It is estimated that the Government will spend more than $800,000,000 on hospital and medical care for veterans during the fiscal year beginning July 1. How much of that will go to projects similar to the empty but fully equipped hospitals at Beckley and Clarksburg has not been estimated.

Beckley was the twenty-third and Clarksburg the twenty-fourth building completed in the current program which aims at 75 new hospitals and hospital additions by 1956, with a total of 131,000 available beds, including 80,000 for non-service-connected cases. Yet Administrator Gray has admitted to a Senate committee that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to staff the number of hospital beds now authorized. In many instances the unfortunate choice of site, far from any important medical center, bars specialized assistance and expert treatment required in many cases.

Stop Gerrymandering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement which I submitted to the House Judiciary Committee on April 2, 1951, with reference to H. R. 2648, which seeks to stop gerrymandering of congressional districts:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTEENTH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, RE H. R. 2648, TO REQUIRE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS COMPOSED OF CONTIGUOUS AND COMPACT TERRITORIES IN THE ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to you in support of H. R. 2648.

There can be little doubt that gerrymandering is merely a modern adaptation of the old, rotten borough system. It is not democratic and tends to destroy the democratic process. H. R. 2648, if enacted into law, will go a long way toward carrying out the intent of the founding fathers, as expressed in our Constitution. It will tend to provide fair and equal representation. There can be no justification for having one Member of the House of Representatives elected to act for 800,000 people while other Representatives, elected out of the same State, may represent districts with as few as 200,000 people.

Unless the Congress will perform its duty, as required of it by the Constitution, by the enactment of H. R. 2648, the States will continue to ignore and violate the injunction of the United States Constitution for equal representation. I urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

Let me take this opportunity to commend your chairman and members of your committee for their devotion to duty in this and other matters.

Generating Electricity by Sun Heat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the entire country was taken by surprise when President Peron of Argentina intimated that the scientists of that country had developed a process of generating electricity or atomic energy, with sun heat. It seems to me that Mr. Peron's scientists were trying to make use of a development which the scientists of this country announced many years ago—that of developing electricity with heat from the sun.

As we move forward into the electric age and note the wonderful progress that has been made since Edison invented the electric light—the incandescent lamp—70 years ago, we are prone to take more seriously the astounding suggestions of the marvelous developments that lie ahead of us. Here is one of the most astounding propositions that has ever come under my observation, that of generating an unlimited amount of electricity by the heat of the sun. If it proves a success, it will mean the production, not of billions of kilowatt-hours, but of trillions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy every year.

In a report made by Dr. Charles G. Abbot, of the Smithsonian Institution, in 1939, it was stated that one of the Southwestern States "could supply from solar radiation over 10,000,000,000,000 horsepower-hours per year of mechanical power, which compares with the power possibilities of all coal, oil, and water at present used annually for heat, light, and power combined in the United States."

I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Abbot, of April 5 of this year, stating that the electric energy that can be produced on one square mile of the arid area in the Southwest would amount to "nearly a million horsepower per square mile." That would mean anywhere from one to three billion kilowatt-hours. If electricity can be generated from the heat of the sun and properly stored, as Dr. Abbot suggests in his letter, it will mean the real beginning of a new day in the use of electric power, the like of which we have never known, and of which most of us have never dreamed.

Remember that when Thomas A. Edison was working on the development of the electric light the leading scientists of the world were ridiculing him, as many of them no doubt are today ridiculing Dr. Abbott and those other scientists who have joined him in this program to generate electricity from the heat of the sun.

The year I came to Congress the people throughout the United States used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Last year, 1950, they used a little more than 329,000,000,000, or almost 10 times as much as was used 30 years ago.

Thirty years ago not even 3 percent of our farmers had electric lights in their homes. Today approximately 90 percent of the farm homes of this country are electrified.

If this program of generating electricity from sun heat and storing it for use the day round and the year round could be developed, it would bring about as great a revolution, in proportion, as did Edison's invention of the electric light—the incandescent lamp—which made possible the use of electric power for all purposes for which it is employed today.

At this point, I am inserting Dr. Abbot's letter of April 5, which I trust everyone who reads this RECORD will take the time to read. The matter referred to follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: As you request, I put the substance of our phone conversation into a letter.

The southwest part of the United States has a very large percentage of cloudless sky. There is a region in Nevada, California, New Mexico, and Arizona where some 150,000 square miles of contiguous desert has an annual rainfall of 3 to 5 inches, and a percentage of 70 to 90 percent of cloudless sky. Other less cloudless areas are available.

The average intensity of the energy of sun rays in the clear sky in this region is about 1.4 calories per square centimeter per minute (5.2 B. t. u. per square foot per minute) equivalent to 1.15 horsepower per square yard, or nearly a million horsepower per square mile.

The devices shown in my patents No. 2,247,830 of July 1, 1941, and 2,460,482 of February 1, 1949, respectively, are computed to be able, in connection with the most mechanically efficient steam engines, to convert 15 and 25 percent, respectively, of the solar energy intercepted by their mirrors into mechanical work. The rectangular mirror, shown in Patent No. 2,247,830, is the easier to construct, but if wholesale production was in question, cheap means of producing the circular, more efficient, mirror of Patent No. 2,460,482 would be prepared.

At efficiencies such as these, if only one-tenth of the desert area above referred to were devoted to production of power, more than 20 times as much power could be produced from solar energy as is used for all purposes, heating, lighting, transportation, and manufacturing in the United States.

Three objections rise to the mind.

Firstly. The sun is obscured at night and in cloudy weather. Continuous power availability may be had by (a) storing heat in water at high temperatures; (b) storing electricity in storage batteries; (c) by electrolyzing water, storing the hydrogen (oxygen is available in the air), and burning it as power is needed.

Secondly. Power can hardly be efficiently distributed by electricity more than 500 miles. Solar power would, of course, be produced also in other States where cloudiness is not excessive. This would cause a movement of population, if solar power was depended on for manufacturing. Similarly, the cotton manufacture, formerly almost confined to New England, has gone to the South to be near the cheaper facilities. Power stored as hydrogen could of course be distributed, and to a moderate extent also in storage batteries.

Thirdly. Large mirrors would present their surfaces to winds. This limitation would perhaps hold solar power units to not more than 50 horsepower. This would require of circular mirrors a diameter approaching 50 feet. Many units could, however, be combined.

The cost of solar power comprises a return on the investment for machines and the cost of supervision and maintenance. The solar boiler, compared to an automobile or a sewing machine, or a typewriter or a computing machine, is far more simple, and if built wholesale would be very cheap. Little expense for supervision would be required, for the apparatus moves automatically to follow the sun. Maintenance also would be relatively inexpensive. It is impossible to estimate with certainty on these things until fairly large solar boilers have been built and tested. But I believe the cost of solar power in California would be less than the cost of coal power at the mines. Of course other areas are available, though less cloudless.

As yet, no engineering-scale solar boilers have been constructed along the lines above referred to. Workable models are on exhibition in the old Smithsonian Building in Washington, D. C.

In closing, I may remark that power was approaching a bottleneck in World War II; that at present a considerable supply of oil for power is imported, and subject to interruption by submarines in war. A power source in the desert, above referred to, would be immune to ships and, covering a wide area, would be difficultly interrupted by bombing.

The solar energy is produced in the sun by atomic processes which, so far, have not been available on earth. The fission atomic-energy production is costly and dangerous. It seems a pity not to avail ourselves of the enormous quantities of atomically produced energy furnished freely by the sun, without the dangers attending terrestrial atomic sources.

Yours sincerely,

C. G. ABBOT.

Exemption of Operas and Symphonies From Admission Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and letter:

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF HON. ALBERT P. MORANO, OF CONNECTICUT

President Truman has received a request from ALBERT P. MORANO (Republican, Connecticut), to support his bill to exempt operas and symphonies from Federal admissions taxes.

Mr. MORANO, in a letter to the President released today, pointed out that Mr. Truman's reputation as a lover of good music exceeds that of any previous President. His

daughter, he said, has established herself firmly in the music world, and the First Lady, active in music circles, is well aware of the cultural need music fills.

The text of Mr. MORANO's letter follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was in the audience which shared with you and Mrs. Truman the wonderful experience of hearing Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, as rendered by the National Symphony Orchestra in Constitution Hall on Wednesday evening.

Fittingly, the inspiring choral symphony was dedicated to Brotherhood Week, for the message of this great work is: "All mankind shall join as brothers."

The visiting foreign ministers of 28 Western Hemisphere Republics surely shared our pride in witnessing the chorus of Negroes and other groups, joined voices in this theme. What better confirmation of the need for the continued advancement of such ideals as wrought through music.

Your reputation as a lover of good music exceeds that of any previous President. Your daughter, with her gracious personality and lovely voice, has established herself firmly in the music world. The First Lady is active in music circles, and well aware of the cultural need music fills.

Good music—the great common denominator between peoples—faces what appears to be insurmountable financial difficulties. This includes our great nonprofit symphony orchestras and opera companies, which cannot survive unless properly supported.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you support H. R. 2524, and that in your weekly meeting of legislative leaders, you urge them to enact this measure. It is a nonpartisan measure designed to assist these great musical organizations in their goal to bring the wonders of music into the hearts and homes of all, especially in these troubled times when understanding between nations and people can benefit from its common language.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT P. MORANO.

Immorality in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on April 8, 1951:

It is not a very happy or pleasant subject which I have selected for discussion with you on this occasion but it is one which is not only timely but also which strikes at the very foundation and security of our Government. It has nothing to do with communism or Communists, with debts or high taxes, nor with war and conscription or any other of the manifold problems which confront the American people and perplex the Congress. Simply stated, it has to do with honesty and decency, morality, and character on the part of people in government or those dealing with government.

Recent exposures of several investigating committees of the Congress have brought to light a condition which is most discouraging and disheartening—political favoritism has reached a new low in our current history ranging all the way from petty bribery through the medium of mink coats and deep freezers to exorbitant and unconscionable profits to an extent which has brought the entire Government into disrepute and has shattered the public confidence in all public officials.

This condition is distressing and deplorable but it is not new in our history. In times past the people have found dishonest and corrupt public officials who have been promptly punished either through criminal prosecution or summary dismissal from their posts of duty. No such treatment of these corrupt officials now appears to be in the offing; instead, it is proposed that some commission be constituted which will establish a code of conduct for our public officials. That is the development which to my mind is far more deplorable than the fact of corruption itself. To think that we have reached the point in our national life when it is felt that a formal code of moral conduct is necessary to guide the work of our public officials is most distressing—a depth to which I doubt if our country has ever sunk so low. The tragedy of it is that the only solution to be advanced for the correction of this condition of depravity is the formulation of a set of written rules which will be framed appropriately and hung conspicuously on the wall of each officeholder from clerk to President in the naive belief that by doing this the evils will be corrected and thenceforth our officials and servants will perform honestly and honorably. Alice was never more fanciful in her Wonderland peregrinations.

Public office is a post of public trust; no set of formalized rules of conduct are needed. Printed principles of ethics do not make people ethical in their judgments or their actions; laws do not make people honest, they simply discourage dishonesty. Good men in public office need no set of rules, evil men would give no more attention to such a format than as though it did not exist.

Where, then, does the trouble lie that we find corruption rampant in government and that the mode of correction is the concoction of a set of principles which may or may not prescribe the proper attitudes of character which the lessons of the ages have taught to us? To be sure, initially the fault lies with the very persons who have provided the basis for these disclosures of impropriety as well as those in office who through some purpose known only to themselves have failed or refused to take appropriate action to treat the guilty in the fashion which they deserve. But fundamentally the fault lies with us, the American people, ourselves for allowing such persons to be in office and the fact that we have placed them in these positions is the consequence of a new concept of life which has come upon us in recent years but which is quite foreign to the American way.

This new demoralization is the product of two decades of profligacy and sophistry in government which has blinded and distorted the judgment of the people. It is the concept of a solicitous Santa Claus, of getting something for nothing, of dependence upon someone else for our intellectual as well as economic security. Our sense of moral values has become warped and debased; our self-reliance, our self-initiative, our self-respect have been undermined and weakened.

Only by a reawakening by the American people to the causes of this distressing condition and a reconsecration to the unwritten laws of morality and decency and character which have guided us in the past can this dangerous trend be curbed, decent people placed in posts of trust and commissions to devise rules of conduct be assigned to other fields of endeavor where their talents can be centered in more constructive uses.

The Honorable James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1951, the Honorable James M. Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and a former Member of the United States Senate, appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to present certain testimony and to comment on legislation affecting the Federal Trade Commission.

In presenting him to the committee, our distinguished chairman, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, addressed him as follows:

Senator Mead is well known to the members of this committee, but as we know, you got your training where it is very often gotten by distinguished Government officials and others, in the House of Representatives. We want you to know that we are glad to have you here a Chairman of this Commission and will be glad to hear you.

At this point Mr. Mead proceeded to present his testimony to the committee, which was followed with utmost interest by the members.

James M. Mead has attained a most impressive career which underscores the opportunities still existing for the average American youth to reach the top through sheer character and industry. At an early age he was elected by the Buffalo railroad switchmen as president of their union. In 1910 he found his way to Washington and received an appointment on the Capitol Police Force, in which capacity he served for a year around the legislative halls where he was destined to sit one day in his own right.

After returning to his home city, Mead became successively a member of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County in 1914, he served as a member of the New York State Assembly from 1914 to 1918, was elected a Representative from Buffalo to the Sixty-eighth Congress and served through the Seventy-fifth Congress. In 1938 he was appointed to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Copeland, and 2 years later he was reelected to the Senate for a full term. In the Senate, he served as chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, succeeding in this office our present President, Harry S. Truman, who headed the same committee when he was a member of the Senate. Mr. Truman had the opportunity to observe the ability, industry, and integrity of Mr. Mead. Consequently, upon the expiration of the latter's term in the Senate in 1949, President Truman named him as chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Mead's philosophy toward business is aptly expressed in his own words:

It is self-evident that the well-being of our economy cannot be divorced from the well-being of small and medium-sized corporations. * * * The nessence of the

revitalization of small business requires that it be provided with more capital and better credit facilities.

The comments of the members of our committee on Mr. Mead's ability and the fine work he is doing as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission deserve wide attention. After Mr. Mead presented his testimony, the following views and observations were made:

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, Senator Mead, the only thing I have to say is that you said you were unused to being a witness. I do not think anybody ever appeared before the committee with more aplomb and savoir-faire, and it is what we expected from you.

Commissioner MEAD. Thank you very much, Congressman. I feel a little bit uneasy on this end of the project. No matter how often I presided or participated in committee deliberations I felt like a raw amateur the first time I appeared as a representative of the Federal Trade Commission looking for money.

Mr. HARRIS. I also, Mr. Mead, want to accept the statement made by our colleague from New England. You have given us a very enlightening picture of the problems of your great Commission. There are a lot of technical questions that you must deal with. We well recognize that when we get to dealing with our economy of the country and various businesses, entanglements, and so forth, it becomes exceedingly technical, we found out the other day.

You have made some very interesting suggestions here with reference to legislation, most of which, of course, comes under the jurisdiction of this committee. I believe, however, the proposed amendments to the Clayton-Patman-Robinson Act will go to the Judiciary Committee. I assume that as full an explanation as you have given to this committee will be very helpful and beneficial will also be given to the members of the Judiciary Committee in order that their attention will be called to matters you have in mind.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, as a freshman on this committee, I realize that I should be seen but not heard, but may I trespass at this time to join in the sentiments of my colleagues, Congressmen McGUIRE and HARRIS? I should like this committee to know that Senator Jim Mead is one of New York's favorite sons, and has the love and affection and respect of all of the people of the Empire State. Of course, today he belongs to the Nation as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and he is doing a swell job. The statement which he just gave this committee was informative, interesting, and constructive. To my mind his testimony clearly indicates that he has made a very intensive study of the problems confronting the Commission, and I want to commend him for his fine grasp of the subject matter which he has just called to our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WOLVERTON is recognized.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues to the right who have sought to pay tribute to the ability of the witness. It has been my privilege to have been associated with him for many years in the House. The ability that he shows today in his splendid statement that he has presented to us is no different than the ability that he showed on all occasions in the House. I concur with the gentleman from New York. I would not ordinarily concur in everything that comes out of New York, but I would concur in the fact that he has mentioned a high regard in which you are held, not only in the State but far beyond the boundaries of the State. It is very gratifying for me to see appointments such as yours made to these boards, commissions, authorities, and so forth, because it brings to those boards a man, as in your case, with a background of experience that makes you realistic rather than theoretical in your approach, and you have demonstrated that this morning in the statement that you have presented to us. I am certain that I echo the feeling that is in the thought and mind and heart of every member of this committee—that we are appreciative of the way in which you have brought this matter to us and the realization upon your part of the desire of cooperation between this committee and those agencies of Government that come more or less within the legislative jurisdiction of this committee.

I think there is a great deal that can be accomplished by a better understanding and a closer relationship existing between the Congress and these agencies, and that it would result in common good.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Senator Mead, I want to concur in what the others said about complimenting you. The thing that has always impressed me about you is that when you were a Senator representing the great State of New York, very, very busy all the time, as everybody knows you always have been, you were never too busy to accord the greatest courtesy to even the most unknown Members of the House, and those that you had from time to time opportunity to meet. It impressed me very much, and I have told a good many of my friends about you in that connection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Senator, I join in the encomiums that have been heaped upon you this morning. I appreciated your statement very much.

Mr. O'HARA. Senator Mead, I share with my colleagues of the committee the very high regard and respect for you. I have been sitting here and listening to all of these tributes which have been paid to you, and knowing your background as a baseball player, I am amazed that you have not been recommended as the commissioner of baseball. You are the only distinguished person in the United States that has not been mentioned.

Commissioner MEAD. Mr. Chairman, if I may just express my deep sense of gratitude for the—and this is uncharitable—undeserved encomiums that have been paid to me this morning, and for the patience with which you listened to me. If I may leave with the assurance that the Federal Trade Commission will respond instantly, and as effectively as we can, to your every request, and that we will try to carry out the law which you have outlined for us, and that we will try to be that arm of Congress in the matter of investigations that it was intended that we should be.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Commissioner, the rest of the committee have done such a wonderful job of appropriating all the beautiful things that could be said that there is not much left for the Chairman to say. But the Chairman assures you that I have the deepest affection for you, and that I am more pleased than I can tell you about the wonderful way you have handled the case here this morning.

An American Plan for National Security Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on April 3 the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] made what I believe to be ill-considered charges against the proponents of national security training. It was somewhat of a shock to me to find a member of the Republican Party unwittingly giving voice and official recognition to the insidious propaganda of the Communist Party.

I should like to have answered the gentleman forthwith, because I felt it important that his charges be answered without delay. It seems, however, that the members of the Armed Services Committee feel bound by precedent to dominate the argument in the Committee of the Whole to the exclusion of noncommittee members, who desire to carry on the debate as a debate rather than as a mere series of overly long prepared statements, having no immediate relation to the phases of the subject which some of the members would like to have discussed.

I have full respect for the older Members of Congress who have served in the House for a long time, but their willingness to spend all of their lives as Members of the House of Representatives, and their ability to get reelected, does by no means give them the omniscience that the seniority system tends to cause some of them to feel they possess. This is evidenced by the fact that most of these older Members have been in power in this Congress while this Nation was drifting into the precarious and confused condition which presently exists. It seems entirely possible that less fixed and inflexible viewpoints brought to the Congress by some of the newer Members might prove beneficial to the Nation, and in this I am, of course, not speaking for myself, except as one who would like the opportunity to hear what some of the newer Members think about some of the issues before the Congress.

Of course, I recognize the heavy responsibility carried by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I feel that under his guidance the committee has done a fine job in endeavoring to hammer out a compromise likely to be supported by a majority of the members, and this without compromising away the more essential beneficial provisions of the proposed legislation.

Now to get back to the speech by the gentleman from California, I will not repeat much of that speech, because it is available in the RECORD. I should like, however, to point out that on February 12, February 26, and March 15 of this year, I called attention of the House to the formation of phony Communist peace organizations, formed for the obvious purpose of fighting national security training through the diabolical method of causing it to become identified in the public mind with German militarism, and particularly with Heinz Guderian, Hitler's chief of staff.

From the standpoint of psychology, the association of ideas employed by the Communists is a tactic well known in psychological warfare, and make no mistake about it, the Communist campaign against national security training is psychological warfare against the people of the United States. Obviously, the Communists are not interested in the legitimate arguments against national security training advanced by many loyal Americans who are most certainly sin-

cere, but who are, in my judgment, mistaken. On February 12, I said:

The Communists are, of course, fully cognizant of the fact that many good citizens are concerned, as we all are, over the necessity of requiring our young men to spend considerable time in the Armed Forces. They are seeking to capitalize upon this concern by using it as a pretense to contact as many citizens as possible in order to spread their propaganda calculated to destroy faith in our Government, weaken our Armed Forces, and our determination to resist the aggression plotted by the imperialists in the Kremlin. We can see the propaganda on the petitions, but we know not what lies the Communists used to obtain the signatures. We can well imagine that those who signed will be indexed and cataloged for future softening up by the Communists.

Before coming here from Los Angeles, I received first a telegram and then a mimeographed letter from this so-called peace council. The communications denounced the draft and universal military training. They claimed that these proposals emanated from a Nazi general, and were so obviously the product of the Communist Party that I immediately forwarded them to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the same time, I sent an investigator to the address of the so-called peace council. He found there only a locked door with a paper on the outside and the name "Southern California Peace Council" written on the paper. Apparently, this Communist brainchild was hastily conceived, and the nefarious propaganda was considered so important to the Communists that they started spewing it out before they had time to give their infant front organization even the outward appearance of legitimacy.

The Communists are against national security training only in the United States and other non-Communist countries. They are all for it in Russia and Kremlin-dominated countries, and this of course shows the sheer hypocrisy of their position.

That the Communists set out last year to attack our proposed military training plan the label "Guderian" is evidenced by the telegram which the so-called Southern California Peace Council sent on October 27, 1950, to various candiates, including myself. The telegram reads as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *October 27, 1950.*
Hon. SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY,
Los Angeles:

Current United States News and World Report details plan devised by Nazi General Heinz Guderian for universal military service plan calls for drafting all 19-year-olds regardless physical or mental condition for 2 years training in military and key civilian jobs. It would accomplish complete military control of American economic and political life. Southern California Peace Council in name of all peace groups this area requests statement of your attitude toward Guderian plan now called Universal Military Service.

CHARLES GLENN,
Executive Secretary, Southern California Peace Council.

As a follow-up to the telegram, I received a mimeographed letter. It read as follows:

Re our wire of October 27

(A bulletin of the Southern California Peace Council, 326 West Third Street, room 310, Los Angeles 13, Calif.)

THE GUDERIAN PLAN

United States News and World Report (October 27, 1950) reports on plans for universal military service already approved by military leaders for presentation to Congress. This plan threatens democracy at home and peace throughout the world.

Universal military service differs from universal military training or selective service. Without going into details of other plans, here is what UMT would do:

UMT would conscript every youth of 19, regardless of mental, physical, educational, or marital status. Period of service would be 24 months, with no exemptions from foreign service for youth mustered into military services.

UMT would train only part of the physically adequate youth for the military. Other physically adequate youth would be trained for service under the military in key defense jobs. The military, then, would enter the civilian economy picture as a dominant force.

Most youth aspiring to college would have to give it up until age 21 at least. A youth, entering school at 18, would be removed at age 19 for performance of his 24-month tour of duty. A youth of genius, enrolled at an early age in scientific or medical institute, would be removed from school at 19, regardless of his closeness to graduation. Remove from school as a junior or senior, he could resume studies only after his 24-month tour.

Disabled youth (even to the point of being legless) and physically weak youth—even mentally undeveloped youth—would be conscripted and placed in noncombat jobs with military services or industry.

It is not an accident that UMT follows in carbon-copy detail those plans followed by Adolph Hitler. Presented as a plan of the American General Staff, UMT actually finds its genesis in the work of Gen. Heinz Guderian, former Chief of Staff to Hitler. Guderian was admittedly employed by the United States military to draw up total mobilization plan, UMT.

In its issue of February 10, 1950, United States News and World Report detailed work done by Guderian, calling it "a blueprint to remove defects in a staff plan under which Germany lost two world wars * * * centralization of power in professional military hands is at heart of the Guderian plan. There would be no layers of civilian authority between military and the President as Commander in Chief."

On September 8, 1950, the same magazine reported Guderian's boast that h's plan is a Bible for American military officers and is approved by President Truman and Gen. Omar Bradley.

Universal military service is at best a pretty way of saying "the Guderian plan." Although United States News does not, in its October 27 issue, call UMT Guderian's plan, its earlier reports make such a step unnecessary.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The blueprint for total American fascism has been known to exist in Washington for some time. Many candidates, some of them incumbents, may choose to deny knowledge of UMT and Guderian's part of it. When such is the case, you can still inform your candidate of the facts behind UMT which will face Congress at its next session.

There is adequate time to so inform your candidate and to secure an expression of opinion from him. There is also time to react to his expression of opinion, time and opportunity on November 7 at the polls.

There is adequate time to protest UMT and the part of General Guderian in its formulation. Protest to your Congressman, the President and Cabinet members.

There is also adequate time to tell your friends and neighbors wherever they gather, in their homes, churches, places of employment, to tell them of UMT—the Guderian plan—to organize and mobilize their sentiments against universal military service.

The expenditures of this time and this energy is vitally necessary if we are do do our share in bringing peace to the world and defeat of UMT would be a seven-league step in that direction.

The Guderian plan, once put into action, won't stop in the United States. It is a plan for domination of the world by a United States under the iron heel of a military dictatorship. History has proved time and again that such a dictatorship is not an end in itself, but is a means towards a larger end—military conquest. The Guderian plan is proof—if such is needed—that the American military machine does not intend always to stop at some Manchurian border.

In this regard, the Southern California Peace Council urges that protests on the Guderian plan be accompanied by resolutions on the use of United States armed force in Asia.

The wanton destruction of Korea—its people and its industries—is followed now by a $2,000,000,000 armaments loan to France for the purposes of building up the French Government's "dirty war" invasion of Indochina for the purposes of supporting the corrupt night-club emperor, Bao Dai; and there are broad hints that American military might well be committed to Indochina, even as it has been committed to Korea.

As the same time, we press Western Europe into rearmament program, putting guns once again into the hands of Nazis, and forcing upon the North Atlantic nations a military combination under the leadership of General Eisenhower.

These moves portend war. These moves can be halted by action of the people in pressing for abandonment of the Guderian plan for adoption in the United Nations of the Nehru plan. This is the central hope for world peace.

THE NEHRU PLAN

The very character of the United Nations would be destroyed if current United States efforts to bypass and undermine the Security Council were successful. In the words of India's Premier Nehru, such steps, if successful, would make of the UN "an organization for war, rather than peace."

All Asia is today up in arms against the military domination policies—the "new colonialism"—of the U. S. A. In this regard and at this moment, India, with a seat in the United Nations, finds herself Asia's spokesman against settlement by saturation bombing of the problems which beset whole peoples to search for freedom.

Through Sir Benegal Rau at the UN, India's Premier Nehru has proposed that the Korean War and all other conflicts in Asia and Europe be mediated by the UN; he has proposed that such mediation can have real meaning only if the People's Republic of China be seated in the Security Council and the General Assembly of UN; he has proposed that UN mediation can have real meaning only if voice is given both North and South Koreans; he has proposed that the UN concern itself with conciliating the differences between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. in approaches to the Korean problem.

None of Premier Nehru's proposals has been adopted in the UN. The peoples of all Asia are today expressing their desires for national freedom. The UN Charter guarantees the right to expression of such desires; the Nehru proposals would implement the guaranties of the UN Charter. American military might in Korea, Indochina, all Asia, undermines those guaranties.

The Southern California Peace Council urges that the Nehru proposals be made known to every peace group, in churches, in homes, in shops and offices and that support, in the form of letters and resolutions go to Sir Benegal Rau, India's UN delegate, Lake Success, N. Y.

We urge, too, that a stand on the Nehru proposals be taken by all incumbent Congressmen and Senators. We urge, in these days before elections, that all candidates be approached by delegations and in meetings, that candidates be made to take a concrete stand on peace or war by an expression of support or opposition to the Nehru plan, by an expression of support for or opposition to the Guderian plan, now known as universal military service.

In all instances, the people must know what is happening to their peace. Tell your neighbors, your coworkers, your organizations about the Guderian plan and the Nehru plan. The people can be organized for peace. Knowledge is your best organizer.

ATTENTION

Armistice Day is November 11. On this day the Southern California Peace Council will sponsor a work meeting for all individuals and organizations interested in peace. Plans for activity of all in search of peace will be presented. A concrete program for full activity will be presented Saturday, November 11, 1 to 5 p. m., Park Manor, 607 southwestern.

After receiving the telegram and letter, I investigated the peace council because it was obvious to me that it was a Communist-front organization. In 1939 and 1940 I was chairman of the California State Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, and because of that experience I can usually discern Communist propaganda, which is in reality quite transparent to anyone who has taken the trouble to study their methods and objectives. My suspicions were borne out by the later activities of the so-called peace council which I described in my talks referred to a few moments ago. These activities included the barring of a newspaper staff writer from one of the so-called peace meetings because of the fact that he was seen taking notes. It is no coincidence that last Friday our own House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report describing the activities of these phony Communist peace organizations.

I have no way of knowing why the gentleman from California permitted himself to be the vehicle by which propaganda spread by the Communist Party was placed in the RECORD of this House. The gentleman is a fine, loyal American and most certainly would not knowingly spread Communist propaganda. It is obvious, however, that he either agrees with the Communists and believes that our Armed Services Committee is furthering some kind of a plot to turn this country into a military dictatorship along the lines of German militarism, or else he is himself the victim of subversive propaganda. Those of us who favor national security training are certainly entitled to answer the gentleman by making it clear that we are not militarists; we do not favor dictatorship of any kind; and we are proposing an American plan for national security training, our own plan, and not a plan suggested by Guderian or any other person of similar views.

In his laborious attack upon our Army leaders, the gentleman omitted the admirals, and I suspect that much of the classified matter which the gentleman inserted in the RECORD was nothing more than a rehash of the bitter recriminations over the unification program—recriminations which in the interest of national security and unity should be allowed to remain buried. The gentleman accused the Army of circulating in the Pentagon a military analysis by Guderian, and inserted that analysis in the RECORD, but the letter of transmittal from the Historical Division of the Army says, in plain words:

The solution outlined in Manuscript No. T-113 was evolved by Guderian without guidance or suggestions from Army personnel; its distribution does not constitute endorsement of Guderian's recommendations by the Historical Division of the Department of the Army.

There were times during my own service in the Army when I was called upon to see that histories were prepared of the operations of our units, in order that any mistakes might be subject to later study. It seems to me the Army Historical Division would have been negligent indeed if it failed to study the causes of the failures and successes by both sides in World War II in order to enable us to avoid repetition of our own undiscovered errors which our adversaries might be in a position to disclose to us, or to discover errors which they themselves made about which we might have no knowledge. The analysis by Guderian would quite naturally be of interest to the military leaders of all nations, and I am sorry that the gentleman has seen fit to make it available to our enemies in spite of the fact that it evidently was classified by the Army in order to keep its contents from falling into the hands of our enemies who might desire to see it.

This whole matter of divulging the contents of classified material is serious indeed, and if the gentleman has served in the Armed Forces, he should know better than to lightly divulge the contents of classified documents. Classification of documents is a matter of consequence, and in many cases only a trained intelligence officer is in a position to know the importance of keeping a particular document classified. Breaches of security can cost many lives.

I am reminded of the shock I received when our wartime breaking of the Japanese secret code was made public. As one of those who regarded our success in breaking that code as a top-secret matter, I could not understand why we should put any possible future enemies on notice relative to weaknesses in the Japanese security system, thereby giving them the opportunity to avoid similar weaknesses in their own system. Whoever divulged to the gentleman the contents of the classified matter which he placed in the RECORD should be investigated, and I believe this is particularly important when one sees the similarity between the argument used by the gentleman and the propaganda spread by the phony Communist peace groups. We simply cannot afford a break-down of military security. The lives of too many people are involved. If the documents were cleared, as to security, which I hope was the case, the gentleman should so inform the House, and that phase of the matter will no longer cause concern to those of us who dislike and fear the effects of breaches of security.

Without going into great detail, it is obvious from a comparison of what the Comunists claim national security training to be, and what our Armed Services Committee has proposed, that there is no similarity except that any plan for national security training must, of necessity, involve an obligation on the part of every eligible person to accept training, or the plan cannot truthfully be called democratic and universal. The plan proposed in S. 1, as amended by our committee, is in line with the recommendations made by George Washington, when he was President of the United States. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has made a very excellent analysis and historical summary of universal military training and the problem of military manpower—Public Affairs Bulletin No. 90, February 1951. I should like to commend it to all persons interested in what I believe to be an impartial survey of the available evidence both for and against national security training. On page 25 of the document, there appears the following:

During the 7 years under the Articles of Confederation the same situation prevailed. A primary objective of Washington himself in supporting the new Constitution was to provide adequately for the national defense. His idea was that there must at all times be a small professional army, but the primary purpose of this army was to provide a nucleus for a national militia. "Although a large standing army in time of peace," he wrote in a recently discovered treatise, Sentiments on a Peace Establishment, "hath ever been considered dangerous to the liberties of a country, yet a few troops, under certain circumstances, are not only safe, but indispensably necessary. The only probable means of preventing insult or hostility for any length of time, and from having exempted from the consequent calamities of war, is to put the national militia in such a condition as that they may appear truly respectable in the eyes of our friends and formidable to those who would otherwise become our enemies." (Washington, George. Writings of George Washington from the original manuscript sources, 1745-99. (John C. Fitzpatrick, ed.) Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office (1931-44), vol. 26, p. 374 ff.)

Washington's concept of the national militia (i. e., a militia not controlled by the several States but by the Federal Government), as expressed in this document of 1783, runs thus:

"It may be laid down, as a primary position, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services in the defense of it, and consequently that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exceptions) from 18 to 50 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice (and) duly organized into commands. * * * They ought to be regularly mustered and trained, and to have the arms and accoutrements inspected at certain appointed times (and) able-bodied young men, between the ages of 18 and 25 * * * drafted to form a corps in every State * * * to be employed whenever it may become necessary in the service of their country * * * but no independent or volunteer companies for-

eign to the establishment should be tolerated."

It now appears that Washington's professional army, established to be the nucleus of a nation (that is, a Federal) militia, was itself to be a citizen army, a special fraction of the militia.

On becoming President, Washington called upon Congress for a "uniform and effective system for the militia of the United States," pointing out the diminishing number of veterans of the Revolution who were well-instructed officers and soldiers. The only response was an authorization to call into service from time to time such part of the militia of the States, respectively, as he should judge necessary. The States were unwilling to give up their control. A year later, in 1790, Congress authorized enlistment for a regular army of 1,216 officers and men, to be formed into one regiment of infantry and one regiment of artillery. Congress rejected in that same year the bill for a national militia, the Boudinot bill, which had been the result of many years of study and collaboration on the part of Washington himself, General Knox (the first Secretary of War) and Baron von Steuben, who has been called "Washington's one-man general staff." Strictly speaking, the Boudinot bill was not rejected; it was emasculated by amendments, and finally emerged as the "Militia Act of 1792" which stood on the statute books for over a hundred years.

The Militia Act of 1792 affirmed the citizen's obligation for military service, and the Government's power to compel such service. Section I provided "that each and every free able-bodied white male citizen * * * who is or shall be of the age of 18 years shall * * * be enrolled in the militia * * *." The value of the act for national defense, however, was vitiated by the fact that the "Uniform Militia" which it established was not a Federal force, but 13 separate armies under the control of the 13 separate States. The Federal Government had to leave to the States all requirements for training, discipline, and inspection. The Federal Government could call out these troops under certain conditions, but had to take what the States offered. It was not long before the States had granted so many exemptions, had suffered so much favoritism to develop in the choice of officers for political reasons, had provided for no service of supply, and in general had administered their militia with so much laxity, that when the test of real service came, the militia was found wanting and fell into disrepute.

The essence of the plan which President Washington proposed is the one the proponents of S. 1, as amended, wish to see adopted. We want a strong Nation. We want our citizens trained to defend the Nation, but we do not want a huge, permanent, standing Army which lack of national security training might make necessary for a period of indefinite duration. Now, it is obvious that the Communists could not have made headway against national security training by calling it the President Washington plan, which it is. They were forced, for their purposes, to call it the Guderian plan, which it is not. The great wisdom of President Washington is once again demonstrated by the fact that the Eighty-second Congress is today finding it necessary to adopt the more essential features of the plan which he proposed to the First Congress.

National security training cannot be considered in an abstract way without relation to time, place, and circumstance. As an abstract proposition, very few of us would favor it, but man has not evolved sufficiently or become sufficiently civilized to compose his differences with others without resort to force. To protect those of us who believe in peaceful methods against the ruthlessness of would-be tyrants, it is necessary that we remain at all times prepared to defend ourselves, and it is for this reason only that national security training can be and is, in my opinion, justified. No hysteria impels me to this conclusion. Several of the opponents of national security training have, during the course of this debate, accused the proponents of acting in an atmosphere of hysteria. It is a strange coincidence that hysteria, too, is a word always used by the Communists to describe efforts to discover them and nullify their influence. The proponents of this legislation are proposing it in a calm, deliberate manner, not as something new, but something old which has been too long neglected. We cannot make our Nation secure by castigating our military leaders, many of whom are too disposed toward pomp and ceremony, and who most certainly suffer from some of the shortcomings ascribed to them by the opposition, but we cannot prepare our defenses or prevent war by destroying our Military Establishment, much as we dislike some of its practices. Of course, in a way, I suppose we fulminate against our generals because we hate war, and all that goes with it, and our generals symbolize the fact that, no matter how distasteful war may be, it nevertheless hovers over us like an ominous black cloud.

I had plently to say about the generals during my military service, but the fact remains that our generals have always guided our Armies to ultimate victory, and I take it we are all agreed that this is an important measure of their ability. It probably is not easy for our military men, who bear full responsibility for our protection, to watch our political antics which some continue to indulge in right up to the brink of disaster. They would like to get on with the job, and some of them might harbor an impulse to overstep their proper bounds in order to acquire power and speed and direct our decisions, but I do not believe that there is any concerted Pentagon plot to make this country a military dictatorship, and certainly if there were national security training would be a mistaken way to accomplish it. Civilians who have served in the Armed Forces, as have many of the Members of this House, and who have been subjected to military discipline, can certainly be depended upon to resist military control even more than those who have never personally experienced it. National security training will, in my judgment, cause our young men to be more attached, and not less attached, to the principles of our Constitution.

The bill is, of course, not perfect. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has announced his intention to amend it in a manner suggested by some of the members. I, myself have an amendment already drawn, deleting the provision of the bill dealing with segregation. I regard this provision as retrogressive and unwise. The bill is, however, essentially sound and capable of being amended in such a manner as to make it acceptable to all who believe in the principle of, and necessity for, national security training.

State Bar of Texas "ROD Month" Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the State bar of Texas has set a precedent in my home State through its January citizenship project, designated as "ROD Month"—responsibilities, obligations, and duties of the citizen. The "ROD" idea was conceived by John Ben Shepperd, Texas, secretary of state and chairman of the Texas Bar's American Citizenship Committee. Following the announcement of the idea in a speech at a San Antonio bar convention in San Antonio last summer, the American citizenship committee, under the direction of Shepperd, began formulating plans for the State-wide project, the first of its type ever to be undertaken by the Texas Bar. My friend, fellow townsman, and distinguished lawyer, T. Kellis Dibrell, of San Antonio, served as chairman of the ROD subcommittee.

Other committee members were: Roberty Storey, Jr., Dallas; Dalton Cross, San Antonio; Levert J. Able, Houston; Homer E. Dean, Jr., Alice; C. W. Kennedy, Jr., Crockett; George Grant Roane, Rosenberg; Byron Skelton, Temple; and James C. Watson, Houston.

Slogan for the month was "Spare the 'ROD' and spoil the country," and its purpose was to encourage Texans to think more about what contributions they can make to democracy rather than what they can get from it. The program was based on the assumption that in order to perpetuate individual freedoms and to have liberty without hindrance, it is necessary to make wise use of these freedoms and liberties and to be responsible to them. The committee also advanced the idea that as efforts are increased to build up the physical defenses of this democracy it is fully as necessary to increase vigilance over the personal freedoms of its citizens.

Many civic clubs and schools over the State were invited to participate in the project. At the close of January, 1,500 ROD programs had been reported by these groups. Speakers on these occasions were members of both the junior and senior bar associations of Texas. ROD month received wide publicity through the press, radio, and television.

The committee, in order to remind Texans of their responsibilities to the rights granted them in the Constitution

and Bill of Rights, prepared a bill of responsibilities which catalogs duties of allegiance, awareness, defense of rights, patriotic activity, education, propagation of democracy, free enterprise, and self-reliance. The bill is thought to be the first authoritative statement of a citizen's responsibilities ever to be drafted, and since it was written, approximately one-quarter million copies of it have been distributed. A copy appears below:

BILL OF RESPONSIBILITIES

We who advocate democracy as the best form of government for an enlightened and progressive people, enjoying as we do the blessings of liberty under the Constitution of the United States, do set forth this bill of responsibilities as a guide to all citizens for the preservation of individual freedom and democratic government.

I. It shall be the duty of every citizen to render undivided allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, to work for its betterment and perpetuation, to respect the sovereignty of the people's government, and to defend the Nation against all its enemies whomsoever.

II. It shall be the duty of every citizen to be familiar with the Constitution of the United States and to be informed as to what rights and liberties are his, and to use these rights in such manner as is consistent with his own welfare and the welfare of his fellow citizens.

III. It shall be the duty of every citizen to defend with his life the rights and liberties granted to him and to his fellow citizens by the Constitution, to obey the laws of the land and aid in their enforcement, and to oppose vigorously any persons whose intention is to transgress the law or to oppress the rights of others.

IV. It shall be the duty of every citizen to make honest, wise, and courageous use of the free and secret ballot at every election; to exercise freedom of thought, speech, and worship; to protect the freedom of the press; to safeguard the right of trial by jury and to render willing jury service when called upon; and to perform all other acts conducive to the perpetuation of the rights set forth in the Constitution.

V. It shall be the duty of every citizen to protect and sustain the unwritten liberties and rights vested in him by custom and usage and to perpetuate the ideals of the equality and dignity of the individual, upon which the Constitution is founded.

VI. It shall be the duty of every citizen to be active in the political party of his choice, and to be vigilant of the public officers, to render all possible aid to them, and to serve in public office by appointment or election when qualified and when called upon to do so. It shall be his duty to strive for the selection of public officers of ability and upright character; and when holding public office, to serve in such manner as will subordinate private or minority interests to those of the people at large.

VII. It shall be the duty of every citizen to achieve the highest practicable level of education, and to work for the advancement of education by supporting and improving the public schools and by fostering the desire for education among his fellow citizens.

VIII. It shall be the duty of every citizen to instruct his children in the principles of freedom and to spread the ideals of democratic government at home and abroad.

IX. It shall be the duty of every citizen to defend the right to buy and sell, to own land and other property, to engage in commerce, and to work and earn a living wage, as a fundamental guaranty of the freedom and welfare of the Nation.

X. It shall be the duty of every citizen to preserve an attitude of self-reliance, and to use all legitimate means to achieve financial independence and security; to practice thrift and economy in his own affairs and to require the same of local, State, and Federal Government.

In order that citizens of Texas might take stock of their citizenship activities during the past year, the committee prepared a citizenship questionnaire called Were You a Full-Time Citizen in 1950? It was reprinted in many newspapers and one-quarter million copies of it have been distributed. The questionnaire is reprinted below:

WERE YOU A FULL-TIME CITIZEN IN 1950?

(Prepared by the American Citizenship Committee of the State bar of Texas)

Test yourself and find out if you were a full-time citizen in 1950. Consider only the questions which are applicable to you. The highest possible score is 130. You may type your citizenship according to the following scores: 110–130, superior; 95–109, good; 70–94, average; 50–69, fair, and below 49, poor.

1. Did you pay your poll tax in 1950? (Five points.)

2. Did you vote—

(a) In the July primary? (Five points.)
(b) In the August primary? (Five points.)
(c) In the general election? (Ten points.)
(d) In your city election? (Five points.)
(e) In your school election? (Five points.)

3. Did you make a conscientious effort to find out something about all the candidates on the ballot each time you voted? (Ten points.)

4. Did you attend—

(a) The precinct or county convention of the party of your choice? (Five points.)
(b) A meeting of your city council during the year? (Two points.)
(c) A meeting of your school board during the year? (Three points.)
(d) A meeting of your commissioners' court? (Two points.)

5. Did you do any work in your party in 1950? (Five points.)

6. Did you serve on a jury in 1950? (Five points.)

7. Do you know—

(a) Who the two United States Senators from Texas are? (One point each.)
(b) Who your United States Congressman is? (Two points.)
(c) Who your State representative and senator are? (One point each.)
(d) Who the State Governor is? (One point.)
(e) Who the speaker of the State house is? (One point.)
(f) How your United States Congressman voted on any major bill during the last session of Congress? (Five points.)
(g) How your State representative or senator voted on any major bill during the last session of the legislature? (Five points.)

8. Did you write to your Federal or State representative or senator on any issue during 1950? (Ten points.)

9. Are you active in a civic group such as the chamber of commerce, Rotary Club, Lions Club, Jaycees, American Legion, VFW, study or business club, PTA, League of Women Voters? (Five points for each with a maximum of 10 points.)

10. Do you keep well informed on current public issues? (Five points.)

11. Can you list the Bill of Rights? (One point for each.)

12. Did you attend church regularly in 1950? (Five points.)

13. Did you contribute regularly to the support of any church in 1950? (Three points.)

14. Did you contribute to a worthwhile charity during the year? (Two points.)

One of the first radio talks on ROD month was presented over the Texas Quality Network by Secretary of State Shepperd, with the introduction by Mr. Dibrell. The text is printed here:

TQN BROADCAST, JANUARY 5, 1951, STATE BAR ROD MONTH

Mr. DIBRELL. In our present state of national emergency, we have been asked to contribute our every physical resource to the defense of the country, we have been asked to forget such selfish interests as higher wages and shorter working hours and to pledge ourselves to the burden of higher taxes and longer hours on the job. We are asked to help preserve our democratic form of government through military preparedness which must be accomplished through financial, mental, and physical sacrifices on the part of every person. Most of us have no doubt at all about the final outcome of a total war, should the situation come to that, we are confident that right would win in the end, that the United States and her allies would defeat the communistic aggressors. But right now here at home, how are we progressing in our small, silent battle against those of our citizens who have lost their spirit of self-reliance, unselfishiness, initiative, and industry and their sense of obligation to themselves, to others, and to their freedom? The lawyers of Texas have united themselves in order to intensify the battle against those who are in arrears in discharging their citizenship responsibilities. During January, which the State bar Texas is calling "Responsibilities, obligations, and duties month"—or in short ROD month—the American Citizenship Committee of the bar is launching a campaign to get every Texan to think more about his duties to his citizenship rights than about the rights themselves. Our committee has adopted this project because we believe that the light of freedom cannot burn forever without constantly being watched and rekindled by freedom-loving people. Many ROD speeches and programs will be presented during the month for civic organizations and schools, and one of the first of these is scheduled for tonight by Secretary of State John Ben Shepperd, American Citizenship Committee chairman, who first advanced the ROD idea in a speech at a July bar convention in San Antonio. Mr. Shepperd, former national president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, is well known for the citizenship work he has done as originator of Democracy Beats Communism Week, now known as the Gladewater plan, and as chairman of the 1950 Texas H-Y Youth and Government program, of the Americanism Committee of the Texas Department, American Legion, and of the Education for Citizenship Committee of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce. As chairman of this first ROD project to be directed by the bar, I now present my distinguished friend and fellow lawyer, John Ben Shepperd.

Mr. SHEPPERD. One hundred and sixty-four years have passed since the Constitution of the United States of America was written for a "by, of, and for the people" form of government. During this period, which is only a brief moment in the span of time, Americans have enjoyed a freedom acquired only after a small group of our ancestors undertook a perilous trip across the sea, spent many years of privation and tyranny in tiny, insecure colonies and fought a war with their mother country.

We Americans come from a sturdy stock, from a group of pioneers who were willing to risk their lives many times for the freedom of religion, speech, and action—the freedom which would give them worth and dignity as

individuals. The sturdiness and strength of the first American settlers became innate characteristics in each successive generation, and the history of those generations is a series of epic tales of territorial expansion, scientific discoveries, important inventions, economic and political growth.

As we take a backward look over the past three centuries, we see in a vast panorama the growth of the United States—a growth which began in tiny settlements on the New England coast and spread at tremendous speed from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Canadian to the Mexican border.

The growth was not realized without hardships and adversities nor without wars.

The American people have fought wars for economic reasons, for expansion, and in self-defense. We have also fought wars for liberty.

Many moving stories, poignantly expressing the desire and the will to ever be free, have had their beginning when our country was in war or on the point of war. Some of the most famous have lived through the ages and are just as moving today as they were many years ago.

Everyone knows the story of how Patrick Henry roused the colonists, who were on the verge of making a peaceful settlement with England, to open rebellion against their mother country, which had grown to be tyrannical. His "Give me liberty or give me death" inspired the colonial group, inferior in numbers and means, to a victory which meant a place for them among the free nations of the world.

Our own Texas ancestors scored another victory for freedom when they fought and defeated their Mexican rulers who outnumbered them 2 to 1. But Texas independence was not won until such valiant crusaders for right and freedom as Travis, Bowie, and Crockett were killed at the Alamo, as fewer than 200 Texans fought 4,000 Mexicans led by Santa Ana.

Out of World War I comes the story of a soldier whose dying words were, "I am glad I gave my life for the freedom of the world."

We now smirk at the statement that we have fought two world wars to make the world safe for democracy—but behind that smirk is an inner feeling of sickness at the realization that neither war accomplished its purpose for long. We become even more sickened when we are reminded in the daily news that a third world war is lurking near.

It is imperative that we defend our country against communism; it is imperative that we make an all-out effort to throttle the aggression of the malicious enemies of mankind. Through our concerted efforts we can set the world right again, we can suppress communism perhaps even without an all-out war. But when then? What of our personal rights and liberties granted to us by the Constitution? Will they still be intact? We have been enjoying them for a long, long time. So long, in fact, that we now take them as a matter of course.

We have gladly accepted every right and freedom that the Constitution and Bill of Rights have offered us. How highly have we valued these things? What have we given in return for our everyday liberties?

It hasn't occurred to a great many people that with each right accorded us, we have a corresponding duty. This fact has become very real to the lawyers of Texas in their daily dealings with legal matters pertaining to rights and responsibilities, and offenses against the rights of others. With the ROD program, sponsored by the State Bar of Texas, we want to awaken the public to their citizenship responsibilities. It is with great concern that we as lawyers face the fact that an American man will engage in physical warfare to defend the country itself and to defend his right to vote, but he will not insure the internal safety of the country by spending 30 minutes finding out something about the man who is running for district attorney—and he will not spend another 15 minutes going to vote for the qualified candidate who could be of real benefit to the country.

We will fight a war, but we won't serve on the jury without being almost forced to do so.

We are willing to give our lives for our country, but we will not take time to make occasional visits to meetings of the city council or school board where vital issues affecting us and our children are decided.

We will die for democracy, but we won't take time to write to our Representatives or Senators on any controversial issue.

We are willing to serve in our country's Army, but we won't work actively on citizenship and Americanism projects sponsored by civic organizations.

Too many people believe that their liberties are secure as long as the Constitution exists. That is only partly true. If liberty is to live, the people of the United States have got to stop looking at Government as though it were the job of the other person. Does the business man wait for a friend to replenish the stock in his store? Does a doctor just sit back and wait for his patient to be cured miraculously? Does a farmer plant cotton year after year in the same field and expect the yield to remain constant? Does a professor stay away from his classes expecting his students to learn his course by themselves?

No; the business man looks after his merchandise, the doctor makes a great effort to find a cure for his patient, the farmer keeps up his crop yield by rotations, and the professor spends much time in preparing lectures which will enlighten his students.

But what of the citizen and his citizenship? Do we sit back expecting to have the liberties promised by the Bill of Rights and Constitution fulfilled with no effort whatever on the part of the individual? Yes, most of us do. We feel no responsibility at all to our rights. We do not realize that if we ever lose our liberties it will not be through defeat on the battlefield, but it will be caused by our failure to keep faith with them by fulfilling our duties as citizens.

What exactly are our duties as citizens? To answer this question the State bar's American Citizenship Committee has prepared a bill of responsibilities which is designed as a guide to good, responsible citizenship. During ROD month the bill will be distributed over the State. I would like to read it to you. (Bill of responsibilities.)

A bill of responsibilities such as this, if kept ever before us, will help us fight not only public lethargy and gradual dwindling of hard-won freedom but also against the tendency in times of crisis for rigid controls to put a permanent halter on the rights of the individual, which tendency is fatal to the democratic ideal.

Representative editorial comment on ROD month follows:

One of the most comprehensive and unusual citizenship programs yet devised is now actively underway in Texas. * * * As the fundamental basis for this ROD program the Texas American Citizenship Committee prepared a bill of responsibilities which was widely distributed through the State. A copy of this outstanding document is enclosed with this bulletin. It deserves the widest publicity throughout the United States (Citizenship Bulletin, January 1951, published by the American Citizenship Committee of the American Bar Association).

"Government for the people" is the ascendant political philosophy of 1951, with millions of Americans thinking only of the favors they can get from the Government. They are completely disinterested in the implications of government of and by them. It is the purpose of the Houston Junior Bar Association, cooperating with the State Bar's ROD program, to prevent the further spread of this attitude toward government before it destroys democracy (the Houston Chronicle, January 23, 1951).

A "citizenship score card" is being used by the American Citizenship Committee of the State Bar of Texas in its January educational programs in civic organizations and schools. The score card permits the individual to rate himself on 14 points of good citizenship. * * * Some pretty low scores might be turned in, even by recognized civic leaders and those who consider them exemplars of citizenship in their communities (the Austin American, January 8, 1951).

How many Americans were full-time citizens in 1950? Not many, if the quality of their citizenship is based on a questionnaire prepared by the American Citizenship Committee of the State Bar of Texas. * * * The citizen, who can say "yes" to all these questions is such a rarity he might be nonexistent. (Beaumont Enterprise, January 4, 1951.)

Through the ROD month program, the bar leaders hope to arouse the people to inform themselves better, and to think more seriously concerning their civic obligations than they have up to now. What public service is more needed, or could prove more useful? (San Antonio, Tex., Express, December 27, 1950.)

Most publicity material that comes into a newspaper office is not worth the paper it is mimeographed on. But, despite the high percentage of stuff that is absolutely unusable, all such material must be opened and at least scanned. You have to scan it because once in a while something worth while turns up in the mimeographed letters. Just such worth-while material came to my desk the other day from an organization that might do a lot worse, the State Bar of Texas. * * * There is only one thing I would like to suggest to the State Bar of Texas. Wouldn't it be better to make the ROD campaign not just a project for January—but a continuing campaign to last all year? I think it would. (Al Altwegg in the Arlington, Tex., Journal, January 12, 1951.)

Probably no better way for self-appraisal of citizenship could be devised than the point system of the citizenship questionnaire the ROD committee has outlined. (San Antonio, Tex., News, January 16, 1951.)

Quotes from letters on the ROD month project follow:

I returned a few days ago * * * and found on my desk the very interesting communications indicating the progress of your ROD citizenship program in Texas. Needless to say, I am very greatly impressed. (John C. Cooper, Princeton, N. J., chairman, standing committee on American Citizenship of the American Bar Association.)

The American Citizenship Committee of the State Bar of Texas, of which the Honorable John Ben Shepperd, secretary of state of Texas, is chairman, has prepared a bill of responsibilities for the guidance of our citizens. A copy of this excellent document is enclosed herewith. * * * Members of the American Bar Association have long felt that too little emphasis has been given to the responsibilities of a citizen. The State Bar of Texas, through its American citizenship committee, has performed an outstanding public service in preparing the enclosed bill of responsibilities. (Taken from a letter written by the Honorable John C. Cooper,

Princeton, N. J., to Tappan Gregory, editor of the American Bar Association Journal.)

I received a copy of the bill of responsibilities today and I think it is one of the finest resolutions I have read. (Taken from a letter written by Hon. John R. Sailer, attorney at law in Elizabeth, N. J., to Vernon Law Book Co., Kansas City, Mo.)

Thanks for the ROD month material and the bill of responsibilities. You are on the right track in an excellent manner. (F. G. Swanson, Tyler, Tex., attorney.)

We had a wonderful talk on a ROD program last night. I didn't realize that we as American people could do as little as we do and still think that we are doing our best as citizens. * * * I wish to take the opportunity as secretary of the Azle Lions Club and as an individual to thank the State Bar of Texas for giving us this most unusual and inspiring speakers' material. (Jim Bob Nation, Azle.)

This program you have this month is certainly one that can do much good. I would like to see all of the other clubs in this town use it at one of their meetings; also I would like for the schools here to inject some of it into their classwork. (L. E. Ray, Aransas Pass Lions Club.)

We had a splendid address on ROD month and had distributed the citizenship questionnaire to our membership, to the superintendent of the Grand Prairie school system, the Business and Professional Women's Club and the Federated Women's Club. We have had a number of requests for the bill of responsibilities. (Joe F. Cooper, commander, American Legion, Grand Prairie.)

Thanks for sending enough copies of the bill of responsibilities for the pupils in my class. The bill is so excellent that I would like to have enough additional copies for all the students in my building. (Miss Jacqueline Pratt, teacher, Mission Public School.)

We have presented ROD programs for the Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis Clubs and have given ROD radio programs over two local stations. * * * All professors of business law at A. and M. College have gladly agreed to speak 20 minutes in each of their classes on the ROD subject. It is significant to note that by this channel, our program will be brought to the attention of 750 heterogeneous students who will represent a composite group of the entire student body of this institution. (Arthur Stewart, Bryan attorney.)

Manpower Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Jim G. Lucas which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 9, 1951:

TWENTY THOUSAND NONESSENTIALS IN D. C.—SERVICEMEN ARE WASTED

(By Jim G. Lucas)

(NOTE.—You've heard a lot lately of this country's manpower problems at a time when we're trying to build up our Armed Forces. Manpower is a basic and precious commodity for the military—but it can be wasted. How much of that is going on today? Scripps-Howard Reporter Jim Lucas, a World War II veteran who spent 5 months in Korea and is nationally known as an analyst and writer on military affairs, has recently completed a careful study of the question. This is the first of a series in which he sets forth his findings.)

The Armed Forces have been pressing Congress for more fighting men, ever since the Korean War broke out.

Yet the record shows that they're wasting much of the manpower they have.

Without too much digging you can count 20,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines—most of them around Washington—working in nonessential jobs. Nonessential, at least, in the sense that they're not what the men were hired to do—fight battles, man ships, and fly planes.

Between 3,000 and 4,000 work in the Pentagon. Another 1,900 hold public relations jobs, and 13,000 are on recruiting duty here and all over the country. Another 1,350 are on or subject to ceremonial details here. Approximately 800 fly special missions out of Washington for high Government officials. Another 225 are running a correspondence school. In lesser degree, it's the same at military command headquarters wherever they are located.

Some of these nonfighters in uniform like their work and are good at their respective jobs. But others are frankly embarrassed and eager to get on with the Military Establishment's main job—which is the build-up of a capable, well-trained fighting force.

ONE MORE DIVISION

Twenty thousand men would give us an extra Army division. We could use it in Korea. Or it would give us seven heavy-bomber and 12 jet-fighter groups. It would man six aircraft carriers the size of the Midway, with 2,000 men left over. That would be enough for a battleship. Naturally, it would be impossible to lump them together and assign them to the same outfit, because they come from all services. But the illustration shows what's happened.

That's only scratching the surface. These 20,000 men are the ones you can put the finger on and say "Here, Joe." It doesn't include the countless thousands clerking in post exchanges and ships stores, in laundries, officers' clubs, or in Army and Fleet post offices. For some reason, information cannot be published on the post-office roster.

No one contends that the services these men perform aren't necessary. The armed services must have post exchanges, laundries, clubs, and post offices. But a strong case can be made that these are jobs which can be filled by civilians or by men now rejected as unfit for combat duty.

It does little good to check the personnel files. Because the records conceal—rather than tell—the story.

MOS DEVICE

All services, for instance, employ a little device known as the MOS. MOS stands for Military Occupation Specialty.

Theoretically, a man's MOS is the key to his job assignment. He may have several MOS numbers revealing he's competent in several fields.

In practice, however, the system is a good cover-up. A man may be listed in the MOS files as a machine gunner but given the job of mowing a general's lawn. The only way to find out he's doing something else is to watch him doing it.

When I began research on this series I submitted a number of questions to all the services. Among them was one asking how many enlisted men were assigned to the Pentagon. After a week and a half an Army public information captain came up with the answers, warning in advance that they weren't what I wanted because I hadn't put the questions properly.

SOUNDS SILLY

"There are no enlisted men assigned to the Pentagon as such," he said, and he added, "I know that sounds silly."

He went on to explain that Army enlisted men working in the Pentagon were assigned to a number of paper units throughout the city and detailed to the Pentagon as "additional duty." As far as the records were concerned, however, they were stationed at Fort Meyer, Fort McNair, etc. A couple of enlisted men were busily typing while this discussion went on. Before we were through an enlisted messenger deposited a sheaf of papers on the captain's desk.

I'd also asked how many enlisted men were assigned as clerks, typists, cooks, messengers, waiters, etc. After each question the Army had written a big zero.

I protested that I'd eaten lunch in the general's mess and seen six enlisted men—all of combat age—waiting on tables.

"Probably true," the captain said. "But that's not their MOS. You'd have to check the file of each man personally. As far as their MOS is concerned, they're doing some other job. They're probably carried as drivers of riflemen. They're just filling in as waiters. I'll bet you can check every MOS in Washington and you won't find a single man listed as a waiter."

THE MILITARY SIDE

The services have some apparently valid explanations. One general pointed out that if we begin accepting 4-Fs, "they'll be on the taxpayer's back the rest of their lives. Every one of them will qualify for a pension. We'd lose money in the long run."

The Navy said its policy was to guarantee a man 2 years of shore duty after he'd been at sea 2 years. As long as he's ashore he might as well work at the Pentagon and save the Government that much.

The Air Force says it's trying to replace enlisted men with enlisted women, but is not altogether successful.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Pilgrim is a worthy designation of a weekly church bulletin, printed by the First Congregational Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which church I am a charter member. It is one of the largest churches of that denomination in the United States. The distinguished pastor is Rev. Emerson G. Hangen, formerly a chaplain of the United States Navy. Each week in the Pilgrim, on the back page thereof, is printed some pertinent or appropriate word which has more than just local significance or origin. The Pilgrim is mailed to me each week.

In view of the instant and immediate need of this Congress doing something tangible and intelligent and generous to the starving people of India, in connection with supplying of grain during this time of present famine in India, I know that you and my colleagues of this Congress will be pleased to read these two articles herewith by Dr. John C. Bennett, in the March 11 and 18, 1951, issues of the Pilgrim; and one by Dr. James K. Mathews, in the February 25, 1951, issue.

Dr. Hangen informs me that Dr. Bennett, the author of two of these articles, is one of the keenest Christian observers of our world, and one of the great theologians of our day, and is located at

Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Dr. Hangen further states that "This is one of the great issues of our day—a problem with which Christian people should be familiar."

Dr. Mathews is associate secretary of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

The articles follow:

[From the Pilgrim of March 11, 1951]

HAS INDIA AN ALTERNATIVE?

(By John C. Bennett)

PART I

What is the alternative to communism? That is the question that has haunted me ever since I left India. Everywhere I went in India that was the question that the most thoughtful people asked. Many of them saw no alternative shaping up in their own country. Any alternative must deal radically with the three great problems of most Asian lands: desperate poverty, oppressive landlordism, and political corruption. Nehru is generally admired but there is great dissillusionment about the Congress Party. I am sure that the Indian people want to have a constitutional democracy and that they abhor totalitarianism, but I found many who fear that because of failure to solve economic and social problems and because of the corruption that gnaws away at the foundations of government, communism will come whether they want it or not.

I went to India to discuss with Christians the Christian response to communism, but I had to admit that Christianity does not have a full economic program and that it is not a movement with political power which would put such a program into effect if it had one. It is the responsibility of the Christian to try to find the best program on which Christians and non-Christians can unite to solve the problems that drive people to communism as a desperate remedy. But a small Christian minority cannot, of itself, create such a program, even though it should do everything in its power to aid in its development.

Are we deceiving ourselves?

America may think that it has a program. But everything that we do presupposes such fabulous prosperity that our institutions and our advice seem irrelevant to the needs of a very poor country. Also, Americans speak so often as though they care only about freedom, but freedom alone will solve no problem. I often wonder why it is that America cannot make clear to the world that we really do care about justice and security as well as about freedom. I had to explain to Indian audiences that our actual institutions are better than our ideology and that we have had something like a social revolution in the past generation ourselves. If we were to emphasize all that we have accomplished in the interests of justice and security in recent years we would seem less irrelevant than we do when we stress only freedom; but, even so, in this country we were able to begin at such a different point from India with its vast population. We should give all the assistance possible to India—technical assistance and immediate economic help—but the task of creating an effective political alternative to communism is a task for India, and one of the greatest difficulty. I have organized my conclusions about the situation in India under the following generalizations:

First, the Communist movement at present is not very strong. In fact, I was surprised to discover much less sympathy for communism than I had expected. The Communist Party had shocked India by its use of violence during the years immediately after the war. It had to change its policy and it has been badly split. There are many ex-Communists who know what communism is and they can provide insight about communism that is very much needed in Asia.

We must remember that in India communism never did gain the leadership of the movement for independence. In fact, during the final years of the struggle when the Congress was opposed to the war the Communists were on the side of Britain as an ally of Russia. So the Communist use of the drive for national independence—so important today in Indochina, is not an important factor in India. This first generalization may seem to be a very hopeful one, but I warn the reader that it is the only one that can give him much comfort.

Communism's open door

Second, the external conditions that invite communism are present in India. I have already mentioned them—poverty, landlordism, and political corruption. They are not equally bad everywhere. I found that conditions are much more serious, for example, in Hyderabad than in Travancore. In the southeast, famine conditions are widespread. I spent some days in Madras and Tambaram, which are protected urban centers surrounded by a famine area where people are slowly starving. I shall tell about one experience that helped me understand the way in which poverty, landlordism, and political corruption constitute a single problem.

On a visit to the state of Hyderabad, I found that in the villages there is a civil war between the police and the Communists. The Communists do not control any villages fully, but they come out at night and make trouble. The villagers are often more afraid of the police than they are of the Communists. The police tend to be more indiscriminate in their violence than the Communists. I found that there are laws on the books which would rid the state of the worst features of its old feudal system (thus removing the chief condition which invites communism) but that these laws cannot be applied because the agents of government are bribed by the landlords.

Never before had I seen the full meaning of corruption. It is not merely a morally offensive accompaniment of government activity. It paralyzes government activity if the vested interests succeed in bribing the agents on which government must depend. It prevents the necessary social changes. Corruption is probably the major source of frustration because it prevents the overcoming of other sources of frustration. In every country I visited (Lebanon, Pakistan, India, Thailand, the Philippines) I heard the same story of corruption. This may be the factor which, more than any other, will drive people against their will to communism. Whatever may be said about communism, it does seem to be able to cut through this appalling corruption, at least for a time. So, while communism is not popular in India, the external factors that make for communism are there.

[From the Pilgrim of March 18, 1951]

HAS INDIA AN ALTERNATIVE?

(By John C. Bennett)

PART II

Third. I found a very general tendency to take an optimistic view of Chinese communism and of any likely development of communism in Asia. Asia has for so long been able to blame the west for its own ills that there is a natural habit of thinking that if only Asia is left to itself it will do better than the west. In discussion I always emphasized the fact that wherever communism has had power for long it has become intolerably oppressive tyranny. I explained the steps by which this tyranny developed in Eastern Europe. But usually there was a response to this effect: That was Europe; it will not be so in Asia. Even though I stressed the danger of losing national independence because of the way power is centralized in Russia, there was not a very vivid awareness of such a threat. Let me repeat that there was not much pro-communism or pro-Russian sentiment. Also, there was a definite rejection of the Indian communism party. But there was this vaguely favorable attitude toward communism in China.

Fatalism widespread

Fourth. What distressed me most was a very widespread fatalism about communism among people who were opposed to it. This fatalism may be related in part to a fatalistic tendency in the religions of India, but it has its chief source in the fact that the problems of the country are so desperate. If there were any alternative to communism on the horizon this fatalism would probably disappear, but I found no one who has great confidence in any such alternative. Communism may not solve any problem in the long run but it does appear to have a solution. It is a movement that has a definite program related to the special grievances of people and a definite political strategy for putting the program into effect. It has the momentum that comes from successes in other lands, especially in China. It is now almost impossible for Americans to understand how people anywhere can think of communism as a solution. For us it constitutes the greatest problem.

I always emphasized, while in India, the illusions in communism and especially the sad way in which what appears to be good turns out in practice to be the entering wedge for overwhelming evil. But this kind of argument is much more convincing to people in the west who have much to lose in terms of economic opportunity and cultural and spiritual freedom. How much do the 90 percent who are illiterate and who eke out a bare existence have to lose? Talk of loss of freedom means very little to people who cannot read and who never travel far from their village or who, as refugees, have no permanent home. I can foresee a situation in which communism will make a whole nation literate in order to indoctrinate it with its false slogans of hatred. But it is hard to make any such spiritual danger vivid in advance.

This was the most difficult question that I had to face: Is it not possible that the oppressive aspects of communism may be only a phase that will pass and that in a generation or so the majority of people in a country that has a feudal background may be better off as a result of a Communist revolution?

Will Communist tyranny pass?

It is easy to answer that question in New York, but I wish that more Americans had to answer it in Calcutta. I could point out both the uncertainty that any such permanent good might come and its cost even if it should come. The uncertainty would be admitted but about the cost I would be pressed with the question: Cost to whom? To the 90 percent or to the 10 percent? When driven back to this point I would often say that, granted the possibility assumed in the question, it is still premature to decide that India cannot find its own way to a constructive social revolution without having to rely upon the leadership of Moscow—an independent Indian social revolution that would prepare the people for opportunities that communism itself would deny them. But that leads us back to the original question of this article: What is the alternative to communism?

The difference between the west and the east is that we in the west have so much to lose that communism itself is our great problem. In the east the strength of communism is the symptom of more urgent problems. It is this different way of feeling about the issue that causes the people of India to be so indifferent to America's effort to save Asia

from communism in Korea. I personally believe that effort, supported as it is by the United Nations, is right. Also I believe that we must make military preparations on an adequate scale to ward off a possible Russian attack upon some other part of the non-Communist world.

Causes and effect

But all this military activity is a way of gaining time to do more constructive things to counteract communism in the world. We are becoming so obsessed by this military approach that we may forget these other tasks. As we think of Asia cannot we give less attention to deliverance from communism and more attention to deliverance from the poverty, landlordism, and corruption which are the causes of Asian communism? This is far removed from the present American mood. It is harder and more baffling than to make ourselves militarily strong. But if we do not place our emphasis here, communism will advance in Asia no matter how great our military strength.

At this moment when feeling runs high in America against all in other countries who do not see the Communist issue exactly as it is seen here, I plead for better understanding of the Indian position. I have tried to explain some of its backgrounds in this article. I agree with the criticism that Indian statesmen have some illusions about Chinese communism, but I doubt if these illusions are worse than the prevalent American illusion that the Communist problem is primarily a military problem. To return to America today is to discover here a strange intransigence, a great narrowing of spirit, a growing inability to understand points of view other than our own. There could be no better corrective than for American Christians to go out of their way to see this greatest struggle of our time as it is seen in India.

[From the Pilgrim of February 25, 1951]

STORED FOOD IS AMERICA'S ARSENAL OF PEACE

(By James K. Mathews)

These are days when we are preoccupied by wars and rumors of wars. But Christians must also be occupied with the ways of peace. During World War II the United States was known as the arsenal of democracy. We have today an arsenal of peace. Will we learn to use it?

America's arsenal of peace is her great store of food. Under the price-support program, the American people, through their Government, possess food stores reported to be worth as much as $4,000,000,000.

Presumably our political and military leaders are aware that this is a great potential weapon for peace. Recent grants of aid in the form of food to Yugoslavia and Italy would seem to indicate as much. Leaders of hungry nations know we possess this weapon. So doubtless does Joseph Stalin. But are we American Christians sufficiently aware of it? Will we insist that our Government utilize this food as a nonmilitary measure of meeting our present situation? Rightly used, it can do much to preserve peace and at the same time combat the Communist menace.

A major opportunity for us to use our arsenal of peace now confronts us. The Government of India has recently approached the United States Government for a grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grains, particularly wheat. This food is desperately needed, but India, a dollar-scarce land, can ill afford to pay. It should be made available as an outright gift, or at concession rates on extended credit. The right response promptly made by Americans may help to preserve peace and to assure the continued friendship of democratic India.

India's need for food is not well understood in this country. She has now undergone nearly 10 years of shortage, although she has been fighting a fierce, and until recently a winning battle on the food front. Prior to 1942 India imported a large part of Burma's rice surplus. The Japanese invasion cut off that source, which, due to continued disturbed conditions within Burma, has not been restored. The situation became so acute that in 1943 between 3,000,000 and 5,000,000 Indians in Bengal died of starvation. American GI's saw thousands die on the streets of Calcutta.

To meet these unpleasant situations, India has taken extreme and heroic measures. She has strict rationing and a careful procurement of food by government. Her rationing system has been called the most efficient in the world. Furthermore, India has embarked on extensive land-reclamation schemes. These involve clearing lands and draining swamps. The Saturday Evening Post, December 17, 1950, tells of the most extensive project in central India, the reclaiming of 3,000,000 acres of fertile land, up to the present rendered useless by a pernicious type of deep-rooted grass.

From natural causes India has been visited with additional leanness in recent months. In parts of the south, drought is now in its third year. In some other areas—Bihar, Crissa, East Punjab, and some of northern India—there have occurred severe floods. In other areas locusts have damaged crops. Assam was visited in August with the most severe earthquake yet recorded. All these natural disasters caused a loss of 6,000,000 tons of food from the country's already slender supplies.

It is this deficiency that must somehow be made up. India proposes to do this by purchasing 4,000,000 tons from Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the United States of America. The remaining 2,000,000 tons is the quantity India is requesting from the United States on the most favorable terms.

It is the opinion of many Christians, including this writer, that the United States should make available this food, preferably as a gift. Here are some of the reasons:

1. Because of India's acute need and valiant endeavor to meet it by her own resources. In her present circumstance of desperation and our situation of abundance, the problem becomes, under God, a moral one for us. Our store of food grains under Government control is variously estimated at from 7,000,000 to 11,000,000 tons. It is said that it is costing us over $70,000,000 yearly simply to store this grain. Remember, India is not asking for aid as a gift; she does not wish to assume the beggar's role. We should see the need and be inspired to give.

2. Because India is a bulwark of democracy. Her constitution and tradition are democratic; her leaders are democratic.

3. Because such an act may do more to combat communism than many armed divisions. Our use now of our "Arsenal of Peace" may win the abiding friendship of India's people.

To make grain available to India will require Congressional action. Christians can register their sentiment on this question in Washington. Thousands in many parts of the country have already done so. Church people can write President Truman, Senators, and Congressmen. Christian bodies, such as the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the Methodist Board of Missions, the American Board, the Golden Rule Foundation, and other such groups have gone on record by resolutions, favoring such action. But individuals must act, and promptly. It is a matter of life or death for many people in India. May it not be a matter of life or death for us?

The Confusion of UMT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, April 9, 1951:

THE CONFUSION OF UMT

The House has gone to work on Mr. Truman's program to convert America into a military state and has started auspiciously by compelling the Administration to abandon its demand for immediate passage of a universal military training bill. In theory, the measure has been shelved for study during the coming 6 months. More probably, it has been killed.

At best, UMT would have been a confusing and contradictory project while the country was engaged in peacetime conscription and the creation of large standing forces. There is no connection between these two designs for the procurement of military man power, yet the Administration tried to serve them up in a single package. Universal training would have competed with conscription, so that, if there is a requirement to prepare men for action quickly, UMT would have hindered the attainment of that end.

At worst, UMT would have saddled on the country a permanent state of militarization, in which the high command would have been vested with a claim over every young man as he came to military age. This system has long been in effect in Europe. It accounts for much of the great European emigration to the United States. Its military effectiveness may be disputed on the ground that the nations which practiced it were the losers in every great war.

The sentiment of the House on this issue was so manifest that the Truman leadership abandoned the project without a fight. The victory was the more striking in that the Senate, on March 9, had refused, by a vote of 68 to 20, to strike UMT from the military manpower legislation approved on that day. The Senators passed both UMT and a 24-month draft, beginning at the age of 18.

THE PUBLIC KILLED IT

It is clear that the House, on this issue, is close to the sentiments of the people—much closer than the Senators, who either have not been reading their mail or who, having read it, were too timorous to buck the administration. The recent Easter recess gave House Members an opportunity to get home and find out what their constituents were thinking. They returned to Washington with a knowledge of the people's convictions, and the shelving of UMT resulted directly.

With this proof of its understanding and temper, the House may now be expected to deal firmly with Truman's thesis that he possesses inherent powers to dispatch troops to the proposed European army under General Eisenhower without let or hindrance by Congress. The Senate met this challenge by passing an advisory resolution that he be permitted to send up to four divisions, after which he would be expected to obtain congressional approval for further levies. The Senators also proposed that the House act with them in the form of a concurrent resolution.

What the people expect of the House, and what we confidently believe the House will

do, is to speak with none of the Senate's equivocation on this subject. Congressmen have urged that the House address itself to the problem through a joint resolution, having the force of law, which would put it up to the Senate if the two Houses were to agree. It has been further proposed in the House that Mr. Truman be required to obtain the permission of Congress before he sends any troops at all, and that this provision be written into the pending conscription bill.

We believe that this is the way to deal with the matter. Truman and his military cronies have tried to steal the ball and run with it, and they should be brought down by a hard tackle. The President is even now proposing to start two divisions to Europe without awaiting House action. He should not be allowed to get away with it. He is subject to the authority of Congress—which means the whole Congress, not merely the Senate half of it. The House can warn him that if he persists in endeavoring to usurp powers not fully allotted him, it can, through its control of appropriations, stop him in his tracks.

THE OLD SCARE TECHNIQUE

The administration has sought to bring pressure upon House Members by voicing veiled hints of impending calamities. Speaker RAYBURN descended from the rostrum to hint that Russian troops were massed beyond the Manchurian border in China, ready to intervene in Korea or strike elsewhere. The Speaker referred to "a terrible danger and maybe the beginning of world war III." Truman confined himself to the delphic utterance that RAYBURN is a "truthful man."

Congressmen have freely asserted that this looks like the same old scare technique employed by the administration countless times to jam pet legislation through a reluctant Congress. How can Congress or the people know the truth? The administration has lied to them so many times that they are no longer trusted. If RAYBURN and Truman hoped to profit by crying, "Wolf!" the strategy misfired. The refusal of the House to submit on UMT showed a skepticism which should be carried over to the related issues of conscription and troops for Europe.

One Hundred and Thirtieth Anniversary of Greece's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are appended hereto news reports from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune of today on the parade marking the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Greece.

This is an outstanding event for it commemorates a new achievement of Greek independence, the triumph at long last over the Communist invaders and subversives who were responsible for the devastating civil war just brought to a close during this one hundred and thirtieth year of Greece's independence. In World War II Greece fought magnificently against the legions of Mussolini and Hitler and made a glorious record among all the free peoples. In their successful struggle against the Communist horde in the recent civil war Greece showed her enduring belief in freedom by refusing to be dismayed by disconcerting Communist tactics and by the aid to the Communists of powerful neighboring states, and went on to ultimate triumph. The American people recognize in Greece a powerful ally and a fighting friend in the vitally strategic Mediterranean area situated at the crossroads between Europe and the Near and Middle East.

The friendship and cooperation between the people of the United States and the people of Greece has been earned in common trial and suffering. It will be enduring through the years. The fine Americans who marched in the parade and the tens of thousands of other Americans of Greek extraction will keep alive in our country a knowledge of Greek history, culture, and tradition which will additionally fortify this friendship.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1951]

FIFTH AVENUE PARADE HAILS FREE GREECE—125,000 WATCH 15,000 MARCH IN PAGEANT DEPICTING GLORY OF PAST, HONOR OF TODAY

Hellenic-American societies celebrated the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Greek independence yesterday with a Fifth Avenue parade that portrayed the colorful story of Greece's history.

Mayor Impelliteri was honorary grand marshal, leading the marchers up the avenue from Sixty-second Street to the reviewing stand at Sixty-eighth Street, where he was joined by Greek dignitaries, other city officials, and representatives of the United Nations.

There were 15,000 persons in the parade, and, according to the police, 125,000 spectators lined Fifth Avenue sidewalks all the way to Seventy-fourth Street, where the marchers turned east to the Greek Cathedral to receive the blessing of Archbishop Michael, of North and South America.

A THREEFOLD OBJECTIVE

The parade had a threefold purpose. It was an expression of gratitude to the people of the United States for their aid to Greece; it protested the abduction of 28,000 Greek children who are being detained behind the iron curtain, and it called for the reunion of the island of Cyprus with Greece.

One of the placards depicted Cyprus held by British chains and asserted that "Cyprus prefers her poor mother to her rich stepmother."

As the parade drew to a close Mayor Impelliteri, in a brief address, praised the pageant, declaring that the placards represent what a free people want for the democratic people of Greece.

In the parade were golden chariots of ancient days, likenesses of Alexander the Great and Homer, elaborate floats with Grecian goddesses and scores of other visual reminders of the glory that was Greece.

Leading the marchers was 9-year-old Anastasia Vagionis, wearing a Royal Guard evzone with great poise, for this was her fifth casting in the role. She is the daughter of Nicholas Vagionis, general chairman of the event. Behind her marched mounted policemen. Thirty-one bands provided music.

COSTUMES OF MANY VOGUES

Costumes worn by the members of the various Hellenic societies represented virtually every vogue from every province since the days of ancient Greece. There were old warriors with spears, and a relatively modern military man on a gray horse representing Gen. Theodore Kolocotronis, who was credited with Greece's victory over Turkey in 1921. And there was a group of Greek sailors who came from Boston where they are preparing to take two destroyers, gifts of the United States, to Greece on April 13.

The real show stopper was 20-month-old Katherine Siegrist, of 515 West Eighty-fourth Street. She held up the parade in front of the reviewing stand when she burst into tears as photographers swarmed around her. Mayor Impelliteri called for her and her tears ceased, but there was a new outburst when the photographers again approached her. Finally, after posing with the mayor, she rejoined the parade.

Earlier, Mr. Vagionis had sent a telegram to President Truman expressing gratitude for American aid to Greece and remarking that the march would signify "our admiration for the United Nations forces in Korea who are now fighting communism and for the Greek battalions, which in recent days were so highly lauded by General MacArthur and you, Mr. President, for their heroic gallantry."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 9, 1951]

PARADE MARKS ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH YEAR OF GREEK LIBERTY—15,000 MARCH UP FIFTH AVENUE—AMERICAN INDIANS AND THREE BAGPIPE BANDS IN LINE

New Yorkers of Greek ancestry marched in a Fifth Avenue parade yesterday afternoon to commemorate the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Greece's independence. The 15,000 paraders included many women dressed in costumes native to various Greek provinces and bearing jugs and fruit, but also incongruously, three bagpipe bands and a contingent of American Indians.

The spectators, who were estimated by police at 125,000, crowded along the line of march from Sixty-second to Seventy-fourth Streets. They appeared not to notice the violations of the parade theme, and clapped heartily for the Indians and bagpipers, as well as for stately floats decorated with cheerful bunting, and municipal, school, and military bands.

MAYOR MARCHES SIX BLOCKS

Anastasia Vagionis, 9, daughter of Nicholas Vagionis, president of the Federation of Hellenic American Societies, the sponsoring organization, led the parade, which started from Sixty-second Street at 2:30 p. m. Mayor Vincent R. Impelliteri marched six blocks and climbed aboard the reviewing stand at Sixty-eighth Street, where he was joined by Athanasios Politis, Greek Ambassador to the United States; Alexis Kyrou, permanent Greek delegate to the United Nations, and Anthony Poumpouris, Greek Consul General in New York.

One of the parade high lights was a rider on a snow-white horse symbolizing Gen. Theodore Kolocotronis, who led the Greek Army to victory over the Turks in 1821. The actual date of Greek Independence Day is March 25, but since the Greek parade would have coincided with the Easter parade this year, it was postponed to yesterday.

Several floats in the parade were devoted to themes demanding that Great Britain relinquish jurisdiction over Cyprus and return the island to Greek control. Banners and placards stated that 97 percent of Cypriote residents had favored Greek annexation in a recent plebiscite.

SECOND REVIEW AT GREEK CATHEDRAL

The paraders turned right at Seventy-fourth Street and continued to a second reviewing stand in front of the Greek Cathedral of the Holy Trinity, 319 East Seventy-fourth Street. A 23-man contingent of the

Greek Navy formed the honor guard across the street, facing the reviewing officials.

These officials included Archbishop Michael, of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and the Rev. Basil F. Fithimiou, dean of the cathedral.

The parade was followed by a doxology in thanksgiving for the liberation of Greece. Archbishop Michael led the service in Greek within the cathedral.

Packaged Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised and chagrined to receive the following letter from the fine patriotic women of Caldwell, Idaho, and at a loss to understand their reasons for writing such a letter until I read the editorial titled "Packaged Thinking" in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, April 8, 1951, which is hereto appended.

Despite the fact that the United Nations has proven to be an instigator rather than a preventer of wars, has supplied a sounding board for our enemies to besmear and slander us, and has become a roosting place for spies, traitors, and fugitives from the New Deal, many honest sincere people still give support to this iniquity because they have been propagandized into believing that the United Nations is the world's last hope for peace.

I trust that after reading this editorial, the good women of Caldwell, Idaho, will recognize the United Nations for what it is—an ineffective debating society to lull us into a false security while our enemies without and traitors within replace our American system of Government with a militaristic, fascistic, totalitarian power state.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CALDWELL,
Caldwell, Idaho, March 29, 1951.

Hon. JOHN WOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOOD: The League of Women Voters of the United States has from the founding of the United Nations wholeheartedly supported it. We of the Caldwell League, having studied the UN and watched current events affecting the UN during our 3 years of organization, join in that support.

We believe that even if there were no atomic bomb the steady march of scientific progress makes isolation impossible. We believe that membership in a world organization dedicated to the elimination of the causes of war and implemented to settle disputes offers the only possible hope for achieving ultimate peace. By supporting the UN and such regional arrangements as the Atlantic Pact, provided for under the UN Charter, we Americans can safeguard our own interests.

There are naturally military risks involved, but no course open to our country is without those risks. As wives and mothers we are all too aware of the possible suffering and heartaches that lie ahead for all of us, but we know that by acting wisely now our leaders may not only reduce future suffering, but eliminate future crises. The present Korean war has brought suffering to many Americans, but its shadow is small compared to that of a total war.

We urge you to work toward the building of a stronger United Nations. We hope you will vote for legislation that will not only strengthen the UN and develop its several agencies, but that you will support sufficient appropriations to enable us to meet our commitments under the UN and the Atlantic Pact and thus make them more than moral instruments for peace.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. ELDEN DARLING,
President.
Mrs. JOHN V. WALKER,
Action Chairman.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 8, 1951]

PACKAGED THINKING

There has just started up in this city of 1,001 nights and a night of intrigue and even more by day, still yet another operation designed to press life, light, and independent intellect out of the American citizen.

This latest one calls itself "The Women's Clearing House for National Security." Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, chairman. Member organizations are:

American Association of University Women, American Legion Auxiliary, American Women's Voluntary Services, Association of Women of the American Farm Bureau, Soroptimist, General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Association of Negro Professional and Business Women, Association of Women Lawyers, Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Pilot International, Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary, Zonta. It is instantly obvious that here are collected under a single dispensation, some of the finest and most useful women's organizations in the United States, superb in accomplishment and purpose.

But if it is one thing for the Women Lawyers to have their own special group, the Soroptimists to have their affairs, the American Legion Auxiliary to have theirs; it is quite another thing entirely for all of them to be tied together as above indicated.

The reason why, for the benefit of those ladies who may sense something wrong, but have not had time to dig into the details, is that such set-ups produce intellectual robots instead of citizens.

HOW IT IS DONE

Any woman who wants to see how that is done should write to the National Industrial conference board, 247 Park Avenue, New York City, and ask for a copy of an article entitled "Packaged Thinking for Women," by Lucille Crain and Anne Hamilton.

You will have to send along 25 cents, for this survey is no free throwaway, undertaking in itself to produce packaged thinking in disguise by opposing somebody else's packaged thinking.

All it does is to analyze the way 10,000,000 American women enveloped in some 21 organizations, were being subjected to thought control by a handful of specialists here in Washington, as of 1948 when the article was written.

Says the opening paragraph:

"The political structure of American women has the form of a pyramid. Its base is 10,000,000 federated women. They are represented by 21 separate organizations. At the apex is the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, seated in Washington."

MAKING THE BULLETS

The joint committee, in 1948, was making the bullets, over at 1649 K Street NW., and the ladies' clubs all around the country were shooting them.

Most of the deadly consequences, in affairs both foreign and domestic, were achieved without the rank and file ever knowing what they had done.

Now, 3 years later, a feminine observer says:

"This Women's Clearing House for National Security, my suspicious mind tells me, is a sort of marriage of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, which packaged thinking first presented in its true light, and the program information exchange, now defunct, also analyzed in packaged thinking.

"My suspicion is that this is one more way by which important women's organizations are going to be used to reflect administration propaganda."

PACKAGED THINKING TECHNIQUE

Of course that is probably an obvious purpose. More than that, the packaged thinking technique can be further demonstrated with evidence and material at hand here at the Times-Herald in the form of exhibits furnished to this newspaper by members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

For instance, the blue-covered job labeled: "How shall we strengthen the United Nations? Program outline and discussion hit on various proposals looking toward world government now before Congress and the American people."

Inside the covers there is package thinking, for sure, put together with all the slick silky style of the propagandist at his most deadly.

COUPLE OF SAMPLES

BENTON and Bowles, before BILL became one of the windiest of Senators and Chester a has-been ex-Governor of Connecticut, were never more razzle-dazzle.

Members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs should just dig out one of those kits and read it all through again now. A second look will open any innocent's eyes.

Compare, for instance, with another such kit in gray and brown, entitled: "Briefing Session on Foreign Policy, January 28 to February 2, 1951, Washington, D. C., and New York City."

Read, compare, and ask yourself how your own ideas of the world and what's in it got that way.

Women's organizations, like men's, can do good when the members are in control of the programs, not when the programs are in control of the members.

Incidentally, packaged thinking is no special sin of women. If anything, men are worse. For as indicated by the devices and evidence above cited, at least it requires the most professional order of technique to get the ladies lined up.

But as for the men, they have been lassoed by the millions and their hides nailed on the barn doors of the Nation with no trouble at all.

Indeed, it has not even been the work of strangers. The boys have done it to themselves.

California-Arizona Water-Rights Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Pasadena Star-News of March 19, 1951]

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR CHAPMAN AGAIN LINES UP WITH ARIZONA

The California-Arizona water-rights controversy, growing from the Arizona Central

Valley project bill, has, as recently remarked in this place, begun boiling in Washington, and now Interior Secretary Chapman has added fuel to the fire by renewing his endorsement of the measure.

For 3 years now Congress has been considering this fantastic reclamation project, whose primary purpose would be to rescue approximately 150,000 acres of Arizona desert land which were put under cultivation during the war-boom days of the early 1940's and to supply water for an additional 100,000 acres.

To accomplish this, authors of the plan propose to build a mighty dam on the Colorado River above Hoover Dam; to build, below Parker Dam, four pump lifts which would raise 1,200,000 acre-feet of irrigation water to a height of almost 1,000 feet; and to construct a network of aqueducts and canals for transporting this water over 315 miles across Arizona where it finally would be used to grow ordinary field crops.

Cost of this amazing project was estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation at $738,000,000 in 1948. Considering increased prices of labor and material since then, it is safe to assume original costs alone would be near $1,000,000,000. This is five times the cost of the Hoover Dam, many times the cost of the Panama Canal, much more than the cost of developing the TVA, and far more than the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Area to be benefited is all within the State of Arizona, and the project would directly benefit only 25,000 farmers. Interior Secretary Chapman reports there are only about 6,000 farms within the project area and that of these, 420 farms contain 55 percent of the land to be irrigated. In other words, the project would give benefits of more than $550,000 to each of these 420 large landowners, and tens of thousands to each of the other 5,600 farm owners.

If Arizona wishes to defray the entire expense of this project, doubtless it would be all right, providing its installation did not take water away from California, where a greater number of people reside. But when the entire billion-dollar cost of this project is to be borne by the taxpayers of the Nation for the benefit of a handful of land speculators in Arizona, the matter is of serious concern.

The Bureau of Reclamation insists Arizona farmers who are to receive the water can afford to pay only $4.50 per acre-foot for it. But, on the basis of the 50-year repayment period proposed, the cost of delivering the water would amount to $18 per acre-foot annually, or four times the charge estimated by the Bureau. Here again the burden of costs would fall upon the taxpayers in the other 47 States.

Former Senator Downey of California testified last year: "Central Arizona land is worth at most $300 an acre, but at $300 an acre the whole irrigated area of central Arizona, less than 600,000 acres, could be bought for $180,000,000, and the 150,000 acres at stake could be bought for $45,000,000."

The United States agricultural census for 1945 lists the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the State of Arizona at $287,000,000. The original expenditures for the proposed central Arizona project would be almost three times that figure.

No land should be reclaimed and irrigated by the Federal Government at excessive cost to produce crops which are already surplus or which can be produced more cheaply elsewhere; water should be allotted from the Colorado on the basis of the most water for the greatest number of people; California and Arizona should obtain just and proportionate shares. Logic and justice argue strongly against a billion-dollar central water project.

In the Interest of National Unity, General MacArthur Should Report in Person to the Congress of the United States on Conditions in Asia

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a House resolution that conveys to the President of the United States that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that he, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, should direct General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur to return to the United States and to report on the progress, problems, and probabilities of the Korean situation at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives in order that the duly elected representatives of the people may be fully informed thereon.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are split today as to our policy in global defense against Communist aggression. This condition results from the fact that we have full information as to what the conditions are in Europe as presented to Congress and the American people by General Eisenhower.

This is not true as far as Asia is concerned because we have been denied a first-hand report from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who knows more about the Orient, the oriental mind, and our economic and military problems in Asia than any other living American.

To successfully defend ourselves against world communism, we must have a united people supporting a world policy which will not put all our military eggs in the European basket at the expense of our reputation and prestige in the Far East.

You will recall that during World War II, from the standpoint of manpower and war matériel, including $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease to Russia, we predominantly favored the European theater, leaving General MacArthur to achieve his miraculous victory on a shoestring. To top it off, Russia was permitted through a 9-day participation in the Pacific war to claim equal credit in this victory.

Today we have a similar situation as prevailed during World War II, with the policy of our Government favoring Europe and very little consideration being given to the Far East which without doubt holds the solution to a lasting world peace.

Let us examine the situation. It is no secret that the Chinese Reds, with the assistance of Russia, are assembling in Manchuria units of the old Japanese Kwantung Army which surrendered to the Russians, but were never repatriated. It is also known that with this added strength the Russians are not only regrouping the Chinese Red Army, but they are training, equipping, and supplying them for future campaigns.

In addition, it has been disclosed that in the deployment of this Communist-trained hard core of the Kwantung army at least a part has been quietly infiltrated to the south half of Sakhalin Island which is 40 miles north of Japan.

To strengthen the communistic Chinese Army the presence of Russian jet planes in the Canton area, manned by Chinese pilots, reveals that for the past 8 months Russian instructors have trained hundreds of the Chinese in the handling of jet planes. While this has been going on, the Chinese Reds in turn have made available to the Russians the port of Tsingtao on the China coast, and three snorkel-type Russian submarines have been sent there to be used in the training of Chinese submarine crews.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an alarmist, nor am I carrying anybody's banner. As a Member of Congress, I feel it my duty and responsibility to recognize the situation in the Far East. I feel that before we can legislate intelligently on our global defense, we must have that half of the picture which has been held from us. I repeat that only General MacArthur can give us that picture honestly and completely.

World war III, if it comes, will take every ounce of unified American effort. Therefore, every difference of opinion and division of thought among our people must be reconciled.

The answer to the problem of achieving national unity is to give equal emphasis to the problems of Asia that have been given to the problems of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this is possible only when you and I and every Member of this Congress have heard from the lips of General MacArthur the unvarnished, uncensored, and unflavored report on conditions in the Orient.

The United States Air Force Fighter and Bomber Groups Are Hard-Bitten Veteran Outfits Which Will Go to Any Target on Earth With Atom Bombs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune of March 22 carried an article by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson, noted feature writer and aviation editor, with respect to the status of our fighting men of the Air Force now stationed in England. Among other interesting observations made by Mr. Wilson was one which had to do with the benefits which have accrued through basing our Air Force training on the British Isles.

In its deterrent effect—

Gill Robb Wilson wrote—

the command of General Johnson is acknowledged throughout Europe to have played a vital part in influencing the Soviet.

In commenting further with respect to this training, Mr. Wilson went on to say that—

Seven hundred and seventy crews from the United States have passed through the hands of the Third Air Division since its inception, and 1,600 crossings of the Atlantic Ocean racked up without accident.

Mr. Speaker, this article is so timely and of such informative value with respect to the splendid work which our Air Force is doing abroad that I am asking unanimous consent of my colleagues in the House to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD this article by Gill Robb Wilson, now aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Wilson's article reads as follows:

THE AIR WORLD—UNITED STATES AIRMEN IN BRITAIN—A DETERRENT TO RUSSIA

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

SCULTHORPE, England.—United States air power in the United Kingdom is organized under the title of the Third Air Division. Based on British airdromes in two general areas, East Anglia and the Midlands, its mission has been twofold.

In one case the Third Air Division is in position to supplement British retaliation against sudden aggression. In the next case its mission is to train United States strategic air groups in rotation from America. Both missions involve close coordination with the Royal Air Force and the warning system of England's defense.

In composition the American outfit involves 20,000 airmen and officers who staff a general headquarters and maintain the bases and supply depots necessary to serve the rotating bomber and fighter groups from home.

Commanding the Third Air Division from headquarters near Northhold Air Base outside London is Maj. Gen. Leon Johnson, former commander of the Fifteenth Air Force and wearer of the Medal of Honor for gallantry in leading the Ploesti raids against Romanian oil. Deputy to General Johnson is Maj. Gen. J. P. McConnell, and heading the big maintenance depot at Burtonwood and the supplemental one at Sealand is Brig. Gen. Robert Oliver.

UNDER WASHINGTON

When originally organized by General Johnson in July 1948, the Third Air Division came under control of United States Air Forces in Europe, but subsequently was placed directly under the Chief of Staff of the Air Forces at Washington. In the overall plan of reorganization for European defense, the division is once again under USAFE, commanded by Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad.

In its deterrent effect, the command of General Johnson is acknowledged throughout Europe to have played a vital part in influencing the Soviet. The Third Air Division, usually supporting medium-bomber groups (B-29's), still has big teeth. Its bomber and fighter groups are hard-bitten veteran outfits which will go to any target on earth with atom bombs in necessity. Their training over the oceans and free lands of Europe is not exactly of the primary type. Mid-air refueling is, of course, routine procedure for both bombers and fighters.

For actual practice bombing, two ranges are available, one at Helgoland and the other off the Wash on the east coast of England. Radar bomb scoring can be practiced on any target in free Europe and the same is true of photographic simulated targeting. Air-to-air gunnery practice and escort tactics are furnished by both the Third Air Division's own fighters and those of the RAF.

During the usual 3-month period for which any one bomber or fighter group is trained under the Third Air Division, its individual crews will fly a dozen missions of an average 10-hour duration. Some of the missions may be 20 hours and others but 5 or less, but the average is about 10.

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED OCEAN CROSSINGS

Seven hundred and seventy crews from the United States have passed through the hands of the Third Air Division since its inception, and 1,600 crossings of the Atlantic have been racked up without accident. Since GCA (radar) landings are as routine in European weather as they are abnormal in Texas, the safety factor compiled by the Third Air Division's training is remarkable.

Until recently the antiaircraft defense of United States air bases in England was provided by the British Army, but now the Thirty-second AAA Brigade of the United States Army has taken over ack-ack responsibilities to secure training with the division. Gen. Thomas Handy, commanding United States Army forces in Europe, has just completed his first inspection of the Thirty-second Brigade—a vivid memory to the writer who followed the doughty general for 2 days in the deluge and mud of an English March. Col. Metticus May, commanding the Thirty-second Brigade, reports that his GI's and the Third Air Division's airmen already have been welded together in a working unit.

Presently dispersed around the east Anglican group of air bases—Mildenhall, Sculthorpe, Lakenheath, Wyton, and Bassingbourne—are the bombers of the Five Hundred and Ninth Wing of the Eighth Strategic Air Force, under Col. John Ryan. In support is the Thirty-first Fighter Wing equipped with Republic F-84E's, under Col. E. H. Dunham, and an element of the Thirty-eighth Strategic Reconnaissance Wing.

Opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Comes From Every Nook and Corner of the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said without fear of contradiction that only 15 percent of our population will benefit from the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, but every American taxpayer will be called upon to foot his share of the bill for such an economic monstrosity.

From every nook and corner of this Nation the newspapers of the country are protesting the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the editors of these papers are speaking up for the 85 percent of us who will receive no benefits but who will have to chip in and pay the bill.

Here are just a few of the editorials from newspapers in various States who speak out against the St. Lawrence seaway project.

[From the Independence (Mo.) News of February 2, 1951]

HAPPENINGS THAT AFFECT THE FUTURE OF EVERY AMERICAN INDIVIDUAL

The country was prepared for a shock from Mr. Truman's budget message. It got a sharper one than many had bargained for.

The most striking part of the message lay in the way domestic projects were lumped with the defense effort. As a Wall Street Journal news account described it, "President Truman is putting the Fair Deal into uniform. All the old familiar ambitions; from the Brannan farm-subsidy plan and the St. Lawrence seaway project to establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Committee and Federal health insurance, were injected into the gigantic defense budget for 1951-52."

[From the Dover (Del.) State News of February 1, 1951]

TAXES PLUS ECONOMY

The country was prepared for a shock from Mr. Truman's budget message. It got a sharper one than many had bargained for.

The most striking part of the message lay in the way domestic projects were lumped with the defense effort. As a Wall Street Journal news account described it, "President Truman is putting the Fair Deal into uniform. All the old familiar ambitions, from the Brannan farm-subsidy plan and the St. Lawrence seaway project to establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Committee and Federal health insurance, were injected into the gigantic defense budget for 1951-52."

[From the Gloucester (Mass.) Times of March 3, 1951]

SEAWAY SILLINESS

Whenever we want to write an easy editorial, we find the chance usually before us in Washington's foolish dragging out again of the St. Lawrence seaway project. The project is to the front again, and it doesn't take any more thinking than it ever has on the part of either writer or reader to condemn it as a typical political way of wasting our money.

President Truman just now tries to give some semblance of real need to the thought of deepening the St. Lawrence River and its connection with our Great Lakes so that deep-draft boats can navigate it by suggesting it will help our national defense; in particular, would allow iron ore to be carried easily from Quebec and Labrador to land-shipping points on the lakes adjacent to steel centers. All that doesn't take away the foolishness of it all. It will be years before we've really got to have those ores.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Journal of January 18, 1951]

MR. TRUMAN, YOUR "DEAL" IS SHOWING

Every man, woman, and child knows that a new dress or a new suit can lift the spirit and bring a measure of new hope even to the downcast.

President Truman knows this. Accordingly, he has dressed his Fair Deal program in a new suit—a military uniform—and has sent it on a fresh parade before Congress. The uniform is fine, Mr. Truman—only trouble is, your Deal is showing.

In your call for a $71,500,000,000 budget for the next fiscal year and stupendous new taxes, Mr. President, your cloak of military necessity has been stretched so thin that the old Fair Deal program is showing all around.

There's the old Brannan farm-subsidy plan, repudiated by the people throughout the great Midwest farm belt; there's the St. Lawrence seaway project which has previously been rejected; there's the old project to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission; there's the same old socialistic Federal medicine program; and, among other things, another proposal to get the Federal Government deeper into the electric-power business, and national meddling with the public school system supported by the States.

[From the Kingman (Kans.) Journal of March 2, 1951]

NO END TO USELESS SPENDING

The current world crisis, which has come home with a bang to the United States, should have at least one beneficial effect and that is to discourage certain costly and highly dubious political schemes. But will it? Present indications are it will not. Instead, there are those in high places who are using this emergency to foist their schemes upon the public under the deceptive guise of national defense.

One such scheme—out of many others—is the St. Lawrence waterway, on which the Government would spend hundreds of millions of dollars for inland water transport facilities in Canada. The same thing was proposed in 1941 when we were told that it was a must and we would have to have it to win World War II. Now we are being told again it is a must and we will have to have it to win the next war.

It is claimed that the St. Lawrence project would result in cheaper transportation and power. This is true only if a large part of the cost were charged off to other purposes—only, in other words, if Government subsidized the business with the taxpayers' money similar to the bookkeeping system now used on the TVA.

[From the New Orleans (La.) States of January 30, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Inclusion of the St. Lawrence seaway project as one item in President Truman's budget has stirred proponents here and there to dust off their pleas for the gigantic international boondoggle.

One such editorial the other day in a northern paper followed the theme of its caption, "St. Lawrence seaway—A defense must."

Maybe they're dreaming about what the seaway might do, if it worked, in world war IV. It's a cinch it would have no defense value earlier than that. Quite likely it would weaken America's defenses by pushing the Nation's financial load to the breaking point.

[From the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Oklahoman of February 8, 1951)

CHEAPENING PATRIOTISM

With a measure of presumption and considerable brass the supporters of the long-debated St. Lawrence waterways project are now out with a declaration that their pet project should be completed forthwith as a measure of national defense. Of course they are trying to make capital of a grave national emergency. They believe that Congressmen who never have looked with any degree of favor upon the St. Lawrence project will support it now if they can only be convinced that the country never will be safe again unless their project is completed.

With the St. Lawrence running exactly as it is running today the United States has won several full grown wars. And we are persuaded that the United States will remain capable of defending itself, even if the St. Lawrence Basin is never improved.

[From the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times of February 19, 1951]

It is difficult to comprehend how the proposed St. Lawrence waterway would be an aid to our defense efforts, but President Truman again recommended it to Congress. We won two world wars without it and engineers have estimated that its completion would require 7 years and it would be icebound for 5 months out of the year. The old argument was that the seaway would aid our farmers in shipping wheat to Liverpool which controlled the world market. Well, Liverpool controls nothing anymore and the amount of wheat which farmers can now ship abroad and the price is fixed by international agreement.

[From the Newburgh (N. Y.) News of February 24, 1951]

ARGUING FOR ST. LAWRENCE SCHEME

We are not spending money fast enough, so we must go into the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, Secretary of Defense Marshall tells us. This is the gist of what he says, even though there is a camouflage of national defense. The fallacies of arguments for this scheme have been exposed for more than a generation, but its backers seemingly never give up hope.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch of February 20, 1951]

ATLANTIC PORTS IN DANGER

Norfolk port interests wisely are taking steps to organize opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project which was pressed first by President Roosevelt and now is being pressed strongly by President Truman. The opposition is based upon the fact that the development of the proposed waterway for ocean traffic into the Great Lakes would create grave danger for the Atlantic and Gulf ports. The need for action on the part of the opposition arises urgently.

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain of January 17, 1951]

DOES PRESIDENT TRUMAN MEAN WHAT HE SAYS?

In his report on the state of the Union and again in his budget message President Truman lays great stress on the necessity of refusing appropriations on nonessential projects at this particular time, when our program of national defense and aid to our friends abroad is so important.

But in his budget message the President also demands appropriations for projects which are not a part of our defense program in any sense of the word.

For instance, Mr. Truman wants an appropriation to build the St. Lawrence tidewater canal which would cost many millions of dollars with Uncle Sam to be asked to put up about 60 percent of the cost.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of February 4, 1951]

MR. TRUMAN AND TAXES

Whatever it takes in the way of taxes to pay for mobilization as we go should be levied. And whatever it takes in the way of cutting back domestic civilian expenditures of the Government to equalize the burden on the taxpayer should be done.

President Truman's request for $10,000,000,000 in new taxes, therefore, should be granted, because it will probably take that much more than we are already paying to meet the cost of mobilization.

* * * * *

Or, if Congress grants President Truman's request and authorizes the St. Lawrence seaway, the Government will be putting vast quantities of materials, labor, and money into postponable civilian production when they ought to be going into war production.

The Government, then, will be bidding against its own war production to carry out its postponable civilian production.

And that means more burdensome taxes for all of us.

Let us, then, pay that $10,000,000,000 in extra taxes without complaining, but let us as individual taxpayers demand that Congress hold back the other six or seven billion dollars that Mr. Truman will ask until he demonstrates that his administration is willing to make the same kind of sacrifice that he demands of us.

The Crime Probe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Indianapolis Star of March 27, 1951. It pertains to the demand on the part of the people in my district to have the estimable work of the Kefauver committee continued:

KOKOMO PETITION URGES UNITED STATES CRIME PROBE CONTINUE

KOKOMO, IND.—A factory foreman's letter urging longer life for the Kefauver committee snowballed within a few hours into a petition asking Indiana Congressmen to help keep the committee's probe going.

Representative JOHN V. BEAMER announced at Washington yesterday he had received a petition signed by 60 Kokomo residents.

It asked that "you do all that is possible to keep in effect the Kefauver crime-investigating committee."

It was sent by Fred E. Parker, a Chrysler Corp. foreman, who said it was "the first time I'd ever written anybody about anything."

Before mailing it he showed it to a few friends, who immediately wanted to sign it and have their friends sign it, too. Parker said he did not solicit any signatures.

Copies of the letter also were sent to Indiana's two Senators, WILLIAM E. JENNER and HOMER E. CAPEHART.

BEAMER said it was the first formal Hoosier expression of approval of the Kefauver investigation.

To the Point of Absurdity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reporter-Dispatch, White Plains, N. Y., for February 21, 1951:

TO THE POINT OF ABSURDITY

Although many of us abhor wire tapping and all that it connotes, the fact is being brought home more and more clearly that—under court authorization—it contains more benefits to society than fundamental harm.

We are learning that, if wire tapping can embarrass law violators without harming honest citizens, it should be used.

We are beginning to recognize that, if a wire tap can confound a traitor to our country, we should not hesitate to give preference to our country and what it stands for rather than to a person who would betray our Nation and its freedoms.

Congress right now finds itself confronted with that very choice. It is unpleasant, certainly, to think of legalizing wire tapping. Nobody would argue wire tapping is a nice thing to do. Yet nobody would hesitate to confess that catching and prosecuting criminals is not a nice business, either.

Wire tapping that has been authorized by the county court has been effective as a tool of law enforcement. It has ripped out telephone service from hundreds of places discovered to be violating the law. It has stopped what was described as an interstate gambling information service in Yonkers.

In the national picture, the Judith Coplon spy case dramatized the embarrassment that came to the prosecution because it could not use wire-tapping evidence. A higher court held the evidence thus obtained to be illegal. The court ordered a new trial, while declaring that the girl's guilt was plain.

The court suggested to Congress that legalization of limited official wire tapping would obviate such a paradox as it found itself in.

One of the primary rules for any government—particularly for our Federal Government—is not to permit itself to become a darned fool. There is no need to stymie the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation so that the criminal gentry always have an upper hand. There is no reason for giving traitorously inclined persons an advantage over and beyond that which accrues to decent citizens.

The FBI has been entrusted to protect national security. It deserves to have the tools and the laws to enable it to do a good job.

The bill now in Congress, H. R. 479, by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York State, should become law without too much delay. It incorporates safeguards to honest citizens. We share Congressman KEATING's suggestion to Congress that our present inhibitions in trying to protect ourselves against treason are "certainly carrying the right of privacy to an absurd and ridiculous length."

We believe, as Mr. KEATING does, that "no nation can survive which does not meet problems threatening its very existence with more realism than this."

Letters From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] made some remarks in regard to two letters from soldiers in Korea, which have been inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] on March 13, and the second inserted by myself on April 5. The gentleman from Illinois calls attention to the almost identical language of these two letters and attributes the similarity to some deep, dark Communist plot to undermine the morale of our troops in Korea, and demands that the Army immediately conduct an investigation into the source of these letters. I wish to state first, that I had no idea at the time I inserted this letter into the RECORD that another letter containing almost identical language had previously been inserted. However, since having this called to my attention I have conducted a little research into the matter and think possibly that I have an explanation for the similarity which is a little less sinister than that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. I find that the writers of both letters are assigned to the same unit—an Engineer detachment. One is a corporal and the other a private first class. I also learned that five men in this unit got together and composed the letter in question and then sent it to five different papers in different parts of the country.

However, it seems to me that this is not the important issue raised by these letters, irrespective of what their original source might be. I have read the reports of the propaganda campaign which the Communists are waging against our forces in Korea, much of it aimed at undermining our morale by raising the very questions posed in these two letters. One of the strange quirks of the military mind is that they sometimes seem to think that they can maintain morale within military units subject to such attacks by somehow or other insulating them from the propaganda. Such an effort is foredoomed to failure, because the enemy will always succeed in planting the seed of dissatisfaction. The only effective way to cope with such propaganda is to keep the forces in question well supplied with answers to all the questions which the enemy raises. If there are no satisfactory answers, bad morale is bound to result.

This gets me back to my original purpose for inserting the letter in the RECORD. It seems to me that the questions raised in the letter should be answered. We cannot expect to draft men and send them to fight and possibly die for us in Korea and then refuse to tell them why we are doing so and what our purpose is in fighting such a war. I inserted the letter in the RECORD because I felt that the questions raised in it should be and must be answered to the satisfaction not only of Corporal Case but of every other man in uniform in Korea. I also felt that I did not myself know any satisfactory answers to these questions, and if anyone did know it would have to be here in Washington. It was my hope that by my insertion of the letter in the RECORD it might come to the attention of some authority here in Washington who felt he knew the answers and would accept the corporal's challenge to write him and give him satisfactory explanations.

The answer certainly is not to have the Army investigate into the matter with the view that it is some sort of a Communist plot. Such investigations would usually better be described as inquisitions, generally serving only to aggravate the morale problem rather than to rectify it. We have only to remember the statement issued by a supposedly responsible military official at the Lackland Air Force Base in Texas last January, attributing the reports of overcrowding and bad organization at that base to some sort of a subversive plot.

I would like to state further that I feel that Corporal Case has every right to be dissatisfied with the way in which he has been treated by the so-called freedom-loving Nation. He was drafted at the age of 18 and taken out of high school before the completion of his high-school course, sometime about the end of World War II. After spending 3½ years in service, including a tour of duty in Germany, and after having managed to complete his high-school course via a correspondence school while in service, he was discharged from the Army with the understanding that he would go into the inactive Reserves and not be recalled except in case of a national emergency. He then attempted to further his education and entered Indiana University. After barely 1 year in the university, he was again recalled to active military service last September 13 months before the national emergency had been declared by President Truman. I say that as an American citizen and as a man in uniform against his will, he has every right to ask these questions and he likewise has every right to receive satisfactory answers.

Justice Department Enforcement of the Antimonopoly Laws Faulty and Injurious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, everybody complains about monopoly and criticizes the laws now on the books for failure to curb the evil, but nobody ever does anything effective about it. Elaborate and expensive investigations about monopoly are conducted, usually ending in the rediscovery that a small number of corporations control a great portion of business, that over the years the number of individual proprietors has decreased, that wealth is concentrated and is growing more so, that prices are controlled and yet have risen, and so on. The investigations generally end with recommendations that something ought to be done, that bigness is bad and should be prohibited, that fines should be increased, that more money should be appropriated for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, that consent decrees should not be made, that corporations should be required to have licenses from the Federal Government, and so on. More economic books are written based on the material gathered in the investigations; more and more money is appropriated; but the evil of monopoly continues and grows. As the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly of this House has stated, "Investigations of monopoly have not been lacking in recent years, but inquiries in this field which have had as their aim concrete legislation have been few." (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, of the Committee on the Judiciary, serial No. 14, part 1, p. iii.)

I have received a letter from Mr. Harry C. Arthur, Jr., a constituent who is an

independent exhibitor engaged in the motion picture theater business, describing some of the monopoly conditions in that business which he and others have had to endure for a generation or more, and calling attention to grave weaknesses and failures in enforcement of the law, manifested by the manner in which the Department is at this time failing to deal adequately with the dissolution of the motion picture trust. Mr. Arthur's letter makes clear that at this time deficiency in the antitrust laws lies largely in the Department of Justice rather than in the law itself. This inadequacy of enforcement can be easily, and should be quickly, corrected by the Department of Justice. The facts and views stated by Mr. Arthur, it seems to me, will be enlightening and of value to Members of Congress, and they clearly demand the serious, sympathetic and prompt action of officials of the Government in charge of the enforcement of the antimonopoly laws.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. Arthur's letter as follows:

FANCHON & MARCO, INC.,
Los Angeles, March 20, 1951.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: This letter is written to bring to your attention certain improper methods of the Department of Justice in the administration of the antitrust laws, which strengthen and increase unlawful monopoly and restraint of trade; and to propose legislation for the correction and prevention of such methods.

For many years I have been engaged as an independent exhibitor in the motion-picture business, principally in St. Louis and Los Angeles, Long Beach, and nearby places in California. I will, therefore, deal specifically with the conduct of the Department of Justice relative to unlawful monopoly and restraint of trade in the motion-picture business, although I am reliably informed that the motion-picture case is by no means a rare or peculiar instance.

The several theater companies in which I am interested are among the people of whom the Supreme Court made the following statement in a recent decision about the motion-picture monopoly: "The trade victims of this conspiracy have in large measure been the small independent operators. They are the ones that have felt most keenly the discriminatory practices and predatory activities in which defendants have freely indulged. They have been the victims of the massed purchasing power of the larger units in the industry. It is largely out of the ruins of the small operators that the large empires of exhibitors have been built."

The motion-picture business is about 80 percent monopoly and 20 percent independent American competitive enterprise, the latter, however, being subjected to heavy burdens and restrictions imposed by the monopoly overlords. The motion-picture industry is probably among the first 10 or 15 largest industries in the United States, representing in proprietors and employees half a million or more people, the great majority of whom are in the independent competitive part of the business. The total income of the industry is larger but most of it accrues to and is distributed among people in the monopoly part. As of this date, about 69,000,000 people (or less) attend motion-picture theaters each week in the United States, which is a decrease of about 80,500,000 in 1946, and a very substantial falling off.

The two great and ancient evils of monopoly are impoverishment of the product and excessive prices. Today this industry is the chronic and dying victim of both diseases. As the monopoly has grown the quality of the pictures has deteriorated and the admission prices have increased. Patronage has fallen away. But the independent exhibitors desirous of retrieving the lost patronage by admission price reduction are obstructed and prevented from doing so by continuation of the monopoly dictation of high admission prices; while the monopoly theaters, though free and able to reduce prices, are unwilling and refuse.

For 10 or 15 years prior to 1938, independent motion-picture exhibitors all over the country poured into the Department of Justice a steady stream of complaints and cries for protection against the discriminatory practices and predatory activities of the large film and theater companies, referred to many years later by the Supreme Court in the quotation cited above. With minor and ineffectual exceptions, however, nothing was done by the Government under the antitrust laws, until July 1938. Meantime the monopoly had grown to enormous proportions and to virtually indestructible strength. Many independent exhibitors had been cracked on the head by the monopoly blackjack, their businesses ruined, their theaters closed up or torn down. I was forced to give up to the monopoly companies, theater interests in California, Arizona, and elsewhere. In a typical case, my business associates were compelled to transfer to the Fox combination a beautiful, modern, newly built theater in Inglewood, Calif., because of the conspiratorial refusal of the other companies to furnish pictures for use in competition with Fox. Some of the independent exhibitors sold out in whole or in part to the monopoly, and became monopoly subordinates and employees. Therein the country has suffered another of the evils of monopoly, the relegation of many independent proprietors to the subordinate status of dependents and servants of the monopoly.

In July 1938 the Government filed a suit under the antitrust laws to break up the monopoly. It charged that five great film companies had acquired practically all of the large first-run theaters in the principal cities in the country and many of the later-run houses, and had divided the country up among themselves as to exhibition; for instance, the Eastern and Southern States being assigned to Paramount, and the Western and Pacific Coast States to Fox. It charged a Nation-wide system of admission price fixing by these companies, the establishment and practice of a multifarious system of discriminations and restrictions imposed on the independent theater and film companies, and a strict and unlawful regimentation of the entire industry for the benefit of the large companies. In that suit the Government asked that the defendants be divested of the many theaters which they had acquired by the unlawful methods. Naturally, the filing of the Government suit inspired the independents with hope that this harsh and un-American system would soon be at an end.

But, having filed the suit, nothing else was done by the Government for a long time. Two years later, in November 1940, the Department of Justice and the defendants entered into a consent decree, which provided for leaving the monopoly structure organically intact, and for the application of an experimental and obviously ineffectual remedy for the restrictive practices. That pretended remedy was the establishment of a system of tribunals throughout the country, financed and controlled by the monopoly companies, which were to receive complaints of the independent exhibitors. The decree was a distinct victory for monopoly, and a sad and discouraging disappointment for the independents.

It took the Department of Justice about 4 years to discover the futility of this experiment by which monopoly was expected to cure monopoly. On August 7, 1944, more than 6 years after the institution of the suit, the Department officially stated that the consent "decree is now inadequate to perform its intended function of restraining the violations of law alleged in the complaint and conforming the operation of the decree defendants to the requirements of the Sherman Act."

The Department of Justice is the largest, the best equipped, and most expensive law office in the world; and it is hard to believe that the futility of that consent decree was not clearly obvious to it in the beginning.

The consent decree having failed, the Department of Justice brought the case on for trial, and the trial began in October 1945. The defendants were held guilty of practically all the discriminations and predatory acts charged, and those acts were prohibited. Although for many years the Department of Justice had collected and undoubtedly possessed much evidence of the unlawful methods used to eliminate independent theaters, to ruin the exhibitors and to acquire their properties and businesses, not one of the victims was called as a witness to prove this ugly and brutal phase of the case. Although the Department of Justice records must be loaded with information of such methods, no evidence at all to that effect was produced by the Government. As a result, the trial court refused to order the divestiture of any theaters.

On the refusal of divestiture by the trial court, the Department appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and on May 3, 1948, the Supreme Court handed down an opinion which amounted to a complete victory for the Government on that phase of the case. I am told that the decision of the Supreme Court is the greatest victory ever achieved by the Government with regard to dissolution of corporate monopoly, that it is a clarifying landmark case in antimonopoly law, and should be a powerful and effectual precedent for use by the Government in similar cases. Briefly stated, the rule laid down in that decision was that every acquisition made by the unlawful methods and practices by the defendants was subject to divestiture. The Supreme Court, therefore, sent the case back to the trial court with instructions to ascertain what theaters had been acquired by such methods and to require that they be disposed of.

Had that mandate been carried out, many of the theaters would have been recovered by former owners, and the rest would have come into the hands of a diversity of independent operators. By that method, without a doubt, competition would have been restored, and much of the wreckage and ruination caused by the big film companies would have been repaired.

But any such wholesome result had been forestalled by further consent decrees between the Department of Justice and the monopoly companies, which represent a surrender by the Government of at least 75 percent of the fruits of the victory in the Supreme Court. These consent decrees were made by drawing a curtain over the savage and criminal competitive methods used by the defendants, the large film companies. As the trial court to which the case had been remanded for divestiture said: "We were also directed to determine whether any 'illegal fruits' were acquired or maintained by the defendants as results of unlawful conspiracies and to divest any such fruits, irrespective of whether the monopoly had in fact been achieved. The plaintiff (the Government) has not introduced evidence to support any claim of divestiture of 'illegal fruits'

and expressly reserves the presentation of such an issue for the future."

As of this time such consent decrees have been made with three of the five monopoly combinations, and according to latest reports, the fourth, dealing with the Fox combination, is to be presented to the Court early in April. The decrees already filed relate to the Paramount, Warner, and RKO combinations. As all are substantially alike, I will confine my description to the Paramount decree.

Paramount was a great combination of picture making and exhibiting corporations. It had about 1,500 of the principal theaters in the country, and was the largest aggregation of theaters in the world. It enjoyed very valuable and exclusive preferences in the use of the Paramount pictures. Considering the similar preferences and priorities with regard to the pictures of the other film companies, which the Paramount theaters also enjoyed as a result of the unlawful division of territory condemned by the Supreme Court, the mere number of theaters did not correctly reflect the dominating position of the company. Had the principle of dissolution pronounced by the Supreme Court been applied, I venture to say Paramount would have retained less than 100 theaters.

The Paramount consent decree was entered March 4, 1949. The leading feature of that decree was the separation of the theaters from the picture-making and film-renting part of the business. All of the theaters were transferred to a newly created corporation.

As that decree was originally entered, it was provided that the new theater corporation and the corporation retaining the picture-making and renting business should not have common stockholders; but already that requirement had been modified with the consent of the Department of Justice. Experience justifies the fear that future modifications will be made and in the end a complete community of interest and reunion of the companies will occur. In fact, the decree provides that the court shall retain jurisdiction for future modifications.

The second main feature of the Paramount decree was an ostensible requirement that the new theater company should dispose of some of the theaters received by it in the divorcement transaction. The maximum requirement of the decree is that the corporation shall divest about 700 theaters, which would still leave it the largest aggregation of theaters in the world, still possessing the massed purchasing power condemned by the Supreme Court. I say the requirement to dispose of theaters is merely ostensible because in this respect the decree is so heavily loaded with conditions, alternatives, choices, options, and qualifications favoring the retention of theaters by Paramount that it amounts to no real requirement at all. Moreover, those contingencies and escape devices with which the decree is loaded will give rise to so many complex factual and legal issues to be referred to and decided by the court that compliance, if it ever occurs, will be postponed for many years.

The third main feature of the decree is the express permission to Paramount to acquire many theaters. One would not expect to find such permission in a judgment whose ostensible purpose is to end monopoly and dissolve the massed purchasing power which had been used so injuriously to the public interest. In many instances exhibitors found it impossible to get a necessary supply of pictures unless they gave up an interest in their businesses to the monopoly film companies, and as a result Paramount acquired stock interests in many such companies. In such cases, the decree, instead of compelling relinquishment of the acquired interest, permits Paramount to acquire the outstanding interest. The decree of March 1949, however, placed a limit on such acquisitions. For instance, as to theaters in Texas, the permission to make such an acquisition is limited to 44 theaters. But as recently as March 1 that limitation has been modified and broken down with the consent of the Department of Justice, and by a method which seems to have been largely devised by Government lawyers.

That transaction, which was effectuated by an amendment of the decree of March 1949, also provides for the ostensible divestiture of other theaters, supposed to offset in some measure the number of theaters acquired, but, again, that provision is subject to a complexity of conditions, exceptions, options, and qualifications, which make the divestitures improbable and long delayed, and which will involve the court in the decision of numerous questions, all favoring the retention of the largest number of theaters by Paramount. The mere administration of this amendment, which is to occur over a period of 5 years or more, will undoubtedly cost the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars of the money appropriated by Congress for the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

On March 1 last the Court was asked by the Department of Justice to approve a transaction by which Paramount acquired and added to theaters already held from 95 to 171 theaters in Texas, by acquiring the Consolidated Theaters, Inc., for $12,500,000. Three Government lawyers appeared and strongly urged the Court to approve the transaction, on the specious theory that to increase the number of theaters already controlled by Paramount would promote competition in the exhibition field in Texas and elsewhere. Two short days before the hearing a statement was published in one of the trade periodicals that objections to the transaction would be permitted. Naturally, because of the extreme shortness of the time and the meager and inexact information published, few people in the industry were able to take advantage of the permission. Nevertheless, my counsel appeared and registered serious objections to the transaction. Under the circumstances, those objections were foredoomed to failure; and the Court accepted the proposal of the Department of Justice. For our pains my counsel and the people represented by him were severely criticized by the Government and Paramount counsel for making the objection.

It was, indeed, too much to expect the Court to reject such a transaction sponsored by an important department of the Government in conjunction with the $100,000,000 Paramount Co., merely upon the objection of a few small companies, however valid and correct their criticisms might be.

The manner in which this case has been handled has produced widespread lack of confidence among independent exhibitors throughout the country in the sincerity and effectiveness of the Department of Justice in the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Supreme Court Justice Jackson, and former Attorney General, is reported to have stated that antitrust cases have been brought for political reasons; and, in the light of the motion-picture consent judgments, one wonders whether they are not also settled on the same basis. The following is an excerpt from newspapers published on February 10, 1951:

"At a recent New York Bar Association dinner, Supreme Court Justice Jackson stated that for some years antitrust suits were started against business firms on a political basis.

"Jackson added that he saw no reason for not being candid about the situation. 'After all,' he said 'they had to be picked on some basis.'

"Reports of those present at the dinner reveal that Jackson and others present got a big laugh out of his admission."

The foregoing is by no means a rare and isolated case. If such maladministration of the antitrust laws is not ended, Congress ought to cease appropriating money for the enforcement of those laws. I am informed that the current appropriation is close to four million dollars, much of which, as I have shown, has been misused for the creation and protection of monopoly and restraint of trade.

Specifically, I suggest that Congress should amend the antitrust laws by enacting that no decree in any antitrust case shall be consented to by the Department of Justice and entered by the court until at least 90 days public notice shall have been given to people in the trade affected, and a full and complete opportunity has been had to register their objections and counter proposals in the court, with the right to appeal if the objections and proposals shall be disregarded. I suggest also that the appropriation for the enforcement of the antitrust laws should contain a limitation to the effect that no part should be paid for services incident to the entry or modification of any consent decree providing for the retention or acquisition by any company of any property or business which has been, or may be, acquired or used by or for monopolistic methods.

If only part of what I state is true, I think you will agree with me that the powers of our great and beloved Government for enforcement of the antitrust laws have been greatly abused, and that the restrictions described above should be imposed so that the laws may be enforced against and not in favor of monopoly. All, or almost all, of the foregoing can be proven by records of the Department of Justice, including records of interviews with and evidence furnished by many independent exhibitors throughout the country.

I stand ready, also, to furnish such other information to the same effect as is available to me.

Respectfully,

FANCHON & MARCO, INC.,
By HARRY C. ARTHUR, JR.

Cincinnati Enquirer Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from a recent issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer which centralizes the results of a poll taken by that newspaper on 10 of the most important subjects of discussion today. Since the ballots on these questions went into more than 300,000 homes in the Central Ohio Valley, the viewpoints of those who replied are of particular interest.

The editorial follows:

READERS VOTE "NO" ON "18" DRAFT, PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION, TRUMAN, ACHESON—ALSO ARMY ABROAD—UNLESS CONGRESS ACTS—"YES" ON RED INQUIRY, WAGE, STEEL'S CONTROL

(By Ollie M. James)

History is on the dead run these days. Profoundly important decisions are being reached almost amidst a millrace of moments. From the somber chambers of city

council to the august assemblies at Lake Success, things are happening. The destiny of the Nation is being written with a hurried hand. The shape of tomorrow's world is being determined. Everybody, it would seem, is speaking in the name of the public.

What does John Smith think about it—and his wife Mary?

A plain wholesome curiosity about the individual viewpoint on the urgent issues of the day prompted the Enquirer to run an Enquirer Reader's Poll ballot last week end, urging the expression of individual viewpoints on 10 of the foremost topics of popular discussion.

These ballots went into more than 300,000 homes in the central Ohio Valley, concerting both the daily and Sunday subscription lists of the Enquirer. There was no expectation that the return would constitute a scientific poll, even though the base of public opinion thereby contacted was vastly broader than ordinarily is reached by the scientific pollsters. No prizes were offered, and no pressure was exerted for people to respond. The ballots merely were printed as an opportunity for individuals to register their viewpoints.

Some of the results were surprising. A straight news story would blurt them out in the lead. In this report, though, they are purposely subordinated to all this preamble of explanation to emphasize that the editors of the Enquirer are not trying to prove anything, nor did they want to prove anything, by calling on the voice of the public.

Only 1,610 voted in the reader's poll. We say "only 1,610" again merely for the sake of keeping things in proper perspective, although that was a fair sample or cross-section of readers who took the time and went to the trouble and expense of filling out the poll forms and mailing them back to the Enquirer. (Many pretentious scientific polls have based their conclusions on far fewer responses.)

Furthermore, readers were asked to vote on all 10 issues—and most did. So it was assumed that there would be some balancing-out of personal prejudices on the various issues.

This was the "sock-dolager": In response to the first question, "Were Harry Truman to run again for President of the United States, would you vote for him?" Only 93 out of 1,566 persons said "Yes." Percentagewise, the reader opinion against President Truman's reelection was equaled in only one other category. On the seventh question of the poll, "Do you believe in Government prevention of strikes during time of war and national emergency?" there was another preponderance of 94 percent—this time affirmative.

Although comments were not solicited, some readers went to special effort to emphasize how they felt on the subject of reelecting President Truman. Here are a few comments culled from the returns: "Hell, no." "A thousand times no." "We need character, ability, and thrift in Washington." "Never did vote for him." "Yes; if he is opposed to TAFT or MCCARTHY." "He should be impeached."

Eighty-eight percent of the readers responding to the poll answered "Yes" to the second question on the list, "Should the military forces of Chiang Kai-shek be used in the conflict in Korea?"

There was a notable unanimity of response to the third question on the readers' poll, "Is President Truman justified in keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?" Eighty-five percent of the poll returns were marked "No" on this question.

Were the ballot markers strictly men and women opposed to administration policies? The returns provided some answer (and tended to bear out the hope that individual prejudices and biases would level off in the answering of 10 different questions) when readers voted almost 2 to 1, or 938 against 520, in favor of continuing the United Nations' offensive north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

"Shall we send four more divisions to Europe without the consent of Congress?" This question—hewing to the heart of the great debate in Washington—was answered in the negative by 80 percent of the readers.

"Is the drafting of 18-year-olds necessary and proper?" On this question there was a significant division of opinion. Forty-six percent said "Yes" and 54 percent said "No." (Of all 10 questions, the second largest number of readers avoided committing themselves on this issue.)

"Do you favor tighter control of wages as well as of prices to halt inflation?" That, the last question on the poll, encountered surprising accord. The vote was 91 percent for tighter control.

By the same precise percentage, readers expressed approval of a State-wide investigation of communism in Ohio, as recently ordered by unanimous vote of the State general assembly. Only 9 percent of the readers opposed the idea.

A local issue, phrased in this question: "If you voted for the proportional representation type of election in 1947, would you again vote for it?" yielded a striking response. The vote, as broken down into percentages, was 65 to 35 against proportional representation. The totals ran: For proportional representation, 359; against, 654; not voting, 597. (The poll ballots asked persons living outside Cincinnati to ignore the question, so the number of those not voting therefore included both nonresidents as well as previous opponents of proportional representation.)

What does it all prove? The editors of the Enquirer do not undertake to say. But they are proceeding on the assumption that it has been an interesting experiment in sampling general public opinion on the foremost issues of the day—and that it has given John Smith and his wife Mary a chance to say what they think on specific questions, apart from Election Day pressures of politics. The poll will be repeated periodically hereafter, as important issues arise.

This newspaper—and every conscientious man in public office—wants to know how America thinks.

Ballots were received from some very important personages. But the editors rested their opinion, in deciding on the worth of the readers' poll, on a note from one woman reader. It said simply:

"Thanks for the privilege of expressing my opinion."

Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of remarks of the Honorable John Lodge, Governor of Connecticut, before the quarterly New England Council dinner, Hartford, March 22, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Robertson, officers and members of the New England Council, honored guests, it gives me especial pleasure to welcome you to Hartford, and to meet with so many citizens of distinction from Connecticut and from our sister New England States.

Your distinguished president, Mr. Wheeler, has accorded me what I can describe only as an overwhelming introduction. Assuredly my own modest merits deserve no such generous accolade. I can only assume that as a large, handsome man, he is accustomed to doing things in a large handsome way.

In recent weeks it has been my privilege to see Mr. Wheeler in action at close range. I noted with admiration the vigor and tenacity with which he grapples with problems close to his heart. It was never my good fortune to see him play football for the alma mater which we share in common, but knowing that he was one of the greatest tackles ever to perform for Harvard, I found myself wishing that there could be a few Walter Wheelers on Harvard's present day football squads.

This morning, attracted by the beauty of the scene, I walked part way to the office. And as I went along, I thought what a remarkable organization the New England Council is. I reflected upon all that the Council has done to promote winter sports in New England. It has given us skiing for the Christmas week end and for the New Year's week end. And now, lo and behold, it provides us with skiing for the Easter week end.

Recognizing the indomitable spirit and resourcefulness of your president, I have no doubt that that ingenious gentleman could, if he put his mind to the problem, see to it that we have skiing also for the Fourth of July.

I take great satisfaction from being with my fellow New Englanders this evening. For, both as individuals in your several communities and as a well-organized body, you represent the best in civic responsibility. Because of your devotion to this historic and beautiful region, because of your faith in yourselves, and your neighbors, you have banded together to foster, not merely the economy of the New England States, but the ideals and the traditions stamped by our stout forefathers upon the rugged hills and gracious valleys of the area.

In your more than a quarter century of service to New England, you have contributed tellingly to the development of our industries which now produce manufactures totaling more than $14,000,000,000 annually. Because of your far-sighted and constructive attitudes, you have assuredly been a compelling factor in the attainment of New England's excellent labor-management record. You have helped to make famous the agricultural products of our region. You have given impetus to the sound growth of our many colleges, universities and technical and preparatory schools.

Moreover, while on the one hand you have encouraged among us a prosperous business and industrial economy, you have also made your influence felt in the achievement of greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of State and local government affairs. In short, the New England council has been a good friend and wise counselor to the entire region. Under your guidance and tutelage you have enabled New England to fulfill more abundantly the destiny to which it is entitled through the superlative character and ability of its people.

Such thoughtful efforts have not only their long-term value. Their worth becomes dramatically apparent in times of stress. There is no doubt in my mind that we in New England have been enabled by the program of the council to make a notably more effective contribution to the national defense effort than would otherwise have been possible.

At the opening of the Connecticut General Assembly, I said, "We in Connecticut must, as we have done in the past, throw into

the scale of our national defense all the creative energy and all the productive increase of which our 2,000,000 citizens are capable. Connecticut is a famous arsenal of the Nation" and has been since Eli Whitney at an abandoned sawmill in Hamden developed the methods of mass production to provide rifles for Washington's army. During the last war Connecticut had the highest per capita production of war goods of all the States. Springfield, Vt., achieved the same honor for communities. Many of the things which can be said for each of the New England States can be recited with equal accuracy for all New England. We in New England must, as we have done in the past, throw into the scale of our national defense all the creative energy and all the productive increase of which our 9,333,000 citizens are capable.

One of the reasons for the creation and for the continued existence of the New England Council is to provide a medium whereby the business leaders of New England can express their opinions concerning public affairs and help guide the actions of government. The existence of the organization as such a medium seems, however, to have led some business leaders to believe that there is no need for them to be vocal individually.

Inasmuch as the business leader is almost invariably a person of superior initiative and sense of responsibility, and since in many instances he is able to express his views forcefully and cogently, it is to be hoped that you who play leading roles in our economy will be willing individually, as well as collectively, to demonstrate your belief in our economic, social, and governmental systems by expressing your opinions freely and in public.

The currency of the businessman is dollars. We who hold public office are concerned with another kind of currency—the currency called public support. May I be so bold as to suggest that if our business leaders are to be truly influential in public affairs, they must be as courageous in terms of their own currency as they would like their public servants to be when those public servants are placed under pressure by certain segments of the electorate.

At the suggestion of the six New England governors, the New England Council was brought into being a little more than a quarter of a century ago. The succeeding governors have continued to cooperate with each other in the furtherance of projects of value to all New England.

As we become more and more concerned with the same problems we shall need further to implement the New England Governors' Conference by some kind of informal machinery to develop material for consideration by the governors at their meeting and for carrying out the policies determined by them.

Each of the States has a commission on intergovernmental cooperation. I am suggesting to Gov. Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Governors' Conference, that those commissions be utilized to do the staff work.

I attended earlier this month in Washington the New England Economic and Defense Conference sponsored by the New England congressional delegation and the New England Council. To me it did not seem that the Federal procurement agencies have set up at this time adequate machinery to keep small business informed on contract and subcontract opportunities. The New England people might well work out more practical methods. I have designated the Connecticut Development Commission as the official State agency to assist small business in this matter. That agency will be glad to work together with similar offices in the other New England States and with your council.

The New England States have for many years cooperated with one another in the conservation and development of our natural resources through the medium of interstate compacts.

All the States except Vermont are partners in the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Compact. All have joined the compact for mutual assistance in fighting forest fires. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut are members of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact. It seems likely that Vermont and New Hampshire and possibly Maine will join this year. The Federal New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee a week ago gave the States a green light for going ahead with action on interstate compacts concerned with control of floods in the Connecticut and Merrimack River Valleys.

Currently, the New England States are working on a compact for mutual assistance for civil defense. Massachusetts and New Hampshire have already ratified a civil defense agreement. I understand that the civil defense authorities of the area are to meet in Boston on April 3 to devise an agreement for all the New England States which can be submitted to Congress for approval as a compact. As a further safeguard for the lives and homes of our people, and in protection of the New England industries so vital to national defense, I trust that this compact will shortly come into being.

Of considerable interest to everyone in New England is the 4-year study of our natural resources and those of New York State by a committee of six Federal agencies created by Presidential directive.

I might say, parenthetically, that of all the water flowing in Connecticut's 8,500 miles of rivers and brooks, 70 percent comes into Connecticut from outside the State. The Connecticut River at the Massachusetts-Connecticut State line represents approximately two-thirds of our inland water resources. We are naturally keenly interested in working with the up-river States in water management problems.

I am very much pleased that the Inter-Agency Committee last Friday, in response to my urging, gave the four States in the Connecticut River Valley full clearance to ratify the Connecticut River flood control compact as drafted by the duly authorized representatives of the States. That action lends much weight to the statements of the interagency committee that it wishes to cooperate with the State governments in resources management programs. Failure to have given New England a green light in this matter and on the New England interstate water pollution control compact would have constituted a serious setback to State participation in the work of the committee.

We can also all approve the action of the interagency committee last Friday during its meeting here in Hartford, giving the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission clearance to take such action as they see fit, without waiting for further study by the committee, relative to the proposed construction of a hydroelectric dam in the Connecticut River at Enfield Rapids.

This constitutes a favorable precedent for leaving the way open for the development of other desirable power projects in New England and New York without waiting for the conclusions of the interagency committee in June of 1954.

But your program tomorrow morning includes a discussion of the interagency committee's work and I will refrain from further comment concerning it, other than to express the opinion that the States seem to be more than pulling their weight in the boat. It is to be hoped that the results of the 4 years of study will be such that all New England can support it.

I am sure you will understand if I take some family pride in the Federal Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1950. Section 205 of that act, as most of you know, resulted from the introduction in the Congress of the so-called Lodge-Furcolo amendment, a bipartisan measure sponsored by my brother, Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Congressman FURCOLO, of Springfield, Mass. That amendment was the inception of the program being carried out by the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee.

I am still at a loss to understand why this section, which had the general approval of both Houses of the Congress, should have been so severely criticized by the President and why it should have been necessary for him to resort to a Presidential directive to achieve the same general objective. But this is not the time to debate that question.

At a meeting of the New England Governors in Boston last January, I asked whether the study authorized by the Congress was to be forgotten and whether there would be duplication of expenditure or manpower to cover the same field under both congressional and Presidential directives.

I have been assured by Col. F. F. Frech, chairman of the committee, that this matter has been given continuing and serious consideration and that every effort is being made to avoid such duplication.

When the interagency committee completes its study in 1954 the New England States should continue their interstate cooperation in the development of plans, programs, and projects for the continued management of natural resources in those ways which will best satisfy the needs and desires of our people.

Those needs and desires will increase and change from time to time and those changes will always make it possible to undertake new plans. We must be sure that interest in our soil, forest, mineral, wildlife, and water resources is not permitted to diminish with the ending of the study.

When I first accepted the invitation to speak at this meeting I hoped to be able to make a definite statement concerning the proposal to build a steel mill in New England. Unfortunately, it is not possible to do so tonight. In connection with the discussion of whether a steel mill should be built in Connecticut or in New England, it is of interest to note that the first successful iron mill in America was in Massachusetts and that the first steel made in America was produced in Simsbury, Conn.

As you know, the New England Steel Development Corp. established by your organization, to promote the construction of a steel mill in New England, engaged a firm of consulting engineers to determine the potential market which could be supplied competitively by a steel mill in Waterford, Conn., and also to prepare estimates of the cost of construction and of operation for such a mill and to determine whether it would be a sound business venture. Governor Bowles appointed a Governor's steel advisory committee to advise Connecticut as to the feasibility of constructing such a mill in this State.

The report of the engineers was submitted 2 weeks ago and was immediately withdrawn. Your steel development corporation is now awaiting a revised report. Until it is received and can be studied neither your corporation nor our committee can state definitely whether the mill can be expected to operate as a private enterprise project. The Governor's steel advisory committee has reported to me that it cannot make a recommendation as to the desirability or feasibility of the project.

Your corporation obtained from the Federal Government a certificate of necessity under the internal revenue law which would permit the steel mill to depreciate three-fourths of its investment at 20 percent per year instead of the normal 3½ percent. This certificate expires in 7 weeks.

A number of such certificates have been issued to encourage expansion of steel production capacity of the country as a defense measure. The Federal agencies have indicated that additional certificates will not be issued. We have not yet learned definitely whether the certificate for the New England mill can be renewed.

The Connecticut General Assembly has before it a proposal that the State grant power of eminent domain to acquire the site in Waterford, Conn., selected by your corporation, for the mill. There is understandable reluctance however, about taking such a drastic step until there is sufficient guaranty that the proposed mill will be economically feasible and will provide the hoped-for benefits to New England's and Connecticut's economy.

I have appointed a community adjustment committee to define the type of collateral problems which might develop in eastern Connecticut as a result of the construction of the proposed steel mill and to suggest what steps should be taken to meet those problems.

It seems likely that the reports of the consulting engineers, the New England Steel Development Corp., the governor's steel advisory committee and the committee on community adjustment problems will shortly be available for consideration.

Despite the fact that New England is a well-knit entity in many respects there still is less community interest throughout the area than was once the case. The New England Council has done much to better this situation, but there remains room for improvement.

We in Connecticut have too little knowledge of what goes on in the northern New England States, partly because the news from there which reaches Connecticut papers through various news services is to a considerable degree the sensational type. Similarly, the newspapers of the Northern States carry too little news of what is happening in Connecticut.

For example, we in New England are very much interested in hydroelectric power, but there are few people in southern New England who know that a power dam was finished on the Connecticut River in New Hampshire and Vermont last year and that another is proposed for construction in the near future. Residents of northern New England have little knowledge of the proposal to construct a power dam on the Connecticut River in Connecticut.

New England's consumption of power is growing by leaps and bounds. During the war a number of power generators scheduled for installation here were diverted by the Federal Government to other parts of the United States and to Russia. Since the war, much new generating capacity has been installed. We have managed to meet all demands and at the same time keep on hand a larger margin of emergency reserve than any other region in the country. Power consumption will continue to grow at a rapid rate. Consummation of present plans will keep us ahead of the demand.

New England is a high-cost area for making power as it is a high-cost area for making other things. We have high wage scales and must import raw materials. In the scurry to see that we always have adequate facilities for making all the power we can use, we must not forget to keep a sharp pencil at work on the cost of power. It is not enough to simply make sure that rates are equitable as between producer and consumer. Keeping the rates just is one thing. Keeping them as low as possible is even more important.

The proposals for the St. Lawrence seaway, and the development of hydroelectric power at the International Rapids and projected redevelopment of Niagara Falls for additional hydroelectric power are of more than academic interest to the people of New England. For many years there has been a belief in New England that development of the St. Lawrence seaway from the ocean to the Great Lakes would have adverse effects on New England's harbors and on the waterway and railway transportation systems of the area.

Recommendations by General Marshall and Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilizer, that the St. Lawrence seaway should be built promptly, indicate the importance ascribed to this project as a defense measure. We in New England should make every effort to determine the adverse effects which this development might bring about in New England and to take steps to compensate for them.

New England, which provides such a relatively large portion of the Federal tax dollar, should obtain dependable assurance that the proposed seaway, which would cost the citizens of this area so much money, must at least not hurt the citizens of the area. Moreover, those parts of New England which, geographically, are in a position to benefit from the projected new hydroelectric power development should seek to establish that such benefit is to be forthcoming.

For many years there has been an exchange of some power between New England and New York State. We should determine the plans of New York State for integrating the power developed at the St. Lawrence and at Niagara Falls through existing transmission and distribution systems of New York State and the surrounding States, particularly New England.

The St. Lawrence and Niagara power is largely base power and there is a likelihood that peak power developed at proposed hydroelectric sites in New England can be exchanged with New York.

In the best interests of New England we should work with the New York State people in the furtherance of their program.

Possessed of relatively meager natural resources, New England has evolved from a wilderness into a densely populated and heavily industralized region with unusually high per capita income and standards of living. Ingenuity and a willingness to work together have been welded by a traditional independence of spirit into a winning formula.

Our spiritual, educational, and cultural standards do not lag behind our material attainments.

It is interesting to reflect that three-fourths of New England's land area is covered by forest growth. In no other region of the United States is the proportion of forest land as great as it is in New England.

Early in the twentieth century New England took the lead in the United States in working for the purchase of mountain lands for national forests. The two national forests in New England have a significant role in the New England forestry picture, but they are small in relation to the total forest area of the six States. New England's forestry problem is primarily a problem of management of privately owned lands.

In thickly populated and heavily industrialized Massachusetts and Connecticut, forests occupy two-thirds and three-fifths of the land areas. Population is concentrated and cropland is scarce. Agriculture, like population, is concentrated in the most suitable areas and like industry is highly specialized. New England counties in Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut rank high among 2,500 competing counties in the United States in the value of farm products.

We cannot, as you of the New England council so well recognize, rest on our oars. Other areas, until recently, relatively undeveloped, with more abundant natural resources and with new-found devices are building fast on the industrial and commercial foundations on which our forefathers struggled laboriously. We must not be content to keep abreast of the stream of civilization which forever flows at an increasing speed. We must continue to pioneer—not against the obstacles of a new country, but to surmount the higher and higher hurdles which are natural developments in an old region. Our job is one of rebuilding and redevelopment.

I had opportunity the other day to read the attractive and tastefully compiled booklet recently issued by the New England council. I was particularly struck by its compelling title "The Rising Tide Lifts All the Boats."

"The rising tide lifts all the boats." How aptly that phrase describes the meaning which underlies the work of the council. For your efforts are not channeled into a narrow field. You do not concern yourselves solely with greater volume of business or larger output of production, useful though such progress is to the development of our region. You have enlarged your concepts to the circle of your duties. In a large-spirited way you have directed your very great talents and energies to the whole problem of making New England a better and still better area in which to live, to work, and to bring up the children whose endeavors will be built upon our own. This is an intelligent and modern-minded approach.

We who have been entrusted with public office in New England must look increasingly to you of the New England council for informed opinion and for help in the shaping and execution of the policies which we hold vital to the well-being of our communities, our States, and the entire section.

New England has a unique flavor. Around the very words, "New England" have accreted a store of legend and tradition. It is a flavor compounded of our salty ways and our fabled independence of spirit. Its essence clings to our picturesque hills and nestles around the centuries old homesteads of our quiet valleys.

When we think of New England, what pictures come to the mind: Magnificent stretches of white sea beach, brooks, and streams turbulent as the course of our history, wide rivers, and majestic lakes. New England is the laconic twang of the Yankee farmer; it is the skilled fingers of the artisan; it is the deep snow of Maine winters; it is the diverse arts and crafts of a hundred hardy racial stocks; it is the clang of 20,000 busy factories; it is the immemorial shade of campus elms.

But for all New England's scenic charm, for all its quaint lore, for all its mighty tradition, this region of ours owes its real greatness to another factor, and that factor is the human growth and progress which have been made in our six States for more than 300 years. Roll back that long chronicle and you will observe that the core of New England is the courage, the hardihood, and the dynanism of her people. Those are the qualities that have made us a great region, and that will keep us a great region.

I salute you gentlemen of the New England council for your determination that these priceless attributes of New England character and talent shall be given their fullest encouragement to flower and to spread. For what God has given us in New England let us offer thanks not alone with our tongues but with enduring creative enterprise of hand and heart and mind to the end that this region which we love and serve shall become a land teeming with productive increase, and shall prosper in all its ways.

Voice of America and Charles M. Hulten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, during debate yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] read into the RECORD a portion of the committee hearings which pertained to the Voice of America program where he was interrogating Mr. Charles M. Hulten, general manager, International Information and Education Exchange Program. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] left the impression that he does not believe Mr. Hulten is qualified to be general manager of this tremendous operation, and particularly the Voice of America program. I concur in the opinion of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

There seems to be a discrepancy between his evaluation of Mr. Hulten and the profile of Mr. Hulten which appears on page 10 of the March 21, 1951, edition of the U. S. A. Life Air Bulletin, for use by press and radio. The profile of Mr. Hulten which appears in this bulletin reads as follows:

CHARLES M. HULTEN, GENERAL MANAGER, INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATION EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(In Burma an agriculturalist tells a farmer how to improve his crops. In Indonesia a musician reads a review of a New York concert. In Chile a classroom of children watch an educational film. In Poland a woman turns a radio dial to hear how the United Nations is fighting Communist aggression. These and countless similar incidents are the end result of America's information and educational exchange program, which every day sends the voice of democracy sounding around the world.)

In January 1950 the United States Department of State decided that this program, which is the Nation's most effective method of combating Kremlin propaganda, needed a general manager. The decision was made so that Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, could be freed of the day-to-day problems of the expanding program to devote more of his time to high-level policy matters.

There was one logical person to fill the position of general manager for the program: the dynamic, square-jawed man who was then serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration—Charles M. Hulten. Mr. Hulten had had wide experience as a newspaperman and university professor. He had held executive positions in the Government for almost 10 years. His abilities in the fields of administration and information had won him the respect and admiration of all who had worked with him.

As general manager of the program, Mr. Hulten has charge of the Office of International Information and the Office of Educational Exchange. Under the Information Office the Voice of America radio programs are broadcast to countries all over the world, including Russia and the iron-curtain countries, and news reels, film strips, press features, and other material are sent to nations that have a free flow of information.

The Educational Exchange Office arranges for the exchange of students, teachers, journalists, and labor leaders between the United States and other countries. This program also includes the setting up and maintaining of more than 130 free libraries in countries all over the world.

Mr. Hulten was well qualified to take over the demanding task of managing these two programs. He was graduated from the University of Wisconsin's School of Journalism in 1929 and received his master of arts degree there 2 years later. During his college course he worked as a staff member of the Wisconsin State Journal in Madison. For 4 years he worked on several other Midwestern newspapers, both as a reporter and editor.

In 1934 he joined the faculty of the University of Oregon as associate professor of journalism. It was there that he met Margaret Britts Reid, a charming young writer, and they were married in 1936. In 1939 Mr. Hulten took a leave of absence from the University of Oregon to spend a year at Stanford University as acting assistant professor of journalism.

A few months after the United States entered World War II, he was brought to Washington as a consultant to the United States Bureau of the Budget. He continued with the Budget Bureau as senior management analyst for a year and a half. Mr. Hulten then transferred to the Office of War Information, where he became Assistant Director for Management. It was there that he met Edward W. Barrett, the Assistant Director for Overseas Operations. The two men built up a sound working cooperation in those days that continues in their present close association.

After the war ended, Mr. Hulten joined the Department of State as a top executive in the information program, and the following year was appointed deputy to WILLIAM BENTON, then Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Hulten took over many of the operational duties of the Public Affairs program and represented Mr. BENTON on committees and in policy conferences.

A man of great force and personal magnetism, Mr. Hulten was named in February 1947 as deputy to John E. Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration. In that important post he was closely associated with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). He was a United States delegate to the UNESCO general conference in Mexico City in 1947 and in Beirut in 1948. In 1948 and 1949 he was the United States representative of the UNESCO Advisory Panel on Finance and Administration in Paris.

Since he became general manager of the information and educational exchange program, Mr. Hulten has traveled in South America, Europe, and the Near East to see at first hand the field operations of his program.

Mr. Hulten, whose grandparents came to America from Sweden, was born in Athens, Wis., on June 10, 1909. He is proud of his Swedish inheritance and of being brought up in the midwestern region of the country, which he considers the heart of America. He and Mrs. Hulten live in Washington, D. C., with their 9-year-old son, Charles. Mrs. Hulten has given up her writing career and now devotes her time to her family and community activities.

Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of the way Members of Congress are asked to write up their own biography for insertion in the Congressional Directory. In all probability this profile was edited, if not actually written by Mr. Hulten. It states, and I quote:

Mr. Hulten was well qualified to take over the demanding task of managing these two programs.

Is it not strange that out of the millions of men in the United States that, and I quote again from the profile, "There was one logical person to fill the position of general manager for the program: the dynamic, square-jawed man who was then serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration—Charles M. Hulten."

I cannot help but wonder if Mr. Hulten's wide experience could be the few years he spent as a young man working for newspapers.

Again, the author of the profile of Mr. Hulten, which evidently was meant to be beamed over the ether waves of the Voice of America did not spare himself when he states:

A man of great force and personal magnetism, Mr. Hulten was named in February 1947 as deputy to John E. Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural to assume that the people who know Mr. Hulten will be in the best position to judge who is right, Mr. ROONEY or the author of the profile. From Mr. Hulten's performance with the Voice of America I reiterate that I concur in Mr. ROONEY'S opinion that Mr. Hulten is not qualified to be general manager of this tremendous operation.

The Nation's Predicament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial, entitled "The Nation's Predicament," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Monday, April 9, 1951:

THE NATION'S PREDICAMENT

General MacArthur's letter to Representative JOE MARTIN has touched off a new tirade against the general in Washington and London.

Let there be no mistake about it. The American people have no quarrel with General MacArthur. They do not resent the advice he has offered and much less do they resent the fact that he has offered it.

The American people know that 9,000 American boys have been killed in the Korean War, but do not know what purpose this sacrifice is supposed to serve or how it is to be ended. They want to hear anything General MacArthur may have to say on either point and they don't care a hoot if Mr. Truman's feelings are hurt or the feelings of the British Foreign Office are hurt.

Mr. Truman, the addle-brained gift to the Nation of the Prendergast mobsters, put the United States into the Korean War without the advice of Congress and in violation of the constitutional provision that only Congress may declare war. He still doesn't know what the war is about. He doesn't know how to win it and resents the advice on this point offered by General MacArthur. Mr. Truman isn't supporting the war to the available limit, for he intends to send four divisions to Europe where there is no war instead of Korea where there is one.

Instead of heeding MacArthur, Mr. Truman leans on Acheson, the Anglo-Canadian friend of a traitor; on the Pentagon brass who have sold out for foreign decorations; on civilians whose main concern in life is gaining social recognition abroad; on international bankers and industrial profiteers.

The only hope for the country lies in Congress. We believe there is enough intelligence and devotion there to work out an honorable escape from the predicament which the addlehead has brought about. But if a majority of the Members of Congress betray their country, we are, indeed, lost.

The Editor Visits Front in Korea—Paul C. Smith Says MacArthur Can Win if He Is Given Freedom to Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members to the following newspaper account of an interview of Mr. Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, by Earnest Hoberecht of the United Press. Mr. Smith is one of California's most widely known editors, and is a gentleman whose attainments cause his carefully considered statements to be of considerable importance.

The article follows:

THE EDITOR VISITS FRONT IN KOREA—PAUL C. SMITH SAYS MACARTHUR CAN WIN IF HE IS GIVEN FREEDOM TO FIGHT

(By Earnest Hoberecht)

TOKYO, April 4.—Paul C. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, said today (Wednesday) in an interview that the United Nations forces in Korea can win the war if permitted to attack across the Yalu River into China.

"I think the present forces in Korea can win the war against the Chinese armies in Korea if they are permitted to liquidate the present military handicaps which result from those directives which prevent them from operating on the other side of the Yalu River," said Smith, who visited North Korea with Gen. Douglas MacArthur Tuesday.

Smith gave his views on the Korean situation after he returned from Korea, where he flew Tuesday with MacArthur. He jeeped 15 miles into North Korea on the east coast with the United Nations commander in chief.

WAR EXPERIENCE

In World War II, Smith served in both the Marines and the Navy. He was a commander in the Navy at the time of the Japanese surrender.

"With our forces in the Orient," he said, "all we need is freedom to conduct a sound military operation."

He explained that this means that "when and if necessary, we knock out the supply lines of the Communist sources of power in Korea by air and sea."

"This means a sea blockade of China and air attacks where required," he pointed out.

"I admit," he said, "there is a calculated risk involved with the possibility of yet another intervention by Russia, but in view of China's repeatedly stated determination to drive us from Korea, it seems to me that anything short of acceptance of that risk will just result in no net gain for the anti-Communist forces of the world.

"FREEDOM TO FIGHT

"These anti-Communist forces, of which the UN units in Korea are both the spearhead and the main body, must be given freedom to fight as sound military leadership would normally fight or they are being sent to die for a lip-service cause with their hands tied behind them."

Smith said he was deeply impressed with General MacArthur, whom he had never met previously.

"General MacArthur suffers only from two things," said Smith. He listed these as "his fair weather friends and his very petty detractors."

Smith said MacArthur suffered less at the hands of his petty detractors "because they really can't touch him much."

Smith said General MacArthur possesses one of the "greatest vocabularies that I have ever encountered."

"And," said Smith, "he impresses me as having even the greater distinction of knowing what every word means."

He expressed complete confidence in MacArthur's leadership.

He paid tribute to the field forces serving under MacArthur.

Smith said that in view of what MacArthur and his fighting men in the field have had to work with, "the American people can be grateful as hell to this leader and his men."

Smith said after studying the situation and seeing considerable background material on the situation he was convinced that there has never been at any time a retreat.

TOUGH TERRAIN

He said that sometimes the United Nations forces were outnumbered as high as 20 to 1 and had to fight their way out, but they were only fighting in a different direction, as Marine Maj. Gen. O. P. Smith had stated.

"The terrain in Korea is as rotten and rough as I have ever seen," the San Francisco editor said.

He said he was greatly impressed with the evidence of complete unification of the Armed Forces under General MacArthur. He said he had observed this at both the top level and the working level.

"The services work well together and understand each other's problems," he said. Every unit has done a hell of a job.

Smith said he "was convinced that the only thing General MacArthur needs—and which he should have fast—is clarification of the mission in Korea as well as Asia as a whole.

"If our mission is unification of Korea, then the thirty-eighth parallel is not a proper political question and it is a tactically improper military line."

Smith said, "One of the main jobs of the American people" who are 7,000 to 10,000 miles from the scene of the show-down, is to see that the outfits here, from MacArthur to the newest recruit have the whole-hearted support of the Nation and those allied with them in the United Nations.

"It is difficult for anybody to keep his eye on the enemy at the front if he has to spend most of his time and energy pulling political stilettos out of his back,' Smith said.

He said he fully understood that there are political questions which can be decided only at the highest levels in the United Nations.

He said he was convinced that this point is well understood by General MacArthur.

But he said he was not convinced that some of those in high political quarters understand the urgency of General MacArthur's position as a field commander.

"As a field commander," Smith said, "he has every right to point up the urgency of the situation and to meet the situation on the strength of his own resources when there is pussyfooting or quibbling and his overall directives are inadequate or confusing."

Smith said he has been interested here in running down some of the so-called expert criticism of General MacArthur and his staff members.

For example, he said, he had been interested in the charges that some of MacArthur's staff had been with him too long.

On the basis of his experience here, he said, he found this criticism completely invalid.

"I have been impressed with the exceptional competence of MacArthur's staff," Smith said. "This exceptional competence stems from the fact that they have been working together through thick and thin for a decade.

"Any idea that such experience and understanding within a top staff is bad rather than good is to me contrary to practical sense."

The Price of Inaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commonweal of April 6, 1951:

THE PRICE OF INACTION

India is thousands of miles away. Its masses are chronically poverty-stricken. The peoples of the East have ever been subject to drought, flood, and famine. That is one way some balance is maintained between powers of sustenance and population. Besides India's threatened famine is largely due to her own chauvinism, from failure to purchase surplus grain from Moslem Pakistan. And why should India be deserving of special American consideration? Have not Mr. Nehru, Sir Benegal Rau, and others opposed this country's proposals about North Korea and Communist China when the chips were down in the UN? Too many other items deserve precedence at a time when we are girding strenuously for our own self-defense.

Some such sentiments are believed to account for the failure of Congress to take action on Mr. Truman's formal request for surplus grain for India of over 6 weeks ago. Meanwhile Indian conditions have grown considerably worse. Pakistan no longer has an exportable grain surplus. Continued drought in Bihar has meant the failure of the winter crop and some forty millions there are in immediate peril. Will this in itself have any appreciable effect on men who subscribe to the sentiments outlined above—to those who would make a sharp distinction between "playing Santa Claus" and carrying on what they hold to be the only proper functions of a government, the pursuance of a policy of strictly national interest, come what may?

But in the interim other things have also been taking place. Communist China has agreed to ship in 50,000 tons of rice and more than a quarter of it has already arrived, although negotiations with China were instituted some time after American negotiations were begun on the same subject. Soviet Russia likewise has offered a barter arrangement of 50,000 tons of wheat—an agreement similar, it is true, to what was effected between

the two nations last year. But no American grain, aside from that procured here by straight purchase, is en route or even in prospect at this most critical hour.

Perhaps the moment has arrived to reconsider. Leave the humanitarian argument out of it, put it all on cold-war terms. Think of our potential support in India and throughout all non-Communist Asia. How will that be affected by our refusal to avert a major famine by shipping some of our grain surpluses at the very time both Communist China and Soviet Russia are sending in grain (if in far from adequate amounts)? That puts a different complexion on the matter.

When Congress reconvenes after its Easter recess, it should consider the editorial reaction of an Indian weekly newspaper, the Naya Sabera, of Lucknow, on continued American inaction and the first grain shipments from Communist China. It is "quite clear who has genuine concern for the welfare of the Indian people." There is only one possible answer to that.

What Should Be Our International Economic Policy in a Period of Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 26 last Mr. George A. Sloan, chairman of the International Chamber of Commerce, made a splendid contribution to the subject of our international economic policy in a very able address before the Economic Club of Detroit at Detroit, Mich. Mr. Sloan, in addition to occupying the important position of chairman of this group, is a man of broad knowledge and ability. His utterances are usually worthwhile. His address before the Detroit group was no exception.

With the thought that Mr. Sloan's thinking may be of value to our people generally, and in order that it might have a broader circulation, which it deserves, I submit it herewith.

Mr. Sloan's address is as follows:

It is indeed an honor to appear before this distinguished group and to explore with you some of today's economic problems with particular reference to international trade and policy in a period of rearmament.

Looking over the list of your past speakers I find the names of many friends who have addressed you. It is with a sense of humility that I come to the Economic Club of Detroit in the footsteps of such outstanding industrial and financial leaders as Thomas J. Watson, Sr., Phil Reed, Randy Burgess, Irving Olds, Paul Hoffman, John Hancock, and Warren Lee Pierson.

The subject assigned to me is an exceedingly difficult one, too often obscured because of the constant changes in the international field from month to month. It would be presumptuous of any businessman to undertake to explain specifically where business stands or should stand in the present confused state of world conditions. And yet I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that a sound solution of pressing economic problems, of international nature, is imperative if we are to maintain a healthy political and social America.

In the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce are businessmen from all walks of industrial and corporate life. For many years these businessmen, many of them colleagues of yours, have worked actively on our study groups and devoted many hours of careful thought to possible solutions to international economic problems. Often we have succeeded; other times not.

Because of frequent exchange of views with these businessmen and also with businessmen of other free nations who are actively engaged in the International Chamber of Commerce, I am willing to expose myself to you in the hope that we might clarify our mutual thinking.

The free world is faced with a grave crisis and perhaps its greatest challenge to survival. We must develop—and we have made a good beginning—the strength of the free nations to counteract the aggressive moves of communism.

A foreign economic policy, by definition, should be the true reflector of the world we live in. Let us for a moment, therefore, examine the world at midcentury.

The paramount objective of our foreign policy should be the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace. It should include friendly cultural intercourse among nations as well as mutually advantageous trade among nations.

What many of us knew for many years has been brought out into the open with the invasion of Korea by the Communist hordes. But Korea has carried us nearer to facing reality: Our lives are threatened by an aggressive force that has shown its intentions to eliminate from its well-planned path of imperialistic advances the obstacle represented by the freedom of the individual.

Today, more than ever before, we Americans are called upon for an expression of national unity, for a sense of purpose, and for a decisive spirit. Unity must start at home in our foreign dealings, especially our international economic relations.

Nearly 6 years ago the United States was at its prime of strength as a world power. No one doubted this strength. Today there are doubts about our leadership and policy in many capitals of the free world, in London, in Paris, in Rome. Actually, the power of the United States has not diminished to warrant such doubts.

The Soviets have made two major gains. They have swung China into their orbit and they are said to have the atom bomb. On the other hand, the United States has made tremendous gains. Since Korea there is more of a spirit of unity. Production, economic growth have been our determining factors. Korea has awakened many of those who did not previously visualize the antagonism in the Soviet system.

The Western World, especially Western Europe, is better off today than in any period since the end of World War II. Western Europe has turned from an area disorganized by the effects of war into a smoother-flowing economic and political community. While not completely recovered from devastations and dislocations the most difficult part of the Western European reconstruction task has been achieved.

The established centers of freedom have survived. They have withstood two attacks by German militarism. Where free institutions are maintained, men have continued to make advances in material wealth, in understanding of fellow men, in science, in tolerance, and in decency.

Still, the world today has no peace. There are large masses of people—good, intelligent, industrious people—who are being led to slaughter by political leaders and are denied the right to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The world continues to consist of the "haves" and the "have nots." You may ask, "Have or have not what?" And my answer is have or have not freedom of access to the world's raw materials (as promised in the Atlantic Charter to victor and vanquished alike); have or have not the freedom to own, to use, and to risk the mechanical means of production; have or have not the right to the just rewards of their honest labor; have or have not the right to determine and to control their own destiny as freemen; because they are denied their rightful opportunity to utilize nature's endless bounty for their own well-being and individual happiness.

Human misery in the Western World is certainly much smaller now than it was in the nineteenth century. That this was possible in spite of two world wars is sufficient answer to those who claim Western civilization is in decay. Notwithstanding the postwar poverty of Europe and the rest of the world, the West as a whole is richer in kind and in spirit than ever. But the situation in many friendly countries still presents a challenge to the United States if the spread of communism is to be held in check.

The twentieth century has witnessed the United States coming of age as a world power. "The leadership to which the United States has succeeded," said the renowned London Economist recently, "has turned out to be that not of a gloriously expanding world economy but of a half-world on the defensive, therefore imposing more in responsibilities than it provides in privileges. America has accepted these responsibilities with doubt and hesitation and now and then with inconsistencies. But on the whole," concludes the Economist, "the performance has been one * * * of remarkable foresight and energy."

The present world situation requires an expression of utmost responsibility and leadership from the United States, from American businessmen. In the past, many of us have been most reluctant to accept this responsibility. We can offer as alibi the fact that we survived the early years of our Republic only by avoiding entangling alliances. World leadership has been thrust upon us so rapidly in the last decade or so that we appear to be inexperienced and in fact we are inexperienced. When we are faced with international problems we are frequently, if not mostly, indecisive because we have few precedents on which to base our policy.

A transformation so swift as that of the last 10 years cannot be experienced by a relatively young nation without mistakes in action and without moments of doubt. It should be most reassuring to all of us who believe in the freedom of the individual that our system of democracy always induces self-doubt. The current congressional debate on foreign policy is a true indicator of this.

Surely, America's future depends on how widely and how wisely it carries out the responsibilities of leadership. The central point must be the unification of the free world in the face of aggression and threats of aggression. Each member of the free world acting alone is too weak to counteract these threats or to resist attack. Not even the United States standing alone can be powerful enough for self-defense. Acting together, the free nations by moral standards and productive achievements will bring about the currently lacking balance of power. In all these endeavors our basic aim must always remain the same: The maintenance of peace but without sacrifice of freedom.

The fear of what the next moves of the Soviets and their satellites will be is in-

herent in the policies and the thinking of free peoples everywhere. Hearings before congressional committees, debates before the House of Commons, discussions in the French Parliament—all are influenced by the foremost consideration of what the next moves of the Soviets may be.

With the free world in a twilight of war (which we hope will brighten rather than darken in due course by our own actions) the challenge is even greater. We have to superimpose a military economy on a civilian economy in the hope that the least amount of belt-tightening will be necessary. This situation brings with it an inflationary tendency.

Actually, the foremost enemy of the Western World, at the present, is inflation. We must stop putting fuel on the flame, while, at the same time, feebly trying to put out inflation's flame with a sprinkling can. Either we all—and I mean all—make the necessary sacrifices now to stop inflation or we will be faced later with the reality of making much bigger, if not total, sacrifices.

If you want any substantiation of this, study the inflation experiences in Germany, in China, in France, in Italy. The aftereffects of inflation in Germany helped in producing Hitler; it gave China Mao Tse-tung; to Italy Mussolini, and to France an unhappy parade of cabinets that require a score card to keep track of. But more than this, inflation destroyed confidence everywhere in these countries. And even here in America, it has and is steadily undermining the confidence of our people.

Inflation is Stalin's best ally. Next to Soviet imperialism this is the most difficult problem facing America and our friends abroad.

This then is a bird's-eye view of the world we live in. It is the setting on which we must apply our foreign economic policy.

The first question that now arises is: What should be our short-range, our immediate, international economic policy?

Development of strength at a rapid pace to offset the military power of the nations in the Soviet orbit is, I should think, objective No. 1. The plans are becoming better defined. They are being carried out by the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington on the American level and the Defense Production Board under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Businessmen are and should be the prime policy movers of these efforts. And, industrial operations, as can be witnessed so well in Detroit, are carrying the production effort.

I am confident that rapid rearmament of the non-Soviet world will—within a short period—create superiority of political, economic, and military strength on our part. Such a state of conditions would make the Kremlin stop, look, and listen before embarking on other diversionary invasion movements. The Western World must concentrate its efforts for the next 2 or 3 years on harnessing its resources for defense.

In the process of rearmament, some distortions in production, prices, and trade already have become apparent. Resources that would otherwise be available to civil consumption and investment in the promotion of freer trade and raising standards of living have been transferred to military needs.

The businessman (wherever he lives in the free world) is committed to do all in his power to assist his country in utilizing the productive facilities for the rearmament of the Western World. In our defense efforts we will undoubtedly have to endure mental and physical strain for an indefinite period if we are to maintain our freedom and economic liberties. Without freedoms the heart will have been removed from our defense.

The free world cannot go on focusing exclusively on being strong enough to wipe out aggression before it actually occurs. At some point, whenever the Kremlin will decide, there has to come a break in the international tension. At some point the success of the free world will be measured not by self-preservation efforts, but by our ability to expand economic capacity to such an extent that we can offer to both our own people and the people in the underdeveloped areas increased standards, both material and moral, that dictatorships of any kind are in no position to provide.

In the knowledge of this important factor, it stands to reason that the free world must move forward to expand its productive facilities, its economic strength, its scientific knowledge. So we therefore come to objective No. 2:

We cannot withdraw behind a protective curtain of isolation because for many vital commodities the United States is dependent on external resources. Of the 15 basic minerals, the United States is relatively self-sufficient in only 6—coal, petroleum, iron, sulfur, phosphate, and potash. In the case of iron, various ferro-alloys must be imported before steel can be made. The automobile industry in Detroit is well aware of the fact that 100 percent of tin, chrome, and cordage fibers are imported. Ninety-two percent of our manganese and cobalt, 73 percent of tungsten, and 34 percent of our yearly requirements for lead are mined outside of the United States. Our foreign economic policy must be based on a full realization of these facts. In order to make their economies most productive, the countries of the Western World need an adequate and equitable supply of required raw materials, together with a flow of essential consumer goods.

To assure an adequate supply of strategic raw materials for all countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), and the other non-Soviet nations, it is necessary to have in permanent operation joint allocation boards, eliminating thereby the inflationary effects of free-market competition for scarce material. The price effects of such an uncontrolled rush for materials is imposing severe strains on the economy of some countries, including our own.

It is gratifying to know that a start in the direction of international allocation and procurement of materials is now being made. The current sessions of the raw-material commodity groups in Washington are one way of controlling this weakness. It is essential, however, that private channels be assigned, wherever possible, the responsibility to carry out this raw-material goal. Also, an international arrangement like this should be maintained only for the period of the emergency. Then it is imperative that free-market competition must be reinstituted.

There is still a puzzle as to who in Washington is responsible for our own international allocation-procurement activities. About 10 agencies and departments are in the picture, despite the fact that the first order issued by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, as Defense Mobilizer, created an interdepartmental Committee on Foreign Supplies and Requirements, under the chairmanship of ECA Administrator William C. Foster.

The United States Government should immediately clarify the raw-material situation so that there will be an end to the kind of vacuum that seems to persist in Washington. Instead of the many overlapping agencies in the field now, there should be one Government agency—possibly ECA—in sole charge of the temporary allocation and procurement of raw materials.

One of the most crying needs of the moment is the elimination of the inconsistent performance by a host of administrative agencies—some 23 of them—that have a governmental finger in the international economic pie, with resultant confusion to all concerned.

Three notable and informed sources lately have proposed that the proper exercise of our foreign economic policy demands the consolidation of all the scattered efforts within a single governmental agency. Headed by a man of outstanding ability with public acceptance, this agency should have the equivalent of Cabinet status.

First, there was the Gordon Gray report, rather outdated at this time because it was originally conceived before Korea. Then, the speeches and writings of our own United States Council executive committee member Paul Hoffman (who certainly knows this problem first-hand and can speak with feeling about administrative foul-ups in the Government). And finally, we are confronted with the recent report of Nelson Rockefeller's International Development Advisory Board. (This report, though its other recommendations require careful study before we can determine whether businessmen should endorse them is unqualifiedly correct on the demand for a single agency.)

The Hoover Commission in many other fields has pointed out the waste and inefficiency and stupid duplication of much of our administrative structure in Washington and abroad. Here, in the field of foreign economic policy, is a situation ripe for a Hoover Commission approach.

These then are some factors that make up our short-range foreign economic policy.

It behooves businessmen to look beyond this period of emergency, the period when we have reached a balance of power, with rearmament complete so that no nation would dare attack us. What will we do then, I might ask, with the resources in materials and manpower that have been increased. Will we have to cut back and expose ourselves to the fear of depression and unemployment? I think that every businessman in the United States should look ahead to that future date and ponder over the possibility of formulating a program that would assist in furthering economic growth and apply the gains made to the common good. This would enable us to minimize unemployment and to utilize the expanded resources in such a way that they will be available to more and more people.

At the forthcoming Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce, which will be held in Lisbon, Portugal, from June 10 through 16, the world business community, including the American representatives, will discuss aspects of such a program for action by the world business community. We hope that the Detroit business group will be most helpful in looking ahead along these lines when the United States Council, together with some of your outstanding groups here in Detroit, will have a meeting in your city on May 3. And of course, we sincerely hope that Detroit will be represented in Lisbon. It seems to us that these meetings provide a tremendous challenge to the businessmen to preserve a competitive enterprise system which otherwise might falter.

If the free nations of the world do not succeed in avoiding economic maladjustments—if they fail to establish an environment in which communities can advance materially and spiritually—there is always the danger that the people will be driven into communism. Only by our performance can we hope to contain the advances of communism. Take the example of the Chinese. The Chinese farmer who has accepted or even welcomed communism as relief from the misery, oppression, and corruption of his lot will learn in time that the promises of the Communists are hollow. Collectivism will soon take back the land made available

to him. The cancellation of debts, which was made possible through liquidation of the money lender, will be replaced by oppressive taxes. Communism will soon become a yoke.

But communism has never yet been eliminated in any country where a Communist regime obtained power. We must act, therefore, before the cancerous growth of communism can spread.

An economic strategy for peace should certainly include a drive to reform traditional modes of production and distribution and increase sharply the productivity of men and machines. This is one way to meet threats of foreign aggression and international collapse. One of the major steps in that direction is to demonstrate the adaptability and flexibility of the American productive system to our European friends. Fortune magazine, in its February 1951 issue, made quite an essential point in this respect. "United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world for getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary," said Fortune, "to suggest the means: there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchanges of all sorts."

American capitalism—as exemplified in particular by industry in Detroit—has learned that the secret of national prosperity is to eliminate the idea that the many cannot have what the few enjoy. American capitalism of 50 years ago can hardly be recognized when compared with American capitalism of today. Unhappily, the same cannot be said for European capitalism. One of the gravest weaknesses in the armor of the Western World's economic policy is the persisting, time-worn attitude of European capitalism.

In the United States the living standards and working conditions of the average citizen have shown constant and remarkable improvement. In Europe this has not been true. There are many reasons for this, including the trend to socialism and the emphasis which European capitalism places on an outmoded cartel system. Many European businessmen dislike competition. I think there is great danger in this state of mind. We must distinguish between capitalism which works for the few and capitalism which works for the many. The trend of European capitalism has been away from a sense of responsibility to the community. I am sure the morale of people of Europe would rise if they could identify European capitalism with a positive rather than a negative policy.

Today many ardent anti-Communists abroad are suspicious of the motives of American capitalism. By explaining the true contribution of American capitalism to the world in terms of the gains of the individual working men and women here in Detroit and in other great industrial centers, I am sure we as businessmen will develop our most successful weapon against Soviet propaganda. This should be a major component of our foreign economic policy.

We must win people as well as diplomatic and military battles if we hope to stop communism. Communism has been making progress in other countries under oppression and poverty. Our long-range international economic policy must keep in mind that a removal of these conditions is an obligation. The Communists have imagination, boldness, and courage—all couched in a fanatical devotion to a cause. We can reply with far more effective boldness and courage.

It is significant that I am speaking to you on the same day that in Washington the Foreign Ministers of the 21 American Republics are opening their deliberations on, among other things, how the raw material and productive resources of the Western Hemisphere can be stepped up.

Point 3 on the agenda of the sessions is the following:

"Emergency economic cooperation: (a) Production and distribution for defense purposes; and (b) production and distribution of products in short supply and utilization of necessary services to meet requirements of the American Republics and measures to facilitate insofar as possible the carrying out of programs of economic development."

As we understand it, the Latin-American countries are asking such questions as: Can a reasonable market be guaranteed after the emergency for expanded Latin-American production? Will we (Latin Americans) be able to obtain sufficient technological know-how from the United States to expand production and increase standards of living? The question of additional American capital investment will also be on the minds of our friends from below our southern borders.

We are asking the Latin Americans to expand raw material production for the current defense program. And the Latin Americans are determined, as we understand it, to bargain for a position where the gains made during the emergency would be of benefit after the emergency is over.

As part of our long-range foreign economic policy, there should be an expansion in the investment of private companies abroad. Many American companies that have invested in subsidiaries and affiliates abroad have had satisfactory experience with the exception of transferring earnings to the United States. Naturally, we must do all in our power to convince the Government that the obstacles to foreign investments, such as double taxation, lack of convertibility, and other similar controls, be corrected so that American business will have incentives to take its dollars abroad.

Private investment going abroad is a desirable way to fortify the economies and raise the standards of living of foreign countries. It is a most effective countermove to the conditions that breed poverty and oppression. Private foreign investment would also relieve the taxpayer of the burden of providing through his government direct assistance and grants to other nations. When private capital goes abroad it brings with it American know-how and managerial skill and thus directly contributes to the welfare of the recipient nations.

But we must be realistic. Congress should provide much of the necessary encouragement by passing legislation deferring taxation of earnings on foreign activities of American companies until they are brought home. At the same time bilateral treaties must be concluded to assure the transfer of earnings to corporations in capital exporting countries and to eliminate double taxation.

You will hear more about such programs from the International Chamber of Commerce and the United States Council. Our foreign-investment committee is at work now to offer specific recommendations to governments and business looking to increased flow of capital across boundaries.

In summary, our foreign economic policy, both short range and long range, should embrace the following:

1. Establishment and maintenance of just and lasting peace as our paramount objective.

2. All-out drive to stop inflation in every part of the free world.

3. Increase of efforts to develop, procure, and allocate raw materials internationally—to be maintained for period of emergency only.

4. Development of non-Soviet world's strength at rapid rate.

5. Administration of all United States aid efforts under a single agency.

6. Enlightened and active United States world economic leadership.

7. Planning by business today beyond emergency period.

8. Fulfillment of business' role with enlightened cooperation by governments in making possible an extensive flow of foreign investment abroad.

These ideas reflect the discussions at the International Chamber of Commerce and the United States Council; they also reflect discussions with government leaders in many parts of the world.

In the past the United States has followed a short-sighted course in our foreign economic relations. We sought and rejoiced in the expansion of our foreign trade. But we were reluctant to accept the fact that it lacked a healthy balance and that it was being sustained by loans and grants that in the end would be too great a burden on foreign debtors, not to mention our own taxpayers.

We claimed repayment of war debts which prejudiced prospects of solvency of private industrial development which we ourselves were encouraging.

It is a challenge to the American business community to learn from our mistakes and to act accordingly.

We would be right in risking much on the faith that economic improvement and development, widely shared and achieved by cooperative efforts, will make it more likely that the free nations will stand together. The ultimate result would be that at some day in the future the Soviets will realize the futility of their efforts in undermining the free nations and suspend their struggle for world domination. We must be ready to work in this direction and to rise above the problems of the day and plan as business statesmen.

The Senator and the General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, merits careful scrutiny and study by every person who is interested in understanding the true issues involved in the current foreign policy debate, which is attracting such wide attention:

THE SENATOR AND THE GENERAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator TAFT is talking about Korea and Formosa in a wey which sounds as if he had not understood General MacArthur.

The Senator seems to think that there are 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa who—if only we permitted it and gave them arms—would march onto the transports, would sail across the Formosa Straits, would land on the mainland, would invade Red China, and take the pressure off our boys fighting in Korea.

To the Senator it is, therefore, tragic and ridiculous not to use this gigantic military asset. Here we are hard pressed in Korea; there in Formosa is a huge army, an army bigger, he thinks, than all the armies on both sides now fighting in Korea. All that this huge army lacks, he thinks, is arms and President Truman's permission to invade China and some United States naval and air assistance involving, the Senator thinks, no American infantry.

But who told Senator TAFT about this army on Formosa, and about how big it is, and about what arms it could use, and what it would take to have it invade China? Not General MacArthur in his many public pro-

nouncements. The general has not said that Chiang and his troops on Formosa are able to decide the struggle in our favor. The general has not said, as Senator TAFT and Representative MARTIN seem to think, that if Chiang's men were helped to fight more, we would have to fight less.

What General MacArthur is arguing for is not less fighting by Americans in the Far East but much more fighting by Americans in the Far East. He wants, as he wrote to Mr. MARTIN, to "follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counterforce." He wants to wage an all-out war against China instead of the localized war he is now waging in Korea. The general does not say—and obviously he does not believe—that this would be the camparatively easy little war, fought largely with Chiang's infantry, which Senator TAFT is dreaming about. The war which the general is advocating is the great war which, he contends, would decide the world-wide conflict. He wants the third world war now and he wants to fight it in the Far East.

But what the Senator wants is not to get us deeper into a bigger war. He wants a way out of the war which is already too big for him—which, as a matter of fact, was already too big for him on the 25th of June. Because he wants less war, especially less war involving the infantry, the Senator has allowed himself to believe that Chiang's army can take over and be a substitute for our ground troops.

There is a great difference—in fact, all the difference in the world—between Senator TAFT's idea that Chiang could "take the pressure off our boys fighting in Korea" and General MacArthur's idea that this is the time and that the Far East is the place to join the issue with the Communist powers and seek a military decision.

Senator TAFT ought to know, though apparently he does not, that Chiang's policy is not to invade China in order to relieve us in Korea. Chiang's policy is to get us into a general war with China in order to make certain that he can stay in Formosa and in the hope that General MacArthur would eventually put him back into power in China.

The argument about Chiang and his army is not at all, as Senator TAFT seems to think, about whether to accept or to refuse the assistance of an important military ally. If Chiang were an important military ally, nobody in his senses would refuse his assistance. But the fact of the matter is that there is serious doubt as to whether Chiang's army could even be relied upon to hold Formosa, and I do not believe that there is a responsible military man in the world who thinks it could invade China.

The argument about Chiang is an argument about whether to enlarge the Korean War into a general war. Those who believe in a general war with China know perfectly well that if Chiang's army were able to invade China it would be only because there was an American Army in front of it.

Coordinated Recreation Program Needed by Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter which I have presented to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, requesting consideration of H. R. 2766, a bill to create a Federal corporation which would provide a nearly self-supporting coordinated recreation program for Federal employees, which I introduced on February 19.

I am also including as a part of my remarks the text of the bill, in the belief that it will be of interest to hundreds of organizations.

The letter follows:

APRIL 9, 1951.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While we gather our energies to meet the threat of foreign aggression which endangers our Nation we must not lose that fight by ill-considered manpower policies at home. I recently introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the main body of an article titled "Don't Send Your Daughter to Washington." This article was based on the evidence and facts gathering dust in the files of Community Chest agencies, Federal Government offices, and elsewhere, and well on the way to being entirely forgotten. Yet if we are to avoid the disastrous mistakes of World War II we must become concerned in the present emergency with the lessons we should have learned but seem too willing to forget or ignore.

The Liberty magazine article by the able writer of the Washington Post, Sam Stavisky, points out:

"It's an ugly fact that the tremendous influx of 'G-girls' into Washington during World War II, together with wartime conditions and tensions there, combined to make Washington the Nation's No. 1 boom town for unwed mothers in 1944.

"The records of the National Office of Vital Statistics give evidence that the Nation's Capital has held on to that unenviable record ever since.

"In 1945, Washington's illegitimate babies numbered 105 out of every 1,000 live births; in 1946, there were 98 out of 1,000; in 1947, there were 94 out of 1,000. In every one of those years, Washington's illegitimacy ratio has been more than double the national average. The Federal statistics don't go beyond 1947, but the local statistics for the first half of 1950, as collected by the District of Columbia Health Department, indicate that the unmarried mother boom is hitting an all-time high.

"Even as the boom expands, approximately 100,000 more 'G-girls' will be herded into Washington—as the mobilization effort intensifies through 1951—to pound the endless rows of typewriters and to cultivate the endless columns of files in ever-burgeoning defense agencies.

"These recruits are trooping into a city short of decent housing and short of adequate recreational facilities. They are crowding into a city in which—according to a 1947 Census Bureau survey of metropolitan Washington—there are five women for every four men 14 to 44 years of age, four women to three men in the 20-to-24-age bracket. The combined shortages—housing, recreational facilities, eligible men—provide a fertile ground for giving another spurt to the boom in unwed mothers.

"The same combination of shortages was discovered in Washington by 'G-girls' of World War II, who flocked to the Nation's Capital to do their part. Poor, sometimes vile housing, insufficient recreational outlets, and desperate competition for the available men broke down the unstable girls, mentally and emotionally. Some got in trouble through unwed pregnancy; some with venereal diseases. (Oh, yes; the Nation's Capital also has a thriving boom in VD.)

"What's in store for Washington—unless corrective measures are taken—can be glimpsed in the report of the Committee on Unmarried Parenthood, District of Columbia Council of Social Agencies, made late in 1944. It read in part:

" 'Individual agencies all reported an increase in the number of unmarried mothers coming to them, particularly the young pregnant girl. One agency which had in 1938 accepted for care 16 unmarried mothers and pregnant girls in 1943 accepted 128. * * * This increase does not allow for those cases which might have been accepted if there had been adequate staff and facilities to meet all requests.

" 'Most agencies have been experiencing an increase in applications among unmarried mothers who are new settlers in the community, many of these being young Government employees who plan to resume work in the District of Columbia after the birth of their babies and prefer not to return to the place of their legal residence.'

"The report pointed out that the local agencies, already overburdened with the requests for help from legally resident unwed mothers, were generally unable to assume responsibility for the newcomers. As a result, some of the unwed mothers had to be thrust, along with their illegitimate offspring, back into the community from which they came—and into social ostracism. Because of the legal red tape, lack of funds by the municipal government, indifference, and apathy of the Federal Government, the nonresident unmarried mother—the report observed—'is frequently cut adrift from all normal human relationships through which she might receive help. * * *'

"The situation hasn't changed much since that report was read. The municipal and local community chest agencies are still understaffed, overworked, and lacking in funds. And Uncle Sam is still pretty much indifferent to the problem.

"Along with illegitimacy, the venereal disease rate also boomed during the war and postwar years in Washington. By 1948, VD was claiming six times as many victims in the District of Columbia as in 1941, with 13,000 cases reported, and 25,000 more cases unreported but suspected by health officials. By 1948, Washington's gonorrhea rate was five and one-half times the national average, with three to four times the number of cases than in cities of comparable population—such as Baltimore, Cleveland, and St. Louis.

"Back in 1941 the local health department reported that 93 percent of the VD infected soldiers at Fort Belvoir, Va., and 43 percent of the infected draftees at Fort Meade, Md., blamed Washington girls for their trouble.

"Two years later—in 1943—Washington was accused by the Army of infecting twice as many soldiers with VD as any other city.

"Now who do you suppose was blamed for this situation? Streetwalkers? Camp followers? Prostitutes? Not at all. Washington police did a commendable job in cleaning up and eliminating the Capital's bawdy houses.

"But the police found themselves helpless in attempting to cope with the 'victory girls,' with the 'cuddle bunnies.'

"Efforts at controlling the amateur boom in illicit sexual relations made little headway. In 1945, the last year of the war, more than 65 percent of GI's infected with VD could blame their disease on 'amateur' carriers. Twenty-four cases of GI gonorrhea were traced to one 'nice' girl, whose promiscuity made her as dangerous to our troops as a full battalion of enemy soldiers on the front line.

"The Washington Federation of Churches investigated the problem during the war and came up with the conclusion that 80 percent of infections among GI's were attributable to the young, 'innocent' type of

girl. The local Criminal Justice Association found that the sharp increase in juvenile delinquency was due to the 'uniform-happy' girls who feel they can't say no to a soldier.

"Several times during the Second World War, congressional committees took a hurried glance into the shameful conditions but did little or nothing about it. Testimony before these committees, however, demonstrated that Uncle Sam was largely to blame.

"Testimony before congressional committees, presented by Dr. Winfred Overholser, Superintendent of famed St. Elizabeths mental hospital, made it clear that Uncle Sam's indiscriminate hiring program during World War II brought hundreds of mentally and emotionally unstable girls into Washington at a time when the economic and social tensions were at their worst.

" 'Too many of the girls brought here were young adolescents not very well adjusted, who found the excitement of wartime Washington conducive to recklessness,' observes Miss Patricia Morse, license officer of the District Public Welfare Department.

"Instead of glamour, the girls discovered Washington was a place where the abnormally high cost of living nullified what looked to them like high salaries. Decent quarters were hard to obtain and even poor quarters were expensive. The files of the Community Chest agencies and municipal welfare units abound with instances of a half dozen or more Government girls being jammed into a single cellar or attic room at $25 or more a month for each girl. * * *

"Of course, it is true that good housing, adequate recreational facilities, and the opportunity to meet single men won't stop girls from getting into trouble. But as Capt Rhoda Milliken, of the Women's Bureau, points out, these three things will help prevent a number of individual tradegies. * * *

"Recently, Ray Everett, of the Social Hygiene Society, issued a strong statement warning the Federal agencies that their recruiting drives were duplicating the ballyhoo and repeating the take-one, take-all mistakes of World War II. 'There were too many needless home-front casualties,' he said."

This is part of the Liberty magazine article which I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now the District of Columbia Armed Services Hospitality Committee, whose seventy-odd members are appointed by the District's Commissioners, has recently, as a result of the facts set forth in this article, set up a subcommittee "to foster recreation activities for women in uniform, young Government employees, and wives of service personnel." But is this enough? Do the District Commissioners fully meet their responsibilities by the appointment of a public committee which has no funds? Will this new committee be able to adequately meet a situation that the Community Chest, the District Public Welfare Department, the churches, and other agencies of Washington's municipal government was unable to meet during World War II, and afterward?

What does the Federal Government propose to do about this problem? Will it continue to evade its responsibilities during this national emergency as it did all through World War II?

I for one am not content to wait for the next thrilling installment, while the Government recruiting drive suffers from the Capital's reputation for evil.

On February 19 I introduced in the Eighty-second Congress H. R. 2766, a bill to create a Federal corporation for an organized recreation program for Federal employees with special attention to metropolitan areas. The same or similar bills were introduced at the same time by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], and in the Senate by Senators LANGER, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, and MORSE.

It took little persuasion to convince me of the merit—nay, the necessity—of such legislation. Not even the busy day of a Member of Congress is impervious to the parade of human tragedies running through the daily newspapers of Washington, and of other large cities with heavy concentrations of Federal employees, such as my own city of New York.

So far as I am concerned, I believe I am fully aware of the valid criticisms of such a program, and in the balance I find the arguments in its favor far, far outweigh those against.

The bill which I have introduced, H. R. 2766, has been referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which you are chairman. In deference to you and to my other friends on the committee I wish to explain that the bill I have introduced is, as far as I am concerned, little more than a legislative draft. It may well be that any bill reported by the committee will be much changed in language.

However, I am convinced that the fundamental idea is sound, and that the time is long overdue for the Congress and the Federal Government to recognize its responsibilities as an employer of young people whom it is recruiting from all over the Nation, and its responsibilities to their families.

The National Industrial Conference Board, a management-research agency, in its study, Employee Recreation Activities—Studies in Personnel Policy No. 102, has made a definitive report on the welfare and recreation policies of some 250 of America's major industries and shown that they invest up to a median annual expenditure per employee of $10, with a median annual total expenditure for recreation per employee (company and employee contributions and payments from other sources) of $14.60. These companies know that such programs pay off in increased loyalty, efficiency, morale, and health terms for their employees. My bill, which is before your committee, is based on the experience of American industry over the past 50 years or more.

The bill is in a very real sense a wartime measure. There is no reason, however, why the program, once established, could not continue on in peacetime after the termination of the national emergency, since Federal employees will contribute half of its funds probably.

I urge you, therefore, to request reports on my bill from the appropriate Federal departments and agencies, and that you grant hearings on it as soon as these reports are in, with leading representatives of industrial recreation programs invited to testify, as well as spokesmen for social welfare, social hygiene, mental health, and other interested agencies.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress, Ninetcenth District, New York.

H. R. 2766

A bill to create a Federal corporation to improve the efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare of Federal employees, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to establish and maintain a recreation program among Federal employees for the improvement of their efficiency, morale, health, and general welfare, and to establish and maintain in the District of Columbia and in other areas of substantial Federal employment, recreation centers primarily for the service and benefit of employees of the Government, there is hereby created as an agency and instrumentality of the United States a body corporate, to be known as the Federal Employees' Recreation Corporation, hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation." In its capacity as sole owner of the Corporation, the United States shall be represented by the President, or the head of such Government agency as may be designated by him, hereinafter referred to as the "supervisory official."

SEC. 2. The Corporation shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of 25 directors who shall be appointed by the supervisory official. Nineteen of these directors shall be selected from the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government, not more than one being selected from any one department or agency. The remaining six directors shall be selected from nominees designated by national labor organizations with which associations of Federal Government employees are affiliated, not more than two being selected from nominees designated by any one labor organization. One director shall be designated by the supervisory official as chairman of the board. The board shall meet at least quarterly. Directors shall serve without pay, but shall receive their actual and necessary travel and other expenses in connection with their attendance at directors' meetings without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949 or the Standardized Government Travel Regulations. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the board, and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The board shall confine itself to over-all policy making, directive, and general supervisory functions. Directors shall serve for a term of 1 year.

SEC. 4. The Corporation shall be administered by and under the direction of a President to be appointed by the board of directors and responsible to such board in the discharge of the duties of his office.

SEC. 5. To the extent necessary to enable it to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this act the Corporation shall have the following powers:

(a) To have succession until dissolved by act of Congress.

(b) To adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(c) To adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) To sue and be sued in its corporate name.

(e) To determine the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws specifically applicable to Government corporations.

(f) To acquire, in any lawful manner, any property—real, personal, mixed—tangible or intangible; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same.

(g) To appoint and prescribe the duties of such officers, attorneys, agents, and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions, to fix and pay such compensation to them for their services as the Corporation may determine, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(h) To enter into contracts and to execute all instruments necessary or appropriate consistent with the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(i) To use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(j) To accept gifts or donations of services, or of property—real, personal, or

mixed—tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes herein authorized.

(k) To take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers herein specifically conferred upon it.

SEC. 6. In fulfillment of its objects, the Corporation is authorized—

(a) to organize and sponsor recreation programs for all employees of the Government, including theatrical and musical productions, drama groups and little-theater activities, choruses, symphony orchestras, bands, ballet, all performing arts, visual arts, lectures, folk arts, and handicrafts, including folk dancing, athletics of all kinds, including outdoor and indoor sports, travel tours, swimming, vacationing, and all other forms of accepted recreational activities;

(b) to arrange for and secure the fullest use of all public land, including Federal park land, for such activities;

(c) to arrange for and secure the participation of all Federal Government employees who are competent as teachers or interested as employees in participating in such activities;

(d) to arrange for and secure the use of any Government buildings suitable for any of such activities;

(e) to lease or build and maintain buildings and other facilities in the District of Columbia and in other areas of substantial Federal employment for use in carrying on such activities, including, as appropriate dining facilities, lodging for transients, lounge facilities, reading rooms, space for social functions and amusements, libraries, and auditoriums;

(f) to organize a National Advisory Committee of outstanding national leaders in such activities. The National Advisory Committee and the individual members thereof shall advise the board of directors in planning, judging, and setting standards of performance, and assist in such other ways as will generally serve to advance the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Corporation shall authorize the establishment of reasonable charges wherever practicable, the proceeds therefrom to be utilized in defraying the general expenses of the Corporation.

SEC. 8. The Corporation shall pay the cost of all services, supplies, utilities, maintenance, and repairs furnished or performed by any Government agency for the benefit of the Corporation, but shall not be required to pay rent on space occupied by it for any purpose in any Government building, public park, or other public land.

SEC. 9. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 10. As used in this act, the terms "Government building" and "public land" mean any building or portion thereof or any land (including improvements thereon) owned or controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, but do not include the Capitol or the Senate or House Office Buildings.

SEC. 11. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by inserting after "Panama Railroad Company" a semicolon and the following: "Federal Employees' Recreation Corporation."

SEC. 12. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective 60 days after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Federal Employees' Recreation Act."

"National Calamity Would Ensue Were We To Reach the Peak of Our Productivity and Find Ourselves Financially a Broken Nation; Because of This Fact We Must Successfully Combat Inflation in Order To Become the Mightiest of All Nations."—Charles E. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body to ascertain and with definite certainty the actual conditions that face this country not alone with respect to our foreign problems but with the problems that confront us right here on our home front.

The existent war situation has now forced new shortages of materials and new controls upon wages, labor, prices, and other segments of our economy, to the end that it becomes difficult to assess day by day what particular business or enterprise will next be adversely affected in this fight to control inflation and keep our arms production booming.

Americans everywhere feel secure in knowing that there is no man with greater capabilities to handle the stupendous job than Mr. Charles E. Wilson, whom the President recently called to Washington to take over the colossal task of running the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, already the Nation has been made immeasurably safer against aggression due to the leadership of Mr. Charles Wilson—and that much has been accomplished with respect to the stabilization program is even now reflected in the suspension of increased tax rates—in credits, savings, prices, wages, and rents.

Mr. Speaker, I intend within a short time to address the House and recite in detail the wonderful accomplishments that have been already thus far effected through the Office of the Defense Mobilization, but I now want to direct the attention of my colleagues to an interview with the Director of Defense Mobilization, as carried in the United States News and World Report.

I can think of no other man in these United States who could have boiled down into so few words every fundamental and economic facet of our economy as well as did our good friend, Charlie Wilson; and it is because of the fact that this interview in the United States News and World Report is so terse, short, factual, and informative that I ask the unanimous consent to spread it, black on white, on the records of this day's proceedings, in order that businessmen everywhere may learn how well the affairs of this Nation are being cared for under the capable leadership of one of America's greatest business executives.

Interview in the United States News and World Report with the Honorable Charles E. Wilson reads as follows:

WE'LL BE MIGHTY WITHIN 3 YEARS—AN INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES E. WILSON, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE: New controls and new shortages have been forced by the war situation now facing United States. What can manufacturers, businessmen, workers, and consumers expect in the months ahead? Who will be affected next as regulation follows regulation in the fight to control inflation and keep arms production booming?

(To answer these questions, United States News and World Report invited to its conference rooms the man who knows most about the defense effort, Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization. The interview follows.)

Question. Do you look upon this program, Mr. Wilson, with any feeling that it will last 1 year, 2 years, 5 years? Are you planning for this emergency period with a definite duration in mind?

Answer. We hope it will be short but intend to achieve great potential military strength over about a 3-year period.

Question. You mean that within that 3-year period the bulk of your organization of the defense effort will have been completed?

Answer. Not only the organizational phase of it, but I believe that over that 3-year period our production of defense material and building of Armed Forces will have brought our country both to a point of real military strength and to an even greater military potential.

Question. Do you believe that the civilian needs and the military needs will tend to complement one another in about 3 years?

Answer. Our belief is that if we can go on with a civilian production of approximately $275,000,000,000 income figure, and superimpose on that a defense-material production of about $50,000,000,000, at the end of calendar 1951, we ought to be able to take care of our military requirements and the training of our vastly increased Army, Navy, and Air Force. We should also have considerable equipment for fighting a considerably greater engagement than we now have in Korea, if an enemy should make it necessary.

In 1952, if we can get approximately $50,000,000,000 worth of defense material produced, we think we would be in a position at the end of that year to fight a pretty substantial war with materials in existence. And, God willing, if there is no all-out war, at the end of the third year it seems to us that we will have a really mighty array of weapons ready, and facilities available to increase military production very rapidly, if necessary.

Question. When do you look for the peak of this current program to be reached?

Answer. In the third year. By that time it is our belief that we would be able to fight an all-out war from the production lines of the country.

Question. Can we assume that your program is based upon stockpiling immediately the things that you would use in war and also on the building up of plant capacity?

Answer. We are building plant capacity. It is not only for weapons. We are increasing plant capacity for those items of raw materials, steel, aluminum, and so on, that are in scarce supply now. About the only reason we have to cut back civilian production is because we just can't afford the full use of those items for civilian production and meet our requirements of defense material at the same time.

But in the third year, as the program of steel expansion and aluminum expansion and other items come through, we ought to

be able actually to expand our output of civilian goods and, at the same time, meet our requirements of defense material.

Question. If international tension eases, do you think it will have an impact on your program?

Answer. It hasn't to date because I don't think it has caused the legislators to refuse needed appropriations to go ahead with the very large programs. Of course, if the world tensions eased tremendously, the problem would be different. It would depend on how much they eased, and how much people believe tension had really eased.

Question. Do you think there will be run-away inflation?

Answer. No. I don't think there will be run-away inflation. I think it is one of the most serious enemies we have, however. It is one that we've got to combat if we're going to become mighty. America must be mighty. It would be a terrible price to pay, however, if when we reached that mighty position we were a broken nation financially.

Question. Do you feel yourself getting hold of inflation?

Answer. After all, remember I've been here 3 months. I think my associates have made some progress and I think there is need for a great deal more progress. We're going to give it everything we have.

Question. In all fields—in finance and direct controls?

Answer. Absolutely. We've been criticized a great deal, you know, for inadequacy of our efforts at price control and wage control, so far. I have no doubt we deserved the criticism. At least we've established some ceilings. The situation leaves room for lots of improvement. We've begun to establish controls of various kinds. All in all, I think there are some signs of progress.

Question. There are lots of complaints that goods aren't flowing as rapidly as they might—but industry hasn't had orders very long, has it?

Answer. That's right. But that will come.

RISING OUTPUT IN 3-YEAR PERIOD

Question. On the matter of armament production, do you visualize a gradual rise over a 3-year period, or hitting a $50,000,000,000 plateau and staying there for 3 years?

Answer. Production of defense goods will go up on a rising scale for the 3-year period. Suppose we place orders at the rate of forty-some-billion dollars this year. Goods won't come off the production line at that rate this year. Next year production will rise much more rapidly, and in the third year it will be coming out at the rate of $50,000,000,000 or more.

Question. And then do you expect weapons production to fall off, or will that rise?

Answer. I don't know what the world condition will be. Our policy depends on the world tensions. It depends on whether we obsolete the things we are making this year, and you know how fast we obsolete, especially big airplanes. In the last war, before we got the last runs of them they were obsolete or we thought they were. So things go in America.

Question. The armament business, then, is going to be a large business for some time to come, isn't it?

Answer. My guess is that it will continue for quite a while.

Question. Are controls here to stay?

Answer. I will say this—one of the real jobs we have this year is to keep our economy in balance. That is, to keep a proper balance between plant expansion for future raw-material production and future weapons production on the one hand, and the output of end items this year on the other. If we were willing to forego all plant expansion, we could increase the end-item production this year. We are striving for proper balance.

CAPACITY: DOUBLE 1940

Question. There has been a tremendous increase in plant capacity in the last 5 years since the war, hasn't there?

Answer. Yes, there has been. It has been variously estimated, but in some categories I believe it is a 100-percent increase over our production capacity of 1940. It has been 50 percent in many categories since the end of World War II.

Question. Has that been accomplished by many companies through a plowing back of their profits?

Answer. Plowing back their profits, greatly expanding their plants and improving their existing facilities.

Question. And a new expansion program is under way now?

Answer. That's right. The one under way now is running into many billions of dollars.

Question. Do you have any estimate about how many billions?

Answer. No. I know what the figure is of Government loans and Government amortization. Somebody contrasted it with the iceberg—only about one-eighth shows and the other seven-eights is under water. That's a good deal like the situation with regard to the expansion of plants by private organizations. They have been spending a great deal of money on expansion, and not many people seem to know about it.

Question. What will happen when we are able to meet the military needs and the civilian needs? Will we get a terrific depression at that time?

Answer. Well, we certainly won't get the kind of depression or set-back we would have gotten had we tried to meet this defense-material production problem by going straight up in, let's say, 2 years. You would have had terrific dislocation. I hate to think what would have happened to us.

Question. Have you a fixed understanding as to the size of the military budget for the next 3 years?

Answer. We have an understanding with the military that if we can go through with approximately $50,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years for defense materials——

Question. That $50,000,000,000 is on material alone, not on services?

Answer. That's on the soft and hard goods for the military. If we do that, we will meet their requirements. We have fully approved the military program.

Question. How is industry adjusting itself to this situation as you see the picture?

Answer. I think it is adjusting itself very well. The Defense Department has actually contracted with industry in the last 2 months over $10,000,000,000 and industry has absorbed it very well.

Question. Do you think many industries will be able to do what you said in your speech the automobile industry was going to do, that is, put out a 1948-size production and still fill your defense orders in 1951?

Answer. Raw material is the only limiting factor that I know of now.

Question. Because the capacity exists, apparently, to do the military job and still give us what we got in 1948—only 3 years ago?

Answer. The capacity is unlimited. That's what we really have—capacity unlimited.

Question. Seems to be a terrific country——

Answer. It's wonderful—and I believe the country can absorb the impact of defense cost.

Question. What about raw materials?

Answer. Of course, that is one of our difficulties at the moment. In steel and aluminum we are hoping to meet the shortages with a greatly expanded program already agreed to. But we have other problems. Copper offers some problems in getting enough, but I think we can do it.

SOLVING LABOR SHORTAGE

Question. Are you going to have enough workers for these great productive machines? Isn't there going to be a shortage of manpower?

Answer. There may be. We haven't the unemployed that we had at the beginnnig of the last war to draw on. I don't think we will need as many workers for defense work as we needed before.

Question. You will have a drain from the military, too, on workers, won't you?

Answer. Yes; but women will take defense jobs, and, of course, there are a million new workers becoming of working age every year. We are working only 40 hours a week now, and we can work overtime. After all, a 44-hour week would give us 10 percent more hours. Ten percent more production would be quite a little on a $300,000,000,000 annual output. It would be $30,000,000,000 of the fifty billion of defense goods right there alone.

Question. Are we going to get any unemployment in this interim?

Answer. It hasn't shown up. I think that shows what a good job Bill Harrison and his group in the National Production Authority have done. While there have been curtailments in use of material, yet defense-material production to beginning to pick up any slack that may come about as nondefense production may decline. I think there will be more dislocations. I am quite sure there will be, especially as we cut back the automotive industry, as one illustration. I think we are bound to get dislocations of labor and of other groups, which are unpleasant to contemplate.

Question. Will it last long?

Answer. No; I don't believe it will. Many of the new jobs are opening up. For example, the automotive industry is pretty fast at lining up the new productive facilities and they'll swing the workers over pretty quickly. I don't think we are facing very serious dislocations of labor there.

Question. Are civilians going to face very much cut-back on what they can have?

Answer. We have cut back raw materials to automobile and refrigerator manufacturers, as one instance. I think by the third quarter there may be a 20-percent reduction in certain consumer goods. But that's from a very, very high level.

Question. Are you contemplating, when you begin these cuts, any such thing as rationing?

Answer. We may have to come to it in some places and under certain conditions. But so far our plans don't contemplate rationing.

RATIONING MAY NOT BE NECESSARY

Question. Then you're depending upon our privately operated distribution system to do its own allocating of what's left after the Government takes its share?

Answer. That's right. And I think the reason that that is sound is that, if we can keep the civilian economy at something like $275,000,000,000, rationing may not be necessary.

Question. But some form of controlled materials plan may be necessary?

Answer. We will undoubtedly have a controlled materials plan in operation by the middle of the year.

Question. To what will that apply?

Answer. We know now that it will have to apply to steel, aluminum, and copper. Those are the principal commodities. There are many other shortages, however—cobalt, nickel, other metals. But it's a strange thing how industry works out. It finds a way to eliminate the need for some of those scarce materials. Take the electronics industry. They have very adroitly, I think, minimized the use of scarce materials—cobalt, for example.

Question. Could you give us some estimate of when the supply of consumer durables is likely to loosen up again?

Answer. Well, it is pretty loose now. It's going to get a little tighter.

Question. It is getting tighter now, but when is it going to start the other way?

Answer. Oh, it will be well over a year—I would say at least 18 months from now.

Question. Sometime during the latter part of 1952?

Answer. Yes, somewhere in there.

Question. Would we begin to get more new cars?

Answer. Yes; we may be down considerably by that time from our current high production rate—perhaps 30 or 40 percent down.

Question. But even that's not a very low rate for producing automobiles, is it?

Answer. No; if you stop to think, it's more than we produced in 1948—or about what we produced in 1948—and that wasn't too bad. We got along. When you see the roads and the parking lots jammed with shiny new cars—I think maybe we can stand a slowing down.

NEED FOR MANPOWER COMMITTEE

Question. What is there to the reports that come bobbing up every now and then about some plan or idea of conscripting labor—what is there to that?

Answer. I don't know what there is to it. All I would say is that there is absolutely no substance to it. I know of no one—and I mean no one—in the Office of Defense Mobilization who has ever for a moment considered the necessity of conscription of labor in this situation.

Question. You've never thought of the situation in manpower being that tight?

Answer. That's right. How silly it would be with defense production only about 20 percent of our total requirements to think of conscription of labor.

Question. Will you have some drain, however, through the draft on key executives and key people, skilled workers?

Answer. We will have, I'm sure.

Question. How are you going to deal with that problem?

Answer. It's one of the reasons that we have a manpower committee that will have to deal with those problems. We have established a committee with representatives of the Departments of Defense and Commerce and Agriculture and Labor and headed by a man from our own office, Arthur Flemming.

Question. Do you think you will need manpower controls—such as those we had during World War II?

Answer. If we have an all-out war.

Question. But in this 3-year period?

Answer. I am hoping we will not need compulsory manpower controls.

NEUTRAL BODY FOR LABOR CONTROL

Question. Do you visualize the selection and allocation of manpower as a job that has to be done by so-called neutrals who are not identified with the various contending groups?

Answer. I don't think you can use for that purpose any agency that is at the same time a claimant for manpower. It can't be a claimant and a judge. The Labor Department, for instance, is a claimant. It operates the United States Employment Service as one of its many jobs.

Question. Isn't that true of Agriculture, which will want to keep men on the farms?

Answer. That's right, and that's why we've got to come to a neutral body. At least, that's my belief.

Question. The Labor Department would, however, continue its present operations?

Answer. There would be no change in its operations at all. This is only policy making and the laying down of fundamental principles. That's all—no changes in administrative responsibilities.

Question. No directives—nothing to get excited about?

Answer. I think not. The Manpower Policy Committee is a policy-making group. I don't anticipate any difficulty in getting unanimous decisions from its members. Incidentally, they would also deal with the problem of colleges—whether boys with 3 years behind them, say, should be taken out immediately—all that sort of thing.

Question. Would the Labor Department still be in charge of getting manpower for industrial plants?

Answer. Absolutely—no function they now have would be taken away at all. None whatever.

Question. Isn't that the phase that the unions are worried about?

Answer. I said that in my interview in Florida and I've been criticized for saying it. They say that isn't what's bothering them at all. We had had meetings with labor officials and I listened to a great many speeches on that subject. I thought from what they said that it was worrying them.

Question. What is worrying them?

Answer. There are a lot of things worrying them, of course. The decisions we made on wage ceilings, as an example.

Question. They were generous, weren't they?

Answer. That's a matter of opinion, I'm afraid.

Question. What were the other things?

Answer. Well, they think that the price control hasn't been as effective as it should be. And I guess we have to admit that—it's far from perfect. But I don't know whether you could expect to get it working perfectly in such a short time. I think it will take a little longer, and we will need understanding and cooperation.

WAGE LEVELS VERSUS LIVING COSTS

Question. It's a question of which comes first—the chicken or the egg, isn't it?

Answer. That's right. This business of stemming inflation, I am beginning to find out, has many, many facets to it. Here we are sitting as a Nation now with greatly increased wage levels. Then we have numerous labor contracts, the cost of living, the improvement factor, the incentive factor—really what is being asked over all, is the sixth wage-increase round—at the moment when all are being asked to make sacrifices. I don't think there is any question about it. Now that inevitably would make the cost of living go up.

Question. A vicious circle?

Answer. Yes—because wage increases affect parity prices and drive up the cost of food. Therefore, the cost of living goes up again, and then the cost-of-living allowance in wages goes up again, so "round and round she goes and where she stops, nobody knows."

Question. Aren't you really describing the difficulties democracy has with a planned economy?

Answer. Of course.

Question. In your set-up, are you trying to work out your problems with different economic groups? For example, are you looking at this picture as necessitating cooperation with agriculture, with transportation, with business, and with labor?

Answer. That's right.

Question. And do you see these various economic groups as cooperating in your future program?

Answer. I'm certainly hoping they will. And as a matter of fact, I'm going one step further with it. In addition to having the advisory committee of labor, I'm hoping shortly to establish an agricultural group to advise on the problems of defense mobilization. And, of course, a similar group of businessmen, to go the next step. As great questions arise—maybe controversial questions—where what is done for one group has considerable impact on the other groups, I hope to bring them all together and consider the problem over all.

Question. Some sort of over-all advisory group?

Answer. That's right. I just don't believe that you can settle separately some of these questions with respect to inflation and wage control. You can't settle the wage-control problem unless at the same time you look at the impact of that settlement on, say, parity prices in agriculture.

HOW BUSINESSMEN COOPERATE

Question. Where are you going to get the personnel for those advisory commissions, and so on? Are they to be people who are going to detach themselves from their businesses and their vocations?

Answer. No. The advisory groups will remain in their own businesses, but give us such counsel as we need.

Question. But in the top-level group such as your own will you have people devoting their time wholly to Government?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. That's in the Government service?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Do you think people in that category should divorce themselves from their businesses while on the job for the Government?

Answer. I think so; certainly while actually on the job.

Question. You've done that yourself?

Answer. I have. I quit industry completely this time, as I did in 1942.

Question. Are you going back this time?

Answer. I think not.

Question. Devote yourself to public service, perhaps?

Answer. I don't know. I don't know whether I should live so long as to even think about it, the way things are going.

Question. Haven't you been under a good deal of a strain?

Answer. Slightly.

Question. Did you have a nice time in Key West?

Answer. Yes, I had a nice day in Key West with the President. I spent about 3 hours down there. It was the first time I had been down there in years. When I went down there before it was for fishing. This time I wasn't fishing for anything. But I spent a good deal of time with the President going over the program.

Question. Did you get the green light?

Answer. Oh, yes. Especially on this debt-control business that I have been working on.

Question. What do you mean by debt control?

Answer. Interest rate, credit control.

Question. What do you see in the way of any revision, or perhaps suspension, of our current laws during this period of emergency? Do you see any need for suspending or revising the antitrust laws or Taft-Hartley law?

Answer. No, I don't. I know of no good reason to do it.

Question. Do you think we need a no-strike pledge from labor now? Are we having any trouble with strikes?

Answer. We have had some serious trouble in the woolen industry. It's a very, very serious thing. We have been unable to get the woolens that we need for the uniforms.

Question. Would a no-strike pledge help that kind of situation?

Answer. Yes, I think a no-strike pledge—if you could get it—would help.

Question. Is there any talk about asking for a no-strike pledge in connection with a labor disputes board?

Answer. If we have a disputes board that will probably be one of the considerations. But we haven't decided on a disputes board.

Question. We've seen in the papers a good deal about the complaints made by labor. Have you received any complaints from other groups? For instance, has business felt that sometimes you weren't doing what they wanted done, too?

Answer. Oh, yes. To some degree on amortization of new plants.

Question. Distribution of materials?

Answer. Yes—cutting them back—but mainly on the amortization program. I just don't happen to believe in complete amortization of plants at taxpayers' expense.

Question. So you've had some differences with industry on that?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. They haven't, however, made vocal their complaints, perhaps, have they?

Answer. No, they haven't been as vitriolic about it and they haven't gone on the radio about it every night as some groups are doing.

DEFENSE ROLE OF INDUSTRY LEADERS

Question. What is your thought as to the comment which has been made that big business is really in control of the defense program?

Answer. Of course that has been aired. I haven't seen any sign of it. I'm the fellow who has been shot at principally on it. I might say that I feel that my associates need no defense because I've never seen any sign of prejudice on their part. You know, I've been perfectly amazed at the way men from big business, medium business, any kind of business, come into the organization. They just become Government employees without any regard for their former status. And, as far as hours of work is concerned, usually I leave the office at 7:30 or 8 o'clock, and when I go down the halls there are those men at their desks—and their secretaries. That's one of the eye-openers to me—everybody working until all hours. It amazes me that men will come in from their normal vocations and undertake conscientiously work of this kind and then find themselves damned for being big business. Patriotism cuts across all economic lines. I believe that.

Question. Do you think that, when these men take positions as representatives of the Government of the United States, they feel a sense of responsibility to the Government rather than to any other interest?

Answer. I do. The only reason that most of them are down here is that when the President said we were in a very, very severe crisis, they believed him. They're willing to sacrifice themselves and their jobs. They entirely forget their own interests. I've never seen any sign of class partisanship among my associates at all.

TRUST BUSTER TO BUREAUCRAT

Question. In choosing your lieutenants, you haven't selected them entirely from "big-business," have you? Isn't your general counsel, Herbert Bergson, the former trust buster of the Department of Justice?

Answer. That's right. The very fellow who has just prosecuted me in any number of cases.

Question. And you made him your general counsel?

Answer. Sure, because I knew he was able to forget the past and just become a Government employee as I was. I quit the General Electric Co. and became a bureaucrat, and I had no doubt that he would be able to do the same thing—meanwhile, he had gone into private law practice. He has been a wonderful adjunct to our office.

Question. If you should succeed with this program of getting this enormous output in 3 years, and if you do it by voluntary means, will it not be a rather exceptional feat? Is not this the first time such a program has been attempted in this country in what you might call a near-war period?

Answer. Yes. It will be a huge production. I believe that voluntary means is the only way we can achieve it.

Question. We have heard much talk about whether you can justify 120,000,000 tons of steel or near that in anything but a war period. What's going to happen afterward?

Answer. That's a question that doesn't bother me one bit. If you believe that this is a mature economy and that we are going to have 18,000,000 more tons of steel to use in a static civilian economy, you've got something to worry about. But I don't believe it's a mature economy. I think we're still in the pioneering stage in the United States. I think that 10 years from now, if we have peace—and God knows I hope we have it—you will be talking about more production, not less, for the civilian economy.

Question. What do you think of Jesse Jones' idea that you take over the RFC, too?

Answer. I think Jesse is kidding me.

Second Annual Big Ten Conference of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening I had the pleasure of talking to an enthusiastic group of young Republicans at Madison, Wis. These young people gathered there from the universities of the Middle West which comprise the Big Ten conference. On Friday afternoon they listened to a fine keynote address by His Excellency, Walter Kohler, Jr., Governor of Wisconsin. The remainder of the 3-day conference time was spent in committee work and plenary conference sessions.

The meeting at Madison was the second annual Big Ten Conference of Young Republicans. The first was held at Ann Arbor, Mich., in 1950 with the University of Michigan Young Republicans as hosts, just as the University of Wisconsin Young Republicans were hosts at Madison. At their first conference, the delegates were privileged to hear Gov. Harold Stassen and our able and hard-working colleague from Michigan, JERRY FORD.

I was glad to join the distinguished company of Walter Kohler, Harold Stassen, and Jerry Ford by talking to the fine group of young men and women who attended the conference at Madison.

As a part of the record of this successful conference, I include here the text of my remarks:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GLENN R. DAVIS, OF WISCONSIN'S SECOND DISTRICT, AT LORAINE HOTEL BANQUET OF THE SECOND ANNUAL BIG TEN CONFERENCE OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS, FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1951

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow young Republicans, all of you have been welcomed here both officially and unofficially so that it is not necessary for me to welcome you to the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. His Excellency Governor Kohler, our State chairman, Wayne Hood, and your conference chairman, Roland Veith, have put that welcome in words, and I'm sure that the young Republicans here at the University of Wisconsin have put that welcome in many actions during the course of the day. On the other hand, it is indeed a welcome sight and a source of real inspiration and encouragement to look upon this fine gathering of middle western young Republicans. All of us here speak the same kind of Republican language and I'm sure that we shall have no difficulty in understanding each other here tonight, and that all of you will be able to understand each other in the course of your discussions here at this conference.

I mention the importance of our understanding in the light of the experience of a foreign-born plumber here in Madison who had some difficulty with the English language, who used hydrochloric acid to clean a clogged drain. The success was so immediate that he wrote to the Bureau of Standards in Washington to explain his success. In due time he received a letter from an official in the Bureau of Standards which read as follows: "The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable but the corrosive residue is incompatible with metallic permanence." The plumber wrote back that he was glad the Bureau of Standards agreed with him.

Sometime later the plumber received a subsequent letter from the Bureau of Standards which said: "We cannot assume responsibility for the production of toxic and noxious residue with hydrochloric acid and suggest you use an alternate procedure." The plumber again wrote he was happy that the Bureau agreed. Finally someone in the Bureau caught on to the fact that the plumber didn't understand the fancy and technical language and so he wrote: "Don't use hydrochloric acid. It eats hell out of the pipes."

It does help to understand each other. In your discussions here in your committees in this conference I hope that you will be able to reach real Republican understanding.

It was here in the Middle West that the Republican Party was born and cradled. Its birth at Ripon, Wis., was followed by its baptism at Jackson, Mich. Illinois claims the man whose leadership brought our party to national strength and ascendancy. It was Indiana which raised that man to manhood before he moved to Illinois. Even today, the Middle West is our party's greatest source of strength. The heartland of our Nation is also the heartland of our party.

I feel very much at home here in this company tonight, not only because this happens to be in the district which it is my honor to represent in Congress, but also because I can talk to you as a middle western young Republican to middle western young Republicans. We young Republicans, the youthful leaders of our party, are here without boasting, but in a sincere determination to recognize and face up to the importance of our position. It is clear to us that our Nation needs a strong Republican Party and that the Republican Party needs us young Republicans.

I'm happy to point out that here in Wisconsin youth has a dominant position in the councils of our party. In the Badger State we have a lieutenant governor, two members of the House of Representatives, and the State chairman of our party who are under 40; and we have a governor, a United States Senator, and two other members in the House of Representatives who are in their forties. This youthful Republican vigor cannot be discounted in explaining that we have all Republican State officers, two Republican United States Senators, 9 out of 10 Republican United States Representatives, and three-fourths of the membership of our State legislature who are Republicans. We Wisconsin young Republicans intend to keep it that way. The people of Wisconsin, as in most of the States of the Middle West, know that the letters GOP stand for economy, efficiency, and honesty in government.

In your organization and discussion programs of today, tomorrow, and Sunday I trust that you will lay the foundation for new future hopes and aspirations. It has ever been the habit of youth to look forward

instead of backward, to the future instead of to the past. As young men and women of high ideals of citizenship, we need to recognize that our ideals can be realized only through the practical application of our rights and privileges of citizens—in other words, through practical politics. We need to realize that every good citizen is a politician, for politics, while not an exact science, is nevertheless the science of government. In this republican form of government every citizen ought to be a student of that science. Let us recognize frankly that politics is to be the aim and the objective and the practice of young Republicans. Our job is to sell practical politics to other young people as a part of their responsibility of citizenship and to interest youth in working within the framework of the Republican Party. To be successful in this, we must offer not only a year-round program of activity, we must be able to demonstrate that the hopes and ideals of young people are best expressed in the principles and programs of our party. While thus serving as a rallying point for youth, we can well serve our party, for we must not overlook the fact that we, as individual young Republicans, are also members of the Republican Party.

We have a dual membership in our party just as we have a dual citizenship in our State and Nation. It has never been intended that young Republicans shall serve as apprentices before active participation in party and governmental affairs. It has never been intended that young Republican meetings shall be polite debating societies for the discussion of academic or moot questions. Young people seek action, and I suggest that young Republicans are admirably fitted for the following fourfold task:

First, we can have a lasting effect on our party and its program by taking leadership in a year-round program of political education and discussion. Youth can best sustain necessary party activity in the period after one election is over and before another election is hard upon us again. A youthful group of Republican workers with the initiative and the public-spiritedness to make theirs a year-round program will soon find that they are the leaders of their party and that their party has become the leading party in their community. By knowing more, by doing more, we can give meaning to our viewpoints. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and by year-round discussion programs in our local communities we can achieve the knowledge and know-how to be effective in politics and effective in Government.

Second, we must make ourselves heard in party councils. Success as young Republicans will not be measured alone by the size of membership rolls or the existence of live, working organizations. It must be measured also by the number of young Republicans who are members of county Republican committees, are precinct committeemen or committeewomen, and are in attendance and take active parts in county, district or State Republican conventions. Again I repeat—we are an integral part of the Republican organization. Our identity as young Republicans is significant as a meeting ground and as a training school for our work in the senior councils of the party.

Third, we young Republicans must be active in Government. It is not enough that we shall demonstrate our effectiveness as practical political workers in behalf of Republican candidates, we must furnish some of the candidates of the Republican Party at local, State, and National levels. All of us canont be officeholders, but many of us who could be competent Republican servants of our Government have never offered ourselves for public service.

Political campaigning and political office holding is hard lot, discouraging at times and often unappreciated, but they are functions that young people are admirably fitted by youth, energy, and spirit to perform. I know from experience, from having worked with them, that some of the outstanding present and future leaders of the House of Representatives are to be found in the ranks of the young Republicans. The names of JERRY FORD and CHARLIE POTTER, of Michigan; BILL AYRES, of Ohio; BILL SPRINGER and TIM SHEEHAN, of Illinois; ROSS ADAIR, SHEP CRUMPACKER and CHUCK BROWNSON, of Indiana; and JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin; are certainly to be found in the category of young Republican leaders of the House.

To them politics, public service, is a career. Robert Louis Stevenson once said that politics is perhaps the only profession for which no preparation is thought necessary. Robert Louis Stevenson, of course, was strictly a writer of fiction. It may be true that few people think preparation is necessary, but that too is fiction.

At the National Republican Convention at Philadelphia in 1948, former President Hoover told the delegates: "If you follow the counsel of those who believe that politics is only a game to be played for personal advantage, you are wasting your time and effort."

Young Republicans must stand ready for active responsible stewardship in Government.

Fourthly and finally, young Republicans—and youth has always furnished the idealism of all generations—must instill within our party a fundamental honesty in political principle and political practice. We must be the conscience of our party as well as the guardian of its principles. Some of our older brethren, who have watched our opponents win elections through misrepresentation and vilification, may well express wonder as to whether a conscience pays off in practical politics. As young Republicans we must prove to them and to the American people that honesty and forthrightness are as important in politics as in any field of endeavor and that there is still enough respect for those virtues in this America to eventually bring down scorn and repudiation upon the heads of those who believe and practice otherwise. Sooner or later the time will come when the American people will repudiate those who seek to maintain or obtain the control of Government on the basis of misrepresentation, half-truths, vilification, trick phrases, favoritism, and influence. We must be sure that we stand clean and ready when that time arrives.

Surely the moral fiber of the American people is much higher than the morality of the present national administration would indicate. Given the leadership of young men and women with clean hands and clear hearts, the American people will repudiate those who have at least tolerated, if not encouraged, reprehensible standards of loyalty and trust. Grover Cleveland, who certainly would not recognize his current Democratic successors, often repeated the statement: "A public office is a public trust," and he governed himself and his administration accordingly. Under the Truman administration code, basic integrity has been replaced by technical legality. People in high appointed places of influence no longer ask "Is it right?" Rather they ask, "Can I get by without being prosecuted?" This attitude has been evident in Washington for too long a time. In recent weeks, it has become evident to the American people everywhere.

For instance, the American people now know the name of the White House stenographer who received a $9,500 natural pastel mink—"one of the better coats"—from a friend of her influential husband.

The American people now know the name of that husband of the White House stenographer who, until his wife became secretary to Senator Harry S. Truman, was a clerk in a chain store, a dairy worker, a restaurant worker, a garage man. Then when his wife came to Washington he did, too, and before World War II worked in a bureau at not more than $1,800 a year. Following the war (in the meantime his wife had moved to the White House with her boss) he rose rapidly in the RFC to $7,500 a year. He became the man to see when White House influence was wanted. He became an insurance counselor, he had acquired parts of oil wells, a brewery, and other business enterprises. He bought a $52,000 home in Washington. His income rose to $60,000 annually. There is where the Fulbright committee found him and burst his balloon, but his wife continues to work as a White House secretary. It might be mentioned that she quit wearing the mink coat before spring came to Washington.

The American people now know that before the site for the H-bomb plant in South Carolina was publicly announced friends of people in high places quietly bought up thousands of acres of land in the immediate vicinity.

The American people now know that Mississippi Senators and Members of the House publicly complained that Federal jobs were sold in their State by Mississippi Democrats friendly to the administration. The payment was in cash, never by check.

The American people now know that Gen. Harry Vaughan, exposed as the friend of the fixer and perjurer John Maragon, and as the employer of an Australian lady friend brought to this country under special legislation, continues as military adviser to the President.

The American people know of these and many more like them. President Truman knows about them, too, but faced with this kind of a record of imposition on himself and on the American people, did the President ask any sort of an explanation from his "friends"? He did not. Did he dismiss any of them? He did not. When confronted by a reporter who asked what he proposed to do about these scandals the President's reply was, "My people are all honorable—all of them are. * * * My house is always clean."

The editor of the widely read U. S. News and World Report summarizes the President's attitude this way: "Mr. Truman is to ignore the storm over influence business in Washington. The President won't fire anybody, won't believe that anything is wrong. RFC, if abolished by Congress, will be saved by Presidential veto. Influence business, very big business, will continue to thrive. It is not viewed with disfavor by the White House. It greases political wheels."

We all admire loyalty to friends. It's a fine gesture to refrain from turning your back on a friend. That is one thing—it is quite another for the President to turn his back on the rest of the American people.

This obvious cloak of immorality which enshrouds this administration is there for all to see. For about a score of years now there has been another cloak less visible, yet less revealing, just as immoral, just as conscienceless. This lack of conscience will be paid for by our children and grandchildren, and other generations to come. It is the immoral and destructive habit of repeated deficits in our Federal finance.

If any man shall keep his family in luxury while he is alive, meantime saddling himself and that family with debts that can mean only hardship or bankruptcy in the future—would anyone here say that that was not immoral? What then shall we say about the leaders of the Democratic administration which has conducted the financial affairs of our country in such a manner?

In our House Appropriations Committee now we are wrestling with the President's budget requests totaling more than $94,000,000,000—$71,000,000,000 to be spent in the

coming fiscal year. The balance to be authorizations for spending in the years to come.

That amount can be and must be reduced. Budget cutting always is difficult and always painful but that does not detract from its necessity. The people are looking to the Republicans in Congress, with help from moderate Democrats, to cut the fat from this spending program. Federal programs which might be classed as justifiable conveniences in normal times, become unjustifiable luxuries in times like these.

Early this year, in his message to Congress, the President stressed the necessity for defense and soft-pedaled his habitually expensive so-called welfare program. But his voice was evidently softened simply to lessen the vigilance of the American people. For neatly tucked away in convenient corners of the budget tent, near flaps through which two familiar characters with long ears and humped backs named "Charles" and "Oscar" could get their noses—near those flaps were additional appropriations for the unauthorized and repudiated Brannan strait-Jacket, give-away farm plan, and the Ewing compulsory free-doctor-nurse-and-pill plan. There were other such programs which the President included in his budget in the guise of defense necessity. They spell out the measure of the insincerity—yes the cynicism, the fiscal irresponsibility of this administration. In the daylight of peace, in a darkness of war, in the twilight of emergency, the practices of political patronage are never set aside; the lust for power is ever present; their habits of spending have not been reformed. It is inescapable that these habits and these practices would not only continue the depletion of the Treasury, but that they move in the direction of debauching—destroying the moral fiber—of the electorate. By this method, through Government hand-outs, grants, subsidies, and aid programs, has the traditional republican form of government, the government of Jefferson and of Lincoln, been weakened and transformed. The normal relationship of the levels of government has been reversed. Their proper relationship, it seems to me, can be illustrated by a triangle, the broad base which represents our local units of government, the government units which are closest to the people, most responsible to the people, and can in most cases most effectively deal with their problems. As the triangle narrows from the broad base we reach the legitimate area af the operation of the State government. This area of problems includes those which cannot be adequately handled at the local levels. Then as we approach the apex we reach the legitimate area of the operation of the Federal Government in dealing with our domestic problems.

In the last score of years, the Democrats have, however, completely reversed this traditional relationship. Under the current practices, the broad base of the triangle now represents the enveloping field of activities of the Federal Government.

The triangle then narrows into the area of the State government with a closely confined area of local responsibility in the region adjacent to the apex. Our tax moneys are being poured in at the top of this inverted triangle, the largest portion taken by the Federal Government, and then what is left trickles down into the area of the State and local governments. Thus have the legitimate areas of taxation of the State and local governments been usurped. Thus has the Federal Government made it impossible for these units of Government to meet the responsibilities which are rightfully theirs. I think we can attribute no small portion of the lack of civic responsibility and civic morale to the fact that State and local governments have been placed in a completely dependent and subservient position with relation to the Government in Washington.

By way of summation let me restate what I consider to be the four particular functions of Young Republicans and young Republican organizations. First, a sponsorship and participation in a year-round program of political education and discussion. Second, effective participation in the councils of the Republican Party. Third, active participation in and responsible stewardship in government. Fourth and finally, the championship and guardianship of the conscience, the forthrightness, the sound traditional principles of our party and our government.

I hope, fellow young Republicans, that you will leave this conference with the inspiration and the determination to do all that which needs to be done between now and November of 1952. Other young people must be brought into the Republican fold. The leadership for which the American people are crying must be developed, a leadership which is worthy of the confidence of the American people, a leadership which will stand for fiscal responsibility, for honesty, for decency, for respect for the republican form of government.

Our cause is not only the cause of young Republicanism. We are to be but the instrument for righteousness, and the beneficiaries of a change in government only insofar as those benefits are to be distributed to all the people of America. We Republicans must fight for and accept the responsibilities of the leadership of the Nation in 1952. Much of the work that must be done, much of the leadership that must be furnished, must come from Young Republicans like ourselves. A Republican victory in 1952 will be a victory for decency, a victory for all America, a victory for freemen everywhere.

I hope that in your work here tomorrow and Sunday and in your work between now and November of 1952, your realization of the importance of your task as young Republicans will gladden your heart and give speed and lightness to your hands.

Congress Should Keep Faith With Heroes Who Have Given Their Lives and Fought Valiantly for Their Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in every war America has called on our citizens without regard to race. In Korea today history is being written and the heroic deeds of men of many races are daily brought to our attention. Congress should keep faith with these heroes. It can do it by refusing to write into the universal service and military training bill now under consideration requirements for segregation.

The articles which I include herewith appeared in the Nation's newspapers recently. I could fill the RECORD with hundreds such stories.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of March 3, 1951]

PFC JONES WREAKS HAVOC IN KOREA—ANOTHER HERO FOR MEMPHIS

ON THE HAN RIVER, KOREA.—Pfc Aaron Jones, 21-year-old native of Memphis, is in line for the Silver Star Medal, third-ranking United States combat decoration, for his heroic action sparking an attack upon some 200 Chinese Red troops here recently.

The outstanding feature of Jones' action was the fact that he is a Browning automatic rifleman, but used unfamiliar weapons, such as hand grenades, a captured rifle, and an abandoned machine gun to wreak havoc upon the enemy.

GUN JAMMED

The only Negro in his nine-man squad, Jones and his comrades were part of a force assigned to take a hill on which the Chinese Red troops were dug in. Just as the signal for the charge came his gun jammed.

Not wanting to be left out of the excitement, he grabbed up some hand grenades and closed in with the rest of the outfit. Halfway up the slope, the hand grenades came in handy. A burp gun, firing from above, pinned down the American attackers.

Jones, with complete disregard for his life, jumped to his feet and hurled a grenade up the hill. There was an explosion, then silence, and the attack again rolled forward.

GRABBED NEW WEAPON

Reaching the top, the American troops locked in hand-to-hand struggle with the enemy, Jones grabbed up a rifle, a Japanese single-shot rifle, with no bullets, and scurried around quickly to pick up some ammunition. When he had gotten some he downed two of the enemy as they were running.

The following day, in another hill attack, he spotted a Red force advancing up the other side of the slope. The regular machine gunners were eating at the time, so he took over one of the spray guns and downed 11 of the advancing enemy on the first burst.

EX-BOY SCOUT

Pfc Jones' parents are Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Jones, of 959 Porter Street. He attended Booker T. Washington High School and was a member of Boy Scout Troop 166, sponsored by the LeMoyne Gardens Tenant Association. He has several brothers and sisters.

A few weeks ago another Memphis soldier, Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn, was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for exceptional gallantry in action in Korea, giving his life to save his comrades.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1951]

DSC AWARDED NEGRO PRIVATE WHO GAVE LIFE TO SAVE OUTFIT

TOKYO, January 25.—A Tennessee private has been awarded posthumously the Distinguished Service Cross for giving his life so his platoon could evade a Communist flanking action near Nuri in Korea.

The citation praised Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn, Jr., of Memphis for extraordinary heroism in action.

The colored private single-handedly wiped out Red machine-gun crews threatening his unit.

In awarding him the Nation's second highest military award, Far East command headquarters said that on August 15 Cleaborn's unit, Company A, Thirty-fourth Infantry Regiment, "attacked a ridge where the enemy was occupying positions with excellent observation and fields of fire.

"Some of the enemy had infiltrated and flanking action had occurred and his platoon was pinned down almost immediately by machine-gun fire from the rear.

"Despite the extreme hazard of interlacing machine-gun fire Cleaborn gained the ridge and killed the machine-gun crews to the front. From the continuous firing of his weapon Cleaborn's hands were severely burned.

"Disregarding his burned hands, when his platoon began a withdrawal he remained on

the ridge to cover withdrawal of his comrades and to permit evacuation of the wounded. He continued firing from this position, thus denying the enemy access to adjacent high ground.

"While furnishing protective fire, Private Cleaborn was mortally wounded. His heroic self-sacrifice permitted the withdrawal of his platoon to new positions."

HERO COULDN'T FIND JOB, SO HE JOINED THE ARMY

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 25.—Pvt. Edward O. Cleaborn joined the Army because he couldn't find a job.

The heroic youngster was one of nine children of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Cleaborn, Sr. He was a native of Merigold, Miss.

In his last letter home, Private Cleaborn told his mother he had been "in a tight spot but came out all right, thank the Lord."

Maj. William R. Oliver, Organized Reserve Corps instructor here, said the award will be presented either by Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, commander of the Third Army in Atlanta, or by a general on his staff.

Major Oliver said Cleaborn's mother said she preferred to have the ceremony held in a church. They live in a slum section.

[From the Washington Post of March 31, 1951]

SOLDIER'S IS POSTHUMOUS—NAVY FLIER, INDIAN CORPORAL AWARDED MEDALS OF HONOR

(By John G. Norris)

Two stories of extraordinary heroism involving a white Navy pilot from Massachusetts, a Negro flier from Mississippi, and an American Indian from Wisconsin fighting Chinese Communists in North Korea were told yesterday by the Department of Defense.

Lt. (jg) Thomas J. Hudner, Fall River, Mass., the Pentagon announced, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for risking his life in a vain attempt to save the life of a squadron mate, Ensign Jesse Leroy Brown, Hattiesburg, Miss. Brown was the first American Negro naval officer to lose his life in combat and the Navy's first Negro aviator.

Corp. Mitchell Red Cloud, Jr., Friendship, Wis., who died saving his Army company from a fanatical Chinese attack, was awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously at the same time.

Navy pilots Hudner and Brown, both of the aircraft carrier *Leyte*, were flying close support for marines fighting near the Cangjin Reservoir December 5, when Brown's plane was hit by Chinese ack-ack fire and crashed.

"Quickly maneuvering to circle the downed pilot and protect him from enemy troops infesting the area," said the citation of yesterday's award, "Lieutenant Hudner risked his life to save the injured flier who was trapped alive in the burning wreckage.

"Fully aware of the extreme danger in landing in the rough mountainous terrain and the scant hope of escape or survival in subzero temperature, he put his plane down skillfully in a deliberate wheels-up landing in the presence of enemy troops.

"With his bare hands, he packed the fuselage with snow to keep the flames away from the pilot and struggled to free him. Unsuccessful in this, he * * * radioed other airborne planes, requesting that a helicopter be dispatched with an ax and fire extinguisher."

When the 'copter arrived, rescue attempts were renewed, but failed.

President Truman will personally present the Nation's highest military award to Hudner at a White House ceremony April 13. He will be the first Navy man to receive the Medal of Honor for Korean service.

"Corporal Red Cloud was with his outfit, Company E, Nineteenth Infantry of the Twenty-fourth Division, near Chongyon, North Korea, at dawn, last November 5, when the enemy attacked without warning. He opened fire with his automatic rifle without waiting to take cover.

Badly hit by a burst from an enemy "burp" gun, the Winnebago Indian wrapped his arm around a tree to keep from falling and continued to fire until he fell mortally wounded.

"This heroic act," said Red Cloud's citation, "stopped the enemy from overrunning his company's position and gained time for reorganization and evacuation of the wounded.

"Corporal Red Cloud's dauntless courage and gallant self-sacrifice reflects the highest credit upon himself and upholds the esteemed traditions of the Army of the United States."

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will present the Medal of Honor to the deceased soldier's mother, Mrs. Nellie Red Cloud, at a Pentagon ceremony Tuesday. Red Cloud, a World War II marine, was the son of Mitchell Red Cloud, Sr., a former White House guard, who died in 1946.

Deferment of Some College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Pilot:

NO DODGE FROM THE DRAFT

The President's plan which allows the deferment of some college students has been the occasion for more than the usual quota of scatter-brained reactions. Some people who are quite incapable of seeing the more subtle issues arising in the problems of our national life found here something they could really put their teeth into; in too many cases, however, having reached the dental area, this was as close as the matter came to the brain. To them it appeared to be nothing more than a defiance of all the democratic traditions, to be in fact discriminatory; it is a poor politician or public figure who does not know what stand to take on these subjects. The results then have made up in vigor and passion for what they lacked in rationality and reflection.

If a man limited his reading on this subject to the large literature of its objectors, he would be under the impression that the President of the United States had suddenly exempted from the necessity of military service a certain portion of the community whose numbers were to be decided by their relatively high I. Q. This would indeed be the creation of an intellectual elite and those first to complain should be the Armed Forces themselves who, by this means, would become a vast mass of unlettered or at least less educated men. The process too would be undemocratic since the norm for exemption would be restricted to one single quality—intellectual ability—and not the most important one at that. The results would be catastrophic from every point of view—military, political, scientific, cultural, and not the least of all, that of public morale.

Fortunately for all concerned the situation we face is not at all like this one envisioned by some of our more easily alarmed citizens. There is no question at all of grounds for exemption; there is quite a different matter under discussion, that of deferment. Here the question is not, "Who can best serve his country?" but rather, "Among those who can best serve the country when are college students most valuable in the service of that country?" It is not an attempt to remove those who go to college from the necessity of serving in the Armed Forces of the Nation; it is a practical program designed to take them into that service when they are most valuable to it and generally most valuable to the Nation as a whole. It would be the height of folly to exclude college students from the draft; they are the strong citizens of tomorrow and they have a most significant contribution to make to the Armed Forces as to society itself. At the same time wisdom as well as prudence suggest that we use this significant group in an economy which will produce the most effective results. This way of acting is in keeping with our policies in other areas of our population. The farmer, the man in industry, the scientist, the clergyman, the father of a family—all of these are absorbed into the service of the country in a manner which will insure the best possible contribution to the war effort and the general health of the community as well. To be just as rational about the college student is not to display favoritism but simple common sense.

Nor is it, as some maintain, merely a question of providing in the future enough scientists to carry on the researches necessary for the progress of our mechanical civilization. There are values which when weighed beside this one make it shrink into insignificance. Our colleges have as their principal work the task of producing not merely scholars or scientists but mature men; in times of crisis like this one it would be foolhardy indeed to cut off the supply of this rarest of all commodities. The college and the university must not be sacrificed to the god of war; its facilities and its extraordinary powers for good must however be directed toward the saving of our civilization.

Training the American Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Cy Snyder:

What we have a right to expect of every American boy is that he shall turn out to be a good American man. Not $4, not $40, but over $400,000,000 was spent across the retail counters of America in 1950 for what—cap pistols, toy machine guns, cowboy hats, pants, shirts, vests, shoes, boots, belts, badges, saddles, cereals, tooth brushes, and a mile-long list of cowboy merchandise for our American boys.

It was purchased by American women because our primary education is controlled by women, our manners are dictated by women, and 90 percent of our earnings are spent by women. In face of all this, the real old-time cowboys have changed their trade name titles to ranchers, like the baby sitters have changed their profession to child monitors for fear someone in the clothing industry will start to promote outfits for them with guns and knives to kill the kidnapers.

Every little boy likes to play with a hammer, saw, wrench, and rule. Every little boy likes to dabble in red, white, and blue paint. Every little boy likes to build his

scooter for the soap box derby. All you have to do is give a boy a tool and he won't want a gun.

Parents all over the Nation are stirred by this social menace, and everywhere are asking for an answer to this problem. I have no desire to start a local, State, and National movement. I only wish that we could go to Hopalong Cassidy, Roy Rogers, and Gene Autry, since they have become the idols of our American boys, and ask them if they will start to show the boys over television and radio what can be done with tools rather than guns. I wish that some one could go to Hollywood and show them that interesting things can be done with tools to entertain the minds of our youth constructively rather than destructively.

I realize that we live in and under a capitalistic system of government in which profit is the selfish motive of all things. But I wish that we could go to the manufacturers who sponsor six-gun this and six-gun that radio and television shows, and ask them to please make it six-tools for this and six-tools for that. I realize that it is too late now to help those of our youth whose crimes are being committed daily, in which we read in our papers such headlines as appeared a few days ago: "Boy, 8, kills mother and father." But it is not too late to start today teaching and showing our children the use of tools for entertainment and knowledge.

The strong influence among youth is to look like, and act like, their idols in their dream world. But suppose for a moment that these idols of screen and television would change to good American clothes with a dash of buttons, carpenter aprons to replace holsters for tools, I will assure you that the fad of cowboy outfits would begin to diminish overnight, along with crime magazines.

However, where there is life there is hope. Let us be thankful for the work of the 4-H Clubs of America which are keeping our farm children busy building the constructive things of life. Thanks for the Boy and Girl Scouts of America and their great leaders.

It always makes my heart thrill in listening over the radio to Horace Heidt's program when he says, "It's better to build boys than to mend men." Let us start to dramatize the life of Jesus, the great Carpenter of Nazareth, down through the ages of our great builders of the universe. These men's lives can be dramatized on the screen, radio, and television so great and powerful that they too can become the idols of our American boys. They, too, were given tools, for they did not want guns.

And now as my contribution to American youth may I start a slogan here in your county that will echo throughout the Nation: "Give a boy a tool and he won't want a gun."

Barred From Ride but Not Silver Star Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Pilot, Saturday, April 7, 1951:

HE WAS BARRED FROM RIDE TO SCHOOL BUT NOT FROM WINNING HERO'S MEDAL

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 5.—They wouldn't let him ride a school bus here because he went to a Catholic school. But there is no embargo on Silver Star Medals for bravery when any fighting man in Korea shows the courage in action that merits one—and young Francis Normoyle has won his.

The parents of the 22-year-old United States Naval hospitalman, Mr. and Mrs. George J. Normoyle, have been notified that Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commander of the First Marines, has pinned the Silver Star on him in Korea.

Serving as a corpsman with the Marines, young Normoyle went out under heavy fire to bring in three wounded Marines, the last of whom he rescued although he himself was wounded in the meantime.

His father, asked for a picture of the young high-school football and track star, brought it to the offices of the Catholic Northwest Progress, diocesan paper of Seattle. He was asked what school young Normoyle had attended.

HARD AND EVIL THING

"Well," he replied, "Francis went to St. Michael's School in Olympia until they made that rule about not letting Catholic school pupils ride on the school buses. After that he had to go to Tumwater School; we live 8 miles out of Olympia."

And then Mr. Normoyle, a kind and gentle man, added:

"It is a hard and evil thing, that rule."

Francis' Silver Star citation read:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against the enemy while serving with a Marine infantry company in Korea on 25th September 1950." Hospitalman Normoyle was acting as a corpsman when his platoon was engaged in a heavy fire fight with a well-entrenched and concealed enemy.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address, recently delivered by Prof. Louis F. Budenz, on the Justice for Poland radio series sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress, together with the introductory remarks by Attorney Paul P. Flak:

INTRODUCTION BY ATTORNEY PAUL P. FLAK

Munich in 1938 and Yalta in 1945 are two black pages of recent history. The appeasement of Hitler brought on World War II, while the appeasement of Stalin confronts us with world war III.

Western democracies under Chamberlain betrayed Czechoslovakia, while under Churchill and Roosevelt Poland and other countries were betrayed and Communist chains riveted on their lands and souls.

Both Munich and Yalta violated international morality and exposed ugly indifference and cynicism of western leaders who, in place of honesty employed temporary expediency.

At Yalta Roosevelt threw aside the opportunity to rebuild the world on justice, preferring materialistic instead of Christian code of ethics. The world has lost faith in our leaders and respect for our democracy, for while we proclaim loudly the merits of freedom and independence, we have thrown our friends into Communist slavery.

We are paying now for our folly at Yalta through the expenditure of billions of dollars and sacrifice of the lives of our men in Korea.

Appeasement of tyrants is indeed a black page in our history and in order to erase this moral crime we must repudiate Yalta and wipe out the curse of the United States.

Our speaker today is a man who startled the world by his candid exposure of secret Communist activities in the United States. As editor of the Daily Worker he had an opportunity to know and study the workings of communism. Resigning the editorship in 1945 he returned to Catholicism and is at present assistant professor of economics at Fordham University. It gives me pleasure to introduce Louis F. Budenz.

TRANSCRIPTION OF RADIO TALK BY LOUIS BUDENZ FOR THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Poland is a name which brings warmth to the hearts of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Our United States owes a special debt of honor to the Polish people—they whose heroism has kept alive so long the light of freedom in eastern Europe. It is Poland which was made the reason for the opening of World War II. It is Poland which, ironically enough, we find nevetheless today in the toils of Soviet tyranny and slavery.

How has this event occurred? In order to answer it, in order to meet this challenge, in order to plead for freedom and justice to Poland, I am indeed honored in speaking these few words to you today. Particularly do I consider it of the most importance that this be done, since the Polish people, in addition to their great love for their native liberty, have ever cherished a devotion to the mother of God, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Their great national shrine is dedicated to her, and around that shrine there still rise the hopes of those people who have encouraged all Europe and the entire world to hope that sometime we could write down in the annals of mankind the end of totalitarianism and of Soviet tyranny.

Let us review for a moment what has occurred in regard to these Polish people, 95 percent anticommunistic in sentiment. When I was a member of the Communist conspiracy I was advised that the Communist Party of Poland was particularly weak. They received criticism from Moscow because they did not win the adherence of more than 2 percent of the Polish people. It is this conspiracy, this small band of brigands, which today imposes its bloody hand upon 95 percent of the Polish people. We Americans cannot wash our hands of what has transpired. Our security is bound up in the fact that there is a Red Poland today. One is bound up in the fact that we, in a certain sense, so shamelessly acquiesced in permitting Soviet Russia to achieve its conquest of that nation.

In 1944 the Red armies were advancing toward Warsaw, the capital of these people. They were only a short distance away—some few miles—when Molotov, then the "mouthpiece" of Soviet Russia, called for the Poles to rise. They did so under General Boer—250,000 of them—and were made the victims of Nazi artillery and superior mechanized warfare. All through the ferments of their struggle the Red armies remained the same distance away from Warsaw. Let us not forget that, although we very soon did so in the months that were to follow.

Then, beyond all this, the United States asked Stalin to grant permission for a shuttle, an air shuttle, across Warsaw in order to drop into that city supplies—that is, of food and military equipment—to help the Poles in their battle against the Nazis. This was essential in order that the shuttle could reach Soviet soil at the other end from Great Britain. Permission was denied the American soldiery and Air Force to undertake any such shuttle adventure; and, indeed, finally only the smallest shuttle was permitted—inadequate, thoroughly inadequate, to meet the great emergency.

That meant that Stalin decreed, by keeping his army so far away from Poland, that Warsaw should be destroyed.

In the face of this we find that at Yalta, under the guidance of Alger Hiss, we acquiesced in giving Stalin control of the destiny of Poland. We instituted the idea of so-called free and unfettered elections, but these free and unfettered elections were to be supervised practically and realistically by Joseph Stalin and his agents in Poland. This has been brought to our attention so eloquently by our Ambassador in that country at the time, Arthur Bliss Lane, that I need dwell upon it no longer.

America thereby made itself a party, at least in part, to what transpired in Poland. It put the seal of approval in reality upon the achievement of a Red Poland. Incidentally, I do know, as a Communist leader in the United States at this time, that it was the great desire of the Kremlin that there be achieved during that immediate period after World War II, a Red Poland and a Red China. This Red Poland was to insure the conquest of Europe.

Poland's coal, second only to that of Russia's herself or perhaps even superior to it on the continent of Europe, was to be added to that of Russia and to such coal as could be bought by Soviet control in Germany as a means of a dynamic material upon which to base the coming conquest in Europe.

In a like manner, Red China was to assure the conquest of Japan, the Philippines, Hawaii, the Pacific, and the driving of America completely from the Pacific and all adjoining lands. It was this dual attack upon the United States from Europe and from Asia which the Kremlin decided upon before World War II had terminated and which I, incidentally, called to the attention of the American people upon leaving the Communist Party in the fall of 1945. I stated then that there would be a creeping blitzkrieg across the continents of Europe and of Asia, designed to attack the United States, but first submerging certain nations beginning with Poland on the one hand and China on the other hand. We can see then that Poland was very essential to the security of the United States, and we can observe that the failure to protect Poland and to protect Polish liberty has had a very adverse effect upon the fortunes of the United States so far as its own security is concerned. We can say, of course, without wishing to oversimplify the matter, that the 40,000 casualties in Korea tonight are in part due to the lack of appreciation by America as a whole of the importance of Poland, as it is likewise due to the lack of appreciation by America of the value of China to the United States, as a defense against Soviet aggregation. Beyond all this, the United States does have a special responsibility to the Polish people in that out of the betrayal of Poland in which we acquiesced, that is, to a large measure, there has come the betrayal of the Hungarian people, the conquest of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Many of those nations have been involved in what has occurred. Out of it, fear transpired in Poland. This was totally unnecessary; it was absolutely criminal. There can be no excuse whatsoever that today a Red Poland sits in the United Nations. It is my furthered hope—I hope it will be your furthered prayer, all of you listening to this radio audience—that the United States will be able to understand its moral responsibility to the Polish people and insist that a Red Poland be driven out of the council of the nations.

I say that the first measure in regard to the justice of Poland should be the expulsion of the Red Polish representatives from the United Nations and that the motion should be made by the delegation of the United States.

We are today branding Red China as the aggressor. We must, if we are to be logical, brand Soviet Russia as the aggressor in Poland. We cannot from any viewpoint appease that state of affairs which imposes a small coterie of armed brigands upon a people which is totally anti-Communist and which is out of sympathy completely with the Communist regime.

One of our best allies in the coming struggle with Soviet Russia (for this struggle will be intensified due to Soviet Russia's intent to dominate and conquer the world) will be those Polish patriots who have so long made their mark upon the pages of the struggle for liberty throughout the world.

Let us hope and pray that each one of us in our own community will be able to do our part to make America conscious of its duty to Poland to win, in the years that are to come, genuine justice to the Polish people.

Prosegregation Provision in Military Service and Training Bill Should Be Defeated

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the prosegregation section of the legislation we are now considering in the House on military service and training should be stricken from the bill. I will offer an amendment tomorrow to accomplish the defeat of this unfair and unwise provision. The Defense Establishment supports my position.

Let the following editorials give the Members of the House some idea of the evils of such ill-conceived legislation.

[From the Norfolk Journal and Guide of March 31, 1951]

A LESSON IN HOW TO WIN VOTES—AND LOSE A WAR

Under a directive of the President, who is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the various military services have for some time been working toward equality of opportunity (widely called integration) in the military services. Notable progress has been made.

The Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives recently had under consideration legislation dealing with military manpower. Amendments designed to defeat the program of integration were presented by southern Congressmen.

Voting against them were able Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, and two other southern Members; among those voting for the crippling amendments was Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia's Second District, embracing Norfolk and Portsmouth and contiguous territory.

As so often happens, some Republicans not from the South joined with the southern bloc of Democrats in supporting the measure, some of them, no doubt, for purely political reasons—to embarrass the majority party and the Democratic administration.

The merits of military equality of opportunity, both as a democratic step and as a proper utilization of our manpower, have been reviewed too often in these columns to make necessary a restatement of them at this time. What strikes us as nearly treasonable while we are fighting a bloody shooting war in Asia and a losing propaganda war—is that any American could so embarrass our Military Establishment under the circumstances.

The Army particularly has moved most cautiously, if not reluctantly, in carrying out the integration program. Those who would seek to force it now to upset its training procedures in order to enforce harsh and wasteful and dangerous segregation and discrimination, would place a nearly intolerable burden on the Army.

This is tragic. We may very well, and soon, be fighting for our actual existence as a free Nation. Millions of men and billions of dollars are needed to build up a defense force insuring our safety.

To achieve the objectives will require near miracles. To turn back the clock, as would the dissident element in Congress, could easily undermine the training of service men and drastically reduce the efficiency of the fighting forces. The Army should be trusted to do what is best for the Nation.

Under Russia's prodding we are fighting hordes of nonwhite soldiers now. Half of Korea and the hundreds of millions in China are against us. India with its teeming millions is hearing constantly that racial intolerance is the earmark of America. The Communists are telling the populations of other Asiatic countries that we seek to dominate the world and enslave the darker races.

If we fight in the name of democracy, freedom, and equality and, in our own Armed Forces, deny that by our actions, then we hand our enemies a great weapon on a silver platter.

[From the Cleveland Call and Post of March 24, 1951]

DEFEAT THIS INSULT

With the fearful shadow of equality in the Armed Forces of this Nation staring them in the face, a group of unreconstructed rebels, led this time by Representative WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, is desperately seeking to write into the Military Training Act a vicious and insulting amendment that would permit their equally unreconstructed sons to refuse to serve in units with members of the Negro race.

When will we ever learn?

In addition to hurling an insult into the faces of the gallant Negro men who are presently bleeding and dying in Korea for the so-called preservation of a nebulous thing called democracy, these bigoted southerners continue in the most effective way to provide grist for the Russian propaganda mill. The end result is the prolongation of the cold war that is uncomfortably hot these days, and a further deflection away from American ideals by the millions of nonwhites throughout the world.

Even Committee Chairman VINSON, who hails from Georgia, was in opposition to this latest Dixiecrat whimsey. VINSON not only realizes its adverse effect on American diplomacy in these critical times, but even more realistically pointed out that the stupid amendment won't work even if enacted into law.

Significantly the Republicans are again guilty of aiding and abetting their southern colleagues in this attempt to evade the fulfillment of real democracy in our Armed Forces. They evidently consider it a small price to pay for southern support later on more important legislation they desire.

The NAACP has notified all of its branches to shower their Representatives in the Congress with protests against this amendment urging them to vote against it.

We urge readers of this newspaper to add their protests today.

[From the Pittsburgh Courier of April 7, 1951]

FUNNY BUSINESS WITH UMT

Last week Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, CIO, protested that "antiviolence and anti-Jim Crow amendments" had been eliminated from the universal training and service bill which is still

in the House Armed Services Committee, and pointed out that the "Winstead pro-segregation amendment" has been approved by the committee.

There seems to be little doubt that certain elements in Congress and the country at large are bent on using UMT as a means of fastening Negro segregation and discrimination more firmly on the armed services.

They hope that the current war hysteria will enable them to stampede this bill through Congress, with all of its undesirable amendments intact.

It is doubtful in our minds whether universal military training is desirable or necessary, and there is justifiable fear that it may be used not only to fasten Jim Crowism to military training but will give our fascistic brass hats too much control over the young workers of this Nation. That would be another blow to democracy.

[From the Chicago Defender of March 31, 1951]

CUNNING LITTLE BLOCKHEADS

The crafty fighters for white supremacy do not always show their hand in public, but it is not difficult to find evidence of their handiwork. Last week the House Armed Services Committee held a closed-door meeting on the draft bill, and when it was over a Jim Crow provision was attached to the measure. By a 20–11 secret vote, the committee was sucked in by Congressman ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, who engineered the segregation deal.

Reporter Robert S. Allen revealed that 12 Republicans joined the Dixiecrats in approving the Jim Crow rider although 3 southern Congressmen refused to go along. The chairman of the committee, CARL VINSON, of Georgia, voted against the Jim Crow rider because he said the military leaders did not want it in the bill and had warned him against it.

The boys on the side of white supremacy, however, do not care what happens to the United States military machine as long as they keep dear old Jim Crow. The Yankee Republicans, who should know better, seem to be unusually willing to oblige their Dixiecrat friends.

This shocking action taken in secret by the House Armed Services Committee will destroy the new program for integration if the rider is allowed to stand. Every effort must be made to alert the entire Congress on this issue. The cunning little blockheads who put their prejudices above the best interests of their country have got to be defeated. They are playing Stalin's game whether they know it or not.

The Italian Peace Treaty of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks the question as to whether or not American troops should be sent to Europe to help defend the nations of Western Europe was debated before the American people. None of us minimize the importance of this issue. All of us were aware of the great impact it had on the American home. For, resolving this issue in the affirmative meant that once more boys in American uniform would be going to foreign soil prepared to defend the principles of democracy.

As one who has great faith in, and esteem for General Eisenhower, I am thoroughly in accord with his conclusions that the free nations of the world must band together or else freedom perishes. However, I believe it significant too, to point out that considerable emphasis was made of the fact that these nations of Europe should not lie down, that the job could not be done and would not be done by us alone—but, that the nations of Europe must have the will to resist and defend themselves. In his report to the people, upon his return from Europe, General Eisenhower indicated that the people of Europe were eager to do their share—and, had already taken steps to build up their own defenses—that everywhere the will to resist was evident.

It is inconceivable to me, therefore, that we continue to recognize the validity of treaties which impose restrictions on some of these nations of Europe to arm in their own defense. It is anomalous that we can expect a nation such as Italy to defend herself and her friends in Western Europe, while we continue to give assent to the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947. This treaty, a product of postwar hatred and revenge, was engineered, in a great measure, by Russia. It was deliberately designed to reduce Italy to a condition of helplessness; to render her militarily and economically weak. Under the terms of this Italian Peace Treaty of 1947, Italy has been limited to a 185,000-man army. This is the same country which during World War II raised an army of 8,000,000 men and contributed, in the latter years of the war, very much toward the victory over Germany.

General Eisenhower has said, and every available report will show, that Italy has always indicated her willingness and her eagerness to resist any Russian aggression and to fight on the side of the free world. She has indicated her eagerness to raise a substantial army, and to do her part as a party to the Mutual Assistance Pact.

However, because of the restrictions placed on the size of her army, Italy cannot take such steps. And, while Italy is rendered militarily weak, Russia, the principal author of the harsh terms of the Italian Treaty, will also be the principal benefactor, for she will be gaining in strength.

The Italian Government has warned the West that Russia's Balkan satilites are rearming and she has appealed for a revision of this treaty. However, nothing has been done. And, as a result, it is impossible for Italy to contribute her fullest potential to the defense of her friends and neighbors in Western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this Italian peace treaty is totally inconsistent with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, Marshall Plan, mutual defense assistance programs, and our North Atlantic Treaty. How can we possibly stand in the anomalous position of urging this nation to defend itself, when we recognize the validity of a treaty which makes it impossible for her to do so.

I am fully confident that the people of Italy who, as recent as 1948 successfully threw off the yoke of Communism, will not be found wanting in their will to resist any Communist aggression, providing they are permitted to properly defend themselves. And, that which is basic and which we cannot lose sight of, is that if we permit Italy to increase her armed forces, it will not be necessary for as many American boys to go abroad and defend the Europeans.

The question, therefore, is not only whether the Italian Peace Treaty should be declared invalid, but, how best can we permit the nations of Europe, with whom we are banded, to increase their armed forces to defend themselves in case of aggression. I think we can expect the fullest participation from a nation such as Italy in the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact, if we declare the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947 invalid.

For this reason, I have today introduced a Joint Resolution to relieve the Government of Italy of its obligations to the United States under the Treaty of Peace with Italy and which requests the President to join with other signatories as may accept, in negotiating a new peace treaty.

Public Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic on the subject of public morality. Since there appears to be so much agitation for improvement of the ethics and morality of public officials, it might be well to give consideration to these qualities in our people generally. I commend this article to the attention of the Members:

PUBLIC MORALITY

In the midst of the congressional committee hearings and investigations that have become one of the most important elements in American life today, a United States Senator comes forward with a suggestion for a study of ethical standards in public affairs by a commission of eminent private citizens. This seems to revive a notion expressed quite often that there is a particular sort of morality that applies to public life and that it is different from the ordinary type of morality.

From this talk about public morality, one might conclude either that the person in public office enjoys certain exemptions from the moral code imposed upon the private citizen, or that he is held to a stricter code. The one attitude claims that allowances must be made for the heavy responsibilities borne by the public officials, that he can't be bothered with too many fine distinctions of right and wrong, and should be judged only by the general results of his conduct in office; the other view would transfer to the public official the blame for any and all wrongdoing on the part of his subordinates.

The fact is, of course, that there is not, and cannot be, any distinction between public and private morality; if the standard of morality respected by the private citizens is low, it is idle to expect that public morality

will be high. Every individual has the obligation to obey the moral code as it applies to his particular state in life; this means that he must obey the natural law and the Commandments of God, without exception; that he must comply with the Constitution and with the duly enacted statutes of the country of which he is a citizen; that if he is elected or appointed to public office he must conscientiously fulfill all the duties of that office. The citizen has an obligation to support the law just as binding as is the public official's obligation to enforce it; violation and evasion on the one hand are just as reprehensible as favoritism and malfeasance on the other.

ON THE SCREEN

The Kefauver committee television hearings have put graphically before the country a lot of shocking evidence about the prevalence of organized crime in this country, and of the grip it has established on public officials in many places. None of this was new; the committee had all its facts carefully assembled, and merely called its witnesses to tell their stories personally so that people everywhere could get a better idea of what it all meant.

And what has been the reaction? A wave of indignation demanding reform? Some deep searching of consciences on the part of the members of the television audiences as to whether or not they are to blame in part for the shocking conditions uncovered? Or just a sort of surprised enjoyment of the whole thing as a strikingly different show, with some admiration for the skill and efficiency of the investigators who built up the cases and perhaps some near-sympathy for the racketeers who showed themselves skilled and efficient, too, in carrying out their greedy, ruthless objectives?

It is a foregone conclusion that this unprecedented 1951 crime study will bring no improvement to the moral climate of the Nation unless it stirs the people to action. This action must take place on the local community level, in demands that police departments and other law-enforcement agencies do the work entrusted to them, in checking the records of candidates for public office, in refusal to be quieted by spasmodic clean-ups that leave the basic evils untouched. Here in Pittsburgh we have had many newspaper exposés of crime and racketeering in the past. How long was public interest, or the interest of the crusading newspapers, maintained?

ONLY ONE CURE

Reform is necessary; exposés are necessary; clean-ups are necessary. But there can be no hope of getting the country out of the clutches of the present crime ring, or of a new crime ring that will spring up the day after the present one is eliminated, unless and until there is a resurgence of true morality among the people of this country.

For our moral standards are low; we tolerate and practice all sorts of evasions of the natural law and the commandments, as well as of the civil law. Some of our colleges teach our young men that getting ahead is more important than adhering to truth and justice; there are whole sections of the learned legal profession that study the law for loopholes and never bring the moral code to the attention of their clients; there is a new profession of psychiatry, some of the practioners of which give their patients comforting and immoral assurance about adultery and other transgressions of the commandments; we have a business code that practically means grab all you can.

To build up all these false values, we have had a whole generation exposed to newspapers and magazines and motion pictures that sensationalized and glamorized crime, that made heroes and heroines of Hollywood figures of low character; we have had these agencies of public information belittling the commandments and preaching the doctrine of secularism. (They are not so bad today, but it is a belated and inadequate change that has come over them.) They bear a heavy responsibility for the terrifying increase in divorces, for the prevalence of juvenile delinquency, for the lapse of respect for the Lord's Day.

So it is in the face of powerfully debasing influences, and against a tradition that accepts too many violations of justice and decency, that right moral standards must be established among the people, and thereby established in public life. This is precisely the mission of the church in society; this is serving the cause of God. It will be difficult, but to say that it is impossible is to deny our faith. Step by step, zeal and holiness can lift men out of the swamp of materialism and immorality that has brought such disorder and unhappiness upon us.

Celler Reapportionment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the text of a statement I have submitted to the House Judiciary Committee regarding the Celler reapportionment bill—H. R. 2648—which the committee now has under consideration. I wholeheartedly support this legislation because I consider it an important step in the direction of eliminating abuses to which I refer in my statement.

My statement is as follows:

STATEMENT ON REAPPORTIONMENT (THE CELLER BILL, H. R. 2648)

The Celler bill, on which public hearings are now being held, goes to the very heart of representative government. Because of its deep significance I am happy to be permitted to present my views to the committee at this time.

When the United States Constitution was adopted, provision was made for representation in the Congress through two United States Senators representing States, embracing the total population of their respective States. It was also provided that the people in all the States shall have representation through their Representatives on the basis of equality of population.

James Madison, who played such a prominent role in the drafting of the Constitution, insisted that the legislatures of the States ought not to have the uncontrolled right of regulating the time, places, and manner of holding elections. This philosophy of fair and equal representation is indeed a foundation stone of representative government under our Constitution. In the constitutional debates it was clearly the view of the framers that each constituent should have equal voice with others throughout the land in the election of their representatives. It was equally stated that each representative should have as nearly as practicable an equal number of persons whom he represented.

Through the failure of Congress to establish standards for the States to follow in the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, some State legislatures have abused their power in carving out congressional districts within their States. Flagrant abuses have crept into our system of electing Representatives.

For instance, it was never intended that Members of the House should represent the whole population of a State except, of course, where a State does not have adequate population entitling it to more than one representative. As early as 1842 (in the Apportionment Act of that date) the Congress specifically spelled out this idea that representatives should be elected from specific districts and not at large. But we still have today examples of this abuse. A representative is elected at large in the State of Ohio, representing the total population of that State—approximately 8,000,000 persons. In that same State the Representative from the Fifth District has only 166,932 constituents. This makes a farce of representative government. In a lesser degree the same thing is true in Connecticut where one Representative is elected at large representing the entire State having a population of almost 2,000,000 persons in 1950. One congressional district (the Fifth) in this same State had in 1950 only 273,584 persons.

But the greatest abuse of all lies in the discrepancy in the size of population between districts within some of the States where no Representative is elected at large. Here are some examples from the 1950 census: For instance, in Ohio, the Twenty-second Congressional District contains a population of approximately 908,000, while the Fifth District contains approximately 167,000. In Texas, the Eighth District has a population of 802,000, while the Seventeenth District has only 226,000. California presents a similar picture with a spread of almost half a million population between the most populous and the smallest districts. Frankly, these are the most flagrant cases, but such inequality prevails in very many of the 48 States.

It is clear that such reapportionment made by the State legislatures, unregulated by the Congress, has led to a gross departure from the fundamental principle of representative government in our democracy. The framers of the Constitution would have viewed this existing situation with dismay. How far the State legislatures have wandered away from the ideal is further seen in the gerrymandering process in many States. Political parties which dominate the State legislatures indulge in the nefarious practice of so dividing up the States into congressional districts as to preserve their partisan political advantage; and, of course, to the disadvantage of the minority party. In this practice, no fair consideration is given to the people who reside in the districts affected.

To fully appreciate how gerrymandering is practiced, one has to study the maps to see the strange contours and shapes of the districts after they are carved out in the gerrymandering process.

As I read the Celler bill, H. R. 2648, I am persuaded that its provisions will go a long way toward eliminating the abuses to which I have referred. My understanding is that the bill does not take away from the State the function of carving out the congressional districts. The bill does, however, set up congressional standards to which the State must conform. The standards are those which it was always intended that the States themselves would use but have failed to do so. The Celler bill, for the first time, implies that the House, being the judge of its own Members, will use sanctions against any State that fails to conform to the standards set up in the bill.

I shall not enter into a discussion of the constitutionality of this proposed measure. The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of this learned committee, has expressed his positive belief that the bill is constitutional and has cited court decisions to support his view.

Editorials, as well as the writings of nationally known columnists clearly reflect a public opinion favorable to the objectives

of the Celler bill. I should like to cite a few examples:

One of the country's outstanding, if not the outstanding, newspaper, the New York Times, had this to say:

"In a recent message to Congress, President Truman rightly declared that 'it is fundamental to the whole structure of the Constitution that all citizens have equal representation, so far as practicable, in the House of Representatives.' This principle has been damaged over the years by the reluctance of State legislatures to alter the boundaries of congressional districts in conformity with the uneven growth of population; and it is this situation which the administration is now seeking to correct through legislation just introduced in Congress. * * * Whether the bill just introduced by Mr. CELLER to accomplish this purpose is too extreme is a fair subject for debate. Whether the proposed reform would benefit the Democrats rather than the Republicans, the city rather than the rural areas, is interesting but irrelevant. But the intent of equalizing the congressional representation within the States is sound, and certainly in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution."

From the deep South, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, after calling attention to some of the possible objections to the Celler bill, has this to say:

"But it can be said that it also would go far toward achieving the desirable objective of fair and equal representation of the State's population in Congress. Although under its terms Congress would go further than ever before in directing the State legislatures how to redistrict, it may be that the Texas Legislature would welcome such guidance."

In Ohio, the Cleveland Press editorial states that—

"He [CELLER] says the Supreme Court has held that Congress has power to set up standards which the States must follow. Citizens who believe that each American has a right to an equal and effective voice in the conduct of his Government should favor and work for adoption of such reforms as CELLER proposes."

From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette comes this statement:

"This is an excellent bill and should be speedily approved by Congress. Experience shows that the States aren't always scrupulous about seeing to that equality of representation in the House inherent in the Constitution. A club such as Mr. CELLER has fashioned would go a long way toward correcting their laxity."

These are typical of many editorial comments from various geographical sections of the country. It is true, of course, that there have also been editorials adverse to the Celler bill.

President Truman deserves great credit for having called the attention of the Congress and the country to the need for legislation dealing with this important subject. Congressman CELLER has implemented the President's recommendation in the proposal which I heartily endorse.

It's Your Food Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to make some references to an extension of remarks by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, in the RECORD of March 28.

Senator SPARKMAN's extension of remarks included an article by Lauren Soth of the magazine Successful Farming. The lead paragraph states:

America's No. 1 farm problem today is not fair prices for farmers. Neither is it adjustment of production, soil conservation, nor any of the other perplexing questions which have bothered farmers and the Government in recent years. It is manpower.

Mr. Soth's article is an intelligent discussion, and I commend its reading to all Members of Congress who have problems of farm manpower existent in their districts or in their States. Senator SPARKMAN is to be commended for making this timely and important contribution.

The farmers of this Nation have been asked to produce to the maximum. Being still free and with an intelligence enlarged by experiences dating as far back as 1914 through two wars and numerous emergencies, our farmers will of necessity take an inventory of the calculated risks that the coming tillage and harvest may involve. If manpower is to be short, they will plant those crops entailing the least demands for manpower. They may have to let their lands lay fallow. They must have manpower.

In any event we of the Congress cannot ignore or escape their problems. If those problems can be solved by our action—let us act.

SUPPLY STILL AFFECTS PRICES

Farm production is vital. Food and fiber rank high as defense material. Moreover, peak production of a balanced supply is the only economically sound means of just, equitable and inexpensive price control.

Those in urban areas might well withhold their comments on rural problems until they have thought through the entire procession of circumstances that may influence adequate supplies—and, therefore, by causing scarcities, force high prices. Too often this is not done. The clamor goes up for strong-arm legislation with its expensive corollary of administration, including sleuths and enforcement. And so, by superficial thinking and reactionary legislation to control a scarcity we add to the costs of government and further deplete an already short supply of labor.

There is, of course, a common purpose for American achievement. The present defense effort is one. If it is western civilization we are defending, let us know clearly what the virtues of western civilization are. Free producers, free production, and free markets could be one—but those virtues have long since been lost in the fogs of expediency. Yet, free production, ample production, today, is one of our goals. It is time that urban and rural America sought out and planted their feet firmly on common ground.

THE ISSUE MUST BE CLEAR

We do not lack evidence, today, of the basis of our differences. They have been well outlined.

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor has now issued its report. In the name of full farm production that report needs constructive criticism. Yesterday my colleague, the Honorable SAMUEL W. YORTY, of California, placed a most complete summary of that report in the Appendix of the RECORD along with editorial comment from the New York Times and a copy of President Truman's statement. Let me recommend, also, a reading of Mr. YORTY's extension to all those who would fully understand both sides of the American farmers' No. 1 problem.

Yesterday, also, the Washington Post had an editorial on migrant farm labor. It follows:

MIGRANT FARM LABOR

The exhaustive survey of social, economic, health, and educational conditions of farm migrants made by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor is a shocking exposé of official neglect and private exploitation—a story about men and women living in insanitary camps without community ties and "usually beyond the reach of local school, health, and welfare authorities." There are at least a million of these migrants, about half of whom are domestic workers. The other half is made up of approximately 100,000 Mexicans legally under contract, 400,000 so-called Mexican wetbacks, who have illegally entered the country by slipping across the land border or wading or swimming across the Rio Grande, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans. These migratory workers supply only 3 to 4 percent of the man-days of work used to produce the Nation's farm output. The great majority are employed on some 125,000 large farms producing cotton, fruits, vegetables, and sugar beets. Nevertheless, they make important contributions to farm output and are in great demand at critical periods of crop production.

Since more farm labor will be needed this year to replace men entering the military services and to harvest an extended acreage, pressure for increased importation of foreign labor, chiefly Mexican, is mounting. However, the Commission concludes that no special measures should be taken to increase the number of alien contract laborers beyond the number admitted last year and that legalization for employment purposes of aliens illegally in the United States should be discontinued. "We are convinced," it declares, "that by better recruitment and placement of domestic labor, we would have eliminated most, if not all, of the occasion for the certifications of labor shortage during the years 1947–50."

In that connection the report sharply criticizes the practice of legalizing the status of "wetbacks" and giving them employment in preference to workers who have not violated our immigration laws. It charges, too, that field officers of the Immigration Service have been under pressure from Washington to go easy on deportations until crops have been harvested. It further implies that if the Farm Placement Division of the United States Employment Service had done a more effective recruitment and placement job at home, there would not have been a labor shortage requiring the importation of large numbers of aliens. As a matter of fact, the Commission received evidence that last year some American workers were actually dismissed to make way for contract Mexican labor.

Numerous recommendations are made by the Commission designed to raise the living standards of migrant farm labor, such as minimum wage legislation, establishment of Federal and State minimum housing standards, grants to the States to conduct health programs among migratory workers and vigorous enforcement of child-labor laws. These recommendations, which cover both

alien and domestic migrants, provide evidence, if any were required, of shameful neglect of this group.

The problem growing out of our dependence on alien labor is only one aspect of the general problem of migratory labor, but it is an important one. For cheap foreign labor creates the very scarcities that lead to an influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards. We agree with the Commission that our efforts in future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial obviously presumes that there is a larger supply of available migrant farm labor in the United States than actually exists. For our own information, the principles involved and the actual practice of recruiting farm labor from existing domestic labor pools has been tried before. It was not successful for several reasons. First, those not employed in a period of high production are obviously those who will not be employed continuously or effectively in any economic situation.

The farmers of this Nation wish that this were not true. But, again, they have had actual experience with domestic labor, forcibly recruited—and often from those lists most unlikely to succeed as tillers of the soil or harvesters of crops for the tables of our cities and armed camps. Moreover, most of our effective producing rural areas are today mechanized and the era of specialization influences them also. Skill is as much a prerequisite on the modern farm as it is in the factory from whose shadows the migrant laborer may have been moved, at Government expense, both ways.

Let us note the conclusion of the above editorial:

The problem growing out of our dependence on alien labor is only one aspect of the general problem of migratory labor, but it is an important one, for cheap foreign labor creates the very scarcities that lead to an influx of aliens willing to work for wages that are indecently low according to American standards. We agree with the Commission that our efforts in the future should be directed toward increasing the number of our own farm workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

I feel it a duty to point out the fallacies in this editorial's conclusions. There would be no demand for foreign labor were there an available supply of trained domestic farm labor; also, under programs which we finally had to resort to—in all logic—in World War II, Mexican and other foreign labor could not be designated as cheap. These programs were inaugurated under the full jurisdiction of the Agriculture, State, Labor, and Justice Departments. This labor was recruited legally where available farm-labor pools existed in Mexico and other foreign labor areas. This auxiliary labor was brought into the United States under complete regulation. There was no violation of the immigration laws. The wage scales paid were the same as those paid to other farm laborers of like ability and at the end of the contract period this labor was returned to its source. To say that this labor was employed for wages that are unusually low, obviously, points up one of the difficulties that exists in our society today by reason of a jumping at conclusions already existing in a closed mind.

Let me conclude these remarks by again stating that the Congress of the United States has a real problem on its hands as the farmers of this Nation face the task of supplying you and the defense effort with the food and fibers necessary to a successful conclusion of the national responsibility which faces 150,000,000 Americans.

The MacArthur Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 9, 1951:

THE MACARTHUR ISSUE

President Truman and his political and military advisers are in a quandary over what to do about General MacArthur.

Involved in that decision is the larger and more perplexing problem of what to do about the Korean war.

General MacArthur would have been relieved of his command long ago were it not for the fact that his return would focus the attention of Congress and the country on questions he has raised which the administration would rather not discuss.

The very thought of the colorful commander relating the untold part of his story to a congressional committee, and the vast audiences such committees now command, could cause sleepless nights in some high places.

The vital question, of course, is the matter of bringing the war in Korea to a successful end. If the President has such a plan, he has kept it to himself.

All the proposals General MacArthur has made have been vetoed by the White House, in concert with the British Foreign Office—or possibly under prodding by it.

He wanted to bomb the Chinese railways and the Manchurian bases which were supplying the enemy, but the answer was no.

He wanted to allow the Chinese Nationalists to open a second front on their own mainland. Again the answer was no.

Most inexplicable of all is why South Korean recruits are not being armed and trained eventually to relieve our troops. When he was asked why this was not being done, General MacArthur replied that it was due to "political considerations" over which he had no control.

If he were relieved of his command and called before Congress, the general probably would explain just what these political considerations were. They could be interesting.

Why should Americans bear the brunt of the fighting when there are Asiatics who could do so, if they were given the equipment and permitted to fight?

General MacArthur is on the spot only because he has raised these questions, despite the attempts to silence him. Even most of the second guessers now concede his handling of the war itself has been admirable, particularly considering his limited resources and the restrictions imposed upon him.

Recalling or reprimanding General MacArthur will not clarify the question of our war objectives, and it must be clarified. Nothing will be settled by trying to silence the legitimate spokesmen for the American troops who are fighting in Korea and who want to know why they are there. That is the issue.

American intervention in Korea as an agency of the United Nations made sense when it was understood to be a part of a larger plan drawing a line against further Communist aggression everywhere. But that plan has been abandoned in favor of appeasement, under pressure from Britain and India.

So what are we fighting for now?

Are we merely holding a line, at a fearful cost in American lives, until the Communists can be bought off by giving them Formosa, and perhaps additional territory? Nothing else can be inferred from the only plans for a settlement which have been approved or seriously entertained by the United Nations.

General MacArthur has repeatedly asked for new instructions, but has received none. In the absence of such instructions, he has offered his own plan to win the war. That has been disapproved without the formality of a vote by the organization he is supposed to be serving. So there is no plan. That is General MacArthur's complaint, and it is a legitimate one.

If President Truman will take counsel with himself he will see that the fault is not with his commander in the field but with the British Socialists and their yes men and fellow travelers in the State Department who have taken the conduct of the war out of the general's hands and now do not know what to do with it.

How United States Dollars Have Been Arming Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which I prepared for the April issue of the Reader's Digest:

HOW UNITED STATES DOLLARS HAVE BEEN ARMING RUSSIA

(By Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, of Illinois)

American dollars and American technical skill built the Russian military juggernaut. Over the last 10 years, the tremendous industrial capacity of the United States has been the principal source of supply for iron-curtain armament. Without the strategic raw materials and critical machine tools supplied, directly and indirectly, by American dollars, the Kremlin's imperialistic war engine could not have attained its present menacing power.

We began in the years 1941–46 with $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease gifts to Russia. We contributed almost $2,000,000,000 to her between the years 1945 and 1947 under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In April 1948 we launched the Marshall plan. Although Russia was excluded from direct participation in its $15,000,000,000 fund, she was aided immeasurably by indirect trade through the 16 Marshall-plan countries.

The ruble area has received from these countries about $2,500,000,000 in raw materials, tools, and critical machinery—the very sinews of war. We supplied the raw materials to Western Europe in the form of Marshall plan gifts. Western Europe fabricated the essential industrial products required for the Kremlin arsenal, and traded them eastward for wheat, cotton, grains, caviar, tobacco, furs, and ores.

Not until December 1950, when the Hungnam evacuation was under way in North Korea, did our State Department begin to close the leaks in the Marshall plan pipeline. In the preceding decade, United States contributions, direct and indirect, commercial and governmental, to the Kremlin war machine totaled $16,000,000,000.

Two additional decisions in United States foreign policy after 1945 further strengthened Russia's industrial potential for war. We permitted the removal from Germany of several billions of dollars' worth of key industrial plants—machinery, tools, equipment, and skilled manpower. While these plants were being dismantled and moved to Russia, we were supplying, under the Marshall plan, tools and materials with which to rebuild, in part, the identical industries in Western Germany, as necessary to general European recovery. And on the other side of the world we withdrew all support from the Chinese Nationalists, while we permitted Russia to take over the vast industrial potential of Manchuria.

With these industrial resources from Germany and Manchuria, plus freedom of trade with all Marshall plan recipients, Russia soon emerged as a dominant industrial power of Europe and Asia.

Our lend-lease gifts gave Russia her first free access to American industrial secrets. Complete industrial plants were transported behind the Urals. The catalog of plants shipped to Soviet territory included three oil refineries and a tire factory. We also provided an electric-power program, which cost $135,000,000; a railroad-improvement program; and a steel-expansion program which involved more than $300,000,000.

At the same time the Soviet purchasing mission, which at one time numbered 1,500 especially schooled spies, was permitted by us to inspect, document, and photograph significant industrial centers in the United States.

Direct shipment of atom-bomb materials to Russia from the lend-lease air terminal at Great Falls, Mont., in February 1944, is recorded in the annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for 1950:

"The United States, through actions of the Office of the Foreign Economic Administration, had licensed for export to the Soviet Union materials vital to the production of the atom bomb. The Soviet Union received on one occasion a shipment of 200 pounds of uranium nitrate. On another occasion it received a shipment of 468 pounds of uranium oxide, 1,000 pounds of uranium nitrate, 2 shipments of heavy water, and 25 pounds of uranium metal.

"Investigation further disclosed that the Soviet Union was permitted, without regard to censorship or customs-inspection regulations, to send out of the United States blueprints of the General Electric plant at Lynn, Mass.; diagrams of an electrically operated ship developed by the Groton, Conn., shipbuilding works; diagrams of an A–20 type military craft; and other blueprints and data relating to our industrial strength."

The committee reported that Semen Vasilenko, a member of the Soviet purchasing commission in Washington, returned to Moscow early in 1944 carrying "six bags containing special information concerning metallurgical research and other developments vital to the military. Vasilenko today is head of the production of metal pipes and tools in the Soviet Union."

This intensive course in American industrial methods was aided further by another act of incredible American naïveté. Immediately after the war the Department of Commerce allowed Russia free access to all American patents, of which some 13,000 were microfilmed for transmission to Moscow. Through this Department we also gave Russia access to almost all the technical and scientific secrets obtained from the Germans by our occupation forces in Europe.

Russia got approximately 30 percent of all our lend-lease grants. The list of things we gave her is too long to cite here, but an idea of its scope can be gained from these few items: 376,000 motor trucks; 7,056 tanks; 51,503 jeeps; 345,000 tons of explosives; 15,417,000 pairs of Army boots; $1,100,000,000 worth of machinery and tools.

The basic tools, equipment, and metals thus obtained were the seedbed of Russia's postwar military expansion—and her diplomatic arrogance. Despite the tremendous destruction wrought on her by the Nazi invasion, Russia's industrial production for 1948, measured in over-all tonnage, began to approach her prewar volume of 1940.

This revitalized productive capacity was aimed primarily at future military potential. By 1946, to illustrate, Russia's production of heavy capital goods was 14 percent above 1940, while her production of consumers' goods was still 43 percent below 1940. So marked was the development of Stalin's military potential that the House Committee on Foreign Aid (the Herter committee) reported in April 1948: "It would appear incorrect to argue that the Soviet Union is not now strong enough to undertake substantial military operations."

Despite this clear warning, our diplomatic policy continued to provide the iron-curtain area, through normal trade channels, with every basic and scarce item required for its expanding military machine. In a press conference in November 1947, President Truman stated that he saw no reason to interfere with shipments of industrial equipment needed by Russia for postwar reconstruction. In line with this policy, United States exports to Russia and her European satellites in 1947 amounted to $432,000,000, including $81,000,000 worth of industrial machinery and $23,000,000 in machine tools.

W. Averell Harriman, roving ambassador under the Marshall plan, was questioned about our trade with Russia by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in January 1948. He stoutly rejected the suggestion of an airtight military embargo against the ruble area. So did ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman when he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February 1950.

Under this policy, every attempt in Congress to curb around-the-corner shipments of strategic tools and materials to Russia from Marshall plan countries met with determined opposition, not only from the State and Commerce Departments and ECA, but from the White House as well.

As soon as the Marshall plan became effective in April 1948, the European nations began carrying out a series of trade treaties to facilitate exchange of western industrial products for Russian wheat, furs, and minerals. By January 1950 there were 96 such treaties in effect between Eastern and Western Europe.

The British Internal Combustion Engine Manufacturers' Association, as one example, disclosed that Russia had obtained from Britain $34,129,037 worth of electrical generators and powerhouse equipment during the years 1946–50. This represented about 28 percent of the entire British export of these items. It was under these same trade treaties that Britain shipped to Communist China in July 1950—the first month after the Korean aggression—650,000 gallons of gasoline and 9,000 tons of rubber.

In one 3-month period in 1950, Britain shipped $42,532,000 worth of machinery and basic war materials to the iron curtain nations. During the same period, Italy shipped $26,897,000; France, $18,694,000; Belgium, $19,603,000. Here is more than $100,000,000 in war potential shipped to Russia from Western Europe in 3 months.

The frank willingness of many of Western Germany's industrialists to continue to do business with Russia results also in a steady flow of goods through the interzonal border. The rate of these shipments, substantially increased since the Bonn government assumed control over all German exports, is now estimated at about $230,000,000 a year. Such shipments include sheet and tubular steel, ball bearings, machine tools, rubber and copper.

In Vienna the energetic Soviet-manned International Trading Corp. is busily rounding up strategic material for Russia, sneaking Marshall plan goods under the iron curtain at a rate of $4,000,000 worth each week.

Our Marshall plan grants to Europe during the first quarter of 1950 were $770,000,000. During those same months Western Europe shipped $176,000,000 in machinery and strategic materials to Russia and the iron curtain arsenal. These official figures mean that, indirectly, Russia got about 22 cents of every Marshall plan dollar to help build her war machine.

In the original Marshall plan authorization, Congress inserted two provisions specifically designed to head off sales of critical and strategic materials to Russia by nations that were given Marshall plan aid. The first directed the ECA, "in the interest of national security," to "refuse delivery insofar as practicable" of materials to be manufactured into products for a nonparticipating country, if the finished product would be refused an export license by the United States of America. A second safeguarding amendment authorized ECA to challenge any export license to a nonparticipating country if it deemed the transaction inconsistent with the major purposes of the European reconstruction program.

To what extent did the administration enforce these provisions? One revealing answer is found in the address on August 26, 1950, of Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington, in the House: "In 1949 these western democracies, to whom we are supplying arms, sold more than $1,000,000,000 in supplies to Russia and her satellites. If we want the nations of Western Europe to cease trading with the enemy, we must stop trading with the enemy ourselves. Several Congressmen, including myself, have implored the State Department to stop this senseless business of supplying the Russians, by our trade with them, American dollars with which to buy war supplies."

On November 29, 1950, the O'Conor subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported: "We found that shipments to Red China have gone forward in substantial quantities from both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of our country, even after the Communist attack on Korea last June." Among the shipments were 15,000,000 gallons of petroleum products; 10,000 tons of steel plate; 4,500,000 pounds of copper ingots; 5,347,000 pounds of tin plate. These shocking revelations precipitated the embargo on American shipments to China in December 1950.

Public opinion is aroused and indignant. If Congress faithfully reflects the mood of America it will say, in effect: "Not one dollar for any country which supplies, directly or indirectly, an iota of military potential to the Kremlin's arsenal of aggression."

Big Business, Big Profits Under Our Democratic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my absence I received from Mr. A. B. Kaiser, general manager of the tax department of Sears, Roebuck & Co., a copy of an address which he delivered in Chicago on March 8, 1951. It is quite lengthy, which prevents my inserting it in the RECORD. In the speech he criticizes and complains unfairly and without reason or justification against the Democratic administration. He sheds crocodile tears about business conditions and finds fault in general. To my mind his statements were ridiculous, especially since his firm had a deficit of over $2,500,000 in 1932—the last Republican year—but whose profits during the Democratic administration of which he complains so bitterly, both before and after taxes, mounted to heights never before attained in history, as is the case with most other big business.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. made profits of well over $1,500,000,000 before taxes and almost a billion dollars after taxes under this Democratic administration. I note in the press of April 10 that business corporations paid cash dividends of almost $8,000,000,000 in 1950, which is almost 20 percent over the 1949 banner year figure. The December figure of almost two billions was 45 percent higher than for December 1949.

I sent a letter to Mr. Kaiser which I am inserting with my remarks, giving him the true facts, in an effort to set him right, and in the hope that other men in high position with big business will take notice and not make such unwarranted and untrue accusations and statements.

Mr. A. R. KAISER,
Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. KAISER: I have seen a copy of your address, Socialism and Polio, and would like to make a few comments thereon.

I also am opposed to waste in government—and elsewhere—but apparently you regard as wasteful the whole successful program of the Democratic administration for the past 18 years. As has been done for 18 years, you prate about the impending "bankruptcy." You cast your eyes backward to the "good" old pre-New Deal days of President Hoover.

Perhaps you would like the country—and Sears, Roebuck & Co.—to enjoy such prosperity as was ours under Hoover's Republican administration. Need I remind you that at the end of this administration—for Sears' accounting period ending January 28, 1933—your company sustained a deficit of over two and one-half million dollars? Being somewhat more practical, I would appreciate receiving the "loss" sustained by Sears, Roebuck during the 18 years of Democratic administration, which you claim is bringing rack and ruin to the business of the Nation. The administration which you consider a socialistic-communistic dictatorship enabled your company to make profits of about $1,663,000,000. In one fiscal year alone, you made over $253,000,000.

By the first year of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's second term, your company was making far greater profits than it made during 1929, the peak year of the Republican boom economy. These profits were made of sturdier material than those of the twenties; they were to continue and to increase. They resulted from President Roosevelt's fundamental idea that a sound economy must be based on the policy of getting purchasing power into the hands of the average man. This average man is the person who buys your products. If he does not have the funds to buy, you will again get the good old days of Hooverism—if that is what you want.

The truth of the matter is that business sometimes has to be pushed into doing what is really best for it. Judging from your remarks, some segments of our business community have not yet learned that what helps the average man is in the long run helpful to their business. I might remind you that business prospers more on a large volume with high wages and fair prices than it does when low wages and unemployment prevail and prices are kept artificially higher than they would be under competitive conditions.

Let me close with a word about our unbalanced budget in the postwar years of prosperity. President Truman did his best to give the country a balanced budget, but the big taxpayers had enough influence to override his ideas and have their rates cut and have loopholes created, by which they could avoid paying their just share of the Nation's tax burden.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

Resignation of Hon. M. E. Thompson from Office of Price Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the taxpaying public are continually asking where their tax dollar goes. This case of former Governor Thompson, of Georgia, which I am inserting under unanimous consent, of undisclosed parasites can be multiplied hundreds of times.

REFUSING TO BE TAX PARASITE, OPS OFFICIAL QUITS IN DISGUST—CONSULTANT AT $53.48 A DAY

Former Gov. M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, yesterday quit as a consultant with the Office of Price Stabilization, charging that "official Washington is drifting in a sea of confusion, inefficiency, waste and extravagance."

Thompson said in a statement that he came to Washington as codirector for territories for OPS.

"Knowing that it was impossible to have two directors for the same job," Thompson said, "I offered to resign and accept another assignment."

But, he added:

"For 12 weeks I have been carried on the payroll as a consultant at a salary, plus expense account, of $53.48 per day. Yet, during this time, I have been consulted about nothing. I have had no assignment to do anything.

"On February 19 at the White House, I told the President the story up until then. He called Don Dawson (Presidential assistant) and instructed him to see that the mess was straightened out immediately. It hasn't been done.

"Under the circumstances, I refuse to accept salary and expense money from the taxpayers when I am rendering no public service.

"I am resigning and returning to my home in Valdosta, Ga., I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers."

Thompson said that there are "thousands upon thousands of others who are rendering no service but are on the public payroll, not only in Washington but throughout the United States."

He charged that no real effort has been made to stabilize prices.

"Even those charged with the responsibility have contributed to the upward surge of prices by deliberately predicting higher prices," he said.

"While the price spiral continues to rise, the bottom is dropping out of moral values."

He continued that "thousands of loyal Americans are giving unselfishly of their time to defense work, but their efforts are being nullified by the indecision, bungling, and interference of scheming politicians who are motivated solely by their desire to stay in power. The American people are being victimized by a national conspiracy of mediocrity."

Thompson, a Democrat, said that now is the time for "the people of America to make plans to free themselves in 1952 from the gang that has led the people into this mess.

"And as for me, I will not support the Democratic Party in the national election in 1952 unless its banner is rescued from the greedy hands of the gang now hiding behind it for protection. If this be political treason, make the most of it."

Thompson said that no one could question his record of unfaltering loyalty to the Democratic administration.

He said that in 1948 when the States rights movement split the South, "my efforts resulted in Georgia remaining loyal to the Democratic Party."

But he continued:

"Conditions existing in the national administration are so deplorable today that loyalty to party and patriotism to country constitute a conflict."

Thompson said that in Washington the "only refuge being held out to a confused people is the sign of the double cross."

Explaining his job status with OPS, Thompson said he received a telegram last January 21 from OPS Director Michael DiSalle "asking me to come to Washington to accept the job of regional director of OPS with headquarters in Atlanta. I accepted."

En route, Thompson said he was intercepted in Atlanta by telephone calls from the Democratic National Committee "telling me that Dixiecrat Herman Talmadge, Governor of Georgia, was protesting my appointment."

Arriving in Washington, I reported to Mr. DiSalle's office. Mr. DiSalle refused to see me, and I was told to report first to the Democratic National Committee office. There I was requested to accept the directorship of OPS for Territories. For the sake of harmony in the defense effort I agreed to accept.

"For 8 days I remained in my hotel expecting any moment to be assigned to the duties of the office, and when the assignment was made I was amazed to learn that another man and I were at the same time to be sworn in for the same office, at the same salaries and with the same duties.

"During the next 2 weeks, nothing was done and no program for administration of price controls in the Territories was promulgated."

Thompson was sworn in as codirector along with former Mayor Herbert Meighan, of Gadsden, Ala.

Thompson told a reporter he submitted his resignation to DiSalle yesterday afternoon.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—DiSalle last night said in a statement that Thompson actually was sworn in as Acting Deputy Director of the fourteenth region but was dissatisfied with the role of deputy.

("Many times as I worked late at night," DiSalle said, "he would call me from his hotel room complaining bitterly of his lot as deputy. * * * I asked him to be patient * * * until we could find a position that suited him and fitted his capabilities. We finally determined that in view of the fact that he was a former governor he might be helpful in contacting governors and other State officials in explaining the price-control program and the part they might play in making the program a success.

(DiSalle said "It is to be regretted that in the administration of a very important program the action of 1 employee out of 4,000 should necessitate the taking of time to make this statement."

(White House Press Secretary Joseph Short knew nothing about Thompson's blast until reporters called it to his attention in the late afternoon. President Truman had left his office for Blair House, and Administrative Assistant Dawson was in El Dorado Springs, Mo., where he went to visit his ailing father.

(Short said he would try to find out something about the Thompson matter today.)

All Should Be Dealt With Alike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., for April 4, 1951:

ALL SHOULD BE DEALT WITH ALIKE

The draft is the democratic way of raising a wartime army. It treats all men alike. If a young man is physically fit and of sound mind, he goes into service when he reaches military age. In an expanding army a young fellow with intelligence and the right attitude has a good chance to get ahead.

The Army needs men with special skills. It gets them from its manpower pool of buck privates by trade-testing those whose records show previous experience. That's how it selects truck drivers, telephone linemen, and bridge builders. That's how premedical men could be routed back to professional study after completing basic training.

A soldierly bearing and a high I. Q. in his intelligence test is a recruit's passport to officer candidates' school. Many a rookie has gone from private to major in the draft army.

That's the way it was and that's the way it should be. But from now on it's not going to be that way.

President Truman's Executive order, which authorizes selective service boards to defer the bright college boys, will make many a veteran of 1917–18 and 1941–45 ask himself, "Who sold the President that idea?"

With more than a million nonveterans in college now and more coming up, no one knows how many hundred thousand students will be exempted from service because they had good grades or because they will be able to pass the aptitude tests to be given on May 26 and June 16 and 30.

The order prompted many a cynical remark by boys who are crowding closer to the draft age. The policy makers in the Defense Department ought to hear what is being said. What this order will do to the morale of men fighting in Korea today is your guess, or anybody's.

Mr. Truman has set up a caste system. Nobody would suggest that a medical student be yanked out of school and put into camp, or that a research student in chemistry should be denied a deferment. But why exempt a bright lad who is spending 4 years in a liberal arts college simply because it's the thing to do and because his father can afford to send him? And why put a uniform on the boy who decided to learn a trade at 17 if the school athlete can beat the draft by proving his aptitude for a career in physical education? Let's apply the UMT principle, which means everyone fit for service undergoes training.

After the First World War the American Legion, in national convention, made a ringing declaration for an all-inclusive draft of manpower and other national resources, if war came again. Has the Legion forgotten its high resolution of a bygone day?

Every post in the country ought to make itself heard so that sentiment back home can find expression in Congress.

Continuance of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to each Member of Congress the fine statement made by Director Walter E. Cosgriff, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in defense of that agency. As you know, Director Cosgriff's appointment to this board was made just last August, and so he has not been with the RFC long enough to be biased, but long enough to know of its value to small businesses. His reasons for the continuation of the RFC as an experienced banker can, I assume, be accepted at face value. Certainly no one will challenge his figures.

The matter follows:

Assailing the privately owned national banking system for failing in its job, Reconstruction Finance Corporation Director Walter E. Cosgriff yesterday called for a house cleaning of "those who have abused authority." He urged the continuance of RFC as an essential to American economy.

The former president of a 16-unit western banking chain and the only RFC director so far untouched by Fulbright committee criticism, Mr. Cosgriff answered in an interview those calling for abolition of the loan agency.

"No one called for abolition of the Army when Maj. Gen. Benny Meyers went to jail," Mr. Cosgriff protested.

The 19-year-old RFC must continue, he contends, "because the Nation's private banking system is either unable or unwilling to meet national credit needs."

SAYS AGENCY MUST CONTINUE

"If both long-term loans and the financing of such large new enterprises as the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. were available in the regular credit market, I would favor abolishing RFC even if Abraham Lincoln were its single administrator," Mr. Cosgriff said. "But private banks are not doing the job and, for that reason, I, as a Republican, believe the abusers of authority—including myself, if I'm guilty—should be turned out and the agency continued."

To document his charge of banking failure, the 37-year-old Salt Lake City banker who became an RFC director last August cited key RFC statistics: 631,351 business loans totaling $16,000,000,000 made over 19 years with only $134,000,000 of bad loans and a $600,000,000 net profit to the Federal Government.

"With all the scandal, the influence and the favoritism," he said, "the RFC has a loss record of about 1 percent on more than 600,000 loans. Each of these loans was made after the applicant produced certifications from the bank with which he does business, and from one other, that credit was unavailable. That our 'bank reject' loans pay out 99 percent seems sufficient evidence that banks are not servicing legitimate credit needs."

PRIVATE BANKS SHUN RISK

Mr. Cosgriff says American bankers fail in today's obligations because Government-backed bonds and guaranteed home loans lead them to shun business risks.

"Business that could have got private credit in 1910 are today denied it," he said. "Kaiser-Frazer is an example. Kaiser came to the RFC for $666,000,000, first, because big banks that could have made the loan listened to his competitors who did not want it made and secondly, because it was simpler and safer for them to put their cash in Government 'sure things.'

"This typifies a fundamental change in a banking system which, until the 1930's lived off the interest from business loans. In the last 20 years bank deposits have multiplied and, simultaneously, Government bond issues and guaranteed mortgages have offered profitable and sure investments."

"The result," said Mr. Cosgriff, "is that American bankers have turned their backs on the business loans with which America was built."

"I am against wild banking," he insisted, "but the pendulum has now swung too far to the conservative side."

The RFC Director agrees with the Hoover Commission that Government guaranties of business loans, similar to FHA insurance of home loans, would be better than direct Federal advances to private borrowers. But he added:

BANKERS' GROUPS KILL PLAN

"Every time a definite business-loan-guaranty plan is advanced," he said, "the American Bankers Association and other powerful groups kill it in congressional committee."

Since its 1932 birthday, the "average" RFC loan has been for $35,000, and 19 out of every 20 loans made have been for less than $100,000, he said.

"The Commerce Department counts 3,000,000 so-called small businesses. Our record of 500,000 small loans means we have helped 1 out of every 6 of them at some time or other."

In Fairness to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the New

York Daily Mirror, April 3, 1951, published as a public service by a group of leading citizens of Greater Lynn, Mass.:

ORCHESTRA OF EIGHT MILLION

We wish to congratulate three fine Americans of our city: Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who presided over the court which tried the atom-bomb spies, and United States Attorney Irving H. Saypol and his assistant, Roy Cohn, who prosecuted and convicted those spies, Julius Rosenberg, Ethel Rosenberg, and Morton Sobell.

Some bigots will say the three spies are Jews and will denounce all Jews. They will forget to say that the judge, the prosecutor, and his assistant who did such a magnificent job for America, are also Jews.

The unfairness of drawing general conclusions from particular instances; the indecency of fixing a universal stereotype from a bad type is here exemplified.

It would be like saying that all the fine Americans of Italian descent in our city are like Frank Costello or Joe Adonis, rather than Arturo Toscanini or our Mayor Vincent Impellitterri.

It would be like saying that all the hard-working, decent Negroes in our city are like Paul Robeson, instead of like Ralph Bunche or Jackie Robinson.

It would be like saying that all the Americans in our city of Anglo-Saxon stock are like Alger Hiss, instead of like Bishop Sherrill.

It would be like saying that all Irishmen are like "Cockeye" Dunn, instead of like John Coleman and Gen. Rosie O'Donnell.

There is no logic in drawing false conclusions from a minimum of facts. Who dares say this Rosenberg creature is typical of our citizens of Jewish persuasion, when against him can be pitted millions of Americans such as Bernard M. Baruch, Bernard Gimbel, Jesse Isidor Straus, Barney Balaban, Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chaplain Joshua Goldberg, Rudolph Halley, and so many others who come quickly to mind?

We raise this very sensitive question because our city is the home of citizens of fairly immediate foreign origin. Of course, we are all of foreign origin at one time, and the history of our city shows that when a group became "old timers" they tended to look down on the "newcomers."

In a list of the white population in 1940 whose mother tongue was other than English, there were 429,000 Germans, 896,000 Italians, 163,000 Poles, 149,000 Russians, 121,000 Spaniards, and 911,000 who spoke Yiddish, a Germanic dialect used by Jews. Altogether this list included more than 26 varieties of "mother tongues" for a total of 3,000,000 persons.

Undoubtedly, during the past 10 years, this list has decreased, for the pattern is constant in our city, namely, that by the third generation the process of relating the "newcomer" to America completes itself and the "newcomers" become "old timers."

But we are not a melting pot, as Israel Zangwill so graphically described us. We are more like a symphony orchestra, in which men play various instruments, violins, 'cellos, flutes, oboes, trumpets, drums, and so on. Each plays differently; yet out of their differences comes the glorious Beethoven's Fifth or even George Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue.

Harmony means neither sameness nor monotony. It does mean cooperation, self-discipline, and teamwork.

Of course there will sometimes be a devil who plays out of tune and out of time. He has to be straightened out or kicked out.

But because there is one sour note, we do not tear down Carnegie Hall.

Hon. William T. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD mention of a fine tribute accorded a distinguished fellow Member of the House of Representatives, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of the Second Congressional District. On Wednesday, February 21, 1951, my colleague from the city of Philadelphia was awarded a life membership in the American Legion, Breen-McCracken Post 270, of that city. Presentation of the life membership, accompanied by a gold membership card, was made by the Honorable Vincent A. Carroll, judge of the Court of Common Pleas No. 2, of Philadelphia; and participating in the special presentation ceremonies were Welden M. Trauger, commander of Breen-McCracken Post; Harry Stinger, national committeeman of the American Legion; James Aitkins, sixth district commander; and John Stay, fourth district commander of the American Legion.

This high honor was bestowed upon Representative GRANAHAN in recognition of his tireless efforts in behalf of veterans' legislation and American Legion activities. A veteran of World War I and an active member of the Legion of long standing, Representative GRANAHAN'S sympathetic, understanding work in behalf of veterans' legislation has ever been in the highest tradition of American citizenship, and as an able and responsible representative of his constituents in our National Government. It is with pleasure that I record the high tribute and honor bestowed upon Representative GRANAHAN and express my firm conviction, as well as the feeling of others among his colleagues, that the recognition conferred upon him is well deserved and likewise reflects credit upon Breen-McCracken Post of the American Legion.

The New Draft Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by the president of Princeton University which I feel should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. Dr. Dodds made this statement on the contemplated change in our selective service policy on Sunday, April 8, 1951.

This distinguished educator calls the new policy "wrong for the country" and feels that college students generally have suffered because of the temporizing in Washington on the draft situation.

The statement follows:

As one who has consistently believed that universal military training and service is essential in the present world situation, I naturally view the proposal for almost blanket deferment of college students as wrong for the Nation and detrimental to the best interests of the colleges in the long run.

The Executive order places college students, as such, in a preferred position which entirely misrepresents their basic patriotism and willingness to serve. On the other hand, the proposal to defer students in subjects essential to the defense effort is sound and should be preserved. The impact on the morale of troops now in service of any program of college deferment beyond essential needs is obvious.

I yield to no one in the importance I attribute to the national need for young men broadly educated in the fields of humanities and social sciences. If, as I hope, a system of universal-military training is adopted promptly, these values need suffer no essential loss once that system is established and the rotation of men through the armed services permits a return of the college population to normal.

To be sure, the period of transition will create the gravest difficulties in the educational world. But I believe that these difficulties can be resolved without resort to a deferment policy so broad and so little selective as the Executive order contemplates.

College students have suffered greatly from the strains imposed by the temporizing in Washington and continued confusion over the Government's plans for the immediate future. They can and will adjust patriotically to national needs.

As one close to the strains they have been under and sympathetic to them, I hope that the present confusion will be quickly resolved in the interest of the principle of share and share alike in posts in which the individual's services will count for most.

After all, this is what the college men want. And I believe it preferable to protecting them against interruption of their college careers, which would react adversely upon their influence as future leaders and the long-time values of the subjects they are studying.

What Price Patriotism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article titled "What Price Patriotism?" This article was written by Dr. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of John B. Stetson University, at DeLand, Fla. It follows:

WHAT PRICE PATRIOTISM?

There is no evidence to suggest that Lord Macaulay was an especially malicious individual, but if he was, and if he were alive today, he might very well be rubbing his hands and preparing to say, "I told you so." That sagacious English statesman didn't think very highly of Thomas Jefferson's ideas and he predicted that the democratic government which Jefferson evolved for America would

crack up about now. He declared that one of two things would happen: (1) Either "some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand" or (2) "your Republic will be as fearfully plundered * * * by barbarians of the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference * * * the Huns and Vandals who ravished the Roman Empire came from without. * * * Your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own institutions."

Macaulay was pretty sure that pressure groups eventually would bring about the Nation's downfall by electing legislators who would hand over to them the wealth created by others. He thought of pressure groups in terms of workingmen hearing their "children cry for more bread," for he came along several generations too soon to think in terms of political action committees, farm blocs, veterans' organizations, old-age pension clubs, manufacturers' associations, and similar symbols of an age in which most of us are less worried about getting bread than we are tires.

If pressure groups didn't cause the crash, he figured that some strongly entrenched group (he thought it would be the military) would do the trick by depriving us of our liberty in their efforts to save order and prosperity. Such pessimistic conclusions were not arrived at impulsively. Macaulay watched our Government in operation for half a century before he made his dire predictions. He did not expect to see the smash-up in his time, but he said, "Your fate I believe certain, though it is deferred."

Today thoughtful Americans are wondering a bit fearfully just how good a prophet Macaulay was. They see the shadow of the Government growing larger and that of the individual citizen growing smaller. They see free enterprise becoming restricted enterprise. Even in the face of socialistic disillusionment abroad, they see Americans who, under private management, have made themselves the most prosperous and successful people on earth, being gently coaxed into trying Government management—with pennies from their own till. They see Washington swarming with economic doctors, who, though pleased with the golden eggs, are itching to operate on the goose.

These economic experimenters are causing increasing concern to many citizens. Now, with so much of our attention focused on our tremendously vital defense effort, the set-up should be about perfect for them. With powerful propaganda machines at their command, millions of dollars of tax money to play with, and almost everybody looking the other direction, they should be in a position to "correct the shortcomings of our democratic form of government" to their hearts' content.

What will our Government be like when the smoke lifts? Will these well-meaning planners turn out to be a twentieth-century variety of kind Huns and gentle vandals (armed with pens instead of spears) who will, with the most altruistic intentions, destroy our time-tested way of life if we don't watch out? Nations catch socialism in two ways: Either they are exposed to it through revolution or, as is the case with creeping socialism, they breathe too long the stagnant air of apathy.

With uncanny foresight, Macaulay pointed out some of the problems that would be facing us a century after his death. But the most important factor of all he overlooked—the one thing that can save us from the fate he predicted; that is, the character of the American people—the fact that when they get their back up Americans can be a strong for preserving their Government as he thought they would be for overthrowing it. He failed to realize that by the middle of the twentieth century most Americans would still like their form of government—imperfect though it is. He thought their selfishness would be the rock upon which their ship of state would be wrecked. What he did not foresee was that out of the self-reliance and individual initiative engendered by their institutions the great body of Americans—both inside and outside of pressure groups—would have become so contented and prosperous that their selfish desires would be less compelling than the deep pride they would have in their country. Loyalty—though he did not know it—will dissipate selfishness and apathy, too. He failed to take into account that wonderful thing called patriotism.

We are likely to be hearing a great deal about patriotism in the months ahead. It is probable that a lot of strange items will be offered in patriotic wrappers. It might be a good idea to take time out to discover just what patriotism is. Exactly what is this powerful force that can upset Macaulay's unhappy calculations? What does it require of us as individuals?

Dictionary definitions are inadequate. Patriotism is more than "love of ones' country"; it involves attitude, alertness, action. It requires, first of all, a deep conviction that the principles for which our country stands are right. It implies a personal determination to guard these standards, not from change, but from unwise change, or change slipped over on us. It connotes an active loyalty—not the kind that lets George do it.

There are two kinds of patriotism. The wartime patriotism which all of us know about, and a deeper, less emotional kind—the patriotism of peace. The first kind we usually turn on and off on holidays and during war scares. The other is something continuous, an element in our character like self-respect, good sportsmanship, or love of one's family.

Like freedom, patriotism is not free. The price was high at Valley Forge; it is higher today in Korea. For us at home, there is a price. We must believe fervently in our country's basic ideals, and stand for them ourselves—boldly and unashamed. We must protect these ideals against the political dreamers and economic theorists who offer us enticing substitutes, some original, some imported (with the directions on the box). We must support the institutions which are teaching our time-tested principles to the young men and young women upon whom we must depend to preserve our national heritage in the future.

Among such institutions are the hundreds of small, independent, Christian colleges which for so many years have been training their students, through precept and example, to pull their own weight as good citizens—self-respecting, self-reliant, loyal. America will be needing these privately supported colleges in the years to come—perhaps as never before—for they are ramparts from which our American way of life will be defended. Are you helping to keep these ramparts strong?

Myself I Must Make Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison:

MYSELF I MUST MAKE STRONG

(By Hubert M. Harrison)

In the midst of confusion, criticism, and near chaos that overshadows our democratic effort to arm ourselves to save our Nation's life, the average citizen is bewildered. Every honest patriot wants to do his part for his country and yet he doesn't know where to fit into the giant plan.

For most of us, the best thing to do is to attend to our own jobs with a new spirit of devotion. The armchair strategist who thinks he can give MacArthur a few pointers, the radio diplomat who questions the loyalty and integrity of high officials, the selfish schemers who are trying to make money out of this crisis of mankind, the workman who risks slavery for his children by refusing to produce, the fomenters of race prejudice; all these are hindering the war effort and playing into Stalin's hands.

No matter how weak and corrupt some of our leaders in Washington are, the fact remains that they are our leaders. Although Alan Valentine, former Economic Stabilizer, may be right in his indictment of the low moral tone of the Capital, impeachment is difficult and practically impossible under our system. Valentine said: "The moral ground on which contemporary Washington now rests is so low that mists of contagion can rise quickly and spread far." The official Government, Valentine said, is headed by "an honest, well-intentioned, and industrious President." But there exists a "second government nominally headed by the President but with activities of which he can be only vaguely aware."

I am glad I do not have General Eisenhower's terrifying responsibility but I do have my own little job to do. I am accountable for the way I serve now and shall be throughout all time. Myself I must make strong.

The farmer who does not do his utmost to make his acres produce food or feed to full capacity; the workman who does not do an honest day's work; the businessman who does not do the best possible job of management with all his heart and soul; the housewife who refuses or neglects to make a home to comfort, sustain, and inspire her menfolks in their tasks; the community that does not do its best by its own efforts, without calling on Austin or Washington for help; all these are weakening the Nation.

The man or woman who through lack of will power, sickness, or overindulgence, comes to the point that he is not self-supporting and becomes a charge on relatives or the community, is a liability to family, community and state and hinders the war effort although not intentionally disloyal.

This Nation, rich as it is, cannot afford to defeat communism at home and abroad and take care of everybody at the same time. All who possibly can must stand on their own feet.

Under God and my Nation's flag, my duty is to do my job the best that I know how. Myself I must make strong.

The MacArthur Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include yesterday's editorial from the Washington Post:

THE MACARTHUR PROBLEM

The crisis produced by General MacArthur's repeated efforts to run away with the diplomatic ball in the Far East seems to have excited little more than a ripple among the American people. This is due to the way that the crisis has been muted. In reality civil supremacy is at stake in our Government. General MacArthur has now told all and sundry, including a leader of the opposition, that he is not in sympathy with the United States or the United Nations policy in the Far East. Nor is this all. General MacArthur, in his repeated statements, is trying himself to seize the initiative in policy making. Over the week end several United Nations governments, including Canada's and Britain's have expressed open alarm, and the crisis is thus as much one in our international relations as one in our domestic Government.

Since the outbreak of the Korean War, the President has given his confidence to the supreme commander without stint. This has been due in some part to the lessons that he has drawn from our history. The chief lesson stems from some of Lincoln's intervention with the conduct of war operations. Mr. Truman, indeed, has gone too far in deferring to the supreme commander. Not once but several times he has answered the question of action beyond the thirty-eighth parallel by saying that the issue lay with the military commander on the spot. He never seemed to realize that beyond the thirty-eighth the question was not military but politico-military. General MacArthur knew better, and, before he seized the initiative, he complained of a "policy void." However, there was no policy void on the subject matter of MacArthur's letter to Representative MARTIN on March 20. Here the American policy on the neutralization of Formosa stands, yet General MacArthur came out for support of a Chiang Kai-shek attack on mainland China. And 7 days later, having already seen a summary of a policy directive on Korea, he issued his own cease-fire, and in a manner calculated to inflame the situation with regard not only to our enemies but also to our allies. This is a course of conduct that the President, out of sheer protection of his office and his prerogatives, simply cannot ignore.

Any reassertion of the President's authority as Commander in Chief and initiator of the country's foreign policy would win him, we feel sure, the support of the American people. That's what they are crying out for—leadership. The institutions of this country are too precious to be trifled with. Mr. Truman is not without courage, as was shown when General MacArthur last time sought to distort the President's foreign policy before the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But the present question is one of extraordinary delicacy. We are in a hairsbreadth zone of war, and the state of our policies, moreover, has run down so rapidly that the spirit of faction is uppermost. General MacArthur has become more of a politician than a general. He appears to have a sort of personal organization here, there, and everywhere. And to many of the Republicans he is sharing the spotlight with McCARTHY as a symbol of opposition. It is a thoroughly unhealthy situation—alien to our institutions, likely at any time to tip the scales in favor of all-out war with China, and destined to leave this country isolated in what the Arizona Daily Star calls "hopeless crusades for unlimited objectives impossible of attainment."

Farmers Face Big Crop Loss—1950 Wheat Rust May Strike Area Again This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Agriculture appropriation bill will shortly come before the House, I believe a study of the article which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on April 8 will be of interest to the Members.

Evidence has shown that the farmers of the Midwest lost $20,000,000 at least in wheat production alone in 1951 due to the outbreak of a new race of rust known as 15B. To combat this outbreak it is very necessary that a new strain of wheat be developed which will be resistant to that particular rust. Closely alined to this is the need for a sufficient appropriation to continue the very worth while work of barberry eradication. The article reads as follows:

FARMERS FACE BIG CROP LOSS—1950 WHEAT RUST MAY STRIKE AREA AGAIN THIS YEAR

(By Russell Asleson)

Minnesota's legislature is being asked to appropriate $210,000 for emergency rust-control research.

Farmers and the grain industry alike have marked such a program "rush." They've got to find new rust-resistant wheat in a hurry to stay in business.

Rust is an airborne fungus that can cause a wheat field to have an almost complete crop failure. It's been around to plague farmers in one form or another for years, but plant scientists have been breeding new kinds of wheat to meet such emergencies.

For 10 years the situation was well under control. Until 1950.

Years of good work were toppled almost overnight when a new strain of rust, more infectious than any previously known, suddenly found weather conditions ideal and began to race through the durum fields of northern North Dakota and Minnesota.

Scientists had labeled it 15B and knew it had been around for nearly 15 years, lurking undercover and waiting. It had been termed "potentially dangerous" by Dr. E. C. Stakman, University of Minnesota plant pathology chief and the world's leading authority on rust.

As early as 1938 Stakman had predicted its explosion.

The 1950 eruption cost Minnesota and the Dakotas an estimated twenty-three and a half million dollars in lost crops, hitting hardest in North Dakota's durum area where farmers lost nearly $20,000,000.

Farmers viewing ruined fields found no variety withstood the fungus onslaught. All commercial wheats, including durum, which is used in making of macaroni and spaghetti, were affected.

That's the situation that brought on the emergency, not only on a State but a national level.

Another 15B invasion this year must be liberally sprinkled with big "ifs," but the possibility must be considered by agricultural experts fitting together the jig-saw puzzle of the Nation's food supply.

What measures can be taken as preventive medicine against any future epidemic? There are three steps:

The immediate is development of new resistant varieties.

The permanent is eradicating barberry bushes on which new rust races develop.

The experimental is chemical control of rust.

For some time it has been known that sulfur dust can control rust. But it takes more than one application, making it too costly and uneconomic. The Bureau of Plant Industry is working on other chemicals but to date has nothing promising.

Any permanent solution must take the barberry bush into consideration. Barberry is the only plant on which rust exists in its sexual stage and it is on this host that races do their crossing—or hybridization. It is fortunate that not all such hybrids are as virulent as their parents.

Since 1918 barberry elimination has been a cooperative State and Federal venture. Field headquarters for an 18-State area are in Minneapolis, in charge of Raymond O. Bulger.

The barberry program has eliminated 393,830,000 bushes on 143,029 properties, but work must be stepped up. Congress is being asked to increase the present appropriation of $700,000 by 15 percent. Minnesota has been providing $15,000 a year.

It is in the plant breeding end of the fight, however, that scientists are racing against time. It takes from 12 to 15 generations of wheat to develop a new variety.

To speed up the process, promising strains have been grown this winter in California and will be planted this spring in the North. Thousands of types are being tested for resistance under the widest ranges of temperature, light, and humidity. Last year the breeders were working on the second to sixth generations of some strains.

If they get the legislative appropriation fully half will go into new greenhouses at the University of Minnesota. With adequate help and space, the breeders say they can grow three to four generations a year instead of two, as they are now doing.

When they do find a resistant strain their work isn't done. The farmer wants a wheat that will yield well, stand up well, and retain its kernels when ripe. The miller wants a high protein wheat that will make fine, white flour.

While the plant scientist is trying to combine all these factors into a wheat that also has resistance to rust, a new rust may also be developing to lay waste to the new wheat.

E. R. Ausemus, University of Minnesota agronomist, has some promising rust-resistant strains but say that even at best it will be several years before varieties resistant to 15B and with the right growing and milling qualities are available for planting.

Minnesota and North Dakota scientists are playing a vital role in a Nation-wide effort to protect the food supply. North Dakota's Legislature appropriated $83,000 for the work, and a Federal grant of $60,000 is being sought from Congress for research.

What are the possibilities of another outbreak of 15B this summer?

The potential is there. It could break out if a spell of hot, humid weather hits at a critical time.

But because of the uncertainties of weather, predicting rust epidemics is a bit risky.

"Look at all the heat the weatherman gets when he predicts a clear day and snow turns up," said Don Fletcher, excutive secretary of the rust prevention committee.

It is entirely practicable to determine the areas of danger and name the races which are prevalent, thereby supplying the material for storm warnings.

Such storm warnings are flying this spring. Agricultural men know that the rust spores

blew South last fall and were found in southern wheat fields. They were perpetuated on green grains and wild grasses always present in the continuous grain belt from Mexico to Canada.

They also know race 15B is now independent of barbery, and any strong southern wind will start the return journey. Some of the stem-rust spores have been found as high as 10,000 feet.

But the South had a hard, tough, and dry winter, and a lot of the wheat crop was lost. If the patches of rusted grain still left do not develop the northern crop may be safe—from 15B.

"There are no grounds for flatly predicting a return of 15B this year," reported Fletcher. "The threat is there, however, and we have no way of stopping it if weather conditions are right for rust."

Let's take a look at this saboteur:

Rust looks just like the ordinary iron pipe variety, except that it is found on the stems of the grain. The dusty, brick-red substance, however, is a living parasite—a fungus so tiny some are less than one-thousandth of an inch in diameter.

The collection of parasites suck the food sap in the stems—food that should be going up to the kernels to make them plump and full. When the wheat stem is completely girdled by the rust, considerable moisture also is lost and the stem is weakened so it breaks off easily in the wind.

The result of rust is seen in shrunken kernels of poor quality. It can cause any degree of damage to a crop, depending on severity of infection.

North Dakota farmers were out some 9,000,000 bushels of durum worth $18,013,000 and 2,000,000 bushels of bread wheat worth $3,723,000. Minnesota lost 556,000 bushels of durum worth $1,145,000. South Dakota had a $780,000 loss, mostly in bread wheats.

Through many years of wheat breeding and selection, plant scientists had been able to give the American farmers wheats that resisted the rust diseases most prevalent.

But like the youngster vaccinated for smallpox who then turned around to catch measles, 15B came along to supply the measles.

The late 1950 spring put wheat crops several weeks behind normal development. It also gave 15B its chance to invade wheats never before rusted. Only the fact much of the bread-wheat crop was mature prevented it from being hard hit.

How do these new races spring up to menace crops?

Wheat rust is in the red spore stage when it multiplies on the growing crop. When the straw becomes dead, the rust goes into the black spore stage in which it survives the winter's cold, coming to life and germinating the next spring. The wind picks these newly germinated spores from the straw and deposits them on young barberry leaves.

The spores dig into the leaves and start building up, producing small, blister-like sores called cluster cups. Later, spores from the cluster cups are mixed together, either by insects or by two cups growing together.

The mating of spores from two cluster cups if they are of different races may produce a brand-new race—a hybrid—ready to make a short hop via the wind to a susceptible plant.

"Nature," says Fletcher, "is continually plotting such disease warfare against our crops and only continual scientific defense will save us from future food shortages. If our farmer and miller is to stay in business, he must be given means to outmaneuver these rusts that destroy overnight what it has taken years to develop."

Income Tax Relief for Professional Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in today's press by one of America's most distinguished commentators, Mr. George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., is introducing a bill into Congress to rescue the professional workers of this country from permanent poverty. For precisely that fate faces lawyers, doctors, architects, writers, and others, who, no matter what they earn, are being squeezed between taxes and high prices, without any opportunity to save for the future.

COUDERT's bill is to aid those men and women who are not eligible as beneficiaries of corporate or other private pension plans. These plans are really savings.

For instance, I was recently looking at the card of a Sears, Roebuck file clerk who had been with that company many years and, as I calculated it, she has saved, through their plan, $60,000. I would not mind being a file clerk with such savings.

Professional men, writers, artists, farmers, and small-business men are now unable to make great savings, unless they swindle, because of taxes which are geared against them.

COUDERT's idea is to permit the postponement of Federal taxes as regards a portion of their earned net income, so that the amount of money shall be contributed as a restricted retirement fund.

The worst phase of this situation, as it affects professional men, writers, and artists, is that their earnings are up and down, a lot one year and not so much another year.

If they could keep their earnings, they could average out over a few years. But the way it is, a writer may earn a fortune in 1 year and get taxed for the full amount in that year, and then he does not earn for a few years and is broke.

The Treasury amortizes machines; why not men?

COUDERT says:

"It is of utmost importance to encourage young men to enter the professions and small business. Yet the operations of the present tax laws, instead of giving this encouragement, tend to do the exact opposite by making corporation employment more attractive to young men. I believe this to be against the public interest."

I tried to read the Coudert bill and, like all other acts of Congress dealing with taxation, it gets so involved that you have to hire a lawyer and an accountant to discover how it works.

But it is enough for me that it gives to the white-collar folks a chance to put aside something of their earnings for the day when the joints ache and the hand is shaky and the eyes not so good.

Even columnists lose their popularity after a while, and some even lose their value. Yet, under the present set-up, they cannot save in their limited good years. I, for instance, started this business in 1917. I have, I hope, worked hard at my trade, which involves voluminous reading, the cultivation of memory, travel in many parts of the world, and some small, unheroic element of risk.

In our business a young person is hired on the general assumption that he knows nothing. Then, for 10 or 15 years, he keeps on learning the hard way, his product appearing in black ink on white paper for all to see.

So our hero arrives. But so has Uncle Sam. He tells his wife that he is now a big shot, but she wants to know how it happens that E. Merl Young's wife grabs a $9,540 mink coat while she has to wear mouton, which is fancy for sheepskin. Our genius tells her to go fight the Treasury.

Well, maybe there are 10 wonderful years, during which the great man sits on the dais and rises for a bow and then up comes another young fellow and pushes him into the back pages. So there is nothing to do but to become a ghost writer.

But savings. There are none except what Uncle Sam gave to the British to bridge their dollar gap—only a small share of it—which must make a man feel noble.

A man really earns little more than he can keep after he has met taxes and his cost of living. Men who want to save and cannot save because their taxes are too high are not earning what they think they earn.

Actually, they are only an intermediary step between those who pay them and the Treasury.

What remains is hardly compensation for the work they do. They are being kidded; they are kidding themselves.

The Coudert bill offers a good way out and should be supported.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman comes as a severe shock to me, and I am sure to 99 percent of the people in my congressional district. It is true that the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power under the Constitution to wield the ax wherever he sees fit as far as his military commanders are concerned, but the reason given for the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur really takes the cake.

If I read the President's statement correctly, the reason given for the dismissal was that—

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations.

What policy is the President talking about? You cannot support or implement a policy that you know nothing about or that is nothing more than a figment of a few people's imagination.

We have been doddling along so long now in Korea that it took some kind of statement from General MacArthur to arouse the State Department, the White House, and the United Nations out of their lethargic sleep and let them know there is a war going on, that more and

more of our boys are dying every day and being maimed for life, simply because we have had no clear-cut policy in the Far East and we still have not one today. There has been a lack of direction, and no ultimate objective for the fighting in Korea has been established.

These people who talk about General MacArthur's dismissal opening the gates to a peaceful conclusion of the Korean War do not know what they are talking about. I would just like to point out that General MacArthur had nothing to gain by prolonging the Korean War for he already has his five stars.

It could be that the well-known armchair strategists, General Marshall and Anna Rosenberg, had their say along with our renowned Secretary of State, whose magic wand still waves over the administration.

Then, too, I just cannot understand how our United Nations allies, who have made a combined contribution in manpower and material of less than 15 percent of our own contribution in Korea always seem to have so much to say about how the Korean War should be fought.

As the President said in his statement, "General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established," and I would like to add to this that the final chapters in the life of General MacArthur, as yet unwritten, will bring to light the sordid tales of how the Roosevelt and Truman administrations sold China down the river and opened the floodgates of godless Communist aggression upon all of Asia.

For a Sound National Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter which has been sent to the Members of this House by a former distinguished Senator from New York and Representative from New York's Forty-first Congressional District, James W. Wadsworth. No man in America has given more careful and more extensive consideration to the problems of forging a sound national military policy for this country, in time of peace as in time of war, than has Senator Wadsworth. During the decades when he was an illustrious Member of this Congress, he worked with dedicated purpose toward that end. His plea in the following letter for a national military policy which will include provisions for a continuing program of military training for our young men deserves attentive consideration by every Member of this House.

Senator Wadsworth's letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 6, 1951.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Returning to my Washington residence temporarily after 2 months' absence from the country and being deeply concerned by the trend of events, I venture to address you on a subject which has gripped my attention for a long time—the subject being national military policy.

I think you will agree with me that the United States has never, up to this day, adopted a military policy endurable in time of peace and effective in time of war. Lacking such a policy we have been forced to meet attacks upon us by the desperately hasty mobilization of untrained manpower. In other words, we have commenced to get ready to fight after the fight has started. The cost in dollars has been staggering (witness the national debt) and, more important, the sacrifice in lives has been tragic. Moreover, our unreadiness, well known over the world, has tempted the aggressor to attack, confident that he could attain his objective while we were still in the throes of preparation.

None of us can be certain about what the future will bring. We may have strong allies or we may be caught alone. In any event, our best protection is strength, organized and maintained in time of peace. I am sure no thoughtful person will deny the truth of that statement. Then, how shall we develop and maintain peacetime strength? Shall we support, in time of peace, a regular, professional military force strong enough to meet a major emergency? It is obvious, if we think twice, that we can't do it unless we are willing to pay two fearful penalties—one a crushing financial burden and the other the creation, eventually, of a dominating professional military caste. The payment of such penalties would go far toward Prussianizing this country—a prospect which is abhorrent to every thoughtful American.

Is there no other way for us to be strong? For more than 30 years I have been convinced that there is such a way and that, if followed, it would provide strength without injuring our free institutions. Look back at the two great wars which we have fought since 1917 and it will be noted that the overwhelming majority of our defenders was drawn from civil life. Those defenders came into the service of their country eager but untrained. They served and suffered. Without them we would have lost. Trained or untrained, the civilian, summoned to the defense of his country is the man who, in the long run, must save it. Without him we're gone. If this be conceded, is it not wise for us to see to it that the civilian is trained in time of peace so that we may have a great civilian reserve ready to answer the call, should it come? Is there any other way by which we can be strong? There is none.

And is it undemocratic to require capable young men to prepare themselves for the defense of their country? Is it not a part of the true democratic spirit for all such men to assume the obligation? If it is not their obligation, who will assume it? Volunteers? Our history shows conclusively that reliance upon volunteers has failed utterly and the underlying reason for the failure has been that such a system, if you can call it so, is fundamentally undemocratic.

Today there is pending before the House of Representatives a measure which, if approved, will establish, for the first time in our history, a national military policy emerging from the experience of the past, calculated to meet the strains of the future and, most important, founded upon a truly democratic concept. To strike from this bill those provisions relating to the training of our young men under predominant civilian control would throw us back into the confusion of no policy—the same old story—and cause every potential aggressor to rejoice.

Remember, they are watching us. I am hoping earnestly that the Congress will dispel further confusion at home and deny encouragement to our enemies abroad by adopting this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. WADSWORTH.

Ousting of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the ousting of General MacArthur completes the Truman administration record of capitulation to British foreign policy. Even though the people of this country, and their elected representatives, have overwhelmingly expressed the desire for freedom of action in Korea and a quick end to the killing of American boys in that battle area, the President's advisors in the State Department have succeeded in subordinating our wishes and in upholding Britain and other nations of Europe in declaring that continent the most critical military area.

This is not merely the firing of a general in the field but a complete sell-out of a strong American foreign policy. There have been over 1,000,000 casualties in the Korean War to date on both sides—yet the President refuses to consider this as a major war area and to take the appropriate steps to assure victory in Korea.

MacArthur has gone about his task of winning the Korean War despite the handicaps placed upon him. The United Nations has taken no stand in over a month on the ultimate aims in Korea, and the Truman administration has adopted a similar stand-pat program. Despite these factors, MacArthur has been trying to win a major war as quickly as possible with the smallest number of casualties.

President Truman's action will bring unbridled joy to the hearts of the Communists in Moscow and Peiping and in other capitals of the world. The American Communists and fellow travelers are now in complete command of our foreign policy. This is appeasement of the worst sort.

A War Without Plan, Without Preparation, and Without Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit herewith a column entitled "They're Never Mailed,"

by Henry W. Clune, which was published in the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle on March 6, 1951, together with a copy of my reply to the column, which was published in the Democrat and Chronicle of March 20, 1951:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of March 6, 1951]

SEEN AND HEARD

(By Henry W. Clune)

THEY'RE NEVER MAILED

Sometimes I wake up in the middle of the night in a cold sweat. Then it becomes a hot sweat. Then I get up and go downstairs and write a letter to the Congressman. A letter written to a Congressman in the middle of the night under a head of steam is no thing to put in the mail, and in the morning I have always destroyed what I have written. "Mad Letters" are often unreasonable, always intemperate and seldom effective. And I am not mad at my Congressman as a person. I am mad only at the craziness that appears pandemic in Washington.

I got off of those unmailed "mad letters" the other midnight after reading in the newspapers that the casualties among our fighting forces in Korea now number more than 50,000. That is an awfully lot of good American men to be knocked off in what the President of the United States once blithely described as a "police action." It seems particularly tragic when the thing goes on interminably, with no one, so far as I have been able to find out, defining its objective.

I don't pretend to know anything about the international situation. It's not my line. I'm no pundit or seer. Neither am I overly impressed by those who claim to know all the answers to the problems of the present crisis. I can second guess as well as they can, even though my finger isn't held tightly on the pulse of the world, as a fellow on the radio, with a little too much boast for my taste, claimed the other day that his was.

But I have three sons of military age, one of whom is back in the Army for a second hitch, and several of his friends who were called back with him now lie dead in Korea, sacrificed to a horde of barbarian monsters who are too great in number ever wholly to be defeated by American forces. I don't know the international score, but I'd be as bitter as gall and think it a wasteful sacrifice, if my son suffered a similar fate.

I'm biased by personal and selfish interests, to be sure. But a man worrying about his own son can also have a good deal of concern for the son of the man sitting next to him at a restaurant table or in a bus. From what I ascertain from listening to the comments of people in the street, the great majority of them have no stomach for the Korean war, and the soldiers who suffer the possibility of exposure to it definitely want out.

They write to me about it and they don't write as they did during the last war. There was a fine high spirit among them then. It was reflected in their letters. They thought they knew what that was all about. This time they write bitterly about what one of them called the muddling by the meatheads in Washington. One man who left a wife and two children and a home he had just started to buy, recently wrote:

"They have given the unorganized Reserves, of which I am one, a lousy deal in this thing. I had nearly 3 years of overseas service in the last war. Much of that service was fighting service. I came out with a good 10 years added to my life. I thought at last I had a chance to live a normal life. Now I'm back in the Army, and God knows where I'll be a month from now.

"They say Korea. They say our job is to bleed the Chinese Communists white. And that we've got to save face in the Orient. Who's face? Harry Truman's at the loss of a couple of hundred thousand Americans? Or a million. It could reach that number, if the Chinese keep pouring in, and we keep pouring in against them. What's our goal, how will we know when we've won? Joe Stalin must be laughing."

A couple of soldiers have sent me columns by Westbrook Pegler. One who did this wrote, "I never liked Pegler before. But read what I have underscored, and see if you don't agree." The lines marked were these:

"Why are American men in Korea? How can this ghastly folly end in any advantage to this country? They are there for a jumble of disgraceful reasons, starting with Roosevelt's 'recognition' of Soviet Russia and rising to the lamentable climax of Truman's offhand decision to send a few companies of milk-fed riflemen into a loathsome, unknown country to be slaughtered by an enemy as elusive as a fog. * * * How did we get into this damned thing? Does anybody want to go on with it besides the contemptible fakers who make war medicine?"

As I said, I tore up my midnight "mad letter" to the Congressman. But maybe he'll read this. I hope he does.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of March 20, 1951]

SEEN AND HEARD

(By Henry W. Clune)

CONGRESSIONAL REPLY

DEAR HENRY: That midnight "mad letter" about Korea that you wrote to your Congressman, tore up, and then wrote about in your column of March 6, has wound up on my desk in multiple copies. You say modestly that you "don't claim that your finger is on the pulse of the world," but a couple of typical correspondents indicate the contrary. One writes that "Henry Clune has put his finger on one of his readers' pulse, namely mine." And another encloses your column with the comment that your view that Korea is a "wasteful sacrifice" is "so true."

Of course, it is true, Henry. I doubt that Americans realize yet how true it is. I said last summer that we had been plunged into a war with Korea, "without plan, without preparation, and without objectives." (And, of course, without consultation. Time has only deepened my conviction that the decision to intervene in Korea was not a military decision: it was a political decision, and moreover, a political campaign decision. We have just seen the Reds move in on Tibet, but not one official hand has been wrung, so far as I know, over the Tibetans. Could it be a matter of timing?)

As you know, at the time the decision was made to go into Korea we had withdrawn our Armed Forces from the peninsula, accepting the Army's view that it was militarily undefensible.

We knew, from official reports of the UN Commission on Korea, that the North Koreans and the Chinese Reds had completed a military-aid agreement in 1949. We knew, because the UN Commission on Korea had told us so, on May 10, 1950, that the North Koreans were massing and mobilizing on the thirty-eighth parallel and that "there was imminent danger of invasion from the north."

But the administration had officially washed its hands of Korea, had evacuated our Army, had announced that our western line of defense did not extend to the peninsula. Korea was a political and military vacuum and the Reds moved in.

If during our occupation, a stable republican government had been established in South Korea, our "police action" might still have been justified on the basis of a gallant defense of a sister republic struggling to establish democratic self-government. The plain fact is that the contrary was true. Our efforts at creating a sound civil, democratic government and a working economy were a spectacular and extravagant failure.

According to C. Clyde Mitchell, an American administrator in the United States military government of Korea: "In 1948, as the United States transferred authority to the new government of South Korea, the industry of the country was virtually wrecked. Inflation was growing worse. Koreans were slaughtering Koreans by the hundreds in bloody riots. Political parties multiplied; seldom were they able to reach an agreement on any course of action. Korean police were as brutal as the Japanese police had been. Civil rights were practically unknown; restrictions on the freedom of speech had been instituted which were so severe as to be called by responsible Korean observers 'totalitarian thought control.' The new Korean Government had shown no great desire to change the traditional way of government by squeeze and patronage."

I am not pointing the finger of scorn in citing this. There are understandable historic, psychological, and ethnic reasons why this was so. But that was the situation. Korea was regarded as militarily undefensible. And experience had proved it to be disastrously unready for a republican form of government. Why, then, did we let Stalin choose it for us as a battleground? I did not know at that time, and I still do not know.

And I am less irked than some over the fact that the UN drags its feet in supporting us in Korea, because I realize that the Europeans and Latin Americans may be as puzzled as I am over this campaign to defend "democracy" at the gates of Seoul. Europe fears, as one of her leading statesmen recently put it, "that the United States might lose itself in an Asiatic war where it might find a fate similar to that of Napoleon in Russia: numerous and great successes, but absolute impossibility of bringing the war to an end, a terrible waste of strength for a problematic result."

What, then, to do about it?

Well, Henry, Alcoholics Anonymous have a wonderful prayer which goes something like this: "God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; the courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference." Perhaps that is also a prayer for our times.

For example, sooner or later we are going to have to arrive at a settlement in Korea. It is now a ruined country, economically, spiritually, and in every other way. I do not imagine it greatly matters to the plain people of Korea today who wins the fight, so long as the fighting stops. The least that we will probably settle for is a toehold on the peninsula to save our so-called face. The most that we can win is a destroyed, demoralized, subjugated, and bankrupt country. We shall pour more billions into it, after the settlement, to repair some of the destruction, but the major problem of establishing stable self-government there will be farther than ever from solution. It seems to me that this is the time to reflect that there are some things we cannot change, in 1 generation or 10, and I hope, we shall have the serenity and the intelligence to accept that fact.

There are some things we can change though, and I also hope we have the courage to recognize and change them.

As freeborn Americans we do not have to continue in office an administration which has brought us to this disastrous pass. We have learned the hard way that in foreign affairs this administration has been soft-

headed, opportunistic, purblind, and unrealistic. In domestic affairs, it has been extravagant, capricious, and corrupt. We do have the ballot box where we can correct these things. Let us have the courage and sustained conviction to use it.

I am not saying to you that the Republicans, if in power, will correct these things in a week or a year. I am saying that this administration has stayed in power too long; that, as one of the Washington newspapers recently put it, it can no longer distinguish between the fruity, ripe aroma of hung pheasant and something that just plain stinks.

We are today saddled with the highest budget, the largest debt, the most far-flung commitments, and one of the most extravagant and corrupt governments in the history of our country. Stalin himself couldn't have planned it better. And American voters are the only ones who can do anything about it.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Representative, Forty-first Congressional District.

Use of Chinese Nationalist Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Question of Calculated Risk," regarding the proposal to use Chinese Nationalist troops, which appeared in the Washington Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION OF CALCULATED RISK—ADMINISTRATION MUST SOON FACE SQUARELY ISSUE RAISED BY MACARTHUR ON CHIANG TROOP USE

(By Constantine Brown)

The question the administration may have to face squarely in the near future is whether to take a calculated risk and give the Chinese Nationalists the green light to land in southern China, as General MacArthur has recommended, or follow the British-Indian line and accept a peace with the Chinese Communists in Korea on their own terms.

General MacArthur's statement last week is reliably reported to have been preceded by a realistic summation of the situation, as follows:

1. Because of our commitments in Europe there is no likelihood of the United States sending any further reinforcements.

2. The other members of the United Nations which have forces in Korea cannot increase them. Neither Britain nor France can add a single platoon to the forces available there. France has her hands full in Indochina, while Britain has engaged everything at her disposal for the Far East in Malaya and Hong Kong.

3. For reasons known best to the administration in Washington no support has been given to the South Korean Government to increase its fighting power. Some 250,000 South Koreans are available. These men, who could have been trained for combat, did not receive the needed weapons for training or fighting, despite President Syngman Rhee's repeated pleas to Washington.

Dr. Rhee had to draw on his meager dollar reserves to engage American Reserve officers to train his young men and also to purchase some equipment. Recently more than 100,000 men in training camps had to be released because of lack of food and clothing.

When queried about the correctness of this report, which was published in American newspapers, General MacArthur stated that this was a matter between the American and Korean Governments and outside the scope of his authority. Thus, the United Nations forces are being deprived of between 150,000 and 200,000 reinforcements, which could have been drawn from South Korean manpower, because "something had gone wrong in Washington."

4. The Chinese Communists are building up their striking power for an early spring offensive. Their ground forces are estimated by Allied intelligence at between 400,000 and 500,000 men in North Korea. A force of undetermined strength is being gathered on the eastern and western North Korean boundaries.

There are good reasons for believing that for the first time since the outbreak of hostilities the enemy will be provided with an adequate air force and possibly will be supported by volunteer submarines.

Thus, on the Allied side we are confronted with a situation in which we cannot possibly hope for any additional ground forces. These are a top priority in the present war in Asia, since the high command is not allowed to use its air power strategically.

The enemy, relying on his masses of ground forces and reassured that his sanctuaries across the Yalu River will not be molested by UN aviation, can look to the future with confidence.

Under these conditions General MacArthur once more has made a final plea to his superiors in Washington to permit the Chinese Nationalists to enter the war. The opposition to use of these forces came last summer from the State Department where it was believed that so long as the Nationalists did not intervene the Communists would remain outside the conflict.

The diplomats were wrong, principally because the Indian ambassador at Peiping, who was our listening post, had drawn the wrong conclusions from his conversations with the Communist leaders. But it would be useless now to try to place the blame on anybody for such a plausible error. The important thing now is to prevent a defeat or stalemate, which might be tantamount to defeat.

The Nationalist Government in Formosa is a charter member of the United Nations. Its representative in that organization is a permanent member of the Security Council. The fact that some governments, such as those of Britain and India, have withdrawn their recognition from the Nationalists and extended it to the Communists does not change in any way the situation of Nationalist China in the UN. Hence, legalistically and realistically the Nationalists are entitled to every assistance for opening a second front in guerrilla-ridden Southern China.

The Final Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the firing of MacArthur is another and perhaps the final step of appeasement by Truman and Acheson and ranks in the American hall of shame with the sell-outs at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran.

When generals who are military pygmies compared to MacArthur prepared the order relieving him of command, they told every American fighting man that courage, skill, intellectual honesty, and a deep conviction in fundamental American principles of individual liberty and freedom, for which they are asked to die, had been relegated to the scrap heap.

When President Truman directed the removal of MacArthur, he told the world that henceforth the clique of Lattimore, Jessup, and Dean Acheson, the discredited leader whose policies brought about the Korean War and 60,000 American casualties and who is a professed supporter of a convicted traitor, will direct future military policies.

America faces its greatest crisis. It is not of a military nature. The people must now decide for all time whether they will permit a Communist-sympathizing Secretary of State to tear out the fighting heart of America and deliver it on the platter of appeasement to our enemies.

Attitude of British Labor Party Toward General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence regarding the attitude of the British Labor Government toward the muzzling or removing of General MacArthur, which appeared in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SET OF RULES SUGGESTED—BRITISH LABOR "LEFT-WINGERS" COULD BE PLACATED BY MUZZLING OR OUSTER OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

(By David Lawrence)

There's an ironical answer—although perhaps one not too palatable for Americans—with which to try to placate the "left-wing" members of the Labor government in Great Britain who seems to think General MacArthur should either be muzzled or removed from his command. It would be to formulate a new set of rules somewhat as follows:

1. No officer or enlisted man of the Armed Forces of the United States shall hereafter answer any letter from any Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who addresses any inquiry to him.

2. If any military man happens to write a personal letter or a letter commenting on matters of public interest to some Member of Congress who makes such a letter public, believing it in the public interest to do so, the immediate expulsion of any such Member of Congress shall be ordered and a certified copy of the removal action shall be sent to the British House of Commons or to any other complaining governments in the UN.

It might, of course, encourage the British Socialists who have introduced a motion in the House of Commons calling for an expression of "no confidence" in General MacArthur to feel that the adoption of such a motion is tantamount to an order to President Truman to discipline General MacArthur and that it will establish a precedent for regulating the behavior of other American officials in the future.

Seriously, however, the episode is likely to split the British Parliament as it is bound to split the American Congress if it is pressed. The Labor government in Britain really cannot afford to make an issue of it with the American Government without at the same time creating in the United States the very kind of dissension that the British are represented as anxious to avoid with respect to European as well as far-eastern problems.

For, if the British "left-wing" move proceeds further, it is bound to have repercussions on this side in Congress. Already the United States Navy is seriously considering withdrawal from the over-all command principle with respect to the inter-allied command in the Atlantic. American Naval officers say they do not want to see any of their number subjected to the same kind of criticism that has already been directed toward General MacArthur.

The truth of the matter is that General MacArthur is just being made the scapegoat for the differences of opinion which have existed between Washington and London for several months as to what should be done in Korea. General MacArthur has publicly appealed to the United Nations for military help. He has appealed for reinforcements again and again to no avail. He has pointed out the dangers of stalemate. He has urged that he be given the right to bombard the bases from which the Chinese Communists are coming to attack his troops. He has made his recommendations through official channels and has got nowhere. It is apparent that General MacArthur is pleading on behalf of the 250,000 Americans who are stagnated in Korea and destined to fight indefinitely there without further help from the European allies.

Maybe the British criticism will unwittingly have a beneficial effect. It may compel a showdown inside the UN on Korea. For it looks as if a decided effort is being made to force the UN out of Korea through a program of abject withdrawal. Again and again these elements have called for peace negotiations, and every time the Chinese Communists have answered with arrogance and defiance, because they undoubtedly regard these constant overtures as a sign of UN weakness. But irrespective of the sacrifices that have been made, the "left wingers" in London, through professing to believe in freedom of speech, now evidently object even to the statement of the case to the people of the world as General MacArthur has tried to do. They do not want any further discussion by the man on the ground—even though he be the UN Commander in Chief—unless it fits their point of view.

President Truman has been urged here, too, by some of the anti-MacArthur group to discipline or reprimand the general. Some of the pressure is coming from the peace-at-any-price elements here. All that can be said is that if General MacArthur is disciplined, it will touch off a political controversy that will not end with the fate of the general himself but will affect American policies toward Europe in general and Britain in particular for a long time to come.

The American Government has kept silent too long as to its own viewpoint with respect to Korea. A declaration of aims and purposes in Korea might at least clear the air and let the world know that the sacrifices undertaken since last June in the name of a war against aggression have not been in vain.

St. Lawrence Waterway, Panama Sea-Level Project, and National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, two gigantic construction projects, strenuously advocated over many years primarily on the basis of their alleged necessity to the national defense, are the St. Lawrence waterway and the so-called sea-level canal at Panama.

During the hearings on the St. Lawrence proposal before the House Committee on Public Works on April 9, 1951, former Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, in a notable presentation definitely clarified the principal national defense issues concerning these two undertakings and revealed the major fallacies in the reasoning underlying their advocacy.

In this connection special attention is invited to a list of authoritative articles on the atomic bomb, security, and national defense in an extension of remarks of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Operation of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 16, page A5580—entitled "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Bibliographical List." More recent articles dealing with the same subject have been published in subsequent issues of the RECORD in extensions of remarks of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa.

The main ideas in these articles obviously apply to the St. Lawrence waterway as well as to an Isthmian Canal, and support the opinions expressed by former Representative Bradley. His views, backed as they are, by a broad naval and civil governmental experience, merit the most careful study by every Member of Congress, especially those on the committees charged with responsibilities affecting the national security. They clearly emphasize the urgent need, long recognized by distinguished Members of Congress, for the Congress to have the benefit of technical opinions by the best qualified independent authorities whenever considering construction projects of vast magnitude.

For the complete record of former Representative Bradley's discussion, attention is invited to the forthcoming printed hearing on the St. Lawrence proposal. Meanwhile, under special leave accorded, I quote the full text of his basic statement:

STATEMENT BY CAPT. WILLIS W. BRADLEY, USN, RETIRED, BEFORE THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ON THE PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, my name is Willis W. Bradley. While I am appearing at the invitation of the St. Lawrence Project Conference, I do not appear as one of its officials or representatives. Rather, I put myself in the category of the average American taxpayer who views with alarm as taxes rise and the value of his dollars melts away.

To save time, I submit the following information in an effort to qualify as a witness whose ideas deserve consideration in the formulation of your views on this St. Lawrence project.

I am a captain in the Navy, retired after more than 40 years of service. However, the opinions I express here should not be taken as having any connection, either direct or implied, with the Navy Department. I am a graduate of the Naval War College and a postgraduate in naval ordnance and gunnery. For some 7 years, I was a member of the Board of Inspection and Survey of the Navy, inspecting more than a thousand ships of all types and accepting, on behalf of the Government, more than 500 ships of various categories. In the political and administrative fields, I have been Governor of Guam and a Member of this House of Representatives. While a Member of Congress, I served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Ship Operation, Construction, and Maritime Labor. For some years I have carried out extensive studies of the Panama Canal and have participated in the controversy over the proposed replacement of the present lock-type installation with a sea-level canal, due to alleged inability to defend present locks and dams against aerial bombing.

I trust these comments will serve as an adequate qualification.

II. GENERAL

With all due respect for the prominent gentlemen who have appeared heretofore in advocacy of this St. Lawrence waterway, I find myself in opposition to it purely on the basis of what seems to be for the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

Let me quote from the Wall Street Journal of February 26, 1951. Under the heading "Review and outlook" we read:

"One of the serious dangers to which the country's rearmament effort is being exposed is the anxiety of almost innumerable interest groups to grind their particular axes on it. This, that, and the other project and pet legislative scheme is declared, in terms of alarm, to be essential to our survival as a Nation.

"Let enough of these plots succeed and Marshal Stalin may well grin contentedly behind his pipe * * * etc."

It is easy to recognize the solemn truth of these words of the Wall Street Journal.

III. SECURITY

A major claim of the waterway proponents is that the national security will be greatly enhanced by an extension of deep-water shipbuilding and ship-repair operations to the Great Lakes. This claim seems to resolve itself into two phases: First, greater security from enemy attack; and, second, provision of needed additional shipyards.

Prior to the advent of long-range bombing the Great Lakes region was one of the most secure areas of the Nation insofar as damage from enemy action is concerned. Even now, it might be so if our prospective opponent were situated in the Southern Hemisphere or were of small potential air effectiveness. However, such conditions do not prevail and are not likely within the foreseeable future.

We have only one potential enemy sufficiently strong to worry us in the sense of national survival. That is the Soviet Union.

The Soviet is not a great sea power and there is small prospect of it becoming one, other than as this might be accomplished

through the operations of a huge submarine force. The really great strength of the Soviet Union is in its army and its air force. It must be apparent even to the novice in world strategy that any assault upon the continental United States is almost certain to be from the air. The shortest route from probable Soviet air bases is across the Arctic to the Pacific Northwest, the upper Great Lakes country, or the New England States.

I doubt if the Soviet Union now has any aircraft which can fly a worth-while bombing mission to the United States and return to base, but I haven't the least doubt they will have such craft in the near future. They can fly such a mission now on a one-way basis, deliver their bombs, and land for capture or internment as the case might be. This assertion is verified by Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, who stated in the Saturday Evening Post of February 17, 1951, that—

"The Soviet Union, for example, now has at least 450 planes that can strike our major population and industrial centers from bases in the U. S. S. R."

Thus, we find that the Great Lakes area has become one of our most exposed frontiers and any idea that the national security can be enhanced by increasing the density of shipbuilding facilities therein, at the expense of less-exposed regions, should be abandoned as without foundation in fact.

Additional shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, other conditions permitting, would best enhance the national security by being situated in the deep South, say a hundred miles up the Mississippi, up the St. John's River in Florida, and in other spots similarly located with reference to exposed frontiers.

Permit me to quote Vice Adm. Russell Willson before a Senate subcommittee holding hearings on this St. Lawrence waterway project in 1947. Admiral Willson said:

"In my opinion, the concept that this project would make a substantial contribution to national security by providing additional facilities for deep-sea vessels in a relatively secure area has been nullified by the recent and prospective developments in the field of warfare."

IV. SHIPBUILDING

At the hearing above mentioned, Admiral Willson also said:

"I see nothing in the warfare of the future to change the role which the Great Lakes shipyards played in the last war. They built 510 small vessels up to and including escort vessels and submarines. Any additional capacity could be used for similar purposes, as this was only 12½ percent of the number of these types of vessels built during the war."

And also:

"Had I the decision I would think long and hard before I counted heavily on shipbuilding facilities for deep-water vessels on the Great Lakes, when all facilities there could be used many times over for equally necessary small vessels."

The fact is that we now have many times the shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities needed in time of peace. We have so many yards that our west coast is without a single large ship under construction—that yards stand empty from Canada to the Mexican border—that others exist precariously on repair jobs and on crumbs thrown by the Government as vessels are taken out of reserve and restored to active service.

Shipbuilding has become so scarce since World War II that mechanics and other artificers employed in the trade have scattered to the winds—obliged to turn their hands to any job offering a living wage. Great yards—such as Calship at Los Angeles and Oregon Ship at Portland—yards which in their heyday delivered a Victory ship every 4 days—are dismantled as unneeded in the future.

Yards on the east coast and in the Gulf have been more fortunate than those in the West but, at times, these big establishments have been reduced to a single job in hand.

I quote from the 1950 annual report of the Shipbuilders Council of America:

"The report of activities for the past year and the outlook for the immediate future is not encouraging.

"No contracts for naval vessels were placed with private shipyards since the last annual report in 1949 and no new contracts for naval vessels are in sight.

"The present and prospective activity in the industry is not now sufficient in volume to maintain that degree of efficiency necessary to have an adequate core of shipbuilding and ship repairing know-how available to meet another emergency."

Facilities for expansion of shipbuilding on salt water coasts are tremendous as has been shown in the two World Wars.

Great Lakes shipbuilders have done excellent work in the past on vessels which can be brought to the sea through existing outlets, but, as previously stated, they produced only 12½ percent of the smaller ships constructed for the Navy during World War II. The need for these small vessels (mine sweepers, antisubmarine craft, picket and patrol boats, landing craft of various types) is likely to be just about unlimited in the event of another great war.

I should strongly recommend to the Great Lakes people that they put aside local pride and ambition and recognize that their most valuable contribution in any future war effort in this particular field is in the expeditious and economical production of ships which can utilize present outlets to the sea.

In concluding this section, I submit that, in my opinion, the argument that additional deep-water shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities in the Great Lakes would materially enhance the national security is fallacious, and that expenditures of Federal funds to bring about the establishment of such facilities in the Great Lakes would be unsound, uneconomical, and a travesty on the efforts of this Congress to hold the cost of national security to the lowest level consistent with the safety of the United States.

V. CANALS

The St. Lawrence seaway project involves an extensive use of canals for ships passing from salt water to the Great Lakes. As a general rule, both owners and masters of large ships regard canals, more especially lock canals, with distrust and dislike due to the time required for passage and the very considerable risk of damage to the ships, the locks, or both. In view of this, canals for large vessels cannot expect to be successful financially unless they serve as an indispensable link or are great time savers, for there is no place in industry where the adage "time is money" is more applicable than in shipping.

As a partial consequence of the above, estimates of probable overseas world trade which would move through the waterway are quite likely to be exaggerated, and the adverse sentiments expressed by American steamship men in letters inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1947, by Senator Overton, are likely to be more nearly accurate than the estimates of proponents of the project. Even the most discerning man cannot say just what trade will or will not utilize the waterway. It is not as simple as that. One can only surmise from a general knowledge of ships and seamen, of probable profits, of risks and delays involved.

Canals are alike in many ways, and one such is their actual cost as compared to preconstruction estimates. Each time the estimators are sure they are right. Each time they turn out to be wrong. This is just a human failing because even the best engineers are not omniscient and so are not able to foresee costs for years ahead. Also they can't foretell what legislators and politicians may do in the construction period.

Take these few figures from the Minority Report by Senator LODGE in 1948 (80th Cong., Rept. No. 810, pt. 2):

	Estimates	Actual costs
Welland Canal	$40,000,000	$120,000,000
Chicago drainage canal	16,000,000	53,000,000
New York State barge canal	62,000,000	176,000,000

Completed costs for these canals averaged 197.5 percent above the estimates.

Of course, a considerable part of the St. Lawrence costs will be for dam construction. So let us take Senator LODGE's figures on dams:

	Estimates	Actual costs
Bonneville	$42,000,000	$80,000,000
Coulee	113,000,000	159,000,000
Hoover	70,000,000	116,000,000

Completed costs for these dams averaged 57.7 percent above the estimates.

When one carefully considers these statistics he is quite likely to arrive at the conclusion that the St. Lawrence waterway project will cost at least 100 percent more than current estimates. This is not said in a critical mood but rather in the spirit that we may better face the music now than in 1953 or in 1955 when we have gone too far to reconsider. We have excellent engineers and estimators but, with minor errors for round numbers, human limitations seem to be expressed in the cold figures given above and I hold that the evidence is quite conclusive.

Here let me quote Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, before a Senate subcommittee on June 13, 1947:

"With regard to your query as to what the actual cost of construction would be should the project be built within 7 years, it is difficult to form an opinion. I believe we are now in the peak period of postwar construction cost levels. However, conjecture is dangerous and I cannot make a forecast."

In view of the increase in costs during the last year or so, what a wise man General Wheeler was when he made that statement.

The estimates presented by General Pick in his recent statement before this subcommittee covers 6 years instead of 7. The estimated costs for the United States are $566,794,000. In the light of the above figures, it would appear that we can arrive at only a well-calculated guess of what the actual costs would be.

VI. LOCKS

The basic purpose of a navigation lock is to transfer a ship from one water level to another.

The avowed purpose of the St. Lawrence locks is to open the Great Lakes to deep-water shipping.

The alleged reason why this great project should be undertaken now, in a time of deficit governmental finance, is the enhancement of our national security through the assurance of a flow of Labrador ore sufficient to maintain an adequate supply of high-grade iron ore for Great Lake furnaces.

Our problem then is:

Are Americans justified in placing major dependence for an adequate steel supply in time of war on a flow of iron ore which must pass through 16 widely scattered locks situated in territory decidedly vulnerable to enemy air attack?

The answer to that question should, in my opinion, be a major factor in the consideration of this proposed legislation.

Current proposals for the St. Lawrence waterway envisage three sections with locks for navigational purposes. These are: Welland Canal, length 27.6 miles with eight locks having a normal lift of 327 feet; International Rapids Section, length 46 miles with three locks having a normal lift of 84 feet; Canadian Section, length 68 miles with five locks having a normal lift of 133 feet.

In all, 16 locks having a normal lift of 544 feet.

The standard lock dimensions are to be in accord with those of existing Welland Canal locks, that is, 800 feet by 80 feet by 30 feet.

VII. PANAMA CANAL

A comprehensive study of canal vulnerability to enemy attack has been made recently covering the Panama Canal. We should be able to draw conclusions, both valuable and pertinent, from that study.

In Public Law 280, the Seventy-ninth Congress authorized the Governor of the Panama Canal to investigate the means of increasing the capacity and the security of the Canal to meet future needs both as to interoceanic commerce and as to the betterment of the national defense.

The Governor, in making his investigations, had the services of a board of consulting engineers employed under his authority. These engineers reviewed the studies made by him and concurred with his report which was transmitted to the Eightieth Congress on December 1, 1947.

In his report, the Governor recommended what amounts to a new Panama canal at sea level at an initially estimated cost of $2,483,000,000, and an estimated time of completion of 10 years.

The Governor's report is long and complicated but its main features have been summarized in the Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers, 1949, volume 114, by Col. James H. Stratton, United States Army, who was the supervising engineer in the preparation of the report.

Colonel Stratton writes:

"Although no one can say what course World War II would have taken had the Japanese followed up Pearl Harbor (Hawaii) with an attack on the Panama Canal, it is now clear that the locks could have been destroyed and the canal emptied into the sea had an attack been made and the defenses penetrated. The development of larger bombs and new weapons of both conventional and atomic types since Pearl Harbor leaves no doubt as to the vulnerability of the canal to enemy attack and sabotage."

And further—

"It can be stated, however, that the lock canal cannot be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons. At best the protection that could be provided a lock canal would only increase the difficulties rendering it useless. * * * The lock type of canal, no matter how strongly constructed, would not increase security to meet the needs of national defense."

Although I have been a consistent opponent of the sea-level project, as recommended by the Governor of the Panama Canal, my opposition has not been on the basis that the locks or other structures in the present canal can be made impregnable to severe damage by bombing or sabotage. Rather, it has been because of my belief that the alleged advantage in security of any practicable sea-level canal over the present lock-lake type, when reasonably protected and prepared to withstand attack, has not been sufficiently established to justify the vast expenditure required to change over to the sea-level type. It is my opinion that the sea-level canal, as recommended by the governor, would cost the American people in excess of $5,000,000,000 by the time of its completion and I have not, so far, been able to see that the additional security afforded by the change would be worth that price.

However, I find myself in agreement with Colonel Stratton, when he writes:

"The penetration of canal defenses by rockets, guided missiles, or robot planes loaded with powerful conventional or atomic explosives launched from the air, from ship or submarine at sea, or from a land base, must be accepted as a possibility."

I am, therefore, of the opinion that we must accept Colonel Stratton's statement—"It can be said, however, that the lock canal cannnot be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons—as a reasonable premise, in fact, as a declaration of the very best technical knowledge available along these lines at the present time."

VIII. ST. LAWRENCE RELIABILITY

As the alleged reason for undertaking this project now is to assure Great Lakes furnaces of an adequate flow of high-grade iron ore in event of hostilities, and as it is maintained that a considerable part of this ore must come from Labrador via the proposed waterway, then real lack of security of locks, dams, or other vital waterway structures, will destroy the reasonable assurance of that Labrador ore supply and thus eliminate the basic reason for enactment of this legislation.

Just how reliable will the St. Lawrence waterway be in event of war with the Soviet Union?

Consider here a few extracts from General Vandenberg's article in the Saturday Evening Post:

"The American people must realize it is impossible to amass or invent an absolute, impregnable defense against bombing attacks by a strong, determined enemy.

"Should war come, we can expect to destroy not more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are accomplished.

"Even if we had many more interceptor planes and antiaircraft guns and a radar screen that blanketed all approaches to our boundaries, a predictable 70 percent of the enemy's planes would penetrate our defenses despite the extraordinary valor and skill of our pilots.

"The bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack mounted in sufficient strength by the Americans, British, or Germans ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offensive always has a crushing advantage in aerial warfare, and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future."

And now for a few expressions of opinion by Maj. Gen. Follette Bradley, United States Army, retired, before the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on this same subject in 1947:

"The St. Lawrence seaway and power project now lies in the most exposed and vulnerable part of continental United States except Alaska.

"The real question is: Can the project with its 40 locks, more or less, and its proposed dams and powerhouses be defended against enemy air attacks? I answer categorically, 'No'."

Just recall, please, pertinent extracts from the Governor's report:

"It can be stated, however, that the lock canal cannot be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons.

"The lock type of canal, no matter how strongly constructed, would not increase security to meet the needs of national defense."

There we have the cold, hard facts from men who are trained at public expense to know what destructive forces locks and dams may be expected to resist. And these gentlemen say "the lock canal cannot be made resistant to atomic bombs or modern conventional weapons."

Is it possible to present more blasting and conclusive evidence that the proposed waterway cannot be made a secure link in the system of national defense?

Thus, I believe we have arrived at answers to the several questions previously propounded.

Question. Can enemy attack inflict sufficient damage of the proposed waterway to stop the flow of iron ore from Labrador for an extended time?

Answer. Assuming the enemy to be of the strength and location of the Soviet Union—most decidedly, yes.

Question. Just how reliable will the proposed St. Lawrence waterway be in the event of war with the Soviet Union.

Answer. Thoroughly unreliable.

Question. Are Americans justified in placing major dependence for an adequate steel supply in time of war on a flow of iron ore which must pass through 16 widely-scattered locks situated in territory decidedly vulnerable to enemy air attack?

Answer. Emphatically, no.

We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that the American people should reject as detrimental to the public safety the claim that the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway project would greatly enhance the national security by providing an adequate and dependable flow of high-grade iron ore from Labrador sources.

IX. PROBABLE OVERSEAS-GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

Proponents' claim is that the provision of a 27-foot waterway into the Great Lakes would result in the establishment of a considerable overseas Great Lakes shipping. This claim deserves careful consideration.

At present there is a 14-foot channel into the Great Lakes. As far as I know, not one single American-flag ship is utilizing that channel in regular trade, and there is no change in prospect.

I quote from the statement of Mr. Harry C. Brockel, director, Port of Milwaukee Commission, before this subcommittee, in 1950:

"This trade went into eclipse for several decades, but was briskly revised after World War I, when European shipowners sought new trade routes. The St. Lawrence gateway, neglected by American shipping interests, was recognized as a new shipping artery by European shipowners. British and Scandinavian tramp vessels able to carry about 1,500 tons of cargo on the 14-foot draft of the St. Lawrence canals were chartered to haul bulk cargo between European ports and the Great Lakes."

The uninformed, reading this statement, would conclude that our American shipowners just neglected their opportunities—their responsibilities to the American people—and so let this trade go by default to the foreigners. I doubt if Mr. Brockel had any intention of conveying this impression but, to me, it seems to do so, and I want to go on record as of the belief that such an idea is entirely erroneous. American shipowners just couldn't make a success of that shipping. Their expenses for ship construction and operation were so high that the business went to foreigners whose ships and labor cost less than similar items under the American flag.

In my dealings with American ship owners and operators, I have found them to be rather keen businessmen, fully alive to their responsibilities to the public, both as individuals and as a Nation, but, nevertheless,

obliged to meet their payrolls, expenses, and taxes.

According to figures just furnished to me by the National Federation of American Shipping, only 115 American-flag vessels out of our 1,177 privately owned ships, as of January 1, 1951, draw 25 feet or less at full load. Only 94 such vessels draw 24 feet or less at full load.

A 27-foot channel would be usable, then, for only about 9.7 percent of these ships even if one were willing to take the considerable risk of having only a trifle more than 1 foot of fresh water under the keel of ships drawing 25 feet in salt water. Only 8 percent would come within the more reasonable category of drawing 24 feet or less.

I realize that ships do not always sail at full load, and I have read Admiral Cochrane's statement and statistics covering possible utilization of the waterway by partially-loaded American-flag ships which could, in many instances, load to full displacement after reaching deep water. I believe this statement may lead one to be overoptimistic. I think it tends to make the listener accept the possible traffic as a somewhat sure-fire indicator of probable traffic, whereas I am of the opinion that the normal need of topping off in cargo, fuel, and supplies, will score heavily against any extensive use of the proposed waterway under these conditions.

A knowledge of the history of the American merchant marine leads me to believe that such shipping as would use the 27-foot channel into the Great Lakes for regular service would be almost 100-percent foreign flag. With current costs of American-built ships and American labor, I do not see how it could be profitable for our ships to compete in this foreign trade. Neither can I see shipping of any volume between Great Lakes ports and ocean ports of the United States, as the length of the voyage, terminal charges, stevedoring, and so forth, would likely make such a service unprofitable.

For years I have fought steadily to keep American-flag merchant vessels on the seas and to prevent our seamen and engineers from being displaced by foreigners working for wages entirely too low for a decent standard of American living.

I have made this fight with full appreciation of the fact that foreign-flag vessels can carry the goods cheaper than Americans, and just as efficiently, and that transportation might be somewhat less expensive if foreigners were allowed a clear field in the water-borne trade. But America has not reached its present position of the world's greatest nation by utilizing the cheapest of everything as we go along. We protect our farmers, our manufacturers, and many of our basic industries. We permit and encourage labor unions so the working man may receive a fair return for his toil. We do not allow the foreigner to engage in coastwise commerce and we have extended this rule to include Puerto Rico, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands. We encourage and protect essential trade-route ocean shipping by means of subsidies. We do these things because we have learned by experience that the best interests of all of us are served thereby.

Over the years we have built up a huge transportation system to care for the Great Lakes region. That system includes immense facilities in the way of ships, railroads, terminal set-ups, canals, and a thousand and one other things. It is operating satisfactorily, generally speaking, with American labor, American capital, and American equipment. It may not operate as cheaply as could be expected if foreigners took over. It may not be quite as economical to some of the particular interests in the Great Lakes region and contiguous States as a foreign set-up would be. But, when one thinks of the Nation as a whole, of the average taxpayer from Maine to California, it is my opinion that the present arrangement is more economical than one which would result from the enactment of this legislation, and that it should not be scrapped either for the benefit of the relatively few Americans who would profit therefrom or of the foreign shipping which might prosper by taking over in this internal economy of the United States.

X. SUMMARY

I submit, Mr. Chairman, as a summary of my statement, these conclusions:

(a) The Great Lakes area has become one of our frontiers most exposed to enemy attack.

(b) Additional Great Lakes shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities for large deep-water ships are unnecessary either in peace or war.

(c) War shipbuilding in the Great Lakes should be restricted to local needs and to such other vessels as can reach the sea through current outlets.

(d) The argument that deep-water shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities in the Great Lakes would materially enhance the national security is fallacious.

(e) Previous experiences indicate that the actual cost of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway may well exceed current estimates by 100 percent.

(f) An impregnable defense against determined air attack has not so far been achieved and there is nothing to indicate that it will be achieved.

(g) A lock canal cannot be made "resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons."

(h) Enemy attack can, and likely would, seriously damage the proposed waterway and thus block ship transits for an undetermined time.

(i) America is not justified in placing dependence for a reliable ore supply in time of war on the proposed waterway.

(j) Such overseas trade as might develop through a 27-foot channel would likely be 100 percent in foreign bottoms.

(k) The present set-up for Great Lakes region transportation is more economical to the average taxpayer of the Nation than would be the case if this proposed legislation were enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this proposal for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway should not be enacted.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I view with alarm the increasing power being assumed by the President over the military affairs of our Nation as shown in the summary dismissal of our outstanding military-government leader in Korea, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

It is in the same category with Truman's vicious letters to some other people who have been brave enough to face his personal wrath by giving honest constructive criticism of our Executive.

It is my humble opinion that this Nation does not have any other person who is so well versed in the physical, economic, and financial situation among the peoples of the Far East, and the loss of General MacArthur from our staff will greatly weaken our position among the members of the United Nations.

This action on the part of our Chief Executive in his role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces is a stunning blow to my optimism which I have felt about the Korean situation during the past few weeks.

Questionnaire on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN REGAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from a brief trip, during our Easter recess, to my congressional district of west Texas, which includes the city of El Paso.

Many fine, patriotic Americans of pioneer stock make their homes in El Paso and throughout my area and they are gravely concerned with the course of events in our country; the many real and nonessential services dispensed by our Government; the aid being given to European countries and peoples; our many costly bureaus and the huge number of governmental employees, now exceeding 2,000,000 persons; our huge national debt and our constantly increasing tax burden.

Recently, one of our businessmen, Norman L. Casner, Jr., president of the Casner Motor Co., of El Paso, became so concerned that he sought the views of the citizens of that area through publishing a comprehensive questionnaire in the daily newspapers, the space for which he paid regular advertising rates.

It is my opinion that the membership will be interested in the views as expressed in the preliminary returns as they bear on matters now before Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that they be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today at the close of these remarks:

CASNER MOTOR CO., INC.,
El Paso, Tex., March 26, 1951.

To the United States Congressional Delegation of Texas, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: We have in our files over 3,000 signed ballots concerning the matters listed below. For your information and guidance we respectfully submit the tabulated results of these ballots:

1. Are you for or against our representatives taking action right now, to eliminate the waste, the unnecessary jobs, inefficiency, and extravagance within each major department of our Government?

A. For, 2,970—99 percent.

B. Against, 20—six-tenths of 1 percent.

C. No opinion, 11—four-tenths of 1 percent.

2. Do you think our Government should stop giving and lending money and materials, other than military material, to foreign countries, until we can do so with a reasonable tax load, and a diminishing national debt?

A. Yes, 2,793—93.1 percent.
B. No, 153—5.1 percent.
C. No opinion, 55—1.8 percent.

3. Do you think our representatives should take action to correct legislation that requires our Government to buy farm products and other commodities in huge, unusable and unsalable quantities, with taxpayers' money?

A. Yes, 2,906—96.9 percent.
B. No, 58—1.9 percent.
C. No opinion, 37—1.2 percent.

4. Are you for or against admitting Red China into the United Nations?

A. For, 162—5.4 percent.
B. Against, 2,722—90.7 percent.
C. No opinion, 117—3.9 percent.

5. Are you for or against legislation that will prevent the President from ever again committing our Nation to undeclared war, or to any other unusual foreign duty, without consent of Congress or congressional committee?

A. For, 2,513, 83.8 percent.
B. Against, 361, 12 percent.
C. No opinion, 127, 4.2 percent.

6. Do you think the UN should impose an embargo and blockade against the Chinese mainland, and encourage Chiang Kai-shek with moral and material support against the communists?

A. Yes, 2,755—97.8 percent.
B. No, 81—2.7 percent.
C. No opinion, 165—5.5 percent.

7. Do you think our State Department needs a "good overhauling" beginning at the top?

A. Yes, 2,797—93.2 percent.
B. No, 64—2.1 percent.
C. No opinion, 140—4.7 percent.

8. Are you for or against legislation to stop all trade, direct or indirect, with Russia, and forbid entry of people, ships, and goods from Communist dominated countries, into this country?

A. For, 2,764—92.1 percent.
B. Against, 110—3.7 percent.
C. No opinion, 127—4.2 percent.

9. Are you for or against an immediate and all inclusive clean-out of Communists and "Fellow Travelers", from every department of the Government, and air-tight steps taken to keep them out?

A. For, 2,942—98.0 percent.
B. Against, 25—eight-tenths of 1 percent.
C. No opinion, 34—1.1 percent.

10. Are you for or against sending a large standing army to Europe?

A. For, 810—27 percent.
B. Against, 1,633—54.4 percent.
C. No opinion, 558—18.6 percent.

We will be very glad to forward these ballots to any responsible party requesting them. Otherwise, we shall retain them in our file for a reasonable length of time before disposing of them.

Very respectfully yours,

NORMAN L. CASNER,
President.

DOUGLASS, DOUGLAS, OLIVER & HUGHES,
El Paso, Tex., March 28, 1951.

Mr. N. L. CASNER,
Casner Motor Co., Inc.,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR MR. CASNER: We have counted the ballots submitted to us as at March 27, 1951, and we hereby certify that there were 3,001 ballots.

DOUGLASS, DOUGLAS, OLIVER & HUGHES,
By R. A. DOUGLAS.

The Price of Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have, written by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, regarding the price of lead.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I noticed in the Wall Street Journal of last Wednesday that the British Ministry of Supply has raised the price of lead to 20 cents a pound and the price of zinc to 20 cents per pound, an increase of 3 cents. The British Ministry of Supply does all the buying and selling of metals in Great Britain. Our ceiling price is 17½ cents, East St. Louis, for zinc, and, in lead, I find there is a two-price ceiling recognized, that is, 17 cents per pound, New York, for lead mined in my own State of New Mexico, and 18½ cents, New York, for lead mined in Mexico, Peru, Canada, and elsewhere and imported into the United States. So far as I can ascertain this discriminatory two-price system in lead has not been duplicated in other commodities. I understand that the volume of foreign lead being sold at the 18½ cent level is roughly the same as the volume of domestic lead sold at the 17-cent level. It seems to me manifestly unfair to all the lead miners in the United States for them not to be able to receive the same price for their product as manufacturers are willing and permitted to pay for lead of foreign origin.

If a two-price ceiling is to be permitted for lead there should logically be two prices for storage batteries, white lead paint, Ethyl gasoline, plumbing goods, and other articles made from lead. I am wondering how the Office of Price Stabilization proposes to facilitate the flow of such lead ores and pig lead from foreign countries, which we need to supplement our domestic supply, when the ceiling prices here are now at least 3 cents below the market in England. Obviously, England and European countries will be able to outbid us and draw any Mexican, Canadian, and other lead they might need at the 20 cent price. Inasmuch as the tremendous volume of lead now consumed in the United States, about 1,250,000 tons per year, requires the importation of a certain amount of foreign lead, our domestic civilian and defense production will suffer unless the Government agencies quickly make up their minds as to how they are going to reconcile a low domestic price for lead with a higher foreign price, either through Government purchases at a high price and disposal here at the ceiling price, or raising the domestic price to the world level. During the last war premiums were paid to stimulate domestic production. In view of the high world price of lead today premiums should not be necessary if the miners get the benefit of the world market, or its equivalent.

I know from my own experience that the prospectors and miners in my own State of New Mexico generally do not know very much about the world picture in the metal markets. They merely read the metal quotations in their local papers and, unfortunately, the only price quoted nowadays is the ceiling price of 17 cents. I doubt if very many of them know that the world market is now far above this quotation. They get very little satisfaction out of technical discussions of world trade and a world fight against inflation. They have payrolls to meet and money is what they need to meet them.

I take it that Great Britain is just as much concerned with inflation as we are. If that nation is apparently prepared to pay 20 cents per pound for its lead, I should think we could do likewise. What answer can I give to lead producers in New Mexico?

In any event, the two-price ceiling for lead is inexcusable and should be abandoned speedily.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

Proposed Amendment of Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency on the proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

In view of the statement made this afternoon by the majority leader, Senator MCFARLAND, urging Mr. Charles E. Wilson and the heads of the defense mobilization agencies to speed up their work on recommended amendments to the Defense Production Act, I am glad to make known the decisions of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which met early this afternoon.

The committee will begin consideration of an extension of the Defense Production Act and any amendments to the act on Tuesday, May 1, and will continue through Friday, May 25. The committee will meet daily, Monday through Friday.

In view of the fact that several titles of the Defense Production Act and the Rent Control Act expire on June 30, it will be necessary for the committee to complete its hearings not later than May 25 in order to have the bill before the Senate in June.

Realizing the tremendous interest in this legislation, the committee has further instructed me, as chairman, to limit oral testimony during these hearings to representatives of major national organizations who will be able to represent the various segments of the national economy. I want to make it plain that, while we will not be able during the remaining time to hear each individual, the committee will welcome any written statement which may be filed for the benefit of the members during their consideration of this legislation.

The committee had previously agreed that any extension of Federal rent control would

be considered in conjunction with the hearings on that portion of the Defense Production Act relating to authority for general economic controls.

The committee also agreed that any request to testify during these hearings must be filed not later than Wednesday, April 25, in order that the committee may determine the order of appearance for the witnesses who will open the hearings the following week.

Easing German Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Easing German Controls," which appeared in the Washington Star on yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASING GERMAN CONTROLS

The common defense of the Atlantic community has been additionally strengthened by the latest Anglo-French-American relaxation of controls on West Germany's industrial production. The Ruhr—"the workshop of Europe"—will now be rid of many former restraints, and its stepped-up output, in addition to promoting the country's internal economic health, cannot fail to contribute significantly to the free world's effort to counter the threat of Red aggression.

As agreed upon by the three-power Allied High Commission, the relaxation covers a wide and varied field of productive enterprise. Among other things, it removes all limitations on the size and speed of the merchant ships that the Germans are capable of building, and it permits them to resume the manufacture of synthetic oil and rubber. Further, it authorizes them to make ball bearings, primary aluminum, electronic tubes of different kinds, certain types of machine tools and similar items heretofore prohibited or rigidly restricted. Finally, it provides that the present ceiling on their steel output (11,000,000 tons yearly) may be lifted to help build the defenses of Western Europe.

The only thing still subject to strict limitations and outright prohibitions is West German production of a military nature. A special three-power Allied law continues to apply against atomic activity, and other controls remain in force against the manufacture of aircraft, certain electronic equipment and weapons in general. It is noteworthy, however, that the new Anglo-French-American agreement makes allowance for the possibility of granting licenses to companies in the Ruhr and elsewhere to turn out armaments or related items when, as and if such output is found to be desirable or necessary to bulwark the security of the Atlantic community as a whole.

All this is a far cry from the time when some people saw wisdom in the so-called Morgenthau plan. That political and economic absurdity would have done violence to all the laws of nature with a program designed to reduce the Germans to a completely deindustrialized nation of farmers. But the character of Soviet policy, if not simple sanity, soon demonstrated how such "pastoralization" could have ended only in a Western catastrophe. Our Allied relaxation of controls represents a common-sense recognition of the fact that Germany's productive capacity is of prime importance to the defense of freedom.

Posthumous Decoration of Corp. Bobby Smith, of Anderson, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial which appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent on April 5, 1951. It is an open letter to the United Nations concerning the presentation posthumously of the Distinguished Service Cross to Corp. Bobby Smith, of Anderson, S. C., who gave his life in Korea. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONCERNING THE LATE CORP. BOBBY SMITH

UNITED NATIONS,
Lake Success, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: We have just learned that the United States Army's General Hodge is coming to Anderson April 12 to present the Distinguished Service Cross to Corp. Bobby Smith, of Anderson.

Corporal Smith will not be here to receive the medal. Corporal Smith is dead.

The medal will be awarded, as they say, posthumously. It will be given to Bobby's parents, who live at No. 5, Bailey Street, in the pleasant Equinox community.

The medal is in recognition of Corporal Smith's devotion to duty, and to his willingness to sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty.

He is one of many heroes, living and dead, whose courage nourished on the good South Carolina air hereabouts and whose love of country springs from a long line of patriots who have fought in all our wars, from the Revolution forward.

Corporal Smith is not the first Anderson County boy to breathe his last in Korea, nor will he be the last.

All of us realize that men are going to be killed when there is war and the families of those who are on the battle lines steel themselves daily against bad news, the meanwhile praying that the fateful telegrams will not come.

Many such telegrams came to Anderson during the last war, gentlemen. Too many have come this time.

It is bad enough when the aims of the war are clear. It is much worse when those aims are confused, faltering, and uncertain as they are today.

We would like to think that when Corporal Smith fell he was convinced that he was dying for his country, and that his sacrifice would contribute in some effective way to eventual peace on earth.

It is fitting and proper that a high general should come to our city bearing a medal for Corp. Bobby Smith, thus assuring that this soldier will be remembered always in the hearts of his countrymen.

But, gentlemen—

The list of Bobby Smiths is growing every hour while you so-called diplomats chatter away inanely, sidestepping the cold facts, dodging the issues, and generally putting on as cowardly a display as has ever disgraced the pages of human history.

You sit there in the security of lushly furnished meeting rooms fearing to show leadership, backing away from challenging all-out the aggression which brought Bobby Smith and others like him to their untimely graves.

You backbite General MacArthur and others who are trying to bring the killing to an end. You want to gag those who would tell the truth about Korea.

It is understandable that you would gag MacArthur. Every time he opens his mouth and says anything about ending the Korean War he puts the UN on the spot.

Every day you procrastinate you are building higher the fire of demand that MacArthur be brought home and allowed to tell the people the truth.

People want to know why the war is being dragged out, they want to know why the killing continues, and the demand will mount in coming days when and if the Chinese Reds launch their threatened offensive which may result in the greatest blood-letting of the war thus far.

People want to hear from the White House, too. It's time for the American voice in UN to be heard a lot louder than ever before. There has been too much pussyfooting, too much fear of stepping on toes, too much regard for the next election and not enough for the lives of American men.

The life of one "Bobby" Smith is too high a price to pay to keep your shabbily operating organization alive if you can offer no more than you have to date.

There was a day, gentlemen, when the UN was looked upon as the hope of the world. You have succeeded only in killing thousands of American "Bobby" Smiths, and you can't or won't say why.

Ours is the voice of one newspaper in what you striped-pants boys sarcastically refer to as the hinterland, but we've got millions of cousins throughout the land who are in chorus with us.

Pay heed, gentlemen, lest that chorus mount in volume until it blows down the hypocritical house of straw in which you cower, paralyzed by fear, and shamed by the deeds of valor of Cpl. "Bobby" Smith and his comrades in arms.

THE INDEPENDENT.

An Undemocratic Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following news story carried by newspapers in the Forty-first Congressional District, New York, bearing on the President's recent executive order exempting college students with certain scholastic

ratings from the draft. The news story, datelined Batavia, N. Y., April 8, follows:

President Truman's recent Executive order exempting college students with C ratings from the draft was attacked here today by former Senator James W. Wadsworth, who said he was "aghast" at its implications. Speaking over station WBTA as a guest on Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG'S weekly radio program, the former Representative from the Forty-first District expressed the hope that widespread opposition to this order would be registered throughout the country, and that it would be heard.

The President's order says, in effect, according to Senator Wadsworth, "that if you attain a rating of 70 percent you need not serve your country, but if you obtain a rating of only 69 percent, you must go into the foxholes."

"I don't like it," he said. "I don't believe the Armed Forces should be made up of men who don't stand high in school. They should be made up of men of every conceivable rating in school."

Senator Wadsworth said he favored deferment of certain students who are being trained in science, engineering, electronics, etc., but objected to the blanket use of a "C" rating for deferments.

Congressman OSTERTAG, concurring in these views, commented that the deferment of draftees on the basis of brains rather than character or military requirements is both unsound and undemocratic.

Concentration of Power in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, last week end I returned to Kansas for a few days. While in Topeka I visited with a former colleague and distinguished Member of this body, Senator Arthur Capper, who retains his interest in public affairs, as is evidenced by his broadcast of April 8, 1951, from Station WIBW, Topeka, Kans.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Capper's broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because the former Senator gives a timely warning on what is going on in the grab for power within our Government.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPPER SAYS—INCREASINGLY DISTURBED BY GRAB FOR POWER WITHIN GOVERNMENT

A post card from a Mr. J. K. Leiser of Hartford, Kans., indicates that I did not cover quite enough territory a few Sundays ago when I discussed socialism and communism, and attempted to define the same. That was in answer to a letter from Mrs. H. P. Davis, of Neodesha, Kans.

Mr. Leiser wants me to define also fascism, and express my opinion on fascism.

Well, the best definition, and most easily understood, is that fascism is socialism effected through the corporation.

That is, fascism is that form of socialism—abolition of private property—in which the Socialist state is operated through corporations, either government owned or government controlled.

Most recent example, of course, was furnished by Mussolini's so-called corporate state.

As I believe I pointed out 2 weeks ago, communism and socialism hold this in common, by definition:

Communism: The opposite of the system of private property.

Socialism: A state or system in which there is no private property.

To which I now add—

Fascism: Socialism (or the Socialist state) accomplished and operated through the corporation.

You will notice that what we call Russian communism in reality is state socialism. That Soviet Russia takes this same view is evidenced by the official name, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

You may remember also that the word Nazi in common usage a few years ago, is an abbreviation of national (or state) socialism.

All four isms—communism, socialism, naziism, and fascism—are forms of the same concept of government and the relationship between government and the individual.

What we now see in Britain is the spectacle of state socialism masquerading as a labor government.

When the United States withdraws—perhaps I should say if and when the United States withdraws—its financial and other forms of economic support from the British Labor government, the odds strongly are that Britain will have to become openly a Socialist state.

Whether you boldly call the onion an onion, or try to kid yourself and others by calling the onion a rose, you still get the smell of the onion instead of the scent of the rose.

Returning from the realm of poesy to the starkness of fact.

In the Socialist state—whether you call it by that title, or call it the Communist state, the Fascist state, the garrison state, or the police state—the outstanding feature of that state is that the government is everything, all-powerful; the individual is nothing, powerless.

As one Frank Chordorov, a classic economist who also is able to write, put it in one of his articles in Human Events weekly pamphlet recently:

"Any course that tends to increase the power of government must deplete the power of the individual."

I say to you, and I should ponder that statement well, my friends, and very seriously and thoughtfully—

"Any course that tends to increase the power of government must deplete the power of the individual."

That is why some of us, for some time, have become increasingly disturbed by what might be termed the "grab for power" in government.

This grab for power has not been just in the Federal Government in Washington. It has been evident in State capitols; in municipal governments—city councils and commissions and managers; in school boards; throughout Government bureaus and agencies.

And moreover, this grab for power is not just power in government and power over patronage.

The grab includes the grab for power over business; over agriculture; over industry; over money and credit; over electrical power, transportation and communications; down the road, power over labor—after using arrogant but short-sighted labor leaders to center all power in a government which these anticipate they can control, forever and a day; and of course, power over the individual, his life and living, his freedom of thought, action, movements.

In the last analysis, the exercise of this power calls for dictatorial methods, dictators, dictatorships—all the way from local school boards to the supposedly three-branched Federal Government.

The focal point in this contest for several months past has been the Senate of the United States, over whether the war-making power resides in the White House or in the Congress of the United States.

Public attention on this struggle between the White House and the Congress has been diverted in the past few months by (1) the crime investigations by the Kefauver committee of the Senate, and (2) the RFC investigations by the Fulbright committee of the Senate.

Instead of following the so-called great debate in the Senate, and the almost equally important struggles in the House of Representatives, people have been regaled with spectacular and televised developments by those committees.

The heart of the issue, the kernel of the coconut, in the great debate is over the war-making power in our Federal Government.

I do not mean at this time to go into the proposition of the transference of the war-making power of the Government of the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In the long run that might be even more fatal than what the fight in the Senate is against today—whether the President shall be allowed to usurp the war-making power.

But for the immediate future, who shall exercise the war-making power is the all-important issue involved in the "great debate." In the news columns and to a great extent in the public mind the issue is figured "troops to Europe."

But the "troops to Europe" really is only the superficial issue, the token, so to speak, of the real issue.

The real issue, I will say again, is who shall exercise the war-making power.

At the risk of repetition of some ideas I expressed some 6 weeks ago, I propose to discuss again this matter of war-making power.

First, I quote from Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, who said a few days ago:

"One of the major struggles in the evolution of both modern and ancient democracy has been to popularize controls of the decision on war or peace, and to restrict the freedom of the head of the nation to use the armed forces at his own discretion.

"For centuries kings, at whim, sent armies to fight in foreign lands where thousands of voiceless subjects paid the price of their lives. Memories of these evils left strong fears. * * *

"The American colonists inherited these fears, strengthened by forced participation in colonial wars which were the result of decisions over which the colonists had no control. * * *

"It was with these traditional fears that the founding fathers set out in framing the Constitution to control the power to involve the new Nation in war. It was to Congress that the Constitution specifically entrusted not only the sole power to declare war but also (other powers in connection with waging wars). * * *

"The makers of the Constitution did not conceive of the President's powers as commander in chief to be unlimited.

"They clearly intended that the danger of an irresponsible sovereign were to be avoided by the United States. * * * They concentrated the power to raise, finance, and govern the armed forces, as well as the power to declare war, in the hands of Congress.

"A long line of distinguished Presidents, reaching down into the twentieth century, thought these decisions wise and abided by them."

A few more than a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln put it this way:

"Kings have always been involving and impoverishing their peoples in wars, pre-

tending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object.

"This our (Constitutional) Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power to bring this oppression upon us."

More than a half-century before Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson expressed it this way:

The Constitution, he said, "had muzzled the dog of war" by transferring the power of "letting him loose from the executive to the legislative * * * from those who spend to those who are to pay."

And I would add this comment of my own, in reference to the great debate of 1950–51.

If the war-making power resides in the President, then America has returned to the days of the ruler—the days when the ruler's word was law; the days when the people themselves had nothing to say about the Government's decisions as to war or peace.

Of course, the one-man rule of a subject people was one of the things our forefathers left Europe to escape.

Europe, after they left it, has remained much the same, despite the claims to the contrary. Even since the American Revolution we have seen a Napoleon, a Bismarck, a Wilhelm, a Hitler, a Mussolini, a Stalin, and the evils they have brought to the world, through one-man rule.

I fear too many of our present generation do not realize this. So they are falling for the idea of turning over to a strong man the powers—not only the war-making powers, but also the taxing powers, the money and credit and other control powers, the conscription powers, that the kings used to have.

And as surely as we surrender those powers to the all-powerful, we will have our Napoleons, our Wilhelms, our Hitlers, our Mussolinis, our Stalins, and all the attendant evils.

It is far from happy prospect.

Friends, I believe the country is becoming aroused to the danger, as evidenced by the growing public support accorded Senators who have been waging the fight against turning the war-making power over to the President.

This is one fight that should be continued, and waged with undeviating vigor. Eternal vigilance and eternal resistance are the only guaranties of liberty.

The Dakota Cowboy Who Became President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Dakota Cowboy Who Became President," by Hjalmar Bjornson, which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on April 8, 1951. It deals with the life of the late Theodore Roosevelt.

It is estimated that it will cost approximately $150 over the regular amount allowed for printing, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, even though the cost exceeds the regular amount.

In my opinion, Mr. President, it is one of the finest, most concise, and clear articles ever written about Theodore Roosevelt's life in the State of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAKOTA COWBOY WHO BECAME PRESIDENT—SAD, DISCOURAGED TEDDY ROOSEVELT FOUND IN THE BADLANDS A NEW VIGOR THAT CARRIED HIM TO THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Hjalmar Bjornson)

For more than 60 years Teddy Roosevelt and the badlands of North Dakota have been associated as closely in the public mind as Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Yet many may not realize today how potently the Little Missouri wastelands influenced the career of the future President.

Theodore Roosevelt was both a sad and disillusioned man when he came to Dakota Territory in 1884. In February of that year his mother and his wife had died within a few hours of each other. The slender young New York assemblyman was left a widower at 25, with an infant daughter to rear—Alice, who was to become the darling of the White House.

Not many weeks after that personal tragedy, Roosevelt suffered a bitter political disappointment. The Republican Party machine soundly defeated an independent faction Roosevelt had led.

Life seemed dark indeed as Roosevelt gloomily packed his bags and boarded a train for the Little Missouri to get away from the world. He was, said a friend, "a broken-hearted man." Roosevelt himself wrote his sister, Anna, some time after his arrival in North Dakota:

"I am sorry my political career should be over, but after all it makes very little difference."

Roosevelt at that time could not foresee the therapeutic value of the West and of his new cowboy companions. Neither did he count on the force of his own ego. Before his badlands venture ended 3 years later, a Medora friend prophesied: "That man will be President someday."

How the rough frontier life restored Teddy Roosevelt's health and confidence in himself is clearly revealed in the Letters of Theodore Roosevelt, now being published by the Harvard University Press. Edited by Elting E. Morison, the first two volumes throw new sidelights on the factors that made Theodore Roosevelt the political maverick he was.

Roosevelt first fell in love with the Little Missouri badlands in the fall of 1883, before his wife and mother died. He had journeyed West to hunt buffalo as a guest of the Eaton brothers of the Custer Trail ranch, who then were in the process of founding the dude ranch industry. The wild beauty of the buttes and brakes, the rugged life of the cattlemen, enthralled him. He purchased, before he returned East, a partnership in the Maltese Cross ranch adjoining the Eatons, 7 miles up the river from present-day Medora. He renamed the ranch Chimney Butte.

It was to Chimney Butte that he fled to forget his personal grief and get away from political problems in 1884.

"I am out here," he said, "because I cannot get up any enthusiasm for the Republican candidate (James G. Blaine) and it seems to me to punch cattle is the best way to avoid campaigning."

But soon after he reached Dakota, Roosevelt's melancholy vanished. The West gave him new excitement and a new gamble. Within a month he wrote to his sister Anna, enthusiastically:

"Well, I have been having a glorious time here, and am well hardened now. I have just come in from spending 13 hours in the saddle. For every day I have been here I have had my hands full. First and foremost, the cattle have done well, and I regard the outlook for making the business a success as being very hopeful.

"This winter I lost about 25 head from wolves, cold, and the like; the others are in admirable shape, and I have about 155 calves. I shall put on a thousand more cattle and shall make it my regular business. In the autumn I shall bring out Bill Seawall and Bill Dow and put them up on a ranch with a very few cattle to start with, and in the course of a couple years give them quite a little herd also.

"I have never been in better health than on this trip. I am in the saddle all day long either taking part in the round-up of the cattle or else hunting antelope. I got one the other day—another good head for our famous hall at Leeholm.

"The country is growing on me, more and more; it has a curious fantastic beauty of its own; and as I own six or eight horses I have a fresh one every day and ride on a lope all day long. How sound I do sleep at night now. There is not so much game, however; the cattlemen have crowded it out and only a few antelope and deer remain.

"I shot a few jack rabbits and curlews, with a rifle; and I also killed eight rattlesnakes. Tomorrow my two men go east for the cattle; and I shall start out alone to try my hand at finding my way over the prairie by myself."

Roosevelt had caught the enthusiasm that was roaring through the Dakota country like a prairie fire. It was a good year, and everybody plunged in the wildest speculation. The New Yorker's interest in politics flared again, too. He paused in the heat of the round-up to write to Henry Cabot Lodge that summer:

"I shall be East about a week after you get this letter and I wish to see you at once. I am very anxious you should take no steps hastily for I do not know a man in the country whose future I regard as so promising as is yours; and I would not for anything have you do a single thing that could hurt it, unless it was a question of principle when of course I should not advise you to hesitate for a moment."

Back in Medora after that trip East he again wrote Lodge:

"In a day or two I will start out with two hunters, six riding ponies and a canvas top prairie schooner, for the Big Horn mountains. You would be amused to see me, in my little broad sombrero hat, fringed and beaded buckskin shirt, horsehide chaparajos or riding trousers, and cowhide boots with braided bridle and silver spurs.

"I have always liked horse and rifle. Being like yourself, I prefer * * * sport which needs a buckskin shirt to those whose votaries adopt the red coat. A buffalo is nobler game than an anise seed bag. The Anglomaniacs to the contrary notwithstanding."

Roosevelt took pride in his hunting prowess and he loved to boast about his successes. He wrote his sister Anna from Wyoming: "We met a dozen parties either of English or eastern amateurs or of professional hunters, who were on the mountain at the same time we were; but not one of them had half the success I had. This was mainly because they hunted on horseback, much the easiest and least laborious way, while Merrifield and I, in our moccasins and buckskin suits, hunted almost every day on foot, following the game into the deepest and most inaccessible ravines. (Arthur Merrifield was one of Roosevelt's partners in the Chimney Butte ranch.)

"Then again, most of them would only venture to attack the grizzly bears if they found them in the open, or if they were several men together, while we followed them into their own chosen haunts and never but one of us has shot at a bear."

Though Roosevelt the hunter was to follow his hobby to the remotest corners of the world in later years, he never forgot the first bear he killed.

"We had found where he had been feeding on the carcass of an elk; and followed his trail into a dense pine forest fairly choked with fallen timber. While noiselessly and slowly threading our way through the thickest part of it, I saw Merrifield, who was directly ahead of me, sink suddenly to his knees and turn half around, with face fairly ablaze with excitement.

"Cocking my rifle and stepping quickly forward, I found myself face to face with a great bear, who was less than 25 feet off—not eight steps. He had been roused from his sleep by our approach; he sat up in his lair, and turned his huge head slowly toward us.

"At that distance and in such a place it was very necessary to kill or disable him at the first fire; doubtless my face was pretty white, but the blue barrel was as steady as a rock as I glanced along it until I could see the top of the bead fairly between his two sinister looking eyes; as I pulled the trigger I jumped aside out of the smoke, to be ready if he charged; but it was needless, for the great brute was struggling in the death agony, and, as you will see when I bring home his skin the bullet hole in his skull was exactly between his eyes as if I had measured the distance with a carpenter's rule.

"This bear was nearly nine feet long and weighed over a thousand pounds. I had grand sport with the elk too, and the woods fairly rang with my shouting when I brought down my first lordly bull, with great branching antlers; but after I had begun bear killing other sport seemed tame.

"Oh, I have had good sport; and enough excitement and fatigue to prevent overmuch thought; and moreover I have at last been able to sleep well at night. But unless I was bear hunting all the time I'm afraid I should soon get as restless with this life as with the life at home."

Roosevelt's life in Dakota, however, was not all hunting. He became the owner of two ranches—the Chimney Butte, near Medora, and the Elkhorn, 35 miles down river. He apparently intended to remain a rancher for he wrote his friends back East, "I do not believe that I shall ever be likely to come back into political life."

Roosevelt enjoyed ranch work and, whether he knew anything about cattle or not, felt his work was important. He wrote Lodge from Medora in 1885:

"I have had hard work, and a good deal of fun since I came out here. Tomorrow I start for the round-up, and I've just come in from taking a thousand head of cattle up on the trail. The weather was very bad and I had my hands full, working night and day and being able to take off my clothes but once during the week I was out.

"The river has been very high recently and I have had on two or three occasions to swim my horse across it; a new experience to me. Otherwise I have done little that is exciting in the way of horsemanship; as you know I am no horseman, and I cannot ride an unbroken horse with any comfort. The other day I lunched with the Marquis de Mores, a French cavalry officer; he had hunted all through France, but he told me he never saw in Europe such stiff jumping as we had on the Meadowbrook hunt."

The name of Antoine de Vallombrosa, Marquis de Mores, introduces one of the more bizarre incidents of Roosevelt's life in Dakota.

The Marquis de Mores, a hot-blooded French nobleman about the same age as Roosevelt, had arrived in Dakota in the spring of 1883, some months before the New Yorker's first visit.

De Mores had made nearly half a million dollars trading on the Bourse in Paris. Then he had married Medora Van Hoffman, daughter of a Wall Street banker and multimillionaire.

He came to the Dakota hamlet then known as Little Missouri, bought an estate totaling some 600 square miles, built a new town across the river from Little Missouri and named it Medora, for his wife.

The marquis had conceived the idea of establishing a huge packing plant at Medora, building a chain of refrigerated storehouses across the country and, in short, running the Chicago packers out of business by slaughtering beef at its source. His plans were sound—so sound that, his sympathetic biographers claim, the big packing companies and their Wall Street financiers ganged up on the Frenchman and forced him to abandon his enterprise, after he had spent nearly $1,500,000.

De Mores unjustly connected Roosevelt, his badlands neighbor, with his Wall Street enemies—and with a prosecution for murder, in which De Mores was acquitted but which he also blamed on his financial foes. De Mores wrote Roosevelt a note in the fall of 1885, saying: "If you are my enemy, I want to know it. I am always on hand as you know and between gentlemen it is easy to settle matters of this sort directly."

Roosevelt was well aware that the Frenchman had killed two men in earlier years, in duels in France. Yet he quickly responded:

"Most emphatically I am not your enemy; if I were you would know it, for I would be an open one and would not have asked you to my house or gone to yours. As your final words, however, seem to imply a threat, it is due to myself to say that the statement is not made through any fear of possible consequences to me; I too, as you know, am always on hand, and am ever ready to hold myself accountable in any way for anything I have said or done."

That was sufficient to soothe the count, but rumors of the incident spread over the badlands. The marquis had challenged Roosevelt to a duel, the story ran. Roosevelt had accepted, had chosen to fight with rifles at 12 paces. But the duel never came off.

Roosevelt did have some experience with frontier gunplay.

Three rustlers fleeing from a posse stole a boat from his headquarters ranch and rowed downstream. Roosevelt, then a deputy sheriff in Billings County, started in pursuit. He described the chase as follows:

"I got the three horse thieves in fine shape. My two main men and I ran down the river 3 days in our boat and then came on their camp by surprise.

"We simply crept noiselessly up, rising when only a few yards distant, covered them with cocked rifles while I told them to throw up their hands. They saw that we had the drop on them completely and I guess they also saw that we surely meant to shoot if they hesitated and so their hands went up at once.

"We kept them with us nearly a week, being caught in an ice jam; then we came to a ranch where I got a wagon, and I sent my two men on downstream with the boat, while I took the three captives overland, a 2 days journey, to a town where I could give them to the sheriff."

Rustlers were a constant problem of the early cattlemen, and Roosevelt was an active member of the stockmen's association, whose main concern was curbing cattle thieves. In the spring of 1886 he wrote: "I have just returned from the stockmen's convention at Miles City, which raw, thriving frontier town was for 3 days thronged with hundreds of rough-looking, broad-hatted men, numbering among them all the great cattle and horse raisers of the Northwest. I took my position very well in the convention, and indeed these westerners have now pretty well accepted me as one of themselves, and as a representative stockman. I am on the executive committee of the association and president of its Dakota branch—all of which directly helps me in my business relations here."

Roosevelt had some misgivings about how he was being accepted as a cowhand. There was reason for this.

The first time he took part in a round-up, the story goes, two hardened cowboys heard him shout, "hasten forward quickly there," in his shrill eastern accent. The phrase became a byword in the Dakotas. He was called "Four-eyes" because of his glasses, and cowboys often smiled as he joined them on the round-up or at the bar. But he earned the respect of the westerners and they were his stanchest political supporters in the years that followed. He took part in their fun and other affairs, and in 1886 delivered a Fourth of July speech at Dickinson to "a great crowd of cowboys and grangers."

Roosevelt enjoyed the vigorous life of the range, thinking nothing of spending as much as 18 hours a day in the saddle. But he was only a part-time cowboy. He never forgot his literary interests and even when preparing to chase horse thieves, he wrote Lodge. "I shall take Matthew Arnold along. I had had no chance at all to read it as yet."

He spent part of his time writing and had fixed up a study in his ranch house. In a letter to his family he told how his time was divided:

"Three out of four days I spend the morning and evening in the ranch house where I have a sitting room all to myself reading and working at various pieces I have now on hand. They may come to nothing whatever, but on the other hand they may succeed. At any rate I am doing some honest work whatever the result is. I have managed to combine an outdoors life, possessing much variety and excitement and now and then a little adventure, with a literary life also."

Once when a relative was thinking of coming West to visit he wrote back and said: "I rather dread seeing you at table, for we have of course no social distinctions, and the cowboys sit down in their shirt sleeves."

His family wrote him about the strikes that were then troubling the country and he answered by saying: "My men here are hard working, laboring men, who work longer hours for no greater wages than many of the strikers; but they are Americans through and through; I believe nothing would give them greater pleasure than a chance with their rifles at one of the mobs. When we get the papers, especially in relation to the dynamite business, they become more furiously angry and excited than I do."

Roosevelt believed in direct action, and had little patience for arbitration or a peaceful approach. A border incident with Mexico in the early fall of 1886 bothered him and in referring to it he gave first expression to an idea that formed the basis of his "rough riders" in the later Spanish-American War. He wrote to Henry Cabot Lodge from Medora: "I have written on to the Secretary of War Endicott offering to try to raise some companies of horse riflemen out here in the event of trouble with Mexico.

"Will you telegraph me at once if war becomes inevitable? Out here things are so much behind hand that I might not hear the news for a week. I haven't the least idea there will be any trouble; but as my chance of doing anything in the future worth doing seems to grow continually smaller I intend to grasp at every opportunity that turns up.

"I think there is some good fighting stuff among these harum-scarum rough riders out here; whether I can bring it out is another

matter. All the boys were delighted with your photographs except the one in which you left the saddle which they spotted at once."

Nothing came of the Mexican incident, but the idea that there was fighting stuff in the harum-scarum West never left Roosevelt. He turned to it again when he felt a need to grasp every opportunity that was available to him.

Roosevelt's boyish enthusiasm for the badlands and the life of a gentleman cowhand lasted until the winter of 1886–87—the winter of the big blizzards that ruined cattlemen all over the West. He spent that winter in the East, as usual, but he returned in April to Medora and its desolated ranges.

"I am bluer than indigo about the cattle," he wrote. "It is even worse than I feared; I wish I was sure I would lose no more than half the money, $30,000, I invested here. I am planning how to get out of it."

He wrote to Lodge in the same vein: "Well, we have had a perfect smashup all through the cattle country. The losses are crippling. For the first time I have been utterly unable to enjoy a visit to my ranch. I shall be glad to get home."

But Roosevelt doubtless would have quit the West eventually, without the impetus provided by the blizzards. In 1887 he married again, and by that time he was again taking an active interest in politics. From then on his interest in the West was largely sentimental.

He did go back, however, to hunt and to seek votes—once while running for Vice President in 1900, again in 1903 when he was President and looking forward to the nomination in 1904.

When his train reached Medora on the latter trip, he wrote afterward, "The entire population of the badlands, down to the smallest baby, had gathered to greet me. This was formerly my own home station. The old men and women I knew well; the younger ones had been wild, tow-headed children when I worked along the Little Missouri. They had all gathered in the town hall which was draped for a dance. I shook hands with them all, and almost each one had some memory of special association with me which he or she wished to discuss. I only regretted that I could not spend hours with them."

The cowboy who had become President then looked back upon his life in the free and open West and extracted from it the philosophy of his later years. "We knew toil and hardship and hunger and thirst," he said, "and we saw men die violent deaths as they worked among the horses and cattle, or fought in evil feuds with one another; but we felt the beat of hardy life in our veins, and ours was the glory of work and the joy of living."

The swashbuckling life of those years was gone, as he said, "to the isle of the ghosts and of strange dead memories." But Theodore Roosevelt had taken with him to the Presidency the free spirit of both the old and new West.

Proposed Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from Mr. Robert Delson, of New York City, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, urging immediate action on the aid to India proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN FOR INDIA, NOW

It is of the utmost importance that Congress should take speedy action to make available grain to India and to do so on a gift rather than a loan basis.

Our differences with India on foreign policy should not lessen our interest in aiding its suffering millions. To argue otherwise is to assume that no nation may expect help from the United States unless it is a willing satellite. Such an assumption can only serve the purposes of the Kremlin and must be vigorously repudiated by the American people. I believe, however, that the fundamental sympathies of the Indian Government and people are in accord with our own and that this will be manifested as our own position and that of the Soviet Union is demonstrated in action.

In the meantime, we should not too hastily reject the possibility that India's independent role may help to retard the transformation of the political into a military war. If, as now appears, this should prove impossible, our sympathetic understanding of India's role is likely to influence the Nehru government to associate itself more closely with the democratic governments against Soviet aggression. Let us understand, however, that the heritage of suspicion bequeathed by western colonialism can be dissipated only very slowly and will continue to retard cooperation even on matters of common interest.

In order that the proposed legislation should serve its full purpose, the grain should be made available as a gift. Careful study has revealed the fact that India would be unable to repay a loan without seriously impeding its ability to carry out its development program, including its plans for producing desperately needed foodstuffs.

Even more undesirable is the proposal that India acquire the grain from us on a barter basis. India is already making available to us all of the strategic materials and other export commodities which she can presently produce. (India shipped to the United States in 1950 three-quarters of its total exports of manganese and mica; 1951 deliveries are continuing at a greater rate than the 1950 average.) The dollars she is to receive for this are already earmarked for imports of food and other essential commodities and could not be diverted to repayment of a loan.

ROBERT DELSON,
Member, American Emergency Food Commission.
NEW YORK.

The United Nations and Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gould Lincoln, dealing with the war in Korea and the attitude of the United Nations toward the Chinese Communist Government, which appeared recently in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

IT'S TIME UNITED STATES PUBLIC KNEW OF KOREA DEALS—BRITISH SHOULD STOP YAPPING ABOUT GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

Does the United Nations wish to win the war in Korea (against Red China) or not? Or is the purpose to make some deal in the future which will admit the Chinese Communist Government into the United Nations itself? It's about time these questions were cleared up.

The loud screams from Britain, particularly the members of the Labor government and the supporting press, over the military views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur—who very clearly wishes to win the Korean war and not to make any concessions to the Chinese Communists—point up the issue. Not only do these British demand that General MacArthur be recalled or controlled, but they assert the purpose of the United Nations is to avoid an all-out war with China and to bring the new China, by peaceful means, into the world family of nations.

THREE MAJOR CRITICISMS

The United Nations many weeks ago voted Communist China an aggressor—because of the war the Communist Chinese are waging against the UN forces in Korea. But it was with apparent reluctance that the British and some of the other member nations supported this condemnation. The Red Chinese remain aggressors. The military situation in Korea, however, because of the unwillingness of the United Nations to permit an attack on Communist bases, supplies, and men across the border in Manchuria, is made tremendously difficult for the UN armies, under the command of General MacArthur.

General MacArthur has been variously criticized—in this country as well as in Britain—for outspoken comments and his proposals that the UN forces attack the Communist bases wherever they find them and that the Chinese Nationalist armies in Formosa be used in a direct attack upon the Chinese mainland. One of the criticisms here is that a military commander has no business making political statements—such as his recent letter to Republican leader JOE MARTIN, of the House. Another is that he is preventing a settlement of the war in Korea, and a third that his comments and proposals threaten to force a third world war.

An answer to the first criticism is that Mr. MARTIN, having made a speech in which he urged the use of the Chinese Nationalists in an all-out effort to end the Korean War, wrote to General MacArthur and asked his views. To the second criticism, it may be said that the Chinese Communists have given no indication they want a settlement—and they seem to be satisfied to continue a war in which the UN's armed forces are hamstrung by being prevented from attacking enemy bases. In reply to the criticism that MacArthur's statements may hasten a third world war, it may be pointed out that the present efforts to discredit General MacArthur can only result in encouraging the Chinese Communists to continue the war in Korea, and in making them believe that the United Nations never intended to do more than slap them on the wrist.

CLEAR STATEMENT NEEDED

General MacArthur's letters and statements do not alter the underlying issues in this Korean war—waged now by the Chinese Communists, with Russian approval and supplies, if not men—against the United

Nations. A failure of the UN to win the Korean war—and by winning the war is meant a settlement that will provide for a free Korea, without appeasement of the Chinese Reds—would be a tremendous blow to the free nations which are opposing world Communist aggression. The loss of the war would mean, in all probability, a consolidation of Asia under Communist domination. On the other hand, a defeat for the Red Chinese would be a major blow to Communst aggression everywhere in the world—and that includes Europe and the British Isles.

It's time that the administration make a clear pronouncement on Korea and what goes on there, so that the American people, who are supplying the vast majority of the fighting men and practically all of the supplies to carry on the war, may understand what they may expect; and it's time the British stop their yapping about General MacArthur—a great general who does not go two ways at the same time.

Should the RFC Be Abolished?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senate will soon begin debate on Reorganization Plan No. 1, pertaining to the RFC.

Last Sunday, on the American Forum of the Air, I debated the proposal, Should the RFC be abolished? with Mr. Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of our discussion.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE RFC BE ABOLISHED?

ANNOUNCER. Should the RFC be abolished?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C. Each week at this time the American Forum of the Air presents special guest speakers, so that you in your home may enjoy authoritative discussions of the provocative and vital topics of our time.

Here today to discuss this problem is Senator JAMES P. KEM, Republican, of Missouri, a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and author of a resolution to abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Mr. Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and Chairman of the Small Manufacturers' Emergency Committee, and your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Recent hearings by the Senate Banking Subcommittee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, have uncovered evidence of mismanagement and so-called influence in the granting of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—the RFC. President Truman has proposed that the agency be reorganized, replacing the five board members with a single administrator. But many have urged that the RFC be abolished; that there is no longer a need for it, that its functions can be handled otherwise.

Today, the American Forum of the Air attempts to look at both sides of the RFC case. Should the RFC be reorganized? Or should it be abolished as proposed by Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri?

Now, Mr. Berge, as Chairman of the Small Manufacturers' Emergency Committee, would you explain your charges that big business is trying to kill off the RFC at the expense of small business?

Mr. BERGE. Mr. Granik, one of the crying needs of small manufacturers and small business generally in this country today is for long-term and intermediate credit in order to expand their businesses and get their share of the production that is necessary for our national economy.

Local banks are not permitted to make intermediate and long-term loans: I mean, loans for 3, 5, and 10 years, which small business urgently needs.

When it comes to the big banks of the country, the Wall Street banks and insurance companies, they are not interested in making a loan for $100,000 or $75,000 in some remote place in Georgia or Texas. Moreover, since these loans that small manufacturers' enterprise needs, generally put those manufacturers in competition with big business, with monopolistic interests, these banks and insurance companies are all the more unwilling to help out because it is a well known fact that there are interlocking directorates between the large, monopolistic corporations of the country and the larger banks.

The banks are represented on the boards of the big corporations, and the big corporations are represented on the boards of the banks. They are seizing on this opportunity which they think is a windfall because of certain revelations about irregularities in the RFC. They are seizing on this to make an all-out drive for abolition of the RFC which I think would be disastrous to the small businessmen of the country.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEM, do you have a statement?

Senator KEM. I have seen no evidence whatever that big business and banking interests oppose the continuation of the RFC. Those who stand to profit from the RFC's operations through favoritism and influence are the principal ones that are opposing the discontinuation of the RFC.

Those who value RFC as a useful tool to bring about and promote the handout state, that is, as a step toward socializing banking in the United States, and those who are holding lush jobs under the RFC, favor its continuance.

Many of these are liberals; that is, they are liberal with other people's money.

My opinion is that the RFC has survived its usefulness. For that reason, I have introduced into the Congress a bill to abolish it, lock, stock, and barrel.

What I propose is an orderly liquidation under the Secretary of the Treasury.

Moderator GRANIK. And with a decent burial?

Senator KEM. Yes; and with a decent burial as Mr. Jesse Jones so well said.

There is nothing so permanent, as has been said, as a temporary government agency. The RFC was organized as a temporary agency: It was to last for a year, and it was to help banks and businesses through the depression.

Since that time, RFC has been like Topsy. It has just growed and growed. Now we know, unfortunately, it has become more and more corrupt.

Moderator GRANIK. Mr. Berge, do you think it has outlived its usefulness?

Mr. BERGE. No; I certainly don't. The fact that it was originally organized for a temporary purpose, I think is irrelevant.

In 1932, when it was formed, we were in a banking and industrial crisis brought about by mismanagement of private business. A lot of the big banks of the country were about to fail. Railroads were in receivership. That was the need then, and the RFC met that need. It made big loans; loans to banks like the Dawes' Bank in Chicago. It was $80,000,000 as I recall it.

I don't criticise that because if the bank had failed, a lot of people would have suffered. But that was the need then.

Conditions changed. In the war, World War II, RFC was needed for necessary financing of war enterprises and now, since the war, during the late forties, RFC served a very important need in supplying long-term and intermediate credit to small enterprises, small manufacturers who could not get it, as I have said before, from their local banks.

At the present time, the RFC is needed in the mobilization program. Without going into detail, it is carrying on the financing of many projects that are essential in the mobilization effort which, again, can't get private credit.

So the fact that something was regarded as temporary at its inception, does not necessarily mean that it should be abolished now, because times change. Congress has apparently changed its mind from time to time by extending the RFC.

I would like to ask Senator KEM a question. He said there wasn't any evidence that big banks wanted the RFC abolished. What is the significance of the fact that the Wall Street Journal is making an all-out drive for its abolishment, and we might mention Colonel McCormick's papers, and the Scripps-Howard papers, and the fact that it is the bigger enterprises and not the small businesses that want the RFC terminated.

Senator KEM. I did not know that. I know that those papers you have mentioned have always stood for the free-enterprise system. They have been against socialization of industry in any way.

The disclosures brought about by the Fulbright committee make it clear that, as a result of political pressure, unsound loans in large amounts have been made by the RFC. In many cases, the intent of Congress has been wholly disregarded. These aromas emitting from the RFC—it has been called a Royal Fruit Cake—prove that it is spoiled through and through. The American people want it abolished.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to ask a question?

Mr. BERGE. I just thought that it is in order, briefly, to go into the banking record of the RFC.

Senator KEM. It seems to me, Mr. Berge, if you will permit me to say so, you meet yourself coming back. You say, first, that the big banks and the big business of the country want the RFC abolished, and then you complain about large loans made to the RFC.

I think that shows why there is only one banker who appeared before the McClellan committee. He was Mr. Cosgriff, the president of a bank in Utah and a member of the Board of Directors of RFC, who made a strong plea for the continuation of the RFC. That is the only banker that appeared before the committee.

I just want to say this. One of the fundamental principles in the American constitutional system is that the control of the purse strings of the Federal Government shall remain in the hands of the elected representatives of the people.

The RFC purse strings are in the hands of power-hungry, self-seeking bureaucrats who never have to answer to the people.

Mr. BERGE. I am not criticizing any large loans of the RFC because whether a loan is large or small can only be judged in relation to the industry. A loan of half a million dollars may be large if it is for a manufacturer of toys, say, or gadgets. But it

would be small in relation to steel and aluminum. What is small business, small manufactures, has to be judged in relation to the industry where the loan is made.

The loans that the RFC has made have promoted competition in steel and in aluminum and in other principal industries where the loan might, in terms of dollars and cents, be large. But the fact is that something like 90 percent of the loans of RFC have been under a hundred thousand dollars, and a substantial number of those have been under $25,000.

Senator KEM. Let me say, in that connection, that 75 percent of the total amount of the loans made by RFC have been in loans of more than $100,000. In other words, over $4,000,000,000 has been loaned by RFC since it started, and three-fourths, or more than $3,500,000,000 has been authorized in loans of more than a hundred thousand dollars.

Now, we do not have time to go into the loans, but I might mention that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad received $85,000,000. Kaiser-Frazer, in 1949, received an RFC loan of $44,000,000, and in December of 1950 came back and got another $25,000,000. Then there is the odiferous Lustron loan of $37,500,000. The RFC tells us they have charged off as a loss almost all of that loan. The people have taken on the chin a loss of $35,500,000.

Then there is the Texmass, or perhaps it ought to be called the Texmess, loan of $10,100,000.

It just does not do to talk here about the great beneficence of the RFC to small business. The fact is that over three-fourths of their loans have been made to these agencies of special privilege who come down here and wangle through loans in tremendous amounts.

Moderator GRANIK. I would like to ask how this great banking institution can regain public confidence after all it took about finagling and improper influence.

Senator KEM. I could answer that question. I would like to say that the RFC, in my opinion, must go. The people will be satisfied with nothing less. They are fed up. They are fed up with political favoritism, influence, unearned fees, natural royal pastel mink coats, free luxury hotel accomodations for Government officials.

People from all over the country are writing to Members of Congress and asking, "Are there no more public morals in Washington? Have they gone out of style?" That sort of thing hurts the pride of every American, every decent American.

Mr. BERGE. About those things, nobody is going to defend, and I am certainly not, any of the irregularities that have been shown by the Fulbright committee. But you do not throw the baby out with the bath. Those instances of influence, deplorable as they may have been in some instances, are not any argument against continuance of the RFC.

There have been numerous instances in our history where people have not been entirely faithful to their trust. When Secretary Fall was sent to prison that was no argument for abolishing the Department of the Interior. For that matter, let us look at private business concerns.

There are plenty of instances where private bankers have not lived up to the highest ethics of their calling. I remember that a man named Whitney and a man named Mitchel went to jail in New York for mismanagement and various derelictions in connection with their private banking operations. That was no reason for closing their institutions.

Senator KEM. If those men were running the RFC, that would be one very good reason to abolish it.

Moderator GRANIK. Gentlemen, I have before me a copy of last year's Senate hearings relating to the transfer of the RFC to the Commerce Department. I would like to quote part of Secretary Charles Sawyer's testimony. He said:

"I do feel that the lending of money as it is done by the RFC, or should be done, is a business function. Believing, as I do, that the job of the Department of Commerce is to assist business, it does not violate any theory of mine, to say that the RFC and its activities is a very proper part of our effort to help American business."

Just prior to his saying that, Senator SCHOEPPEL said:

"Mr. Secretary, you are the head of the great Commerce Department of the country and doing a very creditable job. * * * I think that has been pretty generally reflected in your activity and in your conduct of the Department."

In view of that feeling, would it not be a possible solution to put the RFC in the Department of Commerce?

Senator KEM. That plan has been before the Congress and was turned down sometime ago. I do not feel that you gain any thing by taking the same personnel over and putting them under Secretary Sawyer. He is pretty busy, busy in court and otherwise. I do not think you gain anything by that. I think what the people want is to have the house cleaned, lock, stock, and barrel, as I have said.

Mr. BERGE. Certainly there is no objection to cleaning the house. If you have a few bad apples in a barrel, you throw them out. You don't throw away the whole barrel.

The question here is whether the RFC performs a vital function in our economy or not.

Senator KEM. There are a lot of other questions besides that. One is whether it wouldn't be a wholesome example to every other agency in Washington to move in on this one that has proven itself to be unfaithful in its trust.

Mr. BERGE. No, Senator, there are a large number of employees in the RFC. They have a fine technical and competent staff. Only a relatively few people have been involved in these charges.

I want to point this out. At the hearing before the Expenditures Committee of the Senate, I believe it was, the Chairman of the Board, W. E. Harber, and Director Walter E. Cosgriff were complimented by Members of the Senate for the way they had administered their trust. As I recall it, when Mr. Cosgriff pointed out, that in the last 6 months they had instituted numerous reforms within the organization which saved the taxpayers money and which assured better administration in the future, Senator SCHOEPPEL, from your neighboring state in effect said, "I didn't know about that. Why haven't we learned about it?" Mr. Cosgriff stated, "We couldn't get it in the papers. They wouldn't print it."

Senator KEM. If you are calling Senator SCHOEPPEL as a witness for the continuation of the RFC, I think you have a very poor witness because just yesterday he voted for the resolution disapproving the reorganization plan of the President. The record I think shows that Senator SCHOEPPEL is against the continuation of this political grab bag for White House favoritism.

Mr. BERGE. I don't know whether voting against that particular resolution means he is against continuing the RFC or not. There are a number of legislators, I understand, who will disapprove the President's plan but don't want the RFC abolished.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us take some question from the audience to see how people feel about it.

Congressman BROWNSON. I have a question for Mr. Berge. I am CHARLES B. BROWNSON, a businessman and Representative from the State of Indiana.

In this time of inflation when there is too much money in circulation already, how do you justify the effects on our total economy of continuing this depression-born RFC which loans public funds and only adds to the inflationary spiral?

Mr. BERGE. Sir, since the middle of 1950 the offices of the RFC all over the country have been directed only to make loans that are connected with the defense effort, defense loans or defense related loans. Those are not inflationary. Moreover, loans to increase production, as I understand it, do not have an inflationary effect. Inflation comes from a shortage of goods. If the RFC hews to this line that has been laid down for this period, its effect is not going to be inflationary.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KEM?

Senator KEM. I want to point out in connection with Congressman BROWNSON'S question, that we see the Government crying out and scolding the banks for making too many loans. The banks are told: "You are lending too freely." Yet we have 60 or 70 Government agencies opening the sluice gates of public money and distributing it around. By doing so they are adding fuel to the fires of inflation.

As Senator BYRD pointed out, by abolishing the RFC you can get rid from the payroll over 3,000 people, you can save $18,000,000 a year in administrative costs.

Now there are some useful functions of the RFC such as the rubber, tin, and abaca programs. They can go to the Commerce Department, of the Defense Department, or somewhere else. We don't have to carry on this huge agency distributing public money all over the United States, to snake farms in California, gambling casinos in Reno, Nev., and luxury hotels in Florida. I think the people are thoroughly convinced that they have no interest in financing enterprises like that.

Mr. BERGE. We are talking, Senator, anyhow about the present, and the loans that are authorized now are only defense loans and defense related loans.

Senator KEM. Defense production authorities are authorized to make loans for defense purposes directly and are set up to do that. There is no reason to have the RFC competing with defense production authorities in making loans. My position is that most defense loans can be made by commercial banks. Where they can't, they ought to be made by defense production authorities.

Mr. BERGE. Do you know, Senator, what the small manufacturers in Missouri think about this? There have been some 180 of them that have been beneficiaries in the last couple years when they couldn't get credit from the big banks.

Senator KEM. I wish time permitted us to discuss some of the loans made in Missouri.

Mr. BERGE. Our association of small manufacturers has some letters from your constituents who are very eager to have this organization continue.

Senator KEM. It is peculiar and an interesting thing that not one of them has contacted me.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us hear from another Member of the House.

Congressman LECOMPTE. My name is KARL M. LECOMPTE, Member of Congress from Ohio. I have a question for Senator KEM.

Senator, have you at any time asked the RFC to make a loan to small private business?

Senator KEM. I am glad you asked that, Congressman, because I am glad to be able to state my position on that. Since I have been in Washington, I have felt that loans of the public money when they are made should be made on a business basis and not a political basis. I have been importuned by many citizens in my State to assist them

to get loans from the RFC. I have told them politely but firmly that I couldn't do it.

It is a source of satisfaction to me to know that Mr. Truman has in his files no letter from me urging loans from the RFC to private business concerns in my State or anywhere else.

Moderator GRANIK. Mr. Berge, do you want to comment on that?

Mr. BERGE. Well, I am willing to go along on any law which would forbid a Senator or Congressman from bringing pressure on the RFC to make loans. We are all for having this thing conducted on a clean basis. My organization of small manufacturers is not seeking, certainly, to condone any influence or favoritism, but just as we would want private business conducted on a high standard, we are eager that public business should, but people are essentially the same whether in Government or out, and the banking record of the RFC is a good one. It has made money.

The Senator talked a moment ago about economy. The RFC is one institution that has made money for the taxpayers. Its losses have been less than 1 percent over the years.

Senator KEM. Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, introduced in the RECORD last Thursday some figures that he has just secured after much insistence from the Bureau of the Budget. Those figures showed that RFC has operated at a loss of over $12,000,000,000.

Now this notion that the RFC has made a profit just cannot stand up. Theodore Hertz, the accountant for the Fulbright committee, who has been a professional accountant of high standing for 20 years, says that the figures that the RFC issued showing a profit for 1949 of some $5,000,000 are absolutely fallacious. As a matter of fact, the RFC that year operated at a loss of $6,500,000.

Now I would like to ask any businessman in the radio audience if he believes that a business that has been conducted as it has been shown the RFC has been conducted in the last few years can make money.

Moderator GRANIK. Mr. Berge.

Mr. BERGE. When you say they have lost money, Senator, you are taking into account the projects they have operated at the request of Congress under special legislation that required it. They operated the Defense Plants Corporation and during the last war the RFC had numerous war activities which certainly were expendable and not to be reckoned as showing a deficit. When I say they have made $500,000, I am talking about their banking operations where the RFC Board exercised the discretion that bankers exercised.

Senator KEM. I will tell you another reason, Mr. Berge, why I take with a grain of salt these figures that have come from the RFC showing a profit. The law requires the RFC, as every other Government corporation, to make to the Congress by January 15 of every year a written report of its operations during the preceding fiscal year ending June 30. The RFC has wholly failed to comply with that requirement of law. Now if we cannot get the figures from them, except after we have a Fulbright committee investigation, should we continue an organization like that, lending enormous sums of the peoples' money taken from the people in taxes?

Moderator GRANIK. May we take another question? Go ahead, sir.

FROM THE AUDIENCE. I have a question I would like to direct to Mr. Berge. Is not the handling of banking matters by the Government charged in some quarters with being socialistic, being competitive with private business?

Mr. BERGE. The RFC loans are not competitive with private business, because the RFC won't make loans unless they have a letter from the local bank that it will not handle the loan. In other words, the credit needs of the country as business is being conducted today need an RFC, and the RFC will not compete with private banks. The trouble is that private banks today don't want to risk capital any more. They sit around and clip coupons on Government bonds rather than make loans to small-business enterprises. So, except for the RFC, a lot of small manufacturers today would not be in business.

Senator KEM. I just want to say that I think there is no reason for the RFC to be kept alive any longer. I think its end is overdue. I believe that these men that Mr. Berge weeps about, these small-business men, can get money at the local banks. If they can't get it down there and they are engaged in defense activities, they can come up here and get it from defense production authorities. If they can't get it either place, there is considerable doubt in my mind whether in a period of inflation there is a public interest in having such a business expand.

Mr. BERGE. Our Small Manufacturers' Committee results from the fact that there are plenty of small-business men who are not able to get credit although the enterprises are sound.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for summary, Mr. Berge.

Mr. BERGE. My argument is that there are several reasons why the RFC should be kept. I won't undertake to cover them all in the summary.

First, small business finds it difficult, if not impossible, to get capital from local banks for long-term or intermediate capital investments and hence must turn to the RFC.

Second, new business finds it difficult, if not impossible, to get started without obtaining Government credit, because, being new businesses, it does not have a previous record of earnings which can be submitted as a basis for obtaining loans; hence they, too, must turn to the RFC.

Third, there is no doubt but that big investment houses have agreements with each other to restrict the entrance of new business in industries dominated by a few firms. Firms which are dominant in the capital goods industries are so interlaced with the investment houses and the banks that the investment banking facilities of the country do not look with approval in many cases on promoting competition for existing business.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Berge. Your summary, Senator KEM.

Senator KEM. What Mr. Berge has been talking about is clearly a violation of the Sherman antitrust law, and I wonder why, when Mr. Berge was head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, he did not prosecute people who were doing things like that.

The RFC's contribution toward a sound economy in my judgment has been on the negative side since the close of World War II. There is no public interest in prolonging the life of a business that can't exist without artificial oxygen from the Public Treasury. There is no public interest in financing a business where the people running it have no particular qualifications or have had no experience in business. There is no public interest in forcing competitors to the wall by artificially flooding the market with goods of a Government-financed enterprise.

All of these economic sins are being committed by the RFC.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on "Should the RFC be abolished?" Our speakers have been Senator JAMES P. KEM, Republican, of Missouri; and Mr. Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and chairman of the Small Manufacturers' Emergency Committee.

Fair Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that H. R. 2648, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, has aroused Nation-wide interest and support. Typical of editorials appearing throughout the country is the following which appeared in the San Francisco News of April 2, 1951:

FAIR REPRESENTATION

Each Member of the United States House of Representatives ought to represent approximately the same number of people.

There are good reasons why each can't represent exactly the same number. But there's no good reason for, and no fairness in, the huge disparities that now exist.

One Ohio Representative, for example, has over 908,000 people in his district. Another from the same State has only 167,000. And one from South Dakota has only 148,000.

In six States there is a difference of more than 400,000 between the populations of the largest and smallest congressional districts.

In six other States, the gap is more than 300,000. In 12 others, it is more than 200,000.

That's not all. Some States, instead of forming new districts as their populations increase, elect Representatives at Large. And many States have districts "gerrymandered" into peculiar shapes to block in or block out groups of voters for political advantage.

Growth of the Nation's population, as shown by the 1950 census, means that some States are now entitled to more seats in the House, others to fewer, others to their present number.

So, before the 1952 elections, redistricting will be necessary in many States and desirable in almost all. This redistricting ought to correct the present inequities. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, has introduced an administration-sponsored bill intended to force their correction.

The bill proposes:

That each State entitled to more than one Representative shall establish a congressional district for each Representative. (To stop the practice of electing Congressmen at Large.)

That each district shall be composed of compact and contiguous territory. (To stop gerrymandering.)

That each district's population shall not be more than 15 percent larger or smaller than the average number obtained by dividing the State's total population by the number of districts in the State. (To insure that each Representative shall represent as nearly as possible the same number of people.)

Mr. CELLER's bill would enforce itself by denying a seat in the House to any Representative elected from a district not conforming to the bill's requirements. He says the Supreme Court has held that Congress has power to set up standards which the States must follow.

Many politicians, in and out of Congress, may not like this bill because it would deprive them of unfair political advantages now enjoyed.

But citizens who believe that each American has a right to an equal and effective voice in the conduct of his Government should favor and work for adoption of such reform as Mr. CELLER proposes.

A Turkish View on Friendship With Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Turkey and Israel are sometimes referred to as the only two great military powers of the Near East and the only two countries in that area of the world that are truly democratic. Both are great friends of the United States.

In this connection, I believe the Members of this House will find it extremely interesting to read the views of a Turkish official on the friendly and peaceful relations of his country and Israel. Turkey, a Moslem country, was one of the first in the Near East to grant recognition and establish friendly relations with Israel.

Mr. Altemur Kilic, the author of the article The Friendship of Turkey and Israel, is an information officer in the press bureau of the Department of Public Information at the United Nations. He is scheduled to return to Turkey soon to assume the editorship of a new afternoon newspaper in that country. His article appeared in the March-April 1951 issue of the magazine Land Reborn, published by the American Christian Palestine Committee, and is as follows:

THE FRIENDSHIP OF TURKEY AND ISRAEL

(By Altemur Kilic)

I feel safe in asserting that Israel has no better friend in the Middle East than the Turkish Republic. This friendship is not merely a government-to-government relationship. Nor is it only the Realpolitik of both nation's statesmen. On the contrary, the friendship goes deeper; for Israelis and Turks have, I believe, much in common.

Foremost among the factors which encourage Turkish-Israel friendship is the youthfulness of minds and ideas in both peoples. Although Turks and Israelis are proud of their respective pasts, they have their eyes firmly fixed on the future.

Secondly, both Israel and Turkey are European in outlook. They may be situated on the western fringe of Asia, but neither the customs nor the culture of the Orient have as much influence as do the mores and morals of the West.

Thirdly, both Turks and Israelis are activistic in their approach to social and political problems. Both nations are not retarded by a yearning for the splendors and glories of their historic pasts. They are rather impelled by a modern desire to rid their lands of the disease, poverty, ignorance, and feudal structures which have far too long been the curse of the Middle East. Here both Israel and Turkey join in a modern crusade.

Fourthly, Turkey and Israel are the only two genuinely democratic states in the entire Middle East. Turkey granted full diplomatic recognition to the new State of Israel, not only because the Turkish people admired the courage and steadfastness of the Jews in their recent struggle for a home of their own, and their zeal in creating their new, modern state, but also because Turkey anticipated a healthy flow of Israel-Turkish trade and thus an ever closer bond between the two lands. (It is true that our economic relations with Israel mean, at present, many more exports from Turkey to Israel than exports from Israel to Turkey; but this imbalance is in process of being righted.)

In these four respects, we Turks directly parallel the Israelis. On several other scores we have somewhat divergent characteristics:

1. Turkey must transform its masses into an industrial population while Israel must reverse the industrial-rural process for many tens of thousands of its people.

2. We still have a considerable amount of illiteracy to alter; Israel has an unusually high rate of literacy, not alone for the Middle East where illiteracy abounds, but even in comparison with the highly literate nations of the European land mass.

3. Turkey has moved swiftly in this past generation since the days of the great Kemal Ataturk, but still has a long road to travel in search of its ultimate goal of urbanization, industrialization, modernization, and western education; Israels' particular problems are, in contrast, those of deurbanization and the training for productivity and integration of its industry and agriculture.

4. Turkey belongs to the West, not only because the Soviet Union demands our vital Straits and two of our eastern provinces, but also because of our concept of democracy. Israel, doubtless mindful of the problematic fate of several million Jews still behind the iron curtain in Russia and Soviet-oriented lands, prefers a policy of "nonidentification" with either East or West; but Turkey believes Israel's preoccupation with her own particular problems will, in time, give way to the necessity of taking sides in the East-West struggle and joining a collective security arrangement against the Soviet bloc.

I believe that Turkish-Israel friendship promises many fruits for the future, within both the framework of Middle Eastern politics, in particular, and the framework of our common quest for world peace, in general.

Two-Ocean Issues Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TWO-OCEAN ISSUES UNCHANGED—MACARTHUR WAS RIGHT IN 1942 AS HE IS NOW IN PLEAS FOR DUE ATTENTION TO PACIFIC

(By David Lawrence)

Starting just 9 years ago, in the spring of 1942, and continuing from then on throughout most of World War II, the same controversy was going on as is emerging today—how much force to allocate to Asia and the Pacific and how much to Europe.

But the public didn't know much about it at the time, nor did it know how earnestly General MacArthur, backed up by Fleet Admiral King, pleaded for enough strength to win the war in the Pacific.

The fundamental issues haven't changed. When all the emotion has been removed from the present atmosphere of politics in Washington and London, and the European leaders face realistically the fact that from the Pacific Ocean can come a direct threat to United States territory in Alaska and to our vital bases on Okinawa, the Philippines, and Japan, a global strategy and viewpoint will come into its own once more.

It was because the American people for the most part had their eyes fastened on the spectacular battles in Europe that they did not appraise the remarkable struggle under heavy odds that our Army under MacArthur and our Air Force and Navy put up in the Pacific against a major power which had the naval strength and the air power to sweep to the tip of southeast Asia even while fighting a major war on the mainland of China. All this happened in the three long years before VE-day, while the American public looked on it as a secondary, if not unimportant, adventure in what was sometimes referred to in a somewhat derogatory fashion as "island hopping."

Few people today realize that, apart from heavy casualties of ground troops, 10,000 American boys were killed or wounded on the decks of American naval vessels in the immediate vicinity of Okinawa—the largest casualty list for a single battle in the history of any navy—as the ships stood guard there like sitting ducks for 83 days. They couldn't move away because the Navy's own air power was busily engaged in protecting ground operations and no other air power was available in the western Pacific to destroy the bases on Formosa, on the mainland of China and in south Japan from which the suicide planes were coming day after day. It did not hearten the American boys on the ships or in our Army and Marine Corps fighting on Okinawa—we had more than 275,000 men committed to the action there—to be told that our big B–29's were doing strategic bombing and were destroying vital factories in Japan. What the troops and sailors wanted and begged for was the destruction of the land bases just a few hundred miles away from which those enemy bombers were coming to Okinawa. It was the same old story of inadequate strength.

General MacArthur begged his countrymen not to forsake those vital air and submarine bases, but to do everything in our power to help Chiang Kai-shek or any other friendly influence inside China so as to keep the Communists from dominating the Far East. It goes without saying that the next time all of China and Korea and important bases in Japan will be in the hands of a hostile power unless the Communists are licked—and licked now.

It is therefore, a basic concept of global strategy which was ignored by the European press and to no small extent by those American observers who regarded the present flare-up as just a little matter of personalities or of excessive zeal by a prominent general. What seems to be overlooked is that, if world war III breaks out, the Pacific Ocean will not be a quiet lake. There are big factories on our Pacific coast which will hardly be immune from attack if the defenses of the Pacific are neglected—if America does not plan its strategy so as to reach out as effectively to destroy submarine bases in Asia as we appear to be doing with respect to those hostile bases in Europe from which submarine threats can come to menace shipping and the transportation of troops in the Atlantic.

Europeans who are not bounded on any coast by the waters of the Pacific do not seem to realize that the United States is a two-ocean country. Even today the European press is talking about American military strength getting bogged down in Asia as if there were some magic way of erasing the Pacific and the Asiatic strongholds from the map and persuading the military chiefs of the Communist regime politely to give up any idea of attacking us from that quarter of the globe when war comes.

High officers of our Navy, it can be stated positively, say that, while General MacArthur has not always selected the most tactful way to express himself, fundamentally he was 100 percent right when he declared America must be sure of winning the war now in Asia or else Europe will be lost too.

General MacArthur was right in 1942, and he was right again in arguing for due attention to the Pacific and most of all against any abject surrender or compromise in Asia that means the same thing militarily. He was arguing for the mothers and fathers of the boys enlisted today in the United States Navy who again will bear the brunt of any such attacks. He was arguing for the 250,000 men of our Army and Air Force now in the Pacific. He was making a sensational plea against misunderstanding of the fundamentals of global strategy.

MacArthur Has Outlived His Usefulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not practice the profession of "arm-chair general." I do know enough about military affairs and Government, however, to appreciate that a man in public office who desires to direct a military campaign should become a member of the armed services, and that a general who attempts to direct the affairs of state should retire from the armed services and run for elective office. No matter how much praise may be due to General MacArthur as a soldier all must agree that he has outlived his usefulness as a general because of his insistence upon entering into the field of civil affairs.

Whether you agree or disagree with MacArthur's foreign policy no one can deny that as one in charge of military campaigns he has no right to make foreign policy.

I am happy to direct your attention to the fact that I am not alone in this conclusion. The syndicated columns of Drew Pearson and Stewart Alsop, and an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, are in agreement with my thoughts on the subject. Those articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 11, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

MAC ARTHUR FRICTION RECOUNTED

At two Cabinet meetings in the past 3 weeks, General MacArthur's unauthorized policy statements have come in for important, even heated, discussion.

Most heated debate was not last week but immediately after MacArthur's pre-Easter statement of March 24, in which he proposed a peace meeting with Chinese military commanders.

At this Cabinet meeting the President remarked that he was sorry he hadn't fired MacArthur last summer—following his out-of-line statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. What aroused the President's heat just before Easter was that MacArthur's peace statement was one which Truman himself was planning to make.

What happened was that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had cabled MacArthur, for his perusal and personal reaction, a copy of an Easter appeal for peace which the State Department had already discussed with the British and French and which Truman planned to issue publicly.

But, without a word to Washington, MacArthur made the statement himself. Part of his text was almost verbatim with that sent him by the Joint Chiefs, though his threat to bomb Chinese bases was entirely his own.

MAC ARTHUR'S RECORD

Naturally Washington boiled.

Next day, Secretary of Defense Marshall sent MacArthur a personal cable ordering him to clear all future policy statements with him. That cable was dated March 25, and MacArthur's letter to former Speaker JOE MARTIN was dated March 20, so technically, at least, MacArthur is in the clear.

In the eyes of the Defense Department, however, he is not. For on December 5, 1950, confidential orders were sent to all military commanders to clear all policy statements with the Defense Department in Washington. Furthermore, MacArthur has had a history of jumping the traces, some of which is well known, some not, but all of which has made relations between him and his Commander in Chief more strained than at any time in recent American history. Here is the record:

Jump No. 1: In December 1949 MacArthur let off steam to a group of Republican Senators visiting him in Tokyo about sending United States arms and troops to Formosa. This teed off the running debate between the administration and the China bloc in Congress over Chinese intervention which continued for months.

Jump No. 2: In the spring of 1950, MacArthur took an unauthorized trip to Formosa, got a lot of publicity kissing Madame Chiang Kai-shek's hand, and openly discussed the idea of building up Formosa as a base. This was in complete contradiction of the Government's policy, and he obviously knew it.

Jump No. 3: After we got into the Korean War, MacArthur sent his famous letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding the use of Formosa as a base. He was reprimanded by Truman.

Wake Island: It was around this time that Averell Harriman, special representative of the President, went to Tokyo to soothe the general's fur. At this time Harriman got MacArthur's solemn promise to make no more policy statement without clearing them with Washington.

TRUMAN IS CHARMED

Following this, Truman made his special pilgrimage to confer with MacArthur on Wake Island. When he first arrived, he was a little nonplussed by the way the general strolled nonchalantly down to the runway—a little late—to meet him; and by the fact that MacArthur failed to salute his Commander in Chief. He was also disappointed that MacArthur's accompanying party consisted chiefly of his personal doctor, his valet, and Ambassador Muccio, whereas Truman had brought the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a group of experts prepared to discuss important Far Eastern problems.

It was because MacArthur brought no experts to discuss anything that the conference was so abbreviated.

However, during their brief time together, MacArthur charmed Truman completely and the President came away singing his praises.

Jump No. 4: Came during MacArthur's November drive into North Korea. This was only a partial jump-over-the-traces, because Truman had given him the green light to dash up to the Manchurian border. However, on more than three occasions the State Department relayed warnings that the Chinese were about to attack—one from the French, one from India, and several from the British.

On another occasion, when the State Department urgently proposed a public statement assuring the Chinese that the big dams supplying water power to all Manchuria would not be bombed, MacArthur sent back a curt three-word telegram: "Do not concur."

[From the Washington Post]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

MAC ARTHUR

It is at least conceivable that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur will be recalled by President Truman, perhaps even before this report is published. Truman is furious at what he considers MacArthur's insubordination. Those around Truman are convinced that the recent spate of pronouncements from MacArthur have been consciously designed to forestall Truman, who had planned to issue a statement of his own on Korean War aims. Finally, the pressure is heavy on Truman to demonstrate once and for all that he is master in his own house.

Yet on balance it is much more likely that cautious counsels will prevail, and that the administration will try to deal with "the MacArthur problem" by pressing ahead with a Japanese peace treaty with all possible speed. MacArthur himself has often intimated that he will lay down his proconsular duties once a Japanese peace treaty is signed.

It is therefore fervently hoped in administration circles that final arrangements for signing a treaty can be reached by early midsummer, that MacArthur will sign in the name of the American Government; and that he will then retire in a final blaze of glory, to a chorus of sighs of relief in Washington and the European capitals. This spectacle, of the American Government pressing feverishly for a peace treaty with a former enemy nation in order to dispose of a supposedly subordinate American official would be laughable if the issue raised were not so serious.

For there is nothing at all laughable in the issue which has caused a bitter public dispute between the American Government and its field commander at a time when a new Chinese offensive is certain, and Soviet intervention in Korea at least possible. The issue is this: Should the United States engage in a major war with China, in alliance with Chiang Kai-shek?

Surely if MacArthur's statements mean anything, they mean that this is what MacArthur wants to do. And the great majority of the policy-making officials of the Government are convinced that such a course would lead straight to disaster.

In the first place, they argue, such a war would be "a war between the shark and the tiger," an impossible war which could never be won. In the second place, the course MacArthur proposes would destroy the whole painfully built structure of American alliances. Finally, this country's European allies, and especially the British, are convinced that such a course would make inevitable a third world war for which our European allies are nakedly unprepared.

British intelligence has warned repeatedly that the Soviets are committed to intervene openly in case of an American attack on the Chinese mainland. Such intervention, which would presumably include bombing MacArthur's own "privileged sanctuary" in Japan, could hardly fail to lead to a third world war. MacArthur is reported to dissent strongly from this view, but it is worth recalling that the British also warned of the Chinese intervention, which MacArthur assured Truman on Wake Island would not occur.

Yet MacArthur's position has one great strength. It is simple, positive, and understandable—the way to fight a war is to try to win it, by using all available means to defeat your enemy. The official administration thesis sounds, by contrast, fuzzy and Micawberish. If the forthcoming offensive

is smashing, according to this thesis, the Chinese and their Soviet masters may be willing sooner or later to come to terms.

This may not be quite as Micawberish as it sounds. For it is certainly true that both the Chinese and Russians have paid heavily for their Korean adventure. The Chinese have lost the flower of their best army, while their plans for expansion in southeast Asia have had to be at least postponed. As for the Russians, they have seen the western allies awakened from their lethargy by Korea, and beginning to organize their defenses in earnest.

Thus what seems to be in prospect is a long test of staying power, in which all the advantages are by no means on the side of the Communists. The trouble is that MacArthur is unfitted by temperament to command a local war of limited objectives and indefinite duration.

Yet MacArthur is right when he implies that this country cannot accept a bloody stalemate in Korea forever. Perhaps, as the administration hopes, the Chinese and the Russians will decide to cut their losses if the prospective offensive fails, and will then agree to an acceptable settlement. Perhaps the Russians will force the issue by intervening openly. If neither happens, there must be some sort of show-down eventually. When that time comes, however, it will be well to remember what MacArthur and his admirers forget—that the Ruhr Valley is a far more important stake in the world struggle than the Yangtse Valley, and that the real source of Communist power is in Moscow, not Peiping.

[From the Washington Post]

BRING MACARTHUR HOME

The issue that General MacArthur has catapulted into the camp of the free world is not Asia or Europe, Korea, or China, or a local or a continental war. It is General MacArthur versus Authority, and Authority can no longer duck it. In the circumstances the resolution that Senator FERGUSON has proposed for the visit of a committee of Congress to General MacArthur has become ridiculous. General MacArthur should do the traveling—and with Washington as his destination.

Why another congressional mission to Tokyo, anyway? Scarcely a month passes without one or other legislators traipsing across the Pacific to listen to the authoritative words of the Supreme Commander. After 15 years, when General MacArthur was last in America, the trips are beginning to look like pilgrimages. It is hardly dignified that our representatives should have to go all the way to Japan to check what General MacArthur is expressing so freely in public and private. The time has come for General MacArthur to be recalled for report. He has now launched a campaign upon the free world for the extension of the military campaign against communism throughout Asia—to free Asia, as he put it awhile ago. For this all-encompassing crusade he is reported to be demanding a free hand, something unheard of in history and something in the present circumstances of the United Nations war that the United States itself hasn't got. It is clearly impossible to keep General MacArthur in the command so long as this major conflict between subagent and agent and between both he and the principal remains.

The time, aside from the new urgency, is long overdue for General MacArthur to return. Government and people before this needed a chance to become acquainted with a man who by his long absence was becoming a myth and yet who was carrying a great responsibility to the United States on his shoulders. General MacArthur would have himself benefited from it. Even Anteaos had to renew his strength and refresh his outlook by occasional contact with the earth, and the same prescription would have profited General MacArthur. He would at least have been able himself to check at first hand with his somewhat intimidated and silent superiors.

In default of President Truman grasping the nettle in the manner of Lincoln and Polk, the way to get General MacArthur here is through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Recall for report is the general practice with the diplomats and military chieftains of all countries, and General MacArthur has been left too long in Napoleonic aloofness. It may be argued that for military reasons MacArthur cannot leave his post. But MacArthur's headquarters are in Japan, not in Korea, and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway is in operational or tactical charge in Korea, with a virtually autonomous command. General Ridgway has done so well there that there can be no doubt of his competence to be left alone for a spell.

Senator FERGUSON excuses the waiting upon General MacArthur because the President himself journeyed over the Pacific to meet General MacArthur. However, the President did not go to Tokyo. Nor did he establish any precedent. He had in mind the convenience of both himself as Commander in Chief and General MacArthur in holding the rendezvous at Wake Island. At that time the Supreme Commander, in spite of his situation at the Japanese base, was handling operations more intimately than he is now. So far as is known, the President chose the site, and his purpose, it is said, was to hear from General MacArthur's own lips the data about Chinese dispositions in North Korea and an estimate of the situation created by them. The general was put on the beam on policy, and the President in turn got an assurance that the Chinese would not intervene, though this is what they did almost before MacArthur got back.

All this, of course, is supposition but a reason for any hearing that Congress might call in case General MacArthur comes to town, presumably, would be to clear up the fog over this Wake Island meeting. Congress is likewise entitled to some comprehension of the help (or lack of it) that in the light of changing requirements MacArthur has been afforded to execute the command he was given. But the Executive must take action beforehand in laying down policy anew and restoring authority. If, after report and consultation, this means the supercession of General MacArthur, that must be faced, for if the conflict continues, our feeble Government will be left without any standing at home, and abroad we might as well prepare to see our allies in NATO, RIO, and the United Nations fade away.

Divine Discontent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following sermon preached in St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Akron, Ohio, by the rector, the Reverend Walter F. Tunks, D. D., on Palm Sunday morning, March 18, 1951, and broadcast over Station WADC:

In recent years have appeared many books designed to tell us how to achieve inner calm and serenity. The eagerness with which they have been bought and read would indicate that they have answered a real need. They reflect the pressure and tension of our day—the demons that, in some form, all of us must fight—fear, worry, frustration, personal inadequacy, and that tired feeling of being pushed beyond endurance. The story may be apocryphal, but is typical of our overwrought nerves, that a tired businessman sank into a dentist's chair with a sigh of deep satisfaction and said, "Thank God for the opportunity to come here once in awhile and relax."

Long on the list of best sellers was a helpful book called Peace of Mind, by Rabbi Joshua Liebman, whose untimely death removed a distinguished scholar and teacher. Then came a book which had wide circulation called Peace of Soul, by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, known to many Americans through his preaching on the radio Catholic hour. Many people have been helped by the preaching and writing of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. He has shown them how to relax their bodies, release mental tension, by opening hidden reservoirs of spiritual power. All these books answer a need that was voiced by Whittier so beautifully in his well-loved hymn:

"Drop Thy still dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease,
Take from our souls the strain and stress
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

Peace of mind and peace of soul are great possessions. Together, they form one of life's greatest blessings—contentment. Through the ages poets and philosophers have sung the praises of contentment. Confucius wrote of himself, "With only plain rice to eat, with only water to drink, and with only an arm for a pillow, I am still content." In a world where material things are so fragile, he had discovered that the only durable wealth is the inner riches of heart and mind and soul. "Contentment is natural wealth," said Socrates, "luxury is artificial poverty." That is the essence of Thoreau's teaching about his simple life at Walden Pond. A man can live happily and well in a cabin in the woods with the brooks and birds as his companions, if he has a good conscience and a sensitive mind, plus an appreciation of nature. I like to think that it was the King himself who wrote in the Book of Proverbs: "Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox with hatred." Perhaps he had stopped one day at a peasant's abode and discovered how good food can taste in a simple home where there is love and understanding and comradeship, and he recalled how tedious were court banquets with hatred, envy, and intrigue lurking in the background. Shakespeare knew what a great blessing is contentment and how rarely those in high office possess it. In Henry the Sixth he makes the King say:

"My crown is in my heart, not on my head;
Not decked with diamonds, and Indian stones,
Not to be seen; my crown is called Content
A crown it is that seldom kings enjoy."

Contentment seems all the more praiseworthy when we encounter those who never seem to possess it. Restless and dissatisfied, they are unhappy wherever you find them. Put them down anywhere and they will find something to complain about. You never ask them how they are. You know in advance. They are not well. They grumble about the weather, about their food, about their church, and they can tell you all that is wrong in our country. Their conversation is a monologue of discontents. The world was not made to their liking.

Their unhappiness is, of course, only the toxic poisoning of their self-centeredness. They never get themselves off their hands. On the other hand, you think of a great soul like Paul, chained in a prison cell, writing confidently to his friends, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am to be content." Anyone who can say that has mastered one of life's hardest lessons. What happens to us is not the decisive factor. It is our inner response that tells the story. Happiness is mental rather than environmental. In his deep concern for others, Paul had learned to think less and less about himself. There is no inner peace without that. Dr. McCracken writes of a woman who had lost her son and had become bitter, hard, and inconsolable until her health failed and her mind weakened. Her husband took her to a famous French neurologist who undertook an unusual method to effect her cure. He took her for a long drive through villages that had borne the fear and fire and devastation of war. "Madam," he said, "in nearly all these humble little homes there is a poor woman who has lost a son. In some there are mothers who have lost two or three sons. Is your grief greater than theirs? Go home and bear your sorrow with courage and patience." Some of us, I feel sure, would be ashamed of our petty complaints if we had imagination enough to understand the far heavier loads some people are carrying with cheerfulness and fortitude.

Probably there would be no disagreement among us this morning as to the value of contentment. Yet, I venture to say, that it is not the supreme goal of life. A popular radio program advertises the fact that its product comes from contented cows. That brings to your mind a lovely pastoral scene—a herd of cattle grazing peacefully in lush meadows under a bright summer sky—amid all the beauty of the countryside. But we humans are different from cows. We have moral consciousness. We have ambitions. We have ideals for ourselves and for our world. We dare not live in lazy indifference to what goes on around us. There are times and places and situations in which we have no right to be contented. We have no right to live in peace with racial discrimination and social injustice. We have no right to close our eyes to slums and poverty and crime. Who wants to live with inner peace that can be had only by closing one's ears to the still, sad voice of humanity?

When Catherine the Great made a tour of her country, her ministers went ahead of her, carefully arranging her schedule. Nice little homes were built along the route the Empress was to travel—like the fake houses that are a part of Hollywood technique—made for the cameras, not to live in. Peasants were instructed to appear along the roadway wearing their Sunday best, with happy smiling faces. The lame, the blind, and the deformed were hustled off the streets. The Empress must see no misery and want. She must not know the desperate condition of her people.

What decent person wants contentment at such a price? I think Fulton Oursler is right in something he wrote recently: "Our greatest danger is not from Russia, but from ourselves, from our growing disregard of principles, and our reliance upon expediency. Along this immoral road, we have already gone too far, feeling meanwhile more discontent than ever before. In book shops and drug stores, in correspondence courses and lectures, we seek peace of mind, peace of soul. Our private lives reflect the public evidence of decay and we are not happy about it. The renewal of conscience in modern society is its only hope."

We Americans may well take that rebuke to ourselves. We are an easy-going, complacent people, too ready to compromise with evil because it takes too much trouble to correct it. Perhaps the greatest weakness in our country today is our lack of moral indignation. We have no right to be satisfied with the low moral standards that prevail in high places today. We have no right to make peace with crooks and gamblers and racketeers and to accept the criminal alliance between the underworld and politics. The scandals that have come out of the mismanagement of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the brazen peddling of influence in high government circles, the old Pendergast morals that are so generally accepted in Washington today, the betrayal of trust by officials in our State Department, and the nonchalance of those who call treason only a "red herring" ought to stir us with righteous wrath. At any social gathering you can hear plently of grumbling about the corruption in Washington, but how easily we charge it off as the inevitable spawn of politics. "To the victor belongs the spoils" we say, and with a synical shrug of the shoulders, we seem to imply there isn't anything we can do about it.

But there is something we can do about it. We can examine our own individual lives and strive to correct what is wrong with them. Bad government always leads to our own doorsills—our willingness to live with low and easy moral standards. We are like the farmer who said "Don't tell me how to farm any better. I don't farm as good now as I know how." Most of us make the same confession. We don't live nearly as well as we know how. We know better, but it is too much effort to do better. We permit our children to do questionable things, not because we approve of them, but because we don't want them to be thought queer or different from our neighbor's children. With most of us selfishness is still the major sin. Expounding his philosophy of life, George Jean Nathan, the drama critic, said, "To me pleasure and my own personal happiness are all I deem worth a hoot." There is pure, unadulterated selfishness for you. Where would our city and our country be if all of us decided that the only thing worth a hoot is our own personal happiness? What decent person wants contentment if it means only the ability of the biggest hog to get to the feeding trough first?

Religion can bring us inner peace. But it ought also to fill us with divine discontent. Religion was never meant to be an anesthetic. Paul spoke of it as power. The word that he used was "dunamos." Dynamite, if you please. Every moral gain that has ever been made in this world was the result of someone's revolt against the status quo.

Again and again in the Gospels we hear Jesus saying, "Ye have heard it said of old time * * * but I say unto you." He walked straight across those old traditions and they snapped like cobwebs. It is pleasant to think of the Master healing the sick, forgiving the sinful, and taking little children into His arms to bless them. But there is no mistaking the moral indignation that flamed in His words and looks as he lashed out against the moral complacency of his times.

On this Palm Sunday we think of that strange procession that paused for a moment on the brow of Mount Olivet before entering the Holy City. There were tears in the Master's eyes. He was not thinking of himself and the suffering that lay ahead for him. He was thinking of the city and the people He loved, so blind to their impending fate. How contented the city was as it lay there bathed in the morning sunlight—how proud of its past history, how indifferent to its spiritual need. There was Pilate, the Roman Governor, the very embodiment of human pride—more concerned about holding his office than administering justice, and ready to turn an innocent man over to be crucified rather than take any chance of stirring up trouble for himself. Jesus must still weep when He sees how much irresponsibility still remains in high places.

There were the money changers in the temple, making fat profits out of their unholy traffic in the sanctuary of God. They had turtledoves for sale. Who raised them? They came from the pigeon farms of Annas, the ex-high priest and father-in-law of Caiaphas, the reigning high priest, and they sold, of course, for a nice profit. If you wanted to buy them you had to exchange Roman coins for temple currency, for the Roman coins bore the image of the hated Emperor—and the exchange, of course, brought further revenue for the high priest. Is it any wonder that Jesus strode into the temple a few days later and drove the grafters out. It wasn't the small whip of cords that frightened them. It was the high and holy indignation they saw in those eyes that looked straight through them. And He said unto them: "It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves." Graft is still graft, whether it be in turtle doves or deep freeze deals or mink coats or bribes paid by the underworld for police protection or the public money siphoned off to individuals by influential politicians.

Jerusalem was quite content that spring morning when Jesus looked out over the city with tears in His eyes. How perilous complacency can be. Little did the people understand or care about the destruction that was impending.

What of America? I pray that the spirit of Jesus may fill us with divine discontent with all that is wrong in our national life. Wherever there is injustice, wherever there is racial hatred and discrimination, wherever there is graft, corruption, and crime, wherever low moral standards prevail, we have no right to be contented. Are we for Jesus or against Him? Each gives his answer by the quality of his own life.

VA Sees Doctor, Nurse Loss to Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as further proof of the desperate situation that has developed in our veterans' hospitals, due to inadequate medical, dental, and nursing staffs, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Maj. Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, dealing with the problem that now exists and with the acute situation brought about by the arbitrary action of the armed service in raiding these staffs by calling up for active duty medical reservists and other medical men now in the service of the Veterans' Administration.

General Gray's letter, which follows, is self-explanatory:

VA SEES DOCTOR, NURSE LOSS TO ARMED SERVICES' NEEDS

(By Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator, Veterans' Affairs)

WASHINGTON.—An 8-year-old specter has returned to haunt Veterans' Administration officials—the serious depletion of professional medical personnel by the present military situation. The situation isn't as desperate as it was in early 1943 when the

loss of doctors threatened to wreck the entire VA medical set-up, but is gradually moving in that direction despite law and and increasing work load.

VA has lost approximately 400 physicians to the Armed Forces since the start of the Korean hostilities. Nearly that many nurses have been called to active duty, and the dental service losses have been in about the same proportion.

The growing shortage of physicians is the gravest of VA's medical manpower problems. Approximately half of VA's 4,000 full-time doctors are Reserve officers. Many of these are senior Reserve officers in organized units. Others are senior Reserves not in organized units but in categories badly needed by the Armed Forces. Add to these the residents in the Reserves and those vulnerable to the draft, many of whom were trained as Navy V-12s or under the Army specialized training program, and the picture becomes even darker.

WHAT VA IS DOING

First, VA is attempting to call to attention the fact that under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, it has priority equal to that of any other agency in the manpower pool and the problems of supply. This VA did not have in 1943.

Second, VA has established a manpower board that makes representations to the Armed Forces for delays in calls to active duty of all physicians, dentists and nurses and for many other essential medical personnel who are members of the Reserves. To date, the board has been only moderately successful, and the best it can obtain for those ordered into uniform is a 6 months delay. Full-time physcians subject to the draft must take their chances with their local selective service boards, but hospital managers have been instructed to go to bat for them wherever possible.

Third, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has introduced H. R. 2996 in the House of Representatives, a bill that would have the effect of freezing all VA Department Medicine and Surgery employees in their positions. This measure, which has been referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, should have the immediate effect of emphasizing the seriousness of the situation and may result at the hearing in calling attention to the little-noticed fact that VA does have equal priority under the law and that it was the intent of the Congress to confer such a priority on VA to prevent the very thing that is now happening.

LOAD IS INCREASING

Fourth, representatives of VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery have appeared before the Health Resources Advisory (Rusk) Committee of the National Security Resources Board and, together with the Deputy Administrator, have conferred with the NSRB chairman to present VA's problem. They have also appeared with the Deputy Administrator before the Armed Forces Personel Policy Board to point out that we have a current and increasing load, a part of which can be attributed to the agreement by VA to accept as patients service personnel with certain types of chronic illnesses and disabilities. They have further pointed out that the existing procedures for calling Reserve officers have resulted in serious losses in certain categories of medical specialties.

Deferments and delays in calls to active duty provide little help since they are but temporary in nature and there is no source of medical manpower from which replacements can be recruited.

VA officials hope that one or all of the four courses of action will stem or help to stem the tide. Otherwise VA will be placed in the same disastrous position as it was in 1942 when no positive protective action was taken until too many of its physicians and dentists had entered the military service. Finally, the only effective procedure was the commissioning of VA physicians and dentists generally, and eventually it was even necessary for the Armed Forces to supplement VA staffs with military personnel.

Price Control on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received by me from Mr. R. M. Eaton, resident manager of the Hazard Insulated Wire Works, division of the Okonite Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

HAZARD INSULATED WIRE WORKS,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., March 28, 1951.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: In letter of the 15th (acknowledging receipt of Bache & Co.'s release entitled "Bucking the Law of Supply and Demand," you asked me to prepare a statement, which I have been trying to do ever since.

It has taken so long because I feel that handling of the copper situation by present governmental controls is not entirely in accord with basic economy, as I understand it. I do not pretend to be an economist, but in nearly 50 years of active business life have always found supply and demand to be the factor regulating price, and it would seem to me the metal markets are simply acting in accordance with the law. In this respect let me quote from the above-mentioned release:

"When that law (supply and demand) is interfered with, then supply and demand get out of balance. Representatives of the domestic copper-producing industry who met recently in Washington with officials of the Defense Minerals Administration, told these officials, according to the trade press, that current ceiling prices on copper are diverting some foreign supplies from the domestic market. We anticipated that that would happen, and in our market letter dated February 13, 1951, we said:

"'If the Government should impose a ceiling on the domestic price of copper and if this ceiling should be lower than the world price, the domestic supply position may be placed in double jeopardy, through a drop in domestic output and the loss of foreign copper. Producers in other parts of the world will seek an outlet for their copper where the highest prices are being paid and many European consumers are already paying more than 24½ cents for copper and are anxious to buy large quantities at higher prices.'

"It should be obvious that if this situation is allowed to continue unchecked, the domestic shortage of copper is likely to become much more serious than it is already."

The above being so, it would seem to me that the 2-cent-per-pound import on copper should be suspended, and it should have been done long ago for the benefit of everyone and not retained for the benefit of a small minority group. The market should be allowed to find its own level so that consumers permitted to use the metal for making civilian articles (who are unable to get all they need at the market price of 24½ cents per pound) can buy additional amounts at whatever price necessary and pass this increased cost on to customers who want to buy their products—no matter what the price is.

While certain producers may accumulate enormous profits by this process, they could be siphoned off to the Government by excess-profits taxes, so that in the long run the Government would benefit.

It is my contention, therefore, that all producers of virgin materials should be encouraged to produce, since everything is in short supply. It is also my contention—as stated above—that there is no greater incentive to production than the natural law of supply and demand. If that law is allowed to function freely, all domestic and foreign producers will be attracted to the best market—which should be in this country since the potential consumption is far greater here than anywhere else in the world.

The present price controls and tariffs on virgin materials are preventing necessary supplies of these materials, and Congress can profitably weigh the advantages of free markets for these raw materials versus the hamstringing caused by controls.

Very truly yours,
HAZARD INSULATED WIRE WORKS,
DIVISION OF THE OKONITE CO.,
R. M. EATON, *Resident Manager.*

Graft Endangers Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the March 22 issue of the Verndale Sun, published in Verndale, Minn., appears the Weekly Newsletter of Representative FRED MARSHALL, Sixth District, Minnesota. Representative MARSHALL is known throughout the State of Minnesota as a man of great integrity, sincerity, and courage. His comments regarding moral and ethical standards of conduct in the Federal service are worthy of the study and attention of every citizen. I ask unanimous consent that Representative MARSHALL's newsletter be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAFT ENDANGERS FEDERAL SERVICE

Everyone interested in honest government must be bewildered and shocked by the almost daily reports of corruption and scandal being disclosed in Government operations. The very fact that this is headline news indicates that it is the unusual and not the usual.

I have no patience with those who betray their fellow workers and their Government by dishonesty. They are parasites and we must work to rid our Government of them and their practices. Their effect is even more far reaching than their immediate evil.

It is difficult to know just how much our Government has been weakened by reluctance of good men and women to accept positions because of these episodes.

In hearings last week on the Voice of America program it was revealed that Edward Barrett left Newsweek magazine at a considerable financial sacrifice to take charge of this important work. He then discovered

that topflight personnel he needed refused to accept positions for fear of character assassination and the stigma of bureaucracy.

This situation makes it imperative that the present disclosures be pursued and that action be taken to encourage the loyal officials and employees who are quietly and efficiently serving the taxpayer. Only by ridding Government of graft and corruption can confidence be restored.

Corruption is not new or unique. Every administration has suffered from the greedy and power-hungry who seek to use Government for their own selfish interests. No political party is immune from those within its ranks who are there only for power or profit without regard for its political philosophy or principles.

This is true at every level of government—city, county, State, and Federal. And it will remain true until the facts are given to the people and they act to correct the abuses of authority and prestige. Our kind of government does not usually permit these things to remain hidden long, unless the people themselves permit it.

Those who out of false loyalty to party or friends defend dishonesty are most guilty. The attitude of my party or my friends, right or wrong, is moral cowardice which breeds corruption and undermines the fabric of government.

Outright theft or embezzlement in government cannot go long undetected. More dangerous are the peddlers of influence, the 5-percenters, the fixers, and the shake-down artists. These are the men and women who use their positions and their friends for personal gain.

The acceptance of a mink coat by a White House stenographer from persons interested in obtaining Federal assistance is an indication of moral laxity which a good citizen cannot condone.

The whole intricate maze of doubtful operations in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by some of its officials endangers a program which makes 80 percent of its loans to small businesses needing less than $50,000. But this fact is obscured by the disgusting spectacle of its officials collaborating with men in the White House and in Congress to set up questionable financial ventures and Miami Beach hotels.

Throughout history there has been a market for the intangible commodity known as influence. As long as men choose to be greedy and to profit from the needs or suffering of others, there will be a market for influence.

In exposing the officials who willingly permit themselves to be used, we sometimes overlook the moral degeneration of those who buy influence. Those who sell influence and those who buy influence are equally bad.

Elected officials as well as appointed officials are a part of the pattern of evil. Charges of patronage being peddled over the counter in Mississippi are not isolated incidents. Employment of persons by any agency without regard to ability is a dangerous practice. We, too, find people administering important programs who have little conception of the problems involved.

It is shocking to find that many Congressmen and Senators are receiving retainers or salaries from other sources. I have found my job more than a full-time job—it is a job that can never be completely done. Yet if these men are accepting salaries or retainers they must be providing services. And can anyone vote in the best interests of all of the people of a district, if he stands to make personal profit for a particular interest?

Though committees of the House and Senate are performing a great service in uncovering corruption and dishonesty, Congress must also look at itself. It may be legal for a Senator to spend thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to send telegraphic accounts of his speeches all over the country. It may be legal but it is morally wrong.

This is the heart of the problem. Many of the practices disclosed are not illegal. Yet, we cannot set mere legality as the standard of public life. Rather we ought to set the moral virtues as the standard of service in Government and to restore confidence in Government.

FRED MARSHALL.

In Memory of the Greatest American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been the fortune of our Nation to have had great leaders come to the fore in the times of crisis. Six years ago tomorrow the free world mourned the death of one of the great leaders of all time—Franklin D. Roosevelt. He came to us when our Nation was in the midst of a terrible depression. He warned against fear and made the decisions which led us out of the depths of economic distress. He was ready when the Nazi monster unleashed war on our world. His decisions and his leadership led the free world to victory.

Six years ago tomorrow his successor, President Harry S. Truman, stepped into Roosevelt's shoes. President Truman has had to make great decisions during his 6 years in office. Every decision he has made has been made in the desire and in the great wish that it will take us farther down the road to eventual peace and security. President Truman had a tremendous decision to make on the question of using the atomic bomb. He made his decision resolutely.

He had a decision to make as to whether our Nation would give its unfailing support to the international cause of the United Nations. His critics, those men of little faith fought him, but he has not turned back.

He fought for the Truman doctrine, he gave his wholehearted support to make the Marshall plan work. His was a guiding hand in bringing the North Atlantic Pact into being.

Last year he was faced with an invasion of the Republic of Korea by the forces of the Kremlin. He made the decision that the Kremlin had gone far enough. The people of the free world have applauded his decision. His decision was made in the belief that it was another contribution to peace.

It is not easy to make controversial decisions in the time of great crisis when emotions and partisanship are running rampant. History only will record the correctness of the decision which is made, and history will record that the great decisions which have been made in the first 6 years of President Truman's administration have been made in the interest of peace for our generation and for generations to come.

Sometime in today's early hours President Truman had to make another controversial decision of high moment to the world; and, knowing the storm of abuse which would fall on him, he made that decision resolutely: To relieve Gen. Douglas MacArthur of his command functions.

This was a decision as painful as any ever made by President Roosevelt; and it may be as great in its impact on the world's future.

I remember vividly the sense of loss that I felt myself when I learned of President Roosevelt's death; I know that almost every man and woman in the free world felt the same sharp sense of personal desolation; and I know that Harry Truman, taking his sacred oath of office in the midst of the world's greatest war was not immune.

He has told us so; humbly and honestly, he has told the world that his only hope was to so conduct his office that he would not be ashamed to face his predecessor.

Surely today we need to hark back to the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his calm assurance. We need to remember his most striking phrase: "All we have to fear is fear itself."

Rev. Joseph Murgas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent in this House the Eleventh Pennsylvania District, comprising the county of Luzerne in the State of Pennsylvania, with Wilkes-Barre as the county seat. And further I have the distinction of living in that part of the city of Wilkes-Barre—up in North Wilkes-Barre—within the very parish so satisfactorily served by that great and beloved priest, distinguished scholar and scientist, Rev. Joseph Murgas.

And so on this day in April I use this great forum of democracy and freedom to pay tribute to his memory and I read from the book written by Mr. Stephen J. Palickar, an excellent biography of Father Murgas:

REV. JOSEPH MURGAS

As a servant in the vineyard of Christ, a humanitarian, and a man of science, Rev. Joseph Murgas' immutable characteristic was his intense love of truth and accuracy. A conspicuous manifestation of his quality in his life is traced to the early days of his priesthood when, as an austere art critic in his native Slovakia, he pointed to the false interpretation of a painting in the Hungarian House of Parliament by a famous Magyar artist who attempted to portray a certain historical event in the life of two nations. The circumstances which followed the daring performance of Father Murgas brought him to America where, as a priest, he continued to spread the truth of the gospel to his countrymen, a task he was aptly qualified to fulfill because of his sympathetic under-

standing of the human heart and a firm belief in the immortality of the soul.

His keen intellect and the blessing of his theological training helped in providing him with a sound scientific grounding which not only added to his lore, but also proved beneficial to civilization. In this category his fertile brain enabled him to emerge as a pioneer inventor in the field of wireless telegraphy and radio, and as a result of his work in this realm of science, he gained an aura of glamour which since has been denied him.

In addition to his religious, social, artistic, political and naturalistic accomplishments, Father Murgas' creative ability led him to invent a new and faster method of wireless communication known as the "Tone-system" by which, instead of the "dot" and "dash" spark impulse used in the Morse method, a musical effect arranged in different tones representing each letter of the alphabet was used to dispatch messages by wireless telegraphy.

Rev. Joseph Murgas further delved, and was the first to succeed in transmitting voice sounds by means of wireless which contributed toward making his device the forerunner of present-day radio.

An Ex-Artillery Captain Fires a General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, an ex-artillery captain has achieved the ultimate. He has fired the general.

I wonder what Hiss counseled this.

The supreme irony is that Mr. Truman invokes the Constitution as the basis of his action. This is the same Constitution which Mr. Truman flouted when he plunged the Nation into war without the authority of the Congress.

History records that one famous American general was fired—Gen. George McClellan—because he would not fight. Not until this morning, however, has an American general been fired because he insisted upon fighting a war he had been ordered to prosecute.

The President complains that MacArthur "is unable to give wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations."

He spoke more truly than he realized.

Certainly MacArthur has been unable to give his wholehearted support to the tragic absurdity that it is possible to repel and defeat aggression without defeating the aggressor and without using every military resource to accomplish that defeat.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to a blockade of Formosa which denies the Nationalist Chinese Government the right to fulfill its United Nations obligation to resist aggression.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to failure to provide South Koreans with arms to resist the invaders of their homeland and thereby save countless American lives.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to policies which prevented his carrying the war to the enemy's supply bases.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to the perpetuation of a futile stalemate in an aimless war which already has cost nearly 60,000 American casualties.

He has been unable to give his wholehearted support to policies which can have no ultimate outcome but appeasement.

If that is insubordination, then millions of MacArthur's fellow Americans are insubordinate.

Will the ex-artillery captain fire them, too?

Operation Statesmen—Increased Enrollment at Military Colleges Points Up Need for an Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Newsweek Magazine carries on the cover a picture of West Point cadets in the historic dress uniforms that are a heritage from the earliest days of the United States Military Academy. Out of date though these uniforms of 1802 seem in the year 1951, there is nothing old-fashioned, out-of-date, or superfluous about the training the cadets at the Academy are receiving today. These picked young men, being educated at public expense, are being educated to become public leaders. As the author of the article states:

> In the present (or Kremlin-spooked) world it was apparent that, whether all Americans liked it or not, military leadership was playing and would continue to play a vital part in Government policy and administration. As Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently put it: "Today, in this half peace, half war, neither the soldier nor the diplomat alone can lead the American people in a wise course of international action. Both voices must be heard if American policy is to be realistic and effective."

Facing the realities of this period of tension in which we live, the West Point Military Academy is giving its hand-picked men the best education for all eventualities—and for service to their country as soldiers and leaders.

What is happening at West Point is also happening at Annapolis, at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, and at eight civilian schools specifically recognized by the Department of Defense as preferred sources for officer procurement. New courses are preparing men for new responsibilities. Increased applications are permitting new and even higher standards of selection. But new quotas are also permitting larger graduation classes. The military schools of the country are girding to face an emergency, and are in every way proving their own sense of responsibility to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in this Newsweek article on what the military academies are doing to turn out the best men, mentally, morally, and physically, to serve our country in any eventuality, one important fact is conspicuous by its absence There is no Air Force Academy. There is nowhere in the United States an academy that trains leaders for our United States Air Force in the way in which other schools train leaders for our Army, our Navy, and our Coast Guard.

The Air Force, it is true, has its own cadets—and trains them to be pilots, navigators, and bombardiers. But their Air Force training is technical and begins only after their required civilian and academic training has been completed. The Air Force has no opportunities and no facilities for taking young men just out of high school and giving them the sort of intensified training in leadership that the other services are giving other young men who will become leaders.

This deficiency is being met, after a fashion, by taking 25 percent of both Annapolis and West Point graduates for the Air Force—an expedient that creates a situation that is at once unfair to the Air Force and to the other services. It deprives both the Army and the Navy of leaders trained for the respective needs of these services, whereas it gives to the Air Force officers primarily trained in fields other than those involving basically Air Force requirements. Basically, the training that must be given an Army officer is training in civil engineering, and West Point graduates have built most of our harbors, many of our bridges, and our great Panama Canal. Basically, the training that must be given a naval officer is training in mechanical engineering, and Navy Academy graduates are outstanding among men who follow the sea. But what the Air Force requires is officers trained in aeronautical engineering—for the mastery of a third element, that is neither sea nor land.

The unfairness of the existing situation points up the pressing need for an Air Force Academy, but the need is now greater than the need of a single service for military leaders. In this air age, in which our survival may depend on our ability to retain control of the air, not only over the United States but over any lands where freedom is threatened, the need is for strategists who are educated in the problems, the tactics, the responsibilities and the science of the air.

The forces with which we are confronted in the world today demand that we seek perfection in our armed force. We must rely on quality rather than quantity, on the effective use of technical equipment rather than on manpower. Along with other essential qualities our officer corps must have a high intelligence and educational level. All of them should, in fact, have a full college education as a minimum requirement.

If an Air Academy could be opened in the summer of 1952, its first contribution

to an increase in the officer corps of the three services would not occur before 1956. The first full strength class of graduates could not reasonably be produced earlier than 1960. Hence, it is perfectly true that an Air Force Academy, even if authorized today, would have little or no effect on the specific emergency with which we are now confronted. But the tensions that disturb the peace today may well last through the lifetime of most of us, and through future generations. We must build our defenses not merely for 1951, but for 1961, and for all the years ahead. An Air Force Academy at this time is necessary as part of our long-range insurance, not merely to build up the Air Force but the Army and the Navy as well, since West Point and Annapolis do not actually meet the needs of Army and Navy, much less those of the Air Force.

We must remember the stern warning of Winston Churchill, who said:

For good or ill, air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power.

If the United States is to retain leadership in the world, and hence in the air, it becomes the responsibility of American citizens and of the American Congress to establish an Air Force Academy that will produce the leaders qualified to win and maintain for us military mastery in this element which Americans were the first to conquer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, Operation Statesmen, from the March 25, 1951, issue of Newsweek magazine.

The article is as follows:

WEST POINT PRODUCING SOLDIER STATESMEN AS MILITARY COLLEGES FACE BIGGEST BOOM

The rush was on. There hadn't been anything like it since 1942. While many college leaders in America deplored the loss of boys to the services and predicted declines in enrollment of up to 40 percent, military colleges braced themselves for the biggest boom in their history.

The three service Academies—West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn.—are limited by law in their enrollments. They were turning away more applicants than ever before. Most of the eight "tin colleges," civilian schools especially recognized by the Pentagon for their strict military training, were getting about two or three times as many applications as they could accept. The eight: Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Clemson Agricultural College, the Citadel, Virginia Military Institute, Norwich University, Pennsylvania Military College, and North Georgia College. In Army slang they are called "tin" to differentiate the "brass," or top officer personnel, which traditionally comes from the official schools. Gen. George Marshall, top Army officer of the Second World War and present Secretary of Defense, is a graduate of VMI.

The tin colleges, whose enrollments now total some 13,000, could expect the pressure on them to get heavier. Since the schools require virtually all male students to take ROTC and live a military life in uniform, the recent Senate draft bill (Newsweek, March 19) grants the ROTC men of these eight colleges the same deferments as service-Academy students. The House bill, up for an early vote, contains the same provision. And the 100 Regular and 400 Reserve Army commissions that usually go to these 8 schools will be more than doubled this June.

ACADEMY RUSH

At Annapolis, largest of the service Academies, 3,600 middies were crammed into huge Bancroft Hall's space for 2,900. The present student body is the largest in the 106-year existence of the Naval Academy.

The Coast Guard Academy, smallest (with an enrollment of 500) and youngest (75 years old) of the federally supported Academies, had room for only 1 out of every 30 men who qualified mentally. In February, 6,201 tooks its exams; only 200 were picked.

West Point, oldest of the three official military schools, was taking the boom most calmly. Celebrating the start of its one hundred and fiftieth year last week, the great gray fortress above the Hudson maintained the same enrollment that it had 5 years ago—the authorized 2,496. But for last year's 14 Presidential appointments, 310 had competed. Some 1,500 Regular Army personnel applied for the Point; 50 applicants took exams, and 12 were selected. Congressmen and Senators appoint 85 percent of the cadets and 60 percent of Annapolis' middies. Some reported 100 applicants for each of the 4 Point and 5 Annapolis appointments which they may have attending at the same time.

Military instructors saw only one reason for the boom. Thousands of boys preferred several years in a military school, followed by an officer's commission, to a drafted private's job in the Infantry. As for the service Academies, by initial selection, training, and constant culling in the course of the free education they give their students, they still produced most of the cream of the country's military leadership. And of a significantly different kind.

In the present (or Kremlin-spooked) world it was apparent that, whether all Americans liked it or not, military leadership was playing and would continue to play a vital part in Government policy and administration. As Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently put it: "Today, in this half peace, half war, neither the soldier nor the diplomat alone can lead the American people in a wise course of international action. Both voices must be heard if American policy is to be realistic and effective."

There was no question that the voice of the military was being heard in statesmanship. George C. Marshall, Virginia Military Institute, 1901; Dwight D. Eisenhower and Bradley, United States Military Academy, 1915, were clearly helping to shape the vital foreign-policy decisions of the Republic. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, United States Military Academy, 1903, could not stay out of the dire headlines from Asia even if he wanted to. Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Naval Academy, 1905, headed up the ticklish work of the Presidential Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

LEADERSHIP

Both Annapolis and West Point have realized the new trend in military education. Since the end of the Second World War, both have established new departments of "leadership." Of the approximately 3,000 hours each West Point cadet spends in study and recitation during his 4 years, roughly 40 percent are now devoted to social-humanistic studies. (Cadets take an additional 2,000 hours of military training, mostly in the summer.)

Old-time Pointers might frown on such newfangled ideas. These were certainly different from the original concept of a United States Military Academy when it was founded as an engineering school under Maj. Jonathan Williams in 1802. The original 5 officers and 10 cadets had dwindled to 1 of each by 1812, when the war with England brought new strength to the United States Military Academy. In the nineteenth century, Pointers built all the Nation's main and cross-country railroad lines and mapped and surveyed the coasts and frontiers. Later they completed such major engineering projects as the Panama Canal.

Something like that atmosphere has returned to the Point. Under its 1945 Superintendent, Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, geography was restored after a 50-year absence from the curriculum; history of the Far East, Russia, and Latin America, and United States diplomatic history were modernized. Subjects like economics of security now give first classmen (seniors) training in resources and manpower and their capability of conversion to a wartime economy. Student conferences with other colleges bring cadets in contact with their civilian brothers.

In international relations, contemporary problems are studied. In part of the course—Operation Statesman, begun in 1947—first classmen finish their international-relations training by studying a major United States foreign problem. In groups of 18, they examine and report on such thorny projects as writing a peace treaty for Japan or Germany, implementing the point 4 program, or proposing United States policy toward the disposition of Italy's former African colonies.

JETS AND ATOMS

Each cadet must take a language—the only choice he has in the curriculum—and 180 hours of English. In the scientific-engineering side of his liberal education, the Pointer studies atomic energy and electronics via oversize machines and demonstrations. The principles of jet propulsion can be learned firsthand from an F-80 jet engine donated last January by the Air Force, whither, incidentally, 25 percent of the cadets and of the Annapolis middies go on graduation. The $180,000 gift is the only such bodiless engine outside research laboratories and roars its exhaust out over the Hudson River, much to the consternation of nearby Cold Springs, N. Y., residents.

The department of military psychology and leadership, suggested in 1946 by General Eisenhower, proposes to the cadets such concrete problems as how to tell an incipient squad leader that he is about to be sent to cooks-and-bakers school instead, how to cope with a pregnant girl who accuses a soldier in your company of fatherhood, or what to tell your roommate when he breaks a fighter-plane formation which you command. (Annapolis has a similar course.) Military psychology and leadership also oversees the aptitude system whereby each man grades the 100 men of all classes in his company on leadership qualities. Each cadet is rated 9 times in his point career. If he consistently ends up at the bottom of the list, he gets advice from his superiors and the staff psychologist. If this does not help, he is advised to resign without disgrace because of his lack of leadership qualities. (Annapolis aptitude ratings do not permit a middie to rate a man above him.)

PLEBES AND RULES

Military psychology and leadership also takes the plebes (freshmen) under its wing. Hazing and the miseries of "bracing" (sucking in the chin and stomach, throwing out the chest and shoulders) were long the tradition at the Point. Today the plebe need never brace in public and physical hazing is forbidden. As one first classman puts it, "instead of driving the plebes we're leaving them alone. That old stuff was nonsense." Plebes each have an officer adviser among the 310 faculty members. These advisers invite the plebes to their homes and listen to their worries.

Bound by duty and honor, cadets are now allowed to drink in uniform 25 miles from the Academy (formerly they never could drink in uniform). While the new Point Superintendent, Maj. Gen. Frederick A. Irving,

who took over in January,[1] is willing to trust his men with less discipline under the honor system, Annapolis is now undergoing a tightening-up of already strict rules. Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill, Superintendent since last April, felt the middies were having it too soft. First classmen who in years past enjoyed every other week end off have suddenly found that they now have only four or five a semester. Annapolis plebes may not "drag" (date) except on rare occasions.

Civilians may wonder at the purpose of such training. But it is part of the Academies' attempt to turn out the very best men mentally, morally, and physically.

About half of each Coast Guard class "bilges out" before graduation, as the heavy engineering course is a tough one. Some 25 out of every 100 middies don't make it. West Point has managed to cut its "foundlings" from 50 percent 100 years ago to the present 20 percent. At the eight tin colleges drop-outs are much lower, with Texas A. & M.'s 11 percent unusually high.

Training for peacetime governmental service, as well as possible war command, has put a tremendous responsibility on the military academies and colleges. Out of a wave of applicants they have had to choose not only the good men. They have had to pick the best—and give them the best education for all eventualities—to wit, "Operation statesmen."

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in connection with the recall early this morning of General MacArthur, an editorial entitled "What Now, Mr. President?" published today in the Washington News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT NOW, MR. PRESIDENT?

Now, Mr. President, that you have fired General MacArthur, what next?

You have appointed General Ridgway as his successor to all United States and UN Far East commands.

Yet, 2 days ago, General Ridgway said:

"I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. I have no personal knowledge of negotiations for a political settlement. * * * There is nothing transitory, nothing temporary, about this situation we are in so far as a fight against communism is concerned. For Communist leaders this is a life and death struggle. The Communists will not vary their objectives. These fellows are out to destroy us no matter how long it takes."

Isn't that the same thing that General MacArthur has been saying?

By firing General MacArthur, Mr. President, have you come any closer to winning or ending the war in Korea?

That, eventually, is the test you must meet.

Serving General MacArthur's head up on a platter may temporarily appease the yapping yahoos of the British Socialist Government. But Britain has only 13,000 ground troops in Korea.

It may bring a frenzied delight to Prime Minister Nehru of India. But India has sent only an ambulance unit and some gunny sacks to Korea.

It may give some satisfaction to the French, but they have only 600 men in Korea.

Yet, what word goes to the 250,000 Americans alive and fighting in Korea? What is to be done in retribution for the 60,000 American casualties, including the 9,000 American dead—what assurance that their bleeding and dying shall not have been in vain?

General MacArthur has been sacked because, it is said, he was insubordinate.

General MacArthur's crime is that he saw no sense in fighting a losing or a futile war.

He insisted that we get this war over with—by victory, as has been the American habit.

To do the job, he asked for reinforcements—from all members of the United Nations—and a free hand to mount the maximum counter-offensive against the enemy. He asked that the 500,000 troops of Nationalist China be permitted to fight on our side.

He asked for these things because he wanted to win the war so that our troops could come home.

Secretary of State Acheson and the British Socialists and Nehru have won a great victory. They have got General MacArthur's scalp—which has been their goal for many months.

But now that the diplomats and the politicians have taken over this war, what are they going to do with it?

The President's order relieving General MacArthur of his command authorized him to issue such travel orders as he wishes to go any place he sees fit. But that does not apply to the 250,000 American troops under his command. They are left in Korea.

What is to be done about these men?

What about Korea?

What about the rest of Asia?

Centralization of Military Apparent Aim of Vinson UMT Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there is strong evidence to support the conviction that the UMT proposal submitted by Secretary of Defense Marshall represented one more attempt in the series of efforts to centralize all military power in the Federal Government.

The most ominous feature of the UMT issue will be missed completely if this factor is overlooked or minimized.

The fact that both the Senate UMT bill, as finally adopted, and the House bill, now under consideration, modify the original Marshall bill provisions to some degree, particularly so far as the status of the National Guard is concerned, does not alter the facts as to the apparent intent of General Marshall and the Pentagon to move substantially closer to complete centralization of military power.

Unless there is constant alertness to this aspect of the UMT proposal, there is still no assurance that this further centralization will not be an effect of UMT legislation.

The original Marshall bill puts Congress on notice as to the Pentagon's intent and continued desire on this score. It puts Congress on notice that there has been no serious effort to approach the problem of preparedness through the decentralized National Guard approach. And it certainly puts Congress on notice that it can expect stubborn resistance and obstruction, so far as the Pentagon is concerned, to any attempt to make that approach.

THE GRAY BOARD'S KIDNAPING PLAN

There are strong grounds for believing that the Marshall UMT bill was an attempt to accomplish, through the back door, what it hoped to achieve by the 1948 proposal to kidnap the National Guard.

It is important, for background purposes, to review the essential facts of this kidnaping effort, represented by the recommendation of the Committee on Civilian Components, commonly called the Gray Board, in its report of June 30, 1948.

On October 13, 1945—just prior to the retirement of General Marshall as Army Chief of Staff—a statement of approved War Department policies affecting the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps was issued by the War Department. This plan contemplated an M-day force, to comprise the Nation's first line of defense, made up of approximately 850,000 men in the Regular Army and Air Force, another 680,000 men in the National Guard, and approximately 220,000 men in the Organized Reserve, for a total of 1,750,000 men capable of immediate mobilization in the event of aggression.

In 1947 the Committee on Civilian Components was brought into being. Its report of June 30, 1948, included certain findings and recommendations which added up to a proposal that the National Guard be brought directly under control of the Federal Government.

Before these findings and recommendations are cited, however, attention should be called to the constitutional provisions regarding a decentralized militia which, today, is the National Guard of the several States.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides:

The Congress shall have power—

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

The Constitution, in the same article and section, also provides:

The Congress shall have power—

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

[1] General Irving succeeded Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore, General Taylor's successor in 1949. General Moore recently died in Korea after a helicopter accident.

The significance of these two provisions is a twofold balancing of powers, responsibilities, and authority so far as the Armed Forces of the Nation and the States are concerned:

First. The Federal Government was given the power to provide for a standing Army, subject to the 2-year appropriation limitation; the Federal Government also was given authority to prescribe the discipline to govern the State militia.

Second. The States were assured the support of the Federal Government for its militia—National Guard—since the Federal Government would organize and arm these State troops; at the same time the States retained control over the militia through its power to appoint the officers and train the troops comprising the militia.

This, then, is a provision for effective decentralization of military control and authority except (a) for Federal control of the standing Army; (b) Federal control of the militia when called into the service of the United States.

Thus the Constitution did not contemplate (a) a permanent, peacetime Federal Militia; (b) the right of the Federal Government to federalize the militia in peacetime—that is, at any time other than when necessary "to call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

GRAY REPORT PROPOSAL

The Gray report held that "the National Guard must be directly under Federal control" in order to accomplish its accepted national role or mission as defined in the October 13, 1945, War Department policies.

The report further recommended specifically:

1. Establishing the Reserve forces of the Army under the Army clause of the Constitution.
2. Establishing the Reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate (Federal) legal authority.
3. Incorporating the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps into the Army Reserve force under the name of the "National Guard of the United States."
4. Incorporating the Air National Guard and Air Reserve into the Air Force Reserve under the name of the "United States Air Force Reserve."

Subsequently the Secretary of Defense, on December 15, 1948, recommended to the President, among other things, the federalization of the Air National Guard, and greater Federal control over the personnel, equipment, facilities, and allocation of moneys to the States.

PROTESTS MADE BY STATE LEGISLATURES

These developments brought vigorous protests from the States. Memorials to Congress were adopted opposing the proposed federalization. Besides the Michigan Legislature, acting under dates of April 29 and May 17, 1949, similar action was taken by the States of South Carolina, Maryland, South Dakota, Indiana, Massachusetts, Utah, Arkansas, Maine, Minnesota, and Oregon, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Michigan resolution stated, among other things:

Such federalization would violate the principle of State's rights.

* * * Federalization * * * would violate existing agreements between the Federal Government and the sovereign States whereby the States accepted in good faith the allotments made by the War Department in 1945, and have completed the organization of such allotments, insofar as authorized by the Congress and for which funds have been provided. * * *

* * * Federalization would destroy at one blow the Nation Guard as it now exists * * * and would result in the centralization of all military power in the Federal Government and ultimately in the hands of a few, and thus pave the way for the establishment of a dictatorship, military or otherwise, in this country. * * *

* * * The States * * * would be compelled to organize and maintain State troops at great cost to the States with the result that there would thus be maintained a Federal reserve and State military force, creating a great duplication of effort and expense. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, pp. 7214–7215.)

The resolutions adopted by the other States contained similar statements as to the consequence of proposed federalization of the National Guard.

STATEMENTS BY GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

In an address at Bloomington, Ill., January 27, 1949, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, commander of One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, Thirty-third Division, Illinois National Guard, made these statements regarding the proposed federalization of the National Guard:

From time to time, powerful groups of individuals have sought to destroy the traditional principles upon which the National Guard was founded and has been maintained throughout our history. They have repeatedly attempted to kidnap the Guard from the States and place it directly under control of the Federal Government. The latest assault on the National Guard, and the rights of States, has been launched under the cloak of so-called unification of the Armed Forces by the Committee on Civilian Components.

General Klein quoted former Governor Green, of Illinois, as saying:

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the Governors of almost all States when I say that we will fight to the last ditch against this proposal. National Guard officers and men have proven themselves superior to the fighting men of the strongest militaristic nations of the world. They are ready for effective action sooner than officers and men in the Federal Reserves which were organized after World War I. * * * I believe * * * the War Department records will reveal that in World War II not a single unit of the Organized Reserve Corps was called into Federal service as a unit—a record not conducive to capturing the trust and confidence of the Nation.

General Klein then added:

The Federal Government has also had direct Federal control of the Organized Reserve Corps since the end of World War II and has had the opportunity to make the Organized Reserve Corps as efficient as the National Guard is under State control, but has failed to do so. Thirty years of apparent failure with the ORC prior to World War II and continued failure since World War II is a poor recommendation. What assurance has the Nation that the Army, with the National Guard under Federal control, will be more successful than the States have been?

General Klein pointed out that the concern of the Gray board over delay in putting the National Guard into Federal service and transfer of Federal property could be corrected by an amendment to the National Defense Act "which would automatically place the National Guard under Federal control the instant Congress declares a National Emergency." He said such a recommendation had been submitted to the Defense Department some time ago.

Then General Klein gave this warning:

It is not too difficult to visualize that at some future time an ambitious, selfish individual, group or organization would be able to use this great power to continue its control of the Government, or endeavor to seize such control. This one possibility alone is enough to condemn forever this great centralization of power, which one day might place this, the last free nation in the world, in jeopardy of losing the freedom for which so many of our people died.

* * * The National Guard system, comprising as it does—citizen soldiers—has always been a bulwark against the concentration of military power in our Federal Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 2, pp. 1493–94.)

General Klein cited as one further argument against federalization the fact that in event of an atomic attack wiping out Washington, it would be tremendously important to continue military decentralization "of, if you please, a continuation of the present National Guard system." In such an emergency, he pointed out:

The only remaining recognized authority in such a crisis would be the governors of the sovereign States. If the National Guard were federalized * * * these governors would be without the legal power to employ the troops.

COLLIER'S EDITORIAL ON FEDERALIZATION

The March 26, 1949, Collier's carried a vigorous editorial opposing the federalization of the National Guard. Its argument is summed up as follows:

Ours is a Federal and not a National Government. The difference is far more than a matter of words. It is the difference between a Nazi or a Communist state and a free state. * * *

* * * Let's not federalize the National Guard or any other governmental enterprise that can be successfully operated by State or local governments. (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 13, p. A1987.)

GENERAL MARSHALL'S ADMISSION OF FAILURE

Apropos of what General Klein said, above—and Governor Green—regarding the failure of the Federal Government to develop an effective Reserve system, note the following statement by General Marshall, quoted in the April 13, 1951, United States News and World Report, page 31:

We started in June from a state of bankruptcy as to available trained reserves. Whatever Reserve organizations we had were only 40 or 50 percent of strength, and that strength only partially trained. * * * What we are now trying to do is overcome this complete deficiency of trained men that we've had.

While this may be in part an attempt to belittle the National Guard, although Marshall said, page 28, "the National Guard as part of" the "Reserve system have the equivalent of 34 divisions of ground troops with 50 percent strength," it obviously applies particularly to the Organized Reserve Corps.

Insofar as what Marshall says is true it is an admission of the Pentagon's failure to obey the orders of the President issued October 15, 1948—Executive Order No. 10,007, Federal Register, volume 13, October 19, 1948, page 6099.

Included in this order was the following:

The Secretary of Defense, and the head of each Department in the National Military Establishment, shall proceed without delay, utilizing every practicable resource of the regular components of the Armed Forces, to organize all Reserve component units, and to train such additional individuals now or hereafter members of the Active Reserve, as may be required for the national security; and to establish vigorous and progressive programs of appropriate instruction and training for all elements of the Reserve components, including the National Guard.

FAILURE TO ACTIVATE THE NATIONAL GUARD

In this connection, it is interesting to note the criticism voiced in the House on April 14, 1948, by Congressman Keefe. After pointing out that the War Department had spent or obligated only a little over $30,000,000 after making a showing of need for $143,000,000, which was appropriated, Mr. Keefe said:

The National Guard units have not been recruited and have not been made attractive to the boys who would otherwise enlist in the National Guard. They have not been given the equipment that they ought to have in order to make it attractive to enlistees to go into the National Guard. In the face of the Army's contention that they need more young men in the armed services to the extent that they are carrying on a constant campaign for universal military training, it seems to me there may be some logical connection between their failure to lay emphasis on activation of the National Guard until they get the UMT put over. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 4, p. 4444.)

Mr. Andrews, of New York, pointed out, further—and this was 3 years ago—that under the selective-service provisions for exemption of men who signed up with the National Guard—

It will add enough men to the National Guard so that they will have all that they possibly can use, and they will be under World War II officers if the Government recognizes them in a way they should be recognized (ibid., p. 4448).

WARNING WAS GIVEN IN JANUARY 1948

General Marshall now complains of the state of bankruptcy so far as trained reserves is concerned. The Pentagon has no one but itself to blame. As long ago as January 15, 1948, Congressman SIKES said this in the House. After pointing out that "a very small percentage" of the military budget had been used for the Reserves, he continued:

I believe the departments received all they requested from Congress for Reserve and National Guard activities. * * *

* * * The strength allotted to the National Guard by the Departments of Army and Air is close to 700,000 officers and men. Today in fact the National Guard is made up of skeleton units, partially equipped, which total about 200,000 men. Can we afford to allow the National Guard to remain as skeleton units awaiting possible passage of UMT legislation? Is it not more practical to inaugurate a drive of sufficient amount to bring these units up to usable strength, to equip and train them for modern warfare, as War Department blueprints long ago envisioned?

The Organized Reserve, in which over a million wartime officers and men signified their interest by joining, is today anything but an effective security force. Only a small percentage of its officers have received assignment to actual functioning units. The enlisted reserves, about 600,000 of them, are altogether too small in number. * * *

* * * Certainly 2½ years is sufficient time for the leaders of our Armed Forces to realize that something should have been done with our citizen components to effectively weld them into the proper kind of security forces. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 1, p. 223.)

Yet today Marshall scolds the American people for letting down in peacetime. He insists on UMT to build an enduring posture of defense.

On April 8 of the same year, Congressman Mathews charged that the Defense Department was failing to use funds voted by Congress and at the same time there were rumors that "the Army says it does not have the funds to finance the field training of the National Guard." And Mathews asked:

Is the high brass of the Army again sabotaging the National Guard? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 3, p. 4252.)

GENERAL WALSH TESTIMONY BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE

Here is the pattern: An attempt by the Pentagon to take over, "kidnap" the National Guard. At the same time neglect of the National Guard as now constituted; neglect of the Organized Reserve; and still complaint, as of April 1951, over the bankruptcy of the present Reserve set-up when desperately needed in June 1950.

Now does not the situation highlighted by the testimony of Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association of the United States, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, January 19, 1951, fit into this same Pentagon policy of "rule or ruin"?

First. Walsh said National Guard Association officials had not seen a copy of the Marshall bill until the afternoon before they were called on to testify.

Second. Walsh said the bill "did little" for the National Guard and "may, in effect, mark the end of the Army and Air National Guard."

Third. He charged that the bill was before the committee illegally since there had been a failure to bring the matter before a War Department committee on which National Guard was represented, as required by law.

Fourth. He said it had never been contemplated by the National Guard that UMT would be tied to a draft-extension bill.

Fifth. He warned that the service called for under this hyphenated bill "will accrue to the Regular Armed Forces" rather than to "organized units of the civilian components"—including the National Guard.

Sixth. He said:

The National Guard is most dubious that under the provisions contained in this bill, it will obtain any substantial numbers and anywhere near sufficient to maintain its required strength. If this proves to be the case, and we think it will, then the Army and Air National Guard will wither and die.

Seventh. He charged that the Marshall bill eliminated the exemption from the draft of present and potential National Guard personnel, cutting off the guard's source of manpower.

Eighth. He said the bill omitted the declaration of Congress' intent that when units and organizations are needed in excess of the regular forces, the guard shall be ordered to active service. I believe this item is the one Marshall told the House committee was omitted by oversight due to the Defense Department working until 2 or 3 in the morning. It was added to both the Senate and House bills. Are we sure this oversight was unintentional?

Ninth. Walsh complained that the National Guard had not been activated except for a few units and added:

The sounder approach to the problem would be, in our opinion, to order into the active military service of the United States all of the Army and Air National Guard * * * which is not now in * * * active service * * * on the basis of a phased mobilization. (P. 718, Senate hearings.)

Tenth. Walsh ridiculed the argument that prospective draftees were using the National Guard to hide from the draft, pointing out that they wouldn't be hiding from the draft if the Defense Department called the guard to active duty.

Eleventh. Walsh asked that if only half of the 18-year-olds were going to be taken for active service with the Regular forces, could not they be used as a source of added manpower for the National Guard?

Twelfth. He further charged:

We are being in a large measure reduced in efficiency rather than having our efficiency increased at this time, because a lot of our equipment is being taken from us, some of our enlisted men and * * * officers have been permitted to volunteer for active service, and all those things reduce the efficiency of the National Guard as a reserve ready for mobilization.

Thirteenth. It is apparent that Walsh later gave his endorsement to the House bill because he felt that it restored the omissions he objected to, corrected many of the weaknesses of the Marshall bill, and provided for UMT, which he favors.

CONCLUSION

The fact remains that the intent of General Marshall and the Pentagon seems clear. The kindest thing that can be said is that it was not their intent to strengthen and safeguard and utilize to the maximum the National Guard as now constituted.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that having been stymied in their effort to kidnap the National Guard they propose to starve it to death, weaken it as a competitor to the Pentagon-controlled Organized Reserve.

Certainly the basic consideration in any approach to UMT must be a complete reversal of emphasis and interest—from that of empire building by the Pentagon which is on record through its effort to centralize military control to development of decentralized, citizen-type reserves and military training program.

Certainly the Pentagon has given ample notice within the past few years of the need for the Congress and the American people to be vigilant.

The Barden substitute to S. 1 must be adopted.

Legion Head Urges Korean Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, current press reports indicate that National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion, has offended the White House by a statement that, "General MacArthur has been fighting the Korean war with both hands tied behind his back." This conclusion is not entirely new so far as Commander Cocke is concerned. Under leave to extend my remarks I quote here extract from a report written by Mr. Cocke following his recent visit to the Korean front as published in the March 29 issue of the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes:

From private and from command officers with multiple stars on their shoulders I received queries as to what Washington was going to resolve on the Korean situation and when. I could not answer that query, but countered by asking them what they thought should be done.

They were not hesitant in their answers, posed in various ways but all adding up to: "Send us more men. Decide upon what our ultimate goal is to be. Realize that even to win a stalemate additional strength must be sent and sent soon."

That from these men, wise in military lore, gave me pause.

As darkness precluded further visits we returned to General Ridgway's headquarters and batted the breeze, as old soldiers will. I found that this grenade-toting ex-paratrooper worries over the questions asked, too. He is striving to find the answers. But the answers, it seem to me, are not at Army level. They lie in the much higher echelon. But answers there must be. There is a limit to human endurance, and that limit is reached much quicker when one doesn't even know what the ultimate goal is.

We have crossed and recrossed the Han River many times. Now it is ours again. The thirty-eighth parallel is close by. Is that to be our digging-in place, or are we going back to the Yalu River again? Who is going to decide whether the Manchurian border, across which the enemy brazenly stores matériel of war and masses his troops, is to be inviolate again? General MacArthur's communiques have stopped hinting that it is within his province to order our planes across that line. Yet, if we are to be successful in this war, we cannot afford to allow the enemy to mass his strength and thumb his nose at us while we sit on this side of the border and await permission to cut the cancer at its source.

Wars are not won that way.

There definitely is a crying need for replacements and, if we are to be successful in even accomplishing a stalemate and maintaining it, there must be some definite goal established.

Whether that goal be the thirty-eighth parallel or whether we must strike at the root of the enemy's supply bases, is a question that General MacArthur says is beyond his authority.

But someone's authority it is. Is it President Truman? Is it the United Nations secretariat? Is it the free nations as a unit, or is it the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Frankly, I do not know, but an answer must be given and a decision made—and soon.

Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota takes great pride in the success and growth of its cooperative movement and associations. One of the outstanding examples of effective cooperative enterprise is the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis. Recently this organization celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. Mr. Russell Aslesen, staff writer for the Minneapolis Tribune, has described the growth of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale in an article in the Minneapolis Tribune, March 25, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDLAND CO-OP SUCCESS EXCEEDS ROSY DREAMS OF EARLY BACKERS

A handful of discontented Minnesota farmers met at the old State Capitol Building in St. Paul September 8, 1926.

Most were directors of local cooperative oil companies which were springing up in the area and trying to weather the financial storm.

Like the rest of the Nation, these men had been watching—or taking part in—the successful fight of Minnesota's dairy interests to unite local cooperatives into the area-wide marketing associations.

"If you can carry cooperation in a milk can, you can carry it in a gasoline can," said more than one riled-up southern Minnesota farmer.

After the mutterings against "obstinate petroleum industry" and "exorbitant profit margins" died down, the farmers formally signed articles of incorporation for the world's first wholesale oil cooperative.

It was thus that Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis was born.

Even its most rabid backers, like A. P. Bartsch, Owatonna, Minn., first president, had no idea they were starting the modern miracle of cooperative success.

The most fanatic would have hesitated to predict that in 25 years, the cooperative would have a volume of business totaling $29,460,995 or facilities worth $3,411,788. Or have returned $5,483,843 to patrons over the 25-year period.

That is the success story Midland officers will carry to their membership at the silver anniversary meeting Monday through Wednesday in Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis.

From a rented desk, a dynamic manager and an idea 25 years ago, Midland has mushroomed into an organization owned by some 600 local co-ops and serving 300,000 families in Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Iowa.

It no longer distributes only oil and gas. It has a line of food and farm supplies, in many cases manufacturing them. Either outright or with other co-op partners, it owns oil wells in Oklahoma, refineries in Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma; mills in Minnesota and Wisconsin; fertilizer plants in Idaho; farm machinery manufacturing plants in Ohio, Indiana, and Minnesota; and food plants in Indiana.

Midland often has been referred to as "an idea whose time had come."

The "co-operative ground," well fertilized by failures, was ready to produce.

Farmers at that time had watched the sharp price breaks following World War I and later watched farm credit shrinking.

A group of farmers at Cottonwood, Minn., in 1921 had applied the basic principles found successful in their co-op creameries and shipping associations—and gone into the gas and oil business.

Not long afterward, Casco, New London, Van Dyne, and Manawa, Wis., had organizations distributing petroleum products on a cooperative basis.

The idea came of age when Marshall, Jackson, Owatonna, Redwood Falls, Dawson, and Albert Lea, Minn., soon followed and by 1926 co-op bulk plants and filling stations were being put up all over both States.

They bought their products from the "old line" companies, an arrangement they found unsatisfactory at times. The idea of a central organization to wholesale their own oil began to take form.

There were other unrecorded preliminaries that culminated in the St. Paul meeting to draw up articles for the wholesale oil co-op, then called the Minnesota Co-op Oil Co.

At that point, they had the cooperative. But they had no capital, no manager or facilities.

That was the situation that faced E. G. Cort, Freeborn County agent, late in November 1926, when the board of directors "hired" him.

Cort, a dynamic worker, was obsessed with the cooperative idea and to demonstrate his faith in that idea, "gambled" with the board. He was hired without salary, with salary to be discussed if he made good.

So it was that on January 2, 1927, Cort slid behind a desk in an office at 3300 East Hennepin Avenue he shared with another firm. He was manager of a corporation without working capital or capital stock.

Cort was a pioneer in trail blazing the program to put more ownership into the hands of more people. A graduate of Iowa State College in 1911, he had taught school and farmed in Chippewa County, Minn., before going to Albert Lea as county agent in 1923. While county agent, he became active in the cooperative movement and helped form the Freeborn County oil cooperative.

With no angel to underwrite the enterprise, the new co-op led a hand-to-mouth existence. It was set up on a membership basis with a local co-op becoming a member by paying annual membership fees of $20 for the first bulk station and $5 for each additional bulk or service station.

It also is recorded that the local co-ops paid in advance for cars of gasoline.

Cort was a driving force but a quiet, unassuming man named F. H. Osborne, Albert Lea, the first secretary-treasurer, provided an ideal balance wheel to him. Osborne worked behind the scenes, advising Cort in a fatherly

fashion and husbanding the meager resources. He was a businessman turned farmer, who knew farm problems could not be solved on an individual basis.

The first year's operation showed net savings of $3,473 on a volume of almost $270,000. It spurred the men of Midland to increase their tempo and the successes of the first few years may have produced a confidence not completely justified.

Achievements did not come without compensation or opposition but by the end of 10 years, the volume grew to more than $3,000,000.

The co-op got a permanent home at 739 Northeast Johnson Street in 1931 when it bought a World War I chemical plant, idle since hostilities. They paid $9,000 for the building and land now valued at more than $150,000.

Present responsibilities of Midland management rest on the shoulders of 6-foot 4-inch A. J. Smaby, a Minnesotan of Scandinavian ancestry. He was manager of the Tri-County Co-op Oil Association in Rushford, Minn., before coming to Midland in 1936 as credit manager. He became manager in 1941 when Cort suffered a heart attack.

J. F. Shea, Pickett, Wis., now is president of the board.

Under this management, sales hit a record high of $29,549,000 and net savings of $2,276,000 in 1948.

Midland, although having interests in oil wells and refineries, still isn't self-sufficient in crude oil. As a result of a squeeze of crude and refinery prices of petroleum products in 1949, the firm was in the red for the first time in history and lost $197,164.

It bounced back in 1950 with net savings of $1,064,332.

Here are some other highlights in its rise:

1933: Sales reach $1,000,000.

1934: Change name to Midland Co-op Wholesale and change from membership organization to capital-stock firm.

1935: Second largest distributor of petroleum products in Minnesota.

1941: Teamed with Indiana Farm Bureau Co-op to get fertilizer plant at Hartsdale.

1943: The year of going into production. Authorized purchase of refinery at Cushing, Okla., for $1,000,000; also with other co-ops bought refinery at McPherson, Kans., and Ohio Cultivator Co., at Bellevue, Ohio; and bought Burkhardt Milling Co. and started to process feed.

1944: Bought $200,000 warehouse at Northwest terminal, Minneapolis.

1945: Organized Northwest Co-op Mills along with Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, Farmers Union Central Exchange, and Central Cooperative Wholesale.

1946: Bought 21 producing oil wells in Oklahoma. With others helped organize Millers Creek Coal Co-op.

1948: One of three firms in Premier Petroleum Co. with four refineries in Texas and one in Louisiana.

Midland points with pride to a record of $195,642,430 in sales in 25 years and its gross margin of $24,452,671.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the summary dismissal of General MacArthur is shocking and dictatorial. Before taking any such drastic steps, General MacArthur should have been recalled for consultation with congressional leaders and given the opportunity to present his views in person.

No man in the service of the American Government knows more about the Far East than General MacArthur. No man in current history has done more to secure the safety of our country. No man in our entire history has done so much to establish American prestige in the most important area of the Asiatic world, the islands of Japan.

Dismissing him from his command shakes the confidence of the entire Far East in American policy and destroys what he has built up for the American people during a liftime of devoted, faithful service to our Government, and all that America represents in the world today.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I want to include several documents pertaining to the action early this morning by the President in relieving General MacArthur of his Far East command. These are important documents and must be carefully considered by every American.

The first document is a statement by the President announcing that he had relieved the general. The second document is his order to General MacArthur relieving him. The third document appoints Lieutenant General Ridgway as General MacArthur's successor. The remaining documents were issued by the White House to indicate the background which made the President's actions imperative. They show that General MacArthur had been fully cognizant of the desires of the President and that in spite of this knowledge he had continued to act without regard for the President's wishes. One group of these releases show that despite the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had proposed armament for the South Korean military forces, General MacArthur had tried to get the arms for the Japanese police forces.

The documents follow:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, APRIL 10, 1951

With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties. In view of the specific responsibilities imposed upon me by the Constitution of the United States and the added responsibility which has been entrusted to me by the United Nations, I have decided that I must make a change of command in the Far East. I have, therefore, relieved General MacArthur of his commands and have designated Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway as his successor.

Full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy. It is fundamental, however, that military commanders must be governed by the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and Constitution. In time of crisis, this consideration is particularly compelling.

General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established. The Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the distinguished and exceptional service which he has rendered his country in posts of great responsibility. For that reason I repeat my regret at the necessity for the action I feel compelled to take in his case.

ORDER TO GENERAL MACARTHUR FROM THE PRESIDENT, APRIL 10, 1951

I deeply regret that it becomes my duty as President and Commander in Chief of the United States military forces to replace you as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East.

You will turn over your commands, effective at once, to Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. You are authorized to have issued such orders as are necessary to complete desired travel to such place as you select.

My reasons for your replacement will be made public concurrently with the delivery to you of the foregoing order and are contained in the next following message. (See attached statement by the President.)

APRIL 10, 1951.

ORDER TO LT. GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY FROM GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The President has decided to relieve General MacArthur and appoint you as his successor as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East.

It is realized that your presence in Korea in the immediate future is highly important, but we are sure you can make the proper distribution of your time until you can turn over active command of the Eighth Army to its new commander. For this purpose, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet is en route to report to you for such duties as you may direct.

DECEMBER 6, 1950.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff.
To: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan (and Other Commanders).

1. The President, as of December 5, forwarded a memo to all cabinet members and to the chairman, NSRB; administrator, ECA; director, CIA; administrator, ESA; and director Selective Service, which reads as follows:

"In the light of the present critical international situation, and until further written notice from me, I wish that each one of you would take immediate steps to reduce the number of public speeches pertaining to foreign or military policy made by officials of the departments and agencies of the executive branch. This applies to officials in the field as well as those in Washington.

"No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning foreign policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of State.

"No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning military policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of Defense.

"In addition to the copies submitted to the Departments of State or Defense for clearance, advance copies of speeches and press

releases concerning foreign policy or military policy should be submitted to the White House for information.

"The purpose of this memorandum is not to curtail the flow of information to the American people, but rather to insure that the information made public is accurate and fully in accord with the policies of the United States Government."

2. He also forwarded the following to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense:

"In addition to the policy expressed in my memorandum of this date to the heads of departments, concerning the clearance of speeches and statements, I wish the following steps to be taken:

"Officials overseas, including military commanders and diplomatic representatives, should be ordered to exercise extreme caution in public statements, to clear all but routine statements with their departments, and to refrain from direct communication on military or foreign policy with newspapers, magazines, or other publicity media in the United States."

3. The above is transmitted to you for guidance and appropriate action.

MARCH 20, 1951.

To: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff.

State planning Presidential announcement shortly that, with clearing of bulk of South Korea of aggressors, United Nations now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. Strong U. N. feeling persists that further diplomatic effort toward settlement should be made before any advance with major forces north of thirty-eighth parallel. Time will be required to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop. Recognizing that parallel has no military significance, State has asked JCS what authority you should have to permit sufficient freedom of action for next few weeks to provide security for U. N. forces and maintain contact with enemy. Your recommendations desired.

[From the New York Times of March 25, 1951]

TEXT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR'S STATEMENT

TOKYO.—Operations continue according to schedule and plan. We have now substantially cleared South Korea of organized Communist forces. It is becoming increasingly evident that the heavy destruction along the enemy's lines of supply, caused by our 'round-the-clock massive air and naval bombardment, has left his troops in the forward battle area deficient in requirements to sustain his operations.

This weakness is being brilliantly exploited by our ground forces. The enemy's human wave tactics definitely failed him as our own forces become seasoned to this form of warfare; his tactics of infiltration are but contributing to his piecemeal losses, and he is showing less stamina than our own troops under rigors of climate, terrain, and battle.

Of even greater significance than our tactical success has been the clear revelation that this new enemy, Red China, of such exaggerated and vaunted military power, lacks the industrial capacity to provide adequately many critical items essential to the conduct of modern war.

He lacks manufacturing bases and those raw materials needed to produce, maintain and operate even moderate air and naval power, and he cannot provide the essentials for successful ground operations, such as tanks, heavy artillery, and other refinements science has introduced into the conduct of military campaigns.

Formerly his great numerical potential might well have filled this gap, but with the development of existing methods of mass destruction, numbers alone do not offset vulnerability inherent in such deficiencies. Control of the sea and air, which in turn means control over supplies, communications and transportation, are no less essential and decisive now than in the past.

When this control exists as in our case and is coupled with the inferiority of ground firepower, as in the enemy's case, the resulting disparity is such that it cannot be overcome by bravery, however fanatical, or the most gross indifference to human loss.

These military weaknesses have been clearly and definitely revealed since Red China entered upon its undeclared war in Korea. Even under inhibitions which now restrict activity of the United Nations forces and the corresponding military advantages which accrue to Red China, it has been shown its complete inability to accomplish by force of arms the conquest of Korea.

The enemy therefore must by now be painfully aware that a decision of the United Nations to depart from its tolerant effort to contain the war to the area of Korea through expansion of our military operations to his coastal areas and interior bases would doom Red China to the risk of imminent military collapse.

These basic facts being established, there should be no insuperable difficulty arriving at decisions on the Korean problem if the issues are resolved on their own merits without being burdened by extraneous matters not directly related to Korea, such as Formosa and China's seat in the United Nations.

The Korean Nation and people which have been so cruelly ravaged must not be sacrificed. That is the paramount concern. Apart from the military area of the problem where the issues are resolved in the course of combat, the fundamental questions continue to be political in nature and must find their answer in the diplomatic sphere.

Within the area of my authority as military commander, however, it should be needless to say I stand ready at any time to confer in the field with the commander in chief of the enemy forces in an earnest effort to find any military means whereby the realization of the political objectives of the United Nations in Korea, to which no nation may justly take exceptions, might be accomplished without further bloodshed.

MARCH 24, 1951.

To: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff, personal for MacArthur.

The President has directed that your attention be called to his order as transmitted December 6, 1950. In view of the information given you March 20, 1951, any further statements by you must be coordinated as prescribed in the order of December 6.

The President has also directed that in the event Communist military leaders request an armistice in the field; you immediately report that fact to the JCS for instructions.

JANUARY 4, 1951.

To: Commander in Chief, United Nations Command, Tokyo, Japan.

From: Joint Chiefs of Staff.

1. The problem of arming additional ROK manpower is under consideration by JCS. Following information is furnished:

(a) No machine guns, mortars, antitank guns, or artillery can be made available from the ZI; however, the following can be made available in a reasonably short time:

(1) 160,000 model 1903 rifles, with a backup of spare parts for 50,000.

(2) 70,000 submachine guns.

(3) 150,000 M1 carbines.

(4) 8,000 model 1918 Browning automatic rifles.

(b) Ammunition supply for the M3 submachine guns, the Browning automatic rifles, 100,000 model 1903 rifles, and 100,000 M1 carbines is feasible.

2. Based on availability of above weapons it appears that ROK forces could be increased by from 200,000 to 300,000 men, armed with rifles, automatic rifles, carbines and submachine guns. However, unless used in part to form new divisions, which would be relatively ineffective due to lack of infantry-supporting weapons and artillery, it is probably that only on the order of 75,000 can be effectively utilized initially, with an ultimate build-up to approximately 100,000 in the following type organizations:

(a) Augment the rifle strength of ROK divisions and other U. N. forces.

(b) Form special units for guarding lines of communication and for operations against Communist guerrillas.

(c) Conduct guerrilla operations in Communist-held territory.

3. JCS are of the opinion that recruitment for new units should include, but not be limited to, the membership of the Korean Youth Corps and/or any other group in the ROK. Arms should be issued only to organized units under the control and discipline of the military authorities in Korea.

4. Request your comments and recommendations to include:

(a) Total number of additional ROK personnel that can be profitably employed.

(b) Method of employment, namely, new divisions, additional strength in current divisions, etc.

(c) Length of time required to organize and train additional manpower.

(d) Other points in connection with current problem.

JANUARY 6, 1951.

From: Commander in Chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

To: Department of the Army for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Considered here that influence of past and possible future events is of importance equal to or greater than matériel availability in analyzing problem of arming additional ROK manpower.

Continued effort has been made since June 25, 1950, to effect the most practicable utilization of Korean personnel. In addition to materially augmenting the ROK army, members of the Youth Corps and other qualified males have been supplied with significant quantities of small arms for the purpose of strengthening police units, antiguerrilla security elements, and creation of special organizations to operate in enemy-held territory. Despite the relatively large number of nonarmy personnel now under arms, enemy guerrilla units continue to operate effectively in many widely scattered regions of South Korea. Friendly guerrilla forces, however, have accomplished little in Communist rear areas—primarily due to lack of strong willed leadership.

The type and quantity of weapons indicated by JCS as being currently available would have equal application to equipping the National Police Reserve of Japan, the immediate requirements for which were stated. Unless the quantities listed in JCS message are in excess of the current and foreseeable needs of the NPRJ, it is possible that the over-all interests of the United States will be better served by making these weapons available to increase the security of Japan rather than arming additional ROK forces.

In view of the probable restricted size of the battlefield in which we may operate in the near future, and the high priority of NPRJ requirements, the value of attempting to organize, train, and arm additional ROK forces in the immediate future appears questionable. It is considered that the short-range requirement can best be met by utilizing available manpower to replace losses in existing ROK units rather than creating

new organizations. The long-range requirement for or desirability of arming additional ROK personnel appears to be dependent primarily upon determination of the future United States military position with respect to both the Korean campaign and the generally critical situation in the Far East.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1951]

LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN OF MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH 20, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: I am most grateful for your note of the 8th forwarding me a copy of your address of February 12. The latter I have read with much interest and find that with the passage of years you have certainly lost none of your old-time punch.

My views and recommendations with respect to the situation created by Red China's entry into war against us in Korea have been submitted to Washington in most complete detail. Generally these views are well known and clearly understood, as they follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counter force as we have never failed to do in the past. Your view with respect to the utilization of the Chinese forces on Formosa is in conflict with neither logic nor this tradition.

It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words; that if we lose the war to communism in Asia the fall of Europe is inevitable, win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom. As you point out we must win. There is no substitute for victory.

With renewed thanks and expressions of most cordial regard, I am

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

Resolution by City Council of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of the House to the following resolution introduced in the city council of the city of New York by Hon. Edward Vogel, the councilman representing my own district:

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 2156, by Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Congressman of the Fourteenth New York District, to provide for a Christopher Columbus memorial arbor in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the act provides, "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to receive, through the Citizens Committee for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor, donations of 52 trees and 52 bronze plaques each inscribed with the name of one of the States;" and

Whereas the act provides that said row of trees shall be known as the Christopher Columbus memorial arbor; and

Whereas the act further provides that said row of trees shall be maintained by the National Park Service "in honor of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of America, and as a perpetual tribute to those members of the Armed Forces of the United States who gave their lives in Italy during World War II, for the preservation of freedom in America and the liberation of Italy": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of New York, does hereby memorialize the New York delegation of Congress to support this act and does hereby memorialize Congress to enact this measure at its present session.

British Mercenary China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News by Jay Franklin:

BRITISH MERCENARY CHINA POLICY

(By Jay Franklin)

American observers recently returned from Britain report that British policy in the Far East is concentrated on the object of collaring as much as possible of the China trade for the benefit of the United Kingdom.

They point out that it was the British officials in Asia who did most to circulate the report that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers and who also did their best to undermine the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

The benefit to Britain promised to be enormous: By underwriting the overthrow of Chiang, the British would not only get the good will of the Communist regime but we would automatically be stripped of the prestige we had earned by liberating China from the Japanese and staking Chiang to control of China.

Chief operating force in this policy is said to have been the famous British shipping and trading concern of Jardine, Matthieson which traditionally is allowed by the foreign office to determine British policy in China.

Hence the bitterness of the British against Chiang's naval blockade of Shanghai until President Truman obligingly compelled Chiang to withdraw his squadron under the pretense of defending Formosa. Hence, too, the fury of the Hong Kong merchants at the American embargo on shipments of contraband of war to that British colony on the China coast.

The Korean war has placed this British policy under a severe strain. American public opinion has no use for a policy of appeasement toward the Chinese Communists. British attempts to persuade us to go slow in Asia have boomeranged against the natural British desire to have us continue to support their military and economic position in Europe.

This is what lies behind the British fuss over whether our forces shall pass the thirty-eighth parallel. Since that imaginary line did not stop the Chinese troops that General Mao poured across the Yalu River last fall, it is hard to see why we should regard it as an obstacle to our military operations, provided, of course, we can get north of it again.

Truth is, the fight we have put up in Korea has increased our prestige in Asia, and since trade follows military prestige as day follows night, the problem that confronts London has become more difficult. Before the game is played out, the British may decide that they let themselves be played for suckers by the Chinese Reds in the hope of lining their commercial pockets at our expense.

Committee of One Hundred, of Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article on a very important job that is being done in my district.

It is with pride as a member of the Committee of One Hundred, of Birmingham, Ala., that I insert the following news story in the RECORD. This article, by Birmingham News staff writer Robert Kincey, tells of the awakened community spirit abroad in our district as a result of the fine work of the Committee of One Hundred in a campaign to promote our area. We owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, and William P. Engle, president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, who were in Washington with us today in connection with this challenging project. We are also indebted to their coworkers at home, Clarence Lloyd, committee director; Hugh Bigler, executive vice president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce; and W. W. French, Jr., chairman of the campaign which has far exceeded at this time the $552,362 raised at the time the following story was written:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 8, 1951]

THEY'LL TELL THE WORLD—COMMITTEE OF ONE HUNDRED, ARMED WITH $552,362, TO "SELL" BIRMINGHAM—CAMPAIGN GOES OVER TOP AND KEEPS RIGHT ON GOING

(By Robert W. Kincey)

Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred was all armed Saturday night for the biggest game hunt Alabama has ever known.

They're going to beat the bushes from Maine to California and from the Gulf to the Lakes in a Nation-wide advertising and promotion campaign for which business, industry, and individuals of Jefferson County have made a cool $552,362 available.

And in setting a record for the community with the most spectacular successful campaign of all time, the committee stands ready to tell the world:

"That's typical of the way it's done in Birmingham."

This is a city, they will point out from the records, that doesn't fail in its own undertakings. What it starts it finishes.

That's the way it is in Birmingham; the way it will be for those who get themselves a slice of the biggest cake ever to be cut in the community.

SHORTEST, SWEETEST

The campaign is far and away over the top, with pledges still coming in, most of them on a voluntary basis.

The campaign, the shortest and sweetest in the history of the community, has shattered every box-office record Birmingham and Jefferson County have ever known.

And it's going to play an extended engagement because of popular demand.

The advisory committee of the Committee of One Hundred will hold open house at the chamber of commerce for all who want to ride the bandwagon, but, thus far, had not been able to get a seat.

The standing-room-only sign was hung up Friday while the committee solicitors and the auditing staff were counting the cash and rounding up eleventh-hour prospects.

OVER TOP, FOR SURE

"The drive is definitely and measurably over the top," said W. W. French, Jr., chairman. "But we cannot and we will not close the door in the face of these firms and individuals who have not had an opportunity to participate. It is their town as much as it is ours. We've already set what looks like a national record in such undertakings. We might as well make it even more spectacular."

To which Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., chairman of the Committee of One Hundred, and William P. Engel, president of the chamber of commerce, added:

"The more money we get, the better job we can and will do. This community effort has attracted Nation-wide attention. It is unequaled, so far as we know, in the history of American cities. It is a magnificent tribute to the awakened spirit of Birmingham and its Jefferson County neighbors.

"This is not and never has been a campaign in the ordinary sense of the word. It is a demonstration that the people of this great county are determined to exploit to the fullest the fabulous resources in these rugged hills and valleys."

PURE INVESTMENT

"This national advertising fund is exactly what we have emphasized from the start. It is not a contribution to pay someone's salary down at the chamber of commerce. It is not a contribution of any sort. It is a cold dollars-and-cents investment in Birmingham and Jefferson County.

"And to the everlasting credit of Birmingham and its neighboring communities, we have reached the point where we have put aside petty differences and jealousies and can pull together for the utmost development of the greatest county in all the land.

"The response has been so enthusiastic, spontaneous, and contagious it is amazing. There is a new spirit abroad in Jefferson County today. This most sensational of all campaigns is ample testimonial to that.

"Birmingham and Jefferson County now have no records to break but their own. We invite every citizen, every firm, and every industry to participate. We could scarcely do less in view of the tremendous and heartwarming response. Nothing even approaching it has ever happened in this community before."

WHEELS ARE ROLLING

And the wheels of the advertising campaign already have started to roll, even while the money continues to come in.

Approved yesterday afternoon was an advertisement in the New York Times to tell the world what Birmingham has done. Press associations were asking for the story before the money had been counted. They are that much interested in what the biggest city on earth for its age has done, the like of which probably never has been done before.

It all started a year ago in January when the now famous Committee of One Hundred came into being at a meeting at the Tutwiler Hotel.

That meeting was remarkable for the fact that not a man declined his appointment. The committee rolled up a collective sleeve and went to work. And 1950 was a spectacular year in Birmingham. Mr. Engel, a member of the original Committee of One Hundred, assumed the presidency of the Chamber of Commerce a year later.

Subsequently he made his talk-of-the-town "Hold That Steel" address to the Kiwanis Club. That address, which had repercussions over the length and breadth of the land, further fired the imagination and the enthusiasm of the entire county.

THINGS ARE POPPING

Mr. Engel then and there predicted nothing but the district's ineptitude stood between it and a population of 1,000,000 by 1970. He envisioned great things for the district. And those things have started to happen.

Not the least of which, the city's leaders are agreed, is the half million campaign. There was scarcely a "no" to an assigned quota to business firms or individuals. There was hardly a suggestion that an assigned quota be lowered. There were many instances in which they were voluntarily raised.

Nest egg for the $500,000 advertising fund came from the Alabama Power Co., whose board chairman, Thomas W. Martin, swept the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce off its feet in January when he said Alabama Power Co. would make available $100,000 of a half million dollar fund to advertise the district nationally provided the community raised $400,000, payable over a 5-year period.

Mr. Engel then and there accepted the challenge. The campaign was carefully mapped. First meeting was a week ago Friday. Solicitors did not take the field until Monday afternoon of last week.

They found many ardent Birmingham boosters out of the city. Others still have to clear the matter through regular routine. All that is to be taken into account when the effort is stamped "finis" and the books closed.

OTHERS CHIME IN

Illustrative of the country-wide enthusiasm was a quick announcement that the Bessemer Chamber of Commerce would heartily join hands with Birmingham and put $25,000 in the pot.

Along came the Tarrant Chamber of Commerce with $5,000 and the Fairfield Chamber of Commerce with another $7,500, all unsolicited.

From the Shades Valley Chamber of Commerce Saturday came pledge cards bearing the signatures of every merchant in Homewood.

And that's the reason it's a county-wide proposition and an extended engagement has been ordered. So that everybody who wants in on a good thing can do it and do it to his heart's content.

Removal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding the removal of General MacArthur:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RALPH W. GWINN, OF NEW YORK, REGARDING REMOVAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

MacArthur has been busted out with Wedemeyer, Chennault, Hurley, Denfeld, and Cromelin, because our own popular-front Communist-dominated Government does not really want to win the war in Korea. It refuses to answer MacArthur's questions on that point. He has asked for the help of the 2,000,000 men now in China and Korea. He asked for the help of the Japanese. Our Government refused. It would not even feed and supply 400,000 reservists now in training camps in Korea to relieve the pressure on our own boys, fighting and dying in Korea.

Thus the program mapped out by Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore in 1945 to deliver the Asiatic people to godless communism is working out according to plan. They destroyed Chiang Kai-shek and his forces. They are determined to destroy Syngman Rhee and leave him no organized forces against communism.

Now with MacArthur out of the way Red China can be added to the family of nations and Formosa delivered to it. What is more with MacArthur out of Japan the floodgates are open to the organization of the Communist Party there. The Japanese people who made such a magnificent recovery under MacArthur—in fact all of the forces of freedom, have been let down into what looks like a red sea surrounding the whole of Asia.

This conduct of our foreign affairs in Asia and the refusal to give MacArthur help throws light on the European situation. We are sending ground forces to Europe to fight unequal ground forces from Russia. The commander in chief of these forces in Europe speaks freely as a military and political leader on both military and political subjects without censure. MacArthur confined his remarks to military affairs and was busted for that alone. Will our popular-front Communist-dominated Government in European policy deliver our forces in Europe to Moscow in the same way it has delivered them in Asia? This is the terrifying question growing out of the MacArthur incident.

Possibly nothing short of the setting of the stage for impeachment proceedings will bring out the tragic corruption in the management of our foreign affairs. It greatly exceeds our domestic corruption and its consequences are more damaging. Out of such a proceeding the people might organize an honest Government and offset the notion in the Kremlin that America will not fight communism at home, in Asia or in Europe.

It is depressing beyond words that the Communist-dominated government in Britain was ready to blast the news, almost before we got it, that the victory had been won—MacArthur was out—Red China would be recognized and Formosa delivered to it.

Our Country, MacArthur, Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the Republicans, having no issue with which to go before the American people, are stopping at nothing to gain some publicity in the hope that it may aid them in the 1952 campaign. In their conference this morning called by the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], they saw fit to criticize the President's action in relieving MacArthur of his imperialistic and czarish activities and are making a political issue of it. Some of the Republican newspapers, of course, will hail this attack against the President

with glee. However, I feel that the Republicans have overplayed their hand as to impeachment. I did not quite gather from the verbal explanation of the statement given me today whether it was the impeachment of MacArthur or the President that was suggested. Perhaps, if any action is to be taken, it should be a court martial of General MacArthur for deliberately and willfully disobeying orders of his superiors.

Mr. Speaker, now, who is General MacArthur about whom there is such a hullabaloo? I recall that in 1932 former servicemen came to Washington to plead with President Hoover and the administration for food and relief. These veterans, without funds either for cheap hotel accommodations or rooming quarters, were obliged to sleep in the parks or on Government properties in the vicinity of the Capitol and the Mall, and it was President Hoover who gave orders to move them from the premises they occupied. General MacArthur, head of the Military District of Washington, brought Fort Myer troops to effect their dispersal. When some of the veterans did not move fast enough, it was General MacArthur who issued orders to fire. Instead of obtaining work or bread they sought, he fed them with lead. Several were killed, one from my congressional district, and many were wounded.

Several of the large Republican newspapers have been building up General MacArthur as a great general and a legendary figure in military prowess. I, myself, have known him only from the time that he was part of the drastic and outrageous action against Gen. Billy Mitchell who ventured the opinion in an address or magazine article that airplanes could destroy battleships. The resulting court martial and his forced resignation from the Air Force hastened General Mitchell's death. Congress posthumously elevated him to the rank of a general officer.

Today our President, after long and careful consideration given to the problem, has finally removed Five Star Gen. Douglas MacArthur from all Far East commands.

This action on the part of the President has been long awaited by the country and is long overdue. It is elementary that a private who disobeys his commanding officer may be court martialed, and if found guilty, will be dismissed for the good of the service.

The President's statement clearly sets forth the necessity for taking action. It follows in part:

> With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties.
>
> Full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy. It is fundamental, however, that military commanders must be governed by the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and Constitution. In time of crisis, this consideration is particularly compelling.

Now let us briefly take up the President's reasons. We must remember that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the United States military forces and keep this fact in mind throughout the discussion. We must not let our bias and prejudice make us forget this paramount constitutional provision.

I stated before that the private who disobeys his commanding officer is subject to court martial and dismissal if not death, depending on the situation. Let us take MacArthur's case, for, after all, his is a case just like that of the doughboy, the corporal, or the sergeant.

The statement "Formosa Must Be Defended," which MacArthur made and sent to the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago last September, was certainly one calculated and designed to stir up contention and controversy in the country. It was not his prerogative nor within his official duties as a military man to talk about "misconceptions currently voiced concerning the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific," nor was he required "in the public interest to avail myself of this opportunity to state my views thereon."

Did he not consider for one moment that as the leader of the United Nations military forces, he was also subject to the requirements of the diplomatic and military considerations which devolved only upon that body and its officials?

Was it proper, becoming, and wise for him, in the same message, to continue in the following view:

> Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare arguments by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa, we alienate continental Asia.

And following in further critical language against administration policies:

> Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient.

Only the general understands the Orient. The President does not know what is going on there, the State Department, and the other agencies of the Government, with their various officials who have been in the Orient for many years, who have been studying and are intimately acquainted with these questions, do not know what is going on. The astute orientals who form part of the United Nations—they, too, know nothing about the Orient, although they have lived with their problems during a lifetime—they also do not understand though they themselves are orientals.

And then, as if to further embarrass those directing our policies in the Far East, MacArthur grows more sarcastic and belligerent when he states that—

> They do not grasp that it is in the pattern of oriental psychology to respect and follow aggressive, resolute, and dynamic leadership to quickly turn from a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the oriental mentality.

Now, I ask, under what process of logical reasoning could any fair-minded aid unbiased thinking person come to the conclusion that MacArthur was within his rights as a military man, commanding military forces, to make and publish these observations? All the Veterans of Foreign Wars asked MacArthur to do was to extend greetings in response to those sent him by the organization.

Now if this were MacArthur's first outburst on the subject, we might pass it off as coming from a soldier under constant and steady pressure letting off steam. But no; this not the case of a first time.

In December of 1949 the general, surrounded by his Republican friends, a group of Republican Senators visiting in Tokyo, divested himself of some unauthorized remarks concerning sending United States arms and troops to Formosa. As a result, heated debates were touched off in Congress between the partisan minded Formosan interventionists and the administration supporters—all of which, it is clear, had nothing to do with MacArthur's duties and responsibility as a military commander of troops of all nations, including our own in the Far East. Of course the Republicans howled and cried out that the general was gagged by the administration which they charged was keeping the truth from the American people. If ever a man deserved a reprimand certainly MacArthur deserved that one.

It may have escaped the memory of some, but certainly not mine, that just about a year ago, the general, with no reason at all for being in Formosa—no doubt for the purpose of giving greater publicity to his position in regard to Formosa—allowed himself to be photographed kissing the hand of Madame Chiang Kai-shek. She is the wife of a general allegedly the most questionable of all Chinese war overlords. At the same time he publicly supported the policy of building Formosa as a base of operations. Again MacArthur knew full well at the time he made the statement that he was running at cross purposes with the Government's position. Yet he chose to sound off regardless of the consequences which his unauthorized remarks might produce, since he considers himself the sole authority both in matters military and diplomatic relating to the Orient, and more than often on subjects covering the entire world.

We all remember shortly after the incident of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that MacArthur himself met on Wake Island with W. Averell Harriman, who acted as the President's special representative, and agreed implicitly that he would refrain from making declarations on policy unless he received Washington clearance. He broke his promise. Why? I will develop that later because I want to bring to your attention the hostile attitude which he demonstrated toward the President, his Commander in Chief, shortly after the Harriman conference on the occasion of the President's special visit to MacArthur on Wake Island. The press reports told us that MacArthur arrived late for the meeting, failed to accord the proper courtesy he owed the office of his superior and, most important of all, had neglected to prepare himself for the conference, with experts and others who might supplement his, MacArthur's, views. The newspapers further reported that the President believing this an important meeting, for he had traveled thousands of miles under great physical inconvenience, had

brought with him the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a number of experts on the Far East for discussional purposes. Nevertheless, the President came away from the short meeting, no doubt planned for a longer period, apparently satisfied that General MacArthur would stay "hitched" to his military duties.

Another disagreement came to light as a result of last November's dash into Northern Korea which resulted in disastrous UN military defeat and, instead of "Home by Christmas" which he had publicly proclaimed to the troops, we are still in Korea and have been obliged to send additional troops and replacements. We are informed that on several occasions prior to this march to the Manchurian border, he had been officially informed that the Chinese were massed for attack and that warnings from the French, from India, and the British had come to him to the same effect. Yet he went on his own and incurred severe losses in men and equipment as well as causing loss of our prestige among the Asiatics and in the United Nations. I believe this action might have had an appreciable effect upon the fall elections.

It is further reported that on the occasion of the State Department's public statement assuring the Chinese that the large dams supplying water and power to Manchuria would not be bombed, MacArthur cabled a curt "Do not concur."

And, as if all these headstrong and unwise actions were not sufficient to overturn our Nation's policy to contain the war in Korea and avoid a general war in China with its terrific and disastrous consequences, we find the general divesting himself of a most incendiary statement, namely, that sent a few days ago to the minority leader of the House, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

It is beyond my comprehension that such a letter containing so much dynamite and calculated to upset the equilibrium of our diplomatic course should have been made public. It could only serve to do harm wherever and whenever it might be publicized in view of the nature of the writing.

First. It was unauthorized and was in the nature of a special pleading—a pleading for the MacArthur cause to win the war in the Far East at all costs and unmindful of the over-all position in Europe and of the world.

Second. It was political in nature—its only purpose being to choose up sides and bring on a highly controversial subject, the discussion of which would be harmful to and create disunity in the country.

Third. Militarily, the use of National Chinese troops to fight the Chinese Communists would not necessarily bring victory and would, of course, involve us in an all-out war, which the President and the Nation are seeking to avoid, and thereby bringing about a lasting and enduring world-wide peace.

Mr. Speaker, I have many interesting and factual newspaper articles and editorials which have appeared in impartial and independent publications which have the real interest of our country's welfare at heart. However, I do not wish to unduly encumber the record by inserting all of them, but under the leave given me to extend my remarks I shall include an editorial entitled "Mac and Political Policy," which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, an outstanding metropolitan daily. This editorial, in all likelihood, together with other forceful articles and editorials appearing in the press throughout the country express the views and opinions of the vast majority of the people of our Nation, and contributed in some degree in aiding the President to reach the conclusion that he should demand the resignation of General MacArthur. The editorial is as follows:

MAC AND POLITICAL POLICY

We have called frequent attention to a saying of Clemenceau, French "Tiger" of World War I and Versailles, to the effect that war is too important a business to be left to the generals.

That's a good maxim for any democracy which is unfortunate enough to be engaged in war, as we are in Korea at this moment. Nobody likes war, least of all the people who live in a democracy. When the people of a real democracy engage in war, it is only to preserve their free way of life. They have no aggressive designs, no lust for conquest.

The American people want to avoid a general war with China—or any other country. But powerful forces are moving to bring on such a conflagration, intentionally or not. Senator TAFT, Senate Republican chief, and House GOP Leader MARTIN have joined the parade. MARTIN was first, advocating in a recent speech that Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist troops be used to open a second front on the Chinese mainland. TAFT jumped into line yesterday, urging that Chiang's forces be let loose to conduct raids on the mainland.

Ostensibly, either action would relieve Red Chinese pressure in Korea. But realistically, either maneuver could easily fan the Korean action into a major war before the free world is strong enough to fight such a war.

There was a big wave of excitement the other day when General MacArthur told MARTIN that he was right. Actually, MacArthur himself for a long time has been agitating for a big push aimed at the heart of China. MARTIN and other Republican lawmakers in Washington who have been spouting that line are merely following MacArthur's lead.

They are pleased to do so, not because they really want more war—for most of those Republicans are isolationists—but because they feel it is one way of embarrassing the Truman administration. They think that pitting MacArthur against President Truman is sound policies in the year preceding the 1952 Presidential election.

Administration policy, which is the official policy of the United States, is to keep the war in the Far East localized in Korea if at all possible. The policy also places the greater stress on rearming Western Europe and helping defend it against possible Communist aggression.

Along with most American military experts and diplomats, Mr. Truman and Secretary Acheson believe that the grand prize in Russia's eyes is not the conquest of Asia at this moment. The consensus is that what Russia wants is Iranian oil and the rich industrial plant of Western Europe to produce the steel and the machines of war needed for Soviet domination of the world.

MacArthur does not agree. He is far away from Europe and contends that the world stands at the crossroads in Asia. He says that if Asia is lost, Western Europe is bound to be easy prey for the Russians. He apparently believes that all Russia needs is the raw materials of Asia rather than the industrial might of Western Europe.

MacArthur sees only one side of the world picture. Certainly the raw materials of Asia are as vital to us as they are to Russia and should be kept out of Communist hands if possible. But there is a difference between the policy of keeping the Communists pent up where they now are and the MacArthur proposal to throw Communists out of huge land masses that they now occupy.

We do not blame MacArthur unduly for his zeal in his cause. Any good general—and MacArthur is a great general—wants to win the war on his front. That is the job of a professional soldier.

But it should be part of the job of a professional soldier serving under the flag of a democracy to respect our institutions and traditions. One of those traditions is that military authority is subordinate to civilian authority. Our civilian authorities make the political decisions in times of war and our military authorities do their best to carry out those decisions.

If MacArthur wants to belabor the political decisions which have been made by our civilian authorities, we believe he has a perfect right to do so—as a civilian.

But so long as he remains as commander of the United Nations forces in Korea he should address his political statements and views to UN officials and to Mr. Truman.

MacArthur's stature is hurt when he engages in subterfuge and ruse in an attempt to get across a political point.

Government Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the administration is spending considerable time in trying to find a new source of tax revenue. On the other hand, little effort is being made to curtail expenditures. The handling of veterans' hospitals is a national scandal, and in southern California we have a fine example of that. We all know how the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital in Van Nuys was closed in May 1950 and moved to Long Beach merely to help a Democratic Congressman. Now, since the Navy needs a hospital in Long Beach, the Navy intends to build another one instead of the Veterans' Administration moving back and reactivating the Birmingham hospital which is not in use.

I am attaching a letter from Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, calling my attention to that very matter:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 4, 1951.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POULSON: It has come to my attention that consideration is being given to the construction of a new naval hospital building in Long Beach.

As you may recall, I registered a protest in behalf of the citizens of Los Angeles against the closing of the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital in Van Nuys in May 1950, and the moving of several hundred patients to the present naval hospital in Long Beach, allegedly for reasons of economy.

Now it is proposed to build another hospital in Long Beach for the Navy, with the Veterans' Administration continuing to use

the present naval hospital, which is not equipped to provide for paraplegics or tubercular patients.

Would it not be more logical and economical to return the present Long Beach hospital to the Navy Department and remodel the Birmingham hospital in Van Nuys, a site which is ideally suited for the treatment and care of paraplegics and those suffering from respiratory conditions? It is believed that this would accomplish the desired objectives at a considerable saving to the Government and with greater consideration for the needs of the veterans.

I strongly urge that you do all in your power to bring about this suggested change in planning for Federal hospitals in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Sincerely yours,

FLETCHER BOWRON, *Mayor.*

Some Questions, Mr. Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times for Tuesday, April 3, 1951:

SOME QUESTIONS, MR. ANDREWS

Mr. BERT ANDREWS,
Gridiron Speaker, Memorial Union.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: As principal speaker at the gridiron banquet tonight, you will undoubtedly discuss some of the aspects of the current Washington scene as it relates to the newspaper profession. We wonder if you will touch upon a point which has lately disturbed us.

For years the organizations which are supposed to be the spokesmen for the profession of journalism have been pinning medals on themselves as the unswerving defenders of a free press. The American Publishers' Association, the Inland Press, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press, and the others gather at their periodic conventions, roll their eyes, beat their stuffed shirts, and intone their solemn vows to uphold and defend freedom of the press. They talk sanctimoniously of their sacred obligation to guard against any invasion of the freedom of the press.

For all this preening and strutting, for all the loud and brave talk, it has become increasingly apparent in the last decade that the American press is abdicating its responsibility to fight for a truly free press in America. Its spokesmen recite the pompous clichés of the past and rededicate themselves to defending freedom of the press in the abstract. But when they face a specific case of a dangerous assault on the free press, they are indifferent or are busy throwing editorial thunderbolts at some violation of the right of a free press in a far away Afghanistan or Argentina.

We are currently witnessing a typical example of this. The outrageous silencing of La Prensa by the Argentine Dictator Peron is engaging the attention of the American press. But when the same kind of an assault is made on the freedom of the press in this country a brooding silence lies over the editorial rooms of our big newspapers.

We refer to the assault made on Drew Pearson by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. In the 40 years of our newspaper experience we have not seen a more dangerous attempt to subvert the freedom of the press than was made by the political mountebank who now serves this State in the United States Senate.

We saw in this assault an attempt on the part of MCCARTHY to use the power of his place in the United States Senate and the privilege of his immunity to destroy a newspaperman with whose views he disagreed. Hiding behind the official immunity granted him by the Government of the United States he sought to silence Pearson by smearing his reputation and by calling for a boycott against Pearson by radio sponsors and newspaper publishers.

What is the difference between his technique and that employed by Peron? Both seek to use government power for their ends. Peron to destroy La Prensa. MCCARTHY to destroy Pearson.

If MCCARTHY can use the power of his public office in this way, then every other member of the United States Senate can do likewise. If every Member of the Senate can use this type of terrorism, then every Member of the House of Representatives can use the power of his office to silence newspapers and newspapermen who disagree with them. Members of the State legislatures can do the same. The fruits of McCarthyism are already ripening in the Wisconsin Legislature where we see the watch fob McCarthy's following the Senator's lead in their irresponsible and slanderous attacks on people with whom they disagree.

If McCarthyism goes unchallenged, then officialdom, the Government, has found the way to use the Peron technique in silencing the radio and the press in the United States. Think what it would mean if every Member of Congress and every member of every State legislature, operating from foxholes of legislative immunity, could attack and urge a boycott of every newspaperman or radio commentator who criticized a Member of Congress or a legislator. Today we are witnessing a trend in which McCarthyism is using a system of political terrorism and intimidation to establish a system of thought control and conformity. McCarthyism may be the forerunner of a totalitarianism which will be a threat to the American free way of life. And the American press continues to remain silent in the face of this dangerous assault.

MCCARTHY is a politician who has shown nothing but contempt for the laws and traditions of this State, whose veracity has been publicly challenged by the State supreme court, who has been charged by his profession and found guilty by the highest court of violating the laws and the constitution, the moral code, and his oath as an attorney and a judge. This is the kind of a man who can make a dangerous attack on a basic American freedom and go unchallenged by the press of this country.

None of the organizations which are supposed to speak for the press has challenged the McCarthy assault on Pearson. None of the spokesmen for the schools of journalism, which are supposed to be teaching our students their future responsibilities as custodians of the traditions of the free press, have spoken out against the dangerous precedent set by MCCARTHY in his demand for a boycott against an American writer and radio commentator.

This dereliction of responsibility and this spineless surrender to the loud-mouth demagogs promoting the current hysteria has sickened us of these publishers pow-wows, journalistic banquets, and gridiron shindigs at which the professionals get together for an orgy of undeserved self-praise.

It was in 1948, Mr. Andrews, that you won the Pulitzer price and the Heywood Broun memorial award for your splendid expose of the Washington witch hunting which, given new life by the lies of MCCARTHY, has made a cowardly cabal out of a great profession. What about you, Mr. Andrews? Have you got the stamina to stand up like you did in 1948 or does MCCARTHY have you joining the ranks of conformity, too?

Have you got the courage to tell the newspaper people in Wisconsin what they need to hear or will you speak from under the bed and tell them what they want to hear? Will you tell them that McCarthyism is a dangerous threat to a free press and a free radio?

Sincerely yours,

THE CAPITAL TIMES.

Post Office in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a Federal building in the city of Lawrence

Whereas the city of Lawrence is sorely in need of increased post-office facilities; and

Whereas the presently existing building housing the post office in said city is inadequate for the purposes of said office and for the offices of other agencies of the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a new Federal building in the city of Lawrence to house the post office and other Federal offices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the state secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted March 28, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence April 2, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The President's Radio Address on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the text of a radio address by the President of the United States:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S RADIO ADDRESS ON KOREA, UNITED STATES FAR EASTERN POLICY

I want to talk plainly to you tonight about what we are doing in Korea and about our policy in the Far East.

In the simplest terms what we are doing in Korea is this: We are trying to prevent a third world war.

I think most people in this country recognized that fact last June. And they warmly

supported the decision of the Government to help the Republic of Korea against the Communist aggressors. Now, many persons, even some who applauded our decision to defend Korea, have forgotten the basic reason for our action.

It is right for us to be in Korea. It was right last June. It is right today.

I want to remind you why this is true.

The Communists in the Kremlin are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world. If they were to succeed, the United States would be numbered among their principal victims. It must be clear to everyone that the United States cannot—and will not—sit idly by and await foreign conquest. The only question is: When is the best time to meet the threat and how?

The best time to meet the threat is in the beginning. It is easier to put out a fire in the beginning when it is small than after it has become a roaring blaze.

And the best way to meet the threat of aggression is for the peace-loving nations to act together. If they don't act together, they are likely to be picked off, one by one.

ASSAILS INACTION OF THIRTIES

If they had followed the right policies in the 1930's—if the free countries had acted together, to crush the aggression of the dictators, and if they had acted in the beginning, when the aggression was small—there probably would have been no World War II.

If history has taught us anything, it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace everywhere in the world. When that aggression is supported by the cruel and selfish rulers of a powerful nation who are bent on conquest, it becomes a clear and present danger to the security and independence of every free nation.

This is a lesson that most people in this country have learned thoroughly. This is the basic reason why we joined in creating the United Nations. And, since the end of World War II, we have been putting that lesson into practice—we have been working with other free nations to check the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union before they can result in a third world war.

That is what we did in Greece, when that nation was threatened by the aggression of international communism.

The attack against Greece could have led to general war. But this country came to the aid of Greece. The United Nations supported Greek resistance. With our help, the determination and efforts of the Greek people defeated the attack on the spot.

Another big Communist threat to peace was the Berlin blockade. That, too, could have led to war. But again it was settled because free men would not back down in an emergency.

The aggression against Korea is the boldest and most dangerous move the Communists have yet made.

The attack on Korea was part of a greater plan for conquering all of Asia.

I would like to read to you from a secret intelligence report which came to us after the attack. It is a report of a speech a Communist Army officer in North Korea gave to a group of spies and saboteurs last May, one month before South Korea was invaded. The report shows in great detail how this invasion was part of a carefully prepared plot. Here is part of what the Communist officer, who had been trained in Moscow, told his men:

"Our forces," he said, "are scheduled to attack South Korean forces about the middle of June . . . The coming attack on South Korea marks the first step toward the liberation of Asia."

Notice that he used the word "liberation." That is Communist double-talk meaning "conquest."

QUOTES ANOTHER SECRET REPORT

I have another secret intelligence report here. This one tells what another Communist officer in the Far East told his men several months before the invasion of Korea. Here is what he said: "In order to successfully undertake the long awaited world revolution, we must first unify Asia . . . Java, Indochina, Malaya, India, Tibet, Thailand, Philippines, and Japan are our ultimate targets . . . The United States is the only obstacle on our road for the liberation of all countries in Southeast Asia. In other words, we must unify the people of Asia and crush the United States."

That is what the Communist leaders are telling their people, and that is what they have been trying to do.

They want to control all Asia from the Kremlin.

This plan of conquest is in flat contradiction to what we believe. We believe that Korea belongs to the Koreans, that India belongs to the Indians—that all the nations of Asia should be free to work out their affairs in their own way. This is the basis of peace in the Far East and everywhere else.

The whole Communist imperialism is back of the attack on peace in the Far East. It was the Soviet Union that trained and equipped the North Koreans for aggression. The Chinese Communists massed 44 well-trained and well-equipped divisions on the Korean frontier. These were the troops they threw into battle when the North Korean Communists were beaten.

The question we have had to face is whether the Communist plan of conquest can be stopped without general war. Our Government and other countries associated with us in the United Nations believe that the best chance of stopping it without war is to meet the attack in Korea and defeat it there.

That is what we have been doing. It is a difficult and bitter task.

But so far it has been successful.

So far, we have prevented world war III.

So far, by fighting a limited war in Korea, we have prevented aggression from succeeding, and bringing on a general war. And the ability of the whole free world to resist Communist aggression has been greatly improved.

SAYS FOES HAVE RECEIVED LESSON

We have taught the enemy a lesson. He has found out that aggression is not cheap or easy. Moreover, men all over the world who want to remain free have been given new courage and new hope. They know now that the champions of freedom can stand up and fight and that they will stand up and fight.

Our resolute stand in Korea is helping the forces of freedom now fighting in Indochina and other countries in that part of the world. It has already slowed down the timetable of conquest.

In Korea itself, there are signs that the enemy is building up his ground forces for a new mass offensive. We also know that there have been large increases in the enemy's available air forces.

If a new attack comes, I feel confident it will be turned back. The United Nations fighting forces are tough and able and well equipped. They are fighting for a just cause. They are proving to all the world that the principle of collective security will work. We are proud of all these forces for the magnificent job they have done against heavy odds. We pray that their efforts may succeed, for upon their success may hinge the peace of the world.

The Communist side must now choose its course of action. The Communist rulers may press the attack against us. They may take further action which will spread the conflict. They have that choice, and with it the awful responsibility for what may follow. The Communists also have the choice of a peaceful settlement which could lead to a general relaxation of tensions in the Far East. The decision is theirs, because the forces of the United Nations will strive to limit the conflict if possible.

We do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war—not to start one. The best way to do that is to make it plain that we and the other free countries will continue to resist the attack.

But you may ask, why can't we take other steps to punish the aggressor? Why don't we bomb Manchuria and China itself? Why don't we assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on the mainland of China?

POINTS TO RISK OF WORLD WAR

If we were to do these things we would be running a very grave risk of starting a general war. If that were to happen, we would have brought about the exact situation we are trying to prevent.

If we were to do these things we would become entangled in a vast conflict on the continent of Asia and our task would become immeasurably more difficult all over the world.

What would suit the ambitions of the Kremlin better than for our military forces to be committed to a full-scale war with Red China?

It may well be that, in spite of our best efforts, the Communists may spread the war. But it would be wrong—tragically wrong—for us to take the initiative in extending the war.

The dangers are great. Make no mistake about it. Behind the North Koreans and Chinese Communists in the front lines stand additional millions of Chinese soldiers. And behind the Chinese stand the tanks, the planes, the submarines, the soldiers, and the scheming rulers of the Soviet Union.

Our aim is to avoid the spread of the conflict.

The course we have been following is the one best calculated to avoid an all-out war. It is the course consistent that our obligation to do all we can to maintain international peace and security. Our experience in Greece and Berlin shows that it is the most effective course of action we can follow.

First of all, it is clear that our efforts in Korea can blunt the will of the Chinese Communists to continue the struggle. The United Nations forces have put up a tremendous fight in Korea and have inflicted very heavy casualties on the enemy. Our forces are stronger now than they have been before. These are plain facts which may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack.

Second, the free world as a whole is growing in military strength every day. In the United States, in Western Europe, and throughout the world, freemen are alert to the Soviet threat and are building their defenses. This may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea—and from undertaking new acts of aggression elsewhere.

ASSERTS DOOR TO PEACE IS OPEN

If the Communist authorities realize they cannot defeat us in Korea, if they realize it would be foolhardy to widen the hostilities beyond Korea, then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible. The door is always open.

Then we may achieve a settlement in Korea which will not compromise the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

I have thought long and hard about this question of extending the war in Asia. I have discussed it many times with the ablest military advisers in the country. I believe with all my heart that the course we are following is the best course.

I believe that we must try to limit the war to Korea for these vital reasons: To make sure that the precious lives of our fighting

men are not wasted; to see that the security of our country and the free world is not needlessly jeopardized; and to prevent a third world war.

A number of events have made it evident that General MacArthur did not agree with that policy. I have, therefore, considered it essential to relieve General MacArthur so that there would be no doubt or confusion as to the real purpose and aim of our policy.

It was with the deepest personal regret that I found myself compelled to take this action. General MacArthur is one of our greatest military commanders. But the cause of world peace is more important than any individual.

The change in commands in the Far East means no change whatever in the policy of the United States. We will carry on the fight in Korea with vigor and determination in an effort to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

We are ready, at any time, to negotiate for a restoration of peace in the area. But we will not engage in appeasement. We are only interested in real peace.

GIVES BASIS FOR PEACE

Real peace can be achieved through a settlement based on the following factors:

1. The fighting must stop.

2. Concrete steps must be taken to insure that the fighting will not break out again.

3. There must be an end of the aggression.

A settlement founded upon these elements would open the way for the unification of Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign forces.

In the meantime, I want to be clear about our military objective. We are fighting to resist an outrageous aggression in Korea. We are trying to keep the Korean conflict from spreading to other areas. But at the same time we must conduct our military activities so as to insure the security of our forces. This is essential if they are to continue the fight until the enemy abandons its ruthless attempt to destroy the Republic of Korea.

That is our military objective—to repel attack and to restore peace.

In the hard fighting in Korea, we are proving that collective action among nations is not only a high principle but a workable means of resisting aggression. Defeat of aggression in Korea may be the turning point in the world's search for a practical way of achieving peace and security.

The struggle of the United Nations in Korea is a struggle for peace.

The free nations have united their strength in an effort to prevent a third world war.

That war can come if the Communist leaders want it to come. But this Nation and its allies will not be responsible for its coming.

We do not want to widen the conflict. We will use every effort to prevent that disaster. And in so doing, we know that we are following the great principles of peace, freedom, and justice.

Salary Raises for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address of Henry J. Mahady, Latrobe, Pa., State commander of American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—before Clyde Kelly Branch, No. 84, National Association of Letter Carriers, at Pittsburgh:

Each year I look forward to meeting my old friends from the Pittsburgh post office. On such social occasions one ordinarily does not discuss weighty or serious matters. This year, with your permission, I will yield to the necessity of the times and take up a matter which from the viewpoint of the public and yourselves needs immediate attention and consideration.

I have received many letters from my many friends in the postal service. Some have given up their jobs with Uncle Sam and joined the ranks of industrial workers. Some have surrendered the hard-earned seniority and earned credits toward retirement while others were younger but promising top-flight men, of the type that merit the reputation the postal workers have earned so well and have gone into other work. Why has this occurred?

Their letters have explained why they have so acted, or were planning to so act. Economic necessity is the only way you can sum up the reasons given. One couldn't afford to "set up" his own home. Another couldn't support his family as rising prices plus his fixed obligations were forcing him deeper and deeper into debt and into the hands of creditors.

Inflation has pressured our Government and postal workers into leaving their chosen work to go into other fields because their fixed income couldn't stand the demands of rising prices.

How can we keep our career men? How can we stop this flight of top-grade men into other fields? How can we continue to attract top-grade men into postal service? Only by forwarding that legislation which will adjust their wages to the changed cost of living caused by inflationary pressure. One of the inequities caused by inflationary pressures is the fact that white-collar and Government workers and pensioners bear the brunt of it and generally they are a class who are least able to bear it.

Veterans who went into service are least able to stand this pressure. I am sure that dignified assertion of your demands to Congress will show them your necessity. I am sure that the public when it is pointed out to them will back legislation like H. R. 244 and S. bill 355.

I knew that there were many veterans among you. However, I never realized that there were so many veterans in the postal ranks until this last 2 months. I am proud of that fact. The armed services and postal employment are both services to the public as a whole. In both you keep the society functioning. In both you have a duty. Where there are so many veterans and so many high-type men as in the postal service we know communism is at a minimum and its doctrines will be given short shift.

I know there is a limit to patience where one's family is denied economic necessities and debts are piling up. But you as citizens must be patient. These times of crisis and adjustment require that the Government be strong. You are not only an arm of the Government but a necessary link in the industrial system. You must keep the postal service strong.

There are a number of bills before the Congress of the United States providing for raises in pay. H. R. 244 and Senate bill 355 are but two which strive to bring your pay in line with remuneration in other fields. You must have faith. You must have patience. Your lawmakers are alerted to your needs and I feel sure that you will not be disappointed.

You must realize that there are a class of people who think that anyone who has a Government job has a sinecure. They do not know of your problems. Little do they realize that you compete for jobs; that you are on your feet for many hours; that you must please the public no matter what the difficulty; that mail delayed by strikes or weather or holiday rush must be delivered on time; that you get sick and tired and worn out even as others do; that your children cry at night and disturb your rest; and finally that your wages must keep pace with prices.

Your reputation for delivering the goods and as citizens is good. You have earned this reputation by sacrifice and hard work, patience at this time will keep it.

I have examined charts, statistics, articles, arguments, and countless releases. The story is clear, the need apparent. Reasonable men cannot long deny apparent and obvious need. You must have confidence in your elected officials. They are reasonable men and should act promptly. I have no doubt that your matter will be given every consideration at an early date.

We, in AMVETS, feel that service to the community is the prime aim of our organization. We salute you as you have proved and will continue to prove that this is the prime objective of your organization. I apologize for talking shop at a social function, but you must pardon me. I and others are much concerned over the matter.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Will Ruin the Bituminous Coal Industry in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the evil effect of the St. Lawrence seaway project on the bituminous coal industry is evidenced by the following resolution adopted by the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and the Eastern Bituminous Coal Association.

Every Member of Congress should read the following resolution because it proves conclusively that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is a menace not only to the economy of our Nation but principally to the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas—

"1. The members of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association are producers of bituminous coal from mines located in the central district of Pennsylvania, the State of Maryland, and the counties of Grant, Mineral, and Tucker in West Virginia.

"2. The production of bituminous coal is by far the major industry in this area and its economy is largely dependent upon production and transportation of coal and many communities are solely dependent upon them. In 1950 the area produced 46,250,000 tons of bituminous coal and employed more than 47,000 miners to whom it paid more than $130,000,000 in wages. The

market value of its coal product was more than $230,000,000.

"3. Approximately 85 percent of the coal produced in the area is transported from the mines by rail and delivered to those portions of the United States and Canada lying east of a north-south line drawn through Buffalo, N. Y., and north of an east-west line drawn through Washington, D. C. Large quantities of coal produced in the area are shipped to points in northern New York and in eastern Ontario.

"4. The entire bituminous coal industry of the United States, which in 1950 produced more than 500,000,000 tons of coal, employed approximately 425,000 miners to whom it paid more than $1,200,000,000 in wages, will be adversely affected by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project, because

"(a) It will make accessible to foreign-produced fuel an area which currently consumes large quantities of coal of which, it is reliably estimated, more than 35,000,000 tons of coal per annum, the equivalent in domestic coal production of 544,000 man-days, may well be displaced by foreign fuel. Without the seaway, this area cannot be reached by foreign fuel in significant quantities because of prohibitive transportation costs from the seacoast;

"(b) The hydropower development on the St. Lawrence River, estimated at from 570,000 to 750,000 kilowatts of firm power, will displace (or prevent its future use) an average of 2,500,000 tons of coal per annum, the equivalent in domestic coal production of 38,880 man-days;

"(c) The loss of employment in the railroad industry will equal that of the coal industry, for it requires a man-day of railroad labor to transport a man-day of coal production.

"5. Aside from the loss of employment and loss of invested capital in the coal and railroad industries, and the adverse effect upon the economy of the communities dependent thereon, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project is not in the Nation's interest because

"(a) The Nation cannot afford to pile the cost of the seaway, estimated at $1,500,000,000, on top of the tremendous cost of the current defense program which now strains the national economy, nor can it afford to divert manpower and materials to a project which because of the length of time required for its construction (at least 7 years) cannot be of immediate aid to defense;

"(b) if the country needs more electric power, it can obtain it more speedily and at less capital cost by the construction of steam-operated plants, and at less operating cost unless the public project be subsidized by the taxpayers;

"(c) the seaway is of doubtful value in time of war (it would be unnavigable 5 months of every year) and would be difficult to defend (the bombing of its locks would put it completely out of commission);

"(d) the seaway is of value in time of peace only to a small segment of the total economy of the Nation and will do much damage to many other segments, not only to the coal and railroad industries, but also to the American merchant marine, the established coastal ports, and others: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the directors of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association, in joint session assembled, do hereby record their opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric project and do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to oppose the same; and further

"*Resolved*, That the executive director of these associations be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President of the Senate, to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, to each of Pennsylvania's Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to such other persons as he may deem advisable."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolutions adopted unanimously on March 29, 1951, by the boards of directors of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association in joint session.

R. T. LAING, *Secretary*.

What the People Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I feel fortunate today, to be able to present this House of Representatives with some figures, reflecting the state of public opinion in the Seventeenth Michigan Congressional District, concerning the very issues raised by President Truman's action, which only yesterday shocked and alarmed every patriotic American.

The action I refer to, of course, was the tragically misguided, and possibly disastrous, order issued by the President, relieving Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur of his American and United Nations commands in the Far East.

In presenting these figures, representing a poll taken in my behalf by two fine newspapers, the Pontiac Daily Press and the Royal Oak Daily Tribune, perhaps I should mention the fact that the Seventeenth Michigan Congressional District is one of the largest in the Nation, from the standpoint of population.

Located within the Seventeenth District are several great industrial areas, extensive farming areas, commercial areas, and a tremendous concentration of homes, from the wealthiest to the poorest, whose owners have their places of business and employment variously, throughout the Detroit metropolitan area.

I think I can say without question, that the Seventeenth District offers a cross-section of the thinking, political and economic, which prevails everywhere in the great American Middle West. And more than that, too, because of recent years Detroit's vast industrial expansion has drawn to the Seventeenth Congressional District, literally scores of thousands of Americans, of all races and creeds, from every State in the Union.

The public opinion poll, which I am about to give you the results, was taken by means of a questionnaire, published for 2 days on the front pages of the newspapers I have mentioned. The questionnaire contained 10 questions, as follows:

1. Do you favor the administration's foreign policies?
2. Do you favor arming North and South America?
3. Are you in favor of all-out mobilization?
4. Do you favor strong defenses in the Atlantic?
5. Do you favor sending troops to Europe?
6. Do you favor keeping troops in Korea?
7. Do you favor military aid to Chiang Kai-shek?
8. Should our foreign policies be reexamined?
9. Do you think Mr. Acheson should resign?
10. Should nonessential civilian expenditures be reduced?

Of the 697 newspaper readers voting on question No. 1—do you favor the administration's foreign policies?—645 voted "no." Only 52 voted "yes."

Of the 689 voting on question No. 2—do you favor arming North and South America?—488 voted "yes." Only 201 voted "no."

Of the 690 voting on question No. 3—are you in favor of all-out mobilization?—400 voted "no." Those voting "yes" numbered 290.

Of the 696 voting on question No. 4—do you favor strong defenses in the Atlantic?—609 voted "yes." Only 87 voted "no."

Of the 673 voting on question No. 5—do you favor sending troops to Europe?—456 voted "no." Only 217 voted "yes."

Of the 708 voting on question No. 6—do you favor keeping troops in Korea?—474 voted "no." Only 234 voted "yes."

Of the 703 who voted on question No. 7—do you favor military aid to Chiang Kai-shek?—406 voted "yes." Those who voted "no" numbered 297.

Of the 732 who voted on question No. 8—should our foreign policies be reexamined?—692 voted "yes." Only 40 voted "no."

Of the 708 who voted on question No. 9—do you think Mr. Acheson should resign?—582 voted "yes." Only 126 voted "no."

Of the 722 who voted on question No. 10—do you think nonessential civilian spending should be reduced?—647 voted "yes." Only 75 voted "no."

From the foregoing, which I trust has not proved tedious, it may be concluded that public opinion in the Seventeenth Michigan Congressional District, as a cross-section of Middle Western thought, if not that of the entire Nation, inclines as follows:

First. Strongly against the Truman administration's foreign policies.

Second. Strongly in favor of arming North and South America, as recommended by former President Herbert Hoover.

Third. Slightly against all-out mobilization at this time.

Fourth. Strongly in favor of adequate defenses in the Atlantic.

Fifth. Strongly against sending troops to Europe, presumably at least until European nations of the west show a real disposition to rearm and resist Communist aggression.

Sixth. Approximately 2 to 1 against keeping troops in Korea.

Seventh. Rather strongly in favor of extending military aid to Chiang Kai-shek, the ratio in favor being about 4 to 3.

Eighth. Almost unanimously in favor of reexamining the foreign policies of the Truman administration.

Ninth. Very strongly, indeed, that Mr. Acheson should resign, the ratio being almost 5 to 1 in favor of his resignation.

Tenth. Almost unanimously in favor of a drastic reduction in all nonessential civilian spending by the Government, the ratio being nearly 10 to 1.

It is my conviction that anybody who will consider the results of this public-opinion poll, as I have given them to you, can conclude in the light of common sense, only that the American people, not only in Michigan but throughout the Nation, overwhelmingly support the ideas of former President Herbert Hoover and Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur.

And now I hope you will bear with me, while I repeat something I said earlier.

The action of President Truman in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur of the far-eastern command is one of the most tragic events in American history. There is no precedent for it.

Lincoln removed several generals in the Union Army during the War Between the States because of incompetence. This is not the case with General MacArthur.

The President demanded the impossible; namely, the support of a virtually nonexistent foreign policy with respect to Asia. MacArthur is a great general and a great statesman. Because he sought to fill a void, where no real policy, either of the United States or the United Nations, was in existence, he has been sacrificed on the altar of politics.

President Truman has liquidated communism's greatest enemy, in the person of General MacArthur, who has served so long, so nobly, and so well. The President's action has gone far to destroy what little confidence the American people, the people of Japan, and the other peoples of the Far East ever have had in the objectives and purposes of the Truman administration.

It has been well said that today there is rejoicing in the Kremlin, as the Red dictator and his regime arrive at the natural conclusion, that preparations are in progress for a new appeasement—another Munich—in the Far East.

Railroad Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the inauguration of the railroad retirement system, it has been my earnest desire to make it the best retirement system in the world. The insufficiency and financial instability of the old private so-called pension systems prevailing on the railroads led me, in the latter part of the Hoover administration, to introduce the first bill for the protection of railroad workers. My interest in the subject continued and has continued to the present time.

I, therefore, sponsored the Railroad Retirement Act of 1934, the 1935 act, the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and all important amendments to these acts up to the present time.

There is a general desire among railroad workers at the present time for amendments which would increase the benefits to which the railroad workers should be entitled. This is not an unnatural desire when we realize that the purchasing power of a dollar has lessened very substantially since the enactment of the provisions of the railroad retirement law. Among railroad workers, there is also an even more general feeling of opposition to the increase in assessments for the purpose of providing more liberal benefits. It is easy to see, therefore, that the problem confronting us in the effort to be of assistance to the railroad workers is not an easy one.

Any true friend of the railroad men of the United States who understands the requirements of a sound railroad retirement system must first of all be certain that what is proposed will not jeopardize the financial soundness of the system. For many months, I have been making a very careful study of the whole situation and have been in consultation with those who are most competent to advise in regard to the matter and who are most familiar with the problem as at present presented.

After many consultations with experts of the Railroad Retirement Board and officials of the Railway Labor Executives Association, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3669, which I believe will afford substantial help and, at the same time, will not jeopardize the financial stability of the retirement system. I may say here that already during the few months of the present Congress approximately 30 bills have been introduced for the purpose of increasing the benefits payable under the retirement law. Practically all of these measures, if enacted into law, would menace the soundness of the system, if not immediately wreck it. I am anxious above all other considerations to avoid any such disaster as the destruction of the financial soundness of the system. I am more than pleased with the good will evidenced by many of the bills, but I am sure that their authors will understand that they will be of greater help to the railroad workers by cooperating in the passage of this measure which will result in the increase of benefits and in no way harm the system.

I hope that we can arrange for hearings on my bill at the earliest possible date available to our committee. At that time, we shall be glad to hear well qualified witnesses in regard to the different aspects of the problem.

Maturing War Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many people who are concerned with what to do about their maturing war bonds. If they cash them in at the present time, they must report a profit for income-tax purposes and will lose a part of their increased value. On the other hand, many people are concerned about holding on to their bonds for a greater period of time because of the depreciation of the dollar over the past 10 years.

This depreciation is most readily seen in the following case: If a man in 1941 bought a brand-new low-priced car instead of a war bond for $750, he could have enjoyed a moderate use of that car over a 10-year period. If he invested it in war bonds, he would now get back $1,000 from the Government, of which he would have to pay, say, an average of 30 percent income tax on the $250 increment. Therefore, the citizen would have a net amount of $925 available to date. However, if he went to buy a new low-priced car today of the same make as he bought in 1941, he could not touch it for much less than $2,000.

The above example holds true for practically any other commodity one would care to select. Therefore, it can be seen that many people are quite concerned with this problem and the various answers to the problem were very well brought out in the following article by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Sun-Times:

WAR BONDS MATURING; PUBLIC ASKS: "WHAT SHALL I DO?"

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

On every hand one hears the question: "My first war bonds soon will be maturing. What shall I do?"

Many of those who bought war bonds never made any other investments. Consequently they lack the experience needed to decide wisely.

First, let us examine the alternatives. Anyone who owns series E savings bonds purchased after May 1, 1941, has, on their maturity, three choices.

He may turn the bonds in at his bank or at the Federal Reserve bank and receive the full redemption price, $25 for a bond originally bought for $18.75; $50 for the $37.50 bond; $100 for the $75 bond; $500 for the $375 bond; and $1,000 for the $750 bond.

In such case he will have to include in his income when he files his return next year the entire interest accrued on the bond, as for example the $25 on a $100 bond. In short, he will have to pay back to the Government in the form of taxes, depending on his income bracket, from 20 percent to 91 percent of the interest he receives for the 10-year loan of his money. This, despite the fact that the purchasing power of the $100 he receives today is substantially less than the $75 he invested 10 years ago.

Bondholders can escape temporarily this tax charge by accepting the second alternative. This involves doing nothing. The owner can just hold on to his bonds. He can do this deliberately or simply through negligence or forgetfulness and the result is the same.

The bonds will automatically be extended indefinitely up to a maximum of 10 years. Interest will accrue at a straight 2½ percent rate for the first 7½ years and then at an accelerated rate so that if held for a full 10 years the return would approximate 2.9 percent compounded semiannually.

Such bonds can be cashed in at any time and the interest obtained to the nearest 6 months' period prior to the date of cashing.

INTEREST ADDED EVERY 6 MONTHS

In other words, during the first 6 months no additional interest would be payable but after that each half year 1¼ per cent would be added to the original redemption value of the bond until 7½ years elapsed. After that,

the interest would be at an accelerated rate and if a $100 bond is held for the full 10 years the additional interest would be $33.33.

When the bond is cashed, the interest for both the first 10 years and the subsequent period must be reported as income for Federal tax purposes.

The third option is to exchange maturing E bonds for registered series G bonds. These will bear interest at the flat rate of 2½ percent per annum payable semiannually from the issue date until their maturity in 12 years. The minimum denomination, however, is $500. Until such a total is reached, maturing E bonds may be accumulated over any 12 consecutive calendar months and presented for exchange not later than two calendar months after the month of maturity of the last bond in the group.

These G bonds may be redeemed at par at any time after 6 months upon one calendar month's notice. However, the privilege of deferring taxes on the interest of the E bonds (also the interest each 6 months on the new G bonds) does not apply if this exchange is made.

I repeat what I have said many times before: That as long as the purchasing value of the dollar has depreciated substantially during the period covered by this loan of money to the Government and particularly inasmuch as this decline in the value of the dollar has occurred largely as a result of Government policies, it does not strike me as fair that the patriotic buyers of their country's bonds should have to pay taxes on an income which in terms of purchasing power is actually a loss rather than a gain.

However, until or unless Congress changes the law that is the situation.

Which of the three alternatives should the bondholder decide upon? This depends upon individual circumstances and individual conclusions as to the outlook.

DELAYING TAX MAY BE ADVANTAGEOUS

For an individual above the age of 55 and anticipating retirement at 65 and a consequent sharp decline in his income, postponing the date when the tax collector must be paid holds certain obvious advantages. If one believes that the tax rates will be lower some time during the 10 years ahead, again there are obvious advantages in postponing the year in which the taxes on these investments will be paid.

On the other hand, if one feels that the Government will have no better success than it has had in stopping inflation, the depreciation in the true value of the dollar is such as to make any fixed-income investment (all bonds, saving accounts, insurance, annuities, preferred stocks, mortgages, etc.) unprofitable.

If such a conclusion is reached, the bondholder is faced with other problems. First of all, should he hold the bonds as a duty of citizenship? Second, should he hold them as part of the fight against inflation? Any other course would probably add to the inflationary pressures. Third, if his duty as a citizen rests lightly and he cares little for his responsibility to fight inflation, what will he choose to do with the funds obtained from his maturing bonds? Go on a spending spree at today's all-time high prices, adding fuel to the fires of inflation? Or shall he invest in other things, stocks, perchance, also already selling at around the highest prices in history, or real estate where inflation has sent values soaring?

The choice, it will be seen, is not an easy one. Many other individual factors will govern the decision.

The average citizen, I suspect, will follow the easiest course of doing nothing, which, in effect, means extending the bonds. He should do something more—write another and still another letter to his Senators and his Congressman demanding more effective action against inflation than anything witnessed thus far.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa., dated April 11, 1951, entitled "MacArthur Ousted":

MACARTHUR OUSTED

That there would be a show-down with General MacArthur over his policies and pronouncements with regard to the war in the Far East was inevitable. What happened early this morning—relief of General MacArthur of his command by President Truman—should have been no great surprise. Mr. Truman says his action was based on General MacArthur's inability to give "his wholehearted support to United States and United Nations policies." In a nutshell, General MacArthur not only wanted to direct the shooting war but the diplomatic war as well. Had he confined himself to his own particular field, the one for which he was trained—the shooting war—he would have been immeasurably better off and President Truman would not have been forced to take such drastic action as relieving him of his command. In World War I, General Pershing did just that and in World War II General Eisenhower stuck to fighting and left diplomacy to those who were delegated to attend to diplomatic missions.

As the New York Herald Tribune said only yesterday, and the Times quoted that declaration, "there must be unity of command and if General MacArthur cannot accommodate himself to the basic strategy of his Commander in Chief—President Truman—his further usefulness as a general must necessarily come in question." General MacArthur had unfortunately allowed himself to become a disturbing element in a political as well as a military sense. His pronouncements of policy as regards the Far East, apparently without consulting the State Department or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were embarrassing and annoying. While many will take sides with him, some merely because they are against the Truman administration and can see political advantage in a disturbed situation, the great majority of the American people will conclude there must be one commander in chief, that his decisions should be accepted and those refusing to abide by them should retire from active service.

It can hardly be said President Truman acted hastily in relieving General MacArthur of his command. Months ago Mr. Truman made a long journey to the mid-Pacific to confer with General MacArthur. Emissaries of the administration have gone to Tokyo and met with the general. Only a few days ago Army Secretary Pace conferred with MacArthur. As of yesterday it was announced from Tokyo that General MacArthur made it plain to his superiors that he intended to keep right on fighting for a freer hand in the Korean War.

General MacArthur, it has long been contended, is Asia-minded. He sees the future of the world decided upon the soil of Asia rather than of Europe. His pronouncements, it is contended, have embarrassed General Eisenhower in the latter's efforts to build up the defenses of Europe. Now the situation has been resolved, unfortunately but nontheless necessarily, through relief of General MacArthur of his command. He has been succeeded by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who is all soldier and who since he was put in command of the Eighth Army in Korea has done a great job. It is expected General Ridgway will stick to his knitting—that is fighting.

President Truman expressed his regret that he had to relieve General MacArthur of his command. He said at the same time that MacArthur's place in history "as one of our greatest commanders is fully established" and that "the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the distinguished and exceptional service which he has rendered his country in posts of great responsibility."

President Truman is not the first Chief Executive faced with situations similar in many respects to the controversy which has raged around General MacArthur. Lincoln and other chiefs had to act summarily and relieve commanders who assumed too much authority and who insisted on acting on their own. There was great hubbub at those times and efforts made to gain political advantage over the action, just as there is today, with President Truman's opponents dragging the whole thing down into the swamps of petty politics. Whatever way you look at it the present situation is not nice. To General MacArthur it is humiliating. He brought it on himself by talking too much and too often.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Winchell:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MACARTHUR—THE STORY BEHIND THE STORY

The greatest scandal in American history is now out in the open. The scandal is not the dismissal of General MacArthur; it is the foreign policy which made it inevitable. General MacArthur and Secretary Acheson are only symbols in a titanic struggle going on behind the scenes. The forces which caused MacArthur's dismissal are not in Washington. They are in London. The administration, faced with the break-up of the Atlantic Pact by Great Britain unless it appeases Red China, took the step of double appeasement (of both Moscow and London) by firing MacArthur.

These are the facts: Secretary Acheson, as recently as last summer, attempted to honor his secret commitment to Great Britain to recognize Red China and admit her to the United Nations. He is on record as stating we would not veto Red China if she succeeded in getting a majority vote. Great Britain, as Red China's floor leader, attempted to get the majority. As another step, Secretary Acheson initiated a deliberate program to play down the importance of Formosa. Senator KNOWLAND, of California, produced documentary evidence that Secretary Acheson had secretly instructed all State Department policy makers to minimize the strategic importance of Formosa. In short, the Chinese Nationalist government, by secret agreement between the United States and Britain, was to be thrown to the wolves. American public opinion stopped this also. MacArthur, of course, opposed it throughout.

The President and Secretary Acheson, until public opinion reversed them, took the

view that since Asia has no industry, that continent would never be a factor in the next war. The Acheson formula called for the virtual abandonment of Asia. It was, of course, heavily supported by those who believe communism can be appeased. The American public did not subscribe to the view. It became impossible for the administration to force its secret agreement through the Senate. After practically declaring Korea could not be defended, the President ordered the troops in when Acheson's appeasement failed again. The same action followed in Indochina. After refusing arms, the President sent them.

The reason Great Britain is desperate is that Red China is even more so. The whole of South China is in a virtual state of insurrection. Guerrillas, to the extent of more than a million, are in operation on the Chinese mainland. Until Formosa is liquidated, until Chiang's army is out of existence, Red China will always be on the brink of civil war. The Reds realize this so much that they are prepared to vacate South China, if attacked there. Thus, Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek are at the heart of the Far East question, and not Korea. MacArthur favors using them. Acheson's commitments to Great Britain forbid it. As an example, a shipment of rubber is being loaded at Singapore, destination the Red forces.

MacArthur, contrary to the general impression, is within his rights even as a soldier in defying the President. His oath is to the Constitution and to the men under his command. If he deems the orders of his superiors in conflict with them, he is under a duty to make known his objections. The President, by the same token, has a right to relieve him but he cannot punish. Under the Constitution General MacArthur cannot be dishonorably dismissed from the United States Army for adhering to his oath to the Constitution as he sees it.

It is well that the struggle is at last out in the open. The deadlock of the forces behind the scene was strangling the Nation. Because the truth is that while MacArthur has just been relieved by the President, the United States Senate has long ago dismissed Secretary Acheson for all practical purposes. Acheson is Secretary of State in title only by whim of the President and not by will of the people. Both the Democratic and Republican Senate leaderships have repudiated him. They have put all foreign nations on notice that the Secretary is without power to reach any agreement without their consent. And that consent is not forthcoming.

As recently as last week, Acheson's Voice of America appropriation was cut 90 percent which is a repeated demand that he resign. Nor is the rebellion against Acheson confined to the Senate. General Eisenhower has abruptly ended the efforts of Secretary Acheson to name his political advisers. The ECA Administration, the Marshall plan—ignores the State Department, to its intense rage—and carries on its own foreign policy. Since this bureau deals out the goods, it has far higher prestige than the State Department. Its domestic policy is very clear: It avoids Acheson because it doesn't want its appropriation cut, too. Thus, the United States has three foreign policies: One military, one economic, and the third, a poor loser, the diplomatic one.

It is not the struggle between MacArthur and Acheson which is paramount. The first consideration is the welfare of the Nation. Paradoxically, General MacArthur has been relieved but not dismissed with dishonor. Secretary Acheson has been dismissed, practically with dishonor by the United States Senate, but has not been relieved by the President. It is only natural, therefore, that the Nation itself is dividing into two camps.

By purely objective reporting standards, the country has never been so divided since Fort Sumter. All thinking Americans must realize the division within the action is far more serious than any personality involved. General MacArthur's removal has its chief meaning in its political repercussions. General Ridgway is an able soldier; he is capable of carrying on the command. But the blocking of the President and Acheson by the Senate has resulted in the stoppage of universal military training and a general desire to limit the personalities of the administration as much as possible. In this, the Congress as a whole reflects the will of the American people. They simply will not trust their sons to State Department policies under Secretary Acheson. Experts call them reversals when leaders contradict themselves in diplomacy. But reporters call them massacres when it happens on the battlefield.

The administration would never have fired MacArthur if left to itself. The mighty pressure necessary to dismiss the general came from the West, and not from the East. It is this simple. London blackmailed the White House with threats of breaking up the Atlantic alliance. The White House caved in. The great struggle between the President and the Senate has reached final showdown. It is the Senate's move; in removing General MacArthur the President has defied the Senate to impeach Secretary Acheson. It is put up or shut up now.

To Clean Up the Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "To Clean Up the Ohio," which appeared in the New York Times this morning:

TO CLEAN UP THE OHIO

A long stride forward in the control of river pollution has been insured by a notable decision this week of the Supreme Court. Many more spectacular cases may have a less permanent effect than this one on the welfare of our country, for pollution of streams and rivers has become a national problem of the first importance.

In a far-seeing attempt to do something about the increasingly intolerable pollution of the waters of the Ohio River Basin, the eight States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Virginia, and West Virginia in 1948 joined together in a compact establishing the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. They recognized, as the Court says, "that they were faced with one of the problems of Government that are defined by natural rather than political boundaries." Interstate action was essential to clean up the waters of an area covering about 155,000 square miles, waters into which some 1,100 cities and towns drained their sewage and waste; and interstate action was taken. But then the Supreme Court of West Virginia held that that State legislature's adherence to the compact was invalid, as it violated the State constitution. It is this ruling that the Supreme Court of the United States overturned, thus firmly establishing the Ohio River compact as a workable method of interstate cooperation.

"The compact involves a reasonable and carefully limited delegation of power to an interstate agency," Justice Frankfurter noted; and Justice Jackson added that "if the compact system is to have vitality and integrity" West Virginia may not unilaterally "read herself out" of this interstate obligation. As an official of the sanitation commission has said, the Court's decision confirms the right of the various States "to join together to develop a more effective campaign to promote clean streams." It should give encouragement to other States that may be considering this method of attacking a problem that is general throughout the country and that cries out for remedial action.

Slovaks Protest Against Religious Persecution in Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an appeal sent by Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, president of the Slovak League of America, to the President and the Congress of the United States:

SLOVAKS PROTEST AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN SLOVAKIA

To the President and Congress of the United States of America:

As Americans of Slovak descent we protest against the imprisonment of Bishop John Vojtassak, Bishop Michael Buzalka, and Bishop Paul Gojdic. We have been profoundly shocked by the mock trial and by the harsh, unjust, and inhuman treatment they have been subjected to by the Communist regime of Gottwald.

The travesty of justice, as manifested in the trial and verdict of the three Slovak bishops, is merely another example of the persecution raging in every country where the Communists rule. We are convinced that the Slovak bishops—like Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac—have been imprisoned because they, too, dared to oppose a totalitarian dictator for his suppression of religious freedom.

The Czechoslovakia of today would not exist except for the free flow of American blood and American dollars during the war. America cannot and must not stand idly by while Slovakia is being sacrificed to the Red Moloch of Moscow. Perverters of decency must not be permitted to destroy the forces of good without challenge by governments which call themselves Christian. The crimes committed in Slovakia are crimes not only against the unfortunate people living there, but crimes against ourselves as members of the human family.

We are so concerned about the injustice of the trial and the sentence of the three Slovak bishops not because we happen to be of Slovak descent, but primarily because we are Americans. The Slovak bishops represent each one of us. It is because in defending human rights, the inherent rights of their people to political and religious freedom, they are defending the rights of the individual person. They are defending our rights. And it was for those very rights that we toiled, suffered, and sacrificed so much during the war years.

The Czecho-Communist regime of Prague knows that the Slovak people rejected communism long ago. They know that the Slovaks have fought against it relentlessly for over a century. That explains why that regime is so determined to exterminate all Slovak political and religious leaders who oppose them and their brutal rule.

We urge the President and the Congress of the United States to make an official protest to the Czechoslovak Government against the imprisonment of the Slovak bishops and the persecution of religion in Slovakia. We also urge our President and our Congress to break all diplomatic relations with the Czecho-Communist regime of Prague which has sinned so grievously against humanity and the fundamental principles of freedom. Finally, we urge our President and our Congress to bring these crimes against humanity, the crimes against the Slovak nation, to the attention of the United Nations and request that body to investigate those crimes.

Today we protest before God and the world against the systematic torture and persecution of the Slovak bishops and the murder of the faithful whose lives already have been taken by the godless Reds of Prague.

PHILIP A. HROBAK,
President, the Slovak League of America.
MIDDLETOWN, PA., *January 23, 1951.*

Segregation Provision in Draft-UMT Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to me, and I believe to everyone here, that this motion to strike the segregation portion of the draft-UMT bill providing that any soldier might have the right to request that he serve in a unit of his own race is not made for the purpose of aiding the war effort, or to make us stronger, or to make an attack by Russia more remote, but to bring into play more agitation, more strife, and their partisan politics into a most serious matter. This provision is as fair provision as I ever saw. This provision simply allows our boys to cast a vote for their preference.

Much has been said on the floor here by the opposition to the effect if a boy is old enough to fight, he is old enough to vote, and then this opposition proceeds to try to deny these boys the right to vote on this important question. Those who want to be in unsegregated units need only express his desire to do so, and by the same token those who desire to serve in segregated units should be allowed to express their wish to do so. The people of the United States want this provision in this bill. The boys—and they are just boys—have the right to insist that you not require them to be guinea pigs for a social experiment and to make them the only people in this country that this experiment is tried out upon. It is a cruel thing to say to these boys that we will take you from your homes, we will put you in war, we will bury some of you, no doubt about that, but, nevertheless, we have some minorities we intend to honor at your expense.

If you will give this bill a try, you will find to your entire satisfaction that the Negroes, if let alone and are not high pressured by pressure groups, there will not be one Negro in a thousand that will ask to serve in a mixed unit where they will suffer complete embarrassment. If there be any person who insists upon legislation requiring another to associate with him, that insistence would prove an unmistakable sign of inferiority when one is not content to remain with his own race, then that person is inferior and a troublemaker. I respectfully ask that no consideration be given that silly prattle that to leave this portion in the bill will furnish propaganda to Russia. One of our main troubles here is that we have kowtowed to Russia and off-color groups too long, and we have too many times forgotten the rights of the old-fashioned Southerner and the old-fashioned Yankee.

I will tell you how to talk to Russia, and that is simply to talk to Russia in the only language she understands. That language is force and might. Let us tell Russia that we have had all the foolishness from her and her stripe, whether in Russia or in the United States, that we will tolerate; that peace is what we want if we can have it honorably, but if fight we must, we will do it, and so efficiently she will not rise to fight again.

Let us pass this bill just as it is, and let us do it now. This bill is a sobering thing, but it is life insurance to us and to our boys. It has been said it is fine to die for your country, but I declare it is much better to make the enemy die for his country. Let us tell Russia and the trouble makers at home that they are no longer the "Who's Who in America," but that they belong to that class of "Who's Through in America."

Aid for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial printed in the San Francisco Chronicle for March 31, 1951, on the subject of the proposed shipment of grains to India. I want to express my own personal concern over the failure of Congress to act on this vital, humanitarian project. The editorial aptly expresses the feelings of, what I am sure is, the great majority of people in this country. It seems to me inexcusable that we should trifle with human lives by delaying action on H. R. 3017.

Further in regard to these proposed shipments I should like to comment on the various proposals and questions about methods of shipment. In my personal opinion, inasmuch as the wheat to be shipped will be in the nature of a gift from the people of the United States to the people of India, there is no reason why all of that wheat should not be carried in American owned and manned vessels as long as any such vessels are available. With our own merchant marine and seamen not fully employed, there is no justification for subsidizing any foreign shipping interests through payments for these shipments. In conformity with established practice on ECA and other similar goods, I shall support an amendment to H. R. 3017 requiring at least 50-percent carriage in American bottoms; however, I strongly urge all those concerned with administration of the program to use 100 percent of the available capacity in American vessels.

The editorial from the Chronicle follows:

DAWDLING IN INDIA AID

The Congressmen who for a month and a half have stalled American famine relief for India will no doubt have noticed the New Delhi report that in some villages inhabitants are eating one meal every other day. Also the news that the Indian Government has had to break its promise, made on the expectation of American generosity, to increase the 9-ounce daily food ration.

These news items do not take much space in the papers, but they do in the consciences of many Americans and in the attitudes of most Indians. The bank account of good will which the United States might have hoped to create by the gift of 2,000,000 tons of our surplus wheat is being squandered through delay.

Surely it is time for Congress to come to terms with a proposal that, as former President Hoover said, "has nothing to do with politics but with our fundamental Christian faith." It is not agreeable to see the United States, for the first time in its history, failing to answer the appeal of a famine-stricken people.

It is indefensible for Congressmen to withhold the gift out of pique over differences between Nehru's policy and their personal policy. It is unfortunate that some of them, from motives that they would be quick to condemn in foreign colonial relations, insist upon squeezing out payment for the wheat in Indian raw materials. The basic fact is that if India had the raw materials to get the dollars to buy the wheat, she would doubtless buy it and be done with it. As a matter of fact, India is buying 1,500,000 tons in the United States and Canadian markets; it is because she cannot pay dollars for the balance of 2,000,000 tons she needs that the administration has proposed a Marshall-plan kind of gift.

Russia is already in with an offer of wheat for India—a show-window offer, no doubt, and unlikely to be performed, but still more of an offer than we have yet made. We wonder what the Congressmen who are concerned about India's politics think about the politics in that?

The People of My Congressional District Resent the Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the dismissal of General MacArthur from his far-eastern command by President Truman I have received the greatest bar-

rage of protests on any subject during my congressional career.

These protests come from people of all shades of political faith; and while they do not question the President's right as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to relieve General MacArthur, they express indignation over the shabby manner in which he was treated, despite the fact that it is universally recognized that General MacArthur knows more about the Orient and its inhabitants than any other living American.

The people of my congressional district realize that the President's action against General MacArthur was motivated by the desire of the Chief Executive to uphold the policies that were formulated by the Truman-Acheson-Hiss regime.

In addition to the many long-distance telephone calls from my congressional district and the hundreds of letters and telegrams, I have not received one single communication supporting President Truman.

Here are only a few of the telegrams I received deploring the action of President Truman.

DuBois, Pa.: "As an American I resented the President's insult to the Marines a year ago. I resented the President's insinuation of red herring. I also have resented the manner in which the President of the United States has conducted himself through his letters and threats to individuals. I now resent his firing General MacArthur. I speak as an American and as a veteran of World War II, and I am in favor of impeachment and whatever you deem necessary, JIMMY, it's all right with me."

Claysburg, Pa.: "Removal of MacArthur most deplorable and dangerous action taken in years. Public sentiment here strong against Truman. Impeachment of Truman and Acheson demanded."

Altoona, Pa.: "Removal of MacArthur most deplorable and a tragic happening for America. Public opinion demands impeachment of Truman and removal of his henchmen in Washington."

Altoona, Pa.: "I recommend you impeach Truman and Acheson, the friends of Uncle Joe and Alger Hiss."

DuBois, Pa.: "Are you a Communist or an American. Impeachment."

DuBois, Pa.: "Moral and intelligence level of Chief Executive has become so low, see impeachment proceedings as only hope for future of United States."

Tyrone, Pa.: "Can't something be done to stop Truman's blunders. Dean Acheson's part in the MacArthur decision should not go unnoticed."

Clearfield, Pa.: "President Truman should be impeached. We need a capable, self-reliant man to head our Government."

State College, Pa.: "My family and I strongly object to removal of General MacArthur. Never could understand the reasons behind Korean War. If we are not fighting it to win we had better pull up stakes and come home. To summarize, we have no confidence in the present administration either here or abroad."

Snow Shoe, Pa.: "Would recommend MacArthur be reinstated and Truman impeached."

DuBois, Pa.: "Son-in-law in Korea doesn't like ousting MacArthur. Impeachment for Truman."

Altoona, Pa.: "We protest very vigorously treatment given MacArthur from across the pond and from those in high positions in Washington. Are we going to have another Billy Mitchell? We heartily agree General MacArthur should come home and tell the American people the true story of the situation in Asia." Adjutant, veterans' organizations.

State College, Pa.: "The British sneak attack on General MacArthur has made an isolationist out of me. I now take my place beside Colonel McCormack."

Altoona, Pa.: "Can't you fellows harness Harry? You have my support."

DuBois, Pa.: "We, the undersigned, highly resent the withdrawal of MacArthur. We urge the impeachment of the President of the United States" (signed by 15 constituents).

Altoona, Pa.: "The action of President Truman last night deserves the severest condemnation of all true citizens. By his dismissal of General MacArthur he has accomplished surrender of our country to the British and to appeasement-loving State Department officials. Hope that you will take the lead with vigorous action tending towards removal of these incompetents or worse from public office."

Clearfield, Pa.: "Approve your recent resolution recalling General MacArthur to appear before your session of Congress; inadequate military condition in Korea which has caused great international crisis should be aired to the country."

Tyrone, Pa.: "Following General MacArthur's dismissal, I demand the impeachment of President Truman."

Hollidaysburg, Pa.: "Things are going from worse to horrible. Impeach Truman."

Altoona, Pa.: "We demand immediate action on reinstatement of General MacArthur as commander of far eastern Armed Forces and immediate action on impeachment of Truman as President of the United States."

Altoona, Pa.: "Just heard the tragic news of MacArthur's dismissal. No tragedy could be greater to the future of our national welfare; would encourage the impeachment of Truman. Absolutely mentally incompetent and unfit for leadership in the hour of our greatest need."

Altoona, Pa.: "Time to impeach Truman and Acheson."

DuBois, Pa.: "For the sake of America. Vote to impeach Truman."

Bellefonte, Pa.: "Relieving of MacArthur was typical of an unsuccessful shirt salesman in a job too big for him."

Altoona, Pa.: "Impeach Truman, fire Acheson, and reinstate MacArthur."

DuBois, Pa.: "Highly resent removal of MacArthur. Urge impeachment of President."

DuBois, Pa.: "I consider it a national disgrace the firing of General MacArthur. Any man who has done so much with so little for his country has certainly earned retirement with the highest possible honor award. Should be called to Washington for first hand Far East information for Congress, State Department, and UN."

Altoona, Pa.: "As your constituents we ask you to do your utmost to have Truman impeached for his infamous action in relieving MacArthur of his command."

Altoona, Pa.: "We mothers disapprove of President Truman's action with General MacArthur. Stalin must be as happy as our boys in Korea and Japanese people are disillusioned." (Signed by 11 mothers.)

Clearfield, Pa.: "Feel MacArthur's removal is an infamous act. Suggest stopping all aid to England until they stop all aid and comfort to Red China."

State College, Pa.: "Feel that MacArthur in right. Who runs the war, the military or the political. Time something is done."

State College, Pa.: "Now is the time to put the ax on Harry. Impeach him now."

Altoona, Pa.: "Impeach Truman and Acheson."

DuBois, Pa.: "Am against dismissal of MacArthur. Want it corrected even if it means impeachment of Truman."

East Freedom, Pa.: "The people demand quick action from you and your fellow Congressmen. They want a sweeping clean-up at once of this disgraceful administration. Their only hope is action at once by the Congress."

State College, Pa.: "Violently opposed to MacArthur's dismissal. Letter of explanation to follow."

Altoona, Pa.: "Truman should be impeached, Acheson forced to resign, and MacArthur reinstated."

DuBois, Pa.: "Have son in Korea. Do not oust MacArthur. Impeach Truman."

DuBois, Pa.: "At times situations warrant drastic measures but from past performances the removal of General MacArthur is probably just another one of those mistakes. Why should the facts be hid from us if, repeat, if there are such facts. I would back you on the immediate suggestion of impeachment of the President." (Signed by four constituents.)

San Francisco Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial published in the San Francisco Call Bulletin on April 9, 1951. The editorial deals with the crippling effect on maritime commerce through the port of San Francisco as a result of undermanning of the Customs Bureau staff and provision of insufficient funds for the Bureau to properly perform its functions in processing shipments through the port.

The editorial cites the fact that there are now 22,000 individual shipment entries at the port which are awaiting processing. The inevitable result of such a situation is to drive business away from the port of San Francisco. In view of the vital importance of the city as a link with the East in these troublous times, when so many critical imports are in urgent demand, and in view of the harmful effects to the city, the State of California, and to the Nation as a result of this serious situation I call the attention of Congress to the urgent need for providing an adequate staff for the Customs Bureau at San Francisco. I particularly wish to call the attention of the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for acting on Customs Bureau appropriations to this matter, and to urge that they investigate the San Francisco needs thoroughly with a view to correcting the situation, and permitting prompt and efficient service at the port.

The editorial follows:

SAN FRANCISCO IRON CURTAIN—CRIPPLING CUSTOMS SERVICE IS FALSE ECONOMY WHICH INJURES SHIPPING, ABETS SMUGGLING

A sort of inadvertent iron curtain of commerce has been dropped around the port of San Francisco.

It is, you might say, a "customs tailored" curtain. For it has to do with customs.

And if the general public does not realize the significance of this curtain, you may be sure that the people in maritime commerce, the traders and shippers and importers, do.

Prompt, efficient customs service is vitally important as a stimulus to increased shipping here—a goal for which all are striving.

Conversely, delays and slowdowns in the administration of the customs regulations and duties—and they are many and varied—tend to discourage shipping and shunt it away from this port.

However, such slowdowns and delays are inevitable when the Customs Bureau here is undermanned and when it is forced to skimp along on insufficient funds.

And that, at present, is the case. For instance, there are now some 22,000 entries at the port of San Francisco which have not yet been processed.

These consignments are shut out, in effect, by the afore-mentioned iron curtain. Customs agents simply haven't had enough time to get around to them.

Customs Collector Paul Leake and his staff are doing the best they can with what they've got, but the fact of the matter is they haven't got the wherewithal to do their best job.

The business which has to be done by the Customs Bureau here has, during the current fiscal year, increased 95 percent over the amount (as reflected in customs collections) during a comparable period during the preceding fiscal year.

Necessity for administering the export controls which prevent contraband shipments to Communists in the Far East, and the increasing menace of smuggled dope from the Orient, place additional burdens upon the customs men.

In the face of all this wouldn't it seem advisable and prudent that the allocations for customs service here be increased?

But Members of the House of Representatives, it seems, can't see it that way.

The Appropriations Committee, for example, chopped $800,000 out of the original Customs Bureau budget. Then the House itself whacked off another $675,000.

Governmental economy, of course, is essential in these times and always to be desired. But it should be real economy.

To log-roll through juicy pork-barrel items here and there and then make up for it by cutting down on essential services is not economy.

Penny-pinching which results in loss of customs revenue and which injures shipping is not economy.

Our backlog of 22,000 entries held up because of a shackled Customs Bureau is an example of how this kind of shortsightedness jams up shipping.

It is to be hoped that the Senate will see the importance of an adequate customs service, and that Congress in the future will see to it that this important service is given the attention it deserves.

Hard-Coal Miners Outproduce the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article taken from the Sunday Independent of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for April 25, 1951:

HARD-COAL MINERS OUTPRODUCE THE WORLD

Pennsylvania's anthracite miners have the best production record of any coal diggers in the world.

The 75,377 of them average 2.87 tons, or 5,740 pounds, of coal each shift.

This is more than twice the output per man per shift for the miners of Great Britain, who turn out only 1.32 tons a shift.

BELGIANS FAR DOWN

And Belgium's miners, about whom much has been written on their ability to mine coal, average only 0.766 of a ton a shift. This is only 27 percent of the production of a Pennsylvania miner.

In Western Germany the miners average 1.14 tons and in France the production average per shift of a miner is 0.831 of a ton, or 146 pounds better than the Belgium average.

PLENTY OF HEAT

On the basis that a Pennsylvania hard-coal miner works about 200 days a year, it is estimated that each of them produces enough coal annually to heat the average home for 45 years.

Another interesting fact obtained from State department of mines statistical division concerned the use of 1.09 pounds of explosives for the production of every ton of coal.

In 1949 a total of 48,766,255 pounds of explosives—24,383 tons—was used. This tremendous amount of black powder, dynamite, and other permissible explosives is believed to equal the total amount of powder used during the entire Revolutionary War.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in summarily dismissing General MacArthur creates a situation that causes deep concern to all thoughtful citizens. That he had the legal right to do so there is no question in my mind. However, I doubt the wisdom of his doing so at this time and in the manner in which he did so. This is no time for precipitous or impetuous action.

The situation is so involved that I think an opportunity should have been afforded for the fullest consideration and study. To that end, I think General MacArthur should have been requested to return and permitted to express his views based on his long and intimate knowledge of far-eastern affairs. For this reason I am fully in accord with a complete investigation of our military and foreign policy and an opportunity for full expression by General MacArthur of his views. I want the American people, as well as their Congress, to be fully informed.

On the basis of such facts as I now have, I am of the opinion that the President has committed a grievous error. It seems to me that his action in dismissing General MacArthur at this time plays right into the hands of the Communists and those nations, supposed to be our allies, who have recognized Red China and continued to ship strategic materials to them, that could and probably have been used against our boys fighting in Korea. When you consider that we have 250,000 men there at this time, and have had 60,000 casualties, as compared to a small handful from a few other nations of the United Nations, and no support in the way of men from upward of 45 nations, members of the United Nations, then I think our policies should be determined with due regard to our own interests and not those of nations who have contributed so little to support us in Korea.

The time has come when the lid should be taken off and the American people fully advised of what is going on—why our boys are called upon to die, and, whether our Nation is a party to the appeasement of Red China; I want the fullest possible disclosure of all the facts. Then our people and their Congress can determine, on the basis of such facts, what our course should be. In the meantime, I shall endeavor to be circumspect in word and act, and I will continually seek to ascertain every available fact pertinent to the entire subject.

President Truman Shocks and Injures the United States Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, never before since I have been a Member of Congress, have I known the citizens in my district in Kentucky to be shocked so profoundly as they were on yesterday when they learned the sad and tragic news that President Truman had peremptorily removed Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command of our troops in the Korean War and his position in occupied Japan. Citizens of all walks of life and members of both great political parties in our district in Kentucky were so stunned that it temporarily stopped and paralyzed the business life of various communities, and I have been informed by reliable persons that congregations and town meetings were held, groups were gathered together upon the streets, and almost a universal expression of protest went up against this sudden action of the President of the United States.

The people of America know that General MacArthur has made an outstanding success of the occupation of the island of Japan. They further know that this has cost the United States taxpayers very little money as compared to the outlay of billions of dollars of American money in the European theater since the close of World War II.

The average American citizen also knows that mainly through the efforts of General MacArthur and his wise and

humane administration of our affairs in Japan since the fall of that country near the end of World War II, a great spirit of friendliness and cooperation has spread throughout the nation of Japan toward America. General MacArthur has been a wise administrator, he has built up good will, confidence, and respect among the Japanese people for the American way of life, for freedom and liberty and the worth of the individual. Nowhere in the world has a greater contribution been made upon behalf of free governments in their struggle against communism, dictatorship, and oppression, than MacArthur has made in Japan.

His sudden removal by our impetuous President leaves America with no man that can fully and adequately take his place.

We were upon the verge of signing a treaty with Japan and bringing her into the society of nations upon the side of decency, Christianity, and freedom, for which our great country is struggling.

For the President of the United States to suddenly remove Gen. Douglas MacArthur from the theater of operations in the Pacific, is a great shock, not only to the American people, but to the Japanese people, and I fear that it may open the door to an encroachment of communism on the islands of Japan and among the Japanese people.

Aside from this, with America engaged in a bloody war in Korea, the action of the President of the United States has suddenly removed from our side in that great struggle, the greatest military genius that America now possesses, and a man who understands and knows more about Korea, China, Japan, the Pacific and Asiatic theater than any other man in the United States.

The argument is heard that the President removed MacArthur because MacArthur had requested and urged the use of Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa to help us fight the Korean War and to strike back at the continent of China and oppose the Red Chinese armies in China, so as to divert pressure from our own forces fighting in Korea.

When General MacArthur first suggested allowing Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Army of half a million men, helping us, the argument by the present administration was advanced that it may cause Red China to come into Korea and assist north Korea against our forces. Well, this great Chinese army that would have been glad to assist us, was immobilized and prevented from coming in on our side, and the fear of the administration and Dean Acheson that we may make the Red Chinese armies mad, proved to be just one more mistake made along the appeasement road that has been followed so often by the State Department.

Red China came in anyhow, and has been killing American boys for weeks and months.

MacArthur took the position that we should blockade the coast of Red China and prevent much necessary war materials from reaching the enemy and he advocated, if necessary, to bomb the supply depots of the enemy, and apparently was of the opinion that no victory could be had in Korea by our forces unless we used the troops available to us in the Nationalist Chinese Army, and unless we used the power we possessed to stop and destroy the enemy.

It is my opinion that General MacArthur more nearly represented the sentiment of the American people when he, in substance, made the statement that we were suffering approximately 1,400 casualties a week and that we were accomplishing practically nothing, and that we had very little hope of ultimate victory, unless he were permitted to use some of the power that we have and use some of the friendly allies that were anxious to come in and fight with us.

Some fear among the leaders of the Truman administration has been expressed that the war in Korea may spread.

The fear which I now have, after the State Department has succeeded in inducing President Truman to remove MacArthur, and after the British Government has apparently caught the ear of the present administration with their appeasement arguments, is that we can accomplish nothing in Korea, that our only hope will be an appeasing compromise which will, in substance, be a defeat for our great Nation, that our chances to retrieve anything in China will be now forever lost, and I fear that the war may indeed spread to Japan and Formosa, and maybe to the Philippine Islands.

For the past 5 years, every time any sort of appeasement has been undertaken, instead of stopping Russia and communism, it has encouraged her and she has gone forward to conquer more free peoples.

Of course, the great principles of freedom and liberty and Christianity that America stands for, is far more important than the fortunes of any man; more important than Truman or Acheson or MacArthur, or anyone else.

This great country of ours has been floundering for five long years under the incompetent and weak leadership of the present Truman administration. Long and sincere efforts have been made by many of us to bring about unity of purpose in the United States, regardless of politics, in this time of crisis.

Nothing could have happened, that I know of, that will come nearer destroying the unity among our people than the sudden and peremptory dismissal of General MacArthur from his command in the Pacific.

Where do we go from here? Will we continue to listen to England, that has been the beneficiary of many billions of American dollars and who contributed only a handful—a token force—in the battle in Korea? Will we weaken further and give Formosa to Russia and the Red Chinese, so as to insure the domination of the entire Pacific by this monstrous enemy of mankind? Will we take the advice of England and some other vacillating nations, and grant to this barbaric aggressor, Red China, a seat at the council table in the United Nations? Will we continue to fight and spend a thousand or more American lives each week in Korea, without knowing where we are going or what our ultimate purposes are?

It is a terrible thing to contemplate, a great country, in possibly its darkest hour, to be under the leadership of a weak and impetuous man like our present President.

We heard on the radio this morning that more telegrams of protest are arriving in Washington addressed to Congressmen than ever before in the history of the Western Union Co. I believe this is true, because citizens from my own district are flooding my office with telegrams protesting this drastic action on the part of the President in removing a great commander at a crucial time, and while many of these telegrams express shock and bitterness and lack of confidence in the administration, it is perfectly apparent that the American people feel that a grave mistake has been made and that something should be done about it. I am including one of these telegrams which I received this morning from my home district. It follows:

HARLAN, KY., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. JAMES S. GOLDEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the opinion of all that I have talked to regarding the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It should not have been done and some action should be taken. Evidently the wrong man was dismissed.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED G. AANDAHL
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I have given to the press and used in reply to numerous communications deploring the dismissal of General MacArthur:

A long series of events, crystallizing in the recent unfortunate MacArthur incident has disturbed the American people to Nation-wide publicly expressed indignation.

The vindication of either of the principal participants, or the chastisement of the other, is of secondary importance. The foremost question is that of maximum protection for the members of our Armed Forces on the field of battle, and the influence of what we may do on the future peace of the world.

At a moment when outward congressional expressions follow a close party cleavage, it is hard to know where political color ends and true statesmanship prevails. Political opinions should be reserved in the back of our thinking for use at a subsequent time.

Most of the Members of Congress in both parties feel that General MacArthur should be invited to return to the United States and give a report to the American people. I feel very strongly that this should be done and am fully supporting the Republican resolution.

It will be many years before we can fully measure the impact of the MacArthur dismissal on the present war, and on the future peace, and we will never be able to know it with complete exactness, because we will

not experience the result under the other condition. Calm judgment must prevail. Even then, carefully considered decision may result in drastic action.

In the dismissal of General MacArthur, we have certainly suffered an unwise loss of a colorful and able leader, one who held the respect and admiration of the Asiatic people, and who constantly exerted aggressive, forthright support of all that is truly American against the abusive wave of spreading communism.

Louisiana Is Proud of the Outstanding Career and Public Service of Col. Henry A. Rougon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article reproduced from the Pointe Coupee Banner which so vivdly describes the amazing public service for 22 years of one of Louisiana's most distinguished, unselfish, and outstanding citizens. The article is as follows:

Col. Henry A. Rougon, veteran employee of over 22 years of active service with the State, was retired by the Louisiana State Employees' Retirement System on December 31, 1950, having served Louisiana since September 15, 1928, in key positions with the department of highways, department of State police, secretary of state, and for the past 9 years as field auditor, corporation franchise tax division, State department of revenue, with headquarters in New Orleans.

From young manhood, Rougon has taken an active part in parish and State affairs and politics. A business and civic leader, he has always been on hand to accept public responsibilities. Rougon has been a member of the parish police jury from ward 8 since 1936, having served as president of that body for 8 years. He has also been a member of the Democratic State Central Committee since 1936, and is presently serving as First vice president of the Louisiana Police Jury Association of Louisiana.

His brilliant military service record is thus described in the Historical Encyclopedia of Louisiana: "Enlisted at the age of 28 on August 26, 1917, as a private in the Regular Army and detailed as a student officer to the Second Reserve Officers Training Camp at Camp Pike, Ark. Assigned to the Eighty-seventh Division, United States Army, and attached to the Personnel Force, Intelligence Section, with active military service in England and France. Due to his intimate knowledge of military science, he was later assigned with the Allied troops and received official recognition for meritorious service from the French, English, Belgian, and Italian Governments. He was a friend of Marshal F. Foch, generalissimo of the armies, and in 1927 personally represented the State of Louisiana on a diplomatic mission of good will to the Allied Nations, as the personal representative of the Governor of Louisiana and officials of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion to the Second American Expeditionary Force, and was officially received by the governments of France, England, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Luxemburg, and the territory of Germany. Colonel Rougon served as military aide and on the governors' staff of O. H. Simpson, Huey P. Long, Alvin O. King, Oscar K. Allen, James A. Noe, and Richard W. Leche. On his mission to France in 1927, he was presented by the French Republic, a special certificate of commemoration, signed by President Gaston Doumergue of France, and the military governor of Paris, Gen. Henri Gouraud. He was presented with a tableau de la reconnaissance nationale, 1914–18, by the Union Nationale des Combattante of France, the tableau representing the military leaders of the Allied nations of World War I, Colonel Rougon's picture being part of the group appearing on the tableau. He was received by King Albert of Belgium, and in the name of the Belgian Government was presented a parchment commemorating his service with the United States Army. Rougon was received by the President of France, Gaston Doumergue, and General Foch, and presented with the French Government's high military honor, The Meritorious French Legion of Honor.

The encyclopedia further records, "Colonel Rougon is one of the most beloved members of the American Legion in Louisiana, and for many years devoted the greater part of his time unselfishly, and wholly without compensation in behalf of former members of the American Expeditionary Force. He has filled many offices in the organization, and is in addition, a member of the Louisiana Society Des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars."

When Miss Margaret Wilson, daughter of the late President, visited Europe to entertain the soldiers, Colonel Rougon served as her military aide for the period of the tour. At the Allied Peace Mission in Paris, in 1927, he was the choice of the Allied Nations, by special preference, to stand between Marshal Ferdinand Foch and Gen. John J. Pershing, during the passing in review of the Allied Nations parade, and at all official military receptions held.

Rougon was drafted into service for the first and second inaugurations of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and pressed into active service with the United States Secret Service at the White House in Washington, D. C., remaining on active duty for a period of some 15 days upon each occasion.

His service with the State began in 1928 when Gov. Huey P. Long personally appointed him a captain inspector of the State police, and from September 15, 1928, to the time of Senator Long's assassination in the State capitol at Baton Rouge on the night of September 8, 1935, at 9:26 p. m., Rougon was an intimate of the late Senator. He was an eye witness of the shooting, having been only a few feet from the late Senator at the time of the assassination. Following the shooting, Rougon remained in charge of State police on duty at the capitol until the building was cleared of everyone. He was with Long when he died September 10, 1935, and on duty at the burial of the famed politician, September 12, 1935.

Colonel Rougon is an active member of many organizations. He has held membership in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks for the past 39 years, Woodmen of the World for the past 42 years, the American Legion since 1919, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Louisiana Society Des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux since 1920. He has been a fourth-degree Knight for 12 years, and a member of the Knights of Columbus for the past 16 years, and has held membership in the New Roads Lions Club for 12 years.

Colonel Rougon is joint owner with his sisters, Misses Ida and Itha Rougon of Austerlitz, Mathilda, and adjoining tracts of land, and as manager of the large plantation, has made a success of the operation of the place. Austerlitz, and the livestock farm rank among the outstanding farms of the parish. Rougon's home has been termed "the garden spot of Louisiana."

The 60-year old colonel had this to say, when queried as to what was next on his agenda: "Retired, I should say not. I am still young and in my prime, and ready to go, now that I have severed by State connection, it's my intention to devote most of my time to the affairs of my parish and State, and I expect to take an active part in politics in the coming parish election and that of the State gubernatorial primary and campaign to start during the latter part of the year."

The Civil Versus the Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include two excerpts from Public Affairs Bulletin, No. 94, published by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress entitled "The Concept of Civil Supremacy Over the Military in the United States," by William R. Tansill.

The first excerpt is a statement by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, setting forth the desirable and ideal relationship between the soldier and civilian in working out our world interests and responsibilities. Writing in Reader's Digest last October, General Bradley said:

The conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility. Military policy in our democratic America must always remain the servant of national arms. But today, amid new global dangers, neither the diplomat nor the soldier alone can lead the American people to wise international action. Both voices must be heard if the course pursued is to be realistic and effective.

The soldier can see strategic perils that the civilian might readily overlook. The soldier must not direct the civilian policy, but the civilian must never overcommit the soldier. We must never have a foreign policy that sends our Armed Forces to world tasks beyond their capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, the second excerpt from this bulletin which I wish to include in RECORD is a statement made by General Eisenhower to the Manchester Evening Leader on January 22, 1948, in explanation of why he was not available for nomination to high political office.

General Eisenhower wrote:

It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power will be best sustained, and our people will have great confidence that it is so sustained, when lifelong-professional soldiers, in the absence of some obvious and overriding reasons, abstain from seeking high political office. This truth has a possible inverse application. I would regard it as unalloyed tragedy for our country if ever should come the day when military commanders might be selected with an eye to their future potentialities in the political field rather than exclusively upon judgment as to their military abilities.

Happenings in Washington—Program No. 38

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release prepared by me, entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 38," in the nature of a report to my constituents in Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM No. 38

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

One of the most encouraging developments in recent years is the great wave of moral indignation now sweeping the country as a result of the Kefauver and Fulbright committee investigations.

The disclosures of crime, corruption, and bribery, in and out of government, have proven beyond any question, that the great majority of our citizens are on the side of law and order. They want to drive out dishonesty in public office, wherever it exists.

The impact of television on the public consciousness has been tremendous. Of course there are some who looked upon the television broadcasts as mere entertainment, but they were very much in the minority.

For the most part the decent, self-respecting citizens were shocked and outraged by the sordid story brought right into their own homes on the television screen.

It is not necessary for me to review the scandalous testimony unfolded on the witness stand before the Kefauver committee. Most of you have heard some of it or have read about it.

The question to be considered now is, What can be done about it?

That question logically splits up into four parts:

First, what can the President do about it? Second, what can Congress do about it?

Third, what can State and local government do about it?

Fourth, and most important of all—what can you—the general public—do about it?

As to the first question—what can the President do?—it has been traditional in our country to look to the White House for moral leadership.

The Presidency is a symbol of integrity, of resolute and unswerving devotion to the spirit, as well as the letter of the law and the highest ethical standards.

I have the deepest respect for Mr. Truman and the highest regard for his many admirable personal qualities. During World War II he was chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, and gained an outstanding reputation as an aggressive fighter against contract frauds and profiteering.

That is why it is so difficult to understand the protection with which he has surrounded those whose questionable, if not illegal dealings, have been brought to light by the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In the face of plain evidence that political influence and favoritism were bought and sold in the granting of loans running into millions of dollars, the President has taken no action. He has ignored demands from members of his own party that he clean house.

He has closed his eyes to the deep freeze deal, the mink coat episode, the free vacations at expensive Florida hotels, and the operations of influence peddlers who claimed close White House connections.

No word of condemnation or even criticism came from the President. He said the members of his staff are all honorable men. He insisted there was no evidence to prove they had done anything illegal.

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the RFC investigating committee, took a different view. He put it this way, and I quote:

"It is bad enough to have corruption in our midst, but it is worse if it is to be condoned or accepted as inevitable."

It seems to me that the first thing the President can and should do is to have a spring house-cleaning—and when I say house-cleaning I mean a thorough housecleaning from the top floor to the basement.

He should welcome the opportunity to rid himself of those who have betrayed his confidence and trust.

By so doing he could help restore confidence in the integrity of his administration. He could set an example of official morality for every other department of the Government.

He could strike an effective blow at organized crime and racketeering by directing the Bureau of Internal Revenue to demand the same accurate and detailed income-tax returns from racketeers as are now required from decent people.

Why should a racketeer be allowed to file a return listing "miscellaneous income" while the ordinary citizen must show the nature of his business and reveal all the sources of his income?

It has been charged that the Government has been defrauded of millions of dollars by loose handling of income-tax returns from gamblers and other underworld characters.

The President has complete power to put an end to such practices. He can order the Bureau of Internal Revenue to carry on relentless war against these chiselers and tax dodgers.

The next question is concerned with what Congress can do.

It must be remembered that Congress has no power to legislate in local or State gambling. It has jurisdiction only over rackets operating across State lines.

In the last session Congress passed a law forbidding the interstate shipment of slot machines and other gambling devices, except into States where their use has been legalized.

Federal legislation should also make it a criminal offense to place or accept bets and transmit information across State lines to be used in gambling establishments.

Such legislation must be carefully drawn so as not to impair the fundamental right of the freedom of the press in the legitimate use of sports information for the benefit of newspaper readers.

Congress should give thought to the establishment of crime investigation commission to advise on further legislation needed to wipe out the activities of interstate crime syndicates.

We turn now to what State and local governments can do. Here we reach the foundation on which we must build good, decent government.

I cannot express as clearly or as forcefully the importance of State and local law enforcement as was done by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI when he appeared before the Kefauver committee.

Here is what he said, and I quote:

"If the laws against gambling were earnestly vigorously enforced, organized gambling could be eliminated within 48 hours in any community in the land. * * *

"The local gambling czar stands at the very center of gambling in this country.

"He is the man who controls the so-called mobs, pays for or arranges for police protection and is the directing energy of the entire mob, of criminality which protects such activities in the local community."

Mr. Hoover continued:

"Without question, these local czars have common purposes and working tools, and may well have contacts with national figures in gambling. * * *

"But these same national figures are themselves dependent, in their operations, upon local gambling czars.

"If you would strike at the national ramifications of gambling, the only effective way I know to do the job permanently is to blast the foundation out from under them."

Mr. Hoover stated, and I agree with him whole-heartedly, that the law-enforcement officers of our Nation, for the most part, are honest and are anxious to do a good job. "Regardless of their personal honesty, however," Mr. Hoover said, "they are frequently powerless to act. If they are dominated by the criminal-alined politician, ruthless rackets and vice are inevitable."

From my own experience in State government I am convinced that the most successful battle against vice and racketeering must be fought at the local level.

Now, let us turn our attention to the fourth and most important phase—what can you, the general public, do?

I think it is generally understood that law enforcement in any community can only be as effective as the citizens demand.

The crime investigations will have served no useful purpose whatever if we say, "What's the use? We will always have corruption. We will always have racketeering."

In many cities definite steps have been launched for a more vigorous fight against organized crime.

But permanent results can be gained only by a new awakening of civic responsibility.

We can only hope that the citizens generally will be aroused to look upon participation in political affairs as a duty which must not be evaded or ignored.

If that condition is achieved, we can restore political management of both parties to the people.

It will serve notice that only men of character and integrity can be elected to public office. It will attract men of that caliber to present themselves as candidates.

We can drive out of power every politician who looks upon public office as a source of private profit.

We can smash, wherever it exists, the unholy alliance between the crooked politician and the slimy underworld racketeer.

These things can be done not by passing new laws, not by grand-jury action, not by the courts, but by the irresistible force of public opinion, translated into political action at the ballot box.

And when I speak of political action I am not pleading the cause of any particular party.

I have in mind the kind of politics in which every good citizen has an active part; that produces good government and promotes the welfare of all the people.

The ballot is the greatest weapon in defense of right, honor, and decency.

There are enough clean, decent, God-fearing people in the United States to destroy the evil influences that have brought us to a condition of moral depression.

But the citizen who fails to vote invites corruption by his indifference and neglect.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Federal Aid for Public School Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 28, 1951, I introduced a bill, which is Senate bill 990, which would result in the extension of Federal aid to assist in raising public school teachers' salaries. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, RELATING TO S. 990, A BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. President, on February 28, 1951, I introduced a bill which would give Federal aid to help raise public-school teachers' salaries.

For over 30 years, Congress has been considering general Federal-aid-to-education bills. I, myself, have sponsored several comprehensive Federal aid bills, but no comprehensive Federal-aid-to-education program has passed Congress; not mine or anyone else's. Yet, the need for Federal aid to education continues to demand the Nation's attention.

There are many fields in which Federal aid is needed, but I am convinced that there are five fields in which the need is most pressing. These fields are:

1. Aid for public school teachers' salaries.
2. Aid for public school construction.
3. Aid to provide funds for scholarships and loans for worthy, needy students.
4. Aid to help eradicate adult illiteracy in United States.
5. Aid to provide essential services for all children in America to protect and promote their health and welfare.

While many Federal-aid bills, which have been before Congress, were of such general nature that any or all of these needs could have been met through these bills, only a few of the bills thus far introduced have specifically provided that each and all of these needs must be met, and have provided a special means through which to meet them. It is essential that each need to be met be expressly provided in the bill, lest any State decide to use all of the funds granted for one of these purposes, or for general maintenance. Actually, the bill which the Senate passed last year, did not assure a single teacher in the United States 1-cent increase in his or her pay. It did not assure a single service to any child in the United States.

Now I voted for the bill because it was the only Federal aid bill which I had a chance to vote on, and I hoped the House would write more specific provisions into it. Let me emphasize that the need for specific authorization for specific purposes must be set forth in the bill, or else the full sum may be used for any one purpose stated. I base this statement on the decision of the United States Supreme Court in a case arising in Washington State.

The case of *King County, Washington* v. *Seattle School Board District* (263 U. S. 361), establishes the need for specific legislative allotment for each specific purpose for which funds are desired. This case grew from a special Federal appropriation board, to the State of Washington, "for education, roads, and bridges." All three purposes were named in the bill, and at first, all three purposes were equally served from the Federal funds. However, soon thereafter, the practice was started of cutting down on the sum allowed for education, and later for bridges. Finally, not one cent of the money allocated in the total fund was given for education. The board of education decided to take the case to court, and carried the case to the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled that if the State uses all of the funds for any one authorized item, it does not have to use any of the sum for the other two authorized purposes. By similar reasoning, it follows that if the bill authorizes funds for school maintenance and teachers' salaries, that the State may use all of the sum for school maintenance so as not to increase the State's appropriation for maintenance and deny the teachers 1 cent of increase.

It is not the intent, I believe, of the Members of the United States Senate, to support Federal aid for education to make it possible for any State to deny to the public-school teachers of any State, any increase in their salaries through a Federal aid bill. Yet, the only way to assure to the teachers that they will receive an increase in pay through a Federal aid appropriation, is to have the law expressly require such payments. This requirement is the basis of my bill.

Yet, judging from the action of our Congress, I now realize that while some Members may accept a general bill with specific purposes for the use of authorized funds precisely set forth, and many others would take a chance on letting the several States each allocate the funds as may be desired, that more and more Members are eager to have a chance to vote on each provision for which Federal aid is needed in a separate bill.

There is a growing feeling that each provision should be voted up or down on its own merits. I have, therefore, introduced the bill which appears to me to provide aid where it is sorely needed, to raise the salaries of public-school teachers. I can not see how the principle in such a bill can be controversial.

I had, in this bill, introduced another basic principle in relation to the distribution of funds.

I believe the funds given to each State should not only recognize the relative need of the State among the several States, but we should also serve as a means of help and requiring a State to more nearly equalize salaries within the States.

In some of our richest States today, teachers are paid less than $150; some even less than $100 a month. I am most concerned with helping raise the salaries of the lowest paid classroom teacher. Thus, the bill I am now introducing, will provide aid for just this group. As for the other four needs which I have mentioned, and I feel must be met, I believe they will be taken care of. I am happy to note that the emergency housing program bill provides aid for community facilities, including public-school construction.

Next, I note with pleasure that there are a number of bills in, already, to help provide aid for loans and scholarships for worthy, needy, American students. I think that even the American Medical Association will not, at this time, try again to stop legislation to help provide training for more doctors. Our Nation is keenly sensitive now, for utilizing and training our natural resources—human resources, I mean.

I shall, myself, later sponsor a separate bill, providing Federal aid for services, to protect and promote the health and welfare of every child in our America. Please note that I favor such aid for every child in our America, and not only for every American child, for today every child is sacred because he is a child, regardless of his race or creed, nationality or status, and every child in our America is today a great and magnificent responsibility of every American citizen.

The last of my five needs, I presume, will again be covered in a bill which I expect my good friend the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Senator KILGORE, will sponsor. He has, for several years, spearheaded the fight to wipe out adult illiteracy. I shall help him in every way I can in that fight, but today I plead for American public-school teachers and the children whom they teach. I hope that we may soon have hearings on this bill.

Development of Public Opinion on International and Domestic Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter I have received from Mr. Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs. I feel that the information contained in this letter is of such value and importance that it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR IVES: The Committee on National Affairs seeks the development and the mobilization of an informed public opinion on international and domestic questions important to the welfare of the United States.

Its officers, directors, and membership represent a wide variety of political views, and it takes no public position upon any major issue without the consent of its executive committee.

The committee is dedicated to the maintenance of the civil liberties guaranteed under the Constitution, and to international political, military, and economic cooperation among freedom-loving peoples. It has vigorously supported the United Nations, the European recovery program, the Atlantic Pact, the military-assistance program, and the exposure of the dangers of Communist infiltration in this country and Communist aggression abroad.

In implementing its educational work the committee supports candidates for national office whenever a political campaign involves issues which the committee considers important to the national welfare. Among such candidates whom the committee has at one time or another supported are a number of Members of the present Congress of both major parties.

The committee believes that it is eminently proper that the citizens of all States should help to bring home to the voters in individual States the salient facts concern-

ing the views and voting records of their candidates for Federal office, since obviously the welfare of every American citizen from Maine to California is affected by the caliber of the Members of Congress elected in each State. The vote of a Senator from Maine or a Representative from California touches the life of the citizen of New York and Florida, Illinois, and Texas as much as it does that of the citizen of the State or district he represents. Furthermore, the salaries of Members of Congress are paid by the Federal Government from the taxes levied upon all the people, not by the individual States.

The committee looks forward to devoting ever more vigorous and effective efforts to its objectives, believing that the organized activities of patriotic Americans to develop and mobilize public opinion represents a natural and desirable function in any progressive democracy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. MCKEE.

Letter of Condolence to Family of Sam Durrance From Hon. Claude Pepper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a letter written by Hon. Claude Pepper, former United States Senator from Florida, to the family of a recently deceased rural minister who had spent a lifetime preaching and administering to the needs of humble people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *March 27, 1951.*

MRS. SAM DURRANCE AND FAMILY,
Zolfo Springs, Fla.

DEAR MRS. DURRANCE AND FAMILY: I was in Washington when Sam passed away and didn't know of it until Ches just got word to me. I wish I could have been in Florida so I could have personally attended his funeral and joined the other thousands there to pay tribute to your dear husband and father, my unfailing friend, this great man for God and good, Sam.

Ches was here yesterday and was telling me about the truckloads of flowers, as well as the thousands of friends at his funeral. It was a deserved reward, for Sam has spent a diligent lifetime serving and helping other people, as you so well know. It is encouraging to believe that a man who spent a lifetime doing good, attending the sick and the imprisoned, helping the needy, comforting the sorrowing, and inspiring the discouraged, who sacrificed nearly all material possessions to his high ministry, should have come to old age with enough material possessions to give comfort and security to him and his family and to have been so wonderfully and widely loved and honored as he was. So Sam's life was fittingly rewarded and he had the kind of a monument he most cherished.

A great emptiness has come into the world for me in losing Sam. I thought he was one of the finest men I ever knew. He was one of the most eloquent men I ever heard. My memory will never dim of the speeches I heard him make in the camp and in the company of good friends when we were all happily together. Sam was the people's minister and friend. The poor were his charge and his flock. Like the Christ he went about teaching and doing good. It was for them he cared and it was they who poured out their hearts in affection and gratitude to him.

I told Ches yesterday that I regretted that somehow I had failed to get an autographed photograph of Sam. Ches said he would get a photograph if he could.

Mrs. Pepper and I want you to know that we share your sorrow at Sam's passing; that we join the host who honored him, and we will ever be among the multitude to revere and to love him.

If I can ever be of any service to you, or to any member of the family, it will be a privilege to have you call upon me.

Warmest regards, and

Always sincerely yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

Discovery of Oil in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Welcome, Podner!" published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of April 9, 1951. This editorial deals with the discovery of oil in North Dakota. I particularly invite the attention of Senators to the fact that it contains a very pleasing reference to myself.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME "PODNER"

Oklahoma welcomes North Dakota, its twenty-sixth partner, into the oil-producing fraternity and ponders the change the completion of a thousand more successful wells would make in the Sioux State.

We hope the wells will come in flowing black gold. It is too early to tell, of course. Amerada's discovery last Thursday in the Williston Basin of northwestern North Dakota is full of significance, but it must be admitted that so far it isn't as commercially important as the stock traders make it. A well producing 350 barrels of 53-gravity oil a day from 11,660 feet is hardly a gusher, even when it is accompanied by steady gas pressure.

The significance lies in the fact that the well seems to have been completed in a new horizon, one which has hitherto been found to be unproductive. The structure is said to take in considerable area in North Dakota, Montana, and the province of Manitoba, in Canada, and it will now be tested throughout, so in thousands of ranch, farm, and village homes today they are singing the petroleum hymn that begins "Praise God from whom oil blessings flow."

There is more prosperity per pint in petroleum than in any other of Mother Nature's precious possessions. There is prosperity even in the search for petroleum though not a pint is found. The free-spending exploration and drilling crews give the locales they visit something to talk about for years afterward.

North Dakota can use a little more prosperity, and the United States needs another great oil field, for we are dependent now on imports to avoid rationing of gasoline. Wheat has always been the mainstay of the State's economy. It is first in the Nation in the spring and durum varieties. But wheat has its ups and down, and there have been times when North Dakotans suffered from crop failures or low prices or both and gave vent to their disappointment in disconcerting ways. The Nonpartisan League of the period 1910–20 was one outgrowth of such a disappointment. It socialized segments of private competitive business there and spread into Minnesota, where it also succeeded in putting a governor in office. It threatened for a time to set the prairies of the Midwest on fire politically as far south as Oklahoma.

It has since almost disappeared as a separate political force, though such colorful remnants remain before the public as United States Senator BILL LANGER, of North Dakota, who defies classification as anything but a flame-spurting economic rebel on the national scene. Some of the changes the league instituted in the name of reform remain woven in the fabric of the State, such as the powerful cooperatives. Others have been discarded after trials. But every device known to the rebellious farmer to snatch him from the wringer if circumstances should titillate him remain ready for use. It will be exciting to be in the oil business in North Dakota, where such divergent philosophies as the State and the industry have are bound to clash. The oil way will finally prevail. There is nothing so soothing of passion as a monthly production or royalty check.

The rugged honesty of the North Dakotans will make a hit with the oilmen. There is no doubt about the ruggedness of the old-timers there. One has to be of good material to wear through the winters on the vast, unprotected rolling plain that is the eastern part of the State. One has to be downright tough to make a living ranching in the Badlands in the western part, or to put up with the vagaries of the big Missouri River, which flows across the State from upper Montana toward its rendezvous with the Mississippi, and the smaller but equally flood-famous Red River, which parts North Dakota from Minnesota.

Honesty comes natural in rugged people who know and respect each other. And plenty of North Dakotans know nearly everyone of importance in their State. After all, there are only 616,000 of them, or were before the oil boom hit last week. Besides, if they have a traditional leader in North Dakota, it is Theodore Roosevelt, whose ghost gallops arcund Medora, one of the Badland towns. The great Roosevelt lived there once as a rancher and a park nearby is a memorial to him. Another park marks the starting point of Gen. George Custer's ill-fated expedition against Sitting Bull and his Sioux warriers. Still a third park in the Turtle Mountains on the international boundary celebrates the continuous peace between the United States and Canada.

North Dakota is apt to give the petroleum industry a new slogan. It may break out any day with the claim to being the oil center of the continent. There will be a certain justification for it. Oil does seem to be everywhere if only one will search long and deeply enough for it. And North Dakota is the geographic center of North America. The exact spot is in Pierce County, about 50 miles west of Devils Lake.

Tulsa, the oil capital of the world, won't mind the competitive slogan. The discovery in North Dakota has also widened our importance in the industry. Most of the companies with great acreage under lease

there are directed from here. But even if they were not we would still wish North Dakotans a new oil well every day in the year and extra ones on holidays. Our word to them is: It's great to live in a State of fine people, good wheat, broad-backed cattle—and oil.

Can Security Be Socialized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Can Security Be Socialized?" written by Asa V. Call, president of the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., and published in the Journal of the American Society of Chartered Life Underwriters.

I think the article presents an issue with which we are to be faced very shortly. I have been receiving letters from mothers and fathers who now have to make social-security returns. They must sign applications if there is a maid working in the house. I have also received letters from farmers who have helpers. When we think of the thousands of persons whom the Government is going to reemploy, I believe that this article will throw light on the question whether security can be socialized.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN SECURITY BE SOCIALIZED?

Less than 20 years ago few Americans favored any part of the program now called social security—known then as the dole.

Today, however, and despite the increased need of economy in a nation committed to a vast defense program, all too few appear ready to challenge the concept of socialized security and its staggering costs. Anyone who dares do so is likely to be confronted with, "But we cannot let people starve." This supposedly conclusive response is made with the implication that it is monstrous to think of leaving to voluntary effort the care of the indigent.

In fact, however, compulsion—government or private—is the surest way to bring about mass hunger and starvation. And the surest way to abolish hunger and famine is to establish freedom, including freedom to own and bestow goods obtained by production, trade, and thrift.

How can this restrictive pattern of life be changed? Only by individuals willing to risk persecution to keep what they produce and earn, using it for themselves or disposing of it as they see fit, without regard to collectivistic notions. Americans can help by maintaining their own freedom, so that they may show what a free, individualistic people can do. They can help by opposing those who would squander our Nation's wealth in collectivistic programs, which have impoverished and degraded men since history began.

Only free persons develop the high productivity, income, and wealth necessary for generous aid. That is because freedom means opportunity, which permits development of initiative and enterprise. It also means individual responsibility, resulting in foresight, thrift, and industry. Moreover, since production and accumulation of wealth are easier as individuals specialize and exchange services, free peoples also develop the attitudes necessary for cooperation: consideration for others, dependability and honesty, open-mindedness, and the types of personality that engender good will and mutual esteem. These attitudes all make for increased output, which in turn increases capacity for mutual aid. Both the increase in prosperity and the cooperative attitudes make it easier for persons of limited talents to make a living.

Free persons progress in ability to produce, in recognition of self-responsibility, and in sensitivity to the wants and interests of their fellows. They attack the problem of hunger and want by increasing production and by developing the attitudes and institutions of self-help and mutual aid.

Forced charity is not charity at all; it is expropriation. Forced saving is not thrift, and forced cooperation is not cooperation. All are forms of slavery. Neither expropriation nor enslavement encourages enterprise, teaches responsibility, or develops philanthropy.

As the incentive to self-help is belittled and exploited, a sense of frustration and futility seizes upon both indigent and producers. They become easy prey for fakers of every sort—political, economic, medical, and intellectual—who offer utopian schemes for getting something for nothing, or who peddle miraculous cures and wondrous new revelations.

Only gradually does it become clear that compulsion is a degenerating influence; that although it can seize and restrict it cannot invent, inspire, or efficiently manage.

Freedom means exposure to competition. In a free market, producers compete to offer more and better goods and services to everyone. This competition makes it necessary for producers constantly to improve their methods in order to survive in business.

Good societies develop only as individuals gain freedom and learn to bear responsibility. Over the ages, increasing numbers of persons have realized this. They have recognized that only in freedom can they attain their full stature as human beings. Increasingly they see that only in freedom can they find increasing satisfaction for their desires and needs.

We must steadfastly keep alive the ideal of individual freedom and the means for achieving earned security, for in sober truth, there is no other kind.

Opposed to Winstead Segregation Provision of Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Winstead provision in the pending bill. It provides for a system of segregation in our Armed Forces. This, in my opinion, would be un-American in principle. We call men into the service of our country regardless of race, color, or creed. Patriotism is not and cannot be based upon the color of the skin of the soldier. Colored troops have shown in every war this Nation has been engaged in that they fight with honor and rare courage. Furthermore, we should not discredit our Nation in its fight for freedom of all peoples by any indication that we make distinctions on the basis of color in our Armed Forces. The result of such a course could seriously and detrimentally affect not only unity within our own borders but likewise diminish our influence among the peoples of the world. Therefore, I support the Price-Powell amendment to strike the Winstead provision from the bill.

Public-Opinion Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which came to me from a friend of mine in Nebraska. It has to do with public-opinion polls on some of the very important questions such as troops to Europe and the Korean situation, now being discussed by many Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Radio station WJAG, Norfolk, Nebr., completed a public opinion survey April 8, 1951. The survey consisted of three questions, originally broached on the station's noon forum program, The Voice of the People. Interest was entirely spontaneous. No prizes were offered. Questions were repeated once each day.

The duration of the survey was 3 weeks. Opinions were received through mail, personal interviews, and telephone interviews. The total responses totaled 756. Of this number, 460 were by letter, 200 by personal interview, and the remainder by telephone interview.

The tabulated results of the opinion survey were as follows:

Question No. 1: Shall we withdraw our troops from Korea and leave that country to the Communists? Yes, 46.6 percent; no, 48.4 percent; qualified, 5 percent.

(The popular qualification, stop at the thirty-eighth parallel.)

Question No. 2: Should the President or Congress have the authority to send United States troops overseas?—Congress, 69.9 percent; President, 5.9 percent; President and Congress, 15.4 percent; undecided, 8.8 percent.

Question No. 3: Should the United States send additional troops to Europe under General Eisenhower's command? Yes, 39.5 percent; no, 52.6 percent; qualified, 7.9 percent.

(The popular qualification, United States supply troops in fair proportion with European countries.)

Radio station WJAG has drawn these conclusions after completion of the tabulation of the opinion survey:

First. Persons submitting opinions by letter were more extreme; that is, more conservative or radical.

Second. Persons submitting opinions by personal or telephone interviews were by far

the more aggressive. These persons tended to favor remaining in Korea and also sending more troops to Europe. A majority personally interviewed bemoaned General MacArthur's present position; most of them feeling he and his troops were not receiving proper support.

Third. That a definite state of confusion exists within the public minds pertaining to United States foreign policy, but that the trend is definitely established for more decisions to be made by Congress. Those advocating withdrawal of troops from Korea frequently asked "Why are we there?" Others suggested withdrawal unless we fight more aggressively.

Fourth. Those interviewed complained the public was not being properly informed. Many expressed doubt that Congress was being taken into confidence on foreign issues.

A separate breakdown of the survey by sex showed no substantial change in the above percentages. Women displayed only a slight tendency to avoid conflict by returning our troops or keeping them at home.

The Defense Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relating to the defense housing bill recently passed by the Senate, which appeared in today's edition of the Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEFENSE HOUSING BILL

In ordinary circumstances it would be safe to prophesy favorable House action for the defense housing bill that has just passed the Senate. Any measure the Senate can debate in a mere 2 days, and then approve without dissent, ought to commend itself to the "other body."

Besides, this one appears to be a big improvement on similar bills passed in previous emergencies. It is more modest than the administration draft—the $1,500,000,000 it would make available in Government-insured mortgages to stimulate private construction of rental housing in defense areas is only half the amount sought. But that may not be a draw-back as far as the House is concerned, and in the bill there are many provisions of solid merit.

The bill provides, for example, that no builder could get an insured loan in an amount greater than the actual cost of the housing involved. If that seems like an unnecessary safeguard, the appearance is deceptive. During the debate Senator MAYBANK declared that in World War II builders had got loans as high as 120 percent—even 150 percent, according to Senator LONG—of the cost of the housing they were putting up. Senator DOUGLAS said some had put up no money at all and some had made money on the mortgage.

Other language would limit application of the law to those parts of the country the President designated as "critical defense housing areas." In cases where private contractors did not bid on a project within 90 days the Federal Government would be authorized to undertake it—up to a maximum amount of $50,000,000.

The need for legislation of this kind is obvious. As Senator FREAR has pointed out, something must be done when a tank plant threatens to double the population of a town like Newark in a matter of months. But it is not so obvious that the House, in its present negative mood, will see it that way.

Pacifist Stand by a Quaker, and Threat of Loss of Citizenship by Disabled Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled Two Cases Strike Sour Note, by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Washington Star on Tuesday of this week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO CASES STRIKE SOUR NOTE: QUAKER GETS 10-YEAR TERM FOR PACIFIST STAND—DISABLED SOLDIER MAY LOSE CITIZENSHIP

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Some months ago Robert Mitchener, an 18-year-old Kansas student, a Quaker of Quaker missionary parents, refused on religious grounds to register for the draft, was arrested, pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to a short term in prison.

On his release, he received a questionnaire and orders to report. He again advised the authorities of his conscientious objections. He was rearrested, charged with failing to fill out a questionnaire, to report for a physical examination, and to report for induction, tried, and sentenced to 10 years in prison.

The Constitution protects freedom of religion. The Society of Friends stands against participation in war, although it leaves individual decisions to its members.

Robert Mitchener believes war is incompatible with the teachings of Christ, and registry for the draft an act of participation in preparation for war. His mind is clear. But what of the mind of Judge Hill, who sentenced him?

Can the armed services thereby compel Mitchener to become a soldier? On the contrary, as a felon, the Army could not accept him.

Will the example deter others? Hardly. There is nothing more stubborn than a man fanatically holding a faith. The British could not compel Gandhi and every time he was imprisoned, his following increased.

Will 10 years in prison make Mitchener a better citizen?

I have never believed that conscientious objectors should be exempted from national service. But there are many services which a conscientious objector can perform.

The judge who sentenced him was a prosecutor of Japanese war criminals. He then sentenced men for preparing for aggressive war. Young Mitchener, by the same judge was sentenced for refusing to have anything to do with war.

American authorities caused it to be written into the Japanese Constitution that Japan should never have an army. So a Japanese subject to an American commander, who tried to organize a soldiery, would be acting feloniously.

No wonder the human mind is confused.

Thirty-four-year-old Cyril Claude Andersen was not a conscientious objector. He believed Nazi Germany and Japan should be stopped. He entered the American Army, became a major, and in 1947 was retired, so badly injured as to be rated a 100 percent disability case.

Mr. Andersen's father, a native of Denmark, had been naturalized in 1922. He had temporarily left his family in England. Anticipating their arrival he erroneously registered them as residents at his own Brooklyn address.

Last fall Mr. Andersen was informed that the certificate issued his mother and her children by the American consul at Newcastle in England on the ground of his father's error was not an immigration visa. Therefore he is liable to deportation.

But the law requires an American officer to be a citizen. If his citizenship claim was illegal, he was an illegal officer, and is an illegal cripple.

The law may be able to do something about the first two, but what medical science failed to accomplish the law cannot.

By admitting that he was never a citizen and applying now for naturalization, Mr. Andersen would jeopardize his status as a retired officer. He would also have to "forswear allegiance to a foreign government," which, with his broken body hung with decorations for heroic service, seems to him a cosmic joke.

In the current "struggle for the minds of men," which revolves around the relation of the individual to the state, these cases strike a sour note.

Proposed Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short but timely editorial from the Denver Monitor of April 6, 1951. This editorial pulls the rug from under those who would classify some young Americans as second-class citizens. Military service in time of war has ever been an honored and glorified service in the United States, and worthy of all citizens. Let us keep it that way.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW CASTE SYSTEM?

President Truman's action providing for deferment of college students from the draft on the basis of scholarship and aptitude tests looks like the beginning of a new caste system. Membership in this "elite" group will apparently be limited to students with above average grades.

The scholarship deferment plan is basically undemocratic—this Nation was founded on the premise that all shall have equal opportunities. Moreover, the plan is impractical since it assumes that by academic hocus pocus all the "brainy" young men can be separated from the "dummies." Albert Einstein, unquestionably one of the world's greatest geniuses, was regarded as slow and unpromising by his teachers who, if they had been asked for an opinion of young Einstein's mental ability, would undoubtedly have classified him as mediocre.

And, finally, the plan is unfair because on the one hand it places the stigma of mediocrity upon thousands of young men and tells them in effect that they're cannon fodder material, and on the other hand, it coddles a small group of untouchables as being mentally superior and therefore too good to fight.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's outstanding columnists commented this morning on the MacArthur dismissal. I should like to include their articles in our RECORD along with an editorial entitled "On the Record" which appeared in the Washington Post today. The articles follow:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE PRESIDENT AND THE GENERAL

When Taft was President and Stimson was his Secretary of War and Gen. Leonard Wood was Chief of Staff there was a very able officer with powerful supporters in Congress who disagreed sharply and profoundly with the basic military policy of the United States. That was some 40 years ago. Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth, the Adjutant General, was opposed to what was then a new development in the American Army, namely, the General Staff which in matters of policy was under the President but over all commanders and bureau chiefs.

The purpose of the General Staff, as Stimson and Bundy describe it in their book, On Active Service, was to "meet three requirements: Civilian control in the executive branch, sound general planning and constant cross-fertilization between the line of the Army and its high command in Washington."

But though General Wood was Chief of Staff, the most powerful officer in the War Department was General Ainsworth who had more friends in Congress than did General Wood. A conflict ensued over many matters. The basic issue in all of them was whether the Chief of Staff—who is called that because he is the agent, via the civilian Secretary of the President—was superior to all other officers of the Army. General Ainsworth resisted this idea and though Secretary Stimson had "once before been forced to warn Ainsworth against insubordination," it was not long before Ainsworth again took issue with the Chief of Staff "in a memorandum so grossly insubordinate that as soon as he read it, Stimson realized that the time for drastic action had come."

Stimson consulted President Taft and Senator Elihu Root who, as Secretary of War, had created the General Staff. They agreed with Stimson that discipline had to be restored and Taft said to him: "Stimson, it has fallen to you to do a dirty job which your predecessors ought to have done before you."

Ainsworth was relieved. Twenty-five years later after he had again been Secretary of War, Stimson wrote that "since the relief of Ainsworth no important challenge has been given to the final authority of the Chief of Staff, under the Secretary and the President. Even the great Pershing, field commander of the entire fighting Army in 1918, learned that in the making of long-range decisions he was subordinate to the Chief of Staff in Washington."

It has fallen to President Truman and to his Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, to do the same kind of dirty job which President Taft and his Secretary of War had to do 40 years ago. The final authority of the Chiefs of Staff under the Secretary and the President has been openly and repeatedly challenged by a much greater and more powerful man than Ainsworth. The President and the Secretary have done their duty. They have been faithful to their trust.

General MacArthur's actions are a great enigma. He challenged the President publicly, defiantly, and on issues of such moment that they concern deeply not only this Government but some 50 other governments. It is impossible to believe that a soldier of his eminence and his experience, himself a former Chief of Staff, himself a commander of armies who must know the importance of discipline, cannot have known that he was challenging the authority of his lawful superiors.

What, then, did he believe would be the outcome if he persisted, and indeed made his challenge to the President ever sharper? Can he have failed to realize that either he would have to be relieved or that the President of the United States would have publicly to abdicate the substance of his whole authority in the issues of war and peace? General MacArthur must have known that there was no third course, one of compromise. He must have known it because the President has tried compromise for over a year. But General MacArthur himself has in fact taken the position that the issue could not be compromised.

The question, therefore, is whether General MacArthur chose to force the President to relieve him—or whether he thought from what he had seen during the past year that the President would give in and would take his orders from Tokyo.

A plausible case can be made for either of these theories. Neither can as yet be proved. But this much is certain: General MacArthur deliberately narrowed the choice and meant to force a showdown with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East. He did that by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him and submitting to him.

MACARTHUR'S POSITION

(By Marquis Childs)

MARTYRDOM VERSUS WAR WITH CHINA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following column was written a few hours before President Truman relieved General MacArthur of his command.)

Future historians of the present era, if anyone is left to write history, are bound to find some puzzling contradictions in the days we are now living through. How they will finally explain the Republican position on the controversy over Europe or Asia, peace or war, it would be interesting to know.

During the debate on the issue of troops for the North Atlantic defense command, Republican Senators warned in ominous language of the dangers of a military dictatorship. To give the Commander in Chief, and through him General Eisenhower, the right to determine whether additional divisions should go to Europe without the approval of Congress would be to surrender the preeminent right of civilian control over the military. Even such ordinary sensible men as Senator MORSE of Oregon fulminated on this theme.

Yet now they support apparently without any reservations a commander in the field who has decided to establish a new policy in the Far East. Actually, of course, it is not a new policy.

What General MacArthur said in his letter to Representative MARTIN is what he has said repeatedly to almost every important visitor to Tokyo in recent years. Many of these visitors have come back ardent advocates and agents of the MacArthur policy. In recent months they have brought ever greater pressure to reverse the United Nations-Truman-Marshall-Acheson policy, which is for limited war restricted to Korea, in favor of all-out war against Communist China.

General MacArthur seems to have decided that the time has now come to bring this out into the open and force the issue. That is shown even more clearly in Russell Brines' latest dispatch from Tokyo. The Brines dispatch, inspired at the highest level, declares that officers on MacArthur's staff are sure that his views are increasingly popular back home. Therefore, he can have what he has apparently meant to have from the beginning—a full-scale war in Asia.

Here is an extraordinary situation. One can feel the deepest sympathy and understanding for MacArthur's position as a military commander who sees an offensive being built up from a privileged sanctuary. As a professional soldier, loyal to the American tradition of civilian authority over policy, the general has the choice of carrying out the orders he is given or resigning his command.

In a full-scale war against Communist China the United States would have no allies in Asia or the Middle East. Perhaps this would not be important for the immediate future in view of the military deficiencies of these countries.

What would be vitally important is that the common front of western nations against communism would be cracked or shattered. Great Britain probably would be brought into a war against China by the force of events. But we would have reluctant and unhappy allies in the west in such a war.

MacArthur's staff may be right about public opinion in this country although how they make this determination from a distance of 7,000 miles is hard to see. Surely, however, they cannot understand the depth of feeling in the rest of the Western World.

Canada is a significant example. Next week 6,000 Canadian troops are due to sail for Korea. These men had their basic training in Canada and their combat training at Fort Lewis in the State of Washington.

They are the only sizable reenforcement for the UN army that is now in sight. Those who know Canada say that if these troops sail to what appears to be a war in China rather than in Korea, there will be a very angry reaction in Canadian public opinion. Support for the MacArthur policy of a showdown with communism in Asia rather than in Europe is said to be negligible to the point of being nonexistent in our neighbar to the north.

If we look candidly at what has been happening here at home, we must admit that in important areas the soldier has been supplanting the civilian as policy maker. It may be argued that military policy is superior to civil policy. But a conflict between the two, dividing Americans at home and estranging America's allies abroad, is intolerable.

With his innate predilection for the dramatic, accentuated by the frustrations and the slights he felt in the last war, MacArthur is determined to come home—when he comes home at last—as hero and savior. He seems now, however, to have decided that if he canot be a savior, he will at least be a martyr.

ON THE RECORD

The confidential documents released by the White House in conjunction with the announcement of General MacArthur's recall afford full proof of the President's conclusion that the Far East commander "is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations." They show, indeed, that the general had persistently thwarted those policies, and, judging from the climactic interview with Secretary Pace, intended to maintain and even prosecute his defiance. In the circumstances, his removal from command was inescapable if civilian authority was to prevail over military rule.

Three stark facts emerge from the documents. The first of these is that General MacArthur repeatedly violated the President's directive that statements relating to the political implications of the far-eastern war be cleared first in Washington. Such breaches of discipline would have been tolerated on the part of no other officer—and could no longer be tolerated on General MacArthur's part without a complete abdication of the policy-making function by the President.

The second plain fact disclosed by the documents is that General MacArthur himself—not the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff—was responsible for the failure to rearm South Korean military forces. The Joint Chiefs sent to General MacArthur a proposal to provide a very considerable supply of rifles, submachine guns, carbines, and automatic rifles, together with stocks of ammunition, in order to increase the number of South Korean troops by 200,000 to 300,000 men. The general, having his own ideas about expansion of the war to areas outside Korea, rejected this proposal, urging that the available arms be used to equip the National Police Reserve of Japan. From the point of view of effective prosecution of the Korean War, this disagreement as to policy was profoundly significant.

The third and most important of the revelations was that General MacArthur deliberately forestalled United Nations diplomatic overtures for a settlement of the Korean War by the wholly unauthorized issuance of a truce proposal from his own headquarters—a truce proposal couched in such terms as to be manifestly unacceptable to the enemy. The general had been advised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the State Department was planning a Presidential announcement to the effect that the United Nations was ready to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. General MacArthur, instead of responding to the Joint Chiefs, issued a public statement on his own initiative, using in part the very language contained in the proposed Presidential statement—and adding to it words which made diplomatic negotiation impossible. Thus the diplomatic demarche had to be withdrawn. This was insubordination of a most mischievous and disingenuous kind. The general's continuance in command, after that action, became a menace to American and United Nations policy.

Does the President's Policy Offer Hope of Peace in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems that no act of the President has created more interest upon the part of citizens than his abrupt dismissal of General MacArthur. I am including as part of my remarks, with the consent granted by the House, an editorial appearing today in the News, of Washington, D. C., entitled "A Policy Without Hope." It reads as follows:

A POLICY WITHOUT HOPE

President Truman last night called the war in Korea a struggle for peace, but his speech was in fact a defense of appeasement.

He said the Communists in the Kremlin are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world.

But his only answer to that threat was a limited war in which a ruthless enemy will continue to enjoy all of the advantages of initiative.

He implied that the peace-loving nations had united to defeat aggression in Korea. But that is not the case. The United States has 250,000 ground troops in Korea. No other member of the United Nations has more than 5 percent of that number there. Most members have contributed nothing.

This is not collective action against aggression. It is little more than the action of a single Nation—the United States. And our own part has been less than wholehearted, for our troops have been sent into battle with restraints on their freedom of action.

That is no way to win a war, and nothing Mr. Truman said offered any hope of winning the war.

SITTING DUCKS

Mr. Truman said the whole Communist imperialism, headed by the Soviet Union, was behind the attack on the peace in the Far East.

There can be little doubt about that.

The best chance of stopping this aggression without what he termed "a general war," the President said, "is to meet the attack in Korea and defeat it there."

That was General MacArthur's position, too.

But our limited military efforts are not calculated to defeat this attack, and that is where Mr. Truman and General MacArthur parted.

"There are signs that the enemy is building up his ground forces for a new mass offensive," Mr. Truman acknowledged. But he did not say that the United Nations forces are being reinforced to meet this attack, for that is not being done.

Because of this neglect the UN forces, awaiting the enemy attack, are like sitting ducks.

This was one of the major issues between the President and General MacArthur.

Nothing the President said last night offered any alternatives to any of General MacArthur's recommendations.

Meanwhile, quite contrary to Mr. Truman's view that "men all over the world who want to remain free have been given new courage and new hope" by what he called our "resolute stand in Korea," our Government has lost prestige everywhere by its procrastination and indecision.

Nine months ago, 52 of the 59 members of the United Nations supported military sanctions against North Korea. But by the time the Chinese Communists intervened in the war we could not muster a corporal's guard in the UN to vote similar sanctions against them. Beyond Greece, Turkey, Nationalist China, and the Philippines, what nations can we count on today to support a forthright stand against aggression in Asia?

THE ENEMY BASES

The President touched on the crux of the immediate issue when he tried to explain why our forces have not been allowed to bomb the enemy bases in Manchuria and China proper, where the Reds are organizing for the spring offensive.

To do so, he held, might lead to a general war.

If the war in which we are now engaged is not a general war, it is at least a major war. Our casualty lists prove that.

But if it is a third world war the President is thinking about, would not a defeat in Korea, which we are inviting, be more likely to lead to such a war than a show of determination and strength? Weakness usually prompts attack. That was General MacArthur's view when he urged that we hit Red China so hard that it would stop asking for trouble.

"What would suit the ambitions of the Kremlin better than for our military forces to be committed to a full-scale war with Red China?" Mr. Truman asked. We would say, an appeasement policy which would give the Kremlin what it wants without fighting, as the British are eager to do in the case of Formosa.

But bombing enemy bases in Manchuria need not lead to a full-scale war. The moment Red China backed out of the war our bombers could be recalled. No one, certainly not General MacArthur, has urged use of American ground troops in Manchuria.

THE UN'S PRINCIPLES

Mr. Truman said our major objective is to achieve a settlement in Korea which will not "compromise the principles and purposes of the United Nations." What principles?

The United Nations has a standing offer to discuss paying blackmail to buy peace with Red China. What kind of settlement would be more immoral?

This cowardly proposal cannot be defended in the name of peace; nothing could be better calculated to encourage Red aggression than a policy of rewarding aggression.

Finally, Mr. Truman reverted to the subject of collective security. The fighting in Korea, he said, is proving that "collective action among nations is not only a high principle but a workable means of resisting aggression."

Any soldier in Korea knows better.

No nation but our own has given more than token assistance in this war. A roll call of the troops in Korea will show that. And because of that, public confidence in the principle of collective security is being destroyed.

Yet the President's speech gave the impression that he actually believes the war in Korea has the united support of the United Nations.

Shadow and Substance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 10, 1951:

SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE—A STABLE DOLLAR IS INFINITELY MORE IMPORTANT THAN CHEAP MONEY POLICY, WHOSE PRINCIPAL VICTIM IS THE SAVER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Congressman HOWARD BUFFETT, of Nebraska, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, recently raised a very important point that is usually overlooked by orators who specialize in denouncing the "bad old days" before the coming of the New Deal. In a message to his constituents the Congressman drew a startling comparison between losses through bank failures and losses through inflation.

"Remember the bank closings up to 1933?" he wrote. "And all the money people lost in busted banks? For years those losses—a real tragedy—were favorite campaign oratory of New Dealers. Large as those losses were, they were peanuts compared with the losses now being forced on United States savings-bond holders. During 1950 alone United States savings bonds lost $3,600,000,000 in purchasing power. By contrast, all losses by bank depositors from 1921 through 1933 totaled $1,900,000,000."

ALL FORMS OF SAVINGS AT STAKE

This is a forcible illustration of the grave illusions which are sometimes fostered in the name of state provision against want. The validity of many of the means of promoting individual security which have become popular during the last two decades—social-security benefits, pension funds, artificial supports for high farm prices and high-money wages—is inseparably linked with the stability of the dollar. This is equally true for those who have tried to assure their own security by saving money, or by purchasing life insurance or investing in Government and private bonds and stocks.

When there is steady erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar through improvident Government finance and a steady increase in currency in circulation and bank holdings of Government securities an investor must run very fast, indeed, if he is not to remain in the same place, or even fall behind.

LOSS IN BUYING POWER

Take the case of a man who, in 1941, paid $7,500 for savings bonds, on the promise of the Government to pay him $10,000 in 1951. He can claim his $10,000 now. But they are not the same kind of dollars that he invested 10 years ago. Although the interest he received by holding his bonds to maturity works out at 2.9 percent annually, his $10,000 today is worth less, in terms of almost anything he might wish to buy, than $7,500 was worth 10 years ago. And the Federal and perhaps the State tax authorities take a substantial cut of his illusory paper gain of $2,500.

An investment of $7,500 in reasonably well-selected common stocks would have probably doubled in value during the 1941–51 period and would have given a much higher annual yield. This fact should not be considered an argument for a general stampede into common stocks on the part of inexperienced investors. The law that whatever goes up must come down has often found painful application in the case of stock, real estate, and other speculative values.

FIGHTS INFLATION

The savings bond is an intrinsically desirable form of investment. It makes for a wide distribution of the public debt. The money that is used for the purchase of savings bonds is withdrawn from circulation and from the chase of dollars for goods. This is certainly a worth-while objective when the prospective heavy increase in spending for military purposes will strengthen inflationary pressures.

However, it seems doubtful whether a high level of purchases and holding of savings bonds can be maintained by exhortation and advertisement alone. The amount of these bonds sold to the public increased enormously during the war years, 1941–45. There is a danger that, if holders are dubious about their long-term value, we may face a situation of "bonds bursting in air"; of large amounts of these bonds being cashed, with a consequent heating up of the inflationary boiler.

Congress has now authorized continued payment of interest on these bonds for a second period of 10 years after they fall due. One wonders whether this meets the fiscal needs of the situation. The individual who may be hesitating whether to cash his bonds or renew them for another 10 years may take a pad and pencil and engage in figuring. He may wonder whether, just as 1,000 1951 dollars are unequal to 750 1941 dollars in real value, the same may not be true of 1,333 1961 dollars, compared with 1,000 of the present vintage.

TAX-EXEMPT ANNUITIES

Apart from broader measures designed to combat inflation, the Treasury could make the savings bonds more attractive by giving them, perhaps with some limitation as to amount, tax-exempt status.

To insist, as the Treasury has been doing until there was a recent modification of policy, on maintaining cheap money and an artificially low yield on Government bonds at the expense of enhancing inflationary pressure is indeed to sacrifice substance for shadow. The stability of the dollar is infinitely more important than the day-by-day quotation on Government securities. Steps to insure this stability should include a constant war on waste and appropriate credit restrictions, along with a more realistic attitude, designed to attract investment by private individuals in Government securities.

General MacArthur Insists That He Complied With All Directives and Did Not Disobey Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, those who defend the action of President Truman in dismissing General MacArthur do so in many instances by the claim that General MacArthur was guilty of insubordination. On this subject an article appearing in today's issue of the News, Washington, D. C., sheds considerable light. In accordance with the consent granted to me, I include the article as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

OBEYED ORDERS, MACARTHUR INSISTS—COMPLIED WITH ALL DIRECTIVES

TOKYO, April 12.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur today indirectly contested the charges that led to his dismissal and insisted he had complied with all Washington's directives on the Korean War.

Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, the general's closest adviser, issued a formal statement setting forth for the first time General MacArthur's views on the arguments cited by President Truman in firing him as Supreme United States and UN Commander.

"The general feels that he has complied meticulously with all directives he has received, not only recently but throughout his entire military service," General Whitney said.

He said General MacArthur did not believe he had exceeded his authority either in his March 24 offer to discuss a military truce with the Communist commander in the field or in his controversial letter to House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN on possible use of Chinese Nationalist troops.

WITHIN HIS RIGHTS

"The general has interpreted both * * * as dealing exclusively with the military situation and within the area of his uncontested authority to speak," General Whitney said. "The one bore not the slightest relationship to the other."

General Whitney issued the statement after announcing that he had requested retirement from active duty in order to accompany General MacArthur on his departure from Japan.

General Whitney said he was issuing the statement to clarify news dispatches from the United States referring to President Truman's directive of December 6. That warned no public statements should be issued on foreign policy without clearance by the State Department.

NOT A GAG

"The directive of December 6 was not directed to General MacArthur personally, but * * * to all executive agencies of the Government," he said.

"Immediately after its receipt, General MacArthur submitted a proposed communique to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who informed him, among other things, that it was not necessary to submit military communiques referring to military operations. * * *

"Furthermore, the directive of December 6 (by its terms and spirit, was interpreted at this headquarters as applying solely to formal public statements and not to communiques, correspondence, or personal conversations with others."

Moreover, he said, President Truman denied at a press conference, January 13, that there was any curb on General MacArthur's authority "to speak freely on the Korean War."

ON ROK ARMY

General Whitney also referred to the exchange between General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on organizing, training, and arming additional South Korean Army units.

General MacArthur recommended against it when early "conditions indicated the possibility of evacuation," he said.

"Subsequently, when our initiative had been reassumed," he said, "General MacArthur * * * authorized a 25 percent increase in each Republic of Korea division.

"It was obviously quite beyond the capability of this theater to arm and equip 500,000 more Koreans. Their utilization, therefore, became a matter of political policy under the global military assistance program," General Whitney explained.

Amendment of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the constitution of the United States

"Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States reads in part as follows: "The Congress * * * on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States"; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Iowa, in view of the increasing tax problems of the State, caused in large part by the invasion of tax sources by the Federal Government, believes that its problems as well as the problems of other States similarly situated, can be solved only by some restraint upon present unrestrained exercise of the taxing power by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is using and has been using for a number of years the taxing power to produce revenue beyond a legitimate necessity of a Federal government, other than defense needs, and has been using the funds so raised to invade the province of legislation of the States and to appropriate in many fields that which amounts to a dole to the States of the money raised therefrom to accomplish many purposes, most of them worthy, but by the described process making the money available only under conditions which result in a control by the Federal Government from centralized agencies in Washington, in many cases unfit, and in other cases unable to administer the laws according to the local needs because of varying conditions in the country as a whole; resulting in inequities in the administration of the very benefits purported to be granted; and

"Whereas State and local needs are disadvantaged because the people are already taxed far beyond the real need for any purpose other than forcing the centralization of all government in Washington; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States clearly foresaw the possibility of a condition similar to that herein described, and made provision in the Constitution for safeguarding the States against any oppression or invasion of rights by the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Iowa*, That said legislature, hereby and pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the proposing of the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The power to levy taxes and appropriate the revenues therefrom heretofore granted to the Congress by the States in the several articles of this constitution is hereby limited.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall be in effect except during a state of war, hereafter declared, when it shall be suspended. The suspension thereof shall end upon the termination of the war but not later than three months after the cessation of hostilities, whichever shall be earlier. The cessation of hostilities, may be declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by concurrent action of the legislatures of 32 States.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of article V, this article may be suspended for a time certain or amended at any time by concurrent action of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

"'SEC. 4. There shall be set aside in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund into which shall be paid 25 percent of all taxes collected by authority derived from the sixteenth amendment to this Constitution, except as provided in section 5, and 25 percent of all sums collected by the United States from any other tax levied for revenue.

"'SEC. 5. There shall be set aside in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund into which shall be paid all sums received from taxes levied on personal incomes in excess of 50 percent thereof and from taxes levied on income or profits of corporations in excess of 38 percent thereof.

"'SEC. 6. Before paying any sums into the funds created by sections 4 and 5 hereof, the Treasurer of the United States shall deduct therefrom 20 percent which shall be used in payment of the principal of the national debt of the United States.

"'SEC. 7. No tax shall hereafter be imposed on that portion of the incomes of individuals which does not exceed, in the case of unmarried persons the sum of $600 per annum, and in the case of married persons the sum of $1,200 per annum jointly. A minimum deduction of $600 per annum shall be allowed for each dependent.

"'SEC. 8. The Treasurer of the United States shall once in each year, from the separate fund created by section 4 hereof, pay to each of the several States one-fourth of 1 percent of said fund and from the remainder of said fund shall pay to each State a portion of such remainder determined by the population of each State in ratio to the entire population of the several States according to the latest Federal decennial census or any subsequent general census authorized by law.

"'SEC. 9. The Treasurer of the United States shall, from the separate fund created by section 5 hereof, pay to each State, once in each year, a sum equal to the amount of money in such fund which was collected from persons or corporations within such State.

"'SEC. 10. Any sums paid hereunder to the several States shall be available for appropriation only by the legislatures thereof. The legislatures may appropriate therefrom for any purpose not forbidden by the constitutions of the respective States and may appropriate therefrom for expenditures within the States for any purpose for which appropriations have heretofore been made by the Congress except such purposes as are specifically reserved by this Constitution for the exclusive power of the Congress. The people of each State may limit the expenditures of funds herein made available to the legislature, but shall not direct the appropriations thereof.

"'SEC. 11. Each legislature shall have power by rule or resolution to provide for the assembly thereof in special sessions for the purpose of considering amendments to, the suspension of or the ratification of amendments proposed to this article.

"'SEC. 12. Each legislature shall have power to elect one or more persons to represent such legislature in any council or convention of States created by concurrent action of the legislatures of 32 States for the purpose of obtaining uniform action by the legislatures of the several States in any matters connected with the amendment of this article.

"'SEC. 13. The Congress shall not create, admit, or form new States from the territory of the several States as constituted on the 1st day of January 1949, and shall not create, form, or admit more than three States from the Territories and insular possessions under the jurisdiction of the United States on the 1st day of January 1949, or from territory thereafter acquired without the express consent of the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"'SEC. 14. On and after January 1, 1949, the dollar shall be the unit of the currency. The gold content of the dollar as fixed on January 1, 1949, shall not be decreased.

"'SEC. 15. Concurrent action of the legislatures of the several States as used herein shall mean the adoption of the same resolution by the required number of legislatures. A limit of time may be fixed by such resolution within which such concurrent action shall be taken. No legislature shall revoke the affirmative action of a preceding legislature taken therein.

"'SEC. 16. During any period when this article is in effect the Congress may, by concurrent resolution adopted by two-thirds of both Houses wherein declaration is made that additional funds are necessary for the defense of the Nation, limit the amount of money required by this article to be returned to the several States. Such limitation shall continue until terminated by the Congress or by concurrent action of a majority of the legislatures of the several States. Upon termination of any such limitation, the Congress may not thereafter impose a limitation without the express consent by concurrent action of a majority of the legislatures of the several States.

"'SEC. 17. This article is declared to be self-executing'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That attested copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress and to each Member of the Iowa delegation in Congress, and that printed copies thereof, showing that said concurrent resolution was adopted by the Legislature of Iowa, be sent to each house of each legislature of each State of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this application hereby made by the Legislature of the State of Iowa shall constitute a continuing application in accordance with article V, of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States shall have made similar applications pursuant to said article V; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That since this is an exercise by a State of the United States of a power granted to it under the Constitution, the request is hereby made that the official journals and RECORD of both Houses of Congress, shall include the resolution or a notice of its receipt to the Congress, together with similar applications from other States, so that the Congress and the various States shall be apprised of the time when the necessary number of States shall have so exercised their power under article V of the Constitution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That since this method of proposing amendments to the Constitution has never been completed to the point of calling a convention and no interpretation of the power of the States in the exercise of this right has ever been made by any court or any qualified tribunal, if there be such, and since the exercise of the power is a matter of basic sovereign rights and the interpretation thereof is primarily in the sovereign government making such exercise and since

the power to use such right in full also carries the power to use such right in part the Legislature of the State of Iowa interprets article V to mean that if two-thirds of the States make application for a convention to propose an identical amendment to the Constitution for ratification with a limitation that such amendment be the only matter before it, that such convention would have power only to propose the specified amendment and would be limited to such proposal and would not have power to vary the text thereof nor would it have power to propose other amendments on the same or different propositions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Iowa does not, by this exercise of its power under article V, authorize the Congress to call a convention for any purpose other than the proposing of the specific amendment which is a part hereof; nor does it authorize any representative of the State of Iowa who may participate in such convention to consider or to agree to the proposing of any amendment other than the one made a part hereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That by its actions in these premises, the Legislature of the State of Iowa does not in any way limit in any other proceeding its right to exercise its power to the full extent; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress, in exercising its power of decision as to the method of ratification of the proposed article by the legislatures or by conventions, is hereby requested to require that the ratification be by the legislatures.

"HERMAN B. LORD,
"LEO ELTHON,
"EARL C. FISHBAUGH, JR.,
"X. T. PRENTIS,
"W. ELDON WALTER,
"CHARLES S. VAN EATON,
"PHILIP T. HEDIN."

We, W. H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate,
W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.

For GI's: Ham 'n Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, any improvement in the necessarily unpleasant life of the GI is good news, and I am glad to report that field rations are taking a turn for the better.

Yesterday's New York Times reported as follows:

NEW FOR GI'S IN FIELD: CANNED HAM AND EGGS

VINELAND, N. J., April 10.—Seabrook Farms, near Bridgeton, is venturing on something new—canned ham and eggs for GI's in the field. The Department of Defense announced the award of the contract. For Seabrook, which also is in the frozen-foods business, the ham 'n eggs is something new. The eggs will not be the powdered variety, at which GI's turned up their noses during the last war, but scrambled whole eggs. The ham will be chopped.

The company also won a contract for beef and vegetables for the Armed Forces. The products will be part of a "five-in-one" ration replacing the old K-ration. It will provide 4,000 calories a man for five men for one day.

The Venice Maid Co., of Vineland, has received a contract for spaghetti and meat balls, for the Armed Forces, adding more variety to the field menu.

It is a pleasure to report that my district will be contributing ham and eggs, beef and vegetables, and spaghetti and meat balls in lieu of the old K-rations.

On the same day that this article appeared, Mr. C. F. Seabrook, the founder and president of the famous Seabrook Farms, the largest freezing and processing plant of its kind in the world, was honored by leading citizens throughout New Jersey at a dinner in Princeton for his outstanding contributions to agriculture and food processing.

General MacArthur's Distinguished Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussion that has taken place concerning the act of President Truman in dismissing General MacArthur, no question has been raised or denial made that General MacArthur has had a distinguished career as a soldier.

An article by Oland D. Russell, Scripps-Howard staff writer, appearing in today's issue of the News, Washington, D. C., in few but sufficient words sets forth the general acknowledgment of the distinguished career of General MacArthur. It reads as follows:

MACARTHUR PROMISED TO STAY "UNLESS"

(By Oland D. Russell)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur once said he would stay in Japan until his task was completed, unless he was called away by some "extraordinary occurrence." The extraordinary has occurred. He will be home soon.

Biographers use mostly superlatives to describe his meteoric career: Graduated from West Point with the highest scholastic and military standing in history, youngest division commander in World War I, "the greatest field commander produced by the war" (Newton D. Baker), youngest major general, youngest ever to serve as superintendent of the Military Academy, youngest Chief of Staff, at 50.

Planner and executor of the most brilliant campaign of World War II, "one without a flaw" (Gen. George C. Marshall), leader of first foreign armed force ever to invade Japan, his landing there in the face of several million organized and armed Japanese "the outstanding accomplishment of any military commander during the war" (Winston Churchill). "With the full realization of our Pacific victory, you have been its principal architect" (Henry L. Stimson).

As Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, he was clothed with the highest exclusive responsibility ever entrusted to an American officer overseas. As virtual ruler of 70,000,000 people his new role raised him from the field of military science to international statesmanship. In a swift flow of directives to the Japanese Emperor and Government, he set about to transform a feudalistic, medieval Oriental people into a democratic nation.

To the Japanese people he became a liberator rather than a conqueror. They all but deified him. A Tokyo paper once had to remind the populace that he was not a living god. He gave them a new democratic constitution, drastically revised their way of life, and by the end of June 1950 he could look back on another of his many jobs well done.

Then came Korea, and he took over a new task, when he was 5 months past 70 years old, to command United Nations forces, almost altogether American, first defensively, and then offensively, against full-scale Communist attack. The Inchon landing behind the enemy, "the most masterful and audacious strategic stroke in all history" (Admiral William Halsey). "A miracle" (Gen. Omar Bradley). The push to the Manchurian border, then Chinese Red intervention in overwhelming numbers, driving our forces again below the thirty-eighth parallel to an unending stalemate, his hands tied because Washington and the UN denied him authority to bomb the Chinese bases in Manchuria for fear of risking a war with the Chinese Reds he was already fighting.

On that and allied issues—his insistence on use of Chinese Nationalist troops to open a second front against the Reds, and on his contention that the main threat of Russia to the free world must be met in Asia rather than Europe—the Truman-MacArthur differences flared to an inevitable showdown which came yesterday at the White House, the long-ago-forecast extraordinary occurrence.

Operation Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a brilliant address by that outstanding national vice commander of the American Legion, the Honorable Lewis K. Gough, before the spring rally banquet, department of South Carolina American Legion, in Columbia, S. C., on March 20, 1951.

Mr. Gough speaks as a distinguished veteran of the recent conflict. He speaks the thoughts and the feeling of this fine organization. His thoughts are timely and pertinent to the discussion of UMT and preparedness in general.

I want the entire Congress to have the opportunity to read the remarks of this outstanding young Californian:

OPERATION SURVIVAL

(By Lewis K. Gough)

My fellow Legionnaires and members of the Auxiliary, it is a real pleasure being with you again in South Carolina. I have had the privilege of partaking of your justly famed southern hospitality before in frequent visits to the South, and it is particularly enjoyable to be with you this first day of spring and on such a beautiful day.

I regret that I am going to have to inject a sober note into this pleasant gathering. However, I am going to speak to you on a grim subject—that of operation survival. I am not speaking abstractly about survival of freedom-loving people everywhere or even of the people of America. I am talking about us—you and me—the people of Columbia

and Charleston, and the people of Pasadena and Santa Barbara. We are in a struggle for our lives—to the finish—now. If we lose—as a nation, as a free society, as a people, we die. If we win we may live in peace.

Lenin has said the only safe enemy is one whose power has not just been defeated but destroyed and annihilated, and if his disciple Stalin is successful we will lose forever. Our margin of safety is less than you think.

I am speaking to you today on the basis of information made available to me as your representative on frequent visits to our Nation's Capital. I have had the opportunity of hearing first-hand from leaders in Congress, in the State Department, in the military, and I shall endeavor to give you an estimate of the situation as of the present moment.

It is most difficult to speak on a situation which is ever changing, and the mood in Washington reflects the material changes in world conditions from week to week. Last December there was a wave of despair in our Nation's Capitol which no longer exists. The mood has changed so much that our Congress seems to have lost its sense of urgency.

Let us think back to December for a moment. The Chinese Communists were on the offensive in Korea where we had just experienced our first Gallipoli or Dunkerque and another seemed to be pending. The fall of Indochina seemed imminent as the Chinese Reds massed at Nanning on their southern border. Indications pointed to communistic offensives in Germany or Yugoslavia, or both, in the spring of 1951.

The thinking of the State Department in December seemed to be that we would face our period of greatest danger in the immediate future. They seemed to feel that the relative superiority of arms between the Soviets and this country was at its peak, and the imbalance was already starting to decline. They seemed to feel that war was a definite possibility in 1951.

It must be recognized, however, that the thinking of the military leaders in December represented a consistent attitude in that they felt that our greatest danger would be when the Soviets had achieved a strategic stockpile of atomic bombs, adequate transportation facilities, and the necessary oil to conduct a global war.

Let us analyze this further for a moment. Strategic stockpile means just what it says, not a balance of one for one, but rather a sufficient number of A-bombs to be able to retaliate effectively against our centers of production if we should loose the A-bomb on them. Our very knowledge of such a stockpile would be a deterring factor of our use of the bomb in their opinion.

During 1950 the Soviets put top priority emphasis on production of transportation facilities. In the 5 years prior to this their emphasis was on the hardware of war—the tanks, the artillery, the ammunition. And they put twice as much steel into this hardware in this period as did we, a Nation five times greater in steel production. The switch in emphasis came because they had achieved the superiority they desired in such tactical items, but they needed locomotives and trucks, and intelligence tells us now they will have their adequate stockpile by the end of 1952.

Oil is a necessity for any war machine, and the most tragic news we have heard for our hopes for peace in a long time was the announcement a few days ago of the recent nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian oil industry in Iran which starts tipping the tank toward Russia. The Soviets have worked for this for many months through the Tudeh subversive organization in Iran, through which the Communist phase one is being actively furthered. This phase is the subversion, treason, infiltration operation which has been so effective in other countries and leads to phase two—the violence and police-state methods. And it is entirely possible that the Soviets will have the oil they need from the great oil center of Iran in the near future.

On the basis of the above the Pentagon leaders seem to feel that our period of greatest danger is still ahead.

Why, then, has there been such a change in the general attitude in our Nation's Capital; First and foremost, the Soviets themselves have eased the tension until war does not seem as imminent in March as it did in December. Since December our resolution has become more apparent. The Korean War is now going well. European rearmament is starting to move. Last month Washington signed $5,000,000,000 worth of arms contracts, which is double the December figure. The draft bill and UMT are meeting less opposition than was anticipated. A major factor relates itself to the atomic explosions near Las Vegas, Nev., where we pulled up the corner of the curtain just a bit and lowered it before the Soviets could have a real look. We let them know that we had sufficient A-bombs to test them in number whenever we desired, and that further tests would be held this summer. We implied that we had tactical atomic weapons as well as strategic weapons far superior to those previously developed. This must have had a terrific impact on the Soviet planning, and they purposely relieved the tension which existed in December and asked for negotiations in a Four Power Conference.

And so it seems immediate war is not as imminent. However, global war is still definitely possible any time with present tensions as they now exist. The most optimistic view is that if war can be averted these tensions will continue for many years to come, during which time we must build and maintain power to deter the aggressor or to fight if war should come. These will be years of partial normalcy for us—of austerity and frugality beyond precedent, which we must accept with individual patriotic willingness.

Our present policy of firmness may avert war, but a real danger will arise if Congress should allow itself to be lulled by Soviet strategy and lose its sense of urgency. This would slow up our program as each point is argued and would undermine the very program which now gives us such hope. It is as self-evident in March as it was in December that if immediate war is averted we must have speed and effectiveness in matching a firm policy for peace with adequate power to implement it effectively.

Such a firm policy must embrace realistic conditions for peaceful coexistence with the Soviets as its No. 1 objective. We of the American Legion believe the emphasis must be on averting war, and the objective of preparing ourselves to fighting a war if it comes should always be secondary. In averting war we must end the arsonist's ability to continue to light fires around the Communist periphery. We must roll back the power of world communism by dismantling police and slave states until they are no longer puppets, and through effective inspection and control of arms, atomic and otherwise.

We will have to win one of two conflicts, either the ideological or the military, and until we do we will live in dread, with our youth in uniform, spending seventy billions per year and upward, and without the normalcy we love. We have been losing the ideological war through apathy and lack of understanding of the problem. This is evidenced by the fact that in 1945 the ratio of communism to democracy was but 1 to 9 in our favor. But 5 years have passed—years based upon the decisions arrived at in Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran—years which felt the influence of Alger Hiss, Remington, Dr. Fuchs, and Henry Wallace. And now the ratio is 5 to 4 in favor of the Communists.

Let us now make a quick estimate of the situation to help us with our own thinking. In such planning we first must establish our appreciation of the objective, and I should like to tell you what the Communists say that communism is, and I quote from their own publication, Pravda: "The nature of our program is not mere talk, but is an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. Our objective is world revolution, our ultimate aim is world-wide communism. Our fighting preparations are for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship."

We were so naive in 1939 when Hitler in Mein Kampf told us of his intentions, and those of us that served in the ETO know how close he came to making good his boasts. Now Stalin is telling us in "Lessons in Leninism" that it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should exist side by side over a long period of time with imperialistic, capitalistic democracies—ultimately one or the other must conquer. He tells us further that the only way the final test may be averted is for the United States to surrender in the face of ever-growing socialistic encirclement.

To give you a conception of our task, let us consider forces available and forces opposed. Lieutenant General Gruenther and others, in appearing before our last session of Congress, told us that the Soviets had 14,000 combat planes in operation to our 6,000, that we were producing only one-twelfth as many planes on Korea day as we were on Pearl Harbor Day. The Soviets have 175 army divisions to our 17, and we possess but 44 divisions among the democracies. Our great Navy is gradually emerging from its moth balls, but the Soviets have 300 submarines, including 70 type No. 21, Snorkel undersea craft. The Soviets have made great strides in developing their magnetic 8-mile target-seeking torpedoes. We said in 1945 that we will need no more tanks and we let many rot and rust, or destroyed them. At present we have but 7,000 tanks to 45,000 for the Soviets, of which 700 of their's are the Mark III Joseph Stalin superheavy, and we have no heavies. Both countries have atom bombs. Our superior strategic stockpile has been a great deterring factor. It is interesting to note that Russia has expended 18 percent of her per capita income for her armed services in the last 5 years and we spent 6 percent for the same purpose—and Russia never demobilized as we knocked our Armed Forces apart with a hammer, literally speaking.

As already pointed out, we produce five times as much steel as Russia, but she has put twice as much steel into war hardware as we have since 1945. Russia possesses the advantage of a tremendous fifth column and we do not.

This strength-in-being implements the Soviet program of world conquest. Their main objective is to dominate the minds of men throughout the world. Their tool is communism, a versatile and effective plan which they sell in the name of peace, unity, and individual prosperity, and those that buy this package deal learn too late that they have bought mass slavery instead. Their successes are due largely to our weakness and appeasement. We started a trend with our withdrawal at the Elbe in 1945 that has not been reversed since, and the American Legion continues to urge that the very term "appeasement" must be stricken from the lexicon of American diplomacy as we make ourselves strong and respected.

One of the most encouraging signs recently has been the great awakening of our citizens for at last they have become awake, alert, and aroused. Through compulsion of events they have taken a more vital interest

in foreign affairs than ever before in recent history. A year ago this Nation was in a mood of fatalism close to helpless despair. We feared we had lost the ability to control our own destiny. With our awakening we are still despondent, but no longer do we carry our despondency to the point of a hopeless defeatism. We are beginning to speak up. We find we are still freemen. We will not be carried blindly where others direct. We will control our own destiny. In this rebirth of determination there is a new source of strength. If freemen think, speak, and act resolutely we may still be able to ward off the evils of war, and we will be more effective in the fighting if it comes. As General "Ike" has said: "One hundred and fifty million freemen can accomplish practically anything if they put their mind to it."

With this awakening the administration has suddenly discovered that the people disagree with many policies of their leadership. This is a fact that they must recognize. We must have no "red herrings" now.

As our people become aroused and shed their apathy and the administration feels the weight of their opinion, we may still be able to prevent the cycle of man of which Tom Payne speaks when he says: "Man lifts himself from subjugation and slavery to liberty and freedom, from there to opportunity and prosperity from which he declines to luxury and apathy and finally to subjugation and slavery." Americans must have a sense of urgency—an awareness of personal dedication and a blazing faith if we are to escape this cycle—as we have been in the luxury and apathy stage for the past 5 years.

This year of our Lord 1951 must be a year not only of reexamination, but of decision. The hour is late. The year of decision should have been made in 1945 when we had adequate power to implement our policy. It was then we should have had realistic decision plus adequate power to make it effective. Instead we chose the soft, easy road, the road of weakness and appeasement, the road of Neville Chamberlain or a Stanley Baldwin. We thought we could buy friends and security. We took refuge in our possession of the atom bomb. When we learned the enemy had this awful secret, we found our solace and comfort in the strategic concept of long-ranged bombers, atomic weapons, guided missiles, and push-button warfare; and as we enjoyed our luxury and apathy we had our business as usual, our politics as usual, and a lavish standard of living. John Foster Dulles was so right when he said: "We have made all the mistakes we can afford to make and still survive." Our first step in reexamination is a comprehensive all-inclusive study of our national purpose in world affairs. Our foreign policy and its implementation must have top priority above all else in our interest, for the decisions we arrive at affect our country's future and the fate of the world.

A very encouraging sign is the sincere, earnest, and useful attempt to reexamine our policy in the recent talks of many of our national leaders. They are giving us basic principles of grand strategy to consider. This is good as long as it remains above personal and partisan levels. Their points of view differ you say—but the differences are more constructive than confusing and there are certain key points that stand out from all their talks in which they are in agreement. These are:

1. We must have no more appeasement.

2. We need effective deterrence to Russia's armed aggression. We must rely on our power to deter and we must have the kind of military power which can retaliate effectively against Russia if the Red army marches in Europe and which can deny to the Soviet Union the use of anything which they might conquer, by destroying it and keeping it destroyed.

3. We want all the allies we can get who are willing and able to fight but we want to know now who will stand up and be counted. We do not intend to carry any excess baggage with us in this life and death struggle.

4. We must have full speed ahead in accelerating our war potential. Time is the most fragile of our strategic weapons.

5. We will rely on the United Nations to provide our goals providing it shows requisite moral courage.

Korea has moved up the time table for Russia. The purpose of our intervention there was to prevent a general war—on the assumption that the Soviets would not face the calculated risk of a general war beginning in so unstrategic an area. We assumed that Korea was the first step in the long program of aggression which, if continued, would lead to a Munich-like situation. Our assumptions were probably correct then. We were probably being tested. However, as Korea fighting disclosed the true extent of American disarmament, weakness and unpreparedness, the Politburo concluded it was willing to risk a general war after all as it pressed the button for the Chinese Reds to enter the fray. Consequently, Russia greatly contracted the time table of her immense imperialistic program. Our trouble in Korea stems not from having gone too far—but rather we did not go far enough soon enough with firm, resolute, definite decision, implemented by adequate power to make it effective. As usual our sins are those of omission, not commission. We cannot seem to learn that as Winston Churchill says (and he says so much in such few words): "The weakness of the virtuous permits the malice of the wicked."

Indochina may be Russia's next one-alarm fire. To take this country would round out the Kremlin's triumph in Asia. We hear that our fighting force in Korea is tying up the Chinese Communists best fighting force, which postpones interventions in Indochina, but the situation there is tense and dangerous. Recent intelligence tells us that a Chinese liberation army of 250,000 is now at Nanning just above the border. This army, with its heavy equipment, plus Ho Chi Minh's 100,000, would mean the same imbalance of power contrasted with the 150,000 French Vietnam forces that caused our difficulty in Korea. Recently the French were forced to close their consulates in Kunming and Canton so that they may no longer observe. A Soviet air mission landed this month in Hainan with modern planes, including jets, which soon may be transferred to China's Reds. We have noted recent changes in propaganda of the Nationalist Vietminh forces which no longer are "exclusively Nationalist," but Ho himself, a long-time friend of Mao, who controls Red China (they were together in the Cominform in Moscow for their early training), is quoted as telling of the glorious advantages of Indochina being liberated by their friends the Chinese. We hear that non-Communist Nationalists are being liquidated from the Vietminh forces.

With the imminent fall of Indochina, Siam, Burma, and Malaya will soon follow. Indochina is the olive in the top of the bottle and the other countries of southeast Asia with their deplorable economic and political conditions provide the troublesome waters where the Communists like best to fish.

This spring is critical in view of the perils that surround us. While the French, British, and United States are occupied in Asia, Stalin may take advantage of this diversion to light the four-alarm fire by striking into Western Germany and Yugoslavia before the West can build the force that is now on paper. I know if I were Stalin and had his disregard for human life, I would risk the atomic bombing of civilians, realizing the results of such bombing on dispersed military targets and dispersed technical forces probably would not be decisive. The imbalance of power will probably never be more favorable to Stalin. Maybe he is thinking of just this, as we hear that the bridges of East Germany and the Balkans are being reinforced to take his heavy tanks. Thirty Soviet divisions are available for immedi te action in East Germany with artillery and mechanized units attached. Four thousand planes and six thousand tanks are stationed in this area. Perhaps, however, he may plan to use the Poles, Czechs, and East Germans for a Korean-type action with Russian support against our weak defensive divisions.

Why, you ask, has he not marched already in Europe? I concur with Churchill that the atom bomb as retaliation has been a strong deterring factor. Also, he undoubtedly considered we were stronger than he now knows us to be. Also, Stalin has been doing well so far without having to resort to force as is so evident graphically if you look at the map of the world in 1945 and now.

In view of all these considerations a lack of feeling of urgency in Washington is alarming. The weight of expressed public opinion must be felt at once. The No. 1 weapon now as in the past for world peace is informed, expressed public opinion. Without citizens recognizing their individual responsibility in a democracy we have government by default as the organized vociferous minority will predominates. This was evident in the year just past when approximately 80 percent of our people who preferred universal military training could not obtain it because the articulate minority prevented such legislation. Informed, intelligent, patriotic American citizens on the basis of reexamination must achieve decision and action. For 32 years the American Legion has been dedicated to this purpose.

Germany and Japan are major factors in the world situation. These two nations were bulwarks against the expansion of the czarist regime of Russia in their imperialistic designs. The same two nations prevented the Communists from expanding in the same manner, but then in 1945 we destroyed first Germany and then Japan, and then in 1946 we destroyed our own power. What has happened since was inevitable.

There are four major industrial areas in the world today. These are, in order, the United States, Soviet Russia, the Ruhr of Germany, and Japan. If we should lose these areas to the Communists, either through phase one, subversion, or phase two, violence, we would lose the balance of power industrially speaking, perhaps irretrievably.

In the East we have committed ourselves to defend Japan in a defensive line which extends from Japan through Okinawa, Formosa, to the Philippines. In the West we must defend a line as far east as the combined thinking of our statesmen and military leaders think is feasible. The thinking of Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, Marshall, and Clay must be given much weight in arriving at this very important decision. The trouble spots at the present to watch carefully are Iran, Indochina, Japan, Germany, and Yugoslavia.

On the basis of the foregoing the American Legion presents "operation survival" as a program to bring us peace by compulsion. First and foremost, we must have a systematic mobilization of all armed forces in sufficient degree to meet the immediate peril. This must be done on an enduring basis as quickly as training facilities and materials will permit.

Secondly, we must have universal military training to provide trained manpower for the long-range pull. No longer must we go from the valleys to the peaks in our national preparedness with each world crisis. Such a policy has forced us to fight a war on the average of every 20 years of our national existence. The full force of the Legion and the Auxiliary is fighting this moment for

UMT in our Nation's Capital, and in our fight we will not compromise on our long-established principles that UMT must be civilian controlled. It must have adequate safeguards for education, religion, science, and industry, and it must have a mandatory provision to make it effective when selective service expires to adequately deal with crises of the future.

Third, we must have industrial mobilization sufficient to give us strategic stockpiles of all essential materials as soon as possible.

Fourth, we must strengthen our internal security through strict enforcement of the Communist-control law, to destroy the Communist beachheads within our midst. We must intern the known Communists now as 1 day after war is declared, if such there be, will be 1 day too late to deal with this fifth column, without parallel in world history.

We must curtail or eliminate every possible public and private nonessential expenditure. This means achieving proper priority of expenditures at top level. We must put first things first; henceforth, American dollars must be fighting dollars. Years of austerity and frugal living are ahead if we are to avoid national bankruptcy.

Fifth, last but not least, in our strategy for peace we much achieve rearmament not only militarily but spiritually as well. In the early days of this country our founders and forefathers, our builders and defenders, asked and received guidance, inspiration, help and strength from God in achieving a great Nation. Now too many of us have forgotten our faith. There are veterans among us who found religion so naturally in their fox holes, in liferafts and parachutes, and many have forgotten as well. We must return to God in our daily lives as the firmest basis in solving our problems, which today as before, are beyond human achievement to work out alone.

The Bible tells us peace is not to be obtained by merely saying peace, peace, when there is no peace. The Bible realistically says, "Be strong and acquit yourselves like men." The Bible, in St. Luke 11: 21, tells us, "A strong man armed keeps his palace, his goods are at peace." We should be proud of the shining armor that we wear as modern Christian crusaders—the last defenders of a way of life brought to us by Christ himself, defending against the pagan philosophies of communism that deny the very existence of Christ and all his teachings. This is the real struggle for God and country—the very precept of the American Legion.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 12, 1951:

HIGH-SCHOOL PUPILS HEAVILY FOR UMT—STUDY REVEALS A TREMENDOUS PROTEST AMONG SENIORS OVER SCHOLARSHIP DEFERMENTS

High-school seniors, selected as a random sample by the board of education's division of educational and vocational guidance, favor adoption of universal military training by as much as 8 to 1, Dr. Morris Krugman, an assistant superintendent, announced yesterday.

Addressing the New York City Welfare Council's unit on vocational guidance at the McBurney Young Men's Christian Association, 215 West Twenty-third Street, Dr. Krugman, who is in charge of guidance programs, said that the seniors favored UMT over the present Selective Service System.

Dr. Krugman said the study was conducted in six senior high schools and that the 8-to-1 vote was given in an academic high school, where a detailed analysis of 125 seniors' opinions had been made. He added, however, that in general the students favored universal military training. Further proof of this, he said, is that students intend to enter colleges with Reserve Officers Training Corps units.

Dr. Krugman reported that comments made by the students showed a tremendous protest against deferments for superior college students.

Col. Candler Cobb, city director of selective service, said that high-school students were pretty safe from induction even if the proposed bill to draft 18-year-olds was passed.

ONLY ONE IN FIVE FEELS FUTILITY

Dr. Krugman noted that 80 percent of the students in the survey said they were studying either harder or as diligently as they had been before the present emergency. Only 20 percent indicated they had a sense of futility in their work.

Both students and educators are confused by the ever-changing draft regulations, Dr. Krugman said, adding that this confusion makes it difficult to give students adequate educational and vocational guidance.

Despite the world situation and the emergency mobilization here only 30 percent of the students were mildly or severely disturbed by events. The other 70 percent indicated no anxiety, Dr. Krugman reported.

In the academic high schools superior students are neither discouraged nor are students leaving in droves as some reports have indicated, Dr. Krugman said. Even average students in academic high schools are not leaving. However, in vocational schools, where promises of good jobs and pay are beckoning, more pupils are leaving as soon as they have developed a skill, Dr. Krugman said.

Korean Policy in for Censure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

KOREAN POLICY IN FOR CENSURE—GOP DETERMINED TO PRESS ISSUE AGAINST TRUMAN AND TO SEEK REMOVAL OF ACHESON AND OTHERS

(By David Lawrence)

Six years ago today Vice President Truman took the oath of office as President—and now a substantial number of Republicans in party conference are talking about presenting a resolution of impeachment and trying him before the Senate of the United States.

The charge would be that Mr. Truman violated his oath of office by carrying on a war in Korea against China without the consent of Congress. The Constitution specifically says that only Congress may declare war.

The Republicans are determined, first, to investigate all phases of foreign policy as well as the circumstances surrounding the removal of General MacArthur. They are determined also to press in due time for the impeachment and removal of Secretary of State Acheson and any other officials who may be implicated in what the Republicans feel is a betrayal of the Nation's interests in Korea and the Far East.

An impeachment resolution requires a majority vote of the House of Representatives. Removal requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Obviously at this time, with the apparent line-up of many Democrats on the side of Mr. Truman, there are not enough votes as yet to impeach. But the Republicans will carry the issue to the country and in the next several months attempt to line up enough public sentiment to compel many of the Democrats in Congress to break with the President, or run the risk of themselves being beaten at the polls on an emotional issue.

For the whole Korean policy will come in for censure. Why, it will be asked, were 250,000 American boys sent to fight in Korea without authority of Congress and to suffer more than 55,000 casualties while the commander of the armies there was forbidden to prosecute the war effectively against the enemy?

Mr. Truman's action in ousting General MacArthur will accentuate the underlying issues—appeasement of communism in the Far East while resisting it in Europe. Some of the consequences that may follow from the President's sensational step are the following:

1. The Japanese people may become alarmed and fearful of Communist infiltration. The Communist Party there will be encouraged, for it was General MacArthur who really held it in check.

2. The Nationalists inside China will become discouraged and will feel that resistance against the Communists now is futile.

3. The British Labor Government and particularly its left wing will be stimulated to criticize American policies in the future and will step up its demand for a recognition of Communist China, admission of the Communist regime into the U. N., and the turning over of Formosa to the Communists.

4. Russia will feel that the United States Government is weak and irresolute, and Moscow may go ahead with plans to start trouble in other areas—pressing harder in Iran and Yugoslavia and perhaps renewing its pressure on Turkey.

5. Appeasement will be denounced on all sides, but nevertheless a truce involving a compromise will be offered to the Communist Chinese. This could virtually nullify all the sacrifices made by U. N. troops and particularly by the South Koreans, who now fear they will be turned over for massacre to the Communist authorities.

6. Demands will arise for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Korea on the theory that their effectiveness as a fighting force has been impaired because no authority is forthcoming to bomb Manchurian bases or use Chiang Kai-shek's troops to aid in opening a second front in Asia as MacArthur advocated.

7. Domestic political strife will be intensified. The issue will not remain narrow, as the administration may wish to keep it—that is, focused on the simple question of whether a military man did or did not obey orders. It will be broadened to force a showdown on the views held by General MacArthur on far eastern policy.

8. An explanation will be demanded by the Republicans as to why General Ridgway was permitted to express political views on the whole far eastern political situation within the past few weeks and was promoted after his utterances. He told the press that the United Nations might well stop at the thirty-eighth parallel and achieve victory. He discussed highly controversial questions relating to U. N. policy. Was this cleared first with the authorities in Washington?

9. No committee of Congress hereafter will dare to question any military officer without the feeling that it is not getting the facts or the true judgment of the witness. Instead, only one viewpoint will prevail—that of the party in power.

10. An appeasement program could mean a third world war in a year or two, just as Munich in 1938 was followed by the outbreak of war in 1939 after Hitler had concluded that the Allies were divided and America would not fight.

These are but a few of the many effects that may ensue as the National Capital is rocked by one of the most emotional crises in many years—something that will not end with the ouster of General MacArthur but only at the polls in 1952. And all of this might have been avoided if Mr. Truman had called General MacArthur back for consultation, had given him a chance to express his views face to face, and then asked him point blank whether he wished to be relieved of his command or accept the Truman policies without further discussion. This would have been more statesmanlike than dismissing a general and announcing it first to the press of the world without even an opportunity for conference.

Certainly Douglas MacArthur deserved more consideration from the Government under whose flag he has fought so long and so valiantly.

The Impact of Mobilization on the Constitutional System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Prof. Clinton Rossiter, Cornell University, speaking at the afternoon session of the spring meeting of the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor, New York City:

THE IMPACT OF MOBILIZATION ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Life in the United States in the twentieth century seems to have been, as an amateur historian once remarked, "just one damned thing after another." The conditions under which the American system has been operating ever since 1914 have been those of emergency rather than routine, strife rather than stability, tension rather than serenity. Threat of war, war, inflation, deflation, boom, panic, depression, recession, industrial conflict, threat of war, total war, inflation, industrial conflict, and cold war with hot flashes have followed one another in bewildering succession. Four decades of crisis have left many Americans convinced that there is nothing quite so normal as abnormality.

The effects of these years of emergency upon our social, economic, and political institutions have been profound, so profound indeed that some thoughtful people are wondering out loud whether what Karl Popper calls the "open society" has the stamina to survive in a world that seems to have gone permanently mad. Our task today, as I understand it, is to do some "wondering out loud" ourselves: to take stock of our situations as of April 11, 1951; to list those changes now being worked in our system by this most recent emergency, mobilization; to recognize the threats to freedom inherent in the methods and values of the garrison state; and to put our minds at rest, but not to sleep, about the capacity of a free United States to survive this extended crisis.

The sources and characeristics of this most recent emergency are too familiar to bear repeating. Our decision to mobilize and to build up our defenses was the result of a reluctant judgment that an imbalance of power among the great nations would exist for an indefinite period, and that we had best be ready for anything up to and including all-out war. The present emergency can therefore be described as "watchful waiting." We are in for who-knows-how-many years of guns and butter at home and a "respectable posture of defense" abroad.

Watchful waiting has already worked several notable changes in our constitutional system. In some instances this has meant the acceleration or redirection of a trend already under way, in others the creation of an entirely novel arrangement or problem. But in all instances the electric touch of emergency can be clearly felt. I should like to call the briefest sort of attention to the most important results of these months of mobilization for the Presidency, the administration, Congress, the Supreme Court, the parties, the Federal system, and the Constitution itself.

The Presidency: An axiom of political science to which all history votes support is this: Emergency in the life of a constitutional state inevitably brings an increase in executive power and prestige, always at least temporarily, more often than not permanently. The past 18 years have constituted one of the great historical meridians of the Presidency, and not just because Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman liked to think of themselves as "strong presidents," men who like Jackson, Lincoln, and T. R. were jealous guardians of their legitimate prerogatives. Because of war and depression the Presidency is a visibly more potent and complex instrument of democratic Government today than it was 20 or 30 or 50 years ago.

Mobilization and cold war have certainly done nothing to reverse this trend. It might almost be said that Mr. Truman now takes for granted many powers and arrangements that Mr. Roosevelt recognized as strictly emergency in character and purpose, for example: the rich deposit of laws designed for Presidential use in war and emergency that has been building up in the United States Code for 160 years; the effective merging of the President's activities as Commander in Chief and as Chief of Foreign Relations, with the obvious result that his position in each of these areas has been strengthened considerably; and the President's participation, as the most interested third party imaginable, in the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

The most momentous change of all, one tnat has been especially pronounced in the Truman incumbency, even more pronounced since June 1950, has been the progressive "institutionalization" or "pluralization" of the Presidency. Ever since the establishment of the Executive Office of the President in September 1939, the most interesting fact about the Presidency has been the growth of that complexity of offices and officials that today includes the Bureau of the Budget, the National Security Council, the White House Office, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Resources Board, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and a flying squad of formal and informal advisers. The Presidency, looked at as a working instrument of government, is no longer a one-man job; or rather, the Presidency remains constitutionally a one-man job only because there are a thousand or so persons in and around the White House, 30 or 40 of them operating at the very highest level, with the one purpose in life of helping the President to execute his own responsibilities. We will be shrewder observers of events in this period of mobilization if we will think and speak of the Presidency rather than of the President. For many paramount purposes the office has indeed been institutionalized and pluralized, and the citizen who observes Truman alone—and not Wilson, Acheson, Harriman, Eisenhower, Barkley, Steelman, Bradley, Murphy, Lawton, Symington, Keyserling, and the rest—is getting a blurred picture of our great executive institution. The conjunction of mobilization, which has thrown a hundred new burdens on an already overburdened President, and Mr. Truman, who knows how to delegate authority as well as any President in history, has accelerated this development to a noticeable degree.

The administration: The impact of mobilization on the national economy has raised up two major problems in public administration. I use the word "problems" rather than "effects" or "changes" advisedly, for it is not at all clear what their outcome will be. The most that I can do in this instance is to indicate that certain developments are under way. I would hardly dare or care to predict that they will continue indefinitely along the lines already being followed.

The first point to be noticed about the national administration under the stress of the past 9 months is that the machinery of mobilization—the offices and agencies through which we hope to stimulate production, allocate short supplies, distribute manpower, control prices, handle labor disputes, and in general produce all the guns and all the butter we could possibly require—seems to be better organized and better directed than the complexity of emergency agencies that performed these functions in World War II. I must confess that I, like any good citizen, have my full share of trouble following the lines of responsibility that head up through Mr. Wilson to the President himself; and I must confess, too, that it often seems that we are making mistakes and experiencing confusion that we were sure we were not going to have to tolerate again. Yet there are many hopeful signs, at least of an administrative nature: the forthright manner in which Mr. Truman has delegated his own authority over the home front primarily to one man, and has made him the nearest thing to an assistant president we could possibly want; the way in which Congress has left the President pretty much alone in his efforts to shape up an organization for mobilization, principally by refusing to establish an independent agency like OPA; and the vital fact that ODM is a truly parent and directing authority, as OEM, Mr. Roosevelt's paper holding company, was not.

The second problem cast up in our laps by the troubled waters of a combined war-peace economy is the perplexing and still unresolved conflict between the Secretary of the Treasury, an official directly responsible to the President, and the Federal Open Market Committee, an appendage of a statutorily independent commission, over the ticklish question of support of the market in Government bonds. Political scientists have always wondered just how independent the independent regulatory commissions really were, and the tempest they blew up in early February was made to order for classroom discussions.

Unfortunately but not unexpectedly the conflict was resolved in no clear-cut fashion, and we must wait the usual decent period to know what passed among the President, Mr. Snyder, Mr. McCabe, Mr. Martin, and the other principals. The administrative lessons we can learn from this passage-at-arms, which was clearly a product of the strain of mobilization upon an already inflated economy, would seem to be these:

First, the independent commissions—FRS, ICC, SEC, FCC, FPC, FTC, CAB, and NLRB—are not as independent of Presidential solicitude as the theory nourished by *Humphrey's Executor* v. *U. S.*[1] had led us all to believe. Second, when an independent commission exercises authority in an area in which the President is vitally interested, even constitutionally responsible, we cannot expect him to let it go its own independent way. And, third, Congress would therefore be well advised in establishing and empowering such commissions to confine them to functions that are in fact no concern of the President's. If a commission is to be legally independent, it must first be factually independent. We should not forget that in this instance the Federal Reserve System was dealing, as was its statutory right and duty, with an issue that mobilization had made equally the President's right and duty. Under the circumstances of mobilization conflict was inevitable.

Congress: The pressures of the present emergency have initiated or redirected several interesting developments in the organization and methods of Congress. The National Legislature seems determined to make the best of normal abnormalcy, to give the lie to those skeptics who insist that the one clear duty of a legislature in time of international tension is to emulate Brer Fox ("he lay low") and Tar Baby ("she ain't sayin' nuthin' "). Quite the contrary, Congress is riding high and saying plenty. Mr. Truman himself gave the Houses a left-handed but nonetheless effective compliment in his press conference of March 1 when he remarked that the debates in Congress might have a very ill effect on the success of our foreign relations. To the President's credit, it should be added that he acknowledged without qualification the right of Members of Congress to make any number of speeches on any number of subjects. Had he been asked, ex-Senator Truman would doubtless have added that the committees and subcommittees of Congress could make any number of investigations on any number of subjects in the area of mobilization, something that the specially created Maybank committee (Joint Committee on Defense Production) is just beginning to undertake in force.

Certainly the great debate, however sure the dispatch of additional troops after General Eisenhower's return and report, has been a healthy affair. Our last two Presidents have been far too cavalier in their pre-war diplomacy, and it was high time that Congress, even if it has lost all final choice whether to declare war or not, be at least consulted on the major steps that might lead to war. The debate in the Senate and out of doors brought millions to the realization that the dispatch of several divisions of citizen soldiers to Europe for an indefinite period of watchful waiting was something quite different from the dispatch of a boatload of Marines to repay an insult to an American consul by the aroused citizens of a banana republic. Congress may henceforth insist that on occasions of this moment—when the very future of the Nation is at stake, and when there is plenty of time to consult the two Houses and their leading committees—it have, like the Queen in Bagehot's the English Constitution, "the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn." The single-house or concurrent resolution could well become a vital factor in the future conduct of American foreign affairs. If used with tact, vigor, and frugality, it should strengthen rather than weaken the President's necessarily dominant, but not necessarily absolute, position as Commander in Chief and chief of foreign relations.

[1] 295 U. S. 602 (1935).

Another healthy departure has been the brilliant defense of the Federal Reserve System by several outstanding Senators of both parties. If the independent commissions are to maintain their independence, their first line of defense must be intelligent support in Congress. And the beginning of intelligence in this delicate political and administrative problem is, as I have already indicated, a recognition of the legitimate interests and responsibilities of the President of the United States.

The congressional ledger is unfortunately loaded with the usual array of debits. Political scientists, who suffer gladly the professional disability of boundless naiveté, probably never will understand why Congress is so remiss in the matter of self-improvement. We will never understand why something can't be done about the filibuster, lobbies, roll calls, the seniority rule, the burden of the District of Columbia, overbearing investigating committees, inadequate staffing, private bills, logrolling, lack of party discipline, and a system that forces all but the toughest or safest Member to be something quite remote from Burke's idea of a national legislator. Above all, we will never understand why the gentlemen who grieve most openly about the "designs of the encroaching Executive" are the very same gentlemen who block or vitiate those reforms that would raise the level of legislative efficiency to a point where Congress could begin to make good some of the pretensions of its chief defenders. Congress will do more leading when it is organized to lead. It is primarily for Congress to decide how important Congress is going to be in the garrison state.

Our other major institutions—the Supreme Court, the parties, the Federal system—may be disposed of briefly. The Court seems destined to go on indefinitely as an extremely negative factor in the decision of the great constitutional and political questions that the emergency keeps tossing up. The nature of the present crisis, the make-up of the Court, and the heavy-handed precedent of such World War II cases as *Korematsu* v. *United States*, *Steuart and Brothers* v. *Bowles*, *Woods* v. *Milier Co.*, and *Yakus* v. *United States* lead me to predict with some certainty—and this is one of two predictions I will indulge myself—that the great weapon of judicial review of Federal legislation will remain in the arsenal of disuse where it has been, except for one or two faint-hearted sorties, for 14 years. In this regard I think the blunt words of Justice Jackson in *Korematsu* v. *United States* are well worth remembering:

"I would not lead people to rely on this Court for a review that seems to me wholly delusive. * * * If the people ever let command of the war power fall into irresponsible and unscrupulous hands, the courts wield no power equal to its restraint. The chief restraint upon those who command the physical force of the country, in the future as in the past, must be their responsibility to the political judgments of their contemporaries and to the moral judgments of history." [2]

The most noticeable effect that mobilization and cold war have had on our two parties is one that the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association must look upon with misgivings. For a number of reasons, most notably the way in which the issues of domestic mobilization and foreign policy seem to cut across party lines, there is even less party discipline in the Eighty-second than in the Eighty-first Congress. Moreover, mobilization and cold war may postpone indefinitely that break-up of the solid South that many of these same observers agree is the one sure step toward what the Committee on Political Parties pleads for—a more responsible two-party system.[3]

The Federal system—which is at once a network of institutions, a patter of legal and constitutional arrangements, and a basic American value—continues to develop under the impetus of mobilization in the same two directions it has been traveling ever since the Civil War: away from State rights and toward centralization, away from competition and toward cooperation. At the first trend we can look with disquiet but hardly with surprise. If the Government at Washington grows ever more powerful, it is because the problems delegated to it for solution grow ever more pressing. War, whether hot or cold, is a near-monopoly of the National Government. The trend to Federal-State cooperation is one that we can all welcome. Through a courageous and inventive use of the new techniques of Federal cooperation a wise Congress might yet stake out that sphere of decentralization called for by David Lilienthal in his This I Do Believe. The Selective Service System is the most instructive example of the effectiveness and essential democracy of a national program in which major policies are laid down at the center and wide discretion is left to the extremities. This truly Federal technique may be one bold answer to the problems and dangers of the leviathan state.

Finally, a word about the Constitution itself. I remember clearly, like the good student he wanted me to be, an observation of my distinguished teacher, Edward S. Corwin, on the nature of a constitution. A constitution, said he, could be looked upon as two things: as a grant of power, and as a catalog of limitations. Now there can be no doubt that the problems of the past two decades, the efforts of President and Congress to solve them, and the refusal of the Court (since 1937) to sit in severe judgment on these efforts, have placed the emphasis in present-day constitutional law on the concept of the Constitution as grant of power. John Marshall expounded the Constitution; we have expanded it. The mighty bulwarks of the constitutional limitationists—the separation of powers, the principle of nondelegation, the equal protection and due process clauses, and the necessary and proper clause—have been flattened and pulverized by the engines of war. I do not lament this turn of events as tearfully as do some teachers of constitutional law, because I honestly do not see how the United States could have met the social and military challenges of these brutal decades without a Government exercising power on a spacious scale. And however varied our answers to the question, "What has become of our Constitution?" no one of us will deny that in the garrison state the emphasis must be on constitutional power rather than on constitutional limitations.

By way of conclusion, may I make my second prediction. I feel as certain as one can feel about such things that our constitutional system will prove equal to the tasks and the threats of the garrison state. The classic textbooks, especially those printed across the water, have always made much of the rigidity and limitations in the American constitutional system. Perhaps the successors to these classics will make much of its

[2] 323 U. S. 214, 248 (1944). The citations of the other three cases are, respectively, 322 U. S. 398 (1944); 333 U. S. 138 (1948); 321 U. S. 414 (1944). I have tried to explain why these precedents are "heavy-handed" in The Supreme Court and the Commander in Chief (Ithaca, 1951), 48–54, 85–87, 98–99, 126–132.

[3] The report of the committee, Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System, was issued as a supplement to the September 1950 issue of the American Political Science Review.

flexibility and powers. Even now our institutions, as I have tried to show, are shaping themselves slowly, carefully, searchingly, pragmatically—in other words, democratically—to the exorbitant pressures of mobilization and cold war. Even now we are recognizing once again the transcendent political wisdom of the framers of the Constitution, who gave us a system with so nice and adjustable a balance between power, which will save us from destruction, and limitations, which will save us from ourselves.

Draft Deferments for College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Port Washington Herald, of Port Washington, Wis., April 4. The question of dividing our society by way of granting deferments to certain classes and groups is certainly not consistent with our American way of life. I have received many protests from the citizens of the Sixth Wisconsin Congressional District and I want to protest vigorously Executive Order 10230 which was issued by the selective service office March 31. It is my earnest hope that the Armed Services Committee will see the fallacy of this order and do everything that they can to correct this injustice. The draft boards of Wisconsin consist of men and women who are most capable in determining in their own areas the deferments necessary to the walfare of our people.

WANTED: AN ANSWER

"President Truman in a sweeping order Saturday authorized draft deferments for hundreds of thousands of college boys whose grades are good or who pass a special aptitude test" (Associated Press).

Why?

To provide future leaders of this Nation? There is no doubt but what this country could stand some trained men at the helm. And neither is there any doubt but what college training is necessary for that task.

But is it fair to defer men who have an opportunity to attend college while those less privileged are to be drafted?

The argument is offered that the test is based on aptitude. If that is true, why can't these youths, who purportedly are the future leaders of the Nation, serve as all other men must do? And if these youths have this alleged superior ability, couldn't they resume their studies after their term of service as was done after the second blood-draining contest?

Or is it possible that life is so much more dear for these elite than for those of the common herd that it must be preserved?

The sweeping order is an ill-concealed attempt to save the skins of those who have the financial opportunities to attend a university. It is a scheme whereby a youth, who is not a complete moron, can purchase immunity from service in the Armed Forces. What provision is made for the student, who through working for funds to finance his education, is forced to drop out one semester to build up his backlog. Regardless of his academic standing, he becomes eligible for induction.

If ever a violation of the Constitution was flaunted in the face of the American public, this order is that instance.

If money can protect some Americans, why not hire the Hessians and protect them all?

Why?

This question will be sent to Senators A. WILEY and J. MCCARTHY and Congressman VAN PELT.

Danger From Sabotage, Espionage, and Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address delivered by Mr. Elliott Earl, former Naval Intelligence Officer, at the joint meeting of the Chelsea and Everett Rotary Clubs of Massachusetts, which appeared in the Chelsea Record, of Chelsea, Mass., on April 10, 1951:

As serious and grim as this problem is, there is no reason why I can't lighten it a little with a story or two. Perhaps I can start out by defining what intelligence is. My notion is that it is knowing with assurance. The day after I made my Bostonian Society talk I had the privilege of addressing the Faculty Club at MIT and my friend and counselor, Dr. Karl T. Compton, favored me with his presence. During lunch the subject of education and intelligence were discussed. I ventured the thought that intelligence might be a product of education. Dr. Compton asked me what I thought education might be. My answer was the incompetent teaching the incomprehensible to the ignorant—and I suppose I should say that this gives you an idea of what I think some of our efforts in connection with intelligence activities have amounted to in recent years in this country.

SPIES HERE NOT CAUGHT

But, seriously, I want you to know about the spies who have transmitted atomic information to Russia, and who have not yet been either arrested or sentenced to death—as they promptly would be if they were operating in Russia.

On March 26, 1951, the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation appeared before the Kefauver crime committee. They made some very important statements. You probably heard them if you had access to a television set. I think the remarks made by Mr. Hoover were particularly significant. He said that many criminals were engaged in legal enterprises. You will recall that he said it was the duty of local communities and States to see that these characters were cleaned out. You will then recall that when Senator WHERRY pressed him about Communists in business he didn't have a very satisfactory answer.

In general, I agree with Mr. Hoover that this problem of Communist espionage, sabotage, and subversion is a local problem, but when local folks or the FBI or the military intelligence services get irrefutable evidence of espionage it seems to me that the Department of Justice should prosecute.

TELLS ABOUT TYPICAL CELL

If I am right, let me tell you about a Communist espionage cell which was operating at high speed in 1943 in the University of California radiation laboratories. Let me tell you about Comrades M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, and T—they are still free and they are still alive and none in the Government has done anything about them, in spite of the fact that one of the group was observed by the FBI and military intelligence service delivering atomic data to a Russian espionage courier in 1943.

Let's study this espionage cell, maybe we will learn something. Maybe we will then understand why it is necessary to have on the books the Internal Security Act of 1950. It is a pretty stringent piece of law.

ACTIVITIES OF WOMAN

Consider Comrade M, if you will—a woman—and in context with a consideration of her, I would like to have you consider a crate of sardine cans which contained the so-called Little Sports Collection of Bolshevik sabotage manuals written in Spanish, disguised as sports manuals. That is on the outside they looked like directions for playing games—kind of rough games—like blowing up power plants, and taking over communications facilities. You will recall the New York Herald Tribune ran a series on them called The Threat of Red Sabotage. My point is in connection with Comrade M, who is a biologist with slightly Red views, went to Spain in 1937 looking for a man. He was a member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade who had been killed by the time she arrived. The sad duty of informing Comrade M of the death of her lover fell to Comrade N, then a lieutenant colonel in the brigade. He has many aliases and is one, if not the one most effective espionage agent for the Bolsheviks now running around free in this country. He has been arrested many times but somehow the Government seems unable to hold him, or, pin anything on him. At this time I should tell you that it is pretty well accepted in intelligence circles that the hard core of Bolshevik espionage agents are made up of individuals who served with the Communists in Spain. They are the elite of the Communist espionage apparatus. If you know of any of them keep your eye on them and turn your observations over to the FBI. So Comrade M, the woman of the cell, qualifies as one of the elite Communist spies. Who do you think she married after she returned to this country from Spain? No less than the scientist who helped to assemble the atomic bomb. Don't ever discount the ability of the MVD, the Russian intelligence service. I consider them to be the best in the world today. They don't make many mistakes because when they do they liquidate those who make them.

NOW WIFE OF SCIENTIST

Now, let's consider Comrade N, who met Comrade M in Spain and who is now the wife of one of the scientists who assembled the atomic bomb. Comrade N really is "it" when it comes to espionage, sabotage, and subversion. He was assigned as the special agent in charge of the cell as early as 1940 at the University of California to find out what experiments were being carried on there in the field of nuclear research—the Russian intelligence service having learned as early as 1939, that our knowledge in this field might have military implications.

ATTENDS SCHOOL FOR SABOTAGE

In 1931 Comrade N was sent to Moscow and there he attended the Lenin school for world revolution. There he learned the fine arts of espionage, sabotage, and subversion. Mind you, this was 20 years ago. He is today a postgraduate student of the art of espionage. He is a doctor of spying, sabotage, and subversion. He received his passport from our State Department under fraudulent circumstances.

Taking the short course at the Lenin school, he only spent 2 years there. He then

went to Shanghai where he served his internship in the black arts. Back in the United States in 1934 he served as a "section organizer." Soon he was tapped by the Politburo for service in Spain—and that is where he met Comrade M, the woman in the cell. During his war service in Spain, the Daily Worker ran numerous articles praising his activities. Upon his return to America from Spain he was given a top position in the espionage apparatuses in America. He was given the job of collecting secrets about the atom bomb as it was being developed at the radiation laboratories at Berkeley, Calif. Probably one of the reasons he was given the assignment was because of his intimate knowledge of Comrade M, the woman he had met in Spain, and who became the wife of the scientist who directed the assembly of the atom bomb.

Now, Comrade N had learned his lessons at the Lenin school of sabotage well. His first job was to assemble the espionage cell. N recruited a bright lad whom we will designate as Comrade O. He was the organizer for the cell. It is believed he recruited Comrades P and Q, both brilliant students and physical scientists. Occasionally the group used to meet at Comrade M's home, either through pre-arrangement or by chance. At these meetings Comrade N would sell the idea that the Russians were allies and therefore entitled to know any advantages which might accrue from scientific developments.

NO ARRESTS WERE MADE

About this time the CIC intelligence agents became a little frantic. Here was espionage going on in front of them. Hurried appeals were immediately made to the Department of Justice and State Departments to pick up the cell—the same faulty reasoning as prevailed in the case of Lt. Andrew Roth, the intelligence officer involved in the Amerasia case. Both the Department of Justice and the State Department refused to authorize the arrests.

Imagine, if you can, the heartsickness of the intelligence officers in this case. Here they had the goods. Here they had perhaps the future of western civilization in their hands—and what happened—some strange characters in the Department of Justice and State Department—perhaps enemy agents like Coplon and Hiss—refused to authorize arrests. The Bolsheviks considered the information so important that the third secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington flew to San Francisco soon after its receipt. That is the receipt of the formula in Washington in the Soviet Embassy—and grave Comrade N a handsome cash bonus for his traitorous and nefarious activities.

NO AUTHORITY FOR ARRESTS

Comrade N continued his spying, and our intelligence services, both military and FBI, kept our Government informed day by day as to the activities of this cell. Our security agents at the University of California denied authority to make arrests pleaded with the authorities to discharge the members of the cell from the staff of the radiation laboratory. Was this authority forthcoming? It was not. Russia was our friend. Pro-Communists in our State Department and in the Department of Justice refused to uphold our espionage statutes. And I say to you now that it is not too late to find out who these traitors were and bring them to the bar of justice—and I demand that it be done. The other members of the Communist cell at the University of California have not been prosecuted for wartime espionage. They should be. The House Committee on Un-American Activities in September 1948, recommended that Comrade N be prosecuted under the provisions of the espionage act of 1917—the same act under which the Rosenbergs have been sentenced to death. Why hasn't the Department of Justice done its job?

As late as December 4, 1950, Comrade N and numerous other members of the Berkley Bolshevik espionage cell were cited for contempt of Congress, taken into custody, and later released in $1,500 bail.

INDUSTRIAL SABOTAGE

Three or four months ago I attended a closed conference in New York dealing with this subject. Actually, the subject of the discussion was controlling sabotage and espionage in industry. Most of the informed people in this country on this subject were in attendance at that conference. Because it was a closed conference I cannot report on it. Except this—the responsibility for controlling Communist espionage sabotage and subversion rests with the local management of a business or industry in which Communists may have an interest. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with this policy. There is no one in the stream all the way to the White House who is in a better position to identify Bolshevik spies and saboteurs than the folks who run businesses who may be the target of their activities. If you have any suspicions, turn them in to the FBI. Or if you do not wish to be identified, turn them in to me. I'll see that they get to the FBI without disclosing the source. Now, you may say, "What is a suspicion?" And now I want to pay my respect to a son of Chelsea—a great artist, perhaps the greatest in the use of motion pictures as a medium of expression. I pay tribute to Louis de Rochemont, the creator and editor of the March of Time, and such masterpieces of American life as Lost Boundaries, The House on Ninety-second Street, Whistle at Eatons Corner—real life motion pictures of America—the authentic America—the America that is, with all of the incisive clarity of a de Rochemont publication—and by that I include film production.

DE ROCHEMONT TO PRODUCE SPY FILM

Well, I have good news. Mr. de Rochemont is going to turn in his talent to help to show how the Bolshevik espionage apparatus works in this country. Actually, he is now at work producing a film titled "Turn East on Beacon Street?" He is going to show how an espionage ring actually works right here in Boston, with incidents culled from FBI files. Seventy-five percent of the movie will be filmed in and around Boston, although names and places will be disguised, as I have done in my talks. They are true incidents in connection with the work of a present ring of Bolshevik spies working against American democracy with their headquarters right here in Boston.

Mr. de Rochemont will help you to see how little people—perhaps our neighbors—who ride on busses and perhaps belong to this club, make a fast buck, and then regret it all the rest of their lives, because when they take that buck they become entrapped in the Communist espionage web. A friend persuades them to steal a small part of a secret formula like Comrade N and P at Berkeley, maybe it isn't the atomic bomb, maybe it is only some data on a bateriological test that has been run at Boston University, maybe it is not even classified as a military project. But the results are wanted by the Russians. So maybe your son or a friend says "what harm, I'll give him the answer, besides I need the money." Then when your son or your friend is approached again, what happens? He is ordered to do something—this time a little more dangerous—a little closer to treason—so he refuses. Then the MVD makes itself felt. He is told to do it. He has no choice—otherwise he will be turned in as a Russian spy. He does what he is told, and thereafter there is no questioning what he will do. He has become a traitor—an active agent for the MVD, the Russian intelligence service.

The Russian intelligence service is the slickest bunch of confidence men on the face of the earth. The reason the public does not realize this is because they do not get caught. When they get caught, they have outlived their usefulness. Coplon's boy friend, the Russian engineer who worked for the United Nations secretariat is no doubt dead now. I guess I won't say anything about Coplon—there isn't time and I do not like to get too exercised about this problem.

I am telling you now, that the danger from the atom bomb is very real and present, but it is only half the story. The other half is the danger from sabotage, espionage and subversion, which can do just as much damage to our industrial production.

This form of attack is considered by many who are informed to be much more likely than bombing. Plants engaged on defense contracts are considered to be prime targets. The range of activity of saboteurs will be wide and very difficult to detect—from damaging our utilities to tampering with the control mechanism of our production, and even creating conditions to damage wholesale our personnel engaged on defense work.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Back of the Brannan Plan," by Louis Bromfield, which appeared in the April issue of the Freeman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK OF THE BRANNAN PLAN
(By Louis Bromfield)

The Brannan plan, along with much of Mr. Truman's Fair Deal program, appears to be dead. Its revival or the appearance on the horizon of something like it might well occur if inflation continues to a point where the national economy breaks down and a depression follows. This, of course, is exactly what Stalin is waiting for, along with the Communists in this country and their fellow travelers in the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere in our bureaucratic structure. Not only would we be in for more intricate and comprehensive agricultural supports and regimentation, but we should find at once that the Communists were up to their old tricks. There would probably be a whole new set of borers from within like those who in the thirties infested our Department of Agriculture and made their way into other divisions of the Government.

Therefore, it might be worth while to look into the past in order better to understand the future. The bag of tricks would probably be the same.

The story of the infiltration of Government agencies is not half told as yet. And beyond it, there were other elements which confused the situation during the thirties. One of them was the fact that John L. Lewis and the CIO were welcoming the Communists into the fold of organized labor and condoning, if not cooperating with, their operations within government. John L. eventually

found that you cannot play with Commies, but it took the CIO much longer to repudiate them and clean house.

For a long time certain leaders of labor have cherished two dreams. The first is to turn the whole Government into a Socialist operation; the second, to bring about an alliance between organized labor and the farmers—which alone could make it possible to attain the first ambition: The attempt on the part of labor leaders to organize everybody is not merely sociological and benevolent; it is also political, particularly in the minds of leaders like Walter Reuther and apparently, of late, even like Philip Murray. This ambition suited the Communists. It was the same trick by which they had duped the organized labor forces of other nations and then taken over. So we got a curious pattern of the Communists attempting to use organized labor, and organized labor thinking it was using the Communists, while both were bent upon using the farmer together with his great political influence.

As a rule the farmer isn't easy to use. He is an independent cuss who doesn't like Government intervention and hates anything connected with socialism. In every country where the Communists have taken power, the landowners and even the prosperous peasants and tenants represent the stiffest opposition to the regime. But to the Communist, control of the landowner and farmer is first on the schedule for the revolution—if the farmer does not raise enough food the rest of the nation does not eat, and a counterrevolution can occur.

John L. Lewis with his catch-all District 50 tried again and again to organize the farmers into a force cooperating with labor in the role of stooge, and failed. Here enter the Farmers' Union, Lee Pressman, and a very smart gentleman called James Patton. Together with certain labor leaders they decided to set up their own farmers' organization not upon a union basis but ostensibly upon the basis of the already sturdily established Grange and the Farm Bureau, both of which had steadfastly refused to be taken in either by the blandishments or the threats of organized labor and of the Communists lurking in the background.

In their corner, the labor leaders, spurred by the clever Mr. Pressman (who recently confessed that he had been a member of the Communist Party) and abetted by Mr. Patton, set out to split up the farmers and capture them by surprise. This again was a sound Communist pattern. The only thing lacking was the tools. It was quite impossible to penetrate and capture the two great farmers' organizations, so they virtually invented a stooge called the Farmers' Union. Until that time the organization had had a kind of lingering existence; it still has today save for the brazen voice of Mr. Patton, which makes it sound far more important than it is, and the sympathies of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, who was declared the special "darling" of the Farmers' Union during its 1950 convention in Denver.

The capture of the Farmers' Union was a comparatively easy operation. Early in its career the headquarters were moved into the offices of Communists Lem Harris and Harold Ware, the latter an acknowledged, violent leader trained in Moscow. But that was not the only headquarters it used. When you wanted to contact some official of the Farmers' Union, it was often necessary to go to the headquarters of the CIO to find him, generally in Jim Carey's office. At that time Carey was not the ardent enemy of the Communists that he became when they took over his own United Electrical Workers and threw him out of office. The whole business in those days was a triple play from the Communists to the CIO to the Farmers' Union and back again.

It is probable that the move-in on the Farmers' Union was made on Communist advice, since the organization represented on the whole the farmers of the lowest economic status. Its membership is still made up largely of sharecroppers and tenant farmers, and it prospers not at all in the more solid agricultural areas or among the more successful farmers who feed the Nation. In such an organization it was possible to apply the old Communist technique of appealing to class hatred to divide the farmers, a technique still used by Mr. Patton and his friends.

During this period a double picture was presented. On the one hand there was a CIO-Communist-guided Farmers' Union; on the other, Communists and fellow-travelers working simultaneously inside the Government and notably in the Department of Agriculture. These inside operators were all in divisions set up to impose regimentation in one form or another upon the farmer, or to court him with bribes and free payments and political favoritism. There were the wise guys, like Lee Pressman and Alger Hiss, who eventually outsmarted themselves, the soft-headed sentimentalists of the Henry Wallace type who looked upon Moscow as the New Jerusalem, and the bright young men who came to town, often from fresh-water colleges, and overnight were given positions of great authority—not upon any grounds of ability or experience but simply because they were devoted to New Deal precepts.

In all of this the Henry Wallaces and the bright young incompetents were a great help. And when Chester C. Davis cleaned house in the Department (a scared Wallace lacked the courage and hid away in Virginia), a great troop of this element resigned and followed the guilty ones into the street. Most of them, like their leaders, simply moved over into other Government departments to continue their sabotage. But the purge was a great setback to the whole plan of taking over the farmers either by guile or by force, either through the Department or through the stalking horse of the Farmers' Union.

It is noteworthy that with Henry Wallace began the whole policy of taking into the Department all sorts of people who knew little or nothing about either agriculture or agricultural economics. Until this time it had always been assumed that men and women in the Department should have some knowledge which equipped them to aid the farmer; but with the establishment of countless New Deal agencies and bureaus, outsiders streamed in until 90 percent or more in the New Deal bureaus, even down to those who filled minor positions, were Communists, fellow travelers, or at least pinks. Mr. Pressman, the confessed leader, Mr. Chambers, and Miss Bentley, have testified to this. At that time or even today it would have been difficult indeed for the Communists to recruit agricultural authorities or politicians who had any sympathy for communism—except from the Farmers' Union.

In referring to the whole group that infested the Department of Agriculture, including Pressman and a half dozen other leaders who were fired, Chester Davis said with notable moderation that "their object was to remake our economic system and they would subordinate every other consideration to that end." Obviously the interests of the farmer and even of agriculture itself were of little or no importance to them.

In several cases the leaders actually attempted to carry off or destroy the records in their offices, which were, of course, Government property. A lot of their underlings resigned with them. However, a great number of those involved in one way or another in the infiltration remained with the Department and are still there, using pressures and influences toward the socialization of agriculture and the capture of the farmer. This is well known and accepted in Washington. All of these bureaucrats are in the administration bureaus set up under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. You will find none of them in the research bureaus, the extension service, or in any of the legitimate agricultural bureaus.

It is this group, an offshoot of the old infiltration, who together with James Patton of the Farmers' Union and a couple of other outsiders, concocted the Brannan plan of noisome and ill-fated history. When you take the Brannan plan apart all the past influences become evident, even to the influence of the CIO through its perpetual ambition to take the farmers into camp.

The intent of the very first principle of the plan is childishly apparent. It would lower the cost of food to the consumer while guaranteeing a profitable price to the farmer, with the taxpayer—a faceless, nameless fellow whom everybody kicks around—paying the difference. This was calculated to bring together organized labor and the organized farmer, while making everybody else happy. By tying two such powerful groups into one force it would guarantee complete political power to the organized labor group, which could then set up a labor government along Socialist lines, perhaps with some Communist trimmings. The plan deliberately left out the big farmer and the highly prosperous farmer, which meant in most cases the better kind of farmer. In other words, the rich farmer became a sort of kulak; the next stage might well be confiscation and division of his land. The regimentation of the farmer proposed in the Brannan plan was a bureaucratic nightmare and, once enforced, it would leave the farmer bound and tied, a captive and a victim.

How much Mr. Brannan actually had to do with the plan has never become clear. His is the prime example of the bureaucratic career. Originally a not-too-successful lawyer in Denver, he was one of those bright young men who came to Washington with the New Deal. Finally he found a berth as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and when Clinton Anderson resigned was made Secretary to keep the seat warm for a political appointment after the Presidential election. Here he exercised a talent for edging upward and making his position secure. When most big Democrats were lukewarm about Mr. Truman's chances, Mr. Brannan campaigned day and night and made himself generally indispensable. His reward was the Secretariat. How much Mr. Brannan knows of agriculture and what sympathies he has toward the farmer are questions which remain wide open, to put it mildly. What he did produce out of the hat, whether on his own or as a stooge, was a first-class socialist proposal designed to take the farmer into camp and deliver him over to organized labor. And all of this was the natural outcome of that triple play back in the thirties.

The triple play is still in operation, although the CIO has cleared its skirts of the Communists and would prefer to forget the days when it played ball with them. Mr. Pressman went on to become secretary and legal advisor to the CIO and was the guiding spirit in the organization of its Political Action Committee, whose campaign turned out so disastrously in the last elections. Mr. Patton continues to be perpetual president of the Farmers' Union, and brought Secretary Brannan to its 1950 convention to be canonized as a patron saint of the radical minority farmers' organization.

The program adopted at that convention, a document written with dialetic skill and shrewdness, places great emphasis on the family farm. It neglects to say that many a large and prosperous farm is a family farm. It neglects to say with a curious ignorance of American agriculture, that the size of a

farm has little to do with whether or not it is a family farm. In the Southwest 50,000 acres may be a family farm. In other areas I have known family operations on a few acres to produce incomes in excess of $100,000 a year.

The Brannan plan and the purpose of the Farmers' Union is avowedly directed at the redistribution of large farms and their division into small farms. The program implies that everybody should have a small farm, whether the unit is efficient or not. This, of course, is the first step to be taken when Soviet Russia invades a country. The land is divided arbitrarily into small holdings; then, after it has been proved that this cannot work, the next step is to establish collective farms, dispossessing the small owners and putting them all under the direction of the state.

The published program puts great emphasis on youth camps and recreation camps where special study can be given to specified problems. This, again, is a page directly out of the Communist book. It is now well known, even by the labor unions through sad experience, that such camps become centers of intensified Communist indoctrination.

Strongly urged is the formation of farmers' committees so designed as to "build a direct channel of administrative and policy communication between farmers' committees at the grass roots and the Secetary of Agriculture in Washington." What is this but the local Soviet? A little further on we read:

"The function of the local committees should be broadened so as to include responsibility in its area for all action programs of the Department. In some instances there are statutory difficulties to this arrangement as in the case of the soil-conservation district boards of supervisors. For purposes of coordination, farmers' committees should include members representative of the programs for which it has no statutory responsibility. [The object is to give farmers one committee to deal with instead of many]."

The matter in brackets are mine, but the meaning is clear enough. Plausible, but out of what book did it come? This is followed by:

"We recognize, however, that our legislative efforts must be fortified with political action. Family farming must be defended at the ballot box. Candidates must be judged, elected, and defeated on a basis of their records in light of the Farmers' Union program or our legislative efforts will be hampered."

Innocent? Read some of the propaganda addressed to the peasants when the division of land occurred in Poland. The wording is almost identical. Still further we read:

"We deplore the continuation in peacetime of so gigantic a Military Establishment as the United States now maintains. We take this position not only on economic grounds but because the existence of so large a military class is always a threat to civil government. On the same grounds, we restate our opposition to universal military training and to further extension of the Selective Service System."

Why should what is assumed to be a purely agricultural organization make such a careful point of cutting down our military forces? The next follows naturally:

"We believe that disarmament in this respect (the hydrogen and atomic bombs) and in all others must begin at once, and that the key to atomic disarmament lies in action through the UN for the destruction of all bombs, an end to further work of any kind in the development of these weapons, and the simultaneous imposition of a rigid control and inspection system."

Very plausible again and something which any citizen would advocate, but why is such emphasis put upon it by what is ostensibly a farmers' organization? And what nation is the only one in the UN which objects to any system of rigid control and inspection?

A dozen other passages could be quoted which appear equally odd in the program of a farmers' organization. (Incidentally, the Nebraska branch of the Farmers' Union refused to endorse the program and withdrew.) Naturally support is given not only to the Brannan plan but to every bureau or proposed bureau which tends to socialize the Nation and to concentrate power in Washington and especially in the Department of Agriculture. It is not difficult to see why Secretary Brannan and the Farmers Union love each other.

Recently Secretary Brannan advised the appointment of James Patton to the advisory committee on agricultural controls appointed by Secretary of Defense Symington, although Allan Kline, president of the largest and most representative of the farmers' organizations, the National Farm Bureau, was passed over entirely. The appointment of Murray Lincoln of the Ohio Farm Bureau Insurance Co. to a post on the committee was merely slippery deception. Mr. Lincoln, once secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau, has no connection whatever with the National Farm Bureau, and only vaguely with the Ohio Farm Bureau through its subsidiary insurance company. He has always been looked upon with disfavor by the national organization because of his radicalism. In the vicious campaign of labor to defeat Senator TAFT in Ohio, Mr. Lincoln, alone among those having any connection, even remote, with the Farm Bureau, came out publicly for TAFT's opponent and gained the name of "would-be Judas goat" of the farmers. Although he represents no group of farmers save perhaps some of the minority in the Farmers' Union, Secretary Symington selected him to regulate the farmers, along with Patton, who represents the smallest and weakest of the farm organizations.

The third appointee was Albert Goss, head of the National Grange, a fine man but not a fighter like Kline of the Farm Bureau, or Patton. Mr. Goss died recently, and at this writing no appointment has been made to fill his place. So the farmers of America are left to the doubtfully tender mercies of Jim Patton, Murray Lincoln, and Secretary Brannan. This may mean that for the moment Patton and Brannan have got what they want, but it is mighty poor politics and may account to a large extent for the overwhelming defeat of the candidates who advocated the Brannan plan. The people do eventually smell things out, and the farmer is not so dumb as the "liberal" bureaucrats in Washington would like to believe. In short, Mr. Brannan has become a serious liability to Truman and the national Democratic organization, both of whom ostensibly believed not so long ago that the Brannan plan was going to take in everybody and pave the way for a Labor-Socialist government. It may just be that this is another instance of the "wise guys" outsmarting themselves.

Senator MCCARTHY has been loud and perhaps rash in his wholesale denunciations of the Communist and Socialist influences within the Government, but there is a considerable quantity of truth in his accusations. The whole truth is difficult to unearth because of the devious ways in which the Communists operate, because of the cooperation given them by now disappointed and bitter bureaucrats, and because much of the story goes back into the thirties. From the Amerasia case and the State Department's China policy through to the Brannan plan, the old influences are still operating, and as the Nation faces crisis after crisis, the whole web-like structure of influences may well prove even more tenuous than it has been up to now.

Contributions to Public Health Legislation by the Late Senator Virgil M. Chapman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article paying tribute to the late Senator Virgil M. Chapman, published in the Food and Drug Review for April 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

Senator Virgil M. Chapman's tragic death on March 8 brought many splendid tributes to his public service during a distinguished legislative career. To these, Deputy Commissioner Charles W. Crawford adds the following comments on Senator Chapman's outstanding contribution to the history of Federal food and drug regulation:

"Because of Virgil Chapman's great modesty, he did not gain the public recognition he deserved for his vitally important role in enacting the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. He often told me he felt that this was his greatest contribution during his long career in Congress.

"When the bill which eventually became our present law was passed by the Senate in 1935 and went to the House, it was referred to a subcommittee of which Mr. Chapman was chairman. It was loaded with emasculating amendments forced into it by the patent medicine industry over the heroic opposition of Senator Royal S. Copeland, its sponsor in the upper House. The industry group was elated in the belief that they had such command of the situation that they could either compel the enactment of a new law that would give less consumer protection than the Food and Drugs Act of 1906, or at least prevent new legislation of any kind.

"But they had not reckoned on facing a man like Chapman. Between sessions of his committee he worked far into the nights reading publications and records and talking with persons familiar with the problems. Industry witnesses before the committee found themselves in trouble when they tried to distort facts or gloss over those unfavorable to their objectives. Always courteous and good-humored, his cross-questioning was as keen and skillfully directed as a surgeon's scalpel. It laid bare for all to see the greed and disregard for human welfare that underlay so much of the opposition to a better law.

"This hearing turned the tide. As the facts Chapman exposed became more generally known, real progress set in. He continued his active support until the measure was finally passed. He was responsible for including a highly important provision during the last committee meeting before the bill went to the floor for passage. This was section 301 (k), which asserts control over articles received from interstate sources until sale to the ultimate consumer. Chapman aided in writing the Miller amendment of 1948 which broadened and consolidated this control.

"Virgil Chapman's place is secure as a distinguished legislator, statesman, and humanitarian. The public generally, and

particularly we who enforce food and drug legislation, owe him an everlasting debt. We who were privileged to know him and work with him have lost a dearly beloved friend."

The Atomic Secrets Spy Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation has followed with tremendous interest the historic legal decision in New York which saw the sentencing of two individuals to death for the first time in American history by a civil court on the charge of having committed treason during wartime.

One could dwell at great length on the meaning of that decision, and on the historic verdict rendered by Federal Judge Irving Kaufman, after what must have been, I am sure, much soul searching. But I think that better than any comments which I could make, the Judge's own address to the convicted traitors speaks eloquently for itself. His remarks may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6 on page A1835, as reproduced by request of Congressman LOUIS HELLER, of New York.

I was particularly interested in this case because it had been my pleasure, as ranking Republican member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to support the confirmation of Judge Kaufman, who, although of a different political faith than my own, came to us with the sort of outstanding qualifications which I have sought for all nominees to the bench. Coincidentally, in fact, the United States prosecuting attorney in this case, Hon. Irving Saypol, had also received my support, although here, again, we are of different political faiths; but his record, too, spoke ably for itself.

So at this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following material:

(a) An Associated Press news story carried in newspapers of April 6 regarding the precedent-making nature of this sentence;

(b) An editorial carried in the April 6 issue of the New York Daily Mirror expressing patriotic sentiments which I think will be of interest to every American; and

(c) The text of a Milwaukee Journal editorial of the same date.

I particularly commend the reading of the New York Mirror editorial to those folks who might, unfortunately, have some bit of un-American racial or religious prejudice in their systems. This editorial, I feel, may help to cleanse such prejudice from them, and make them better Americans.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From a New York dispatch of the Associated Press of April 6, 1951]

SPIES, TRAITORS, SABOTEURS—DEATH SENTENCE FOR ROSENBERGS IS WITHOUT PRECEDENT IN CIVILIAN COURTS, HISTORIAN REPORTS

The sentencing of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, both citizens, for espionage adds a new page to American history. The penalty has never been imposed on a spy in this country by a civilian court.

Dr. Allan Nevins, Columbia University professor of history, author and twice a Pulitzer prize winner, said that no death sentences, either in peacetime or wartime, have been handed down by the civil courts against an American since the Government enacted its Espionage Act in 1917. This does not count executions ordered by wartime courts-martial.

Under the older laws on treason and sedition, he said, several death sentences have been rendered but not carried out. He said he recalled no major Federal civil court case in which an American traitor paid with his life.

However, in a famous case on the eve of the Civil War, Abolitionist John Brown was hanged in 1859 for treason against the State of Virginia. This was not a Federal case. Brown was convicted in Virginia of murder and treason in fomenting a slave uprising and leading an attack on the Federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Va.

Principals in other celebrated cases of treason and conspiracy noted by Nevins include:

"John Fries, an American agitator and opponent of direct taxation, who led the so-called Fries rebellion in Pennsylvania in 1789. He was convicted of treason by a Federal jury, and sentenced to death, but was pardoned by President John Adams. Aaron Burr, who after his close defeat by Thomas Jefferson for the Presidency, plotted to set up an independent government in the Southwest, with New Orleans as capital. He was charged with treason, but acquitted after a 6-month trial at Richmond, Va., in 1807."

In the Civil War period, Lambdin P. Mulligan, an Indiana editor, was sentenced to death in 1866 by a military court for treason, insurrection, and giving aid to the Confederacy. However, the Supreme Court freed him, ruling that the military courts had no jurisdiction, even though the State was under martial law, because civil courts were still functioning. Nevins said this case has "always been regarded as a great vindication of civil liberties in this country."

Several other persons were arrested on treason charges after the Civil War, including President Jefferson Davis of the Confederacy, but were later freed under a general amnesty.

The most famous American traitor was Benedict Arnold, Revolutionary War general, who funneled information to the British and later joined the British forces against the Colonies. Afterward, he fled to England. "If he had been caught, he would have been tried by a court martial and put to death." Nevins said.

Most noted cases in which military courts recently have imposed death penalties on Americans on such charges are those of William C. Colepaugh and Herbert Hans Haupt.

Haupt, 22, a German-born naturalized citizen, was one of six Nazi saboteurs executed in 1942 after they landed on the Atlantic coast from a submarine, were caught and tried by a military commission. The others were Germans.

Colepaugh, 26, of Niantic, Conn., was tried by a court martial as a Nazi spy, and sentenced in 1945 to hang. President Truman later commuted the sentence to life imprisonment.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 6, 1951]

ORCHESTRA OF 8,000,000

We wish to congratulate three fine Americans of our city: Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who presided over the court which tried the atom-bomb spies, and United States Attorney Irving H. Saypol and his assistant, Roy Cohn, who prosecuted and convicted those spies, Julius Rosenberg, Ethel Rosenberg, and Morton Sobell.

Some bigots will say the three spies are Jews and will denounce all Jews. They will forget to say that the judge, the prosecutor and his assistant who did such a magnificent jobs for America, are also Jews.

The unfairness of drawing general conclusions from particular instances; the indecency of fixing a universal stereotype from a bad type is here exemplified.

It would be like saying that all the fine Americans of Italian descent in our city are like Frank Costello or Joe Adonis, rather than Arturo Toscanini or our Mayor Vincent Impellitteri.

It would be like saying that all the hard-working, decent Negroes in our city are like Paul Robeson, instead of like Ralph Bunche or Jackie Robinson.

It would be like saying that all the Americans in our city of Anglo-Saxon stock are like Alger Hiss, instead of like Bishop Sherrill.

It would be like saying that all Irishmen are like "Cockeye" Dunn, instead of like John Coleman and General Rosie O'Donnell.

There is no logic in drawing false conclusions from a minimum of facts. Who dares say this Rosenberg creature is typical of our citizens of Jewish persuasion, when against him can be pitted millions of Americans such as Bernard M. Baruch, Bernard Gimbel, Jesse Isidor Straus, Barney Balaban, Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chaplain Joshua Goldberg, Rudolph Halley, and so many others who come quickly to mind?

We raise this very sensitive question because our city is the home of citizens of fairly immediate foreign origin. Of course, we were all of foreign origin at one time, and the history of our city shows that when a group became "old-timers" they tended to look down on the "newcomers."

In a list of the white population in 1940 whose mother tongue was other than English, there were 429,000 Germans, 896,000 Italians, 163,000 Poles, 149,000 Russians, 121,000 Spaniards, and 911,000 who spoke Yiddish, a Germanic dialect used by Jews. Altogether this list included more than 26 varieties of "mother tongues" for a total of 3,000,000 persons.

Undoubtedly, during the past 10 years, this list has decreased, for the pattern is constant in our city, namely, that by the third generation the process of relating the "newcomer" to America completes itself and the "newcomers" become "old-timers."

But we are not a melting pot, as Israel Zangwill so graphically described us. We are more like a symphony orchestra, in which men play various instruments, violins, cellos, flutes, oboes, trumpets, drums, and so on. Each plays differently; yet out of their differences comes the glorious Beethoven's Fifth or even George Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue.

Harmony means neither sameness nor monotony. It does mean cooperation, self-discipline, and teamwork.

Of course, there will sometimes be a devil who plays out of tune and out of time. He has to be straightened out or kicked out.

But because there is one sour note we do not tear down Carnegie Hall.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 6, 1951]

IT IS A LIFE AND DEATH MATTER

There was no sentence other than death justified in the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, convicted atom bomb spies.

In ordering the execution of the Rosenbergs Judge Irving R. Kaufman made clear something that needs to be impressed upon every American—that betrayal of our country in these perilous days is far more serious than merely engaging in an interesting conspiratorial pastime.

It is, as the court said, "crime worse than murder." The Rosenbergs plotted, in time of war, against their own Nation. From time immemorial there has been no more serious crime.

We still have too many misguided persons who seem to feel that it is still possible to play at pro-Russianism and excuse it as juvenile idealism. If the Rosenberg case helps make it clear that the struggle between the free world and Soviet imperialism is in fact a life and death matter, it will do the Nation a great service.

Strengthening of the Government's Loyalty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "To Plug a Loyalty Loophole," from Tuesday's Washington Star. The editorial relates to the bill (S. 1273) which I introduced last week as an essential first step in strengthening the Government's loyalty program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PLUG A LOYALTY LOOPHOLE

A serious loophole in the Government's loyalty program would be plugged if Congress approved an amendment to the Hatch Act proposed by Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan. The amendment would bar from Federal employment any worker about whose loyalty there is reasonable doubt. Had such a rule been in effect when the case of William Remington was before the Loyalty Review Board it is highly improbable that he would have been cleared. Board officials have disclosed that they had serious doubts about Remington's loyalty, but felt that the wording of an Executive order did not permit dismissal.

It was the Remington case which moved the Loyalty Review Board to request President Truman to change the order so as to give the Government, not a suspected employee, the benefit of any doubt. The Board pointed out that under the original loyalty order issued by President Roosevelt in 1942 the doubt could be resolved in favor of the Government. That order authorized the firing or rejection of any Federal employee when "there is a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States." When the postwar loyalty program was instituted, however, the wording was modified so as to require a showing that "reasonable grounds exist for a belief that the person is disloyal to the Government of the United States." The Review Board placed great stress on the "is," contending that this meant that even if the Board had positive proof of disloyalty a year or a month ago, but lacked evidence of the employee's disloyalty at the time of the inquiry, he must be cleared. It was under this interpretation that the Review Board overruled a Department of Commerce loyalty board which had recommended Remington's dismissal.

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, made an oblique reference to this loyalty situation during his testimony recently before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Questioned about the presence in Washington of 210 known Communists and about the possibility that some of them may be in the Government service, Mr. Hoover commented that the FBI passes all pertinent information along to loyalty boards, but that the boards operate under the policy that unless an individual can be proved to be a Communist he cannot be denied Government employment. He added that the Communists "are not carrying cards any more and they have no membership lists."

Chairman Hiram Bingham of the Loyalty Review Board is right in holding that it should not be necessary to produce a membership card in order to oust an employee about whose loyalty there is a "reasonable doubt." The Ferguson amendment to the Hatch Act would give the loyalty boards full authority to protect the Government in such instances. The Remington case ought to convince Congress of the wisdom of adopting the amendment.

General MacArthur, American Martyr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, since President Truman announced to the world early Wednesday morning that General MacArthur was being relieved of his Far East command, Americans have been voicing their indignation. My office has been deluged with telegrams and letters voicing disapproval of this arbitrary action of the President.

A few apologists for the Acheson policy of appeasement toward the Communists in China would have us believe that the people are supporting President Truman's action. If the reaction of the people of the Twelfth District of California is any criterion, I do not believe that this is true. Information has reached my office to the effect that the entire west coast is aroused and is seething with indignation. The people have construed President Truman's speech of Wednesday night as further evidence that the ill-advised policy of the past few years which has caused our Nation to suffer 60,000 casualties in Korea will be continued. President Truman has shown that he still places a high value on the judgment of Dean Acheson and his confederates in the State Department. The following article which appeared in the New York Times of April 11 will give the members of this body some idea of what folks think out on the west coast:

DISMISSAL ANGERS SOUTH CALIFORNIA—TRUMAN HANGED IN EFFIGY AT SAN GABRIEL—LOS ANGELES COUNCIL HALTS IN SORROW

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 11.—Protests against President Truman's dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur flared through southern California today and were capped in many cases by demands for impeachment of the President.

In San Gabriel the President was hanged in effigy. In the Los Angeles City Hall the city council adjourned "in sorrowful contemplation of the political assassination" of General MacArthur. Mayor Bowron said he was greatly concerned, agitated, and discouraged.

Automobiles suddenly appeared on downtown streets plastered with signs: "Oust President Truman."

Lifelong Democrats joined Republicans in the complaints.

CALLS TO PAPERS CONTINUOUS

Telephone calls to newspapers began immediately after the firing was announced. They continued all Tuesday night, all day today and on into the night again.

Thousands asked for information on how to write and wire their Representatives and Senators KNOWLAND and NIXON. Others added they were sending additional telegrams direct to the White House.

Nine out of ten were vehemently critical of President Truman's action. Occasionally one voice in the deluge would rise to defend him.

Clergymen, diplomats, and businessmen joined unidentified workmen—veterans and relatives of servicemen now in Korea—in castigating the President.

"I am thoroughly incensed," said Byron C. Hanna, former president of both the chamber of commerce and the Southern California Businessmen's Association. "Of all the series of blunders this administration has committed this is the most calamitous one for the American people.

"The administration seems to have discharged General MacArthur because he wanted to protect the lives of American soldiers fighting in Korea. The administration didn't want him to do that.

"I think President Truman should be impeached."

James Roosevelt, unsuccessful candidate for Governor last November, said he hoped the debate over the President's action "will not resolve into a political dogfight."

"The President is the Commander in Chief," Mr. Roosevelt said. "If he felt any commander in the field was not carrying out the policy of the Government, just as Abraham Lincoln found in the Civil War, it was his duty to remove him.

"Nevertheless, having served under General MacArthur's command in the Pacific, I feel from a military point of view he is one of our greatest generals."

LEGION OFFICER SHOCKED

Lewis K. Gough, of Pasadena, national vice commander of the American Legion said: "I know that the amazing news of the removal of one of the greatest military leaders of all time will stun and shock the 4,000,000 members of the American Legion and its auxiliary.

"While serving as commander in chief in the Pacific General MacArthur's voice should have been heard and listened to influencing proper global strategy. That it was not listened to is largely due to lack of requisite moral courage on the part of the United Nations.

"His unfortunate removal will jeopardize the United Nations position in the far-eastern theater and undoubtedly will have shocking effect on our officers and troops there."

Patrick J. Cooney, lifelong Democrat and father of five sons who entered military service: "MacArthur repeatedly refused to obey his Commander in Chief and refused to follow the United Nations' policy.

"This very momentous decision required great strength of character but was necessary if we are to preserve our governmental system set up by our founding fathers. History will record that President Truman was right."

Assistant Attorney General William V. O'Connor said "whenever any military commander in the field is unable to give loyal and wholehearted support to the policies formulated by the United States and the United Nations in the time of such a crisis, the President as Commander in Chief has no alternative but to relieve that commander."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this newspaper article which cites the statements of many prominent figures including Mr. Lewis K. Gough, National vice commander of the American Legion, I have received many telegrams from people in all walks of life expressing disgust at this latest Administration bungle. The following are examples of the type of telegrams I have received:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

For heaven's sake get this man Truman out of the White House before he bungles us into oblivion.

H. T. GATES.
DITTO, INC.,

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur affair is travesty of justice, spineless leadership by Truman, and despicable foreign intimidation.

J. E. COBERLY, Jr.

POMONA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Bitterly protest MacArthur's removal. Obviously beginning of appeasement Red China. Are we headed for another Munich. Above wired NIXON, KNOWLAND.

F. BAKER WALLACE.

PASADENA, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Start impeachment proceedings immediately against Acheson for gross incompetence. His only success has been in getting rid of his competent opposition. And against Truman for unlimited graft and corruption in office.

ROBERT P. POTTENGER.
HELEN C. POTTENGER.
ROLAND C. POWERS.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Must honestly urge you do everything in your power impeach Truman. Dismissal MacArthur climax of most disgraceful administration our history. As a Knight of Columbus you know we are obligated to do things constitutionally. Fear two-bit ward heeler will deliver us to Communist if allowed to complete term of office.

EARL DAVIS.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

My organization very incensed over the MacArthur discharge. This critical development seems to demand that Congress and Senate take immediate steps about the State Department. How can we help? Having meeting Thursday morning. Please wire instructions.

HELEN WYSONG,
President, San Gabriel Valley Republican Women.

SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: Phones been ringing since MacArthur fired. Everyone irate. What can be done?

JACK MOORE.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

Representatitve PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Replacement of General MacArthur is last straw. How long is Congress going to allow Truman and his British confederate to imperil our country. Suggest immediate impeachment proceedings against Truman and immediate withdrawal from UN. Acheson should be forced to resign at once. Enough is enough.

JAMES AND HAZEL RABBITT.

BALDWIN PARK, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

What can an American do to have any effect on a President who puts appeasement of communism above the lives of the American boys fighting in Korea.

MRS. DOROTHY CLARK.
OTIS CLARK.
IVA LEE RUDD.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Entire Twelfth District and San Gabriel Valley in uproar over MacArthur's dismissal. Suggest resolution to remove Acheson and restore MacArthur to duty. Please get in and fight.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR F. SIMPSON.

DUARTE, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to impeach Truman for selling out the country by firing MacArthur.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN R. CLARK.

PASADENA, CALIF.

PATRICK HILLINGS, CONGRESSMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Relieving MacArthur of his far eastern command is the final slap in the face of the citizens of America and to a great man who has truly dedicated his life to his country. I recommend that you do all in your power to curb the action of a President and State Department who are responsible for the stupid policy.

ROBERT H. BENSINGER.

SOUTH PASADENA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We feel our foreign policy is in a complete state of confusion and that the dismissal of General MacArthur is a grave mistake and merely adds to the confusion.

FISK & MASON.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We cannot find words to express our disappointment, disgust, and apprehension at removal of General MacArthur. Suggest everything possible be done to correct situation.

TEMPLE CITY REPUBLICAN CLUB.

SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Impeach President Truman and get rid of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Mrs. EDNA S. DILLON.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest ouster MacArthur. Demand his full reinstatement or impeachment Truman. Clean out State Department.

DOROTHY J. WOLFF.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

To save our great country, impeach Truman and Acheson.

GEORGIA MAXEY.

POMONA, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Now is the time for all good Congressmen to come to the aid of their country and impeach the White House haberdasher. Let's do it.

F. C. FARWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Honorable P. J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

It is imperative that the blundering Truman be impeached before he completely surrenders these United States to communism.

ROLAND SEIDLER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to add my protest to the ill-advised action taken by Mr. Truman. General MacArthur has a glorious record of 48 years' service to his country. Most Americans appreciate what MacArthur is doing, even if Mr. Truman does not. Please help put a stop to any further playing into Communist hands.

WM. H. SIMON.

AZUSA, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

I think the action of our President in regard to MacArthur is outrageous. Won't you please do something about it? Everyone with whom I have come in contact is deeply resentful.

WILLIAM MICHAEL ANDERSON.

WHITTIER, CALIF.

Hon. PAT HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Truman's action removing General MacArthur arousing entire west coast in protest. We have last last trace of confidence in Truman, Acheson, and Marshall. We urge you vigorously oppose this drift to appeasement. Devote all energy to removing from office this totally incompetent President whose leadership we renounce.

MORRIS FRANKLIN RICHARDSON.

COVINA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur incident biggest of the many administration blunders. America has been sold out to the Communists thru this act. Bring our boys home from every foreign country. Impeach Truman and Acheson.

TRACY SKELTON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Congressman PAT HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Eighty-four of my fellow workers at the plant demand impeachment of Truman and Acheson. Can't something be done.

R. J. PIERCE.

MONROVIA, CALIF.

Hon. PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest strongly dismissal of MacArthur. Urge your support to dismiss Acheson and Marshall. Watch England. If possible, impeach Truman.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES E. ATWOOD.

POMONA, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur case last straw. Demand you support immediate impeachment Truman and Acheson. Demand MacArthur address Congress.

R. V. BOLTON.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

How long, yes, how long are you all going to sit by and watch our country being handed over by Truman, Acheson, Marshall, et al.? I ask you.

HEDDA HOPPER.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

We are firmly convinced Harry Truman is not the man for President. Has fallen down on the job too often. We have no faith in our administration.

HARRISON AND PHYLLIS BEMIS.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.

Congressman PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe Acheson's policies are wrong and I strongly favor those of MacArthur.

ROBERT F. MARONDE.

Inefficiency and Waste in the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s, broadcast of April 10, 1951, is of interest to the Members of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD and believe that it will be enlightening.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM BROADCAST OF FULTON LEWIS, JR., APRIL 10, 1951

You, out over the country, hear a lot of rumblings about the confusion, the inefficiency, the waste, the politics that is going on in the defense program here in Washington, and no doubt it has troubled you to some extent. There have been charges that the defense agencies have been manned on a political-patronage basis, with appointments being cleared through the Democratic National Committee, that the whole thing has been made a gigantic political pork barrel, in a glorified pattern of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, that there is no real program in the interest of the public and no regard for the amount of money being spent, that the one objective seems to be to get as many people on the payroll as possible and spend as much as possible.

You may remember the days of the dual governorship fight in Georgia, when Herman Talmadge was trying to claim the Governor's chair against Lt. Gov. M. E. Thompson. The courts ruled that Thompson was next in line due to the fact that the Governor-elect, Gene Talmadge, died before he took office, and Thompson served a 2-year term as Georgia's Governor as a result. Last fall, after completing those 2 years, he retired to private life until he was brought to Washington early this year to become an assistant to Mike DiSalle, head of the Office of Price Stabilization, in the defense effort.

This afternoon he turned in his resignation from that job, and I have here a statement from him which I believe will be of tremendous interest to you. Please note that this does not come from any Republican; indeed, until he came to Washington, Governor Thompson was an uncompromising supporter of Mr Truman and the Truman faction of the Democratic Party, as against the Dixiecrat faction. So this is the statement of one of Mr. Truman's own supporters—up until the present time.

What is even more important, it is the story of a patriotic American who has seen the inside of what is going on here His statement needs no comment from me. I present it to you verbatim:

"No one can even question my record of unfaltering loyalty to the national administration and Democratic Party. The record speaks for itself.

"In 1948, when the Dixiecrat movement split the solid South, my efforts resulted in Georgia remaining loyal to the Democratic Party.

"Conditions existing in the national administration are so deplorable today that loyalty to party and patriotism to country constitute a conflict.

"Official Washington today is drifting in a sea of confusion, inefficiency, waste, and extravagance, with the only refuge being held out to a confused people is the sign of the double cross.

"On January 21 I received a telegram at my home in Valdosta, Ga., from Mike DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, asking me to come to Washington to accept the job as regional director of OPS with headquarters in Atlanta. I accepted.

"On my way to Washington to assume the responsibilities of the office, I was intercepted in Atlanta by telephone calls from the Democratic National Committee telling me that Dixiecrat Herman Talmadge, Governor of Georgia, was protesting my appointment.

"Arriving in Washington, I reported to Mr. DiSalle's office. Mr. DiSalle refused to see me, and I was told to report first to the Democratic National Committee office. There I was requested to accept the directorship of OPS for territories. For the sake of harmony in the defense effort, I agreed to accept.

"For 8 days I remained in my hotel expecting any moment to be assigned to the duties of the office, and when the assignment was made I was amazed to learn that another man and I were at the same time to be sworn in for the same office, at the same salaries, and with the same duties.

"During the next 2 weeks nothing was done and no program for administration of price controls in the territories was promulgated.

"Knowing that it was impossible to have two directors for the same job, I offered to resign and accept another assignment.

"For 12 weeks I have been carried on the payroll as a consultant at a salary plus expense account of $53.48 per day. Yet, during this time, I have been consulted about nothing. I have had no assignment to do anything.

"On February 19, at the White House, I told the President the story up until then. He called Don Dawson and instructed him to see that the mess was straightened out immediately. It hasn't been done.

"Under the circumstances, I refuse to accept salary and expense money from the taxpayers when I am rendering no public service. I am resigning and returning to my home in Valdosta, Ga. I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers.

"There are thousands upon thousands of others rendering no service but are on the public payroll, not only in Washington but throughout the United States.

"No real effort has been made to stabilize prices. Even those charged with this responsibility have contributed to the upward surge of prices by deliberately predicting higher prices. While the price spiral continues to rise, the bottom is dropping out of moral values.

"Thousands of loyal Americans are giving unselfishly of their time to the defense work, but their efforts are being nullified by the indecision, bungling, and interference of scheming politicians who are motivated solely by their desire to stay in power. The American people are being victimized by a national conspiracy of mediocrity.

"In 1951 is the time for the people of America to make plans to free themselves in 1952 from the gang that has led the people into this mess.

"And as for me, I will not support the Democratic Party in the national election in 1952 unless its banner is rescued from the greedy hands of the gang now hiding behind it for protection. If this be political treason, make the most of it."

That is the end of the statement.

Now, I have also a carbon copy of the actual memorandum which Governor Thompson tells me he personally handed to President Truman on February 19. He tells me the President read it in full, commented that it was an awful mess, called in assistant Donald Dawson—the same Donald Dawson who was mixed up in the RFC investigations—and told Dawson to have it corrected. Let me read you the memorandum to the President:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1951.*

"MEMORANDUM

"1. Early in January I was told by Mr. DiSalle, at his office here in Washington, that I could expect the appointment of regional director (region V), with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga.

"2. On January 21 I received a telegram from Mr. DiSalle to that effect in Valdosta, Ga. I immediately sent a telegram accepting the appointment.

"3. On January 24 I reported to Mr. DiSalle's office in Washington and to the Shoreham Hotel for a conference as instructed by the telegram from Mr. DiSalle.

"4. While en route to Washington to assume my duties, I received a telephone call in Atlanta, Ga., from Turney Gratz, of the Democratic National Committee, informing me, in effect, that Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, opposed my appointment, even though United States Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL had recommended my appointment.

"5. On the day of my arrival in Washington I was told by Turney Gratz that I would be transferred to the fourteenth territorial region as its director.

"6. I remained in Washington 8 days without anyone informing me as to my status. On the eighth day, when I appeared in Tempo E presumably to take an oath of office as a director, I met, for the first time, a Mr. Herbert Meighan. He and I were informed that we were going to be appointed codirectors of regional district XIV. On that day both Mr. Meighan and I were qualified, through form 57, as consultants to OPS.

"7. Eight days following my qualifying as a consultant, Mr. Meighan and I were sworn in with considerable ceremony and newspaper publicity by Mr. Justice Tom Clark as regional codirectors.

"8. Six days afterward Mr. Meighan and I were informed by Mr. Richard Cook, Assistant Administrator for Management, that it was impossible to have codirectors for any region. Upon receipt of this information from Mr. Cook, and in order to prevent further confusion and embarrassment to Mr. Meighan, I suggested to Mr. Cook that Mr. Meighan be named the director of the fourteenth region.

"9. You can readily understand and appreciate the personal and public embarrassment that I sustained during the confused period of time, as I have outlined above; especially the fact that news releases, presumably by the Public Information Section of OPS, and certainly not by me, had been released and printed over the entire State of Georgia concerning my appointments, transfers, and demotions.

"10. For the sake of harmony and loyalty to the administration and my country, I have refrained from giving any interviews to the press or otherwise making my position known to the public until it has at this time reached a point that I must call the matter to your attention.

"Present status: Despite my willingness to accept practically anything that may be offered, in order to keep the administration's agency in a creditable light before the public, I can tell you with certainty that I have no status at this time. In other words, status unknown."

That is the end of the memorandum; and there is the story of ex-Gov. M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, and his experience in the defense program, which is supposed to be building up the Nation's strength for the future.

How do you like it?

Richland's New Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from a recent issue of the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review regarding the new school buildings at the atomic-energy reservation in the State of Washington.

I am, of course, happy that the Government workers there have these facilities there in which to educate their children. However, the issue arises naturally as to the equity involved by the amount of money expended by the Atomic Energy to supply school facilities for these children while similar facilities are not granted to the children of other Government workers on other Government reservations in the State of Washington and elsewhere in the Nation. Many of my colleagues have fought long and hard and worried much over Federal funds to assist school districts to enlarge their school facilities that they might take care of the influx of Government workers and their children on Government reservations at dams, defense plants, cantonments, reclamation projects, and the whole great list where Federal aid is recognized and granted.

There should be some uniformity in the treatment of school districts. To spend $4,000,000 on one junior high school almost by wave of a hand and then to make it difficult for the granting of appropriation items such as one-fourth million or one-half million dollars for similar facilities elsewhere just does not appear to be equitable.

I am inserting this article in the RECORD because these facilities obviously were provided from funds which the House of Representatives was asked to appropriate in the guise of secrecy when there was no need of having these super-secret funds hidden behind such a cloak. They were to be used not for Atomic Energy as such but for the creation and supplying of facilities for educational purposes.

I do trust that a study of this problem will be made by the appropriate committees and some standards of appropriations arrived at that will be fair to all concerned.

RICHLAND'S NEW SCHOOLS—CARMICHAEL AND SPALDING ARE MODERN AS THE ATOM

(By Halwyn R. Smith)

CARMICHAEL JUNIOR HIGH

Every week-day morning at the stroke of 9, Nancy Ann, age 13, passes through the portals of one of America's newest and most modern junior high schools with her fellow classmates, Betty and Jane.

Carmichael junior high school was completed in Richland, "the atomic city," last year at a cost of $4,000,000.

Entering the grand foyer of the school seems to the girls that they are passing in to Grand Central Station. The ceiling is 30 feet skyward and supported by a number of massive columns, 4 feet square.

Nancy and her two classmates pass down the south wing of the school's 4 wings and enter one of the 17 classrooms. They begin wracking their brains over the intricacies of mathematics. The classroom is typical of the others and is 40 feet long and 25 feet wide. It accommodates 30 students. One whole side of the room is comprised of steel-framed windows so that the room is extremely well lighted. What really strikes the eye, though, are the white blackboards upon which the students write with black chalk.

Brain weary after toying with five times five, Nancy and her friends emerge into the hallway and walk back to the grand foyer where they strike down off the west wing. At the end of this they walk down a series of steps into the gymnasium. All told they have walked two blocks.

The gymnasium is 97 feet long and 81 feet wide. It is laid out for two badminton courts, two volleyball courts, and one basketball court. It has folding bleachers which can be pushed up out of the way to give additional floor space.

Nancy feels extremely fit after her day's exercise, and it is well, for her next class is in the music room which is directly underneath the auditorium stage. Her class consists of 40 musicians, which comprises the school orchestra. The music room is soundproofed and quite ample in size to house the embryo musicians. There are three individual practice rooms to house those students who need a little more practice to perfect their umpahs and allay their squeaks on the violins. After this they join the full orchestra and give forth with the strains of Auld Lang Syne. What catches the eye in this room is the green blackboard upon which the students write with yellow chalk.

As Nancy puts away her instrument and walks down the hall to the foyer, her steps quicken for it is lunch time. Adjacent to the foyer is the school cafeteria. She passes into it and is soon busily engaged in stuffing herself with a combination of meat, vegetable, fruit, and milk, all for the price of 30 cents. This is varied on Thursday with the pièce de résistance which is turkey. One whole side of the cafeteria is devoted to glass windows which look down over the vast expanse of school grounds.

During the day's grind of classes there are two intermission periods during the morning and the afternoon. Nancy and her students invariably retire to the school grounds which is equipped with basketball courts, softball diamonds and football fields.

There are many other rooms contained in the new school that do not concern Nancy for there is a very modern woodworking shop, general science room, audio-visual room, mechanical drawing room, handsomely equipped home economics and lecture room, school supply salesroom. All told there are 17 classrooms, one cafeteria, one gymnasium and eight special purpose rooms. What is most impressive perhaps is the fact that when small cubicles such as the janitor's supply room, halls and similar rooms are counted the school has a total of 123 rooms.

The building itself is of poured concrete and its exterior is plastered with metal trim for the cornice. It is well lighted on all sides by steel sash windows. The floors are poured concrete covered with various types of tile, asphalt tile, quarry tile, felt tile.

It covers an area of 101,000 square feet and is located on a tract of ground 23 acres in size. It has 24,000 square yards of asphalt for parking and 3,600 square yards for tennis courts.

Many community activities are held in the school, for there are classes in dancing, folk dancing, and evening games of volleyball. Then there are various classes in handicraft, art, woodworking, and others held for village members. Meetings of various clubs and groups are also held. Mixers are held after sports contests.

SPALDING GRADE SCHOOL

When Johnny went marching off to school this fall he may or may not have had as nice a school to enter as Spalding elementary school in Richland. If he did have he was fortunate; for it was designed by one of the Nation's foremost architectural firms and represents the absolute ultra in modern grade-school design.

It was completed last year to provide educational accommodations for the ever-increasing number of children of the atomic workers who have been added to the city. The building is of composite wood frame and concrete construction and cost $2,000,000. Painted a dazzling white it looms up on the landscape as a ship of knowledge floating down the ways to the seas of higher learning.

Possibly the Johnny of your town attends a school cramped by congested streets and dwarfed by tall buildings. Maybe he goes to

one of the little one-room schoolhouses which are still existent in many parts of the country. The boy from the city would love Spalding for it is located on a tract of ground 17 acres in size. Every room is exposed to fresh air and sunlight. The boy from the country would probably be amazed at the school's size, but he would not be lacking the broad expanse which surrounds his own little school. The school itself covers 1⅓ acres of the tract, or more exactly 56,000 square feet.

If Johnny had entered Spalding he would have found himself 1 of 604 pupils who are accommodated by its 18 classrooms, 2 kindergartens, 5 special-purpose rooms, and last but not least, a cafeteria.

He wouldn't find himself crowded, for the average classroom is 24 by 40 feet in size, which gives him 32 square feet of space or an area 6 by 6 feet.

There are added attractions that Johnny would like; an art room if he is artistically inclined, or a library if he is literary minded. If athletic, he would like its gymnasium, which is 76 by 86 feet and equipped with three volley-ball courts. At one end he would find a stage 22 feet in depth on which he could do a little acting good or bad. Other special-purpose rooms consist of physical-education rooms in which he would be trained to grow straight and tall.

Lunch time might find him in the school's very modern cafeteria, which is 76 by 47 feet in size, but many of the pupils go home for their noon-day luncheons in the surrounding new 1,000-ranch-house district, for which area the school was built to serve. Many community functions as well as church services are held in the school.

Johnny would find Spalding not only interesting inside but outside as well, for its grounds encompass tennis courts, basketball courts, and playground equipment of every description.

ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL,
Spokane, Wash., April 4, 1951.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
Member of Congress, Fifth District of Washington, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: Pursuant to the matter of the nursing-education program in Congress that we discussed by telephone last Friday, I believe that many Members of Congress are beginning to realize that the American taxpayer is genuinely adamant against further extravagances in Government, and new taxes are not smiled upon while the administration continues to insist on pushing their thinly veiled social program. There is a rumor afoot that in addition to paying hospital employees excessive salaries in Government institutions the proponents of socialized medicine are attempting to gain support of the national nurses organizations as a step toward controlling the medical profession and hospitals. This is purely a rumor but is worth considering in any proposed legislation.

There are many Federal educational programs in effect at the present time with scholarships in mining, agriculture, etc., given. However, none of these has entailed setting up special bureaus for its administration, but, as I understand it, Federal funds are allocated through existing State agencies with certain requirements to be met. Why can't Federal subsidy to nursing education be handled on the same plane? Under the Cadet Corps program, all controls came from Washington, which necessitated national audits at the end of the program that cost the taxpayer far more than they ever recovered in misspent funds. We had periodic inspections by well-meaning nurses who had no more idea of State requirements or regulations than the man in the moon, but they spent money and hours of nursing time in each hospital, not to mention the oceans of reports. It is my opinion that a simple program of Federal assistance to schools of nursing on a scholarship basis would produce an increase in graduate nurses, and the overwhelming majority of funds allocated would go for the purpose intended if handled in the manner described above.

Believe it or not, there is quite a feeling that all the brains in the country are not centered in the District of Columbia. The administration is supposed to support the philosophy of States' rights, believe it or not. Therefore, let's stick to the simple legislation and assist the States in producing nurses through Federal allocation with a minimum of red tape, distributed by existing State agencies to those hospitals operating a 3-year school, producing registered nurses, and collegiate schools of nursing that meet the requirements of their respective States, not the goals set by a few nursing educators from the American League of Nursing Education in New York who have not nursed a sick patient in 15 years and haven't the slightest idea of practical nursing education. They had their innings the last time and look at the mess they made of it with their uniforms, brass buttons, and costly periodical reports which I doubt were ever read.

I would be glad to appear before your committee but I fail to see where I could do any good that Al Whitehall of the Washington Bureau of the American Hospital Association could not equal if not surpass.

Kindest regards to you and Sally.

Very sincerely yours,

GORDON W. GILBERT,
Administrator.

Public Reaction to MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the contents of a number of telegrams which were received at my office. For the information of the Members of Congress, these are typical of the hundreds and thousands of telegrams being received since the President relieved General MacArthur of his command. It is quite significant of the feeling of the people back home that I have not received one single message in support of the President's action. For brevity I am omitting the datelines and signatures. These telegrams came from Chicago, Ill.:

Sincerely urge you do everything possible to correct President's decision re MacArthur. Also strongly protest other snap decisions by President. Suggest you do everything possible to curb power of Executive Office in future to protect American interests. Further suggest you do everything in your power to end present Korean situation victoriously by whatever means at hand.

Western Union will not accept expression of true thoughts of this household. Let's impeach Truman.

Just heard of MacArthur being kicked out. Suggest you look for another Hiss in Blair House.

In the firm belief that Gen. Douglas MacArthur was prosecuting the fight in Korea to as near a decisive victory as can ever be attained by anyone in dealing with communistically backed or fostered forces, we believe the dismissal of the soldier in time of war conditions and conflict, under whatever guise and circumstances, gives ready aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States of America alone and without consideration whatsoever to United Nations entanglements. Therefore, we, as loyal Americans, fearful for the future of this, our country, in the hands of a Commander in Chief who gives such treasonable aid and comfort. Earnestly urge and beseech you to institute on our behalf proper proceedings for the impeachment of Harry S. Truman, and this at once or show cause.

I protest the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and humbly beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

Protesting MacArthur's dismissal. Humbly beseech you start impeachment against Harry S. Truman immediately.

As an American citizen and taxpayer I urge immediate proceedings for the impeachment of President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, and Secretary of War Pace.

I want to vigorously enter my protest in the strongest possible way against the firing of MacArthur.

We wish to protest this latest outrage on the part of the pig in the White House. We demand his immediate impeachment and the reinstatement of General MacArthur.

I want to vigorously enter my protest in the strongest possible way against the firing of MacArthur.

I protest the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and humbly beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

Vigorously protest dismissal of General MacArthur. Suggest and recommend your immediate action in my behalf as a citizen and taxpayer.

We the people expect our Congress to do something immediately pertaining the lousy decision made about the MacArthur situation in Korea.

Demand immediate investigation of MacArthur release.

Make report to public.

Please, not another Munich. Do not appease Reds. Uphold MacArthur.

Your loyalty to the people of the United States at this historical moment will support General MacArthur's position against President Truman's latest decision to support England at all costs with American lives, to stall the efforts of an all-out war with Russia. American Lithuanians have denounced administration's policy of appeasing Russia while our country is being exterminated. We call upon you now as an American citizen to prove your right to represent our people in Washington during this greatest crisis in our history. Your own action and vote in Congress will determine your future length of servitude to the American people. America must remain free and strong to preserve everything we fought for in many centuries and to protect our citizens' lives at the expense of those who desire to conquer America and subject her people to communism. We must remain free with

our own representatives of Congress supporting the great majority thinking in our democratic Nation. We call upon you at this hour to support General MacArthur's position to defeat Russia's world conquest.

Use every effort to impeach President Truman.

Let's see some action now. Make investigation and report to public regarding disgraceful firing of MacArthur. (Two signatures.)

We protest undignified and unjust removal of MacArthur. (Two signatures.)

In view of shocking news report this morning suggest the following: Immediate impeachment proceedings. Bring MacArthur home. Get out of Korea. Run alien-dominated United Nations into the Atlantic.

If impeachment of the President is not possible, let's work for a constitutional amendment to prevent such outrages. The MacArthur dismissal was an exercise of authority which might be safe in the hands of honest men, but we seem to need protection against others.

Impeach the imbecile.

Impeach the Judas in the White House who sold us down the river to left wingers, and the UN. American people never did get a chance to vote for the UN, if they wanted it or did not want it. Long live MacArthur.

We vigorously protest President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from the command in the Far East. Suggest the general be brought home and be permitted to tell the American people the truth on conditions in Korea. We are fed up with political double talk emanating from our State Department. (Two signatures.)

The voters demand impeach President. Recall MacArthur.

Registering protest on unjust and unwise dismissal of General MacArthur. (Two signatures.)

Demand you start impeachment proceedings against President. His removal of MacArthur shows his preference for American boys to be killed in Korea.

We beg of you to fight for MacArthur, a man of truth and fearlessness. Impeachment for Truman.

A great American is crucified and Stalin's stock zooms. When the wicked rule, the people mourn. Truman must be impeached.

We veterans of Southwest Pacific protest the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and humbly beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

May I express with many others that the unprecedented action of relieving General MacArthur of his command is beyond any understanding?

I strongly protest the removal of MacArthur; remove Truman instead.

Impeach Truman and Acheson.

We, as your supporters, demand you back MacArthur to the limit. Fight the monsters.

Impeach the B who calls himself President.

Could MacArthur's dismissal be reason for impeachment Truman and Acheson removal?

We taxpayers of Illinois protest the firing of MacArthur and as our Representatives we demand you fire Truman and Acheson.

Consider MacArthur ouster national disgrace exceeded only by presence of Harry Truman in White House. Implore you to do everything in your power to correct both conditions.

As a citizen of the United States the only way you can support the oath you took to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, is by the immediate impeachment of Harry S. Truman, George C. Marshall, and Dean Acheson. Everything they have done without the approval of Congress has brought this country closer to defeat. The Congress of the United States is now the only bulwark between the citizens' freedom and slavery under the Communists. I ask nothing but that you do your duty as a Member of the Eighty-second Congress.

As State senator and congressman we demand your action on return of General MacArthur to his former command. (70 signatures.)

MacArthur dismissal one of the greatest blunders and catastrophes in our history.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is too late for America. Save her now.

Why don't you impeach Truman?

Please remove the menace from the White House at once before Joe Stalin moves in.

Unless you take immediate action to force the President to represent the people you might as well resign and admit we have a dictatorship. If the only way is impeachment, let's start proceedings.

Protesting removal General MacArthur. Urge his hearing before joint session.

We, the taxpayers of Illinois, protest the dismissing of General MacArthur and humbly beseech you as our Representatives to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once. (Six signatures.)

Indignantly and vehemently denounce MacArthur's ouster. How stupid can we get?

You should demand the impeachment of President Truman, the dismissal of Secretary of State Acheson, and the reinstatement of General MacArthur. You, as well as President Truman, were elected to represent the American people, not the United Nations. Let's not be sold down the river.

We demand disciplinary action for Trumans' greatest mistake. Impeachment desired.

Does not Truman's removal of our great General MacArthur constitute treason? He has certainly sold out the country he swore to defend. We beseech you to start impeachment proceedings against Harry S. Truman at once.

When outside forces can dictate who shall be in command of United States fighting forces it is time for Congress to assert itself.

Please support impeachment program against Truman and Acheson.

Strongly urge MacArthur be restored; Truman impeached. (Five signatures.)

Demand action against Truman. Please support MacArthur.

Demand vigorous protest over MacArthur. Suggest Truman's impeachment.

Impeach Harry S. Truman.

Truman Administration Policies Versus MacArthur Republicism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more apparent as we view the activities of the Republican Party leaders that they are in desperate search of issues upon which they can go to the country with a reasonable chance of winning in 1952.

This pattern extends even to local elections where, witness the recent test which was had in the Chicago mayoralty election. There the Republican candidate, Robert L. Hunter, and his Republican followers sought to convince the electorate that the Truman policies were leading us to disaster and ruin. Mayor Martin H. Kennelly who has supported President Truman in 1948, campaigned on his record with the result that he received a thumping majority of 152,000 votes in a light cast of votes. In this instance, at a local level and in the second largest city of the Nation, the effect of the Republicans who had injected national issues in the campaign to convert the people against the President's policies, proved to be in vain.

Prior hereto, House Republicans believing that the results of the congressional elections of 1950 were a strong trend in their direction, succeeded, with the help of some southern Democrats to modify the liberalized 21-day discharge rule in the House Committee on Rules, and reestablished the old reactionary rule whereby worthwhile legislation could be "bottled up" through a coalition of 7 of the 12 members constituting a majority of the 12 members comprising the membership of the committee. The effect of this change means that legislation could not be considered by the House unless a petition signed by 218 Members of the House was effected—a very difficult condition or procedure to comply with.

Now comes the MacArthur incident, and again we find the Republicans attempting to make capital of his dismissal, which, in my opinion, was long overdue and well-deserved by him.

Loud cries of impeachment came from the Republicans with the first news that

General MacArthur had been relieved of his command because of insubordination. Today the noise is faint and indistinct because it was found that the people agree with President Truman when he said last night, "full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of a free democracy." The Truman critics have found out in a short time that the American people are firm in their determination that they will not tolerate military dictatorship of the Peron type in Argentina, or the Franco kind in Spain, or for that matter any type of military dictatorship as against the Nation's supreme civilian authority, namely, the President of the United States and commander of the Armed Forces.

Yesterday, in my remarks to the House under title, "Our Country, MacArthur, Politics," I inserted an editorial which appeareed in the April 8 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times. This forceful article certainly expresses well the futility of Republican efforts to make capital of the MacArthur dismissal.

Notwithstanding that General MacArthur indirectly claimed today through his adviser, General Whitney, that he did not disobey orders, the record is replete with the directives given him by the duly constituted authority. I set forth yesterday in my remarks for the RECORD instances of such misconduct, and I am certain that when the full record is made clear to the American people at the appropriate time and in the proper form, General MacArthur will have been found to have transgressed more often than is generally thought today.

Mr. Speaker, personally I feel that the President, in his speech to the country last night, made his position and that of the United Nations very clear. I am satisfied that, notwithstanding the attacks of certain newspapers and commentators, the outstanding and most noted journalists fully endorse the President's position.

In conclusion, I wish as an extension of remarks to include a few of the more informed factual newspaper accounts, including excerpts from an article by Marquis Childs, appearing in the Washington Post, as follows:

General MacArthur seems to have decided that the time has now come to bring this out into the open and force the issue. He can have what he has apparently meant to have from the beginning—a full-scale war in Asia.

As a professional soldier loyal to the American tradition of civilian authority over policy, the general has the choice of carrying out the orders he is given or resigning his command.

[From the Washington Post]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE GENERAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

When Taft was President and Stimson was his Secretary of War and Gen. Leonard Wood was Chief of Staff there was a very able officer with powerful supporters in Congress who disgreed sharply and profoundly with the basic military policy of the United States. That was some 40 years ago. Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth, the Adjutant General, was opposed to what was then a new development in the American Army, namely, the General Staff which in matters of policy was under the President but over all commanders and bureau chiefs.

The purpose of the General Staff, as Stimson and Bundy describe it in their book, On Active Service, was to "meet three requirements: civilian control in the executive branch, sound general planning, and constant cross-fertilization between the line of the Army and its high command in Washington."

But though General Wood was Chief of Staff, the most powerful officer in the War Department was General Ainsworth who had more friends in Congress than did General Wood. A conflict ensued over many matters. The basic issue in all of them was whether the Chief of Staff—who is called that because he is the agent, via the civilian Secretary, of the President—was superior to all other officers of the Army. General Ainsworth resisted this idea and though Secretary Stimson had "once before been forced to warn Ainsworth against insubordination," it was not long before Ainsworth again took issue with the Chief of Staff "in a memorandum so grossly insubordinate that as soon as he read it Stimson realized that the time for drastic action had come."

Stimson consulted President Taft and Senator Elihu Root who, as Secretary of War, had created the General Staff. They agreed with Stimson that discipline had to be restored and Taft said to him: "Stimson, it has fallen to you to do a dirty job which your predecessors ought to have done before you."

Ainsworth was relieved. Twenty-five years later after he had again been Secretary of War, Stimson wrote that "since the relief of Ainsworth no important challenge has been given to the final authority of the Chief of Staff, under the Secretary and the President. Even the great Pershing, field commander of the entire fighting Army in 1918, learned that in the making of long-range decisions he was subordinate to the Chief of Staff in Washington."

It has fallen to President Truman and to his Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, to do the same kind of dirty job which President Taft and his Secretary of War had to do 40 years ago. The final authority of the Chiefs of Staff under the Secretary and the President has been openly and repeatedly challenged by a much greater and more powerful man than Ainsworth. The President and the Secretary have done their duty. They have been faithful to their trust.

General MacArthur's actions are a great enigma. He challenged the President publicly, defiantly, and on issues of such moment that they concern deeply not only this Government but some 50 other governments. It is impossible to believe that a soldier of his eminence and his experience, himself a former Chief of Staff, himself a commander of armies who must know the importance of discipline, cannot have known that he was challenging the authority of his lawful superiors.

What, then, did he believe would be the outcome if he persisted, and indeed made his challenge to the President ever sharper Can he have failed to realize that either he would have to be relieved or that the President of the United States would have publicly to abdicate the substance of his whole authority in the issues of war and peace? General MacArthur must have known that there was no third course, one of compromise. He must have known it because the President has tried compromise for over a year. But General MacArthur himself has in fact taken the position that the issue could not be compromised.

The question, therefore, is whether General MacArthur chose to force the President to relieve him, or whether he thought from what he had seen during the past year that the President would give in and would take his orders from Tokyo.

A plausible case can be made for either of these theories. Neither can as yet be proved. But this much is certain: General MacArthur deliberately narrowed the choice and meant to force a showdown with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East. He did that by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him and submitting to him.

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of April 12, 1951]

THE TRUMAN-MACARTHUR SHOWDOWN

Circumstances have forced President Truman to make many momentous and controversial decisions. One of these was his decision to fire General MacArthur for insubordination.

As we said in late editions of yesterday's Sun-Times, the decision was inevitable in a democracy such as ours. No general is bigger than the Government of the United States or his constitutional commander in chief.

The lifeblood of a democracy is the supremacy of civilian authority over military authority.

Nevertheless, national passions have been inflamed by the incident. National unity is threatened at a time when the Nation can ill afford to face such a threat.

All thoughtful Americans will regret, as Mr. Truman himself did, that he was forced to have a showdown with MacArthur at this time. But it was MacArthur and his highly voluble backers, particularly among the President's political enemies, who brought the issue to a head.

The President's last line of retreat was cut off when MacArthur openly disregarded Mr. Truman's constitutional powers to make our foreign policy by advocating the opening of a second front on the Chinese mainland. It was a direct challenge of the administration's policy of trying to localize the Korean conflict.

The course advocated by MacArthur was not less war but more war. It courted the beginning of a third world war at a time when the free nations of the world are not fully prepared for such a struggle.

In their eagerness to make political capital of MacArthur's head-on clash with Mr. Truman, many Republicans who have been howling for peace fell for the MacArthur line. One of these Republicans is Senator TAFT, of Ohio.

Other Americans who long have been warning against the danger of a military dictatorship in this country nevertheless allied themselves with MacArthur in his defiance of the Nation's supreme civilian authority.

The isolationist Republicans justified their support of MacArthur's position by echoing his argument that it would be possible to open a second front in China without drawing Russia into the war.

They forgot—or conveniently ignored—the fact that it was also MacArthur who had advanced the argument that United Nations forces in Korea could drive to the Yula River without drawing Red China into the war.

As we have said before, and as Mr. Truman said in regretfully dismissing the colorful general, MacArthur will still rank in history as one of our greatest military commanders. But the quarrel today is not with MacArthur's performance in strictly military matters.

In attempting to set himself above the constitutional powers of the presidency, MacArthur not only was insubsordinate; he also was doing violence to one of our most cherished traditions—that the ideal soldier is one who respects and observes the essential civilian nature of our institutions.

Next year, 1952, is a presidential election year. It is almost too much to ask even in the name of national unity that the President's more rabid political foes cease fanning the flames of the MacArthur incident.

But we can hope that the American people as a whole eventually will tire of the sport

and buckle down to the tremendous mobilization job that still lies ahead of us. In the final analysis, the American people can retain their heads even when their political leaders can't.

Even without MacArthur there is still a war to be won in Korea. His successor, General Ridgway, is a brilliant and conscientious soldier who adheres scrupulously to the historic division of military and civilian powers in this democracy of ours. He merits, and we are sure he will receive, the support of every American.

When MacArthur comes home, as he intends to do, after an absence of 14 years, he will receive the tumultuous welcome earned by a military hero. We feel that he should present his views to the American people. As Mr. Truman said, "Full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of a free democracy."

The crying need today is for national unity. We believe that the good sense of the American people will prevail and give us that unity in spite of the politicians.

Appeasement and Surrender of Independence Go Hand in Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many wires, letters, editorial comments, are to the effect that Russian and other Communists throughout the world are rejoicing because of the President's removal of General MacArthur from his Far East commands.

Communists, quick to recognize their enemies and the removal or demotion of any opponent from a position of authority, are jubilant because their most powerful single foe in the Far East, General MacArthur, has been arbitrarily kicked out of the position in which for so long he has acted effectively to unite the Japanese people in opposition to the Communists' attempt to infiltrate into their government.

Acheson and those who have for so long been sympathetic to the Communist cause; who have so often, whatever may have been their intentions, followed a policy detrimental to the interests of this country, have won another victory in their campaign to displace MacArthur, to place the Chinese Communists and Russia in a commanding position in United Nations.

Last night, in New York, at the annual meeting of the New York Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Mr. John B. Trevor delivered an address well worthy of everyone's attention.

Mr. Trevor is president emeritus of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, which he organized in 1929. He is a graduate of Harvard and of Columbia University Law School. During the First World War, he was in command of military intelligence in the entire New York area. In 1919, he served as special deputy attorney general for the State of New York, and later, as associate counsel for the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

For many years, he has devoted his time and efforts to the elimination of subversive elements in our Government, and to the perpetuation of our Constitution and the principles for which it stands.

Mr. Trevor's address of last night was as follows:

The problem which faces us as a result of the President's impulsive action is no mere question of discipline for a general or even of justice for a great leader. You must realize that what we do now will set the pattern for the future in the European theater. If we bow to the demands of our more vociferous allies in this matter, we shall be setting precedents that will haunt us in the future. If we allow Britain and France and India to ally themselves with Acheson and his kind, what can we do when they try to use the same methods on General Eisenhower—if they insist on hampering his movements and limiting his striking ability? Stupid and vindictive decisions now may cause us to lay millions of American boys on the battlefields of Europe.

The morning papers offer us conclusive proof that this hasty removal of General MacArthur is no mere accident nor isolated happening. It is obviously part of a pattern of foreign policy which is going to be thrown in the faces of the American people before they have time to take decisive action upon the decisions which will be made. Take note of this Washington dispatch dated April 10, to the New York Times: "Britain has suggested to the United States that Communist China be brought into negotiations of the Japanese Peace Treaty, and that provision be made now for the eventual return of Formosa to Communist China. Obviously, these steps could not be taken until General MacArthur had been removed from the scene."

We shall be told that General MacArthur had to be removed because he has interfered with the political aspects of our problems. Then let us be logical. We should, on the same ground, lose no time in removing Secretary Acheson, who has consistently and persistently meddled in strictly military matters and has carried on a feud with General MacArthur with catastrophic results for the United States.

We are at war with China. Chinese divisions of the Red Army have been, and are being thrown into battle against American forces. The killing of American boys in Korea is just as much an act of war against the United States as the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor.

The folly of our Government in its policy toward Korea has been monumental. In part, of course, it is the fruit of the greater folly—our association in the United Nations and the consequent embroilment and prospective embroilment of the United States in controversies which are of no concern to the great mass of the American people.

The order for the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea and the abandonment of South Korea in June 1949, as ordered by the President, was an invitation to the Communists of North Korea to overrun the whole country. The subsequent order by the President for the United States troops to reenter Korea and act as a foreguard of the United Nations forces was, so far as can be ascertained at this moment, a violation of the law.

For example, section VI of the act of Congress, which took us into the United Nations, provides in substance that the President should negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations, which shall be subject to the approval of Congress by appropriate act providing for the numbers and types of Armed Forces to be made available to the Council for the purpose of maintaining peace and security. So far as can be ascertained no such agreement was ever submitted for the approval of Congress.

In the light of these disquieting facts, it would appear to be urgent that the American people demand of their representatives in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, that an immediate and comprehensive investigation be made of our foreign policy and commitments of every nature. Obviously the first step in such an inquiry should be the extension of an invitation to General MacArthur to appear before this investigating committee and lay all the facts at his disposal before it for the information of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, not only, as Mr. Trevor so clearly pointed out, has the President surrendered to those who by their actions, at the request of Britain, France, and India, have lent support to the Communist program, but apparently he intends to go another step down that ruinous road and after carrying on a war in Asia on the pretext that we dare not appease Stalin, that we must fight the Communists, by supporting Britain's move to cease fire in Korea, he intends to turn over Formosa to the Chinese Communists, and to continue indefinitely the occupation of Korea by American Armed Forces, to protect the British in Hong Kong, the French in Indochina; the interests of both nations wherever in the eastern world they may need protection, and so appease the Communists.

I have never favored, I do not now favor, a war in the Far East, but I do believe with MacArthur that, if we are to have a war, our enemy should not be given sanctuary, "cities of refuge," behind an arbitrary geographical line, where he may lick his wounds, repair his losses, and again go forward to murder Americans.

What, you ask, would I do? As always, I would follow, insofar as it is possible and consistent with our own national security, the advice given by George Washington in his Farewell Message to the Continental Congress, the similar advice given the Congress by Thomas Jefferson in his inaugural address.

Never would I conscript American youth, American flesh and blood, to fight under a foreign flag, a foreign commander, solely for the advancement of the interests of countries other than my own.

Mr. Truman said last night it was his desire to limit the war in the East to Korea—fine. If the war is to be limited, why then send an Army to Europe while turning over China and Formosa to the Communists?

The Tidelands Oil Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial by Ken Byerly, of the Lewis-

town (Mont.) Daily News, dated April 2 1951, dealing with the so-called tidelands oil question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT

(By Ken Byerly)

WHO WANTS TO GRAB IN THE "BIG GRAB"?

The Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, according to Editor and Publisher, has launched a crusade against the "big grab" of the Federal Government, and is getting newspapers throughout the country to join.

The Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News would like to be included among those who will not join.

The Dallas paper (circulation 150,000) says the "big grab" is the Federal retention of control over the tidelands and an estimated $268,000,000,000 in oil reserves contained in these off-shore underwater lands.

The Lewistown paper (circulation 4,000) thinks that the Dallas paper has confused the issue—that instead it is advocating the "big grab" when it proposes taking these vast riches away from the people of the United States as a whole and turning them over to a few States. It feels that Texas, and a few other coastal States, are doing the grabbing. But, with $268,000,000,000 as the take, this is apparently worth a try.

ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-TWO MILES

It is 1,832 miles from Lewistown to the Texas tidewater at Galveston, but Montanans have quite a stake in the Lone Star State's attempt at the "big grab" for themselves, as do people in all the 17 reclamation States of the West.

To review history a bit, when Congress opened up western lands for homesteaders or sale, the proceeds went to the dry or reclamation States, of which there are 17. They used the money to develop irrigation projects.

When, this income fell off, Montana and other reclamation States were cut off from this source of revenue.

But under the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, minerals and oil on Federal lands which were reserved by Uncle Sam have closed the gap and provided money to replace that formerly received from sale of public lands.

Nobody paid much attention to the ocean belts, which are included in the public lands, until the oil companies discovered that they were rich in oil resources.

SOFTER TOUCH?

The tidelands States, urged on by the big oil companies, then decided they wished the States rather than the Federal Government to control these riches. The theory, apparently, of the big oil companies was that they could get more out of the tideland States than they could out of Uncle Sam.

But if the tidelands should go to the States on which they front, then all Federal lands in inland States should also be turned over to the States in which they are located. After all, there is no difference.

Putting it in another way, if Texas or California has a right to demand the tidelands, then Montana, Wyoming, or Idaho have the same right to demand all of the Federal lands within their borders.

A tideland test was made a few years ago, which was carried all the way to the United States Supreme Court, which decided in 1947 that Federal ownership of the tidelands was proper.

But this didn't satisfy the big oil companies, and certain of the tideland States. They continue to demand control of the $268,000,000,000 oil reserves. And this is where the Dallas News comes in with its series of articles entitled "The Big Grab," which is an attempt to grab the tidelands.

Actually, forgetting the rights of the reclamation States, we can't see what all the shouting is about. After all, the tideland States still have their fingers deepest in the "sugar bowl."

KICKBACK ANYWAY

Under present laws, 37½ percent of the bonuses, royalties, and other take from the tidelands oil will go back to the State of origin, which would be Texas in the case of oil off the Texas coast. Ten percent remains with Uncle Sam to administer the fund, and 52½ percent will be appropriated by Congress for use on reclamation projects in the reclamation States.

Congress even decides how this will be divided so far as projects are concerned, which means that the larger States with the bigger congressional delegations—such as Texas and California—will have the greatest advantage in securing the larger share of this money.

So Texas and California, for example, will no doubt get quite a share of the 52½ percent that goes into the Federal Treasury from the tidelands, to be distributed to the 17 reclamation States.

Add it all up, and it looks like the tideland States are already in the saddle. They not only want the grapes—they want the vines, too.

When the Dallas News cries about the "big grab," the term is misleading. It applies to Texas and other tidewater States in the present fight, and not to Uncle Sam.

It is an attempt to grab, by a few, what rightly belongs to the many.

The United States Can Have But One President at a Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under our form of goverment our President is elected. We elect only one President and we must be served by only one President. No man has a right to accept a public trust whether in the armed services, the diplomatic service, or otherwise, at the hands of the President, unless he is responsive and responsible to him. When the holder of any such public trusts refuses to follow the directions of his Commander in Chief, when he no longer sees eye to eye with the policy of his President, he should relieve himself of the embarrassment by resigning.

When he does not follow that course, but persists in making his own policy, he necessarily incurs whatever shame must go with a dismissal.

No self-respecting President, no President who is faithful to his oath of office, could do other than dispense with the services of a man who willfully sets himself up as more authoritative or more important than his superior even if the latter were not vested with the sole constitutional authority.

President Truman is to be congratulated for the wisdom and the courage he displayed in relieving General MacArthur of his commands.

I am happy to note that the responsible press of the country overwhelmingly endorses the President's action, even though a part of that same press disagrees with his policy. The New York Herald Tribune of April 12, 1951, editorializes as follows:

The most obvious fact about the dismissal of General MacArthur is that he virtually forced his own removal. In high policy as in war there is no room for a divided command. Basic American policy—as defined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the State Department, the President, and, apparently, by the majority opinion of the country—has been to fight a holding war against Communist aggression in the Far East in conjunction with our allies, while building the alliance to a point at which it can prevent Communist aggression in Europe. General MacArthur disagreed with this basic strategic concept.

* * * * *

Here was divided command at its worst.

The Christian Science Monitor on April 11, 1951, said:

The situation had become such that the United States was speaking with two voices on national policy and military measures. Moreover, the UN commander in Korea was evidently not in sympathy with UN aims there—poorly defined as they are. The situation could be cleared up only by a decision on one side or the other. Unless the basic policies of the United States and the United Nations were to be overturned, it became necessary for General MacArthur to conform, to resign, or be removed.

The New York Times on April 12, 1951, said:

Throughout the first 6 months of the war in Korea statements issued in Tokyo by Gen. Douglas MacArthur at fairly frequent intervals indicated dissatisfaction on his part with one aspect or another of the policy, or lack of policy, demonstrated in this struggle by the United States, the United Nations or both. The record now shows that on two occasions (December 6 and again on March 24) General MacArthur was warned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that no further statements regarding policy should be issued by military commanders in the field without first being cleared in Washington. The record also shows that General MacArthur ignored both these warnings and subsequently made such statements.

* * * * *

Policy with respect to the conduct of a war cannot be made in two places. Under the American system, and specifically under the American Constitution, policy is made by the President of the United States. The policy chosen may prove in any given case to be wise or unwise; it may require a fundamental change on the basis of experience; but the Constitution puts the making of policy in the civilian hands of the Chief Executive, and it is the clear duty of the military to express its doubts or its dissent through proper military channels and not in public debate. It is, furthermore, the clear duty of the military to follow a specific Presidential directive, such as was twice issued to General MacArthur in this case.

We have no doubt, therefore, that the President acted properly in dismissing General MacArthur on the grounds stated, and no doubt, on the basis of the record, that a point had been reached at which it was necessary for him to take this action. Nor have we any doubt that these conclusions are fully shared by General MacArthur's fellow-officers in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In the Washington Post of April 12, 1951, we find the following:

The illustrious career of General MacArthur came to an end upon an inglorious note which will be regretted by all America. But there was no help for it. There is no room in our society for indispensable men or for ungovernable generals, no provision

in our Constitution for the President to play second fiddle. Civil supremacy had to be reasserted, and it was wisest to reassert civil supremacy unmistakably. The German peril got its head and sustenance from the hospitality of the German people to a general staff that had become a law unto itself. Japan was taken on the warpath by an army clique that overrode civilian government. These things must not happen here. We all have reason to be grateful that no segment of our society has been more critical of the self-willed conduct of General MacArthur than the high officers of our armed services. MacArthur, we feel sure, had no military following outside the dazzled court with which he had surrounded himself in Tokyo.

The supercession of General MacArthur is the first sign in months of a firm hand at the helm of our affairs. Mr. Truman should never again relax his initiative. He is the Commander in Chief and the organ of our foreign affairs.

The Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1951, approves the President's action in the following language:

Mr. Truman's decision to relieve General MacArthur of all his commands was a proper and necessary one. Whatever the partisans may say or do, the simple fact remains that we cannot have two commanders in chief. All soldiers must obey the orders that come to them from above; otherwise there is chaos.

The New York Post of April 11, 1951, very properly said the following:

President Truman has shown wisdom and courage in ending General MacArthur's one-man rebellion against civilian rule of American foreign policy.

We believe the great majority of his countrymen will support the President's stand. We think history will record it as a moment in which he rose dramatically to the tragic demands of his office.

The confusionists have rushed to their posts. There is tremendous sound and fury as the Old Guard Republican battalions take their front-line places along the Potomac. Long may they rave.

Yet the issues are as clear as they are fateful.

General MacArthur was engaged in open and reckless revolt against his Commander in Chief and the civilian officials who administer our foreign policy. They believe (and most Americans agree with them) that the soundest course for America and the world is to limit the Korean War and, if humanly possible, achieve an honorable peace.

MacArthur dissented. He viewed the Korean conflict as the opening skirmish in world war III. He was determined to plunge the United States and the United Nations into all-out war with China. He did not merely voice these opinions in private recommendations to Washington. He shouted them to everyone who would listen.

When he was directed to clear any public pronouncements with his superiors, he flagrantly defied the directive.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, he would have in effect engineered a successful military uprising against civilian authority, which is a pillar of our democracy.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, the coalition of free nations in the United Nations would have been destroyed and we would find ourselves engaged in a lonely war with China's millions.

In the face of MacArthur's calculated insurrection, plainly documented in the exhibits released by the White House early today the show-down was inevitable.

Mr. Truman didn't start this fight. He didn't seek it. He tried long and hard to resolve it without an explosion.

But each conciliatory gesture increased MacArthur's defiance. The general was literally engaged in a two-front war, and his obsession with his war against the White House steadily overshadowed his interest in the Korean front.

President Truman was confronted with the choice of summary action or total abdication of national leadership.

We applaud his action.

* * * * *

The irresponsible will have their field day. Puny men who would rather fight Harry S. Truman than build freedom's defenses against Communist aggression will aim all their popguns at the President. But Mr. Truman will gain new respect and affection from men of good will at home and abroad for his gallantry under fire. There are no persuasive words of restraint we can address to the know-nothings at this juncture, but we are sure that thousands of citizens who appreciate the nature of the President's ordeal will let him know their feelings now.

In recent weeks many eminent Republican philosophers and essayists have suggested that the only real question confronting the country was whether MacArthur would let Mr. Truman remain in the White House.

Mr. Truman has given them their answer. In doing so he has reaffirmed the dignity of his office and the strength of our free institutions.

Finally, let me direct your attention to the column by Walter Lippmann which appeared in newspapers throughout the country on April 12, 1951, in which he said:

The question, therefore, is whether General MacArthur chose to force the President to relieve him or whether he thought from what he had seen during the past year that the President would give in and would take his orders from Tokyo.

A plausible case can be made for either of these theories; neither can as yet be proved. But this much is certain: General MacArthur deliberately narrowed the choice and meant to force a show-down with the President of the United States on the issue of a general war in the Far East. He did that by compelling the President to choose publicly between relieving him and submitting to him.

Republicans Might Remember Calvin Coolidge and General Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, to say that I have been shocked by the clamor in support of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the face of his clear insubordination to his superior military and civilian chiefs is to indulge in a masterpiece of understatement.

While I myself have received almost as much mail in support of President Truman as I have from the administration's critics, there is one inescapable fact which shines out from the hysterical letters and telegrams from MacArthur's idolaters: That there was nothing spontaneous about this response.

The similarity of the language, of the names signed to the wires, letters, and post cards, and in one case a curious error in the return address, all suggest a systematic campaign with a central direction. The fact that the more scurrilous attacks on the President preceded by several hours the utterance of the same kind of attack on the floor also suggests a coordination of effort which certainly is not the spontaneous ignition of an inflamed public opinion, but rather the planned work of a sort of arson by propaganda.

THE BILLY MITCHELL CASE

In my own remarks yesterday I suggested a comparison between the action of Maj. Gen. Douglas MacArthur as a member of the court-martial which tried Col. William Mitchell in 1926 on eight specifications of a charge of violation of the Ninety-sixth Article of War, and the present case of General MacArthur as the insubordinate.

I have since received additional information which further points up the parallel.

In confirming the finding of the court—though reducing the severity of the penalty—the late President Calvin Coolidge made a statement astonishingly like that made by President Truman in the relief of General MacArthur.

It must be remembered in this context that the offenses were similar.

It was not for their personal views but for their open defiance of superior authority that both Mitchell and MacArthur were relieved, and certainly MacArthur's defiance was more flagrant and more portentous.

Are we to believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the view of the minority party a Republican President can do no wrong and a Democratic President can do no right?

I am certain that those with more time and facilities at their disposal will explore further the parallel between the Mitchell and the MacArthur cases.

NEW YORK POST SUPPORTS TRUMAN

Meanwhile, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of an incisive editorial from the New York Post of Wednesday, April 11, and, from the same paper the same day, an editorial column by Max Lerner, both of which reflect a much more mature reaction to world events than I have seen in the sensational yellow press:

[From the New York Post of April 11, 1951]

THE GREAT DECISION

President Truman has shown wisdom and courage in ending General MacArthur's one-man rebellion against civilian rule of American foreign policy.

We believe the great majority of his countrymen will support the President's stand. We think history will record it as a moment in which he rose dramatically to the tragic demands of his office.

The confusionists have rushed to their posts. There is tremendous sound and fury as the Old Guard Republican battalions take their front-line places along the Potomac. Long may they rave.

Yet the issues are as clear as they are fateful.

General MacArthur was engaged in open and reckless revolt against his Commander in Chief and the civilian officials who administer our foreign policy. They believe (and most Americans agree with them) that the soundest course for America and the world is to limit the Korean War and, if humanly possible, achieve an honorable peace.

MacArthur dissented. He viewed the Korean conflict as the opening skirmish in world war III. He was determined to plunge

the United States and the United Nations into all-out war with China. He did not merely voice these opinions in private recommendations to Washington. He shouted them to everyone who would listen.

When he was directed to clear any public pronouncements with his superiors, he flagrantly defied the directive.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, he would have in effect engineered a successful military uprising against civilian authority, which is a pillar of our democracy.

If MacArthur's coup had succeeded, the coalition of free nations in the United Nations would have been destroyed and we would find ourselves engaged in a lonely war with China's millions.

In the face of MacArthur's calculated insurrection, plainly documented in the exhibits released by the White House early today, the show-down was inevitable.

Mr. Truman didn't start this fight. He didn't seek it. He tried long and hard to resolve it without an explosion.

But each conciliatory gesture increased MacArthur's defiance. The general was literally engaged in a two-front war; and his obsession with his war against the White House steadily overshadowed his interest in the Korean front.

President Truman was confronted with the choice of summary action or total abdication of national leadership.

We applaud his action.

In the clamor that has already begun the Republican strategists and their typewriter commandos will valiantly strive to befuddle the country.

They will attempt to prove that the only issue in the dispute was whether General MacArthur should have been allowed to use Chiang Kai-shek's idle troops.

In reality, of course, what MacArthur was proposing was no such limited and luxurious course. He was proposing—and on this point he was more honest than his political cheer leaders—total war with China. He was proposing an infinitely greater commitment of American troops to China than any now contemplated. None of his political supporters has dared to spell out the dimensions of his dream.

The MacArthur blueprint for the conquest of Asia inevitably collided with all UN efforts to achieve peace in Korea. That was the heart of the rising anti-MacArthur resentment among our allies. That was the basic cause of the deepening divisions in the free world.

Today the fog may seem thick on Capitol Hill but the ouster of MacArthur has cleared the international air.

It has cemented the unity of free men. It has destroyed any moral uncertainty about our cause in Korea. It has once again put the issue of war or peace where it belongs—squarely up to the Chinese Communists.

Mr. Truman's action has blasted the biggest propaganda guns of the commissars in Europe and Asia alike. We do not know whether new mediation efforts in Korea will succeed or fail. We do know there can be no doubt anywhere in the world about responsibility for prolongation of the war. The President's dismissal of MacArthur in itself reaffirms the integrity of the goals which we and our allies have proclaimed in Korea.

The irresponsibles will have their field day. Puny men who would rather fight Harry S. Truman than build freedom's defenses against Communist aggression will aim all their pop-guns at the President. But Mr. Truman will gain new respect and affection from men of good will at home and abroad for his gallantry under fire. There are no persuasive words of restraint we can address to the know-nothings at this juncture; but we are sure that thousands of citizens who appreciate the nature of the President's ordeal will let him know their feelings now.

In recent weeks many eminent Republican philosophers and essayists have suggested that the only real question confronting the country was whether MacArthur would let Mr. Truman remain in the White House.

Mr. Truman has given them their answer. In doing so he has reaffirmed the dignity of his office and the strength of our free institutions.

[From the New York Post of April 11, 1951]

THE CRACKDOWN

(By Max Lerner)

The crackdown on Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman had to come. And it is well that it came when it did instead of being delayed again and again. There could never have been any doubt on the main issue, which was not the question of policy in Asia but the question of who has the right to shape the foreign policy of the United States.

Nevertheless it took courage for President Truman to do what he did. When a general hurls a direct challenge at the whole civilian authority of the American Government, and refuses to conduct his command except on the terms of his own political high policy, his challenge cannot be met by appeasement or double-talk or cowardly acquiescence.

There is only one way to meet it, and that is by the resolution and courage which the President has shown.

This MacArthur crisis is the first major internal crisis of the military caste that America has had to meet during this era of world wars. To find anything like its equal one must look to the political adventures of the Reichswehr generals or of the military dictatorship of Latin America. Since the days of Cromwell the British, with their common sense and their discipline, have managed to steer clear of such crises. America has had the good fortune to have military heroes like Eisenhower and Marshall, Bradley and Nimitz, who have had a basic concern for civilian democratic practices. Even the Billy Mitchell affair and the recent battle of the Pentagon over the admirals have been minor compared with the MacArthur crisis.

The first result of the President's decision is bound to be healthy. America itself was caught in a conflict of loyalties, between loyalty to democratic government, and loyalty to a flaming military symbol who had become a hero and myth to many, and an antiadministration messiah who could never do wrong. Such a conflict of loyalties between a military hero and a democratic society is bound to end in disaster unless it is decisively resolved.

We are also caught in a crisis of confidence in the United Nations, and among our allies in Western Europe and in the Near East and India. Another few weeks of this crisis, and the whole fabric of understanding that we had labored for years to build up with our allies would have toppled in ruins.

Now that crisis of confidence has been resolved, and the free world can once more stand together in unity against the threat of Kremlin imperialism, in Asia and Europe as well.

But it would be folly to believe that the MacArthur crisis is now over. In one sense the rough part of it has just begun. The real fight is still ahead.

Don't underestimate MacArthur's flair for the dramatic, or his sense of destiny at whose service his dramatic sense functions.

Will he accept his dismissal from his high posts, and come home as a private citizen determined to do nothing to split his country further and exploit the split? Or will he lend his name and fame and personality to a movement that can fan all the worst hatreds and the most inflammable emotions in the Nation?

In The Riddle of MacArthur, John Gunther says there is much of the old-fashioned nineteenth century political liberal in him. I hope Gunther will be proved right, for a nineteenth century liberal—or a twentieth century one for that matter—would never dream of pushing his fight to the edge of civil strife. Will MacArthur show that kind of restraint?

One can guess that on his return to America from which he has been absent so long, MacArthur will be received by a considerable segment of the press and Congress and the people both as a hero and a martyr. I have been traveling currently in the deeply Republican territory of Rochester and Buffalo, and many of the people with whom I have discussed MacArthur give him an almost grotesque idolatry and have made him the symbol of all their anxieties and frustrations. Both those who want the Korean war extended and those who think we should never have entered it link hands in supporting him and cursing Truman and Acheson.

Once the big batteries among the Congress Republicans and the press reactionaries start firing, the din will be deafening. This is what MacArthur has all along counted on, and the threat on this was his trump card. He is now probably ready to play it.

President Truman has known all this, which is what makes his act all the more courageous. He has shown himself willing to meet one of the peak crises of his Presidency unflinchingly.

He has been patient, all too patient, for months. He has given MacArthur the benefit of every doubt, shown him every deference.

Surely never in the history of a democracy has a civilian government acted so patiently, and never has a military man so blatantly goaded it and jibed at it.

In the end there was no other answer but to show that the foreign policy of the United States is shaped in the United States, by the people we have elected to shape it, and not at the whim of a supreme commander in Tokyo.

Wagner once had the fantasy of a Gotterdamerung, or Twilight of the Gods, in which they went down with a magnificent crash, pulling the pillars of the world down after them. It remains to see whether MacArthur has still this delusion of Wagnerian grandeur.

If there is to be a fight, there is no question that American democracy will win. But what a tragic waste it will mean at a time when every energy is needed for the larger world crisis.

Indian Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the following recent article concerning our American Indians, written by George Sokolsky, brought to the attention of the Members of the House:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Every day there is something new to discover in the United States. This country is so big and varied, and in each section the people are so different.

The other day I was in Tucson, Ariz., and I went to the Rotary Club there to listen to the chief of the Papagos deliver one of the most eloquent speeches that I had ever heard.

His name is Thomas A. Segundo and he is so obviously a leader of men that were

he not an Indian—a ward of the Department of the Interior—he could have been a Member of Congress without any loss to that august body.

What struck me so closely is that we, who are so eager to aid every nation on earth, do practically nothing for those from whom we have taken this country; that we violate our treaties with them; and that there are bills in Congress, at the present moment, designed to rob them, to steal their lands, and to deprive them of the few benefits remaining to them.

Perhaps we need a point 4 program for the American Indian right here at home.

Millions, if not billions of dollars, have been spent by the American taxpayer on the Indian Bureau, but there is little evidence to show benefits to the Indian from these expenditures. In fact, it would seem, from the results, that the design of the Bureau has been to make the Indian more dependent upon the bureaucrats.

The Papagos, for instance, can report that they have fewer schools and hospitalization facilities than 10 years ago.

Most Americans might look at the figure of 2,855,024 acres that the Papagos have as a reservation, and assume that they are land rich. But Arizona is an arid country, its desert lands being among the least productive in the United States.

I am told that in many parts of the West the Indian reservations are on bad lands where living is difficult unless oil or minerals are found and the Indians are not robbed.

We know too little about these people whom we conquered. We, who have the advantage of living here, owe them at least the debt of fair treatment.

I have on several occasions in these pieces called attention to the facts that the so-called pigmented peoples of the world, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, distrust the United States more than they do Soviet Russia.

The reason is that they are more offended by our social attitude toward the pigmented people in our midst.

Soviet Russia has taken full advantage of this and has conducted a long and successful propaganda against this country on the basis of what they call white supremacy.

While not accepting the Russian version of our social position, I cannot deny that they have presented a picture which Chinese, Indians, Iranians, Pakistani, and all the peoples of Africa accept as true.

In Korea many of our major difficulties have arisen from the belief that all Americans hate and like to kill those who are not white.

This presents a serious problem for a nation which is seeking allies among these very peoples. Certainly our treatment of the American Indian confirms the suspicion of unfairness. Even if we cannot be responsible for what our ancestors did, we must avoid doing more of the same, and if we do not behave decently for the sake of the American Indian, we might from the standpoint of national self-interest.

I was told that some of the most outrageous bills introduced in Congress are designed to rob the Indian of his lands in the interest of oil companies which know of oil deposits beneath the soil.

It would be advantageous to the United States to give the Indian a square deal, to make him an independent citizen, and to protect him in his economic rights. We have taken a good country from him.

We have treated other peoples whom we have conquered, the Cubans, the Filipinos, the Japanese, and the Germans, with fairness. We can treat the Indians with fairness and justice.

Money wasted by a Washington bureau does not always indicate benefits to those who require them. Perhaps if we consulted the American Indians, they might come up with a better program than we have yet seen.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Federated Legislative Committee of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me at Harrisburg last Tuesday, April 10, at the annual luncheon of the Federated Legislative Committee of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an inspiration to meet again with this courageous group of God fearing men and women.

Over the years you have manned the ramparts defending good government. You have battled bravely for law and order, the Constitution and the American way of life.

Year after year you have taken part in government in order that we may have good laws and that good men may have aid in properly administering them.

Never in the history of the United States have we needed organizations like yours as much as we do today.

Our country is confronted with so many dangers. People point to the dangers but take no action. They fail to realize that in America the laws are passed and enforced by the people. The source of all power is in the hands of the people if they will assert themselves.

The greatest danger to America is not from without. It is from within. The real dangers are here at home.

The terrible revelations we have had during the last few months should shake us out of our complacency.

There has been brought forcefully to our attention the existence of widespread evils which threaten the foundations of free government.

There has been produced clear and convincing evidence that men in high Government places have betrayed the responsibilities entrusted to them.

We have been told how racketeers and gambling syndicates have gained wealth and power through corrupt alliances with some law enforcement officers and crooked politicians.

These shocking disclosures should have only one meaning. They should be a call to every decent, self-respecting American to engage in relentless war against the forces of vice and lawlessness.

Senator FULBRIGHT stated the case very clearly when he said:

"It is bad enough to have corruption in our midst but it is worse if it is to be condoned and accepted as inevitable."

It has been proposed that we formulate a new statement of ethical standards and moral principles for the conduct of public affairs.

That might be helpful, but I believe we can place complete reliance upon the eternal truths that have guided men of good will on the path of honor and righteousness since the dawn of Christianity.

No man in possession of his mental faculties is unable to distinguish between right and wrong. Even those whose vision is blinded by selfishness, greed, and the desire for quick riches are aware of what is good and what is in violation of law or morality.

No man-made code of ethics can replace the guide to human conduct set forth in the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount.

Obedience to the laws of God and man is the foundation of good citizenship and good government.

Patriotism, religion, and high moral standards are fundamental qualities without which no nation can go forward.

Regardless of its form of government, regardless of the laws placed upon its books, no nation can rise above the moral and spiritual standards of its people.

No community can be better than its individuals.

That is why I say that every good citizen, every man and woman who worships at the altar of God, should take an intelligent, patriotic, and militant part in government.

That means taking part in politics. It means working for the election of men of integrity and high character—dedicated to public service rather than personal power or private gain.

It means arousing public opinion to a higher standard of morality, to inspire deeper respect for the law and to assure confidence in the integrity of our officials and our courts.

An informed and aroused electorate could overnight transform corruption into sound government by turning grafting officials out of office.

In his testimony before the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, made this significant statement, and I quote:

"If the laws against gambling were earnestly and vigorously enforced, organized gambling would be eliminated within 48 hours in any community in the land."

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Hoover but I know that permanent results cannot be achieved without a great awakening of civic responsibility.

The most effective leadership in that direction should, and must, come from the pulpit and from the great body of laymen who hold official positions in our church organizations.

The ills from which our Nation suffers today can be overcome if we have a strong, militant church, battling day in and day out, for good sound, clean, economic Government.

That means fighting for a solvent America. It means vigorous and aggressive action against all forms of waste and extravagance in Government spending. It means determined opposition to unsound fiscal policies, unbalanced budgets, excessive taxation, increasing public debt, and the destructive force of runaway inflation.

We must remember that bankruptcy is the inevitable consequence of spending beyond one's means, whether by an individual or a government. And we must take warning from history that national bankruptcy always brings a totalitarian form of government. That means the loss of all individual freedom, including the most precious of all, freedom of religion.

Therefore, I say to you men and women of the church, clean and decent government is your business. Economy in government is your business.

There must be a real understanding of patriotic Americanism. All must recognize the sovereignty of God and the immortality of the soul. Then we shall have brotherhood among men. Churches and nations will unite for peace and good will in the world.

Lastly, in this period of stress and uncertainty we should all live so we may be counted on the Lord's side.

That will give us an army of such strength and with such faith that none can defeat us.

Immigration Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution which was adopted by the United States Grand Lodge, Independent Order Brith Abraham, with reference to pending immigration bills. I heartily endorse the recommendations set forth therein.

Whereas for more than 2 years committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been studying and conducting hearings for the purpose of revising the United States immigration and nationality laws; and

Whereas hearings on bills introduced by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, and Representative EMANUEL CELLER are now being held in Washington before a Joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Independent Order Brith Abraham go on record that the sections of the proposed bill the order is interested in are:

1. To support the pooling of unused quotas, which would utilize unused portions of annual quotas and make them available to other qualified immigrants so as to assure the admission of the over-all total of 154,000 immigrants per year as originally fixed by Congress.

2. To support maximum review of judicial and administrative rulings and to support the proposal for the establishment of a Visa Review Board, the same as presently exists in the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

3. To oppose any provisions in the bill which do away with or fail to include provisions for statutes of limitations.

4. To oppose the principle of selective immigration on the ground that it approaches the immigrant from an economic standpoint; regards immigrants as commodities, and ignores the basis of traditional American immigration policies.

5. To support the principles of equal treatment of involuntary members of totalitarian groups, whether of the left or right.

6. To favor the use of the latest possible census period as a basis for computing quotas so as to take into account the latest changes for distribution of population.

7. To support liberalization of the provisions for suspension of deportation, and not to remove the existing law which requires either a stated period of residence or proof that deportation would result in hardship.

LOUIS A. WEISSMAN,
Grand Master.
ADOLPH STERN,
Grand Secretary.

The Communists Rejoice Over the Removal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Times-Herald of April 13, 1951, by Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher, expresses quite accurately the sentiments that are disclosed by true Americans from whom I am receiving communications.

The Communists have infiltrated into the key positions of our Government throughout a long period of time, and have practically taken over our foreign policies. Some years ago I published at my own expense a list of over 600 alleged Communists in Government, and gave the name and address of each, and claimed no immunity for mentioning their names and alleged communism. I circulated this list among all of the Legion posts of my district. This was years before present developments.

I have called attention time and again in the RECORD of the activities of Alger Hiss in the trade-agreements program. It will be recalled that I warned the House that a large percent of the 101 experts who went to the Geneva Conference to deal with tariff rates were Communists.

The time has long since passed when the American people can afford to surrender their vital interests to these subversive elements, domestic and foreign, that are now applauding the removal of General MacArthur in the Far East.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred:

LITTLE LIES TO SUPPORT THE BIG LIE

The Communist Party in the United States has enthusiastically endorsed the dismissal of General MacArthur, calling him an "ultra-warmonger" and "the Caesar of the Pacific." They know their real enemies from their pretended ones.

The British Socialists are ecstatic, for they really procured MacArthur's dismissal through their tool, Acheson, the Anglo-Canadian friend of traitors. They hate the general because his efforts to rehabilitate Japan threaten them with a trade rival. They are anxious to give Korea and Formosa to the Communists as a bribe for their retention of Hong Kong.

The French are also exultant. Their political structure is so permeated with communism that they can organize neither industry nor an army effectively enough to defend themselves. Their contributions to the United Nations forces in Korea have been minuscule, and they resent the use of American forces there. The French want those divisions in Europe to give France the protection her people will not give themselves.

NATION SHOCKED

The people who are shocked and horrified by Mr. Truman's dismissal of the Nation's greatest soldier are the voters of the United States. Their spontaneous protests have overwhelmed the telegraph offices of Washington. Thousands of their messages demand the impeachment of Truman and Acheson.

Mr. Truman went on the radio Wednesday night in an effort to stem this national tide of anger. He and Acheson realized that they had fired the general for saying what the people of the Nation think. It was therefore necessary for Truman to defend his foreign policy, particularly in Asia. That policy is based on a big lie, the big lie of collective security. Its defense required a series of little falsehoods and half truths.

"If history has taught us anything," asserted Mr. Truman, "it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace everywhere in the world."

This is a lie, often repeated to justify killing American youths in every swamp or desert on the globe, in the role of world policemen. If aggression anywhere is a threat to peace everywhere, why is Mr. Truman silent about British aggression against the free nation of Egypt; about British exploitation of Iranian oil that is threatening to drive the Persians into the arms of Russia; about French enslavement of Morocco, and all the other aggressions of European colonialism?

He dwelt on free nations banding together for collective security. This is a double-barreled lie. There are no free countries aside from the United States, Scandinavia, and Switzerland. Britain is a Socialist tyranny at home and a colonial tyranny abroad. France combines Communist decay with tottering imperialism. Both have succumbed to the theory that man is the property of the state, which Truman seeks to inflict on us, and that means the death of freedom.

As for collective security, where is it? We provide the security, and the rest of the world does the collecting. The United Nations is a fraud. It reluctantly endorsed Mr. Truman's unconstitutional war in Korea, and has been doing everything in its power since to placate the Communists and give them across the conference table what they have failed to win by arms.

LIMITED WAR IS ITSELF A LIE

Mr. Truman said that in Korea we have taught the enemy a lesson. In the next breath he said that the enemy is building up forces for a new attack. What he didn't say is that this rally of Communist strength is being accomplished with his approval and assistance. His directive of March 20 forbade General MacArthur to go in force across the thirty-eighth parallel. This is what Mr. Truman calls limited war. It is not limited merely to Korea. It is limited to South Korea.

"Limited war" is in itself a lie. What is being conducted in Korea, by direction of Truman and the United Nations, is a war without an objective and without end. This is supposed to keep us out of a general war. Communist China fights us, but we are not to fight China. There is nothing limited about the casualties that this folly has inflicted on America.

Mr. Truman quite obviously doesn't want a military victory in Korea because the British, who dominate his policy, don't want one. This sell-out to the Reds is already prepared. They are to have Formosa and a seat in U. N., the British promise. In these circumstances Mr. Truman's conditions for peace in Korea become a mockery.

He says that fighting must stop, concrete steps must be taken to insure against resumption of fighting, and there must be an end to the aggression. This, he says, will prepare the way for the unification of Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign forces.

These are empty words. They cannot mean what Mr. Truman wants people to believe they mean. If he and the United Nations pursue such a program, Korea will be unified, but it will be as a Red Korea.

He would withdraw foreign forces. That leaves the North Korean Communist Army the master of the peninsula.

Mr. Truman's joint chiefs of staff only recently reported that it had no supply of such infantry weapons as mortars and machine guns with which to arm idle South Korean reserves. Those weapons, apparently, are earmarked for Europe. The Truman program, his speech makes apparent, is to liquidate his Korean misadventure in order to prepare American conscripts for a new slaughter across the Atlantic.

Truman's folly is as appalling as his falsehoods.

He and his Svengali, Acheson, must be impeached.

Scandal Marked White House Since Truman Took Over Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the deluge of telegrams and letters from the highways and byways of the Nation and from people in all walks of life, protesting the middle-of-the-night action of President Truman in firing General MacArthur and the bitterness which his action has engendered on the home front is due in a large measure to the nausea inflicted on the people by the Truman administration.

This latest episode came almost 6 years ago to the day from the time the ex-Missouri haberdasher, who had been rescued by Tom Pendergast, was shoved behind the Chief Executive's desk in the White House.

On that occasion, Mr. Truman likened his feelings to having a load of hay fall on him. Almost each new act and each new utterance emphasizes the existence of the effects of such an experience.

Millions of Americans are suffering from an ailment which the family physician used to call overloaded stomach. They are sick at stomach and weary at heart. The high blood pressure among the citizens, brought on by the MacArthur removal, is as much a flare-up from national malnutrition caused by absence of grounds for confidence in officials in charge of foreign and domestic affairs in Washington as anything else.

This malady has been induced and aggravated by ptomaine poisoning from such things as 5-percenters, mink coats, deep freezers, perjury, disclosures of alliances between politicians and crooks, and ill-framed utterances from the White House in men's room language, concerning punched noses to be forthcoming when the Chief Executive turns in the keys to the White House because certain newspapermen have not always said honeyed words about the President and his family.

American citizens are once again proving themselves a patient lot. The President would do well to look about him for this trait in his fellow citizens and try to absorb some of it himself in these trying times.

Americans have had the atom-bomb secret stolen from them by Communist spies and yet heard the Chief Executive berate a congressional committee attempting to expose Moscow-directed espionage operations. They have learned of the theft of top-flight Government secrets and yet heard the Secretary of State say "he would not turn his back" on one of his aides accused in the plot. The aide, incidentally, was convicted of perjury and is now in jail.

They have tolerated a long list of scandals that have decorated the Truman Fair Deal administration like a Christmas tree.

A Washington newspaper, the Times-Herald, has summarized these scandals which have been inflicted on the public since Mr. Truman became boss in the White House. It appears they will have historical significance in this great and tragic era, and for that reason I am asking that the article be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SCANDAL MARKED WHITE HOUSE SINCE TRUMAN TOOK OVER RULE—FAVORITISM, INFLUENCE ORDER OF THE DAY PUNCTUATED WITH FREEZERS, MINK COATS

The Truman administration has been pockmarked by scandals almost from the day Harry S. Truman raised his right hand in the Cabinet room of the executive offices and became the thirty-third President of the United States.

While the new Chief Executive humbly begged for help in carrying out the task thrust upon his shoulders by death, an army of cronies, friends, political pals, and relatives went to work to help themselves mostly at the expense of taxpayers.

Favoritism and influence became the order of the day. Fixers, swindlers, manipulators, Communist spies, and Red fellow travelers operated within the administration and even from within the White House.

SCANDALS GALORE

The administration has been marked by scandals bursting in the air. These include favors, vote frauds, deep freezes, mink coats, vast profits for pals, spying, treason, 5 percent operations, and other forms of graft and corruption.

Administration apologists maintain that Mr. Truman doesn't know about the corruption around him. Critics maintain he doesn't care. The record is at hand to speak for itself.

Shortly after he became Vice President, Mr. Truman flew to Kansas City to attend the funeral of Tom Pendergast, boss of the notorious Kansas City Democratic machine, who had not long before been released from prison for income-tax evasion. Pendergast had picked Mr. Truman, after he had failed as a haberdasher, and launched him into politics. For loyal service to the machine Pendergast made him a Senator.

FIRED PENDERGAST'S JAILER

Almost his first act as President was to fire Maurice Milligán, United States attorney general in Kansas City. Milligan had put Pendergast in jail. Mr. Truman also fired Attorney General Francis Biddle, who had refused to remove Milligan.

Mr. Truman won the senatorial election in 1934 by 41,000 votes. The majority came from Kansas City where the Pendergast machine had long been and still is adept at stealing votes. In the 1934 election the announced count showed 120,180 votes for Mr. Truman and only 1,221 for his opponent.

Two years later a Federal judge started a clean-up which ended in removing 58,881 ghost votes from the Kansas City polling lists.

In the August 1946 primary vote frauds were charged and ballots were impounded. On a night in May 1947, while Mr. Truman was sleeping in a hotel a few blocks away, the courthouse safe, containing the ballots, was dynamited and the ballots were stolen. No one was ever prosecuted for the crime.

PARDONED IN VOTE FRAUD

A few months later Mr. Truman pardoned Mrs. Frances Ryan, one of 63 Kansas City election frauders, and restored her civil rights. This cog in the Pendergast machine was convicted for her part in 1936 vote frauds. The White House described the pardon as routine.

Last year another scandal exploded in Kansas City with fatal results. As the Senate Crime Committee was investigating the alliance between crime and the Democratic machine in that city, Charles Binaggio, gangster, was slain with his bodyguard in a Democratic ward headquarters. Binaggio met his death underneath a picture of Truman.

Binaggio's assassination blocked his plans to invest $200,000 in the New Mexico pumice enterprise of David F. Wallace, brother-in-law of the President. Wallace became interested in developing pumice when it appeared that the material might be used in building blocks more impervious to atomic radiation than other building materials. The involved fortunes of Pumex, a corporation formed to follow the development, have never been untangled by Congress.

From the outset of his administration Mr. Truman doled out plums to his pals and cronies with the lavish hand of a medieval monarch. Ability counted for nothing against friendship.

MRS. TRUMAN ON PAYROLL

The President began doling out Federal largesse when he was a Senator. He put Mrs. Truman on his senatorial payroll and eventually raised her to $4,000 a year. When this became a scandal because Mrs. Truman did not go to his office it was explained that Mrs. Truman helped her husband at home by reading Missouri newspapers. Daughter Margaret has parlayed the White House and an undistinguished voice into one of the highest paying radio contracts.

It was not long before activities of the President's official family were revealed, Brig. Gen. Wallace H. Graham, the President's personal physician, was found to have been trading in the grain market, using inside information to make profits. Instead of being removed, he was promoted.

FIVE-PERCENTER JAILED

Major General Vaughan, the President's military aide, was revealed to have accepted seven deep freezes in return for favors granted. One of the freezes went to Mrs. Truman. Vaughan pulled many wires even to getting scarce materials for a race track when veterans were clamoring for homes.

The deep freezes were an incident in the scandal of influence peddling by persons who charged 5 percent for their wire pulling. The inquiry by Congress resulted in only one jail sentence—that for John Maragon, a one-time Kansas City bootblack, who was sentenced to jail for perjury. Investigators charged him with making $120,000 in a 5-year period when he had sworn his income was only $30,000.

Donald Dawson, White House administrative assistant on personnel, is the latest member of the Truman official family to be involved in scandal. He is charged with employing influence to win RFC loans for friends and deserving Democrats. He has refused to appear before a Senate subcommittee investigating the RFC. Mr. Truman has not made him appear to tell his story.

Mrs. Lauretta Young, a White House stenographer, got a $9,500 pastel mink coat, which has figured in the investigation. Joseph Rosenbaum, interested in securing RFC loans, says he loaned money to her husband, E. Merl Young, so that he might purchase the coat.

FROM $1,900 TO $60,000

Mrs. Young was a secretary to the President when he was a Senator. Mr. Truman got the husband a job as messenger at $1,900 a year. When Mr. Truman became President, Young became an RFC examiner and then an expediter. That is, he assisted persons desiring RFC loans. His income for last year was estimated at $60,000 by Senate investigators.

The RFC scandal also uncovered a ship deal under which a group of administration figures and military men made a $2,800,000 profit on an investment of $100,000. The

group included the late former Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, former Representative Joseph Casey, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Admiral William F. (Bull) Halsey and Brig. Gen. Julius Holmes.

The administration is working to shut off investigation of the RFC scandals. It is reliably reported that there are available almost a thousand influence letters to the RFC. Of these it is reported that Dawson wrote 100, Democratic National Chairman William Boyle wrote 50 and various Members of Congress wrote 800.

The administration is also seeking to shut off the investigation into crime, which has linked Democratic city machines to crime. Alliances have been uncovered in Chicago, Kansas City, Miami, New York, and other cities.

In New York gangsters were revealed as associating with top Democratic figures, including former Mayor William O'Dwyer, who resigned the mayoralty just before the lid blew off the scandal and was appointed ambassador to Mexico by Mr. Truman.

OTHERS GIVEN PARDON

James W. Curley, Democratic leader in Massachusetts and former mayor of Boston, got a pardon from Mr. Truman. He was sentenced to prison on a mail-fraud charge. Another New Dealer was convicted on the same fraud. He was Donald W. Smith, former National Labor Relations Board member.

Mr. Truman opened prison doors last December to E. F. Prichard, Jr., a protege of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, who was sentenced to 2 years in jail for ballot-box stuffing. Prichard, a Harvard graduate, was a New Deal lawyer.

Other recipients of Truman pardons and parole were Joseph M. Schenck, the motion-picture producer who was convicted on income-tax dodging; James Gavin, a pal of Vice President BARKLEY and a contributor to the Democratic Party, who also ran afoul of income-tax laws, and Frank Banning, a jewel thief. Banning admitted his pardon had been obtained by political influence. Within a year he was put back in jail under a 60-year sentence for shooting a policeman.

New Dealers and Fair Dealers sent to prison during Mr. Truman's years in the White House include: Former Representative Andrew J. May, Democrat, of Kentucky, who was convicted of accepting bribes of $53,634 to further fortunes of an Illinois munitions firm. Murray and Henry Garsson, heads of the firm, also went to jail.

Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers of the Air Force, sentenced to prison for inducing a former business associate to lie under oath. Testimony showed that as second ranking Army Air Force purchasing officer he took profits of $150,000 out of an aviation electric corporation.

Eugene B. Casey, former White House aide to President Roosevelt, was sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined $30,000 in 1947 for income-tax evasion.

Kenneth Romney, Sergeant at Arms of the House for 15 years, was jailed in 1947 when a $143,863 shortage was found in his accounts.

The most sensational scandal of the Truman administration has been the disclosures of the influences of Communists and fellow travelers in the administration.

FIELD FLEES TO REDS

Capstone of this scandal is Alger Hiss, who went to jail last month after appeal to the Supreme Court failed on his conviction as a perjurer-spy. Although Hiss' spying was done under the Roosevelt administration, the Truman administration bent every effort to win his release. Even after the conviction State Secretary Acheson said he would not turn his back on his pal.

Henry Julian Wadleigh and Noel Field, State Department officials figured in the Hiss trial but were never accused themselves. Wadleigh admitted stealing 400 to 500 documents and passing them on for relay to Moscow. Field fled behind the iron curtain and is assumed to be in Russia.

Judith Coplon, an employee of the Justice Department, was convicted of spying by juries in New York and Washington. The New York conviction, which involved a Soviet U. N. attaché, Valentin Gubichev, was reversed and remanded for new trial. A Washington spying conviction still stands over her.

William Remington, a Commerce Department official, was convicted of lying about Communist connections. The administration had worked to discredit the case against him in a general indictment of Communist exposures as "red herrings."

BRIDGES CONVICTED AS LIAR

Harry Bridges, head of the west coast longshoremen's union, who was a stanch New Dealer, was convicted of lying when he swore that he wasn't a Communist at the time he took out naturalization papers.

The Amerasia case is another phase of the administration scandal involving Communists and Communist spying. John S. Service, a State Department official, and Philip J. Jaffe, editor of the magazine Amerasia, were among six persons involved in the case.

Others were Kate Mitchell, coeditor of the magazine; Andrew Roth, a Navy lieutenant; Emanual S. Larsen, another State Department employee, and Mark S. Gayn.

Class Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution:

CITY OF CHELSEA, MASS., *April 9, 1951.*

RESOLUTION AGAINST THE DEFERMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS FROM ENTERING THE MILITARY SERVICE

Whereas the President has promulgated an order deferring the drafting of college students; and

Whereas the city government of Chelsea consider this an un-American method of all citizens bearing the same burden, both poor and rich; and

Whereas there should be no class legislation where the safety of a country is concerned and all Americans should bear their equal rights, privileges, and duties of their citizenship: Now, therefore, we register our protest and urge the President and Congress not to enforce this promulgation;

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and all the Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

JAMES A. HANLON.

In board of aldermen, April 9, 1951, adopted.
Approved, April 11, 1951.

JOSEPH A. MELLEY,
Mayor.

A true copy.
Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRRELL,
City Clerk.

Senator Wherry Defends General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the American people are deeply disturbed over the action of President Truman in summarily relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from command of United Nations troops in the war in Korea.

Some observations on this tragic action were made by the junior Senator from Nebraska over the Mutual Broadcasting System last night in reply to a radio address by the President the previous night.

The junior Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for insertion and printing of his address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WHERRY DEFENDS GENERAL MACARTHUR

(Senator WHERRY denounces President Truman's removal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as supreme commander of United Nations forces in the war in Korea—as shabby treatment for a great soldier, statesman, and patriot; urges congressional hearing for General MacArthur and investigation of administration's foreign policies and national defense planning.)

My fellow Americans, the action of President Truman in summarily relieving Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command over the United Nations forces in Korea—and from his other high commands in the Pacific—is added evidence there is vital need for examination and investigation by the Congress of the administration's foreign policies and national defense planning.

As we survey the world of today, the record of failure in foreign policies, that has brought us dangerously near another world war, the war in Korea dragging along in indecision, and increasing the tear-stained pillows across the Nation, the exposures of moral decay in high places, the Government's fiscal situation depending upon deeper and deeper drafts upon the taxpayers, the times cry aloud for this Congress to reassert its independence and develop a sound national defense policy.

In both foreign policy and national defense partisan political approaches deserve the condemnation of every patriotic citizen.

We must accomplish a united front in our dealings with foreign nations. To inject partisanship into national defense planning in which the lives and future of our youth are at stake is completely in contradiction with the American way.

But it is the right and duty of every citizen—and especially those of us in the Congress—to offer constructive criticism. That is the process of our republican form of government.

It is in this spirit that I address you tonight, and judging by the flood of telegrams and letters which have come to my office, and the volume of telephone calls from all parts of the country in the last 48 hours, the American people are deeply disturbed over

the dismissal of General MacArthur, our vacillating foreign policy, and our hit-or-miss national defense planning.

What the American people want is national security. They are asking for a sound program of national defense. They are demanding a thorough congressional ventilation of the Truman-MacArthur affair, and other phases of the administration's zigzag, inept foreign policies that have led our Nation to the brink of another world war.

Cries of "wolf, wolf" and charges that others are trying to maneuver the United States into another world war, will not enable those responsible for our present perilous situation to escape the wrath of the American people.

To charge General MacArthur with attempting to involve the United States in a gigantic war with Red China and precipitate unleashing of a third world war is resented by every thinking American familiar with the glorious record of this great statesman, soldier, patriot.

The pygmies cannot bring down this giant, this tower of strength and deserving idol of the American people.

Compare the monumental record of General MacArthur with that of his accusers, with their record of moral decay, greed, corruption, and confusion of these weaklings in the Truman administration.

The result of such a comparison can be only an alarm to the American people.

With all the force that is in me, fellow Americans, I ask you to remember the admonition that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The obvious truth is that the ship of state is floundering in a whirlpool of mink coats, paternalism, RFC-influenced loans, crooked political machines in league with national organizations, class arrayed against class, and a new scandal the order of the day.

Yes, fellow Americans, it is high time to become vigilant and militant. Your freedoms are at stake, and there is danger that runaway inflation will consume the people's wealth and render our beloved country unable to stand as the bulwark of freedom against the communistic threat.

Pollyanna speeches by the President that he is against war and is trying to prevent a third world war are not enough. The American people do not question his sincerity or his patriotism. None of us wants another world war. But there is an old adage that the road to destruction is paved with good intentions.

Fellow Americans, Gen. Douglas MacArthur needs no defense. He will take care of that when he comes home. And this leader of our victorious forces in the Pacific in World War II, this wounded hero of World War I, will return to his beloved country in triumph armed with the sword of experience and a knowledge of economic, political, and military conditions in the Far East unsurpassed by any living American.

On behalf of many Republican Members of the Congress (an overwhelming majority of them), I have introduced into the Senate a concurrent resolution, inviting General MacArthur to address a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives.

An identical resolution has been introduced in the House by the minority leader, JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts. These resolutions should be adopted by both Houses, and we are making every effort we can for their adoption. On the floor of the Senate I invited all the members of the Democratic Party to join in support of the resolution.

General MacArthur is entitled to his day in court. The American people want to hear what General MacArthur has to say. They are waiting for his words of wisdom.

The Nation heard over this mutual network last night the President's weak defense of his shabby treatment of this great general and statesman. Now, let us hear from General MacArthur. Let's extend him an invitation to report to the Congress and to the American people.

But more than fair play is involved. Fundamental basic issues are at stake. They can be resolved only by the Congress as representatives of the people.

I do not question the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to relieve General MacArthur—or any other military officer from his command or commands. But I do question the wisdom of the President in removing General MacArthur.

My memories go back to the court martialing of Gen. Billy Mitchell, the great exponent of air power. Oh, yes; there was a roar of condemnation against Billy Mitchell, because he exposed the stupidity of majoring in ground forces where there was available the overpowering weapon of airplanes.

Billy Mitchell, too, was smeared and finally drummed out of the air corps by court martial. But Billy Mitchell was right and—long after his death—the Congress belatedly recognized the tremendous service he had given to his country. A resolution was unanimously adopted and this great patriot was decorated posthumously. And this Nation owes Billy Mitchell an everlasting debt of gratitude for the services he performed.

Again and again the President, in his radio address last night, stated that he was trying to prevent a third world war, and that his removal of the general was designed to show, that it was done to prove he does not want a third world war.

Well, who got us into this war? This is Truman's war and let the record show that the President did not obtain a declaration of war by the Congress as the Constitution provides.

I have seen no statements by General MacArthur that he wants a third world war. I have not seen any statement by him that he wants to send American foot soldiers into Manchuria. Certainly he has not suggested an all-out war with China. He has advised, that the offer of a half-million anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa to join the United Nations forces should be accepted.

Is there any reason why these volunteers should be rejected? They will take the places of thousands of American boys who will be drafted and sent to Korea.

The North Korea Communists have no qualm against accepting the aid of any Communists, whether they be Chinese, Japanese, or Russian.

These anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa are directly interested in victory for the republican forces of Korea. They desire to aid the South Koreans. Why should their request for an opportunity to help be denied? Is it better to let your sons fight and die in Korea than to let these anti-Communist Chinese fight for a toehold toward eventual liberation of their native China?

But, yet, fellow Americans, that is what the administration's policy means.

General MacArthur has said that the United Nations forces are fighting with one arm behind their backs, meaning inability to bomb Communist supply bases across the Yalu River creates a great handicap. Everybody knows this is true. General MacArthur revealed no military secret in pointing that out.

And, fellow Americans, the constitutional power of the President—as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces—gives him no authority to consign American troops to fight under conditions in which they cannot defend themselves.

Certainly the Constitution does not give the Commander in Chief the power to subject American boys to enemy fire without the right to fire back.

Certainly this is the position that the Commander in Chief has taken in Korea, and you can interpret it no other way.

Over and over, the President says, he is against a third world war growing out of the conflict in Korea. But our forces in Korea are now fighting Chinese Reds. They are there by many thousands and there are hundreds of thousands behind them in China. Indications now are that they are going to continue to pour into Korea, and the fighting against Red Chinese and perhaps other "volunteer" Communists, will continue on and on in Korea.

And, I ask you, what hope did President Truman offer to you, the American people, last night for a victorious conclusion of his mission to Korea? When will it ever end?

Yes; and lest we forget, fellow Americans, it was his mission. He ordered the American forces into action without approval of the Congress. He usurped that power to make war. He did so without authority of the Congress; and, let me remind you, Congress never has surrendered its war-making power to the United Nations.

It appears, from the President's radio address, that there is a new policy for our forces in Korea. They were sent there originally to liberate all of Korea, take the offensive, and punish the North Koreans and their helpers into submission.

But now it is evident we are to wage a holding action in Korea somewhere near the thirty-eighth parallel. Our forces are to stand there like the Rock of Gibraltar—beating down the onrushing hordes from across the Yalu River.

We now are to prove to the Communist by this firm stand that it is folly for them to continue the war and they should humbly appeal for peace, turn over all of Korea to the Koreans, and never make war again.

Fellow Americans, the President now has written off his original venture into Korea to defeat the North Koreans and restore freedom to the whole country. His new policy now is to show the North Koreans and Red China that they cannot drive us out.

That's the Korean policy of the administration.

O Mr. President, there is not much comfort in this outlook. The new strategy means more and more tear-stained pillows throughout our land.

This is why the American people want to hear General MacArthur. They believe that from his vast knowledge and experience in the South Pacific, he can recommend a better way to accomplish vindication for the forces of freedom in Korea.

There is much more to this desperate situation than the mechanics of warfare. The attitude of Western Europe is obvious to the American people. It is quite natural that Western Europe would like to have priority on America's manpower and America's resources.

Why, the Socialist Government of Great Britain, which has not hesitated to permit the sale of war materials to Soviet Russia and Red China, and which has conducted a thriving business with the Communists through Hong Kong, now has the audacity to insist that Formosa be turned over to Red China and that Red China, the Moscow-directed bandits that took over the Republic of China, should sit with the United States in making a peace treaty with Japan.

The pattern is familiar. Step by step the Dean Acheson policy of appeasement of the Communists goes forward. There is rejoicing tonight among the pro-Communists who run in and out of the State Department like water through a sieve. Under

Mr. Acheson's let-the-dust-settle policy in Asia, the Reds were able to take over all of China and thrust their tentacles southward.

General MacArthur was in the Pacific all of this time. Let us hear from him. Let us have the truth, exposing the blackest chapter in American history. Let the American people know what pressures have been brought upon the Truman administration from Western European countries to wind up the Korean war with the best face-saver terms possible.

All of these matters should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress. The United States Senate in adopting recently a resolution approving the sending of four ground divisions to Europe for integration into the North Atlantic Treaty international army served notice upon the President that he should obtain the approval of the Congress before sending any more divisions over there.

This was a wholesome indication of revival of the Congress as the policy-making department of the Government. It was one road block to President Truman's efforts to establish a military dictatorship.

It was notice to the President and his power-grabbing clique that the Senate and the American people reject his philosophy that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, can assign them anywhere in the world for any purpose he deems in the public interest, and wherever he alone believes American security is threatened.

The President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but he is not a dictator over the Nation's defense policies. Congress alone has the power to declare war.

We Americans don't believe in divine rights for kings or presidents.

My fellow Americans, there is grave danger that unless the Congress develops a sound global defense policy the Nation's manpower and resources will be frittered away by the administration in preparedness for a land war with Soviet Russia if she attacks.

The bayonet generals who dominate the Pentagon in Washington are calling the signals in cooperation with Dean Acheson's political manipulations around the globe.

The kind of thinking that dominates our national defense planning is reflected in an address made by Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at the Army Day conference in Boston on February 4, 1949—and I quote General Bradley:

"I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground."

Now, General Bradley has served his Nation with great distinction. We honor him for his great contribution to victory in World War II, but he plainly wants to prepare for war along classical lines, long before the advent of the war plane.

General Bradley, General Marshall, General Collins, and the other dominant voices in the Pentagon are foot soldiers by training. They apparently have never learned the lessons in air power that Gen. Billy Mitchell gave.

They fail to recognize that the advent of the intercontinental bomber has revolutionized warfare. They refuse to admit that the United States now has long-range bombers that can fly from this country to any target in Russia and back home nonstop.

They fail to recognize that the Red air force is just 5½ hours away from the United States. They ignore the warning of General Vandenberg, a Chief of the Air Force, that if Russian long-range bombers strike the United States in force, over the North pole, 70 percent of them would get through and reduce our industrial centers to ashes.

No, fellow Americans, the bayonet generals of the Pentagon want to build a defensive army in Western Europe to fight Russia on the ground, Russia with her present 175 divisions in being, hundreds more available within weeks, and backed by 500,000,000 slave laborers.

To engage the Russian army on the ground, before her war industrial potential has been pulverized by air power, would be sheer madness, a reckless, wanton disregard for the lives of American boys and a cruel hoax upon the people of Western Europe.

General LeMay testified before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees on the Wherry resolution, as follows:

"General LEMAY. Well, sir, I do not believe that we need to match Russia division for division fighting a full-scale war on the ground. I do not believe we should conduct a war against Russia in that manner.

"Senator WHERRY. How would you conduct it?

"General LEMAY. I would use the weapons at which we are more proficient and better capable of providing. We are not capable of fighting the Russian Empire by matching their manpower.

* * * * *

"Senator WHERRY. What would happen to the armies of Russia in the field if her war potential, the industrial war potential, were destroyed at home?

"General LEMAY. An army in the field becomes impotent when it is not resupplied.

"Senator WHERRY. So with the destruction of Russia's war potential, the Russian Army would disintegrate?

"General LEMAY. If they could not be resupplied they would become ineffective.

"Senator WHERRY. If you had to choose between defense dollars, and I would like to say that I accept the figures of Senator BYRD that the expenditures of budgets for the balance of this fiscal year and next year will reach approximately $144,700,000,000, if you had to choose defense dollars, what would you choose to spend to build the deterrent which you think would stop a Russian invasion?

"General LEMAY. I would choose the weapon of air power."

That was General LeMay speaking, the man who delivered by air the knock-out blows that paved the way for victory over Japan, blows that made it unnecessary to land foot soldiers on the soil of Japan.

Gen. Carl Spaatz, who commanded the Allied air forces in Western Europe in World War II, says, and I quote:

"A wall of flesh is being built in Western Europe."

General Spaatz further says that if we had been properly prepared in bombers at the outset of World War II there would have been no need for the Normandy landing.

My information is there has been a slowing down of orders for long-range bombers, the kind that can pulverize Russia's war potential, and a stepping up of orders for tactical planes, to be used as support for ground warfare in Europe if war comes.

Our air power is being dribbled out, deployed around the world in the fatuous planning to engage Russia in ground warfare, when, for every $1,000,000,000 spent on troops for Europe, we can build 280 strategic bombers which could be used to destroy Russia's war industrial potential. You would be shocked if I told you the small number we have.

The American people simply do not have the resources to raise, equip, and maintain an army in Western Europe big enough to stop the Russian hordes and at the same time finance an invincible navy and obtain mastery of the air.

We should cut our defense cloth to fit the pattern. We can afford to obtain mastery of the air, to build an invincible navy, and we can also afford to finance a mobile army.

But first priority is mastery of the air. Control the air and you control the ground under it.

Fellow Americans, crucial decisions in national defense planning are in the making. The issue soon will come up in the Congress when appropriations for national defense are considered. Then it will be up to the Congress to determine how the defense dollar shall be divided.

You, my fellow citizens, are the sovereign power to determine through your Congress how that defense dollar shall be divided and how many dollars shall be appropriated.

Congress, all of us, need the advice of such great military experts at Gen. Douglas MacArthur to help us in determining this question of high public policy.

We, the American people, want no more Yaltas, no more Tehrans, or Potsdams; no more Pearl Harbors; no more secrecy on matters that affect their lives and fortunes.

Time and again we Republicans in the Congress have offered our full, complete cooperation with President Truman in developing some effective foreign policies and national defense policies.

He has ignored the Republican leadership of the Congress in the development of both.

He claims the power of a dictator over our national defense policies and in foreign affairs and international policies. We learn of his commitments only after they have been made, sometimes through the press and radio.

My countrymen, this condition is intolerable among free people. Again I appeal to the President to work hand in hand with the Congress in determining the policies upon which the very life of the Republic may depend.

With all kindness in my heart, I urge the President to cast aside the radical clique that envelops him, to share his heavy burdens with the American people and their representatives in the Congress.

This is the historic way.

This is the American way.

And now, Mr. President, the American people demand it.

Public Opinion Poll by Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News Upon National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for printing in the Appendix a very interesting poll of public opinion which was recently compiled by the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News.

The results are extremely interesting from both a local and a national standpoint and indicates by the size of the poll how deeply interested the people are in the matters which presently challenge the attention of Congress.

I believe the Elgin Courier-News is to be congratulated on this constructive effort in the field of public service. It will enhance citizen interest in the issues before Congress, in national affairs generally, as nothing else can do.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cumulative and percentage results of the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News readers' ballot upon national issues

[Ballot published in 1 issue of the paper, Mar. 31, 1951. Results include those received and tallied Apr. 2-9, 1951]

	Yes		No		Not voting (percent)
	Votes	Percent	Votes	Percent	
Should 18-year-olds be drafted?	294	13.6	1,817	84.0	2.4
Should the Nation commit a large standing army to service in Europe?	68	3.1	2,054	95.0	1.9
Should a congressional committee continue an investigation of organized crime and graft in this country?	1,997	92.4	52	2.4	5.2
Should nondefense spending be cut to the bone?	1,875	86.7	234	10.8	2.5
Should Congress act to rid every department of the Government of Communists?	2,127	98.4	11	.5	1.1
Should the State Department be overhauled from top to bottom?	2,069	95.7	44	2.0	2.3
Should the President be prevented from committing American manpower to undeclared wars?	2,067	95.6	75	3.4	1.0
Should the Nation adopt universal military training?	1,060	49.0	1,012	46.8	4.2
Should Congress adopt all recommendations of the Hoover Commission for streamlining government?	1,839	85.0	159	7.3	7.7
Should Congress appropriate taxpayers' money to bolster prices of farm products and other commodities?	90	4.1	2,009	92.9	3.0

Voting upon the readership ballot was voluntary. Readers were invited in the news columns to clip and mark the ballots and mail or bring them to the newspaper office. Through the April 2 to 9 period in question, 1,497 ballots were returned, while the total of readers of legal age voting upon the issues were 2,161. Net paid circulation of the Courier-News upon the day the ballot was published, March 31, 1951, was 21,058. Additional returns are being received, but only those tallied through April 9 are included above.

The Korean War and the Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject the Korean War and the Dismissal of General MacArthur, which I delivered last night before the Yale Club of New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The administration invoked the Korean war. In our general resistance to Communist aggression throughout the world we have necessarily adopted different policies in different places. To some states we give only economic aid. To other states, such as Greece and Turkey, we send military equipment and American officers for training purposes. In a few locations we are prepared to send American troops. Our program must be limited by our total economic and military strength, and by the hope for practical success, particularly if we are to send American soldiers into battle. Our Government decided that Korea was not defensible and withdrew our troops from Korea, something we never should have done if we intended to return. We put Korea in the class of those states which were to receive military aid, but we gave no aid, except small arms and military advice. We failed to send airplanes or tanks and heavy artillery. The State Department asked for money for that purpose but, after a year, it developed that none of the money had been spent. The President himself said finally that we were only undertaking to give arms to the South Koreans to prevent border raids and internal aggression. Some appeaser in the State Department was afraid that with real arms they might have attacked the Communists in North Korea. Then, in January 1950, Secretary Acheson made a public statement to the effect that the American line of defense in the Pacific was Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. In order to support the State Department's left-wing prejudice against Chiang Kai-shek and the policy of defending Formosa, which he and others had suggested, Acheson made clear his policy that the United States would not assure either Korea or Formosa against attack by the sending of troops. With such a reaffirmation of our far eastern policy, is it any wonder that Soviet Russia and the Korean Communists took the Secretary of State at his word? If we were contemplating the recognition of Communist China, as the Secretary clearly indicated at that time, then certainly the Communists could well believe that if they could once occupy Korea, they could look forward to recognition by the United States of Communist Korea. To Soviet Russia, Korea was a soft spot into which they could move their Communist satellites without cost. Every indication is that a firm anti-Communist policy in Formosa and Korea would have avoided war altogether.

2. When the North Koreans attacked, the President without authority from Congress sent American soldiers into war. I have pointed out frequently that he completely usurped power where he had no constitutional right.

The President last night spent half of his speech justifying the action of the United States in entering the Korean war, on the ground that the attack was the first military aggression since the war and that failure to resist North Korean aggression would have led to world war III. Against the most serious handicaps, with full risk of involving both Communist China and Communist Russia in the war, he rashly sent to Korea every American soldier who was available. There have been nearly 60,000 casualties.

I agree there was a good logical argument for the United States, by action of President and Congress, to reverse our past policy and undertake to punish the first outright military aggression since the Second World War. We secured a recommendation of the Security Council to that effect, because the Russians were then boycotting the Council and were not present. But we overlooked the fact that this was merely a temporary condition and that when the Russians returned we could no longer count on United Nations support.

The United Nations army, made up almost entirely of Americans, was successful and captured most of North Korea. Certainly it had to move beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, and was authorized to do so; otherwise the whole theory of the United Nations would have been nullified. If the United Nations only drives back an aggressor to the border after the war has destroyed the country attacked and the aggressor country is not invaded or punished, then nations will have everything to gain by aggression, and nothing to lose.

But when the United Nations objective in Korea was almost accomplished, we faced a second aggression from a much more powerful nation, namely, Communist China. This was not only an aggression against Korea, it was an aggression against the United Nations itself and an attack on its army and its authority. This aggression has been largely successful and has reconquered half of Korea from the United Nations. But the Security Council refuses to act at all, and the United Nations Assembly at last reluctantly denounced the Red Chinese as aggressors, a fact obvious to everybody else for months. But they did nothing more, and they have, in fact, tried to hamper any punishment of the aggressor or even a retaking of the land which the aggressor has seized.

In this treatment of Communist China, the United Nations has abandoned every ideal for which it was established. If the original sending of American troops to Korea was to prevent world war III, then that purpose has been long completely lost from sight. It cannot now be accomplished without an aggressive war against Communist China and a punishment of the aggressor, as the North Koreans were punished.

The President's position is completely inconsistent. He justified an active move against Korean aggression as a means of preventing world war III. In the second half of his speech he claims world war III is prevented by a timid war against Communist China, and maintaining a Maginot line defense against an aggressor who has already accomplished half his purpose. He justifies two completely inconsistent courses as means of preventing world war III. I don't suppose there has ever been a more ridiculously inconsistent justification for vital moves in foreign policy.

The truth is we misjudged the power of the United Nations; we misjudged the intentions of the Chinese Communists and now we are in a situation to which there is no completely satisfactory solution.

3. Three policies are being proposed in Korea. Policy No. 1 is a more active battle against Red China. From a moral standpoint, we would be wholly justified in a complete invasion of China to punish an unprovoked aggressor. Practical considerations, of course, make it impossible, and no one has proposed it. Genereal MacArthur and everyone else knows it would take many American divisions, and that those divisions are not available and will not be for 2 years. Also I agree that such a move might unduly incite Soviet Russia to war.

Proposals for a more active war have been limited to two, as referred to by the President in his speech. One is that we assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on the mainland of China. Second that we bomb communications, supply depots, and industrial plants in Manchuria and China itself. Neither of these would mean a general war in China. Both of them would have a direct effect in weakening the Chinese armies in Korea. It seems utterly ridiculous to me that when there are 500,000 soldiers on For-

mosa, some of them well-trained and ready to go, and thousands of guerrillas in south China with whom they can cooperate, we should not permit raids and invasion to make as much trouble for the Chinese Communists as possible and force the withdrawal of some of their troops from Korea. Probably Chiang could not make at this time an all-out invasion, but he could keep south China in an uproar and many Communist troops diverted from Korea. That might make all the difference in our success there, and might save thousands of American lives. I cannot see why such a policy would in any way incite Russia to war. Or we could use these soldiers in Korea, as Chiang proposed. The truth is that this policy is not undertaken, first, because of the prejudices of Secretary of State Acheson and Secretary of Defense Marshall against Chiang and, second, because it would upset the trade of the British with Communist China.

The bombing of communications and concentrations in China might have more possibility of bringing Russia into the war. But without it our Korean War presents a ridiculous spectacle. The whole Chinese attack on our Army can be built up behind the Yalu River in a kind of game sanctuary.

If there is no other way to bring war in Korea to an end, I think we would have to bomb these Chinese communications and Chinese Armies and take a chance of Russian aggression. In Europe we have not hesitated to do many things which the Russians may well regard as threatening their security. The whole Atlantic Pact, certainly the arming of Germany, is an incentive for Russia to enter the war before the army is built up. I cannot see that any bombing of China without invasion can be regarded in any way by Russia as an aggressive move against Russia itself, or a reason for war, unless they have made up their minds to start a third world war anyway.

The whole thesis of Senator KERR yesterday in the Senate that a full-scale invasion of China means a third world war is of no consequence because no one is proposing such a war. We are only trying to fight more successfully a war in Korea.

Policy No. 2 is that proposed by the President last night. It is a Maginot-line policy. We are to continue to conduct a war with our hands tied behind our backs. We are to refuse all assistance from the Chinese Nationalists. It is like a football game in which our team, when it reaches the 50-yard line, is always instructed to kick. Our team can never score, and sooner or later somebody on the other side will catch the ball and make a touchdown. As I read the President's speech, he suggests that if we don't notice that the Chinese are there in Korea, after a while they will go away. His hopes are almost pitiful. If we inflict sufficient casualties, he says, this "may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack." If they see the world arming "this may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea." If they realize they cannot defeat us in Korea (except to the extent they have already done so) "then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible." This certainly proposes a stalemate war. It makes a joke of the United Nations ban against aggression, and encourages aggression elsewhere. The President himself points out that back in China there "stand additional millions of Chinese soldiers." They will have lost nothing except a few men, and manpower in China is cheap. It is ridiculous to say that we are preventing either aggression or world war III by this stalemate war. The Chinese aggression has captured half of Korea and cowed most of the free world. Half of our effective Army is tied up in a position 5,000 miles from home, from which it would be very difficult to rescue it if the Russians started a war. It must be quite a temptation to them, if they really contemplate starting world war III.

Policy No. 3 is to end the war by appeasement. That is the policy with which the administration has constantly flirted. That is the policy which Secretary Acheson indicated before the Korean War when he proposed to turn over Formosa to the Communists. That is the policy the State Department approved when it instructed the American representatives to accept the cease-fire plan of January 13, 1951. That plan provided for the withdrawal of all foreign armies from Korea—almost certainly leaving the Korean Communists in full control. At the same time we agreed to sit down with the British, the Russians, and the Chinese Communists to discuss the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, and also the disposition of Formosa. The Chinese Nationalists were to be excluded. This is also the policy urged upon us by the British, who wish us to surrender Formosa and recognize Communist China by admitting them to the peace negotiations with Japan.

In view of Secretary Acheson's past acts, and under this wavering administration, no one can be certain that they will not adopt this program. The President uses the words "no appeasement," but he completely omitted from his speech any repudiation of the policy of surrendering Formosa to China or the United Nations or the policy of recognizing the Chinese Communists. Of course, such a policy would destroy the whole basis of the United Nations as an instrument against aggression. It would reward the aggressor instead of punishing the aggressor. Such a policy would render useless the death and wounding of 60,000 American boys in Korea. Such a policy would encourage the Chinese Communists to invade Indochina, Burma, Thailand, and Malaya. It would be undiluted appeasement and would not even save our face. I have never been able to understand the British position, which seems to me a terrible mistake from their own standpoint. We certainly know enough of Communist thinking today to be certain that they would sweep on into the soft spots of southeast Asia until the British lose both Hong Kong and Singapore. The British ought to be backing Chiang Kai-shek in South China to prevent the development of any such program.

I have discussed the three plans for conducting the Korean War. General MacArthur favored the first, but I think his determination to bring his views to the American people was brought about far more by his fear, and his justified fear, of the adoption of plan No. 3. I think he spoke out, endangering his own position, because he felt that only thus could the American people be brought to realize the danger of the Acheson policy. The firing of General MacArthur has led the world to believe that we are looking in the direction of appeasement. It is a blow to every man and every country in the Far East that favored an aggressive attitude toward the spread of communism. It is an encouragement to every Communist in the Far East and throughout the world. It has caused a tragic weakening of our moral position.

More than that, it throws away a large part of the good will we had created in Japan. The white man by himself cannot today undertake to rule the Far East. The influence of freedom can only be built up by believers in freedom among the far-eastern peoples themselves. The only strong friends we had in the Far East were the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa and the Japanese. The President has discouraged both by the dismissal of MacArthur.

It would be hard to deliberately invent a more disastrous series of policy moves than this administration has adopted during the past 18 months in the Far East. Far from preventing world war III it has involved us in a major war which now has no purpose whatsoever; and it has encouraged an aggression which makes a larger war far more likely in the future. Any American must be sick at heart to see the useless waste of life and the wavering weakness of the administration, which has reduced the United States position in Asia to a new low.

The Place of Big Business in Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial entitled "Bigger and Better Businesses Needed," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGGER AND BETTER BUSINESSES NEEDED

Bigger and better businesses will be needed in the United States in the years ahead to meet the tremendous expense of mobilization in combating the threats of world conditions, especially the determined aggressions of Soviet Russia.

The United States News and World Report in the current issue cites General Motors Corp. as an example of what one of the big business firms of the Nation is doing to help keep the wheels of our Government turning.

General Motors during 1950 did a gross business of $7,500,000,000. It turned out products that satisfied its customers.

Of that amount, United States News states that $1,700,000,000 was paid directly to the Government in taxes.

The firm's workers, 465,000 of them, received $1,900,000,000. The Government collected at least $200,000,000 in taxes from the workers. Firms supplying General Motors with needed materials and equipment received $3,500,000,000. The Government collected another $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 from the supply firms.

The 445,000 stockholders received $539,000,000 in dividends. The Government collected an estimated $150,000,000 more in taxes from the stockholders.

General Motors produced at least $1,700,000,000 taxes for the Government.

United States News Week makes this comment:

"With $70,000,000,000 in bills to pay, the Federal Government must encourage corporations to grow and to be prosperous. Otherwise the Government will find it harder to do the things it wants to do."

The Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column of Walter Winchell published in the New York Daily Mirror on March 27 last, in which he discussed the investigation by the Kefauver committee.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN NEW YORK

(By Walter Winchell)

MR. AND MRS. UNITED STATES: The Kefauver committee has done a good job of showing up the American underworld with its political tie-ups. But never in history has the sinful life been given the effective—and misleading—advertising it got from the Senate hearings in the last few weeks. When the average, hard-working, debt-ridden citizen heard that a Frank Costello can swing elections and keep $50,000 in cash around the house for spending money—his first reaction was not apt to be indignation so much as envy.

But that's one of the limitations of this modern world. Television can give a picture, but only the mind can give the view. For every so-called successful Costello there are 5,000 misled kids in reform schools and 10,000 men behind prison bars. Frank Costello, on the surface, was a winner. But the losers in the criminal game—the prisoners in the penitentiary—could have testified that all of Costello's money isn't worth the right of a free man to take a walk in the spring.

When the chic Virginia Hill unfolded her amazing life story (contributing nothing to the committee's knowledge of crime—after her tardy arrival was excused by Senator KEFAUVER with the explanation "ladies from my part of the country are traditionally late"), many a young girl must have wondered: Who really knows best? Mother or Virginia Hill? After doing all the things called wrong, there she was on top of the world, with a beautiful home in Miami Beach and a handsome husband and baby.

But it is a very hard life for any woman to receive more attention than affection—and even harder to receive more affection than respect. The life of Virginia Hill sounds glamorous to the uninitiated. But as Damon Runyon said: "It reads a whole lot better than it lives." Most women would gladly trade every fur coat or Miami mansion they might own to avoid having the man they love shot between the eyes with a rifle—or the thousand tortured hours spent waiting for it. And, of course, for every girl like Virginia Hill who hit the high lights of the shadow circuit, there are 10,000 pitifully dependent upon the whim of a criminal's twisted mind for their next meal. Television could not tell anyone of their stories—not only because it is too gruesome—but because there is nothing more boring than repeated sordidness.

The Senators have proven that the underworld is based on one principal source of revenue—gambling—and 90 percent of that horse gambling. But some eminent psychologists would tell you the reason public interest and indignation are so high was not because the spotlight was on Frank Costello—but because America was holding the mirror up to itself. Frank Costello, sitting in the witness chair, was not the average citizen's $2 bet come home to win—but come home to roost.

Whether or not the average citizen likes to believe it, it is just as immoral for him to place an illegal bet with the gamblers as it is for the gamblers to bribe public officials. The gamblers do not use their own money to bribe public officials; they haven't enough. They must use the public's. Anyone born before noon today knows that part of his $2 bet goes to the crooked combine between criminals and politicians. Under the common law, knowing that, makes him an accessory before the fact—and an accessory before the fact is a principal to the crime. Accordingly, Mr. and Mrs. Betting America, take a good look at Frank Costello, because more than he was your enemy—he was your agent.

What the television pictures lacked was a montage. They should have had plenty of background shots; in fact, they left out the main character, which was Mr. and Mrs. Millions of Betting Public. They should have shown background shots of the crowds swarming up to the betting windows; the busy horse rooms around the country serviced by the eminently respectable A. T. & T., and the conservative newspapers with the racing results. And, of course, the delegation of happy United States Senators being received by the Governor of Kentucky at last year's Kentucky Derby. Or, to make it more timely, the horde of Washington politicians skipping the Kefauver hearings to swarm out to the opening of Laurel last Good Friday.

This is no defense of gambling or official bribing, but it is an attack on hypocrisy. Under his constitutional rights, Frank Costello need not confess to anything on the witness stand. On the other hand, Costello is perfectly satisfied with the gambling situation. Mr. and Mrs. America and the United States Senate are not. They want to do something about it. But, unfortunately, it is a first rule of the law they say they seek to uphold that the applicant come in with clean hands. Well, Mr. and Mrs. America, at least half of you haven't got them. The hands of half the adult population are soiled by the billions of dollars they have paid out in $2 bets—the tiny little raindrops out of which comes the torrent of corruption. Mr. and Mrs. Two-Dollar Bettor, you can stop speculating on who is the man higher up. Not very surprisingly—to those who know how the system works—Mr. and Mrs. Two-Dollar Bettor—it is you.

Vice alone does not make a hypocrite. A hypocrite is a man who denies his own vices—while he seeks to punish his own failings in others. Whatever the betting laws may say, betting on horse races is an ancient American tradition, a long-fixed habit, and a time-honored institution. Once this is admitted, the public won't need the underworld as its broker—any more than it now needs a rum-runner to deliver its $8,000,000,000 annual intake of alcoholic liquors. Sure gambling is bad for you, but overeating kills 1,000 times more breadwinners yearly than all the roulette wheels combined.

Gambling is as broad as the Nation—and not as narrow as the televised pictures of the witness stand. What people are—and what people should be—is as old a story as the Garden of Eden. As Lincoln Steffens said of that: "It wasn't Adam's fault and it wasn't Eve's fault. It wasn't the serpent's fault either. It was the fault of the apple they wanted."

The great crime of a hypocrite is that he demands a scapegoat as proof of the truth of the lie he is telling to himself. In the long scheme of justice, it can't be good law that a nondescript goes to jail as a common gambler, while the judge who sentences him knows that the prisoner helped pay the man who gave the judge his job on the bench. A long historical record proves that if the code of the silent criminal were not stronger than the criminal code of New York State, there would have been many prisoners who would have testified they were less guilty than the judges who sentenced them—and that the hearts of those judges were as black as their robes.

Again, this is no defense of gambling. But it does charge that the aristocratic bluebloods of the jockey club—who stage the races—and Frank Costello, the common gambler—are more than brothers under the skin. They are brothers under the table. And Mr. and Mrs. Two Dollar Bettor—you are the first guilty link of the chains—on another man's wrist.

Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Only What You Help Make It," written by "Bud" Calman, and published in the April 5 edition of the Sturgis News, of Sturgis, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY WHAT YOU HELP MAKE IT

(By "Bud" Calman)

A young man asked of me the other day, "To what does the present generation have to look forward to and plan for?"—that was a real question. I know that in back of that young man's mind were the thoughts of continued rising taxes; taxes for this, taxes for that, give to this and give to that—blood banks to try and save lives offered up in the name of peace, with little outlook for peace; save on this and save on that—sacrifices—buy defense bonds, high prices and hard to make both ends meet with only the forecast of things to get worse, rather than better. Yes; our forefathers had a struggle to establish this country of ours, but then each day, each week they could see some progress being made, while today the young people see naught in the future but sacrifices, while all the time the conditions seem to get worse. What hope does the future hold? Only, my young friend, that men may be free eventually from tyranny of men like Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Stalins—when that will be, if you will live to see it, none can foretell, but whatever the price, it is not too great so long as you can call yourself free men, so long as you can have sanctity of home; so long as you are free to choose your religion; so long as there is hope left in man, there is a chance for a better world for some future generation,

maybe not yours, maybe for your great-great-grandchildren—it was to that end that the Pilgrims made the initial sacrifice and to which generations since on this continent have dedicated their endeavors. Raise your head young man, look to the heavens, there is a future for you—where and when, only time will tell, only God in those heavens knows and he will reveal that time to you, when in his plan of things, the time is right, but never, never give up hope, it is the foundation on which the structure of your life is built; it is the bulwark against the rising tides of hate and greed and tyranny; it is the rainbow that promises for you and all mankind a tomorrow, which can only be what you help to make it.

The President's Radio Address on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Winchell:

NEW YORK, April 12.—The President's speech—and the truth—false and misleading statements are shunned in the commercial world. In the diplomatic world, however, they are exalted as state papers. The President gave his grounds for firing MacArthur at 10:30 Wednesday night, but the real reasons and the real cause had been printed that very morning on the front page of the New York Times.

This is the dispatch: WASHINGTON.—"Britain has suggested to the United States that Communist China be brought into the negotiations for a Japanese peace treaty * * * and, further, that the treaty provide for the ultimate if not immediate return of Formosa to 'China.' * * * By China, the British mean the regime of Mao Tse-tung (Communist)." In short, Secretary Acheson's commitments to London call not only for the sellout of Formosa, but Japan also.

Said Mr. Truman: "If history has taught us anything, it is that aggression anywhere in the world is a threat to peace anywhere in the world. And since World War II, we have been putting that lesson into practice—we're working with the free nations to check the designs of the Soviet Union. * * * That is what we did in Greece."

The actual records show that since the Second World War, the President has earned the title of the greatest appeaser in history. "This is what we did in Greece," is not what Mr. Truman did in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and 11 other countries. He surrendered them. He didn't intend to oppose Communist imperialism. If he did, why did he, as recently as 1 year ago, pigeonhole the 70-group Air Force, mothball the fleet, and then tell the American people that "peace" was near? The news is that until very recently history hadn't as yet taught President Truman the simple fundamental that you can't appease a dictator.

"The attack in Korea was part of a great plan for conquering all of Asia," said the President. This is the very same man who called it a "police action" only eight bloody months ago. "I would like to read to you from a secret intelligence report which came after the attack," continued the President. It is apparent that for a considerable time the President has been furnished an intelligence report after events happen, such as the Bogota riots. An intelligence report after an event isn't an intelligence report at all. It is an alibi. Obviously, if the intelligence report had been effective, President Truman would have had more troops ready to meet the attack. The so-called intelligence report had already been confirmed by thousands of American corpses. If the President really wanted the people to read an intelligence report, he would release the Wedemeyer report to the public. That will be the day.

Said the President: "The whole Communist imperialism is back of the attack on peace in the Far East. It was the Soviet Union that trained and equipped the North Koreans for aggression." But the President failed to mention that the Russians were sold jets by Great Britain; that the Soviet Army rolls on British rubber and the Soviet soldier sleeps in an English woolen blanket. The President did not say that the chief source of Red China's supply was not Moscow, but Hong Kong and Singapore. That would interfere with peaceful international relations, as the truth often does.

"The question we have had to face," continued the President, "is whether the Communist plan of conquest can be stopped without a general war." The President apparently forgot his Secretary of Defense, George Marshall, had within the last month told the American people they were already in a global war and fighting for their lives.

"We have taught the enemy a lesson," intoned the President. "He has found out that aggression is not cheap or easy." The truth is, however, and the records show, that the enemy seized 11 countries while Mr. Truman was busy disarming our country on an economy basis. The "enemy" took 11 countries without firing a single shot, and without loss of a single Russian soldier. That's an easy bargain, as the Gold Star Mothers of Korea would be happy to testify.

"The Communist side must now choose its course of action," said the President. This, in diplomatic language, is a frank admission that the President has surrendered the initiative. It is not a United Nations or an American program that is to be decisive. In short, what happens next is Stalin's choice. This is great policy for Marshal Stalin—especially to tell him so.

Said the President: "Behind the North Koreans and Chinese Communists stand millions of Chinese soldiers. And behind the Chinese soldiers stand the tanks, the planes, the submarines, the soldiers and the scheming rulers of the Soviet Union." But this isn't what the President said last June. At that time he called it a mere "police action." The President failed to tell the American people what he was doing while the Communist strength, which he now admits, was being built up. President Truman's administration was busy selling war factories, mothballing the fleet, and disbanding the Army. As a matter of fact, within the last month his own Democratic Senators proved that ex-convict John Maragon, armed with a White House letter from General Vaughan, was selling the very United States arms the President now says we must build up.

Said the President of General MacArthur: "It was with deepest personal regret that I found myself compelled to take this action. General MacArthur is one of our greatest military commanders. But the cause of world peace is more important than any individual." The Daily Worker, in much more abusive language, heartily agrees with President Truman in calling General MacArthur a danger to world peace. Today's headlines in the Daily Worker hail President Truman—and say that no greater blow has ever been struck for their cause. For once, the Daily Worker is right.

Will Communist China Become a Member of the United Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the administration's sudden effort to go back to appease Russia through the urging of India, Great Britain, and quite a majority of the members of the United Nations, will not succeed in the admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations, the surrender of the Nationalist Chinese to their executioners and the abandonment of Japan and the Philippines.

With Russia in the League, no world peace is possible and anyone with any understanding at all of the aims of Russia ought to know that. If Red China is admitted, the chances of world peace become much less. With India and Great Britain clamoring for this recognition of Communist China, you can see that world peace of the capitalistic countries is doomed. Russia is determined to exterminate the religion of all countries and to destroy capitalism anywhere and everywhere. An appeasement program makes Russia just that much stronger, and the recognition of Red China would be a fitting climax to the downfall of all hopes of world peace and the downfall of the United Nations, so far as we are concerned. If our purpose in the Orient is to stop the spread of communism, the recognition of Red China, branded by the UN as an aggressor, is furthering and not arresting the spread of communism.

If Red China is admitted to the UN., it is noticed that if any aggressor wants to start on a campaign of slaughter of the troops of the UN and do enough of it, that is the surest way to gain a membership in the UN.

The President says he wants to confine the war to Korea and not cause a third world war. That is just what Russia wants—they want to have us fight in Korea and not go beyond that while Russia siphons the troops of Manchuria and the rest of China to meet us with hordes that we can never kill off fast enough to win that war. It's a nice arrangement for our enemies, but an impossible goal for the United States.

England is dead-set on having Red China recognized. Does anyone not know why the English take this attitude? They take it for business reasons—just as they always do in protecting the trade of England. They are nicely seated in Hong Kong and Singapore, and are carrying on a brisk trade right now in

strategic war material with Red China, while her own men—what few she has sent to Korea—are presumed to be fighting against Red China. There is no doubt now—none whatever—that England will transfer material—which we give her—to our enemies. England is likewise still trading with the Russians.

Under these circumstances, should this Nation feel disposed to send our boys overseas to protect England? Have not we any sense left, or have we lost our balance?

The President has boldly told Congress that he will send troops anywhere he wants and engage in any conflict he wants to, in any part of the world, without the consent of Congress. The President will do it, too, because there is not moral fiber enough left in a spineless Congress to stop him. An attempt was made Wednesday to do it, but the vote was 168 to 192 against interfering with the President.

A Guy Who Knows the Score

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ed Kennedy, from the Indianapolis Times of April 10, 1951:

A GUY WHO KNOWS THE SCORE—BATTLE-WORN GI's SHUN POLITICS, BACK UP MAC—PLASTER PARIS ROW IN ATTERBURY HOSPITAL RIDES ALONG WITH GENERAL IN CONDUCT OF WAR

(By Ed Kennedy)

They don't give a damn for politics on plaster-paris row.

But they have some very definite ideas on the way the Korean War should be handled.

Plaster-paris row is made up of the wards at the Camp Atterbury General Hospital where the boys back from the front mend their Commie bullet-shattered bones.

Nobody's asked them what they think about the present row over General MacArthur. Nobody ever asks combat soldiers what they think.

"We'll take that hill, men"—or "we'll hold this line if it takes all winter" is all they ever hear until a spade slaps them in the face—with full military honors, of course, or they land in a hospital.

NUTS

As the "MacArthur's genius" against MacArthur "should be sacked" argument sweeps Washington and European capitals, the wounded GI's at Atterbury got a chance to voice their opinions to the Times.

"Nuts to the politicians," one of them cracked. "Mac's the only one in the bunch that understands the far-eastern problem and has guts enough to stand up to it."

The soldiers expressed no great love for MacArthur the man. But they did express great respect for MacArthur the soldier and statesman.

On his present statements they backed him to a man.

1. Chinese Nationalist troops should be permitted and helped to make a landing on the Red-held mainland of China.

2. Our planes should not be restricted in their bombing of Red bases which supply their forces in Korea.

A HELLUVA NOTE

3. The United Nations commander is a country mile ahead of Washington, the State Department, and the politicians who would smear him.

"It's a helluva note to be out there fighting for a guy who knows the score and then read your home-town newspaper to see some jerk back in Washington blasting him," a young officer remarked.

Another officer summed it up another way: "To me the argument is stupid. They call one issue a military issue—this they say MacArthur can talk about. They call another issue political and say he can't talk about it. They put that out of his realm.

WAR IS POLITICAL

"This is screwy. War in itself is political. It is a continuation of our national policy by force. Policy is politics. Not Republican versus Democrat politics, but international politics. At MacArthur's level you can't separate the two," he asserted.

Other typical comments:

"If he hadn't been out there the last 6 years, they would have talked us clean back to Pearl Harbor." "He never made any secret deals with the Russians." "He's getting old—but he knows how to handle them." "He'd turn his back on Alger Hiss, I'll bet." "If he wants it and thinks it's best for the country, I'm for it." "What a show-off, but he's the only real authority on the problem; they're damn fools to treat him the way they do." "I'm only 17. I enlisted in a peacetime Army. I think everything stinks. When I'm better I want out. The hell with it. Got a cigarette?"

"THINK" STUFF IS OUT

Comic books are the only thing that would stand a chance to make a best seller's list at the Atterbury hospital—the "think" stuff is out.

But when it comes to the Korean War they have some ideas. And the ideas of the privates first class and platoon leaders alike, are with Doug.

Training of Draftees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the following letters in the RECORD, which are in connection with the training some of our draftees are receiving before they are sent into combat. This brings out one reason why I believe we urgently need UMT in the very near future, because the present training system is not working in the best interests of either our men or of our country. A study of the separation of procedures for combat training and technical training should be made by the Armed Services Committee in detail and in an early attempt to produce workable UMT legislation for the period of the emergency instead of the unforeseeable future.

The letters follow:

APRIL 10, 1951.

HON. CHARLES BROWNSON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We received a telegram last Friday, April 6, telling us our son was killed in action in Korea on March 16, 1951. He was our only child and we are heartbroken to get such news.

We are also very, very bitter, not because he was drafted, but because he was sent to cooking school at Fort Knox, Ky., from which he graduated January 2, 1951, then they turned around and sent him right to Korea with no advanced training whatsoever and put him in the First Cavalry Division and into the front lines. In less than 3 weeks in action and 6 months in service he was killed. I am not the only bitter and grieving mother of boys here from Indianapolis whose boys are in the same division over there now whom I know are being slaughtered in the same way. It is about time something is done to stop these wars.

Our son was inducted into the Army here in Indianapolis, September 6, 1950, and sent to Fort Knox, Ky. After just barely 5 weeks of basic training, he was sent to 2128 ASU Food Service School there at Fort Knox to become a cook. He graduated from there and received his diploma on January 2, 1951. He came home on a 14-day furlough and left here January 19, 1951, for Camp Stoneman, Calif., arriving there January 22, 1951. Their ship (U. S. S. *Gen. Stuart Heintzelman*) sailed January 30, 1951. They arrived at Tokyo, Japan, about February 19 or 20 and were at Camp Drake, near Tokyo. We had the one letter from Tokyo written February 21. The next and only letter from Korea was written March 4, 1951, so, you see, they were just about 1 week in Tokyo and sent right into Korea and put in the front lines where he was killed March 16, 1951, after not even 3 weeks in battle.

Our son never handled a gun in his life and was it fair to train them to be cooks and then put them in the front lines? Perhaps if he had been trained for such a thing he might have had a chance. Now, the rest of those boys who were his buddies are perhaps still in there fighting with no more training than he had.

Most sincerely,

APRIL 9, 1951.

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Office of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHUCK: This morning one of our employees came to me with a problem that I believe is worthy of investigation at your level.

His son was called into service, September 5, 1950, and sent to Fort Knox, Ky. After just 1 month of training he was assigned to the cooks and bakers school. He attended this school until December and upon graduation was sent home for a 3-week leave. At the end of his leave he was sent to San Francisco and within a week was shipped to Japan. Four days after arrival he was in the front lines as a combat infantryman. It is obvious on the face of it that this lad was sent into combat with only a month of training which is totally inadequate. You and I both know the terrific cost that we paid by sending untrained personnel into battle. Recently I attended a conference in Chicago at which a member of the Defense Board was present. I asked him about this question of untrained personnel being sent into combat and he stated that it was their policy that lads with no previous military training were to be given 4 months of basic training before they could be shipped out of the country. Following their movement to

foreign shores they would be given 2 months of combat training before they would be allowed to enter combat. This is an excellent policy if it is followed. While I recognize that mistakes can be made, in this particular case the boy had two friends of his who had about the same experience. All three boys were from Indianapolis and all three were sent into Korea with inadequate training. One of those boys was killed a couple of weeks ago. The son of our employee was wounded on March 8.

I really believe that this is a matter which you should investigate for the good of our Army as well as the interest of our citizenship. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

———

APRIL 11, 1951.

HON. CHARLES BROWNSON,
Office of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROWNSON: Following is a letter which I also sent to the Secretary of the Army. I am appealing to you as my Congressman to see if there is something that you can do to aid in the investigation of this practice. I would appreciate any assistance that you can give to see that problems like this are straightened out.

As a parent I wish to register a protest against a practice of sending untrained boys into combat. This practice is contrary to my understanding of the policy of the armed services and it should be investigated.

My son, ——— ———, was inducted September 6, 1950, and sent to Fort Knox, Ky. After about a month of training, he was sent to the cooks and bakers school there. Graduating January 2, 1951, he came home for 3 weeks. Then he was sent to San Francisco. Within a week he was sent to Japan and 4 days after arrival he was in Korea as a combat infantryman. He was wounded March 8, 1951, and since March 20 I have had no word from him.

It is my understanding that new inductees without any previous military service were supposed to receive 4 months' basic training and 2 months of combat training before entering combat. My son had hardly a month of basic training. His schooling is completely wasted.

Do you not agree that this is an example of some of the mistakes made in World War II? Untrained men suffer more casualties than trained men. Surely some system can be worked out to see that the men we send into battle know how to do their job right.

I would admit the possibility of a mistake if it were not that two other men, just like my son, from Indianapolis, and at the same time, had almost the same experience. One of these men is now dead.

For the sake of insuring the best army that we can get, can you not investigate how such errors can be made. I am positive my son was sent into battle months before he was adequately trained.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

The Bonus March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rumblings coming from the underground and rumors emanating from the left-wing press, it is clearly evident a campaign is getting underway to start smearing General MacArthur.

These Communist-inspired forces will attempt to show that General MacArthur was the one who inspired and caused the "bonus marchers" to be evicted from the Capital. In view of this prospective smear campaign, I set forth what I believe to be the facts relative to this eviction.

The Communist-inspired bonus march in 1932 is described in un-American activities reports and other official documents as Communist inspired and led.

It was the first open effort to coerce the Congress of the United States by physical manpower force.

July 28, 1932, found a portion of the bonus marchers camped in abandoned temporary buildings from which the police were ordered to move them. They defied the police. Several policemen were injured.

In the fighting which followed one bonus marcher was killed and another received injuries from which he died.

The civil authorities, in writing, told President Hoover that the civil authorities could not control the situation and asked for troops.

The President told Secretary of War Patrick J. Hurley to restore order.

Hurley passed the order on to General MacArthur as Chief of Staff of the Army.

MacArthur told Lt. Col. George Patton, Jr., to submit a plan.

Patton proposed use of a company of tanks and a squadron of cavalry, pointing out that if infantry were used the agitators would push participants against the bayonets and bloodshed would follow. Patton contended that cavalry on horseback and men in tanks could see over the heads of the crowd, spot the agitators, and retain control without bloodshed. The plan was approved by MacArthur.

The Patton-led troops, accompanied by MacArthur, moved to the bonus-marchers' encampment.

MacArthur, moving out alone, ahead of the troops, met the leaders and told them they had 1 hour to get out of town.

By the end of that hour the movement out of town began.

From the time the military took over no one was seriously injured, no shot was fired, and the subsequent propaganda in Communist publications that soldiers of 1932 used bayonets and bullets to kill veterans of 1918 was flat falsification.

The War Department release of August 3, 1932, over the signature of General Hurley, covers these facts. It is a matter of filed record and can be obtained by the Armed Services Committee or any other committee of Congress which cares to look at the record.

When Representative PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, read into the RECORD yesterday the exultation of the Communist Daily Worker over the decapitation of General MacArthur, the reasons for the Communist jubilation were not, perhaps, fully explained. But consider these facts:

The Communists, by their bonus march, tried to use physical force to intimidate Congress in connection with pending legislation.

Four men, in chain of command, stopped that move. They were President Hoover, Secretary of War Hurley, General MacArthur, and Colonel, later General, Patton.

Every Member of this House knows the subsequent continued drive of the Communist forces in America against these four men. Every Member who is willing to look at the record knows that each of the four fought the Communists to a bitter standstill.

President Hoover and Secretary Hurley are out of office and General Patton is dead. General MacArthur was the one remaining target.

There has been loose talk about the bonus march, and what it really was, and who motivated it.

I am presenting these facts, without rancor, just to keep the record straight, by sticking to the record.

Heroic Stand of Sixty-fifth Puerto Rican Infantry Regiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I called the attention of the House of Representatives to the heroic stand made by the Puerto Rican Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment in covering the successful retreat of our mainland Marines in Korea.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading the latest report coming out of Korea dealing with the bravery and stamina of these Americans from Puerto Rico. It appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, April 8, being a dispatch from Greg MacGregor, a correspondent.

This article points out that our Puerto Rican soldiers have "won the highest respect from men of all nations fighting in the United Nations line" and that despite the history of heavy action by this group, the Puerto Ricans have more volunteers than they can use. It is said this is the only regiment in Korea that has no replacement problem.

Since this story appeared at about the same time, the press carried the decision of a Federal judge imposing the death penalty on a Puerto Rican for his part in a revoluntionary plot, this account of the daring of a truly American regiment of Puerto Ricans is worthy of our attention:

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA, April 7.—Only 8 miles behind the front lines, a hard-played softball game was going on this afternoon. Going into the ninth inning, with the score tied, both teams were giving everything they had.

As the sun beat down on the diamond, marked off by flour on a fat tract in the rice paddies, the spectators were going wild with excitement, jumping up and down and shouting encouragement and advice.

Just 5 days ago, the same players and spectators were fighting for their lives as they drove the Chinese Communists back across

the thirty-eighth parallel. These were members of the Puerto Rican Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment of the Third Division.

Since these Latin-American warriors arrived on the peninsula on September 23, they have shown the same spirit on the battlefield that they showed in the ball game this afternoon. They have asked no quarter nor have they given any. They won the highest respect from men of all nations fighting in the United Nations lines.

This war has given these Americans their first chance to show their mettle as a unit. Although they fought with credit during World War II in southern France and North Africa, they were always assigned in small units to other regiments. In this war, they were determined to prove to their country and the world that they take a back seat to no one on the field of battle when they work together as a team.

The Sixty-fifth has been cited for its accomplishments in Korea "above and beyond the call of duty." They distinguished themselves at Hamhung, they fought a rear guard action at the Hungnam evacuation and aided materially in preventing this retreat from becoming a hopeless rout. And, recently, they fought their way from the Han River up over the thirty-eighth parallel.

Despite this history of heavy action, the Puerto Ricans have more volunteers than they can use. It can be stated accurately that this regiment is the only one in Korea with no replacement problem. It has replacements in rear areas eager to be called into action against the Communists.

In addition, military leaders here have been notified that it would be no problem to raise another 50,000 Puerto Rican volunteers in their homeland, which is justly proud of its own regiment.

Although the sub-zero Korean winter is very foreign to these troops, accustomed to the warm sun of their island, their casualties from frost and cold are no greater than those suffered by any other regiment.

Colonel William W. Harris of St. Louis, who commands the regiment, has only the highest praise for his men.

"I have never seen men more eager and willing to do a good job for you," he said. "They are very proud people, both as Puerto Ricans and members of the Sixty-fifth. Morale is no problem in this outfit. I can honestly say it is as high or higher than in any other regiment in Korea."

To date, the Puerto Ricans have destroyed 19 of the enemy for every man they have lost.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power-Development Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System on Tuesday, April 10, on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the many questions involving the security of the Nation, now pending before the United States Congress, is the question of the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project. This is not a new question. It has been under consideration in one form or another for more than three decades. Today, however, it is an urgent and vital question which must be taken up and acted upon without further delay.

I have always favored the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and have urged it for the past 30 years. It has been similarly urged and advocated by every President of the United States since Woodrow Wilson—both Republicans and Democrats. Today, however, we can no longer afford to spend more time in merely urging it. Today we must build it. Today it is a question of our national security.

I am not alone in making such a statement. This statement, as to the vital necessity of the St. Lawrence undertaking, has been made by the Secretary of Defense George Marshall, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by our Secretary of State, by the Secretary of Commerce, by the Secretary of Agriculture, and by the Secretary of the Interior. It has been made by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Charles E. Wilson.

Every civilian and military authority in a position of responsibility for our defense and mobilization, and many other ranking Government officials have stated that this is an essential project and must be immediately undertaken.

I cannot understand how the opponents of this project can assume for themselves the responsibility of declaring that this project is not essential to our security. Who are these groups and individuals who presume to tell the people that General Marshall is wrong; that General Bradley is wrong; that General Collins is wrong; that Admiral Sherman is wrong; that General Vandenberg is wrong; that Secretary Acheson is wrong and that President Truman is wrong in declaring that the St. Lawrence Project is necessary to the defense and the effective mobilization of the United States?

These opponents are the spokesmen for certain railroad interests and for certain shipping and port interests which believe—very mistakenly—that their own business and economic enterprises would be harmfully affected by the construction of this great project. These opponents are the private power interests who are opposed to the low cost public power that would be available for the industries and people of New York State and of the neighboring New England States.

These are the groups which declare that the St. Lawrence Project is not essential for our defense and security. These groups argue that the St. Lawrence Project would cost too much and that it will not be useful.

Of course neither of these arguments is true. Every responsible official has testified to the economic soundness of the project, to its feasibility, and to its necessity. By further delaying this project we cater to the fears and prejudices of a few private interests—fears and prejudices which are entirely unfounded—at the expense of the welfare of the entire Nation and, under present conditions, at the expense of our national security.

Today we are short on electric power throughout the Northeast. In many cities and towns, industries cannot expand—and new ones cannot be located—because of the shortage of available power, and especially of low-cost power. Yet here is a river rushing down to the sea carrying water which could, at this very moment, be providing us with 2,200,000 additional horsepower.

Every year that the St. Lawrence Project remains unbuilt we are losing 13 billion kilowatt hours of electrical energy. Every day, every hour that goes by without this power project, we are wasting electricity and committing an extravagance just as great as if we were to throw the number of dollars equivalent to the value of this power into the Atlantic Ocean.

At this moment all of our efforts are being directed toward increasing the productive power of our national industrial machine. The St. Lawrence project is a necessary step toward that end. It will increase the ability of the United States to turn out the matériel and armaments necessary to defend our territory and our people. But the St. Lawrence project goes beyond this. It will safeguard the lives of American seamen in the event of hostilities. For these reasons alone, how can we hesitate to give it our full support?

The St. Lawrence project involves improving short stretches of the St. Lawrence River channel in order to make this entire river navigable for ocean-going vessels. We would thus provide a new waterway from the Atlantic reaching into the very heart of our country and of Canada. This is the seaway part of the St. Lawrence project.

As a sponsor of the St. Lawrence legislation, I have had to give serious thought to the burdens now weighing down on the American taxpayer. The St. Lawrence dual project, I am happy to say, will completely pay for itself. Over a period of 50 years, the seaway will pay for itself. Over a much shorter period, the power project will pay for itself.

Besides costing the taxpayer nothing, the project will save millions of dollars in transportation and power costs. We in New York State can well appreciate that, for we now are paying higher rates for electricity than all but seven States in the Union.

I mention the cost, however, only to give an idea of the soundness of the proposal. I am firmly convinced that no matter what price we must pay for the security of our people, it is a bargain. But in the case of the St. Lawrence, the result will be not an expense but a vast saving, not only to the people but to the Government.

If the St. Lawrence River is made navigable, ships will be able to bring iron ore directly from Labrador and Canada to steel mills at Cleveland, Toledo, or any port on the Great Lakes. Compared with shipping the ore through the Atlantic Ocean and then inland by rail, the savings will be tremendous. Those savings would be reflected in the price of steel, since you, as taxpayers, are buying colossal quantities of steel through your Government, it is in your own interest to build this seaway.

More important, the cargo shipped through the seaway is sure of reaching its destination. The tragedy of ore ships, torpedoed in the last war is too recent to be forgotten. Five out of seven of our ships bringing ore from Chile through the Atlantic were sunk in the last war. American lives were lost. Now we have an opportunity to ship ore through a protected waterway which in wartime would avoid dangerous Atlantic waters. And by doing this we would avoid risking the lives of many American boys.

There are some people in my own city of New York who oppose the St. Lawrence project. They claim that the export trade of New York will be harmed by the seaway. Their fears are unfounded. The 30,000,000 tons of iron ore which will one day move through the seaway are not New York traffic. The grain freighters which will bear 10,000,000 tons of the Nation's wheat and corn from the Midwest to the markets of the world are not stealing that traffic from New York.

New York is entering, I am sure, a great period of expansion. This will be promoted and encouraged by the St. Lawrence project.

Russia has announced that she will develop 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity on the Volga River. That is roughly twice what we plan to develop on the St. Lawrence. Russia is building canals across hundreds of miles to connect the White, the Black, the Baltic, and the Caspian Seas. How can we dare to sit back and watch these ac-

tivities without taking some action on our own? Only 114 miles of the St. Lawrence River remain to be cleared to open a waterway almost 2,500 miles long, a lifeline from the Atlantic Ocean to the interior of the continent. The cost, about $566,000,000 to be expended over a period of several years and all of which is to be repaid, is tiny in a $60,000,000,000 defense budget.

The signs point to a long period of mobilizing our strength. General Bradley and General Eisenhower have estimated this period at 10 to 20 years. By starting the St. Lawrence project immediately it can be finished in 4 years and the strength of this hemisphere immeasurably increased.

My fellow citizens, this is a matter of the greatest urgency. This is not a matter of my personal opinion. It is the consensus of our responsible defense leaders. Would you take the word of General Marshall and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the need to build three new aircraft carriers or B-36 airplanes? Why not take the word of these same leaders on a project which would cost even less than the aircraft carriers or B-36 planes, which would be self-liquidating and which would result in great benefits for this country of ours, for which our children and our grandchildren will thank us?

Indicate your support of this project to your Representatives and Senators in Congress. The time is now. We shall have a tragic account to settle with history if we delay this project any further.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, during all my service in Congress I have never seen such a spontaneous uprising on the part of the American people in indignation over the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman.

The people of my district are alarmed, disgusted, bitter, and angry. They have every reason to be. I have received many long-distance phone calls, and hundreds of letters and telegrams expressing resentment of the President's action.

No words of mine can adequately convey just how the people of my district feel about this, and I am accordingly inserting in the RECORD just a few samples of the telegrams I have received. In this way I shall be able to convey to the Congress and to the country what my people think about the firing of our country's great military leader who probably knows, more than any other man, the exact situation in the Far East.

Here are some samples:

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—For heaven's sake, LES, what has happened to this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Let's forget about the Republicans and Democrats for a while and try to find enough real Americans down there to salvage something from this wreckage.

PAXTON, ILL.—Time for Congress to change Commander in Chief, that American affairs, both national and foreign, be conducted by Americans for Americans. Time that we stop appeasing the enemies who are killing our boys in Korea. Time for Congress to work on the American plan. Do it now.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Firing MacArthur is Joe Stalin's greatest achievement. Worst news since Pearl Harbor. Everybody wants to know where do we go from here.

KANKAKEE, ILL.—As a good Democrat, I advocate the impeachment of President Truman.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—If you can't oust Truman please kick out Marshall and Acheson.

PAXTON, ILL.—It's later than you think. At least MacArthur had his own foreign policy—more than we can say for our State Department. Let's wake up, give us some legislation to let us at least know why our boys are being killed. We veterans of World War I and II think the whole mess stinks, especially in Washington.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Please use your influence to have terrible wrong done American people and General MacArthur corrected by having Acheson fired and General MacArthur appointed Secretary of State.

CHENOA, ILL.—This community shocked by treatment of General MacArthur. This has brought about more comment and discussion in our grain office today than anything in history. We feel that the time has come for action to remedy this situation that brought this about. We hope action will be forthcoming by all Members of Congress.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Impeach the little ward politician stupidity from Kansas City. This is another sell-out of our country to those dirty Britons who run the Far East while our sons give up their lives for British domination and dirty dollars. It's just more dirty politics.

ROANOKE, ILL.—Keep MacArthur and impeach Truman.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL.—Shocked with irresponsible dismissal of MacArthur. Administration policy threatens our survival. Congress must reestablish its constitutional powers. Impeachment urged.

We Must Not Rush Into World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject We Must Not Rush Into World War III.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the present turbulent days when people are greatly upset over world conditions in general, it has been difficult to explain why General MacArthur should leave his post and be replaced at the President's orders by his former subordinate. Possibly General Eisenhower gave us a clue in his address to Congress on February 1 immediately after his return from Europe. When he had outlined the powers and resources of the democracies, he was asked why we should be frightened of dictator nations if we had great quantities of oil and steel far superior to theirs. He replied, "Only for one reason—because they have unity of purpose." Then he added: "What we have got to do is to meet that unity with a higher type, the unity of free men that will not be defeated."

It has been interesting to me that a group of scientists working at the research laboratory at Los Alamos, N. Mex., which is the principal center of study on all atomic explosion activities in this country, have seen the issue more clearly than most people view it. They sensed that the demands of General MacArthur could bring on a third world war. It has been pointed out in the last few hours that MacArthur sought the right, not only to bomb Chinese bases in Manchuria, but also to bombard the China coast and that he would have liked to have the troops of Chiang Kai-shek armed by the United States and land on the Chinese mainland in a major invasion. That, of course, could only mean that everyone of Chiang's troops would have to be accompanied by a half-dozen soldiers from the United States. Since Russia has a nonaggression pact with China, that could only mean the beginning of world war III.

These scientists at Los Alamos preferred to have a group in the United Nations direct the army in Korea. They know the power of the weapons which they are helping to create. They know how much the destructive force of an atomic explosion has been multiplied by recent scientific developments which they have largely directed. Therefore, it was of particular interest to me to read in the Albuquerque Journal of April 8 an item pointing out how these men at Los Alamos tried to make their contribution toward keeping America out of a third world war. They wanted the research and study which they have been making of nuclear energy to be of benefit in lifting burdens off the backs of the peoples of the world and not used in a sudden attempt to see if explosion after explosion could rock our great cities, destroy our homes and slaughter people by the millions. The article from the Albuquerque Journal is as follows:

"Some of the leading scientists at Los Alamos, research center for hydrogen bomb work, are worried men these days. Working with weapons of cataclysmic proportions naturally makes for sharp reflections on world conditions, and the thought of many physicists, chemists and mathematicians is that the conduct of the Korean war is bringing the world dangerously near the inferno of an atomic world war.

"These men, many of them from countries all over the world, feel the Korean war should be conducted by the United Nations rather than by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The fear is that MacArthur may provoke the Chinese Communists into a large-scale move against the UN forces which would be certain, in their opinion, to precipitate a world-wide conflagration.

"For the past few years, any worries or thoughts Los Alamos residents have had have been limited to private discussions among friends. But 2 weeks ago, some scientists felt that continued silence was shirking their duty and they met to draw up a proposal calling for creation of a group in the UN to direct the army in Korea.

"The feeling was that a statement of this kind coming from Los Alamos might be taken more seriously than a similar action from other cities."

In addition, I think it noteworthy that not all our military leaders were trigger-happy,

that nearly all of them were opposed to an Army clique overriding civilian government. It is of tremendous significance that every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored the removal of General MacArthur. They recognized that it was his privilege to want to conduct a general war, but they could remember how wrong he had been in his judgment that the Chinese Communists would not be brought into the Korean conflict if he crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and shoved his armies close to the Manchurian border.

Therefore, it is possible that other military leaders might not have been impressed by his feeling that if we bombed the mainland of China and placed our battleships off the Chinese coast and sprayed shells into their cities, the Chinese Communists would flee in fright and that Russia would not come to their assistance. There were those who believed that such an action by us could only be the beginning of a third world war.

One of the most useful editorials that I have read was one which appeared in the Washington Post of April 12, entitled "The President Acts." It is quite obvious that the editors of the Washington Post regretted that the career of General MacArthur should end on such an unhappy note but they proceeded to analyze the crisis which had developed. It is that analysis which strikes me as helpful in trying to understand the reasons for the President's action. The editorial is as follows:

"THE PRESIDENT ACTS

"The illustrious career of General MacArthur came to an end upon an inglorious note which will be regretted by all America. But there was no help for it. There is no room in our society for indispensable men or for ungovernable generals, no provision in our Constitution for the President to play second fiddle. Civil supremacy had to be reasserted, and it was wisest to reassert civil supremacy unmistakably. The German peril got its head and sustenance from the hospitality of the German people to a general staff that had become a law unto itself. Japan was taken on the warpath by an army clique that overrode civilian government. These things must not happen here. We all have reason to be grateful that no segment of our society has been more critical of the self-willed conduct of General MacArthur than the high officers of our armed services. MacArthur, we feel sure, had no military following outside the dazzled court with which he had surrounded himself in Tokyo.

"The supercession of General MacArthur is the first sign in months of a firm hand at the helm of our affairs. Mr. Truman should never again relax his initiative. He is the Commander in Chief and the organ of our foreign affairs, yet he had seemed to be giving General MacArthur one opportunity after another to indulge his assumption of the highest authority. This he did, in particular, when he declared time after time that decisions at the thirty-eighth parallel were properly those of the supreme commander. In so doing he seemed to be giving a free hand to a man he knew had no sympathy with the policy he was given to execute. Our policy is to fight a limited war in the Far East; MacArthur wanted to fight a general and an all-out war. MacArthur is a crusader who feels that, with or without allies, the United States must embark up a 'jihad' against communism in Asia—which means communism everywhere. This is an aim that has no settled lodgment in official Washington.

"Our policy-makers, alas, have hitherto blown hot and cold about the nature of our adversary as well as about the problem of authority. It is time they developed a new clarity. To act upon the theory that our military enemy is communism is to condemn this country to an endless military adventure that would dig its grave and the grave of Western civilization. The religious wars of the sixteenth century are the supreme lesson in history that an idea cannot be conquered militarily. On the contrary, an idea thrives on military operations against it, and it is conceivable, perhaps sure, that communism would still be going stronger after all Russia had been laid in waste. The enemy against which the free world is arming is the gang who have captured Russia. Any identification of the enemy along the ideological lines of General MacArthur's reasoning is the way to play the game of Soviet Russia. 'So long as there are discontented groups within the Western nations,' says Herbert Butterfield in Christianity and History, 'the Soviet Union is perhaps clear-sighted in its recognition of the interest it has in keeping diplomacy on an ideological basis.'

"So the greatest urgency underlines the need to set our military sights straight in our two-headed struggle. This the President can furnish by leadership. To be a leader in a democracy in a crisis is to be a prophet—an awakener, as Jacques Maritain calls it. Lack of such leadership will infallibly turn people to false prophets. And that is not all. Popular recognition of leadership requires not only inspiration at the top but confidence in the men in positions of subordinate authority. Now that the President has shown who's boss, he ought to seek the people's suffrage by revamping his official family. Certainly the crisis is not over as a result of his ouster of MacArthur. It may be only beginning, and the President should rise to his opportunity, not be content to react to a breach of discipline. There is a house to put in order in Washington as well as in Tokyo."

Finally, I have been greatly interested in the appraisals of columnists and commentators. From the column of Stewart Alsop in this morning's Washington Post I pick out these words as informative: "Either President Truman or General MacArthur had to be fired, and a general cannot fire his Commander in Chief. It is really as simple as that."

Marquis Childs, under the heading, "Storm over MacArthur," had many interesting things to say. Here are two or three paragraphs from that article:

"Some who are so passionately for MacArthur seem to be for him in the belief that if he were only given his own way, he would find a magical means to end the war and bring peace to the Pacific. This does not, of course, conform to the facts. The MacArthur policy would certainly have expanded the Pacific war.

"Behind MacArthur is the whole of the so-called China lobby. It has large resources of money, including the support of a half-dozen Chinese in this country, most of the members of the Soong family, who are reported to have sums in banks in Switzerland, the Argentine, Holland, and the United States.

"This violent quarrel can mean a further paralysis of Government at a time when it is vital to rearm and, through rearming, to unify the coalition of western nations. If we can't have our way in the Far East, the extremists may say, in effect, to the President, "Then you will not get your way in Europe." Obstructionism under our system of divided powers can do a lot when there is no really responsible control in Congress as between Republicans and Democrats.

"Already the evidence of it has been ample in this Congress. If it now goes on to impede vital measures, we shall have paid a terrible price for our divisions."

That is the note which needs to be remembered. The actions of General MacArthur in proclaiming that Formosa is more important to the defense of the United States than France, his action in writing to the Republican leader of the House of Representatives, JOE MARTIN, in support of a policy completely contrary to the policy of his Commander in Chief could only mean a division, a disunity, and give a clue as to why his removal was imperative. Our country had to come to the principle which General Eisenhower had laid down. One thing was required and that was unity of purpose. If it has been impossible to achieve it in the Congress, it nevertheless had to be obtained in the Korean command.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the St. Lawrence seaway, written by Clem Norton and published in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News of April 8, 1951, including certain corrections of typographical errors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE

Boston's leaders are wrong in opposing the St. Lawrence waterway. It will help the port of Boston. Every President since Wilson has recommended it. President Truman and Eisenhower claim that it's necessary for national security. Steel officials who once termed the idea a "Socialist's ditch" now approve, so as to bring ore by ship from the Quebec, Labrador area, because our Mesabi ore is running out. Today, Quebec ore comes by ocean steamer to Montreal and is then dumped into boats small enough to navigate the 14-foot Canadian Canal which bypasses the International Rapids, but this method is too expensive. United States Steel has built a plant on the water near Philadelphia so as to utilize ore from Venezuela. National Steel contemplates building mills in Connecticut. If Midwest steel is unable to obtain foreign ore by water, then it may mean that it will have to move east, and this would mean ghost cities and a tremendous economic upheaval.

The St. Lawrence is the greatest undeveloped hydroelectric river on the continent. It's a Mediterranean Sea, stretching 2,200 miles into the heart of the continent from the ocean to Duluth. It reaches right into the great industrial and agricultural heart of the Midwest. The steady-flowing St. Lawrence, fed by the Great Lakes containing half the fresh water of the world will produce 2,600,000 kilowatts of electricity annually, half to go to Canada, at about half the cost of steam-generated power. President Truman claims that we produced over 100,000 planes during the war, a fantastic figure, only because of Tennessee and Columbia River hydroelectric power. New England a power-starved area, can use some of that cheap electricity. American homes have more than doubled their consumption of electricity in the past 10 years.

WHO?

Well, who is stopping this development? Who is strong enough to thwart our war chiefs who claim that it's necessary for national security? A lobby made up of rep-

resentatives of utilities, chambers of commerce, railroads, and ports on the eastern seaboards, plus banks and insurance companies who have investments in the said enterprises. And what's their argument? That they'll lose freight revenue. That the cocoa and coffee, say, that now comes by boat to an Atlantic port and is then shipped by rail to Detroit, will be taken by ship, right to Detroit if the St. Lawrence is deepened. That autos that now come from Detroit to Boston by rail, will then come by ship, but why not if the freight rate is $20 to $30 less an auto?

The Boston Chamber once approved the idea when private capital was to do the job. Ninety percent of the work has been completed. Less than 125 miles of dredging remains to be done at the International Rapids between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Cornwall, Ontario.

Here are other arguments used against the idea, but none seem valid. It will be frozen up, 5 months of the year. There is fog. A 27-foot depth is not enough. The Federal Government will have to dredge out harbors at Chicago, Detroit, and so on. Answer: Montreal, frozen up 5 months a year, does more business than any port on the continent with the exception of New York. Fog does not interfere. The Soo Canal on the Great Lakes, frozen up 5 months a year, does a bigger business than the Panama and Suez Canals put together. General Marshall testified that most of the world's ships could use the 27-foot depth, and facts support him, for the average ship is seldom loaded to the limit. And if a greater depth is necessary, that can come later.

Opening up the St. Lawrence will bring up a Midwest market to, say, the baby-carriage manufacturer in Gardner, Mass. A thousand other illustrations might be given. And Boston, being the largest near port to the St. Lawrence, should benefit, as it benefited by the opening of the Panama Canal. But when Panama was suggested, certain Boston officials objected, as they object today to the St. Lawrence affair.

How much longer will millions of our people in the Midwest allow themselves to continue to be locked up from access to the oceans of the world, when the project calls for an expenditure of less than $800,000,000 and the dredging of less than 125 miles? The money will be paid back, because the idea is self-liquidating because of tolls.

We think nothing of giving a needy nation $800,000,000 or more outright. The sum, as money goes today, is peanuts.

With a third world war threatening, and millions of our boys offering their lives, and our national leaders demanding this improvement for national security purposes, how much longer can selfish interests prevent progress?

But the idea is so right, that it is coming, just as sure as is tomorrow.

If we only could get these basic facts to the people.

Presentation of ECA Certificates of Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. William C. Foster, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, at the national presentation ceremony of ECA certificates of cooperation, held in Washington on April 3.

Mr. Foster is one of our ablest and most distinguished administrators, with long experience, both in business and in Government. He came into Government with the admiration of the business community through his outstanding work for the Committee for Economic Development and elsewhere. He has won the support of everyone with whom he has worked in Washington, and, although there are many executives who are more publicized, I doubt whether there is any in Washington today who is more popular or respected.

I call the particular attention of the Congress to his admonition that—

If anything approximating a $100,000,000,000 increase in European productivity is to be achieved, it must have the full support of European management and European labor—and to obtain that support, the ECA must undertake one of the greatest educational jobs in history—to teach new ideas, new techniques, to peoples whose economic tradition causes them to reject innovation almost by reflex action.

In these few phrases Mr. Foster outlines the difficult road of the future on which we are now embarked. I know his many warm friends in the Congress, among whom I am proud to number myself, all wish him well in his great and unprecedented task.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM C. FOSTER, ADMINISTRATOR, ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

My principal assignment today—certainly one of the most pleasant that I have ever had—is to express, on behalf of all of us in ECA, the profound appreciation we all feel for the constructive and intimate cooperation we have received from American management and from American labor.

I am especially pleased that our colleagues and partners in the European Recovery Program, as represented by the distinguished Ambassadors and Ministers of the Western European governments, have been able to join us today. By their very presence, they testify to the appreciation felt by their own peoples for the contributions of American management and labor to the success of the Marshall plan.

From the outset, the support of management and labor—both through their individual members and their associations and chambers and unions—has helped to sustain the Marshall plan and to give it drive and direction. Such organizations as the NAM and the CIO, the United States chamber and the A. F. of L., the CED and the International Association of Machinists, the Foreign Trade Council and others have conducted their own careful and searching studies of the Marshall plan. Then they endorsed it, helping to sway public opinion in its favor. And every time the Marshall plan came up before Congress for a review of things done, and a forecast of things still to be done, these groups of management and labor continued their support—not by means of any blanket approval but by means of constructive criticism, and suggestions for improvement. Equally important, perhaps, has been the way in which these management and labor groups have helped us at ECA to recruit the kind of skilled executive and technical and labor personnel to staff ECA here in Washington and overseas.

In my opinion, however, the most valuable contribution American management and American labor have made to the Marshall plan is to be found in their wholehearted cooperation in our technical assistance program.

For I firmly believe that the future of western civilization in substantial measure depends upon the ability of management, labor and governments in Western Europe to grasp the principles of American productivity and put them into practice. The essentials of American productivity are being demonstrated by our technical assistance program, and are being applied, at an ever-increasing rate. But both demonstration and application need to be tremendously stepped up in speed, in size, and in scope. No need is more urgent; no task demands more attention than to expand and to quicken our technical assistance program which must stand at the very core of our efforts to produce more in Western Europe—to produce more so that everybody will have more.

I should like to summarize—very briefly—a few of the accomplishments already chalked up to the credit of our ECA technical assistance program.

During the past 2 years, ECA has brought to the United States more than 400 teams of technicians, managers, and workers from almost every sector of Western European industry.

Thanks to the cooperation of our business and industrial associations, and particularly the individual manufacturing firms, these teams were able to visit more than 2,000 plants, to study our American methods in production and distribution. They have been able to discuss their observations with all ranks of American producers in the plants they visited. They talked to top executives in the board room and to workers at punch presses and looms and lathes and along assembly lines. Thanks to the cooperation of the labor unions, these teams have been given the opportunity to discuss work conditions in United States industry with thousands of our own working men and women. They have heard from them what American productivity means to them and their families.

It is still too early to fully assess the results of this program. But we do know it is yielding encouraging results. This is reflected by the fact that industrial production in Western Europe had in 1950 reached a level of 27 percent above 1938; agricultural production 9 percent above; intra-European trade 25 percent, and European exports to the rest of the world 30 percent above prewar.

But quite as significant as these physical results is the fact that Western Europe is rapidly becoming "productivity conscious." This is particularly true among younger executives and labor leaders. In many plants, in many industries, they are building up pressures to break down the obsolescent, wasteful methods that have become so firmly entrenched in the European industrial tradition. They are replacing outworn methods with modern methods. And in hundreds of Western European factories, they are succeeding with astonishing results. To illustrate this trend, let me read just a single paragraph from the report of one of our ECA representatives abroad, written after a visit to a French foundry:

"Upon his return from a technical assistance mission to the United States, the head of the foundry division at Etablissement Japhy Freres decided to overhaul operations. He cut out the making of certain castings, rearranged his equipment, and retrained his workers. In 1 year he reduced man-hours per ton from 222 to 83, cut his prices 25 to 30 percent, and raised wages 20 to 25 percent. A year ago this foundry was

losing 2,000,000 francs a month; today it is in the black."

Today, on the third anniversary of the Marshall plan, all of us in this room can feel a deep sense of gratification at the goals that have been gained. In most of Western Europe the job of rehabilitation has been largely completed. If we lived in a peaceful world, today, I think we might well be able to say that the job of European recovery has been virtually accomplished, and that Marshall plan outlays could be reduced to a small volume of "wind-up" aid to a few countries.

But I am compelled by the circumstances we all face to tell you very bluntly, there is more to do. For the brutal fact is that we do not live in a peaceful world today, nor in anything approaching it.

We live in a world that may be plunged into total, atomic war, by one of the most ruthless, imperialistic powers in history—a power that has already demonstrated through its satellites and puppets, its willingness to resort to naked aggression.

Remarkable progress—as General Marshall says "near miraculous" progress has been made by Western Europe under the Marshall plan. Nevertheless, the ERP countries are still not strong enough to sustain—by themselves alone—the kind of defense program that the Soviet menace requires—without seriously impairing the living standard they have recently restored. To reduce those living standards now, to any appreciable extent, would be to jeopardize the gains we have scored during the first 3 years of the Marshall plan. People who have just emerged from the quagmire of poverty and deprivation will not welcome the prospect of being bogged down again. Any serious impairment of living standards in Western Europe today would change the psychological climate from hopefulness and confidence and the will to resist Soviet threats into pessimism, doubt and "neutralism." It would certainly generate the kind of social and political unrest which might very possibly leave Western Europe even more vulnerable to aggression from within than she is to aggression from without.

I have already mentioned that the industrial and agricultural production of the ERP countries is well above prewar. Against this, however, must be weighed a 10 percent increase in population and the crucial fact that prewar standards of living in most European countries were so low that they gave rise to nazism and fascism, and plunged us all into World War II.

To many Europeans the defense program which we are urging upon them, looks, not like a choice between guns and butter but like a choice between guns and bread. The limiting factor of preparedness efforts in Western Europe is not the unwillingness of the governments or the peoples to defend themselves; it is simply their economic inability to carry an adequate defense program, superimposed upon the civilian economies.

The United States is now compelled, in its own self-interest to help Western Europe rearm.

However, we in ECA believe that the western European countries, within a few years, cannot only assume the full burden of a defense program, but also can raise the living standards of their people—at the same time.

We do not believe that the choice for Western Europe is between guns or bread. We are convinced that Western Europe can—if its people will make the necessary effort and take the necessary risks—have both guns and bread, and a little butter too. We are convinced that the ERP countries can, within a reasonable number of years, increase their total output of goods and services by an additional $100,000,000,000 worth annually. That should be their goal.

Obviously, if anything approaching a $100,000,000,000 increase in annual output can be achieved by Western Europe, its countries can undertake a defense program many times the size of the Military Establishment now proposed. They could carry a defense program of $40,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 annually, if necessary, and at the same time raise their living standards by 50 percent. And what is most important both to American taxpayers and to the western Europeans themselves, today's ERP countries could soon become completely independent of outside economic assistance.

Many of us in ECA think that one answer to Western Europe's defense problems, her economic problems, her social and political problems, can be summed up in one single word—productivity. And when I say productivity, I include all of the elements—human and material—that make productivity possible and effective.

I am sure that many of our friends in Western Europe share with us the conviction that the very existence of their civilization, that the success of the Western World's effort to meet the menace of communism depends upon a creative and operative and very specific and realistic program to raise their productivity. Our particular part of the job is to show them that the goal of raising that productivity by even such a high amount as $100,000,000,000 is something that can be—and, indeed, must be—achieved. It is our part of the job to help them realize more clearly and perhaps more understandingly the inescapable necessity of doing all the difficult and even painful things that are part and parcel of a successful productivity program.

Let me list what we in ECA consider to be the indispensable ingredients in any such undertaking:

First of all, there must be an expanded technical assistance program. Under our present TA arrangements, we have been able to convey the lessons of American productivity to a few thousands of western European managers, technicians, and workers. Now, we must develop techniques to drive these lessons home to all European management, to all European technicians, to all European labor, and to their governments.

Second, a mass market must be created to enable western European producers to sell their wares at a price at a profit that will justify their adoption of mass production and distribution methods. By this I mean that the ERP countries must take swift and positive action to bring into being now a mass European market.

Third, the savings which result from improved production and distribution methods must be passed on to the consumers in the form of lower prices and to the worker in the form of higher wages. Otherwise, it will be impossible to release the purchasing power required to create that mass market and to keep it going. To say all this in another way, what I mean is more goods, such as bread, and shoes, for the people and more services, such as electric light and medical care for the people and more guns and more tanks and more planes for their defense.

Fourth, the self-strangulating practices of so many European industries in restricting output, in limiting markets, in pegging high prices must be abolished. In their place must come both the psychological and practical acceptance of high-volume production, high wages, high profits, all based upon an ever-lower-unit cost.

Fifth, sound fiscal and financial policies must be vigorously applied both by European governments and by the European business community. Without drastic fiscal reforms, without new attitudes toward the role of the budget and the fiscal machinery, it will be impossible to develop mass markets in Western Europe.

Sixth, our friends in Western Europe are recognizing more and more that American productivity does not derive only from installing expensive equipment in a factory—even though that equipment may be important to that factory's record of production. They are recognizing that even more important is the ability—the know-how—of making the best possible use of all the equipment, of all the tools, of all the material on hand. Consider, for example, the experience of a French shoe manufacturer who visited the United States with a technical mission last spring. His name is Maurice Douheret. He is the manager-owner of Etablissements ROC, and he has been able to increase his output from 400 to 600 pairs of shoes per day, simply by rejigging his machines and standardizing his output. His only capital expenditure was a modest sum to install automatic regulators, and improve his lighting and ventilating systems. As a result of this productivity increase, Mr. Douheret reports that he has raised the wages of his workers 20 percent and absorbed a 20-percent advance in raw-material costs, without raising his prices.

The ECA therefore believes that Western European industry could quickly achieve a substantial increase in its ability to produce with a comparatively small outlay of new capital, simply by using more efficiently its human and material resources inside the plant and by completely revamping its merchandising methods. These, of course, are problems of education. They are problems of teaching; they are problems of imparting the lore and learning of American management and technicians and labor to their opposite numbers in Western Europe.

In view of this need to educate, I think that the ECA has got to find a way to bring management and labor even more closely into our program than ever before. I am sure that you, representatives of the great business and union organizations appreciate quite as much as I do that the venture I have just outlined cannot fulfill its aims through the efforts of governments alone. If anything approximating a $100,000,000,000 increase in European productivity is to be achieved, it must have the full support of European management and European labor. To obtain that support, the ECA in concert with the governments of Western Europe must undertake one of the greatest educational jobs in history. It is the job of teaching new ideas, and new techniques, to peoples whose economic tradition causes them to reject innovation almost by reflex action.

I am only revealing the obvious when I say that you representatives of American management and American labor can certainly command a more sympathetic audience from your opposite numbers in Western Europe than can ECA officials. We are, after all, the officials of a foreign government. But you can discuss new methods and new ideas from a common approach, a common concern, a common preoccupation, and a common store of experience. Your opposite numbers abroad will therefore heed you more attentively than they would heed even the officials of their own government agencies.

In the very near future, my associates and I expect to call upon you gentlemen and your colleagues in industrial and labor groups, to seek your advice and recommendations. We are going to ask you to join us in this educational job, along every step of the way.

I have said that a prodigious increase in productivity for Western Europe can build the strength to forefend both internal and external aggression. Hence productivity has to be regarded, not merely as a means to heighten physical resources but also as a means to heighten spiritual resources. When the chips are down men will defend only those values in which they believe, only those institutions in which they participate. Seen in this light, productivity is an instrument of peace—that peace which can be based only upon "strength for the free world." Strength for the free world is more than a slogan. It is the lifeline of freedom in our day.

Proposed Amalgamation of Dixie Democrats and Yank Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Monday last, April 9, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] delivered an interesting and informative speech to the Exchange Club in Jackson, Miss.

An editorial written by Mr. Fred Sullens, distinguished and able editor of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, and a report of the speech of the Senator from South Dakota, appeared in the April 9 issue of this newspaper.

On behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the news report of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the news report of the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of April 10, 1951]

SENATOR MUNDT'S GREAT SPEECH

Senator KARL MUNDT, South Dakota Republican, has the answer, and it is a very definite answer.

Only through a coalition of conservative Republicans and States' rights Democrats can the Nation's drift toward a welfare state be checked.

A welfare state, be it understood, is communism in the making.

When the South Dakota Senator, addressing the Exchange Club of Jackson Monday afternoon, proposed a coalition of this character in the presidential campaign next year to oppose the welfare-state Democrats he was cheered to the echo. Not mere polite applause, mind you, but ear-splitting rebel yells of the kind heard at political gatherings in this State threescore years ago. Members of the Exchange Club and their guests almost lifted the roof from the Hotel Edwards ballroom. It was a complete refutation of the belief that citizens of Jackson had long since forgotten how to cheer; that they manifest applause only by polite handclapping. This time they surely had their hearts in it.

The Exchange Club is not a political organization—just another of those rather numerous luncheon clubs—but it has within its membership many of the leading business and professional men of Jackson, mostly of the younger generation, men who keep abreast of the times, who are familiar with current trends, and of whom it can be fairly said that they represent a first-class cross-section of public sentiment in this community.

That such a body of men would not only respectfully listen to a proposal from a Republican political leader, but receive his proposal with the wildest enthusiasm, would have astonished President Truman and his welfare-state leaders if they had been privileged to hear it.

The important truth is that political history was written at that Exchange Club meeting in Jackson Monday afternoon—history from which this Nation is going to hear some distinct repercussions in the near future.

In truth and in fact, it was the beginning of a movement to launch a new national political movement or organization that will have to be reckoned with in the presidential campaign next year.

It may be known as the Democratic-Republican alliance, the Liberty Party, the Human Rights Party, or some other name that will adequately describe its purpose, and that purpose will be to get rid of the Government now in power in Washington.

Senator MUNDT was coldly logical in his proposal. Affirming his faith in the doctrine of States' rights as it has been so earnestly preached by southern Democrats, he declared that this doctrine is equally important in all other States of the Union. It is a doctrine now denied in platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. In fact, the platforms of the two parties are so much alike that one might well say to each, "A plague on both your houses."

With cogent reasoning and splendid eloquence Senator MUNDT drew a picture of the dangers into which this Nation is drifting. The rights and functions of free men are dwindling, free enterprise and individual initiative are being thwarted, and if the freedom for which our forefathers fought is to be restored in these United States we must have a political upheaval that will sweep out of office all who favor a welfare state, White House dictatorship, and the deadly encroachments of bureaucracy. Our citizens have inalienable rights in the Federal Government and the States that must not be surrendered or modified. It is the curse of communism slowly eating at the vitals of our Nation, just as it is doing in other parts of the world where more than one-half of all people now living are dominated by communism and will eventually be reduced to an economic state nothing short of slavery.

Communism is a lie on its face, said Senator MUNDT. It is not a sharing and sharing alike of worldly goods. It is not even a sharing according to need as preached by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Communism is a Godless way of life. It is financial control by a greedy and remorseless few of the entire social and economic fabric of the Nation. Communism is a remorseless dictatorship that not only denies God but likewise the rights of free men and women.

It is to battle with a deadly menace such as this that Senator MUNDT urged southern Democrats and conservative Republicans to join forces next year and put forth a candidate for President who will recognize the rights of States, the time-honored traditions of the South, and offer to the Nation a platform of which all citizens who love freedom can stand.

It will be useless, said the speaker, for the South to hope to win its fight within the Democratic Party. The melancholy truth is that the South lost control of the Democratic Party at the party national convention in Chicago in 1936 when it agreed to repeal of the two-thirds rule, and that power will never be restored to the South by Northern, Eastern, and Western States.

Throughout his address, covering more than an hour, Senator MUNDT was earnest, forceful, and plausible. Not once did he descend to demagogy or sprinkle his speech with specious reasoning.

And he did bring down the house—something no other Republican ever succeeded in doing in this general latitude and longitude. That in itself was an astonishing achievement.

Just about this time next year—maybe sooner—you are going to be hearing some lively echoes of a political speech delivered in Jackson on Monday afternoon, April 9, by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of April 9, 1951]

MUNDT TELLS JACKSON CIVIC LEADERS DIXIE DEMOCRATS CAN JOIN YANK REPUBLICANS

"It is entirely within the realm of political possibility that northern Republicans and southern Democrats may form an alliance by the next presidential election," Senator KARL MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota) told the Jackson Exchange Club Monday at noon.

About 300 Jackson and Mississippi leaders heard the Republican Senator make this history-making statement.

Senator MUNDT is one of three Members of the United States Senate investigating committee who Monday morning opened hearings on charges of Federal job sales in Mississippi.

"All over America, in every State, there has never before been so much interest in the alliance between southern Democrats and northern Republicans of like mind, so that they can vote for the same candidate for President and elect an administration dedicated to the preservation of States' rights, the protection of the individual freedoms of our citizens, and our private enterprise economy," MUNDT declared.

He declined to predict who might be favored as a Presidential candidate in the event the two groups formed an alliance by the next election.

He said, however, that perhaps the slate would be a combination of northern Republicans and southern Democrats.

"As in any alliance, each group has to come halfway across the street," he continued.

"By bringing together two groups that have the same basic political and economic interests the hurdle of party labels can be eliminated in the interests of basic American principals," said MUNDT.

Today, said MUNDT, America is reaping the sorry dividence of a multiparty system. He warned that splinter parties were becoming so numerous that they were weakening the Nation.

The Republican Senator, introduced by Senator JOHN STENNIS, paid tribute to Gov. Fielding Wright for the courage to stand up against the Truman Democrats and their platform of socialism.

Senator MUNDT said for the 16 years he has been in Congress, "I have voted with the conservative Senators from the South against legislation with socialistic trends."

He said he would like to see the Democrats of the South walk out again if their party at the 1952 convention nominates Truman or any other of his kind with leftist leanings.

Then, he added, these Southern conservative leaders could instead of trying to form a third party, come to the Republican convention and tell us Republicans to nominate a conservative Democrat for the Vice Presidency on a Republican ticket * * * and also advise us about what planks in our platform are repugnant to the South.

Since the socialist trend began in 1935, MUNDT emphasized, both major parties have been appealing in their platforms for the big city socialistic blocs.

"What we have today," he declared, actually is four splinter parties * * * the conservative and so-called liberal elements of Republicans and Democrats."

Predicting that with ingenuity and proper engineering the conservative elements of the North and South can form an alliance to insure proper leadership, MUNDT suggested:

"Let's abandon the elephant and the jackass of the two major parties by forming this alliance and use maybe the eagle as an emblem of a party. Surely, we would then have a genuine two-party system in which there would be no mistake or misunderstanding on principles."

"Only Dixie can save the Nation, and saving the Nation means saving the world," declared Senator KARL MUNDT in a mind-gripping speech that held the closest attention of its hearers.

Senator MUNDT is the open champion and staunch advocate of a coalition between conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats for the purpose of restoring State rights as a fundamental principle of our Government.

"We are today in the midst of that ageless contest between man and State to determine which shall be the master," said Senator MUNDT. "Today we see our Government steadily encroaching on the rights as well as the plain duties of our people, through a vicious policy of asking them to look to Washington for everything.

"Personally, I am a liberal in the concept of Thomas Jefferson. I am a firm believer in State rights but I also believe in the people assuming their full responsibility and not looking to the Government to provide them with easy living. When all these new proposals are being made to us by those who champion the welfare State we should stop and ask ourselves are such things necessary, are such things practical, and can we afford the expense involved. If we continue in our present path the end is bankruptcy. We must not permit the Government to become masters of the people. Too many men are exercising too much authority over too many people for too long a time. They must be forced to remember that they are servants, not masters."

Senator MUNDT's statements on States rights and private-enterprise principles were interrupted by generous applause of Exchange Club members and about 200 guests of outstanding Mississippi political leaders and businessmen. He spoke 30 minutes past the civic club dead line.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Seaway Arguments," published in the Omaha World-Herald of March 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY ARGUMENTS

When the St. Lawrence seaway project was proposed to Congress this year, the battle lines formed almost immediately.

New England, the Atlantic ports and the Eastern railroads were against it. Most of the Great Lakes ports, except Chicago, were for it. Chicago, as always, seemed to be suffering from a bad case of schizophrenia. It was both for the seaway and against it.

New York's Mayor Impellitteri sounded off about this madcap scheme and Detroit and Milwaukee interests implied that grass will grow in their streets unless the seaway is completed. Such extravagant claims are no longer news.

The seaway is not a madcap scheme, nor is the commercial future of a few lake cities a matter of compelling national importance. The only possible justification for the project in these huge-spending times is its importance to national defense.

The Department of Defense and Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson say it is urgently needed. They say the channeling of the St. Lawrence will permit Labrador iron ore to reach Pittsburgh and Gary, thus easing the American shortage of high-grade ore.

If the seaway can be sold to the country on this basis, well and good. But there should be no more of the regional sparring by the what's-in-it-for-me boys. Long ago they prejudiced many people against the St. Lawrence seaway project and they could be the means of killing it now.

MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur's Dismissal," published in the Birmingham (Ala.) News of April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Pronounced differences of view between General MacArthur and those to whom he was responsible produced a situation that could not be permitted to continue indefinitely.

To have ignored that sharp conflict over policy in the conduct of the Korean conflict would probably have had progressively serious effects.

Surely the reaction among United States and United Nations troops to such a continuing situation would have been bad. Our relations with our allies would likely have been worsened. The Communists doubtless would have exploited these differences to the utmost. Something had to be done.

This paper believes the great majority of the American people will recognize that military commanders should be subject to their superiors in the making of general policy. MacArthur has indicated quite clearly that he intended to make certain of his own views known, notably in his recent letter to Representative JOE MARTIN, Massachusetts Republican. The general plainly desired to extend the conflict. He endorsed MARTIN'S idea of using Chinese Nationalist troops to open another front. He expressed the view that Asia rather than Europe is the major theater of conflict now with communism.

These ideas go directly against the policy of the United States Government and of the United Nations to limit the Korean conflict as much as is feasible.

The divergences produced great uncertainties as to the conduct of the war—uncertainties among our allies, uncertainties among the Communists.

President Truman could have rebuked General MacArthur. But the commander already had had repeated plain indications that his comments expressing conflicting views on broad policy were not in order. The President evidently felt that the results of a reprimand would not be satisfactory. And while such a drastic step as removal of a great military leader produces deep regrets in this country in one respect, it is not difficult to understand how Mr. Truman reached the conclusion that such a step was now called for.

It should be borne clearly in mind that the differences in this situation did not involve only the President and MacArthur. The Joint Chiefs of Staff is largely responsible for American military policy. It has opposed extending the war.

What General MacArthur thought would be the course of such an extension is far from clear. Of course he has not set forth his ideas in that connection. Could he have thought a decisive victory could have been won over the Communists in a general war in China? Does he believe the Russians would remain out of such a conflict? Where would it lead?

MacArthur, as Mr. Truman emphasizes, has performed tremendous services to the country. He has been responsible for some great military achievements. He has the gratitude and admiration of the Nation for these services.

It is fortunate that so able a commander as General Ridgway is available to take over the far-reaching responsibilities of command in the Far East.

Value of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Dollars and Sense," delivered by Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., before the Coeur d'Alene (Idaho) Chamber of Commerce on April 5, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLARS AND SENSE

(By Frank Lilly)

If, back in 1940, your doctor told you after a physical check-up that you were sound as a dollar, and if, thereafter, it developed that you actually had various weaknesses which have resulted in the loss of sight of one eye, the loss of hearing in one ear, the use of an arm and a leg, and in addition, you now have both asthma and stomach ulcers, your doctor was absolutely right: you were as sound as the 1940 dollar which has had a bad case of dropsy, dropping down to a present value of less than 50 cents on the average and as low as 27 cents for such items as bread, butter, coffee, sugar, corn, cotton, beef, lard, copper, lead, zinc, tin, among numerous examples that could be given.

Thus, even if you now have more than twice as much in the bank, twice as much savings, life insurance, bonds, real estate, and other assets as you had in 1940, you are not quite so well off as you were at that time, and 11 years of your life are gone. Believe it or not, you are not so well off as you were in 1933 unless you now have assets more than two and one-half times larger than in that depression year if measured in terms of the constant dollar used in a recent report of the United States Department of Commerce.

The practical effect of this decrease in the value of the dollar is the same as if the Government had made a capital levy of over 50 percent, leaving you the short end of your

savings, life insurance, and any pensions you may have earned in the service of an employer of your Government.

It is true that a part of the dollar's depreciation was due to the war, and few of us object to the loss sustained in the purchase of the so-called savings bonds, but the fact is that the depreciation started before the war and that the largest part of the loss of value has occurred in the last 5 years.

It is important to bear in mind that the dollar has no meaning except in terms of what it will buy. Confusion in this connection is responsible for much of the muddled thinking and the hue and cry over inflation, as if it were some new and strange animal that ate dollars. Actually inflation is the corollary of the depreciation, or deflation, of the dollar.

The stage for inflation was set back in 1933 when we went off gold and adopted irredeemable printing press paper currency. Like the sawdust that Mortimer Snerd substituted for the wheat bran he fed his chickens, it seemed to work; but it was inevitable that sooner or later we would find ourselves getting woodpeckers instead of little chicks out of the settings of wooden eggs.

This is the way the paper currency system works: Federal Reserve notes (IOU's) are issued against public and private debt, and because such so-called money is easily created it is in turn easily spent. Sooner or later, usually sooner, these debt-based dollars become so numerous that they lose a part of their buying power. In other words, prices rise and you have inflation through deflation of the dollar.

At this juncture, I suggest that you take a good look at one of your $10 bills. You will find that it is a Federal Reserve note which is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury. If you are curious to see what "lawful money" looks like and send your bill to the Treasury, you will receive two $5 United States notes which are redeemable in lawful money—and that is as far as you go.

You may say, as some people have said to me: I don't care what it is, money, currency, or what not, just so long as I can get enough of it to buy what I want with it. And, because more currency is needed to buy what people want to buy, wages are increased to meet higher prices and more and more debts are created as a base for more and more paper currency. This puts prices and wages up again and so on and on.

Eventually efforts are made to stop the paper-money racket responsible for the inflation. Price and wage controls are tried with resultant black markets and strikes. Bankers are required to tighten up on loans which, for the most part, are required only by small business since big business usually has ample funds, or can get them through Government loans by hiring the right attorney or with the gift of a pink mink fur coat.

In some quarters, it has been suggested that higher taxes will halt inflation. Maybe so, but an increase of 1,117 percent since 1940 in the Federal tax-take from your income and profits has not stopped inflation. Under the present monetary set-up, any increase in the tax-take will, in all probability, be offset by more printing-press debt-based currency.

The plain, unadulterated, and simple truth of the matter is that we must restore to this country the sound money of the Constitution, after which all other reforms can be accomplished. Managed currency requires a management to control prices and management of personal affairs, and these in turn lead to socialism and/or communism.

If and when an American citizen can redeem his currency in hard money, his bonds will have a sound and relatively constant value. Why doesn't our Government give us honest, gold-backed money so that we can know that the bonds we buy will be good down through the years? Provide such a bond and it will not be necessary to put on expensive campaigns and pressures to buy and hold them, or to pay more than a minimum interest on them if the interest is made payable in gold.

The United States should set an example for the world by providing its citizens with the best money in the world. As matters now stand, our paper currency is not as good as some other currencies, and no one wants our paper dollars except to buy goods from us or exchange them for gold which we sell abroad at a lower price than any other country will sell, while, at the same time, denying the right to own gold to our own citizens.

To put back into the dollar the cents it has lost we must put some sense into our monetary system and discard the practices foisted upon us by textbook economists and Marxists. No nation can be truly free with a paper currency that is not redeemable in something which has a storage of value.

Gold and silver are simple and definite forms of wealth, understood by men throughout the civilized world. They are not tainted with debt or deceit; they cannot be created at will and can be produced only by honest sweat and toil. They cannot be inflated, deflated, or debauched. Why don't we make full use of them, instead of kidding ourselves that a debt-based printing-press paper currency can be as good as gold?

It is your inalienable right as a citizen to own gold, which is the one best and safest form of wealth in this world. You owe it to yourself and to your loved ones to insist that this right be speedily restored by providing our country with a sound, honest constitutional hard money system.

In conclusion, I quote from Money Makes the Mare Go, by John McBride:

"An unsound monetary system is more fruitful of human misery than war, pestilence, and famine, and has brought more injustice than all the bad laws ever written. Until a sound monetary system is adopted, all the present frenzied efforts for permanent peace, economic recovery, a balanced budget, tax reduction, better labor-management relations, foreign aid, and a free world are just so much sound and fury signifying nothing. The dumping of additional billions of dollars into Europe and Asia will serve only as a temporary expedient, just prolong the agony, and hasten us on the way to bankruptcy."

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on the 12th day of April, the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette carried a surpassing editorial entitled "Battlefield Courage." It should be read by all, but particularly by all who are suffering from the present Nation-wide epidemic of acute MacArthuritis. I ask unanimous consent that this praiseworthy editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLEFIELD COURAGE—MACARTHUR WAS DISMISSED FOR DOING WHAT HE HIMSELF WOULDN'T TOLERATE

Yesterday marked the passing from the active military picture of one of this country's greatest generals. The man whose name has been gospel to adult and schoolboy alike for more than a decade as he led our GI's to victory after victory from Pearl Harbor to Korea was placed on the inactive list for the one thing he himself would not tolerate—insubordination.

General MacArthur was fired by the only man in the world who could do the job, his boss—the President of the United States.

Mr. Truman, regardless of any shortcomings, has shown once more that he has guts and he will act when he thinks he acts for the welfare of the Nation.

Make no mistake about it. It took battlefield courage—the same kind of courage with which the general is familiar—for the President to remove MacArthur from his command.

He fully realized the decision would be unpopular. Certainly he anticipated the reaction arising from the people who idolize MacArthur and think he can do no wrong. This newspaper has been one of his stanchest admirers.

Many of these are the same people who elected Mr. Truman as their President in 1948. By doing so they made him Commander in Chief over all branches of the Armed Forces and every man serving in them—including General MacArthur.

These are the people to whom Mr. Truman must answer for his every act, while his subordinate, General MacArthur, had only to answer to his Commander in Chief.

The removal order was not the idea of President Truman alone. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, highest military authority in the United States, stamped their approval on the order. It was not done with snap judgment but only after days and months of studied consideration.

General MacArthur was relieved of his armies because of insubordination which can no more be condoned in a general than it can be in a private in the ranks.

He was disobedient—not once, but repeatedly. To allow such disobedience to continue would make the function of the military impossible. In every sense and under every condition, it was MacArthur's duty to obey orders from the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff strictly and without question. This he did not do.

His flagrant defiance of the President was indirectly a defiance of every citizen of the United States. This defiant and arrogant ignoring of Mr. Truman had weakened the authority and the influence of the President of the United States throughout the world.

And for all of General MacArthur's tremendous reputation, he could not act as President, the chosen leader of all the people of the United States.

While MacArthur wielded his great influence in a restricted sphere of the world, the President is the symbol of this Nation's authority throughout the globe, encompassing that part that General MacArthur has preferred to treat peculiarly as his own.

MacArthur had plainly tried to dictate our policy as respects conditions in that zone. He had no authority whatever to do so. His actions repeatedly have crossed up Washington and the United Nations. The President is authorized to set foreign policies. His military commanders are required only to carry them out, not make them. This MacArthur was trying to do despite the fact his knowledge was limited to the East. It must be remembered he has been absent from this country for 15 years.

The President, holding in his hand the fate of our reputation in the over-all, broad realm of policy, would not let MacArthur get away with it.

As long ago as last December 8 the Gazette said editorially:

"To keep MacArthur in command because of any sentimental consideration would be such disregard of practical procedure as to be not only childishly foolish but positively criminal. The lives of hundreds of thousands of our young men are at stake, and the prestige of this country has already suffered distressingly. We cannot afford to risk anything more on a man who has pitifully failed and who, under the circumstances, could be depended upon to be responsible for further failures."

We have not altered from that position.

About the most charitable thing we can say about General MacArthur is that the piling up of the years may have served to warp his judgment and to impair his usefulness.

Whether he is the unwitting tool of certain politicians is not entirely clear. We are slow to believe that he would sell out his command and his country for political office, misled as he may be. But he has followed what many define as a party line instead of the patriotic line.

For some time it has been obvious that MacArthur was the darling of the Hearst newspapers. Now the blatant Hearst press, the antiadministration newspapers, and MacArthur's own sizable corps of press agents will drum up his dismissal into a cause celebre.

The deposed general should take a hint from our other remarkably popular general, Ike Eisenhower, who has expressed the hope that MacArthur will not intentionally allow himself to be held up as a wounded martyr to the further disunity of a troubled Nation faced with growing danger.

Leaders of both our major political parties must reassess their consciences and reawaken again that spirit of cooperation which carried America through the perilous years of World War II. There has been disunity in the ranks of both Democrats and Republicans. Things must be put right.

The people of our Nation too must stop and reflect. Hasty, feverish, and thoughtless action will not suffice.

Let the people answer these questions:

How would MacArthur have acted if one of his battlefield commanders had disobeyed?

How has he acted?

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Fundamental Principle Was at Stake," published in the Staunton News-Leader, Staunton, Va., on Thursday, April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE WAS AT STAKE

Involved in the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a more fundamental question than that of doing something to win an outright victory in the Korean War, or of the decisive theater (Asia or Europe) in the war for survival. It is that of the supremacy of the civil government over the military establishment and over any great general, however popular a hero he may be.

From its very birth, the Republic has feared militarism, meaning rule by generals who scorn the civil authority and force it to do their will. This fear emanated from the experiences of the early settlers in their native lands of Europe. They knew that militarism led to oppression and tyranny, and often to war for the aggrandizement of military leaders. This fear was reflected in the Constitution, which subordinated the military services to the civil authority by making the President Commander in Chief, and through the first 10 amendments (the Bill of Rights) placed certain restrictions upon the military to protect the rights of civilians.

It is only necessary to recall the march of militarism in other nations in our own time to realize how wise the founding fathers were in definitely subordinating the military branches to the civil authority, and how wise each generation has been in guarding against any step which might breach this safeguard. No democratic republic could long survive as such once the military establishment gained supremacy, for military rule and popular rule simply cannot operate simultaneously.

The record now released shows that General MacArthur had clearly and persistently flouted the civil authority and the policy-making, over-all strategic authority of the Military Establishment itself. He went over the heads of his constitutional superiors, to Congress and people. This he could properly have done by retiring from his vital command positions and going openly to the hustings. Instead, he chose a path of defiance, and one which invited a serious and perhaps fatal rupture with our allies in the free world.

President Truman has shown real courage in dealing condignly with the great hero. He knew that for relieving him, he would be assailed by Republican leaders with all the vigor and vituperation at their command, and that they would have a strong measure of popular support because many will believe MacArthur right in his concept of Asia as the decisive theater and in his demand for freedom of action against Communist China.

When this second great debate has ended, the majority support of Congress and people will be behind the President, for he has necessarily upheld the civil authority in recalling a general who would not take orders or directives, and the realities of the world situation make Europe and not Asia the decisive theater for years to come. Moreover, there is a wide realization that MacArthur has had a Jehovah complex for years, and the American people generally do not cotton to a leader who believes himself infallible, the late F. D. R. to the contrary.

All sorts of black results will be written into the President's action. It will be viewed as destructive of Army morale in Korea, as alienating the Japanese people, who have come to look upon MacArthur as something of a god, and as aiding the Communist armies by removing a leader with strategical genius who is feared by the enemy. The extreme view which some no doubt will advance is that world war III will be hastened because of the advantages accruing to the Soviet.

It is too much to expect the Republicans and other critics of the administration's handling of the war and the program for defense of the free world to keep their shirts on. None of the dire results already being predicted will eventuate, but the rearmament program will be slowed down by Republican attacks. They would have found something else of which to make political capital, however, so Mr. Truman was wise in disregarding the ammunition he would provide them in firing MacArthur. It is nothing short of tragic that the people in Washington can't pull together in war and defense matters and fight their political battles over domestic issues.

In addition to upholding the power of the civil authority, the President's summary action should result at least in the formulation of clear-cut policy in regard to the Korean War, on the part of both the United States and the United Nations. With China ignoring all efforts of the latter to negotiate and this country engaging in a controversy over the question of basic strategy, there is little probability that Peiping will backtrack now on its appeasement demands. Washington and the UN majority have shown no disposition to entertain those demands, and they will certainly not be tolerated now that the UN forces have shown their ability to maul the Reds in Korea and either advance or hold.

With Russia pledged by the Moscow pact with Red China to assist the latter if attacked, there will be no diminution of western fears of all-out war if the MacArthur demands for action against the mainland were to prevail. With no negotiations in progress and none in prospect, and with appeasement of Red China unthinkable, the wisest course for the west is to announce that there will be no general advance beyond the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel and that it will hold on that line until the Reds get enough men killed to stop their aggression.

Concurrently, an effective South Korean defense army should be built, equipped, and trained, that the UN forces may eventually disengage. If there is any other course open, other than a continuation of the present impossible war without objectives, it is not apparent unless western nations decide they are willing to risk all-out war in the Orient, which would mean the certain fall of Western Europe to Russia.

Dismissal of General MacArthur is a Victory for Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of many, including myself, it would seem that the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President is a victory for Soviet Russia. If anyone has a different viewpoint a reading of the Daily Worker would convince them otherwise. This paper which is looked upon as the mouthpiece in the United States of Moscow policy has demonstrated time and again its opposition to General MacArthur. It has time and again demanded his recall. When this was accomplished it literally screamed its satisfaction.

In an article appearing in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., today by George Sokolsky, he says:

The President's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur may prove to be as great a military victory for Soviet Russia as Stalingrad and as great a diplomatic victory as Yalta.

The article in its entirety reads as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The President's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur may prove to be as great a military victory for Soviet Russia as Stalingrad and as great a diplomatic victory as Yalta.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur did not make the Korean War. Every step he took after VJ-day (August 14, 1945) has been designed to prevent just such a war.

He sought to build an East Asian League of Nations, including Nationalist China, which would be a bulwark against the advancing might of Soviet Russia in that vastly populated area of the world. He realized early that our policy in China was ill-conceived and without reality.

He supported the Wedemeyer reports on China and Korea—reports which would have saved us from our current grief. MacArthur did not believe that Korea could be held by the United States on the terms arranged at Teheran and Yalta, but when on June 25, 1950, he was ordered into war there by President Truman and Dean Acheson, he undertook to save the glory of the American flag with his eyes blindfolded and at least one hand tied behind his back.

Within a few days, he discovered that he was not an American commander, but a United Nations commander.

He discovered that unlike any other commanding general in the field, his decisions were subject to the approval of a vast congress of nations, large and small, among whom are our enemies, Soviet Russia and Poland, to mention only two.

He also discovered that Great Britain, with as much responsibility as we have to maintain treaty obligations and the integrity of the United Nations, was engaged in a weird strategy which included three divergent and contradictory factors:

1. To send token troops to fight in the Korean War;

2. To oppose such second-front tactics as might be useful, as, for instance, support of Nationalist China and the anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland;

3. To use all efforts, including their effective propaganda agencies, to limit the Korean War to a stalemated, targetless action with the view that American aid and largesse might not be diverted from Europe to Asia.

And in conjunction with this, MacArthur discovered that India, just freed from the British raj, emerged as a Soviet spokesman, the reason for this unusual demarche being the Kashmir and other antagonisms against Pakistan, Nehru seeking Russian support in his struggle against Moslems in India.

On all sides he saw the United States being sacrificed while American sons were being killed.

War is unpleasant under any circumstances; it becomes a horror when the commanding general is being stabbed in the back and the troops under him are being sacrificed on the altar of political necessities. No general wants his men to die for nothing.

All this, General MacArthur in his roundabout language to Congressman JOE MARTIN, has made clear to the American people.

It is a pity that General MacArthur had to use such means as letters to Congressmen and private individuals to break through his muzzling by the Pentagon and the State Department.

He wanted his own people to know that it is impossible to bring this Korean War to a victorious end. For this, he has been dismissed on the basis of insubordination.

As a military man, he knows that what the geniuses in Washington want to do is ridiculous, impossible. They want to play an unending game of tag, with nobody getting hurt except the troops there.

The plan is the loquacious dream of gentle personalities who have a great capacity for loving the enemy.

Their confusion arises from a lack of focus; they are global in their outlook, without anchorage in the United States of America.

They do not quite know whether they really prefer the American system of life or any other. Acheson and Marshall accept British policy because they cannot devise a policy of their own.

To a man of MacArthur's training and history, these men must appear like curiosities, more perilous than a fighting enemy, for lacking cohesion of thought, they move simultaneously in different directions which at times make them appear to be miasmic.

The crime against Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been that he has been given responsibility, but he has not been permitted to win a war or to tell America why we are failing in a war. No man could have held such a position too long with dignity and honor.

Televising of Congressional Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 26), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over the Nation I have received innumerable letters from average citizens, attorneys, radio and TV people on the subject of my comments on the televising of congressional hearings. I have pointed out that television is a miraculous medium which can have tremendous constructive values for public education.

At the same time, I have also indicated that the televising of open hearings at which criminals and other questionable characters appear, can lay the basis for slander to a degree which we have heretofore never conceived. In other words, if poorly prepared open hearings are held, without there having been executive sessions previously to sift testimony, weigh facts, consider evidence, and give individuals the opportunity to defend themselves if they are accused, then congressional committees will have violated their responsibility. They will have permitted the smearing of innocent names and reputations before millions of televiewers. That is why I submitted Senate Resolution 106, providing for a study of this whole subject.

As an indication of the reactions of many people throughout our country, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

(a) Excerpts from numerous letters to me on this issue, as well as

(b) Excerpts from a column by Mr. Allen Sims which appeared in the April 5 issue of the Barron (Wis.) News-Shield.

(c) Excerpts from a very interesting article on the more general subject of broadcasting legislative proceedings. This article, entitled "Congress on the Air," was written by Mr. Ralph Goldman and published in the Public Opinion Quarterly, winter 1950–51 issue. It reviews the long controversy of broadcasting floor sessions of the Congress.

There being no objection, the correspondence and news comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From a distinguished attorney in Milwaukee:

"MARCH 31, 1951.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"United States Senator,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I think that you are to be congratulated in the stand that you have taken with reference to televising proceedings of committees of Congress. You are certainly the very first to point out the dangers inherent in a congressional investigation which is being televised. Some of us feel very strongly that if a witness does not desire to testify before the television apparatus, that such witness' feelings should be respected, at least within certain limits. You have performed an outstanding public service in suggesting the difficulties inherent in a congressional investigation, and I am sure that as a result of your analysis, either legislation will be proposed or a tradition established by the Congress which will represent whatever compromise may be necessary between the public welfare on the one hand and individual rights of witnesses on the other."

An individual in Missouri:

"MARCH 26, 1951.

"Hon. Senator WILEY,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR: I want to endorse your position relative to the television shows that are being put on by some television companies. This exhibition is not in my opinion for the purpose of promoting law enforcement but purely for commercial business. It seems to me that thing is below the standards of dignity. It will not be long if this thing is allowed to be carried on that the soap, beer, and cereal companies are advertising their wares at these investigations and court trial."

From Brooklyn, N. Y.:

"MARCH 22, 1951.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have just been reading an Associated Press dispatch in which you are quoted as having said that the televising of congressional committee investigations could 'become a monster which can destroy innocent individuals, whole corporations, political parties and entire administrations.'

"Much the same thought must have come to millions of others during the broadcasting of the Kefauver hearings in New York.

"In view of your many months of experience with the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I hope that you will be able to make a substantial recommendation to the Senate soon in this regard."

[From the Barron County (Wis.) News-Shield of April 5, 1951]

YOU AND I

(By Alan Sims)

How would you like to be listening to or watching a television program and suddenly hear your name or telephone number mentioned in connection with some gambler, gangster, or hoodlum?

How would you like to be asked to tell in public how much you earn or how much wealth you have?

These are not ridiculous questions. The recent hearings held by the very sincere and capably led Kefauver Crime Committee had such experiences. Gamblers were asked to check lists of telephone numbers which had come to the attention of the committee. Among the names and numbers were those of other gamblers * * * but also there were names of relatives, social acquaintances * * * and even that of a doctor. And in another instance the name of a well-known industrialist, a man of high standing, was used by a gangster to try to convey a close friendship and to excuse his appearance at a political meeting.

The Kefauver Crime Committee has accomplished much good. It has shown the public what lies behind political campaigns in New York City and in some other large communities. It has shown the public what gangsters look like. It has revealed connections between certain politicians and law-enforcement officers and criminals. But the general implications of a Senate Crime Committee are most dangerous. It is too easy to bring in the name of innocent people and in this present day we are too apt to judge a man by association. And the questions that inquire into a man's wealth or earnings * * * even those of a gangster, it seems, would be best asked in private hearings. The answers to these questions are too tempting to other criminals in terms of blackmail or kidnaping or robbery.

In our courts, many safeguards have been built over the centuries to protect innocent people. These safeguards are lacking in these crime investigations.

And consider, too, what might happen if a crime committee were put under the leadership of less honorable men * * * possibly of some fanatical laborite or industrialist or some overzealous religious mind. Such powers could be used to destroy one's enemies, to ruin innocent people, to bring disaster upon great institutions.

* * * * *

Senator WILEY has come out emphatically against more crime investigation as it is now being done. He has pointed out the dangers and has requested a thorough study of the problems that have developed and the dangers to innocent people. He should be given fullest support to the end that every fair effort to combat crime should be developed while at the same time everything that can be should be done to protect innocent men and women.

Law-enforcement agencies should be made to do their work honestly and fully * * * under the usual safeguards for innocent people * * * then there would be no need for these public television shows.

CONGRESS ON THE AIR

(By Ralph M. Goldman)

The impact of communication technique upon the scope, intensity, and very nature of politics has long been recognized by political professionals. In the field of Presidential campaigning alone, the sources, content, methods, channels, and effects of communication have been of keenest concern to the men in charge. Hamilton spoke through John Fenno's Gazette of the United States, Jefferson's party had Philip Freeneau's National Gazette. Jackson's managers used the mass meeting as it never had been used before. Ben Day's one-cent New York Sun in 1833, supplementing the six-cent newspapers, brought the newly enfranchised masses into national politics. Mark Hanna revolutionized campaigning with his army of 1,400 campaign speakers and his barrage of 120,000,000 campaign pamphlets and other documents. Coolidge pioneered in making use of the new radio medium. Franklin D. Roosevelt's effectiveness over the air made history. The National Conventions were televised in 1948.

Thus the party contest for the office of Chief Executive has become a complex and massive communications operation, involving television, radio, newspapers, magazines, motion pictures, rallies, telephone, correspondence, pamphlets, and personal face-to-face forms of communication. The rest of the world generally looks to an American Presidential contest as one of the most important ingredients of our democracy-at-work.

But American democracy has its legislative as well as its executive aspect. The communications revolution is bound to catch up with the legislative process even more than it already has. The newspapers have long covered and interpreted Congress, its activities and its leadership, with amplitude and skill. Radio and television have only begun to explore the possibilities. A new synthesis of legislative process and mass media is in the making and seems only to wait upon the appropriate catalyst, for the elements to be combined are many and the inertia to be overcome is great.

LEGISLATIVE BROADCASTS: PRO AND CON

Broadcasting congressional proceedings is no longer a novel idea, nor would it be an adventure into uncharted fields. Experience in the field of broadcasting legislative proceedings is plentiful at every level of government, from the United Nations to the New York City Council. The synthesis is not an easy one to make, but the ways in which it has been achieved have been numerous, and often ingenious. Before examining some of these, it may be useful to mention some of the theoretical pros and cons on this subject. On the credit side the arguments run as follows:

1. Legislative broadcasts help focus public attention upon the debate and discussion stage of democratic policy making. Recent use of radio by public executives and strong leaders has given a monolithic appearance to the policy-making processes. The give-and-take of debate and reconciliation has been obscured and could best be presented to the general public by broadcasts of legislative proceedings.

2. Legislative broadcasts tend to strengthen our conceptions of popular sovereignty. The people have the right to hear their representatives in action. In like manner, the awareness of a large and immediate public audience has a salutary effect upon the activities of representatives in legislative session. Popular sovereignty is effective in direct proportion to the extent to which representatives are self-conscious and responsible.

3. Legislative broadcasts serve as a major channel for popular political education, a testing ground for the quality of leadership and the issues of the day.

4. Among the media of mass communication, the psychologists tell us, radio is the one which gives its audience the greatest sense of direct personal participation. This sense of participation is another vital aspect of democratic group life and one which is enlarged and reinforced by the broadcasting of legislative deliberations.

5. Reports of legislative activity usually reach the public through several different channels, with varying degrees of accuracy and objectivity. Putting the legislature on the air is a method of checking the reports received by way of the other media.

6. Such broadcasts help constituents to separate out the worth-while from the inept among their representatives.

There are a great number of difficult technical questions, which, of themselves, operate to discourage proposals for legislative broadcasts. Setting these technical matters aside for the moment, the more general criticisms usually are as follows:

1. Legislative proceedings bore the average radio listener and succeed in attracting only a very limited audience.

2. Legislators use air time to harangue the folks back home rather than concentrate upon legislative business.

3. Public knowledge of legislative goings-on and bickering might seriously discredit the entire legislative process itself.

4. American commercial radio cannot meet its business requirements by putting prolonged legislative proceedings on the air. The objections of advertisers—the main source of operating income for broadcasters—would have to be given serious consideration so long as American broadcasting remains a self-supporting industry.

5. Selective broadcasting would present delicate, even insurmountable, editing problems.

6. Since legislators are immune from suit, radio would provide them with another outlet for abusive slander, libel, and innuendo, with perhaps even more serious consequences than now experienced through the other media.

SOME EXPERIENCES: INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL

The United Nations: Legislative broadcasts have emanated from different levels of government—international, national, State, and local. At the international level, it is premature to call the United Nations a government or a legislature in the true sense of these terms. At most, we may call the UN an incipient government. In any event, the broadcasting of UN proceedings goes back to its very first sessions, in 1946. Early coverage was quite inadequate. Complaints were heard that the large networks scheduled only a smattering of the UN broadcast material made available to them. Distant stations found the costs of telephone lines from UN headquarters prohibitive. Commercial requirements forced the networks away from this kind of public-service broadcast and the task devolved upon WNYC, New York City's noncommercial, low-budget station.

Station WNYC gives complete coverage to the Security Council and the General Assembly meetings, providing its own pick-up and serving as an originating station for any other independent station which may care to carry the material (a popular practice during the UN's first year.)

* * * * *

In addition to the programing offered to it by Station WNYC, the American public also hears the United Nations Today, a daily quarter-hour review of significant international developments. This program is highlighted by the recorded voices of delegates as they speak. It goes over more than 170 stations coast to coast and is heard in 16 States. Weekly programs include: Memo from Lake Success, carried by 96 CBS affiliates; Two Billion Strong, a half-hour ABC program; and UN Story, carried over 300 stations.

New Zealand: What have been the developments with respect to legislatures at the national level? The first country to broadcast the proceedings of its legislature was New Zealand. In 1936 this country's first Labor Party Prime Minister, Michael Joseph Savage, contended that the Conservative-dominated press was not giving his party fair news coverage. When the Government-owned Station 2-YA was established, Savage appointed himself as the first Minister of Broadcasting. Broadcasting the proceedings of the House of Representatives was his own project, to serve not only partisan but also national needs.

Since the House of Representatives is the heart of the New Zealand legislative process, it alone was wired for broadcast purposes. Some five microphones were strategically located throughout the Chamber. At first, all proceedings were broadcast, the time span usually running from 2:30 p. m. to 11 p. m. or longer, with a two hour intermission for dinner. Later, the broadcasts were limited to fewer and more closely scheduled hours, 11 p. m. becoming the regular sign-off time.

The use of radio made necessary some modifications in parliamentary practice. For instance, the selection of speakers from both parties, from day to day, and the order in which it was agreed that they should take the floor became matters of considerable importance in view of the fact that those who took the floor during the most popular listening hours were assured of a wider audience than they would otherwise enjoy. In addition, both Government and opposition insisted upon an equal number of speakers

in each and every debate. For purposes of military security during wartime, the Speaker was authorized to censor speeches by use of a push-button which could cut off the broadcast. A green light in front of the Speaker's table indicated that the speech was on the air; a red light flashed on when a speech had been cut off.

* * * * *

On July 10, 1946, broadcasts from the Australian Parliament were commenced over the government-owned radio station of that country. Before broadcasts began, there was an intensive search for some formula whereby the weekly 16 hours of air time could be divided equitably between the Senate and the House of Representatives. Steps were taken in the direction of protecting members against libel suits. There was also great anxiety that the public might view with contempt the legislative proceedings and much attention was given to the matter of controlling the more boisterous members. That the program has been a success is evident from the results of a survey made in August 1946, by the Australian public-opinion polls, Asked: "Do you think the broadcasts from Parliament should be continued, reduced, or stopped," the Australian people voted decisively for continuation. Specifically, the distribution of the vote was:

	Percent
Continued	68
Reduced	7
Stopped	18
Undecided	7

* * * * *

THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The case history with respect to our own Congress has been more experimental and inconclusive. It is generally known that Congressmen, as individuals, have made good use of radio. For example, the Columbia Broadcasting System alone has reported that, from 1928 to 1940, Senators addressed radio audiences over Columbia sustaining programs more than 700 times and Representatives over 500 times. * * *

At a time when a resolution to authorize direct pick-up broadcasting was pending before Congress, New York's Station WMCA undertook to dramatize the proceedings as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During December 1944, "The Halls of Congress" went on the air. Senators and Congressmen were portrayed by professional actors. Many outstanding congressional debates were presented; for example, those on FEPC, the poll tax, Bretton Woods, etc. Best broadcast hours—during 1 year from 3:30 to 4 p. m. on Sundays, during another from 9:30 to 10 p. m. on Wednesdays—were assigned to this popular weekly program.

"Following Congress," a dramatization similar to that of WMCA, has been one of the novel public-affairs offerings of the University of Wisconsin College of the Air. It is a weekly half-hour program on some important subject selected from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Speeches are abstracted and parts are acted out by students. The entire project is aimed at augmenting classroom contact with the work of Congress. Copies of the script are mimeographed for use by other schools.

In Congress itself, bills and resolutions have been introduced from time to time since 1931 calling for the broadcasting of proceedings directly from the floor of each House. * * *

Putting Congress on the air was one of the more significant matters dealt with during the 1945 hearings before the LaFollette-Monroney Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Some of the testimony and comment are both informative and suggestive.

A limited broadcast period with short speeches was among the suggestions offered. One Senator suggested a daily Senate broadcast from 10 a. m. to noon, with the speaking schedule arranged by committees on the majority and minority sides. The problems of time allocation, unrepresentative coverage, and public disinterest were stressed by one critical Representative. Another Representative argued that selective broadcasts need emphasize only the more dramatic moments in the legislature's work. Since half or more of congressional time is consumed in technical and detailed discussion of bills, use of recording devices was recommended so that edited transcriptions could be put on the air during evening hours. It was noted that American commercial stations must necessarily plan their broadcasting schedule a week in advance, a factor which would require that meetings of Congress be more closely planned.

Among the questions raised were these: (1) Should the listener have the option of tuning in to different stations in order to hear the separate proceedings of the Senate, the House, or the various committees? (2) Would a Government-owned station be necessary in order to get this type of broadcasting onto the air? (3) Would it be desirable to make some prior announcement of legislative program content for the information and convenience of listeners?

* * * * *

A statement by Dr. Robert D. Leigh, director of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, set forth a particularly interesting approach to this problem. "It will be necessary for Congress to organize its procedure and discussion so that the necessary condensations and emphasis upon important issues can actually be brought to the microphone." Full meetings of the two Houses, he pointed out, generally serve either of two purposes: (1) To record the votes on measures reported out from committees; and (2) to carry debate aimed primarily at influencing opinion among the Congressmen's constituents or at explaining reasons for individual decisions taken on particular measures. Dr. Leigh suggested that these functions could be performed over two kinds of evening radio sessions, each of which would occupy one evening a week. One would be a voting session very much like an opinion day in the Supreme Court. The other evening would carry congressional debates on important issues, arranged by a special bipartisan steering committee.

Typical of the kind of resolution placed before Congress is the Pepper-Coffee resolution which was pending at the time of the La Follette-Monroney hearings. In part, it stated: "Radio broadcasting stations and radio broadcasting networks are hereby authorized to broadcast any proceedings on the floor of the Senate or of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That no station or network shall be required to broadcast any proceedings, nor shall any proceedings of either House be broadcast when such House otherwise orders." This kind of resolution, of course, is entirely inadequate to the proposal it makes. Its generality ignores the intricacies of arranging this kind of broadcast. It calls for no permanent or certain commitments on the part of either Congress or the stations. It gives no permanent agency the responsibility for getting things done and for resolving operating problems.

At the time of the La Follette-Monroney investigation, engineers of the Federal Communications Commission favored the use of Government-assigned short-wave facilities. It was estimated that a new broadcasting plant in the Capitol would cost about $2,000,000. The annual cost of two congressional stations was set at about $800,000. The Big Four among the networks—Mutual, NBC, CBS, and ABC—also submitted plans describing proposed recording, broadcasting, and television facilities. To date Congress has taken no action on any of these proposals.

CONCLUSIONS: RECONCILING LEGISLATIVE PROCESS AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

We see therefore, that broadcasting the proceedings of a legislature is no longer a matter of reform. It is more a matter of initiative and working out the details. However, these are no small obstacles. The details include the wide diversity of interests to be reconciled and the hard-to-crack technical questions. The American system of radio broadcasting is a complex commercial process, involving relationships among network, regional, and local broadcasters, advertisers, advertising agencies, the Federal Communications Commission, the manufacturers of radio sets, programing organizations, and trade, labor, professional, and audience groups. The United States Congress is an equally complex legislative process, involving relationships among its Members, political parties, pressure groups, constituents, and other branches of the National Government.

Some of the technical questions are these: Shall AM, FM, or short-wave channels be used? Shall the program be financed by the broadcasters, by Congress, or by some new blend of public-service broadcasting and commercial advertising? Shall coverage of the proceedings be complete or selective? If selective, shall selection be a preliminary process, for example, closer planning of legislative proceedings, or shall selection take place ex post facto, perhaps by having transcriptions edited by a bipartisan committee? What are best broadcast hours? What about the use of commentators and professional actors? Are these desirable?

The most stubborn stumbling block of all is the question of initiative. * * *

Finally, there are the broadcasters, facing, as always, the hard necessity of earning their own way. For them, the proposal to put Congress on the air may offer a rare opportunity for rendering public service, for meeting the challenge of the other media, for broadening the base for cross-network cooperation, for dealing with the notorious shortage of fresh broadcast material, and for undertaking new experiments in broadcaster-advertiser arrangements. On the other hand, it is easy to understand why broadcaster initiative might be resented by the other principals. In the final analysis, some specially created, representative, and thoroughly detached agency, capable of carrying the ball and of inventing adjustments for the achievement of short- and long-term objectives, may be the most effective way to reconcile the needs of the legislative process and the communication system.

One thing, however, seems certain. The Congress of the United States should enjoy all the advantages and disadvantages of twentieth-century communications in the same way that the Presidency does. Furthermore, putting Congress on the air would demonstrate for all the world to hear how a democracy is able to create unity out of diversity.

A Victory for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of sincere and thoughtful Americans who see in President Truman's shabby treatment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur a victory for Russia.

The following editorial taken from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune is well worth reading:

A VICTORY FOR RUSSIA

Soviet Russia won its greatest victory of the cold war Wednesday at 1 a. m. when President Truman announced to the world that Gen. Douglas MacArthur had been relieved of all his commands.

Perhaps an adequate commentary on this action is to be found in the words of a British diplomat, quoted by the Associated Press Wednesday night. Said the Briton, "Good old Harry."

But, observe what some leading Americans said:

Former President Hoover: "This action can bring great tragedy to our country."

An Altoona shopman said, "I believe he should have been left there (MacArthur). He knows what it's all about."

Mr. Truman has given in again to the pressure of the British Socialists, who have been clamoring for him to get rid of MacArthur for months. The British don't want anything to upset their position in the Orient any further. They even had the gall to demand that Red China, our bitter enemy, shall have a role in the Japanese peace pact.

MacArthur constantly sought to crush the enemy, to get the job done. He repeatedly has asked for more troops, more freedom to wage war against the Reds. Always he has been refused.

Well, now the British Socialists have won. And Mr. Acheson, who places Europe above all, has succeeded in removing a thorn in the side of the State Department, MacArthur. A thorn, because MacArthur ignored State Department stupidity, and handled Japan as the State Department has never handled any responsibility.

Calls received from the public, at the Tribune office, and at the local office of Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT in the postoffice building, show the trend of thought.

And, that trend tragically shows a lack of confidence in the administration.

Why? Because in one instance after the other, those who called proved to be women, wives and mothers, and all showed concern for their men in the service now.

What does that show? Certainly, it shows lack of faith in our Washington leadership, and confidence of the highest caliber in MacArthur.

That is the real test of leadership, no matter what else one may say—faith.

A Japanese cab driver remarked, "It is a great pity."

It is a great pity that international politics, and diplomacy in this country directed by inept men, can remove one of our greatest leaders.

It is enough to cause concern for the future of America.

General MacArthur has shown the only successful administration of an occupied land, Japan. He has succeeded in keeping Russia in its place in Japan. And he is the only American, civilian or military, who has been able to do this.

Since the end of World War II, the Russians have fought with MacArthur over the occupation of Japan. Time and again he has put them in their place. They have made no headway against him.

Now, their greatest obstacle in Japan has been removed, and by his own Government.

He has had over 30 years' experience in the Far East. General Ridgway, undoubtedly an able soldier, who replaces him, served in Sicily and Normandy.

How is he fitted to take over command in the Far East?

It is amazing that the President should show such prejudice and ill judgment as to remove our top commander while our forces are advancing in Korea, and bracing for enemy attack.

General Ridgway, MacArthur's successor, is quoted as saying much the same thing MacArthur was fired for saying.

Ridgway said only 3 days ago, "I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. For the Communists, this is a life and death struggle. They will not vary their objective. These fellows are out to destroy us no matter how long it takes.

MacArthur wanted to destroy the enemy in the quickest, most efficient way, and with the least cost in American lives.

Both these military men, Ridgway and his predecessor, MacArthur, see no end to the bloody Korean war as it is being fought now.

Yet, Mr. Truman insists that it be fought that way. London wants it that way. Paris wants it that way.

But, how about the 200,000 Yanks who are doing the fighting and dying? How do they want it? Don't they want to get it done, and get out of there? How does Mr. Truman's action serve them?

Peanut Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, "peanut politicians" in high places are still at work. The latest display of really petty stuff was the snub given the head of the Nation's largest farm organization when President Truman failed to appoint President Allan B. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau, as a member of the new Mobilization Policy Advisory Board.

The following article by Earl Richert which appeared in the Washington News of April 10, 1951, tells the story. It can fairly be assumed that Secretary of Agriculture Brannan passed upon the appointments as far as the four agriculture members of the Board are concerned before the appointments were made by President Truman. Friends and members of the American Farm Bureau sincerely hope that President Truman and Secretary Brannan are getting a lot of satisfaction out of such petty political maneuvering:

President Truman has gone out of his way to snub the head of the Nation's largest farm organization, President Allan B. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau.

Result is that now, with labor officially back in the mobilization set-up after weeks of maneuvering, it's the Farm Bureau that's "off the reservation."

The Kline snub—one of the most direct the Capital has seen in a long time—came last week end when Mr. Truman appointed the 16 members of his new Mobilization Policy Advisory Board. (This is the Board that's supposed to bring harmony to the mobilization set-up.)

As agriculture's four board members the President named the presidents of the No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 largest farm organizations—Herschel D. Newsom, of the Grange; James G. Patton, of the Farmers' Union; and D. W. Brooks, of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. Then for the Farm Bureau's representative the President went far down in the bureau set-up to pick Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau. Mr. Wiser is not even on the Farm Bureau's 20-man board of directors.

Mr. Wiser, reportedly because of the snub to Mr. Kline, informed President Truman yesterday that he would be unable to serve. A White House spokesman declined to comment on the resignation. No successor has been chosen.

Farm Bureau leaders say no boycott of the Mobilization Board is contemplated.

"How can you boycott something you haven't been asked to join?" asked Roger Fleming, legislative representative of the Farm Bureau.

It was pointed out that Mr. Truman had named to the new board the presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the CIO, as well as the presidents of the other three big farm groups.

Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said he thought all American Farm Bureau members would take the Kline snub as an affront. "I think it most unfortunate that the administration saw fit to take a slap at the largest farm organization at this time when we need cooperation from everybody," he said.

Mr. Kline has long been the major thorn in the side of Agriculture Secretary Charles Brannan. He has been the most active opponent of the Secretary's controversial farm plan.

Mr. Kline only recently recommended a 20 percent slash in the Agriculture Department's administrative expenses and a large cut in funds for the soil conservation program. He said this should be done in the interests of Government economy.

"I guess," said one Farm Bureau official, "that John L. Lewis now has a rival. Mr. Truman wouldn't even consider Mr. Kline for dog catcher either."

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD BREEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, in the thousands of paragraphs that have already been written in the pro and con discussion in regard to General MacArthur's removal as United States commander in chief in the Far East, the following editorial, which appeared in the Dayton Daily News for April 11, 1951, spotlights with great clarity some of the important features of today's most controversial subject.

The publisher of the Dayton Daily News is the Honorable James M. Cox, former three-time Governor of the great State of Ohio, and the Democratic standard bearer for the Presidency of the United States in 1920. The Governor's thinking in the matter is directly reflected in this editoral, and his excellent background and study in national and international matters makes this editorial doubly valuable and important.

I wish to extend my compliments to the editorial staff of the Dayton Daily News; and to my colleagues, I respectfully invite their attention to the following editorial:

TRUMAN AND MACARTHUR

It is a tragedy, in many respects, that the long and brilliant command of General MacArthur in the Far East has ended in his dismissal by the President. MacArthur has been one of the world's outstanding soldiers and soldier-strategists. He has been a fine administrator of Japan. His prestige is deservedly high in Asia. He has great claims on the gratitude of America.

On sober reflection, we are sure, a majority of Americans will come to feel that the President had no choice but to terminate MacArthur's command. MacArthur's view of global policy was badly distorted; from most of a military lifetime spent in Asia, he thought, perhaps naturally, that the fate of the world revolved about Asia. If his advice had been followed, it could have led us into tragic pitfalls.

But that is not the issue on which MacArthur was dismissed. If he had been content to press his views through military channels, to argue to his heart's content with his superiors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and then to accept their decision and carry on like the good soldier, the case would have been different. But MacArthur, in spite of repeated urgings that later were translated into definite warnings, insisted on going over the heads of his superiors and carrying the arguments to Members of Congress, the newspapers, and the people.

To put it bluntly, MacArthur was insubordinate. Insubordination is one quality that cannot be tolerated in a soldier, whether he be a general or a private. Without discipline, without loyal discharge of the commands of superiors, there can be no effective army. Would MacArthur himself have permitted General Ridgway to lobby in the press and in Congress against his (MacArthur's) strategy? Would Ridgway have permitted his division commanders this freedom? Would one of Ridgway's brigade commanders have allowed a captain to make a public issue of whether Hill 101 or Hill 114 should be the next objective of his company? Surely not. What would happen, even in a football game, if a halfback who didn't think the play called by the quarterback would work, were to rush to the sidelines, grab a megaphone from the hands of a cheerleader, and make an impassioned speech to the spectators about it?

Abraham Lincoln had trouble with more than one general, such as McClellan and "Fighting Joe" Hooker, who were mixed up in their view of the pyramid of authority. Lincoln, after many displays of patience, got rid of his insubordinate generals. It is hard to imagine what the outcome of the war might have been if he hadn't.

At issue here, of course, is not only the inviolability of a military chain of command, but something even higher. That is the American principle of ultimate civilian control of military policy. Theater commanders who will not stick to commanding but who insist on invading the field of over-all military and diplomatic strategy present a direct challenge to this basic safeguard planted in the United States Constitution by a very wise set of founding fathers.

The immediate issue is that of MacArthur's insubordination, and the impossibility of conducting effective policy in the atmosphere created by it. However, it is not beside the point to consider where the country might have been led had MacArthur's advice finally prevailed, or, worse still, had he at last embarked on certain military actions in defiance of authority.

1. We might easily have precipitated war with Russia, which no person of sound sense wants to do at this time. Russia has a mutual assistance pact with China, which might be brought into play if we bombed Manchuria or if we turned Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa loose for an invasion of the Chinese mainland. This, incidentally, is the opinion expressed by Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, who in World War II was one of MacArthur's two top Pacific commanders. General Eichelberger said:

"I believe Stalin committed himself to protect China from attack when he succeeded in getting the Chinese Reds into action in Korea."

2. At the least we would have spread the war in China, extending our involvement from the narrow peninsula of Korea, which can be held with a couple of hundred thousand men, to the mainland, in which we might have to sink millions. In this way we would have bled ourselves white while Russia sat back and watched without expending a single division of her own army.

3. By getting bogged down in Asia, we would have diverted our main drive from the defense of Europe, presenting Stalin with an easy conquest of highly industrialized nations which, once settled in his orbit, would give him the power to outproduce us for war and make our ultimate defeat inevitable. MacArthur would have succeeded in doing what he failed to do in the last war, namely, in overriding the very wise priority which was given to European operations by Roosevelt and Churchill.

4. We could have lost the vital support of our European allies. Sensing our inability to give them effective help in defending themselves while our face was turned toward Asia, they would be likely to give up the ghost and seek to make the best terms possible with Stalin.

5. We could have pushed the 400,000,000 people of India (and millions of other Asiatic waverers) from the neutral column into the enemy column. The ultimate consequences of uniting all Asia against us would be incalculable.

6. We could have lost our chance to detach 450,000,000 Chinese from the Russian orbit. As developing Communist tyranny rips the mask from the falsely advertised face of Red benevolence, there is a chance that the Chinese, fiercely individualistic and never for long hospitable to foreign masters, will take the path that Tito took in Yugoslavia. But if we were to loose the hated, discredited Chiang Kai-shek upon them, we would be the villains in their eyes. Instead of giving the Russians enough rope to hang themselves, we would take the rope right out of their hands and fit it to our own neck.

There will be much discussion as to whether President Truman, by moving drastically to preserve the integrity of our chain of command, the inviolability of our principle of civil control over the military, and the chance for success of our foreign policy, acted, from the standpoint of politics, unwisely. We say there was nothing else he could do, and we think the public will come to admire a President, who, with his country's safety at stake, had the courage to rise above politics. It is fair to assume, meanwhile, that the decision was shared by Secretary of Defense George Marshall, Chief of Staff Omar Bradley, and the three service chiefs, Admiral Sherman and Generals Collins and Vandenberg, and that it was applauded by our allies.

As we said in the beginning, it is a tragedy that MacArthur's brilliant and immensely useful career had to come to this end. But it is not President Truman who has tarnished the bright shield; MacArthur did it himself by his own rash refusal to play a team game in America's greatest crisis.

Public Reaction to MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include additional samples of the hundreds of messages which I have received since the President relieved General MacArthur of his command. They are from citizens of Chicago, Ill.:

Why have the people's representatives in Government in Washington allowed corruption, scandal, communism, sex perversion, gangsterism, swindling, and all the evils that go with our present Government to remain in spite of public exposure. Why don't you act to remove the stench? The time has come for you and your colleagues to look deeply into your souls. America first before party loyalty. America first before you trade your political favors. America first before internal graft and corruption. America first before England and Europe. I urgently petition the immediate removal of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall from office. I petition MacArthur be reinstated and given a full public hearing in the United States Senate and House.

MacArthur dismissal tragic almost unbelievable. Looks like Russian victory from inside Washington. Please protest out loud. Need your help.

Dismissal MacArthur stunning blow to myself, family, and friends. Stop. How long can this fine country of ours tolerate deceit, half-truths, insincerity, inefficiency, and political corruption promulgated by present administration? Stop. Impeachment proceedings should be seriously considered.

We think that Presidential dismissal of General MacArthur is tragic and deplorable. A great loss to our country. We cannot go on forever killing and wounding American boys in Korea for what. We have faith in MacArthur's wisdom. Washington's whole Asiatic foreign policy needs revealing investigation. We are looking to you for action. You have our support.

What difference does it make whether or not we have a united Korea. Ireland is not united, so what? Ask the President to fire the boys in Korea and bring them back with MacArthur.

Say, the people I have contacted are bitterly shocked over the President's actions towards General MacArthur is putting it mildly. As long as Mr. Truman saw fit to take this action against one of the greatest generals ever known, why not pull our boys out along with him?

Urge impeachment of Truman and congressional investigation of Acheson. Please notice Communist approval of Truman's base action.

Truman-Acheson policy of appeasement must be stopped. Impeachments imperative.

Urge immediate dismissal and investigation of Dean Acheson and impeachment of President Truman. Urge appearance of General MacArthur before joint session. America's future now depends on the action taken by you and your colleagues. We urge you to act vigorously and promptly.

Just heard President Truman's speech. Think it very poorly said. Please impeach him.

Deplore MacArthur's dismissal. Demand Truman's impeachment. No appeasement of Communists.

After hearing our beloved Harry speak tonight our club is unanimous opinion impeach him (141 members).

Because the United States is not a British Colony you will have the complete support of this family of four in any impeachment proceedings against the President.

Firing of MacArthur a terrible tragedy and a national disgrace. Situation should be investigated to find out why American interests are subordinated to those of England and other United Nations. MacArthur is superior to all in the administration, in everything but title. Administration's Far East policy proved wrong in every phase during the past 5 years. Why not get MacArthur to state his views to Congress (20 signatures).

Urge immediate impeachment President Truman and cronies. America must be represented by people whose real interest is in their own country and not influenced by foreign nations. Reinstate MacArthur (18 signatures).

You are undoubtedly conscious of the widespread concern of our fellow Americans in this critical hour in Washington. We trust to you to support all necessary measures and make use of the guiding knowledge that General MacArthur has for us Americans in this critical hour. We are all worried and feel you are not going to fail us.

I want to register my protest of the firing of General MacArthur. Of all the people in the United Nations and our Executive and State Department, he is the only one who has a policy and objective. President Truman and Secretary Acheson should be impeached. They have played into the hands of the Russians.

Truman finally showed his hand. Let us know ours and impeach an untrue man.

As a common voter I am not in favor of Truman's firing MacArthur. To me it is the act of an inferior leader. There was time enough for a good leader to have prevented the incident. There is a very fine line being drawn between military and political policy.

Stunned over Truman's arbitrary dismissal of General MacArthur. This is not a matter of party politics but of national existence. Congressional inquiry is mandatory.

MacArthur a casualty of political factors behind our effort in the Korean war. The President declared war in Korea without authority of Congress and then dismissed our most brilliant military leader. President's action is a victory for communism even if he is too stupid to see it. Down with communistic thinking here and abroad. Down with inefficient thinking in high Government offices. Impeachment action desirable to stop wasteful spending of American lives and money and to stop goofy Government.

Harry had his inning. See that Mac gets to bat.

When an ex-National Guard captain fires a 5-star general impeachment of the National Guard captain is in order.

Truman has again proven his inability to think clearly or act wisely. Unless he is removed from office promptly we are facing a tragic future.

Please register protest to blundering Truman policies in foreign affairs and especially to the MacArthur removal.

MacArthur dismissal is the most disgraceful act in American history.

As our representative in Congress your duty lies in demanding impeachment Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson. The fumbling incompetence of their administration must be removed while we still have a country and a way of life to protect.

So the best general in the world gets fired by the worst President in the world. Nice knowing that we have so many Representatives in Washington that really believe in protecting the American way of life.

The deplorable lack of firm and moral leadership is a national disgrace. Congress must take over that leadership immediately, and if necessary start impeachment proceedings.

Shocking isn't it. A great American like General MacArthur treated so terribly by the little men in high places in Washington.

The men who have fought and died in the Pacific have died in vain. Throw off the British yoke. Restore MacArthur. Oust the State Department crowd. Do it now.

It is my honest belief that the people of the United States are being sold out and American blood is being spilled and will continue to be spilled to satisfy and justify the whims and stubbornness of a man who has repeatedly exhibited his ignorance and incompetence in the highest office in the land.

The action strikes me as being the most drastic of a long series of circumstances leading to eventual complete capitulation to communism by the administration.

You must realize that the latest outrageous act of the President and his cohorts is more than the American people can stomach.

Impeach that stupid President and let's get back to a free country. Also while you are at it run the United Nations back to Switzerland and let's have a free America again.

In view of the many disclosures of decadence within the administration and the petty politicking in the removal of General MacArthur, I respectfully request that you move for the immediate impeachment of President Harry S. Truman and the dismissal from office of Secretary of State Acheson and others of his ilk.

Because General MacArthur dared to be an American he is summarily discharged. We have finally sold out to England and the other Europeans who do not like General MacArthur.

Address of His Holiness Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, one of the deepest elements of religious conviction since the beginning of time has been the aspiration of man to exist in a world without war. For many centuries this has been a great hope—in our own country it has become a great necessity. The development of the atomic bomb makes it certain that another world war may mean the end of our planet.

In this connection, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently made by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in the course of an audience with delegates of the Fourth Congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government, on April 6. Among those present at this audience were two Americans, Paul Shipman Andrews, dean of the School of Law of Syracuse University, and the Reverend Donald Harrington, of New York City, who represented a United States organization which participated in the Congress, the United World Federalists.

As one who has been a consistent supporter of House Concurrent Resolution 64, to strengthen the United Nations, which has been cosponsored by Representative HAYS of Arkansas and Representative JUDD of Minnesota, and who has always regarded the development and strengthening of the United Nations to the point where it can prevent aggression and maintain peace, as an act which accords with my deepest religious convictions, I am proud and happy to learn that the Pope has expressed his support for those who are striving to achieve a federal world government.

The address follows:

We are very appreciative of the deference you have shown us by this visit to the Vatican, and we have pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our warm interest in the cause of peace in the midst of humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proofs of this interest. It is, moreover, inherent in our mission. The maintenance or reestablishment of peace has always been and always will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have been far from equal to our efforts and our acts, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and by her exhortations, by her incessant activities, and by ceaseless prayers.

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least where one respects and appreciates at their true value independence and the mission which the church holds from God, in spheres where one does not seek to make her the docile servant of political egoists, and where she is not treated as an enemy.

The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is always with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. Also, she knows, and this is her duty, how to discern the true and the false friends of peace.

She desires it, and therefore she applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine, natural and supernatural order, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement, my friends, has the task of creating an effective political order. There is nothing more in keeping with the traditional doctrines of the church, or better adapted to her teaching, as to legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present world crisis An organization of this nature must, therefore, be set up, even if only to end the competitive rearming of nations, through which, for decades past, peoples have exhausted their efforts and drained their resources. You, my friends, are of the opinion that, in order to be effective, this world political order should be of a Federal nature. If you understand by this that this order should not be bound to the wheels of some mechanical system, you are again in harmony with the principles of political and social life so firmly laid down and sustained by the church. Indeed, no world organization could exist if it did not harmonize with human relations as a whole and with the normal organic order regulating relations between men and between diverse peoples. Failing this, whatever might be its structure, it would be impossible for this organization to stand up and endure.

For this reason we are convinced that your first care should be to establish solidly and restore these fundamental principles in every national and constitutional, economic and social, cultural and moral sphere.

At the present time in the national and constitutional sphere, the life of nations is everywhere dislocated by the blind worship of the value of majorities. It is the citizen who is the elector. But, as such he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the displacement of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. Although an elector, he does not count as such, but there is no question as to the place and part he takes in his family and profession.

In the economic and social sphere there is no natural organic unity amongst producers, since quantitative utilitarianism, which is the sole consideration in the matter of cost price, is the only norm determining the places of production and distribution of labor; since it is the question of class which divides men artificially in society, and the standard is no longer that of cooperation within the professional community.

In the cultural and moral domain, individual liberty, freed from all ties, all rules, all objective and social values, is only in reality a devastating anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Until one has strengthened the universal political organization and placed it on the indispensable basis, there is a risk of it infecting itself with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarianism. We should like to invite those who are thinking of this remedy, for example, to a world parliament, particularly from a federalist point of view, to reflect on this. Otherwise, they would be hand in glove with the forces of destruction, from which our political and social order has already suffered too much; they would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce man to the state of an inert instrument.

If, therefore, within the meaning of federalism, the future world political organization cannot, under any pretext, allow itself to be caught up into the movement of the unitarian machine, it will not possess effective authority except insofar as it safeguards and favors everywhere the clean life of a healthy human community, of a society all the members of which vie with each other for the good of all humanity.

What a large amount of moral firmness, intelligent foresight and supple adaptation this world authority will have to possess, these being more than ever necessary in critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will need to be supported by authority. After all our past and present trials, should we dare to say that the resources and methods of the governments and politicians of the day are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without agreeing to leave the beaten track from time to time, without appealing to the experience of history and to a sane social philosophy, and also to a certain intuitiveness of creative imagination.

There, my friends, is a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face; you have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We would express to you our wishes for your entire success and with all our heart we will pray to God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task.

If You Want To Practice Real Economy, Then Junk the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Jackson (Miss.) News, of February 9, 1951, recommends the immediate junking of the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The editorial follows:

THIS PROJECT NEEDS JUNKING

President Truman's renewed pleas for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, this time on the basis of defense necessity, should be shelved quickly and decisively by Congress. Even to debate this extravagant, impractical, repeatedly discredited venture would be sheer waste.

In his $71,600,000,000 budget message the President again trotted out this moldy old joker—it's been hanging around since 1895—along with a lot of other costly nonessentials. A few days later, in a letter to the chairman of the St. Lawrence deep sea waterway labor conference in Detroit, Mr. Truman said that "in the present emergency" the project has become urgent.

Furthermore, he added that, because our steel industry must be built up, the seaway was needed to bring in iron ore, not only from Labrador but from Venezuela by a route well protected from enemy submarines. Just how Venezuelan ore would be protected on the long ocean haul to the mouth of the St. Lawrence wasn't made clear.

But what, precisely, is the seaway's urgency from a defense viewpoint? This high-priced water connecting Great Lakes ports with the Atlantic Ocean is ice-bound about 5 months of the year, rendering it useless for long periods.

To transport ocean tonnage to lake ports would require the building of some 50 dams. One enemy bomb that shattered a single lock could tie up the whole system.

A few years ago the expense of this vast spending project was figured at $642,000,000, of which Canada would pay $204,000,000. In 1948, when the seaway was debated in Congress without action, the cost was estimated variously at $750,000,000 to $1,500,000,000. Today's cost would be vastly greater.

And that isn't all. By diverting ocean freight, including iron ore, to the Great Lakes, the seaway would cause untold losses to eastern United States seaports, including Philadelphia. Projected steel plants along the Delaware will require a great deal of that Venezuelan ore the President talked about.

Revival of the St. Lawrence seaway hoax now, when this Nation is faced with defense necessities involving multibillion outlays, is thoroughly inexcusable. Congress should pay no attention to the seaway bills already introduced, and get on with real security needs.

Who Is Cheering the Dismissal of MacArthur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, a matter of days—4 to be exact—has intervened to give the Nation and the world an opportunity to evaluate the effect of President Truman's startling announcement that General MacArthur had been relieved of his command over American and United Nations forces engaged in bloody war with the Communist aggressors in Korea. There has been no abatement in the fiery protests of outraged citizens across the land despite the address of the President to the Nation which sought to justify the action. These protests have continued, and grown in volume, notwithstanding the fact that few argue the President's authority to act as he did. That is not the issue. The wisdom of his policy is challenged, not his authority.

The protests have come, not from organized groups directed by leaders self-appointed or otherwise. Rather they have come from individual citizens, from "the man on the street," the housewife, the mothers and wives of servicemen, from Americans without regard to creed or politics.

Perhaps, then, it would be significant to note the source of some of the reaction on the other side of the question. Who, if anyone, is applauding the action of the President?

It is now a matter of documented record that first favorable action came from foreign shores. Not on the American battle lines in Korea, to be sure, but from the seats of government in England and France, and most unfortunate of all, from the Lake Success headquarters of the United Nations. Unbiased news reports are the source of word of cheers for the dismissal of MacArthur in London, for instance. There the Socialist

Government of Britain hastened to announce the removal of MacArthur might pave the way for the admission of Red China to Japanese peace treaty discussions, the sacrifice of vital Formosa to our present enemy, the same Red China, and ultimately a seat in the United Nations for that nation. To go further to observe that such a policy would preserve Hong Kong and Chinese trade for the British would not be to depart far from the obvious.

France, even though to a lesser degree, has been reluctant to move too vigorously in the Far East with the hope of preserving in part a crumbling empire in Indochina. To this list, Italy can be added, and for similar reasons.

And the United Nations, embryo hope of ultimate world peace, found less and less interest in the efforts of a brilliant American commander who insisted on winning a war he did not seek and a war he was ordered to prosecute.

But most appalling of all is the cheering from quite another source. It comes from the heart of enemy power. It comes from the Kremlin itself. The Daily Worker, New York newspaper, acknowledged as the mouthpiece of the Moscow line and Joe Stalin himself, brazenly applauded the ousting of MacArthur. "Way paved for peace," the Daily Worker shouted. Peace on Moscow terms, of course, a second Munich so to speak. For the Daily Worker confidently predicted the terms cautiously voiced in London.

The American effort seeks peace, of course, as President Truman repeatedly asserted in his address Wednesday night. But the American people who have already suffered 60,000 casualties in the so-far-undeclared war in Korea do not regard any degree of appeasement with communism as peace. They do not regard the granting of rewards for aggression as any guaranty against future aggression.

Obviously, then, there must be an immediate reexamination of the entire problem of American foreign policy and American military policy. There must be a searching study of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in which convicted traitor Alger Hiss once played such an important formulating role. For President Truman, in ousting General MacArthur, clearly has made his choice on the side of the Secretary of State, for he has shown he will not turn his back on the man who said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss.

To the now vital review of American aims in the Far East, and, indeed, throughout the world, the views of one man can offer more substantial guidance than any other single person. That man, of course, is General MacArthur. It should not be necessary to force the Truman-Acheson-State Department clique to cooperate in making his views available. It should not be necessary to force reluctant administration leaders to invite MacArthur to appear before a joint session of the Congress at the earliest possible moment to give his countrymen the benefit of his views and experience. Those views should be sought voluntarily, immediately, and in justice to 200,000 American troops left behind to carry on a struggle bogged down not in the mud of Korea but in the bureaucracy of Washington.

It is only natural that much of the present demand for action should come from those who regard General MacArthur as one of the greatest military leaders of all time. Even those who ousted him concede the general's stature in the field of his life-long service. But the more important point has best been stressed by a distinguished colleague qualified to speak by background, experience, and intimate knowledge of the far-eastern problem. Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, after the news of the President's action, had this to say:

My concern is not for General MacArthur. He is a giant whom the pygmies cannot tolerate because he has been so consistently right about Asia and they so consistently wrong. His place in history is secure. It will vindicate him and condemn his opponents who threw away in five short years the magnificent victory in the Pacific which he and 4,000,000 Americans won at such great cost—108,000 of them with their lives.

My concern is for the peace and security of the United States.

Few people seem to realize the completely unique position of prestige and confidence which General MacArthur commanded in Asia, and especially in Japan. His removal is likely to open the way for the Communists to chip away and destroy the faith of the Japanese people in us and in the United Nations. If that happens, then a settlement in Korea will not end the war, it will just move from Korea to Japan. If we abandon Formosa in a futile effort to buy the Reds off, we do not end the struggle; we simply shift it from Formosa to the Philippines. And if we let the Philippines and Japan go, "in order to avoid war with Communist China," do we solve the problem? No. We just move the conflict to Alaska and Hawaii. And if we sell them out "in order to get peace," we do not avoid world war III; we just make certain much of it will be fought in the northwestern States of our own country. You have to stop this glacier somewhere. We did not stop it at the 50-yard line at the end of the last war. Instead we moved back to our 40-yard line and invited the Russians to take Eastern Europe, Manchuria, North Korea, and the strategically placed islands north of Japan. Now we are down to about our 30-yard line due to the idiotic attempt to make the Chinese Communists our friends by walking out on our Chinese allies. Now it is proposed, in line with British ideas, to move back to the 20-yard line—the move MacArthur opposed so strenuously. Just where are we to stop retreating? At our 10-yard line when only Europe remains? Or the 5-yard line when only the Western Hemisphere remains? Or the 1-yard line when only the interior of the United States remains?

I do not want to have to fight at the last ditch for the sheer survival of the United States; that is, the real issue: not the fate of MacArthur, but of ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the facts, as we know them to exist now, it is impossible for the Nation to feel any measure of security in the words of President Truman as he sought to justify his willful and precipitate action. None will doubt his sincerity as he said the war in Korea is "a struggle for peace," but a careful study of his address gives rise to the conviction that though he hopes truly to avoid a general war in Asia, he has no real plan for the attainment of that goal.

The President quoted from intelligence documents revealing the Communists regard the United States as the only obstacle in the road for the "liberation"—Communist term for conquest—of all the countries in Southeast Asia. One of the documents asserted the Communists must "unify the people of Asia and crush the United States."

Commenting on this, the Washington Star, not an antiadministration newspaper, observed editorially:

Does Mr. Truman believe that these reports accurately reflect the Communist aims in Asia? Presumably so, for otherwise he would not have put them before the American people. But if he does believe them, if he believes that the real objective of the Communists is the conquest of Asia and the destruction of the United States, then he believes what General MacArthur believes, and what the general has been saying ever since the fighting began.

In the light of these Communist objectives, what justification is there for the hope that our enemies will agree to any settlement in Korea that will bring peace and an end to aggression in Asia? Is it not more reasonable to believe that General MacArthur is right—that the Communists have launched their bid for world domination of Asia, that they will not enter into any decent settlement in which we can have the slightest confidence, and that we have no rational choice except to take up the challenge and meet force with superior force? No doubt it was done unwittingly, but Mr. Truman has made himself a persuasive witness in support of the MacArthur thesis.

Mr. Truman's plan, if he can be said to have a plan, was summed up in this paragraph: "If the Communist authorities realize that they cannot defeat us in Korea, if they realize it would be foolhardy to widen the conflict beyond Korea, then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression. A peaceful settlement may then be possible."

"If" this and "may" that. A something-may-turn-up strategy in which the wish is father to the thought. What kind of a basis is that for the conduct of a bloody, bitter war which has cost the United States nearly 60,000 casualties and which will cost us thousands more? Is it right to send men out to fight and die in a war which depends for its objective on nothing more than a flimsy hope that somehow the Communists, who have betrayed every promise that they have ever made, will be induced to sit down and make a trustworthy settlement forsaking all of their self-proclaimed ambitions?

Hope may spring eternally, but it does not win wars. The more one weighs the President's remarks, the stronger becomes the conviction that we are simply deluding ourselves if we believe that the war in Korea can be won and peace restored to Asia by anything less than the maximum effort of which we are capable.

Mr. Speaker, out of indignation of Americans generally must come a new determination to examine the facts, to weigh the issues, and to formulate a policy which has for its goal the security of the United States. For only the security of the United States will preserve the hope of ultimate freedom for men and for nations. To that task General MacArthur may yet make his greatest contribution toward the preservation of his country. The hour is late, but not too late for a people united in purpose and strengthened in faith. General MacArthur has the capacity to crystallize that purpose and restore that faith.

The MacArthur Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Parkersburg Sentinel, Farkersburg, W. Va., April 11, 1951:

THE MACARTHUR AFFAIR

The angry storm of debate, criticism, and resentment which broke over the head of President Truman today as a result of his dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur will, it is safe to predict, overshadow any other single issue to date in his administration. The lines in Washington are going to be drawn largely along political boundaries, with Republicans hailing MacArthur as the savior of the West and Democrats expressing regret that he is such a devil. Neither description is true.

The confidence and trust which people in these United States repose in Gen. Douglas MacArthur—despite past criticisms—cannot be gainsaid. The course which he advocated in fighting communism in the Far East, in general, and Korea in particular, is the course which, we believe, the bulk of the American people would wish the administration to follow—and damn the Russian torpedoes.

MacArthur's great experience in the East, and his confidence in the policy he advocated carry tremendous weight in this country. Putting it briefly, General MacArthur wanted more troops and arms for an all-out war against communism, including hitting China proper and including the use of Japanese and Chinese Nationalist forces.

We agree—but the administration does not, and the President is General MacArthur's Commander in Chief, as he is ours. We believe that public pressure eventually would have forced a change in administration policy, but we must also remember that policy is formulated largely on the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, who know our military capacities at this hour. It also should be remembered that the joint chiefs include men fully as able as Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

It is true, also, that there are sometimes many considerations—of which the public is not and cannot be aware—taken into account by the administration in formulating foreign diplomatic and military policy.

In spite of all this, the emotions of the people generally are going to figure largely in the debate over General MacArthur's dismissal. Yet there are certain incontrovertible facts, which lead us to believe that MacArthur's ego convinced him that he was so big a man the administration would not dare to dismiss him no matter how flagrantly he disregarded instructions. Even President Roosevelt, noted for his handling of men and for his inflexible insistence on discipline, complained about MacArthur's pronounced tendency to set his own judgment above all other considerations.

It is a fact which cannot be disputed that on December 6, 1950, the Joint Chiefs of Staff instructed all military and civilian bigwigs "to refrain from direct communication on military or foreign policy with newspapers, magazines, or other publicity media in the United States." This was clearly designed to prevent long-distance debates between military commanders and Washington, and between high Government officials and the administration. It also clearly implied that differences of opinion should be ironed out within the administration.

On top of that, MacArthur was informed on March 20 that the President planned to announce that the United Nations was under pressure for a negotiated peace in Korea, and that diplomatic discussions would be sought. In the face of these advices, only 5 days later—March 25—General MacArthur sought to grab the ball and run by offering to arrange a political settlement by meeting with the Chinese Communist commander in Korea. He was rebuked for that, and instructed that the December 6 order must be obeyed. Yet, thereafter a letter dated March 20, written to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, Massachusetts, again challenged administration policy and called for all-out war against communism in the Far East.

The manner in which General MacArthur was dismissed rankles even with those who believe that an insubordinate general—no matter how high his position nor how much public favor he holds—should be deposed. It would have been a much more satisfactory solution, we are certain, if General MacArthur had been recalled to Washington—in itself a form of discipline—and given his choice of obeying orders or being dismissed. At least such a method would have satisfied those who have so much confidence in the general.

The conclusion is inescapable, we believe, that while the dismissal of General MacArthur was undeniably justified on the basis of his own considered acts, the manner in which it was brought about was far less than desirable. It is saddening to see the brilliant military career of a great man marred by such an affair, however necessary.

H. R. 1870, for the Protection of the Bald Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1951, I introduced H. R. 1870 for the protection of the bald eagle which is legislation of great merit and which should be passed at once. In fact it was passed by the House in the last session of the Congress but did not receive Senate action due to lack of time. I hope it will be passed by both Houses and approved by the President at an early date.

I have just received a letter from Inez E. Moore, of Valdez, Alaska, urging the passage of this legislation and enclosing a poem entitled "The Bald Eagle," which is of interest in consideration of this important problem. I include the letter and the poem as part of these remarks:

VALDEZ, ALASKA, *April 9, 1951.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I see by the Alaska Sportsman where you tried to get a law passed to protect the American Eagle and now that Alaska has raised the bounty to $2.50 on Bald Eagles in Alaska I do hope you will try again to make it a crime to kill them.

I have tried to put into rhyme my feelings in the matter since I mailed a copy to Liberty magazine. I hope they will publish it and perhaps get some of the lawmakers awake to the fact before the bird is entirely exterminated. A copy of the poem is enclosed.

Thank you,

MRS. INEZ E. MOORE.

THE BALD EAGLE

I'm the emblem of Freedom with a price on my head.
No right have I now, my proud wings to spread.
My food I obtain with beak and with claw,
While predacious man is protected by law.

His meat he will get with dogs, traps or guns.
He'll gaff the poor fish when spawning time comes.
He kill off the caribou just for its hide
While a baby fawn starves, cause its mother he spied.

When you look at a dollar—with my wings outspread—
Remember, its two fifty he placed on my head.
Our Congress, almost, a bill did it pass
That would have protected my rights, but alas.

They squabbled and argued on this and on that
So the bill—it was shelved—and let me down FLAT.
When you look at your dollar—do this for me—
Look in their lockers and name what you see—

Moose, Caribou, Deer, and Fish out of season,
Ducks, Geese, and Swan—all without reason.
Then pass a law—"A bounty to pay."
For predacious man, who takes game that way.

Glenn H. Curtiss Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, for many years, I have sponsored a resolution in the House of Representatives providing for the creation of a Curtiss Memorial Commission for the purpose of erection of a suitable monument commemorating the contribution of Glenn Hammond Curtiss in the discovery and development of the art of aviation and commemorating the first sustained kilometer flight and the first seaplane flight in all history.

Recently a communication has been sent me by Miss Joan Lofgren, secretary of the Glenn Curtiss Chapter of the Historical Association of New York State located at Hammondsport, N. Y., in which the pupils of the Hammondsport Central School express their reasons for urging the creation of such a memorial. I am pleased to extend in the RECORD this communication:

HAMMONDSPORT CENTRAL SCHOOL,
Hammondsport, N. Y., April 3, 1951.

Hon. STERLING COLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are students of the Hammondsport Central School, Hammondsport, N. Y. This year we organized a branch of the Historical Association of New York State.

Hammondsport has a very interesting historical background. We were surprised to discover that no one had started a memorial here for Glenn Curtiss, one of the greatest pioneers in aviation. Glenn Curtiss was born and lived most of his short life here in Hammondsport. Our club's greatest ambition is to have a memorial in honor of Glenn Curtiss.

We visualize in our dreams a small attractive building in his memory. There are tentative plans for building a new school where he had the original hangars for his "infant" planes. We feel that back of our new school would be an ideal place for such a memorial. In this building which would be open to the public, we would put relics, pictures, and information connected with Glenn Curtiss and his achievements.

As young citizens we do not feel ashamed to ask the National Government for help in financing a memorial for so great a man. We feel he did much for our country. He founded the first flying school to which people from all over the world came. Glenn Curtiss had many inventors as friends such as Alexander Graham Bell, Henry Ford, and Harold McCormick. On March 2, 1908, Curtiss made his first little airplane. He flew the one-stop flight along the Hudson from Albany to New York. It was the first flight in the Empire State. In 1909 Curtiss won the James Gordon Bennett trophy in France.

He opened the Curtiss Exhibition Circus and people like Lincoln Beachy, Fred Havens, and Eugene Ely became well known with their daring stunts. When the First World War broke out Curtiss was kept busy making planes for the Government. When Curtiss died many famous men came for his burial. After all of these national achievements we feel that not only his community, but also his country, should have the privilege to honor him.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN CURTISS CHAPTER,
JOAN LOFGREN, *Secretary.*

What Honorable Men Are Doing in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, This week the former Governor of Georgia, M. E. Thompson, resigned his job as a consultant with the Office of Price Stabilization because he refused to accept a salary and expense account without working. He was asked to take the position of Codirector for Territories for the OPS at a pay rate of $53.48 per day. This is approximately $15,000 per year. He was listed as a consultant, but nobody bothered to consult him. He had not a single assignment in 12 weeks. So he quit.

In case you think that the Governor did not try very hard to get work, do not. He tried. On February 19, 1951, he told the President what was happening. The President called in his assistant, Mr. Donald Dawson, and ordered him to straighten out the whole mess pronto. It never was done. In resigning Mr. Thompson said:

Under the circumstances I refuse to accept salary and expense money from the taxpayers when I am rendering no public service. I am returning to my home. I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers.

He added one additional thought:

There are thousands upon thousands of others rendering no service, but still on the public payroll, not only in Washington but throughout the United States.

Sweat on, Mr. Taxpayer, sweat on.

National Service Life Insurance Benefits Continued for Future Veterans—Amendment Sponsored in House Adopted—Veterans Gratuitous Indemnity Act Perfected or Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the conferees on H. R. 1 reached agreement on the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 and today this measure has been adopted by both bodies. The work of the conferees in this connection was most creditable and insures that this meritorious proposal shall be made available for men in the service, those later called into the service, and to our future veterans.

It was the source of much gratification to me personally and to many other Members that the conferees saw fit to include in the conference bill the provision to permit future veterans to continue national service life insurance after service in the same manner that veterans heretofore have been permitted to maintain such insurance.

Section 8 of the conference report provides as follows:

Within 120 days after discharge (during which time the veteran is covered by the gratuitous indemnity) he may apply for, without medical examination, a term policy up to $10,000. The premium is to be based upon the 1941 commissioner's standard ordinary table of mortality with interest at 2¼ percent per annum. In the future all NSLI policies will be issued on this table which means greatly reduced premiums but no dividends will be payable, and the only plan on which the insurance will be issued will be on the 5-year level premium term plan.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House did not include these provisions in the bill which it passed. There were many members, like myself, who felt that the inclusion of such was most desirable—but the amendment which I was pleased to offer to that effect was turned down by the House. However, it was the source of much gratification that the amendment which I introduced and proposed has been adopted by the conferees and both Houses and is now near final enactment into law. The other features of the bill are excellent and desirable, and I consider that this important legislation has been perfected—certainly greatly improved.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from debate on H. R. 1 when it was before the House. The excerpts, as presented here, are from the RECORD of January 24, 1951.

The excerpts are as follows:

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman should point out that while there is nothing in this legislation which would impair the right of contract with veterans of World War I and World War II, if part II of the bill is adopted there will be no further issuance of national service life insurance to future veterans.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Except those who are disabled, in accordance with the provision that I have mentioned.

* * * * *

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering here today is substantially the same measure as was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress and passed by unanimous consent on the floor of the House at that time. It has been again favorably reported as was well pointed out. I think in view of the Korean situation it is very important that this constitute a part of the initial legislation of this new Congress. I have supported this measure both in committee and on the floor of the House. It has already been pointed out as to what the bill provides. It provides $10,000 indemnity coverage for all men called into the service. The bill is made retroactive to June 27, 1950, and covers the National Guard men who were killed in the train crash in Ohio last summer, and also the Tennessee guardsmen who were killed in an airplane crash while returning from maneuvers in South Carolina. There are other excellent features of the bill, including the monthly installment payment of $92.90 per month over a period of 10 years. The bill also restricts payments to member of the serviceman's family. The measure exempts the indemnity from claims of creditors and from taxation. All of these features of the bill are meritorious and beneficial and commend it for passage.

However, as has been pointed out, a new policy is injected into the bill with respect to part II of the bill. The position of the American Legion has not been made known heretofore with respect to this legislation. It has been said several times that two or three of the major veterans' organizations favor it, but we have here the testimony of representatives of the American Legion with respect to the measure. In brief, I might quote them as follows:

In testimony before the committee on this bill, T. O. Krable, chairman of the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion said:

"We cannot be a party to any abridgment of the benefits and provisions that have been made by the Government to both veterans of World War I and World War II. The American Legion strongly urges that provision be made that veterans be permitted to continue their national service life insurance after separation."

Certainly the right of the veteran to obtain national service life insurance should be preserved and the right to existing benefits continued, all considerations of service being taken into account. The American Legion adopted a resolution at Indianapolis on November 19, last, reading, in part, as follows:

"The American Legion reaffirms its stand that national service life insurance and

United States Government insurance contracts and trust funds established heretofore should be preserved, and that an opportunity to obtain national service life insurance should be continued for members of the Armed Forces and veterans."

I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk which would permit a man, after being discharged, to apply for national service life insurance if he cares to do so. The argument has been made that such a provision would continue the Government in the insurance business. Let me say that the Government is going to continue in the insurance business for a long time to come, regardless of the action we take here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. May I just finish this statement first, and then I will be glad to yield.

The information I have been able to obtain is that only one out of seven ex-servicemen have continued their national service life insurance after discharge. That is, as of now, only 10 percent of the veterans of World War I have continued their national service life insurance, and only 25 percent of the veterans of World War II have continued their insurance. So the number is not great, but those who wish to contract for Government life insurance should be permitted to do so after discharge. My amendment would permit this.

Here are some of the reasons why it should be done: Because it is a right that was given to veterans of World War I and extended to veterans of World War II. But to veterans of the Korean War we would deny them the right to have national service life insurance. Those men who are fighting today will probably be 2, 5, or 10 years older after the war, by which time the commercial insurance rates for them will have been enhanced. We do not know how long the emergency will continue. Commercial rates to some of our veterans might have become prohibitive by the end of the emergency and during the time they are in service. Disabilities might have been incurred which, although not recognized by the Veterans' Administration, might be recognized by commercial insurance companies, and a veteran thereby might be denied the right to take out insurance after discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. EVINS. I am wholeheartedly and strongly in favor of the automatic coverage feature of this bill and am, of course, supporting the legislation, but I feel my amendment would improve and perfect the legislation by permitting the continuance of national service life insurance after discharge. Let us not say in effect to our future veteran that "After you are released from the service we will forget all about your service;" but rather let us say that a grateful Nation appreciates the service and sacrifice of our men of arms. Let us say that America will not forget. Let us perfect this legislation and let us pass it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has mentioned certain coverage. Would it cover a case of this kind? A plane from the Philippines to Okinawa went into the mountains on December 19. The plane went down and some Army personnel were killed. Would this bill cover a case of that kind?

Mr. EVINS. If the accident occurred after June 27, 1950, and if it were incident to call or maneuvers it would cover such an accident.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentlewoman. I hope that the amendment which will be offered later may have the favorable consideration of the House.

The argument was made, as was pointed out, that this bill will take the Veterans' Administration out of the insurance business. May I say that it is going to be necessary for the Government to continue in the insurance business for the next 50 years because of existing contracts.

It has been further insisted that the bill will effect a savings in manpower. To the extent that the measure does so, I applaud the action taken. However, the manpower requirements of the bill will take effect largely after the war is over and history and experience of veterans' insurance show that only about one out of seven ex-service men continue their insurance and the manpower argument is not persuasive. As I say, I hope the amendment will be agreed to. If it is not adopted here, I feel sure I can predict that it will be adopted in the other body.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. In World Wars I and II men had no coverage unless they paid for it. Is not that correct?

Mr. EVINS. That is quite true.

Mr. MORTON. So the enlisted man gets the benefit of this indemnity even though he is not permitted under the terms of the bill before us to get in on the national service life insurance program.

Mr. EVINS. Not on the national life insurance program for that is, in effect, discontinued, but he is given war service insurance coverage. After serving a period of four, five, or more years, and after discharge the veteran may find the commercial insurance rates so high as to be prohibitive.

Mr. MORTON. We can deal with that when that question comes up.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has pointed to the crux of this bill, the question of insurance coverage after a man has been honorably discharged and released from the service. Our future veterans should be entitled to apply for national service life insurance on the same basis as veterans of World Wars I and II.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee whether he has submitted this amendment to the committee and whether it was considered there? And, if so, what was the result?

Mr. EVINS. This amendment was not considered by the committee. The bill was reported out the first day that the committee met when the committee was organized, and the amendment was not considered. But I will say to the gentleman that it has had very careful consideration in its draftsmanship.

Mr. RANKIN. Why does not the gentleman from Tennessee tell the House that he did not bring this amendment before the committee, and that he seconded the motion to report the bill out as it is?

Mr. EVINS. I not only seconded the motion to report the bill, but I have consistently supported this measure. I think the bill is a good bill, but that we could improve upon it by adoption of the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. RANKIN. Another point I would like to make for the benefit of the Members is that in previous wars the serviceman did not have the benefit of this automatic insurance.

Mr. EVINS. I may say to the gentleman that representatives of the American Legion not only made Legion position clear in testimony before the subcommittee but also sent to me a statement of its position on this issue and this statement was passed around by me to members of the committee but was not acted upon.

What action we take here today may well determine the economic security of untold thousands of families of veterans in the future.

* * * * *

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. EVINS: Strike out all of part II and substitute the following:

" 'PART II—ISSUANCE OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

" 'SEC. 10. Section 602 (c) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

" ' "(4) Any person who has had active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to the termination of the present emergency, as proclaimed by the President, shall be granted national service life insurance upon application therefor in writing after discharge or release from such active service and upon payment of premiums and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing such person to be in good health at the time of such application: *Provided*, That in any case in which such application is made within 5 years after discharge or release from active service the Administrator shall not deny for the purposes of this paragraph that the applicant is in good health because of any disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, and waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) shall not be denied in any case under this paragraph on the ground that total service-connected disability commenced prior to the effective date of such insurance: *And provided further*, That in any case in which insurance is granted by reason of the preceding proviso the premium paid on such insurance shall be credited directly to the national service life insurance appropriations, and any payments of benefits on such insurance shall be made directly from such appropriations."

" 'SEC. 11. This part may be cited as the "Insurance Act of 1951." ' "

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. May I say that I have had the assistance of the Legislative Drafting Service, of the general counsel's office of the Veterans' Administration, and of the officials of the various veterans' organizations with respect to the language in this amendment. So it has been carefully prepared. It provides simply in substance that an honorably discharged veteran after the present hostilities may make application for and where qualified and on the same basis be granted national service life insurance as veterans of World War I and World War II. All this amendment does is give to future veterans the opportunity to acquire national service life insurance. We know that there will not be the great administrative cost of the insurance program during any future war under terms of this bill. The amendment which I propose would permit those who desire to contract for Government insurance after discharge the right to do so. We have already pointed out that the percentage of veterans who acquired insurance after discharge has, in the past, been limited in number, but those veterans who do desire to obtain veterans' insurance should be permitted to do so. My amendment provides for equity among veterans. It is a continuation of benefits that have already been provided. It is not a retraction, it is not a retrenchment and cutting

back. My amendment would preserve benefits for future veterans which are presently existing in law.

I hope the amendment may be favorably considered by the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course this amendment would merely kill the bill.

Mr. EVINS. I disagree with the gentleman.

* * * * *

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman spoke of additional benefits. All we are going to do is to preserve and save the present benefits; not to cut back.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Let me answer that by saying this: That when we give increased and improved benefits to veterans of each succeeding war of this country, does the gentleman feel that there is an obligation, in addition to those improved benefits, to add thereto any benefits that any veteran has ever had in the history of the United States? I think that is about what the position of the gentleman amounts to.

* * * * *

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, the indemnity provisions of H. R. 1 are certainly sound and desirable, but there should be added to this bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, which amendment would give to the veterans now in service the same opportunities to acquire national service life insurance that were given to those of us who served in World War II.

Truman Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the important factor in the Truman-MacArthur controversy centers around the determination of our American foreign policy. No military commander, no matter how brilliant he may be, shall have the right under the Constitution to assume the authority of determining our foreign policy.

General MacArthur, in assuming such authority, has created great danger to this country. Those who, like the Republican leaders, have encouraged him in his course for political reasons, should be made to understand that they are playing with fire and are subverting the safety of the country to their own sordid political end. Our ship of state cannot be guided by two men at the same time without endangering the ship.

The President had no choice but to recall General MacArthur, and in due course, the sober sense of the American people will prevail. The present intense emotional clamor will die down. The more intense the feeling the more quickly it is expended.

The President stated the aims of our Government effectively and with due solemnity when he appeared on television and radio this past Wednesday evening. Our policy is to thwart aggression in Korea and wherever else it raises its ugly head, in association with the members of the United Nations. We must act in concert with these nations. We dare not isolate ourselves. We will not go beyond Korea unless Communist China and Communist Russia force us to do so. By bombing Chinese bases and following the MacArthur suggestions we would be in a world war up to our necks. The American people do not want this, and the President has gaged properly the fundamental American viewpoint. If the Communists want world war, so be it. We have no choice. But the awful responsibility will be on them.

Under the Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief. General MacArthur disobeyed not only instructions given by the Commander in Chief, but he also disobeyed instructions of his other superior, Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General MacArthur's course was also opposed by Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Sherman argued that we could not afford to get involved in a war with Communist China and that if we followed General MacArthur's insistence upon bombing Chinese bases, we would do so. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg of the Air Forces, and Gen. Joe Collins, Army Chief of Staff, concurred in this view.

The War Department—

Remarked General Eisenhower before the Congress in 1947—

understands its place in this Government and does not try to usurp anybody else's place. We are an executive agency. We recognize where the policy-making responsibility lies, and no matter what is done, we will be in there pitching to carry out exactly what we are told to do.

General MacArthur has failed to carry out the orders of the policy-making branch of the Government. General MacArthur is a strict disciplinarian. He would not tolerate any disobedience from any officer under him.

This is not the first time in our history that the civilian authority was compelled to crack down on the military when the latter sought to bypass its authority. President Lincoln did exactly what President Truman did when he relieved Gen. George B. McClellan of his command. McClellan was a brilliant soldier and the darling of his day with a large part of the public. McClellan's intransigeance and his bypassing of the White House in bidding for public support, caused the end of his military career. President Wilson was compelled to discourage in forceful manner the disobedience of Gen. Leonard Wood.

If General MacArthur differed with the over-all policy of the Government and wished emphatically to protest, his course was plain. He should have resigned his command and his commission, and as an ordinary citizen he could have vigorously fought his cause. But he chose to do this in uniform. That he could not do in our governmental structure.

I approve of the President's course, and I do this despite the past attainments and rare ability of General MacArthur.

Christian Churches Uphold MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include the resolution passed by the National Association of Evangelicals in its convention in Chicago, Ill., on April 11, 1951, expressing admiration of General MacArthur's Christian character and personal integrity and calling for an immediate investigation of all circumstances attendant upon his recall:

Resolution passed by the special assembly of the National Association of Evangelicals called to consider the crisis facing the Nation:

"Inasmuch as Gen. Douglas MacArthur has opened the door and encouraged and welcomed Christian missionaries to Japan and the Far East; and

"Inasmuch as his Christian testimony has always been courageously given and his opposition to communism widely known; and

"Inasmuch as his position has made him one of the greatest foes to communism and friend of democracy or the American way of life; now

"In the light of his being relieved of his commands, we the National Association of Evangelicals desire to go on record expressing our confidence in the General and therefore be it:

"*Resolved*, That we send to General MacArthur this expression of our confidence and admiration of his Christian character and personal integrity, our appreciation of his devotion to the principles of Christian liberty, especially religious freedom during his term of duty as general in charge of the Army in the Far East, as general in charge of the occupation forces in Japan, and as general in charge of the United Nations forces in Korea, and assuring him of our prayers; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we now call upon all Christians within these shores and abroad to get upon their knees in prayer to the end that this Nation might be preserved in liberty and God be truly honored."

Resolution presented by special committee and unanimously passed by the general assembly of the National Association of Evangelicals, Chicago, Ill.:

"Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur has demonstrated irreproachable personal integrity in contrast with the lack of integrity and widespread corruption and graft in high places, and whereas General MacArthur has demonstrated his understanding and insight of communism by firm and unrelenting opposition to its extension, while others in high places have displayed their lack of understanding by their record of appeasement and failure to oppose Communist aggression, and whereas General MacArthur has proved in a decade his wise and able leadership both in war and reconstructive peace in a time when the American international policy has been vacillating, impotent, and culpable; and

"Whereas the national confusion and uncertainty growing out of General MacArthur's removal from command in the Orient, coupled with the lack of a stable and well-developed foreign policy, has resulted in immeasurable bewilderment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the National Association of Evangelicals, representing 33 denomi-

nations and a service constituency of more than 10,000,000 Evangelical Protestants, declare in view of these basic facts, that we confidently leave with God and with the judgment of history the complete vindication of this great man; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That we call the American people to a national day of humiliation and prayer for divine guidance in this critical hour of national affairs, and that we call upon every pastor to set apart a portion of the morning service on Sunday, April 15, for special intercession for Government and Nation; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That, without implying our competence to judge the technicalities of this case, we appreciate the example of Christian citizenship and moral and spiritual alertness provided by General MacArthur in a period of national duress, and further, that we deplore the alarmist tactics of many of our present national leaders, which might easily plunge us into a third world war, and caution against the employment of the sense of urgency for purposes of political expedience."

A second and stronger resolution arising from popular demand unanimously passed by the general assembly, following the adoption of the above resolution:

"Moved, seconded, and unanimously carried that we call upon the Congress of the United States to undertake an immediate investigation of all the circumstances attendant upon the recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his commands and take appropriate action."

Truman Versus MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a telegram outlining my position on the Truman-MacArthur controversy, which my hometown newspaper, the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, had asked me to submit:

HAROLD HARRIS,
Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

While General MacArthur's departure as Far Eastern Commander has momentarily aroused a national controversy I feel history will eventually vindicate President Truman for the step he has taken. It is worth remembering it was done after deliberation and consultation with top governmental and military leaders. At stake here is not the fate of an individual, no matter how great or important, but the fate and future of the American people and of all western civilization. By continually thwarting the policies of the United States and the United Nations, MacArthur breached discipline to an extent which threatened to embroil the whole world in a new and most destructive conflagration, namely, a third world war which we are desperately trying to avoid. At the same time, the President was faced with the surrender of his policy-making functions as established by the Constitution. Civil authority had to be reestablished for the continuation of our democratic process, otherwise we would have drifted into military dictatorship. Let us not forget the example in Rome when the greatest and most powerful republic in ancient times came under the domination of popular military heroes who seized control and ended the republic forever. It is to the credit of the founders of our Republic who, in drafting the Constitution, were cognizant of Roman history and wisely entrusted supreme power to the civilian government over the military in our country. Hence the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces and the military authorities are subordinate to him. General Eisenhower made a very striking observation, saying "When you put on a uniform there are certain inhibitions you accept." In a democracy such as ours unruly generals are as such outmoded as indispensable men.

Congressman LOUIS B. HELLER.

Removal of General MacArthur a Severe Loss in the Fight To Prevent the Spread of Communism in Japan and the Entire Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's issue of the News, Washington, D. C., by Oland D. Russell, Scripps-Howard staff writer, points out forcibly and logically the disastrous effect that may result from the withdrawal of General MacArthur in the fight to prevent the spread of communism in Japan and other countries of Asia. I include it as part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted by the House.

It reads as follows:

MACARTHUR WAS WORTH 10 DIVISIONS
(By Oland D. Russell)

Observers here familiar with the Far East are seriously disturbed by one aspect of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal that so far has got scant attention.

It is the fact that, in the eyes of 80,000,000 Japanese and many other orientals not yet behind the iron curtain, he will be irreplaceable as the symbol and outstanding proponent of resistance to Red aggression.

The able Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway in time may meet the expectations of his supporters as an over-all commander, administration, and occupation chief. But he can scarcely hope to reach the eminence of General MacArthur or his incomparable influence and hold on popular imagination of the Japanese and other free orientals.

To General MacArthur communism has long been the biggest threat to the postwar world, and he has been convinced that there is no mission more important than meeting this challenge—in Asia. This has been the underlying precept of his occupation policies as he sought to turn Japan into a democratic nation which of its own accord would resist communism.

A psychological trait of the Japanese themselves is responsible for his unique, almost miraculous sway over the people dating from the very moment of his arrival in Japan in 1945. Feudalism is still a recent thing in Japan and exerts a strong influence on the people. In feudal times the Japanese were mostly divided into clans. In their centuries of clan wars, when one feudal chief lost to another, the defeated clan unquestioningly transferred its allegiance to the victorious lord. It became an ingrained tradition.

Projected into modern times, it explains, in the opinion of Americans familiar with Japan why the Japanese docilely submitted to the American invasion even when Japan still had a huge army under arms. Japan had lost the war and their modern clan ruler, the Emperor, acknowledge it, thereby simply transferring rule to the victor, General MacArthur, and that, in turn, explains why the supreme commander has carried out the occupation for 6½ years without a single revolt or violent incident.

The pattern of peaceful occupation has now been well set and it may not be disrupted. But neither General Ridgway nor any other possible replacement for General MacArthur will ever command the veneration and adulation that has come from the Japanese.

That is why the Japanese masses were stunned and frightened by his dismissal; why Japanese newspapers came out that first day with extras carrying editorials in black.

What the Japanese fear now is that the change may mean that the United States in removing General MacArthur has decided to abandon Asia completely to communism. As long as General MacArthur was there they—the Filipinos, the free Chinese on Formosa, the guerrilla forces on the China mainland, and the people of Southeast Asia—were certain that he stood as the symbol of our determination to keep them out of Communist clutches.

As one observer put it, General MacArthur in himself was worth 10 divisions to the peace of mind of those in the path of spreading communism.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following telegram received by my office today:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 13, 1951.*
Representative JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please wire collect your position on Truman-MacArthur controversy to be used for publication.

HAROLD N. HARRIS,
Brooklyn Eagle.

In reply I sent the following telegram:

APRIL 13, 1951.

HAROLD N. HARRIS,
Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

In response your wire please be advised that as far as I am concerned President Truman, as Commander in Chief, has the constitutional right and power to dismiss or remove from office General MacArthur or any military commander for insubordination or any other reason. In a democracy it is absolutely essential that military men be controlled by authority of their civilian superiors. Should the day arrive when such authority is flaunted or ignored it would be the beginning of the abrogation of our freedom and democratic way of life and ultimate destruction of the ideals and principles we have nurtured and cherished. I feel that we must not yield in the slightest to the Chinese Communists. I also feel that Congress should insist upon General MacArthur's

immediate testimony before the proper committee on the past and present military and political situation in the Far East.

Please use in toto rather than quote parts of this wire.

Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial and three articles by prominent columnists concerning the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I ask that these articles be made a part of our RECORD:

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

NOW IT COMES OUT

One important point to digest in respect of the removal of General MacArthur is that it will make no difference in the operations in Korea. For all practical purposes Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the new supreme commander, has been making the decisions since his appointment to head the Eighth Army last December. To him belongs the credit, as put by one officer quoted by Christopher Rand in the New York Herald Tribune writing from the battlefield, for getting the Army "turned around in the right direction" after the retreat last fall. It was he who infused new spirit and master-minded the solidly based advances which have been taking place.

What has been suspected, but never before mentioned in so many words, is the growing antipathy that existed between MacArthur and Ridgway. A good soldier, General Ridgway never complained. But, according to Mr. Rand, correspondents observed many indications of jealousy on the part of General MacArthur, including a seeming effort to play down Ridgway's successes, brief dramatic appearances of MacArthur at the front apparently designed to attract publicity, and a double censorship in Tokyo which reportedly was more political than military. General Ridgway, in Mr. Rand's words, "is a well-disciplined man who has kept his peace under slights from General MacArthur's headquarters that have caused widespread talk (in Korea). There is no question that he will be strictly amenable to Washington and will refrain from influencing policy by independent statements."

There is every reason to believe that relationships now will be vastly different. General Ridgway and the new Eighth Army commander, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, are technicians, as well as men of moderation and understanding. Moreover, there will be mutual confidence and similarity of purpose between the Pentagon and the field command. Divided command, in short, is at an end, and we now ought to get some teamwork.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

STORM OVER MACARTHUR

(By Marquis Childs)

TRUMAN'S CRITICS

Where and when the storm now sweeping over Washington will end no one can predict. Not in a long time has there been anything like it. The telegraph boys are carrying bushel baskets of wires to practically every office in the Senate and House and almost without exception they oppose President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from his command.

The talk of impeachment was inevitable. Partly it is political in origin. But in the thousands of wires pouring into the Capital it reflects a long pent-up fury and frustration.

Those who use the word glibly do not realize that impeachment is a solemn constitutional procedure rarely evoked. Only the House of Representatives can vote on the impeachment of a President.

When an impeachment has been voted against a President, the trial is held before the Senate, with the Chief Justice presiding. Conviction is on a vote of two-thirds of those present. The language of the Constitution provides impeachment for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." The Supreme Court has never interpreted that language.

When President Truman first came into the White House, he talked about the trials of one of his predecessors. That was Andrew Johnson, who succeeded to the office on the assassination of Lincoln and thereby inherited the tribulations that come in the wake of a great war. Johnson is the only President in our history to be impeached. By a margin of one vote the Senate failed to vote that impeachment.

It seems most unlikely that anything so drastic will occur in this instance. Yet in the inflamed state of opinion, with all the confusions and conflicts, doubts and uncertainties that beset the American people, one must add that anything can happen.

In the present violent reaction there is plainly a current of unreason. Truman is the symbol on which long-stored-up wrath is being poured out. And that wrath probably traces back in part to the tensions under which we have been living in recent months.

Some who are so passionately for MacArthur seem to be for him in the belief that if he were only given his own way, he would find a magical means to end the war and bring peace to the Pacific. This does not, of course, conform to the facts. The MacArthur policy would certainly have expanded the Pacific war.

Whether it would have meant the start of a third world war is another matter. The British were convinced that Soviet Russia would honor its treaty of mutual assistance with Communist China and come in if American planes attacked the Chinese mainland. MacArthur believed that this danger was negligible.

Whether the storm goes to the point of action against Truman, and the Democratic Party still has at least nominal majorities in both Houses of Congress, its violence will not soon subside. Quite apart from popular feeling, powerful engines of publicity are behind MacArthur. They will work night and day. MacArthur's return to America for the first time in nearly 15 years, his appearance before Congress, the drama in his every word and gesture, all this will keep it going.

Behind MacArthur is the whole of the so-called China lobby. It has large resources of money, including the support of a half dozen Chinese in this country, most of the members of the Soong family, who are reported to have vast sums in banks in Switzerland, the Argentine, Holland and the United States.

It is certainly too early to say what the political consequences of the President's action will be. He is a stubborn man. The very force of the reaction might persuade him to reverse a decision not to run for office again if, as many believe, he has made such a decision.

One thing does seem fairly clear. Even though they may not be able to get at the President himself, his critics and attackers in Congress can take revenge on his policies. And it is here, in my opinion, that there is the possibility for tragedy transcending any man's personal fortunes.

This violent quarrel can mean a further paralysis of Government at a time when it is vital to rearm and through rearming to unify the coalition of western nations. If we can't have our way in the Far East, the extremists may say in effect to the President, then you will not get your way in Europe. Obstructionism under our system of divided powers can do a lot, when there is no really responsible control in Congress, as between Republicans and Democrats.

Already the evidence of it has been ample in this Congress. If it now goes on to impede vital measures, we shall have paid a terrible price for our divisions.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

MAC ARTHUR EVENTS DISCLOSED

It was not until about 11:15 Tuesday night that President Truman actually decided to issue his 1 a. m. statement firing General MacArthur.

The decision to make this momentous step had already been taken, but the timing was set for Friday, not Tuesday midnight. And the reason for the sudden nocturnal press announcement was a telephone call from Secretary of the Army Pace in Tokyo tipping off Truman that MacArthur planned to jump the gun and get out his own statement first.

The President was still smarting from an incident around March 24 when MacArthur had jumped the gun on him, so naturally he was leery. He had sent MacArthur a policy statement for his perusal and personal reaction—a policy which the White House planned to announce as a peace feeler to China. But MacArthur, without notifying Washington, issued the statement himself.

So when Secretary Pace called from Tokyo Tuesday night intimating that MacArthur might rush into print again, the President called Secretary of State Acheson and Deputy Under Secretary Dean Rusk to the White House where they prepared the MacArthur press release.

Prior to that, late on Monday afternoon the Joint Chiefs of Staff held a highly secret session at which there was unanimous sentiment that MacArthur must go.

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a most mild-mannered man, was hottest under the collar against MacArthur. He complained to colleagues that MacArthur's constant sounding off about war with China was undercutting our whole defense plan in Europe and making General Eisenhower's work three times as difficult.

Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, and reported by some as favoring MacArthur's strategy against China, actually threw his weight behind Bradley. Though MacArthur's tactics included a naval operation against China, Admiral Sherman argued that we can't afford to get involved in war with China, and that if you go into China just a little bit—as in bombing bases—you have to be ready to go in all the way.

Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg of the Air Forces and Gen. Joe Collins, Army Chief of Staff, concurred.

Only military man who dragged his feet on MacArthur's ouster was Secretary of Defense Marshall, who has known MacArthur a long time, is 70 years old against MacArthur's 71, and who was in France as a World War I captain when MacArthur was a brigadier general.

One highly significant exchange of information made between the Pentagon and Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway in Tokyo was a cable from Ridgway stating that no mat-

ter what happened, his troops could hold out for 60 days. Regardless of what was thrown at him, Ridgway informed the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he could hold for 2 months.

This cable was in reply to White House fears that following MacArthur's removal, there might be a Chinese attack and a series of American defeats for which Truman, having removed the supreme commander, would get the blame.

HUMBLE HARRY

President Truman's usual peppery remarks have not been in evidence during the MacArthur controversy—not even to his personal advisers. The nearest he came to pepper was at last week's Cabinet meeting, just after former Speaker JOE MARTIN released the MacArthur letter.

"It's time to show the MacArthur's, the Time-Life people and the Scripps-Howard newspapers who is running American foreign policy," he observed tartly.

Day after MacArthur was relieved, however, Truman received a call from former Congressman Maury Maverick of Texas, who congratulated him.

"What you have done will make sure that my grandchildren will be free and that civilian Government will continue in the United States," Maverick said.

The President was neither cocky nor apologetic. He looked a little sad, as if he had made a terrifically hard decision and knew that a terrible storm was going to break over his head.

"Thank you, Maury," he replied. And he wept just a little. "I do my best. I have to follow the Constitution."

Truman went on to tell how hard he had tried to cooperate with MacArthur, how he had flown across the Pacific to meet him on Wake Island.

"You will never know how hard I tried," he said.

General MacArthur's grand strategy for China has never been spelled out in detail to the public but it has been argued back and forth repeatedly with Army Chief of Staff Gen. Joe Collins and Adm. Forest Sherman during their trips to Tokyo. Here is what it boils down to:

1. A mighty United States air strike against Chinese bases in Manchuria where Chinese reserves do their regrouping; also against the Mukden arsenal which sends arms to Korea.

2. A United States air and sea bombardment of the China coast. This would include United States battleship bombardments of China's big coastal cities, such as Shanghai and Tientsin.

3. Chiang Kai-shek's troops to be armed by the United States and landed on the Chinese mainland in a major invasion.

4. Simultaneously an all-out United Nations attack in Korea, with additional troops sent from the United States.

[From the Washington Post of April 13, 1951]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

TRUMAN AND MAC ARTHUR

Either President Truman or General MacArthur had to be fired—and a general cannot fire his Commander in Chief. It is really as simple as that. The fact that MacArthur not only violently opposed the administration's policy, but continued to say so in an endless stream of pronouncements, made a show-down sooner or later inevitable, as MacArthur himself probably recognized. The only real surprise is that Truman decided to dismiss MacArthur immediately, rather than taking the easier way of waiting for the signing of the Japanese peace treaty.

The reasons he did so are inherent in his character and outlook. For one thing, Truman is extraordinarily sensitive where his powers as President are concerned, perhaps in part because he knows that he became President by sheer happenchance.

For another thing, there is Truman's absolutely rigid code, deriving in part from his days as a machine politician, which demands a relationship of unquestioning political loyalty, given and returned, between "the boss" and his subordinates.

With Truman cast in the role of boss and MacArthur in the role of subordinate, this relationship was bound sooner or later to break down. The breaking point came with MacArthur's statement of March 25, which challenged Truman's Presidential authority, and with the Martin letter, which in Truman's eyes was the equivalent of trading with the Republican enemy.

From beginning to end, then, the decision was Truman's, and Truman's alone. In the battle of the titans which is now in prospect, this should be borne in mind. Already MacArthur's dismissal is being described as a triumph for Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and for the views which Acheson is supposed to represent. This is inaccurate on both counts. Acheson was, of course, consulted, but he played no decisive part. He was not even present at the White House meeting on Tuesday afternoon, attended among others, by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Omar Bradley and Presidential Adviser Averell Harriman, when the President finally decided to act.

Moreover, it is odd but true that after the Chinese intervention in Korea, Acheson was the strongest proponent of precisely the course MacArthur now advocates, including bombing the Chinese mainland and using Nationalist troops. He was only dissuaded when it became clear that this course would wreck the Anglo-American alliance, the keystone of American foreign policy.

In fact, the strongest pressure for dismissing MacArthur came, not from the State Department, but from the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense Marshall, Under Secretary Robert Lovett, and all four Joint Chiefs, whose directives MacArthur had consistently disregarded, unanimously favored the move. But the final decision was Truman's and it is Truman who must now play David to MacArthur's Goliath in the great struggle, with its enormous implications for American domestic politics and world strategy, which will now certainly ensue.

This is written on the day of MacArthur's dismissal, and the future is even less clear than usual. But it does seem certain that the MacArthur issue will divide the Congress on fairly strict party lines. As of this writing, the Democratic strategy is to go along with the Wherry resolution inviting MacArthur to address a joint session, but to arrange a joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees beforehand, at which MacArthur can be asked some very pertinent questions. Meanwhile, Truman is expected to take the offensive to explain his constitutional and other reasons for dismissing MacArthur.

As for the Republicans, the Taft-Wherry wing of the party clearly sees MacArthur as the ideal rallying point for an all-out attack on Truman and through Truman, on American foreign policy. The results are likely to depend very largely on what actually happens in Korea. For if the American forces suffer a shattering reversal in the expected Communist offensive (as is all too possible, for reasons which will be discussed in a forthcoming report) MacArthur will seem to be triumphantly vindicated. The demand for the bombing of the Manchurian bases will then become almost irresistible, and Truman, who has resisted this demand, will appear as the architect of disaster. It may be that MacArthur himself has been fully aware of this possibility.

Bombing the Chinese mainland might be the prelude to a third world war. But whatever happens, one thing is clear. The basic issue which has now been posed is whether or not the main American effort, in peace or war, should be diverted from Europe to Asia. MacArthur himself has repeatedly posed this issue, most recently in his astonishing reported statement that Formosa is more important to the defense of the United States than France. This familiar problem is the real issue, behind all the drama and uproar, and it is as crucial an issue as this country faces. If the United States is not to be left without an ally in th world other than Chiang Kai-shek, it can be decided in the end, as it has been decided before, in only one way.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD, a petition signed by a number of residents of the Takoma Park area of Maryland, a part of the Sixth Congressional District:

Whereas this Nation is confronted with ever-increasing domestic perils and world crises which threaten our continued existence as a free and independent people; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have been dominated and controlled in their foreign policies by other countries all to the detriment of the best interests of our country and to the jeopardy of its safety; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman and Secretary Acheson at the behest of the United Nations have involved this country in a costly and destructive Asiatic war without the approval of Congress or the consent of the American people; and

Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose high prestige throughout the entire Orient is universally recognized, has been engaged in an epochal work of reconstruction in Japan and has by brilliant leadership achieved remarkable military successes in Korea; and

Whereas in his capacity of Commander in Chief of the Allied Forces, he has very properly, as a matter of military strategy and patriotic duty, called attention to the necessary steps that must be taken to win the war and prevent our forces from being overwhelmed and eventually defeated and destroyed by the increasing hordes of Red China armed and supported by communistic Russia; and

Whereas the President of the United States has summarily dismissed Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his command—an act which will go down in history as a base appeasement of North Korea, Red China, and Soviet Russia and a craven surrender of the security and best interests of South Korea, Japan, Nationalist China, and these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned, That the Congress of the United States be called upon thoroughly to investigate the above-described conditions and particularly the dismissal of General MacArthur and to demand the resignation and impeachment of any and all persons responsible for the incompetent, unpatriotic and war-breeding foreign policy of the Truman-Acheson administration; and

Resolved, That the original copy of these resolutions be sent to Congressman J. GLENN

BEALL, of the Sixth District, and authentic copies to United States Senators HERBERT R. O'CONOR and JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of the State of Maryland.

William E. Van Zile, Leonard R. Ansell, George E. Nelson, L. V. Lampson, Takoma Park, Md.; S. C. Mitzel, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph F. Sidell, J. Douglas Bradshaw, J. W. Rhodes, F. A. Dierkope, Takoma Park, Md.; M. A. Main, Silver Spring, Md.; Thomas I. Connor, Carl D. Ford, Takoma Park, Md.; O. W. Menefee, Washington, D. C.; Robert E. Lohr, Silver Spring, Md.; O. W. Youngblood, G. W. Holland, Jack Kroehmal, Victor Kroehmal, Le Roy M. Rubottom, Anthony Anselson, Takoma Park, Md.; Antonio Errigo, Washington, D. C.; Russell Carter, Jr., Ervin E. Roenfelt, Errigo Frank, Takoma Park, Md.; Isaac N. Cramer, Lanham, Md.; Frank E. Lucas, Fred J. Taylor, Takoma Park, Md.; Idris Morris, Washington, D. C.; Karl Xander, Charles H. Klinck, C. P. Crezee, Takoma Park, Md.; Wendell Mongain, Bethesda, Md.; P. J. Michael, Newton M. Brooke, Jr., Takoma Park, Md.; Simon O. Smith and W. Arline Sanl, Rockville, Md.; Roy C. Potts, H. T. Morse, M. D., R. C. Miller, Takoma Park, Md.; William A. Benjamin, Ednor, Md.; M. C. Taft, W. E. Phillips, Takoma Park, Md.

The Real Story of Sampson Will Be Shocker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE REAL STORY OF SAMPSON WILL BE SHOCKER

(By Alexander F. Jones)

The real story of the Sampson Air Base rehabilitation, and of the waste and irregularities involved, has not been told as yet.

But it will be told as soon as the congressional subcommittee digests the findings resulting from its brief trip to Sampson. The committee, composed of Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican of Pennsylvania, and L. GARY CLEMENTE, Democrat of New York, knew what it wanted before it arrived and, therefore, spent a minimum of time examining plumbers and other workmen on the amount of their overtime.

What the committee really wanted to know was how the contract for the work was let in the first place and this inquiry was very much on the q. t.

Here is what they found out:

The bids for this job were opened on December 24, last, and the low bid of $2,677,000 won the contract for the Five Boro-Malan Co., of New York City.

The low bid was $700,000 under the next lowest and $4,000,000 under the bid of one well-known construction firm which had sent a crew of estimators to Sampson before making its bid. Executives of this firm stated that the work of rehabilitating Sampson could not possibly be done for $2,677,000.

The Five Boro-Malan Co. started work at Sampson on January 3.

On that very day the company received a letter from the district Army engineer stating the initial phase of the work would have to be completed in 30 instead of 90 days and to accomplish this the job was being placed on a cost-plus basis. The sky was the limit, the original contract did not mean anything, and the gate was wide open on costs.

And on the day before, January 2, the Five Boro-Malan Co. was incorporated under the State of New York laws at Albany, with an issue of 250 shares of stock, no par value.

It is small wonder that the congressional committee is very, very interested.

Here is a New York City company, which did not exist as a corporate entity in this State when it bid on the contract—and was granted it—being given a spare no expense carte blanche on the day it started work. The contract on which it got the job on a ridiculously low estimate did not mean a thing.

The Congressmen were particularly interested in the matter of what happened at Sampson between January 3 and February 23.

For on February 23 two other construction companies were added to the Sampson project and a new contract, including Five Boro-Malan, was let for $18,000,000.

A neat little jump from $2,677,000.

It was from January 3 to February 23, when the Five Boro-Malan Co. was operating exclusively, that the incidents of extreme overtime, dumping of usable lumber and other materials, occurred.

A very pretty picture.

For the Army engineers to contend that their sole interest in the Sampson project is and has been, to complete a rush job is so much eye-wash.

The Army Engineering Corps knows every construction firm of importance in this country. It knows all about awarding contracts. That is why it sends bright boys to the Harvard School of Business Administration.

We hope the committee, and its counsel, go to the very bottom of this matter. It is only one example of many in this country where the armed services have wasted uncounted millions of dollars by neglect, unbelievable stupidity, and worse—and we mean worse.

The United States Navy got out of Sampson so fast after World War II that bread dough was not even taken out of ovens. The water was not even shut off and pipes froze and burst. No provision was made for watchmen and millions of dollars in property was lost in vandalism.

We hope we live long enough to see a new kind of parade on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington.

In the reviewing stand in Lafayette Park across from the White House would be the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the high command, and all officers connected with disbursement in the armed services, and the entire Government, and all Members of Congress.

The marching divisions, keeping step from gutter to gutter, would be the taxpayers.

There would be division after division of men and women who pay up to $100 annually in Federal taxes.

It would take about 20 minutes for them to pass the stand with their banners: "It took all of us to pay for your neglect at Sampson."

Then would come the divisions in a higher bracket bearing the banner: "It took all of us to pay for your bad RFC loans."

And so on—hour after hour—division after division—until the "big brass" in the reviewing stands collapsed.

Such a parade is long overdue.

The vast sums that Washington throws around have lost all significance in terms of money.

But translate them into terms of people and the Government would learn—or relearn—that it takes the sacrifices of thousands, yes, of millions—to pay the cost of a single blind, stupid mistake—like the neglect at Sampson.

Manpower Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree this is the time to place a limit on the size of the Military Establishment we are building for national defense. I am not aware that there is a ceiling on the number of men being kept under arms by our enemies, or any limit on the number of threats they can direct at us. Nor am I aware that there is a ceiling on the number of Americans who might be killed by any enemy attack on the United States; though there is good reason to fear that a ceiling on the size of our Defense Establishment would invite such an attack.

A ceiling on the manpower we would muster for our defense is not so much a ceiling on strength as it is a reduction to weakness. It is like telling a basketball player he must make no more than 10 goals in any game, or a halfback that he must never run more than 20 yards.

When I spoke last Wednesday, I deplored the complacency of Americans in assuming that because there is no danger today, though there was danger yesterday, there will be no danger tomorrow. The patriotism of Americans in meeting an immediate emergency has always been great; but our unwillingness to face realistically an undefined future is equally characteristic. If we impose a ceiling on the Military Establishment we are reluctantly about to raise we expose ourselves even further to the charge of complacency. A limited defense against unlimited aggression can scarcely prove more profitable than no defense at all. If we place a ceiling on our Military Establishment, are we not telling our enemies to exceed that ceiling, and their victory over us is assured.

In searching for an explanation as to why intelligent men, sincere men, and good Americans all should yield to the lure of such complacency, I begin to wonder if communism has not already won a victory. Limited aggression in Korea—therefore limited mobilization here. But meanwhile, behind the heavy blackness of the iron curtain, and deep in the remoteness of Eurasia, communism mobilizes its own unlimited manpower.

How trusting we are, but how gullible. How peace loving we are, and how misguided. How honest we are, and how foolish. Has Russia told us how many men she has under arms, or what ceiling she means to place on her own mobilization? Has Russia made a bargain that if we raise an army of only three and a half million men, she will raise an army of only 4,000,000. And has she promised that with only this half million advantage over us, she will not attack us? It is possible that we could be defeated, even if her advantage were less.

Russia makes no promises that she intends to keep, and does not keep those she has made. Why should we therefore,

make promises to her? We promise to raise a military force of only three and a half million men. Why not more consistently promise not to fight if attacked, or to surrender promptly at the first act of aggression? Ceiling on manpower, indeed. Since when has our democracy consented to enjoy only limited freedom, or limited democracy?

Mr. Speaker, there was a time, in another, but not less critical, period in our history when Americans were not so faint-hearted. The response one American made to the threat of aggression was to assert, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." And with those millions to support it, our democracy endured.

Today the faint-hearted among us would paraphrase that cry: "Three and a half million for defense—and tell us what you exact in tribute."

Surely, surely, we are not so faint-hearted, or as yet so defeated, that we are ready to make such a bargain.

The amendment to place a ceiling on military manpower in this critical period should be defeated.

Ours Not To Reason Why?—MacArthur or Gag Rule Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the MacArthur dismissal, one of the most historic decisions of our times, represents the most flagrant effort on the part of the national administration to curb freedom of expression in the past generation. General MacArthur has been far more than a military officer. He has been our administrator in full charge of Japan. To an extent unrealized in our own country, he has been running the Japanese Government, its economy, its social institutions, and its educational structure. By dismissing MacArthur, Truman has not only silenced a general, but has also checked the entire course of our far-eastern policy development.

These elements are sufficiently destructive in themselves, but the further implication of the gag is equally shocking. Mr. Truman and his advisers have apparently decided that the rule for Americans henceforth must be "Ours Not To Reason Why, Ours But To Do and Die." If we are not to be permitted to speak freely and to analyze the reasons for our decisions, the age of American freedom is past. American generals have historically asserted the right to think and to speak up. On the urgent immediate question, most Americans share the common belief that MacArthur knows more about the Far East than the President and his entire far-eastern department put together. If we are dismissing people, there may be good reason to think the wrong fellow was dismissed.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, today I received the following telegram:

Hon. DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please wire collect your position on Truman-MacArthur controversy to be used for publication.

HAROLD N. HARRIS,
The Brooklyn Eagle.

In response to the telegram from the Brooklyn Eagle, I sent the following reply:

Mr. HAROLD N. HARRIS,
The Brooklyn Eagle,
Brooklyn, N. Y.:

As a Member of the House of Representatives the Constitution does not provide me with any official right to question the President's actions in the MacArthur case. Article II section 2 of the Constitution names the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Under this article he has the right to name or remove with or without cause any of his military subordinates. It is not incumbent upon the President to furnish any explanation regarding the removal of any subordinate. Since this is a constitutional government with the Congress having definite constitutional limitations you may rest assured that there will not be any action on the part of Congress other than the utterance of words that will be ineffective. The President's decision is final.

Congressman DONALD L. O'TOOLE.

Autobiography of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this very excellent sermon by the pastor of my church in Bronxville, N. Y., the Reverend Dr. Lowell Russell Ditzen:

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF FREEDOM

(By the Reverend Lowell R. Ditzen, D. D., Bronxville, N. Y.)

Text: "The truth shall make you free"—(John 8:32).

Today, in the turbulent forum of world opinion, freedom is on trial.

Communism blatantly labels it "a vestigial remain of bourgeois ideology," and cries for its destruction.

Totalitarianism, in a hundred guises, adroitly points out its weaknesses and urges that its banners be forsaken.

Materialism puts out its choicest wares and affirms that all of man's hungers can be filled by its products.

Against all these, the apostles of freedom sometimes find their listeners few, their advocates all too often silent.

It is little wonder that many, once possessed by the dream of freedom, now waver before the loud evangelists for "order" or "security."

For how can an idea argue with substance? With what weapons can David overcome Goliath when the strength of David is of the spirit and the strength of Goliath is of the forge? How can the delicate steel of eternity and righteousness win an immediate round against the bludgeons of noise and prejudice?

If the present defense and future course of freedom depended alone on outward trends that seem to dominate our modern life, the way of freedom would seem clouded indeed.

But there is yet another hall of judgment, another court of opinion, where the voice of freedom cannot be stilled. That court and throne of power is in the soul of every man.

There: where deep calls unto deep; where truth will have its say even though error appears to govern; where the still small voice of right will be heard though the words of half-truth and ignorance reverberate in the ears; there, in the soul of man, freedom speaks.

And it says:

"I am called by the name of Freedom.

"My origin is in the unknown beginning before the worlds were brought into being. Ere the fires and mists of nothingness swirled and cleared to reveal stars and sun and the majesty of the firmament, I was. Before the beginning of time I lived in the heart of God.

"When that Eternal Spirit molded a figure from the dust and breathed into it the warmth of existence, the glory of hope and the balances of reason, I, Freedom, was imparted, too—a pure spark from the soul of perfection—into the life of man.

"As God watched His last and crowning creation walk into his new world, He mused:

" 'He must travel twixt darkness and the light, between heaven and hell, between good and evil. He will falter. He will fall. The dreamless dust from whence he came will seek to claim him again.

" 'Yet on the altars of his soul I have lit the fires of truth, of love, of faith, and of freedom. If he will but walk by these lights, he will triumph. The dust will loose its hold, and I shall claim him as my own.' "

"Of my beginning this is all I know. But knowing this, I know that I live, as strong as hunger, as compelling as love, as sure as death, at the inmost core of man's being.

"There are those who have not so understood. Some have sought to stifle me in their own soul and to destroy me in the lives of others. Club and spear, arrow and battering ram, the rack and the stake, musket and cannon, tank and bomb, have been vainly used to destroy me. They have tried but to no avail—for I yet remain. Like embers still glowing deep within the ashes of a forgotten fire, so I still live, even in the soul of those who profess to hate me and seek to destroy me.

"Many have been the sufferers, many have been the broken bodies that have borne the fury and the anguish of the world's ignorance on my behalf. Sad, mangled bodies there have been—from which some men have turned, saying, 'it's over now. This one no longer will give us his idle talk of freedom. Yes, this one is dead.'

"But it is not over, for I yet live.

"Socrates drank his hemlock. It is right to say that his breath ceased. His body was put away. His words were no longer to be heard by the ears of men. Yet the yearning to think without restraint and to speak openly, to be free in mind and soul and voice—that part of me that lived in him lives on. That, the hemlock could not claim.

"On Golgotha's dark brow the nails pierced deep. The spear added its final assurance that life was done. Even the noble lips

themselves had whispered, 'It is finished.' But it was not finished. The spirit of Jesus lives on to fan the delicate flames of liberty and of longing for freedom, into a consuming fire. A power it is, that spirit of Christ—a power to set men free—free from error, free from sin, free from death.

"Time would fail me to tell of all who suffered for freedom's sake, who were stoned, who were burned, who set out on pathless oceans, through unknown forests, seeking a place where they might live as freemen. Many were lost. But their longing for freedom was not lost.

"This I know, that as God's Spirit lives, and men remain men, I too shall live.

"You ask me what I am?

"I am longing and hope. I am dreams. I am faith. I am incorruption growing in the soil of corruption.

"When voices are raised saying, 'These poor shall not perish; this injustice must be righted,' it is my voice that speaks. When opportunities are enlarged, when privileges are increased, when shackles are broken, when burdens are lifted, there am I. And when the Cross is raised to comfort and redeem the children of men, again it is I who am the deed and the doer, the act and the actor.

"Some have cried 'Down with tyranny,' 'Give me liberty or give me death.' These are my words. Though they are spoken by men it is the ageless singing of my song that is sung.

"What am I?

"I am tears that weep over oppression. I am the curses that damn the injustice of the slums, I am the sadness that mourns untimely death. I am the struggle against dark selfishness which blights another's hopes. I am the patient minds that seek the paths of cooperation toward the best good for all mankind in the councils of statecraft. I am the heart of every righteous act. I am the voice that pleads of fairness, for justice, for tolerance and consideration of man for man. I am the painstaking observation that weighs the balances in the halls of justice. I am the hand that clothes a naked body, that heals a wound, that gives a cup of water to the thirsty. I am the sweat that comes in work to clean a filthy street. I am the plan and the sharing which enables children with bloated stomachs and spindly legs to sit at a farmer's table and romp in a green meadow. I am the precious memories of saints and scientists, the poets and philosophers in whom my light became a beacon.

"This is what I am. I am the spirit that creates a song, a church, a letter, an oration, a hospital, a book, a laboratory, a constitution, a college, in which there is a seeking to unshackle the mind, to soothe pain, to send God's children onto higher paths of peace and plenty.

"My enemies—who are they?

"The tyrant? Yes; the tyrant, whether he sits on a throne or at the head of a family table, he is my enemy.

"The greedy? Yes; wherever the wild horse of personal desire runs without control to injure or trample another, there is my enemy. More surely my enemy is that ignorance which permits the spirit of avarice to dominate the concern of man for his fellow men.

"The careless who sell their birthright as freemen for a mess of pottage, no matter to what label they succumb, whether it be 'peace,' or 'security,' or 'safety'—for these I weep. They are the foolish and deluded ones who learn their gold has purchased a false idol, when the price has been their liberty. They are enemies to the best within themselves—and so, enemies of mine.

"It is not alone tyrants or the lustful or the indifferent against whom I am opposed—but caution, which holds back from a venturesome act for freedom's sake; fear that stays the hand which should strike with courage; silence which dumbs the lips that should cry boldly in times of decision—these, too, are my enemies.

"Of them you should be aware. They lurk in the depths of each man's being, ready to blot out the light of independence and the flashes of truth that lift life from the jungle and spur man upward toward the life of God.

"But though such enemies be on the field—I will not be destroyed. They may claim a battle; but the final victory is yet to be decided.

"You would know of my future?

"How can I reply but to say that you will be the one to answer. My tomorrow will be determined by your today.

"If I may make a plea, it is that you, who are the sons of men and the sons of God, will not allow my betrayal within yourselves or in the world without. Should you deny me, you deny the best within your heart and mind. Your act is treacherous to God.

"I am freedom, the breath of eternity, seeking through you to bring true life into the world. It is you, the man and the woman of today, who, for good or for ill, will add to my chronicle that shall be read tomorrow.

"Will the future generations be shackled by the grim forces of ignorance and arrogance? Will they curse the Esaus of this day who would exchange their free birthright for a mess of pottage? Must they regird themselves to rewin inalienable rights and privileges at the cost of blood and death?

"Or standing on a higher plateau of peace and prosperity shall they face their future with hope and look back on their past with gladness?

"That future, be it for the good or the ill of freedom, is yours to determine now.

"Be adequate. Be strong. Be free!"

The Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make the statement that my vote of nay on Senate bill 1 was an expression of no confidence in the President of the United States to whom this measure extends further authority.

1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1951, in my debate in favor of this bill, on pages 3435–3436 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I said:

I do wish to now mention a couple of subjects and ideas that I mentioned in the Armed Services Committee, and I do it with a great deal of feeling that they are important to consider under this universal military training proposal. I think this House should be reminded of the fact that if and when this UMT program is set up it is set up for the youth of our Nation between 18½ and 19 years of age, the "tender" young men of our Nation, so-called, the youngest in our military call. On pages 36 and 37 of the committee hearings there is quoted there a discussion between myself and General Marshall. Then later in the report, a discussion between myself and Mrs. Rosenberg and General Hershey dealing with the matter of the morals and welfare of these young men in the UMT.

I wish to say, as one Member of Congress, I shall expect the commission, when it is set up, and if no commission is set up, I expect any bill passed by this Congress to contain adequate provisions to protect, as far as they can be, the morals and the welfare of the young men who go into this national training corps. I think it is high time that we in this Congress declare ourselves that we are not afraid to speak clearly and firmly on the proposition that the conditions and circumstances surrounding the training of boys and young men must be to the uttermost for their protection and their strength, rather than for their weakness and the destruction of their character and their morals. Such protection against commercialized vice of all kinds is a must.

Since my remarks of April 6 referred to, some have asked me to call attention for the RECORD in this debate today the discussion on this question of vice surrounding the camps as it occurred in the Armed Services Committee of which I am a member.

Here it is verbatim, to wit:

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Some of us, General, have had sons that have served in the last war and aren't with us today, can't be, and some of them went in at very tender ages.

Have you yet directed or has anyone under you yet directed that there be any established policy to see to it that the conditions surrounding the camps and in the camps, referring to the use of liquor, referring to prostitution and other problems that arise out of mass military effort, are such as to make it as positive as possible that the boys, whose parents are desirous that their boys come out of their military service without their morals having been unnecessarily destroyed are provided with adequate recreation and athletic and sports facilities and other programs for the men and women in all the armed services?

Secretary MARSHALL. Well, frankly, sir, I have not, up to the present moment, gone into that particular aspect of the matter. I am quite certain——

Mr. DOYLE. Don't you think it is necessary——

Secretary MARSHALL. May I finish my answer?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Secretary MARSHALL. Because I said up to the present moment I haven't done it, but that doesn't mean I am not going to do it. And I also feel assured that it is being done, because we learned that out of the last war and it presents a great many difficulties.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I——

Secretary MARSHALL. And it is very important to us from several standpoints. It is important to morale of the Army and it is vital to the support of the civil population.

Mr. DOYLE. I hope we are promptly advised that it has been done.

Secretary MARSHALL. I will have that brought before your committee in detail.

Mr. DOYLE. One more statement, General. In reading the objectives of this bill and its proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act of 1948, I recognize that, of course, the military service is but temporary in the experience of American boys at present and I hope it will always be temporary, consistent with the best interests of our national defense.

In other words, one of the fears that many of my people have is that our Nation may unnecessarily become militarized. Therefore, may I ask you this, as I read this bill: Will it be inconsistent with this bill in the form of amendments to have a statement also included in the policy that it is the policy of Congress that these boys who are called into service get this training, in scientific research and development and health and education and military training, and return to civilian life as soon as possible, consistent with our national defense interests?

Secretary MARSHALL. Offhand, I wouldn't see any objection to that, but I would like to have a little bit more time to consider it.

Mr. DOYLE. Isn't that one of the objectives of our Nation?

Secretary MARSHALL. It is, and I must address myself to one phase of what you have just said as to militarizing our people. Anybody who watched the demobilization of our armies never got that idea, because the minute the emergency ceases everybody goes home and our great complication is to keep a few on guard until the next phase.

I think that was the case after the Civil War. It certainly was the case in 1919. And it was—well, as an understatement, it was quite the case in 1945. I remember I had to come up here and explain to as many as 600 Members of Congress once or twice something about the demobilization, when the Army was dissolving literally in my lap. I couldn't find the Army one day to the next. I don't think you can change the American boy. He doesn't change very readily into a military automaton.

Our great problem is to get him into the military system to the extent that it is necessary. I think one of the failures of our planning in the War Department in the last war was we hadn't given the same amount of attention to how we were going to affect the state of mind of the soldier and the people as the demobilization period came up. As a matter of fact, the Lord blessed us and war came to an end so suddenly that we were caught off center. We are now in the midst of tremendous effort. But every indication that we have is that you can't enforce a military feeling on our people unless there is an immediate objective before them that all can recognize is of vast importance to the country.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I make this statement in closing so the general will understand the import of my question.

I am very vigorously in support of an adequate armed military strength, but I do wish to emphasize that that to me should only be according to our present need and that always the objective of the military is to return those boys to civilian life in the utmost good health and the utmost good character and the utmost strength to protect our Nation.

Secretary MARSHALL. That certainly would be our desire.

I am very happy, therefore, that Mr. COLE, the distinguished Armed Services Committee member from New York, offered his amendment. The record shows I offered a similar amendment in committee which was not adopted. This amendment offered by Mr. COLE is better, I believe, than the one I offered.

"Our Strength Is Being Used To Prevent War, Not To Wage It; the Young Men in Uniform Are Standing Between the American People and Destruction; We Are Proud of Every One of Them"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to address the House, then to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD of today's proceedings a script of the thirtieth Battle Report, Washington—the National Broadcasting Co. television program presented each Sunday afternoon.

On the occasion of the broadcast of this particular teledocumentary, Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, was with President Truman in Key West, Fla., and made his talk from there. The presentation was made by way of film recording and on this occasion Dr. Steelman brought to the television audience Hon. George Allen, United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia; the internationally famous authority on the Arctic and Arctic flying, Col. Bernt Balchen, a man to whom the area of the North Pole is almost as familiar as the dome of the Nation's Capitol is to the Members of this House. Colonel Balchen is now the United States Air Force's expert on Arctic aviation. His talk is something that will long be remembered by those who heard him discuss the Arctic center of the globe on this notable television broadcast.

On the program also was Maj. William W. Wright, one of the first United States marines returned to this country from Korea under the new rotation program, and as he told of his return, one can live and sense the glorious feeling experienced in having been one of the thousand marines homeward bound on the U. S. S. *Breckinridge*, sailing into the Golden Gate on this unforgettable voyage. Last but not least on the program were some of the greatest pictures ever filmed and presented on any television screen. They were taken by the Jones Brothers, the twin photographers of NBC, and made particularly for the Battle Report, Washington program. As historical documents, they will forever constitute one of the most complete records of this day and time ever recorded.

I am happy to announce that what was presented was a small part of the wonderful picture footage taken by the Jones boys and scheduled for reproduction on Battle Report, Washington.

What follows is but a few lines of an epic word picture painted by Lou Hazam of the story in Yugoslavia—commenting on the photo news as exhibited on the screen. This word-picture by Hazam constitutes one of the best pieces of script writing ever presented on the television screen:

The story of Yugoslavia is written in the faces of its people, 16,000,000 of them, who are making history by insisting on being themselves. Principally Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, they occupy a mountainous country, big as New York and Pennsylvania put together, a country of six republics and several different languages. Let us read what is written in their faces by what the camera finds behind them, stopping first for a brief visit with our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George Allen, who makes this special statement for you who watch Battle Report.

Mr. Speaker, thus on another Sunday, the National Broadcasting Co. and Dr. John R. Steelman have brought to the American people a report on several most interesting subjects—made by men who by virtue of both experience and training are highly qualified to address themselves to the subjects selected for discussion.

The thirtieth Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers, was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON, MARCH 18, 1951

Mr. DAVID BRINKLEY. Once again Seoul falls to UN troops, battling Korea's spring thaw as well as the enemy. And once again NBC television turns its cameras on the Nation's capital for your weekly Battle Report.

Washington, one eye on the Big Four deadlock in Paris, the other on Korea—Korea where our forces, slowed by rain, are now within 20 miles or less of the controversial thirty-eighth parallel.

Today on Battle Report the famous Arctic flier, Col. Bernt Balchen, who knows the top of the world like you know your own back yard; Marine Maj. William W. Wright, one of the first home from Korea under the new rotation plan; and the third of NBC's exclusive teledocumentaries on Europe, Battle Report, Yugoslavia. But first, by way of film from Key West, Fla., where he is with President Truman—the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. JOHN R. STEELMAN. Like many others in Government, I frequently receive letters from parents who complain because their sons are selected for military service. Today I have been thinking about those letters. I can understand why they were written. I have sincere and deep sympathy, not only for the parents, but also for the sons whose careers are interrupted.

There is no doubt in my mind that parents everywhere in the world dislike the idea of their sons being called into the armed services. That includes the parents behind the iron curtain as well as those in the free world.

But, just so long as tyrants seek to dominate the world, we in the United States have no alternative but to build up our military strength. That is the only language the tyrants understand. If we were weak they would trample over us without mercy; destroy every material thing we own and make us slaves of a cruel and autocratic state. We have seen with our own eyes the tragic fate which has overtaken weak nations.

We have chosen to build up our armed strength so no one will dare attack us. Our strength is being used to prevent war, not to wage it. The young men in uniform are standing between us and destruction.

All over the world today, representatives of our Government are working tirelessly to prevent war. That is their primary task. Some are engaged in efforts to build a more prosperous world for less fortunate persons. These are the men and women working on

fight against the Nazis. It is not for us to say that the Yugoslavians cannot be overcome. One thing, however, seems certain—anyone who undertakes to challenge this nation with arms will pay dearly for the offense.

Mr. BRINKLEY. If we would defend ourselves and the free world, one place we must be prepared to dig our fox holes is in the arctic snow. Since the potential enemy is closest to us over these north polar regions, here we must learn to live and fight. Under simulated combat conditions—as shown in these pictures—American troops and specially designed equipment are now being tested against the rigors of some of the bitterest climate on earth.

To our next guest, even the North Pole is no stranger. Norwegian-born, and once with its air force, he is now an American citizen. In the last war, he built the Army base on Greenland; later served with the Eighth Air Force and OSS in Scandinavia. Until January, he commanded the Tenth Rescue Squadron in Alaska. For an appraisal of the strategic arctic from a man who knows what he's talking about—here is the Air Force's arctic expert—Col. Bernt Balchen.

Col. BERNT BALCHEN. The old Mercator projection map of the world with its inhabited areas about in the center of the map, topped off at either end with the desolate, unproductive polar areas, is not applicable any more for our geographical conception of our world. It is also interesting to note that the large industrial and commercial centers—which in time of war would become the prime targets for the strategic air forces of the countries involved in an armed conflict—practically all are situated between latitudes 35° and 50° north.

Long range traffic between the commercial centers, or, if war should come, long range strategic missions between North America and possible targets in Soviet, will naturally take the shortest route—the great circle track.

The vertex of these air lanes all converge toward the North Pole and into the Arctic regions. Up till now we have had two large areas of our globe that have not been the place for large military strategic operations. These are the Arctic and the Antarctic regions. Having been considered of little or no commercial or strategic value and the logistical problems too difficult to tackle with the knowledge up till now.

As far as the Arctic regions are concerned, this is a thing of the past. The Arctic regions are located in the center of the big industrial and strategic target areas of our globe. One can say with justification that the Arctic from being one of our coldest areas has turned to become one of the "hot spots" of today and tomorrow.

This attracted attention is partly due to recent discoveries of natural resources, but overwhelmingly from its new increased military strategic importance.

In any future conflict, it is reasonable to assume that the arctic and subarctic regions might be the areas from which some of the first, and maybe decisive, aerial attacks would be initiated.

Three of our inhabited continents—North America, Europe, and Asia—meet at the ice-covered beaches of the Arctic Ocean, and the extreme northern parts of these continents are the arctic land areas.

The shortest routes—the great circle tracks—between a number of industrial centers and military bases in North America and the Soviet, particularly points in the Ural and Siberian industrial complexes, are all passing through the arctic regions and some of them nearly across the geographical North Pole.

This strategic problem is very convenient for the Air Forces' strategic bombing of industrial targets with modern types of high-efficiency projectiles. Wiping out the war production potential of an enemy should greatly reduce our loss and costs of any future war.

Our latest types of aircraft are well capable of performing these missions.

The low temperatures that would be encountered on these flights across the Arctic regions are no more severe than encountered in daily operations at high altitudes anywhere else on the globe.

On the whole, flights across the polar regions have no major problems with our electronic aids to polar navigation. High aircraft and engine efficiency and high pro-efficiency level of flight crews make this type of operations practically daily routine flights.

On a military mission across the polar regions, most of the track would be inside the Arctic Circle and, also, likely most of it over the Arctic Ocean. With the exception of the southern parts of the Arctic regions, it is very unlikely that any opposition in the form of antiaircraft, radar, and defensive fighters should be encountered. The unlikelihood of not encountering opposition on about two-thirds of the trip would give the crews a better opportunity to concentrate on navigation and flight problems. To quote Gen. H. H. Arnold: "If a world war III should come, the strategic center will be the North Pole."

To quote General Spaatz: "Across the Arctic, any industrial target (country) is within the reach of our Air Force. The United States is similarly exposed. We are really all open across the Arctic."

It is obvious, from the previous, that as we improve the range of our bombers or, looking at the peaceful aspect of the picture, the commercial long-range nonstop operations, for instance between the west coast of the States and India, the Near East or the east coast of the United States and China, would all cross the Arctic regions, and some of them very close to the pole.

With the progress of aviation, military or civil, ground installations all over the Arctic land areas are needed for efficient and safe conduct of these operations. A complete network of weather, radar stations, also some emergency landing fields, would be required. These installations would provide a permanent bulwark in the defense line of our continent.

Mr. BRINKLEY. The memory of our retreat to Hugnam will live long in many minds. Cold, snow, and sleet seemed to join with the enemy in one unholy conspiracy to bring death to those who dared to try to make it. The same tough conditions were faced by others all throughout the winter in Korea. Many men, there since the first day of the North Korean invasion in June, battled on without relief as the Communist tide poured down on the heels of the North wind.

Recently, the U. S. S. *Breckinridge* sailed into the Golden Gate of California with many who tasted this unforgettable experience * * * the first Marines brought home under the Armed Forces new rotation plan. To tell you who were chosen to come, and how * * * as well as how it feels to be home again, here is one of the passengers on the *Breckinridge*—Maj. William W. Wright.

Maj. W. W. WRIGHT. Just a little over a week ago, I was one of a group of a thousand Marines listening to the cheers of thousands as we rode down Market Street in San Francisco. We were the first Marines to return to the States as a result of the recently-established Marine Corps' rotation plan. It was a mighty satisfying thing—that reception accorded us in San Francisco. Passing under the Golden Gate bridge is always a satisfying experience, but this time there was more to greet us than that beautiful piece of engineering.

When our ship, the U. S. S. *Breckinridge*, arrived in Frisco, each of us was given one of these cards which reads, "With pride and gratitude, San Francisco welcomes you, a fighting marine, home from the battlefront of Korea." Thousands of San Franciscoans turned out to lend proof to that message of welcome. There was the band and welcoming committee at the dock, the motorcade through ticker-tape and cheers, and later, numerous parties and receptions, all adding up to a mighty warm welcome—a far cry from the cold of Korea. This rotation plan was evidence to those of us who were aboard the *Breckinridge* was selected for rotation because of three things. The first group was selected for their long period of combat duty. Another group was selected because they had been awarded two Purple Hearts—evidence that they had been twice wounded in action. The third group, of which I was a member, was what the corpsmen called, cold weather cases—victims of the rugged winter weather which brought on an unprecedented number of cases of frostbite and respiratory troubles. * * * That Korean weather will long be a subject of discussion among military personnel. We learned a lot from it. As the officer in charge of keeping a battalion of the Seventh Marines supplied, I know first-hand of our attempts to meet the Korean winter head-on. Even before I was evacuated late in November, each marine in my outfit had been properly equipped with the latest available cold weather clothing. But in spite of our years of experimentation, and in spite of our extensive preparations for winter fighting in Korea, mother nature proved a pretty tough enemy to lick. * * * I know that reports circulated here in the States to the effect that, at one time, our Marines in North Korea were fighting in below-zero temperatures while still clad only in their summer uniforms. It is difficult to understand just how such rumors got started. * * * When the First Marine Division headed for Korea from California, we took with us complete supplies of cold weather clothing, and we had them on hand when the weather turned cold. Of course, at times, enemy action made the supply problem difficult, and some of the marines were temporarily without their winter gear. But by the time things really got rough, every marine in Korea was equipped with the best winter clothing we had developed up to that time. Right now, the lessons we have learned in Korea are being evaluated, and new winter clothing is constantly being developed. But a wonderful way to keep warm, I discovered, is to make that most welcome incoming trip through the Golden Gate.

Mr. BRINKLEY. And so—until we turn our cameras on the Nation again the week after next for another telecdocumentary—this, then, against the background of Battle-front Korea, is David Brinkley putting a period on your thirtieth battle report, Washington.

United States Lacks Aim in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following column of comment by Hanson W. Baldwin,

the so-called point 4 program. Others are in daily contact with the officials of foreign governments. Still others are busy telling the story of our country and making it clear to all that we want peace.

Back of all these men and women is our strength. Our ability to produce the material things of life is one asset. Our unselfish willingness to help others is winning new friends for us every day. Our armed might—these young men in uniform—are the bulwark behind which we can keep working to build a world of peace and prosperity.

We are proud of every one of them.

Mr. BRINKLEY. This is the armed border of Yugoslavia—Yugoslavia which faced the Soviet giant, once its brother, and cried aloud to the world its declaration of independence. This is the border that touches four Soviet satellites—Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania—and Italy and Austria in the north, Greece on the south. This is Communist Yugoslavia where the impossible has happened, affecting the whole balance of power in Europe. Rebellious Yugoslavia, which only last week handed the governments of the west this tough-talking, 481-page white book, formally challenging Russia with applying threatening pressure against her. It is from this Yugoslavia that our cameramen, the Jones brothers, send us their third NBC exclusive documentary report on Europe. We invite you now to see this country, as no American camera has been permitted to show it in recent years through Battle Report, Yugoslavia.

The story of Yugoslavia is written in the faces of its people, 16,000,000 of them, who are making history by insisting on being themselves. Principally Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, they occupy a mountainous country, big as New York and Pennsylvania put together—a country of six republics and several different languages. Let us read what is written in their faces by what the camera finds behind them, stopping first for a brief visit with our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George Allen, who makes this special statement for you who watch Battle Report.

Hon. GEORGE ALLEN. Good afternoon. Yugoslavia is the only eastern European country from which this program will be able to report to the American people. And that fact alone is significant. Although Yugoslavia is a communistic country, this report comes from a country where, fortunately, the heavy iron curtain of the Cominform has been lifted, and it comes from a country that fiercely determines to defend itself against aggression. Yugoslavia is in the Balkans, and that term conjures up pictures today more than ever before of the powder keg. Today, Yugoslavia's existence is threatened by Russia's satellite troops—troops which we know are far in excess of treaty limitation. These troops stand ready on Yugoslavia's frontier. Guns are poised, the powder is dry; the only remaining question is whether the masters of the Kremlin will give the orders for the fingers to touch the triggers.

Mr. BRINKLEY. This is the heart of the embattled Yugoslavia of which Ambassador Allen speaks—Belgrade, Yugoslavia's Moscow, much destroyed by the war. Work on a new Belgrade ceased when the break with Russia came in order to concentrate workers on defense projects.

For industrial goods Yugoslavia, always predominantly agricultural, has been trying to build new industries. This machine-tool factory, outside Belgrade, was shipped down from Germany in toto after the war and given to Yugoslavia as its share of reparations from the Nazis. It employs 4,000 workers on day and night shifts to provide the nation with the machines they'll need to make their own goods.

Coal is needed to power this rush to industrialize—coal essential to fueling Yugoslavia's defense. And, along with coal, wood—making these two items of vital importance in Yugoslavia today. This coal mine, near Zagreb, about 300 miles north of Belgrade, is practically closed and deserted owing to a breakdown of irreplaceable machinery, illustrating how Yugoslavia is further hampered in tapping its right mineral resources. by being equipment-poor. Thus one vicious circle: Machines needed to produce power to produce machines.

The faces of these people whose government is seeking to industrialize are the faces of farmers, men and women who know only the plow, peasants who form the backbone of the country. Russian propaganda leveled at Tito charges that individual peasant farming still predominates in Yugoslavia, and the land is not yet completely nationalized. But Tito, who knows his fate is bound closely to the peasant, proceeds cautiously here.

Tito, like Stalin, also has a plan designed to streamline agriculture.

On farms like this one, while this still looks primitive, the idea is to introduce modern equipment and farming methods to land that often never before felt an iron plow. But pressure to socialize a large segment of the farm population and land has lapsed in the past year, so that today only about one-fourth of Yugoslavia's farmland has come under some form of cooperative, collective state management.

More faces—the faces of Yugoslavia's children, much like children anywhere in whose hands will lie the future of Communist Yugoslavia in the new, untraveled road it has cut out for itself.

With schools like this elementary school in Belgrade, Yugoslavia struggles to meet its youth's educational needs. At the same time it wrestles with the country's economic problems. This school, one of the best, handles 3,000 pupils—pupils from whom must come the future experts now so scarce and so necessary to Yugoslavia's economy, scientific development, and public life. Schooling is compulsory up to high school.

The state, too, in this communized land, has bold programs for the health of its citizens. This modern hospital in Belgrade renders free service to those who cannot pay. Typhoid, malaria, and TB take a high toll in a country that has only 4,000 doctors and needs 16,000.

And these faces? These are the faces of the people's rulers. As the Jones boys put it, "Lots of stuff in Yugoslavia was restricted and the weather was lousy for outdoor shooting, so we tried to concentrate on the political and government angle to show just how this Communist-type government runs."

See this for yourself in scenes never filmed by westerners before through the Jones brothers' cameras.

Yugoslavia's Government is modeled after the Soviet Union. However, the Communist workers' council such as you see meeting here is typically a Yugoslav Communist experiment. The idea—to give to men and women who run the machines in industry and operate the farms the responsibility for management and production.

The basic unit of local government is the people's committee. Every village and every few miles of city area has one. They function in the conspicuous shadow of Tito's giant-size portrait, now no longer inevitably flanked by Father Stalin's.

And now another NBC exclusive. You are looking at scenes no western cameramen have ever been permitted to shoot before. You are in the inner sanctum of the Federal Council—the House of Representatives of Yugoslavia's Congress. Here meet 405 delegates from the 6 republics, roughly analogous to our States, that go to make up the country.

And here are the heads of the Government, the 15 principal ministers—the men who actually do the ruling.

Speaking, Edward Kardelj, former school teacher, now Vice Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, intellectual and political architect of the state. He is called by many Tito's probable successor.

And finally the man whose daring has challenged the Soviet and astonished the world, the man whose determination that his country shall be master of its own fate and shape its destiny to something more than a Soviet satellite makes him, as someone said, the greatest single threat to world communism—Josip-Broz, commonly called Tito, really seven Titos—(1) marshal of the Yugoslav Army and its commander in chief; (2) Minister of National Defense; (3) secretary general of the Yugoslav Communist Party; (4) chairman of the party's central committee; (5) leader of the Yugoslav Politboro; (6) chief of the people's front; and (7) Prime Minister of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Of this Tito, Ambassador Allen reports to us.

Hon. GEORGE ALLEN. Probably no single person on Joseph Stalin's purge list has as high a price on his head as Marshal Tito. Stalin would relish his liquidation with a deeper personal satisfaction than anybody else. Stalin has not yet ordered his satellite troops to march, and from this we may gain a very good lesson. That lesson is that determination and a sound military defense are very persuasive arguments these days in favor of peace.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Determined to help those standing up to Russia's ambitions to overrun the world, United States ships are now carrying to Yugoslavia cargoes of needed supplies such as no longer reach her from Russia and her satellites. In addition to sending food, we have loaned Yugoslavia $55,000,000.

We are also exporting information about the United States of America—truthful information about our country to counteract the previous untruthful propaganda about us. In Belgrade's America House American books, magazines, newspapers, phonograph records are finding an eager audience among young and, yes, among old.

But where American democracy is truly making friends and influencing people is through American observers who travel about the country to see if our food is really reaching the people.

Following one such observer with their cameras, the Jones brothers saw him warmly greeted in one of Yugoslavia's rural communities.

He is assisted by an interpreter. The Yugoslav Government provides gas for the jeep.

Here, the exchange of a cigarette—valued highly in an austerity-stricken country—does more for international understanding than a million treaties.

An American hand put in a Yugoslav hand and shaken in warm parting, speaks what is in our heart—America's desire to live in good will and friendship with all the world's peoples.

And who is to say this man and this jeep—America—is not helping peace to prevail?

And now, to close this third NBC Battle Report, Europe, back to our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, George Allen.

Hon. GEORGE ALLEN. One might expect, in the face of the mounting threat, to find the people of Yugoslavia worried and jittery, but the fact is that, while they are naturally concerned about the future, they are by no means jittery. Yugoslavians are a very realistic people, and today we find them quietly courageous and astonishingly determined. Those of us who are able to observe the situation here close at hand are convinced that insofar as the Yugoslavians are concerned, there is no danger at all of a Munich-type settlement here. The Yugoslavians will fight, no matter who the attacker might be nor in what form the attack comes. And the way the Yugoslavians can fight was demonstrated with deadly earnestness during their

more than 50 years of service to the public schools of this State.

Many years ago Joe an 'Lanta Pummill selected a quiet wooded plot near Eminence, long known to them, as the site for their dream home. Nine years ago they built a livable, modern house near the crest of a hill, beneath tall, sturdy trees and beside a friendly spring that gurgles around the clock. The house was built for gracious living and it was chinked with pleasant memories. Joe liked to show each convenience to old friends who dropped in, and he was hurt if the guest departed too soon. Complete with birdhouses, fish pool, and winding drives, they called it JoLanta Springs.

There can't be much of Joe in the Salem cemetery. He was too eager, too enthusiastic, to restless in life to remain inactive long. Possibly Joe is walking hill trails with discouraged Ozark boys and girls, offering an encouraging pat on the shoulder. He must be moving through hundreds of schoolrooms, where teachers are unconsciously following his retreating shadow. Could is be that Joe is ringing in a group of heavenly cherubs to a classroom they had to leave suddenly when they were called up? We don't mean to be sacrilegious but, knowing Joe, we can't help wondering.

We never learned what words they cut on his marker, but we are carrying around in our memory a line for Joe. Direct and sincere—as was his life. It goes like this:

Joe Pummill—Teacher—Mission Accomplished.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Truman is going to recall everyone in Korea who has expressed a strong dissent from the conduct of American foreign policies, who will be left to fight?

God or Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a part of a radio presentation delivered by Stella Terrill Mann on Christmas Day, 1950. The address follows:

GOD OR GOVERNMENT?

We come again to celebrating the traditional birthday of the Prince of Peace in a world at war. But there is hope. For never before in the history of man have there been so many people determined to make the world a better place for all men as there are today.

We are on the threshold of the possibilities of the blessings of the atomic age. To use atomic energy only for atomic bombs is about as intelligent as it would be to use electricity only for the electric chair. Our scientists and industrialists say all the other problems for a world of abundance, leisure and culture beyond belief have already been solved except the human relations problems. How to get each man to treat all men as brothers, how to get each man to use the creative spirit of God within him, and not hand over this privilege and responsibility to some one else, is the problem. That is all that stands between our threat of an atomic war today and an atomic age of peace and plenty tomorrow.

It all comes down to one question: Shall we the people look to God or to Government for a better world?

The people want peace. History shows us that governments which have total control of their citizens soon run them into debt and misery. It cannot be otherwise. For men who would control the lives of others are blinded by their own greed, egotism, and arrogance. They do not see that the methods which create abundance work only under freedom. To hide their failures they demand more powers, more taxes, build war machines, wage wars of aggression to steal what they failed to produce, the while promising a better world and permanent peace. It happened to Germany twice in our day, to Italy, to Japan, and is now happening to Russia. Surely not one American mother wants a war in Korea. Yet our Government, without ever declaring war, has taken us into war in Korea. I am sure the Russian people do not want war. It is the Russian Government that wants war.

We must conclude government cannot keep peace. For peace we must look to people, who look to God. For the individual who looks to God for help lives at peace with himself and has good will toward his fellowmen.

We the people want food, necessities, conveniences, and even the luxuries of life for all men. America has the highest standard of living in the world. This is not due to superior resources, land area, or manpower. Russia has more natural resources, the British Empire has more land; China, with one-fourth of the earth's population, has more manpower. America's wealth is the result of our peculiar form of government which always has until the last 20 years or so, left each man alone to find God and to work out his destiny with his own abilities, unhampered. Our motto was, "That governs best which governs least." Under it this country flourished.

America's free religion, science, art, literature, and industry produced abundance. The individual's freedom to criticize, investigate, fail, try again, improve, work as long as he cared to, produced as much as he desired, with a reasonable hope of extra reward for extra effort, is what made America prosperous.

This free Nation under God produced great men and brought genius to us from around the world, here to work freely. Individuals earned fortunes, set up industrial laboratories, built and endowed universities and experiment stations. These institutions perfected know-how that produced an economy of plenty. As for good, free men, asking questions of God, nature, learned to produce 10 bushels, a hundred bushels of wheat or corn where only a few bushels grew before.

But now, in our day, with this Nation under Government regulations we see men paid not to produce, food animals destroyed, food plowed under, burned, to keep up Government fixed, Government controlled, Government forced high prices. The Government's blue potato scandal cost the American people $500,000,000. Government's paper plans for a better world destroyed the increase God had given. Little men, presuming to know more than God, flung back God's plan for plenty in favor of their own human wisdom. Meanwhile, millions go hungry. Such crimes against nature will not go unpunished. We shall all suffer for it; those who committed the crime and we, the people—who permitted it.

Communist Russia, the world's supreme example of a totally governed people, is violently anti-God, believes only in government—in men, as means of a better world. Russia rants that the Western Powers are "materialistic." This makes a strong appeal to many idealists who do not think it through. For the fact remains that the total benefit to be derived from Russia's better world plan is a wholly materialistic one—more bread for more people. But she promises it only at the expense of all else. She demands that the individual give up his mental, physical, spiritual, social freedom. He is forced to become both liar and coward. He must deny God, himself and his brother man. He is robbed of life if his party superiors deem it necessary in order that the government plans might go through.

The Russian Government is breeding poverty and stagnation by cutting off plenty and growth at the fountainhead, the creative spirit which God planted in every man. Russia's leaders do not see that the purpose of life is not merely more bread but more of total livingness. Man does not live by bread alone, but by giving free outlet to all those qualities and abilities which make of him not only a man, but an individual man, different from all other men. When a free man works with God for his own benefit he develops himself by working without limitation, fear, or hate. When he succeeds, all the world benefits.

The evidence is all around us: Government cannot produce a higher standard of living. Government has no productive power. Government has only force of law, police powers, backed up by punishment, the ultimate of which is death. Unlimited production results only from unlimited thinking, unlimited effort, unlimited love of individuals who believe man is unlimited when he works under freedom and justice. For that, we must look to people who look to God.

To look to God for help is an old American custom. All of America's greatest men including Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln looked to God for help. America was settled by people who wanted less of government and more of God. Our republican form of government came out of the Bible. Benjamin Franklin reminded the disagreeing framers of our Constitution they needed guidance of God and moved that they have prayer every morning before the business session opened. His motion carried and from that day, the work went on smoothly.

George Washington Carver tells us he walked in the woods and fields asking questions of God. He said, "Anything will give up its secrets if you love it enough." The totalitarian government controlled experiment conceived in hate, born of fear, has neither time nor inclination for loving investigation.

Henry Ford did not look to government but to God for a personal fortune and a better world. He once said he kept a Bible in every room so he could always have one at hand wherever he sat down. We are not surprised to learn the announced purpose of the $238,000,000 Ford Foundation, largest in the world, is to help create a better world by studying problems of human relations and finding a way to end war.

The Christians are only one group of Americans who believe in looking to God for help. Desiring a better world for all men these Christians have as individuals sent billions of dollars around the world for schools, churches, hospitals, food, clothing, shelter. They have put the Bible into 150 languages and 50 nations.

Everywhere the people who believe in God are trying to stop governments, mere men, from taking away rights and liberties of individuals. If governments succeed in further controls, civilization will go backward. We shall have war. Since it is a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, no

from the New York Times of Friday, April 13:

UNITED STATES LACKS AIM IN KOREA—NO EARLY END SEEN TO LIMITED WAR—AMERICAN PEOPLE BECOME MORE IMPATIENT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The controversy over General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has had at least one beneficial result; it has served to dramatize and define one of the basic problems we now face in the Orient—how to end the Korean War.

This problem is bound to become more acute as the weeks pass, as the American toll of casualties becomes bigger and bigger, and as no clear end to the fighting appears. Americans are an impatient people, as Lieut. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, General MacArthur's successor, has noted. They can take casualties when there is a clear and stated objective, but if no such objective is apparent their national impatience is certain to manifest itself.

Yet it is clear that, as of today, we have no clear-cut objective in Korea; there does not appear to be any quick political or military end in sight to the fighting; we have the bull by the tail and don't know how to let go.

The normal objective of military operations is to destroy the enemy's armed forces, or, as the Air Force would prefer to put it, to destroy the enemy nation's will and capacity to resist. Under present conditions neither is possible in Korea.

LIMITED WAR BEING FOUGHT

We are fighting a limited war there—a war limited geographically by the Yalu River on the Manchurian frontier and limited, in the amount of force we are willing to commit, approximately by the dimensions of the present army. We have had, since mid-January, our period of greatest success, as measured by our casualties as compared to the enemy's. Yet the United States alone has been suffering battle casualties in this period at the rate of about 1,200 weekly.

Our total battle casualties—now approximately 60,000 killed, wounded, prisoners, and missing since the Korean War started—probably would be swollen to considerably more than 100,000, if accidental casualties such as motor accidents and plane crashes, frostbite, disease, etc., were included. One hundred thousand total casualties in 9 months of war is a sizable price to pay for a limited conflict in which no decision against the two major aggressors in the Orient—Communist Russia and Communist China—is possible.

There is, moreover, no proof whatsoever that our objective since January 15, defined as "homicidal and not geographical," is really paying off in terms of weakening Communist China. It is certain that Red China is a nation under strain; it is probable that Peiping's preoccupation with the Korean fighting has diverted its attention from more vulnerable areas of possible Communist aggression in Asia.

RED CHINA NOW STRONGER

But a case can be made that Communist China is militarily stronger today than it was when it intervened in Korea last October. It has mobilized more manpower; Russian material aid has been increased and the Chinese Communist air force certainly is much stronger.

The administration, Britain and other of our United Nations allies have expressed the hope, which seems fatuous against our background of experience to date in Korea, that the enemy may be willing to negotiate and to end the Korean campaign.

It is entirely conceivable that Peiping and Moscow may indeed interpret the MacArthur removal as an invitation to negotiate, although it seems unlikely that any such attempt will be made until the enemy offensive, generally expected in two or three weeks, has shot its bolt, and perhaps has driven us back south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

ROTATION SYSTEM STARTS

But even if the enemy achieves no decisive success in any new blows he may launch against us, any negotiations the Communists are willing to undertake will almost certainly be based on the old familiar formula, a place for Communist China in the United Nations and the surrender of Formosa to Peiping. If we accept such terms they can mean only an oriental Munich; not a prevention of general war, but merely a postponement of it, and at terms that will be extremely disadvantageous to us. Negotiations, therefore, do not appear hopeful at present.

Yet despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that no end is in sight in Korea, and in the face of an impending enemy offensive, the Army has started a rotation system for our soldiers there. The system will in a few weeks take 500 experienced and battle-hardened men a day away from the Eighth Army. In other words, the Eighth Army will be losing shortly the equivalent of virtually a division a month in trained fighting men, and these men will be replaced by green replacements from the States.

The men in Korea need rest, but the rotation system is still based on the faulty individual replacement basis that caused so much harm in World War II. It will mean, if it is carried out, the virtual disruption of some of our combat units in Korea, just as the point system tore apart our Army after the end of World War II.

It is clear, too, as spring and the season of intensified fighting comes in Korea that the United States and othe United Nations powers that are fighting in Korea are deeply divided not only about Korea and what the course of action should be there, but about far-eastern policy in general.

General MacArthur's sudden replacement, therefore, is certain to dramatize the need for some definite answers to pressing questions.

Are we getting anywhere in Korea, or are we becoming more deeply mired in a strategic morass?

How can the Korean War be ended?

What should our foreign policy be in Asia?

These questions—and their answers—are the key to the great debate that took flame Wednesday when the American "proconsul" in Tokyo ended his military career.

The Late Joseph G. Pummill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the March 1951 issue of Missouri Schools by Forrest E. Wolverton, editor of the publication. The article, entitled "Mission Accomplished," is a worthy and merited tribute to a master teacher, a valuable citizen, a noble character, and an appreciative friend.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

Down in Shannon County they closed the schoolhouse door on Joe Pummill for the last time. There were flowers and music and the Word.

It happened May 13, but the editor only recently learned of his passing. We had missed him around the department offices. We missed his broad, tall form, strong as the sturdy oaks that grew from his planting at JoLanta Springs. But most of all we missed the bright, sincere smile, warm as reflected sunshine from the southern slope of his native hills. It was a good smile. It had to be, because he kept it going through 45 years of school teaching.

Joe would be amused and a little embarrassed if he thought anyone was calling him a master teacher. Yet, in the editor's book he is so listed. Not because he was a scholar, as his long time membership in Phi Delta Kappa attested. Not because of his technical skill, which his professional degrees established. Important as these things are, they are not enough to make the teacher a master. Joe opened little minds, tightly closed by ignorance and superstition. He fanned faint sparks of ambition into sturdy flames of success. He handled spirited youngsters with a tight rein, but in the manner that the driver of thoroughbreds encourages and coaxes rather than restrains. He could "light a shuck" beneath the indolent, and love them none-the-less. He infected his pupils with his own joy in learning, and he shared his rich storehouse of knowledge with thousands of boys and girls. Joe listened when famous educators explained new systems of pedagogy, but it was he who went back home and directed the learning of the young.

Joe could put on a pair of scuffed shoes and strike out across fields and woods with some Ozark boy or girl, bent on a mission to convince Pop and Mom that high school wasn't "foolishment" for a "purt-nigh grown man or woman." He did. No one will ever know just how many bright boys and girls Joe found in dark hill cabins where environment was slowly stifling real talent, undiscovered and uncultivated. Nor can anyone know how many hours he spent sitting in hickory-bark chairs, around stone fireplaces, explaining to a suspicious parent just how high-school training could be the golden key that unlocks the door to success for talented youngsters. No one can really know, but in 45 years of trying there would have to be many. The editor can think offhand of a dozen successful professional people who owe their start to Joe's gentle pushing.

Joe's experience ran the gamut of positions in the teaching field. He was both a teacher and a State supervisor of rural schools; he was a high-school teacher, superintendent, and State supervisor of high schools. He was a statistician in the Jefferson City office of the State department of education, and he taught classes in college. He taught the children; he taught the children's teachers, then he went out and supervised these teachers on the job. He worked 19 years in one position; 25 years teaching with his wife, Atlanta. That's about all there is for a teacher to do.

The editor recalls that Joe was uncomfortable when he had to ask for special approval of substandard teachers. He was most professionally minded. Neither could Joe follow the easy philosophy of expediency. Rather than sign reports that he knew were inaccurate, he would prefer to give up his position. He did.

Joe loved life and knew how to enjoy it. Atlanta says that she cannot recall a day when he did not say it was great to be alive and he was so fortunate. He was almost never ill. His interests, avocationally, were many and varied. Old-timers recall that around the Ozark hard-ball loop Joe was a whiz. He supported school athletics with interest—but honesty. Active in church work and other community affairs, he was closing the annual drive for funds for the cancer society when the last bell rang for him. He liked to recognize individual worth when he found it. Among the papers in his desk administrators discovered a fine tribute to a long-time coworker, Mrs. Ida Seaman, of Eminence, who recently closed

man should look to men for peace and progress, but to God. We cannot trust our welfare to human egotism, frailty, or lack of wisdom that ends in secret agreements and acts that we, the people, will have to pay for in taxes, freedom, and lives.

What we must have is a people's peace. When we get that all else will follow naturally. But we must first have peace before we can go forward, one world, under God. We can get that peace only by turning to God. For when we look to God we unify ourselves with the Creative Spirit of the universe. We work then with the Mind that created the world and man; with the Love that is mindful of man. He who made the ear, can He not hear? When we look to God we do not want to control or exploit our neighbor. Instead, we want to give him the greatest possible amount of freedom. When we look to God we free ourselves. When we look to government for help we enslave ourselves; we sell our birthright of freedom for a temporary mess of pottage. All over the world the people are awakening to this fact.

You and I, individuals, can put an end to Government dictatorships that lead to war, poverty, and misery. The individual who works with God cannot fail. Gandhi, one individual, whipped the British Empire with love and peaceful resistance. His faith moved mountains of opposition. He, an individual, opened the way for India's freedom.

If one man will today make up his mind that he will get behind the Russian iron curtain and tell the truth about freedom and America to the Russian people, it will be done. When he gets there, he will find God and the people waiting to welcome him. For one man and truth is mightier than the whole Russian Government and its lies. For good is not accomplished by "might nor by power but by my spirit, saith Jehovah."

God or government? How long shall we halt between two decisions? Let us this day begin a one-person campaign for a people's peace through love and prayer. Let each of us set aside 5 minutes of every day to pray for individual and world peace. Presently we shall see it go national, then world-wide, covering every minute of the 24 hours. We shall get peace, then a better world for all men. I have set 3 o'clock every afternoon as my time to turn to God. Will you join me, my friend?

Show-Down on Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 11, 1951, clearly points out the danger that confronts western reclamation in the fantastic central Arizona project bill now pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

THIS IS THE SHOW-DOWN ON WATER

This is the supreme moment in southern California's long struggle over the water of the Colorado River.

In Washington this week the final decisive events are shaping in the United States Senate and House of Representatives. At issue is the so-called $738,000,000 central Arizona project, around which revolves the entire great controversy over use of Colorado River water.

No longer can southern Californians shut their eyes to the danger that confronts them.

DECISION IMMINENT

The decision probably is to be made in the next few days.

And Arizona definitely is sweeping toward a political offensive of unprecedented ferocity, entirely unmindful of legal, moral, or financial considerations. The plain truth is that the apathy of California may result in a permanent crippling of the future of this State, unless there is an immediate awakening.

In its simplest terms the whole question has resolved itself into a startling combination of fanatical zeal on one side and sleepy indifference on the other. Arizonians have joined in a holy crusade to put over their objective. Most Californians don't even know what it is all about and are too bored to find out.

The awakening for residents of this area and, indeed, for the taxpayers of the whole United States is going to be cruel and bitter, indeed, if Arizona succeeds in its aims.

The central Arizona project is easily explained.

It is an attempt, by political pressure, to force through Congress a scheme so far-fetched and fabulously costly that many people literally have been unable to grasp its preposterousness.

ARIZONA'S PROPOSAL

Arizona is asking, in a bill known as S. 75, that more than 1,000,000 acre-feet (325,000,000,000 gallons) a year be diverted from the Colorado River at Parker Dam, be raised 1,000 feet by pump lift and be run through hundreds of miles of canals to the central Arizona section around Phoenix. The area is to be benefited consists of about 500,000 acres.

The Interior Department has estimated that the interest charges on the project would toal more than $2,000,000,000.

It admittedly is impossible for the relatively small population of central Arizona to pay the costs. These would have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United States.

Thus the project is not reclamation in the always-accepted sense that an area needing water contracts for it and pays back the costs in 40 or 50 years. Instead, it is straight subsidy out of the United States Treasury.

California always has paid her way in water projects, such as the Metropolitan Water District Aqueduct from the Colorado River.

Why should Arizonans be supported from the United States Treasury when Californians and all other westerners stand on their own feet and pay their bills in a regular business way?

This matter involves no question of the right to the water itself. Arizona may or may not have a legally sound claim to the 1,250,000 acre-feet of water in controversy. Only the Supreme Court can decide that issue.

But, regardless of whether Arizona or California owns the water, the present question is solely one of the attempt to provide for its use at a cost of more than $2,000,000,000.

And here is where Arizona's sheer political effrontery comes in.

Democratic Senator HAYDEN is chairman of the Rules Committee, Democratic Senator MCFARLAND is floor leader, They carry tremendous power.

JUSTICE FOR CALIFORNIA

California, on the other hand, has only justice and right on her side. Her contracts are threatened without benefit of a court decision; her water future is jeopardized by sheer political steam rolling. Her only recourse is to acquaint Senators and Representatives from other States with the truth and the financial facts.

It should be a powerful argument in New York or Pennsylvania or Illinois or Texas to know that the residents of those States and all the other States are going to have to pay more than $2,000,000,000 to support Arizona.

Of course Arizona needs the water. It is hard hit by drought. So is California. But the rules of common sense and fair play still have to prevail in both States.

Legally established contracts must be fulfilled. Normal standards of reclamation and business must be met.

California asks no more and will accept no less.

But the immediate political threat must be met in Congress with every weapon of truth and reason that can be mustered. The fight still can be won, if Californians will awake.

A Sorry Day in Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a part of an editorial which appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel under date of April 11, 1951, and my response thereto:

A SORRY DAY IN INFAMY

President Truman has capped a career already replete with blunders with the most tragic blunder of them all in firing General MacArthur from his far-eastern commands.

Never was the tragedy of a small-minded county politician sitting at the head of the greatest Nation on earth more apparent. Never has executive infamy reached such a low. Never has it so endangered the future of the world.

The Pendergast machine product is showing his real colors as never before. President Truman should be impeached. The sooner Congress gets on with it the better.

To that end, the News-Sentinel today has wired Indiana's Senators and Representatives as follows:

"In the light of the shockingly tragic discharge of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we urge the immediate impeachment of President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson. The honor of the United States before the anti-communistic world demands no less a step."

It is characteristic of the crudeness of a Chief Executive who would like to go around punching people's noses that General MacArthur, with 50 years of long and distinguished service as a soldier, received his first dismissal notice over the Armed Forces radio newscast.

Could it be that General MacArthur, by making forthright statements on the Asiatic situation of which he is an acknowledged authority, was deliberately forcing an intolerable situation to a head? Knowing the personal risks involved, did he invite recall or reprimand for the larger purpose of bringing the issue into clearer focus?

Whether so intending, General MacArthur, statesman, world policeman, and military leader, has brought this about, with backhanded cooperation from an inane President.

General MacArthur's recall is a great loss to Japan where he was revered as statesman and soldier. It will render an already explosive situation even more explosive. It will be hailed in the Kremlin as a great victory for the cause of communism. Mac-

Arthur has long been a symbol of the anti-Communist forces.

MacArthur's dismissal means that Dean Acheson is still in the saddle. Indeed the sickly conciliatory order of recall might well have been composed by the Secretary of State.

Japan is now understandably shaken in its confidence of the United States whose weak and vacillating position is evidenced by the Communist infiltration, if not open attack. Japan now becomes an inviting target for Communist infiltration, if not upon attack. The fine relationship between our country and Japan, built, by General MacArthur's genius as an occupying commander, has been imperiled by one mad stroke of the Truman pen.

General MacArthur is the victim of too many rear seat drivers. The mixed command in which he found himself was intolerable from the first. Unhappily he was expected to reconcile the American way with the UN way, an impossible task.

General MacArthur's stature gains in his dismissal. The American people are with him.

A Harry Truman firing a Douglas MacArthur, in the perspective of time, will approximate the effect of a Pekinese snapping at a St. Bernard.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN E. ROSS ADAIR, APRIL 12, 1951, ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

This is indeed a dark day in American history.

The President's peremptory dismissal of General MacArthur is deplorable. It has thoroughly aroused the American people. Their denunciation of our irresponsible and incompetent leadership is bitter. Many have urged impeachment proceedings.

All wonder what his next foolish step will be to jeopardize further our Nation's security.

Truman's impetuous demonstration of authority as Commander in Chief in removing General MacArthur amounts to capitulation to the demands of the Chinese Communists and the British Socialists in the Far East. Asia is in danger of being turned over to the aggressors. It could mean that we have sacrificed in vain the blood of 60,000 American soldiers to Truman-Acheson diplomacy. The sell-out to the Communists which was begun at Yalta and Tehran has now taken its next logical step.

General MacArthur guided our military forces to victory in the Pacific in World War II. He carried out the high ideals of our Nation in establishing the peace in Japan. After the President brashly plunged us into the Korean war, he relied upon MacArthur to lead the United Nations against the Communist aggressors. Now, he brusquely casts that trusted leader aside because he dared tell the truth about our blunders in Asia.

I have consistently attacked the foreign policies of this administration as being contrary to the best interests of our country. After this tragic demonstration, I am more than ever opposed to permitting the destiny of America to continue in the hands of diplomats of the Acheson-Hiss stripe.

Even though the President has dismissed General MacArthur from his post, that shall not stop our demands for a reversal of our foreign policy. To make this possible we must have the support of some members of the Democratic Party which is in control of Congress.

For the good of our Nation and in order to prevent further assumption of powers by the President, this must be done.

The battle to save our country and protect the freedom-loving nations of the world from aggressive totalitarianism must be won here. Continued irresponsible leadership can lose it.

Farm Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be faced with the necessity for extending price and wage controls beyond their present expiration date of June 30, 1951. One of the questions sure to come up is what to do about fixing price ceilings on agricultural commodities. Some will want to continue the present policy of not allowing these ceilings to be placed below parity; others will want to do away with this restriction.

A teacher of vocational agriculture in my district has written me on the general subject of farm income, expenses, and profits. His letter presents the point of view of the small farmer, and he cites figures on the production of hogs, beef, and eggs, to substantiate his statement. I think the letter is worthy of consideration by all Members of Congress, and I take pleasure in inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEAR SIR: There is much talk today about regulating farm prices. As a teacher of vocational agriculture I have an opportunity to see the farmers' cost of production from many angles. I also find it hard to teach at the present time because of price uncertainties. The veterans that I teach seem to be wondering if their efforts toward expansion and becoming established on the farm may lead to failure.

I realize that it is next to impossible to see the farmer's situation all the way from Washington and to get the best qualified men to work on farm price controls. As the veterans and I see it price controls could do much more harm than good. It is hard to believe that price controls will work on anything but finished products.

The class and I have endeavored to work up the basic commodities in our community in order to give you a clearer picture of what we farmers are up against. I find that many farmers do not realize what their cost of production is, and as a result produce that commodity at a loss. As a result the market price is lowered still more. Maybe our education program for farmers has failed to get results, or maybe the educators aren't going about the job the right way. What a farmer needs to know is what it is costing him per pound, dozen, bushel, or hundredweight to produce that certain commodity. This information is difficult to find written in farmer language, or even in teacher language.

The enclosed figures have been figured on the high side instead of the low side. The average farmer would not make that much profit on the particular commodity. Cotton and beef cattle have not been figured due to such a great variation in production per acre. As for cotton it will cost the farmer between 20 and 30 cents per pound to produce a pound of cotton. If a farmer clears $35 per acre he is doing good. Beef cattle is the rich man's enterprise. The large cattleman is where he is today because he inherited the money or business, he is an oil man, or he has been in the business many years and has seen many hard times. The veterans that I teach aren't in this class. They are struggling trying to get established.

It is hoped that this bit of information will help you see the picture as we farmers see it. As long as there is no shortage of food and basic items why control prices? If necessary we can send you the middle man's mark-up on farm commodities. I am sure that you realize this though.

Yours truly,

Hog production

[Feeding 200 head of hogs to 225 pounds market weight]

Expenses:	
Cost of feeder pigs $7 each	$1,400
Cost of feed:	
Corn $4 per hundred, 750 pounds per hog	6,000
Supplement $6.75 per hundred, 80 pounds per hog	1,080
Supplies and vaccine	200
Depreciation on equipment	10
Cost of production, not including labor or gasoline	8,690
Income: 200 head of hogs at 22 cents per pound	9,900
Profit, not including labor or gasoline	1,210
Profit per hog	6.05
Profit per day	6.72

Beef production

[Feeding 50 head of beef steers, starting weight 250 pounds, for 120 days]

Expenses:	
Cost of steers (250 pounds each)	$4,375
Cost of feed:	
Concentrates, 1,440 pounds at $4.75 per hundred	3,420
Hay, 18 tons at $30 per ton	540
Supplies and vaccine	100
Cost, not including labor or gasoline	8,435
Income: 50 steers, weight 490 pounds, at 35 cents per pound	8,575
Profit, not including labor or gasoline	140
Profit per head	2.80
Profit per day	1.16

The capital investment is what keeps most veterans and beginning farmers out of the business.

Egg production

[For a 500-hen flock with 175-egg average per hen]

Expenses:	
Cost of chicks at 1-day old, 40 cents each	$200.00
Cost of feed up to laying, $1.50 per bird	750.00
Cost of feed for 1 year's lay:	
Grain, $3 per hundred	600.00
Mash, $5 per hundred	1,100.00
Medication and supplies	100.00
Depreciation on building and equipment	40.00
Electricity, $2 per month	36.00
Cost of production not including labor or gasoline	2,826.00
Income:	
400 layers housed, with 175 eggs per hen, 5,833 dozen at 40 cents	2,333.20
Sale of old birds, $1 each	400.00
Total income	2,733.20
Net loss not including labor or gasoline	92.80

To make a profit today on eggs, the egg average per hen must be at least 200 eggs. Many egg producers don't get that many eggs.

McCarthyism Is Good for Achesonitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was just about a year ago that the administration was in the white heat of perhaps its greatest effort in moving heaven and earth to prevent the exposure of the Soviet dictated Tehran-Yalta-Potsdam line it had been following in far-eastern policy for several years that finally resulted in the loss of China to the free world.

Against an avalanche of opposition, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, pressed for an investigation which, of course, the Tydings committee never really conducted.

Following is speech of Alfred Kohlberg given April 3, 1951, at the Lost Battalion Hall, Queens, New York City, which I wish to include in my remarks:

MCCARTHYISM AND KOREA

(By Alfred Kohlberg)

Recently, before a panel of the American Civil Liberties Union in Washington, Senator LEHMAN said:

"The black evil of McCarthyism has captured the imagination of the American people."

That's the most encouraging statement I've heard out of Senator LEHMAN since way back when he backslid from Wall Street and landed way down in the New Deal.

What is McCarthyism?

Very simply put, it consists of exposing disloyalty, dishonesty, and actual treason in Government, and demanding something be done about it, now, before it's too late.

McCarthyism is a very old American custom. It is an age-old American determination to get rid of traitors and grafters and disloyal servants.

You all remember the fall of France to Hitler, in just 6 weeks of June and July of 1940. You remember how it became known that a Nazi fifth column and a Communist fifth column, working together under the Hitler-Stalin pact, had undermined the French Army and Air Force. Even the Minister for Air was suspected of being a member of the Communist conspiracy. The French cried: "Nous sommes trahui" (We are betrayed.) But it was too late.

France had had a McCarthy. His name was de Kerillis. But they would not listen.

You all remember how Czechoslovakia was seized from within in 2 days of 1948. After it was over, Foreign Minister Fierlinger and other high officials revealed that they had been secret Communists all the time. Czechoslovakia fell for lack of a McCarthy in time.

When suspicion pointed to Gen. George Washington's close friend and favorite officer, Gen. Benedict Arnold, he said nothing about "red herrings" or "not turning his back," but had him watched and broke up the conspiracy. Just a little early-American McCarthyism.

During World War I President Woodrow Wilson said:

"We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. Honesty and competence need no shield of secrecy."

Let me repeat that: "Honesty and competence"—and, I might add, loyalty to one's country—"need no shield of secrecy." Sounds just like JOE MCCARTHY; doesn't it?

Shortly after Wilson's death, during the moral let-down with which we seem to indulge ourselves after each war, two Democratic Senators charged corruption in the Teapot Dome leases. Anticipating Democratic President Truman and Attorney General McGrath, 26 years later, Republican Attorney General Dougherty called it a "red herring" and refused to open the files. But Republican President Coolidge, in the American tradition, fired the Attorney General and opened the files. As a result his Secretary of the Interior and several others went to jail. McCarthyism triumphed.

We badly needed some good old American McCarthyism when the Reds and pinkoes in the State Department were making the deals at Moscow, and Tehran, and Quebec, and Yalta, and Potsdam, that sold out Poland and Yugoslavia and all Eastern Europe, and China, too.

We suffered from lack of some active McCarthyism when Alger Hiss was put in charge of organizing the UN and being its first Secretary General, and when he sat behind President Roosevelt's chair at Yalta. Also when he was Dean Acheson's right-hand man in firing the anti-Reds out of the State Department in 1944 and 1945, as testified to under oath by Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle.

There should have been a little sample of McCarthyism back in 1942, when Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson cleared Nathan Gregory Silvermaster for access to top secrets, over the objections of Major General Strong, head of Army Intelligence.

And, when General Eisenhower ordered General Patton to stop 30 miles from Prague, and General Keating 30 miles from Berlin, so the slowpoke Russians could have both prizes. And then ordered our troops to draw back from Jachimov in Czechoslovakia, and from Thuringia and Saxony, in Germany.

Only later we began to learn that the Erzegebirge area lies in Jachimov and Thuringia and Saxony. And it's from the Erzegebirge that Russia is now getting its uranium. Maybe when the atom bombs fall, we'll realize just how sad it was that JOE MCCARTHY was flying in the Marine Air Force in the Pacific at that time, instead of raising hell in Washington.

We needed a MCCARTHY when Lauchlin Currie, secretary to President Truman, countermanded the order from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to General Eisenhower, to send surrendered German arms and ammunition to Chiang Kai-shek. It was all destroyed, instead.

And, MCCARTHY was still in the Pacific when somebody ordered destruction of all the Chinese lend-lease ammunition at the end of the war. The Army admits the destruction, but we don't know who ordered it.

When Henry Wallace went to China in 1944 with three famous pro-Reds, Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, and John Hazard, he secretly reported to President Roosevelt, but his secret reports were omitted from the famous China white paper. Senator HERBERT O'CONOR, of Maryland, got one of them from Mr. Wallace, and made it public. It's refrain was "Chiang must go." O'CONOR having accomplished that much, we now turn to MCCARTHY to find the Guru behind Henry Wallace that time.

That mention of John Carter Vincent, brings to mind his recent demotion from Minister to Switzerland, to be Consul-General in the dirty little North African town of Tangier. The Washington scuttle-butt on this strange proceeding is that Vincent was caught leaking secret information to the Soviets; that prosecution was demanded by Gen. Bedell Smith, but that the State Department prevailed on him to be satisfied with Vincent's demotion. Then General Smith is supposed to have come into possession of a letter from Secretary Acheson to Vincent saying he had done all he could to protect him, but this demotion was the best he could do. I don't know whether this story is true, or not. If Americans are to have any faith at all in their State Department, and if Vincent and Acheson are to be cleared, nothing but the most thorough McCarthyism, and exposure of all pertinent facts, can bring that about.

Going back to China, who planned the Marshall mission to make Chiang take the commies into his government? Maybe, considering how many Communists we have in ours, it all seemed perfectly fair to General Marshall at the time.

And, who wrote the Truman message of December 15, 1945, saying: "No aid to China unless the Communists are taken in." And, who induced General Marshall to put an airtight embargo on all arms and ammunition to Chiang Kai-shek all during 1946, 1947, and 1948—the crucial years? General Marshall, referring to the embargo, is reported to have said: "As Chief of Staff, I armed over 30 Chinese divisions. By a stroke of the pen I have disarmed them."

And, who, just last year, put the ORO, the Operations Research Office of the Department of the Army, under the School of International Studies of John Hopkins University? The ORO is the super-secret research outfit that evaluates the effectiveness of weapons and has first access to all super-secret weapon developments. And, guess who is head of that Hopkins School of International Studies—none other than Owen Lattimore. That was only last year. You seem to have missed out on that one, Senator. Maybe, you cannot cover the whole waterfront. Maybe, we badly need more JOE MCCARTHYS.

I could go on with instances like this all evening, but I'm supposed to talk about China and Korea.

Korea is only a little peninsula that hangs down from Manchuria, which is a part of China. And the story of China cries aloud for some McCarthyism, and also more MacArthurism.

At the end of World War II, America counted 108,000 dead and 350,000 wounded in the Pacific. But we were unconditionally victorious, and the victory was ours, alone. The British and Anzacs had only token forces. The Russians came in only for the last 5 days, to grab what they could. The Chinese fought for 8 years, and suffered fantastic losses, but theirs was mainly a holding action.

The victory was ours. And every one of the billion people of Asia understood it perfectly, even if the American State Department didn't.

Shortly after VJ-day our supreme commander forwarded a report to the War Department, evaluating the armed forces in China. He reported the Chinese Communists had between 125,000 and 250,000 guerrilla troops, badly armed. Under his command were 4,000,000 Chinese regulars, and the American-Chinese Air Force.

He proposed that, with Chinese Government agreement, America guarantee the personal safety of the Communist leaders, and their right to participate as a legal political party in free elections under American supervision, after peace was restored. For this, they were to lay down their arms. If the Communists refused to agree, he proposed that he surround and disarm them by force. Dozens of officials of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and OSS saw that report. Our commander's proposal was exactly in accordance with the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms, for which we claimed to be fighting.

Decision on this report was postponed. The next month, Ambassador Pat Hurley returned, and resigned, for reasons never made public.

General Marshall was appointed, and on December 11 sat down with Dean Acheson to

write out the instructions President Truman was to give him. According to the general's testimony, the rough draft was sent over to this same John Carter Vincent to be polished up. The instructions were the exact opposite of the Supreme Commander's recommendations. They demanded practical control of the Government of China by the Communists, without an election, and while they kept their army.

Right there, a good dose of McCarthyism was needed to find out who overruled the plan to prevent a civil war in China. Was he the same man who now has turned that Chinese civil war that didn't need to happen into a Chinese-American war? And, is he the same man who now ties General MacArthur's hand, so that he may not bomb Manchuria, and so he may not use the troops of Chiang Kai-shek, either in Korea or to establish a second front in China, and who orders the Seventh Fleet to protect the coast of Red China so the oil and cotton and steel and copper and tools and ammunition may flow in to kill our sons in Korea? Just last week, the new commander of the Seventh Fleet, Vice Adm. Harold M. Martin, stated that it was his duty to protect the coast of Red China.

Ever since that December 11, 1945, President Truman, Dean Acheson, and General Marshall have been jointly and separately in complete control of our China policy. The blame, or the credit, for everything from the civil war that didn't need to happen in China to the 60,000 American casualties in the present United Nations civil war in Korea is entirely theirs.

If, like the French, we are not some day to cry out when it is too late, "We are betrayed," then we must have scores of Joe McCarthys in the Senate and a George Washington, or Woodrow Wilson, or Cal Coolidge in the White House to open up the files. We, the people, are the rulers of America. Who are these hired servants who say we may not check on the way they are running and have run our affairs?

We need a million little McCarthys, like you and me, to demand a clean-up that's long overdue, to dig out the facts, to exonerate the innocent, to convict the Soviet agents, and to fire their dupes. Senator, is this a private fight, or can we all get in it, too?

You all know that sometimes in the fall you hear the scurrying of little feet in the walls and attic and find signs of mice in the garret. You may not see any mice to point at, but you know they are there, and you set the traps or call in the exterminators.

The sign of mice or rats are apparent all over our national structure. Due to congressional pressure, a couple of the rats named by Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley were finally convicted, 11 years too late. But more than 30 others named by Chambers and Bentley have not even been arrested and are going about their regular business. And their regular business is bad business for us.

Just one illustration of what they put over is Gen. Omar Bradley's statement of no aid to Chiang Kai-shek. He says if we arm Chiang's forces and land them on the beaches they'll go right over to the Communists. Here is General Bradley, a good American, with no personal knowledge of China, being hoodwinked into a complete Communist-line statement. The facts are simple, and his own Intelligence Department must have them, but somebody is keeping them from him.

The facts are that all but a few thousand local volunteers of Chiang's 700,000 troops on Formosa are mainland boys. They fought their way, short of arms, and practically without ammunition, to coastal ports in 1949, when the Nationalists were overwhelmed. I saw some of these men being landed when I was in Formosa in July 1949. Wounded, sick, defeated, in rags, they had fought their way out. Yet, somebody makes General Bradley believe that they would go over to the Communists now. Because of this theory, we won't let any anti-Communist Chinese fight on our side. It looks like a very exclusive war out there—for Americans only.

While we wait and do nothing, the rats are double-crossing our sons fighting in Korea; they are double-crossing the only native anti-Communist armed force in all East Asia—the 700,000 men and 2,000,000 guerrillas of Chiang Kai-shek. And they are preparing a slow-appeasement deal in the UN, while they tie General MacArthur's hands behind him, and now gag him besides.

It's high time to set plenty of traps and also to call in that famous firm of rat exterminators, the Messrs. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and company.

Who Is Responsible for Our Far-Eastern Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question has been properly raised as to who is actually responsible for our far-eastern policy. Time and again it has been apparent that some of our supposed allies have shown a desire to appease Red China. In many instances it has gone beyond appeasement and taken on the aspect of actual help. Recognition of Red China by Great Britain, the shipment of strategic material, even the sending of jet engines to Russia, and many other acts of similar character by nations members of the United Nations have made our war in Korea more difficult, is undisputed. Thus, the question naturally arises to what extent has foreign influence brought about a willingness upon the part of our administration to participate in the appeasement policy toward Red China.

Two editorials appearing today in the News, Washington, D. C., shed some light on this important question I include them as a part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted to me. They read as follows:

LONDON-MADE POLICIES

Two basic issues were involved in the controversy which led to President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur:

1. The restrictions which compelled the general to conduct a war of limited operations against Red China.

2. The relative importance of Asia in the conflict with communism.

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway is a thoroughly capable officer. But his Korean command wears the same handcuffs that chafed General MacArthur.

The President is gambling on the assumption that peace can be achieved by letting the Chinese Reds off with an easy war. The politicians in Washington, London, and New Delhi are to have their inning before further consideration is given to the question of pushing the war to a successful military conclusion.

Meanwhile, Mr. Truman is risking fearful odds in not reinforcing our troops to meet the enemy's spring offensive, if pending peace proposals fail. A bad guess could lead to a military catastrophe. Adequate insurance should be taken so that our forces are not caught in a trap.

The issue between General MacArthur and the State Department on our policy in Asia involves the security of the United States in a much larger field.

In making the original decision to resist the Red attack in South Korea, President Truman apparently intended to extend the Atlantic Pact doctrine to the Pacific area by drawing a line against Communist aggression everywhere. The United Nations supported that position when it adopted military sanctions against the invading Communists.

The British Foreign Office, however, persuaded the State Department to scrap that policy in favor of one of appeasement the moment Red China entered the war.

Britain traditionally has regarded Asia as a field for commercial exploitation, and has relatively little concern for the welfare of the Asiatic peoples. Against that background it is understandable why an impoverished Britain, now governed by a Pacifist-Socialist regime, should adopt a one-ocean defense program in the search for a cheap and limited security. But how can any American statesman or military leader defend such a strategic concept for a country which has both Pacific and Atlantic coasts?

General MacArthur raised this question again and again without getting a satisfactory answer.

Three years ago, Secretary of State Acheson dismissed the idea of a Pacific defense pact as "premature." Since that time the State Department has accepted the Downing Street thesis that Europe should have first priority in all measures adopted to contain communism, despite the fact that it was in Asia where we first became involved in World War II. And despite the fact that we are now engaged in a shooting war in Asia.

Britain has lost most of her great Indian Empire, so today is willing to trade Formosa to the Reds in the hope of buying immunity for her crown colony at Hong Kong. In General MacArthur's view—and who knows the Pacific area better?—Formosa is as important to us as France when American security is considered. The Japanese used Formosa as the springboard for their attack on the Philippines, and Formosa could serve the same purpose for the Reds. American policy should not be made in London on this matter.

In the present discussion of a Japanese peace settlement, the British want to impose restrictions upon Japanese shipping, because the two countries are competitors in that field. Again, however, American interests are in the other direction, for we are underwriting the Japanese economy until it can become self-sustaining.

These considerations would suggest that the British attitude toward General MacArthur was not due solely to differences of opinion with respect to the Korean War.

And now who is left to speak up for American interests?

THEY KNOW THEIR STUFF

It is interesting that the State Department saw fit to inform the Indian Embassy in Washington of General MacArthur's dismissal a full hour before the news was released to the American public.

Mme. Pandit, India's Ambassador to this country, disclosed that—not without a note of pride. She told a radio interviewer that the news was conveyed to me at midnight. Americans could wait.

The anti-MacArthur State Department knew, of course, that Socialist Prime Minister Nehru's India would be delighted with the advance tip.

Nehru's country has been consistently on the side of Red China, whose forces are

fighting the MacArthur-led American troops in Korea. India looks upon General MacArthur as the bogeyman of western imperialism. And only the other day Nehru, out of his vast knowledge of such matters, said it was a mistake to let military commanders make policy statements. Meaning, General MacArthur ought to be kicked out.

We wonder whether the busy little beavers of the State Department were equally prompt in phoning the Free China Embassy. It's doubtful. There wouldn't be any chance of mutual congratulations in that quarter.

Correcting an Injustice to Fred Searls, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, recently Representative ENGLE, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, criticized Mr. Fred Searls, Jr., in connection with his services as assistant to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization.

As Mr. Searls was never given the opportunity to be heard by the committee, I am including in my remarks copy of letter directed by Mr. Searls to the Honorable JOHN R. MURDOCK, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and a letter from Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, former War Mobilization Director, under whom Mr. Searls served. It appears to me that an injustice has been done a man who has served his country unselfishly, patriotically and well, and I want the record to show it. The letters follow:

NEWMONT MINING CORP.,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1951.

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Current daily papers of New York and Washington have carried statements that Representative ENGLE of your committee has called for my resignation or at least attributed my recent resignation as Assistant to the Director of Defense Mobilization to improper conduct in my position. I understand that it is charged that I have used my position to benefit the Newmont Mining Corp. of which I am president, while opposing proposed subsidies under the Defense Act to other mining companies or individuals.

Inasmuch as your committee had requested me to testify today in respect to those matters, I had expected to use the opportunity to refute such charges and to defend my views. Since you have now canceled the hearing, and left me no opportunity to defend myself, I am using this letter as a means of doing so and respectfully request that you make it a part of the permanent public record of the committee.

At the request of Mr. Wilson and General Clay, who is a friend of mine from the last war, I entered the service of the Office of Defense Mobilization on December 27, 1950.

Prior to entering the service, I advised Mr. Wilson and General Clay that the only possible reason I could think of for not complying with their request, was that I understood that the Magma Copper Co., in which Newmont owned at that time and still owns a share interest of about 22 percent, had been requested by the Defense Minerals Administration to equip its San Manuel property; and that a negotiation was being had, with which, however, I had had no contact or connection. I also explained that I had never been an officer or director of Magma Copper Co. Mr. Wilson and General Clay stated they could see no objection to my aiding them in the capacity of an adviser on materials. I have had no contact of any kind with such negotiations in Washington, New York, or elsewhere.

General Clay further explained that I would probably not have any direct responsibility or connection with the negotiations for expanding domestic mineral production, anyway, because under the set-up and regulations, these matters would be in the hands of DMA, unless some dispute arose or some question requiring Mr. Wilson's attention was brought up. I have had no connection or even discussion regarding the various projects for expansion of domestic mineral production, except to deliver to Mr. Boyd and Mr. Larson—on one occasion—an expression of anxiety on the part of Mr. Wilson that the aluminum expansion contracts were not proceeding fast enough.

I have, as a result of experience in the last war, been opposed to subsidies being paid to marginal mines and undeveloped prospects during the periods of full employment, believing that the desired end is not accomplished by these measures. My testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has apparently been made available to Mr. ENGLE, sets forth the loss in total nonferrous production which occurred during the last period of subsidies.

The desired end could be very much better accomplished by minor changes in the tax laws to permit "expensing" of exploration development by mining companies, and in the case of small mines and small deposits, to permit an easy write-off of losses incurred by owners or participants in development when efforts to develop and operate incur losses. In this connection the recommendations of the American Mining Congress should be given serious consideration.

While in Washington I wrote a letter to Mr. Harrison, of the DPA, and discussed with Mr. Boyd, of the DMA, these ideas. Neither of them agreed with me to the point of believing that subsidies to domestic marginal mines and prospects could be avoided. Whereupon I dropped the matter, except that I also tried to explain my position in this respect to the Senate Committee on Internal and Insular Affairs on February 13.

I resigned from the Office of Defense Mobilization because the business of my company required my constant presence. My resignation was before, and not because of, the criticism of your committee.

I have cleared the above statements with Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who authorizes me to state that he will confirm them to the committee if requested.

Mr. ENGLE is also quoted as having lifted out of its context a sentence in my testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to the effect that "any type of subsidy for the mining industry is objectionable." I think it is. I also think all controls are objectionable. But that does not mean that we do not have to have some forms of both in wartime. The testimony as a whole, however (cf. pp. 258, 279 et seq. of the record), recognizes that the Government must accord some sort of financial aid to concerns who are required to alter normal plans and procedure in favor of expedited expansion of facilities and production required to meet wartime needs.

What I fear, and am on record as opposing, is the sudden revival and reopening during a period of short labor supply, of hundreds of marginal mines and prospects. Such projects are too likely to be affected by the fact that "The squeaky wheel gets the grease," with the inevitable result that the more marginal the mine, the bigger the subsidy and the smaller the production. With a fairly constant mine labor supply, there could be a serious drop in production, as bad or worse than in 1944 to 1946.

In conclusion, permit me to ask that you give me the break of believing that I have at all times endeavored to give the Government, honestly and sincerely, the benefit (or detriment if that is the opinion of the committee) of my views on the subject under discussion. I yield to no one in my desire and in the somewhat successful efforts of my company to increase mineral production. We are all Americans and we are in trouble. Congressional committees should not be so ready to impugn the integrity of experienced and willing contributors to the defense effort as to make it impossible to attract them.

I believe that the country's interest will be best served if the Congress will pass a law which will lay down the procedure to be followed, rather than to leave it permissive, and subject to debate amongst the interested agencies. I would like to persuade the committee to go the tax change route, but I pledge myself and our company to follow, as we always have, the legislation that is finally passed.

I append my record of Government service.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SEARLS, Jr.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE OF FRED SEARLS, JR.

September 1940–November 1941: British Purchasing Commission.

November 1941–April 1942: Civilian consultant, Ammunition Division, Ordnance.

April–October 1942: Executive Assistant to Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration.

October 1942–February 1943: Director of Facilities Bureau, War Production Board.

February 1942–February 1943: member, Planning Committee, War Production Board.

February–June 1943: Executive Assistant to Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration.

June 1943–May 1944: Assistant to Director, Office of War Mobilization.

November 1944: Strategic-bombing survey inspection of European targets.

December 1944 to about October 1945: Assistant to Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

October 1945–November 1946: Special Assistant to the Secretary of State.

March–October 1946: President's Evaluation Commission, Atomic Bomb Tests.

March 1946–January 1947: United States delegation to the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy.

December 1947–January 1948: Ruhr survey for General Clay.

March 1948: National Security Resources Board.

December 1948: German-war-potential report.

December 1950–March 7, 1951: Office of Defense Mobilization.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbia, April 11, 1951.

Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: Fred Searls, Jr., president of Newmont Mining Corp., served in my office during the war while I was Director of War Mobilization.

He is one of the finest characters I have ever known. He served as my representative with the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in many other capacities. When I became Secretary of State, he again helped me in my efforts to negotiate for bases in foreign countries.

Recently, Representative ENGLE, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs criticized Mr. Searls in connection

with his service as assistant to Charles E. Wilson. Searls has written to Chairman MURDOCK a letter, copy of which is enclosed. Because a meeting at which Searls was to testify was canceled and he has had no opportunity to defend himself against the criticism of Congressman ENGLE, he has requested me to have some friend in the House insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should appreciate it if you would do this.

My experience with Searls causes me to say that I will vouch for the truthfulness of any statement he makes in this or in any other communication. Furthermore, I know that while serving various agencies during World War II, he frequently advocated policies he believed advantageous to the Government when it was against his financial interest. He is one man who always places the interest of his country above his personal interest.

With best wishes to you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many Members who were seeking recognition, among them many who had not heretofore had an opportunity to express themselves in regard to the provisions of the bill under consideration, and since my position on this legislation is so well known that I have yielded to my colleagues who have just come to the Congress.

However, Mr. Speaker, I might reiterate, just for the record at this time that, since I have been a Member of Congress I have consistently worked for the building up of the national defense of our country, and especially have I supported universal military training.

Universal military training was a part of the original bill when introduced, and I am sorry to say that while I do not agree to the "watered down" provisions of the bill under the amendments presented, this provision is better than no provision at all for universal military training.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when legislation was reported out of the Armed Services Committee some years ago I was the only member who introduced discharge petitions to force the Rules Committee to report out these bills for consideration by the Congress.

It will be recalled that I introduced a discharge petition on the bill by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], as also I introduced a discharge petition on the legislation on the bill by the distinguished Member from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Unfortunately, neither of the bills above referred to were ever dislodged from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, with full respect for the members of the Rules Committee, I feel that they were sincere in their position; however, I feel that a great mistake was made which is borne out by the situation which we face today.

Communist Daily Worker Cheers the Firing of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, April 11, 1951, was a great day for the Communists. With tremendous jubilation they shouted their delight in the elimination of their most formidable opponent in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The Communist Daily Worker, quickly able to recognize the discharge of MacArthur as the abject act of appeasement that it was, shouted in the largest size type available "Now End the War." Not since Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich proclaiming "peace in our time" has the world been witness to such a disgraceful abandonment of the hopes of millions of people for liberation from their tyranny.

I include herewith articles which appeared in the Communist Daily Worker of April 12, 1951:

NOW END THE WAR

A tremendous feeling of gratification will be felt all over the Nation today that the war-hungry General MacArthur who called openly for world war III has been fired by the Government.

With the firing of this arrogant militarist, the peace camp of the world has won an important gain which opens up very great opportunities to advance the cause of peace.

MacArthur is out.

Now the war in Korea must be ditched as well.

The men who pushed the United States into the suicidal invasion of Korea in June 1950 betrayed the Nation. They are responsible for the 60,000 American casualties, and the more than 1,000,000 Korean dead and wounded men, women, and children.

If it was a betrayal of America to start the war against Korea, it is equally a betrayal to continue it another single day, with all its horror, devastation, and useless massacre of innocent people.

In firing MacArthur, President Truman has not ordered General Ridgway to cease the bloodletting. On the contrary, General Ridgway has just announced that he wants more war in Korea, that it "cannot be called off like a baseball game." He has also announced that he looks toward a world war with the socialist states of which the Korean slaughter was merely "the first round."

All Americans who rejoice today that the war incendiary MacArthur is out owe it to themselves to put enormous public pressure on the Government to negotiate for peace in Asia with China, and for peace in Europe with the Soviet Union.

It was Truman who gave MacArthur his orders for war in Korea; it was Truman who ordered the seizure of Chinese Taiwan (Formosa). It is Truman and Eisenhower who will seek the rearming of the Nazi war leaders in West Germany. These dangers still face America. In fact, under the inevitable howl of rage from the Taft-Hearst-MacArthur forces against the Government, President Truman now will seek to prove to those groups that the basic Washington-Wall Street program for "war against communism" on a world scale is not only unchanged but will be pressed more than ever.

Why did MacArthur have to go? Because he was embarrassing the Government before the world with his open demands for starting world war III immediately in Asia.

The Government's plan for world domination rests on the rearming of German Fascist war power, with Europe as the planned main battlefield. MacArthur would not accept this variant of the basic strategy.

By revealing the Government's goal to a world war, MacArthur was exposing the Truman government before the world. The Atlantic Pact was beginning to burst at the seams as Britain and France saw MacArthur pushing them into a vast colonial war against all of Asia.

The British and French capitalist classes know they cannot win such a war against all of Asia; they know they could not persuade the people of Western Europe to follow them into it. MacArthur was making it impossible for the prowar governments in West Europe to hide their aims from their restless and angry populations.

The military failure of the MacArthur-Dulles-Truman war in Korea is a failure of the political aims of the Government in Asia. It has been proved beyond all doubt that the aggressive aims of the Washington-Wall Street leadership in Asia cannot overcome the overwhelming resistance of the Asian people now striking out for their national freedom. The heroic Korean and Chinese people proved that. India knows it. Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, Burma, etc., all know it.

In preparing for world domination via Europe, the Government hopes to cover up this growing crisis in its policy of rejecting an American-Soviet peace agreement. But the fatal weaknesses in this pro-Fascist prowar plan will become just as stark in West Europe as they have been revealed in Asia.

The popular applause approving the dismissal of MacArthur arises from the profound mass yearning for peace in Korea, and for a genuine peace negotiation with the Soviet Union.

That yearning for peace must not be betrayed or deceived. It must not be bullied into silence by the ragings of the pro-MacArthur forces clamoring for war against China; it must not be silent while the Truman Government refuses to settle with Peoples China and the Soviet Union as great powers on an equal footing.

There is no question that there are millions of Americans passionately eager for peace, disgusted with the whole Truman-led war in Korea, who have been sold the view that the way to peace lies along the line preached by MacArthur-Taft-Hoover. We need solidarity with these fellow-Americans on the common desire for peace, even though we must convince them that the MacArthur-Taft path, no less than Truman's, leads to the war they fear. Millions applaud Truman's action because they want peace; millions denounce Truman out of the same desire for peace. The desire for peace should unite them all.

Common sense and the national interest demand that President Truman return Formosa to its rightful owner, China; that a cease fire in Korea be immediately established with negotiations for the rapid withdrawal of all non-Korean forces, leaving the Korean people to decide their own destiny. China must be admitted to the UN. Instead of the continuing Washington sabotage of an agreement with the Soviet Union at the Paris Big Four ministers conference, the Nation should insist on real negotiations for a peaceful, united Germany, for disarmament, and for outlawing the A-bomb with UN inspection. Our country should enter into a Five Power Peace Pact with the Soviet Union.

The Communists were among the first to demand the recall of MacArthur as a menace to America and world peace; this was a patriotic service for which they were reviled and smeared. But events have proved them right.

The job now is for all Americans, regardless of their views on many issues, to unite now to press forward the gain which the peace camp and the American people have achieved. This must be the swift ending of the suicidal, criminal sacrifice of our American boys in a war against the freedom-seeking Korean people.

End the Korean War at once!

PEACE GROUP SAYS: "QUIT KOREA"

Organizations dedicated to peace yesterday urged President Truman to follow up his recall of General MacArthur by ending the Korean War and initiating a big-power conference to end all exsting differences. The American Peace Crusade, in a wire to Truman, declared:

"Long overdue removal of General MacArthur opens new opportunity to end bloody Korean conflict. Urge you heed the hopes of millions of Americans by initiating immediate negotiations for peaceful settlement in Korea and withdrawal of United States troops. Urge further that you instruct Ambassador Jessup at Deputy Foreign Ministers' Conference in Paris to use this moment of high hope for peace to reach effective agreement with Soviet Union and other nations leading to long-term peaceful relations on world scale."

Former Congressman Vito Marcantonio, ALP State chairman, said:

"The order dismissing General MacArthur was signed by President Truman, but dictated by the American people.

"The White House has had to recognize the meaning of mail to Congressmen and the President, which is running 100 to 1 in favor of bringing the boys home from Korea and stopping the senseless slaughter by immediate negotiations for peace. From the homes, the farms, the shops, the factories of our land comes the urgent mandate that now is the great moment to end the hostilities and to substitute the conference table for bloody battlefields in the settlement of differences.

"The dismissal of General MacArthur is a great victory for the millions of Americans and for the people all over the world who want peace. His plans for deliberately spreading the area of combat and for lighting a fuse on an atomic world war must be decisively and unconditionally dismissed, along with himself.

"A change in military commanders is not enough.

"There must be a change—sincere, prompt, and effective—in the whole bipartisan policy of war. There must be a halt to the scuttling of the four-power peace conference now going on, and a genuine effort at peaceful negotiation must be begun.

"We call upon President Truman to dismiss the program for war and to install a program for peace."

LABOR PLEA

The text of a wire to President Truman by the New York Labor Conference for Peace, signed by Samuel Freedman, chairman, read:

"We are convinced that the great majority of the American people approve your action in relieving General MacArthur of his command. The removal of General MacArthur who not only blocked settlement of the Korean war but also sought to spread the war to China, should be followed by an immediate peaceful settlement of the war in Korea. We trade unionists urge you to take steps now to initiate peace negotiations to bring about an end to the war in Korea and the return home of the American troops.

"This occasion also offers a new opportunity to call a conference of Britain, France, Soviet Union, China, and United States to discuss settling all existing international differences."

PROGRESSIVE PARTY

A statement by Progressive Party leaders Elmer A. Benson, chairman, and C. B. Baldwin, secretary, said:

"The dismissal of General MacArthur by the President is a significant victory for the peace forces of this Nation and the world. At every important step, General MacArthur's statements have been designed to prevent peace and widen the war in Asia. The American people want not only the dismissal of a general but an end to the tragic war in Korea that he prolonged.

"This step can be the beginning of the road to real peace which the American people are demanding. What is necessary now is to initiate negotiations for a settlement in Korea, to carry out the conference of Foreign Ministers, and to stop the rearming of Germany.

"The American people will not be misled by any Taft-Hoover-Wherry partisan sideshow over MacArthur's dismissal for they recognize that it is his policies which have led to the tragic consequences in Korea. The American people reject the administration's substitute of arming Europe for war. They demand peace first—either war in Asia, or rearming of Europe."

Thousands of telegrams were pouring in at the White House, among them one from CIO President Philip Murray congratulating the President and predicting that the "overwhelming mass of American citizens" will support his action.

NOW OUST WAR POLICY

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, yesterday issued the following comment on the removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by President Truman:

"The long overdue ouster of the ultra-warmonger, General MacArthur, Caesar of the Pacific, must be more than a change of command. The people should demand that it be the first step in swiftly negotiating an end to the Korean War, returning our boys, making peace in the Far East and re-creating the United Nations in the spirit of the UN Charter by inclusion of People's China. The American people desire profoundly to avert world war III. They are striving not only to silence and shackle the more open and rabid exponents of a preventive war now, but more and more are moving in opposition to the Truman-Dulles bipartisan war policies which led to the Korean War and which, if unchecked, will lead to an atomic world war.

"In short, the people want peace not only in Asia but in the whole world. They don't want world war III ignited in Asia by a MacArthur or in Europe by an Eisenhower.

"The real issue today is not an Asia first war vs. a Europe first war. The real issue is world war or world peace.

"Peace supporters, regardless of political differences or past prejudices, must seize this unique moment to intervene. They should act unitedly not only to end the bloodletting in the Far East but to relieve war tensions everywhere. That requires that the American people and labor in the first instance press for: the success of the current Paris Foreign Deputies Conference, negotiations for a five-power peace pact, and a return to the Roosevelt 'grand design' of big power unity with its keystone of American-Soviet friendship."

GOOD RIDDANCE TO MACARTHUR

(By William Z. Foster)

The forced retirement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his position as Mikado and general imperialist dictator in the Far East will be welcomed with a sense of relief by the peace forces all over the world. MacArthur's whole course, especially since the outbreak of the war in Korea, has been to spread the war in Asia and thus to precipitate a third world war. His steps in this general direction have been bold, brazen, and unmistakable.

All over the world there has been a rising demand for the removal of this arch warmonger and firebrand. From day to day the peoples of all countries have feared that this fanatical imperialist, upon his own initiative, would arbitrarily bomb China or take some other brutal and irresponsible steps that would plunge the world irretrievably into a disastrous holocaust. The peoples will hail his removal as a victory for peace.

That the world-wide protest of the peoples had much to do with MacArthur's being fired unceremoniously is indisputable. But it would be the gravest kind of a mistake to conclude therefrom, that the war danger is now past and that peace is assured.

The actuality of the situation is that the quarrel between Truman and MacArthur is not over whether or not there should be a war. Both of them are warmongers, and their dispute is as to where the war should be made to begin. MacArthur is one of that powerful group of imperialists, especially supported by the Republican Party, who want to start the great conflagration by attempting the conquest of Asia. Whereas Truman, an even more powerful spokesman for Wall Street than MacArthur, voices the demand of those monopolists, who hold that the conquest of the world must start with the overrunning of Europe.

Truman was also moved to fire MacArthur from fear that the latter's bull-in-the-chinashop aggressions would break up the imperialist war alliance that is being so carefully built up by the State Department.

Instead, therefore, of the Truman administration utilizing the removal of the jingo MacArthur to establish world peace, it will aim to put more steam into its campaign to militarize the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany, and thus to prepare even more frenziedly for a clash in Europe with the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. At the same time, but as a subordinate part of its strategy, Truman will strive to defeat People's China and all other democratic forces in Asia.

This is no occasion, therefore, for the forces of peace to fall victims to peace illusions regarding President Truman. Instead, the peace forces, who have raised their voices so sharply in the MacArthur incident, should now press harder than ever to have the Korean war ended with a democratic peace. They should also demand emphatically that the four-power conference now going on in Paris be the opening door to a real easing of the present dangerous world tensions. As things stand now, the Paris meeting is being sabotaged by the State Department, which in no sense wants a democratic peace settlement with the U. S. S. R.

Good riddance to MacArthur. All peace-loving people may well rejoice at his being fired. But if his displacement is to be made into a real step toward world peace, this can be done only by sailing into the Hoovers, Tafts, McCarthys, and Knowlands who are backing him, and especially by defeating the militaristic plans of the even larger menace of war represented by the Truman administration itself.

The Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable time consumed on the

discussion of the draft bill. I have been surprised that there seems to be very little consideration being given to what we are doing to the morale of the people affected. In my opinion the following letter shows that we must give our boys more protection during the training period:

Dear Mr. AYRES: Mrs. B——— and myself returned last evening from visiting our only child, a boy 19, who is in the Air Force, stationed at Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss. What we saw in and around Biloxi is hard to believe.

Gambling joints run wide open, with soldiers in uniform losing their paltry few dollars at dice tables and roulette wheels.

Although I understand Mississippi is a dry State, bars and saloons operate just as openly as they do here in Akron. I saw many a young boy in uniform who obviously could not have been over 18 or 19 buying liquor at these bars with no questions asked.

Wherever you go in Biloxi there are hundreds of slot machines all openly displayed.

It is obvious that such a condition could not exist without the connivance of local enforcement officers, and while I can understand crooked enforcement officers, I cannot understand how the Air Force tolerates such a condition.

There are 40,000 young men in this camp with thousands continuously passing through and the moral effect upon them must be tremendous. Most of them are away from home for the first time in new and strange surroundings and instead of being treated the way they are entitled to be treated, they are being victimized wherever they turn.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PENNSYLVANIA FEDERATION OF
YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS,
April 7, 1951.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT: Now that the universal military training bill is currently being debated in the House of Representatives, I felt that you might like to know that the Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republican Clubs stands in favor of the establishment of universal military training.

At our most recent convention, the federation went on record as recommending "the establishment of universal military training so that young Americans will be properly prepared to serve their country in the armed services if needed; and to prevent the unnecessary casualties which are inherent in untrained troops."

The above resolution is by action of our complete convention and not just the board of directors. We are bringing this to your attention for whatever effect it might have on your decision in the current debate.

If the Young Republicans can be of any assistance to you, don't fail to call on us.

Sincerely,

K. L. SHIRK, Jr.,
Chairman.

LANCASTER, PA.

MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the April 12, 1951, issue of the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat:

MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Seldom has American public opinion been so sharply divided as on the MacArthur issue, climaxed yesterday by President Truman's order that the recalcitrant general be removed immediately from his Far East commands. With some, regrettably, the issue involves politics, and that angle will be pursued relentlessly, we can be assured, to the end that the general may come home to blast the administration in public statements and addresses which may well figure in the 1952 election. But for most the issue is this:

Was General MacArthur right or wrong in departing from his responsibility as a military commander to express sentiments on foreign policy and strategy that ran counter to those of the UN, the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department? Was he right or wrong when he became a self-appointed diplomat, over and above his duties as the commander of the United Nations forces in Korea?

With full appreciation of the General's high qualifications as a soldier and his eminent success in the rehabilitation of Japan, this newspaper believes the drastic action by the President was justified.

MacArthur was guilty of insubordination, which cannot be tolerated within the military set-up. He deliberately assumed authority in a field which was not his to command—the making of foreign policy. He violated the explicit orders of his Commander in Chief, a procedure he would not have countenanced for a minute by his subordinates. He flouted his superior command not once, but many times, and after several warnings.

He would have been removed months ago had not the President, with a wary regard for the political dynamite in such action, been well aware of the explosive content in the emotions of the American citizens. Now he has taken the long step with reluctance. MacArthur was and is on all counts the "hottest potato" Mr. Truman has been called on to handle.

General MacArthur expects to return to the States within 3 weeks. He may address a joint session of Congress and air his views on the entire Far East situation. His remarks, to Congress or otherwise, will attract the serious attention of every American citizen, and may serve to clarify White House thinking, or at least put its Korean policy in sharper focus. As a retired Army officer, he can speak without restraint—and doubtless will.

The most unfortunate aspect of the controversy is that in many respects the program which MacArthur championed, in defiance of the President, was realistic and logical. He would have been no soldier at all had he not chafed at the restrictions imposed on him in fighting the Reds in Korea. He was not permitted to bomb the supply concentrations of the enemy.

His UN directives were vague, never clearly detailed. He knew that a stalemate at the thirty-eighth parallel settled nothing, yet when he called for reinforcements to exploit the gains made in recent months, he was denied them. He wished to employ the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa, either in Korea or in an assault on the Chinese mainland, but Washington did not approve.

This newspaper believes he was in error in stating that the place for a showdown with Russia is in Asia, that Europe is secondary.

But above all, there can be no denial that the general was the spectacular victim of a White House-State Department foreign policy that has been consistently inconsistent and vacillating. Neither MacArthur nor the American people have ever been clearly advised as to the precise program the administration has fixed for Far East operations. Mr. Truman has repeatedly sought refuge in the United Nations when a forthright decision was required—and the impotent UN, timid and unenthusiastic, sat on its hands while the situation worsened.

The UN never had much stomach for the Korean "police action." And when MacArthur became a problem child who threatened to involve the UN in a world war by operations against the stooges of Moscow, the Red Chinese, Great Britain, and France, in particular, were apprehensive and called for caution. Well they knew that if the United States went to war against Russia in the Orient, we would not have enough men or matériel to do a good job of helping defend West Europe against Communist aggression. Presumably the President was influenced by British and French representations, and for good reason.

Technically, when the UN was committed to action in Korea, the war should have been directed by its Security Council. But this was impossible while Russia had a seat on that Council. Hence, the United States was given the job in view of our leadership in securing UN approval of the aggressor resolution and the preponderance of our commitments in men and matériel to that area. MacArthur's appointment was in line with that agreement.

But notwithstanding the frustration that plagued MacArthur, his conviction that our Far East policy was bungled and unrealistic, he was a soldier, subject to the same fundamentals of discipline as any private in the ranks. When he gave a command, it was obeyed or else. When he received a command, it was his duty to obey or take the consequences.

We understand that General Eisenhower, while in supreme command in Europe in the last war, did not approve of many things he was asked to do. Certainly, for instance, he believed the western allies should have been permitted to occupy Berlin instead of allowing the Russians to take it over, with results we all know. But Eisenhower had his orders and he followed them. MacArthur had his orders and he flouted them.

We by no means agree that the White House-State Department policy for the Far East has been without fault. Neither the President nor Secretary Acheson at any time have indicated they knew where they were going or how they expected to get there, and we can imagine MacArthur's soul-writhing because of his conviction that he knew best.

But something that was earmarked as policy had the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, both in superior command to MacArthur, and what they ordered he should have done his best to carry out. The proper place for him to lodge his protests was with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, and it is their ultimate responsibility if they ignored him and adopted a plan that proved to be wrong.

Flamboyant critical statements from the battlefield, letters home to sympathetic friends who made them public, proposals to negotiate with the enemy at a time when, so the President says, the UN was well along toward an understanding with Red China—all these are extracurricular procedures which

are not a military prerogative. If every general in a war disdains orders and operates on his own and as he thinks best, the end result could be disaster.

The chain reaction of the MacArthur dismissal will be heard for many months. The general, now released from all restrictions, may be expected to speak his piece to the American public. He will have ample help in and outside Congress.

Basically the general would expand the war, make the Far East the chief area of combat, as against the UN policy of isolating Korea and concentrating on the defense of Europe. It is difficult to see how those who agree with MacArthur that the war must be carried to China can in the same breath declare that his program must be followed to save the further slaughter of American soldiers.

General MacArthur makes his exit after 48 years in the Army service of his country. His achievements in the Pacific were historic; he was a brilliant occupation commander in Japan. It is unfortunate that he is compelled to quit under tortured circumstances.

President Truman's Speech on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night, April 14, 1951, a great Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner was held at the National Guard Armory in Washington, D. C. Many outstanding speeches were delivered on this occasion. I include herewith the unselfish and courageous remarks of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri:

My fellow Americans, this is a meeting of Democrats. More important than that, it is a meeting of Americans. It is a meeting of Americans who put the welfare of their country first.

This is a time when all Americans should put their country first. This is no time for business as usual—or for politics as usual.

There are some people, I am sorry to say, who are playing petty politics right now with the future of the country and the peace of the world. These people seem to think that it is more important to win the next election than it is to prevent another world war. I don't want any Democrat to have such ideas.

I want every Democrat to put patriotism above politics.

Our country is in deadly danger. We face a powerful and ruthless enemy. The only way we can prevail over that enemy is for every man and woman in this country to put national interest above personal interest.

What we are trying to do is to establish peace in the world. And the only way you can have peace in the world is to bring about international law and order.

The men we are honoring here tonight—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson—knew that.

In their day, the United States was small and weak.

Nevertheless, Jefferson and Jackson stood up for international law and order. They worked for peace, but they would not stoop to appeasement. They knew that the United States could not be safe unless it was willing to fight for what was right.

When Jefferson was President our merchant ships were attacked by the Barbary pirates who ruled the north coast of Africa. These pirates lived by robbery and human slavery. They were collecting huge sums of money in tribute from European nations. Then the Barbary pirates began to demand that the United States pay them millions of dollars for leaving our ships alone. They were arrogant and they were brutal, and they got away with it until someone finally stood up against them.

Jefferson decided to put a stop to the whole thing. He knew that there were times when a country has to fight against international crime. He sent the United States Navy to Africa. He sent the marines ashore at Tripoli. He carried the battle to the enemy nearly 5,000 miles away from the United States.

We smashed the power of those bandits, and we won the praise and gratitude of the world. The Pope at that time, Pius VII, declared, "the American commander, with a small force and in a short space of time, has done more for the cause of Christianity than the most powerful nations of Christendom have done for ages."

Jefferson did not believe this Nation could submit to pirates, and neither do we.

Now, as then, there is no room for piracy in a free world.

Now, as then, there are times when our country has to fight for law and order.

Today, however, the danger we face is not just a gang of pirates in one part of the world.

It is a danger that threatens every nation on earth, every religious faith, every home, and every person in this land. It is the danger that arises from the plans of the Kremlin to conquer the civilized world.

The rulers of the Kremlin have abandoned any serious attempt to improve the lives of the people they control. They are taking the men and women and the resources under their control and welding them into a mighty machine for war and conquest.

They think they can divide the democratic nations and overthrow them one by one.

If they can do that, they will succeed in isolating and surrounding the United States.

Then we should either have to fight a terrible war, against great odds—or yield to the demands of the Kremlin.

Either alternative would be a desperate one.

We must meet this threat just as firmly as Jefferson met the threat of the Barbary pirates.

There is no higher purpose to which we can dedicate ourselves as Democrats and Americans.

For 5 years, we have been checking and countering the threats of Communist expansion—all around the world. We have been helping to strengthen free nations to stand up and resist this pressure. Our policy thwarted the Soviet master plan of expansion. So the Communist leaders reported to open aggression.

This called for a show-down.

The free world gave its answer.

We went to the defense of Korea.

When we did that, nearly everyone in the United States approved. Nearly everyone but the Communists agreed that it was the only thing to do. But now, there are people who say we should not have done it. There are people who say we should get out of Korea.

These people are making a terrible mistake.

They think that we could stop the fight if we got out of Korea. That is not true.

If we got out of Korea, the Communist leaders would strike somewhere else. They would strike at Japan, or the Middle East, or in Europe.

And sooner or later they would go on to strike at South America, and at our own country.

We do not have a choice between fighting in Korea or not fighting at all. Our choice lies between fighting in Korea or fighting somewhere else—somewhere more difficult—and probably somewhere closer to home.

Our struggle against aggression in Korea has had profound effects.

First, it is preventing our Communist enemy from carrying out his plans. By fighting in Korea, we have kept the rulers of the Kremlin from conquering other countries on their list.

Second, it has given the free world warning, and time to begin building up its own defenses. Our struggle has made it clear, not only here, but abroad, that the free world must prepare to defend itself.

Third, our firm stand in Korea has placed a great strain on the whole system of dictatorship. Dictatorships cannot survive continued reverses. Cracks are already beginning to appear in the structure of international communism.

I do not want to hear anyone say that our effort in Korea has been wasted. Our men there have been fighting for you and for me—for everyone of us—for our homes, our futures, and the future of our children—just as surely as if they were fighting on our own soil.

They are fighting in Korea to save us from having to fight on our own soil.

They are fighting to prevent the sacrifices and suffering of a third world war.

It is important to remember that our purpose in Korea is to stop the world war that would result if Communist aggression were to go unchecked. Our purpose is to restore peace.

If the Communist leaders have learned the lesson that aggression will not be tolerated by the free nations of the world, it should be possible to reach a peaceful settlement in Korea.

But it must be settled on a basis that will protect the objectives for which the United Nations are fighting.

To reach such a settlement, the Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders must abandon their aggression.

On that point there can be no compromise.

We will not engage in appeasement.

We will make no deals that would reward aggression.

Let there be no mistake in the Kremlin. We want peace—in Korea and in the rest of the world. But we will not give in to aggression.

We know that appeasement does not lead to peace but leads to war. Our efforts to prevent war must be founded upon the preservation of freedom and justice.

That is why we are supporting the United Nations.

That is why we are aiding the free countries to build their economic strength.

That is why we are building up our own military defenses and helping other free nations to build theirs.

These are basic elements of our foreign policy.

Our foreign policy is a world policy, a policy of world peace—peace not only in the Wester Hemisphere, but in Europe, in Asia—all around the globe.

It is a foreign policy which is above any one party. In recent years, our foreign policy has been shaped by, and supported by, many leaders in both political parties working together. Our foreign policy is truly bipartisan. It is arrived at by "give and take," and improved by criticism and discussion.

That is the way it ought to be, and the way we are going to try to keep it. We welcome fair and honest debate.

But in recent months we have heard too much political hokum attacking the bipartisan foreign policy.

The people who are making these attacks cannot agree on any foreign policy of their own. They are just against the foreign policy this country is following. They are not trying to help this country find its way in these troubled times. They are just trying to confuse us. Why? Because they think if the country is confused enough, they may be able to win the next election.

Let me give you a few examples of the thinking of these confusers.

They say they want a powerful defense system, second to none—but they are against universal military training.

They say they want other free nations to resist aggression—but they don't want us to send any troops to help.

They want us to get out of Korea—but they urge us to wage an aggressive war against China.

They say it will provoke Russia to attack if we send troops to Europe—but they are sure Russia won't come in if we carry the war to China.

They say they want to crush communism—and yet they want us to draw back into our shell and let the rest of the world be overrun by the Reds.

They say they are worried because the Russians outnumber us—but they are not interested in keeping allies who can help us.

The long and short of it is that they want defenses without spending the money, they want us to wage war without an army, they want us to have victory without taking any risks, and they want us to try to run the whole world and to run it without any friends.

We can't afford to be diverted and upset by these political attacks.

We have a big job to do here at home. Our job is to get our defense program carried out quickly and efficiently.

We have made tremendous strides in building our defenses in the last few months. We have more than doubled the size of our Armed Forces since last June 25; the newest types of planes and tanks are coming off the assembly lines; and we are building an industrial system which can turn out more military supplies than ever before in our history.

With our European partners, we are building a strong combined defense force for the North Atlantic area, under the leadership of a great American, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

At a time like this, when we as a Nation are having to build up our Armed Forces and turn out all the material they need, we cannot—as individuals—do all the things we would normally do here at home. We can't build all the new houses we would like; we can't buy all the new gadgets and conveniences we would like. All of us will have to wait a while or do without many things we want.

But I know all Americans will gladly sacrifice some of the material comforts of life to defend the freedoms which give us our inner strength and security.

The Democratic Party has pioneered in the great advances our Nation has made in providing a better life for all our people. The Democratic Party has led the way to better homes, better education, better health, and higher incomes. The Democratic Party has led the way to new respect for the dignity and the worth of the individual. These achievements have come about because of our basic belief, the belief that every individual and every group in our Nation should have a fair deal.

A fair deal has been our pledge to the American people.

It is still our pledge.

In a time of national emergency like the present, when we all face danger together, it is more important than ever before that everyone have a fair deal.

A fair deal for everyone today means that we all share—and share alike—the responsibilities and sacrifices of our defense program.

On the battlefields of Korea our men fight together for a common purpose. Black and white, rich and poor, share common hardships, and often a common fate. The laborer's son, the farmer's son, and the businessman's son are fighting shoulder to shoulder in Korea.

We must have that same united approach to a common cause here at home.

It is as clear now as it was in Jefferson's day that we can enjoy the benefits of freedom only if we assume the responsibilities that go with it.

At this critical time in world history, men and women everywhere look to our Nation for leadership. They know that hope for a better life, human freedom, decency, justice, religion—all these things—depend upon the vigor with which we lead the free world in its fight for survival.

We shall not fail them.

We have known danger many times before, and we have never yielded. The ideals of Jefferson and Jackson have carried us through crises in the past.

They have given us a better and a fuller life.

I am confident that these same ideals will lead us to our goal of a free and peaceful world.

International Children's Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on chapter X in Report No. 298 accompanying the third supplemental appropriations bill for 1951. On the basis of this report, the committee appears to be under a misapprehension as to how the International Children's Fund operates.

Last year I inserted in the RECORD a letter from Herbert Hoover concerning UNICEF in which he stated:

> I do not believe there is any foreign activity in which our Government can engage that has as many returns both from a human and from an economic point of view.

Mr. Hoover does not make exaggerated statements, nor is he a blind follower of the United Nations. He is a statesman known throughout the world for his understanding and support of sound humanitarian enterprises. My concern for this program stems from exactly these two points stressed by Mr. Hoover and my comments today are to further elaborate this position.

The difference between the supposedly high percentage of United States support for this program, as compared with our share in other United Nations programs, is explained first, by the misunderstanding concerning the basis of the matching ratio, described in the following paragraph, and secondly, by the type of program carried out by the Children's Fund. Most of our contributions to the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are utilized entirely for administrative purposes, on the other hand, the greater part of United States appropriations to UNICEF are used for procurement, particularly dried skim milk, and shipping. It is precisely because our contributions to UNICEF have made it possible for this tangible program of international assistance to children to operate in the practical form of a commodity supply program at the community level that outstanding leaders such as Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover have enthusiastically endorsed this program. The fund is administered by an American businessman, Mr. Maurice Pate, of Massachusetts and Colorado, who has kept administrative costs at an average of 5 percent during the first 3 years of its operation.

The printed report of the hearings accompanying this bill indicates that the Department of State urged support for an appropriation of $12,500,000, on the basis of 72–28-percent formula, which the Department said carried over from UNRRA. The present matching formula did not come from UNRRA but was established by Congress. Originally, this House suggested a 50–50 formula as the basis for financing UNICEF. Fifty percent of the total new resources available for child care programs were to come from the United States, the other 50 percent would comprise 25 percent contributed by other governments for use outside their territories and 25 percent in new resources from receiving countries. The conference altered the proportions somewhat and established the formula of 72 percent from the United States, 28 percent from other governments, for use outside their territories and another 100 percent from receiving countries. Thus the United States share was 36 percent of the total government contributions.

I am attaching a table showing the composition of resources for UNICEF assisted child-care programs from June 1947 to March 1951. This table shows that the United States has actually contributed 34 percent of all resources, which include some nongovernmental contributions. In order to maintain this position and stimulate the additional 100-percent contributions from receiving countries, it will be necessary to retain the 72–28-percent ratio for government contributions used outside national territories.

Thus for the current year, the fund needs $12,500,000 from this country, $5,000,000 from other governments—half of which has already been received and allocated—and another $17,000,000 from receiving countries.

Since UNICEF resources have never been adequate to meet more than the minimum needs of children in most UNICEF receiving countries, the fund has utilized its meager resources in strategic programs designed to help governments establish services for children which could be continued by those governments after UNICEF leaves. Successful pursuit of this policy has made it possible for UNICEF to shift its emphasis from countries which were the immediate victims of the Second World

Roosevelt would jokingly tell Mrs. Roosevelt to put away the carving knife for fear my father-in-law, a cousin and aide of T. R., might use it against Taft.

I mention it because the easiest thing in the world today is to join the wolfpack and kick Harry Truman in the pants. You, however, have not attained your present position by taking the easy way.

And you, in view of your father's record, in view of your own record as a champion of the Constitution, can better understand this fundamental issue than any other man I know.

That issue is the Constitution of the United States—which provides that, if a general wants to run the Government, he must take off his uniform and become a civilian like the rest of us. He cannot have the perquisites and protection of the uniform and give orders to the White House, too.

Furthermore, you cannot have a general who has been running for President and who may still have political ambitions overruling the President of the United States.

As far as President Truman is concerned, my personal feelings toward him are about the same as yours. He has castigated me just as much as he has you. But there is a difference between respect for the office of President and respect for the man. The former is something which must not be soiled or sullied by unfair Senate debate. And the office of President carries with it not only the power but the obligation, under the Constitution, to remove a general who challenges the Constitution.

People are easily confused these days, but you can help to prevent their confusion. And while it might be popular and even healthy to impeach Harry Truman, do it on the grounds of corruption in his administration. There you might be on solid ground. Don't do it on an issue for which your father and every other President has kept the torch of civilian government burning—the principle that no soldier can overrule a civilian elected by the people.

Or, if you will, impeach the President on the ground that his policy is wrong. Impeach him on the issue of failure in China.

It might be healthy if you or Senator WHERRY introduced a resolution embodying the exact terms of the MacArthur letter to JOE MARTIN, and let the Senate debate it—debate the bombing of Chinese bases, the landing of Chiang Kai-shek's troops on the mainland, and the full probabilities and objectives of war with China.

This is an important, vital question upon which we should have full debate, upon which the public should be fully informed. I hope such a resolution will be introduced.

But do not, I urge, confuse the issue by challenging the basic principle of our Constitution in regard to civilian rule.

I have just returned from a trip through Europe. And I can report that you cannot travel abroad these days without sensing how vital is the issue now before our country. Many of the European nations have been through the struggle between military and civilian rule. They have seen the elected parliaments of Italy and Germany weaken. They have seen the people—shaken in their confidence of the democratic system, confused by unfair debate—turn to military dictatorships.

It is out of such confusion, when nations have weak civilian leaders and strong military leaders, that dictatorships spring.

Now, it is easy to jump on an unpopular President—as your family well remembers. It is easy to jump on him and to muddy up public opinion with confusing issues—such as the so-called Ballinger scandals which led to the overwhelming defeat of your father, and which history later proved not to have been scandals after all.

It is also easy to fool the public with a lot of phony flag-waving on an issue which your father and no other President worth his salt would have stood for—namely, permitting a general to thumb his nose at the civilian branch of the Government and get away with it.

But the times today are too dangerous. And it is in days such as these, when we do not have the most astute brains in or around the White House, that we need leadership and courage such as yours outside the White House to keep us on an even keel.

Respectfully yours,

DREW PEARSON.

Voice of America Spreads Its Message Through Classics and Jam Sessions Alike

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alice Eversman, from the Washington Sunday Star of April 15, 1951:

VOICE OF AMERICA SPREADS ITS MESSAGE THROUGH CLASSICS AND JAM SESSIONS ALIKE

(By Alice Eversman)

The broadcast of the final program of the National Symphony Orchestra to all parts of the world on the Voice of America called attention in a personal way to this important service being tendered in the name of music. Although most of the broadcasts are concerned with the spreading of necessary facts about this country, the spirit of our people as reflected in the music they hear, perform, and compose is also made known. About 15,000 recordings of transcribed programs are sent monthly to 75 countries. During November, December, January, and February some 10,691 hours of programing time were used.

The material for the broadcasts has been assembled and sorted since 1943, when the American Federation of Musicians granted permission to the Voice to record any music put on the air. The music unit staff is one of the busiest in the set-up. They must be constantly on the lookout for the kind of performances to select and have the proper knowledge to prepare the program notes accompanying each recording. Furthermore, they must be ready with an answer to any question that might come up in the 220,000 letters sent the Voice annually from the far corners of the world. Each month a committee of music experts must audition about 100 hours of material, some of which will be discarded, and others put into the library for future use.

The sending of recorded music is governed by the wishes of the people in the area to which it goes. Unfortunately, symphonic music rates the lowest attention. American popular songs and dance music are much in demand, the Voice supplying 250 stations in Brazil alone with the former in the Your Hit Parade program, and European stations with the recordings of Dixieland jazz. An effort is made, however, to maintain a balance between serious classical, semiclassical, and popular music.

Compositions by American composers, recitals by native musicians, as well as those by renowned instrumentalists and operatic singers, and programs by the great orchestras of the United States are included in the first category. One performance by the Metropolitan Opera is always part of the shipments and some particular event, such as the Bach Festival in Bethlehem or the Boston Symphony concerts at Tanglewood, is included.

RELIGIOUS MUSIC INCLUDED

Excerpts from musical shows as South Pacific, the favoriate singers on radio programs, dance and jazz bands, constitute the popular list, while pleasant orchestral numbers, instrumental music of the same kind, spirituals and folk songs form the semiclassics. Every Sunday there are religious broadcasts, with music by such groups as the Trinity Choir of St. Paul's Parish in New York, the choir of East Liberty Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, the Schola Cantorum of St. Thomas' in Bloomfield, or that of the Church of the Immaculate Conception in Los Angeles. Most of these latter programs have been beamed to the Far East.

One of the most notable programs is, Fun With Music, designed for children all over the world. Already 26 15-minute recordings have been sent to a number of countries for local broadcasts with commentaries in the language of the country. They follow, mostly, the style used in the youth concerts with some deviations. For instance, there is one program of circus music where calliopes and bassy melodies create the atmosphere for elephants and clowns. Excerpts from Humperdinck's Hansel and Gretel are among the children's operas given which also include Douglas Moore's, the Emperor's New Clothes, and George Kleinsinger's, Tubby the Tuba. The story of the instruments in the orchestras occupies three programs and the history of the piano from 1700 to the present, is traced on two. The highlights of American history from 1620 to 1865 are told for the youngsters in music and even the geography of this country is described in this medium. High school boys and girls, in choruses or ensembles, participate in these programs.

The Voice uses its musical material in two ways. Some of it is transmitted by shortwave broadcasts as programs or as incidental or atmospheric music for some of the dramas. Others are put on the records in assembled programs which are shipped to 90 Embassies, consulates, and other far outposts of the State Department.

The local radio stations receive these packaged programs and clubs or schools are permitted to borrow them. The problem lies in supplying the music of most appeal to the different countries. France, Italy, Spain, and Latin America like our popular music best. India and Indonesia favor military bands. A special tribute was paid to the Marine Band for its recorded performance of the Pakistan national anthem by its composer, Ahmed G. Chagla. He wrote:

"This is exactly how the music should be interpreted. The Marine Band performance is all the more commendable because the melody is foreign to western instrumentalists—." Only Northern Europe craves the symphonic music with soloists.

A particular effort is being made to acquaint the world with the serious works by American composers. Most European nations feel they can supply what music of that nature is wanted and ask for the lighter American kind so popular abroad. However, there is a series called "American Composer" where native compositions in orchestral, chamber music or soloist performance are recorded and sent out. More than a hundred overseas offices receive this allotment. Commercial recordings and published compositions are also supplied to information centers for study and performance by any who desire to have them.

PORTABLES REACH THE REMOTE

Where there are no radios, the Voice sends out jeeps, as in Aden, Arabia, for instance,

War to the long-range, but nevertheless emergency needs of the less developed countries in Asia and Latin America.

As a result of these humanitarian programs many millions of children have already been protected from death, disease, and malnutrition, and many millions more will benefit from the national services stimulated by UNICEF assistance.

All this has been accomplished at an incredibly small cost as indicated by the UNICEF total annual expenditures to country programs:

1948	$43,000,000
1949	35,000,000
1950	32,000,000

Under the present formula these sums amount to one-half the cost for specific programs, the other half being contributed by the receiving countries.

It is for these reasons that I would urge the representatives of the House Appropriation Committee, when they meet in conference with the representatives of the Senate, to restore the full appropriation to the International Children's Fund so that the United States may continue to provide at least one-third of the total resources raised for international assistance to children.

Composition of resources for UNICEF assisted child-care programs

[In thousands of dollars]

	United States	Other governments	Total
I. Composition of all UNICEF resources from June 1947 through March 1951:			
(a) Government contributions	75,000	32,400	107,400
(b) Private contributions	1,100	11,300	12,400
(c) UNRRA residual assets	23,400	8,900	32,300
(d) Miscellaneous (interest, marine claims, difference in exchange, etc.)	1,500	400	1,900
Total resources available for allocation	101,000	53,000	154,000
II. Estimated local contributions of recipient governments made to match UNICEF imports under country agreements		142,000	142,000
Grand total	101,000	195,000	296,000
III. Percentage	*Percent* 34	*Percent* 66	*Percent* 100

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I am today sending to those who have written to me relative to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal:

DEAR ——: This will acknowledge receipt of your recent communication relative to the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his far eastern command.

As you know, I have at all times been an ardent supporter of General MacArthur as a military leader, and I am still of the opinion that he ranks among our Nation's top military tacticians. However, no military leader, no matter how brilliant he may be, shall or can have the authority under the Constitution of the United States to assume the responsibility for determining our foreign policy.

On our policy in the Far East, I feel—and I have always felt—that we should continue to recognize Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government; that we should refuse recognition of Communist China; and refuse admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

No American general is bigger than the Government of the United States. No American general is bigger than his constitutional Commander in Chief. The very existence of our democracy demands that military authority be subordinate to civilian authority.

I am quite certain that President Truman fully realized that his decision to depose MacArthur would be unpopular. It took battlefield courage on the part of the President of the United States to remove MacArthur from his command. I am in wholehearted accord with the President's decision because I have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States—without any reservations whatsoever—and under article II, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, the President is specifically named as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

Under article II, he has the right to remove any of his military subordinates. The authority of the civilian Commander in Chief must always be supreme. Civilian control is essential in a democracy. The day military men are encouraged or permitted to flaunt the orders of their civilian superiors, is the day our democracy starts on the last long mile to destruction. Had President Truman not acted as he did, his political, personal, and emotional critics would then, I believe, have some justification for demanding his impeachment for not carrying out his sworn duty as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The most obvious factor about the dismissal of General MacArthur is that he forced his own removal. He would not tolerate any disobedience from any officer under his command. Yet, he willfully disobeyed not only the Commander in Chief, President Truman, but also his military superiors on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is an attitude I cannot and will not condone under any circumstances.

I believe that General MacArthur should be accorded the honor of addressing a joint session of Congress and I further believe that he should be requested by the appropriate committees of Congress to give us the benefit of his views on the Far East and answer questions pertaining to our far-eastern policy. I intend to request the Committee on Foreign Affairs to issue an invitation to General MacArthur to appear before that committee so that he can be questioned and so that his answers to the questions asked may be fully known not only to the American Congress but to the American people as well.

I realize full well that as far as the present controversy is concerned, I am not on the popular side. It has been a privilege to serve you in Congress under our present form of government. Under a government controlled by the military, I doubt if you could write to your Congressman and tell him whether you approve or disapprove his actions in representing you in the Congress of the United States.

The question of MacArthur is of little importance compared to the question as to whether or not we shall have a representative government under civilian control or a military government to which civilians will be subordinate. The founding fathers of this great Republic recognized this question and acted wisely in subordinating the military.

I am not one of those who can swing with the political pendulum. My decision is to stand on the side of the Constitution of the United States which I will uphold and defend to my last breath. What happens to me because of this decision is unimportant; my country and our Constitution must always come first.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MacArthur Issues Brought Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an open letter by Drew Pearson, undoubtedly a most controversial figure inside and outside the ranks of journalism, to the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, who himself could not by the farthest stretch of the imagination be called a noncontroversial figure.

I call this open letter to the attention of the House because it makes sense to me, good sense, common sense—a commodity which is being used less and less during an era when we need more and more of it.

It makes little difference whether or not we agree or disagree with Drew Pearson, and it makes less difference whether we like or dislike him. But it does make a great deal of difference whether or not we rise above personalities in a crisis when personalities seem to outweigh sober judgment and cold logic.

It does not make any difference from whom words of sound advice come, just so long as the words generate stability. For my part, I believe Drew Pearson has performed a public service in writing this letter and has contributed much in these tense times.

Here is the open letter which appeared in today's press:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—MACARTHUR ISSUES BROUGHT OUT

(By Drew Pearson)

Today's column takes the form of a letter from Drew Pearson to Senator ROBERT A. TAFT on the MacArthur-Truman controversy.

APRIL 14, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: When your father was President of the United States, my late father-in-law, a general and a military man all his life, had about the same opinion of him that Douglas MacArthur has of the present occupant of the White House. In fact, your father, whom history records as having done a fine job as Secretary of War, incurred the wrath of many military men, because he both kept within his budget and kept the military in their place.

He fully grasped the fundamental fact around which our Constitution is written—that ours is a civilian government, in which the military takes orders from civilians. He even carried it out so conscientiously that, when your father was Secretary of War and used to come to the White House, Teddy

The NEA (see enclosure) criticizes "setting up a permanent system of military training in the United States." I protest the term "permanent" since statutes are always subject to repeal by the Congress. Use of such term seems designed falsely to excite people and thus to build up opposition. The NEA release also counsels delay on UMT until "present critical international disputes * * * have been settled." Six years since the collapse of the Axis, is there any evidence that such disputes ever will be settled? The NEA release continues the argument over 18, 18½, or 19 as the age, and over 21, 24, or 26 months as the period of military training. All those questions have been thrown up by opponents merely to fill the air with dust, produce delay, and defeat action.

In the stress of actual war we are fully ready to trust our all to the military authorities. But whenever immediate danger seems to lessen, teachers and preachers by the thousands, do-gooders, and America-lasters—all are ready to tell the military just what we need. If our military heads do not know what we need, let us replace them; but let us forsake the leadership of those who mostly know nothing at all about the matter, and begin to rely on the experts. The supreme tragedy of our democracy today is not that so many of our people are "blind mice," but rather that so few of us even suspect our blindness.

The simple fact is that we have never been prepared for a single one of the wars fought since we became a Nation. Had not other democracies fought the opposition almost to a standstill before we entered, we might have been thoroughly beaten in both World Wars. I condemn all this quibbling and ask that just once we get ready for war in time of peace, after having followed the opposite course for 175 years.

I believe this is enough, but sometimes I feel that I should love the privilege of having my remarks extended a few thousand words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very respectfully yours,

WM. A. COOK.

Will the President Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 14, 1951:

WILL THE PRESIDENT ACT?

President Truman has shown that he has the determination and the courage to rebuke insubordination, but the list of unrebuked improprieties among his associates is a growing one. Why does he not deal with them with the same forcefulness?

While applauding Mr. Truman for his handling of the MacArthur problem, the Post-Dispatch is bound to deplore his totally contrary handling of other problems of personnel which come within the Presidential responsibility.

Two new problems of this nature have just been added to an already long list.

There is the Mississippi job-selling scandal, involving Paul Dillon, of St. Louis, one-time lawyer for Capone gangsters. There is the case of the White House aide who is said to have tried to persuade Senator TOBEY not to be too tough on another White House aide in the inquiry into the RFC.

What is the President going to do about these new cases? Is he going to pass them by complacently, as he already has done with many, with such unfortunate results?

Or is he going to begin, even though belatedly, to make plain to present offenders, and to potential future offenders, that ethical laxity in the administration and in the party will not be tolerated by him?

In the Mississippi scandal, Chairman Boyle, of the Democratic National Committee, has fired National Committeeman Hood, but testimony given to the Senate investigators implicates members of the State committee as well. By sworn testimony not only were jobs bought and sold. By admission of the committees' own counsel the committee made it a part of its stated policy to exert political influence on the RFC.

Paul Dillon's alleged part in helping Hood form the pro-Truman committee makes that proceeding all the more suspect, and all the more damaging to Mr. Truman. Dillon once managed a Truman campaign in St. Louis. It was he who helped obtain a parole for four Capone gangsters—Philip D'Andrea, Paul Ricca, Charles Gioe, and Louis Campagna. An appellate court, upholding their conviction, had called these men "a ruthless and grasping crew of blackmailers whose crimes struck at the very heart of society."

Under these circumstances, does Mr. Truman deem it enough for Chairman Boyle to fire the national committeeman from Mississippi? Should not all members of the State committee who participated in the sale of Federal office, or who countenanced it in silence, be replaced with members who can be relied upon? And should not the President in clear terms denounce what has gone on in Mississippi and pledge every effort to expose, halt, and punish all such wrongdoing in the future?

In the affair of the White House aides, former Senator Wheeler, of Montana, says that at the request of one of them, David K. Niles, he asked Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, "not to be too tough" on another of them, Donald S. Dawson, who has been mentioned as one of the inner clique exerting political influence on RFC lending policies.

Did Mr. Truman know what Mr. Niles was doing? What kind of check is there against political manipulations by persons close to the President? Does Mr. Truman not think that an attempt by one of his aides to suppress or tone down evidence in a senatorial investigation is grounds for dismissal?

As the Post-Dispatch said the other day, the moral tone of official Washington can hardly be expected to rise higher than the tone the President sets. Here are two cases in which what he does, or fails to do, will either put a brake on the deterioration of Washington ethics, or permit it to go unimpeded on its downward way.

Universal Military Training Necessary to Long-Range Security Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion after much study and reflection that we must have UMT as part of our long-term policy for our national security.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, who has an unusual grasp on security problems, had a very penetrating article, which expresses my views, in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16, 1951.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article, which I hope every Member of the House will read:

IS UMT NECESSARY?

Considering how hard it is for the layman to understand UMT (universal military training), it is, it seems to me, doing remarkably well in Congress. The reason that UMT is so hard to understand is that it is not needed now, would not and could not be put into general operation now, and if the world conflict brings us nearer to war, it will not be used at all.

The case for UMT rests on the possibility that having rearmed and improved the balance of power we may succeed in doing what we say we are trying to do—namely, to avert a great war. UMT is designed not for a third world war, but for the only alternative to a third world war—namely, for an armed truce between the two coalitions in which they find it possible to coexist.

UMT, therefore, is designed for a time which may or may not come. No one can possibly know for certain whether that time will or will not come. That is to say a time when we are not engaged in ground fighting, as we are now in Korea, when it would be sound military policy not to have as big a standing Army as we hope to have in 1952; when, nevertheless, it would be suicidal folly not to be able to enlarge that smaller Army quickly in case of trouble.

It is fair to say, I think, that the measure would pass readily enough, substantially as General Marshall wishes it, if it were made plainer than it has yet been made that the military-manpower bill contains the draft and universal military training in one package because we must be prepared both for war and for an armed truce—and that it would be exceedingly dangerous not to be prepared for both of these contingencies.

If unhappily war were certain, there would be no point in talking about UMT. We should rely entirely on the draft to prepare for the war and to fight the war. Today, and for at least 2 years to come, our task is to build up our Armed Forces, which were at the level of about 1,400,000 men at the start of the Korean war. The level which we are aiming at is 3,500,000. This is being done by volunteering backed up by the draft. While this build-up is going on UMT is not needed. The men are being trained in the Army before they serve in the Army, and when they have finished their term of service they will remain in the Reserve for some years to come. In this period of emergency build-up the facilities and the instructors needed to operate universal military training on any large scale are preempted by the Army itself.

Moreover, though expert opinion is not unanimous on this point, it is probable that if we are compelled to keep the Armed Forces at the level of 3,500,000 men in uniform, then probably UMT could not be put into operation, nor would UMT be needed with such a big standing Army replenished by the draft. The drafted men, with their long training and service in the Armed Forces and, after that, with their 6 or 8 years in the Reserve, would be all the military manpower that the country—considering its ocean frontiers—could use in the early stages of any war.

Universal military training is preparation for the long pull, the long armed truce which is the best that anybody has reason to hope for. If there is to be a long armed truce, the maintenance of a huge standing army will become a very serious matter. The financial cost to the Government will be huge. But that is almost certainly a comparatively minor part of the trouble. The

equipped with portable sound-producing units. There, in the public square, the programs will be played, usually accompanied by a documentary motion-picture film flashed on a sheet stretched across the square. In some cities, where the United States has public-information libraries, transcribed concerts are given to audiences.

How much of the shortwave broadcasts reach the people has not been estimated definitely, although it is known that 50 percent of all residents in Western Germany hear them and there are 2,500,000 steady listeners in France. Some of it gets through the iron curtain, for one Soviet magazine wrote that the Voice was "synonymous with lying and provocational fiction to millions of Soviet people." The jamming that takes place on broadcasts beamed to Russia requires that most of the time be utilized for news and comment so that some of it will get through. Also, music is easily detected, when not of the Soviet vintage, and dire punishment may descend on those who listen to it.

The Voice, however, continues its good work. It sends to Radio Tjanst of Sweden some of the "jam sessions" in Greenwich Village, or the Philadelphia Orchestra for Radio Turkey at Ankara. Radio Rome hears the Metropolitan's performance of "Don Carlo" exactly as produced in New York, and the program of Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians will be sent over the Andes. Now, in its recorded form, the performance of the National Symphony Orchestra of April 4, broadcast "live" that night, will be placed in many of the "packages" sent out to the far away places of the world.

No Defense Need in the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas (Tex.) News of February 4, 1951, carries the following editorial under the caption "No defense need in St. Lawrence." Every Member of Congress should read this interesting editorial:

NO DEFENSE NEED IN ST. LAWRENCE

Patriotism, remarked Samuel Johnson, who knew men, is the last refuge of the damned scoundrel. He said that close to 200 years ago, and human nature has not changed for the better. So when your sleazy politician can think of no better argument, he proffers his shoddy ware in the name of national defense.

So back to Congress once more comes the St. Lawrence project. Hurry, boys, hurry. We must have it for national defense. Forget all of your old objections. Get the thing under way.

To start on, the St. Lawrence is not a genuine waterway project. Even under the best of conditions, it would not be an all-year thoroughfare for deep-draft, oceangoing vessels. The river is ice locked for a substantial part of every year and impassable for traffic. But, as W. F. Heavey, general manager of the Port of Houston, pointed out the other day in a letter to the Wall Street Journal, the proposed 27-foot project is impracticable for ocean ships with pay loads to and from the Great Lakes ports. Even the Houston Ship Channel has an authorized depth of 36 feet. So the obvious idea is to get 27 feet approved, then go later to 36 as a necessity. But costs are estimated only on the first figure.

The St. Lawrence is a hydroelectric power project. In spite of the claims for its prospective power, river flow, as the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, opposing the plan, points out, will limit kilowatt production to 820,000 in the flood season and 570,000 in any low-water period. Present steam plants serving New York City are capable of more than 570,000 kilowatts individually.

The St. Lawrence is not a necessary project. It is questionable if it is in any way desirable. Fully 15 years back the exhaustive research study by the nonpartisan Brookings Institution analyzed the proposal and demonstrated conclusively that the costs would be far out of proportion to the potential benefits. Since then the costs have risen enormously and the benefits have not enlarged. No one has successfully refuted the Brookings figures. Proponents of the project do not even try.

But once more we are told that a costly folly is necessary to defense. Patriotism, as Sam Johnson remarked, is the last refuge.

Talk of Impeachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Thomas L. Stokes expresses my views and, I am sure, the views of a substantial majority of the dispassionate citizens of the United States and the free world:

IMPEACH TRUMAN? FOR THESE "CRIMES"?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—There's been lots of wild talk about "impeachment" of President Truman because of his removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Republicans spilled it all over the Capitol—for 1 day—to try to indicate their high dudgeon and to give an incendiary slogan to telegram and letter addicts all over the country. They never meant it seriously. For they are wise enough politically, since they have created a martyr of their own, not to offer one to the other side. They would thus lose their advantage.

WOULD CLEAR THE AIR

But it might, indeed, clear the air all around if an impeachment of Harry Truman were sought. For there are many counts. Those of us who are familiar with impeachment proceedings can imagine the scene—the solemn managers on the part of the House, which prefers the charges, being announced formally before the Senate, which is the trial body, and submitting the bill of indictment, somewhat as follows:

1. He, Harry Truman, upheld the Constitution of the United States by removing a general who had arrogated to himself the making of policy and thus asserted the supremacy of the civilian over the military.

2. He, Harry Truman, opposed this particular policy which would begin an all-out, all-Asian war, a trap long laid by the Kremlin.

3. He, Harry Truman, formulated the "Truman doctrine" for aid to Greece and Turkey, which was approved by Congress and which checked the advance of Soviet imperialism in that strategic area.

REVISED EUROPEAN ECONOMY

4. He, Harry Truman, espoused the Marshall plan, which Congress approved and which has revived the economy of Western Europe so that its people again are at work, again have hope, and are no longer willing prey for communism which is rapidly losing ground.

5. He, Harry Truman, sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty which the Senate ratified, and which implemented economic aid with military assistance so that Western Europe can defend herself.

6. He, Harry Truman, appointed Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to command the combined Western European army, which won united support of Congress and the Nation.

7. He, Harry Truman, evolved a new defense program to strengthen our own Nation which Congress is working out, step by step.

8. He, Harry Truman, initiated the United Nations challenge to North Korean Communist aggression, boldly and promptly, recognizing clearly the new Russian strategy of striking through masked satellites and understanding, too, that aggression must be checked where it appears, else the dictator will be emboldened to move as he pleases and on his own terms.

GAVE MACARTHUR SUPPORT

9. He, Harry Truman, opened the way for appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as commander of the U. N. armies, and gave him every support.

10. He, Harry Truman, is for a civil rights program to assure every American citizen the rights guaranteed by our Constitution regardless of race, creed, or color.

11. He, Harry Truman, is for decent wages and working conditions for our people in peace and war; for decent housing, for improved education and health methods and facilities; for development of our natural resources to provide new opportunities for our people.

12. He, Harry Truman, is for curbing the rapacity of the selfish and powerful who would exploit others to their advantage.

13. He, Harry Truman, won the 1948 election.

14. He, Harry Truman, is a Democrat.

15. He, Harry Truman, is a human being, not a superman.

Of all these things he, Harry Truman, is guilty.

And may God have mercy on his soul.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NORTH COLLEGE HILL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 6, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESS: Though I have been one of your constituents for several years, I have never bothered your office with a communication, but now it's different: Today I received a release from the National Education Association opposing universal military training. I am a life member of the NEA, and a churchman from my youth, but the present leadership of both organizations totally misrepresents my views on national preparedness.

Abdul Hamid Zanganeh, and the decision of the Iranian Parliament to nationalize the great Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., the situation in that country has reached trigger-fine explosiveness. Upon the outcome of that situation could depend no less a thing than world peace itself.

Lying on the southern borders of the Soviet Union and within a few minutes' flying distance of the main Russian oil fields, Iran is of great importance for at least two reasons. First is its strategic importance. If Iran should go Communist, Russian influence would reach the Indian Ocean, the Middle East would be isolated from India, and the whole balance of power in that part of the world would shift.

The second reason is oil—black, thick, priceless, and nearly inexhaustible. Several thousand years ago the ancient Iranians founded a religious movement called Zoroastrianism, based upon the worship of fire, which they would kindle from the dark, oily ooze which soaked through their country's soil. Now, however, that oil is used to fire something else—the trucks, tanks, planes of the West's military might.

CRUCIAL TO RUSSIA

Yet important as this oil is to the West—it supplies the major portion of Britain's home consumption and is a tremendous dollar earner—it would be even more important to the Soviet Union. Best estimates are that oil production is lagging throughout the Communist world, and it is believed that this may be one of the reasons Moscow so far has avoided a general war. With reserve stocks from Iran, Russian hesitancy might possibly change.

As well as any place in the world, Iran typifies what the forces of democracy are up against in their effort to establish stability and to insure peace. Simply put, Iran is a bewildering compound of unbelievable poverty, stupendous riches, diplomatic intrigue, and hatred for foreigners.

On one side stands the mass of the people—toiling, illiterate, and so poor that they are barely able to feed and clothe their children. On the other side stands the tiny coterie of land owners, industrialists, tribal sheiks, and politicians—owning most of the land, receiving all the privileges, giving all the orders, and monopolizing the country's fabulous wealth.

TWO SEETHING ELEMENTS

This condition has produced two dangerous elements of discord. The first is the Communist Tudeh Party, which aims to turn the country into another Soviet satellite. The activities of this party gave the United Nations its first crisis when, in the spring of 1946, Tudehists attempted to set up an independent left-wing state in the Iranian Province of Azerbaijan.

The second dangerous element is that of wild and exaggerated nationalism, which sees every foreigner as an enemy and every tie with the outside world as exploitation. It was this element which caused the assassination of General Razmara and forced through the nationalization of oil. In a way, these nationalists are as dangerous as the Tudehists, since their activities, if unchecked, could produce such economic and political chaos as to cause Iran's internal collapse.

In other words, conditions in Iran are those which produce the muddy waters of social and economic discord in which communism has learned to fish with signal success. Once roiled, such waters seldom clear until at least some of the legitimate demands of the poor and discontented have been satisfied.

While it is true that a few preliminary steps have been taken in the direction of greater social justice, such as distribution of the royal estates among the needy peasants, only the surface has been scratched so far.

In the opinion of those who have followed Iranian developments most closely, two things are needed.

First and foremost, the West must avoid further antagonizing the nationalists. With patience, it seems likely that the nationalists can be satisfied and the West can obtain Iran's oil.

After that, it is clear that some new and greater contribution must be made to Iran's economic betterment. For many months, Iran has sought a $25,000,000 loan from the United States—a tiny amount when set against today's vast military expenditures. When the loan did not materialize, it added noticeably to that antiwestern sentiment which lies as close to the Iranian surface as do the oil deposits—and is just as inflammable.

Iran is not lost to the West yet. Indeed, there is no irresistible reason why it should be lost. But events of the past month have shown how easy it could be to lose that rich and strategic area. Only wisdom, firmness, diplomacy, and generosity on the part of the West, principally in Washington and London, can prevent the iron curtain from enclosing that land as it has enclosed so many others.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the State, Columbia, S. C., of April 13 and 14, 1951:

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of April 13, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR CASE

Since General MacArthur is a military man, born and bred, it is hard for us to understand why he would continue to broadcast his views on the international situation, when his superior in rank had admonished him not to do so. Evidently the general was so convinced that his program was necessary that he felt he should disregard usual military injunctions. Or, perhaps, the general, so long accustomed to being a law unto himself, not even returning to this country some months ago to testify when invited by a Senate committee to do so, had begun to think he was not subject to orders. As to the whys and wherefores of General MacArthur's attitude, we wouldn't know. We are only speculating. But the fact cannot be overlooked that he is charged with ignoring directives, and if he did, therein lies a basic weakness in his case.

That General MacArthur not only was expected, but was obligated, to give the country the benefit of his thinking as to our future course in the Far East is not to be denied by any fair person. But if those responsible for our overhead planning felt that public utterance of conflicting views by one in General MacArthur's position hindered the Nation's efforts to avoid a third world war, then it was reasonable to ask that such statements be cleared through Washington. If General MacArthur felt he could not comply with this request, he could have freed himself from any limitations by asking to be relieved. And we don't understand why he didn't do so and beat the President to the draw.

As to whether the MacArthur plan or the Washington plan is the better way to prevent a third world war is not a question to be settled by public debate. But in forming policies, authority must be placed in some hand, and the Constitution gives this supreme command to the President, whether or not he be an able military man. However, a wise executive in any field seeks, and takes, sound advice from competent people. We hope President Truman availed himself of the counsel of such men as General Marshall, Chief of Staff Collins, and others before determining upon a course.

The debate will rage for years as to whether General MacArthur should have been relieved. And there will always be differences of opinion in the matter. But for the moment, the question is academic. General MacArthur is no longer in command, and the President is not going to reverse himself and reinstate him.

General Ridgway, a competent officer of wide experience, is the man charged now with the responsibility of leading our troops in Korea and directing Japanese affairs. It is an almost superhuman task that has been assigned him, to take over where General MacArthur, with years in the Orient, has left off. But General Ridgway's shoulders are broad, and we believe he is competent to assume the multipost role which has been thrust upon him so suddenly.

When General MacArthur returns to the States there will be much to-do over him. He likely will be the center of demonstrations. The public will line up for and against him. He will be spoken of as the Republican candidate for President, and might get the nomination. All of which is all right. This is a free country and we should have free expression. But this is all right only so long as the dispute does not hamper us in our war effort. Personalities must be placed second when a country is fighting for its existence.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of April 14, 1951]

NO PLACE FOR POLITICS

One unfortunate angle to the MacArthur removal is that already it is taking on a political aspect, and this is no time for a partisan line-up on foreign policy.

The Republicans are leading the denunciation of the President. They are even talking of instituting impeachment proceedings, but on what ground it is not clear. Democrats of the national hue are lining up behind Mr. Truman. And a merry war of party accusations is in full rage. This is to be regretted. The MacArthur case should be argued on its merits, and on its merits only.

If General Ridgway proves to the leader that those who know him expect him to be; if he does as well as chief of the Far Eastern Command as he did as general of the Eighth Army, the fury will in comparatively short time be spent. But if there is a turn for the worse in Korea, and the international situation elsewhere does not look so good, MacArthur's stock will rise, and Truman will be blamed for the course the war has taken.

As the State sees it, this is no time for wild talk, incrimination, and reincrimination. It is a time for calm decision. Like or dislike of either Truman or MacArthur should have no place in the appraisal of the drastic action which removed with one stroke of the pen an honored general from all of his commands.

If General MacArthur failed to respect the admonitions of his superior officer, the President, and persisted in making statements which embarrassed Washington in its dealings with other countries, he courted reprimand and possibly removal. Perhaps that was his way of making his point. We don't

serious difficulty will be the young men in the camps—their education and their careers interrupted, separated from their families and friends, their normal plans to marry and raise families postponed—with not enough to do and with no reason to feel that what they are doing is urgent and important.

A great standing army, which is not going off to war, is—as the American people have always known—dangerous and demoralizing and wasteful. It will generate pressures—pressure to have a war and get it over with or pressure not to have a war and to go home. An Army affecting Congress and public opinion in this fashion will make it impossible to carry out a firm and prudent foreign policy. Universal military training is designed to train a Reserve for the Armed Forces which will permit the standing Army to be reduced—if 2 or 3 years hence when we are rearmed, war is not imminent and we are in an armed truce.

The more one studies the matter, the more impressive—so it seemed to me—is the military statesmanship of Marshall and Lovett. They have understood, as almost everyone has, the imperative necessity of increasing rapidly our immediate military power. They have understood, as I suppose most of us have, that our military power must be capable of rapid expansion beyond the expansion which is actually undertaken now.

But they have understood also, though not many understood it at the outset, that they must not expand the Military Establishment beyond the point of no return—that is to say to a size where it cannot be supported indefinitely and where, therefore, a war becomes necessary before the Military Establishment deteriorates. It is a very high form of statesmanship—to have grasped this and to have been able to translate the idea into a concrete military program. But that is how and why universal military training has become an integral part of a sound military policy.

Letter From a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a ringing letter of Americanism addressed by Marine Sgt. Albert Currier to all Americans:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe of April 1, 1951]

LETTER FROM A MARINE

(Marine Sgt. Albert Currier, 28-year-old Nahant veteran of World War II, is a patient at Chelsea Naval Hospital where he has been recovering from severe head wounds received while serving with E Company, Second Battalion, Seventh Regiment, First Marine Division at the Choisin Reservoir, Korea. He wrote this letter to parents before starting convalescent leave which he will spend with his wife and three children. He tells what the Marine Corps has meant to him. He expects to be hospitalized for the next year and a half. Sergeant Currier's father and two brothers were also marines.)

DEAR FATHERS AND MOTHERS OF MEN WHO SOON MAY ENTER SERVICE: I know it's tough to see your boy leave home to enter military service, but, believe me, the forces that threaten our American way of life aren't fooling. Even though you realize this you're probably lying awake nights wondering what is best for your boy to do.

Perhaps, as you read this, you'll wonder how a guy with a hole in his head can bring you any comfort. Well, there's no getting round it, that's a chance that every man takes when called to defend his country.

But, sure as shootin', his chances for survival are greater if he belongs to an outfit that demands ample training before going into combat and teaches him, through mind and body coordination, to think and act quickly. That's what you get in the Marine Corps and that's what paid off at the Choisin Reservoir. There could have been thousands more casualties in the strategic withdrawal from Hanghum but for the discipline, unity, and teamwork of marines trained for leadership.

It was that strict discipline throughout the ranks that made it possible for the marines to fight their way out of the icy Communist trap at the reservoir, bringing their wounded with them. It was why they were able to salvage men and equipment with the exception of useless articles of personnel gear in the successful though desperate evacuation of Hanghum.

To be a marine is to learn the meaning of comradeship. Take me, for example. I got hit up near the reservoir on top of a 3,500-foot hill. It was November 4, and the day before we'd seen our first Chinese Communist, two prisoners in heavy quilted clothes who walked into us. I was covering our forward observers with harassing fire—setting my mortar to the right range when I saw a green flash, felt something like a bee sting, and that was the last I knew till I woke up in the Tokyo General Hospital 6 days later on the birthday of the Marine Corps.

GETS BEST TREATMENT

But my buddies took care of me. They applied wound compresses and carried me down the hill, on a stretcher, two at a time on relief. I don't know how long it took them to get through the thick underbrush and shrubbery, but I do know that it took 3½ hours to climb the hill in the first place.

They turned me in to the aid station, where I got blood plasma and had my dressings changed. Then they went back to fight. Later I got a letter from them with a paragraph from each gun crew and every guy in the platoon signed it. I won't part with that letter in a hurry. You see, I'm 28, years older than most of my buddies, so they used to call me the mother of the outfit.

To show the kind of medical care that a man gets in the Marine Corps, I want to tell you that 9 hours after I got hit I was on the operating table at Tokyo General Hospital, after being flown out of the line by helicopter to Hungnam Airfield and then by emergency flight to Tokyo.

The wound had caused hemorrhage of the brain and 32 fragments of bone were removed from the back of my skull. I got 7 pints of whole blood and 47 spinal taps. While I was unconscious a Gray Lady wrote to my wife in almost the same words I would have used myself. Every week while I was on the critical list my wife was notified of my progress.

If your boy joins the Marine Corps, I hope he'll never need the drastic medical treatment I did; but if he does, he'll get it—the best all the way through. He'll also have religious guidance and counsel in personal problems from the chaplain of his faith. He'll be taught discipline, manners, and morals. And he won't lack for educational opportunities.

THE OUTFIT IS TOPS

The Marine Corps Institute offers more than 200 correspondence courses, at Government expense, earning up to 2 years' college credit. Marine Corps training courses in aviation, Diesel engines, photography, radio, telegraphy, cooking, baking, engineering, business administration, and other subjects fit a man for a civilian job and additional income after retirement. The higher his rating, the more retirement pay he'll get.

Pride in the Marine Corps, in being a member of a tough outfit that has been winning battles for 175 years, is something a man never loses. Once a marine, always a marine; and if you see a man who has served in the corps walking down the street in civilian clothes, you'll recognize him. It's a wholesome feeling.

During the war we were all together in the Pacific, all in the Second Marine Division. My brother Bill was the first to go in 1942. He served in First Marine Aviation at Munda. Then my dad, Donald H. Currier, volunteered at the age of 48. He was the only one of us to get wounded—on the Marshall Islands. I joined up after he did, and then my brother Donald H., Jr., came in.

I saw dad at Pearl Harbor, then went on to Saipan and then to Tinian, where I met Donald. From there I went to Okinawa, and after the Japanese surrender served 3½ months' occupation duty. I got my discharge from the Marine Corps Reserve that year, but reenlisted in the Regulars in 1947.

My son wants to be a marine, and if he was 18 he would be.

Good luck to you and your boy.

Iran's Crisis Explosive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Iran's Crisis Explosive," written by Joseph G. Harrison, foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

This article was reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., and appeared in the Washington Post on April 3, 1951.

The International Latex Corp. has established a wide reputation over a period of years of public service advertisements in order to bring to the attention of the public various views and information available on many important problems.

The article is as follows:

IRAN'S CRISIS EXPLOSIVE

(By Joseph G. Harrison, foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

Most of vast Asia, from its dripping jungles to its glacial highlands, is in turmoil.

Whole nations, peoples, and areas—some of them with cultures thousands of years old—are in upheaval, discarding the old, trying the new, overthrowing governments, strengthening democracy, or establishing dictatorships.

Surprised by the violence of movements affecting hundreds of millions of persons, the Western World must adapt itself now to a new Asia. And it must do so swiftly and wisely if it is to save what remains of that immense land mass for democracy and progress.

If there has been any doubt about this, it now has been forcefully dispelled by the recent events in Iran.

TRIGGER-FINE STATUS

With the assassination of Premier Ali Razmara and former Minister of Education

know. On the other hand, if, as one of his chief aides declared, the general disobeyed no directives, the specific cause of removal is not so clear. But this much is certain: The President, acting either on his own or with advice of consultants, decided he thought General MacArthur's attitude was hurting the country's chances of remaining out of a third world war, and, justifiably or unjustifiably, ordered the general to turn his duties over to someone else. Mr. Truman having acted, General MacArthur is out, but our problems in the Far East and elsewhere are still with us. This it would be fatal to forget.

To show how the argument is becoming an interparty one, Senator WHERRY in replying to the President spoke not as an individual Senator incensed over what had occured but as the Senate's Republican leader. He made no effort to conceal his partisan approach.

If the defense effort has been set back, as many contend, by MacArthur's removal, it will be further set back if our foreign relations are put on a partisan, rather than a bipartisan, basis. The good of the country must be put above the 1952 election.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have wondered how long the President of the United States, Commander in Chief, would tolerate the disobedience of General of the Army MacArthur to the orders of his superiors and his disregard of the policies of our Nation and as approved by the United Nations and all of our leaders.

In the past few days I have inserted in the RECORD, for the information of the House and the country, several articles, editorials, and comments of several outstanding recognized international authorities. Today I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Wallace Deuel which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of April 15 that clearly sets forth the willful disregard of General MacArthur on four occasions, to assurances given to the emissary of the President, W. Averell Harriman, to Chief of Staff General Collins, and to the President himself who, for and in the interest of peace, traveled thousands of miles to confer with General MacArthur. Consequently, I cannot understand why many people fail to realize that it is not a question between President Truman and General MacArthur as individuals but one involving the authority of the office of the Presidency under the Constitution of the United States.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this situation has arisen in willful disregard of orders and purposely made to create a political issue, in cooperation with and upon the insistence of the Republican leaders and newspapers. Mr. Deuel's article follows, and I also include an Associated Press report captioned "Vatican paper backs Truman firing of Mac":

[From the Washington Star of April 15, 1951]

CONSTITUTIONAL DIVISION OF POWERS FIGURES IN TRUMAN-MACARTHUR RUPTURE—PRINCIPLE IS OFTEN MORE HONORED IN BREACH THAN IN PRACTICE—OTHER MILITARISTS HAVE RAISED ISSUE

(By Wallace Deuel)

The Nation's most colorful and most controversial senior soldier tried to defy the Constitution this week—and failed.

President Truman relieved General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his command for prolonged and repeated flouting of orders and replaced him with Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

Republicans, who have long been partial to MacArthur—as he has sometimes seemed to be to them—sprang to his defense, the general prepared to come home to state his case, and the country was plunged into a bitter controversy.

The final outcome and consequences of these dramatic events remained uncertain at week's end. At least one towering fact emerged out of all the fire and fury, however:

This fact is that President Truman has reasserted the constitutional principle of the supremacy of the civilian authority of the Republic over the military.

HONORED IN BREACH

It has sometimes seemed, during the past decade or more, that this principle has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Enjoying vast powers, and checked by few lets or hindrances, some of America's strong-willed generals and admirals have tended to act as though they were answerable to no superior authority, civil or military. Discipline, to these men, has appeared to be something which they imposed on others, but which was not to be imposed on them. There has been no one, it has seemed at times, who could command the commanders.

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States," the Constitution provides. Some generals have not obeyed.

The Constitution also makes the President primarily responsible for the conduct of the country's foreign relations, too, but some generals have not paid conspicuous heed to this provision either.

General MacArthur has finally forced this constitutional issue of the powers of the Presidency.

MacArthur has been a proud and imperious man all his life, and he has been increasingly intransigent since the end of World War II. He has outdone even himself, however, since the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

The drama of his defiance during this latter period has played itself out in a prologue and four acts—up to now.

PROLOGUE

The curtain rose on the prologue early in August, when MacArthur flew to Formosa, last precarious foothold of the Chinese Nationalist regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, to discuss plans for the island's defense.

The military dispositions which MacArthur made are still official secrets. In addition to making these arrangements, however, the general also did two other things which, far from remaining secret, attracted world-wide and not altogether indulgent notice:

He kissed Mme. Chiang's hand (notwithstanding the fact that the hand was gloved at the time) and he uttered spirited and martial sentiments about Formosa, the Chinese civil war, communism, and world policy in general.

The Chinese Nationalists exploited these statements to the utmost. They also intimated that MacArthur had gone much further, in secret conversations, and had promised them support above and beyond any contemplated by American policy.

This all caused some unease in Washington, and it caused even greater unease among America's friends and allies.

The United States had U. N. sanction, and it had allies, in what it was doing in Korea, but it had neither in what it was doing in Formosa. There, America was alone. Its allies, indeed, heartily disapproved of America's China policy. The United States might completely isolate itself in the world if it did what MacArthur seemed to propose should be done.

President Truman decided there was some danger that MacArthur might have mistaken what American national policy was. Accordingly, he sent W. Averell Harriman, special White House adviser on foreign affairs, on a mission to explain matters to the general.

Mr. Harriman returned to Washington, in due course, full of assurances. All was in order, he said. MacArthur understood what policy was and would, of course, respect it. The general is a soldier, said Mr. Harriman; he will do what he is told.

The prologue of the drama ended on this tranquillizing note.

Hardly were Mr. Harriman's shirts back from the laundry, however, when General MacArthur demonstrated that he could not have paid too close attention to what the White House emissary had said. For the curtain now rose on the general's first virtually open defiance of the President.

ACT I

Mr. Truman had proclaimed that the United States had no selfish interests in Formosa, and no aggressive designs on it. This country had intervened in the island only temporarily and only to neutralize it, the President had said—to protect the flank of the forces fighting in Korea, and to prevent the spread of the conflict. The future status of the island could be determined only by international agreement after peace had been restored.

This policy was not to MacArthur's liking, and he opposed it in official recommendations to his superiors in Washington. The general was overruled, however. The policy would stand, he was informed, and must be upheld.

But MacArthur refused to uphold it. On the contrary, he appealed to public opinion against his superiors.

He sent a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, then in convention assembled in Chicago, in which he repeated the same arguments against the national policy which his superiors had rejected. Some of the arguments were even stated in the same language in the message as that in which they had been stated in the recommendations.

American policy, General MacArthur said, must be aggressive. The whole Pacific must be an American moat.

Formosa, he insisted, was an essential link in an "island chain" from which "we can dominate with air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore." America must, accordingly, retain control of the island indefinitely, for the purposes of this country's own national security.

The arguments of those who differed with him were "fallacious and threadbare," MacArthur said, and were marked by "hypocrisy and sophistry." It was unfortunate that these arguments had "confused and deluded" many individuals "distant from the actual scene."

The general sent a large number of advance copies of this remarkable statement to friends and acquaintances in the United States, and to a wide assortment of editors, but he did not send any to the State Department, the Pentagon, or the White House. Official Washington learned about the message from newspapermen shortly before it was due to be released.

President Truman was intensely annoyed. He immediately ordered MacArthur to withdraw his message. The general complied. The message could not be suppressed, however. It was already in the hands of too many people. It was published on August 28.

American policy thus was again frustrated, American pledges were again made suspect, and America's allies were again alarmed and alienated.

The President nevertheless made another effort to keep the peace with MacArthur. He sent the general a message praising him for his military accomplishments and explaining once again, with conspicuous tact, what American policy in Asia was and why he had had to ask that the general's message be withdrawn. General MacArthur seemed to accept the President's position and once again harmony seemed to reign.

Once again the curtain fell on a peaceful note. All seemed well, or at least reasonably well.

ACT II

Yet misgivings may have lingered in the President's mind. In any event, Mr. Truman flew to Wake Island on October 12 for a personal visit with MacArthur.

There were conferences in which other officials took part, and the President and the general talked privately for an hour as well. Mr. Truman returned to the United States on October 16, professedly as full of confidence and good will as Mr. Harriman was previously.

The President paid stirring public tributes to MacArthur, and proclaimed that all was and would be well. He denounced a reporter who asked him at a press conference on October 19 if he and the general were now in agreement. It was outrageous even to raise such a question, the President angrily declared.

This was not, of course, an answer to the question which the reporter had asked. Were the President and the general in agreement or were they not? Perhaps the President wasn't sure himself.

But if there were any doubts in Mr. Truman's mind, they were soon dispelled.

ACT III

In November General MacArthur launched an offensive which was to destroy such of the enemy's remaining forces as could be destroyed and drive the rest out of the country.

This was to be an "end the war" offensive. "I want to make good on my statement that they (the U. N. troops) are going to eat their Christmas dinner at home," the general said.

But the offensive ended in tragedy. The Chinese Communists intervened in Korea on a massive scale, and threw the U. N. forces reeling back to below the thirty-eighth parallel.

This was a military disaster, but not yet a political one. MacArthur, however, now threatened to turn the defeat into a political disaster too.

There was some public criticism of the general's conduct of the "end the war" offensive, and some questioning as to whether he should have undertaken it at all. MacArthur reacted with characteristically fierce resentment.

"Never was a man so sorely tried," he exclaimed, and he made a whole series of public pronouncements in which he blamed the defeat in Korea on Washington and on the United Nations.

He blamed them for not warning him that the Chinese Communists would intervene. He blamed them for denying him authority to bomb Manchuria. He said that the limitations imposed on him were unprecedented in military annals.

General MacArthur also asked that he be allowed to use Chinese Nationalist troops in Korea, and he said yet once again that it was necessary to destroy world communism in Asia.

There was much sympathy for MacArthur at this juncture of affairs. But the course of action he was advocating was contrary to the best military judgment in Washington. It was contrary to national policy. It was contrary to repeated assurances as to American intentions which this Government had proclaimed to the world. It was contrary to the policies of America's principal friends and allies. It was contrary to MacArthur's instructions.

Once again the general seemed to be confirming Communist charges that the United States had embarked on a policy of aggression in the Far East, and once again he alarmed and alienated America's allies.

This was the third occasion in 3 months on which the general had undertaken publicly, contrary to the orders of his Commander in Chief, to reverse the Nation's foreign policy. The President, however, still tried to keep the peace with his commander.

Publicly, Mr. Truman stoutly defended General MacArthur against his critics, and even privately he limited himself to directing the Joint Chiefs of Staff to admonish the general to clear future military and foreign policy utterances with his superiors. Categorical instructions to this effect went to MacArthur on December 6.

Washington also sent Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, to the Far East to confer with General MacArthur and, among other things, to request him to pay more heed to orders and advice from the Capital.

General Collins returned as optimistic as Mr. Harriman and the President had been after their conferences with MacArthur. He had just as little justification for his cheery mood as the President and Mr. Harriman had had for theirs, as events were once more to prove.

ACT IV

The fourth and thus far final act of the drama opened March 20.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff on that day sent MacArthur a message informing him that the United States was planning, in cooperation with other United Nations members, to make a new cease-fire proposal to the Chinese Communists. The Joint Chiefs asked the general to send them any comment he might care to make on this proposal.

General MacArthur did not reply to the Joint Chiefs' request. Instead, on March 24, he made a cease-fire proposal of his own. In it he threatened that the U. N. might attack the Chinese mainland if Peiping did not stop fighting in Korea.

General MacArthur followed this up with a second stirring manifesto which he gave out the next day.

This 48-hour period of March 24 and 25 was the point of no return in the general's destiny. The action of the drama now quickened.

On March 24 the Joint Chiefs sent MacArthur a new admonition:

"The President has directed," they informed him, "that your attention be called to his order as transmitted December 6, 1950. In view of the information given you March 20, 1951, any further statements by you must be coordinated as prescribed in the order of December 6."

"Must?" This reminder had no more effect than the original order had had.

On April 5, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, House minority leader, read on the floor of the House a letter General MacArthur had written him insisting yet once again that world communism must be fought in Asia, and fought now—as, indeed, the general said he was doing.

On the same day, the London Daily Telegraph published an interview which it said General MacArthur had given its military correspondent and in which the general was quoted as saying much the same things he had written to Representative MARTIN, but in even more intransigent tones and terms.

There was to be one more incident before the denouement. The magazine Freeman published a message from General MacArthur to one of its editors in which the general asserted that 120,000 South Korean troops had been released from combat duty by "political" decisions beyond his authority.

The clear implication was that this action had been taken against MacArthur's wishes, and that it had unduly weakened his forces.

In fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had proposed providing arms for these troops, and for a considerable larger number in addition, for the purpose of maintaining them in the field in Korea, but MacArthur had recommended that the arms be given to the Japanese national police reserve instead.

It was only now, finally and at long last, that the President took decisive action against his contumacious commander. Mr. Truman acted in the only manner which remained possible if any action was to be taken at all: He relieved General MacArthur of his command, told the world why he was doing so, and published some of the evidence in the case.

General MacArthur's challenge to the constitutional authority of the President has been so spectacular that some shrewd observers think the general has deliberately forced the climax which was reached this week. He was determined to achieve either absolute authority or a sensational martyrdom, in this view.

The martyrdom, if that should be his lot, would be peculiarly poignant if General MacArthur should appear to fall victim to foreigners, politicians, diplomats, and other such unloved persons, and the general has sought to formulate the issue in these terms. The more raucous of his admirers echo and outdo him in this claim.

In fact, however, the issue is between MacArthur and the Constitution of the United States. The issue is whether the civilian Commander in Chief is to exercise effective authority over the military.

This would be the issue even if there were important disagreements between America and its principal allies and associates on the fundamentals of the policy which the general has defied, or between the Pentagon and the White House. But there are no such disagreements, so far as the duly constituted authorities are concerned.

There is a clear consensus among these authorities, both military and civilian, that the challenge of world communism must be met in the first instance in Europe, not in Asia.

There is a clear consensus, furthermore, that the Communist challenge must be met, so long as conceivably possible, by means short of general war—and that there is a fair chance that it can be met successfully by such means.

The free nations must seek to localize any and every conflict which may break out, in this judgment. Above all, they must avoid, at almost any cost, being drawn into a major war on the mainland of Asia.

If general war is to come, then it must come only because the Communists are determined it must come, and force it on the world. The free nations must not start it.

Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public-assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,340,000,000 during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public-assistance recipients and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Adopted by the house March 28, 1951.

WARREN L. WARD,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Unacceptable Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Joplin Globe of April 13, 1951:

UNACCEPTABLE EXPLANATION

In his radio address to the Nation Wednesday night, President Truman attempted to justify his summary dismissal of General MacArthur by explaining that the general is not in agreement with United States and UN policy in the Far East.

Even if one grants that this is true, it by no means will be deemed a sufficient excuse by MacArthur's admirers and supporters for the harsh and spectacular method used in ousting the general from all his commands.

But it is also true that millions are by no means convinced United States and UN policy as President Truman outlined it has been clear enough heretofore for General MacArthur or anybody else to understand just what it is or has been.

Merely to plead that we want no third world war is no explanation for the unceremonious firing of MacArthur. Nobody wants a third world war. Certainly MacArthur doesn't. But neither he nor millions of others are ready to accept a back-down from the position taken by the United States and the UN last June as the only safe recipe for avoiding a third world war.

Such a back-down is exactly what is proposed by the Asia policy as described by President Truman Wednesday night.

When he directed MacArthur to use United States military forces to challenge the aggression of North Koreans last June the idea was that the free nations of the world must make all of Korea safe for freedom. Now the President and his advisers are apparently convinced we cannot do this; that the best out is to accept a compromise that will leave the North Koreans at the thirty-eighth parallel to ready themselves for another march into South Korea at some future date.

Is it surprising General MacArthur would be dissatisfied with any such conclusion to a war that has already cost the United States more than 50,000 casualties? He is the type that believes in finishing a job. He doesn't accept defeat, partial or complete, with complacency, which is the major explanation for his great popularity with so many Americans. And which also is a major and sufficient reason why he should never have been subjected to the outrageous treatment he has been accorded.

General MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the New Haven (Conn.) Evening Register April 11, 1951, which reflects an unbiased and mature reaction to the removal of General MacArthur.

I am proud to see the New Haven Register join the great majority of the responsible press of the country by endorsing the action of President Truman:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

It had to happen.

President Truman's decision to remove General MacArthur from the Supreme Command in the Far East involving not merely the war in Korea but also the supreme command in the whole Asiatic area and the occupation of Japan was determined upon, no doubt, after the most serious consideration. The policies of the President and of General MacArthur were clearly divergent. The general had merely a military situation to consider; the President had both the military and the diplomatic situation to pass upon.

Under the Constitution the President is declared to be the Commander in Chief of our military forces. However wise the attitude of General MacArthur in deciding upon a total all-out war in the Far East and that of the President in proceeding more cautiously, taking into consideration the views of our allies in Europe and in the United Nations, the decision was up to the President and to the President alone. General MacArthur could not be permitted to assume the dual role.

Whether in the course of events the President or General MacArthur is right as to the policy that should be pursued, it was certainly not up to the general to decide. He necessarily could not know all the facts and it was his duty to fall in line with the instructions he received, whether they seemed to him wise or not.

This leaves the situation very unclear. For a long time the American public has been deeply divided in its opinion as to what our policy in this whole world crisis should be. The American public has been restless under what has appeared to be a policy of indecision in our national leadership, an indecision made more evident by divergent political views expressed in Washington. For a time at least, this apparent indecision must continue for the simple reason that it would be most unwise from any standpoint to let the Russians know just what our ultimate plans are to be. They will not know now whether they have got to prepare for a long war in Asia or in the Middle East or in the Balkans or in Western Europe. What they do know now is that plans are being made to cope with aggression wherever it may seem to be most threatening and to meet it there, not merely with all the power we can command, but with the fullest cooperation of the countries in Western Europe and our allies in the United Nations, to whom we are committed and whose opinions and judgment we are naturally called upon to consider if we are to preserve that unity which is essential to a final accomplishment of our aims. While the American people are naturally most anxious to know what our policy is to be, they should, in our opinion, exercise the greatest patience and not participate in any political maneuvering that should make it necessary to let the Russians know what to expect.

In the meantime—and, in fact, that has been true from the very beginning—the most unwise and unpatriotic course at the moment would be to force a disclosure to the Russians of what they may have to meet. Let us keep them guessing. We should proceed as rapidly as possible in our military and industrial preparations so that if and when a more immediate crisis or threat of aggression should develop it can be promptly and effectively dealt with.

Rubber Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include two announcements as recorded.

A number of my colleagues have discussed matters related to the following announcements, and some of them asked me to secure information for the RECORD so the questions could be pinpointed:

The Board of Trade announced last night that licenses will be required from April 9 for the export of raw gutta-percha, raw natural rubber, including crepe, and natural rubber latex, to all destinations other than the Commonwealth, the Irish Republic, and the United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE BY THE FEDERATION OF MALAYA AND SINGAPORE APRIL 5, 1951

The Governments of the Federation of Malaya and Singapore announced jointly last night their intention of adopting measures of destinational control over rubber exports. This conforms with the recently announced decision of the British Government to control such exports in order to prevent unduly large quantities of rubber being sent to any destinations so that insufficient supplies are left available for the United Kingdom and other friendly countries.

2. In the Federation, open general licenses for rubber exports will be withdrawn from April 9, when all exports will come under

And again, if general war comes, the primary effort to win it must be made in Europe, not Asia.

This country's constitutional authorities also agree with those of most of the rest of the free world in their attitude toward MacArthur's policy acts and utterances of the past 9 months.

They do not mean and do not intend to be overruled and reversed by any single individual. Least of all do they mean or intend to be overruled and reversed by the open defiance of a general who, no matter how great a field marshal he may be, they have finally, reluctantly, and regretfully concluded is dangerously mistaken in his thinking and dangerously unsuited in temperament for the great responsibilities which always must accompany great authority.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of April 14, 1951]

VATICAN PAPER BACKS TRUMAN FIRING OF MAC

VATICAN CITY.—Osservatore Romano's news commentator said Saturday, President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur proclaims a "desire for peace, not by words, but by a decisive act—one that might even be against his own popularity."

The comment—by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci—was the first on MacArthur to appear in the Vatican newspaper that usually reflects the opinion of Pope Pius XII.

Bernucci pointed out that some commentators had observed that the Korean situation would not be altered by the general's recall, but only if the United Nations desire to negotiate met a similar willingness on the part of Peiping.

"But," said the Osservatore writer, "MacArthur remained the expression of that policy that held all further diplomatic effort to be useless and thought that the decision could be obtained only by military success—in practice, war against China with all the risks that could come from it."

Inviting World War III?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for April 20, 1951:

INVITING WORLD WAR III?

(By David Lawrence)

One issue transcends all others in the controversy that has risen over the removal of General MacArthur as the United Nations Commander in the Far East.

It is whether this sensational step will be construed by the Politburo in Moscow as a sign of strength or of weakness. Will not the very circumstances under which the general was relieved of his command encourage the aggressors and lead them to extend their bold adventures in different parts of the world?

General MacArthur has been the symbol of a determined resistance against Communist aggression—a symbol of the use of total force against an unscrupulous enemy. His removal amounts to a political restriction upon the right of a military commander to fight the enemy with a maximum use of air power directed to any part of adjacent enemy territory.

Instead of fighting a war to win, we are to drag along in a stalemate in Korea—we are to fight without a decision or a second front in Asia to harass our enemies. For months and maybe years, our troops will be subjected to recurrent attacks, while the Chinese Communists, aided by Russian supplies and equipment, continuously pour their manpower into the Korean Peninsula and steadily increase our casualty lists.

The American is not one accustomed to fighting with his hands tied behind his back. Several hundred Russian jet planes attacked our air force last week in what the news dispatches described as "the greatest jet battle in history." Yet Mr. Truman says we must not attack the bases from which these jets came. If the Commander in Chief in Washington, however, calls for a limited war and wants it fought that way, every soldier and sailor and airman must obey. Certainly the President has a constitutional right to secure compliance with his orders and to remove General MacArthur. Similarly, the general now has a right as an American citizen in a democracy to accept that dismissal and carry his case to the country.

If we are to grow technical, Congress, too, has some constitutional rights. It can impeach President Truman not only for carrying on a war in Korea without a declaration of war by Congress, but primarily for failing to let our troops fight the enemy with all the weapons at their command. We already have had 60,000 casualties in 9 months—more than we had in the first full year of World War II.

The debate will go on for a long time now. It will, regrettably, become political. The President may have satisfied Britain, but he has split America. He has destroyed the bipartisan approach to foreign policy which we had a right to hope for. Certainly MacArthur was entitled to a personal hearing before any order of dismissal was issued.

Meanwhile, what do the Russians think? They read that our Department of State on March 20 requested MacArthur to agree to deploy his troops in such a way as to avoid "any advance with major forces north of thirty-eighth parallel" and yet to "permit sufficient freedom of action for next few weeks to provide security for United Nations forces and maintain contact with enemy," so as to give time "to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop."

They read the speech of the American President publicly confessing his fear of enraging the new master of Asia—Communist imperialism.

They read also that the Labor government in Great Britain is proposing to placate the Communist Chinese by turning over Formosa to them.

They read that the British Government not only wants Communist China admitted to the United Nations but to sit as a partner at the treaty conferences which are to determine the fate of the Japanese people.

If this doesn't all add up to appeasement, then the Kremlin doesn't have any interpretive brains, doesn't know the difference between a cringing, craven attitude and a forthright, courageous position.

England says: "Appease in Asia and save Europe."

MacArthur says: "Appease in Asia and you lose Europe."

Truman says, in effect: "Don't appease but also don't fight with all your might—the enemy might get mad."

The average American will say: "Appease anywhere, show weakness to a bandit or a bully, and you're lost. To keep on saying you're afraid to go into a big fight will only invite attack from the other fellow."

We must now increase even more our military strength. To diminish our armament and reward the aggressor for his aggression by admitting Red China into the U. N.—as the British advocate—is just to invite world war III. Chamberlain, by his compromise at Munich, invited World War II. It could be that, in beginning to yield step by step to the British policy, President Truman—with the best intentions in the world to do the very opposite—has committed us to fighting world war III both in Asia and Europe.

Public-Assistance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

HOUSE RESOLUTION 37, SUBMITTED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the lower house of the Illinois State Legislature has for some time last past carried on an investigation on behalf of the State of Illinois in order to determine accurately the facts pertaining to the public-assistance program operated by the State in conjunction with the Federal Government under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

The lower house of the State Legislature in Illinois is in favor of amending the public assistance code of Illinois and thereby make available to public inspection a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State.

It is conceded that such an amendment is in conflict with the present Federal law.

I call attention to the language of the resolution which follows and, under unanimous consent, extend the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD, to wit:

House Resolution 37

Whereas the Congress of the United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public-assistance programs operated by the various States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public-welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the Public Assistance Code of Illinois which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the

licensing control and quantities sent to various destinations will be kept under continuous supervision. No special written application for export licenses will be necessary for shipments to the United Kingdom, Canada, the sterling Dominions, the Irish Republic, and the United States; instead, authority to export will be endorsed by the customs officer upon ordinary export declaration. In all other cases advance written applications must be made for export licenses.

3. In Singapore, where rubber exports are already subject to licensing for other reasons, destination control will now be introduced.

The Act of an Irresponsible Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, by both word and deed President Truman has proven himself unpredictable, unreliable, and irresponsible. He should have been impeached when he ordered MacArthur into Korea in the first place. MacArthur's removal is the act of an irresponsible man. Tragic consequences can be expected as a result of that act. Joe Stalin must be wearing a broad grin these days.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent. It expresses the general feeling of the people of my district so well that I place it in the RECORD as a true expression of the indignation and resentment of the people of Illinois:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MASON: As a citizen of the United States of America and a veteran who saw combat in the last war, I wish to express to my elected Representative my deep outrage at the manner in which the President has violated the trust of the American people and failed to support the interests of his country.

By his blundering and thoughtless act in relieving General MacArthur, the President has placated the cowardly diplomats of our self-interested and parasitic allies, deserted the thousands of Americans who have died or will die in Korea because he ordered them there in the first place, completely and despicably shattered the prestige of the American people and American military leaders as far as Asia is concerned, and given more aid and comfort to our enemies than can be measured.

I tolerated his unstatesmanlike "s. o. b." letters, his labeling the marines as policemen; I accepted his ordering of Americans to die in combat without the sanction of the people; I was disgusted but willing to wait when I heard how his multitude of questionable friends had taken the American people for everything from deep freezers to million-dollar RFC loans, but this final act has completely destroyed my faith in his ability to administer the great office which he holds.

I don't care if the President is a Democrat or a Republican, but I insist that he must always and unswervingly be an American. I can no longer figure out who Mr. Truman represents, but it sure as hell isn't the American people.

If the President's current acts are guided, there are certainly some large "red herrings" in Washington. If his acts are his own ideas, the man is utterly incompetent to hold his office.

I hope you know what flag is flying over the White House. I am beginning to doubt that the President does.

No Time for Hasty Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a thoughtful and impartial editorial which appeared in the Orlando (Fla.) Morning Sentinel on Friday, April 13, 1951, discussing the events of the past week, under the heading "No time for hasty judgment":

NO TIME FOR HASTY JUDGMENT

Never in the modern history of our country has it received such dramatic news as the firing of General MacArthur by President Truman.

MacArthur, although an able general with a brilliant war record, has not lacked for personal publicity. His staff has done a wonderful job of selling him to the American public as well as to our soldiers on duty all over the world. He has constantly been in moving-picture news reels and magazine articles in the most favorable light.

At best, MacArthur is, to tell the truth, a complex individual.

As John Gunther writes in the Riddle of MacArthur:

"Brilliant and masterful on one hand, vain and enigmatic on the other—what manner of man is Douglas MacArthur?"

To the average American, however—and particularly to the women—he represents the idol and ideal of our military prowess. This is even more so of MacArthur than Eisenhower. We don't think Eisenhower has worked at the publicity job as much so as the older man in the Pacific.

Meanwhile, as all of his favorable publicity was building up MacArthur as the modern George Washington, Mr. Truman has been receiving almost as much unfavorable publicity as MacArthur received favorable publicity. The President has been inclined to go off half-cocked, write scorching letters to individuals, low-rate the marines, cram social equality down the throats of Americans, and otherwise make himself thoroughly hated.

So now, when the President may have come up to size and for once, acted like a great leader for the long-range welfare of his country, his countrymen, and the peace of the world, the people doubt him. Having lost complete confidence in Mr. Truman, the people seem to think that he fired MacArthur out of spite. That he just wrote another nasty letter—this time, to a general sitting out there on the frontier of our security and doing what he could to protect it. All of which has certainly made many an American as sore as a wet hen.

But, while General MacArthur is a popular hero in the eyes of the average American, the public should not condemn his discharge by the President too hastily.

Unfortunately, we are not allowed behind the scenes in Washington. We, who are prone to criticize Truman and his advisers for letting this grand old warrior out now, must realize that Washington has more information than we have.

Washington knows, for instance, whether or not we are now able to fight a war with China. Washington knows, for instance, whether Stalin is trying to suck us into Asia and while we are thus employed, on an all-out full-scale war, tear the guts out of Europe, take over its industrial centers, and conquer Europe quite as easily as Hitler did. With Europe in the bag, England would be a pushover and then China would fall at Stalin's ease just as Paris fell after Hitler rushed to the Channel coast.

We must also remember that MacArthur is 71. We must also realize that when we see him debarking from a plane in Korea, he is bent and stooped. He is old and he looks it.

It may be that Mr. Truman and his advisers are trying to forestall world war III right now, simply because they know that this Nation is not ready for it.

It is apparent that MacArthur was willing to take the risk of world war III. He was willing to send the Nationalist troops from Formosa into China. But should he do so? This might mean the beginning of another, perhaps the last, war.

As we said no longer than a week ago, we believe the troops of Chiang Kai-shek should be employed in a second front of China. But now that Mr. Truman and his advisers have ousted General MacArthur so dramatically, it is apparent that Truman and others know considerably more than the editor of this newspaper. It seems that they have interpreted the design of the Russian attack and that they are now refusing to stick their heads in a trap. If Truman is thinking thusly, he is thinking correctly.

But what has happened in such dramatic fashion in the last few hours cannot detract from MacArthur and his record.

MacArthur is certainly crowned in glory.

He has won himself a position in American history, the like of which few of our military commanders have achieved.

At 71, it is time for him now to retire and rest.

He should wear the laurel leaves, the crown of glory. But to wear them well he should neither aspire to the Presidency in 1952—because he will be too old at 72—nor should he seek to create a third world war by speaking and writing assignments.

He is a great man—as history will record him—if he is great enough to quit now.

Van Fleet to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under permission to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Post of April 12 about a man whom I consider one of our great generals, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, the new commander in Korea. I had the opportunity to see General Van Fleet's work in Greece at the close of the campaign against the Communist guerrillas, and it seems to me that it is a chapter in American military history that the entire country should know

about. I have always felt that General Van Fleet did not receive the recognition which he deserved.

VAN FLEET TO KOREA

James A. Van Fleet and Matthew B. Ridgway have proved their mettle brilliantly, and should make a great team in the Far East. The ability that General Ridgway has displayed in retrieving the near-debacle beginning last November in Korea is already the theme of many encomiums among military experts everywhere. Of late he has become well known to all Americans. Ridgway's successor in the field command, Van Fleet, is, however, hardly known at all. Yet he is a born soldier, and has already covered himself with laurels in almost precisely the same kind of operation in Greece which he will now undertake in Korea. In military circles the Greek campaign is called a classic.

No commander in modern times has been handed such a platter of handicaps as Van Fleet was given in Greece. Talk about "sanctuaries"—meaning the political limitations imposed by limited wars: the Greek guerrillas had a real sanctuary which fitted Greece almost like a canopy. It stretched across nearly 1,000 miles of frontier from the Adriatic to the Aegean belonging to Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. Directed from a capital in a mountain fastness in northern Greece, the guerrillas fought mainly as raiders, but they also put up pitched battles, and kept the whole countryside terrorized. Time after time General Van Fleet went after them, but was met by a combination of factors which for months had him baffled. There was the mountainous terrain, which is similar to Korea's. Then there was the fear that had all Greece in its grip which made the country people the accessories of guerrillas who always came back. Finally, there was the facility with which the guerrillas, when hard-pressed, could skip over the overarching frontier for rest and replenishment from the larder and arsenal of the three neighboring countries. It was the stiffest task that any field commander could possibly imagine, but Van Fleet was undaunted, let alone uncomplaining.

Early in 1949, Van Fleet engineered a totally new campaign. He instituted a curfew in rural Greece, persuaded this land of villagers that his troops would never relinquish protection, and then proceeded systematically to flush mountain range and valley of the guerrilla bands. The final stroke was delivered when he pushed them to prearranged destinations at Grammos and Vitsi on the Albanian border. Then he drove right along the border and simultaneously loosed Hell-divers with which his Greeks had been trained in secret and made his final bag. The war was over, August 1949, but the world by that time had other preoccupations with Moscow, and failed to appreciate the success. When you think of Pershing's and Kitchener's 3-year travail in the Philippines and South Africa, respectively, you get some comprehension of this man's achievement.

Van Fleet, we wrote a year ago, has left a memory with the Greek soldiers that is bright and shining as well as indelible. They know him as a great captain who welded together a new army and led it to victory and left it a real factor in any future reckoning in the Balkans. We know him as a fine and authentic American with a modesty and a simplicity and a loyalty which are altogether admirable. Policy toward Greece dictated that Van Fleet should take no credit for the successful campaign, but this was natural to Van Fleet, who is one of the most self-effacing men in the Army. There could not have been a better choice to succeed General Ridgway, who now goes to Tokyo with a new assignment, in filling which he will have the good wishes of his countrymen.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows so clearly states the fundamental issue underlying the relief of General MacArthur that I consider it well worth every Member's time to read. The author of this letter, W. Prewitt Ewing, of Kansas City, Mo., understands that the future of the United States and freedom is vastly more important than partisan political advantage.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. RICHARD BOLLING,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLING: In spite of all the tumult and furor over the President's relieving General MacArthur of his commands, it seems to me as a private citizen that no good purpose would be served by the general's being invited to address a joint session of the Senate and the House. It is my hope that you will vote against such a resolution if presented to the House.

It is my judgment that, had the debate between the President and Commander in Chief and the general been permitted to continue by reports on the radio and through the press, it would have been the cause of bad morale in the enlisted ranks of all the Armed Forces and that it would have caused widening of the rifts between the various branches of the Armed Forces. For General MacArthur to be permitted to dignify and glorify his opinions and himself by appearing before a joint session would only add to the probability of these unhappy results. It is hard for me to believe that any soldier failed to recognize the acts and pronouncements of General MacArthur as insubordination.

Anybody with one eye and half sense knows that General MacArthur will have every opportunity upon his return to express his opinions—and probably for highly lucrative stipends. He will not go without a hearing. It may be that he shall have opportunity to express himself before a committee, or committees, of the Congress. It is certain that Robert McCormick will be hard put to find room in his Chicago Tribune for news other than MacArthur in the next coming months. It is further certain that the Republicans in Congress who put the next election ahead of the next generation will make every effort to exploit the MacArthur incident, although their doing so can only increase the confusion and disunity with which the Nation appears now to be so beset. There is an immorality and debasement of integrity which they would pass off in the name of patriotism.

The broad issues which we face are above and beyond the fate of the Democrats or the Republicans in the next election. It appears that Republican Senators, like DUFF and SALTONSTALL, have shown their greater stature in recognition of this fact, and we can only hope that their views will prevail upon their sides in the two Houses of Congress.

Let us, whatever the hardships and whatever the outcry, see that the supremacy of the civil Government and civil policy shall prevail over the military. To reverse this bedrock principle is to follow the course of Mussolini's Italy, of Hitler's Germany, and of Hirohito's Japan—directly to the Fascist state.

If the President made a mistake, and I do not think he did, the mistake was of but temporary consequence. To have condoned and encouraged the military over the civil Government would have been to set us upon a tragic and possibly fatal undemocratic road.

Very truly yours,

W. PREWITT EWING.

I have read Mr. Ewing's letter and wish to say that it expresses my sentiments and judgments.

EUGENE M. MOORE.

Mother Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the time will soon be here when the entire Nation will be observing Mother's Day. I think it is most fitting that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on February 18, 1951, concerning Mrs. George C. Eisenhart. All of Nebraska is proud of this mother and her family.

The article is as follows:

MOTHER EXTRAORDINARY—NINE SUCCESSFUL SONS, TWO DAUGHTERS ARE TRIBUTES TO MRS. GEORGE EISENHART

(By Doris Minney)

If you had chanced to stop in at the George G. Eisenhart home in Culbertson, Nebr., in the 1920's you would have come upon a cluster of romping, rosy-cheeked youngsters and growing young men and women—the 15 children of the late pioneer banker and Mrs. Eisenhart.

Today the 11 remaining children and their remarkable mother are living illustrations of the fine democratic citizens that develop in the typical, well-managed American home.

Now the nine sons and two daughters are scattered over the United States; their father is dead, but their handsome, bright-eyed mother is keeping "the heart of the home" alive for her children and her children's children to return to when they can.

"I want to keep them united as long as I can," she says if you ask her what is her greatest desire.

THREE COLONELS IN FAMILY

An airplane may suddenly rumble in the skies above McCook (where Mrs. Eisenhart has lived since December 1949). The pilot may be one of her two aviator sons, Col. Don Eisenhart, from Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, or Col. Charles Eisenhart, deputy director of public relations with the United States Air Force in Washington, D. C. Or it may be her son-in-law, Col. M. R. Lemon, flying in from Kelly Field at San Antonio, Tex., to bring word from her daughter, the former Elinor Eisenhart, and their three tots.

If the weather is open and there is a homecoming football game at the University of Nebraska (which school was attended by 10 of the Eisenharts) you may see a dark red roadster cruising along on Highway 6 toward Lincoln. Behind the wheel is brunette Marjorie Eisenhart, principal of East Ward School in McCook. Other occupants are her mother, Mrs. George Eisenhart, and Sally Cunningham, McCook physical education

teacher, who makes her home with the Eisenharts during the school term. She is the daughter of Congressman PAUL CUNNINGHAM, of Des Moines.

The trio of women are chatting at a lively pace about the beauty of the crispy fall weather; about how fine it will be to see a football game; about their anticipated reunion with Wayne, a senior in vocational agriculture at the University of Nebraska, and with Carroll, a representative of an insurance company in Omaha.

Eight of the Eisenhart boys—all except Charles, who graduated from Kearney State Teachers College—attended the University of Nebraska and were members of Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity.

"I always plan to attend at least one football game each fall," Mrs. Eisenhart remarks enthusiastically. And you recall that her son, Kirwin, now with an insurance company in Alhambra, Calif., had played on the Nebraska football team, and that two other sons had lettered in track. They were Edward (Ned), now cashier in the Culbertson State Bank founded by his father in 1886, and Warren, a cadet in the junior class at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

When Mrs. Eisenhart tells you that all of her children have been athletic and that she and her husband made great efforts to attend all the football, basketball, and track meets in which their lively progeny participated, you understand when she says:

"My hobbies were always keeping in touch with my children's activities."

After that thrilling football game in which Nebraska defeated Missouri, Mrs. Eisenhart, Marjorie, and Sally enjoyed the planned reunion with Wayne and Carroll.

Later as they were driving homeward they stopped at Clay Center hoping to see Russell Eisenhart, who is with the Soil Conservation Service, but Russell and his family were not home. So they drove on to Cambridge, where Hugh Eisenhart is an attorney with Frank Butler, brother of United States Senator HUGH BUTLER. But when they reached Cambridge it was late, so they did not stop—since it was only 30 miles on to McCook—so Hugh and family would be driving home soon.

LOVE AND DISCIPLINE

As you talk with this alert mother whose gray hair is arranged in a pompadour that frames her vibrant face and high lights her dark, penetrating eyes, you notice that she wears silvery earrings to match the buttons on her trim, dressmaker-style dress. And you wonder how she managed to preserve that well-groomed appearance after a lifetime of serving her children.

For Mrs. George G. Eisenhart is typical of the mothers of the 1900's who sewed and mended and cooked for her family with "changeable help." Not only did she make dresses for her four daughters (two of whom are now dead), but she made underwear for her 11 growing sons (two of whom died).

"We were a family in which the father just loved all of us. The boys had implicit faith in their father—in his goodness," she says with a touch of emotion in her generally controlled voice.

Then she goes on in a brisk manner to say, "Yes, it was their father's goodness and my discipline by which our family developed. My husband and I never interfered or overstepped one another's orders. We were careful not to infringe upon one another's ideas."

Mrs. Eisenhart says there's no secret about how she succeeded in raising so large a family to become healthy, well-educated citizens. "It just took hard work. Faith. Perseverance. You just never let up for a single day when you have a family."

The family lived by a very definite schedule.

"Every child had a hook by the back door on which to hang his clothes when he came in from play. Each child had his own drawer for clothing and underwear (which was never put away unmended). And meals were always at a regular time. My babies had to go to bed at 7 p. m., rain or shine, until they were 4 or 5 years old," the mother recalls.

Democratic principles were established in family living. Mrs. Eisenhart says: "I put it up to the children this way: This home belongs to all of us. It's up to all of us to help take care of it. I tried to show them that they were a part of an organization.

"Each one had definite tasks. The boys always helped with the dishes.

"I always tried to stress in my children responsibility and the necessity of keeping their promises," the wise mother recalls.

"CHEAPER BY THE DOZEN"

Smiling, she continued: "When Charles was home recently some one asked him: 'Do you remember anything particularly well about your childhood?' Charles replied readily, 'Hardly a week goes by that I don't remember one thing.' Well, I wonder what that one thing was. Then Charles went on to say: 'I remember that some one was always saying to me, "The older boys wouldn't have done that." '"

Mrs. Eisenhart read the book, Cheaper by the Dozen, and saw the movie version. She feels there was little similarity between the Gilbreath interpretation of communal life of a big family and the Eisenhart family life.

"I wasn't that good," the Nebraska mother says simply, in referring to the smooth manner in which Mrs. Gilbreath handled the often stormy impacts of her impetuous children and efficiency-expert husband.

"The part I enjoyed most in the book and movie was that referring to the Gilbreath family going for a ride in their automobile."

For every Sunday after all of the Eisenharts had attended Sunday school and church and had a good dinner, 10 or 11 of the children and their parents would take off in the family auto which had a drop seat to accommodate the extra load of small passengers.

"That was our Sunday recreation and the children loved it," she remembers.

Another form of recreation of which the Eisenhart boys were particularly fond was camping out.

Mrs. Eisenhart recalls that although her husband was not especially fond of this rugged form of diversion, he saw that his sons had the opportunity to enjoy the wholesome activity.

"I remember once he camped out with the boys near Estes Park when it was very cold and seemed disagreeable to him. However, he put up no objections because the boys thought it a wonderful event."

THE GIRLS CAME LATE

There wasn't a girl in the Eisenhart family until after six sons had put in their appearance, so the girls were never assigned to too much supervision.

"I was glad the girls weren't among the older of the children," Mrs. Eisenhart says. "They might have been inclined to shoulder too many responsibilities of rearing the other children. The boys were always good to help, but boys always get away from home more than girls, so duties are not so constant with them."

This innate sense of justice seasons all of Mrs. Eisenhart's dealings with her "considerable" family. There was never any partiality or prejudice demonstrated by this judicious woman, who says:

"The children all have been wonderful to me, and I'm equally fond of all of them."

Sally Cunningham, who has been adopted into the clan of recent years since she and Marjorie Eisenhart began sharing an apartment, says:

"I've met every one of the children, and they are a perfect tribute to their parents."

ON SCHEDULE

In matters of discipline Mrs. Eisenhart was firm and fair.

"I seldom punished them," she says. "The most severe treatment I employed was the use of a little green switch when they ran off. A primary rule was that the children were all to come directly home from school and change into play clothes. If they planned to go elsewhere to play, they were to report such to me. If there had to be punishment, that was by denying them the privileges they most liked (such as camping trips)."

There were narrow escapes in the Eisenhart family just as there are bound to be in any sizable family. One of the narrowest occurred at the swimming hole on the Republican River. It was the custom of the boys to run down a bank to the river, jump a barbed wire fence that fringed the bank, and jump directly into the water.

One time Charles Eisenhart slipped when he attempted to clear the fence, fell across the jagged wire and was torn open until his "innards" were exposed. The doctor who sewed him back together doubted that Charles would survive, but he did.

Three of the Eisenhart children died of diphtheria; one died of strep throat.

"The only way you live through such tragedies is that there are tasks awaiting you so you can't stop. There's a baby crying. So you just have to go on—working it off—whether it's grief or otherwise," she says philosophically.

AND 16 GRANDCHILDREN

Humorous incidents were so numerous in the course of family living that if you ask Mrs. Eisenhart to tell of such, she'll say:

"You should ask the children that."

She does recall that when one of the Eisenhart boys brought his fiancée home to give the family a "look-over," the girl, an only child, was almost bewildered at the sight of so many handsome boys gathered around the family table.

"She just kept looking from one to another in amazement," Mrs. Eisenhart recalls as amusement lights her dark, intelligent eyes.

Incidentally, the girl became an Eisenhart by marriage. As of now there are seven daughters-in-law; one son-in-law; 16 grandchildren.

In Mrs. Eisenhart's opinion, large families may not be advisable for all people. She thinks it would be difficult to raise one in the new, smaller houses. But she says:

"I know that a large family was meant for me. It was almost a religion with me."

She considers her greatest reward "seeing my children grow up to live well-adjusted, useful lives."

IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

Despite the demands of motherhood and home making, Mrs. Eisenhart found time to serve as chairman of the Culbertson Public Library Board for 26 years. She was thrice matron of the Culbertson Order of the Eastern Star; a charter member of the Culbertson Woman's Club; an active member of the Presbyterian Woman's Group.

Her married children all have families.

"They all love children," Mrs. Eisenhart says happily.

Then smiling, she adds, "Occasionally the boys tell me they know too much about child care. 'We have to help our wives too much,' they chide good-naturedly."

For the Eisenharts are known for their cooperativeness. The second generation, like the first, continues to carry the torch of service not only at home but in public affairs.

During World War II seven of Mrs. Eisenhart's sons were in service. Four of them and her son-in-law were overseas at one time.

Ask, "How do you keep up with letter writing?"

She'll reply, "I don't. And sometimes I hate myself for it. The children all write. Some of them regularly each week."

REMEMBERED BY PUPILS

That Mrs. Eisenhart devotes the major portion of her time and thinking to her family is admirable and expected. Equally admirable is her concern over the development of her community and State.

She was born in New York; came with her parents to Hayes County, Nebr., when she was a small child; returned to Ballston Spa, N. Y., to attend high school. Then she came back to Nebraska to teach school winters; attend school each summer.

It was while she was teaching in Culbertson that she met and married George Eisenhart. One of her fondest memories is of how her banker husband served as counselor to farmers of that prosperous agricultural area.

Today Mrs. Eisenhart speaks with enthusiasm of the continued extension of irrigation facilities in that community by the Bureau of Reclamation. "This will help stabilize the farmers' income," she says with genuine concern.

Among the farmers and farmers' wives in the Culbertson vicinity are many who were students of Mrs. Eisenhart. One such is Mrs. Alex Eisenach, who was born in Russia and came to Culbertson with her parents when she was 6 years old. Mrs. Eisenach says:

"I started to school when I was 7. Mrs. Eisenhart was my teacher. I couldn't speak English very well (the child spoke German) and I liked her because she was so kind and patient with me. In later years I clerked in the Wacker store in Culbertson and I was pleased because Mrs. Eisenhart always came to me to be waited on."

The estimation of Mrs. Eisenhart's exceptional talent for teaching and motherhood is multiplied by the number of people one may talk with who have known her through the years.

Even though Mrs. Eisenhart will never find time to paint a picture, or write a book, she has created a family that reflects the finest in democratic ideals. In her life motherhood has become an art.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reaction to President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur has been extensive and varied. To cite one instance, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, April 15, 1951:

VATICAN PAPER BACKS TRUMAN STEP IN MACARTHUR CASE AS AID TO PEACE

ROME, April 14.—President Truman's dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was described by l'Osservatore Romano today as a decisive act proclaiming a desire for peace.

The MacArthur case was removed from the international plane to one essentially domestic by the dismissal, said the Vatican newspaper, which usually reflects the opinion of Pope Pius XII. The newspaper noted that President Truman's decision might even be against his own popularity.

This first editorial comment on the case by l'Osservatore Romano was written by Girogio Luigi Bernucci.

It said General MacArthur had been "the expression of that policy which held all further diplomatic effort (toward a Korean settlement) to be useless and thought that the decision could be obtained only by military success—in practice, war against China with all the risks that could come from it."

"He found himself waging limited war, but not the enemy, which could count upon vast numerical superiority that could not be touched beyond the Manchurian frontier," the editorial added.

"The logical deduction he drew was that of making means adequate to the end. But the consequence—Truman observed—could be a general conflict.

"The President of the United States refused a policy that presented such a risk for the United States and the world.

"With the discard of the hypothesis to attempt to end the conflict by force of arms, there now remains that of seeking a solution through negotiations."

Noting foreign Communist declarations that General MacArthur had been dismissed because of military reversals or popular opinion against the war, the paper said the affair had "ignited a discussion between the two parties that monopolize the great majority of the American electorate."

It went on to say that President Truman "has—it has been observed—placed himself above contingent party interests with a gesture to ease the situation.

"Unfortunately, it seems that the reply to Truman's gesture comes only with propaganda, which, however, will not change the facts," the newspaper concluded.

He Defied His Superior Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Detroit News of April 12 regarding the recent decision to relieve General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his command in the Far East:

HE DEFIED HIS SUPERIOR OFFICER

Three years ago next November the American people made their choice of a Commander in Chief as well as a President to guide their affairs until 1952.

By the vote of the majority, these responsibilities were given to Harry S. Truman.

Under the system of government in which this majority believes, and must continue to support if we are to remain a democracy, the major policies of our Nation are administered by him, even as they are formed by his guidance and the action of the elected representatives of the people.

Were we to depart from this system, we might still endure, but it would not be under a Government of the United States as we have known it since the days of the founding fathers.

So long as the fundamental principle remains, it is unthinkable and intolerable that any lesser servant of Government, either in a civil or military capacity, should undertake deliberately to overrule the President of the United States or seek by counsel to change what is being done.

When the principle is violated, the main victim is the system itself, and the political discipline which as a people we derive from it.

During his last several months as Supreme Commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur gave repeated and deliberate offense to this concept of how the Nation should be governed.

He intervened in political and foreign policy matters not within his province; he ignored the instructions of his Commander in Chief.

The President, in due course, removed him.

Probably no event since Pearl Harbor has more thoroughly shocked and stunned the Nation than this one action closing the public career of one individual. It remains to see whether we will prove capable of viewing the case in perspective, clearly recognizing the vital issue, or will permit partisan prejudice and personal respect for MacArthur's great services to the Nation to compound the damage already done.

The signs are not yet hopeful.

Almost before the ink was dry on the President's order, political party leaders were being routed out of their beds so that they might make capital of the incident.

Resolutions of condemnation were being passed by organizations throughout the country before they had paused to acquaint themselves with all the facts.

What can possibly come of all this except a further beclouding of principle, and a greater deterioration in a situation which calls above all else for national unity?

Never once has the road been closed to MacArthur by which other men bring their influence rightfully to bear in the making of national policy.

At any stage he could have returned to Washington, given his counsel to Mr. Truman and his advisers, and either persuaded them to his way, or resigned, if he believed their policy unsupportable. But this he did not do.

That put it up to the President, after repeated affront, to take the hard and unenviable decision which he regarded as necessary.

In so doing he must have had the advice and support of Defense Secretary Marshall, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs General Bradley, Secretary of the Army Pace, and Army Chief of Staff Gen. J. Lawton Collins.

All these men, by virtue of their training and responsibilities, must be concerned with the question of whether this Nation can survive, or its arms endure in strength, when basic disciplines are trod underfoot.

The American people cannot do better now than turn their minds to this same question, not alone as it applies to the removal of a general, but as it bears on all aspects of the national life.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is overwhelmingly in favor of tidelands legislation which will reestablish in the States the title to all lands within their described boundaries. Congress should act at once to reassert the principle that a sovereign cannot take property without compensation. When the House last

expressed itself on this subject, it voted 257 to 29 against the Federal Government's seizure of State property. Prior to 1937, no good lawyer ever questioned the title of the States in this property which said States had possessed for more than 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, the attorney general of Texas has been a champion of right principles in this matter. He has recently addressed to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY a letter reviewing some of the issues. This letter should be made a part of the RECORD, and I offer it for the benefit of those interested in the subject matter:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., April 10, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your letter of April 8, addressed to the Governors of the 48 States in which you present your views in favor of Federal interim control of the so-called tidelands and against restoration of State ownership.

While we have always disagreed as to the ultimate permanent solution of this long-standing controversy, I have had the highest respect for you and for the sincerity of your views. In fact, I have agreed with you on the desirability of interim legislation which would permit uninterrupted development of natural resources from the tideland belt, provided the interim legislation does not prejudice the position of the States in their aim for a quitclaim bill as the proper and just permanent legislation.

At your recent hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 20, Texas' Governor Shivers, Land Commissioner Giles, and I filed a joint statement approving the general idea of your interim bill and suggesting amendments which we hoped would be adopted in order that we might support it. These facts are cited merely to recall to your mind that I have favored continued development of this property during the present national emergency the same as you have done. The only major difference between us results from the insistence of Federal officials that they be given exclusive leasing powers over the area during the interim. This is a position with which you agree because it would not hinder, but would actually help, in your fight for permanent Federal control. For the same reason, it is only natural that State officials should fear and oppose such a provision in interim legislation. I see no reason why this interim legislation should not allow continued operations by the States with approval by the Department of Interior, just as has been done for nearly 4 years in California under stipulations between that State and Federal officials. Or a joint operation between the State and Federal officials could be provided so as to give neither side an advantage when permanent legislation is considered.

Regardless of who is right, the fact remains that a majority of the Members of the House (257 to 29 on the last vote in 1948 after the California decision) and a majority in the Senate favor ultimate restoration of this property to the States because of their long-recognized ownership and good faith possession. The States discovered and developed the resources in these lands; and, except for recent Federal claims and lawsuits, there would be no threat of delay in development today. The President and his Cabinet members ignore the majority in Congress, as well as the national emergency, when they threaten to stop production from these lands unless it is placed under exclusive Federal control. If the emergency is as great as you indicate, it would seem that the President would be willing to sign any bill that receives a majority vote in Congress and guarantees continued development of the property. If you are correct in saying that Federal officials would stop production of resources from these lands rather than permit a majority of Congress to provide for their continued development by the States, then the need for their development must not be as great as your letter to the governors would indicate.

Still hoping that a fair interim bill can be worked out, I regret that you have by your letter to the governors raised points which are aimed solely against permanent State ownership legislation. I fear this will cause more opposition to the general idea of interim legislation. At least, you have directed arguments to the governors which I feel compelled to answer as follows:

1. You state that the officials and the press of only three States—California, Texas, and Louisiana—seem to be interested in this issue. Possibly you have overlooked the fact that the Governors Conference (composed of the 48 governors) has been on record since 1948 in favor of State ownership legislation. This is also true of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, the American Association of Port Authorities, National Association of State Land Officials, National Conference of Mayors, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, National Reclamation Association, and many others whose resolutions are listed in the previous lengthy hearings which were made a part of the record in your present hearings in order to conserve the time of your committee. It is doubtful if there is any one domestic issue today on which State officials stand more united than the fight to restore and confirm State ownership of submerged lands. The quitclaim bill now before your committee, authored by 35 Senators representing 24 States, further demonstrates that interest is not localized.

2. You state that if for any reason this bill (your interim Federal control bill) should not pass, this production will be suspended. This assumes that the President and Federal officials will substitute their will for the will of the majority in Congress and end all production rather than yield to the Congress. I do not believe this exists as a real danger. In fact, I raised this as a possible result in a Supreme Court brief in *United States* v. *Texas*, and the reply filed thereto by Solicitor General Perlman said:

"The United States has no intention of stopping production of oil from existing wells * * * the Secretary of Interior stands ready, on behalf of the United States to authorize continued production from existing wells on proper terms and conditions."

As you know, such continued production has been authorized by order of the Secretary of Interior dated December 11, 1950, and subsequent extensions thereof.

3. You say that nationalization of oil by Iran may result in our loss of this supply of oil to Russia, and urge this as a reason for immediate Federal control of heretofore State-operated marginal sea lands. Actually, the States feel that in nationalizing tidelands, our Federal Government is doing to us exactly what Iran is doing to the British lease owners and that danger lurks in nationalization of State resources here at home as much as abroad. Your own colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming, Hon. LESTER C. HUNT, made this point very forcefully when, as Governor of Wyoming, he wrote the Senate Judiciary Committee in favor of State ownership legislation on February 21, 1948, as follows:

"I share the fear of our people in the establishment of the Supreme Court's doctrine in the tidelands case to the effect that the Federal Government has paramount rights and dominion over the California tidelands. * * * This paramount right and the dominion superior to the rights of the mere title owner to these lands would be the establishment of a dangerous doctrine in America. If this doctrine could be established as to oil because of its part in national defense and the Federal Government's utilization thereof in its conduct of international affairs, this would be the entering wedge toward the nationalization of other vital natural resources. Every State in the Union has some vital natural resource that the National Government could use for national defense and its conduct of international affairs."

Also, eminent authorities on international law believe that Federal control of these submerged lands under the theory of the Supreme Court that they are part of the international domain may result in Russia or other countries making some claim to share in the resources. Judge Manley O. Hudson, Chairman of the United Nations Commission on International Law, Dean Roscoe Pound, Dr. Charles Cheney Hyde, and other experts in the field recently made this joint statement:

"Implicit in the denomination of the area as international domain is the possibility of other nations having rights therein other than innocent passage through the waters. Spain, Mexico, France, England, Russia, and other nations can make no reasonable assertion of an interest in the oil and other minerals within the 3-league Gulfward boundary of Texas so long as this Court recognizes that the area was removed from international domain when it became a part of the Republic of Texas. * * * A contrary conclusion by the United States Supreme Court could well be used by other nations as an opening for claims not now asserted."

4. You urge that governors of interior States should have no fear of losing their river beds, lakes, and other lands beneath inland waters because "the executive branch of the Government has never asserted title to the lands beneath navigable waters, whether * * * the beds of streams or the beds of harbors or bays." The answer is that neither had Federal officials asserted claim to the marginal belt for over 100 years. According to the Supreme Court's California tidelands opinion, the recognition by Federal officials of State ownership is not binding. Promises of Federal officials as to what they will or will not claim are not given much weight by their successors in office. For instance, President Polk, when negotiating for Texas' annexation, wrote Sam Houston, "Of course, I will maintain the Texian title to the extent which she claims it to be * * *." In 1950 Federal officials not only failed to maintain Texas' title but laid claim to it for exclusive Federal use without compensation. In doing so, they also reversed many recent statements of a contrary intention.

If Congress allows the tidelands cases to remain as the law of our land, there is real danger that future Federal officials and Supreme Court Justices will extend it to inland waters. Your colleague from Wyoming, Senator HUNT, also made this point in his letter of February 21, 1948, to the Senate Judiciary Committee, as follows:

"The doctrine announced in the California case is so broad that it is susceptible to the theory's being applied to lands under lakes, bays, rivers, and other navigable inland waters."

Both the Senate and House Committees on Judiciary made the following report after 17 days of testimony on this subject in 1948:

"State officials from every inland State in the Union, except three, testified or submitted statements that in their opinion the decision had clouded the long-asserted titles

of the inland States to lands and natural resources below navigable waters within the boundaries of the inland States. * * *

"The Supreme Court has as much power to overrule its prior decisions laying down the inland-water rule as it had power to change its belief regarding ownership of the marginal belt within the boundaries of the States; and it may well do so in view of its holding in the California case, unless Congress acts to establish the law for the future."

The very fact that you have in the past offered a bill to quitclaim lands beneath inland waters is evidence enough that their titles have been clouded. However, inland waters cover 45,251 square miles of land as compared with 26,608 square miles of marginal sea within coastal State boundaries. Oil, coal, and iron ore beneath inland waters are just as necessary to national defense as are the same minerals beneath coastal waters, and the Federal Government has the same duty to protect and defend them. Therefore, it has been consistently agreed among coastal and inland State officials that it would be unfair to quitclaim lands under inland waters without quitclaiming the same type of lands under coastal waters lying within State boundaries. The quitclaim bill (S. 940) introduced by 35 Senators covers both inland and coastal waters. It is not limited to the 28 coastal and Great Lakes States but treats all lands beneath navigable waters of all 48 States as State property just as all previous Supreme Court decisions did for over 100 years.

5. You argue that in view of the Supreme Court decisions the marginal belt lands of Texas, California, and Louisiana belong to all the people of the Nation and should not be quitclaimed to those States. I am sure you would not be so harsh with us if you compared our position with that of your own State of Wyoming when the Federal Government obtained a Supreme Court decision against your State declaring the United States to be the owner of a section of land which had been held in good faith for 57 years by your State public-school fund. Oil, valued at more than $3,000,000 had been discovered on this section of land. The Supreme Court went against Wyoming in a case which Senator HUNT (then Governor) said was an almost identical situation with the California tidelands case.

In this situation, you very properly authored a bill in Congress quitclaiming this section of land to Wyoming, in spite of the Supreme Court's decision and in spite of the argument of the Department of the Interior and Department of Justice that it belonged to all the people and should not be quitclaimed. Congress restored title to Wyoming on that part of the section on which oil was being produced. We who urge restoration to the public-school fund of Texas of the lands which we have held in good faith for over 100 years occupy the same position as you did in the case of Wyoming. The oil under our lands is no more valuable for national defense than the oil under Wyoming land, and the Federal Government is as much obliged to defend Wyoming as it is to defend Texas. The truth is that regardless of which government owns or administers the land, oil and other necessary resources will always be available to our Nation for defense, and it is sincerely believed that with the long experience and present machinery in operation, more oil can be produced in this emergency under State control than would be produced if this added burden is placed upon an already overburdened Federal agency.

I would appreciate your inserting this letter in the record of your present hearings, and I will take the liberty of sending copies to my fellow State attorneys general.

While I have felt compelled to answer some of your arguments against the quitclaim bill, I still stand ready to support your interim bill if it is amended so as not to prejudice, or gain undue advantage against, the States on permanent legislation.

I assure you of my continued esteem.

Sincerely yours,

PRICE DANIEL,
Attorney General.

Mr. Thompson Tells All as Democrat Ears Burn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, former Governor Thompson, of Georgia, has given a splendid example to the American people, the method by which the New Deal bureaucracy picks the pocket of the taxpayers. I feel that he has performed a real service because the charge of waste and extravagance comes from a man who, normally because of his official position and previous service, would be reluctant to criticize the Democratic Party. It is to his everlasting credit that he has disclosed the outrageous manner in which the bureaucrats disregard the public which they are supposed to serve.

The Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., has written an editorial which I feel should be brought to the attention of the American people and especially to the attention of the Truman administration. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of April 12, 1951]

MR. THOMPSON TELLS ALL AS DEMOCRAT EARS BURN

The Democratic Party's high command will have quite a time laughing off M. E. Thompson. Mr. Thompson is a former Governor of Georgia, naturally a Democrat by birth and inheritance, and one who has carried many a precinct in his time. Therefore his roar of outrage as he resigns from the Office of Price Stabilization, protesting that it is an obese bureaucracy and that the whole structure of government is no better, gets a play that the MacArthur headlines could dwarf.

Going to Washington on invitation to talk about helping out in OPS, Mr. Thompson found himself after more or less mysterious adventures set down in a cubbyhole with the title of consultant. Nobody consulted him, though he was drawing $53.48 a day plus expenses. He had plenty of time to look around, and the more he looked the more he saw of a clutter of idle consultants. As he tells it, he was there to do a job, not just to get a job, and the situation palled on him. What he exploded at last, with all those good round words like "confusion, inefficiency, waste, and extravagance," would have done credit to a Hoover, if not to a WHERRY.

For Mr. Thompson's purpose the timing of his blast was perfect; for the Democratic strategists, it couldn't have been worse. It came on top of the accumulating revelations about the RFC and about the trails of patronage and influence that led to the President's secretariat and the office of W. M. Boyle, the Democratic National Chairman. It was intermingled with the echoes from Mississippi, where even the weary ears of investigating Senators prick up at testimony of arrant pedding of Federal jobs for cash on the barrel. It was supported by, at the same time it gave added volume to, all the testimony on 5-percenters and political spoils that has been pouring out for several years.

There must be considerable consternation as Mr. Thompson pulls out and tells all as he goes. They must have expected that he would be quiet and grateful along with others whom the organization felt it had to take care of as deserving Democrats. But it is plain that when Mr. Thompson consults, he wants to be consulted. He is obviously a rare bird in the political bush.

Thought Control in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a condensation of an article entitled "Thought Control in the United States of America," which appeared in the American Legion magazine. The condensation was published in the April issue of the Catholic Digest.

THOUGHT CONTROL IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—PUBLISHERS ARE PERMITTING COMMUNISTS TO CENSOR THE BOOKS YOU READ

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

John Smith went into a bookstore for a copy of Seeds of Treason. He had followed the Alger Hiss trial. He knew this book was an objective study of the whole sordid affair.

The clerk, without looking up, told him they didn't have the book in stock. "Why not?" he asked. "How should I know?" she said. "We just don't have it."

"How about that book by Owen Lattimore called Ordeal by Slander?" She fell over herself in her eagerness to haul out a fresh copy. "Such a wonderful book. You'll be so glad you bought it."

Smith didn't buy, because he knew it was a self-whitewashing job by an accused leftist badly in need of whitewashing.

The next day, near his own suburban home, Smith dropped into a book-and-stationery store run by a woman he knew. No, she didn't have Seeds of Treason either. Yes, she did have Lattimore's book. Why? She depended on the reviews in the New York Times and the Herald Tribune for directions on the purchase of books. Neither thought much of Seeds of Treason, but they praised the Lattimore book. So she bought it to sell and didn't buy the other.

John Smith could be anybody. And the town could be your town. His two experiences represent two techniques used by Communists to exercise their thought control over all of us.

In the 1930's Russian-born propaganda had a fantastic success in our country. Eugene Lyons, longtime foe of Communists, called those years the red decade. The Communist popular front penetrated into our every walk of life and thought. It got into the labor movement, education, youth activities; it poisoned the movies, art, and every branch of publishing. At its highest point (1938)

it had deliberate agents and starry-eyed collaborators among New Deal officials, educators, rich women, novelists, and editors. One phase was book publishing and reviewing.

Books are published to be sold just as shoes or sardines are. They are advertised, too, just as other merchandise. But a book gets free advertising that shoes do not. A book is reviewed in papers and magazines, over the radio and on television. Most book reviewers tell the public whether the book is worth buying or not. On the reviewer's honesty and knowledge a book stands or falls, and so does the author's reputation and his livelihood.

If the reviews are unfavorable, the publisher won't spend money on advertising. He can't afford to. If there are no reviews, he can less afford it. The bookseller, who depends on reviews and advertising to purchase, will, therefore, not stock it. Thus many important books can be left to wither on the vine, provided the right techniques are used on them.

The Communists were first to realize what the effective techniques are. They got trusted party members into publishing houses. They made sure they had plenty of authors to log-roll for other party authors, or to apply the hatchet to anti-Communist writers. They spotted fellow travelers among book reviewers. Finally, they put their own little people in retail bookstores as sales clerks.

Whenever a book comes along that is damaging to the Communist effort, the entire strength of their forces is marshaled against it. They bear down on naive people in book reviews, syndicated columns, and editorials.

The syndicated columnist, Bob Considine, is one of the country's best writers. He is fearless, calls the shots as he sees them. Last summer Considine spoke about his field of specialized writing on a national radio network. He said it wields the greatest power. The writer, therefore, should have a corresponding sense of responsibility. By and large, he said, columnists are fair-minded men and women. But he added, "If there is any apparent antireligious feeling among these specialists in journalism, it will be found chiefly among the book reviewers of certain leading New York newspapers and literary publications.

"Here a rather shocking situation prevails," he went on. "If you write a book which steps on the toes of our home-grown left wingers, bamboozled liberals, or outright Communists, or their idols abroad, you can almost count on receiving a number of sour reviews—where the reviews hurt most. There are, of course, outstanding exceptions to this rule. But the average big-city book critic sets himself up as a defender of the legend that those who speak out against Communists and their pale pink carbon copies are automatically cheap sensationalists, warmongers, and unctuous serfs of Wall Street.

"Some of these book reviewers get away with murder, even though their reviews appear in newspapers and magazines which could not possibly exist under communism. The reader of a fat Sunday newspaper digests an editorial renouncing communism, or shudders through stories of torture behind the iron curtain, and then turns to the book-review sections to encounter an inbred critic beating to a pulp a book author who is trying to say the same thing. They seem to produce nothing, these critics. Their role is simply to belt any writer who has the industry and knowledge to produce an anti-Communist tome. Deplorably, few authors have any way of retorting, rebutting, or suing the critic for pulling the rug from under years of devoted work.

"We have book publishers, too, among them who will not touch an anti-Communist book. Among these are some shrewd fellows who have sense enough to know that such books will be solidly battered by the critics, and probably lose money. But there are others who seem to believe with the critics and, like them, are Russia-firsters.

"I can speak with a little personal experience in this latter respect," Considine continued. "I had something to do with the editing of a book named The Rape of Poland, written by the exiled Premier, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk. He gave a detailed account of how Communists were able to seize that predominantly Catholic country with hardly the firing of a shot—except in the prisons of the secret police. The publisher who originally planned to produce the book actually asked Mikolajczyk to tone down his accounts of the tortures and murders inflicted on Polish patriots during the destruction of that country's hard-won liberties. Mikolajczyk, of course, refused to go along with this treacherous suggestion. He found another publisher—one with the courage to let the truth be told."

Mikolajczyk's book, The Rape of Poland, subtitled "Pattern of Soviet Aggression," was published, without censorship or distortion, by Whittlesey House, a division of the McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Sometimes the attack centers on the author, regardless of the book. John T. Flynn, author of The Road Ahead, is one such victim. His book is a warning that millions who say they hate communism are actually helping them at every turn. The Communist Party has been able to use the professional liberals to do their dirty work.

Devin Garrity of Devin Adair reports, "We published the book and waited for the reviews, especially the Sunday New York Herald Tribune. After 2 months, when it seemed fairly certain there would be no review, I began inquiries and learned the review copy had been received and was on file, but it had been marked for the silent treatment. No review was scheduled for it. We then bought advertising space in the Herald Tribune's Sunday book section and ran the excellent and fair review of Mr. Flynn's book which had been published in Human Events, a small Washington, D. C., publication. The Herald Tribune then changed its position and a review did appear—a smear job to counteract the effect of the favorable review we had bought the space to run."

For a perfect example of the all-out, four-alarm attack on an anti-Communist book by another well-known anti-Communist author, W. L. White's Report on the Russians, is probably the classic example. In the summer of 1944, when the United States and Russia were fighting Hitler, Mr. White accompanied Eric Johnston, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, on a 6 weeks' trip to Russia. It was decidedly to Russian advantage to put aside its long-standing rule of secrecy and allow these American visitors to go about the country.

The White book, telling of his trip through Russia, was published by Harcourt Brace. The book was so abused by Stalinist agents in the book trade that reviewers for libraries and church organizations were suggesting, "Don't read it; it's a prejudiced book." The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., a Red outfit subsequently declared subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, led the attack with an elaborate, expensive, 32-page two-color brochure, which boldly purpoted to be "the truth." The Rev. Dr. William Howard Melish followed with an adverse review in the Churchman. Dr. Melish is notorious for his consistent support of Red fronts. It is difficult to see what kind of clairvoyance he has in Brooklyn that would enable him to judge the accuracy of the eyewitness reports of Mr. White from Russia. One of the hatchet men on Mr. White's book was Edgar Snow, writer-editor for the Saturday Evening Post. Mr. Snow has long been on good terms with the left. The Saturday Review of Literature chose Mr. Snow to do the job on George Creel's latest book, Russia's Race for Asia, and Snow produced a highly unfair review.

No better illustration of the effectiveness of the campaign to distort opinion on China can be found than a look back at China now, and at our terrible adventure in Korea, all the more heart-rending because it should not have been necessary. And while we're looking at the wreckage, let's take a look at the battle of the books, a battle which the Communists won through their involuntary helpers as much as through their dedicated party comrades. The American people had no real knowledge of China. The leftists filled the vacuum with their own books, reviewed favorably by each other; and by deriding and denouncing all others who had a kind word to say for the lawful Nationalist Government of China, or its leader and sworn enemy of communism, Chiang Kai-shek.

Who are some of these authors and reviewers?

One is Gunther Stein, who in 1945 brought out The Challenge of Red China. This book was reviewed in the New York Times by Nathaniel Peffer. It was a glowing review.

Another is the late Agnes Smedley, who wrote numerous flattering reviews of comradely books. She herself delivered a hefty volume, which Knopf brought out in 1943, titled "Battle Hymn of China." The Chinese Communists were glorified in this one, not only in the text, but in artful juxtapositions of photos and captions. On one page, for instance, is a heart-moving photograph of a Chinese war orphan and a flattering portrait of Chu Teh, captioned "Father of the Red Army."

It was not until after the war was over, however, that the bumper crop of books on China and the Far East appeared. Most, if not all, were reviewed in a way that must have been highly pleasing to Moscow. Take John K. Fairbank, of Harvard, for instance. In 1948, Professor Fairbank wrote The United States and China, published by the Harvard University Press.

The book was praised with enthusiasm by the late Richard Lauterbach and Owen Lattimore. On February 9, 1947, Mr. Fairbank reviewed two other books for the Times: China's Destiny, by Chiang Kai-shek, an edition approved by the author; and an edited unauthorized version of the same book prepared by Philip Jaffe. Fairbank reviewed these together and managed to say nothing about Jaffe's known bias for the pro-Communist case in China, or of his involvement in the Amerasia case, in which Jaffe was fined for participation in the theft of secret documents from the State Department.

For more logjamming, Mrs. Annalee Jacoby appeared in the New York Times Sunday book section on December 16, 1946, as reviewer of My Twenty-Five Years in China, by John B. Powell, an American of unquestioned integrity who lost both his feet in a Japanese prison. Here she took sharp issue with the author, who persisted in calling the Chinese Communists bandits. Mrs. Jacoby berated the author as a "reactionary" and insisted that peace in China's civil war depended on "progress in negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communists." She was especially contemptuous of Powell's suggestions that there is a "Red menace."

When another non-Communist book, this time on Japan, Japan and the Son of Heaven, by Willard Price, was reviewed in the Times of October 14, 1945, the reviewer was none other than Owen Lattimore, who criticized the book unfavorably. When Lattimore's own book, Solution in Asia, was reviewed in the February 25, 1945, issue, Edgar Snow was given the task. Between them they sold the readers of the Times book section the perfect appeasement-of-Russia program. Snow found

the book "penetrating and comprehensive, yet a succinct and logical exposition of the main dilemmas which face us."

Neglected almost entirely, when it wasn't slammed and damned, was Freda Utley's Last Chance in China, which attempted to awaken the American people to the dangers that would face us if communism succeeded in capturing China. Mrs. Utley, as a very young woman, was a member of the British Communist Party and lived in Moscow for 6 years as wife of a Russian citizen who was not a Communist. She worked as a specialist on far-eastern questions at the Moscow Institute of World Economy and Politics. Her rapid disillusionment and why she came to regard the Soviet Government as a tyranny as bad if not worse than Hitler's, is related in her The Dream We Lost. Needless to say, the book was equally, if not more, lost than her later one on China.

The studied practice of ignoring, neglecting, or damning with faint praise books that sought to show the danger from Communist infiltration began far back. The Red Decade, by Eugene Lyons, published in 1941, was the first really authoritative and informative book on the Stalinist penetration of America. At the time he wrote it, Mr. Lyons was editor of a national magazine and had behind him a successful record of best sellers in books and an equally distinguished record as a foreign correspondent and magazine writer. He speaks Russian, worked in Moscow for the United Press, and was the first American newspaperman to interview Stalin. The Red Decade, even more than his earlier work, Assignment in Utopia, earned him the title of red baiter and got him damned high and low by the "intellectuals," "liberals," and Russophiles. Most reviewers were displeased because Mr. Lyons' probing in The Red Decade revealed the infection among their friends, the intellectuals.

The current party line is to sneer at all ex-Communists, to deny and insult their repentance. This is particularly necessary to the Communists because they must try to offset the damage done their cause by such sincere and repentant men as Whittaker Chambers, who testified against Hiss, and Louis Budenz, whose testimony helped convict the 11 top Communists in the United States.

The latest victim of their sneers is Angela Calomiris.[1] When she was a girl, and weighed only 90 pounds, she was invited to join the FBI. She did. But the job she got was to join the Communist Party and to report the treason of these Russophiles to the Government. She spent 7 years doing just that. She did a superb job, at great personal risk and at no salary.

When the 11 Communist leaders were being tried in New York, she appeared on the witness stand against them. They were amazed, but they quickly recovered. At once the air was filled with Communist cat calls. These traitors to the United States shouted, "She is a spy. She is a traitor." All the Marxist monkeys, who had been collecting pennies from the faithful, put down their tin cups and ran up and down chattering, "Spy! Spy!" poor little Angela, who had given 7 years of her young life to her country, was called, by Marxist stooges for Stalin, a spy.

Then Angela wrote a book about her experiences. She called it the Red Masquerade, and the J. B. Lippincott Co. published it. The New York Times and the Herald Tribune gave her book the silent treatment. It should have been reviewed on the first page of their book sections. It wasn't reviewed at all. It was ignored. Communist Party technique No. 1 was applied to the book.

[1] Material from this point on is new; it did not appear in the original article.

On November 2 George Sokolsky got mad. He had met Angela and read her book. He looked for the reviews and, when they failed to appear, he let out a blast in his column that was heard even in the Times and Tribune offices.

On November 19 both of these great papers got the word. A. H. Raskin reviewed the book for the Times. He began: "The war against Communist infiltration has produced a new kind of spy. * * *" This sort of technique is called damnation by indirection. Later he says it cost Angela $30 a month for party dues and the Government footed the bill. Therefore, he concludes the Government is a contributor to the Communist Party. Marcus Duffield reviewed Angela's book for the Herald Tribune (also on November 19, after the Sokolsky prod). He also comes to the dues. He says, "The FBI, being outrageously thrifty, paid her nothing, except bare expenses, such as party dues."

Now you have the cloven hooves on both feet. One says the FBI shouldn't have paid anything. The other says it paid too much. All of this is an attempt to smear Angela. This is professional integrity gone to Moscow. If a lady were so treated in a bar, any one real American would have thrown these two reviewers out. If our publishers are real Americans, they, too, should give the heave-ho to their pinkos. The people of free America demand professional integrity in professionals. They do not like the present second-hand thought control exercised by dishonest professionals.

How To Steal and Profiteer Legally—OPS Is the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article entitled "The Return of the Prodigal" by Harry Serwer, and published by Human Events on April 4.

Price control is an economic narcotic. Like other narcotics, an excessive dosage leads to moral degeneracy.

OPS today is about as useful as a rowboat on a desert, or a sprinkling can in a flood.

THE RETURN OF THE PRODIGAL

(By Harry Serwer)

On January 26 the OPS issued an arrogant order known as the general freeze. It was as cruel as a brat plucking wings off an insect, and for the same reason: The OPS didn't know any better. The order limited the ceiling of each item to the highest price it actually brought in the open market between December 19 and January 25, inclusive.

On the day of the freeze every producer and distributor in this country—bar none—was committed for large blocks of merchandise at increased prices—prices which had been soaring, backing, and filling since the inauguration of the Korean shindig. Much of this merchandise had been ordered many months before, and some at prices that were then shooting through the roof. The OPS said, in effect: "If you have goods coming in at high prices, that is your hard luck. You sell them at the ceiling even if you lose money."

Obviously, there wasn't a businessman in the whole Nation who could add a legitimate mark-up to such merchandise without committing a crime; and so, at one fell swoop the OPS added a horde of criminals to the roster. Businessmen were frantically calling their lawyers and accountants and asking what course they should puruse; many were told to ignore the general freeze, and so did. Others took it on the chin by adding the decreed profit which, in many instances, did not cover overhead.

The resentment and clamor became so great that the OPS ducked into a huddle, and on February 27 it came up with a directive captioned "CPR 7," which replaced, in part, the retail stipulations contained in the general freeze. It covered more than 200,000 items—truly a gargantuan job for the Falstaffian misfits who had concocted it.

CPR 7 is known as a divisional factor directive. It aims to control prices by limiting ceilings to historical mark-ups. The divisional factor is a formula introduced apparently to complicate matters.

A couple of vinegar plants got into the wine barrel. Business was asked to absorb all or some of the rising costs. Labor was busting through the 10-percent wage rise limit, sending prices up still further. There was no real shortage because retailers were cutting prices on even such critical merchandise as television sets, furniture, and electrical appliances in order to encourage sales and reduce inventories.

Indeed, there were fairly reliable reports that warehouses were clogged to the rafters with all sorts of commodities. One economist, who represents a number of substantial appliance manufacturers, told me that only 33⅓ percent of current accounts receivable were being collected. This meant that inventories were very heavy, and obviously as large as—or larger than—the capital and surplus of the business.

II

There is no need for control at this moment, if the Department of Commerce is correct in its Survey of Current Business (January 1951 issue). The Survey reinterprets current unit production in 1939 dollars and arrives at a unit increase of 70 percent over 1941. This was accomplished with a labor increase of 24 percent and a working-hour decrease of 10 percent. Thus we have a weighted increase of 66 percent in production. Since our Armed Forces are now limited to 3,500,000 men as against 14,000,000 in World War II, it would appear that we have ample production for both civil and war needs unless the Government plans monumental stockpiling beyond the needs of its own Armed Forces. That may very well be. If the administration proposes to stockpile and all comers willing to take up arms against Russia—then only does the general freeze make sense.

Control must therefore be considered as a part of the psychological pattern for making the country war-minded again. War-minded people partiotically give up more and more of their traditional rights and freedoms. If there is no shortage, control is meaningless; it is not only difficult to attain ceiling prices, but a demand may even develop for floor prices. If there is a shortage, control is a successful device for generating black markets, because the latter are nothing more than free markets vilified.

There are legitimate black markets as well as illegitimate black markets. If a retailer pays the ceiling price plus some cash under the table—that is illegitimate. If the retailer says to the wholesaler, "Sell me 50 dozen of your rayon blouses and I'll feature your name in a newspaper page," that's legitimate.

In the first case the manufacturer received the cash direct. What did he do with it? He socked it away; or he in turn paid under-the-table cash for prime or semi-processed commodities, without which he

couldn't continue business; or he tried to find subterfuge to sneak that dough into his business (very difficult with a lot of OPA harpies snooping around for a fast buck).

In the legitimate case the retailer picked up the wholesaler's advertising check (or the wholesaler picked up the primary producer's advertising check). Flip through World War II advertising pages and note how many resource brands were featured by wholesalers and retailers. The great majority were direct or implied deals for merchandise.

III

Another legitimate black market was called copping the double profit. This was a diller. There were many large producers who, in peacetime, sold only to jobbers, sales agents, and wholesalers. These producers wanted none of the headaches which come with direct distribution. But in war shortages all these headaches disappear: production is king. So, these producers double-crossed their historical outlets and sold to the retailer directly. It paid off—and how! Stealing the wholesaler's 10- or 20-percent discount, and getting it without any additional overhead cost, was a windfall. It was legitimate but shockingly immoral; and, yet, a large number of America's substantial business firms went after that double profit. The gimmick was called going vertical—very snooty terminology.

Another phase of the black market is the gadget racket. Sure, the auto dealer will sell you a new car at ceiling; but you must buy $600 worth of unneeded gadgets or you'll wait until judgment day. In fact, accessory gadgets provided more black-market dough than the basic item.

Then there was the tie-in. If a pen was price-fixed at $3, it practically disappeared from the market; but the company which made it would brazenly insist—or hint—that if you wanted a couple of dozen, you'd have to take, as a part of the deal, a few $64 pens and one or two $125 sets. This was also indulged in by top concerns.

Another legitimate black-market operation ran something like this. A need black "wiffnuff" very badly. B has them and is confining his sale to his old customers. B sells strictly at ceiling—not because he is honest, but because he is afraid of taking under-the-table cash. A tells B he has a hot tip on the market and that he is buying 200 shares for B. A doesn't want the money just yet—he'll lay it out and tell B when to send it. Three weeks later—usually sooner—A consults the stock-market page, chooses a stock that has gone up 5 to 10 points, notifies B that he sold the stock at a profit and sends him a check for that profit. B knows it is a phony but keeps the dough; and in a day or two A gets all the black "wiffnuff" he needs at ceiling—and why not? Sometimes A tells B he can get him an auto at strictly ceiling. A pays the black-market price and loses the difference; but the "wiffnuff" is worth a "helluva" lot more to him, because unfinished merchandise is piling up on him, waiting only for "wiffnuff."

IV

Now, let me explain a very legitimate black-market racket. Mr. Jones weaves "gray" (unfinished) goods. His ceiling markup is 10 percent. The cloth costs 45 cents a yard to produce. He is legally entitled to 50 cents a yard. Jonesy is making a wad of dough on a nickel-a-yard profit, because his volume has doubled in a seller's market, his distribution cost is nil, and all the hazards of doing business have disappeared. But he is not satisfied.

He puts his nephew, Willie, into the converting business. (A converter buys "gray" goods and finishes them for the cutting-up trade or for retailing over the counter.) Willie's converting cost is about 20 cents a yard, which brings his total per yard up to 70 cents. He is legally entitled to a 17 percent mark-up, which brings his selling price up to 85 cents a yard. But Jones, who is really Willie's undercover partner, is still not satisfied. So he puts his other nephew, Richard, into the jobbing business. As jobber, Richard is allowed a 12-percent mark-up on the 85-cent cost. This now brings the cloth up to 95 cents a yard.

Is Richard allowed to sell the goods in the open market? Oh, no! Jonesy now scours the market for manufacturers who will give him a partnership for a nominal or no investment; and he, in turn, will supply them with all the cloth they need. (Remember, this was in a period when any dope with a fabric allotment could open a hole-in-the-wall business and get all the orders he wanted.)

Now, you may be sure that Jonesy was at least an equal partner in each of these enterprises. The OPA allowed Jonesy a nickel profit. Instead, he wound up with that nickel plus half of the difference between 50 cents and the final 95 cents at the jobber's level. But that isn't all. Suppose he has an interest in a blouse factory which has a $60-a-dozen ceiling. There may be a net profit of $9 a dozen in a seller's market. Since a dozen blouses averages 25 yards, Jonesy splits half of another 36 cents a yard. That Government-allowed nickel becomes 45 cents profit on a fabric which cost him 45 cents—quite legitimate.

All this seems to be on the way back. The general freeze is the royal red carpet for the prodigal son of the OPA.

The Larger Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the recent removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his post in Japan has brought forth both instantaneous and spontaneous replies from people all over the country. The citizens of the United States are deeply concerned, as they have a right to be; and Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned over this action.

I have made it a point to talk to the people who should know whether the course of action taken by the President was right or wrong. Within the last few days I have read in the newspapers and heard over the radio and saw on television the views and comments of various persons. I have studied it all with great interest, and I feel that the solidest approach to the question is contained in an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Saturday, April 14, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the aforementioned editorial entitled "The Larger Issues":

THE LARGER ISSUES

In many respects the present controversy over General MacArthur represents an elemental and emotional outburst expressing the anger and frustration of a nation which, less than 6 years after its greatest victory, finds itself again at war and facing the danger of another world war. But the storm could reach its present violence only because it has been and is being whipped up by political partisans of often opposite persuasion—ranging from Republican extremists on one side to the lunatic fringe of the British Labor Party on the other—who seek to exploit General MacArthur's colorful personality and positive views for their own ends, irrespective of the merits of the case.

This situation makes it all the more necessary for men of goodwill to consider the fundamental issues involved, soberly and realistically. As we see it, there are three such issues. The first, fundamental to free government, is the issue of civil versus military authority. That issue has already been decided in President Truman's favor. Even the strongest partisans of General MacArthur refrain from challenging the President's authority to dismiss him, and the record shows clearly that the general laid himself open to such action. This was not a case of "theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die." General MacArthur had the right, the opportunity and even the duty to present his views and recommendations—through military channels. He had no right to challenge the policy of his Government, or even the prescribed strategy where it involved policy. Such a challenge, especially when backed up by appeals over the President's head to the public and especially to the political opposition, was insubordination which challenged the fundamental concept of our Government.

The second issue, stated by President Truman in his address on Wednesday evening to the Nation, is how best to avoid a new world war. General MacArthur holds that such a war can best be prevented by extending the Korean war to China—by bombing that country's military bases, especially in Manchuria, by blockading its coasts, and by using Chiang Kai-shek's forces to establish a second front on the Chinese mainland. Such measures, he is convinced, can crush the Chinese Communists without bringing Soviet Russia into the war, despite the Chinese-Soviet pact and his wrong guess on Chinese Communist intervention in Korea.

In contrast, President Truman holds that such measures could well precipitate the new world war; that we must avoid every action that could be exploited in order to put responsibility for such a catastrophe on us and thus isolate us from our allies and split the free world, and that the best way of avoiding such a situation is to limit the present war to Korea, despite the handicaps involved, in the hope of a peaceful settlement. This policy may fail, and Soviet imperialism may yet lead to all-out war. But in such a case the responsibility will be clear, and the free world will have gained both time and solidarity. We agree with the President.

The third issue is which is our first front—Europe or Asia? General MacArthur and many of his supporters hold that it is Asia—that, in the general's words to Representative MARTIN, it is in Asia that the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that by fighting in Asia we are also fighting Europe's war for salvation. This view is based partly on the fact that we are already at war in Asia, partly on opposition in some quarter to our European policies, and partly on Lenin's and Stalin's own maxim that the Western World will be conquered by conquering Asia first.

There is no doubt that the global conflict in which we are engaged has two fronts, and that it is essential to hold both of them. There is likewise no doubt that our front in Asia has been gravely impaired by the blunders of our policy toward China. But now, as during the last war, it is and will remain true that Europe is our first front and concern. For while Asia may have the manpower, Europe is both the cradle of our civi-

lization and the continent of our allies, with an industrial potential that can spell the difference between victory and defeat. It was such considerations as these that led to the recent overwhelming approval by the Senate of the dispatch of additional troops for Europe, and the MacArthur dismissal has not changed the situation.

We Are at War With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is attempting to justify President Truman's removal of General MacArthur as supreme commander in the Far East on the basis that General MacArthur was attempting to get us into war with Red China by advocating the bombing of air bases, supply lines, and troop concentrations in Manchuria.

If we are not now at war with Communist China, I think the President and his advisors would do well to advise Congress and the people just whom we are fighting in Korea. Last December hordes of Chinese poured across the Yalu River and drove our forces to a point south of the thirty-eighth parallel. Airplanes bearing the red star of Communist China take off from airfields in the so-called privileged sanctuary of Manchuria, rise to a safe altitude, then zoom across the Yalu River dealing death and destruction to our forces in the air and on the ground. A military commander in such a situation would be most derelict if he did not have the inclination to use every means at hand to strike at these troops and destroy these aircraft before they could get into a position to inflict casualties upon his own forces.

To date we have suffered 60,000 casualties in Korea, and despite the handcuffs placed upon him by Truman and Acheson, General MacArthur's outnumbered forces have succeeded in destroying large numbers of Chinese Communists.

Despite these facts, Truman and Acheson tell us that if MacArthur attempts to protect his men from further casualities, he is trying to get us into war with Red China when it is the very same Red China that is causing us so much grief.

In scanning the news columns, I have not detected any let-up in the war in Korea. The same Communist Chinese are continuing to kill and maim our boys and reports are filtering in to the effect that new forces are massing for a spring offensive. The Daily Worker has hailed Mr. Truman for "exercising sound judgment in dismissing General MacArthur." The Communist press knows that with MacArthur gone the United States has lost one of its greatest bulwarks against Communist expansion in the Far East and that the policy of appeasement of the Reds engineered by Dean Acheson over the past 5 years will continue.

It is tragic to note that President Truman who flew to Kansas City at the expense of the taxpayers to attend Tom Pendergast's funeral several years ago will be too busy to greet General MacArthur at the airport when he arrives Thursday. In his place he is sending his military aide, Gen. Harry Vaughan who is noted for his deep freeze deals, corruption, scandals, and dispensing of favors at the White House.

A Century of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 24th of last month Rev. Paul W. Rishell, pastor, and his parishioners celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the South Congregational Church in my congressional district.

For over a century now the South Congregational Church has been a pillar of strength to the community life of Brooklyn. I am sure I bespeak the thoughts of the great majority of the residents of the Twelfth Congressional District when I wish Pastor Rishell and his congregation many, many more years of fruitful service to our community.

Under the permission previously granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Saturday, April 14, 1951:

A CENTURY OF SERVICE

It's a tough job to live a hundred years and all that time serve the community with humane and spiritual purpose. It takes an unusual resiliency against the world's chill and sometimes unfriendly winds and it takes living, vibrant faith in the task at hand.

Brooklyn's South Congregational Church had what it takes 100 years ago when it organized on March 24, 1851, with 23 members. It still has it and it still thrives as a great community institution, serving its people and spreading divine and human good in its everyday activities.

The church has had a fine history and is retaining its good name under the guiding hand of the Reverend Paul W. Rishell, the eleventh pastor. The first church was dedicated by Brooklyn's famous Henry Ward Beecher. We wish the South Congregational Church and its parishioners many more fruitful years to come.

Shameless Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the sentiments and the indisputable facts set forth in the editorial in the Standard-Times of Bedford, Mass., under date of April 13, 1951, with reference to the brutal dismissal of General MacArthur by President Truman. It requires hours to open the letters and telegrams that are pouring into my office asking for the impeachment of President Truman and Secretary Acheson.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the editorial entitled "Shameless Betrayal," to which I have heretofore referred:

SHAMELESS BETRAYAL

President Truman's speech Wednesday was a shameless attempt to undermine the confidence and affection which the American people feel for General MacArthur by accusing him of provoking a third world war.

As an excuse for his shocking removal of MacArthur, the President charges MacArthur with "provoking" world war III by (1) asking that he be allowed to bomb the bases of the Communist army in Manchuria, a classic tactic in modern warfare, and (2) by urging we give support to Chiang Kai-shek instead of the present policy of tying his hands.

To charge that bombing Manchuria and freeing Chiang would provoke world war III is spineless speculation by minds without courage.

Winston Churchill said in the Commons in November Stalin would decide when world war III would start and probably nothing England or ourselves could do would change the Moscow timetable.

The world knows with what genius and courage MacArthur was trying to win the war in Korea, handicapped at every turn by the indecision and nonsupport of the President and of Secretary of State Acheson, fronting for the United Nations.

The President's policy in Korea was to fight a little war, fight it hard, but not too hard, for fear it might become a big war.

Of course, this policy couldn't win as MacArthur knew and said, and for this frank honesty of the soldier he is fired "so that," as the President weakly said, "there would bo no doubt or confusion as to the real purpose of and aim of our policy."

After probably the greatest military service to his country since George Washington, General MacArthur is removed from all authority because he asked for authority to fight the Korean War successfully, a war that already has brought America more than 60,000 casualties.

This present Korean dilemma has no precedent in American history.

We are fighting Communist China in Korea, but we are her faithful ally in Formosa, where we have forbidden Chiang Kai-shek to make an aggressive move.

What could please Communist China more than to have MacArthur ordered to fight hard "but not too hard" in Korea, while Acheson ties Chiang's hands in Formosa?

This Truman-Acheson Korean War formula is a perfect set-up for Communist China.

Communist China can only hope it will remain in status quo until, by wholesale liquidation of anti-Communist forces, Moscow style (said already to number many millions), all hope of a National counter-revolution is destroyed.

No wonder three offers of truce to Communist China have been turned down. Disgraceful as the terms were to our honor, they were contemptuously refused.

Yes, we are fighting Communist China in Korea but we are faithful allies of Communist China in Formosa.

Meanwhile, there is no hope of victory.

Truman is afraid to fight hard for fear it might bring on world war III.

Communist China hesitates to drive us off the Korean peninsula for fear that might bring on world war III through a realistic and aroused America.

The Truman-Acheson formula for the Korean War is a war without victory and without peace.

Watch for the most degrading moment in American history, an offer (British leftist Labor inspired), to extend to Communist China a seat in the United Nations, a voice in the treaty with Japan, and surrender of Formosa—in return for a Korean armistice.

Such an offer, of course, could not be made without United States approval.

Not only would such a proposal be the final betrayal of the only remaining Chinese leader capable of opposing communism in China, our ally of World War II—but, miserable as is the idea of such a proposal, I believe it would be refused by Communist China and Stalin—even if it were proposed to deliver Chiang Kai-shek in person to his—and our—enemies.

BASIL BREWER,
Publisher.

MacArthur: The Man and the Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, as MacArthur returns home, both his accomplishment as a soldier and his views on foreign policy will be most carefully weighed and analyzed. As a contribution to this discussion, I desire to place in the RECORD the following article and editorial from the April 2, 1951, Fortnight:

MACARTHUR: THE MAN AND THE MYTH

Gen. Douglas MacArthur needs no defense from his enemies. But how can he protect himself from his friends, those idolatrous worshipers who make him internationally ridiculous by deafening the public ear with claims of his omnipotence and omniscience; by attributing to him all the wisdom and all the virtue under the sun, with none of the faults that flesh is heir to?

After all, General MacArthur is only human. If you cut him, he will bleed. If you shoot him in a vulnerable spot, he will die. He has had a long and distinguished career in the service of his country. There can be no possible question of his personal courage, nor of his normal competence as an officer. He proved that in World War I.

Like any normal human being, General MacArthur has made his share of mistakes. Unfortunately, the foremost of these have been tragic ones in times of crisis, in the Philippines and in Korea, and have cost many American lives.

WHY?

On December 7, 1941, when news of Pearl Harbor reached the Philippines, where he was in command, Air Force officers begged for permission to take off and bomb Japanese airfields on Formosa, whence they knew attacks on them would soon and inevitably come. This permission was refused because there had been no official declaration of war by the American Congress. Surely enough, 8 hours after Pearl Harbor, the Japanese bombers came down from Formosa and destroyed virtually all the American planes in the Philippines as they sat helplessly on the ground.

This error in judgment rested squarely on MacArthur. It was first brought to light in Bill White's book, They Were Expendable, published early in the war. It was confirmed by Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times, in his recent book, Mistakes of World War II.

ACTION?

MacArthur's mistakes in Korea have received a lot of recent publicity and his strident apologists have rushed in to shout them down or shift the blame to other shoulders. The most recent factual report, and a shocking thing it was, was published in Fortnight, February 19, in an unsigned article by an officer who landed and served with the First Marine Division in Korea. This anonymous writer told of gross incompetence and actual cowardice on the part of some Army officers, and of the complete lack of training and morale of many of the enlisted men who had been part of MacArthur's occupation forces in Japan.

After all, MacArthur had been superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point and he certainly knew how to train officers and men. Why hadn't he done so?

The Fortnight article practically blew the roof off the Pentagon. Maj. Gen. F. L. Parks, the Army's Chief of Public Information in Washington, issued a statement branding the charges "irresponsible and ill-considered." To borrow an old legal cliché, he couldn't deny the allegations so he defied the allegators.

It was reliably reported that the Pentagon's hatchet men were sharpening their tomahawks to have the scalp of the unidentified writer, who was a Navy chaplain recently returned from Korea. These hatchet men are not to be laughed off when one considers how they got Admiral Louis Denfeld summarily fired as Chief of Naval Operations for speaking his mind when asked about internal politics in the Department of Defense.

There is a rising indignation among some of the less informed upon discovering that their military idol has feet of clay. He has been so sickeningly goose-greased and blatantly ballyhooed by such a large section of the American press since the beginning of World War II that the general public lost its perspective of the man. He could run faster, jump farther, dive deeper, and come up drier than anybody. He knew everything. He could do no wrong. The dawning realization that they have been deceived has made some people pretty mad and the natural human tendency is to take it out on the doughty General.

WHO, ME?

Unfortunately, there's a lot of evidence to the effect that he, too, has been deceived. He has come to believe his own publicity, just like a Hollywood screen star. The late William S. Hart, strong, silent hero of early films, was a broken-down third-rate Shakespearean actor when he got his first break in western pictures. His producer's press agents concocted a tailor-made biography for him telling how Hart was a child of the western plains raised among the Indians, speaking many of their dialects. The tale told of many hair-raising battles with bear, bison, and aborigines; of great exploits with that white-maned old fraud, Buffalo Bill. Hart swallowed it whole and believed it to the hilt. He went to his grave mumbling, "They went that-a-away, pardner." It's deplorable that General MacArthur has shown symptoms of the same ailment.

In our books he was caught completely off base by the sudden beginning of hostilities in Korea last June. His vociferous claque in Tokyo and Washington rushed into print to say that Korea was not a part of his command and so he was not supposed to know what was going on there. But his title was supreme commander in the Far East. That included Korea.

You can't marshal overnight an army of 100,000, with tanks, big guns, and other heavy motorized equipment; you can't hide that under a silk handkerchief as a magician does a bowl of goldfish. It would seem that in the weeks necessary to mount this attack a small, idle portion of General MacArthur's omniscience would have smelled it out. One good intelligence officer in Korea could have warned him.

The occupation troops he threw into the fray from Japan, who had been under his command and available for training for an adequate period to make them soldiers, wrote one of the most disgraceful chapters in American military history. In the face of the enemy they threw down their arms and ran, screaming like hysterical high-school girls that they were occupational troops, not combat forces, and they didn't want to fight.

MAC ARTHUR AGAIN

The Americans were about to be pushed into the sea when the First Marine Division and First Marine Aircraft Wing arrived to stem the tide. The subsequent Marine landing at Inchon, behind the enemy's lines, and their swift penetration inland broke the back of the North Korean Army and assured a swift victory for MacArthur.

He took all the bows. Reams of copy poured from the typewriters of his personal publicity staff to the effect that MacArthur had personally staged all this, even to figuring out the tides at Inchon. Expert oceanographers can tell you what the tides will be anywhere in the world a hundred years from now. This landing was no different from the ones the First Marine Division had been making for several years in practice from Camp Pendleton. No unit as small as a marine raider platoon would ever make an amphibious landing without a thorough advance check of the moon and the tides. But it was a great MacArthur victory.

THE TREATMENT

Early in the Korean hostilities a number of American newspapers printed a syndicated serial labeled "the MacArthur Story" by one Frederic S. Marquardt, who was billed as the Chief of the Office of War Information in the Southwest Pacific during World War II. MacArthur should have sued for libel.

The opening article said: "MacArthur has been called, with justification, the savior of Australia, the liberator of the Philippines, and the conqueror of Japan."

What is the justification? He was not the savior of Australia. He was not the conqueror of Japan. And with all due respect to the great warrior, he did have some help in the Philippines—such as, for instance, Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet, which was probably the most powerful armada that has ever been afloat.

MORE

Marquardt warmed to his work with: "A Japanese in Tokyo once solemnly assured me that MacArthur had a Japanese mother. 'Otherwise,' he said, 'General MacArthur could not have conquered Japan.'"

Nobody conquered Japan. The Nipponese threw in the towel because the going got too rough. MacArthur had nothing whatever to do with the circumstances that brought this about.

Marquardt continued: "Many others have helped make the MacArthur story. His Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Edward M. Almond, called MacArthur the greatest man alive."

This is the same General Almond who, against all intelligence reports and all expert advice ordered the First Marine Division

into the disastrous venture of fighting their way across a 7,000-foot mountain range in blizzardy, subzero weather on a hopeless, fruitless mission from which they had to fight their way back with heavy losses for themselves but almost unbelievable losses to the enemy.

OTHER FOLK

One wonders if General Almond, who has not yet been court-martialed, has ever heard of a chubby old gentleman in England named Winston Churchill; or of affable "Ike" Eisenhower, who successfully commanded in Africa and Europe infinitely more troops in infinitely bigger operations than MacArthur ever dreamed of; or of dignified, white-haired Admiral Chester Nimitz, whose official designation in World War II was "Commander in Chief of the Pacific Ocean Area," which would seem to include the territory in which General MacArthur was throwing his weight about at the time.

But wait. Marquardt has more: "Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commander of the Far Eastern Air Forces, went Almond one better. 'He's the greatest man who ever lived,' Stratemeyer said of MacArthur."

Phew! That really is taking in a lot of territory. But do you think even this satifies Mr. Marquardt? Read him further: "An unidentified Japanese spokesman once topped both the generals. He is quoted in John Lacerda's book, The Conqueror Comes to Tea, as saying, 'We look to MacArthur as the second Jesus Christ.'"

No human being can possibly live up to such ridiculous adulation and flattery. And yet it is still going on.

A brief, unbiased, and objective review of the war with Japan might clear the atmosphere a little and put General MacArthur in his proper and, surely, not unfavorable light. Both credit and blame should be placed where they are due.

One does not need to be a military expert or have access to secret files to know that there were six major phases of this war which culminated in the enemy's unconditional surrender before his country was conquered.

First. The first phase started the day after Pearl Harbor. It comprised the whittling down of Japan's navy and merchant marine by submarines of the United States Fleet. Japan was not self-supporting. Food and oil and raw materials for her war machine had to be brought from Manchuria and other captured territory. The American submariners were the great unsung heroes of the war. In constant danger for months at a time, they gnawed away at Japan's life lines until the pinch was felt there long before there was a possibility of an attack on the homeland.

General MacArthur had nothing to do with this. His only connection with a submarine was early in 1942 when one of them helped the MacArthur family to escape to Australia from Corregidor.

Second. The second major phase of the war included the air and naval battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, and the many engagements around Guadalcanal. Until then, the Japanese had not only superiority but almost complete dominance on the sea and in the air. But they lost so many ships and planes, and, what proved to be even more important, they lost so many first-string pilots, they were never able to recover their advantage. We lost heavily, too, but America's replacement potential was so preponderant that from then on the advantage was increasingly on our side.

General MacArthur had nothing whatever to do with these operations. They were not in his area of command. He was sitting helplessly in Australia with practically no one to boss. Virtually all of Australia's and New Zealand's fighting strength had been lost in North Africa and Malaya, and Uncle Sam had not been able to send him many troops yet.

To say that he was the savior of Australia is absurd. Australia was saved when the Marines took Guadalcanal. That was the Allies' first land victory over the Axis. It was Japan's farthest point of advance. From then on to the end of the war, Japan was backing up.

General MacArthur had no more to do with Guadalcanal than he did with the landings in Normandy. The Marines were led in the field by Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, later commandant of the corps. Admiral Halsey was commander in chief, under Admiral Nimitz, of the South Pacific area.

Third. The third major phase of the war was the taking of Saipan, Tinian, and Guam—and later Iwo Jima. These bloody and costly operations were carried out by marine divisions with well-coordinated support from the Navy. General MacArthur was thousands of miles away. All he knew about these activities was from routine reports he received after they had taken place.

These islands provided bases for the massive B–29 raids on the Japanese homeland, which constituted the fourth phase of the war and the beginning of the end. These raids not only razed factories, shipyards, and other military targets, but forced down the throats of the Japanese people the bitter knowledge of their eventual, inevitable doom. The B–29's were under the personal direction of the late Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Air Force. "Hap" Arnold was MacArthur's equal in rank, and certainly not his lobbygow.

END

The fifth phase was made up of the spectacular victories of Admiral Halsey and his famous Third Fleet in the Philippine and China Seas and around Japan itself. They destroyed practically all that was left of the enemy's fleet and air force. They ranged the eastern coast of Japan, firing at will and without return at any targets within range, while Navy planes from Halsey's carriers swarmed over the cities and towns, making it unsafe for a Japanese gardener to ride a bicycle or trundle a wheelbarrow down the main street of his village.

General MacArthur certainly did not control Admiral Halsey. Admiral Halsey couldn't even control himself. He made some pretty silly statements about riding Emperor Hirohito's famous white horse down the main street of Tokyo, and later admitted ruefully that he never had learned to keep his big mouth shut. But this didn't affect his record as one of the greatest fighting sailors since John Paul Jones.

FINALE

The sixth and final phase of the war was hardly a phase. It was more of a coup de grâce. It was the dropping of two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Japanese were already thoroughly licked and knew it. They had already started overtures to negotiate for peace without the unconditional surrender demanded by the United States. The A-bombs saved their face. Nobody could be expected to stand up against such weapons. They could surrender unconditionally and still retain a little self-respect after their brazen declaration following Pearl Harbor that the ultimate peace would be dictated by them in the White House.

Even the most bumbling Boswell in the MacArthur entourage would hardly claim that he invented the atomic bomb and personally hurled two of them across the intervening waters at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the way Washington putatively pitched a dollar across the Potomac.

MacArthur did not command or participate in any major action against the Japanese. Bataan was a hopeless holding action. The American forces there were written off from the start. They gave a gallant account of themselves. It is not to MacArthur's discredit that he escaped and left Jonathan Wainwright to become the martyr of Corregidor. Both were following military orders from their superiors.

It is not to MacArthur's discredit that he had little to work with when he arrived in Australia and that it was a long time before he could get going. It is not to his discredit that he played a minor role in the Pacific war. The conflict was much bigger than any one individual. His conquest of New Britain and New Guinea were bloody and dreadful affairs for those involved, but they had little bearing on the final defeat of Japan.

REMEMBER?

The liberation of the Philippines was a moral but not a military necessity. Many thousands of American lives would have been saved if that had been postponed until after the Japanese surrender, which was then inexorably in sight. Surely General MacArthur must have been misquoted in the bombastic utterances as he landed at Leyte: "I have returned. Rally to me." Surely he must have known how much better it would have sounded to posterity to say: "We have returned. Rally to us." For he was not alone.

It is not to MacArthur's discredit that no troops under his command ever came in contact with the main body of the Japanese Army. This latter force was in Manchuria facing the Chinese Communists and the Russians. They only gave up their arms upon the definite order of their deified Mikado.

It is not to MacArthur's discredit that Admirals Nimitz, Halsey, and Spruance, and Marine Generals Vandergrift, "Howling Mad" Smith, and the late Roy S. Geiger commanded in more important strategical victories than he did. That is the fortune of war.

APPROPRIATE

General MacArthur's appointment to preside at the Japanese surrender on the deck of the Battleship *Missouri* was undoubtedly a tribute to his age and seniority in years of service, a tribute which he justly deserved. But this was not an admission that he had fought the war all by himself, as his fanatical followers would now have the world believe. His subsequent selection to command the occupation forces did not make him a star-spangled Mikado, or a Shinto god.

Mr. Marquardt has been quoted here far beyond his deserts because he is typical of the fawning sycophants who are so wild in their adoration of the aging general. The panegyric petered out pitifully toward the end. After all, when you open by calling your hero a second Jesus Christ, what is there left for an encore?

WHERE NOW?

In baseball when a player loses his batting eye, or a pitcher loses control and walks too many men, he is benched to let someone else try to pull the game out of the fire. There's no sentiment involved. Winning is the important thing. Why shouldn't this obtain in the much grimmer game of war?

General MacArthur has already achieved all the personal glory that one man can carry to the grave. He has given more than a half century of his 71 years in distinguished service to his country. He has been twice wounded. There are no further medals to give him.

Why should the autumn of his life be distorted to absurdity by those overdazzled by the reflection of his effulgence? Why can't he be brought home now, in all dignity and honor, to receive the triumphant reception that is his due, and then be turned gratefully out to grass?

THE MACARTHUR LEGEND: FACT AND FANCY

The accompanying article on Gen. Douglas MacArthur tends to deflate one of the most fantastic legends of our time—and we regard it as long past due. The author, who served as a bomber pilot in the Army Air Corps in World War I, and in the Pacific in World War II, reflects accurately the viewpoint of many thousands of men of all branches of the service who spent weary years between Noumea and Tokyo.

To these men Nimitz, Halsey, Hap Arnold, Vandegrift, Jimmy Doolittle, Buckner, Roy Geiger, "Howlin' Mad" Smith, Lemay, Cates, Patch, Spruance, Mitscher were the names to conjure with.

To those who were there it has always been a mystery why the American people ever swallowed the myth of General MacArthur's preponderant part in the Pacific war.

Nonetheless, we regard General MacArthur as one of the world's major figures because he has ruled Japan so effectively that today we are just about ready to count on the Japanese—our savage enemies of a few year back—as trusted allies against world communism.

We also regard him as having been as right about the American destiny in Asia as Secretary of State Acheson has been wrong.

The civilized world owes a vast debt to General MacArthur for his magnificent performance in Japan and for his advocacy of a militant and realistic, rather than a theoretical and defensive, policy in Asia. History, we believe, will grant him laurels for these two phases of his amazing career far beyond the laurels he will receive for his military prowess.

It is not pleasant to recall that General MacArthur was the commanding officer of the occupation troops in Japan who failed so miserably in the early stages of the Korean War because they had been permitted to grow soft and indolent, because no one had bothered to train them or indoctrinate them in the duties of a soldier, and because they were permitted to go into battle with officers many of whom proved unfit to lead troops. As commander of these troops it was MacArthur's duty to train them and keep them trained, and in this he signally failed.

No Fortnight article has elicited more heartfelt thanks from more diverse people than has the Shame and Glory of Korea—February 19 issue. Men who served in every branch of the service have applauded it. Corroboration has come from many quarters. It is quite clear that the United States Army, which has, of course, officially scoffed at the story, is on the spot with the American people.

It is Fortnight's sincere belief that the basic philosophy of the Army leaves much to be desired and that its methods are inadequate to the successful defense of the Republic.

We believe that the American taxpayer is not getting enough fight per dollar out of his Army, callous as that may sound, and that the Army brass had better reexamine its situation with a cold, stern eye and do something about it—fast.

Fortnight has recently extolled Gen. Matthew Ridgway, now in active command in Korea, as the kind of Army leader of which we need more. Reports from Korea indicate that his capacity for front-line leadership has done wonders for the morale and courage of his troops and that his bold, aggressive methods are finally welding a real army in place of the sad motley originally sent to Korea by General MacArthur.

In subsequent issues Fortnight—with the help of a number of military experts—will venture to propose changes in the Army's basic philosophy and improvements in its methods—training, promotion, recruiting, etc.—which, we believe, will make it possible for a 2,000,000 Army to do the job of the seven- or eight-million Army of World War II—and do it far faster at a fraction of the former cost.

For hundreds of years Rome, even when rotten at its core, was successfully defended by the Roman legions who never exceeded 375,000 at any one time, yet defended Roman rule in Britain, Gaul, along the Rhine and the Danube, in North Africa, Egypt, and the entire Near East.

The United States needs what Rome had—a relatively small, rigorously trained, well-officered, dependable combat army.

Thirty divisions of crack troops can better defend this country than 100 unreliable divisions that eat the taxpayers out of house and home and take years to become effective in actual combat.

An expanded Marine Corps, as proposed in Senate bill 677 by Senator DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), is an essential part of the answer. The other part lies in the reform of the United States Army. Fortnight will have more to say on this subject in subsequent issues.

O. D. KUP,
Publisher.

Bill To Permit Registration of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Bill Ziebach, sports editor of the Mobile Press Register in Mobile, Ala.

As one who is qualified to judge, Mr. Ziebach is unhesitating in his opinion that H. R. 3023 should be passed as soon as possible.

I hope that petty politics will not deter action on this measure.

Mr. Ziebach's column is entitled "Out o' Doors" and is widely read throughout the South. I feel sure that support for the Hall bill will increase as the result of his words.

OUT O' DOORS WITH BILL ZIEBACH

BILL TO PROHIBIT REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

At last a man's man has taken legal steps to close a loophole that could result in seizure of citizens' firearms and consequently render this country's civilians impotent to resist aggression from within or without. Representative EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of New York (may his name be blessed for his action) has introduced H. R. 3023 into Congress, which, if passed, will prohibit any State requiring citizens to register private weapons.

Although the Constitution of the United States gives every citizen the right to own and bear arms, its makers had no experience with the sly methods of modern traitors who use the writing pen as an instrument to first suppress, then arrest and liquidate men and women who would fight for their freedom.

Taking cognizance of this unholy situation, Representative HALL's bill provides as follows:

"A bill to prohibit registration of firearms already issued legally and to protect citizens against unconstitutional seizure of private weapons

"Whereas during World War II, Nazi-minded officers attempted to pass laws abridging the constitutional right of a private citizen to bear arms; and

"Whereas these same officers started their anti-American program by calling for registration of all privately owned firearms; and

"Whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States this inherent privilege to our citizens to protect their hearths and homes by possessing arms; and

"Whereas in the several States, the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally issued private weapons with design to eventual seizure of firearms owned by individual citizens: Therefore

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no citizen shall be compelled to register firearms which he is in legal possession of.

"SEC. 2. No Federal, State, or local officers shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess them."

The measure was referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means on March 1.

There is again a movement in some of the States to register firearms. This bill, if passed, would prevent any such further promotion to curtail the rights of our people which are guaranteed by the Constitution.

Year after year, a slimy few have repeatedly introduced legislation into Congress and State law-making bodies to compel registration of firearms owned by civilians. Year after year it is necessary for patriotic citizens to defend themselves against laws which would put every gun owner under police supervision and enable fifth columnists to quickly gather patriots before firing squads when and if they deem force necessary to subjugate this country.

If ever a law was needed, Representative HALL'S bill is the one, and every patriotic organization and individual citizen should let their Congressmen know their will—as well as conveying word of their support to HALL.

But let no man be subdued if ever gun confiscatory legislation is passed. Let him register one, if he must, but bury two for readiness, as the time will be near when he'll need them.

Congratulations to Archbishop Molloy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to note the granting last week by His Holiness Pope Pius XII, of the title of archbishop to the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, beloved bishop of Brooklyn for these past many years.

The following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of April 12, 1951, indicates the esteem and respect in which Archbishop Molloy is held by the citizenry of Brooklyn and Long Island of all religious faiths:

CONGRATULATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP MOLLOY

The people of Brooklyn—of all faiths and shades of religious belief—were pleasantly surprised to learn of the latest honor bestowed upon the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, the reverend bishop of the Catholic faithful here.

He has been singled out to receive the title of archbishop as a personal recognition by

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, for the exemplary execution of his episcopal duties as head of this diocese, which has the largest Catholic population of any in the country.

This honor, we are informed, comes in the nature of a personal tribute rather than one which would designate Brooklyn as an archdiocese. The proximity of Brooklyn to the Archdiocese of New York may be the reason for the unique distinction of conferring the title of archbishop upon His Excellency while Brooklyn still remains a diocese.

We think it is not too much of an exaggeration to say that in the hearts of the Catholics here Archbishop Molloy has won such high esteem that no ecclesiastical dignity would be unmerited.

As a citizen, a public figure, an administrator, a speaker, and scholar as well as a religious leader, Archbishop Molloy has won the respect and good will of the whole community of Brooklyn during his nearly 30 years as head of the diocese. In these days when the very foundations of the world are threatened by onslaught from materialistic and atheistic forces, it is reassuring to have spiritual leaders of the stature of the new archbishop.

The Brooklyn Eagle joins with all men and women of good will in extending to Archbishop Molloy heartfelt expression of felicitations on his well-deserved honor.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by W. L. Clayton before a joint session of the Texas Legislature, Austin, Tex., March 6, 1951:

It is a great honor and pleasure you have given me to speak to you on the foreign policy of the United States, the most important subject in the world today.

We could be wrong on every other subject and right on that and the country is rich enough and virile enough to pull out of its mistakes and go forward; but if we are wrong on foreign policy we could be right on everything else and the results still could be disastrous, not only to the people of the United States but to the whole world.

Now, what is the foreign policy of the United States?

Whatever division there may be among our people regarding method or procedure, there is no difference of opinion regarding objective.

The United States covets neither the lands nor possessions of any country or people; on the contrary our interests lie in the maintenance of the independence and integrity of all peoples.

The objective of United States foreign policy therefore is world peace and its preservation under conditions which will insure to all law-abiding peoples life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now how is this objective to be achieved?

Should we continue military and economic aid to our allies in Europe or should we follow the advice of Mr. Hoover and send not another soldier, not another dollar to Europe until they have got themselves in condition where they won't need either?

Should we continue to fight alongside United Nations forces in Korea until the Communists learn that they not only cannot run us out but that it is too costly to try or should we turn tail and get out now as best we can?

These are some of the vital details of foreign policy on which opinions differ.

I recently saw a cartoon in which the snout of a symbolic elephant was labeled "Put 'em in the front lines," whereas the tail said "Keep 'em in the rear," and the principal proponents of these contradictory policies were to be seen in the background shouting their respective arguments—Dewey and Stassen upholding the snout and Hoover and Taft the tail.

Nobody suggests the withdrawal under present conditions of the United States troops already in Europe; and if our military authorities decide that these troops should be reinforced, that is a military decision which should not be reversed by political laymen. Any policy question involved here was really decided when the North Atlantic Treaty was entered into under our leadership.

That treaty commits us to go to the defense of our European allies if they are attacked. Would it not be wise when we are all gravely threatened with attack to take concerted measures to try to prevent it rather than sit supinely back and wait for the blow to be struck?

What the free world faces is just what our Original Thirteen Colonies faced when they created a Federal Union and wrote the Constitution of the United States and is expressed in this simple phrase: "United we stand; divided we fall."

Europe is the next great prize Russia seeks. If Communist Russia should conquer Western Europe with its vast complex of coal, steel, industry, and technology, you may be sure that the end of world war III would find the United States, winner or loser, no longer the home of the brave and the land of the free.

But all these arguments about Europe are now academic because the decision has been made and the American people have made it. Our destiny is insolubly linked with Western Europe, the home of our ancestors and the birthplace of our social and political ideals.

The only question is, Can this link be made strong enough in time to prevent world war III, or to win that war if it should come?

Unfortunately, the answer to that question is locked in the minds of a little group of rapacious and powerful men sitting in the Kremlin—men without religion, without conscience, without decency, without mercy.

These men intend to conquer the world; they have told us that.

But they want to do it the cheapest and easiest way for them.

If by pressing a button they could gain world victory they would not hesitate to press that button even if it meant murdering millions of innocent men, women, and children.

As these men look out over the world and try to appraise the chances and risks involved in their schemes, we can imagine their leader Stalin addressing them somewhat as follows:

"Our greatest advantage lies in the disunity of our enemy. It is true they have entered into a pact but we all know what that means; pacts are made to break whenever a member finds that it no longer serves his interest.

"Imagine their difficulties. There are 12 members of the pact; they have selected a military head but he is subject to 12 political heads, now conducting 12 separate foreign policies. They are continually squabbling about Asiatic policy, about German policy, about the so-called Schuman plan, etc. They are unable to reach agreement on vital issues. How can this general organize and lead an army of 12 different nationalities subject to orders from 12 different governments? They will find themselves entangled in red tape, in the endless conferences and inefficiencies of their own boasted freedom. That kind of organization cannot stand up against the unity, the cohesion, the discipline of the Communist forces."

When General Eisenhower addressed Congress on February 1, immediately after his return from Europe, he spoke of the vast resources and great potentialities of the democracies and asked why we should be frightened of dictatorial government and then he gave this answer: "Only for one reason—because they have a unity of purpose." And then he said: "What we have got to do is to meet that unity with a higher type, the unity of free men that will not be defeated."

In this vast struggle which is raging throughout the world for the minds and loyalties of men, the weakness of the foreign policy of all the democracies lies in the fact that such policy is mostly negative—it is against something. The Communist policy on the other hand is positive; they have a program to cure all the ills of all people. It is a false program, of course, but anyway it is something positive. And make no mistake about it, it is catching on in the world.

The free world must shift from the negative to the positive if it is to win this struggle.

All history proves that peace cannot long be maintained by pacts and armaments races. The two ideas are completely antithetic. And we must never forget that the very foundation of our foreign policy is the establishment and maintenance of permanent world peace.

As vicious and repugnant as communism is, permanent world peace will never be secured by simply fighting communism even though the Communists lose.

To think that this road would lead to peace is to completely misunderstand what is happening to the world in which we live.

It is a tragic mistake to look upon communism as the only obstacle to a continuation of our tranquil enjoyment of the luxurious life, while much of the rest of the world lives in poverty.

Communism is but an outward manifestation of the world revolution now in progress—a revolution of the "have-nots," not so much against the "haves" as against their own lot in life. This is particularly true of the Orient with more than a billion people, 90 percent of whom are clutching at the ragged edge of a miserable existence.

When the Premier of Pakistan was in Texas about a year ago, he said that when he thought of the United States, he saw an island, fabulously prosperous, but still an island, surrounded by a sea of poverty, of cold and of hunger; and it frightened him.

There are just too many hundreds of millions of people in the world who go to bed cold and hungry every night to expect that victory in the fight to contain communism will bring peace to the world.

Some one will probably say: "But this misery of which you speak has always been with us. How does the situation today differ from the past?" The answer to that is to be found in the techniques of the modern world.

Formerly the miserable lived and died in ignorance; so far as they knew the whole world lived and died in misery; but today they know better.

Justice William Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, stated the other day in a speech in Arizona that when he was recently in Iran, he found in a city of 40,000 people on the Russian border, 10,000 radios, all battery operated. You may be sure that Communist Russia tells those people every day and every night that the United States lives in luxury at their expense; that we are exploiting their oil and other raw materials and sucking the life's blood out of the people who are the real owners of the wealth of the world.

strength for defense, to mobilize it in the shortest possible time, to mobilize it with the least possible danger to our economy, and to mobilize it with no impairment of our freedoms and with the least possible impairment of our standard of living.

I can say to you with utter sincerity that he did not ask me to serve any selfish purpose—his own or any other man's.

If I am to carry out the instructions of the President, and if I am to live with my conscience, I must put aside self-interest, and I shall expect others—all others without exception—to do the same. On this point there can be no compromise. For the important thing to bear in mind is this—and let me emphasize it from my heart—no man has a right to compromise the life or safety of a single boy in Korea or to compromise the future of this Nation.

We have had our difficulties, even as we have had our triumphs of progress. But only yesterday there met for the first time with the President the National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy, representing substantially all segments of our people—agriculture, commerce and industry, labor, and the public. It is my sincere hope that this Board will be the means of giving a strong impulse to the successful carrying out of our program of defense mobilization on a basis of equality of sacrifice.

As Chairman of the Board I represent no group except that magnificent one known as the people of the United States. I will listen to advice from the representatives of any group, big or small. In fact, I welcome it, and I will give it all heed. I will listen to the advice of any single citizen. But in the end I am sure that the people of this country want their governmental policy to be determined by their Government. I cannot act in any interest except in the interest of all of our people.

I think I know our people and I think I know the great spiritual values they will bring to the task of uniting our country.

This Nation has victoriously survived every crisis. Now—aroused, strong, unified, confident, each in his own place seeking to serve our country, trusting in each other, and trusting in God—I know that once again we will successfully defend our homes, our liberties, and the land we love.

The Tafts and the MacArthurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, by coincidence, the Associated Press, on April 14, carried two Taft-MacArthur stories. These were reported in the New York Times on April 15. It happens, however, that one described a clash between the father of the Senator from Ohio and the father of General MacArthur. The other concerns a proposed joining together of the famous sons of these famous men. Because of the rather odd coincidence, I am asking that these articles be included in our RECORD:

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

MACARTHUR'S FATHER WAS IN NOTED ROW—CLASH WITH EX-PRESIDENT TAFT ON RULE IN THE PHILIPPINES LED TO GENERAL'S REMOVAL

WASHINGTON, April 14.—The father of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, a noted soldier of 50 years ago, also had a bitter dispute with civilian authorities.

Although it involved a domestic political controversy of the period, in a few respects it was strikingly similar to the present situation evolving around Douglas MacArthur.

It may have affected the final years of Gen. Arthur MacArthur's career.

According to historical accounts of the incident this is what happened:

The United States had acquired the Philippine Islands from Spain as a result of the Spanish-American War. In the summer of 1898 Arthur MacArthur went to the Philippines. In May 1900 he became Military Governor.

About that time Republican President William McKinley sent William Howard Taft at the head of a Commission charged with establishing a civilian government in the Philippines. Taft arrived June 3, 1900, just a month after MacArthur had assumed his governorship.

Back home there was a national political fight going on, with President McKinley under heavy pressure from his Democratic opponents to end what they considered expensive military operations against Philippine elements fighting the American takeover. There were demands for early establishment of civilian government in the islands.

In MacArthur's command there was a feeling that only the Army could do the job of restoring order and giving western civilization to the Islanders. The Taft Commission encountered a cold attitude on the part of the general.

Taft waited for MacArthur to pay his respects, but the general sent a colonel instead. Finally Taft himself went to see MacArthur, who gave him a cool welcome and assigned for the commission's use only one small room in the Governor's palace.

Taft thereupon undertook a series of reports on MacArthur to Secretary of War Elihu Root in Washington. He even threatened to resign.

In this antagonistic atmosphere the two men and their associates existed for a year. Then on July 4, 1901, Taft became Civilian Governor of the islands. MacArthur was relieved of his command and returned to military duty in the United States.

In 1907 MacArthur finished a tour of duty as commander of the Army's division of the Pacific and was considered by many in line to become Chief of Staff.

But Secretary of War Taft preferred Gen. J. F. Bell, and MacArthur remained in semi-retirement until his actual retirement at 64 years of age in June 1909.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

TAFT, MACARTHUR FAVORED—THEY ARE CAPEHART'S PICK FOR 1952 PRESIDENTIAL TICKET

FRENCH LICK, IND., April 14.—Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, today proposed a 1952 Republican ticket of Taft for President and MacArthur for Vice President.

He said that Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, "has more delegates than anybody and is the popular choice."

Senator CAPEHART told newsman that Mr. TAFT would give the Republican party the best leadership on domestic issues and that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur would do the same on foreign policy.

Asked how General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower might figure in next year's Presidential campaign, Senator CAPEHART replied:

"I don't suppose he could get away from his mission in Europe. He is tied up in Europe and will be inactive politically for many years."

Senator CAPEHART came to French Lick, a southern Indiana resort, to address a meeting of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in favor of scrutinizing carefully every request of any kind for funds which comes to Congress in these days of mounting deficits. I want to have all of the facts—and the story behind these facts. But I do not see how anyone can feel that the proposition to send grain to India has not been fully explored, and how anyone can question the need.

I should like at this time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two very fine editorials from a very fine newspaper, the Salt Lake Tribune, which point out the dangers of any further delay in voting the funds to send grain to India immediately:

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 16, 1951]

DELAYING AID TO HUNGRY PEOPLE IS DANGEROUS

Backfiring of some assistance programs in the past and realization that our resources are limited has slowed down some American international relief undertakings.

It was sensible, therefore, for Congress to examine carefully the proposal to send food grain to India, where many thousands of persons are starving. The entire proposition has been explored and the testimony is in. There is no question of the imperative need. There should be no further delay. Famine does not wait.

In a sense, the good intentions and honesty of the United States are on trial before the world. Even the most rabid critics of India and its Government have not proposed that we refuse to furnish food to the starving. Only the details about payment and terms are debated. We have the grain and ships are available. All that is required now is appropriate Government action.

If the United States were to refuse aid now countless peoples throughout the world would be convinced that we put a price tag on our acts of mercy, that we help only when we can coerce. However false the charges might be, it would not help us to win friends throughout the globe. The cognomen, "Uncle Shylock," is less flattering than "Uncle Sugar." More important than reaction of other peoples, however, is our own self-respect. We simply cannot afford to be unresponsive to pleas to mitigate human suffering.

Hunger is on the march in India. It is extremely dangerous to further delay the food we have and they need so urgently.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 28, 1951]

WHILE HUMANS STARVE

The humanitarian phase has been repeatedly stressed in connection with the proposal to send surplus grain to save lives in India.

While droughts were followed by hurricanes, destroying India's maize and wheat crops, contrary nature has overflowed the wheat bowl of the United States. Not to be outdone by nature, Congressmen have perversely decided that starving stomachs can wait. There is grave danger that the grain measure, proposed by the administration with the blessing of Herbert Hoover,

Those who do not hear this over the radio will get the story from those who do.

The first job of the free world is to make itself so strong that the aggressor dare not strike. Peace can doubtless be secured temporarily in this way, and only in this way.

The free world is proceeding on this policy through the machinery created by the North Atlantic Treaty, as cumbersome and inefficient as that machinery is.

This will give us a breathing spell. It would be a tragic mistake to expect that it will give us permanent world peace.

The ferment which is working at the heart of the world, keeping it in pain and anguish, is too potent to yield to the persuasion of armies, of battleships, and bombers.

Indeed, that sort of extravagant trappings, created out of the blood, sweat, and tears of men, will in the end add fuel to the seething caldron of unrest which is now gripping the world.

In truth, the road to permanent world peace must be a much less costly road than the one we are now following.

It is the job of the United States, as leader of the free world, to find this road and to lead the democracies of the world in planting their feet firmly upon it, determined to follow it to the end.

For some time now the free world has been drawing closer and closer together.

The foreign policy of the United States is largely responsible for this—lend-lease, UNRRA, the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the British loan, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, and numerous other international actions under the leadership of the United States all attest the strong community of interest of the democratic nations.

But the free world is still separated into too many political and economic compartments to bring about the kind of strong organization necessary, first, for its own preservation, and, second, for the job of raising the standard of living of the peoples of the world if foundations of permanent peace are to be well laid.

To create such an organization and to do such a job, the free world must unite politically, militarily, economically. It must speak with 1 voice instead of 12 or 15 or 20 voices, not all saying the same thing. It must eliminate barriers to the movement of goods within its own boundaries, preliminary to the elimination of world barriers, to the end that markets may be enormously enlarged and that production may be rationalized on the basis of comparative advantage. This would substantially reduce the cost of goods to the people, would bring about a great increase in the production of raw materials throughout the world, and result in the development of the world's resources and production facilities on a scale never before seen. The need of subsidies and grants would cease; the standard of living would automatically rise throughout the world; tranquillity would be restored, and permanent world peace would be within our grasp.

Mr. Charles Wilson and Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles E. Wilson, who is doing a most creditable task as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The address was delivered by Mr. Wilson over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Tuesday, April 10, 1951. Those who know him know that Mr. Wilson clearly set forth his basic and most constructive views:

A week ago the President gave the American people the first report of our progress in defense mobilization. It was a heartening report in many respects. But both before and after it was issued there has been much evidence that many Americans believe we can slacken our efforts to achieve America's might.

It is to caution against this tendency to complacency—rather, in fact, to tell you of the dire need to go forward energetically and resolutely and unitedly—that I talk to you tonight.

The whole history of the human race is the story of the struggle of men to be free—to determine the kind of government under which they would live—to worship God in their own way—to choose freely how they would earn a living.

This struggle went on all over the world for more than 50 centuries during which the war lords, kings, and emperors ruled the earth; tyranny was the common lot of man.

Men before us fought for the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights, but the great liberation really began with the founding of this Republic. Before that, out of all the billions who inhabited this earth, never more than three or four million people, at any one time, had enjoyed liberty and freedom as we conceive liberty and freedom.

Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton intended us to be forever free. Government was to be the servant of the people and not their master. Government was to represent all of the people and no man or any group of men were to have any rights or any freedoms beyond those that were to be enjoyed by all of our people.

Under that Government, as conceived by the founders of this Nation, we have developed a freedom and an economy that have given liberty to more people and a better standard of living to more people than mankind has ever known.

All over the world, free nations, inspired by our example, came into being. Within the last 40 years these free nations, in two great world wars, have united to resist assaults upon the liberties of mankind.

Now once more tyranny is on the march. A dictatorship, more absolute and ruthless than any that the world has ever known, challenges all that we have so dearly won. It believes that the only way it can be safe is to undermine or overcome all other governments.

Please do not believe that I seek to frighten you. You know the basic facts as well as I know them. The dreadful shadow moves over this earth. In a short 12 years nation after nation has disappeared behind the iron curtain—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Eastern Germany, part of Finland, China, and half of Korea—800,000,000 people—a third of the population of the earth.

Untold millions are in slave labor camps and mines and factories, producing materials and munitions of war. Other millions are impressed into the largest armed force this world has ever known—all of these poised to be hurled at the last bulwarks of freedom and liberty.

This brings us face to face with the question whether our country and our way of life are worth the price we must pay to defend them. Here and now we must decide for ourselves the price of freedom. Each of us must decide in his own heart whether he will do his part niggardly or magnificently.

We must decide whether we will be greatly patriotic or whether we will be meanly partisan for ourselves or for any group or class.

I know you will agree with me that what we have here in America is not only worth fighting for, but worth sacrificing for.

And this brings us face to face with the question of what we must do to defend ourselves.

I repeat, we live in a democracy. The Congress will determine how much money is to be made available and for what it is to be spent. The President will administer this program, and as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces will direct their use.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is charged with the mobilization of men and materials and the over-all direction of the acquisition of everything required by the Armed Forces.

We are charged to do this without destroying or impairing the economy of this Nation.

This requires, in effect, almost a miracle of equilibrium. Give the Army and the Navy and the Air Force the millions of men they require, without destroying the labor force which must produce their weapons, and give them food and clothing, equipment, and arms without destroying the labor force which must produce all of the things necessary for the maintenance of our civilian economy.

At the same time we must see to it that rents and prices and wages do not get into an upward spiral, or there would be no money left from the civilian economy to support the defense effort.

We also need what amounts to almost a miracle of timing. The development of scientific weapons of war means that the rate at which some weapons become obsolete is terrific. So we must make, or be ready to make, all of the things that our Armed Forces need with which to defend us, without having to maintain maximum weapon production at all times.

But at the end, what we really need is an honest will on the part of everybody to seek the best solutions that will protect this country in its essential defense program, and that will stop the inflation which may destroy that program.

The defense program is rolling.

The transition from a full employment economy to a defense program is being achieved in matters of production with less dislocation and more speed than anyone had thought possible.

We are building up the facilities to produce for the Armed Forces, so that they can be expanded with the greatest rapidity in any situation that confronts us.

Contracts for defense production are moving at the rate of nearly $4,000,000,000 a month. Actual production should catch up, this very year, with the rate of spending.

Tonight I can report to you with the utmost confidence that there is building up, here in America, a machinery of defense so powerful that when it is completed no dictator in his right mind would dare attack us.

At the same time, I want to make it crystal clear that we have a gigantic task here at home to maintain our economy under this tremendous burden.

It is necessary that this program have the support of every man and woman in the United States. Every one of us must be willing to give up something—but, more important, we must resist the temptation to claim or grab more than is rightly and justly due us.

When the President asked me to undertake this task, he outlined a single and wholly patriotic goal—to mobilize our

dure and guide the lives of its citizens through social, economical, and political strife.

This essay attempts to prove that the American Constitution is what Gladstone called "The greatest work ever struck off by the mind and purpose of man" and that it is superior as an instrument of government even in this complicated modern world.

What qualities make this body of laws so outstanding at the time it was written and in our own day? The Government under the Constitution determined to be democratic, to work under a system in which all the citizens decide questions of public policy, either directly or through their elected representatives. The people profit by a democracy because it strives to promote the interests of society as a whole.

Democracy respects the civil liberties of all. Among these liberties are the right to form one's opinions and express them freely, the right of petition, the freedom of religion, and the right to impartial justice.

It furnishes every individual with equal educational opportunity, regardless of race, religion, social status, and so on.

Democracy promotes those economic, political, and social conditions that are necessary for the enjoyment of liberty.

Democracy demonstrates that far-reaching changes can be carried out in an orderly and peaceful fashion, when the decision to make the changes has been reached by democratic means, that is, by the majority.

It liberates, develops, and uses the intelligence of all its citizens and equips them with the knowledge needed for the promotion of national efficiency.

Democracy teaches that every privilege entails a corresponding duty, and carries with it an obligation to subordinate personal interest for the common good.

The above principles are the ideals that the American Constitution has striven for but they have not always been perfectly realized in our country due to weak instruments. The courts under the American Constitution since the time that John Marshall established their prestige have attempted in all possible ways to administer justice. The Supreme Court has kept apace with the expansion of the country, the complicated social problems, increase of transportation and commerce, and big business—problems which did not exist at the time of the origin of the Constitution. The ability and right to cope with these situations have been handed down from the time of John Marshall who insisted that Congress had implied powers as well as expressed powers.

Another reason the Constitution has guided our ship of state so successfully is the wise system of checks and balances. The power of the Constitution was divided into three separate functions, the executive, legislative, and judicial.

The task of putting and keeping the country on a financial basis was one of the headaches of the framers that was alleviated by Hamilton. Our country has been prosperous and blessed by God despite panics, depressions, and wars, but never has it been faced with such a huge debt as today. Congress, using the powers given by the Constitution, is trying to cope with the situation.

The National Government under Congress today furnishes much leadership, driving force, and money for education, health, and social security. Institutions for the aged, blind, and mentally deficient have been the result of Government aid and supervision.

In relation to the defense program the Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war, raise and support forces for the national defense, make laws for the regulation of these forces for the national defense, to provide for calling forth the militia and the organizing, arming, and disciplining of it when in the service of the United States.

We have seen how this power has been utilized for the successful defense of our land.

If it had not been for the regulations of Congress under the Constitution in regard to commerce and big business, we would probably have a dictatorial government.

The United States has made a supreme effort through the Monroe Doctrine, League of Nations, the United Nations, and other foreign policies, to preserve world peace and normal economic conditions with all her neighbors in other lands.

Today our Government faces a critical and complicated situation in world affairs and we pray that it will stand the test as it has so courageously done in the past.

The Constitution is now more than a century and a half old. It has been praised and it has been severely criticized. It was written for a primitive rural people with an eighteenth-century background but it has grown through amendments and custom and decision to such an extent that it serves as the written instrument of government for a highly industrialized people of 150,000,000 covering a vast expanse of territory. It has survived prosperity and panic. And remember, the Nation is still young.

The Martin Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the Members have wondered, as I have, whether or not General MacArthur intended that his letter to our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], should be made public. In a personal letter, a military officer is apt to freely express himself without considering the results that might flow from publication of his private thoughts. I do not quite understand why the Congressman from Massachusetts expected the general to send him a second message, telling him not to make the first public. Yet this is evidently what the gentleman expected if the following news story by the Associated Press is a correct account of an address by the gentleman.

The rule that silence gives consent applies legally only when one is under a duty to speak, and I cannot conceive, under the circumstances, that the general was bound to affirmatively inform the gentleman that the letter was not for publication. If military personnel cannot trust Members of Congress to keep private letters confidential, we will lose the opportunity to obtain information not otherwise available. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts had better authority than his North Attleboro speech indicated for his publication of the general's letter.

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star of April 16, 1951]

ADMINISTRATION SEEKS TO SMEAR MACARTHUR, MARTIN CHARGES

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., April 16.—* * * Mr. MARTIN declared "the issue in this dispute is much greater than MacArthur's career or the loss of a continent to the Communists."

He said: "We are barred from hearing the views of anybody who owes his position to the Truman administration if those views disagree with Truman's. * * * According to this rule Eisenhower cannot speak unless it is what Truman wants to say. When such rules govern we are coming pretty close to dictatorship."

HELD LETTER 10 DAYS

Mr. MARTIN said he had withheld for 10 days General MacArthur's letter stating the general's views on far eastern policy while he (MARTIN) waited for some indication from MacArthur that he wanted the letter withheld from publication.

The minority leader said he finally came to the conclusion he "owed it to the American people to tell them the information I had from a great and reliable source."

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, department of Ohio, in sponsoring an annual essay contest for high-school students, is certainly stimulating the Americanism of the youth of our land, this year's subject being the American Constitution in a Modern World.

As the Representative of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Ohio, I am, indeed, proud that one of our fine young boys, Leo Collins, of Alliance, is among the winners.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is a pleasure to include Leo's essay:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Leo Collins, Alliance, Ohio)

In September 1788 the Constitution of the United States of America was finally ratified and put into effect. The efforts and sacrifices of thousands of men and women, who for centuries had had that hope for freedom, went into that document. The men who wrote and made our Constitution did not write it to meet just the present needs of a small and poor country, but they had visions of a nation which would someday be truly great.

In the approximately 163 years since our Constitution was formed, our Nation has grown from a few small Colonies along the eastern coast of North America to one of the largest, richest, and most powerful countries in the world. Stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and with approximately 150,000,000 people, the United States has proved that a nation based on a constitution of freedom can and will survive and prosper.

will be talked to death. Meantime, the President of the India League of America says that at least 1,000,000 Indians will die of disease or starvation unless Congress quickly approves the grant.

Approval of this program no doubt would do more than all possible diplomatic maneuvers to win friends in the Far East. Meantime, it is reported that congressional reluctance to act has driven New Delhi to ask Russia for grain. What a potent propaganda subject would be created if the Soviets furnished the Indians the needed grain while American Congressmen indulged in futile filibusters over the question of repayment.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to the Congress and the country the prize-winning essay of Miss Sue Rowe, a Bexley, Ohio, high school senior, in the Ohio American Legion essay contest for 1951. It is worth reading by all of us, and I am proud that Miss Rowe comes from my district.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Sue Rowe)

The Constitution in today's world is not a charter of rights handed down by the Government to the people, but a limit of power placed on the Government by the people. The Constitution is not a law granted to the people, but a supreme law made by the people for the United States of America. It is in these facts that the glory of the United States Constitution lies.

People today say that our generation knows more about the Constitution than the founding fathers; but the Constitution makers knew more about good government. Our forefathers laid the foundations and the framework of the Government which are stated in the preamble to the Constitution. Because these men had great foresight in realizing the requirements of a true and lasting democracy, they left the next generation free to establish the Nation socially and economically. The people have been so busy building the Nation that they have not yet nearly begun to fill the inherited framework of freedom.

These pioneers of democracy knew the temptation of a government to take more power or to misuse the power granted to it. Any clause which would make the Constitution superior to the people was removed.

The originators of the Constitution also knew that these fundamental principles must last, not for an age, but for all time. The final draft of the Constitution was so successful that it has been used as the framework of the United Nations Charter.

Today's world is divided by an enormous chasm between two schools of thought. One idea is stated word for word by the preamble and the Bill of Rights. The other centers around the ideology that the state is the supreme power and that the individual exists only to serve and to promote the Government. Education in such a government exists only to make the individual more useful to the state. All opposition to such a government is suppressed.

The Constitution has been found so flexible, so elastic, and so adaptable that it fits perfectly into this world of constant change and has been equal to every new condition presented to it. The elastic clause which gives Congress the power to make laws necessary for completing the work of the Government has been one factor which has made the Constitution so flexible. In these times of economic distress, inflation, and unrest in foreign countries, our supreme law has new goals to conquer.

The Constitution defends us daily; it stands between us and the fallacy that man belongs to the state. The throne, crown, and sceptor of the people is the Constitution which, as long as it is maintained in letter and in spirit, secures liberties and pursuits of happiness. The Constitution is the candle which will light the way of the world through future years and centuries.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting essays written by Mr. Kenneth Creasy of Delaware, Ohio, and Mr. Maurice Bouffioux of Mt. Vernon, Ohio. Mr. Creasy and Mr. Bouffioux are two of the winners of the Annual Essay Contest sponsored by the Department of Ohio American Legion and the Auxiliary.

Twelve winners were chosen from the thousands of essays submitted with three being selected from each high school grade. Mr. Bouffioux placed first, along with two others, in the ninth grade division, while Mr. Creasy shared top honors in the senior class.

The title, Mr. Speaker, this year was "The American Constitution in a Modern World." The work of these young men certainly merits the time of every Member of Congress to carefully analyze their recommendations.

I am indeed very thankful, Mr. Speaker, that the American Legion and the Auxiliary sponsor such a program and I am grateful that so many young people—the youth of today and the manhood and womanhood of tomorrow—will devote many hours of time and study in preparation of an essay of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Creasy of Delaware and Mr. Bouffioux of Mt. Vernon for their endeavors and their achievements and I am happy to submit their essays for your consideration.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Kenneth Creasy)

Any sensible person will tell you that a building, in order to stand over a long duration of time, must be of firm foundation and structure. Likewise, governments must be sound in structure, and they must be built upon foundations that can withstand all that might challenge them.

Think back with me, if you will, to the years immediately preceding 1789. During that time, the leaders of our country grasped a belief in an idea, and this idea was later to become the foundation of our democracy. In truth, they wished to do something that would let us live and do as we had dreamed of doing since our venture onto this great continent. Thus, our forefathers came upon a plan for organizing a government dedicated to the belief that all men should be free to live in peace. They believed, as we believe today, that we should be a self-governing people. Yes, these men began to develop their dream, and then, they began to act as if what they believed were true. The result was the Constitution of the United States of America.

Thus, by virtue of our Constitution, our Government was established, consisting of three branches: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. In more common terms: the President, the Congress, and the Courts. With these established, our country began to make history. We grew, we prospered, and in doing so we rejoiced.

As times changed and life in our world, and our United States became more and more complex, our Government had to adjust itself to meet many changing conditions. The tests of the strength and flexibility of our Constitution became great and numerous. But, as the forward-looking men who had conceived it had believed, the Constitution was strong enough to withstand even the problems offered by a more modernized world.

Let us look at the preamble of the Constitution and see precisely what is promised by that document. It goes as follows: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

From its very beginning, the Constitution has been used for guidance in all our governmental undertakings. For example, our courts provide justice to all who come before them.

Much has been done to provide for the common defense, as can be witnessed by the establishment of military power. Closely related to the common defense is the general welfare. Along this line Federal highways, parks, and the like have been constructed. Of necessity, a system of social security was set up to provide for the economic and social well being of the individual.

Obviously, the American Constitution works extremely well in the modern world. This is evidenced by the fact that it has been amended only 21 times in 162 years.

To sum it up, I would say that our Constitution has proved itself to be a firm foundation for Government, and the guiding light behind our success. This document, developed in 1789, is the basis of the American way. Truly, it has made our Government, as Abe Lincoln said, "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Maurice Bouffioux, Mount Vernon, Ohio)

The American Constitution in this modern world of today, is, as it was intended to be in the beginning, a workable government based on the fact that all men are created equal and have inalienable rights which must be protected. Since it is based on these God-given rights, it has, and is destined to en-

The American Constitution has changed very little since it was first formed. It has proved that the common people, once they realize what freedom in a democracy like ours can mean, will never give it up. The modes of transportation and material surroundings and even the methods of waging wars to defend our hard-won freedoms have changed, but as our Constitution was not based on material things but rather on ideals, it has endured through the years. It is a guide which helps you to gain material things and bring greater happiness into your life while still allowing you to have your personal freedoms.

Yet you often wonder just what effect our Constitution has on our modern world. But, actually, it is not a hard problem to solve when you realize that today, even more so than back in 1789, people all over the world are crying out against and trying to escape from the persecution and injustices which dictators and communistic governments are forcing on them. Our Nation, with our Constitution as its base, stands as the only truly free country in the world. The world is slowly but surely learning that a nation can be free and prosper with equality for all of the people.

As you look around you, you realize that behind all of our conveniences, which we consider so important today, such as the telephone, electric light, and the automobile, is our Constitution. It has given our people the freedoms that are so necessary for a person to be able to sit down with an untroubled mind to work on problems of bettering himself and his fellowman.

Yes; when we begin to think about it, we realize that we owe our forefathers more than we will ever be able to repay for their sacrifices and hardships which they went through to make our Constitution live. It is our duty to carry on the traditions of our country so that our Constitution will live on and our descendants will reap the benefits of it just as we have done.

CARE: An Asset for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have contributed to the humanitarian work that CARE is doing across the world—alleviating human suffering and bringing happiness to countless thousands—know that all too little is known of this splendid organization. Under unanimous consent of the House, therefore, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the March 4, 1951, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, entitled "An Asset for Freedom."

The editorial follows:

AN ASSET FOR FREEDOM

People around the world, whatever their nationality, their race, or their religion, have very elementary aspirations. They want enough to eat, sufficient clothing, a roof over their heads, and the means to make the lot of their children better than their own has been.

This fact explains more about the world, the struggle to control it, the basis of political power and the opportunities for leadership than pages of governmental statistics on steel production, shipping tonnage, or wheat output.

The idea is that of Paul Comly French, executive director of CARE (Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe), who spoke before the City Club Forum yesterday, especially on the needs of Yugoslavia. In the last 4 years French has been in virtually every country in the world, mixing not only with the heads of governments, drawing up relief agreements, but what is more important, with the common people. In that time French has crossed the Atlantic 51 times and has been around the world three times. Twelve days ago he was in Yugoslavia.

The work that CARE has done in transmitting more than 10,000,000 packages to needy persons abroad since the war has been one of the greatest assets for freedom in the postwar world. It has reached down to the lower strata of society in every country, places where Marshall plans do not reach and where such aid, going mainly to industries that only indirectly pass on the benefits to the individual, are often never heard of.

In the next 6 months, under the government and CARE distribution of food surpluses in Yugoslavia, one-fourth of the population will receive aid from the United States and will know it is from the United States. The aberrations and political chicanery of UNRRA will be avoided. While Marshal Tito still proclaims his independence of both the east and the west, this distribution to be carried out under the constant checking throughout the country of 16 inspectors, will do more to win support for the west than all the diplomatic arrangements that Washington may make.

CARE operates only in those countries where it can supervise its work. It has pulled out of such nations as Rumania and Bulgaria, where the Communists were interested only in using it as a political weapon. In its operation, we believe, is to be found a key to success in international relations on the level that counts most—the good will of the populations. Governments, especially our own which has so badly fumbled its propaganda opportunities, might well take a lesson from this humanitarian, nonprofit organization.

MacArthur and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will be interested in the following editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News. Mr. Boddy has long advocated greater interest in the peoples of Asia. His calm analysis of the General MacArthur episode is worthy of attention:

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of April 12, 1951]

DANGER OF UN SPLIT OVER KOREAN POLICY

Until repercussions from the violent shock of General MacArthur's removal from command subside there will be little if any chance for the voice of reason and common sense to be heard.

Even now, however, it is well to keep in mind that the split between General MacArthur and his followers and the Truman administration with its supporters is only one part of the picture.

There is grave danger that the United Nations itself may be divided into two irreconcilable blocks.

Carlos P. Romula, 1949 president of the General Assembly of the UN, gives this clear picture of why United Nations forces are fighting in Korea (the Yale Review, December 1950):

"After centuries of obscurity and submergence, Asia has assumed a new importance in world affairs. It has emerged as one of the main proving grounds of the United Nations, a place of decision on the issue of war or peace, and one of the reasons for which the deep social and economic disequilibrium of modern society will have to be redressed if the future is to be made secure from ruinous conflicts, wars, and revolutions.

"Korea, which is the epitome of the plight and the challenge of Asia, is a turning point in the life of the United Nations. The attack upon the Republic of Korea on June 25, 1950, drove the world organization to the wall. It had to resist aggression and maintain the rule of law or surrender its right to continued existence."

UN FACED DEADLY PERIL

"After 5 years of alternating crises and recoveries, which sorely tried its vitality and power though never to the point of mortal danger, the United Nations suddenly found itself confronted with deadly peril south of the thirty-eighth parallel in embattled Korea.

"There it had to make a stand, politically and militarily, and it did."

It made a stand, right enough, but about 98 percent of that stand was made by the United States, and every day it is becoming increasingly obvious that the United States and the United Nations are not, in fact, "standing" for the same objective.

A large section of UN members is growing more and more voluble in its demand that Red China be admitted to membership.

An overwhelming majority of the people of the United States on the other hand, do not hesitate to express their conviction that the UN has no more chance to survive Communist cells within its organization than a human body has to survive cancerous tissue.

As of today, at least, it appears that the Truman administration is unwilling to compel a showdown on this issue as it would be doing if it followed General MacArthur's proposed program.

This unwillingness may be caused by some important facts that are not available to the public.

For one thing, the MacArthur plan of war against China might cause an immediate split between the United States and her European allies at the very time when General Eisenhower is moving heaven and earth to prepare defenses against Red aggression in Europe.

UNITED STATES WOULD STAND ALONE

In any event, it seems certain that if we were to pursue an uncompromising policy of all-out war against communism in Asia we would have to stand alone except for such manpower help as could be organized among the rebellious hordes within Asia itself.

Even though the Truman administration were in agreement with the MacArthur policy in principle, the practical question of whether we are yet ready for the drastic action called for by that policy is one this writer, certainly, is unprepared to answer. And being unprepared he feels that hot, emotional outbursts would be a grave disservice to the public.

For many years the Daily News has been expressing the conviction that the era of the Pacific is at hand; that with mass man

on the land mass of the world, which is Asia, and not Europe, which is the sick appendage of Asia, rests the fate of western civilization.

Our course of action, however, must be the product of extremely careful timing, enlightened statesmanship and diplomacy.

It is very easy to get into a terrible war of destruction and almost impossible to get out of it. It seems to us that now is the time to prepare defenses against war rather than a time to expand the one we are in.

The Communists are not getting stronger in Asia. Starvation, disease, internal confusion, lack of transportation, oil and production facilities combine to work against them.

The United States, on the other hand, is getting stronger with each passing week.

For all of these reasons we cannot escape the feeling that the administration had no choice but to head its team in Asia with a commander who can conscientiously play the kind of game upon which we are now relying to win the long, weary years that lie ahead in the battle of readjustment.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial appearing in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 13, 1951, that seems to me to be pertinent at this time. If all the newspapers and news commentators would have exercised the same good judgment in the MacArthur case as did the Deseret News there would have been less hysteria among the people and certainly the advice given in the editorial of ascertaining all the facts before expressing a judgment is sound for both newspapers as well as individuals.

The editorial follows:

MACARTHUR CASE DEMANDS ALL FACTS BEFORE JUDGMENT—SO LET'S WAIT

If ever there was a time when snap judgment was dangerous, impertinent, and even maliciously mischievous, the case of the abrupt removal of General MacArthur from his hatful of commands is one.

If it should be true that MacArthur has been an insubordinate soldier, and that is the one prime hard fact in the case, then Mr. Truman performed no more than his obvious duty in replacing him with a soldier who will obey orders as a military man is sworn to do.

But even if that should be true it would be hard to see that prime fact clearly as things stand now.

The incident is an element in a stew of domestic and international politics which boils so hot and tumultuously that the comment and debate it has aroused, not only in this country but across the world, is thus far almost altogether the sharp ejaculation of personal and political emotion rather than expression of objective reason and considered judgment.

The latter must wait until all of the facts are known.

Certainly not all of the facts are known now; for one thing, among many, MacArthur himself has not been heard, and how nearly those who have taken it upon themselves to speak for him come to saying what he himself would say, no one but the general himself now can know. And it will require the consideration of international lawyers to make clear to most of us exactly how the President of the United States could remove a United Nations generalissimo and replace him with a man of his own choice, without formal UN by-your-leave.

The answer to a good many other questions, all equally important connected with this business remains obscure.

Until thorough and competent investigation clears them up, until all of the pertinent facts are plainly established, the Deseret News prefers to reserve judgment on the MacArthur case.

This is too important a matter for it to be in the public interest for any responsible public expresser of opinion to permit itself to go off half-cocked. That includes newspapers.

We do think it correct, however, to hope at this point that the complete clarification of all of the facts connected with the MacArthur case will help to unmesh the tangle of acts and motives and curiosities of politics which seems to make the whole pattern of this country's international policy during recent years, obscure.

If anybody now can give a flat outright answer to every question that has been asked in good faith about the conduct of our international policy since 1945, we have not met him—in Washington or anywhere else.

What the country wants in that connection is precisely what we are waiting for in the MacArthur case. A plain, frank, unequivocal display of the facts.

Revenue Taxes Affecting Wine-Producing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress will shortly be asked to legislate on a new revenue-raising bill. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has concluded lengthy hearings on all phases of the subject and is now in the process of marking up a 1951 tax bill for reporting to the House. I have been seriously disturbed by the possibility that the President's recommendations for wholesale increases in excise taxes will be accepted, without adequate consideration of the use of more equitable means of obtaining increased revenue, such as closing the many loopholes in corporation and income-tax provisions which we all know to exist. I have been most particularly alarmed at the consequences should the proposed excessive increases on wine taxes be put into effect, as have my colleagues from California and other grape-producing areas.

My mail has been full of letters from grape growers and others engaged in some phase of the wine-producing industry documenting the disastrous effects to be anticipated if the ruinous taxes proposed are enacted. One of these letters so intelligently pictures the situation, and includes such conclusive arguments, that I ask that it be reproduced in the RECORD accompanying these remarks. I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues, both on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House as a whole, will give very serious thought to the points raised in the letter written by Mr. Laurence F. Hosmer, of Lodi, Calif., which follows:

LODI, CALIF., *March 29, 1951.*

The Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been operating a vineyard for 30 years, deriving all the income for the support of my family from that source, and can honestly say that I am familiar with the production of grapes. Since the repeal of prohibition I have been a member of a cooperative winery, and as such have become very much aware of the relationship of the wine market to the other two segments of the vineyard industry, the fresh grape shipping, and the raisin market. They are so closely balanced that disturbance of any of the three results in distress to all. On a total of 36 acres, my annual production varies between 300 and 370 tons per year. Of this total, about 85 tons are of strictly wine varieties and of the balance, less than half are of premium quality profitable to ship. Consequently, of my total production, less than 30 percent can be counted on to show a profit if packed and shipped, and if the wine market is depressed, the portion that is shipped will show very little or no profit either.

During the years 1943 to 1946 inclusive, the price of wine was high, and the fresh grapes shipped also brought good prices. In addition to the tax on wine, I was also paying a heavy income tax, so the Government was deriving quite a bit of revenue from my few acres. At the close of 1946 the wine market became badly depressed, continuing to be increasingly so through 1947, 1948, 1949. During these years, even with the utmost thrift and diligence, I could scarcely get back the cost of production from my vineyard, and paid no income taxes. My situation was almost universal among vineyardists during these years, and some were in worse case than I. Bear in mind that 158,000 families in America derive their livelihood from the growing of grapes. Experience has shown that as little as 10 percent of the total overproduction of wine can depress the entire grape industry; and this proposed fantastic tax on wine would have the effect of producing many times such a surplus constricting the market for wine by over 50 percent.

That would be the initial effect, but the cumulative piling up of surplus on surplus through successive vintage seasons would result in such economic catastrophe that a few seasons would mark the complete destruction of the vineyard industry of this country. Perhaps a few of the huge corporations, as Schenley, would survive, but the farm families would be finished, 158,000 of them. I believe that an intelligent examination of this question would show that if this wine tax were left as it is, the huge harvest of income tax from growers of grapes, and all persons connected with the wine industry, would surpass any increase of the tax on wine, with its inevitable decrease in taxes paid by growers and others.

In the hard years of 1947-49 the Government family had to step in and support the sagging raisin industry with millions of dollars. If the wine industry becomes a dead

goose, throwing vast surpluses of grapes into the shipping channels, and the raisin drying yards the same thing will happen again. No revenue, but millions again poured out to save the raisin farmers. Why not let the goose live, and you can continue to pick up the golden eggs? As citizens and farmers, we don't object to paying our share of the taxes—and big ones in these times—but we claim the right to make the money to pay them with. We get along nicely without mink coats but are passionately addicted to the practice of feeding and clothing our families. This proposed tax on wine is so unrealistic that it seems incredible that a responsible public official could have suggested it.

Yours very truly,

LAURENCE F. HOEMER.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, of Pontiac, Mich.

This is one of Michigan's great newspapers and the editorial reflects in large measure the anger of the people of the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

America is seething.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been given the Presidential heave-ho in the most brutal manner possible. He was baldly kicked into the alley and the door slammed in his face.

Here is United States diplomacy at its worst.

Again Truman reaches the bottom of the barrel.

General MacArthur has been a controversial figure much of the time recently, but his severest critics can hardly condone the wanton and calculated cruelty in the manner a great man's military career has been terminated.

There were many avenues open to the President if he wished to end the general's services. He could have recalled him to this country. He could have returned him to Washington as an adviser. He could have brought him home for a personal discussion and kept him here as long as he wished.

The general's a gentleman.

Many feel he's a great national hero.

He deserved to be treated like one.

Certainly, an individual with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's capacity and incisive mind is bound to pop off occasionally. That's a part of the package. Even President Lincoln didn't look for perfection in his generals and when he was advised that one of his top sources was nipping a bit, he suggested the brand be ascertained and some provided the other generals.

Whether you believe that the American leader in Japan was an asset or a liability at this particular time, his great service to his country should guarantee him consideration, respect, and even Presidential deference.

President Truman blunders again.

His infinite capacity for diplomatic ineptitude is emphasized once more.

The Nation is rallying to the general's cause in sweeping condemnation of the back alley methods employed by the White House. The question of whether MacArthur was the proper man for the Korean campaign at this moment is quite aside from the question of whether a great national hero should be summarily kicked out the window because a small-time politician sits in the White House and possesses the authority.

In fact, the pronouncement occasioned so great a turmoil that the President went to the radio the same night to explain his action to an angry Nation. His reasoning may have been perfectly sound so far as the situation is concerned, but nothing he said explained the method employed.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star is running a series of articles from Mr. John Gunther's new book, The Riddle of MacArthur. Right now, while the Republicans are blaming the administration for all of our Asiatic troubles, the following article rather interestingly points up the fact that even the great General MacArthur has been accused of making errors:

THE RIDDLE OF MACARTHUR—GENERAL WAS BRILLIANT SOLDIER, BUT IS ACCUSED OF BLUNDERS—PLANES CAUGHT ON GROUND IN PHILIPPINES 10 HOURS AFTER JAPANESE ATTACK ON HAWAII

(By John Gunther)

General MacArthur came with the Rainbow Division to France in October 1917, and won practically every medal that the Army could bestow. His bravery was brilliant. He fought in the Champagne-Marne area, and took part in the Aisne-Marne offensive. He was wounded twice, gassed once. One legend is that the first wound came because of an error in the high command; his troops were bombarded by their own artillery.

General MacArthur rose to the rank of brigadier general and, at last, became commander of the division he helped create. One of his officers for a time, though he never met him, was a Missourian named Harry Truman. The general fought at St. Mihiel, Wouvre, and Sedan. Then, after the armistice, he got his first taste of military occupation and the administration of a defeated enemy by serving briefly at Bonn, now the capital of Western Germany.

Back home, he worked in the office of the Chief of Staff, and then for 3 years (1919–22) was superintendent of West Point. Twice he returned to the Philippines for brief tours (1923 and 1928), and in the United States he successively commanded the IV, III, and IX Corps Areas, until he was appointed Chief of Staff in November 1930. In this post he won both loyal friends and unrelenting enemies. He pressed for bigger Army appropriations, gave heed to the problems of a unified command, and preached for mechanization, mobility, and the vital importance of air and armored warfare. Normally his term would have expired in 1934, but President Roosevelt kept him on till October 1935.

MAC ARTHUR FURIOUS WITH DOUGLAS

Lewis Douglas, Mr. Roosevelt's first director of the budget (who many years later became American Ambassador to London), had the job of paring down Government expenditures 25 percent. General MacArthur came to a budget hearing, to resist cuts in the Army appropriation, and spoke for an hour strenuously. Then Mr. Douglas quietly asked him, "General, do you expect a serious epidemic of dysentery in the United States Army?" General MacArthur, taken aback, said "No."

Mr. Douglas then inquired why his budget for toilet paper—among other things—was so extraordinarily high; he had gone through all the Army figures, and thought that they were padded. General MacArthur was so furious that he stopped his testimony forthwith and bluntly left the room. A year or so later Mr. Douglas ran into him, and apologized for the way he had put the question. Then General MacArthur handsomely apologized, too.

Under President Hoover, General MacArthur had been the focus of a bitter controversy because he evicted the bonus marchers from Anacostia Flats in Washington, D. C. Photographs showing him in suavely shined boots and brilliant, glittering uniform as he directed this unfortunate business did not do him much good. But he himself was not responsible for the eviction; the order came to him from higher up, through Secretary of War Hurley, and he had no choice but to obey. There has never been an instance in General MacArthur's history of specific refusal to obey an order. But it has taken him a long time to live down what seemed an outrageously harsh and flowery display of force against a hungry, miserable group of fellow citizens.

RETIRES FROM ARMY IN 1937

General MacArthur didn't know quite where to turn when he finished his tour as Chief of Staff in 1935. He had reached the top; he was only 55, ambitious, and in perfect health. The political atmosphere in Washington was not congenial. So when his old friend, Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippines, suggested that he go out to Manila as military adviser to the Commonwealth with the unprecedented rank of field marshal, he accepted. He retired from the United States Army in 1937, and devoted himself exclusively to the Philippines (his fourth term of service there) for the next 4 years.

He liked the life of Manila, and worked at his job—the organization of Philippine defenses on a long-range basis—with zeal and acumen. He hoped, if the Japanese gave him time, to train 40,000 men annually for 10 years, build up a small fleet of patrol torpedo boats and create a seasoned air force. His basic tenet was to equip the islands so that an attack would cost an enemy more than the value received, he told me in Manila once. He was convinced that there were only two beaches in the archipelago where an enemy could land, and (again if he had time) that the invaders could be held. Like practically everybody else he underestimated the Japanese.

It is hardly necessary to recapitulate here the story of General MacArthur in World War II. By the summer of 1941 practically everybody knew that war was coming—sometime. Mr. Roosevelt recalled him to active status as a major general on July 26, 1941, and promoted him to lieutenant general the next day, in command of all United States Army Forces in the Far East; the Philippine army became part of the American command. General MacArthur was severely embarrassed by the destruction of his planes on Clark Field on Pearl Harbor day. The Japanese caught him in exactly the same naked and exposed state as they caught the Americans in Hawaii, though he had ample warning since the Pearl Harbor attack had come 10 hours before.

Today the inclination of his staff is to blame a subordinate officer for this botch and

blunder. General MacArthur himself thought that war was inevitable, but he did not expect it till the spring of 1942, and he felt that the Japanese would probably bypass the Philippines in favor of softer spots to the south.

SERIOUS BLUNDER RECALLED

One may bring this story up to the present again by mentioning that General MacArthur has several times made serious blunders in judgment, based on faulty information. The attack on South Korea on June 25 apparently took him by complete surprise, and he thought that the Korean War was won after the landing at Inchon on September 15. He told Mr. Truman at their meeting on Wake Island a month later that the danger of Chinese intervention had passed, but the Chinese drastically fooled him. Then (though he tried to wriggle out of this by saying that the remark had only been "jocular") he predicted flatly that the American troops would be home by Christmas—only 3 or 4 days before they were caught by surprise and hammered back. General MacArthur, having scouted the ground personally for what was to have been his final advance, crashed into a colossal trap—moreover a trap about which he was fully aware.

Yet he has been generally regarded as the very symbol and incarnation of military omniscience. Few people dared to criticize him when he lost his planes on the Philippines; it was almost as if a conspiracy of silence existed to protect him, and most people are loath to criticize him now.

Mr. Roosevelt was, as everybody knows, violently attacked because American officers at Pearl Harbor were caught unaware and unprepared. Those who like to calumniate Mr. Roosevelt usually take earnest care to ignore the fact that General MacArthur in the Philippines likewise lost most of his planes on the ground. Most Roosevelt haters are MacArthur lovers (and vice versa) which perhaps serves to explain their easy exculpation of General MacArthur while Mr. Roosevelt is still venomously maligned.

General MacArthur thought—another error—that Manila could be held for a long period, because Corregidor was "the strongest single fortified point in the world." He did not think that the Japanese, or anybody, were capable of the type of attack they launched. He was wrong.

It's Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein part of a short address delivered by Abraham Lincoln at Indianapolis on February 11, 1861.

I know of no statement or opinion expressed that has a greater challenge in it for America today than this short address by the Great Emancipator, delivered nearly 90 years ago. All Americans should read it:

IT'S YOUR BUSINESS—HERE'S AN ALMOST-FORGOTTEN MESSAGE FROM ABRAHAM LINCOLN

In all trying positions in which I shall be placed, and doubtless I shall be placed in many such, my reliance will be upon you and the people of the United States; and I wish you to remember, now and forever, that it is your business, and not mine; that if the Union of these States and the liberties of this people shall be lost, it is but little to any one man of 52 years of age, but a great deal to the 30,000,000 people who inhabit these United States, and to their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?

The Fallacy of the Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Cannot Be Overcome by Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting editorial exposing the fallacy of the St. Lawrence seaway was taken from the columns of the March 5, 1951, issue of the Mobile (Ala.) Register:

FALLACY OF THIS PROPOSED SEAWAY CANNOT BE OVERCOME BY ARGUMENT

The more its proponents clamor for its construction, the more obvious and irrefutable becomes the fallacy of the proposed so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

Long alert in counseling against dumping American tax money into that hocus-pocus project has been New York City's West Side Association of Commerce.

One of the conspicuous facts about the proposed so-called seaway is, of course, that for several months out of each twelve it would be icebound and not available for use by shipping.

Among other conspicuous facts is that the channel would be too shallow for most American merchant ships, while a vastly larger proportion of foreign-flag ships would be able to navigate it.

Thus the proponents of the so-called seaway are in a position of clamoring for the expenditure of American tax money to create a rank discrimination against the American Merchant Marine.

This contrast between the percent of American and foreign ships that could negotiate the seaway has just been cited by James W. Danahy, vice president of the West Side Association of Commerce in New York.

Mr. Danahy called it an "incontrovertible fact that 58 percent of foreign-flag ships have a draft which would permit use of the seaway, while only 10 percent of American ships come within this classification."

Meanwhile United States Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, has delivered another blast at the project.

Congressman VAN ZANDT speaks of "manifold reasons" why the proposed so-called seaway is "an economic monstrosity and should not be foisted upon the American taxpayers who are already overburdened by taxes that take about 35 cents out of every dollar they earn."

He reminds that "the St. Lawrence project is nothing new," because "for the past 50 years it has been talked of at different intervals, only to be shunted aside as impractical and unsound." As others have done, Mr. VAN ZANDT points out that now "advocates of this economic monstrosity have garbed it in the armor of national defense" in the hope of shoving it across under that label.

But nobody is being fooled. The fallacy of the project cannot be concealed by parading it "in the garb of national defense."

As Mr. VAN ZANDT recalls, its advocates over a period of many years have urged construction of the proposed so-called seaway for "practically every reason under the sun." But none of these arguments, nor all of them together, can ever overcome the fundamental fallacy of the project.

A Policy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, over the networks of the National Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Liberty Broadcasting System, on Friday evening, April 13, 1951:

Good evening.

The midnight removal of General MacArthur has brought into clear focus the fundamental issue facing the American people. That issue is whether the United States shall be bled white by an endless chain of puppet wars and puppet crises promoted by the Kremlin or whether the United States, through courageous and bold leadership, can take decisive actiton that will put an end to Russia's schemes and thus avert a third world world war.

It was on this grave issue that one of the greatest military geniuses of all time, General MacArthur, patriotically decided to stand or fall. His place in history was already secure; he is now immortal.

Let us examine the administration's case.

The administration says that it is trying to prevent a little war from becoming a world war. At the same time, it says that it intends to do this without further appeasement of the Communists. In the same breath, it speaks of willingness to negotiate a peace.

PEACE

First, what is peace?

True peace is obtained when two or more nations agree to mutual courses of conduct and then live up to the letter and spirit of those agreements.

When the administration talks about the possibility of a negotiated peace, we must ask ourselves with whom are we negotiating? The answer to that question is that we are negotiating with the Communists.

In other words, the administration again is flirting with the dangerous idea that you can make a deal with the Communists, when everybody knows that no one has ever made a successful peace with the Communists. Why? Because the Communists have never lived up to a single agreement in history.

What kind of a negotiated peace would we get?

Would it be the so-called peace that we had from 1945 until the outbreak of the Korean War?

Would it be the same kind of peace that let the Soviet Union take over control of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Eastern Germany, one by one?

Would it be the kind of peace that would again permit the Soviet Union to knock off one country after another like so many tenpins?

Would it be a kind of peace that would now let the Soviet Union add South Korea, Formosa, Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Indochina, the Malayas, Pakistan, and Thailand to the already conquered areas of Manchuria, China, North Korea, and Tibet?

Even the administration admits the Kremlin has laid out a plan for world conquest. This plan calls for the eventual seizure of every nation on earth by any one of four means—by infiltration, by revolution, by external pressure, or by war. China, for example, was taken by revolution, Czechoslovakia by infiltration, Rumania by external pressure, and war was resorted to in the case of South Korea.

The truth is that the Soviet Union is never at peace and never has been. It is always employing one or more of its four means of forcing its political objectives upon unwilling peoples.

Let the administration explain how it proposes to negotiate a peace under such conditions. To lead the American people to believe that such a thing is possible is barefaced deception.

Until we face the stark facts that confront us in the Communist conspiracy to take over the world, we are certain to drift steadily toward ultimate disaster.

AVERT WAR

How, then, is peace possible? How do we avert a third world war?

The only thing that has ever stopped the Kremlin is a show of strength, a display of will and incisive leadership on the part of those threatened by the Soviet Union.

Milquetoast leadership is the Kremlin's dish.

It grows fat on negotiated deals.

Let us look at the record.

So long as the principal nations of the world were strong, Communist success was limited to the confines of the Soviet Union. In fact, as any schoolboy knows, the only reason Russia became the victim of communism was the appalling weakness of the czars, coupled with the fatal disintegration of that nation as a result of the First World War.

So long as Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, and the other victims of Soviet expansion remained strong, they remained free. So long as Britain, France, and the United States displayed courage and strength, the Kremlin planners kept their plans hidden from the world.

Even little South Korea is an example of how the Kremlin has always pounced at the slightest display of weakness. Less than a year after we had withdrawn our troops from South Korea, the Communists invaded.

I think, therefore, we can consider it a basic principle of conduct in meeting the Communist problem, that only by full employment of strength, courage, and incisive leadership can the world Communist conspiracy be repelled and eventually defeated.

And I am convinced that it is only by adopting this principle that we can avert a third world war. Only by strengthening the hands of our friends in Europe and in Asia and by remaining strong ourselves can a general conflict be avoided.

But that is not all. We must forge new methods and new techniques to meet the threat of communism without resort to war. We are in default in the field of psychological warfare; our counterpropaganda is weak, unimaginative, and without appeal to the oppressed peoples of the world. It is paramount that new methods and techniques be devised.

The great tragedy today is that we have people in high office who either cannot see the need of, or provide the leadership for, such a course of conduct.

FORSAKING ASIA?

In the field of practical application of policy, there are many of us who are convinced that the present plans of the administration call for us only to strengthen our friends in Europe while deserting our friends in Asia. We are forced to this conclusion by two sets of facts:

1. From 1945 until June 1950, the administration pursued a frustrating and contradictory policy of containment of communism in Europe and appeasement of communism in Asia. The policy on Asia had its roots in the Yalta Conference, but it was clearly enunciated when President Truman, on the advice of Dean Acheson, announced to the world on December 15, 1945, that unless Communists were admitted to the established Government of China, aid from America would no longer be forthcoming. At the same time, Mr. Truman dispatched General Marshall to China with orders to stop the mopping up of Communist forces which was being carried to a successful conclusion by the established Government of China. American aid was cut off to China early in 1946 by General Marshall to force a truce at the very instant when government troops were winning their battle against the Chinese Reds—the very same Chinese Reds who today are waging war against us along the thirty-eighth parallel. That is all a matter of record, uncontested and undisputed.

2. In June 1950, on what appeared to be a sudden impulse, the administration without consultation with Congress, plunged the United States into the Korean conflict, obtaining the approval of the United Nations after having done so. In the next 6 months, the fighting surged from the tip of Korea to the Manchurian border, only to become mysteriously stalled in recent weeks in the general area of the thirty-eighth parallel, while rumors of a negotiated peace have circulated freely. Now, General MacArthur—a firm believer in the principle that only by a show of strength and decisive leadership can the Communists be repelled—has been removed because he opposed maintaining a costly stalemate in Korea at the expense of American lives.

APPEASEMENT REVISITED

Those of us in Washington who have watched the emphasis shift in recent months, from winning the war in Korea to proposals to send American troops to Europe, have had every reason to believe that the old policy of opposing communism in Europe, while appeasing it in Asia, is with us once again.

It is significant that General MacArthur's removal on Wednesday coincided with the disclosure that the British Government was proposing to our Government that Formosa be turned over to Red China, that Red China take part in writing the Japanese peace treaty, and that Red China be admitted to the United Nations. Nor have we forgotten that only a few short weeks ago our own Government endorsed a United Nations proposal for a negotiated settlement in Korea that abandoned basic principles which made this country great.

In short, there is evidence on every hand that appeasement of communism in Asia is again the watchword.

Certainly, we should exert every effort commensurate with our security to give Europe the strength so essential to blocking the conspirators in the Kremlin. Certainly, we should do everything possible to prevent the free peoples and resources of Europe from coming under Soviet domination. To fail to do this would be calamitous.

But we insist that to do this, and only this, while deserting Asia, would mean eventual Soviet domination of the entire world.

This administration cannot long continue to hold the world up like an apple, inviting the Soviet Union to take fresh bites, without eventually ending up clutching only the stem of disaster. Make no mistake about it, the Kremlin appetite knows no limits.

If we are going to stop communism, and if that is our policy as the administration claims it to be, then let's stop it on our own terms and not those of the Kremlin.

ASIA IS THE KEY

We will never be able to dictate peace on our terms unless we maintain strength in Asia. Asia, with its vast resources and enormous pool of manpower, is the key.

What we desperately need are policies and a strategy of a truly global nature because we are confronted with a global threat. Anything less than policies of these dimensions can only fail. Anything less can only mean a third world war and untold destruction.

The Kremlin shakes a fist at Europe, but its eyes are on Asia and have been for a quarter of a century. All anyone has to do is read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Communist Daily Worker.

William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Worker on December 2, 1945: "The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front."

Hitler, in Mein Kampf, stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation.

Tojo knew that Asia was the key to the world situation.

Military strategists of many governments have declared the same thing time and time again.

General MacArthur knew it, and he was fired summarily for attempting to impart his knowledge to the American people.

In fact, almost everybody except the administration in Washington seems to know it, if we can judge by the thousands of telegrams descending upon our Capital.

SECOND FRONT

On February 12, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, I made a speech on this very vital issue. I proposed that the anti-Communist Chinese forces on Formosa be permitted to open a second front in China to relieve the pressure on our American boys in Korea and to lessen the threat to Europe.

Subsequently, I sent a copy of my speech to General MacArthur asking his views. The general replied that he was in accord with the proposal. He took the eminently sound position that while we were only exchanging words in Europe, we were exchanging bullets in Korea, and that our forces in Asia were entitled to the employment of policies that would win the struggle in Korea.

There have been attempts, notably in the Communist Daily Worker, and on the part of some befuddled thinkers, to label MacArthur as a war maker who was seeking a third world war. Such diabolical nonsense as this needs no answer in America, acceptable though it may be in Socialist circles in Britain and Communist circles in Russia. No clear-thinking American doubts for one moment the integrity of General MacArthur and his earnest desire to bring the war in Korea to a successful and speedy conclusion and to establish world peace. And I am certain that our people will give General MacArthur the most heart-warming reception in history when he returns home next week.

I think it is plain to the American people that General MacArthur was given an assignment to win the war in Korea. I think it is plain to every one of us that things had finally reached the point where not only the general but every American had the right to raise the question of whether we were in Korea to win or to lose.

Speaking only for myself, I must say that I was, and am, more so today than ever, deeply disturbed over the prospect of American boys continuing the struggle in Korea against the overwhelming hordes of Chinese Reds without some supporting move to relieve the pressure upon them.

WHO IS WAR MAKING?

Why this administration-ordered stalemate at the thirty-eighth parallel? Why this mysterious death lock while American casualties mount endlessly?

I think the American people are entitled to answers to those questions, and they have not received them.

For weeks our American forces have been on a treadmill of destruction along the thirty-eighth parallel where they die by the hundreds daily without so much as gaining a meter or losing a mile.

And the President tells us, as General MacArthur before him warned us, that the Chinese Reds are mounting a new and gigantic offensive.

But no one save MacArthur has told us what we can do about it, and he has been fired.

Talk about war making.

At its present rate of reckless conduct, this administration is likely to go down as the most senseless war makers of all time.

I ask you: How much longer can we sacrifice American lives and risk America's future when it should be perfectly clear to anyone that we are lacking the essential global strategy to meet the threat of world communism?

I think the American people have every right to know what the prospects are of such over-all policies being formulated and put into action. I would be less than truthful if I failed to point out the present chances are practically zero.

The reasons are right before us in Washington. We have only to call the roll of the top military and diplomatic advisers to the President here in Washington to understand why we are not going to achieve this desperately needed over-all strategy under this administration.

NO POLICY IN SIGHT

In the Pentagon the five top advisers to the President are Generals Marshall, Bradley, Collins, and Vandenberg and Admiral Sherman. Except for Admiral Sherman, every one of these men has mainly gained his experience in Europe. These generals have neither the background nor the knowledge of the complexities and subtleties inherent in the Far East.

This is not to say that our armed services are devoid of generals and admirals who have the necessary experience. There are plenty of them, both on the active and the retired lists.

Why does not the White House consult and give equal weight to such outstanding authorities on the Far East as Gens. R. O. Richardson, Jr., Kruger, Sutherland, Whitney, Chennault, Hodge, and Wedemeyer; and such Naval admirals as Spruance, King, Halsey, Radford, Yarnell, Bogan, and Denfeld; such Marine Corps generals as Vandegrift, Cates, Edson, and H. M. Smith?

But the domination of Europe-minded advisers is not limited to our Department of Defense, but extends to our policy-making State Department.

The record of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, needs no introduction here. The strange background of John P. Davies, John Stewart Service, Owen Lattimore, and the rest of the appeasement clique of the State Department officials and consultants on far-eastern policy, have long since been exposed by the fall of China to the Communists.

Yet, the influence of Dean Acheson upon the White House is profound and far-reaching. It is to our everlasting chagrin that this clique of appeasers should be regularly consulted while outstanding men of reputation and experience in the Far East have been dismissed from or deported to harmless outposts of our diplomatic service. I refer to such eminent experts as Joseph Grew, Nelson Johnson, Stanley Hornbeck, Patrick J. Hurley, Eugene Dooman, Joseph Ballentine, Adolphe Berle, William Bullitt, Everett Drumwright, and Angus Ward.

It is a black page in American history when a Dean Acheson triumphs and a Douglas MacArthur falls.

Little wonder that we lack the breadth of policy and strategy so necessary to defeat world communism, when you realize that for the most part our policy-makers resemble the fabled Cyclops who had only one eye and it in the center of their foreheads.

THE DILEMMA WE FACE

It has been the hope of many of us with respect to Asia that the administration might some day realize the folly of appeasement in the Far East, much as it reversed its policy of appeasement in Europe in 1947 and promulgated the strategy of containment of communism. Unfortunately, however, the words may be written by the White House, but the real tunes are called by the State Department and the Pentagon.

Yet no one can deny that in this crisis the need for sound policies can no longer go unfulfilled. The question is what can we do about it?

Plainly, the burden is on the Eighty-second Congress. When the executive branch fails, the Congress must act.

So far Republicans in Congress have taken the lead in the demand for a complete reexamination of our foreign and military policies. Scores of Democrats tell us privately that we are right and that action is imperative. It is our hope that outstanding Democrats will see their way clear to join us in a major move to strengthen American participation in world affairs.

This should be no party issue. This should be an American cause in which every citizen, regardless of party, should join.

There are millions of American mothers who want for their sons the peace, the prosperity, and the happiness that free men are rightfully entitled to. There are millions of patriotic American men who are willing to offer their services and their lives to preserve America and to bring about world peace, but they, too, deserve assurances that the sacrifices they make will lead to a better world for everyone.

We in America must not be misled by the nearsighted or selfish aims of any nation, friendly though it may be to us. Beyond a doubt, it is up to us to provide not only the sinews but the clear thinking to win the fight against world communism.

We should work, and work hard, to strengthen the North Atlantic family of nations, the Asiatic community of free peoples, and our sister republics in the Americas.

We should continue our efforts to work within the structure of the United Nations, and to strengthen that organization so that it can become inevitably the instrument of peace in the world.

We should meticulously avoid errors in the future that will weaken our hand anywhere. The removal of General MacArthur weakened us in the Far East; it did not strengthen us. For Japan, the day of General MacArthur's dismissal was a day of profound sorrow. In fact, all over Asia, the removal of the general sent a chill of horror down the backs of freemen, lest it mean that they were to be abandoned to Communist expansion.

General Ridgway, the successor to General MacArthur, is a man of outstanding ability. We hope and pray for his success, and we fervently desire that he, too, may rise to the stature in the Far East which General MacArthur attained.

Above all else, we should reach a clear decision on the Korean question.

If we are going to stay in Korea, let us not shackle General Ridgway as General MacArthur was shackled.

If we are not going to stay in Korea, let's make the decision now and stop what would amount to senseless destruction of American lives.

Finally, let me say that time is not on our side. Time, as things stand today, is a full partner in the Communist conspiracy.

There are 1,500,000 anti-Communist guerrillas in the south of China. How long do you think they can hold out if we do not aid them?

There are 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa who can be used in military service. How long will they hold out when our British friends talk of turning Formosa over to the Chinese Reds?

To French Indochina, to Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Pakistan, and India, the operations of the Chinese Reds are a constant threat. How long will they hold out if we turn our backs on Asia?

We are a mighty Nation, and we are entitled to mighty leadership.

We are too mighty for appeasement.

We are too humane to support a senseless drain of American blood in an endless treadmill war.

We must remember that if we have the proper leadership, a little in material things can go a long way when effectively applied. Successful policies are not measured in billions of dollars, millions of foot soldiers, and thousands of planes. The true measure is how effectively those dollars, those men, and those planes are employed.

Every American citizen has a part to play in the molding of public opinion and in obtaining the best out of Government and the best in leadership. If each of us puts his shoulder to the wheel, his mind to the task, and his faith in God, we can achieve the objectives we all seek.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Scranton Tribune, Scranton, Pa., dated April 12, 1951, relative to Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

HE ASKED FOR IT

There unquestionably will be deep regret and resentment among the many friends and supporters of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the result of the action of President Truman in relieving him of his command in the Far East.

Hardly anyone will question the fact that MacArthur has established himself as one of our Nation's greatest soldiers. Volumes could be written on his accomplishments in the military field. His courage, his ability as a military leader, his integrity, and his fine reputation cannot be questioned.

As the President so aptly said, "The Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for the distinguished and exceptional service which he has rendered his country in posts of great responsibility."

Under the circumstances, the President's action in relieving MacArthur of his command represented a grave and serious decision which is bound to have repercussions of far-reaching effect. There will be those, for example, who will inject the issue of politics into this situation. That issue does not belong and honest-thinking persons will dismiss it.

There will be others who will endeavor to becloud the real issue by injecting that of our foreign policy—a highly controversial subject. There is no question that our foreign policy was a major factor in this situation. It was in this field that MacArthur

and the President disagreed. But it cannot be said that the disagreement was the issue determining the President's action. MacArthur was entitled to his own views on foreign policy, just as every other citizen. But in MacArthur's case the parallel ended right there.

MacArthur, first of all, was a soldier and he was subject, as a soldier, to the orders of his Commander in Chief, President Truman, and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not once, but several times, MacArthur was given specific orders by those in higher command to refrain from making public utterances relative to this Nation's foreign policy without first clearing them with his superiors.

MacArthur chose to ignore those orders, time after time and despite repeated warnings.

As far back as December 1949 MacArthur voiced sentiments contrary to the administration's policies in the Far East by telling, publicly, a group of United States Senators who visited him in Tokyo that we should send arms and troops to Formosa. Then in early 1950 he took an unauthorized and highly publicized trip to Formosa to fraternize with Chiang Kai-shek and openly discussed the proposition of building up Formosa as a base, contrary to our expressed foreign policy. After the Korean War started MacArthur sent a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars here advocating a policy contrary to that which our State Department had announced relative to Formosa. He was reprimanded by the President.

Mr. Truman, recognizing the gravity of MacArthur's continued conduct, even flew out to Wake Island to confer with him and to reach an understanding about clearance of his, MacArthur's, statements in the future. But the result was negative.

It was not long before MacArthur suggested that he be allowed to supersede the President, the State Department, and the United Nations and go out on the field of battle and make a deal for peace with a Chinese Red general. Then followed another public declaration to the effect that the United Nations forces should be allowed to bomb the Chinese mainland and the United States should release the Nationalist Chinese army from Formosa to attack the Chinese mainland.

Obviously General MacArthur could not be silenced; just as obviously he refused to take orders. As recently as less than a month ago the Joint Chiefs of Staff again told MacArthur to clear his statements on foreign policy and the Far East with Washington.

Commenting on this last warning, the Tribune, in an editorial on March 28, said: "It might be said that the talkative general was so instructed before and has ignored the instructions. In that case, he has been given another chance and if he muddies up the water again the consequence will be his own doing."

General MacArthur asked for it.

Please, Mr. DiSalle, Read This Letter and Then Quit Demanding the Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter which points out in clear, concise words just how impossible it is for the little-business men of America to comply with CPR Order No. 7.

A like letter has been received by other Iowa Congressmen.

IOWA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION,
Mason City, Iowa, April 12, 1951.

Representative BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: This letter is a personal appeal from me to you to help a considerable number of your constituents who are hardware retailers and are among the 20,000 members of this association.

The Office of Price Stabilization has just issued an amendment to its order CPR–7 to include a considerable amount of the merchandise which these small retailers handle.

If their sales of all the goods carried total $20,000 a year, these retailers must abide by this regulation. That means that a very considerable majority of our members will be subject to it.

This order provides an elaborate, complicated system of making price charts. You would be interested to have the OPS send you a copy of the entire CPR–7 order and just glance through it. I wouldn't ask any busy man like you to read the whole thing.

But your little hardware man, with his undermanned establishment, is required to read, and understand, this entire order and to make charts showing his cost and selling prices on all the items he carries which are subject to this order—and they will be about 10,000.

This little dealer—most of them don't even have an adding machine, much less a machine for calculating percentages—is required to figure his margin on each separate item and then his average mark-up on the category in which these particular items are placed.

That procedure is all right for a great department store with its staff of trained accountants. But it is just out of the question for a little hardware store with an entire crew of perhaps five people who are just getting into the busiest part of their business year.

We wonder, however, if it is all right for the big stores because this morning we received a bulletin from Roland Jones, secretary of the American Retail Federation, in Washington, D. C., and we quote:

"Far more disturbing is the fact that out of some 35 charts received by the Washington office (OPS) last week, only two of them were correctly made out."

Now, if the big operators can't do it right, how can the little fellow do it?

Now, the small hardware dealer, Mr. JENSEN, is required to have these charts prepared by April 30. If he waits for the Government he won't even have a copy of the order by then. These dealers don't subscribe to the Federal Register. And OPS doesn't have any list of them to which it mails its regulations.

How in the name of peace can the dealer ever get this job done in less than 3 weeks?

We will send him information but it will take us 3 weeks to get the material printed that we will require and get it into his hands.

Just one example of the absurdity of this regulation, for retail hardware stores, is the requirement that each cost on the list that the dealer enters must be supported by an invoice showing that it is the actual cost.

Well, most hardware retailers buy the majority of their merchandise from jobbers. And a single jobber's invoice may have as many as a hundred different items on it. But the dealer who puts down that his cost of a certain hammer is $1 is supposed to hunt through these jobber invoices until he finds the one on which he was billed $1 for these hammers and then enter on his pricing chart the name of the jobber and the date of that invoice.

Then every dealer has lots of merchandise that he may have had on hand 2 or 3 years. He hasn't saved the invoice for that merchandise. He has his cost marked on the item, or the box in which it is carried, but when you tell him he has to produce an invoice to prove that he has told the truth when he entered that cost, you are asking for the impossible.

Well, suppose the dealer decides he just can't live up to the requirements of this order. What are the penalties? Very light, I can assure you, sir. If the dealer hasn't complied with the price filing by May 30, he is prohibited from selling any of the merchandise. All he has to do is to go out of business because some crazy loons in Washington have cooked up an order that he can't conform to.

Our representative has told OPS people from the beginning that hardware retailers couldn't comply with the CPR–7 order and was assured by them that they wouldn't be required to. But here they are.

Please don't answer this letter with a form reply. I don't care if you don't answer it at all. But please do call Mr. DiSalle, or some one else and see if those OPS people can't be taught some sense.

If you want to, send them this letter and ask them to tell you where it is wrong.

I am going to count on you for some action, Mr. JENSEN. I believe you are a good friend of the little fellow and the hardware retailer is surely one of them.

Yours very truly,
IOWA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION,
PHILIP R. JACOBSON, *Secretary.*

Address Before Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by me before the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association in Providence, R. I.:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association, invited guests, and friends, whether you selected the date of your banquet by accident or design, it fits in perfectly with the congressional Easter vacation. Thus I am able to escape the hurly-burly of Washington for the moment and mingle with you gentlemen who are, whether or not you know it, business associates of mine, for following the illustrious example of our United States Attorney General, I, too, have an interest in a Rhode Island dealership.

I can say in all sincerity that it is a pleasure for me to be with you and to be associated with you because I have a great admiration for the industry you represent. I also have sentiments of respect for your business acumen, because whenever you have occasion to write me on matters which affect your business, I have always been impressed with the force and logic which accompanies your views on legislation.

In our American industrial civilization of today the automotive industry is not only a most important sustaining unit, it might

be called the keystone of our industrial arch. This great automobile business had its birth when our people were emerging from an agricultural or agrarian civilization and were turning those qualities of imagination, initiative and resourcefulness to increasing American production.

The automotive industry has been in the forefront of that development and set the pattern and created the blueprint of that productive capacity which has made the United States the leading nation of the world. Today in this country it can be said that our economy is geared to the rubber-tired wheel. Leadership among nations cannot be maintained with the noblest motives energizing that leadership unless a position of economic leadership is sustained. The automotive blueprint of production, adapted to other industries, has been responsible for the fact that while the people of the United States constitute less than 7 percent of the world's population, they produce 50 percent of the world's manufactured goods.

This is something of which you may be proud. I am aware that you gentlemen represent not the production segment, but the distribution and servicing part of this great automotive industry. But I am likewise aware that production could not have attained its impressive totals unless you as a class of American merchants distributed and serviced the vehicles which the factories produce. Although Rhode Island is a tiny portion of the retail automobile industry, it is common knowledge that automobile dealers by and large in the United States, from standpoint of the aggregate number of employees in your part of the industry, namely, distribution and servicing, is greater than the number engaged in production. I understand also that the aggregate investment of 45,000 dealers throughout the United States is a greater aggregate than the total investment of all the automobile factories combined.

Regarding modern civilization it has been said that agriculture and transportation are the handmaidens of industry. This automotive business is not only a prime factor in industry, it might also be said that it produces the instrument for transportation so that in addition to being the most important stone in our structure of industry, it likewise produces the instruments upon which a good part of our transportation depends.

The burden of responsibility created by the very importance of this industry is a heavy responsibility. Though it might be contended that the preponderance of investment and number of employees being in that branch represented by you gentlemen should result in the ground rules of this great industry being promulgated by you, it nevertheless is a fact that the ground rules are promulgated by the production segment of the industry. Perhaps it is fair that the ground rules be laid down by that other branch of the industry, the production branch, because though you gentlemen carry the ball, they make it. But I would say the legal maxim that "there is no right without a responsibility" is not only a legal guide, it is an immutable truth. It behooves those who lay down the ground rules to be fair and equitable. It behooves them to take cognizance of the rights and equities of their team mates who distribute and service the vehicles that the manufacturers produce. It behooves them to police their industry to guard against the imposition of requirements which can be so economically detrimental as to cause disruption and distress in our economic fabric. It behooves them to so interpret the ground rules that there will be no repetition of the condition of some years ago, in which the average business life of an automobile dealer was 3 years, according to a study made by a great university. It behooves them to refrain from imposition of requirements which may hamper imagination and the disposition of the individual to do his best work without arbitrary interference.

Of course, it goes without saying that while the factory has an obligation to be fair with the dealer, the dealer in his turn must be fair not only with the factory but with the public. In my opinion the great bank of good will which the dealers the length and breadth of the country built up during World War II by their ingenious and effective means to maintain civilian transportation melted away in the immediate years following the war. Then, tempted by the great demand of the public for new cars and the willingness of the public to pay any price for them, the few dealers who could not resist the opportunity for big profits did irreparable harm to you all as merchants.

Today's rearmament program in this country undoubtedly will afford a similar opportunity for dealers to swell their profits and with no thought of preaching to you let me strongly urge you one and all to conduct your business in such a manner that the public may continue to have full faith and confidence in you.

Today our Government is in the process of imposing ceilings on new and used cars, parts and services, as well on all other items of business and while of necessity these ceilings will require considerable revision and adjustment, as time goes on, I cannot urge you too strongly, in the common cause of defense, to hold the line and accord to the Office of Price Stabilization your full and willing support.

I suppose I should not take my seat without discussing to some extent the taxes which may be imposed upon your retail business by the Government. Frankly, I do not intend to say or promise too much, for I am but one of 435 Representatives in Congress and then, too, there is the Senate which plays its full part in the legislative picture, but I will say this much—I intend to scrutinize closely all taxes contemplated to make sure that your industry is not compelled to pay more than its full share. The costs of building up the defenses of this country are, as you well know, great. They will continue for some time to come. I know, that as loyal and patriotic citizens, you are willing to pay your full share of these costs. But whenever in my opinion these costs are excessive or unfair, you can rely upon my voice in opposition to pyramiding these taxes to a point where they will tend to slow down or obstruct such an important segment of our retail industry as the automobile business. That I promise you. Taxes defeat their purpose when by their very weight they retard acceleration of business and industry or discourage initiative. And acceleration and the building-up of production today is all important.

To determine the fine line between adequate revenue and taxes that are unduly oppressive is the task which today confronts your elected representatives. Let me assure you we fully recognize that responsibility. The problems confronting us would disturb us far more did we not feel that the American people today fully recognize the importance of our regaining with the utmost speed a position of such military power as to deter those whose professed objectives have been to plunge the world into a third war. United we stand today. The issues involved which are the cause and purpose of our rearmament are so weighty as to enable us, both in Government and industry, to jointly cooperate in their adjustment and solution.

You automobile merchants played your part nobly in World War II. I know we can count on your effective cooperation today, tomorrow and until the hour of peril is past.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the distinguished military expert of the New York Times, has this morning made an extremely valuable contribution to the great debate which has now been brought into focus by the dismissal of General MacArthur, over the course which our far eastern policy should take. The analysis by Mr. Baldwin of the different courses which the United States might pursue concludes with the recommendations for extension of the war in the Far East, but by strictly limited means. His detailed recommendations as to the specific measures which the United States should take seem to me to parallel very closely the policy advocated by General MacArthur. They should be studied with care by those who today are condemning MacArthur's policy, even before the general has had a full hearing.

THE GREAT DEBATE: II—FOUR POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION SEEN IF KOREAN CEASE-FIRE NEGOTIATIONS FAIL

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The fighting in Korea yesterday was—as it has been for many months now—vicious but indecisive; no end was in sight.

Political negotiations directed toward the ending of that war should be welcomed. But if, as seems probable, any negotiated termination of the campaign on a basis acceptable to us proves impossible, we then will face only four possible courses of action:

1. Indefinite continuation of the present limited war in Korea.

2. Withdrawal from Korea.

3. Unlimited extension of war to Communist Chinese territory; and if necessary, to Russia; in other words, unlimited war in the Far East, and perhaps in the world.

4. Extension of the war, but by strictly limited means; in other words, fighting a less limited war than we are now doing.

Any and all of these courses must be based on two basic postulates: (a) Even though Europe should have strategic priority, Europe cannot be saved by losing Asia; in other words, the spread of communism in Asia must be halted if we are to win the struggle for the world; (b) there is no possible course of action that does not involve risks—grave risks and the ultimate risk of general war.

FIRST COURSE HELD IMPRACTICAL

The first course—indefinite continuation of the present situation in Korea—can be ruled out as a practical possibility on psychological and political grounds. Unless some end to fighting looms in Korea, the morale of our troops and of the South Koreans is bound to deteriorate; moreover, public opinion in this country will not tolerate indefinitely a toll of casualties with no end in sight. From the strategic point of view, the continued concentration for an indefinite period of so much of our strength in Korea, and the military and economic drain it represents should not be tolerated for more than another 3 to 6 months.

The second course—deliberate withdrawal from Korea—means throwing in the sponge before the knock-down. It would represent a run-out, not only to those we supported in Korea but to all anti-Communist forces in Asia; it would represent appeasement in a new form. It would have intolerable political, moral, and psychological consequences throughout Asia and the world; United States prestige would fall to a new low; our position in Japan would be imperiled; and communism almost certainly would spread.

The third course—unlimited extension of the war to Communist Chinese territory—and if Russia intervened, to Russia—would, as President Truman said, bring on the very thing we are trying to prevent, world war III. An invasion of Communist China with United States forces, or even large-scale blockade and bombardment of China by United States sea and air power, would mean the commitment of far greater force to the Orient than we now have there. If Russia abstained from direct aid to China, we would become involved in a major war against a secondary opponent—a war that would be likely to continue for a long time and that would leave Russia relatively free for other moves in Europe and elsewhere.

This policy suffers from the same disadvantages as does the "preventive war" theory; it brings on the very thing we are trying to prevent—general war—and it might commit us to that war at a disadvantage; we might be shadow-boxing with the real opponent, Russia, while heavily engaged with the secondary opponent, China.

Only the fourth course offers, at least for the foreseeable future, any conceivable hope. Yet we must frankly face the fact that this course, like all the others, runs the risk of war. Any attempt to fight a limited war—though limited wars are the only ones that offer the hope of future political stability—may be doomed to failure; wars have the habit of spreading; and if we deliberately make the war in Korea less limited, we may not be able to control its ultimate spread. But, given the position we are in today, there is no alternative, and any course we take—most of all appeasement—runs the risk of general war.

A limited extension of the war in Korea should include immediately the following positive measures:

1. A large-scale rearmament and reorganization of the Chinese Nationalists' forces on Formosa, supervised and directed by a large United States military mission.

2. Restriction of the Formosan functions of the United States Seventh Fleet to defense of Formosa against Communist invasion; that is, permission for the resumption of the limited blockade of the Chinese coast by the Nationalist Navy, and for Nationalist air raids and commando raids on that coast.

3. A large-scale effort to supply, arm, and organize Chinese guerrillas. This should be done quietly, but vigorously. Our aim should be the fractionalization of Communist China, and support, not necessarily of one anti-Communist leader but of many.

4. The equipping, as rapidly as possible, of additional South Koreans, but no faster than they can be trained effectively and screened politically.

5. A speed-up in the rearmament of Japan.

6. Continued political, economic, psychological and military aid to selected non-Communist governments and factions in Asia, but supervised by United States missions and on our terms.

STEPS HELD INADVISABLE

The new less limited war should not include, at least initially:

1. Large-scale invasion of the Chinese mainland by the Nationalists.

2. Use of United States planes or ships against Communist China outside of the Korean area.

3. Bombardment of the enemy's Manchurian air bases and supply dumps and communication lines. This prohibition, however, should remain in force only so long as the enemy air actions in Korea remain defensive. If enemy air force should intervene massively in deep penetration of Korea against our air, naval, or ground forces, and/or if the safety of our troops in Korea were imperiled, Manchurian bases should be bombed immediately, even though there are both military and political liabilities to such action.

We face, therefore, as the great Truman-MacArthur debate opens, a crisis in the Orient, and in the world. We should welcome political negotiations, on the basis of the thirty-eighth parallel, looking toward the end of the Korean War, but we should never make any basic concessions, such as the admission of Communist China to the United Nations or the surrender of Formosa to the Communists, to secure an armistice. If a negotiated end to the war proves impossible, we must resolutely face the extension of military measures, despite the risk implied.

Three considerations are basic to any course we may follow in the Orient. The first is that we must use Asians to fight Asians. The second is that a defensive policy, or a policy of drift-and-wait never can stem the tide of communism; a policy of a limited offensive—politically, economically, militarily, psychologically—is essential. And the third is that, if Russia and Communist China want general war, any of our attempts to limit the Korean conflagration are futile. In other words, world war III is more likely to be the result of what the enemy does than of what we do. If we fear to take action because of possible enemy reaction, obviously we can formulate no policy worthy of the name.

Bureaucrats at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the shocking waste and extravagance in Government departments:

BUREAUCRATS AT WORK
(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Washington in the spring: The Navy is in a stew. A House Appropriations Committee has just discovered that the Navy has 11,000,000 dozen oyster forks on hand. That's 11,000,000 dozen. Nobody in the Navy quite knows why or how so many were purchased, or what they are going to do with them. There aren't that many oysters, let alone Navy personnel.

But any howling over this extravagance will be drowned out. The Government is buying 100 electric organs, valued at $150,285. That's $1,502.85 per organ.

Along with the 93-year supply of light bulbs accumulated by one Washington bureau there are stacked up 3,000,000 pounds of peanut butter, 6,000,000 pounds of sugar, 175,028 cans of condensed milk, and something to sneeze about, 1,000,000 pounds of black pepper.

Lawyers, of course, never need fear unemployment so long as Washington exists.

The Department of Justice has 1,600 lawyers on its payroll, wants more. Sixteen of them engage in private practice, seldom visit their offices, yet receive full pay, accrued leave, and a 30-day annual vacation.

Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, is hiring a $10,000-a-year recreation specialist to help out in the defense emergency. Apparently the plan is to teach people how to use all the WPA parks scattered across the country. Ewing also is embarked on an extensive program of vocational training for industry, although thousands of GI's were trained under the GI bill of rights.

To add to the confusion, Congress is about to approve a $25,000 request to test air raid sirens around the country. And the Civil Defense Administration has changed its mind. It no longer wants to build concrete bomb shelters deep in the ground to protect civilians against atom bomb attacks. Now the agency proposes to shore up basements in Government buildings and others and to reinforce buildings with concrete shock walls. And to learn how badly scared we are the CDA is conducting polls across the country. The big test will be whether or not people worry more about the atom or the administration.

Fish have also gone to war. The Fish and Wildlife Service has set up a defense fisheries agency to coordinate fish activities into the defense effort. Naturally this will require money and manpower.

To keep us posted on this and other ideas emanating from Washington the Department of the Interior has 110 press agents. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, as an emergency measure, is demanding 100 more employees to gather housing statistics, although the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration have tons of facts on housing gathering dust in their files.

If you want to travel, the Defense Production Administration is the place to work. It has requested from Congress funds amounting to $1,200 each for employees to travel in 1951. It is also paying average salaries of $7,000 annually, compared to overall Government average of $3,600.

One bureaucrat has admitted to Congress that he has "stockpiled" stenographers. He keeps them shuffling papers until there are typing chores as a result of the defense emergency. Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, is pleading with the Government to use women more extensively in the defense effort. This may be the answer:

The Office of Price Stabilization now has 120 lawyers on the payroll. Its enforcement officer, Edward Morgan, was chief counsel of the Tydings Investigation Subcommittee that whitewashed charges of Communists in Government. Morgan also helped handle the Senate Pearl Harbor investigation for the Democrats.

As a wind-up to Washington in the spring it might be well to remind the bureaucrats that since they started spending billions to control inflation, prices, wages, etc., it is costing us on the average of 43 percent more to live today than before the Korean War started.

When the Emerald Isle Is One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following poem written by Ray Beckett, of Providence, R. I., on March 17, 1951:

WHEN THE EMERALD ISLE IS ONE

Let's say a prayer, when the world's aware
That the Emerald Isle is one.
They'll be no North of Ireland
To darken the Irish sun.
We'll click our heels, to the Irish reels
When the pipers gaily play,
We'll celebrate, from Malin Head
To the end of Bantry Bay.
Let's tip our hats to the Mikes and Pats
Who fought and died unsung
With the Parnells, Moores and Emmets
Of the silv'ry Irish tongues.
March on me boy, let's not destroy
The work already done,
And Irish hearts will know no joy
'Til the Emerald Isle is one.

—*Ray Beckett.*

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I directed attention of the House to an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Now It Comes Out." The following editorial is a sequel. I am also including an interesting editorial from the Post, entitled "MacArthur's Return." The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post of April 14, 1951]

NOW IT COMES OUT—II

Every Washington reporter is familiar with the diplomatic denial—the procedure whereby a news story is denounced by an official if it becomes embarrassing, even though the facts originally came from him. The practice is a vicious one. It victimizes the public as well as the press; and it has been responsible for the scrambling of an awful lot of history. Now the tales are beginning to unfold of how General MacArthur's headquarters participated in this little game.

Item: In January, Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News reported from Tokyo that according to an authoritative source General MacArthur wanted to pull American troops out of Korea and carry the war to China by air and naval blockade. The story was immediately denied in both Tokyo and Washington. Col. Marion P. Echols, General MacArthur's press officer who passed the story, later denounced it as a figment of the imagination.

Now Mr. Beech discloses in a new dispatch that the source of his information was Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, military secretary to General MacArthur and virtually an echo of the supreme commander. It is inconceivable that General Whitney, whose loyalty has been slavish, would misrepresent the feelings of his superior. Christopher Rand, reporting from Tokyo in the New York Herald Tribune, adds confirming evidence that General MacArthur was not misrepresented. General MacArthur's aim, he says, "seemingly was to provoke a large-scale showdown with Red China and possibly Russia. Korea was a minute detail in it and probably an unwelcome one—there always has been sentiment in the MacArthur headquarters for abandoning Korea and removing the hostilities elsewhere."

The blanket of censorship in Japan has hitherto made it virtually impossible, of course, to ascertain the facts. Now that this cat is out of the bag, perhaps we can learn of the other instances in which the press has been victimized for telling the truth.

[From the Washington Post]

MACARTHUR'S RETURN

President Truman has accepted with good grace the decision of congressional leaders to invite General MacArthur ceremonially to speak before a joint meeting of the House and Senate. Naturally this does not mean that the administration wishes to give General MacArthur a great national forum for the airing of his disagreement with the President or even for the exposition of his views on far-eastern policy. Rather it means that General MacArthur is to be accorded the reception he deserves as a military hero in spite of his dismissal from his far-eastern command.

It must be taken for granted that General MacArthur will understand the situation and will not take advantage of this generous gesture to magnify the schism that his removal has caused. Belatedly he is to be honored for his illustrious service in World War II and for his commanding work in Japan. In that tribute all the people as well as all of Congress can join without reserve. The fact remains, however, that he has been deposed from his command for insubordination, and if the joint session should be used in any way as a protest against that essential action or to enter into controversy on the points involved in his dismissal, the joint session would become a reproach to him and to the dignity and judgment of the Congress.

Quite apart from the joint session, there is a natural desire on the part of Members of Congress to hear General MacArthur's version of the events that led to his dismissal by President Truman and his view of the conflict in the Far East. The country has a similar interest in the MacArthur story, and it is good news that he is coming home to tell it. Just before the President ousted General MacArthur, this newspaper suggested that he be recalled for report. What is wanted in this connection is not oratory but exposition, and that exposition can most appropriately come in sessions of the committees dealing with the armed services and foreign relations.

In this atmosphere General MacArthur should have complete freedom for telling his story. The important thing is that the controversial aspects of his return to Washington shall not be injected into the congressional ceremony in his honor. Congress as well as the people must learn to distinguish between MacArthur the military hero and MacArthur the superseded exponent of a rejected policy while in an administrative role.

Higher Mail Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is considering the advisability of a general increase in postage rates, it might be well to look at the problem from the angle of the folks who will be called upon to pay these increases. Sometimes higher rates do not result either in improved service or increased returns, and a recent editorial in the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier indicates that a sharp increase in postal rates might actually mean less money for the Post Office Department. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this editorial:

HIGHER MAIL RATES

There is another side to the question of whether postal rates should be raised, as Mr. Truman desires. The Government has said the increases are needed to cut $275,000,000 off the Post Office Department deficit. Mail users show the argument is not all on the Truman side.

Abolishing penny post cards never has worked. When the 2-cent rate was tried in 1917, the volume dropped 70 percent. The same thing occurred, after a brief trial, in 1925.

Second class is used by newspapers and magazines. The proposal is to double the rates. For a figure close to the proposed costs, many publishing companies could set up their own delivery systems or switch to some other method. The post-office revenues would go down, not up. Small, nonprofit, and educational periodicals would be real sufferers in a rate increase. Many would go broke.

Direct-mail advertising uses third-class mail. A rate boost would force some of the thousands of businessmen who use this service out of business. First-class mail is regarded by the Post Office Department as a paying proposition, so it doesn't intend to change the 3-cent rate.

Operating costs of the post office are fairly well fixed. Those who oppose the proposed increase in mail rates cite the case of the telephone companies. The cost to them of a nighttime long-distance call is much higher than in the daytime, but the rate to users is much lower.

The same thing applies to the post office. It has to pay overhead, whether it does any business or not. Mail users are convinced that with the proposed increases, postal business will fall off so sharply that the Department, in the end, will lose more money than it is losing now.

The Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic dismissal of General MacArthur who has been looked upon by millions of Japanese and the people of the Orient as a "symbol of the justice of democracy and the military power of the United States" at this critical time has not only shocked the people of the Orient, but has been a great shock to the people of the United States who have protested by wires and letters to Members of Congress with a deluge of mail never before witnessed in Washington.

Whether or not the President had the right to dismiss General MacArthur is not now of too great importance. The important thing now is that the Military

Affairs Committee in questioning General MacArthur, the military leaders here in Washington, and the State Department bring out all of the facts surrounding the present unfortunate situation. General MacArthur's brilliant military achievements and experience in the Philippines, and his administration of Japan, totaling a period of 14 years, permits him to speak from a background of greater knowledge and experience than the President or anyone in the Pentagon or the State Department.

General MacArthur and General Ridgway as well have stated in substance "that unless the foreign policy is changed here in Washington so that our military commanders in the field are permitted to destroy by bombing enemy bases and supply lines beyond the Yalu River the war in Korea will be dragged out indefinitely into a stalemate."

Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur took this position to prevent the repetition of hundreds of thousands of Chinese troops who struck us near the Yula River during the terrible cold of last winter and who drove our forces back far below the thirty-eighth parallel, and forced evacuation of Hungnam in the dead of winter resulting in the loss of the lives of thousands of soldiers in that long and terrible retreat, and millions of dollars' worth of munitions, equipment, and supplies that fell into the hands of the enemy.

Lieutenant General Stratemeyer in command of the Air Force in Korea has warned that hereafter we can expect serious competition from a newly created North Korean air force equipped with jet fighters and operated by trained Chinese Communists trained by the Russians again flying over at will for an assault on our troops, with our Air Force being allowed to chase them back only to the border.

It has been a cardinal principal of war that the supply lines and bases of an enemy must be destroyed to reduce the power of the enemy in the field.

General Eisenhower and our Chief of Staff agree that if a war comes with Russia in Europe we must, by air power, destroy with bombs the industrial plants back of the line, and the enemy's concentration depots to prevent supplies reaching the enemy in the field. The same should hold true in Korea now.

That is exactly what General MacArthur and General Ridgway or any military man knows must be done if we are to bring the aggression in Korea to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, the issues in the controversy between President Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur will require time-consuming investigations and studies before they are resolved to the satisfaction of the American people.

For more than 6 years our people have lived in a state of confusion. They have been confused by the mistakes of our foreign policies and by our domestic policies as well. We have moved from one emergency to another, but always with heavy Federal expenditures, which increase as time goes on.

To appraise Truman's judgment now in the Far East the people have a right to ask:

Was his judgment good when at Potsdam he approved an agreement that gave Russia and the Chinese Communists control of Manchuria and the north half of Korea which ultimately gave them control of all of China?

Did he use good judgment when he later sent General Marshall to China to carry out his policy to force the Chinese Nationalist Government, then our ally, to accept the Northern Chinese Communists of Manchuria with equal rights into a coalition government of all China? This action helped to defeat the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Was the President's judgment sound when he and Secretary of State Acheson stated to the world prior to the war in Korea that Korea and Formosa laid outside of our sphere of influence in the Orient, and outside of our perimeter of defense?

The people have a right to ask, If we intended to defend South Korea, why were those statements made and why did the President cause all of our military forces to be withdrawn from South Korea?

They have the right to ask the further question, Why did the President and Secretary of State Acheson change their foreign policy within 24 hours after South Korea was invaded in June 1950?

Here again, Mr. Truman's judgment appears subject to question. He sent the Seventh Fleet to patrol the waters surrounding Formosa, to prevent raids by Nationalist Armies on the mainland, and raids by the Communist Armies on Formosa.

When the Reds invaded South Korea, and Chiang Kai-shek offered 30,000 trained troops to help halt the aggression, this aid was refused. However, American soldiers were rushed from Japan, and the United States to carry the burden of thrusting back the invaders.

Mr. Speaker, our whole diplomatic and military policies since Yalta need to be reexamined. The Congress needs to have all the facts. The cloak of secrecy should be removed from our diplomatic blunders, and those responsible for the mistakes should be ousted from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, when General MacArthur returns to Washington Thursday to present his story to the Congress and the American people he will face several handicaps.

First of all, he is still in the military service of his Nation. He will not be allowed to disclose facts that affect the military security of the Nation, regardless of whether or not they are right or wrong.

He will not have at his disposal a large force of publicity men and writers to present his side of the controversy. But President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Secretary Marshall do have at their disposal a powerful propaganda machine of hundreds of informational and publicity personnel, who will present the administration's side of the picture in great details, magnifying, of course, every small digression or apparent mistake during General MacArthur's administration and glorifying the aims of President Truman to contain the aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the question now resolves around one single factor:

Was General MacArthur right in his military appraisal of the situation and should the military situation be subordinated to political international considerations?

If General MacArthur has blundered in Korea, it will be the first acknowledged blunder of this great military leader in his career. If the international political advisers to President Truman have blundered, the Congress and the American people have a right to know all the facts.

It appears the following are some of the questions which should be answered:

First. What directives, if any, were issued by the United Nations to General MacArthur?

Second. What counter directives, if any, were issued by President Truman to General MacArthur?

Third. What contributions by other nations to the expeditionary forces in Korea were made with the understanding that the Supreme Allied Commander would not be allowed to exercise full and complete military discretion in conducting the campaign to repel the invaders and achieve a military victory?

Fourth. What members of the United Nations, if any, have been supplying neutral aid—conducting business with both sides—to the enemy in South Korea?

Mr. Speaker, when these questions, among others, are answered, the American people and the Congress will be in a better position to judge between the policies of President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and the internationalists in our Government, and the strictly military policies and objectives of America's greatest military leader of modern times—Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are in fact the Government. Their thousands of letters to their Congressmen by over 100 to 1 condemn the action of the President in his removal of General MacArthur. They appear to have lost all confidence in his Secretary of State, Acheson.

The Congress must assert itself, bring out all the facts, and assume greater control in the direction of the affairs of the Government.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who may not have seen the following articles in the Washington Post, I should like to call attention to the columns by Mr. Walter Lippmann and Mr. Marquis Childs, and

also an editorial entitled "Churchill on War":

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

LIMITED WAR

It is sad but true that no good solution is now possible in Korea. The high objectives which the General Assembly proclaimed in the resolution of October 7—namely, "the establishment of a unified, independent, and democratic government of Korea"—are not now attainable.

The best that can be had now is an armistice at the old frontier of South and North Korea, at the thirty-eighth parallel. It is also the least the United Nations can accept. An armistice in the middle of Korea would amount to a recognition by both sides that Korea cannot be unified in a limited war—in a limited war both sides will have to be content with limited objectives.

The restoration of the status quo ante is a limited objective. The war which is being fought in Korea has been a limited war—that is to say it has been confined to hostilities within the Korean Peninsula; each side has operated from a "sanctuary" outside the limited theater of hostilities, which the other side did not attack. Only a limited objective can be attained by a war which is limited.

If we want more than the limited objective of restoring the South Korea frontier, having repelled the original aggression of June 25, then we must accept the risks of a general war in the Far East. The UN resolution of October 7, insofar as it was sincerely meant, authorized and indeed directed General MacArthur to unit Korea by force of arms, and then to hold elections, etc., etc.

General MacArthur's great error was that he misjudged the intentions of Red China, and thus persuaded the civilian authorities here to believe that the UN resolution could be carried out by the limited forces and the kind of limited war which General MacArthur was conducting. Had General MacArthur's estimate of the situation been better, he would have advised the President that the UN resolution of October 7 should not be adopted unless the United States and its principal allies were prepared to engage in a general war in the Far East. That is what he is saying now. That is what he should have said before October 7.

By the same token had the State Department's intelligence been better, had it not been swept off its feet by the Inchon victory, had it not been so much the captive of its critics that it dares not have the courage of its convictions, it would not have promoted the UN resolution of October 7. It would have worked to attain in September, when we were victorious, the armistice which it would now, after so much bloodshed, like to attain through a stalemate.

The question now is whether the country will agree with reasonable unity that our military objective in Korea is the limited one of repelling aggression south of the thirty-eighth parallel and restoring the South Korean Republic. We can, and we should, still hold it as a political and a diplomatic objective that Korea should eventually be united by democratic means. But we cannot unify Korea by a war confined to the Korean Peninsula, and we shall get nowhere in this controversy until we make the choice of limited objectives out of a limited war or unlimited objectives out of an unlimited war.

The critical weakness of President Truman's position is that while he proclaims his intention to limit the war, he has not mustered up the courage to tell the people clearly that in a limited war we can obtain only limited results.

The view which General MacArthur laid down to Congressman Martin was, unless he has been greatly misunderstood, that if the limitations on our military actions were removed, a victory not only in Korea but in the global issue could be attained. No one has yet explained publicly how so great and glorious a result can be achieved by bombing Chinese cities and using Chiang's troops on Formosa, as Senator TAFT now describes it, "to conduct raids on the mainland." No one has explained how the Soviet Union can be defeated by a hit-and-run campaign against China.

Until it is explained more convincingly than it has as yet been, it must surely be the first principle of our strategy never to commit our main forces—namely our strategic air power and all the forces on which it depends—except against the main adversary. There may be, and indeed there is, room for argument as to whether the main theater of war—in the event of war—would be Europe, the Middle East, or the Far East. But there can be no room for argument, I submit, that the main adversary is the Red Army of the Soviet Union, and that it would be strategic lunacy to commit our main forces, the main forces of the Atlantic community and of western Christendom, until the Kremlin commits its main forces.

[From the Washington Post of April 14, 1951]

RIDGWAY'S TIMETABLE

(By Marquis Childs)

WHY CHIANG'S TROOPS CAN'T BE USED

The documents released by the White House show quite clearly how impossible it was to have any coherent policy with Tokyo pulling one way and Washington another. That is the paramount fact that must not be lost sight of in the midst of the violent reaction the President's decision has produced.

But now the burden is on the coalition of western powers within the United Nations to show that they can carry out a policy intended to resolve the conflict in Korea. Too often delay and indecision have seemed to justify General MacArthur in rushing in to fill a vacuum. The generalizations contained in President Truman's speech do not constitute a policy.

Before the clash with MacArthur reached the head-on collision stage, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had worked out a military plan. It had been accepted by the new commander in chief in the Far East, Lieut. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who actually has been directing military operations in Korea for some time. The plan called for a tentative timetable more or less as follows:

The United Nations armies will meet the new Communist offensive. They may be compelled to give up some of the ground won in recent weeks. But there is confidence in the Ridgway command that the offensive can be repulsed. With additional large-cale Communist losses piled on top of the half-million or more suffered after the November intervention, the Chinese will then conclude that they cannot win in Korea.

This will be apparent by mid-September. At that time the Korean situation will be stalemated. The way will then be open to truce negotiations with the Communist regime in Peiping.

But even if they still refuse to consider any negotiation, as they have done for the past 2 months, a stalemate in fact will be taken for granted and plans based on that assumption. If events develop in this fashion, it is estimated that two American divisions will be left in Korea along with some other UN units.

At the same time four trained and seasoned American divisions will be kept in Japan. These divisions will not be allowed to lapse into occupation status, but will be kept in a state of readiness. They could be quickly shifted back to Korea should the Communists again invade from the north.

A basic consideration in this plan is to build up South Korean troops through training and arms provided from this country. This last, as the documents released by the White House show, was blocked by General MacArthur who wanted the arms given to the Jap police.

In this connection it is interesting to note the recommendations of William R. Mathews, editor of the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, and an authority on the Far East and MacArthur's command. In an article written before MacArthur's recall, Mathews suggested that "instead of demobilizing more than 200,000 Koreans for lack of arms, we should find the arms for them and continue their training." Frequently a supporter and long an admirer of MacArthur, Mathews wrote:

"If we allow ourselves to be drawn into a war in China, we will not win it militarily or politically. We will exhaust ourselves. We will not harm the source of communism, we will allow the Soviet Union to grow so strong that it can choose its own time to march west in Europe."

Much of the anger directed at President Truman appears to be motivated by the belief that through using the Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa, as MacArthur advocated, the war in Korea could be shortened and American lives saved. This touches the usefulness of the refugee army under Chiang Kai-shek. The illusion is cherished by some that this is a force in being, trained, seasoned, equipped, which could be picked up in a matter of days or weeks and dropped down on the mainland of China or onto the Korean peninsula.

Even the most ardent advocates of Chiang and the Nationalists, including retired American admirals and generals who are Chiang's paid advisers on Formosa, have never said that. A large amount of equipment is needed to rehabilitate an army that for nearly 2 years has been held together under difficulties. Rear Adm. Charles M. Cooke (retired), former commander of the United States Seventh Fleet, and Chiang's most important adviser, put the cost of that equipment at $250,000,000 some time ago and rising prices would have upped it considerably by now.

But realistic observers on Formosa point to a far more important consideration—that the United States would have to give 100-percent air-sea support to any action by the Nationalists against the mainland. The chances were at least 20-to-1 that this would have meant a war of indefinite duration and extent with China. It was this risk that President Truman and the Western powers refused to take.

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1951]

DULLES AND THE JAPANESE PACT

(By Marquis Childs)

NEW IMPORTANCE

A few hours after the dramatic White House announcement of General MacArthur's dismissal, President Truman summoned John Foster Dulles from the State Department. The President told Dulles he wanted him to go to Japan immediately to push as hard as possible for a peace treaty with the Japanese.

Behind the urgency of this request was a deep concern over Japanese reaction to MacArthur's removal. If it was a shock in this country, it exploded with the force of a bombshell in Japan and particularly among middle- and upper-class groups that have looked to America for protection from communism and for economic stability.

The reaction has in fact been far more serious, according to confidential reports to Washington, than the news has indicated.

The Japs have traditionally bowed to authority and General MacArthur had become a kind of second emperor; a symbol of power and security. It was ever feared that the government of Premier Yoshida might fall as a consequence of the news.

After Dulles had heard the President outline this newest mission to Japan, he hesitated for a moment. Both men seated in the quiet of the President's oval study were aware of the extreme difficulty and gravity of the assignment. In the vacuum left by MacArthur's departure a multitude of problems, both military and diplomatic, would have to be solved.

Dulles replied that he was willing to go but he wanted to be reassured that there was no change in American policy with respect to Japan and the Far East. In pushing for a peace treaty at the earliest opportunity, he has been determined not to permit Russian obstructionism to stand in the way of a settlement. He does not believe, as the British seem to, that Communist China should be permitted to take part in decisions on the treaty.

The President responded with great earnestness. He said there was no change whatsoever in the basic policy of the American Government. He gave his special ambassador full power to proceed with a Japanese treaty along the lines he has been following.

In the way in which he has proceeded to try to bring order and stability in the Pacific through a union of non-Communist powers, including Japan, Dulles has given one of the few examples of constructive statesmanship in the postwar world. Secretary of State Acheson gave his Republican adviser virtually a free hand on Japan. And instead of waiting to react against Communist action, as has happened more often than not in other parts of the world, Dulles has gone ahead with a constructive program intended to integrate Japan into the society of free nations not later than the end of this year.

This is the third time in less than 9 months that Dulles has made the long and wearying flight to Tokyo. He was at MacArthur's headquarters when the North Korean Communists launched their attack on the South Korean Republic last June. Returning to America, he expressed the belief that the United Nations would meet aggression with force.

His second trip began shortly after the first of this year. Five weeks were spent in laying the groundwork for a Japanese treaty and a possible future Pacific defense pact with all the nations involved. Besides Japan, Dulles visited Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. He expressed the hope at the end of his tour that a treaty might be concluded not later than midsummer.

If he had permitted political considerations to sway him, Dulles might have hesitated about going on this third assignment for another reason. He went into the State Department at the request of his good friend, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. The ailing VANDENBERG made it a specific condition of a continuing bipartisan approach to foreign policy that Dulles be made one of Acheson's chief advisers. Several other Republican names had been suggested, after Dulles' bitter and unsuccessful contest with HERBERT LEHMAN for the New York Senate seat in the fall of 1949, but VANDENBERG insisted on Dulles.

Now, however, extremists in Dulles' party are out to destroy anyone who tries to work with the administration toward a constructive foreign policy. Dulles knew that the attacks would be tripled and quadrupled in the context of the MacArthur controversy. Yet he went—and he went, in my opinion, because he has a deep sense of responsibility in a world torn with dissensions that threaten utter destruction.

It sometimes seems as though the extremists here at home were perfectly willing to bring on this destruction. If only they can heap the blame on Truman and Acheson, they seem ready and even eager to embrace any calamity. And correspondingly they vilify any and all, regardless of party or conviction, who work constructively for stability.

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1951]

CHURCHILL ON WAR

We'll let the man who woke up this country to the Soviet menace with his Fulton, Mo., speech of March 1946, Winston Churchill, write an editorial for us today, with a reprint of a passage from his The Gathering Storm. Says this modern man of war, in some reflections about Munich:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. Religion and virtue alike lend their sanctions to meekness and humility, not only between men but between nations. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands. How many misunderstandings which led to wars could have been removed by temporizing. How often have countries fought cruel wars and then after a few years of peace found themselves not only friends but allies.

"The Sermon on the Mount is the last word in Christian ethics. Everyone respects the Quakers. Still, it is not on these terms that ministers assume their responsibilities of guiding states. Their duty is first so to deal with other nations as to avoid strife and war and to eschew aggression in all its forms, whether for nationalistic or ideological objects. But the safety of the state, the lives and freedom of their own fellow countrymen, to whom they owe their position, make it right and imperative in the last resort, or when a final and definite conviction has been reached, that the use of force should not be excluded. If the circumstances are such as to warrant it, force may be used.

"And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. There is no merit in putting off a war for a year if, when it comes, it is a far worse war or one much harder to win. These are the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind has throughout its history been so frequently impaled. Final judgment upon them can only be recorded by history in relation to the facts of the case as known to the parties at the time, and also as subsequently proved."

Great Man Fired for Standing by America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Port Jervis Union Gazette on the only topic the American people are interested in—the so-called firing of General MacArthur:

GREAT MAN FIRED FOR STANDING BY AMERICA

To say that most Americans were astounded this morning on learning that the President had fired General MacArthur from four or five big jobs, is putting it mildly, although this action had been foreseen for some time. It was long known that the man on the spot was having trouble trying to get the Truman, Acheson, Hiss-loving crowd at the White House to really see what was needed if the UN (mostly American) forces were to be kept from annihilation in the Far East.

Ever since General Marshall advocated the selling of the Chiang Nationalists down the river and thus letting the Reds, backed by Russia, take over the celestial millions, it has been known that little was to be done to save the Far East from communism. Of course the little police action in Korea could be fought by a few thousand soldiers, and let China be overrun if necessary.

There must be joy as well as Joe at the Kremlin today, for even Joe himself could not have won a bigger victory for himself than the UN, mostly British and French, have won for him. It will eventually turn out to have been another Yalta or Potsdam.

While we have been shelling out money to protect and save Europe, we have been sending men over to Korea, and although MacArthur has continually asked for more men and munitions and quick help, the White House has listened to the Europeans and given what they wished, letting the Far East sink deeper into Red hands.

Just what caused the sudden midnight action at the White House may never be known by the general public until years later. The American people want to know what sort of shenanigans have been going on lately, and if the United States is again to be the sucker for someone else. The man who likes to talk of hitting people on the nose has a real problem facing him.

Our candidate for the Presidency next year is a man named MacArthur. America needs him, and he is now free.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the great New York Times, on Sunday, April 15, ran the following weekly summary of the dispute occasioned by the dismissal of General MacArthur:

GREATER DEBATE ON MACARTHUR AND POLICY

The great debate—which had ended the week before with Congress' endorsement of the dispatch of American troops to defend Europe—was succeeded last week by the "greater debate." It was touched off by one of the most dramatic incidents in American history.

On Tuesday General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, 71, held the offices of Supreme Commander, United Nations Forces in Korea; Supreme Commander for Allied Powers, Japan; Commander in Chief, Far East.

On Wednesday Douglas MacArthur was a general without a command. His President and Commander in Chief, Harry S. Truman, had dismissed him for insubordination, for openly and repeatedly clashing with the administration on basic matters of foreign policy.

The dismissal of General MacArthur brought into acute focus three issues:

1. The issue of the President's use of his constitutional authority to maintain civilian supremacy over the military.

2. The issue of where to concentrate the west's power in the world struggle against communism—in Europe or in Asia.

3. The issue of whether to keep fighting a limited war in Korea or to take the risk of a big war in trying to force a decision against the Chinese Communists.

The debate over these issues came immediately. In many parts of the Nation there was an outcry of protest against the MacArthur ouster. President Truman went on the air to explain his position to the people. Leading Republicans, hotly denouncing him, flung down a challenge to the fundamentals of the administration's foreign policy.

This week the debate moves into a spectacular phase. General MacArthur returns to set foot on the soil of the continental United States for the first time in 14 years.

THE BACKGROUND

Douglas MacArthur had from his youth a feeling that he was to be a man of destiny, that in Shakespeare's words, he was "not born to sue, but to command." He was graduated from West Point with the highest 4-year average (98.14) in history; he was the youngest division commander in France in World War I; then the youngest Chief of Staff; then youngest four-star general since Grant. In World War II, in his sixties, he led 11 landings personally.

His theatrical flair caught the imagination (his famous statement upon landing at Leyte in 1944, "I have returned. By the Grace of Almighty God, our forces stand again on Philippine soil. * * * Rally to me. * * * Let no heart be faint"). His imperious manner rubbed many people the wrong way. His communiqués referred to "my air force," "my navy." Yet even his critics, after an interview with him, would come away impressed by his personality. In the Japanese occupation headquarters in Tokyo General MacArthur was surrounded by aides who almost idolized him. In his office in Tokyo's Dai Ichi building hung the framed story of a Roman general who said, "We shall pay no attention to any counsel but such as shall be framed within our camp."

CHAPTERS OF DISPUTE

The direct controversy between General MacArthur and President Truman took the form of a long series of disputes. Some are public knowledge; others are recorded in documents that are still in secret files.

These were outstanding chapters in the controversy:

Chapter I took place when the Korean War was in its beachhead phase. There were reports of Chinese Communist divisions massing in Manchuria. A prime concern of the administration was to keep Communist China, if possible, from intervening in the war. In August General MacArthur sent a statement to an encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago. He recommended strongly that the United States hold on to Formosa—the sanctuary of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government—as a base vital to American security in the Pacific. President Truman saw an advance copy of the statement; he ordered it withdrawn but it got into print anyway. Then the President, in a fireside chat, said: "We do not want Formosa or any part of Asia for ourselves. We believe that the future of Formosa * * * should be settled peaceably * * * by international action."

Chapter II took place when the UN troops—ordered into an "end-the-war" offensive by General MacArthur—were sent reeling back by Chinese Communist forces in North Korea. There were hurried and delicate negotiations between the United States and its Allies on what to do about the Chinese aggression. The decision was to fight on but to leave the door open to negotiations with Communist China. On December 1 General MacArthur said that because he was not given authority to bomb Communist China, he faced "an enormous handicap, without precedent in military history." On December 6 the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent to General MacArthur copies of a Presidential memo applying to officials of the executive branch. It said: "No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning foreign policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of State; no [such statement] concerning military policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of Defense."

Chapter III took place during the UN's attrition offensive—the offensive that slowly pushed the Chinese Communists back toward parallel 38. Intelligence reports had it that the Chinese Communists were massing in North Kora and Manchuria for a big push. Fourteen UN countries with troops fighting in Korea were working on a restatement of their aims. They hoped that Mao Tse-tung could be induced to reconsider the refusals he had made in the past to UN truce proposals.

On March 20 the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent General MacArthur a message which said: "State planning Presidential announcement shortly that, with clearing of bulk of South Korea of aggressors, United Nations now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea."

Four days later General MacArthur, without consulting Washington, offered to meet on the field of battle with the Chinese Communist military commander and talk truce. He coupled the offer with an implied threat. He said: "The enemy must * * * be painfully aware that a decision of the United Nations to depart from its tolerant effort to contain the war to the area of Korea through expansion of our military operations to his coastal areas and interior bases would doom Red China * * *."

TRUMAN WAS FURIOUS

The MacArthur statement caused dismay and anger at the UN and in Washington. President Truman was described by his intimates as furious. At his direction the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent General MacArthur a message sternly recalling the December 6 document advising him and all other commanders to steer away from foreign and military policy statements until they had been cleared by Washington.

Chapter IV opened at 3:04 p. m., Thursday, April 5. A news ticker in a White House office tapped out a bulletin from Capitol Hill reporting that House Republican JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., had read in Congress a letter from General MacArthur calling for a new United States foreign policy: The landing of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa-based troops on the mainland to open a second front against the Chinese Communists and the concentration of power in Asia rather than Europe. There followed quickly additional bulletins, and the text of the general's letter, which read, in part: "It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words."

An assistant White House press secretary tore the yellow sheet of copy from the ticker and within minutes handed it to the President. Mr. Truman read it quickly. Then and there he made up his mind:

MacArthur must go.

For 5 days after reaching his decision—alone—President Truman weighed the best way to carry it out, the question of who should succeed General MacArthur, and the timing of the announcement. Only a very few, through those days, knew that he had made up his mind. It was one of the best-kept secrets in Washington history.

On April 6, a week ago Friday, at the close of a Cabinet meeting, Mr. Truman asked Defense Secretary George C. Marshall and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Omar Bradley to stay behind. The President informed them of the decision. The machinery for the dismissal of General MacArthur was set in motion.

Such was the prelude to the high drama of last week.

WEEK OF DRAMA

Over last week-end there grew in Washington a feeling that something was up. The scuttlebut was that Mr. Truman probably would deliver a direct rebuke to General MacArthur, but nothing more.

On Monday the President met with his congressional leaders. The question of General MacArthur came up. But even then he did not make it quite clear that he had reached an irrevocable decision.

On Tuesday morning Mr. Truman ordered the assembly of documentary material for the order dismissing General MacArthur. A small group, including General Bradley, Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Matthew Connelly, Secretary to the President, and Joseph Short, White House Press Secretary, started to work in the Cabinet room. At around 10 p. m. they went to Blair House with the assembled documents. The President approved the papers with a few changes.

UPROAR ANTICIPATED

At this Blair House meeting there was discussion of probable reaction. The conferees figured—accurately—that there would be an uproar in Congress and that the first response from the public would be adverse. But the President said: "If your decision is right you must go ahead with it even if you know there will be a storm of disapproval. If you are right," he said, "the American people will in time support you."

That evening the White House correspondents went home at the usual time. At midnight telephone calls from the White House routed them out of bed; they were summoned to a press conference. At 12:05 a. m. Wednesday, the Associated Press sent out this alert to papers throughout the country:

"EDITORS: The White House has called in reporters for an announcement at 1 a. m. eastern standard time. There is no indication of the subject matter."

At 1 a. m. Press Secretary Short greeted 50 sleepy-eyed reporters. The President had already gone to bed. The conference lasted 5 minutes. Mr. Short read out the Presidential statement. It said:

"With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties. * * * I have decided that I must make a change of command in the Far East. I have, therefore, relieved General MacArthur of his commands and have designated Lieut. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway as his successor."

At the same time an order went out from Secretary Marshall to General Ridgway, notifying him of his promotion and of his replacement as Eighth Army commander by Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet.

It was 3 p. m. in Tokyo. At his American Embassy residence, General MacArthur had just finished luncheon with friends. An aide delivered a brown envelope marked "Flash." Inside was the dismissal notice from President Truman. General MacArthur did not change expression as he read it.

MAC ARTHUR'S STAFF INCENSED

His aides showed hot anger at the news. One, reading the order, which gave the general authority "to have issued such orders as are necessary to complete desired travel to such place as you select," said bitterly, "Why didn't Truman say 'To Elba'?"

The news reached General Ridgway at a command post near the Korean battle front where he was escorting Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., on an inspection tour. The general said, "This thing just hit me." The next day he and Mr. Pace flew to Tokyo for a talk with General MacArthur. General Van Fleet was in Florida when he got word of his new assignment; he flew immediately to Washington and from there to Korea.

By mid-Wednesday the reaction in the United States to Mr. Truman's bold decision was boiling up. The volume of protest was extraordinary. Letters, telegrams, and telephone calls by the tens of thousands poured into the White House, congressional offices, and newspapers. Across the country demonstrators carried signs saying, "Oust Truman" and "Out with Acheson." In at least one town, in California, the President was burned in effigy.

In Washington, House and Senate Republican leaders held a tense strategy conference. During the meeting Representative MARTIN telephoned Tokyo and spoke to a MacArthur aide. Afterward he announced that the GOP would move to have General MacArthur invited to address a joint session of Congress. "Impeachments," he said, had been "discussed." In using the plural he apparently had both Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson in mind.

At the same time the President's staff was hastily drafting a radio and television address to state his case to the public. Mr. Truman delivered it at 10:30 p. m.

By Thursday General MacArthur was packing for his homeward journey. In the United States it was announced that he had accepted a job as an official for Remington-Rand, Inc. In a speech in New York that night Senator ROBERT A. TAFT served notice that the main line of Republican attack on the President will be the charge that General MacArthur's dismissal means appeasement of communism in the Far East.

INVITATION BY CONGRESS

On Friday decisions were made for a full inquiry into the dispute. The Democrats cleared the way for an official invitation for General MacArthur to address the Members of Congress. Mr. Truman announced he was "happy" that Congress planned to "bestow this honor" on the general. At the same time the Senate Armed Services Committee voted unanimously to investigate General MacArthur's dismissal and invited him to be one of the first witnesses.

In New York Mayor Impellitteri announced that the city would honor the general with the traditional ticker-tape parade and ceremonies accorded returning heroes and special visitors. The major cabled the general the invitation along with New York's cordial greetings.

Yesterday from Tokyo, General MacArthur cabled his acceptance and said he would arrive in New York this Thursday. He also notified the Senate Armed Services Committee he thought it inappropriate for him to appear as a committee witness while Congress was considering the invitation to him to address Congress as a whole. He said he wanted to talk to Congress in general terms.

THE ISSUES

Out of the events of the week there emerged sharply the three issues of the greater debate.

As for the first issue—the employment of the President's authority over his military commander—these views have been set out: Some said that it was the politicians who had encroached on General MacArthur's realm, and not he on the politicians. This school feels that the general knows far more about the true situation in the Orient than anyone in Washington. But on the other side was the traditional argument that in a democracy, the soldier—as General Eisenhower said—"accepts certain inhibitions" when he puts on the uniform. His job is to carry out policy, and his views on what it should be must be conveyed through channels and not voiced in public.

As for the second issue—whether to concentrate on Europe or Asia—these are the main arguments: Those who hold the MacArthur view believe world war III has already started, that the Russians have chosen Asia as their battlefield, that a fight to a decision must be pressed against Communist China. On the other side are those who argue that Western Europe, with its industries, is the prime Russian target. They say that the Kremlin would like nothing better than to have the west's major forces committed in Asia, leaving the Russians free to move into the vacuum in Europe. This school believes a world war may still be avoided if the West builds strong enough forces in Europe to make aggression costly.

As for the third issue—policy on the Korean war—these are the conflicting positions: General MacArthur and his supporters hold that the only way to avoid an endless and bloody stalemate is to bomb Chinese bases and land Chiang Kai-shek's troops on the mainland. The administration school says this would lead Peiping to invoke the Sino-Soviet mutual-aid pact, the Russians might come in, and world war III would be on. The UN's job, this group argues, is to halt the aggressor, and then try to get a negotiated peace.

We Have a Better Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the prize-winning oration for boys by Gerald Ottenheimer, of Georgetown Prep, in the twentieth annual oratorical contest sponsored by the Catholic University Conference of Clerics and Religious held at the Catholic University Gymnasium on April 15. The judges of this contest were my charming colleague, the Honorable Edna F. Kelley, of the Tenth New York Congressional District, the Honorable Stephen Jackson, from the Department of Defense, and the Honorable Edward A. Tamm, judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and I had the honor to be the presiding chairman:

WE HAVE A BETTER ANSWER

Just recently we were offered the strange, sad picture of a United States Senator weeping over the Nation, weeping over the decay of morals which is eating at the vitals of the country he loves. Strange, this picture? Yes; for when have we ever seen the like before? Sad? Yes; because there are so few who realize the conditions that bring tears to his eyes. Although he may not have known it, the Senator was weeping over a condition brought about by the two great demigods of the twentieth century, the Divinity of the Dollar and the Goddess of Sense Satisfaction.

Let us consider what the first demigod has given us. When a student athlete betrays his college for the tinkle of a coin, when a California orange grower doubles his prices after a hurricane in Florida and calls it the law of supply and demand, when a sewer rat pollutes the souls of innocent children by peddling dope, when a quisling betrays his democratic nation to an atheistic tyrant, and worst of all, when the Christian population is so unconcerned that well it may be said of it—it fiddles while Rome burns—then, perhaps, the Senator has some cause to weep.

The second demigod is sense satisfaction. The warped mind that constantly craves to gratify every whim of passion is like the maddened vulture that gnawed out Titius' liver time and time again. When purity is flayed alive and sex becomes a science, when the blessings of a family are neglected for the purchase of a Cadillac, when the bond of marriage is regarded as a temporary spree, when the filth of a pagan feast is portrayed behind the colorful jacket of a best seller, then, perhaps, the Senator has reason to weep.

But, fellow students, is weeping the answer? Is that all we are going to do? No; we know better than that. We know that our religion is a brave optimism that hopes in man because it believes in God. What are we going to do? We will fulfill our responsibilities by living as best we know how in the mystical body of Christ. For the mystical body is at the heart of all true Catholic action. I shall give three ways by which, I think, we students may really live in the mystical body of Christ.

First, we must realize that the sacrifice of the Mass is not just a Sunday morning prayer meeting where we donate a quarter and ardently hope that Father won't talk too long. It is not a devotion at which we take a merely passive interest in the age-old drama being enacted on the altar. But it is a living sacrifice in which we, the congregation, the priest, and Christ, offer the divine victim to God. Remember that at every moment, somewhere throughout the world, a sanctus bell chimes, a ray of light in all the darkness, and the faithful offer God to God.

But, fellow students, this is attending Mass; we must live the Mass. Look at the motley crew at the first sacrifice—Calvary. He died for them. Some of us are not even willing to live with them. We must not grade a man on the color of his skin but by the metal of his soul. We must think, pray, and live in the plural of we, us, our, and not in the narrow selfish—I, my, mine. This, fellow students, is living the Mass.

Our second responsibility is expressed in the words of St. Ignatius, "Age quod agis"—"Do what you are doing." At present our task is to get an education. Each man's soul is a container ranging in size from a thimble to a 500-gallon tank; our task is to fill that container. Some of us are thimbles, some tanks, and the fortunate are just middle-sized buckets. But remember that the full thimble is more precious to Christ than the half-filled tank.

By constant application to study we shall train ourselves so that one day Catholic truth and Catholic ideals may penetrate every corridor of life. We have enough so-called great men on whose tombstone could well be inscribed:

"Here lie the bones of Dr. Smythe,
He knew everything but the purpose of life."

We must prepare ourselves so that in the silently approaching future we are capable of fulfilling our mission—spreading and preaching Catholic action—as a lawyer, doctor, housewife, janitor, or farmer—the love and knowledge of Christ are needed everywhere. Well might we keep in mind the old words, "Learn as if you were to live always."

Our third obligation is to resist the temptations of these twentieth century demigods—the dollar bill and sense satisfaction.

A 32-inch television screen, a flashy sport coat, a souped-up hot rod, these are all very flattering to our ego. And a peacock-feathered hat, provided the feather be long enough, might possibly help us brush the gates of heaven, but it will never open them. For money is a means, not an end. If we use it to gain our heavenly goal, it is one of the greatest gifts we have. However if we use it merely to fill our wardrobe or our stomach, it were better we never owned a cent. We must not succumb to that modern heresy that the dollar is divine but must place our capital in the bank of Heaven—there will be no crash there.

The second demi-god is sense satisfaction. The sixth and ninth commandments were never so ignored as they are today. If we follow the maxim of eat, drink and be merry, it is not tomorrow we die—we are already dead. Will we trade in the peaceful quiet behind the sanctuary lamp for the voluptuous gaiety behind the neon one? Are we to exchange the majestic harmony of the liturgical chant for the impassioned downbeat of night club jazz? Will we, can we abandon the blue veil of Our Lady's purity for the black rags of modern vice?

Fellow students, you and only you can answer these questions. There is no middle road. For—

"To every man there opens
A high way and a low;
And some take the high way
And some men take the low;
And in between on the misty flats
The crowd moves to and fro.
But to every man there opens
A high way and a low;
And you must choose the way
You want your soul to go."

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, may I direct attention of the House to two thought-provoking columns in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 15; one by Mr. Andre Visson, and one by Mr. Stewart Alsop:

[From the Washington Post of April 15, 1951]

DIVISION OVER MACARTHUR

(By Andre Visson)

QUESTION OF STRATEGY

The dramatic dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur has stirred up such violent emotions that it has become almost impossible to analyze the sensational developments calmly and objectively. This, however, must be done if we want to evaluate its political impact on the future of this country and of the free world.

The first, natural reaction of the people in this country was to approach the MacArthur drama on either a partisan or human level. This was perhaps inevitable, since MacArthur and Truman are both standard-bearers of their respective parties. Moreover, MacArthur is one of the most striking personalities of our time.

Other great American generals—Eisenhower, Marshall, Bradley—are both leaders and common Americans. MacArthur is the only general—the only living American—who for millions of his countrymen has become the symbol of their Nation outside its borders. He is the only living American who has become the object of hero worship. He has been absent from this country for 15 years, but he has remained present in millions of American hearts.

His personality has many typically American characteristics. He is bold, fighting, uncompromising, impatient, and has an exceptional penchant for drama. All this, added to his striking physical appearance, has made him the great national hero. And if his military prestige has been somewhat impaired by the defeat at the Yalu River last November, following the imprudent announcement attributed to him that the boys would be "back for Christmas," he has now probably acquired the new prestige of a martyr.

All men of outstanding personality who cannot find their place in the conventional structure of modern society inevitably become controversial figures. France recently had a similar experience with General de Gaulle, and in the late nineteenth century with General Boulanger. But it is especially unfortunate when such men divide their nation as deeply as General MacArthur has done.

All thinking, patriotic Americans, whether Democrats or Republicans, are extremely unhappy over this division. But as human beings they find it hard to control their emotions. And when it comes to politics, they have a natural desire to turn this great national drama to their party's advantage.

The Democrats, even those who reproach President Truman for having waited until this dramatic denouncement became inevitable, are trying to present a united front in support of the President. The Republicans, even those who do not agree with all MacArthur's strategic conceptions, are trying to present a united front in support of MacArthur. But behind these human emotions and partisan passions are fundamental and vital issues. And these issues cannot be aproached on an emotional plane.

The first fundamental issue is the supremacy of the civilian over the military in the American democracy. On this point, the overwhelming majority of Americans, if they could make themselves forget that the "civilian" is Truman, and the "military" is MacArthur, would undoubtedly agree that "of course, in our democracy the military must be subordinate to civilian authority." This is the view not only of civilians, but of all great American military leaders.

The second fundamental issue is the kind of strategy best suited at the present time to American interests and American possibilities. Here the views are divided.

MacArthur's strategy has been stated by him both privately and publicly: the strategic priority of Asia; the strengthening and defense of Formosa; the use of the Chinese Nationalist forces; the blockade of China; the bombing of Manchuria and, if necessary, other Chinese provinces. In other words, MacArthur—and his strategic views are shared by a certain fraction of Republicans—sincerely believes that the struggle against communism should be decided in Asia, even at the risk of an all-out war with China, and if need be with Soviet Russia.

The strategy of the administration has been different. And it is necessary to emphasize that this is not Mr. Truman's personal strategy. It is the strategy worked out by both his political advisers in the State Department and his military advisers in the Pentagon. It can be summed up as follows: The strategic priority of Europe; the containment of Communist expansion everywhere; fighting Communist aggression wherever possible, but trying to avoid an all-out war until Western Europe is strong enough to resist, with American aid, a Communist attack. As for Formosa, the view of the Pentagon has been that in a war it should be denied to the enemy, but that it is not strategically vital enough to start a world war for it.

Since these two strategies are in opposition, the conflict was inevitable. President Truman has emphasized that General MacArthur was dismissed because his strategy could lead to a world war. It can be assumed that this risk has now been reduced. But for how long? The answer can be given only by the Kremlin. What will be the next Communist move? Now that they have conclusive evidence of our desire not to carry the war to China, will they be willing to work out a compromise? Or, feeling secure in Manchuria, will they not make a new move in Indochina—a much richer prize than Korea?

Western Europe is relieved by MacArthur's dismissal. But responsible circles in Washington have the unhappy feeling that the end of fighting in Asia is not yet in sight.

[From the Washington Post of April 15, 1951]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE TIMING FAVORS MACARTHUR

It may well be that in choosing this particular time to dismiss General MacArthur, President Truman has chosen the best possible time—for MacArthur. It may even be that General MacArthur had just this in mind when he decided to force the issue. For it is clear that the outcome of the battle between the President and the general will be determined, in the end, not in Washington, but in Korea.

In dismissing MacArthur, President Truman has, of course, risked his political life. In the most unlikely event that the attempts to reach an acceptable settlement with the Chinese and their Soviet masters now succeed, and the fighting ends, Truman will enjoy a great historic triumph. If there is no settlement, but the expected Communist offensive is contained, the stalemate on the battlefield will be reflected in a stalemate between Truman and MacArthur.

But if the Communists again break through our lines; if this time the breakthrough is successfully exploited, and if our forces are seriously endangered, then disaster in Korea will be disaster also for Truman. For then the demand for attacking targets in China proper, for using Nationalist troops, and for fighting the war in Asia, which MacArthur wants, will become irresistible.

MacArthur will seem triumphantly vindicated, while Truman will appear the architect of national disaster. And as both Truman and MacArthur are certainly fully aware, the danger of a successful Communist offensive in Korea is now as great as it has ever been.

The best way to explain why the danger is now considered so serious is, oddly enough, to quote from a report cabled from Korea by this reporter's partner some months ago:

"The recurrent crises in the fighting here always took the form of a great hole being torn in our lines, and then being stopped by our mobile reserves being moved up before the walking enemy could exploit the break-through. But even two enemy intruder fighters, attacking the interminable lines of our transport * * * would have been enough to produce a 24-hour tangle. Then the holes in our line could not have been stopped in time. The break-throughs would then have been fully exploited. And we should have lost our foothold in Korea."

This pattern has held throughout the Korea fighting. Sheer weight of manpower has made possible numerous Communist breakthroughs, the most serious being the near-defeat after the Chinese intervention. But the Communist breakthroughs have

never in the end been fully exploited, because the Communists have lacked sufficient heavy weapons and mobility, and above all because they have lacked any offensive air power at all.

That is why reports that the Chinese are for the first time receiving important quantities of heavy weapons and transport from Soviet Siberian stocks are taken with deadly seriousness by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But what is taken even more seriously is the report that an offensive Communist air force is now being organized.

This force is believed to consist of about 500 Russian fighters and light bombers, manned by intensively trained Chinese and North Koreans. Such a force could not seriously challenge American air superiority. But given cloud cover during the Korean rainy season, and given the interdiction against attacking Manchurian bases, our Air Force cannot possibly prevent strafings and hit-and-run strikes behind our lines.

General Ridgway, who, rather than MacArthur, has actually been in full command of the United Nations forces in Korea for many weeks, is a brilliant field commander, and his troops are more battleworthy than ever before. Yet the danger of a successful enemy offensive is real, and it is a danger which might all but destroy President Truman, as Truman himself must know.

Infinitely more is at stake, of course, than the political fortunes of a Truman or a MacArthur. War, even a small war, has a sullen, imperious logic of its own. If an enemy offensive, supported by air power based in Manchuria, endangered our troops, the logic of war would demand the bombing of the Manchurian bases, however much Truman might wish to localize the conflict. This would logically lead in turn to the bombing of Chinese lines of communications, and cities. Then the Soviets would be forced to intervene openly, or accept the equivalent of an intolerable defeat.

Thus the logic of a small war leads to a great war. This logical progression toward world disaster cannot now be halted by Truman or MacArthur. It can be halted only if the men in the Kremlin decide to cut their losses in Korea, or if Ridgway and his men smash at the outset the offensive which is otherwise in prospect.

Post-Office Workers Should Get a Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the April 12 issue of the Cleveland Press, entitled "Post-Office Workers Should Get a Pay Raise."

POST-OFFICE WORKERS SHOULD GET A PAY RAISE

Postal workers are organized into unions but don't have the right to strike because they're Federal employees.

When they want a pay raise they have to appeal to Congress. But they aren't a strong lobby in Washington. They aren't in a position to swing the vote in any key States.

So, unless public opinion is on their side, Congress is likely to pass them up.

The starting wage of the highest-paid post-office employee, a clerk or carrier, is $2,670 a year. After 9 years they get $3,670, and after another 15 years the top-grade worker can earn $3,970.

Despite the pension and security that go with the job, this pay isn't enough to attract, keep, or satisfy the intelligent, reliable kind of employee the post office needs.

Bills have been introduced in the Senate and House to give postal employees a raise. The underpaid workers shouldn't be the goats of the big argument over postal rates and the Department's deficit.

They don't have parity to protect them from climbing living costs. They need and deserve that wage boost.

The MacArthur Ouster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the April 21 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "The MacArthur Ouster":

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: If the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last great debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The general, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The general wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the widest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical air force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last great debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of ensuring their security.

From Where I Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following column written by Dr. Harry Halpern, which appeared in the April 6, 1951, Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center. It speaks volumes:

FROM WHERE I STAND

As I descended the steps to the subway station, a man walked in front of me carrying a small valise and an overcoat slung across his arm. He fell and I helped him get up. He brushed his clothes and said, "Thank you. It's very nice of you." It needed only a brief look to realize that he was drunk. We waited for the train and he began to talk with the trace of an Irish accent. Obviously he was not a common drunk. With the typical loquaciousness of the inebriate, he told me his life's story. He had taught Latin as a young man and had served in World War I. His quotations in Latin were well chosen and correct.

"It doesn't matter," he said, "whether a man knows how to square X—Y, or whether he talks many languages. It's being human that counts. I'm drunk and I know it. Yet I'm a better man than some lousy guy who hates others because they're black or Jewish or Catholic or anything else. Picking up a man when he falls is the biggest thing in life." He went on and on.

Engrossed in the conversation, I, together with my "friend" boarded the wrong train. We sat down together. Just then a white-

bearded Jew approached me. "Does this train go to Utica Avenue?" he asked. I answered him and he sat down near me. "I'm still green here," he said, "and I don't know my way around." My Irish acquaintance gazed upon this patriarchal Jew. He asked me to translate what he was saying. "You know," he said, "that fellow looks like a character out of the Bible."

The old Jew told me how much he admired America. Here in the subway he wasn't lost because he found someone who could speak Yiddish. From the other side of me came the incessant talk of the Latin teacher. "You must be a lawyer," he said. I asked him how he knew. "Well," he said, "if you were a teacher you'd be in school. If you were a physician you'd be carrying your tools. You're not a salesman because you're reading a book on philosophy. So you must be a lawyer." I didn't contradict him.

So we rode together, the Irishman, the old Jew, and I. At Borough Hall the gentleman carrying his valise got up with me, "I'm getting off here," he said, "and you must have a drink on me." I told him I was busy and bid him farewell.

Many people have tried to define the spirit of America. But here was a definition found in no dictionary. The bearded Jew, a son of Erin, and I—this is America, a place where, "picking up a man when he falls" is considered one of the great, if not the greatest thing in life.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention of the House to the following excerpts from an article by the famous writer, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. The article appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, April 15.

I should also like to call attention to an editorial from the same edition entitled "The MacArthur Storm." The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

GENERAL RIDGWAY TAKES OVER IN A CRITICAL SITUATION—ENEMY IS PREPARING A BIG OFFENSIVE AND JAPANESE PROBLEMS ARE PRESSING

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

In Japan itself, the MacArthur retirement is almost certain to mean major staff changes. The Bataan crowd that has been with General MacArthur so many years is likely to retire; one of the MacArthur stalwarts—Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, the general's political and government adviser and close confidant—is returning to the United States with MacArthur and already has applied for retirement. Another controversial figure on the staff, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, intelligence officer, had been anxious to retire before the Korean War started, and is now almost certain to do so.

In addition to these and other extensive staff changes, there will be profound changes in methods with General Ridgway as the new Supreme Commander, Allied Powers, in Tokyo. General Ridgway is not a man to isolate and insulate himself, as did General MacArthur. MacArthur concerned himself only with the broadest problems of the occupation and our military policies; he rarely deviated from the beaten path between his Embassy quarters and the Dai Ichi Building; he had very few personal contacts with the Japanese (and only intermittent ones with others than those close to him on the staff) and he had little first-hand knowledge about Japan.

RIDGWAY'S JOB

Ridgway will want to see for himself; he will concern himself particularly with the maintenance of discipline and training in our military forces in Japan—standards which had fallen to a low ebb before Korea; and as a good disciplinarian, he will stamp out rackets and black marketing, which at periods and in places during the occupation flourished unchecked.

General Ridgway's designated relief in command of the Eighth Army, General Van Fleet, is an experienced division and corps commander from World War II, and he comes to Korea after postwar experience in Greece. This experience, where the general had to combine military knowledge with a hard-won appreciation of the intricacies of international and (Greek) domestic politics and of guerrilla warfare, should stand him in good stead in Korea, where both guerrillas and South Korean politics are major factors influencing the military campaign.

Staff changes under General Van Fleet in the Eighth Army are not likely to be major; the new commander will inherit the staff which supported the late Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker and General Ridgway. There may be some slow infiltration of new blood, but not quickly.

SMOOTHER RELATIONSHIPS

The principal change will be in smoother command and staff relationships with Tokyo. In the MacArthur regime one man was king, and there were no crown princes. MacArthur's staff—and quite possibly the "Old Man" himself—were jealous of too much publicity focused on any of his major subordinates. Moreover, Tokyo knew that Ridgway was a "Pentagon man." Prior to his arrival, Tokyo had been running the Korean War from hundreds of miles away; after his arrival the consolidation of command in Korea and General Ridgway's own quiet forcefulness led to a greater concentration of control in Korea. Undercover friction had, therefore, existed between Tokyo and Korea—though probably not on the MacArthur-Ridgway level—and this will now be largely eliminated.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR STORM

It is possible that by the time General MacArthur returns to the United States this week some of the initial fury of the storm raised by his dismissal will have blown itself out. From the standpoint of national unity in a time of grave trouble this is greatly to be desired. Calamity will have been added to the tragedy of the MacArthur case if high passion and partisan politics are permitted to turn this necessary disciplinary action into a national rift that cannot be closed in the face of danger. On the other hand, some good purpose will have been served if calm discussion of the really vital issues involved brings out a clearer policy in the United States and in the United Nations in respect to Korea and the rest of the Far East.

We believe that the majority of sober-minded Americans will agree that President Truman's action was justified in the light of the complete difference of opinion on Far Eastern policy between Washington and General MacArthur and the general's demonstrated unwillingness to accede to the decisions of his superiors. Those same Americans may not be willing to agree that the action finally taken by the President was inevitable from the start. They may quite properly hold that wiser courses of action, taken earlier, would have made this final step unnecessary.

Moreover, we believe that most Americans will be unimpressed by the shouts of delight coming from various parts of the world over the general's dismissal. There is, inevitably, the uneasy suspicion in this country that at least some of this expression of joy has arisen from a desire to follow an appeasement policy toward Red China and the knowledge that General MacArthur was adamantly opposed to that appeasement.

The members of the United Nations who have been sighing with relief over the general's recall can justify their attitude only if they take a strong position on the issues which are still before them. If, on the other hand, they use his departure as the occasion to promote fresh and further concessions to the aggressors whom they have named, Americans will be right in their suspicion of motives.

Some of the criticism of General MacArthur has been based on the assumption or misapprehension that it was his personality and his opinions, and those alone, that stood in the way of a prompt settlement of the Korean issues. There has been the repeated implication that once he was out of the way the Chinese Communists and their Russian masters would immediately be ready to sit down in reasonableness and agree to an honorable peace. There is little ground for this sort of optimism. The most recent military news from Korea, indeed, would point in exactly the opposite direction.

It takes two parties to make an agreement. It takes some measure of good will and some desire for peace on both sides to have peace. The United Nations has repeatedly affirmed its desire for peace and its essential good will. Thus far there has been no sign that these sentiments are reciprocated. It is difficult to see how General MacArthur's departure will bring that reciprocity into being.

It is plain, however, that the Chinese Communists are interpreting this action in the case of the general as a sign of weakness and confusion. Since they assume that we are weak and confused, we may expect that their attitude toward a settlement now will be at least as arrogant as it has been in the past. They will demand, as the price for their halting their military attack on the United Nations, that they be rewarded by the grant of the island of Formosa and honored by an invitation to membership in the organization that they have attacked.

The storm that has been raised will, of course, force a reexamination of our far-eastern policies. In that reexamination it will be well for the United States and the United Nations to remember that the choice of peace or war lies now, as it has previously, in hands other than ours. Clarification on that point may be one good thing to come out of the present unhappy situation.

Izaak Walton Director Endorses Hall Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows the Izaak Walton League to be one of the foremost outdoor organizations in the country.

Therefore, support of the Hall bill, H. R. 3023, is materially strengthened with receipt of the following letter and

resolution from the league's national director, Mr. Burton H. Atwood:

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Winnetka, Ill., April 14, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I offer my congratulations for the introduction of H. R. 3023. It is so important to the rights of citizens that it should receive wide support.

Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed last week at the national convention of the Izaak Walton League. It steals some of your words because they so aptly describe the situation.

However, may I suggest that you give consideration to amending the bill to read "no citizen shall be required to register or license firearms. * * *" Such a change might prevent registration by the subterfuge of licensing.

Very truly yours,
BURTON H. ATWOOD,
National Director.

Resolution 6

Whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States the inherent privilege of our citizens to protect their hearths and homes by possessing arms; and

Whereas in the several States the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally owned weapons: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., in convention assembled at Cincinnati, Ohio, April 5–7, 1951, That no citizen shall be compelled to register, or license, legal firearms which he is in lawful possession of; and be it further

Resolved, That no Federal, State, or local officers shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess and use them.

Are We a Nation of Dopes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems a tragic shame that Great Britain has been able for so many years, to dictate American foreign policy in the Far East.

The removal of General MacArthur from supreme command in the Pacific gives the Communists more cause for rejoicing than the abdication of the Mikado. Everybody knows MacArthur is the symbol of American strength in the Orient.

The British have long feared that MacArthur's program of winning the Korean war would sound the death knell to their flourishing opium trade. Six hundred million Chinese are addicted wholly, or in part, to the use of opium, because Lord Sassoon forced them into opium dens a century ago.

Hong Kong is the dope capital of the world and harbors the dregs of society, ruled over by a handful of little dictators.

The British have a secret deal with Communist China. The Red government will let Lord Sassoon sell his opium to the Chinese, if Britain will throw a monkey wrench into the MacArthur program of victory for America.

Is the United States to be a sovereign Government with an American policy toward the Commies without tthe British telling us to surrender to them? Or should we reenter the British sphere of influence and flood our own markets and submit our own people to the influence of Britain's billion dollar, going concern of opium peddling?

If we give up without a fight, we are a Nation of dopes, stupid from the pipe dreams of British opium clouds.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the annual convention of the National Independent Meat Packers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., April 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR., CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

I am delighted and honored to meet with you in Chicago today. As independent meat packers you represent both a vital defense industry and an American ideal. Meat packing is essential to building national strength—the strength we must have to meet the challenge to our freedom—the strength we hope will lead to world peace. The American ideal is the free enterprise system under which your industry was made possible and under which it has prospered and developed.

Freedom to make our own decisions—by that I mean independence of thought and action—has been the cornerstone upon which we have built our great community. It was for this freedom that the signers of the Declaration of Independence mutually pledged their lives and the future of the Nation they created. Today we should all make the same pledge, to each other and to America.

Under this freedom our Nation has become great. Under this freedom our people enjoy the greatest blessings on earth. We are the best fed, the most adequately clothed and housed, and the least-governed people on earth. And we have reached such heights through the freedom of our private enterprise system, a system in which initiative is encouraged, not hampered, by government.

The very fact that we have achieved so much, places a tremendous responsibility on our shoulders. We have become the citadel of democracy. All the free peoples of the world look to us to help defend and nourish the freedom we cherish for ourselves and for them. But at least one group is out to destroy our way of life. Through brute force and by the instillation of fear, its leaders seek to stamp out the torch of freedom wherever it burns.

The liberty-loving people of the world should know that all we ask is that in the name of freedom the people of each country should be given the opportunity to have a government of their own free choice.

We all want peace. We are now enlarging our military force in the hope that by becoming strong we will deter further aggression, and as a result bring lasting peace. We hold membership in the United Nations because we believe this organization offers the best and perhaps the only way to peace. The United Nations is yet young and undernourished. It needs the solid food of confidence and trust amongst its members. I feel that our Nation has contributed its share of these. Would that other nations had done as well.

On Sunday, June 25, 1950, the Communist forces of North Korea crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. This open act of aggression challenged the very existence of the United Nations. If we backed down, which country might be next? Would we not be repeating the errors that preceded World War II? What of Manchuria, Ethiopia, and Poland? When do you put out a fire? Do you try to get it under control while it is small or wait until it is burning the roof over your head? We learned the answer the hard way, and a million American casualties will prove it.

The Korean situation may yet result in a blessing in disguise. It shocked us into the realization that the Communists are determined to stamp out the concept of freedom from the mind of man. It awakened us to our own weaknesses and pointed out sharply our basic unpreparedness. We had drifted into the old American brand of complacency and we were laying ourselves wide open to attack. Like Rip Van Winkle, we slumbered without realizing it. But now, finally awakened, we have set out to build our national strength, having learned that force is the only language understood in the Kremlin. We are a long way from being out of danger, but we are making exceptional progress. We are still confronted with the problem of some countries allied with us but continuing to supply Red China with war material. That must be stopped if the free peoples of the world are to prevail.

Even here in this country we are divided as to just how our strength should be used. When the decision was made to stand up to the Communists in Korea there was a shout of "bravo." "It's about time," was the comment everywhere. But a few months later, when reverses set us back, the doubters began to cry that we should never have gone into Korea. We should get out and come back home. Let the other freedom-loving people of the world stand by themselves. Let us violate the pledge made by the United Nations, they said.

If anyone can think of a better way to turn the world over to the Communists than by pulling out of Korea, I'd like to know what it is. The Kremlin expected us to follow the course advocated by the doubters.

All this hesitation and indecision gives just that much more encouragement to the aggressors. We should leave the question of deploying our military forces to military leaders. Check the list: Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Collins, Sherman, Vandenberg, and many others. I have faith in them. They are men who have proved their worth. They led our troops to victory in World War II.

But we cannot stand alone. Other freedom-loving peoples should not expect us to carry the full load. They may not be able to do all that should be done, but if they will do their best, it is all we can ask of them.

I think we should stand up for what we believe to be right and let Russia know that we mean business. We must impress upon her that we are not going to permit further aggressive moves by her satellites. If we warn Russia that we will construe such moves as aggression by the Kremlin itself, then there is a good chance for peace. But backing up and compromising our position on the issues of freedom will only lead to further aggression.

It is indeed fortunate that we are entering this period of great emergency in a strong economic position. When the Korean trouble began last June, all of our major economic groups—agriculture, industry, and labor—were in a comparatively sound and healthy state. Industrial production was high and has since gone even higher, making it possible so far to not only supply our defense needs but at the same time produce an almost normal stream of consumer goods. Unemployment is on the wane.

Agriculture is in an exceptionally strong position. Financially, farmers are in good shape, despite a postwar decline in income, and they have the capital or can obtain it, to finance the increased production that is needed. Several years of intensive conservation programs have greatly strengthened the Nation's farm economy, and the reserves in the soil are bolstered by substantial reserves in our granaries. These grain reserves have been a godsend. They are the direct result of the price-support provisions of the farm program, provisions that have enabled us to store for later use a supply of our basic commodities produced over and above immediate needs.

But we must not take this agricultural strength for granted. You who process meat have a direct stake in the ability of agriculture to produce and to prosper. Not so long ago I had an opportunity to visit the Middle East, and what I saw there made a deep impression on me. Centuries ago the people who lived along the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers undoubtedly felt that nothing could disrupt their agricultural productivity. How wrong they were. And how poor their economy eventually became is apparent throughout the area—and all because of the loss of soil fertility. An area that once supported 25 or 30 million people now gives a bare existence to a scant 3,000,000. Some historians say that ancient Persia could at one time support agriculturally an estimated 105,000,000 people. Now, at most, not over 15,000,000 exist there. Proper conservation practices could have averted this catastrophe.

Surely this experience of an older nation holds a striking lesson for our own people. We cannot take our great heritage of rich soil for granted. It is the basic source of our national strength. The rich and productive soil provides the tremendous quantities of all varieties of food and fiber that are so vital to our existence. We must take all necessary steps to insure its continued productivity.

And right now in our whole agricultural picture, nothing is more important than a continued high level of production of the commodity that you deal in—meat. Meat is the basic ingredient of our Nation's diet. It provides essential quantities of the protein, fat, iron, thiamin, and other important dietary items that make up our high standard of living. Your industry—the packing industry—is a vital link in the chain of our meat supply. It performs the service of processing and moving large quantities of meat on its way to the consumer.

In addition to this, your industry supplies byproducts that are vitally needed, and which today—in this time of emergency—are doubly important. Insulin, for example, the drug that means life to a half million diabetics, comes from meat animals. I was surprised to learn—as even some of you may be—that it requires 20,000 animals to produce 1 pound of this life-saving drug. In addition to insulin, the new healer, ACTH, and scores of other life-giving pharmaceuticals are obtained from various glands of meat animals. From facts such as these, the public can obtain some slight conception of the importance of even this secondary aspect of your industry.

The pituitary glands from 400,000 hogs are required to provide 1 pound of ACTH. Nor does the contribution of the pig, the steer, and the sheep, to our welfare end with a constant flow of these vital miracle drugs from the packer. All of us, in our everyday life, are in almost continuous contact with such well-known products as lard, leather, soaps, gelatin, glycerin, tallow, casings, and fertilizer—which are derived through the packers' operations.

Yes; yours is a great industry—one that has made and will continue to make a great contribution to our country's welfare.

I might add, incidentally, that my own interest in your industry goes back many years. As a young lawyer, in my first trip out through the country, just before World War I, I visited packing plants in Chicago and saw at first hand the operations of these plants as they were carried out at that time. Even before this, as a college student, I worked as a harvest hand in the wheat fields of Oklahoma and other States to the north. I remember my interest in the livestock yards and packing plants at Omaha, and I have a vivid recollection of the large herds of cattle that roamed the ranges of the great cattle States. I have not lost that early and basic interest in this phase of agriculture, and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I find that these early experiences give me a better perspective on the varied problems that concern our great agricultural Nation.

One thing that we have learned over the years is that more income in the hands of more and more people means more and more money spent for food. Meat, perhaps to a greater extent than any other agricultural commodity, is directly affected by increased spending power. People will buy meat and more meat if they have the wherewithal to do so. They are buying larger quantities of meat now than 10 years ago, because buying power has been given to millions who, not too many years back, were among the unemployed. Our national buying power has been spread out, and these new income earners are all potential customers for meat. As they get regular work and regular incomes, the demand for meat increases.

The result of all this is that even an estimated 148 pounds of meat available per capita this year will not be enough to prevent inflationary pressures from developing. This means that production must be raised to even higher levels. What is needed is the maximum production of meat animals consistent with available feed and forage supplies.

Fortunately, we have large reserves of grain, particularly corn, that are providing feed for livestock. But we must look ahead to future years, and statistics show that we are currently using up our feeds at a faster rate than we are producing them. To meet this situation, the United States Department of Agriculture is urging farmers to do everything possible to increase corn production this year, and so provide the increased feed supplies that are essential for our meat, dairy, and poultry industries.

As a further step toward bringing feed supplies into better balance with needed livestock production, we must also do everything possible to husband the feed supplies now on hand. Making the most efficient use of these feed supplies is important to all of us. It is important to you as processors because I know that you would be the first to recognize the hardship of a forced liquidation of livestock, brought on by a feed shortage. We must do everything we can to prevent that.

Because production of livestock is vitally important, nothing should be allowed to interfere with it. I have opposed price ceilings on livestock for this reason. I believe that if price ceilings on agricultural commodities are necessary to fight inflation, they should be imposed as near the final product as possible. Any action taken that would result in lowered meat production will come back to haunt us a hundredfold.

I am basically opposed to ceilings on any raw agricultural product when we need increased production. Increased production in itself will solve the problem in time. That can be attained, provided we do not shackle incentive by restrictive regulations. A price ceiling tends to offset incentive, and should be avoided as long as there are other and safer ways of achieving the same effect in fighting inflation. I might add—for your information—that when the time comes to renew the current defense production authority, I intend to take steps to limit the scope of the act with respect to raw agricultural products.

Naturally some controls are needed in the emergency confronting us. But—and this is basic—we don't want to hamstring our economy with a lot of unnecessary controls. I intend to scrutinize closely all new proposals from bureaucrats whose only answer to a difficult problem is to slap on additional governmental regulations.

As I said, some controls are needed in an emergency. During the last war we had a lot of controls in the livestock and meat industry. They seemed to be needed then, and we imposed rationing, price controls, slaughter controls, set-asides, and subsidies. We ended up, however, with black markets. I hope that we have learned a lesson from the troubles we had during that period.

The situation is quite different this time. For one thing, we are starting from a higher level of production and we are not yet engaged in an all-out mobilization effort. In fact, quite the reverse is true, in that we are trying to preserve our strength in preparation for whatever may lie ahead, whether it be a year from now or 10 years hence.

Slaughter controls have already been announced, and I think this is a good move. Such controls, if properly handled, will keep fly-by-night operators out of business. It is essential, too, that consumers everywhere get fair and proper distribution of meat, and slaughter controls are one of the methods that, if properly administered, can help assure this. Furthermore, these controls are designed to keep slaughtering within legitimate channels, so that all of the important byproducts will be recovered and utilized. In substance, I feel that we need some control measures to protect consumers and the economy as a whole, but my underlying philosophy here is: Let us not have any unnecessary regimentation.

Your own industry can help a lot in this situation by instituting a bit of self-policing. For example: if you refuse to take undue advantage of a favorable price situation that will work hardship on others—you may be able to make the case against price ceilings more acceptable to the average consumer. You in the meat industry are in the middle of this problem. Your product has triggered much of the public support for price controls. I'm not going to say that the price rises that brought the demand for controls were solely due to actions of the meat industry, but I do feel that more self-restraint at the proper time might have headed off some of this price pressure.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been making a study of various food prices. We have gathered some interesting material from figures obtained from retailers and from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Such statistics as these, for example: Between the latter part of January 1950 and January, 1951, the price of good grade steers (now called choice) increased about 17 percent at Chicago. During the same period, the wholesale price of comparable carcass beef increased 20 percent, and the average price of several retail cuts went up 31 percent in the Washington area and 28 percent in eight representative cities.

During the same period, the part the farmer received of the consumer's dollar spent for beef dropped from 75 cents in January 1950 to 71 cents in January 1951. I might add that material gathered in other fields snowed somewhat the same conclusions.

Along this line I hope that the large packers will not take advantage of the present situation and do anything which would serve to drive smaller packers to the wall. This national crisis must not be used as an opportunity for the big packer to put the small packers out of business. This would be most unfortunate for the welfare of our country. The smaller independent businesses are essential to our free economy. One thing that we all must watch out for is the danger of too much concentration on big operations, whether they are in big business or in big government. There are inherent evils in both. Efficiency, as reflected in big business, can be very attractive, but it can also be dangerous in a democracy such as ours.

We have seen the danger signs of large-scale operations in agricultural production. We have seen communities where the small farmer has been squeezed by mammoth commercial operations, and I want to say that I am in full agreement with statements recently made by the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants regarding the need for more positive help in maintaining the family-sized farm as a fundamental part of American agriculture.

One hundred years ago about 85 percent of the people in this country tilled the soil, while the remainder lived in towns and cities and were occupied in industry. Today the reverse is true. And this trend away from the farms continues. In part, this movement into the cities is inevitable, the natural result of our tremendous industrial development in the last hundred years. But we must see to it that the industrial growth that has drawn so many of our farm youth to the cities does not eventually take over American farming. Our farms and our farm families are the primary bulwarks of our democracy, and we must insure them against extinction. The tradition of the American farm is part and parcel of the spirit of America.

Back before the First World War my late father was a sugarcane planter. His operations supported many families. In order to operate the farm, about 125 laborers were required during harvest time. He needed 12 wagons with 4 mules each and a large number of cane loaders. Today my brother and a cousin operate this same farm, with 3 tractors and 12 workers. One harvesting machine, operated by 2 men, takes the place of 80 laborers, and 1 cane loading machine, run by 1 man, does the work of 16 cane loaders. It cost my father, before World War I, about a dollar per ton to harvest and load cane on cars, in contrast to the 85 cents per ton that present operations require.

I have a farm of my own, but it is too small to operate mechanically. I grow some sugarcane, and my cost of harvesting is more than double that of my brother. Obviously, I am at a disadvantage to compete with him in these operations. But nonetheless, there must continue to be a place for small operators in American agriculture. The same truth applies, I am sure, to the small packer.

I mentioned the fact earlier that agriculture was in a strong position when this emergency developed. This means much to the Nation, and we should all realize that this didn't happen just by accident. Sound farm programs through the years have built this strength. Certainly it means a lot to your industry, which is so directly dependent on productive agriculture.

I sponsored the basic farm legislation which made our present farm programs possible. I am very proud of that fact. In 1937, when I first came to the Senate, my first major assignment was to serve on a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, created for the purpose of holding hearings pertaining to our farm problem. It will be recalled that the basic act of 1933 had been declared unconstitutional. In drafting legislation to replace the 1933 act, we decided on a new technique. Instead of having farm leaders come to committee hearings in Washington, we decided to take the hearings to the farmers throughout the country. The hearings that we held at these grass roots formed the basis of our present program.

Ten years later, I was again selected, with others, to make a further study to determine how the program had worked and whether it needed improvement. It was my privilege to again hear as witnesses many of the farmers who had testified 10 years previously, and it warmed my heart to hear them say, almost in unison, everywhere we went, "Senators, we are satisfied with what we have. Unless you can give us something better, let well enough alone."

There has been too much loose talk lately about farmers having an unfair advantage in current defense laws and otherwise. That farmers have an unfair advantage is just not a fact. The farmer is entitled, like everyone else, to a fair price for his products. If prices for certain of his commodities are forced to stay below a fair parity figure, we are inviting trouble in the form of an unbalanced or dislocated production later on. Net income of farm operators dropped from almost $18,000,000,000 in 1947 to sixteen and five-tenths billion in 1948, to fourteen billion in 1949, and to thirteen billion in 1950.

The farmer is asking only for a fair break. In the period just before the Korean attack, no other major segment of our economy went through so severe an economic set-back as did agriculture. Both corporate profits after taxes and hourly earnings of factory workers are well above the 1947 level. Corporate profits, after a small decline, have now climbed up to new records and are running 32 percent above the 1947 figure. Similarly, hourly earnings of factory workers in 1950 were 18 percent above the 1947 level. And yet the farmers, as certain interests would have you believe, is the villain. It just isn't so.

We must continue a sound price-support structure for agriculture. I, for one, will have no part of the thinking that this is the time to do away with these farm programs, or to give up the parity-price concept of fair returns.

The Defense Production Act contains a provision that ceiling prices cannot be placed on agricultural commodities at a level below parity, or below the prices farmers received during the month before Korea—whichever is higher. There have been suggestions that this provision should be removed or modified. There have also been suggestions that the parity level should be frozen as of some definite date, and not permit any adjustments after that date no matter how much prices might increase for the things a farmer has to buy.

In my opinion, it would be a fatal mistake to destroy the parity principle in that way. Parity is the measuring stick of fair returns for farmers. It is the assurance that he can pay his costs of production and stay in business, producing at the high levels demanded by the emergency.

The provisions in the present Defense Production Act are almost identical to those under which OPA operated during World War II. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, provided that no maximum prices should be established at less than the higher of parity or prices in a base period. Let us not get stampeded into giving up agriculture's basic protections. The whole economy will suffer if we do. And as a matter of fact, it has been estimated that the cost of living index would go up less than 2 percent if all farm commodities now below parity were automatically brought up to the parity level.

I understand that you men in the meat packing business are still in relatively good shape with regard to materials and facilities needed to continue your operations. Reports show that few requests have been received from your industry for assistance from the National Production Authority. Apparently you have not been having as much trouble as some other industries.

We know, however, that shortages of certain critical materials you use can be expected as we move further along with the national mobilization effort. And we know that you must have repair and replacement parts for grinders, boilers, motors, canning lines—and all the other equipment of a modern packing plant. Shortages of steel—and particularly stainless steel—probably will be felt first.

To prepare for what may lie ahead, the Department of Agriculture has cooperated with the American Meat Institute in working out the requirements of the packing industry for the rest of this year and the first part of 1952. These requirements are presented to the National Production Authority.

The Department of Agriculture acts as a claimant before NPA and other Government agencies, supporting the requests of farmers and the food industry for the scarce items they must have. It does everything it can to head off shortages. It will not be possible, however, for this claimant work to be fully effective until a program similar to the controlled-materials plan of World War II is in operation. Such a plan, which I understand NPA expects to have in effect this summer, will make possible definite allocations of scarce basic materials for various users—including food processors.

Meanwhile, Department officials who are representing agriculture and its related industries before NPA report that they are receiving full cooperation. A good illustration is the recent amendment to the tin order (NPA M-25) which makes tin cans available to perishable-food processors. Under this amendment, cans will be available in unlimited amounts—or at 100 percent of the base period—for almost all canned meats except prepared chicken and scrapple. We must keep driving for this sort of consideration for the vital food production and processing industries.

The emergency we face is very real and very serious. Only the future will reveal the extent to which we will have to expand our economy and tighten our belts on the civilian front. We can and we will win the struggle, however long it may require, if only we protect and encourage our private enterprise system, and avoid throwing needless bureaucratic road blocks in its way. We should provide Government help where it is appropriate and needed, but we must impose only those controls which are necessary.

It is essential that we rely primarily on the democratic system of free enterprise that has made us the greatest productive force on earth.

America's productive might should give any would-be aggressor pause to stop and think. Let us hope that we will not be compelled to expend our energies and our lifeblood in the fighting of another cruel world war. Instead, let us continue to protect, develop, and conserve our resources, and at the same time expand our industrial might. Let us make these United States a better place in which to live, and a source from which the light of freedom can shine undimmed throughout the world.

Proposed Alliance Between Democrats of the South and Republicans of the North

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio interview of myself by Bert Andrews, of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. This is Bert Andrews, reporting from Washington.

A new investigation is about to get under way. It will begin in Jackson, Miss., on Monday, and it will deal with charges that Federal jobs were sold pretty freely there—to people who had the money to pay for them. Some of the jobs were in the new price-control set-up. Some of them were post-office jobs. With me tonight is a member of the subcommittee that will do the investigating—a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. He is Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota. We're going to talk about the up-coming investigation—and about Senator MUNDT's belief that a true alliance ought to be formed among Republicans—and among Democrats who think the way Republicans do. First, Senator MUNDT, what do you think will be turned up in the hearings that will begin in Jackson, Miss., on Monday?

Senator MUNDT. First, I'd like to point out, Mr. Andrews, that none of the members of the Mississippi delegation in the Senate and the House are involved in any way in these charges. As a matter of fact, all the members of the delegation have been very helpful in bringing evidence before our committee and in suggesting leads for our field investigators in Mississippi—so the investigators could dig out the facts. What we have here is an outgrowth of the presidential campaign of 1948 in which Mississippi cast its electoral votes for the Dixiecrats. That naturally didn't set too well with the Truman administration and the Democratic National Committee here in Washington.

Mr. ANDREWS. And as I understand it, one of the results was that the national Democratic administration did what could be expected in such a case—they decided to cut patronage off from the Dixiecrats.

Senator MUNDT. Yes; and the Administration established a State Democratic patronage committee of its own selection down in Mississippi, with headquarters in Jackson. It wasn't long before rumors began to fly that jobs were being handed out—at a price. And it wasn't much longer before those rumors began to solidify into facts that seemed to warrant a thorough investigation. Our committee first heard of it when Senator EASTLAND and Senator STENNIS—both of Mississippi—put some evidence before us in executive session. They placed evidence and affidavits before us, citing specific cases where jobs had been offered for sale. This evidence came from individuals who—as good honest citizens—refused to try to buy Federal jobs.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can you tell me how many examples of that practice were supplied to the committee, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I presume the initial evidence furnished by the two Senators from Mississippi related to 10 or a dozen cases. Since then, our field investigators have discovered quite a number of additional cases. All of this will be made a matter of public record at the hearings which will open in Jackson on Monday.

Mr. ANDREWS. You emphasized, Senator MUNDT, that the Mississippi Senators and Congressmen were not involved in this matter in any way. But I know enough about politics to assume that any matters dealing with Federal patronage stem in some way from somebody in Washington. Do you have any idea who in Washington may be mentioned in the hearings?

Senator MUNDT. Keep in mind, Mr. Andrews, that the spadework thus far has been done by investigators for the committee, as is the custom in such inquiries. Senator HOEY, of North Carolina, and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and I haven't had the opportunity of studying the field reports as yet. We'll go over them when we get to Jackson—go over with the chief investigator, Mr. Flanigan. Until then, I can only guess as to what names will come out. But I would imagine that we'll run into some of the usual influence peddlers in Washington who are willing to sell their country short even when our boys are dying in Korea. I'll tell you, Mr. Andrews, that if we don't clean up some of these messes our way of life may be destroyed by these slimy creatures who undermine it from within. I think their practices are pretty sickening and before these investigations are over I expect some of them to land where they belong—in the Federal penitentiary.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, since you're going to head south, Senator MUNDT, let's talk about another subject on which you have expressed some interesting ideas. I mean your suggestion for an alliance between the Republican Party and the Democrats who shy away from the regular Democratic Party. Do you think it's a really workable idea?

Senator MUNDT. I have no doubt at all that the idea of forming a formal alliance between the Democrats of the South who believe in States rights and oppose state socialism—and the Republicans of the North—is feasible. In the main, northern Republicans share many of the basic political and economic convictions of the antiadministration southern Democrats. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that in the Congress—for the past 15 years—southern Democrats and Republicans have joined together time after time to defeat the major encroachments of big government and many of the moves that would take us down the road to socialism.

Mr. ANDREWS. What would be the primary purpose of this working alliance, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. It's primary objective would be to develop a political formula by which the voters who support these Members of Congress who think alike and who vote alike, regardless of party lines, could vote for the same candidate for President. That would give us an administration in the White House and a Congress which could work in harmony for the preservation of private enterprise and States' rights in this country.

Mr. ANDREWS. We were speaking, Senator MUNDT, of your belief that an alliance of Republicans and southern Democrats could be made to work, and could nominate and elect a President of its own choice in 1952. Let's look at it concretely—what is the first step that would have to be taken?

Senator MUNDT. Well, Mr. Andrews, here is what I have proposed in a great many speeches in the South and in several talks in New York, Pennsylvania, and other northern points. First, I think it is a perfectly safe political prediction that the next national Democratic convention will either nominate President Truman for another term or somebody to the left of him—somebody even more inclined to favor socialistic enterprises, the break-down of State's rights, and the build-up of an all-powerful Federal Government. I base this prediction on the fact that those controlling the Democratic Party today have found it politically profitable and successful to write a platform and to nominate a candidate that will appeal to the pressure groups and the big city Democratic machine organizations. They simply ignore the desires and the ideals of southern Democrats in the belief that southern voters will continue to support the Democratic Party regardless.

Mr. ANDREWS. But that isn't quite responsive to my question, Senator MUNDT. My question is: What is the first step that would have to be taken to set up an alliance such as you suggest?

Senator MUNDT. Let me answer that question directly, Mr. Andrews. The first step would be a sort of declaration of independence by southern Democrats such as they engaged in at the 1948 National Democratic Convention. If President Truman or somebody to the left of him is nominated in 1952, I would expect many of them to walk out of the Democratic Convention. That would set the stage for the operation of the alliance I have in mind. I would suggest that a group of southern leaders would then send a committee to the Republican Convention—which, I hope, this time will be held after the Democratic Convention—and suggest a panel of candidates whom they would be willing to support. Candidates recommended from among both Republican and Democratic prospects.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does that mean that holding the Republican Convention after the Democratic Convention is an essential part of your proposal, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Not exactly, Mr. Andrews. I think it would be helpful since it would permit the dissatisfied and unhappy delegates from the Democratic Convention to have a voice in suggesting a panel of acceptable candidates. However, should the Republican National Committee insist on holding its convention first once more, a preconvention caucus or meeting could still be arranged with representatives of the Southern group because by convention time it should be clear as to just what type of Democratic Presidential candidate is likely to emerge from the convention.

Mr. ANDREWS. You spoke of dissatisfied and unhappy Democratic delegates and you were talking about the coming conventions. So you sound as though you were pretty sure that there will be some such Democrats who will be unhappy after their convention and completely dissatisfied. Are you suggesting that they ought to declare themselves now?

Senator MUNDT. Yes; that would certainly be helpful, Mr. Andrews. As a matter of

fact, Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, has rather clearly indicated his dissatisfaction with the trends of the Truman administration. Obviously, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has done the same. I am hopeful that before convention time a considerable number of courageous leading Democrats from the South—both in and out of public life—will declare themselves as being willing to help formulate an effective alliance between Democrats with their point of view and the Republican effort to stop today's mad march toward the all-powerful state and national socialism.

Mr. ANDREWS. You say you are hopeful, Senator MUNDT; have you received any evidence that such hopes might be realized?

Senator MUNDT. Indeed, I have, Mr. Andrews. My office has received over 500 letters from 39 different States. Fully 360 of these letters have come from the South, and I am frank to say I have been both surpised and gratified at the great support that this movement has in the States south of the Mason and Dixon's line. But as a former reporter, myself, Mr. Andrews, let me throw that question back at you. You have a Democrat on your program one week and a Republican on the next week. You are completely fair in alternating them and in your questions. Do you believe that all Democrats are Truman Democrats or have you detected signs of dissatisfaction among those that you have interviewed?

Mr. ANDREWS. After all, Senator MUNDT, I do the questioning and let the listeners make up their minds. However, since you asked me I would say that there are both Truman and anti-Truman Democrats just as there are pro-Taft and anti-Taft Republicans.

For one final question, Senator MUNDT—do you, as a Republican, really believe that there is danger of this country going down the road to socialism as you said earlier or are you just talking as a Republican?

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Andrews, I am completely serious and sincere in my fear that unless we can elect a national administration that will respect individual enterprise and States rights we may end up with a Socialist government just as was the experience of Great Britain. Britain—as the evidence clearly shows—went Socialist because in that country those opposing it were divided into two different groups just as is the case in America today. For example, had there been no Liberal Party candidates in the field in the last British election, the records show that the anti-Socialists would have elected a majority of 29 in the House of Commons. If that had happened, Britain would never have nationalized steel and, as you know, the nationalization of steel is really the final step to socialism in an economy based on modern industry.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 14, 1951, Washington celebrates with another of its famous Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners.

The following quotation from Thomas Jefferson is most appropriate today:

Reading, reflection, and time have convinced me that the interests of society require the observation of those moral precepts only in which all religions agree (for all forbid us to murder, steal, plunder, or bear false witness), and that we should not intermeddle with the particular dogmas in which all religions differ, and which are totally unconnected with morality. In all of them we see good men, and as many in one as another. The varieties in the structure and action of the human mind as in those of the body, are the work of our Creator, against which it cannot be a religious duty to erect the standard of uniformity.

Assignment of American Ground Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address on the subject It's Not War; It's Not Peace, delivered by me at a meeting of the League of Women Voters in New York City on Saturday, April 14, 1951, and broadcast over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week's action by the United States Senate in finally determining Senate policy with regard to the assignment of American ground troops to Europe would demonstrate that the title of my remarks today was a potent factor in the Senate's deliberations.

One group in the Senate has seemed to argue that we are at peace because no declaration of war has been made by the Congress and that, regardless of any amount of fighting which may be involved, no condition of war can exist until a formal declaration to that effect has been made by the Congress. Another Senate group has seemed to argue just as ardently that war itself is a condition and a fact and that when this condition and this fact exist, there is war, regardless of congressional attitude concerning the matter.

Today we seem to be at peace only to the extent that Soviet Russia has not yet seen fit to make a direct attack upon us or our allies, and that a declaration of war itself has not been made by ourselves or by our allies or by Soviet Russia. In every other way, the evidence points strongly to an actual condition of war at the present time.

Surely the violent fighting which has occurred in Korea and the heavy casualties we have suffered there over the past 9 or 10 months cannot be construed by any stretch of the imagination to be acts of peace. Whether or not the United States forces are fighting there as a component part of the forces of the United Nations in a so-called police action, they are fighting, nevertheless, in our own interest and for our own defense against the armies of Red China. Very large numbers of Americans—in the air, on the sea, and on the land—have been and are participating in a growing war for the defense of ourselves and the protection of our free institutions, as well as for the defense of other free nations and free institutions everywhere. The fact that, as a member of the United Nations, we are thus participating in war, makes war itself no less a reality.

In the European theater, Russian strategy thus far has not called for a hot war. The difference between a cold war and a hot war is merely a difference of degree and severity. The motive, the intent, the purpose, and the objective in both types of war are identical.

The very fact that, during the period since the close of World War II, Soviet Russia has been devoting her chief effort to the building of armament and the raising of armies, while the free world has been disarming and struggling to rehabilitate its peoples and to restore its economies as preliminary steps to the restoration of peace and freedom everywhere, is indicative of the sinster purpose of the Soviets. The very fact that, during this same period, through intrigue and subterfuge and infiltration, Soviet Russia has been pursuing a course of aggression and conquest among her neighbors, provides further conclusive evidence of her diabolical intent. The very fact that, by obstructive tactics, Soviet Russia has conspired with her satellites to make the United Nations virtually impotent and to frustrate its every effort to preserve peace and to establish security against aggression and attack for every nation on earth, offers undeniable proof that Soviet Russia intends to conquer the world and to destroy all freedom and to employ to this end every effective device at her command.

And so, for the sake of self-preservation, the free nations of the world have been forced to take defensive action. The Marshall plan was undertaken and the North Atlantic Treaty was effectuated. And now, under the terms of that treaty, the United States is in the process of implementing it by sending additional Armed Forces to Europe.

There may be some who regard these activities as belonging to a regime of peace, but in a very real sense they are a planned maneuver against the armed attack which threatens. There may be some who regard these military operations as belonging to the ways of peace and I wish that this were so, and I pray that it may be so. But no longer can there be doubt that these defensive maneuvers are calculated to provide an effective fighting resistance if and when the freedom and independence of our European allies are challenged by Soviet Russia through the medium of armed conflict.

As long as there remains in the world an aggressor as powerful and ruthless as is Soviet Russia, there can be no peace. Periods of comparative calm, when there is little or no fighting, must not delude us and our allies into thinking that peace has come. Indeed, such a delusion can be our greatest danger as we proceed in preparations for defense. This delusion can be the Achilles' heel of the western world. More than anything else, it can cause our ultimate downfall and destruction.

This year and the years immediately ahead are likely to be for America among the most trying years in our whole history. As a free people, we hate regimentation and controls in any form and under any conditions. They are wholly contrary to American life in time of peace, but they are essential to American life in time of war, and they are essential to American life right now if we are to be able to avoid all-out war or if, not avoiding all-out war, we are to be able to survive it when it may come.

I realize, of course, that a substantial number of the American people are most reluctant to entrust President Truman with the powers which are essential to the Presidency if our preparedness program is to be completed on time. Lack of a definite foreign policy—in fact, almost no foreign policy at all—and unsavory disclosures concerning State Department personnel and activities have occasioned a public distrust, which borders on outright hostility, toward those responsible for our foreign affairs. The confusion, incompetence, and questionable practices, which so patently exist in certain

administrative agencies, have served further to reduce public confidence in the administration. The lack of leadership on the part of the President himself and his personal shortcomings, including his unfortunate displays of temper, have still further aggravated the situation. His action in removing General MacArthur from the position of supreme commander in the Far East is the latest incident to cause public indignation toward Mr. Truman.

The President's defiance of the Congress has resulted in the worst kind of relationship between our national legislative body and our Chief Executive. This impasse has served to intensify the growing demand that the Congress take over the direction and operation of the Government.

I can well appreciate the provocation for this attitude, but I must point out that, even were the Congress able—legally and constitutionally—to grasp such control and to assume such responsibility, it is not geared to do so. Five hundred and thirty-one persons, influenced by varying pressures and local interests, can never effectively direct or administer functions of Government which require immediate decision and swift action. The fact that the Senate alone has just consumed 87 days—almost 3 months, in reaching a conclusion regarding the matter of congressional policy with respect to the assignment of American ground troops to Europe, is compelling evidence of the inability of a legislative body to act in an executive capacity.

Recognizing, as I do, the weaknesses of the President and his administration, but recognizing, most of all, the grave crisis which now confronts the country, I believe that the Congress should insist upon exercising its basic function as the over-all policymaking body in those fields of activity which constitutionally are within the domain of the Congress. At the same time, I believe that the Congress should not seek to usurp the prerogatives of the Chief Executive; rather, it should endeavor to cooperate with him and to support him in every reasonable and necessary effort affecting the safety and defense of the country. The President's refusal to reciprocate can never excuse the Congress from failing to do its share in its relationship with him. Angry as many of us may be because of overt actions by the President, we cannot afford to lose our perspective. Only through reason and common sense and rationality can the Nation, in the present circumstances, prepare to meet whatever eventuality may impend.

So I say to you today: Call present conditions what we will—peace or war—we must prepare for the worst. And we must have the courage and faith and conviction to continue in this preparation and defense as long as we and the free world are threatened by powerful forces of aggression. Upon our capacity temporarily to endure privation and sacrifice depends our ultimate survival as a free people. May God grant to us the strength of character to do the job that must be done.

Challenge to Mr. Truman To Follow MacArthur's Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last fall, as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, I introduced Hon. Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, for a radio address. In asking that the address be printed in the RECORD at this time, I wish to point out that in this concise, straightforward address, delivered 6 months ago, Governor Stassen brilliantly analyzed with remarkable accuracy the mistakes and blunders of the foreign policy of this administration in the Far East, and warned of the dangers toward which those mistakes were leading us, resulting, as they have, in the high-handed dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

This address constitutes a prophetic, concise, and specific evaluation of the circumstances that have brought our far eastern foreign policy to its current tragic crisis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STASSEN'S BROADCAST CHALLENGING TRUMAN TO FOLLOW MACARTHUR'S ADVICE ON ASIA

My fellow citizens, President Truman has just returned from a meeting with General MacArthur at Wake Island. I am glad he went. I am glad the conference took place. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is one of the greatest generals in all of history. He has demonstrated over and over again his brilliant knowledge of military strategy, his magnificent execution of well-conceived plans, his understanding of all related factors of people and of materials and of terrain, and his inspiring courage in the face of danger.

Any impartial observer must agree that General MacArthur is the best informed American with regard to the entire Asiatic situation.

It is very clear that if President Truman had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 5 years ago China would not today be under Communist leadership.

If President Truman had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 4 years ago, the Communists would not today be worried about what would happen next in Burma.

If the President had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 2 years ago, the United States would not today be reading casualty lists of the youth of our Nation killed and wounded in Korea.

If the President had asked and accepted General MacArthur's advice 1 year ago the United Nations would not now be concerned about what to do next in Formosa.

SOME KEY QUESTIONS

Therefore, I believe that the key question on the lips of the American people, the direct question which they would ask President Truman as he reports to the Nation tomorrow night is this:

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice in Asia and in the western Pacific?"

To be more exact, the people ask of the President:

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice as to the United States position in the United Nations with reference to Communist China?

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice as to the United States position in the United Nations on the question of Formosa?"

"Will you now accept General MacArthur's advice as to the United States' position with reference to Indochina?

And in view of the fact that General MacArthur has been right through these years, and the President and the State Department have been wrong, I believe the people of America are further entitled to say to the President that if he is not willing to commit himself at this late date to follow General MacArthur's advice, then he should explain in detail to the people why not.

The courageous fighting and heavy sacrifice of our men in uniform, and the brilliant leadership of General MacArthur, have combined to pull the United States and the United Nations out of a very bad hole in Korea through a hard-won military victory. They have redeemed in blood the postwar blunders of diplomacy in this one spot in the world.

There are a large number of other blunders in Asia which are still unredeemed. The big question of the future is whether able leadership and competent advice is to have a chance to redeem them before they too must be redeemed at such high cost and in the most precious of all payments—American blood.

CITES OPPOSITION

A review of the 5-year postwar record in the far Pacific sounds almost unbelievable today. Time after time, since that dramatic ceremony on the U. S. S. *Missouri* ending the Japanese War, the administration and the State Department have endeavored to undermine and weaken General MacArthur.

In the fighting he had command of all the forces in that far Pacific area. But after his forces won the victory, China was promptly taken out of his jurisdiction, Formosa was taken out of his jurisdiction, the Philippines were taken out of his jurisdiction, Indochina was taken out of his jurisdiction, and even Korea was taken away from his supervision.

In Japan itself, in instance after instance, the State Department tried to weaken and confuse and depreciate his efforts. On the twentieth day of September 1945, a direct and outrageous effort was made to slap him down when it was stated by the then Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, that General MacArthur was wrong to announce policy with regard to occupation troops and that the Truman administration and not the Occupation Command in Japan would decide the policies.

In December 1945, he was not consulted about the Moscow Conference on Far East decisions.

Then as recently as August 26, 1950, he was summarily told to withdraw a message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars which sincerely stated his views of the United States military strategy in the Pacific in response to a request.

Great soldier and statesman and patriot that he is, he overlooked all of these things without ever complaining. He did the greatest occupation job in all history. He successfully administered the rebuilding of a nation of 70 million people in a brief space of 5 years, and won the friendship of the Japanese population notwithstanding the terrific defeat which he himself had supervised in World War II.

ASSIGNMENT IN KOREA

With this same great spirit he accepted the sudden assignment to defend Korea, an assignment which up to the time of that order on June 27, 1950, after the fighting had started, had not been in his jurisdiction and had not been his responsibility. In spite of the weakened and partially armed units which were available due to the mismanagement of affairs in Washington, he rapidly brought together a magnificent fighting force which is winning the victories in Korea.

It is indeed strange that in these five long years, the Commander in Chief has never invited this great general to come to the National Capital to there receive the recognition and acclaim of a grateful Nation.

But be all that as it may, in the very critical dangerous world situation now confronting America, I am pleased that at long last

the President has talked to General MacArthur.

If the President will now appoint him supreme commander of American military interests in all of the Asiatic-Pacific area, we will acclaim the President for that action.

We will acclaim him for that action just as we have in the past commended him for the appointment of Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the Marshall plan, under bipartisan supervision; and just as we have in the past commended him for the appointment of George C. Marshall as Secretary of Defense, with bipartisan approval.

Such action on his part would result in strong, bipartisan support in Asia and the backing of all of the people of America. If the President will do this I believe the United Nations Assembly would soon appoint General MacArthur as the United Nations supreme commander of all of their military forces and strategy in the Asiatic-Pacific area.

A MAC ARTHUR PLAN

From such action there would rapidly develop a MacArthur plan for Asia, which would do for that vast and important area and for its billions of peoples the parallel of what the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact have done for Europe.

Such action would immediately make it clear to the Communist rulers in the Russian Kremlin that they could no longer look to profit from the blunders and the weakness of American policy in Asia.

Such action would do more to stop the Soviet Union's drift toward war and to lead to genuine moves by Premier Stalin and the Politburo for a just world peace than any other single move that could now be made.

Under our political system, no one person can really speak for the Republican Party when it is in the minority in the National Government. But I am confident that I can speak for the Republican Party in this one thing. If the President will place General MacArthur in supreme command of American military policy and interests in all of the Asiatic-Pacific area and will follow his advice, the President will have the united enthusiastic backing of the Republican Party in this action.

But if, on the other hand, the President returns from this long and dramatic journey, occurring as it does on the eve of the senatorial and congressional elections, and if he by careful staging speaks from one of the crucial States in that election—California—and if he poses for numerous photographs with his personal candidates for the senatorship and governship of California—and if he says nothing more to the people than vague talk about Korea and defense which could have been written up before he ever left Washington, and if he talks about agreement with General MacArthur over Korea and Japan in matters in which there could be no real disagreement as the United Nations has already acted in Korea, and General MacArthur is already in military command in Korea and Japan, and if he glosses over or evades these key and difficult and dangerous Asiatic policy questions of China and Formosa and Asiatic communism on which he and America desperately need General MacArthur's advice and leadership, then the Republicans and the American people will conclude that the flight to the Pacific has not been a sincere statesmanlike journey, but rather a sinful political escapade.

There is a very disquieting report here in Washington. It is a report that this flight to the far Pacific did not arise from any conferences with the President's diplomatic or defense officials. The report is that it arose in a conference with his Missouri political friends during the evening hour on board his yacht in Chesapeake Bay.

WHERE THE CREDIT WENT

According to this report one of his political friends told the President that his senatorial and congressional candidates were in a bad way throughout the country because of the feeling that things had been badly handled in Washington, and that the people were giving all of the credit for the Korean victories to General MacArthur and the marines and the Army and the Air Force and the Navy.

This adviser said, according to the report, that the President had to share the headlines with General MacArthur, and that the way to do this was to fly out to see the general, and then to translate that into political assistance for the embattled candidates for Senators and Congressmen in the key States before the November 7 election.

The report continues that this political observer pointed out that the great strength of the unusually able group of Republican candidates who are before the people in the key States of the Nation, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in New York, Governor Taft in Ohio, James Duff in Pennsylvania, Eugene Millikin in Colorado, John Lodge and Prescott Bush and Joseph Talbot in Connecticut, Governor Youngdahl in Minnesota, Governor Kelly in Michigan, Walter Kohler in Wisconsin, Val Peterson in Nebraska, Joseph Martin and his associates, and a host of others, including many young veterans of World War II as new candidates, could well lead to a devastating defeat on November 7.

DANGER AT HOME

According to this report the subject of the conversation on the President's yacht when the decision to make the MacArthur flight occurred was not the dangers to our country of an Asiatic Communist advance, but rather the danger to the President's political friends of an American Republican advance.

The only way to judge whether this report is true, or whether the President is sincerely endeavoring to work out Asiatic policy in his visit to General MacArthur, will be to observe the circumstances and actions of his journey and of his conduct after he returns.

If this whole effort is an attempt to bask in the luster of this great military leader and his hard-fighting, deeply wounded but victorious forces, and then to reflect a portion of that luster to the political advantage of candidates who have themselves in many instances opposed everything that the general and his fighting forces stand for, then the Nation will say to its President—for shame.

DISQUIETING CIRCUMSTANCES

There are a number of circumstances that are rather disquieting to the people in connection with the trip.

The fact that General acArthur did not know about it until after it was announced sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that the top officials of defense and diplomacy did not know about it until after it was decided sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that one of the largest airplanes built is used to take along a full load of motion picture cameramen and photographers and writers sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that he talks about the unification of the services and their joint operation under General MacArthur without acknowledging that the Unification Act was passed by the Eightieth Congress with a Republican majority sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

The fact that the report to the people upon return is to be made from the hot election State of California rather than the nonelection Capital at Washington sounds more like politics and less like statesmanship.

It is a fact that the candidate for Senator in California whom he will be supporting, and with whom the Vice President was extensively photographed as they paraded around Los Angeles last Monday, voted against many of the key laws which have been passed to strengthen the fight for freedom and against communism.

This candidate voted against the law which now permits the key defense departments to discharge poor security risks, even though the law passed overwhelmingly with solid Republican votes and considerable Democratic votes for a total of 327 to 14.

This candidate also voted against the program for aid to Greece and Turkey in their fight against Communists.

This candidate voted against selective service in 1948, without which General MacArthur would have had even fewer forces at his command for the Korean fight.

This candidate voted against the appropriation for the Un-American Activities Committee as recently as March 23, 1950, even though it passed with a solid vote of Republicans and a substantial vote of Democrats.

HE FORECASTS EVENTS

If it is politics that he is playing, then it will further show itself in appearances on one pretext or another in Illinois and Ohio and Connecticut and Pennsylvania and New York and Indiana.

If it is politics that he is playing then in these last days before election we can look for additional dramatic moves, such as the appointment of Chief Justice Vinson as Secretary of State and the appointment of Dean Acheson as Chief Justice; such as the announcement of intention to appoint General Eisenhower as commander of Western Europe, but without actually making the appointment; and such as the announcement of the intention to roll back the consumer prices, but without actually starting the roll-back, knowing full well that it is too late to effectively carry out a roll-back.

A soldier's mother said to me that as she thinks of the tragic price we have paid in Korea for the errors at the end of World War II, and thinks of the sadness and anxiety in so many homes in America tonight, and thinks of the young lives that have been disrupted or destroyed, she has a sense of indignation at the circus celebration atmosphere of this multi-camera escorted journey of the President.

A young veteran commented to me that the President is riding his airplane all the way to Wake Island in order that he can ride General MacArthur's coattail all the way to November 7. I sincerely hope this comment proves to be unfounded. I say that with deep feeling, because what our America and the cause of freedom needs in these weeks and months immediatey ahead is not clever politics, but, rather, great statesmanship.

AWAITS THE REPORT

The President, and only the President, can appoint the top leadership in the broad strategic commands in Western Europe and in Asia that are so essential to our future security and the prospects of freedom.

The President, and only the President, can clean up the all-time record high of corruption and of gambling and of vice sordidly peeping out into view in the great cities of our country by taking forthright action of the type that cleaned out the Capone gang and other hoodlums of the prohibition period.

Let me close with this solemn pledge: That whatsoever may be the strength of the Republicans after the people make their decision on November 7, we will support the President in every measure of rearming and in every measure for economic stability and in every measure of world policy in which

he leads in a frank and open and American manner.

As an earnest of that we can point to the remarkable record in the Eightieth Congress with its Republican majority and its many key decisions under Senator VANDENBERG'S leadership; and before that to the constructive service of our Republican Party in strengthening the Dumbarton Oaks Charter and developing the clauses which in recent years have saved the United Nations from veto strangulation; and before that in steadfastly backing lend-lease and similar steps in the fight for freedom in the 1940's.

My fellow citizens, we await the report of the President.

Better Medical Care in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a most illuminating address delivered by Dr. Norman H. Gemmill to his colleagues of the York County, Pa., Medical Society. In his address Dr. Gemmill asks his fellow doctors to take the same constructive approach to winning the good will of the American people that I have urged on the American Medical Association for many years. Specifically, he points out that if the doctors themselves were to undertake first to discover and then to meet the real needs of the American people for better medical care, they "would not be expending the millions of dollars that they are today, through lobbying and the channels of advertisement, in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address, as reported in the columns of the Gazette and Daily of York, Pa., for March 15, 1951, together with a follow-up editorial on Dr. Gemmill's remarks, which appeared in the same paper on Friday, March 23, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily of March 15, 1951]

PHYSICIANS REBUKED FOR IGNORING PUBLIC, AND EXCESSIVE FEES

(Dr. Norman H. Gemmill, retiring president of York County Medical Society, tells colleagues some doctors charge excessive fees and are indifferent to night and Thursday calls. If profession was not in "public disfavor" it would not be spending millions through lobbying and advertising "in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public," Dr. Gemmill declares.)

Excessive cost of medical care, physicians' indifference to night and Thursday calls and to "good doctor-patient relationship" draw criticism in the parting message of Dr. Norman H. Gemmill, Stewartstown, retiring president of the York County Medical Society.

The medical profession, Dr. Gemmill declared, is in public disfavor for these reasons.

"If we were not held in this public disfavor at the present time (and there's no use kidding ourselves that it doesn't exist)," he said, "I daresay we would not be expending the millions of dollars that we are today, through lobbying and the channels of advertisement, in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public."

Dr. Gemmill yesterday gave the Gazette and Daily permission to use the text of his message, which was delivered as an address before the medical society at its annual banquet last month at the Country Club of York, and will be reprinted in the society's March bulletin.

Throughout the speech, he noted that his criticisms did not apply to all doctors.

Text follows:

There are several pleas I would like to leave with you as I relinquish my position as President of our medical society.

ASKS DEEPER CONSECRATION

The first is a plea for a deeper consecration on the part of all of us to the noble profession we represent, viz medicine, and an honest effort by each of us to try to regain some of the high esteem and respect of the people which our profession has lost in the past decade. The time has arrived when we, as a profession, should pause and take inventory of ourselves because never before have we experienced such poor public relations at a time when we urgently need good public relations.

If we were not held in this public disfavor at the present time (and there's no use kidding ourselves it doesn't exist) I dare say we would not be expending the millions of dollars that we are today through lobbying and the channels of advertisement, in order to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public.

To what can we attribute this change in attitude by the public toward our profession?

BLAMES DOCTORS FOR DISFAVOR

Can all the blame be placed on the so-called left wingers or "pinks" throughout our country who we know advocate a program of socialized medicine? No, I dare say not. Is it because patients have changed? No, I believe not. Although they may be more exacting and demanding of the physician today, due to their increased medical knowledge obtained through the sources of the radio, newspapers, and certain magazine articles, they still represent sick people, approaching the doctor in a friendly spirit, choosing him in whom they have the most confidence to give them relief from their physical and mental sufferings.

Therefore, we must conclude that doctors themselves have made some "changes for the worse" during the past years. Not in regards to their professional competence, for medical education and training is infinitely better today than it was in my student days, but in regards to their relationship with mankind. Might we say that some of use have gained such a lofty opinion of ourselves as to regard ourselves "masters of the universe" rather than "servants of humanity" which God intended us to be as physicians.

Let us consider what I believe myself to represent some of these "changes for the worse" which may have crept into our profession.

CITES HIGH HOSPITAL COST

Certainly the cost of medical care is excessive today. Especially in the case of hospitalization over which, of course, we as physicians can exert very little control. But this high cost is also due in part to exorbitant fees charged by a minority in general practice and in the fields of specialization.

If every pre-medical student were asked why he had chosen medicine as a profession, I am afraid a great many of these young men, by their answers, would visualize themselves in a fairly high income bracket, living a somewhat smug and comfortable life without the expenditure of too much time and effort, while the motive of service should have been uppermost in their minds in enabling them to have arrived at such an important decision in their life. And this "profit motive," in too many cases, is carried down with them through medical college, hospital training, and into private practice.

If we want to determine whether this profit motive activates any of us today we can do so by our answer to several questions.

Do we manifest as deep an interest in those patients who cannot pay as in those patients whom we know will pay us well? And do we readily agree to accept house visits to new patients without first being assured they will pay for the service?

Another change for the worse, on the part of doctors, is our indifference and independence, on the part of some of us, to accept calls at any hour of the day or night or on any day of the week. (Sweet oil for the child's earache or paregoric for his bellyache until morning.) Or worst of all when your local telephone exchange can't locate a doctor on a Thursday or a holiday in the case of an emergency.

RECALLS PAST

In the younger days of our fellow practitioners who have received their 50-year service medal, and others in this age group who will soon have this signal honor conferred upon them, I dare say this was a thing unheard of, for I am certain their patient's interests came before their own, and many a vacation was given up due to a seriously ill patient or expectant mother. Night calls were no more agreeable in those horse-and-buggy days than they are today. And yet they cheerfully accepted them as a necessary part of their profession and even though the call may have come in at night they didn't charge a double fee for such service.

True, it is still the right of every American doctor to determine how hard he will work and what he will charge for doing his work. But the abuse of this right by some of us has not improved public relations one bit.

I ofttimes wonder if hospital staff and dispensary members realize their golden opportunity to help improve public relations. I dare say this is too frequently overlooked. Institutional care oft becomes so mechanical with us that we frequently forget the personal equation. It must be difficult to be on your guard at all times and render the same service and attention to all patients, irrespective of their race, creed, or whether it is an indigent case. And yet there should be no difference.

ADVICE TO YOUNG DOCTORS

The young man who is just entering private practice can do much to endear himself in the hearts of his clientele and thus help rekindle a burning fire of warmth toward the medical profession. You must remember that although you are far better equipped and trained than we were, the world still doesn't owe you a living until you can justify it.

The moment you enter private practice you are confronted with responsibilities and complex problems which you never encountered before as an intern or resident. It behooves each one of you, especially those who desert the larger cities for the smaller communities, to study the social and economic structure of that community which you have chosen in order that your relationship with the public at large will not be overlooked and neglected while at the same time you are concentrating so much on building up good doctor-patient relationship.

SERVICE TO HUMANITY

In other words what I am trying to say is that the success of any of us is not measured by the wealth we accumulate nor the luxury in which we live, nor by the number of patients we can boast of seeing in our office each day, but rather should we be judged by the service we render to humanity and to the community in which we live.

So much for public relations. The thoughts expressed are not necessarily new to you, but it is good for us to keep turning them over in our minds, and, if guilty as charged, let's try to improve ourselves.

In conclusion, my final plea is for increased tolerance and less professional jealousy among the members of our profession. (And I direct these remarks to the profession as a whole and not just our own local group.) If we can't get along with ourselves, how can we hope to get along with society?

As we meet on such formal occasions as these, with a few cocktails to add to the merriment, an outsider would gather the impression we are one happy, harmonious family. And yet we may no sooner leave this room or building ere someone stabs us in the back.

How quick we are to see and condemn the faults of others while at the same time we consider ourselves above reproach. As the Moffat translation puts it, "Why are we so quick to see the splinter in our brother's eye and so often fail to see the plank in our own eye?"

Or as Kipling states it in that great poem of his, If: "When being lied about, don't deal in lies," if you would be called, "A Man."

Therefore, it behooves us at all times to be guarded in our criticism of a fellow practitioner, lest what we say, when repeated by the other fellow, is misconstrued, or misrepresented. How often I have been misquoted to any of my brother practitioners, by some patients who dislike me, I do not know. We all experience some of these unpleasant relationships.

QUOTES SCRIPTURE

Wouldn't we all be far better off, if, when such stories of criticism are carried back to our ears by the way of the grapevine, that rather than assume that tit-for-tat attitude (an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth) we would let our minds revert to those passages of Scripture as recorded in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the twelfth chapter, where we read these words: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves but rather give way unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

In the December issue of a booklet on daily devotions called Today, I ran across these verses which presented a challenge that I thought was well worth passing on to you and would be a splendid New Year resolution for each one of us to make. And I quote:

"I asked the New Year for some message sweet,
Some rule of life with which to guide my feet.
I asked, and paused, He answered soft and low,
God's will to know.

"Will knowledge then suffice, 'New Year,' I cried;
And ere the question into silence died,
The answer came, Nay, but remember, too,
God's will to do.

"Once more I asked, 'Is there nothing more to tell?'
And once again the answer sweetly fell,
'Yes,' this thing, all other things above,
God's will to love."

If each of us were to search our hearts to discover God's will for us (and surely He has a plan for each of our lives) and once we discover it, would attempt to carry it out, irrespective of the self-denial and sacrifice it would entail, and above all, to have in our hearts a burning love for our fellow men, even as God loves us, then the relationship between us would be such as to enable us to be that one happy, harmonious family which I stated earlier in my remarks does not exist today. And this goal is one which each of us should earnestly desire and strive to attain.

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, March 23, 1951]

HEALTH AND DOCTORS

When Dr. Norman H. Gemmill, retiring president of the county medical society, told his colleagues recently that they should reform in certain ways in order to "regain the high esteem and respect of the people," he hit upon a very important point.

It was this. Dr. Gemmill, remarking that the profession was in disfavor, said frankly that the millions being spent "through lobbying and the channels of advertisement" by the AMA (American Medical Association) are being spent "to buy ourselves back into the good graces of the public."

Dr. Gemmill, of course, was a professional man speaking to brother professionals when he made the remark. Perhaps that is why he put the case so bluntly. It should be noted, however, that the AMA, in its messages to the public, never lets on that what it is trying to do is purchase a better reputation for doctors.

Not at all. The theme of the AMA is that its campaign, costing an amount estimated by Senator JAMES MURRAY at $20,000,000, is in the public, not the doctor's, interest. The AMA is spending the millions collected at the rate of $25 per from individual doctors, and in huge contributions from drug-trade associations and insurance companies, to tell the people that their health care is in good hands, that Federal health insurance is not only unnecessary but an actual menace to the well-being of United States citizens.

If Dr. Gemmill's references to the AMA campaign can be assumed to reflect the opinions of the medical profession, the doctors' organization is engaged upon a very dubious enterprise. It is informing the people that what it chooses to call "socialized medicine" is a threat to their independent selection of doctors and methods of health care. But the real threat of socialized medicine, if one goes by the implications of what Dr. Gemmill had to say, is not to the people at all but to the privilege of the medical profession to think of themselves first and the health of the people second.

This is not to say that all doctors are so minded. But according to Dr. Gemmill there are many that are. He very honestly deplored the fact and he urged his listeners to become once again "'servants of humanity,' as God intended us to be as physicians." He told the doctors that high fees, disregard for patients of low income, unwillingness to accept night calls, and so forth, were indications that the profit motive had come to dominate elements of the profession. He called for a return to the ideal of service to the people.

No one would argue with him on that score. His analysis of the failings of certain doctors, his recommendations to his colleagues, were impressive and forthright. But might it not be possible for Dr. Gemmill and other enlightened representatives of his profession to turn their attention also to the professional standards and ethics of the AMA? Could it be that in employing the AMA phrase, socialized medicine, Dr. Gemmill, without realizing it, is adopting standards in the field of propaganda which he would scorn in the field of science?

As matters stand, not one doctor in York County has ever taken the public position that the facts about the Nation's health and the facts about a proposed system of Federal health insurance be discussed in a rational and democratic fashion. Would not such a position, taken, say, by the medical society itself, be the best possible means for local practitioners as a group to reestablish, in the words of Dr. Gemmill, their relationship with mankind?

Research Into Causes and Treatment of Asthma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication with respect to the need for an all-out effort to find the causes and cures of one of our most widespread health problems.

I am very glad to be able to inform the writer that through the National Institutes of Health created by the Congress, and sponsored by all members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, such research as my correspondent mentions is now being carried on. The work is being done both at the Bethesda institutes, and through grants made by the institutes to research workers in universities and medical centers throughout the United States. It is limited only by the necessity consequently faced by the Congress of determining what amounts of money can be made available by the people of the United States for such life-saving work, as against the amounts which, through the machinations of Communist Soviet Russia, we are forced to expend in creating instruments of death and destruction.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POMONA, N. Y., *March 27, 1951.*

DEAR HON. SENATOR MURRAY: I trust you receive this card. The Good Book states, "Seek and ye shall find." So why can't some real smart doctor with ability discover a cure for asthma? Some can work miracles with the heart, eyes, brain, etc., but asthmatics painfully almost choke to death and a great many have. Like many, I cannot find any real lasting relief. What is asthma? Is it smarter than doctors? Bah. Time, life, and science march on, yes, for better bombs, aircraft, better this and that as we read, hear, and see. But asthma, a great basic health enemy, is still with us in the millions throughout the United States of America. Why? A cure for asthma is urgently needed—not pity or a truckload of someone's old Christmas cards. It's about time now to hear about a safe, lasting, reliable, effective treatment or a Senate national health-investigating committee on why asthma is still smarter than doctors. The great many that have died, the dying that can't write, and the asthmatics still praying in hope—with these facts, prompt me on

to a national crusade to bring about a cure for asthma, so help me God.

As a humane interest of public service, I beg of you to kindly voice my above sincere letter into the RECORD before the Senate and Congress, also release my letter to the press for publication, please.

God bless you and yours.

S. G. LYMAN.

Maine's National Oratory Champ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Maine's National Oratory Champ Would 'Stump' for Governor Payne," which appeared in the Portland Press-Herald on April 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, April 6.—A 17-year-old Milo High School senior who earlier this week was asked to assist Vice President BARKLEY in the art of public speaking agreed today to mount the stump for his State's Governor.

And John G. Decker is qualified to assist either man. He won a national oratorical contest this week, a $4,000 scholarship and an extra $1,000 for Milo High School.

Handsome and quiet, the youth who from all appearances takes celebrities in his stride today, received his initial introduction to Maine's governmental set-up.

He was vigorously applauded when introduced to both the Maine Senate and House of Representatives. In the next breath he told Gov. Frederick G. Payne he would answer his call to pinch-hit on a speaking engagement or two.

"Do you think you might like to enter public life, John?" Payne asked the youth.

"Well, I'm thinking of taking engineering in college," he replied.

"I may send you a note asking you to go out and make a few speeches for me, O. K.?" the Governor asked.

"Sure, if I can help," was the answer.

The dark-haired, dark-eyed Decker arrived here yesterday morning after winning the national competition at Columbia University, New York, last Tuesday night.

He had visited New York City and Washington, D. C., where he received congratulations of Vice President BARKLEY and Maine Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH and OWEN BREWSTER.

"Live Safely, Live Happily" was the title of Decker's winning speech. He participated in observances in connection with New York City's safety week.

On the trip with John was his teacher at Milo High, Mrs. Pauline Kealiher, who says she "had John under my wing for just this year."

To her goes much credit for his success, John says.

Just after the Governor and State Senator Carroll McKusick, Republican, of Parkman, had praised the youth for his ability and for the fame he has brought his State, Decker was asked in an interview:

"What is your reaction to this sort of thing, to meeting such persons as the Vice President, your State's Senators in Washington, and the Governor? Make you nervous?"

"Gee, it might if they weren't such swell people to meet," he replied, "nobody could get nervous with them. They put you at ease. They're swell."

Official Inspection Trip of Commissioner F. A. Delgado in Different Provinces of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I enclose a report of a very interesting inspection trip made in the Philippine Islands by our former colleague the Honorable F. A. Delgado, a member of the United States Philippines War Damage Commission, which I include also with my remarks regarding the distinguished career of our former colleague:

OFFICIAL INSPECTION TRIP OF COMMISSIONER F. A. DELGADO IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES OF THE PHILIPPINES

"By resolution of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission of December 8, 1950, a final inspection of the different provinces was authorized. Accordingly, Commissioner Francisco A. Delgado, accompanied by Engineer Jose Garrido of the Bureau of Public Claims and Examiner Vicente Roco of the Bureau of Private Claims made a tour of inspection through almost all the provinces of the Philippine Archipelago beginning December 26, 1950, and ending on January 22, 1951. The trips were made by plane and by automobile.

"Starting in the Province of Laguna, Sta. Cruz, the capital of the province, and the municipality of Pagsanjan, were visited. In passing the different municipalities from Sta. Cruz to Pagsanjan were inspected.

"The inspection proceeded to the Province of Quezon, through many municipalities of the Province of Laguna and the Province of Quezon, which were also inspected in passing. Lucena, the capital of the Province of Quezon, was visited.

"The next trip took the party to the Mountain Province and the City of Baguio, and thence to La Union Province, inspecting on the way the municipalities of both provinces through which they passed. San Fernando City, capital of La Union Province, was also visited.

"Baguio was made the headquarters of the party while in northern Luzon and from there they proceeded to Lingayen, capital of Pangasinan Province, visiting on the way the municipalities of the adjoining provinces through which they passed.

"The next tour of inspection was to the Visayan Islands and Mindanao. From Manila the party proceeded to Iloilo City and Iloilo Province; thence to Bacolod City and Province of Occidental Negros; thence to the province and city of Cebu; thence to the province and city of Zamboanga via Dipolog; and thence to the City of Dumaguete and Province of Negros Oriental.

"Upon their return to Manila the party proceeded to the Bicol region, visiting the Provinces of Camarines Sur, Albay, and Camarines Norte, the cities of Naga and Legaspi, and the municipalities of the said provinces accessible by automobile.

"The last tour of the party was in central Luzon, visiting the Provinces of Batangas, Pampanga, and Bulacan, their respective capitals, and other municipalities.

"In all the provincial capitals, cities, and towns visited, the members of the party were met and otherwise shown every courtesy by the respective provincial governors, members of the provincial board, city and district engineers, city mayors, municipal mayors, and other provincial, city, and municipal officials, as well as by the officers of civic organizations such as the Jaycees, the Rotary, and Lions Clubs, and other prominent citizens.

"In all the places visited the party held conferences and an open forum in which everybody was given a chance to speak his mind in connection with public and private war-damage claims. Explanations of the work and procedures of the Commission were made and the doubts and misgivings in connection with the private claims brought to the attention of the party were explained away.

"As regards the public claims in the different provinces and cities inspected, the party has found that all the public projects to which the Commission has made awards have been completed with the exception of some details which cannot be completed because of the insufficiency of the funds allocated. There were projects, however, which looked even better than the original ones. The party also found out that the great majority of the municipalities inspected badly needed barrio schools, municipal buildings, public markets and other public buildings, hospital, dispensaries, and school equipment which were destroyed during the last world war and which could not be rehabilitated for lack of funds.

"Provincial, city and municipal officials in the different provinces, cities, and municipalities inspected were unanimous in clamoring for additional funds to complete the rehabilitation of the uncompleted projects and to rehabilitate the many buildings and equipment for which no awards were made.

"As regards the private claims, the feeling was also unanimous that the Commission has acted with fairness and justice to all private claimants but that a third payment, at least sufficient to complete the 75 percent of the approved amount promised in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, is needed if the good work already started is to attain at least a practicable rehabilitation of the economy of the provinces and the individual citizens thereof.

"Commissioner Delgado has had the previous opportunity during 1947 and 1948 to go through most of the provinces visited in his final inspection and for this reason he was most profoundly impressed with a deep feeling of satisfaction to have observed the extent of the rehabilitation accomplished by the Philippine War Damage Commission, with the limited funds at its disposal, throughout the entire Philippine Archipelago. He found out that every provincial capital and town now presents, so to speak, a "new look," at least in the center of the "poblacion." Also that provincial capitals, hospitals, high schools, trade schools, central schools, dispensaries, other school buildings, and some barrio schools looked normal and as in the prewar days of peace and prosperity in the Philippines. Indeed, in many cases, the reconstructed buildings were by far better in appearance and usefulness than their prewar counterparts. Withal, it was also obviously apparent that much more still remains to be done, specially in the case of barrio schools, hospitals, dispensaries, waterworks, municipal and market buildings, equipment, etc. It is, therefore, no wonder that the feeling is absolutely unanimous among officials and private citizens of all classes of the absolute need of further assistance. All realize the great good accomplished by the aid thus far rendered and are profoundly grateful therefor to the American Government and people. But they also

feel that there is urgent and essential need for more assistance. The feeling is general that the Commission has acted fairly and justly with the limited funds under its disposal, and that the work of the Commission has greatly enhanced the traditional good will and friendship of the Filipino people for the American people, their ideals and their way of life.

"In view of the foregoing, Commissioner Delgado's only recommendation in his report to the Commission was that the latter, or at least the individual members thereof, do all they can toward the immediate consideration and approval of the Kefauver bill or some other measure which would authorize the appropriation of an additional $100,000,000, at least, for further war damage compensation in the Philippines.

"Acting with rapidity apparently hitherto unknown in agencies of government, the United States Philippine War Damage Commission has concluded the task assigned to it by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. It has finished its work prior to the legal deadline fixed by the Congress and at less than the legislatively prescribed cost.

"The Philippine Rehabilitation Act was a nonpartisan measure. It was enacted shortly before the Philippines was granted independence by the United States, after having been under this Nation's tutelage for nearly 50 years. A strong mutual friendship had existed between our two peoples during this half century. The Philippine people fought side by side with us during the war and remained loyal to democratic ideals and to the United States during the grim days of the occupation. When it came time to grant them independence, their country had been ravaged by war. Their finances had been depleted sorely; individuals had suffered terrific personal losses and were in dire need of aid.

"As a partial measure of assistance, and so that our friends would not be granted independence as a free nation when they were not in a financial position to start on such a grave, new venture, the Congress adopted the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. This law provided for payment in part of war-damage claims arising out of the destruction to, or loss of, private property, as well as for partial rehabilitation of damaged public property. At the time of the adoption of the law, it was almost impossible to determine the exact amount of money that would be needed to finance reconstruction, but the Congress authorized the expenditure of $400,000,000 for the payment of private claims and administrative expenses relating thereto. This fund was placed under the jurisdiction of the War Damage Commission, as was an additional $57,000,000 for the payment of claims for damage to public property.

"The Rehabilitation Act, in itself, was unprecedented in that no nation previously had undertaken to pay war damages in another country in a similar manner or on such a scale. The Commission, therefore, had no precedents to follow. Yet, today, its work is completed. First, the law required it to end its operations relating to the adjudication of public property claims by June 30, 1950. This was done and, when the Commission concluded this part of its activities, the benefits of its public property rehabilitation awards included classroom facilities for 3,200,000 students, hospital beds for 3,200 patients, water for 6,700,000 people, direct employment for 20,000 workmen, and extensive office accommodations for the executives and staffs of the national, provincial, and municipal governments.

"In addition, the law required the Commission to complete its entire operation not later than April 30, 1951. It has been finished ahead of schedule. The Commission was allowed $12,000,000 for administrative expenses attendant to the adjudication and payment of private claims. Actually, $10,350,000, or only 2.6 percent of the total appropriation, was expended and the savings are being returned to the Treasury of the United States. The Commission, prior to its closing, had adjudicated approximately 1,250,000 private claims and had paid the beneficiaries almost $390,000,000. Industry, business, and agriculture, as well as the individual, have benefited substantially although the appropriated funds have not permitted the full payments authorized by the Rehabilitation Act. There are many people who believe the United States should appropriate additional funds so that the commitments of the act would be met fully. Others believe we should give even more extensive aid to the Philippines. This is not the medium through which to espouse either of these proposals, regardless of one's sympathies. There will be other times and instruments for that."

Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Delgado has occupied the unique position during his service with the Commission of being the only foreign national to be nominated to a post on a United States Government agency and to have had that nomination confirmed by the United States Senate. Prior to his appointment he had a long and illustrious record. He attended Compton High School, Compton, Calif., as one of the first group of Filipino students to study in the United States. He pursued his education at the University of Indiana, where he received his degrees of bachelor of laws and doctor of laws. He received his master of laws, cum laude, from Yale in 1908. After a distinguished career in the Philippines, which included service as a member of the Philippine House of Representatives, he served in the United States House of Representatives as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States. He has been a justice of the Philippine Court of Appeals, and declined a nomination to the Supreme Court of the Philippines. He is president of the Philippine Bar Association. He was a delegate of the Philippine Commonwealth to the International Committee of Jurists at Washington, April 1945, which prepared the draft of the Statute of the International Court of Justice of the United Nations. He was a member of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in 1945, and was nominated to the International Court of Justice of the United Nations in 1946 by the Philippine Government.

A distinguished jurist and statesman, Commissioner Francisco A. Delgado has concluded his occupancy of a high post in the United States Government after serving in it for almost 5 years. In that period, as always, he has been vitally concerned with the welfare of his own people but has scrupulously acted in the interests of the United States, for which he has constantly maintained a deep and abiding friendship. It has been said that no man can serve two masters. In Commissioner Delgado we have an illustrous public servant of the Philippines and of the United States serving both at the same time on the highest plane, giving to each the full benefit of his ability and integrity. For this notable achievement and for his outstanding contribution to the lasting, harmonious relationship between our two nations, I can but extend to him the most infinite praise.

Kefauver Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting item from Mr. Clement Norton, well-known Boston newspaperman, that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Sunday, April 1, 1951, concerning the Kefauver Crime Investigation Committee:

KEFAUVER

The biggest political shock of the day, was the smash hit of television in the Kefauver committee hearings. Politicians are still running and ducking and whispering trying to find out what it all means. What it all adds up to. For, if millions of people can watch them, many of them are done. They might as well throw in the towel and quit, in the language of the ring.

And, if you were to select from all the Congress a cast, you could not have selected a better one, than the Kefauver group for the curtain opener, in which millions of Americans saw and heard their first congressional hearing. The puritanical, honest New England TOBEY, crying like a child twice. I liked him. The able Senator O'CONOR. The 48-year-old chairman, Senator CAREY ESTES KEFAUVER, a Chattanooga, Tenn., lawyer and Yale law grad, televised well. He was clean-cut and good-looking, and best of all, he gave every one of the millions of people who saw and heard him, a first-class lesson in basic culture, in innate kindness, in everyday charitableness. In understanding and in social sensitivity to the rights of others. His equable, calm, warm, resonant, low, well-spaced words with just a hint of a delightful southern drawl, calmed the troubled waters time and time again.

It was one of the greatest lessons ever taught to the largest class in history, and I'm sure, that as a result of it, thousands of judges will go back on the bench and be more considerate to unfortunates, and millions of people will quietly but surely improve their manners, after being subjected to the terrific impact of seeing and hearing the cultured Senator KEFAUVER with his innately fair technique.

MIGHT

The Senator might have sat up there and lorded it over everybody. He might have yelled and roared and bellowed at the gangsters and been applauded by the multitude. He might have literally strutted sitting down for he was in a position that no person in American politics had ever been before, and he fully realized all this, and deliberately decided to be himself—to be natural. In short, to be innately kind and considerate to everybody. He did not try to hog the show, but would let other Senators and committee attorneys take over. He might have jumped on Frank Costello and waved the flag and Bible, a sure-fire hit, but no, he was gentle and kind to Costello.

I like that kind of conduct. It showed that KEFAUVER had real class. Real culture in his make-up. It made me feel that my country, my Government, never can go down, so long as such outstanding men are on guard in Washington. And I was pleased to find that everybody had a good word for Senator KEFAUVER that I asked in my poll. The man out of the bar, the college professor, the department store clerk, the barber.

And then, I could stand up and cheer for KEFAUVER, when I found that on his Wash-

ington office wall are the scribbled drawings of his 7-year-old daughter. That he had two children and wanted a third, and thought that this was impossible, so he adopted a third child, and now, to his joy, a third child has been born into the family, making four children, all told. KEFAUVER has fought monopolies, has fought for public housing for the underprivileged, and has, on the whole, a grand record of standing for the people against powerful entrenched interests.

I'm completely sold on Senator KEFAUVER. That television performance was terrific. Science has brought something new and something better into our lives.

Food Aid for India—On-the-Spot Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

I

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, without reading political implications into the bill for food aid to India, it is nevertheless proper to understand the impact upon government stability of famine there. The best evidence on this situation is an on-the-spot report from Dr. Frank Laubach, special counselor and representative of the committee on world literacy and Christian literature, Foreign Missions Conference of North America, showing the Communist menace in the various famine-affected areas in India. This letter is Dr. Laubach's normal report to his own committee dated March 4, 1951, and received here the end of March, and transmitted to me by Executive Secretary Alfred D. Moore, of the committee, with permission to insert pertinent excerpts from it:

BOMBAY, INDIA, *March 4, 1951.*

I was asked in America to collect material about the Christian answer to communism in India. I am here with 30 of the leading Indian Christians of all India. I told them about this request and asked them to be frank. The result appalled me. Communism is far more menacing than even I had dreamed.

The delegate from Amritsar close to Pakistan said the Communists are very active, persuading millions to believe that they must kill the rich and take what they have. As minister, he wanted to know how to stem the tide.

The delegates from Telengana (Hyderabad State) said that the Communists have so swept that pathetically hungry state that if a Communist army marched in, 99 percent of the people would welcome it. Hyderabad in the past has been the most terrible example of enormous wealth and terrible poverty side by side, in all India. The Communists took many rich landowners out and cut them to pieces with the hearty approval of the poor.

The delegate from Madras state said the Communists have workers everywhere, and that they go and read to the people, who being ignorant and hating their landlords are rapidly becoming Communists. They tell the people, "We are going to kill the big landowners and distribute the land." The tenants, the robber castes, and the idle ex-servicemen are falling for it.

Another delegate from Madras says the people are told that Nehru is backing the rich who run the government, and so all the poor are being turned against Nehru. The new government, when it took over from England, promised to right the wrongs allowed by the British, but the poor still have little or nothing more than they had before.

Communist teachers are converting their students, and there are fifth-columns in all colleges. The Communists say they are the only people in India who really try to emancipate the poor. They constantly threaten to kill Christian pastors unless they become Communists. They are getting many Christians to adopt what they call "Christian communism."

One delegate from the center of the greatest violence in Telengana (Hyderabad) said: "I believe God sent communism to destroy the wicked rich; 75 percent of the rich were murdered by the Communists and the other 25 percent are now repentent and good. The Communists said to the masses: 'You built the roads, but you cannot ride on them. You built the houses, but you cannot live in decent houses.' "

In the March 1 Times of India, the leading article says that not even in Telengana has the Communist menace assumed such dangerous proportions as in Assam, among the most backward and impoverished tribal people.

The delegate from Calcutta is very reticent to say even one word, but did say that the people there are just waiting for the Communists to come and liberate them.

I must not write a long letter, but these delegates agree that India is rapidly going Communist in every state and province. They say that every day the American Congress either criticizes the Indian Government, or delays helping the starving in India, millions of Indians are going Communist, believing that only the Communists can liberate them from poverty. Before many months it will be another "too little too late."

I was told that some Congressmen are coming to India. They should come soon and they should listen, welcome frank truth, and not do all the talking. I was told by missionaries recently from China that a Congressman I shall not name, called them together in Shanghai, talked to them for 4 hours and went away without listening to them. I suggest that they consult not missionaries nor Indian officials, but Christian native pastors.

A recent shipment of only 12,000 tons of Russian grain to India brought the bitter newspaper comment: "It begins to be evident who it is that is concerned about the people of India."

Very sincerely yours with my prayer,
FRANK LAUBACH.

II

Mr. Speaker, there is also attached appended an on-the-spot report contained in an editorial by Norman Cousins in the Saturday Review of Literature of March 31, 1951. This editorial was also the subject of full-page advertisements in New York and other papers, sponsored by Freedom House:

NEW DELHI.—Once you have seen the look of hunger on the face of a man it is difficult to put it out of your mind. I have seen the look of hunger on the faces of thousands of men, and I know I shall never forget it.

I first saw the hungry in a jail on the island of Ceylon. They were illegal immigrants fleeing the famine in the south of India, and the Government of Ceylon was detaining them in a prison in Jaffna until arrangements could be worked out for their return to India. They had come by small boat, landing during the night on the north coast of Ceylon, where some of them had been picked up by the police. No one knew how many Indians had fled to Ceylon in this summer.

In the jail at Jaffna I spoke to a woman of 55 who looked closer to 90. I doubt that she weighed 80 pounds. Her face was little more than a bare skull out of which small eyes glowed feverishly. She had come to Ceylon to join her married daughter, who had escaped successfully 2 months earlier. This much she was willing to tell, but she would not tell the police where her daughter might be found, even though it meant she herself would be returned to India alone.

I next saw the hungry in the south of India, where the suffering is most acute. I saw them against a background of parched and browned fields, with pale stubbles where rich rice paddies should have been. The reason for it was that the rains never came this year. They didn't come last year either or the year before that or the year before that.

"Four years, no monsoon," one of the elders in a village 40 miles from Madras told me. "The older people have thought hard but they do not remember when before the fields have been so dry. The wells are very low."

He looked up at the scudding clouds. "Clouds like this used to bring rain. Now they go out to sea and drop their rain where there is no need of it. The old people can eat little. If they are thin it is no great harm. Ghandi was thin. But the children are thin and they become sick quickly. Smallpox has killed many of them. Thirty had smallpox in this village. Sixteen died.

"We send men into the cities to work so they can buy rice to bring back to the village. But there is so little rice and the rations have been cut again, and what they bring back cannot fill the bowls of many persons. We eat what we can—bananas and some coconuts—but very many people here are starving."

I next saw the faces of the hungry on the streets of Calcutta. Many of them were homeless. They had lost their homes during the partition of India when Pakistan was created. They were Hindus who feared the Moslems, and they had abandoned their homes in Pakistan and crossed over into India. In India there are perhaps eight or ten million such refugees—it might be millions more; no one knows exactly how many. Thousands of them came into Calcutta, the world's largest city, looking for food and homes. They slept in the streets. Wherever you went at night, on the main thoroughfares or in the alleys or in the hallways, you could see the human forms huddled together against the cool night. During the day they waited in lines for government food or they begged.

Near the luxurious Grand Hotel in Calcutta was a child of 8 or 9, with not enough clothes to conceal the bloated, empty belly of hunger. He was looking in the streets for scraps of food. Nearby was a young woman of about twenty, her body covered by the rags of what once must have been a handsome sari. A child of 2 was on her hip. The child was badly undernourished, and his head rested on his mother's shoulder. His face was empty and expressionless. I also saw the hungry of Bangalore. They sat against the walls of buildings and waited.

Then I saw them in Delhi. There are more of the hungry and homeless in Delhi than in any other city in the world. As in Calcutta, many of them are refugees—maybe 500,000 or 600,000—and they have crowded into the city, setting up crude wood-and-straw shelters, most of them closet size. And every day the dead are carried out by men who are little more than half alive themselves. I stood on the corner of a busy street

in Delhi and watched the refugees as they passed. Out of the thousands who passed by only two would be considered plump by American standards.

The Indians are reluctant to talk about themselves or about their hardships. I was able, however, to win the confidence of the attendant assigned to my room. He told me about his 6-year-old son, the one with tuberculosis. He said his son had been praying a great deal recently, much more than usual, and he had asked his son what he had been praying for. "My son was praying that he might die. He wanted to die and he wanted God to make him into a crow. I had told him about the crows that fly into the open windows of the hotel rooms and pick up food on the tables and then carry the food off. My son said he wanted to be a crow so he could fly wherever there was food and bring it back to our family."

Then the attendant, whose name was Arun, turned away from me and knelt down to fix the fire. "India has been hungry for many months," he said. "They are saying that America has known about this need and that America has not wished to send us food."

I replied that what he had been told was not true. What had happened was that we had been too slow in responding to India's need, and that was bad enough. Americans had to operate through their Government and often democratic government is slow in doing what has to be done promptly. I asked him to believe that millions of Americans were deeply concerned and were prodding our Government to action.

Then he mentioned the report he had read in the newspapers about the American Senators who wanted to punish India because India did not agree with the United States in the United Nations.

"It is true is it not, sir, that we may not get the food because we do not say what you wish us to say?"

I had to think a little while before replying, because I wasn't too sure that what he had feared might not turn out to be true. Should I have told him that it might take many days before the wheat bill might pass during which time he would have to watch his youngsters continue to eat out of partially filled bowls?

Finally, I told him that there was no real answer to his question, except to say that we would do our best, our very best, and that the American people would be angry if any attempt were made to deprive other people of food because we might disagree with their leaders.

Arun finished making the fire and left. It occurred to me that what ought to be done was to take Arun to the United States on the very next plane and bring him before the Senate of the United States.

If the Congressmen don't want to give wheat to Arun and countless millions of his countrymen, then they ought to tell it to Arun directly. Let them answer Arun's questions—if they can. Let them hear about Arun's children and then tell him exactly why a Nation which has a surplus of wheat does not feel that it wants to put politics to one side when people are starving.

Then, after telling Arun why he will get no wheat, let us finish the job. Let us recall the appropriation for the Voice of America and for all our information services abroad. Let us shut down all our efforts to combat Communist propaganda against us. There is no point telling our story to the world if there is nothing for us to say. All the Voice of America can do is to try to provide a real, true account of what is happening in America. What we say can and should be a reflection of what we do.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to speak to peoples and only to governments. The most powerful language in the world today is food. It is clearly understood. It builds bridges mightier by far than radio broadcasts or published material, especially when people have no radios or cannot read.

My purpose in coming to India was to try to tell the Indian people about America and to try to answer the many lies being told about us. Those lies are aimed at splitting America off from the rest of the world. Yet there is nothing Soviet propaganda can say about us that can do nearly the harm that we can do to ourselves if we should turn our back today not only on India but on the meaning of America itself.

General MacArthur's Greatness Cannot Be Subdued by Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the rising flood of indignation from average citizens all over this Nation is pouring into Washington in support of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and in protest against the action of President Truman in summarily dismissing General MacArthur.

Never before in history have the people so strongly protested the action of a Chief Executive. Never before have the American people completely lost confidence in the administration elected by them to office, and viewed with suspicion and distrust the motivation behind the acts of the President and the Secretary of State.

Angry demands for drastic action have been voiced by an outraged citizenry which fears that a continuation of the senseless blundering mistakes of the President and his administration will bring disaster to the United States.

The people today look to the Congress to rise to its responsibilities and develop a leadership which the Nation can trust to consider the welfare and security of the United States of America, and to take such steps as are possible to prevent further blunders and mismanagement in the administration.

From all parts of the country editorial writers have voiced their regret that the President chose to remove General MacArthur from his command. The following is one of the most eloquent and direct reviews of the MacArthur dismissal which appeared in a recent edition of the Tidings, published in Los Angeles, Calif.:

The symbol of hope becomes the legend of despair. The Nation reels in stunned dismay with the MacArthur dismissal. Resentment flares in a fateful hour. The spokesman of Christian values and American ideals in the Orient, whose towering courage won the respect of friend and erstwhile foe and steeled them both against a newer menace, is abruptly silenced and humbled while Acheson's design of disaster sweeps inexorably toward deeper disgrace and newer infamy.

There has been torment for General MacArthur since a decade ago when the goading of diplomacy outstripped military preparedness and brought about the fiasco of the Philippines. Even in the tragedy of Corregidor, when he was narrowly spared the death march of Bataan, he kept alive the hope of freedom in Asia by vowing victory and return. Slowed by a lack of matériel in what then too was considered a secondary theater of operations, he nevertheless by a brilliant series of tactical surprises in hedgehopping maneuvers finally sloshed ashore at Leyte and readied the final thrust at the enemy mainland. Victory hovered even before Hiroshima.

He pursued his undeviating way ignoring the petty jealousy of President, circumventing diplomat playing at strategy, unheedful of the biting carp and cant of the liberal fringe peddling the planted alien propaganda that could not diminish his stature or deflect his resolve not only to defeat the enemy but to thwart the pretensions of supposed friends. He knew the caliber of our dubious allies and like General Patton, whose spirit was also seared by the foreign flame, tried to alert America to the sinister peril that shaped. Who can deny that if the views of these two God-fearing men and eminent military strategists had prevailed, we would not now be in dread with apprehensions of doom?

General MacArthur was nowhere more magnificent than amid the ruins of Seoul leading his men in the Lord's Prayer even as the United Nations planned the sell-out of American valor and sacrifice. His was the responsibility for American lives in Korea, and in the welter of conflicting directives and tactical restrictions he knew the danger that massed against our soldiers in the privileged sanctuary of Manchuria. With 60,000 casualties in Korea, he could be pardoned if he was compelled to speak yet again when he was not heard before.

His long experience in the Orient ranked him as an observer of American interests in the Far East far more qualified in the sequence of events than Lattimore, Acheson, Service, Carter, and Jessup, and he recognized that an Asia in chains boded ill for the future of freedom in Europe as well. But there was never even the will to measure his views in the unfolding series of diplomatic blunders.

It is our tradition both in peace and war that the military bows before the higher word of the Executive. This has been a workable policy insuring unity of direction in a common effort. The repeated remonstrances of General MacArthur revealed deep-seated divergence with the views in Washington. Yet who will say in the days we see that Acheson is right and MacArthur wrong? The mandate of the people last November should have given point and meaning to the unfortunate episode.

It is regrettable that Mr. Truman resolved the impasse by summary dismissal. He might have understood with more patience the anguish of a commander in the field, with death and devastation all around, hindered and hampered by diplomacy in a situation without precedent like the Korean incident. He might, if he considered removal justifiable, have brought a show of unity to the land and preserved the respect of the world by appointing a noble American to higher honors in other avenues of service. The country in this hour has need of men of the character and integrity of MacArthur. This is no time to invite suspicion and deeper distrust by the callous disregard of one who has served America faithfully, wisely, and well.

National Disunity Worst Effect of MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 17, 1951:

NATIONAL DISUNITY WORST EFFECT OF MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—President Truman his split America. He has stirred up such dissension and division among the American people that the disunity which prevails today transcends in importance even the issues which led to his dismissal of General MacArthur.

From all over the country the evidence is piling up that Mr. Truman has stirred up bitterness such as has not been noted since the days before the Civil War. The emotional reaction to the dismissal of General MacArthur has not been lessened by the strangely partisan behavior that has developed in Congress itself.

Thus, the Democrats at first resented the idea of a joint meeting to hear General MacArthur. Only upon further reflection did they decide to go along with plans to welcome the general.

Then came the sniping and the inuendoes. Mr. Truman, who told the Democrats gathered at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner last Saturday night to put the national interest above personal interest, promptly followed his own political impulses and started off another wave of bitterness by his innuendo against General MacArthur.

VAUGHAN TO BE GREETER

Within the last 24 hours another incident has brought more irritation. It has been announced that, when General MacArthur returns to Washington after an absence of 14 years spent fighting for his country, the only man who is to be sent to the airport by the White House to greet him is General Vaughan.

No more stupid way of belittling the visit of General MacArthur could have been dreamed up at the White House. If this is a sample of the political judgment of the President or of his advisers, it indicates that the poor strategy which led to the peremptory firing of MacArthur has not been followed by any better understanding of the public temper.

There were half a dozen ways by which the President could have relieved General MacArthur of his command. There were many ways by which the split in this country could have been avoided. But what is much worse is that the Democratic Party in Congress has lined up solidly against General MacArthur and in defense of President Truman's arbitrary action. Conversely, the Republicans, seeing the whole thing taking on a political flavor, have themselves lined up in self-defense and in defense of General MacArthur.

TRAGEDY FOR AMERICA

Thus has the most important issue before the country—how to prevent a big-scale war—been turned over to political handling. This cannot bring a bipartisan approach to world policy. It cannot bring a united spirit behind any program of the administration. It is about the worst tragedy that could have befallen America.

President Truman must accept full responsibility for the blunder. He did not tell the party leaders in advance what he intended to do or how he intended to do it. He asked opinions from a few of the leaders, to be sure, and indicated that he had to do something. But it was one-man Government that finally functioned. One man in the White House, in a sudden decision late last Tuesday, decided to dismiss a general who had served his country well and to announce that decision to the press. One-man Government treated with contempt not only the valiant service of a great general but also the principle of affording a hearing to an important official engaged in an important assignment 8,000 miles away from home—a mission of civil as well as military management of an occupied country.

Mr. Truman could have sent for General MacArthur and could have threshed out the differences. If they could not have been resolved, Mr. Truman could have given MacArthur the choice of retiring or of being relieved forthwith.

FALSE ISSUE TRUMPED UP

A false issue is now being trumped up. It is an argument being advanced by the President that MacArthur wants to bring on a large-scale war and that Mr. Truman wants peace. Nothing could be more illustrative of the narrowness of vision that prevails in Washington today. For General MacArthur is sincerely convinced that the proposals he has championed mean peace. Many observers—not in the Military Establishment—believe an appeasement policy by the President and the Department of State will bring on a third world war with all its horrible consequences.

General MacArthur has been reported as opposing peace at any price. Actually he has not been doing any more than asking for a vigorous prosecution of a war in which 60,000 casualties already have been suffered by the United States—more casualties in 9 months than in the first full year of World War II for this country.

The effort to misrepresent MacArthur's position has begun. All the engines of publicity of the administration have been started. The President's gibe at MacArthur at the political dinner Saturday night was the beginning. Already the Democrats are getting ready to turn on the smears. These are sad days for America.

Attempted Regulation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a very pointed and powerful editorial which appeared in the Fox Valley Mirror, published at Carpentersville, Ill., and edited by a two-fisted American citizen, Leonard Fowler.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE AMERICANS ARE NOT BASTARDS; THEY ARE OUR SONS

Something more than a week ago the newspapers read by most of us here in the Middle West flung into our faces, in big, black type across their first pages, this imperiously insolent phrase:

"Aids at Washington consider edict to curb business profits."

Who is it that thus dares to speak of "edict"—when addressed to free American citizens?

Are they so woefully ignorant of the seignorial estate of an American's citizenship?

"Edict!" Do they know not the meaning of this abominable word?

An "edict," however, and whenever used, signifies a directive of supreme command; a rigid law, enunciated by an autocrat before whom all must bow and obey.

How dare, then, do these negligent writers speak of "edict"?

An "edict' is a rule of conduct imposed by an absolute monarch upon his subjects. It is a word that may be addressed solely to bondmen or to slaves.

From the terms of an "edict" there can be no manumission. "Edict" is the merciless tool of the relentless tyrant.

How foolhardy have these traitorous servants of ours grown?

"Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

Must these war-mad, power-drunk servants of ours force us to spurn their meretricious dominion?

If that be true it is time that we repudiate the authority of this mutinous crew of predacious politicians who have seized upon the riches of our treasure and now pretend to assert a dictator's supremacy.

There are 145,000,000 sovereigns in this great land of ours, and not one owns the prerogative to speak for any other.

Before the law all Americans rightfully stand equal—rightfully so.

"Edict." I abhor the word.

How did they dare venture to employ so hateful a term?

Even though used with the utmost discretion, words are tricky tools, ambiguous and cunning; they deceive the unwary. Honeyed and melting, they bring us to the pitiless place of appeasement at Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran.

It is the lying words of beguiling pretenders that have ambushed us so that our fine young men fall by thousands to lie in windrows, at the harsh command of political tricksters. It is they—skilled in the wily use of our mother tongue—that have melted our emotions to provide fortunes for the Double Dealers so safely seated in their morass of chicane politics. They have lured us to our possible destruction because—

The supine and most corrupt amongst us have been given the authority to set up a monopoly of labor—the purchase price of labor's vote, turned into an illegal power to enforce greater excesses for their own gain and against the common weal.

Through the most fantastic injustices this same sordid crew at Washington, that would fix the prices of the products of man's labor, would deny an equal justice in dealing with capital, management, and material, without which not even labor can function.

They have snatched our boys from their schools and their books. In the infancy of their maturity our youth have been conscripted to form an army to fight the battles of other nations in Asia—10,000 miles from their homes. If permitted to continue, we shall be bankrupt in resources, broken in manpower, destitute of initiative. We shall rear a despondent generation—already surrendered to the bitter embrace of despair.

The newspapers suppress some of the more wanton facts, but the backwash of the news reeks with rumors of the perverts in the State Department, traitors dyed red with treason, who have sought to destroy this Nation and all that home and country stand

for. That they may gratify their own whispered indulgences in the lewdness of lechery, they laugh at those who would pursue the pathway to the peaks of glory. Hence this wave of crime against women and children. Sensualists; corrupt weaklings, of the most dissolute depravity and lascivious tongue are drowning in their own slime the pure vision of home, the safety of woman's virtue, and man's sacred obligation to his children.

To march against, to destroy these, death itself would be a sweet sacrifice.

In the whole of Korea—not too much greater in size than the State of Illinois—there are 20 of those yellow devils to 1 of our own brave youngsters.

Even though each American lad be armed with a machine gun, that far land's 23,000,000 barbarians could stone our boys to death—were their rock pile big enough.

In the days when so few of us at Boston were dumping British tea, brought by British ships into Boston Harbor, held by the British Army, there was in the House of Commons, in England's Parliament, a brave man. History has named him "Mr. Pitt."

Pick out all the other Pitts, and there were many of them, but you will find in the annals of those who served Britain only one "Mr. Pitt." When he protested against the enforcement of the Stamp Act; when he decried the use of arms at Concord; when he condemned all harsh measures against the Americans, Mr. Pitt, all alone, had the courage to stand, shaking his finger at the King's bench, and send forth his clarion denunciation:

"Those Americans are not bastards; they are our sons."

Where, in this great Nation; in what place between these broad oceans, lives there another Mr. Pitt?

THE FOX VALLEY FREE PRESS,
LEONARD FOWLER, *Editor*.

Pan American Day, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, it has been our custom for many years to celebrate April 14 as Pan American Day. It affords an opportunity to demonstrate anew the friendship existing among the 21 American Republics, a friendship which has been cemented for more than half a century by the agreements signed at the various inter-American conferences. These agreements have formed the basis for the inter-American system. Of special importance are three of these, namely the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, commonly called the Rio Pact, which was signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947; the Organization of American States; and the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement. The two latter were the result of negotiations at Bogotá in 1948. Great progress in Pan American relations is evidenced by the signing of these treaties which should be of great assistance in keeping peace in the Western Hemisphere and even throughout the world. The successful application of the Rio treaty in disputes in the Caribbean area has already given promise of a more peaceful future.

It is not only in political affairs that the American States have drawn closer together. The idea of the "good neighbor" has been extended to many other fields. As early as 1936 at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held at Buenos Aires, a treaty was drawn up for the exchange of professors, students, and teachers among the American nations. This treaty was called the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations and was subsequently ratified by 17 of the American Republics. The convention provides that every other year professors shall be exchanged, while every year each government will exchange two students selected according to an established procedure with each of the other countries. In addition to the United States, the participating countries are: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. Under this program and subsequent arrangements many students have learned the real meaning of inter-American friendship.

One of the most active organizations for inter-American cooperation is the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, whose activities are based on technical and scientific cooperation with the other nations of the hemisphere in order to strengthen the foundation of their freedom and ours. The programs of the Institute are developmental programs in which technicians from the United States work abroad with the technicians of the cooperating countries to increase the productivity of the farmers, wipe out disease, and to reduce ignorance. These cooperative programs have been outstandingly successful and each of the other participating governments has requested continuance of the programs and has progressively increased the proportion of its contribution. They have been helpful in strengthening democratic institutions and in counteracting the spread of communism throughout the Americas.

While inter-American treaties between the governments are desirable and essential and have brought about a system of cooperation unequaled elsewhere in any region of the world, it is interesting to note other ways by which good relations between the United States and Latin America have been cultivated and promoted.

In these days of almost universal air travel, many persons fly to the various Latin-American countries from the United States and conversely, many persons come to the United States from the States to the south of us. Miami, Fla., in my district, is a central point of departure or arrival for great numbers of these travelers. It is one of the largest air terminals in the United States. Its international airport is the most important serving the Caribbean area and Central and South America. Moreover, it probably serves more vacation travelers than any other airfield. It covers 2,555 acres, has hundreds of buildings, and employs many thousands of people. It has four runways, each of which is approximately 7,000 feet in length and all are 150 feet wide and hard-surfaced. It serves 14 scheduled air carriers and 44 nonscheduled. Probably no other airport takes care of as many unscheduled carriers; and many of these operate between the United States and the Latin-American and Caribbean areas.

English is the prevailing language at the International Airport but Spanish is almost as common. Signs in restaurants, shops, rest rooms, and other facilities appear in both languages. Arrivals and departures are announced in the two tongues. It is not unusual to hear Portuguese or any other half a dozen tongues in the waiting room.

Not only do many passengers arrive and depart from Miami International Airport but tons of mail and even greater tonnage of cargo are handled each year. Much of this is from or bound to some Latin-American country. It has been designated an airport of entry by the Treasury Department. In 1949 customs agents collected more duty on airborne goods here than at all the other airports in the Nation combined. A separate postal station has been set up since the war to handle the postal business. Mail going out of the country is sorted and quickly sent on its way without having to go through the regular Miami post office.

Pan American World Airways has its overhaul and maintenance shops here. They are the largest in the world. Pan American planes fly to all the nations of Latin America, affording quick and reliable transportation. There is no doubt that this has done much to further inter-American understanding since it has made it possible for many people from all of these nations to visit the United States and for Americans to travel southward with great ease and speed.

Florida was originally settled by the Spanish and many Florida inhabitants are descended from these early settlers. Naturally, therefore, the people of my State have a warm affinity for our neighbors in Latin America, many of whom are also descended from these early explorers. They have many common interests and Spanish-speaking peoples are given a cordial welcome in Florida.

A number of inter-American centers were established in various parts of the United States in the early forties under the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. These centers proved to be of great benefit in implementing the good neighbor policy. They afforded an opportunity for citizens of one American country to learn more about the history, culture, geography, and trade of the other American nations. Such a cultural and trade center has been established at Miami, which is already the focus for so much inter-American activity. There is no doubt that this center when completed will further promote the cordial friendship among the American nations.

We of south Florida salute our American neighbors on this Pan-American Day and join in the hope that the fellowship and friendship existing between the freedom loving nations of the Western Hemisphere will serve as an inspiration to the other nations of the world.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman, Democratic National Committee, and director, women's division, at the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on April 14, 1951:

Tonight I am the representative of the millions upon millions of women who four times voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President and who 3 years ago voted for Harry Truman to continue to be our President. Women who voted Democratic in 1948 were not, to put it bluntly, buying a pig in a poke for President Truman had been demonstrating his brand of leadership ever since he took office in 1945 when Roosevelt died.

Women who voted Democratic in 1948 knew they were voting for a President who courageously would carry on the fight for peace and a better life for all, which is the goal of every woman, be she white, yellow or black, a college graduate or illiterate, whatever her status, occupation or profession.

Remember that the great statues of peace, justice, law and order are the faces and forms of women; that the great torch of liberty is held aloft in the hands of a woman. I have never had the misfortune to meet a woman who did not abhor war, who did not feel that wars never have settled anything. But this does not mean that women are idealistically impractical or that they are appeasers. No, they know that when evil forces are at large, they must be destroyed and sometimes it is necessary to use force to destroy them. But women know that if our civilization is to survive we must wage peace with the same energy and crusading devotion with which we have waged war when it has been thrust upon us. Women know that President Truman has the same abhorrence of war, the same desire to avoid a third world war that they have.

I believe that women all over this land were encouraged when they heard the President simply and solemnly state the far-eastern policy of the United States last Wednesday night. Women everywhere, even in Russia and the other countries behind the iron curtain, if the Voice of America could reach of them, must have been impressed with his sincerity and the rational policy he was enunciating. Let us hope that the Voice of America soon will be a strong voice, clearly heard behind the iron curtain and that we, as a unified people, will use every means within our power to make the Russian people believe that we honestly want true peace, that we do not seek war and that we would rather use our vast resources and power to build a decent world than to destroy any part of the world.

The President made it clear Wednesday night that the United States and the United Nations will not take action that might start a third world war, but that they will resist aggression. They are fighting in Korea as a warning to the Communists that the free nations will and can defend free people. Fighting in Korea may have averted a third world war; it could be that the reason we can meet here tonight, unafraid that enemy planes might drop bombs on us while we dine, is because our President had the courage to send our troops into Korea and because he has the courage to refuse to allow a military commander to take action that might inflame the Communists into starting a third world war.

On Wednesday night, President Truman warned that the Communist rulers may take further action which will spread the conflict. "They have that choice," he said, "and with it the awful responsibility for what may follow."

So, I say to you, Mr. President, and the 5,000 other Democrats who are here tonight, women everywhere can have renewed hope for eventual peace because you, as the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Nation have the same profound devotion to peace—peace with honor, peace not just for our time but for all time.

We thank God that we have a President who will fight for peace, who will not be swayed by those who place politics above our national security; who will not be intimidated by those who would sacrifice peace for their own political ambitions.

Tonight, as we pay honor to the founders of the Democratic Party, Jefferson and Jackson, let us salute our great President who is carrying out the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

Our children and grandchildren will be free to assemble as we are assembled tonight because we had Roosevelt in the White House for 12 years and because we have had Harry Truman there for 6 of the most perilous years in our history. And we will have him there for 5 more, please God.

A Tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur by Alfonso Mirabal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur by my friend Alfonso Mirabal.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR
(By Alfonso Mirabal)

It is proper and appropriate that at the termination of a lifelong service rendered our country by a famous contemporary personality that a tribute be paid him.

Words seem very inadequate, inept and ineffectual to fully honor the leadership and aspiration that this great military leader and statesman gave to all Americans throughout the years of ordeal and wars, in which he devoted his life, and to which so willingly he served his fellowmen.

A brief review of his life is a review of "Americana."

Douglas MacArthur was born at Little Rock, Ark., on January 26, 1880.

His military career began with his graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point, where he graduated with the highest honors in 1903.

The first assignment was with the Engineers Corps in the Philippine Islands. It was in these islands MacArthur many years later led one of the most dramatic defenses in military history.

In 1914 MacArthur made a creditable and fine record in an expedition to Mexico.

He was selected as Chief of the Censorship Division when the United States entered World War I. His work was of such high merits that he was promoted to the rank of colonel in August of 1917. He asked for active duty and soon became Chief of Staff of the noted Rainbow Division in October, 1917. This division was one of the roughest, hard-hitting forces in the war area. In February of 1918 he received a citation for gallantry from the commander of the French Seventh Army, and the next June he was promoted to brigadier general. He was placed in command of the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade, which broke the Kriembilde line north of Verdun in October; he next commanded the Rainbow Division. He led it through the Meuse-Argonne offensive and in the advance of Sedan, and later took it to the Rhine as part of the Army of Occupation.

In June, 1919, he became the youngest officer ever to be honored with the superintendency of the Military Academy at West Point.

In 1922 he was assigned to command the Manila District.

He was made a Major General in 1925—being the youngest with that rank in the Army. So, again in 1930, when he was selected as Chief of Staff, United States Army, with the temporary rank of General, he was the youngest man ever appointed to that post. As Chief of Staff he was military adviser to several presidents.

In 1935 he was granted leave to help the Philippine Commonwealth prepare its national defenses.

At his own request he retired in 1937. His retirement, however, was not for long, as his knowledge of military strategy was widely recognized as unsurpassed. He was recalled to duty with the appointment of commander general of all United States troops in the Far East and promoted to the rank of lieutenant general. He became a full general in December of 1941. In March of 1942 he received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Perhaps one of the most notable events, still fresh in the minds of Americans, occurred in March 1942, when General MacArthur on the direct orders of President Roosevelt relinquished his post on Bataan and made a dramatic 2,000-mile trip by plane, submarine, and motor torpedo boat to Australia, where he assumed the supreme command of the land, sea and air forces of the United Nations in the southwest Pacific during World War II. He was accompanied on this most historic trip by his wife and young son Arthur. It is now history how he conquered one island after another to fulfill his dramatic vow to return to the Philippines and forcefully retake it from the enemy. While the whole world of free, liberty-loving nations prayed, he led the troops in hand-to-hand combat into Leyte. At the head of his troops he waded through the surf in that famous battle. Even grade-school youngsters today can relate how MacArthur, after taking the Philippines as commander of the allied forces, spearheaded the war against Japan. Aboard the battleship *Missouri* he in company with our other military leaders signed the formal surrender in Tokyo Bay. Over and over again he has set aside any regard for his personal safety by going to the front in the battles in Korea as was his custom in the two World Wars.

In the present Far East war, MacArthur had a fourfold duty. He was supreme allied occupation commander in Japan, United Nations commander in chief for Korea, United States commander in chief for the Far East, and commanding general of the United States Army in the Far East.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by the Honorable William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on April 14, 1951:

On behalf of the Democratic National Committee I welcome you to the 1951 Jefferson-Jackson dinner. I thank each one of you for your attendance—for your enthusiasm, and for your party loyalty.

I extend special thanks to the members of the dinner committee for the long hours and hard work that have made this occasion so outstandingly successful under the chairmanship of a distinguished Democrat, the former Secretary of the Navy, John L. Sullivan, and the equally distinguished cochairman, the charming wife of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mrs. Charles F. Brannan, and under the stewardship of our able treasurer, the Honorable Sidney Salomon, Jr.

Because of their efforts and your constant and loyal support, my job as chairman has been made a pleasant one.

We are meeting tonight at a serious and solemn hour. We are gathered to rededicate ourselves to the principles of two great Americans—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

However, we do not meet solely as partisan members of a political party. Instead, we gather together as Americans to join hands with all other Americans—to pray—to work—to fight for the security of our country.

Your meeting here in a spirit of patriotism and unity is a tribute to the courage and leadership of our great President, Harry S. Truman.

At no time in the history of this Nation have the words "Let us unite with one heart and one mind" meant so much as they do today. These were the words of Jefferson 150 years ago. These are the sentiments of our great leader, President Harry S. Truman.

Thus we gather not merely to celebrate—not merely to achieve political aims—not as representatives of any partisan group—but as Americans who are concerned with the problems which confront our Nation and the world.

This is the hour in which we proudly point to our heritage as Americans. The founders of this Nation proved ready and willing to make any sacrifice for the good of the Nation and its people.

No sacrifice will be too great. We in our generation must meet whatever demands are made for the sake of our country, for the patriotic citizens to make for the security of the Nation.

When the security of this Nation is at stake there is no time for partisan politics.

Patriotism must come before politics.

The hour has passed when men may think in terms of pettiness. Selfishness, envy, and greed must not be part of the thinking of mankind if we are to save America, preserve our freedom, and give hope to a troubled world.

We need a single-minded unity in our determination to preserve our national integrity and our American way of life.

We have repeatedly asked for unity for all patriotic Americans regardless of political affiliations to work together for the security of our country and we continue to ask for unity.

We have borne with patience and, if necessary, we will continue to bear the abuse, slander, smears, and lies which some members of the minority party resort to in order to further their own selfish purposes.

These irresponsible attacks are not in the interest of America. President Truman has dedicated his very life toward the attainment of world peace—and he, like Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt in their days, has had to endure the attacks of the powerful interests who use devious and underhanded means designed to mislead and confuse the American public.

But the American people have repeatedly proven themselves to be too well informed to be misled by such tactics.

In politics as in life itself, right will prevail. The American people know that the Democratic Party stands for what is right.

We must refuse to listen to the shrill voices of discontent and disunity. Those individuals who seek to sow seeds of distrust and to divide our people should feel the full weight of public condemnation.

The Democratic Party will hold intact the progress we have made for the benefit of the farmers, the workers, business and professional men and women, and for all the people in this country.

The Democratic Party will continue to be the party of the people as it has since the days of Jefferson and Jackson.

It has advanced under the stirring leadership of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman.

The fundamental issue of our time is the fight between freedom and Communist slavery. In this fight our country by the grace of God stands a free, prosperous, and strong Nation—we intend to keep it that way—and we will under the leadership of our great President, Harry S. Truman.

This is an hour in which men with firm convictions renew their belief in the democratic way of life—indeed in their faith in Almighty God. The faith of our fathers must be found in our hearts—in our minds and souls—as we stand steadfast today in support of our leaders.

In this hour of peril we who are part of the Democratic Party have no desire for partisan political advantage and we ask all patriotic Americans to join with us to give to America its greatest strength and thereby bring about world peace.

America will win through this period of danger. I pray God that the day will soon come when the blessings of peace and prosperity will be made secure to every person in this land, and when the bountiful production of all the great industries of the world will be fully available for the peaceful advancement of mankind instead of for destruction.

These are our objectives. I ask all Americans to join with us tonight in support of our great leader in this fight to save the world.

Proposed Grant of $150,000,000 to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Louisville Times of April 4 published an editorial entitled "Israel Deserves Our Assistance in Its Time of Trouble." This is a very fine editorial, from an outstanding newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL DESERVES OUR ASSISTANCE IN ITS TIME OF TROUBLE

The bill introduced in the House of Representatives this week to grant $150,000,000 to Israel points up again for us far removed from the scene (those who are there need no reminder) how desperate is the situation in that newest and most hopeful of countries. Surrounded by hostile peoples, overpopulated in relation to production, suffering from an inflation which makes ours look mild and torn internally by conflicting viewpoints, Israel is in a serious condition.

The bill granting the $150,000,000 was introduced by Representative MCCORMACK, House Democratic leader, and thus presumably is an administration measure. But even its passage would go only a short way toward solving Israel's trouble. Some idea of the magnitude of that problem can be gained from the fact that the Israeli government is seeking in the next 3 years a development fund of $1,500,000,000, including a $500,000,000 bond issue in this country.

According to Moshe Brilliant in a New York Times dispatch early this year, Israel's principal economic problems, "the gap between consumption and production, the adverse balance of trade and the threat of inflation," result largely from the doubling of the country's population (to 1,350,000) in 2½ years, the growth of the Arab minority through territorial expansion and the fact that Israel's neighbors are hostile.

It is the population expansion which particularly interests us because, in a sense, Israel was formed to give homeless Jews a home. This she has done and is doing. In 1950 alone, 170,000 persons entered the country. At the end of the year 40,000 were living in immigrant camps, dependent on the Jewish Agency while awaiting work and living accommodations.

Even in a naturally rich country expansion at this rate would create enormous problems. But Israel is not rich. Hal Lehrman, writing in Commentary some time ago, said: "The simple truth, to begin with, is that no more than a quarter to a third of Israel's economy can be agricultural. This country must sell abroad in order to buy food; in the long run, it must export or die." But in order to export it needs to import raw materials, machines, and money. It needs money to develop new territories, new industries, new factories, new housing accommodations.

As a result of the current economic instability, private sources of money are drying up. Lehrman, in the article mentioned previously, said, "The high costs of labor, fuel, electric power and transport, the low level of mechanization, the Israeli pound's lopsided rate of exchange all go into the making of a headache which many prospective foreign Jewish investors show themselves reluctant to chance for the sake of uncertain and slender profits."

With Israel importing about seven times as much as she exports and with private capital becoming reluctant to invest in those fundamentals which would ease that imbalance, it is no wonder that Israel has been seeking assistance from the United States Government. Nor is there any doubt that we should give all the help we can to aid that country for whose founding we are partly responsible.

The Anglo-American Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, the Anglo-American partnership, by Lawrence Hunt, of New York City, at the fifty-fifth annual convention of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in Philadelphia, on Saturday, April 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members of the academy, ladies and gentlemen, I am highly honored and deeply grateful for the opportunity to address the annual convention of this great institution about some of the questions for which we are seeking honest and sensible answers.

One of the major lessons from Asia and the chief lesson of our times is the supreme necessity, for the survival of the free world, of our Anglo-American partnership.

Today Russia has a great hope and a great objective—that Britain and America will fail to win the battle for freedom throughout the world. Her leaders shrewdly count, not only on their own skill, but on our follies, to disunite us; they count on the reactionaries who never learn; they count perhaps even more on the pseudo intellectuals, the doctrinaires, and the perverse perfectionists with their frantic lust for self-deception. The Communists today, like the Nazis yesterday, know that if they can divide Britain and America they can conquer the world. To divide Britain and America—that is their supreme hope, as it is the supreme hope of all the enemies of man's freedom.

Will the Russian Communists succeed?

If the outcome depended on our frustrated and glamour-seeking politicians and our pseudo intellectuals, the answer would be "Yes." There is no use denying that they have done some harm and will do much more harm if they can. But those people do not speak for America.

It is true that there is an extreme but very small left-wing group in Britain which does not like the Anglo-American partnership and is unfairly critical of America. But the responsible leaders of both the Labor government and the Conservative opposition have repudiated these extremists and have expressed, again and again and again, inside and outside of Parliament, their understanding and appreciation of America's efforts to protect the free nations against Soviet imperialism. They have expressed, again and again and again, the British people's gratitude for the help of their American partner.

Here in America we have been deluged in recent months with a constant stream of propaganda about Brition trading with the enemy, Britain's appeasement of China, and about the British dragging their feet. There has been no serious effort here, comparable to that in England, by the responsible leaders of both our parties, to refute this vilification and abuse which can only give aid and comfort to Soviet communism; no real attempt by our leaders in or out of politics to tell the American people the truth about our British partner, to urge understanding and fair play, even when there are differences in methods about meeting the menace of Soviet imperialism.

The upshot of it all is that the thinking of many honest people has become confused, their nerves jangled and their emotions jaded. Even supposedly intelligent people—even lawyers—frequently stop thinking these days and mentally go to sleep with a slogan or a catch phrase.

The chief purpose of my remarks today is to suggest briefly that we question some of these abusive criticisms, and, however painful to the prejudices or disturbing to the ignorance of some Americans, that we try—really try—to be fair to our British partner. Without fair play toward others, we shall become a mentally corrupt people. Without fair play, our Anglo-American partnership will ultimately fail. Without fair play, our civilization will go down in ruin.

Of course I do not mean that there should be any suppression of honest differences among the members of our English-speaking family. Advice to other nations has always been the greatest American export, in volume if not in value, and we must expect and even welcome a fair balance of trade in that respect, as in others. But in these days of high tension we have what Anthony Eden calls "the responsibility to choose our words." Our propagandists for world war III are perversely imitating the Russian tactics of vilification and abuse, even toward our stanchest ally, about comparatively minor differences. These Russian tactics have not been persuasive with the free peoples of the world, and their imitation by people in this country obscures America's finest purposes and tends to thwart her best efforts to avoid another war.

Now about Britain "trading with the enemy." That accusation is chiefly concerned with Hong Kong's trade with China and Russia. Let's face the facts. Hong Kong applies the same controls to trade with China as are applied by Britain. This trade is nearly all in goods and materials produced in many other countries. The export to Communist countries of nearly 300 articles, including munitions, chemicals, machine tools, etc., is absolutely forbidden, and the export of another hundred articles is carefully restricted, and the export of still another hundred articles is subject to the constant supervision of the British Government.

Many of the free nations are receiving in this trade with Russia and China materials necessary to their own economic strength and essential to their ability to rearm and defend themselves against Communist aggression. It is helpful to note that the occupying authorities in Japan recently accepted Chinese conditions for the continuation of the import of coke coal from certain mines in north China in exchange for the equal value of Japanese cotton yarn on a barter basis. Such an exchange makes sense under present world conditions; is this "trading with the enemy"?

Let's face the facts.

About one-third of Hong Kong's trade is with China. In the first 11 months of 1950 about $340,000,000 in trade went to China and about $144,000,000 to the United States. There are now about two and one-half to three million inhabitants of Hong Kong as compared with 600,000 in 1945. If that crowded little island, an outpost of democratic civilization, is not permitted to conduct legitimate trade, the consequent economic collapse and civil strife would make almost certain its conquest from within. It is true that Russia is buying some rubber from the rubber producing countries, including some of the British Commonwealth countries. But the United States is taking eight times as much of the total world rubber production as Russia and 10 times what China purchased last year.

Again I say, let's face the facts.

Britain and America are not at war with China or Russia. Our policy is to avoid war with them. That is what our political leaders are constantly telling us and the rest of the world. We must assume that they are telling the truth. It is true that a few noisy fanatics, possibly some stock speculators who are worried about a peace scare, and some strangely perverse folk with the gruesome faith that the atom bomb will solve the major problems of a turbulent world, actually think that a third world war is imminent and inevitable, and even desirable. But the American people don't want another world war, and they do want their Government to avoid such a war.

An economic blockade of China would be a major act of war, an act which would assume that war with China, a world war, had begun. Our British partner does not believe that such a blockade could be effective, and it would, of course, create more difficulties than it would solve. Would such a blockade try to prevent Indian cotton and Pakistan jute and Indonesian rubber from getting to China's ports? Would we sink Indian ships carrying goods and materials? Would such a blockade make China more or less dependent upon Russia's aid and support?

One of the hardest tasts of statesmanship is to keep local wars from becoming major conflicts; to end local wars, not extend them. That is what all the free peoples, including the American people, desperately want. But we Americans must make our actions fit our words, or the Voice of America will be a monumental sham.

Whatever we do, let's stop talking nonsense about Britain trading with the enemy, and let's try to use some of the common sense which we are so sure we possess.

Our propagandists for a third world war and many self-deluded perfectionists are denouncing Britain's so-called appeasement of China, particularly because Britain has recognized the Communist Chinese Government and has supported the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Again I say, let's face the facts, painful though they be. The fact is, much as we and Britain dislike it, that the Communist Chinese Government is in control, as far as any Chinese Government ever has been, of the mainland of China. America recognizes, as Britain recognizes, the governments of Russia; of Poland, whose United Nations representative is on our program; of other Russian satellite countries; of Yugoslavia, which boasts that its communism is purer than the Russian brand; of Spain, Argentina, and other governments with an unpleasant odor. Why not China? Diplomatic recognition, as our British friends point out, does not mean approval, but simply means the recognition of a fact—even an unpleasant fact.

Russia and her satellites, and some other nations we do not like or admire, are members of the United Nations, which is a world organization embracing all kinds of nations, and not a defensive alliance such as the Atlantic Pact. If Russia and its satellites are members of the United Nations, why not Communist China?

Our British partner has no illusions about the Communists in China nor any hope that tomorrow, or next week, or next month, Communist China will become a democracy or will sever her present ties with Russia. But the British do believe—and I submit that we Americans should also believe—that in the long run there is a chance that China will become less dependent on Russia and that her national interests in the future, as in the past, will keep her from becoming a vast Russian satellite without a life of her own—another Russian slave state. Hard as it may be, we should try to take the long

view and not resort or succumb to the slogans and catchphrases of our propagandists for world war III.

But the most unscrupulous and the most malicious accusation by these propagandists is that the British are dragging their feet.

Again I say, let's face the facts.

In proportion to her population—one-third of ours—Britain has today as many men in her armed forces combating or restraining Communist aggression as has the United States. Her forces are fighting or are on guard at 19 key points throughout the world. Anthony Eden has pointed out in the April issue of Foreign Affairs that these British forces are stretched in relation to the availability of trained men and modern arms more tautly than those of any other country, ally, or enemy. The British were fighting in Malaya for 2 years before the Communist aggression in Korea last June. Britain has had universal military training for men 18 to 26 since 1947. We are still talking about it. The British people, for more than 10 years, have voluntarily submitted to a rationing system, in some respects severer today than ever before, unknown and perhaps even unbearable in this country. And why? To repair the awful damage of war, to enable their country to pay its own way, to meet its obligations, and to play its part in the defense of the freedom of mankind. One egg and 8 pence worth of meat a week.

Who are dragging their feet?

The results of this self-restraint and self-sacrifice on the part of the British people should be reassuring to their friends and astounding to future historians. Our partner has achieved solvency at least for the moment. She has raised her industrial production 50 percent and her exports 70 percent above the prewar level. Proportionately, she is doing at least as much as America in meeting the menace of Soviet communism.

Nor is this the whole story. It is much easier for a rich man to contribute 15 percent of his income to worthy causes than it is for a man of modest means. In the one case there may be the sacrifice of some luxuries, in the other of bare necessities. The true test is how much a man is doing as compared with what he can do.

Who are dragging their feet?

You can't expect a Republican like me to sing hosannas to the British Labor Party. Many of us Americans have grave doubts about the doctor's prescription now being administered to the British people, but I have not the slightest doubt that they will survive both the malady and the remedy. Moreover, we must admit, again in the spirit of fair play, that many of the measures adopted by the British Labor Government during the past 6 years would also have been adopted in substance by the Conservatives. And as regards the main problems of foreign policy, the British people are united. As Winston Churchill remarked in the House of Commons on the eve of Prime Minister Attlee's recent visit to America—"Here in Britain, and I doubt not throughout the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations, we always follow a very simple rule which has helped us in maintaining the safety of this country—the worse things get the more we stand together."

Armament is not enough to save the world. That is one of the chief lessons from Asia. Our British partner knows that, and despite all the sacrifices and hardships of her people, Great Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth are already making, under the Colombo plan, the most constructive and statesmanlike effort of our generation to preserve and to develop the democratic way of life in Asia.

The Colombo plan, as you know, is a comprehensve 6-year program for economic development in South and South East Asia which was drawn up by seven nations of the Commonwealth—Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ceylon, India, and Pakistan. The plan was first proposed in January 1950, and after several other meetings was finally announced last November. It covers an area of 570,000,000 people—one-quarter of the world's population. Its aim is to put 13,000,000 more acres under cultivation, to increase grain production by 10 percent, and electricity generating capacity by 67 percent. The total 6-year cost is estimated at about $5,500,000,000, of which $2,200,000,000 will be raised within the Commonwealth countries in Asia, exclusive of their sterling balances, and $3,300,000,000 will be raised by external financial aid, including sterling releases and outright gifts. Britain has already pledged $40,000,000, including sterling releases of nearly $700,000,000 dollars, and will probably make an outright gift in the near future of $150,000,000. A central agency known as the Council for Technical Cooperation, has alreardy begun operations at its headquarters in Colombo, Ceylon. Representatives from other Asiatic countries such as Burma, Indonecia, Thailand and Indochina are working in close cooperation with the Commonwealth countries. What have we done? We are appropriating about $35,000,000 for our point 4 program.

Who are "dragg ng their feet"?

We could participate in the Colombo plan on a bilateral or a multilateral basis and contribute the balance necessary to achieve its goal. Or we could, in a spirit of partnership with the British Commonwealth, work out some feasible plan for dovetailing a greatly expanded point 4 program with the Colombo plan. What the American people must realize is the urgent need for such a great undertaking. The problems of Asia can't be solved by radio broadcasts, by dropping atomic bombs, or by letting hundreds of thousands of people starve to death because American politicians are piqued by the failure of Indian politicians to agree at all times as to the best methods of preserving a free and democratic world. The magnificent American effort under the Marshall plan helped save Europe from communism and helped restore her war-damaged economy. In Asia, the Anglo-American partnership must work literally "from the ground up" to prevent hundreds of millions of human beings from sinking even lower in the scale of living and from becoming a prey to Communist propaganda. Our British partner and her sister nations in the Commonwealth are leading the way to meet the most pressing problems of Asia. What will we do?

Perhaps we can get a suggestion from Thomas Jefferson.

You will remember that President Monroe wrote to Jefferson asking his advice about the British suggestion for what later became known as the Monroe Doctrine. On October 23, 1823, the author of the Declaration of Independence wrote to Monroe as follows:

"The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of Independence. * * * One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this proceeding; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we * * * bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. * * * With her on our side we need not fear the whole world."

"Emancipate a continent." With our British partner we did emancipate the South American Continent from the menace of the holy alliance. In the last war the Anglo-American partnership emancipated the continent of Europe. Together America and Britain, in these next few years, can emancipate the continent of Asia, including perhaps even China.

The skeptics and scoffers will again talk about rat holes. But they are not the kind kind of people who will save their own country or the world from disaster. They do not know, or do not want to know, the facts of life in the year of our Lord 1951.

What Britain and the other nations of the Commonwealth are doing is not charity or a mere stopgap measure to feed people one year and let them starve the next, but a program of self-help which, in terms of the objects to be achieved and the needs which must be met, will cost very little. If we are willing in one form or another to play our part, it will cost us less than one-tenth—less than one-twentieth—of what we propose to spend on armament during the next 2 years. Are we willing now, as Jefferson proposed long ago, to join our British partner in the emancipation of a continent? Or shall we Americans drag our feet?

We need not only a Voice of America but a voice to America—a voice which will tell us that the desperately hungry peoples of the world must have the means to earn their daily bread, that the starving masses of Asia cannot eat the Constitution, that noisy boasts of American democracy do not satisfy the empty bellies of children, that we cannot long enjoy a paradise inside of America with hell outside.

The task will not be easy. We Americans will continue to be denounced as "greedy imperialists." We are finding that criticism a little hard to bear, because it's not true and possibly because it was once the favorite epithet of many Americans when Britain alone was doing the thankless jobs of the world. At any rate, our British friends can assure us that the first hundred years are the hardest.

When you hear or read any more malicious nonsense about the British "dragging their feet," I suggest that you look at the record of yesterday as well as at the facts of today.

Much as some Americans would like to forget it, the record shows that, in the first 2 years of the last World War, we were a mentally confused and spiritually sick people. Our right-wing isolationists thought we could do business with Hitler, our left-wing isolationists thought it was an "imperialist war" until Russia was attacked, and most Americans hardly knew what to think. Even after the invasion of Holland and Belgium and the slaughter of Rotterdam, even after the fall of France, even after the Battle of Britain, even while nearly the whole European Continent writhed under the torture of German tyranny, even while the British Commonwealth stood utterly alone, even then both the candidates for the Presidency in the election of 1940, despite their obvious sympathies, deemed it politically necessary to assure the people, in the most fervent terms, that the United States would not enter the war "except in the case of attack."

And yet, throughout that dismal period of doubt and delay, the American people did slowly but surely come to realize their danger and their need of Britain for their very salvation. We knew, deep down, that if Britain were conquered, the very soul of western civilization would be gone forever. British courage gave us good cheer and strengthened our hearts. Dunkerque, Britain's greatest defeat, helped us on the hard road to moral recovery. So did the Battle of Britain, her greatest victory. The blitz helped. The fires of London rekindled the American conscience.

Yes, we also did a magnificent job. I simply suggest that we look at both the record of yesterday and the facts of today so that we can understand and appreciate the kind of partner we shall have in the long, hard days ahead.

In the future, there will be world conferences, and many of them will fail. There will be all kinds of international formulas and

they will fade away. There will be glittering slogans and they will be forgotten.

But if the American and the British peoples have faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future, and charity toward each other's shortcomings, then, as friends, as partners, and as allies, they can go forward together into the future, as far as the human eye can see, in dignity, in freedom, and, let us hope, in peace.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by the Honorable John L. Sullivan, chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Committee, at the National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., on April 14, 1951:

It is for me a very great honor to welcome so many real Democrats to the 1951 Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner in Washington. We meet here on the day after the two hundred and eighth anniversary of the birth of one of America's greatest Presidents, Thomas Jefferson. He and Andrew Jackson—the other great President in whose memory we meet tonight—for more than 100 years have furnished a great part of the inspiration, the courage, and the vision which has lighted the way for a greater America and a far better world.

It is a real thrill for a man from New Hampshire to see over 5,000 Democrats gathered under one roof. We don't have Democratic crowds quite this size in the Granite State. But we have just as much enthusiasm and just as much courage.

Before proceeding to introduce the distinguished guests at this head table there is one thought that I would like to give this audience.

For the past several months in the newspapers, on the radio, and through all the media of communications, the American people have witnessed a constant barrage of charges and countercharges involving varying derelictions of duty by Federal employees and former employees. Some of these incidents have been displeasing and repugnant to us all. However large the organization of Government becomes, any deficiency of malfeasance in the discharge of a public trust by even the least of our public officials or employees is a matter of concern to us all. Insofar as such derelictions are proved, they must be punished, and the offenders removed from the Government. In public affairs, public self-criticism is the mark of a progressive, dynamic democracy. Today such self-criticism and searching examination is very properly being carried on at great lengths. Whenever it is motivated by a desire for improvement it is all to the good.

It would be well, however, for us to cultivate a sense of proportion, and to evaluate the relative importance of these incidents. We must remind ourselves and our friends of the truly great issues which face the world today, of the truly great progress that has been achieved in the last few years toward preventing the outbreak of world war III and preserving the peace of the world. We must do this frequently lest these issues that are of paramount importance to us all, and which will determine the kind of world in which our children and our children's children will live, become obscured in the minutiae of the moment.

I ask you to turn your minds back 4 years to March 1947. At that time the most optimistic among us felt that Greece had been lost to the free world, that Turkey was in dire jeopardy, that Italy was ready to fall into the hands of the Communists. Yugoslavia was the brightest satellite in the Communist crown, and the future of freedom and democracy in France was most uncertain to say the best. What a difference has come over the face of Western Europe in these few short years because of changes in the viewpoint, in the hope of the people of those five countries. Great comfort and new courage was born to all the freedom-loving peoples on both sides of the iron curtain. This was not just an accident. This new birth of freedom and hope from the Bosporus to the English Channel in very large part was due to the vision, courage, determination, and the leadership of the one man who, as head of the greatest nation in the free world today, bears the lion's share of the responsibility of preserving freedom and democracy wherever it now exists—our great President, Harry S. Truman.

The Greek-Turkish-aid program, the Marshall plan and its effective implementation through the Economic Cooperation Administration, the North Atlantic Treaty with its mutual-defense-assistance program are among the things which our President has achieved. These are the things which flow from the Truman doctrine. These are the things that restored hope in the world. They are the things that will be remembered in this world 100 years from tonight.

America's resolute resistance to the blockade in Berlin and our defense of South Korea in the face of cruel aggression prove once and for all that the champions of freedom can and do stand up and fight.

Realizing what Korea is costing us in the lives of fine young men and the disruption of our economy, some people today question the wisdom of our decision to resist aggression in Korea. There will never be any doubt in my mind that this decision was right.

It so happens that I was in Europe when the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. During those 48 hours in which our Government remained silent while going through the procedure of the last-resort provisions of the United Nations Charter, the confidence of Western Europeans in America melted like butter in the noonday sun. On all sides I was told that this was a repetition of our failure to follow through on the League of Nations after World War I. Things looked pretty grim. If the doubt in America's integrity and resolution had contintued for another week, Western Europe would have been lost to democracy for generations, and the cooperation we are now receiving from the Atlantic Pact nations could never have been achieved.

However, 2 days after the invasion of Korea the President of the United States in a ringing statement announced our resistance to aggression in such clear and unmistakable terms that people all over Western Europe were lifted from the depths of despondency to the heights of hope. Well may that decision of the President of the United States be recorded by the historians of the twenty-first century as the turning point in the world conflict between the powers of evil and the friends of freedom.

The people of America, knowing that the fate of civilization, that human freedom, and the dignity of man is at stake, will in my opinion support in 1952 the party that has waged for many long years such a heroic struggle against oppression and aggression, the party that has fought such an enlightened and courageous fight in behalf of all those things that make life worth the living, the party of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman.

Conditions in the Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star of April 12, 1951, entitled "It Stinks—Clean It Up."

This editorial has been sent to me by a number of people in my State indicating that it has made a profound impression. They ask: Cannot Congress do something constructive about the deplorable conditions existing in the executive branch of our Government, as shown here?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT STINKS—CLEAN IT UP

The furor over dismissal of General MacArthur should not obscure what is, if anything, an even more serious matter.

It is the gross political maneuvering, the wire pulling, the use of influence in dipsensing jobs and favors, the confusion, the inefficiency, and the waste that dominate far too much of the Washington scene right up to the top. It is the evidence of the exceedingly low standards of conduct that govern a good section of the Nation's public life today.

And this at a time when people are being called upon to labor and to sacrifice, to support the program of mobilization and defense, and to be on their guard against any complacency or let-down at a time of stress when the Nation's security is gravely endangered.

The American people are ready to do their full part in mobilization and the rest. They are not ready to tolerate the mismanagement and the rottenness that are presently being laid out before their eyes.

For added to the exposures by the Fulbright committee investigating the RFC, the Kefauver committee investigating the underworld and its political links in the big cities, the revelations of influence peddling, and the work of the 5-percenters along with the scandals in the handling of surplus war materials—added to all that is the amazing account of former Gov. M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, and his experience with the job business in Washington.

Here was a loyal Democrat with a fine record of public service who presumably was being called in to take over a responsible position with the Office of Price Stabilization. Although he was not hard up for a Government job, Thompson responded with a feeling of partiotic duty.

To his consternation he found on reporting to the OPS that he couldn't be seen by Director DiSalle but instead must report to the office of the Democratic National Committee. That political agency evidently was serving as the clearinghouse for important jobs and the proper official agencies were being short-circuited. But after his discovery that another man was being considered for the same job, Thompson agreed to a reshuffle of his supposed duties and then waited for a call to take over.

He waited till the patience of any conscientious man would have been exhausted. He was being paid his salary and $53.48 a day for expenses—yet for 12 weeks had never

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

been consulted or called upon for any official work. His response was to resign and expose the whole mess, denouncing the "deplorable conditions in the national administration" that make party loyalty and patriotism impossible at the same time, and declaring there "are thousands upon thousands" of job holders on the Federal payrolls in Washington and throughout the country who "are rendering no service."

There in the whole shameful record is the grave situation that confronts the American people in a time of stress. It's a call for Nation-wide protest and a demand for correction—if it can be had under the conditions that exist today. In time, if not soon, it will be had. For public indignation will mount until a clean-up has been achieved in the name both of decency and the Nation's well-being.

Public Acclaim for MacArthur—Public Disgust for Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the interests of the American people and the United States have once again been subordinated to the scheming machinations of foreign interests, and Anglophile Americans, led by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and President Truman, and a great American patriot and military leader, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has been purged from his command.

What manner of administration do we have in America today? Who are these men in the highest positions in the land serving? Have they forgotten their oath of office, which pledges them to represent the people of the United States? Have they ever heard of the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution which established the sovereignty of the United States?

General MacArthur had the courage as an American citizen and as a professional soldier to face facts realistically in this period of world crisis, and to report bluntly to his Government and to the American people that the time has come to end this state of "war which is not war" in Korea, and either attack the enemy at every point or withdraw.

For his patriotic stand General MacArthur has been dismissed. He has been dismissed because of criticism from a foreign nation, a nation whose first consideration is its own self-interests and now how many American boys are spilling their blood on Korean soil.

The people of America are outraged at this latest Truman blunder, a blunder which may cost far more than anyone can today estimate in American lives and resources. At a time when the administration has again and again stressed the need for unity in our land, Mr. Truman has again demonstrated his elephantine tact by the removal of General MacArthur, the most effective action he could possibly have taken at this time to create Nation-wide disunity in our land.

Wires are pouring into Washington demanding the removal of Truman and Acheson without further delay. Certainly there can no longer be any doubt that President Truman is not capable of holding the high office to which he was, unfortunately, elected. The wave of indignation sweeping this country is without precedent. Never in history have the people demanded the removal of a President and a Secretary of State as they are today demanding the removal of Truman and Acheson.

More than 6 months ago I demanded the impeachment of Truman and Acheson in response to the urgent requests for such action from citizens in all parts of the Nation. Today I believe this action is still needed for the good of the United States.

If Mr. Truman wants unity in America and is willing to make a patriotic sacrifice in the best interests of his country, he would resign from the office where he has failed so miserably and at so great a cost to the United States.

This Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Douglas MacArthur, a brilliant military strategist, a good American. His name will be honored in the history of his country. Those who would humiliate and defile him will be remembered for their infamy.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who's President?" from the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S PRESIDENT?

Most sober, thinking persons, regardless of their political affiliation, subscribe to the statement that in view of all of the circumstances President Truman had no other course than to relieve General MacArthur of his command.

General MacArthur has been a good soldier, but apparently either he or his advisers—or both—believe that he, MacArthur, had become more important than the office of the President of the United States. The American people, as much as they may admire MacArthur as a military man, did not elect him President. They, or a majority of them at least, elected Harry Truman President of the United States.

It makes little difference whether one believes that Harry Truman is a great President or an indifferent President. The real thing to remember is that throughout all of the years of our Republic's life it has been found that it was not safe to permit the military to run the Nation. In fact, our Founding Fathers made considerable effort to avoid this situation and their fears were well based in historical fact.

General MacArthur has no more right to address a joint session of Congress than any other general who has been relieved of his command. Obviously, his address could be nothing more than a defense of his actions as commanding officer of the Far East and if he wishes to defend that action he, no doubt, will be given ample opportunity to do so by the Republican Party that at long last has found a candidate to run for the Presidency.

General MacArthur has a perfect right to run for the Presidency of the United States. That right, if not opportunity, is available to any American citizen, but he doesn't have the right as commander of a military force to take over the duties of the President of the United States. And that is exactly what he has been trying to do—and doing in some respect—for the past several years. He has violated almost all of the rules laid down by the Government for the military even to the extent of using the military wires to funnel some of his "messages" to such sympathetic organizations as the Chicago Tribune and other comparable publications. Instead of informing his Commander in Chief, President Truman, of his actions in many cases, as MacArthur demanded his subordinates do, he communicated directly with JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader in Congress.

So, the issue has been joined. General MacArthur must come home and we certainly hope he runs for the office of President of the United States. Several years ago he dabbled with the idea and figuratively speaking "poked his toe in the water" in one of the Midwestern States' primaries. He failed to finish in the money, to use a phrase. Perhaps he will fare better the next time—and the next time in 1952 because he is the darling of the Chicago Tribune and its vast network of propaganda.

But the important thing is that in 1952 MacArthur will be running as a private citizen for the Presidency and not in the dual role of commander in chief of our far eastern forces as well as a self-appointed king above the Presidency which is, of course, the highest gift in the hands of the American people.

We do not pretend to have any information relative to the consequences of peace in Korea in view of the MacArthur ouster. Neither do we assume to pass upon the manner in which MacArthur had to be removed. We do insist that in view of the repeated acts of defiance to the authority of the Presidency, however, that the only criticism that President Truman justifiably should face is the criticism of waiting too long.

There was a feeling prior to Wednesday amongst many people that MacArthur was too powerful for the President of the United States to either discipline or remove.

There was feeling among some of the MacArthur military clique—and that clique was and is large within the military—that MacArthur was more important than the President. There is a feeling amongst the military too—that part of the military which is by far the most substantial part, that MacArthur was bad for the Armed Forces Establishment in that he took the attitude that whatever he did was right—regardless—while the same thing done by another might well bring on a reprimand or a court martial.

Yes, we hope that MacArthur is the Republican nominee for the Presidency. That will put the issue where it belongs—on the soap boxes—and take it out of the military where it never did belong but where too much of MacArthur's public relations have been for far too long.

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Allegan, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith a resolution adopted by the city council of my home town of Allegan, Mich., together with the letter which accompanied it:

CITY OF ALLEGAN,
Allegan, Mich., April 13, 1951.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This community, like the rest of the Nation, is stunned by the recent action of the President in the dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The enclosed resolution expresses the feeling of the city council. I sincerely hope you will make those feelings known to the Congress.

Cordially and sincerely yours,
P. H. BEAUVAIS,
City Manager.

"Whereas it is the judgment of the City Council of the City of Allegan, Allegan County, Mich., that—

"1. Shortly after the cessation of hostilities in World War II it became apparent to most intelligent people that the Communist government of Russia had dedicated itself to the expansion of Communism and the destruction of the free nations of the world.

"2. Despite the necessity of opposing communism by the use of all reasonable and available means and forces in the best interest and security of the United States, President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson did, contrary to our welfare and security, aid and abet communism in China and withheld material aid and support from Nationalist China.

"3. President Truman and Secretary Acheson did, precedent to June of 1950, contrary to a legislative enactment of the Congress of the United States, with apparent intent to circumvent and evade the will of Congress, arbitrarily and willfully refuse to advance to the Government of the Republic of Korea upwards of ten billions of dollars, appropriated by the Congress for the defense of said republic against a possible attack by the Communists of North Korea.

"4. By reason of the direct aid given to Red China and the refusal of our State Department to render aid to Nationalist China, and the refusal to advance the moneys appropriated by the Congress for the defense of South Korea, the Communists of North Korea were enabled to, and did, in June of 1950, launch a successful invasion of South Korea, and in which they were later fortified and assisted by Red Chinese armies.

"5. Immediately thereafter President Truman did, contrary to his constitutional authority, engage these United States in a war, under the guise and pretext that he was acting under authority of the United Nations and engaging solely in a police action.

"6. Having involved this Nation illegally in a war in Korea, the President and the Secretary of State did, in contradiction to the security and welfare of the Armed Forces committed to action in Korea and under his command, arbitrarily refuse authority to Gen. Douglas MacArthur to—

"(a) Bomb the staging areas and sources of supply for the Communist hordes, located across the Korean border in Manchuria.

"(b) Blockade the coast of Red China so as to prevent the shipment of supplies and war matériel to Red China.

"(c) Use the armies of Nationalist China stationed on Formosa.

"(d) Equip and arm an estimated 500,000 South Koreans, able, willing, and anxious to fight.

"7. By reason of the foregoing acts and policies, thousands of our American men have now become casualties of war, to be followed by untold thousands.

"8. General MacArthur did, from bitter experience and first-hand knowledge in the interest of those fighting under him and for the ultimate security of this Nation, properly and openly publicize his request for authority to wage a war as it should be waged, successfully.

"9. President Truman did, we believe at the instigation of Secretary Acheson and by reason of the influence exerted by the British Foreign Office, without justification and contrary to the welfare and security of this nation, which he has sworn to defend, summarily remove General MacArthur from his position of command in the Asiatic theater.

"10. General MacArthur has, insofar as it was within his power to do so, acted in the best interest of those serving under his command and this Nation, and President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson are guilty of gross neglect and incompetence in office and the usurpation of authority to the detriment of and danger to the United States.

"Therefore the city council of the city of Allegan, Allegan County, State of Michigan, memorializes the Congress of the United States to institute an investigation, and if the finding warrant carry out proceedings appropriate to impeach and remove from office the President of the United States, Mr. Harry S. Truman, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, as we firmly believe such action is necessary for the safety, security, and future welfare of this nation."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution made and unanimously adopted by the city council of the city of Allegan, Allegan County, Mich., at a special meeting thereof held on the 12th day of April A. D. 1951.

P. H. BEAUVAIS,
City Clerk.

The President Should Be Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as an answer to some of those critics who have condemned the President for his recent action in relieving General MacArthur, I have requested permission to extend in the Appendix an editorial written by Kent Wilson, editor of the Missouri Cash-Book, one of the leading newspapers of southeast Missouri.

While this editor does not at all times see eye-to-eye with President Truman, and has from time to time been critical of this administration, I believe that in this editorial he has pointed out the fallacy of the argument being used by those who are seeking to use this incident as a rallying point for a political campaign issue in 1952. While, of course, I have received a few—less than a dozen—telegrams and letters condemning the President, it is interesting to note that most of the communications have come from those who have been most critical of everything that this administration has done.

In addition to the letters of condemnation, I have also received messages supporting the President. Typical of these is a letter which states:

I want to express to you my support of the President in his decision to dismiss General MacArthur and I urge you to use your influence in his behalf.

In my opinion MacArthur should have been released from his command long ago. A man who causes disunity in these times when unity of purpose is essential and who puts his personal ambitions before his country and who believes himself to be bigger than his Government has no business being in a place of authority be he general or private.

No doubt the action will arouse a storm of controversy and much abuse will be heaped upon the President, but I think he has proved himself to be of great moral stature and has shown that he is a man of unbounded courage in making this decision and I believe he should be supported.

Herewith follows the editorial from the Missouri Cash-Book:

The following editorial was written Monday night, some 24 hours prior to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal from all his military commands, which is concrete evidence that this paper endorses President Truman's action.

If the editor was in President Truman's shoes, General MacArthur would have a gag shoved into his big mouth and retired to public life where he could hobnob with the Republican congressional leaders and tear loose on our administration to his heart's content, and we wouldn't fear the results. These Republicans who have suddenly become so hopeful of the discord he would cause in an open fight on our foreign policies should he be retired, would be sorely disappointed. They do not know the public pulse.

The general has been more of an actor in recent years than a soldier, boiling over with ego. The editor of this paper has never talked with a veteran of either of the two last world wars who had a good word for him, and they are too patriotic ever to be swayed by any of his arguments.

MacArthur should at least be relieved of any authority outside of Japan. We at one time thought he was a great soldier, but recent events cause us to doubt this. The Christian Science Monitor says, "A number of GI's remember ruefully that the five-star general was sure the Communist Chinese would not intervene when he spread his troops widely over North Korea, where they took one of the worst defeats in American military history."

To cover up his failures to date in the present strife, MacArthur is strongly demanding that the Chinese Nationalists be urged and aided to invade China. Those who are in a position to know state that China is prepared for such an attack and that when it happens we will be momentarily thrust into world war III. It does not require a military genius to know that such a move

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

would not "take the pressure off American troops in Korea" as the five-star general says, but would bring Russia into the conflict, first by aid of an adequate air and submarine force furnished by Russia which would render our present position untenable. Further, Russia will never sit idly by whenever the defeat of China by the United States appears ever probable.

MacArthur loses sight of another great danger, and that is the mobilization of Russian divisions in great number in East Germany and at several other points in Europe. Should we be drawn into a war with China, just what would happen if we were forced simultaneously to wage war both in Asia and Europe now?

We believe that the administration's present policy is to avoid another world conflict by a delaying action, the purpose being in the interim to use every available means to effect a peace agreement, in order to gain 2 or 3 years to get adequately prepared for defense, if not aggression.

We firmly believe that the ambition of Taft for the presidency far exceeds his love of country, and if we should be suddenly rushed into another world war the responsibility will rest upon the shoulders of the Tafts and the MacArthurs.

Attitude of Great Britain Toward Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The British Solution," which recently appeared in the Idaho Statesman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH SOLUTION

The reported British demand for a major sellout to Communist China, coming at the same time as the MacArthur dismissal, puts a fitting climax on a comedy of errors. Only it's really not so funny.

All that the British foreign office has in mind is turning over Formosa to the Peiping bandits (which would mean wholesale slaughter of thousands of Chiang Kai-shek's followers) and allowing Mao Tze-tung a full voice in formulating a Japanese peace treaty. Next step, logically, would be to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Surely no more craven and unprincipled suggestion has ever passed from one government to another. Its acceptance would once and for all scuttle any hope that the United Nations can be made an instrument to enforce world peace (a pretty dim hope at present) and its reward for brutality would turn into bitter mockery the sacrifices in lives which have been made.

The mere suggestion that the Communist rulers of China should have the least word in drawing up a peace treaty with Japan—a nation where Douglas MacArthur worked mightily to destroy Communist influence—is an insult to the people of the United States. What the men who fought from Guadalcanal to Okinawa would think of any such concession could not be printed.

Obviously the time has come for the United States to ask Britain bluntly if it knows which side in the far-eastern dispute it wants to be on. Certainly American soldiers have little business fighting in Korea if Britain has for its long-range goal a series of lucrative concessions to Red China.

This newspaper has no use for the Anglophobic attitude of some publications, but it can recognize the odor of skunk when it detects it. And that is precisely the smell connected with the latest policy statement of the British Socialist Government—strong enough to turn stomachs thousands of miles away.

Kicking General MacArthur out of command was bad enough. Offering to give Communist China all that it could conceivably want constitutes an act of lunacy, and betrayal.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the round-up of editorial comment on the dismissal of General MacArthur which appeared in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of April 14, 1951.

The Charleston Gazette's own front-page editorial on this subject on April 12, entitled "Battlefield Courage: MacArthur Was Dismissed for Doing What He Himself Wouldn't Tolerate," was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on April 13, upon the request of my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

There being no objection, the compendium was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN RIGHT IN FIRING MACARTHUR, OUTSTANDING EDITORIALISTS DECIDE

Sober opinion of most of the Nation's outstanding newspapers reflect the editorial view that President Truman followed the only course left him in dismissing General MacArthur.

Here are excerpts from editorials written after studied reflection in the case:

The New York Times: "Policy with respect to the conduct of a war cannot be made in two places. Under the American system, and specifically under the American Constitution, policy is made by the President of the United States. The policy chosen may prove in any given case to be wise or unwise; it may require a fundamental change on the basis of experience; but the Constitution puts the making of policy in the civilian hands of the Chief Executive, and it is the clear duty of the military to express its doubts or its dissent through proper military channels and not in public debate. We have no doubt, therefore, that the President acted properly."

The Christian Science Monitor: "The situation had become such that the United States was speaking with two voices on national policy and military measures. Moreover, the UN commander in Korea was evidently not in sympathy with UN aims there—poorly defined as they are. The situation could be cleared up only by a decision on one side or the other. Unless the basic policies of the United States and the United Nations were to be overturned, it became necessary for General MacArthur to conform, to resign, or be removed."

The Atlanta Constitution: "There is just one issue: Who is going to give the orders and who is the supreme authority? Is it a general serving in a nation's army, or the government of the nation? General MacArthur is a great general and a great man. But his country is greater than he. Whatever the sacrifice or loss of face or dangers incurred by his dismissal, they must be met. To do otherwise would be to destroy the authority of the Government of our country."

The Baltimore (morning) Sun: "The correct decision, so far as can be judged now, would be to continue the course which Mr. Truman has done his uncertain best to justify. If we are to fight the hordes of Russia and China and their satellites it is surely better to fight them with allies at our side to help us than to go it alone. If we deliberately start to fight them in Asia we shall almost certainly be alone."

The Wall Street Journal: "Given the situation as it stood, it is difficult to see how President Truman could have done other than he did in dismissing General MacArthur. That is true regardless of how much provocation General MacArthur had for acting as he did act. Indeed, he must have known that he would be dismissed and thought that he would accomplish something by forcing the President's hand."

The Dayton Journal Herald: "Let there be no mistake about it, the President was justified in removing MacArthur. The general has been repeatedly insubordinate, and insubordinate in a way which threatened the success of the country's foreign policy. That he got away with it so long is not a tribute to Mr. Truman's patience, for no strong President up to his job could be patient in that way. Rather it is a disclosure of Mr. Truman's futility."

The Charlotte Observer: "Since General MacArthur had demonstrated by his persistent public statements that he would not abide by the directives of his superiors, there was nothing left for the President to do but to relieve him of his commands, regardless of who was right or wrong or errors had been responsible for the developed intolerable situation."

The Louisville Courier Journal: "This would be the worst of all times for a field commander to dictate the foreign policy of the United States. That is what MacArthur showed himself determined to do, in spite of repeated and specific orders from Washington. The Korean conflict cannot be isolated from the rest of the world. An action by an American general there could bring a hail of atom bombs on the roofs of a dozen American cities. * * * So President Truman took the inevitable step."

The Roanoke Times: "It was clearly within the President's power and authority to dismiss a general who had repeatedly defied instructions * * *. The bitter controversy that is in prospect over the affair cannot be helpful and will, on the contrary, be most unfortunate if not actually disastrous."

Abuse of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and intelligently written letter addressed to the editor of the Seattle

Times, by a citizen of the State of Washington, and published in April 6, 1951, issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

EDITOR, THE TIMES:

Gross abuse of American freedom is a national danger. Liberty under law is the foundation of durable democratic government. It means that each person is free within the circle of his own right. Law seeks prevention of injury and would do justice to those who suffer harm.

Lamentably, liberty is abused by men of all stations. Even governments pervert their purpose to preserve order and justice; they enact unjust laws and adopt sinister policies. Legislatures stop clocks despite time limit; courts validate such glaring law evasion.

Pressure groups, factions, lobbies, powerful individuals abuse liberty in pursuit of selfish ends. Men alone or in gangs commit atrocious murders. Thieves, cheats, frauds, and racketeers abound. Gambling and vice flourish. Bribery and perjury may soon become popular habits.

Evil men congregate in cities to feast off the gullibility of others. Criminals from abroad live here as princely jackals. Organized crime is rife, the Communist dastardly contrives treason against our whole system of liberty, while cynically invoking protection of the liberty he would destroy. On the other hand idealists fear to defend liberty lest they abridge it.

Contributing to delinquency is the good citizen's disregard of civic duty, his own refusal to obey the law because it is the law, his fatal undervaluation of priceless lawful liberty. Laws must be enforced; if enforced, fewer would be necessary.

Constitutional democracy, if neglected or abused, quickly decays. But fortunately it carries within itself recurring strength through the supreme right of self-rule at the ballot box. This right must be revered and all citizens alerted to evils which corrupt or endanger the Republic.

If we do not rule ourselves, others will. There is no escape from the rule. The duty to vote for competent men and to administer impartial government is a duty of stern realism, for government is what we make it, not a self-executing ideal.

Hard-headed men, who flinch not from corrective action, must take the helm of state. A republic rich in purse but poor in character is foredoomed.

Who then is responsible for what is wrong in this free country? The citizens—you and I—are responsible. Our hope lies not in sporadic reform but in a sustained national revival of personal rectitude.

AUSTIN E. GRIFFITHS.

Proposed Freezing of Farm Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unjust to the Farmer," published in the Greenville (S. C.) News on April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNJUST TO THE FARMER

Senator MAYBANK uses vigorously emphatic language in his expressed determination to oppose the proposed plan to freeze farm parity prices as a way of curbing food-price rises.

But we think not only farmers, but most other citizens who endeavor to think this matter through, will agree that his position is sound and logical.

The calculated parity price for farm products, of course, rises when the things the farmer has to buy rise in price; and so the brilliant idea has occurred to some of our controllers to decree that what was parity last January, must continue to be parity no matter what other prices do, subjecting farm products to ceiling price orders at that level.

Any such action would destroy the whole theory of parity prices for farmers, and might as well be accompanied by total elimination of all legal and other conceptions of parity, along with an arbitrary ceiling on all these prices at a level no higher than the parity figure of last January.

Let it be kept in mind that the conception of parity for farm products is essentially a price relationship. It grows out of calculations that in order to be on a balanced price relationship with the rest of the economy, the farmer should receive prices for his products which bear the same relationship to prices of other goods as they bore during a former period regarded as a normal economic time. And it is obvious, of course, that if the prices of other goods rise, the farmer's calculated parity must rise also if there is to continue to be that same balanced price relationship.

There may be argument as to whether or not this is the most accurate means of figuring how the farmer ought to stand in price matters on an equitable basis with the rest of the economy, but we don't believe any of the critics, even, have suggested what he regarded as a fairer formula for this purpose. The Government, of course, does not guarantee farmers parity prices, but the whole theory of this policy is that it is desirable from the standpoint of fairness that the farmer receive as much as parity prices, and the Government gives him some help in the effort to do so by granting commodity loans at some figure below parity.

The issue now is that the price control law does not permit a ceiling to be placed on these farm commodities until and unless they reach parity prices. And that certainly seems a fair and logical proposition, so long as it is held as a public policy that it is only equitable that the farmer should receive as much as parity for his goods.

It should be obvious that if other goods rise in price and the farmer's so-called parity is not permitted to rise beyond an arbitrarily designated figure of some months ago, his price cease to be parity and the term becomes meaningless.

And it ought to be clear that farm parity prices will not rise unless other prices rise. The way to keep parity down is to keep the other prices down, since they are the basic cause of the rise and fall of parity.

One might pertinently ask the question: Is it in any way fair to the farmer to allow price rises in other goods, yet prevent him from receiving, even if the market offers it, a price that would maintain an equitable relationship with the things he must buy?

As a matter of fact, the greater part of the farm products from which foods are made still sell below the calculated parity. To fix a ceiling at what parity was a few months ago, would thus not probably at this time reduce the price of many or any of them. And unless our controllers, who say they are going to keep other prices from rising, really think other prices are going up considerably more, how can they claim that this proposed step would be of any real value?

Senator MAYBANK has spoken forthrightly on this issue. His words are worth reading again. Noting that farmers' income has shrunk $6,000,000,000 since 1948, he added: "There has been an outrageous campaign to deceive and fool the people of the United States, to have them believe that parity prices are largely responsible for inflation."

And that is well said, we think.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Tragic Error," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick on April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER TRAGIC ERROR

Add another tragic error to the tragic career of a little man trying to fill a big job with a jocular grin and an inflated ego as his only assets.

For the ousting of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by the temporary resident of the White House is, to the average citizen at least, nothing short of a tragic error.

It removes from the active military scene at a time of great national peril one of this Nation's outstanding soldiers and a man whose years of experience have schooled him in far-eastern problems to a far greater degree than the cumulative total of all the political demagogues in Washington. That, in itself, is tragedy enough.

But more tragic than the ousting of a military commander, though he be one of tried and proven ability, is the implied determination of the socialistic nitwits to continue the hesitant and wavering policy in the Far East—a policy that already has gotten us into one of the sorriest messes in which this Nation ever has found itself; a policy that has cost us upward of 60,000 casualties in Korea with the end nowhere in sight.

General MacArthur was fired for insubordination, so the little man said. Technically, that may be true. But to the average citizen he was sacrificed on the altar of appeasement because he dared raise his voice against the futility of waging a war in which his hands were tied and his movements restricted, while his enemy was given privileged sanctuary and was free to use every means at his command to deal out death and destruction.

The ouster of the heroic commander was received with cheers in the capitals of Britain, France, India, and some other nations allied with the United States in the Korean struggle. And well it might. For theirs has been a puny contribution to the common fight against communism. They consistently have sought to appease Red China and have been gunning for months for MacArthur's scalp because he dared appraise the situation in its true light.

But in the cities, the towns, and the rural areas of America, there was no cheering.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

For herein reside the families of those 60,000 brave youths who already have been sacrificed on bloody Korean fields, and the additional 250,000 youths now waging a heroic but apparently futile struggle 6,000 miles from home.

It was for these brave youths that General MacArthur dared speak out. His was a voice crying in the wilderness for the troops, the facilities and the freedom of movement necessary to avoid useless sacrifice and to win the war for freemen everywhere. But his voice was drowned out by the pussyfooters and wishful thinkers who still believe you can compromise and negotiate with international communism.

General MacArthur's ouster removes a pillar of strength from the free world's far eastern defense. And it still fails to solve the primary question of how to end the fighting in Korea without advantage to Communist China and its master, Soviet Russia.

This is the question in which all America is vitally interested. And the man in the White House will be held strictly accountable to the American people for the answer. The outlook is fraught with fear. For it was disastrous leadership and bungling policy that led us down the road to bloody Korea. That leadership and that policy still are with us.

It is difficult to see how the firing of General MacArthur brings us any closer to winning or ending the war in Korea. But for the sake of those brave youths on the fighting front, for the sake of this Nation and freedom-loving peoples everywhere, it is to be hoped that out of the furore and the debate aroused by the general's ouster will come a firm and resolute policy under which Americans may unite and march forward to victory and lasting peace.

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur Forgot," from the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR FORGOT

When a young man is selected to enter the United States Military Academy at West Point, he is regarded as officer material for the United States Army. During his years of training at the Academy he learns first of all how to take orders. You cannot learn how to give orders unless you know first how to take orders.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur had all the benefit of the fine training that the Nation gives its selected military men. Certainly in his undergraduate days he learned how to take orders. And he became a great military man well qualified to give orders.

But since 1937 General MacArthur has been in the Pacific, first in the Philippines, then directing the war in the Pacific, accepting the Japanese surrender, remaining as occupation commander in Japan, and finally leading United Nations forces in opposing Communist aggression in Korea.

In all this time General MacArthur has not returned to the continental United States. Although many times during those years General MacArthur's actions and public pronouncements seemed to redound mostly to the glory of MacArthur, no one in high position questioned his military sagacity. His succession of important assignments indicates the confidence that his superiors had in his ability.

What many seem to forget right now is that General MacArthur did have superiors. He was not a law unto himself. He was accountable to the Commander in Chief, who is the President of the United States.

During the past few months General MacArthur has overstepped the bounds of military propriety to oppose publicly the military and world political policies of his Commander in Chief. Other military leaders have been at odds with their superiors but it hasn't often caused them to air their private views to the public.

MacArthur's willingness to state his own views, even though they clashed with those of the Commander in Chief and with those of the United Nations delegates indicates that the general has been too long out of touch with his country and too much enamored of the title of Supreme Commander. His refusal to go along with the policies of the United Nations violated the first rule of a soldier. He forgot how to take orders.

It is unfortunate that the whole affair now is a domestic political affair with the Republicans rallying to defend MacArthur and the Democrats supporting President Truman. But General MacArthur made his actions political by permitting his views to be aired by Republican leaders here at home. General MacArthur had no objection to having his statements released by House Republican Leader JOE MARTIN. General MacArthur expressed no objection to the frequent injection of his name as a Republican Presidential possibility.

The situation became intolerable when General MacArthur, apparently without the knowledge of his superiors, offered to accept the surrender of the Chinese Reds and North Koreans and make a battlefield settlement of the Korean War. This unilateral action upset whatever political maneuvering for a negotiated peace was under way.

President Truman could do no less than relieve MacArthur of his duties. It became clear that General MacArthur was unable to play on the team because he objected to the strategy. General MacArthur during his years of high command has forgotten how to take orders.

President Dropped Emotional Atom Bomb Not on Enemy, But on America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following penetrating analysis of the MacArthur dismissal by Dr. D. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Nashville, Tenn.

The column is from the Nashville Banner:

THE MACARTHUR AFFAIR

(By Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor, First Presbyterian Church)

Early on Wednesday morning, April 11, the President of the United States dropped an emotional atomic bomb on America. Unlike the usual atomic bomb the force of this one was not limited to a scant 10 miles of territory. It blasted the entire Nation, nay, its force was felt in every capital in the world. Not even Pearl Harbor produced more confusion and emotional shock. A declaration of war with Russia could not have created greater comment and activity.

As the emotional smoke continues to billow and roll back and forth across the land, depending on which way the political and emotional winds blow, there are several things we must keep in mind.

1. General MacArthur is a great soldier. His record speaks for itself. His record as a cadet at West Point; his record in World War I; his record as Superintendent of West Point; his record in World War II, underscore with heavy lines this first contention. He was and is a great soldier and a brilliant general.

2. He is a great administrator. He proved that in the Philippines. He has proved it again in Japan. In Japan he has set an all-time high in the reconstruction of a defeated nation.

3. He is a great American. I make bold to assert that the reason why he talked out of turn, if he did, is to be found in his high sense of patriotism. What else could he do? The White House would not listen. The State Department would not listen. The Pentagon would not listen. They were looking at the Korean War in terms of getting along with England, France, and India. MacArthur saw it purely from the American standpoint. Since we are doing nine-tenths of the fighting, and nine and nine-tenths of the paying, sustaining too, nine-tenths of the casualties, why shouldn't our considerations come first? Why should nations that have recognized Red China for commercial reasons, who advocate giving Formosa to China, inviting the Red rapists to participate in the peace treaty with Japan, and in the future of the United Nations, exert more power over our conduct of the war in Korea than we do?

I thank God that MacArthur would not be muzzled like an ox. I am glad that he put our national safety above his own advantages. I rejoice in the knowledge that there is at least one leader left who will not be dominated by fear of Russia or Washington, and who refuses to permit America to be sold out in the interests of our so-called friends.

MacArthur knows as none other, save those associated with him in Asia, that we have surrendered our safety as a nation to the unsafe United Nations; that without bombing bases beyond the Yalu we cannot win the Korean War; that the present plan plays right into the hands of the Soviet which is not swayed in its actions by our hopes; that the Korean War has not and will not prevent world war III if the Russians are set to wage it; that there can be no peace between Communists and Americans, and that our men and our money are being ground to bloody dust in a venture that cannot end in victory without becoming bigger.

MacArthur did not bomb bases beyond the Yalu. He did not open a second front. He did not release the Formosan forces. He did write his convictions on kites and fly them world-high that all Americans outside of Washington might see and be warned. For that I am grateful.

America today is like a lifeguard that jumped into wave-beaten seas to rescue a group of people whose boat had capsized. The swimmer is strong, skilled, and courageous, but what can he do when all these people lay hold on him, demanding that if he saves any he must save all? Try as he may, he makes little progress shoreward. The people he went to rescue cling to his arms, his head, his legs, his body; tugging, screaming, beating. Will he ever be able to make the shore?

That is the way MacArthur sees the situation confronting his country. He has given

his best to America. He has fought to win, and that against almost impossible odds, and because he advocated the only honest measures that can bring victory to our forces he is released of his command.

If he is guilty of talking out of turn today, he was just as guilty 5 months ago. Why was he not recalled to the States, faced by his critics, and, then, either removed or supported?

I fear it is a case of an ex-captain of artillery lowering political guns against a five-star general. Once more greatness has been misunderstood by those who lack it.

The Fair Deal has again dealt unfairly with America's welfare, smearing for reasons one of the truly great men in the history of this Nation, a great military leader, a skilled political administrator, a sincere Christian gentleman, and a true son of Uncle Sam. Under the leadership we have we can never win at home or abroad.

Replacement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial written by Mr. Ed Post, Jr., and which appeared in the Cleveland Times, of Shelby, N. C., on April 10, 1951. Mr. Post served in the recent World War and has had extensive experience under General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESIGN OF INDISCRETION

The confusion born of Douglas MacArthur will not cease until he is relieved of all command.

MacArthur is not naively blundering into these indiscretions. There has been a sufficient number of them to indicate a purpose and a strategy behind them.

The Republicans appear delighted to nurture the cause of MacArthur as a source of embarrassment to the Democratic administration, but that is the game of playing with disastrous fire, because MacArthur is forcing the issue of whether or not the military arm or the civilian arm shall formulate international policy for our Nation. If MacArthur wins, it could well mark the beginning of the end of American democracy in eventual subservience of our Nation and our free political structure to the militarist clique.

We would admit and accord whatever claims of merit might be made for Douglas MacArthur as a military commander, with the reservation that has ever been or shall be flawless or unsusceptible to error. But, even granting all exaggerated as well as founded claims of his military prowess, there remain in the man three indisputable traits which minimize his greatness and make of him a real threat to any cause he serves:

1. Indiscretion. MacArthur's unwillingness to fulfill his commission within the bounds of authority bestowed by it, his laxity in self-discipline, both in restraint of his personal opinions and in carrying out his mission without undue complaint that he is not supported as he deserves or given the free hand he thinks he merits; this stubborn indiscretion by its repetition is revealed to be in fact disregard of his mission as defined.

2. Devotion to himself: It would not be stretching the everyday evidence to say that MacArthur's primary aim is to build and preserve the myth of himself as an historic hero. The successful and determined execution of his mission is incidental or secondary at best. Even remotely selfless loyalty and devotion to a people and a cause is not characterized in a commissioned—not elected—servant who unrelentingly thrusts himself daily to the forefront of publicity and continues a distracting and surely time-consuming stream of personal and irresponsible communications to publicity media, broadcasting his private opinions with abandon, regardless of whether or not they conform with the decisions which he is hired to execute.

3. Messianic complex: It is the evident conviction of Douglas MacArthur that he was sent to this earth for the purpose of redeeming the entire world and redeeming it with arms and bloodshed alone. His apparent conviction is that he, and he alone, is possessed of the knowledge of destiny and correct action.

Lest some may think that the appearance of these traits in Douglas MacArthur are to be dated with the Korean War and may have resulted in the man as a result of the confusions and frustrations of the Korean War, we hasten to reprint a doggerel classic which appeared in the Pacific theater during the waning years of World War II. It first appeared in this column on February 27, 1948, and we reprint it now to show that these traits of MacArthur were documented in satire long before he was thwarted in his desire to launch all-out war on the Asiatic mainland.

Three years ago we wrote:

"For a year before and after the invasion of the Philippines by the Great Returner, the quantity of classified information which was revealed in daily press communiques from MacArthur's headquarters was a major topic of bull-sessions in the Pacific. While most military headquarters in that theater of operation kept silent about possible future operations, General Doug, striking the pose of a messiah, refused to let anyone forget that, even if no one else was, he was pressing the war effort. Finally, it became a standing joke that soldiers, sailors, and marines—all of whom MacArthur claimed in his oracular pronouncements to the press as members of his own personal crusade, speaking of 'my' troops, 'my' ships, and 'my' planes—could learn where they would land next by keeping up with Doug's communiques and by tuning in each evening on the Voice of Freedom, a 1-hour broadcast beamed from the general's headquarters by a licensed commercial station, allegedly paid for by the Army and used to reassure the American Armed Forces in the Pacific that Doug was looking after them, would deliver them from evil and was arranging to win the war for them—not only in the Pacific, but by repeated inferences, through his influence on strategy in the European theater also.

"Shortly before the Philippine campaign was launched a doggerel epic appeared in the Pacific theater and passed from ship to ship in the Third, Fifth, and Seventh Fleets and from battalion to battalion through the Army and the Marine divisions stationed on that half of the globe."

This is the document:

"For two long years, since blood and tears
have been so very rife,
Confusion in our war news burdens more a
soldier's life.
But from this chaos, daily, like a hospice on
the way,
Like a shining light to guide us, rises Doug's
communiqué.

"For should we fail to get the mail, if prisoners won't talk,
If radios are indisposed and carrier pigeons walk,
We have no fear, because we'll hear tomorrow's news today
And see our operations plan in Doug's communiqué.

"Here, too, is told the saga bold of virile deathless youth
In stories seldom tarnished with the plain unvarnished truth.
It's quite a rag, it waves the flag, its motif is the fray,
And modesty is plain to see in Doug's communiqué—

" 'My battleships bombarded the Nips from Maine to Singapore,
My subs have sunk a million tons; they'll sink a billion more.
My aircraft bombed Berlin last night. In Italy, they say,
Our turn's tonight, because it's right in Doug's communiqué.

" 'My armored tanks have mowed his ranks, so Rommel's gone to hide;
And the frozen steppes of Russia see my wild Don Cossacks ride.
My brave beleaguered Chitniks make the Axis sweat and pay.'
It's got to be—it's what we see in Doug's communiqué.

"His area is quite cosmic and capricious as a breeze,
Ninety times as big as Texas, bigger than Los Angeles.
It springs from lost Atlantis up to where the angels play,
And no sparrow falls unheeded—it's in Doug's communiqué.

"He used to say, 'And with God's help,' but lately it would seem
That his patience is exhausted and God's on his second team;
And the Cabots and the Lodges, too, have long ceased to pray
That they'll even squeeze a byline into Doug's communiqué.

"And while possibly a rumor now, some day it will be a fact
That the Lord will hear a deep voice say, 'Move over, God; it's Mac.'
So bet your shoes that all the news that last great judgment day
Will go to press in nothing less than Doug's communiqué."

MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman and MacArthur," from the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN AND MACARTHUR

President Truman's action in ousting General MacArthur has stirred the Nation and the world as few other actions of his administration have done. We believe he had

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

no alternative. MacArthur himself, whether deliberately or not, made his dismissal inevitable by his continued disagreement with the policies which he was duty-bound to carry out. Any United States President facing the same situation, would have been compelled to make the decision Mr. Truman made. The policies of government must be made by duly constituted civilian authorities, not by military commanders in the field.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Truman had to act as he did. Many Americans are indignant, for they believed in MacArthur. But General MacArthur had shown that he was not in sympathy or agreement with United States or UN policies in Asia, which, right or wrong, were made by the Government the people elected.

In simple and candid language the President last night told the Nation we are fighting in Korea to prevent world war III. He dismissed General MacArthur, he said, because MacArthur's insistence that the war be expanded into China jeopardized that aim.

We are trying to stop a war, not start one, the President said. It would be tragically wrong to take the initiative in spreading the war in Asia.

General MacArthur is unquestionably one of the great military figures of all time. He is a man of sincerity and high purpose, a great soldier. His record throughout the Pacific war and the occupation of Japan is unique. He has truly been a bulwark against communism in the Orient.

The record shows that President Truman, too, has been a bulwark against communism. The fight he has waged has been equally effective against its spread.

History will show that the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the decision to use force against the Reds in Korea, the building up of Europe's strength, the rearming of our own country are positive and aggressive measures which have already contained and curbed the Russian aggressors.

The action in Korea is a vital part of the Truman policy of meeting Red aggression wherever it shows itself and we believe that policy should be continued. In Greece and in Berlin similar action short of all-out war stopped the aggressors. Mr. Truman believes it will do so again. Until now it has, and we have gained precious time to rebuild our strength while another general war is held in abeyance. We are hurting the Reds in Korea more than they are hurting us. It seems sensible to continue that course.

Attempts to make MacArthur's dismissal appear as appeasement of the Soviets are distortions of the truth. We will not appease Russia. The terms which the President set last night for peace in the Orient made that clear. In addition the action of Secretary Acheson in rejecting British overtures to give Red China a voice in the Japanese peace treaty points up the fact that the cries of another Munich are not based on fact.

But to launch attacks on China now as MacArthur wished to do, would mean the United States would be committed to an interminable war on the continent of Asia. We would lose Europe, which would be far more costly in the long run, for we could not fight now on two such fronts. With Europe would go our allies of the Atlantic Pact, and what is even more important, the continent's industrial productive capacity. The United States would stand alone against a dominant Russia. It is unthinkable.

We are winning now in Korea. We are building strength at home and in Europe. We are gaining steadily in the efforts we have launched to crush the ugly serpent head of communism. But this is not the time to launch attacks on China and start the war which we are trying to prevent.

Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Latin Resources Vital to United States in Time of War," written by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, published in the New York Journal-American of April 5 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN RESOURCES VITAL TO UNITED STATES IN TIME OF WAR

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, internationally famous airplane designer and aviation authority)

The current meeting of the organization of American States, which unfortunately has received very little attention from the press, is, in the opinion of this writer, of the utmost importance. Its success or failure may determine our very survival if the world situation deteriorates and we are forced into a major show-down with the Communist nations.

Should this occur, the world will immediately be divided into two geographical halves. We shall be excluded from the enemy half as effectively as he will be excluded from ours. All sources of strategic supplies outside of this hemisphere will be denied to us by enemy air power.

It is, therefore, patently clear that we must proceed without further delay to develop the raw materials, productive capacity, and unity of purpose of the Americas so that this hemisphere will be, in fact and not merely in prospect, a completely self-contained and self-sufficient base to sustain the military power against Communist aggression.

SHIPS WERE IMPORTANT

Before the advent of global range aircraft, only navies could project military force from one hemisphere to another. Our ships not only carried our war machine to overseas bases, but also brought the needed strategic materials from the distant corners of the earth back to this country to keep our industrial effort going.

During the last war, therefore, the only way that the Axis powers could deny us vital strategic materials was to attack our shipping in an effort to cut off our lines of supply. That is why Germany invested a great part of its national effort in submarine warfare. And they nearly succeeded when our shipping losses in the Atlantic reached the colossal figure of 1,000,000 tons a month.

Fortunately for us, the battle of supply lines had at that time stopped being solely a naval problem. Air power had entered the equation. It was air vigilance, air search, and air attacks on submarines both on the high seas and in their breeding grounds on enemy soil that eventually emasculated the enemy's grip on our supply lines, and saved us the victory.

SOVIET SUBMARINES

It has been said that Russia is building a great fleet of submarines. Such a step is militarily profitable from the Russian point of view so long as we persist in the balanced-forces strategy and accordingly disperse our land forces all over the world, maintain bases along the entire periphery of the Soviet sphere of domination, and draw our strategic materials from the enemy's back yard thousands of miles away. They are building undersea weapons because we are building targets for these weapons.

On the other hand, Russia is quite capable of a strategic deception, and we must treat the propaganda concerning her great undersea fleet with a grain of salt.

Once her air power assumes major proportions and can deliver its massive stroke in any direction of the compass, she may ignore our supply lines and strike directly at the sources of strategic materials instead.

ENEMY AIR POWER

The enemy's air force based in China and the Balkans can readily reach any spot in Europe, Asia, and Africa that attempts to trade with us, and keep them neutralized. The very threat of annihilation from overhead may intimidate these regions and prevent them from supplying us.

The choice they will have is to desist, or be destroyed. One need not be a strategist to realize that it is beyond the realm of possibility to endow all of these remote spots with air defense capable of warding off the entire striking power of the Eurasian continent.

Thus we may have an invincible Navy, complete command of the seas and a vast merchant marine, and yet face strategic strangulation because our ships have nothing to transport.

Under these new conditions, therefore, it is not sea power, but again air power that will be decisive. Only the right kind of air force, if and when created, operating directly from this hemisphere, could destroy the enemy's air power and regain access to these strategic points.

But in order to guarantee our air force such an uninterrupted offensive, we must forge it from strategic materials located in this hemisphere.

However, the United States alone, for all its amazing riches, is a have-not Nation in terms of certain strategic materials. In the past we have counted complacently on a flow of rubber, hemp, and other key materials from the East Indies, the Philippines, and Indochina.

Smugness gave way to alarm early in the last war when Japanese aviation closed off our access to Manila hemp, silk, quinine, and rubber. We lost 90 percent of chromium, 87 percent of tungsten, 85 percent of mica, 80 percent of tin, 60 percent of wool.

We are headed for a similar shock if we do not organize this hemisphere now for development of its resources. Taken as a whole, the hemisphere has all the ingredients required for the implementation of a modern military force. Yet, at this very dangerous moment in world history we are still not self-sustaining. The cause of our plight lies in the absence of adequate planning and foresight.

TIME YET TO ACT

Fortunately, there is still time to open up the almost inexhaustible resources of South America, to replace or supplement those that are located within the sphere of domination of the Communist nations.

For example, there is enough managanese in Brazil to supply the needs of our entire steel industry. Tungsten and wolfram, which we derived largely from China, is available in northern Argentina, Bolivia, and Chile. The cobalt that is so crucial for jet engine production exists in South America.

The success of the organization of American states, therefore, is not only of the greatest importance to every living person in this hemisphere, but to all freedom-loving people, and particularly to Europe, whose survival depends on the deterrent power of America's military strength and industrial output.

GLOBAL WAR RIVALS

Tomorrow's global war, if it comes, will find the total resources of one hemisphere pitted against the total resources of the other. It is evident, then, that hemispheric solidarity is not merely desirable—it is imperative. In any showdown, our destinies are irrevocably interwoven with those of our South American neighbors. We shall all sink or swim together.

The South American countries must be given assistance and encouraged to develop their resources with the utmost dispatch. We must unite this hemisphere into an efficient organization, and see to it that our standard of living will never be impaired by the shutting off of vital materials elsewhere.

LATINS ARE PROUD

Recently I visited South America and had the opportunity to discuss the defense of our hemisphere with the presidents and military heads of several countries. The Latin Americans are proud and sensitive. They are aware that we need their help even as they need ours.

What they want are opportunities to collaborate as equals among equals. Our very stature and power require that we act in a spirit of fair neighborliness, and we may be sure that it will be answered in kind.

This is the challenge that now faces American statesmanship and the American people. When our policymakers have grasped these basic conditions, we shall then be able to work out a realistic hemisphere policy under which the Americas can be truly unified to face the common danger.

The Political Effect of the MacArthur Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio discussion which took place over the American Forum of the Air on the subject, "The Political Effect of the MacArthur Incident," on April 15, 1951, participated in by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

There being no objection, the radio discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL EFFECT OF THE MACARTHUR INCIDENT

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C. Each week at this time, the American Forum of the Air presents special guest speakers, so that you in your home may enjoy authoritative discussions of the provocative and vital topics of our time.

Here today to discuss this problem are Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma, and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California, and your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Gen. Douglas MacArthur will soon land in the United States for the first time in 14 years. By relieving MacArthur of his command, President Truman has touched off one of the most explosive issues on Capitol Hill. The debate, which found congressional leaders divided on the troops-to-Europe issue, has now been expanded to include the controversy over our policy in Asia.

General MacArthur is expected to address the Congress, his remarks—his differences with the President over foreign policy—will unquestionably have far-reaching repercussions.

Today, the American Forum of the Air considers the so-called MacArthur incident in a special round-table discussion. Because of this internationally important controversy, we have postponed for a later date the program originally scheduled, "Would a Realinement of Our Political Parties be Beneficial?"

Now to start the debate. Senator KERR, just why did the President replace MacArthur?

Senator KERR. Well, the President had to replace MacArthur or permit the military authority to be neutralized, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff being disregarded by a field commander. He had to remove MacArthur or permit the military to dictate to the civilian authority. He had to remove him or abandon the United Nations objectives in Korea—to stop aggression, to punish the aggressor, to limit the conflict. He had to remove him or risk MacArthur's taking this Nation alone into the jungle and mire of China in an all-out world conflict.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. I disagree with Senator KERR in his statement. In the first place, it was not necessary to eliminate General MacArthur from command. The situation is that General MacArthur has made a great contribution to our opposition to communism in the Far East. He stood as a symbol to the opposition to communism. This has undermined the anti-Communist forces in the Far East. It has undermined our position in Japan.

No one questions the constitutional power of the President to do what he did, but we do question his judgment in doing what he did.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Granik, I feel that the President had no other choice. I agree with Senator KNOWLAND that General MacArthur has done a great job in Japan, and he has made a great contribution in the fight against communism. But I don't think anyone can dispute the fact that General MacArthur had reached the point where he simply was out of step, out of step with the policy laid down by our Government relating to our program in the Far East, out of step with our Joint Chiefs of Staff, who were laying down the military program. And it was either to go over the heads of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and yield to General MacArthur, or else it was to continue to take the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and replace General MacArthur. I think the President had no other choice.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Granik, it seems to me that the President's action with regard to MacArthur is just another indication that a pernicious pattern of performance is developing in the White House which does not augur very well for America's future. It appears to me that the attitude in the White House today is: either agree with everything that is done, or else you are going to be deposed. I suppose you could say it: if you don't agree, you are going to lose your position. First it was Louis Johnson; now it is Douglas MacArthur; tomorrow it may be Ike Eisenhower.

In other words, if Dean Acheson and Harry Truman find themselves in disagreement on policy with someone, and if they find those people who oppose them talking to Republicans, out they go. Cut off their heads. That, I think, is rather dangerous in American policy, and it has never been part of the American tradition.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. It wasn't a contest between MacArthur and Dean Acheson. It was a contest between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It wasn't a contest between MacArthur and the State Department. It was a contest between MacArthur and the Defense Department. It wasn't a matter of agreeing with a whim of the President of the United States. It was a matter either of carrying out a policy agreed upon by the United Nations and about which we are working over there, or of the field commander carrying out the orders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

When matters get to that point, it isn't a question of debate between the superior and the subordinate commanders. It is either a job for the subordinate commander to obey the orders and carry them out, or move out of the way and let somebody in who will.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, Mr. Granik, the actual facts of the matter are that General MacArthur violated none of his military directives. To the contrary, he was given certain directives by the United Nations for the purpose of unifying and making a free Korea. When he tried to carry out those directives successfully, he was interfered with both at Lake Success and Washington, in carrying out his military responsibilities.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer that, Senator Sparkman?

Senator SPARKMAN. I just can't agree with Senator Knowland in that statement. In fact, I think it is noticeable in the press throughout the country that it is conceded that General MacArthur was out of step with the directives and failed to go through with the directives that had been issued by our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, let me give one example. On March 20, our Joint Chiefs of Staff notified General MacArthur that due to the fine progress that had been made, some kind of a plan was going to be approached toward opening up negotiations. It just simply tipped him off, with a highly secret document. Four days later General MacArthur comes out and issues a statement along the same line. Now, if that was not being out of step, I don't know what is.

Just one other example. The Joint Chiefs of Staff suggested to General MacArthur the rearming, or the arming—the supplying—of the South Koreans, and sent a long directive regarding that. And General MacArthur, instead of acceding to their wishes and arming the South Koreans to help fight the North Koreans, decided he wanted to use that equipment on the Japanese state police. Now, if that is not being out of step with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with our policy that has been established by our Government, I do not know what can be.

Senator MUNDT. Of course, as long as you keep talking about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, you have a great advantage over us; because any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who talks to the Republicans loses his job. The only people who have been talking publicly are Dean Acheson and Harry Truman; so consequently the Senator from California and I have to quote them. We know we

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

would not lose our jobs if we mention their names.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND, do you want to add a word there?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes. The fact of the matter is that in one of the national news magazines this last week General MacArthur wired to say that he had never seen this directive prior to the time that he issued his statement on March 24.

Senator SPARKMAN. You mean the directive of March 20?

Senator KNOWLAND. That is right. And it had never been presented to him. He had never seen the details of the situation at all. Now, that is one thing.

The second is that they have released certain extracts from hitherto top secret documents which will support their position, and they have denied to the Congress of the United States, upon the official request of its committees, the surrendering of the Wedemeyer report, which I think will show gross incompetence in the executive branch of the Government.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR, are you bursting with a question?

Senator KERR. No, I am not bursting with a question. I am enthusiastic with an answer. The remark that he made about MacArthur saying something over there is in error. The statement was made by Whitney.

You remember, JOSEPH MARTIN, the Republican leader in the House, came out and said that he had talked with MacArthur and MacArthur had accepted his invitation to come back and address the Congress. And everybody was all excited about whether he should or should not; when, lo and behold, some enterprising newspaperman broke through the censorship which MacArthur has imposed over there——

Senator KNOWLAND. At the request of the Joint Chiefs.

Senator KERR. To advise the American people that MARTIN hasn't talked to MacArthur at all, that MARTIN had talked to Whitney. Now, MacArthur is going to be back here in a few days. He wants to come before the Congress. The Democrats want him to come before the Armed Services Committee. And we want to find out what it has been that he has been advocating over there about aggressive action, about carrying this war to China.

I notice in the Christian Science Monitor, here, of Friday, a quote from Senator TAFT in New York the other night, in which it says: "Senator TAFT's New York speech in which he said prevention of a third world conflict cannot now be accomplished without an aggressive war against Communist China." That is the basic issue here politically, Mr. Moderator, as to whether or not the American people are going to permit a few Republican leaders and General MacArthur to lead us into a situation of all-out war against Red China on the continent of Asia, or whether we are going to limit our forces over there to the accomplishment of the objectives of stopping aggression in Korea, punishing the aggressor, limiting the scope of the conflict, and then working out peace.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Moderator, I would like to say that I think we are getting down to brass tacks now. The Senator from Oklahoma has begun to bring in the name of Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts. And that probably is the reason why Douglas MacArthur is no longer in charge of the Asiatic theater. Because Douglas MacArthur talked to a Republican Member of Congress. Because Douglas MacArthur thought that Republicans as well as Democrats had a right to know what was going on in Asia, now he is to be pilloried. Now they are anxious to get him into a secret committee room, so that the public cannot be there, rather than have him address the Congress. But fortunately the ire of the American public is such that they are insisting that he talk to them.

Actually, MacArthur made two mistakes. The first mistake he made was in talking to a Republican Congressman. That was considered bad in Democratic circles. Then he made the error of turning his back on the man who would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. Consequently they are pillorying him for that. As far as his specific activities are concerned, up to now, anyhow, no one has questioned the fact that Douglas MacArthur did not start the war in Korea. Somebody in the White House, or the State Department, ordered him to start the shooting. So they can't say he upset the peace of Asia.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR referred to the possibility of an aggressive war against Red China. Would you care to comment on that, Senator KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. I was in Korea this last November, and I can say that General MacArthur has never recommended an invasion by American forces of Red China. I believe it is necessary to get rid of that red herring to start with. I do not believe it is necessary to have a declaration of war, but I do think it is necessary to untie the hands of our fighting men there, so that they are not being required to go up as our fighting planes and bombers are, and find that the Russian-made enemy planes can go back into a sanctuary area and keep from being attacked in their nests.

General Stratemeyer yesterday pointed out that it was an almost impossible task to ask men to risk their lives when the enemy is operating from a sanctuary we could not attack. That has never before happened in American history.

Senator SPARKMAN. I want to get back to something my friend KARL MUNDT said. Now, everybody knows that there have probably been twice as many Republican Members of Congress visiting General MacArthur in the east as there have been Democrats. I think there is no argument about that at all. And goodness knows, we are not objecting to his appearing before Congress. We are joining in the invitation. We do say that he ought to subject himself to questioning before a congressional committee, upon which both Democrats and Republicans sit; and it will not be a secret meeting, because there is no reason why it cannot be an open meeting.

I think we ought to stick to the gist of this subject, and that is that General MacArthur undoubtedly was advocating a policy that meant the spread of this war, when we are trying to localize it. He undoubtedly put himself on that side. And now we find our Republican friends lining up with him, advocating what would amount to a third world war.

Senator KNOWLAND. Don't you think this means the survival of the Nation is at stake?

Senator SPARKMAN. I think it means the spreading of the war, when we are trying to localize it.

I want to quote from Senator TAFT's New York speech. Now just listen to this. This is from the New York Times: "A more active battle against China, involving use of the National troops on Formosa under control of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and an invasion of China was"—he was talking, by the way, about this aggressive plan that General MacArthur was advocating—"was justified from a moral standpoint, but practical considerations, notably the size of the armies and the danger that it would incite Russia into an active war, made it impossible."

Now, that is Senator TAFT speaking about this very program. And I think everybody who goes into it will realize that the inevitable result of what General MacArthur was advocating was a spread of this war and the start of world war III at a place where we don't want it, and at a time when we are not prepared to meet it.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KNOWLAND, do you want to comment on that?

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, what General MacArthur was trying to avoid was a far eastern Munich that would make inevitable world war III.

Senator SPARKMAN. We do not have to have a Munich.

Senator KNOWLAND. We know that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. The British just a few days ago advocated that Formosa be turned over to the Chinese Communists; that the Chinese Communists be admitted into the United Nations and that they participate in the Japanese peace treaty. If that would not be a full-fledged far-eastern Munich I would like to know what you would consider it. The removal of General MacArthur was the first step in being able to achieve that surrender to British appeasement.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Moderator, I want to challenge that statement, and I want to say here positively that the United States has no idea and never has had of letting the Red Chinese participate in the Japanese peace treaty or of surrendering Formosa. I happen to be chairman of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee and I happen to know that Britain did not propose this 3 days ago, they proposed it 10 days or more ago. We immediately had a hearing on it and the statement was made positively that we would not, under any conditions, and Britain has been informed that we would not accede to it. And we are going to stand fast on it. The removal of MacArthur has no bearing on it whatsoever.

Senator MUNDT. I am not so sure about that.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, I am.

Senator MUNDT. Whether it was 10 days or 3 days is immaterial. But these proposals that Great Britain makes have a habit of being accepted by the administration. Great Britain was in favor of removing MacArthur and has been in favor of removing MacArthur for a long time. So has France, the Communist Party in America, and so have a great many others. You give one reason for his removal. It looks to us like there is another reason for it. At least it is a concession to the appeasement forces around the world and every Communist country ran its colors at the top of the mast when MacArthur was eventually removed. They consider it an appeasement of Red China and an appeasement of the Communists.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. I want to go back to the statement made about the secret meeting. The Armed Services Committee, including the Republicans and Democrats, invited General MacArthur to come before them in a public meeting where he could make his statement and be cross-examined. Now, my good friends over here say they do not want MacArthur to be up against a sanctuary. Yet they seek to place him in a sanctuary.

Senator KNOWLAND. He will take care of himself when he gets here.

Senator KERR. He has already wired back that he will not appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee until he finds out whether he is going to be given a hero's welcome.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Kerr, I am sorry.

Senator KERR. I want to say that I am opposed to his being offered a sanctuary where he will not be subject to cross-examination. Any time Congress lets a man, who has been relieved of his command for insubordination come before them to make a speech and at the same time be free from cross-examination, Congress is tying both of their hands

behind them. And I get back to the statement Senator MUNDT made about disagreeing with Dean Acheson. Dean Acheson had no more to do with the military orders that went down to MacArthur than Senator MUNDT did. They were issued by the Commander in Chief and when MacArthur disregarded and disobeyed them he was disobeying the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander in Chief.

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, I would like to speak on that subject. I happen to be a member of the Armed Services Committee. General MacArthur has not declined to appear before the committee. He suggested that he should not make an appearance before the committee until he had had a chance to appear before the full Congress. And, Senator RUSSELL, the chairman of the committee is now in communication with him. That is the first situation. The second one is that the State Department has interfered in the military strategy of the Far East and as far as I am concerned I would rather take the judgment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as to our defense needs in the Pacific than I would the judgment of Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator SPARKMAN?

Senator SPARKMAN. Of course that is the trouble with this whole debate. They try to shove aside the fact that stands out just as clearly as it can for those who want to see it that our policy in the conduct of the Korean war was decided upon by the military experts upon whom we depend for military advice in our Government, the three who make up the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They keep referring to Dean Acheson. Dean Acheson has not one single thing to do with the military policy in Korea, it is the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and every single paper that was issued to General MacArthur comes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Why do we not talk about their judgment as to how to run things in Korea, as to how to run the war? Why is it that the people who were afraid of provoking war by sending troops to Europe are not afraid of provoking an all-out effort in China? Why is it that they desire appeasement in Europe and aggression in Asia?

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. The reason we talk about Dean Acheson is because I happen to know, having served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee all the time this Chinese policy was being shaped, that Dean Acheson and the State Department stood as a road block consistently stopping us from doing anything that would be of assistance to Nationalist China. That fact stands out. The fact as you mentioned it that Dean Acheson had nothing to do with foreign policy does not stand up very clearly to me because the Joint Chiefs of Staff had to make this program consistent with the foreign policy of the country.

Senator KNOWLAND. How do you account for the fact that on the 23d of December 1949 Dean Acheson and the State Department sent to all of our consular officials overseas a communication which was withheld at that time from the American public to get them acquainted with the facts, so they could educate the public that Formosa had no strategic value, when that was contrary to the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and it was contrary to the judgment of our responsible military and naval commanders in that area of the world? It was not until they disclosed the matter on the floor of the Senate that the State Department finally admitted that they had sent that out, but they refused to furnish the original documents to the Senate of the United States.

Senator SPARKMAN. Was that on December 23 of last year or year before last?

Senator KNOWLAND. 1949.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, 1949. As a matter of fact, if you will refer back to that whole statement, and particularly to the explanation that was given a few days after that for which Dean Acheson had been so severely attacked, you will see that he outlined our responsibility for defense, and he said that that line ran down through Japan and the Philippines, and he went on to say, not that Formosa had no strategic value, but that the question of defense of Korea and Formosa was a United Nations question rather than a United States question.

Senator KNOWLAND. He amended that statement by saying that Korea and Formosa were outside our line of defense. He issued an open invitation for the North Korean Communists to attack Korea and for the Chinese Communists to attack Formosa.

Senator SPARKMAN. Not at all. What he was saying was that it was not the individual policy of the United States. Read the statement.

Senator KNOWLAND. I have read it many times.

Senator SPARKMAN. Read the statement. He said definitely that the defense of Japan and the Philippines was the individual responsibility of the United States but that Formosa and Korea were the responsibility of the United Nations. It was all in the same question and when you quote one you ought to quote the other.

Senator KNOWLAND. The responsible command out there, naval and military, feels that the loss of Formosa would be detrimental to the strategic defense of this country and would move our defenses back to the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California in this age of the atomic weapon and the airplane.

Senator SPARKMAN. We will not lose Formosa.

Senator KNOWLAND. We will if the appeasers have their way about it.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are not the appeasers.

Senator KNOWLAND. But the British are.

Senator KERR. We are not going to lose Formosa for the very simple reason that our fleet is now protecting it. You cannot escape your responsibility in this regard by favoring MacArthur and his policy, that would spread the war, by talking about Britain. Certainly Britain is our ally and there are things with them that I do not agree with but I am mighty glad they are allies. You cannot escape the responsibility of MacArthur by attacking Dean Acheson for the very simple reason that MacArthur was the man who refused to obey orders of the Commander in Chief and refused to carry out the policy of the United Nations, and refused to operate on a basis that would prevent the spread of the conflict, but rather favored that which would cause it to spread.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Let's straighten out, first of all, what the fleet is doing around Formosa. The fleet is around Formosa in order to keep the Nationalist government in Formosa from attacking the Red Communists in China and the Red Communists are attacking us. That makes it a pretty difficult war for our GI's in Korea because it is the first time in American history that you have had the American Navy on one side of the war and the Army on the other side of the war. That is carrying competition a little too far between Annapolis and West Point. All that we are asking is that the fleet be withdrawn and let the Nationalists in Formosa decide what they want to do about attacking our enemy, the Red Communists in China.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer that?

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes, I do. That just simply is not the case. As a matter of fact, if our fleet were not protecting the Nationalists on Formosa the Chinese Communists would take it overnight. We are protecting the Nationalists rather than holding them off the mainland.

Senator KNOWLAND. We are doing two things, John, we are protecting the Island of Formosa and we are preventing them from making any incursions on the mainland. It is a two-edged situation.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, we are preventing the Chinese from making incursions on Formosa, too.

Moderator GRANIK. One question?

Question. My question is for Senator KERR. Is the MacArthur incident the kick-off for the political campaign for 1952, or was it just a coincidence?

Senator KERR. It was just a coincidence but it is going to result in the American people finding out the hopeless confusion and the hopeless dissension in the ranks of the Republican Party. It is going to prove that the responsible leadership of the Republican Party here in Washington is a war party. It has shown that men like Lodge and Saltonstall and Duff and Dulles and Austin have been shoved aside, those who helped build the bipartisan policy and who helped fight for it and support it. They are being shoved aside and those who believe in the program of spreading this war in China to follow MacArthur are in the saddle and I think it is going to result in that which will be most helpful to the Democratic Party and the American people.

Senator KNOWLAND. Just let me say this, Mr. Moderator. Since the year 1908, when I was born, we have been in three wars, including the Korean war. All of them have been under Democratic administrations. I participated in one as a soldier. If Senator KERR would take the position that the Democratic Party is a party of peace that does not make sense.

Now all Americans, Republicans and Democrats, have had to fight in all three of these wars including the Korean war, which is now going on.

Senator KERR. That is the reason we do not want it to spread to Red China; that is the reason we want to prevent a world war now; that is the reason we want to limit the conflict and make the peace as soon as we can, instead of permitting it to spread around the world and get to the point where there never will be any hope of getting out.

Senator MUNDT. I do not know where Senator KERR has been living in the last 6 months if he thinks there is danger of the war spreading to Red China. Red Chinese have been shooting American GIs for a long time in Korea. That war has already spread. What we want is a chance to defend the lives of the American GIs now fighting for freedom on the Korean Peninsula.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Policy, Not Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the times are too perilous for us to indulge in the luxury of a free-for-all partisan scrap, even if the President has acted impulsively and thrown the administration into a vulnerable political position.

The somber background of our young men, dying on foreign soil, and the growing menace of communism might call for restraint and sober nonpartisan judgment.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If we allow our minds to be diverted by political expediency, or secondary arguments over military properties, the control of the military by civilians and similar traditional issues, we will only compound mistakes already made.

It is generally admitted that, constitutionally, the Chief Executive is within his legal rights in changing commanders. Let us concede that, and also the fact that any military commander is justified in obeying his own conscience, even as did Gen. Billy Mitchell.

The real need of the hour is a sound and practical objective with respect to the war in Korea and the over-all policy in the Far East.

Congress is not the only branch of the Government that should be sensitive to the will of the people in policy matters. The executive branch, likewise, is only an arm of the Government of the people, by the people.

The people are speaking and, if my mail is at all indicative of the general sentiment, they want a firm policy in Asia that will end all traces of appeasement of communism and give our forces in Korea the green light to end that conflict victoriously, with as few casualties as possible.

The President and the State Department would do well to listen to these voices with the view of guiding the ship of state in accordance with the will and judgment of the Nation as a whole.

The following editorial from the April 13 edition of the Easton Star-Democrat, a Maryland paper that has always been Democratic, as it name implies, ably states what many of the citizens in my district are saying and thinking at this crucial moment:

THE MACARTHUR DISMISSAL

President Truman's summary dismissal of General MacArthur has profoundly shocked the Nation. Immediate reaction to this rash act in this area was that the President had gone too far; that it is too bad Truman cannot be removed from office with the same ease. Indeed, several Republican Senators were quoted as demanding President Truman's impeachment, although this can be considered virtually impossible in view of the two-thirds rule.

The President's action should touch off a round of official celebration in the Kremlin. MacArthur was an archenemy of communism at the time when the boys in Washington were holding hands with the boys in the Kremlin. It can be said with truth that at least part of the clamor for General MacArthur's dismissal was sponsored, aided, and abetted by the Communists throughout the world.

British and French politicians are more than pleased over MacArthur's downfall, although they haven't had the courage to state their pleasure publicly even though it is they who have been calling for this action all along. Their contention has been that an aging general was being allowed to lead the world into another war. Their real reason for opposing MacArthur was the fear that emphasis on the fight against Communist aggression in Asia would divert military aid from Europe. What these foreigners fail to realize and what President Truman is learning with emphasis at the moment is that to many Americans General MacArthur is a treasured symbol of dynamic democracy in the best Teddy Roosevelt tradition.

We are not among those who have been blinded through the years by the so-called MacArthur magnetism, and certainly his actions in the past few months cannot be condoned on a purely military basis. Under our present system of government a civilian, the President, is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the military is expected to take orders and remain silent. On this basis there can be no denial that General MacArthur is in the wrong; although in his position as supreme commander he violated no rule or regulation.

Apart from this narrow military viewpoint, it must be acknowledged that the general's long years of military and political experience in the Far East make his opinion of particular value. The President or the Congress should have provided a channel for the expression of these views. General MacArthur should have been recalled to Washington to testify in full, once and for all. His testimony would have been certain to intensify the debate regarding far-eastern policy, but such searching examination of policy would have been good for the country, just as it was in the instance of the debate on aid to Western Europe. (In which General Eisenhower had a hand.) Out of it might have come a far-eastern policy that was at once realistic, and supported by a clear majority of the American people. Heaven only knows this country needs a far-eastern policy. There would have been no MacArthur incidents, and possibly no war in Korea if administration policy in the Far East had not been such a deplorable failure since World War II. The supreme tragedy is that even now, with men dying or being wounded at the rate of 1,400 a week in Korea, there is still no clear-cut American policy in the Far East. Where leadership was needed, there has existed a vacuum.

Right or wrong, General MacArthur has always been a leader. His recommendation of a policy to avoid a stalemate in the Korean war is the only definite and authoritative statement of policy on the subject available for consideration. And the general's warning that Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest in Asia, is also a compelling declaration deserving of the most searching examination.

President Truman's actions in recent months to muzzle the most outspoken critic of a State Department in which the American people have no confidence on far-eastern affairs, have left a bad taste in everyone's mouth. His surrender to the demands of foreigners and weak-livered diplomats in the State Department in dismissing MacArthur is a great disservice to the American people.

In many respects this could be General MacArthur's finest hour. If he will use his new freedom to return to the United States and give the American public the full benefit of his views, he is likely to find more support than has ever been accorded him in his long and gallant career. We may now see the true temper of MacArthur steel as compared with Truman mink coats and red herrings.

The Issue in MacArthur Dismissal Is One of Policies in Asia, Not One of Civilian Versus Military Control, for There Was no Insubordination

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extraordinarily sane, sound, and lucid broadcast on April 15, 1951, by Mr. David Lawrence, editor of United States News and World Report:

The American people seem to be talking about just one thing and asking many questions about it, and that is the removal of General MacArthur. The first question, as you might well surmise, is this: "Hasn't the President of the United States the right to fire any general?"

Of course he has that right. But the real question is, "Was President Truman right in firing General MacArthur?"

I think the President need not have dismissed MacArthur but could easily have resolved the differences in a manner that would not have split America and would not have humiliated a national hero. When an important executive is 8,000 miles away from home base on an important assignment, and the wires get crossed up with messages from his employer, you don't fire him on the spot—you bring him home and have a face-to-face talk with him and a showdown, and then if you can't clear up the misunderstanding you ask him to resign or fire him. Tokyo, after all, is less than 48 hours away from Washington in flying time.

The next question: "What was the misunderstanding? What are the facts? Didn't MacArthur just simply disobey orders?"

As I examine the facts, MacArthur complied with his orders as he understood them, and his military secretary, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, says the same thing. This is an odd time to accuse a man who has been Chief of Staff of the United States Army either of not knowing how to obey orders or of willfully disobeying orders. The orders given MacArthur, as I read them, were never explicit, and the so-called policies, if there were any, were never explained clearly to General MacArthur. The whole key to the controversy can be found by taking as an example one of the important messages released by the White House last week. This was sent to MacArthur on March 20 by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Because that message is bound to be the basis for the judgment of this case in history, I'm going to read it to you and then explain it. It is brief. I quote:

"To the commander in chief, Far East, Tokyo, Japan.

"From (the) Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

"State (Department) planning Presidential announcement shortly that with the clearing of (the) bulk of South Korea of aggressors, the United Nations are now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. Strong UN feeling persists that further diplomatic effort toward a settlement should be made before any advance with major forces north of (the) thirty-eighth parallel. Time will be required to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop. Recognizing that (the thirty-eighth parallel has no military significance, (the) State (Department) has asked (the) Joint Chiefs of Staff what authority you should have to permit sufficient freedom of action for (the) next few weeks to provide security for (the) UN forces and maintain contact with (the) enemy. Your recommendations (are) desired."

Now note carefully the language. There is not a word in that message which says that the United Nations has decided on a policy, nor that the United States has decided on a policy. It simply says that "a strong feeling persists." It sounds like the speculative dispatches of any Washington newspaper correspondent as he writes about the fluctuating sentiment in Washington.

Now what is a military commander 8,000 miles away to do when he gets a vague message like that which does not give him any decision on policy, but merely the expression of some bureaucrat's plan in the Department of State? And who operates our Army nowadays, anyway? Surely not the Department of State! Yet, that Department asks a general in the field to deploy his troops, not for a day or two, but for a few weeks—a few weeks, mind you—in such a way as to prevent any advance of his major forces. At the same time he is asked to provide for the security of UN forces and he is told to maintain contact with the enemy. What kind of double-talk is that, really?

The next question—"Isn't the Commander in Chief, namely, the President, supreme? Can't he impose whatever policy he pleases?"

No, he cannot, if Congress disagrees, because the President is accountable to his boss—the people of the United States. Under our written Constitution, the people's representatives, namely, the Congress, can, so to speak, court-martial the Commander in Chief. They can impeach the President and remove him from office if they think the people want them to do it.

On what charge can a President be impeached—you might ask. He can be impeached for failing to do his duty as he has sworn to do it under the Constitution. One charge being mentioned in Congress is that the President failed to get a declaration of formal authority from Congress to conduct an action with 250,000 American troops—Army, Navy, and Air Force—8,000 miles away from our mainland, all of which the President now in his speeches frankly calls a "war." Congress alone has the authority to declare war.

Another charge mentioned is that he has refused to grant our troops in Korea permission to strike at enemy bases even though they have been under enemy air attack and that he has thus needlessly sacrificed American lives.

It takes a majority vote, however, of the House of Representatives to present a formal charge of impeachment, and it takes two-thirds of the Senate to remove a President.

Next question: "Is this MacArthur controversy a partisan matter?"

No, of course not. We have already had 60,000 casualties in 9 months in Korea, which is more casualties than the United States suffered in its first full year of World War II. The sons of Republicans are being killed or wounded in Korea as well as the sons of Democrats.

Next question: "Isn't this an issue of civilian authority versus military authority?"

No, it is not. The Congress is also a civilian authority and it was the letter which General MacArthur wrote to Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts, minority leader, in answer to one from Mr. MARTIN, which really infuriated Mr. Truman and caused him to remove General MacArthur.

I was talking with Representative MARTIN on that point today and he authorized me to say:

"After what happened to MacArthur we in Congress cannot expect to get the truth. In the future no member of the armed services will dare to testify before any investigating committee of Congress or answer any letter from a Member of Congress if his information or judgment is at variance with the Truman policies. There goes our much-vaunted civil authority—for Congress is a coordinate branch of the Government of the United States under our Constitution, and when we get one-man government we don't have representative government any longer." (That's the end of the quotation from Mr. MARTIN.)

Now the next question: "Is it correct to say that MacArthur wants to extend the war and Truman wants to prevent a war?"

No, it isn't correct. For each man is sincerely convinced that he has the answer as to the best method of preventing world war III. I leave it to you, however, as to what prevents a big war. Is it when you tell the enemy every other day that you're afraid to get into a big fight and keep on saying to your own troops, "You must not fight the enemy with all your might because it might antagonize them"—or is it when you give your troops the right to fight the enemy with maximum force? We never yet have entered any war just to get a stalemate or a draw. We go in to win, and to secure respect for our rights.

"But was not MacArthur told not to issue foreign policy statements?"

Yes; but he is on the ground in a military area. Commanders have the right to discuss military and related questions. I examined all the directives and statements made public last week by the White House as having been sent to MacArthur, and I did not find a single explicit instruction that covers what MacArthur wrote to Congressman MARTIN. If by any twisted construction of those messages, it is said he did violate orders, then so did General Ridgway on March 12 when he said if we stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel we would achieve victory. This could be taken to be a political statement, too. Also, General Stratemeyer, of the Fifth Air Force, pointedly told the press last Friday about the bases in Manchuria from which planes were coming every day now to destroy our planes and attack our troops. That is an expression of opinion similar to MacArthur's, especially as General Stratemeyer pointed out how difficult it will be for us now to protect our troops. Incidentally, those six B-29's, with all their crews, those big superfortresses, have been lost by enemy action, and yet we are unable to attack the bases from which those enemy planes are coming.

"Did General MacArthur's statements hurt us with our allies in the United Nations?"

The answer is to ask: "How much actual agreement is there among our allies today?" The British recognize Communist China, yet they are at war with Communist China. They want us to turn Formosa over to Communist China. We don't want to do so. They want Communist China to sit in at the treaty conferences to determine the fate of the Japanese people. The American Government doesn't want Red China in that conference. The British are sending war supplies to the Communist Chinese. What kind of a United Nations policy is that when our best friend in the UN actually follows a policy opposite to that of the United States?

And General MacArthur is relieved of his command supposedly, as the President puts it, for failing to give "wholehearted support to UN policies." What UN policies?

America is disunited today. It will not be reunited by the wishful thinking of pollyannas who cry out that we just must not debate among ourselves. The real answer is to discuss all this freely in the court of public opinion and have it out.

If General MacArthur is wrong, let us have the facts to prove it. If Mr. Truman has committed a blunder that may aggravate world conditions and invite a third world war—just as Chamberlain by his appeasement policies invited World War II—then let Congress consider the facts about that also.

For both General MacArthur and President Truman are now on trial in the court of public opinion, and the only answer that can come in this controversy must come from the people themselves, by the fullest expression of opinions communicated freely in our democracy to their Representatives in Congress and to the President.

Effect of Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Applecart and Its Badly Teetering Load," by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

THE APPLECART AND ITS BADLY TEETERING LOAD

WASHINGTON, April 16.—The Stars and Stripes snapshot of General Eisenhower—when he was told at Coblenz that General MacArthur had been relieved of his duties in the Far East—is one of those rare news photographs which reveal more than words can do. Many of the implications and conceivable consequences of the President's order have been listed, analyzed and forecast. But in the troubled look which the camera caught and was broadly circulated on the first page of this newspaper and others today it is possible to see the greatest of these:

Will Mr. Truman's action provoke a controversy in the United States that will seriously deflect the military program for the defense of Western Europe, which the North Atlantic Treaty nations have entrusted to General Eisenhower? Will General MacArthur dedicate himself to that objective, and by what means?

It is already apparent that, if these were the thoughts behind the Eisenhower look of anxious regret, they were prescient. The effects of the relief order on official Washington have been numerous, among them the manifestation of a popular will to pay public honor to General MacArthur for his military achievements and his extraordinary record as proconsul in Japan. But not only those Republican politicians who long have been critics of the administration's Far East policies have seized upon the President's action as a catalyst to combine with irresistible force all the pressures for an open reexamination and change of these policies. A number of Democrats and many students of foreign policy outside the political community also have their doubts, and welcome any incident which might produce a resurvey of global strategic values as estimated by the administration.

The existing handicaps

Considering his assignment, bearing in mind the difficulties of carrying it out successfully even in ideal circumstances, it is obvious that General Eisenhower requires national concentration on his problem as well as national support of his efforts to solve it. Except for Great Britain there are soft spots throughout the military foundation for the Eisenhower army; this correspondent noted some of them in recent dispatches from France, Italy, and Western Germany. And divisions on policy and purpose in many areas between the United States and Great Britain diminish the impact of the highly creditable rearmament program undertaken in London.

The West German Government's partnership in European defense is beset by the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Communist propaganda of "unification and neutrality," which has also attracted many young people and sincere anti-Communists in that country, and is the dream of the German population. The same propaganda has penetrated into the thinking of the French, despite the gallant strivings of the Government to repel it. There is little relish among the Italian people for the military posture which Mussolini was the last to try and fail to establish, and partisan politics is impeding the effort of the Government at Rome to pass the rearmament budget.

These and other situations—the diplomatic impasse over joining Spain, Turkey, and Greece to the NATO; the mounting threat to Yugoslavia, which puts a new burden on the allied channels of supply; the sputtering fuses which lead to nationalistic explosives in the Middle East—have added critical factors to the many General Eisenhower has encountered from the beginning. If now the United States is to be diverted seriously from his mission, and if this—whether or not it brings about a change of military emphasis—is to lessen, however briefly, the faith of the treaty nations in our devotion to his enterprise, that is a very serious possibility from the standpoint of those who believe in the essential priority of what General Eisenhower has been directed to do.

A "PEARL HARBOR" INQUIRY

The events of this week in the United States, and especially in Washington, will furnish some of the answers and point the way to the rest. And today's demand of the Republicans for a "Pearl Harbor" inquiry into the administration's courses in the Far East since the Japanese war ended may tend toward the very answers which would imperil General Eisenhower's project. This possible consequence could have been uppermost among his thoughts on the instant of hearing about General MacArthur.

The administration's critics on the Far East have had a strong case for years. But as long as General MacArthur was on active service they could count only on his oblique assistance in promoting it. That was powerful and took direct form in his letter to Representative Martin, of Masachusetts. Yet what these critics still needed for a "Pearl Harbor" inquiry was his presence in this country and his unfettered testimony. The first, knowingly and with basic courage, the President provided them with when he relieved the Far East commander. Whether the second will be what the critics hope for must await General MacArthur's first question-and-answer appearance before congressional committees, though its nature may be foreshadowed by his address to the joint meeting of the House and the Senate.

Assuming that the MacArthur contribution will be documented proof of all the Far East policy critics have contended, the record will not necesarily lead to that diversion of military emphasis to Asia which would end the Eisenhower project. But that is among the grave possibilities evoked by the President's order, and no one is more aware of it than Eisenhower himself.

Small War or Big?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very well considered editorial entitled "Small War or Big?" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Boston.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL WAR OR BIG?

To get at the central meaning of the MacArthur controversy Americans need to ask themselves this question:

"Which of two wars do we want to fight, the war which began in Korea on last June 25 or 'an entirely new war' which would certainly spread to much of China and might envelop the world?"

The American purpose as stated by President Truman is to prevent world war III by vigorously resisting aggression but starting no new fires.

The war which the North Korean Communist puppets started—and which was taken up by the United States, the United Nations, and the Chinese Communists—was and still is a war for specific objectives and within geographical limits. The objectives, from the United Nations side, are (1) to repel and discourage aggression, and (2) to establish an independent, unified Korea.

The United Nations forces have won notable gains toward those objectives and are still advancing.

But is that too slow? Are Americans so eager to get out of a small war that they must take on a very much bigger war to extinguish it? Or does this sense of urgency arise from an exasperation with communism, a fear of it which has smoldered since the Reds first took over Russia in 1917, and a tacit assumption of irrepressible conflict which can end only in final war with that system?

The struggle has taken place by means short of war, by limited wars, by propaganda, and by civil strife, and it will continue in some form until the fallacious tenets and methods of communism no longer appeal to extensive sections of humanity. Whether the struggle shall be peaceful or violent, narrow or broad, rests partly with Communists, partly with opponents of communism.

Where Communists choose the road of war, as in Korea and earlier, Greece, they must be met with arms. But if Americans deliberately choose to bomb Chinese cities, containing great numbers of people not in sympathy with the Communists, even because Chinese Reds have shot American soldiers in Korea, it will certainly look to the ordinary Chinese and to a great many other people as if Americans are the aggressors.

When, as is commonly suspected, the Soviet rulers in Moscow gave a go-ahead to the North Koreans the conclusion was widely drawn that the Kremlin was willing to risk precipitating a third world war in reaching for its objectives. This was rightly considered a cold-blooded and reprehensible attitude.

Would a similar judgment be passed on the United States if, rather than accept a sharp handicap in the UN's method of waging war for Korea, it should insist on making air attacks which—if last year's Sino-Russian Treaty means anything—would bring Russian arms in on the side of the Chinese?

Of course, it is argued by advocates of such a course that Russia would not actually intervene but would back down before a show of sufficient force. Possibly that is true, but it may also be remembered that the original Communist move across the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea was predicated on a belief that the United States would not use force to resist that action.

To be sure, there is need for sharper crystallization of policies and courses of action by the UN in bringing the Korean matter to a satisfactory conclusion. There should be earnest Anglo-American consultations to bring the views of these two leading nations closer together on dealing with Communist China. And there should be more meaningful discussions in the UN Sanctions Committee looking toward tighter control of trade with China and toward added contributions of troops to Korea.

The choice of broad courses here described is scarcely one on which any mortal could assume to know all the pertinent factors or to exercise an infallible judgment. The subject is one for earnest public debate and equally earnest individual soul-searching. To us it seems that the more justifiable course lies in the direction of limitation of war and of refusing to foment additional hostilities.

Another Idea Would Be To Have Our Own Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Bruce Barton entitled "The British:"

Dr. George Riley, the famous osteopath, was once invited to meet George Bernard Shaw, a devotee of osteopathy.

They had hardly shaken hands before Shaw burst into bitter vituperation of America.

Dr. Riley stood it for about 3 minutes and then cried out: "Stop that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. How dare you, a man whose food and clothes and roof-tree are principally paid for by the money of American book buyers and playgoers, how dare you say such things about a country and a people of which you are so abysmally ignorant? I never knew such impudence."

Shaw shut his mouth. A look of amazement came into his eyes, but with it a glint of admiration. He told a friend afterward: "That man Riley is one of the most interesting people I ever met."

Too many British authors and lecturers have accepted our hospitality—often lavish and effusive to the point of servility—taken their winnings and gone back home to write and talk scurvily about us.

Too many of the British people as a whole, jealous of our prosperity, are unfriendly at heart. For years they sold us the idea that, except for protection of their fleet, we would have been helpless. But they never said from whom their fleet was protecting us; and in our Civil War, when our need of help was most desperate, their seapower, instead of helping us, tried to destroy our merchant marine.

Yet I admire the British. They write the English language better than we—we have no Shakespeare, no Milton. Their administration of justice is swifter, cheaper, and more dignified. In the conduct of foreign affairs they are so much smarter that it just is not funny.

Indeed, one of my distinguished lawyer friends, a long-time subscriber to the London Spectator, tells me that by reading it he has long been able to predict 6 months in advance just what our State Department would do—the British loan, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and so forth.

Lately, Russia has been making our foreign policy. When she lets out a blast, we promptly blast her back. When she nudges the North Koreans into starting a rumpus, we obligingly reply with our whole Army and heaven only knows how many billions of dol-

lars, while she loses not one soldier or one ruble.

Dancing to Russia's fiddle is getting us nowhere. We might better go back to letting the English manage us, however much we may dislike them. They know their way around, especially in the Orient, where they operated for more than 150 years at a handsome profit.

Another idea, of course, would be to have our own foreign policy. But since, to make any sense, this would have to be based on America first, it is out. Every other nation can be for itself first. But not the United States. The mere suggestion is "un-American."

The Lincoln Legend, Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 15, 1951, a group of several hundred citizens gathered at Ford's Theater in our Nation's capital. It was there, on April 14, 1865, that an assassin fired a shot, that, on the following day, ushered into eternity, one of the world's greatest characters. Although 86 years have elapsed since that tragic hour the name of Abraham Lincoln still "belongs to the ages."

The chairman of Sunday's memorial service, sponsored by the National Park Service and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, was our colleague, Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Royal Oak, Mich. The principal address was delivered by Dr. J. Walter Coleman, superintendent of the Gettysburg National Military Park of Gettysburg, Pa., and is hereto included as an extension of my remarks:

I undertook this little task in the belief that it would be an interesting exercise to compare some of the opinions which people expressed toward Lincoln in his own day and at present. Due allowance must, of course, be made for the familiar American tendency of letting adverse opinion of public figures mellow rapidly with the years. But, while some of this change in attitude toward Lincoln is sentimental, much of it, as I shall illustrate, is carefully considered. Unfavorable criticisms must be viewed against the customs of the times. If the late President Roosevelt, for example, had delivered an oratorical gem like the Gettysburg address, what would have been the comments of his severest editorial critics? I doubt that any of them would have sought an unenviable immortality by calling it disgraceful, but we must bear in mind that a considerable percentage of the comment on any incumbent President is automatically unfavorable. It is also human nature for indignant objectors to a Presidential course of action to be more vocal than the supporters.

We would therefore expect bitter expressions of disapproval during his lifetime and a generally more friendly attitude in later years. But this natural trend does not account for the even heightening interest in the man on not merely a national but a world-wide basis. The Lincoln legend is growing.

The reasons for this growth are not hard to find, but let me present a few personal observations to illustrate that it is a fact. For example, the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania has members scattered throughout the country. It meets at Gettysburg, always on November 19, and at some other times throughout the year. Mr. John D. Lippy, Jr., who is with us today, proprietor of the Lincoln Room in the Wills House is the president and I am the secretary. Its membership is a cross section of American life. From Philadelphia we have had a woodworking craftsman, an express agent, an AFL organizer, and the president of Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co. We have battlefield guides, a grocery store manager, a college president and a high executive in the Du Pont Co. They belong to the organization because they are interested in attending programs devoted to Lincoln, the man of the people.

I have been at Gettysburg 10 years. My observation has been that people visiting the park and cemetery are about as much interested in Lincoln's address as they are in the battle. This opinion is supported by the guides, our historians, and persons operating the several private museum displays in the town. Dr. Henry Hanson, president of Gettysburg College, told me once of the visit of a famous Japanese educator whom he conducted over the battlefield as his guest. It was a cold rainy day. They finally reached the national cemetery and the visitor left the car and stood, hatless, on the spot where the address had been delivered. "This is the memory," he said, "that I want to take back with me." Dr. Waldo Leland, last Wednesday, related an almost identical experience with the Minister from Norway.

Travelers have told me that they have commonly encountered school children in countries like Denmark and Switzerland who could recite the address perfectly in English. I think there can be no question that Lincoln's stature as a world figure is constantly increasing. Our American stronghold of democracy is, of course, more important in world affairs now than it was nine decades ago, but much of its importance stems from the fact that we had a Lincoln when we needed him, and that "When the Judgment thunders split the house, he held the ridgpole up and spiked again the rafters of the home." Great scholars are constantly finding in him a subject for study. They tell us how he emerged, how he found a general, how he conducted diplomacy in carpet slippers and how he shared the ordeal of the Union. If we cannot all understand the deeper complexities of that social and political cataclysm of the sixties, we all do know that the man surmounted fantastic difficulties in rising to our highest national honor, and in steering the ship of state through those troubled waters.

Lincoln's background, for an American legend, could hardly be improved upon. His people were English, they came to America before the Revolution. They migrated gradually westward by going down the great valley of Virginia from Pennsylvania, like Daniel Boone. Lincoln was born in a log cabin. His grandfather was killed by the Indians. Thomas Lincoln, his father, was poor but he possessed those skills essential to the frontier which gave his family enough to eat and wear. Abraham's schooling was brief, even for the frontier, but this unlettered man was able, by keen logic and homely aphorism, to hold his own in the courtroom or on the stump, with the smartest people, first in that part of Illinois or later, most anywhere. Abe Lincoln was big and strong in the days when the expression a "good man" had two different meanings, depending on which word received the inflection. He could chop and split rails, he could shoot. His private life was impeccable, but he could tell and enjoy a story as well as the next fellow when he was out with the boys. He didn't mind people taking a drink, although he didn't use the stuff himself. He had sincere Christian convictions which were, however, not formalized into any particular dogma. This Horatio Alger formula for human interest is doubtless a factor in the legend, if it does not affect our objective estimate of his ability. Contemporary critics were not impressed by it.

I have often talked with my father about the Civil War and Lincoln. Born in 1855 in Susquehanna County, Pa., he retained vivid childhood recollections. When I recently visited the little family burial plot a hundred yards from our home, I discovered the reason why memories of the Battle of Gettysburg were a trifle vague. Six of his little cousins were buried that week, victims of typhoid fever. His recovery left him too weak to be much interested in affairs of 1863, but he remembered well his tenth birthday, Monday, April 17, 1865. The mailman, slogging through the spring mud, brought stirring news that day. He first reported that two local Republican youths had been drafted, and a friendly Lemocrat had escaped the call. He was quite happy. Was there any other news? Oh, yes, Old Abe has been shot and I'm glad of it. The brutality of the statement shocked the little boy, and he often mentioned it. Fifty years later, when I was 10, my father reminded me of the incident. He said, "You know, I've thought about it quite a lot, and as near as I can figure out, Lincoln was about as great a man as Washington." A ground swell for the Lincoln legend.

Grandfather's comments come to me second hand, but on the subject of Lincoln they are definitely pungent. His district was famous, briefly, in the middle forties because of Congressman David Wilmot and his famous provisos, but, by the fifties, as Prof. Avery Craven recalls, Wilmot had already returned to enjoy a well-deserved obscurity in his backward constituency. He had been the lone Pennsylvanian to vote against a protective tariff. The irate Governor of Pennsylvania declared that the only thing that district ever manufactured was shingles and they stole the lumber to make them. He was wrong on two counts. They had plenty of shingle timber, and they also made whisky.

Congressman Wilmot was succeeded by his law partner, and my grandfather's attorney, Galusha A. Grow. Mr. Grow, later to become Speaker of the House, switched from the Democratic to the Republican Party, and grandfather disapproved of him and his famous Homestead Act. He thought that the new party was giving away land to worthless migrants who should have to buy it like his grandfather had done. His widowed sister, married to a Maryland Carroll, killed in the Confederate Army at Buzzard's Roost, had brought back reports about slavery that were somewhat at variance with Uncle Tom's Cabin, and he had a poor opinion generally of President Lincoln.

One of grandfather's youthful friends was an eccentric boy named Locke. His mother was a Ross who lived about a mile away. David Ross Locke had gone out to Ohio and become a newspaper man, writing what my grandfather called nonsense. He was a great favorite of Lincoln and had been entertained at the White House. He wrote under the absurd name of Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby.

But the years were to mellow even the considered opinions of Mr. Darius Coleman. He died thinking that Lincoln's Presidency was maybe the best thing that could have happened, but he always wished that Horace Greeley could have beaten Grant.

Lincoln made men follow him. When Noah Brooks went to hear him at the Cooper Union Institute he was cynical. He saw his awkwardness and heard the uncouth frontier pronunciation. "Old fellow, you won't do," he said. "It's all very well for the Wild West, but this will never go, down in New York." As Brooks recalled it later, "A friend said to me after the meeting, What do you think of Abe Lincoln, the rail-splitter? He's the greatest man since St. Paul, I said, and I think so yet."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In 1894 Woodrow Wilson was a professor of jurisprudence and political science at Wesleyan College. In an article for Forum magazine, entitled "A Calendar of Great Americans," he designated Lincoln as "the supreme American of our history."

Lincoln is a man of so universal appeal that he has become virtually all things to all people. Like the scripture, he is quoted by all shades from reactionary to pink. Conservatives warn us that we must return to the Lincolnian principles of government if our Nation is to remain free, overlooking the dire fact that Lincoln's government was at war from the outset and was forced, as I see it, to employ all kinds of restrictive measures, repugnant to Americans at times of peace. Radicals, on the other hand, assure us that freedom can only be attained by more and more drastic legislation, curbing the evils of capitalistic slave driving, and citing the Emancipation Proclamation and the thirteenth amendment as the beginning. Would Lincoln, if he were to be reincarnated today, be puzzled by these apparent contradictions? No, they existed also in his day. He would recall that the Republicans were denounced in 1856 as Communists and as high tariff economic royalists, alike.

Lincoln is great because he served as a fine leader of a mighty nation in the first war of modern times, in terms of the mechanical age. He had the courage to try to keep that Nation one, choosing the awful alternative of internecine war, rather than to let the dissenting States form their own government. In poker parlance, they might have split the pot, and ended the game peaceably, but this was not to be, and the times have borne out the wisdom of the course of action. The war for the Union was the first fought with weapons of steam (the gunboat and the locomotive), electricity (instantaneous communication by telegraph), and the enormous ramifications of these devices. It was the first great war directed from headquarters at the Nation's Capital. It was the first struggle of major proportions to be adequately reported in the daily papers.

We know that Lincoln's greatness is based on tangible evidence of his vast ability. And yet we love him, we revere his memory for other qualities. About a week before his death, when Lincoln entered Richmond he called at the home of Gen. George Pickett. The general was originally a Virginian who lived in Illinois as a young man and had been appointed to the United States Military Academy from that State. The President knew him quite well. He asked if General Pickett were at home, and he was told that the general was with his command in the Army. The servant offered to take a message, and asked who it was that he should say had called. The President replied, "just tell him that it was an old friend from Illinois." When I recall that expression, I feel that in a very real sense, to me, to all of us, Lincoln is primarily an old friend from Illinois.

Preservation of American Sovereignty Over Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement presented by me to the House Committee on Public Works on April 11, 1951, pointing out what I believe to be a serious defect in the agreement with Canada for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVE AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY OVER LAKE MICHIGAN

(Statement by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, since the birth of this Nation and its expansion to the west, we have adhered to the position that Lake Michigan is wholly American. It lies entirely within our boundaries and is fed only by water that has fallen on our soil—and its waters are ours to do with as we will. That position has been expressly recognized and conceded in formal treaties with Canada, particularly the treaty of 1909, which is the basis for our present relationships with Canada with respect to these waters.

For many years, our diplomatic representatives exercised constant vigilance to insure that there were no encroachments upon our sovereignty over that great body of water. And it required much care and vigilance. Our neighbors, with true British tenacity, have constantly sought to obtain some sort of toehold that would give them ground to assert an interest in it.

That tenacity of the Canadians first bore fruit in the early treaty negotiations between the United States and Canada for development of the still pending St. Lawrence seaway project. The treaty negotiated some 20 years ago contained a provision, article VIII, which would have internationalized Lake Michigan.

Under this proviso, Lake Michigan would have been placed in the category of the boundary Lakes—Superior, Huron, Erie and Ontario. Article VIII specifically empowered an international board to enter all cases of disagreement in matters relating to the waters of Lake Michigan. The international board thus was empowered to control and perhaps prevent the use of waters of Lake Michigan by Chicago or any of the other lakes or cities.

That treaty fortunately failed of ratification in the Senate. There can be no doubt that the inclusion of article VIII in the covenant contributed largely to its defeat.

The present proposed agreement between the United States and Canada for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway was negotiated by the two Governments and submitted as a substitute for the defeated treaty. Again, those who represented us in the matter would have surrendered our sovereignty over Lake Michigan. Article VIII in its original form was rewritten into the new covenant. The framers didn't even have the originality to change the article number.

The abhorrence with which the legislative branch regards this reversal of our traditional policy has been demonstrated in the past and is again shown in the case of the pending resolutions to approve the St. Lawrence seaway agreement. Even those who favor the project have taken exception to this article. Their resolutions specifically provide for its elimination from the agreement.

I feel that I may fairly state that we have good ground to be suspicious of our own diplomats so far as this question is concerned. Twice within 20 years they have attempted to enter into deals with Canada that would undo the efforts of their predecessors for a hundred years before them. We have learned through experience that we must be constantly on guard if we are to protect our heritage in the waters of that Great Lake.

The Secretary of State has lately appeared before this committee in support of the pending resolutions, including the elimination of article VIII (c). However, his statement has raised very serious questions in my mind. By a series of half-truths and omissions of highly important facts, he has created the distinct impression that he is prepared to surrender to the British Empire the power to tell us what we may or may not do with the waters of Lake Michigan.

While the Secretary agreed to the elimination of article VIII (c), I am fearful that the very nature of his reasoning on the subject, as expressed in his statement before the committee, may have tended to restore it in full force and effect.

He argued that striking out article VIII (c) does not weaken Canadian rights and does not make American rights any more secure. In this fashion, the Secretary would negate the efforts of the Congress to safeguard the traditional United States jurisdiction over its great inland lake, 60 miles from the international border. Statements of highly placed Government officials in formal hearings before congressional committees may be given great weight in the future interpretation of the agreement.

Mr. Acheson's reasoning requires some analysis. First, he states that "the 1909 treaty provides that no uses, obstructions, or diversions of boundary waters might thereafter be made on either side of the line without respect to the International Joint Commission or to a special agreement between the parties."

Later, discussing specifically the elimination of article VIII (c), he acknowledges that that article (for the internationalizing of Lake Michigan) was intended in particular to relate to possible future increase in the diversion of Lake Michigan waters through the Chicago Drainage Canal. In that connection, he went on to say: "The issue as to the Chicago Drainage Canal was settled by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, in April 1930, which enjoined the objectionable diversion. The International Joint Commission has complete jurisdiction over diversion of boundary waters in general, and both countries have regarded with satisfaction the exercise of that jurisdiction by the Commission."

Thus, we have a responsible official of our Government stating categorically that the question of diversion at Chicago is settled for all time. He certainly implies that any other question that might arise would fall within the jurisdiction of an international tribunal. What he did not explain is that the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 contains a definition of boundary waters which excludes Lake Michigan in its entirety. Included within that term are only those waters through which pass the international boundary, while the northernmost point of Lake Michigan is some 60 miles south of that line. Specifically, the definition excludes those tributary waters which flow into boundary waters.

This entire exclusion of Lake Michigan was no matter of accident or happenstance. It was done deliberately and carefully in order to insure that our complete sovereignty was in no way endangered.

On January 30, 1909, the Honorable Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, a great diplomat, and a great American, appeared before the Senate committee to explain the provisions of that treaty. After the preliminary article, containing the definition, was read, Secretary Root states: "The definition of boundary waters was carefully drawn in order to exclude Lake Michigan."

The 1909 treaty, and the explanatory statements of those responsible for its promulgation, seem perfectly clear as to the strict limits of the jurisdiction of the international tribunal. Not until recent years, when it

seems to have become the fashion for our diplomats to give away that for which our predecessors strived, has anyone thrown doubt upon it. Now we have from the Secretary of State a statement which might well be cited by our neighbors in support of a contrary view.

So far as the diversion question itself is concerned, Mr. Acheson would brush it aside by the bland assertion that it has been finally and conclusively settled by the Supreme Court in the Lake Levels case. He implies that the whole question is now of no importance.

If it is of no importance, why should our Canadian neighbors have been so anxious to write article VIII into the treaty which was signed in 1932, and defeated in the Senate a couple of years later? Why have they insisted on inserting article VIII (c), into this agreement? The answer is obvious from the Supreme Court decision, which may be found at 281 United States 179.

There the Court, Mr. Justice Holmes delivering the opinion, clearly recognized that it was dealing with a controversy between States, in a field where the Congress had not exercised its authority. The decision is strictly limited to those issues.

The prospect of such congressional action appears throughout the opinion, as where the Court said, "These requirements (of immediate action) as between the parties are the constitutional right of those States, subject to whatever modification they hereafter may be subjected to by Congress acting within its authority. It will be time enough to consider the scope of that authority when it is exercised. * * * The right of the complainants to a decree is not affected by the possibility that Congress may take some action in the matter."

At other points the Court said, "All action of the parties and the Court in this case will be subject, of course, to any order that Congress may make in pursuance of its constitutional powers and any modification that necessity may show should be made by this Court," and "The amount of water ultimately to be withdrawn unless Congress may prescribe a different measure is relatively small."

In its decree, the Court specified that any of the parties might from time to time apply to the Court for action or relief with respect to various points of its provisions, including the diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

It therefore is evident that the diversion question is far from being settled in the conclusive manner that Mr. Acheson implies. To the contrary, it may be reopened at any time that need therefor becomes pressing—by further proceedings in the Court, or by action of the Congress.

In the light of this diplomatic background, it is extremely important to be sure exactly what Mr. Acheson meant. When he said, "The issue as to the Chicago drainage canal was settled by the decision of the Supreme Court," was that statement intended to give assurance to Canada that the case would never be reopened? In other words, is his entire statement to be interpreted as an assurance to Canada that we are prepared to relinquish our complete sovereignty over Lake Michigan? If such an assurance is to be part of the permanent record of these hearings, it may be difficult to prevent such an interpretation of this agreement.

Although the Secretary of State may not be able to tie the hands of future Congresses completely, he may make it exceedingly difficult for Congress ever to take action in opposition to his interpretation of the agreement. The Executive has a veto over the actions of Congress, which can be overridden only by a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

If the question of the use of the waters of Lake Michigan should be opened by Congress, what then? Mr. Acheson implies that any possible dispute between this country and Canada will be settled by the International Joint Commission. Judging from his remarks, Canada is satisfied that leaving out article VIII (c) will make no difference in the actual interpretation of the agreement. Certainly Congress is under the impression that deleting article VIII (c) does make a difference. That is why we are leaving it out.

Are we to infer that Canada will have just as much to say in the use of Lake Michigan waters without article VIII (c), as they would have with it? That is the only inference that I can draw from the Secretary's remarks.

Gentlemen, this is not a matter to be treated lightly. This is a great Nation with, we earnestly hope, a long and glorious future. The needs of that future cannot now be foretold with certainty. Diversion from Lake Michigan may have to be increased before too long. There already are indications that the present flow may not long suffice to meet the combined needs of sanitation in the growing Chicago area and the needs of the expanding commerce over the Lake-to-the-Gulf waterway, authorized and completed by the Congress since the taking of evidence in that case.

Surely, we must not now permit the creation of a situation which might in the future operate to rob us of rights which have been so zealously guarded by those who preceded us.

When people employ the term "sold down the river," they usually refer to the Mississippi. If this radical departure from our previous policy is permitted to stand, the people of this Nation, particularly those of the midcontinent area, are likely to discover that they have been sold down the St. Lawrence.

I hope the day will never come when we in the United States of America have to ask any foreign country, friend or foe, whether we can divert water out of a lake entirely within our own borders, and drawing water entirely from American soil.

Hearings before this committee have shown that many of the proponents of the seaway have feared economic stagnation in the Great Lakes area if the seaway was not completed. The improper use of the waters of Lake Michigan could stagnate industries already established. The loss of control of Lake Michigan could stifle the development of Chicago, Gary, and many other cities around Lake Michigan.

I submit that this matter is too vital to our sovereignty and our future welfare to be treated casually or informally. In view of Mr. Acheson's position, the entire question of the St. Lawrence should be made the subject of a formal treaty, spelling out in detail just what is intended to be covered, and just how each item is to be treated. We should lay the whole picture before the American people. Only in that fashion can we be sure that we are not through loose interpretation and casual conversation of the diplomatic corps, to lay a basis for abandonment of strongholds so staunchly manned in the past.

Truman's Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Senate Resolution No. 49 which was adopted by the Senate of the State of Illinois on April 11, 1951:

"Senate Resolution 49

"Whereas early this morning President Truman announced the discharge of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from all of his military commands; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has long been a symbol of the determination of the free peoples of the world to resist totalitarian aggression and has been looked to with hope by the freedom-loving peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the shocking action of the President leaves our fighting men stranded in Korea without benefit of the leadership of General MacArthur, and further leaves the people of our Nation in a greater state of confusion and with further lack of knowledge as to true conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois*, That we express our unqualified confidence in General MacArthur and vigorously condemn the irresponsible and capricious action of the President in summarily discharging him from his command and that we further condemn such action without an opportunity to General MacArthur and others of his command to inform the people of our Nation of the true condition of affairs in Korea and the Far East; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we further criticize and condemn the policies of the present administration of the United States for withholding information, if any exists, to justify this action."

Adopted by the senate April 11, 1951.

WALLACE THOMPSON,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tablet, Brooklyn, N. Y., for April 14, 1951:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

A genuine American whose love of his country is first. A commander who won glory on a dozen battlefields; a strategist whose epoch-making achievements saved lives while winning victories; an administrator who obtained the confidence of the defeated foe and brought order out of chaos.

A Christian who believes in God and totally rejects communism, who never called its tyrannical head "Uncle Joe," who never found Russia an enigma and who neither compromised his principles nor attempted to appease an unappeasable tyranny.

A citizen who loves his country, first, last and all the time. For him there is no divided allegiance, no placing of Britain or any other country above his own. To him we all owe a debt which is impossible to repay in full.

HE CAN TAKE IT

The five-star general has lost his four commands. He does not have to worry. He got out at a good time and for a good reason and with the respect of his countrymen. He may be the means of exposing once

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and for all the subversive forces of hidden government assailed last year by Senator McCarthy, whose attacks on the enemy from within—our deadliest foe—are being more widely accepted each day as entirely justified.

It is lamentable that a temporary victory is scored over this rugged and authentic American by Dean Acheson, who could not turn his back on Alger Hiss, and by Gen. George Marshall, whose mission to China and its aftermath transferred that country from a friend to a foe and made communism the victor at a cost in lives, blood, and dollars that is incalculable.

General MacArthur has one charge against him. He was not obedient to civilian political leadership. He was not like other generals who sat silent while Russia was handed half of Germany and was permitted to seize other nations whose freedom they saw betrayed: who likewise offered no protest when our own Armed Forces were liquidated while the Reds solidified their aggression.

General MacArthur lost his command, but he saved his reputation. The charge of insubordination he can wear without odium.

THE PRESIDENT'S CASE

President Truman presented his case over the radio and television networks Wednesday night. Obviously nervous and under strain, Mr. Truman was on the defensive. What he failed to say aroused more interest than what he said. For instance, he emphasized that the United Nations, enemy was Soviet Russia; he failed to mention that Soviet Russia is the predominant force in the United Nations. Again, he declared the aim of the United States is to help peoples enslaved by Soviet Russia regain their independence; he did not mention the assignment of the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent the Chinese on Formosa from attempting to liberate their homeland. Most frightening of all to anyone with an elementary knowledge of communism was his incredible opinion that Soviet Russia could be scared or diverted from her objective—to enslave the world—by a show of strength in Korea.

President Truman has had his say. Now let General MacArthur present his case over the same Nation-wide facilities. The American people will hand down the verdict.

A Tragic Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter. It expresses very clearly the concern and indignation of my constituents in the Sixth Wisconsin Congressional District. It expresses the bitterness of an aroused people who for a week have been flooding my office with telegrams and letters asking that the President be impeached and that our State Department be given a thorough cleaning starting with its head, Dean Acheson and all the others who would not turn their backs on a traitor. The Congress of these United States will and must accept this challenge. It is my sincere hope that after hearing General MacArthur express his own views and opinions to proceed at once on a constructive program—a program that will rebuild the morale of the American people rather than support the retrogressors and the socialistc schemers of England. Mr. Speaker, my oath of office was not taken lightly and I pledge to my colleagues my whole-hearted support to clean out the offices of our Government of men and women who would have us appease any foreign power. The editorial from the Reporter follows:

A Tragic Incident

Americans are shocked by the action of President Harry S. Truman in depriving Gen. Douglas MacArthur of his commands in the Orient at a climactic stage in the civilized world's battle to halt the spread of Russian Communist imperialism.

The President's orders can be criticized bitterly and defended cautiously, but to remove a great leader in such a manner does not seem the American way.

Yes, General MacArthur was a military man. He was brought up in the Army and lived the life of a soldier. There were many young men who fought in the Pacific during World War II. All of them knew that he was a hard taskmaster. They knew he expected them to act as soldiers and give their lives if need be in the defense of their country. Still, many a father and mother were thankful that so rigid a disciplinarian was in charge of their sons. He fought for the welfare of his men. He believed in ending a war as quickly as possible with a minimum loss of life and in getting the men back to their families.

General MacArthur wanted to finish the war in Korea. He wanted his boys back with their families. He realize that the war never could be won the way it is being fought and the way Washington wanted him to fight it. A stalemate in war is worse than war itself. It means the unnecessary sacrifice of life. We can go on fighting for 25 years or more and in the end be no closer to victory than we are today.

It is admitted that possibly there was little else President Truman could have done under the circumstances, but we believe he might have been more of a diplomat and prevented those circumstances. It is apparent, perhaps, that General MacArthur failed to obey instructions of his Commander in Chief, but there is a serious question who was the better acquainted with the real thing—the man on the spot or the man in the White House.

We regret that there should be so deep and so wide a breach in the difference of opinion between a great commander in the field and the administration itself as to the importance of the far-eastern theater.

Now that General MacArthur has been dismissed, isn't it time that something was done about Secretary of State Dean Acheson who dictated the policies which actually led to the breach between the President and General MacArthur?

The rift between the President and the general reminds us of Munich and Hitler. Serving the general's head up on a platter may appease the yapping yahoos of the British Socialist Government temporarily, but now that the diplomats and the politicians have taken over this war, what are they going to do with it?

General MacArthur, we are convinced, was asked to work completely in the dark. The outcome was inevitable.

The irony of the whole thing is that Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who has replaced General MacArthur, holds practically the same views as his former commander. He has said as much in various statements which have come from him out of Korea.

MacArthur is a great general. Loss of his services to the country in this time of need is tragic.

House Concurrent Resolution 93

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein House Concurrent Resolution 93, which was introduced by me on April 16, 1951, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is hereby expressed to be the sense of the Congress that, because the people of the Nation have lost confidence in the foreign policies of the administration and in the manner in which those policies have been executed by Dean Acheson, he should be removed forthwith from the office of Secretary of State.

Sec. 2. It is further expressed to be the sense of the Congress that, because of the confidence which the people of the Nation have in General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, he should be afforded an opportunity to appear before a joint session of the Congress to give his views upon the situation in the Far East, and thereafter his experience and counsel should be utilized for the benefit of the people of our Nation at this time of grave crisis.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an article by Mr. Rukeyser in the Journal-American on the dismissal of General MacArthur.

Mr. Rukeyser points out clearly that the men rejected by President Truman are the men whose names will be on the honor rolls of the future. The article follows:

Dismissal of MacArthur

(By M. S. Rukeyser)

America's top resources consist of the know-how of creative personalities, and the public sense of shock over the ouster of Gen. Douglas MacArthur reflected widespread instinctive appreciation of that fact.

The battle of the routineers against sheer excellency goes on in numerous areas of activity. The intrigue against MacArthur has seen its counterpart in the recent attempt of pressure groups to agitate against Charles E. Wilson, generalissimo of defense mobilization.

In science, as well as in the practical arts, the conventional tend to resent original source minds, on whom accelerated progress so much depends. Back in 1926 General Billy Mitchell was disciplined because he visualized the meaning of air power earlier than the persons who were his technical superiors.

From his days at West Point where he made top grades, General MacArthur has distinguished himself in thought as well as in action.

He has long been a symbol of American intelligence and strength.

He was not disposed to follow the line of least resistance, and permit his silence to give his fellow countrymen a false sense of security.

MacArthur's stature is measured by his unwillingness to alibi failure on the ground that he was following orders.

His chief aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney has stated that the general has complied meticulously with all directives he has received.

But as the responsible chief on the ground he undertook to make his full contribution to the formulation of policies in the interest of the United States.

There is no gainsaying the fact that there were differences of opinion between the general and those who tried to put wraps around him which lessened opportunities for victory.

But for the politicians to talk sanctimoniously as though the differences were only those of form, technicality, and discipline is to be grossly misleading.

It is part of the record that President Truman himself was none too meticulous in respecting the legal technicalities. Truman involved the United States in the Korean War without affirmative action by Congress by the device of characterizing it as a police action.

By removing General MacArthur from his command, Truman has in effect removed from the general the inhibitions on his self-expression. Now MacArthur will be released to set forth his ideas for the guidance of Congress and the American people.

None at this stage can add to or detract from MacArthur's record of extraordinary achievement. His record in the rehabilitation of Japan is virtually without precedent, and his great accomplishments on the field of battle in two world wars are recorded in the annals of history.

The slur on MacArthur recalls the fate meted out to the late Andrew W. Mellon, who served two terms as Secretary of the Treasury prior to the New Deal. As a public service, Mellon put his extraordinary fiscal talents at the disposal of the Federal Government. His achievement was epitomized in the reduction of the Federal debt by a billion dollars a year.

On his retirement, instead of erecting a monument to Mellon, the New Deal administration had him indicted for fraud in his personal income taxes. (The fact that Mellon disproved the charges in court is beside the point; it does not erase the record of impudence on the part of vindictive politicians, little men in big jobs.)

President Truman has shown an extraordinary loyalty to cronies and hacks among his employees. He sticks to them stubbornly in spite of revelations of improprieties. But his rejects include such first-rate personalities as MacArthur; Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, former Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers; Admiral Louis Emil Denfeld, former Naval Chief of Staff; and Robert Newton Denham, former chief counsel, National Labor Relations Board. The list of rejects sounds like a roll of honor.

Truman Goes Astray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two leading editorials published in the Oregonian in my congressional district, one entitled "MacArthur Had To Go, but Now What, Mr. Truman?" which appeared on April 12, 1951, and the other entitled "Truman Goes Astray," which appeared April 13, 1951, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of April 12, 1951]

MACARTHUR HAD TO GO, BUT NOW WHAT, MR. TRUMAN?

This newspaper has been besieged with telephone calls denouncing President Harry S. Truman for the removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Thousands of telegrams to the White House and Congress express similar outrage of the senders. Even some who have opposed the Korean War as futile and mistaken censure the President. This articulate reaction is reported from all over the United States. Defenders of the President have had little to say.

This hurricane of criticism cannot be attributed entirely to the popularity of General MacArthur. American public opinion has long been sharply divided there. Rather, it is the culmination of deep and gradually building resentment and apprehension of the foreign policies of President Truman and his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. Republicans in Congress, quick to realize this, already are calling for General MacArthur's appearance before Congress—even for impeachment of the President.

When there is a cooling of public anger, the issues will become more plain. These, we fear, will divide the American people as they have seldom been divided in our times.

Fundamentally, the question is not whether General MacArthur as commander of the American and United Nations forces in the Orient was right in publicly advocating the use of Chinese Nationalist troops against Red China and UN bombing of the China mainland. It is not whether President Truman was right in ordering the UN forces to confine the war to the Korean Peninsula, denying the use of their full strength against numerically superior forces.

The basic issue is whether the traditional authority of civil government over military government shall be maintained in the United States. In plain words, General MacArthur defied the authority of the President in advocating foreign policies contrary to those of the civilian government. We think his purpose was laudable—to arouse the American people to the great peril of our men in Korea and thus to obtain the weapons to fight a successful war. But would it have been laudable had he put his words into action, without Presidential or congressional sanction, and carried the war to China—and to the Soviet Union if need be?

This newspaper stands for the supreme authority of civil government. The President and the general, in the situation which has developed, could not carry on their separate authorities. The general's authority was assumed, the President's founded in the Constitution.

But now that the President has asserted his authority, what will the American people say of his policies which have led us into a war which he is unwilling to let us win? The people's anger at the firing of General MacArthur is their answer. The smug satisfaction in the capitals of Europe, the Arab Nations, the Far East, and the Soviet sphere is the goad to their anger.

It was the soft Acheson-Truman policy in Asia—the abandonment of Formosa and Korea to Communist attack—which brought on the Korean War. Our Government, encouraged by the appeasers in the UN, left South Korea helpless and informed the Kremlin that we would not lift a finger to prevent aggression in the Orient. With that invitation, the Communists swarmed over the thirty-eighth parallel and increased their pressure on Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

Now they are saying in London, Paris, Cairo, and New Delhi that the removal of MacArthur opens a new approach to settlement of the Korean War. What does that mean? The only terms the Chinese Communist government has advanced for even discussing a settlement are the cession of Formosa and the withdrawal of UN troops from Korea.

The British and the French are incredibly enmeshed in their fear and self-interest if they believe that with Formosa and Korea in Communist hands, Hong Kong and Indochina will be safe. It is the old, disgraceful story of Munich all over again. For our part, abandonment of Formosa and Korea would mean that in a brief time we would have to draw another defense line against Communist aggression in weakened Japan, the Philippines, and Alaska.

No one in authority has presented an alternative to General MacArthur's demand for the power and the strength to win the war in Korea and stop Red aggression in its tracks. The President's removal of MacArthur leaves Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway in the same exposed and helpless position.

This, we feel, is the deep-lying cause of public anger against President Truman and his European-minded advisers in the State Department. Virtually abandoned by the United Nations in a police action the UN approved, our soldiers await the man-mass of Asia, fighting a defensive war on terms arranged by persons and nations with other fish to fry. Now that the President has rid himself of General MacArthur, whose courage and brilliance as a soldier can be questioned by no one, will the policy be one of submission to communism, or will he give General Ridgway the tools to win?

[From the Oregonian of April 13, 1951]

TRUMAN GOES ASTRAY

President Truman's defense of his limited war policy in the Far East—in his hurry-up radio address intended to counteract the national tide of criticism of the replacement of General MacArthur—is inconsistent. Whether his foreign policy is his own—the sole result of his best judgment and consultation with American advisers—or whether it has been influenced by pressures from abroad is of grave concern to the people of the United States. For it may have to be changed.

The heart of his policy of refusing to permit United Nations forces in Korea to defend themselves by bombing Chinese-Russian supply lines and bases in Manchuria lies in his statement: "We are trying to prevent a third world war."

His initial assumption is that the Soviet Union is encouraging and supplying Communist China to make war against the free nations in Korea. This, everyone knows. The Russians armed and trained the North Korean Communists and led them up to the thirty-eighth parallel. The group of MIG jet planes which attacked American bombers a day after General MacArthur was fired were Russian planes, operating from Chinese bases in the "sanctuary," and possibly piloted by Russians.

The purpose of the Soviet Union, the President avers, is to draw the United States into a full-scale war against China, with commitment of land, sea, and air forces to such an extent that the United States would be terribly weakened. This is the fear shared by the Europeans—that American power may be so exhausted by fighting the Chinese that it will not be available to throw back a Russian invasion of Western Europe.

This theory necessarily embraces the belief that the Chinese Reds would fight Russia's war of world conquest in the Orient, as a puppet nation without help or with little

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

help from the U. S. S. R., while the Soviets devoted their entire strength to the conquest of Europe.

But to have their hands free in Europe, the Soviets would have to be assured first of deep and irrevocable commitment of American forces in the Far East.

Neither General MacArthur nor anyone else has advocated commitment of large-scale American land forces to war on the Chinese mainland. All that has been asked is the right to unleash our Air Force where it will do the most good in stopping the mass invasion of Korea by Chinese troops.

We give no consideration here, nor did General MacArthur, to the mutual-assistance pact signed by Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse-tung. It means no more in Communist performance than did the Soviet-Nationalist China nonaggression pact or the German-Russian-Japanese agreement broken in World War II both by Germany and by Russia. Had the Soviet Union been sincere in declaring the Korean War a defensive war by Red China against American invasion, the Russians would already be in the far eastern fighting.

President Truman's case against bombing Chinese bases falls apart if one accepts, as he seems to accept, the premise that the Soviet Union's hope is to conquer Europe while puppet Chinese armies fight the Kremlin's war in Asia. We suspect, along with General MacArthur, that such bombing would hasten China's withdrawal from the Korean War without added hazard of Russian intervention.

Policy Over Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 17, 1951:

POLICY OVER POLITICS

The first purpose of the American people in the MacArthur affair should be to clarify and unify their aims in the Far East. There is still hope that a firmer, sharper national policy can be hammered out of the debate which started with so much emphasis on personalities and politics. The general's return may even promote the exercise of good will and good sense.

One unifying development is already in evidence—the purpose to give him a warm and appreciative welcome home. Even those most opposed to the general's views are joining generously in paying tribute to his great services. And General MacArthur shows a desire to speak only in general terms rather than to become the angry spearhead of a crusade. We assume that he will follow through with this tone. If so, he can do much to hold the debate on a higher level.

But the discussion will have to go beyond generalities. Questioning by congressional committees rather than formal speechmaking is the most promising way of digging below the surface of this question. Much will depend on whether the politicians continue to make a political football of the general's dismissal. If the Wherry-Martin Republicans pursue their attacks on President Truman, Democrats will doubtless counterattack, hitting the general on the question of insubordination.

Things have gone so far already that this kind of inquiry may be inescapable. But it is likely to be less useful than an effort to get out on the table all relevant and nonsecret information regarding policy issues. General MacArthur has called the policy which seeks to limit hostilities to Korea a "handicap unprecedented in military history." So far we have not seen why bombing Chinese bases is so vital that to do it America should risk appearing as an aggressor, splitting the United Nations and bringing Russia in. But General MacArthur's reasons should be fully laid out.

At the same time it would be highly useful to have a review and estimate of what has been and is being accomplished in Korea. Although General MacArthur has appeared to be out of sympathy with the recent purposes of UN there, we doubt if he will "throw down" the Korean enterprise as completely as Senator TAFT did a few days ago. The latter seemed to regard as futile all the sacrifices made in Korea.

The vast majority of Americans supported the decision to resist aggression in Korea. If it was right last July, is it not right today? As we see it, the action of the UN there may well prove to be a historic step in the organization of peace. It reversed the policy of appeasement which led to World War II and proved the peace-loving nations' ability to join in halting lawlessness. The Kremlin's plans were upset, the North Koreans overthrown, and the Chinese Reds punished.

Senator TAFT says the Chinese have lost nothing except a few men. American military estimates run from 200,000 to 300,000. The economic drain on a poor country is heavy, and the Reds' military prestige has been seriously damaged. Of course, the situation is far from what might be wished and a happy ending is not readily visible. But let us not undervalue the policy which has united the forces of 14 nations in active resistance to aggression. May we not still hope that Korea has raised a real barrier to Russian imperialism and is giving the free nations time to gain the strength which can prevent world war III?

Declaration of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, after visiting the battlefields of Korea, after seeing first-hand the tremendous price being paid by our fighting men in dead and wounded, it seems to me that the Congress has overlooked one responsibility of major importance—that of declaring war.

That we are at war is obvious. All the branches of our fighting forces are employed in combat. Our casualties have now mounted to more than 60,000 men, about 10,000 of whom have given their lives in this, the dirtiest, cruelest war in history. The President of the United States repeatedly refers to the war in Korea. We are asked to draft the boys from our States and districts to fill the needs of the war in Korea. We are required to appropriate billions to prosecute the war in Korea.

The Constitution of the United States places upon Congress, and Congress alone, the power and responsibility to declare war. It seems to me an immoral and shameful thing to send our boys to their death in a war which Congress has not officially declared to exist.

I realize that any Member of this House can introduce a resolution for a declaration of war against those who have declared war, by their aggressions against us and other members of the United Nations. However, I am informed that such responsibility rests primarily upon the administration leaders. I, therefore, call upon the majority leaders of this House to assume their duty in this respect. We are at war. Why then should administration spokesmen ignore their clear duty to recognize the war in a constitutional manner?

Radio Poll in Nebraska on Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the results of a poll conducted by radio station WJAG at Norfolk, Nebr., giving the opinions of a typical cross-section of Nebraska residents on several questions of current interest relating to our military policy. This poll was completed prior to the dismissal of General MacArthur. I offer a news release prepared by the radio station, giving results of the opinion survey, together with various comments on it.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Radio station WJAG, Norfolk, Nebr., completed a public-opinion survey April 8, 1951. The survey consisted of three questions, originally broached on the station's noon forum program the Voice of the People. Interest was entirely spontaneous. No prizes were offered. Questions were repeated once each day.

The duration of the survey was 3 weeks. Opinions were received through mail, personal interviews and telephone interviews. The total responses were 756. Of this number 460 were by letter, 200 by personal interview, the remainder by telephone interview.

The tabulated results of the opinion survey were as follows:

Question No. 1: Shall we withdraw our troops from Korea and leave that country to the Communists?

Yes, 46.6 percent.
No, 48.4 percent.
Qualified, 5 percent.
(The popular qualification, stop at the thirty-eighth parallel.)

Question No. 2: Should the President or Congress have the authority to send United States troops overseas?

Congress, 69.9 percent.
President, 5.9 percent.
President and Congress, 15.4 percent.
Undecided, 8.8 percent.

Question No. 3: Should the United States send additional troops to Europe under General Eisenhower's command?

Yes, 39.5 percent.
No, 52.6 percent.
Qualified, 7.9 percent.
(The popular qualification, United States supply troops in fair proportion with European countries.)

Results of the poll have been requested by Senators BUTLER and WHERRY, and Congressman KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska. Senator BUTLER said he intended to insert the results in the RECORD.

Radio station WJAG has drawn these conclusions after completion of the tabulation of the opinion survey:

First. Persons submitting opinions by letter were more extreme; that is, more conservative or radical.

Second. Persons submitting opinions by personal or telephone interviews were by far the more aggressive. These persons tended to favor remaining in Korea and also sending more troops to Europe. A majority personally interviewed bemoaned General MacArthur's present position; most of them feeling he and his troops were not receiving proper support.

Third. That a definite state of confusion exists within the public minds pertaining to United States foreign policy but that the trend is definitely established for more decisions to be made by Congress. Those advocating withdrawal of troops from Korea frequently asked "Why are we there?" Others suggested withdrawal unless we fight more aggressively.

Fourth. Those interviewed complained the public was not being properly informed. Many expressed doubt that Congress was being taken into confidence on foreign issues.

A separate breakdown of the survey by sex showed no substantial change in the above percentages. Women displayed only a slight tendency to avoid conflict by returning our troops or keeping them at home.

Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a noteworthy address delivered by our colleague the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of the Fortieth District, State of New York, before the New York State DAR luncheon on Tuesday, April 17, in Washington, D. C.:

ADDRESS AT NEW YORK STATE DAR LUNCHEON BY HON. KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK

Madam State Regent Cook, my distinguished colleague, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Daughters of the American Revolution of New York State, whoever picked out this week for the annual DAR Congress ought to be able to land a job anywhere as a crystal-ball gazer. When your State regent wrote me last November asking me to address your luncheon meeting today, I must confess that in my acceptance I did not envision, as your committee on arrangements seems to have done, the momentous events of last week and this week. You are certainly here at a historic moment, quite in keeping with the traditions of your illustrious organization. My remarks for this occasion were prepared before last Wednesday morning at 1 a. m., hence they will not relate, except in passing, to the great controversy which has rocked the country. Perhaps that is just as well, for if feeling is running as high throughout New York State from which you hail as it is in Washington and as my bushel baskets of mail indicate that it is in my own congressional district, it may be a welcome relief to you to hear, as it is to me to talk, about some subject other than the President's dismissal of a great military figure.

Just let me say this one word. Despite the strong convictions which you or I may have as to the wisdom or otherwise and the justice or injustice of the action which has taken place, the important thing for us as Americans to do is to look to the future. Let us not forget that hundreds of thousands of American youth, our most precious possession, are either in the Far East, or on ships, or in camps destined for that theater of operations. Let us not forget that their welfare and, perhaps, their lives and the lives of you and me and the welfare of our children and grandchildren depend upon keeping our heads and steering the right course in the days that lie ahead.

In other words, the real problem upon which we must focus our attention is not what to do with President Truman or General MacArthur, but what to do with Korea.

Our young men out there are being made targets because someone in Washington or in New York or perhaps London or Paris cannot make up his mind what to do.

We cannot sit still and do nothing. It seems to me we must choose a course and do it soon. We cannot simply sit back and wait for somebody or some event to bail us out. We have gone too far to continue the old policy of "let the dust settle in the Far East."

We must get away from platitudes and get down to business. We have heard enough of phrase making about avoiding a third world war, about the control of the military by the civilian, about the inherent powers of a Commander in Chief—all these so-called issues which are not issues at all. Everyone accepts them as basic principles. At the moment we have only one plan advanced for narrowing the Korean conflict and bringing the Korean War to a speedy conclusion. That may not be the right plan, but it is high time that any others who have any other plan lay it out on the table and let us examine it and compare it with the one already advanced. And in selecting the course to follow, let us base our decision not on personalities, not on a stubborn adherence to positions which may have once been taken but which no longer recognize the reality of the hour, but rather by an open-minded and unbiased appraisal of the evidence which can now be brought to bear on this problem.

One fact emerges starkly from the grim pattern of war and violence—only strength impresses the aggressors. Only strength, military, economic, social and above all, spiritual, can form the soil from which a just, lasting, and honorable peace will spring.

The forces of evil which are loose in the world today are atheistic and lawless, and have no respect for the rights or wishes of either other persons or other nations. Today, much as we may dislike the fact, to be well-intentioned and peace-loving is not enough. America must be so strong that the warlords and dictators will be convinced that they must abandon their announced plans to crush the United States and dominate the world.

The new and terrifying weapons which man has invented have, perforce, altered our conception of our role in the world and our plans for defense of our country. It is no longer enough to possess the productive capacity to turn out weapons in such quantity that we will win the war eventually. Eventually is many atomic bombs too late in this age. With guided missiles and jet planes carrying atomic weapons at hundreds of miles an hour—almost faster than the uninitiated can conceive—our defenses can never be down and our guard never relaxed so long as the forces of aggression continue to demonstrate that they are merely waiting the appropriate time to turn their fury on the free world.

It is startling and unpleasant to have to comprehend these facts, but it is the terrible truth that the world today is, quite literally, sitting on a powder keg.

To spend billions annually on weapons and armies seems a horrible waste of our substance when only a fraction might be spent on projects and activities which would spell permanently a better living for us all. But America must be strong to survive. Some of the luxuries which we have come to take for granted must be sacrificed or postponed until that strength is attained and an era of peace reasonably assured.

We face a long period of personal and national sacrifice in which we all must and will share. The budget for our national Defense Establishment will be increased. Increased taxes—income, excise, and corporation—must be expected. But whatever the price of our freedom, it is small when compared with the alternatives. There is no bargain basement when it comes to buying liberty.

But while we necessarily appropriate more billions for defense we must bear in mind the perils of bankrupting our national economy. America is a tremendously wealthy country, but even we cannot continue to spend extravagantly for both swords and plowshares. We must cut down nonessential spending on the national scene, just as increased taxes and inflated prices force us as individuals to cut down our purchases of luxuries. We must make every possible effort to pare Government hand-outs, subsidies, and peacetime construction to the bone. There is a limit, which I believe has very nearly been reached, to the amount which the Government can extract from the individual taxpayer.

Yet we must attempt to pay as we go as much as possible. The only course of safety and sanity is to cut down on what might be called Government frills.

Our country cannot operate in the red year after year and continue to be solvent. Now that the international situation has become so menacing, it is even more vital that we do everything in our power to balance the budget. If this cannot be completely successful in view of our vast defense expenditures, we must, at least, do all that we can to achieve this goal.

Nothing would please our potential enemies more than to see our economy collapse in a state of national bankruptcy. It would save them the trouble and expense of trying to take us over by other means if we committed national suicide by overextending ourselves to the point of financial exhaustion.

In addition, if we come as close as is possible to balancing the budget by paring unnecessary expenditures, we lessen by that much the inflationary forces. As you housewives know all too well, inflation is no longer merely a threat, it has become the unwelcome guest in your marketing basket and at your dining-room table.

It is a basic economic fact that Government spending which is not balanced by the taxes it collects adds more and more fuel to the flames of inflation, since the Government, unlike business, does not produce wealth or goods when it spends money. It merely puts more money into circulation which in turn causes the prices of all goods to rise.

A dramatic illustration of the effects of governmental spending of more money than is collected can be seen in the price rise from 1933 to the present time. During this time the only years the budget was balanced was during the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress, 1947 and 1948. As a direct consequence, a basket of groceries which cost

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

$2.59 only 11 years ago in 1939, now costs $5.80—or more than double the amount. Similarly, up goes the cost of guns, tanks, planes, and ships which the Government buys.

Time and time again we have been warned by Kremlin spokesmen of the basic strategy of promoting our destruction by undermining our domestic economy. By this means, it is held, the eventual wreck of the Nation can be accomplished by our enemies just as surely and far more cheaply than by a successful war. By this means we could be made to ruin ourselves. Accordingly, for more than a decade, besides stealing our state secrets and fomenting internal dissension, the Communist effort has been concentrated upon forcing us into a calamitous national bankruptcy from which chaos must ensue.

At the same time there is another peril we must face. If, to finance our defense projects or for any other reason, we resort to the Government taking over private industry or usurping the traditional role of individual initiative in this land, we shall have lost the very freedom we are striving to maintain.

England chose this path in order to finance the cost of rebuilding her war-ravaged country, but without the hypodermics of aid from the United States, she would have been financially ruined. Furthermore, it turned out to be a case of stepping from the frying pan into the fire, since socialism is a false solution and does not represent a real or permanent cure for financial troubles.

If, for any reason, America is led or lured by false promises down this road, we shall have killed the goose that lays the golden eggs, since it is our economic system that has made us the wealthiest and most powerful Nation in the world and made possible the standard of living which, like freedom, we here in America have come to take for granted.

Time and again it has been demonstrated that our free economy has resulted in a higher standard of living and improved working conditions through the initiative and inventiveness of men who are able to reap the benefits of their industry and talent. On the other hand, socialism undermines the character of the citizen and destroys his incentive to better his condition or risk his capital in new ventures.

In a Socialist country, people have no incentive to improve the machine and tools with which they work, since they realize that they will not gain the rewards of their own skill. Anyone will work twice as hard if he is working to improve his own lot in life, and not merely working for the benefit of some vague economic theory or some government bureaucrat. It is only natural and proper that men should wish to improve their economic position in life and thus be able to buy a few luxuries and extras for their families.

People who have resigned themselves to living on government doles or handouts without any hope of improving their status except by government action have forfeited much of the joy of living, and also a vast amount of self respect.

Our country was founded on the desire of men to be independent and free to determine and influence their own futures without arbitrary rule by a Government bureaucrat, no matter whether titled or merely appointed. It was a love of adventure and a willingness to risk unknown dangers, possessed by our pioneering forefathers and inherited by their descendants, that has made our country great, and it is still the chief characteristic of Americans today, whether their ancestors came over on the *Mayflower* or immigrated last year.

So it is not that I fear that Americans would knowingly sell their birthright for a mess of Government pottage, but I do fear that in the press of defending ourselves from possible outside attack we may unwittingly be sold a bill of socialistic goods in the name of national interest.

At the same time, we must beware of placing undue emphasis on the materialistic aspect. We must devote an appropriate portion of our time and energies to building the spiritual side of our national life.

To combat the forces of communism in all their nefarious and menacing guises, it is necessary to understand thoroughly the nature of the evil we face. Communism has become a religion to its followers. They are fanatics, possessed of the zeal and unreasoning devotion which makes all fanatics dangerous. The early exponents and teachers of international communism understood that to be accepted and practiced, religion and faith in God must be supplanted by an equally intense and deep belief in the Communist state and the ultimate victory of international communism. Since it is the nature of man to worship a power greater than himself, the Communist credo substituted the state and the theory of communism. This was a necessity, since communism requires the complete subordination of the individual to the good of the masses, except that as it is presently practiced the masses are synonymous with the Kremlin masters, who are absolute dictators, ruling Russia and the satellite nations for one purpose and one purpose only, their own personal aggrandizement.

As the forces of lawlessness and atheism continue to dominate the lives of millions of people abroad, we must make certain that we do not neglect our privilege to worship at the church of our choice—that privilege for which our ancestors risked their lives and fortunes.

Confidence in the rightness of our cause and the certainty that right will triumph over the evil forces of totalitarianism and godlessness will lend strength to our convictions of ultimate victory. The realization that our entire civilization and culture are at stake will endow us with the courage to resist this terrible menace, without at the same time becoming panicky or losing our nerve. Free men and women, firm in their faith in their fundamental beliefs, will always be able to defend the most determined assaults upon that freedom.

Thus, with deep religious conviction and trust, we must spend our efforts unceasingly to spread the doctrine of the inherent worth of the individual and his right to live according to his own determination, sustained by our knowledge of the moral rightness of our cause and of the eternal justice of the God in whom we place our trust.

MacArthur's Dismissal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent granted, I include as part of these remarks, an editorial pertinent to the times which appeared in the Mount Vernon Daily Herald, of Mount Vernon, Wash., on April 12, 1951:

Not since the sudden death of Franklin D. Roosevelt 6 years ago today has our Nation been so profoundly shocked as it was early yesterday when President Truman, without preliminary warning or notice, deprived Gen. Douglas MacArthur of all commands in the Far East and told him he was free to travel anywhere he pleased as a five-star general of the United States Army.

Never was Mr. Truman's ineptitude or unfitness as the Nation's Chief Executive so clearly shown following a long chain of inexcusable temperamental actions and unpopular quick decisions. A White House press conference was called at 1 o'clock in the morning to flash the Commander in Chief's order around the world, and while Press Secretary Short read the announcement, President Truman went to bed. It is now certain that MacArthur had no advance information until the cablegram was handed to him in Tokyo. His entire staff was astounded. It is worth noting that Secretary of War, Frank Pace arrived in Tokyo some 24 hours previously direct from Washington and had conferred with General MacArthur with no hint of the bombshell about to be exploded.

Now, America does not treat its hero leaders in this fashion, particularly military heroes, of which MacArthur was and is acknowledged to be one. He was not a defeated and unpopular general, like Meade, whom Lincoln removed in the middle of the Civil War to make way for the aggressive Grant. MacArthur has been running a successful war in Korea, with his hands practically tied, as just reported by National Commander Cocke, of the American Legion, in a blistering criticism on the conduct of the war. Before Korea, MacArthur won undying fame in history for his defeat of the Japanese after one of the most brilliant campaigns in modern military history. It was MacArthur who made the peace with Japan and took over control by order of the United Nations. In 5 years he has brought peace, order, and reconstruction to that nation of 80,000,000. We have never heard it denied that he has done a truly remarkable job in Japan. He has spent most of his life in the Far East. It is said—and it is likely true—that he knows the oriental peoples better than any living American. The President in firing him so ungraciously gave him credit for being one of our ablest military leaders and commanders.

Why, then, an amazed and angry public, both Republicans and Democrats and people who are just good citizens without hidebound political ties, want to know was General MacArthur fired in such a humiliating manner at the very top of such a remarkable career of exemplary public service. The official reason given to him was that he was out of sympathy with his Government's policies and talked contrary to orders of his Commander in Chief—the President—contained in an order dated December 6 last that any and all public statements of Army and Navy officers concerning foreign policies must be cleared by the State Department, and therefore disobedient.

MacArthur has been complaining bitterly over having his hands tied by United Nations and being unable to bring the war to a conclusion while thousands of lives were being sacrificed. Undoubtedly he has expressed his views frankly. After all, he is a great general, in supreme far eastern command, successful guardian of the Japanese Empire, a top authority on the Orient, a great pillar in our Asiatic defense. It is pretty hard, if not impossible, to shut up a man of his caliber, carrying such a tremendous responsibility on the other side of the world. It is difficult to make him a mere Army robot taking orders off the board each morning. He was more than a military commander; he was a trained statesman, but denied by the Truman administration as such.

The bald truth is that some of the advice and recommendations of MacArthur have been finding deep roots of approval and stirring up powerful opposition to the policies of Truman and Acheson, who have been getting nowhere in the Korean War or in making peace with China or in holding the friendship of India, or winning Asiatic allies. General MacArthur should have been brought back here months ago to give his views to Congress and the American people

instead of being gagged by a State Department under the thumb of United Nations. Both the British and the French have been trying to get rid of General MacArthur for sometime past. It looks as though the English were running our diplomacy, telling us what is best for us in both Europe and Asia, probably because we possess so little aptitude and ability ourselves. The French follow the English of course.

President Truman made a very simple, naive, 15-minute defense talk over the radio networks last night, bearing down on the idea that we were trying to keep the Korean War from growing into a third world war and intimating that General MacArthur was taking us into another global war and therefore had to be removed. Opinions on that score will differ widely. The argument has been going on now for almost a year while 60,000 Americans have been killed, wounded, or taken prisoners. Our United Nations allies have been furnishing only around 10 percent of the forces involved. United Nations isn't any nearer peace now than last June; in fact they may be nearer all-out war with China. We're still fumbling and drifting.

We wouldn't say that General MacArthur has all the right answers and, if left to himself, could bring peace in Asia. We can't see some things as he sees them. But we do assert with confidence that he is abler and better informed than our President, the State Department, and the entire Pentagon army staff and that his views deserve the highest respect and consideration. His loss as a far eastern adviser is a tragic one to the country. We are still wholly unwilling that United Nations should run our foreign affairs and dismiss our commanding generals and civil administrators abroad.

Technically, President Truman may be entirely within the law in firing MacArthur for military insubordination but he should have known better than to do what he did the way he did it. His action may have very immediate and serious world-wide effects involving the welfare and safety of the United States. Definitely, all politics aside, we believe the Truman administration has pulled a first-class boner in the MacArthur incident which the American people will neither forgive nor forget. General MacArthur will undoubtedly return to defend himself and his views, when the full measure of his standing among his fellow citizens will be apparent.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Appeasement, 1951 Style," published in the Altoona Tribune of Friday, April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEASEMENT, 1951 STYLE

As the uproar continues over the President's dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, two aspects of this important incident stand out above all others, and are worthy of serious consideration, uncolored by political bias of any sort.

First, it is sufficiently clear that the President could have averted this uproar by privately asking the general to retire. MacArthur has remarked on various occasions about retiring when his Japan job is done.

Such a move would have been the part of wisdom. It would have prevented showing to the world the demoralizing spectacle of a top military commander being relieved of duty, which spectacle always gives rise to reports of a weak and a divided leadership.

Moscow seized upon this incident at once to declare American leadership is confused. And, indeed, this seems adequate evidence of confusion.

It serves no purpose whatsoever publicly to break MacArthur in this fashion. It is dangerous to American policies in the Far East, for it means loss of face, loss of dignity, in the eyes of the Japanese people, who had the highest respect for MacArthur and, through him, of American leadership.

This ill-advised public dismissal may have dangerous repercussions in Japan, which we had planned to hold against Red encroachment, and which MacArthur so far has succeeded in doing.

Secondly, Mr. Truman, in his Wednesday night broadcast, put his dismissal of MacArthur on the basis of "peace." Certainly, there is room for controversy on this. Yet, it is important to look at Mr. Truman's explanation closely.

The closer one looks, the more it shapes up into appeasement. The mere fact that the President denied it is appeasement does not alter the fact that it suspiciously resembles it.

Mr. Truman appears content to let the UN forces fight the back and forth war that has been going on for so many months, with a toll of some 60,000 American casualties.

Both MacArthur and his successor, General Ridgway, have said there is no hope in sight for military settlement in Korea. And, both have said there is no political settlement in sight.

What then?

Mr. Truman does not answer that. He merely states his position, undoubtedly dictated by Secretary of State Acheson, and, probably, to Acheson from London, that we do not want the war to spread, to develop into general war, and he charges General MacArthur's demand for permission to use Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist troops, and to bomb China, would invite general war.

Why? He doesn't say. The President doesn't explain that.

Every single move in this cold war has been on Russian initiative. Russia holds the initiative in Korea. She holds the initiative for making general war.

Regardless of anything Mr. Truman might say, Russia is in a position to precipitate general war in Korea just as readily as though we were to carry the war into China.

In fact, Russia's incentive lies in Korea, for there, she held control of the north portion, directly.

General MacArthur was in favor of making war on the enemy. That was his job. To do it effectively, he wanted UN permission to bomb enemy bases and supply lines in Manchuria.

Truman said no, that would invite general war.

What is this but appeasement?

Russia and Communists in general have hailed MacArthur's dismissal. What does that indicate but appeasement?

Certainly, we want no general war. We want peace as soon as possible. But, when did appeasement of the Reds bring peace? The more they are given, the more they demand.

To make a deal with the China Reds, as Britain, India, and some others of the UN want, would be a shameful thing, after all this blood letting in Korea.

Mr. Truman sent our troops into Korea. Mr. Truman refused to let the military wage war. He wants it on the police basis prescribed by Britain, which also wants full recognition of these vicious Reds whom we now battle on the fields and in the mountains of Korea.

The President started this Korean business. But, he can't find the means of ending it, and he refused to let MacArthur try.

That appears to be the substance of this situation. Talk of insubordination and disobedience of orders by MacArthur is just so much wind to blow away the bad smell of prejudice and ill judgment.

The Great Turnout—Hail the Hero!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by H. L. Phillips:

THE GREAT TURNOUT—HAIL THE HERO!—OR HOW TO STAGE A MACARTHUR PARADE AND DO SOMETHING FOR YOURSELF

(By H. L. Phillips)

WELCOME PARADE FOR DOUG

Section I

MacArthur clubs of America.
Societies for promotion of candor.
Anti-double-talkers of the world.
Federated associations of pipe and tobacco men.
Dark sun-glass manufacturers.
Republican clubs of the United States of America.
Organizations opposed to the Missouri Waltz.

Section II

Decorated floats: The GOP in Search of a Winner; the Democrats in Search of an Alibi; Where Am I? (Chiang Kai-shek supporters); the Needler (John Bull getting Uncle Sam to do it his way as usual); Little Red Riding Hood (a novel float depicting the little girl watching the wolf eat grandma but prevented by queer rules from doing much about it); Victory Through Veto Power (this one got in from the Kremlin by mistake).

Section III

UN debating teams (just hoping Douglas will never get back); the international "We Will Vote War but We Won't Do Much To Back It Up" Clubs. Baseball magnates (wondering if he would consider becoming commissioner of baseball); basketball promoters (in a similar mood).

THE HUCKSTERS FIND SOME GAME

Section IV (What's in it for me?)

Book publishers.
Lecture agents.
Video talent scouts.
Hollywood producers, script writers, and idea men.

Advertising agents (all hoping to get him to endorse the cigarette that guarantees nonchalance, the beer that builds morale, the hair tonic that swept the Pacific, the Tokyo to Washington Tours, Inc., and the soap that is dynamite to the Pentagon and other irritants).

Section V

Pageant of bands. Forty UN delegations playing, I Can Send You Anything but Men, Sammy; I'll Always Be Behind You, and Never Mind How Far, etc; Downing Street Fusiliers rendering, Praise the War but Give

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Recognition. Indian lute players giving out with, It Had To Be You.

Section VI

Kefauver committee. (It realizes this is the only way it could get back into the public eye.)

Section VII

Band Wagon Jumpers of America.
Political Trend Interpreters.
Idol Worshipers League of North America.
Pulse Feelers.
Martyr Builders of the World.
Democratic spies (trying to figure out how far this thing can go).
Unemployed Republicans.
TAFT for President, Eisenhower for President, and Stassen for President clubs, all too apprehensive to keep in step.
JOE MARTIN Fife and Drum Corps.

TO KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Section VIII

Omar Bradley and George Marshall (just making sure Douglas sticks to the parade). White House statisticians and checkers (trying to estimate the ticker tape, confetti, etc., for a comparison with the Lindbergh parade and other past events).

Section IX

Advertising floats, cages, Gallup pollers, puzzled voters, national pro-and-con clubs, ambulances, police wagons, etc.

To Perpetuate Good Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, because the editorial is typical of many being printed in newspapers and magazines, large and small, throughout the country, I am having printed in the RECORD the following from the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican concerning H. R. 2524, the bill which would exempt symphony orchestras and opera from the Federal admissions tax:

EXEMPT THE ORCHESTRAS

One particularly unjust tax is the 20-percent box-office levy that adds heavily to the deficits of nonprofit organizations like civic orchestras, dependent on help from their friends to start with.

Amusement is amusement, if you want to look at it that way; but it strikes us as both unfair and unsmart for the Federal Government to take exactly the same kind of cut from the gate receipts at a summer music festival as it takes when some promoter puts on an evening of women wrestlers.

This is why we think it would be wise of Congress to approve legislation introduced by Representative ALBERT MORANO, the Connecticut Representative who took Governor Lodge's place.

The Morano bill is a moderate measure. It doesn't go all the way in drawing the line between cultural and noncultural diversion. It does, however, make a distinction that ought to provide a starting point.

In Representative MORANO's proposed legislation the 20-percent amusement tax that now applies indiscriminately would be modified to exempt nonprofit orchestras—like the Waterbury Civic Orchestra, for instance.

This Waterbury orchestra has had hard going this year. Like all institutions of its kind it has felt the novelty impact of television. Audiences haven't been quite as large as they have been in former years. The civic orchestra, which has to expect each concert will cost from $1,200 to $1,700, has had bad luck with the weather this year, too.

When the Waterbury Civic Orchestra gives its final performance for the season on Sunday, it hopes, naturally, to have a full house. Even if it does, however, it can't hope to break even for the day's event. Musical organizations, like all of us, have felt the effect of higher living costs.

As Conductor Mario DiCecco will tell you, it costs the Waterbury orchestra about $2.50 for each $2 worth of box office receipts.

To help make up the deficit this orchestra, like the world's greatest, is dependent on the generosity of its friends.

But passage of the Morano bill would help a lot, as anyone can see. Of the $2.50 it costs for each $2 ticket, 40 cents is for the Federal amusement tax.

The orchestra's friends could help a great deal if they would write their Senators and their Congressmen urging passage of Representative MORANO's measure, H. R. 2524.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 16, the Ohio delegation of the House of Representatives had as their guests the winners of the essay contest held by the American Legion, Department of Ohio. One of these winners is Robert Butz, tenth grade, of Monclova High School, Monclova, Ohio, in the district which I have the honor to represent. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the essay with which this fine young American won an award in the tenth-grade group. It is a lucid and eloquent expression, showing a clear understanding of the Constitution and the practices which will continue to make it the greatest instrument ever devised by man for the government of a free people.

The essay follows:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Robert Butz, Monclova, Ohio)

Today, our civilization is complex, our problems are difficult, and the Government has greatly expanded its activities. Under these conditions a higher degree of intelligence is necessary for good citizenship, and a broad knowledge is necessary to have good leadership. More extensive study of the basic principles of our governmental system would give a clearer view of our Constitution.

The powers set forth by our Constitution consist of three main branches.

1. Good laws must be made to satisfy the common needs of the people. This is called the lawmaking or legislative department.

2. The laws must be made to work so that the people may benefit by them. The carrying out or enforcing of laws is called executive department.

3. So that the laws may be understood and the difference of opinion be settled we have the judicial department.

Government is a human product and is no better and no worse than the men and women who are responsible for it. The United States Constitution is the oldest Federal constitution in existence. It was so wisely planned that it has served as the basis for our Government without necessary change for almost a century and a half. Calvin Coolidge, as President, said, "To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded the human race."

Most other great nations of the world have passed through revolutions that have completely changed their system of government.

At the time of the writing of our Constitution, American life was simple, rural, and agricultural. The leaders of the Constitutional Convention believed that the immediate needs of the country at that time was a practical, strong and stable form of government. The members of the Convention debated many of the issues at great length. Some members took a jealous or selfish attitude and were severely scolded for their thoughtlessness of the country. That was indeed similar to the heated debates and committee reports that are evident in the sessions of Congress today. As a result of these sessions, we are advised as to the findings and we must abide by all decisions. We can understand how the finished Constitution contained a series of compromises, adopted to reconcile the different interests of the various classes and sections of the country. Our American history shows that by broad minded compromise a strong central authority and individual freedom of government that had been established for a new and weak nation more than a century ago is still satisfactory for a great and powerful civilization today. We readily see that by the power of amendment to our Constitution we can, if the need be great enough and due to the change in our life and interests, make our governing laws so that a great many people will show progress.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gen. Douglas MacArthur Is Fired but 'Mink Coat' Brigade Marches On," which appeared in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR IS FIRED, BUT "MINK COAT" BRIGADE MARCHES ON

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the most brilliant soldiers and statesmen in the past nearly half century of American history, has been summarily stripped of all his commands in the Far East by President Truman.

The entire world was rocked by the action of the President, which is without precedent in the history of free nations.

President Truman stated that he felt General MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies shaped by the United States and the United Nations. He declared that military commanders must be governed by policies and directives of the Government and in time of crisis this consideration is particularly compelling.

It is quite true that General MacArthur has opposed the policies of the United States,

which acts for the United Nations. In recent weeks General MacArthur has been insistent in his demands that something be done to end the aimless war in Korea in which American lives and resources are being squandered to no avail.

There is no record of General MacArthur having failed to perform his duty as commander of the troops of the United Nations and the United States in the Far East, even though he has opposed the general policy.

General MacArthur was discharged because he stated publicly he opposed these policies. He had continued to perform the duties assigned to him. He has never been in sympathy with the Far East policy favored by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and now Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, acting for President Truman. Our methods in the Far East permitted the Communists to seize China.

Sumner Welles, closely associated with former President Franklin D. Roosevelt for about 10 years, in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post captioned "What is the matter with our foreign policy?" asserted that Soviet Russia planned to gain domination of Asia and then wage full-scale aggression against Europe and the remainder of the free world.

General MacArthur has contended that Soviet Russia must be halted in Asia and that an all-out war must be conducted in Korea against the Chinese and North Korean Reds. He has advocated use of the troops of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek massed and trained on Formosa.

In his reference to the Far East, Sumner Welles, who attained the rank of Under Secretary of State under President Roosevelt, declared:

"During the years before 1939, I was repeatedly amazed that only a handful of the higher officials in Washington had ever read Hitler's Mein Kampf, although in that book, for all who cared to see, were set forth in fullest detail all Hitler's beliefs and all his intentions. It would be interesting to know how many of those chiefly responsible for our far-eastern policy since 1945 are familiar with the writings of Lenin or with the cardinal doctrines that he and Stalin had laid down with regard to the Far East. For these show that one of the basic tenets of Soviet communism has always been that once the billion and a half men and women in China, India, and Southeast Asia have been indoctrinated with communism and are linked to the people of Russia in the struggle to bring about the world triumph of the Communist ideology, the immense superiority in manpower of that alliance will insure the defeat of western capitalism. Certainly the American policy in the Far East between 1945 and 1950 has expedited rather than retarded the achievement of that aim."

General MacArthur, in his effort to bring a change of policy in the Far East, has insisted that the struggle in Korea is in reality a war to save Western Europe and America. Sumner Welles, one of former President Roosevelt's trusted aides, agrees with General MacArthur.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, Secretary of Defense Marshall, and their advisers have maintained that it is far more important to stop the Communists in Europe than in Asia. They have sided with Great Britain and France in their handling of affairs in the Far East.

Meanwhile, the United States is furnishing the sinews of war in Korea manpower, munitions, warships, and warplanes.

Our men and resources are being dissipated in a conflict in which no real attempt is being made to defeat the Red hordes of China and North Korea.

It is understandable that President Truman has been annoyed by General MacArthur. But the general's chief offense is that he refused to remain silent. He felt impelled to present his views. It is understandable that General MacArthur who has spent most of his active years in the Far East felt that he, as a representative of the American people, should adopt the course he followed.

President Truman has created a new crisis in the conduct of our foreign policy. His action has been lauded in Europe but has spread dismay in Japan, only remaining contact of the west in the Far East, where the general is held in highest esteem.

It might be stated, too, that Japan is the only nation of the Far East in which the Communists have not been able to make gains.

The American people will have a chance to form their opinion for General MacArthur has stated that he is willing to return to America to continue his fight against policies he so strongly opposes.

The Truman-MacArthur controversy could prove to be the spark needed to arouse America and bring an end to the confused and aimless foreign policy of recent years. This policy has been marked by appeasement of the Reds.

General MacArthur opposes this policy of appeasement. He believes that it is weakening and undermining the strength and resources of the free world, especially the United States.

Removal of General MacArthur from the Far East is continuing a policy of appeasement and can only be pleasing to the Moscow schemers for General MacArthur in the Far East and Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia are the only leaders who have successfully thwarted them in their schemes and plans.

So General MacArthur, a man of integrity and recognized ability, is removed from the post he has filled so capably in the Far East but the mink-coat, deep-freeze, 5-percent, war-surplus, and influence brigades are still in command at Washington undermining our morals and wasting our heritage.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fine address on freedom of the press, which was delivered at the Founders' Day banquet of Delta Tau Delta by Benjamin M. McKelway, editor of the great evening newspaper of the Nation's Capital, the Washington Star.

Mr. McKelway began his newspaper career as a Washington reporter 35 years ago. After working as a newspaperman in Washington and in Connecticut, he joined the staff of the Star in 1921, and was successively reporter, city editor, news editor, managing editor, and associate editor. He has been editor since 1946. He is one of the distinguished newspapermen of our time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Benjamin M. McKelway)

I hope there are no newspapermen present here this evening. I don't trust them. They misquote me. Well, they don't exactly misquote me, but this is the way it goes.

After I say my piece I look at the papers to see if they spelled my name right. And to see if they got my name up toward the top of the story, instead of down at the bottom, and if they put in that part about how the audience applauded, when I sat down.

But what do I find? I find a couple of sentences attributed to me in quotation marks. And I say to myself: "The Lord knows I couldn't have said anything like that. No man could be stupid enough to make a statement like that."

And then I begin thinking over what it was I said and I realize I did say something like they said I said in the paper. But why did they want to pick out that part of what I said? Why didn't they take that good part, down toward the end of the speech, where I said—Oh, well—you know what I mean.

But if I were you I would never make a speech when there are any newspapermen around. They are a dangerous bunch of people. Do you know what they would rather do than anything else? Do you know what gives them the greatest amount of purely malicious pleasure?

Well, I'll tell you. They like to puncture a stuffed shirt, and listen to wind whistling out of it.

And speaking of stuffed shirts, Brother Delts, you take a man who has been out of college for 36 years. You invite him to make a speech at a founders-day banquet of Delta Tau Delta. You butter him up a little, stick him up here at the head table, surrounded by people like a distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court and the other big shots up here, looking out over an audience composed of brother Delts who paid $6 apiece to come here. And what sort of wind comes out of this stuffed shirt?

Well, he is apt to reminisce, and tell you about how we used to run a fraternity. How people like Carl Butman, George Degnan, Rhesa Norris, and Tom Peyton—and I—but I am not going to do that, because if I start it somebody else will begin to reminisce and if there is anything that bores me it is reminiscence, except when I'm doing the reminiscing.

So, perhaps the best place to start is with a confession. For confession is good for the soul. And I confess that I've been a pretty sorry sort of Delt.

I haven't been to a chapter meeting for 36 years. I've forgotten the grip. I've forgotten the password. I've forgotten the secret parts I once was so anxious to learn. And I lost my pin, many years ago, under circumstances that I do not care to discuss here.

But I'll tell you some of the things I haven't forgotten. And I like to think they are more important than some of the things that I was told, as a youngster, that I must never forget.

One is the deep pride I felt when I was pledged and initiated into Delta Tau Delta. Nobody can ever take that away from me. Another is that indefinable sense of kinship I've always felt toward anybody who happens to be a Delt, the sort of kinship that binds people together who share something that no one else in the world can share in quite the same way.

And I have been extremely fortunate, as a father, in being able to experience that intimate satisfaction that came to me when three sons, going to two colleges, far apart, went Delt.

And I shall not forget how it felt, when they were in college, to visit them and to enter a chapter house, not merely as another dad, but as a Delt, and to find out that I was mistaken when I concluded that Gamma Eta Chapter in 1916 was composed of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the finest group of youngsters ever assembled under one roof.

For I found that these other groups, assembled under other roofs, 25 years later, were even finer—and I think they get better with every generation of young Americans.

It is a great honor, which I feel deeply, to be here this evening as one of a group of Delt newspapermen who have been singled out for pleasant distinction of being mentioned at a Founders' Day banquet.

It is a great honor to be here with such fine newspapermen as my friends, here at the head table—Oliver Hoyem, Bob Estabrook, Rad Mobley, and Charley Gridley—as well as others who are in the audience.

And I find it hard to tell you how pleased I am that a younger Delt, Bill Murphy, back from the wars, is here with us. Everybody who knew his father, loved him, and if young Bill becomes even half as good a newspaperman as his father was, with his father's sense of honor, his gentleness, and his understanding of the responsibilities that newspaper work imposes—young Bill will have something to be proud of.

It makes me very proud of being a Delt and of being a newspaperman to know of how many good newspapermen are Delts.

And now that I have you here, I would like to tell you something of my idea about where that noble calling of free journalism, that we newspapermen try to serve, fits into the great struggle that is going on in the world today between two sharply antagonistic ideas of living and what we call freedom in living.

I believe that the nature of this debate over freedom in the world today is very well illustrated by the outlines of the debate over freedom of the press.

For the debate in the world over freedom of the press goes to the heart of the whole, larger debate over all individual freedoms. And if we understand something of this debate over freedom of the press, we may understand more of what lies behind the debate over all the other freedoms that you and I enjoy as American citizens—freedoms that have never yet been won, or, having been won have been snatched away, from over half of the people of this world.

One of the odd things about this debate over freedom of the press—and it is true, more or less, in the debate over other freedoms—is that there is really no clear conflict over the idea that a free press is wholly desirable in any form of society. Everybody champions the idea of a free press. Everybody defends it.

The argument, in fact, is not over freedom of the press. The argument lies in what we mean by freedom of the press; in other words, freedom from what?

The Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Constitution of the United States both guarantee freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The Russian Constitution, after setting forth such guaranties, injects a condition to the effect that this freedom depends upon, and here I quote the words, "conformity to the interests of the working people, and in order to strengthen the Socialist system. * * *"

Our guaranty of press freedom in the United States is contained in these simple words from the first amendment to our Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. * * *"

The essential difference, then, between the Russian Constitution's guaranty of freedom of the press and that which is contained in our own Constitution is that the Russian freedom of the press is contingent upon its use in behalf of the working people and the Socialist system.

In our own Constitution, this freedom is guaranteed without qualification. In Russia, freedom of the press means freedom from private control; in our country, it means freedom from Government control.

Thus, the Russian might argue as follows in defense of his brand of freedom of the press: "In Russia we have a free press. It is free to publish. It is free to use a printing plan. It is free to obtain paper and ink. It is free to use labor and skill of the men who produce it. It is free from private control. And it is free to print the news of what is going on, and to interpret the meaning of that news—provided, that what is printed serves the interest of the working people and is used to strengthen the society under which they live."

But here we interrupt this defender of the Russian brand of freedom. We ask, "Who decides whether what is printed happens to be in the interest of the people of Russia and the system under which they live?"

The answer is, "government." And who is government? The government is the rather small group of men and women who happen to control it, and who look on government as the master, rather than the servant, of the people who live under it.

The decision of what is fit to print in the interest of the people of Russia is left with the people in control of government. They may ban the publication of information they believe is not in the interest of the people.

They regard their press as an important instrument of government, as much a part of government as the army, the police, and the utilization of slave labor, for no dictatorship can survive unless the press is controlled by the dictator.

If the men in control of the Russian Government believe it is in the interest of a people to be told only one side of the story, only that side is told.

If they believe it is in the interests of the Russian people to receive a distorted version of how the people in other parts of the world conduct their affairs, that is the version they receive.

If they believe it is in the interests of the Russian people to be told nothing, then the people are told nothing.

Freedom of the press in Russia, then, means freedom from all control of the press—except the exclusive control exercised by government.

We correctly associate this government control of the press with totalitarianism. And because totalitarianism as we know it today is regarded by us now as something rather new, there is a disposition sometimes to regard the totalitarian idea of press freedom also as something new under the sun. And its apparent newness attracts a following.

As a matter of fact, that idea of government control of the press is about as old as the device of printing words on paper.

The really revolutionary idea of the free press is that which is written into our own Constitution—a press that is free of all government control.

This idea, relatively new in the world and still under trial, emerged from the struggles and the experience of men who lived under a government-controlled press.

They came to know and to feel its tyranny. The invention of the printing press placed a powerful instrument in the hands of government. And the government of a few centuries ago—whether church or state, or a combination of the two—recognized and used that instrument for their protection, just as current dictatorships use it today.

The power to license the printing press gave the government the power to control what was printed; therefore, the power to suppress new ideas. Men were imprisoned and sentenced to fearful forms of torture for the use of unlicensed presses which turned out material not approved by the sovereign. And there is little doubt that such control over what is printed has always been explained or defended by the government on the ground that control is necessary in the best interests of the people.

The great poet, John Milton, was one of the men who gave wings to words in proposing the revolutionary idea of a press free of government control. He was rebelling against government control of the press in a speech to Parliament some 300 years ago when he said:

"And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter."

We believe in a free press in this country. But our idea of a free press is a press free from the control of government. We believe that our press serves the people. But we do not believe that any government should decide whether what is printed is or is not in the public interest. That decision should be left for the people themselves.

Our press is controlled. But it is controlled by men of every conceivable doctrine, in politics, in economics, and in religion. The man who runs a newspaper may be a conservative. Or he may be a radical. He may be one who opposes any change in our form of government and uses his newspaper to resist such change. Or he may believe that our form of government should be changed to something modeled on the Russian plan, and he uses his newspaper to advocate that change.

"He" who controls a newspaper may be a labor union or a religious sect or the owner of a copper mine or a chain of grocery stores. "He" whoever he may be, is the owner of one, or a combination of several, of the 1,850 daily and 9,661 weekly newspapers in the United States.

The result is that when these newspapers speak, they never speak as one voice, as do the newspapers of Russia or other countries where government controls the press. They speak in a multitude of voices, confusing, argumentative, clamorous. But from the babel there is apt to emerge the truth. And we leave to the people rather than to government the recognition of where the truth may lie.

That is the theory behind our freedom of the press. This freedom of the press is something that belongs to the people. It is their property. It is not the property of the owners of newspapers. We know that the idea of press freedom—freedom from Government control—was planted in a fertile soil and cultivated by men who valued freedom above everything else and had staked their lives, their fortunes, and their honor to win it.

It was an idea that was given a new legal basis by being written into the Constitution itself. That legal basis placed it beyond the reach of Government, in contrast to the constitutions of other governments which place conditions on press freedom and permits its curtailment in certain emergencies.

Our freedom of the press does not depend upon the views of the government in power, nor is it affected by some real or imaginary emergency.

The American press is free—with rare and narrow exceptions—to obtain and to print any news that it can secure of what is going on in Government or anywhere else. Its freedom of comment, even to the extent of ridiculing Government and its officials in the harshest of terms, is restricted legally only by the laws of libel, and these are rarely invoked.

This freedom of the press has been encouraged by what might be called a characteristically American attitude toward constituted authority. Americans do not like to be pushed around by Government and are inherently suspicious of any govern-

mental action which suggests the prospect of being pushed around.

The men who wrote our Constitution, for example, were fearful the Government they were creating might, like the governments against which they had rebelled, use the crime of treason to punish citizens who did not agree with Government. So treason, a crime for which thousands of men have been imprisoned and executed in other lands—and for which they are being tried and executed today in the iron curtain countries—is so tightly defined by our Constitution that our Government is rarely able to prove it. The Federal Government has never executed a citizen for treason in the 160 years of its existence—years which included a civil war.

The American press has been able to identify its own interests with those of the public which it serves, and to a degree that is found in no other country of the world. Newspapers thrive on the exposure of wrong from which the people might suffer. They are often the first to challenge the exercise, by any official of government, of anything savoring of dictatorial powers.

American newspapers more often take up the cudgels for the underdog than for the top dog, on the theory that the function of the press, as Mr. Dooley defined it, is "to comfort the afflicted and to afflict the comfortable." For this approach means circulation. And advertising revenue, on which the papers depend for existence, follows circulation and approval by the people of the paper they read.

And so long as this press is free—free to print the news of what is going on, free to place before the people the questions that only the people are capable of deciding for themselves, free to point out what it regards as the shortcomings of government along with the things to be praised in government, free to compete for attention and respect in the market place of ideas—our freedoms are protected.

For we must always remember that freedom of the press is not an isolated freedom that stands by itself. Our various freedoms and rights—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and of petition, the right of trial by jury—all of these are interdependent, and the destruction of one can bring down others with it.

It is only our people who can preserve these freedoms. And these people must be well informed on the news of the day; they must feel the responsibilities that go with citizenship in a free country; they must take part in their Government by voting; they must stand for good government by voting for good men. They must be bound together by some of those honorable ties that are singled out for mention in the creed of Delta Tau Delta—education, in order "to live and learn the truth," brotherhood, friendship, and a foundation that rests on conscience.

We are probably strong enough to protect ourselves from attack by other powers in the world today, although the threat is grave and always present. But we must be strong enough to protect our freedoms from the less easily recognized menace of those who promise new and glittering rewards, sometimes called rights, in exchange for those basic rights and freedoms that were won for us by men who had learned through bitter experience the dangers of an all-powerful government.

A great lover of freedom, a great defender of the common people, the late Justice Brandeis expressed that thought in words that I would like to leave with you as I close:

"Experience should teach us to be on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the leading editorial in the New York Times of today, Wednesday, April 18, entitled "The Initiative in Korea," which, as I see it, states the problem in that area in a very clear manner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INITIATIVE IN KOREA

The removal of General MacArthur from his far-eastern commands symbolizes a decision on at least one issue of world-wide significance. Insofar as the United Nations and the United States can control the course of events the Korean war will remain limited to Korea and will not be extended to Communist China. This decision is another demonstration that while the United Nations and the United States continue to resist aggression at the point where such aggression is taking place, they will do all that they can to preserve the larger framework of world peace and to avert a new world war. As such a demonstration, the decision can be welcomed and supported.

But this decision does not end the Korean war. It does not provide any basis for a peaceful settlement. On the contrary, the war continues with increased intensity, and the storm precipitated by General MacArthur's dismissal has served to obscure the vital fact that the United Nations forces have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in force. This is a war which for the moment is being fought in a military and diplomatic vacuum.

Militarily it remains a war of maneuver as the best method of disturbing the enemy's preparation for a spring offensive, and as the only available alternative to an impossible positional war, which, in all expert military opinion, would lead to the destruction of the United Nations forces. In that respect the Korean war continues to resemble the Duke of Wellington's peninsular campaign against Napoleon in Spain. And its achievements are substantial. It has thrown back Communist aggression to beyond the point from which this aggression started. It has saved South Korea, which was the original purpose of the United Nations, even if it has been unable to achieve the larger United Nations objective of unifying all Korea in a free and democratic state. It has upset the Communist timetable of conquest. It has provided relief for other areas under Communist pressure—areas including not only Indochina and Malaya but also Europe. And it has provided a proving ground for western men and arms which has already led to a complete reorganization and reorientation of western strategy and tactics.

But for the present the Korean war must remain, as General Bradley pointed out yesterday, primarily a defensive war, which could result in a military stalemate. This fact, however, puts added responsibility on both the United Nations and on the statesmen of the Western World to take the initiative in seeking a political solution of the issues involved, and if such a solution is immediately unattainable to issue a new and unequivocal declaration of purposes, so that both the fighting forces at the front and the nations supporting them will know what they are fighting for. If the free world fails to do this, the initiative will inevitably be taken by the Communist world. The first attempt at this is already under way, as shown by the North Korean messages to the United Nations proposing, amid insolent diatribes against the United States, a conference of all the countries concerned in the Korean conflict, including Communist China and Soviet Russia, to establish peace on Communist terms.

These messages from the North Korean puppets or the Chinese puppets of the Kremlin have obviously been sent for propaganda purposes and need not be taken too seriously. But they are a token of what may be expected along the same line, and the new Communist peace offensive will not be discouraged by the indecision which continues to mark all United Nations activity with respect to Korea, or by the timid inquiries addressed to Peiping by India, based on the false proposition that the removal of General MacArthur has also removed the main obstacle to peace.

Having repudiated the soldier's solution of meeting force with maximum counterforce, it is the duty of the United Nations to speak out clearly and plainly, not only to define the aim of the war but also to abate the confusion which the dispute about General MacArthur has created. The effort must be to reunite the moral forces of the world as in the brave days of last June, when the Korean action got under way.

Televising Hearings of Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials from the pages of Broadcasting magazine, the first entitled "Faultless Reporter," from the issue of March 26; the second entitled "Puzzle: Find the Television Cameras," from the issue of April 2; and the third entitled "The Congress and TV," from the issue of April 16. These editorials deal with televising the hearings of congressional committees. I do not altogether agree with the conclusions reached in the editorials, but the arguments made in them are so well stated that I feel strongly they should be made available to the readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Broadcasting of March 26, 1951]

FAULTLESS REPORTER

To evaluate the true significance of television as a spectator at public hearings like those of the Kefauver committee, it is necessary to ignore much of the emotional debate that rages on that subject these days and to view the arrival of this incomparable instrument in proper historical perspective.

To a large extent the evolution of government from the monarchial authoritarianism

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of feudal times to the parliamentary democracy of today has depended upon the opening of government activity not only to public participation but also to public scrutiny.

The star chamber courts, whose dark secrecy protected the most unjust verdict, gave way to public trials and the jury system. Lawmaking was removed from the inaccessible throne room to the public meeting house of parliamentary bodies.

This evolution has been slow and at times painful (the U. S. Senate met behind closed doors until 1792 when forced by editorial pressure to admit the public), but it has been made inevitable by the very nature of democratic progress. True democracy requires that all branches of the government function in full view of the people.

In television, there is at hand an instrument that brings this evolutionary process to very nearly an ultimate stage of development. If one is to accept the theory that corruption and ineptitudes flourish in concealment and wither when exposed, one must also believe that television is the greatest enemy of governmental chicanery and bumbling yet invented.

In the debate that ranges these days as to the propriety of television's presence at public hearings like those of the Kefauver committee the question has been raised (surprisingly, by some thoughtful persons) as to whether a witness' rights to a fair trial are abrogated if he is required to perform before an audience larger than can be accommodated in the hearing chamber.

We submit that his rights are not impaired. Indeed they are protected to an extent undreamed of by the great jurists who conceived and advanced the principle of public trial. If 50 spectators in a court room enhance a defendant's chances of fair trial, how much greater insurance is provided by an audience of millions?

There is another argument that says television injures the dignity of proceedings, that its lights demean a hearing room to the level of a carnival, that participants are apt to adjust their behavior in recognition of the fact they are being observed and so neglect the essence of the case at hand in their concern for making a favorable impression on the audience. This argument is faulty too.

The lights to which objections have been raised are not necessary to television, but are put there by newsreel cameramen. In itself television provides no greater distraction to the sensible participant than the audience that is present in person.

The onus of propriety in the conduct of a televised hearing is on the examiner and the witness alike. Television has an absolutely impartial eye and ear. It does not edit or interpret. It simply sees and hears. It cannot turn a hearing into a carnival unless the hearing itself is so conducted. It cannot make a man a bum unless he is one.

At every stage of progress since feudal times there have been powerful men who for selfish purposes have endeavored to counteract reforms, to perpetuate the status quo essential to their own survival. There is no doubt that the introduction of television as a spectator at Government proceedings represents an important stage of this continuing evolution, and as a consequence it has its enemies.

Who are the enemies of television? They are those who cannot stand its merciless inspection.

Its friends are all those who believe the star chamber and the unquestioned king are obsolete and that the struggle toward democracy has been worth while.

[From Broadcasting of April 2, 1951]

PUZZLE: FIND THE TELEVISION CAMERAS

Take a close look at this picture.

It was made during a Washington session of the Kefauver committee. The picture was distributed by Acme Newspictures, which serves newspapers, so it could hardly be argued that the photographer was going out of his way to plan a shot that would be especially favorable to television.

Look at the picture.

There are five still cameramen crouched under the nose of the witness. They are waiting to explode flash bulbs in his face.

There are eight motion-picture cameras ranged against the wall. Notice the bright Kleig light at top, left of center. If somebody extinguished that light, the eight newsreel cameras couldn't make a picture that would be decipherable.

Over in the right top corner is one television camera. If that Kleig light that is so necessary to the newsreels were to go out, the operator of the TV camera would make a quick adjustment of its lenses and continue to transmit a picture of high quality. TV doesn't need that blinding light at all. It doesn't need illumination any brighter than that ordinarily provided in a public meeting room.

This picture does not show all the news coverage equipment that was in the room at the time. There were two other TV cameras, and there were also other newsreel cameras (and other newsreel lights) as well as other still cameras (fitted out with flash guns), including the one that made this shot.

It shows enough, however, to emphasize the foolishness of the hullabaloo being raised these days by critics who claim television defaces premises to which it is admitted.

We are publishing the picture because we think it goes a long way toward establishing just which of the news-coverage instruments causes the more distraction to a witness.

A lot of people are confused on this point. They associate television with strong lights and whirring cameras. The gamblers Kleinman and Rothkopf who refused to answer questions last Monday night were represented by an attorney who protested that TV cameras were grinding and that the bright TV lights were on. He also mentioned the presence of newsreel and still photographers, but the emphasis was on TV.

Newspaper reports of the Kefauver committee hearings for the past 2 weeks have repeatedly referred to television lights—so repeatedly indeed that bright lights and TV are by now fixed as inseparable in the minds of many.

To listen to the objections of bashful gamblers and their shrewd attorneys and to read the newspapers, it is easy to believe that there is so much TV equipment in a hearing chamber that there is scarcely room for anyone else. This picture tells a different story.

If contempt proceedings against the reluctant witnesses, Kleinman and Rothkopf, are prosecuted, the legal precedent establishing the rights of TV will unquestionably be set. These rights will also be influenced if the Senate agrees to proceed with a general investigation of the subject.

We suggest that this picture constitutes an excellent piece of documentary evidence in such proceedings. It shows that TV is not the medium that upsets the decorum of a hearing. Indeed, it is the least obtrusive instrument in the place.

[From Broadcasting of April 16, 1951]

THE CONGRESS AND TV

The roar of congressional and editorial comment aroused by the telecasts of the Kefauver committee hearings has, thank heavens, diminished.

We take advantage of what may be only a temporary calm to make a few comments of our own. Such considered opinions, carefully expressed, as were projected in recent weeks were, we fear, drowned out by the greater din of those who joined in an argument that was without articulation and pretty much without thought.

The general hubbub over the Kefauver telecasts did not add up to an enlightening record. So many people rushed to print or rostrum with a frantic contribution, lest the popularity of the question expire before their names and quotes were noticed, that the main issues were utterly deserted. A man anxious to get into an act as big as the Kefauver critical chorus is apt to cast about for a unique angle not theretofore covered by the others. This sort of thing, multiplied by a majority of all those in the act, does not guarantee coherent discussion.

Looking back over the main currents of the argument, one cannot avoid concluding that the debate did not rage over television at all. The thing that was really worrying most of the arguers—although they may not have recognized it themselves—was the conduct of Congress.

Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, the noted New York jurist, told Yale law students that TV could become a "sinister weapon of slander * * * if safeguards are not set up to control its use."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, introduced a resolution calling for a senatorial study of the intricate problems raised by telecasts of congressional proceedings.

Walter Lippmann strayed from global conundrums long enough to recommend that telecasts of congressional hearings be prohibited until a policy on the subject can be defined.

What worried all three of these distinguished commentators was that somehow the dignity of congressional procedures and the rights of witnesses were jeopardized by television. That is rather fuzzy thinking, coming from such usually sensible minds.

Visualize a telecast session of a congressional committee at which an intemperate interrogator makes an accusatory and unanswerable statement against a witness. It is true that this would be an offense against the dignity of the proceedings and the witness' rights. But we wish to point out that television would only report the offense. It would not commit it.

Indeed, TV would report the incident more accurately than any other news instrument or agent in the room.

The newspaper reporter writes his version of the offense. His story is edited by a copy reader and may be further altered by an editor operating under a policy that either favors or opposes the parties involved. A headline is written, intended not only to summarize the story but also to do its bit in avoiding a decline in the newspaper's sales.

The chances for error, exaggeration, or distortion in the newspaper system of covering news are appalling and constiute an omnipresent problem for the conscientious newspaperman.

What similar chances are run by television? None.

Television is essentially an electronic transmission of a news event as it happens. The system is virtually incapable of error or distortion.

Now what Judge Leibowitz and Senator Wiley, and Mr. Lippmann are really talking about, it seems to us, is that they fear a danger in exposing congressional proceedings to public observation. That is to say, exposing them just as they happen, without editing, without interpretation or—more to the point—protection of any kind.

In one way or another all three of them have participated in, and certainly observed, many congressional sessions. It may be that because of their first-hand experience in these matters their fears are not without ground.

It is conceivable that the political fortunes of some Members of the Congress would not be enhanced if their behavior were projected, undisguised and unvarnished, directly to the citizens. Indeed it is quite possible that the

regular and comprehensive telecasting of proceedings would exert a profound change in the personnel and deportment of the Congress.

Such a change would be forced because television, being totally unbiased, shows up a man exactly as he is, whether a phony, a bumbler, or a sensible statesman.

Since Messrs. Leibowitz, Wiley, and Lippmann are learned men and conspicuous champions of democratic government, it is difficult to understand how all of them have fallen into inconsistency in commenting on the subject of congressional television. If any one of them were individually refused admission to a public hearing of Congress or any of its committees, we are sure his protests would be heard from coast to coast.

How possibly, then, can they object to the admission of a larger audience? What the Congress can do in the presence of Messrs. Leibowitz, Wiley, and Lippmann it should not hide from the other citizens of the United States.

The question of television's place in the family of newsgathering media is destined to be argued in the courts and in the Congress. We fervently hope that its place will be defined for what it is—the most impeccable reporter ever to witness and report a news story—and that it will be given free access to all those occasions that the electorate is guaranteed a right to scrutinize under our parliamentary democracy.

The President Rose in Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "With Time Comes Reason," which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of April 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH TIME COMES REASON

A week has elapsed and sober thinking is returning since President Truman released a bomb-burst over the head of General MacArthur.

It has been interesting to watch the gradual descent back to earth of sane Americans who in the heat of the moment popped off into an indignant emotional spree.

Highly significant has been the quieter tone lately adopted by antiadministration newspapers whose first reaction was a barrage of bombast, ballots, and abuse against the President and Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces.

But with their reasoning returned they now are counseling the people, and the politicians, to restrain themselves, to think this thing through, and above all, not to crucify President Truman.

These pleas for reason are being made through the editorial columns of newspapers where blood pressures ran high and thinking was distorted at first encounter with the news.

While toning down their attacks on this score, however, they have not lifted their guns from Mr. Truman entirely and he still is the recipient of blame for all phases of Government action, even the target of those who seek political favor in city halls.

Frothing outcries of "impeachment" which arose from headline-conscious politicians also have faded to whispers. All the cries, of course, came from Mr. Truman's Republican foes who thought that here was the supreme chance to loosen the axe.

But after realizing what they charged could in no way be supported, and after hearing wiser counsel, they have preferred to forget what they first demanded so vociferously.

The newest charge is "appeasement" of Red China and Soviet Russia and that Mr. Truman has manufactured a new Munich. Mr. Truman is to blame solely, they scream.

It is inconceivable that President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, General Marshall, and General Bradley would seek to appease any person or any nation for the benefit of communism. The American people know this. Yet when President Truman is charged solely it is inescapable that the same thing is leveled at Acheson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The case in point is that Mr. Truman, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department, acting with the United Nations, had laid down a policy which General MacArthur was to follow. He disagreed and abrogated that policy, sincere in the belief that he was right and that Mr. Truman and his advisers were wrong.

It was then that Mr. Truman chose to exercise his civilian authority over all the Armed Forces and fired the general. The Constitution gives him that authority.

After General MacArthur concludes his triumphal return, one which we think he richly deserves, it is certainly within his rights to tell Congress and the American people what he believes and what he has so strongly advocated. The President was among the first to acknowledge that this is right.

We believe that General MacArthur will say plenty, so much in fact that many prominent Republicans who have geared themselves for a try for the Presidency in 1952 will find their own chances in jeopardy.

Then we will see the usual carping and backfilling of those who have whipped up a bandwagon of steam for a great American soldier-statesman. His present adulators, we predict, will be the first to desert him if they find their personal ambitions are about to be thwarted.

Only events ahead in these historic months will prove or disprove President Truman's stanch adherence to the course that has been set in world affairs, a course that General MacArthur could not follow.

But we believe that, whatever the outcome, history will record that President Truman acted with tremendous courage in firing General MacArthur and that whatever the opinion of him held by the people he rose a great step in personal stature.

Stephen Brunauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on article under the headline "Under the Navy's procedures," disclosing information with reference to the case of Stephen Brunauer and the inquiry into his loyalty. The article appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal on April 16, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER THE NAVY'S PROCEDURES

Just for the record:

One year ago Senator MCCARTHY read off the names of Stephan Brunauer, explosives researcher for the United States Navy, and his wife, Esther, in connection with his charges of subversive influences in Government.

For which Senator MCCARTHY was promptly and thenceforward called 17 kinds of a nasty name.

On Tuesday, the United States State Department announced the suspension of Stephan Brunauer "under Navy Department loyalty and security procedures." Esther also was suspended from her post on the Navy's United Nations relations staff pending further action on her husband.

Ex-Senator Tydings' further comment is respectfully solicited.

Home Rule for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a collection of editorials from Alaska newspapers endorsing my proposal that Alaska be given at this time the right to elect its own governor, rather than statehood. Through some oversight one of the editorials I intended to insert, from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, of Fairbanks, Alaska, did not appear with the others. I therefore now ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this point entitled "First Things First."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The stage is set in Washington for the introduction into the Eighty-second Congress of legislation to grant Alaskans the right to elect their own governor.

This is a right already enjoyed by all other Americans and by the people of Puerto Rico—it is a right that has been long in coming to Alaskans and one which is needed now as never before.

Never in her 83 years under the American flag has Alaska so required the wise and understanding leadership of a governor whose primary interest is exercising the will of Alaskans in the administration of Territorial affairs. In the years ahead the Territory will be faced with difficult decisions and knotty problems, and the solution of these problems come only through the expressed will of the people if Alaskans are to take their rightful place as full-fledged members of the American Republic.

It is unthinkable that the Territory and its people should be deemed incapable of producing and electing their own chief executive, thereby making a first and wholly

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

logical step toward mastery of their own governmental affairs.

No valid arguments have yet been presented by opponents of this move, but a number of flimsy smoke screens have been set up to becloud the issue.

Principal opponent of legislation providing for the election of the Governor of Alaska is, strangely enough, a man who is himself elected by the people.

Delegate E. L. BARTLETT has refused to endorse or lend his support to the proposed legislation, taking the stand that he will settle for nothing short of statehood. BARTLETT's affection for federally appointed Ernest Gruening has long been known, but it has never been suspected that this friendship runs so deep as to blind BARTLETT to the desires of the people he represents.

Ernest Gruening would naturally find a gubernatorial election extremely distasteful, and he can be counted upon to exercise all of the power and influence of his political machine to defeat the bill which would bring to an end his Juneau gravy train. Gruening is no doubt very aware of the fact that if his name ever appeared on a ballot he would be laughed out of the Territory by the citizens over whom he has ridden roughshod during his tenure of federally appointed office.

BARTLETT's action in refusing to support legislation permitting Alaskans the right to rid themselves once and for all of this man is totally unexplainable even to those who voted him into the office of Delegate.

His sole defense for his action is based on his statement:

"I regret that I cannot agree with you that Alaska is only entitled to an elective Governor. * * * I stand for an elective Governor plus many other things. Some of those changes would be far, far more important than the privilege of electing our own Governor."

In other words, having placed the cart before the horse by urging statehood before we have proven we can govern ourselves, BARTLETT refused to permit the horse to be returned to its rightful place. Like a petulant child tutored only to sing one tune, he cries: "I want statehood immediately or nothing at all."

The plain fact of the matter is that the bill to elect our governor would in no way hinder or retard the Senate action on statehood. Even the most ardent proponents of statehood now agree that there would be a lapse of years between the time the enabling bill is passed by Congress and the time actual statehood is achieved.

This lapse would be due to the necessity of electing delegates to a constitutional convention who would draft a State constitution, after which this constitution would have to be approved or amended by the Congress of the United States.

Alaskans agree that the major need for statehood lies in the desire of the Territory to be freed from the bureaucratic system of Federal controls by which Alaskan development is now hamstrung. And in the drafting of both the Statehood Enabling Act and the State constitution special care must be given to see that this primary aim is accomplished, for without a complete divorcement from present Federal controls statehood would be an empty achievement indeed.

In view of this, does it not seem illogical that the drafting of the Statehood Enabling Act and of the State constitution should be carried out under the direction and supervision of a Federally appointed governor? Where is the guaranty or safeguard against perpetuation of the Federal bureaucracy?

Does it not seem more logical and more in the best interests of the Territory that this work be completed under a man elected by the citizens of Alaska—a man who Alaskans know will carry out their expressed desires and wishes?

Alaskans should now—this year—begin laying the solid groundwork of self-government that will lead to statehood by proving themselves capable of maintaining their own house in good order. They must not be misled by job-conscious politicians who attempt to confuse the issue so as to remain securely in office.

The first move in achieving self-government is to urge Congress to pass immediately the bill granting us the right to elect an Alaskan governor.

Senator McCarthy and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Jumping Joe' in Action," published in the Spring Valley (Wis.) Sun of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"JUMPING JOE" IN ACTION

Saturday night in the Fort Atkinson city auditorium, Senator JOE MCCARTHY spoke to an audience of 700 skeptics. We were among them.

Attending the Wisconsin Press Association in convention at Milwaukee Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, we had been assured by our friends of the Milwaukee Journal that MCCARTHY would deliver a speech of mild generalities in Fort Atkinson.

"On the Fort Atkinson platform he won't have the protection of his senatorial privilege," they told us. "He won't dare name names."

But the Irishman from Green Bay did name names. He branded as Communists three men currently serving in the State Department, one holding a vital executive post in United Nations.

To our satisfaction, at least, JOE MCCARTHY answered the most frequent of the criticisms directed against him: That he wouldn't say as an unprotected citizen what he says as a protected Senator.

If JOE MCCARTHY dealt in falsehoods Saturday night, he uttered slander against at least five citizens, who can sue him for all he possesses and imprison him for criminal slander.

But he won't be sued, he won't be forced to pay damages, he won't be imprisoned.

Our friends at the Milwaukee Journal and the Madison Cap-Times won't tell you why JOE MCCARTHY won't be sued, but we can tell you. He won't be sued because Saturday night JOE MCCARTHY was exposing a sad situation which exists in high governmental circles, especially in our State Department.

The Milwaukee Journal has a circulation approximately a third of a million. The Sun has a circulation of 2,000. Logically, the Journal should be at least 150 times smarter than we are, and they probably are. But unfortunately the toilers in the editorial vineyards of the mighty Journal and Cap-Times suffer from the same human frailties as us lesser mortals. They love to hear the sound of their own wind whistling past their noses, and they love to choose up sides. To the Journal and the Cap-Times anti-McCarthyism is a fascinating game, pleasing to their ego and pleasing to their circulation departments.

That we can understand. But Saturday night two images kept getting in the way of our understanding of the Journal and Cap-Times motives.

There was the day Dr. E. H. Fast, Spring Valley Legion commander, came into the Sun office to tell us that his brother had been slain in Korea. There was the day more recently when Mom Woodmansee came in to tell us that Jimmy had been killed on the same front.

To Dr. Fast and Mom Woodmansee, McCarthyism and anti-McCarthyism is no game. If it is a game, it's a game in which the chips are all red with American blood.

We supported Bob LaFollette against JOE MCCARTHY. We fought JOE MCCARTHY with all the ammunition we had. But this is no moment for political buffoonery. This is the moment to ask ourselves: Would Dr. Fast's brother and Mom Woodmansee's son have had a better chance to be alive today if the situation JOE MCCARTHY describes didn't exist?

If you forget politics and the sometimes silly political games we mortals play, the answer can scarcely be anything but "Yes."

In the waters bordering Formosa our Seventh Fleet is engaged in the task of keeping the 700,000 soldiers of Chiang from attacking the Communists on the mainland, so that the Communists on the mainland may freely attack and kill Americans on Korea.

What do the Journal and the Cap-Times say about this? That there is grave danger that the hungry hordes of Chiang would desert and move over to the Communist ranks once they were turned loose.

Yet in the same issue of the Journal in which this plausible explanation is advanced, we read that American citizens have been sentenced to death and long imprisonment for revealing atom-bomb secrets. If the situation were reversed, if Chiang were seeking aid from us, he could reasonably reject it with equal logic by the evidence of the Journal's own headlines.

The favorite device of dictatorships has been the splitting of their opposition by planting the seeds of distrust. These seeds have fallen upon fertile grounds in our State Department and in the editorial rooms of the Journal and the Cap-Times.

When JOE MCCARTHY had finished Saturday night, there were few skeptics in the jammed auditorium. We were in a position to witness perhaps 400 of the 700 in the audience. Only two remained seated. The rest rose as one person, clapping and cheering. Among them were four able Fort Atkinson industrialists, two competent Fort Atkinson labor leaders, a half dozen loyal Democrats. When the Journal calls these men spineless hacks, the Journal engages in senseless name calling as regrettable as the angry impulse which prompted Senator MCCARTHY to refer to the Journal and the Cap-Times as the "Wisconsin editions of the Daily Worker."

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Americans All," by Dr.

Daniel A. Poling, on the subject of General MacArthur's dismissal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS ALL

(By Daniel A. Poling)

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Even if the basic arguments for General MacArthur's dismissal are granted—arguments which center in divided authority and the primacy of Washington—this other basic fact stands clear. MacArthur was a civil administrator as well as military. He was the shaper of the democratic destiny of Japan. Almost immediately he would have been at the peace table. His repudiation now brings dismay to all anti-Communist forces in the Far East. It was without discrimination between his two responsibilities. The President not only fired the general, he removed the statesman.

There was a better way than this—infinitely better. Also those responsible were given ample time to discover it. But now we know that it was too much to expect that the State Department would find that way.

The editions carrying the announced forced retirement of Douglas MacArthur also printed on their front pages the news that Britian's Government had formally asked that Red China be invited to sit in on the Japanese peace conference, that the proposed peace terms be submitted to Peiping in advance, and that negotiations proceed looking to the return of Formosa to China. (Britain recognizes Red China.) To all of this the American people will not consent—make no mistake about that. Only the complete reversal of our far-eastern policy can now atone for a moral debacle that could very quickly become an irretrievable political and military disaster.

At this writing the administration's decision makes Nehru of India glad; also the British Labor Government; also the Hongkong vilifiers of the great general; and Owen Lattimore, with all other supporters of the "agrarian revolution"; and, of course, the Far Eastern Affairs Division of the State Department. Finally, this dismissal confirms and justifies the strategy of Moscow and Red China.

Throughout the postwar period Douglas MacArthur, of all administrators in occupied areas, has had the clearest vision in dealing with Communist Russia. Also he has been the most implacable though courteous foe of Red Moscow's advance toward world revolution. In two recent visits to the Far East, both of which took me to Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and China, and on the second of which I visited Formosa, I found MacArthur to be communism's No. 1 hate. Now they are free of that—or are they?

It is our good fortune that so competent a general as Matthew Ridgway succeeds to the command in Korea. What he has been handed in Tokyo is quite unfair to him. In Tokyo and at the peace table, as well as for the continuing administration of Japan's new democracy, the wisdom and genius of MacArthur were the first imperative.

Now let the people call General MacArthur home—call him home to make his report to Congress, to give his full story so long suppressed. Let the wild talk of impeachment be dismissed as wild. But there should be a complete investigation of the State Department's far eastern policy and program—an investigation reaching back to the infamous white paper and behind it, and finding answers to the questions: Why the "cease-fire"? Why the determined effort to impose a coalition government upon Chiang? Why the 2 years' of delay in releasing General Wedemeyer's report and the continued refusal to release the Korean section of that report? I believe that inevitably this investigation would expose the fallacy of the arguments advanced to justify rejecting Chiang's offer of troops for Korea. The Korean war is not an all-out world war, but it is a major war for us—count the casualties.

In the President's radio address following MacArthur's dismissal, he offered no alternatives to the General's recommendations. And when our United Nations allies acclaim the dismissal as strengthening the hope for a negotiated peace, always the terms they suggest or imply, involve paying blackmail to Red China.

Douglas MacArthur states and believes that he has followed his directives, been punctilious in keeping his place, and that he has violated no military amenities. Conscious of his dual relationship, for which he was not responsible, he has made an utmost endeavor to be at once a good soldier and a wise administrator of civilian affairs.

It was not without significance that while every Secretary of State since 1945, when the General was given supreme command in the Far East, has made repeated trips to Europe, not one—Byrnes, Marshall, nor Acheson—went to see him. They went to London and Paris, Moscow and Berlin, but they never went to Tokyo. Their failure to travel west was something more than a vote of confidence in MacArthur. This State Department indifference, this lack of knowledge, this failure to include the General and those associated with his convictions in the shaping of high policy, have contributed to a program is Asia almost completely the opposite of the program in Europe.

In the Far East freedom and democracy go forward as with hands manacled and hopping on one leg. But we have faith to believe that they go forward.

As for Douglas MacArthur, again he has fought to win a war as quickly as possible, saving as many lives as possible, and he has not fought in vain. Perhaps he has just begun to fight.

It was pointed out that MacArthur couldn't be spared from his duties long enough to permit him to go all the way to Washington. Thus it was that President Truman journeyed to Wake Island, met and conferred with MacArthur there. They parted after their conference with the general going back to Tokyo and President Truman returning to Washington.

After that conference President Truman was at pains to express confidence in General MacArthur and his conduct of the Korean war. But it seems clear now that the conference was an attempt to get MacArthur to play ball with United Nations policies instead of trying to direct things himself. Nobody wanted to embarrass the great MacArthur. But we know now that the general was determined to sing the prima donna role. He refused to sing in the chorus as he was ordered.

All along MacArthur has been mollified and coddled because he was temperamental and prone to spectacular actions and startling pronouncements. Some of his acts and statements smacked so much of melodrama that we couldn't help feel that there was a stage manager in the wings. Most likely it was MacArthur himself who pulled the strings to keep the name of the general in the headlines.

No, there most certainly has been no persecution of a great man. Instead there was remarkable patience with a man who became particularly obstreperous whenever a reporter took out his pencil or when the photographers' flash bulbs began to pop.

The idea of permitting a discharged military man to appear before Congress to tell his side of the story is absurd. If you fail to obey orders in your job, you will get fired, too. Will you then clamor for a public meeting at the courthouse to tell the public why you think your boss was wrong?

General MacArthur finally overreached himself in his prima donna pose. He had been petted and pampered so long that he thought it would always be so. But President Truman's patience must have worn extremely thin long before he took action. It was necessary to put an end to pampering and that's what Truman did.

Patience Worn Thin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patience Worn Thin," which appeared in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE WORN THIN

Just how far is the President of the United States supposed to go to preen the fine plumage or polish the brass of temperamental military genius?

Now that General MacArthur has been dismissed for what amounts to insubordination, there is such a hue and cry from Republican MacArthur worshipers that you'd think a saint had been insulted.

Don't you remember when the President felt it was necessary to sit down and talk with MacArthur? Did President Truman order him to Washington for a conference? Of course not. Instead, President Truman bent over backward to make it look good for MacArthur. The President agreed to meet MacArthur on a Pacific island.

Proposed Assistance for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine speech on the subject of aid to Israel, delivered by our colleague, the distinguished Junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] before the members of the Temple Beth Israel at West Hartford, Conn., on Monday, April 16.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Among the many engagements I have made in a crowded schedule for this one week in Connecticut, I take particular pleasure in this meeting with you. One reason is that it gives me a welcome opportunity to pay simple tribute to one of your members. I have come to know and respect him for his service in Congress, his integrity, his insight on public questions. Certainly it is one

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the happier phases of my service in the Senate to be associated with a man of his capacity. I refer, of course, to your distinguished member, and one of the most distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, ABE RIBICOFF.

Further, I was very glad this evening to talk to you briefly about some aspects of our foreign policy, particularly in relation to the grant-in-aid for the State of Israel which I have joined in sponsoring in the Congress. This project, within the area of our foreign policy, is especially related to my own past experience and my present interest in nonmilitary programs in aid of our foreign policy objectives. In the early 1940's when I served as consultant to Mr. Nelson Rockefeller in the Office of Inter-American Affairs, his brilliant leadership worked out a pattern of economic and technical assistance which was the forerunner—the grandfather as it were—of the present Point Four program. Later, in my capacity as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs in the two years immediately following the close of World War II, I worked at close range with those other non-military aspects of foreign policy, diplomacy, and economic and foreign information policies in all their varied forms.

In setting up this distinction between military and non-military aspects of foreign policy, we must be on guard against the distortions and unjustified criticisms of these nonmilitary programs by some of their opponents in Congress, and by some of our critics abroad—on either side of the iron curtain. In no circumstances do I assert, nor have we built these programs on the assumption, that polemics about the American way will stop military force. Further, let us beware of the fallacy at the other extreme—that the need for military force in appropriate instances shows that nonmilitary programs are a waste of the taxpayer's money.

Once aggression has taken the form of military force, it can only be repelled with effective forces of defense. That is the meaning of UN action in Korea. Further, where military force is ominously threatened, we must employ military assistance to forestall its use. That is the meaning of our Greek-Turkish program, and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which we are now implementing.

On the other hand, it is ultimate suicide to place our faith in those who want us to rely on military assistance alone. We must help our friends throughout the world to build economic sinews, for defense against military aggression as well as against economic and political subversion. We must take the lead in helping to develop and improve the economic life in those many areas of the world where economic or political backwardness provide the prime breeding places of communism. Here we have the prime points of weakness in the free world around the Soviet perimeter. As Nelson Rockefeller reported recently in his brilliant report, "To do nothing is to invite despair; to act is to hope." The gains of ECA in rolling back communism in Europe show that this hope is tangible and realizable.

In the area of information policy, no informed observer will question the urgency of the great campaign of truth I have long advocated—to combat the falsehoods of Communist propaganda about the motives behind our economic assistance, our diplomacy, and our military aid. But beyond that wholly defensive effort, we must fortify the spirit and the will to resist. Without this spirit, weapons would be useless. What good is a machine gun in the hands of a man who doesn't want to pull the trigger? Further, we must marshal the great leadership and influence of America in the modern world, in advancing the goals of human rights and free institutions, wherever and whenever we can. A brilliant plan along these lines is the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution of which I am proud to be a sponsor, to get the truth to the Russian people themselves.

All of these objectives and goals and programs are included in this vitally important area which I am calling the non-military aspect of foreign policy.

All these major objectives in American foreign policy would be substantially advanced by enactment of the legislation authorizing a grant-in-aid of one hundred fifty million dollars for the State of Israel. This legislation is in response to the request which has formally been submitted to the State Department by the government of that country. Senators MCMAHON, DOUGLAS, and TAFT, and many other Senators of both parties, about thirty-five in all, have joined in sponsorship of this important measure. In the House of Representatives, sponsorship has been equally widespread and nonpartisan.

This bill in my judgment is in line with the long-standing policy of the United States, and especially of the Truman Administration, to help establish a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, or rather, to help re-establish on this sacred soil the commonwealth which flourished there in ancient times and for which the Jewish people throughout the ages have never ceased to aspire, to work, to pray, and to die. All of us here tonight can take great pride in the fact that the United States exerted strong leadership in the United Nations to give legal as well as moral sanction to the State of Israel.

My good friend, Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, has summed up our profound interest in the new State in these terms:

"There are not one but three Israels—the land of the past, the land of the present, and the land of the future—and to the free world—the story of Israel is a vital and intimate part of the story of mankind."

The Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, has spoken of its future in terms which are indeed prophetic:

"I do not think of Jews as being the chosen people. But we have a dream—to build a civilization in (Israel) knowing that this country occupies a special place in world history, which will be free of the evils of our time. It must be a civilization based on the teachings of our prophets and on the strength of modern science. When I say prophets, I mean the ethics of their teachings; when I say science, I mean the material means to make this country a model for the entire Middle East."

These high goals should have a special reality and vividness for all the people of the United States because in many significant ways the birth and development of this small country of Israel so closely resemble our own. Its people are now moved by the same pioneer spirit as we were. It is the scene of a great migration movement which reminds us to the influx into the United States within the last century. It was born in a revolutionary war which recalls our own. Indeed, history may someday record that the emancipation of Israel's people meant as much for the independence and liberation of the Middle East as 1776 meant to this Hemisphere. Yes, this little country of Israel fashions its daily life and its institutions in the image of western democracy. It respects human personality. It defends the right of its people to be free. It encourages private initiative—Fortune magazine has praised Israel's foreign investment law as a model for other countries. While it vigilantly guards the freedoms of its citizens, it mobilizes its economy to raise the living standards of all.

Here is a laboratory for the democratic way of life in the Near East. Here is a pilot plant in an area of the world potentially as sensitive and dangerous as any other anywhere. Here is Israel, within the framework of democratic institutions—businessmen and workers, industry and labor, working together in devotion to the common welfare. Here, as in America, is demonstration to the world that a democratic system which fosters free enterprise and simultaneously stimulates cooperative effort can make tremendous strides for the welfare of all.

The great migration movement is at once the most remarkable feature of the new state and the source of its present economic embarrassment. Those who worked for the creation of the state of Israel—and there are many among you who took the lead—told the free people of the world, they told the Congress, they told the United Nations, they told the people of the United States—that the state if established would provide a sanctuary for all who wanted to go there—that the doors would not only be thrown open but that they would stay open. Now I do not think that many of you ever anticipated that in less than three years the DP camps of Europe would be emptied of all Jews; that Israel's population would be increased by almost six hundred thousand men, women, and children—a seventy-five percent increase in three years. Such a voluntary mass influx has no parallel in recorded history. The United States never in any single year increased its population by more than three percent. By the end of 1954 the State of Israel will have increased its population by two hundred percent. The anticipated increase within the next three years alone would be equivalent to an immigration of seventy million people to the United States. This immigration has been called not a melting pot, but a pressure cooker.

This movement is further remarkable for a great and unique reason; the criterion of admission has not been the welfare of the existing community, but rather the overriding necessity of those who entered. Moreover, the ever deepening crisis in international affairs serves to increase the scale and urgency of this immigration.

I need not tell you here tonight about the significance of this human tide. Too many of you have been closer to the problem than I have. But let me mention the aspects which have impressed me most strongly. This is the emphasis on the welfare of children. Special programs for the movement of orphaned children have been developed with the utmost care and love and effectiveness. They are now pouring into the country at the rate of about one thousand a month, and they come, mind you, from sixty-two different countries, with all the problems and the needs that that single fact implies. As the parents of three orphan children—three of Mrs. Benton's and my children are adopted children—you will understand the strong emotional appeal which this great program has for us.

Receiving and expanding and aiding this great human stream is a remarkable economy geared to long-range economic goals as well as to the urgent problems of immediate rapid growth. Among the many achievements are the growth of thousands of small manufacturers and other independent businesses, in a great variety of fields looking to the self-sufficiency of the country in the not-too-distant future. In a single issue of a monthly publication of the Jewish Agency for Palestine which crosses my desk, entitled "Economic Horizons," I have read in concrete terms the story of new rubber tire factories, of chemical plants, of nonferrous industries, of manufacturers of shoes and clothing, of hotels, shipping, dairy cattle, handicrafts, of new pipelines and agricultural settlements, of new forests and new fisheries. American capital has been the major stimulation of these new and vital horizons in free enterprise in the Middle East—the General

Tire & Rubber Co., the Ford Motor Co., Kaiser-Frazer, and many others. Think a moment of this amazing fact: Investment in new enterprises in Israel was equivalent to more than twenty-five percent of the national income in 1949 and more than thirty percent of the national income in 1950.

The population of Israel itself has tightened its belt to a degree not known in our country—or in Great Britain even in wartime. The United Jewish Appeal has contributed astonishingly more than a total of more than two hundred thirty million dollars from individual Americans between 1948 and 1950. The United States has granted loans through the Export-Import Bank, at interest, to help finance this great capital expansion upon which the future of Israel depends. Yet the need for hard currency continues at high and emergency levels. In order to bridge the gap until the expanded economy of the country can come into balance with the consumer needs of this growing population, Israel will continue to require great economic help from the outside. Otherwise, it cannot maintain its economic gains and fulfill our hopes. The grant which is provided by the legislation now pending in Congress will greatly help in bridging this dollar gap.

Since World War II the United States Government has helped to restore many countries impoverished by the conflict. Its program of assistance has been threefold. It began with direct relief to people in need (UNRRA). Secondly, we went on to stabilize their economies and thus strengthen the democratic institutions of their governments. Finally, we are now assisting them to erect their military defenses.

This three-prong policy has braced the free world. Nations menaced by subversion have been enabled to maintain their freedom. Nations threatened by aggression have been encouraged to buttress their defense and to affirm their determination to resist attack. New vitality has been given to the great concepts of liberty and human rights.

President Truman's chief messages to Congress this year have stressed the importance of continuing now our foreign-aid programs. Military aid predominates in Europe, economic aid in the Near and Far East. President Truman has put it well: "Economic stagnation is the advance guard of Soviet conquest—economic development is the spearhead of freedom." By far the greater part of our foreign aid in recent years has been in the form of grants; in 1950, grants represented ninety-two percent of the total, to countries all around the world. The presently proposed legislation will include Israel.

The Point Four assistance which Israel has thus far received—in the amount of only one hundred thousand dollars—has been devoted entirely to technical assistance. Fortunately this has not been devoted to such areas as elementary sanitation or education, important as these are, but rather advanced techniques in industry and agriculture to the techniques directed to the special problem of this semi-arid country. The newly proposed grants of one hundred fifty million dollars would be a specialized form of Point Four assistance, in the highest and best sense of that program.

Mr. Sidney Sherwood, Secretary of the Export-Import Bank, has publicly paid tribute to the economical and effective use made by Israel of the loans advanced through that agency. With the safeguards written into the proposed legislation, and with the degree of private investment which Israel is achieving, there can be no question of the effectiveness of the grant to accomplish major objectives of the Point Four program; to help other people to help themselves, to develop the means of production and of livelihood, to advance the goals of freemen everywhere.

Israel has already returned compensating benefits to us by its refugee-resettlement program which has vastly reduced the burden of displaced-persons camps on international relief agencies and upon the United States Treasury. The grant now proposed is a substantial investment in progress which will bring far greater dividends per dollar than anything we could spend on the displaced-persons camps. We should consider ourselves well rewarded if, in this critical area of the world, on the bridgehead of three continents, close to the dividing line of east and west, we help to erect a sturdy democratic nation, dedicated to the defense of freedom, determined to resist aggression, pledged to stand firmly in the front ranks of the free world.

Five Years of CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of March 11, 1951:

FIVE YEARS OF CARE

It was just 5 years ago that CARE, the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, dispatched its first relief shipment, and since that time an estimated 10,000,000 parcels have been distributed by the agency. Of them, Germany, Austria, Great Britain, France, and Italy have received the greatest share.

Paul Comly French, the executive director, points out that when CARE was organized late in 1945, its program was simple. The agency, established by several large relief and welfare groups, had acquired a stock of surplus Army rations. They could be bought by individuals in this country and CARE arranged the shipping and guaranteed delivery to specified friends or relatives overseas.

Today there are more than 20 different packages from which a donor in this country may choose. While most of them consist of food selected to meet the diet preferences or shortages in various countries, there also are clothing and textile parcels. The program even has been broadened so that packages may be sent to unspecified individuals or institutions. This general relief aspect of the program has enabled CARE to send books and plows as well as food in wholesale quantities.

While the agency has retained its original name, its activities have shifted more and more to the East. It has been shipping supplies to Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Korea, and Japan. Of the packages shipped last year, 490,000 went to Germany, 106,000 to Great Britain, 56,000 to Israel, 43,000 to Austria, 37,000 to France, 32,000 to Japan, and much smaller numbers to other countries.

Food made up about 85 percent of the 1950 parcels. It is expected that the total number of packages shipped this year will exceed the 1950 total because of new food needs in many areas. Prices range from $4 to $18.25, although the standard food package still is $10. Everyone who has sent CARE packages to needy persons abroad is well aware of the gratitude expressed by the recipients. Many beneficiaries have written long letters in appreciation of the gifts.

It is good to note that CARE is functioning today as faithfully as when first it was established. It has achieved a great deal, too, in acquainting Americans with persons in other countries and in cementing friendships among them.

Profiteering and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, labor organizations, joined together in a mutual purpose, have constantly pointed out the profiteering practices of a number of America's largest industries and called for the Government to stop profiteering. In an article published in the American Federationist, Mr. Boris Shishkin, the American Federation of Labor's nationally recognized economist, protests that "while the Korean crisis was testing the mettle of all Americans in their ability to respond to the great threat to us and to all the free world, quite a lot of corporate enterprises were kindling the fires of inflation at home."

Mr. Shishkin's article follows:

PROFITEERING AND INFLATION

(By Boris Shishkin, economist, American Federation of Labor

Inflation is a menace to everyone. When prices are rising, the dollar buys less. The worker receiving the same number of dollars takes a wage cut. His real wages decline. When a manufacturer earns the same profit, but the dollar buys less, his company's real earnings go down.

To stop inflation is everybody's business. On the stable value of the dollar depends the future worth of our savings, pensions, and insurance policies. Much more depends on it: the future stability and growth of our country; even the future of the free world.

If inflation is to be stopped, sacrifices are inevitable. But inflation controls will not work unless the anti-inflation program is even-handed. No group of people will be willing to give up things they need and want when they see others enriching themselves at the same time.

Workers who work for wages are willing to make their full contribution toward inflation control. But in doing so they want to be sure that the goods and services they produce do not become the source of enrichment, at their expense, to business in which they are employed.

How has the average worker in manufacturing fared during the past year? Between January 1950 and February 1951, average earnings, without overtime, of manufacturing workers increased 9.1 percent. But during the same period the cost of living, as measured by the consumers' price index, went up 9.3 percent. So, actually, the real wage of the manufacturing workers went down during this time. Workers in retail trade fared even worse and in a service trade, such as the laundry industry, the workers had a cut of nearly 4 percent in their real wages.

No one can claim that the explosive inflationary spurt which took place after the Communist invasion of South Korea, driving the cost of living up 8 percent in 6 months, was due to any cause other than shameless, speculative profiteering. Surely it was not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

due to an unbalanced Government budget; for once our Federal budget was balanced. Even Government spending was quite a bit less in 1950 than it was in 1949. And certainly it was not due to rising wages.

Our country's national income in 1950 rose 10.8 percent above 1949. And compensation received by all employees in America in 1950 was also 10.8 percent above 1949. But remember that in 1950 more people were employed—this accounts for a good part of the increase—and that those employed worked longer hours than in 1949. So that there was no disproportionate increase in wages.

The favorite myth of the antilabor propagandists—that higher pay of workers enables them to splurge on thick steaks and finery, bringing on higher prices—is completely exploded by the fact that between 1949 and 1950 personal consumption expenditures increased less than the national income.

Now look what happened to commodity prices during 1950. Wholesale prices of nonferrous metals went up more than 40 percent; lumber up 20 percent; livestock up 24 percent.

The real riot of speculation and profiteering—profiteering out of national emergency—followed the Communist invasion of South Korea. In 6 months, July to December 1950, the average American was taken to the cleaners by the get-rich-quick boys. He got fleeced both as a consumer and as a taxpayer who in the end must meet the jacked-up cost of defense.

In the last 6 months of 1950 wholesale prices of fats and oils jumped 61.7 percent. Hides and skins up 38 percent. Cotton goods up more than 35 percent. Woolen goods up 32 percent. Tires and tubes 23 percent. Paper and pulp up 22 percent. And so on. For the American people this was pretty bad business. But many of our businessmen evidently thought that making a quick profit was good business and the public be damned. So wherever they could they tried to buy cheap and sell dear.

Corporate profits in 1950 were 45.6 percent above 1949. In the fourth quarter of 1950 they were 74 percent above the fourth quarter of 1949. Even after taxes 1950 profits were 32 percent above 1949, and in the fourth quarter they were 58 percent above the same period in the previous year.

Take Montgomery Ward & Co. In 1949 their net profit was $48,000,000. In 1950 it was $74,000,000, a gain of 55 percent. Did they sell more goods? Well, their dollar sales increased 8 percent but, since prices were up, they evidently sold less goods for lots more money.

While the Korean crisis was testing the mettle of all Americans in their ability to respond to the great threat to us and to all the free world, quite a lot of corporate enterprises were kindling the fires of inflation at home. And they cannot blame it all on some foreign villains for jacking up the prices of raw materials we get from overseas.

Look at the facts—make a simple comparison of net profits of our corporations in 1949 and 1950. Do clothes cost you more than a year ago? Well, according to the Wall Street Journal, the net earnings of 24 textile companies went up 56 percent. Rubber? Profits of 12 rubber corporations went up 90 percent. Paper? Twenty-one pulp and paper corporations increased their profits 63 percent.

Twenty-three electrical and radio companies increased profits 42 percent. Twenty-five chemical companies raised profits 40 percent. Twenty-eight iron and steel companies earned 43 percent more in profits, and 14 mining and metals corporations earned almost 68 percent more in 1950 than they did in 1949.

These are some of the facts that the Director of Defense Mobilization seems to have missed in his report to the President on April 1. Indeed, Congress and the Government economic stabilizers have been missing such facts all along.

For example, on March 1 the Office of Price Stabilization gave a 3½-percent price increase on automobiles. Did this constitute relief to impoverished and hard-pressed auto manufacturers? Well, on March 5 the General Motors Corp. announced that in 1950 its $834,000,000 profit was 27 percent higher than in 1949, breaking all-time records.

The first step to get the American people behind the anti-inflation drive is to stop profiteering. Labor asks that an even-handed program of just economic stabilization be put into effect before we have to resort to a parade of bigger criminals than have yet been seen on television.

St. Lawrence Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Portland (Maine) Express in the edition of January 31, 1951, asks the following pointed question: "Of what use to our national-defense efforts would a frozen ship canal be?" In his editorial which follows he discusses the question more fully:

ST. LAWRENCE FOLLY

Well, of all things.

The Fair Dealers, casting about for ways to spend money faster and faster, have dusted off the old St. Lawrence River canal and waterpower scheme as a likely prospect. They sure could squirt a good many billions of tax dollars into that rathole—if the taxpayers' Representatives in Congress would just, please, give them the nod.

Anyway, the administration now is getting set to give this old chestnut another big boost. It has had the foresight, moreover, to sell its waterway arguments to certain nominal Republicans. Among these we find Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and New Hampshire's liberal Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.

WILEY says it would be "an absolute sin" not to squander our money, right away, deepening the St. Lawrence waterway to permit large ocean-going ships to enter the Great Lakes (small ocean steamers can and do go inland to Cleveland and Detroit now, through the existing canal system.)

And TOBEY, sounding for all the world like any typical Fair Dealer, would have us believe that "our long-term national defense, the economic growth of our good Canadian friends" (who, by the way, have all but put our port of Portland out of business and who have certainly taken no pains to heighten the living standards of Maine coast fishermen and lobstermen, with whom they compete) "the future of heavy industry and commerce of our own great Midwest, the electric-power hunger of our industries and consumers in New England and New York, are all tied up in the success of the St. Lawrence seaway."

No kidding!

What the Senator means, presumably, is that if the present St. Lawrence River canals were widened and deepened to permit the passage of larger steamers that can now navigate above Montreal, big ore-carrying ships could travel from Labrador to Buffalo and Cleveland and Lorain—and that would, undeniably, be important from the national defense viewpoint.

There is just one flaw in this pleasant picture of a steady stream of ocean-going ships linking Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and the other Great Lakes ports with the Seven Seas.

Still, it is a big flaw: Ice.

As Senator TOBEY probably knows, the Canadian cities of Quebec and Montreal, on the St. Lawrence River, are important seaports during 7 out of every 12 months. But during the five winter months, they are as much inland cities, and as completely cut off from the sea, as are Winnipeg or Kansas City. They are cut off from the sea by ice which no steamship can negotiate.

The ice which locks the St. Lawrence from shore to shore all winter would also, just as certainly, lock tight the system of ship canals which Senator TOBEY and his Fair Deal playmates want to build—largely to promote "the economic growth of our good Canadian friends"—with more dollars withheld from the pay envelopes of working people in Maine, New Hampshire, and 46 other States.

Of what use, to our National defense effort, would a frozen ship canal be?

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is a copy of a letter that I have received in protest against the firing of General MacArthur. This letter was written by the high school students of Downs, Kans. Here is what they said:

APRIL 12, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We as a group of high-school students wish to express our opinion regarding the ousting of General MacArthur.

In the first place we question your reasons for dismissing General MacArthur as commander of the United Nations forces. We are aware of the fact that you had given the general orders not to express his opinion in regard to foreign policy. But we also have been taught as Americans to take pride in the fact that we have freedom of speech. Does General MacArthur have freedom of speech? We believe that any American regardless of position, is free to express his opinion. It appears to us that you are afraid to have such a respected man as General MacArthur express an opinion that conflicts with yours. We, as American citizens, are intelligent enough to choose from varying foreign policies.

We feel that you, as President of the United States, should be more concerned with representing the people of America rather than being influenced by foreign elements. If communism is the enemy of democracy, then why cannot all forces opposing communism be turned loose to fight it? If we are opposing the Chinese Reds in Korea, why cannot the Chinese Nationalists be permitted to fight the common enemy?

We question your discharging personnel who have proved themselves worthy, when others who have had evidence brought against them proving them unworthy, remain as our public servants.

It is our earnest desire that this letter be received by you as further evidence of the dissatisfaction of the American public with your actions.

Yours sincerely,

(Twenty-six signatures.)

The Question Never Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 10, 1951:

THE QUESTION NEVER ANSWERED

Alger Hiss was smoked out about 10 years after Whittaker Chambers told his story to Adolf Berle for transmission to Franklin Roosevelt. When the House Un-American Activities Committee caught up with the Hiss case, the FBI had known about it for 8 years.

In 1946 the late Canadian Premier Mackenzie King made a special trip to Washington to tell President Truman what he had learned of the Russian spy ring in the United States as a result of the Canadian spy inquiry.

In the course of the recent spy trial of the Rosenbergs and Sobell it was disclosed that the FBI had much of the information in the case back in 1947.

THE FBI HAD THE EVIDENCE

The FBI also knew for years that the Amtorg Trading Co. in New York was the clearing house for Russian spies, whence our techniques in the production of chemicals, war materials, electronic devices and the atom bomb were transmitted to Moscow.

Why was action put off for so long in these and other such matters?

The Hiss case never would have come to trial if the Un-American Activities Committee had not been diligent. Other cases might not have been subject to official action to this day if the arrest of Klaus Fuchs in Britain early last year had not forced the hand of the American administration—for the Fuchs confession spotlighted espionage in the United States so clearly that action could no longer be withheld.

More than a year after Mr. Mackenzie King talked to him, President Truman told the press (on August 19, 1948,) he believed that no war secrets had gotten out of this country. (We shall let the reader off with only this one reference to "red herring," an epithet which Mr. Truman has employed several times since 1948.)

But again the question, why was nothing done when it could have been done, when action on information available might have saved some of our secrets and alerted the Nation for the future?

NOTHING WAS DONE

Nobody outside the Government knows exactly, but it is certain that somewhere in its executive branch some person or group of persons of great influence has kept the bloodhounds leashed. Here is some testimony which hints at where to look for this person or persons:

Larry E. Kerley is an ex-FBI man who once pursued a Russian spy called Arthur Adams. When he had made his case against this man he was ordered to let the spy leave the country unmolested. The order, Kerley said, came through the State Department, whereupon he resigned from the FBI in protest of what he believed was a betrayal of his country. That was in October, 1945.

Kerley was called to testify before Senator PAT MCCARRAN'S Judiciary Subcommittee investigating subversive aliens in September of 1949. He said:

"Russia's espionage activities in this country continued almost unchecked throughout the entire course of the last war. In accordance with instructions from the State Department * * * the Federal Bureau of Investigation was not even permitted to open an espionage case against any Russian suspect without State Department approval."

Senator O'CONOR asked: "Did you understand that that was to include also American participants?"

"Yes," said Kerley, "because if they were arrested that would disclose the whole apparatus, you see."

Senator O'CONOR asked: "Mr. Kerley, was the information that was gathered in connection with espionage activity to which you have referred forwarded to the State Department or was the State Department made aware of the nature of the disclosures?"

"In all cases," Kerley said, "they were kept closely advised."

FREE HAND FOR RUSSIANS

It should be borne in mind that Kerley quit the FBI just after the war was over. So it could be explained that what he told the committee about was a tactful wartime accommodation—that State Department officials, along with officials of other departments who fawned on our democratic Russian allies, acted on the belief that the brotherhood of battle entitled the Commies to steal everything which was not nailed down—or which we had not already given them under lend-lease.

But that explanation would not be valid for the lack of action in and after 1946, by which time Secretary of State Byrnes had learned in Moscow, right from the "horse's mouth," that Russia was not a friend but a foe, something which "nonliberal" Americans had been convinced of for 25 years.

We know that the American Communists and their Russian friends have been gingerly handled right down to the present. We know that the Government has taken no action against any of them except under pressure. The trial of the 12 Communist Party leaders in New York resulted from the heat generated by congressional investigation and was an attempt to turn this heat off.

These are facts for a citizen to bear in mind whenever he hears a "liberal" disparage the un-American investigating committee or any like congressional group. If we ever are to learn who in the executive branch of the Government protects the Communists, and why, Congress is our only instrument. The fix is still on in the executive branch.

Equal Status in Medical Professions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in this time of national emergency and mobilization, the various health professions are making a vital contribution by maintaining the health of our civilian population as well as those directly engaged in the defense effort.

Because I believe it is pertinent and important to the selective service and the UMT measure, I am placing in the RECORD excerpts from a statement which was directed to the House Armed Services Committee by Mr. George P. Sheridan, director of Legislative Affairs for the International Chiropractors.

The statement by Mr. Sheridan urged the committee to recognize the part the chiropractic profession occupies in the defense effort by specifically granting equal status with other health professions under deferment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Draft Act, Senate 1:

INTERNATIONAL CHIROPRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
Davenport, Iowa, March 5, 1951.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VINSON: Your committee currently has before it for consideration, Senate 1, Universal Military Training and Draft Act.

As adopted by the Senate, this measure would deny to the chiropractic profession equal status with other healing professions under deferment provisions designed to maintain the national health, safety, and interest.

The nation's manpower requirements, both foreign and domestic, will undoubtedly necessitate the service of doctors and students of chiropractic and they patriotically stand ready to provide whatever share is needed.

A very concrete and serious problem is presented, however, as to the policy which the Congress establishes with regard to the drafting of doctors of chiropractic, in order that there will not be indiscriminate calling of doctors without reference to community needs and without proper safeguards to insure maintainng an adequate balance of supply in each area.

This same problem extends to the educational level and the training of students in chiropractic schools and colleges. Action at the local level which does not conform with national policy will disrupt both the curricular and financial structure of these institutions as well as adversely affect the systematic flow of new doctors to supply the requirements of those who depend upon chiropractic.

The situation is especially important in view of the recognized deficiency of practitioners in the healing arts currently required to meet the minimum health needs of the Nation.

The chiropractic profession is the second largest of the healing arts. Comprising approximately 19,000 doctors, it renders health service to 30,000,000 Americans. As such it represents a vital segment of the total manpower available to administer to national health requirements.

A recent survey by the International Chiropractors Association, using the 12-State yardstick formula adopted by the Federal Security Agency as a basis, establishes 1 chiropractor per 4,000 people as the minimum consistent with health needs. This compares with a present ratio of 1 chiropractor per 8,900 persons. The survey found an existing need for more than 18,000 chiropractors to satisfy minimum requirements. Taking into account population increases and attrition from death, retirement, and so forth, 2,840 replacements must be supplied annually by chiropractic colleges.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Actual present enrollment in the seven largest schools, comprising 80 percent of total enrollment, is 2,492, according to a January 1951 survey. Of these students, 5x.6 percent are in the age bracket subject to present selective service regulations, and a large percentage of the remainder are subject to call as members of the active Reserve. It is estimated that but an approximate 750 students will graduate from chiropractic colleges annually on the basis of the present enrollment in standard 4-year courses.

From this survey the conclusion is inescapable that the civilian health will be endangered and the survival of the chiropractic profession threatened unless adequate provision is made to insure an equitable quota of chiropractic practitioners and students.

The Congress has indicated that it recognizes this problem as applied generally to all the healing arts. We desire to point out, however, that chiropractic has been held as a separate and distinct profession by the courts and by provision of the licensure statutes in most States. Experience demonstrates that unless chiropractic is specifically named it will not be accorded equality of status with other healing arts when provisions of this bill are carried out within the various jurisdictions.

The chiropractic profession asks no special consideration. It does plead for equal treatment with the other healing professions in order that it may continue to fulfill its demonstrated important part in the public health and welfare.

Deferment of a fair proportion of chiropractic personnel will have no appreciable effect on meeting military requirements, whereas failure to do so will deny to an increasing percentage of people the opportunity to obtain adequate health care.

It is respectfully urged, therefore, that your committee amend Senate 1 by specifically including chiropractic by name in the provisions of the act dealing with deferment of individual doctors and students of the healing professions.

Respectfully,

GEORGE P. SHERIDAN,
Director of Legislative Affairs,
International Chiropractors Association.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of Congress have received many letters and telegrams which contain many fine statements over the midnight firing of General MacArthur.

Here is a telegram that I think is most significant both as to the context and to the number of persons signing it.

Glen Elder, Kansas, a fine prosperous little town in North Central Kansas has a population of 580 people.

Yet within a few hours after the MacArthur discharge was heard, 115 voters had put their names on a telegram protesting this degradation of MacArthur.

Here is what the telegram said:

Impeach the red herring from the Presidential chair and clean up our State Department. If we are going to lose our Government to communism do it honorably on the battlefield.

(Signed by 115 persons.)

Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter that expresses the feelings of the farmers in many sections in regard to the selective service board membership:

THE PENDULUM SWINGS FROM ONE EXTREME TO THE OTHER

BRODBECK BROS.,
Wabash, Ind., March 19, 1951.

JOHN V. BEAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: You will perhaps be interested in knowing that the county agricultural extension committee of which you are a member met Friday to discuss the selective-service law in its relation to the deferment of local farm boys who are irreplaceable and more particularly to the over-all level of agricultural production of food, feed, and fiber. The discussion was carried on on a high level and was not injected with petty personal grievances. Mr. Ward Vandegrift, the local draft appeal agent was present and discussed the weaknesses of the draft law from the standpoint of the appeal agent.

We are still so close in point of time to World War II that the abuses of the Selective Service System as then administered are not forgotten.

In the first place, too many men without any true agricultural interest, background, and experience left the city to farm and were granted agricultural deferments, thereby escaping the draft. Second, farmers of financial means bought up more land, equipment, and livestock to qualify sons for deferment under the system of points of production units that was set up as a standard or basis for such deferments. Naturally, such abuses were undemocratic and aroused the ire of city people and farmers of less financial means whose sons had to serve in the Army because of failure to qualify for deferment.

So now the pendulum has swung in the other direction, and perhaps too far, so far that, unless the situation is corrected soon, far greater damage will be done to the Nation's security through a reduction of vital foodstuffs than was ever done by the inequalities in World War II.

Three factors are causing many local draft boards to swing to the opposite extreme in administering the Selective Service Act at the present time. First, the pressure of urban public opinion resulting from these aforesaid abuses of the last war period that the farm boy is no better than theirs (in which they are duly justified). Second, the fact that the law does not require that one member of the local board should be a bona fide farmer, and third, that no standard or yardstick was provided for the guidance of the local board in making their deferments. The absence of such a yardstick or standard makes for a very great lack of uniformity of action among the various county boards and leaves entirely too much up to the local boards whose decisions too often seem to be guided by prejudice rather than facts and economic considerations of maintaining our farm production during periods of national crisis. For example, one board member in Wabash County said that the board did not care whether farmers produced any food during the next 4 years or not as there was plenty of surplus on hand. As another example, in a neighboring county, a man who was appointed to the draft board made the statement that he did not really want the job, but that he would like to be on it long enough "to slap some of those d—— farm boys into the Army." And as a further example, taken from the higher level, out of 55 cases that have been cited to the State Appeal Board by our local appeal agent, 54 cases have been flatly denied by a vote of 3 to 0, and the other one by a vote of 2 to 1. Obviously, the intent of selective service becomes null and void and it becomes instead a universal draft.

At this point, we grant further that if there were plenty of manpower in every productive segment of society, industrial, scientific, and agricultural, then the universal draft would be democratic and theoretically desirable. Equality of opportunity in our democracy carries with it equality of responsibility and sacrifice so one man is no better than another, provided he were not irreplaceable.

But such a satisfactory balance and supply of manpower is not available in the scientific and agricultural fields as compared to the industrial for several reasons: First, because of the lure of short hours and high wages paid by industry, labor has been drained off the farm to a dangerously low level. Second—because a very high percentage of farm owners and operators are now past 50 years of age, and so are no longer able to carry on with their usual vigor and vitality, some annual replacements of manpower on the farm are just as necessary and logical as replacements of machinery, fences and soil fertility.

From whence shall these replacements come? The proponents of the universal draft propose drafting all the farm boys and the bringing in of foreign labor such as Mexicans, and Jamaicans to replace them. True, such labor can help in periods of peak labor loads in harvesting seasonal crops such as tomatoes, sweet corn, sugar beets, etc. But they are not fitted either by training, background, or inclination to carry on the many skilled operations necessary to modern farming, such as tractor and equipment operations, feeding livestock, producing butter, eggs, milk and so on.

Now, having stated the existing ills and dangers to our economy in our present minor conflict, and more especially should we get into an all-out global war with Russia whereby we would again be called on to feed our allies as well as ourselves, it is the opinion of this group as well as that of many other straight-thinking farmers that two remedies should be applied at once.

An amendment to the existing bills now pending in Congress that whenever possible a bona fide farmer should be appointed on the draft board, should be made a part of the new law.

Second, an amendment to this same legislation directing or mandating the director of the draft to furnish a reasonable and workable yardstick or standard to local draft boards as a basis for their decisions in hardship cases and that of irreplaceable draftees. Such a standard would secure much greater uniformity as between counties than now exists, where everything is left up to the judgment of the local board.

Third, this standard or yardstick should also be furnished to the State appeal boards for their guidance in appeal cases.

Anything which you may do to present this viewpoint to the committees in charge of this legislation to make this draft law more reasonable and keep it truly selective will be very much appreciated.

Incidentally, the vast majority of our people feel that we had no business in Korea in the first place, and that we should get out of there promptly, or either give MacArthur authority to fight in such a manner as to bring the war to a quick conclusion rather than sacrifice American lives

unnecessarily in a long-drawn-out stalemate.

Also, the majority of our citizens in this section approve the deferment of students in the upper brackets in colleges as we just cannot afford to kill off the potential scientists of tomorrow upon the grounds that they are no better than ordinary unskilled labor. They may be no better, but they are certainly far more valuable to the Nation's future welfare. To put them on the firing line can become national suicide.

Very truly yours,

L. A. BRODBECK.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, many say that the youth of our country do not think and are not interested in the world affairs. Here is what an 18-year-old wrote in regard to the firing of MacArthur:

APRIL 18, 1951.

Representative WINT SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SMITH: My name is ———. I am 18 years old and a senior in high school.

The people of the United States are not asking for any more than can be expected from any full-blooded American. They just want to live nice, comfortable lives, with the assurance of good, clean, and sound government and all this yakatea-yaky stuff, that we hear all the time, left out.

There is no sense of any man, whether butcher, baker, or President to offer to those associated with him so little cooperation. This alone proves some of the qualities of any man. Mr. Truman is definitely deficient in this quality; the least he could do is aid Congress, at least a little for the people. No one man, whether President or industrialist, is sufficiently infallable to decide the fate of a nation, without at the very least some of the views of the people and the Congress taken into consideration.

We want peace; there must be unity and coherence, and, above all, integrity and fortitude in the Government. At present we have the most notorious problematical predicament any country has ever known. We have disunity, dishonesty, and little or no courage in all our governmental functions.

The word "peace" is a great, big, and wonderful word. In my dictionary it says it means a state of rest or tranquillity; freedom from war or disturbance. This word, in my estimation, is badly abused.

Did you say peace? Well—look back a little. This country hasn't had a decent day of peace for so long that it had ought to be ashamed of itself. We try to help everyone and look what we got—world war III, we're in it, we were in it, and we will be in it for a long time to come.

I am not saying this in my stupid way, so that I won't be drafted or have an easy life; quite on the contrary. I sincerely believe that all these wonderful Americans had ought to be treated at the very least fairly and honestly.

I think you will find, Mr. Smith, that if this country doesn't do something drastic within the next few days, weeks, or months that this country is lost and may God help us and have mercy on us.

I definitely want Mr. Truman impeached along with Acheson as so many Americans do who love their country. I do believe, however, that Mr. Truman and Acheson are not all our trouble. All Communists and atheists must be extirpated from all branches of our Government.

As far as Mr. Truman's action against MacArthur. I was very sorry to hear this because I believe Mr. MacArthur is a very capable man. He is reliable, efficient, and has demonstrated many of his abilities throughout his life. He gave his entire life for his country and that is something Truman hasn't and doesn't intend to do.

The people of the United States are on the uproar. Why? The people of the United States have been led around by the nose and have listened to this, that, and everything, including true and untrue communistic statements and ballyhoo. Is there any wonder why we have all this confusion.

I pray to God to give to you strength, courage, and guidance through the years to come and may God protect all of us.

Sincerely yours.

Statement by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by the President of the United States released today at 4 p. m.:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The United States is moving steadily forward in concert with other countries of the Pacific in its determination to make ever stronger the position of the free world in the Pacific Ocean area.

In connection with the reestablishment of peace with Japan, we are discussing with the Japanese Government the implementation of its expressed desire for a post-treaty security arrangement pursuant to which United States Armed Forces might on a provisional basis remain in and about Japan.

The United States maintains, and expects to continue to maintain, its Armed Forces in the Ryukyus, particularly at Okinawa.

In the Philippines, the United States is accorded certain military operating rights and facilities pursuant to an agreement with the Government of the Philippines and the whole world knows that the United States recognizes that an armed attack on the Philippines would be looked upon by the United States as dangerous to its own peace and safety and that it would act accordingly.

The Governments of Australia and New Zealand, in connection with the reestablishment of peace with Japan, have suggested an arrangement between them and the United States, pursuant to articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter which would make clear that in the event of an armed attack upon any one of them in the Pacific, each of the three would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes; and which would establish consultation to strengthen security on the basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid.

The possibilities of such an arrangement were fully explored by Mr. Dulles at Canberra, Australia, and Wellington, New Zealand, and have since been informally discussed with the appropriate subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

I have now asked the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and Mr. Dulles, as my special representative in relation to the Japanese peace settlement and related matters, to pursue this matter further concurrently with the prosecution of the other negotiations necessary to bring the Japanese peace settlement to an early and satisfactory conclusion.

The series of arrangements and dispositions outlined above, will strengthen the fabric of peace in the whole Pacific Ocean area, where security is strongly influenced by sea and air power. They constitute natural initial steps in the consolidation of peace in that area and also will contribute to the building of universal peace as sought by the United Nations and under which great goal the efforts of our Nation are now being largely dedicated.

Danger! Communists at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by Bruno Shaw, radio news analyst and foreign correspondent, which appeared in the April issue of the Elks magazine.

This article points up the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in acquainting the public with the insidious operating mechanics of the Communist Party in the United States:

DANGER!' COMMUNISTS AT WORK — LOOK BEFORE YOU SIGN, FOR UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ARE SKILLFULLY HIDDEN

(By Bruno Shaw)

"Danger! Communists at work." Every high school and college in the country; every industrial plant; every association, group and church of every denomination, should carve that slogan on its doorstep—should exert every last ounce of effort to impress it unfailingly in the minds and hearts of its students, members, employees and associates.

"The Communist Party is like a submerged submarine," said J. Peters, former Russian head of a Communist spy ring in the United States; "the part that you see above water is the periscope, but the part underneath is the real Communist organization; that is the conspiratorial apparatus."

Communist and Communist-front organizers exploit to full advantage the naturally questioning and even rebellious attitude of American youth toward authority. Countless unwary youngsters have been enrolled in renegade organizations such as American Student Union, American Youth Congress, Friends of the Campus, National Student League, World Youth Council, and many more.

Thousands of young Americans on high-school and college campuses from coast to coast, under the delusion that they were joining a liberal, patriotic organization, became members of American Youth for Democracy. Unknown to most of them is the fact that this organization was formerly the Young Communist League.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report for the year 1950,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

takes a grim view of Communist activities in the United States. "With the Armed Forces of the United States actually pitted in conflict against the legions of international communism," says the report, "the Communist Party of the United States can no longer be viewed passively as a group of mere political and ideological dissidents, but must be looked upon with all seriousness as a military fifth column actively aiding our enemies."

The House committee is convinced that members of Communist-front organizations which advocate policies designed to weaken the United States resistance to Communist aggression (as all of them do), are, wittingly or unwittingly, enemies of the Nation; and that those who sign Communist-front petitions, offered for their signatures under a variety of disguises, are either extremely naive or fools or knaves.

Representative JOHN S. WOOD, of Georgia, is chairman of the House committee. It is possible now, says Mr. WOOD, for American citizens to secure from the House committee information about any petition, appeal, or organization they may be asked to sign or to join. There is no reason in the world, he declares, for anyone to allow himself to be tricked into participating in an un-American activity.

What, precisely, is an un-American activity? "Any action of any individual or organization," says Mr. WOOD, "which seeks to alter or change the form of government of this Nation by other than the method pointed out in the Constitution, or who seeks by violent and unlawful methods to interfere with the orderly operations of the Government or any of its subdivisions—is un-American."

Does the committee stifle public debate? Does it tend to exercise thought control? Does it threaten freedom of expression on behalf of causes which may be unpopular at the moment?

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, ranking member of the committee, says "No." "The House committee," says Mr. WALTER, "is solely an instrument of investigation and education. It has no punitive power. It may subpena persons and question them about their activities and associations. It hopes that, by revealing the genuine nature of subversive groups in the United States, Americans will become more careful about lending their names and support to causes they have not personally investigated."

There are plenty of such causes. The newest publication of the House committee, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, lists 624 Communist or Communist-front groups and 204 newspapers and periodicals of a similar nature, actively operating in the United States.

Labor unions are a prime Communist objective. How unions become subject to Communist control is described in the committee's series 100 Things You Should Know About Communism. In the labor section of the series, David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, who waged a successful fight against Communist infiltration, exposes Red techniques. He cites, as an example of their deliberate intent, the Communist-led strike of 1926, which cost $4,500,000 and left in its wake a chaotic garment industry and a crippled union.

Among the Communist-led unions the House committee has helped to expose are the United Office and Professional Workers of America; the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; the International Fur and Leather Workers. Eleven such unions already have been expelled from the CIO because of their Communist domination, including those three.

WHAT THEY BELIEVE

Communism, in the opinion of the House committee, is the clear and present danger. Prominently displayed on the flyleaf of 100 Things You Should Know About Communism, is the sworn statement of William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States: "No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Does the House committee investigate subversive activities other than Communist? It does, but only to a limited extent. This may be accounted for by its limited budget and staff. On February 7, the House appropriated $200,000 for the committee's expenses for the current year. The staff numbers 34 persons, of whom 8 are investigators. Criticism was expressed to me even in congressional quarters that the committee has not been sufficiently diligent in exposing the man-on-a-white-horse groups, right-wing totalitarian organizations, and racist antiminority groups, the respectability of which rests solely on the slender reed that they, too, are anti-Communist.

Louis J. Russell, 39-year-old former FBI man, is senior investigator of the House committee. What the committee is able to fry at its hearings depends to a large extent upon the number and quality of fish Mr. Russell and his staff are able to gather in their nets.

Mr. Russell and his assistant, Mr. Donald T. Appell, gave full and complete answers to the endless questions I raised in my search for information about the Communist conspiratorial octopus whose tentacles pry into every corner of American life. They seemed to enjoy, for a change, the novelty of being in the witness box.

In addition to the strain of what might be considered their normal activity of searching out and interrogating persons suspected of subversive activities, the committee is harassed by a variety of crackpots and lunatic-fringers who believe that the only way to preserve democracy is to abolish it, and who wear down the flagstones of the House corridors with their unflagging visitations. Most of these eager-beavers find their way to Mr. Russell's office with plans that range all the way from appointing a chancelor of the United States to abolishing Government altogether.

How does the committee's expressed purpose work in action? Generally, in the public interest. It has uncovered or helped to make known to the public hundreds of individuals and groups engaged in operations designed to overthrow the Government and destroy our freedom, all the way from Soviet spies and saboteurs to American youth group organizers.

AGENTS UNCOVERED

The apparatus of the Communist conspiracy exposed to public view by the House committee includes figures such as Semen Vasilenko, who escaped to Russia with vital metallurgical research and atomic-energy information; Arthur Adams, a Soviet agent who obtained information relating to the atomic bomb; Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, who defied the authority of the House committee to subpena him for hearing and was sentenced to a $1,000 fine and a year in jail, where he is at present.

The 81 pamphlets published by the committee in 1950, describing Communist and Communist-front activities, reveal the nature of the Communist conspiracy in our midst. Typical of the views held by many of those engaged in it is the following brief excerpt from the testimony of Steve Nelson. At hearings held in June 1949, Steve Nelson (alias Louis Evans, Joseph Fleischinger) was questioned by Representative MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, a member of the House committee:

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Nelson, in the event of war between the United States and Russia, to which country would you owe your allegiance and loyalty in such a conflict?

"Mr. NELSON. I refuse to answer that question."

Steve Nelson was cited for contempt for refusing to answer direct questions throughout the hearings. At subsequent hearings before the committee, the full shocking details of the activities of Nelson and his accomplices were told by Matthew Cvetic, undercover agent for the FBI. Nelson was identified as a Communist organizer specializing in securing control over labor unions in vital industries.

A vast amount of time consumed at committee hearings is spent in an endeavor to persuade recalcitrant witnesses to answer direct questions. After examining thousands of pages of verbatim testimony, one begins to understand the need for almost superhuman patience when dealing with elusive, frustrating characters who, standing on their constitutional rights, and guided by expert lawyer-quibblers, are dedicated to the destruction of the very constitutional rights they call upon for their own protection.

The testimony of Philip A. Bart, general manager of the Freedom of the Press, publishers of the official Communist Party organ, the Daily Worker, is a case in point. The hearing was held on June 21, 1950. Here is a brief excerpt of the questioning by Mr. Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., committee counsel, and the replies made by Mr. Bart:

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been out of the United States?

"Mr. BART. I refuse to answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever used the name John William Fox?

"Mr. BART. I will not answer this question, which, in accordance with article V of the Constitution, may be used by this committee to incriminate me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bart, I hand you a photostatic copy of an application for passport signed in the name of John William Fox, and I will ask you to look at the photograph appearing on the second page and state to me whether or not that is a photograph of you?

"Mr. BART (after examining document), I refuse to answer."

The House Committee has no power to mete out punishment to those whose subversive activities may be proven, or even to those who refuse to answer the committee's questions. Punitive action rests with the Attorney General and other prosecuting agencies of the Government. And no legal action can be taken against a witness until, and unless, that person has been indicted by a grand jury in the district in which the hearing has been held.

MEANS OF EVASION

Witnesses who refuse to answer questions usually resort to one of three means of evading them. First, by quoting the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides for freedom of speech, press, and assembly; secondly, by declaring that the House committee is not legally constituted and is without constitutional authority to conduct the hearing; and third, by claiming immunity under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "No

person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

The first two of these inviting avenues of escape proved, in many cases, to be blind alleys, and witnesses who attempted to employ them ultimately found themselves in jail. Outstanding examples of witnesses who claimed immunity under the first amendment were the Hollywood Ten: Alvah Bessie, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Robert Adrian Scott, and Dalton Trumbo. All were sentenced to $1,000 fine and a year in jail. All had refused to answer the question: "Are you a Communist?"

The courts have held that the first amendment does not provide immunity because there is no abridgment of speech in requiring a direct "yes" or "no" to the question. The courts have held, too, that the House committee does have constitutional authority to conduct hearings and question witnesses. The claim of immunity under the fifth amendment still remains to be decided definitely by a test case.

LINE ON FIFTH COLUMN

According to the committee's 1950 report, "some 1,300 witnesses have testified in public and executive hearings held in the past 12 years. The committee's continuing study of Communist activity since 1938 has resulted in a voluminous collection of information concerning the leaders of programs and aims of an entrenched potential fifth column made up of the 54,000 members of the Communist Party and its half million followers, and their increasing efforts in behalf of the forces of international communism. The committee has unearthed information concerning the activities and methods of foreign agents intent on missions of propaganda, espionage, and sabotage. This information will serve as a valuable tool in the protection of our country against espionage and sabotage from within in this period of national emergency."

Witnesses who have appeared before the committee included several whose purpose was to protest against injury to their reputations, either because of the way they were listed in committee files or because of misinterpretation of information supplied by the committee, which, because of incorrect evaluation, caused personal injury to loyal American citizens. Though complaints of this sort have been comparatively few, they are responsible for major criticism of the committee's methods of recording and reporting.

COMMITTEE'S ATTITUDE

The conduct of the present House committee hearings is a far cry from that of the capricious Dies committee, which had seven incandescent years of existence from 1938 to 1944, inclusive, or that of the J. Parnell Thomas committee, which came later. It is unlikely that the present committee, under the chairmanship of Representaitve JOHN S. WOOD will ever be known as the Wood committee. Mr. WOOD is not, apparently, that kind of a headline hunter. He is not averse to headlines. He would like more of them; but for the committee and its work, and not for himself, in order that the public may better understand the nature of the menace of totalitarianism of any kind.

Mr. WOOD is the kind of person described by novelists who WAX sentimental over Dixie, as a southern gentleman. You have a feeling, sitting in his office in the Old House Office Building, of being welcome and at home. You know, because of the burden of his committee work (he is a member of several committees) and because of his congressional duties, that he is a hurried, harried man. But you would never know it when his time is yours for the moment. That segment of time, no matter how small or how large it may be, is yours entirely.

It seems deplorably true that we have not changed very much since Barnum said: "There's a sucker born every minute." Mr. WOOD points, for example, to the Communist-inspired Stockholm peace petition campaign of last year. Marcel Schere, an individual with a long public record of Communist Party affiliation and activities, who has been identified as closely associated with a Communist atomic espionage ring, appeared before the House committee on June 21 and admitted that he WAS one of those in charge of this drive in New York City.

Thousands of American citizens throughout the United States affixed their signatures to this Moscow-inspired peace petition. The Cominform officially claims that 2,000,000 Americans signed it. Their names and addresses will constitute a gigantic and valuable mailing list for the Communist Party which will bombard them with deceptively worded literature and solicit them for funds under innumerable disguises.

What the Stockholm peace petition actually called for was the adoption of the Soviet plan for restriction of atomic energy. The peace petition called for a pledge to ban the use of the atomic bomb, but without any international inspection of Soviet activities in atomic bomb production. It did not mention the desirability of banning the tremendous armies and armament the U. S. S. R. and its satellites have built up since 1945, nor did it mention the illegal rearmament by the U. S. S. R. of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania far beyond the limits imposed in the peace treaties. And, of course, it did not mention that this plan, disguised as a peace petition, was overwhelmingly rejected time and again by the majority of the United Nations.

PEACE IN NAME ONLY

A similar subversive call to peace was issued by the Daily Worker on February 1 of this year, calling for a peace pilgrimage to Washington to be held on March 1, under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade, one of the many fronts that more honestly could be called the Moscow sabotage operation.

The American Peace Crusade is the same old Kremlin wolf in a new sheepskin. It is an offshoot of the Communist conspiracy known in 1949 as the Partisans of Peace movement. Its original plan was to collect 400,000,000 signatures throughout the world, of which 5,000,000 were to be secured in the United States. The American Peace Crusade took over early this year with a call for UN forces to get out of Korea, and for Red China to be seated immediately in the United Nations.

On February 19 the House committee published the March of Treason, which lists the leading Communist and Communist-front sponsors of the American Peace Crusade. With information of this kind available for the asking (schools and organizations can get these leaflets free of charge from the committee), there is no reason why any intelligent person should allow himself to be beguiled into signing Communist-inspired petitions.

Before leaving Washington I called once more on Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, who, among his colleagues, is one of the most highly regarded members of the House. I asked him for his estimate of the Nation's awareness of the nature and extent of Communist activities.

"Not 2 percent of the American people realize that communism is a world-wide conspiracy," said Mr. WALTER, "or that when Lenin said, and Stalin reiterated, that our two forms of government could not live peacefully side by side, and that only one of them could survive, they really meant it."

A line needs to be drawn between loyal, intellectually honest Americans who may be in open disagreement with current national policy, whose freedom to express their views must not be impaired or curtailed, and whose persons and reputations must be given every safeguard if we are to remain, in fact, a free people; and those who, for ulterior motives, support policies or actions inimical to our national security.

But clearly, if Mr. WALTER'S estimate is even approximately correct, much educational work remains to be done. Equally clear is the fact that in the present clouded ideological climate there must be available a responsible source of information concerning individuals and groups whose activities are subject to question, and a tribunal before which those persons may be questioned. The record demonstrates that the present House committee serves this useful and essential function in our national community, and that we would be badly off without it.

The record provides unmistakable warning. In addition, that it is high time for all Americans — men and women, boys and girls—to pause for reflection before signing petitions and appeals for projects which, on the surface, seem in accord with their own liberal views, and that, remembering the submerged submarine of the conspiratorial apparatus among us, they should bear in mind: "Danger; Communists at work."

Warning on Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, recently several Members of the House have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, articles from the St. Louis Star-Times, regarding the Toronto stock frauds.

It appears that some Toronto brokers and dealers have been promoting the sale of stocks in gold, silver, uranium, cobalt, and oil—all worthless projects. They have obtained lists of prospective American investors and have been circularizing these prospects from the east coast to the west coast, with excellent results, and with intent to defraud. It is estimated that they take as much as fifty-two millions of dollars annually from Americans. Such promotions are illegal in the United States, but are permitted in the Province of Ontario.

These circulars have also reached my district, and while I know some of my constituents have not been gullible, others may fall for this propaganda. Therefore, I am taking this means of bringing this matter to their attention, so they may be duly warned against investing in any stock offered by Toronto brokers, without prior investigation. I am also requesting the Post Office Department to check into the matter to see what can be done to prevent such mail from coming into the United States.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Address by William Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last night I attended a dinner meeting of a type that undoubtedly is held in great numbers throughout our Nation. A panel of distinguished persons presented their views and opinions on the Far East conflict and our international relations. At this dinner conference of the Council Against Communist Aggression, presided over by Mr. Marx Lewis, the best analysis and approach to the subject under consideration was, in my opinion, contained in the address of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. His message I commend to my colleagues for their consideration:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT A DINNER CONFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 17, 1951

Today the menace of Communist imperialism presents the entire free world with a clear and immediate danger. If there was once a time when vain hopes and wishful thoughts could be safely indulged, that time is past. If we now prepare for the worst, we are not likely to be disappointed.

The first shot fired into the back of the free Republic of Korea should have sufficed to awaken the most distant and complacent of nations to an awareness of peril—if any new alarm were still required at so late a stage. That vicious attack was aimed not at one small republic only, but at the institution of human freedom itself.

Regardless of subsequent events, it will stand to the everlasting credit of this Nation that it acted with supreme courage in the face of this critical challenge to its role as the champion of liberty and international morality. In rallying the moral and material support of the United Nations to the defense of Korea, it accomplished an unprecedented feat of diplomacy. It gave renewed confidence to all who stand for freedom and decency against heavy odds elsewhere in the world.

If this brutal crime against humanity had been allowed, through our default, to find reward rather than retribution, we would be meeting here tonight in desperation rather than in hope. The moral and physical defenses of the free world would have suffered an irreparable breach. The will to resist aggression in India, in Iran, in western Europe—in every nation around the whole circumference of communism—would have been undermined.

It is well to remember that fact when these issues are drawn into the arena of partisan contention, to be reexamined in the clear light of hindsight. It is well to remember also, when tardy voices are raised in criticism of the decision which committed us to the defense of Korea, that our own freedom would have been lost long ago if it had been left in the charge of the summer soldier and sunshine patriot.

The vital questions today are concerned with the future rather than the past. The next steps are the important ones.

Honest men may disagree on what these steps should be. But all responsible citizens must surely agree that there can be no drawing back on our part at this late date in the campaign against Communist aggression.

The basic all-pervading issue today, on which there can be no disunity, is the clear and unmistakable one of survival versus extinction. To relax our efforts and to indulge the comfortable illusion that the worst might be past would be to court extinction. To concentrate our forces unwisely, or to seek refuge in grand isolation, would be to assure it.

The dangers we face are impartial and nonpartisan. Democrats and Republicans; liberals and conservatives; workers, farmers, and industrialists—all share the common risk. The chains that are forged in Moscow are designed to fit all groups and individuals, without favor or privilege. We shall all be enchained together unless we prove capable of united resistance. Out of the division and acrimony which surrounds us now, some workable basis must be found for a new popular front—a popular front against Soviet imperialism.

When the survival of freedom is finally assured, there will be time enough for the pursuit of partisan aims and ambitions. For the present, we have but too little time in which to take those necessary steps which will assure the survival of freedom—so that our normal pursuits may ultimately be resumed.

The line of battle in the fight for survival is not remote from any individual, though Korea is half a world away. It is a continuous line, extending from the front in Korea, back over the channels of communication and supply to Washington, to the factories, the farms, the shops, and the homes of America.

Our line of defense extends through the front in Korea in a continuous chain around the entire globe. Korea is but one small segment of the full arc of Communist encirclement and pressure.

The military aggression in Korea is but one of the manifold forces which the Communist conspiracy has set in motion to challenge the peace and security of the free world. Our military endeavors are no more than one phase of the general campaign which will be required to frustrate those forces.

Korea is a small part of the universal pattern of Communist aggression—a pattern which includes systematic obstructionism in the United Nations, sporadic violence in India, a Moscow-inspired civil war in Indochina, the cynical Stockholm petition campaign in the United States, sabotage in England and Western Germany, threats against Iran, the exploitation of race hatred in Asia and Africa—and all the other uses to which slander, subversion, sabotage, and civil strife lend themselves.

It is an old formula, in particularly expert hands—exploit every weakness, divide and conquer.

The constant threat of attack by the forces of communism should be apparent to all. What is not so apparent is where the next blow is likely to fall and what form it will take. We can only be sure that it will probably strike at what the Kremlin considers to be our point of greatest weakness, wherever that might be at any given time. To concentrate all our strength and attention upon any one area is to invite an attack upon other vital areas.

The issue will not be resolved by any simple means nor by any single classic military maneuver, no matter how brilliantly executed.

The enlightened defense of the free world today is the most complex task ever undertaken by man. It encompasses the entire range of human activities—political, social, economic, as well as military. The international activities of free trade-unions, the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, the Voice of America, and grain for the starving masses of Indian are as much a part of it as the North Atlantic Treaty alliance and the United Nations action in Korea. Success in any of these spheres can be more than offset by failure or neglect in another. They all involve contact with instruments and avenues of Communist expansion and aggression.

It is vain to debate the relative importance of Asia and Europe in the strategy of opposition to communism. We cannot afford to indulge the luxury of a choice between the two. Nor can we safely concentrate on any one set of weapons—military, economic, political, or moral—in this conflict. Both areas are vital and all the weapons we can muster are needed.

We must attain military superiority all along our entire line of defense. We must develop a system of working unity with all the free nations of the world, in Asia as well as Europe. We must expand our programs of economic assistance and development so as to give the masses of the world a genuine stake in freedom and to demonstrate the superiority of democracy over Communist despotism.

These primary tasks are sufficient to absorb all our energies and resources for a long time to come. They will require foresight, sacrifice, and courage of a high order.

The price is high, but no price is too great to pay for the preservation of human decency, liberty, and world peace. Our only concern must be to see that we receive full value in return for the price we pay by disposing our resources and forces in such a manner as to best contribute to the ends we seek.

American Eagle Is Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following speaks for itself:

OBITUARY NOTICE

American eagle is dead. Long live American eagle! She died of exhaustion, caused by loss of blood resulting from the thousands of parasites sucking her lifeblood. These parasites proved fatal to American eagle.

American eagle resisted gallantly until her last breath. She fought for her life; but, the thousands of blood-sucking parasites were too much for American eagle to survive.

American eagle was done to death by parasites known as: "5 percenters," "muscle-inners," "traitors," "homosexuals," "pinkos," "sex perverts," "gangster politicos," "RFC grafters," "deep freezers," "gimmick patrioteers," "mink coaters," and thousands more parasites, of like species.

Turkey buzzard, the bird with the red beak, will be successor to American eagle.

American eagle was a faithful bird. She was 175 years old, when done to death by parasites. She always flew high. She never winked her eye.

American eagle's passing will be mourned by millions, including American soldiers, wearing the uniform of their country; and laying their lives on the line "that freedom and liberty might not perish from the earth."

This obituary notice is being sent to friends of American eagle, everywhere.

Friends will please omit flowers.

JOHN C. CROWE,
Grass-Root American.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Public Speeches by Military Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bradley Utters the 'Party Line'," by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADLEY UTTERS THE "PARTY LINE"—HEAD OF JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF OUTLINES THE VIEWS ADMINISTRATION WANTS GENERALS TO PROPAGATE

(By David Lawrence)

If anything were needed to prove how uneven and unfair the Truman administration has been in trying to apply to General MacArthur its so-called rules or orders about public speeches, a reading of the speech just made by General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, supplies that need.

For General Bradley, though disclaiming that he is making a foreign policy speech, goes on to make a speech which is identical in subject matter with the statements of General MacArthur.

General Bradley, however, utters the "party line"—the views the administration wants the generals to propagate. Presumably they are the honest convictions of General Bradley and are not affected by any fear that, if he expressed himself otherwise, he, too, might be fired.

So what America sees now is a system whereby only what the Government puts out can be spoken. There is no such thing evidently as a pro and con debate by the military men about our military situation in the world. They can only say what they are told to say. Hence much of what they do say will be discounted as political in the sense of following a "party line" and not really a military judgment on subjects on which there are obviously differences of opinion. The people will never get the truth that way.

General Bradley himself, moreover, was contradictory. After noting that the Communists in Korea were building up for another drive, he said in his speech:

"There is no assurance that even when this attack is dispelled that the war will be over."

Having, therefore, confirmed what General MacArthur has been saying—namely, that a "stalemate" is in prospect unless American troops can defend themselves against air attack by bombing the enemy bases—General Bradley goes on to say:

"If at all possible, Korea should be settled on the present battleground."

But who will assure any settlement in any place? The enemy which is building up its drive as immunity is given to its own air bases in Manchuria, or the UN forces who are compelled to stand still and take day-by-day punishment without moving forward to win a victory? What soldier ever advocated such a doctrine before to explain 60,000 casualties?

General Bradley does not seem to take account of anything the enemy may do to our troops in Korea, as most soldiers would, but simply contents himself with the statement: "Fundamentally we Americans are apt to become impatient with a situation that has no foreseeable conclusion. We all would like to know when the war in Korea will be over."

That is a masterpiece of understatement. It reflects the whole floundering viewpoint of the administration today. For General Bradley has no answer except to continue negotiation in this world-wide conflict as long as possible.

General Bradley takes his political cue directly from Mr. Truman in making the following observation:

"Enlarging the battle to a full-scale war is never an economical or morally acceptable solution to a limited conflict."

But who limits the conflict? The aggressors who are supposed to be defeated or the defenders who are supposed to stand still indefinitely?

The plain implication is that General MacArthur deliberately wants to provoke a large-scale war. There is not a word of proof to back up such an allegation. General Bradley makes a serious mistake in swallowing the political chatter of the administration when he adopts the assumption that our troops in Korea are to be attacked but not permitted to defend themselves with maximum force.

The crowning irony of General Bradley's speech is in this disclaimer:

"In outlining my thoughts on this matter, I have no intention of entering the foreign policy field or even urging a particular policy in the conduct of foreign affairs. Conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility. But a soldier can often see strategic perils that the layman might overlook."

General MacArthur, too, saw those perils. He also claimed that he was discussing not foreign policy but only military policy and its strategic perils. But he was fired because he ventured to differ. He did not know that in America freedom to speak by Government officials was accorded only to those who follow the party line.

Someday the Voice of America had better reexamine the glowing things it says about the virtues of free America and concede it is talking fiction when it says an opposition view is not suppressed in America and that purges cannot happen here.

Civilian Supremacy in Our Constitutional System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared today in the Washington Post. The letter deals with the importance of civilian supremacy in our constitutional system. It is signed by a group of distinguished American political scientists, including the President of the American Political Science Association, Professor Peter Odegard.

Mr. President, this is not a partisan document. Both Democrats and Republicans are included among the signers. For this reason I wish that all thoughtful Americans could have the privilege of reading this brief but eloquent statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR AND THE CONSTITUTION

It is General MacArthur, not President Truman, whose actions have imperiled the basis of our constitutional system. The Declaration of Independence, in listing its complaints against George III, contains these words: "He has affected to make the military independent of and superior to the civil power." That was one of the issues which made our forefathers decide to create a new Nation and organize a new system of government.

The Constitution of the United States, over whose drafting George Washington presided, declares with unmistakable clarity that the President is Commander in Chief. All military officers swear an oath of allegiance to the Constitution which automatically requires their obedience to the directives of the President. To argue for or to act upon any other view is to be subversive of the Constitution.

Policy in international relations is determined in our country by the officials whom the people elect and send to the Congress and to the White House. It is not to be determined by Army, Navy, or Air Force commanders.

This principle holds good, irrespective of the party in power for the time being. It would apply with the same force if the President were a Republican and a military field commander were a partisan of the Democrats.

Indeed, it was precisely this situation which confronted Abraham Lincoln, and he met it in precisely the same manner. To hold otherwise is to lay this Republic open to the dangers of Caesarism, and to discard twenty-five centuries of political experience in the Western World.

We, the undersigned teachers of political science, including both Republicans and Democrats, stand by this fundamental principle of democracy and of the Constitution that civilian authority must always be paramount over military authority. Considering the facts that are of public record, we think that the President, who has sworn in his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, was left with no alternative but to dismiss General MacArthur.

Peter H. Odegard, Charles Aikin, Frank M. Russell, Victor Rosenblum, Joseph P. Harris, Julian Towster, T. A. Bisson, Joseph D. Lubin, Henry L. Janssen, Glenn Tinder, Jr., Lloyd Fisher, Robert A. Scalapino, Leslie Lipson, George A. Lipsky, Dwight Waldo, Yosal Rogart, Samuel C. May, John W. Baker, Rogers Hoffman, Robert A. Hayton, Hans Kelsen, Rhoten A. Smith, Ivan M. Ponedel, Christopher Dyer-Bennet, Cheryl J. Petersen, Samuel B. Bloom, Robert J. Pitchell.

SAN FRANCISCO.

"Why Is My Son Fighting in Korea?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written and published by David Lawrence

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on the subject of why American boys are fighting in Korea:

"WHY IS MY SON IN KOREA?"

(By David Lawrence)

The mother of a boy twice wounded in Korea asks this writer: "Why is my son fighting in Korea?" The question was not a protest, but an earnest search for a definition.

American boys are fighting in Korea—

1. Because the sacrifice being made in Korea can save millions of young men now at home—the 18-year-olds, the 16-year-olds, the 12-year-olds—sparing them the necessity of fighting another world war.

2. Because from those who fought at the Marne and Chateau-Thierry, in Tunisia and at Anzio, in the Battle of the Bulge, at Midway, on New Guinea, Guadalcanal, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa—from those brave men there has been passed down the responsibility to preserve the American tradition for which so many of them died. This generation now is demonstrating in Korea that a great nation, untainted by the materialism of territorial ambition or the greed of conquest—having twice fought for principle and laid down its arms without a single act of selfishness toward its allies or a single act of dishonor toward its enemies—still will fight for principle and the cause of humanity.

* * * * *

4. Because an attack against free men anywhere is a menace to democracy everywhere. A readiness to meet the aggressor in Korea can deter the master of that same aggressor from precipitating a larger-scale war elsewhere.

5. Because America cannot allow the aggressor to come by sea or air or land to our shores. If aggression were to be successful in Korea, the Russian-Chinese alliance could then invade Japan and its northern islands and secure air bases for attack on nearby Alaska. If Northwest territory were threatened, so would our own Pacific coast cities soon be threatened, too.

6. Because America must mobilize her strength and not risk the defeat that can come if the whole free world is conquered and the total resources of our present allies are then appropriated by our enemy and its satellites for a final strike against us.

* * * * *

9. Because it is essential to the peace of the world that an international organization, such as the United Nations, stimulate a will to peace, and this means also a will to fight against aggression. Unhappily among our allies it has been questioned whether a shell-shocked populace can regain the will to fight. What we do in Korea can revive the fighting spirit of European peoples and demonstrate to peoples everywhere that the American will to fight for a just cause has not perished.

10. Because the American boys who fought and came home and the boys who never came back from World War I and World War II will have fought in vain if there now is a disintegration of spirit, a dissolution of the great moral purpose that guides brave men to give their lives in a noble cause.

11. Because, just as Christianity does not condone the suicide of the individual, Christianity rejects the suicide of the state—the basic fallacy of pacifism.

12. Because we are our brother's keepers and because, as we see a drowning man struggling to reach the shore, the instinct is to go to his rescue. What that instinct means to the individual, it means to a nation whose greatness today, as in the past, is still sublimated by an unselfish effort to relieve human suffering and to emancipate men, women, and children from slavery. On the battlefields of Korea our youth is saving our own democracy from its sins of materialism and its indulgences and making it strong again. And it must be strong to insure the survival of the forces of good in the world and their triumph over the age-old forces of evil.

13. Because the troops in Korea and the airmen and sailors nearby are the crusaders of our time—crusaders for justice and crusaders for the rights of freemen to live in this world free from fear, free from the perennial terror imposed upon us by evil men.

14. Because the brave youth in Korea are putting to shame those thoughtless brethren in Britain and France and even in America who begrudge the dollars and pounds they now must forego, who worship the false gods of creature comfort even as the battalions in Korea, despising such weakness, lift their faces to the next ridge with the immortal courage that makes them worthy of man's finest accolade.

"The Hundreds of Thousands of Communists Now Buried in Korea, Where Our Entire Force Numbers Less Than Enemy Fatalities, Evidence the Foolhardiness of Launching an Attack by Ground Troops Without Proper Air Coverage and Power"—Gen. Carl A. Spaatz

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the preponderance of thought of the Members of this House is that the first line of national defense is our Air Force. They furthermore believe what Joseph Stalin stated to Winston Churchill while the Battle of Stalingrad was still in progress, when he said:

The bravest of all troops are helpless if they lack adequate air protection.

Moreover, every thoughtful Member is in agreement with "Tooey" Spaatz when he said:

The hundreds of thousands of Communists now buried in Korea—where our entire strength was even less than the number of their dead—gives evidence to the foolhardiness of the Communists launching an attack by foot soldiers without proper air coverage.

The Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force, even in his capacity as a private citizen, has for many years been one of America's greatest exponents of maintaining an adequacy of air power for the peace and security of this Nation.

There has never been any difference of opinion whatsoever between the Secretary of the Air Force and Gen. "Tooey" Spaatz, ex-Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, whom General Eisenhower once characterized as "the world's greatest air strategist."

Secretary Finletter and "Tooey" Spaatz have worked hand-in-hand to achieve "air supremacy" for these United States—and to do so at the minimum expenditure of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress are now concerned with a manpower bill—and the struggle is still on with respect to the number of troops that we are to send to Europe. It seems appropriate, therefore, that I should extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the article addressed to me by my son, Rob, as published in the Air Force Magazine of April 1951—by Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired.

General Spaatz' article entitled "The Airpower Odds Against the Free World," freely discusses the reliance which the military is placing on the number of divisions of ground troops we are sending to Europe—with apparently little or no thought going toward building up our Air Force commensurate with the tactical and strategic strength needed to support the ground troops.

The article by General Spaatz is not alone thought-provoking—it was downright disturbing for me to read that—

In the United States, arsenal of democracy and leader of the free world, we are looking backward and groundward in our military thinking. We are more sentimental than practical in our allocation of manpower for defense, inconsistent and lagging in our scheduling of military and related equipment. We seem reluctant to profit by the military truths gained from hard-won experience in World War II, and blind to the military truths emerging from the Korean campaign. In our approach to the mission in Western Europe we may be betraying not only the youths we would draft for those battlefields but also the war-scarred people of Europe who once again live under the gun.

It is high time we face some facts and live up to them.

Our ability to win this battle and properly support our troops cannot be gaged by looking down and counting our doughboys on the ground, but only by looking up and counting the Russian planes in the air.

Most of the principals in the great debate have finally concluded that it is useless to attempt to match the Russian ground army, man for man. That is rather an obvious deduction, but still a sign of progress. In counting our airpower needs, however, our leaders are left with no alternative. They must out-match Russia in numbers of modern planes, and must build aircraft toward that goal.

To meet the Finletter Commission's survival recommendations—the airpower production needs are more than double the estimated number of aircraft that will be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of the 95-group program—more than triple the estimated number of aircraft must be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of an air battle with Russia is still another story.

It is because you all know "Tooey" Spaatz and Tom Finletter—know their sincere love of country and devotion to duty—that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the article published in the April issue of the Air Force Magazine, entitled, "The Airpower Odds Against the Free World."

The article reads as follows:

THE AIRPOWER ODDS AGAINST THE FREE WORLD—WE ARE LOSING THE BATTLE FOR COMMAND OF THE AIR AND PROTECTION OF OUR TROOPS IN EUROPE—WE ARE LOSING IT IN WASHINGTON—THE RESULT MAY SPELL DISASTER

(By Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired, chairman of the board, Air Force Association)

"The Germans were able to concentrate in this area great reserves of aviation, and in the air in the ratio of 2 to 1. We have

nc' enough fighters for protection of our forces from the air. Even the bravest troops are helpless if they lack air protection."

In these words, written October 5, 1942, Marshal Stalin commented to Winston Churchill on the Battle of Stalingrad then in progress.

It has often been said that the Russians will never forget Stalingrad. It hasn't been said often enough that Stalin and Russia will never forget, as a result of Stalingrad, the helplessness of ground troops under air attack, the deficiencies in fighter aircraft, the lack of air superiority—and their meaning in modern warfare.

If Stalin and Russia need current evidence of the plight of ground troops when air superiority is lacking, they are finding it in their Korean experience. The hundreds of thousands of Communist dead in this campaign are grim testimony to the fallacy of launching a surface attack without adequate air cover. Certainly, had Stalin not had every reason to believe that the United States would not retaliate against aggression in Korea, he would hardly have become a party to this aggression. While he now permits Russia's satellite forces to be slaughtered in Korea without air protection, we can be sure he will never allow such a situation to prevail whenever his own well-trained troops might be involved. The Korean experience, it is safe to assume, has stimulated Russia's interest in air superiority to new heights.

The Russians are realists. Are we? Is the free world approaching the threat to its very existence with equal realism? In the answer lies the hope for the future of western civilization.

I must report, on the basis of the evidence available, that unless we call a halt to the present trend, shift our gears, and take off in another direction, that hope is thin indeed.

In the United States, arsenal of democracy and leader of the free world, we are looking backward and groundward in our military thinking. We are more sentimental than practical in our allocation of manpower for defense, inconsistent and lagging in our scheduling of military and related equipment. We seem reluctant to profit by the military truths gained from hard-won experience in World War II, and blind to the military truths emerging from the Korean campaign. In our approach to the mission in Western Europe we may be betraying not only the youths we would draft for those battlefields but also the war-scarred people of Europe who once again live under the gun.

It is high time we face some facts and live up to them.

We must recognize, first of all, the so-called great debate over American divisions for Europe for what it really is—more a diplomatic than a military argument. We must settle the issue with dispatch—provide the minimum divisions required to give the western powers the courage to build up their own strength—and meanwhile get on with other matters more vital in the long run to the people of Western Europe as well as to ourselves. And we must get on with them quickly, for time is running out.

There is no questioning the fact that the free world must be unified, virtually at all cost, to prevent and if necessary to combat further Russian aggression, and if this demands four more American divisions, or whatever number General Eisenhower deems necessary, on the Continent, it may well be a worthy investment. But we must not delude ourselves for a moment that these ground divisions, even if magnified in number many times, will give the powers in the Kremlin a single sleepless night.

Wall-of-flesh strategy is not the answer to our problems or to the problems of Western Europe. It is, in my opinion, the sure way to disaster. And yet, it is the prevailing philosophy in Washington today.

While our leaders are sapping their time and energy over how many ground divisions to send to Europe, over the minimum age of our new draftees, and similar problems, the only deterrent we have to Russian aggression, the only real preventive to all-out war in the world today, goes wanting for lack of adequate attention.

We have created a mental bomb shelter in the belief that our superiority in atomic weapons is the full measure of this deterrent force. It appears easy to forget that a superior atomic stockpile is useless without superior atomic bombers and without a superior air defense to help protect both the stockpile and the bombers. If we remember at all, we take final refuge in the B–36, seemingly unaware of the few B–36's we have on hand and equally unaware of their weakness in sustaining power. We seem undisturbed by the fact that Russia has the motive and the capability for producing intercontinental bombers more modern than those we are now operating, and can be counted on to produce them.

The strengthening and modernization of our own intercontinental bomber fleet must be our first military priority—come what may. Against the military requirement, we are proceeding far too slowly.

While we pursue the wall of flesh philosophy, we are losing the first and crucial battle in any possible war with Russia—the battle for command of the air.

All our responsible military commanders know that command of the air is the first priority of modern warfare. Air superiority, as a prerequisite to all military action on land or sea is inherent in the operational doctrine of all our Armed Forces.

Yet, if she so desires, Russia can command the air over Europe and Asia.

Though we have known and lived with this cold fact since the end of World War II, it becomes a startling revelation when we see it before us in cold print. Let us consider what it means. Let us think back to May 10, 1940, when Hitler began his blitzkrieg of the Low Countries and France. The Allies had 155 ground divisions in the field at that time, well trained and well prepared—for the wrong kind of war. Hitler did the job with far less ground strength (it is reported that 60 percent of the German fighting was accomplished by 10 Panzer and 5 motorized divisions) but he also had command of the air. German superiority in tanks played a major role in the campaign, and this gave new emphasis to tank warfare. Out of World War II came the military axiom that "the only answer to a tank is another tank." And yet, as was reported in the last issue of this magazine, fully 75 percent of all enemy tanks destroyed in Korea have been destroyed from the air. We must proceed cautiously with these axioms from World War II.

It should become known by one and all that the ground divisions the free world hopes to muster by the end of 1952 in Western Europe, if called upon to fight, must do their fighting without the protection that comes through command of the air. Let us consider what this might mean.

In Korea where we enjoy air superiority—at Russia's discretion, of course—our casualties number some 60,000 against hundreds of thousands of enemy casualties. And we now know that 47 percent of these enemy casualties have been attributed directly to airpower. Thus, in a situation where air superiority is not ours, we must be prepared to think of the enemy's casualty rate in Korea as our casualty rate in Western Europe, and perhaps magnified somewhat. We must consider whether the countries of Europe, already torn by the ravages of a recent war, are capable of accepting such casualties. And we must consider whether the mothers of America are prepared to accept them.

In the hands of Russia, command of the air leaves Europe naked and paralyzed, no matter how many ground divisions the free nations may be able to put in the field.

In the hands of the free world, command of the air becomes, not only war-tested insurance that ground action has a fair chance to succeed, but also an added deterrent to Russian aggression (since realistic Russia knows it cannot win without air superiority).

Yet, command of the air over Europe and Asia has been lost to the free world since the end of the last war, and will continue to be lost to it for some time to come. If there is a surer way to national suicide, in a world threatened by international bandits, I have yet to hear about it.

This is a good time to explain—as it seems so necessary to do when discussing air power these days—that air power's priority position in modern warfare in no way implies that air power can do the job alone. The American Navy, now the most powerful in the world, must be kept the most powerful in order to fulfill its important mission in any war with Russia; and the Navy can contribute to the air superiority mission, particularly in the Pacific theater. The American Army, it should go without saying, is equally vital. Let there be no mistake on these points. But we must see the three services in their proper perspective. In a war with Russia there is not, for example, the remotest chance that our ground forces can defeat the Russian Army by coming to full grips with all its divisions. The Russian Army must be strangled by the bombing of the industries behind the troops, the industries supplying them with the weapons of war. Our own ground forces, outside of some local attacks to secure specific positions, must be considered as a supporting force holding the air bases from which we pound the life out of the heart of the Russian military machine. Any other concept is, to my mind, dangerously unrealistic. War with Russia, should it come, will be decided by air power supported by surface forces, and not by surface forces supported by air power. We must recognize this relationship before it is forced upon us by the hard facts of combat.

The battle for command of the air begins, not over the battlefield, but in the White House, in Congress, in the press, on the drawing boards, and on the production lines. In these spheres of military activity (and in a democracy they are all of that) we are certainly losing the air battle to Russia.

We are losing the air battle, first, because our thinking is muddled with regard to the basic requirements, the true goals, in this battle. There is, for example, a dangerous tendency in this country to approach the question of air support for ground troops in terms of the number of ground troops to be supported. We hear, even among Air Force people, that we can provide the necessary support aviation only after we have determined how many ground divisions we will have to support. This is the type of thinking apparently being applied to the military build-up for Western Europe. Establish the ground strength available, so this reasoning goes, then slap an air umbrella of protective aircraft over the heads of the troops as they check in on the Continent—much as you issue them dungarees and mess kits—and you have created the "unified" air-ground team.

This may be the way to get the team, but it is hardly the way to keep it alive.

The air support of our ground troops, in Western Europe, in Asia, and anywhere else in the world, does not begin with the air umbrella over the battlefield. It begins at the source of trouble, the enemy's homeland, and with our only conceivable threat to that source—our strategic air power. And simultaneously it begins with the battle that will determine, in the long run, the personal fate and military contribution of both the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

airmen in a B–36 over Moscow and the doughboy in a foxhole in Berlin—the battle for command of the air.

Our ability to win this battle and properly support our troops can be gaged not by looking down and counting our doughboys on the ground, but only by looking up and counting the Russian planes in the air.

Most of the principals in the "great debate" have finally concluded that it is useless to attempt to match the Russian ground army, man for man. That is rather an obvious deduction, but still a sign of progress. In counting our air-power needs, however, our leaders are left with no alternative. They must outmatch Russia in numbers of modern planes, and must build aircraft toward that goal.

The current furor over how many divisions for Europe, from a military standpoint at least, is not the primary point to be argued. Whether we send 4 or 400 divisions to Europe, we must first build and maintain air strength capable of mastering the air strength of Russia. Without this mastery, Western Europe becomes a huge trap for our soldiers and for the soldiers of all the free nations. Without it, our mobilization efforts and mobilization dollars will be wasted.

In our preparation for the battle to command the air we can find little refuge in our stockpile of planes in storage from World War II. Only a few of the light bombers now in mothballs might be utilized in this battle and they will not be adequate much longer. This part of the air-power job calls primarily for fighter aircraft and the thousands of reciprocating fighters we have in mothballs will be useless. This will be a job for jets because Russia has them by the thousands.

An evaluation of our position in an air battle for Western Europe must begin with a comparison of our jet-fighter strength and that of Russia. We can eliminate from the figuring our jet fighters which must be held in Korea or in other parts of the world, depending on the situation of the moment, and those we must hold in North America for the air defense of our homeland, and we cannot depend for several years at least on other nations of the Atlantic Pact providing us with many jet fighters for the air battle. The few jets our allies will be able to produce, even under the best conditions, will be sorely needed for their own local air defense. Great Britain especially will need all the jets she can produce and then some for the defense of her own shores, within which lies some of the free world's most important air bases.

There are many other factors, of course. Quality of equipment and quality of manpower are two important ones, and in neither of these categories should we sell Russia short. As the engineering battle rages today behind the scenes for command of the air, we can find little solace in the knowledge that Russia is building her jet-fighter fleet with the help of and from the designs of some of the world's greatest fighter-plane experts—the German scientists and technicians she obtained as booty from World War II. They put the first combat jets in the air and in 1944 were at least 5 years ahead of the rest of the world in jet-fighter development. Perhaps we have overcome this technological lead, but it would be faulty military thinking of the first order to depend and plan on it. As for the Russian airmen, we know enough about them to judge them with respect; our superiority in this field, if one exists, must not be overemphasized in our planning. All in all, we can presume—but not count too heavily on—a qualitative edge in this battle for command of the air, and this is more than outweighed by Russia's vast quantitative superiority.

The problem resolves itself, of course, on the production lines of America. Here it becomes evident that as a nation we are not taking our own best advice or even meeting our own production programs, much less matching Russia's output.

With the billions appropriated for the military, it is hard to believe that we are not building an air force of the strength recommended as far back as 1948 by the President's Air Policy (Finletter) Commission as a minimum requirement for survival in the air age. It is even harder to believe when we realize that this committee's report preceded evidence of Russia's atomic developments, the Berlin airlift and the war in Korea. And yet, the fact is that we are not measuring up even to this survival program.

True, it has been announced that we are shooting for a 95-group air force by the end of 1952. And the President has announced that we will increase our aircraft production five times by the end of 1951. But let us weigh announced production objectives against production line facts.

Jet engines are the key to our air-power production effort. Shortly after the President's announcement, a leading engine manufacturer stated bluntly that we could do no better than triple our aircraft production by the end of 1951. At the current rate of expansion programing, we will be fortunate to achieve two and a half times the production rate in 1951, and again in 1952.

Our 95-group program is moving slower than planned. We cannot possibly realize it by mid-1952. And even if we could, this program would not equal in numbers of planes or in sustained striking power the 70-group air force recommended by the Finletter Commission. The reason, of course, is that the Commission's program calls for sizable aircraft and manpower reserve—all told, an air force totaling 97 groups, including 27 in the Air National Guard, all equipped, trained, and ready for immediate action in the event of war, plus 34 adequately equipped groups in the Air Force Reserve. The 95-group program, which will absorb virtually all organized Air Reserve and Air Guard groups available, obviously does not call for such reserve strength.

By pulling planes out of mothballs we would have enough aircraft to equip, in numbers, a 95-group air force by the end of 1952. But this would be providing an air force half equipped with obsolescent planes. And we would still be faced with the basic problem of providing by that time sufficient trained personnel.

In terms of the modern planes needed to match Russia in the air—the only terms worthy of consideration—we are building the equivalent of a 50-group air force through 1952.

What are our air-power production needs? To meet the Finletter Commission's survival recommendations—more than double the estimated number of aircraft that will be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of the 95-group program—more than triple the estimated number of aircraft to be produced for the Air Force this year. To meet the requirements of an air battle with Russia is another story.

But this is the only story that holds the key to command of the air and, therefore, to the defense of Western Europe. And it is the only story that counts for our ground troops who, however brave, as Russia learned at Stalingrad, "are helpless without air protection."

That we are not preparing to give our troops, and those of the other free nations, even the minimum air protection they deserve, by all the rules of modern war, is apparent in the production deficiencies now staring us in the face.

The air-power odds we have created and continue to create against the ground forces being built up for the defense of Western Europe are nothing short of appalling. From the best available published figures, it can be concluded that in numbers of front-line modern aircraft available for an air battle over Western Europe today, Russia holds at least a 10 to 1 margin; and on the basis of our present production tempo, even if we assume no increase in Russia's current air strength (an implausible assumption used only to emphasize our own position) it can likewise be concluded that the free world will still be on the short end of at least a 5 to 1 margin in Western Europe at the end of 1952. And even this doesn't reveal the true measure of Russia's air superiority in Western Europe, for we must assume that her air strength includes, in addition to front-line aircraft all crews that qualify for such an air battle, and a reserve of planes and crews, also qualifying, as replacements against combat attrition. By the very nature of our air-power buildup, such reserve strength cannot be assumed, under present programing for our own Air Force.

Let us think for the moment of only the front-line odds, of what it means to be outnumbered 10 to 1 or 5 to 1 or even 2 to 1 (as Russia was outnumbered at Stalingrad) in a struggle for command of the air. Think of what it might mean to our troops down below, to the tide of battle in Western Europe, to the whole war effort of the free world.

In these air-power odds against us, we find the cold, hard facts of modern war, of inadequate mobilization—of potential disaster.

There can be no more fiddling with our air power. With wisdom and courage we must strive for command of the air. It may not yet be too late, and whether it is or not, we have no alternative but to go after it. We must not deviate from our goal. We must use all the skills and tools necessary for the job. And we must conquer, at the very outset, the one real barrier that faces us. Before we can broaden our mobilization base to achieve command of the air, we must first broaden our mobilization thinking. This is the crucial step in the air battle, and we must take it today.

The MacArthur Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished and respected columnists in America, Jack Bell, of the Miami Herald, has just written a brilliant, sensible analysis of the MacArthur incident. I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to read this article and to especially note the admonition of this eminent journalist that humanity and world peace must be placed ahead of partisan politics.

The article follows:

THE TOWN CRIER
(By Jack Bell)

Our President has fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It had to be. The aging MacArthur who has made his own rules in the Far East for a long, long time had to go or the United States had to scrap the United Nations.

MacArthur was supreme military commander for United Nations. All my Army life—and I've had my share of it—I've heard them say, "As a military man it isn't my duty to shape the policy. My job is to carry out the orders of the State Department and the President."

General MacArthur has gone far beyond that. He openly criticized our State Department, as well as France, England, and other United Nations governments with troops in action in Korea.

More than once, at first surreptitiously then openly, MacArthur has demanded that our Navy be used to ferry Chiang Kai-shek's troops from Formosa to an invasion of southeast China; even when he knew the diplomatic corps felt that would lead to a general war in the Far East.

As a military government ruler in postwar Japan, MacArthur seems to have done a fine job. As a field general or battle strategist, he has shown very little. In World War II we can understand he hadn't the men or equipment to stop superior Jap forces, and that ultimate defeat of the Japs was largely a naval task. But in Korea, MacArthur's tactical mistakes have been obvious, tragic, and too well known to escape censure.

I can understand MacArthur's wishes. He is a soldier, and he realizes the impossibility of defeating the enemy with the men and tactics at hand. In the soldier's code, any war should be all-out war, and that is what he demanded. Our President and leaders of other United Nations governments are working on the premise that all-out war should come only when every possible alternative has failed.

WORLD IS THE STAKE

It has been obvious for some weeks that other United Nations governments were not going along with this all-out war policy. So President Truman, although I believe he agrees with them, virtually had to demote MacArthur or withdraw from United Nations. It is inconceivable that the United States is going alone into a general war with China, which, in fact, means China with Russia as a supply base.

As for the United States political aspects of the MacArthur removal, they make me ill. American troops are dying. American young men are going into service by the hundreds of thousands. Our Nation, our world, is the stake.

And the Republicans rise up and yell en masse. The Democrats pretty firmly support the President. The writers in Washington get the political aspects into the first paragraph of their stories.

Can it be possible that all Republican leaders really want an all-out war with MacArthur in command, or do they think this will help them in the election? And do the Democrats all feel this was the only move, or are they fearful it will help kick them out of office? Is no one in Washington thinking of humanity first, world peace rather than election to office?

Don't forget, in the meantime, that MacArthur has been replaced by a great soldier, a thorough gentleman, a true American, and, I'm sure, a pretty shrewd diplomat. I predict a great change for the better in the Far East diplomatic friendliness toward this Nation. And God knows we can use some.

A Golden Opportunity for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Golden Opportunity for General MacArthur," by Anne O'Hare McCormick, published in the New York Times this morning. In this article, Mrs. McCormick shows her customary brilliant insight in her advice to our great returning soldier.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR

It seems impossible for Americans to talk about anything but General MacArthur, and his triumphant homecoming adds to the general absorption in a single theme. This is an extreme example of the familiar phenomenon that the public cannot get excited over more than one sensation at a time. Other events on the world scene are just as importunate as they were, but they fade into the background like figures on a stage when the lights focus on one spot. In this case the appearance of the general in person steals the light from the political conflict that rages around him and fixes it on the soldier. As he emerges from the clouds of distance and controversy and steps on the home ground he is not so much a burning issue, or the commander relieved of his posts, as he is the conquering hero returning from the wars amid the plaudits of his countrymen.

The all-American welcome is to the great captain of the Pacific campaign. The President has done his part in accenting the soldier's role by clearing the way for a demonstration in the capital and canceling a speech he was to have delivered on Thursday to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in order not to detract from MacArthur's Day.

SIGN OF CONTRADICTION

There are many anxious Americans who wish that the general could hold that note. He comes home to a country rent by angers and dissensions and frustrations. He comes at a moment of crisis when the defense of the free world rests mainly on the United States. The people he has not seen for fourteen years have changed in the interval; they are at once more mature, sobered by the knowledge of what they have to do, and more uncertain, confused about how the heavy task is to be accomplished. Between conflicting counsels at home and pulls and tugs from abroad—all inspired by the same hopes and fears—they are in danger of losing the sense of direction, and the sense of proportion, which will determine the course of many nations besides our own.

General MacArthur comes as a sign of this contradiction. He can add to the confusion and uncertainty. The circumstances of his recall and the time of his return make him the storm center of differences wider than divergences on war policy, and pettier and more partisan than a great Nation, ready to respond to clear and confident leadership, can afford to indulge in at an hour when it must make national and international decisions of crucial importance. He can easily become the means of aggravating these differences, the shiny new instrument of a stale party opposition that works to weaken a policy the majority of Americans have supported at every test vote, and undermine our position in the world.

General MacArthur could do something else. He has not spoken since he was relieved of his commands, and what he intends to say in addressing Congress and the Nation in Washington tomorrow is still a matter of guesswork. He may defend his own course or he may speak in general terms and wait until later to expound the views in regard to Korea and China which put the commander in the field in open opposition to the policy of the United States and the United Nations.

But as a student of history and a lover of drama what an opportunity he has to make history and drama on the grand scale. He has the power to turn the present anticlimax into the climax of a brilliant career. A high American official of the United Nations, developing this theme a day or two ago, grew eloquent in pointing out the electrifying effect it would have if the General could bring himself to say that nothing mattered so much as American unity in the face of danger—neither the President nor himself, neither Republican nor Democratic political strategy, neither personal ambition nor personal grievance. "What an occasion it would be," said this official, "if MacArthur confounded his critics by refusing to be the storm center of debate and becoming the rallying point for national unity."

Such a course would confound the general's supporters as well as his critics. It seems a little beyond the bounds of probability and human nature. The debate on foreign policy, which now involves preparation for peace or war, is likely to go on, whether or not MacArthur allows himself to be used as the Big Stick for the Republicans who want to stop the fighting in Korea one day and extend it to China the next.

THE GREATEST SERVICE

The point is, however, and it will doubtless become clear to the general as he hears at close range the true voice of America, that the country as a whole is already unified behind the policies we are now pursuing. The doubts and confusions of today are not on the central issue of who or where the main adversary is and what we have to do first to save ourselves and a world in which it is possible for free men to live. The misgivings are on the competence of our political leaders, on how to end the Korean stalemate, how to deal with the irritations that are inevitable in partnerships between unequal allies. The problem today is to reunify the people around a policy which has already been accepted because there is no viable alternative.

We are where we are for lack of another place to go, another line to follow. The need is not for debate but for a clear restatement of the principles and limitations which dictate our policy. General MacArthur could perform the greatest of all his services to the country by recognizing these inevitables and persuading admirers to follow him.

Famine in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Making Communists," and an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "A Race With Death," both of which were reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., in the Washington Post on April 10, 1951.

These editorials point out that our continued failure to relieve the impending famine in India is a serious blow to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

our moral position throughout the world in the struggle with communism.

In reprinting these excellent editorials the International Latex Corp. has again performed a public service by calling attention to the urgency of a pressing world problem.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING COMMUNISTS

(An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor)

Some Members of Congress who, on paper, are most passionate anti-Communists have found an extremely effective way of making Communists. It is to let 100,000,000 people in India go hungry while Americans sit tightly and comfortably on a stored surplus of wheat amounting to several times the famine need in that land.

Congress has had before it since February 12 a recommendation to give India a needed 2,000,000 tons of grain besides the roughly 2,000,000 tons that nation is buying in the United States and 2,000,000 tons it is buying elsewhere.

Meanwhile, a great deal is said in many quarters about convincing the rest of the world of the advantages of democracy and free enterprise, about "selling" capitalism instead of communism.

In the State of Bihar in India the grain ration has been reduced below nine ounces a day and is considered less than enough to assure survival for long of those who depend on the ration alone. Relief of such conditions takes weeks even after shipment of grain is authorized, and other provinces are approaching similar distress.

In such circumstances discussion of ideologies becomes academic, but Communist incitement and agitation thrive. So great an American as Senator Borah, an authority on the United States Constitution and its importance, said in 1934, "The people can't eat the Constitution."

The people of India cannot satisfyingly fill their stomachs with preachments on freedom and opportunity if they have not the opportunity to eat. It rests with the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to put on the Legislative Calendar a bill which would give them a little nourishing evidence of the free world's efficiency and its interest in their fate.

A RACE WITH DEATH

(An editorial in the Washington Post)

It is not pretty to watch Congress dawdle while the specter of famine hovers over India. Even if legislators act with all possible speed to approve the bill giving India 2,000,000 tons of grain, it will be a close race. The grain must be sent to ports, and ships must be broken out of storage; it has been impossible to keep them ready on a standby basis. Yet unless grain is in Indian hands by June, a breakdown in the rationing system is likely; already the people are on a 9-ounce minimum ration, and even this is not available in some areas. President Truman, in his request to Congress in February, put April 1 as the deadline for delivery of the first million tons.

The depressing part of the affair is that it has become confused with all sorts of side issues. First, objections were cited to Prime Minister Nehru's attitude on Korea; then there was talk of making the grain a loan, although India is in no shape to repay it; then India's embargo on certain strategic materials—monazite and beryl—became a stumbling block. This newspaper believes, as respects the latter point, that the American position on access to strategic materials ought to be made quite plain. But none of these factors is reason to deny or delay the grain. It is not in the American tradition, when a stricken person asks for food, to demand to know first how he voted in the last election.

As the Washington Federation of Churches has pointed out in a letter to Speaker RAYBURN, indifference to starvation is "an evil not to be tolerated by Christian conscience." Help now would be "a merciful weapon in our struggle against communism" and would "do much to heal the widening rift between this country and India." Yet while Congress dallies, Russia has made propaganda by offering to sell India 50,000 tons of wheat, and Communist China—itself faced with starvation in many areas—has capitalized on the American delay by offering a million tons of rice. They are doubtless phony offers, both of them; but they make good propaganda, and are pathetic illustrations of India's desperation.

There is reason to believe that the House Rules Committee, which has been sitting on the bill, will report it out when Speaker RAYBURN believes he has the votes to pass it. The test cannot be put off longer, and we cannot believe that if the issue is placed squarely before House Members, they will turn it down. This country would be harmed as much as India if Congress should turn its back on both a moral obligation to humanity and the opportunity to strike a blow in behalf of stability in India.

Let's Count a Few Noses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Mr. King Cady in the Newberg (Oreg.) Graphic:

LET'S COUNT A FEW NOSES

As the great debate still surges across the country it appears that in Washington, at least, some of the fine-feathered pronunciamentos are beginning to hatch out a few brass tacks.

A principal area of contention which recently has become specific is whether or not we should send additional divisions to Europe, and if so, how many.

Senator TAFT is leader of a congressional group which believes that some European nations are only half-heartedly preparing to defend themselves, and that the United States should have certain guaranties—i. e., divisions in being—before we dispatch additional troops.

Administration spokesmen, on the other hand, contend that all European nations are proceeding satisfactorily to organize defense forces, and that no limit should be placed on the number of divisions to be sent overseas.

The question that immediately arises is: Who is talking through what hat? Obviously, both sides cannot be right.

Although the Graphic is far from convinced that additional United States divisions are necessary, or even wise, in Europe, the attitude of the various United Nations members toward stopping Soviet imperialism seems painfully apparent in the present Korean war.

Recently the Graphic wrote Representative WALTER NORBLAD, of the First Oregon Congressional District, and asked him to obtain actual percentages of each of the United Nations in the Korean theater. Mr. NORBLAD secured the information from Secretary of Defense George Marshall, pertinent extracts of whose letter are quoted below:

"The United States Army, in furnishing the preponderance of men and munitions in the action in Korea, has contributed 43 percent of the ground force personnel; the Republic of Korea, about 43 percent; Great Britain, over 3½ percent; and Turkey, 1½ percent. (Eight other) nations * * * furnished under 1 percent (each) of the ground forces. * * *

"The United States Navy is providing 85 percent of the naval strength now operating in Korean waters. * * *

"The United States Air Force is furnishing * * * 95 percent (of the aircraft)."

It is apparent from Secretary Marshall's figures that, aside from the South Koreans, Uncle Sam is carrying the great bulk of the load.

Although the allied members of the United Nations have voted both Red Korea and Red China to be armed aggressors, it does not appear that they are in any great hurry to back up their judgments with fighting men. Such forces as they have sent to Korea are purely token forces useful for securing a voice at the conference table after the blood has been shed.

Although it must be assumed that the European nations would be far more willing to raise divisions for the defense of their homelands than for close-in fighting in a far-off Asiatic country, it does not seem amiss to ask, Exactly how many divisions actually have been raised?

Before Harry S. Truman is given a blank check to disperse America's fighting men over the face of the earth, we should require a few specific answers to that question.

Dangers of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Maryland Action Guild, a group of Catholic men pledged to fight communism, and a resolution adopted by them at their meeting on Monday night. I am bringing this to the attention of the Members, so they may realize that many of our citizens are aware of the terrible danger of communism and are actively working to fight it.

The letter follows:

MARYLAND ACTION GUILD,
Baltimore, Md., April 17, 1951.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution which was adopted at a meeting of our membership, with about 400 present, on April 16, 1951.

Read this resolution and give it your most earnest consideration. We are gravely concerned that there are indications that our Government is actually considering a negotiated peace which involves the handing over of Korea and Formosa to the Reds, and the recognition of Red China in the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. O'NEILL,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE MARYLAND ACTION GUILD, MEETING AT ST. IGNATIUS HALL, APRIL 16, 1951

Be it resolved, That every member of the Maryland delegation to the United States Congress be advised of our earnest desire that he do everything in his power to insure—

1. That the United States Government will not permit the present, or any other, Communist Government of China to have any voice, directly or indirectly, in the shaping of the peace treaty which will determine the fate of the Japanese people.

2. That the United States Government will not give its assent, tacitly or otherwise, to any agreement or arrangement whereby the present, or any other, Communist Government of China will acquire any control of, or jurisdiction over, Formosa.

3. That the United States Government will not grant any recognition to the present, or any other, Communist Government of China.

4. That the United States Government will resist any effort to install a Communist delegation in China's place on the Security Council of the United Nations, even, if necessary, invoking for that purpose the veto power of the United States.

Asia Military Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Gun Jumped on MacArthur," by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUN JUMPED ON MACARTHUR—HEAVY HAND OF DIPLOMATS IS RECOGNIZED BEHIND BRADLEY'S SPEECH ON ASIA MILITARY POLICY

(By Constantine Brown)

Before General MacArthur had an opportunity to speak to the American people in his address to Congress tomorrow the administration jumped the gun.

In a speech in Chicago the soldier's soldier, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, attempted to steal the former supreme commander's thunder by stating—without mentioning General MacArthur's name—that Asia military policies advocated by some would jeopardize world peace.

General Bradley is recognized by all as a first-class field commander. He is a well-disciplined soldier who obeys without murmur the orders of his superiors. During the bitter argument which brought about the dismissal of Admiral Louis Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations in 1949, he toed the line indicated by his civilian superior, Defense Secretary Johnson. He denounced the plans for a strong naval air arm and for an increase in the Marine Corps and described the advocates of strengthening those branches as Fancy Dans.

General Bradley's speech was cleared by the White House and the State Department. Those familiar with the views and the style of the latter can see the heavy hand of our diplomats in General Bradley's exposé of our objectives in Korea. The five-star general summed them up as follows:

"1. Protect and maintain our form of government and our way of life against any challenge."

These are magnificent words. But from the practical point of view we did not have to go to Korea, nearly 8,000 miles away, to do so. We went to Korea, ideologically, to repel aggression. Practically, however we went there to prevent the Communists from gaining a vitally important, strategic objective which would have been a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan, where we had four occupation divisions.

President Truman ordered the sending of forces to Korea before the United Nations concurred. Of course, he knew that that organization would not oppose such a step once our Government decided on it, particularly since it was obvious that we would bear the brunt of the campaign.

The "police action," as President Truman described it at that time, had little to do with the "protection of our form of Government and life." If Korea had not been vitally important from the strategic point of view we may have acted as we did in the case of other Russian ravaged nations—deplore it but do nothing about it.

2. Gen. Bradley stated—and once more the heavy hand of the State Department becomes apparent—that in Korea "we seek peace by every means at our command, but there will be only one price we won't pay—appeasement."

We have sought peace in Korea for several months. The State Department was disposed to accept the humiliating terms provided by the United Nations truce team and by the Arab-Asian bloc. These approaches were not dignified by even an answer from the Peiping government. General MacArthur, who now is accused of jumping the gun on the State Department when he asked the Red leaders to hoist the flag of truce or accept dire consequences, was honored with a negative answer by his enemies.

Since that time the British have been active in attempts to settle the Korean problem. The terms are well-known now: The Chinese Communists are to be a party to writing a Japanese peace treaty: Formosa is to be handed over to the Peiping puppets. If that is not appeasement, what is it?

It is true that the State Department has turned down this British proposal as unacceptable. It is difficult to conceive how else Secretary of State Acheson could have acted, considering the high tension which exists throughout this country over our Asiatic policies.

3. The third bromide incorporated in General Bradley's speech by the State Department writers was that our objective in Korea was "to assure peace not only for ourselves but for all other nations. For this reason we support the United Nations."

The latter sentence is true, insofar as we are concerned. But there is little noticeable support for us in that organization. Britain's late Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, spoke in a similar vein after his triumphal return from Munich. People believed then that appeasement was conducive to peace, regardless of what happened to the little fellows at whose expense the appeasement was made.

General Bradley also stated that the use the Reds have made of their air bases in Manchuria to date has not warranted United Nations bombing of them. This is somewhat of a misconstruction of General MacArthur's recommendations.

The former supreme Allied commander urged the bombing not of Red air bases but of their military installations and lines of communication in Manchuria, whence they supply their fighting forces with reinforcements and equipment. And that is an entirely different thing from the use of their air bases, which are of only relative importance.

Truman's Dumbest Act, His View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, a letter by Mr. J. Webb Saffold, of Cleveland, Ohio, which appeared in the Cleveland News on Monday, April 16, 1951:

TRUMAN'S DUMBEST ACT, HIS VIEW

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

SIR: The real reason that Truman fired MacArthur is that the American general refused to lose the war in Korea to the Communists.

His accusers say that he overstepped the bounds and so should be removed.

What bounds?

Who laid them down?

You should know by now—the Kremlin laid them down through our State Department, or is it theirs? The Reds set out to get MacArthur 2 years ago (according to Louis Budenz) because he was the last obstacle to their taking over all of Asia. Dean Acheson wins again and the Red tide rolls on.

This typically Truman act was the dumbest of all the dumb things that Truman has done while encumbering the high office of President for three reasons.

First, the people of America realize that MacArthur knows more about the Far East than all the other top military brass put together, and, while they are under Truman's thumb, MacArthur is not.

The people trust MacArthur and they do not trust Truman and Acheson.

Second, kicking MacArthur out is the hardest blow to the morale of our 250,000 boys fighting and dying in Korea, as well as the troops of all the other nations standing with them in the freezing mud under the pale blue and white banner of the UN.

Third, it is a terrible blow to the Japanese people, who trusted MacArthur as they have never trusted any other westerner. They now feel that the Communist hordes are closing in around them and that no one will stop the Red flood. That puts in jeopardy all the billions we have poured into Japan since World War II, and all of the blood of our 50,000 dead, wounded, and missing in Korea.

By this act, "Pendergast Harry" impeaches himself, because the Truman administration is corrupt and pro-Communist and has been since the very start, and it grows worse with every passing hour. Now the whole rotten record must be paraded before the American people in full detail so they can read between the lines and remember it forever.

It is the most perfidious record of any administration in the entire history of our great Nation. The New Deal-Fair Deal-"Snare Deal" has sold us out from Yalta to Tehran and from Tehran to Potsdam, and from Potsdam to the scuttling of China to the Reds by Acheson and Marshall, backed by Truman; on down to the war in Korea, which would have been avoided but for the betrayal in China. And now we have the firing of MacArthur to complete the tragedy.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It is all one continuous trail of treason and corruption with more thousands being added to the Government payroll already staggering under a burden of gold bricks who draw your money and do nothing but draw it.

This racket is being perpetrated upon you to build up the payroll vote for the election of 1952 to try to continue in power an administration that is already licked, but which is spending our Nation into bankruptcy on the Lenin plan which underlies the Brannan plan and all the other plans peddled to you by innocuous names at your expense by the Socialistic sell-out on the Potomac.

You must know by this time that the State Department has functioned more as an arm of the Kremlin than a department in the United States Government.

We cannot win the war against communism with that kind of leadership.

We cannot prevent world war III by winning or losing military stalemates in Korea, or by putting up just enough opposition to lose the world to communism in the foreseeable future. The will-o'-the-wisp of a negotiated peace is the bait that you are supposed to take to continue this losing battle.

Our only hope is to change the leadership—and MacArthur should be able to help us clean house in Washington.

J. WEBB SAFFOLD.

Republicans and MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, April 18, is well worth the consideration of every Member. It presents an enlightened and objective analysis of a situation which could develop such divisiveness and partisan strife as to seriously affect the national interest in a time of great emergency.

The editorial follows:

REPUBLICANS AND MACARTHUR

The return of General MacArthur to this country presents the Republican Party with an issue which it can legitimately exploit to its great advantage. At the same time it confronts the party with dangerous temptations. Upon the way the Republican leadership acts in these crucial days depends in no small measure the whole political line-up for 1952. The degree of discernment and statesmanship it shows will determine whether it is to be an unbeatable force or profoundly divided and demoralized.

The sudden dismissal of MacArthur brings into dramatic focus the lack of direction and the confusion of policy which have characterized the administration throughout the conduct of the Korean hostilities. Neither President Truman nor his aides made clear to the country the objectives of our fighting or the outlines of a settlement. In addresses since the general's recall the President has, it is true, thrown light upon the general situation. But he did this tardily, after the crisis between Washington and Tokyo had become insoluble except by the most drastic means; meanwhile a vacuum had been allowed to exist. MacArthur was thus inclined to supply the missing leadership. Truman's final act in removing MacArthur was unavoidable; but that the situation should have been permitted to deteriorate to this point was not unavoidable by any means. On this score the administration bears heavy blame, and the opposition has a chance to bring it home to the whole country.

The opposition, besides, has the opportunity, as well as the obligation, to see that General MacArthur is given a hearing in secret committee as well as before the Congress. It is more than likely that a full airing of our conduct of the Korean War and of our far-eastern policy will reveal much that is damaging to the administration. Matters will be brought to a head, and the Republicans will be lacking in political sagacity and resourcefulness if they do not press their advantage.

There are limits, however, beyond which the Republican Party can go only at risk of creating deep divisions within its ranks and of stirring up a strongly adverse reaction among the public. Those limits were exceeded by the irresponsible cries for the President's impeachment—now happily subsided. They will be exceeded if the party adopts General MacArthur as its spokesman on foreign affairs, follows after him blindly, and tries to elevate him into a political force. It is one thing for the party to maintain that our policy in Asia could have been pursued more effectively; it would be another, and infinitely dangerous, thing to identify itself with the idea that Europe is to be sacrificed in an attempt to win a decision against communism by general warfare in the east. There is, we believe, no real sentiment for this view in the country, and there is none in the Republican Party, except among a small minority of extremists. Against these extremists the Republicans must now be on guard. For they have the power to darken as hopeful a future as the party has ever faced.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having introduced the first bill providing for the creation of the RFC, and having fought for its enactment, I endeavored to get the floor to congratulate the President on the appointment of Mr. Stuart Symington as the Director of this great Government agency and to set forth some important facts concerning its operation, in view of the unwarranted criticism and attacks made recently and the talk about abolishing the agency.

Consequently, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

I hope you Members who have the interest of the small-business man and the country at heart, and want the real facts about the operation of the RFC from its beginning, the loans made, the losses taken, the profits made, will read my remarks.

During the last few weeks a great deal of publicity and criticism has been leveled at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The charge has been made that influence was used to obtain favorable action for certain applicants for loans. Later on it was brought out that many Members of Congress had also asked favorable consideration for applicants. I venture to say that there is not a Member of Congress, either in the House or Senate, who has not been importuned, at one time or another, to obtain aid and to urge speedier action on applications filed by constituents or firms in his district or State, and this is entirely natural as part of the duties of a representative of the people. I know the investigation now under way of the letters written by Members of the Congress to the members of the Board in behalf of their constituents will disclose nothing improper. Of course, there is no doubt but that many people have also, in desperation, turned to the White House for aid. There is nothing strange in that. What I have been interested in for years is that loans should be made, and that is why I proposed the creation of such a lending agency in the Government years ago.

I admit that some loans were made that received a great deal of critical publicity, such as the Lustron loan. It must be kept in mind, however, that at the time this loan was made there was a very great and serious demand by the people of the Nation for low-cost housing and it was felt this firm could provide this much-needed housing and at low cost, which unfortunately miscarried.

But let us take up the history of the RFC from the very beginning. When the great crash descended upon the Nation in 1929, during the Hoover Republican administration, and thousands of small-business men and manufacturers found themselves faced with bankruptcy and the complete closing of their plants, I prepared and introduced a bill, H. R. 5116, in the Seventy-second Congress, in 1931, providing for the creation of a National Relief Finance Corporation to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States. Unfortunately I was unable to convince a majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, who, under the influence of Mr. Ogden Mills, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Republican President Hoover, took the position that my bill went too far and that it should wait until the following year, which was a Presidential election year. However, in the meantime, the Republicans submitted their own bill, which was approved by the committee and passed by the House. President Hoover vetoed the original bill, insisting that a provision be inserted that no loans be granted to municipalities or States unless such loans were for self-liquidating projects, which denied to the municipalities and States the opportunity to proceed with their plans to provide employment by building many necessary facilities. The bill was amended and finally passed, becoming effective January 22, 1932.

President Hoover then appointed Charles G. Dawes, Republican Vice President under Coolidge, of Chicago, as the first president of the Corporation. It is significant that one of the first loans made under the act was to the Central Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, Mr. Dawes own bank, in the amount of $85,000,000. While this and other huge loans were made to banks and financial institutions and helped save many of them from complete collapse, it had also been agreed

that aid would be given to the thousands of smaller banks throughout the country that were caught in the crash, but this the banker representatives on the Board failed to do. Mr. Dawes resigned as head of RFC when the loan to his bank was consummated. Shortly after his departure Jesse Jones became Chairman.

Mr. Jones, who was appointed by President Hoover as a Democratic member of the Board and naturally was made chairman following Mr. Dawes departure, together with his banker friends, unfortunately, completely controlled and dominated the RFC. He and his brothers and nephews exercised vast control over banks, hotels, apartment houses, and business institutions upon which loans were made by the Corporation. He was the Board.

I read with amazement that Mr. Jones is now advocating the abolition of the RFC. Is he fearful that the new chairman, Mr. Symington, will follow the same selfish methods that he, Jones, employed while directing the RFC by appointing his relatives as receivers and trustees of properties upon which loans are made?

In the early years of operation very little consideration was given to the needs of small business. However, huge loans were made to the great life insurance companies, nearly all of which were insolvent, and to the railroads, and big business which had been milked dry by the promoters and stock-market operators. The Government had to bail them out through RFC. Small business received no help whatever.

With the inauguration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt the picture began to change. The act was amended in 1935 to include aid to small business. I shall dwell a little more in detail on this later in my remarks. I should like to call your attention now to the following summary of loan activity of the RFC and its subsidiaries from the date of its incorporation to December 31, 1950, as compiled by the Corporation:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries—Summary of loan activity from dates of incorporation through Dec. 31, 1950

	Authorizations		Amount disbursed	Amount charged off	Outstanding at Dec. 31, 1950[1]	
	Number	Amount			Number	Amount
Loans and securities:						
Industrial and commercial enterprises, including national-defense loans	61,622	$4,744,878,243	$2,313,597,283	[2] $63,572,516	7,058	$435,567,640
Railroads	355	1,259,402,287	1,137,731,375	19,124,315	24	107,876,721
Financial institutions	20,663	4,799,741,953	3,900,106,730	38,537,766	440	102,581,332
Political subdivisions of States and Territories	6,198	1,510,508,487	1,265,789,393	9,094,422	337	22,519,161
Catastrophe	26,315	61,444,880	49,441,685	3,523,614	834	4,089,784
Other loans	2,004	417,303,822	285,292,315	214,221	1	43,600
Foreign governments	3	495,000,000	460,000,000		2	97,607,509
Subtotal	122,540	13,288,279,672	9,411,958,181	134,064,854	8,696	769,684,747
Insured and guaranteed (FHA and VA) mortgages	513,777	3,564,836,804	2,244,046,866		18,496	91,909,197
Subtotal	636,317	16,853,116,476	11,656,005,047	134,064,854	27,182	861,593,944
Other U. S. Government agencies	110	4,268,089,665	2,997,208,962			
Grand total	636,427	21,121,206,141	14,653,214,009	[3] 134,064,854	27,182	861,593,944

[1] Exclusive of 4,741 deferred participation loans outstanding, RFC's share $97,054,254.
[2] Includes Lustron Corp. charge-off of $35,500,000.
[3] Exclusive of provisions of $59,374,949 and $5,737,061 for estimated losses in collection of direct and deferred participation loans, respectively, outstanding at Dec. 31, 1950.

You will note from this summary the tremendous volume of loans made to financial institutions and railroads. The railroad loans average almost $4,000,000 each, while those to financial institutions average well over $1,500,000. To the credit of the RFC you will note that on a total of slightly more than $14,500,000,000 disbursed during all of these years, only $134,000,000 has been charged off as loss, which represents a loss of about 1 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to another compilation prepared by the RFC, which is a summary of business loan authorizations and amounts written off, divided into two classifications—loans of $500,000 and less, and loans of more than $500,000:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

EXHIBIT A.—*A summary of business-loan authorizations, and amounts written off, by size of loan authorized*

CUMULATIVE THROUGH DEC. 31, 1950 [1]

[Dollar figures are in thousands]

TOTAL NUMBER AND AMOUNT APPROVED—CUMULATIVE THROUGH DEC. 31, 1950

	Loan authorizations of $500,000 or less		Loan authorizations of more than $500,000		Total authorized	
	Number	Gross amount	Number	Gross amount	Number	Gross amount
Business loan authorizations, including mining loans, loans for national defense, and direct mortgage loans made by RFCMC	60,016	$2,392,000	1,006	$2,885,000	61,022	$5,277,000

TOTAL NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF LOANS WRITTEN OFF—CUMULATIVE THROUGH DEC. 31, 1950

	Loans written off of $500,000 or less		Loans written off of more than $500,000		Total written off	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Business loans	1,300	$13,546	20	$24,130	1,320	$37,976
Mining loans (including national defense loans)	615	6,466	1	1,173	616	7,639
National defense loans (other)	77	2,244	4	15,714	81	17,958
Total	1,992	22,556	25	41,017	2,017	63,573

[1] Detail of loans written off for the period July 1, 1950, through Dec. 31, 1950, not yet available.

These figures are very significant. They show that some 60,000 loans of $500,000 and less were made to small business, aggregating $2,400,000,000, with an average of about $40,000 per loan. They also show that about 1,000 loans were made over $500,000 for a total of about $2,900,000,000, averaging about $2,900,000 per loan. The compilation furnished me also indicates very clearly that after Mr. Jones' departure as Chairman the volume of small business loans increased greatly.

The figures in the table above definitely indicate that it is not small business that has distorted the picture of RFC operations. Rather, they point out that aid to small business is sound; that it is necessary in thousands of cases; that the average small-business man is honest and trustworthy and highly deserving of the assistance of his Government in time of financial need. There is no way, of course, of measuring the great benefits that have accrued to individual communities and to the Nation as a result of this assistance given to small business. In virtually every case private banks and lending institutions refused to care for the needs of these honest businessmen, so vital to the community life of our Nation. In making these loans to small business, RFC fulfilled the true and original purpose which I proposed, and has contributed immeasurably to the preservation of free enterprise, a sound economy and real service to the rank and file of our people.

During all of my years of service in this House I have fought for the small-business man and his welfare. He is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the backbone of our economy. He is in almost daily contact with the millions of our population, honestly endeavoring to render service at a modest return for his labors. If it be socialism, as my Republican colleagues continually charge, to lend a helping hand to small business when financial stress occurs and relief is denied by the normal channels of credit, the private banks and financial institutions, then let them make the most of it. It is, and always has been, my firm conviction that honest and efficient Government has a major responsibility in protecting the economy generally by stepping in with assistance to this small-business man when he is denied such aid by those who purport to be the only ones endowed with the right to handle such financial problems but fail to do so.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the RFC has made some questionable loans. What financial institution has not? But when the above figures and tabulations have been studied carefuly, it is very clear that the history of the RFC has been one of great service to our economy; it has served a most useful purpose in bolstering our business activity in time of need. Its record of losses is a very favorable one, judged by the great volume of business it has transacted.

This hue and cry about favoritism and influence in connection with the operation of this Government agency is nothing new. I have heard it raised time and again over the years. My Republican friends are cautiously silent whenever the question of huge loans to their favored friends in big business is concerned. There is no criticism from them of the use of this agency and its resources at this very moment by the big steel interests in securing certificates of necessity aggregating almost $2,000,000,000 to expand their plants, under terms of amortization through tax favoritism which virtually turns these huge sums over to them scot free. This will provide them with additional facilities at the taxpayers' expense for future use in reaping tremendous profits at the expense of the rank and file of our people. With the tremendous surpluses they and other corporations now possess, and the great profits they made in 1950, amounting to over $1,300,000,000 for 10 of the largest steel companies, they were fully able to meet this cost of plant expansion without calling upon the Government for this great handout. Their voices are raised to the high heavens, however, when loans are made in good faith for the purpose of providing decent housing for their workers or to small-business competitors. It is a matter of record that nearly all of the very large loans made by the Corporation have gone to Republicans or to Republican institutions.

Yes; I favor calling to account any Government agency that exercises poor judgment in the handling of taxpayers' money, but I resent very strongly the argument and the demand that this great agency—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—should be abolished simply because the big banks and private financial institutions ask it, or that it be placed under the domination of the Republican minority in Congress simply because several errors of judgment may have been made by the Board.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the RFC has a definite and vital role in our economy. It must be continued as a source of relief to small business. Greater leeway should be given it to care for the needs and requirements of small business—financial assistance which is constantly being denied it by the so-called normal channels of borrowing in time of stress.

My Republican colleagues are constantly taking credit for the formulation and creation of the RFC. And yet, as I stated previously, there is hardly a single instance of a loan being made while under Republican control to small business. As I stated before, as soon as the Corporation was created, it was used by the Republican President of RFC., Charles G. Dawes, to take care of his own institution to the tune of millions, and the record is very clear that that original loan has not, to this date, been fully liquidated. There is still a balance due of over $9,000,000.

What was the role played by this important agency during World War II? During this period the RFC built and leased more than 2,000 plants and other facilities to aid in the war effort. No word of complaint was raised by the opposition over its activities when the very life of this Nation was at stake. Among the plants constructed were those for the development and production of synthetic rubber, which today has made us almost completely nondependent upon the Asian sources of crude rubber. This great feat could never have been accomplished if we had depended upon private industry to finance the job. It provided funds for the Texas tin smelter, the only tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere, for which we recently authorized additional help during the present emergency. The RFC provided funds for the creation of 62 flying schools and 150 other facilities direly needed to win the war. It had a very vital part in the ultimate victory that was ours during the years.

In my original bill, it is true, I recommended the appointment of five outstanding Americans as directors of the lending agency proposed. They were Mr. William Gibbs McAdoo, Mr. Calvin Coolidge, Mr. Alfred Smith, Mr. Eugene Stevens, of the Federal Reserve system in Chicago, and the Secretary of the Treasury, but in view of conditions today I have favored the President's proposal for a single director. Under Mr. Symington, whom President Truman has just named to direct the Corporation, I feel confident the business of the RFC will be conducted efficiently and well, and that small business will be given every consideration, thus carrying out the original intent of this legislation.

Let me call your attention to this final set of figures to show how well this agency has performed its work. The RFC has paid into the Treasury of the United States in the form of interest on the money borrowed, about $396,000,000. In addition, the Corporation has earned a net profit of more than $600,000,000. It has paid to the Treasury, also, $327,000,000 as dividends on the corporation's stock, owned by the United States and held by it. The original stock was $500,000,000, and it has retired $400,000,000 at par, leaving a capital stock today of $100,000,000.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is my candid opinion there are very few Members who have not been asked to intercede for some small-business institution in his district or State, as I stated earlier. I know I have done so. I interceded on behalf of the city of Chicago Board of Education in the 1930's when the banks refused to come to the assistance of this great city, notwithstanding its school teachers had not been paid for 2 years. The Board, under Mr. Jones' direction, refused this loan. I found it necessary to secure the enactment of special legislation authorizing the Board to make the loan, and I am pleased to state this loan was not only repaid in full, but the RFC made a profit of $225,000 thereon.

I also aided three small-business firms in Chicago in procuring loans and in every instance the loans were fully repaid with interest. Though I, myself, have found fault with the delays on applications for small loans, and the red tape and time consumed before final action has resulted, I have every confidence in the outstanding administrative ability of Mr. Symington and his desire to expedite procedures in the organization to the satisfaction of small business.

Mr. Speaker, when real facts are laid before the American people and the Congress, they dispel the unwarranted political criticisms launched against this important Government agency in particular, and this administration in general.

The President and the General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the syndicated column of Thomas Stokes which appeared in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—We've had letter-writing generals before.

There was Gen. Winfield Scott, who wrote embittered letters about President Polk. "Old Fuss and Feathers," with his plumed hat and gorgeous sashes, was unsuccessfully running for President while he was successfully running the Mexican War.

There was Gen. George B. McClellan, who wrote embittered personal letters about President Lincoln, but privately to his wife. He was running unsuccessfully for President while unsuccessfully running a war.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur matches the other two in the overweening ego that seems to go with some military temperaments. He is beginning to approach them, too, in magisterial epistolary traffic, which appears the inevitable and necessary outlet for such temperaments. He is a successful general, admittedly so, ambitious also for something or other, vindication or martyrdom, though obviously not for the Presidency. That was tried once—in 1948. Now the general is too old.

But we have a new factor in this modern replica of past history that has been generally overlooked.

Why has nobody gone back of General MacArthur and inquired into the propriety of the inspiration for his latest epistle?

Reference is to the letter from Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, to General MacArthur. JOE MARTIN is leader of the Republican Party in the House, and high in its councils generally. He is a former Speaker of the House. It would seem that, as a civilian officer of our Government, he would look to the civilian head of our Government, the President of the United States—whoever he might be or of whatever political party—who also is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and commander in chief also of General MacArthur.

This is a free country—but there are certain proprieties.

Why is JOE MARTIN writing letters to a general in the field under orders?

The answer appears obvious. His letter was the overt act, at long last, to signify something that has been going on around here a long time. That is that an element of the Republican Party is using General MacArthur to strike at the President of the United States. That mixes politics into management of our foreign policy at a critical time and at what would seem a dangerous risk to our national interests.

It feeds the general's ego—and so he acquiesces with that political naïveté which is often also the attribute of military men. The general also is being used by those in the Republican Party who are jealous of General Eisenhower as a possible political figure.

When you analyze the MacArthur disciples in the Republican Party you encounter a strange psychosis. It might be called jingo-isolationism. It withdraws now, as before the last war, from sound and logical policies designed to buttress ourselves around the world against encroachment of friends and allies, and yet goes off in a weird and dizzy dream of a crusade against the whole continent of Asia. There is a sort of Ghengis Khan atmosphere about it, with panoplied legions, pipes and timbrels, streaming off under the flaming banner of General MacArthur, a veritable American Mikado, and with a coleader in the exiled Chinese generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, who has been rejected by his own people.

Of course, there would be no panoplied legions riding brightly accoutered steeds and carrying spears and long swords, but American doughboys, trudging right into the third world war. Military men generally—except General MacArthur—see it as impossible and tragic.

And here at home, while this dream is being nurtured, those who conjure it up are opposing solid and substantial moves to make ourselves strong, including universal military training, and are alienating our allies of the western world who, after all, must be our chief reliance.

Against UMT they raise the argument that it would give too much power to the military. Yet they are building up a glamorous military figure to the size where today he boldly challenges the civilian head of our Government, the President of the United States.

It gets down to as simple an issue as that—a dangerous blow at our traditional civilian control.

At an appropriate time, President Polk summarily removed "Old Fuss and Feathers" Scott. President Lincoln was very patient with General McClellan, who looked good on paper but couldn't win battles, but eventually supplanted him.

President Truman has been most patient with General MacArthur.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received today from Mr. Joe Kornfedder, formerly known as Joe Zach. He was a member of the Communist Politburo for a considerable number of years, was a very close friend of Joe Stalin, repeatedly attended the schools of sabotage and espionage in Moscow, and finally broke with the Communist Party in the middle or late thirties. The letter is one which I recommend to every Member of the Senate as "must" reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13, 1951.

DEAR JOE: So the thing has finally happened. MacArthur is out. It is a wonder that our system, which has produced so many things for the good of man, can stand the corruption, greed, egotism, hypocrisy, and ineptitude to which we are now subjected. I sometimes wonder if even Stalin's sick totalitarianism may not get the best of us while we are the victims of such leadership. This latest action of Truman is right out of the Pendergast bag of tricks. But it may play the role of the lance that pricked the boil and its long accumulated pus; and who knows, it may in the long run be all to the good.

The spectacle of removing a general of MacArthur's stature as one would kick out a bum has really aroused the country. Truman certainly had the worst possible timing for this action. If he had done it while we were being driven back in Korea it would not have had the same effect. But to remove a general in this fashion who, after taking over an impossible military situation turned defeat into victory twice—that is something which an over-patient public could be aroused about.

MacArthur, who with inadequate forces first defeated Stalin's North Koreans and then the highly over-rated Chinese Communist armies, knew all along and has proved what we long suspected—that Stalin's empire is not what it is cracked up to be by our appeasers. I wonder sometimes whether the Acheson-Truman-Marshall axis did not throw the Korean situation deliberately into his lap in order to discredit him, and now that he has pulled a victory out of it, are removing him in order to stop him in his tracks—or do I give them credit for too much intelligence in that?

It is remarkable with what crudeness they did the job. Even a third-rate politician could have done it better. To treat MacArthur like a dog is, amongst other things, the thing that John Q. Citizen resents. They talk about insubordination! They who have sabotaged congressional decisions for years, bypassed Congress in a hundred ways, made a mockery out of law when the law did not suit their purposes, and honored the law only when it served their ends. Only the Costellos could have made an impudence of that sort.

I don't have to tell you how this cabal sickened loyal and true Americans out of office or shoved them to the sidelines for years, both in the civil and military branches of government. You know a lot more than I do how they enthroned incompetent mummies like Marshall and Machiavellian Rasputins like Acheson, not to speak of the man in the White House who learned his ways with the Pendergast mob and brought the lessons he learned there into the presidency. How much lower can one sink?

Had it not been for a MacArthur, there would now be a Kremlin stooge promoted, Tito fashion, in charge of Japan. And that is quite a story, the particulars of which you know. In that case, the Kremlin would have not only China but Japan as well, and with that there would be indeed peace in Asia—Stalin's peace.

I hope all these facts and many more will come out as a result of the latest adventure of the Acheson-Truman-Marshall axis. It is to the everlasting credit of General MacArthur that he resisted them all these years, instead of fading out of the picture as others were made to do and as they tried to make him do thus forcing them to show their hand at the worst possible moment.

As to Truman's speech, that is for the kindergarten. The assumption that Stalin's policy is determined by pantomime gestures of peace on the part of those he is making war against or is preparing to attack, is senile and ridiculous beyond words. Just the contrary is true; if Stalin is ready for world war, then his appetite for such a war will be whetted by Truman's action. Those who speak out of weakness only invite attack when they deal with gangsters such at Stalin. Is it not curious how Acheson and Truman can coo like doves for peace when they address themselves to Stalin, and strike like a lion against those who are Stalin's uncompromising enemies? All that the Acheson-Truman-Marshall axis has done in this case by removing a redoubtable and able enemy of Stalin's, sending this country into a spin, is to whet Stalin's appetite for aggression. Oh, yes. Truman has done another thing; he has mobilized a maximum of opposition against himself, and that may in the long run bring about the sort of unity this country has been in need of for a long time, and hence be the only good result of Truman's treacherous and inordinate action.

With my very best wishes,

JOE.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in view of the soundness of the sentiment expressed in a letter I have received from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Clarence Robison, of Shawnee, Okla., I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAWNEE, OKLA., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.
Hon. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senate.
Hon. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives
of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The bravest and best thing President Truman has done during his term of office has been to remove a field officer who refused to follow the directions of his superiors. This Government in truth "cannot long endure" if such conduct should be tolerated.

MacArthur should not be permitted to come before Congress to attack his superior officers. Unless, of course, impeachment is first ordered by the Congress.

If we are not to be the laughingstock of the nations and of history, in this stern period of our history, we must act like men, and not like spoiled brats, and insubordination should be stamped out. The highest place is the proper place to start.

I trust that MacArthur shall be taken as another man in this case, and his treatment should be as any other officer who refuses to obey orders. As I understand it, he is now at liberty to take the stump on his own, if he wants to, which is the proper place for him to air his views.

The President may be guilty of a lot of foolish things, but this act is not one of them. The very stability of our Nation is at stake here.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE ROBISON,
Attorney at Law.

Massachusetts House Lauds Henry Gillen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution passed by the Massachusetts House of Representatives on the passing of one of the greatest newspapermen in the United States. The late Henry Gillen not only was editor of a large metropolitan paper but he was active in the civic, fraternal, and community life of greater Boston.

He was known the world over for the enlightening and interesting poems that he wrote for his readers, and the general public:

HOUSE LAUDS HENRY GILLEN—RESOLUTION IN HONOR OF LATE EDITOR PASSED

The house of representatives unanimously passed a resolution today in tribute to Henry Gillen, Boston Post executive, who died Friday. It was introduced by Representative Bernard M. Lally, of Dorchester. It was enacted as follows:

"Whereas Henry Gillen, editor of the Boston Post, has passed away; and

"Whereas his death cut short a brilliant newspaper career which he began while a student at college and continued until such time as he became the chief editorial writer; and

"Whereas he will be missed as not only a true and loyal friend by his intimates but by the hundreds who read his lovely verse and enjoyed his keen good sense and literary competency: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby expresses its profound regret and deep sorrow on the passing of one of the Commonwealth's great citizens; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house cause a copy of these resolutions to be forwarded to the family of the late Henry Gillen and the Boston Post."

Labor's Role in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, American labor is playing a great and significant role today in the struggle against communism and is making important contributions in helping to promote our foreign-policy aims. As a result of this development, the Labor Department's Office of International Labor Affairs, in cooperation with the American labor movement, is performing a laudatory task in strengthening the forces of democracy abroad.

This phase of the Labor Department's work is under the guidance of my very good friend, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Philip M. Kaiser. I am particularly proud of Mr. Kaiser's record of accomplishments because he is a native of Brooklyn, where he was born 37 years ago. He is a Government career man, having risen through the ranks of Government service, where he began as an economist with the Federal Reserve System in 1939. In 1946 he moved over to the Department of Labor, where he became director of the Office of International Labor Affairs and last year was named Assistant Secretary. He is the American representative on the governing body of the International Labor Organization and twice headed the United States delegation to the ILO annual conferences.

A very timely and informative article by Mr. Kaiser on labor and foreign affairs appears in the April 1951 issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly publication of the American Federation of Labor. It is as follows:

LABOR AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Philip Kaiser)

The American labor movement was among the first to appreciate the nature of the Communist menace. As early as its 1920 convention, the American Federation of Labor, concerned about the triumph of communism in Russia, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor is not justified in taking any action which could be construed as an assistance to or approval of the Soviet Government of Russia as long as that government is based upon authority which has not been vested in it by a popular representative national assemblage of the Russian people; or so long as it endeavors to create revolutionists in the well-established, civilized nations of the world; or so long as it advocates and applies the militarization of labor and prevents the organizing and functioning of trade unions and the maintenance of a free press and free public assemblage."

Aware of the threat of communism, the American Federation of Labor has done something about it, freely and voluntarily. American labor, by its own direct efforts and by its support of a constructive American foreign policy, undertook to defeat Communist aggression with the weapons of freedom and prosperity.

American unions have given moral and material support to their fellow workers struggling to stave off the Communist virus in other lands. They have sent abroad many of their ablest leaders to carry high the torch of free trade unionism and all that free labor implies for the democratic process.

Trade unionists have been lent to the Government to represent the American people in the foreign service as labor attachés and in the Marshall plan agency. On its own, American labor has stationed some of its officers in Europe and Asia to deliver the message of American labor directly to foreign workers. Historians of the future will, I am sure, pay full credit to American labor for its achievement in giving the democratic ideal meaning and life for the workers of other countries.

As President Truman said recently:

"The story of free American labor, told by American trade-unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials."

The American labor movement has done its magnificent job abroad on its own, free from the dictates of Government. This is part of the great American story. Responsible American citizens, acting through organizations of their own choosing, have seen fit voluntarily to give a major part of their resources and efforts to strengthening freedom in other countries.

It is important for every citizen, and especially for American labor, to understand how our own Government—responsive to the will of the people—is organized to conduct a democratic foreign policy in the present world crisis. Our foreign policy today, both in its formulation and in its conduct, takes account of the vital labor factor.

I have been in the Department of Labor since 1946, first as director of the Office of International Labor Affairs and now as Assistant Secretary of Labor. During this period the international activities of the Department of Labor have developed into an increasingly effective operation.

This is the result of a greater awareness that, in a representative government, labor must be an integral part of what we call foreign affairs. It is a result also of our awareness that democracy can survive only if the Communist challenge to free trade-unionism is defeated. A challenge to free trade-unionism is, at the same time, a challenge to the democratic process.

Two years ago the Hoover Commission made an intensive survey of the organization of our Government. In the course of its study of foreign affairs, the Commission made findings which are of great significance to every American citizen. Our foreign policy, the Commission noted, is positive and anti-isolationist. The United States has embarked upon affirmative programs—full and responsible participation in the United Nations, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, military assistance, point 4—designed to strengthen in freedom-loving nations the

economic and security foundations upon which democracy must build.

A second major conclusion of the Hoover Commission was that it is no longer possible to separate domestic policy from foreign policy. The two are inseparable. Our domestic agricultural policies, for example, have their effect upon the prices of agricultural products in other countries. Similarly, products made abroad by cheap labor are a threat to our own labor standards.

From these two basic concepts—our positive foreign policy and the indivisibility of our foreign and domestic policies—the Hoover Commission formulated its recommendations on how our Government should conduct its foreign affairs. The Department of State, the Commission said, is the President's arm for foreign policy, assisting him in formulating that policy and in carrying it out. But the Commission pointed out that the Department of State cannot do this job by itself. It must rely on other agencies of the Government to assist it both in developing and in carrying out our foreign policy.

Thus, where labor is concerned, the Department of State looks to the Department of Labor for advice and assistance. In the same way, the Department of State looks to the Department of Agriculture in the agricultural field, the Treasury Department in the financial field, the Department of Commerce in the commercial field, and so forth.

That is why the Department of Labor participates in foreign affairs. It is important, I think, for the American labor movement to know what the Labor Department, under the able leadership of Secretary Maurice J. Tobin, has been and is doing in the international field.

Since 1946 the Secretary of Labor has had a Trade Union Advisory Committee on International Affairs. George Meany, Matthew Woll, David Dubinsky, and George P. Delaney represent the American Federation of Labor. They are joined at the conference table by four representatives of the CIO and two from the railroad brotherhoods.

The advisory committee has met periodically with the Secretary and other key officials of the Department of Labor to discuss what the American labor movement thinks on the whole range of American foreign affairs.

Naturally, the primary emphasis is on the labor aspects of foreign policy, but by its very nature that covers pretty much the whole field. For who can limit the scope of labor's interests? Labor is as interested in our policy toward Korea or Soviet Russia as it is in tariffs, internationalization of the Ruhr, or international labor standards.

In the Foreign Service Act of 1946, Congress established the philosophy of a unified Foreign Service broadly representative of the interests of all the American people. The act created a Board of the Foreign Service, to "make recommendations to the Secretary [of State] concerning the functions of the Service, the policies and procedures to govern the selection, assignment, rating and promotion of Foreign Service officers, and the policies and procedures to govern the administration and personnel management of the Service.

Congress specified that the Board be composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. In other words, Congress, through the Foreign Service Act of 1946, gave recognition to the principle that American labor has as large a stake in our total Foreign Service enterprise as does American business or agriculture.

In addition to advising the Secretary of State on the over-all operation of the Foreign Service, the Department of Labor is especially concerned with the labor attaché program. The first labor attaché was appointed in 1943. The number has increased to 31 full-time labor attachés and 18 half-time labor reporting officers, stationed in 46 key spots over the globe.

Their job is to report to Washington current labor developments in their areas. These are vital data in the formulation of foreign policies and programs. The labor attachés also inform foreign peoples about American labor affairs and the role of free trade-unions in our democratic society.

In cooperation with the Department of State, the Department of Labor, through the Office of International Labor Affairs, is responsible for recruiting labor attachés and for working out their assignments abroad. A number of our ablest labor attachés have come from the ranks of organized labor. These men are making a great contribution to the Foreign Service because they combine an intimate knowledge of American labor affairs with a facility for establishing a mutual understanding with foreign trade unionists.

I believe the day will soon come when we will have trade unionists serving as American ambassadors to foreign countries. Even now there are former trade unionists among the chiefs of mission of the Marshall plan agency.

Readers of the American Federationist are familiar with the work of the International Labor Organization. One of its great founders was Samuel Gompers. The ILO is unique among international organizations because it is composed of representatives of employers and workers as well as of governments.

George P. Delaney, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, represents the workers of the United States in this important specialized agency of the United Nations. Charles P. McCormick, president of McCormick and Co., Baltimore, has been elected by the employers of the United States to represent them at the ILO. I am the United States Government representative on the governing body of the ILO and have been privileged to head the United States delegations to the last two annual ILO conferences.

Under the over-all foreign policy guidance of the Department of State, the Department of Labor has primary responsibility for United States activities connected with the ILO. The objective of the ILO is to strengthen the foundations of peace by improving the social and economic conditions of workers throughout the world. The ILO is dedicated to the propositions that "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere," that "labor is not a commodity" and that "freedom of association is essential to sustained progress."

Through the adoption of international standards relating to decent labor conditions and through operating programs, the ILO seeks to improve the economic and social conditions upon which communism and totalitarianism can breed. It has recently created a commission to investigate violations of freedom of association. It seeks to raise the standards of workers everywhere so that our products will not have to compete on world markets with products of other countries produced by sweatshop labor. To the extent that the ILO is successful in this work, our own labor standards here in America are protected.

The ILO is not the only international organization which deals with labor matters. The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has formulated policies on such matters as freedom of association, forced labor, full employment, slavery, migration, equal pay for equal work, the Covenant of Human Rights, and technical assistance. These issues, among others, are of real concern to labor, and the Department of Labor has participated in drafting instructions for United States delegates to the United Nations.

Officials of the Department of Labor have also served as advisers to the United States delegates at meetings of various United Nations bodies. In addition, representatives of the American labor movement have themselves served as members of the United States delegations to UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization.

The reciprocal trade agreements program is a cornerstone of our country's foreign economic policy. This program is designed to provide both national and international economic stability and progress through the promotion of international trade. The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign nations with a view to reducing American tariff rates, within certain limits established by law, in return for reciprocal tariff reductions by other countries. The President, of course, takes no action which would threaten injury to American industry or to American labor standards and employment.

The Department of Labor, because of the effects which tariff actions may have on such matters as the employment and purchasing power of the individual worker, participates fully in all stages of the Government's work connected with the trade agreements program. One of our important activities is to make sure that all international unions know on which commodities the United States intends to negotiate, so that the unions affected may present their views in the public hearings which are held before the Government determines whether or not it will offer tariff concessions on specific items. Another activity is the study of the effects on foreign labor of possible United States tariff reductions, in order to maximize the benefits of free international trade to workers abroad while at the same time protecting our own.

In all of our international activities, through daily contact with officials of the State Department and other agencies, we strive to see to it that the labor aspects of American foreign policy are given appropriate consideration in both the development and the conduct of our total foreign policy.

The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the Department of State, has been conducting exchange programs designed to strengthen democratic forces in other countries on a level where it counts. Two of these are providing technical assistance to other governments and arranging for foreign labor leaders and officials to observe conditions in the United States.

Under the first we have given training in the United States to officials of foreign Ministries of Labor in such fields as labor law administration, industrial safety, labor statistics, women's employment, manpower training and employment service organization. We have also sent out consultants in these fields.

By helping other countries to strengthen their government labor services, we are helping to improve the lot of the individual worker. Recently, for example, two officials of the United States Department of Labor participated in the Bell mission, which President Truman sent at the request of President Quirino to survey conditions in the Philippines. The mission made several basic recommendations to raise the standards of the Philippine worker. We are now working to put these recommendations into effect.

The program of observation in the United States for foreign labor leaders is one with which the American Federation of Labor is familiar. We have looked to American labor to carry out a major share of the task and labor has responded magnificently. This program brings carefully selected foreign labor leaders to the United States to see for themselves what America is like, how our unions operate, how our people live and the

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES

general role of labor in the American community. The American Federation of Labor, on its own, has carried on similar programs.

In many respects these exchange programs are the meat of foreign relations. There is no more effective way to expose the lies and distortions which Communists and totalitarian propaganda have been spreading about America than to have foreign labor leaders see for themselves the truth about our Nation. Only in this way can they know what we are really doing. Only in this way can they come to understand our great democratic heritage.

One of these visitors, when he returned to his native land, made many speeches. Each time he started off by saying:

"What I am going to tell you about America is not what I was told to say by some Government official because I couldn't hear. I don't speak the language. What I am going to tell you I saw with my own eyes and I know it is true."

He then went on to describe labor's role in American democracy, contrasting the lies the Communists had been spreading with the facts he had himself seen in America.

This is an outline of what the Department of Labor is doing internationally. Our aim is to help strengthen democracy abroad and at home. This is our road to peace.

In the grave crisis that besets the world, totalitarian forces are seeking to extend their power. We have learned from bitter experience that the only language totalitarians understand is the language of strength. Our hope for checking the aggression of Communist imperialism lies in creating situations of strength—where people are united behind a representative government and determined to maintain their independence; where people can count on strong support from other free countries and from the United Nations; where people can hope to win a better life by their own efforts.

The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the mutual-defense-assistance pact, point 4 and technical cooperation, and our firm stand in Korea—all these are designed to create situations of strength.

The Department of Labor and the American labor movement have both made significant contributions to this basic aim of American foreign power.

The American Constitution in a Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio annually sponsors an essay contest to make us more conscious of the American way of life and the freedom that we enjoy under our form of government.

I am proud that one of the winners is from the Thirteenth District, and I am including the following essay of James Greenawalt, of Vermilion, Ohio:

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By James Greenawalt, Vermilion, Ohio)

The Constitution of the United States is the unique contribution of America to nation building. Its framers showed the world that independent States could, through peaceful agreement, form a Federal Union in which powers of general concern were vested in the Union, while authority in local matters was retained by the States.

The foresight and wisdom of the framers of the Constitution still amazes us. This instrument, created by these comparatively young men in the midst of a great crisis over 160 years ago, has served our Nation long and well. It truly fits the spirit of the people living under it.

A free people forming themselves into a nation will always have to set down the general principles and rules for a new government. Such a written constitution is not incapable of growth and adaption. Our own is not a dead contract which must be interpreted exactly as the parties who entered into it understood it. Rather, it is a living agreement which develops with time and adapts itself to economic and social changes brought about by our greatly increased population, industrialization, new means of transportation and communication.

The elastic clause of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to legislate on all matters "necessary and proper for carrying into execution" the enumerated powers, makes it flexible to the spirit of the people governed by it and to those who administer it. Ever since the Constitution was framed, it has been undergoing clarification and interpretation.

The Constitution has grown through the years. There have been only 21 formal amendments, the first 12 being added shortly after its framing. An unwritten Constitution has developed through legislation, court decisions, party practices and customs, that is just as strong as the written one in many cases. For example, good legislation establishing Federal courts, administrative departments, boards, and commissions has supplemented the Constitution. The great body of our American law is not in the written Constitution but is to be found in the decision of our courts. The Supreme Court has assumed the power to invalidate acts of Congress which are in its opinion contrary to the Constitution. Party practices have been responsible for the establishment of the President's Cabinet, for the conversion of the electoral college into a party agency, and of the determining by caucuses of procedures and policies of the House of Representatives. Customs in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution have also played their part.

Thus we see that our Constitution has survived the changing times. It has built America into a strong, free nation. It has given us the highest standard of living for the average person found anywhere in the world. It has made us a peace-loving Nation willing to aid other countries in maintaining world peace. It has proved itself to be adequate for past and present needs and it will be able to adapt itself to the future problems and needs of this modern world.

The MacArthur Question—Personalities or Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am now, and have for many years been, an ardent admirer of the military genius of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Through the ages he will undoubtedly rank with the great military commanders of all time.

I think it is altogether fitting that he receive of his country a hero's welcome. I am looking forward to hearing his address to Congress tomorrow. He is certainly qualified to speak on far-eastern affairs, and I am hopeful that his message will be helpful to us in formulating a foreign policy that will be in the best interests of the United States, and that will be helpful in somehow finding a formula that will restore peace to the world.

I personally feel that the issues with which we are confronted are much bigger than that of any personality. I do not believe that we should attempt to make policy decisions upon any basis other than that of fact and principle. Our foreign policy, our military policy, civilian control of the Government, military discipline all appear to be elements of the big question. I hope that it can be resolved on the basis of principle, not prejudice, not personality, not politics. Our 60,000 Korean casualties call on all of us to chart a correct course, to find a sound solution.

As a part of my remarks, I include an article by Alyce Billings Walker from the Friday, April 13, issue of the Birmingham News:

IT SEEMS TO ME OUR MAIN PROBLEM REMAINS DEMOCRACY

(By Alyce Billings Walker)

"My country, right or wrong."

So, I'm going to keep my mouth shut, and pray the good Lord to get us out of the mess that engulfs us.

That, it seems to me, is the best I can do as a citizen. I'll not be a part of the clamoring, hysterical mob behaving just as our enemies would have us do. I'll not take my stand for Truman or for MacArthur, but for the United States of America and democracy as it was conceived by people who placed country before self.

I've read and listened to every scrap of information I could in the last 48 hours. My first impulse, too, was to sit in judgment on one or the other of the two men who have now upset the whole world. I made a list of the merits and demerits of both as recorded in the newspapers, over the radio, and from memory. It added up to the simple fact that I'm neither a Truman or a MacArthur "fan," but for each I have degrees of respect and admiration.

But, out of all the listening, reading, evaluating I have done, there evolved one indisputable fact: The President of the United States and the former commander in chief of the United Nations forces in Korea are each guilty of playing politics when the peace of the world was at stake. For that I cannot forgive them.

Truman is no mental giant, as historians will record. MacArthur is no diplomat, as his well-known temperamental outbursts through the years testify.

But Harry Truman is President of the United States and, as such, was MacArthur's Commander in Chief. I grant you, the latter has been strangely treated, and undoubtedly for political reasons. But so long as he was wearing the uniform of the United States Army, he was obligated to behave as a soldier, not as a leading man with the whole world as his stage.

If he could not conscientiously follow instructions of his superiors, he could have resigned his command. Reputed to be a strict disciplinarian, it seems strange that he should have repeatedly been guilty of what amounted to insubordination.

Time may prove MacArthur entirely right in his judgment of how war in Asia should be conducted—one does remember Billy Mitchell. But I believe he would have guaran-

teed his personal prestige and better protected the interests of his country by resigning on the grounds of maintaining his principles, than by forcing his discharge.

At the moment, he is martyr in the eyes of vast numbers of admirers and with others who can see no right in anything Truman does.

Frankly, I for one am not too interested in individual political martyrs at the moment. I'm only concerned about the thousands of young, unsung martyrs who are being sacrificed on war's altar trying to defend their imperiled country.

Progress in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, commends the Congress for its action in voting out the segregation amendment to the armed service or manpower bill which was before the House last week.

His editorial follows:

NO SEGREGATION IN UNIFORM

The House has taken the only honorable action possible by eliminating the segregation clause from the draft bill.

It was an indirect clause, but it was segregation, just the same. It provided that draftees would have the right to ask assignment to units of their own race.

No such provision was contained in the Senate bill. The House Military Affairs Committee inserted it in the measure by a 21-12 vote, on motion by Representative WINSTEAD, (Democrat, Mississippi). It provided that inducted men's preferences would "govern any future assignment * * * insofar as military necessity may permit." The privilege was to go only to draftees, not to volunteers or reservists.

The clause was a definite repudiation of President Truman's Executive order calling for equality of opportunity and treatment in the armed services. It was 2 years ago that the order was issued, calling on the Secretary of Defense "to take steps to have the remaining instances of discrimination * * * eliminated as rapidly as possible."

The Armed Forces have made progress toward that goal. Nearly a year ago a Presidential committee reported that, "All Army jobs are now open to Negroes. * * * All Army school courses are open to Negroes without restriction or quotas. * * * All jobs and ratings in the Navy general service now are open to all enlisted men without regard to race or color. * * * The Marine Corps has abolished its segregated Negro training units. * * * All Air Force jobs and schools are open to qualified personnel without racial restriction or quotas."

The Army now asserts it has complete integration in training centers, though the color line remains in some combat units. As of last March 18, it reported 11.7 percent of its enlisted personnel and 2.1 percent of its officers were Negroes.

Although the Navy says it has "no special or unusual provisions" as regards race, only 3 percent of its enlisted personnel are Negroes while it has only 19 Negro officers. The Air Force has 5.6 percent Negroes in its enlisted ranks and only 0.6 percent among officers. The Marine Corps asserts segregation is gone but has no figures on Negro personnel "because we don't make race distinctions on service records."

The Winstead amendment was an attempt to undo all this by an indirect attack. It represented the sort of thinking that can't be accepted if we expect democracy to stand up in the conflict with communism. Its defeat in the House, duplicating the defeat of a similar move in the Senate a year ago, is heartening.

Veterans' Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter written by Mr. Miles Kennedy, director of the legislative commission of the American Legion; Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, legislative director of Disabled American Veterans; Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and Mr. Clarence G. Adamy, national service director, American Veterans of World War II. The statement reads as follows:

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress:

We, the undersigned, representing the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II wish to strongly protest the report of the Department of Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives which recommends the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from $1,583,000 to $743,500. The committee expressed its belief that one Federal veterans' representative and a clerk-stenographer for each State and Territory, together with a small headquarters staff, would be adequate. This action amounts to a cut of over 53 percent, and in money, an amount of $839,500. This constitutes a staggering and crippling blow to an already small but hard-working and sincere Government service agency.

The Veterans' Employment Service is mandated by the people of this Nation and the Congress under provision of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to cooperate and aid the United States Employment Service and the State employment services to the end that veterans shall receive the maximum of job counseling and job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. To reduce this splendid, compact, well-organized force of 176 professional field representatives together with the eight professional staff members located in Washington to a shell of some 53 field representatives and a correspondingly smaller unit in headquarters would simply render the Veterans' Employment Service incapable of performing the responsibilities and duties mandated to them by law.

Let us point out that there still remains a sizable future task to be accomplished in terms of employment of veterans currently being trained under programs sponsored by the Government. As of February 28, 1951, the Veterans' Administration cites 1,576,484 veterans in educational and training programs under provisions of Public Law 346. On this same date, there were 93,604 disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation. The majority of these trainees are potential manpower for defense industry or activities contributing to the defense program. The present conflict in Korea and the increased mobilization of our Armed Forces can only result in a substantial increase in the number of disabled veterans who will require job-finding assistance. By late 1951 and early 1952, the Veterans' Employment Service will probably be faced with a situation which will not differ basically from that of 1945 and 1946. Thousands of servicemen will be discharged from service with combat disabilities and additional thousands with injuries resulting from training and other accidents. It will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Employment Service to facilitate their return to civilian life by finding them suitable employment.

Notwithstanding statistics which indicate that there are 62,000,000 people employed today and the labor market is tightening, the fact remains that there are many communities where employment is spotty. Many areas still have relatively high unemployment. Opportunity to materially reduce unemployment in these areas appears to be small because of geographical location, housing shortage, and inability of large number of workers to migrate. The particular problem as we representatives of the veterans' organizations see it is that the Veterans' Employment Service can make a most significant contribution in using its special facilities to gain for the veteran advancement from mediocre jobs to positions which will make full use of the skills he has acquired and the experience he has undergone in training.

The task of rendering special services to veterans in the field of gainful employment remains great. Current operations of and deployment of personnel of the Veterans' Employment Service is servicing efficiently and valuably to the welfare of our fighting men and women upon their discharge from service to their country. We believe that it is absolutely essential that their efforts and continuing positive accomplishments be maintained.

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II at their respective 1950 conventions and encampments mandated full support to the maintenance of the Veterans' Employment Service and its operation of service to veterans in the field of gainful employment. We, therefore, the undersigned, respectfully request that action be taken which will result in the restoration of funds to the full amount as requested by the President in his budget for the fiscal year 1952, $1,583,000.

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director, Legislative Commission, the American Legion.
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director of Legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.
CLARENCE G. ADAMY,
National Service Director, American Veterans of World War II.

Appeasement or a Munich?—No

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing some shrill talk about appeasement or a Munich in the Far East. I have been shocked by these irresponsible

UNIVERSITY OF WILMINGTON LIBRARIES

statements. We must debate the present crisis on the issues and not on emotion or partisan considerations.

The critics of President Truman and the admiinstration are playing directly into the hands of the Communists with their rantings about appeasement. And, at the same time, they are aiding the propagandists of the Kremlin by their talk of war in the Orient.

What do the American people want? They want peace and that is what our President is working for. We are derelict in our duty if we spread hysterical and false statements at this time.

The President is working for peace and the free peoples of the world are behind him. Last June, when the Communists attacked the Republic of Korea, our President made the decision to ask the United Nations to furnish the military force to stop the aggression. This was not appeasement. This was firm, resolute action.

When the Chinese Communists came into the war in November and the outlook was dark, our President and the United Nations did not falter. They declared the Chinese Communists as aggressors. They poured in the men and machines to stop the aggressors. This was no Munich. This action was that of men with the will to fight for what they considered to be right.

The Communists have wanted to take Formosa. Our President has protected that island with the Seventh Fleet. Appeasers would have long since given up Formosa. But, by the action of President Truman not one Communist has set foot on the island.

There have been some in the United Nations who have wanted to give in to the Chinese Communists by allowing them into the UN and by giving them a voice in the Japanese Peace Treaty talks. In spite of the false propaganda by the critics of the President, our Nation has stood consistently against such a deal.

In his speech to the Nation on last Wednesday, the President declared firmly for peace. He said in forceful terms:

> We are ready, at any time to negotiate for a restoration of peace in the area. But we will not engage in appeasement. We are only interested in real peace.
>
> Real peace can be achieved through a settlement based on the following factors:
>
> 1. The fighting must stop.
>
> 2. Concrete steps must be taken to insure that the fighting will not break out again.
>
> 3. There must be an end to aggression.

This, I say, is a real program for peace. Anyone who charges otherwise is guilty only of trying to avoid the truth, and of confusing the people. They are guilty of what the President calls political hokum and they have truthfully put their own personal aggrandizement above the good of their country.

If the truth were known, they are more interested in getting us into a war than in trying to bring about a real peace. They should quit hiding behind their sham of misrepresentation and distortion of the facts.

The Mediterranean—Strategic Road to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth in the RECORD a very excellent article by William H. Hessler which appeared in the April 3, 1951, issue of the Reporter.

I feel sure the Members will find this helpful to bring into proper focus many of the matters on which we will legislate.

The article follows:

THE MEDITERRANEAN—STRATEGIC ROAD TO RUSSIA

(By William H. Hessler)

For any nation that commands the sea and air, the Mediterranean is the highroad to the Soviet heartland. To be sure, Korea and Western Europe are getting the headlines at the moment, and, for the tireless writers of science fiction, the new frontier of the Arctic is a theme of endless fascination. But our military planners are giving some hard thought to the Mediterranean.

In February, American and British naval and air officers met in Malta to plan a stronger, more integrated deployment of their strength in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. About the same time, the United States and France began negotiations to reactivate five wartime air bases in Morocco. The upshot is a program for the rapid build-up of air and sea bases from Gibraltar to the Persian Gulf. Runways are to be lengthened and underground gasoline dumps provided in Morocco, Tripoli, Egypt, Cyprus, Jordan, Iraq, and Iran. Weather-observation stations are to be installed and communications equipment set up—so that America's heavier aircraft can fly from these positions, which dot the Mediterranean for more than 2,000 miles from west to east.

This joint program has been made public. But there are certainly other strategic plans not on the public record. When Red Fleet printed a jittery charge that the United States and Britain are preparing offensive war against Russia's Black Sea ports, it revealed the Kremlin's respect for the striking power of carrier-based aircraft. Russia's defenses against fast, low-altitude, sea-based planes are weaker than those against big, relatively slow long-range bombers.

There is no mistaking the stress put on the eastern Mediterranean lately. Along with the Malta and Paris meetings, there has been a thorough canvass of the entire area by Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter, who, although new in that post, is an old hand at air power. British sent Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, commander of its Middle East forces, to Israel on a mission frankly strategic in aim; and Israel has opened the door to staff talks with American military men. George W. Perkins, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, took a trip to Belgrade at the same time that his counterpart for the Middle East, George C. McGhee, led a procession of high officials, military and civilian, to Turkey, a country pressing Washington for outright alliance.

The biggest conference of military leaders, however, was held in Paris in the first week of March, when General Eisenhower and sundry subordinates met with Admiral Robert B. Carney, commanding our Mediterranean forces; Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations; and General Robertson. Their subject was the organization and use of sea power in the Mediterranean. In the aggregate, these top-level dealings bear witness to the urgency of military readiness there.

The constant search of American military planners is for potential means of bringing air and sea power to bear on the Soviet Union if necessary. They can plan to stand on the defensive in the Far East and on the islands flanking the eastern shore of Asia once the Korean War is ended. They can provide radar warning stations and interceptor squadrons for the defense of North America in the northwest, north, and northeast—the possible danger zones. They can anticipate the path of the main Soviet attack in Europe, because it would have to come on the northern plain that extends from Moscow to the English Channel.

But these are problems of defense, and defense of itself does not win wars. America's most telling weapons for offensive war are aircraft—land-based and sea-based. They range from single-place fighters to the six-engine B-36, and their armament from .50-caliber machine guns to the atomic bomb. The strategic planners find their most urgent and most baffling task in determining how to deploy their offensive power where it would hurt the Kremlin most, support our allies best, and also protect our prime sources of strategic materials and our sea lanes to them.

This search for the means of staging a retaliatory offensive and of supporting valued partners leads military men inexorably to the Mediterranean. That tideless sea can best be thought of as an arm of the Atlantic extending into the heart of the Eurasian-African land mass, the "world island" of the geopoliticians. It is a long, irregular corridor, rimmed completely by friendly or neutral nations (except for the short Albanian coast), reaching nearly to the front door of the Soviet Union. For Britain, after the opening of the Suez Canal back in 1869, it was the supreme sea-communication line, linking the homeland with India and Australasia. Today it has four big strategic uses.

First and foremost, it is an avenue on which air-sea power could be brought to bear against the Soviet Union and its European satellites. Second, it is a sea lane for the logistical support of southern France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey. Third, it is an efficient sea lane to the Middle East and the richest petroleum lands of the world. Finally, it would be a formidable water barrier against a European continent held by the Red army, if it should come to that.

The main body of Europe is a peninsula, flanked by the Baltic and the Mediterranean. In war, the Baltic would be a Russian lake, because the entrances are too constricted and shallow for our penetration, because it is too small for maneuver, and because it parallels the flat northern plains of Europe. But the Mediterranean, with ample sea room for ships to maneuver and with friendly nations all around, contains a series of north-south peninsulas (Greece, Italy, Spain). It is evident that the north of Europe, being a wide corridor open at both ends, is vulnerable to any strong land force, while the south of Europe is cut off from the north by mountains and trisected by projecting arms of the Mediterranean (Aegean, Adriatic, Ligurian Seas). By the logic of geography, in modern war southern Europe must "belong" to the dominant sea power, just as northern Europe must "belong" to the dominant land power.

Our chief political allies are in the west of Europe. The problem there is to create

enough defensive strength to fight a holding war. Our natural geographic allies for offensive action are in the south, in a broken east-west row, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Italy, Spain.

America, as the preeminent sea power, has a relation of mutual dependence with these impoverished Mediterranean states in a strategic deployment ordered by geography. Turkey and Greece are a shield keeping Russia from the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean. Yugoslavia is a shield keeping Russia from the Adriatic and central Mediterranean. Spain adjoins the only reliable entrance to the Mediterranean. Simply by existing as non-Soviet states, these countries make the Middle Sea a viable sea lane for us. At the same time, while we and the British command its waters, the Mediterranean is a highway on which we can bring support to these partners who are not yet (excepting Italy) formal allies. We look to them as buffers for our sea corridor. They look to us for munitions, supply, reinforcement, and air support.

Starting with these geographic realities, we can piece together the main elements of the potential counteroffensive strategy now taking form. Fast carrier task forces would roam the Mediterranean sending fast, low-altitude fight-bombers northward against tactical targets. Land-based fighters and attack bombers would do the same, working from many bases scattered through the islands and peninsulas of the region. The primary task would be to achieve command of the air, the secondary to slow aggressor ground forces.

Medium-range bombers from well-protected bases farther back would fly north and northeast to smash at strategic targets in the satellite states, European Russia, and the vital area just behind the Urals. The planned improvement of British air bases in Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Cyprus, and Tripoli is a clear preparation for such a counteroffensive. Greek and Turkish airfields could serve as forward bases for fighter aircraft—on bomber-escort missions and offensive sweeps.

Just what our heavier aircraft would be able to do from bases in the British Isles or what our monster B–36's could do from their aerie in Texas only actual performance in all-out war can confirm. It would depend on how well the Russians have developed their high-altitude defenses. Long-range bombers would be relied on to deliver main offensive blows at strategic targets in the Soviet Union, but even if these aerial battleships did all that was expected of them, they could not keep the Red army out of Western Europe. Wrecking Soviet tank factories would then be no more important than wrecking Soviet tanks on the move eastward.

Meantime, if Soviet ground forces attacked, merchantmen of the United States and some allies would be plowing eastward through the Mediterranean under antisubmarine escort. This maritime service of supply would bring to our air bases throughout the area the ammunition, fuel, foodstuffs, defensive ground-force contingents, fighter-aircraft replacements, and other items essential to overseas aerial operations. It would bring the nations of southern Europe equipment to sharpen their harrying thrusts northward against the exposed southern flank of the Soviet war machine, a flank that would grow ever longer as the attack moved westward. On this sea route also we might deploy amphibious task forces of great mobility and fire power for special jobs in southern Europe, the Middle East, or (if Red fleet's fears were confirmed) the Black littoral of Russia.

Middle eastern petroleum poses an acute problem for strategic planners, because the oil-bearing regions of Iran, Iraq, and Arabia are not protected by natural barriers against oil-hungry Russia. If we cannot insure the holding of these areas against Soviet troops (a ground-force task of large dimensions), utilizing these oil fields.

Even in the worst conceivable circumstances—seizure and occupation of the great bulk of Europe by Communist forces—the Mediterranean would remain immensely important in Anglo-American strategy. With their overwhelming superiority in sea power, America and Britain could maintain logistical support for air bases in north Africa and on various islands—Crete, Cyprus, Malta, Sardinia. To hold the islands would be an air-sea task. To hold North Africa would require only sea command of the Mediterranean and ground-force defense of a 100-mile front on the Isthmus of Suez. In 1943 Allied victory was accomplished in north Africa mainly because Anglo-American sea power in the Mediterranean tended to isolate Rommel's armies. In reverse, the same sea command could assure the safety and effective operation of air bases in and south of the Mediterranean.

Whether we assume the best or the worst, whether we should manage to hold most of Europe, or lose it, we cannot hang back and trust to the British Isles—Mr. Hoover's unsinkable aircraft carrier and the cornerstone of his cautious strategy of passive defense. Britain lies at the end of the north European plain, separated from it by 18 miles of water. It backs up a purely defensive position. From British bases, we could launch retaliatory bomber strikes against Moscow and Leningrad, and fighter and attack planes for the support of defensive ground forces on the European plain. But if we wanted to win such a war, and not merely go through the motions of resisting, we would do better to work from the British air bases scattered from Gibraltar to the Persian Gulf. Britain's contribution is not merely a cluster of airfields in the home islands, but a series of shrewdly placed positions along the underbelly of Europe, won by centuries of canny diplomacy and stubborn fighting.

The plan for deploying the power of the West in the Mediterranean are new, but they rest on extensive preparation—on 3 years of support for Turkey and Greece, on the resuscitation of Italian naval power, and on Washington's recent rather wary conciliation of the Franco regime. The Mediterranean area has been cultivated by diplomats in advance of its exploitation by soldiers and sailors.

Italian naval power is not to be laughed away. Set against that of the United States, it is trifling—25,000 officers and men (the limit imposed by treaty) against half a million. Forbidden by treaty to maintain aircraft carriers or submarines, Italy cannot pose as a great naval power. But in the Mediterranean, it could contribute the small, fast craft that count for so much in antisubmarine warfare in calm, restricted waters.

Spain enters the calculations of any Mediterranean strategy because a hostile power in Andalusia could endanger our use of the Strait of Gibraltar. The whole edifice of an offensive and defensive strategy for the region would collapse if the guns or planes of a strong enemy dominated the 15-mile-wide passage. Under Generalissimo Franco or anybody else, therefore, Spain needs to be persuaded—and if necessary helped—to defend its own soil. But that is about all the Western Powers really need from Spain.

To make our offensive-defensive Mediterranean strategy effective, political planners must try to gain the active, full-scale participation of two powers not yet woven into the fabric of the North Atlantic alliance—Yugoslavia and Turkey. Their armies, properly employed, could neutralize nearly half the ground-force strength Russia would have initially for an attack in Europe.

The problems faced by political planners, however, are a story in themselves. It is enough to observe, in purely strategic terms, that one down-to-earth fact must guide our political dealings with the Mediterranean states—that Tito's Yugoslavia can help us prevent war with Russia, or else help us mightily to prevent the loss of Western Europe if war should come, while Franco's Spain could do little more than provide a last-gasp defensive beachhead on the Continent from which to undertake the stupendously bloody and heart-breaking task of reconquering all Europe once it was stupidly lost. This is spelled out clearly by Tito and his spokesmen, who have said Yugoslavia will fight if Greece is attacked, if Italy is invaded through Austria, if Russia strikes in Germany. That covers about everything but an end run through Norway. Yugoslavia is in our corner. And it has force and the incentive to use it.

Our emergent strategy for the Mediterranean needs to be far better understood across the breadth of America. There are two ingredients for a successful strategic plan. One is to keep Soviet armies out of industrial Western Europe. The other is to throw in a relentless succession of hard belly punches by sea and air from all around the perimeter of the Red world. And for this second task, which is the counteroffensive and therefore the decisive task, the Mediterranean beckons. It is a high road flanked by friends, and it leads to the doorstep of Stalin's Eurasian heartland.

New York Editor Approves Hall Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, continuing the long list of valued and ardent supporters of the Hall antiregistration bill, I incorporate herewith in the Appendix a fine editorial by Mr. John J. O'Connor, hunting and fishing authority and editor of the Bronx Times.

Mr. O'Connor's broad outlook both in his own field of sports and also upon our national affairs leads him to some constructive conclusions which are contained in his following column:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Orchids and salutations to Congressman EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, Binghamton, N. Y., for introducing H. R. 3023, a bill which prohibits the registration of firearms.

This bill is so important to the rights of the citizens of this country that it is given here in its complete text:

"A bill to prohibit registration of firearms already issued legally and to protect citizens against unconstitutional seizure of private weapons

"Whereas during World War II, Nazi-minded officers attempted to pass laws abridging the constitutional right of a private citizen to bear arms; and

"Whereas these same officers started their anti-American program by calling for registration of all privately owned firearms; and

"Whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States this inherent privilege to our citizens to protect their hearths—homes by possessing arms; and

"Whereas in the several States, the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally issued

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

private weapons with design to eventual seizure of firearms owned by individual citizens: Therefore,

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no citizen shall be compelled to register of firearms of which he is in legal possession.

"SEC. 2. No Federal, State, or local officer shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess them."

To the good citizens and sportsmen alike, please protect your constitutional rights, and write or wire your Congressman today, telling him to give his backing to bill H. R. 3023, as it is now referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

BIRDS GO OFF MILADY'S BONNET

After April 15, the plumage of wild birds may not be sold in New York State, according to a conservation law passed 10 years ago which gave feather merchants and millinery establishments a decade to dispose of plumage already on hand.

That means that milady's bonnet henceforth offered for sale in this State may sport only the feathers of certain birds captivity-reared in the United States, and classified by law as "domestic fowl." Exempt under the law is the plumage of "domestic fowl," such as feathers of the following birds raised in captivity in the United States: chickens, turkeys, guineas, geese, ducks, pigeons, ostriches, rheas, peafowl, and eight varieties of pheasants or their hybrids; ringnecks, goldens, silvers, Lady Amhersts, Reeves, Swinhoe, and brown and blue eared.

The law does not apply to licensed commercial fly-tying feathers which traditionally have been used in the making of fishing lures, but all feather and millinery merchants, under the law, must turn over all remaining supplies of illegal plumage to the State Conservation Department by May 19, 1951.

Blows Whistle on Additional Abuses of Hazard Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter recently published in Armed Forces on the subject of the abuses of flight pay:

BLOWS WHISTLE ON ADDITIONAL ABUSES OF HAZARD PAY

To the EDITOR:

In reference to a letter concerning sub hazard pay, in the March 24 issue of Armed Force, I am an ex-airedale and can vouch for the fact that submen are not alone in their plight.

While in a patrol squadron in the Pacific men not actually needed in the crews were flown 4 hours a month for the sole purpose of giving them flight pay. That condition exists today.

On several naval air stations, I ran across a more openly unfair deal. There the ground crew men of various departments were given flight pay, chiefs getting most of the skins, first class next, and so on down the line. The seamen and third class got practically no chance at the flight pay. None of the men had any business whatsoever flying. The flight skins were assigned to various departments strictly as a favor.

Paper time was another ruse used during the war. A man who was getting this unneeded flight pay would let some air-happy seaman fly under his name. The seaman got the thrill, the man whose name he signed in the log got the pay.

Another device which was occasionally used was the falsification of the BuSandA form sent to disbursing, which authorized the flight pay. The form would contain one or two names which had never appeared on any flight sheet. These free-riders would then be credited flight pay when they had actually flown no time during the entire month.

Of course, it goes without saying that an officer's life is now worth 100 bucks per month when he risks it. An enlisted man's body, containing less vital chemicals, such as gold, is worth only $50 per month in hazard pay.

AN EX-AIREDALE.

Majority Views on Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following statement:

STATEMENT OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS CONCERNING S. 75 AND H. R. 1500, CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House has given several weeks of study to this proposed legislation. We have heard experts on all aspects of the project. We have just returned from a trip to the Southwest, where all features of the project were viewed and personal interviews were undertaken. As a result of these studies, we have arrived at certain suggestions and conclusions concerning S. 75 and the companion bill, H. R. 1500.

The committee knows of the extreme drought situation that faces the area from western Kansas to the Pacific Ocean and from the Navajo country to the Mexican border. On the trip members of the committee witnessed many empty reservoirs and vast fields that could not be irrigated due to lack of water. We discovered a shortage of power because of shortage of water for hydroelectric facilities. We learned of lowering water tables. On the other hand, in the Colorado River the committee saw thousands of second-feet of water not being presently used.

We are fully cognizant of the great benefit that could accrue to central Arizona if this water, presently going to waste, could be put to use in this drought-stricken area.

We believe, however, that the proposed bills, as presently presented to the committee, would not provide the relief hoped for. We want to be helpful to Arizona and her people in the solving of the serious present water problem. We, feel, however, that the bills, in their present form, would not resolve the water problem facing Arizona. We think that the legal question of the right to the use of waters of the lower Colorado River Basin would not be resolved by the legislation; that the adjudication of the water rights should come before authorization of the project, and not following; the committee is fearful that the method provided in the legislation is not the proper procedure and would not result in obtaining adjudication of these rights by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The need for adjudication of the rights to the use of waters of the lower Colorado River Basin was admitted by every witness before the committee. Adjudication has been recommended by the President, the Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of the Budget, the Judiciary Committee, and this committee of the Congress. It is a fact recognized in section 13 of the bills under consideration. There is no argument on this point. The following quotations indicate the agreement of all concerned for the necessity of the adjudication of the water rights in the lower Colorado River Basin:

"Authorization of any of the projects inventoried in the report should not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President until a determination is made of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system." (H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., p. 1.)

"The first question raised was whether there is enough water in the Colorado River, available for use in Arizona, to satisfy the needs of this project on a permanent basis. The President has stated many times that he would like to see a definitive settlement of the rights of the various States to waters of the Colorado River system, in order that decisions on projects to be developed in the public interest may be made on a firm basis with respect to water rights. The President consistently has indicated his unwillingness to take any position favorable to authorization of the central Arizona project until settlement of the water-rights controversy has been brough about." (Bureau of the Budget, in letter to chairman of House Committee on Public Lands, dated April 19, 1950.)

"There is agreement among all agencies concerned as to the urgent need for resolution of the water-rights issues involved." (Report of Director of Bureau of the Budget, May 19, 1948 hearings, H. J. Res. 225, 80th Cong., House Judiciary Committee.)

"That further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred, by lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system." (Report of Commissioner of Reclamation, H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess., Secretary's interim report on Colorado River.)

"Assurance of a water supply is an important element of the plan yet to be resolved. The showing in the report of the availability of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes is based upon the assumption that the claims of the State of Arizona to this water are valid. It should be noted, however, as the regional director and the Commissioner of Reclamation have pointed out, that the State of California has challenged the validity of Arizona's claim. If the contentions of the State of Arizona are correct, there is an ample water supply for this project. If the contentions of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply available from the Colorado River for this diversion." (Secretary of Interior's report in letter of transmittal of the project planning report, H. Doc. 136, 81st Cong.)

"There is not available for use in the other State sufficient water for all the projects, Federal and local, which are already in existence or authorized." (Report of the Secretary on S. J. Res. 145, 80th Cong.)

"The committee feels the dispute between these two States on the lower Colorado River Basin should be determined and settled by

agreement between the two States or by court decision because the dispute between these two States jeopardizes and will delay the possibility of prompt development of any further projects for the diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin.

"Therefore the committee recommends that immediate settlement of this dispute by compact or arbitration be made, or that the Attorney General of the United States promptly institute an action in the United States Supreme Court against the States of the lower basin, and other necessary parties, requiring them to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin." (House Committee on Public Lands, in Report No. 910, July 14, 1947, on H. R. 1597 (reauthorizing the Gila project).)

The point we wish to make here is the complete agreement of administrative and legislative agencies, including the President, Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of the Budget, House Judiciary Committee, and this committee of the Congress, as to the need of adjudication of the waters of the lower Colorado River Basin.

If the committee should proceed with the authorization of the central Arizona project, as contemplated in the proposed legislation, in the light of the foregoing, this committee and the Congress might well find itself in the position of having authorized a project which would entail the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars that, because of a Court decision (which must be made), might well find itself without sufficient water and therefore uneconomical and unfeasible.

The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the funds could not be appropriated until the water rights were determined. (See sec. 13 of the bills.) We are not convinced this is the case. It will be noted the section deals with expenditures, not appropriations, and provides for the suspension of expenditures for the construction of certain features of the project while a suit is pending. (Described in section 12.) However, the resumption of the Secretary's power of expenditure is not conditioned on the result of the suit. In other words, he may resume construction and thereby the use of appropriations as soon as the suit is ended, regardless of the result.

To state the matter in another way: The prohibition in this section against expenditures would end (1) if the State brought no action within 6 months, or (2) if the Court should dispose of the action on technical ground without settling the controversy.

It further appears to us that the matter of prohibition against expenditures is one that would be determined by the Secretary of the Interior—not by the Congress—if this bill was enacted into law. In other words, the spending of appropriations would be determined by the Secretary and not by the Congress. We feel that such a determination is one that should rest with the Congress before expenditures are made.

Argument was made before the committee that enactment of this proposed legislation is necessary in order to set up a justiciable case for consideration of the Court. We are inclined to believe that is not the case and that, in fact, because of the limitations in this bill, the matter will cause the Court to refuse consideration. The committee finds that the Court did hear an almost identical case: *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S. 589). The prayer, the issues, and the results, as described in that case, all closely parallel with the central Arizona project.

"The prayer was for a determination of the equitable share of each State in the water and of the priorities of all appropriations in both States and for an injunction restraining alleged wrongful diversions." (*Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U. S., at p. 592).)

Again, in hearings on the Gila project in the Eightieth Congress before this committee the committee stated:

"The committee feels the dispute between these two States on the lower Colorado River Basin should be determined and settled by agreement between the two States or by Court decision because the dispute between these two States jeopardizes and will delay the possibility of prompt development of any further projects for the diversion of water from the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower Colorado River Basin. (Rept. No. 910, July 14, 1947, on H. R. 1597.)

"That further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred by lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system." (From Secretary's Interim Report by Commissioner of Reclamation on the Colorado River—H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess.)

"The evidence supports the finding of the special master that the dependable natural flow of the river during the irrigation season has long been overappropriated. A genuine controversy exists. The States have not been able to settle their differences by compact. The areas involved are arid or semiarid. Water in dependable amounts is essential to the maintenance of the vast agricultural enterprises established on the various sections of the river. The dry cycle which has continued over a decade has precipitated a clash of interests which between sovereign powers could be traditionally settled only by diplomacy or war. The original jurisdiction of this Court is one of the alternative methods provided by the framers of our Constitution." (*Arizona* v. *California* (283 U. S. 423, 462–464).)

Obviously, these are parallel situations to one which now presents itself to this committee. The Court's summary of the controversy in the case of *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* reads, in part, as follows:

"If this were an equity suit to enjoin threatened injury, the showing made by Nebraska might possibly be insufficient. But *Wyoming* v. *Colorado*, supra, indicates that where the claims to the water of a river exceed the supply a controversy exists appropriate for judicial determination. If there were a surplus of unappropriated water, different considerations would be applicable. Cf. *Arizona* v. *California* (298 U. S. 558, L. ed. 1331, 56 S. Ct. 848). But where there is not enough water in the river to satisfy the claims asserted against it, the situation is not basically different from that where two or more persons claim the right to the same parcel of land. The present claimants being States we think the clash of interests to be of that character and dignity which makes the controversy a justiciable one under our original jurisdiction. (From p. 610 of the Court's summary.)

It will be noted the Court held that there was a justiciable controversy and one under its original jurisdiction.

It should be remembered that for 29 years a fruitless effort to arrive at an interstate compact for the use of the waters of the lower Colorado Basin has been going on.

In the case of *Colorado* v. *Kansas* (320 U. S. 383), at page 616, the Court has this to say:

"But the efforts at settlement in this case have failed. A genuine controversy exists. The gravity and importance of the case are apparent. The difficulties of drafting and enforcing a decree are no justification for us to refuse to perform the important function entrusted to us by the Constitution."

These considerations justify the opinion stated by the Secretary of the Interior at hearings before this committee on H. R. 934 and 935, Eighty-first Congress, first session, page 1150.

"The bare statement of these questions, the knowledge that there is disagreement between Arizona and California about the answers to be given them, and the fact that, if the contentions of either State are accepted in full and if full development of the upper basin within the limits fixed by the Colorado River compact is assumed, there is not available for use in the other State sufficient water for all the projects, Federal and local, which are already in existence or authorized would seem to indicate that there exists a justiciable controversy between the States."

The committee notes that it took the Court only 3½ to 8 months to decide the three previous cases of Arizona against California. We therefore believe that this committee was wholly justified when it recommended that immediate settlement of this dispute by compact or arbitration be made, or that the Attorney General of the United States promptly institute an action in the United States Supreme Court against the States of the lower basin, and other necessary parties, requiring them to assert and have determined their claims and rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin.

We think that this suit could be brought at an early date and that this committee have the benefit of the determination of the court of the water rights of the lower Colorado River Basin.

We would like to call attention to the limitations in the bills before us which might result in the refusal of the court to resolve the dispute. Sections 12 and 13 prescribe the manner and instructions with respect to the suit proposed in the legislation to be submitted to the Supreme Court. There is a limitation on the subject matter of the suit to the right to divert water through aqueducts or tunnels to be constructed pursuant to this act. It is noted that only the diversion proposed in S. 75 and H. R. 1500 would come within the prerogative of the court under limitation prescribed by this legislation. We doubt the Supreme Court could arrive at an equitable determination of the rights involved if it accepted the case under these limitations.

It appears to us that there are several acts and compacts, in addition to the proposed legislation, that would enter into the controversy. There is the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self-Limitation Act, and the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act. Also, there is the Mexican Water Treaty, the act of the Arizona Legislature of 1944, which recognized certain rights in California, and possibly others. It is difficult for us to see how the Supreme Court could determine the aggregate rights of the States to the use of waters in the lower Colorado River Basin under the limitations imposed by sections 12 and 13 of the bills. It might well result in the Court refusing to consider the suit.

We recognize the great need for additional water for maintenance of the present economy in Arizona and would like to be helpful in solving the present difficulties. We therefore suggest to the proponents of S. 75 and H. R. 1500 that steps immediately be taken for the adjudication of the rights to the use of the waters in the lower Colorado River Basin; that a firm settlement be reached with the Indians who will be damaged by the construction of the project (we feel that section 14 is not a satisfactory solution).

It seems to us most unfortunate that two great States of this Union, both so vitally affected by the use of Colorado River water, should not arbitrate these issues.

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING LIBRARIES

Engineers and financial experts, whose position would be one of neutrality between the States involved, could be found to determine these issues on a sound, equitable and feasible basis. Such action by both States would be an indication of a desire to resolve the issue in the best interests of the Nation. Propaganda and charges and counter charges have but befogged the issues and undoubtedly jeopardized the position of both States.

We urge the parties in interest to give serious consideration to such arbitration so that we may take affirmative and constructive action.

WALTER S. BARING, J. ERNEST WHARTON, DEAN P. TAYLOR, JOHN P. SAYLOR, EDWARD H. JENISON, FRED G. AANDAHL, A. L. MILLER, FRED L. CRAWFORD, FRANK A. BOW, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, NORRIS POULSON, HAMER BUDGE, WESLEY A. D'EWART, CLAIR ENGLE, SAM YORTY.

CONCURRING STATEMENT BY ENGLE AND YORTY

The undersigned, not having participated in the original drafting of the foregoing statement, wish to concur with the following explanaton in two instances:

First, with reference to the third paragraph on the first page: There is water presently going to waste and the use of it would benefit Arizona. But, this is water belonging to the upper basin which is unused at the present time; and, water belonging to Arizona and California for presently constructed or authorized projects and to Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico which is not currently being used. Consequently, although this water is currently going to waste, it will be used, and no further projects (the central Arizona included) can be predicated on it.

Second, the third paragraph on page eleven: It is admitted that additional water would help the economy of Arizona as it would any area in the arid southwest. But Arizona has exercised no care in the utilization of her existing water, and is flagrantly over-using her water. The record is replete with evidence of this fact, including the records of the Department of Agriculture that agricultural production in Arizona since 1946 in spite of her short water supply has increased more in volume and dollars than any State in the Union.

Finally, we think the statement is clear that it is premature to determine the disputed question of economic feasibility of the proposed project until the water rights in the lower basin are first determined, and that that basic question is reversed for future consideration.

CLAIR ENGLE,
SAM YORTY.

Key to United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor by Joseph C. Harsch:

STATE OF THE NATION
(By Joseph C. Harsch)
KEY TO UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

WASHINGTON.—The most revealing single passage in President Truman's April 11 radio address on foreign policy was the one which read:

"If they had followed the right policies in the 1930's—if the free countries had acted together to crush the aggression of the dictators, and if they had acted in the beginning when the aggression was small—there would probably have been no World War II.

"The beginning when the aggression was small," in the period which led down the sorry road to World War II, was in 1930, when Japan first tested the waters of aggression in Manchuria.

The historians and the diplomats who have gone back over the record of the pre-World War II period have inclined more and more to put their finger on that year as the place where history could have been shaped differently if the free countries had joined together to halt the first test of aggression instead of pulling apart and letting it happen.

The man who put his finger most emphatically upon that year and upon the story of inaction in the West was Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State at the time in the Cabinet of President Hoover.

And it is to be noted that no other book on the history of that period so often is studied and quoted from by the present planners of our foreign policy as Mr. Stimson's book On Active Service.

In that book Mr. Stimson tells how he begged and pleaded and reasoned with Mr. Hoover to be allowed to use the military power of the United States in a common effort to halt that first case of aggression. He tells with cold disapproval of Mr. Hoover's refusal to allow him to move the Pacific Fleet beyond Pearl Harbor, and how his efforts to organize a collective front with the British broke down because he could do no more than bluff and because the British felt that a bluff was bound to fail.

Mr. Stimson is the real philosopher of postwar American foreign policy. His book is the textbook which has been consulted at every step down this other and different road. Dean Acheson is the foreign-policy disciple of Henry L. Stimson and President Truman is the convinced student.

To a large degree, the great debate through which we have just passed on European policy has been just another round in the old argument between the philosophy of Mr. Hoover and the philosophy of Mr. Stimson. The difference is that this time Mr. Hoover is not President and is not in a position to hold the fleet at Pearl Harbor. The students of Mr. Stimson are in office and have been willing to use the Army of the United States in Greece, the Air Force in the Berlin airlift, and all branches of our Armed Forces in Korea.

So far, the story this time is the reverse of the story of the 1930's. Everything Mr. Stimson wanted to do then and was denied permission to do by Mr. Hoover is being done now in spite of the protests of Mr. Hoover's friends and followers. That they do protest is the most natural thing in the world, because, if the Stimson plan of action succeeds in saving us from a third great world war, Mr. Stimson's stand in 1930 will be vindicated and Mr. Hoover's refuted.

The issue is not really between Democrats and Republicans. By political accident, it happens that Messrs. Truman and Acheson are the present executive heirs of the Stimson tradition. But General Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, and Senators Lodge, Duff, and Morse—all Republicans—are just as much heirs of the same tradition. And the shadow of Theodore Roosevelt is behind the doctrines of Mr. Stimson.

The duel is between those who believe there can be security in isolation and those who believe there can be security only in collective resistance to aggression. The antagonists of the moment would appear to be General MacArthur and President Truman. The real antagonists today, as at every stage of the continuing great debate, are the philosophies of Herbert Hoover and Henry L. Stimson.

Arbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, each year, the State of Nebraska, whose Third District I have the privilege to serve, honors J. Sterling Morton, the father of Arbor Day. My State observes its yearly celebration of Arbor Day on the birthday of its founder, April 22.

The significance of what J. Sterling Morton did nearly four score years ago has been almost lost behind the silken mist of the poetry, legend, and emotionalism which is still—and justly so—part of Arbor Day.

What Morton—one-time Governor of Nebraska and one-time Secretary of Agriculture—really did was to give forest conservation back to the people. Successful conservation can only come from individual communities individually aroused. The great Nebraskan provided the spark which spread like a prairie fire across the country from ocean to ocean.

In 1682, when children who had landed at Plymouth Rock were still alive, William Penn decreed that an acre should be maintained in forest land for every five cleared in lands granted by him.

The Penn decree was issued in a community—an area which had not attained the working status of a true province.

Shortly after the acceptance by the original 13 States of the Constitution, in 1791, the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture offered medals for the planting of locust trees—a type of timber then in great demand.

The New York Society heard a committee report in 1795 recommending that inferior farm land be devoted to tree raising.

In 1804 the Massachusetts Society gave premiums for growing trees. This movement did not die out suddenly in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts State Legislature in 1817 asked its State department of agriculture to encourage tree planting, particularly the growing of oaks for ship timbers. Later, in 1837, the same State legislature authorized a survey of forest conditions in the State to induce landowners to consider the importance of continuing, improving, and enlarging the forests of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out at this time that the movements to preserve our forests, to increase them, which occurred immediately after the War of Independence arose from the people and were not imposed on the people. Side by side with this movement of community conservation there was arising still an-

other force—the force of expanding Federal Government.

From 1799, when Congress authorized President Adams to buy reserves of live oak on the South Carolina and Georgia coasts, until the end of the War Between the States there was an almost unbroken record of Federal legislation pertaining to forests. Practically none of this legislation originated with the people most affected by the progressive elimination of forests—the communities actually dependent upon them. During that period Congress took it upon itself to think for the people rather than to represent the people.

War Between the States changed that. The popular voice raised from a matter of displeasure to a roar of discontent. One writer puts it this way:

> The heavy requirements for wood during the war and the extensive destruction in some areas by military operations, the rapid pace of lumbering in the Lakes States and the widespread destruction by forest fires, the growing realization of the relation of forests to stream flow and water supplies—all caused people to think about future timber supplies and the importance of forest cover.

Popular interest was further quickened by the paper by Rev. Frederick Starr in 1865 in which he advocated the immediate undertaking of Government research on how to manage forests and how to establish plantations.

Stirred on, perhaps, by the Starr report, the Wisconsin State Legislature set up a forest commission headed by I. A. Lapham in 1867. The Lapham commssion stressed the need for tree planting. This was in the very year when Nebraska became a full-fledged State.

In 1869, Maine appointed a commission on foreign policy.

Little permanent results came from the Wisconsin or the Maine effort, but better methods of transportation and the printing press spread the news over the Nation.

It requires no crystal ball to picture the resourceful J. Sterling Morton assemblying the forest story from all parts of the United States, analyzing it, and then—determining what was wrong and what must be done to right the wrong.

Let us try to follow his line of thought.

The Constitution has not changed. Over 80 years of assault from without and internal strife has not materially altered it. The Constitution arose from the people. It was not imposed on them. The Bill of Rights arose from the people. It was not imposed upon them. The amendments originated from sources other than the actual people he, J. Sterling Morton, could count on the fingers of one hand. Things which rise from the people endure. If conservation was to endure the determination to conserve forests, to plant trees, must arise from the people and not be thrust upon them from above or from without the community circle.

It must have been in this manner that J. Sterling Morton decided upon the absolute need of Arbor Day.

The first Arbor Day, April 10, 1872, saw more than a million trees planted in Nebraska.

Thirteen years later, in 1885, Governor Morton could tell the American Forestry Congress that Nebraska had more than 700,000 acres of planted trees.

J. Sterling Morton's reasoning paid off.

In 1949, 508 farmers in Nebraska and South Dakota were asked to place a cash value on trees. How much was their annual savings in their fuel bill alone due to windbreaks? Their answer? An average of $15.85.

In an experiment at Holdredge, Nebr., it was found by scientific measurement that trees used as windbreaks reduced fuel costs by 22.9 percent.

Livestock breeders in Nebraska estimated that windbreaks saved them through preserving feed and calf crops some $300 per year. Dairymen in the vicinity placed their savings from the same cause at $600 per year.

Farm families depend on gardens for much of their food. Most of them know the value of trees as a windbreak in increasing the crop from garden and orchard, as well as the quality of fruit and vegetable. Three hundred and twenty-three Nebraska farmers averaged a crop increase valued at $67.15 per year due to trees.

Yes; J. Sterling Morton's reasoning has certainly paid off—in practical cash returns as well as in beauty which may not be measured.

For April 22, 1951—Nebraska's Arbor Day—I have one thought, and that thought is a prayer:

May God bless the enduring memory of J. Sterling Morton, that great man who returned the major share in planting trees back to the people from whom that right was taken, the people to whom that right has always—and justly—belonged.

After the Tumult and Shouting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Lowell Mellett which appeared in the Evening Star on April 17, 1951:

AFTER THE TUMULT AND SHOUTING—MACARTHUR MAY DISAPPOINT POLITICAL PARTISANS SEEKING TO USE HIM FOR THEIR OWN PURPOSES

(By Lowell Mellett)

This week, the tumult and the shouting. This week, the hero's return and the admiring Nation's welcome. Next week and for many weeks to come, the sober business of deciding or trying to decide where we go from here. That, a matter of gravest importance, may depend to considerable extent on the hero himself, on his willingness to subordinate to the country's best interest his natural desire for personal vindication.

As the week began his willingness in this respect appeared open to some doubt. The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee had wired General MacArthur an invitation to appear before the committee to testify and be questioned concerning the military situation in the Far East. Hearings on the subject had already been scheduled with Secretary of Defense Marshall as the first witness. The general in reply had informed Chairman RUSSELL that resolutions were pending in Congress inviting him to address a joint meeting of the House and Senate and until action had been taken on those resolutions he would deem it inappropriate to make any other plans.

Chairman RUSSELL, of course, was fully aware of the resolutions offered by the Republican leaders of the two Houses and, regardless of the spirit in which they were offered, he was as willing as anybody to see this courtesy extended to the general. What he proposed was in no way calculated to interfere with the general's big moment. And as a veteran legislator, the chairman could consider himself quite competent to judge of what is appropriate and what inappropriate in the matter of calling witnesses. His commitee has called lots of generals in the past and will call lots of them in the future.

What Chairman RUSSELL may have thought he didn't say immediately. Disposed to be charitable, he could have thought that the general had confused the United States Senate with the Japense Diet, to which he has habitually handed down the law. Disposed to be charitable in another direction, he may have got an inkling of the patience the President has exercised in his dealings with the general. But his colleagues in the Senate haven't the slightest doubt that in due course the Russell committee will expose the general to a searching examination, no matter how "inappropriate" that may seem to the general.

To be of real service to the country the general will have to respond to the questioning in the spirit in which it is advanced, an earnest desire to clear up the confusion that has been thrown around our far-eastern policy by his political friends. As the situation grows more ominous in Korea, this has become imperative. If the general takes counsel while in Washington with his old companions in arms and submits himself to the kind of briefing on the European and world situation that he seems never to have absorbed while in Tokyo, his experience and judgment can be turned to good account and he can reclaim the reputation of a selfless citizen as well as a brilliant soldier.

If the general, however, takes counsel only of a political group that has its sights set on a target no higher than next year's election he can only serve to confound the current confusion and make the implementation of any intelligent national policy almost impossible.

The political partisans want to use him. The hatchet, or egg-throwing, brigade want to make him their own. It is to be hoped that he understands, or comes quickly to understand, this element and is prepared to disappoint it.

Eagle Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to the work of a great humanitarian organization, the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

UNIVERSITY OF WILLAMETTE LIBRARIES

I have the deep honor to be a member of the aerie of this organization in my home town of Crookston, Minn.

As an example of the constant effort of the Eagles to relieve human misery, I call your attention to the following article from April edition of the Eagle, its national publication. It concerns the fine work done by the Crookston Aerie in helping the Indians in northern Minnesota:

EAGLE HEARTS—THE SHIVERING CHIPPEWAS, FACING A CRUEL MINNESOTA WINTER, FOUND A TRUE SAMARITAN IN CROOKSTON AERIE

(By Ross O. Schmidt)

Most of America has just passed through a long and rugged winter. In the majority of States there have been record-breaking snowstorms and temperatures that have sent the thermometer dipping to below normal figures. Minnesota has had its share of cold weather and up near the Canadian border there were days when the cold was registered at 25, 35, and even 41 degrees below zero.

Such cold weather poses many problems, even when you have warm clothes to wear and comfortably steam-heated houses or apartments. It is much worse when you have to face such winter weather without shoes and overcoats and nice warm mufflers and mittens. This is the problem that faced the Chippewa Indians on the Red Lake Indian Reservation in Minnesota. The school kiddies just couldn't get to school because they didn't have enough warm clothes to go around.

The plight of the Indians in Minnesota was not overlooked because there is a fine branch of the Eagles, aerie 873, at Crookston, Minn. Brother HAROLD C. HAGEN, United States Representative in Congress from the Ninth Minnesota District, took the problem of the Indians on the Red Lake Reservation to his aerie. Congressman HAGEN told of the plight and hardships facing the Indians—told how the children were forced to stay out of school because of the lack of warm clothing.

It didn't take long for the hearts of the Crookston members to warm to this appeal and a drive was launched to collect clothing for the Indians, especially the children. The first drive was conducted last year and proved highly successful. This winter, with its record-breaking cold, the need was even greater, and Brother HAGEN again appealed to the Crookston aerie. Eagles and their families and friends responded with the result that a great quantity of blankets, scarfs, belts, socks, mittens, stockings, blouses, sweaters, shirts, shoes and boots, overshoes, rubbers, overcoats, underwear, jackets, pajamas, diapers, stocking caps, dresses, skirts, and overalls were donated.

The success of the drive was emphasized by George E. Saunders, superintendent of schools of Beltrami County, who was responsible for the distribution. Mr. Saunders, in a letter to the Crookston aerie, said:

"On behalf of the people of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, I wish to thank you and the good people of Crookston for the fine assortment of clothes you sent us.

"A large amount of the clothes have been given out and I am sure they were appreciated.

"It was wonderful of the people who donated the clothes to have them so clean and nice."

The Crookston Daily Times, in an article telling of the success of the drive, said:

"Drives come and go, but the recipients of gifts of good will from people of good will do not forget. We think those who gave to this cause will be warmed by the thought that the Indians of the Red Lake Reservation are warm this winter thanks to them."

The hearts of the members of the Crookston aerie and the hearts of all Eagles everywhere are warmed by the thought that these Indian children have not been forgotten and that our great order has been able to extend its services to these people who need it so badly.

The real spirit of eagledom was the inspiration for this great humanitarian undertaking, thanks to Brother HAGEN and his fellow members in the Crookston aerie.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat Believes "The Drastic Action by the President Was Justified"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is news when the St. Louis Globe-Democrat admits that the President of the United States is right. Although as stated on its masthead, "The Globe-Democrat is an independent newspaper printing the news impartially, supporting what it believes to be right, and opposing what it believes to be wrong, without regard to party politics," it seems that the Globe-Democrat has almost without exception found some reason why it should not support President Truman, or his policies, and it is a rare occasion when the Globe-Democrat finds anything to commend which originates with a Democratic administration. Despite the fact that the Republican Party has seen fit to make a political issue out of President Truman's courageous action in risking what he knew would be immediate condemnation by those who have been and still are admirers of General MacArthur, I believe, as does the Globe-Democrat, that attention should be directed to the real issue in this action.

Certainly General MacArthur cannot recommend that every officer follow his example in setting himself up as a self-appointed diplomat, over and above his duties as a commander who is obligated to receive and execute the orders of his superiors. It is not a question of whether General MacArthur is correct in his appraisal of the situation in the Far East. It is not a question of whether or not the foreign policy which he recommends is the one the United States should adopt. The question is, Was General MacArthur right or wrong in departing from his military responsibilities to challenge the policies which had been adopted by the United Nations, the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department?

A reading of the editorial from the Globe-Democrat should convince those who believe there must be a unity of purpose that General MacArthur, in order to be consistent with his 48 years of military experience, should have resigned his command before he committed the gravest sin in his own soldier's handbook—failure to obey orders.

The editorial follows:

MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL

Seldom has American public opinion been so sharply divided as on the MacArthur issue, climaxed yesterday by President Truman's order that the recalcitrant general be removed immediately from his Far East commands. With some, regrettably, the issue involves politics, and that angle will be pursued relentlessly, we can be assured, to the end that the general may come home to blast the administration in public statements and addresses which may well figure in the 1952 election. But for most the issue is this: Was General MacArthur right or wrong in departing from his responsibility as a military commander to express sentiments on foreign policy and strategy that ran counter to those of the UN, the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the State Department Was he right or wrong when he became a self-appointed diplomat, over and above his duties as the commander of the United Nations forces in Korea?

With full appreciation of the general's high qualifications as a soldier and his eminent success in the rehabilitation of Japan, this newspaper believes the drastic action by the President was justified.

MacArthur was guilty of insubordination, which cannot be tolerated within the military set-up. He deliberately assumed authority in a field which was not his to command—the making of foreign policy. He violated the explicit orders of his Commander in Chief, a procedure he would not have countenanced for a minute by his subordinates. He flouted his superior command not once, but many times, and after several warnings.

He would have been removed months ago had not the President, with a wary regard for the political dynamite in such action, been well aware of the explosive content in the emotions of the American citizens. Now he has taken the long step with reluctance. MacArthur was and is on all counts the hottest potato Mr. Truman has been called on to handle.

General MacArthur expects to return to the States within 3 weeks. He may address a joint session of Congress and air his views on the entire Far East situation. His remarks, to Congress or otherwise, will attract the serious attention of every American citizen, and may serve to clarify White House thinking, or at least put its Korean policy in sharper focus. As a retired Army officer, he can speak without restraint—and doubtless will.

The most unfortunate aspect of the controversy is that in many respects the program which MacArthur championed, in defiance of the President, was realistic and logical. He would have been no soldier at all had he not chafed at the restrictions imposed on him in fighting the Reds in Korea. He was not permitted to bomb the supply concentrations of the enemy.

His UN directives were vague, never clearly detailed. He knew that a stalemate at the thirty-eighth parallel settled nothing, yet when he called for reinforcements to exploit the gains made in recent months, he was denied them. He wished to employ the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa either in Korea or in an assault on the Chinese mainland, but Washington did not approve.

This newspaper believes he was in error in stating that the place for a show-down with Russia is in Asia, that Europe is secondary.

But above all, there can be no denial that the general was the spectacular victim of a White House-State Department foreign policy that has been consistently inconsistent and vacillating. Neither MacArthur nor the American people have ever been clearly advised as to the precise program the administration has fixed for Far East operations.

Mr. Truman has repeatedly sought refuge in the United Nations when a forthright decision was required—and the impotent UN, timid and unenthusiastic, sat on its hands while the situation worsened.

The UN never had much stomach for the Korean police action. And when MacArthur became a problem child who threatened to involve the UN in a world war by operations against the stooges of Moscow, the Red Chinese, Great Britain, and France, in particular, were apprehensive and called for caution. Well they knew that if the United States went to war against Russia in the Orient we would not have enough men or matériel to do a good job of helping defend West Europe against Communist aggression. Presumably the President was influenced by British and French representations, and for good reason.

Technically, when the UN was committed to action in Korea, the war should have been directed by its Security Council. But this was impossible while Russia had a seat on that Council. Hence, the United States was given the job in view of our leadership in securing UN approval of the aggressor resolution and the preponderance of our commitments in men and matériel to that area. MacArthur's appointment was in line with that agreement.

But notwithstanding the frustration that plagued MacArthur, his conviction that our Far East policy was bungled and unrealistic, he was a soldier, subject to the same fundamentals of discipline as any private in the ranks. When he gave a command, it was obeyed or else. When he received a command, it was his duty to obey or take the consequences.

We understand that General Eisenhower, while in supreme command in Europe in the last war, did not approve of many things he was asked to do. Certainly, for instance, he believed the Western Allies should have been permitted to occupy Berlin instead of allowing the Russians to take it over, with results we all know. But Eisenhower had his orders and he followed them. MacArthur had his orders and he flouted them.

We by no means agree that the White House-State Department policy for the Far East has been without fault. Neither the President nor Secretary Acheson at any time have indicated they knew where they were going or how they expected to get there, and we can imagine MacArthur's soul writhing because of his conviction that he knew best.

But something that was earmarked as policy had the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, both in superior command to MacArthur, and what they ordered he should have done his best to carry out. The proper place for him to lodge his protests was with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, and it is their ultimate responsibility if they ignored him and adopted a plan that proved to be wrong.

Flamboyant critical statements from the battlefield, letters home to sympathetic friends who made them public, proposals to negotiate with the enemy at a time when, so the President says, the UN was well along toward an understanding with Red China—all these are extracurriculum procedures which are not a military prerogative. If every general in a war disdains orders and operates on his own and as he thinks best, the end result could be disaster.

The chain reaction of the MacArthur dismissal will be heard for many months. The general, now released from all restrictions, may be expected to speak his piece to the American public. He will have ample help in and outside Congress.

Basically, the general would expand the war, make the Far East the chief area of combat, as against the UN policy of isolating Korea and concentrating on the defense of Europe. It is difficult to see how those who agree with MacArthur that the war must be carried to China can in the same breath declare that his program must be followed to save the further slaughter of American soldiers.

General MacArthur makes his exit after 48 years in the Army service of his country. His achievements in the Pacific were historic; he was a brilliant occupation commander in Japan. It is unfortunate that he is compelled to quit under tortured circumstances.

Japan Under MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Japan Under MacArthur," taken from the Evening Star of April 17:

JAPAN UNDER MACARTHUR

It is not surprising that hundreds of thousands of Japanese got up early in the morning and jammed Tokyo's streets to say a heartfelt good-by to General MacArthur. In paying him this tribute—the most impressive of its kind ever accorded a foreigner in that highly ceremonious land—they undoubtedly reflected the feelings of the overwhelming majority of their countrymen. At the same time, in thus displaying their affectionate and almost reverential regard for him as a person, they gave the world a striking measure of his great success in running the occupation as supreme commander for the Allied Powers.

That success has been obvious for some time past. Unlike Germany, Japan, after its defeat, was not partitioned into four parts and occupied by as many powers. Instead, it remained a unity, with American policy dominant, and General MacArthur—through his SCAP organization—brilliantly capitalized on that fact. With a personality perfectly tailored to the task, with administrative ability of the highest order, and with his extraordinary knowledge of the problems and psychology of Asia as a whole, he quickly shifted from the role of conqueror to the role of reconstructor, setting in rapid motion a Japanese military, social, political, economic, and spiritual revolution of the most far-reaching kind.

One of General MacArthur's first big successes was the program under which SCAP swiftly disarmed, demobilized, and returned to peaceful pursuits more than 6,000,000 Japanese troops. Similarly, through rigid controls and other means, he cut down the country's industrial potential for war. Beyond that, in a move without precedent in modern history, he saw to it that Japan adopted a constitution in which it bound itself never again to maintain an army, navy, or air force. Indeed, if anything, he did almost too good a job in carrying out his demilitarization directives, for the constitutional ban on the military has always seemed unrealistic in the teeth of the Soviet threat—a fact which he himself has implicitly acknowledged in his recent recommendations for limited rearmament.

In other respects, however, the constitution hammered out under General MacArthur's supervision is hardly open to question. Emperor worship, the warrior caste, feudalism, thought control, the secret police, and every kindred instrument of totalitarian regimentation and oppression have been swept away. In their place have been substituted such things as universal free education, collective bargaining for labor, the voting franchise for women as well as men, basic liberties like those of our own Bill of Rights, and similar fundamental constitutional guaranties reposing full sovereignty in the Japanese people, making them their own masters, placing them well on the road toward genuine democracy.

In line with all this, moreover, General MacArthur is to be credited with having hit hard at the excesses of the giant trusts of the Zaibatsu (the "money clique"), through which about a score of families used to control the economy of the entire country. He is to be credited, too, with having effected agrarian reforms that have emancipated millions of tenant farmers from serfdom by enabling them to buy and work their own land. Finally, in the over-all economic sphere, he has so effectively administered our American aid that Japan today—after having been flat on its back little more than 5 years ago—shows an index of industrial activity higher than prewar, and it conceivably may manage, if given some good breaks, to become self-supporting by the end of next year.

General MacArthur, in short, has had a tremendous, and on the whole very beneficent, impact on a nation of more than 70,000,000 people. History offers few, if any, examples quite like it. Japan, of course, is by no means out of the woods. Its democracy is still young. Its economic recovery is still tentative. Its social and spiritual transformation may yet prove to be more apparent than real. Yet, if it holds fast to the road that the great American "proconsul" has carved out for it, it can prosper in freedom. That is the immense contribution he has made to the life of the Japanese. Small wonder that many millions of them deeply regret his sudden departure.

A Newspaperman Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, among those who constantly serve our great Nation and who are among the many going about their daily tasks unsung, and often little rewarded, are the small-town newspaper publishers.

One such publisher was Mr. P. W. Kemp, former publisher of the Marshall County Banner at Argyle, Minn. Mr. Kemp passed away March 25 at the age of 75 years, 35 of which he published his newspaper.

The attached editorial is a tribute to Mr. Kemp and was written for the Banner by his successor, E. L. Holmlund. These beautiful words of tribute to Mr. Kemp are, in a way, a tribute to all small-town editors and publishers.

The editorial follows:

WE SORROW AS DEATH CLAIMS OUR PREDECESSOR

There are many things that for a small-town publisher are not the easiest things to do. But one of the most difficult tasks for him to perform is to chronicle the life and passing of a beloved friend and neighbor. Such is our task today, as we pause briefly to pay tribute to Mr. P. W. Kemp, our

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LIBRARIES

predecessor as publisher of the Banner, and for the past 8 years our mentor and very good friend. Percy, as we had learned to address him, seemed almost like a grandfather to us, so close had our associations become during these seemingly short 8 years.

It is no mere idle expression when it is said, "the community mourns the death of Percy Kemp." His was a full and busy life, and we like to think of him now as having gone to a well-earned rest and his reward.

He possessed the finest of qualities given to man. He was honest, thrifty, frugal, and hard working. When, as a young man he first engaged in the trade he loved, he related to us that he worked almost a full year without a cent of pay just for the privilege of learning the trade of being a newspaperman. As his community-wide associations broadened, he grew in stature, in mind, and in usefulness. He was public spirited, gave generously of his time to community matters, and his advice was sought because he had the respect of his neighbors. Percy was a "gentleman of the old school" who loved his fellow citizens. He was fearless and outspoken but he was a fair fighter, and many of those whom he fought the hardest were his most sincere admirers. He fought in the open, and there was never any doubt as to where he stood on any question of public interest.

Greatness is not always in the high places. It thrives in the hearts of real men in every walk of life. We think Mr. Kemp was one of them, and for this solemn occasion we'd like to close with this bit of verse:

"He is gone but not forgotten—
All his tasks on earth are done—
Hard he worked toward each endeavor
'Til his great reward was one.
See, he sleeps in peaceful comfort
And his loved ones shed a tear.
Gather closer, gather closer,
He has nothing now to fear
For he rests; he rests in comfort,
He has only gone to sleep.
We who loved him linger near him
But we do not need to weep.
—*"Franklin Lee Stevenson."*

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the Columbia Daily Tribune, of Columbia, Mo., on the subject of President Truman's action in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur and replacing him with General Ridgway as our military leader and commander in the Far East:

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of April 12, 1951]

OUT GOES THE GENERAL

In one of the most spectacular ousters in history, President Truman has relieved Gen. Douglas MacArthur of all his commands in the Far East.

Having decided to discipline the egotistical general, we believe President Truman was smart in firing him completely, because MacArthur is a person who brooks no compromise. You take him whole hog or none. To have relieved him of his Korean command and left him in charge of the Japense occupation would have left the door open for future trouble.

There is no clear-cut answer to the question of whether MacArthur is right or wrong in wanting to bomb Chinese bases and enlist the support of Chiang's Nationalist troops. But there is a clear-cut answer to the question of whether a man in MacArthur's position should arrogate to himself the responsibility and the power of dictating policy in the global strategy against Communist aggression. The answer is "No."

Rightly or wrongly, we are operating on the principle that the best way to achieve peace is through a world organization. The United States, together with many other nations, has solemnly accepted this proposition, and MacArthur is a soldier working under orders from this leadership. For a top general in a strategic theater to repeatedly challenge that accepted leadership not only precludes the possibility of any coordinated effort, it actually lends aid and comfort to the enemy.

Coming at this time, MacArthur's ouster will precipitate a storm of criticism around President Truman's head. In the eyes of his many worshipers, MacArthur is now a martyr. Truman is the Pontius Pilate. It would have been better—and equally appropriate—to have fired MacArthur last December after his ill-fated promise to bring the boys home by Christmas and while the Chinese hordes were sweeping over United Nations forces which MacArthur had unwisely spread thin over a broad and defenseless front. Truman might well have brought the general home by Christmas.

General MacArthur is now free to speak his piece. Let him lay his views before the country. If the American people are convinced, then they have the power to follow him—even to the point of deciding that to be bound by the leadership of a world organization composed of a lot of weak and indecisive allies is not the best way for the United States to get along in the world.

But meanwhile, let's operate as a team and according to the accepted rules.

Another Iowan Cries Out Against Bewilderment and Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the letter which I am causing to be inserted here was written to me by a friend, John Fletcher, who for many years served as a district judge and attorney general in the State of Iowa.

Mr. Fletcher raises questions which have never been answered adequately either in or out of Congress. Bewilderment and confusion are abroad in this land today because of the failure on the part of responsible officials to answer these and other questions.

It is because I believe his thought-provoking letter is deserving of the consideration of others that I have caused it to be inserted in the RECORD. It follows:

MAPLETON, IOWA.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: You know sometimes I sit around and think and again I just sit. Of late, like a lot of people, I'm bewildered about what has come over our Government. Everybody asks that question.

Unless someone steps forward to the front of the rostrum soon and explains better than it ever has been explained before what this war is about and why, then these American people are going to lose the last scintilla of the faith they have left in our system of government. This does not only apply to the so-called leaders of the administration but to the so-called leaders of the opposition as well.

Neither side answers the questions uppermost in the minds of the average citizen, viz: Is this war necessary? Has there been a good-faith effort by capable men to settle differences by peaceful means? If there has been the people are not advised.

The nations now at war are the United States and China. Have capable representatives of those two countries sat down around a table to discuss their differences in a real attempt to reach an agreement. I'm not talking about the so-called United Nations. That will never unite on anything so long as commercial achievement at any price is placed above the peace and happiness of the individual.

Are we not at war because those in charge want war? If so, why? Can we see an underlying reason for talking war and waging war?

If we stop waging war and talking war, how long would it take for this false economic structure we have been building up for the past 20 years to totally collapse? My own guess is that the collapse would come long before the 1952 elections if we stopped talking war today. There has never been a time since the last shot was fired in World War II that governmentally we have not talked war. Why?

Which would be harder on the American people, economic collapse, which must come eventually, or this war phobia that is destroying the faith of our citizens in their Government as one dedicated to peace and not to conquest of peoples of other nations who want their own kind of government whether it suits us or not.

I am, as you know, that last man who would believe in a communistic form of government but as a true American, I am the last man who would say peoples in other lands have not the right to adopt and live under their own form of government.

We have not set out to police people who are alone aggressors, but all people who believe in communism wherever they may be, whether peaceful or otherwise. We have so declared ourselves whether they are within our confines or live separate as a nation by themselves.

We not only continuously, as a Government, talk war but we are proselyting the people of other nations to become war-minded. We talk war, we eat war, we sleep war. Our topic everywhere is war. Do we actually know what we are doing to ourselves or do we care? Are we interested in the peace of the world or saving a vagabond's dream of an economic utopia where nobody works but everybody eats?

Every military nation since time began has eventually massacred its own citizenry—morally, socially, and economically—and has reduced it to the lowest form of peasantry and finally serfdom. Read your unbiased history since the fall of the Roman Empire down to A. D. 1951. Name one who survived.

What ended the 30 years of Scandinavian war? Poverty. What became of proud old England, the Empire on whose flag the sun never set? Its sun as a world power has set forever. What became of France that boasted the finest trained soldiery in the world? Too weak economically ever to try to defend itself. What of Italy, of the Kaiser's Germany, and of Hitler's Germany? The desire to whip and dictate to all the world killed them all. Great as we may be and

feel, is there an answer for all in the history of the past?

A Nation such as ours might well maintain an Army of considerable size on our own soil and a good Navy and Air Corps so long as there is war and rumors of wars but why should we seek war when we are not assailed? I'm not talking isolation, I'm talking about howling for war and daring others to fight and insisting they arm for war. I remember when the American press praised Hitler's great peacetime army and how he was building a great economic Germany. Thousands of fine Americans paid the price of dismantling it with their lives. The citizenry of Germany will spend the lives of generations yet unborn to build back the destruction militarism caused their country. They had better faced the economic condition with stoicism and fortitude that would have earned the gratitude and praise of a friendly world but militarism lost their all.

Can 6 percent of the people of the world, great and resourceful as we may be, feed, clothe, house, educate, arm, train to fight, whip, and destroy at will the other 94 percent of the people?

I'm wondering if the influence of commercial greed doesn't weigh more with our so-called leaders than patriotic duty on both sides.

Wishing you every success, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN FLETCHER.

Support for MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress today, April 19, 1951, has heard Gen. Douglas MacArthur address a joint meeting and discuss the conduct of the war in Korea. Along with other Members of the Congress, I was deeply impressed by the wisdom and sincerity of his words.

Among other things, General MacArthur advocated the use of the Chinese Nationalist military forces against the forces of the Communist enemy. I wish to inform the Members of the House that on April 12, 1951, the Senate of the State of California passed a resolution relative to the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in combat against the Chinese Communists.

The resolution follows:

Senate Resolution 114

Resolution relative to the use of Chinese Nationalist troops in combat against Chinese Communists

Whereas during the past few days California's National Guard, Fortieth Division, arrived in Japan; and

Whereas President Harry S. Truman has seen fit to relieve General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of all authority as commander of United Nations forces in Korea, commander of United States military forces, Far East theater, for alleged noncooperation; and

Whereas General MacArthur has advocated the use of Chinese Nationalist military troops in combat against Chinese Communist military forces; and

Whereas such dismissal indicates an opinion of the President of the United States to refuse to allow Chinese Nationalist troops to aid and assist United States military forces presently engaged in combat against Communist military units in Korea; and

Whereas the Senate of the State of California recognizes that the military action in Korea is but a battle in the war against communism; and

Whereas the Chinese Nationalist Army leaders have indicated their desire to aid and assist United States forces in engaging in combat for the purposes of defeating and destroying the Chinese Communist military forces; and

Whereas all governments of nations desirous of joining in a crusade to destroy communistic aggressors should be encouraged and utilized to the end that the majority of lives sacrificed in the present conflict against the Chinese Communist troops should not be drawn in vast measure from American military personnel, and in particular the anticipated use of the California Fortieth National Guard Division: Therefore

The Senate of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States to seriously reexamine the desirability of permitting the use of Chinese Nationalist military forces in the common cause of destroying Chinese Communist aggression in Asia, and the utilization of Chinese Nationalist troops prior to, or in conjunction with, utilization of California Fortieth National Guard Division in combat.

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Credit Due Joseph P. Kennedy for Part in the Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the great debate has waxed and waned in Congress, and I think the people are due some explanation as to the concepts and origins of the movement toward conservation of our manpower and resources.

These conservationists have been misnamed isolationists, and the connotation of the word has given the general public the erroneous idea that an isolationist is an ostrich with his head buried in the sand.

The conservationist of our blood and treasure, of our manpower, and our resources—which I might add are not unlimited—is not an isolationist nor an ostrich.

He is in allegory an American eagle; watchful, sane, faithful, fierce. He guards his own domain.

As we look back over the great debate, we find a singular figure as responsible for it.

He is Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. Kennedy has been of the opinion for a long time that we can weaken ourselves to the point of emaciation by our foreign adventures.

His philosophy appears to agree with that of George Washington, and I suppose his critics will find ways to blame him for that.

We all know that Mr. Kennedy is one of the closest advisers of former President Herbert Hoover and counseled him to emerge from retirement to his present position of elder statesman. Mr. Kennedy was the activating force in the Hoover plan. He is a human dynamo, as his career shows, and just the man to furnish the string to Mr. Hoover's bow.

It will be recalled that the great debate was opened by Mr. Kennedy's speech at the University of Virginia. It was followed by Mr. Hoover's speech, and the momentum of the issue carried it into the Senate. If there were a medal of honor for civilians, it should have been awarded to these two men.

One of the profound features of Mr. Kennedy's views is the conviction that to commit too much of our power abroad will play into Russia's hands for a quick and decisive victory.

Europe is her front yard and she can crush almost anything by land power.

We can defeat any aggressor who defies our combined land, sea, and air power.

By getting us to commit most of our land power in Europe, he has us in her lap. We can be beautifully booby-trapped.

More and more people are beginning to believe that, although we should fight aggression, we should not commit all of our strength in an area where we are at the greatest disadvantage.

If Mr. Kennedy had not made the effort, the great debate would not have been sparked. And, if the debate had not taken place, the issue of overseas commitments might never have reached a limit.

Truman's Appeasement of the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, why continue Mr. Truman's war against overwhelming Communists and at the same time let them win a victory through appeasement? David Lawrence expresses Mr. Truman's inconsistency in the following words:

DENIALS OF APPEASEMENT BELIED—KOREAN REPUBLIC WILL BE THROWN TO WOLVES BY DIPLOMACY UNLESS UNITED STATES PUBLIC ACTS

President Truman keeps on denying in his speeches that there is any appeasement of the Communists intended, but the fact remains that in the State Department a plan to do what really amounts to an appeasement of Communist China is being hatched.

The first public intimation that appeasement was in the wind came, strangely enough, in a White House release of a message that was sent by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on March 20 to General MacArthur. The real purpose in releasing the message—if it wasn't done accidentally—was to show

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that General MacArthur jumped the gun, so to speak, when he broadcast directly his appeal to the Chinese Communist military commander to agree to an armistice.

The stories have been widely disseminated by administration supporters that General MacArthur stole the thunder of the Government back home by making an appeal to his opposite military commander similar to that which the State Department intended to make through the UN and that he followed the wording closely. It has been asserted, moreover, that the policy in question was cleared with the United Nations and that General MacArthur spilled the beans.

There is not a scintilla of truth in either of these allegations. The message of March 20 is bound to become a historic document not only because it shows there was no United Nations policy or decision by the American Government but because it shows that the State Department was telling General MacArthur to deploy his troops in some sort of confusing military operation whereby he didn't advance but yet maintained contact with the enemy while the diplomats were to talk for a few weeks.

Here is the text of that message:

"To the Commander in Chief, Far East, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

"State [Department] planning Presidential announcement shortly that, with [the] clearing of the bulk of South Korea of aggressors, United Nations [are] now preparing to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea. Strong feeling persists that further diplomatic effort toward settlement should be made before any advance with major forces north of [the] thirty-eighth parallel. Time will be required to determine diplomatic reactions and permit new negotiations that may develop. Recognizing that [the thirty-eighth] parallel has no military significance, [the] State [Department] has asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff what authority you should have to permit sufficient freedom of action for [the] next few weeks to provide security for [the] UN forces and maintain contact with [the] enemy. Your recommendations [are] desired."

The foregoing shows how speculative and vague the State Department's plan was. It does not reveal the basis, if any, which the State Department had for virtually ordering American troops to stand still and be shot at while diplomats talked even though the enemy had not agreed to hold his fire. Every piece of evidence thus far from press dispatches and from Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, reveals that the Communist Government at Peiping has rebuffed every effort to talk peace and has lately refused even to make appointments at the Chinese Foreign Office with diplomatic representatives there from Britain, India, and Sweden to talk about the subject. Why was the State Department so anxious to stop our side from fighting while it did a job of palavering with other governments? The only answer is that an appeasement program is in the works. Here are its details:

A cease-fire line in a zigzag direction a few miles north and also a few miles south of the thirty-eighth parallel is to be the armistice line. This is supposed to be our victory line. When we gain that line, as General Ridgway in his political statement on March 12 said, America and the United Nations will have gained a victory.

The rest, it seems, is to be left to diplomacy. Thus is the Korean Republic to be thrown to the Communist wolves. Thus also is the UN to accept the thirty-eighth parallel line as all that it ever achieved since last June against the aggressor even though the UN branded Red China as an aggressor and is supposed to have resolved at one time to liberate all Korea. But the new plan presupposes that no liberation by military means can be achieved and that attainment of the barrier at the thirty-eighth parallel is the substitute.

The legal basis for the plan is that, our military objective having been attained, the political objective is a matter for UN determination. The idea of an independent, united Korea is to be left to diplomatic negotiations with Red China presumably over a long period of time. Thus 60,000 casualties will have been suffered by the American Government just to maintain the thirty-eighth parallel and to admit that the UN could not push the aggressor out of Korea but must let him stay where he started from last June—ready, perhaps, to jump across the parallel at any time. The Red Chinese have said all foreign troops must be withdrawn and this presumably means the Communist North Koreans of course will remain. That's the appeasement plan. It will of course be denied that this is appeasement. But this was what was planned before General MacArthur was fired. Maybe it will not materialize now because American public opinion may prevent it from being consummated.

Mr. Speaker, why should we continue to meddle in foreign affairs? Why should we not follow the advice of Washington and Thomas Jefferson, keep our men from fighting in futile wars, wherever and whenever some other nation seeks to use us to their own advantage?

Red China Is Too High a Price for a Truce in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial appearing in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

RED CHINA IS TOO HIGH A PRICE FOR A TRUCE IN KOREA

It's a solid bet that General MacArthur's statement of March 24 didn't burn up the State Department because it suggested the possibility of a military truce in Korea, or even because it hinted at attacks on the bases from which the Chinese Reds spark their attacks on United Nations forces. The general's offense was that he put his finger on the State Department's secret shame—namely, its apparently persistent determination to sell Formosa to the Communists and admit said Communists into the UN, as the price of a shaky peace in Korea.

MacArthur said: "There should be no insuperable difficulty in arriving at decisions on the Korean problem if the issues are resolved on their own merits without being burdened by extraneous matters not directly related to Korea, such as Formosa and China's seat in the United Nations."

This frank and obviously sound observation recalled the United Nations cease-fire proposal of January—for some reason or other concurred in by the United States—which suggested that a conference including Russia and Red China be called to settle Asiatic problems, including, among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations.

Fortunately, the open intervention of Red China in Korea made it difficult to go on with this monkey business, and most people assumed the proposal was a dead pigeon. The ire in the State Department suggests that it isn't; that the Acheson-Jessup zeal for a bad bargain with communism in Asia is as hearty as ever. Anyway, we ought to know soon.

As one ground for suspicion, James Reston, of the New York Times, who often reflects State Department thinking, wrote in his dispatch on the MacArthur statement: "As a matter of fact, the longer the war in Korea has continued, the less confidence there is in official quarters here that any solution can be found on any other basis than the above"—that is, a deal on Formosa and a Red seat in UN.

Most people, of course, agree that political decisions are not for military commanders to make and General MacArthur's proposal for a field armistice was made in full recognition of that fact. However, it is easy to understand that a commander in the field who has at least twice been deterred from pursuing the Red aggressor to his lair might be tempted to use this device to learn whether the war in Korea is something more conclusive than "Operation Killer" or is only a prelude to vast and unnecessary concessions in Asia.

Anyway, it would be a good idea to let the American people in on what's cooking. There is certainly no sentiment for a deal by which, in exchange for a hunk of Korea, which has little military importance, we would (1) hand over Formosa, which has vital strategic importance, and (2) consent to admission into the United Nations of the Chinese People's Republic. In other words, to end a war that we are at least not losing, we would hand over political and military advantages which would make it all but impossible to remain in the western Pacific at all.

But who says we can't end the Korean War on a decent basis, without surrendering our honor or future security? On March 24, MacArthur thought we could. What was wrong with letting him try?

United States Workers' Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we are always concerned with the morale of American workers. There are countless debates on the floor of this House concerning the problems of labor, but it seems we worry only about labor employed by private industry and forget all about the thousands of workers employed by the United States Government.

I think it is time we consider the morale of our own employees if we want to maintain adequate standards in the performance of Government duties. The question of the morale of United States workers has been expertly discussed by Joseph Young, writer for the Washington Sunday Star in an article in that paper on April 8. I recommend this article to the attention of the Members.

It follows:

UNITED STATES WORKERS' MORALE SUFFERS AS A RESULT OF WAR OF NERVES

(By Joseph Young)

Federal employee leaders charge that Government morale is suffering as a result of the war of nerves being waged against Federal workers.

They declare various moves in Congress as well as in the executive department to reduce employee benefits and privileges, plus adverse personnel restrictions already in effect, are causing unrest among employees.

The A. F. of L. Government Employees Council, which is composed of 22 unions with a Federal employee membership of 500,000 declares morale is at a low ebb.

Employee officials say this results from many conditions. Among them they name the moves in Congress to reduce annual and sick leave benefits and lower overtime payments. The stalling tactics by the administration and the House Civil Service Committee on the Federal pay-raise measure is another reason cited. And the proposal to work employees on around-the-clock shifts isn't helping employee morale, they say.

In addition, the present ban on permanent appointments, promotions and transfers in Government is hurting morale, they charge.

The attempts being made by the Defense Department to freeze its employees in their jobs and prevent them from transferring to other Government agencies are also cited as causing great employee dissatisfaction.

RELATIONSHIP TERRIBLE

A top employee leader put it this way: "The management-employee relationship in Government is terrible. Part of the blame rests with Congress and part with the executive branch.

"Where in private industry do you see attempts made to reduce employee benefits? The pattern is just the opposite. Employee benefits are constantly increased rather than decreased.

"This is sound management policy and business knows it. Yet here we have Congress and some parts of the executive branch of Government trying to reduce benefits.

"We're not saying that there aren't some things wrong in Government and that economies should not be made. But why take it out on the employee?

"Why take away vacation and sick leave benefits that employees have had for years? Any money that would be saved by such action would be more than lost by the resignation of top-flight people in Government who would quit in disgust. It's common knowledge that a lot of our top scientific, technical, and professional personnel have been recruited into Government and have remained, not for the money involved, but for the liberal vacation and sick-leave benefits."

OVERTIME PAY ATTACKED

"The same goes for attempts to reduce overtime payments and other benefits. As for overtime, Government employees already receive far less than the time-and-one-half overtime payments that is the law of the land for workers in private industry. And now some Members of Congress want to reduce these payments still further."

Employee leaders also sharply criticize lack of action on Federal pay legislation, declaring that it is terribly discouraging for Government workers to see private industry workers secure cost-of-living pay boosts while they receive none.

Of course some of the moves to cut benefits, such as the one to reduce overtime payments, in all probability won't succeed. But the move to cut annual and sick-leave benefits is a serious one and is backed by many Members of Congress.

Employee officials say that the average Government worker is trying to do a conscientious job to help his country in the national emergency program as well as to serve the public. But they declare that it cannot be expected that employees will do their best work while they are under constant badgering and threats.

Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at Dedication of Kings Daughters' Hospital, Staunton, Va., and Introductory Remarks by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech made by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, at the dedication of the King's Daughters' Hospital, Staunton, Va., April 15, 1951, and the remarks I made in introducing him.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW KING'S DAUGHTERS' HOSPITAL, STAUNTON, VA., APRIL 15, 1951

A kind and gracious providence has smiled upon us as we gather today to dedicate an institution of peace and to pay tribute to an undertaking in the realm of humanitarianism. May the sentiments for peace in the world that today rise up in our hearts ascend to that judgment throne where Staunton's Woodrow Wilson said, "Justice and mercy are reconciled and the Judge and brother are one." I coveted this opportunity to warmly congratulate the good people of Staunton, Augusta, and Highland on their remarkable achievement of financing a two and a half million dollar hospital which has equipment and facilities that are the equal of any in the Commonwealth.

One of my most prized possessions is a miniature of my mother made when she was 17 years old and a student at the Female Institute in Staunton, now called Stuart Hall. Last fall she died at the age of 92. On her ninetieth birthday she told me that she had lived through four wars and that was enough war for one lifetime. Her father and nine of his brothers served in the Confederate Army. Five of them were killed. In those days a serious battle wound meant death, a tragic reminder of the fact that throughout recorded history man has placed more emphasis upon killing than upon curing his fellow man.

Long before my mother came to Staunton this historic city had become known to the medical profession through the outstanding work of Dr. Alexander Humphreys, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh. In the days of Dr. Humphreys there was no medical school in Virginia or the South and no training school for nurses. Virginia doctors trained abroad would train Virginia boys who desired to practice medicine.

In a remarkable address this morning Dr. Richard Bell told of five boys who were trained by Dr. Humphreys, all of whom became famous. One of them was William Henry Harrison, of Charles City County, Va., who became President of the United States, and another was Ephriam McDowell, who was born in Fairfield, Va., then a part of Augusta County, and after studying at the University of Edinburgh, located in Kentucky for the practice of medicine. In 1809 he performed the famous abdominal operation on Mrs. Crawford and is properly called the father of abdominal surgery. Dr. Ephriam McDowell represents the great State of Kentucky in the Congressional Hall of Fame.

The dedication of this wonderful new hospital illustrates how deeply indebted we are to a city that even in Colonial days was a pioneer in medical science and to the public-spirited women of a previous generation who had a vision of practical Christianity.

Hundreds of years before Christ the temples of Saturn were used as medical schools. But hospitals as we now know them were not established until the fourth century A. D. and in Europe dated largely from the fifteenth century. Not until the eighteenth century were there any hospitals outside of the big cities, and that was true of Virginia even in the nineteenth century. It was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that we had trained nurses for hospital service. Florence Nightingale began her memorable study of hospitals and hospital nursing in 1854 when England was stirred by reports of the suffering of wounded soldiers in the Crimean War. When Florence Nightingale returned from the Crimean War, after saving many of those wounded in the bloody battle of Balaclava, Queen Victoria instituted a reform in all military hospitals and in 1887 devoted a fund of $350,000 to a training institution for nurses along the lines advocated by Florence Nightingale.

About that time a Christian organization dedicated to welfare work and the care of the lame, the halt, and the blind known as the International Order of King's Daughters and Sons was formed. It was composed of those who acknowledged Christ as King and who were willing to carry on His work. A chapter of that organization was formed in Staunton, and in 1896 it founded the King's Daughters Hospital. That was the first general hospital in the valley, and in the entire State there were only seven more.

The hospital we are to dedicate today is the outgrowth of the efforts of consecrated men and women of Staunton who believe that we build in vain a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of spiritual force and the principles of the Prince of Peace.

For these memorable ceremonies we are indeed fortunate to have as our guest speaker a distinguished statesman from Alabama, who, first as a Member of the House and later as a Member of the Senate, has recognized the need for hospitals and medical care and who sponsored the first bill ever passed by the Congress of the United States to make grants-in-aid to localities for hospital construction.

Our guest speaker, in keeping with his program to promote the welfare of the masses, was author of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to create a Federal yardstick to determine the proper cost of hydroelectric energy and of the Rural Telephone Act. He also has been coauthor of the Farm Housing Act, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, of the school-lunch program, voluntary health insurance bill, local public health units bill, child health services bill, Federal aid to education, Vocational Education Act of 1946, General Housing Act, the GI bill of rights, and numerous other measures of national import.

As a member of the Senate Labor Committee he endeared himself to his southern colleagues through the preparation of the minority report against FEPC, which Senator

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA LIBRARIES

RUSSELL of Georgia, termed "a jewel." But it is the Hill-Burton Act by which he is best known to all Virginians interested in a modern hospital program. His standing in the Senate is evidenced by the fact that from 1940 to 1946 he was the Democratic whip, voluntarily relinquishing that important assignment because of the press of his other senatorial duties.

No doubt from his great grandfather Rev. William W. Hill, and his grandfather, Rev. L. L. Hill, both pioneer Methodist ministers in Alabama, he inherited a zeal for promoting the welfare of the masses and from his father, Dr. Luther Leonidas Hill, of Montgomery, one of the South's foremost surgeons, his interest in medical education and medical care. From his grandfather on his mother's side, Mark Lyons, of Mobile, who fought under Albert Sidney Johnston, he inherited his love for Robert E. Lee and the fundamental principle of State's rights.

It gives me great pleasure to present to you my friend and Senate colleague, Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama.

SPEECH OF HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE KING'S DAUGHTERS' HOSPITAL, STAUNTON, VA.

It is pleasant to be in Staunton today on this fine occasion. I want to thank you for letting me come and be with you for the dedication of your magnificent new King's Daughters' Hospital.

I always feel an inspiration when I come to Virginia. The loveliness of the Shenandoah Valley through which I have been traveling this morning is representative of the beauty of Virginia's countryside.

As I drove along I thought not only of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and the other great and illustrious Virginia sons who made such mighty contributions to the building of our Nation—I thought how particularly fitting that this hospital, Virginia's first completely new hospital to be started under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act should be erected in this lovely city that gave us three great doctors, Alexander Humphries, teacher of that pioneer in abdominal surgery, Ephraim McDowell, and that immortal doctor of humanities, Woodrow Wilson.

I am happy to be here in the home State of my good friends and esteemed colleagues, your able and distinguished Senators, HARRY BYRD and WILLIS ROBERTSON. It is good that Senator ROBERTSON can be with us. Senator BYRD told me of his disappointment over his inability to be here.

You who have watched this hospital grow day by day and stone by stone have the immeasurable satisfaction of knowing that the hospital is your hospital—the product of your planning, your energies, and your devotion. It is the product of the splendid vision and untiring labors of Mrs. Herbert Smith and your other hospital trustees and hospital officials. I commend and congratulate each of you.

This hospital marks a new day of medical care for the people of Staunton, Augusta County, and the surrounding area. It will give them the finest medical and surgical care. No resources of time and money, of architectural planning or materials have been spared to make this hospital the most modern, the best-equipped hospital of its kind.

Here are operating rooms, laboratories, obstetrical and pediatric rooms; departments for physical therapy, and emergency and clinical treatment. Here is the finest X-ray equipment for treating cancer and other diseases. The broad grounds and spacious sundeck of this hospital offer the convalescent the healing, strengthening benefits of light and air and sunshine in pleasant surroundings.

In building your hospital you confirm the wisdom of our Hospital Act—the wisdom of helping the people to do for themselves. You show that when the Government helps to meet the need for hospitals by providing assistance grants, the people, with their sense of local responsibility and local leadership, are eager to meet the opportunity and build their own hospitals.

This hospital is built for the future. And even as its doors are opened, I urge you to draw again upon that fine cooperative spirit that brought it into being, to move on to the next vital step for securing its benefits to all the people—the step of integrating voluntary health insurance facilities with your hospital.

I like to use as an illustration of the practical accomplishment of this kind of integration the case of the Lanier Memorial Hospital in my own State of Alabama. Constructed under the same Hospital Act, this hospital opened its doors about 18 months ago. Around the hospital, as the medical center of another lovely valley community, has been built a voluntary system of prepaid health insurance that insures the people that at all times they can receive hospital and medical care without sudden financial burden.

This Alabama community in its accomplishment, has offered as a pattern for all the Nation, the objective of our voluntary health insurance bill in Congress. What they are doing bears out our faith in the voluntary methods of democracy. It supports our confidence in the ability of the people to act for themselves and to provide medical care for themselves by preserving and strengthening and building upon our free American medical system, without compulsion and without reliance upon a socialized system.

We are often reminded that too little thought and effort are being devoted to our health—our most vital personal and national resource. I imagine General Opie, who has given so unstintingly of his time to the building of this hospital, could tell us a great deal about the miracles of modern medicine in rescuing the lives of battle casualties and of the rate at which disease is weakening our manpower resources. He could tell us that the physical rejection rate today under selective service is higher than during World War II. Since Korea the equivalent of 17 infantry divisions have been rejected for physical defects. Think of it. Three hundred thousand young men between the ages of 19 and 25—the flower of our defense manpower—found physically unfit to serve. What better warning do we need before we move on all fronts to correct this appalling situation caused in such large measure by neglect of our Nation's health.

When I talk about health and what we must do for the health of our people, I like to speak of the six pillars of health—doctors, hospitals, preventive medicine, research, education, and the soil—each vital to every one of us and to the Nation's well being.

You have good doctors here in this great section of the Shenandoah Valley. This hospital will help to insure that you continue to have good doctors. But throughout the Nation there is a serious shortage of both hospital and medical personnel. We must train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians. We must follow your example and build the hospitals we need to give all our people adequate hospital service.

The marvelous strides that we have made against typhoid fever, scarlet fever, diphtheria, malaria, smallpox, pellagra, and other such diseases is proof of what can be accomplished through our public health services in the field of preventive medicine. We must provide urgently needed help to the States, their counties, and cities in their never-ending struggle against disease—cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, mental disease, infantile paralysis. We must help them in the advancement of such specialized programs as maternal and child care.

We must provide more intense and greater research to study the causes of disease and to bring forth new discoveries for prevention and cure. Surely a nation that can produce the atomic bomb can find the cause and cure for cancer.

I wonder if you were surprised when I named the soil as one of the pillars of health. You and I know what happens to an automobile if we put the wrong kind of oil in it, or if we get grit in the gasoline. The same thing applies to the machinery of the human body. The right food that we put into our bodies makes for health and strength. The wrong food makes for weakness and sickness. The minerals and nutrients which feed and make up our bodies come to us from the plants and products of the soil. More and more doctors and scientists attribute diseases to deficiencies of minerals in our soil.

Down in Deaf Smith County, Tex., they have no decay of the teeth because the minerals in the soil of that county prevent such decay. Missouri does not just happen to be a mule-raising section. It produces big, tough mules because of the phosphorous and other minerals in its soil.

And so the farmer in his farming practices and soil conservation is working and contributing to your health and my health and the health of all our people. That is why it is so important that we continue to help the farmer in his soil conservation. In helping him we are helping all.

Education is essential to health. Health and education go hand in hand. It is the educated person who knows best how to take care of himself and preserve his health. The more uneducated and illiterate people are, the more sickness and disease we find among them. We must make certain that America's children, tomorrow's citizens and defenders of our democracy, have the opportunity for the education that will equip them for the responsibilities of citizenship and the building of lasting peace.

These are six pillars of health. All must be strong if our people are to be strong and healthy and we are to have a strong America.

The great hope of all of us today is for peace. And our hope for building and keeping the peace lies in a strong America. America must be strong in her Armed Forces, her armed might. She must be strong in her economy and strong in the united determination of her people to save and build the peace.

We know that during the last war the final victory of our fighting forces was made possible by production. American workers and American management produced more war materials than the rest of the world combined. American farmers pushed food and fiber production to record heights.

As we produced to win the war, we must produce today to defend our freedom and win the peace. As you increase the harvest of your acres here in the Shenandoah Valley, as you increase the production in your mills and factories, you can know that you are waging the fight for peace and freedom in the spirit of your own great son, Woodrow Wilson, who gave us these words—the finest tribute ever paid to a people:

"There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and

peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

This afternoon as we dedicate your beautiful hospital, we know that this is the Sabbath Day, the day of Him whom we call the Great Physician, of Him whom we call the Prince of Peace. In His name and in His spirit, let us dedicate this hospital, setting an example to all Virginia and to all the Nation that as we shall follow in His footsteps by healing the sick and binding up their wounds, so shall we follow in His footsteps in the building of the peace of the world.

Letter From a Soldier in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a letter from a member of our fighting force in Korea to his commanding officer in World War II who is a constituent and a valued friend of mine. The letter without the names of the parties and the location of the fighting force deleted is as follows:

At the present time our regiment is in ——— reserve. After our push up to Chunchon we were pulled out into reserve.

I believe our reserve time is just about up now. Not much activity along the front, just light action and naturally very heavy patrolling. I imagine by the time you receive this letter something will have happened one way or the other. I look for the Chinese to start an offensive before long.

———, this is an entirely different war than the one we fought in Germany. These people (Chinese) are fanatics. They have to be dug out, and I mean dug.

The weather is fairly nice now, I am sure thankful for that, because the past winter was rough. Thought I would freeze in spite of everything. It's nice now; not very cold at all.

I have been in Korea 4½ months. When I left Japan in November I was assigned to the ——— division, but when I got to Korea, they assigned me to the ——— and I have been here ever since. I am first sergeant of this company. It's not a bad job, as all the communications jobs are filled, and have been. Got a large company, and a good one. This sure is a fighting outfit. None of us are happy here, and don't enjoy it a bit; but as long as we have to be here we will do our best.

Something ought to be done for some of these boys over here. There are men here who have been over here over 8 months, and ———, they are shot. I've got some boys who are just kids, and they have been up front so long they aren't going to make it much longer. I can't understand what is wrong with the Army. If the Chinese don't kill these men, the Army will. I know there are more men than that in the Army. I don't suppose I will ever be in a position to do anything about this; but my one vote will sure go in the opposite direction, next time. I've seen them crack up. I've seen them brought into the aid station wounded for life, and I've seen the dead ones. I know we are fighting for what is right; but I can't see letting the same ones do it all the time. These poor kids will never be the same again, and if I ever get out of Army this time, I never want anything whatsoever to do with it. You should hear these boys cough at night. I know I am bitter, but not because of myself; but for what I have seen in Korea. It's a dirty stinking mess. The Army isn't what it was when you and I were in before.

It's just about dark and I will have to close. I shall try and write you occasionally. Take it easy and pray for us.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent who has a distingushed record in World War II, informs me that the man who wrote this letter, who is also a citizen of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee which I have the honor of representing, spent 5 years or 6 years in the Army serving throughout World War II, staying in the Reserves after leaving active duty, that he has a wife and one child and that after some 5 years of civilian life he was recalled to active duty, given 9 days' training, and shipped to the Pacific theater.

Mr. Speaker, these men who are going through the horrors of Korea must be relieved. The heritage and history of America is too great to permit this condition to continue.

Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of personal pride, privilege, and satisfaction to be able to number among my constituents Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr., an outstanding American—an outstanding citizen of the city of Newark, N. J. For many, many years Mrs. O'Brien has devoted herself unselfishly and untiringly in the interest of her fellow man. No matter what effort was entailed, so long as the welfare of others was concerned, Mrs. O'Brien, in the true Christian spirit, has always responded to the call.

Some years ago the citizenry of Newark in recognition of her great services had her proclaimed as a real humanitarian. Mrs. O'Brien might easily have rested on this well-deserved distinction, but, instead in a self-effacing manner, she carried on—and her good works multiplied. She continued to bring solace to the afflicted and comfort and assistance to the needy. The governing body of the city of Newark has held it fitting to issue a proclamation, designating April 15 Angel Day in honor of the Angel of Newark—Mrs. John F. O'Brien.

I join in the sentiment expressed in this fitting tribute and under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a proclamation issued by Mayor Ralph A. Villani, of Newark, N. J., under date of April 12 concerning the activities of Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr.:

Whereas Mrs. John F. O'Brien, Jr., identified with all things humane and noble all of her life; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Brien, having served the city of Newark for 32 years in institutional endeavors with such institutions as the blind, Crippled Children's Hospital, St. Michaels Hospital, orphanages, the Little Sisters of the Poor, Ivy Haven, and numerous other charitable and social agencies; and

Whereas, Mrs. O'Brien, having been greatly responsible for the passage of legislative bills toward the betterment of the underprivileged as well as removing the stigma which might reflect unpleasantly upon individuals and families who have become victims of circumstances beyond their control; having been responsible for the changing of the name of Ivy Haven from Alms House and the permanent removal of the use of the word "pauper" in any way referred to the aged or the poor; and

Whereas, this being the fourth anniversary of the passage of that humane bill, in cognizance of this and her other noble endeavors having received recognition by having been named "Angel" at Ivy Haven and referred to as "Angel of Newark" by the press, and by people of all walks of life and by myself as well, having first-hand knowledge of her many pioneering efforts of which she has given of her own, in time, health and finances:

Now, therefore, I, Ralph A. Villani, mayor of the city of Newark, and for my colleagues, Commissioners Meyer C. Ellenstein, John B. Keenan, Stephen J. Moran, and Leo P. Carlin, do hereby proclaim April 15, 1951, as Angel Day in honor of one who rightfully deserves the nomen for her unstinting sacrifices that Newark may be a better place to live in and humanity may be better to live with.

RALPH A. VILLANI,
Mayor.

APRIL 12, 1951.

Should UN Members Traffic With Our Enemies and Should We Hand Over Formosa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, if the plan of General MacArthur to help the people of Japan, the Philippines, and Formosa to hold out against Communist aggression is accepted and the China coast is blockaded, the war can be ended in Korea. If this blockade is put on, then those trading strategic material to the Reds will be caught red-handed. The very first catch will be Great Britain. As long as England can keep on shipping war materials to China, the war will continue and those materials will be used by the Red Chinese in fighting the troops of the United Nations, which include a small force from Britain. This must be comforting to the British soldiers fighting in Korea to know that their own country is making it possible for the war to continue. When a government can sacrifice its own men to save its trade, it is noticed that we are associating with the most perfidious and selfish nation on the earth today. This same England

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

is determined that Red China shall be admitted to the United Nations and that Formosa shall be turned over to the Communists. Nothing will prevent it, unless there is an aroused spirit in America. Our State Department often behaves more English than American, and finally may agree to this appeasement. If we reward the aggressors with the gift of Formosa our chain of defenses against the Communists in the Pacific will be broken.

TRADE WITH REDS

In view of the shameless trafficking with the enemy by some of our United Nations allies, I have introduced a resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) providing that our UN delegates shall be instructed to move for expulsion of guilty countries from the organization. My bill also provides that any American found guilty of trafficking with those against whom we are engaged in actual combat shall be declared engaged in treasonable activities and tried for treason as the Constitution provides.

The statement made by the President that he will send troops anywhere he wants to any time he wants to without the consent of Congress, and other intemperate statements of the Truman-Acheson administration, the untimely dismissal of General MacArthur—all have aroused the American people to a pitch of alarm never before witnessed in the history of this Republic.

The aroused feeling of the people was not alone the dismissal of General MacArthur but an accumulation of all these unfortunate statements and acts.

REWARD AGGRESSION?

Should the State Department finally surrender Formosa to Red China and break our chain of defenses against the Communists, the fury of the American people will far surpass their reaction to the MacArthur incident, and nothing will stop it except the retirement or impeachment of all those in the administration who are responsible for the move. The State Department earlier scuttled all opposition to the Communists in China, and if Formosa is scuttled, we would lose the key to our defense system against the Communist hordes of Asia.

Treason in the Constitution is defined as levying war against the United States or giving aid and comfort to its enemies. If the administration joins Great Britain in giving up Formosa, it is treason, or I do not know what acts would constitute that crime.

Panama Canal Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since 1947 the Panama Canal has been the subject of recurrent discussion in the Congress, and the time is approaching when definite action should be taken toward the proper resolution of this problem.

In the RECORD of April 11, 1951, in an extension of remarks by Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, was published an unusually able statement by former Member of Congress Willis W. Bradley, of Long Beach, Calif., before the House Committee on Public Works. This statement dealt at some length with the St. Lawrence seaway and the Panama sea-level project.

Another recent contribution by former Representative Bradley concerning the Panama Canal was published as an editorial in the April 4, 1951, edition of the well-known Pacific coast newspaper, the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram.

Under leave accorded, I am pleased to include it in my remarks:

DON'T OVERDO ON PANAMA CANAL CHANGES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, a former Congressman from the Eighteenth Congressional District, is a recognized authority on the Panama Canal. His home is at 284 Argonne Avenue, Long Beach.)

(By Capt. Willis W. Bradley, U. S. Navy, retired)

The people of the West pay a large part of the expenses of the Panama Canal so what happens there concerns the pocketbook of every resident of this southern California region.

When the Canal was constructed it seemed primarily a national defense feature. In that aspect, the usual way would have been to charge the original cost off to national security. However, since the big ditch was to serve both commercial vessels and warships, its cost was set up as an interest-bearing investment and commercial traffic has paid tolls based on operating expense, plus interest on the investment, from the day of opening. This has kept tolls unnecessarily high and has cost consumers in California many millions more than their fair share of all expenditures incurred by Uncle Sam in the Canal Zone.

Recently, efforts have been made by the Department of the Army, charged with operation of the Canal, to increase tolls because of higher present-day costs of almost everything one buys. The proposed increases have been blocked by loud dissent from the Congress, from shipping activities, and from Pacific Coast States, but Canal authorities are ready to delve into our pocketbooks for more money at the first opportunity.

When the Canal was constructed it was designed to operate on three levels. * * * There is a group of three locks on the Atlantic side (the Gatun locks) which give a total lift of about 85 feet from the level of the Atlantic to Gatun Lake. On the Pacific side we find two sets of locks: First, the Miraflores locks, consisting of two steps with a total lift of about 54 feet from the Pacific level to Miraflores Lake, and then the Pedro Miguel lock, with a single lift of about 31 feet from Miraflores Lake to the upper level of the Canal (that of Gatun Lake), which prevails at the Pacific end of Gaillard (Culebra) cut.

The Canal has been very satisfactory during its short life although operating experience has brought out several serious faults in design.

Now in correcting these faults we should be certain that we are not led into a morass of public spending having every appearance of boondoggling on a gigantic scale. Such spending is threatened in current proposals to lower the present Panama Canal to sea level at an estimated cost of $2,500,000,000. These proposals were made to the Congress by the Governor of the Panama Canal in a report submitted in 1947 and they are being pushed energetically. The main reason assigned for this vast conversion proposal is alleged greater national security in this atomic-bomb age.

There are several fallacies in the sea-level proposals. The suggested project is not a conversion, as represented to the public, but rather an almost entirely new canal. It is a conversion in the same sense as rebuilding your home by providing an entirely new house of different design, but keeping your old front door and street number. The initial estimate of $2,500,000,000 ($2,483,000,000 to be more exact) is considered conservatively to be less than half of the probable final cost. The new canal would infringe on the territory of the Republic of Panama and so require a new treaty embodying additional concessions from Panama which—if obtainable—would undoubtedly be very expensive in increased annual payments to Panama and might involve a heavy indemnity for property concerned. The best information available is that a sea-level canal would be about as vulnerable as the present lock canal to atomic-bomb attack and damage.

An alternative to the expensive sea-level project, proposed by Capt. Miles DuVal, United States Navy, retired, seems to satisfy every apparent need at moderate cost. This plan calls for changes to provide a lake at the Pacific end—accomplished by increasing the Miraflores locks from two stage to three-stage, by eliminating the Pedro Miguel lock, and the construction of a series of larger locks at both Atlantic and Pacific entrances.

Fantastic Claims Are Being Made by the Supporters of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on March 10, 1951, in an editorial exposes the fantastic claims of the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The editorial follows:

FANTASTIC CLAIMS

Fantastic claims are being made by the supporters of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, who see in the war emergency an opportunity to put over a scheme which has been consistently rejected by Congress for 20 years. Almost as far-fetched are some of the arguments advanced by opponents of the seaway, which leaves the average taxpayer, who must foot the bill, thoroughly bewildered.

It is a little hard for him to understand why in the midst of mobilization this country should consider undertaking to spend more than $1,000,000,000, plus urgently needed manpower and materials, to build a waterway, more than half of which lies entirely outside the boundaries of the United States. The best estimate of the manpower required was made by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, then Chief of Army Engineers, in testifying before Congress in 1947. He reported that

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LIBRARIES

111,355 man-years of work would be required to construct a 27-foot channel in the International Rapids section alone. This would mean the services of 23,600 men for 4 years. It does not include the work needed on connecting channels of the Great Lakes, the deepening of harbors, or the work in the Canadian section of the waterway.

Proponents of the seaway urge its construction now on the plea that it would provide a water route for the movement of iron ore from Labrador; a movement which it is estimated would average approximately 10,000,000 tons annually. Assuming that the seaway could be built for $1,000,000,000 this would represent an investment of $100 a ton for Labrador ore at a time when known ore reserves in this country can supply the Nation's maximum needs for more than a decade. In addition there are in this country billions of tons of taconite containing iron. It would be far more practical to spend a small fraction of the cost of the seaway to build taconite processing plants.

The real objective of the St. Lawrence project is not navigation, but power development. New York and New England interests urge the project because they see in it the opportunity to secure the development of electric power at the expense of the taxpayers of the rest of the country. It is, in short, a grandiose TVA, to subsidize power users of New England.

This country does not need more TVA's. It certainly cannot afford to dissipate money, manpower and materials on a TVA scheme which could not be finished in any event until long after the present war emergency is past. Congress has recognized these considerations, and other valid arguments against the seaway in the past. They should prevail again, despite the pressure that is being brought to put over the seaway in the guise of a mobilization project.

Britain Refuses to Participate in Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the supporters of the reciprocal trade agreements program were shocked to learn that Britain has refused to join with other nations in cutting tariffs. At Torquay, England, the United States and 38 countries agreed to tariff cuts, but not the British.

The story about this conference appeared in the Star on Sunday, April 22. Said article is included as part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES AND 38 NATIONS AGREE ON TARIFF CUTS, BUT BRITAIN DOES NOT

TORQUAY, ENGLAND, April 21.—New agreements lowering still further some of the tariff barriers to world trade were signed today by the United States and 38 other nations. The details are temporarily secret.

In addition to 147 separate tariff-reducing agreements between pairs of nations, cuts previously agreed on at two earlier conferences since World War II were continued until 1954.

The Torquay Conference of members of the postwar General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade ended after nearly 7 months. Conference headquarters said "a substantial list of concessions has been achieved which will be applied over a very extensive area of world trade."

TALKS BREAK DOWN

But the biggest failure was a breakdown of negotiations between the United States and most of the British Commonwealth nations.

The United States reached tariff-reducing agreements with 17 of the 24 nations with whom it negotiated, including Canada, a member of the British Commonwealth, and Belgium, Brazil, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Indonesia, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Western Germany, Korea, Peru, and Turkey.

But it failed to reach an agreement with Britain, Australia, New Zealand, India, and South Africa—all Commonwealth members—and Cuba and Guatemala.

COULDN'T GET TOGETHER

"They wouldn't give us what we wanted and we couldn't give them what they wanted," said Carl Corse, State Department trade expert who headed the 99-man American delegation.

Mr. Corse was authorized to reduce by as much as 50 percent the import duties on about 3,000 items. In return, the United States wanted tariff reductions by the Commonwealth countries which would have effectively broken down the empire preference system in operation for 19 years.

Britain was tempted to give up the system which she erected in 1932 as a shield against the world depression. By this system, Britain and the Commonwealth countries charge lower tariffs on each other's goods than they do on the products of other countries.

TARIFF CUTS WOULD HELP

American tariff cuts would have helped Britain's drive to earn more dollars by sales of goods to the United States. But trade experts believe she finally decided to stick to empire preference because she would have difficulty in holding her empire markets against United States mass-production industries if pounds and dollars should become freely convertible some time in the future.

The members of the General Agreement on Tariffs do more than 80 percent of the world's international trade.

The exact tariff cuts that were agreed on will not be published until May 9, when each nation which gave or received reductions will make them public. All the new tariff changes will be published May 12 by Gatt headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland.

Under the Gatt system, the deals are made between the principal buyers and sellers of each separate product. Then the lowered tariffs are extended to all Gatt members.

Our Multiple Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of a sermon delivered by the Reverend Edward Hughes Pruden, pastor of First Baptist Church of Washington, on April 15, 1951.

The sermon follows:

OUR MULTIPLE CHALLENGE

Ephesians 6: 12: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

It has been customary to assume that the group of Christians to whom was committed the most staggering task in all of history was that little group of disciples on the Galilean hillside to whom Jesus gave the great commission. We know that they did receive a staggering responsibility. They must have been shaken to their very foundations by all of the implications bound up in the great commission: What it required of them; and how alert, sacrificial, and full of eagerness they would have to be if that commission was ever to be carried out in all of its greatness and power.

But I am inclined to believe today that the Christians of this generation have confronting them an even more tremendous and frightening responsibility, for we are confronted on every hand by a variety of problem situations which give us grave concern, and which are more or less related to one another as far as their total impact upon the cause of Christ is concerned. Looked at together, they might be likened to a mighty octopus with its tentacles stretched toward us in all directions, challenging or threatening us constantly with the possibilities wrapped up in the influences they possess. I should like to mention a few of these particular problems with which we are confronted and indicate ways in which we must face them.

First of all among these problem situations I would mention an engulfing defeatism—a sense of being conquered even before the struggle begins. I am afraid that far too many Americans have been afflicted with this malady. We find fears around us which approach psychopathic proportions. Men and women are not only afraid but are not embarrassed to admit these fears, and they resort to terribly emotional extremes in expressing their anxieties.

This was illustrated last week when the news was released to the world that General MacArthur had been relieved of his command. Some of the excessively emotional responses to that news was due, of course, to great admiration for the general; some of it was due to an unreasoning political partisanship; but much of it was due to the vicious and deliberate campaign of hate and suspicion in which a few newspapers and radio commentators have been engaged. These scaremongers would have us believe that there is a subversive in every Government office; that our leaders are under the influence of some sinister organization of traitors; and that we are on the verge of being taken over by Russia. Those of us who are at all intelligent know that that is absolute foolishness, but the tragedy of it is that there are enough uninformed, simple-minded, emotionally unstable people in the world to accept that propaganda as though it were gospel truth. Many of those who called the newspapers last week and couldn't speak coherently because of the emotional upheaval within them were victims of this kind of propaganda. They were indeed pathetic victims because they were so sincere and honest about it all, having accepted as absolute fact the rumors the suggestions, and the suspicions which had been circulated by some of these commentators. I don't know which commentators you listen to but I hope you listen with a selective mind. You can no more accept everything you hear on the radio than you can accept

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

everything that is printed in the newspapers. We must use our intelligence and discriminate between that which is vicious and which undermines confidence in ourselves and our Government, and that which our intelligence tells us is sane and reasonable. We have come to a sad day in the life of our country when a United States Senator can stand on the floor of the Senate with so little regard for the truth and the intelligence of the people and make this statement, "Our Government," he said, "is in the hands of a secret inner coterie which is directed by the agents of the Soviet Union." It is hard for me to believe that a Senator could be ignorant enough to believe that. We know that it isn't so, and I am inclined to believe that the Senator knows that it isn't so. We who are Christians must be an enlightening and stabilizing influence in society. We must help to calm those who have been unnecessarily aroused. We must help men to know the truth that they may be free—free from fear and falsehood, from the domination of false propaganda disseminated by unscrupulous men. It is our duty to confront men with the steadying influences of the Christian gospel.

Here again may I quote once more a verse of scripture which you have already noticed is frequently on my lips—the verse from the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians, "Love is always eager to believe the best." If we find ourselves eager to believe the worst, either about America, its leadership, or our fellow citizens, let's reexamine the basis of our own discipleship, for love is never eager to believe falsehood. Love is disinclined to accept uncomplimentary statements regarding one's fellowmen. If I believed that communism was so attractive, compelling and absolute in its appeal that multitudes of people in our Government had fallen for it, it would shake my confidence in democracy, but I don't believe that communism is that kind of thing. I believe it appeals only to people who are so downtrodden that they will grasp at anything to give them some hope, or to people who are mentally unstable. I don't believe there is a normal human being in the world to whom communism has any appeal. That is why I don't lie awake at night thinking of what communism is going to do to America. Our people generally are too well off and too intelligent ever to fall for that kind of philosophy. Of course, here and there you find a few who because of some unusual circumstances have become victims of the communistic ideology, but they constitute a small and an almost negligible minority. We must do something to counteract the campaign of fear which many seem deliberately trying to create at a time when we need all the confidence and courage and united spirit which we can possibly muster.

In the second place, we are confronted by communistic fanaticism. Communism isn't just a philosophy; it is a crusade. It isn't just something which men accept passively, but it is something which they are trying to share intensively. We read in the newspapers about the Communist soldiers in North Korea, and the Chinese Communist soldiers, who come against our fighting men in wave upon wave, like the waters of the sea, giving themselves completely and eagerly in a great crusading spirit for the establishment of their own ideology. Now it isn't enough for us to denounce communism, and be on the alert against it, but we must somehow reproduce in our own relationship to Christianity something of that zeal, determination, and crusading spirit which the devotees of a pagan philosophy are everywhere demonstrating. To some of you I have mentioned before the Indian student at Bacone College in Oklahoma who came back from his summer vacation last September after spending his holidays with his family on the reservation. When he arrived on the campus the president of the college said to him, "John, what is wrong with you? You look as though you are completely exhausted and spent." And the student said, "Doctor, just before leaving the Indian reservation I took part in the sun dance of my tribe." And when the president required as to what that involved he said, "That required that we should dance in a wild, frenzied fashion for 3 days and 3 nights without stopping for food or drink. Every man in the tribe but one fell by the wayside out of sheer exhaustion." Then the president asked, "John, why on earth did you do it?" And John replied, "We did it in the hope that we might drive the war out of Korea." While we may smile at the innocence and the foolishness of trying to end a war by a sun dance, the question we ought to ask ourselves is this, "How much am I willing to endure that the war may be driven out of Korea? What would I do for 3 days and 3 nights if I knew that by doing it the war might be brought to a conclusion?" Would we stay on our knees in prayer 3 days and 3 nights, and if we did, would we not want perhaps a pillow under our knees? It isn't enough to denounce the dangerous doctrines of the enemy; we must match their zeal and enthusiasm, or we shall lose the world while they are winning it.

A third thing with which we are confronted in these days is current secularism—the tendency to put our major time and attention upon things, that which we can see and touch; surrounding ourselves with little conveniences and comforts while neglecting the deeper things of the spirit. Dr. Fosdick was everlastingly right in that line in his hymn which says that we are rich in things, but poor in soul. People all over the world know of America's wealth and our vast variety of bodily comforts. We are noted for those things, but we are not noted for our spiritual power. No one in the world looks to us as the great exemplars of moral characteristics to which they can turn. They think of us in terms of automobiles, radios, and conveniences of every conceivable sort—things which minister to our love of luxury rather than the things which express our spiritual aspirations. Fifty percent of the American people are in no religious organization whatever, and many are only nominal members, so that the impact of America's influence upon the world is by no means a spiritual impact; it is largely a material one. Somehow we must turn the tide of this tendency in our corporate life that we may demonstrate a different spirit to a spiritually hungry humanity.

In the fourth place, we are confronted with militant clericalism—the tendency of a great ecclesiastical hierarchy to seek more and more political advantages in order that it may strengthen its own position in the life of America and the world. You who hear me Sunday after Sunday know how much I believe in cooperating with all Christians, and I shall always believe in that. Not only would I work with Protestant Christians but with Catholic Christians or any other Christians who will help to establish the spiritual foundations of the Kingdom of God. That is one of the great longings of my spirit. But we must never become so obsessed with the idea of cooperation that we close our eyes to the dangers that threaten our historic principles of soul liberty and religious freedom, and those factors which war against our basic doctrine of the separation of chuch and state. We must hold out forever a hand of cooperation along spiritual lines, but forever lift our hands against any efforts to use political means to strengthen the position of any ecclesiastical body, our own or any other, anywhere in the world.

Still again, we are confronted by what might be called splinter particularisms—the tendency to take some phase of the Christian religion and exalt that to a place of prominence to the neglect of all other phases. We have, for instance, the Christian Science movement which emphasizes the healing power of God. We believe in that just as thoroughly as any Christian Scientist in all the world, but we think it is a mistake to take that one phase of our belief and give to it such prominence that all other phases are practically forgotten. We think of moral rearmament with its emphasis upon a changed life and the fact that men need not remain as they are. We believe in that thoroughly, and we preach it constantly, but we must not exalt that idea to the point of ignoring all else within our faith. We think of alcoholics anonymous, and rejoice in the way in which that movement has reached down and lifted men out of hopelessness to a place of respect and honor; but that too is only a partial expression of what the Christian faith can do for humanity. However, while we are mentioning these things we ought to acknowledge that perhaps we too are at fault, for maybe these who were formerly active within the churches are reaching out to other organizations because they have not found in the church that for which their hearts hunger; and perhaps we have been so busy emphasizing other phases of the Christian message that we have neglected these phases to which we should have given more of our time and attention.

We are confronted, too, today by what might be called general indifferentism. The man on the street isn't hostile to the church. In most instances, he is simply indifferent to the church, and we are terribly afraid he is indifferent because he has found so little in us to challenge him or to cause him to look at the church in admiration. The early Christians were a revolutionary people. They accepted a doctrine which was considered dangerous to the state and to society. Why do you suppose they were put to death in the arena in Rome, and why was Jesus crucified at Jerusalem Not for the amusement of the people; not for the satisfaction of their leaders; but because they were considered dangerous, subversive, heretical and all the rest of it. These early Christians were people willing to constitute a small and unpopular minority. Someone has said of us that we are little more than the revolutionary sons of revolutionary fathers. Whereas they were a revolutionizing influence in society, we try to conform to society, to be like the world in which we live. I heard two little boys playing yesterday and one of them did something rather daring, after which he said, "I like the dangerous life." That is the kind of life that appeals to any honest-to-goodness human being with a spark of adventure within his soul and spirit. But we don't present enough of the adventurous character of the Christian faith to cause men to be challenged by it, or to make them turn to the church in great admiration.

We are also confronted these days by aggressive sectarianism. In spite of all our progress in Christian cooperation there are still forces at work in our world seeking to divide us into little competing, warring groups. They do this first of all by trying to create suspicion regarding our great Protestant leaders. They do it by saying that we will be disloyal to our denomination if we are cooperative with other Christians. They do it by saying that if we are not careful we will build up a great superchurch which will rob us of our liberties and take away our congregational and personal freedom. We must be on the alert to answer these charges; to demonstrate that they are not true; and to give ourselves in utmost devotion to the cause of Christian unity in a divided world.

And last of all, we are confronted as Christians today by an incomplete evangelism. In all of our churches there are scores of people who are only partially saved; people

who have taken the first step or two on the ladder leading to discipleship; but who have hesitated to go further, or climbed back down altogether. And because of this incomplete evangelism we have great multitudes of people who are only half-hearted in their devotion to Christ and His church. Every now and then the officers of our church hold a meeting to decide how on earth we can get several hundred members of our church who are now inactive to participate in some way in the life of the church; to come occasionally; to give at least once a year; to demonstrate some little semblance of interest and concern. What is going on in our church is going on in every church in America, and all of that is an illustration of an incomplete evangelism. These indifferent members are those who either thoughtlessly, or without any understanding of what they are doing came down to the front and accepted Christ, went back and took their seats, and have forgotten all about it ever since. They started out in a promising way but they never followed through to any kind of conclusion. Until we can do something about this situation the churches of Christ will never be the power in society they were intended to be.

So today as we look at these problem situations all around us, and at our multiple responsibility in a day like this, we are inclined to say, "Who is equal to these things?" If we had a lesser leader we might well give up in despair, but we have a great Leader—One who is strong above all our conceptions of strength: One who is destined to triumph in spite of all the forces that are in league against Him. And we have two words from Him which perhaps will give us the courage we require; "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world"; and "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's pleasure to give unto you the Kingdom."

Arbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, 79 years ago, on April 10, 1872, Arbor Day was observed for the first time by one of these United States.

It is significant that the State wherein this constructive movement originated was my home State, Nebraska.

Why did Arbor Day begin in Nebraska?

There are many reasons.

Nebraska needed trees to develop and conserve its vast potential for agricultural production. The farmer needed trees about his house for shade in the summer. He needed trees about his house to protect it from the blizzards in the winter. It was only an easy, natural step to establish State-wide tree belts along section lines and along boundaries between farm properties. The tree belt, outgrowth of Arbor Day planting, was a familiar sight in Nebraska long before—yes; many decades before—this method of crop preservation was advocated on a national scale.

The historic origin of the people who pioneered Nebraska gave them a universal respect and appreciation for the beauty of trees. Swedes from the wooded hillsides of far-off Scandinavia became substantial Nebraska citizens early in the saga of our State. Germans from the storied regions of the Black Forest brought their skills and their traditions to early Nebraska. French Canadians from the north woods added their numbers and their ability to the infant State. Czechs from the woodlands of Bohemia brought their keen evaluation of tree beauty to the State I am proud to call home.

Nor were the American-born pioneers remiss in their desire to be tree-planters. Men and women from the great tree stands of Wisconsin and Michigan, alive to the knowledge of the value of trees, were among the first to settle in Nebraska. After the War Between the States, hundreds of southerners from the tree-rich lands of Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina came West, lured by the rumors of the promised land of that time—Nebraska.

With the need and the people present in my home State, it was inevitable that a powerful urge should move Nebraskans to plant trees. Wherever and whenever pioneers got together—at church, at the cross-roads grocery, at the county courthouse—it became one of the certain topics of conversation. Nobody denied the need. Everybody was in favor of it. The favorite question of the era was: "Why don't somebody do something about it?"

It was very much like a situation with which all of us are now familiar. For years—and especially since the outbreak of the war in Korea—alert Americans have been asking themselves: "What is our foreign policy? Do we have any? Why don't somebody do something about it?" General MacArthur, in his recent letter to Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts did do something about it. He focused and crystallized the aroused interest of the American people.

Seventy-nine years ago, when Nebraskans called for somebody to do something about it, their pleas were also answered. J. Sterling Morton did what Nebraskans had thought about and talked about.

Morton—editor, farmer, philosopher—was, above all, a public servant. He was a Democrat, the Nation's third Secretary of Agriculture. Yet, what he did was done for the whole people of the State wherein he lived, regardless of party. He was a two-fisted political battler. Yet, he was never guilty of low-blow tactics. He believed that the people were the power. His creed was to serve, rather than to dictate; to guide, rather than to dominate. No man was more aware of the true responsibilities of leadership under a republican form of government than J. Sterling Morton.

Even in the awareness that he was doing right and that he had popular support behind him, J. Sterling Morton was beset with difficulties. He had to plan. He had to consider the set ideas of like-thinking men. He had to accept recommendations and he had to reject them. The culmination of his plan—to be accepted by the legislature of the 5-year-old State—had to be so worded as to offend neither North nor South, neither Nebraskan of French origin nor Nebraskan of German origin, neither Catholic nor Protestant.

History records that Mr. Morton adopted suggestions and made changes in his original plan; but, nevertheless, kept the germ of his idea intact. History also records that, in line with Nebraska's reliance on education, the father of Arbor Day, called upon the children of Nebraska to help in making his dream into an accomplished fact. Men and women are alive today who, as children, took part in the first observance. Men, women, and children—whole families—"pitched in" to make that first Arbor Day a success. Communities dropped all other work to share in it. It was the greatest "planting bee" up to that time. To get some idea of the enthusiasm with which Nebraskans put their shoulders to the wheel, it is a matter of record that between sunrise and sunset on April 10, 1872, in our sparsely settled infant State more than 1,000,000 trees and shrubs were planted. Nothing short of an all-out community of effort on a State-wide basis could have accomplished that outstanding feat.

Like all good ideas, Arbor Day was not confined within the borders of our State of Nebraska. It spread. It was intended to spread. Today, 79 years after that first Arbor Day, it is observed in every State in these United States and in the District of Columbia. We of Nebraska are not alarmed because Arbor Day is not honored on the same day by every State. In fact, we of Nebraska are pleased that no unanimity does exist among the States. We of Nebraska are, and always have been, individualists. We do not servilely accept regimentation. Neither do we succumb to pressure from the Federal government to give up rights which essentially belong to each of the several States. We are glad that Florida has Arbor Day on January 20 and that Rhode Island has it on May 4. We are glad that it is proclaimed by the Governor in Wyoming and proclaimed by the State legislature in other States. We of Nebraska do not care when other States have Arbor Day or how they officially proclaim it. It is enough for us that they observe it as free components of the United States—with the constitutional right of self-determination.

In Nebraska, we observe Arbor Day on April 22 because that day is the birthday of J. Sterling Morton, its originator. That is our right as a still sovereign State.

Nebraskans are proud that the great movement of Arbor Day originated in our State. We are equally proud that the movement has carried forward, without interruption, gaining momentum—until the present. We pray that it will continue its march of progress into the uncharted future. Whatever the future of Arbor Day, we know that it will contribute to the happiness of all free men since it arose from the mind of men who loved the soil and trees—the gift of the soil—of men whose dedication to nature forever bespeaks their eternal faith in God.

Approved For Release 2004/05/07 : CIA-RDP57-00384R000100040001-1

The Korea on the Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an article from the pen of Dr. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla., which is entitled "The Korea on the Campus":

THE KOREA ON THE CAMPUS
(By J. Ollie Edmunds)

To realistic Americans it is becoming appallingly clear that unless something is done about it, small independent colleges as we have known them in the past are on the way out. They are caught in a crushing economic nutcracker—between shrinking incomes and skyrocketing costs. The war is tumbling their enrollments. Everything from grass seed to textbooks is going up. Each one faces a Korea on its own campus.

For these valiant grass-roots colleges, where Christian character is considered as important as chemistry and the development of self-reliance as vital to the training of good citizens as the teaching of psychology, the alternatives are stark and urgent:

1. They can give up the ghost and go out of business;

2. They can accept political subsidies from the Government and "let the one who pays the fiddler call the tunes—if they are willing to cease being independent colleges, free to give their students religious training and free to turn thumbs down on socialistic theories; or

3. They can take their case direct to vigilant Americans who believe in perpetuating the private-enterprise system in education as well as in business and ask them to support the institutions that stand for the things for which they stand.

Most of these colleges will choose the third alternative. They will not give up without a struggle, for they are built of the same stuff of which our country has been built. The United States has astonished the world with its vitality. Through self-reliance and individual initiative, it has become one of the most important nations on earth. The small gift-supported colleges which have trained so many of the leaders in our free-enterprise system have played a lively part in bringing this about. They have no hesitancy, therefore, in asking good citizens, many of whom may never have given to a college before, to help them to stay strong so that they can continue to teach tomorrow's young men and young women the principles and ideals which have made our country great.

At no time has such teaching been more desperately needed. An alarming change is coming over many Americans. Like an insidious, sweet-smelling anesthetic, the tempting fragrance of Government-managed "security" is numbing their initiative and dulling their self-respect. Good citizens who once knew the meaning of righteous indignation, and who in the past would have instantly resented any attempt to "plan their economy," have been shrugging their shoulders at practices which should shock them. Even worse, many of their sons and daughters who have never lived in any other period except this narcotic era seem ready to accept as gospel truth the debilitating ideas which have been emanating from fuzzy-minded "planners" who, innocently or for ulterior motives, are sapping these young people of their self-reliance—the young men and young women to whom America must look for leadership in the future.

What is to be done about all this? What can we as individuals do about it? What ought the business concerns which are fighting to preserve their traditional concepts of free enterprise do about it?

Education—aggressive education—provides the only practical answer. We can either sit by and let our principles—and perhaps our country—go by default, or we can take positive action to strengthen the institutions which are teaching their students to understand and appreciate their heritage of freedom, democracy, and individual enterprise—ideals for which, all too soon, they may be asked to die. Such colleges are close to the people. All over the Nation they are a stabilizing influence. If only they can be given relief from their financial worries they can provide our country with the kind of Christian lawyers, ministers, statesmen, educators, business leaders, and clear-thinking citizens that can keep America America.

War-shattered enrollments and rising costs have plunged these colleges into a life or death struggle for survival. Financial help they must have—and quickly. If the men and women and the business concerns whose success has been built on our individual enterprise system do not stand back of such colleges, who will?

Is not what Americans have been fighting with guns to save overseas worth fighting with dollars to save at home?

Who Makes the Wars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question of war or peace is one in which the people of this Nation are vitally interested. The desire for peace is the spirit and the soul of our people. Consequently, our people are desirous of determining who is responsible when we do go to war. An editorial appearing today in the Washington Times-Herald, under the title "Who Makes the Wars?" goes into this all-important question in a manner that challenges the thoughtful and considerate attention of all citizens without regard to political affiliation.

Under the unanimous consent granted, I include it as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

WHO MAKES THE WARS?

Three Senators became engaged in a shoving match when Senator CAPEHART, Indiana Republican, registered his outrage at attempts of New Dealers during the course of a radio transcription to represent him as a warmonger, the Republican Party as the party of war, and General MacArthur as its agent in seeking war.

These fantastic aspersions were cast by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and Senator LEHMAN, of New York, who were obviously following the defensive propaganda line that has been laid down for apologists of Mr. Truman's own war-making policies. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, among others, are engaging in the same slander, and the fact that General MacArthur was constrained to answer the desperate lie that he is a warmonger indicates how the gravest kind of distortion can be given currency through a skillful and persistent propaganda.

NATURAL BEDFELLOWS

The New Deal line on MacArthur also happens to be the Communist line. The Daily Worker refers to General MacArthur as war hungry, war incendiary, and as a menace to America and world peace. It is also the British line. As usual, the New Dealers are making common cause with their natural allies and accepted masters.

Mr. Truman's purpose is to beguile the people into forgetting a fact that should never be forgotten—that he and his party are the authors of wars. Every foreign war of this century has been a Democratic war. The Wilson war, the Roosevelt war, and now the Truman war in Korea are all of undisputed parentage. There has been no Republican war in the twentieth century. There is not now any MacArthur war. If the war in Asia should be enlarged, it will still be Truman's war. He put us there.

He put America into the war in Korea, although the Constitution says that only Congress may declare war. He never consulted Congress.

He went into his war with the pretext that he was complying with a call from the United Nations, and then had to induce the United Nations to give retroactive sanction to his unilateral action. Even if this country owed any responsibility to the United Nations—and no such responsibility existed at the time that Truman acted—the New Deal President did not satisfy the legal requirements established by Congress to fulfill the responsibility.

Public Law 764 had been on the statute books for 5 years when Truman ordered American forces into Korea. That law specified that no American forces could be placed at the disposal of UN until the President had concluded an agreement with UN for their use, and the agreement had then been submitted to Congress and ratified. Truman entered no agreement with UN. He submitted no such agreement to Congress for approval. He acted on his own and the war is his alone.

General MacArthur was not consulted in this decision. He received orders to conduct the war which Truman initiated.

MacArthur's part in the war was discharged brilliantly until the character of an emerging victory was completely transformed by the intervention of Communist China. Truman has sought to blame MacArthur for failing to know that China would come into the war. If MacArthur had been able to guess that development what difference would it have made? We were in Korea, and we were stuck there by order of Truman.

DELUDES PEOPLE

In decreeing the original entry into this war, it was Truman's responsibility to assess the risks, including the always apparent possibility that Communist China, or Russia, or both, might intervene. The decision to accept the hazard was his, and the responsibility for extension of the war through Chinese intervention was necessarily his, for it cannot be separated from the basic decision he made in entering the war.

The Truman propaganda is intended to delude the people into forgetting that he is the author of the war, that the subsequent extension of the war to Communist China flowed out of his unconstitutional act, and that if the war should expand still further, that will also be his responsibility, for the expansion could not affect America if he had not sent American troops into the conflict in the first place.

The present pose of Truman and the Democrats that they are the party of peace, although they made the war, and the blood of more than 60,000 Americans is already on their hands, can only provoke contempt. But they brazenly charge that the Republi-

cans, or MacArthur, or anybody but themselves are the people to blame for the war, and are the people to blame if the war bursts its present bounds and becomes world war III. If it does, it is still Truman's war, still a New Deal war.

The best estimate of why the administration has adopted these tactics is that it is in a desperate predicament. Having committed the United States to the war, it can now see no way either to win or to disengage. It is stuck with the squalling, uncouth brat. It is looking anywhere and everywhere, hoping to unload the unwelcome handful on somebody else. It has tried that on MacArthur, but the thing won't stick. It has tried it on the Republicans, but again the transfer of guilt and odium cannot be accomplished.

In every controvery there is a starting point. First things come first. Why is the Nation concerned about Korea? Why is the Nation up in arms at the unfair railroading of MacArthur? Because, and only because, Truman created the whole situation when he went to war, of his own say-so, in Korea.

MacArthur Will Not Fade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including two very timely editorials that appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 20, 1951. Both are pertinent to the MacArthur story:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1951]

THIS WILL NOT FADE

The dauntless spirit, the selfless patriotism, which made America the hope and inspiration of the world shone again when Gen. Douglas MacArthur stood before Congress.

Shone with all the more splendor against the shoddy background of present-day political Washington, with its influence peddlers and its favor seekers, its tolerance of mediocrity in moral standards and official conduct.

For the moment the Achesons and the Vaughans could be forgotten. Here was a man fit to stand with Lincoln when he said:

"I am responsible * * * to the American people, to the Christian world, to history, and on my final account to God."

Douglas MacArthur's speech was a message of hope and courage, of faith and firm conviction.

He offered a way to secure the peace and save American lives. And he laid it on the line that the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the past had agreed to the validity of that plan.

In reply to the appeasers who now dominate American foreign policy, he said that if the enemy can divide his strength on two fronts it is for us to counter his effort, because the Communist threat is global.

Like blackmail, he said, appeasement lays the basis for new and successively greater demands until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only alternative.

"Why surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field?" he asked. "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision."

General MacArthur went on to explain that America cannot be secured against the advances of communism by defending Europe alone, for our strategic frontier embraces the Pacific as well as the Atlantic Ocean. We are well protected at present by the island chain, extending from the Aleutians to the Marianas and held by ourselves and our allies, he pointed out.

But the victorious leader of the island war in the Pacific warned that any major breach in that chain, such as the surrender of Formosa to the Reds, would render vulnerable to determined attack every other major segment of our defenses.

This, he asserted, is a military estimate to which he has yet to find a military leader who will take exception. Yet Formosa is the island which Britain wants to hand over to the Communists, and our State Department has supported Britain in that position.

General MacArthur mentioned none of his detractors by name, and he treated his differences with them with dignity and restraint.

"While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea," he said, "that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound one." But, he continued, when Red China entered the war, that created an entirely new situation which called for new decisions in the diplomatic field to permit realistic adjustment of military strategy.

"Such decisions," he added, "have not been forthcoming."

Indeed, until this very hour none have been made. Yet, because he sought new instructions from the United Nations, General MacArthur has been accused of invading the fields of diplomacy and political policy.

"I called for reinforcements, but was informed that reinforcements were not available," he said.

Without them, "the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory."

When he pressed this issue, General MacArthur was relieved of his command and deprived of opportunity to end the conflict "with the least loss of time and a minimum sacrifice of life."

The armchair strategists won't find it easy to make that appear the policy of a saber-rattling warmonger.

The great soldier who was laying down his sword after 52 years in the service of his country faced the verdict of history unafraid, as he prepared quietly to fade away.

But the millions of Americans who heard and read General MacArthur's message will expect answers to the questions he raised.

They will be as one with him in anguish and anxiety for the gallant men left in Korea who remain in his thoughts and prayers. Each new tabulation of American casualties will add strength to his demand for prompt decisions which will end this conflict honorably and with a minimum sacrifice of life.

The old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty will not stand alone in days ahead. He has inspired a resurgence of American faith, courage, and devotion. It will not, must not, fail to make his hopes and dreams for honorable peace become reality.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1951]

THE UN BRUSH-OFF

The United Nations apparently has no interest in General MacArthur.

This despite the fact that he was the first man to command a military force in the field under the UN banner. And the fact that for the past 10 months he has been fighting for the very survival of the UN.

United Nations headquarters are in New York. General MacArthur is receiving in New York today one of the greatest welcomes ever accorded a hero in our time. Yet there were no plans for him to visit the pretentious new UN building there on his triumphant tour of the city.

The UN officially has expressed no desire to see its former commander. It is just a coincidence that the acting Secretary General is a Soviet citizen, sitting in, under a rotation system which the UN dearly loves, for Trygve Lie, who has gone to visit Europe and the Middle East.

Normally, it might be supposed that an organization of nations which is trying to preserve the fiction of carrying on a war would like to hear from its commander who has just come back from that war. But there's nothing strange about it. For actually, the UN has had no heart for the Korean War since the Chinese Reds joined in.

Only a few months ago the UN listened at length to the shouts and snarls of one Wu Hsiu-chan. He was the representative of the Chinese Reds, whom the British want to seat in the UN.

But the UN has no time for Douglas MacArthur.

Three Choices in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ferdinand Kuhn, from the Washington Post of April 22, 1951:

THREE CHOICES IN KOREA

(By Ferdinand Kuhn)

Now that the emotional jag of the MacArthur welcome is over, the Nation has a headache—and not the kind that will go away with a dose of headache powder.

The Korean war is about to enter its tenth month with no end in sight. The American people would not be themselves if they did not want to end it and get their men home.

"We are a people of convulsive and impatient nature," Dean Acheson wrote 3 years ago, before he learned as Secretary of State how convulsive American opinion could be. We want quick results, whether in sport, in business, or in war.

And because the Korean war does not promise quick results, its idealistic beginnings tend to be forgotten, its coldly practical purposes are ignored, and its future course produces divisions of opinion that seemed last week to be tearing the country apart.

A TRADITIONAL LAG

One would suppose, from the impatience to get this war ended, that a 10 months' war was something new in American experience. Yet 10 months after our entry into the last war, Guadalcanal was still our only land battleground. Ten months after the start of the Civil War, there had been only one major battle, and 10 months after Lexington and Concord the end of the beginning had not yet come.

When a country takes up arms, in a small war or a big one, it cannot look ahead to a stately succession of events, all developing on schedule to a foreordained end. It seldom knows at the start just how or when the victory will come.

War, said Winston Churchill a generation ago, is a voyage "across waters uncharted toward coasts unknown." So it is with this Korean enterprise which now leaves so many Americans impatient for a clean-cut ending.

Even General MacArthur now concedes that the decision to resist aggression in Korea was "sound." Had it not been taken

quickly, with all its risks, the political and military position of the United States and its Allies would have collapsed and aggressors would have been put on notice all over the world that they could strike anywhere, at any time, without fear of being stopped.

To be impatient now, 10 months later, may be in tune with the American tradition and temperament, but it is only another way of denying the rightness of what was done last June. It gets nowhere and it obscures the purposes of the first international peace-enforcement action in all history.

THREE ALTERNATIVES

How, then, is this pioneer effort in Korea to end with success and honor. Three alternatives are up for debate and for national decision.

The first of them General MacArthur outlined from the rostrum of Congress on Thursday. Victory, he assured the watching and listening Nation, could come from blockading China, intensifying economic pressure, ferrying the armies of Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland and destroying Chinese bases in Manchuria. The general would also hold Formosa permanently, so that American guns could "dominate" the coast of Asia from Vladivostok to Singapore and keep the Pacific an American "lake."

The air-sea war against China, outside the Korean Peninsula, has already been ruled out by the administration and its Allies. It has been ruled out because of the conviction that it would bring, not victory, but a ruinous world war; not an end of anything, but the start of a bloodletting that could have no end.

It has been ruled out because of the fear that it would bring Soviet Russia into active intervention in the Korean war, and perhaps in other areas as well.

With MacArthur's prescription ruled out as a quack remedy, what else can be done to end the war in Korea. Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington, has proposed an answer in the form of a Senate resolution. His proposal has not the ghost of a chance of adoption, but at least it constitutes the second alternative before the American people now.

It is, quite simply, to pull out of Korea altogether, to cut the losses, to retire to a defense line on island territory from Japan to the Philippines. Certainly the course of Senator CAIN would save American lives, in the short run; it would bring home the officers who are needed to train the new draft armies here and it would give the United States the illusion of being the master of events instead of seeming to be their prisoner.

But a deliberate withdrawal would put a curse of Cain upon us in the eyes of small and exposed nations everywhere. It would condemn our South Korean allies to the torture chamber or the execution squad when the Communists marched in.

It would signal to every nation that fears for its future: "This is what you can expect from having the United States as your friend." And it would surely start a world-wide scramble to get on the Communist bandwagon. So this alternative, too, has been rejected by the administration, and General Bradley is only the latest of many official spokesmen who have said we would not get out of Korea unless driven out by overwhelming force.

THE REMAINING COURSE

Only one course remains, the course against which General MacArthur flashed his oratorical sword in Congress on Thursday. It is to stay and fight in Korea, to avoid widening the war by any action of our own, and to be ready for a negotiated truce whenever the enemy is ready to agree to the UN terms.

It should be remembered that the UN did not tell the United States, as its agent, to go and conquer all of Korea. Its instructions, passed on to General MacArthur, were to repel aggression and to restore peace and security in the area. It also had voted long before, in 1947, for the establishment of a unified, democratic, and independent Korea, a goal that had been fixed much earlier in the Cairo declaration of the United States, Britain, and China, and had been accepted by the Russians themselves at Potsdam in 1945.

The UN also called on the Chinese and the North Koreans last January for a cease-fire, to be followed by a withdrawal, by stages, of all non-Korean troops. There would have to be assurance, presumably by the supervision of UN teams, that the truce would not become a screen behind which the aggressors could build up a new offensive. And only after a cease-fire, and after an agreement on the future of Korea, would there be negotiations for a wider far eastern settlement, including a discussion of Formosa and a Chinese Communist seat in the United Nations.

These are still the UN terms; they are still the American terms, in spite of General MacArthur's implied statement that anything of the sort would be appeasement. But there is no indication at the moment that the Chinese Communists are ready to accept anything of the sort.

On the contrary, most military reports from Korea suggest that the Chinese are building up a massive new offensive, this time with the help of Chinese and possibly Soviet airpower from bases in Manchuria and Siberia.

Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, the new commander in Korea, is making all his dispositions accordingly—first, to keep the enemy off balance; second to keep his air force ready to shoot any enemy planes out of the sky; and third, to concentrate his firepower in defensible positions if the long-expected attack should come.

The Army leaders in Korea and in the Pentagon here are steadfastly confident that a new offensive can be smashed. They fully believe that the heavy losses already suffered by the Chinese will be doubled and trebled if a full-scale onslaught is tried.

If Chinese or Soviet bomber fleets should strike as part of a great offensive, the UN command would have no hesitation in bombing to destroy the bases north of the Yalu, as General MacArthur has recommended. The war in Korea would thus be widened by the enemy's own decision, and the threat of a new world war would, of course, be nearer.

If, on the other hand, the offensive should turn out to be another great land drive, of the sort that pushed the UN forces back in November, and if the offensive should result in nothing but terrible Chinese casualties, official Washington believes the Chinese Communists would be more willing to discuss a truce than they are now.

And if the offensive does not materialize, if there is a long lull instead, it is not at all impossible that a cease fire can be worked out on terms the UN can accept.

Such are the calculations of those who dismissed General MacArthur from his command, and who now dismiss his ideas as reckless and dangerous. The calculations rest on one basic assumption; that a new world war has not yet begun and can still be averted. They assume, too, that the limited war in Korea is worth all its cost in lives and treasure if it keeps the Chinese pinned down, makes the Russians hesitate, and shows clearly that aggression does not pay.

A course of this kind will not be pleasant for the American people, for their military leaders, or for the men who may have to fight through another fall and winter in Korea. If it is to succeed, two new ingredients will have to be added to the fortitude of the fighting men on the scene.

One is a far greater effort by other UN member nations to send troops for war and occupation duties. So far, as the American public knows only too well, a dozen other nations are represented in the Korean fighting by a total of only 25,000 men.

Nothing injects as much bitterness into the current MacArthur campaign as the belief, among the general's admirers, that other countries have let him down.

The conspicuous offenders include Australia, with only a battalion in Korea; Brazil, with almost 50,000,000 people and without a single soldier on the scene; and India and Pakistan, so intent on their miserable quarrel over Kashmir that they have not sent any of their excellently trained troops to serve the UN cause.

The administration here is moving heaven and earth to get these and other countries, notably the Latin Americans, to see their duty and to do it without further delay.

The second new ingredient of success, as the administration sees it, is patience from the American people. It will not be easy for the families of fighting men to go on supporting a war in which complete victory is not yet in sight.

Americans "are not interested in moral victories, but in victory," wrote D. W. Brogan, the British historian, an acute and friendly judge of our national character. In all our wars there has come a time of public restlessness because the final outcome was hidden from public view. It is more apparent in the Korean war than in any other because of the unprecedented nature and purpose of the struggle. But those who have the responsibility have the firm and unshaken belief that patience will pay rich dividends in the end.

State Department Gets Aid From Churchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of April 22, 1951:

STATE DEPARTMENT GETS AID FROM CHURCHMEN

The State Department yesterday announced formation of a religious advisory panel to counsel Assistant Secretary Edward W. Barrett on the religious content of this country's information and educational programs abroad.

The panel, which has held its first meeting with Mr. Barrett, consists of Msgr. Thomas J. McCarthy, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Isaac Frank, of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington; and the Reverend Edward Hughes Pruden, president of the American Baptist Convention. All three men live in Washington.

"We are convinced," Mr. Barrett said in a statement, "that our campaign of truth can be made tremendously more effective through increasing the proportion of religious materials in the radio programs, pamphlets, and motion pictures that we are sending to people of all religious faiths the world over.

"We will of course continue to adhere strictly to the principle of absolute impartiality in dealing with the various sects."

MacArthur's Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Washington correspondent Ingrid Jewell, of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, on the subject of MacArthur's welcome in Washington, which article appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Friday, April 20, 1951:

FEDERAL WORKERS VIEW PARADE WITH POLITICAL TONGUE IN CHEEK—MILITARY SHOW, FIXED BAYONETS JAR SPECTATORS

(By Ingrid Jewell)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—Washington today gave Gen. Douglas MacArthur a thoughtful, courteous hearing.

It was a pleasant spring day, with a south wind to ruffle the ranks of flags and the blossoming of fruit trees, and spread the fragrance of new grass tramped under many feet.

It was a day for the outpouring of affection to a national hero.

But things didn't happen that way.

The man in the street in Washington more than likely is a Government worker; or he is closely associated with Government workers. He is politically astute. Probably that is why today he viewed with quiet, attentive interest, but without spontaneous enthusiasm, the military pageant that was spread before him. He knew that General MacArthur had challenged not only the President but also the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and he wanted to know why before he made up his mind to applaud.

DAMPENED BY BAYONETS

For one thing, it dampens gaiety a bit to have to look across a line of fixed bayonets to see a parade. Admiral Nimitz, and General Eisenhower, and Wainwright all had parades in their honor when they came back heroes from the war. But no one thought it necessary to fix bayonets. They came immediately after the war's end, when the country was in a celebrating mood, and they came entirely free from political controversy. Probably all those things contributed to the contagious happiness that marked their celebrations. Those parades were fun; MacArthur's was not.

Probably 75,000 people were gathered on the Washington Monument Grounds, a natural amphitheater, to see the General receive the key to the city. Probably as many more lined Pennsylvania Avenue—the Avenue of Presidents—to watch his progress from the Capitol. The street was carefully roped off. That had not been thought necessary for other heroes.

Probably it was not the general's decision. But a great deal of trouble was taken to make sure the public did not participate in this parade. They were kept in their places.

It is consistent that the general's only really uninhibited receptions came from the hard core of Republican extremists in Congress and from the Daughters of the American Revolution, whose convention he visited for a few minutes during his busy afternoon. The Daughters awaited him impatiently; cried excitedly: "He's here!" as he strode on their stage; applauded and shouted when he assured them solemnly, "In this hour of crisis, all patriots look to you"; and would not let him go until they had sung a verse of Faith of Our Fathers, Living Still. In old-time movie parlance, the general would be known as a heavy. The DAR loved him.

FAILURE AT INFORMALITY

He made his triumphal march in an old trench coat, and a cap unadorned by scrambled eggs. Yet he failed to achieve informality. His speech was perfunctory; his actions abrupt. Even his compliments were imperious. Probably he was tired.

There were loud-speakers everywhere. By far the high point of his performance was his speech to Congress. While he was speaking, the city was hushed to follow the radio. In restaurants the diners handled their silver and dishes quietly; on the Monument Grounds, parents hushed their noisy youngsters so as not to miss a word.

MANY ARE IN UNIFORM

Besides the ranks of soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines that flanked the line of march and manned the bands, there were countless young men in uniform among the spectators.

Up the gently sloping park from the reviewing stand at the Monument Grounds was the White House, now bound by scaffolding attendant on its remodeling, but beautiful even in disarray.

The young soldiers looked that way and one said, "Is Truman here today?"

"No, he's hiding," another replied, and they laughed. MacArthur evoked no laughter.

MRS. MACARTHUR APPEALING

Mrs. MacArthur, a generation younger than he, small and pert with her arms full of roses, was appealing, so was the boy, Arthur, sitting between his parents on the back seat of the huge black touring car with the top down. But the illusion of a family drive was dispelled by the motorcycle escort, charging ahead with red lights flashing.

MacArthur's Removal a "Human Sacrifice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sterling-Rock Falls Gazette, of Illinois. This is truly a great editorial and should be read by every American:

MACARTHUR'S REMOVAL A "HUMAN SACRIFICE"

This editorial may well be presumptuous. But as things stand this, Friday, morning, April 20, 1951—there seems little doubt that Gen. Douglas MacArthur's removal was a "human sacrifice."

So far, no denial has been made of General MacArthur's statement that the "top brass" endorsed his Far East military objectives.

In an effort to ease the criticism of the administration, other high officials and the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, the White House has authorized the following statement:

"STATEMENT NOT DENIED

"Thursday night's Pentagon statement did not specifically deny what the general said.

"The Pentagon statement said:

"'In response to inquiries from the press concerning General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Pentagon spokesman said the White House had authorized him to state that the action taken by the President in relieving General MacArthur was based upon the unanimous recommendations of the President's principal civilian and military advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The reasons for General MacArthur's relief have been stated previously by the President.'"

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was placed in supreme command of the United States and UN troops in Korea, to win the war, and as General MacArthur so convincingly stated in his address, "in war, there is no substitute for victory."

We appreciate that the interests of England, France, and other European countries are akin to our own. We realize the desirability of cooperation with our friendly nations.

We also appreciate the magnificent job that General MacArthur did in conquering Japan, and the even more marvelous job he did of making the people of that country our friends.

But it was President Truman who ordered the troops into Korea, in an effort to save the people of that country from the slavery of communism.

It was President Truman who placed General MacArthur in charge of our forces in that country.

It must have been the decision of President Truman, through the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, that MacArthur could not have the help he needed to achieve the victory, presumably he was supposed to achieve.

It was President Truman who removed the General from his command in Korea and his other high positions he had held and executed with such great honor.

The White House statement says the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff endorsed the removal of General MacArthur, but the causes were said to be political, a field in which they are not presumed to function.

It, therefore, is presumed that the removal of General MacArthur and the approval of his removal by the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, was forced, either by President Truman himself or by influences outside this country.

With all due respect to our desire to work with the other friendly nations in this, perhaps the world's greatest crisis, the friendship of every nation in the world, including Communist Russia itself, is not worth the "human sacrifice" of one single man of the stature of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

And even more certain are we, that if to maintain the friendship of supposedly friendly nations, we have not only to furnish the sinews of war, but foot the bill as well; and in addition take our orders from outside the boundaries of these United States, then it is time that we save our materials, our cash, and our Armed Forces and spend our time and strength defending our own Nation.

We believe in the spirit that "we are our brother's keeper," but so far as we know there is no place in the Bible that forbids us from also being "our own keeper," seeking and accepting, of course, divine guidance.

We don't give a "tinker's dam" who the man happens to be; we don't care if he occupies the highest position of honor this country can confer upon him; we don't care if this includes the "highest brass" of which this Nation can boast—the time has come when every citizen of this country must have a rebirth of the "old-fashioned patriotism" that places country above self.

When it is possible in this country to remove from a high position, a man of the

character, ability, and loyalty of General MacArthur, a "human sacrifice" if you please, even when his military tactics had the approval of his superior officers; when it is necessary to appease any nation—even Communist Russia—by the needless sacrifice of the lives of over 1,000 of our young men daily; to satisfy the lust for power, position, or to "cover up" indefensible mistakes of judgment "it seems to me," the time has come to call a halt.

And in our desire to refrain from being presumptuous to speak with respect, as well as decency—that is stating the case mildly.

PRESTON F. GRANDON,
Publisher, Sterling-Rock Falls Gazette.

Let's Keep "That Something"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article entitled "Let's Keep 'That Something'," a thoughtful and inspiring discussion from the pen of Dr. J. Ollie Edmunds, president of John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla.:

LET'S KEEP "THAT SOMETHING"
(By J. Ollie Edmunds)

Americans are different from any other people on earth. Here is why: The men who cut the pattern for them a century and three-quarters ago held a deep conviction that men—all men—are born with qualities that give them an unique status. The simple fact that man was born a human being, they felt, marks him as the most important thing God ever created—and entitles him to a certain dignity and to self-respect. They believed that in this sense men are born equal and are endowed with certain God-given, not man-given, rights—to live, to be free, to build their lives without unnecessary interference.

These profound thinkers designed our Government on the basis of this conviction—a new kind of government—one which would be operated by the people themselves. Jefferson said this was to be a great experiment which would determine for all time whether "men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master." He predicted future happiness for Americans "if we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them."

In the lively decades which have followed we Americans have become a great and virile people—self-reliant and free. Most historians have thought we could write Q. E. D. after Jefferson's theory that men are able to govern themselves—that we had demonstrated the truth of such precepts for all the world to see. Now they are not so sure. Something seems to be happening to America—and to Americans.

During the depression and World War II we gave up some of our freedom temporarily. Since then we have discovered that freedoms relinquished temporarily are hard to get back. Emergency regulations have led to planning and now the Government—which according to our rules is supposed to be the servant of the people—is pretty much taking over the running of our lives. This planning appears to be changing not only the character of our Government but the character of our people. Millions now seem willing to give up some of their independence if only the Government will take care of them.

The great cause for alarm is not that the planners are planning our lives but that we are allowing them to do it. And the most tragic aspect of it all is that so many of us, who should be more far-seeing, are helping them, by scurrying to Washington every time our own security is endangered, every time we ourselves want some planning from the Government.

This country was not built by men who relied on somebody else to take care of them. It was built by men who relied on themselves—who dared to shape their own lives—who had enough courage to blaze new trails—enough confidence in themselves to risk their chances on rewards.

This self-reliance is our American legacy. It is the secret of "that something" which so long has stamped Americans as Americans. Some call it individual initiative; others backbone. But whatever it is called, it is a precious ingredient in our national character—one which we must not lose.

The time has come for us to reaffirm the things we stand for—to reassert our inalienable rights to human dignity, self-respect, self-reliance—to be again the kind of people Americans are.

Such a crusade for renewed independence will require a succession of inspired leaders—not just men who are opposed to communism, or diluted communism, but men who are militantly for the American way of life. Where are we more likely to find such leaders than in the small independent colleges, which teach self-reliance and practice it?

Today these colleges are working against great odds of war-shattered enrollments and shrinking incomes; but they still are instilling "that something" in their students.

Such colleges are setting tomorrow's standards for tomorrow's citizens. Now, as never before, these non-tax-supported colleges need the help of responsible men and women—practical help. At a time like this, it is not enough that they have the support of those who give their approval and nothing more—who give their blessing when it is their dollars that are needed. They must have the help of people like you.

Prophecies of Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Iron County Register, Ironton, Mo., published by Mr. Eli P. Ake in the newspaper of April 19, 1951:

The people are tired of old scarecrows—they frighten no longer. They are tired of hearing that the President is trying to precipitate us into war while he works day and night for peace; tired of the harangue of critics with their insidious charges that Government is ruining business while industrial and commercial prosperity is evident on every hand; tired of being told how Government is going broke because the Democratic Party believes in social security for the masses; tired of having every administration action damned and consigned to failure before it has a chance to succeed; tired of being informed that everything the President proposes is wrong merely because of his advocacy thereof; tired of the pratings of Hoover and other discredited individuals who now seek to define the proper manner for conducting the Government of a country which was left flat and feeble after 12 years of their own management; tired of dismal prophecies of doom and disaster, of destitution and despair—tired of a major political party relying on dire predictions of future calamities under Democratic rule instead of offering a positive program of its own. And isn't it all enough to make everyone tired?

Another Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party, the New Deal, the Fair Deal, or what have you, has developed smear campaigns into a fine art. The cruelty with which it has sought to assassinate the character of prominent and patriotic men is one of the blackest spots in modern political history. The people of this country have not forgotten the extent to which a program of slander and libel was carried out against Mr. Herbert Hoover. The American people have now become aware of this vicious practice of the administration, and, therefore, will be on the alert, and not, I hope, be deceived thereby.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article published in the Washington Times-Herald under date of April 23, 1951:

NIXON BARES WHITE HOUSE MAC SMEAR
(By Robert Young)

Senator NIXON, Republican, of California, charged yesterday that under direct orders from the White House, the Defense and State Departments have been working night and day mapping "one of the most vicious smear campaigns in history" against General MacArthur.

NIXON said that the Pentagon and State Department assigned scores of their personnel to the smear project. They said the campaign is now ready to be sprung.

LISTS SMEAR PROJECTS

"The American people should know that one of the most vicious smear campaigns in history has been mapped out in Washington against General MacArthur," the Senator asserted in a statement. "The smear brigade and professional lint pickers have been working night and day since the MacArthur incident began 2 weeks ago."

Acting on White House orders, NIXON continued, military and State Department employees have been digging through "every single file" dealing with MacArthur's 52 years of service. He listed the following as smear projects which were ordered and which are still being worked upon:

1. Five top staff technicians in the Pentagon have been analyzing for more than a week every military operation conducted by MacArthur in Korea for the purpose of finding flaws in that record and discrediting him as a military leader.

STAFF ORGANIZATION PROBED

2. The Pentagon's military government section has been ordered to comb the five-

star general's record as supreme occupation commander in Japan since the end of the war in 1945 for the purpose of trying to discredit his handling of the occupation.

3. Experts have been directed to explore every aspect of MacArthur's staff organization, both in World War II and the Korean war.

4. G-2 (Army intelligence) has been ordered to make a complete study of all intelligence communications received from MacArthur. NIXON commented that MacArthur's Pentagon critics contend such an analysis "will hit him at his most vulnerable spot."

5. The historical sections of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have been assigned the job of examining every World War II document involving MacArthur, involving his communiques and press statements.

6. The Marine Corps has the assignment of trying to find fault with MacArthur's role in the World War II island-hopping strategy which began with Guadalcanal.

SURPLUS HANDLING STUDIED

7. Scrutiny of MacArthur's handling of surplus property disposal at the end of the last war has been ordered.

NIXON's charges followed the disclosure by the Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune last Friday that the Pentagon had begun in earnest to prepare a defense of President Truman's and the Joint Chiefs of Staff's Korean war and far eastern policies against the smashing attack hurled by MacArthur in his address to Congress the day before.

The Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune learned that Army, Navy, and Air Force staffs were gathering secret documents from their files in an effort to demonstrate that the military chiefs disagreed with MacArthur on major phases of war strategy and policy.

OTHER DOCUMENTS SIFTED

An authoritative source said that for every point made by MacArthur, the Pentagon would try to dig up some statement or document from its files "that might be interpreted as putting MacArthur in a bad light."

The Pentagon announced Saturday in reply to mounting demands that Congress be given access to all documents pertaining to the MacArthur-administration split that only an analysis of the basic differences would be provided. It was reported yesterday, however, that despite this statement, Senate investigators will in the end be given the opportunity to examine anything they wish, although some of the examining and questioning would be in secret session because of national security considerations.

ALL EVIDENCE ASKED

Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the combined Senate Armed Services-Foreign Relations Committee which will investigate the MacArthur controversy, said Saturday the investigators will demand all evidence pertinent to the dispute over far eastern policy and pertinent to MacArthur's dismissal by President Truman on April 11.

RUSSELL said his committee will demand all available documents on last fall's Wake Island conference between MacArthur and Mr. Truman. The administration has been taking the line that MacArthur advised the President on Wake Island that the Korean Communists would quickly be defeated and gave assurances the Chinese Reds would not intervene in the war. The Senate committee hearing is scheduled to open about April 30, with MacArthur as the first witness.

NIXON declared in his statement yesterday that it is significant in connection with the Pentagon-State Department effort to discredit MacArthur that "heretofore secret documents are being reclassified and let out to administration pipelines in the press and radio."

NIXON said that the first salvo in the smear campaign was fired last Friday with the publication of a New York Times story citing secret documents on the Wake Island meeting "obviously selected to spotlight every action of the general which might reflect on him unfavorably."

POINTS TO KOREA JOB

"The new test for classifying documents now seems to be not whether the publication of a document would affect the security of the Nation, but whether it would affect the political security of the administration," NIXON asserted. "Apparently the Pentagon leaks like a sieve when the administration has political linen to wash."

NIXON said that instead of spending time and manpower in an effort to discredit MacArthur's past, the energies of the Pentagon and State Department "might be better spent devising ways to develop an effective far eastern diplomatic and military policy and thereby bring to an end the appalling casualties in Korea."

MacArthur was fired because he offered his program for ending the war in Korea with "victory and not appeasement [and] the administration rejected that program," NIXON said.

Address by Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, Before the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 17 the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] addressed the congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Constitution Hall in the city of Washington, D. C. This forceful address by our distinguished colleague, discussing the grave issues and problems of our times, should be read by all our citizens, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, AT CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 17, 1951

I esteem your invitation to speak to you tonight as a very great honor. I wish every man, woman, and child in the country could have the opportunity I have to attend a meeting of the descendants of those who fought and died for American freedom, the greatest gift any generation ever made to its descendants.

Such a meeting, of course, is impossible. But, if I were to attempt to repay you for this privilege of rededicating myself to the ideals which have made America the greatest nation in all history, I believe I could do no better than to give you a word of encouragement and appreciation for your efforts to rekindle within us the vital spark of unselfish patriotic devotion and unity in the cause of American liberty, freedom, and democracy.

In the vocabulary of the DAR's, there is only one ism and that is 100 percent Americanism. What I especially like about you is that you not only know what is right but you have the courage and fortitude to fight for what is right, just as your ancestors fought and died to give freedom to us of this generation. These are not the empty words of a politician here to tickle your vanity. They are an expression from the heart of one who appreciates the great work you have undertaken to preserve your heritage, and mine, and that of all who avail themselves of the opportunities this Nation gives so freely.

As I go about the public business which has been entrusted to me I am shocked and alarmed by the delusion and disunity in which we face what is probably our greatest crisis since Valley Forge.

I will speak with the utmost frankness. This is an obligation of every public man which is even greater in the present period of national peril.

I tell you now, as I have said before, the test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, are determined by what I believe to be best for my country. I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that such must be the test to be applied to everything by everybody in this country—in public office or not—for a long time to come if we are to restore the peace and freedom for which this Nation was founded and to which it is dedicated.

It seems to me if conditions now existing continue, our security is in more danger from disunity at home than from enemies abroad. We cannot prepare ourselves for a global war, which may be forced upon us, if we spend our time and energies fighting among ourselves. We can only have peace, which all of us so earnestly desire, if we remain strong, and strength can only come from national unity, but cohesive action can only come in this democracy of ours by free and full discussions of the great issues confronting us.

For this and other reasons I was one who urged that General MacArthur be invited to address the joint meeting of Congress at the Capitol, to give this great hero the same consideration and dignified reception as was given that other military hero, General Eisenhower, on his return. And then let us all pray that, out of a free discussion, may come the best solution of these grave perils that confront us. Only here in all the world could such a debate occur, under like conditions, but that is how democracy works and this is how democracy is preserved.

May I state in language which is perhaps over-simplified those cornerstones of freedom which must be preserved: American democracy in very simple language, is an association of all American citizens governed by Federal and State constitutions and by-laws enacted by the elected representatives of the people. It relies upon a three-branch government, each independent of the other.

The American people have risen to resist successfully open attacks made upon this system such as the effort of President Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court because decisions made by the court then did not meet his approval. When President Truman wrote his Secretary of Commerce recently to ignore the order of a Federal court, it was Judge Bennett Clark of the United States court of appeals, who in the court room said these words that will go down in history:

"If you have an idea," said Judge Clark, "that a letter from the President has any weight in this court, you are mistaken. He has no more standing in this court than any other citizen. He has no right to influence litigation."

This is in the traditions of the Clark family and came from a true patriot.

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP57-00384R000100020001-5

It is the independence of the three-branch government that preserves our liberties and prevents dictatorship.

I do not fear direct assaults upon our principles so much as I fear the sapping of the vigor of our people and our Government by termites boring from within.

In the coming years—and perhaps for generations—we will have two great burdens to carry: On one hand we must make ourselves so militarily strong as to protect us from the aggression of communistic nations, and, on the other, we must preserve and fortify our free enterprise system, which, after all is said and done, is the real source of our strength and future security.

The strength of a vigorous free enterprise system is a greater deterrent to world conflict and a more dependable guardian of peace than a United Nations organization will ever be. It is the only force in the world today that Russia fears. It must be preserved.

Russia well knows of our capacity to mass produce implements of war—those things that kill people—as we furnished these war equipments to her in World War II without which she could not have driven the Germans from her soil. Our best insurance, let me repeat, against war is to strengthen and not weaken this production capacity.

One striking example of America's free enterprise system is that we are now producing twice as much steel as all the world combined and four times more than Soviet Russia under her slave system. As steel is the base of all war materials, Russia has just cause to fear our mass production capacity.

Let us not be deluded. The emergency in which we now find ourselves will exist, in all probability, for many, many years. Today Russia has the time table, and Russia has control of the initiative. She began the Korean war—costly to us in blood and treasure—but Russia has not lost a single soldier. We shall have to live for a long time in a period of crisis and be on a war alert even though world war III does not materialize, and pray God it will not. We must constantly bear in mind that the threat of war in a democracy over a long period can be as destructive to our economic system as war itself.

General Bradley has said that other side-line wars can be instigated by Russia. She can turn these side-line wars on and off like a spigot of water. She can bleed us white before the supreme test comes when we may be called upon to fight the combined might of communistic nations. If Russia determines on war she can fix the hour and the place and the day of the conflict, or she can, for years to come, conduct against us a war of economic attrition, sapping our resources and weakening our system of government. This may be her sinister purpose—I am inclined to think it is—and in the past 5 years she has made considerable progress in this direction.

I am not an appeaser. Our future security demands a definite as well as a realistic foreign policy. Russia has such a policy. She has played her cards diplomatically well—much better than has the United States.

We jeopardize our future if we continue to pursue a vague policy of impractical altruism. It must be realistic—and we serve neither ourselves nor the free people of the world when we undertake burdens beyond our ability to carry; make promises we cannot fulfill. We may be powerful but there is a limit beyond which we cannot go and survive. We cannot, I think, go over the world like Don Quixote tilting our lances at every windmill that may have a Communist behind it.

We cannot go over the world trying to make Democrats of people who do not want to be Democrats and who do not, in fact, comprehend what democracy means.

If first things are to come first, what we need above everything else is an impregnable national defense. This may determine whether or not we will live or die.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I pledge to you that I will continue to do all in my power to provide such a defense.

I am for compulsory military training and spoke for this program in the Senate. I am for an adequate, fully trained army within our borders. I am for an Air Force of 70 groups, or more. I am for a radar screen around this country.

These things I have been advocating and voting for for years. We do not have them now. We must do our level best to prod those responsible to get them quickly.

And I am for a great navy. I am intensely proud of the United States Navy and the United States Marines. I do not think the marines are policemen or propagandists.

Fiscal preparedness is the first step toward military preparedness and this you have asked me to discuss with you tonight.

On January 15, the President appeared before the Congress and made this specific pledge:

"It (the Government) must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

Yet, a week later he submitted to Congress a budget which, if adopted, will actually increase nondefense spending to the highest level in the history of the Nation whether in peace or in war.

Not only that but in the time of our greatest crisis the President renews his advocacy of the socialistic measures known as the Fair Deal.

The President continues to recommend socialized medicine, he recommends socialized farming, he recommends socialized housing. If you socialize your health, your food, and the roof over your head, you have taken a step from which there can be no retreat. We would soon be in the same deplorable condition as is England.

The President said he had a mandate to pass such legislation in his 1948 election but these measures were not even issues in that campaign.

What has prevented the passage of the socialistic measures? It has been a very effective coalition between the southern Democrats in Congress and the Republicans. I, as one constitutional Democrat, am very proud to have been an active member of that coalition.

The President asks citizens to make deep sacrifices in their daily living yet he declines to make political sacrifices by the curtailment or suspension of measures for the distribution of public funds for nonessential purposes.

In my experience of 18 years in the Senate, under the conditions existing, I regard this budget message as the very height of fiscal irresponsibility.

Unity and the sacrifices necessary to save our country must be a two-way street. They must come from the Government as well as from the citizens.

BYRD'S EYE VIEW OF OUR FISCAL AFFAIRS

We began World War I with a debt of $1,000,000,000, World War II with a debt of $60,000,000,000. Our Federal debt now exceeds $260,000,000,000, plus the debts of States and their subdivisions of $21,000,000,000, a total public indebtedness of $281,000,000,000 and the end is not yet.

In the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, if the budget as submitted by the President is adopted and without new taxes, the result will be approximately as follows:

Expenditures	$72,000,000,000
Tax receipts	58,000,000,000
Deficit	14,000,000,000

With the Federal expenditure level running at $75,000,000,000, total public expenditures, including those by States and subdivisions, will reach approximately $100,000,000,000 annually. This would be about 40 percent of the $225,000,000,000 national income earned by all our people. In other words, in each 5-day week we shall be working 2 days for the Government and 3 days for ourselves.

Our Federal Government is permeated with waste and inefficiency and extravagance. We have 2,200,000 Federal civilian employees and are adding 2,200 new civilian employees every day. Last month the military establishment alone employed 60,000 new civilian employees and only drafted 80,000 in uniform.

The armed services are the greatest wasters of civilian manpower of all agencies of the Government.

The military should recognize the necessity of conserving manpower as it is our main strength in war.

In the Pentagon Building alone the military has 35,000 civilian employees under one roof and no real effort has yet been made to place this gigantic operation on a basis of efficiency.

Faced as we are with grave perils, what would you and I do as sensible men and women if we had the power?

We would eliminate every single nonessential expenditure, including those things in the category of being desirable but not absolutely essential. We would cut off 400,000 of the more than 2,000,000 Federal employees, save their salaries and release them for war work.

We would demand a balanced budget. Remember you never go broke when you pay as you go.

We would demand the saving of billions by the elimination of waste and extravagance and in nonessential functions of the Government. If we should save 10 percent in the President's budget, which means seven to eight billions, this would eliminate the necessity of 50 percent of the new taxes that have been requested.

You, the citizens, may not have this direct authority but you do have the power to hold the elective officials to a strict accountability to discharge their responsibilities on the level of high patriotism consistent with the perils of the great burdens that face us.

I am always willing to vote for taxes for national defense, but I do not like the idea of placing great additional burdens on an already overburdened people for wasteful political spending.

There are thousands of ways the President's budget can be trimmed without affecting essential activities.

I have prepared and will take pleasure in sending you a detailed list if you so request.

Remember that deficit spending means one of two things—either higher taxes which are already approaching confiscatory levels or more debt which is bound to be accompanied by inflation that no amount of regimentation can curb.

We have assumed the responsibility of propping up the economy of half the world. We have assumed the responsibility of helping to arm half the world. We have assumed the responsibility of arming ourselves. We have refused to deny ourselves of wasteful, nonessential domestic-civilian luxuries.

We cannot expect much help from the nations which are associated with us for they are more wards than allies.

Neither democratic freedom nor the free-enterprise system can survive either confiscatory taxes or overwhelming debt.

Our worst strain in the desperate days ahead may be economic attrition at home. We must put Santa Claus in a deep freeze for the duration of the emergency. We can-

not carry the world on our shoulders abroad and the New Deal on our backs at home.

The President has dared the Congress to reduce his budget. He has spoken in a belligerent tone. His dare should be accepted. The Constitution gives only to Congress the power to appropriate public funds. The President can only recommend. To attempt to coerce or intimidate Congress in the execution of this constitutional power of appropriating money, is a step toward dictatorship, as the power of the purse in the hands of Congress is a major bulwark in our free Government.

The people, I feel confident, want nondefense spending cut to the bone. It remains to be seen whether an obstinate President who has dared the Congress to reduce his budget can defeat this overwhelming public sentiment.

Why is America great? It is not our population, as we have only 6 percent of the population of the world. It is not our area, which is only a tiny speck on the world's surface. It is not our natural resources, which are being rapidly depleted by the obligations we have undertaken. It is our individual freedom and the free-enterprise system is the vital spark that stimulates every American to gain such reward as his own industry and capacity make him worthy of.

This much is certain: The vital need of the moment is leadership characterized by unselfish and selfless patriotism which will present the stern issues and requirements to the American people for the wisdom of their decision, unencumbered by personal jealousies and political considerations. We have had such leadership in every crisis of the past. It is not too much to ask now. If it is not forthcoming then it is up to us, in lesser positions, through unselfish patriotic organizations to do the best we can with the tools at hand.

In such an emergency as this I know of no better organization than the DAR through which effective effort can be made for our survival and preservation as free people individually and collectively.

The first requirement is sound fiscal condition for the Government of the United States. If freedom in the United States is destroyed either by our own economic folly or by totalitarian might, it will not survive anywhere else in the world. When the light of democracy goes out in America, it is gone everywhere. Who is there to take the torch of liberty to follow us if we fail?

It was on Virginia soil at Yorktown that the independence declared in Jefferson's words was made permanent by Washington's sword. It was in Hanover Town on the Pamunkey River on September 21, 1775, that the Virginia Committee of Safety met. Among its resolutions included one that each district of Virginia should provide itself with colors. On one side was to be the name of the district and on the other was to be inscribed "Virginia for constitutional liberty."

I read this to you because it shows, I think, that we have a certain political constancy and consistency in Virginia, and are now, as a State, "for constitutional liberty" as surely as in 1775. I place emphasis on both words, "constitutional" and " liberty."

And so I say that Virginia yields to no other Commonwealth or State in appreciation of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

We are thankful for what your predecessors have done and for the noble work you are doing in this day, and we pray God that the ideals of the DAR will continue in the years to come as a bulwark of strength to hold the line for the preservation of our freedoms founded upon constitutional democracy.

Jackson Day Address by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Jackson Day address by the Junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] delivered in New Haven, Conn., April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the second time in thirteen months I've talked to you at a Connecticut Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. I hope you won't decide that every time I open my mouth you've got to charge me $100 to make me enjoy it and to persuade me that I'm a resident Democrat.

But I'll be back next year—and the year after that—even if I have to get a loan from the RFC to swing it.

It's good to be with you tonight. In these times of chaos and unspeakable danger, as Secretary Hull described them to me, it's good to be a Democrat. Yes, I'm very proud to be a Democrat.

Last year my 85-year-old Aunt Mary Benton gave me the theme for my speech. She claimed that the only other Benton ever to make the United States Senate was a distant kinsman, or kinfolk as the Southerners say—Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, who a century ago served five terms in the United States Senate. A great Senator he was. Last year I looked him up in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. I think you'll agree that its report shows he was a good Democrat, and perhaps of a kind not yet extinct. I quote:

"Although Senator Benton was so independent that he had a great dislike for party caucuses—and despised party platforms—during thirty years of public life, he never voted anything else but the straight Democratic ticket."

He was Andrew Jackson's majority leader in the Senate. The Britannica reports that he once shot Andrew Jackson in a tavern brawl. That perhaps was carrying independence a little far. Yes, Old Hickory carried Senator Benton's bullet in his tough hide all his days. Last year I asked you where you could find another speaker for your Jackson Day dinner who could claim he was kinfolk to a man who put a bullet into Andrew Jackson. (You can see that you have here a powerful argument for keeping a Benton in the United States Senate.)

Since my election nothing has pleased me more than when Ted Granik, the moderator of the American Forum of the Air, introduced me as "Mr. Democrat" when I debated foreign policy with Senator TAFT on a TV hookup. Last Sunday I was again called "Mr. Democrat" on Mrs. Roosevelt's TV program. Nothing could make me more proud, even though I started late in life to work for the title and can't possibly deserve it until I've worked at it for many, many years to come.

Ted Granik started it all when he introduced Senator TAFT as "Mr. Republican." I immediately disagreed. I said Senator TAFT might more properly be called "Mr. Fifty-Percent Republican." I said I had been listening to Governor Stassen, John Foster Dulles, and Governor Dewey. Senator TAFT replied that I would find out about that later. I then told him I would compromise by agreeing to call him "Mr. Sixty-six and Two-thirds Republican." He didn't seem to like that much better. He may be right, at that. In 1952 we shall find out whether he is right.

Of course, when Ted Granik called me "Mr. Democrat" he tied it up to an event which I sometimes think must have called for divine intervention—my own election. It was my victory—it was your victory—in the senatorial election here in Connecticut which gave the Democratic Party its majority of 49 in the United States Senate.

It was right here in New Haven last June, when I talked before a meeting of Tom Keyes' registrars, that I predicted that our Connecticut election was far more than a local affair. I predicted that the control of the United States Senate would hinge on whether we in Connecticut kept our two Democratic United States Senators in office.

I shall now tell you a secret. I stole that idea. And where did I get it? From my great colleague, BRIEN MCMAHON, without whose support and endorsement Governor Bowles would never have appointed me, nor would I ever have accepted. I shall now tell you another secret, an open one. Whenever I make a smart political prediction there's a good chance I'm plagiarizing from BRIEN MCMAHON, one of our great Senators in the great Democratic tradition of Connecticut.

That prediction to Tom Keyes' boys was fulfilled to the last bitter drop. You may recall the early morning hours of November 8. Certainly I shall never forget them. The United States marshals were at work in the last three towns to be heard from—Monroe, Haddam, Pomfret—when I went to bed at 7 a. m. It looked then like a victory by perhaps less than 500 votes—though it turned out to be 1102. Mrs. Benton, a natural politician if ever there was one—both of her grandmothers must have been Irish—Yankee-Irish—followed me to bed at 10 a. m.

Yes; we won, you and I, and when I reached Washington Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, who had won in 1948 by 83 votes out of a population of 3,500,000, Senator JOHNSON said, "Bill, compared to me, I call you 'Landslide BENTON.'"

I shall now say more. My victory was Chet Bowles' great victory, though it is I who get the plaudits of victory. It was your work and Chet's great run which brought out the big vote, which elected me and which contributed no-man-knows-how-much to BRIEN MCMAHON's big margin. Senator ANDERSON, Chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, told me that two of the greatest runs in the United States were by candidates who were defeated: Chet Bowles and Frank Myers in Pennsylvania. This is what the professionals at the national level know.

So thanks to you and to BRIEN MCMAHON and Chet Bowles, here I was last November, the newest Democrat, the most junior of all the Senators, Senator No. 96, winning by the slimmest margin and at the latest hour—destined to help keep the management of American foreign policy in the hands of the one party which not only understands the chaos and unspeakable danger of our times, but has a program of hope with which to combat them.

May I now suggest that the control of the United States Senate seems likely to control not only United States foreign policy—but world policy—and the chance, and the risk of war or peace? Little did you know, when you were making new voters, that you were helping determine the course of United States foreign policy, and the risk of war and peace.

One of the telegrams I received on November 8 was from my old friend Beardsley

Ruml. You'll recall him as the author of the famous pay-as-you-go tax policy. He's a professional psychologist and one of America's shrewdest publicists. Pay-as-you-go Ruml wired me, "Congratulations on winning by such a small margin. Now everyone who helped you can claim the credit."

Was there ever a truer statement? Many in this room can claim credit for all of, or most of, or much more than, those 1,102 votes. And was there ever better proof of the value of that extra effort, that final effort? My victory grew also of course from the masterly campaign leadership provided by John Bailey, from the hard work and great fight put up by our fine State ticket; and from the votes pulled to our Democratic ticket by our outstanding congressional candidates. But even more than all this, I learned last fall that in victory the credit must go to you here, to you who raised the dollars and the dimes, manned the headquarters, organized the mailing crews, supervised the doorbell pushing, and got out the votes.

To help show you why all of us should be proud to be Democrats, let me tonight for a moment imagine with you that you are entering the United States Senate, and that you are undecided whether to join the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Let us all imagine that we are Senate fence-sitters for a while before we decide which way to jump. And before we jump, let us be exposed for a few weeks to what goes on in the United States Senate.

First, we agree that we see the Democratic Party split and divided on a few domestic issues, notably on civil rights. We agree that this is a most unhappy division.

But on most other domestic issues—day after day—we see the Democrats as the men of hope and faith, the men of optimism and courage. We see the Republicans as the men who doubt and dissect and who do nothing.

On international issues the Republicans are even more deeply divided than are the Democrats on civil rights. Here in foreign policy we find the big issues on which our destiny now depends. We see the Republicans rent by a great chasm. It divides those Eastern Republicans who, with Senators Vandenberg and MORSE, in the Senate tend to work with the Administration to help fashion the so-called bipartisan policy—from those Republicans of the Midwest or far West who want to lash out right now this very day and take a chance on the big war—or who want to pull back now and retreat into President Hoover's so-called "Gibraltar," or Senator TAFT'S "citadel."

When I prepared this talk for you tonight Senator Vandenberg was living. Last night he died. The tears in my eyes today were tears for Senator Vandenberg. When I served as Assistant Secretary of State I regularly slipped in and out of his audiences for guidance and stimulation and renewed confidence. Without publicity or fanfare he worked with me on my difficult responsibilities in the holding together of the Voice of America, the establishment of UNESCO and the other grave questions with which I was wrestling. He was one of the greatest men of our generation. His loss is a great loss to the Democratic Party, to all the American people, and most particularly to the Republican Party. The absence of his leadership, in my judgment, accounts in considerable measure for the tragic misjudgment and blunders of Republican strategy this very day and for many months past. We Democrats today can join with all our fellow citizens in paying tribute to this great man who in time of his country's peril rose above the Republican Party and above party partisanship to become the chief architect and bulwark of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy—which he preferred to call unpartisan—upon which in my judgment the very life of our country depends.

It is under the leadership of a Democratic President that communism has been stopped in the Middle East, through the Greek-Turkish aid program; that communism in Europe has been checked with the Marshall plan, and now the military aid program; that, we can hope, communism is in process of being rolled back in Asia by the Point Four program, by the Voice of America, by the vigorous action of the United Nations, and by the use of force where force is unavoidable.

You are beginning to see why I tell you that any intelligent fence-sitter who entered the United States Senate today would be ashamed, after a reasonable period of observation, to ask to be listed as anything but a Democrat.

Now, I believe in the two-party system. We need a minority opposition party in this country. Some of the Republicans show some promise of developing into a fairly effective—if permanent—minority opposition. However, I suggest that it has been a couple of Democrats, Senators KEFAUVER and FULBRIGHT, who have done the big job of investigation and exposure, the kind of job historically expected from the opposition.

As a Democrat, in the Senate or out of it, you can justly feel yourselves responsible for our world-wide leadership in this great and terrifying struggle for liberty and freedom. Think it over: it is you and others like you who are responsible for the Democratic control of the Senate and the great gift of freedom for free men everywhere. Yes; that's what it means to be a Democrat.

We Democrats now have a strong and constructive program. We have always had a program. We've always been progressive. Our Democratic Party has risen through generations of growth because it has been an aggressive political force. It served the people in the time of Jefferson and Jackson. It served them under Wilson and Roosevelt. It is serving the people today under a great President to whom the historians will do justice if the newspapers won't: President Harry S. Truman.

You can be proud of the fact our Democratic Party has a solid program. It is a program founded on progress, on humility, and on a desire to give each man his due so that he may live in freedom and security. Further, our program is the program for peace.

We Democrats will have to wait until 1952 to find out what the Republicans think they decide they're going to profess to stand for. We can now say this: they consistently failed at the turn of the century, and the people turned to Woodrow Wilson. Wilson brought about domestic reforms that the Republicans have never dared repeal, though they opposed him and his reforms bitterly at the time. When the Republican leadership failed again in the twenties, the people again turned to the Democratic Party. The major reforms enacted since 1933 under President Roosevelt and President Truman are largely unchallenged today.

For our part, the role of the Democratic Party is to give leadership and to act. Further our role, on appropriate occasions, is to point with pride; and this evening I may say is such an occasion. The role of the Republicans is to criticize, and view with alarm. Let us make sure we keep the Republicans in that historic role.

Without the hopes and ideals of you who are the brawn and sinews of the Democratic Party, without your continued leadership with our voters here in Connecticut and everywhere, and without your willingness to put in long hours and hard work so that we may achieve a place in the sun for free men everywhere—without these things of you and from you, God only knows where this Nation would stand today. And where this Nation stands today, the whole free world will follow. Yes, we can stand tonight and cheer for the Democratic Party, for it guards freedom and security for the world that is not enslaved. Let us remember this as we work for 1952, and for another Democratic victory.

The Use of Television in Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on April 17, before the National Association of Broadcasters' meeting at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] delivered a very informative address on the great value of television and radio in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, STEVENS HOTEL, CHICAGO, APRIL 17, 1951

There is today a new and vital influence upon Government. As Harriet Van Horne said in the New York World-Telegram of April 6, "When this turbulent year departs into the spheres, the learned historians doubtless will pull on their beards and ponder: What hath 1951 done to set it among the high tides of the calendar? And the answer will come: 1951 was the year television rose up to bring the people back into the Government. The year that restored the dignity of plain goodness and reaffirmed the right of the people to protest."

Before we talk about radio and television, I want to salute the responsible press of America. There is no absolute substitute for the printed word. We hear a broadcast; we see a telecast; but, time soon dims our memory of the details. Details are recorded forever by the printed word. There is a definite and peculiar place for all these media. And America is better off because that is true.

Radio and television aroused the public concerning the work of our Senate Crime Investigating Committee. We could not have achieved its goals without them. For that, the committee members are grateful. But, had it not been for the American press—there probably would never have been an inquiry into organized crime.

It was newspaper and magazine articles which first directed my own attention to the need. Coupling these items with reports of crime commissions the country over, I prepared two legislative measures in late 1949. One measure would have outlawed the shipment in interstate commerce of gaming devices. The other would have regulated the transmission of racing information for illegal purposes. The first such bill has since become the law of the land. But neither of my proposals were ever presented in Congress. My legislative assistant and I studied the situations we sought to remedy in great detail. In the process we discov-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ered we knew virtually nothing about the actual conditions we sought to remedy with new laws.

So, instead, we asked the Senate to allow us to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce. We felt that this was necessary to enable Congress to legislate intelligently.

But our proposal was delayed in passage. It was here that the American press interceded editorially. Demands were made for the passage of the resolution forthwith—and it was passed forthwith.

We sought to exercise extreme caution as we began. We hoped to disappoint those anticipating a circus atmosphere. We resolved never to engage in head-line hunting. We hoped for a calm and serious study of the problem—all without fanfare. Yet, we recognized the newsworthiness of our undertaking. We knew that, by its very nature, it would be somewhat sensational. And we knew also that the sleeping giant of public opinion must be awakened to bring about renewed vigor in law enforcement.

As we swung around our selected circuit radio began to help. Local stations canceled commercial programs to broadcast our hearings. Often, our deliberations were broadcast or rebroadcast from start to finish. This served two purposes. First, it emphasized the sordidness of certain local situations. Local citizens gained knowledge of the corruption by criminals of certain of their officials. They became angry, and determined to clean out their own affairs. Secondly, those who became once interested maintained that interest. They followed our hearings elsewhere when we left their own city. This was important to our mission.

It soon became evident that many underworld characters operated across State lines. It was evident, also, that they enjoyed interlocking understandings. Earlier testimony of officials of the Narcotics Bureau was confirmed. We had been told that these criminals engaged in multiple forms of illegal or immoral commerce. This soon was documented. The interstate pattern began to take shape, but the general recognition of the pattern was not widespread. It was apparent only to a few close followers of our efforts. Nationally, the consensus was that our principal contribution was in unearthing long-dormant cases. The focal point of our undertaking was not being grasped. It would not be, unless and until, the American public gained—through an appreciation of the various intertwining local operations—a national picture.

But a broad view was essential. The sleeping giant of public opinion would not be stirred. Unfortunately, the normal course of public opinion is one of apathy. Because of this apathy, I agreed to write a series of magazine articles. I have been severely taken to task for so doing. But, all of us know that only a small percentage of Americans ever digest the contents of an official document.

I felt the story should be told in more readable manner, if the public was to understand the import of our discoveries. My great desire was for the people to get the facts and to act on the basis of these facts. Law enforcement basically is a problem for local people. The primary responsibility is on Main Street—not on Pennsylvania Avenue. Of course, we in Washington, must share the burden also. We could have expected little correction if the public had not become aroused. I did not forsee television as a medium for doing the job. It did not occur to me that your industry would handle our later hearings as you did. Neither did I anticipate the impact your service would have on Mr. and Mrs. America, otherwise, I would have been less eager to write the story. But television bridged the critical gap. You trained your cameras on us in New York and Washington for 3 weeks. And America saw and heard for herself, then America responded.

For several days, you took us into the living rooms of 30,000,000 Americans. They were first interested, then startled, next indignant, and, finally, determined to do something about it.

Our objective was achieved, but the story does not end. It will never completely end. Continuing viligance is required. There are also immediate tasks ahead. Congress now has full information available to it. Congress must act to make our Federal laws more effective. Congress must see to it that national enforcement agencies actually enforce the laws. And Congress needs a code for the conduct of congressional investigations. The members of these committees must be fair with witnesses. Partisan politics has no place in such activities. There must be no demogoguery. Committee purposes should not be distorted with side issues. We must remember always our office is public service; it is not to permit or encourage a public spectacle. If Congress is at fault in these particulars, it is not the fault of television and radio or newspapers. These media merely report what occurs. Congress should correct its own procedures where they are found to be improper and undignified.

If more functions of Government are subjected to television, we shall achieve better government. Television presents the most nearly perfect facsimile of an actual event yet developed. It is good that the people see their public servants in spontaneous, unrehearsed action. This unseen means of discipline cannot help but improve our efficiency.

Our hearings demonstrated again that, not only does Congress need a code for the conduct of its committees—particularly as to television—but, the television industry also needs a code.

Your experience with this new medium is limited. Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities 3 years ago when Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers appeared were televised. But, the situation has changed since that time. Back then your audience was limited. Today, it is unlimited. I think you would do well to appraise what has happened and anticipate what is likely to follow.

The particular governmental unit affected is involved in some of these decisions. In others, the decision is entirely yours. Certainly, your code must follow the code of governments.

Tonight, thanks to you, there is a new, live interest abroad in public affairs. We must all work together to nurture that interest on the part of the people. Ours is a Government by the people as well as for the people. When the people are best informed, then, is our freedom the most secure. To hold the interest of the people in public affairs, ground rules must be established.

Your industry must decide which future public hearings to cover. There will undoubtedly follow in the wake of our inquiry, many others at all levels of government. Sometimes, you may not be welcome. Even the doors of the United States Senate were closed to public scrutiny in its infancy. But, when the coverage is in the public interest, it must somehow be accomplished.

It is important that the public know the whole story. One of our witnesses in New York exemplifies this point. Frank Costello was interviewed by Walter Winchell in Florida, following his appearance before our committee. He appears to have been more talkative in that interview than he was in ours. Mr. Costello is quoted as saying the television cameras unnerved him, causing him to lapse into the slang of the tough East Side district of New York where he was raised. Those who were adjudging Costello—from the head down, at least—gained a true picture of the real man if his statement is to be accepted. Otherwise, the youth of this Nation might have retained the illusion that Costello was a suave and glamorous "businessman." Radio and television fortunately ripped the artificial cloak of respectability from this man. The public saw the man for what he really is.

If we did not have public hearings, we would have star chamber procedures. Witnesses have been testifying in congressional hearings since about 1850. Their testimony is printed and circulated; it is quoted in the press, on the radio, and in public documents; and, when the testimony is of sufficient interest it is recorded by newsreel and newspaper cameras and reproduced fully on the radio. Television is but another progressive step in bringing the Government and its people closer together.

There are many safeguards you will need. You must devise ways and means of improving your mechanical participation. There should be a minimum of light and heat, and collateral noises can and should be eliminated. Coverage should never be undertaken unless it can be complete. It is unfair to a witness to present only a part of a matter concerning him.

One of your more delicate problems is that of sponsorship. I would prefer that the programs be free of sponsorship and rendered as a public service. I recognize the expense item you have, and any sponsorship necessary should consist of institutional advertising. Governmental proceedings are not a fit subject to aid the sale of a commercial product. I urge upon you careful attention to this subject.

Your individual stations—107 television and 2,800 radio outlets—can do much to thwart gamblers. You can arrange matters to prevent the perverting of legitimate sporting news by the gambling element. And, of course, your medium can assist local citizens and authorities in stamping out crime at home.

There is no family in America beyond your reach. You are the perpetrators, or inheritors, of a great medium. Your inheritance consists of genius, enthusiasm, and courage which built a great industry. For that, all of you deserve the gratitude of a nation. So long as you operate in free enterprise, there can be no iron curtain thick enough to cause a separation of the people of America.

The Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the appendix of the RECORD a breakdown by States of the estimated $2,000,000,000 cost of the proposed central Arizona project. These figures were computed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C., and are based upon the percentage payments by each State.

There being no objection, the breakdown was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost to Nation's taxpayers—by States—of central Arizona project—Official statement by Secretary of the Interior indicates extra tax burden of $2,075,729,000 for interest alone if Congress approves fantastic project bill S. 75

State	State's percent of total [1]	Cost to taxpayers [2]
Alabama	1.17	$24,286,000
Arizona	.37	7,680,000
Arkansas	.72	14,945,000
California	8.32	172,701,000
Colorado	.80	16,606,000
Connecticut	1.67	34,665,000
Delaware	.40	8,303,000
Florida	1.29	26,777,000
Georgia	1.40	29,060,000
Idaho	.32	6,642,000
Illinois	7.59	157,548,000
Indiana	2.29	47,534,000
Iowa	1.58	32,797,000
Kansas	1.15	23,871,000
Kentucky	1.20	24,909,000
Louisiana	1.22	25,324,000
Maine	.44	9,133,000
Maryland	1.68	34,872,000
Massachusetts	3.40	70,575,000
Michigan	4.71	97,767,000
Minnesota	1.86	38,609,000
Mississippi	.71	14,738,000
Missouri	2.53	52,516,000
Montana	.35	7,265,000
Nebraska	.86	17,851,000
Nevada	.13	2,698,000
New Hampshire	.29	6,020,000
New Jersey	3.29	68,291,000
New Mexico	.28	5,812,000
New York	14.67	304,509,000
North Carolina	1.59	33,004,000
North Dakota	.34	7,057,000
Ohio	5.78	119,977,000
Oklahoma	1.17	24,286,000
Oregon	1.04	21,588,000
Pennsylvania	7.62	158,171,000
Rhode Island	.56	11,624,000
South Carolina	.76	15,776,000
South Dakota	.36	7,473,000
Tennessee	1.37	28,438,000
Texas	4.38	90,917,000
Utah	.34	7,056,000
Vermont	.18	3,736,000
Virginia	1.49	30,928,000
Washington	1.65	34,250,000
West Virginia	.92	19,097,000
Wisconsin	2.10	43,590,000
Wyoming	.18	3,736,000
District of Columbia, Hawaii and Alaska	1.48	30,721,000
United States total	100.00	2,075,729,000

[1] Percentages of total tax burden that each State will bear were computed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[2] Cost to the Nation's taxpayers of $2,075,729,000 is an official estimate of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. It is based on the provisions of S. 75 (central Arizona project bill) and the following specified conditions: Construction cost estimate of $708,780,000 made by the Bureau of Reclamation (S. Rept. No. 832, 81st Cong., 1st sess.); an interest rate of 2½ percent; an 8-year construction period; and a 75-year financing period. The Secretary's statement appears in his letter dated June 28, 1950, to J. Hardin Peterson, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee. The statement was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Death of Walter Damrosch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on December 22, 1950, there died in the city of New York a great musician and musical conductor, Walter Damrosch. Dr. Damrosch, during a long and extraordinarily useful life, brought to millions of people an appreciation of classical music. He was a man of great energy and enthusiasm, and made available to the American public many works by unforgettable composers both of the old and of the new world. He was a conductor of the New York Symphony for 41 years and of the Metropolitan Opera for 50.

His greatest contribution, I believe, however, was in organizing and for many years conducting the children's concerts at Carnegie Hall and over a radio network. Through his efforts and his enthusiasm several generations of children grew to understand and appreciate good music. Walter Damrosch brought happiness to many homes and to countless people.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials regarding this great American, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, December 24, 1950, and in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, December 25.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 24, 1950]

WALTER DAMROSCH

This is one person's reminiscence of children's concerts at Carnegie Hall 30 years ago: "You never felt as if you were in a big auditorium. You were sitting on grandpa's knee, and he loved music so much he had to tell you about it. He spoke very slowly and with a heavy German accent: 'Now, children, today we have a symphony by Papa Haydn * * *.'"

The conductor was Walter Damrosch, and he introduced millions of persons to classical music that way. For years he had a network radio program like the Carnegie Hall concerts; schools all over the country stopped classes for an hour once a week to hear the program. He was also a conductor of the New York Symphony for 41 years and the Metropolitan Opera for 50, and he had one opera of his own performed at the Metropolitan. Last Friday at 88, Walter Damrosch died at his home in New York.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 25, 1950]

WALTER DAMROSCH

More than one generation knew Walter Damrosch as a great and devoted musician. There are those among us who can remember him as the youthful conductor of the Oratorio Society, which this Christmas, as in Christmases past, is carrying on the tradition established by Walter Damrosch's eminent father, Leopold. The same generation, too, can recall the dramatic day when the young Damrosch took the baton from his dead father's hands to conduct at the Metropolitan Opera House. A still later generation knew him best as the guiding spirit of the New York Symphony, in a bygone era when two major ochestrats, not one, were needed to satisfy this city's musical needs. And, finally, there are countless Americans alive today who first encountered music in Dr. Damrosch's famous music-appreciation programs broadcast every Friday morning in thousands of public schools.

To all these endeavors, Dr. Damrosch brought a compelling and contagious enthusiasm for music as a great gladdener of the human spirit. He was responsible for bringing many new works to the American public by masters such as Brahms, Tchaikovsky, and Ravel, and he was one of the few composers who lived long enough to see one of his own works staged at the Metropolitan Opera House. But it was his energetic and unceasing efforts to inseminate music in a difficult soil, rather than his own creative accomplishments, great as they were, that insured his fame and high place in American musical history. If today we have a large and perceptive musical public in America, it is in no small degree the result of his untiring efforts. He both preached and practiced music, and upon his death at 88, the great multitude of music lovers who mourn him offers the best measure of the success of his life's endeavor.

The Issues of Our Far-Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the caption "The deadly chain," written by Stewart Alsop and printed in the Washington Post of April 20, 1951. Mr. Alsop makes a clear statement of the issues of our far-eastern policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Stewart Alsop)
THE DEADLY CHAIN

Both President Truman and General MacArthur sometimes seem like actors in a play, who have learned their lines well, but who can have no real influence on the outcome of the drama. Certainly, ever since the Korean aggression, each event has had an inner logic of its own, leading inexorably to the next event, irrespective of the views or wishes of Presidents or generals. What has been true of the past may well be true of the future.

Consider how logical, even in retrospect inevitable, has been the progression of events leading up to our present situation:

1. The United States withdraws its troops from Korea, and the Government adopts the policy that South Korea is neither militarily defensible nor strategically essential. Given the nature of the American state, it was inevitable that this policy should become known in detail to the Kremlin. Given the nature of the Soviet state, which demands the expansion of Soviet power wherever the risk does not appear too great, the Korean aggression was then also inevitable.

2. Faced with the reality of aggression, rather than an imaginary contingency, the American Government instantly and inevitably recognized that successful aggression in Korea would lead straight to disaster. With almost unanimous national support, Truman committed American power to Korea.

3. Sooner or later, American power was sure to destroy the power of the North Koreans. Once this was done, the militarily meaningless line of thirty-eighth parallel was sure to be crossed.

4. Given both the fears and the ambitions which Communist doctrine engenders, it was then at least logical that the Chinese Communists should intervene. It was logical that surprise and numerical superiority should give the Chinese initially a great military advantage. And it was logical also that mobility, firepower, and air domination, all of which the Chinese lacked, should then swing the military advantage against the Communists.

5. It was then logical that the Soviets should try to make up these deficiencies, by supplying the missing components for a successful offensive—transport, heavy weapons, and offensive air power—to their Chinese satellites. This the Soviets have now apparently done, and an offensive is in prospect.

This is where we stand now. Fortunately for the sanity of the of the human race, the future is unknowable. But consider the steps which could logically derive from the present situation, whatever President Truman or General MacArthur may propose or desire:

6. The use of offensive air power for the first time behind our lines could have the most serious consequences, as General Stratemeyer has hinted. If the consequences threaten to be sufficiently serious, the Manchurian air bases will certainly be attacked, as both Truman and MacArthur well know.

7. Having once extended the war to Chinese territory, it will then be logical to hit Chinese supply lines and even cities; to blockade the China coast; to support the Nationalists, and to take all the other steps which MacArthur favors. Again, as Truman and MacArthur know, elaborate plans for doing all these things if it becomes necessary have already been made.

8. This will be the great turning point. But judging from the Chinese precedent, the Russians will then logically intervene, whether openly or in some thin disguise. This will lead to a third world war.

It is President Truman's position that somewhere between five and six, or at least between six and seven, this deadly chain of logic can be broken. But he does not say at all how this is to be done. It is General MacArthur's position that six and seven can be undertaken with decisive effect, and without bringing on eight. But he gives no convincing reasons for believing either that the effect will be decisive, or that the Russians will not intervene.

But what is clear from the foregoing is that events, rather than the views of MacArthur or Truman, will determine our future course. The fact is that the United States alone cannot break the chain, simply because the United States cannot and will not adopt a policy of appeasement or surrender. Yet the chain may yet be broken. Events are sure to force some sort of showdown, probably soon. When it comes, the showdown must be with the real masters of the situation, the men in the Kremlin, rather than their satraps in Peiping.

Those best qualified to judge still believe that the Soviet rulers do not want war, if only because atomic war would surely destroy their regime. Thus if it is made crystal clear that the dismissal of MacArthur is not the prelude to appeasement; that a reasonable Korean settlement which does not reward aggression is nevertheless possible; and that the ultimate alternative is a third world war, there is still a chance for peace. It may even be a good chance.

The Menace of World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent address on the subject of the menace of world communism, delivered by the Very Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, on April 17, before the annual Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Constitution Hall.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF WORLD COMMUNISM

(By Rev. Edmund A. Walsh)

May I, at the outset, express to the Daughters of the American Revolution my sincere appreciation of the privilege again accorded me of participating to some slight degree in the important work so long and so vigorously conducted by your organization. Time and the inexorable weight of irrefutable evidence have both conspired to vindicate the warnings and the programs for an alert and concrete national defense which I have heard advocated from this platform for over 20 years. Your organization is not of the Johnny-Come-Lately variety. You are not among those who now feel the spur of the obvious and clamor for protection and preparedness against a menace that was always present and which never deceived the eye or the intellect of informed Americans familiar with the strategy and tactics of world communism. You have no need to take your patriotism out of moth balls nor seek new ground whereon to stand. You never fell into the trap that Moscow wove for the eager beavers of the pink decade. In this very hall you often raised your voice against the gigantic conspiracy of ridicule and supercilious pedagogy to which the youth of America was subjected in so many colleges and universities of the land during the last two decades. As America sees her younger generation rallying to her defense by millions and dying heroically in distant outposts of the world, our people should thank God on bended knees for a generation that was not lost to civic virtue but proved to be better judges of values than so many of their mentors. Though confused and shaken, perhaps, by the deluge of alleged liberalism, subtle sarcasm, and open scorn directed against the old loyalties by long-haired males and short-haired females posing as advanced thinkers, the youth of the land came through that fiery ordeal substantially unscathed.

Recall for a moment the favored positions then held by the sappers of Christianity and democracy. From high place and from low, from university chair and village green, from the pages of periodicals, from lecture platforms and youth movements, they bored like termites at the foundations of American life, attacking religion in the name of pseudo-science, casting doubt at the Constitution under pretext of political wisdom, seeking social revolution through spurious economic reform and generally creating the impression that America was a decadent plutocracy ripe for the avenging sword of the left wing.

Where now are the dilettants of organized social demolition—the scorners of patriotism and advocates of alien ideologies? Silent as the tomb in which their intellectual bankruptcy lies buried. They dove into cyclone cellars, to emerge stealthily thereafter and creep, in many cases, into Government posts and defense positions. Their chosen victims, youth in particular, defied the planned corruption and now form the very bulwark of America. To them and to those who sealed their loyalty with the bright honor of their young blood, be gratitude and reverent memory.

The cessation of hostilities in 1945 in both Europe and Asia ended one phase of human history, only to usher in another not less decisive for the survival of western civilization.

One of the constant objectives of Communist tactics is the creation of confusion, divided counsel, and procrastination in the ranks of ther opponents. This Machiavellian device was conspicuous and successful in the conquest of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and other satellite lands whose freedoms have been suffocated under the weight of power devoid of conscience or respect for human personality. Lenin, at a very early date, and with complete frankness set the compass for this wholly materialistic philosophy which controls Communist thought and determines Soviet foreign policy:

"We repudiate all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts. We say that this is deception, a fraud, which clogs the brains of the workers and peasants in the interests of the landlords and capitalists.

"We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is deduced from the class struggle of the proletariat.

"That is why we say that for us there is no such thing as morality taken outside of human society; such a morality is a fraud. For us, morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat." (Lenin, speech before the Young Communist League, October 2, 1920.)

This pronouncement explains the apparent lack of consistency and predictability in Soviet negotiators. Their international policy, despite Winston Churchill's celebrated apothegm, is not "a riddle wrapped up in a mystery inside an enigma." It is the most consistent foreign policy in the world today, because tactical inconsistency is made to serve the Communist grand strategy of world domination.

The Russian revolution never relaxes, though it has sometimes stumbled. It changes tactics and personnel but never renounces its program of planned chaos. It shifts gears and reduces speed but never loses direction or sight of its objectives. It gains or loses momentum but never changes its inner nature or renounces responsibility to itself. It substitutes new forms and places of attack but never relents in its conspiracy for world domination. It swaps the blockade of Berlin for most of China. It concedes you a dime but pockets a dollar. It pretends to love peace and justice but sponsors an aggressive war in Korea.

It must never be forgotten that the Marxian creed, as interpreted by Lenin and Stalin, holds that war between the United States and Soviet Russia is inevitable. Lenin himself laid down that basic doctrine:

"We live * * * not only in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either one or the other will conquer. And until that end comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and bourgeois states is inevitable."

By imperialist states, Lenin meant the non-Communist states of the world. Coru-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

menting on this fundamental tenet of Soviet belief, Mr. Stalin once added the laconic remark: "Clear, one would think."

He further declared:

"Thus in the course of further development of international revolution two centers will form on a world scale: a Socialist center, binding to itself the countries that gravitate to socialism, and a capitalist center, binding to itself the countries that gravitate to capitalism. The struggle between these two centers for the possession of the world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and communism in the whole world."

Whatever final consequences emerge from the war in Korea, one conclusion seems inescapable. If successful there, the Russian revolution will have gone far toward destroying the United Nations. That would usher in an unpredictable period of interstatal anarchy for an exhausted humanity newly disillusioned. It would mean a return to the ice age of international relations and the triumph of totalitarianism. It would mean another long step on the road to that vision of the world in flames which Zinoviev, then head of the Third International, pictured to the visiting Asiatics, at the Congress of the Peoples of the East, held at Baku, in September 1920:

"The real revolution will blaze up when the 800,000,000 people who live in Asia unite with us * * * when we see the hundreds of millions of people in revolt. Now we must kindle a holy war. * * *"

If checked in Korea, the revolution will assuredly strike again, directly or indirectly, on some other sector of its extended battlefront and at a moment of its own choosing. It can never consent to become a nonpracticing world revolution. At best, its managers may accept a prorogated truce—until a safe opportunity to strike presents itself.

Its tactics, however, are calculated to keep the heart and the central military force of the revolution uncommitted to direct conflict. The risks and the wearing-down process are left to others. By stimulating class warfare on the periphery of the bourgeois world now here, now there, now in Burma, now in Malaya, now in Iran, now in Indochina, or Greece, or Turkey, or Italy, it will force the United States to be forever committed to the piecemeal defense of democracy on an expanding global front without conceivably ever meeting the real enemy face to face except in the form of bootlegged Russian tanks, Soviet-made planes, and disguised Soviet personnel. This exhausting process of attrition can continue without the stronghold of the conspiracy ever experiencing direct assault, while the cost in men, money, and supplies will become a permanent and crushing charge on our national economy. How long can we stand that cost? And what shall we do with that enormous war potential when it reaches full growth? Moscow, on the other hand, can husband its unspent forces against the hoped-for day of complete exhaustion on the part of the United States, which will be expected to bear the lion's share of global defense. Should the lion falter or sustain a crippling wound, the Politburo will recognize the moment and send its hordes across the moat already provided by its expendable satellites for the final encounter with the west. Japan will be a prime target. The Philippines, bound to the United States by many ties, will be in mortal danger, and it is not outside the possibilities that Soviet Russia will one day claim Alaska as rightful Russian land and attempt to repossess it, declaring the sale of that Territory by the czarist government in 1867 to have been a null-and-void betrayal of Russian interest by the Romanov dynasty. The only restraining argument at this moment is the atomic bomb—an advantage that is rapidly diminishing as Moscow increases its stockpile.

The rule-or-ruin psychology was manifested in late October 1950, on the occasion of the debates in the United Nations on the reappointment of Mr. Trygve Lie as Secretary General. Despite the obstinate attempts of the Soviet bloc to repudiate Mr. Lie because of his performance of duty during the crisis over Korea, the Assembly voted to reappoint. Whereupon Mr. Vishinsky announced that the Soviet delegation would have nothing to do with the Secretary General and would ignore the decision of the majority. On November 1 an attempt was made by two gunmen to assassinate the President of the United States in Blair House. Two men were killed and several wounded. Telegrams of sympathy and congratulations on his escape reached Mr. Truman from virtually all major foreign powers except from the Kremlin.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson, long an advocate of conciliation with Moscow, finally though reluctantly came to the only tenable conclusion open either to intelligence or charity. "There can be no lasting settlement," he wrote in 1947, "until the men in the Kremlin either change their minds or lose their jobs." At the present moment there is no sign of either miracle. And should one be announced, the players in this prolonged game of global geopolitics must keep a sharp eye on the prestidigitator as he shuffles the elusive pea back and forth among the walnut shells. He is an old hand at it. And there always lurks in the offing another explosive possibility. Good faith and reciprocated confidence are the cement which makes the diverse human elements cohere within the structure of international relations. Because of the habitual lying and twisted propaganda of Soviet negotiators, it can easily come to pass that no man will believe them even in some great emergency when they may be forced into the necessity of wanting to tell the truth.

The record is clear and the future designs of Soviet Russia are not unclear. Her gamble in Korea was logical perfidy. Edmund Burke in 1772 warned Europe that the partition of Poland by Prussia, Austria, and Russia would not be the end of the feasting. It was, he pointed out, only a breakfast for the great armed powers; but where would they dine? He knew that neither history nor appetite for power ever stops short.

The true question before the American people and before their representatives in Congress is not so much the cost in dollars, though heavy, but the alternative possibilities. If the grim record of the past 5 years of Soviet-American relations has achieved anything, it has clarified the cold war down to a basic consideration. The debate is not whether we can afford to do the necessary things for the defense of Christian civilization, but can we afford not to do them.

It is cold comfort but a necessary audit at this point to remember that when Lenin began translating the complexities of Marxian metaphysics into the hard realities of life in Russia on his return from Switzerland in April 1917, he had possibly 75,000 to 80,000 followers. Some records put the figure as low as 40,000. When he became dictator on November 7, his Bolsheviks had increased to 175,000 in a population then estimated at 150,000,000. Today, 34 years later, the power of the Kremlin reaches down and influences directly or indirectly something like one-third of the human race, possibly 800,000,000 persons. On the continent of Europe one of every two inhabitants lives under controls and policies dictated by the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party. With the momentum acquired by the revolution in China, the same proportion now threatens for Asia. Who shall predict the consequences? What will happen to civilization if another generation becomes enslaved to the earthy humanism which has been dominant in Soviet Russia since 1917 and is now the official goal in the satellite lands? That moral and intellectual degradation of spirit to the level of the flesh and of matter has made fear the dominant atmosphere in which government operates. There is no free science; there is no free church; no freedom of the press, of speech, of labor, of education, of art; nor of literature, nor of industrial enterprise, nor even of movement from one city to another. What will happen to the souls of its victims if the resultant forced obedience and servitude freezes into a fixed culture? What will happen if submission and servility become a habit born of fatigue and frustrated hopes? What will become of truth if its expression is confined to the rigid pattern of dialectical materialism in the service of militant atheism? If falsehood becomes state policy? When even language and the vocabulary of human relationships become distorted and dragooned into the party line? Who shall say that such a sickness will never spread? Even the two-thirds of the human race not directly subjected to the Communist empire are vitally affected by it, since the foreign and domestic policy of every government is profoundly influenced and often conditioned by what the Kremlin does.

One conclusion seems inevitable. Direct conflict with America is definitely assumed and clearly predicted, as must appear to any careful reader of official pronouncements made by Lenin and Stalin. The manner and timing of that eventual clash probably constitute the main preoccupation of the technicians charged with scheduling the progressive stages of world revolution. What counts for the world, then, is the political psychology and declared objectives of Soviet Russia's small governing class at a given moment, not the mute and captive aspirations of her 200,000,000 inhabitants. They are not the real enemy. The only argument respected by their masters is evidence of power possessed, in being, and ready for instant release.

Because of the global strategy of world communism, one must school himself to see its objectives steadily and see them whole. It is the same revolution operating on many battlefronts and in many forms, whether military in Korea or political in Eastern Germany, or through terrorism in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, or by use of spies and traitors in the United States and Canada. Like a chameleon, the Politburo changes color in changing circumstances but never deviates from its plotted course. Wholly devoid of respect for international law, except when it can be invoked in Moscow's favor, the managers of this consolidated world revolution, by their tactics, have maneuvered the Government of the United States into the present tragic impasse between General MacArthur and President Truman. Though patently associated with Communist China in attacking American forces in Korea, Soviet Russia relies on a fiction to cover its participation, even as it relied on a fiction to isolate Berlin in 1948 and starve the inhabitants into submission to the satraps from Moscow. That pretense was met and defeated by the colossal daring and ingenuity of the airlift. Defeated there, the Politburo transferred their attention to China, then to Korea and resurrected the ancient device of warfare by proxy. Charged by the United Nations with the over-all duty of crushing the military forces opposing him, General MacArthur deemed it the part of realism to pursue the aggressor to his lair north of the thirty-eighth parallel and destroy his military capacity to inflict another 60,000 casualties on American troops. His point of view recognizes the practical impossibility of dealing with the fringe of a

conflagration without extinguishing the self-renewing sources of the blaze.

The President, on the other hand, is confronted with an equally impressive weight of argument and public obligation attaching to his high office. As Commander in Chief of all the Armed Forces of the United States, he has the unquestioned right to transfer, relieve, or recall any commander in the field, particularly if he is convinced that the officer's conduct is not consistent with directives lawfully issued. General MacArthur's prompt obedience to the specific recall is in the best tradition of his profession. This is all in the book of regulations and the case would seem to be closed—if it ended there.

But, at bottom, we are not faced with a domestic, a legal, or a jurisdictional problem; the basic issue remains unsolved no matter what happens to General MacArthur. There still remains the historic confrontation between the two mighty opponents who, as Lenin and Stalin both unequivocally declared, must sooner or later meet in some titanic Armageddon. War between them is inevitable according to Mr. Stalin. That being so, the best place to meet the enemy is in Asia, concludes General MacArthur, whose knowledge of the Soviet mind is not inferior to any man I have yet met.

The President, on the other hand, together with his advisers, believes that Western Europe is a more favorable and crucial battlefront. Moreover, to adopt the logistics of warfare presumably favored by General MacArthur, might precipitate world war III before we are prepared for it, in the opinion of official Washington. Hence, regretfully but in good conscience, the President took the drastic step that needs no description here.

I should like to emphasize at this point that I have no political nor partisan motivation in anything I may say touching this dramatic episode. I am only a disenfranchised inhabitant of the District of Columbia and owe allegiance to neither political party, since neither has deemed us important enough to be admitted to the franchise. Hence, like every legal resident of the District, I am obliged by the nature of things to cultivate that impartiality which the Non-Partisan League endeavors to achieve by art. What I do assert is that both the General and the President can remain major influences in meeting the greatest crisis and the greatest peril that has ever menaced this country. One of them is a brilliant and distinguished soldier whose military achievements lie outside the area of the current controversy. The other is the President of that Nation to whom the entire world now looks with hope and expectation of leadership. Now that the military requirement of personal censure have been fulfilled by the prompt return of General MacArthur, a new chapter is about to be written on the blank pages of a very uncertain future. Controversy and disunity at home cannot but please the Politburo and dismay all Christendom. What a thrilling and heartening spectacle it would be to the entire non-Communist world in its present agony of anxiety, if, for example, President Truman were waiting at the airport when General MacArthur descends from his long flight. Such a gesture of national unity, or any other similar proof of greatness of mind would by no means indicate that the European point of view, so widely expressed in the overseas press, had been ignored or minimized. What a shock it would be to the Kremlin to see these two great symbols of power enter Washington shoulder to shoulder in a common resolve to meet the common enemy of mankind in unity of heart, and mind, and might. It would be notice to the Kremlin that the Government of the United States intends to use every component of its physical, intellectual, and moral assets in meeting its international obligations.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Trouble Ahead on Student Deferment," published in the Peoria Star on April 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROUBLE AHEAD ON STUDENT DEFERMENT

There is some logic to support the President's order providing draft deferment to college students on the basis of scholastic ability, but it seems to us more than offset by what may be anticipated in trouble. Doesn't it amount to setting up a Nation-wide competition among college students, with deferment from military service as the winners' prizes?

General Hershey pointed out that the President's order was in harmony with the will of Congress, which provided for draft deferments "in such numbers as may be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest." It requires a broad interpretation of "the national interest" to warrant the deferment of students on the basis of their intellectual capacity. There is some merit in arguing that these are the scientists, doctors, and engineers of the future, but it will be a bitter thought to many a student who is not intelligent enough to win deferment, that a democracy is setting up a class of elite intellectuals from which he is barred.

One can imagine such complaints as "We're dumb, so we do the shooting and get shot at. The smart guys get the soft jobs."

There is a good deal of justification for that anticipated complaint. We see in it an all too prevalent attitude, expressed by the editor of an eastern newspaper. He recognized the need for training bright young men for scientific and technical work. But he added that "provision must likewise be made to insure that the vital thread of our cultural and political heritage will not be snapped by a generation of men who through no fault of their own may have to spend much of their learning years studying the arts of war."

To us that is an odious thought. It means that intellectually gifted young men are too valuable to the state to be used in the defense of the state. Valuable in what way? In that they constitute an elite class in whom our cultural heritage must be preserved.

In addition to the fact that the principle stated above is foreign to the principle of equality in a free country, we can think of two practical objections to the operation of the President's deferment plan.

First, deferment is to be based on students' class standing and on psychological tests designed to measure learning capacity. Is the psychological capacity for learning a guaranty that the man is qualified to be a member of the elite who will preserve our cultural heritage? Some of our greatest rogues and criminals have had the keenest minds. If Alger Hiss were a college student, no doubt he would pass the test with flying colors. And it should be remembered that it has been among the American intelligentsia that communism has enjoyed the greatest hospitality.

Second, in spite of the development of psychological testing, we doubt that the techniques are accurate enough to be used as a criterion for determining who, in the future, will contribute most to scientific advancement or the preservation of our cultural heritage. As we remember it, Thomas Edison was rated a very poor student in his few years in school. And Abraham Lincoln's life was a series of dismal failures before he became President of the United States. We doubt if psychological tests can discover the future Edisons and Lincolns.

The principle of intellectual distinction in selective service, like the recent proposal to provide Federal scholarships for persons who might become most valuable to their country in specialized service, is a totalitarian principle. Its basic hypothesis is that the individual belongs to the state. The principle is abhorrent to those who believe in the democratic ideals and traditions of the United States.

Ambassador O'Dwyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, through the kindness of my good friend, Carroll Cone, an executive of Pan American Airways, I have received a copy of a translation of an editorial concerning Ambassador O'Dwyer, and I ask unanimous consent that the translation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation of editorial from Excelsior, Mexico City, April 3, 1951]

VERY GOOD, MR. TRUMAN

It does not escape anyone that the return to Mexico of Mr. O'Dwyer, the United States Ambassador, has been received by the Mexican public with a strong feeling of friendliness. The daily newspapers have been publishing the incidents of the testimony which the Ambassador rendered to an investigating commission of the Senate of his country, and it is looked upon favorably that President Truman has supported him in his high mission in Mexico and that President Aleman has shown his good will with regard to O'Dwyer by sending him the Presidential plane to New York for his return trip to Mexico.

In reality—and we are guided by information published in the New York press—the investigation which the commission of the Senate is carrying on with regard to the activities of the gangsters is nothing new. At least every year some scandal is raised for political purposes, which scandal as a rule melts like a snowball exposed to the sun's rays.

One New York publication calls the investigations referred to an "old story." The political aim pursued with regard to this matter is clearly outlined. It is the continual fight of the two large historic parties of the United States and of the groups within them. On the other hand, using common sense, it sounds ridiculous that the mayor of the largest city of the world, as is New York, should have accepted a donation of $10,000 from a syndical fire chief of that city. Naturally, Mr. O'Dwyer denied this charge before the Senate commission.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

What we wish to emphasize is that the testimony in question and its political repercussions constitute an internal problem of the United States. What the Mexican opinion has looked upon with pleasure is the return of the Ambassador, who has known how to win our good will because of his simplicity, of his respect for Mexican customs, and because of the personal interest he has shown for all cultural activities, and therefore for the prestige of our country. Ambassador O'Dwyer personifies good understanding, friendship between the two countries on a firm basis of mutual respect, and the good-neighbor policy.

Wake Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Wake Up, America," delivered by me at the dinner of the Brand Names Foundation in the ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

(By Senator JAMES H. DUFF, of Pennsylvania)

Right now this country faces the most critical period in its history. For my part it is almost impossible to overestimate the danger. And that danger is magnified by the recent let-down both in interest and concern by the public as well as by responsible public officials

Everything that goes on world-wide indicates that we in America should be acutely aware that we are opposed by a brutal, world-ambitious and powerful enemy—an enemy whose aim is the destruction of the United States. Russia realizes better than we seem to that the United States is the last powerful road block against the domination of the whole modern world by the evil men in the Kremlin. And yet we in America are not united either in purpose or in determination in the face of this threat to our very existence.

The almost endless discussion and wide divergence of opinion on all matters having to do with our preparation for defense is sure proof that as a Nation we are neither fully appreciative of our danger nor of the urgency needed to quickly prepare us to meet that danger. As a people we are undecided where we are headed, how we expect to get there, or what we will do when we do get there.

There lingers among many of us the hope that somehow as a people we can separate ourselves from the problems of the rest of the world, and thereby escape the furious turmoil that surges and flows back and forth everywhere around the globe. There was a time when we could do this. While there are those who still maintain that they can disclaim the tag of isolationism, in substance nevertheless their thinking represents an unawareness of the danger we face together with a lack of appreciation of the complete change in the physical character of our situation today when compared with former years.

In the days when isolationism was a proper and beneficial American policy, the physical facts of our situation justified isolationism, because the barriers of two oceans placed us beyond the probability of successful attack by those who might be our enemies. But that time is past. For while we remain separated by those two oceans from Europe on the east and Asia on the west, neither those oceans nor the friendly nations who are our neighbors north and south are no longer a barrier to aggressive nations. Today we live in an age when both time and place barriers have been destroyed.

What has happened in this age of air communication and transportation has made all nations our neighbors. As a people we can no longer be tempted by the memory of those former days of isolation with the hope that we can still be isolated, because then we were in fact isolated from the rest of the world by physical barriers. But the physical facts of today's world prevent isolation just as in those days they made isolation both possible and desirable.

Last month a British bomber flew nonstop from Western Europe to eastern North America in 4 hours and 37 minutes. That flight was almost as meaningful to America as the discovery of this land by Columbus. It connected Europe and America in only 37 minutes longer than it takes the best express train to make the run between the National Capital at Washington and New York City. Think of it—4 hours by train from the National Capital at Washington to New York City and only 4 hours and 37 minutes by plane from Europe to America. However little we may relish the idea, it meant that whatever happens in Europe also affects us here in the United States almost as much as if it happened in one of our adjoining States. Certainly it means that Western Europe must be denied to the Russians unless the whole concentrated area of industrial enterprise of the eastern United States is open to atomic bombing immediately world war III comes up.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, the other day made this statement:

"Should war come we can expect to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making the attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are completed. And our preparations today are not yet beefed up even to achieve that figure. Even if we had many more interceptor planes and antiaircraft guns and radar screens that blanketed all approaches to our boundaries, a predictable 70 percent of the enemy planes would penetrate our defenses despite the extraordinary valor and skill of our pilots. * * * The bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offense always has a crushing advantage in aerial warfare and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future."

In the light of this testimony by the Chief of our Air Force, and with the knowledge that only 4½ hours separate Europe from America by air, it ought to be clear that we dare not yield Western Europe to Russia if we expect to protect our great industrial centers from continuous bombing from bases in Western Europe should it be overrun by Russia.

With our air-closeness to Europe there can be no safe and sure fortress here in America.

One of the necessary lines of defense for the United States is now certainly Western Europe.

Nor is it of ourselves alone that we must think, because we in America are the leaders of the free people of today's world. We did not come by that leadership out of a desire to carry on war, or to create a colonial empire, or with imperialistic ambitions as the Russians assert. We came into that leadership by default of the power of those who had exercised it before us and because we represent more forcefully than any other great nation the idealism of freedom in today's world.

When we assumed world leadership, even against the wishes of many of our people, it came to us naturally by reason of our power and what we stand for. And we have it today whether we want it or not and with the leadership we also have the responsibility that always accompanies it.

Every realistic person knows that communism is on the march everywhere. Communism is united everywhere. But the free people are not united nor energized by common purpose. If communism is to be stopped, if freedom is to be saved, we in America must exercise the full responsibility that we occupy as leaders of all those opposed to returning the world to a period of darkness to which all the doctrine of communism tends.

Everyone knows that America desires peace. Russia's assertions to the contrary are mere smoke screens to conceal her own imperialistic, power-mad designs. There is every reason why we should want peace here in America. The average American enjoys the greatest material well-being ever enjoyed by people anywhere. And at the same time we have had unexampled civil and religious liberty. We have nothing to gain by war. On the contrary, we have everything to lose by another world conflict.

It is Russia that has decided that war will be the order of today's world. No other meaning can be ascribed to the vast military preparation of Russia that grows week by week, month by month, and year by year. And since Russia has indicated by the whole course of its action since World War II that it is its purpose to dominate the world, we in America dare not refuse to be prepared.

The enormous military preparation of Russia is aimed at ultimate war with the United States. Therefore, we must be prepared for any eventuality, because Russia may attack any hour of the night or day and without notice. That is the method of all totalitarian and aggressive nations. There is no reason to suspect anything less of the Communists because already since World War II Russia has gobbled up all its neighbors, set itself up in the very heart of Europe, and now moves far east across Asia to the Korean Peninsula and the Pacific Ocean.

What must happen to arouse America to the seriousness of the crisis that confronts us? Will it be necessary to repeat Pearl Harbors across America? Will we wait until a great number of industrial centers are struck the same night at the same time by coordinated atomic bomb attacks by the Russian air force in an endeavor to wipe out the industrial supremacy of this Nation? Or will we prepare? And will we prepare in time? And will we prepare sufficiently to develop our might so that Russia will be convinced that even if she should pull a sneak attack our power of retaliation will be so annihilating that communism dare not risk the devastation of that retaliation?

Today's world is on fire. Unless we help to put it out we too will inevitably be consumed in the conflagration.

We are now in far graver danger than before either World War I or World War II. It required the sinking of the *Lusitania* to awaken us to our danger in World War I. The perfidious attack on Pearl Harbor was necessary to awaken us in World War II. In

this atomic age we dare not risk the danger of an all-out attack by atomic bombing on this country before the scales drop from our eyes to disclose the danger by which we are confronted.

When Russia decided to use her puppets in Korea to further extend her control over Asia, we in America were genuinely aroused and deeply concerned by our battle losses in that far-off war. Now, well on to a year later, we seem to have settled down into a period of relative indifference, with business and politics and everything else as usual.

From the very fact that the Red Army in Korea is right now building its forces to a new power and maximum, there is renewed evidence that it is the purpose of Russia to force the fighting there even if world war III comes on thereby.

What do we in America propose to do to meet this tremendous crisis? That is a question every American should ask himself, because in a free country preparation depends in the end upon the sentiment of the people.

In my solemn judgment right now we in America face the ordeal of survival. It is imperative therefore that we make up our minds to what we intend to do. Then we must insist upon a program of action commensurate with the dangers. We must go forward continuously until we are in the position of such power that Russia dare not run the risk of starting world war III.

And to properly prepare this country, the present fogginess and confusion that exists in much of the public thinking must be burned out and that must be done immediately. Examine the situation in the command in Korea; the failure of many to realize the risk of having Western Europe overrun by Russia; and the recent directive on deferment of bright college boys.

The situation in the command in Korea is a specific instance. The American people have a right to know who is going to run the show in Korea, what the objectives are, and how those objectives are sought to be accomplished. There must be a definite, clean-cut statement as to what is political policy and what is Army policy and who is deciding which and why.

The MacArthur situation is a case in point. It is regrettable that the dismissal of General MacArthur had to take place. But if dismissal was the only way to accomplish unity then it had to be done because the lack of unity was harmful to the best interests of the Nation. When the commander in the field publicly and repeatedly disagreed with the Commander in Chief and the Joint Chiefs of Staff he thereby created an impossible situation that had to be resolved.

Supreme authority in the Armed Forces must reside somewhere. Under the Constitution of the United States it resides in the President as Commander in Chief. To permit a continuous dispute as to authority and military policy at the most critical juncture in our history is unthinkable.

Whether we agree with the political judgment of the President as Commander in Chief is entirely another proposition. That can only be resolved by the American people in the election of a new President.

As another example of the confusion that exists in the country and of the resentment that grows out of lack of proper direction, let us take the matter of deferment of college students of high grade. Certainly, that would be an un-American thing to do. I am sure our people would not tolerate putting bright college students on a pedestal and allowing the rest to remain in a subordinate position in the matter of service to their country. This country needs brains in its armed services right down the line, as well as in the other phases of our national activities. But above everything else, to create exemptions or preferences for any class in America is intolerable to the average citizen's ideas and would not work. The deferment of bright college students would absolutely be in contradiction to the fundamental principles of American democracy.

As for Western Europe, the so-called great debate revealed the utter confusion of many and the failure or unwillingness of some people to understand that we dare not risk the capture of Western Europe by Russia, even apart from the danger of Russia using Western Europe as a base for attack by her upon the United States.

The industrial production of Western Europe is too great to be joined to that of Russia in a war where production may well turn the scales for victory. During the past year the productive capacity of Western Europe increased to 130 percent of what it was during World War II. It is currently running at the rate of 140 percent of World War II production. When we realize that Hitler in World War II without the production of either Russia or England almost overran the world in 4 years, it becomes clear how imperative it is that this increased production of Western Europe must be denied to Russia if we are to win through in a possible conflict for survival against communism.

The people of Western Europe and the people of the United States are together responsible for 90 percent of all the inventions and betterments that go to make up modern living. They have the same know-how as we do. Without Western Europe, Russia cannot possibly defeat the free people of the world in the event the Reds decide to risk world war III in the attempt at world domination. Therefore, above all else, at this critical juncture of civilization, Western Europe with its common cultural, moral, religious and legal background, cannot be permitted to be overrun.

Here in America we are a free, peace-loving people, so we are at a tremendous disadvantage when dealing with an aggressor nation. We are in a terrific dilemma, because we do not know whether Russia will strike in the immediate future or after a long period of years. But in any event the tension will continue to be upon us and the danger will be as great one day as another, irrespective of what horn of the dilemma we face.

Therefore, first off we must be ready at all times against a possible attempt at a knock-out blow by a sneak attack. In this connection, never was this old slogan more apt—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Consequently, we must prepare immediately to be strong and to stay strong. No halfway measures will do. We must not only be strong in military might, we must also maintain high industrial production geared for defense needs, because in modern warfare, in the long run, industrial production is equally as vital as military preparation. On the long view, if we are obliged to be ready over a long period, it is imperative also that we work and prepare our plans on the basis of feasible and practical financial costs so that we do not ruin ourselves by bankruptcy while we are waiting to prepare ourselves for what Russia will probably attempt eventually.

On the floor of the Senate the other day it was stated that it costs Russia only $7 a year for the pay of a private soldier. Even a brigadier general in the Russian Army receives compensation of only $300 per year. By comparison, the lowest-paid soldier in our Army receives $1,080 per year. And the maintenance of a man in the field in our Army, plus his allotted proportion of all the maintenance and equipment cost assignable out of general operations, puts the expense in the American Army at $10,000 per man per year. A Regular standing army of 4,000,000 men, therefore, would cost this country $40,000,000,000 per year while we stood by awaiting the course of Russian decision and action.

It is clear that this vast expense for a standing army is more than we can afford. Our problem must be solved some other way. The only practical alternative is universal military training.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, recently made the following statement with reference to universal military training, with which I am entirely in accord:

"No man is wise enough to know how long the present emergency will last. One thing we do know. Unless we give unequivocal proof now of our determination to organize our defenses on a sound, long-range basis, our potential enemies will be encouraged to believe that we will, sooner or later, relax our vigilance and provide them with an opportunity to achieve their goal of world domination. * * * Scrapping universal military training * * * would be sufficient to cancel the assurance that our defenses would have, for the first time, an enduring base that would guarantee us adequate military strength at a cost we could bear for the years of critical world tension that we now face. Universal military training is not a step toward militarizing our country. Its effect is precisely the opposite. * * * It would require fewer men under arms, while giving us a vastly greater number of trained men quickly available for duty in a sudden emergency."

As I have tried to make clear, in my judgment, we will face the danger of such an emergency for a long time, in the event world war III does not come up with shocking and startling suddenness.

One military crisis after another pops up here and there around the world; in each case with the Russians pulling the strings in the background. Within the last month the Middle East oil picture became strong in focus as a result of Russian manipulation and interference. Now Korea looms larger with mounting Red forces building up behind their front as a part of their spring offensive. In Yugoslavia and the Balkan countries the tempo steps up to a place where the possibility of a start of world war III looms there.

This world-wide movement and anxiety and turmoil makes clear that we in America must avail ourselves of these precious months of time to prepare ouselves for the worst, instead of assuming that our defense is a casual matter that may be attended to at some reasonable leisure. We have not adjusted ourselves and our attitudes or our preparations to the critical posture of events facing us. The fact is we are not treating the situation as the vital and tremendous emergency which it is. That goes for all America and since it does, certainly our slogan ought to be "Wake Up, America."

It must be made clear to every American citizen that unless we are realistic enough to appreciate the danger, to take the necessary steps in preparation of defense, and to make the necessary sacrifices, we of this generation may not be able to transmit to those who come after us the blessings of which we ourselves have been the heirs and beneficiaries and which have made us the most prosperous, the most fortunate, and the most favored of all people in the whole history of civilization. That heritage has come to us as a result of sacrifice and unless we are willing to approach our responsibilities in the spirit of sacrifice, we will not be worthy successors of the great men and women who have given us what we have.

We face the challenge of survival. If we are to successfully accept that challenge, we must be willing to do the things necessary to meet it. And unless we do and until we do, neither ourselves, nor our children, nor our children's children will continue to enjoy the blessings which have made America the most wonderful place in the whole world.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Let us preserve this last best hope of earth."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Crisis in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in these days of stress and trial, all of us are particularly concerned with the present status and future of America's higher education. In the recent past, I have benefited from reading the thirty-first biennial report of the board of regents of the University of Washington. I was particularly impressed by the President's introduction. I believe that every Member of the Congress will benefit from what President Raymond B. Allen has said. Dr. Allen has stated that the University of Washington must and intends to prepare its students, as mature human beings, to assume their personal responsibilities for the welfare of their families, their communities, and their Nation. He concludes his definition of the university's teaching mission in these words:

The noblest end of education is the development of young men and women dedicated to useful lives of self-reliant citizenship and responsible leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that the president's introduction be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, where it may provide the reader with encouragement, and with an awareness of the fact that one of America's great educational institutions is determined to conquer and scale the obstacles and problems of the present in order that the university and its students and graduates may keep pace with progress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S INTRODUCTION

EDUCATION IN CRISIS

This report is written at a time of gravest crisis, at a time when freemen everywhere are striving to purge their institutions of weakness and buttress them for a struggle that threatens their whole way of life. By reason of this fact, this report differs from those that have gone before. It is far different from what it might have been had it been written 6 months ago.

The pattern of Communist aggression is unmistakable. To anyone willing to judge the Kremlin and its satellites by their actions rather than their words, the naked aggression in Asia can appear only as a part of a larger design of world domination.

Communist China's intervention in Korea insults and defies the United Nations decision to protect the free people of the world from violence and terror. The classic strategy of infiltration and of psychological, economic, political, and guerrilla warfare are softening Southeast Asia for conquest. India, Japan, and the Philippines have their places on the Kremlin's timetable. Western Europe raises its guard, uncertain when or where the blow will fall.

Inspired by hate and fear of the ideas, ideals, and moral unity of the West, the U. S. S. R.-controlled international Communist organization is engaged in a brutal international civil war against freedom and is using the United Nations organization as a battleground upon which to wage psychological and political warfare on the free world. Because it suits her design for world dominion, Russia gives lip service to the purposes of the United Nations. But now the Kremlin's true allegiance is clear, and the moral indignation of the free world mounts as practical security measures are finally being taken.

Perhaps the most important of the security measures we can take is the strengthening of education for freedom. Now that we know our enemy and know that he is active here at home and throughout the world, we should strengthen the educational bastions of the free world.

If we are to survive, we must know ourselves as well as our enemy. Our resources are many, but if we are to prevent another world war, or if we are to win such a war should it come, we shall have to excel in more than science, technology, and industrial output. We shall have to show the world that, as individuals and as a Nation, we are clear and strong in our resolution to act in the interest of freemen and for freedom for men everywhere.

Naturally, our enemy wants to engage us on ground that is to his advantage—ground on which guerrilla tactics will win. Fortunately, such tactics are not strange to Americans. By these tactics, Americans won their own freedom and opened up the West. This, however, is not the only lesson our national history has taught us. A more important lesson we have learned, or should have learned, concerns the nature of security.

BUILDING SELF-RELIANT CITIZENS

The only real security a society can have is based on the individual security of self-reliant citizens. Unfortunately, in our quest for security in an industrial society, we have too often weakened the incentives for individual self-reliance. We have done this in many subtle ways, some of which are rooted in education and the home. Are children encouraged to assume responsibility, and thus to become self-reliant as adults, by a society which gives them little or nothing responsible to do? Does lock-step education develop independence?

If education is to make its maximum contribution, it will do so by placing greater responsibility on young people themselves to sharpen their own powers of mind and perception, to strengthen their bodies, and to toughen their moral and spiritual fiber. Such toughness of body, mind, and spirit characterized our forefathers. The present generation has these qualities, but, in the all too many cases where they are only latent, it is the responsibility of the home, the school, and the church to bring them out and develop them and thus to better prepare our youth for survival in a world already at war. I am convinced that youth educated and trained for the kind of war in which we are now engaged will be individuals who can survive and who, by the very nature of their training, will forever cherish the freedom which is the priceless heritage of western civilization.

This kind of training always has been, and always should be, the objective of education in a democratic society. The present emergency challenges education by making clear that this objective is not merely desirable but is essential to survival.

The University of Washington is acutely aware of its responsibility in the present emergency. This report is not, however, a report of a university getting ready for cataclysm. It is precisely the opposite. It is a report showing how the university's long-term programs have actually strengthened it to assume positive leadership in whatever activities are needed, whether in peace or in war. It is this kind of forward-looking management that this report attempts to depict. The report seeks to picture the university's broad, over-all patterns of activity—what the university is, what it does, how well it does it. It does not pretend to detail all of the individual accomplishments, fine as they are, in the scores of colleges, schools, and departments, for to do so would risk losing sight of the forest for the trees.

No one knows precisely what the national situation holds for American education in general or for the University of Washington in particular. We are aware, of course, that the present situation, characterized by simultaneous search for peace and preparation for war, places a heavy responsibility upon higher education and poses for it a tremendous challenge. This is not merely a matter of how selective service calls may affect enrollment, although we must face realistically the probability of some kind of universal service if the Nation is to achieve its goal of armed security. It is not merely a matter of maintaining the Nation's pool of trained scientific manpower during a period of mobilization or universal service, difficult as this problem will be if all young men are called to service on reaching the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school. It is not merely the problem of getting the ablest of these young men back into college for specialized training, both in their own interest and in that of the Nation. It is not only the problem of how colleges and universities can best serve in national defense programs. It is all these things, yet it is something else as well. The real challenge that faces America's colleges and universities includes the challenge of preserving the truths and values of American civilization, of maintaining and enhancing the intellectual and spiritual, as well as the material, strength of the whole Nation and the Western World, of guarding, over a long period, perhaps, the habit of intellectual endeavor and the respect for principles and values which undergird the whole structure of our free society.

THE SEARCH FOR ULTIMATE VALUES

The University of Washington proposes to meet these challenges with selflessness and with a keen awareness of basic moral values. The university is not seeking merely to strengthen itself as an institution, nor does it feel that, if global war comes, it need only convert to training programs while it goes among the people bidding them to be strong. What the university faces is a decision on a course of action that will preserve it and, if possible, strengthen it as a rampart of freedom. If it should fail in this it will have failed to meet the greatest challenge of all.

Against this background the work of the university stands out in its many dimensions. Yet, if one is to judge the university and evaluate its performance, he needs something more. He needs a plumb line of permanent mission, of objectives, against which to measure for trueness the university's work. With this in mind, it has seemed proper to preface this report with a statement of the mission of the University of Washington, as those responsible for its administration conceive that mission to be:

The university exists to serve the people of the State of Washington; through teaching, to train young men and women for more intelligent, responsible, and productive lives; by research, to develop more adequate solutions to social and scientific problems; and by every means to apply its knowledge and skills in the interest of the people who support and sustain the university and thus give it life. The university's function is to so organize and nurture this life as to build ever more securely a free society of free and self-reliant men and women.

The research and service objectives of the university are clear. Their accomplishments depends upon the maintenance of superior staff and facilities, high standards of performance, and the application of energy, skill, and imagination to human and material problems. The university's record in this re-

gard, an excellent one, is becoming better year by year.

The teaching mission of the university, on the other hand, is by no means so simple or so easy of accomplishment. It is a mission shared by education in free institutions everywhere. There is a great ferment over its definition and over means for its full realization. The university is concerned, of course, with creating the proper conditions for learning, with keeping alive the good and true in the past experience of mankind, with the development of skills, with the cultivation of habits of industry, curiosity, and imagination, and with seeking perspective and wholeness of understanding. But the university must go beyond these traditional and admittedly fine concepts if it is to be worthy of its name. It must prepare its students, as mature human beings, to assume their personal responsibilities for the welfare of their families, their communities, and their Nation. The university, then, must not be satisfied with mere training for vocational competence and personal achievement. Above all else, the University must seek and develop in youth those qualities of character, idealism, and spirit without which learning, however brilliant, is socially sterile and possibly dangerous. The noblest end of education is the development of young men and women dedicated to useful lives of self-reliant citizenship and responsible leadership.

This, then, is the mission that motivates your university and unifies it in time of crisis. Never before in history has the accomplishment of these objectives been more sorely needed. Never before have the integrity and security of the Nation been in greater jeopardy. It is the purpose of this report to show how the university has attempted to meet its own high standards and how it will seek to respond with purpose and force to whatever challenge the future may bring.

RAYMOND B. ALLEN.

Proposed Sale of Old German Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't Sell the Embassy," which appeared a few days ago in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It has to do with Senate bill 873, introduced by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], introduced for the purpose of preventing the sale of the old Germany Embassy. I hope the bill will be brought up for early consideration in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T SELL THE EMBASSY

What seems to us to be a waste of time and energy and a deal that we have to pay for in the end anyway, is the attempt of Alien Property Office to sell the old German Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue in Washington.

It is a nice little cottage with 70 rooms and 13 baths. It was seized from the Hitler government when the United States entered World War II. The highest bid received was $101,050, and this, the alien property custodian says, is too low. He will try to negotiate a higher price.

The folly of this projected deal consists in selling this property at a time when diplomatic relations are being reestablished with the Bonn government.

Because military government still retains a measure of control over German affairs, Bonn has not yet been authorized to appoint full ministers or ambassadors. It is empowered, however, to reestablish the consular service and to send charges d'affaires to friendly countries. Sooner or later, as occupational direction relaxes and Bonn becomes sovereign, ambassadors will be accredited to other powers. At the rate controls have been lifted that will not be far off.

Where, then, will the ambassador hang his hat? When, before that time, a charge d'affairs is sent to Washington as one already has been dispatched to London, where will he operate?

It would be much better to hold this property in trust until Germany is back on its feet and then return it to the new, responsible German Government. The Russians have given the German Embassy in Moscow into the keeping of an envoy from the eastern zone. In Prague the Czechs have done the same. Likewise, the Turks have returned the property to the Bonn government.

Maybe this isn't the way to operate on American lines. We will probably persist in selling the property. Then, when the Germans need a new embassy, some agency of the Federal Government will donate them the money with which to buy it just as we donate so much cash to other countries to make up for equally shortsighted mistakes.

Narcotics

REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the press releases over the week end indicate that the Senate Committee on Crime intends to recommend, among other things, legislation greatly tightening up the penalties for narcotic violators in the United States. I am very glad to inform the House that a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has been working on this problem for the past 3 or 4 weeks, and we have now recommended to the Committee on Ways and Means the adoption of H. R. 3490, which has the full approval of the law-enforcement officials of this country and which, in my opinion, if adopted, will go a long way toward suppressing the narcotic trade in this country.

The letter from the Attorney General and the grand-jury report are as follows:

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOGGS: In accordance with the understanding at the hearing held by your subcommittee on various bills, particularly H. R. 3490, introduced by you and proposing certain amendments to the Federal narcotic laws respecting the penalties to be imposed, there is enclosed a copy of a recent report of the Federal grand jury at Detroit, Mich., on drug addiction among teen-agers.

You will note that this grand jury recommends the passage of H. R. 2340, which, except for minor changes and clarifications, is very similar to H. R. 3490, and upon which the department commented in its recent letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL GRAND JURY AT DETROIT, MICH., ON DRUG ADDICTION AMONG TEEN-AGERS

We, your grand jurors, duly empaneled in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, to inquire into and investigate such matters as are presented to us, or that shall be called to our attention, involving offenses committed within said district, and specifically matters involving violations of the narcotics laws, particularly the use of narcotics by so-called teen-agers, make the following report on our investigation of such matters:

Your grand jurors report that conditions of the most shocking nature were revealed in the testimony adduced before them; that young people ranging in age between 14 and 21 have become confirmed and inveterate users of heroin, morphine, and cocaine; that these young people, upon becoming enslaved through their addiction to narcotics, resorted not only to thievery in the homes of their parents and relatives but became shoplifters and common thieves, and that many of the young girls became prostitutes because of their craving for narcotics and the necessity of obtaining money to purchase enough to satisfy the daily needs of their uncontrollable craving.

The powerful stimulus of the constant threat of illness soon dominates the life of an addict. In the case of the school youth they start diverting their money for lunches and other school expenses to the purchase of narcotics. Soon they must quit school so that they can devote full time to the pursuit of the money necessary to support their habit. The tragic record shows that the girls usually drift into prostitution as one way to obtain the money necessary, and the boys drift into thievery of all kinds and into gambling. Usually the thefts first take the form of stealing valuables from the home to be pawned. Sooner or later, if the parents or guardians do not learn of the addiction and place the patient under treatment, continued thefts outside the home come to the attention of the juvenile authorities. From the foregoing facts your grand jurors reach the inescapable conclusion that narcotic addiction is the root of, and is responsible for, the widespread wave of crime that constantly plagues our society.

Your grand jurors find that the smoking of marihuana has become the daring thing to do among our school children of the teen-age group, and an increasing number of those who experiment with marihuana go on to experiment with the innocent looking white powder known as heroin, which has suddenly become so easy to purchase in many neighborhoods near schools. At first, there doesn't seem to be much difference between smoking marihuana cigarettes and sniffing white powder in searching for a thrill; the tragic fact is that the majority of the youngsters who start experimenting with heroin do not know that a physical dependence is developed which makes it impossible to stop taking it without becoming desperately ill. The painful withdrawal from heroin and other similar narcotic drugs can be accomplished only by a harrowing withdrawal illness of 10 to 14 days' duration, followed by a period of several months of convalescence

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and rehabilitation if the patient is to have any chance of remaining off drugs. From sniffing heroin ("snorting" is the less elegant expression), the new addict soon has to shift to the hypodermic or intravenous injection of heroin by syringe and needle in order to obtain the maximum effect from the drug which his body now demands.

Your grand jurors find that these young people first commenced the use of marihuana through association with those who had formed the habit; that their curiosity contributed to the habit of smoking marihuana and soon thereafter the nervous condition brought on by the smoking of marihuana led them to the use of heroin, which created not a habit but an addiction, dominating their bodies and minds. Your grand jurors were amazed and appalled by the revelations which reflected the moral degradation of the individual and the disintegration of the family life of those who were affected—the misery and sorrow that is caused by narcotic addiction can only be attested to by families whose members have become victims.

Your grand jurors find that in some instances these young people were able to obtain marihuana in stores across the street from some of the schools in Detroit, where they not only purchased it, but were given the opportunity to smoke it. In most of these cases, we find that the student would soon leave school to follow other smokers whose paths lead to bars where the bands are patronized, to a great extent, by young people. We find that there is a strong propensity on the part of users of marihuana to follow bands, a good many of whose members are marihuana smokers, and whose popularity with the so-called "be-bop" music attract large numbers of young people to dance halls and bars, and other places where liquor is dispensed. It was in such associations that most of the marihuana users were introduced to heroin, and once introduced to heroin, they became "hooked."

We find that treatment of the individual addict is extremely important, not only to bring about the rehabilitation of the individual, but also because drug addiction is, in a sense, infectious. Each active addict at liberty in the population acts as a focus for spreading addiction. In teen-agers, the invariable history is that addiction started as the result of association with another addict.

We find that some parents of victims were extremely remiss in their parental duties, manifesting in some cases a total lack of solicitude towards the welfare of their children; that many parents are completely indifferent as to the whereabouts of their children, their associations and social diversions or recreation, and many of these young people were left to themselves to mold their lives without any parental guidance or interest, rendering them in many instances easy prey to evil influences. The indifference and ignorance of some parents was so incredibly profound that some of these children were able to smoke marihuana and even inject heroin in their homes without detection for long periods of time.

We find that in the past very little emphasis has been placed upon the provision of adequate personnel for the enforcement of the narcotic laws; that apathy and total lack of appreciation of the importance of adequate and proper enforcement of the narcotic laws is responsible for the unbelievable numbers of narcotic peddlers providing the teen-agers with a facility for the purchase of narcotics which has led to the increase of narcotic addiction now rampant in our communities, and that, as many teen-agers testified before us, narcotic addiction will continue to increase unless a positive and systematic program of apprehending and prosecuting those who commercialize the illicit sale of narcotics is put into operation and supported with unrelenting vigor.

We therefore recommend the passage of Congressman DONOVAN'S bill, H. R. 2340, as the best weapon to suppress the abuse of narcotic drugs. This bill provides a mandatory sentence of 5 years for the second offense for narcotic peddling and 10 years for the third offense. This recommendation is made without any reflection upon the judge of the eastern district of Michigan, whose heavy sentences in these cases have helped to prevent a much heavier traffic in illicit narcotics here than we now have.

We recommend that the State Legislature of Michigan enact the following amendment to the State Uniform Narcotic Act, and suggest that other States adopt this amendment:

"Whoever violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $—— and be imprisoned not less than 2 or more than 5 years. For a second offense, or in the case of a first conviction of violation of any provision of this act, the offender shall previously have been convicted of any violation of the laws of the United States or of any other State, territory, or district relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, the offender shall be fined not more than $—— and be imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a third or subsequent offense, or if the offender shall previously have been convicted two or more times in the aggregate of any violation of the law of the United States or of any other State, territory or district relating to narcotic drugs or marihuana, the offender shall be fined not more than $——, and be imprisoned not less than 10 years or more than 20 years. Except in the case of conviction for a first offense for violation of the provisions of this act, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation or parole shall not be granted until the minimum imprisonment herein provided for the offense shall have been served."

We recommend that legislation now before the Michigan State Legislature providing, in substance, that persons under the age of 21 be excluded from establishments where intoxicating liquor is dispensed by one glass, be passed.

We find that some countries in Europe, particularly Italy and Turkey, where heroin is produced for medical purposes, for some unexplainable reason have a production of heroin far in excess of their medical needs. We find that of such excess of heroin produced by these foreign countries, a goodly proportion is being smuggled into the United States and thereafter is being illicitly sold here.

We find that the smuggling of narcotics into the United States from these countries is carried on to a great extent by seamen on steamships traveling between Europe and the United States. We find that vigorous measures to deter these seamen from smuggling must be applied, and that if such measures were used—such as permanent revocation of seamen's licenses and vigorous prosecution upon detection—the supply of illicit heroin in the United States would be reduced to a minimum. This would eliminate many peddlers and the consequent exposure of our youth to drugs.

We recommend that seamen detected in smuggling narcotics into the United States be severely punished by permanent revocation of their licenses, disbarment from membership in mariners' unions, and criminal prosecution. We urge that the United Nations Narcotic Commission make a firm and unrelenting effort to bring about the same vigorous measures in punishing seamen of other nations for the same violations.

We strongly recommend that the United Nations Narcotic Commission exert its influence upon those nations producing narcotics beyond their medical needs and that said Commission request these nations that the production of narcotics be limited to the necessary medical needs of their countries. We make this recommendation with the firm belief and understanding that the elimination of excessive production of narcotics on the part of some of these foreign countries will have a most beneficial effect upon the United States by eliminating much of the illicit narcotics now being smuggled into the United States.

We strongly recommend that the Congress of the United States make immediate appropriation of funds necessary to increase the facilities of the United States Public Health hospitals for the treatment of addicts at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.

We strongly recommend that the Congress of the United States provide the Federal Bureau of Narcotics with more agents for the entire country, in order to bring about satisfactory enforcement of the law. This recommendation is made with the firm belief and conviction that unless the Federal Bureau of Narcotics is given sufficient personnel to cope with the illicit narcotic traffic, our youth will be constantly in danger.

We recommend that the city of Detroit, as well as other cities throughout the United States, increase their narcotic police forces. This recommendation is made with the firm belief and conviction that adequate personnel in a municipality for the enforcement of the narcotic laws will compensate for itself in relief from crime such as larceny, robbery, housebreaking, and prostitution, which are crimes generally engaged in by addicts to obtain money to support their addiction.

We find that the use of marihuana alone does not create an addiction, and that while the use of marihuana leads to the use of heroin, marihuana does not develop a physical dependence such as is developed following the use of heroin. We, therefore, find that exemption from military service of those found to be using marihuana is not justified. We recommend that no exemptions from military service be given to those merely using marihuana. We recommend that the military authorities set up a special work detail where those using marihuana to any substantial extent may be temporarily confined and rehabilitated for military service.

We recommend that the Michigan State Legislature pass legislation to quarantine drug addicts by requiring them to be committed to hospitals until they are pronounced cured by medical authorities.

Your grand jurors feel that the advisability and propriety of establishing an educational program for dissemination of information concerning narcotic addiction requires a more serious study.

The grand jury deplores the unnecessary publicity which followed the narcotic conviction of a popular picture star and the exploitation of this conviction by certain Hollywood studios, which had a telling impact on many young people who began using narcotics. Glorification of persons who have been connected with the narcotic racket is bound to have a detrimental effect on persons of impressionable age, and glamorizing these questionable characters has contributed to the current wave of youthful addiction.

We urge that the Michigan Liquor Control Commission and other law enforcement agencies increase their vigilance over those bars where the bands feature so-called be-bop music and attract large numbers of our teen-agers.

We urge that the owners of these establishments be compelled to assume more responsibility in guarding against persons suspected of dispensing narcotics; and that while most of these licensees are sincere in complying with the regulations to which they are subject, a few of them have shown a definite indifference to the presence of narcotic users and peddlers in their business places, and we

recommend that the Michigan Liquor Control Commission consider seriously the revocation of licenses issued to those who display a lack of interest in and responsibility for the presence of suspected users and peddlers of narcotics in their places of business.

We urge that the parent-teacher organizations become more militant in a program of definitely eradicating demoralizing influences in the vicinity of the schools; that such organizations recruit for members more parents of high-school students, and adopt a system of screening, with vigorous and unrelenting determination, all business places in close proximity to school areas.

We urge that all civic organizations, particularly businessmen's organizations, in our communities seek out the business places where young people are permitted to congregate for long periods of time without any apparent reason and ascertain whether the owners thereof are sincere and conscientious in their efforts to detect the use of marihuana; that they expose business places where tolerance and indifference of the owners have made possible conditions under which users and peddlers of marihuana have flourished with impunity. We firmly believe that a cooperative program on the part of these organizations will contribute materially toward discouraging the use of narcotics among our young people.

Your grand jurors express their gratitude for the splendid cooperation given by the office of the United States district attorney, the agents of the Bureau of Narcotics, and the local bureau of narcotics. These agents are to be complimented for their devotion to their duties, working long hours under difficult conditions with inadequate personnel.

Your grand jury wishes to impress upon everyone that the problem of narcotic addiction places a responsibility not just on the enforcement officers, the social workers, the school authorities, or on any one segment of society, but upon every one of us. We must assume that responsibility and use whatever resources may be at our disposal to combat in every possible way the evil forces and influences that have, thus far, demoralized our youth to an alarming degree.

Respectfully submitted.

In the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commonweal:

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In March 1945, a few days before the death of President Roosevelt, Robert Sherwood returned to this country from the Pacific theater of operations where he had made an inspection tour for the President, having been especially instructed to get General MacArthur's views on our future Pacific policy. When Sherwood, who said he was enormously impressed with the range of MacArthur's views on the Orient, made his report to Roosevelt, the President remarked: "I wish that he (MacArthur) would sometimes tell some of these things to me." So deeply suspicious of the Democratic administration were MacArthur and his staff, that Sherwood said he found the unmistakable signs of a persecution complex at work in the MacArthur entourage.

In recent months General MacArthur chose to impose his private views on his Commander in Chief by means of a message to a veterans' convention, an unauthorized message and implied challenge to the Chinese commander in Korea, and a letter to the minority leader of the House. All told, one can only judge these actions to have been the behavior pattern of a man who put himself above the laws of courtesy and country.

MacArthur's opinion on Pacific policy—which is, that Asia is the decisive battlefield to be defended against the Communists and that therefore we should extend and not limit the Korean war—is an opinion totally in opposition to American foreign policy; in holding this opinion, MacArthur was defying the judgment of the President, the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Eisenhower, the majority of the United Nations and the majority of the Congress. One may, if he is an admirer of the general's, believe that the general was acting in a democratic manner, in deference to the will of the majority and in the best interests of the principle we fight for, the principle of the democratic way of life. But the burden of the proof is on him. This, it seems to us, was the behavior of a man in defiance of the majority, a man with a will-to-power that was contemptuous of the prevailing reason of the majority; this, in short, was the behavior of the self-appointed genius who always thinks he knows what is best for the ignorant masses and whose actions are in the pattern of history's long chronicle of dictators.

Maybe MacArthur was right; maybe he was one of those rare and enlightened leaders destined to show mankind the way. Certainly he had reason to be restive, since he had been in a most difficult military position ever since the United Nations was forced to defend itself on the distant and disadvantageous Korean Peninsula.

But in our judgment MacArthur was disastrously wrong and we are of the opinion that the mystique of his enlightened leadership was a cult too jealously guarded by a selected group of admirers to be genuine. We consider MacArthur's policy to have been wrong for the following reasons:

First, we believe that in order to wage war now against the West, the Soviets must have the steel-making capacity of the Ruhr, or Japan, or both. Therefore western policy should be to prohibit Russia from the Ruhr and Japan by building up a defensive position in the free world with all haste, in the hope of stalemating the threat of a world war.

Second, we believe that in order to give us time to build these defenses, every effort should be made to limit the Korean war to Korea, because to bomb Manchuria means to bomb the rest of China eventually, and this in turn means that Russia will be forced to come to the direct aid of Mao Tse-tung. Since the United States cannot hope to defeat the Communists through nonatomic air power alone (we could not destroy the North Korean army with air power, nor can we destroy the Chinese armies now, even though we have had absolute control of the air), we would, then, following MacArthur's strategy, have to send our armies into the futile and bloody trap of a land war in Asia. Were this to happen, Russia would have accomplished her desire to spread and thin out our nonatomic air and land forces around the world to a point of such overextension that it is doubtful whether Western arms could be supreme in any one theater of war.

Third, since it is possible that under such circumstances the great powers will resort to atomic warfare (especially if the rumored atomic artillery shells are a reality), we believe that it is the moral obligation of Christians first to exhaust every possible means of averting this unspeakable massacre, and one of those means right now is to limit the war to Korea, making every effort to discharge our moral obligation to defend the United Nations there without providing further conflict.

Fourth, we believe that the present foreign policy of the administration is essentially correct in its European emphasis and in its combined objective of defense and negotiation. This policy is by far a better hope for an honorable peace than the swaggering belligerency of MacArthur.

In his last attempts to dictate the far eastern foreign policy of this country and of the United Nations, General MacArthur clearly exceeded his authority and, in defying the normal processes of the democratic code, he placed himself outside the cause and the ideology we are trying to defend; he in fact brought on his own dismissal. Surely the President acted with sincere regret, as he has said. But certainly his decision was for the common good; it was, we believe, the only decision he could have taken in the interests of discharging his responsibility to the country and to all those throughout the world who look to us now for a reasonable example of leadership.

In a very real sense Mr. Truman could only afford to make this decision trusting in the ability of his countrymen to weigh the facts impartially; if the MacArthur partisans choose to attack Mr. Truman as wildly as we anticipate they will, then we believe that those who support the President in this matter have every good reason to stand by him now and thus vindicate the high trust he has placed in them.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unacceptable Explanation," from the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of April 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNACCEPTABLE EXPLANATION

In his radio address to the Nation Wednesday night, President Truman attempted to justify his summary dismissal of General MacArthur by explaining that the general is not in agreement with United States and UN policy in the Far East.

Even if one grants that this is true, it by no means will be deemed a sufficient excuse by MacArthur's admirers and supporters for the harsh and spectacular method used in ousting the general from all his commands.

But it is also true that millions are by no means convinced United States and UN policy, as President Truman outlined it, has been clear enough heretofore for General MacArthur or anybody else to understand just what it is or has been.

Merely to plead that we want no third world war is no explanation for the unceremonious firing of MacArthur. Nobody wants a third world war. Certainly MacArthur doesn't. But neither he nor millions of others are ready to accept a back-down from the position taken by the United States and the UN last June as the only safe recipe for avoiding a third world war.

Such a back-down is exactly what is proposed by the Asia policy as described by President Truman Wednesday night.

When he directed MacArthur to use United States military forces to challenge the aggression of North Koreans last June the idea was that the free nations of the world must make all of Korea safe for freedom. Now the President and his advisers are apparently convinced we cannot do this; that the best out is to accept a compromise that will leave the North Koreans at the thirty-eighth parallel to ready themselves for another march into South Korea at some future date.

Is it surprising General MacArthur would be dissatisfied with any such conclusion to a war that has already cost the United States more than 50,000 casualties? He is the type that believes in finishing a job. He doesn't accept defeat, partial or complete, with complacency—which is the major explanation for his great popularity with so many Americans. And which also is a major and sufficient reason why he should never have been subjected to the outrageous treatment he has been accorded.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from the rector of Christ Church, Episcopal, of Lexington, Ky. The Reverend James W. Kennedy is pastor of the church of which I am a member. He is the author of the book The Man Who Wanted to Know, and has created the character "Parson Jim" in writings and radio programs.

Personally, I am very much impressed with his plea for wheat for India, because it strips this issue of all the doubts that surround it. This includes, of course, concern over the policies of the representatives of India in the United Nations. No one will question the use of our surplus wheat for this purpose when it is considered entirely as a humanitarian act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRIST CHURCH,
Lexington, Ky., April 14, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR UNDERWOOD: I quite realize the tremendous difficulties in the way of passing that wheat for India bill, both from the standpoint of governmental red tape and the private transportation facilities which it would require. I am also convinced that there is no intention on the part of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to use this bill as a political measure. When I think of the amazing job which Florence Nightingale did in the face of insuperable odds, and those odds mainly with Government officials and procedures, I realize that anything, no matter what it is, i. it is right and needful, can be accomplished, provided however there is one man or one woman utterly convinced and given to the cause. I believe more than any other single factor our delay in doing this Christian act has lost us more support in the world at large than any other single thing. Certainly the motivation behind it should not be to gain the good will of anybody, but to recognize the terrible needs which at least we can do what we can to meet.

I feel very strongly about this and I wish there were something I could do about it. I am sure you will do what you can. If only the sentiment of the country could filter into the committee where this is holed up. I believe this humanitarian step must be taken in God's name, or we'll never be able to look ourselves in the face again.

Best regards,

JAMES W. KENNEDY.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a powerful editorial which appeared in the Lathrop (Mo.) Optimist, April 12, 1951. It was evidently written by E. L. Fisher, the editor and owner of this excellent paper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR IS FIRED

Truman has fired General MacArthur. He says, to save the lives of American boys; to prevent the war from spreading beyond Korea. So, American boys and a few from other nations are to continue to give their lives indefinitely fighting Red Chinese who can retire behind a boundary line and be free from any attack by land, air, or sea while they mass their forces to sufficient strength to attack again. They can repeat this maneuver unlimited times until they mass sufficient strength to overwhelm us.

MacArthur kept insisting that a second front consisting of anti-Communist Chinese be armed and given the go sign. No one denies that there are millions of Chinese who are anti-Red, who would love to fight the Communists if they had anything more than sticks and stones for weapons. General MacArthur believes, along with millions of other Americans, that the quickest way to end the war (or Truman's police action) is to use these millions of Chinese on a second front. America is the greatest industrial nation in the world; but we do not have the most manpower. We are pitifully short on manpower compared with China and Russia. But, we could use our vast industrial ability, arm millions of Chinese to fight the Red Chinese, thus combining Nationalist China's manpower and our productive capacity. This should be a winning team if given a chance. But this seems to have no chance under Truman. What if we did have to put a few troops along with the Chinese? An American life lost there is no more precious than one in Korea.

Truman and his advisers have been proven wrong so much in recent events that it is difficult to have any confidence in their judgment now.

Remember, Truman withdrew an American army of 40,000 men from South Korea a few months before the Communist-led North Koreans attacked South Korea. If they had been there well armed, the Reds would not have dared to attack. That blunder started the whole war that has cost all these American lives.

It all adds up to this: Truman has fired one of the most, if not the most, brilliant military men this Nation has ever produced and has failed to accomplish anything by it.

Limited Expansion of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding General MacArthur's address before the joint meeting of Congress, which appeared in the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News of April 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General MacArthur's address to the Congress yesterday was able and more than a little moving in many places. The dramatic manner in which the "old soldier" appeared before the joint session will do more to help sell his point of view than all the words of all the others who favor the policies he advocates.

Except for the maudlin ending of the speech, the general spoke with obvious conviction and sincerity. He condemned the Truman administration's policy in Korea and the Orient, but there was none of the politics evident in the general's speech which others have been carrying on in his name.

MacArthur, however, said little that he has not said before, except his assertion that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have favored broadening the war. That is sharply at variance with the statements of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Omar Bradley, who on Tuesday rejected MacArthur's views and stated categorically that MacArthur's military policies "would jeopardize world peace."

The general did not at any point question the President's right to remove him from command, nor did he deny what most commentators have termed his insubordination. On the contrary, he restated the policies which he previously advocated and which led to his dismissal.

In essence, MacArthur called for a limited expansion of the war in Korea by economic and naval blockade of China, by air operations over China, and by the use of Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist troops on Formosa.

These are proposals which have been considered and turned down, by the civilian policy makers of the Government, and, presumably, by the Joint Chiefs. They were rejected on the basis that although these operations might be conceived on a limited scale, keeping them limited could prove impossible.

The issue seems to us to boil down to this: Can there in practice be any such thing as the limited expansion of the war which MacArthur favors? Can United States objectives in Asia be attained in any other manner? And, if not, are we prepared to fight Russia in Asia, in Europe, or on any other front she might choose such as the Middle East?

It is quite true that we fought World War II on two fronts against great odds and won. If we have to, we can do it again. But let

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

us go into this thing realistically, rather than on a wave of emotional patriotism stirred by a popular military hero.

MacArthur stated that he did not believe the prospect of having to fight on two fronts should deter this Nation. He said that Russia, too, would be fighting on two fronts. But what he did not say is that Russia would be supplying her armies over shorter land routes while we supplied our's across the vast distances of oceans, which this time would be infested with Russian submarines. Nor did he mention the fact that the brunt of Russia's war in the Far East would be borne not by Russians but by China's almost limitless manpower.

MacArthur's chief point was that he does not believe that Russia would necessarily come into the fight. But that is only conjecture. She might and she might not. All we know is that she has an agreement to come to the aid of the Chinese Communists in the event of attack which she might want to keep because of the effect on her other satellites, and that, further, she is masterminding the Korean war.

We agree with MacArthur that it is vital to American security to keep a firm hold on Formosa, but as for his plan to use Chiang Kai-shek's ill-equipped troops, that is another question. The general called for United States logistical support for them, but many competent observers say it would take much more. Chiang lacks sea and air power for an invasion and the only nation we know of which could supply such power is the United States.

Perhaps if the isolationists who have climbed on the MacArthur bandwagon had been a little less bent on keeping the United States from building up its strength, we might be in a better position now to risk starting world war III.

This newspaper has consistently and strongly advocated armed strength as the only answer to the Russian menace. We advocate that now. We firmly believe that only in strength is there a chance for peace.

But we do not advocate starting a new global war now—at least not until we are strong enough to win it, or until such time as the American people demonstrate they want such a war and are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to insure its success. Wars must be made of sterner stuff than ovations for heroic generals.

One positive gain for the Nation could result from all the controversy which the MacArthur case has caused. If the country faced now with the necessity of reiterating its present Asian and world policy or formulating a new and even stronger one—is stirred to a faster rearmament peace General MacArthur will have rendered another invaluable service.

The controversy centers upon the fact that our armed strength is not yet great enough to meet the challenges which it faces.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRONG MAN WAS FIRED

There must be rejoicing in the Kremlin today. For Harry Truman has fired the man who has stood as the bulwark against complete Communist domination in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

And he did it with all the finesse of a Kansas City gangster bumping off a victim, or a mad butcher wielding a meat ax. The manner he chose is, in military circles, considered as only less disgraceful than by court martial, and many officers in similar straits have demanded a trial so that they could be heard. General MacArthur, notwithstanding he had committed the unpardonable sin of making an accidental President jealous by his stature and by his standing with the American people, deserved better than this.

The dismissal of MacArthur makes it official—ours are suicide troops fighting in Korea. We are not after military victory. They must fight on—die on— until diplomats who have messed up everything they have handled in the past finally achieve a Munich in the Far East. Not only that—any commander who speaks out against such folly must face the headsman's ax.

Yes, it is as if the bat boy had booted Joe DiMaggio off the squad—as if the office boy had fired the chairman of the board. For the man who keeps a General Vaughn has dared deprive the Nation of the services of a Douglas MacArthur.

Why was MacArthur fired?

He was fired because he sickened at the sight of American boys dying in a fight they cannot win. He was fired because he believes we should accept the eagerly offered help of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's armies. He was fired because he tried to secure permission to blockade our enemy's ports, and to bomb the transportation centers through which are moving the men and materials which are killing American boys. He was fired because he asked for more American troops to help fight against such odds. He was fired because when he could not get action from an administration which has made such a muddle of things in the Far East and entangled us in such a hopeless fight he disregarded regulations and discharged his greater duty of informing the American people of the truth as he sees it.

He who dared speak out against a policy Prime Minister Mentzies of Australia has dubbed "midsummer madness" gets the sack.

The administration may try to tell the people MacArthur was relieved because he wanted to embroil us in a big land war in Asia. This is poppycock. He wanted nothing more than to turn Chinese loose on Chinese to blockade China's ports, to bomb Manchuria. A few months ago the general publicly stated that anyone who advocates invading China with American troops should have his head examined.

Yes, Harry Truman fired General MacArthur. Yes, the Stars and stripes have dipped to the Union Jack. Yes, our free enterprise country has knuckled under to Britian's socialist failures. We who put up with a Montie when we were furnishing the bulk of the troops must give up a MacArthur because a government contributing only a token force in Korea does not like him. Yes, American interests have been sacrificed to those of the British Empire.

Let's look at MacArthur.

Fourteen years ago, back in 1937 when an administration in Washington was serenely sure no war was ahead, General Douglas MacArthur, retired after a brilliant career which carried him to the top as Chief of Staff, left for the Phillipines to try to build up the Philippine National Guard against the war MacArthur saw brewing in the Far East. He wasn't given time enough, money enough, help enough, yet when Pearl Harbor came along he and his slender forces waged an epic fight for months against overwhelming odds.

Later, island by island, without a single bloody mistake, without taking a single backward step, using the gleanings left over after the needs of the European campaign had been met, he led our forces to victory over Japan months or years before Washington thought possible.

Then, within few short years as head of the occupation in Japan, he built it into a democratic, friendly ally, far more true than many of those beside whom we fought in World War II. He kept the Commies out of Japan. There were no such occupation headaches as came out of Germany.

In Korea, bound and shackled by ridiculous restrictions and never with enough troops to do the job, he first licked the North Koreans and then the Red Chinese, and had them on the run at the very moment the man who should have been his stanchest backer publicly disgraced him at a 1 a. m. press conference, about which MacArthur first heard on the radio.

In all those 14 years MacArthur has served this country well. In every endeavor of his life he has been a success. No American leader today knows the problems of the Far East so well, or understands the Orient so thoroughly. Never have his talents been so needed by the people.

It is to be hoped that General MacArthur will now return home and speak freely, that he will rally the American people to force our policy into saner channels.

What has happened is tragic, for the wrong man has been fired. The American people would reverse the situation if but given the chance, judging by the temper of Aurorans today.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Wrong Man Was Fired," from the Aurora (Mo.) Advertiser of April 11, 1951.

"There Has Been No Problem Out of the Hundreds in Government to Which John W. Snyder Has Put His Hand but What He Brought Order Out of Chaos, Successes Out of Failures, and Profits Out of Losses"—Frank W. Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, last week I flew home to my district with a heavy heart. I had anticipated for months that traveling with me on that visit would be my good friend and your good friend, Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury. I left him, thank God, well on the road to complete recovery after a serious eye operation, but still in the hospital and unable to make the journey.

The occasion of Secretary Snyder's visit to Mobile was to be in attendance at the annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association of the United States; and, inasmuch as he had previously written an article on the savings-bond program exclusively for the Independent Bankers magazine, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

RECORD both the talk which I made in Mobile and an article entitled "A Report on the Savings Bond Program."

In the absence of Secretary Snyder, I made the following talk:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, members of the Independent Bankers Association of the United States, and friends, I had long looked forward to this day in Mobile.

I know of no greater honor that could have been paid our city or of a finer American who could have visited us than Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury of these United States.

I note the score that your association placed upon having him here as your principal speaker, and I share with you the keen disappointment that he is not here that we might do him honor.

I am, moreover, concerned with the fact that I left him in Washington recovering from an eye operation, and I know that it is the sense of every man present that the Good Lord keep and preserve John Snyder for many, many years to come, and continue him in the wonderful work that he is doing for our country.

I know of no greater honor that could have been bestowed upon me than to have been chosen to present to you a good, true, and long-time friend—humble, sincere, and yet, at the one time, one of the greatest men in our country today—Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and second not even to Andrew Mellon or Alexander Hamilton as the greatest Secretary of the Treasury that this country has ever had.

Mr. Chairman, I need neither point up nor elaborate upon the confusion which we see on every hand in this country today. I am, however, assured by those who have recently returned from Europe as well as from the Middle East and the Far East, that the confusion which we know is not peculiar to these United States, but is, rather, worldwide in its scope.

Upon second thought, it is not hard for any contemplative mind to understand the unrest which exists everywhere on earth when one thinks of the millions upon millions of people who are only now emerging—or shall I say being projected—from centuries of autocratic rule into some form or another of self government entirely new to them.

Mr. Chairman, it is scarcely a fortnight since I sat in my office, one evening, discussing with a learned savant the tremendous changes that have been wrought in world governments in the last half century.

It seems like only yesterday that practically all the European and Asiatic governments were dominated by kings, shahs, sultans, kaisers, emperors, and czars. All were more or less absolute monarchs, whose decrees had the force of laws. In the short space of the last three or four decades, however, all of this has changed. Now there are but few royal monarchs sitting on thrones in today's world—and where that type of government still exists, it is more or less symbolic inasmuch as the crowned heads of such countries are more or less social entities and have little or no say with respect to executive, legislative, and judicial procedures. This, in a large measure, has led to the abdication of democratic processes and the success of dictatorship in lieu thereof.

Even here on our shore there have been marked extensions of human rights and liberties, although from abroad as well as at home have come problems that today are trying the very souls of men.

At the turn of the century a substantial portion of the business of this Nation was conducted in the coin of the realm. The pay envelopes of the workers, in both public and private employment, were stuffed with hard money or, at best, with but a little folding money. Such folding money as was in circulation was backed by huge deposits of gold and silver in the vaults of the United States. That, too, has now changed.

Currency or money today, either in the shape of coins or bills, is used merely as tokens and circulated for convenience' sake only.

Today the Nation's business is done under a system of credit rather than on a monetary basis. John Jones has so many dollars' credit to his account in the bank. Bill Smith, a carpenter, does a job for John Jones—and Jones transfers some of his credit to Smith. Now Smith has credit in the bank and he, in turn, issues checks to the rent man, one to the electric light or gas company, one to his grocer, etc. All, in turn, make deposit of these checks which, again, increases their credits, so that, in the largewise, it might be said that society, as constituted here in America, is today transacting business on the basis of a credit system rather than on a basis of money itself.

I know that all of what I am saying seems elementary to this skilled and experienced banking group; but, concomitant with the turn of the century and, more specifically, upon declaration of World War I, the Federal Government itself began the extensive use of credits and the issuance of long-term bonds to finance its war and other operations—all of which resulted in a huge indebtedness and a great public debt.

Mr. Chairman, it is almost superfluous for me to say that never in history has our Government had to face the problem of managing the public debts that it faces today.

Fortunately, we have as Secretary of the Treasury in the personality of your good friend and my good friend, John W. Snyder, a man distinguished by the genius of his leadership as well as one who inspires the solid confidence of all of his fellow men.

No nation in history has had to struggle more to manage a debt so huge that it taxes both the ability and the willingness of our people to meet it.

Enormous as was our indebtedness when we emerged from World War I, it still was insignificant as compared with the one that exists today.

By way of contrast the problems which faced our country then pale into insignificance.

It is no disparagement to point out that subsequent to World War II and in May 1920, it was practically impossible for the municipalities and States of these United States to sell a single issue of bonds, even though they carried as much as 5 percent interest per annum.

The lack of confidence in the ability of the Treasurer of the United States to manage the debt of that day was so shattered—that a single break in Government bond prices carried United States Liberty Bond issues to discounts of almost 20 percent below par.

Billions of dollars were lost to the holders of all types of bonds—Federal, State, county, municipal, and other bonds—with the financial panic that then swept the country.

True understanding and the real test of successful debt management is best expressed in the situation which exists today with respect to the value of all outstanding issues.

With more than two hundred and sixty billions outstanding, no one person has lost as much as a single penny. This has been due to the effectiveness of stabilization—the Federal-bond program and the successful management of the debt. These are wholly and directly attributable to the understanding, will, skill, and ability of John Wesley Snyder, our great Secretary of the Treasury.

It is indeed no happenstance that John Snyder was able to meet the tremendous task assigned him by the President of the United States when he called him to serve as the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

My friends, I do not have to tell you that John Snyder is no Wall Street tycoon. That he is no feudal baron called into office to serve vested banking interests, international or otherwise—that he is now and has always been a true public servant.

Scarcely 23 years of age, he entered the banking field as a bookkeeper for the First National Bank of a little city in Arkansas. In one aspect or another he has been in the banking business all of his life.

John Snyder has first-hand knowledge of the banking problems of the small-business man, the cotton, the peanut, the tobacco and the wheat farmer. He knows the fiscal problems of the cattle and the hog raisers and to my own mind, no man in the history of our country, with the possible exception of Alexander Hamilton or Andrew Mellon, has had such a comprehensive experience and deep understanding of banking and currency as that possessed by Secretary Snyder.

His steady advancement in his chosen profession had so marked him among those of his profession in the Middle West that it is small wonder he was called into service by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States in 1931.

There, serving as the principal assistant to the receiver of banks, he conducted all administrative duties incident to the liquidation of a vast number of insolvent national banks subsequent to the world-wide depression of 1930.

During the next 5 years, which followed his induction, he proved himself to be probably the greatest administrator and authority on bank liquidation that this world has ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, it was not until 1940 that Mr. Snyder was brought to Washington as special assistant to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Board. To this duty later was added those of the assistant to the full Board of Directors of that mammoth fiscal organization.

"It was here that his superb talents were directed to developing a program to provide for the building, the equipment, and expansion of war defense plants, and from the inception of the War Plants Corporation, Mr. Snyder was installed as operational vice president and director.

"Within 1 year from the day upon which that huge Corporation was founded, more than $1,000,000,000 had been committed to the construction and equipment of stupendous industrial plants in order to more successfully, economically, and expeditiously prosecute the war effort.

"By the end of 1944, commitments in excess of $10,000,000,000, covering aircraft, steel, machine tool, aluminum, magnesium, chemical, and ordnance facilities were financed. With prudence, sagacity, economic and financial soundness, and in wisdom—moneys had been advanced for plants to manufacture synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline (facilities and pipelines), and the United States Defense Plant Corporation owned not alone nearly 1,000 new huge, gigantic manufacturing concerns but had also financed the expansion of hundreds of privately owned industries in 46 States of the Union.

"Outside of the continental limits of the United States, likewise, commitments had been made for the production of critical and strategic war materials in other countries which ran into the millions of dollars.

"Over this vast banking operation John W. Snyder, war buddy, bosom friend, confidant, and beloved coworker of President Harry Truman—exercising full away—presided as active administrative officer.

When in July 1945 the President appointed Mr. Snyder Director of the War Mobilization

and Reconversion, he immediately initiated an active program to deal with major problems of production and employment and to implement all economic adjustments necessary to a transition from war to peace.

"In preparation for VJ-day, he organized and held successive conference with the heads of all pertinent Government agencies to map out procedure. This to the end that when Japan sued for peace the machinery for a transition to a normal economy was all ready to be set in motion—the construction industry was freed from restrictive wartime controls, other limitations were eased or removed—labor difficulties were adjudicated, and labor strikes in such essential industries as steel and coal mining were quickly settled with both minimum of delay and dislocation in the reconversion program.

Mr. Chairman, I know John W. Snyder. I have been knowing him well—and for a long, long time.

I know that there has been no problem out of the hundreds in Government to which he has put his hand but what he brought—order out of chaos—success out of failure—and profit out of losses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is a single man sitting on either side of the aisle or in both Houses of Congress that did not feel a glow of pride when, on June 25, 1946, John W. Snyder, with all of his great, proven talents and greater abilities, was called to serve by the President as the Secretary of the Treasury of these United States.

Mr. Chairman, the responsibility of that office has grown steadily and tremendously—year by year—since the time it was administered by Alexander Hamilton. The Secretary of the Treasury is today charged by law with the management of the Nation's finances. He superintends the collection of all the internal revenues of the National Government. He directs the form and keeping of public accounts, prepares recommendations for taxation programs and for the support of the public credit.

The Secretary of the Treasury determines methods and policies relating to the procurement of Federal supplies. Under his jurisdiction comes the Coast Guard, the Secret Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, Customs and Internal Revenue. Through the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, he supervises the coinage and printing of all the money in the land.

Last, but not least, of all the stupendous tasks with which this eminently great public official is charged are all activities of the Bureau of Accounts and of Public Debt. An indefatigable worker, it is the latter single activity that keeps John W. Snyder at his desk until the late hours of the night in the conduct of transactions with respect to Government bonds and Government securities.

Mr. Chairman, my secretary only last Thursday advised me that the cloak rooms of the House were ringing with the praises of my good friend, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon pronouncement that he now hopes that he can avoid an increase in Federal income and other taxes in the year of 1952.

This was because in his recent appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary Snyder anticipated that he might, even this year, be able to decrease the Federal debt from income-tax receipts, and declared that he would ask for a second round of taxes—only if and when the budget picture changed so much that such a second round would be absolutely necessary to keep the Government out of the red.

Mr. Speaker, the article which Secretary Snyder wrote for the independent bankers magazine is as follows:

A REPORT ON THE SAVINGS BOND PROGRAM

(By John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury)

On May 1, 1951, the popular series E United States Savings bonds will begin to mature. During 1951 the E bond maturities will amount to $1,100,000,000.

Early this year legislation was introduced in the Congress to authorize the Treasury to provide a method whereby owners of matured series E Savings bonds who do not desire to cash them, may retain their Savings bond investment with no inconvenience to the holder. Some of the holders of maturing series E bonds may, of course, desire to cash them on maturity. These bondholders will find cash waiting for them at any of the 16,000 or more financial institutions which are authorized to redeem Savings bonds upon presentation by their owners. The Treasury believes, however, that a great many bondholders will wish to continue their investment in E bonds. Accordingly, a three-option plan was worked out for handling the maturing bonds.

The arrangements decided upon are that the owners of maturing E bonds may:

1. Accept cash, according to the original terms of the contract; or

2. Continue (subject to approval of Congress) to hold matured E bonds, and earn interest on full maturity value; or

3. Exchange the matured E bonds for current income Savings bonds of series G, in amounts of $500 and multiples thereof.

It bears repeating that under option 1, the owner of any maturing series E bond may receive full cash payment for his bond, if he desires. The Treasury wants this to be made absolutely clear to all E bond investors. Nor would a bondholder's choice of option 2 preclude the subsequent cashing of his bond. Matured E bonds which are retained under the extension plan would remain redeemable at any time.

Once the plan is placed in effect, its options will apply to all outstanding E bonds as they mature, and will apply, by right of contract, to all new series E savings bonds that are issued.

Option 2—that is, the option which permits extension with the payment of interest—would allow investors in E bonds to continue their investment without putting them to any trouble or inconvenience. A holder of a maturing E Bond who wishes to maintain his investment does not need to turn in his bond to effectuate the extension.

The tax feature of the plan—also subject to the approval of the Congress—would, in effect, disregard the original maturity date for series E savings bonds for purposes of tax treatment of interest, if a taxpayer elects to hold his investment in savings bonds in the manner provided by the extension plan. Under existing law, a cash-basis taxpayer may elect either (1) to pay income tax on interest in the year of redemption of the bonds or in the year of maturity, whichever first occurs, or (2) to pay the tax yearly as the interest accrues. Under the optional extension plan, interest on matured E bonds which are retained would not be taxable in the year of original maturity, but the entire amount of interest on the investment would be taxable at redemption or final maturity, unless the taxpayer elects to accrue interest on such bonds annually.

This tax provision would be applicable only to cash-basis taxpayers. It would not be applicable to corporations, or to taxpayers on the accrual method of accounting. No postponement of tax liability would be authorized when the bond owner exercises an option to exchange matured bonds for series G bonds.

As presented to the Congress, the extension option calls for the earning of interest on retained matured E bonds at the rate of 2½ percent simple interest for the first 7½ years, and interest thereafter at a rate sufficient to make the aggregate return for the 10-year extension period 2.9 percent, compounded semiannually. As an example of the operation of this option, it may be assumed that in May 1941, $75 was invested in a series E bond of $100 maturity value. The bond matures in May 1951. If the holder retained the bond for 10 more years under the option extension plan, he would receive $133.33 in May 1961.

The last of the series D savings bonds also are maturing this year. The extension plan would be limited to series E bonds and would not apply to series D bonds. The first series D maturities were in 1949. Obviously, serious administrative complications would arise from any attempt to make the extension plan retroactive. At the same time, it would be highly inequitable for the Government to apply the proposal to some series D bonds and not to others. Furthermore, it should be noted that the terms of issue of the vast majority of series D bonds were more favorable than the E bond terms, since all Government bonds issued prior to March 1, 1941, were wholly exempt from Federal income tax up to $5,000 principal amount.

The decisions with respect to the optional extension plan were made after long deliberation and extensive consultation, covering a period of nearly a year. The Treasury met with individuals and business, labor, industrial, and financial groups, who gave us the benefit of their thought and judgment as to a plan which would be in the best interest of both the bondholders and the Government. The program which was worked out was the result of this cooperative effort.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the readers of the Independent Banker, and others of the banking world, for the cooperation they have given the Treasury in the savings-bond program. A great majority of savings-bond owners look to their banks for information and advice about their savings-bond investments. The banks of the country have done a magnificent job in facilitating the smooth functioning of the whole savings-bond program. They can be equally helpful to the Treasury and to the public in carrying out the E bond maturities program.

MacArthur and Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the New York Times editorial of last Saturday headed "Heard Round the World," and also Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick's column, "Arrival and Departure at a Historic Crossroads," which appeared on the same page. I remind the Senate that last Saturday was the day of the late Senator Vandenberg's funeral. I read the Times editorial page on the plane on the way to Grand Rapids as a member of the official United States Senate delegation to the funeral. Against the background of his great leadership, this editorial and this important column by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mrs. McCormick seem to be extraordinarily apt.

Mr. President, I submit that the Congress must join with the Administration in giving much more attention to the imponderables of foreign policy which, when disregarded, as the Times points out, have often led even the strongest military nations to disaster. We must now build firmly on that structure of policy Senator Vandenberg helped to build. I well remember, Mr. President, his guidance to me during my days as Assistant Secretary of State, when again and again I would slip into his office for advice. He never failed to live up in private to the great reputation for candor and courage which he had achieved publicly throughout the world.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 21, 1951]

HEARD ROUND THE WORLD

General MacArthur's speech before Congress has reverberated around the world, as was to be expected. Also, as was again to be expected, the world's attention is focused at the moment far more on the differences between MacArthur and the Administration, and especially on the possible consequences of the new controversy now dividing the strongest power of the free world, than on the more substantial areas of agreement. Yet, as in the case of the equally important debate on the issue of sending troops to Europe, the agreement on fundamentals is bound to prevail over the differences. There may be some adjustments on subordinate points, but in the end the sound sense of the American people will reassert itself, and this Nation will do whatever is necessary and possible to resist aggression, while striving to preserve the larger framework of world peace.

The areas of agreement have been obscured because the more dramatic passages of General MacArthur's speech dealt with the points of difference. But these areas of agreement are wide enough to assure continued action along lines that have been laid down. This means, first of all, continuation of the global struggle against Communist imperialism on both the Asiatic and the European fronts, and, for that matter, at all points of Communist aggression. It means rejection of any kind of appeasement, and a rapid build-up of our own and our Allies' military strength.

Beyond that, General MacArthur sees eye to eye with the Administration on other points. There are no differences between the two on the important question of Japan or on the proposed Japanese peace treaty. Both agree that the colonial era is being replaced in Asia by a resurgence of Asiatic nationalism which requires complete reorientation of Western policy, and one portion of MacArthur's speech can be quoted verbatim in support of President Truman's Point Four program. Even some of General MacArthur's specific recommendations are not so far out of line with Administration policy that they may not be adopted if circumstances warrant or conditions change. An economic blockade against China is already being considered by the Sanctions Committee of the United Nations. Formosa has not only never been promised to Communist China but the United States is already shipping military supplies to Chiang Kai-shek. Even bombing of Manchuria cannot be excluded if the enemy should resort to massive air attacks.

There are, however, two points on which the differences are substantial, and from these differences the whole controversy derives. One point is that General MacArthur apparently sees not only the Korean war but the whole struggle against Communist imperialism as an almost exclusively American affair, with little regard to the part which the United Nations, the North Atlantic alliance and all the other free nations of the world must play in it. That assumption, which ironically enough runs parallel with the Communist propaganda line, prompts him virtually to ignore the United Nations, whose first military commander he was, as well as the individual free nations and any views they may hold .

The second point of difference is that General MacArthur puts military necessity and quick victory above all other considerations and seems willing to run great risks in their name. That is a military point of view, appropriate for a commander bent upon achieving the objective set for him by the quickest route. But it cannot dominate the decisions of statesmen who must also take into account the political and moral imponderables on which, in the long run, final victory depends.

Disregard of such imponderables has often led to disaster for even the strongest military nations, and this consideration applies with special force to the Korean conflict, which is still dividing the United Nations and the extension of which could lead to consequences that might precipitate another new war requiring new strategic and political decisions, as did the Chinese intervention. It is for this reason that, sometimes in the face of even military advisability, the American Government is moving slowly in order to preserve as much unity as is possible within the United Nations and to avert an American isolation which is the first aim of Soviet policy and which is designed to make us fight a future war alone.

[From the New York Times of April 21, 1951]

ABROAD

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE AT A HISTORIC CROSSROADS

Among the saddest aspects of the stirring drama of the past few days is that the homecoming of General MacArthur overshadowed the passing of Senator Arthur Vandenberg. By custom the Senate adjourns when a Member dies, but on Thursday it had to meet with the House of Representatives to listen and pay honor to the eye-filling and ear-filling hero of the Pacific. Following the joint meeting, his colleagues paid brief tribute to a hero in another field, but their words were all but lost in the reverberating echoes of the oration they had just heard. Hence, even in his death the great Senator from Michigan, leader and victor in one of the most crucial political battles ever fought in the United States, was deprived by a strange coincidence of the full homage he deserved from his country and the world. In the tumult and the shouting acclaiming the warrior's return the departure of the statesman seemed a muted and lonely ending. It was the statesman who faded away and the old soldier who strode into the limelight and assumed a new role.

In a way, however, the simultaneous coming and going of MacArthur and Vandenberg fitted into the historic drama in which both played decisive parts. MacArthur's is not played out; he has captured the center of the stage by sheer power of personality and histrionic art. Instead of diminishing the legend, the real figure enhances it.

NO APPEAL FOR UNITY

The first speaker before the assembly who could be both seen and heard by a national audience, the General did not use that grandstand to make the irresistible appeal for unity that some of us hoped for. He did not carry on where Senator Vandenberg left off. Although he declared that the issues were "beyond the realm of partisan consideration," and although his speech cut across the ideas of hemispheric defense isolationists on the Republican side as well as the political realities on which the Administration bases its course, it is bound to deepen and sharpen division not only on military versus political strategy, but on strictly party lines.

Senator Vandenberg's aim was to unite the country behind a nonpartisan foreign policy. He was so manifestly the prime mover in gaining support for the measures like the Truman doctrine, the European Recovery Program, the Atlantic Pact, and the Pan-American treaty that some of the President's advisers, including General Marshall, suggested at one time that he be named Secretary of State in recognition of his invaluable services as chief architect of an all-American foreign policy.

No doubt General MacArthur also passionately desires an all-American policy, but on his own terms, which he believes basic to our security. Senator Vandenberg was so convinced that unity was the paramount consideration that he was willing to compromise on methods and details in order to achieve it. More important, he was able to convince the majority in his party that a united front at home with the prime essential of American influence abroad. The confusion and schisms in the Republic ranks since he became inactive give the measure of his leadership—and the void his passing leaves in the council of the Senate. His loss at this juncture is as tragic as the break with the Supreme Commander in the Pacific.

VANDENBERG'S LAST PLEA

Yet the structure of policy Vandenberg helped to build remains; it will not fall. He is said to have left a letter which will undoubtedly be a last plea for a closing of the ranks in the face of growing danger. Nor is it by any means certain that the great, if unfinished, work he accomplished will not be furthered rather than halted by MacArthur. Just by stressing the global nature of the war and the necessity of creating strength enough to fight it on both fronts, the general must shock many of his followers—those who clamor for priority for the Asian front, or those who favor a war so much more limited than the Administration that they don't want us to fight anywhere but at home.

The President must be a little shocked, too, to hear the deposed commander come out strongly for Mr. Truman's pet project. One of the most impressive passages in an impressive speech was the insistence of the revolutionary character of the changes in the Orient. In an adroit thrust at his critics in Europe, MacArthur emphasized that "the peoples of Asia found their opportunity in the war just past to throw off the shackles of colonialism and now see the dawn of new opportunity, and heretofore unfelt dignity, and the self-respect of political freedom." The things they strive for he said—food, clothing, shelter, "the realization of the nationalist urge for political freedom * * * form a backdrop to contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism."

What is this but support for Point Four? General MacArthur drew cheers for his advocacy of economic help for Asia, more cheers than the President's program had yet evoked from Congress. But the new crusader for Point Four must be a bit embarrassing for its sponsor just the same. Many commentators have pointed out that MacArthur's entry into the great debate actually narrows and simplifies the issues. At least it reveals that they are not fixed or static. The coming and going of two great figures, at the same time reminds us that both are characters in a moving drama in which events are constantly catching up with and modifying the opinions of men and the policies of governments.

General MacArthur's Address at the Joint Meeting of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful column by Lowell Mellett which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 21, last. The article is entitled "Question Must Be Answered."

Lowell Mellett is one of the most thoughtful columnists in Washington. He brings to journalism a rich, indeed, a unique, background as one of the great public servants of our time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED—SPECIFIC INFORMATION FROM GENERAL MACARTHUR BECOMES MORE IMPORTANT THAN SPEECHES AND RECEPTIONS

(By Lowell Mellett)

This one is not a very easy one to write. That's because it has to be written with the cheers for MacArthur still ringing in the air. It's no fun to be a wet blanket at a party. With this weary old town enjoying such an emotional upheaval as it hasn't had in many years, who wants to be the one to say, "Hey, stop, look, and listen or stop and think about what you've looked at and listened to"? Why not leave it alone?

Here's why. Like everybody else with a television set I watched General MacArthur make his speech to Congress and heard everything he said. Like most everybody else I was carried away at times by the man's eloquence. Nothing like it, in my experience, since the early days of William Jennings Bryan. It had everything. Home and mother, our brave boys, hatred of war, love of peace, old soldiers never die, and God bless America.

Far as I know the general believed every word he spoke and I'm sure he made an awful lot of other people believe. But what was the occasion for his speech and what was the basic issue he discussed? It was whether the President had dealt justly with him in relieving him of his command in the Pacific on the ground of insubordination; that, and whether he or the President had the truer concept of what our national policy should be.

As he outlined his own concept, one completely contrary to that of the President, he scarcely endeavored to defend himself against the charge of insubordination. He offered instead a countercharge. This was, in effect, that certain civilians had been permitted to overrule the Nation's best military brains in a military matter. He said—or, rather, he seemed to say—that he had voiced the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when he urged the bombing of Red Chinese supply bases in Manchuria and support for the return of Chiang Kai-shek's troops to the mainland. It wasn't surprising therefore that Republican Senators and Representatives leaped to their feet to give him the biggest cheer of the day. But it made you wonder. Had Generals Bradley, Collins, and Vandenberg and Admiral Sherman been telling MacArthur one thing, while allowing the President to tell the people something else.

So, as soon as it was available in cold print, you read the text of the speech to see exactly what General MacArthur had said. He had said that for entertaining these views he had been severely criticized, despite my understanding that from a military viewpoint the above views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Which, it is fairly clear, does not mean what at first it seemed to mean. All it means is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would readily agree that, all things being equal or if there were no other considerations involved, it would be good military tactics to do the things he suggested. It doesn't mean that the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree that there are no other considerations involved, considerations which the President and the Nation must take into account.

Nevertheless, General MacArthur in his carefully, not to say deceptively, phrased statement, has raised a question that should not be allowed to remain a question. The testimony of General Bradley and his colleagues is now demanded and with it any specific information that General MacArthur may have. This has become vastly more important than the speeches and receptions now being scheduled in Chicago, Milwaukee, and other cities.

Suppression of La Prensa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, realization of the vast implications of the suppression by the Argentine Government of its world-known daily, La Prensa, fortunately is widespread among the people of our country. The hemisphere-wide support accorded the day of mourning recently staged at the suggestion of the National Press Club is evidence of this.

The April issue of the American Federationist, official organ of the American Federation of Labor, contains an editorial entitled "La Prensa," authorized by President William Green, a great American, which presents in scholarly and convincing fashion the dangers inherent in repression of objective and fearless presentation of national and world events.

Indignation at such dictatorial action is completely in line with the progressive attitude of America's great labor organization, and the capable presentation of the matter in the editorial makes a valuable contribution to the discussions on this vital matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the American Federationist be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA PRENSA

No act of Dictator Peron has met with more unreserved condemnation than his attack on La Prensa, the world-famous independent newspaper of Argentina. This paper had standing throughout cosmopolitan circles and was widely read by Spanish-speaking groups. La Prensa, which followed the standards and practices of the free press, continued to publish and comment editorially on developments and trends even after Juan Peron seized control of the government and began nullifying his country's constitution. While the paper was not popular with the dictatorship, it was not until Peron was harassed by economic difficulties that he took steps to silence this faithful recorder of developments and their implications.

He selected as his tool the captive news vendors' union, an affiliate of the government-controlled national labor federation. The sellers of newspapers and magazines submitted a series of excessive demands, concluding with a demand for 20 percent of the paper's gross income from classified advertisements. These demands were served only on La Prensa, although Peron's controlled union also services other newspapers. A picket line, aided by the police, prevented delivery and shipment of copies of La Prensa coming off the press. Publication had to be suspended.

The employees of the newspaper tried to confer with Minister of Labor to make plain that they had no grievance against management. They were dispersed by Peron's police.

The shameful action against La Prensa followed Peron's successful breaking of a nation-wide strike of railway workers. The dictator moved quickly to arrest the strike leaders, charging them with association with members of parties hostile to Peron and therefore suspected of fomenting the strike for political purposes. The government then promulgated an executive order to mobilize all railways for civilian service of national defense under the army. These workers ceased to be free.

These happenings demonstrate the inevitable development of dictatorships. They start by abandoning government by law. Then they undermine the integrity of the courts and educational institutions. They replace free enterprise by government control and undertakings. They replace free unions by government-controlled puppet organizations and lay violent hands on capital and other private property. To get away with these high-handed deeds the dictator must control the press and other information media.

The right to voluntary association is essential to freedom in living and participating in a free national life. Voluntary organizations are possible only when law and property are respected. Too often the first steps toward the curbing of freedom are taken in a national emergency and with the best intentions. Once started down the road to dictatorship, steps are hard to retrace.

That is the reason the American Federation of Labor attacks at once plans and proposals leading to compulsory work. Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom, which must be maintained by each successive generation.

The Organization of American States has been meeting in Washington to consider western hemisphere security against Communist aggression. A vital key to national security is a free press. We who love liberty cannot watch the murder of a great newspaper without vigorous protest. While Dictator Peron was taking the final step to strangle La Presna, he warned the remaining great independent paper that its editorial freedom will also be ended. A press emasculated and controlled by an irresponsible dictator in what used to be the most progressive country in Latin America is an attack upon the security of all, under present conditions.

MacArthurism: What It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable editorial entitled "MacArthurism: What It Is," which appeared in the Washington Post last Friday.

Here we have an objective and, indeed, a scholarly analysis by one of America's great newspapers, a newspaper most intimately in touch with national policy, of the emotionally moving and elcquent address last Thursday by that great soldier, General Douglas MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHURISM: WHAT IT IS

There was a classic and gladiator quality in General MacArthur's valedictory to America. It was a noble Roman who took his leave before an intent and watching people. The farewell, even if it had been limited to a ceremonial address, would have been charged with drama. But it was much more than that. General MacArthur, against the background of one of the great dismissals of history, made a spectacular attack upon his Government's strategy. No case could have been stated with more power and with more passion. It was an electric performance which had an entire Nation, if not an entire world, spellbound.

Now the real debate is on—the debate upon the edges of which this country has been hovering for a twelve-month past. Some of the facts are still missing. Outstanding among them is the past as well as present position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General MacArthur charged them with a belief at one time in the MacArthur strategy. To what extent is he right? The President must not let Secretary Marshall delay a single instant in putting the record straight. For a long time there has been more than a suspicion in the public mind that the Administration has got out of the habit of coming clean with the American people. It has seemed to forget that its authority springs from the confidence as well as the strength of its constituents. When the facts are in, when the arguments are heard, we have faith that the proper course will be made clear, and that a new unity will be created for following it.

What we plead for in the process is the eschewal of emotion. Wisdom is the product neither of hysteria nor of heat. If, as General MacArthur says (and, in the main, rightly), the Soviet's moves are the response of cold calculation, a free society cannot afford to govern itself differently. It must be sober in decision. To go off half-cocked is to court ruin and disaster. Action must be rigidly realistic when that action may influence the American destiny for a thousand years.

That is why MacArthur's text must be scrutinized with the head and not with either knees or heart. The first point of notice is that not only did he not mention any of the fighting Allies in Korea, he did not once refer to the United Nations. He did not refer to the United Nations because he knew full well that the line of policy he advocated will not commend itself to any of our covenanted allies. On the contrary, his counsel will repel them. This would not, of course, faze the general. The man who used to emit such glowing words about the organization of nations for peace is quite prepared to go it alone. He is a crusader if not a fanatic. But the rest of us must think of consequences. What are they? If Western Europe would not agree with us, then they would go neutral, and 270,000,000 people and 70,000,000 tons of steel would be lost to our armory.

Not only that. It was difficult to figure out whether the general wanted to take up arms against communism or whether he distinguished between Red China or Red Russia. If he had in mind a jihad, or holy war, against a social and political concept, then he should reread his Lincoln. It was not against slavery that Lincoln, idealistic though he was, took up arms, but against a break in the Union. A union is aborning today among all men who cherish liberty. Would Lincoln, as a practical matter, junk this nucleaur community in order to go off at a tangent and try to bayonet an idea? We do not think so.

Aside from the loss of Western Europe moreover, this country would lose the backbone of Asia by following MacArthur. The general is right when he casts out the foolish notion of some of his own supporters that the people of even Communist-run Asia are ideologically Communist. Asians still ask each other by way of greeting, "Have you eaten?" The belly and not the mind is the chief worrier in Asia. Yet, withal, they want to run their own affairs, and, as General MacArthur testified, they are seized with a new and intoxicating nationalism. That means they don't want to be "saved" by America, or by anybody else. To them, overwhelmingly, that would be exchanging one imperialism for another.

For proof of this let those who are bemused by MacArthurism go back to our history. One example will suffice. Toward the end of the First World War the United States decided to intervene in Siberia. The force was under the command of General William S. Graves. It was an idealistic assignment—to get the Czechs, who had been interned in Russia, out of the Siberian ports. But the orders to General Graves gradually changed, and the United States became party to British interventionism "to save Russia from bolshevism." This policy General Graves thought wrong and unwise, but, being a good soldier, he obeyed orders, and never thought of writing to the Joe Martin of his time. However, on his retirement he made known his dissent in a book America's Siberian Intervention. He described how he was the agent for delivering arms and food to one of the Russian Chiang Kai-sheks, Admiral Koltchak. General Graves writes:

"No government can add to its strength from its people while being held in power by foreign bayonets. Koltchak realised this, as I heard him tell Mr. Morris [United States Ambassador to Japan] that he did not want foreigners to fight for him, as the Russian character was such that the Russians would desert him if he received active military support from foreigners. This is not a characteristic of Russians alone, it is the characteristic of all nationals. The United States gained by this act [deliverying food and munitions to Koltchak] the resentment of more than ninety percent of people in Siberia. Our intervention resulted in placing the mass of Russians even more solidly behind the Soviets. This is shown by the promptness with which the Siberian people accepted the Moscow government after the departure of the Allies."

What applies to Russians applies to all nationals.

Ah, says General MacArthur, but the Chinese are different. How much General MacArthur knows about China and the Chinese is shown by the way he let down the President at Wake Island by assuring him that the Chinese would not intervene in North Korea, and particularly by his account of Chinese history. The Chinese, were "non-homogeneous," he says, meaning without political unity, till the turn of the century, when they became consolidated first by Chang Tso-lin, then by Chiang Kai-shek, and then by Communists. Instead of Chang Tso-lin, who was the independent chieftain of Manchuria in the twenties, General MacArthur meant Sun Yat-sen, father of the nationalist revolution which turned China into a republic in 1911.

But let that pass. General MacArthur, thinking of the Chinese in these pathologically nationalistic times as different from the Russians that General Graves encountered, says that all we have to do is blockade the Chinese coast, help Chiang Kai-shek land on the coastline, and give him "logistical support." Blockade, no matter how you slice it, means war. So, as we found in the 'twenties, does economic sanctions. Collective reprisals against China are now under consideration at Lake Success. But the issue is highly delicate. An all-in blockade from Vladivostok to Singapore—a tidy distance, if you look at the map—would mean a denial of raw materials to Western Europe and would put Japan solely on American charity. And what does "logistical support" mean? It means that not only would we have to ferry a discarded politician, Chiang Kai-shek, across, we would have to make sure he would win. How could it be otherwise? All our stakes would be on Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang knows that. Having run away from the Communists every time he came anywhere near them, he would never dream of trying to reconquer China without the United States in front of him, back of him, and all around him. General MacArthur can't make a warrior out of Chiang Kai-shek by thinking so.

No, the course that General MacArthur recommends is a course of all-out intervention, step by inexorable step. It is war. It is war against the wrong foe on the wrong battlefield, fought without allies, with our real enemy husbanding its men and resources while we are wallowing in the Chinese bog. The Japanese could tell General MacArthur something about the size and the depth of the morass into which he would commit America. And Chiang Kai-shek would be the tiger on the American back.

There is a remaining item in the American strategy that General MacArthur advised. It is to end the Korean "sanctuary" in Manchuria by bombing it. General MacArthur omits altogether to mention that we, no less than the Chinese and North Koreans, have a sanctuary. It is located in air-free South Korea and Japan. Whether this sanctuary would remain intact after we start to bomb Manchuria—none can tell. General MacArthur thinks so. The Soviet, he says, "will not necessarily mesh its action with our moves." Perhaps not, though after Wake Island, there will be some hesitation in accepting General MacArthur's judgment on that vital score. He is no better judge of the Russians than of the Chinese. Authorities like George F. Kennan tell us that the Russians are sensitive as no other people are about their frontiers. But, as we say, MacArthur may be right. Our own reaction to his view of Russian policy is that it is a good one for us to follow. Let us not mesh our actions with their moves. Let us not fight the foe that Russia picks for us and commit our force on the battlefield she selects. Let us keep the initiative, and be sovereign over our own strategy.

Our country is at the height of its power and glory. No great power in history has been tolerated which fails to act in concert with the general interests of mankind as mankind conceives these interests. That was the guiding rule of Pax Britannica. It must be the guiding rule of the American power,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

or it will perish. Our actions, in other words, are in the realm of politics as well as in the realm of military power. It was a simple recipe that MacArthur spelled out, too simple, and so simple we would have to do it alone. That the general is a false prophet is apparent in every line of what he said, even in his essay on the strategy of the Pacific. This newspaper pleaded that Formosa be taken over back in 1946; nevertheless it feels that it is nonsense to assert that the whole Pacific and the Americas would be lost by the breach of the Pacific moat through defection of Formosa. After all the aggressive Japanese once had it, and that did not finish America. General MacArthur started his address as a statesman and ended it as a drill sergeant.

Licensing of Radio Broadcast Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors.

Motion Picture Theater Owners of Maryland, Inc., a member of the Allied States Association, through Mr. Lauritz Garman, president, advises that its board of directors feels that the industry has suffered greatly from recent developments in the entertainment field, and that they will be further adversely affected as a result of the action by the Federal Communications Commission, which is discussed in the association's statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WIELDS BLACKJACK

The Federal Communications Commission has just issued a declaration of policy, called a report, which sets a new record for usurpation of authority.[1]

By this report the Commission—

1. Imposes a condition on the right of motion picture companies to qualify for broadcasting licenses based on information coming to it from an unidentified source and without specific findings based upon evidence adduced in support of or opposition to any application for a license.

2. Asserts the authority to regulate the motion picture industry and the use it shall make of its properties although no such authority has been conferred on it by Congress.

3. Would compel the motion picture companies to make available to television broadcasters their finest films and talent as a condition to the right to qualify for broadcasting licenses.

The report was issued as a result of a hearing held a year ago looking to the establishment of a uniform policy to be followed in the licensing of radio broadcast stations to applicants accused or convicted of violating a law of the United States.

[1] Docket No. 9572, March 29, 1951.

The points set down for hearing, as enumerated in the report, did not even hint that the Commission wished to be enlightened as to its authority to advise prospective applicants for licenses or renewals as to the use which they should make of properties which are not subject to the Commission's regulatory powers, in order to qualify for such licenses or renewals.

Specifically, there was not the slightest intimation that the Commission had in mind the possibility of a ruling or even an expression of opinion to the effect that the motion picture companies, in order to be eligible for licenses or renewals, must first make their choicest films and contract artists available for exhibition on television.

While we have not examined all the briefs and arguments offered at the hearing in April 1950, we do not believe that any such startling proposal entered into the discussion. So revolutionary and drastic a proposal would have attracted wide attention and most certainly would have come to our notice.

Sometime between the close of the hearing and the issuance of the report the Commission either evolved the idea, or it was planted with it, that it could force the motion picture companies to supply their best available films and talents to this rival entertainment medium in order to qualify for licenses.

The report recites blandly that "It has come to the Commission's attention that many motion picture companies refuse to make copies of their films available for use by television companies." It then goes on to say that "the success of television will depend to a large measure on the ability of television stations to acquire the best available films and to use the best available talent and stories in their programs."

It would be interesting, and it may become necessary to ferret out the source of this information that "has come to the Commission's attention." We are confident that it was not openly supplied by the participants in this quasi-judicial inquiry. The motion picture companies represented at the hearing apparently had no warning that such a catastrophic ruling was in contemplation. And the thousands of independent theater owners, who are the concern of this association, had no reason to suspect that their interests were involved, much less in jeopardy.

WILL THE COMMISSION NOW REGULATE THE MOVIES?

It doesn't seem possible that the Commission itself could have realized the full implications of its action.

In order to make good on these "primary principles" which are to guide it "in making a case-to-case determination of these applications," the Commission must exercise strict control over the motion picture companies, even to the extent of fixing prices for their products.

Let us consider what could and doubtless will happen if the Commission persists in the policy of requiring the motion picture companies to place their "best available films" at the disposal of its competitor in the entertainment field. A film company desiring a license asserts in its application that it has conformed to the Commission's requirement. A TV station objects and complains that the applicant has not made its best films available. Is the Commission going to set itself up as an expert to pass on the quality of motion pictures?

But that is child's play compared to the difficulties that will arise when a TV station complains—and this will happen—that the applicant has sought to evade the Commission's policy by charging film rentals too high for it to pay. The Commission has proceeded in happy ignorance of the cost of producing the best pictures and the methods used in pricing them, or else it has made the cold-blooded determination to subsidize TV at the expense of the motion picture industry and thus confiscate the latter's property without just compensation.

We are forced to this conclusion because we do not believe it could have been contemplated by the Commission or the person or persons who persuaded it to adopt this policy, that TV would pay film rentals approximating those derived from the theaters.

Admission to a first-run or key neighborhood theater usually is 50 cents or more. Those theaters pay film rentals ranging from 25 to 40 percent of the gross receipts. If the film companies must make their best pictures available to television, they will be entitled to and should demand the same rentals, based on the same factors, that are charged the theaters. But when they demand that the TV people pay from 12½ to 20 cents for each claimed spectator—and we mean the claims they make in seeking sponsors—they will run snivelling to the Commission and claim that the movie companies are flouting the Commission's policy.

Then the Commission will either have to back down on its policy or start fixing the price of film.

COMMISSION WOULD DESTROY GOVERNMENT'S REVENUE

The country is engaged in a mighty preparedness campaign, the object of which is to insure peace. The Congress is confronted with the task of imposing additional taxes to sustain the effort.

Although the motion-picture business is currently in a serious slump, due in some measure to the free entertainment afforded by television, the United States Government still collects a 20-percent tax on every paid admission to a motion-picture theater.

These admission taxes collected from movie patrons amount to about $300,000,000 a year.

Yet the Federal Communication Commission by its declared policy of building up television at the expense of the movies would jeopardize, certainly greatly reduce and possibly destroy this valuable source of revenue.

This grave consequence, evidently not realized or taken into account by the Commission, illustrates the danger of adopting policies affecting industries which are not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction without a full, complete, and open investigation in the course of which information on all angles of the subject is obtained from those most affected and best equipped to furnish it.

Unless the Commission recedes from its position, this phase of the matter should receive the attention of Congress while the tax bill is under consideration.

AND IT MAY STILL BE ALL FOR NAUGHT

The gratuitous nature of the Commission's dictum, and the fact that compliance therewith still will not guarantee any film company a broadcasting license, is one of the most serious aspects of its action.

The greater part of the report deals with the points which were set down for hearing. That part of the report was within the Commission's authority and we have no special fault to find with the conclusions reached. It is true, as the Commission says, that "the major motion-picture companies * * * have violated the antitrust laws over a period of years in the motion-picture field." We think it follows, as the Commission concludes, that such violations are "a matter that the Commission must consider carefully in determining the qualifications of these companies to operate in the public interest."

That is an issue between the film companies and the Commission in which the independent exhibitors have no direct interest. It is a question which will have to be resolved

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on a case-to-case basis when and if those companies apply for licenses.

The only phase of the report that affects the theater owners—and it threatens their very existence—is the next to last paragraph therein which says that the motion-picture companies must make their best films, performers and stories available to television in order to be eligible for a license.

Because it is alien to the questions set down for hearing and does not even deal with adjudged violations of law, it seems to have been added as an irrelevant afterthought. The Commission is careful to say, "We express no opinion at this time as to whether such practices (not supplying films, etc., to TV) are or are not in violation of the antitrust laws." So far as we are aware, no law provides and no court has ever held that it is a violation of law for a private corporation, acting alone and not in concert with others to choose its own customers. And yet the whole purpose of the proceeding was to determine the weight to be given law violations in the granting of licenses.

To reduce the Commission's position to complete absurdity, let us suppose that a motion-picture company has attempted in good faith to comply with the Commission's policy; has made its best films available to TV and thus destroyed their value for exhibition in the theaters. It has destroyed one vast market in hopes of gaining another. And then the Commission, applying the principles discussed in the first six and a half pages of its report, decides that it cannot grant a license to that film company because of its antecedent violations in the motion-picture field.

MOWING DOWN THE INNOCENT BYSTANDERS

The report gives the impression that the Commission moved by some undisclosed impulse hurled a rock at the film companies; but it struck the exhibitors.

It might at least have given consideration to the extent of the havoc which its policies, if carried out, will wreak among the motion-picture exhibitors.

When a picture is shown on television its box-office value in the area in which it is shown is destroyed. About 17,000 theaters are dependent upon an adequate supply of box-office attractions. Of the $2,700,000,000 invested in the entire industry, only $160,000,000 is invested in production and distribution. All of the remainder—94 percent—is invested in theaters.

The 1940 census shows that 177,420 persons were employed in the motion-picture industry. Of these, 33,687 were engaged in production, 11,332 in distribution, and 132,401 in exhibition.

Thus the Federal Communications Commission, of its own motion, has laid down a policy which, if carried out, would endanger the more than $2,000,000,000 invested in theaters and threaten the livelihood of many. The rule prescribed by Congress for the granting of licenses is that "the public convenience, interest, or necessity will be served." Certainly Congress never contemplated that the public interest could be served by tearing down an established industry in order to help a rival industry which, once the novelty has worn off, may not retain public favor.

Despite all the hullabaloo, television's future is still clouded with uncertainty. Its forward surge has slowed down to a walk. Those who glibly predict that television will supplant the movies should read the feature story in the Wall Street Journal for March 26, 1951, entitled "Teetering TV." The Communications Commission may wake up some day and find it has backed the wrong horse. In the meantime, grave damage may result from its present policies. They call for stern resistance by the motion-picture industry, the theaters as well as the producers.

Conditions Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Mr. Adin Ladd, of the merchant marine, has written a most interesting letter to his grandmother who resides in my home town of Skowhegan, Maine. His letter deals with what he saw behind the iron curtain and how what he saw gave him a deeper appreciation of the freedom which we of the United Nations still enjoy.

I commend the letter to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Skowhegan (Maine) Independent-Reporter of April 17, 1951]

ADIN LADD, OF MERCHANT MARINE, WRITES HE IS BACK IN SWEDEN AFTER BEING BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Adin Ladd, A. B., merchant mariner, with the Moore-McCormack Lines, aboard the steamship *Mormackfir*, lately behind the iron curtain has written his grandmother an entertaining letter from Stockholm, Sweden, under date of April 6. He says:

"There are only two ports left now before heading back to the States. So far we have been to Goteborg, Oslo, Copenhagen, and Gdynia. I am disappointed that we aren't to go to Helsinki after coming so near.

"If you asked a Pole when it was the last time he smiled, I think he would have a little difficulty remembering off-hand the occasion. My O. S. and I walked from the docks across the city and back just looking and listening. The only person with a smile on his face was the innumerable pictures of one Joe Stalin that in varying sizes hang in nearly every shop window. And at that, his big moustached grin is as mirthless as the mouth of a cannon. There is almost a chill in the air, like the moment between seeing the smoke and waiting for the explosion. People we met on the streets, as soon as they recognized us as Americans, would avert their eyes, stop talking, and walk a little faster. It was almost embarrassing to walk down the street and definitely uncomfortable. I noticed in one clothing store just two suits in the window and they were second-hand, very old and shabby. The price—$200 and $184 or the equivalent in Polish money. There were several posters in the windows showing American planes bombing Korean women and children, and the only film (movie) had to do with racial discrimination and Russian soldiers beating the American Army. They are doing an excellent job of teaching the Poles to hate everything American including the Americans themselves. Well any way, the short time I spent in Poland was enough to make me depressed in mind for a long time, after we left that sorry country. Also, I realize a little better the broader meaning, and greater yet, the value of the thought 'freedom.' How can mankind have lost the right to smile or look at a stranger walking down a street? This is a three-dimensioned society now all right. We have not only a right and wrong but a left as well. The Communists are right in not allowing their slaves to see the rest of the world and vice versa; that is—right in their own power-hungry way because no one would stand for them if they knew what the other half was missing. I think a Pole would be happy to miss the soldiers and sailors with their submachine guns and constant checking of papers that goes on day after day.

"It is a relief to be back in Sweden today and until iron curtain is just a phrase in history books, I don't care about going on the other side of it again.

"I didn't send the Copenhagen address in the last letter because I didn't think there would be time enough to receive a letter over here. Now it is too late but there should be mail in New York when we get there."

Supplies for Soldiers on the Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Report From Korea—'GI Says United States Goods on Black Market,'" published in the Bloomington Herald-Telephone, Bloomington, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM KOREA—GI SAYS UNITED STATES GOODS ON BLACK MARKET

A Bloomington soldier, fighting in Korea, asked today in a letter to the editor of the Daily Herald-Telephone why American GI's there are forced to turn to the black market to buy American goods such as cigarettes, candy, beer, and writing paper.

Pfc Gerard N. Sira, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Sira, of Maxwell Lane, is with an engineering outfit in Korea. What he has seen in the far eastern country he apparently doesn't like.

He wrote the following letter to the Herald-Telephone:

"DEAR EDITOR: I am just one of many hundreds of GI's over here in Korea that would just like to have a few of his questions answered. I've never seen the fellows in this outfit with me feeling so low as they are here. Their morale is as low as it could possibly get, and that's not good.

"The first question that I want answered is, What are we here fighting for? It's plain to see that the Korean people don't like us. They don't want us around. As far as we know we haven't any real right to be here."

REPORTS BLACK MARKET

"Where is the stuff that should be on the PX shelves going to? I can answer that one for you. I'll even send you pictures to prove it if you want. Our cigarettes, candy, beer, writing paper, and such stuff is all over the streets of Pusan and other Korean cities, in little stands that the kids have rigged up, and selling for 10 times their values. Cigarettes sell for 25 cents a pack on the black market and 10 cents in the PX. The trouble is that they never get on the PX shelf to start with.

"The paper that I am writing this letter on came from a friend of mine in Bloomington. It's a shame when a fellow has to write home for things he should be able to get right here."

ASKS WHERE TRUCKS ARE

"Where's our trucks? We have to drive trucks that are made in Japan, while our trucks are all used by Koreans who let one last about a month.

"Where's our beer. I am drinking Jap beer right now, because the only American beer we could get is on the black market and it costs $1 a can. Ask yourself these questions and see if you can give me a halfway decent answer.

"Where's our clothes? We all have clothes, yes, but the Koreans and the English soldiers also have them. A soldier is supposed to honor his uniform. I'll ask you people from my home town—could you honor the uniform that all the soldiers of the world, and half of the prisoners of war are wearing? I don't think you could. Our Army is supposed to be outstanding. I don't see how it possibly could be with everything wearing one of its uniforms."

WANTS ANSWERS

"I guess maybe this sounds like a lot of plain old griping to some of you folks back home, but just ask a few veterans around there and see if they don't set you straight. I'd like some of these things answered, so let's hear from someone who thinks he knows.

"I hope this gets in the paper, so a lot of the mothers of boys who are over here can see what they are up against.

"Your friend,

"Pfc G. N. SIRA."

On the Outskirts of Armageddon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of March 27, 1951:

ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF ARMAGEDDON

(By Arthur Krock)

FRANKFORT, GERMANY, March 18.—The historic rift between France and Germany, the tragedy of Europe that eventually brought the United States into two global wars and the leadership of the west, must first be bridged over, then eliminated, to preserve human liberty. This is the task to which the Americans in Western Europe are devoting themselves, on the spot. From all the complicated moves and situations which bewilder the newcomer to Germany from Washington this fundamental fact emerges, and dominates the path to any conclusion.

Paris and France, except for the Hotel Astoria near the Arc de Triomphe, are as native to their own culture as ever. But Frankfort, where the High Commission has its base in the I. G. Farben headquarters, and Wiesbaden, where the Air Force soars through and over the town, have become a visible part of the United States. Many sights and sounds declare this. But among the most interesting are the road signs as the traveler nears Frankfort: "No Passing," "Soft Shoulder," "United States P-X 600 Yards." For this is one of the great focal points for the most unusual adventure ever undertaken by the United States. And the historian would be pressed to present a parallel.

The task is not only that of the Economic Cooperation Administration, now well on the way to transition, which was to restore the productive economy of nations devastated by the Second World War. It is not only that of General Eisenhower, which is to build the military section of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to deter the Soviets from Western European aggression. It is not only that of the British and the Western Europeans, plus some others, to do their part of this building and evolve a continental army at last. It is enormously the task of the Allied High Commission in Germany, of which the American part under John J. McCloy is laboring with extraordinary devotion to instill among the Germans the will to place the independence of the individual and the dignity of the human spirit above every other consideration of human life.

This is not to imply that the High Commissions of the British and the French are not pursuing the same objective. But there are several well-known reasons why the most powerful influence to this end must and does come from the American section. If this goal is not attained, neither of the related ones can be, and it is far too early to form an opinion whether success can come.

The principal labor of Mr. McCloy, which is to forge and bind a common social-economic link between France and Germany, can be only briefly appraised in this space. But at this writing there is reason to hope that before it can appear in print the Schuman plan for the basic economic interdependence of France and Germany will have been initialed by the Governments, to be submitted for legislative approval, and that within a matter of weeks this approval will be forthcoming. There is just about that much time for the west to acquire this essential foundation, in the opinion of informed persons here.

If the Schuman plan, originated by French statesmen in one of the few inspired moments since postwar Soviet foreign policy disclosed itself, shall come into being in the required time the principal personal credit must go to Mr. McCloy. To reach the present status of hope for the Schuman plan he has wrestled with the French, the Germans, the British, the industrialists of the Ruhr—and some attorneys they employed in the United States—with greater exertion than Jacob had to put forth with the angel.

From the outset of serious consideration of the Schuman plan Mr. McCloy laid down three absolute conditions. The Ruhr industrial combine, composed of about a dozen men who follow three or four and were determined to regain their cartelized monopoly, must be broken. Instead of being able to obtain even more of the coking coal of the Ruhr required for their productive capacity, they must be limited to 75 percent (he first tried to make it 50 percent) so that steel mills elsewhere on the continent could have essential supplies. Third, the single procurement agency for coking coal must be disbanded and something resembling a free market take its place. The reason why the Schuman plan is on its way to initialing with the indispensable approval of the United States is because Mr. McCloy gained his objectives in substance and largely in detail. The apex of victory was the signed approval of the Conditions by Chancelor Adenauer of the new West German Republic.

If the Schuman plan gets into operation, and works, then, for the first time since Bismarck failed to interest France more in colonial expansion than in the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine, the basic cause of the tragedy of Europe will be on its way to removal. If that happens, the accomplishments of the Marshall plan will take on the fiber of endurance; the "Eisenhower army" will have shorter life as a mere blueprint surrounded by adoring staff officers; the European army will advance from the stage of debate, and the Soviets will be faced with the plain necessity of a change of foreign policy.

There are lions in the high grasses of the untrod areas near the path to these goals—one can almost smell their feral odor from this shattered city—and they may at any time be loosed to destruction which will include their own. No one in authority here disputes the hazard. But the procession of peace is advancing, and the flag of the United States is at the fore.

The Brilliant Record of General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur's return to the United States after an absence of over 14 years, it is fitting that we pause in our tribute to him and study his remarkable military career which is unparalleled in the history of this Nation:

GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Douglas MacArthur was born at Little Rock, Ark., January 26, 1880. He entered the United States Military Academy on June 13, 1899; graduated at the head of his class on June 11, 1903; and was commissioned a second lieutenant of engineers.

Shortly after he was graduated from the United States Military Academy, he sailed for the Philippine Islands. Here he engaged in engineering duties, including construction work at Guimaras Island until October 1904. Upon his return to the United States, he served at San Francisco with the California Debris Commission and as Assisting and Acting Chief Engineering Officer, Pacific Division, until October 1905. He was then ordered to Tokyo where he served as aide to his father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, until September 15, 1906. While on this detail he was given a confidential mission which took him to many countries throughout Asia.

Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to duty with the Second Battalion of Engineers at Washington Barracks, D. C., and, in addition served as aide to President Theodore Roosevelt until August 1907. In February 1908, he was graduated from the Engineer School of Application. He then served as assistant engineer at Milwaukee, Wis. In April 1908, he joined Company K, Third Battalion of Engineers, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Here he served as company officer and also as an instructor in the Mounted Service School and the Army Service School. His 4-year tour at Fort Leavenworth was interrupted by periods of service at San Antonio, Tex., and in the Panama Canal Zone.

He was assigned to duty in the Office of the Chief of Engineers from 1912 until April 1913; as Superintendent of State, War, and Navy Building, until November 1913; and as a member of the General Staff Corps until September 1917. From April until September 1914, he accompanied our expedition to Veracruz as a member of the General Staff.

He conceived the idea of the Rainbow (42d) Division and as Chief of Staff helped

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

direct its organization and training. He arrived with this division in France, October 1917, and served with it until August 1918, in the Vaucouleurs, La Franche, and Rolamont Training Areas; in the Luneville, Baccaret, Esperance-Souain Sectors; in the Champagne-Marne defensive; and in the Aisne-Marne offensive. He commanded the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade in the St. Mihiel, Essey, and Pannes, Woevre, Meuse-Argonne, and Sedan offensives. He then commanded the Forty-second Division until November 1918 and served in the Army of Occupation in Germany until 1919.

Upon his return to the United States, he served in the Office of the Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., until June 1919. He was Superintendent of the United States Military Academy to June 1922, during which time he modernized the courses in military training.

From West Point he was sent to the Philippine Islands, where he served at Headquarters, Philippine Department, until November 1922, in command of the District of Manila until June 1923, and in command of the Twenty-third Infantry Brigade at Fort William McKinley to January 1925. Returning to the United States, he commanded the Fourth Corps Area, Atlanta, Ga., to July 1925; and the Third Corps Area, Baltimore, Md., to September 1928. He was selected president of the 1928 American Olympic team, which he took to Amsterdam, Holland.

In 1928 he returned to the Philippines where he served 2 years as department commander. Upon his arrival in the United States in September 1930, he commanded the Ninth Corps Area, San Francisco, to October 1930, when he became Chief of Staff of the Army. Funds for national defense were at a low ebb. He first saved the skeleton army from the economy wave, then modernized it. He set up the four army and corps area organizations, and the General Headquarters Air Force. The basic blueprints of manpower procurement and industrial mobilization were developed under his direction.

Upon completion of his duty as Chief of Staff in October 1935, he was appointed military adviser to the commonwealth government of the Philippines. He inaugurated a long-range military training program financed by the Philippine Government. His 10-year plan was based upon universal military service.

As conditions in the Orient became critical, on July 26, 1941, he was designated commanding general, United States Army Forces in the Far East. His command included the Philippine department and the forces of the commonwealth government, which were inducted into the United States Army. When he took over this command the Philippine department consisted of 18,000 American and Philippine Scout troops. There were ample Filipino reservists, but their period of training had not been completed.

The stubborn defense of the Philippine-American forces on Bataan threw Japanese conquest plans out of gear and gained valuable time for the defense of Australia.

In March 1942, President Roosevelt ordered General MacArthur from Corregidor to Australia for the purpose of organizing and leading rescue forces back for the liberation of the Philippines. On April 18, 1942, he was made supreme commander of the southwest Pacific area and a meager force of Australians and Americans.

With insufficient forces to justify aggressive action, he decided to defend Australia, first by blocking the Japanese advance in New Guinea, and then by assuming the offensive. In heavy fighting the enemy was stopped at Gona in December 1942.

The next year General MacArthur assumed the offensive and pierced the strong enemy outer perimeter, between Wewak and Rabaul, by securing the Vitiaz Straits.

Seizure of the Admiralty Islands by a coup de main, February 29, 1944, marked the end of a great swinging move pivoting on New Guinea which has been a basic purpose of operations initiated June 29, 1943, when the Southwest Pacific and South Pacific areas were united under General MacArthur's command. Possession of the Admiralties relieved his supply line from threat of flank attack from the east and enabled him to change the axis of his advance from north to west. In the Solomons and Bismarcks a strong enemy had been isolated and bypassed.

The way was now open for a shore-to shore advance to the northwest along the land mass of New Guinea. On April 22, Hollandia, 500 miles west of the Bitiaz Straits, was occupied. The enemy was completely surprised; our losses negligible. The operation threw a loop of envelopment around the enemy's eighteenth army which was dispersed along the New Guinea coast east of Hollandia. Throughout the campaign the enemy had lost 110,000 men and the remainder of his original strength of a quarter of a million was bypassed and became strategically unimportant. By the last of July 1944, General MacArthur had occupied key positions along the entire New Guinea coast with campaigns at Wadke, Sarmi, Biak, Noemfoor, Opmarai, and Sansapor.

Occupation of Morotai, 300 miles south of the Philippines, on September 15, penetrated the Halmahera-Philippine line and imperiled enemy conquests in the East Indies by the threat of envelopment and air attack.

General MacArthur's landing on Leyte on October 20 pierced the center of the enemy's strategic defensive line which extended from Japan through Formosa, the Philippines, the East Indies, Singapore, and Burma. Both enemy flanks thus created were vulnerable to envelopment to the north and to the south. The so-called greater east Asia coprosperity sphere was cut in two and the conquered empire to the south occupied by half a million troops, was severed from Japan proper. Fully realizing the importance of Leyte, the enemy reinforced to the limit of his ability and with his air, land, and sea forces made suicidal attempts to dislodge General MacArthur from the island. This supreme effort of the enemy failed. His fleet and air arm suffered major defeat and his land forces were annihilated.

On December 15, sites for air bases and naval facilities were occupied on Mindoro which would support Luzon operations and insure domination of enemy sea and air routes in the South China Sea. From Leyte a corridor had been driven from east to west which cut the Philippine Archipelago in two.

Luzon was invaded on January 9, 1945. The enemy expected a landing south of Manila. Consequently the Lingayen Gulf landing north of Manila was practically unopposed. This placed American troops in rear of the enemy's main forces, cut his reinforcement and supply lines, and closed his avenue of escape.

By February a great converging movement on Manila was under way. The XI Corps which landed unopposed was driving east from Zambales coast. The Eleventh Airborne Division of the Eighth Army which landed without losses on the west coast of Batanges February 1, was moving rapidly north toward Manila. The Sixth Army had occupied the entire Central Plain of Luzon and its Thirty-seventh Infantry and the First Cavalry Divisions were fighting their way into the outskirts of north Manila.

On February 3, 1945, in a wide envelopment from the east, elements of the First Cavalry Division entered Manila, seized Santo Tomas and Bilibid Prison and liberated thousands of internees and prisoners of war. After desperate fighting Manila was finally liberated on February 23.

By the end of February, Corregidor and Bataan had been occupied.

In March, a vigorous campaign was launched in the Visayans. Palawan, Zamboanga, Panay, Cebu, and Negros were occupied in quick succession. Seizure of the Sulu Archipelago in early April made Tawitawi available as a great strategic air base from which the enemy empire life line to the south was within easy air range. By the 21st of April, General MacArthur's control of the entire Visayan Group was complete. On the 19th of April, from a surprise landing at Malabang and Parang in western Mindanao, Eighth Army units fought their way eastward in a 2-weeks' overland march which brought them to the outskirts of Davao.

In a collateral drive on Borneo, supported by Allied naval and air units, Australian forces occupied Tarakan May 3, Brunei Bay June 10, and Balikpapan July 1. Possession of these objectives made available sources of oil and other needed war materials and completed General MacArthur's tactical control of the entire Southwest Pacific area.

On the 5th of July, General MacArthur declared his Philippine campaign closed. It had been a campaign characterized by great economy in the lives of his men and heavy destruction of the enemy. Twenty-three enemy divisions, or equivalents, had been annihilated and more than 400,000 Japanese had been killed. Of the Philippine campaign General MacArthur announced:

"Working in complete unison the three services inflicted the greatest disaster ever sustained by Japanese arms.

"The objects of the campaign were as follows:

"1. To penetrate and pierce the enemy's center so as to divide him into north and south, his homeland to the north, his captured Pacific possession to the south. Each half could then be enveloped and attacked in turn.

"2. The acquisition of a great land, sea, and air base for future operations both to the north and to the south comparable to the British islands in its use as a base for Allied operations from the west against Germany.

"3. The establishment of a great strangulating air and sea blockade between Japan and the conquered possessions in the Pacific to the south so as to prevent raw materials being sent to the north and supply or reinforcement to the south.

"4. The liberation of the Philippines with the consequent collapse of the enemy's imperial concept of a greater east Asia coprosperity sphere and the reintroduction of democracy in the Far East.

"5. The liberation of our captured officers and men and of internees held in the Philippines.

"6. A crippling blow to the Japanese Army, Navy, and Air Force.

"All of these purposes were accomplished."

On April 6, 1945, General MacArthur was named Commanding General, United States Army Forces in the Pacific. Three months later his Okinawa-based air force had launched air strikes against Japan itself. On August 14, 1945, President Truman announced the appointment of General MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander to receive the Japanese surrender and command the occupation forces in addition to his duties as commander of the United States Army forces in the Pacific. In January 1947 he was designated commander in chief of the Far East Command, retaining his position as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan.

On July 25, 1950, a month after the North Korean Communists had invaded South Korea, General MacArthur assumed command of the United Nations command in the Far East, organized to direct United Nations Forces in the defense of South Korea.

DECORATIONS

Thanks of the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Philippine National Assembly, the Philippine Congress, and the Australian Government have been expressed to General MacArthur for his part in liberating the Philippine Islands during World War II.

He has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Service Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Silver Star with six Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

His foreign decorations include the Philippine Medal of Valor, Distinguished Service Star, Defense Medal, and Liberation Medal; British Knight Grand Cross of the Bath; French Grand Officer, Legion of Honor Fourragère, and Croix de Guerre with four Palms; Belgian Commander Order of Crown; Netherlands Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords (military division); Italian War Cross and Grand Cordon Order of the Crown; Polish Grand Croix Polonia Restituta and Virtutae Militaire; Hungarian Grand Cross Order of Military Merit; Czechoslovakian Grand Cross Order of White Lion; Yugoslavian Grand Cross Order of Military Merit; Mexican Grand Cross of Military Merit; Ecuadoran First Class Decoration Abdon Calderon, and Greek Medal of Valor.

Following are the citations for his American military awards:

Medal of Honor: "For conspicuous leadership in preparing the Philippine Islands to resist conquest, for gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against invading Japanese forces, and for the heroic conduct of defensive and offensive operations on the Bataan peninsula. He mobilized, trained, and led an army which has received world acclaim for its gallant defense against a tremendous superiority of enemy forces in men and arms. His utter disregard of personal danger under heavy fire and aerial bombardment, his calm judgment in each crisis, inspired his troops, galvanized the spirit of resistance of the Filipino people, and confirmed the faith of the American people in their armed forces."

Distinguished Service Cross: For heroism in the Salient du Feys, France, March 9, 1918. When Company D, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry, was under severe attack in the Salient de Feys, France, he voluntarily joined it, upon finding that he could do so without interfering with his normal duties, and by his coolness and conspicuous courage aided materially in its success.

Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross: As brigade commander, General MacArthur personally led his men and by the skillful maneuvering of his brigade made possible the capture of Hills 288, 242, and the Cote de Chatilon, October 14, 15, and 16, 1918. He displayed indomitable resolution and great courage in rallying broken lines and in reforming attacks, thereby making victory possible. On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was the dominant feature.

Distinguished Service Medal: He served with credit as chief of staff of the Twenty-fourth Division in the operations at Chalons and at the Chateau Thierry Salient. In command of the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade he showed himself to be a brilliant commander of skill and judgment. Later he served with distinction as commanding general of the Forty-second Division.

First Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: As Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States since November 21, 1930, he has performed his many important and exacting duties with signal success. He devised and developed the four-army organization of our land forces; he conceived and established the General Headquarters Air Force, thus immeasurably increasing the effectiveness of our air defenses; he intiated a comprehensive program of modernization in the Army's tactics, equipment, training, and organization. In addition, the professional counsel and assistance he has continuously rendered to the President, to the Secretary of War, and to the Congress have been distinguished by such logic, vision, and accuracy as to contribute markedly to the formulation of sound defense policies and the enactment of progressive laws for promoting the Nation's security.

Second Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: For exceptionally distinguished service as supreme commander of Allied forces in the southwest Pacific since March 1942. Under extremely difficult conditions of terrain, climate, and limited forces and material, he expelled the enemy from eastern New Guinea, secured lodgments on the island of New Britain, and gave strategical direction to coordinated operations resulting in the conquest of the New Georgia group and the establishment of the United States Army and Navy forces on Bougainville Island. He had inflicted heavy losses on the enemy and established his forces in positions highly favorable for the construction of offensive operations.

Third Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: "As supreme commander of Allied air, ground, and sea forces in the southwest Pacific, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur planned and personally directed the campaigns which resulted in the liberation of the Philippine Islands. Strongly entrenched and superior enemy forces were overwhelmed and completely destroyed in a series of decisive operations exploiting United States air and sea superiority, coupled with the resolute and courageous fighting of the ground forces. The immediate result of the campaign was control of the China Sea, the isolation of Japanese forces in Burma, Malaya, and Indochina and the termination of coastwise traffic supporting the Japanese armies in central and south China.

"The liberation of the Philippines began with the landings on Leyte on October 20 in which complete strategical surprise was achieved. After bitter fighting under most difficult conditions of weather and terrain, General MacArthur destroyed the Japanese forces, which included the noted First Division of the Kwantung Army. Again surprising the enemy, General MacArthur moved his forces boldly up the western coast of the main Philippine island and effected a landing on the shores of Lingayen Gulf on January 9, 1945. The flawless execution of this hazardous amphibious approach and landing so disorganized the enemy that in a series of deep thrusts Manila was liberated on February 25. The fortress of Corregidor fell soon afterward in a brilliantly conceived and directed combined land, sea, and air operation. By the end of June only isolated groups of the enemy remained on Luzon.

"While the United States Sixth Army was so engaged, Eighth Army units cleared the enemy from the southern islands in a series of amphibious operations. By July 4 organized resistance had terminated, completing the liberation of the Philippine Islands and the 17,000,000 inhabitants from Japanese domination. More than 300,000 dead and 7,000 prisoners were lost by the enemy, our casualties in killed, wounded and missing totaling 60,628. Seventeen of our divisions had opposed and defeated 23 enemy divisions. The air, ground, and naval forces worked in complete unison to inflict this crushing disaster on the Japanese Army."

DEGREES

The following degrees have been conferred upon General MacArthur:

Doctor of Science, Norwich University.

Doctor of Science, Pennsylvania Military College, 1928.

Doctor of Laws, University of Maryland, 1923.

Doctor of Laws, Western Maryland College, 1929.

Doctor of Laws, University of Pittsburgh, 1932.

Doctor of Laws, University of Philippines, 1938.

Doctor of Laws, University of Wisconsin, 1942.

Doctor of Laws, University of Queensland, Australia, 1945.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to the grade of first lieutenant on April 23, 1904; to captain on February 27, 1911; to major on December 11, 1915; to colonel of infantry, National Army, on August 5, 1917; to brigadier general, National Army, on June 26, 1918; to brigadier general, Regular Army, on January 20, 1920; to major general on January 17, 1925. He was appointed Chief of Staff, with the rank of general on November 21, 1930. On October 1, 1935, after serving nearly 5 years as Chief of Staff, he reverted to his permanent rank of major general. In 1936, President Quezon appointed him Field Marshal, Philippine Army. He retired from the United States Army with the rank of general on December 31, 1937, but was recalled to active duty as a major general on July 26, 1941, and was promoted to lieutenant general (temporary) on July 27, 1941. He was promoted to the grade of general (temporary) on December 18, 1941, and to General of the Army on December 18, 1944.

The Christian College in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "The Christian College in America," by Ralph Waldo Lloyd, president of Maryville College.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IN AMERICA

(By Ralph Waldo Lloyd, president of Maryville College)

The United States of America has more institutions of higher learning and more college students than have all the other countries of the world put together. The proportion of American young people who attend college has been multiplied by 5 and the number by 10 during the first half of the twentieth century.

These are important facts, but they are not so much reasons for pride as for concern and action. If our colleges wield wider influence than ever before, wider than do colleges in other nations, then obviously the nature of that influence is of supreme importance. It is cause for grave concern that so many contemporary events in the world confirm what Lord Macaulay said years ago, "Nine-tenths of the calamities that have befallen humanity have no other origin than the union of high intelligence with low desires."

The latest report of the United States Office of Education lists 1,808 colleges, universities, and professional schools. In terms of control, 506 of these are independent, 594 are tax-supported, and 708 are church-related (475 Protestant, 228 Roman Catholic, 5

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Jewish). In terms of emphasis and teaching, most of the church-related colleges and some of the others state that it is their purpose to be Christian. This bulletin is written to set forth the role of the Christian colleges, of which Maryville College is one.

AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

When the Thirteen Colonies became the United States of America there were in existence nine of the present 1808 institutions (Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Brown, Rutgers, Dartmouth). All of them had grown out of the Christian movement, although none is today actively related to any church. During the first half century after adoption of the Constitution, about forty permanent colleges were opened. Of these, three-fourths (among which was Maryville College) were established directly by ministers and people of the churches. From then until the end of the nineteenth century extension of the southern and western frontiers was accompanied by church missionary enterprises which placed schools and colleges all across the land. Often these institutions provided to vast territories their only facilities for educated leadership.

In 1860 there were in the United States 180 higher institutions related to the church and 17 to the State. In 1900 there were still five times as many church colleges as tax-supported colleges, with twice as many students. Today the colleges which announce that it is their purpose to be Christian constitute a less impressive part of the total higher educational system than they once did. Yet they are more numerous, more firmly established, enroll more students than at any time in the past.

Being church-related does not necessarily make a college Christian and being independent or tax-supported does not necessarily prevent its being Christian. But it is common knowledge that only a few colleges which are not related to a church consider their function to be distinctively Christian or organize their faculties and programs to that end.

In the history of the United States the Christian college has played a far more important role than most historians accord it. When the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were formulated and throughout the ensuing century, a century in which the Nation laid the foundations for its present greatness, Christian colleges carried most of the task of higher education. Might there not be some causal connection between these facts? Among all our institutions, the free Christian college was most closely related to our early history and is the most typically American.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IS DIFFERENT

It is not different in its general academic standards and procedures. The accredited Christian college must meet the same educational standards that other accredited colleges meet. But it is different, and that which makes it so is something which it is and does in addition to what other institutions are and do. For one thing, it adds an announcement that its purpose is to be Christian. Substantially all tax-supported and most independent universities feel themselves limited in this matter by laws, tradition, clientele, alumni, faculty, or their own educational philosophy. On the other hand, all church-related and some independent colleges are free to adopt, as definitely as they wish, a program for training students in Christian belief, Christian character, and Christian motives of service.

It is true that some church-related colleges make a far more serious and thoroughgoing effort than do others to add the things that create a distinctive Christian atmosphere and influence. One common and disturbing criticism is that college A or B, which announces itself as Christian, is no different from college or university C or D, which makes no such claim.

What must a college do to be effectively Christian? It must be under a controlling body that adopts and makes regulative a purpose to be Christian; it must have a president and faculty who are committed to this same purpose in contrast to the practice of religious neutrality now so dominant in most large centers of American higher education; it must give to Christianity and the Bible a place in the curriculum comparable to the places given to other great fields of knowledge and life; it must have an over-all program and student and faculty organizations which will foster Christian fellowship, expression, and service; it must test its own official policies and practices by the Christian standard. Colleges are not Christian by drift or by imitating other types of colleges, no matter how famous; they are Christian only through strenuous and constant effort.

An institution can accomplish these things without creating sectarianism. It is not a sectarian but a Christian college which we advocate. It is a college which frankly stands with the church in its larger ministry to the world and for the great central affirmations made by all Christian churches—affirmations made in clear language about God as Father, about Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Savior, about the Kingdom of righteousness on earth.

At the heart of these things is the Christian faculty. Only sympathetic and active Christians should ever be appointed. The chief difference between the Christian college and other colleges may well be in that little word "only." It assures that the teaching of all subjects and the management of all its affairs will be from a Christian point of view. Religion thus becomes a natural and organic part of the college.

"Secular education is only half education with the more important half left out," wrote Sir Robert Peel. It is this more important half which the Christian college particularly aims to supply. Fifteen years ago Dr. Kenneth Scott Latourette published an article under the challenging title, "Dare a College Be Christian?" After reviewing the practical factors involved, he came to this conclusion: "In such a situation colleges and universities which will dare to enter on the Christian pilgrimage have a unique and urgent mission."

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IS ESSENTIAL TO THE FUTURE

To some of us it seems self-evident that since Christian belief, character, and service are recognized as essential to our civilization, they should have a regulative part in the life of our colleges and universities where a large proportion of our future leaders spend four or more of their most maturing years. But to a great many people this does not seem self-evident at all. They do not think it matters much what the colleges or the churches do about religion in higher education; or whether there are colleges which can and do give major emphasis to these fundamentals. That is why the case for the Christian college should be stated plainly and urgently. Here are some of the arguments in that case.

1. It is essential to the Nation: The writers of the Constitution of the United States in 1787 rather surprisingly did not include any reference to education. But the famous ordinance creating the Northwest Territory, between Pennsylvania and the Mississippi River, adopted the same year by the very Congress that called the Constitutional Convention, contains a significant statement, which was substantially repeated in the Ordinance of 1790 that created the Territory south of the Ohio, as follows: "Religion morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." Here in the same sentence education and religion, with morality, are magnified. The assumption seems clear—they go together. That is the view of those who founded this Nation.

Those who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with its basic recognition of God, and later the Constitution and other documents which established government on those principles of independence, would doubtless be amazed that their wise provision for separation of church and state has been used to defend the present extensive separation of religion and education. President Faunce of Brown University once wrote: "Here is our national peril, that the supremely important task of our generation will fall between church and state and be ignored by both; the church may say, 'Education is no longer in our hands'; the state may say, 'On all religious matters we are silent.'"

The roots of democracy and the foundations of this Nation are in the Christian convictions and ideals. Decisions of the United States Supreme Court have contained more than once the statement that this is a Christian nation in its historic beginnings and its dominant religion. For democracy and the Nation to endure, those Christian convictions and ideals must influence men and events more widely and profoundly than they have done in our generation.

Secularism, the organization of life apart from God, runs to its logical results in the pagan nazism of Hitler and in the atheistic communism now seeking to dominate the world. Democracy stands against them as the hope of freemen. But if democracy also organizes life apart from God, how can it stand permanently? Many of our political and educational leaders are sincere Christians, but too often they act with unnecessary timidity about religion.

At the heart of the matter is our education, including our higher education whose influence extends into the Nation and its leadership as never before among any people. In 1910 approximately 4 percent of our college-age youth were in college; by 1940 it was 16 percent; since World War II a million veterans have sent the percentage considerably higher than that. This latter is temporary, it is true, but some increases will certainly continue. The President's Commission on Higher Education, in its much discussed report of 1947, proposes that ways be found by 1960 (chiefly through tax-supported colleges and Government subsidies) to increase the number enormously, to 50 percent of all college-age youth.

It is unthinkable that the nation's 700 church-related colleges could be closed or secularized without national disaster. These church colleges, with the 500 independent institutions, constitute the historic American free-enterprise program of higher education. It is essential to the Nation as well as to education that their influence be increased proportionately as tax-supported colleges and universities become larger, more numerous, and more dominant. It would be a national misfortune if all higher education were under the church; however, there is no danger, even remote, that this will come to pass. It would be an equal, perhaps a greater, misfortune if all were under some unit of Government; and that could happen here as it has happened in other nations.

The Christian philosophy of life and standard of morals, a knowledge of the Bible, and the protection of freedom which strong Christian colleges provide, are essential if the original foundations of this Nation are to be kept and if there is to be a free and great American Nation of the future.

2. The Christian college is essential to the church. It is the only medium through which most Protestant denominations now

participate in the formal educational program in the United States. The churches are doing an impressive work through student pastors and foundations on campuses of large State and independent universities; these institutions, therefore, are not without the ministry of religion, a ministry which officials of the universities value highly and encourage. But we are speaking here especially of schools in whose operation the church has a part. In the nineteenth century there were throughout the country hundreds of academies established and maintained under stimulus from the churches. Most of those under Protestant auspices were abandoned as the system of American public high schools was extended in the early years of the twentieth century. The Protestant churches were and are principal champions of tax-supported public education for all people, yet they probably made a mistake in withdrawing so completely from the fields of secondary and elementary education. However, there is no turning back now, and the college level is the only one on which the Protestant church will have any considerable number of institutions in the future.

The Christian colleges do much to keep the church educationally minded; they increase the church's appreciation of the values of Christian higher education; they save the church from losing touch with modern scholarship; they raise the educational standards within the church; and they supply a majority of the ministers and a large proportion of the lay leaders of the churches. Without these colleges is is conceivable that the church's leadership would shrink to a point where its whole program would be threatened. Furthermore, this other simple but fundamental fact must not be overlooked: the Christian college provides higher education in a Christian atmosphere for the youth of Christian homes.

3. The Christian college is essential to higher education. Each group of American higher institutions (tax-supported, independent, church-related) makes a contribution to the whole and to the others. In accenting the place of the Christian college, there is no intention to discount the essential services of the other types of college. State universities are essential and can do some necessary things which otherwise would not be done. Independent colleges draw support and serve a clientele often not available to other institutions. On their part, Christian colleges are in a position, not occupied by the others, to act on the truth that all higher education is incomplete without religion. It can put the study of religion and the Bible on an equal basis with the study of other great fields of knowledge. It need not divide the student into parts, with one part going to college and another part going to church. Christian education says that man's life is a unity and the whole man ought to be educated. A complete education must treat religion as an integral part of the whole. This is a much needed emphasis in contemporary American higher education.

The church-related colleges have a special mission (shared with independent colleges) in behalf of freedom in higher education. The church is freer from political control than is any other body in the world, as recent and earlier history of many nations abundantly shows. The colleges related to the church, therefore, have the strongest assurance of remaining free. They do a major service in preserving the freedom of all colleges. Tax-supported institutions are the more free from political interference because of the strong Christian colleges which cannot be subjected to any political domination.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE IS UNDER SEVERE PRESSURES

That an institution so typically American, so important to the Nation's pest growth into greatness, and so essential to the future, should be subjected to threatening pressures exerted by the very society it serves is a strange turn of events indeed. But such is the case.

1. Under and through all other pressures is that of the secularism of our modern society. One historian writes that "the history of the modern western mind may be said to be the history of the gradual secularization of man." As in recent generations man discovered and developed more and more the natural forces in his world, he became more and more self-satisfied and self-confident, believing that by wise planning he could master his own situation without reference to God or religion.

Events of the past 10 years have shocked many out of this self-sufficiency. But on the whole, our society continues to put its faith in itself and in physical power, not in God and in spiritual power. Our American education, with all its marvelous advances, has steadily receded from its earlier emphasis on religion and has become secular with its society. Morality is stressed, but usually in terms of humanism and pragmatism, not on a basis of theism. Men have forgotten George Washington's warning that morality depends on religion. This situation had developed by the time this writer was in the public schools, but at that time so much was left out of the school program on all levels that leaving out religion did not seem so remarkable. Today, however, schools include so many things that to omit religion suggests that society and educators count it relatively unimportant.

2. A natural result is the pressure of unappreciation. In many influential educational quarters the need for a positive Christian emphasis is discounted and the Christian college as such is ignored in educational planning. For example, the President's Commission on Higher Education, in 1947, practically dismissed the church college and even the independent college from serious consideration in its proposals for the future. Educators, political leaders, ministers, parents, and students all are affected by such estimates from high quarters.

3. There is a distracting pressure, educators discover, in the very accrediting processes which are intended to do institutions and education good. The major standardizing bodies render an indispensable service. The Christian college must and should meet the standards set for the accrediting of all colleges. But in the final analysis the accrediting bodies find it necessary to measure chiefly by money—money spent for buildings, for instruction, for books, for laboratories. It is hard to give due consideration to other factors such as tone and spiritual influence. The constant necessity of meeting the accrediting standards and their financial demands tends to turn the Christian college's attention from the value of its distinctive Christian function to the values and requirements of the academic function. There are no corresponding pressures upon the college to develop or even to retain its Christian emphasis.

4. There is a pressure of Government also, usually unintentional and indirect but real. The inexorable growth of Federal, State, and municipal taxes is rapidly reducing the giving ability of individuals who otherwise might provide adequate funds for private and church colleges. Because of the endless search for more revenue and because of a limited appreciation for the colleges which are not tax-supported, there now appear frequently in Congress and legislatures proposals to take away the historic tax-exemption privileges of private and church colleges while keeping them for tax-supported colleges. So far most of these proposals have been defeated by the vigilance of the friends of free institutions.

But it ought to be of deep concern that Federal and State officials so often appear to act on the idea that tax-supported colleges are the only ones seriously needed for the future. At this writing there are bills in Congress to provide various new subsidies or education. Some of these are not available to independent and church-related colleges; some are available, but dangerous. This writer believes that nongovernment colleges should not accept any government subsidy lest that subsidy reduce or destroy their historic freedom.

5. There is, of course, an ever-recurring economic pressure. Operation costs go up with every wave of inflation. Endowments earn less than they once did. Charges to students ought not to be made so high as to put the Christian college out of reach of the average Christian home. Enrollments need to be relatively small to insure an effective Christian program even though large enrollment and higher charges would help financial income. There are no unlimited sources of support available to the private college as the taxing power of Government, theoretically unlimited, is available to the tax-supported college. Where can the necessary support be found?

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGES' FUTURE DEPENDS UPON THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The Christian colleges have withstood these pressures with remarkable success in spite of the added and continuous problems of war. They have actually grown stronger, not weaker. Yet, under the pressures which have been mentioned "it may well be," as one prominent educator said 2 years ago, "that within the next two decades will be determined the fate of the independent college in America, and therefore, in the world." The term "independent" here refers to all colleges except those supported by taxes.

If they are to continue, the Christian colleges on their part must be true to their distinctive purpose. But that is only half the need; the other half is support in terms of students and money. Both can be provided adequately if, and only if, Christian people, the church, business firms with vision, and other organizations with the motive of service, really understand and care. They must care a great deal—enough to pay double taxes; one required tax to Government for support of its program of higher education, and one voluntary tax (which really is not a tax but a gift and an investment) to the Christian college and the church for the support of a program of Christian higher education.

The cost is high, but the future is at stake. Our plea is for appreciation and support of all worthy higher institutions—State, independent, and church related—because all are necessary to insure a citizenry enlightened and trained enough to meet the demands of democracy in this complicated age. We urge all colleges, just as we urge the avowedly Christian colleges, to give due place to the first essential which is now so often forgotten—spiritual religion. But our plea is especially for the institutions which also are being too frequently forgotten—the historic Christian colleges of America.

Students from Christian homes are as necessary to these colleges as is money or appreciation. There must be many students to give the colleges strength and breadth of influence. There must be Christian students and alumni to keep the colleges Christian. A majority of church people agree that Christian colleges are essential to American life, but only a limited number really believe this deeply enough to guide their own young people to them. Christians must take Christian colleges more seriously.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Dr. Charles Devol, a member of the Marion College faculty, Marion, Ind., and an editorial, both of which appeared in the Marion Chronicle, Marion, Ind.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have a copy of the statement of Dr. Devol and of the editorial, and had intended to ask to have them printed in the RECORD. I am therefore glad to join in the request of my colleague.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHINA VETERAN SPEAKS

Dr. Charles Devol, who was born in China and resided there for 25 years, and who is on the Marion College faculty, made the following comment today in connection with the dismissal of General MacArthur:

"I feel that in America, where we are accustomed to the freedom of speech and the democratic form of government, that a change of an officer would not be looked upon so seriously, but in China or India or the Philippines or any place else in Asia, I am afraid that the people would gain the impression that we had lost confidence in General MacArthur or that we were not agreed among ourselves in our policies. Some of the Chinese, Filipinos, and others in the anti-Communist groups will be disappointed while the Communists will be happy, because it was their wish to remove him years ago."

MACARTHUR FIRED

There is no question that General MacArthur knew he had stepped out of bounds repeatedly by ignoring the orders of his Commander in Chief and issuing statements in defiance of them. Why he did all the things he did which seemed calculated to bring his removal is a mystery which the general can be expected soon to clear up. He will be welcomed back to his beloved country which he had not visited in many years, as a returned hero, as a man who put his high position on the altar in order to serve his country.

It had been apparent for a long time that MacArthur was trying to win a war in the Far East rather than fight a "police action" which could not be won in Korea. The Pentagon and the United Nations tied his hands. Two weeks ago he said that the best that could be hoped for in Korea was a stalemate. The wanton sacrifice of thousands of fine young Americans plainly revolted and outraged him. To have continued the war in Korea entailing sacrifices of men on such a scale was not in the MacArthur tradition. Obviously he felt that the time to strike in China had come. But the striped pants boys in the State Department and the British influence there finally had their way. Truman dismissed him summarily and the International News Service said the general read the dispatch from a news report before he received the telegraphed message.

Whether the menace of Red aggression could have been stopped in the Far East will remain forever an unsolved mystery by Mr. Truman's off-the-cuff action. The British were acting in their own interest by holding down the troops committed to the Far East while they were carrying on trade with Red China. Certainly with the men at his command MacArthur could see only defeat for his forces and the sacrifice of additional manpower, 90 percent of which was American.

The general now can perform a greater service for his country by disclosing what as commanding general he was forced to keep secret.

Reaction in the United States to the MacArthur dismissal was immediate and bitter. Plainly the American people are sufficiently informed to have stalwart opinions on a subject of great import to them and their country. Widely expressed was the belief that Truman had created another crisis in order to cover up the scandals that are being exposed by the hour. But this may be a sort of crisis with the consequence of which Mr. Truman had not reckoned. The conscience of the people has been stirred. The feeling of outrage and frustration may take many forms. Certainly it will not pass over without furore the like of which has not been seen or heard in the present generation.

Rather than being finished, apparently the great debate has just started.

Was the So-Called British Loan Aid to the English People, or Was it a Weapon for Socialist Politicians To Enslave Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and disastrous stupidity of loans from one government to another stands starkly revealed in the case of the British loan.

In 1946 the so-called British loan was bulled through Congress. The final tactic to put it through was the claim that handouts to the British Government would prevent the spread of communism.

Now take a look at England. It is far down the road to socialism and communism—thanks to the British loan. That handout burdened the American taxpayer with more inflation and more taxes—and at the same time, was a weapon for shackling the British people with socialism.

How many of the present administration policies will have equally disastrous consequences over the next few years?

A solemn and sobering appraisal of England's plight today is contained in the following review from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of April 18, 1951:

THE SOCIALIST TRAGEDY BY IVOR THOMAS

Not in anger but in sorrow, this brilliant Oxford "blue"—newspaperman, officer of the Royal Norfolk Regiment, M. P., and erstwhile stalwart of the Labor Government—admits the resounding flop of socialism in England.

SOCIALISM UNMASKED

Mr. Thomas, like most of the world, wants to see the greatest good for the greatest number. While never a Socialist himself, he was so sympathetic to the aims of the Labor Party that he accepted the offices of Parliamentary Secretary for Aviation and later Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Colonies under the present Government.

This gave him a chance to see the fantastic inefficiency of the present Marxist bureaucracy in England. He saw the payroll padding and chronic deficits of the blundering nationalized industries, the growing tendency of the citizenry to consume as much as possible and produce as little as possible. He saw the island steadily plunging toward sympathy with the Communists, toward uncooperative nationalism, and toward bankruptcy.

Naturally there was only one course which an honorable man could take. In 1948 Mr. Thomas resigned from the Labor Party and now tells in detail why this was his only possible choice.

Why have millions of intelligent Englishmen changed their minds about socialism? Because they are beginning to learn that socialism is only communism by degrees—communism by another name—communism by stealth rather than communism by bloody revolution.

Those who still wear rose-colored glasses when viewing socialism should be reminded that in 1948 the British Labor Government published a special centennary edition of the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, admitting their undying gratitude to the authors to whom socialism owes so much.

Mr. Thomas is convinced that in not-too-long an interval, unless the present Government is overthrown, Englishmen will be deprived of profits, interest, and rents, the first aim of Marx in destroying or leveling all classes above the proletariat.

Already private initiative has been virtually destroyed. The confiscatory taxes have knocked the independence and the courage out of large parts of the populace.

Mr. Thomas insists that the principal ultimate difference between communism and socialism is a matter of tactics. But the Communists at least have the honesty to admit their plot against western civilization.

To support the Socialists as "the best bulwark against their fellow Marxists, the Communists," is, according to Mr. Thomas, the rankest folly. Socialists are already convinced Marxists. Socialists pave the way, both through their ideology and through their economic blundering for Communist dictatorship. Mr. Thomas proves his point with six European examples.

There are only two known ways to make men work: The incentive of pay (plus the right to own personal property) and the incentive of the whip.

Already in England miners and farmers may not leave their industries. And discipline has sunk to such a level in some mining areas that a Labor Government professing the complete interest of the workers has had to close down entire pits.

Already members of the Government are telling housewives they have no more intelligence than their 4-year-old children in choosing items of diet. The next step, presumably, is a nationalized menu.

Despite the fact that this summer the Labor Government is trying to add the second element of "bread and the circus" in the form of the rather desperately conceived festival, England is facing moral, political, and economic crisis. As Mr. Thomas does not say, they will soon be asking America for additional funds, while continuing to play the United States against their fellow Marxists in Moscow—a balance-of-power game which has always ended in war, even when England was a first-class instead of a third-class power.

The time has come to tell our ungrateful debtors that we are not giving our billions to underwrite their form or any other form of Marxism.

What Is To Happen to Our Eighth Army in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written before General MacArthur's address before Congress:

[From Barron's of April 16, 1951]

THE EIGHTH ARMY: ITS FUTURE IS THE NATION'S FIRST CONCERN

In the momentous week that lies ahead the chances favor an intensification of the fighting in Korea at the very time that political debate in this country rises to crescendo.

The announced Communist intention to make their big push in April, the pick-up in air fighting, the sighting of large concentrations behind the Yalu—all favor this conclusion. It should be a sobering one, we think, to all those who may be tempted to make General MacArthur's return to this country into a kind of Saturnalia, as well as to his midget detractors.

For the fact is that the times are too serious for emotionalism and nothing could serve the general or the country worse. Nor is there the slightest point now in rehashing whether the President should have dismissed a great and honored commander, and even less whether he had the right to do so. As in a great trial these "procedural" questions lie behind us. It is time to come to grips with the merits of the case. What should be done about some 250,000 Americans now at the battle front What should this country's Asian policy be—not tomorrow, not a decade hence, but now?

THE GENERAL'S STAND

The opening statements in the case, to continue the legal analogy, are by now well known. The essence of General MacArthur's position is as follows:

1. The American Army in Korea cannot go on indefinitely fighting a limited war, under wraps with no power to strike back at the enemy's supply bases.

2. The war therefore should be extended to the extent of bombing Communist supply lines and releasing the potential of Chiang Kai-shek's forces on Formosa.

3. In the all-out struggle with communism, Asia, not Europe, is today the decisive theater.

The administration position as thus far developed is to deny all three of these propositions. It apparently believes that a limited war can be kept going at least until snow flies again and the danger of Soviet adventures in Europe or other parts of the world is put off at least for another year when the United States will be incomparably stronger. It holds to the view that further involvement in China, particularly on the China mainland, would be a total tragedy for this country. As against the Asian emphasis of General MacArthur, it gives top priority to Europe and the rapid implementation of the Atlantic Pact.

EAST VERSUS WEST

In trying to understand, if not pass on, these fundamental questions, it is well to recall that the pull between an Asian and European orientation for this country is an old one. The United States is a continental Nation, clasping, in Theodore Roosevelt's phrase, "the crest of an ocean in either hand." Through historical accident as much as anything else, the Republican Party, from the turn of the century when John Hay inaugurated the open-door policy, has always emphasized the Pacific. The Democratic Party, due in no small part to the fact that it was in power in two World Wars, has always emphasized the Atlantic and Europe.

The fact is that no foreign policy worthy of the name can disregard either ocean. Europe remains the greatest industrial workshop outside this country. It may be readily granted that loss of this workshop to the Communists would be a fatal blow. At the same time, however, the United States has established interests in the Pacific—Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and the protection of Australia, if not of Malaya—which cannot be set aside, and it has been the consistent duty of MacArthur to uphold them. Moreover—and the point is important—it should be noted that the conditions which in World War II made strategic decision as between the two oceans relatively easy no longer exist.

When, specifically, in 1941, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill decided against General MacArthur's judgment to make Europe the primary theater of action and the Pacific secondary, their choice was in large measure dictated by the harsh realities of the situation. In Europe there was a going war against Hitler, carried forward by Britain. In the Pacific the American Fleet lay at the bottom of Pearl Harbor, requiring at least 2 years to rebuild. The orientation to the Atlantic followed almost inevitably from these circumstances.

Today none of these circumstances is present. The going war against the Communists is in the East. In Europe, General Eisenhower still commands a phantom army. That fact may be used to argue for delay on all fronts, but to the degree that the United States purpose is not just to bend to Communist aggression but to defeat it, then it can be argued—as General MacArthur does argue—that one must close with the enemy where one is at grips with him. And we are at grips in Korea, not in Europe.

Finally, and tipping the scales in favor of MacArthur, there remains the hard, persistent question: What is the Eighth Army in Korea supposed to do? Maybe, it can for a few more months go on fighting a delaying action. Yet General Ridgway himself has described his position as impossible. He sees no chance for decision and meanwhile mounting danger, with the initiative in enemy hands. If the enemy throws in additional air forces, then a wider war, such as MacArthur argues for, becomes inevitable. If he does not, the prospect is for continued casualties, with perhaps in the end a negotiated truce which, on the terms proposed by the U. N. and never openly disavowed by this country, will represent complete and abject far-eastern appeasement.

HIS FINAL SERVICE

The return of MacArthur, in short, must inevitably help to end the State Department's double talk, and smoke the administration out of its micawberism. Meanwhile, and particularly in the coming week, it behooves all citizens to keep their heads. They may thank God they personally do not have to make the vital military decisions now necessary. They may and should do their utmost to allow those in command to work in an atmosphere not of hysteria, but a calm determination.

To welcome General MacArthur back as a returning proconsul, to use him as means of advancing purely partisan causes, is to throw away the great service he can still render his country—the spelling out in detail of what he believes should be done. At stake is more than the reputation of a general or the future of a President or a party. At stake is the fate of as gallant an Army as America has ever put into the field.

Britain's Part in the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former Member of this House, Hon. Bruce Barton, of New York, has long since been known as one of America's most lucid and forceful writers. His books were read avidly by millions of our people and his news articles have been widely read.

The following article touches a hot spot in our relations with foreign countries especially Great Britain. I agree with my friend and former colleague.

BRUCE BARTON SAYS

(By Bruce Barton)

THE BRITISH

Dr. George Riley, the famous osteopath, was once invited to meet George Bernard Shaw, a devotee of osteopathy.

They had hardly shaken hands before Shaw burst into bitter vituperation of America.

Dr. Riley stood it for about 3 minutes and then cried out: "Stop that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. How dare you, a man whose food and clothes and rooftree are principally paid for by the money of American bookbuyers and playgoers, how dare you say such things about a country and a people of which you are so abysmally ignorant. I never knew such impudence."

Shaw shut his mouth. A look of amazement came into his eyes, but with it a glint of admiration. He told a friend afterward: "That man Riley is one of the most interesting people I ever met."

Too many British authors and lecturers have accepted our hospitality—often lavish and effusive to the point of servility—taken their winnings and gone back home to write and talk scurvily about us.

Too many of the British people as a whole, jealous of our prosperity, are unfriendly at heart. For years they sold us the idea that, except for the protection of their fleet, we would have been helpless. But they never said from whom their fleet was protecting us; and in our Civil War, when our need of help was most desperate, their sea power, instead of helping us, tried to destroy our merchant marine.

Yet I admire the British. They write the English language better than we—we have no Shakespeare, no Milton. Their administration of justice is swifter, cheaper, and more dignified. In the conduct of foreign affairs they are so much smarter that it just isn't funny.

Indeed, one of my distinguished lawyer friends, a long-time subscriber to the London Spectator, tells me that by reading it he has long been able to predict 6 months in advance just what our State Department would do—the British loan, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Lately Russia has been making our foreign policy. When she lets out a blast, we promptly blast her back. When she nudges the North Koreans into starting a rumpus, we obligingly reply with our whole army and heaven only knows how many billions of dollars, while she loses not one soldier or one ruble.

Dancing to Russia's fiddle is getting us nowhere. We might better go back to letting the British manage us. They know their way around, especially in the Orient, where

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

they operated for more than 150 years at a handsome profit.

Many of us have another idea—that we ought to have our own American foreign policy. But since, to make any sense, this would have to be based on America first, it seems to be out. Every other nation can be for itself first. But not the United States. The mere suggestion is branded "un-American."

Why We Are Where We Are

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Witness, a Catholic newspaper published at Dubuque, Iowa, on April 19, 1951:

WHY WE ARE WHERE WE ARE

The dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as commander in chief of the U. N. forces in the Far East has given rise to frenzied argumentation and bewilderment among people in all walks of life. Behind that action is the seemingly impossible war in Korea. And behind that struggle stands the fierce, implacable monster of the Soviet. As from a smoldering current of fear and misgivings, frustrating confusion and a thousand unanswered questions have risen. There is one basic question—why are we where we are?

We are where we are because the nations, as a whole, have rejected Christ. This answer appears to be extremely simple. It is that simple. Yet the failure to accept Christ, that is, His teachings, as proclaimed by His church, is the one big cause of the tragic chaos of today. Historically, the failure in a chain of causes and effects goes back for centuries. Even in our time, however, we have been the witnesses of how that failure has brought us to the door of disaster.

In February 1945 the big three met at Yalta. The meeting was held to plan the strategy for ending the war and building the peace of the world. Roosevelt was there. Churchill was there. Stalin was there. (Alger Hiss was there.) But Christ was not invited.

Mellow-voiced radio commentators and high-salaried newspaper columnists told the public how this great meeting was to lay the foundations for the future peace of the world. The leaders were called the Big Three because they were from the big powers and they were to accomplish big things. But what actually happened?

At the Yalta Conference, Poland (largely Catholic) was sold out to the armed atheism of the Soviet and the way was paved for the Communist domination of Eastern Europe and China. Now these eventualities are ascribed to political or diplomatic blunders. But basically it was all because Christ was not welcome at Yalta.

In July 1945 another big conference was held at Potsdam. Churchill was there. Atlee was there. Truman was there. Stalin was there. But Christ was not invited.

Again silver-tongued radio analysts and fast-writing columnists described the Potsdam meeting with shining words. How wonderful it was, they said in effect, for such powerful leaders to get together to plan the peace of the world. But what actually happened?

The Council of Foreign Ministers was formed at Potsdam. Representing the United States, Great Britain, Russia (and China and far-eastern questions), they were to meet to fashion the framework of peace. They met, remember, five times, and each meeting ended in bitter bickering. Some will say these are matters of international relations. But the real reason why the Potsdam plan failed was because Christ did not have a part in it.

The San Francisco Conference sat from April to June 1945. Representatives from 50 nations participated. But Christ was not invited to take part.

Self-appointed prophets of the air waves and last-word-on-anything newspaper scribes classified the formation of the United Nations as a powerful agency for guaranteeing the peace of the world. Fifty-one nations signed the pact of new union. But what actually happened.

The veto power was insisted on by the Soviet delegation and incorporated into the working program of the U. N. (Alger Hiss, remember, was one of the big wheels in the organization of the U. N.) Ever since the Soviet delegates have been using the veto power to cripple the effectiveness of the U. N. The U. N. is failing because from the start Christ was ignored.

Today there is excited debating and painful confusion all over the land. One faction says, "Bomb Manchuria because Red China is already in the war in Korea." Another says, "Confine the war in the Far East to Korea and concentrate on Europe because the Reds may strike there anytime." And millions of people are asking, "Do we know where we are going or what we are to do?"

All this time Stalin and his atheistic henchmen are laughing in secret. For a long time they planned and plotted to divide and confuse us. And now they are succeeding. Our leaders played games with the delegate of hell. The men from Moscow have led our diplomats and so-called statesmen into a snake pit—any way they move they get hurt (and we get hurt).

Many are deliberating over how we can get out of this mess. But we cannot stop effects from causes once set in motion. Our Nation as a whole has turned its back on Christ and now it must eat the bitter fruits in the chaos of hell that is upon us.

Merchant Marine Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Monday, April 23, 1951. Those of us who have had the opportunity of coming to know the great work done at the Maritime Academy will appreciate the importance to the Academy of the early construction of the chapel and we urge the friends of the Merchant Marine to assist as much as possible:

MERCHANT MARINE MEMORIAL

The United States merchant marine is one of the most useful but least lauded organizations for its military and peacetime service to its country. During the Second World War its members bravely faced the dangers of the seas to supply our embattled forces, following the traditions set down by merchant seafarers since the days of the American Revolution. Although many gave their lives to see that the supplies reached their destination, very few of their number have received the recognition bestowed on members of the military and naval services.

With the naming of John M. Franklin, president of the United States Lines, as chairman of the memorial chapel fund campaign of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, a forward step has been taken toward doing honor to these devoted men, of whom 6,000 officers and seamen and 212 cadet-midshipmen died keeping the supply lines open during the war. The planned memorial is an all-religion chapel to be constructed at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island.

This memorial is long overdue. Contributions for its construction may be mailed to memorial fund campaign, United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.

Cards on Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Friday, April 20, 1951:

CARDS ON TABLE

Accorded the privilege of presenting his views before a joint session of Congress, General MacArthur acquitted himself with honor and skill.

There was no doubt that the general, who suddenly has become a violently controversial political figure, desired nothing more than to present his arguments to Congress so that the issue may be debated on its own merits.

He did so with conviction and without injecting any political side issues or using the occasion to stir a partisan frenzy.

The policy he presented was a strictly military policy. The administration believes such a policy is unwise at this time because we are not prepared for the eventuality of world war III.

General MacArthur's proposals make sense strategically so long as we are equipped to face the eventuality. The decision to push to the Manchurian border of Korea made sense strategically, too, but we were not equipped to face what happened—the direct intervention of Red China. General MacArthur's estimate of the situation had a great deal to do with the decision to push north.

It is as unreal to call the administration's policy appeasement as it is unreal to call MacArthur's policy warmongering. There is, however, the risk that the pursuit of MacArthur's policy will touch off world war III despite his belief that it won't. We are not prepared to handle both east and west aggression now. Eventually we will be, and it is entirely possible that administration policy can ease its present restrictions. Now, it must be geared to the eventuality and our ability to meet it, even though the Korean stalemate is a regrettable byproduct. The administration in no sense is abandoning the east, but it must be subordinated to global defense.

General MacArthur has given his side of the picture, the administration has given its side. The debate in Congress can now be held to those practical considerations. The general did his final job well. Now we can get on with the business at hand without emotion and partisanship.

Address by Kenneth Erickson, Youth Governor, State of Washington, Before Joint Session Hi Y Youth Legislature, Olympia, Wash., April 13, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the fourth annual YMCA Model Youth Legislature was held in Olympia, Wash., on April 13 and 14. The youth governor this year was Mr. Kenneth Erickson, of Puyallup, Wash. It is a very fine talk, and I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in reading it. The speech is as follows:

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, Your Excellency Governor Langlie, State officials, my fellow colleagues in the Fourth Washington Youth Legislature, and friends, today we are meeting as the youth of a great Nation and a great State. We are the youth of the world's most progressive and strongest democracy. Yes; our democracy has gained momentum as each succeeding generation of youth has grown and matured to step into the shoes of their elders and take over the ever-increasing problems of national and State Government. Until now, with our generation nearing the threshold of adulthood and responsibility, the United States stands as the one stanch bolt in the door of freedom, straining to hold back the menace of a world threatened by sinister foreign influences.

It is during this struggle, both physical and psychological, that we meet in this legislature; during a time of national emergency, deficit spending, high taxes, and an economy disrupted by enormous defense and rearmament programs. As youth of this State then we have had a great honor bestowed upon us in that we have been given a chance to express our views freely in a State legislature of our own; a chance to use our youthful enthusiasm and optimism, undimmed by prejudice and political viewpoints, to find solutions to the many problems and dilemmas that are unsolved in our State at the present time.

The scope of our task is tremendous. The present National and State situations will hinder us greatly in our attempts to create better conditions in our State. Lack of funds, as you all know, is our main barrier, and it is my firm desire that you take this problem into careful consideration while studying any appropriation bill. In other words, a source of money will have to be found for any legislation which will require funds to enact and carry out. Furthermore it is my desire, and I am sure that it stands to reason, that we confine ourselves with major issues, and discourage any unimportant or otherwise frivolous legislation. The short span of time we have to work in makes this imperative and in the best interests of the success of our legislature.

In short let's use our heads and show the citizens of our State that they have an alert, and intelligent youth, capable in time to take over the real State legislature with integrity and good judgment.

Because time is short and we cannot hope to cover the entire field of wants and needs in our State in 2 days, I have chosen only three main issues which I would like to suggest and outline to you.

National emergency has already been mentioned, defense and rearmament have already been mentioned. They should be spoken of in another regard. Our State of Washington is as important an implement now in our Nation's defense and offense as it was during the Second World War. We are strategically located and within our borders are located some of the Nation's top war installations. Because of these conditions our State occupies a precarious position in case of attack. The science of devastation has made such terrific progress in the last few years that, until effective international controls assure safety, not one country on the earth is entirely safe from the lethal, vehement, and indescribably devastating blows that can be rent with atomic weapons. I have not said these things to scare you or unduly disturb you, but merely to wake you to action on a problem that these conditions bring about. The problem is civilian defense and it is a responsibility and a duty of this legislature to provide an adequate and suitable civilian-defense program. Yes, thousands of our citizen's lives may someday depend on our ability and foresight in providing sufficient protection from attack through a workable plan of civilian defense.

I would recommend for your careful consideration, legislation which would set up a civilian defense commission to be made up of members of the legislature and what technical help deemed necessary. The purpose of this commission would be to set up within our State adequate fire protection, medical aid, and above all a means of educating the public on what to do in case of an attack. Schools present a definite problem in the question of civilian defense. I encourage infinite care in the study of schools' defense problems, and believe me they have them. All students should be taught what to do in case of attack, and drill procedures should be practiced in each school. There is now published by the United States Defense Department a booklet entitled "Survival Under Atomic Attack," which could and should be either given to every student or explained to him carefully. A copy of this booklet should be in the home of every family in the State. Above all, a uniform and clearly defined signal system for caution, warning, and all clear should be set up throughout the State. Cooperation on a local basis will undoubtedly make this problem much easier to solve and is to be greatly encouraged. All in all, this challenge of civilian defense is one which will undoubtedly tax your mentality and knowledge to meet in an adequate manner, but it is a program that must be built strong in our State. We are a link in the Nation's chain of defense, and we owe it, not only to the people of our own State, but to the whole Nation, to be a strong link.

The solving of our defense problem is going to take funds and so it is imperative that you provide a source of revenue to cover the cost of this much-needed program. We have a source of revenue in our State that is providing us with much tax money at the present time, but which has not been developed to its fullest extent, in my opinion. Last year an estimated 2,500,00 tourists visited our State. This was an increase of over 20 percent from 1949. Through proper and intelligent planning this figure could be doubled in a few years. Proper development of our tourist trade could assure monetary changes in our State treasury through gas tax, sales tax, and other revenue paid by tourists who enter our State. We are not doing all we can to develop this important source of income. Actual tourist comments in the Washington Tourist Survey for 1950 made by the State College of Washington School of Economics and Business showed that we do not advertise enough. And may I pause long enough to congratulate the State College on a fine service they have rendered to the State in this survey. Many tourists came to Washington and thoroughly enjoyed it and left wondering why they did not see anything about Washington in national magazines. There is at the present time in our State, a State development agency, which supposedly handles the publicity of the Evergreen State. Yet not one major sportsman's magazine carries advertising concerning our State. Many States have active commissions in this regard and are profiting from them. Mount Rainier, a paradise of scenery for business-weary travelers; Grand Coulee Dam, largest man-made structure on the face of the earth; the beautiful Olympic Peninsula; the ever-interesting Inland Empire; Lake Chelan; Puget Sound, and many other spots of breath-taking beauty and primitive grandeur are located within our borders and afford us with a chance for development toward a profitable end.

I would recommend a complete reorganization of the present agency. This agency should be activated to advertise our State's scenic beauty in a way that would encourage a larger number of tourists. Information should be made readily available to anyone who should inquire concerning our State and careful consideration of the project, I feel, would be of a beneficial nature.

In our State constitution today there is one section which needs amending. Article VI, section I, of our constitution does not stand up to all our system of government should mean to our people. A democracy is supposed to be a government of, by, and for the people; a government of balanced rights and responsibilities. In my estimation, the fact that 18-year-olds cannot vote, which is a right, and yet fight for our country, which is a responsibility, produces an apparent contradiction to this fact. The educational development of our country also has developed to the point where the 21-year-old vote law now in effect is outmoded and unfair to a faction of our people.

There is nothing so magical about the number 21. We don't suddenly change and become intellectually and mentally capable to cast an intelligent ballot overnight. Rather it stands to reason that an 18-year-old, with his high-school course in civics still making an impression on his mind, would be a better voter than a person who, for 3 years, has been away from much contact with the real processes of elections and the qualities to look for in a candidate. An 18-year-old, if he started voting immediately after leaving high school, or even in his senior year in high school, would be more likely to keep on voting and keep his parents voting than a person who has had to start voting of his own accord when he reaches the present legal age of 21. Our schools could provide information concerning voting; how to register, qualifications for voting and other preliminaries to voting. Qualities of various candidates could be discussed in history and world problems classes on an undiscriminating level. Thus we would not only have an increased vote, but we would have a more intelligent vote.

The true unproportional distribution of rights and responsibilities, however, has been written in blood on the battlefields whenever the United States has gone to war in the last 32 years. Our principles are shaken whenever a soldier under 21 is made to fight and perhaps die for a democracy which has not even given him the prime privilege of a mature citizen, the voting privilege. I say if we are old enough to fight for the future of our country, we are old enough to vote for the future of our country.

These three issues do not even scratch the surface of the bills and ideas which will be presented for your approval or disapproval, but they give you an idea of what seem to me to be the major issues for your deliberation.

Efficiency, good judgment, common sense, and faith in God have made our country

Members of Congress have been saying so in a chorus for several days just as if General MacArthur, after 52 years of military service, did not know what was and was not a military order or instruction.

6. General MacArthur's summary dismissal was not recommended by any military man since it meant he was instantly relieved and not only could not say farewell to his troops but had no opportunity to turn over the complicated affairs of his command to a successor.

7. Not a single piece of evidence exists that General MacArthur failed to carry out the policies of the President and the Department of State in his post as Supreme Allied Commander in Japan. Though it wasn't necessary to relieve him of his command when General Ridgway was given command of U. N. operations in Korea, the President swept General MacArthur from all three of his posts and gave the impression that this action was based on the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs.

Small wonder that America is disunited. For, when military men are compelled to become the scapegoats in petty political blunders, respect for institutions of military importance can hardly be enhanced.

Suppression of News Versus Smothering of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, we live in a time of world-wide tension. Under these conditions, freedom of the press creates more than ever the responsibility to report important news fully and fairly.

A sample of the smothering of significant news has recently come to my attention. It concerns General Eisenhower's 3-week military mission to Europe early this year, which was extravagantly publicized, to say the least.

Yet the significant news that, when General Eisenhower was in Rome, the Pope declined to see him was smothered in the New York Times, which reported it, and not printed at all in most American papers. Obviously, the Pope was not willing to be even remotely identified with our new military intervention in Europe.

The New York Times buried this significant news deep in the middle of a column-long story under a different heading on page 11, January 19. The column follows:

EISENHOWER SIFTS ROME ARMS EFFORT—TWO DEAD AND SIXTY INJURED IN CLASHES DURING VISIT—RED MASS PROTESTS FAIL

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, January 18.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower plunged today into his work of investigating Italy's will to fight if attacked and to contribute her share toward the common defense of the West against Soviet imperialism.

His mission being exploratory nothing that could by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as negotiations took place in the conversations that he had this morning with the Italian Cabinet and he limited his role almost exclusively to listening.

This evening after dedicating the rest of his working day to consultations with United States officials in Rome he had a store of data to guide his opinion on how intense the Italian rearmament effort was and how far it might be expected to develop in the future. His task in Rome is thus completed and he plans to leave by plane tomorrow morning for Luxemburg.

Two rioters were killed in clashes with the police during General Eisenhower's stay. One was killed yesterday at Adrano, near Catania, Sicily, and the other today at Comacchio, a poverty-stricken town at the mouth of the Po River. Sixty persons, including several policemen, were wounded or injured in these two places and in minor scuffles in Florence, Milan, Naples, and some smaller places.

ONE THOUSAND COMMUNISTS HELD

About 1,000 Communist activists were arrested or detained in various places. Scattered strikes of brief duration took place in many cities and towns throughout the country today. The day passed in comparative quiet, however, the Communists having abandoned their effort to arouse mass demonstrations against General Eisenhower's presence in Italy.

In Rome the Communist-dominated General Confederation of Labor held a peace meeting with police permission in an open-air, theater. Workers were supposed to abandon their jobs at 3:30 p. m. to attend, but all public services continued to run as usual.

Six or seven thousand workers turned up for the meeting but were easily outnumbered by the truly imposing police force that the authorities concentrated in the vicinity. The meeting broke up quietly after Giuseppe di Vittorio, Communist secretary general of the confederation, and other labor leaders had delivered speeches in favor of peace.

General Eisenhower started his day in Rome by calling on Premier Alcide de Gasperi. After a preliminary exchange of views lasting 40 minutes Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza, Defense Minister Randolfo Pacciardi and Treasury Minister Giuseppe Pella joined the session. The meeting went with considerable detail into the problems of rearmament and preparedness, with particular emphasis upon its economic and financial aspects.

TALK WITH MILITARY CHIEFS

General Eisenhower, who was accompanied by Maj. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, his chief of staff, and by Col. Vernon Walters, then conferred with Signor Pacciardi and the Italian chiefs of staff.

He paid a courtesy call on President Luigi Einaudi and later was the guest of honor at a luncheon given by Signor Pacciardi. The general spent the afternoon working with his staff in his hotel and dined with Ambassador James Clement Dunn. Other guests included leading members of General Eisenhower's mission and top United States Embassy, Economic Cooperation Administration and mutual defense assistance program officials in Rome.

General Eisenhower will leave without being received by the Pope. Vatican circles said that General Eisenhower let it be known that he would have been happy to present his respects to the Pontiff and that the Pope also wished to see him.

Later, however, the view prevailed that it was preferable for the Pope, who has never ceased to plead for peace and who considers himself outside and above all "earthly competitions," not to meet him.

NO INFORMATION ISSUED

No information was given either by the Italians or General Eisenhower on what was said in today's meetings. There is reason to believe, however, that in discussing the political aspects of the European rearmament the Italian Government reiterated its view that war was not imminent. It thinks that the West has 1 year to 18 months in which to rearm and that by the end of that time it may be strong enough to deter Russia.

The possible Soviet reaction to the rearmament of Western Germany is regarded by the Italian Government as a danger. Nevertheless, it favors the rearming of Germany, because otherwise it sees no possibility of defending Europe.

Both Italians and Americans emphasized the cordiality of today's conversations. That is not surprising since there are no fundamental points at issue. The Americans stress the necessity of speed. The Italians are willing to exert their maximum effort and to go as quickly and as far as the United States puts them in a position to go.

If Italy has any requests to make to the United States apart from aiding her rearmament effort they could be summarized as follows: To accelerate the dispatch of men and arms to Europe since these are regarded as essential morale builders, to use whatever troops Italy places at the disposal of an integrated European army for the defense of Italian soil since these are conditions under which they would give the best account of themselves and to extend European defense plans as soon as it is feasible to include Italy in the area that is to be defended in case of aggression.

DAV Warns of Repetition of the Economy Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have received from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans, who calls the attention of Congress to the threat of another Economy Act:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We, of the Disabled American Veterans, are perturbed and somewhat alarmed by certain recommendations made to the Congress recently. The first report is that of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, a nongovernmental group. The second is the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a congressional committee. Each contains recommendations or suggestions to abolish or curtail certain disabled veterans' benefits. Meantime, there are the various pertinent recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission pending in the Congress.

The officers and members of our organization are mainly disturbed because some of the recommendations or suggestions are suspiciously similar to those of two decades ago when the vicious misnamed "Economy Act of 1933" was enacted.

The Committee on Federal Tax Policy labeled its report "A tax program for a solvent America." How much alike is this to the citation of the Economy Act, entitled, "An act to maintain the credit of the United

great and have made our State great. Let us, then, in these next 2 days, use all four with equal fortitude and courage. And let us remember and consider this: In a few years we will no longer be the youth and will enjoy the carefree years no longer. We must learn now what is to be expected of us in the years to come. Preparedness will make our task much easier and will enhance our chance to find a solution to brotherhood among men under the fatherhood of God. Abraham Lincoln stated our problem with immortal beauty and simplicity when he said in his famous "house divided" speech, "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it." Today Lincoln's statement still stands as a challenge of tomorrow, and it is our challenge for a better future. It is up to us. Why not start now?

The Importance of Rice in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, those who have traveled in the lands of the earth where rice constitutes the primary food for millions of people will appreciate the keen observations made by Mr. George E. Sokolsky and all as set forth in a form letter, "To our Distributors:" mailed by the Adolphus Rice Mills, Inc.

In view of present military activities and the proposal to effectuate a Pacific pact, it will be well for our people to obtain a better understanding of the great economic force which is involved in the little word, "rice."

Peoples who live on lower standards than ours do not vary their foods as we do. They eat with monotonous constancy almost the same food every day.

For instance, rice eaters are never satisfied with any other grain or even with a variety of meats and vegetables. Their basic food is rice and whatever they put on the rice is a side dish. This is true of millions of people in the east of Asia.

The rice line lies south of the Yellow River in China and it includes Korea, Japan, the Malay Peninsula, Burma, Siam, French Indochina, and areas of India. It might be possible in such a country as ours to eat cake instead of bread but a rice eater wants rice. Without it he starves. He might try wheat or millet but they do not serve him adequately. He craves rice even after a full meal.

The world production of rice is about 7,600,000,000 bushels and about 95 percent of it is produced in Asia. China never grew enough rice to meet the demands of her population.

It is just diplomatic trickery that, under such circumstances Soviet China offers to sell rice to India, risking the starvation of the people with the object of winning a propagandistic victory. It is a design for conquest at any cost. On the other hand, if Soviet China should conquer Burma or French Indochina or Thailand during the forthcoming summer, the offer of rice to India could be made with safety.

It is to be assumed, therefore that all the factors indicate that both for internal and diplomatic reasons, Soviet China must seek to increase its rice reserves as soon as possible, even if that means that pressures have to be put on neighboring countries, to the extent of conquering them.

Hindsight is of little advantage and these days usually ends in the loss of human life. The Burma, Thailand, French Indochina situation must inevitably lead to trouble as they are the granaries of surplus rice. It does not make sense to ignore this situation or to misunderstand it. We do not have to wait for another Korea, where we were caught without policy or purpose.

The Manchu dynasty, for instance, fell in 1911. This was preceded by unusually high imports of rice in 1902 and in every year following up to 1911. The import of the staple food of a country weakens that country's economy unless, as in the case of Great Britain, exports of products pay for the food. China obtained its additional rice from French Indochina, Thailand (Siam), and Burma.

If we translate this into current politics, it is essential to Communist China that that country have free access to the rice of these other Asiatic nations. If anti-Soviet countries interfere with the movement of rice from those countries to Soviet China, the lack of rice or the high price of rice could be the reason for revolutionary movements in China. A starving people blames its government for failure to provide food, and rebels.

As a matter of fact, much of the labor troubles in China, which preceded the Communist revolution of 1925, was over rice, and the escalator clause which Walter Reuther and General Motors think that they invented was introduced in China many years ago by the British-American Tobacco Co., whose wage scale was determined by the price of a picul (133 pounds) of rice. They found that rice was more important than money.

But it did not work, because inflationary prices knocked the props out from under all schemes and as the price of rice rose the discontent increased. Thus, Li Li-san, now in charge of Manchuria for Soviet Russia, was able to organize strikes in the Yangtze Valley and Shanghai in 1925 to pave the way for the victories of the armies led by Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and Gen. Galens-Bluecher, the Russian, who then was engaged in conquering China—an effort which failed when Chiang Kai-shek turned on the Russians and the Chinese Communists.

Rice is then the one commodity which is related to the politics of these Asiatic countries as it is the basis of their economic life. And Soviet China does not have enough rice to take care of the needs of the people.

Joint Chiefs of Staff on a Political Limb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of Monday, April 23, 1951:

JOINT CHIEFS ON A POLITICAL LIMB—WHITE HOUSE STATEMENTS ON GENERAL MACARTHUR'S DISMISSAL ARE IN VARIANCE WITH WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED

(By David Lawrence)

It's a new experience and a very uncomfortable one for the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to be dragged into the center of a bitter political controversy.

There is, moreover, a serious discrepancy between what the White House has been saying officially—as to the unanimous recommendations of the Joint Chiefs in the MacArthur case—and what actually happened.

The first chapter—the initiative—in the controversy was the administration's sanction of a speech by General Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, last Wednesday in Chicago. This was the day before General MacArthur was due to present his case to a joint meeting of Congress. The big headline in the Wednesday afternoon papers was "General Bradley blasts MacArthur's views." The explanation offered for this advanced rebuttal was that General Bradley had for a long time scheduled the engagement and had to deliver the speech.

The general could as readily have talked about universal military training or something else unrelated to the MacArthur episode.

But once the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs spoke out it was natural that General MacArthur in his Thursday address should reveal that his own military recommendations had been approved in the past by the Joint Chiefs.

Not content with one blunder, the administration then went from the frying pan into the fire with another statement. This one, while issued at the Pentagon, was actually directed by the White House. It came immediately after General MacArthur's speech to Congress on Thursday and the full text of it reads as follows:

"In response to inquiries from the press concerning General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Pentagon spokesman said the White House had authorized him to state that action taken by the President in relieving General MacArthur was based upon the unanimous recommendations of the President's principal civilian and military advisers including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The reasons for General MacArthur's release have been stated previously by the President."

Now the foregoing gives the impression that General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in his address to Congress had to do with his removal. Not a word of his address had any reference to that point. He merely outlined his own military recommendations about the prosecution of the war in Korea and stated that the Joint Chiefs had supported his proposals.

This latter point, therefore, the White House in its statement did not deny at all though a local paper headlined its frontpage article: "MacArthur says Joint Chiefs shared his views but Pentagon declares they favored ouster."

This was natural in view of the misleading official statement. For the White House declaration that the Joint Chiefs had unanimously recommended the President's action is a half truth.

The facts are these:

1. There was no meeting of the Joint Chiefs and no action of a formal nature taken by the Joint Chiefs.

2. There was a meeting in which civilians and military men met with the President who asked their views about the controversy and they generally felt that since Mr. Truman and General MacArthur differed in foreign policy there should be a replacement.

3. The timing of the replacement and the method of making the replacement was not agreed upon, this being left to the President to decide.

4. Some of those present at the meeting had their first news of what the President finally decided when they read the newspapers on Wednesday morning, April 18.

5. Not a single recommendation of a formal nature is in the record to show that the Joint Chiefs took cognizance of any military insubordination or preferred any such charge against General MacArthur. Yet

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ence than conditions warranted. When the blow-off finally came the only criticism we can offer is that it was so long coming.

Last August, on the occasion of General MacArthur's withdrawn message to the VFW convention, the News-Democrat commented:

"General MacArthur apparently has lost sight of the function for which he was hired. Definitely this is not to make or decide the official policy of the United States. His job is merely to help carry out whatever policy is set forth. MacArthur is not Commander in Chief, and although he's been in the service long enough to appreciate this difference, nevertheless he has asserted himself as a rookie."

To this we might add that ever since, he has behaved like a spoiled brat, ignoring the cardinal tenet of the military which is uncompromising obedience to the superior officer.

The headstrong tactics of projecting himself as a principal, responsible only to himself, has unquestionably wrought great harm to our cause. It revealed in MacArthur a streak of ineptness damaging to peace overtures and threatening to spread the Korean conflict into a full-scale world war.

Prior to Korea, MacArthur had generally acquitted ihmself as a competent, and sometimes brilliant, military leader. With his lengthy and well-rounded background in the Orient he should have been in a position to add counsel of inestimable value to this Nation, if tendered confidentially to his superiors.

If, then, an insurmountable conflict of views still persisted, an honorable alternative would have dictated the general's resignation from office and respectful withdrawal from the scene.

Had he chosen this course, General MacArthur's stature would have been enormously enhanced and his potency compounded.

As things turned out, the general has merely succeeded in fomenting a distasteful political tempest at home that can only serve eventually to lessen his evaluation in the eyes of his countrymen.

Missourians Score in National Poster Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Missourians Score in National Poster Contest," taken from the Missouri Wildlife magazine, an official organ of the Conservation Federation of Missouri edited by Mr. Charles H. Callison:

MISSOURIANS SCORE IN NATIONAL POSTER CONTEST

A Missouri boy, Donald Fleming, of Ritenour High School, Overland, was awarded first prize of $250 in the annual conservation poster contest sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation. Donald's poster was adjudged best among nearly a thousand entries from all over the country in the senior high school division.

A Missouri girl, 12-year-old Margie Bussinger of Carthage, won honorable mention and a $10 prize in the junior high school division of the national contest.

Judges for the contest were Walter Weber, noted nature artist attached to the staff of the National Geographic magazine; Albert M. Day, director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and Dr. William Mann, curator of the National Zoological Park in Washington, D. C.

Last fall the executive secretary of the Conservation Federation of Missouri served notice on the national federation that Missouri was going after some of the poster prizes. All chapters were supplied with information about the contest and urged to encourage local entries. Several of them did, and found the poster contest an excellent project through which to stimulate community interest in conservation.

Margie Bussinger, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Bussinger and an eighth grade student at Mark Twain school in Carthage, won first prize in a local competition sponsored by the Carthage Sportsman's Protective League. Prizes of $15, $10, and $5 were awarded in the Carthage contest. The winning entries were then forwarded to Washington for the national competition.

Bob Esterly, president of the Carthage league, said plans have been adopted to secure a large participation next year, particularly among the rural schools.

An Authentic, Documented Statement on the MacArthur-Truman Controversy by the World War II Chief of United States Propaganda Warfare Against Japan and on Behalf of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is the last hope of this Republic. Despite the fact that the Congress has abjectly surrendered to the administrative branch of the Government much of the authority vested in it by the Constitution, the Congress still has the power and the responsibility to maintain our constitutional form of government and repudiate those who would surrender our national sovereignty to a totalitarian state in which we would be outnumbered 15 to 1 and outvoted 59 to 1, as we now are in the United Nations.

Knowledge is power, and the Good Book says, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"; but if, because of prejudice or partisanship, we close our minds to the truth, we are in a fair way of losing our liberties.

Jonathan Swift stated an everlasting truth when he said, "There is none so blind as they that won't see." And I implore my colleagues, particularly the members of the Armed Services Committees, to read with open minds, the following documented statement by my good friend, Clay Osborne, World War II chief of United States propaganda against Japan and on behalf of Korea, so that they may understand more clearly our foreign policy which has brought us dangerously close to world war III:

THE MACARTHUR-TRUMAN CONTROVERSY—WHY?

(By Clay Osborne)

The purge of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur by the President of the United States raises two questions of utmost gravity to the people of the United States.

One question involves the motives and aims of Harry S. Truman and his administration in committing an act unprecedented in American experience. Never, from the time of George Washington until now, has any American President exercised authority as Commander in Chief to remove from any field of battle any top American general:

Whose career and record have been unblemished by failure, incompetence, treason, or personal aggrandizement.

Whose patriotism and personal integrity have been unquestioned even by his critics and enemies.

Whose leadership in the field and whose skill as a military tactician and strategist are unsurpassed in American annals.

Who has been recognized by enemies of America as their No. 1 foe.

Who has under the most perilous and disadvantageous circumstances consistently transformed military disasters into unprecedented American victories by the genius and inspiration of his command.

Who has enjoyed the confidence of the American people at home and of their fighting forces in the field.

Who has been universally recognized as a foremost world authority on both the military and political problems of his areas of command.

And who has throughout a long lifetime and useful career unfailingly and unyieldingly placed the interests and security of the United States above all other considerations—who has unfailingly and unyieldingly never compromised in any matter or challenge involving honor, integrity, and allegiance to the people of the United States and their Constitution comprising the highest authority of law and government.

When any attempt by anyone to render voiceless, and indeed to attempt to discredit, an American leader of General MacArthur's caliber is made, there is compelling challenge to the American people to try to find out why.

MOTIVES AND AIMS OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

The second question raised involves the motives and aims of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Here has been one of the greatest of all American generals honored and respected by his own people—and even by his once-bitterest enemies, the conquered Japanese—to a degree unsurpassed in either American or world history.

At 71 years of age this exemplary American patriot might well have rested content with laurels of achievement far beyond the most extreme expectations of his youth. He might then have been secure in position guaranteeing ease and comfort to himself and his family during remaining years. He then would have been certain that the name "MacArthur" perpetually would be engraved in the hearts of his grateful countrymen and their posterity, and forever enshrined among the great of the earth.

What have been the motives requiring him to risk the damnation of his superiors; to dare the wrath of self-styled politicians; and to place in hazard his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor effectively to defy those who have tried to silence him?

In this hour of established real and present danger there can be no challenge more compelling to every American than to try to understand why.

Examination of some basic evidence in the record of the past 5½ years may enlighten us.

One explanation of the MacArthur conduct is implicit in his oath as a soldier of the United States. Accepting responsibility he vowed, in part:

"I solemnly swear * * * to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic * * * so help me God."

Nowhere in the soldier's oath is to be found even implication of unquestioning loyalty

States." This infamous measure was passed by the Congress with comparatively little consideration and with solemn promises that the disabled veteran and survivors of deceased veterans would not be affected. Within a few months, however, its horrifying results became evident and during the next several years the Congress found it necessary to repeal many of its features. These are so well known they need not be noted herein.

One suggestion in both reports is that all plans for the present Veterans' Administration hospital-construction program be suspended. With this Nation now engaged in the Korean war and seemingly on the verge of world war III, those advisory staffs and researchers responsible for this recommendation should go to some of the Pacific coast ports and meet the hospital ships now returning American war casualties to their homeland. It might be well also for them to visit some of the service and veteran hospitals and meet hospitalized veterans there. Incidentally, these include some of the same service hospitals which only last April were ordered closed in the name of economy.

Other suggestions and recommendations are outlined in the two reports. Explanation of them in this letter would require too much of your time.

The DAV has not objected to any humanitarian project requiring the spending of billions of American dollars and resources abroad, but we do point out these expenditures have increased the inflationary trend and that some of this aid is expended upon former armed enemies of American veterans, with the latter now in danger of another economy act in their own country.

The members of this organization are taxpayers. Their patriotism has been proved. We are as anxious as members of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy to combat inflation. Only recently we vigorously supported the House version of H. R. 1, Eighty-second Congress, because it would provide universal indemnity coverage and, at the same time, we were reliably informed that it would have saved millions of dollars. We desire economy in Government, but we do not desire a repetition of the Economy Act of 1933 at the expense of disabled veterans and of widows and orphans.

It is doubtful if a modern economy act will be a one-package measure. In all likelihood it will be advanced piecemeal and necessarily come from many congressional committees. Therefore, we of the DAV implore you to observe and study each measure before your committees and on the floor to make certain disabled veterans and survivors of deceased veterans will be protected.

The officers and members of this organization will appreciate any consideration you may give to this most important subject.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Nation-Wide Freedom Day Movement Will Be Launched in Chrisman, Ill., May 4, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, a grass-roots expression of public sentiment against Government controls over the press, radio, and our other freedoms will be demonstrated in Chrisman, Ill., in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, on Friday evening, May 4, 1951. Because it is hoped that the idea may find national acceptance and spread to other communities across the Nation where similar demonstrations may take place, I am calling it to the attention of my colleagues under permission granted by the House.

Stanley R. Kent, editor and publisher of the Chrisman Weekly Courier and chairman of publicity for the program, has announced detailed plans for the event, which is said to be the first such public meeting of its kind in the United States. To provide a clear picture of the scope of the undertaking, I include in the RECORD the announcement of the program as carried in the Chrisman Courier in its issue of April 12, 1951. The article follows:

NATION-WIDE FREEDOM DAY MOVEMENT WILL BE LAUNCHED IN CHRISMAN ON MAY 4 WITH PUBLIC MASS MEETING IN NEW GYM—SPONSORED BY LOCAL LEGION POST, COMMERCIAL CLUB, AND LIONS CLUB

Extensive plans are now under way for the launching of a Freedom Day movement in Chrisman on Friday, May 4, from which may stem a national expression of public sentiment against governmental controls of press, speech, radio, and the other freedoms that Americans take for granted.

The Freedom Day movement will be launched in the form of a public mass meeting that will be held in the new Chrisman gymnasium, with a seating capacity of more than 2,000 people. The meeting will start at 8 p. m.

It will be the first such public meeting of its kind in the United States, and will be the first grass roots expression of opposition to governmental regulations, particularly in its apparent effort to control a free press and a free radio.

Newspapers all over America flew their flags at half-mast last week, in mourning for the newspaper La Prensa that was confiscated by the Argentine Government. This was the first invasion by a totalitarian government against the free press in the Western Hemisphere.

The same thing could happen in the United States unless the people are awakened to the fact that their liberties are being threatened by governmental regulations.

The Freedom Day movement is being inaugurated in Chrisman through the combined efforts of the Chrisman American Legion Post, No. 477; the Chrisman Commercial Club; and the Chrisman Lions Club, with the idea of attracting Nation-wide attention.

The suggestion for a freedom day came from various national organizations and individuals who believe that action by the American people should start in a typical small American town. Chrisman has been selected and designated as the typical small American town for the start of such concerted action.

Principal speaker for the freedom-day meeting in Chrisman on May 4 will be Charles Allen Crowder, publisher and editor of the Flora Sentinel at Flora, Ill., who has consented to speak here in the interest of preserving a free press in America.

Mr. Crowder and the Flora Sentinel were the targets of pressure groups who tried to boycott and suppress the Sentinel in 1949 because of the newspaper's presentation of both sides of a labor controversy in the city of Flora. The bitter fighting over the issue brought Nation-wide attention when six of the opposition leaders bought a note and mortgage against the Sentinel and sought to destroy the newspaper. The freedom-of-the-press battle was won when labor unions rallied to the defense of the Sentinel and Mr. Crowder, and the newspaper was saved from the auction block by the loan of $12,000 from an investment-banking firm in Washington, D. C.

Members of the general committee in charge of arrangements for the meeting are Nash C. Breen, commander of the Chrisman Legion Post; Harry E. Haworth, president of the Lions Club; Harold McGlosson, president of the Commercial Club; D. E. Bradley and Stanley R. Kent.

The Freedom Day meeting is entirely nonpolitical and nonsectarian, and is open to the general public. There will be no admission charge. All expenses will be borne by the three local sponsoring organizations.

Invitations to the May 4 meeting are being extended to Vernon L. Nickell, State superintendent of public instruction; United States Senators Paul Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen; Edward H. Jenison, Congressman from the Twenty-third District; W. O. Edwards, M. R. (Bob) Walker, and John P. Meyer, State representatives from this district; William E. Wayland, State senator from this district; and many other dignitaries.

Arrangements are also being made to have represenatives of press associations, radio stations, and daily and weekly newspapers present at this meeting. An effort is also being made to get writers and photographers from Time, Life, and Saturday Evening Post to be present at the Chrisman meeting.

Radio station WLBH at Mattoon has already made arrangements to send a tape recorder to Chrisman to record the activities of the May 4 Freedom Day meeting. This recording will be rebroadcast on the air at a later date.

Local ministers will also participate in the program, and the Chrisman school band will play several patriotic selections during the program.

MacArthur Blow-Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of April 12, 1951, which follows:

MACARTHUR BLOW-OFF

Congressional admirers of Gen. Douglas MacArthur have pounced upon his dramatic ouster as Supreme Allied Commander in the Far East as political fodder, which it certainly is not.

The firing of the general, in fact, reflects a legitimate exercise of necessary action and sound executive common sense by the President of the United States.

We have been considerably less than enthusiastic over many of President Truman's policies and performances, but in this instance we do not question the rightness of his judgment.

Had there been any compromise of principle or lack of decision in the light of General MacArthur's continuing and flagrant insubordination, President Truman would have been grossly remiss in the exercise of his plain duty.

Firing MacArthur was no error of judgment on Mr. Truman's part, as is now charged by many Republican congressional leaders.

Throughout his dealings with his prima donna commander in the Far East, Mr. Truman has shown far more patience and defer-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to his Commander in Chief. MacArthur swore a higher loyalty—to the people of the United States who are the government of freemen under the Constitution.

PRESIDENT'S PURGE ANNOUNCEMENT

When the President asserted in his purge announcement of last Wednesday:

"I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and the United Nations."

Mr. Truman stated a fact which has divided MacArthur from the administration and U. N. policy makers throughout the past 5½ years. MacArthur clashed with his political superiors in matters affecting the security of the United States and of the freedom-loving world even before the actual occupation of Japan and Korea after VJ-day.

Some days prior to the occupation of Korea by either American or Soviet forces, in late August 1945, the Japanese throughout Korea surrendered to Korean underground leaders. Immediately thereafter Korea-wide elections were conducted by and among the Korean people themselves in more than 600 of the principal cities, towns, and villages. By this means a provisional government of liberated Korea was established, temporarily headed by the beloved Korean patriot, Lyuh Heung. The post of chairman was left open for acceptance by the venerable Syngman Rhee when he might arrive from the United States—honoring him for his long fight in exile for a free and independent Korea, and recognizing his wartime service to that nation as head of the Korean Commission in Washington, D. C., and leader of all exiled Koreans—except the Communists—in America and on the Asiatic mainland.

There were at that time no Communists of any consequence in Korea, for they had been exterminated or driven to join the guerrilla bands of Chinese Communists. One of Japan's aims was to destroy communism utterly.

STATE DEPARTMENT IGNORES ESTABLISHED KOREAN GOVERNMENT

Washington's instructions—both political and military—were to ignore the government established by the Koreans, and pressure was brought to bear upon Syngman Rhee not to accept the chairmanship of the provisional government. MacArthur was directed to arrange for the second "surrender" of Japanese north of the thirty-eighth parallel to Russians and south of the thirty-eighth parallel to Americans.

MacArthur protested both these decisions—and the later agreement of the Big Three Foreign Ministers' meeting at Moscow, in December 1945, to preserve the thirty-eighth-parallel line of demarcation between Soviet and American forces of occupation—without avail. He was compelled to obey orders.

The policy of the American Government at that time was not to recognize a government freely chosen by the Korean people themselves and to sponsor division of Korea into two zones of occupation. The northern zone, source and center of practically all power, manufacturing, and industrial capacity of Korea, was handed over to the Russians with signed and secret agreements even before the Soviet forces had crossed the Yalu River from Manchuria.

Prior to actual occupation, there had been American political agreement with the Russians at Yalta and Potsdam to reward Russia's entry into the war against Japan by giving the Soviets control of the three northeastern provinces of free China; concessions at the ice-free port of Harbin; control of the Chinese Eastern Railway; the outright gift of the strategically vital Kuriles, Sakhalin and other islands immediately north of Japan—and suzerainty over the northern half of liberated Korea, which had categorically been promised complete freedom and independence by the official propaganda of the United States directed throughout the Far East during the most critical stages of World War II.

Whether or not such policies of the United States Government ought to have been protested by all right-thinking and decent men in 1945 may be made clear to you by information which at that time was classified as secret. This information is now extremely important to understanding by Americans of the controversy between General MacArthur and the President.

G–2 (MILITARY INTELLIGENCE) REPORT

Before he died, President Franklin D. Roosevelt became suspicious of the aims and motives of the leaders of the Soviet Union, and particularly of the activities of the Communist International on the mainland of Asia. For his information, and for the guidance of the State Department and other top-level agencies of the Government, the Military Intelligence Division of the United States War Department undertook an exhaustive study of communism in the Far East.

In final form, this G–2 report was over 100,000 words in length.

It was delivered to the White House, the State Department, and to top commanders of the United States Army, Air Force, and Navy in all the principal theaters of war under date of July 5, 1945.

It was signed by Gen. P. E. Peabody, Chief, Military Intelligence Service. It was entitled "The Chinese Communist Movement." I have a copy of it before me as I speak.

I read to you the exact text of the five fundamental conclusions of this then secret but since declassified intelligence report:

"Careful study of all materials available and examination of over 2,500 documents and reports has led to a number of basic conclusions. * * * The most important conclusions may be summarized as follows:

"(1) The 'democracy' of the Chinese Communists is Soviet democracy.

"(2) The Chinese Communist movement is part of the international Communist movement, sponsored and guided by Moscow.

"(3) There is reason to believe that Soviet Russia plans to create Russian-dominated areas in Manchuria, Korea, and probably north China.

"(4) A strong and stable China cannot exist without the natural resources of Manchuria and north China.

"(5) In order to prevent the separation of Manchuria and north China from China, it is essential that, if Soviet Russia participates in the war, China not be divided (like Europe) into American-British and Russian zones of military operations and occupation."

There are these further conclusions set forth with extensive and detailed authentication in the body of that G–2 report:

"Throughout their history the Chinese Communists have loyally supported and followed the policies of Soviet Russia and have accepted the whole content of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.

"Contrary to the widely-advertised reports of their sympathizers, the Chinese Communists have fought the Japanese far less than have the National Government troops (of Chiang Kai-shek).

"The Generalissimo and his followers have yielded ground politically and militarily to the Communists in order to avoid an open break; as a Nationalist, Chiang Kai-shek has been primarily interested in the war against Japan."

ADMINISTRATION IGNORES INTELLIGENCE REPORT

And here, Americans, is really a punch-line in this intelligence report:

"The type of peace we shall gain by our victory over Japan depends on our success in aiding the Chinese to regain complete independence * * * for China is the center of the Far East; political, economic and military relationships in the Far East have always revolved around China. Russia became one of the leading world powers by acquiring vast regions from China. * * * Russia's growth as a far-eastern power has depended greatly upon its success in extending its influence in China."

Those are exact quotes from this military intelligence report dated July 5, 1945. It was completed too late to confirm President Roosevelt's own suspicions about the aims of the Communists. But it was delivered to Harry S. Truman and the State Department, as well as to General MacArthur's headquarters:

Nearly 3 weeks before the American appeasement at Potsdam.

Nearly 1 month before the 5-day war of the Russians against Japan, during which the third-rate remnants of the Kwantung Army of the Japanese in Manchuria offered practically no resistance.

Nearly 40 days before the delivery to the Russians of Northern Korea and northern China itself.

It is impossible to overemphasize the importance of these documented facts of record in this particular hour of confusing political propaganda.

Had they been heeded by the President of the United States and the American State Department 5½ years ago in July 1945, there would never have been:

A division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel;

An establishment of the Communist Kim Il Sung government in northern Korea, and the infiltration of Korea by the Communists;

Southern Korea would today not be shattered, and a shambles of wrecked cities, destroyed agriculture, with more than 1,000,000 South Korean dead;

China itself would be a great power in the Far East friendly to the United States under that government which we still recognize as the legal representative of more than 400,000,000 Chinese on the mainland, as well as on Formosa;

Russia and the International would not today have the power to cause internal strife in Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia, Korea, and the Philippines, as well as to pose a threat to the internal stability of Japan now that MacArthur is rendered impotent;

Nor would billions of our money be required to finance what Mr. Truman previously has labelled a police action, but which he termed, tonight, for the first time, a war;

Most important of all, there would not today be some 60,000 American dead, missing, and wounded fighting to correct political decisions made contrary to 5-year-old military knowledge.

Despite information and facts made available to the President of the United States in July 1945—the mass of which was not by any means confined to this single G–2 report—there have been more than 5 years of top-level political decisions and unilateral and secret enunciations of American policies which have month-by-month given the Russians and world Communists more power, with a corresponding decrease in the military and political effectiveness of the American people.

FANTASY BORDERING ON IDIOCY

It ought to be clear to anyone possessing common sense that to speak of political decisions in the international arena as something entirely separable and apart from military decisions is fantasy bordering on idiocy. Russian military and political decisions and policies are inseparable: the one implements or complements the other. And the unsupported United States Government propaganda of these most critical years proclaiming a chain of political victories in the so-called cold war comprise a long series of genuine military disasters for the United States and the free world when appraised by the yardstick of the record itself.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

On VE-day in 1945, Russia was in no military or political position to compel any nation to her will. British-American power was overwhelming in both the military and political sense.

Yet during the years since then, Russia has acquired domination of more than 40 percent of the world's peoples. Beginning with Estonia and reaching a high-water mark recently in Tibet, the Communists have overrun 21 formerly independent nations. It was not possible for Russia to realize this tremendous expansion by her own effort alone.

It was largely the fantastic sums of money—$19,000,000,000 provided by the United States and Great Britain and never recovered at even 10 cents on the dollar—the mountains of matériel freely given by American appeasers and raped from every territory occupied by the Soviets, and the American policy of granting Russia anything demanded that, the record shows, was responsible.

INCREDIBLE RUSSIAN DEMANDS AND AMERICAN APPEASEMENTS

The incredible extremes of such Russian demands and American appeasements is documented in the single example of a startling disclosure by the United Press, datelined Washington, August 6, 1947: I have this before me and I read it to you verbatim:

"Sledge-hammer diplomacy by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and his Deputy, Andrei A. Gromyko, forced reluctant United States Cabinet officers in 1944 to turn over to Russia the American plates for printing German occupation currency, it was revealed tonight by secret records gathered from the files of the State, War, and Treasury Departments and made available by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

"The documents show that Gen. George Marshall, then Chief of Staff, compelled Director A. W. Hall, of the United States Bureau of Printing and Engraving, to give the Russians the master plates, inks, paper, and know-how for printing this currency."

That is the end of the direct quotation. The files of the leading American news services contain additional facts uncovered during the years 1947 and 1948. Among the most important of these is the established fact that American taxpayers redeemed—via the medium of their occupation authorities in Berlin—more than $500,000,000 of this worthless currency up to 1947. There is considerable evidence that this diplomatic triumph of the Washington international policy makers cost Americans in excess of $1,000,000,000 before the occupation reichsmarks were replaced, in 1948, with the new Deutschemarks, and the unlimited and never-accounted-for printing by the Russians at American expense finally halted, after 4 years of unrestricted counterfeiting legalized by the United States Government.

Had Gen. Douglas MacArthur been guilty of this kind of a "deal" with the Russians or Communists in the Far East, he would have been labelled a traitor, court-martialed, and expelled from the service in disgrace.

On November 24, 1947, 12 former Ambassadors of the United States telegraphed the chairman of the Foregin Relations Committee as follows, and I quote:

"We, the undersigned former Ambassadors of the United States, believing that the vital interests of our country would be gravely menaced if China should fall under the domination of the Soviet Union, urge you most strongly to give essential military equipment and economic and financial aid to the Chinese Government.

"F. Lamont Belin, William C. Bullit, William M. Collier, Josephus Daniels, Wesley Frost, James W. Gerard, Boaz Long, Lithgow Osborne, William Phillips, Robert P. Skinner, William H. Standley, Alexander W. Weddel."

STATE DEPARTMENT PURGED FAR EAST EXPERTS

But by 1947, unfortunately for Americans, the leading authority on Japan and Korea, Mr. Eugene Dooman, and our greatest authority on the entire Far East, Dr. Stanley Hornbeck, had been purged by those in control of the State Department, and altogether excluded and silenced in the policies of American affairs in the world.

Despite the recommendations of the unquestionably patriotic American experts on the Far East, and directly contrary to the information and documentation supplied to the White House and the State Department in 1945 by top-level military authorities, the President according to his own statement of record caused the issuance of an ultimatum to Chiang Kai-shek that he would either take the Communists into his Government or else.

In the summer of 1946 Henry Wallace, accompanied by Owen Lattimore, were sent to China allegedly to gather the facts about the Chinese political situation and to report them to the President. The facts, of course, had already been supplied Mr. Truman a year earlier. But Mr. Truman's decision was based upon the prejudice of those who hated Chiang Kai-shek, rather than upon the knowledge of others who neither loved nor hated Chiang but instead thought in terms of what was best for the United States.

ULTIMATUM TO CHIANG KAI-SHEK

The ultimatum delivered to Chiang Kai-shek was documented in the report of January 7, 1947 by, Gen. George C. Marshall—the same policy maker reported by United Press to have caused the American currency plates to be given to the Russians. I now read to you verbatim some choice extracts from General Marshall's report:

"The greatest obstacle to peace has been the complete, almost overwhelming suspicion with which the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang (Nationalist People's Party) regard each other.

"On the one hand, the leaders of the Government are strongly opposed to a communistic form of government. On the other, the Communists frankly state that they are Marxists and intend to work toward establishing a communistic form of government in China."

To depart from the text a moment, I have emphasized some of these words for the reason that they coincide exactly with the conclusions of the secret military intelligence report issued a year and a half earlier.

Continuing General Marshall's text:

"On the side of the Nationalist Government (of China) * * * there is a dominant group of reactionaries who have been opposed, in my opinion, to almost every effort I have made to influence the formation of a genuine coalition government. They were quite frank in stating their belief that cooperation by the Chinese Communist Party in the government was inconceivable.

"On the side of the Chinese Communist Party there are, I believe, liberals as well as radicals * * * it has appeared to me that there is a definite liberal group among the Communists in disgust at the corruption evident in the local governments—men who would put the interests of the Chinese people above ruthless measures to establish a Communist ideology in the immediate future."

To depart again for a moment from this text, I add the personal observation that at no time in the allegedly corrupt local governments of China has there ever been graft and treasonably criminal activities on the scale of that quite recently reported in the American press about some of our own States, and that never during the so-called corrupt regime of Chiang Kai-shek has there ever been betrayal of the people's interests on a scale comparable to the very recent disclosures of the Nation-wide crime syndicate and in exposure of theft of the people's money in investigation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation operations. Also, that for every air-conditioning unit supposed to have been appropriated from UNRRA supplies by Chinese Nationalist officials, there has been a corresponding deep-freeze unit for officials of the United States Government and a mink coat or the equivalent for their employees.

There is the added personal opinion—well documented by news files of the past 5 years—that the so-called one-party rule of Chiang's Kuomintang in China was never more unilateral in making political and military decisions than has been the dominant Truman-Boyle-Acheson direction of our own domestic and foreign affairs without consultation in advance with leaders of the opposition parties.

FINAL BETRAYAL OF WONDERFUL WARTIME ALLY

Comes now the clincher in the January 7, 1947, statement to the American people by General Marshal. I quote:

"The salvation of the situation, as I see it, would be the assumption of leadership by the liberals in the government and in the minority parties.

"If the termination of one-party rule is to be a reality, the Kuomintang should cease to receive financial support from the (United States) Government."

In short, after saying that there were true liberals among the Communists; that the Communists were dedicated to arousing hatred against Americans; that their aim was just as much one-party Communist rule of China as that then being exercised by the reactionaries of Chiang Kai-shek's party, the United States Government declared that Chiang would either have to embrace the Communists and communism or else be deprived of all assistance of Americans.

This ultimatum was delivered, incidentally, after General Marshall had informed the President that the Chinese Communists were counting on an economic collapse of the Chiang Kai-shek government.

It was, of course, powerful diplomacy and highly decirable military tactics and strategy to hasten the economic chaos already threatening the security of the wonderful wartime ally that for three highly critical years had kept the Japanese bogged down in China itself.

For all these and many more reasons, it is not opinion but rather fact of record that the policy of what Generalissimo Truman calls the United States Government between 1945 and 1948, when the Communists began to overrun all of China.

1. To withhold from the legal Nationalist Government, aid, financial and otherwise, even after it had been voted by the American Congress.

2. To assist the Chinese Communists by deliveries to them in Manchuria and Mongolia of UNRRA relief and supplies.

3. To sanction without protest delivery to the Chinese Communists by the Russians of enormous stocks of Japanese guns, equipment and ammunition, as well as transport manufactured in the United States of America and lend-leased to Russia, which had been seized by the Soviets when they poured into Manchuria.

4. To assist the Russians via previously secret, top-level "political decisions" in acquiring control of Manchuria and North China as well as Inner and Outer Mongolia, and in addition to Northern Korea and the strategic islands north of Japan.

5. To undermine the stability of the Chinese Nationalist Government by withholding economic and other aid declared by our military authorities to be essential to the survival of this friendly power, and thus implementing the known aims of the Communists by hastening the collapse of the Nationalists.

PATRIOTIC AMERICANS MUZZLED AND DISCREDITED

General Wedemeyer, whose report was kept from the American people by the President

and excluded from the white paper on China by the State Department, and General MacArthur both repeatedly protested the folly of diplomacy certain to have disastrous effects upon the military and economic future of the United States in Asia.

But these patriots—and every other critic of the pro-Communist American policies in the Far East—have been muzzled year by year and discredited by enormous volumes of distorted facts and propaganda issued to the American people throughout the past 5½ years by the liberals in our own Government.

In 1948 the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs issued a report entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism." This was an exhaustive study comprised of more than 300 pages of careful documentation and analysis of the aims of the Soviet Union and of the Communist International as they had been expressed by their own most important leaders.

I have this report before me: House Document No. 619, published by the United States Government Printing Office in 1948.

Among other findings of this study are the following, which I read verbatim from the text:

"Lenin proclaimed the dictum: 'Some day we shall compel the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy.'

"Stalin in 1927 said: 'Our war against capitalism is inevitable.'

"Stalin in 1938 said: 'The Communist world and the capitalist world cannot coexist on the same planet.'

"Stalin in February 1946 said: 'War until the death of capitalism is our aim.'

"Stalin in September 1947 said: 'Wars are instigated only by the capitalists and imperialists * * * they must be destroyed before there can be peace.'

"Andrei Vishinsky said to the U. N. September 18, 1947: 'The United States is the leading world enemy.'

"In the same month Zhdanov said: 'The United States and capitalism are the real enemies of the Communists and Russia * * * they can be exterminated only by war.'"

The conclusion of this House Committee on Foreign Affairs, FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, chairman, may be summarized in this single sentence:

"The Communists do not believe in peace, and that their hopes are only for chaos and dictatorship must be clearly seen by all Americans."

Therein are stated both the political and military policies of the Soviet Union and of the Communist International guided and controlled by Moscow. Beginning as long ago as the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, in 1918, and unvarying throughout all the years since, the statements of these aims by Soviet leaders and their satellites consistently have made unmistakable the intent of the world Communists to kill everything we regard as decent and right and just on earth—from the spiritual conception of the Almighty to the idea of individual rights and freedom.

These year-by-year statements comprise Soviet directives as clearly stated as were the Nazi directives in Hitler's Mein Kampf and the Tojo directives first enunciated by Baron Giichi Tanaka in his notorious memorial.

After the clarification of these Soviet aims by military intelligence in 1945, and after the compilation of world Communist strategy and tactics by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1948, the counterpolicy of the United States was fondly being announced by Generalissimo Truman in these, which are his own words:

"Joe Stalin * * * you know, I kinda like good, old Joe."

UNITED STATES OPENLY INSULTED AND PILOTS MURDERED

One year ago this month Soviet fliers shot down out of the free skies of the Baltic an unarmed American plane, killing all on board. Stalin himself awarded those Red fliers the highest decoration of the Soviet Union. On April 13 the Soviet Government proclaimed to the world "We have given the brazen, imperialistic, spying Americans a lesson they won't forget." Russia ignored American protests; refused to pay indemnity; openly insulted the United States of America.

One month after this destruction of United States prestige throughout the world, the President of the United States declared: "I think we are now nearer peace than at any time."

It might be well for Americans to remember who has been responsible for ignoring the demands of both his own experts and of the Congress for a minimum of 80 Air Force groups between 1948 and Korea; who caused the disappearance of the American merchant marine from the seas of the world; who has spent more money than all of the preceding Presidents put together in the name of obtaining peace on earth, and at the same time destroyed the capacity of the United States even to defend itself.

Secretary of Defense George Marshall this week has stated that the armed might of the United States simply did not exist last June 25.

Throughout the past 5 years, Russia openly has been building up its military and political power. Throughout those same years, the United States has reduced its power from the predominant force for good on earth to a nadir of ineffectiveness.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR BETRAYAL?

Somebody in the United States Government is responsible for implementing the power of the Soviet Union by destroying the power of the United States.

Four days ago it was pointed out by the leading press services that more than 1,000,000 South Korean men are qualified and eligible for military service. On that same day, April 10, it was also officially confirmed that 120,000 South Korean Reserves had been demobilized.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur stated on that same day of April 10: That this release of South Korean Reserves from call to active duty had been caused by basic political decisions beyond his control.

Since last June, it has been the official United States policy and the official United Nations policy to have 90 percent of all those allegedly fighting for freedom in Korea American fighting men, and the bulk of the expense borne by the American taxpayer. It is now not even good business, according to the policy makers to insist that the vast available manpower of South Korea be trained and equipped to fight its own battles.

Incidentally, also on April 10, the United Sttates announced the granting to Yugoslavia of $600,000,000, "90 percent to be spent for the improvement of Yugoslavia public health and welfare." Yugoslavia has less than half the population of Korea.

ACHESON DEFINES AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The most recent major pronouncement of American foreign policy also echoing United Nations policy was made by the Secretary of State last November 29. At that time Mr. Acheson defined the will of the American people for peace, as follows:

1. The United Nations is the only means by which the United States can conduct its foreign relations.

2. The United States is prepared at all times to "negotiate just settlements of international disputes," but, whereas the Russian concept of international relations is based upon power, the American concept of foreign relations is "founded in humility plus endless patience."

"The United States," said Mr. Acheson, "shall not use its power to settle international disputes."

It was Acheson also who stated American policy last August: "The United States will not use its veto against seating the Chinese Communists in the United Nations." How could the Communists possibly interpret such a statement of American policy in any other way than as an invitation to keep trying—when they already know that Great Britain, India, and all the Soviet followers have already said "amen" to Mr. Acheson's implied invitation?

It was also Acheson who told the world in the name of the American people last year in January: "Korea is outside the defensive perimeter of the United States." Former Secretary of State Sumner Welles is authority for the statement, and I quote:

"The Communist aggression of last June 25 was the direct consequence of Acheson's statement of January"—which to all intents and purposes was a direct invitation to the Communists to go ahead and attack.

GIVE AID AND COMFORT TO OUR ENEMIES

Even after the Communist attack of last June, it was the official policy of the United States Government to give aid and comfort to the Communists of both China and North Korea. It was Mr. Acheson, Mr. Sawyer, and Mr. Truman who permitted the American Department of Commerce to ship, during the single month of last July, $3,000,000 worth of war goods to Communist China. It was also these same policy makers of the United States Government who strengthened the Chinese Communist Government during that same month by purchasing from Mao Tse-tung $12,200,000 worth of Communist goods, and you'll find the documentation for this implementation of political policies at the expense of our military policies in Korea in the United States Census Bureau's Report on Foreign Trade, issued last September 25.

The President's unilateral, unconstitutional, and internationally illegal ukase of last June, ordering Chiang Kai-shek to cease attacks against the Chinese mainland would have been considered an act of war by any other legal government on earth. The Nationalist Government of China is still recognized by both the United States and the United Nations as the only legal government of all of China. But the United States, in the name of the American people, has forbidden that Government to fight for its own life—and is now ready to discuss peace terms with the Asiatic Communists in conferences at which the Chinese Nationalists will be impotent and silenced or ignored. We are ready to make deals with aggressors about lands and areas belonging to recognized governments, but forbidding them to have a voice in the deals.

The most recent policy statement by the President was implicit in his directive of March 20 to MacArthur. This stated: "With the main forces of the enemy in Korea cleared out of South Korea, the United Nations are now prepared to discuss conditions of settlement in Korea."

Last June 27, when the President ordered General MacArthur to send American air power in support of Syngman Rhee's government—a decision then labeled "the most glorious hour in American history"—it was the declared purpose of the United States, later supported by the United Nations, to clear all of Korea of the aggressors. The primary aim of this "police action" was to prove to the world—and to Soviet Russia—that naked aggression cannot be made to pay.

Most of Acheson's statements of policy and the most recent peace aims declarations of the President evidence willingness to dicker with both the Chinese and Korean Communists on the basis of "let's stop the fighting" somewhere near the thirty-eighth parallel. To suggest that such a peace may be made on the basis of withdrawal of all foreign troops can mean only that the U. N. forces and the Chinese forces might withdraw—but the Korean Communists be left in Korea, since they are not foreign.

The aims now do not appear to be the same as the aims of last June.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

But 60,000 Americans have died, been wounded, or captured in the magnificent effort by General MacArthur to free all of Korea, as he was ordered to do last June.

MAC ARTHUR CRITICS NOW PARROT HIS WARNING

As for those who now decry what they allege is General MacArthur's intention to commit American forces on the mainland of Asia in all-out war with China—they are in the strange position today of parroting the warning of Gen. Douglas MacArthur enunciated just 1 year ago?

"Anyone thinking in terms of engaging the hordes of Asia on the Asiatic mainland ought to have his head examined."

It was not General MacArthur who engaged the masses of Asia on the Asiatic mainland in Korea. He was ordered to do so—despite his advice to the contrary—by the President of the United States.

In the light of such overwhelming evidence that what Mr. Truman calls the United States Government has consistently surrendered to the demands of the Soviet Union and to the Communist international during the past 5½ years, and the frightening signs that this same government is now willing once more to talk a new peace after previous failures to achieve peace with self-proclaimed enemies—what would you have done in the shoes of General MacArthur?

When Mr. Truman now declares that there will be no appeasement of our enemies, he utterly ignores the established record of his own appeasement of those same enemies in both Europe and Asia throughout the past disastrous 5 years.

The President is himself authority for the fact that Soviet Russia has broken every one of more than 40 international agreements signed with the United States during this time of creeping disaster—and has kept not one. It is a matter of record that during the 30 months between Potsdam, in July 1945, and December 1947, 49 official United States protests were made to the Soviet Government over violations of agreements—and at no time was Uncle Sam powerful enough diplomatically or militarily to even slap the wrist of "Good old Joe in the Kremlin."

What good now to write another treaty with enemies—until such time as they can have kept one or more of the forty-odd already written—and violated?

SUMMATION OF TRUMAN AND MAC ARTHUR AIMS

The aims of the President and of the State Department appear to be clarified unmistakably by the record of their own declarations:

"Our foreign policy is to meet the open or subversive force of the Russians and the international Communists with humility and endless patience, attested by the humility of having our flyers shot out of free Baltic skies, and the patience of 60,000 casualties in Korea. The United States will not use its power to settle disputes; the United Nations is the only means by which the United States can conduct its foreign relations."

One searches the Constitution of the United States in vain to find a paragraph, a line, or a word authorizing the President or the State Department to fulfill in such manner their oaths to preserve and protect that noblest of all documents of freemen, beginning, "We the people of the United States * * * for ourselves and our posterity."

The aims of Gen. Douglas MacArthur have repeatedly been expressed by his view that ruthless, godless force can be met effectively, in Korea, or anywhere else on earth, only with superior, Christian force.

It was the repetition of this view in his letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, dated Tokyo, Japan, March 20, 1951, that culminated in the ousting of General MacArthur by the generalissimo. General MacArthur wrote:

"Generally these (my) views are well known and clearly understood, as they follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counterforce as we have never failed to do in the past * * * as you point out, we must win. There is no substitute for victory."

Perhaps knowledge of this evidence and fact, which is but a fraction of the enormous amounts available in the official—and very often suppressed or censored files of our own Government—enables you to understand why a great American has remained true to the American people above all else in his life.

Because Gen. Douglas MacArthur swore, "To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic—so help him God."

MacArthur's View on Our Government as a Congressional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky:

THE CORE IS THE CONGRESS

An orderly mind cannot recognize anarchy as within the realm of possibility. General MacArthur once got into a controversy with Kirby Page, editor of The World Tomorrow, in 1931, about some clergymen refusing to serve in war, resulting in a strong letter in which much of his philosophy of life is stated. I take this letter from Frank Waldrop's MacArthur on War, a most interesting study of a truly philosophic mind. MacArthur wrote Page:

"The question of war and peace is one that rests, under our form of government, in Congress. In exercising this authority, Congress voices the will of the majority, whose right to rule is the cornerstone upon which our governmental edifice is built. Under the Constitution, its pronouncement on such a question is final, and is obligatory upon every citizen of the United States. That men who wear the cloth of the church should openly defend repudiation of the laws of the land, with the necessary implications arising from such a general attitude toward our statutes, seems almost unbelievable. It will certainly hearten every potential or actual criminal and malefactor who either has or contemplates breaking some other law. Anomalous as it seems, it apparently stamps the clergyman as a leading exponent of law violation at individual pleasure."

Of course, there is nothing new in this doctrine; it is clearly stated in the Constitution of the United States and in a number of decisions of the Supreme Court. Ours is a congressional government. That is, a representative Republic.

During the last 20 years much has been done to shift the center of authority from the Congress to the President, from the legislative to the Executive. But the will of the people expresses itself best in the Congress, in the debates, the disagreements, the compromises, the acts of the Congress. A willful Executive can work in secrecy and therefore unrelate himself to the will of the people.

Congress can do no business in secrecy and, therefore, cannot betray the will of the people without the knowledge of the people. If the people are careless in their vigilance of Congress, that is the fault of the people who neglect their responsibilities and obligations. But the core of our Government is the Congress and when that core rots, our Nation will fall.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his magnificent address in 1935 to the Rainbow Division, which he commanded in World War I, said:

"Where are the empires of old? Where is Egypt, once a state on a high plane of civilization where a form of socialism prevailed and where the distribution of wealth was regulated? Where are the empires of the East, and the empires of the West which once were the shrines of wealth, wisdom, and culture? Where are Babylon, Persia, Carthage, Rome, Byzantium? They all fell, never to rise again, annihilated at the hands of a more warlike and aggressive people. Their cultures, memories; their cities, ruins. * * *

"And saddest of all, the downfall of Christian Byzantium. When Constantinople fell, that center of learning, pleasure, and wealth, and all the weakness and corruption that goes with it, a pall fell over Asia and southeastern Europe which has never been lifted. * * *

"Two thousand years of existence of the Byzantine Empire, its size, its religion, the wealth of its capital city were but added incentives and inducements to an impecunious conqueror. For wealth is no protection against aggression. It is no more an augury of military and defensive strength in a nation than it is an indication of health in an individual. Success in war depends upon men, not money. No nation has ever been subdued for lack of it. Indeed, nothing is more insolent or provocative or more apt to lead to a breach of the peace than undefended riches among armed men."

It is when the hard core of a people's tradition rots away and nothing remains but individual excesses and competitions for place that a nation perishes. It is in this same speech that MacArthur said in 1935 what is so absolutely true in 1951:

"We all dream of the day when human conduct will be governed by the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount. But as yet it is only a dream. No one desires peace as much as the soldier, for he must pay the greatest penalty in war. Our Army is maintained solely for the preservation of peace, or for the restoration of peace after it has been lost by statesmen or by others."

Staggering of Loan Maturity Dates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter, dated March 26, 1951, which contains a resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota at its annual convention, held in Fargo, N. Dak., on February 14, 1951, dealing with the matter of staggering of loan maturity dates. It is a very important matter, as applying to the farmers of my State. I ask that that portion of the letter setting out the resolution be printed in the Appendix. I hope every Member of the Senate will read it.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. FRED G. AANDAHL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As of possible interest, the following is resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota at its annual convention held in Fargo, N. Dak., on February 14, 1951, recommending the staggering of loan maturity dates:

"Whereas due to the loans on grain granted to farmers through the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture maturing at approximately the same date resulting in the rails being burdened with the transportation of the old grain at the same time the new crops mature and must be moved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota recommend to the Department of Agriculture that the PMA stagger the maturity dates on small grain loans to conform to the harvesting date, thus, giving producers in all sections of the Grain Belt the same length of time on loans but at the same time enabling the rails to move the old crop ahead of the new harvest, and relieving the extraordinary demand for grain cars and required to move both old and new crops at the same time from all producing areas."

It is my understanding that the United States Department of Agriculture has decided against such a program on the 1950 crop, except that the loan dates may be advanced or loans called to meet any unforseeable emergency condition which may arise. In view of the interest manifested by the grain people in all the large grain producing States it would seem the USDA should revise its program to conform to the wishes of the producers and operators of country elevators.

Very truly yours,

R. E. CLARK.

American Legion and Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is not primarily interested in whether the American maritime industry makes 5, 10, or no percentage of profit. However, its members who have been forced to travel across submarine-infested waters cramped in the holds of dirty, hastily converted rust buckets, who have had to eat and sleep in relays for lack of proper accommodations, cannot be blamed for looking upon the transportation which gets him to the wars and—God willing—gets him home again with coldly realistic eyes.

On April 19, before the Washington Propeller Club, Mr. Bruce P. Henderson, chairman of the national security commission of the American Legion, stated the position of the organization he was representing in very accurately chosen words. His remarks seem to me to be of interest to each of us who is charged with a part of the responsibility for the readiness of a well-balanced Defense Establishment. The remarks which Mr. Henderson made are as follows:

No one among you tonight, officials and executives from the shipping and shipbuilding industries, from the Coast Guard, Navy, Army, Maritime Administration, and other segments of Government and industry interested in or concerned with the American merchant marine, ask why you are here.

You realize that your stake in a strong, healthy, and successful merchant marine is both an economic and a social one. Your jobs, your income, yes, even your way of living depends upon such an industry.

But you may be asking why I am here, as chairman of the national security commission of the American Legion—an organization of the veterans of two global wars who have associated themselves together for God and country—to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and to safeguard and to transmit to our posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy—an organization, with its auxiliary, of more than 4,000,000 Americans who are dedicated to the protection of their less fortunate comrades-in-arms and the preservation of those things for which we all have fought—an organization which, over the years, has built up such a reputation that many more millions of Americans look to it for sound leadership in matters pertaining to our national security.

In speaking to you of the merchant marine, I think it is essential that, first of all, you, who represent so many various segments of the merchant marine, and I, who am speaking for this greatest of all veterans' organizations, understand our respective positions with the utmost clarity.

Lest there be misunderstanding, may I point out that our posts are located in every State and Territory of our country and even in foreign countries where American veterans are found—they are in large metropolitan cities and in almost every crossroads hamlet—in the great shipping centers of our coasts and in the great plains of our Midwest.

Our membership comes from every walk of life and is found in every economic level of our population. It is a cross-section of America. The great majority probably never smelled salt water—nor saw a ship—until after they were in the Armed Forces. We are no more interested in shipping as a business than we are in the automobile business, or farming or mining or merchandizing.

As a great national organization, pledged to "inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation, we are devoted—not to the furtherance of any private enterprise—but to the fulfilling of that obligation by working in the public interest for the promotion of all those things which have created—and will increase—the strength of our Nation, its Government, its economy, and what we call our "American way of life."

Aggressive in our efforts to "foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism," we are intolerant of those who would undermine America in any way. Just as we oppose vigorously those subversives who seek to infiltrate into our Government and industry, do we oppose those who seek undue private advantage at the expense of our Nation and to the possible jeopardy of those who will be called upon to risk their lives in its defense.

To be brutally frank, I believe that, in this hour of national peril, when our system of Government is facing a supreme test, private interest must be subservient to the Nation's need for the conservation and efficient use of all of its resources. We are confident that the American people—generally—are taking this attitude and that our Congress is beginning to view adversely those who approach our Government to seek favors for "special interests."

And so we are not interested primarily in whether the American maritime industry makes, 5, 10, 15, or no percent of profit. Fundamentally, we are concerned with how you are solving your share of the problems that face our Nation in these troubled times. Our outlook upon the merchant marine must, of necessity, be cold-blooded, realistic and, on behalf of those whose lives may depend upon you, selfish.

Hard words? Perhaps.

But to men who have fought in muddy foxholes—or have seen their friends plunge to earth in a mass of burning metal or sink quietly beneath the waves—who know what our men in Korea are going through (and those boys become men awfully fast), war is a cold-blooded and realistic thing, and that instinct of self-preservation which is developed so rapidly demands that we examine our merchant marine as critically as a combat soldier examines any other of his weapons.

Our members, who have been forced to travel across submarine-infested waters cramped in the holds of dirty, hastily converted rust buckets, who have been forced to wait in line to get on a jerry-built toilet seat, who have had to eat and sleep in relays for lack of proper accommodations, who have been on a merchant ship that has received so many Coast Guard waivers it's about as acceptable in wartime as an old toothless shark is to his hungry companions, can't be blamed for looking upon the transportation which gets him to the wars, and—God willing—gets him home again, with coldly realistic eyes.

No, gentlemen, to be perfectly honest with you, and to lay all the cards face up on the table, you must understand that basically we cannot be interested in profits, in salaries, in good or bad jobs or in adequate dividends on shipping and shipbuilding stocks.

But don't get me wrong. Sure, these things are important. They are the foundation of free enterprise which has made our Nation what it is today. We know that a successful and healthy maritime industry must have a fair and reasonable profit. We know that these things are tremendously important to you gentlemen here tonight, to any and all of you who depend upon the American merchant marine for his job, his pay check, his dividend payment, to you who have bet your blue chips on this great industry. We have no quarrel with that. I'm just trying to emphasize that we are fighting for the public welfare and not for any "special interest."

I don't want you to forget that the boys who must fight our wars overseas are also interested in your merchant marine, although perhaps in none of these things you hold so dear. They're interested in their lives, in their chances of getting to where they must fight; and in their safe, and comfortable if they can get comfort, return to the land they love so well.

Does all this sound like the beating of emotional drums? I assure you it is not meant to be so. It is only that there are so many Americans who are so concerned with their economic stake in their own particular industry that their thoughts are confined largely to that one small sphere. They don't see the over-all picture. They tend to forget that historically our wars are fought on foreign soils instead of our own, and that,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to carry the war to the enemy, millions of American boys must be carried, preponderantly by our own American merchant marine, to such shores and home again.

You might surmise from these remarks that the American Legion and its millions of members have never been cognizant of these facts before.

The American merchant marine is no newfound love of the American Legion. The history of our organization reveals some very interesting episodes. For example, at our national convention in Kansas City in 1921, just 30 years ago, the American Legion advocated the building, operation, and maintenance of a privately owned and operated United States merchant marine adequate to meet the needs of the Armed Forces in time of war or national emergency, and to serve the commercial requirements of our Nation in time of peace.

Subsequently, for more than a quarter of a century at 30 national conventions, in New Orleans, in Paris, France, in Cleveland, Detroit, Boston, St. Louis, New York, Los Angeles, Miami, and elsewhere, the thousands of delegates at these conventions have mandated our organization to take all practical steps to build up the American merchant marine to a size commensurate with the importance of the United States in world affairs; to provide subsidies if and when necessary to overcome the disparity between American operating and building costs and those of foreign competitors; to ask that at least 50 percent of the trade of the United States be carried in American ships flying the "stars and stripes" and manned by loyal American officers and men; to urge our own members to use American merchant ships for trade and travel.

Tonight you gentlemen here hail the 1936 Merchant Marine Act as your Magna Carta, as a sort of Bible expressing the policy for justification of a strong and healthy American merchant marine. And yet, without assuming undue credit, it is significant that the American Legion was urging, asking, insisting upon the very policies contained in that act at least 12 years prior to its introduction and passage.

In comparatively recent years old-timers in the Legion have listened benignly to expressions from those in your industry which have called the American merchant marine "our fourth arm of national defense," the sine qua non to the successful utilization of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. And yet, again referring to the history of the Legion, 19 years ago at New Orleans, our national convention expressed this same philosophy. In recent years we have been even more insistent "that the development and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine as the fourth dimension of our national defense should be carried out consistently as the national policy declaration of existing law."

It may not be modest to boast about the American Legion and its policies, yet it is only human nature to point with pride to the fact that every Legion mandate about the merchant marine has been amazingly consistent with the verdict of history. The reason is a simple one. Millions of us, in two major World Wars, have had our lives depend upon fast, efficient, and safe troop transports, and the tankers and cargo ships that delivered our supplies.

The foot soldier, in his trench or fox hole was deeply concerned with his supply of food, clothing, and ammunition. The tank or bomber crew soon realized the terrific problem in logistics of supplying it with sufficient fuel, ammunition, and bombs. Even the pilot of the Air Transport Command plane, carrying whole blood across the Atlantic from New York City to the wounded in the Bulge in 24 hours, and returning those wounded to their own country, knew that his mission depended upon the merchant ships that carried the 2,700 gallons of gasoline he took on at the Azores and the food that fed the essential ground personnel there.

Is it any wonder, then, that Legionnaires are fully exercising their rights, as citizens and veterans, in demanding and expecting that the United States shall maintain the kind of an American merchant marine so specifically described in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936? This declaration of policy relates, far better than I, exactly what kind of an adequate and well-balanced shipping fleet this country must have.

With these things in mind, we are determined that Americans shall not learn, from their own bitter experience, the historic fact that nations which have allowed their merchant shipping to fall into decay and decline have also found that their military, political, and economic leadership had disappeared. The stakes are simply too great today to permit anything less than the world's finest merchant marine for the United States of America.

But now we must consider a grievous error which so many national and even local organizations make. Perhaps your Propeller Club has made the same mistake as that made by the Legion up to 1946.

For nearly a quarter of a century, annually and frequently more often, at national executive committee meetings during the year, the American Legion adopted the strongest and most forthright resolutions concerning the American merchant marine. As good and as stimulating as was all of this activity, it became apparent by 1946 that such resolutions were not in themselves sufficient to convince Americans why we must have a strong and adequate merchant marine.

By 1946 we began to witness the diminishing strength of our merchant fleet and shipbuilding activity; our war-built vessels were being sold to foreign interests to compete with our own fleet; the drums began to beat for rebuilding even the fleets of our former enemies; we were failing to build fast, efficient, new ships to replace those lost, damaged, or worn out in World War II; foreign countries, in an effort to build up their own merchant fleets, began to practice unfair discriminations against our shipping while receiving the same treatment in American seaports as that enjoyed by our own ships; our domestic merchant fleet appeared to be slowly strangling to death, and, even worse, a new philosophy began to gain ground that we should, in event of future wars, rely upon the merchant fleets of foreign countries rather than upon a strong one of our own.

It became clear to us in the American Legion by mid-1946 that resolutions and conferences, however stimulating they may be, are simply not enough when a major arm of our national security is imperiled by ideologists, global do-gooders, and economic theorists, often flaunting their unsound but lollypop-tasting philosophies in the very face of that greatest of all American institutions, the Congress of the United States.

Moreover, another and perhaps more timely lesson became so clear as to be startling in its implications. The development of new weapons during and since World War II, and the amazing speed of war itself made us recognize that to have an adequate, strong American merchant marine in times of war or national emergency, we no longer can wait until we are suddenly plunged into war to begin to build such a fleet. We must have a strong merchant marine in times of peace.

I am well aware that such an apparent lesson may be an old story to you gentlemen who deal daily with maritime problems. But I am convinced that this lesson still has not been generally learned by all Americans.

Thus it was in 1946, at our annual national convention in San Francisco, that our national security commission recommended and the convention mandated our millions of members to begin a continuous information and education program in the interests of our fourth arm of national security—the American merchant marine. It became then, and has been ever since, our avowed and patriotic policy to acquaint our membership and the American people, with the necessity for and requirements of the American merchant marine.

Since that time, in cooperation with the maritime industry, the Government and the Congress, tens of thousands of our members have devoted their time, attention, and often energy to this objective of providing more information and education about our fourth arm of security.

It is a tremendous task to inform and educate the membership of an organization as large as ours, and even more laborious to have that membership carry the facts to the public in general. We feel, however, that we have made significant progress during these last 5 years.

During this period, we have printed and distributed well over a half-million pieces of literature—booklets, brochures, pamphlets, folders, personal letters, and bulletins devoted to the facts about the merchant marine. Talks about the American merchant marine have been made in thousands of our 30,000 posts and auxiliary units, located in nearly every city and town in the Nation. In addition, Legionnaires, well acquainted with the facts, have appeared before other civic, business or professional groups, carrying such information to the public and enlisting their support for this cause which is to their own ultimate interest and benefit.

It may surprise you to learn that the American Legion, through its national security commission, has had at least a half-dozen national radio shows, each carried on more than a thousand radio stations, telling and retelling the facts about our fourth arm of security in a dramatic and compelling way.

Through the cooperation of the industry we have been distributing, for nearly the past 4 years, an exceptionally fine motion picture about the merchant marine, which has been seen by well over 2,000,000 Legionnaires, their families, and friends.

More than 25,000 Legionnaires have completed our extension institute which gives them the background, history, programs, activities, and services of our organization. An entire chapter in this course is devoted to the merchant marine.

About a year and a half ago, with the whole-hearted cooperation of your National Federation of American Shipping, the national security commission began publication of a monthly, 4-page Merchant Marine Bulletin, designed to keep about 2,000 of our officers and members engaged in merchant marine or security committee work abreast of developments in our fourth arm of security. Circulation started growing with the first issue, and now the Legion's Merchant Marine Bulletin is mailed each month to more than 17,000 posts in every State, as well as to the other Legionnaires, for a total circulation of about 21,000. Members are urged to pass the bulletin along to their comrades, and total readership may well surpass the 100,000 mark.

All this and more has been done, is being done now, and will be continued in the future by the American Legion. We receive daily proof that this information and education program is outstandingly successful. Such results continually assure us that our original beliefs and convictions are sound, are right, are in the best interests of our Nation. Moreover, such a program convinces us that the American people want, and should receive, the facts about our American merchant marine.

If there is any comment I can make to you gentlemen here tonight, who are so familiar with the merchant marine, it is our

conviction of the need for still more and better information about your industry.

Right now we, of the American Legion, feel there is a desperate shortage of high speed, large, passenger-carrying vessels, quickly convertible to troop vessels if warranted by events which seem extremely close today. From what we have read and heard, there also appears to be a serious shortage of large and fast tanker ships, and particularly a necessity for a ship-replacement program worthy of a nation as productive as ours, of sufficient size to meet our growing international responsibilities. Many of us also hold the sincere conviction of the justification for a reemphasis by the Congress of the United States of the increasingly important role played by the American merchant marine in both peace and war.

These basic facts may sound as shopworn to you as a politician's speech at the end of his campaign. But we are convinced that millions of Americans are still not sufficiently aware of them.

A great American once said, "Give the people the facts, then rely upon their decisions."

We believe that when more Americans possess all the facts about the American merchant marine, they will demand that Old Glory fly at the mastheads of the world's finest, most efficient, and safest fleet of merchant ships; that they will realize that nothing short of an American merchant marine strong enough to meet all the needs of our commerce and travel in peacetime and immediately available to meet the needs of emergency of war, is safe or sensible and that they will insist upon the strengthening of this fourth arm of our national security.

Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Sunday Journal of April 15, 1951:

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

The hope for the future for the American people is bound up in two things: One, that the forces of aggression will not start a third world war this year or next, and two, that the electorate will take advantage of its opportunity in 1952 to change party control in Washington. If a conflict at arms does not develop, involving the democracies with the Red aggressors, including Soviet Russia, and if the American people vote in a commonsense way in the interest of national welfare and security, the situation may be saved in spite of the harm that is being done today by an officialdom that is inept and untrustworthy.

In recent months the public has had its eyes opened to a shocking state of affairs in Washington. It has been apprised of official transgressions in many directions, of abuses of power by a multitude of officials for which the administration directly is responsible but for whom it makes no apology, of questionable relationships between highly placed officials and the scum of the underworld, of errors in judgment at the very seat of power that are shocking, almost unbelievable. Now at last the people have ample opportunity to realize what a serious mistake was made in the Presidential election of 1948.

Harry S. Truman never has been considered a big, broad-gage, understanding man. Indeed, he has his limitations. Before he went to the United States Senate at a nod from Tom Pendergast, of Kansas City, racketeer and party machine boss, he was known as an average man. He never had done anything worthy of notice by his neighbors. Yet this man became President of the United States, and today, according to trusted observers in Washington, is incompetent and inefficient. Not only that, but he does not even have sufficiently good judgment to select the biggest men available to help him in his difficult job. And how that man needs help.

Mr. Truman has the better part of 2 years yet to serve as Chief Executive of the country. The election will be held a year from next November, when a new Congress is to be chosen, and also, let it be hoped, a new President of the United States. The next administration will begin in January 1953. If Russia only will hold off until then, and if in November of 1952 the people vote in the best interests of themselves, their country, and posterity, there may be some daylight for us in the future.

Not in our entire history has there been such a great need as a new regime in Washington when the present Truman term expires. It will be our great good fortune if a third world war does not come while Harry Truman is in office. Constitutionally, as both Mr. Truman and Franklin D. Roosevelt were so fond of reminding their fellow citizens, he is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. He can, if he wishes, tell the foremost military men in the service what to do. He can decide matters of strategy. He has power almost without limit over men of great experience, training, and ability. It is a strange thing that fate permitted a man of his type to guide the destinies of a nation and people such as this is when he had so little with which to do it.

MacArthur Speech Should Clarify Objectives in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by John S. Knight, esteemed American publisher, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press editions of Sunday, April 22, 1951:

MACARTHUR SPEECH SHOULD CLARIFY OUR OBJECTIVES IN KOREA

Gen. Douglas MacArthur's moving and dramatic speech to Members of Congress and the American people should serve one all-important purpose:

The clarification and determination of our objectives in Korea.

I have repeatedly said in these columns that, as a nation, we would never be content with fighting a limited war that had as its purpose the indefinite containment of the enemy with no decisive victory in sight.

To do so would simply not be in the American tradition.

President Truman, Gen. Omar Bradley, and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have all adopted the view that we can carry on our efforts to stop aggression in Korea without appeasement and without precipitating a cataclysm of arms.

To this, General MacArthur replied: "There is no substitute for victory."

All thinking Americans must agree with MacArthur, and with the architects of our foreign policy, that a land invasion of Red China is unthinkable.

But there is a great division of opinion in this country between the MacArthur recommendation that we bomb China's strongholds and the administration's position that we should do nothing to risk an all-out war with Russia.

This is the basic conflict that led to MacArthur's dismissal by the President. It is being debated in every home, office, and factory throughout the land.

Without recounting all of the pros and cons of this second great debate, it is sufficient to say that in his address General MacArthur fully exposed the vital weaknesses of the Truman administration.

MacArthur was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in Korea.

MacArthur was furnished no clear directives following entrance of the Chinese Reds into the Korean war.

MacArthur's request for reinforcements was denied.

As the United Nations sought to appease Red China, MacArthur believed that we should strike at the heart of their military and industrial strength and thus bring the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

To a man of General MacArthur's background, fighting a war without using all of the weapons at his command was beyond comprehension.

When his soldiers asked why military advantages were being surrendered to the enemy, as MacArthur told the Congress Thursday: "I could not answer."

For his vigorously expressed opinion concerning the conduct of the Korean war, General MacArthur was relieved by a petulant President who brooks no opposition from political or military subordinates.

A bigger man than Harry Truman might have found some way to work with General MacArthur and utilize his great prestige in the Far East.

As things were, however, the break was inevitable.

Tragic as we may consider General MacArthur's dismissal to be, once the Nation's highly pitched emotions have calmed down and the parades are over, public opinion will demand that our future policy in Korea be sharply defined.

The people will not long be fooled into accepting Secretary Acheson's assurances that we are pursuing a "steadfast course" in Korea with "unflinching determination."

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Actually, we are conducting a "diplomat's war"; draining away the blood and resources of our country without decisive results.

This situation, I predict, will not be tolerated indefinitely. Either we must push on, or pull out.

General MacArthur's speech has given the people of this country an understanding of our plight and the courage to demand an accounting from our leadership.

If, from his words, and out of the discussions to follow, can be evolved a sane, realistic course of action, General MacArthur's personal tragedy may become the Nation's gain.

In some 30 years of newspaper work, I have never listened to a more touching and superbly presented address than General MacArthur's.

On either side sat ordinarily unsentimental newspaper editors with streams of tears coursing down their cheeks.

Here, indeed, was visible evidence of the tremendous spiritual influence which MacArthur exerts upon those who come into contact with him.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The quiet dignity of the statesman; the pride of a soldier; the reasoned tones of the advocate; the spirit of a patriot.

Yes; this was MacArthur, concealing his emotions in the vastness of his great soul.

As he stood there in the Chamber of the Capitol, strong and erect, the commanding magnetism of his personality was immediately felt by everyone present.

Here was no mere soldier-politician seeking vindication or warming rounds of applause; but a giant among men.

He spoke without rancor or bitterness, yet his references were pointedly direct.

No other speech in our times, with the possible exception of Winston Churchill's famous blood, sweat, and tears exhortation to the British people in the darkest hour of their history, has made such a profound impression upon human minds.

A great American patriot has come to the end of his glorious career. His life, his work, and his character remain as the Nation's heritage.

"Old soldiers never die; they just fade away." so the ballad goes.

But in the minds and hearts of his countrymen, the example of MacArthur, the magnificent, will ever hearten the timid and inspire the strong.

Living or dead, the footprints of such men as Douglas MacArthur are stamped indelibly upon the sands of time.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Aid to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a bill was introduced in both Houses of Congress to extend to the State of Israel a grant-in-aid amounting to $150,000,000. This bill has wide bipartisan sponsorship. In the Senate, it is sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT and 34 of their colleagues. In the House, our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., are sponsoring a similar bill. We can truly say that, in this case, Israel serves as an inspiration to the leadership of both political parties for a notable demonstration of congressional unity.

In extending this grant-in-aid to Israel, we shall be helping her in solving one of the tragic refugee problems of our time—the problem of the homeless Jewish refugees. This is a great humanitarian undertaking which deserves our support.

Israel's success as a democratic state will depend in large measure on the development and stabilization of its economy. A sound economy and a democratic society go hand in hand and should prove to be a determining factor in making Israel impervious to Communist propaganda. The people of Israel are a freedom-loving nation. After a 2,000-year struggle to gain their freedom and independence, they can be relied upon to resist with all the power at their disposal any attempt by a foreign power to destroy their independence and enslave the people.

For the past three decades the United States has supported Jewish aspirations in Palestine, so that today we have the most cordial relations between this country and Israel. As early as June 20, 1922, the Congress of the United States unanimously went on record in support of the "aspirations of the Jewish people to rebuild their ancient homeland." Since then we have voiced our support in word and deeds on numerous occasions, thereby maintaining and continually extending the traditional relationship between the American people and the people of Israel.

Just as American financial aid was helpful to other countries in the achievement of their economic stability and strengthening of their political freedom, so in the case of Israel financial assistance from the United States will surely inspire the achievement of economic equilibrium in Israel.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Israel aid bill when it comes before the House.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Murray Frank, which is published in the April 1951 issue of the New Palestine:

GRANT IN CONGRESS URGED AS SAFEGUARD FOR ISRAEL

(By Murray Frank)

WASHINGTON.—A great stride forward has been made here to secure a grant-in-aid for Israel from the United States in the amount of $150,000,000. A group of 36 Senators, headed by Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) and ROBERT A. TAFT (Republican, Ohio), introduced a bill in the Senate on April 2 urging the extension of financial aid to Israel for the above sum. An identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Democratic Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Republican Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Originally scheduled for introduction on March 22, the bills had to be postponed until after the Easter recess of Congress. Protocol requires that a formal request for financial aid must first be submitted through the proper Government channels by the country seeking such aid. The Ambassador of Israel, Abba Eban, was prepared to submit the formal request to Secretary of State Dean Acheson but in view of the latter's absence from Washington during a good part of March, the meeting between the two did not occur until March 22. Coincidentally, Congress took its recess that day resulting in the postponement.

The bipartisan bill—sponsored by 19 Democrats and 17 Republicans in the Senate—is known as the Israel Aid Act of 1951, but already it is being referred to as the Douglas-Taft bill in the Senate or the McCormack-Martin bill in the House. It contains these highlights:

Financial aid in the form of grants is to be extended to Israel to assist it in developing its natural resources, expand its agricultural and industrial economy, increase its productive capacity and strengthen the friendship between the people of Israel and the American people; a sum of $150,000,000 is to be appropriated during the period ending June 30, 1952, but until the appropriation is made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be authorized to advance $50,000,000 to Israel without interest and this sum is to be repaid when the funds become available following enactment of the bill.

NEEDS OUTLINED

In the memorandum submited by Ambassador Eban to Secretary Acheson, who promised to give full consideration to Israel's request, the economic needs and problems of the Jewish State are outlined:

The shortage of foreign exchange makes it impossible for Israel to attain economic stability, while the lack of raw materials and capital goods impedes its agricultural and industrial development; large-scale Jewish immigration must continue and the immigrants must be absorbed, over a half-million have been admitted in the last 2½ years and another 500,000 are expected in the next 3 to 4 years. The memorandum indicated that the money is to be used for the following purposes; $30,000,000 toward the cost of 70,000 housing units; $105,000,000 for supplies, including wheat; $25,000,000, petroleum; $25,000,000, fodders; $15,000,000 and $40,000,000 for oilseeds, fertilizers, cotton, and textiles, leather, chemicals, etc.; the remainder of $15,000,000 will be used to cover the costs of shipping and insurance in connection with the importation of these supplies.

Senator DOUGLAS and TAFT issued a joint statement indicating the reasons why the United States should grant economic assistance to Israel at this time. Israel, the statement says, has emerged from a bitter struggle for independence "with courage, honor, and success," it has created "a democratic political structure and participated as a respected member in the councils of the United Nations." Next to Turkey, Israel "probably has the strongest army in the Near East," the country has achieved notable gains in agriculture and industry but because of the tremendous growth in population, its standard of living was reduced and it is now threatened with inflation. Other factors mentioned are Israel's strategic location, its importance as a force for democracy, etc. The Senators end their statement with this observation:

"This can be a timely and effective contribution to the protection of the free world and a welcome continuation of American assistance to a people whose initiative, enterprise, and dedication to the building of a genuinely democratic state in the Near East are an inspiration to all."

COSPONSORS LISTED

House leaders MCCORMACK and MARTIN issued somewhat similar, through briefer, statements at the time they introduced the bill in the House of Representatives. For the sake of the record, the Senators who are cosponsors of the Douglas-Taft bill are: Democrats—CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico; WILLIAM BENTON and BRIEN MCMAHON, Connecticut; GUY GILLETTE, Iowa; THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Missouri; LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming; EDWIN JOHNSON, Colorado; ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee; HARLEY M. KILGORE and MATTHEW W. NEELY, West Virginia; HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington; JAMES MURRAY, Montana; HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Maryland; and JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island; Republicans—OWEN BREWSTER and Mrs. MARGARET C. SMITH, Maine; HUGH BUTLER, Nebraska; HARRY P. CAIN, Washington; JAMES DUFF and EDWARD MARTIN, Pennsylvania; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota; IRVING M. IVES, New York; HENRY C. LODGE and LEVERETT M. SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts; WAYNE L. MORSE, Oregon; CHARLES TOBEY, New Hampshire; and MILTON YOUNG, North Dakota.

It may be asked: What are the prospects for early and favorable action on the Israel aid bill? Despite its bipartisan character and the fact that more than a third of the Members of the Senate as sponsors, prompt

and speedy action is not assured. There is considerable degree of sympathetic interest in the matter but it will be an uphill struggle and a long journey. If the State Department should give its approval, passage of the bill will be assured—but this is by no means certain. Undoubtedly, certain conditions of a military and strategic nature may be put forth and other obstacles may arise.

SILVER GIFT HONORS TAFT

An event of considerable interest took place here a few days before the bill was introduced in Congress. At a luncheon given by Ohio Zionists, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver presented a set of 500 volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT to the Israel Knesset. The volumes, covering a period of 43 years, were accepted by Ambassador Eban, who praised the graceful initiative of Dr. Silver and others for making possible the presentation of the books.

Dr. Silver spoke of Senator TAFT's aid to the cause of Zionism in the years preceding the establishment of the Jewish State and listed many instances where TAFT was helpful in recent years, including his support and sponsorship of the bill to extend to Israel a grant-in-aid of $15,000,000. The Zionists of Ohio, he said, express their affection for Senator TAFT who did so much to help establish Israel by presenting these books, each of which will bear the imprint that it was given in his honor for his devotion to the Jewish cause.

Senator TAFT was very moved by this gift in his name. He, too, reminisced about his early efforts on behalf of a Jewish Palestine, he spoke in glowing terms of Israel as a truly democratic state and voiced the opinion that Israel is entitled to every assistance from the American Government. TAFT maintained that Israel actually rendered the United States an economic service by receiving hundred of thousands of refugees.

Seated at the head table with Dr. Silver, Senator TAFT and Ambassador Eban were also Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, Librarian of Congress Dr. Luther Evans, Benjamin V. Cohen, former counselor of the State Department, members of the United States delegation to the U. N., and others.

Ambassador Myron M. Cowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ambassador Myron M. Cowen at the commencement exercises at Silliman University, Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental, on Tuesday, April 3, 1951:

When I accepted the invitation to speak to you today I thought of the many things that could be said—and that usually are said—to young people reaching this stage of their lives. I thought of the day when those words of counsel and encouragement were spoken to me, and of the many times I have heard them since. It struck me that the ideas and values and sentiments had changed little during those years, and that the truths and virtues and objectives they touched upon were no less valid today, but it seemed that somehow there was something wrong with the pace.

There is an urgency and immediacy in life today that gives us less time to ponder its problems, less time to translate our decisions into action. And, as our world has shrunk in terms of time, so have its problems assumed a greater intimacy with our individual lives.

It is because of this intimacy that I decided not to speak to you, but, instead, to speak directly to Pablo.

None of you, perhaps, knows Pablo personally. He graduated with the class of 1950—not from this institution, but from one very much like it, one of Manila's better schools. There was little to distinguish him from his classmates except a certain moodiness that sometimes made him seem almost sullen. There was no more than that to explain why, one day soon after graduation, he joined the dissidents and disappeared into the hills. We can only wonder and ask, as I am asking today.

Why, Pablo, did you feel that your place was outside the free society cherished and upheld by most of your countrymen? You had just received a liberal education in a school where, on one side of you had sat a son of a great landowner, on the other the son of a small farmer in Pampanga. During your years at school you came to know all of the great minds that have contributed to man's progress. You were probably stirred by those revolutionary leaders who led their people to freedom and independence. But why, Pablo, did you choose to join a revolution that is trying to turn the clock back?

Your people have fought for centuries to secure freedom and independence. They have had it for only a few years. Why do you now want to turn them back to a system where man's thought and speech and life itself are rigidly controlled by a small group who hold power only through ruthless force and oppression? Why do you want to turn your country over to a colonialism which has been reaching out for control of Asia since the time of the czars?

When you wave the red flag and shout slogans fresh from the Moscow propaganda mills, when you name your secret propaganda schools "Stalin universities," do you mean that you want for your nation the kind of independence enjoyed by Poland, which, after centuries of struggle against Russian imperialism is today ruled by a Russian general who scarcely can speak Polish? Or like Czechoslovakia, whose greatest heroes and liberators have been liquidated or driven to suicide?

I assume, Pablo, that as a student, you were genuinely moved by the poverty of all too many of your countrymen; that in joining the Communists you really hoped to aid the poor. Have you looked about you in recent months at the fertile farmlands that lie idle because your bloody raids have killed or terrified the farmers who once tilled them? Have you seen the hordes of refugees huddled in the larger towns and cities in improvised temporary shelters, eating what little can be distributed by relief agencies? They are there because you have made life on their own lands and in their own barrios intolerable for them. They could be producing food for themselves and the rest of your people were it not for fear of you. Yes, Pablo, fear of you and the others who claim to be their friends—friends who burn their homes, violate their womenfolk, and loot their few miserable belongings.

Maybe you did not understand that you were working to place your nation under the direct and despotic rule of a master from Moscow or Peiping. But just what do you think you have done to help your country, Pablo? Perhaps you are proud of having murdered some unarmed Americans recently. But aside from destroying a promising new enterprise and throwing a number of your people out of work, what did you and your Communist leaders hope to accomplish by that cowardly crime? Disgrace your nation? The world knows that murder can occur anywhere and is no more or less contemptible wherever it occurs, but that it is only the murderers who are despised. Or did you hope to frighten all Americans away, leaving this country to face aggression alone? You should know better than that, Pablo, if only from the thousands of Americans who have but recently given their lives in defense of the independence of Korea.

There was a time when the peaceful beauty of your countryside could be enjoyed in safety at any hour of the day or night. Today, near your haunts, sudden death or robbery lurks behind the beauty of every bamboo grove. Gaiety, charm, hospitality, and devoted fellowship have long been traditions of your race. Today, in many places, Communist doctrine has substituted hatred, suspicion, and naked fear. It may be necessary for you to destroy the spirit of your people before they can become willing slaves of Red tyranny, but do you think your nation can ever honor you for it?

To those who have never read a book or a newspaper or listened to a radio, the lies and distortions and shameless deceptions of your "Stalin universities" may be persuasive. But what of the others who know the difference, who can hear and read the big lie of the Reds, and, at the same time are living the freedoms of democracy? I am told that just recently many here in the Philippines heard Red China's radio telling the Chinese people of the "hundreds of thousands of Chinese being brutally tortured and mistreated in the Philippines." Apparently a base was being laid for a program of brutal retaliation here if the opportunity ever came. But the derisive laugh that went up from the Chinese living peacefully in these islands could almost be heard in Peiping.

Today in Manila there are a number of people on trial, charged with being parties to a Communist conspiracy against the state, as well as complicity in a number of vicious criminal acts. Their trial has been going on for many weeks. They are defended by some of the best legal minds in the land. Evidence is being weighed with the greatest care, and their every right under the constitution of this Republic is being jealously guarded by the judiciary, by the press, and by various civic organizations—all of which communism is pledged to destroy. Contrast that, Pablo, with your system of marching people down to a river bank and shooting them in the back. Or with justice in Soviet states, where people are arrested and simply disappear, or appear at farcical trials where—dull-eyed and haggard—they mechanically repeat ridiculous confessions.

Just recently some university students felt they had a grievance and demanded that they be heard. The President of the Philippine Republic left his work in Baguio and flew down to Manila to discuss the matter with them. Can you picture Mr. Stalin doing that, Pablo? That is just a small sample of the democratic way of life you and your cohorts want to destroy.

You and they must know the value of those democratic freedoms, Pablo, because you protest frantically whenever it seems that they are being denied to you in your efforts to tear down the very system under which they exist. But most of your fellow countrymen know their value, too. They want to continue to be able to speak their minds freely and openly. They want schools and a press that can bring them the truth about all the world, not a carefully strained bit of intellectual pap padded out with lies and inventions. They want their priests and ministers to guide them in the religion of their choice without the constant threat of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

prison and humiliation that hangs over the clergy in Soviet satellite states. They want the freedom to move about or stay where they please, to work at tasks to their liking, to enjoy the privacy of their homes and the loyalty of their families. Each one of these freedoms is taken from them under Soviet rule, Pablo. Why do you want to do that to your fellow men?

You see, Pablo, I am still giving you the benefit of the doubt. I am assuming that perhaps you are not like the hardened Communist agitator simply greedy for power. Do you honestly believe that Communist rule would give your people a better living? And do you think it worth sacrificing those freedoms I have mentioned? Remember, now, that even your poorest peasant enjoys those rights and freedoms today.

As for the better living, it is very easy for you to get the facts. If you carefully analyze statistics that trickle out from under the iron curtain you can readily see that even in Soviet Russia itself it still takes many more man-hours of labor to earn a loaf of bread or suit of clothes than in democratic lands—this despite the fact that Soviet satellite countries are drained of everything they can spare above barest subsistence. But let us look at it from another angle. If you are really sincere in your desire to improve this country's standard of living, have you considered every means possible without making slaves of your people?

Of course, most obvious is what could be done by restoring peace and order, by putting people and fertile lands back to work producing more food and other products for your own consumption and for sale abroad. By making traffic on your roads free and safe, so that food from your farms could come to your cities and the products from your industries and imports returned to the farmer—all at lower cost because there would be no need to offset losses by looting. And think of the millions in taxes that would be saved if it were not for the unproductive but grim necessity of hunting you down and stopping you from committing more murders.

For an educated man, Pablo, there is the challenge of old and wasteful methods in agriculture. Have you thought how quickly you could relieve the peasant's grinding toil by showing him how to double and treble his crop by modern means and less labor? And how you could lead him into the rich, untouched lands your government offers pioneers—lands that would become his own? And what have you done about malaria which, aside from the suffering it causes, costs your people many days of useful work?

There is a need to process and find new uses for your raw materials, to explore and develop some of the untapped riches of your land. There is a need for competent professional people, for teachers and engineers, for administrators and organizers, for public servants and legislators. Where, incidentally, were your so-called champions of the worker, Pablo, when your Congress was working hard to hammer out a minimum-wage law that ultimately will increase the earnings of almost 90 percent of this country's workers.

At any rate, Pablo, these are some of the things that need doing for the good of your land. And, whether you and your fellow outlaws like it or not, America is going to help your country do them. We are going to help because the great majority of your countrymen have invited us to help; because they regard us as friends and good neighbors and we feel the same about them. Ours is one relationship that your poison pen pals at Pravda will never break up. True, because of their efforts, the requirements of the free world on our resources for defense and development are heavy. But the American people have shouldered the burden without complaint, firm in the conviction that the survival of freedom is worth any sacrifice.

In your country, as elsewhere in Asia, we are willing to help to the limit of our resources in the real revolution of our time, the constructive revolution that has as its objectives the overthrow of human misery and want and the elevation to power of such forms of free society as best fit the needs, the tastes, and the cultural aspirations of the people who comprise them. All that we seek to gain from the success of such revolution is the assurance that we, as well as all others, may live and work out our destiny in a world community ruled by reason, morality, and a decent respect for the rights of others. There is a place for you in that world, Pablo, but you will have to wash the blood off your hands and leave your gun outside.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 17), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] to the Jefferson-Jackson Day audience at York, Pa., on April 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a distinct honor and pleasure for me to be here this evening and to join with you in paying tribute to the memory of those two great Americans, who have given our country and our party the lofty political principles by which this Nation has achieved its present greatness.

Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson need not be recalled to your minds on this occasion with eloquent words or phrases. It will suffice to say that their epoch-making achievements have left to succeeding generations of Americans a rich and indelible heritage upon which we have patterned this way of life.

I am particularly glad to be here in Pennsylvania, for next to the people of my own State there is no group toward whom I feel closer than the citizens of this great Commonwealth. Pennsylvania has always been a friendly and helpful neighbor to us in Delaware, and in the course of this Nation's proud history our two States have separately and together played important and vital roles.

This fine city of York, which, I understand, was known as the "Bread basket of America" during colonial days, has certainly contributed more than its share to the successful growth and development of the Keystone State. Indeed, there are many of us who gaze longingly at the fertile land and the high productiveness of the farm acreage in this section of Pennsylvania. As a farmer I can say with authority that I wish we had some of your good earth in Delaware.

It is very pleasant also this evening to have the opportunity of becoming better acquainted with your able Congressman, JIM LIND, who is doing such a superb job in Washington. He and the members of the dinner committee have already made us feel very much at home.

There was a time, I suppose, when the membership of political parties could gather on occasions such as this in a spirit of real revelry and relaxation. Most everyone enjoys a little political shop talk now and then, and I can well remember dinners of this type in Delaware and elsewhere, in years past, at which we could afford to indulge in these pleasantries.

Unfortunately, my friends, the present hour of history leaves little time or opportunity for gaiety and lightheartedness. The present tense atmosphere, both in this country and particularly abroad, demands instead serious and unending attention to many grim and unfinished tasks, which yet remain before us.

We, in these United States, have lived and suffered through many great crises in the past decade, and our nature is becoming accustomed to unusual, sudden, dramatic, and highly significant incidents in world affairs. Indeed, it is doubtful if any era in modern times has been more filled with literally earth-shaking and tragic events than have these last recent years.

Today is no exception. For we are confronted with the possibility of additional and potentially more dangerous trials than ever before. I regret to say that this appears true, not only because of the threat to our way of life from without, but because of confusion and destructive criticism which is being incited consciously or unconsciously by some people within our own borders.

I need not publicly observe that a serious controversy is threatening our national unity. But, I trust that the clear but difficult duty of the Democratic Party in this matter is understood by all of us.

Ours is the thankless but vitally necessary responsibility of trying to steer a course toward world peace. The way is made more difficult because we must travel through a tense and dangerous maze of political and military obstacles. More than ever before we need strength and character to meet these new and heavy responsibilities. Unfortunately, we are not being helped by some members of the opposition, who, either unknowingly or for selfish political gains, are constantly seeking to complicate our efforts to fabricate a stable and peaceful world where men may live with dignity and justice.

For weeks the Halls of Congress have echoed with oratory in the so-called great debate on foreign affairs. These discussions, for the most part, were devoted to but one phase of our military and diplomatic policy—that affecting Western Europe.

Now, another storm has broken with dramatic suddenness over the horizon—this one has affected our policy in the teeming, unsettled, and war-torn continent of Asia.

This debate which has already opened and will undoubtedly continue for weeks to come is in itself a desirable and healthy thing. In this country, free discussion is our way of bringing problems out into the open, so that the American people can reach their own logical conclusions upon the presentation of all sides. Tragically, however, the issues at stake are so grave and so far reaching that unless our words are carefully chosen and our feelings tempered, the reaction in other lands may be interpreted in a manner which will be neither beneficial to us nor to our allies, who read and hear them.

How sad and ironic it is that one of the great architects of our bipartisan foreign policy has been lost to the country at a time when he is most sorely needed. Without question, the Members of Congress and the people of this Nation have been deprived of an inspiring and devoted public servant in the death this week of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. Would that his calm and steady hand were still helping to guide us in the Senate Chamber now.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I do not propose a lengthy discussion on international problems at this time. However, a few brief observations on what this country is trying to achieve do seem in order if only to clarify the public record. This requires first of all that we approach the problem realistically. We cannot do so by following the whimsical reflections of certain highly respected policy leaders of the Republican Party, who, when all is said and done, have somehow reached the illogical conclusion that the only thing to do is isolate this country from one-half of the world, and, at the same time, launch an all-out war against the other half. Such thinking only creates false impressions among our people who are looking to their representatives in Congress for guidance.

Let us realize that the continued preservation of our way of life, both in this country and in other democratic nations, is a global problem. We cannot separate the issues because some of them are occurring in Europe and some of them in Asia. The fact that war exists now only in Korea should not lead us to the false conclusion that it will not break out tomorrow in Yugoslavia or Iran or some place else. It should be remembered that a leaking dyke must be plugged at all its weak points, or the torrent, built up behind it, will find other openings and engulf us.

But because Korea is uppermost in our minds tonight, particularly as a result of the return of General MacArthur, it might be well to examine briefly the implications of this conflict.

There is, and has been for some time, a school of thought, particularly among some leading Republicans, which calls for an expansion of our military efforts outside the peninsula, into Manchuria, and the Chinese mainland. I wonder, however, if those who have rashly proposed an invasion of the vast Chinese hinterland have ever considered the probable consequences of such an operation—the staggering cost in human lives, or the cost in dollars which could spell ruination for this country's standard of living. And what good, may I ask, would it do if our armies did succeed in capturing Shanghai or Peiping or Chungking or a dozen other Chinese cities. We would have conquered land perhaps, but certainly not the restless millions of Chinese people. And if we sent the remaining troops of Chiang Kai-shek ashore on the mainland, as has been advocated, whom do you think would have to provide the air and sea cover, and, in addition, replace the empty ranks of those who have fallen.

If the Nationalist troops are used anywhere, it should be in Korea, as a part of the United Nations force now engaged against the Communists there. By spreading the conflict to the Chinese mainland we would play directly into the hands of our real enemy, the Soviet Union. It is highly doubtful that if we declared war on China Russia would allow the opportunity to pass without quick retaliation either in Asia or, what is more likely, in Western Europe. If that occurred our thinly spread forces, together with such allies as we might muster, would be neatly buffered by the Chinese Reds, while the Russian Army was free to move at will to outflank us by seizing the North Atlantic area. Surely then there is ample evidence to sustain the thinking that a campaign against China itself is preposterous.

However, the critics of our present policy in Korea, if they fail to steer this Nation into direct conflict on the Chinese mainland, are seeking the same objective through other means. They are calling for all measures short of an actual landing on the Chinese shores. These include, among others, the bombing of bases outside Korea and the blockading of the Chinese coast to mention a few. I will admit that there is more logic for supporting this plan, but even then the likelihood of its success is not overly hopeful. To follow this course would also expand the conflict and draw more men and equipment into Asia. We should take it only as a last resort.

It has been said that there is no parallel to be found in the manner by which the United Nations Forces are conducting the Korean conflict. I believe there is. A parallel exists, or did exist, in the little country of Greece just a short time ago. You will recall at the end of World War II, when Europe lay prostrate and devastated, Soviet Russia, ignoring the principles and aims of the United Nations, threatened, through its satellite powers, to subjugate Greece by direct military methods. The government of that small country was hard pressed, and threatened with disaster by the growing strength of the so-called Greek guerrillas. Had they not been halted, the Communists would have undoubtedly seized that nation, and, perhaps, swept on through Italy as well. But Russia failed in this attempt because the President of the United States, recognizing the Russian aims for what they were, came forward with a bold and imaginative plan to furnish aid to Greece, and to Turkey as well. It was a step which cheered the hearts of war-weary freedom-loving men and women everywhere. Backed by our help, the courageous people of Greece rallied against this threat to their homeland. Key American personnel, including our new commander in Korea, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, revitalized the Greek fighting forces and saved that little country from destruction. I ask you, what would have happened had we followed the isolationists' principles which call for us to virtually abandon the European continent.

There is an important lesson to be learned from the war in Greece. First, it should be noted that the attacks there were put down in the place where they occurred. It was not the purpose of the Truman doctrine to launch an assault upon the satellite neighbors of Greece. To do so then, as now, might well have inflamed the world into war. The Greek campaign was a limited conflict. When it became clear to the puppets, who were fighting against the Government of Greece, that they could not succeed, the Kremlin was compelled to back down. It was not appeasement to refrain from attacking the satellites in our defense of the Greek Government. What we did do, however, was to make plain that an assault upon a free Nation would not be tolerated, and, what is more significant, we beat that attempt where it occurred.

Not only did we succeed in halting communism in Greece, but as a result of another administration program, advocated first by our great Secretary of Defense, Gen. George Marshall, we have now revitalized Western Europe and aided in a rebirth of hope, courage, and strength in those democracies. Yes, as a result of the historic Marshall plan, the local Communist movement in the western democracies have lost in influence and effectiveness.

I well recall the sight of Europe at the end of World War II, and I am sure that there are many veterans of that conflict here tonight, who also remember the chaotic condition of the Continent in 1945. A year and a half ago, I visited sections of Europe again. The magnificent results of the Marshall plan program were stupendous. Europe has reached and passed the crisis successfully. The patient has recovered and, barring only a reckless assault by a desperate foe, the western nations will continue to live and grow in the democratic way of life.

To further strengthen our relationship there, this country has helped to create the North Atlantic Alliance—a treaty which binds the United States and its democratic neighbors in a program of collective security for our mutual welfare and safety.

I am sure that those accomplishments are well known to you here tonight, but they are worth repeating and reemphasizing as a refutation of the reckless and irresponsible charges which we have heard recently to the effect that the United States lacks an effective policy of resistance against the Reds.

Slowly but surely the democratic nations of the west are building and developing their military and economic power. We are doing so, not to make war, but to defend our way of life against a philosophy which, if unchecked, would make slaves of free people everywhere. Much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. Only in Asia on the remote Korean peninsula do the Communists now dare test the strength of the democracies. But, our quick reprisal has stung the Reds and checked them. The loss of American lives in this endeavor has been heartbreaking, but we hope the end is approaching. For those who cruelly say that our intervention in Korea has been in vain, I can only reply by pointing out that thus far we have prevented the spread of this conflict into a full-scale war. In addition, we have raised the hopes of free people everywhere by demonstrating our will to protect the rights of men when they are challenged by those who would enslave them. Korea is a symbol of hope in the free world, which knows the horrors of war and which is preparing to resist such a holocaust if it is thrust upon us.

My friends, the Democratic Party, which has served the best interests of this country for many years, need not cringe before its record in foreign affairs or its achievements here at home. We may be partisan within our own ranks, but we have kept as our objective good government, and for that reason the American people have continued to accept our leadership.

Time is fleeting, and I do not wish to infringe longer on your generous hospitality, but I think we should all keep in mind for the information of those who may challange our party's principles, that since World War II alone, we have enjoyed the greatest prosperity that ever existed on the face of the globe. The postwar depression, which the crapehangers predicted was coming in 1946, has just never arrived. Instead some 20,000,000 motor vehicles have been built and purchased in the United States in the past 5 years. New homes have been built all over the country. Slums have been abolished. Rural electrification has brought new advances and achievements on farms. Business is healthy and stronger. Look at the corporation profits alone. Wages and salaries are higher. More than 60,000,000 people are gainfully employed, and still we go forward in the fields of science, transportation, communication, and many others.

The free world looks to us for guidance and counsel, because under our system of government, we have achieved a greatness unequaled in the history of mankind. The only grave threat to our future existence and welfare that still lies before us can be surmounted if our global policy for the containment of communism can be maintained. The leaders in the Kremlin will not forever be able to trample the hearts and minds of these millions of people whom they now control by brutal force.

The democratic ideas and ideals which have been given impetus and strength by the party of Jefferson and Jackson shine brightly over much of the earth. Sooner or later that light will penetrate into the darkest recesses behind the iron curtain.

Let us, then, as Americans first and then as Democrats continue to place our trust and confidence behind the lofty principles of freedom and justice. The united strength of the free world, political, military, and, above all, spiritual, is growing greater by the hour. As it does, the chances for the Soviet

leaders to win a war of desperation are steadily waning. Even they cannot be blind to stark reality. As our strength increases, the futility of attack will become more evident to them.

Let us, then, turn to the unfinished tasks with vigor and determination, secure in the knowledge that divine providence is with us in the great crusade to lift the hearts and minds of men above the ignoble and wretched state in which the twentieth-century tyrants of the Kremlin have cast them.

A Few Pertinent Questions, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson (Ohio) Gazette:

A FEW PERTINENT QUESTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT, BY A SMALL-TOWN EDITOR TO A BIG-TOWN POLITICIAN, RESPECTFULLY ASKED

Explanation: Your questioner has been a country newspaper editor for 54 years. His recognition by former Presidents has been their personal invitations to attend the inaugurals in 1897 and 1928; and the offer of appointment by Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be one of the seven NIRA dictators for the State of Ohio. (This appointment was promptly declined.)

Agreement: You and I believe in the American way of life with its two-party system. You have stated your desire for intelligent debate and constructive criticism. Although I am a member of the minority party, I am more interested in a worth-while administration of public affairs after the voters have spoken, than I am in the political label of the administration.

Basis for my questions: My questions are based upon your recent Jefferson Day address, with its $100-per-plate campaign fund contribution. Your political party claims that "The Democratic Party (now the New Deal Party) was fathered by the third President, Thomas Jefferson." You profess adherence to Jeffersonian principles.

With one exception, I follow the 11 Jeffersonian principles as enunciated in Jefferson's letter to Elbridge Gary on January 2d, 1799.

I call myself a Republican. President Jefferson said, "We are all Republicans; we are all Federalists." In the broadest sense, we seek to be loyal Americans.

Thomas Jefferson died 6 years before the first national Democratic Convention at Baltimore in 1832. He never heard of a Democratic Party. He never spoke of democracy as if the United States Republic were a political democracy. Our Constitution is based upon a government administered by the people's representatives. It is a Republic, with each of the 48 States required to have a republican form of constitution—a sovereign entity, save in those powers the States or the people delegated to the National Government. Every President from Thomas Jefferson, down to and including Andrew Jackson, until the election of 1832, called himself a Republican.

A CHALLENGE TO MR. TRUMAN

Question No. 1: If you and your political party adhere to the political principles of Thomas Jefferson, have you followed his fourth requirement, namely, "A rigorously frugal administration * * * application of all possible savings of the public revenues to the liquidation of the public debt?"

Answer: No. During 6 years your administration has spent more of the taxpayers' moneys than was spent by all of the Presidents from George Washington, including Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt, and the waging of two World Wars. Such extravagance results in the average American citizen handing over to the Federal Treasury 2 days of labor out of every 6 days' pay.

Question No. 2: If your political philosophy is based upon the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson, have you followed his principle of "and resistance, therefore, to a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to create partisans"?

Answer: No. The facts stand out. So overpadded is the public payroll and so inefficiently managed is the cumbersome Federal machine that, aside from Federal employees at the National Capital, the Federal payroll for political appointees in many counties in the 48 States exceeds that of elected local and county officers, both in number and tax cost.

My partner and myself and our eight employees pay to Washington about 40 times as much in Federal taxes as is imposed by local, county, and State taxes on our business plant at Jefferson, Ashtabula County, Ohio.

Question No. 3: Mr. President, do you, and does the present Democratic Party, or that of Mr. Wilson or Mr. Roosevelt before you, adhere to principle 7 in the Jeffersonian doctrine, namely, "Opposition to linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe"?

Answer: No! You, like Mr. Roosevelt, and like Mr. Wilson when he got over being too proud to fight, have spent most of your energies upon getting involved in and linking the United States with the quarrels of Europe and Asia. Still you boast of being Jeffersonians.

Mr. Roosevelt ignored Congress when he gave 50 destroyers, 500,000 rifles and other war supplies to England, prior to the declaration of war against Germany and Japan by the Congress. Such gifts constituted a warlike act. It may have been justifiable if the President, as Commander in Chief, drops the robes of a civil executive and assumes the sword of a military dictator. By ignoring Congress, the Commander in Chief elevates the military power above the civil power of Congress, as you did in Korea.

The fact that Roosevelt had been warned that the Japanese navy was moving toward Pearl Harbor and an attack could be expected, and that such Roosevelt information was not communicated to the Army nor Navy at Pearl Harbor has no explanation, save that someone at Washington sought to so excite the American people to justify his previous war-like acts by the public's demand for all-out war.

Question No. 4: You and a majority of Americans were swept into adherence to the Charter of the United Nations as a means of maintaining world peace, through an expected physical power and psychological fear of world power to deter or to punish aggression. Nationalist China was, and still is, a member of the United Nations. Does the United States Navy, by your order, patrol the Strait of Formosa to bar Chiang Kai-shek from seeking to regain his native land? If so, is not such fact an act of aggression by the United States? If so, has not the American Navy been used during the Truman Korean police action (another word for war) as an aid in fact to the mutual enemies of the United States and National China?

Answer: Regardless of any intent of your administration, or the excuse that if the Nationalist Chinese army makes a foray upon the aggressors from Manchuria, it would precipitate world war III, the fact that the American Navy was and is still used to keep Chiang Kai-shek in exile prevents a sovereign power from attacking its enemies in China, who are enemies of the United States. The failure of the United Nations to come to the aid of Nationalist China while a member of the Big Five shows the general hypocrisy of the U. N. as an instrument of peace. This failure shows that it, like the kings of Europe seeking the balance of power, still look to force, coupled with diplomatic dishonesty, as the means of saving their own hides.

Socialist England, to save Hong Kong, demands that the Red aggressors—who have killed, wounded or captured more than 60,000 American boys in this Truman police action in Korea—be recognized as coequals of civilized members of the United Nations. England demands that you surrender Formosa to the Communists. Such act would be followed by the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of the friends of the United States. Such bloody appeasement means more than world war III.

A subquestion No. 4: Mr. President, do you believe that many members of the United States Senate would have approved the U. N. Charter treaty, or made any agreement to yield any sovereign power to the U. N. if they had considered, prior to acceptance, that our own Supreme Court holds that a treaty is the supreme law of the land; and that our treaty in accepting the United Nations takes precedence over the Constitution and the statutes of any and all of the 48 States? Thus you aided the conspiracy to alter the form of government of the United States through the U. N.

Under the terms of the U. N. charter, millions of American boys and girls can be drafted and sent, as you claim is your right and power as President of the United States, without consent of Congress, anywhere anytime for any reason to fight wars not of our own making.

Question No. 5: Mr. President, have you kept your oath of office to preserve, protect and defend the Federal Constitution; and do you follow it along Jefferson's interpretation, or do you, like Mr. Roosevelt, believe that by packing the Supreme Court with party-line stooges you can construe the Constitution to mean anything the Justices say it does? I suggest that you read Mr. Jefferson's first principle, namely, "An inviolable preservation of the Federal Constitution, according to the true sense in which it was adopted."

Question No. 6: And finally, Mr. President Truman, do you follow Jefferson's third principle including "resistance to movements for transferring the power of the States to the general government, and all those of that government to the executive branch?"

Answer: Actions speak louder than words. Mr. Truman, the answer is obvious. For 19 long years the New Dealers have been seeking to socialize the Government of the United States. Some seek to make it a Communist dependency of barbaric Russia. Others have dreamed of world government, ignoring the fact varying social, moral and intellectual grades make world union a mad dream. A world union can survive only by unlimited force and dictatorial power.

As Chief Executive you find excuses for increasing the power of the Executive and the centralization of government at Washington.

You have quarreled repeatedly with the legislative branch of Government; and you now find yourself in a deplorable police action which you dare not force to victory lest it be the excuse for an all-out war by Russia. You are the prisoner of false ideals and of your own diplomatic hypocrisy. You had no constitutional right to set yourself up as a military dictator and start a war under the fiction of a "police action." But you did start it. By the skill of General MacArthur and others in military authority victory was in our grasp. But you listened to the siren of the Thames; and your ship came close to national and international

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

disaster by reason of orders not to destroy enemy bases in Manchuria by American air power.

General MacArthur led a long war against Japan in the Pacific. Then, as now, his pleas for more men and more ships were ignored. Japan had a great navy, a great air force, and a great army near or in Japanese territory.

The Chinese Communists are countless, but not as an army. They have no navy except such as may be loaned by Russia. They have no air power, save what comes from Russia. And Russia is far to the west, with only a single rail artery to carry Russian gifts of heavy war matériel.

No. Mr. Truman, you put yourself up as a military dictator; so you recalled General MacArthur because he, as a soldier and a patriotic American, would not aid the scheme to make the United States the victim of ill advice and treachery, led by Socialist England.

Would it not have been wiser to have followed the Jeffersonian doctrine and asked the Congress to declare war rather than to have assumed yourself to be the great I am in this Korean disaster?

CHET LAMPSON.

Federal Income Tax on Interest From Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a resolution adopted by the city of Newark, N. J., concerning its opposition to a Federal income tax on interest received from holders of municipal bonds:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N. J., OPPOSING IMPOSING ON INCOME TAXES ON INTEREST FROM MUNICIPAL BONDS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas it is reported that the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated that the Federal administration may undertake to impose Federal income taxes on interest from municipal bonds, and in opposition thereto we submit the following from the American Municipal News (February 1951, vol. V, No. 2) to wit:

"The American Municipal Association and the State leagues of municipalities are on record in opposition to any attempt to remove the exemption. Such taxation would add 1 to 1¼ percent to the annual interest cost on municipal bonds, so a $1,000,000 serial issue running from 1 to 30 years now bearing interest at about 2 percent would suffer an increase from $310,000 to $450,000 or more—about 50 percent higher. In a statement to municipal officials last week AMA suggested that those who oppose this proposal should attack it now in the House Ways and Means Committee. Arguments against the proposal are (1) it increases one large municipal cost by about 50 percent, (2) it comes at a time when the Treasury proposes to increase many taxes heavily used by States such as on gasoline, beer, liquor, and cigarettes, (3) it opens the way for Federal taxation of municipal enterprises, possibly leading to Federal taxes on the income of local water and light plants, and (4) many vital municipal projects now financed by self-supporting revenue bonds would be impossible if the interest cost were increased."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newark, That we do hereby give expression of our opposition to the imposition of income taxes on interest from municipal bonds, and for the reasons aforesaid and the related depression which would result by the imposition of such income taxes, in the sale of municipal bonds, to the detriment of the municipality; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby request the Senators and Representatives in Congress from New Jersey to give voice and support to the objection of the municipality to such proposal to impose income taxes on the interest on municipal bonds; and it is further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress from New Jersey, and the director of the department of revenue and finance be and he is hereby authorized to take whatever further action is necessary to present to the Federal authorities and to the Congress and the House Ways and Means Committee the opposition of the city of Newark thereto.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.

"Men of the Free World Have the Same Spiritual and Intellectual Horizons Even Though They Speak Different Languages and Use Different Methods To Achieve Their Ends—In Times of Peril It Is This Heritage Which Binds Us Together"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I truly wonder how John Steelman manages to retain the energy to put in the long hours which he does in the discharge of the many and most important duties assigned him by the President—and to seemingly accomplish the desired results with ease, cooperation, precision, and dispatch.

The television program, Battle Report, Washington, upon which he appears each Sunday afternoon—one of his many self-imposed tasks carried on in the national interest—has now become a must item for millions of television viewers each week.

Last Sunday Dr. Steelman brought to the television audience Mr. Thomas D. Cabot, Director of the International Security Affairs of the State Department; Brig. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., Assistant Chief of Army Transportation Corps; Mr. Michael Straus, Commissioner of Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and, last but not least, Commander Robert M. Schwyhart, United States Navy Division Chaplain of the First Division of Marines, recently returned from Korea.

In his introduction of these officials, the assistant to the President himself spoke briefly with respect to the meeting which had taken place with the representatives of the American Republics assembled in Washington last week to discuss hemispheric solidarity and to make plans for the future.

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Steelman said:

All these men are working to build a world of peace—a world where every man can hold up his head in dignity—a world where no man is a slave of another—and is free to seek happiness in his own way.

The report made by Mr. Cabot, Director of International Security Affairs, was heartening inasmuch as Mr. Cabot was able to give assurance that we shall not have to bear the entire burden of the defense for freedom—that the taxpayers of all Allied countries will henceforth share the defense burden with the American taxpayers, and in doing so will more surely provide the combined strength necessary to defend ourselves.

In making report to the American people of the great transportation problem that confronts our military on the Korean peninsula, General Besson said, in part:

The transportation job in Korea, punctuated now and then by sudden disaster, has called for countless renovations. These operations are constantly harassed by exploding roadbeds and burning gondolas; by guerrilla-ambushed trains and truck convoys; by smoke and death in railways tunnels; by locomotives plunging over mountain trestles and trucks sliding off ice-covered roads; by road blocks; by rugged terrain, poor roads, snipers, and bad weather.

He spoke more or less in detail of the particularly difficult task that presented itself during the campaign which occurred after the Hungnam evacuation and indicated wherein paper calculations estimated that 100,000 troops cannot be moved over the rocky and rugged terrain in less than 11 days—that mathematics can be wrong—and the division actually moved in less than 5 days.

Mike Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, needs no introduction to the Members of this Congress. In describing the starvation now existing among the teeming populations of the arid zone of south Asia, where in places crops are harvested by hand as they were before Christ was born, he painted a vivid picture of the tremendous job that can be done and is, in fact, being done by use of the comparably small appropriations made by this Congress for carrying out the provisions of the point 4 program.

Mr. Speaker, of all the men who have ever addressed a television audience, none have brought a more heartfelt consolation to the fathers and mothers of American boys who are fighting in Korea than did Commander Robert M. Schwyhart, division chaplain of the First Marine Corps.

The gracious tribute General MacArthur paid to Hawaii's heroic dead in memory of Korea when he said, "I know little of the dignity of their birth but I surely well know the dignity of their death," was equaled by the tribute paid to all American boys fighting in Korea

by Commander Robert M. Schwyhart when he stated:

The men whom we serve in Korea are the finest in the world. The greatest tribute which can come to us chaplains is to be adjudged worthy of those whom we serve. May God keep all of them in his gracious care.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no more fitting way of having the fires of patriotism kindled in one's breast than to listen to the public officials which Dr. John Steelman brings to the television screen on Battle Report, Washington, each Sunday afternoon.

It is because of the marvelous work which he is accomplishing that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues in this House to again extend my remarks and include therein the thirty-first Battle Report, Washington, which was as follows:

Mr. BRINKLEY. As the Army demonstrates it first new tank since World War II—the Walker Bulldog—26 tons of concrete evidence of our stepped-up defense production—NBC television once again turns its battle-reporting cameras on the Nation's Capitol.

Washington, which, during the past week, greeted the President of France and the Foreign Ministers of Latin America—and Korea, where American troops once again greeted the muddy 38th parallel by crossing it with their heavy "tiger" tanks.

Today Battle Report scans the world through the eyes of its far-flung cameras and four top official guests. They join to bring you a report ranging from the food crisis in southeastern Asia to first-hand experience with the Marines in Korea. But first, we welcome back from Florida, where he has been with President Truman, the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. During the past week Washington has been host to many distinguished visitors. Delegates from all our sister American Republics are here to discuss our family problems, and to make plans for the future. Last Wednesday, President Auriol of France arrived on an official visit.

It is significant that two points are emphasized in the statements made by these visiting dignitaries. First, they proclaim their desire for peace; and secondly, they state, in no uncertain terms, that freedom—the right of every man to seek happiness in his own way—cannot and will not be sacrificed.

Men of the free world have the same spiritual and intellectual heritage, even though they speak different languages and have used different methods to achieve their ends. In time of peril, this heritage is the tie which binds us together. This heritage is the foundation upon which a world of plenty and a world of peace can be built. Let us hope that the plans for mutual help which are now being made will unite us more firmly than ever before.

This afternoon, we will hear from four prominent officials who are engaged in radically different work. First, we have Mr. Thomas D. Cabot, Director of International Security Affairs of the Department of State, who has just returned from Europe where he saw what our partners in the North Atlantic Pact are producing for our common defense. Next, Brig. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., Assistant Chief of the Army Transportation Corps, will tell us about the gigantic task which confronts him. It is the responsibility of his organization to transport everything the Army needs to any place on earth. Mr. Michael Straus, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, who has just returned from South Asia, will tell us how we are cooperating with less fortunate peoples to enable them to increase their food supply, and Commander Robert M. Schwyhart, who recently received the Alexander D. Goode award as chaplain of the year, will tell us of his experiences with the marines in Korea.

All these men are working to build a world of peace—a world where every man can hold up his head in dignity, a world where no man is a slave of another, and is free to seek happiness in his own way.

Mr. BRINKLEY. United Kingdom troops, in the vanguard of our forces in Korea, forces now said to have advanced far beyond the most controversial boundary in modern history. These are men of Canada's famed Princess Pat Light Infantry, who were lately joined by the British Twenty-seventh Brigade and are fighting on the east and central fronts. The common power of Canadian and American troops will be increased even more with the recent agreement between the two countries on the use of similar military equipment. Further evidence of our growing unity, America, is this one-millionth ton of military aid leaving New York for Europe this past week. To tell us more of how the free nations are forging themselves into a single fighting force for mutual defense against communism, we bring you now, just back from touring the Atlantic Pact countries of Europe, the State Department's head of military aid—it's Director of International Security Affairs, Thomas D. Cabot.

Mr. CABOT. The great debate on defending Europe has left doubts in some minds as to the willingness of our allies.

I am convinced that the free nations of Europe realize the danger of the Soviet threat against them, that they are determined to defend themselves and are gaining confidence in their ability to do so.

Furthermore, I feel that our allies will bear their fair share of our mutual defense burdens. Their actual achievements so far in strengthening their defenses, increasing their armed forces and converting their industrial capacities to production for defense indicate that they will accept their full share of the responsibility.

We are building for a lasting peace and it is important that we develop the tremendous potential of Western Europe to support its own defenses and resist attack. Through Marshall-plan aid we have strengthened the internal economies of these countries. We must now expand the productivity of their factories to augment the supply of arms needed for mutual defense against aggression.

All the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has made substantial increases in their defense expenditures over the last year. All of them are increasing their military forces. Compulsory military service of able-bodied young men is now the universal rule among our European allies. The period of service is being notably lengthened to enlarge and improve their trained forces.

Production of weapons is increasing, too, as here at Woolwich Arsenal in England, but it will take time to revive Europe's ability to provide its own arms. Europe's industry cannot compare with ours in capacity. Only here can we hope to get within a reasonable time sufficient new equipment for the forces being mustered.

As Mr. Steelman has told you, I have just returned from accompanying our Under Secretary of State, Mr. Webb, on a trip to London and Paris where we have discussed with General Eisenhower and with our ambassadors and other representatives, the defense plans of our European allies.

Much remains to be done in these countries, just as much remains to be done in the United States. But the increasing sense of urgency and determination among the peoples there is evident on all sides. Our Ambassadors, whose job it is to observe public reactions, all report that the determination of the people of Europe to defend themselves has increased spectacularly during the past few months. There can be no longer any question about the outcome of our joint defense plans. All the many representatives with whom we talked—military men as well as diplomats—had witnessed the same heartening trend.

Our allies, without exception, look to us for leadership and assistance, and our enlightened self-interest requires that we furnish both.

Adding our own strength to that of our allies often makes our resources do triple duty, or even more. Often relatively small additional resources are needed to enable our allies to achieve production in excess of what their own economies could produce without our help. For example plants and manpower which are idle can often be put to work by supplying only a small part of the materials and tools which are lacking. Then, at small cost to us, quantities of arms become available for our mutual defense.

Let us realize fully just what all of these heartening events mean to us. They mean that we shall not have to bear the entire burden of the defense of our freedom. They mean that there will be such a wide sharing of this burden, to the benefit of all free countries, that we shall be able to maintain our own economic strength at a level far above what would otherwise be possible. They mean that the taxpayers of all our allied countries will share the burden with American taxpayers and in doing so will they more surely provide the combined strength necessary to defend ourselves.

This is the real purpose and meaning of our mutual defense assistance program. Every American—especially every American taxpayer—should be aware of these advantages. For the United States to provide this defensive strength alone and unaided—which is the only alternative—could well be beyond our capacity.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Williams Air Force Base, Ariz. Looking to the day when wing formations will be made up of teams of fliers from different countries, French and Dutch pilots, training here in the United States for the Atlantic Pact air force, give a special demonstration for Battle Report—some of the most spectacular jet formation flying our cameras have ever seen.

Operation Tomahawk. The planes—flying boxcars and C-46's. The troops—3,300 paratroopers of the 11th Airborne. All add up, northwest of Seoul, to the biggest mass jump of the war to cut off the retreating Chinese. This job called into play not only the courage of our Air Force, but posed a previous problem of supply for our miracle-working Army Transportation Corps. Here the supply problem calls for taking to the sea. Small South Korean coasters are loaded with artillery and mortar ammunition. The vessels, under Navy escort, then move up the shoreline to an advance port. For more facts on the unique problems of supply posed by the war in Korea, we focus our cameras now on the Assistant Chief of the Army Transportation Corps, Brig. Gen. F. S. Besson.

Brigadier General BESSON. From the very beginning of the Korean emergency the Army Transportation Corps was confronted with a challenging situation to deploy and support United Nations forces in combat. Not since the Civil War has transportation become so all-important in military tactical operations.

The transportation job in Korea, punctuated now and then by sudden disaster, has called for countless renovations. These operations are constantly harassed by exploding roadbeds and burning gondolas; by guerrilla-ambushed trains and truck convoys; by smoke and death in railway tunnels; by locomotives plunging over mountain trestles and trucks sliding off ice-covered roads, by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

roadblocks; by rugged terrain, poor roads, snipers, and bad weather.

The sudden demand for more cargo and speed posed new problems. To lift cargo over inaccessible areas, the Cargo Combat Command was organized. It transports men and materials via air to points where rail or highways do not exist. For the first time in history, aerial ports of embarkation are operating. We organized the Red Ball Express, a train-to-ship-to-truck operation. It moves high priority cargo from Japan to Korea. Horses, mules, and oxen are pressed into service.

Cargo is carried on the backs of men. Inadequate highways make it necessary to push the railroads within mortar range. These men must fight alongside the infantry to get supplies through. A new role for TC soldiers. Railway men build the roadways as the troops advance, destroy them as they fall back and build them again in the slow grind northward. Transportation Corps is engaged in research and planning for new methods of lifting cargo. Transportation helicopter companies are being organized for combat support. Giant conveyor belts to carry supplies over rugged terrain are under research, also aerial tramways to lift cargo from ship to shore where ports do not exist.

Our most difficult test during this campaign occurred after the Hungnam evacuation. More than 100,000 corps troops landed in South Korea. They were earmarked for a hurry-up transfer across the peninsula. The single-track rail system northward was overloaded, roads and bridges were out, communications poor, and strong guerrilla forces were active. It was directed the Seventh Division, with equipment, be moved from Pusan to the Tangyange sector in 5 days. According to paper calculations this move was impossible in less than 11 days. But mathematics can be wrong. The Division was moved in 5 days.

The entire southern beachhead was combed for every piece of rolling stock. The "miracle express" began rolling north in a shuttle system—again a difficult task was accomplished.

The transportation corps uses every means of transport to supply an army in the lines. This includes land, sea, and air, plus the ability to solve each complicated problem with a new idea. Transportation is the first to arrive and the last to leave. A successful military campaign depends on transportation of troops, supplies and equipment to the right place at the right time, in the right amount and in good condition. The transportation corps, so far, has met these requirements.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Water, as these tank troops would probably be quick to agree, can be a curse as well as a blessing. Here the water born of the spring thaw in Korea turns the battlefront into a quagmire—impedes the advance of our Patton tanks as they clear the way for our ground troops. Thus held up, they can only move forward field by field—seeking to harass the flanks of the retreating Communists.

But these are symbols of the blessings of water—dams that light our cities with hydroelectric power and, through irrigation, turn the dessert into bountiful fields of fruits and vegetables. Just back from southeast Asia, where water is a key weapon in the struggle for peace and democracy, comes our next guest. That he may report to you on how we are using this weapon in the battle for freedom and plenty, we present the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior, Michael W. Straus.

Mr. MICHAEL W. STRAUS. Hunger is an invaluable ally to tyranny and war. Our fight to win peace and security will be decided ultimately by our success in helping the world's growing hordes of hungry people find ways to feed and clothe themselves. They can do this by developing and making greater use of their land and water resources, and by harnessing their rivers to make electric power.

Some starvation is usual among the teeming populations of the arid zone of South Asia. Yet Asia has vast lands, now idle for lack of sufficient rainfall to grow crops. If irrigated from the rivers, these lands could produce an abundance of food and clothing.

Asians, through their governments, are now turning to America, and to agencies such as the Reclamation Bureau, for technical aid and advice in putting their idle lands and rivers to work.

Ancient methods of supplying irrigation water to thirsty fields helped to build great Asian civilizations. Primitive methods of pumping water, by back-breaking human labor, are still common. But they no longer suffice, in today's crowded world, even though Asia has plenty of low-cost hand labor. Human, or even animal muscle, however abundant, can't provide water and power on the vast scale needed if food production is to catch up with the population growth.

Many Asians still use buffalo to pull their primitive plows—and, instead of farm machinery, drive these great, lumbering beasts over their fields to prepare the soil to receive the seeds. In many places, crops are still harvested by hand as they were before Christ was born.

Primitive methods of building works to harness the rivers are still prevalent. I saw 60,000 hand laborers, helped by camels, digging one canal. I saw uncounted hundreds of women, toiling like ants under the tropical sun, each one carrying concrete in a basket on her head, to build a dam as high as the Washington Monument.

Inspired by how reclamation dams and power plants, such as Boulder and Grand Coulee, have helped make our own American West prosperous, Asian peoples are taking new hope. They are learning our ways of planning and building.

American reclamation engineers are helping many Asian countries plan and build projects for development of their water resources. This is done in cooperation with the State Department, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the point 4 program. Already this year we have reclamation engineers in Afghanistan, Persia, India, and Ceylon, and others will go to Lebanon and Arabia. These countries, when able, often buy American equipment for construction of their projects.

Asian countries send many of their young engineers to America to gain on-the-job experience with the Bureau of Reclamation. Young engineers from 12 countries are now at work at Reclamation's Engineering Center in Denver, Colo. They come from Turkey, India, Pakistan, Siam, Nepal, and Burma. Some of these young engineers are working on American projects; others on projects for their own lands—such as testing earth to see if it will bear the weight of a dam, testing the strength of concrete—learning how to design structures.

In a single instance, reclamation scientific tests will save the Indian Government $15,000,000 in construction of a dam. Some of our reclamation trainees return home to rise to cabinet rank.

But all of them go home inspired, skilled, and experienced in modern techniques of planning and building water and power projects. They take with them the hope, born of modern America, of peace and better living for their people.

In other days, Reclamation Street, U. S. A., ran from Nebraska to California—where reclamation dams and water and power meant wealth and security for Americans. Today, it runs 25,000 miles around the arid belt of the world—I found it plainly marked Reclamation Street, in both English and Chinese, in the back washes of Hong Kong—and Reclamation Street round the globe is a two-way street—not only do peoples of other lands learn from us, but we gain technical knowledge of great value from them.

We are spending great sums of money to win the world to peace and democracy. But hungry peoples are interested first in something to eat. By helping them to develop their irrigation and hydroelectric power resources, we can make it possible for them to greatly increase their own production of food and clothing. This is the road to peace, democracy, better living and security. That is our destination, travelling on Reclamation Street—round this hungry, troubled world.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Yes, the Marines have landed again—this time, on the Communist Chinese. These are pictures of the first Marine Division back in action. Veterans of the Inchon landing who pushed all the way north to the Manchurian border before being entrapped at the Chonjin reservoir, these Marines were later evacuated by sea. They, are now—after several free months—writing a new chapter in Marine history. (And for most of them it's a grand feeling to be pushing the Communists across the thirty-eighth parallel once more.)

But, though as the Marines are, wherever they go their Chaplains move with them. One such Chaplain is here with us today—the winner of the Alexander D. Goode award for best demonstrating the spirit which motivated the four immortal Chaplains of the ill-fated carrier, the *Dorchester*. Nothing more need be said of him than—we quote—"He expressed his firm faith in God by exemplifying it to the men whom he served." Ladies and gentlemen—the Chaplain of the First Marine Division—Commander Robert M. Schwyhart.

Commander ROBERT M. SCHWYHART. It is indeed a pleasure to be back in the United States with my family and to report to the American people upon the welfare of their young men in Korea.

As Division Chaplain of the First Marine Division, it was my privilege to direct the activities of 28 Navy Chaplains attached to the Division. These men of God, representing many different denominations, are alike in one important respect—they are volunteers. Every one of them is in Korea to serve your men because he has chosen to be there. Furthermore, every one of them is rendering a ministry for which he is especially prepared by training and by experience. A Marine chaplain is as much a specialist in the field of his ministry as a brain surgeon in the field of surgery. You may be sure that your men are being served by ministers, priests, and rabbis, who know their business.

The chaplains are probably the busiest people in the Marine Division. In combat they accompany the troops wherever they go, offering the consultation and inspiration of religion, frequently presenting to their men worthy examples of bravery and devotion to duty. You will be glad to know that eight of the chaplains who serve with me were decorated for bravery in action. Nine chaplains in the First Marine Division have been wounded in action. Day and night, these men of God in uniform devotedly serve their marine parishioners tirelessly, moving from one unit to another, keeping prayerful vigilance over the wounded, pronouncing the last sad words of committal over those who had given their last full measure of devotion. When the battle was done the officers and men of the division went into the rear areas to rest and recover their strength, but this was not a time of rest for the chaplain. His hours were filled with service to his men. He counseled with them, organized recreation for them, shared with them their grief for the fallen, and proudly set up his chapel in a tent over which flew the church pennant.

At night, when the camp was dark, the light was on in the chaplain's tent. He was writing letters of condolence to the fathers and mothers 7,000 miles away who had lost their boys. And it was long after his men were asleep that the chaplain would say a prayer for those committed to his charge and slip into his own bunk.

Although I am proud to have been selected to receive the Alexander D. Goode Lodge award, I could not have done so for myself alone. It represents to me a gracious recognition of the B'nai B'rith of the selfless service offered by all my brother chaplains in the First Marine Division, a tangible token of the strong fellowship which binds us together in spite of our differences of creed, and the common sacrifices which they have endured in order to serve your sons and husbands.

The men whom we serve in Korea are the finest in the world. The greatest tribute which can come to us chaplains is to be adjudged worthy of those whom we serve. May God keep all of them in His gracious care.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Word has just reached us that Robert McCormick, whom you customarily see on Battle Report, put down a few hours ago at Westover Field, Mass.—back from 3 weeks in Europe with NBC cameramen, the Jones brothers. He will be on hand next week to narrate the fourth of our teledocumentaries on Europe—Battle Report, Italy.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of Battlefront Korea, is David Brinkley putting a period on your thirty-first Battle Report, Washington.

Trouble for the Tuna Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Coast tuna industry has grown from little or nothing to the point that it is now the most valuable fishery that the United States possesses. Commendably the industry has developed itself with practically no cost to its Government and almost entirely upon its own resources. It was not until its further development became dependent to a considerable extent upon the negotiations with foreign governments that it became unable to transact its business upon an equal footing without the assistance of its own Government in conducting negotiations.

Problems have now arisen which can be solved only by negotiations between the government whose industries or nationals are involved. Faced with this situation the American tuna industry has turned obviously to its own Government. Through a variety of negotiations there ultimately developed the formulation of a convention with Costa Rica which our Government ratified. Implementary legislation passed through the Congress. It now appears that the Inter-American Tuna Commission for which the convention provided may now fail to carry out its objective for want of the relatively small financing which is required. The facts are well-stated in a letter dated April 18, 1951 which was addressed to me by Mr. Milton E. Brooding, chairman of the executive committee of the Pacific Fisheries Conference. Mr. Brooding's letter is as follows:

PACIFIC FISHERIES CONFERENCE,
Terminal Island, Calif., April 18, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am writing to you concerning the appropriations for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

The primary purpose of this convention and the Commission which is provided by it is to ensure peaceful relations between the United States and the nine Latin American Republics directly to our south on the Pacific in the field of fishery development. These relations have been marked on many occasions in recent years by strife, acrimony, and friction arising out of the rapidly developing tuna fishery of the United States.

It is necessary that an inter-governmental body make investigations, analyze the scientific facts so determined, and recommend such regulations as the scientific facts require, to prevent overfishing. These Latin American Governments must have an equal say with the United States Government in the planning of the investigations, the analysis of the facts and framing of the regulations, otherwise they will not accept the findings as being unbiased.

This is the function of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and it is designed admirably to perform this function. If this Commission is given appropriations to go ahead with its work, it is certain that the international friction will diminish, and the resources will be protected in perpetuity for the use of all peoples of this hemisphere.

The tuna fishery of the Pacific has become the most valuable fishery that the United States possesses. Its product, canned tuna, has become a staple item in the American diet, valuably supplementing our supply of animal protein food. Approximately 11,000,000 cases of tuna have been consumed in the United States during the past year, or about 3½ cans for each man, woman, and child in the country. The annual product is valued in excess of $100,000,000; upward of $125,000,000 is invested in the vessels, canneries, etc., that produce the product, and many thousands of people in the States of California, Oregon and Washington are employed directly in the industry.

The remarkable development of this fishery has been accomplished by the tuna industry by its own initiative, by the investment of private capital, without ever calling upon the Federal Government for assistance, financial or otherwise. It desires to maintain that independent position. It would not call upon the Government for any appropriation whatever if there were any practicable way to handle the problem with private funds.

More than 90 percent of the tuna produced by this industry is caught south of our border. The fishery extends to Northern Peru and works the year around in all of the coastal area between California and Peru. Some of the tuna is caught, under permit from the particular country, in the territorial waters of those several independent nations; most of it comes from the high seas off the coasts of those countries.

Nearly all of the fishing is done by the live bait method. This requires the use of small live fish of particular kinds which are found only in the shallow coastal waters adjacent to the fishing grounds. All of this bait comes from the territorial waters of one or the other of these nine sovereign nations. It is taken under individual boat permits from those nations.

Most of the friction between the fleet and these 9 countries centers on these bait fisheries. These several countries do not use these bait resources themselves but they may want to, at some time in the future when their tuna fisheries develop. They are worried lest the American fishermen overfish and destroy these resources. This worry extends also to the offshore tuna resources, which these countries scarcely use now but may want to use in the future as their populations increase and their supplies of animal protein foods decrease.

These worries express themselves in vigorous political disturbances within some of these countries directed at the United States industry, the enactment of unsound regulations which hamper our industry and do not conserve the resource, and in continual friction which disturbs the friendly relations between the United States and our Latin American neighbors.

The basic reason for this situation is that practically nothing is known about the biology or abundance of the tuna or the bait fish and either their migrations or the effect of the fishery on their abundance. Practically none of the scientific facts needed to detect overfishing or to frame regulations to prevent it are known.

These Latin-American countries do not have trained scientists to do this work. They are so suspicious that the United States is solely intent on exploiting their resources even to the point of destroying them, that they look upon information from the United States on this subject as being biased in favor of exploitation, whether that information comes from the United States Government or from the United States industry. In particular, they are suspicious of the intent of the United States industry. Consequently, the industry itself cannot provide the research information needed. These sovereign nations will not accept it as unbiased information. The industry cannot treat with these sovereign nations. The dealing must be on a governmental level between the Government of the United States and these several governments.

If the Commission is now permitted to die because of lack of appropriations, it is quite as certain that these international frictions will flare up once again in an even more aggravating manner because these Latin-American countries will justly feel that the United States has welshed on the international commitments it has made, and that there is no true interest on the part of the United States in preventing overfishing of these resources. That appears to be what is going to happen.

The Commission held its first meeting in July 1950, and began actual operations in January 1951, when its Director of Investigations entered on duty. The program is under way. Costa Rica has given the Commission its share of the joint expenses, but the United States has only $12,000 of its $59,000 share for the remainder of this fiscal years. These funds will be exhausted by the middle of May and the scientific staff of the Commission will have to be put on payless furlough unless additional funds are forthcoming for the remainder of fiscal 1951.

Pending before the House Appropriations Committee is also the Commission's budget request for fiscal 1952 in the amount of $339,000.

It should be borne in mind that this Commission was established under a convention between the United States and Costa Rica which was ratified without dissenting vote by the Senate of the United States on August 17, 1949, and entered into force on March 3, 1950.

Legislation designed to give effect to this Convention and to authorize appropriations for this purpose passed both the House and Senate last year without dissenting vote and became Public Law 764, Eighty-first Congress

Failure of the Congress to provide funds for the maintenance of the program would in effect be a rescission of the ratification of a convention to which we have invited other nations to adhere, and of the passage of the implementing legislation (Public Law 764, 81st Cong.).

Members of the Pacific Fisheries Conference believe the Congress would not wish to take any action which could be considered by these other nations as a repudiation of such recently approved legislation and we would very much appreciate your doing anything you properly can to assure favorable action by the Appropriations Committee on these two items which are now under consideration as part of the budget of the Department of State.

The Pacific Fisheries Conference is composed of all labor unions, vessel owners associations and trade associations engaged in all of the fisheries of the United States operating from the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, and from the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. A principal purpose of the Pacific Fisheries Conference is to aid the United States Government in every possible way that the fishing industry can to decrease the international friction which the operations of high seas fisheries has so often brought about.

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is considered to be a keystone in the progress of a policy of friendly development of the vast food potential of the Pacific Ocean. This conference has followed the development of this subject from the first. It encouraged the Department of State to negotiate the convention with Costa Rica, and participated in the negotiation. It urged the ratification of the convention by the Senate. It pressed for passage of the implementing legislation through the Congress. It now prays that the Congress will provide the funds with which this Commission can engage in its appointed duties, which we feel are of such importance to the international relations of this Nation and to the continued welfare of one of this hemisphere's great natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON E. BRODDING.
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Pacific Fisheries Conference.

Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Fisheries Conference represents all segments of the fishery industry on the Pacific coast of the United States including the organizations of labor, boat owners, producers or processors, and also the professional associations and publications which are interested in the fisheries field. The amount which is presently involved is something less than $400,000. It might be well to point out that the fisheries are an efficient source of food which has not been expensive to the Federal Government. By comparison the average annual contribution of each fishermen and farmer to total production is 47,000 pounds for the fisherman and 34,500 pounds for the farmer. The annual Federal expenditure for each ton of food produced—Senate Document No. 51, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, page 131—was 83 cents for the fishery produce and $7.04 for the farm produce. The industry as a whole has been very conservative in its requests upon the Government.

Address by Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana, to the National Muscular Dystrophy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] at the National Conference of the Muscular Dystrophy Association in the Statler Hotel, New York City, on April 14, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I deem it a great privilege to be invited to address your first national medical conference.

As chairman of the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have the responsibility of studying all legislative proposals affecting the health and well-being of our people. But, in addition to discharging that official responsibility, I feel it my duty to keep in touch with all developments which promise to help solve national problems in the field of health, even if they have not as yet resulted in the submission of proposals for legislation by the Congress.

Consequently, when I heard of the organization of the Muscular Dystrophy Association some 10 months ago, I promptly inquired into its nature and its objectives. Since then I have tried to keep informed on its progress. As a result of what I thus learned, and on the basis of more than 10 years of committee experience with legislation resulting from the activities of similar organizations, I know I can say with all confidence that the Muscular Dystrophy Association is a splendid organization with a humane purpose; an organization that has already accomplished much that is worth while in furthering its basic aims; an organization that holds great future promise, not only for its members but for the country as a whole; an organization I deem it an honor to appear before.

Naturally I do not have detailed knowledge of the day-to-day workings or activities of your association; nor can I by the furthest stretch of imagination claim to be an authority on muscular dystrophy. But since most people are altogether unaware of this strange malady, perhaps a recapitulation of what I do know about it would be in order here. This is so because yours is a story that should be told and retold. It is a dramatic story; a story of great courage in the face of tremendous odds; a story of mobilizing for battle against a disease that has baffled medical science for centuries—a disease which is an insidious, silent, creeping sort of killer, numbering its victims in the thousands. Many of these sufferers are adults; at least half are children between 3 and 13 years of age—children who should be running and leaping and playing during the most happy and carefree period of life, but children whose muscles are slowly and mysteriously wasting away; children, few of whom will live to adolescence and none of whom will live to maturity unless, through your generous efforts and with the aid of an understanding nation, our vast scientific resources may be mobilized and directed to discover the cause of this dread disease and find a cure for its victims.

To date, your fellow citizens and your Government has done pitifully little to help solve this problem. Not because of any intentional lack of interest, but simply because the people of our country generally have been and, for the most part, still are wholly unaware of its existence. And when even the medical profession so far have learned so little of the disease that most of them cannot recognize or diagnose it, surely the people cannot be blamed if they remain unaware of the compelling need for concerted action against it.

Obviously, the first step in the battle is to create that awareness. And obviously, this is the most difficult step of all because, in the first instance, it can only be taken by the victims of the disease and by their families; by people who, while carrying their own heavy burdens of pain and sorrow and expense must nonetheless rise above their individual burdens and sorrows and join together to help one another and to help their fellow citizens learn of their common plight. This is the step that calls for courage and determination and for sacrifice. And this is the step which, to your great honor and to the Nation's benefit, you took when less than a year ago you organized the Muscular Dystrophy Association and began to set up chapters throughout the country.

All of this early spade work—and it was a gigantic job—was done with the "blood, sweat, and tears" of the association's members—and most important of all—with money contributed by the members themselves. It was a wonderful and typical example of American humanity; of American grit and courage; of people surmounting their own burdens and pitching in and working together to solve a problem beyond the capabilities of individual effort.

The association's first national convention held in New York in January of this year helped spread the word around. Shortly thereafter, the press became aware of the nature of this murderous ailment in the case of the four Godfrey brothers in New York and other young victims living in the Middle West, the South, and on the west coast. And now you have brought into being this first national medical conference on muscular dystrophy—a conference attended by prominent medical men from every section of the United States and from outside our borders. So now, through your generous and persistent efforts, there is real hope that the research needed to find the cause and cure of muscular dystrophy will be undertaken on a scale large enough to be really effective. If you persist in your efforts with the same determination and energy as you have shown to date, you may be sure that what up to now has been a hope will soon become a certainty.

To be sure, there is much yet to be done. The New York Times recently commented in an editorial, and I quote:

"In 1950 only $20,000 was spent on research in muscular dystrophy, and all but $1,000 of this was contributed by the newly organized Muscular Dystrophy Association. It is an anomaly in a country always ready to support medical science that Dr. Ade T. Milhorat, of the New York Hospital—Cornell Medical Center—is the only scientist who is devoting all his working time to research in muscular dystrophy. The evidence that he has collected justifies the belief that a cure can be found not in the remote future but in a few years. The hospitals are ready, but there is no money for research."

Well, I say that if the hospitals are ready, then the money for research should and must be provided. And I believe that since this is a problem of concern to all our people, that a portion of these funds for muscular dystrophy research, as in the case of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

other mysterious maladies, ought to be provided by the Federal Government, to supplement the voluntary contributions made by the members of your association and persons sympathetic to its aims.

It is dreadful to think what might have happened had your association not come to Dr. Milhorat's rescue when lack of funds threatened to curtail his very limited research program. While your grant of $25,000 will make it possible for him to continue, and to expand his activities to some degree, it is most obvious that additional help must be found. The funds given New York Hospital will cover operating expenses for only 2½ months.

As a Member of the United States Senate, I am proud to say that I have either initiated or been the cosponsor of such legislation as the National Cancer Act, welcomed by doctors specializing in that disease and by the American Cancer Society; and the national heart bill, which represents the first really effective attack on heart disease by the Federal Government. I hope, and expect, to be of assistance in furthering the cause of similar organizations in the health and medical field, and I most certainly include in that statement the cause to which the Muscular Dystrophy Association is devoted. I have also had the honor and privilege of cosponsoring legislation which resulted in the establishment of the Neurological and Blindness Institute at Bethesda, Md., a division of the United States Public Health Service. Undoubtedly, some of the funds to be allocated to the Neurological and Blindness Institute at this session of Congress will be used for limited research in an attempt to find the cause and cure for muscular dystrophy.

As a matter of fact, there is no doubt but that the work being done in each of the seven great research centers we have created at Bethesda will contribute its part to the final solution of the problem. For that is the great advance represented by the National Institutes of Health. Instead of having scientists working away at their own separate problems, each of them ignorant of the discoveries or new developments perfected by the others, we now have a mechanism through which every forward step in one field is immediately called to the attention of workers in other fields. It is through this concept of separate but coordinated research that we hope to find the causes and cures for disease far sooner than would otherwise have been possible.

This is all to the good. But, while we are discussing the use of Federal funds for such research, permit me because of my experience in this field to offer a word of advice. Despite what you may occasionally read, ours is not a "give-away" government. Time and time again my colleagues in the Congress have proved that, while they will appropriate money to aid in such research, they will do so only when the people immediately concerned are really attempting to help themselves. Usually Federal aid is made available in amounts approximately equal to those raised by the voluntary groups themselves. This has been true in the past and it is most certainly true now when the Congress is faced with the task of raising the huge funds needed to finance an all-out mobilization.

But I know I need not dwell on this. You have already gone a long way and I know you will persevere in your efforts. I am sure you all share in the thought expressed by your own president, Mr. Paul Cohen, when he said- and I quote:

"By joining our hands we have created the organism that can make more intensive research activity a reality. It is simply a matter of basic arithmetic; the more research we can pay for, the more likely a quicker cure."

And while you continue to campaign for funds and to publicize your efforts and make the layman more conscious of what muscular dystrophy is and what must be done to arrest it, I believe there will be further help forthcoming from still another quarter.

Last year the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am chairman, reported a bill to the Senate calling for a national survey of sickness in the United States. The last public census of the various ailments and afflictions affecting our citizens had been taken in 1939. Since then, the United States had engaged in the most disastrous war in her history, with vast population changes taking place. Therefore, we of the committee felt it imperative that the facts concerning the health of the people be brought up to date.

The bill was subsequently passed by the Senate, but unfortunately did not pass in the House because of the great number of other measures which took precedence over it. However, that bill has been reintroduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY as H. R. 3339. If enough people express their interest and the bill passes the House, I am confident that we in the Senate will again do our part to make it law.

Specifically, as regards muscular dystrophy, such a survey could indicate how many persons suffer from the disease; how many of these are men, women, and children. It would establish just where these individuals live, which of the States have the greatest number of victims; which of the States are devoid of them. It would provide for reports on the disease on a State-wide basis. We would know how the disease strikes as regards age groups, whether it affects all income brackets equally or if it is found just among the middle- or low-income groups. These and dozens of other questions of great importance to our research workers would be answered.

"Knowledge is more than power"—knowledge gives you the power to tackle a problem head on, armed with every available weapon and the right kind of weapon. We, in America, do not have that knowledge as regards the incidence of disease among our people. And if those of you who are kind enough to listen to me today share my belief that it is important to us, I would urge that you let your own Congressmen and Senators know of your interest in the bill calling for a "Survey of Sickness."

And while I am urging action on your part to make this survey possible, let me mention one more bill the passage of which is of great importance to the realization of your hopes. To conquer muscular dystrophy we must first establish the facts; then we must provide for research on those facts; and, finally, we must make sure that we have the skilled medical personnel to put the results of that research to work. The first can be taken care of through the Survey of Sickness bill. The second item through the raising of additional funds for research. But while we are working together on these two, we must also realize all this effort may be wasted unless we move quickly to rescue the schools on which we depend for the training of doctors and nurses from the very grave financial crisis which now threatens them. If we are to have enough doctors and nurses to treat our sick, we must provide Federal assistance to the medical and nursing schools. A bill which will do just that will be debated by the Senate within the next 2 or 3 weeks. It is a strictly nonpartisan and most carefully drawn bill. It is sponsored by Senator TAFT as well as by myself and all of the other members of my committee—Republicans and Democrats alike. It is Senate bill 337—the Federal aid to medical education bill, and it is wholeheartedly endorsed by the deans of our medical schools, by the presidents of our universities, and by the American Dental Association. In addition, it is endorsed by farm and labor groups, by church organizations, and by the American Legion and the Disabled Veterans of America. Yet without your aid and that of other groups throughout the land, this badly needed bill might not pass the Congress because it is opposed by one single organization—by the million-dollar lobby of the American Medical Association.

If we are to conquer muscular dystrophy and similar killers of our people, we must act on all three fronts. We must pass the survey of sickness bill now in the House—so that we may learn the facts. We must provide, through a combination of voluntary and of governmental effort, for greatly increased medical research. And we must pass the aid to medical education bill which is now before the Senate.

All three of these efforts are based on the principle that problems affecting the Nation's health are of concern to us all; that diseases which without warning can strike any family in the Nation warrant the attention of a Government representing those families; that such problems can best be solved when individual citizens join together to attack those problems through their own voluntary organizations and in partnership with their own Government.

It is in keeping with this principle that I urge the members of the Muscular Dystrophy Association to keep working, keep fighting, and in every possible way continue to give proof to the Congress and to the Nation that it is your intention not to rest until this serious malady is tracked down and overcome. With this fact made evident, I am confident that your Government will also assume its share of the responsibility.

And now, in closing, permit me to again express my sincere appreciation of your invitation to join with you today, and also to express my compliments to you for the magnificent effort your association is making in this great humane cause.

"For One Cohen or One Capone, There Are Scores of Less Widely Advertised Tax Evaders of the Same General Stripe—Some of Them Differing Little From the 'Big Fellows'—Even in the Amounts of Money Out of Which They Try To Cheat the Government"—Edward H. Foley, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Independent Bankers Association of the United States met in annual meeting at Mobile, Ala. In attendance at the convention myself, I was privileged to introduce the principal speaker on the program—one of America's youngest, most forceful, and brilliant executives serving the Federal Government in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, Hon. Edward H. Foley, Jr., Under Secretary of the Treasury,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

needs no introduction to the Committee on Banking and Currency of either House nor, for that matter, to the great majority in both Houses here on Capitol Hill.

We know Edward Foley as an indefatigable worker. We know him as a man of great force and drive. We know him as a direct actionist and as a prudent, sagacious, and an able administrator. A graduate of Fordham University, one of America's greatest schools of law, he has long since distinguished himself for his aptitude and ability in that profession as well as in finance.

After having served as assistant general counsel as well as the general counsel of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works he was named assistant general counsel of the Treasury Department itself in 1937 and in May of 1939 was appointed general counsel of that most important department of government.

Resigning his Federal appointment at the outbreak of war, he joined up with the troops, was commissioned a lieutenant colonel and given an assignment as general counsel to the Quartermaster General of the United States Army.

In the following summer he was promoted to the rank of colonel and dispatched to Italy to serve as chief American financial representative of the Allied Control Commission. For his duty in this all-important task he was awarded the Legion of Merit for his distinguished military services in this field.

At the end of the war, Colonel Foley returned to civilian life as general counsel in the Office of Contract Termination and Settlement and was then appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1948.

Known as the watchdog of the lend-lease program, he was given full charge of all Treasury's legal activities at the time that that Department was concerned with playing a major role in world affairs through the establishment of the lend-lease program with the embattled British Empire.

Congressional observers are universally agreed that much of the credit for the manner and the dispatch in which this major piece of legislation was administered belongs to Ed Foley, inasmuch as no small part of the work fell upon the broad shoulders of our great Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, in his address before the Independent Bankers Association, Mr. Foley, among other aspects of the Treasurer's duties, discussed the problem of the enforcement of income-tax evasion against characters of the underworld. In doing so, he pointed out that the activities of gamblers and racketeers with well advertised names—like the Capones, the Mickey Cohens, and others—who appeared before the Kefauver committee did not by any means represent the full problem of income-tax enforcement against that ilk or type of citizen.

For one racketeer—

Mr. Foley told the bankers—

with a widely advertised and well-known headline-rating name, such as appeared on television in the Kefauver committee investigation, there are scores upon scores of others about whom the general public rarely if ever heard but who deserve and, in fact, do get the internal revenue service's most energetic and effective attention.

In his address to the Independent Bankers Association, Under Secretary Foley called the roll of a few of the criminal-type characters who had been indicted, brought to trial, and fined or imprisoned, or who had received both penalties, on pleas and convictions involving violations of internal-revenue laws.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that while Mr. Foley spoke he held in his hand a mimeographed sheaf of papers containing the names of the very sort of persons to whom I refer. He stated that "long as it is, it is still merely a representative list 13 pages long, which the internal revenue services of the Treasury Department had previously presented to the Kefauver committee, setting forth the names and addresses of gamblers and other racketeers who operated in practically every State in the Union."

In almost every case—

Mr. Foley said—

the tax deficiencies and individual penalties assessed ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars and, in some cases, into the millions.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all my colleagues in this House may read one of the most interesting and factual addresses with respect to law enforcement by our Treasury Department, the activities of our Internal Revenue Bureau and other related agencies of Government, that could be made, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include therein the speech made by Hon. Edward H. Foley, Jr., to the Independent Bankers Association, in Mobile, Ala.

The following is the address made by Under Secretary of the Treasury Edward H. Foley before the Independent Bankers Association at the Admiral Semmes Hotel, Mobile, Ala.:

It is an honor to address this gathering of members of the Independent Bankers Association. I am sure every one of you shares my happiness that for tonight's occasion you are convened in this splendid southern city. An unerring destiny long ago endowed Mobile with just about everything to produce a community that is at once beautiful and vital, pleasant, and industrious, restful, and animated.

Born and educated a New Yorker, I must confess that I am not yet completely familiar with all the details of the Mobile formula for city building. But I needed no more than my first acquaintance with this city some 15 years ago, when I addressed a meeting of the Alabama League of Municipalities in Mobile, to be prepared to recommend that formula strongly wherever I may go. Since then I have married one of Alabama's fairest, Emily Ligon, of Montgomery, and with justifiable pride I am happy to relate that the home of Mrs. Foley's parents, the late General and Mrs. Robert F. Ligon, only last January became the new Governor's mansion of this great State.

Many areas of the South have stepped out in front in recent years in planning and carrying through improvement programs. Mobile's great water-front development is particularly notable in this respect, and is a most impressive tribute to the initiative, pride, and civic spirit of its people.

Today we are all giving much thought to the resources on which we rely for defense, and Mobile rates very high among the bastions of production and transportation which dot our coast line.

Tonight I bring to you from Washington a report on another aspect of American strength and American defense. It is a report on a significant phase of that subject of universal interest and concern—Federal taxes.

It is not, let me say at the outset, a report on tax rates. The matter of rates is now before Congress. What I shall talk about tonight is even more important than rates, at least so far as basic and long-range considerations go. It is my purpose to remind you of the salient characteristics on which depend the whole vigor and power of the Federal tax system, and tell you what your Government is doing to protect that system from being undermined by the activities of certain classes of human termites abroad in the land.

You have heard news lately about the relations between the Treasury Department and some of these underworld characters: news of Ralph Capone being arrested at Chicago, of Mickey Cohen being indicted at Los Angeles, and of various similar happenings.

And this may surprise you: If you think those cases of which you have been hearing lately are highly unusual and out of the ordinary, you are mistaken. They are not. The Treasury Department's internal revenue service turns up cases of this nature year after year. Long and painstaking investigations are completed, charges are filed or indictments returned, and fines or prison sentences or both are imposed. If the cases happen to reach the charge-filing stage while some important public inquiry, such as that of the Kefauver committee, is under way, then they rate headlines.

I am glad indeed that this country has had the benefit of the Kefauver committee's work. The committee's program has been of peculiar interest to me because I am the Treasury official designated by Secretary Snyder to supervise the activities of the Department's six law-enforcement agencies.

The Treasury sought to give—and I think did give—to the Kefauver committee the fullest measure of cooperation. Certainly the committee was entitled to nothing less than that.

As to income-tax affairs, however, I am concerned lest misconceptions should gain currency in connection with such discussions and disclosures. I think we must be sure that the conclusions we reach are in correct perspective and reflect a proper emphasis.

For instance, I do not think we can allow the fidelity with which the revenue service administers the income-tax laws to be measured solely in terms of the number of criminal prosecutions it is able to bring, through the Department of Justice, against the Cohens and the Capones.

Not for one minute, let me assure you, will the Service ever ease the pressure it maintains against those notorious boys. But for one Cohen, one Capone, there are scores of less widely advertised tax evaders of the same general stripe, some of them differing little from the "big fellows" even in the amounts of money out of which they try to cheat the Government.

Let me show you what I am talking about. I have here a mimeographed list of names of the sort of people to whom I refer. It is a list 13 pages long which the internal revenue service presented to the Kefauver committee on Tuesday, March 27. The names are those of alleged gamblers, racketeers, and others in the criminal element who have run afoul of the income-tax laws since 1945.

It is merely a "representative list," 150 names, or thereabouts, from a record of 1,500 cases, involving all classes of taxpayers from all parts of the country, in which criminal prosecutions were recommended by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and instituted by United States attorneys.

Here is another list which we handed to the Kefauver committee—34 closely typed pages, this one—giving factual summaries of some of the representative cases prosecuted during the fiscal year 1946 or later. These, I repeat, were cases in which tax evaders allegedly derived their income from such criminal enterprises as gambling, the numbers racket, lotteries, slot machines, extortion, abortion mills, graft and corruption, and vice.

Does the revenue service really make it hot for tax evaders of the gambler and racketeer kind? In these documents you have a pretty conclusive answer. Yes, it does!

We have in this country a self-assessment, voluntary payment system of income taxation. Congress established that system because it accords with the American concept of maximum of individual responsibility and a minimum of Government supervision. It is a fixture in our body of law. Each individual squares his own return with the law's requirements as to reportable income, deductions and credits. We have no Gestapo to look over the taxpayer's shoulder.

In general, this self-assessment, voluntary payment system works pretty well. Nearly all Americans have a sense of responsibility for the common good, and it impels them to try to be honest about their tax payments. Most mistakes in returns are honest ones, with nothing deliberate about them.

The square shooters among taxpayers are entitled to know that they will pay only their fair share of the necessary expense of Government services and protection. They are entitled to know that the proper attention will be paid to those who try deliberately to dodge their tax responsibilities. If in some cases proper attention means the threat or imposition of severe criminal penalties, then the honest taxpayers must know that those penalties are being enforced.

And here let me urge on you an inquiring mind toward any aspersions on the revenue service which you may chance to hear. Before you allow your confidence in the efficiency and the integrity of the service to be shaken, let me urge you to call for more than blanket accusations and vague implications against this vitally important arm of your Government.

I want to tell you a story I heard the other day which is illustrative of the way I feel about the Treasury.

It is the story of a young farmer who assaulted a tramp with a stick of cordwood and wound up in jail. His lawyer finally came to see him and asked, "Jim, how did you come to hit this fellow? You know, you almost killed him. He is in the hospital now and may not live. 'Whatever made you do it?"

"Well, Mr. Smith," said Jim, "you see it was like this. This feller came by the farm the other night, and I invited him in for supper. Right away he started criticizing the furniture. Well, I let that pass because our furniture ain't any great snakes at best. Then he teed off on the food. Well, I let that pass, too. A lot of times my wife's cooking leaves a little something to be desired. Then my wife came in out of the kitchen, and he jumped on her. He said, 'Say, you ain't nothin' but an old bag, are you?' Well, I didn't do nothing about that 'cause as a matter of fact, when she gets that wrapper on, she don't exactly look like Cleopatra, anyway. But then, by jiminies, he started in on the Treasury Department. That was too much for me, so I let him have it."

If you are inclined to wonder why the revenue service does not rush forward with a defense of itself every time some allegation of laxity or favoritism is made, let me remind you that disclosures of individual income tax returns and related records may, under the law, be made only through court proceedings or under certain conditions to committees of Congress.

Public cooperation, confident and sustained, with the revenue service, keeps our Federal tax system working. I think that you and I and all the other individuals who make up the public, must guard carefully against contributing in an ill-considered way to the weakening of the cooperation.

Let me tell you with the utmost sincerity that your confidence in the revenue service is fully merited. Its personnel enforces the tax laws vigorously, honestly, and impartially.

During the years of my association with the Treasury Department in various capacities from general counsel to Under Secretary, the number of employees of the Internal Revenue service who have betrayed their trust has been infinitesimal. And the departure of these very, very few from the path of rectitude has, in every case that I recall, been discovered through the pride and precautions of the service itself.

You perhaps read in recent months of a blast of criticism against the revenue service issued by the California Crime Commission. When the blast was reduced, through careful analysis, to factual elements, it involved asserted misdeeds of two or three deputies in the California and Nevada collection offices. We stated publicly, by way of comment, that Treasury investigations into these misdeeds had been under way for some time. Since then, on the evidence our investigators obtained, two employees have been fired, and one of them and a former employee have been indicted.

I don't want to burden you with figures. But perhaps a few will be helpful.

The revenue service has at present 55,500 employees.

It administers not only the individual income tax, but 78 other Federal tax levies.

The tax returns which must be received and processed each year number 90,000,000.

In addition, about 120,000,000 related documents, such as records of income tax withholdings, must be received and processed.

Last year the revenue service collected nearly $39,000,000,000. This fiscal year the total will rise to almost $48,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1952 it probably will reach $60,000,000,000.

The annual costs of the service total about $246,000,000, so that the expense of collecting each $100 of revenue is about 59 cents.

But that 59 cents per $100 is an average figure. What keeps it so low is the fact that 90 percent of the taxes are paid voluntarily by those honest and straightforward citizens to whom I referred earlier.

It takes half of the entire Revenue Service personnel to collect the other 10 percent of the Federal taxes. This half, 26,000 persons, is assigned to what we call front-line enforcement, beginning with the sifting out of returns which appear deserving of close scrutiny, and proceeding through the whole catalog of enforcement work right up to the handling of the cases against the Cohens and the Capones.

When an enforcement case bears the earmarks of fraud it is taken over by the special agents of the Revenue Service Intelligence Unit. During 1950, 314 cases involving racketeers and gamblers received the attention of the Intelligence Unit investigators. They constituted more than 12 percent of all fraud investigations which that Unit conducted. And they turned up $24,000,000 in additional taxes and penalties proposed for assessment. They also resulted in 1932 recommendations for criminal prosecutions.

A new step has just been taken to render front-line enforcement still more effective. By direction of Secretary Snyder, the Revenue Service is now in process of organizing a Special Fraud Section, made up of investigators who have shown superior skill at breaking through the false financial fronts of the big-time tax evaders. This section will devote its entire time to inquiries into tax dodging by gamblers, racketeers, and others of the confirmed criminal stripe.

I am willing to prophesy that the work of this Special Fraud Section will be productive of many violent headaches for racketeers and gangsters in the days to come.

But I distinctly do not want to prophesy that the activities of the Special Fraud Section, or indeed any other portion of the Revenue Service, will obviate the necessity for greater vigilance on the part of local law-enforcement authorities against all maner of racketeer and gangster criminality.

Almost every day some writer or speaker implies publicly that the Revenue Service should bear general law-enforcement responsibilities, and is in fact to blame for the very existence of gambling and racketeering. For this attitude there is no basis in present public policy as expressed in the Federal statutes. Nor is there any basis for it in the Service's appropriations and its manpower situation.

If State and local governments are to remain impotent against the leaders of organized crime, then the question presents itself whether we should enact Federal laws aimed directly, or as directly as constitutional limitations will permit, at the basic crimes of which the hoodlums are guilty. There is little logic in reliance on the Federal tax laws for the general punishment of State and local gambling and similar crimes, as distinguished from the punishment of the crime of Federal income-tax evasion.

Even for more effective Federal tax enforcement, our laws have some shortcomings. We have our problems of income-tax law enforcement just as the Kefauver committee found itself facing problems of how to elicit information from recalcitrant witnesses. And the Kefauver committee, of course, had all the power of Congress behind it to punish contemptuous and lying witnesses.

The very nature of our voluntary self-assessment tax system requires a specially diligent effort to make it work with respect to those who derive their income from illegal enterprises. They are not the sort of people whose records can be relied upon, and our agents are not so naive as to think they can be. This forces our investigators many times to put in long months of work gathering the most difficult varieties of evidence to create a net worth case. Sometimes the job is an almost impossible one.

Suggestions for revision of the tax statutes are now being studied for the Congress by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. These suggestions would fortify the tax code against evasions of the types of which I have spoken. Generally, they would give our agents a stronger hand in dealing with willful cases of improper returns and improper tax records.

In closing, I want to repeat some remarks by Secretary Snyder which I had the privilege of reading for him before the Kefauver

committee at the last of its public sessions, a short time ago. The Secretary said:

"Our common purpose is to protect a priceless national asset. That asset is public confidence that the affairs of Government, and in particular the affairs of the Internal Revenue Service, are being properly conducted. The responsibility for keeping this confidence inviolate rests upon us all.

"We in the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service give our best efforts to the preservation and strengthening of that confidence. We have every official reason and every personal reason to do so.

"On the personal score we share the concern of every American for the safety of the country and the preservation of our liberties. And we know that our success in collecting the huge revenues required for national defense is dependent in tremendous measure on every honest taxpayer having assurance that the revenue service will leave nothing undone to bring chiselers to justice.

"There is full warrant in the Revenue Service record for every taxpayer to accept that assurance as an established fact. Bringing chiselers to justice has always been the service's determined policy, and continues to be its pledge."

Air Power in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I read with great interest an article in the February 17 Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Truth About Our Air Power," by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

I served as a combat war correspondent in the South Pacific and took part in the liberation of the Philippines. I found myself in agreement with many of the statements of General Vandenberg.

Because of recent events, I have reread the article to which I refer, and I believe there are several paragraphs in this article giving the views of the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force which will clarify some of the issues being debated today. I quote, in part, from General Vandenberg's article:

It is not my province or my intention to criticize the decision of the United Nations which prevented air strikes at the Manchurian troops and supply depots supporting the Chinese. Isolating the battlefield from reinforcements is the prime function of tactical air, and I am simply stating the military fact that air power was rendered practically inoperative when the U. N., in an effort to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Communists, halted offensive action at the Yalu River, the boundary between Manchuria and Korea. U. N. pilots scrupulously obeyed orders by cutting bridges across the Yalu only on the Korean side, but those measures were nullified when the Yalu froze solidly, forming a natural bridge for the Chinese to move up with enough food and light-arms ammunition on their backs to sustain them for weeks.

I believe of further interest is the following statement of General Vandenberg:

A controversy affecting the lives of soldiers cannot be settled by lining up votes as in a popularity contest. It is resolved by weighing the best methods for achieving desired results. All right. The job of tactical aviation is to help win the air war and to weaken the ability of the enemy's ground forces to impede and damage your people.

Mr. Speaker, shall we continue to render our Air Force inoperative in Korea, and permit the continued toll of lives of American troops, which might be saved?

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein excerpts from a sermon delivered last Sunday in the German Congregational Church at Clinton, Mass., by its able and distinguished pastor, the Reverend Harold S. Winship, sergeant major of a machine gun battalion in France during World War I, on the subject of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

None of the many messages I have received on this subject in recent days is couched in such eloquent and balanced language. I am desirous that the House and the Nation should have the opportunity to read it.

Patriotic sentiments contained in this and many of the messages I have received, all point toward the fact that the American people are aroused to the need for decision, unity, and strength in national policy and expect the Congress to discharge its full constitutional duty in promoting these ends. The above-mentioned follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Millions of Americans, through the miracle of radio and television, were deeply impressed when Gen. Douglas MacArthur spoke at the joint meeting of Congress. Why is it that the minds and hearts of so many Americans were stirred and touched and inspired with deep feeling and exalted emotion? Because there stood before us the noble figure of a real man, a true Christian, and a great American.

General MacArthur, in his appearance, his character, and his daily life, is a real man. His splendid physical condition, his self-control over mind and body, and the spirit shown in his words to his fellow Americans—all reveal him as a real man, a man's man, a woman's ideal man.

He stood before us as a courageous Christian—believing in the principles of Christianity, upon which our Constitution is based, believing in the power of prayer to Almighty God, the God of all nations, the Ruler of the universe. What an inspiration it is to us all to see an international leader take such a stand.

General MacArthur made a profound patriotic impression upon his fellow citizens as a great American. His words aroused our enthusiasm, they inspired our renewed loyalty and devotion to our country, and it seemed as if his return home and his presence among us symbolized new hope and stronger faith in the future of our United States of America.

Coal Mines of Pennsylvania Contribute To Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Times-Leader, the Evening News, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., entitled "Coal Mines of Pennsylvania Contribute to Nation":

COAL MINES OF PENNSYLVANIA CONTRIBUTE TO NATION—12,438,552,000 TONS MINED SINCE EARLIEST TIMES

No greater evidence of human energy exists anywhere in the world than that expended, over the years, in digging the coal of Pennsylvania. From the earliest record of mining to the present date, 12,438,552,000 net tons of coal have been removed from under the hills and valleys of Pennsylvania. For many years Pennsylvania mines were producing more than half of the fuel energy of the Nation. Today the State planning board of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce estimates that with the addition of the relatively small, but highly valuable petroleum output of the Commonwealth and its developed water power, our State's mines produce one-seventh of all energy consumed in America.

In the total of Pennsylvania coal production, anthracite, the earliest form of coal in use in our State, represents about 40 percent of all the coal ever mined in our Commonwealth, though that type of coal comes from a relatively restricted area. Today, Pennsylvania produces about half of all the anthracite mined in the world.

To form some notion of how much actual work is represented by the mining of Pennsylvania coal almost staggers the imagination. The Panama Canal has, in recent years, represented the greatest engineering achievement of the modern world. The construction of that Canal required the removal of 240,000,000 cubic yards of earth. Pennsylvania's coal mined out to the end of 1950 represents a total of more than 17,000,000,000 cubic yards, or a total equal to the bulk of material involved in the digging of 71 channels as long and deep as the Panama Canal. As a matter of fact, in many single years, Pennsylvania miners have removed more material than was involved in the digging of that great passageway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

One more comparison might perhaps help us to understand the tremendous contribution made by our State to the settlement and development of this Nation.

In the ancient world, the great Pyramid of Egypt was universally regarded as being the greatest single monument ever constructed by human labor. In the accuracy of design and in the great bulk of its stone

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

work, it is still, quite properly, one of the wonders of the world. It required, over many years, the slave labor of possibly 100,000 men. Massive as that great structure is, and impressive to all who are fortunate enough to see it, the actual bulk of the Pyramid represents only some 3,400,000 cubic yards. In some recent years, the bulk of coal removed from Pennsylvania's mines has represented a volume of material more than 80 times that of the great Pyramid and represents a far greater achievement. It is, in fact, an enduring monument to the thousands of freemen whose energy and skill, over the past 125 years, has done so much to make possible the material progress of our Nation and to create the industrial power which enables us to defend before the world the American system of free enterprise.

Former Governor of Oregon Speaks on MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, former Republican Governor of the State of Oregon, has long held a position of leadership in Oregon politics and affairs. Governor Sprague spearheads political thinking in keeping with the best tradition of liberalism. Always a careful student of affairs, the Governor is to be commended for his straightforward thinking regarding General MacArthur and his return to the United States as he writes in his Salem (Oreg.) Statesman column, It Seems to Me, April 12, 1951:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The first duty of a soldier is to obey orders. General MacArthur failed to obey the orders of his Commander in Chief. I do not see that President Truman had any alternative than to remove him from his command. This is a very unfortunate termination of a brilliant military career, but the general has invited this summary action by the President.

Partisans of MacArthur and foes of Mr. Truman are having success in stirring up public emotions against the President. That is not surprising, and surely was anticipated by Truman. Yet he had the courage to brave that reaction, proving that he had at least one of the qualities of a commander.

Over a considerable period of time MacArthur has been insubordinate in trying by public statement and personal interview to dictate the international policy this country should adopt. These statements have been disruptive, dividing opinion within the country and causing friction with our allies. Such conduct could not be tolerated by the Chief Executive who is charged with prime responsibility in this area. Truman is our President, not MacArthur; and Truman is the one the people should rally behind and support in this time of crisis, not the general who sought to force his own will on our Government and on United Nations.

I have the opinion that much of the furore that is raised over the President's action, and the calls for impeaching the President are rooted less in admiration for MacArthur than in hatred of the President or in a design to wreck his political power. The baying of the wolves for Dean Acheson's blood starts again. One can see the planning of a Roman triumph on MacArthur's return. The general himself with his sense of history, probably regards himself as another Caesar, proconsul of Gaul, about to cross the Rubicon to challenge those in seats of power.

When the emotional storm is over somber judgment will affirm the decision of President Truman. We cannot have divided authority in the conduct of our foreign and military affairs.

Harry S. Truman, President, Versus Douglas MacArthur, General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, never since Pearl Harbor have so many of our people been so deeply aroused.

On June 26, President Truman, without the consent of the Congress, involved us in world war III. As Commander in Chief, he ordered our Armed Forces to fight that war under General MacArthur's orders.

Our men, the foot soldiers—your sons and husbands—went in, fought heroically and—it seems unbelievable—when they appeared to be winning against overwhelming odds, President Truman, Commander in Chief and MacArthur's superior, ordered him not to accept the aid of the 500,000 Chinese Nationalists who wanted to cross to China's mainland from the Island of Formosa, and, on the flank or in the rear, attack the Chinese Communists who had entered the war.

MacArthur was told that he must not use our bombers or air force beyond a certain point to destroy the enemy's supply lines, ammunition dumps or rest areas.

By his orders, President Truman created a "sanctuary," "cities of refuge," to which—as a criminal in biblical times—Communists might flee and find safety.

The result of this order was that, when MacArthur's men went forward, fought and drove the enemy back to a certain line—at one time, the thirty-eighth parallel—there they must stop. Beyond that line the enemy might not be pursued; back of it he might find safety, sanctuary, rest, and, with reinforcements, launch another offensive—and so on, ad infinitum.

Had General Eisenhower in World War II been likewise denied the use of the bombers which destroyed Germany's munitions of war, her submarine bases, that war never could have been won.

Permit an illustration: A football team has a game on. Its opponent is superior in weight; has greater reserve strength in every position. It is told to win. It has outstanding passers, triple-threat men, but the coach says it must not use the pass nor its open-field runners after it reaches the opponent's 38-yard line. It must just buck the center where it is outweighed, outplayed.

The situation in Korea was intolerable. General MacArthur was ordered to fight and, one would assume, win a war. But he was also ordered not to seek the aid of millions of Chinese Nationalists who wanted to fight the Chinese Communists; ordered not to use his bombers to attack the enemy behind the battleline—not to use methods which would aid in winning.

That meant that our men, under General MacArthur—and more than 9,000 have been killed; they have suffered upward of 60,000 casualties—could not win the war in Korea. It meant that the war would continue indefinitely. With this opinion, General Ridgway, who has succeeded General MacArthur in command in the Far East, agreed when he said:

> I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement.

Unfortunately, the politicians in U. N. and here at home have not yet charted their course. The representatives of Britain and France argue with those from Russia and India. The representatives from our country, which has furnished 90 percent of the men, done 90 percent of the fighting, suffered 94.6 percent of the casualties in Korea, apparently await the outcome of that political argument. Our men fight on.

President Truman put us into this war. He is a politician, and the politicians have been running it. General MacArthur is a professional soldier and, as President Truman admits, one of the greatest. Being a patriotic American and a professional soldier, he could not quietly submit, remain silent, while American soldiers were being needlessly slaughtered; their efforts to win the war thwarted. He protested. Because he protested the restrictions which hindered the war effort, he was relieved of command.

President Truman now charges that General MacArthur seeks to involve us in world war III. How false. How absurd. All he asked was that we either get out of this war, or that he be permitted to use established, proven military tactics to win that war as quickly as possible at the least cost in human lives.

President Truman ordered our men into world war III in Asia. His orders created a stalemate there. Indications are that he will follow the policy of United Nations which would give Korea and Formosa to the Communists; make futile the sacrifices of our men who have died there; absurd his contention that we seek through war to contain communism.

Do not be deceived by Mr. Truman's attempt to brand General MacArthur and his supporters as warmongers. President Truman is the man who is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

now seeking an army of three and one-half million or four million men, evidently for the purpose of sending them to Europe, where they may become involved in world war III.

Mr. Truman chose to disregard the advice of MacArthur, the outstanding patriot, administrator, and military expert. Mr. Truman chooses to follow the ruinous policy of Mr. Acheson, who has always been sympathetic toward British interests; whose acts so often have resulted in the advancement of communism.

As Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman had authority to recall General MacArthur. To millions of Americans that seems to be the most tragic mistake which he, a man of many mistakes, has made as President.

The President's removal of General MacArthur, his acceptance of Acheson's policies, has aroused the Nation as it never has been aroused since Pearl Harbor. Acheson's removal is demanded. Congress is asked to impeach the President.

Because President Truman ordered our men into a war where they are being killed, but follows a policy which prohibits the effective use of our Air Force which would save the lives of many of our men, in my judgment the Congress should make every effort to oust him from office.

With a corrupt political machine at his back, Congress may not be successful in that effort. But if the people will continue vigorously to express their desires as they have been doing since General MacArthur's removal, there is hope that Acheson, the supporter of Hiss, may be fired, the country saved from disaster by a Congress fully aware and mindful of their constituents' demands.

Overlong the people have condoned Mr. Truman's shortcomings, put up with a complacent Congress. Our danger now is that they may fail to continue their opposition until they have opportunity in 1952 to restore this Government to the people.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of my weekly radio broadcast to my constituents on April 21, 1951:

Fellow citizens of the Third Congressional District, all other news in Washington this week was overshadowed by the appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the joint meeting of the Congress of the United States on Thursday.

He was a dramatic figure as he strode down the center aisle of the House past his young son, Arthur, who was sitting with the high Army officials in the front aisle seat. He appeared a little tense as he entered the door, but after he had mounted the platform and waved to Mrs. MacArthur, who was sitting on the front row in the gallery, his tension disappeared and he immediately became master of the situation.

General MacArthur's address to the Congress was magnificent. His voice and delivery were superb and his persuasive eloquence made a strong emotional appeal to the entire audience.

With the greater portion of the text of his speech no true American could take exception. It did, however, raise several issues upon which the future security of America depends and it also raised certain questions which demand the immediate investigation of the Congress.

There appears to be a wide difference of opinion between General MacArthur and the administration with respect to our far eastern policies. If the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree with General MacArthur, as he said, the Congress and our people should know that fact. Inquiry should be made by the Congress as to what military assistance this country will have to contribute to the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa to support their effective operation against the Chinese mainland. The ultimate effect of such operations must also be considered. The military advantage must be judged in the light of our global policy, our commitments to the United Nations and our program of cooperation with our allies.

General MacArthur stated that if we bomb the Chinese bases in Manchuria and give support to the forces of Chiang Kai-shek, the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves. We were told the same thing concerning the Chinese Communists when we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. Certainly the intervention of Russia is a factor to be reckoned with and seriously considered before we extend the Korean conflict.

General MacArthur has rendered a great public service in so forcibly presenting these issues. He will not fade away as he predicted. The fact that he is now free to express himself on American policies offers him the greatest opportunity of his brilliant career.

Already General MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been invited to appear as witnesses before appropriate committees of the Congress so that their views may be presented and weighed. These issues should not be determined on the basis of a clash of personalities. They are of far greater importance than the welfare of either Mr. Truman or General MacArthur.

Your Representative will follow the testimony before the congressional committees with interest and support those policies which appear to be for the best interests of the Nation. Frankness compels me to say, however, that I am opposed to the appeasement of communism in any part of the world. I agree with General MacArthur that "history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier war." On the other hand, I do not favor starting a big war in China for the purpose of winning a little war in Korea.

It is a tragedy that in the midst of this debate, so vital to our national security, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, the chief author and exponent of our present bipartisan foreign policy, has passed away. No Member of the entire Congress has contributed more to the advancement of world peace than Senator Vandenberg. His views on foreign policy were respected by Republicans and Democrats alike. His services in the Senate have been sorely missed during his prolonged illness. Following his death on Wednesday night, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday approved a formal resolution praising its former chairman and member for his "wisdom, judgment, and patriotism." It is a great pity that the Nation will not have the benefit of his vision, judgment, and nonpartisan approach in the determination of the grave problems which confront us.

Farm Credit Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 I introduced H. R. 2642 because today there is hardly anything more important to the farmers of the deep South than a sound agricultural program and the credit to finance it.

And of all the things which a farmer needs if he is to do his part in the war effort, the most important is credit. With it, he can get the other things he needs, or do the job which must be done on his farm. H. R. 2642 provides a credit program which will enable farmers to take advantage of the present opportunities to engage successfully in livestock, dairy and poultry production.

H. R. 2642 does not sponsor credit that competes with banks. The loans it deals with are only made to farmers who cannot get financed elsewhere. H. R. 2642 will also develop efficient farm owners.

In farm visits in my own district and throughout the South I have talked to persons who really know farmers and farming, and in their opinion, the farmer is expected to take run-down land, insufficient or inefficient operating equipment, a sorry home and without any help from outside, grow on that farm not only what he needs to feed his own family but also to feed the city production worker and the members of our Armed Forces.

We would not say to a soldier fighting in Korea, "Here is a chuck of wood and a lump of iron ore. Make yourself a gun and beat these Communists." Yet in effect that is what we tell the farmer everytime we deny him credit to buy the seed, feed, livestock, equipment, buildings, or land he needs.

We would not tell the worker in an airplane factory, "Here is a binful of aluminum ore. Use only your hands, but build us an airplane strong enough to defend this Nation." Yet, again, in effect, that is what we are telling the farmer when we ask him to grow the food we need without making it possible for him to do the job. He needs and we must supply credit to do the job.

In 1947 farmers had $18,000,000,000 net farm income. But since 1947 that farm income has been dropping each year as the prices which farmers pay for their equipment and other farm needs rise more rapidly or decline more slowly than the prices farmers receive for the crops and livestock they grow. Last year the farmer's net income was under $13,000,000,000. While that sounds like quite a bit, over 6,000,000 farmers shared

it and the average farmer's net income was only about $2,000.

Almost the cheapest form of city labor gets more for his year's work than that and does not have to take the gamble that the farmer takes.

Almost 3,000,000 farmers, in fact, had gross incomes under $1,500 last year. Out of that they had to pay farm-operating expenses, family living expenses, and to buy whatever seed, feed, fertilizer, or equipment they needed for the next year's crop. They could not possibly do it without credit.

A few of these farmers could get the credit they need from local banks, but not many. With incomes so low, they have not been able to build up the chattels they need for bank security. Even when they can get credit locally, usually the terms require repayment in a short period of time, and these farmers need long repayment periods so they can pay out of increased farm income rather than by selling capital goods. If, for example, a farmer borrows to buy dairy cows, and has to repay the loan in 9 months, then he has to sell the cows to pay the loan and all the benefit he receives is his milk check during the 9-month period.

On the other hand, if he had a long-time loan—say, a 7-year loan such as he might get under H. R. 2642—he should have a number of calves born during that period. He can save some of them to build up his herd, and with the money he gets from the sale of the others and from 7 years of income from milk, he can repay the loan and still have the nucleus of a good herd.

H. R. 2642 makes that type of credit available to the farmer who needs it. It provides a period long enough to repay the loan out of increased farm income instead of sale of capital goods. One indication of the need for this type of credit is the fact that the Farmers Home Administration who now make this type of loan received over 110,000 applications for farm credit during the past 7 months.

Present legislation limits to 5 years the time any borrower may have to repay these Government operating-credit loans. In many cases this is enough; but where the farmer needs to make a complete adjustment in his operations he may require a longer time. In my district, for example, the typical pattern of agriculture has been cotton raising. Today many of these cotton farmers are learning that their farming enterprises are more sound if they also raise other crops and carry livestock. The number of dairy farms in my district is increasing rapidly, and these dairy farmers are getting milk checks every month instead of a cotton check once a year. And their land benefits by being in grass instead of row crops.

But it takes time and money to convert from cotton raising to livestock. A cotton farmer who changes over to a dairyman must develop his pastures, then build a dairy herd. Records kept by the Farmers Home Administration indicate that of the 27,755 borrowers who repaid their operating loans in full during the 1950 fiscal year, 21.5 percent of the borrowers were indebted to the agency longer than 5 years. These farmers proved that they could be successful by earning enough from their farm to repay the loans while supporting their families, but under present laws the Government, after 1951, will allow these potentially successful farmers only 5 years to succeed. H. R. 2642 would allow up to 7 years, a far more realistic figure.

Extending the repayment period and increasing the number of years that a borrower may be assisted are needed to provide a more effective system of credit where larger amounts of credit are required to allow needed expansion or reorganization in farming enterprises.

The bill will also permit loaning larger amounts to a farmer and that too will help his transition to a sounder farming economy.

The bill will also help our Nation's economy by making it possible for more farmers to own their land than to be tenants or sharecroppers on it. The owner husbands his land resources better, tries to build it up, takes an active part in his community affairs. The tenant moves from farm to farm, and seldom remains fixed in one place long enough to build up the land or take an active part in community affairs.

Deep down in the heart of every farmer is an ingrained desire to own his own farm, to have a little bit of America he can call his own. That is real Americanism. The banks know that many of these tenant farmers are good farmers and would be good landowners if given a chance, but the bank's regulations will not permit making long-term real-estate loans to them.

H. R. 2642 helps the banks to make such loans, and to safeguard their own interests, too. The bill broadens the base of the insured mortgage loan program established by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 so that more local banks can lend money to qualified farmers to become farm owners, and have those loans guaranteed by Government.

This insured mortgage program has been growing in importance each year as more and more banks and other private lenders make loans to qualified farmers and accept Government guaranties of repayment and government servicing of all work connected with making or collecting the loans. It has been estimated that 6,000 such loans will be insured—creating 6,000 new farm owners or making family farms out of two small units in this country—during the coming year. Department officials estimate that at peak capacity the program could create or strengthen 30,000 family farms each year if the provisions of H. R. 2642 were in effect. That amounts to only about 10 per county, and surely all Members of Congress know that in their own districts—unless they represent a purely urban area—there are far more than 10 qualified farmers who should be allowed the privilege of family farm ownership.

The bill also broadens the program of real estate development loans to farmers who need to improve their land and buildings to make their farms efficient operating units. It is just as important to help a small farm owner develop his farm as it is to make an owner out of a tenant.

I therefore offer H. R. 2642 as a method of solving many of the farmer's financial problems. With its aid, I believe we can benefit the farmer, the community, and the entire Nation. It provides the farmer adequate credit to do the job which must be done on our farms. It provides money which will be spent in the local community. It insures our Nation of the food and fiber needed by our defense program.

Safety, Health, and Welfare of Inductees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the letter printed below received from General Hershey certainly shows the need for a coordinated program in our armed services:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. AYRES: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 17, enclosing a clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 13, containing the adverse comments of a father and mother who visited their son stationed at Keesler Field, Biloxi, Miss. You also express the opinion that it is my responsibility to see that youths inducted under the Selective Service Act are not subjected to the conditions that apparently exist in the vicinity of Keesler Field, Miss.

Under the present Selective Service Act, the Selective Service System is responsible for the registration, classification, and delivery of its registrants to the Armed Forces induction stations for physical examination or induction. The moment they enter the Armed Forces they are outside the responsibility of the Selective Service System and there is nothing that the Selective Service System can do under the law with regard to the conditions of which your constituent complains. Incidentally, no registrants were inducted pursuant to 1948 Selective Service Act, into the United States Air Force, which prefers to recruit by voluntary enlistment.

While I am in sympathy with, and sincerely appreciate the misgivings of, these parents, I believe that the problem involved must be solved by the Armed Forces in coordination and cooperation with State, county, and city authorities in the neighborhood of military installations.

The Senate version of the Universal Training and Service Act now pending in Congress contained a provision for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission which would have the responsibility for establishing policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of the trainees. The House version provides that the Commission is to direct and control the basic military training of the National Security Training Corps, establishing such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial military training, as are necessary, making adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare

of the trainees. The Commission is required, among oth r things, to prepare and submit to Congress plans covering measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the members of the National Security Training Corps and to prescribe a code of conduct. These directives of the Congress, in my opinion, are steps in the right direction as far as the members of the National Security Training Corps are concerned. However, as far as the Selective Service System is concerned it has no authority or responsibility over its registrants once they are inducted into the Armed Forces.

It would appear that the questions raised by you more properly come within the sphere of the Department of Defense and I am, therefore, taking the liberty of referring your communication to the Secretary of Defense for his consideration. It is hoped that this disposition of the matter will satisfactorily serve your purpose, and I regret that I cannot be more helpful in this situation.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

The Role of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine:

THE ROLE OF MACARTHUR—HE HAS A HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY TO BRING FOCUS AND FORCE TO UNITED STATES POLICY

General MacArthur has a great role—a role of greatness—to play in this country now.

The size of the role is indicated by the fact that he was ousted for no petty reason but because he chose to challenge the whole drift of events and the dominant attitudes of the Government of the United States and of the United Nations.

If we remind ourselves of some of MacArthur's distinguishing qualities and characteristics, we shall be able to sketch the nature of the role itself and his fitness for it.

MacArthur is a man of the west, a man of Asia, and an American.

MacArthur is a man of the west. At all those times when we are not bogged down in trivialities, we realize that it is nothing less than western civilization itself which is in peril in this generation. The peril comes not only from the external barbarian but from weakness and betrayal—or sheer stupidity—within. MacArthur is a man deeply of the west. He knows its history—its spiritual no less than its military history. Greece, Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the age of Britain's greatness—all the splendid and tragic meanings of the drama of these centuries are the constant prompters of his mind and spirit.

MacArthur is a man of Asia. Nothing is sillier than the glib punditing that MacArthur is interested in Asia at the expense of Europe. As a matter of fact, if Truman had been inspired, he would have sent MacArthur to Europe and Eisenhower to Asia. Within a week, Eisenhower, an intensely practical soldier, would have seen how right MacArthur is about Asia. Within a week, all Europe would have recognized the truth of what we have said above about MacArthur. But it is significant and terribly important that MacArthur is a man of Asia. He is today the only man of the west who has in Asia not only immense prestige but also the devoted loyalty of millions and millions of Asians. True, he has bitter enemies there. But who are they? They are the Communists and their dupes. For the people of Japan, for the people of the Philippines and of other islands, for the hundreds of thousands of anti-Communists in China, MacArthur is a great symbol. How do they think of him? As imperialist? Conqueror? No—as liberator and friend.

HIS QUALITIES FIT OUR NEEDS

MacArthur is an American. He has not been in this country for 13 years. He may be "out of touch," as his enemies hope and some friends fear. But his is not the pulse-taking patriotism and he is certainly not the typical American of this or any week's Gallup poll. He is something more important: he is the basic American. Indelibly stamped upon his character are the basic precepts by which this Nation has lived and either will live or, in denial of them, perish.

Besides being a man of the west, a man of Asia, and an American, MacArthur is a number of other things. He is a master of his profession—the profession of arms. This he considers to be an honorable profession; he has served it with honor. He is a statesman—a title which few can claim today but which he earned in Japan by a performance without precedent in history.

Finally, MacArthur, though he may be charged with vanity has the humility to believe in God. This last fact has an important consequence for this hour. For it means that for him it is impossible to divorce policy and action from moral principle. He may not always do the right thing, he may do wrong; the point is that for him right and wrong are basic considerations.

Applying these characteristics of MacArthur to our present confused and perilous situation, we see how aptly they fit our needs.

We need a man of the west because we need a grand alliance of all those national and spiritual elements in Europe and the Americas which are still in allegiance to the highest ideals of the west and which refuse suicide and cynicism. (We can't win the struggle for the world through vulgar, ignorant, provincial nationalism on either side of the Atlantic.) But the leader of the west—whether as spokesman or statesman—must be an American; for circumstances have devolved the task of leadership upon this country. We need a man of the west who, by deeds and character, is accepted as a true friend of Asia in travail. We need, above all, a man of moral principles—that is to say, of moral principles clearly understood so that the policy and action he proposes can be—and inevitably will be—grounded in moral principle.

OUR PERILS ARE HIS TEST

It may seem impossible that any man could rise to the greatness which our present perils demand. At the moment, although he wears as he always will the five stars of a general of the Army, MacArthur is free to speak plainly and honestly to his fellow Americans and the world. He has no political obligations, and will, we hope, contract none. He will, we hope, be wary of all cliques or claques which even now so blatantly seek to use him for ends less noble than we believe his to be. Surely he is wise enough to know that he can be destroyed by idolatrous friends no less than by obvious enemies.

MacArthur's task now is to speak—to cut through and disperse the double-talk, the poisonous politics, the meanness and smallness of most of the speech by which we have been engulfed in these last months. He will speak to northerners and southerners, to Democrats and Republicans, to men whose ancestors came with the Mayflower, and to the refugees who came yesterday. MacArthur may have other tasks to perform later, in or out of Government, but in these next few weeks his task is to put before the Nation a believable policy—to tell us what we ought to do, and why, and to challenge us to choose our course now.

What is certain is that this Nation cannot remain in the passive, helpless, and hopeless position into which it was put by President Truman's speech on April 11. In defending his removal of MacArthur, Truman moved on to a calamitous error—he defined the policy of the United States in a way that ties the Nation's hands and gives all initiative, all power of choice, to the enemy. Not even America is strong enough to win if it has to fight under that handicap.

Can any man rise to the greatness our perils demand? MacArthur may fail—and the cloud of disillusionment may again darken the already dreary landscape of our time. Yet he seems to have been shaped for a role of greatness. His chance of fulfilling it may be measurably increased by every American who will strive himself, in his own thinking and in his own private judgment, to rise as an individual to the greatness of this hour.

Prize-Winning Essays—American Legion Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including essays by two of the winners of the American Legion essay contest in Ohio. Of the 12 winners in the State of Ohio, 2 were in my congressional district. I am very proud of these essays by Miss Dolores Amedei, of Steubenville, Ohio, and Miss Mary Ann Wiggins, of Bellaire, Ohio, and I commend them to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN OUR MODERN WORLD

(By Dolores Amedei)

Although conceived by patriots of a new Nation under living conditions and economic circumstances vastly different from those of present days, the Constitution has successfully met the challenge of rapidly changing conditions in all phases of our national life.

Different political parties find no difficulty, when they assume power, in changing the laws of the land in accordance with their principles and beliefs, under the basic tenets of the Constitution as a fluid yet firm guidepost.

It is because the forefathers, in their wisdom, drafted its basic principles in such broad, democratic fashion, that the Constitution has met the test of time and undoubtedly will be found to meet the complex problems facing us in the future under the entirely new conditions of an atomic age.

In essence, the Constitution is a simple document guaranteeing to all citizens certain rights and privileges that cannot be taken away without due process, meaning that any changes in the application (but not the principles) must be done in such a manner that allows the fullest opportunity for all to have their opinion expressed to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

those by whom the reins of government are handled.

Those guarantics in the Constitution relating to certain freedoms such as (1) of assembly, (2) of religious belief, and (3) of expression, are the bulwarks enjoyed by citizens of the United States that have never been guaranteed to citizens of any other nation. They are the guideposts that make it impossible for this country to plunge headlong into any form of dictatorship, because such forms of government cannot be instituted, let alone continued, where citizens are possessed of these rights.

Modern times require the presence of a time-tried, flexible Constitution capable of yielding to the swiftly changing circumstances of a machine age, yet firm enough to resist (or at least retard sufficiently to allow time for mature consideration) of any sweeping and sudden departures from the recognized concepts of its meanings.

This country is feeling the effects of the impact of new ideas of government less than other nations because its citizenry, feeling more secure in its rights by virtue of constitutional guaranties, are prone to examine those radically different concepts more leisurely and circumspectly than citizens of countries, where because of the absence of such guaranties, any newly advanced ism is seized upon as an attractive, even if untested and unproved, way of bettering the way of life.

One of the most valuable principles of our Constitution is the protection given minority groups, whether religious, economic, or political. This guaranty perhaps makes us appear slower in meeting changes because of the democratic processes that must be adhered to, but results on the other hand in sounder solutions to our problems.

It is because of these things that we can confidently face any problems that may confront us in the foreseeable future with a calm and assurance made possible by the knowledge that no individual, clique, or pressure group can seize power in such a fashion that its will can be forced on all our citizens without their consent.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION IN A MODERN WORLD

(By Mary Ann Wiggins)

The American Constitution embodies the fundamental principles of democracy. These fundamentals do not change quickly for behind them are people, and the will of the people is the basic reason for a democracy.

People all over the world are very much the same. They all want freedom from oppression by the state or by a dictator. When this freedom has once been obtained it becomes a living thing in the hearts of the people who have worked for it, and it cannot be easily taken away. When you have worked for this freedom and your sons and daughters have died on countless battlefields to preserve it, it becomes very precious to you. Such a freedom as this needs a foundation if it is to be kept alive for future generations. The American Constitution is as strong a foundation as can be found in our modern chaotic world.

In crises where other governments have failed, the Constitution has proved itself a stable foundation for our Government. Compare our Constitution with other forms of government. You will find that many of the things that we take for granted are not known in other countries. Hitler had thousands of helpless people put to death without giving them a fair trial or even a trial at all. Under communism people do not experience religious freedom, they are not allowed to speak their opinions freely. They are told what they should believe, what they should read, and how they may vote. The Constitution has survived because it instituted a government of the people, carried out by the chosen representatives of the people.

Our Constitution stands for equality among men. Through our courts it provides a way for all men to receive equal voice before the law.

The Constitution provides protection for the rights of all citizens of our country. Although the Constitution gives many privileges and rights, it also requires that the citizens perform certain duties and obligations. If we want to see our Constitution accomplish the most good we must work to fulfill our obligations as citizens. The Constitution contains the conditions and terms of democracy by which we all must live or suffer the penalty.

By using the power to amend the Constitution, we can overcome difficulties that did not exist when the Constitution was drawn up.

The Constitution, of course, is not perfect. There are many loopholes that must eventually be cleared up. How much can I say about my neighbors and my Government and still be protected by the Constitution? To what extent may I carry out my freedoms and still claim that they are my constitutional rights? These are some of the problems that often bother us.

Most Americans do not realize the far-reaching effects of the Constitution. Our Constitution was drawn up by the ablest statesmen of that time. These men had experienced oppression, and they were well qualified for the job of making a Constitution for a free people. Let's keep it a Constitution for a free people.

MacArthur's Greatest Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sees MacArthur's 'Greatest Hours'," written by Edgar Poe, and published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune For April 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEES MACARTHUR'S "GREATEST HOURS"

(By Edgar Poe)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—The two greatest hours in the colorful life of Gen. Douglas MacArthur were in Tokyo Bay when formal surrender was wrung from Japan and Thursday when he delivered a powerful, drama-packed address at a joint session of Congress.

This correspondent was privileged to be present at both of these tremendous occasions.

Perhaps no one has ever delivered a more spine-tingling, thought-provoking address to the American Congress than did the general of the Army, just dismissed from his Far Eastern commands.

When this correspondent was aboard the battleship *Missouri* to see the conquered and humiliated Japanese representatives of Emperor Hirohito sign the surrender on September 2, 1945, General MacArthur was in his greatest glory. Thursday he was an "old soldier." But to the United States Congress and a jam-packed gallery of leading Americans, General MacArthur truly was "MacArthur the magnificent."

Some veteran observers expressed belief that at no time in American history has a Congress and the audience been more touched than in the general's closing remarks after citing his 52 years of military service. Ringing applause swept over the Chamber. He then told of his hopes and dreams on the plains of West Point.

General MacArthur said those West Point dreams have long since vanished. He said he remembered the old ballad which proclaimed that "old soldiers never die; they just fade away."

"And like the old soldier of that ballad" he said, "I now close my military career and just fade away, an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Good-by."

This statement brought tears streaming to the eyes of Members of Congress, to men and women in the gallery. Hardened soldiers and admirals who were sitting on the front rows took out their handkerchiefs and wiped their tear-filled eyes. So did some Members of Congress. One of those affected was General Wainwright, the great soldier, who was captured when Bataan fell, but who was freed in 1945 just in time to be alongside General MacArthur when the surrender was wrung from the Japanese.

History was made that day. Peace—which turned out to be only temporary—had come to a world that had paid a tremendous price in blood and destruction.

This correspondent a short time later sickened when he stood in the melted ghost-like city of Hiroshima where an estimated 120,000 lives were wiped out with one single bomb. Some 75,000 to 200,000 others had been wounded.

There was no doubt that one of the great historical and horrible happenings of the world had taken place here. An impact on the world had been made at Hiroshima.

In Washington, Thursday, one felt that here, too, a speech of historical significance had been delivered.

Most of the applause during the general's address came from the Republican aisle. They applauded often. A scattering of applause came from the Democratic aisles, but both Republicans and Democrats gave the general a tremendous ovation when he concluded.

As the general walked down the aisle out of the chamber he waved in the direction of Mrs. MacArthur, who was sitting in the gallery. Youthful Arthur MacArthur, who was sitting on the front row on the Democratic side of the aisle applauded his father along with all the Senators and Representatives and the jammed galleries.

General MacArthur had made a triumphant return to the Nation's Capital.

Proposed Sale of the Former German Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the sale of the former German Embassy in this city. The editorials appeared in the German press published in the western occupied zone

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of Germany. I particularly wish to read one of the editorials. It is entitled "Under the Hammer: The United States Between Emotion and Reason." It reads:

UNDER THE HAMMER: THE UNITED STATES BETWEEN EMOTION AND REASON

During the First World War the rules of civilization were still observed. The seizure and the announced sale of the German Embassy Building today obviously belong to the progress of international law, which, if not stopped, will hurt each nation in the long run. Political opportunism may go unpunished while violating minor laws of behavior, but it is fatal to violate international law which binds and protects each member of the family of nations. The advertisement in the Wall Street Journal offering the Embassy for sale has a terrible psychological effect because it opens old wounds which had slowly started to heal. (Excerpt from an article in the Dusseldorfer Nachrichten (Christian Independent), March 21, 1951.)

Mr. President, I may say that the editorials bear out the editorial comment which appeared recently in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, to which reference was made by the junior Senator from Nebraska yesterday, and they bear out the argument that we should have an investigation of the proposed sale of the German Embassy.

There being no objection, the other editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT ONLY STONES

In the midst of forming great world policies (by which the Western Powers intend to lead the Germans back into the community of free nations) one should not forget those little gestures which improve mutual relationships. This was clearly recognized by Senator HUGH BUTLER, who has protested against the policy of putting the former German Embassy in Washington up for sale.

The German Embassy in Washington is not only an accumulation of stones worth a certain number of dollars. Tied up with it, there exist certain imponderable values which one should not add to the heaped ruins of World War II without careful consideration. (Wiesbadener Kurier (Independent), March 13, 1951.)

STEPCHILDREN

German consuls abroad have many difficulties. Consul General Krekeler in New York uses the former quarters of a nylon shop. He could easily have found a place in the rooms of the old German Embassy. This hope has now been destroyed by the United States Department of Justice. The Embassy Building is being put up for sale, and for Americans only. Is this "equal treatment for the Germans"? The Germans are being disinherited and told to accept the status of stepchildren. (Westfalische Nachrichten (Christian Union), March 14, 1951.)

On Academic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a two-column article written by James Marshall, a member of the Board of Education of the City of New York, and published in a recent issue of Strengthening Democracy, a publication of the Board of Education of the City of New York. The article is entitled "On Academic Freedom." I think it is particularly important because it shows the reasons why the Board of Education of the city of New York passed a resolution to the effect that anyone who is a Communist is unfit to be a teacher in the American public school system. No one is going to accuse the city of New York of being a reactionary spot on the American map.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

I believe that we have to begin with the principle that in the forum of the mind all is fair and permissible no matter how unorthodox. Suppression of people who hold unorthodox ideas and discrimination against them because of the views which they may entertain must be abhorrent to all of us who are devoted to democracy as we know it, as it has descended to us from the English and American revolutions, as it has been expressed in the English Bill of Rights, our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution and in the writings of men like Milton, Jefferson, Lincoln, Mr. Justice Holmes, and countless others. This freedom is the very basis of all other freedoms. To place restraint on freedom of thought or discussion in classrooms or lecture halls endangers all other freedoms and imperils our basic American civil rights. This freedom of the mind and of expression as applied in classroom and lecture hall is the very essence of what we call academic freedom. Consequently it is basic to American education.

REQUISITES FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Academic freedom is more than a mere guaranteed power for self-expression. There cannot be academic freedom where a teacher himself is not free, where he himself is for some reason unable to be honest, where he is under pressure to say something or not to say something irrespective of objective truth.

The counterpart to academic freedom may be said to be freedom to learn the truth, the right of students not to have ideas perverted and thought controlled. In the name of academic freedom they have the right to have teachers who, if not always competent to think for themselves, at least have not surrendered intellectual integrity to others to do their thinking for them.

The evidence before us is clear that Communist Party members have a loyalty to Soviet Russia and to the promotion of world communism which is a higher loyalty than loyalty to their own country; that class hatred and the destruction of the bourgeois state are part of Communist doctrine; that the seizure of power in the interest of creating a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat is implicit in Communist Party membership; and that party members engaged in education have the special task of using education for these purposes.

HE CANNOT EXPRESS OBJECTIVE TRUTH

Consequently, how can it be said that anyone committed to Communist doctrine, anyone following the Communist Party line is free? By the nature of his allegiance to communism, his adoption of the Lenin-Stalin system of belief, he cannot accept and express objective truth. He must accept and prosecute class war and the destruction of the bourgeois state. He is bound to his principle that democracy is not the democracy that we know, but something quite different called social democracy. He is obliged to doubt the Mendelian law and to espouse the biological theory of Lysenko. He dare not applaud the music of Shostakovich and Khachaturian and others when that is deemed to be contrary to Communist musical doctrine. His political, economic, and social beliefs must follow the ideological meanderings of the Kremlin line. This is not truth. No man accepting such doctrine can claim the right to teach such concepts in classroom or in lecture hall in the name of academic freedom. He is not academically free if he is in such intellectual bondage. Whether in classroom, in guidance work, or in club work after class he cannot be trusted with children.

Where he conceals the fact that he is a Communist he is all the more unfitted to be a teacher because he is mislabeling his wares. Where students are young and immature, where they cannot fairly be expected to form judgments even where all the facts are available, where they are not free to choose their teachers or hear a contrary doctrine and weigh the two, where they are subject to compulsory education law, as are the children in our schools, then it is the duty of the Board of Education to protect them.

JAMES MARSHALL,
Member, Board of Education.

Assistance for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the India emergency assistance joint resolution, I am deeply disturbed over the failure of the Congress to take prompt action on this measure. The people of India are not faced with the prospect of famine at some time in the dim future: the threat is immediate.

The letters which have poured into my office from all over the State of Missouri indicate the very real concern of our citizens for the hunger-stricken people abroad, and urge that we put decency ahead of political expediency. If we have learned any lesson at all from history, we should have learned that communism finds fertile ground amidst poverty and hunger. We will have only our own parsimony and procrastination to blame if the discouraged people of India turn to communism and Soviet Russia for aid.

It is false economy to deny starving millions grain which we have in abundance, and which will, if timely given, save many lives, and be an eloquent testimonial to the humanity of our people.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat has stated the case well, I think, in a recent editorial:

The United States has tried to assume a position of great moral force in the world. The hope for human integrity, justice, and compassion has attracted millions to the policy of the United States leadership among

the tenuously free people of south Asia. This is being torn and smothered by failure to help now. * * * Here is an instance where we can serve humanity in traditional American fashion and serve our own self-interest by countering Communist posturing with western generosity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "As India Starves" from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 11.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS INDIA STARVES

The teeming millions of India, confronted with famine, have urgently appealed, through their government, for 2,000,000 tons of grain from the United States. This plea was made last December. More than 3 months have passed, yet Congress has done nothing about the request.

Red China has offered 1,000,000 tons and Russia a smaller amount. Probably neither nation has the grain pledged, but they quickly made the promise and no doubt will send in some food. They recognize and capitalize on the propaganda opportunity. Are the seeds of communism literally to be poured into India, while the grain of American humanitarianism is padlocked under congressional dawdling?

Opposition to sending India foods has arisen in Washington. Some object to Prime Minister Nehru's Red appeasement and criticism of our policy in Korea. Some want to bargain for a loan, for atomic materials, for embargo concessions.

This is a wrong time to bargain. Bargaining with death from starvation would justify the Uncle Shylock sobriquet which already is emerging in India.

The United States has tried to assume a position of a great moral force in the world. The hope for human integrity, justice, and compassion has attracted millions to the policy of the United States leadership among the tenuously free peoples of south Asia. This is being torn and smothered by failure to help now.

The hungry of India should not be allowed to starve because we do not approve of the policies of Nehru. Famine should not be a plaything in politics. Whatever may be the doubts over India's Prime Minister and his occasional pro-Red implications, the helpless people of India need American aid. They need it quickly.

The Indian Government stated it must have 6,000,000 tons of grain to avert critical famine. It can pay for only 4,000,000 tons. Indians were led to believe months ago Washington would open its granaries to give what is needed. Now some counties in India have meager provisions to carry them only three more weeks. Bills in Congress to provide the needed grain have been dormant in the House Rules Committee and in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

If Communist sources provide food for India in crisis, there will be strings attached. Even if there weren't, the cause of communism would profit heavily. If we hope to improve the cause of western democracy, we should send the grain without strings. Margaret Parton, writing from New Delhi in the New York Tribune, observed, "While America may not win India with wheat, America may well lose India without wheat."

We have the grain and can afford to send it. The President should take extraordinary measures to help India whip starvation. Here is an instance where we can serve humanity in traditional American fashion and serve our own self-interest by countering Communist posturing with western generosity.

Screen Actors Guild Replies to Gale Sondergaard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild to Miss Gale Sondergaard, which was published in the Hollywood Reporter on March 21, 1951.

The reply of the Screen Actors Guild to Miss Sondergaard's appeal for support of her attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities is most commendable. It is reaffirmation of the unquestioned loyalty and patriotism of the great majority of those persons who are affiliated with the motion-picture industry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCREEN ACTORS GUILD,
March 20, 1951.

Miss GALE SONDERGAARD,
Hollywood, Calif.

DEAR MISS SONDERGAARD: The board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild has received and carefully considered your letter of March 13 which you saw fit also to publish in the press. The Guild's answer should be equally available to the public and will be published.

Your letter (1) attacks as an inquisition the pending hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities into alleged Communist Party activities by a few individuals and (2) asks that the Guild protect you against any consequences of your own personal decisions and actions.

The Communist Party press also has attacked the hearings as a "warmongering, labor and freedom-busting * * * witch-hunt * * * by congressional inquisitors." The Guild board totally rejects this quoted typical Communist Party line. We recognize its obvious purposes of attempting to smear the hearings in advance and to create disrespect for the American form of government.

The deadly seriousness of the international situation dictates the tone of our reply. This is not the time for dialectic fencing. Like the overwhelming majority of the American people, we believe that a "clear and present danger" to our Nation exists. The Guild board believes that all participants in the international Communist Party conspiracy against our Nation should be exposed for what they are—enemies of our country and of our form of government.

It is not the province of the Guild board to decide what is the best method of carrying out this aim. It is our hope that the current House committee hearings will help to do so, in an objective and intelligent manner. We are informed that the committee will guard against smearing of any innocent individuals. We will watch with extreme interest the way in which the hearings are conducted and any and all developments stemming therefrom.

The Guild as a labor union will fight against any secret blacklist created by any group of employers. On the other hand, if any actor by his own actions outside of union activities has so offended American public opinion that he has made himself unsalable at the boxoffice, the Guild cannot and would not want to force any employer to hire him. That is the individual actor's personal responsibility and it cannot be shifted to his union.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Screen Actors Guild.

On the Eve of Victory With MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the memorable day when General MacArthur came home after near completion of his job which began at Bataan and moved to Korea through years of bloodshed, strife, slaughter, hunger, torture, suffering, and conflict—under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article written by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, as a colonel, when he called on General MacArthur in 1945.

General Klein served under General MacArthur in the Pacific theater and holds his past commander in great devotion and esteem, as is set forth in glowing terms in his article entitled "On the Eve of Victory With MacArthur."

This document is submitted with the thought that no matter what accusations are made against him, nor what vindication he achieves, the words of General Klein in 1945 are spoken for the many thousands of men, living and dead, who served under him in the bloody days of Guadalcanal, Biak, Tarawa, and the Philippines—through the tedious years of reconstruction—and now the period of defense of his acts in service to his country. The article follows:

ON THE EVE OF VICTORY WITH MACARTHUR

(By Brig. Gen. Julius Klein)

(Written August 4, 1945, in Luzon, Philippine Islands, for the Army and Navy Journal and International News Service.)

The sign over his door reads simply "CINC." I entered with the natural awe of a soldier for his Commander in Chief, but as he moved from his desk to greet me, I felt my heart pounding as it had so many years ago on my first big assignment as a reporter.

It was late in the day. This man was the nerve center of a gigantic war machine. But I could detect no trace of exhaustion in spite of his many callers and conferences, and the decisions he had rendered that day.

I recalled when I saw him, in the Washington days of Herbert Hoover. I remembered well his youthful dignity, his immaculate dress, and the dashing gallant figure that he cut. With the terrible war at the greatest climax, I was prepared to see a much older man, wear, bearing the mark of the tragic war years.

But the man who greeted me was the MacArthur of old.

He had not altered. He remains the erect, charming, youthful, black-haired soldier of those distant days when he was Chief of Staff.

As he spoke I began to realize the greatness of the man—he has long since proved

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

himself the soldier. My mind flashed back to the great of another war whom I had interviewed, Pershing, Haig, Foch, March, Bliss and the others, and he suffers by comparison with no man. I know why the United States Under Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, in a chat I had with him a few months ago, referred to MacArthur as "the General of the Age." One could sense in his presence the great general, the fine patriot, the statesman, scholar, and humanitarian who embodies all those qualities that make him the most illustrious American of our time.

We discussed various problems facing America now and after the war. The general's great devotion to the sons of America, his interest in the smallest detail concerning the welfare of his men, were only a high light of the interview. MacArthur knows what he wants for them, for America, and he hopes and prays with millions of others that the sacrifices made by the flower of our youth will not have been in vain.

His memory is remarkable. His eloquent use of the English language, his diction, his own presentation of what he tries to bring home to his listener can be matched with the best I have ever read or heard.

When he talks about war and the suffering that it brought about, you detect a sad emotion. It is the only time he resorts to rough language. He knows what Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, and Santo Tomas meant to America, and as I sat there I realized what it meant to MacArthur himself.

As may be expected, he discussed the important strategy of the war with equal brilliance as concerns Army, Navy, or Air Corps activities, and he is not only equally well posted but also something of an expert in the economic, political, international, and cultural consequences of the war. He see with great clarity what is needed in addition to the United Nations Charter to assure lasting peace, with a powerful, strong, and free America guaranteeing that our generation will return to its own form of living and pursuit of happiness.

I had given him a 10-page report on my mission, and as he perused it my eyes strayed round the walls and rested on a framed inscription. Reading it I was struck by the key it gave me to the general's life and actions—I took out my pen and wrote down the words, as MacArthur read on.

"I do the best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right what is said against we won't amount to anything; if it brings me out wrong, all the angels swearing that I was right would make no difference." (Abraham Lincoln.)

I had taken down these words, which I hope I have rendered correctly without knowing that the general had observed me. Looking up, he said:

"I noticed that you were copying Mr. Lincoln's words. I shall remember them always for they give me courage, and often in dark hours I look to that wall and feel comforted."

I was thrilled by the aptness of this inevitable comparison between the two liberators, Lincoln, the great emancipator, and MacArthur, the man who had stood like a wall of steel against the crumbling Australian bastion and held back the yellow tide while he forged the weapon with which he was to cleave his way back to the Philippines. He has returned, and he has brought back freedom and the joy of liberation to our valiant fellow Americans of the Philippine Commonwealth, paving the way for "the road to Tokyo."

Inevitably also, I thought of General Pershing, old "Black Jack," resisting with all his might the inclusion of the young AEF under any but an American commander. His insistance on an integrated American force was fully justified by the triumph of our arms just as MacArthur's embracing courage and brilliant conviction forced recognition of the Philippines as our necessary springboard to victory in the Pacific. Opposition, neglect, apathy, none of these stayed him.

My thoughts turned to the words of Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger as I heard them a few weeks ago at his Eighth Army Headquarters. The man who led the assault on Buna and Biak, and hurled the Eighth Army like an avenging bolt through the Bisayas and Mindanao, had said to me:

"His military achievements are triumphs of courage and ability over limited materials. It was General MacArthur who insisted that the Philippines must be taken as rapidly as possible to divide the Jap Empire, reestablish our prestige in the east and, most important, provide a base for the concentration of overwhelming force for the final blows against Japan.

"Not only did his great heart go out to the people, but he knew that without the Philippines we would have no comparable place where the great supply bases and staging areas, so necessary for our concluding campaign, might be built. So unshakable and so firm was his conviction that this would shorten the war, that he had to express his willingness to advance with what was already available, or not advance at all. His brilliant leadership, statesmanship, and strategy were merely superb tools which he used unsparingly.

"His real claim to greatness in history," concluded General Eichelberger, "lies in the strength of his conviction of the soundness of his daring concept, and in his unparalleled moral courage in beating down all obstacles through years of scarcity, meager troop support, frustration, and criticism."

Typical of the loyalty and esteem in which he is held by his able leaders is the statement made to me some time ago by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., logistical and tactical genius.

"Klein," he said, "I hope and pray that MacArthur will be our commander in chief. He is the only man whom we can follow with confidence wherever he goes; the only man, moreover, whose concern for the success of his mission is touched by his consideration for the safety of his men. He will do great things at a minimum cost."

Both General Eichelberger and General Richardson are old disciples of MacArthur, their association with him dating back to their West Point days some 40 years ago. They, as brilliant tacticians and commanders in their own right, can keenly appreciate his genius and powers of leadership.

There was another inscription on the wall, an essay on youth written by a close friend of the general's, to which he directed my attention. It read in part:

"Youth is not a time of life; it is a state of mind * * * nobody grows old by merely living a number of years; people grow old only by deserting their ideals. Years wrinkle the skin, but to give up enthusiasm wrinkles the soul. Worry, doubt, self-distrust, fear, and despair—these are the long, long years that bow the head and turn the growing spirit back to dust. You are as young as your faith, as old as your doubt, as young as your self-confidence, as old as your fear, as young as your hope, as old as your despair."

It explained the erectness of his carriage, the firmness of his handshake, the stamina that makes his youthful secretaries and staff officers gasp in wonderment.

This insight is carried into the selection of his able lieutenants—the iron-willed Sutherland; Blamey, the swashbuckling Australian; Kenney, daring and forceful; Krueger, a general's general, cool and calculating; Eichelberger, brilliant tactician, fearless and intrepid; Richardson, a logistical and tactical genius, wise, far-seeing, and intensely loyal.

Prominent in that simply furnished room overlooking the shambles of MacArthur's beloved and once beautiful Manila was a tribute by Walter Lippmann to the heroes of Bataan.

"They fought * * * knowing that they themselves had no hope. This is the very heart of courage, transcending all other acts of which men are capable, and the surest proof that man is more than his flesh, his blood, his bones, and his appetite. On this proof as on a rock, that there is in all men a capacity to live and a willingness to die for things which they themselves can never hope to enjoy—there rests the whole of man's dignity and the title to all his rights."

The general paused as he saw that my glance had centered on this inscription. He rose and, laying aside my report, stood there with me as I read it. He drew his head back slowly as he, too, formed the words silently with his lips. Pain and pride and deep emotion crossed his face. Pain perhaps, in the thought that he had been ordered to leave them there, and pride in the knowledge that he had made his pledge, "I shall return," come true. It was as though he rendered a silent salute to those who had fought and bled with him there, and to those who remained to endure the torture and humiliation of those dark hours of America's history.

His faith in the Philippines was no less great than theirs in him. The failure of Tokyo's "Asia for the Asiatics" policy was foredoomed by this, the mutual love and trust they bore.

Bataan is more than just a historic battleground to MacArthur. His love for that sacred spot goes deeper than his personal devotion to the heroes that lie there in glory. For him whose intense patriotism knows no equal, it stood as a bastion of democracy, of freedom, and of human decency, a symbol of the American way of life. It had fallen only after every last ounce of energy had been expended, only after every sacrifice had been made, only after a display of such courage as the world had never known.

Its fall was a blow to the dignity of man, a treacherous stab at the heart of humanity, a thrust at his beloved country that had to be avenged. And so in the shining hour of victory, when General MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander directed the Japanese Emperor to send his emissaries to Manila to accept the surrender terms, he erased forever that blot upon America's history by demanding that, on approaching the city, they flash the symbolic identification signal—"Bataan."

The conversation swung into easier channels. One is held spellbound by MacArthur's eloquence. His keen eyes, calm dignity and extraordinary command of speech make one feel that his presence is not only that of a great military leader, but of a great scholar and teacher. One might think that a man in his position would be engrossed in the task at hand—in maps and charts and figures. But his thoughts rise far above and beyond all these. Free from all illusions, he is alive to all the economic, political, and cultural consequences of war, and to the need for a free and powerful America which will guarantee future generations the right to live in peace and to devote their energies to the benefit of men and the glory of God.

A diplomat to the core, his phenomenal memory reaches out to each unit and individual under his command. He spoke with feeling of the citizen-soldier, that unique product of our democracy. National Guard units have fought long and well, often under the most difficult conditions. The general was especially pleased with the Thirty-third Division, my old outfit whose gallant action at Baguio was highly regarded.

As we returned to our chairs, my reporter's curiosity got the upper hand and I could not help asking a few questions.

"General," I said, "I have read many speculations as to what you will do after the war is over. What really are your plans?"

He smiled at this.

"Klein, I'm going to get myself a great big rocker and put it on my porch before a small, beautiful garden, where I can finally spend life as the average American husband with his family in peace and contentment—that is, if the Nips don't get me first."

I remarked that I doubted the American people would let him do that, but he waved the thought aside.

"Why think of it now. There is so much to do and, like every other GI, my thoughts are of home and rest but first I have a job to do and that job isn't finished, and when my job is finished then, and only then, am I ready to go home * * * to my rocking chair, my garden, and my family."

My colleagues among professional newsmen have told me he seldom makes radio broadcasts, has held few press conferences and, when he does see the press individually or in small groups, it is at their request and not his. The American people have demanded that copy be made of their hero. History has not made him; he has made history.

It was dark when I entered the bomb-shattered streets of Manila. An endless stream of trucks rolled by bearing supplies for the front. Thousands of cranes and winches strained at their task of unloading cargo from the myriad ships that dotted the harbor. Everywhere was a scene of antlike activity. My thoughts turned to the main streets of America and I thanked God that they had been spared the horrors of war.

The lights in the headquarters burned brightly far into the night. MacArthur and his men were awake to insure that the children of America might sleep.

I wrote this article on America's greatest general and foremost citizen at the headquarters of General Eichelberger's Eighth Army, then awaiting movement orders. As it was completed, the world began to rock with the staggering series of blows which were to drive the Japanese to surrender; their vocabulary previously void of this word "surrender," had been enriched.

As MacArthur had planned, this victory was chary of American blood. Not so for the Japs. The blinding flash that completely demolished 60 percent of the city of Hiroshima, on the southern tip of Japan's main island of Honshu, was a terrifying, soul-searing blow to arrogant Nippon. The devastation has been admitted to be beyond all human comprehension, retribution in full for the agony and long privation of General Wainwright and his companions in exile—a just and righteous vengeance for the heroic American lives poured out on the sand of Guadalcanal, Biak, Buna, Tarawa, the Pelaus, and the Philippines, poured out that freedom might return from exile.

General MacArthur and his leaders and his men had fulfilled their pledge; the might of America had seived the Nipponese throat in the final grip of total destruction.

When this terrific news broke, I recalled the advance information General MacArthur had given. His comment at this time belied any thought of personal glory. He saw the possibility of an early end to the war and said:

"Anything can happen now. What branch of service gets any credit is immaterial if this horrible war can come to an end and a needless sacrifice of life be prevented."

My head reeled with the grandeur of comprehension. The Russians, our allies now in the East, unleashed their armor and rolled into Manchuria driving all before them. The general's words, spoken to me only a few days before, stood out in my mind in letters of fire. His gift of prophecy, founded on his capability and knowledge, his strength and inflexible determination, had again come true in total fulfillment.

The Japanese Empire awaits its master, its guide, if it chooses, back to rehabilitation as a nation. What could be more fitting than that this task should fall to that great leader of men whose wisdom as a scholar and as a teacher is no less than his genius as a conqueror?

History's pen is poised, stilled over its perpetual creed in which is inscribed the eternal story, the faults and foibles, the grandeur and the heroism of mankind. A chapter has been finished. We and the peoples of the earth await the next.

Whatever the peace will bring, there are men whose passage through time is marked with meteoric brilliance. Such men are history. Many days have passed since the interview which gave birth to this story. Were they years, they could never eradicate the memory of the emotions it roused, or that swift fulfillment of the general's words of prophecy. His slogans, "I shall return" and "On to Tokyo!" were words come to life.

He had kept his faith with America and with God; let faith be kept with him.

MacArthur Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Union on Saturday, April 21, 1951.

The editorial follows:

MACARTHUR IS RIGHT

Now that the tumult and shouting has subsided and the incidents of the past week can be viewed calmly and dispassionately, there can be but one conclusion—MacArthur is right.

We are at war with Soviet China in Korea. It is not called a war; it is called a police action. Americans are being killed at the rate of one every 15 minutes, but they are not called Americans; they are United Nations troops. But to us they are Americans, and we wonder what they are doing there.

The commander was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the greatest general in the Armed Forces. But he did not take his orders from the United States; he took them from the United Nations, of which Soviet Russia, which instigated the Korean war, is a member with the power of veto.

General MacArthur recognized that this was a war without a target; therefore, as long as it remained so, it could never end except in defeat for our side. He could not fight it to victory, because no one over here knew what a victory would be. General MacArthur was not permitted to fight the war to a victory, because left-wing Europe, refusing to arm itself, sought to appease communism in the Far East and divert all military aid to its own countries.

If the situation is as serious as MacArthur says it is, why are the little men in Washington still debating about how to run the war? If it is not so serious, why are we being asked to pay war taxes?

General MacArthur is one of the greatest Americans in the history of this Nation. His welcome home is without a parallel.

We must never lose sight of the fact that in Korea the Russians are lend-leasing the Chinese jet-propelled planes and submarines, and the British are selling the Chinese rubber and gasoline. Yet Russia is a neutral and Great Britain is actually fighting the Korean war on our side.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the weak and inept administration in Washington—easily the worst in our history—has been used by the British to have MacArthur dismissed. MacArthur is a sacrifice to British trickery.

Most of us are getting tired of what the very little people in Washington think is the art and science of politics. Particularly when they get in the way of great Americans like Douglas MacArthur. For Truman and Acheson have no policy; they play by ear; the chords they strike are consistently flat.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I revise and extend my remarks and include therein two statements, which I made to the press concerning the General MacArthur episode—one, when the general was summarily removed, and the other, after he had delivered a brilliant, eloquent, and penetrating address to the Congress.

Whether one agrees with General MacArthur or not, whether one accepts his thesis in whole or in part, it will be recognized by all fair-minded persons that his speech to the joint session of Congress will go down in history as one of the great speeches of our time.

It is our duty now, as representatives of the people, to try to bring some order out of the confusion that exists throughout the Nation and in the minds of the people concerning national policy. Our democratic way of life permits sharp differences of opinion and that frequently clarifies our policy. But we must never permit these differences to drive a wedge into the structure of national unity and full national cooperation so essential to the conduct of the Koeran war and so vital to the implementation of our national defense. However ardently we may desire peace, however zealously we may strive for it, we must fix our eyes upon the unwavering star of universal freedom which enables us to chart our course safely across the tumultuous seas of confusion and dissension.

We want peace but we do not want a dishonorable peace. We do not want a peace that will carelessly throw away all the fruits of victory. We do not want a peace that will abandon great continents of the world and great historic peoples to the exploitations of ruthless and cruel communistic leadership. We do not want a peace that will further strengthen world communism and enable it in time to destroy democracy and all its blessings and its precious freedoms

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

so cherished by Americans and other liberty-loving peoples. We do not want, and will not stand for, a dishonorable peace which will compromise the true interests of America before the threats and blandishments of the Kremlin and its puppets.

We seek and will be glad to accept peace with honor, peace with justice, peace with protection for democracy, peace with security for our country based upon liberty, universal disarmament, and mutual cooperation and good will.

The important thing and vital thing is not to flinch, not to fear, and not to fail to stand courageously against our potential enemies. I do not favor preventive war or anything resembling it, but we must keep in mind that every day we delay to press for settlement of these great questions of war and peace the Soviet's stockpile of atom bombs is growing together with the armed strength of that mighty power.

But let us not, greatest and most powerful Nation we are, cringe in cowardly and craven surrender before these threats to our Nation, but rather press with renewed vigor and with genuine determination for the kind of a peace that will let all nations, great and small, choose their own form of government and live under institutions of their own selection, unbridled by international bullies and unfettered by international conspiracy, unhampered by internal plots against their independence and security.

We have had the great debate. Now let us get down to brass tacks and have the great show-down—it is long overdue. The above-mentioned follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ON THE FIRING OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

The Commander in Chief has full power to control personnel of the armed services. However, I greatly explore the summary manner in which General MacArthur—great war hero and great American that he is—was removed from his command.

This action is a smashing victory for the British Socialist Government policy of appeasing the Soviets, trading even war materials with the Chinese Reds, and scheming and working to bring the latter into the United Nations, even as their hands are dripping with American blood.

It is most unfortunate, particularly at this time, that the impression of disunity in American policy and military command, should be given to our potential enemies and the rest of the democratic world.

This policy may well mean our complete capitulation in Asia to world communism—the yielding of Formosa, the encompassment of Japan and the Philippines, Soviet domination of all Asia and the breaking of our security line in the Pacific.

STATEMENT BY HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, ON GENERAL MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS

Congress was profoundly impressed by General MacArthur's stirring, historic address. It was statesmanlike, lofty in tone, and carefully avoided personalities.

The General made it clear that he is not an advocate of all-out general war on the mainland of China.

He intimated that, by reason of higher official decisions here, he was lately compelled to wage the Korean war without benefit of air reconnaissance and without being able to strike enemy troop and supply concentrations and air bases behind the lines, which in effect, has required our American and UN forces to conduct the war with one hand tied behind their backs.

He plainly stated that his over-all military objectives and methods had been previously approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and left the clear inference that their execution was blocked by orders from a higher level.

The address poses the question: Will this Nation permit the British Labor Government and appeasers of the Chinese Reds and the Soviet Union in this country to dictate a policy and course of action that could well have the result of leading us into a still graver situation? How about the gallant boys who suffer and die in Korea?

The American people demand, and have a right to know, who is responsible for such a policy and why it is being pursued. We ardently desire peace but we cannot compromise our national safety and endanger our civil liberties before the pressure and artifice of world communism.

I am sure that the American people will be deeply impressed by General MacArthur's observations and will be very grateful to him for his candid, forthright analysis. I hope that his utterances will clear the way for unity, decision, and strength in facing these great problems.

Through patient understanding, through judgments free of the sinister influences of hysteria and propaganda, and through firm, unflinching adherence to American principles and American interest, may our great Nation find the pathway to security and peace.

Alhambra Citizens Protest Removal of MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition signed by 240 prominent citizens of Alhambra, Calif., who have been shocked by the President's tragic dismissal of our great American hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. These signatures were attached to the petition following:

The undersigned hereby request and demand the reinstatement of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to his full command; and further, because of the ill-advised actions on the part of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, we demand his impeachment, also the immediate dismissal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and George C. Marshall.

Mr. Speaker, I share the righteous indignation of these good citizens over the ill-advised action of the President in removing General MacArthur. I feel that General MacArthur's views on our far eastern foreign policy have been far more correct and far more sound than those of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson who have long followed a policy of appeasement of communism at home and abroad.

In order to clarify my thoughts on this issue, I enclose in my remarks the statement issued recently by four of my colleagues and I from Los Angeles County:

APRIL 13, 1951.

JOINT STATEMENT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON MACARTHUR DISMISSAL

In response to the thousands of demands we have received to institute impeachment proceedings against President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson following the summary dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we believe that our constituents are entitled to an expression of our joint views:

1. We vigorously denounce the ruthless manner which President Truman removed General MacArthur from his command in Japan and Korea. The welfare and safety of the United States was, in our belief, more secure with General MacArthur in Tokyo than under any other available leadership.

2. We believe that President Truman's lack of wisdom in summarily removing General MacArthur has aided the enemy in Korea, given comfort to Moscow and Peiping, and opens the way for communism to prevail in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and other Pacific island areas.

3. We vigorously support the House concurrent resolution to invite General MacArthur to address a joint session of Congress and to testify before the House and Senate Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees; and insist that a thorough, complete and exhaustive investigation of our military and foreign policy in Europe and Asia be immediately started and speedily concluded.

4. We agree with leaders in both the Senate and the House that no impeachment proceedings should be instituted until this investigation is completed revealing compelling evidence which can be used as grounds for impeachment. It must be remembered that impeachment by the House and trial in the Senate are similar to indictment by a grand jury and trial before a court of law.

5. Attention must be given to the fact if Mr. Truman is impeached by the House, it requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate to remove him from office. In the event of removal, his successor is Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY. If BARKLEY should decline to serve because of his age, and so forth, the successors in order are: SAM RAYBURN, Dean Acheson, George Marshall, and on down through the President's Cabinet.

6. We have given sober and deliberate thought and consideration to this whole problem. We are fully aware of the temper and the aroused attitude of the public at this time. However, we believe that to institute any proceedings before General MacArthur has had an opportunity to present his side of the story to the Congress and the people would minimize and neutralize the effect and force of his testimony.

Results of Fulton Lewis, Jr., Poll of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months the residents of my congressional district of Pennsylvania have taken part in two polls of public opinion. In addition, some 4,000 telegrams and letters have

been received concerning the Truman-MacArthur controversy.

The sentiment expressed in the two polls and in over 4,000 communications which I have received on the Truman-MacArthur issue is identical with the following tabulation of the results of the radio poll conducted by the Mutual Broadcasting Co.'s Washington commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Mr. Lewis asked his listeners to vote yes or no on the following 16 questions, and mail their votes to their own Representative in Congress. There were 1,880 post cards and letters received by me as a result of the Fulton Lewis poll, with the results as follows:

	Yes	No
1. As of today, would you vote for Harry Truman for President?	12	1,868
2. Should President Truman be allowed to continue to receive the $50,000 tax exempt salary recently voted him by Congress?	84	1,796
3. Do you believe that Congress should continue investigations such as the one into RFC loans and the Kefauver crime hearings and extend those investigations into other activities of Government?	1,844	36
4. Are you in favor of keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?	12	1,868
5. Do you favor the United Nations being in final control of United States troops in Korea or elsewhere?	144	1,736
6. Should Chiang Kai-shek be permitted to send his Nationalist Armies against the Chinese Communists?	1,852	28
7. Do you feel confident that Europe will fight to the end against communism	140	1,740
8. Do you approve of the proposed continuation of economic, along with military, aid to North Atlantic Pact nations?	384	1,496
9. Would you favor a requirement that nations receiving military or economic aid from us must agree to stop trading with Russia, Communist China, or any other iron curtain country?	1,864	16
10. Do you believe President Truman's statement that all Communists and Communist sympathizers have been weeded out of Government?	8	1,872
11. Are you in favor of a permanent peacetime program of universal military training?	1,132	748
12. Do you believe President Truman is making a sincere effort to cut out unnecessary Government spending?	4	1,876
13. Should wages be controlled along with prices?	1,788	92
14. Should the Government prevent strikes in time of war emergency?	1,832	48
15. Are you in favor of calling General MacArthur home for a report to Congress on the far eastern situation?	1,716	164
16. Are you in favor of impeaching President Truman?	1,796	84

Mercy at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the Washington Post of April 24, 1951, entitled "Mercy at a Price":

MERCY AT A PRICE

Apparently opponents of a gift of grain to starving India have won their argument—or, rather, their sit-down strike in the House Rules Committee. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, which initially endorsed a bill to give the grain India needs, now has tentatively approvad a new bill to send the grain on a loan basis. This follows the action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in reporting a bill to make the shipment on half-gift half-loan basis.

Very well. The placing of a financial tag on the grain is in the opinion of this newspaper a misguided move which not only will hamper the effectiveness of what should have been a humanitarian action but also may result in serious financial consequences in India. This country has had plenty of experience with the misunderstandings and ill will engendered by "fuzzy" loans, and the provision for repayment in strategic materials for which India is now obtaining dollars is no exception to this rule. But the most important thing is to get the grain moving, for inevitably there will be some delay even after a bill has been passed. Once bills of some sort are cleared in the House and Senate, then those bodies as a whole should decide on the terms they want.

Reports from Bihar State in India are pathetic. In some sections the people have been reduced to eating roots. The wheat ration has been reduced to a below subsistence level, and often even this ration is not obtainable. Prices are skyrocketing and farmers are having to sell their land to buy food. In short, starvation is becoming a fact while Congress haggles, and India has nowhere else to turn. That sobering thought ought to be impressed upon the minds of our legislators.

If Old MacDonald Has a Farm in Iowa, on That Farm He Has Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Iowa Development Commission:

MARCH 31, 1951.

If Old MacDonald still has a farm, and it's in Iowa, you may safely bet that on that farm he has electricity.

When the power companies last counted their rural Iowa customers, they found there were more customers than there are farms.

This, the Iowa Development Commission comments, is a far cry from the situation 10 years ago, when only 41 percent of Iowa's farms had the benefits of electricity. Five years ago, 62 percent had electric service.

Iowa's present contradiction of 201,527 electrified farm homes on 200,679 farms is really no contradiction at all. Those 848 extra homes merely prove that both the old folks and the young folks on the "home place" have electricity in their separate houses, or that both the owner's and the hired man's house have electric light and power.

The figures also prove that electricity has moved onto the Iowa farm at an impressive rate in the last 10 years.

In 1940, Iowa had 29,455 miles of power lines in the country, taking electricity to 68,509 farm homes.

Now, there are three times as many rural customers, on 2.5 times as many miles of power lines. Iowa now has 73,890 miles of rural power lines.

Of Iowa's rural power users, 63.8 percent are REA customers, 34.3 percent buy their power from private companies, and 2 percent buy from municipal power plants. REA owns 70 percent of the rural power lines; private utilities, 28.2 percent; and city-owned companies, 1.5 percent. More than half the REA power (53.8 percent) is provided by private utility companies.

Big Steel Companies Are Expanding Their Facilities in the Great Lakes Region and Are Not Worried Over the Iron-Ore Fields in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the February 22, 1951, issue of the Jamestown (N. Y.) Journal in an editorial destroys the desperate effort being made to sell the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to the American people in the name of national defense.

Each Member of Congress should read the following editorial titled "That Seaway Project":

THAT SEAWAY PROJECT

The Truman administration is pulling out all the stops in trying to restore life to the St. Lawrence seaway project. Currently, it is taking advantage of the critical international situation in a desperate effort to sell the plan on the ground that the United States must start its part of the seaway now to assure the country of access to an adequate supply of iron ore if war comes.

That such an argument, advanced by high Government officials including Cabinet members, in the stress of the world crisis, may gain congressional supporters for the seaway is altogether possible. The defense program does emphasize the critical need of a steady flow of iron ore. However, there is every reason to believe that the claims of the seaway supporters as to the limitations of the supply of iron ore in Minnesota and Wisconsin are grossly exaggerated. The fact that the big steel companies are substantially expanding their facilities in the Great Lakes region would suggest that they are not greatly worried over the iron ore fields in the United States.

In any event, it must be borne in mind that the project, if approved, would be at least 5 years under construction, and more likely the period would be even longer. What is further to be considered is the fact that in the event of enemy action the seaway, either under construction or after completion, would be a prime enemy target. The cost for the United States, estimated on figures presumably compiled long before the enormous inflation, and which would be materially higher under prevailing conditions, is $600,000,000. Secretary Sawyer says shipping tolls would pay for it in 50 years. That might be. But it is a lot of money to add to the present stupendous outlays of the Government for defense. And the project certainly could not be completed within the period when Russia can be expected to strike, if it should strike at all.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Gallup Poll Indicates Public Believes in What Truman Foreign Policy Is Trying To Accomplish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as stated in an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, Sunday, April 22, 1951, a recent public-opinion poll conducted by Dr. George Gallup on the General MacArthur controversy offers a good example of why it is not wise to attach great political significance to the removal of MacArthur by President Truman without doing some soul searching as to the real issues involved.

Everyone has great admiration for General MacArthur as a military leader. It is to be regretted the present action became necessary, but I feel the general left the President no other course. If you will read the attached editorial carefully you will find references to public opinion on policies that are the real issues in the case.

It is doubtful if the majority of those taking the general's side in the present controversy would support his position on matters of policy. I do know from observation of their voting records that the majority of the congressional supporters of the general have taken opposite policy views.

I feel, as does the writer of the Journal editorial, that some people are using General MacArthur's popularity for partisan purposes and in so doing they are endangering national security.

The Journal editorial follows:

THE PUBLIC MIND

A public-opinion poll conducted by Dr. George Gallup on the MacArthur controversy offers a good example of why it is not wise to attach great political significance to the ouster without doing some soul searching as to the real issues behind it.

Voters questioned backed up General MacArthur. The vote was 62 percent to 29 percent for President Truman's decision.

But does that mean that the great majority go along with the theory of expanding the war against Red China? No, according to the replies to the other questions asked in the survey.

Only 46 percent thought bombing of Chinese bases in Manchuria would end the Korean War, as against 40 percent that thought it would not. And the public voted overwhelmingly against any all-out war with China as suggested by the extreme position of Senator CAIN, of Washington.

Further, 7 out of every 10 voters believe that a war with China means global war with Russia, and 6 out of every 10 voters believe that bombing Chinese bases would bring Russia into the war.

And, most surprising of all, in view of the loose appeasement talk, the public, by a 3-to-2 vote, believes the Truman administration should make stronger efforts to find mutually satisfactory peace terms in Korea; that it has not yet gone far enough in this direction.

These statistics indicate General MacArthur's public popularity as a military commander who has done a great deal for his country, and also represents the traditional American sympathy for a person who was fired from a top job he has earned the hard way. They also indicate that the public generally believes in what the Truman foreign policy is trying to accomplish.

Any attempt to use MacArthur's popularity to force a change in that policy is partisan tinkering with national security.

Army Quartermaster Corps Charged With Wasting Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I call attention to a letter written by one of my constituents, Mr. Fred Irish, of Tama, Iowa, who alleges a serious waste of manpower in the Army Quartermaster Corps.

I have called this situation to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

The letter follows:

TAMA, IOWA.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.:

With the appropriations for our military defense and the utmost utilization of manpower in our Armed Forces in great need of much closer scrutiny, I believe there is an opportunity for a great saving of both men and money in the food-procurement program of the Army Quartermaster Corps. While we have the civilian staff of the United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration standing by, and in some instances having already done the inspection and grading necessary, the Quartermaster Corps sends its full inspection and grading staff to handle all of the original inspection of the dairy and poultry products purchased for their use.

It is my contention that our tax money would be, in this instance, used to a much greater advantage and more able-bodied men (over 19 years of age, if you please) made available for other military duty, if the Dairy and Poultry Inspection and Grading Division of the Production and Marketing Administration personnel were to be given the full responsibility of inspecting and grading all of the dairy and poultry products acquired by the Quartermaster Corps.

It has been my experience to see, in many instances, exact duplication of inspection service by the assignment of Army personnel to the point of operation while the contract is being filled in a plant already operating under PMA supervision. The Army Quartermaster Corps will not accept PMA graded eviscerated poultry products even though they do accept PMA approved plants to furnish the product. They will not accept United States Department of Agriculture grading of New York dressed poultry. If a plant wishes to have continuous United States Department of Agriculture supervision in order to comply with the 1951 approved poultry dressing and grading program, it must undergo the necessary expense of paying for this service, and also the expense of making the product available to the Army Quartermaster Corps when fulfilling an Army contract. This is a waste of manpower and tax money.

The same situation exists in the disregard by the Quartermaster Corps for the PMA grading of shell eggs. Many, if not most, of the produce houses in this State, or in any State which at any time requires the inspection and grading service of either branch, have a resident United States Department of Agriculture inspector running a continuous inspection of shell eggs. Why, then, is it necessary to send military personnel to this plant to do exactly the same work that these people are there to do?

The United States Department of Agriculture has been able to further train excellent personnel, already long experienced in the dairy and poultry industries. The Production and Marketing Administration established the standards of quality and grades as well as the operational requirements for approved plants and their men are specifically trained to foster the adherence to these standards throughout the industry.

It has been my experience to notice the uniformity and fairness of grading among the PMA inspectors and I must say that in many instances there is a general lack of this uniformity within the ranks of the Quartermaster Corps personnel carrying on the inspection and grading. I am sure that this difference is due largely to the long background of experience and diligent training of the PMA personnel. They have shown themselves willing to be helpful and cooperative, in every conceivable manner, in carrying out their duties. They have gone out of their way to help the plants produce a better product for civilian and Army use as well.

I sincerely believe that this is a matter that should receive immediate attention. It is not a matter of setting up a new agency. It is a matter of eliminating all inspections, at origin, of dairy and poultry products purchased by the Army Quartermaster Corps.

Very truly yours,

Mr. FRED IRISH,
Partner, J. H. Neil Creamery Co.

MacArthur's Day—And Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the dominating news of late has been the return of and the welcome to General MacArthur. The great majority of Americans were pleased to extend a joyful and hearty welcome home to this great old soldier of our Pacific war and an outstanding administrator of conquered Japan. The welcome shown to him was a deserved tribute and an understanding of our realization of his outstanding service for the United States. However, around this welcome home has hung a pall of doubt and uncertainty as to just what differences between the President and the general had necessitated his retirement. By this time the air is beginning to clear and fairly sharp lines of agreement and disagreement are coming into the fore. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial of April 20 from the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colo., carefully

spelling out its editorial opinion of the issues. The editorial is written in calmness and has a searching quality after fact. I commend its reading to the Members as a penetrating statement of the issues as seen by one of the outstanding newspaper editors of the Rocky Mountain region. I believe value exists within its contents for believers of either side of the present controversy. The editorial is as follows:

MACARTHUR'S DAY—AND SAY

General MacArthur has had his day and also his say. He has been hailed with an acclaim that should gratify any conquering hero. He has had his opportunity to address the Nation and that address was listened to with close attention and high respect.

From the purely military standpoint the general clearly presented his picture of the Asiatic situation. He made it clear that we must dominate the Pacific. In his picture of the Orient he reaffirmed the well-known fact that it is the Asiatics' urge to nationalism that prompts most of the unrest in the Far East. But in the case of China, according to the general, this nationalism has inspired imperialistic dreams. And out of these new-born dreams developed China's entry into the Korean war. As General MacArthur presented the case, Russia, contrary to general opinion, had little if anything to do with Peiping's decision to invade North Korea. In that belief of the general he apparently holds that we—never once does he mention the United Nations—should bomb Manchurian bases, blockade Chinese ports and fully support Chiang. He discounted fears that such action might bring Russia into the war by only the nonassuring assertion that "the Soviet need not necessarily become involved." We would like for the general to have been more explicit on this. Since he had asserted that the fight between communism and freedom is global, can he assure us that our entry into China would leave Russia unmoved either in Asia or Europe? He ignores entirely the mutual aid pact between China and Russia.

Sincerely disavowing any love for war, General MacArthur still has no faith in organizations such as League of Nations—and by inference the UN— so international issues must still be decided in the crucible of war. While not naming them, the general appears to look upon those who seek to solve the Korean War without extending it to China as appeasers, giving no consideration to their honest aims to limit war while other ways than military are sought to end it.

As a military leader it is easy to understand why MacArthur could not explain the surrender of military advantages in the field—for military victory is the only victory conceivable in this grand old soldier's thinking. But there is a great sector of the human race today that seeks, perhaps mistakenly, to achieve victory without utilizing every military advantage before weighing its ultimate as well as its immediate consequences.

We would have liked for the general to have been more explicit in his advocacy for all-out support of Chiang, one of the most controversial issues of the day.

It was a fine speech, delivered in calmness and earnestness. But it leaves many things to be clarified. Perhaps the general will be more revealing before a Senate Armed Services Committee. The speech may prove most helpful if it forces the United Nations, as well as United States, to fresh consideration of their Far East policies. Whether that consideration would result in any change or not it would prove beneficial in clearing the air and clarifying UN policy—however insignificant that appears to General MacArthur.

Hon. Clare Boothe Luce in Behalf of Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, because Clare Boothe Luce, former Congresswoman from my State, playwright, author, lecturer, and one of the most humanitarian citizens I know, has so eloquently stated the case for the perpetuation of good music by exempting symphony and grand opera organizations from Federal admission taxes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of her remarks made at a dinner for Friends of the Philharmonic-Symphony Society of New York on Monday, April 2, 1951, at the Hotel Plaza, New York, N. Y.:

There are two ways to know how much you need and love music: One is to be able to hear it; the other is not to be able to hear it.

Imagine, if you can, what the world—our world—would be like if no music were ever heard in it. Now that's an amusing idea. Let's play with it for a minute.

Let's imagine the rise of some final, superbarbaric dictator. He's a man, we'll say, who hates music. That's a pretty good definition, incidentally, of the tyrant or hater of humanity. As Shakespeare wrote:

"The man that hath no music in himself
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds
Is fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils."

So, let's pretend that this harmony-hating tyrant bans all music. That is, all man-made music from the world. He commands all musical instruments to be destroyed; orders all musicians exiled. He outlaws all music and music-making by man, woman, or child, in private or in public. Under pain of fine or imprisonment there is to be no singing, even of lullabies, hymns, or national anthems, and no playing, even on combs covered with tissue paper, no less barrel organs, or any kind of tunes no matter how thin or tinkling. There is to be no humming, crooning, whistling, beating of fingers on the table, which would show that one was listening to unheard melodies. A man who sang in the bathtub would be considered a flagrant lawbreaker. This tyrant—a logical fellow—would not even allow martial music to be played for his troops marching off to the wars—they would have to shuffle off bound together like prisoners in a chain gang. (The murder of music would show men to be what this assassination would surely make of them—slaves.)

Anyone caught operating or attending a musical speakeasy—or "play-softly"—would be guilty of breaking the law even if his excuse were that he went there to hear a love song with his girl. The possession of bootleg phonographs or earphones would call for the most severe sentences. Anyone caught in the company of composers or conductors in the musical underground would be sent to a concentration camp as an enemy of the state. There, all he would hear for the rest of his life would be drilling machines, cement smashers, taxi horns, and factory whistles. And such other sounds as issue from machines instead of the soul. Even people who thronged to parks, picnic groves, or the country would be suspected of subversive activity, particularly if they sat silently listening to the birds, the brooks, the bees, the wind in the trees. For this would show both a musical and a religious tendency. These people would plainly be listening to the harmony that lies at the heart of all nature, the author of which is God. They would be reflecting that music making is merely the man-made organizing of nature's sweet wild sounds. Man's participation with God in the harmonious act of creation—the creating of harmony.

"Music is the greatest good that mortals know
And all of heaven we have below."

How many people in such a world would still claim that music was a matter of indifference to them? That they could take it or leave it; that music—especially fine music—"bored" them; that they had no "ear" for music at all? I expect none.

For in the final analysis, what people who say such things really mean is that they prefer thin, or simple, or mediocre sounds to rich, complex, superior musical sounds such as are made by a great symphony orchestra playing the works of great composers. (They only think they prefer them—but that's because they won't or don't listen enough.) But, being reasonable people they would have to admit that there is a place for the finest and the best music in American life and culture, as well as for the mediocre. And, being reasonable people, they would agree that if we ever got around to destroying or suppressing the best, we'd be driven on to destroy the second best, and finally, like our imaginary tyrant, all music.

The destruction or suppression of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra would be the beginning of the end of all fine music in America. Whether it were destroyed by dictatorship, by government taxation and high cost of music making, or suppressed merely owing to a lack of public and private support, it does come to the same thing: The beginning of a world without music.

We dare not let this happen. We must set about saving our finest music and supporting our finest music makers in the American way—by private support, such as you will give them tonight, and by public support, such as we will get from our radio audience listening to our appeals tonight.

The great philosopher, Plato, wrote 2,500 years ago in The Republic, that "when modes of music change, the laws of the state always change with them." A great, free, noble people with a rich, free culture will have great, free, noble orchestras like the New York Philharmonic-Symphony. Where such music and music makers flourish, our liberties are safe.

W. Stuart Symington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has nominated W. Stuart Symington to direct the reorganized Reconstruction Finance Corporation and in my opinion, which I am certain is shared by all in Congress, the President could not have made a better choice.

Mr. Symington has had a distinguished career in business and in government. To the latter he brought experience and efficiency which made him an outstanding administrator and public

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

official. He is recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike as one of the most capable men in government.

His record, as well as the respect he commands from all who are familiar with his work, should enable him to restore public confidence in the RFC. I am certain he will.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial in tribute to Mr. Symington from East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of Friday, April 20, 1951:

USEFUL SYMINGTON

The Senate can be expected to confirm without delay the nomination of W. Stuart Symington to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Symington, responsible to the President, supplants the five-man RFC Board that came under fire as a result of Fulbright committee revelations of influence in high place, even in the White House circle.

Investigation of the great Government lending agency will continue, but since the inquiry will deal with pre-Symington administration, the new RFC head will be free to make whatever changes are necessary to restore its usefulness and regain public confidence.

The Symington appointment is temporary. The former St Louis industrialist is a troubleshooter who has held a succession of important jobs in the higher levels of the Government. Once the RFC has been reorganized—or, possibly, abolished—he will be available for another assignment, and there surely will be one.

President Truman has complained often of the short supply of men of outstanding ability who are willing to accept low-pay, insecure Government jobs. Because such men are few the President has shifted them about so that a half dozen men have completed almost a score of assignments.

One of those men is Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice of the United States. Ordinarily that exalted post would be regarded as the capstone to a distinguished career. But Chief Justice Vinson, former Cabinet member and former "Assistant President," is accounted available for further assignment. He is regarded as a possible Democratic Presidential nominee if Mr. Truman does not want another term. Stuart Symington must be accounted for among the Presidential protentials. He has gathered a lot of Government experience in a few years in the National Capital.

The War in Korea and the Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from two newsgrams appearing in United States News and World Report, the first from the issue of April 20, 1951, and the second from the issue of April 27, 1951. I might add that Americans generally have come to realize that United States News and World Report has an objective point of view and a reputation for high reliability. I think Americans generally will want to read these two very significant excerpts written by the staff of David Lawrence, who has unusual facilities for arriving at factual information in connection with the entire Asiatic problem.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From United States News and World Report of April 20, 1951]

TOMORROW

A truce in Korea remains improbable. Expanding war is more likely.

Communist answer to moves for a truce is to be an offensive. Appeals for peace, soundings, offers of a deal haven't sparked Communist interest.

War, as a result, is to go on. Wars, under way, tend to spread.

With MacArthur in command, Communists did not know what to expect. It might be atom bombing, it might be smashed cities, it might be invasion of south China, it might be anything. Peace might seem better. Without MacArthur, all is simpler. Chinese cities won't be bombed. Invasion won't come. A price will be paid by UN to get peace. There's nothing much to fear, so why not go on fighting and maybe get a higher price later on for peace?

MacArthur's going will encourage the Communists.

Mr. Truman, politically, cannot pay the price for peace in Korea.

Formosa is the Communists' first demand. Britain wants to give it as part payment to the Communists for peace. United States can't agree to that.

UN membership is next. Britain says, "Pay." United States can't agree.

Get out of Korea is the third Communist requirement. After going in, suffering 60,000 casualties, United States now can't suddenly pull out.

So the business of chasing each other up and down the Korean peninsula is to go on. The cost, in United States casualties, averages about 1,400 a week. It's a continuing cost, no end in sight under policies spelled out for Comunists. Idea that Communists will tire of losses and sue for peace is highly unlikely. Manpower is China's cheapest commodity. Losses won't discourage Communists.

As the Communists must size up things in planning new moves:

Mr. Truman's nerve broke at chancing bigger war. Britain gets her way.

Appeasement, not bigger war, is in the wind. United States is ready to deal.

Price for a temporary deal can be held high. United States will pay rather than accept dangers of expanded war in Asia. Whip hand shifts to Communist side.

Actually, Communist leaders may be playing with dynamite. Made bolder by soft talk from United States by punishment for an exponent of victory in war, they may misjudge, go too far, and get smacked. Firing of MacArthur, bid for peace, may help to generate the very expanding war Mr. Truman says he wants to avoid.

[From United States News and World Report of April 27, 1951]

TOMORROW

To help you get the record straight on MacArthur and Truman:

Staff Chiefs of United States did not meet formally and recommend dismissal of General MacArthur. There was no action by Joint Chiefs as a group.

Informally, when their opinion was asked, Staff Chiefs did express the opinion that General MacArthur should be replaced as Supreme Commander.

Method of replacement was not suggested by service leaders.

Mr. Truman, not United States Staff Chiefs, thought up the idea of firing General MacArthur in the middle of the night, without prior consultation, without any explanation. A military commander with 52 years of service to the Nation was fired without a hearing or a chance to take farewell of his troops.

Joint Chiefs, definitely, did not recommend that procedure.

It is true, literally, that Joint Chiefs of United States, in the past, were in agreement with General MacArthur on strategy in waging the present war.

MacArthur strategy called for: (1) economic blockade of China; (2) naval blockade of China's coast; (3) air reconnaissance of Manchuria and of China's coast; (4) end of restrictions on Chiang Kai-shek to use his forces on China mainland and support for Chiang with military supplies, not combat manpower.

Strategy favored by Joint Chiefs, at one point, did coincide.

Ideas of strategy, however, do change. United States strategy is influenced by political as well as military considerations, by attitudes of allies as well as by concepts of strictly United States desires and interests.

United States strategy, as of now, calls for: (1) diplomatic moves to try to get settlement; (2) no blockade of China, no air operations above the Yalu River; (3) limited operations above the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea, to provide for security of UN forces and to maintain contact with the enemy.

General MacArthur differed with this strategy. Joint Chiefs approved the new strategy. Strategy adopted formally on March 20, 1951, was influenced by: (1) Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State; (2) the British Government.

Diplomats, not military men, now will seek to settle the war. How well they succeed remains to be seen. With MacArthur out, they get their chance.

You will be interested in these other points:

The MacArthur letter to JOSEPH MARTIN, dated March 20, Tokyo, had been written and mailed before the new strategy was laid down for the General. The strategy directive, announcing a peace try, reached Tokyo March 21.

A MacArthur peace offer on March 24, Tokyo time, was considered within the prerogatives of a military commander in carrying out his duties.

A directive from the Joint Chiefs, dated March 24, telling MacArthur to coordinate any further statements with Washington was the last word received by the general from the Joint Chiefs or President before the order firing him. The Martin letter was made public in Washington April 5. The order to fire was delivered in Tokyo April 11. That was an interval of 18 days between any exchange of communications with Washington and Tokyo in a war period.

The order to fire was a complete surprise to General MacArthur, wholly unexpected. Its summary nature was without precedent.

In the war itself, Communist leaders, not UN, hold the initiative.

Communists, with initiative, can strike soon or hold off indefinitely, taking whatever time is necessary to build air and ground forces. There will be time to equip new armies, train pilots, acquire planes, build airfields.

The choice of time, methods, build-up of forces is left to Communists.

United States forces, left in the dark, can probe, make limited advances, use planes for attack within a limited area, but can't try to win a decision.

What comes out of that situation is anybody's guess. The next big move, if there is to be one, is up to the Communists. They can play a waiting game or they can throw in all they've got, including air, for a try at

a decision. Only Communists know what the choice is going to be. United States sits and waits.

To get personalities straightened out in a developing argument:

George Marshall, Defense Secretary, is the Europe-first leader. The Marshall thesis is that United States cannot be strong both in Europe and Asia. Asia must be secondary. General MacArthur differs, sees the problem as global.

Dean Acheson, State Secretary, now sides with Marshall. Earlier he had favored broader war with Communist China. Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of Staff Chiefs, is the White House spokesman, expressing official opinions. Chiefs of service staffs operate under White House orders. Staff Chiefs do agree that Korean battlefield could be isolated and the war brought to an end successfully, if Russia did not intervene. Staff Chiefs do agree that, if world war is to come, Europe, not Asia, would be the main theater.

Dwight Eisenhower, supreme commander in Europe, is on the side lines, but inclined more to the Marshall than the MacArthur viewpoint.

Congress Should Review Our Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from Anderson Memorial Post, No. 5996, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Anderson, S. C.:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
ANDERSON MEMORIAL POST, NO. 5996,
Anderson, S. C.

Anderson Memorial Post, No. 5996, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in regular meeting, April 12, 1951, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That—

"1. Whereas we have served our country overseas and may have to do so again, we want our servants in Congress to know that we believe the Congress should review our whole defense plan without fear or favor as to individual or party.

"2. We stand in awe at the report of more than 60,000 casualties for our forces in Korea. Our county has had its share of these. Is it a United Nations affair, or is it that in name and United States in blood and lives lost? If British interests can force out the Supreme Commander in Korea, their contribution of men and arms should more nearly equal ours. Naturally, our servants are aware of the economic interests of Britishers in Asia aside from their concern for the future of Hong Kong.

"3. Our chief concern is with policy rather than with personality. We do not believe there is any such thing as the indispensable man in any field. However, if the United Nations ties us to a sacrifice of American lives in Korea in a questionable venture, we ask immediate revision of future commitments. In the light of our Korean experience, we already feel that the wise and practical course would be to cease to implement the provisions of the Atlantic Pact before we find ourselves involved in another equally hopeless situation.

"4. A clean-up in our official family in Washington should not be delayed if careful investigation of the Korean situation shows dereliction on the part of the two Cabinet heads responsible for the action in Korea—namely, Secretary Acheson and Secretary Marshall. There are no sacred heads in our Government. We humbly remind our servants that it is almost axiomatic that the boss fixes the blame while the leader fixes the breakdown.

"5. Many of our members are already on active duty, and others will go soon. We do not wish to face active service again without the utmost confidence in our high command. Under present conditions confidence is low and still sinking.

"6. This is no effort to present a "pressure bloc" in favor of any individual. We are simple Americans who enjoy living. We feel that the ruthless sacrifice of 20,000 lives should be justified by more than we have been able to glean from the bloody blunder in Korea.

"7. It is not our good fortune to possess any superior wisdom as to what is best. In all humility and without apology, we implore you not to be blinded by party loyalty in a review of our foreign policy. It may sound strong, but nevertheless, it is the view of real Americans and cruelly true that "In Arlington we do not find Republicans or Democrats but silent Americans who in time of danger served their country honorably and now sleep side by side in peace."

"8. Our final hope is in constitutional government which in American practice properly operates around the three related but independent points of the triangle, namely, executive, judicial, and legislative. We fear that constitutional government is in jeopardy. We are depending on our servants in Washington."

Service Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 24, 1951:

SERVICE INSURANCE

Congressional conferees have done a good job of patching up the totally different House and Senate bills on insurance for GIs. They have taken what we regard as the best features of both versions. The net is to expand insurance coverage of men on active duty by making it automatic and retroactive to June 27, 1950, and yet to continue the right of new veterans to retain their Government insurance by paying premiums on a term basis after discharge.

Reconciliation of the two versions was not an easy task. The House had conferred free insurance benefits on all men on active duty but had eliminated any provision for continuation of insurance after discharge, whereas the Senate had granted coverage for a limited time to men killed on active duty but had left other existing provisions undisturbed. The compromise is a liberal system which satisfies the prime need for permanent, universal coverage of men on active duty, takes care of men disabled in service and permits cash refunds on old-style policies, and still meets the worthwhile objective of enabling future veterans to continue low-cost insurance. The conferees deserve a vote of thanks.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Finance Committee is preparing to report to the Senate the bill H. R. 1612, providing for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The House, in passing the bill, saw fit to amend it in such a way as to seriously hamper the effective continuance of the reciprocal trade principle should the amendments be permitted to become law. I do not believe that the Senate should retain those amendments. When the bill comes to conference, I hope that the House will agree to their elimination.

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has approved a statement issued by their World Trade Committee and World Trade Association which cogently outlines the reasons why the four House amendments of which I speak would render the trade-agreements program practically inoperative. This statement is now before the Senate Finance Committee for their consideration. In the hope that it will persuade my colleagues in the House to reconsider their previous stand on this matter, I ask that the statement be printed in full in the RECORD, and I now submit it for that purpose:

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
March 8, 1951.

To: Board of Directors.
From: World Trade Committee and World Trade Association.
Subject: Approval of Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

REQUESTED ACTION

That the board of directors approve the recommendation of the World Trade Committee and the World Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce to approve legislation to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. This act extends the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951.

STATEMENT

There is attached the report of the World Trade Committee and the World Trade Association dated January 30, 1951, recommending approval of legislation to extend the trade agreements program for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951. In supporting this recommendation the two groups submitted a lengthy statement reviewing the history and accomplishments of the program.

The House Ways and Means Committee voted approval of the legislation without amendment. Four amendments were approved by the House of Representatives, which, if approved by the Senate and adopted, would have serious effects on our international relationship with the free countries whose aid and cooperation we are seeking. Further, it would play into the hands of the Soviet propagandists, destroy the effectiveness of the operation of the present program, interfere with the present mobilization program for defense, and penalize the public interest and consumers of the United States, and not accomplish the objectives the proponents desire or claim.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The amendments, following thorough investigation, appear to be restrictive, unnecessary, undesirable, and unworkable, as pointed out in the statement below.

(The proposed amendments as submitted to the Senate and now before the Senate Finance Committee are reproduced and attached.)

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, representing a cross section of all business, agricultural, and national interests of the country which appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of the extension of the program, without amendment for 3 years, will appear before the Senate Finance Committee March 21, 1951, opposing all four amendments. In the FC clipsheet of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of February 16, 1951, they have the following to say:

"Those who favor the highly restrictive provisions (the proposed amendments) show lack of understanding, we believe, of the basic purposes of the trade-agreements program and the benefits which have derived to the United States from the program. To enact such a measure as that which is currently proposed is perhaps worse than no trade-agreements program at all. It would be too cumbersome to be of any practical value. Furthermore, the principle of such restrictive measures is inconsistent with the basic concept of competitive private enterprise and with the practical aspects of the current international situation. In times of shortages throughout the world, it is of extreme importance that movement of materials and goods among free countries be as unrestricted as possible. Such, we believe, can be effected without undue injury to United States domestic industry, and, in fact, with great benefit to this country.

"It is inconceivable that the United States can in good conscience continue to press for removal of barriers by other friendly countries, if the United States itself adopts what is equivalent to an inoperative trade-agreements program."

Serious international effects

The trade-agreements program is the keystone of the foreign economic policy of the United States. The policy today is that we must do everything possible to build up the strength of the United States and the other free nations and to give these peoples a real stake in the future. This can be the only policy to meet the threat of military aggression, of subversion, of stirring up class strife, of exploiting discontent and poverty, and of preventing economic improvement.

An integral part of the process of building strength in the free world has been the effort to expand the flow of trade. Only by a greater exchange of goods between countries can the full benefits of economic development and greater production be maintained (and this means sharing our market with the producing nations of the world). The trade-agreements program has been a major element in our participation in this process of expanding world trade. This program has become a symbol of United States determination to lead in the cooperative effort to expand world trade. Renewal of the act will reaffirm that determination. Failure to renew the act would be a symbol of withdrawal from that cooperative effort.

Short-term renewal of the act with the crippling amendments will in the eyes of the free nations be a repudiation of our economic policy. To them it would have the appearance of our turning back to protectionism and economic isolationism. Their being needlessly denied access to American markets would force them to step up their trade with the Soviet bloc and deprive our defense effort of many badly needed strategic and critical materials.

Such a reversal of trade policy recalls the effects of our adoption of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, which resulted in retaliatory tariffs and a score or more of other restrictive measures and practices on the part of nearly 70 countries, which destroyed two-thirds of the world's foreign trade. History has proved this condition deepened and prolonged the worldwide depression of the thirties. A repetition of this catastrophe would weaken all nations, including our own, and make all an easy prey for Soviet domination without a military struggle.

Another serious effect on our national economy is overlooked by the proponents of these amendments, the jeopardy in which it puts our existing foreign markets for agriculture and industry. The current $10,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 annual exports are of great importance to many major industries. These exports are not only the difference between profit and loss and prosperity and failure for the industries, but the share exported helps maintain stable high prices for the full production sold in the American market. Minority agricultural spokesmen overlook the importance of a totally prosperous American economy on the total sales of all American agricultural products. The economic well-being of the large manufacturing industries selling from 10 to 25 percent of their output overseas is the best guarantee for American agriculture for the orderly sale of the larger part of their production at high stable prices.

The reciprocal trade agreements program has proved successful in expanding our foreign trade. According to official figures published by the United States Department of Commerce (Commerce Reports for February 17, 1940), United States trade with trade agreement countries showed a substantial increase as compared with our trade with nontrade agreement countries.

At the end of 1939 the United States had concluded agreements with 18 countries (and colonies). The first agreement was signed September 3, 1934. This period, 1934–39, can be considered the only normal trading period for comparison purposes. Other actions, such as preparations for and World War II itself, altered the normal trade pattern.

These official figures show that our export trade average value for 1938–39 increased 62.8 percent over the average value for 1934–35. Our export trade with nonagreement countries for the same comparable periods increased only 31.7 percent, thus indicating that American export trade with the trade agreement countries was double that of the trade with nonagreement countries, and that the program was successful in accomplishing its objectives.

On the other hand, there was no extraordinary increase in the volume of imports during the same period. Generally imports from trade agreement countries increased 21.6 percent and those from nonagreement countries 12.5 percent.

The reciprocal trade-agreements program has had the approval of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States since its inception. Many national public-interest organizations have approved the trade-agreements program.

Furthermore, several features of the proposed amendments are inflationary in effect, which are contrary to policies of the National Government at the present time.

The proposed amendments

No. 1. Peril points: The peril-point issue was fully debated in connection with the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1949 and the amendment was then repealed by Congress. When the amendment was proposed in 1948 the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made the following statement before the Senate Finance Committee:

"Placing all responsibility in the Tariff Commission for the determination of so-called peril points appears to have several undesirable effects. These peril points are the maximum and minimum points between which negotiations could proceed without reference to Congress. It is doubtful whether the Tariff Commission could achieve the wide correlation of diverse interests that is now obtained through the interdepartmental committees.

"In the light of its historic functions, the Tariff Commission would probably be chiefly concerned with the impact against the specific domestic commodities involved in negotiation. For the best interests of this country, equal consideration should be given to other producers, to consumers, and to the public generally. To vest the power of determining these peril points solely in the Tariff Commission would make that organization vulnerable to the pressure of affected interests to a degree that might challenge the recognized objectivity of this valuable agency.

"Such a concentration of authority might cause the Commission, from the standpoint of self-protection, to set peril points so conservatively that successful negotiation would have to exceed the range of option. This would mean that almost every successful agreement would necessarily have to go to Congress for approval. Thus it is not only conceivable but even probable that this act may return the highly technical subject of tariff writing to the crowded calendars of Congress."

The requirement in the bill that the Tariff Commission hold public hearings results in duplication of effort. Additional hearings still are necessary because the other departments would otherwise be unable to question the witnesses who have appeared at the Tariff Commission hearings and would thus be unable to obtain in many instances a completely clear understanding of the problem. Furthermore, Tariff Commission hearings do not yield information on United States export products or other matters relating to the agreement. A separate hearing is necessary in order that a segment of the American economy can have an opportunity to be heard. This segment is vastly larger than the one which appears at the Tariff Commission hearing. It consists of people interested in exports; it consists of people who are interested in better international relations; it consists of consumers; it consists of a predominant part of labor; it consists of a large share of the farmers.

The Tariff Commission is not qualified to make determinations regarding the national defense.

Under existing procedures the recommendations which go to the President as to concessions that he should make are the collective judgment of representatives of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Interior, Labor, State, Treasury, the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission. This judgment is reached on the basis of the special knowledge of these representatives resulting from their respective responsibilities and after full public hearings. The record shows that these judgments have been sound.

To substitute peril-point proposals for this procedure, which has worked so well for so long, would be as undesirable as it would be unnecessary. The peril-point procedure, in effect, makes the judgment of a single agency determinative of the extent of tariff concessions; deprives that agency in making its judgment of the right to participate in the discussions of the other agencies concerned with the program; requires that agency to perform the almost impossible task of fixing a precise point which will serve as a sort of guaranty against injury for the future; and results in a duplication of hearings.

Nothing has happened since repeal of this amendment in 1949 and no arguments have been presented to change the view that the peril-point amendment is both unecessary and undesirable.

Furthermore, to carry out the requirements of this amendment in determining the peril points on several thousand commodi-

ties, it will require an expanded working force in the Tariff Commission many times the present size. Businessmen, farmers, and others could expect a flood of new forms and questionnaries to be filled out and a swarm of investigators to study their costs.

No. 2. The escape clause: Ever since the Trade Agreements Act was proposed and all through the administration of the trade-agreements program, there have been industries which have claimed that they would be injured by the program. There is clear evidence, both in the hearings that precede negotiations and in the congressional hearings in connection with renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, that in very few cases have the fears of injury been justified. However, there are adequate means for preventing or remedying any such injury if it occurs after the agreement has gone into effect.

All the trade agreements which have been signed since 1943, including the general agreement on tariffs and trade, have included an escape clause under which any party to the agreement may modify or withdraw an individual concession if it is found that, as a result of unforeseen circumstances and of the concession, imports of the item in question are occurring in such increased quantity and in such circumstances as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. Under this clause the concession may be either partly or wholly withdrawn, a quota imposed on imports, or a rate of duty even higher than that in effect before the concession may be put into effect.

By joint agreement a substantially identical clause was included on October 13, 1950, in the trade agreement between the United States and Switzerland, concluded in 1936.

For the United States, the escape clause action is administered by the Tariff Commission, which makes its recommendation to the President, directly and without participation of any other Government agency.

An industry claiming injury or threat of injury resulting from a trade-agreement concession applies to the Tariff Commission for an investigation and public hearing. If, in the Commission's opinion, a preliminary examination reveals facts warranting a formal investigation, the Commission conducts one and recommends to the President the action, if any, which should be taken.

Although the United States has made concessions on several thousand items in trade agreements that contain the escape clause, only 20 applications for investigations, covering 17 products, have been filed with the Tariff Commission. Five of these are still pending. Of the 15 which have been disposed of, only 1 (involving women's fur felt hats and hat bodies) was found by the Tariff Commission to justify action. In that case the Tariff Commission recommended withdrawal of the concession and this was done.

The careful application of the safeguards observed before concessions are made and the way concessions are tailored to particular needs are primarily responsible for the fact that need for using the escape clause has been minimized.

Furthermore, modifications and withdrawal of concessions have been made in several agreements signed before 1943 where evidence was submitted or investigation by the Tariff Commission found injury or threat of injury to domestic industries. These included certain types of embroidered handkerchiefs from Switzerland, linen fire hose from Canada, fox furs from Canada, and potatoes from Canada.

In view of this history of the operation of the escape clause as well as the fact that during the 17-year life of the reciprocal trade agreements program no industry has suffered harm or injury and that the value of United States export trade and the world's trade as a whole has doubled, proves that the program has been well administered and that the proposals for amendment are unnecessary.

No. 3. Ban of concessions on foreign farm commodities sold at less than domestic support price: This proposed amendment does not appear to be in the public interest. It would tend to pyramid subsidization, it is inflationary in character, contrary to established policy of the Government, and does not appear administratively sound. Unfortunately, there can be no complete reconciliation between tariff protectionism and the program of price supports for agricultural commodities and the program for multilateral tariff negotiations. Removing of concessions on price-supported agricultural products may well cause other nations to retaliate by withdrawing concessions granted to United States products. Such actions would affect all segments of our economy. Does it seem logical, or just, to permit the operation of the domestic support program to invite almost certain retaliation, on the part of foreign countries, which will restrict the exportation of all types of American products?

No. 4. Forbid President to grant tariff concessions to Communist or satellite countries: The reasons motivating this amendment are easily appreciated. However, it appears to be designed as a measure of economic warfare rather than as a trade or tariff measure. Advantages to be gained will be more than outweighed by disadvantages. Benefits gained by the Soviet Union and her satellite countries are at a minimum as all shipments to iron curtain countries are regulated under the Export Control Act. Important to our economy and to our defense at the present time are certain materials, notably tungsten and manganese, which we are getting from the Soviet Union. Does it seem wise to take a step that would deprive ourselves of needed critical materials?

Another element of this amendment must be given serious consideration. We should remember that the actions of the United States, as determined by the Congress, are the criteria for honorable international behavior. Congressional approval of this amendment might jeopardize our continued efforts to secure an honorable and peaceful way to settle and dissipate world instability. This amendment could prove a tremendous tool of psychological warfare by enabling the Politburo to say that the United States is clearly the aggressor nation since it has taken the initiative in breaking off all commercial relations.

We feel more strongly than ever that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended for 3 years without crippling and unnecessary amendments. Its 17 years of successful administration with a minimum, if any, harm to any segments of the United States economy, should be sufficient recommendation for continuation of the program. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce should reaffirm its position by approving this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted.

T. G. FRANCK,
Chairman, World Trade Committee.
FRANK M. JACOBS,
Acting President, World Trade Association.

Peace Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a forthcoming book by Paul Hoffman, former head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, in which he sets forth his views as to the measures by which the United States can avert a third world war. This excerpt was printed in the New York Herald Tribune on April 18.

I think that his proposal for a unified overseas economic administration, which is substantially similar to a proposal made recently by the International Development Advisory Board, deserves the serious consideration of the Congress.

PEACE CAN BE WON

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

SINGLE ALLOCATION AGENCY FOR FOREIGN AID IS URGED AS BAR TO WASTE AND SPUR TO EFFICIENCY

(This is the seventh of a series of articles condensed from Peace Can Be Won, the forthcoming book by Paul Hoffman, former head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, in which he sets forth his views as to the measures by which the United States can avert a third world war.)

From the standpoint of foreign-aid programs I believe the most important lesson we have learned is this: To get maximum efficiency out of the dollars we spend abroad, we must have only one Government agency with responsibility for allocating all funds. Only by concentrating control over our economic activities abroad in the hands of a single agency can we:

(1) Properly apportion aid among countries (several agencies working separately often tend to give one nation too much help, another too little).

(2) Avoid waste of dollars within a country (two or more agencies often duplicate functions).

(3) Control the impact of our dollars upon the economy of a recipient country (too great a pressure for rearming on a nation of full employment, like Britain, could unduly drive down the standard of living; the same dollars applied to rearming in a nation of unemployment, like Germany, would raise the standard of living).

Therefore I should like to recommend most urgently to the American people and to Congress that an Overseas Economic Administration be formed to administer all aid and technical assistance programs abroad; that this administration have a large measure of control over the policies of such lending agencies as the Export-Import Bank; that United States representatives to all international economic organizations be responsible to it; and that this administration have equal rank with the other departments of the Government, such as State, Commerce, Interior, and that its administrator have Cabinet status.

WOULD TAKE OVER ECA

In effect, I recommend that this proposed Overseas Economic Administration take over the present set-up of ECA; that it absorb the point 4 program now administered by the State Department; that it supervise at least the economic side of all sums to be spent in European rearmament under the mutual defense assistance program. Moreover, American representation in the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, International Trade Organization (when we join) and in all other international government bodies dealing with the world receive its policy direction from such an Overseas Economic Administration.

The sense of interdependence among peoples has given the word politics a new meaning for me. Actually, world politics shapes our lives more tellingly than ward politics. A coffee blight in Brazil, a famine in India, devaluation in Britain, the almost

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

perpetual cabinet crises in France, the discovery of uranium ore in Africa, a political assassination in Lebanon, all have an increasingly direct and pervasive influence upon decisions which determine our destiny as individuals and as a people.

What all of this means is that world politics is a vital salient in waging the peace, and that we must have a foreign policy in time of peace which is quite as positive as foreign policy in time of war. Yet it has been only within the last decade that our peacetime foreign policy has been shifting away from the negative toward the positive.

STATE DEPARTMENT HAMPERED

In the broad sense, we all make foreign policy out of our ignorance or out of our knowledge, out of our courage or out of our fear. But the major burden of crystallizing it rests upon the State Department. In coping with this challenge, it is hampered not only by the carry-overs of our ingrained isolationism but also by traditional suspicion of its personnel. I must confess that when I came to Washington I tended to visualize it in terms of striped trousers and wing collars, the mark of an aloof priesthood. I thought of the State Department as an aggregation of cookie pushers whose only diploma was the parchment of snobbism signed by family wealth and connections.

I found out that nothing could be further from the truth. During my 2½ years as ECA Administrator I learned that the State Department is staffed with extremely hard-working, devoted, and competent people. They are drawn from all groups in our society. The very growth of the Department from 5,400 in 1939 to some 24,000 today attests not only to the growth in America's world leadership responsibilities but also to the fact that its qualifications are hardly confined to social position and inherited opulence.

The need for a positive foreign policy to define our relations with all peoples in all parts of the world is of such surpassing importance that I believe the State Department should concentrate all its energies upon this task. It should not dilute its energies nor divert its skills from this transcendent task of policy making by trying to administer a point 4 program or the Voice of America. To engage in these or similar pursuits, instead of delegating them to separate operational agencies, is to confuse staff with line functions.

ADVANTAGES TESTED BY ECA

The advantages of keeping staff and line functions apart have been tested by the Economic Cooperation Administration. ECA was set up as a separate agency to carry out a political aim, a foreign policy directive, by means of an economic-aid program. When the ECA was being established, considerable anxiety was expressed lest the State Department and the ECA get embroiled in jurisdictional disputes. Indeed, Congress was so worried about this possibility that it wrote into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (the enabling legislation for ECA) that the ECA Administrator and the Secretary of State should keep each other fully and currently informed and arrive at mutually acceptable decisions. In case of any moot point which could not be resolved between them, the disagreement was to be laid directly before the President. To date, there has never been a conflict of this kind to take to the President, and I am confident that there will never be one.

Actually, ECA has had the fullest cooperation from the State Department and could not have gone forward successfully without it. I believe that ECA, in turn, by working in the economic field, has helped the State Department move toward one of its major goals: to encourage the peoples of Western Europe to work together more closely than ever before and to perceive more closely the common character of their problems, their opportunities, and their perils. I submit that recent progress in this direction has been due in part to ECA's drive to foster economic integration.

When I made my first visit to Europe as ECA Administrator, back in July 1948, I saw that Western Europe's economy then was like a crazy quilt whose varicolored squares had been cut out but not sewn together. Each nation was striving to be self-sufficient. With this as a goal no single country, nor all 16 of them individually, could possibly make substantial use of the continent's resources. For 50 years, indeed, Western Europe had been moving in the direction of economic nationalism. Countries competed with each other in intensifying trade restrictions, in raising tariffs and in imposing import quotas and exchange controls to protect home industries which were uneconomic and old-fashioned. These impediments to trade naturally made matters worse. They hindered Europe from taking advantage of modern techniques of large-scale, low-cost production which, during those same 50 years, largely accounted for the higher productivity of United States industry and the higher living standards of the American people. The reason is very simple. Large-scale, low-cost production is possible only in a sizable, unified, and unrestricted market area where goods can move freely from factory to consumer.

The harm done by trade barriers among the European nations is best illustrated by comparative production figures between Europe and the United States. In 1900 the per capita output of the European worker and the American worker was virtually the same. Both lived on about the same scale. Yet in 1950 the United States, with a population of 151,000,000, turned out a gross national product of $270,000,000,000 in contrast to the Marshall-plan countries which, with 274,000,000 people, turned out a gross national product of only $170,000,000,000.

The Narcotic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Lynn H. Fairfax, publicity director of Lodge No. 981 of the American Federation of Government Employees, which is, in effect, an experienced dissertation concerning the growth of narcotic addiction in the United States, and recommended congressional action:

The much publicized narcotic situation confronts us at a time when our country is bedeviled with pressing economic and national defense problems. From within, it poses too serious a threat to our teenagers and youth to permit any delayed action because of other problems.

If not checked immediately it also threatens an outburst of crime that will necessitate expanded municipal and State police forces in many sections of our country. New hospital facilities will have to be provided for prolonged treatment of the addicts and the safety of our streets will be endangered. Contrary to the belief held by many persons, there will be no individual isolation from the effects of this situation.

Much confusion exists relative to this problem. A calm study of the facts surrounding the problem will reveal the fact that the Congress and the President of the United States can take the most effective action to suppress it.

Past and present narcotic rings may have engineered this situation by the operation of recruiting services, seeking to expand this vile business through the recruitment of new users. It is significant that our country, with its greater individual monetary wealth, is the only country confronted with this problem.

All narcotics originate outside our boundaries. The very abundant supply in the possession of the countless thousands of individual peddlers throughout our land clearly indicates the necessity of closing more tightly the doors of entry of the illegal traffic from planes, ships, and across our borders.

It must be clear that it is more effective to deprive the individual peddler of his wares than it is to ferret out and arrest him. The Congress can do this.

Any person who brings merchandise or narcotics into the country illegally is a smuggler. The detection of, apprehension, and arrest of smugglers is a function of the Bureau of Customs, which operates the Port Patrol Division and did operate border patrols for many years. Very little publicity has been given this work or the conditions that adversely affect this work.

THE FACTS OF THE PORT PATROL DIVISION

The Port Patrol Division operates cooperatively with but not under the direction of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. It is an armed police force of approximately 1,000 men, carefully selected and screened through oral and written examination, and strategically stationed on docks, at air fields, and in some ports, in radio-equipped mobile cars. It searches vessels and enforces the many laws and regulations of the United States Government.

The individual officer bears the title of customs port patrol officer and is neither an agent nor an inspector.

During more than 40 years on our waterfront areas this Division, known for many years as Customs Guards, has acquired a specialized knowledge of the psychology and craftiness of smugglers, as well as the knowledge of ship construction and operation.

Of particular interest at this time is the narcotic control work performed by this group. Working alone, facing hazards and exposure and rubbing elbows daily with the underworld gangs that hide away on the docks of our larger ports, the individual officer seizes in single operations, at the source of entry into our country, quantities of illegal narcotics sufficient to supply four, five, and six thousand individual peddlers. The customs port patrol officer is the only officer regularly assigned to our docks on a 24-hour basis to apprehend and arrest the narcotic smuggler from the ships, arriving from foreign ports.

It should be noted, however, that other important public service is rendered by this group. High lights are the safeguarding of the public health from diseases which might be brought to us with parrots, monkeys, and other forms of animal life, the protection of agriculture from destructive insects which might accompany various forms of plant life, the protection to our wage earners and to industry through the enforcement of the tariff laws, the apprehension of stowaways who could be subversive subjects, the interception of subversive agents carrying messages to and from other agents employed on ships and the prevention of sabotage to our very important docks in times of war.

The public service it renders entitles it to recognition as one of our major law-enforcement groups, yet its classification under the civil service is lower and not

comparable to any other law-enforcement group.

The potential effectiveness of this group is boundless. Every dock used by freighters or passenger ships arriving from foreign countries is a possible door of entry for the illegal narcotic traffic. One thousand men, divided into three working shifts and with personnel reductions due to days off and illnesses does not permit the coverage of all such docks on our Atlantic and Pacific coasts and in the Gulf ports. The conditions under which the Port Patrol Division operates necessitates the removal of officers from docks where freight vessels are berthed to perform duties in the clearance of travelers through customs control, thereby increasing the number of unattended docks.

Your attention is directed to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 2, page 1921. Here is recorded a letter, written to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK by the Commissioner of Customs at that time concerning a reduction made by the Appropriations Committee to the Customs appropriation for the fiscal year of 1948. Three paragraphs in that letter are very significant and are as follows:

"Reference is made to your telephone request for immediate and detailed information concerning the effect the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in cutting by $3,500,000 the estimates for the appropriation, collecting the revenue from customs 1948, will have on the Customs Service if it stands.

"Careful examination of the possibilities for meeting this situation satisfies me that the only activity that can be discontinued without a substantial revision of statutory law is that directed toward the prevention of smuggling. While this is a clear statutory duty of the Customs Service, there is no statutory prescription as to how it shall be conducted and the effectiveness of our smuggling control has always depended upon the action of the Congress furnishing funds.

"Other functions of the Customs Service create bottlenecks through which all carriers, goods and travelers entering our country must pass. The treatment to be given these carriers, goods, and travelers is prescribed by law and the Customs Service must operate to permit their passage through the customs control, and to keep records and accounts required by law in connection with their movement and the collections of the revenue incident thereto."

The significance of these paragraphs is deepened when considered with a statement made by the Commissioner of Narcotics on April 14, 1947, and recorded in a public document concerning the hearings of the United States Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Excerpts of the question and answer testimony of the Commissioner of Narcotics as recorded on pages 73 and 74 of that document are as follows:

"Senator THYE. The customs officials stand down here at the dock, at the gangplank, watching the people coming in off the ships at the debarkation, and the narcotics agent is down there with the customs official; is he not?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. No, sir.

"Senator THYE. Who determines whether any individual is carrying any narcotics ashore from the ship?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. That is the customs patrol officer, the Customs Service.

"Senator THYE. Then they will apprehend the man if the customs official finds he has opium or any other type of narcotic in his possession, after they have examined his personal belongings in every conceivable manner? Then where do you function in this activity?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. The customs follow that case right to the courts. They tell us about it, and we find out whether the man has any connections. If he has, we work together on it. We work together on joint cases where there is smuggling.

"Senator THYE. You must spend an awful lot of time to figure out whose duty it is to take this case and whose duty it is to take that case.

"Mr. ANSLINGER. No, sir; not a bit. The line is so clear that we never have difficulty along that line.

"Senator THYE. The customs officials down in Norfolk or up in New York or any other port where a passenger vessel docks or a freight vessel docks, and where there is the possibility of an individual carrying narcotics across, do all the supervision?

"Mr. ANSLINGER. That is right."

Gentlemen of the Congress, think upon the facts. They are the same today as they were when the Commissioner of Customs wrote his letter and the Commissioner of Narcotics gave his testimony. The customs port patrol officer is the only obstacle to the unhampered flow of illegal narcotics from our docks. He is the only law-enforcement officer regularly assigned on a 24-hour basis to apprehend and arrest narcotic smugglers on our water-front areas.

The customs service has not had the appropriations or the men to operate their border patrol at all, and for this same reason so many of our docks are unattended as to make United States narcotic control nothing more than a sieve. Because of the statutory situation, customs port patrol officers are removed from docks to perform duties in the clearance of travelers. Can it be believed that the American people desire the apprehension and arrest of narcotic smugglers to be the only activity of the customs service that can be discontinued or curtailed without substantial revision of statutory law?

RECOMMENDED CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The Congress of the United States should recognize the port patrol division of the United States customs service as the major law-enforcement body that it is and should enact a statutory law that will assure that a customs port patrol officer is on every dock where any possibility of smuggling may exist, said assignments to continue without interruption as long as any cargo in which packages of narcotics may be hidden remains upon the pier. The same statutory law should reestablish the border patrol of the customs service upon a basis that will permit short and frequent patrols.

The customs port patrol officer should be classified under the civil service under the same classification held by other law-enforcement groups.

The Congress should appropriate, as a supplemental appropriation if necessary, sufficient funds to finance this.

Stiffer penalties should be enacted for those persons convicted of attempting to smuggle narcotics.

The cost of the recommended action will be returned to the Government, at least in part, through the collection of fines and will be relatively small as compared to the costs of expanded municipal police forces and the provision of hospitals and hospital care for addicts.

Many civic and parent organizations are alarmed by the increase of drug addiction among teen-age school children. The Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs of Queens County, N. Y., with a membership of 60,000 parents, has conducted an exhaustive investigation of the narcotic problem during the past 2 years. On January 20, 1951, the delegate assembly of this organization, meeting in the Hotel Statler in New York City, unanimously passed a resolution urging municipal and Federal officials to increase their respective staffs of law-enforcement officers to prevent the growth of narcotic addiction in our schools. This organization endorses the congressional action recommended in this thesis.

The New York City Federation of Womens Clubs, with a membership of 200,000, equally interested in the welfare of our youth and teen-age school children, has accepted the proposition submitted to their organization by the Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs urging the enactment of Federal legislation to assure the reestablishment of the United States Border Patrol of the United States Customs Service and for the assignment of port patrol officers at all airfields used by planes arriving from foreign lands; also for the uninterrupted assignment of such officers at all piers and docks where any ship arriving from any foreign port is berthed, and for the other recommendations contained in this thesis.

Reason Succeeds to Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been gratified by the change in tone of my mail since the joint meeting of the Congress to hear Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In common with other Members, I received, in the 10-day period immediately following the general's relief from his commands in the Far East, a great deal of rather hysterical mail, terrifying in its implication that so many people in the United States could desire, emotionally, a military dictatorship and could almost deify a distinguished soldier who has not set foot in the United States in 14 years.

It would appear that I was more fortunate than other Members in receiving, at the same time, a considerable volume of very reasonable mail offering support to the position of the President, and that mail is continuing.

It is noteworthy that, almost without exception, the communications I received which indicated support of President Truman did not in any way deprecate General MacArthur's very real gifts and accomplishments; they were addressed rather to the crucial question of constitutional responsibilities and authority. Among these were a number of messages from substantial, recognized groups; under leave, I am inserting a number of these in the RECORD, as follows, together with three individual letters typical of scores of others:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 19, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New York Engineers, CIO, wishes you to know, that in regular meeting assembled April 18, 1951, a motion was passed without a dissenting voice completely supporting President Truman in his removal of General MacArthur for insubordination. Our organization wishes you to understand that we are opposed to any attempt by military forces to supersede civilian authority of the President and the peoples' representatives in Congress. We have great respect for General MacArthur's record but we feel the President must of necessity take the advice

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in military matters rather than the advice of one individual general. We hope you will do nothing that may lead eventually to making our civilian government subordinate to the military as has happened in so many other countries.

EARL KING,
Business Manager, MEBA, No. 33.

NEW YORK STATE CIO COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., April 19, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are forwarding to you the enclosed copy of a statement adopted by this organization's executive board in meeting at the Hotel Statler, New York, April 18, 1951.

Copies of this expression of support for President Truman's action in the case of General MacArthur are also being sent to the President and to the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS HOLLANDER,
President.
HAROLD J. GARNO,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NEW YORK STATE CIO COUNCIL,
April 18, 1951.

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT'S ACTION RE MACARTHUR

The executive board of the New York State CIO Council fully endorses President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from his commands.

In reaffirming civilian control over the military, the President has strengthened a vital democratic principle. In making clear the determination of our country to use its fighting strength most effectively to advance the cause of peace and freedom, he has strengthened our leadership in the world.

The President's action was in the best interests of the Nation and its purposes in this time of world crisis. The artificial storms which are being whipped up by reactionary newspapers and politicians for selfish and unpatriotic purposes cannot obscure that fact.

We are certain that the overwhelming majority of the American people join with us in approval of the President's stand.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 20, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organization consisting of over 20,000 members in the metropolitan area of New York City are squarely behind President Truman in connection with his removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. His action again reaffirms the basic American tradition that this country is governed and controlled by civilians and not by military. We are in full support of President Truman's position against aggression and for the prevention of World War III.

LAUNDRY WORKERS JOINT BOARD OF GREATER NEW YORK, ACWA,
LOUIS SIMON, *Manager.*

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will find attached a statement of the New York City chapter of Americans for Democratic Action dealing with General MacArthur's removal by President Truman.

Inasmuch as this whole situation has become a problem of great debate and public concern, we should appreciate very much having your views on this matter for presentation to both our board of directors and our membership.

Sincerely,

EVELYN DUBROW,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, ADOPTED BY THE NEW YORK CITY CHAPTER OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1951

The New York City Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action joins with other New Yorkers in extending a warm welcome home to General MacArthur, after his absence of 14 years. There are none who will deny his brilliant service to his country during World War II and his right to acclaim for it by the American people.

However, the traditional welcome to this celebrated military figure should not be confused with the partisan ends of cynical politicians seeking to make capital of the general's position. In the present acclaim of General MacArthur for his past achievements, it must not be forgotten that the implications of his publicly stated views are a serious threat to his own country. The points that should be borne in mind are:

1. The basis of our democracy is in the constitutional authority given civilian over military authority. A number of other nations have become military dictatorships because of the abrogation of this principle.

2. This country's foreign policy is based on the assumption that Europe is the crucial continent in our cold war with Russia. If Russia takes over the industrial centers of Europe with their potential production, her additional strength would far outweigh that of the United States. General MacArthur, with his publicly-stated opinion (political, not military) that Asia is more important, has flouted the policy of the United States. He has offended our Atlantic Pact allies by saying that "here (in Asia) we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words." This implies that he believes that issues should be settled through war rather than through negotiations which is contrary to the stated objectives of the United Nations.

3. General MacArthur has disobeyed not only his Commander in Chief, President Truman, but also the Joint Chiefs of Staff, their Chairman, General Bradley, and Secretary of Defense Marshall. Would General MacArthur himself have tolerated such insubordination?

4. Disservice is being doné this country both here and abroad by creating doubt as to what our foreign policy really is and as to how consistent we are in sustaining it. The President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in a far better position to evaluate world issues and world strategy, and they are united in their opposition to General MacArthur's proposals.

The fate of free government continuously hangs upon the maintenance of basic principles: ADA believes that President Truman has built for America a significant milepost in our history by upholding our principles during this crisis.

Because of these facts, and because ADA agrees with President Truman that we are trying to prevent a world war, not start one, and the cause of world peace is more important than any individual, the New York City ADA commends President Truman for removing General MacArthur from office, doing his duty as prescribed in the Constitution and demonstrating to our allies and to the United Nations that they can rely on our good faith in the defense of the free world.

THE NEW YORK YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: At its last meeting on April 12, 1951, the board of directors of the New York Young Democratic Club passed the following resolution in approval of your recall of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur:

"*Resolved*, That—

"We congratulate you on your courageous reaffirmation of the constitutional principles of our democracy;

"You have carried out your clear-cut obligations as President in exercising civilian control over the military."

I take great pleasure in transmitting this resolution to you and in assuring you of our continued support on this matter.

Most respectfully yours,

RICHARD S. LANE,
Corresponding Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to record my strong approval of the action of President Truman in removing from his post a general officer who has left no doubt of his refusal to respect established lines of command or to accept our basic democratic principle subordinating the military to the civilian authority of the United States.

As an attorney, as a veteran of over 3 years of Army service, and as a citizen concerned with the maintenance of our democratic government and republican traditions, I have thought carefully about the issues reportedly involved in this matter. My considered opinion is that President Truman has acted with courage and high purpose to attain and maintain a concept of government that is of greater moment to our Nation than any political or strategic concepts regarding our policy in Korea, Asia, or perhaps anywhere else in the world.

Consequently, I urge that you give to our President the strongest possible support that your office, personal prestige, and superior abilities can muster.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KAPLAN,
Counselor at Law.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I have just written President Truman and Senators Lehman and Ives stating my wholehearted support of Mr. Truman's actions in the MacArthur case. I want to put myself on the record to you, my Representative.

This is the first time I have ever been moved to write a President, Senator, or Representative, but I feel strongly that this MacArthur dismissal has had a profound effect on the American public and that your mail may not be an accurate barometer of public opinion.

You must be aware that in these cases the antis always write. You must further be aware that the supporters of General MacArthur, many of them of extreme right-wing persuasion, are much more likely to write than those who back the President.

Mr. Truman's strategy of confining the war to Korea, as Messrs. Lippmann and Reston have pointed out, is the only sane policy. The alternative is a disastrous, full-scale Pacific war.

I hope you will do your part to see, as General Eisenhower hopefully put it, that MacArthur will not be permitted to become a controversial figure. I do not see why a dismissed general should enjoy an audience before a joint session of Congress. The need today is for national unity and those who are rushing to the general's support are doing so in the hot flush of partisan politics.

Very truly yours,

BURTON R. BENJAMIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 18, 1951.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the MacArthur incident, it is my personal opinion that the President has acted wisely and with great courage.

We must never let the military authority take precedence in any way over our civil authority. I believe that General MacArthur has increased the area of tension for a third world war and, for that reason, I consider him ill-fit to represent the nations of the world as their commander.

As my Representative in Washington, I trust that you will express this opinion, if the need arises.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN R. ANDERSON.

Truman Will Go Down in History as the President Who Refused To Surrender the People's Trust to the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the removal of General MacArthur by the President was a matter of military discipline. No military man is bigger than the Department of Defense—most important, no military man is bigger than his country.

General MacArthur has served his Nation well. He deserves the great tribute a grateful Nation has been paying to him since his return to this country for the first time in 14 years, during which time he has been giving unselfishly of his time and efforts in the fulfillment of his duties.

But even General MacArthur with his great prestige cannot place himself above the Constitution of the United States. We have a civilian government. Civilians direct our foreign and domestic policy. President Truman's courageous action in removing such a popular military hero was a step toward continuing that great tradition of civilian control in America.

I feel, as does the writer of the following editorial which recently appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of Thursday, April 12, 1951, that General MacArthur will go down as one of the greatest of all soldiers, not only in American history, but in world history, and that Harry Truman will go down in history as the President who refused to surrender the people's trust to the military. The editorial:

PRESERVATION OF CIVIL AUTHORITY

Last night President Harry Truman wisely used radio and television to explain to the American people just why he took the drastic step of removing General MacArthur from all of his four commands. The President put the matter on a plane above that of personalities, both General MacArthur's and his own. The core of his explanation was, "We do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war—not to start one." To bomb Manchuria and China and to assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on the mainland of China would be "running a very grave risk of starting a general war. If that were to happen, we would have brought about the exact situation we are trying to prevent."

It is precisely this risk that General MacArthur wants the United States to take. To change foreign policy and broad military strategy the general made various utterances in direct violation of orders for him to clear his statements with Washington. After the latest warning given him in Tokyo on Monday by Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., MacArthur made it clear that he intended to continue leading public pressure and virtually dared his President and Commander in Chief to remove him.

Harry Truman took the dare. Acting as President and Commander in Chief, acting in behalf of the whole constitutional principle of the supremacy of the civil authority over the military, he removed General MacArthur from all his commands, as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief; United Nations Command; Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East.

Douglas MacArthur gave Harry Truman no other choice—except to remove him or to admit to the American people that not their elected civil leader but an appointed military leader was calling the tune.

General MacArthur was pressing for an extension of the war theater to include continental China. This would be the end of all hopes for a negotiated settlement. It would be a major gamble that the Soviet Union would not honor its treaty commitment to aid China in case of attack. If this major gamble was won, there would still be the minor but enormous gamble that Red China could be defeated by airpower, seapower and the landpower of the Nationalist government which were defeated on the mainland 18 months ago. If this major gamble were lost, then world war III would be underway in the area where the United States is least prepared to fight it—in the morasses of Asia, with its vast spaces and limitless manpower. Under all circumstances General MacArthur's policy would put Asia above Europe. It would put the United States in a war where many of the non-Communist nations would regard us as the aggressor. It would divide the United States sharply from its main allies, Great Britain, France, and Canada.

Harry Truman is being bitterly criticized on the grounds of both his policy and his action. But no one can accuse him of not having been patient with MacArthur.

A member of General MacArthur's staff is quoted as saying concerning Harry Truman, "He will lose the next election—and then some." That may be so. That is unimportant. The Presidency of the United States is an office that endures beyond the terms of the particular men who occupy it. The military authority of the United States is a power that endures beyond the men who wield it, even though they be as brilliant and strong as Douglas MacArthur. What is important is that the military remain an arm of the civil authority over which the people have control.

Harry Truman will go down in history as a President who made many mistakes. But at least he will not go down in history as the President who surrendered the people's trust to the military.

In spite of the tragic ending to his magnificent career, Gen. Douglas MacArthur will go down as one of the greatest of all soldiers, not only in American history, but in world history.

The American people are fortunate that to take General MacArthur's commands they have a replacement of the large stature and proven ability of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. The important thing now is to get on with the job—the job of winning or settling the war in Korea; the job of arming to prevent world war III or to win it if it is forced upon us, the job of constructing that stable and peaceful world for which humanity yearns.

General MacArthur has been invited by Republican leaders to address a joint session of Congress, and he has accepted the invitation. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in Europe expressed the hope that MacArthur will not return to the United States and become a controversial figure. This was perhaps too much for which to hope. General MacArthur is eager to be heard and many people are eager to hear him. But it is not too much to hope that despite the debate the American people will close ranks and face up to the challenge of the times.

MacArthur's War Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New Republic of April 23, 1951, speaks for itself. I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

MACARTHUR'S WAR PARTY

The uproar that has followed the removal of General MacArthur shows how necessary that removal was. The general had made himself the head of a political clique, mainly but not wholly inside the Republican Party. Only now does the public get a chance to realize how deep was his divisive effort, or how far it had gone.

MacArthur was not a mere soldier taking orders, as he has tried to picture himself. He was the head of an open conspiracy against the policy of the Government he was sworn to serve. Long before his dismissal by the President, his attitude and that of his supporters had done much to deepen the split in the American Government, to confuse and weaken our relations with the United Nations, and thereby to hamper the war effort in Korea.

The forceful action of President Truman has stripped the general of the power to interfere directly in the policies of his country any longer. MacArthur must now carry on his political activity in the open without benefit of the military disguise. The common sense of the American people will doubtless reject the undemocratic philosophy of militarism for which he stands when it is nakedly presented to them. However, the clique of which MacArthur is the mouthpiece will not be easily daunted. They are dangerous men, bound together by an evil design which they will be slow to relinquish. It is an incongruous crew made up partly of those who advocate an immediate world war in order to prevent one, and in part of isolationists at heart who support MacArthur on the theory that if he were given his way we could in a few months retire behind our own shores and pull them up over us. His domestic support is the Tory wing of journalism and of politics—the people who scream "Communist" at everyone who disagrees with them, the enemies of Roosevelt who are still fighting his spirit 6 years after he went to his grave.

Typical of the lost battalion who have found in the general their leader is James H. Rand who has announced that MacArthur will become an official of his Remington-Rand Corp. The ultra-conservative, ultra-isolationist Rand has admitted long-continued support, including gifts of at least

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

$5,200 to Merwin K. Hart's notorious National Economic Council, long known for its inveterate love of dictators and for its doctrines of "white, Nordic supremacy" here at home. Rand's company became famous in the 1930's for perfecting the Mohawk Valley plan for strikebreaking, widely adopted by antilabor employers. In his new job MacArthur will be associated with another ex-soldier, former Gen. Leslie R. Groves, now a vice president of Remington-Rand, who was also fired by Truman for attempting to put military authority above civilian control in development of atomic energy.

As his political manager, MacArthur will doubtless retain the services of Gen. Courtney Whitney, his aide in Tokyo, a lawyer who has always been a political rather than a military adviser. The cluster of international big-business men who frequent the Waldorf Towers and have followed the unglamorous star of Herbert Hoover in the past will be a ready-made court for the deposed general, as well as eager financiers of any political projects MacArthur may desire to launch.

There will be rich and unscrupulous men for MacArthur to command in his new role. It is important, therefore, to examine what would happen if the General actually got his way.

On purely military grounds, the MacArthur policy for immediate war against China would likely be disastrous.

MacArthur appears to believe that if we engage in total war with China, Russia would not come in. Russia and China have a mutual defense pact pledging each of them to go to war if the other is attacked by any third power. It is true that Russia has broken many pledges in recent years, but it is inconceivable that she could break this one except at a cost in prestige and power she could not afford to pay.

MacArthur believes we could win a quick victory over China; Japan made the same mistake in 1937. It is straining our military resources today to hold our own in the Korean Peninsula, with masses of South Korean troops engaged and with a dozen other UN nations giving support.

MacArthur believes that Chiang's army on Formosa could successfully invade the mainland without the use of American troops. This army of a few hundred thousand men is practically without equipment of the type needed for an invasion. Remember the long years it took the United States to prepare for the Normandy invasion, even with England as a base, and with supply lines thousands of miles shorter; multiply the difficulties of the Normandy landing by 10 and you may be somewhere near the problem a Nationalist invasion presents.

The MacArthur who makes these recommendations is certainly the one who let the entire air force in the Philippines be destroyed on the ground just after Pearl Harbor, the man who divided the army in Korea last November and let it be trapped in one of the worst military reverses in our history.

In the First and Second World Wars the United States had powerful allies who spilled their blood for us while we were making up our minds that it was our war, too. In the struggle in Korea we were able to persuade the United Nations to join us in putting down aggression; but there would be no such action if we now went to war with Communist China on MacArthur's terms. We would lose our most important ally, Great Britain. We would lose the support of the UN, and that body would be destroyed.

To repeat in words of one syllable what everyone knows except MacArthur and his followers:

The democratic world, and most of all the United States, is not yet strong enough in a military sense to fight the Communist bloc on one front, to say nothing of two. We will not be prepared to withstand attack for several years longer. The one overwhelming objective in the meantime is to try to prevent Russia from attacking in Europe, which, with its tremendous industrial installations, is the one great prize in the world struggle. If we can hold Europe, we have a good prospect of holding the world; if we lose, victory is against us.

It may be that Russia will strike before we are ready, no matter what we do or don't do. But if MacArthur's advice were followed if we plunged into the quagmire of China, Stalin would almost certainly strike in Europe, and the United States would be helpless to give the democracies of the west the aid they need and have been promised.

MacArthur's abortive "peace offer" to the Chinese Communists stopped a carefully thought-out proposal of the same character that the United Nations (with the general's knowledge) was about to make. Now that he is out of the way, efforts to end the war on an honorable basis can be pursued. The aggression against South Korea which prompted the UN to take up arms has been successfully checkmated; the invaders have been driven back across the line from which the attack was launched. The war is costing the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists a terrible price. This is the moment for a fresh, determined effort to end the war on terms which will discourage future aggression and strengthen the arm of the UN.

The antagonisms that now divide the world cannot be wiped out in short order. But the desire of peoples all over the world for peace has seldom in history been so great. Patience and steadfastness of purpose are what is called for. These qualities are among the hardest for democracies to develop, but they are nonetheless the essential ones for us to cultivate today. We must perfect the defenses of the free world, always with the objective of a future in which large armament will have no place. The presence of MacArthur in the explosive Far East was a constant danger. His removal permits the resumption of a resolute course toward peace.

Pius XII and World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article written by Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J., which appeared in the April 28 issue of America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "Pius XII and World Federation":

PIUS XII AND WORLD FEDERATION

(By Edward A. Conway, S. J.)

("If winter comes, my Federalist friends exclaim, can spring be far behind?" Thus wrote Father Conway some 2 years ago in an America article on the world federalist movement. For American Catholics who believe in world federation it has been a bleak 2-years' winter since then. But the Holy Father's recent address to delegates of the World Federalist Congress at Rome gives promise of better days.)

The more I study the April 6 discourse of the Holy Father, in which he gave his approbation to the World Federalist movement, the warmer grows my sense of satisfaction. As I write, I have before me the text of his address in French and two unofficial English translations, neither of which can be considered definitive. I hope that we shall soon have an authorized English version, because the discourse, being the first formal papal pronouncement on world government, has profound significance for all students of world affairs. Scholars will be analyzing and interpreting it for months to come. They should have the authentic thought of the Holy Father to work on.

The original text richly repays detailed study. At the very first reading it was obvious to me that here was more than just another extempore greeting to a group of pilgrims. I thought, as I read, that the Holy Father must have worked over that address as carefully as he did over any of his famed Christmas allocutions. I have since been told that his holiness confided to one of his auditors afterward that he had stayed up late the night before to complete the text of his discourse, and that previously he had spent many hours in consultation about it. It seems obvious that the Holy Father had determined to make a major policy pronouncement, and just as obvious that he had determined to use the World Federalist Congress as the occasion for it.

Some of the satisfaction that warms me comes, I confess, from personal considerations. I have been hard pressed at times to defend my presence (with a Catholic bishop) on the national advisory board of United World Federalists, Inc. UWF is the largest membership group among the 70 constituent organizations in 27 countries which make up the world movement for world federal government. The unfortunate and, for me, embarrassing fact is that many American Catholics have been turned against world federalism, and specifically against United World Federalists, by the absurd charge that the entire federalist movement is a Communist conspiracy. Almost daily during the past 3 years I have received letters from Catholics—some inquiring, some indignant—about my part in the federalist movement. It would have been much easier for me to answer them if the Holy Father had ever made a clear-cut and quotable statement dealing directly with world federal government. Unfortunately for me and other Catholic federalists, up to April 6, 1951, he had not.

It was always possible, of course, to prove that a Catholic could be a Catholic and a federalist. But it was necessary to string together texts from the Pope's Christmas allocutions—a hint here and a hint there—sufficient, however, to prove to the unprejudiced that "the new world order" desired by the Pope was actually some form of world federal government. But it was an unsatisfactory business at best, complicated and prohibitively time consuming.

I tried another tack some time ago (America, December 4, 1948, Catholics and World Federation) by arguing not from textual but from circumstantial evidence. On November 11, 1948, the Holy Father had addressed 300 members of the European Union of Federalists at Castel Gandolfo. EUF is a federation of European federalist groups and is closely aligned with the world movement for world federal government. The Holy Father told the European federalists that it was high time to establish a European union. "Some," he added, "are even asking themselves whether it is not already too late."

My World Federalist friends, I reported, were much encouraged by the Holy Father's partial support:

"Even though the Holy Father, they reason, said nothing explicitly about world federation, his warm approval of European federation will surely give immense impetus to their movement and hasten thereby the larger development they desire."

I added—naively, I know now—that I was inclined to agree with my World Federalist

friends. My article ended with the observation:

"American Catholics could make a distinctively Catholic and definitely valuable contribution to the World Federalist movement. It remains to be seen whether the Pope's Armistice Day address will inspire them to do so. At the very least we may expect the more perceptive among them to begin taking an interest in federalism, since it so obviously interests the Pope."

Earlier in the article I had warned the Federalists that "Catholics are curiously and often callously indifferent to noninfallible papal pronouncements." But I was totally unprepared for and correspondingly appalled by what followed. Most of the more perceptive Catholics remained indifferent to federalism, while the less perceptive began to take what I must call a violent interest in the destruction of the whole movement.

Catholic newspapers reprinted the misrepresentations of Merwin K. Hart's rabidly nationalistic economic council letter, and quoted approvingly from Joseph P. Kamp's We Must Abolish the United States, which asserts that the aims and objectives of the American Federalists add up to treason. Indeed treasonous, traitorous, and unpatriotic were among the milder epithets hurled at Catholic Federalists by fellow Catholics. For a time we dismissed these denunciations as being merely what Pius XII called in 1948 "the aberrations of an intransigent nationalism which denies or spurns the common bonds linking the nations together."

It was not long, however, before similar attacks came from more responsible Catholic quarters, based only too obviously on the same poisonous sources. Moreover, authorized representatives of respectable Catholic organizations began to appear before State legislatures demanding the repeal of long-standing world-government resolutions. Thanks to this Catholic intervention, some legislatures either repealed or modified them.

United World Federalists, chief beneficiary of this "Catholic interest in federalism," and much disturbed by it, asked its most prominent Catholic member to do something about it. He is Thomas H. Mahony, Boston attorney, former president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, now chairman of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, and for 3 years chairman of the UWF policy committee. Mr. Mahony tried to lift the level of the debate by compiling Parallel Thinking, Catholic and Federalist, Upon the Organization of the World for Peace. Under five headings: Disarmament; Security and Preparedness; National Sovereignty and its Limitation; Amendments of the United Nations Charter; A Federated World, he compared Catholic statements from St. Augustine to Pius XII with corresponding UWF proposals. Eschewing all argument, Mr. Mahony simply asked his readers to "draw their own reasonable inferences from the comparison." The similarities were sensational.

The booklet was published last September (15 cents, Thomas H. Mahony, 10 State Street, Boston 9, Mass.). But it seems to have made little impression in some Catholic communities—Baltimore, for example. Catholic anti-Federalism reached its apogee there with the appearance of the Baltimore edition of the Catholic Review of February 16, 1951. Under a screaming headline: "Catholics backing anti-Federalist move," the diocesan weekly revealed—it must have had its own revelation—that "almost every Catholic in this archdiocese is expressing support of a resolution * * * up before the Maryland House of Delegates which voices strong objections to the idea of world government as proposed by the Federalists." The Maryland Action Guild, the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic War Veterans were "solidly lined up" with the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, Children of the American Revolution, the Minute Women of Maryland, and the Daughters of 1812. The Federalist resolutions, said the Catholic spokesmen, "collided with Catholic patriotic principles." One Louis Carroll, "speaking for the Maryland Action Guild, said that World Federalists were most surely moving into the footsteps of Lenin and Stalin" (Catholic Review, Feb. 23, 1951, p. 3).

Do you wonder that I as a World Federalist, felt grateful relief and warm satisfaction when I read these words in the Holy Father's April 6 discourse:

"Your movement (the World Movement for a World Federal Government) dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, or better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate or illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances. It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race."

That solemn approbation should end once and for all the argument as to whether a Catholic can be a Federalist. Whether it inspires Catholics to work actively in the Federalist movement remains, as I remarked once before, "to be seen." For my part, I cannot recall a more forthright papal endorsement of any movement, either Catholic, or, as this happens to be, nonsectarian.

Some Catholics, of course, are already saying that the Pope approved only the general ideal of a far-in-the-future world state, not any concrete program for its proximate realization. None but nationalist die-hards would deny that he was talking on April 6 to a definite group with a definite, even though not detailed, program. The Pope implied clearly enough, it seems to me, that the world political organization must be realized as rapidly as possible "if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race"—the current race, not one in the problematical future.

The World Federal Government which W. M. W. F. G. proposes and which the Holy Father has endorsed is a strictly limited one. During its Roman Congress, its fourth, by the way, the movement outlined the powers of that government in its declaration to the foreign ministers of the four great powers, to all the governments of the nations, and to the world's war-weary peoples:

"The time has come when the nations and peoples of the world must create an all-inclusive world federal government which can guarantee to each nation security against attack by others. Such a government must have the power:

"1. To prohibit by law the right of nations to use force or the threat of force in international affairs.

"2. To make laws binding upon individuals and national governments prohibiting the construction or possession of armaments beyond that required for internal police purposes, and to administer an agreed schedule for universal disarmament.

"3. To maintain adequate and effective civilian inspection and police forces to assure that the world law affecting armaments is respected.

"4. To bring to trial in world courts any individuals and groups who conspire to build weapons of war in violation of world law."

Catholics who fear that a world state possessing those powers would swallow up their personal liberties overlook the world federalist proviso that—

"All powers not expressly delegated to the world federal government should be reserved to the nations and their peoples, thus leaving each nation its choice of its own domestic political, economic, social, and religious institutions."

In his Parallel Thinking, Thomas Mahony made it clear that "these proposals do not envisage a superstate in which nations would be merged and lose their identity and domestic autonomy—a unitary state or empire. They contemplate complete autonomy of each nation in its national or domestic field. They merely propose a limitation of the external authority or sovereignty of nations—the right to make war."

"Absolute sovereignty," of course, is the motto emblazoned on the banners of the embattled Catholic opponents of world government. I very much fear that a mistaken notion about sovereignty inspires their charge that world federalism is opposed to Catholic patriotic principles. To put it bluntly, I am afraid that they have never accepted that traditional doctrine of the church with which, according to the Holy Father, the world federalist movement is actually in accord. What is that traditional doctrine? Pius XII forcefully defined it in his Christmas message of 1948:

"The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always been based on the principle that, in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations."

Is it too much to hope that the Holy Father's latest interpretation of that principle and its practical consequences—the ceding to a world government of enough national sovereignty to save the world from catastrophic war—will not "give rise to violent reactions"? My modest hope is that it will inspire all American Catholics to study this remarkable document. Every one of its paragraphs is pregnant with meaning. Almost every one of its lines reminds one of more extended treatment of the same topic in other papal pronouncements.

I hope, too, that the Holy Father's discourse will arouse new interest in Guido Gonella's A World to Reconstruct. Cardinal Stritch's Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Plan published it in 1944 through Bruce of Milwaukee. My esteemed associate, Father LaFarge, predicted at the time (America, September 5, 1944) that the book would produce wide enlightenment. Would that it had. Signor Gonella, most authoritative interpreter of the mind of Pius XII on the problem of world order, may still be, in Father LaFarge's phrase, "strong medicine." But I question whether, in view of the Pope's recent pronouncement, he still is "much stronger medicine than most people in this country and most of our politicians are prepared to swallow." Is it too much to ask that a revised version of Gonella be published promptly?

In view of the widespread misapprehension that all World Federalists are Communist conspirators, it is unfortunate that in the story on the Pope's April 6 discourse distributed by the NC News Service his concluding remarks were omitted. I add them here to reassure and inspire all Catholic Federalists:

"Therein [solving the problem of a world political organization] lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray God to grant you His light and His help in the performance of your task."

May thousands of American Catholics soon merit that benediction. May theirs be the mission of helping the World Federalists to skirt the pitfalls which His Holiness warned against in his cordial endorsement of their movement.

Clarify Our Far East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, April 23, 1951:

Greetings: The fat is in the fire.

President Truman's recall of General MacArthur has touched off one of the hottest issues of this century. At the moment tempers are running high. One is supposed to be for or against, with the few reasonable souls who stand in the middle exposed to a murderous cross-fire.

Where this chain reaction will lead to nobody knows.

The differing viewpoints dramatized by the firing of General MacArthur will have much to do with the outcome of the Presidential campaign of 1952. Much can happen within the next 18 months, both in the United States and in the much larger area of the world itself, to alter the present circumstances and the opinions we now hold.

It is strange that so many Americans have leaped to positive and emotional judgments, pro and con, without first considering the background facts.

I believe that most Americans approve of our policy in Europe. It is realistic and it can point to certain definite accomplishments. By extending vigorous help to Greece and Turkey, we prevented Communist imperialism from breaking out into the Mediterranean. Through the Marshall plan we helped to rebuild the war-shattered and discouraged nations of Europe, eliminating the despair on which communism thrives. By the Atlantic Pact we are starting to build up the collective military strength to resist aggression. This is a hard job and one that will take time. To manage it we have assigned one of our best men, General Eisenhower.

Other nations will have to pitch in and help because we do not possess the power to be equally strong in Europe and in Asia. A choice had to be made, and priority was given to Europe. The industrial plant and resources of Europe, much greater than those of the Far East, must not fall into the hands of Communist Russia. Stalin is deterred only by our head start in the development of atomic weapons and by our industrial might. If he could seize Europe and add its production to that of his empire, our advantage would be canceled and he would then feel confident to attack us. The President and the State Department, Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and Bradley, and many Republican Senators and Representatives from the Northeast recognize that Europe is the key to our survival and insist that we concentrate our efforts there.

We cannot, however, neglect Asia.

The main strength of our Navy, under Republican and Democratic administrations, has been stationed in the Pacific, and in that fact we have a clue to the importance of that region in our security planning. Pearl Harbor, in Hawaii, which is 2,000 miles west of San Francisco, was the first target of the Japanese attack. They understood its strategic value.

The Truman-MacArthur controversy can be dangerous if it is used for partisan advantage. On the other hand, it can be a wholesome challenge if it succeeds in bringing all the facts out into the open so that the American people can decide what our security requirements in the far Pacific should be, and then support that plan with unity. We do not believe in secret diplomacy that considers itself so superior that it does not take the American people into its confidence. We may be wrong in our suspicions, and we hope that we are. But there is a growing doubt in the American mind. Merely the possibility of appeasement in Asia fills us with dread. We cannot charge off our 60,000 casualties in Korea to sporting losses in the game of international chess. We do not relish diplomacy which becomes so involved in scheming that it ties itself up in knots at our expense. We went into Korea for a principle, and that was to defeat bare-faced aggression and to discourage future aggression. We carried the ball for the UN in order to establish that principle firmly, once and for all. Every small nation in the world thanked God for our courageous and unselfish leadership. Then Red China, stupidly playing Red Russia's game, renewed the aggression. Our allies began to hedge on us. Now we fear appeasement of principle so concealed with honeyed words that the American people will be duped into believing that surrender is victory.

What is American policy in the Far East?

Ask that question of the next 10 people you meet, and you will get 10 different answers.

A year from now as we start down the stretch toward a presidential election we hope that public opinion will have decided the best course for our country and that foreign policy will be governed by it, even before the test of the election itself. We cannot wait until November 1952, allowing those who threaten us to profit from our delay.

But first, what is going on in Asia that seems to be so far away?

I think we stand in need of the facts, and it is my purpose to bring some of them to you in broad outline, and as fairly as I can.

Across the wide Pacific ocean are the three most populous nations in the world: Russia, China, and India. In the last two countries, which are far behind in technical progress and where there is insufficient food for all, great political changes have taken place since the end of World War II. For many generations most of Asia in the Pacific had been subject to Western European imperialism. They were used as sources for raw materials, and their people were treated as second-class members of the human race. But the people of Asia are waking up and are growing up. The United States has given independence to the Philippines. Once-powerful Japan, reduced in size, is being reeducated to democratic ways under the American occupation which will end in the near future. India is now a sovereign nation, completely free from British control. The peoples of Indonesia have won freedom from the Dutch. Nationalist ferment is strong in French Indochina and in British Malaya. Burma, Pakistan, and Korea are new nation names on the map.

But, as western imperialism moves out, Russian imperialism moves in. Seizing opportunities created by the recent war, and the dislocations which followed, the U. S. S. R. is tying into its system such border areas as Korea, Manchuria, and Mongolia. Communist movements, directed from Moscow, have been set up in all Asiatic countries. Their job is to make trouble and to prevent the new governments from functioning properly. They cloak their true motives by posing as champions of popular demands for national independence, and for the redress of economic and social grievances. It matters nothing to them that their own native leaders are trying to eliminate poverty and ignorance. In the confusion that follows sudden freedom, the Commies sound off like patriots only to get into positions of power so that they can betray their own countries into Communist slavery.

The security of the United States depends on countering this move by encouraging peaceful and democratic growth, and by helping these new and struggling nations to raise the standard of living for their people.

We have already given several billion dollars in aid to establish a sound foundation for democratic progress in Japan, the Philippines, and in Southern Korea. We have maintained large occupation forces in Japan to discourage attack on that unarmed country. Japan is a progressive nation. It is densely populated and must have markets for trade in order to support its people. But if democracy catches on, it could be a strong ally against Soviet expansion. In Korea and the Philippines, the situation is different. The people have not had the technical and administrative training and experience to handle their own affairs. Inefficiency and corruption make for weakness which the Communists will exploit for the advantage of Russia. The Philippines are sure to receive further help from us. Furthermore, there is a strong bond of friendship between our two peoples, based on mutual help and fair dealing, that promises well for the future.

Next to Japan, China and India are the two most important countries in Asia, and how they go will determine whether Asia cooperates with us or turns against us.

The stark fact in regard to India is the grinding poverty of her teeming millions. Its government is struggling desperately to cope with this elemental and terrifying problem. It has stated that it will take no sides in the cold war. The leaders privately profess opposition to communism, but in the United Nations they are willing to make every concession to appease Red China. By grants of food and technical aid under the point 4 program, we may be able to strengthen India and inspire it to resist aggression, but right now India cannot be depended upon. And understandably. A hungry man needs more than a pep talk.

China is the nub of the situation.

The establishment of the Communist government as the de facto power in China on October 1, 1949, was not the end but the beginning of the Chinese Communist revolution. Although they defeated Chiang in the struggle, they are now rulers of a country that requires a tremendous reorganization. The Communists rose to power as the Nationalists declined. Russian influence is growing. The Chinese would never have invaded Korea in defiance of the United Nations unless directed to do so by Russia. Maybe Chiang was right in saying that we did not give him enough support to halt the Reds, but that question is now largely academic. In the minds of most Asiatics, Chiang is associated with the past, and they have no intention of going backward. For us to back discredited regimes, would play into the hands of Russian propaganda and alienate whatever good will we retain among the Chinese people. There is no other forward-looking group in sight that we can support, but there are several thinly possible developments that would be favorable to the United States. We could hope for the growth of moderating influences within the Chinese Communist Party, or for the breakaway from control by the Kremlin that is known as Titoism. But these are largely wait-and-see prospects, in deference to the cautious attitude that lets Russia call the plays. A policy of hands off and doing nothing could be worse than that of taking a positive calculated risk. We must display some initiative and leadership.

After the end of World War II, there were two schools of thought as to what our policy toward China should be. One maintained that the Chiang regime was hopelessly corrupt and incompetent and was bound to collapse of its own weight, and that the Chinese Communists were different from the Rus-

sian brand. Reckoning that the Chinese Reds would eventually come out on top, these advisers felt we should hop on the bandwagon by backing them early. The other group argued that Chinese governments are traditionally corrupt, and Chiang's was no worse than any other while it was undeniably pro-American. They went on to predict that the Chinese Communists would turn out to be controlled from Moscow and their policy would finally emerge as anti-American.

The first school prevailed.

And the result?

Americans and Chinese Reds are now locked in mortal combat.

Whether that policy will succeed over the long run, in spite of the present contradiction, is a matter of opinion.

As of the moment our foreign policy in Asia is being opened up to searching criticism.

Perhaps it should be revised.

But first, we must get both sides of the story, including any information we have a right to know but has not been divulged to this moment, so that we may decide the future course that is best for our Nation.

A policy that is reasonable and clear to which we will give our whole-hearted support.

Borough Rabbi's Retirement Just Gateway to New Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week's choice by the Brooklyn Eagle of Brooklyn's man of the week is indeed an excellent one. Rabbi Max Reichler has long been a leader of men. I am glad to be able to set forth the article in full as it appeared in Sunday's edition, April 22, 1951:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—BOROUGH RABBI'S RETIREMENT JUST GATEWAY TO NEW FIELD

(By Bert Hochman)

The act of retirement means many things to different people. For most it is a welcome and hard-earned respite capping many years of industrious labor. To others it is a necessary withdrawal from active service due to advancement in years.

But the recent retirement of Rabbi Max Reichler from the pulpit of Beth Sholom-Peoples Temple at Bay Parkway and Benson Avenue has merely ushered in a new period of concentrated activity for the bespectacled clergyman—still a young man at 65 to all outward appearances.

"I've decided to declare a moratorium on all lectures and sermons," exclaimed the ruddy-complexioned gentleman, his blue eyes twinkling. This may have come as a jolt to members of the Bensonhurst congregation last fall, but they warmly responded by naming their spiritual leader for 29 years as rabbi emeritus.

"I've been an active rabbi for 45 years," he explained, "and now I want to devote my time to a little bit of writing I've been planning for many years."

The little bit of writing turns out to be quite an ambitious undertaking for even a youngster of 65. Rabbi Reichler has already started work on a series of five volumes analyzing the influence of the rabbinical period on Christ and the writings of the New Testament. He expects the initial book to be ready by January 1; the rest will take at least several years.

His living quarters at the Hotel St. George resemble a newspaper index department more than the abode of a retired theologian. In his study Rabbi Reichler sits behind a desk littered with assorted memoranda, correspondence, and reference books. Surrounding him on two sides are a set of large filing cabinets, tenanted by an exhaustive index of some 50,000 file cards personally compiled through the years on various religious subjects.

Rabbi Reichler doesn't underestimate the amount of work which will have to be poured into the five-volume undertaking. More than that, he is conscious that the self-appointed task would be a stiff challenge for even a much younger scholar.

"I'd rather try and fail, than fail to try," shrugs the energetic descendant of one of Europe's oldest rabbinical families, whose family line of rabbis goes back to his great-great-grandfather.

That same motto has placed Rabbi Reichler in good stead through many other ambitious challenges of the past.

In 1911 he was asked by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to organize Sinai Temple in the Bronx. He recalls how he started the congregation with seven members and no assets whatsoever. By the time he left in 1922 to take over the Bensonhurst leadership, Sinai Temple boasted more than 400 members, with more than 800 worshipers at its regular services and a new $200,000 edifice.

Similarly, when he came to Beth Sholom-Peoples Temple in February 1922, the newly amalgamated congregation had a membership of 160. Today there is a membership of over 400, its religious school has a paid staff of 15 workers, and close to 400 youngsters attend classes there.

Many of his innovations at the Bensonhurst temple have become standard order of procedure in reform synagogues throughout the country. Chief among these is the congregation taking part in every part of the service, especially the singing of the traditional Hebrew responses.

"I don't want just an audience, I want a participating congregation," says the man who has become known as the spiritual leader of Brooklyn's singing congregation.

Rabbi Reichler was born on November 27, 1885, in Presburg, then part of Hungary, now Czechoslovakia. His father, the late Rabbi Moses Reichler, came to America to take charge of a temple in Utica, N. Y. The family crossed the seas to join him a few years later in 1895.

Through his high-school days in Utica, a local editor sought to interest the youngster in journalism or teaching. But there was never much doubt in his mind; he was going to prepare himself for the Jewish ministry just like his father and grandfathers before him.

He received his B. A. from the University of Cincinnati in 1905, and a year later was ordained a rabbi by the Hebrew Union College. At 21, he was then one of America's youngest men to enter the rabbinical profession.

After pursuing some postgraduate studies at Chicago University, he ministered local congregations in Helena, Ark., and Schenectady, N. Y., before accepting the Bronx assignment. There he met the former Edith Maisner, a school teacher who applied for the principalship of his religious school. Suffice to say she got the job—and 4 years later the couple was married. Mrs. Reichler died in 1944. Their two children are David, 32, and Mrs. Vida Ruth Bial, 29, a speech instructor at Long Island University.

No newcomer to the fold of authors, Rabbi Reichler has always been a prolific writer. Among his works are: The Jewish Conception of Justice, What Is the Talmud?, and The Last Prayers of Jesus, in addition to many Hebrew textbooks. He speaks German, Hebrew and English fluently, and can read Latin, Greek, Arabic, and Syriac.

During World War I, he was a chaplain at Camp Upton. He is former chaplain of Progress Lodge, F. & A. M., and past president of the Association of Reform Rabbis and the Brooklyn Board of Rabbis. World War II found him as Jewish representative on the Brooklyn Interfaith Committee.

On May 12 the Beth Sholom congregation will honor him at a testimonial dinner in the Hotel Pierre, Manhattan. The event will mark the forty-fifth anniversary of his ordination. Rabbi Reichler admitted he will probably have "a few words of thanks to say"—but definitely no lecture or sermon. They are ruled out for the duration of his "retirement."

Essentials of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of Saturday, April 14, 1951, it was my privilege to address a foreign policy conference held in the Ryan Hotel, St. Paul, Minn. This conference was sponsored by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota. Chairman of the conference was Mr. York Langton, president of the Minnesota United Nations Association. This conference was attended by approximately 1,000 persons. Participants included Mr. George Demetriou, professor of political science, University of Minnesota, speaking on the subject You and the Communist Threat; Mr. O. Edmund Clubb, director of the Chinese Section, United States Department of State, on You and the Far East; and Dr. Capper Johnson, professor, International Relations, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., on the subject You and Western Europe. It was my privilege to give the concluding address of the conference. My subject was Essentials of American Foreign Policy.

I wish to pay tribute to the splendid educational program in the field of foreign relations conducted under the direction of the University of Minnesota International Relations Center. I pay particular tribute to the Minnesota United Nations Association, and the Foreign Policy Associations of Minneapolis and St. Paul. The theme of the foreign policy conference was You and the World.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address I delivered at the foreign policy conference be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESSENTIALS OF AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

America's foreign policy is not created in a vacuum. It results from the fact that we are a nation among nations and in constant

association with one another. In this association we must necessarily have a flexible policy to meet changing times and changing conditions. America's foreign policy can never be a predetermined, airtight program of inflexibility.

There are, however, important aspects of our foreign policy to which we are irrevocably dedicated:

1. The maintenance and guaranteeing of America's independence and freedom.

2. Working for and promoting the independence and freedom of peoples and nations everywhere.

3. A firm commitment to work through and with the United Nations. A policy of strengthening the United Nations in order to achieve a just and enduring peace, based upon sound principles of international law and social justice.

4. A well-planned program of political, economic, health, and cultural assistance to those nations and peoples who have dedicated their fortunes and their lives to the cause of freedom.

5. Promoting trade and friendly economic and political relations amongst the nations of the world.

6. A deep and sincere humanitarian concern and generosity for those who are underprivileged and suffering from the ravages of famine, disease, and poverty.

7. Honorably fulfilling all obligations and commitments entered into by treaties and compacts between ourselves and other nations.

8. The maintenance of our national defense military forces.

These principles are part of the glorious history of our Nation.

Let us never forget that we do not live in this world alone. We are not an island unto ourselves. The admonitions of Scripture which remind us that we are our "brother's keeper" need to be applied to the practical realities of international relations and foreign policy. In carrying out the above principles it has been the aim of our Government, first, to aid in the rehabilitation and relief of those who suffered so dearly from the ravages of World War II. This was exemplified by our generous gifts to UNRRA and the interim aid program in 1946 and 1947 to Western Europe.

Secondly, our Government's foreign policy has been directed toward strengthening those free nations that are resisting communism from within and without. This policy has taken shape in the adoption of the Marshall plan of economic aid; the North Atlantic Pact, a compact of the free nations of the Atlantic community dedicated to defense against aggression; aid now being considered for the Republic of India; the Greek-Turkish aid program which preserved freedom and independence for Turkey and Greece; the Voice of America; our program of defense mobilization; and military assistance to our allies.

Thirdly, the policy of our Government is to strike at the roots of Communist growth and infiltration by a broad program of economic, scientific, and technological assistance to the underprivileged and underdeveloped areas of the world. The point 4 program was a beginning. We are now preparing to move forward on a much broader and comprehensive program.

NATURE AND MENACE OF COMMUNISM

In shaping and carrying out our foreign policy, which must, above all, be based on our own self-preservation, it is imperative that every American understand the nature of the menace of communism—how it works, how it gains support, who and what are its natural allies. Communism is more than a military threat; it is destructive of the ideals and principles of our religious faith and of our political philosophy. Wherever communism has thrived, the individual has been enslaved; education has been corrupted and used for the selfish and greedy purposes of those in power; free institutions of business and labor have been destroyed; independent ownership of farms and property has been abolished; the very sanctity of the home and of the family has been jeopardized; freedom of worship has been restricted.

This is the menace of communism—a menace of military force and human slavery. Make no mistake about it—international communism will not satisfy its hungry appetite by enslaving and conquering Europe and Asia. Its ultimate objective and its final blow is directed against the United States, for here, in this great country, is to be found the heart and soul of freedom and democracy.

It is my sincere conviction that we cannot escape—nor, when we understand the issue, do I feel we would want to escape—from assuming the responsibility of leadership for the millions of people who are still dedicated to liberty; nor dare we minimize the threat of brutal power and force that confronts us. It will do us no good merely to hope for peace and security. I believe we must be willing to work and sacrifice for world peace and our own security. The Soviet Union has brought under its control millions of people—satellite nations. Today communism controls over 800,000,000 people. We in the United States, with slightly over 150,000,000 citizens, cannot meet this menace alone. We need friends. We need free allies if we are to preserve our own freedom.

It was the recognition of this obvious fact that prompted our Government to enter into the North Atlantic Pact—an alliance of 13 free nations for mutual defense and common effort in securing peace. The North Atlantic Pact was established within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. It lends strength to the United Nations. Let it be clearly understood that there can be no United Nations if free and independent nations are conquered and absorbed by the Soviet Union. It is because of the military power and the aggressive actions of the Soviet Union and her satellites that it became necessary to implement the North Atlantic Pact by, first, the military assistance program and, secondly, the creation of a Western European defense system including American troops, air power, and naval forces.

TROOPS FOR EUROPE

The defense of Western Europe is essential to the defense of the United States. Western Europe and the United States represent the muscle, the fiber, and the tissue of the forces of freedom. Communist aggression looks upon the countries of Western Europe as but the steps—the gateway—to a frontal attack upon the citadel of liberty, the arsenal of democracy—the United States of America.

The question is simply this: Where do we defend freedom against the constant pressure and force of Communist totalitarianism? Shall 150,000,000 Americans undertake this task alone, or shall we join as a strong and participating partner with our friends and allies where the battle line has been drawn?

Let's make no mistake about it: The defense of Western Europe is the key to the security of the United States. With the people of Western Europe on our side, we have a combination that the Communists cannot beat. But with Western Europe dominated by Soviet Russia, its people enslaved, its resources exploited, its factories producing the materials of war for Russia, we will be faced with an overwhelming preponderance of power that may well spell our doom.

The reasons for this are perfectly clear. Military power consists of manpower, industrial production, natural resources, strategic bases, and the will to fight and resist. If Western Europe is lost to the Communists, the majority of the world's manpower goes to the Communist forces.

If Western Europe is conquered or dominated by the Soviet Union, the balance of industrial production goes to the Communists.

If we lose Western Europe, the overwhelming proportion of raw materials and critical supplies goes to the Communists.

If we lose Western Europe we lose the strategic bases, air and naval, from whence to defend ourselves against Soviet attack.

If Western Europe is controlled by the Communists, a spirit of defeatism and hopelessness will befall all of humanity.

A word about industrial production. There are three great industrial workshops in the world: First, Canada and the United States; second, Western Europe; third, Russia and her satellites. A striking way to illustrate this fact is to look at the world's steel capacity. For every 10 tons of steel we in the United States can produce, Western Europe can produce more than 6 tons. Russia and her satellites can turn out 4 tons. The significance of this is obvious. Add Russia's 4 tons to Europe's 6, and you wind up with a steel capacity equal to our own. On the other hand, combine free Europe and the United States, and the result is a 4 to 1 advantage in our favor.

There are dozens of other illustrations that can be shown, but they all lead back to the conclusion that the productive capacity of Western Europe and the United States combined tremendously exceeds that of Russia and her satellites. And they also lead to the conclusion that our margin of safety would be tremendously reduced if free Europe falls into Russian hands.

But productive capacity isn't the whole story. With Western Europe in their hands, the Communists would quickly take over all the resources of the Old World. The Mediterranean would become a Red Sea. Africa would be defenseless. The Middle East, India, the rest of southeast Asia, Australia, and the island areas of the Southwest Pacific would fall into the Red orbit.

With the loss of Africa would go the uranium supplies upon which our atomic weapons so largely depend. Manganese, an essential component of steel, reaches us today from India and Africa. Loss of those two regions would cripple our steel output. Much of our tin and all of our natural rubber comes from the Malay Straits and the island areas of the Southwest Pacific.

In short, the loss of Western Europe would mean that we were forced to defend ourselves with the resources and manpower of the Western Hemisphere alone and sharply reduced—and that is not a happy prospect.

There are 2,250,000,000 people on earth. About 300,000,000 of them live in the Western Hemisphere—about one-seventh of the world's population. I do not relish the prospect of living in the kind of world in which the Communists control 85 percent of the world's population. And that is exactly what we would face if we walked out on Europe.

We must send troops to Europe because our national self-interest demands that we save Europe from Communist aggression. To refuse to send troops is to serve notice to the Soviet Union that it can walk across the Continent.

And Europe can be saved. Our military experts, from General Eisenhower on down, tell us so, and this is a military question.

They tell us it can be done by building up the combined forces of land, sea, and air.

The second question is, should we limit troops to Europe? I say "No." If the security of Western Europe is basic to the security of the United States, then it would be sheer folly to limit that security by an act of Congress. World War II should have taught us the lesson of "too little and too late." The events leading to World War II should now be conclusive evidence of the futility of half-way measures. Let this be perfectly clear: Military assistance to Europe—troops for Europe—is in our own national interest. We do not know at any time what the next 24 hours may bring, and the lessons of Korea and Pearl Harbor should have taught us we must be thoroughly prepared.

How many troops belong in any one spot is a question which neither you nor I can decide. Congress and the President have decided, through the North Atlantic Pact and the military assistance program, the basic foreign and military policy. Military leaders must decide technical questions of military strength and troop movements. These decisions must then be finally approved and implemented by Executive direction, namely the President, who is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

MOBILIZATION FOR DEFENSE AND PEACE

There are those who are disturbed about our program of military mobilization and what appears to be the tendency toward war. I am sure that people everywhere are disturbed, confused, and emotionally upset. We live in dangerous times. We are faced with the possibility of war, and yet we are not a warlike nation. We desire peace. We have made an honest effort to preserve peace and will continue to make every effort humanly possible, but peace cannot be obtained without strength. Therefore, we are mobilizing our strength not for aggression, not for world power, but rather to impress upon the leaders of the Soviet Union that the free people of the world will resist aggression and force. At the same time, through the councils of the United Nations and through the normal diplomatic channels, we should let the world know that we stand ready at all times for real disarmament under international inspection.

It is our solemn duty to impress upon the people of the world the understanding that wars do not solve problems and that we in the United States have but one desire—peace, freedom, and security. We know that the answer to the aggression of international communism is not to be found in military preparedness and strength alone. Our major emphasis must be directed to creating and building the conditions of peace. Peace in Europe, peace in Asia will come only when injustice and exploitation have been removed; when people have the right of self-government; when economic and social opportunity is made available; when poverty, ignorance, and disease have been checked and rolled back. These are the objectives toward which we should dedicate our efforts.

THE CRISIS IN ASIA

Our world is changing. Whole areas in Asia and Africa are in revolution. Millions of people are seeking their independence and freedom. Some have obtained it—such as the people of Indonesia, India, Burma, and Ceylon; others are aspiring to it—such as the people of Indochina, north Africa, and Malaya. If there has been a weakness in our foreign policy it has been that we as a Nation have failed to identify ourselves with the legitimate desires of the people of Asia and Africa to attain their own independence and their own freedom. It is my considered judgment that we ought not to be resisting this revolution. We ought to give it leadership.

The tragedy of our time is that we have permitted the Communists to identify themselves with these liberation and emancipation movements in Asia and Africa. Yet communism by its very nature is counter-revolution, reaction, and subjugation. International communism's only purpose in joining with these people seeking their independence is to gain control and inflict on these people their vicious and brutal system of exploitation and oppression. Our job is to explain that to the world, not only in words but by setting an example through leadership, through guidance, through generous assistance.

INDIA

We must be patient and understanding—and we ought to be. We too, only a short time ago in human history, obtained our freedom. We rejected colonialism; we were sensitive and jealous of our liberty. And we were justly concerned with our own independence, trying to keep away from foreign entanglements. Let me give you a modern example. I refer to the Republic of India. Here is a nation of over 350,000,000 people that has just obtained its independence after 300 years of colonial exploitation. India is confronted with overwhelming problems within her own borders. She is new in the art of self-government. She is, in a sense, weak in military and economic power but potentially strong and rich.

Many Americans are disturbed, yes, angry because the Government of India does not see eye to eye with us on the problem of communism in China. But shouldn't Americans consider that India is consumed with the difficulties of her new independence and freedom? That she wishes to keep away from foreign entanglements? This is the natural and the historic pattern of new nations. It was our pattern, our experience of less than a hundred years ago. India is a country that is prodemocratic by its constitution, its government, and its philosophy. It has taken stern measures against totalitarian groups within its own borders. It is a part of the British Commonwealth, our major ally. It is without a doubt the leading free country in Asia. Yet, because India has not alined herself with us on the China question, even though she has supported the United Nations' resolution to resist aggression in Korea, she is today being criticized and condemned and is suffering at the hands of our own Government, which is withholding urgently needed food and wheat from India.

You will be interested in knowing that American policy with reference to the Republic of India has been a major concern of mine ever since my arrival in the United States Senate. I have realized the importance of cordial relations between our country and India. I have attempted to make an intensive study of American-Indian relationships, and in particular the political, economic, and social institutions of that great Asiatic power. On several occasions during the past 2 years I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on the subject of India and its position in world affairs. Not only have I brought these matters to the attention of the Senate, but I have also brought to the personal attention of the President and the Secretary of State America's policy with regard to India and the other areas of the Far East.

Better than a year ago I outlined to the President and the Secretary of State the urgent need of food for India if that country were to avert famine and all of the accompanying agony and confusion. Approximately 8 months ago I had the privilege of meeting one of our great Christian leaders from India, Bishop Pickett, of Delhi. I had Bishop Pickett discuss the Indian food shortage with Members of Congress, with the Secretary of State, and with Special Assistant to the President, Mr. Averill Harriman, as well as with Vice President Barkley. I accompanied Bishop Pickett to all of these meetings where he presented the very real need of food for the people of India. At a later date I arranged for the bishop to visit the President.

On December 16, 1950, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, Madam Pandit, made a formal request to our Government for 2,000,000 tons of cereal grains. Following this formal request, I joined with other Members of the Congress in preparing a letter to the President asking for an audience to discuss the food needs of India. Along with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, I arranged for a congressional delegation to visit the President. We received from him assurances that he supported India's request for 2,000,000 tons of grain. The President, subsequently, sent a very strong message to the Congress in support of food for India.

Immediately following the President's message, I joined with three of my colleagues in the Senate in introducing a bill to authorize the Government of the United States to provide the grain that India needs.

It is imperative that there be congressional approval of legislation to provide a grant of 2,000,000 tons of food grain to the people of India. There are disturbing signs in India and in all of Asia—signs of great mistrust on the part of the people of that continent that the United States is not interested in their welfare. You and I know that the American people are a generous people; that by philosophy, tradition, and history we have always demonstrated a keen and abiding interest in the welfare of our fellow men. It is imperative that we use the strength of our abundance in our conflict with communism. Without any expansion of industrial capacity, without any further mobilization of manpower, we can strike deadly blows at international communism by lifting the standard of living and by aiding the sick, the hungry, and the exploited.

The people of Asia face starvation. Freedom loses its meaning if it is without bread. Our Nation, if it is to be effective in the struggle against communism, must respond to the appeal for food from the underprivileged peoples of Asia, Africa, and the other underdeveloped areas. Yes, the most effective way to oppose communism and fascism is to eliminate the causes of those malignant diseases. It is not idealistic to say that we must attack poverty in the world. This is practical realism in the twentieth century. The time to assist the democratic forces in India and in other parts of Asia is now. Every humanitarian consideration, every political and religious consideration, and every consideration of our national interest calls for the Congress to act immediately in support of legislation for food grain for the people of India.

Food for India is symbolic of an over-all comprehensive program that is desperately needed—a program striking at the roots of communistic growth—a program that had its beginning in the point 4 program, as announced by President Truman. We can be a partner in the self-help efforts of these new nations in the Asiatic area. The governments of these new nations are struggling to maintain their integrity and their freedom. These governments, as history has proven, can be destroyed from within. There need be no Communist military attack. The attack of poverty and economic distress can be just as ruinous and destructive as a military blow. Communism in Asia, particularly in the southern and southeastern portions, is growing because the economic conditions are favorable to its growth. The propaganda of communism offers bread and land to the

under-privileged and to the exploited. A bold and comprehensive program of economic assistance can prevent these areas from going communistic.

I point up the issue of India because I believe that if we are to build a world dedicated to a just and enduring peace, if we as Americans are to give leadership, we must not expect all of our friends and allies to agree with us all the time on every issue. Freedom means the right to disagree. We condemn the policy of the Soviet Union for having satellite or stooge nations that say "yes" at every command. Are we not expecting our friends and allies to be subservient to our every wish? This must not be. Free allies, free nations must be expected to have independent judgment, and that judgment must be respected for what it is.

KOREA

I fully realize the tragedy, bloodshed, and destruction that has come with our resistance of aggression in Korea. The attack of the North Koreans and the entrance of Communist China into the Korean conflict is clear and unadulterated aggression. Were we to let this aggression go unchecked, we would again see the pattern of conquest unfold itself with ever-increasing greed and power. Our struggle in Korea is a struggle for freedom, for independence, and for a world based on law and order. Like yourself, I am disappointed that the other members of the United Nations have not felt free to give us greater support. But those valiant men who have sacrificed their lives in Korea and those who are yet battling against tremendous odds, may well save this world from an all-out catastrophic World War III. While the battle is far away from our homeland, the aggressive attack of the Communists in the Korean area is a dagger pointed at our heart. Those who have given their lives in the Korean conflict have done as much to preserve and protect the freedom of America and the rest of the free world as the patriots at Valley Forge, the Argonne, and the Battle of the Bulge. They are fighting the fire of communism to prevent the conflagration from sweeping over our own homeland.

Aggression on the part of any nation against another is banditry and lawlessness. It needs to be challenged just as we in a local community take effective action against those who commit assault and battery or trespass against the private property of others. There isn't a shadow of a doubt that the North Korean action was a part of the over-all program of the Cominform and its aggressive tactics. I repeat, the fact that we met this aggression, despite the risks involved and despite the great sacrifice that it meant, has done a great deal to check the possibility of World War III.

I, for one, am convinced that if this attack had not been challenged, it would have been the "go ahead" signal for any nation in the world to move its troops against another. We know what happened in the Berlin air lift when Russia decided to blockade Berlin. We know that by firm and determined action on the part of our Government and that of Great Britain, the Soviets finally appealed for a settlement and the blockade was lifted. I think the facts of the last few years reveal conclusively that wherever nations refuse to resist Communist pressure, communism moves ahead, conquers, and controls. I think the facts reveal that wherever nations do resist Communist pressure, communism takes another look, sizes up the situation, and comes to an agreement that preserves the peace.

I know there has been a great deal of criticism about what has transpired in Korea. I am not prepared to defend every action that we have taken, but I do defend the moral validity—the righteous purpose of our resistance of aggression.

CHINESE RELATIONS

We Americans are worried and concerned over what has transpired in China. But let us get the record clear. Our Government has been generous with the Chiang Kai-shek Government of the Republic of China. Our Government extended to Chiang's Nationalist Government of China a grand total of $3,598,200 in economic and military aid. Our Government sent one of its most able public officials, Gen. George Marshall, to China in a desperate effort to save the situation. I do not know all of the reasons why the Chinese Communist movement conquered China and defeated the Nationalist Government. But I do know that it was through no fault of ours. The propaganda that has been let loose in America against our policy in China would lead many to believe that it was our responsibility, and ours alone, to save China. But no nation can be saved from the menace of communism if it refuses to save itself. Communism triumphed in Russia because corruption, exploitation, and injustice was rampant under the Czars, because the legitimate government ignored the social, economic, and political needs of the people. I am led to believe that communism triumphed in China, not because of what happened on the battlefields alone, but because of what did not happen in constructive action in the villages, on the farms, in the cities, and throughout the entire society.

The tragic conquest of China by the forces of communism threatens our own security and the security of the free world. There is no doubt but what this was a part of the master plan of the Kremlin. China, a historical friend of the United States, has been turned against us by the Communist leadership and the Communist propaganda. The attack of the Red Chinese armies upon the forces of the United Nations in Korea has clearly demonstrated the true intentions and purposes of Soviet imperialism. The Chinese Communist aggression has brought into sharp focus a fundamental issue of American foreign policy. This was recently dramatized by the President's dismissal of General MacArthur.

DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

The real issue involved in the President's dismissal of General MacArthur is one basic to American Constitutional Government. The President, under the mandate of our Constitution, is Commander in Chief. The President, under the political tradition of our Republic, is responsible for foreign policy. It has been a basic principle of representative government that the military is subordinate to the civilian. The military officers and services are the servants of the Republic, not the master. The action of the President is within the tradition of American Constitutional Government.

The issue is: Shall military commanders dictate and formulate American policy or shall they carry out that policy. In this instance the issue was even more broad because the military action in Korea was not only an American action but one under the over-all supervision of the United Nations. President Truman, as all Presidents before him, demanded that foreign policy be established by the elected representatives of the people, not by any one or a few generals, able as they may be. Once we lose civilian control over foreign and military policy, then we lose the fabric of our democracy.

In dismissing General MacArthur President Truman had no other choice. The general—a brilliant and able military leader, a great man in his own right and by his own record—openly disagreed with our Government's policy and with that of the United Nations. He disagreed with the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No government can exist so divided in policy since no government can be guided by two inconsistent foreign programs.

General MacArthur, as an individual, has a perfect right to disagree with our Government's foreign policy, but as a general subordinate to his Commander in Chief, he has neither the right nor the prerogative to formulate and attempt to carry out his own program and to disregard the program established by the Government. While I have a high regard for General MacArthur and his abilities, I am not prepared to accept his judgment over that of the President, the Secretary of State, the overwhelming majority of the representatives in the United Nations, the majority in the Congress, the Secretary of Defense, and the combined Chiefs of Staff. It should be clearly recognized that the bold statements of General MacArthur were causing great concern in other nations and among our allies.

THE NEED OF ALLIES

While it is true that we as a Nation have been bearing the major burden of the war in Korea, we do have allies there, and those allies stand with us in Western Europe. They are the only allies that we have. It is impossible to keep allies and to maintain a solid defense against Communist aggression if we as a Nation and a Government act in opposition to our allies and disregard their wishes, their policies, and their program. To put it quite bluntly, faced as we are by the Soviet Union and its satellites, with a total population of over 800,000,000, we cannot afford to stand alone. The Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to break us away from our allies. The old tactic of divide and conquer is again being utilized. We must not fall prey to this tactic. We must stand together and work together.

THE ISSUE AND THE RISKS

The issue of foreign policy which divides us today is primarily related to our country's relations with Red China. The issue, simply put, is whether or not, first, our Armed Forces should attack military bases on the Chinese mainland; and secondly, whether or not we should use and assist Chinese Nationalist troops in an attack on the Chinese mainland. This inevitably means extending and expanding the war in Korea.

It is the policy of our Government to do everything possible to limit the present Korean war to the Korean battlefield. It is the firm determination of our Government and our allies not to extend and expand the conflict to the mainland of Asia by any action of ours. The risk involved in a further expansion of the conflict is a possibility of World War III and the full-scale intervention of the Soviet Union. It should be remembered that the Soviet Union has a treaty of alliance and assistance with the Red Chinese Government. This treaty calls for Soviet military assistance in case China is attacked by Japan or any power associated with Japan. Today we are the prime occupiers of Japan. We are associated with Japan. We are now preparing to conclude a treaty with Japan. It is entirely possible that the Soviet Union, under the obligations of her treaty with Communist China, would take direct military action were we to advance to the Chinese mainland. The political policy of the United States Government and its allies is to bring the Korean War to a conclusion and to negotiate an honorable peace.

The position of General MacArthur was clearly and brilliantly stated in his address to the joint session of the Congress. Not only did he recommend economic sanctions against China and a blockade of the Chinese coast by our Navy, but also the use of Chinese Nationalist troops from the island of Formosa and the strategic bombing of Man-

churian bases by our Air Force. As I have stated, we must take into consideration were this program to be adopted, the possibility of open Russian intervention and its consequent effect upon our military position both in the Far East and in Western Europe. We must take into consideration the present military strength of the United States and its allies as compared with the Soviet Union and its satellites. Our mobilization program is just getting under way. Our total military strength is approximately 3,000,000 men. We as yet have not been able to send the additional four divisions to Western Europe. We have had to call up reservists in order to meet the commitments in Korea.

Is it not possible that the strategy of the Soviet is to trick us into a major war in Asia so that an all-out attack can be launched in Western Europe? It is Western Europe that Russia needs. It is Western Europe that has the industrial production, the skilled manpower and the strategic positions that are needed to round out the Soviet military machine. Russia and her satellites have an overabundance of population. They lack in supplies and productive machinery.

Those who support General MacArthur's position state quite confidently that the Soviet Union would not intervene were we to attack the Chinese mainland. Of course, no one really knows what the Soviet will do. But, I call to your attention that General MacArthur clearly stated to the President on the occasion of the President's conference on Wake Island in October 1950, that the Red Chinese armies would not intervene in Korea. I call this to your attention because then as now a risk was being contemplated and a military decision was being made. The military decision was that of advancing to the Yalu River in order to destroy the North Koreans. The risk involved was whether or not the Chinese Communist armies would move into the Korean war. History now tells us the answer. The Chinese armies did come into the war and momentarily the forces of the United Nations suffered tragic losses. It is reasonable to expect that an attack upon the Chinese mainland could and would provoke open Soviet intervention. The questions that we must ask ourselves then are simply these: Do we wish to take that risk? Are we prepared at this time by military strength and mobilization to meet all-out attack by the Soviet? What would be the effect upon our Armed Forces in the area of such a Soviet attack? What would be the effect of a Soviet attack in Western Europe at this time?

It is not divulging any secret when we openly recognize that we are presently weaker in terms of military strength than our adversary. This position will change within a year but today the Soviet Union and its satellites have a much larger army and air force than the United States and its allies. It appears to me that Soviet strategy is based on trapping us into a war on the Asiatic mainland only to strike in Western Europe, destroy our allies, and overrun the Western European countries. If this should happen, we would lose the only allies we have. We would lose the productive power of European industry. We would lose the critical raw materials and the strategic bases that are now under the control and possession of our allies. We would find ourselves without friends or allies and without vitally needed raw materials.

INCONSISTENCIES IN CONGRESS

We must seriously consider the consequences involved in extending and expanding the present conflict when we know what a difficult assignment we now have in Korea alone. It seems contradictory and confusing that the very same Members of the Congress who did everything in their power to either defeat or weaken the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan, to prevent shipment of arms to our allies in Western Europe, and finally to prevent sending American troops for the common defense of Western Europe are now advocating the extension and expansion of hostilities in the Asiatic area. Only a few months ago this same group in Congress was advocating that we get out of Korea; now they are advocating that we go into China. Some Members of the Congress, while advocating an expansion of the war in Asia, have only recently voted to limit our Armed Forces and to weaken the program for selective service and universal military training.

I point out these inconsistencies because they need to be understood. It is clear that you cannot expand a war from Korea to China without taking the risk of World War III. You cannot expand hostilities from Korea to China without having more manpower and a far greater military force. You cannot expand hostilities from Korea to China without risking loss of Western Europe by a Soviet attack. It is imperative that we face up to the facts of our present military strength and that we clearly understand that the Soviet threat is worldwide and not localized.

The logical and consistent outcome of the policy of extending military action to the Chinese mainland was pointedly brought to light by a recent resolution introduced in the Congress by Senator CAIN, of the State of Washington, who proposed that the Government of the United States declare war on Communist China. If this conflict is to grow, if it is to be extended, let it come only by the aggressive designs and tactics of the Soviet Union. If the Chinese Communist forces are assisted by Soviet air power, if our troops in Korea are attacked by concentrated air power—then we have but one choice, and that is to retaliate. This means that our efforts to limit this war in Korea have been checkmated by Soviet interference. The very survival and safety of our troops will demand that we attack the air bases and destroy this air power lest it destroy us. Let it be clear, however, that we would do this in defense. Up to now the Communists and North Korean forces have not had any major air power. Therefore, it has not been militarily necessary to attack the Manchurian air bases. If this new Communist offensive in Korea brings with it waves of airplanes, then we must attack the nests and the bases from whence these planes take off. Let us hope and pray that we can limit the conflict and bring this tragic Korean action to a speedy conclusion on the terms of a just and honorable peace.

International communism now fully understands that we will resist aggression. The policy of our Government has been one of firm and resolute resistance to Communist aggression and subversion. No partisan debate nor any beclouding of the issues can remove from the annals of history the clear and unmistakable fact that President Truman, the Secretary of State, and the Congress in the development of our foreign policy have delivered hammer blows against Communist imperialism.

I welcome General MacArthur's arrival in the United States and his address to the Congress. The debate over foreign policy in the Far East will serve to reaffirm our Far Eastern program and to make it clear and understandable to the American people. It is only fair and honorable that one should await the outcome of the congressional hearings before dogmatic conclusions are made. It is my hope that a basic sense of fair play will continue to permeate our attitude as we discuss and debate our foreign policy. Above all, we must be united as a Nation, for the dangers that we face are great.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AND AMERICAN POLICY

The desire of our Government is to get out of Korea, but only when aggression has been stopped. We are not fighting the Chinese people. The Chinese people have been victims of corruption on one hand and now of a Communist police state on the other. It is the official policy of our Government, and it surely is my personal view, that at all times we should extend the hand of friendship and fellowship to the Chinese people, but to do this does not mean to embrace their masters or their dictators. In fact, if we have true affection for the Chinese people, we will not only want them free from Western domination, but also from Communist dictation. If one has real affection for the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries, he should want, above all else, these people to be liberated from those who have defiled their government and their nation.

Recently I joined with several other Senators in offering a Senate resolution expressing friendship for the Russian people. It is the policy of our Government to disassociate the people from their Communist masters. Our whole program of information and truth must make it clear that our desire is for peace. We must appeal to the people of Russia and her satellites. That appeal must be directed over and beyond the government. There are many evidences of restlessness and of tension within the Soviet empire. It is thoroughly possible that one of the reasons that Russia has not precipitated conflict in Europe is because of the fear that the Communist leaders have of their own people and, particularly, of the people in the conquered countries. Our intelligence agencies report that the Communist leadership is having a difficult time keeping order in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries. The people of Poland and Czechoslovakia are a freedom-loving people. They are proud of their national history. We must appeal to them. We must give them assurance of our support when and if they attempt to throw off the yoke of Communist oppression. This is what is called psychological warfare, an area in which we have been very weak.

SUMMARY

Therefore, our foreign policy must have many parts: in some areas economic assistance, in other areas such as Western Europe, economic assistance plus a political and military alliance. Our policy toward the nations taken over by Russia should be that of encouraging their breaking away, such as happened in Yugoslavia. Once they have broken away, we should offer them whatever assistance is within our means.

Another part of our foreign policy is and must be military and economic strength here at home in the United States. It is for this reason that we are mobilizing our forces, expanding our production, and strengthening our economy. The real secret weapon that America has is the strength of its people, the strength of its government, the power of its industry, the over-all health of its economy. Whatever we do, we must constantly keep in mind that we, the people of the United States, have a great responsibility of leadership. The whole world looks to us for guidance, for inspiration—yes, for economic aid and military assistance. This is a tremendous burden for our people to bear, but, I submit, it is a burden much less crushing than war.

There are no easy answers to these difficult problems that face us today. There is no short cut to peace. We must be prepared for years of earnest endeavor and sacrifice. We must develop a sense of poise and strength that comes through understanding and a realization of the righteousness of our cause. I believe that Almighty God will crown our efforts with success. I join with you in seeking Divine guidance and inspiration, for there are some things man cannot do alone.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the foreign policy of the United States, delivered by me yesterday before the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs at their convention in the Shoreham Hotel in this city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA IN WORLD AFFAIRS

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

I am profoundly grateful for the opportunity to appear before this fine convention of women leaders of the great State of Virginia.

I was tremendously impressed in learning that the theme of your convention was "Enlarge the Place of Thy Tent—Lengthen Thy Cords, Strengthen Thy Stakes." Surely, these words from Isaiah could not have had great applicability today, than at any previous time in American history.

In the great tempest of our times, in the storm that has engulfed the world, it is up to each of us to lengthen the cords and strengthen the stakes of this constitutional Repu'blic—the leader of nations. We can do that by sound thinking, not synthetic thinking, by rational action rather than by emotionalism and hysteria.

OUR PRAYERS GO OUT TO OUR FIGHTING SONS

At this very moment, as I speak to you this evening, thousands of miles away American boys and other United Nations troops are gripped in a life-and-death struggle with the onrushing Chinese Communist hordes. To a considerable extent, the outcome of that vast struggle in the bloody rice paddies and the rugged mountains—that outcome will serve more to determine the future of American foreign policy than virtually anything that is said or done here in Washington.

God bless our fighting sons and their allies. May they withstand the tremendous shock of that onrushing offensive. Though holes may open in the line, may the bulwark of liberty not be breached.

WOMEN AS LEADERS IN THOUGHT AND ACTION

To this fine audience tonight, I do want to express my congraulations for your taking the time out from your busy affairs as housewives, mothers, white collar workers and in every other task—in order to consider the problems of our Nation—yours and mine. When I see a splendid gathering of women leaders such as this, I wish that all of the women who so nobly dedicated their lives to securing the franchise for womankind—I wish that they might have lived to have witnessed inspiring occasions like this. They would be thrilled to see the extent to which women have emerged as leaders in all phases of public life—leaders in thought and action.

You will recall that great American humorist, Will Rogers. Once, he was speaking of the nineteenth amendment which gave the women the right to vote. Will Rogers said, facetiously, "Oh, yes, the nineteenth amendment, that was the law that made women human by act of Congress."

Well, in the years that have passed since women emerged to voting equality, they have proven anew that the deep humanity within every woman, within every mother, every sweetheart, every wife, can be expressed in constructive action in national and international affairs.

VIRGINIA IN THE VANGUARD OF STATES

It is most fitting at this solemn occasion in history that the women of Virginia should be playing so prominent a role. Virginia, the mother of Presidents, has contributed so much to the birth and development of this Republic that this Nation is eternally in its debt.

You will recall the words of a geat Virginian, a great President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence:

"The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time."

Virginia has contributed more than her share of martyrs and champions of liberty. In the spirit of Jefferson, in the spirit of Madison, in the spirit of Washington, let us consider the ways of maintaining the liberty for which so many sons and yes, daughters of Virginia throughout our history have given so much for so long a period of time.

THE THREE BASIC DOMESTIC CHALLENGES

If you and I were to ask ourselves what are the three great challenges of this day insofar as domestic affairs are concerned, we would answer:

1. Maintaining this constitutional Republic with its system of checks and balances between three equal and coordinate branches of Government.

2. Maintaining the American dollar which has already been badly depreciated by inflation's ravages.

3. Maintaining the American economic system, the system of private initiative and private profit, as contrasted with the alien concept of statism, of Government ownership of the means of production and distribution.

These, then, are the three basic challenges insofar as domestic affairs are concerned.

I need hardly tell you that the basic challenge on the foreign scene is that of seeking the path which will best give us peace and preserve the freedom of the world.

THE INSPIRATION OF ARTHUR VANDENBERG

Last week end, friends, there came to my colleagues and myself the sad duty of journeying to Grand Rapids, Mich., to pay our final respects to a great son of Michigan, the Honorable Arthur H. Vandenberg. It had been my pleasure to serve as highest ranking Republican with Arthur Vandenberg in 1947 and 1948 when he was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Then, in 1949, when the fortunes of politics were reversed, it had been my privilege to serve with him as his next ranking colleague on the minority on that committee. Now that he has gone—gone from the physical scene, but certainly not gone from our hearts and minds—I hope that all of us who have been his associates will carry on in the spirit that he so nobly displayed.

FOREIGN DEBATE SHOULD NOT DEGENERATE

I need not tell you that the American people are seriously divided today on many aspects of our foreign policy.

It is my earnest hope and prayer that this controversey will not, however, completely degenerate into a base partisan quarrel between the two political parties, each seeking partisan advantage over the other, irrespective of the consequences to our country. I know that the responsible elements in the Republican Party do not want to see the present situation of disunity intensified and aggravated. Rather, we want to find the common elements of understanding and agreement, so that to the greatest extent possible, we can heal the wounds in the body politic.

That does not mean, however, that the Republicans are willing to sacrifice certain basic principles, certain basic concepts with which you and I are familiar. We are not willing for example, to tolerate appeasement in the false name of "unity" and the sham name of "peace." We are willing and eager, however, to reason out differences in a spirit of judgment, in a spirit of calmness, and in a spirit of goodwill.

In turn, I trust that the Democratic Party—the majority party—will not misinterpret the Republicans' well-justified desire for a thorough investigation of foreign policy.

Whether the present administration were Democratic or Republican, I would speak forth very frankly and say that it has pursued a course of reckless conduct which has dealt severe blows to national unity.

For example, the arbitrary way in which Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a great hero, a great son of Wisconsin, was handled, has produced the largest flood of letter protests in my personal recollection and I believe in the recollection of any living member of the Congress. Why? Because the Administration violated the inherent sense of fair play, of righteous dealing, the inherent sense of gratitude for services well done—these inherent feelings of the American people.

PUBLIC WANTS STATE DEPARTMENT TO BE MORE FRANK

In addition, there is a solemn conviction of the American people that the administration has not been frank with it in presenting the full facts of the diplomatic and military situation, either in Asia or in Europe. There is the constant feeling among Members of Congress and among the American people that there is a covering up of crucial facts, that the administration only grudgingly reveals facts to the American public and then, only after the most intensive pressure has been put on it. There is the feeling that the American public is not taken into the confidence of the administration, but rather that it is spoon-fed single facts one at a time by the administration when it autocratically chooses to reveal such facts, rather than when the American people could use the facts to come to sound decisions.

It was a Virginian from Staunton, a great Democratic President—Woodrow Wilson—who pleaded for "open covenants openly arrived at." Well, let the present administration champion a policy of open agreement, openly arrived at. Let us be done with the cloud of false secrecy, the phony cloud of "I can't tell you because everything is strictly hush-hush."

Now, none of us want to bridge security regulations on certain necessary data which is necessarily confidential. But the words "security," "confidential," "top-secret" have been so abused by the present Administration as to make a complete farce of affairs. It seems that the administration rubberstamps everything "confidential," "top-secret," "super-hush-hush," whether or not it has the slightest justification to do so. What is it afraid of? Is it afraid of the common sense and intelligence of the American people?

FOREIGN, DOMESTIC POLICY COMPLETELY INTERTWINED

We all recognize that no longer is foreign policy a matter separate from domestic policy. Virtually every single action of major consequence in home affairs has repercussions—favorable or unfavorable—in most of the capitals of the world. Therefore the Congress has a tremendous role to play in foreign affairs. We recognize and respect the constitutional principle as stated by the Supreme Court in 1936 in the famous Curtis-Wright case that it is the Executive Branch which is charged with initiating, formulating and spear-heading of foreign policy. But there also must be recognized these facts: (a) Congress' rightful control over the purse;

(b) the Senate's advice-and-consent feature in the Constitution and (c) the interplay between foreign and domestic affairs. Because of all of these factors, the Administration must view the Congress as a partner, rather than as an inferior and a subordinate.

Now, my friends, what are some of the basic propositions of international affairs on which most, if not all of us can agree. Here they are as I see them:

AMERICA MUST BE A LEADER AMONG NATIONS

1. America is and must remain a leader among the nations of the earth, economically, politically, and morally. Whether she likes it or not, this is her role; this is her destiny at this crucial stage in the affairs of western civilization. She cannot retreat, she cannot shirk her duties, she cannot crawl into a shell. The earth has been contracted. Time and space have been virtually annihilated by man's inventiveness and ingenuity.

We believe that we have been precipitated to leadership in order that the great freedoms of which this Nation is the exponent may radiate to all the peoples of earth, and that from these shores, may flow that understanding that will eventuate in world peace. It is not our function to suppress or oppress; it is our function to inspire and enlighten.

We must ever bear in mind that as the leader, it is not our function to meddle in the minutest problems with which we have no legitimate relation, nor is it our intent to enforce our way of life upon those peoples who are not yet ready for it or who do not desire it. We are, however, ready to bring light that the other peoples may find their own way. Later, I shall mention some of our other positive obligations.

WE MUST MOVE ON A GLOBAL CHESSBOARD

2. America must recognize that the whole world is our chessboard and as in a good chess game, we must carefully move all of the figures on it, bearing in mind the total result. The Russians are master chess players. Every single move which they make is integrated into a total pattern. They are masters at creating diversions, masters at feinting, masters at taking our eyes off the point where they will next take the aggressive. Let us match their skills in this global chess game.

THE MAJOR DANGER SPOTS

I particularly point out these danger spots:

(a) Iran, where Russian provocators, spies, and agents are fanning the flames of nationalism into a fury which gravely threatens western oil supplies and which may imperil the whole troubled Near East.

(b) Yugoslavia, where Red and Red satellite divisions maneuver at the borders. They await but the Moscow green light which will signal an invasion for the complete destruction of what has been called in Marxist lingo the heresy of Titoist deviationism.

(c) Eastern Germany, where well-trained Communist police units and other semimilitary and full military forces engage in maneuvers and in a war of nerves against virtually defenseless Western Germany.

And, of course, there are many other danger spots in addition to the Korean battlefront.

3. Now, before I leave the subject of Europe, let me point out that America must and will live up to her obligations under the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Pact. America must and will continue to set the example of keeping faith, but we must insist that keeping faith is a two-way street. We must provide the moral leadership that will bring about in those nations that we deal with a strengthening of will and purpose so as to carry out the policies—economic, military, political—mutually agreed upon. Let that be borne in mind when the omnibus aid bill comes to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee next month.

WE WANT NO MORE HISSES AND NO MORE YALTAS

American foreign policy must ever be based upon sound judgment. But there can be no sound judgment without consideration of all the facts, including facts as to the character and responsibility of those nations with which we deal.

The American representatives who shape our foreign policy must be sound—not wild—in their basic thinking and must not be inoculated with foreign isms. They must not be so foreign-minded that they have lost all sense of their basic American responsibility. We want no more Alger Hisses and no more Yaltas.

WE MUST IMPARTIALLY ANALYZE MAC ARTHUR SUGGESTIONS

4. Now, what about the Far East? Well, my friends, we on the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees must pursue our comprehensive and impartial investigation of the background of General MacArthur's dismissal. We must explore all the controversial points of the MacArthur program which, as you will recall, includes the following:

(a) Bombing of Manchurian bases, the nests where the rats propagate.

(b) Intensification of the economic blockade of Red China.

(c) Imposition of a full naval blockade of the Red Chinese coast.

(d) Removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of the Chinese and Manchurian coasts.

(e) Removal of the restrictions on the arming and use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops.

GOP IS NOT A WAR PARTY

5. Let me at this point state that I resent the slurs which have been cast against the Republican Party to the effect that it is allegedly a war party. I know that every patriotic Republican and for that matter, every patriotic Democrat, recognizes that American diplomats must move heaven and earth, so to speak, so as to prevent our involvement in a third world war.

You mothers, wives, and sweethearts know whereof I speak when I say that war will settle nothing, will solve nothing, will only bring on an endless train of more misery, more disease, more famine, more hatred which can only lead to more statism and still further war.

MOSCOW NOT PEIPING IS OUR REAL FOE

I believe that all segments of American society are agreed on the proposition that under no circumstances must we become involved in a perpetual land war on the Chinese mainland. We would be bled white by such a useless war but for that matter our life blood is being already drained right now in the Korean rice paddies—with no end to the bloodletting in sight.

Whether or not we can utilize Chinese Nationalist troops on the Korean Peninsula or on the mainland proper without further widening the war is the $64 question—the 154,000,000 American-life question.

We must never forget that Red China is not our basic foe; the Kremlin is our real antagonist. Let us keep our eye on the real ball.

I personally am very definitely inclined to feel, as does MacArthur, that Communist Russia will strike when she is good and ready; that is, when she is definitely convinced that victory lies within her grasp and not sooner.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that Russia's trigger finger may be "itching," as the old saying goes, and we certainly don't want the trigger to be pulled so as to explode into a third world war.

AMERICANS DISLIKE SMEARING OF MAC ARTHUR

Before I leave this general point on Asia, I want to say that the American people will tolerate no further smears of Douglas MacArthur. The American people resent the unjustified personal attacks which have been made upon this great hero. But at the same time the American people feel that this whole matter of indulging in personalities is unworthy of our position of leadership. MacArthur himself brilliantly set us an example of restraint and high principle.

Smearing of individuals may make headlines, but it doesn't make common sense and patriotism in a critical time like this or at any time.

SENATOR WILEY'S PROGRAM FOR A COUNTER-OFFENSIVE

One of the most important points of the MacArthur speech to the Congress was his thrilling appeal against a policy of defeatism. Basi in his whole approach was the concept that America cannot passively drift in the stormy seas of Asia. We must boldly seize the helm and direct the ship of state into a harbor of ultimate peace.

I should like to propose to you at this point elements in a program designed as a world-wide counteroffensive. You and I know that the best defense is still a strong offense. We recall the words of a legendary general in World War I who said in effect that his right flank was bending, his left flank was routed, and so he was advancing in the center.

No, my friends, I am not urging a war counteroffensive. I am urging a counteroffensive for peace. Let me therefore suggest the following points:

UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE UP WITH UN PROPOSED OFFENSIVE AGAINST MANCHURIA

(a) I urge the diplomats of our country to seize the offensive and boldly present to the United Nations, and in particular to our British ally, the reasons why so many of us feel that America cannot allow Manchuria to remain a "privileged sanctuary" which reinforces the Red offensive but which is immune to attack. Now, I do not feel that America can by herself initiate all of the policies which General MacArthur recommended. We went into Korea as but 1 of over 50 United Nations. The strategy which we adopt in Korea should be based on concurrence of those nations.

That definitely does not mean, however, that we should merely accept the doctrine of stalemate, which seems to be recommended by some of our allies—allies which incidentally have hardly done a proportionate share of the bleeding and the dying in Korea. On the contrary, let us boldly urge these hesitant allies to consider the need for strong action to bring the Korean fighting to a successful conclusion.

LET US FOSTER CHAOS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

(b) I urge that we seize the counter offensive by boldly stirring up the peoples in Soviet Russia and back of the iron curtain. I urge that we utilize every instrumentality, from hand grenades to "silver bullets" (that is, money), in order to create such a diversion in Joe Stalin's own bailiwick that his fears as to home front trouble will make him hesitate to engage in foreign combat.

We all recognize that Russia is an amalgamation of many diverse nationalities, cultures, and tongues, which unlike our own, have not been assimilated successfully. So, she offers a golden opportunity for us to apply the old Hitlerian technique of "divide and conquer" behind the iron curtain. There are in Russia tens of millions of sullen, restless, strongly nationalist peoples eager to create trouble for their enslavers. I am not urging that we arm them for immediate revolution. But it is, however, time that we gave the Russians some of their own vile medicine.

Let us ship behind the iron curtain quantities of bullets, guns, shells, so that we can cause sporadic outbursts which tie down Soviet and satellite divisions, so that when and if the time comes, there can be widespread guerrilla warfare behind the iron curtain.

LET US SELL THE AMERICAN WAY

(c) Perhaps the greatest single front on which we must seize the counteroffensive is the psychological, the spiritual front. For some reason, we Americans who have the greatest doctrine, the greatest product in the world, have become the poorest salesmen. The world cannot match our merchandising of soap, perfume, or mousetraps but when it comes to selling values which practically all of the two and a half billion of earth could recognize as the highest in the world, somehow we seem to shrink back. And so, I urge that the Congress step up the Voice of America and related information programs. I personally am not one to seek the dissipation of the taxpayers' funds but I am firmly convinced that by sound investment of our appropriations in the overseas information and presentation programs, we can reap a tremendous harvest of good will for our way of life.

POINT 4 HOLDS GREAT CONSTRUCTIVE POSSIBILITIES

One of the greatest points in our counteroffensive is to be found in the point 4 program for aid to underdeveloped areas. But my concept of that program differs considerably from that which has been implied by some administration spokesmen. Some of them have conceived of it as a universal "do good" plan which ends up by giving milk for hottentots whether they like or want milk or not and which pours billions into foreign dams, plants, etc. I say, however, that what we must basically export is the American private enterprise genius which has given us the greatest living standards of the world. We must seek to inject into the politics of foreign peoples the private enterprise "virus" in contrast to the state socialistic concepts which prevail in so many lands.

Now, my friends, I am not recommending that we export the American system of private enterprise intact to every foreign country. Obviously, these various lands are in different stages of development. Obviously, they have different cultural backgrounds, different geographic and economic needs. Let them adapt our system, but basically let them grasp the concept of freedom of enterprise, the concept of profit and loss. Let them understand the dangers of state confiscation.

Our diplomats must sell to foreign governments and peoples the concept that if nationals of America are going to invest their hard-earned money in another nation, they must have equality of protection for their investment. Our nationals must not be harassed or deprived of their life, liberty, or property abroad. We are not, of course, seeking to exploit any people. As Douglas MacArthur pointed out, the day of colonial imperialism is gone, and we say good riddance to it.

CONCLUSION

These then, are a few of the positive planks in a counteroffensive.

Well, I want again to express to you, my friends, my appreciation for your courteous attention and my congratulations on your splendid civic spirit. Good luck and good-by.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Plain Talk Wins People," from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of April 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN TALK WINS PEOPLE

Everywhere Douglas MacArthur goes, the people, by their attendance and their cheers underscore the colossal error Mr. Truman made in his abrupt treatment of the general.

This cavalier dismissal has been followed by speeches and statements by Mr. Truman and many of his advisers. The net effect is that every time one of the administration steps up to undo MacArthur, the administration suffers another setback.

The people are just not interested in having MacArthur smeared. It would be a good thing if the administration could appreciate as much. Then it would be less likely to make silly mistakes of the kind it has been making.

Another thing the administration might take into consideration is that the people are not falling for double talk about MacArthur. The announcement that the Joint Chiefs of Staffs concurred in MacArthur's dismissal is not an answer to his statement that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were agreed on the military principles he followed in Korea.

In short, the old-fashioned Washington gobbledy-gook has about run its course. The people liked that plain exposition of facts General MacArthur gave them. Anyone who wants to discuss foreign policy now will have to use facts and use them honestly. The people are just not interested in listening to a smear campaign.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one from the Commonweal for April 20, 1951, and the other from America, the National Catholic Weekly Review, for April 20, 1951, on the subject of the MacArthur controversy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Commonweal of April 20, 1951]

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In March 1945, a few days before the death of President Roosevelt, Robert Sherwood returned to this country from the Pacific theater of operations where he had made an inspection tour for the President, having been especially instructed to get General MacArthur's views on our future Pacific policy. When Sherwood, who said he was "enormously impressed" with the range of MacArthur's views on the Orient, made his report to Roosevelt, the President remarked: "I wish that he [MacArthur] would sometimes tell some of these things to me." So deeply suspicious of the democratic administration were MacArthur and his staff, that Sherwood said he found the unmistakable signs of "a persecution complex at work" in the MacArthur entourage.

In recent months General MacArthur chose to impose his private views on his Commander in Chief by means of a message to a veterans' convention, an unauthorized message and implied challenge to the Chinese commander in Korea, and a letter to the minority leader of the House. All told, one can only judge these actions to have been the behavior pattern of a man who put himself above the laws of courtesy and country.

MacArthur's opinion on Pacific policy—which is, that Asia is the decisive battlefield to be defended against the Communists and that therefore we should extend and not limit the Korean war—is an opinion totally in opposition to American foreign policy; in holding this opinion, MacArthur was defying the judgment of the President, the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Eisenhower, the majority of the United Nations, and the majority of the Congress. One may, if he is an admirer of the general believe that the general was acting in a democratic manner, in deference to the will of the majority and in the best interests of the principle we fight for, the principle of the "democratic way of life." But the burden of the proof is on him. This, it seems to us, was the behavior of a man in defiance of the majority, a man with a will-to-power that was contemptuous of the prevailing reason of the majority; this, in short, was the behavior of the self-appointed genius who always thinks he knows what is best for the ignorant masses and whose actions are in the pattern of history's long chronicle of dictators.

Maybe MacArthur was right; maybe he was of those rare and enlightened leaders destined to show mankind the way. Certainly he had reason to be restive, since he had been in a most difficult military position ever since the United Nations was forced to defend itself on the distant and disadvantageous Korean Peninsula.

But in our judgment MacArthur was disastrously wrong and we are of the opinion that the mystique of his enlightened leadership was a cult too jealously guarded by a selected group of admirers to be genuine. We consider MacArthur's policy to have been wrong for the following reasons:

First, we believe that in order to wage war now against the west, the Soviets must have the steel-making capacity of the Ruhr, or Japan, or both. Therefore western policy should be to prohibit Russia from the Ruhr and Japan by building up a defensive position in the free world with all haste, in the hope of stalemating the threat of a world war.

Second, we believe that in order to give us time to build these defenses, every effort should be made to limit the Korean war to Korea, because to bomb Manchuria means to bomb the rest of China eventually, and this in turn means that Russia will be forced to come to the direct aid of Mao Tse-tung. Since the United States cannot hope to defeat the Communists through nonatomic air power alone (we could not destroy the North Korean Army with air power, nor can we destroy the Chinese Armies now, even though we have had absolute control of the air), we would, then, following MacArthur's strategy, have to send our armies into the futile and bloody trap of a land war in Asia. Were this to happen, Russia would have accomplished her desire to spread and thin out our nonatomic air and land forces around the world to a point of such overextension that it is doubtful whether western arms could be supreme in any one theater of war.

Third, since it is possible that under such circumstances the great powers will resort to atomic warfare (especially if the rumored atomic artillery shells are a reality), we believe that it is the moral obligation of Christians first to exhaust every possible means of averting this unspeakable massacre, and one of those means right now is to limit the war to Korea, making every effort to discharge our moral obligation to defend the United Nations there without provoking further conflict.

Fourth, we believe that the present foreign policy of the Administration is essentially correct in its European emphasis and in its combined objective of defense and negotiation. This policy is by far a better hope for an honorable peace than the swaggering belligerency of MacArthur.

In his last attempts to dictate the far eastern foreign policy of this country and of the United Nations, General MacArthur clearly exceeded his authority and, in defying the normal processes of the democratic code, he placed himself outside the cause and the ideology we are trying to defend; he in fact brought on his own dismissal. Surely the President acted with sincere regret, as he has said. But certainly his decision was for the common good; it was, we believe, the only decision he could have taken in the interests of discharging his responsibility to the country and to all those throughout the world who look to us now for a reasonable example of leadership.

In a very real sense Mr. Truman could only afford to make this decision trusting in the ability of his countrymen to weigh the facts impartially; if the MacArthur partisans choose to attack Mr. Truman as wildly as we anticipate they will, then we believe that those who support the President in this matter have every good reason to stand by him now and thus vindicate the high trust he has placed in them.

[From the National Catholic Weekly Review of April 20, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last great debate on United States foreign policy.

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The general, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The General wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the general argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief that the U. S. S. R. will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the west, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical Air Force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last great debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of insuring their security.

Why Dispersal Was Shelved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Dispersal Was Shelved," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, 1951. The editorial gives a clear answer to why many Senators voted against the dispersal bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DISPERSAL WAS SHELVED

Defeat of the dispersal-decentralization program in the Senate cannot fairly be attributed to a head-in-the-sand attitude toward the atomic bomb on the part of opponents of the plan. If there was confusion in Congress over the real purpose of the bill, the blame rests largely on those who sponsored it. There was good cause for suspicion at the Capitol that the whole dispersal idea was related only indirectly to atomic security—that the primary object was to provide more space for new Government employees and agencies rather than to save the Government from destruction if A-bombs started to fall.

The suspicion was fed by the nature of the dispersal plan itself. It is true that several defense offices were scheduled to be moved to the satellite Federal office centers skirting the National Capital, but so were a number of agencies which would have little or no part in taking over the Government in event of an atomic catastrophe. And, as some senatorial critics of the plan pointed out, placing some Federal offices only 20 miles from the zero milestone would not guarantee safety—especially if the Russians should succeed in developing a hydrogen bomb. Moreover, the main centers of Federal activity, the really vital spots of the executive establishment, were to remain right inside the target zone in Washington.

Testimony during the hearings indicated that some Federal officials were more concerned with making room in the District of Columbia for the expanding Government than with preparing defenses against atomic attacks. One way of relieving the growing congestion, of course, would be to launch a genuine retrenchment program for nonessential activities, as Senator BYRD, the Hoover Commission, and others have urged. But that alternative does not seem to have been given very serious thought by Federal authorities.

Decentralization—the removal of some agencies to distant cities—was plainly at variance with the fundamental plan for establishing the seat of Government in the District of Columbia. Decentralization, as proposed in the shelved bill, was almost wholly a space-making expedient, not a security project. Decentralization for such a purpose should be a last resort. As the Star has said before, there are still Federal-owned sites within the District where new offices could be built.

The prospect of spending more than $100,000,000 on a program which would offer little assurance of security in event of all-out atomic warfare was not appealing at a time when the need for drastic economy is as urgent as it is today. This prospect, coupled with the understandable reluctance of nearby areas to having the Federal Government take more land off the tax rolls, had much to do with the scuttling of the plan by the Senate yesterday. Until the administration comes forward with more convincing evidence of the urgent need for dispersal and decentralization, and more proof of the defense value of so costly an enterprise, Congress may be excused for failing to show any enthusiasm for the program.

Statement by Erle Cocke, Jr., on the Sixth Anniversary of the Meeting of the Russian and United States Troops at the Elbe River, April 25, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, on the sixth anniversary of the meeting of the Russian and United States troops at the River Elbe on April 25, 1945.

I may add that this statement is being broadcast by the Voice of America in 87 different languages today. It seems a most excellent statement on the friendship of the people of America for the people of Russia.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. By a strange coincidence, and one which has some significance, it is also the anniversary of the

adoption of the United Nations charter at San Francisco.

Mr. BREWSTER. A very happy coincidence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ERLE COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON THE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEETING OF THE RUSSIAN AND UNITED STATES TROOPS AT THE ELBE RIVER, APRIL 25, 1945

SIX years ago today two brave armies met at the Elbe River in Germany and in common cause, grasped hands in friendship.

Russian soldiers and American soldiers defeated nazism—the common enemy of 1945—but the high hopes of peace have been dashed since that memorable day.

In six short years the Stalinist regime, by its military and political aggression, has extended its control to the point where today, 37 out of every 100 people in the world are under the domination of the Soviet Politburo. The regime that rules one-fifth of the earth's surface controls one third of its living.

But the cause for which the Russian soldier fought—the extinction of Nazi-Fascism—has turned upon him, and today a cynical leadership would have him believe that western democracy and American ideals of freedom are even worse than Hitlerism.

Surely 6 years do not change the common man. Only the despot can twist facts to fit his warped mind.

The Russian soldier who clasped the hand of his American comrade-in-arms on the Elbe is, fundamentally the same soldier today.

The American soldier who returned that firm handclasp of friendship has not changed.

The ideology of the United States has not changed. It still calls for a free man in a free world.

But the Kremlin, having tasted victory—a victory that was won not by despotism, but by men who valued freedom, would now have those same friends turn about and declare that handclasp on the Elbe was an empty gesture.

Today in the United States, the friends of fighters for Russian freedom has dedicated itself to friendship for the Russian people in their long struggle against Stalinist slavery.

The American Legion welcomes this group and endorses its anti-Stalinist crusade.

The friends of fighters for Russian freedom has undertaken to tell the Russian people that we make a clear distinction between them and their slave-masters. They, like the American Legion, would have the truth permeate beyond the iron curtain and reach the minds of ordinary Russians.

Let no one think this cannot be done. It is part of Stalin's invincibility myth to say that one cannot reach the Russian people.

We know that the American people are, as they have been in the past, the steadfast friends of the Russian people. Our fight is with the despotic rulers now directing Soviet policy. That, too, is the aim of the friends of fighters for Russian freedom.

On behalf of millions of American veterans, the American Legion reaffirms its solidarity with former comrades-in-arms of the Soviet army who still look forward to the achievement in Russia of those basic freedoms and human rights without which there can be no peace and for which Americans and Russians died.

(Above statement endorsed by commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars; national commander of AMVETS; and national commander of DAV.)

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Sixtieth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in Constitution Hall in this city on April 18, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your great patriotic organization, during all its history, has exerted a powerful influence for sound Americanism.

You have always combated the godless ideologies which would destroy our country.

You have proudly proclaimed the glories of the flag and the greatness of our Republic.

You have been an unconquered bulwark in defense of the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

While others slept, the Daughters of the American Revolution have kept the watch over the ramparts of freedom.

America has never been a country for an easy way of life. It is a land of opportunity, but it calls upon its sons and daughters for courage, self-reliance, hard work, and sacrifice.

Fortunately, those who settled America were sturdy, self-reliant men and women. They had stout hearts and deep convictions. They braved the perils and the hardships of the New World because they loved liberty.

They wanted freedom to worship in the manner which would bring them closest to God. They wanted the right to speak freely and without fear. They wanted the right to take part in their Government.

They didn't look to the Government for security. They did not demand grants, loans, subsidies, or hand-outs. All they asked was freedom and opportunity.

With faith founded upon deep religious convictions, they started to carve out of the wilderness the outlines of advancing civilization on the American Continent.

Their tools were the ax, the rifle, and the Bible—each a true symbol of the elements which have contributed to the greatness of our country.

The ax represents hard work and thrift.

The rifle symbolizes courage and sacrifice in the defense of our high ideals.

The Bible is the truth, the foundation of our Government, the inspiration and guide to justice, righteousness, and peace.

It is not necessary to go into the history of our growth and progress before this splendid audience.

You know the story of our colonial development, of the rising resistance to tyranny, culminating in the ringing declaration that these Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

You have followed the fortunes of the patriots of our independence from Lexington and Concord to the discouragement and cruel suffering at Valley Forge and the final triumph at Yorktown.

The sacred ideals for which our forefathers fought were given expression in the Constitution of the United States, the oldest written Constitution in the world. The far-sighted statesmen who gathered in Independence Hall in the summer of 1787 wanted a form of government that recognized freedom of the individual as God's greatest gift to mankind.

Their whole plan of government was to give men opportunity. Under that system we have made marvelous progress in less than 200 years.

A trackless wilderness has been converted into fertile lands and splendid cities. Great transportation systems and giant industries have been created. Thousands of small businesses have been established, forming the strong backbone of our economy.

Hospitals, educational institutions, research foundations and centers of art and music have been established. More than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and temples have been erected, with a membership exceeding 77,000,000, free to worship as their conscience dictates.

In 200 years we have developed our skills and resources until we enjoy more of the good things of life than any other people on earth.

We have attained the highest cultural level and the highest living standards of any nation in the world.

We are now without question, because of our know-how and our mastery of science, the greatest Nation of all history.

Yet in spite of all these blessings we have reached a time of desperate challenge.

As you well know, our country is confronted, at this moment, with dangers that could destroy our system of free government and the American way of life.

I have no fear that destruction will be brought upon us at the hands of Communist aggressors. I do not fear that the power of a foreign foe will ever destroy this great Republic.

No, my fellow Americans, that is not the greatest danger.

I am convinced that the greatest danger is within our own borders. It lurks among our own people. It is the danger that Lincoln warned against when he said:

At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide.

Today we are confronted with the danger of unsound fiscal policies, unbalanced budgets, excessive taxation and a staggering burden of debt, produced by the waste and extravagance at all levels of government.

These are the real causes of inflation which has robbed the American dollar of its purchasing power.

They point the way to national bankruptcy, which means the destruction of all freedom of the individual.

We are threatened by Government paternalism, which would concentrate complete authority under the dictatorship of an all-powerful socialistic state.

We have the danger from the insidious infiltration of Communists and other subversive elements in our schools and colleges, labor organizations and churches and even into high places in the Government.

Yes, these are dangers that we must guard against, but in my humble opinion, the most pressing danger we face is the weakening of the moral fiber of our people.

That condition grows out of a lack of understanding that a strong moral and spiritual America is the source and foundation of all our national strength.

It has come upon us because too many of our people have neglected or ignored the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. They have forgotten that as Americans we share obligations as well as rights and privileges.

The result has been greatly increased law evasion, tax dodging, and racketeering. It has brought about corrupt partnerships between public officials and the criminal underworld.

The Kefauver committee has disclosed that organized gambling syndicates take $20,000,000,000 a year from the American people by their illegal operations. That is four times as much as we spend for education. It is seven times as much as we give to our churches.

That is a terrible situation. But a greater evil is the political power gained by racketeers and gangsters by corrupting public officials, sworn to support and enforce the law.

In some communities they have built up such powerful strength in both political parties, that they have become an invisible government in city halls and courthouses.

These are the termites that are undermining the foundations of free government.

The soldier cannot move forward effectively, the pilot cannot maneuver his plane as skillfully and the gunner on his ship cannot aim as well if they realize that men back home are evading the law, living easy lives through dishonesty and corruption.

Neither can the mechanic or the farmer produce as much if he knows that a part of his production goes to the listless, the profiteer, the grafter, and the traitor to our country.

In all the sordid story of crime and corruption the most shocking chapter reveals that men in high places in the Government have betrayed the responsibilities entrusted to them.

It tells of men who were morally blinded by selfishness and greed in their desire for quick riches. It describes how they abandoned all honorable standards and pursued a course dictated by political influence, favoritism, and bribery.

And most shameful of all, in my opinion, is the refusal of President Truman to drive out of the Government those whose questionable, if not illegal conduct, has shaken public confidence in his administration.

Perhaps the explanation can be found in the statement of former Democratic Governor M. E. Thompson, of Georgia, when he resigned a week ago as consultant in the Office of Price Stabilization.

Former Governor Thompson resigned in disgust because he had been on the payroll for 12 weeks at $53.48 a day, without having anything to do.

During that time he had plenty of opportunity to observe what was going on. Listen to what he said, and I quote:

"I refuse to be a parasite on the American taxpayers.

"Thousands of loyal Americans," he continued, "are giving unselfishly of their time to defense work, but their efforts are being nullified by the indecision, bungling, and interference of scheming politicians who are motivated solely by their desire to stay in power. The American people are being victimized by a national conspiracy of mediocrity.

"Conditions existing in the national administration are so deplorable today that loyalty to party and patriotism to country constitute a conflict."

Let me say now that when such conditions are created, whether by Republicans or Democrats, our Government is in danger. Party loyalty should cease and real Americanism should assert itself.

Yes, I repeat, the most pressing danger we face is the weakening of the moral fiber of our people.

What is responsible for the critical international situation facing the United States today?

Fundamentally it can be traced to the lack of moral leadership in our appeasement of Communist Russia.

The first fatal step was taken in 1933 when we recognized the Soviet gangster government.

In a speech at Chicago in 1941 ex-President Hoover denounced that action in the words which I now quote:

"Four American Presidents and four Secretaries of State, beginning with Woodrow Wilson, refused to have anything to do with Soviet Russia on the ground of morals and democratic ideals.

"They refused diplomatic recognition. They did so because here is one of the bloodiest tyrannies and terrors ever erected in history. It destroyed every semblance of human rights and human liberty; it is a militant destroyer of the worship of God. It brutally executes millions of innocent people without the semblance of justice. It has enslaved the rest. Moreover it has violated every international covenant, it has carried on a world conspiracy against all democracies, including the United States."

Following World War II the leaders of our Nation sat down with the cut-throats of Moscow and entered into secret conspiracies that enslaved millions of freedom-loving people who looked to the United States for liberty, justice, and the right of self-government.

One by one the small nations of Europe were swallowed up behind the iron curtain—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and part of Finland.

Then came the betrayal of China, loyal friend of the United States for a hundred years, who relied upon us to maintain her independence and national integrity.

Yes; it was the lack of moral leadership that permitted us to enter into these unholy agreements to betray the freedom-loving people of these countries. We abandoned the traditional and time-honored American principles of justice, freedom, and decency under the influence of such traitors as Alger Hiss.

The confused and irresponsible actions of the present administration have spread doubt and anxiety among the American people.

They are worried about the conflict in Korea, where we have already suffered nearly 60,000 casualties.

They are worried because we seem to have no plan.

They have no confidence in the judgment and the integrity of some of the men who have grave responsibilities and exercise great influence and power in our Government.

They have no confidence in the hasty midnight decision which ordered our soldiers into the so-called "police action" in Korea.

And the events of the past week have clearly demonstrated that they have no confidence in the hasty, midnight decision which dismissed that great soldier and patriotic American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Again I say it all stems from a lack of moral leadership at the head of our Government.

Regardless of whatever justification the President may have thought he had—it was a brutal, irresponsible and uncalled for procedure against one of the greatest Americans who has given a lifetime of distinguished, heroic, and patriotic service to his country.

When the history of our time is recorded General MacArthur will be remembered as more than a great soldier. He will be honored as much more than one of our most brilliant military leaders.

His fame will rest equally upon his greatness as a statesman and as a diplomat.

The highest praise will be accorded his wisdom and keen understanding which won the respect and confidence of a conquered people and was winning millions of people in the Far East to the American way of life.

The most ardent hope that fills the hearts of men and women today is the hope for peace in the world, with honor, justice, and freedom.

To achieve peace we must be strong—financially, militarily, industrially—and most important we must set an example to the world of clean, decent, honest living, based on the highest moral and spiritual standards.

We must obey the laws of God and man.

Each of us must do his or her share to make the world of tomorrow a better world, but we must begin by making ourselves better people.

If we put our own house in order we can overcome the forces of evil.

We can achieve victory if we stamp out selfishness and greed and return to the moral principles, the patriotism, the courage and the faith in God that guided your ancestors in their struggle for American independence.

The Age of Government Benevolence and Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Gimme' Age," published in the Meaford Express, of Meaford, Ontario, November 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "GIMME" AGE

(By Joseph Lister Rutledge)

This has become the age of "gimme," in which most issues are subordinated to the overwhelming importance of the hand-out. It has come to be that right and justice and integrity and intelligence must give way before the expanding demands of this group and that. Bit by bit, we are watching the deterioration of peoples whose great traditions have been independence and self-respect. But sadder than that is the fact that we are all active participants in the change. We must say "yes" to every insistent demand; offering in return for political advantage generous slices of that mythical pie from the sky. Anyone who stands up to protest that there is an end to all benevolence, and that end is where benevolence paralyzes the abilities and integrities of a people, is derided as a reactionary. But, thinking soberly, we know that we can't all have everything we want. We know we can't provide cradle to grave security, minimum work hours, soaring wages, and endless featherbedding, both political and social. Still we promise it, hoping that some miracle will save us. What happened to some of the promises already made? Nothing. They did not materialize, that is all. The advantage gained, they were forgotten, or the failure was blamed on someone else.

The sad point of all this is not so much that we have failed in some impossible benefactions. It is that we have come to believe that the great man, the great organization, the great government, is the one that would promise the most. Years ago the soldiers who gathered about the Italian patriot Garibaldi shouted at him: "What will you give us if we follow you?" The great leader faced them sternly. "I'll give you wounds and sickness and suffering and death. But I'll give you, with them, the freedom of Italy." But we—we offer nothing but the full stomach, the lax muscles, the stifled heart. We

have nothing to offer to the mind and the spirit that once led men to achievement; nothing to support the belief that any sacrifice is worth while that leaves us free, standing on our own feet, thinking our own thoughts and obligated to no one but ourselves. We talk of "the good life." But what we mean is the ample life—more free benefits, more free time, more free protection. And for what? That there may be better men and women, better education, better hearts, better homes? Nothing of the kind. Just material things. Not a word about wounds and suffering and the achievement of freedom. Only the slow attrition of hunger satisfied without effort, of security achieved without sacrifice, of production at the sweat of no man's brow. That was not the way that this or any country was born. That is not the way any free country survives.

Improvement in Business Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Buying Spree Ended in March, Department of Commerce Reports." It calls attention to the fact that because of our large production and because of lessened consumer buying, conditions in the various industries of the country are much better.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUYING SPREE ENDED IN MARCH, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REPORTS

The big consumer buying spree of early 1951 halted in March, the Commerce Department reported yesterday. But the Department warned that this "moderation of the inflationary movement" was offset by a rising threat of inflation from another quarter—business firms, plans to invest record sums in new plant and equipment this year.

The threat of a business spending spree was pictured by the agency as making further Government controls or other counter-inflationary action necessary, although some makers of autos and other consumer goods are now cutting output and laying off workers.

In its April Survey of Current Business, the Department commented:

"It is clear that further action—whether this takes the form of direct controls or monetary and fiscal measures, or both—will be required to insure the channeling of sufficient resources for defense purposes and to avoid inflationary excesses."

"In such a period," the Department publication continued, "Government policy must be directed toward curtailing that part of investment (by business in new buildings and machines) as well as consumption not essential to the mobilization effort."

Discussing the slow-down in consumer buying, the Department said March retail sales dropped 5 percent below the preceding month after allowance for seasonable factors. The decline centered in used cars, television sets, household appliances, clothing, and general merchandise.

Compared with March 1950, last month's sales were up 11 percent in dollar volume at a total of $12,620,000,000 but the Department declared the 11-percent rise was "practically all" accounted for by higher prices.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 15, 1951, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the junior Senator from Washington were guests of the Columbia Broadcasting System on its People's Platform program. This program was broadcast nationally, and apparently aroused a considerable amount of interest among those who listened. Many citizens from different areas in the Nation have written to me to say they heard some or all of the program. It was on this program that I suggested that consideration should be given by the Congress to legitimatizing the undeclared war in Korea by declaring war on those enemies who have been fighting against our free forces since June of 1950. A number of persons have written and wanted to know exactly what was said by the Senator from Connecticut and myself on the subject of war. In order to satisfy these requests, and in order that other Members of the Congress may have available to them what was said by the Senator from Connecticut and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Once again the Columbia Broadcasting System presents the People's Platform with Dwight Cooke. "Is the President or General MacArthur right? Is our policy in China sound?" These are the provocative questions highlighting the discussion between two national leaders today on the People's Platform. They are United States Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington. Now for the informal debate on the Korean crisis, here is Chairman Dwight Cooke. Mr. Cooke.

Mr. COOKE. Usually on the People's Platform I start out by giving a slight summary and reiteration of the events which have led up to the subject we're going to discuss on given day. Certainly this is one day when there's no need to do any looking back; everybody remembers the dismissal of General MacArthur, the statement of the President in his speech to the country, various statements coming out of Tokyo, MacArthur's headquarters, and the President's political speech last night. So, sitting on my right and left here on the People's Platform, are two eminent Senators of the two parties, so we will get to work.

Senator BENTON, also a former assistant Secretary of State, I think I'll start with you. What is you opinion on the MacArthur controversy?

Senator BENTON. I'd like to take that question first on a highly personal standpoint. I learned yesterday that General MacArthur is going to become a resident of my State, Connecticut, he's going to settle in Stamford. I think I can safely say he becomes our most famous import. Indeed, Senator, he rivals in fame our most famous export, Secretary Acheson, or even Katherine Hepburn or Gene Tierney. In fact I think he can be said to rival the export of Fuller brushes for which my State is known throughout the country. Could you give me any information, because this will be important to me personally, on whether you think the Republican Party is going to view General MacArthur as an outstanding Presidential candidate.

Senator CAIN. BILL BENTON, I shall always, sir, like to help you personally——

Senator BENTON. Well, thank you.

Senator CAIN. With reference to General MacArthur. He is coming back not to talk politics but to talk with his country about what has and has not taken place in recent months in Korea

Senator BENTON. It is wholly possible that this brilliant, able man against his great career however may interest himself, if not immediately in the question of politics; that the politicians of both parties will be exceedingly interested in hearing. You know, I'm running next year for the Senate in my State. The Republicans haven't selected a candidate yet to run against me. If you don't think he may loom and emerge as a Presidential candidate, my personal interest could be great; he might emerge as a candidate for the Senate and he would be a great ornament to the Senate.

Senator CAIN. Again, William, we have not come to New York today to talk about the personal fortunes of a personal friend of mine. Both parties will be interested in Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And the President of the United States has recently made of General MacArthur a free citizen to do as he wishes.

Senator BENTON. I welcome this distinguished new acquisition to Stamford, Conn. I think perhaps I will answer your question at a different level, Mr. Cooke. Perhaps the difference between Senator CAIN and me on this controversy can be best expressed after reading Senator CAIN's able speech on the floor of the Senate on Friday by my stating that I disagree with him and with General MacArthur on the proposed China policy. It seems to me that General MacArthur wants to get us in what he hopes will be a nice easy war with China and then perhaps into a quick war with Russia, which is a grave risk involved, in order to end the war in Korea.

Senator CAIN. Dwight Cooke, I deny that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has any interest whatsoever in getting this great Nation of ours and our allies into a larger war. Let us not forget that 9 months ago in June of 1950, 53 so-called free nations resolved to make of Korea a free, united, and self-controlled nation. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, first on November 28, following the avalanche of the Red hordes from the north, and secondly on March 7, 1951, merely said to America, to all of our allies and to the world that as yet the free nations of this world have not joined collectively together with power sufficient to carry out the mission which was imposed upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur in June of last year. As I read and listened and thought about our President's speech of Wednesday of last week, he was saying for all the world to hear, and we in this country must make up our minds to agree or disagree, that America's mission and the mission of the United Nations in Korea has changed tremendously and completely from what it was 9 months ago.

Senator BENTON. Senator CAIN, the big thing that we were after in Korea, it seems to me, has been achieved short of military victory. The first big thing we were after was to make out of the United Nations a strong, active, vital potential force in world affairs. If we had not moved into Korea as we did last June, I think the United Nations would have been relegated and in all possibility permanently into a kind of polite debating society or merely a platform for the Russian propaganda attacks upon us. Our action in Korea has demonstrated to the Russians and their allies or satellites the potential resistance any place in the world where aggression breaks out. That's the big thing that has so far been achieved in Korea. That in itself is a psychological victory.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, that is not what we said we were going to Korea to attempt to accomplish. We were going to Korea to repel and chase out the enemy. We have done no such thing. The President of the United States, on Wednesday last, said that power sufficient to undertake and accomplish our mission are not to be given, first to General MacArthur, and now to his successor, Lt. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway. Instead of repelling the aggressor as was our determination 9 months ago, we, through the words of the President, have decided to resist the aggressor, and it's this American's point of view that if all the collective forces of free men everywhere can only resist an aggressor in Korea, they are foredoomed to annihilation and to defeat and to just being wiped off this earth when it comes to a larger war against communism in other and large battle areas.

Senator BENTON. Senator CAIN, let me break in right there. I don't believe we're going to settle these grave and difficult problems and these grave political questions by military conquest alone. The military conquest——

Senator CAIN. I agree.

Senator BENTON. What we're after in Korea is a means to a larger end, which is the collective peace and security not only of the people of the United States but of the free nations of the world. Now you have an element of political judgment on General MacArthur's recommendations on the naval operation—the Chiang Kai-shek operation, the air bombing of the China coast. That is an important political decision as well as a military decision.

Senator CAIN. I agree.

Senator BENTON. Now, you have the four Joint Chiefs of Staff, who seem to differ with General MacArthur, you have the President, you have the leaders in England, in France, in other countries of the world. With all respect to the general's great military talent, at the political level the potential consequences of this Chinese action I would like to suggest that it looks as if everybody's out of step except General MacArthur, Senator CAIN, and Senator TAFT.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, I think that is not a correct thing for you to say. What General MacArthur did on two occasions or more occasions in Korea was to raise some questions—he merely asked the United Nations to make some firm decisions either, to use a slang expression, to "put up" the forces they said last June they would put up or to "shut up" against their own inferred intention of doing nothing further in Korea to expel and repel the invader. I think that Gen. Douglas MacArthur did his Nation and the free world a great favor in asking all of us, Where are we headed? The President of the United States the other night said we are headed this way: "We are going to negotiate a peace in due time with the enemy." The presumption is on the enemy's terms. Korea, which we set out to make free, united, and self-controlled is to continue to be a battleground of frustration and futility because the great forces of freedom have decided they do not have strength sufficient to their undertaking.

Senator BENTON. There's nothing in the record of the evidence anywhere to indicate any thought of any negotiation making peace on the enemy's terms. You couldn't. It is that fear, it is that thought in the hearts of many of our fellow countrymen that lie at the root of part of our grave and deep disagreement——

Senator CAIN. That's quite right.

Senator BENTON. Today in the field of foreign policy.

Senator CAIN. Well, Senator——

Senator BENTON. And on behalf of the President and our leaders in the State Department and on behalf of our British allies, I would deny that thought. Now, to carry that a step further, we have got to reach a point when we try to get a general settlement with the Communists. There's no doubt. Churchill puts it by telling us, as you on the Military Affairs Committee know, to get strong and then negotiate. But there must be a time when we will negotiate if we're going to avoid this world war III.

Senator CAIN. Senator BILL BENTON, permit me to disagree with you for this fundamental reason: For approximately 9 months the mission of the United Nations was to repel and chase out the aggressor if they could while giving evidence always of a desire to sit down and negotiate a reasonable peace. On Wednesday of last week the President of the United States said we are only going to attempt to resist from now on. And against that new characterization or definition of what we're going to do in Korea, the enemy need be in no hurry; he knows our forces aren't going to attempt to go anywhere and the presumption is that we're not going to get enough power to go anywhere, and so that enemy can sit back, continue to fight a war of attrition, keep on nibbling at the peace table until we free powers are required to accept terms that we wouldn't have thought tenable or possible nine short months ago.

Senator BENTON. These are very complicated questions. Your high praise of General Ridgway on the floor of the Senate, Friday afternoon, and the great confidence you had in him, seem to me to be inconsistent with the certainty with which you now prophesy what his military movements are going to be in Korea.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, there is no connection between the two. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, like his predecessor, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, are two of the great fighting generals this world has ever known. But Matthew Bunker Ridgway will have imposed upon him the same decisions of frustration and futility which led to the removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Senator BENTON. So your answer for that is, Let us start the big war right now.

Senator CAIN. I've said no such thing.

Mr. COOKE. Let's get this clear both ways, gentlemen. Senator CAIN, first what is your proposal from here on in the Korean War?

Senator CAIN. I think it is nothing short of this—the President of the United States, the large political leaders of all the free nations of the world collected as they are now at Lake Success, talk constantly and insistently about collective security. Fifty-three nations started out to win first the police action in Korea, and now the war—for the President called it a war the other day—but after 9 months of war 14 nations out of 53 nations have contributed as many as 1 foot soldier to that contest. Now we're not going anywhere for freedom, we're not going anywhere in the direction of victory unless we make collective security what it implies, a "large sacrifice and participation from each and every one of the 53 free nations of the world." That's my answer to the President's speech of the other night—let us do what we say and mean what we intended to do 9 months ago.

Mr. COOKE. And, in the meantime, Senator CAIN, when would you bomb in Manchuria or in China?

Senator CAIN. I would have given to the Supreme Commander—months ago, in November—the authority to bomb the enemy supply lines wherever he thought that tactically and strategically necessary in order to save American lives. I would place in the hands, were I the authority and I'm not, of General Ridgway that same authority. But I in part think the question is academic because if the President's prophecy of the other night comes true that the mass offensive, which the President said was being mobilized north of the Yalu River, is launched on our limited forces, then in self-defense General Ridgway and his men of all these nations must retaliate with everything they've got if they wish to live, and that can only come through bombing the supply and communication lines of the enemy in Manchuria.

Mr. COOKE. There, Senator BENTON, is one side of a foreign policy, what would be your proposal instead.

Senator BENTON. I share wholly Senator CAIN's desire to create a world where we can have collective—what he calls collective security; that, of course, is what we're after in our Korean action. The Korean action symbolizes the effort and hope of the United Nations to take a vast step forward toward collective security.

Now, I'm going to—this is very serious and difficult material we're discussing here. Most of our allies in the United Nations, most of our allies in Europe, disagree with the course of action advocated by General MacArthur and Senator CAIN; these are people not without experience with China and the Orient. I would like at the risk of perhaps some of our listeners thinking I am treating a serious, desperate subject where lives are at stake and where our boys are right today this very minute being killed in Korea, but even at the risk of some people thinking I'm treating it with levity, I would like to tell you and Senator CAIN a little story that perhaps illustrates why I think my policy is the policy of hope, why General MacArthur and Senator CAIN's policy is a policy that may precipitate us into the third war, which otherwise we can hope to avoid.

Senator CAIN. Please give us the story, William.

Mr. COOKE. May I interrupt. Before you give us the story, Senator BENTON, your policy—just a little more clarity on that; instead of an augumentation of the war in the Far East the center of your policy would be what?

Senator BENTON. Well, we have three other approaches to foreign policy as Senator CAIN knows full well out of his membership of the Armed Services Committee over and above military force. Mr. Paul Hoffman, recently retired as the head of the ECA, has written a very brilliant and able book, which is now running in the newspapers of the country, in installments, dealing in large part with these other approaches other than force to foreign policy. Mr. Hoffman's book points out that force alone cannot conquer, or when we have conquered, can't do the job for us. We must have strong economic policy, a good illustration of that is the Marshall plan and point 4; we must have a far stronger information and propaganda policy than ever created or conceived thus far by the State Department. And, of course, we must continue our diplomatic efforts and pressure at the highest level to strengthen the United Nations to achieve collective security.

Senator CAIN. Will you permit me to interject, Senator BILL BENTON, you just said

something very interesting—"We must continue our pressures at the highest level." What we, who are concerned with men who die now in Korea, want to do are to exert some powers at the foot of the ladder through men who were fighting. And let me draw to his attention, Senator BENTON's attention, and everybody else who is concerned—that, look, BILL BENTON——

Senator BENTON. Well, let me tell you my story——

Senator CAIN. I will. Your story comes next—on Korea—that after 9 months of war 52 free nations in terms of collective security about which you hope we're going to have some day, have not collectively contributed as many foot soldiers to the mud and the misery and the bloodshed of Korea as America has lost in casualties. That's why my eye is on that Yalu River in anticipation of the great tragedy which is likely to result from this mass offensive the President told us about the other night and for which, sir, we are not only not prepared today, we are giving no intention of becoming prepared, and I think it a great pity.

Senator BENTON. Senator CAIN, you may have been on the floor of the Senate at the time of the outbreak of the Korean invasion when I was the first to demand that soldiers from other nations be immediately sent into Korea to join our own boys in Korea. * * * that we do not have at this time greater forces but we've got to remember we sent General Eisenhower to Europe to build up the forces there.

Senator CAIN. Is there a war going on in Europe today?

Senator BENTON. We've got to remember that the British, in the Straits Settlements—you know the figures better than I do—the French in Indochina do have detachments of soldiers and the French fighting in Indochina as we are in Korea roughly comparable to our own detachments in Korea.

Senator CAIN. That's right.

Senator BENTON. Now, in other words, that again illustrates the fact that we are in an area where progress is not coming as rapidly as we want it to come and on that you and I agree.

I may say, Senator CAIN, in line with your suggestion and before your suggested approach to the China question and General MacArthur's before I tell my story, which I'm afraid I'm over-building, I wonder why you or some other distinguished Republican leader in the Senate doesn't introduce a resolution unto the floor of the Senate calling for this war against China instead of more or less keeping ourselves behind the brass or the leadership or the ideas of General MacArthur. We've been saying on the floor of the Senate that we in Congress have the power to declare war.

Senator CAIN. Right.

Senator BENTON. And not the President.

Senator CAIN. All right.

Senator BENTON. Well, if we want war with China, why don't you get it out in the open and put in a resolution and call for the declaration of war on China instead of going at it in this backward way through General MacArthur.

Senator CAIN. Look, nobody is going at anything in a backward way. It was only on Wednesday, a couple of nights ago, in the middle of last week, that the President of the United States for the first time ever said that the United States and the United Nations were involved in a war in Korea. After 60,000 Americans had been killed, injured, or lost in action, the President of the United States continued to characterize that amazingly large conflict as being a police action.

Now, this Senator, is giving thought to a question and he is not acting with the speed and the rapidity and without the authority with which the President acted last June. I think because of what the President said last week that there is good and sound reason on Tuesday of next week, which is after the week end is over and a lot of people have thought about it, for a resolution to be offered in the Senate of the United States declaring war in Korea against all of the enemies of the United Nations fighting either in Korea or using contiguous and adjacent territories from which to launch attacks against men who, because we've done nothing in 9 months to destroy the build-up of those attacks, are too defenseless—I intend to make such a resolution to move to focus again public opinion on this question to find out not only where we are, BILL BENTON, but where in God's name are we going.

Senator BENTON. In line with your view, Senator CAIN, that's the frank, courageous, candid approach and it gets it out in the open on the floor of the Senate. And if it means the big war and starting a big war now—I, of course, will oppose your resolution.

Now I'm going to tell you my story.

Senator CAIN. Ah, but before you do that——

Senator BENTON. No, no, no, no, * * * that I postponed this story too long, this is the story——

Senator CAIN. Well, keep this story on Korea and we're for it. All of us.

Senator BENTON. This is the story that illustrates why I think there is more hope in my policy than in General MacArthur's policy. It's a story about an Oriental despot. This Oriental despot, some hundreds of years ago, sentenced one of his courtiers to death. The courtier said to him, "O king."—he said—"O king, before you kill me, give me a 30-day reprieve and in that 30 days I shall teach your favorite ass how to talk." So the king settled back and said, "Well," he said, "all right, what's 30 days?" and he sent the man to his jail and sent him his favorite ass and, of course, the courtier's friends came around and said, "Well, now, what are you up to anyway? What's the idea of this gag of yours?" And the courtier looked at him, and there's much Oriental wisdom now in what the courtier said——

Senator CAIN. We're dealing with the Orient.

Senator BENTON. Yes; we are. And the courtier said, "Well," he said, "you know in the next 30 days, a lot can happen." He said, "In the first place I might die. In the next place, the king might die. But in the third place, there's a bare chance that ass may learn how to talk."

Senator CAIN. Well, BILL, I found your story very interesting. Now through the point of the story, are you asking for patience in Korea? Is that what you're driving at?

Senator BENTON. The American people lack patience on these great issues—that's exactly the point I'm making; it is a characteristic and a grave handicap to us in the difficult problem of the conduct of our foreign policy. We do lack patience. That's precisely the point of the story.

Senator CAIN. Senator BENTON, I agree with you that I think many times we do not have the patience we ought to have, but the patience in this case goes back 9 months, for on the 27th day of June 1950 the President of the United States—without consultation or advice from anybody so far as I know and with totally no patience of any kind—started us off on a collective security effort which has not come to pass.

Senator BENTON. I disagree.

Senator CAIN. So we now are suggesting that in view of this build-up and this mass offensive, which we can anticipate, we must provide our fighting men and our allied friends with that authority sufficient to take care of themselves—that's a calculated risk, if it leads to greater danger in the future that to my way of thinking is a risk we must take or we ought to remove ourselves from Korea at the earliest possible minute.

Senator BENTON. Well, it wasn't the President who precipitated this problem last June, it was the invasion of the North Koreans: it was the Communist policy; it was the naked appearance of Communist policy of invasion which we could all then see and understand.

Senator CAIN. The Orient must have had some patience admittedly before they started the attack. But as soon as they started it, the President exercised none of the patience to which you refer and which got us into this business; some of us want to get us out of it.

Senator BENTON. Well, if I haul off right now and hit you as hard as I can you're not going to be very patient about it—that's what we were up against.

Senator CAIN. And that's what we're up against right now.

Senator BENTON. That's what we were up against in Korea last June. Even the slightest delay last June and those troops would have swept right down and taken over that peninsula if we'd been a week or two later, you know that would have——

Senator CAIN. After 9 months of war it looks as though that same thing is too likely to happen again if we sit in our box in Southern Korea and refuse to give our men, because they do not have power enough, the power to go ahead as free men always ought to do or they ought to back away, lick their wounds, and prepare for a greater conflict on a larger field.

Senator BENTON. I don't see that we have any choice but to put our confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in the talented General Ridgway on these questions. We certainly can't settle them day to day in debates on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. COOKE. That's one area in this MacArthur controversy we haven't taken up, gentlemen, and fascinating as this all is, I would like to ask this kind of a double-barreled question. First you, Senator CAIN. Propriety and the purpose of the MacArthur statements which led up to his dismissal?

Senator CAIN. I have never met General MacArthur. I have never seen him outside of his pictures. He not only is the commanding general of our American forces in Korea, he has been our supreme commander of all allied forces representing the United Nations, which made of him not only a general in a fighting sense but a diplomat in a very high political sense and I conceive that Gen. Douglas MacArthur feeling as he did had no other course to pursue than to place his case as he did before those for whom he worked and by whom he was employed and for the good of civilization everywhere.

Mr. COOKE. Senator BENTON, what do you think Mr. MacArthur—General MacArthur's—purpose was?

Senator BENTON. Well, General MacArthur is one of our most brilliant, experienced and talented leaders has a high duty to the Constitution and to the American people. And I would not pass judgment against him in those high loyalties. Nor did the President. Over a long long period of time. But it is my opinion that finally at the end of this road, at the end of this sequence of decisions, interviews, statements of General MacArthur he knew perfectly well himself the end of the road was the inevitable choice of the President which I think he was seeking and wanted of his dismissal and recall. He gave the President and the joint chiefs of staff no choice. General MacArthur with his brilliance and background must have understood that perfectly well.

Senator CAIN. In October of 1950, 6 months ago, the President of the United States, in an effort to understand the conflict in Korea, where he admitted that Gen. Doug-

las MacArthur knew more militarily and politically than any man on the face of the earth, went half way around the world to Wake Island to confer with the general.

Six short months——

Senator BENTON. That certainly shows he was trying to do his best——

Senator CAIN. And the President at that time had some patience. Six months later because the same man whom he characterized—the President did—as a "great military, political figure" because he raised some figures and because the President had no patience, removed from office a man whose prestige is immeasurable in the eyes of the Orient and whose advice, I think should have been calmly considered before any such fantastic action was taken by the President.

Senator BENTON. Now, HARRY CAIN, you saw the telegram released by the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time of General MacArthur's dismissal—they had wired General MacArthur proposing negotiations with the Chinese leaders—the Communist leaders—General MacArthur instead of answering that wire himself personally in the field went ahead and made his proposal.

Mr. COOKE. Gentleman, I'm afraid we will have to stop going ahead here and let our audience go ahead from here with the facts and with the very strong and frankly put convictions which each of you have put in front of our audience. Thank you very much for your service and clarity and understanding of the MacArthur controversy and our foreign policy.

ANNOUNCER. That was Dwight Cooke, concluding today's People's Platform discussion of General MacArthur and the Korean crisis.

Mr. Cooke's guests were—United States Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, and United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN, of Washington.

Appeasement in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Appeaser, No Firebrand," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of April 23, 1951, discussing appeasement in Korea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO APPEASER, NO FIREBRAND

"Appeasement" is a word that is being thrown around carelessly these days. (Its original meaning has been lost since Neville Chamberlain used it at Munich, and we use it here in its new sense—making dishonorable concessions to an aggressor instead of fighting him.) It is nonsense to speak of appeasement in Korea, where America is fighting a war that has already cost 60,000 casualties; but some congressional critics charge that killing Communists without bombing Manchuria or signing a demand note for the politically and militarily bankrupt Chinese Nationalists is appeasement.

These same critics say—or imply—that to end the fighting in Korea on the basis of the status quo by mutual agreement would be appeasement. Others suggest that any and all efforts to avoid world war III without fighting are appeasement. They simply don't know the meaning of the word.

Nobody calls Winston Churchill an appeaser, and they hadn't better, within his hearing. His long, stern opposition to Communist totalitarianism is well known. It was he who shocked so many Americans in his prophetic Fulton, Mo., speech of March 1946. But since then he has written, in the Gathering Storm:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. Religion and virtue alike lend their sanctions to meekness and humility, not only between men but between nations. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands."

Sentiments like these are now called "appeasement" in some quarters. They are nothing of the kind. They are, as Churchill says, one horn of the "tormenting dilemma" that national leaders must face in times of great crisis.

United States Financial Assistance to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Come One, Come All," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on December 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COME ONE, COME ALL

Uncle Sam's Export-Import Bank has announced a loan of $21,000,000 will be made to Afghanistan for a dam development. A bank spokesman consider this might be called a point-4 project, which will increase food production. He added it would help the country improve its international financial position. That makes sense. The sum of $21,000,000 should improve anyone's finances.

We are also about to bolster the finances of Iran and India, from all accounts. Afghanistan is right in between. If we are all out for a chain of protective friendship clear across Europe, why chance a weak link for a paltry few millions?

Washington, the hand-out mecca, seems to be the world's sole contender for honors at the top of the hit-the-jack-pot parade. The stream of friendly dollar fanciers mills through the Capital like a stampede. It started with a sound desire to aid such war-battered allies as Britain and France. Now it is blossoming into a procession of devout adherents of western democracy, willing to have their national treasuries sugared in the anti-Communist campaign. They like the currency of American woo.

France, Britain, and Belgium, as might be expected, have not gone away empty handed. There have been emissaries from Italy, Brazil, other South American states; from India, Greece, Iran, even Tibet. We may confidently expect the trek to include Germany, Spain, Portugal, Turkey. So far we have not heard from Lapland or Tanganyika territory. But there is still time.

Some of the diplomatic visitors frankly say they intend to remain neutral in the cold war, pledging troth neither to Russia nor the west. They suggest loans while carrying water on both shoulders. And Uncle Sam holds the bag with both hands. Ah, well, the Croesus fixation was never niggardly or too acute.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as dramatic evidence of the necessity to always maintain the integrity of the constitutional principle of the control of the military forces by the civilian authority of our Government, I ask that a paragraph appearing in the Annual Report of Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur for the fiscal year 1932 be reprinted here, and I earnestly invite the attention of every American to this pertinent report on the national strategy of any war.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The national strategy of any war—that is, the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war—are decisions that must be made by the head of the State, acting in conformity with the expressed will of the Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. For example, in every war the United States has waged, the national objective to be attained has involved the Army in land attacks against areas held by the enemy. In every instance missions have been prescribed for the Navy that had in view the assisting and facilitating of the Army's efforts. Yet in no case could these missions and objectives have been properly prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy acting in unison or by a single supersecretary acting for both. The issues involved were so far-reaching in their effects, and so vital to the life of the Nation, that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy effort could not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation, but rather abdication.

Mr. KERR. Next, Mr. President, I wish to include a statement released by me to the press on Thursday, April 19, 1951, outlining the reasons for my stand on the MacArthur controversy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 19.—In the MacArthur controversy, we are confronted with two basic questions:

Do the American people want to risk an all-out war now, or do they want to combat aggression only and continue to push for peace? Do the American people want to

preserve their constitutional democracy, or submit to military dictatorship?

For me, as a Senator and a citizen, a veteran of World War I, the obvious answers can point to only one general course, but it was my deep concern for the immediate safety and welfare of Oklahoma's 45th Division which directly led to my first outspoken opposition to the MacArthur policies.

General MacArthur has made it plain, in defiance of our Government and all our allies, that he wants to risk all-out war against Red China which has a binding mutual aid pact with Russia. Without question, this could plunge our Nation into a terrible tragic world war III in distant Asia, and even worse, it could thus expose our own cities to atomic bombs.

I could not stand by in silence. That is why I stepped out in front on the criticism of General MacArthur.

Many people have inquired as to the background for my action. I will say this:

I had no advance indication concerning the dramatic order which came so soon thereafter from the White House. Neither was there any suggestion from any source in the administration that I speak out.

I made my own decision based on what I believed to be the best interests and the real desires of my own constituents and the rest of my country.

I know that the people of Oklahoma do not want a tragic and futile war in Red China. We know it would swallow up the 45th Division and cost many, many more precious American lives than are being lost in Korea.

The assignment of the 45th Division to Japan has brought the far eastern theater very close to home and given us all added concern for what is happening out there. I have received many sober messages from the relatives and friends of the men in the 45th.

In line with their urgent appeals and requests, I again had obtained assurance from the Secretary of the Army that "there is still no plan to use the 45th for other than occupational purposes in Japan," but he confirmed my belief that any plan is subject to change upon the decision of the theater commander.

I was dictating the announcement to my office secretary when this reference to the theater commander aroused my fears and touched off my original critical statement.

The issue was plain: to strive to prevent more war or to provoke more war—whether we wanted to permit General MacArthur to take risks which could easily plunge our Oklahoma and other American boys into the mire and jungle of Red China, or whether we wanted to try to restrict Korean action and continue to work for a peaceful settlement if it could possibly be achieved.

During the great debate in the Senate last week, Senator KNOWLAND from California, apparently without concern about the fate of his own boys in the 40th Division or those of my State, tauntingly asked me if I wanted a sanctuary for them in Japan.

I replied: "The sons of Oklahoma and California are in the Armed Forces of America. I do not seek any special favors for Oklahoma fighting men wherever they may be; neither would I permit, if I could prevent it, their being uselessly thrown into an incinerator which would result in destroying them and helping no one else."

All of us regretted the climactic developments which necessitated the removal of General MacArthur.

In my original statement, I did not call for the immediate ouster of MacArthur. I still hoped he would respond to reason and be persuaded to accept established procedure and policy. However, despite a personal appeal from Secretary of the Army Pace, General MacArthur again defied his own Government and the combined policies of all our allies.

Naturally, the sudden removal of a public figure has its dramatic impact. General MacArthur has many personal admirers in this country. However, the welfare of our country is bigger than any one man, and this is not a decision to be made on the basis of personalities.

America stands at the crossroads. This is a grave hour in the history of our country. We are in a life-and-death struggle with the godless forces of communism.

The action of the President is restoring unity among the United Nations. It has achieved unity in our Armed Forces in the Far East. Our country needs unity today as much as at any time in her history, and I believe that we can, must, and will find it.

We must face up to the issues that confront us. I think the Congress should engage in a full and free debate, and then, in the democratic way, we should make a decision, close ranks, and forge full speed ahead.

If MacArthur's supporters in Congress want to follow his policies, let them introduce specific legislation. He has urged our bombing of Manchurian bases. He has called for sufficient additional forces to take the troops of Chiang Kai-shek onto the mainland of China.

If their outcry for MacArthur is sincere, let his champions stand up and be counted. Let them support a resolution carrying out General MacArthur's two major proposals which would amount to a declaration of war on China.

At this writing, they have shown no inclination to take any such positive action. They know that the American people do not want an all-out war with Red China. They know that the American people do not want to set off an atomic war with Russia.

The American people want to avoid world war III, either with China or Russia or both, if it is humanly and honorably possible to do so—and I hope and pray that it is.

Mr. KERR. Following that statement, I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement issued by the senior Senator from Oklahoma concerning his reaction to the remarks of General MacArthur before a joint meeting of the Congress on April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I listened earnestly and carefully to General MacArthur's speech. I looked for unity. I didn't find it. I watched for an acknowledgment of the necessity to maintain the integrity of civilian control of the military power. It was not there. I searched for language that would give hope of a limited conflict and a purpose to prevent the spread into world-wide conflagration. He did not provide it.

I listened for words which would promote cooperation between this Nation and our allies for collective security. Those words were not spoken. I expected him who had been in command of the United Nations forces to acknowledge and report on his stewardship and tell how to strengthen the common front. He did not even mention the United Nations or a single ally.

I hoped he would show the way to promote peace and prevent more or larger war. He was not looking in that direction.

Instead, if I understood him, he sounded a call for an expanded war, a second front for sure, and a third front, if it came. The general spoke sadly, but I was much sadder because I was convinced that his plan would not lead us upward to the goal of peace, but would hurl us downward to the awful road of total war.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as the result of the position taken by me on this issue, I received many communications from the people of Oklahoma expressing their reaction to the President's action in the case. I wish now to have inserted at this point another release by me, dated April 26, 1951, referring to this public opinion and expression.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Most of the MacArthur mail, at first, was in favor of the General, but the pro's and con's have been approaching a balance pretty fast. I firmly believe that the weight of public opinion soon will swing against the general's militant policies.

I have always known that "the folks" are just as good as "the people." Together, they have more sense than most anybody and when they think something through, they come up about 9 times out of 10 with the right answer.

I didn't get into the MacArthur fracas to win any popularity contest. I knew it would be hotter than a depot stove, and that it would get more so all the time. However, I figured somebody had to try to stop the flames of war from being spread even if he got a little singed in doing it.

I may wake up dead, but I know I'm right. So, anyway you look at it, that makes me "dead right." (And, I would a lot rather be dead right, than dead wrong.)

I know, the quicker the folks understand that MacArthur's policies would result in a second and far more terrible war in Asia, and an almost certain total war with Russia, the happier they will be that he was relieved of his command in time. Everybody knows the Chinese Reds may force a bigger war on us. If they do, we will meet them and beat them, but we will never be guilty of starting it, nor lacking in an all-out effort to prevent it, if possible.

A burst of mail in the last few days from Oklahoma folks confirms my expectations as to ultimate reaction, and it shows that the people of Oklahoma already are coming to grips with the vital issues. They are reasoning out their opposition to military dictatorship and the MacArthur program to expand the war.

These varied letters and telegrams represent all walks of life and almost every community in the State. But they follow the same general pattern of thought, assuring me that when emotions cool and feeling settles, the people will see the MacArthur policies for what they really are.

In my stand against these policies, I am most grateful to my friends for their confidence and good wishes. I will be eternally grateful to them for giving me so much comfort when the going was tough.

New York Times editorial of April 20, conclusion, keynotes my own position: "General MacArthur, himself, agrees that his proposals are based on two assumptions—namely, that the actions he advocates will crush Communist China, and that Soviet Russia will not necessarily join in the war. But, the general, himself, seems to have doubts about the latter all-important point. And if his assumptions should prove wrong, as they did in the case of Communist China, the actions he advocates could not only lead to the catastrophe of a new world war, they would also put the onus for that war upon us, even in the eyes of our friends. That would mean the destruction of the United Nations and the North Atlantic alliance,

which would leave us to fight the war alone. That risk must be avoided, even at the cost of prolonging the war in Korea."

Mr. KERR. Finally, Mr. President, I should like to have printed an editorial from the Frederick (Okla.) Leader, captioned "The stand of Senator KERR."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STAND OF SENATOR KERR

The tirade loosed upon Senator ROBERT S. KERR by the Daily Oklahoman—a publication whose commitment to the old guard Republican Party has long been a matter of common knowledge—has so carefully obscured the real facts that some people are being grossly misled as to KERR's purposes.

Words flow easily from the pens of those who would mislead, and the beauty of adjectives can easily be used to distort.

Senator KERR, with full realization of gravity of the world situation, has fought selective service from one end of Washington to the other from the time Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division Thunderbirds were federalized into active duty—seeking to get credit for the men so inducted against Oklahoma's draft quota. He seeks this in fairness and equity to prevent a double drain on Oklahoma's own, and his position deserves the praise and commendation of every Sooner citizen. Senator Bob's fight has been so strong, and so sustained in its effort, that he is about to win a victory on the basis of simple mathematical calculations to which selective service officials can find no further defensive answer. He has had assistance from Senator MIKE MONRONEY and others of the Oklahoma delegation.

Senator KERR, with a broad and first-hand knowledge of all the facts of international turmoil, finds Oklahoma's own Forty-fifth Division at sea, bound for the Far East, even before its divisional training was completed and before all its unit complements were properly filled. And this situation arose at a time when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was increasing daily the tempo and tone of his one-man demand that the United States enter immediately on an aggressive pattern against continental China, more glibly described as preventive warfare.

Because of the size of the Forty-fifth and the naturally patriotic fervor of our citizens, no State in the Union has more at stake on a per capita basis in the present conflict in Korea than has Oklahoma. We have given our Thunderbird Division, and the flower of its manhood, and at the same time have met the full draft quota specified. We were already near top of the list on volunteers and reservists called.

Senator KERR has no objection, if it is the will of Congress, the State Department, the Secretary for Defense, Chiefs of Staff, and the people of the United States, to plunge this Nation into the first phases of a so-called preventive war against the Chinese mainland. Such a decision would be based upon unity of action by all our civilian and service people, upon proper preparation of the Military Establishment, and upon a squaring of the manpower situation to the end that those States with mustered National Guard units will not be asked to bear the brunt of an international engagement that could grow into great magnitude.

But Senator KERR does object—and strenuously—to such action being taken solely on the willful desire of one military leader, even if that person happens to be a man of the high caliber and distinguished ability of General MacArthur.

And regardless of the pressure to the contrary, the Nation will continue to hear his objections until more conclusive action is taken to achieve a balancing of contributions by States of manpower exposed to the dangers of conflict in the Far East.

When it dawns upon the people that Senator KERR's aim is cautious service to the people of Oklahoma, who he represents, and to the Nation as a whole, at a time when every step it takes must be morally right and physically possible, the caustic criticism now being heaped upon him in some quarters will sear the fingers of those who write for purpose instead of principle, for demagogery instead of democracy and for profits instead of peace.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Firing' of General MacArthur," published in the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle of April 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS—THE "FIRING" OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

The one thing Mr. Truman and his administration cannot stand is the truth.

He has not been able to stand it in connection with the sorry state of our Military Establishment at the outbreak of the Korean War, despite the expenditure of more than $50,000,000,000 the taxpayers thought were being used for defense purposes.

Facts revealed by a Senate committee in connection with the shameful operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have made the White House and its close associates squirm uncomfortably.

Disclosures of the Kefauver crime investigating committee have reflected the worst kind of discredit on Truman appointees and Truman supporters.

The conviction of Alger Hiss, despite Truman calling the charges against him a "red herring" and Dean Acheson's protestations of friendship were but one of many instances in which the administration has tried to impede the truth in exposure of Communists who have infiltrated into the Government.

And, finally, we now have the summary dismissal of General MacArthur, one of the great soldier statesmen in American history, because he also chose to tell what he believed to be the truth to the embarrassment of Mr. Truman and our weak-kneed allies and the Communist-coddling State Department.

General MacArthur's only offense, as we see it was to speak out when the rules say a soldier must only do and die, but not talk. We think he did it in the best interests of his country and that he has been fully aware of the possible consequences. Soldier that he is, he refused to take the easy way out by keeping quiet.

Let us remember always that it was not General MacArthur, but Mr. Truman and the State Department who created the Korean situation in the first place by splitting the little country with Russia and then letting the Republic of South Korea shift for itself with only token assistance, while the Soviets were training a massive army across the border for many months.

Let us remember, too that it was Mr. Truman and the State Department and General Marshall who, by their insistence on admission of Communists into the Chinese Government and then their repudiation of Chiang Kai-shek, made it possible for the Reds to conquer all China.

And let us remember that General MacArthur has been right over the years while his superiors have been so wrong. While the Communists have been overrunning Europe and China, he has made his occupation of Japan an example for all time. He alone has refused to coddle Moscow and for that reason the island empire today constitutes one of our important bastions of defense.

What, then, has been his great offense? Simply to say that he thinks he is fighting a war without an objective so long as the United Nations refuses to permit him to bomb Communist concentrations in Manchuria; because he has advocated use of Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa to create a diversionary attack against the Chinese mainland, just as the Russians are using their Chinese allies to tie down hundreds of thousands of American boys, and because he has expressed the opinion that the war against Communism must be won on the continent of Asia if it is to be won at all.

Who has he offended? Well, he has offended Messrs. Truman and Acheson and General Marshall who want to concentrate our strength in Europe. He has offended our vascillating allies in the United Nations who are perfectly willing to see American boys die in the mud of Korea without lifting any effective hand of their own to help. He has offended Great Britain whose Socialist government Mr. Truman has been keeping in business with American dollars because Britain wants to remain friendly with Communist China so that she can do business as usual with a people who are killing Americans every hour of the day and night.

And so a great soldier and a great American has been "fired" with about as much tact and diplomacy as would ordinarily be used in getting rid of an office boy who broke the rules once too often; "fired" with only a scant word of praise of one of the outstanding public careers in our history.

But, strangely enough, the outrageous incident has the effect of raising MacArthur's stature and diminishing that of his so-called superiors.

Perhaps he can now return to this country and speak his mind as a free citizen. That should be his right and the American people are entitled to know what he knows and thinks.

Meanwhile it will be a long time before this disgrace of this day is forgotten.

Waste in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing an average of over 300 employees at two hospitals for nearly 6 months with no doctors and no patients. This waste is why there is

not money to properly care for the veterans.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
San Francisco, Calif., April 21, 1951.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: This will acknowledge your letter of April 5, 1951 concerning the new Veterans Administration Hospitals located at Beckley and Clarksburg, W. Va.

The Beckley Hospital was accepted from the contractors on October 6, 1950, and the Clarksburg Hospital was accepted on October 24, 1950. Since the date of acceptance of these two hospitals the following employees have been on duty month by month as follows:

	Beckley	Clarksburg
Oct. 31, 1950	71	54
Nov. 30, 1950	144	113
Dec. 31, 1950	162	134
Jan. 31, 1951	160	144
Feb. 28, 1951	163	176
Mar. 31, 1951	181	195

The hospital at Beckley, W. Va., was opened and accepted its first patient on March 1, 1951, and the Clarksburg Hospital accepted its first patient on March 12, 1951. It was impossible to open these two hospitals earlier because of our inability to recruit the necessary professional staff.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr., *Administrator.*

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "The Palace Guards Win—Or Do They?" published in the New Castle (Pa.) News of April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PALACE GUARDS WIN—OR DO THEY?

There must be merriment in Moscow today.

And somehow we imagine we can hear a sly British chuckle coming out of Number 10 Downing Street.

While in our own State Department Acheson and his boys are marking across the record of conspiracy against MacArthur "Mission Accomplished."

For after 6 years of sniping at Gen. Douglas MacArthur they have his scalp. But his scalp dangles from the chandeliers like the sword of Damocles.

For Douglas MacArthur, America's No. 1 soldier, if not indeed it's No. 1 citizen, has been fired ignominiously, fired just like a ditch digger might be fired by a straw boss.

Fired because he gave voice to the wonderings of millions of American minds, "If we have to fight the Communist why stop at some geographic line?"

MacArthur's crime was that he believed the lives of American boys should not be poured out on foreign lands unless there was some reason in logic at the end of the trail.

He believed that if the Communists were permitted to mass and group over the North Korean border, and strike again and again at the Americans then those nests of vipers should be wiped out. He believed the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa should be turned loose to fight against the Communists for their homeland. He believed it a futile thing to keep fighting within a restricted area in Korea unless a political peace could be consummated.

And so, because MacArthur is a great American, because his soldierly heart had a great sympathy for the fate of his men, because like Billy Mitchell he told the truth, he was fired.

This war, which Truman called a police action, has 250,000 American men in the field. Our casualties are over 60,000.

Great Britain has 13,000 men in the field. Great Britain continues to sell to the Communists. Great Britain wants to hold on to Hong Kong. Britain, therefore, had a reason to undermine MacArthur, a reason rooted in its own national selfishness. Ergo, our American policy must be cut according to the British design and if Dean Acheson is to remain in good standing with the Downing Street brand of diplomacy then MacArthur has to be fired.

And he was.

Acheson engineered the deal which got us out of China. MacArthur protested against such diplomacy. The blunders of Acheson brought on the Korean war and MacArthur was called on once more to lead troops against an enemy.

Because he could not stomach such back-alley diplomacy as we have been getting, because he was outraged at the further slaughter of American boys, he spoke his mind.

Here is the soldier who carved victory out of defeat in the Pacific, who went into Japan as a conquerer and became the Japanese friend through his wise administration.

Here is a man whose record of Americanism shines with a golden glow for over 40 years. "The path of glory leads but to the grave."

As for President Truman's excuse for firing MacArthur—made last night—little can be said for it. The voice was the voice of Truman but the words were the words of Acheson.

Ship Named "O'Higgins"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from the New York Times of April 22, 1951, entitled "Topics of the Times."

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

SHIP NAMED "O'HIGGINS"

Down at the Philadelphia Navy Yard a United States light cruiser, the *Brooklyn*, has been undergoing more than a sea change. She is 16 years old, 10,000 tons, and carries fifteen 6-inch guns. During the last war she helped with various amphibious landings in the Mediterranean. She has been a fighting ship, one for the sons of Brooklyn to be proud of.

Now she has been sold to Chile and is about to take off, staffed by a crew of Chilean sailors, for lands far from the Gowanus. She goes not as the *Brooklyn* but as the *General O'Higgins*. And let no one along Flatbush Avenue or around Borough Hall think that that name does not fit a ship once named the *Brooklyn*. For Bernardo O'Higgins was as fighting a man as ever Sands Street saw. He is the great Chilean national figure, the country's George Washington.

FROM COUNTY MEATH

Just how a fine broth of a boy with the old Irish name of O'Higgins could wind up as the scrappiest and best beloved man in Chilean history is something that only the sons of the Irish could explain fully. The O'Higgins story in Chile begins with Ambrose O'Higgins, from County Meath. An uncle, a Spanish priest, sent him to South America in the middle of the eighteenth century. For some years he was a trader and peddler in Buenos Aires. His Spanish, spoken with an Irish lilt, must have charmed many a customer. Later he went over the Andes to Chile. Frontier wars against the Indians were being fought and Ambrose, now Ambrosio, entered the Spanish Army. By 1788 he was Captain General of Chile.

THE BOY BERNARDO

His son, Bernardo, was born of a Chilean mother on August 20, 1776. From his father Bernardo inherited whatever it is that the sons of the Irish inherit. From his mother he got the charm that attracted everyone who met him and the compassion that he showed all whom he met. He was sent to England for his education. Radical ideas, nurtured by the French Revolution, were in the air. A young man who knew the misery of Spanish rule back home, the state-nurtured ignorance, the power and the selfishness of the privileged, could dream of a better world and of leading men toward it. The sons of the Irish have often dreamed that dream.

RETURN TO CHILE

He returned to Chile in 1802. The long-expected and long-overdue revolt against Spain broke out in 1810. In the front line of the rebels was Bernardo O'Higgins. In 1813 he took supreme command of the rebel army, but in his first attempt to beat the Spanish troops he met defeat. The sons of the Irish have often known that. He saw the Spanish rule restored, with its medieval ignorance and cruelty and disregard for any except the wealthy. In 1816 the great South American revolutionary San Martín was ready to come to the aid of Chile. O'Higgins went to Argentina to join him. They came back over the Andes in January 1817 with 3,000 infantry and 1,000 cavalry. They met the Spanish twice and beat them twice. The revolution in Chile was a reality. The Spanish were out forever and O'Higgins knew what a victory was. The sons of the Irish have sometimes known that, too.

AHEAD OF HIS TIME

Bernardo became the first director of the new state. He wrote the first constitution and aimed it right at the evils that had sickened him. He wanted land taken from the large estates and he advocated popular education. The people supported him; for the first time the nation had one of its own sons as ruler. But the forces against him, even among the Chileans, were strong and he underestimated their strength. The sons of the Irish have sometimes done that. The wealthy and the privileged were glad to be rid of Spanish rule but wanted no change in their traditional power and perquisites. Like other South American revolutionaries, O'Higgins was ahead of his time. The forces against him grew stronger and Bernardo's hopes for a decent world could not withstand them. He was forced to abdicate in 1823. Thereafter each ambitious man in the land tried to be his own political party; 10 different governments followed in quick order.

O'Higgins never again held power. He died in 1842.

AND FAIR SAILING

The *General O'Higgins* will sail shortly from Philadelphia. She is a fine ship. The sons of Brooklyn can wish her fair sailing. The sons of the Irish will take that for granted.

Emphasis on a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, April 25, 1951:

EMPHASIS ON A STATESMAN

The death of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, which under normal conditions would have attracted great national attention and brought to the dead statesman the full tribute and the evaluation which he so richly deserved, came at a moment, however, when another great American held the center of the stage. The accolade was for the living rather than for the dead; an elder statesman simply faded out in the garish demonstrations.

The irony which the turn of events took must be recognized, however, in calmer and more thoughtful retrospect. Senator Vandenberg had given the final years of his public life to the initiation and development of a bipartisan foreign policy, to the cause of unity among his fellow citizens and understanding among nations, to the strengthening and undergirding of democracy and its defenders wherever they might be. To him as much as to any other man should go credit for the North Atlantic Pact and for those cooperative measures which halted communism in its westward march and breathed economic life and a fighting spirit into Europe. There is unquestioned testimony that the effort which the Michigan statesman put into this cause contributed substantially to his ill health and even chopped many years from his life. Had he submitted to the operation from which he never recovered earlier, there is strong belief that he would be alive and perhaps back in the Senate today. He was told that he should have this operation before the Paris conference, but he insisted upon attending, regardless of the consequences, and then became involved in the congressional fight over approval of the peace and security structure of which he was a chief architect. His badly needed operation was indefinitely delayed, and the ultimate result has now been written by the cold hand of Death.

It was as this man faded away last week that disunity, partisanship, bitterness, an isolationism which strangely shifted to the side of a bigger war, reached a new crescendo in the National Capital where he so long served and spread out over the Nation. Quietly he slipped from this mortal scene while the outcry was for the forces, the influences and the policies which he sought to restrain and to recast. There was dramatics in the ensuing activities; but the Vandenberg drama was enacted in the silence of the wings. The center of the stage held and overflowed with the demolition crew of that which he gave his life to construct.

In our humble opinion, however, the final tribute, the final evaluation as statesman, the final record as architect and builder of a more secure and peaceful world will accrue to the dead Senator. When sober reason returns, when Americans look beneath the surface, when parades give way to meditation and reflection, when decisions are left to the mind rather than to the emotions, and when statesmanship, pray Heaven, supersedes partisanship, the genuine stature of the late Senator from Michigan will be fully recognized, his sacrificial effort justified, and his influence and his spirit will go marching on.

A great soldier has his day; a great statesman has his eternity.

How to Fight Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, how to fight inflation and to raise money needed for the defense program are two subjects in which all of us are interested.

The Wage Earner Forum survey published by McFadden Publications, Inc., directed by Edward Smith, has just published a survey made among 1,500 wage-earner families across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following article bearing on these subjects from the Wage Earner Forum, which I believe carries worth-while information:

DEFINITE OPINIONS ON VITAL MATTERS

How to fight inflation, and how to raise money needed for this country's armament program, are two subjects on which the wage earner husbands and wives have definite opinions.

While better than 8 in 10 suggest a freeze on prices as one effective means of fighting inflation, more than half as many also suggest a freeze on wages. Although husbands and wives agree rather closely on a freeze on prices, considerably fewer of the wives are in favor of a freeze on wages. Restrictions on buying are recommended by more than one-fourth of the panel.

Nonessential Government expenditures can be reduced and that is the best means of raising money for our armament program, in the opinion of 8 in 10 of the wage earners and their wives. Two-thirds of them, more husbands than wives, suggest increased corporation taxes. Suggestions of a national tax on the things we buy and an increased personal income tax, as other means of raising the needed money, were checked by about one-fourth in each case.

FAVOR PRICE AND WAGE FREEZES

A freeze on wages, as a means of fighting inflation, is favored by slightly more than half of the men. Union members are more in favor of a freeze on wages (52.9 percent) than those who are not union members. About two out of five of the wives disagree with the men on this point, and it is much less favored in the far West.

There is little variation by age or region (except for the far West) on a freeze on prices, favored by over 80 percent. More of the older men approve restriction on buying. While the percentage of men who favor increased personal income tax is small, it is larger among union men.

Failure to respond to this question was as little as 2.1 for men and women combined, and 0.9 for the men alone.

Of the voluntary comments made by the men and women of the panel, roll-back of prices was most frequent, except that among the men alone a slightly greater number suggested Government restrictions and controls.

In the tabulations which follow, the opinions of wives are not shown separately, but are indicated by comparison of the combined opinions of men and women with those of men alone.

Question. Which of the following do you approve as a means of fighting inflation, or further inflation? (Check one or more, as you see fit.)

Percent of total panel—men, women combined

Freeze on wages	43.5
Freeze on prices	84.8
Restrictions on buying (enforced savings)	28.6
Increased personal income taxes (less spendable income)	3.5
Voluntary comment:	
Roll back prices	2.3
Stop farm aid	.2
Government restriction, control, action (outward)	1.7
Government economy, restriction (within Government)	.6
Miscellaneous	1.0

CUT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

While 81.2 percent of the men favor reduction of nonessential governmental expenditures as a means of raising money for armament, this is somewhat lower among the union members (78.6 percent) and consequently higher among those not members of a union. It is also lower in the Northeastern States.

Next in number checked was to increase corporation taxes; the union men are a little stronger for that (73.2 percent), but it is less favored in the far West.

It will be noted that fewer of the wives checked any of the four most frequently mentioned means for raising money, except in the case of reduction of Government expenditures.

A tax on luxuries and unessentials, and elimination of subsidies were voluntary comments most frequently made. Elimination of subsidies and reduction of aid to Europe were suggested by a total of 4.6 percent of the men.

Of the means of armament financing, the wives checked fewer of the alternatives and made fewer voluntary comments.

Question. "Which of the following ways do you approve as a means of raising the money for the Nation's armament program?" (Check as many as necessary to give your complete opinion.)

Percent of total panel—men and women combined

Increased personal income taxes	19.9
Increased corporation taxes	64.0
A national tax on the things you buy	24.7
Reduction of nonessential Government expenditures	80.2
None; don't think we should arm	1.2
Voluntary comment:	
Tax on luxuries, unessentials	3.2
Cut down on Government employees	.5
Legalize lotteries	.6
Eliminate subsidies, etc	2.9
Cut down aid to Europe, etc	.7
Miscellaneous	.7

Failure to respond to the above question was 0.3 percent of the total panel for the men alone, and 0.9 percent for men and women combined.

DRAFT 18-YEAR-OLDS

The wives are somewhat less in favor of the plan to draft and train 18-year-olds, although nearly two-thirds of them are in favor of it. Among the men the strongest approval and least disapproval is in the age group of those under 30, many of whom

have done their turn of duty in the recent war. Again, the far West is the one region which differs, markedly, from the country as a whole.

While slightly more than half oppose deferment of college students with special ability, this is slightly lower among the wives than the husbands, and also in the Midwest.

Percent of total panel, men, women combined

Question. Do you approve of the current plan to draft and train 18-year-olds?

Yes	67.8
No	29.6
Don't know	.5
Not reported	2.1

Percent of total panel, men, women combined

Question. Do you feel there is any justification for the plan which was proposed for deferment of college students with special ability so as to save them for training in other important fields, science, etc.?

Yes	42.8
No	53.0
Not reported	4.2

VOLUNTARY COMMENTS

Percent of total panel, men and women combined

Against deferment:	
Didn't in War II, why now?	
Can be trained in the Army just as well	1.8
Can resume study after service	.6
Favoring deferment:	
Don't eat all the grain—save some for seed	8.8
If it isn't taken advantage of; too much chance for conniving	5.1
If student was in War II, let him finish college	.2
Difficult getting back to study after war service	.2
Other miscellaneous pro and con	5.2

STAY IN KOREA

A majority of wage earners feel that the United Nations should stay in Korea and keep fighting as long as attack and aggression continue. There are nearly as many who feel they are unable to express an opinion (19.2 percent), as of those who think we should get out now (23.2 percent).

Again, the attitudes show a difference in the far West, where more feel that we should get out of Korea. But of the panel as a whole, considerably more of the men feel that we should stay and fight than do their wives, among whom is also a larger percentage who do not feel that they have a definite opinion to express.

Question. "There seems to be two schools of thought as to whether the United Nations should stay in Korea and keep fighting so long as there is attack and aggression there; or whether they should get out, now. What say you?"

Percent of total panel, men, women combined

Should stay and fight	55.3
Should get out now	23.2
Don't know	19.2
Not reported	2.3

Old-Age Assistance in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

WEST VIRGINIA OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE REPORT INDICATES NATION-WIDE TRAGEDY

TABLE 10.—*Number of cases opened during month by reason for opening, February 1951*

Reason for opening case	Total	Percent of total	Old-age assistance	Aid to the blind	Aid to dependent children	General assistance
Total	1,196	100.0	286	11	404	495
Supplementation of an old age assistance, aid to blind, or aid to dependent children grant	89	7.4	0	0	0	89
Discontinuance of unemployment benefits	3	.2	0	0	2	1
Loss of employment or decreased earnings because of—						
Illness or disablement	482	40.3	67	4	167	244
Lay-off, discharge, or other reason	44	3.7	16	0	15	13
Death or absence of wage earner	216	18.1	16	0	140	60
Loss of allowance or other military payment	10	.8	2	0	3	5
Depletion of savings or other resources	74	6.2	48	1	10	15
Loss or decrease of contribution from relatives	30	2.5	16	0	12	2
Discontinuance of UMW benefits	4	.3	1	0	2	1
Other change in economic circumstances	10	.8	5	1	3	1
Change in law or agency policy	8	.7	0	0	8	0
Attained technical eligibility	63	5.3	52	4	7	0
Discontinuance of other public or private aid	15	1.3	4	0	1	10
Other reasons	148	12.4	59	1	34	54

TABLE 11.—*Number of cases closed during month by reason for closing, February 1951*

Reason for closing case	Total	Percent of total	Old-age assistance	Aid to the blind	Aid to dependent children	General assistance
Total	1,853	100.0	453	10	558	832
Death of recipient	240	12.9	204	5	6	25
Employment of recipient	43	2.3	10	1	2	30
Employment of another person in home	120	6.5	16	0	96	8
Receipt of allowance or other military payment	30	1.6	2	0	22	6
Increased support from persons outside home	24	1.3	7	0	15	2
Increase in OASI benefits	67	3.6	47	0	15	5
Increase in other resources	118	6.4	49	0	36	33
Other material change in economic circumstances	8	.4	2	0	3	3
Absent parent returned or no longer incapacitated	80	4.3	----------	----------	80	----------
Support by remarriage of parent	24	1.3	----------	----------	24	----------
Child reached maximum age or not attending school	40	2.2	----------	----------	40	----------
Admitted to institution	33	1.8	19	0	5	9
Receipt of another type of public or private aid	55	3.0	0	0	5	50
Loss of residence in State or county	69	3.7	9	1	13	46
Change in law or agency policy	735	39.7	48	3	101	583
Other reasons	167	9.0	40	0	95	32

Source: Tables 10 and 11 February 1951 Public Assistance Report of West Virginia.

With all the talk about employing elderly people instead of providing for pensions, why not look at the above tables. They clearly show the hopelessness of such projects so far as most of the aged are concerned. See column No. 3.

Out of 286 new cases, 83 were due to loss of employment.

Out of 453 closed cases, only 10 resulted from employment of recipient.

Note that death accounted for nearly one-half of the closed cases, while employment accounted for less than 1 out of 45. In other words, there is only 1 chance in 22 of an old-age assistance recipient getting any job before he dies—to say nothing of earning a decent living.

General MacArthur's Address to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the address delivered by Gen. Douglas MacArthur on Thursday, April 19, last, was the most outstanding address I have heard delivered before Congress in my many years of service in the House. Words cannot express the deep impression it made upon all who heard it. Its clarity, logic, and sincerity made for it a place among the historic speeches of our country that will not be erased by the passing of time. Never have I seen any assemblage so deeply touched, nor where the deeper emotions were so plainly visible by moistened eyes.

The newspapers of the Nation have given unstinted praise to this memorable speech. The Courier-Post, of Camden, N. J., in its issue of Friday, April 20, 1951, has given its tribute in an analytical editorial entitled "MacArthur States His Case." I include it as part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted. It reads as follows:

MACARTHUR STATES HIS CASE

General MacArthur's great speech before Congress was a masterpiece of clearness and logical reasoning.

He spoke, as had been predicted, in general terms. He did not seek to aggravate the controversy over Asiatic policies that his removal has inflamed.

On the other hand, he did not seek to duck controversial issues. He stated what they were, he gave his views on them in a clear and lucid manner, he stressed the fact that the issues are fundamental and global, and that they cannot be avoided. We must face them.

With "but one purpose in mind—to serve my country," the general expressed the opinion that communism is unappeasable. What is more, it cannot be appeased in one place, separately from another. To appease it in Asia is indirectly—and not too indirectly—appeasing it also in Europe.

The general has faith in America and in America's strength. In his opinion, there can be no greater expression of defeatism than to say that we cannot defend ourselves on both the Asiatic and European fronts.

As to the Asiatic front, the Pacific Ocean and the chain of islands we and the other free nations now hold make it a protective moat to America as long as we provide the necessary defenses for that moat. Sea and air power, he asserts, can defend the line from Vladivostok to Singapore.

But a breach of the line at one point opens the whole line to other breaches and collapse. That is why Formosa must not fall to the Reds. The fall of Formosa would instantly threaten the Philippines and Japan, and almost immediately would threaten our own Pacific coast.

We can and should hold the Pacific moat, MacArthur believes, against the aggressive imperialism of both Soviet Russia and a China newly alive with the spirit of nationalism, a new power in Asia now temporarily allied with Russia, but perhaps only temporarily so allied and perhaps only temporarily communistic.

To hold the moat, however, we must not let down the friends who help us hold it—a regenerated Japan which will not again fail the free world; the Philippines, and Chiang's forces on Formosa.

The decision to intervene in Korea, MacArthur feels, was sound from the military standpoint. Our victory there was complete when Red China suddenly intervened. This created a new war and a new situation not contemplated previously.

It called for new diplomatic decisions which have not, right up to this moment, been made.

MacArthur denounces as libel the reports that he favored a full-scale ground invasion of Red China. No one in his right mind could advocate such a thing, he says.

He did want a stronger economic and naval blockade of China. He wanted the removal of restrictions which tied his hands behind his back in Korea. He wanted the right to make air reconnaissance of the enemy bases behind Korea; the right to make air attacks beyond the Yalu River on enemy bases, to disrupt the enemy's logistics, and to make a real military decision possible.

He wanted and still wants these things, because under present restrictions we are fighting what can never be more than an indecisive campaign, one of terrible and constant attrition, one that the enemy can draw out indefinitely even though we may be able to hold a defensible line in Korea indefinitely.

"War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision," as MacArthur says.

"In war there is no substitute for victory."

But as we are fighting the Korean war now, he believes, like many others, there can be no victory.

The general says that criticism of his views comes largely from lay circles abroad.

He says that our own Joint Chiefs of Staff concur—at least largely—in his views. He is convinced that from the military standpoint they are right, and that if we now pursue a course of appeasement toward Red China it will only fail as appeasement has always failed.

He does not believe that the measures he proposes would backfire against us. Red China, he asserts, is already engaging its maximum power in Korea. He implies that our fear of "extending the war" if we follow his proposals is, in reality, a fear of winning it, ridiculous as that may sound.

And while we allow our fears to rule our actions, we are betraying the very people we took up arms to save—the Koreans who, alone of all the nations engaged in the war, are giving everything they have to preserve their own liberty and the cause of liberty throughout the world; who are risking and suffering death rather than enslavement.

They deserve better of us than that.

MacArthur has stated his case.

The decisions are up to others.

He retires from the stage after 52 years of service to his country with a prayer on his lips that mankind may soon find a better and more equitable system of settling its quarrels than war, whose increasing destructiveness to friend and foe alike has rendered it useless as a solution to them, if it ever was.

But till such a system is devised there will be wars.

And "war's very object is victory."

Have we lost sight of that object in Korea?

Will we realize that defeat, stalemate, or appeasement in Korea mean global defeat, stalemate, or appeasement?

Now holding a western frontier in the far Pacific, are we willing to surrender it; to withdraw to a frontier in California and the rest of our continent's western coast?

These are questions of the greatest importance and magnitude.

MacArthur has shown us what he thinks are the answers.

With a speech that is one of the most powerful and compelling of modern times, he probably has convinced many who were not previously aware of the facts and did not agree with him.

The opposition will offer its rebuttal.

It had better be good.

A Humiliating Spectacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted unanimously on Monday, April 16, by the Service Club of Indianapolis, an organization of 253 members, all of whom are veterans of either World War I or World War II, and sent to me by Frank K. Levinson, president, the Service Club of Indianapolis:

A HUMILIATING SPECTACLE

"And in every province, whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came, there was great mourning among the people, and fasting, and weeping, and wailing; and many lay in sackcloth and ashes."

We would speak of General MacArthur. His head is turning silver with age, and long experience has made him sage. But that did not save him from the arrows of men who strut in pride and vaunt their empty claims. One who but for accident would today be a nameless man amidst the crowd, has allowed his perverse and stubborn will to cause him to strike at one of the greatest military leaders of all time.

Why are we in Korea? Our President told us we were there to preserve our own freedom by thwarting the advance of communism in the free world; and to prove to evil, willful men that aggressive war does not pay. MacArthur was told to lead. Fearlessly he organized his campaign, and began boldly to resist the powers of evil. To him the office and duties of a general were to bring victory to his arms and to preserve his men from needless slaughter and suffering.

Then confusion in our Nation's councils began to show itself. MacArthur was told to fight Communists but only up to an imaginary line. Beyond that line the Reds of China and the Kremlin were to be allowed to gather their strength and from these bases, in a privileged sanctuary, to move out to slaughter our soldiers and then return in safety to those bases for relaxation.

We had an air force that could in any period of 24 hours destroy those bases and choke off all supplies to our enemy then reaching them from Red China. One of our allies on Formosa had 500,000 excellently trained soldiers who were anxious to relieve the pressure on our own fighting men. Another ally had 100,000 men in addition to the great number it already had in the field, who were ready to fight with us if we would but equip them. Our Navy could have blockaded the ports of China and North Korea at any time and thus brought the "agrarian philosophers" of that area promptly to their knees. But these things must not be. Greedy men in Britain, where hope of gain allures, would save Hongkong and continue to deliver for a great profit war materials to our Red enemies. The Kremlin might be irritated; as if he who is bent on doing evil will ever be unable to find his own occasion for doing it.

These considerations were of the most vital military importance. MacArthur discussed them publicly. He had been expressly told he had a right to discuss all military matters which concerned the war he had been told to wage, and that he might discuss them publicly. He would have been negligent had he not attempted to arouse the nations he was supposed to be leading to the dangers involved in such an excess of stupidity.

But he is now returning to us straight from a faithful, unselfish, patient fight and the love and gratitude of a whole Nation go out to him; while men of low degree smugly smile and proudly cling to their faults and wither in their pride. If our forces are not in the Orient to conquer our enemies; if we are now to approve the aggressions of the "agrarian reformers" of Red China and the Kremlin, and allow them to retain all their material gains in China and Korea, let us in the name of God bring our soldiers home at the earliest possible moment consistent with their safety. Then, possibly, at some distant time the Kremlin will allow us to return long enough to care for the graves of our sons who have fallen there, so that future generations may know that they have not been entirely forgotten but that we do honor them who offered up their lives at their Nation's call to suffer needless, useless slaughter.

Mr. President, I move that this declaration be adopted by the Service Club of Indianapolis and that copies be sent to our two Senators, to our Congressman, and to the daily papers of Indianapolis.

WILLIAM P. EVANS.

Mr. Acheson Said Chinese Communists Would Not Enter Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the White House has alleged that Mr. Truman was misled by General MacArthur's statement at Wake Island that the Chinese Communists would not enter the Korean war. It is implied that the President believed this statement to his great regret. In a cablegram

to the editors of the Freeman magazine General MacArthur was asked to confirm or deny the statement that he had so advised the President. The reply was as follows:

The statement quoted in your message of the 13th is entirely without foundation in fact.

MACARTHUR,
Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. Speaker, it seems, however, that the President was getting the kind of information he charges to MacArthur from the very man who has sabotaged the United States in Asia, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State. Members of this House will be interested in a news story that appeared in the New York Times on September 11, 1950, and which relates to the matter under discussion. At this point I am including part of that article. Once again the man who refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss was wrong:

ACHESON DOUBTS PEIPING WAR ENTRY—HOLDS MOVE IN KOREA WOULD BE MADNESS—ASSERTS MODERN WEAPONS WILL BEAT HORDES

(By Jay Walz)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—Secretary of State Acheson declared in a television broadcast tonight that numbers do not necessarily mean strength and offered "modern weapons and ingenuity" as opposition to "all sorts of hordes." He was alluding to hordes of Communist forces.

He also said it would be "sheer madness" for the Chinese Communist Government to enter the Korean war on the side opposing the "free nations of the world."

"The greater part of China to the north, which is made up of Sinkiang, Outer Mongolia, and Manchuria, is Chinese at the present moment only nominally," Mr. Acheson said. "That is where the great cloud from the north, Russian penetration, is operating and it is quite obvious that the plan is to absorb those northern areas of China under Soviet domination.

OWN DISMEMBERMENT

"I give the people in Peiping credit for being intelligent enough to see what is happening to them. Why they should want to further their own dismemberment and destruction by getting at cross purposes with all the free nations of the world who are inherently their friends and have always been friends of the Chinese as against this imperialism coming down from the Soviet Union I cannot see.

"And since there is nothing in it for them, I don't see why they should yield to what is undoubtedly pressures from the Communist movement to get into this Korean row."

The MacArthur Removal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Frankford (Pa.) Gazette of April 19, 1951:

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA

If there is anything the MacArthur removal proves all over again, it is that professional military men should confine their ambitions to the armed services. Unbiased historians will agree that Grant was one of the top United States generals in the field and a sorry spectacle as President of the United States. Professional military men for generations have taken a lesson from this. Black Jack Pershing could have had the Presidential nomination on a silver platter but he was almost rude to people who urged it.

A colorful and ofttimes brilliant military figure of high personal courage, MacArthur has much more than his share of the ham actor and exhibitionist about him. It is this very yen to sing tenor on all possible occasions that creates the compulsion to forever seek the Presidency. It impelled him to produce one of the most pathetic pictures of our time. The scene was the Republican national convention in our city on a stifling hot early morning in July 1948. Almost alone in the all but empty hall, emaciated loyal General Wainwright, hero of Bataan, was given this poor opportunity to place MacArthur's name in nomination. What makes his thirst for office particularly unfortunate is that MacArthur is probably the most disliked member of the brass among the rank and file, in our time. It is extremely unlikely that he could be elected to any national office in spite of the appreciation many of our people feel for some of his accomplishments.

It has been said that he has earned the right to disobey orders or to take violent conflict with them. Funny, he so agreeably followed the Hoover order to gas-bomb the Bonus Army out of Anacostia flats. This was made up of his buddies from World War I and their wives and kids. So MacArthur has had a mixed career which includes military brilliance, ever so much personal courage, a lot of play acting and some very sad decisions. It is ironic that a soldier who once served under him (and did not derive happiness from the connection) could have the very nomination that MacArthur craves. I refer to Dwight Eisenhower. It is unfortunate that some men do not quit their careers at the right time. All of us would have been gladdened if MacArthur had terminated his services before issuing that promise to have the boys back from Korea by Christmas. Too bad a once great pitcher has to be relieved. Good that the defense team has such a fine relief man.

Cordially yours,
WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Where Does Dean Acheson Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport Post on April 24, 1951, reflecting a question being asked, I believe, by an overwhelming majority of the American people:

WHERE DOES ACHESON STAND?

Dean Acheson has reached such a degree of disfavor with the people, one cannot help wonder why it is that President Truman continues to back him up on major issues, as he does.

No matter what the Secretary of State does today, the people will still mistrust him. Almost everyone you talk with expresses strong opposition to him.

The repercussions of the MacArthur dismissal may, of course, make it even more difficult for Mr. Truman to retain him, for if ever there was a voice of opinion expressed in the Nation, it was done in the MacArthur case. And somehow or other, people are of the opinion that Acheson had a big hand in the summary dismissal of MacArthur, even though Mr. Truman would have us believe it was all his own idea.

Congressmen of both parties, from many States, are asking each other about Acheson. If MacArthur was a liability in our foreign policy, and was fired because of his proposals, how about Acheson? Many newspapers throughout the country which approved of the President's ouster of MacArthur, at the same time have urged the Executive to get a new Secretary of State. It sounds more than reasonable to us.

Mr. Acheson has been Secretary of State for a little more than 2 years. It is not a long time, and he has done nothing in that period to distinguish himself to such an extent that he should be retained.

Mr. Truman has set a record in making Cabinet changes, considering the length of respective administrations. Mr. Roosevelt made an average of 1.2 changes per year; Hoover made 0.8; Coolidge, 1.4; and back in the day of "Teddy" Roosevelt, the changes per year were 2.3. Changes under President Truman have been on the average of 3.2 per year. So, he would be right in form if he asked Mr. Acheson to return to his law books.

During the Acheson term we went to war in Korea, but that also is said to have been a Truman decision solely. As for opposition to Red China in the UN, Acheson has said that the United States would not try to use its veto power to bar such an admission. Acheson cannot take any credit for the Atlantic Pact, even though it was ratified while he was Secretary. The credit for that goes to the late distinguished Senator Vandenberg. It was proposed by Mr. Truman before Acheson was sworn in.

Many of his predecessors have been strong men, and distinctive policies still bear their names, such as Hay's "Open Door"; Knox's "Dollar Diplomacy"; Lansing's Japanese agreement; Hughes' naval limitation; Kellogg's treaty renouncing war; and, of course, the Marshall plan, developed by General Marshall.

Try to think of one great policy enunciated and perfected by Dean Acheson. Yes, there was one, when he said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. That was enunciated, but not perfected in the manner which he expected. It is indeed time for Mr. Truman to add to his box score by naming a broad-minded, vigorous, clear-thinking, unselfish, wholly American Secretary of State.

Positive Catholic Action in the Life of the High School Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an address given by Mary Anne Green, of St. Paul's Academy, Washington, D. C., in the twentieth annual oratorical contest sponsored by the Catholic University Conference of Clerics and Religious held at the Catholic University Gymnasium on April 15:

POSITIVE CATHOLIC ACTION IN THE LIFE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT

(By Mary Anne Green, St. Paul's Academy, Washington, D. C.)

We as students of the Catholic Mission Crusade are faced this afternoon with a problem. In fact, the primary purpose for our assembly here is to determine who can best convince the average high-school student that he can change the world in which he is living through a positive, through a determining, and through a practical Catholic action.

If the world in which we live is in need of change, then something must be at fault with the conditions under which we live.

If the Catholic high-school student is being called upon to change this world through positive Catholic action, then he must be aware of the need for change. But even more, if the Catholic high-school student must do this job himself, he must not only be aware of the need for change, but he must also have an absolute, a living conviction that he must roll up his sleeves and get to work.

To this end, I conducted a poll, became an inquiring photographer, so to speak, and I asked 100 teenagers the following questions:

1. Are you satisfied with the conditions of the teen-age world in which you live?

2. Do you think that Catholic youth in general are outstanding in their efforts to influence toward good?

3. Do you actually believe that you are doing your part, or do you think you are indifferent?

4. Of the following obvious faults of modern youth, which do you think is the root of the greatest evil: Greed for money, love of ease and pleasure, disregard for authority, or laxity of morals in company-keeping?

The resuls were enlightening, assuring us that if Catholic youth must do this task of changing the world, he does have an absolute conviction that his world needs change. Only 16 percent were satisfied, proving that Catholic youth does realize the necessity for positive Catholic action. Now the percentage of those who considered Catholic students outstanding in their efforts to do good was greater, 30 percent, but 60 percent believed themselves to be indifferent on this score. Disregard for authority was considered by far the root of the greatest evil with 47 percent; love of ease and pleasure taking second place with 30 percent. Think of it. Sixty-seven percent admitted that they did not say the daily rosary, and 30 percent never made the first Saturdays for peace.

Further, I asked these same youths, whom I questioned at basketball games, at St. Martin's Sunday night dances, at the drug store, and even at a girls' slumber party: "What do you suggest that we can do?" And it was here that the virile quality that makes youth so attractive to those of every age came forth. Straightforwardly, courageously, recklessly (for they indicted themselves), the answers poured from the recreation rooms, from the Boys' Club rooms, down the bowling alleys, across the dance halls, and even from our living rooms like this:

Catholic youth does not pray enough. Catholic teen-agers do not frequent the sacraments enough. Catholic teen-agers could do better jobs of being missionaries in their own homes. Catholic teen-agers follow rather than lead. Catholic teen-agers are apologetic for their faith, instead of being proud, puffed up, that they are signed and sealed as the children whose father is a God, and whose birthright is not transient, but eternal happiness.

Catholic youth does not pray enough. His life is unbalanced. Finding time only for the so-called good times, his prayer life slips woefully into the background. There are many teen-agers here who fill every spare moment of the day with the latest disks, who cannot think, unless they have their favorite station turned on, drooling out the latest blues or be-bop. If only we could not think without tuning in with a short prayer, dedicating our actions to God, instead of to self. How often a day do your thoughts turn to God? Or are you one of the more than 50 percent of Catholic students who admit that they say no prayers but night prayers, unless they are said in school?

Catholic teen-agers do not frequent the sacraments enough. Just as the physical side of man cannot subsist without food, neither can his spiritual nature go without spiritual food. Are you one of the 47 percent who confess that they substitute the good times of Saturday nights for the reception of holy communion on Sunday mornings? Would you dare to start this Saturday night, and drop the A-bomb in your crowd? No Hot Shoppes for us, boys, we're going to communion tomorrow.

Catholic teen-agers could do better jobs of being missionaries in their own homes. Persuade a wayward member to make a mission, and make it with him. Remind the lukewarm of approaching fast days, and no meat sandwiches, yourself. Shock them all, when you ask naively, "Well, who's going to daily mass with me during May?" Sometimes at a meal, a comment like this sets others thinking. "You know what I learned in school today, Pop, that I never knew before? Our capacity for happiness in heaven depends upon the supernatural life we live on earth, and that is determined by the graces we receive through prayer and the sacraments. You know, Pop, for me, that's a greater incentive to pray more."

Catholic teen-agers follow rather than lead. What a tragedy that this is so. Will you say "No," when your date suggests an objectionable movie? Will you refuse to listen to a conversation that is ruining another's good name? Or will you like a weak straw blown hither and thither in the wind, follow the crowd? If one-fifth of the United States is Catholic, out of every five leaders, is one a Catholic? Why not? How many potential leaders should there not be among our ranks—but where are they? Step up, Catholic youth, before it is too late. Take up the standard of catholicism. Cherish it, protect it. But above all, accept the challenge that rings from pole to pole. Be not hearers of the word, Catholic youth, but doers, also.

Time for the President to Recognize MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport Post on April 23, 1951, containing a clear-headed and thoughtful analysis of the conflict between President Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

TIME FOR ACTION COMING

Now that his magnificent New York reception is over and General MacArthur is resting, it is about time for the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the secretaries and congressional leaders to get down to the business of deciding once and for all where we are going with the Korean war. They've had plenty of time for resting, up to now at least.

The outpouring of affection for the general has come spontaneously from the hearts of the American people. The tribute was one due a great man, a hero in every sense of the word. Eventually the cheers of the greatest throng in history will subside, and the political and military leaders of the Nation will have to be concerned with the practical aspects of the MacArthur proposals.

The general didn't make his historic address for glory or for fun. It was one of the most serious patriotic statements ever made by any man, and what he said must be so considered by Mr. Truman and all those who give him advice on policy matters.

If this group delays and fiddles, there will be another roar from the public demanding action. The Korean war, the Asian problem, the strategy to be applied in the war on communism, must be discussed and the answers given frankly and promptly to the American people. General MacArthur must not be excluded from those conferences because of the petty opposition of small and stubborn men.

MacArthur has at least given to the American people through his talk to Congress an aggressive positive program. For nearly a year President Truman's program has been negative and drifting, lacking any earmark of strong leadership.

It is impossible at the moment for any individual to say definitely who is right and who is wrong in the conflict of opinion between the man in the White House and the commander who passed the last 14 years in the field.

But it is possible to develop the right policy for us and the free world if the politicians and the military men will sit down together with the general and work long and hard until they can formulate a definite plan and agree to pursue it to the end. There is no sense in delaying any longer, until they become stalemated and bitter. Action for the good of the country is what the people want.

The next move, as we see it, is up to President Truman. Dinners and parties ought to be canceled, random speeches, sniping, and loose talk should be banned by Executive order, and nothing should be allowed to interfere with an honest, full-time endeavor to get this critical problem settled.

Has he the courage and the good sense to make such a strong move? Or maybe he didn't hear the people's demand for action which accompanied their cheers for the great general. We shall see.

Real Statesmanship Can Repair Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest editorials on the subject of the dismissal of General MacArthur appeared in the Seattle Times on April 20, 1951. I insert it in the RECORD in order to bring it to the attention of the Members:

REAL STATESMANSHIP CAN REPAIR BLUNDERS

Now the American people have heard, from the mind and heart of a great soldier and a great statesman, the full story of the Truman administration's blunderings in the Far East.

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur was stripped of his commands last week, the Times counseled calm thinking and urged its readers to wait until all the facts were in before passing final judgment on this dramatic episode in American annals.

Since then, we have heard President Truman's defense of his action. Now we have General MacArthur's statesmanlike analysis of the military problems posed by Communist aggression in Asia and across the globe. We are convinced that the dismissal of General MacArthur was the latest of a series of monumental mistakes.

MacArthur is right. The President and his advisers are wrong. Calm thinking, however, must still be the order of the day as the people of the United States insist that the Ship of State be squared once more upon the right course.

In his magnificent and convincing address before the Congress yesterday, MacArthur showed us clearly how far off that course the national administration has veered.

When Red China intervened in Korea, a new situation was created which called for new political and diplomatic decisions. These decisions have never been made. That was wrong.

It was wrong to ignore MacArthur's plea for intensified economic and naval blockade of the China coast. It was wrong to restrict air reconnaissance on that coast. It was wrong to prohibit MacArthur's air forces from crossing the Yalu River, thus providing sanctuary for Red planes.

It has been wrong to make no use of Chiang Kai-shek's idle army locked up on Formosa. It has been wrong to subordinate Asia to Europe in American defense plans.

It would be wrong to give Formosa to Red China, if President Truman is thinking of any such acquiescence in British demands. It would be wrong to join in any other form of appeasement of Communist aggressors in Asia, in Europe, or anywhere else.

Last of all, it was wrong to dismiss General MacArthur, and wrong not to summon him home before that step was taken for consultation. It will be wrong if he is not immediately restored to full authority in Korea and Japan.

Whether the Truman administration, after all this record of wrong judgment and ineptitude, can summon the courage and wisdom to repair such great damage is the question of the hour. Frankly, it seems too much to hope for. But Congress, by resolution, should at once point the way.

Now Let's Get Down to Debating Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Denver Post of April 20, 1951:

NOW LET'S GET DOWN TO DEBATING AGAIN

Gen. Douglas MacArthur received a tremendous ovation, one richly deserved, when he spoke before the Congress of the United States Thursday. He is a great soldier and a great orator. He made a great address.

The general ably reviewed the case for a stronger effort in the Korean war. He reiterated his previous call for blockade of the China coast, bombardment of Manchurian bases and use of Nationalist troops to start a second front in China proper.

General MacArthur gave Congress a great deal of ammunition for this Pacific phase of the great debate over foreign policy. He did not, however, make clear a number of issues of the utmost importance.

He did not say whether he wanted this action taken by the United Nations, or, failing that, if the action should be taken by the United States alone. He did say that all military commanders whom he knew, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, favor such action as the best military method of achieving victory in the Korean war. He did not say whether or not all military commanders favor this action in light of known and unknown political circumstances regarding Korea.

Neither did the general say at what stage he believed such actions should be taken. Should they be taken all together? Is the invasion of China by Chinese Nationalists, loosed, supplied, and perhaps transported by America, to be done first or last? If the Chinese Nationalists are routed and defeated, is the United States to send troops to succor them? Are we to supply them with guns? Are we to maintain a beachhead on the China coast to assure them of supplies?

These, of course, are vital questions. They determine the degree of involvement that the United States would accept in a new war of this kind.

General MacArthur is an advocate of the purely military viewpoint on the Korean War. He presented a convincing case. He lent great weight to the cause of those who would strengthen the effort in Korea at all costs.

Not living in a purely military world, the rest of us must pause for a moment to catch our breaths and consider the question from other aspects.

The Denver Post agrees with nearly all the principles laid down by General MacArthur. The editors of this newspaper believe China should be blockaded, Manchurian bases bombed, and even, in case of general war with Russia, that troops of Nationalist China or any other faction should be used to fight for our cause.

Yet there are more important matters in the world than these. If it meant break-up of the United Nations, this newspaper would oppose bombing of Manchurian bases and blockade of the China coast. Above all, we believe the fighting members of the United Nations must remain united.

If General MacArthur meant his measures should become United States policy to be pressed before the United Nations, we agree with him in all but the issue of Nationalist China's troops. We are even inclined to accept his judgment, though we know it lessens the possibility of political settlement, that Formosa must never fall into Communist hands—under any conditions now known.

But if General MacArthur meant that we, the people of the United States, should press the Korea war to this extent at the cost of losing support of our allies, then the Denver Post, for one, must disagree.

Assuming, for a moment, that the United Nations will agree to these measures, let us consider the dangers they pose.

Blockade of the China coast seems to pose little additional danger. It would have some good effect, notably on stopping trade in the area of Hong Kong and Macao.

Bombing of Manchurian bases poses more danger. Red China might well call for Russian entrance into the war, under the terms of the Sino-Soviet mutual assistance treaty.

Would Soviet Russia respond to that call? We do not know. That is a chance we would have to take.

One cannot say emphatically enough how foolish it would be for us to examine any of the measures for a stronger war without examining the possible consequences of them. Of all the measures, the use of Nationalist troops bears the most danger of bringing general war. To us it seems to lead directly into general war and it does not seem to be the best answer for victory in Korea.

On the other side, we must again examine the possible consequences of our present policy. Following that policy, it is hard to see how we can achieve better than military stalemate in Korea. Is there any reason to believe we can achieve a political settlement, without appeasing aggression, under present conditions? The chance seems small. We should take stronger action. General MacArthur has proposed strong action. Except for his proposal that we become involved in a Chinese civil war, this newspaper agrees with him. We would even go further in one way and advocate use of the A-bomb in Korea.

These are knotty problems General MacArthur has posed for the second half of the great debate. Let the gentlemen of Congress debate them now for us all to hear. Finally, let Congress, the people, and the administration decide what policy we will pursue in the United Nations, but let the decision be made on the ground of honest opinion, and not be guided by the expediency of party politics.

The Jennie Reed School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Jennie Reed is one of the best-known

and most highly regarded educators in my home city of Tacoma, Wash. She has merited her enviable reputation in the field of education by her unselfish and outstanding service to the people of our community in the public-school system. The Tacoma school directors and members of the educational staff paid just tribute to her in naming a new school the Jennie Reed School. She richly deserves this honor. Knowing her personally, I take pleasure in including with my remarks an editorial appearing in the Tacoma News-Tribune on April 13, 1951:

THE JENNIE REED SCHOOL

Friday night Tacoma school directors and members of the educational staff pay a great tribute to an associate. They are honoring a living educator at the dedication ceremonies for the Jennie Reed School. This is one of Tacoma's newest and most modern school buildings. Its designation is the greatest of compliments to a distinguished Tacoma woman.

Dr. Jennie Reed came to Tacoma in 1910. She was born in Corning, N. Y., and educated in New York and Pennsylvania. Until 1916 Dr. Reed taught at the Irving School, becoming principal of that institution in 1916. In turn, she served as principal of Jefferson School and Sheridan School. Then she was appointed director of the research and psychological clinic for the Tacoma public schools. Later she served as principal of the McCarver Junior High School and later as principal of the Mary Lyon School. She was then transferred to the central research department. The University of Washington honored her with a doctor's degree in 1933.

Her distinguished work for Tacoma schools is thus recognized by the school directors in the selection of the name. To her hundreds of friends in Tacoma and throughout the State this compliment to a living educator is approved as a tribute to an outstanding woman who has made a great reputation in the educational world.

Your Congressman Will Be There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Citizens' Committee to Oppose Flood Control Dams in the Unadilla and Butternut Valleys:

SOUTH NEW BERLIN, N. Y., *April 20, 1951.*
Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On behalf of the citizens of our valley we wish to thank you for the letters we have received from your office. We also wish to express our appreciation for the stand you have taken regarding the matter.

While it is not our intention to advocate other measures, we wish you success in your flood wall bill.

It is our intention to hold a mass meeting during the latter part of May or early June and would like to have you as our principal speaker. Will you address the meeting? If so, would you pick a Saturday or Sunday afternoon during that time when you will be free and we will plan accordingly?

As you are also against the dams, perhaps you can advise other means that we could use to not only show the proper authorities that we are opposed to these projects but to secure assurance from them that the proposed area dams will not be built.

Very sincerely yours,
CITIZENS COMMITTEE,
WALTER BAGG,
President.

Pattern for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, because Miss Margaret K. Patterson has so eloquently stated a pattern for survival, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of her remarks made to the Burrall Class, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., Sunday morning, March 11, 1951. Miss Patterson is assistant teacher of Burrall Class and principal of the Lafayette School in the District of Columbia. I commend her lecture to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PATTERN FOR SURVIVAL

I attended a meeting of school people recently where the film Pattern for Survival was shown. Perhaps some of you have seen it.

The film first showed in simple terms the nature of the atom bomb, and then showed through the experiences of a family living in a city apartment house the steps to follow in seeking safety in case an atom bomb struck. Included also, in graphic form, were suggestions as to what to do in any number of situations in which a person might find himself—at work, walking in the street, driving a car, riding on a public conveyance, etc.

Pattern for survival. We all are interested in that pattern, are we not? Never before, in our lives certainly, have we been so conscious of the imminent danger of wholesale destruction. Do you find yourself started now and then by some unusual sound or phenomenon which suddenly appears? Life has suddenly become very precious and we look upon each day, each hour, with new eyes—new appreciation.

Did you see the article in the Star recently telling of the young woman who lost her eyesight last November? She had to undergo an operation on her eye for detached retina. For several weeks she had to lie motionless with 25-pound sandbags on each side of her head. She returned to work February 5.

"I'll never cease to thank God every day that I live that I can see sunlight again," said Mrs. Hemp. "I didn't know it could be so beautiful."

Our fears today seem more real than ever before, more grounded on facts, as through all the modern media—press, radio, television—we see and hear the terrible things that may befall us. War of nerves, germ war, atom bomb, hydrogen bomb. Surely it would seem to us that our world—the one in which we live—could not survive.

I heard General Hershey speak a short time ago. He emphasized the fact that each generation had had to face its problems of survival. He cited Lincoln's time—we had been thinking particularly of Lincoln around the 12th of February—and he spoke of the hazards that then threatened life on every hand. Physical comforts were at such a premium that Lincoln's family and the neighbors felt themselves fortunate if they had four sides of a shelter rather than a three-sided lean-to. The mortality rate was high. Many could not survive the rigors of the cold winters and the deprivations they suffered. Lincoln's own mother and sister were among these. Along the frontier areas of our country a man's life was constantly in danger. An Indian might let fly an arrow at any unexpected moment.

"You're no more dead with an A-bomb than you were with an arrow and you're probably a lot more comfortable," said General Hershey.

Pattern for survival. On what are many people relying in their thoughts nowadays?

Some are relying on rationalization for one thing. "Perhaps Russia, after all, will not drop A-bombs on Washington. She is well aware of the fact that we are all set—poised for retaliation. The first move on her part to destroy our cities and our people would lead to immediate destruction of her own cities and people. Not even the leaders, who seem to regard human life lightly, want mass destruction." Yes: rationalization does reassure a bit and contribute somewhat to one's peace of mind.

There are people who are pinning their hopes for survival on information.

"Let's bring our fears out in the open and talk about them. Let's learn more about the nature of the A-bomb—how it works—what it does—what we do in case we are alerted." There are specific things to do, as we are all learning, which will contribute to our safety, wherever we may be when the crisis occurs—seek a bomb shelter, a basement, a wall, a heavy piece of furniture, cover all exposed parts of one's body, keep covered until the all-clear signal is given.

Soon an illustrated pamphlet of instructions will be put into every classroom in the city, and teachers and children will study and learn together how they can help themselves and others when and if the emergency comes. Yes; knowledge does help. I must admit that after viewing the film Pattern for Survival, I felt a little less afraid, a little more assured, that by taking definite safety measures, one's chances for survival are fairly good. The unknown presents one of our outstanding causes of fear.

But are rationalization and knowledge, important as they may prove to be, sufficient to give us that peace of mind, that calm and courage, that will see us through any crisis?

We must have something more. We know that the only thing on which we can really rely is that which lies within our spiritual world—that which lies deep within ourselves—inner resources—"The Kingdom of God within you."

We believe in a God and believe that He lives within our hearts and minds. Not long ago a survey was made of the people of the United States to ascertain their religious beliefs. More than 90 percent said they believed in God. But the survey went on to point out that only about 20 percent showed by their actions that their belief had any governing power in their lives.

Can we get a pattern for survival for ourselves that will help govern our hearts and minds for whatever disaster may come to us?

I should like to suggest three things that might contribute toward building within ourselves a pattern for survival.

1. The first thing I would suggest is to seek—seek spiritual growth.

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you."

And what are these things? They are freedom from anxieties about our material needs as clothing, food and shelter—freedom from doubts and fears which assail us—they are confidence and assurance and faith in the goodness of God.

Let us think of what is implied in that word "seek." We might substitute the word search or study.

"Study to show thyself approved unto God."

Spiritual growth does not just take place automatically because we wish it to do so.

We read the papers, listen to the radio, see television, attend lectures—following definite plants to keep ourselves enlightened about what is going on in the world—all of which is desirable and good but how much time do we give to enlightening ourselves on matters pertaining to the spiritual—to strengthening the spirit?

We know, not just because we have been told or have read about it, but cut of our personal experiences, that faith and prayer are creative forces for courage—and yet think of the minimum of time we give to strengthening these forces—we may crowd into a busy day perhaps a bare 5 minutes or so for study and meditation.

Through active seeking and study we grow into a realization of our inner resources—an identification of self with the God within—and only then can we come into a power that will build a pattern for ourselves capable of withstanding whatever may happen.

Back in Deuteronomy, Moses might well have been speaking to us when he said to his people:

"But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him with all thy heart and with all thy soul."

Through daily study, prayer for guidance, search for enlightment and for truth, joyful thanks for what we have, and now and then, an actual listing of one's assets, problems, and plans in an attempt at personal evaluation—we can build for ourselves a strength and a peace that passeth understanding.

Louis B. Mayer, of MGM, writing in Dr. Peale's little magazine Guideposts tells of the influence throughout his life of his mother, a woman of strength and power, the source of which lay in her daily study and practice of faith and prayer.

2. The second suggestion for building a pattern for survival has to do with self-direction or self-discipline. This is necessary to the accomplishment of anything really worth while. The things that come easy with little effort on our part have little meaning or value for us.

Self-denial or self-discipline just for its own sake is neither virtuous nor wholesome. Only when it is exercised as a constructive measure, as a means to a desirable end can it really be justified.

This matter of self-discipline means standing by convictions, by values which we have had cause to believe are good and right, sometimes at the cost of popularity. It takes courage and action.

The article in the Reader's Digest for March by I. A. R. Wylie entitled "Strength for These Days," speaks of this matter of spiritual exercise. These inner reserves or resources, she calls it the inner citadel, enabling us to meet dangerous and difficult times can only be reached when we stand on the firm ground of moral integrity. It is closed, automatically, she says to the cheat, the liar, the tyrant, the self-seeker. It is closed to us whenever we waver from an absolute code of honor and decency.

Self-discipline (direction) implies choice and in every moment of our lives we are confronted with choices. Someone has said that character is the sum total of all of the choices we have made up to date.

Referring to Mr. Mayer again: He tells of an incident when, as a small boy, he got into a fight with another boy. And while he says that he believes the outcome was a draw, he was still muttering and making ugly threats when he reached home.

His mother seemed to be paying no attention to him but the next day they were out in the country on a family picnic. She called Louis aside, saying that she wanted to show him something. They were in a beautiful valley in Canada and mountains towered on all sides, perfect for echoes.

She asked Louis to repeat what he had said the day before. He pretended not to remember. She reminded him that he said, "Damn you." She then had him say it and he was astonished at the volume of the echo which came back. Then she told him to shout it as loud as he could. He didn't want to do it, but knowing his gentle but firm mother, he shouted the words and they thundered back at him like a voice from heaven denouncing him. Then his mother had him substitute the words "Bless you." When he shouted that, the echo came back a benediction.

"Which do you prefer, my son, "my mother said. "It's entirely up to you. That is the way life is. It always returns to us what we say to it. If you shout at it and at your fellow man, 'damn you,' life and your fellow man will shout it right back at you. If you say to life, to humanity, 'bless you,' then your life will be an echo of those words, 'bless you.'

"Choose ye whom ye shall serve, Louis. You have that choice. As long as you live you will have your choice. Every day, almost every hour, in some way a choice will be presented to you. It says in the Bible, that before you this day is the choice, blessing or cursing. I tell you now, my son, that life will echo back to you what you say to it as surely as you just heard this echo here, and the choice is yours what you shall say for it to echo."

Louis Mayer concludes by saying that like every human being, he had sneaked up on life several times and tried to break the echo, but he had never succeeded, not once. Through every trial that has arisen he has seemed to hear his mother say, "You will have your choice as long as you live."

In this matter of choices civilized man is distinguished from the savage by his willingness to endure present pain for the sake of future satisfactions, even though they are rather far distant.

Finally, we need not only to seek and search for truth to strengthen our inner selves, not only to exercise self-discipline and make the right choices but we need more than ever to go outside ourselves—to lose and find ourselves in meaningful helpfulness to others.

"He that is greatest among you must be servant of all."

As we get older there is a tendency to withdraw more to ourselves—a tendency we have to face. We like our physical comforts—again this matter of self-discipline comes in. It is easier to perform services for ourselves rather than for others.

Miss Wylie cites an instance of World War I of a young American officer who went to the home of an English family to spend his last few days before going to join his regiment in France. They welcomed him like a son. They gave gay parties for him and tried to make his stay with them a delightful memory. Only later did he learn that on the eve of his arrival their only son had been killed in action. The writer says she is sure that by their selfless concern for this young soldier these people had surmounted death and that any feeling of bitterness had been driven from their grief.

The English people were outstanding in this last war. Miss Wylie says that she flew to England in 1944 and to her astonishment she found the people living in hourly danger of violent death, their homes in ruins and with many discomforts and privations—strangely enough, almost gaily happy. And to her surprise, she became happier than she had ever been as she lived among them.

She found women, gently nurtured, often elderly, who gave up sleep and rest night after night to fight fire and help rescue neighbors for whom they had assumed responsibility. They were living and dying at their highest level—all barriers between them had been broken down. Their individual resources of strength had been pooled and had become a mighty torrent. As Paul says, they were members one of another and were a whole, happy, integrated people. There was no question that they had developed a pattern of survival through meeting the hardest challenge they had ever known.

Concerning us, I believe with this writer, and I quote, "If that dire hour should ever come, we shall find, perhaps to our astonishment, that it is also our finest hour—the revelations of our true quality. In all men of good will—all free men—is the inner strength, do they but call upon it, to affirm with Emily Brontë, dying, young, forlorn, her genius half expressed but exultantly undefeated:

" 'No coward soul is mine,
No trembler in the world's storm-troubled sphere;
I see Heaven's glories shine,
And Faith shines equal, arming me from Fear.' "

Maiden Voyage of the "Finntrader"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I had the pleasure and privilege to be among those invited to attend a reception aboard the new 414-foot ship, the *Finntrader*, which was anchored in the Alexandria, Va., harbor after its maiden voyage to America. This ocean vessel is owned by Finnlines, Ltd., a subsidiary of Enso-Gutzeit, the largest producer of pulp paper and wallboard in Finland. I was certainly impressed by this ship—it is a modern, streamlined freighter of 6,400 tons, and has fine quarters for 12 passengers.

The appearance of the *Finntrader* is symbolic of the rebirth of the Finnish merchant marine, and the reestablishment of international trade by the Finnish Republic. This vessel was launched early this year in Holland, where she was built according to Finnish plans, and was fitted out inside in Finland. I am told her owners will in the next year be launching three more sister ships to sail the seven seas and the five oceans.

These new units in an expanding Finnish merchant marine bring to light again the distinguished history of the Finns in maritime annals. For years the Finnish sailing vessels were among the finest on the seas. Used in the wheat trade primarily, they were trim and speedy. Joseph Conrad and Alan

Villiers wrote their vital stories around the tales of the Finnish windjammers. Thus the Finns were friendly rivals of the Norwegians in maritime annals, and Finnish sea captains approached the feats of the famous Leif Erickson.

We in America are proud of Finland, and as Congressman from Minnesota's Eighth District which has a large Finnish-American population, I can say with authority that the Finns who migrated to America are like their brethren in the old country—hardworking, conscientious, and patriotic people who have great contributions to the public welfare.

The Finnish Republic is a young republic—it got its start as an independent nation when it divorced itself from the crumbling empire of the Czars. It set up a constitutional government dedicated to democratic principles, which has met its international obligations at all times. In this connection, it was a worthwhile act on the part of the United States Congress to enact legislation 2 years ago to divert future payments on Finland's World War I debt to this country into a fund for the education and interchange of students between Finland and the United States in order to promote better relations between the two countries. This program is operating in a satisfactory manner, and I am proud to have been among those who helped write the proposal into law.

The launching of the *Finntrader*, and its appearance in American ports, is a testament to the Finnish tradition of industry and initiative. The Finnish Republic has, by its own efforts and without Marshall plan aid, repaired the damages of World War II, and is now making great enonomic progress toward raising the living standards and providing the good life for its people. I join with other Americans in wishing Finland well in this undertaking.

The Truman-MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my home town paper, the Galveston News, there appeared on April 21, an exceptionally fine editorial on the subject of the Truman-MacArthur controversy.

It is an objective and level-headed approach and it provides some badly needed food for thought. Between the lines, it admonishes the reader to act without haste and certainly without passion and to consider the present controversy in the light of history.

I take pleasure in inserting the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that its influence may not be limited to my own people but may be felt by the Congress and the Nation:

HISTORY AND THE FEUD

How history will judge the Truman-MacArthur controversy is a matter for speculation. When time mellows judgment, and gives perspective which we lack in our time, it is not impossible that both men will have increased stature because of what has happened. History has a way of dealing kindly with men who feel strongly about important matters and who act positively.

If President Truman can act with dignity and avoid making political capital of the issue, he may someday be judged as a President forced to defy public sentiment by replacing a national hero for reasons he believed to be essential to the safety of the world and the Nation he guided.

If General MacArthur rejects a mantle of martyrdom and refuses to allow himself to be a political tool, he may find a place in the history books as a soldier who felt a sense of a more urgent duty than the soldierly duty of obedience.

History will have an advantage that today we have not had. All the scores will be in and the results will be recorded. Abraham Lincoln is a folk hero and yet Gen. Robert E. Lee has a place of dignity in our history. The ideological conflict between Lincoln and Lee, and the moral beliefs which compelled the latter to resign as an officer in the army commanded by Lincoln to lead the army which fought it, has not dimmed the memory of either in the hearts of their countrymen.

Only little men show up as little after a long time.

Skirmish Won, But War May Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Thursday, April 19, 1951:

SKIRMISH WON, BUT WAR MAY GO ON

The vote of the House Interior Committee killing (for the time being) the central Arizona project is a victory for California, but not a secure enough one so that we can afford to relax vigilance. The committee voted, 16 to 8, to discontinue further hearings until either the Supreme Court defines the respective water rights of California and Arizona or the two States agree on a division of the Colorado.

But this does not mean the project may not be taken up again for Arizona has not dropped her fight.

The court action cannot be obtained until an enabling resolution is passed by Congress. Such a resolution is pending in the Judiciary Committees of both Houses, but Arizona has blocked consideration. As for agreement, the two States have been disputing for 30 years over this question and seem to have made no progress toward agreement.

The bill which the committee tabled was a proposal to authorize construction of extensive dams, pump lifts, and canals for the purpose of irrigating central Arizona, at a cost estimated at very nearly $800,000,000, but which was regarded as certain to run very much higher.

The committee has been having hearings on the bill which already have run more than 6 weeks. The vote stops the hearings.

Victory climaxed a steady fight by two California Congressmen, Representative POULSON, of Los Angeles, and Representative ENGLE, of Red Bluff, supported by Representative YORTY, of Los Angeles.

They contended that the 1,200,000 acre-feet the project would take from the Colorado was far more than Arizona's just share and would endanger the established rights of California to water; also that the project was impractical in that it could not possibly repay any substantial part of its cost as reclamation projects are supposed to do.

Obviously the costs would have to be paid by the general taxpayers, including those of California.

As to the rights of the two States in the waters of the river, that obviously is a question for the courts, but Arizona has resisted all efforts to take the matter to court.

Arizona's ostensible objection that a suit would take too long is obviously invalid. The defense effort would force postponement of construction for several years in any event and it probably would not take more than a year to get a court decision.

The action of the committee is sound and sensible and the thanks of California are due to its Representatives who fought and won the battle.

General MacArthur's Address to Congress Will Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no one who heard the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he spoke to the Congress of the United States will soon forget. His words spoken with deep conviction and restrained emotion made a profound impression upon those who listened.

General MacArthur reported on the situation in the Pacific Far East as he knows it from his long personal experience in that area as a soldier in the field and as an administrator in Japan. He outlined the history of the Far East, its culture and its aspirations against colonialism, and of the influence of this history upon present events.

And he warned in view of these facts that a defense line in the far Pacific—Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines—is essential to the defense of the western boundaries of the United States itself.

Here was a great American, a statesman and a soldier. As a man who has lived intimately with war and knows its degradation and horror, he deplored the use of war as a means of settling disputes. But he warned that a nation once in war cannot retreat, for "there is no substitute for victory."

General MacArthur received a deserved ovation upon the conclusion of his magnificent address. The following appraisal of his speech by David Lawrence high lights the essential points of the general's report to the Congress:

MAN FROM THE PAGES OF HISTORY—CONGRESS IMPRESSED BY GENERAL'S DRAMATIC APPEAL TO COUNTRYMEN FOR COURAGE AGAINST DEFEATISM

(By David Lawrence)

They came, they saw, and they heard. They—the Congress of the United States—went away profoundly impressed that here was no ordinary man, no ordinary soldier, no ordinary general. For here was a statesman

speaking, a man from the pages of history whose dramatic appeal to his countrymen for courage against defeatism, for boldness, and resoluteness against softness and appeasement will be recorded for all time as the appeal magnificent. Here was Douglas MacArthur closing 52 years of military service to his country.

Those partisans who came expecting a political dynamic or a petty complaint against the fate that deprived him of his command in such humiliating manner found an entirely different spokesman. His speech was the voice of the soldier caught in a trap in Korea but serving his flag and not asking the reason why. His speech was the voice of the America of yesteryears when Americans did not prate of defeat and speak with fear and trembling to the enemy that had despoiled a weaker nation and tortured or killed prisoners.

Members of the Senate and House—Republicans and Democrats—listened as if transfixed. They heard a man of deep conviction, talking with an emotion restrained with difficulty as he told of Asia, the far-off continent where revolutionary changes are in progress. He told of Japan, beaten 6 years ago, but now on the way to democracy. He spoke feelingly of the desperate effort of the Korean people to save their independence. He spoke sympathetically of the slow but sure evolution of government in the Philippines.

But the speech was not one of mere sentiment. It was the well-mobilized argument of a man who for a quarter of a century or more has studied the Far East—its culture and its aspirations against colonialism. He spoke as a liberal about the hopes of peoples as against tyrants. He did not fail to speak also of the great hopes of the world for peace by means of collective security.

All the ideals of America General MacArthur articulated with the measured phrases of a statesman. All the hopes of the world for an end to war as a means of settling disputes he championed with wholehearted devotion. But, he warned, once a nation enters a war, there is no time for retreat or appeasement, no time for compromise. He said with an emphasis that shook the Chamber with applause: "There is no substitute for victory."

The general built up point by point the case for a defense line in the far Pacific—Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines. He said if that line was broken, our own Pacific coast would not be safe. And then he emphasized why it was important to hold Formosa.

The statement that came as the highest surprise was his flat declaration that the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff in the past had agreed with this military strategy.

There will, of course, be controversy over various points in the speech. It will be debated and perhaps investigating committees of Congress will ask for the documents and evidence relating to it.

The general has notified Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that, while he does not want to get into a controversy or pursue these matters, he will willingly cooperate with the committee should it desire him to amplify his views. So Senator RUSSELL plans next week to fix a time, possibly for the following week, when the Armed Services Committee will go into details, with General MacArthur as a witness.

Meanwhile, the National Capital still is shocked by the whole affair. The reception given General MacArthur was so striking that it could not but overwhelm for the time being almost every other activity of the Government. The welcome to the general was, of course, a tribute to a great soldier as well as to a soldier-statesman.

But it was also a human reaction to the summary way in which a great general had been instantly relieved of his command without even being given the opportunity to say farewell to his troops. No similar case is on record in all the history of the United States. Generals have been ordered to relinquish their commands but on none has such a sentence been imposed—without trial—with so abrupt a detachment from his command without a real word of explanation of what orders or instructions he had violated, if any. The conclusion is inescapable—General MacArthur was made the victim of the petty political spirit of our times.

The stature of General MacArthur, after his address to Congress, looms larger and makes an even deeper imprint on the pages of history. He was magnificent in his words of farewell. It was an hour of triumph in which the people, in effect, repudiated the sad implications of government by petty politics and raised their eyes with hope as they heard the first words of real leadership that have come from the National Capital in many a long year.

What a Soldier Boy Thinks When He Leaves His Homeland for War Service Abroad—Dedicated to the Hope for Everlasting Peace and Good Will Among Men—By 19-Year-Old James A. Fenton, Fortieth Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish Dean Acheson and some of his wild-eyed boys would read this letter:

DEAR GRANDPA: When we left Camp Cooke at 4:30 in the morning, we did not get to San Francisco until 5 that night. We left the dock at 6. It was still light when we went under the Oakland Bay Bridge. When we got about 3,000 yards away (beyond) from it, the ship stopped. They did that so we could practice the fire and boat drill before the men got sick. Then we pulled up anchor to start our long, and what seemed to us our trip to death, across the sea.

As we came closer to the Golden Gate Bridge, we passed the "Rock" (Alcatraz). The men and myself talked about it—then we got closer to that mighty span of steel that went from one side of the bay to the other, which to me represented a line. When inside this line, you were in the land of the free and the happy, and when looking out over this line into the darkness of night, it represented the danger and the fear of the unknown you might encounter.

When we came within 200 yards before passing under this work of art, there came a silence over the ship: a silence that is only experienced when men from different States are thinking to themselves, and trying to believe it is all true, that they are being taken from their loved ones, their friends, their homes, mothers and fathers, aunts and uncles, and all the things they believe in.

When we did pass under it, we all looked back. I knew that each and every one of us was thinking the same thing as the city and harbor lights began to fade away. It is difficult to tell you how the men and myself felt as we watched those lights grow dim, many of us wondering if perhaps this was to be our last look at what we loved so dearly. The facial expressions were varied; some of the young ones with the expressions of youthful eagerness and adventure. The veterans and older ones with the attitude of "well here we go again," or "it seems to me I've seen this before."

Until you have left behind all the things you have lived for, or wanted to live for and watched them disappear with the shoreline into the vastness of the sea, you can hardly conceive what being an American can mean.

You may think the men cried aloud as they watched this unbelievable thing happen—not aloud, but deep down inside where it hurts more, and makes you want to cry aloud.

I dream during the daytime more than I do at night. I dream of only one thing—that is to again be on the side of that line, where there is love, hope and happiness.

Well, I am 19 now, as of the 4th (April) a birthday sailing the high seas.

This letter will be mailed from Japan.

Love,

JIMMIE.

Basic Korea Issue Befuddled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

BASIC KOREA ISSUE BEFUDDLED—ADMINISTRATION BEGINNING TO SMEAR MACARTHUR AS WAY TO ANSWER FUNDAMENTAL ARGUMENTS

(By David Lawrence)

General MacArthur's renunciation of any political aspirations and his pointed request that his name should not be used in a political way certainly was a timely demolition of attempts to befuddle the basic issue—whether American boys in Korea are going to be killed day after day without a real chance to fight back at the air forces bombarding them.

The introduction of the political innuendo against General MacArthur was an administration tactic. Smarting under the evident disapproval by the country of the crude method of relieving a distinguished general of his command, the Truman supporters in Congress have hit a new low in politics. They have already begun to smear the general as if that's the way to answer his fundamental arguments.

But the conversation often turned at the Capitol Wednesday to the misuse of the office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to make political speeches for the President and the Truman administration.

General Bradley, as Chairman, does not have a vote in the Joint Chiefs, and it never was intended that he should be the spokesman of the administration when it got into hot water in a political combat on Capitol Hill. General Bradley implied that General MacArthur wants to fight a war on the mainland of China and favors a deliberate expansion of the area of the war. This charge isn't so and causes disappointment among those who had come to look on General Bradley as above the political game.

What the administration fails to see and what General Bradley failed in his speech to meet is the complaint of the mothers and fathers of the boys who are in Korea. These boys don't want to become the victims of giant air raids from Manchurian bases without an effective chance to strike back at those bases.

It is significant that Chairman VINSON (Democrat), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has switched from the

firm position which he took in the case of the removal of Admiral Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations. The admiral testified before Mr. VINSON's committee and was punished as a reprisal for his testimony. General MacArthur was fired because he answered a question from a Member of Congress. Mr. VINSON now says, however, in a letter to a constituent that the whole MacArthur situation "is just this simple." He pointed out that it had been decided by the President that the war in Korea should be localized and that General MacArthur has been advocating that we should win the war by expanding it in Korea and the mainland of China. Mr. VINSON noted that the question was whether we were going to have a little war or a big one and that he wanted to be on the side of a little war.

But that has never been the issue and there isn't a bit of proof that it has ever been. The real issue is this: A decision by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff that Korea was not to be defended was proclaimed officially in January 1950, by Secretary of State Acheson. Then in June 1950, the civilian authority—the President—decided to intervene in Korea, although no adequate military preparations had been made for it. It was a wise decision to make in June 1950, and a wrong decision in January 1950. It was wise in June 1950, because America has never been afraid to be bold when duty called. But if the United States had stationed Marines in the Far Pacific in ample numbers and had not put the bulk of its aircraft carriers "in moth balls," there might have been no war at all in Korea.

Today, however, the question is whether the forces in Korea shall be withdrawn as a consequence of a virtual surrender and appeasement or whether they shall fight to protect themselves against air attack. "Appeasement" is constantly denied but it is the administration's real plan—if the Communists will only come far enough away from their haughty pose to help the administration save face. As to big or little wars, Winston Churchill said in the House of Commons after the Munich appeasement:

"Gentlemen, you have chosen between war and dishonor. You have chosen dishonor. You shall have war."

The answer, as far as the next war is concerned, will come some day when appeasement or what is now euphemistically called a "political settlement" has been effected in Asia. General MacArthur stands as the symbol of opposition to that appeasement, because he honestly believes that a firm position will prevent world war III and that vacillation and phony "peace" talk will only invite world war III.

Airplane Mail and Passenger Service in the Tri-City Area of the Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Members of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

We, the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas that area of the Columbia Basin known as the Tri-City area, comprising the cities of Pasco and Kennewick, the unincorporated area of Richland, and the rural area immediately adjacent thereto, now has a population of some 75,000; and

Whereas the importance of the Tri-City area as an atomic and national defense center makes it vital that rapid transportation facilities exist; and

Whereas the said Tri-City area now has no direct or convenient air communication with coastal cities of the Northwest; and

Whereas the public convenience and necessity of such air transportation service to the coast from the Tri-City area already has been proved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to act promptly to certificate regularly scheduled local airplane mail and passenger service from the Tri-City area to Seattle, via Yakima and Ellensburg; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution immediately to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to the Honorable Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

World Communism and Its Ultimate Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tidings, Los Angeles, Calif., of March 23, 1951:

EL RODEO

As they parley in Paris, we renew our resolution that there must never again be misunderstanding among the free peoples of the world as to the nature of world communism and its ultimate aims. There must never again be misunderstanding above all by the people of the United States.

Along with the civilized world we were shocked with the horror of the Bolshevist seizure of Russia just as the unhappy land sighted deliverance in the allied trumph of the First World War. We made a feeble attempt to rid our gallant ally of the scourge but when the dauntless Poles cleared their land of the marauder and the valiant Magyars quelled the rising of Bela Kun, exhausted and sick of strike and combat, we felt the menace contained beyond the Vistula where, we vainly hoped, it would ultimately be cast aside by the fires of freedom that burned perenially in the breasts of the great Slavic peoples. We sadly underestimated the power and strength of brute force and cunning and cruelty.

For 15 years the regime in Russia was a pariah among the nations, ostracized from the councils of the nations, cut off from the normal channels of trade, denied the friendly hand of the free. As a people, as a nation, we especially seemed to recognize the menace of the upstart to all our glorious Christian traditions, the danger to all our cherished American freedoms. We shuddered at the planned massacre of the Ukraine, the endless liquidation of the flower of Russia, the rape and pillage of the innocent, the long trek of political dissidents to Siberian wastes, the wail of the purged—and we steeled ourselves in resolution that here was a godless tyranny bent on a new enslavement of humanity, insidiously planning world revolution, fomenting wars and rumors of wars—and our free choice was to stand steadfast against this new oriental despotism with all the faith and courage of those who in the past shielded us from the enemy without and made this Nation strong and great.

Then came the great change, the awful contrast. We wonder now how we could have been so deluded. But suddenly, over night, it became the fashionable thing to fawn upon and flatter this ugly thing. We were in one of those unfortunate periods of economic collapse when the Nation reeled in bewilderment, caught in the shackles it had forged. There were cold, empty larders, desolate firesides, and a litany of woes, a requiem of tears saddened the land and filled it with cries of deliverance. At the same time the moral bankruptcy of the lost generation reached a new high, and in our confusion we turned to traffic with this evil thing.

It will not harm to rehearse again the scene: Our technicians perfecting the industrial might of an enemy which despite protestations of friendship was vowed to our destruction; our professors heralding the excellence of this tyranny over our vaunted freedom; our journalists slanting and coloring the news to gloss over Communist excesses, deliberately confusing the issues, bewildering by silence and innuendo; our statesmen and diplomats in undignified social contact squandering the faith of freedom of Christian men over half the world for a mess of Soviet pottage, the collective lunacy of the land which failed to discern the web that was slowly being spun around it.

The fact that we were once uneasy comrades in arms against a common foe does not excuse us. We should still have known—because of our former understanding, because of the callous aggression on Finland, because of the cynical smile on the faces of Molotov and Von Ribbentrop as the pact sealed the mutual plunder of Poland and prepared Hitler's assault on the West. And the sell-out of our friends and our intrepid allies at Yalta and Teheran and Potsdam is something we have not yet had the conscience to disavow.

That is why we repeat that there must never again be misunderstanding among the free peoples of the world as to the nature of world communism and its ultimate aims. There must never again be misunderstanding above all by the people of the United States.

Continued Support for the International Children's Fund Is in Our National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my concern over the drastic cut in the third supplemental appropriation bill from $12,500,000 to $5,000,000 for United States participation in the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

As chairman of the only congressional committee to make an intensive study of

UNICEF, both in respect to the headquarters organization and the field program, I would like to report that I found this special activity for children far more significant for the United States than is generally recognized by this House. I visited headquarters in New York on two different occasions, the European regional office in Paris, and visited with chiefs of mission in Germany, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece, and the Middle East.

The practical character of this action operating at the community level, with its tangible results of improved child health and welfare, has a dynamic appeal to all governments and people. Beyond this human appeal, however, is the effective stimulus of the matching formula. The initiative of the United States Congress in establishing the matching principle for both contributing and recipient countries has proven to be the keystone of UNICEF success. Fifty-four governments have made voluntary contributions for UNICEF assisted programs outside their territories and approximately another $150,000,000 has been made available by recipient countries. I was surprised to find that governments on both sides of the iron curtain were contributing to UNICEF and freely permitting goods to cross usually closed borders. Obvious was the pride which officials in war-devastated countries, as well as those from more prosperous areas, attached to their contributions to this program.

I was impressed in almost every country visited by the magnitude of the UNICEF program in relation to the small sums available. This phenomenon in part stemmed from the strategic character of UNICEF assistance but was only made possible by the organization of hundreds of volunteer local committees composed primarily of parents and teachers who were responsible for the distribution of supplies at the community level. For example, we were informed that in Europe alone UNICEF food has been distributed through more than 50,000 feeding centers, manned by full- or part-time volunteers. Thus tens of thousands of persons are actively engaged in this United Nations program without remuneration.

It would be difficult to measure the extensive humanitarian result of this special assistance to children, but in one country, for example, I saw records of UNICEF-assisted programs which revealed that over a 1-year period, girls in the 12-year-old age group grew in height from 130.6 centimeters to 137.6 centimeters, and weight from 27.7 kilos to 31.6 kilos, as compared to the national average for the same period of 130.9 centimeters for height and 28.5 kilos for weight. Boys in the same age level, who received UNICEF supplies, increased in height 5.1 centimeters and in weight 2 kilos over and above the national average. Government officials and local administrators said that UNICEF imports of supplementary food were not only responsible for increased weight and generally improved child-health condition but were an influential factor in bringing the children back to school.

I felt the international exchange of supplies under this kind of a commodity organization a valuable aspect of the program. In Austria there was sugar from Poland, and cars from Czechoslovakia. In the Middle East, microscopes from Scandinavia and wheat from Yugoslavia, and in Yugoslavia the children were eating Italian rice.

Spot checks showed meticulous reporting and a careful check on the supplies by a staff experienced in the distribution of such commodities.

The fund holds a unique place in the structure of the United Nations as the only body charged with a world-wide supply operation financed on the basis of voluntary contributions from governments, people, and organizations. This aspect of financing by voluntary contributions distinguishes UNICEF from most of the regular United Nations work based on an assessed scale of contributions.

It is not an easy process. Apathy, changes in government, economic vicissitudes, currency and trade regulations combine to make it difficult for UNICEF to rely on sufficient funds for long-range planning. To meet this problem UNICEF has followed the principle of only making allocations when there are sufficient funds on hand to complete a given program. Thus this new cut in the supplemental appropriation will not completely stop operations programed through this fiscal year but will drastically curtail any extension of the present services for children which are just now getting under way in Latin America, the Middle East, and many of the Asian countries.

I was impressed with the high degree of economy and efficiency which characterized the administration of this international program for children, but there are even greater considerations for the benefit of this country which urge me to request the Representatives of this House to restore the full appropriation for the International Children's Fund. For, with many other Members of this body, I agree with General Marshall, when, as Secretary of State, he said:

> Children whose bodies have been starved and warped are likely to develop, if they survive, into a generation of embittered adults. Our national interest as well as our humanitarian instinct demands that we do not permit this to happen. If we fail to do our part for the nourishment and care and normal development today of the children with whom our children will have to live tomorrow, we shall have failed in statesmanship as well as in humanity.

MacArthur's Ouster a Danger to Defense of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

DANGER TO JAPAN'S DEFENSE SEEN AS RESULT OF MACARTHUR'S OUSTER—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS GENERAL WON NATION OVER TO CO-OPERATION FOR WORLD RECOVERY AND PEACE

(By Mark Sullivan)

President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur was not merely a disciplining of him on military grounds. Beyond that and vastly more important, it was expulsion of MacArthur from counsel, from any part in planning or advice. Actually, this had gone on before. During several years MacArthur has been flouted in the public eye and quietly sabotaged. But by Mr. Truman's action the flouting is made formal and whole, permanent and systematic, it is sensationally announced to the world. This has effects that cannot be overcome. The world struggle is, since last Wednesday, a fundamentally changed picture.

Basic in the changed picture is the absence from it of MacArthur, and the fact that his absence is enforced by the President of the United States. The picture now lacks what MacArthur symbolized, world restoration. By what MacArthur accomplished in Japan—changing the sullen bitterness of a conquered people to a spirit that was not merely friendship toward us but eagerness to adopt our ideals and cooperate with us in promoting them in the world—by this, MacArthur brought about perhaps the longest step toward world recovery that has taken place during the postwar period.

MACARTHUR'S CONTRIBUTION

World recovery includes hope of world peace, and progress toward it. To this, MacArthur's contribution has been larger than that of any other statesman. For not only did he bring a powerful and formerly militaristic nation to belief in peace and willingness to promote it in the world; further than that, what MacArthur did in Japan had effects on the thoughts and purposes and hopes of other peoples, especially Asiatic ones. None of these, nor Japan itself, can feel today the way it felt before last Wednesday. It would be an irony, if it were not associated with so somber a tragedy, that Mr. Truman, defending his dismissal of MacArthur, and stating his purpose as prevention of another world war, implies that MacArthur's course would have brought one about.

The changes that have taken place in the world picture include a detail especially ominous to us. Our defense line against advance of Russian communism toward us is potentially moved back some 5,000 miles toward our own shore. Potentially, this had already taken place some 2 years ago when Russian communism overran China and set up in that country the Communist government that now makes war on us. While that was taking place our interest called on us to support the then anti-Communist Republic of China headed by Chiang Kai-shek. But the Truman administration did not merely fail to support Chiang, it took affirmative steps that weakened him. There is abundant and concrete justification for the statement of Senator KNOWLAND of California last September "the State Department tried to bury the Republic of China a dozen times in the last 5 years."

If the dismissal of MacArthur is to become occasion for debate, it is not MacArthur that should be the issue; it is the policy the administration has followed about China during the past 6 years. Once China had fallen to communism, Korea was destined to follow. When Russian communism moved to seize South Korea, resistance to the aggression depended upon the United States. No other country was in a position to act effectively. Whether or not MacArthur was indispensable is not necessary to discuss. It can be assumed that some other com-

mander would have been adequate, though, obviously, MacArthur, by his experience in the East and otherwise, had special qualifications.

JAPAN INDISPENSABLE

But Japan was indispensable. Without it as a base, resistance would have been logistically difficult to the point of impossibility, and the base was made more dependable by the fact that the Japanese people had come to feel affection for MacArthur and, through him, affection for the United States. Besides, they feared and hated Communist Russia and relied upon us to defend them against it.

The changes recently wrought in the world picture cannot avoid disquieting the Japanese people. It is not merely that they see a man whom they idolized removed from them. More or less simultaneously they see Britain propose that Communist China have a place in the making of the treaty of peace about to be made with Japan. They also see Britain propose that Communist China have a seat in the United Nations. They see Britain propose that Formosa be given to Communist China. That has ominous meaning, both for nearby Japan and for us. It would raise a question whether Japan could be defended. Though these proposals have been rejected by the United States, they leave disquiet in their trail.

Former Senator Frank P. Graham Pays Tribute to a Great Statesman and Southern Leader, Charles B. Aycock, in an Address to Joint Session of North Carolina Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest governors any State ever produced was Charles Brantley Aycock, of North Carolina. Recently a former Senator, the Honorable Frank P. Graham, paid an appropriate tribute to this distinguished American in an address to the North Carolina Legislature.

Dr. Graham presents a scholarly and eloquent statement on the contribution that Governor Aycock made to the South's progress in education. No one is better fitted to appraise the career of Governor Aycock than this distinguished and highly respected student of the South's history. It is an honor to be the medium by which the notable address by a beloved southerner is made available to Members of the House of Representatives.

Under leave to extend it, I include the following address by Dr. Graham at the unveiling of the Howard Chandler Christy portrait of Charles B. Aycock, April 9, 1951, in Raleigh, N. C.:

First of all, I wish to express a real sense of inadequacy for the responsibility and a deep sense of gratitude for the invitation of the North Carolina Art Society and the State legislature to interpret anew the enduring meaning of the life and services of Charles Brantley Aycock. It is good from time to time to recapture even fragmentary glimpses of a man whose influence is as ever fair and as ever young as the hopes of children for whose equal opportunity he gave his life. It is altogether fitting that the portrait of this tribune of the people should be painted by a master, distinguished for his noble portraits, and should be hung in this historic hall, famous as the forum of the representatives of the people of North Carolina. May his father, who, during the War Between the States, sat in this hall as a representative of Wayne County, and his mother, whose brow, transmitted to the son, is truly preserved in this portrait, both gather in spirit with us here tonight to share in the commemoration of their son, beloved by his generation above all the sons of North Carolina.

There are certain leaders in the story of our State, who embody in their life and service the meaning of an historic period. With loyalty to the old landmarks, they lay the foundations for the new struggles and hopes toward whose fulfillment the leaders who follow go forward from generation to generation. Such a leader was Charles B. Aycock. His robust heritage was from the rugged pioneer American stock of the early eighteenth century. His democratic idealism is the very stuff of the American dream of the equal opportnuity of all children yet unfilled in the middle of the twentieth century.

I. IN THE HISTORICAL SUCCESSION OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE SOUTHERN STATES NORTH CAROLINA BECAME A LEADER OF THE RISEN SOUTH WHEN AYCOCK BECAME THE LEADER OF NORTH CAROLINA

To catch something of the meaning of the man and his leadership, as we see him come to life again in the frame of this portrait, we must see him in the setting of the age of which he was a gallant and venturesome, kind and simple, inspiring and creative part. The historian characteristically divides our country into sections, our history into periods, and sometimes distinguishes our leaders by regions and eras.

The historians agree that, in the colonial and formative periods of American history, Virginia and Massachusetts, with the cooperation of the original colonies and States, shared a great leadership in colonization, revolution, independence, and federation. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, George Mason, James Madison, John Marshall, and James Monroe have made authentic the primacy of Virginia in the Old South and the pre-eminence of the sons of Virginia in the liberation and organization of the new Nation.

William E. Dodd, my old teacher, in his history of the cotton kingdom gives to South Carolina the southern leadership of the lower South in the middle period. Through the eloquence of Robert Young Hayne, the militant governorship of James Hamilton, the fiery oratory of George McDuffie, and the relentless logic of John C. Calhoun, South Carolina assumed the leadership in our section in the championship of the principles of State sovereignty and the formulation of the creed of the economic, social, and political regionalism of southern rights and institutions. Though Andrew Jackson and James K. Polk and other great southerners as strong nationalists, placed Tennessee and other Southern States high in the council's leadership of the Nation, yet, through Robert Barnwell Rhett of Charleston, along with William L. Yancey of Alabama and Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, South Carolina took the leadership in the secession and confederation of the Southern States.

In the disunion and conflict which divided the North and the South and shattered for a time the Federal union, the greatness of the mind and the nobility of the character and spirit of Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee rose above conflict and bitterness to become the spiritual resource of the reunion of the States. The Midwestern Lincoln, the emancipator of the Negro slaves, nobly magnanimous in victory, and the Virginian Lee, one of the greatest commanders of all time, teacher of youth and reconciliation, sublimely dutiful in defeat, transcended with their immortal spirit both victory and defeat in the reunion and freedom of the United States of America upon whose united strength in support of the United Nations against division and tyranny depends today the freedom and peace of the world. The example of Lincoln and Lee became an inspiration to the youth of America, North and South. The spirit of the new South was soon to be heard, first in the matchless calls of Hill and Grady, of Georgia, a little later in the great educational crusade of Curry of Alabama and Aycock of North Carolina. To all four of these the guiding star of national reconciliation and southern recovery was the nobility of the character, the teaching, and the example of Robert E. Lee.

In the era of the rise of the South from the devastation of the war and the tragedies of reconstruction, Georgia, through the valiant recovery of Atlanta and the eloquent appeals of Benjamin H. Hill and Henry Woodfin Grady, expressive of the heroic spirit of a stricken but dauntless people, became the empire State and the leader in the resurrection of the South.

In the years just before and after the turn of the century and since, North Carolina through her educational, industrial, agricultural, and spiritual pioneers, then became the leader of the risen South. Aycock became the leader of North Carolina when he led the people up from ignorance, poverty, and racial strife through schoolhouse doors, opened to all the children of the people. North Carolina became the leader of the new South when Charles B. Aycock became the leader of North Carolina. The man who in himself preserved the best traditions of a great State, provided the brave and kindly leadership for a turbulent, transitional, and creative age, envisaged the whole commonwealth, all the people, all their industries and institutions, their fears and hopes, who understood and loved them all, beloved by them all, was Charles B. Aycock. Perhaps America's greatest educational governor.

II. THE HERITAGE AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHARLES BRANTLEY AYCOCK

Whence came this man? How did he get that way? In what soil did his rootage sustain the tall timber of his soul? We would know the stock of his heritage, robust in body, brilliant in mind, unyielding in moral power, patient and forward in his sympathies with the people in their common hopes for the equal chance of their children. Deep was his rootage in the soil of rural North Carolina. High was his faith in the people even when they reviled him. Reverent was his oneness with the moral sovereignty which undergirds the nature of man and the universe.

His heritage on both sides of the family was sturdy pioneer English stock, Baptist on his father's side and Quaker on his mother's side. The Baptist and Quaker strains were deep parts of his life and faith. Such God-fearing, self-reliant, farmer folk have long been the rugged democratic backbone of North Carolina. As pointed out by R. D. W. Connor and Clarence Poe in their authentic biography of Aycock, land grants were made to the Aycocks in Northampton County before the middle of the eighteenth century. Two of the east Carolina Aycocks were soldiers in the American Revolution. The first Federal census lists the paternal and maternal ancestors, Aycocks and Hooks, as freeholders of Wayne County lands in 1790.

His father, Benjamin Aycock, was the Wayne County clerk of the court and State legislator who stanchly supported the Confederacy in whose armies two of his sons were soldiers at the front. His mother, herself unlettered, especially inspired her youngest son with a love of learning and a championship of the equal chance for education

which the State had denied to her. Charles was the youngest of her seven boys and perhaps North Carolina's most gifted son in a generation of men great in the rebuilding of an old commonwealth.

Charles B. Aycock was born near Nahunta in Wayne County, November 1, 1859, more than a year before began the war, which shook a continent with its conflict of heroic peoples and its mighty social impacts whose aftermath of ruin and bitterness, struggles and hope, became the reference frame of young Aycock and his generation. This youngest son, with a high capacity for fine feeling, was plastic to the rugged molding of the privations and memories of war, the mistakes and bitterness of reconstruction, and the hopes for a better day. In the spirit of his great forerunner in the affections of the people, Zebulon B. Vance, he accepted with his characteristic good will the "duties of defeat," as enjoined and exemplified by Lee and Vance.

With the faults, frustrations, and hopes of a lively boyhood, young Aycock learned the lessons of a simple democracy in a farm family of 10 children. In the give and take of such a family he grew to respect with kindness the rights, feelings, and personalities of other people. He learned with sympathy the ways of dogs and horses. He tilled the soil and followed the plow. He hunted foxes, wrestled with other boys in the barnyard, tramped the fields and forests, had an ear for the songs of sweet-throated birds, and the melodies and cadenced grandeur of the poets. He learned from nature, from books, from people, and from the times. He learned from the household duties and simple piety of his mother who taught him a high reverence for women, for work, and sacred things.

When he and six brothers walked miles from the farm to a subscription school, it was borne upon him that there was no public school for them and countless thousands like them. His first school was in Nahunta, since named Fremont, where Aycocks still live to give historic association to the name and place. Then at the Wilson Collegiate Institute he sat at the feet of a remarkable teacher, the Elder Sylvester Hassell; "trapped" to the top of the class just ahead of young Josephus Daniels. There young Daniels, later at Chapel Hill and in print shops, got his preparation for his life as a tribune of the people, fighting editor in the cause of the people; as Secretary under Woodrow Wilson, builder of a powerful Navy; and as Ambassador to Mexico, the champion of inter-American good neighborhood. Charles B. Aycock and Josephus Daniels, schoolmates in Wilson, became comrades in arms in the later campaigns against special privilege, tariffs, and monopolies and together fought in the great crusades for the schools of the people. At Wilson, Aycock debated with other such schoolmates as Rudolph Duffy and Frank Daniels, who became his lifelong law partner and friend. In Kinston he was further prepared for the university by Joseph H. Foy, whose influence upon him was ever after one of the precious treasures of his life.

III. INFLUENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY ON AYCOCK

In the fall of 1877, 2 years after the reopening of the university and a few months after the withdrawal of the Federal troops from the Southern States, Charles B. Aycock, fresh from the cotton fields of Wayne County, alighted from a hack in front of the old Watson Hotel in Chapel Hill, to enter the University of North Carolina. Handsome, well proportioned, studious, and with self-reliant charm, he soon became a leader of a little band of remarkable students in the reopened university, which was to open their minds and kindle their hearts with the vision of rebuilding the life of a stricken but dauntless people.

One of these college mates of Aycock, Edwin A. Alderman, has said of the university of those days:

"There was no better place, I think, for the making of leaders in the world, than Chapel Hill in the late seventies. The note of life was simple, rugged, almost primitive. Our young hearts, aflame with the impulses of youth, were quietly conscious of the vicissitudes and sufferings through which our fathers had just passed. The conquered banner and the mournful threnodies of Father Ryan were yielding to songs of hope. A heroic tradition pervaded the place, while hope and struggle, rather than despair or repining, shone in the purpose of the resolute men who were rebuilding the famous old school."

Next to the Father of us all, his mother, and the two charming Woodard sisters of Wilson, N. C., who became the mothers of his eight children, Alma Mater and her sons were, by his own testament, deep and abiding influences in his life. Historic halls of the first State university buildings in America, with the hills and forests around, stirred his imagination with the traditions of the great past of the State and the hopes of the people for greater days to come. In these woods the veterans of the Revolution founded the university of the people. Here studied, played, and dreamed the youth who reached the highest offices and leadership of the State and Nation. The little group of professors, wisely gathered by President Battle carried on the high scholarly traditions of the university in which Charles Aycock, though weak in mathematics, soon excelled in the classics, political economy, and philosophy. He became under their inspiration a master of ideas, words, and logic. He was a match for all contenders in the Phi Society. He early became a leader of the student body and especially of a company of gallant souls who were soon intent upon the educational business of transforming an old State into a new commonwealth.

Unprecedented in the history of the university before or since, in protest at what was considered faculty interference with their elections, the insurgent students elected Charles Aycock the chief marshal during his first year. This story is graphically told by Judge Robert W. Winston, his college mate, life-long friend, and his partner in a great law firm, in his brilliant university day eulogy of Aycock. This turning to him by the students of the university for leadership in a muddled situation was prophetic of the call to him by the people of North Carolina for leadership in troublous times toward better days.

Along with James Y. Joyner and three score other students, Charles Aycock joined the Baptist Church at Chapel Hill under the influence of a young minister, A. C. Dixon, one of the legion of ministers, teachers, writers, governors, judges, legislators, and builders with whom Wake Forest College has blessed the North Carolina of Aycock's generation and since.

Under the wise and kindly President Battle he doubled his courses to study law in his senior year. He also came under the influence of the spirit of a brave woman whose unresting pen in letters to her boys had spurred former governors and countless alumni and legislators to reopen the university. It was the valiant Cornelia Phillips Spencer, who in 1875 climbed to the belfry in the South Building in which Aycock was later to room and rang the college bell which had not rung in Chapel Hill for 5 years. The woman who rang the bell thus announced in spirit to the generation of Charles Aycock that the university was reopened and that the historic institutions of the people were on the march again.

IV. COOPERATION OF ALL INSTITUTIONS

The momentum of the traditions, services, and hopes of almost a hundred years could not be ended by the turbulent times which had closed the university's doors. Noble colleges of the churches for men and for women, historic private academies, and a few public schools had kept the lamps of learning burning during those dark times.

May we, in the spirit of Aycock and in our gratitude, say for them all, both church related and privately endowed institutions, all hail for their great role through the years and all success in the campaigns for building nobler mansions of the mind and soul of youth. It was for this that the university was reopened in 1875, consolidated in renewed and reinforcing strength with the Women's College and the State College in 1931, both founded as products of the great democratic educational crusade. This University of Aycock, this university of the people is the cooperative partner of all the schools and colleges, public, denominational, and private, under the distinguished and devoted leadership of Gordon Gray in able cooperation with Controller W. D. Carmichael, Jr., and the chancelors, R. B. House, J. W. Harrelson, and E. K. Graham II, who has just succeeded the able and beloved Chancelor W. C. Jackson, teacher and biographer of the life and spirit of Aycock.

V. THE GREAT CRUSADE

In the year 1877, in which Charles Aycock entered the reopened university, there was a need for a democratic State-wide system of public schools to undergird all our colleges, industries, institutions, and enterprises of the common life and liberate great bodies of the people from poverty and privilege, prejudice and ignorance, into creative cooperation for a better life for all people.

With the coming to Chapel Hill in one student generation of Charles B. Aycock, Edwin A. Alderman, Charles D. McIver, James Y. Joyner, Locke Craig, M. C. Noble, W. J. Peele, Robert P. Pell, Francis D. Winston, Robert W. Winston, R. A. Doughton, James S. Manning, Robert S. Strange, Horace Williams, Frank Daniels, Charles R. Thomas, and other teachers, builders, and dreamers, something deep and creative happened in the history of North Carolina.

The night on which some of these graduated, two of them, Edwin A. Alderman and Charles D. McIver, later founder of the Woman's College, in the presence of the heritage of Archibald De Bow and Calvin H. Wiley and in the presence of the challenge of much ignorance and poverty in the general life, talked far through the night. As one of them later said in recalling this night that "toward morning 'by a light that was never seen on land or sea'," they had resolved to give their lives to educating the people to the need of education. It had become the stuff of their convictions, under God, that the public schools were the chief hope of a more creative and nobler commonwealth for which they had been preparing as they dreamed their dreams on the holy hill of their great dedication.

From the fires burning on that hill and in other schools and colleges of the State, the torches were lighted for the educational crusade which was to become the inspiring part of an industrial, agricultural, and cultural renaissance. Through dynamic interconnection with movements in other States, this crusade was beginning to stir the hopes of the people for a better day for their children.

Goldsboro, where Charles B. Aycock had been teacher and county superintendent and was now, as the rising attorney in eastern North Carolina, the chairman of the school board, became the front and center of the educational revival. Edward P. Moses, the superintendent, was brilliantly aflame

with the new evangelism and at the Chapel Hill summer school for teachers communicated the flames lighted there and at Goldsboro to the people of the State. Within a brief period there had come to Goldsboro E. P. Moses, from Tennessee; Aycock, Alderman, later president of three universities; Joyner, the extraordinary organizer of the fruits of the Aycock campaigns, and later president of the National Educational Association; Julius Foust, later president of the Woman's College; and Thomas Foust, all from Chapel Hill; Eugene C. Brooks, later the dynamic State superintendent of public instruction and able president of State College, from Trinity College with its great traditions of Braxton Craven and his Normal College at Old Trinity; and leaders and teachers from Wake Forest College, Davidson College, Guilford College, and especially from the woman's colleges in this capital and other strategic towns, and all the other colleges of the State. The State superintendents, Scarborough, Finger, and Mebane were pointing the way.

Goldsboro, under the chairmanship of Aycock, became one of the main proving grounds and the outpost, from which Aycock moved out to lead the bold and brilliant State-wide movement of the people for the education by public taxation of all the children of all the people.

Against the possibility of the fires burning out with sporadic bursts of popular zeal, the urgent need was the championship of laymen, businessmen, farmers, politicians, and parties. The popular crusade, bravely launched by wise and eloquent educators in the Southern States and aided by philanthropic funds in the North, needed the championship of a statesman who with clear analysis, homely illustration, simple logic, profound insight, and flaming zeal, could identify the values of the public schools with both the common work of the people's life and the noble vision of the people's hopes for the equal opportunity of all children, white and black, in the towns and on the farms. The need was for the commitment of a great leader and a great State to a great cause. The man, the place, the cause, and the opportunity came together in North Carolina in 1900 in Charles Brantley Aycock when he committed the people of North Carolina to public taxation for the education of all the children of all the people. The standard he carried through many campaigns and raised aloft at the turn of the century for the turning of this commonwealth has been carried forward by every Governor of North Carolina from the peerless son of Wayne, Charles B. Aycock, to the fighting son of Alamance, W. Kerr Scott.

Near the turn of the century, three stubborn barriers stood across the way up which Aycock would lead the people into the promised land of education and cooperation. The first barrier, as a part of the aftermath of the war, emancipation and reconstruction, was interracial strife and fears attended by the economic and political exploitation of the Negro. The second barrier was the traditional aversion of the people to taxation and especially the taxation of people of property for the education of the children of poor whites and Negroes, both of whom were considered shiftless and incapable of education. The third barrier was much public apathy and indifference to education based on too widespread illiteracy and poverty.

VI. THE THREEFOLD AYCOCK PROGRAM

Charles B. Aycock declared war on ignorance, poverty, privileged education, and the political exploitation of the illiterate Negroes. He became the successful and popular leader of the movement which had three parts: First, the immediate disfranchisement of the illiterate Negroes; second, the disfranchisement of both illiterate whites and illiterate Negroes after 1908; and, third, public taxation for the education of all children of both whites and Negroes as a basis for increasingly more equal opportunity of all people, white and black, to earn and to vote as the common rights of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

It was the first part of his threefold program which won for him a large majority. The second and third parts were the objects of terrific assaults. The wide popularity which had come to him from the first part was dedicated to the fulfillment of the second and third parts of the program. The suggestion to falter and halt in the fulfillment of the whole program was considered by him to be suggestions for the breaking of pledges given by his party and himself, violations of his personal honor, a failure in more equal opportunity for the poorer whites, a monstrous injustice to the defenseless Negroes and a prostitution of his party and his State.

He declared a new and indignant war on three such suggestions. He valiantly withstood the movement to postpone indefinitely the date of 1908 for the disfranchisement of the illiterate whites and was opposed to devices for the disfranchisement of illiterate Negroes after 1908. He met with hot scorn the suggestion to use the taxes paid by each race for the education of the children of that race. He refused to consider the suggestion for common taxation for the existing school terms and separate taxation of the races for any addition to the school terms.

Once when some friends told him that the movement was gathering strength for the separation of the taxes for the respective apportionment to the schools of the races, he answered simply in case that were done he would resign his office as Governor and retire to private life. He would thus have expressed his sense of personal dishonor and aroused the public indignation for the dishonor of the State whose people he respected and loved too much to betray for any office in their power to give.

Even his own county of Wayne joined many other counties in supporting separation of taxes. He was told not to speak his cause at the Democratic convention in Greensboro in 1904, because the mass of people gathered there would howl him down. With the great friend of education, former Gov. Thomas J. Jarvis, at his spiritual side, he made one of the great speeches of his life, unfaltering to the end in support of common taxation for the education of all children. The ovation given him that day was a landmark in the history of North Carolina and the South. On that day Aycock became the triumphant leader of North Carolina and North Carolina became the new leader of the South.

VII. FOUR PERIODS OF INTERRACIAL RELATIONS

We see him historically now, more clearly in the context of better relations between the races in the South. The relations of the races in the South have four main periods. First was the period of the institution of slavery, inherited from the ancient and medieval world, quickly found unprofitable in the North, and found for a time to be profitable in the South with the illusion of privileges which enslaved the blacks and disinherited millions of whites. Slavery could not endure without a denial of the teachings of our religion, without the renunciation of our democracy, and without the erosion of the economic foundations of the freedom, dignity, and enterprise of the human spirit.

The second period was the period of reconstruction based on the premature enfranchisement of the exploited freedmen and the disfranchisement of the conquered Confederate whites. This domination of the whites by the carpet bag regimes backed by Federal bayonets engendered and contributed to much southern fear, bitterness, and violence for a generation.

The third period was the period of intimidation of the blacks by the whites, the disfranchisement of the Negroes, and too much exploitation of the Negroes without the equal opportunity to learn the meaning of citizenship, to work with higher skills of hand and brain, and to vote as a citizen of our State and Nation.

The fourth period evolved from the tragedies and lessons of slavery and war, the carpetbag-freedmen domination of the whites and the white counterintimidation and exploitation of the then illiterate blacks. This fourth period was a period not of domination and counterintimidation but of education and cooperation. Booker T. Washington, who worked his way through Hampton Institute in Virginia and founded Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, preached the gospel of education, honest work, and personal worthiness as the basis of the new orientation for human progress in the relation of the races. The eloquent statesmanship of Booker T. Washington, J. L. M. Curry, Edgar Gardner Murphy, all of Alabama; the Peabody Board, the Southern Education Board, the Southern Education Conference, the Slater Fund, other private benefactions, and the long gathering momentum of the crusades of Alderman and McIver and their valiant cohorts in North Carolina, all contributed to this period of education and cooperation.

The head and front of this fourth period was the political leader who risked his vast popularity, staked his personal honor, committed his party and his State, and dedicated his vast powers of body, mind, and flaming spirit to the cause of common public taxation for the education of all children.

Aycock talked and preached education in every county in North Carolina and in States from Maine to Florida as a flaming evangel sent from God for the education and redemption of all the children of men. For every day of every year of his administration as Governor, a new schoolhouse arose in North Carolina. The last word he said on this earth as he dropped dead in Birmingham speaking to the teachers of Alabama, was the word "education." The last sentence of the last message to the people in which he was to have announced his candidacy for the United States Senate, published after his death, were these words:

"Equal! That is the word. On that word I plant myself and my party—the equal right of every child born on earth to have the opportunity to burgeon out all that there is within him."

VIII. PRESENT OPPORTUNITIES OF PEOPLES OF GOOD WILL OF BOTH RACES TO COOPERATE FOR FEASIBLE STEPS FOR NOBLER RELATIONS OF THE RACES IN AMERICA

Toward the fulfillment of the hopes of Aycock, the American dream of the founders of the Republic, and the teachings of our religion, the people of good will of both races in the North and the South need to get together for nobler relations of the races in America on some such feasible measures and ideas as the following:

1. In view of the origin, history, and power of the "mores" of peoples based on the universal consciousness of kind, an historic social heritage, the degree of the visibility of the difference between races, the largeness of the members of the groups involved and the economic competition of the low-income groups, there is needed a new emphasis on the influence of religion, education, personal kindness, decent respect for the human dignity of persons, and voluntary cooperation of people of good will for better relations in the local communities, in the long haul of the generations for justice on this earth. To our good northern friends, I emphasize the unwisdom of using Federal compulsions

and force at educational levels beyond the levels of acceptance by the people in the States. Such unwise compulsions cause bitter set-backs not enduring progress which mainly comes from within the minds and hearts of the majority of the people in the States.

2. Federal aid to education under State and local control for the more equal education of all the children in all the States.

3. Local-State-Federal cooperation for the prevention of even one lynching by a mob in the South or a gang in the North.

4. Abolition of the poll tax. If Senators and Congressmen pledge their support of prompt ratification in their States, then the most expeditious and feasible way would be by constitutional amendment, originally sponsored in the Senate by the distinguished Governor and lately lamented Senator from North Carolina, J. M. Broughton.

5. Admission of Negroes at the graduate and professional level where equal facilities are not provided in State institutions in acceptance of the established principles and spirit of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court as the supreme law of the land in the States as well as in the Nation. In case separate facilities are under State laws then provision for equal facilities in schools, libraries, extension services, roads, hospitals, sanitation, health, welfare, and equal justice under law. In cases where churches and private endowments have not provided equal facilities, the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has already pointed the voluntary way for denominational and private, professional and graduate schools.

6. The acceptance of the right of Negroes qualified by education to vote in primaries and general elections. The right to be taxed, to be drafted and to die for one's country carries the right to vote as a qualified citizen of our common country.

7. Voluntary cooperation of labor and management and of private and public facilities in the employment of workers, on the basis of competence, needed for maximum production and the national defense of the very human freedom and dignity now imperilled by denials of opportunity from within and by assaults of totalitarian tyranny from without.

8. Over-all and under-all, the dauntless recognition of the brotherhood of all men and the fatherhood of one God "Who made of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth."

By democratic logic, these are contemporary translations of the basic ideas and long range hopes of Thomas Jefferson and Charles B. Aycock.

IX. AYCOCK AND JEFFERSON

From the hill and shrine of Monticello near Charlottesville in the spring of his dauntless hopes there came down into the valleys of men's struggles, a tall, red-haired, sunny-faced young man to take up his battles for human freedom, national independence, religious liberty, public education, equal opportunity, and the abolition of the slave trade as a step in the ultimate abolition of human slavery. The history of America, with all its faults and frustrations, is humanely different because of the life, sufferings and battles of Thomas Jefferson in the cause of human liberty and equal opportunity for all.

From a historic hill in the woods of North Carolina there returned to his people a tall, blue-eyed, sandy-haired, brilliant, and eloquent young man to take up his life-long struggles for the freedom of the mind and the equality of opportunity through the schools of the people. The history of North Carolina, and the South, with all our faults and frustrations, is hopefully different because of the life, sufferings, and battles of Charles B. Aycock in the cause of the liberties of the people and the equal opportunities of their children.

CONCLUSION

The unveiling of this portrait is the symbol of the ever unfolding life of Charles B. Aycock in the life of this Commonwealth of his struggles and his dreams. In this hour we are desperately reminded that his ideas and hopes for the freedom of the human mind, the dignity of the human being, and the equal opportunity and enterprise of the human spirit are imperiled by the most monstrous threats of totalitarian tyranny. May the commemoration of the life and character of Charles Brantley Aycock mean the rededication of all to the ideas and struggles, carried forward by the United States of America, as the leader, under God, of the free peoples of the earth, in a stronger United Nations, as the best hope of human freedom, equal opportunity, and peace in the world.

Postage Stamps Commemorating Centennial of Territorial Government of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington.

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial relating to the issuance of commemorative postage stamps commemorating the centennial of the Territorial government of the State of Washington

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the Territorial government of the State of Washington was instituted and created in the year 1853; and

Whereas it is eminently fitting, proper and necessary that the centennial of the Territorial government be fittingly observed; and

Whereas it is necessary that proper and timely plans be made for the observance and celebration of said centennial; and

Whereas celebrations, educational meetings, pageants, exhibits, and exhibitions depicting the growth of Washington will be held and many books and publications will be published; and

Whereas services in honor of distinguished Washingtonians who have contributed to its growth and illustrious history will be held in commemoration; and

Whereas such celebration of our centennial should be noted and observed not alone by the proud citizens of the State of Washington but also by the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the President and the Postmaster General of the United States that the Postmaster General issue suitable commemorative postage stamps recognizing and honoring the centennial of the institution of the Territorial government of the State of Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington.

Spencer A. Canary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great editors of northwestern Ohio passed away on Wednesday last. His life was that of a pioneer editor with vast experiences in the everyday life of America. His editorials, including that of the day of his death, were an exposition of America.

From my first days in the Congress he graciously shared his vast experiences of a busy newspaper life and I shall be always grateful for that opportunity of learning the American way of life as lived and expressed by Spencer A. Canary.

I want to include the story from the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio, which he loved and served when "30" came:

S. A. CANARY'S LONG COMMUNITY SERVICE ENDED BY DEATH

Yesterday was "30" for Editor Spencer A. Canary, of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune. This symbol, used by all newspaper folk, means the end of the story or the final piece of copy for an edition of the paper.

Our editor passed away last night at 10 o'clock. His passing came with shocking swiftness while he and his wife were discussing plans for arising early this morning to start a motor trip through the Southern States. They were planning to be gone about a month and intended to let their whim and fancy choose their daily destinations.

His preparations for the trip were almost prophetic. He had cleared his desk late yesterday and had bid goodbyes to all the members of the editorial and business staffs.

In turning out the editorial which appeared in yesterday's paper he stated "This is my last editorial. I won't be writing any more after today." This naturally was understood by all to mean that he was not going to bother to write editorials during his extended vacation trip. The shocking truth of the statement came to us with frank reality today.

He was looking forward to the trip with great anticipation. He had just come in possession of a new automobile, the gift of one of his sons, and he had advised Mrs. Canary to pack sufficient clothing for at least a month of touring.

After his usual evening of reading and watching of a television program, he followed Mrs. Canary upstairs, carrying some freshly laundered clothes up to the top landing. On arriving there he sat on the edge of the cedar chest to chat about final plans with Mrs. Canary, advising her that they

would arise early in the morning and travel a while before eating breakfast somewhere along the way.

In the midst of their conversation he started to slump over and slowly slid to the floor without a cry or a sound. A doctor was summoned and he stated that Mr. Canary had died instantly of a stroke; that he had suffered no pain.

The news of his sudden death spread rapidly in spite of the lateness of the hour.

The final rites will be held Saturday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock at the Young Memorial with Rev. Murray Drysdale officiating. The interment will be in the Oak Grove Cemetery. Friends may call at the memorial Friday afternoon after 4 o'clock and during that evening as well as Saturday morning.

Spencer Andrews Canary was born in Bowling Green on May 13, 1874, to John W. and Celia E. (Duncan) Canary, the latter a niece of Gen. William H. Gibson. He was 76 years 11 months and 5 days old at the time of his death.

As a small boy Spence peddled onions in mornings before school and did all sorts of odd jobs for small fees. Starting at the age of 13 he worked on farms nearby during the summer months, his first job involving a daily 7-mile walk to and from the pasture to take care of the cows.

He was proud of the fact that his earliest newspaper experience came when he peddled the Toledo News Bee and Toledo Blade here. He continued to show his great industry by accepting employment as a house-to-house canvasser, one of his items being the standard dictionary when it first came out in 1895.

Spence was possessed of a very keen mind and very great perceptive powers and they were displayed in his school days at Bowling Green High School when he was the salutatorian of his senior class in 1894. In grammar school he won a scholarship in Tri-State Business College for the highest scholarship in the class and he accepted it to take a course in stenography there.

His experience then took him to the schools, first as a janitor and then as a teacher in the seventh grade in Bowling Green. Later he worked industrial life insurance for Metropolitan Life in Toledo.

The early days of photography invited his curiosity and he has often told how he "Huck Finned" on the old Miami canal with a tintype gallery man. One of his most exciting experiences came during a storm when Spence was playing the part of the tow-path mule and he saved his aged partner from death by preventing the ship from going over the old Independence Dam. Another time they experienced a tornado while tenting around Florida and Ridgeville Corners in that area of Ohio.

He enjoyed public debate and joined his brother, Russell, in Seneca County to participate in semimonthly debates in the country schoolhouse. This experience brought him in close touch with public problems and during that time he became the chairman of the first meeting in Bloom township, Seneca County, on a stone road proposal.

Nor was he afraid of hard labor for he worked for 6 months in the 22-foot France Stone Quarry near Bloomville and was always proud of the fact that he never bushed or quit because of fatigue or heat.

Before the turn of the century brought him into the newspaper business, Mr. Canary was stenographer for lawyers, a lumber company and the B. & O. commercial freight office in Toledo.

All of this vast human experience formed a very excellent background for this outstanding newspaperman who first became a reporter for the old Sentinel on November 5, 1900. He became its business manager on January 6, 1902, when he and John T. Hutchinson bought that paper and he served in that capacity until July 1, 1905, when he sold his interest and engaged in book selling before returning to the paper in December of that year.

In October 1907, he bought an interest in the Sentinel-Tribune when the two papers consolidated and he was associate editor until April 1909, when he became the editor of this paper. This month saw him completing his forty-second year as the head of the editorial department of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune.

During that time he covered every type of story possible to experience on a small-town paper. Spence was particularly proud of his prodigies, all reporters whom he had personally trained and had seen develop into able newspaper people.

His personal guidance and teaching formed the entire professional background of three members of the present editorial staff and to him they owe all the credit for what they know about reporting. These are our Society Editor Miss Minniebelle Conley, Neighborhood Editor Wayne R. Coller, and Managing Editor Ivan E. Lake.

Others who have benefited by his liberal advice and guidance include Ross Householder, a mining engineer now in Kingman, Ariz.; Larry Newman, associate editor of the American Weekly Magazine in New York City; Fred Beyerman, assistant city editor of the Chicago Daily News; Don Wolfe, State editor of the Toledo Blade; Homer L. Brady, executive secretary of the Sandusky Chamber of Commerce; Don Shafer, personnel manager with the Owen-Illinois Corp. in Toledo.

Spence was a highly skilled reporter and was recognized far and wide as one of the finest small-city editorial writers in the country. He did not care for the routine of copy desk work and after 1924 he left those tedious duties to others while he covered various beats as a reporter.

There was no better interviewer. No one probed a story to its finest point with any more fervor than he. Our editor was a living example of the energetic reporter who loved the people that he wrote about; who was wa. devoted to this community whose streets breathed their lives out in confidence to him; whose stores, homes, and institutions were living personalities who depended upon the press as their champion.

He began to relax his attentions to news coverage several years before World War II and to spend more time devoting care to his editorial column, the special part of the paper which was strictly his own. But when America became involved in the world conflict and there were no young men available for handling the routine reporting jobs at the courthouse and around the town, Spence again trod the streets to apply his skills to the task.

Mr. Canary unquestionably was a victim of the war. The rugged daily job eventually took its toll. On May 24, 1945, he was a victim of a stroke of paralysis. At that time no one thought that he would write again but his indomitable will, his marvelous courage and his supreme desire to continue his work brought him through.

After many months of convalescence he returned to the office to resume his place and he continued to write editorials with only brief let-ups for vacations until his sudden death last night.

Not many people knew it, but his first stroke took away his ability to manipulate his fingers on a typewriter and every editorial that he had written since that time was in longhand, produced after hours of reading and study of the innumerable problems of the present day.

His record of public service is one with which few persons are familiar because, in true modesty, his activities were never played up in the news of the day. Spence was forever a booster of Bowling Green and Wood County.

He was three times secretary of the Republican Executive Committee and was also secretary of the Central Committee.

In 1904 he and William M. Coen, now deceased, conceived and promoted the City Board of Trade, which was the forerunner of the old Commercial Club, now known as the Chamber of Commerce. When it became known as the Commercial Club in 1910, he was the first secretary and served for 12 years as a director.

It was early in the latter time that Bowling Green suddenly displayed a new growth, winning the fight to gain the Normal School (Bowling Green State University) and being successful in gaining the present armory and post office buildings. He was a very influential figure in every civic enterprise. He was always liberal in support of various enterprises which came to Bowling Green as the result of such community backing.

When the Parent-Teachers Association was organized in Bowling Green he was its first president and continued as a supporter of it always. He served as secretary and president of the Town and Gown Club before his resignation in 1937.

Fraternally he was a Mason, an Elk, a Knight of Pythias, being a past chancellor commander of the latter and was a member of the Royal Arcanum.

He was a member of the Presbyterian Church and had served as secretary of its board of trustees.

The very nature of his position as editor of this county's only daily paper brought him in close association with all types of enterprises and community endeavors. He was associated with J. R. Mann, of Lake Township, in promoting the Wood County Improvement Association of which J. S. Brigham was the temporary chairman and he (Canary) was the secretary until it could be organized among the active farmers. The association was later merged into the Wood County Farm Bureau, being the county nucleus.

Mr. Canary took a very great pride in the part that he played in the preservation to the public of the Maumee River road largely along the line of the old trail. He initiated the fight for its preservation editorially and served as secretary of the fighting organization of which the late George J. Munger, Jr., of Perrysburg, was president. He prepared, wrote, and read the arguments in favor of its preservation. This fight extended from 1917 but was particularly active from May 2, 1927, until the letting of the road improvement on August 30, 1928. That fight prevented the road from being thrown back from the river for the sake of private interests that urged it.

It was natural that this activity should find him also being interested in the history of the Maumee Valley, and so he was a member of the Maumee River Scenic and Historic Association and served as its vice president. This group secured the present park system along the Maumee River. Appointment came through Ohio's Governors George White and John W. Bricker.

An honorary membership in the Ohio Archeological Society evidenced the high esteem in which his work was held by that group. He was included among the editors of the Museum Echo, which is the periodical publication of that organization.

In his humility and belief that he could best serve the public in his editorial capacity rather than by being an active participant in many projects, he often declined official appointments by many of Ohio's governors to various other boards.

Twice he was offered opportunities to accept appointments to the board of trustees of Bowling Green State University, but he would not accept because he felt he could be of greater service in an editorial way if he was not involved officially with the university.

Spencer lived a full life and he loved it. There was very little in the world in which he was not interested. His hobby was human nature. He loved young people. He enjoyed studying all people in the light of phrenology. The Tope School of Phrenology once conferred the honorary title of doctor of phrenology on him in recognition of his knowledge of the subject.

Proper exercise to keep fit was another hobby he enjoyed. It was unquestionably to this that he could credit his remarkable recovery after the 1945 stroke. In sports he was interested especially in boxing, billiards, and scenic motoring.

One of his deepest disappointments in life was the fact that he never got into active service during the Spanish-American War. His father and his mother's brothers were in the Civil War and his ancestors had fought in the Revolutionary War. He did join two "paper" companies and served in two drill companies but was never accepted by Uncle Sam.

In World War I he served in bond campaigns, was a member of the executive committee for the county's war work social service organizations, assisted in Red Cross drives and various other patriotic endeavors.

On December 8, 1903, he was united in marriage to Lucy Lee Chaney, daughter of John and Sarah Chaney in Bowling Green, whose grandfather had served in Congress with John Quincy Adams. To this union were born three sons. Their home was an ideal one and they were most proud of the successful careers of the three boys.

His wife, whom he affectionately called "Duke," and the three sons survive. The latter are John Sumner, an attorney in Cleveland, Robert Barnhard, chief of the division of social administration in the State welfare department in Columbus, and Richard Lee, wholesale distributor of Kelly-Springfield tires of Columbus. Five grandchildren, a niece, Mrs. Celia Mooers-Squires of San Diego, Calif., and a nephew, Wayne Canary, of Toleda, also survive.

He was the last of his immediate family. Preceding him were sisters Mrs. Irene Mooers and Miss Helen Canary, and a brother Russell.

Loyalty of Americans of Rumanian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by American Orthodox citizens of Rumanian descent in Detroit, Mich., on February 18, 1951, showing the loyalty and devotion of Americans of Rumanian descent to the principles of American democracy and their determination not to permit Communist-inspired interference with freedom of their religion:

RESOLUTION

Following the disturbance created among American Orthodox of Rumanian descent by the unauthorized elevation of the former Akron, Ohio, priest, Andrei Moldovan, to the rank of bishop for the Orthodox Rumanians of America an act sanctioned and promoted by the Communist Rumanian Government of Bucharest:

We, representatives and members of 21 religious, fraternal, cultural, and social organizations of Rumanian background, from Detroit, Mich., and Windsor, Ontario, called all American citizens of Rumanian descent to a mass meeting, held February 18, 1951, in the large hall of the Rumanian Home, 1423 Farnsworth Street, Detroit. At this meeting the following resolution was unanimously approved:

"Whereas the Communist government of Rumania, by its terroristic and antidemocratic actions, excluded itself from the respect and consider tion of the civilized world;

"Whereas said government, imposed upon the freedom-loving Rumanian Nation by force, tyrannizes the nation from which we or our ancestors have come to this country;

"Whereas said Rumanian Communist Government's actions are wholly contrary to the aspirations, principles, and freedoms guaranteed by our American form of democratic government;

"Whereas said Communist Government of Rumania sanctioned and has caused the consecration into a bishop on November 12, 1950, in Sibiu, Rumania, of the former Rumanian Orthodox priest of Akron, Ohio, Andrei Moldovan;

"Whereas at the ceremony of Moldovan's consecration the Communist Rumanian Government was officially represented by its Minister of Religion, Stanciu Stoian;

Whereas said Andrei Moldovan was sent immediately by the Rumanian Communist authorities to the United States in order to impose him, illegally, and by force, as the head of the Rumanian Orthodox Church of America;

"Whereas the great majority of the members of our organization are of Orthodox faith;

"We resolve to reject with all possible contempt the unsolicited interference of the Rumanian Communist Government into our religious affairs in the United States;

"We categorically refuse to recognize Andrei Moldovan, appointed by a foreign Communist government, to be the bishop or head of the Rumanian Church of America."

DUMITRU VINTAN,
President of the Action Committee.
NICOLAE DRAGOS,
Chairman of the Meeting.
GEORGE ZAMFIR,
Secretary.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 18, 1951.*

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senate of the United States unanimously confirmed the nomination of Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming to be this Nation's Ambassador to Costa Rica. It was not the first time that General Fleming had been confirmed to a post of responsibility in the Government. He may even hold some sort of a record, because he has been confirmed as Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, Federal Works Administrator, member of the Maritime Commission—then designated Chairman—and as the first Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. So General Fleming's brilliant career as a civilian administrator is well known to all of us here in official Washington.

General Fleming was graduated from West Point at the head of his class just 40 years ago, in 1911, so this year's reunion of his class at the Academy will be the historic one for them. Just 20 years ago, however, the then Major Fleming had won the acclaim of the sports world for the job he had done in rehabilitating West Point's athletic program. Quentin Reynolds then, as now, one of the ablest writers of our times, told of Fleming's work in one of the last columns he wrote for the New York World before it was sold.

A copy of this clipping recently came to light, and so that it will not again be lost I have obtained permission to extend these remarks and include Quentin Reynolds' Looking 'Em Over column from the New York World of 1931 in the RECORD at this point:

LOOKIN 'EM OVER

(By Quentin Reynolds)

FLEMING OF WEST POINT OWNS TREASURE BEYOND PURSE OF MERE ROCKEFELLER

Philip B. Fleming gets the comparatively modest pay allowance of a major in the United States Army, but right now Philip B. Fleming comes very close to being the richest man in the world. No, Major Fleming hasn't been pyramiding that Auburn stock to dizzy profits; he hasn't been buying low and selling high; he has been involved in no get-rich-quick scheme. But on a table in his dining room at West Point, Major Fleming has a little bit of silver which must make him feel very wealthy, indeed. It is the only thing of its kind in the world. It is something which didn't cost the major a cent, but it's something that he wouldn't sell for anything. Now, if you own something which no one has money enough to buy, you certainly must be one of the world's richest men. That's how it is with Major Fleming.

It all started 4 years ago when Fleming was made graduate manager of athletics at West Point. Of course, it really started long before that. It was in 1907 that Fleming was appointed to West Point from Iowa. He was graduated from the Academy in 1911 at the head of his class. But he graduated as a private in his cadet regiment, not as a lieutenant. He had been reduced to the ranks for rather a heinous offense.

Fleming was manager of the football team then, and once, after a hard practice, he sat with the football team at dinner. Some gold-braided officer interrupted the meal to read a long list of orders. The players were all exhausted and hungry after 3 hours of hard scrimmage, and young Fleming, in charge of the training table, with a fine disregard for discipline, said to them: "Go on and eat, never mind that guy," or words to that effect. So the sounds of the gold-braided officer's speech were punctuated by the less-dignified noise of the clash of knife and fork as the hungry athletes went to work on the dinner.

Other officers, horrified at this act of lese majesty, came scurrying up to the table and began hurling imprecations on the heads of the tired football men.

Shows officers alighting place

"It wasn't their fault," Fleming said quietly, "I told them to go ahead and eat. They've had a tough day and they're hungry."

So Fleming took the rap. They demoted him to a private of cadets. Maybe Fleming has forgotten that story now. I heard it from one of his classmates who happened to be one of those hungry football players.

But he lived that episode down quickly enough. Fleming attracted attention right away, because he was a great engineer in the making, and the Army higher-ups didn't take long to discover the fact. He rose rapidly by virtue of excellent work in connection with the building of the Panama Canal and mapping and surveying the Philippine Islands. He was a captain now. In 1917 he was commissioned a major. During the war he commanded Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., with a garrison of 14,000 men. In 1916 he was transferred to West Point. In 1927 Fleming was made graduate manager of West Point, and that was the best break West Point ever received.

Now we're getting nearer to that bit of silver. Part of his job as graduate manager was to meet the writers who accompanied the Army team on trips. He was Major Fleming for a while, but it wasn't long before he was just Phil Fleming. He never realized it, but every time he sat around talking to sports writers he was doing a magnificent job of salesmanship. He was selling West Point. After a while Fleming and West Point became synonymous. When you thought of the Point you thought of Fleming.

At the Army-Notre Dame game in Chicago last fall we all had a lot of fun. Fleming was always with the writers. We all worked together. We played together. On the way home, in the Army special, Fleming casually mentioned that his time was about up at West Point and that he would be transferred very shortly. Why, the thought was incredible. West Point without Phil Fleming? Absurd. Why, how could the Point get along without this dapper little major with his smiling eyes? And how could we all get along without him? Consternation fell upon us.

Out to get even with Fleming

"We have to do something about Phil," someone said. "Let's give him a little something to remember us by."

Plans were made. This wasn't going to be a dinner honoring the Army or West Point. What did we care about West Point? We cared about this gallant friend of ours. So the other night Phil Fleming was guest of honor at a small dinner. Fleming has a host of Army friends in the city, but none of them were there. We didn't invite them. You see, this was just our way of slapping this fellow on the back and saying, "You are a pretty swell guy, Phil, and we're going to miss you." We didn't want a gang of Army officers there. That would have made it more or less formal and stereotyped. This was just a get-together like those we had in Chicago. It was no formal dinner. Why, there weren't even formal speeches. There were only about 20 present. All except four or five were sports writers. Lou Little of Columbia, Maj. Ralph Sasse of West Point, Tuss McLaughery of Brown, Hugo Bezdek of Penn State and Lou Young of Pennsylvania were present. They are all old friends of Phil.

There wasn't even a story written about the dinner. This wasn't something to be covered. We even had an orchestra. It was Grantland Rice who told the orchestra that this was a Navy party, so everyone entered the dining room to the strains of Anchors Aweigh. There was never a dinner like this one. No one present said a good word about Fleming. There were none of the usual sloppy sentimental speeches with which such affairs usually abound. You see, everything was on the level, and when you are really on the level, you don't spend a long time writing out eulogistic speeches which sound very pretty but don't mean very much.

Westbrook Pegler was at his satirical best castigating the guest of the evening. Bill Corum, George Daley, Paul Gallico, George Trevor, Bob Kelly and other football writers all told Fleming how glad they were that West Point had finally decided to get rid of him. Everything was off the record. The more we lambasted Fleming, the broader he smiled. He was storing up glorious memories. Then we gave him the little piece of silver.

Genuine silver in token at that

On it was engraved: "To the Hero of Major Engagements, 1927–31—From the War Correspondents." Now, I don't remember that ever happening before. I don't recall any graduate manager, football coach, boxer or ball player ever being singled out by a group of sports writers for such an honor. Phil Fleming gave a little talk at the windup. Ralph Sasse introduced him, and told him that he was going on last, like any acrobat.

Pegler corrected him. "They always put the star bout on last," he said.

Fleming tried to get serious and tell us how he felt about it. But we all knew how he felt, just as he knew how we felt, and we kidded him out of it. But he did hint that there is some chance that he won't be retired from West Point. This is a great chance for the Army to show a streak of real smartness. They ought to keep that guy there. He has quite an important job, because, although his actual task may be merely to supervise athletics and arrange and approve of schedules, his real job is bigger than that. His real job is to sell the Army to the rest of us and to maintain friendly relations with colleges and the public. That's not the easiest job in the world, for there are many who like to make the Army an object of attack. It's easy to attack the Army, because the Army is too big to hit back.

Well, anyhow, that's the story about the richest man in the world. And if you don't think he is, just try and buy that little piece of silver from him.

Senator Kilgore on the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the thoughtful editorial entitled "Senator KILGORE on the Far East," which was published in the Parkersburg Sentinel, Parkersburg, W. Va., on April 14, 1951:

SENATOR KILGORE ON THE FAR EAST

The statements of United States Senator HARLEY KILGORE, of Beckley, on the dismissal of General MacArthur and with reference to our situation in the Far East are worthy of serious consideration. They will be regarded in a much more serious light in West Virginia, we are certain, and given considerably more weight than the constant flow of blasts in Washington.

Senator KILGORE is not only West Virginia's senior Senator, and an extremely able one, but one of the outstanding Members of the greatest legislative body in the world—the United States Senate. He is avowedly an administration supporter, and he supports the administration policy both with reference to General MacArthur's dismissal and to our present policy of conduct in the Korean war.

What Senator KILGORE said in effect was that we should not carry the Korean war to Red China because of the danger of provoking a third world war. He also, and quite rightly, called attention to the constant policy of the United States of opposing aggression and its desire to avoid becoming an aggressor.

With reference to the dismissal of General MacArthur, Senator KILGORE expressed the firm belief that time will prove President Truman's action was right. Were it possible to strip away politics and emotion from consideration of the actual dismissal, there is no question that everyone would reach the same conclusion as stated by Senator KILGORE. No organization can continue to function effectively, much less the United States of America and its Armed Forces, if an important official or commander is constantly bucking the rest of the outfit.

In this connection, it is with considerable gratification that we see the appearance of MacArthur before a joint session of Congress receiving the happy blessings of President Truman and his administration. This is in thorough accordance with our democratic procedure, and a statesmanlike act on the part of the President. It also removes from many of our minds any doubt that the President dismissed the general from his command for good reasons and not out of pique, and that he did so upon the sound advice of his Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Certainly no one, no matter how partisan, can truthfully say that the President's action was an attempt to muzzle MacArthur. It now stands out for what it was, the simple removal of an officer who refused to obey the orders of his superiors—in other words, insubordination.

There Was Talk of Red China Entering Korean War as Early as August 1950, Statement of Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, Notwithstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed when I read in Sunday's newspapers that Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, aide to General MacArthur, had issued a statement to the press that at the time of the Wake Island conference of President Truman and MacArthur no one in the Government had the slightest idea Red China would intervene in Korea.

Where was Major General Whitney? Certainly he could never qualify as an intelligence officer. If he had been receiving mail from home he would have known that one of the main topics of conversation as early as August of 1950 was the fear Red China would enter the Korean fighting and prolong the struggle. Someone around General MacArthur's headquarters must have heard such reports, even if Major General Whitney did not—and it would be difficult to explain why he did not. We heard them over here—thousands of miles away.

The Wake Island conference was on October 15, 1950. Many weeks before I received a letter from a general officer under General MacArthur's command conveying the optimistic prediction fighting would end in late November. The exact message was:

> The picture is much brighter the last couple of days. We are all quite optimistic. I believe this war should be over late in November.

Naturally, I was elated over such good news and I carried the general's letter with me for days showing it to different Members of the House. They were also pleased but more than one raised the direct question, "But does your friend take into consideration the Chinese Reds coming into the war?"

I promptly replied to the general's letter and I put to him the question so many Members of this House had raised. Shortly I received a reply from him, dated September 6, 1950, in which he said, referring to my lack of enthusiasm over his prediction in his letter dated August 24, 1950:

> You said in your letter that you all weren't as optimistic as we were. We are still cheerful in this part of the world and I believe the date of late November is still good.

So I know that the intervention of Red China was considered likely long before the Wake Island conference—General Whitney notwithstanding. He should have known, too.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a very timely article by Mr. Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. It seems to cover one of the points in the present controversy very well. Mr. Pearson's article:

MACARTHUR DOMINATED AT WAKE

(By Drew Pearson)

A highlight of the current Truman-MacArthur controversy is the New York Times story summarizing the conversations between the two men at Wake Island.

Because the New York Times story had the earmarks of being leaked out by the White House, some MacArthur proponents have challenged it, while MacArthur states that no records were made of the conversations on Wake Island.

In view of this controversy, the Washington Merry-Go-Round's account of the Wake Island conference, published on January 23, some months prior to the Times' April 21 account, may be significant. For the President can hardly be accused of any partiality toward this writer except in his choice of "cuss" words.

Writing at that time—3 months before the Truman-MacArthur controversy—I reported that:

1. MacArthur was so sure of victory he promised General Bradley that he would transfer one full division to Europe.

2. MacArthur assured the President the Chinese would not intervene.

3. MacArthur expected to get his troops back to Japan by Christmas.

4. Because of the certainty of victory, much of the conference was devoted to plans for reconstructing Korea.

5. Highlight of the Wake Island meeting was the brilliant conversation of one man. MacArthur completely dominated the conversation.

WHAT THEY SAID

Because the Wake Island conference now appears to be playing such an important part in the Truman-MacArthur controversy, the salient portions of my January 23 Wake Island column follow:

The President of the United States flew half way 'round the world to confer with General MacArthur, yet aside from a few conversational pleasantries reported by accompanying newsmen, nothing has been published regarding what happened on this mid-Pacific island.

However, I believe it is important that the American people know what took place at Wake Island; so herewith I shall report some of the recorded conversations.

Almost more time was given to a discussion of Korean rehabilitation than to military strategy. When it came to the latter, General MacArthur dominated the conversation.

"The North Koreans," he explained, "have about 15,000 guerrillas left in the south, but the winter will take care of most of them. The others are a beaten force. They are only fighting to save face. It goes against the grain to have to destroy them."

HOME BY CHRISTMAS

MacArthur assured Truman that he could "finish the job in North Korea" in a short time. According to the stenographic notes he said:

"I hope to be able to have the Eighth Army back in Japan by Christmas. I may be able to send a convoy into Pyongyang immediately."

At this point, President Truman asked: "What about Chinese intervention?"

MacArthur's reply was: "They could have intervened earlier when it would have been decisive, but that time has passed. We are no longer fearful of their intervention. Although there are several hundred thousand along the Yalu River, it is not likely that they could cause us much trouble."

He also implied that he could "take care" of the Chinese, even if they decided to cross the Yalu River.

At the same time MacArthur described his plans for completing the conquest of Korea, he also argued against keeping American troops in Korea.

Obviously this raised the question why march across the frozen North Korean wastes to the Yalu River if the plan was to march right back again in time to return the Eighth Army to Japan by Christmas. However, no one at the Wake Island conference seemed to challenge MacArthur regarding this risky move.

MacArthur's advice on the future of Korea was: "We should turn Korea over to the Koreans as quickly as we can and get out as quickly as we can.

"Korea is a poor country," he said, "and we cannot afford to impose an occupation on them * * * military occupations are always failures. I want to withdraw all our troops as soon as possible."

TROOPS TO EUROPE

At one point, Gen. Omar Bradley asked whether MacArthur could make any troops available for Europe in the next few months.

MacArthur replied: "Yes, I think a division can be made available early in 1951."

Bradley also remarked that he hoped MacArthur wouldn't have the same trouble he had with American pilots in Europe shooting up railroad bridges that were needed later for rehabilitation.

"I have had the same trouble," MacArthur replied. The stenographic notes show laughter at this point.

High lights of the Wake Island meeting was the brilliant exposition of one man. MacArthur completely dominated the conversation, and virtually no effort was made to challenge his opinions.

Perhaps also this was the most tragic part of the conference.

Japan's Farewell to General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Tablet for April 21, 1951:

JAPAN'S FAREWELL

The beginning of General MacArthur's return in triumph, not in humiliation, had an auspicious beginning which thrilled Americans. This was the farewell given in Tokyo.

When the general went to Japan less than 6 years ago, it was to preside over a defeated, despirited and embittered people. They received him sullenly and turned their backs upon his presence, the Oriental's demonstration of enmity.

But when the General left, millions bade him farewell in a manner that showed respect, gratitude, and friendship. He was cheered, saluted, prayed for, and almost venerated by the masses of the people, thousands of whom were up before dawn to witness his departure.

The Japanese Diet, in special session, passed the following resolution:

"General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, former Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, helped our country out of the confusion and poverty prevailing at the time the war ended, guided and assisted Japan in establishing democracy and toward a self-supporting economy, thus paving the way for the independence of our nation.

"The entire people of our country are deeply grateful over these excellent achievements of the general."

The Nippon Times, of Tokyo, in a lengthy and flowery editorial said: "Mere words can never describe adequately all that he has meant to this nation whose rebirth as a free, democratic nation the general guided through difficult days with sincerity, understanding, and benevolence. It is with genuine sorrow that the Japanese people will bid him farewell."

Nowhere in history can be found such an instance as that of the head of an army of occupation gaining the universal love and respect of the occupied people.

At the core of these and many other worthwhile reforms was the spirit of peace, democracy, and Christian brotherhood—which symbolized the general's every activity.

"We are sorry to see him leave. He will always hold a warm spot in our hearts. We wish him well wherever he may be. Our doors and hearts will always be open in welcome. History will long record General MacArthur's heroic stature as a soldier, statesman, and democracy's architect for the future."

And our own correspondent, Father Patrick O'Connor, in his article on page 1 of this issue of the Tablet, bespeaks in eloquent language General MacArthur's contribution to the Christian religion in Japan.

AMERICAN HERO

As we look at this great accomplishment in a few years, we thrill at the achievements of an outstanding American and religious-minded leader. He did much for Japan but he did far more for America in bringing about peace and making our country beloved among erstwhile enemies.

Where the general's critics placed their theories in practice, we have lost our good name and influence. This is particularly true in China and in Germany. As for Poland and the other countries of East and Central Europe, the general's critics have suffered defeat after defeat. In those nations we have little influence; we are treated with hatred, contempt, or suspicion. There is no peace.

In Japan this successful civilian administrator was the symbol of anticommunism as well as of Americanism and in this field, too, he made his critics look very bad. He left in an atmosphere of triumph; he accomplished great things and his popularity knew no bounds.

Leaving Tokyo the deposed, "dismissed for insubordination" general was given a hero's welcome in Honolulu, San Francisco, and Washington, while New York City, as this is being writen, is scheduled to outdo itself in a never-to-be-forgotten tribute.

What demonstration of friendship, gratitude, and affection the American people gave for a man who fought for 14 years for his country and its good name without once seeing his native land. And what a response to those who sought to humiliate him, who charged him with disobeying orders, who talked about the civil being above the military when he, as a civilian leader in Japan, brought order out of confusion while they brought confusion where there should be order both nationally and internationally.

The American people, this week, told the world what a towering figure they consider General MacArthur. He will live always in the hearts of his loyal countrymen.

NOW FOR THE "TENSION"

On March 4, 1923, the American people were informed that they were in an emergency. The emergency continued until 1940, when we were informed that the Nation was facing a crisis. The crisis has continued off and on until the present time. Recently Secretary of Defense Marshall informed the Nation that we were in "tension" and, he added, "The tension may continue for 10 years."

On the one hand, we have had the forgotten man, thousands of whose brothers have been sent abroad to die; then we had great fanfare over social security while every American now suffers from a lack of security as officials broadcast direful warnings; then we had the Government insisting on health insurance while telling us to seek the nearest bomb shelter; the "welfare state" has been championed while the warfare state is being legislated.

Oh, for the good old days when to be an American meant to be a free person, one free of the fears of Government administrators, actions, controls, and false leaders, free of people who did not attempt to save you while engaging in wars, who thought of America and its people first, who did not nestle to their breast betrayers and confusionists, whose actions did not continually arouse apprehension, suspicion and enmity.

The Late Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 21, 1951, burial services for Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg were held in his home town, Grand Rapids, Mich. His loss will be keenly felt. For posterity I deem it appropriate to include in my remarks editorials from the Grand Rapids Herald, the Grand Rapids Press, the Grand Haven Daily Tribune, and the Holland Evening Sentinel:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald]

AS THE NATION MOURNS

East and West, North and South, the people's high regard for Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Senator and world statesman, and their sorrow at his passing are reflected in the editorial columns of their newspapers.

He belonged to the Nation and to the world no less than to Grand Rapids and to Michigan.

A few typical expressions follow.

The New York Herald Tribune: "It is only once or twice in a generation that a single speech changes the course of history * * * but the speech Senator Vandenberg delivered in the Senate January 10, 1945, stands apart from all others, a turning point in his own career and a milestone of major significance for the Nation. * * * The memory of the man remains luminous in the minds of the generation that saw his works accomplished."

The New York Times: "Perhaps more than any other political figure of his time he typified America's capacity for change and growth, and symbolized our political conversion from a policy of isolation to world responsibility. * * * If America's adherence to the United Nations, its decision to oppose the expansion of Communist aggression, and its formulation of the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Treaty are among the great events of our epoch, as unquestionably they are, then Senator Vandenberg must retain a central place in contemporary history. * * * The memory of his achievements is not likely to pass away for many years to come."

The New York World-Telegram and Sun: "He became the chief architect of the bipartisan foreign policy. * * * It is his country's great misfortune—but it was no fault of Senator Vandenberg's—that the policy has been limited in application. He protested vainly against the 'tragic failure' of the Truman administration to stand as firmly in Asia as in Europe against Communist domination and aggression. * * * His death is a tragic loss to the country he loved and served wonderfully well."

The Washington Evening Star: "The tyrants of our time have reason to remember him with bitterness and hate. But the rest of us must remember him with an abiding sense of gratitude—a gratitude that must be felt by all who cherish the true meaning of liberty, justice, truth and simple, ordinary decency. * * * If he could leave one admonition with us, it would be not to forget that we are in greater danger of destroying ourselves than of being destroyed from abroad."

The Washington Post: "In his day, he was a Titan in the Senate, and will live in its history along with Clay, Calhoun and Webster. We mourn him as a man who, above all others, has been responsible for the evolution of a sustained international policy in our country. The measure of Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg is the vacuum he leaves on the Republican side of the Senate. Vandenberg squared party and country with his belief that politics during the present crisis should stop at the water's edge."

The Boston Traveler: "There exists in his party no ready replacement for his job of peacemaker on essentials. For his selfless leadership in a critical policy area we owe him a great debt of gratitude."

The Boston Globe: "His career was of enormous assistance to the efforts of many Americans of both parties to make the world more secure against the threat of war. It is to be hoped that other Republicans of prominence will come forward to assume leadership comparable to that of this statesman from Michigan."

The Chicago Sun-Times: "Senator Vandenberg did more than any other Republican to change the course of American foreign policy after World War II. The former isolationist's formal conversion to the cause of international collective security was as historic as it was dramatic. * * * We shall miss his counsel all the more as we come to realize the tremendous debt we owe him."

The Chicago Daily News: "If the United Nations survives the strains of power grabbing that proved too much for its predecessor, the League of Nations, the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan will occupy a large place in the historical evaluation of these times."

The Atlanta Constitution: "While the Nation was paying tribute to a great military man, it was mourning the loss of another patriot of heroic stature—Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, editor and statesman, whose powerful voice was the deciding factor in many history-making policy battles on the Senate floor. * * * His objectives rose high above partisanship toward the kind of unified foreign policy which would enable us to stamp on the Communist aggressor anywhere he raised his ugly head."

The Atlanta Journal: "It was the last and relatively brief phase of his long career that marked the difference between a man of talent and one of creative vision. * * * On that high note ended the active career of a man whose mind and spirit were great enough to put truth above consistency, conscience above pride of opinion and country above party."

The Kansas City Star: "The refusal of Senator Vandenberg to submit to a necessary operation until he had seen two important measures through the Senate was characteristic of the man in his late great years. * * * His hold on general public confidence became so great he was able to keep his party in line and in the first critical years after the war he gave invaluable service to the Nation."

The Detroit News: "The loss to the Nation, more and more evident as his last illness settled upon him, is complete. * * * A capacity for growth was the distinguishing mark of the Vandenberg nature. * * * By a magnificent projection of moral force he swept his party out of isolationism into the new current of world thought and cooperative action for peace. * * * It has been remarked how often in the current great debate one unanswerable sentence from Vandenberg in his prime might have returned it swiftly to its proper course. * * * That Vandenberg was Presidential timber goes without saying, and that he never turned a hand to capitalize on that status is equally a matter of record. Thus his integrity as a free man was uncompromised to the end."

The Detroit Free Press: "The voice of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg is stilled by death. The personal tragedy is that Senator Vandenberg died before the battle for bipartisanship which he led could be won. The national tragedy is that the structure of American unity in face of world perils which he devoted his life to build lies in ruins. * * * There was no other leader in either party able or willing to bridge the chasm opened by partisan approach to our foreign relations. There's none today. * * * Cannot we take from the life of Arthur H. Vandenberg a new dedication to carry on the work he began and bring to fruition the bipartisan approach to the world about us for which he pleaded? We are certain that he would have asked for no greater monument."

The Jackson Citizen Patriot: "Arthur Vandenberg belonged not alone to Michigan or

the Republican Party. He was a great American—perhaps the greatest of this day. In a time when small men grub for graft, when dishonesty, incompetence and greed are common attributes of public life, his integrity was never questioned, his wisdom was respected and his selfless patriotism was recognized. * * * His eyes were ever on the horizon which was his goal; the horizon of men's dreams and ideals and faiths."

The Flint Journal: "His going has left no bitterness, no recriminations, no enmity, but only a sense of irreparable loss. * * * His passing brings sadness, but there remains the memory of a completely honest, selfless, devoted statesman—an example for future leaders to emulate."

The Saginaw News: "Arthur H. Vandenberg's footprints on the sands of time will not soon be obliterated. * * * Another son of Michigan will in due course be appointed to sit in Senator Vandenberg's chair in the Senate Chamber, but it will be a difficult assignment for he will have ever before him the example of a career of national service which knows few parallels."

The Lansing State Journal: "Michigan's distinguished senior Senator was a statesman in the best sense of the word. * * * For the sake of this country and the causes to which he was devoted, it is to be fervently hoped that his great influence for integrity in Government, for unselfish public service, and for peace and justice will continue to be felt through the years to come. He has taken his place among the immortal great of the Nation's illustrious statesmen."

The Battle Creek Enquirer and News: "He never sought universal popularity as the required basis for his championship of causes. He fought that national preservation and human safety were more important than partisan rivalry. * * * In his younger days he had written a book, 'If Hamilton Were Here Today.' There will be many a speculation in the future—and anxiety will seek comfort thereby—as to how the responsibilities of future issues would be met if Vandenberg were here today."

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press]

ARCHITECT OF FREEDOM

The death of Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg will be mourned wherever freemen live and continue to fight for freedom. For no American of the last decade fought that fight more vigorously or contributed more importantly to its victories than Senator Vandenberg. Above all others, he was responsible for one of the most effective weapons the free world has had in that fight—American bipartisan foreign policy.

Until 1943, when Senator Vandenberg voted to extend the President's powers to make reciprocal trade agreements, this country's enemies had hoped that a split between Democrats and Republicans on foreign policy would play into their hands. But with that vote, Senator Vandenberg as the Republican Senate leader on foreign affairs signaled the birth of a foreign policy which was to doom the doctrine of isolation and remove the last sign of disunity within the Nation on the prosecution of the war and securing the peace to come.

The solid achievements of the bipartisan policy are to be noted throughout the western world. Wherever the cloud of communism has been lifted it has been largely because of the existence of that policy and the devoted leadership afforded it by Senator Vandenberg from 1943 to his very death. An early advocate of the United Nations, he was one of the key American figures in San Francisco when U. N. was established and its Charter was written. It was Senator Vandenberg who stepped forward at the critical moment to guarantee Britain's recovery when, in 1946, he spoke eloquently and successfully for the British loan. Greece and Turkey owe their present freedom from communism in large measure to the Michigan statesman, for it was his ceaseless efforts on behalf of the Truman doctrine which guaranteed American aid for those two countries. All Western Europe has cause to be grateful to him for the determined battle he put up for the Marshall plan. And if Western Europe's chances for survival are greater today than they were a year or two ago, they are better very largely because of the decisive part he played in the fashioning of these instruments of foreign policy and in the United States' adherence to the North Atlantic alliance.

Conceivably Congress would have adopted some, if not all, of these measures if Arthur H. Vandenberg had not been in the Senate. But these are stronger measures because of his vigorous fight for them. He, more than any other man, has stood as a symbol of national unity on foreign affairs.

In many ways, Senator Vandenberg's years in the Senate recalled the days of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. One of the great debaters of our time, Arthur Vandenberg could deliver a speech reminiscent of the golden days of oratory. Yet he was unsurpassed in his ability to cut through to the core of an issue, to sum up the central problem in a few clear, crisp sentences and to outline a proper course of action.

He brought, then, to a consideration of modern problems the careful and prolonged analysis that characterized a more leisurely era in our history; but essentially he was a man of action. He was completely of our times. He was a man who had the courage and good sense to alter his views as the times and the background of facts changed; a man who often put aside personal ambition for the sake of his party and country. His voice, though silenced by illness for many months, continued to echo in Washington and international capitals, and his remembered opinions will continue to carry great weight throughout the world for years to come.

It is a heartening thought to the profession and the city which produced this remarkable man that his power of expression and his clear and patriotic thinking on foreign and domestic affairs were shaped and developed through newspaper work, editorial leadership and editorial writing in Grand Rapids, his home community. For many years before he left to become a force in the Nation's and world's history, the Press knew Arthur Vandenberg as a vigorous and brilliant competitor and as a kindly friend in the many contacts of civic life. Nowhere will he be missed more genuinely than in the city which gave him to the service of the world.

[From the Grand Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune]

SENATOR ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

One appraisal was missing after the dramatic appearance of General MacArthur before both Houses of Congress. Senator Arthur Vandenberg had already passed away. Even had he lingered for a few hours longer, he was much too ill to participate in the debate occasioned by the deposed general's address.

Senator Vandenberg's counsel on foreign affairs has been missing for months. Congressmen on both sides of the aisle—and foreign diplomats—have yearned at times for the Senator's recovery, that he might rescue the allies from their confused thinking. He seemed to be trying to oblige their wishes by a grim, heroic struggle to overcome his long sickness.

The cause of a bipartisan foreign policy has been badly crippled by Senator Vandenberg's illness and death. The business world has lost an eloquent spokesman in the Senate. The Republicans will miss one of their truly great leaders.

"What is a conservative?" the late Senator once asked. "At one point the dictionary says 'one who seeks to prevent loss, decay, or injury, and who protects and preserves.' In that sense I want my party to be conservative. * * * But at another point the dictionary says that a conservative is 'one opposed to change or progress.' In that sense I do not want my party to be conservative. If it is static, it will die. It will promote and not prevent decay for itself and country. This is not a static country nor a static age."

Arthur Vandenberg applied this philosophy to his own career. Men and women throughout western Michigan became familiar with his forceful political opinions long before he entered the Senate. He was a newspaperman who was inspired by the greatness of American traditions. His capacity to absorb the political thinking of his day was phenomenal.

Many people do not think of Senator Vandenberg as an author of books. Yet we have three good-sized volumes before us—all of which he wrote or compiled: The Greatest American; Alexander Hamilton (1921); If Hamilton Were Here Today (1923), and The Trail of a Tradition (1926).

There may be others. But these were gifts to another newspaperman who also has gone on. They all deal with the Senator's hero, an American pioneer who ranks with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln as individuals who gave to this country its remarkable form of government.

Some men are elected to public office because they belong to the groups capable of bringing out the largest totals of votes. Others win because they are popular personally. Senator Vandenberg was appointed the first time, then wrote his record by hard work and brilliance. He was—like Alexander Hamilton—a high-grade statesman.

The course of Senator Vandenberg's political fortunes might have been downward except for his willingness to turn away from a seasoned isolationism to all-out internationalism. His fateful decision was reached in 1945. He sensed that the free nations of the world would soon perish unless they banded together. The world had become too small for the Monroe Doctrine and aloof neutrality.

Our early impressions of Senator Vandenberg were mixed with both admiration and awe. Once he read critically a story we had written, while we watched tensely each movement of his big pencil. Michigan newsmen, while not always agreeing with Arthur Vandenberg, seemed to find few subjects on which the Herald's brilliant editor was uninformed. We heard his voice rasp out at political rallies and tried to remember some of the long words in his amazing vocabulary.

We felt we knew him best, however, when in 1941 he spoke before a group of newspapermen at the Spring Lake Country Club. Many said it was one of the finest speeches of his career. It was on this occasion—almost 10 years ago—that he expressed the longing to retire from public activity, loaf a bit, write a few more books, and look back upon a crowded life. These pleasures he was denied.

Senator Vandenberg was a true friend of this area of Michigan he called home. He was never too busy to look after the smallest detail in a request from a constituent. He used his political partisanship with a master's skill, and combined conservatism and progressivism according to the formula he had set up. "I want the Republican Party to be liberal enough to march with the times to dare new answers to new problems and to use the power and strength and initiative of Government to help citizens to help themselves," he once said. "I want the oak to stand. I want the branches to grow."

This is a lofty aim for an individual or country as well as a party.

Senator Vandenberg was of presidential caliber. Some will say that he missed not only this but also the opportunity of being on hand to straighten America out in its present indecision. Others will lament his chance to enjoy the peace in later life he so wanted. But he had mighty compensations—he was in some respects—again like Alexander Hamilton—the most outstanding American statesman of his time. Through his skill in guiding coalition movements, he achieved bipartisanship at crucial moments in history.

The branches of the tree he has planted are bound to grow.

[From the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel]

GROWING TO NATIONAL STATURE

When Arthur H. Vandenberg left Grand Rapids some 20 years ago to fill a place in the United States Senate he was to all intents and purposes a local character. He was not known to any extent outside the bounds of Michigan, and even in this State his main reputation was concentrated in western Michigan, in the area where his newspaper had been circulating.

Now a score of years later, when he has come to the end of his earthly road, he is a national figure. The name of Michigan's senior Senator is as well known in all the 48 States as that of any Member of the upper House in Washington. It is not unreasonable to go further. His name is pretty well known in many of the countries of Europe. The propaganda machine of Soviet Russia took occasion from time to time to cover that name with special abuse. The Russians understood that the Michigan man had exerted a tremendous influence in building up America's defenses against the onsweeping tide of communism.

During those years in the Senate Mr. Vandenberg grew in political stature. When he began his career in Washington he was limited in his outlook, but he was big enough in his personal capacities so that he found it possible to grow into the bigness of that job. Slowly but consistently he kept pace in his political development with the unfolding exigencies of the Nation's history and the world's needs. He had the good fortune—it may have looked like bad fortune to him at the time—to serve in the Senate during a period when his party was out of office. As a member of the opposition minority during the New Deal days, he was faced constantly with the challenge of events.

There is a profound truth in the old saying that "the north wind made the Vikings." It was almost certainly the political north wind that this minority Senator had to brace himself against for years that developed the spiritual muscles which later came to be recognized by the Nation and indeed by the world.

During the past 10 years or so Senator Vandenberg stood above party in the same way in which every truly national leader has to rise above the narrow compromises of party regularity. He remained a Republican of course but he was strong enough to carry his own party along the path that seemed the highway to his country's true interests and highest honor. In the end he came to be recognized more as an American leader than a party strategist.

Like so many other great Americans, he grew up to the stature that the needs of his country demanded. Democracy does not usually breed supermen; nor does it need them. But it often does breed men who, even though they are of average stature, bear within them the power to grow to a size that matches the greatness of great occasions and times. Such a man was Senator Vandenberg.

Recognizing That Television Makes Report That Can't Be Matched, the NBC Sent Its Prize-Winning Cameramen to Critical Europe To Document Current History; Their Ace Commentator, Robert McCormick, Later Joined Them and Helped Prepare Several of These Special Battle Reports, Washington—Dr. John R. Steelman

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman, presents the weekly Battle Report, Washington, and it seems that with each succeeding issue the information conveyed not alone is of even greater interest but is more interestingly exhibited and disclosed.

In this, the thirty-second teledocumentary Battle Report, Washington, the American television audience was given a magnificent treat—first, by way of the splendid pictures photographed by National Broadcasting Co.'s cameramen, Charles and Eugene Jones; and second, through the narration by Lou Hazam. These, taken together with the commentaries by Robert McCormick, make for one of the most spectacular word and moving pictures ever released to the audio and video audience.

Additionally thereto, Dr. Steelman brought to the television screen, on Sunday, April 8, two distinguished visitors, Maj. Orville Munson, of the United States Army, just returned from Korea where he served as liaison officer with the Turkish brigade, and Mr. John C. Dreier, Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Major Munson's story of his experience in fighting alongside the Turkish troops, although a splendid story, is equalled, however, by a report of Mr. Dreier, who tells of the accomplishments made in building hemispheric solidarity and a Gibraltar of democracy, here in the Western Hemisphere.

I doubt very much if anyone could have seen and heard this program of the thirty-second Battle Report, Washington, without experiencing a sense of exultation in realizing just what our country is doing—for all mankind—in making this world a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Members of this House, as well as Americans everywhere, an opportunity to read this intensely human document of today's happenings, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I include therein this thirty-second Battle Report, Washington, which was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK. From the thirty-eighth parallel, latest pictures of General MacArthur as he again visits our troops on the battlefront. And from the Nation's Capital on parallel 38–51, NBC television visits you again with Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, this week going about its defense business through streets abloom with cherry blossoms, and Korea, where the hills are ablaze with gunfire and rumors of an imminent Chinese offensive.

This is Robert McCormick, glad to be back on the job again. Today Battle Report brings you the fourth of its exclusive teledocumentaries on Europe, and reports on our Turkish allies in Korea and the meeting of the Latin-American foreign ministers in Washington. But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. These days in Washington are busy ones for many thousands of workers. The other evening at approximately 9 o'clock I drove by several Government buildings. They were ablaze with light and people were moving about as if it were midday. There is, of course, only one reason for this activity and it can be summed up in one word—defense.

Once again our Nation is in peril. Everything we own, everything we hold sacred—even the life of every man, woman, and child in the United States is threatened. Our only chance of survival is to erect defenses which are so strong no one will dare attack us.

Surely every thinking person knows that the objective of Soviet policy is not the uplifting of the underprivileged. The brutal purging of nonconformists—the vicious denunciation of all who do not submit to the Kremlin yoke—is eloquent testimony to the real ambitions of the tyrants. The nature of Soviet terrorism is self-evident, and the prime targets for this terrorism are the men and women of the United States.

This afternoon we have two distinguished visitors who will report from two different sections of the world. Maj. Orville Munson, of the United States Army, has just returned from Korea where he was liaison officer with the Turkish Brigade. Mr. John C. Dreier, our Ambassador to the Organization of American States, will report on the meeting of the foreign ministers which has been in session here in Washington for the past 2 weeks.

Televisioh at its best is a reporter that can't be matched. Recognizing this, NBC Television sent its prize-winning cameramen, the Jones brothers, to critical Europe to document it for you—country by country. Your narrator, Robert McCormick, later joined them and helped prepare the fourth of these special teledocumentaries. We invite you now to see Battle Report, Italy, and hear the story of that country from one who has just returned—Robert McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I have a little girl about this age myself. Maybe she was on my mind as I traveled about Europe. Anyway, it seemed to me that nowhere was Italy better symbolized than in the picture of this babe among the ruins. A new and young Italy being born out of the ashes of the past.

Most of you remember that past. Only a few years ago—as shown in these actual shots of World War II at San Pietro—its terrible music echoes throughout the countryside in bombs bursting and gunfire. Italy inherited from the war, destruction. Such destruction as this, visited upon the famed abbey of Cassino, driving its monks away. But they have returned. And patiently stone by stone, I saw them rebuilding the abbey again, while below, in the one-time battlefield, now a graveyard, crosses mark where the soldiers lay who keep them company.

In the town of Frascati, 30 miles from Rome, I saw a cat sunning herself in a window.

And in the public square not far away, human beings following her example. Old

men without work—poverty-stricken and hungry—dozing over their shovel handles. Yes; to me the streets of Frascati alone spoke volumes on Italy's basic problem—overpopulation and unemployment—a high birth rate and thousands of people wandering the streets all day with nothing to do. All this for modern Italy to worry about, piled atop the debris of war.

For a place to live, thousands of war-tossed homeless have taken to caves like these, right in a downtown section of Rome. Many of these cave dwellers, 1951, are northern farmers, whose farms were destroyed by the war. Drifting southward, they burrowed these holes into the soft, wet clay of the hillsides of the city and are forced to call the cold damp shelters that resulted, home.

But most Italians pass them by with eyes calloused from long seeing the same sight in southern Italy. For here in Matava, at the heel of the boot, the cave dwellers have been around for 2,000 years.

Italy today, then, is Italy in transition, seeking to come out of the caves of its past into the light, seeking to overcome the problems to which fascism brought it and emerged a healthy member of the democratic family. This has called for American aid, and while in Italy I dropped by to see Mr. Leon Dayton, head of our Economic Cooperation Administration there, to ask him about that aid. This is his answer.

Mr. DAYTON. During the course of the last 2 or 3 years, we have had thousands of tourists here; a great many American businessmen, and others here just for the Italian sunshine, history, and art of Italy. Nearly all of them, at one time or another, have expressed that this work we are doing here is Operation Charity. Well, there is very little that could be further from the truth. I wish there was one way we could tell the American people that this is a real investment in the future. It is not the kind of investment, either, we have to wait 10 years to pay off. In fact, we can see some of the dividends today.

Mr. MCCORMICK. As we traveled the Italian peninsula, the Jones brothers turned their cameras for you on the dividends of American aid, of which Mr. Dayton speaks.

The truth of his remarks is rooted in brick and stone in the new city of Cassino. Rather than reconstruct the former blasted town site, Italy is preserving it as a memorial. The new town is rising in a fresh location a half-mile away. With American aid, new housing—such as this, the largest apartment project in Rome—is now taking shape. In four more months, it will be providing low-cost accommodations for hundreds of families. These balconies, of course, will be for the people, not dictators.

The busy fingers of throbbing machines are already beginning to spin the thread of a new industrial life. A whole new section of this textile factory—which will contain American looms and give work to over 200 people—is now under construction, thanks to American help. We found the workers fully aware of this, and grateful.

But one of the most amazing miracles of all is being worked with the help of these subterranean steam formations. Italy provided the geysers in Tuscany, where it is said that Dante wrote his Divine Comedy. America provided the engineering know-how. And somehow, in some way mysterious to a layman like myself, steam that bubbled from the earth was tapped by huge rigs. Huge stone condensing towers rise into the sky. Borax extracted as a byproduct, and power sent soaring across the land for miles—power to light the city—to keep the wheels of industry turning. But these pictures tell more than the story of the power of Italian-American cooperation. More reconstruction—the bay at Naples, which used to take any left-over bombs from the wartime bombing missions to the Rumanian oil fields.

And now you're leaving one of the world's largest railway stations on Italy's crack train running between Rome and Milan, running on time, we might add, without Mussolini's help. We rode this modern streamliner—further evidence of United States aid—as it sped along miles of new track, going up for a brief visit to the engineer's cabin, shining with the latest type of locomotive equipment. The interiors are as luxurious as anything we've seen in the States. Repairs to the line still go on, but we sped across this bridge at 70 miles an hour—a bridge that formerly could be crossed at only 5 miles an hour. Yes; more evidence that Italy is on the right track. And well might we take pride in its progress, for as ECA's Leon Dayton put it:

Mr. DAYTON. Probably the best example I can give you of the near miracle that is occurring here, and I think, an example of some of the short-term dividends we have gotten from the program, is by making a comparison between 1947 and now 1951. In 1947, the physical facilities of this country were badly destroyed. The people were poverty-stricken. There was a strong Communist minority here playing on these factors to get control of the people and of the Government. But in 1951, Italy has assumed full partnership with the United States. She is preparing to defend the ideals and principles which caused us to make them.

Gentlemen, I spoke to you earlier about some discussion of this work here being called Operation Charity. I think you will find we are getting our money's worth out of Operation Strength for the free world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. And so, as we draw to the close of this report, how best to sum up what our cameras saw and ears heard? Perhaps like this: The glories of which Mussolini boasted were the old glories, symbolized by the wonderful works of art in which Italy is rich, and for which it is deservedly famous. But today—today the Italian people are not so much concerned with this past as they are with the present. The monarchy is gone. Mussolini is gone. In their place is a new Republic whose leader we sought out in his simple office. He greeted us warmly, and said that while our cameras could record the physical evidence of our common effort toward recovery, it could not show what is in Italy's heart and mind. We asked Prime Minister de Gasperi to take this responsibility himself and here he is.

Prime Minister DE GASPERI. That is why I am here today to tell you the sentiments and motives that inspire my Italy. They are: (1) Gratitude for the generous cooperation of the American people; (2) renewed faith in liberty; (3) the firm resolve to defend democracy and to obtain social justice. May God speed us on our common way.

Mr. MCCORMICK. This firm resolve to defend democracy, which Premier de Gasperi pledges, has its strength in the Italian Army, now being born anew with American advice and assistance. We are reserving that portion of our report on Italy for next week. Instead, for our final word, we turn your attention next to our exclusive interview with the Foreign Minister of Italy, Count Carlos Sforza.

Count SFORZA. Now we are allies in the Atlantic Pact. That is why you are just as interested as we are in our rehabilitation and recovery. We will do our best and you may be assured of our loyalty because the Atlantic Pact has been created for peace, for freedom, and for saving our western civilization, and these are our deepest ideals and convictions.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thus, with these assurances of Italian loyalty to the American cause, we close as we began, with this small babe against the ruins, symbolizing the new Italy, young as this child, struggling to live as a free person again in this new world. How well she succeeds will depend not only upon herself, but upon you.

As our infantry moves forward in Korea, they are faced with a new Chinese puzzle to solve. The Communist invaders have broken contact with our troops along much of the western front and pulled back in a surprise withdrawal. Yet, all expectations are of a major enemy counterattack perhaps when we reach the wider waist of the peninsula above the parallel. Our Air Force reports the Chinese massing—perhaps for just such an attack—in the central mountain area, as our soldiers advance cautiously. And here are some troops the Communists have already learned are bad medicine. Our Turkish allies in action around Seoul, teamed up with American tank forces. These Turks need no lesson on the menace of communism. Back home, Russia is on their border. For more information on how highly these troops are valued in Korea, we turn now to a man who can boast 5 campaign stars and some 20 citations, including the DSC. A man who helped train the Turks in Turkey and fought side by side with them in Korea as liaison officer until wounded. Ladies and gentlemen, the Army's Maj. Orville Munson.

Major MUNSON. I was assigned to Turkey in January 1950 as part of the American Mission for Air to Turkey. On arrival I was sent to the Turkish engineering school in Istanbul. While there I taught infantry tactics. That is, I taught engineer units, which normally build bridges and such things, how to reorganize their companies and battalions to fight as infantry when necessary. I was given the job as liaison officer with the Turkish brigade.

Mr. MCCORMICK. How did the Turkish people feel about sending men to Korea, and how did the men themselves feel about going?

Major MUNSON. I can't answer for every individual, but I can say this—the majority of the unit that went to Korea were volunteers, officers and men. And I remember some of the women in Turkey saying that if they went to Korea, and that if they didn't come back as victors, they shouldn't come back at all.

One thing that impressed me so much was on the ship going from Turkey to Korea, the Turks big comment here was that they were afraid that they were not going to get there in time to help out. They actually wanted to spill some blood for the cause of the free world.

Mr. MCCORMICK. What kind of fighters are the Turks?

Major MUNSON. The Turks are a proud people and rightly so. You see the Republic of Turkey is only 27 years old. To gain their independence they fought for 2 years to drive the British, French, and Greeks from their soil. In doing this they had some divisions that fought until every man was killed. With a tradition like this to live up to, the Turks today have a real inspiration. We found that it was very hard to impress the Turks with the advantages of maneuver. The Turks want to just dig in and fight, and as we learned so often, to close in with his bayonet.

They are especially fond of our trucks, tanks, and weapons. The Turkish Army is still mostly horse-drawn, and, therefore, they haven't had too much of an opportunity to work with our equipment—and so at first they find it quite difficult to handle. Naturally, when they see some of the things that our boys can do with that very same equipment, they can't help but admire our ability. Seeing is believing.

They thought our weapons were wonderful. I remember the first comment that the engineer company commander made with regard to our infantry rifle. "Good. Everybody a machine gun."

Mr. McCORMICK. Where were the Turks fighting when you were wounded, Major Munson?

Major MUNSON. You all remember when the Chinese Communists came across the Yalu River in their big offensive? We were trying to secure some high ground in one of the northernmost areas of the Eighth Army sector. I was at that time assigned to one of the infantry companies to assist them in organizing for the attack. There were some tanks assigned to us at that time and they were operated by American personnel, so there was quite a bit of liaison responsibility in interpreting.

The Turks at that time were protecting the right flank of the Eighth Army. They were to hold back the initial punch that was received from the Chinese. This was until the American divisions organized for an orderly withdrawal. Incidentally, there is little need of my having to add this, but the Turks did a swell job. Just ask the boys from the American Second and Twenty-fifth Divisions. They know what I mean.

Mr. McCORMICK. Major, you think a good deal of these soldiers from Turkey, don't you?

Major MUNSON. The Turks know why they are in Korea—to stop aggression, now. They never forgot that their homeland borders on the Soviet Union. But still this fighting brigade was dispatched unhesitatingly to fight halfway around the world to show at considerable cost in life and money that the Turkish Republic considers itself a part of the free world and a spearhead of democracy in the east. The Turks are willing to resist aggression anywhere in the world when called upon by the United Nations to do so. I want to say here, that I consider it a privilege to have had the opportunity to serve with a country whose ideals and aspirations are so fundamentally like our own.

Mr. McCORMICK. As these ground soldiers in the west plunged into North Korea for the deepest penetration, north of Yongpyong, and advanced toward the main enemy base at Kumwha, over their heads the air battle waged hotter than ever. Fifty United States Thunderjets, covering B–29's in a heavy raid on the Manchurian border bridges, ran into 40 Communist jet fighters and routed them. Put that down in your book as the biggest all-jet air battle in history.

Meanwhile, here in Washington, in a sweeping demonstration of cooperation, 21 American Republics signed a brass-tacks agreement to strengthen our own Western Hemisphere against the Communist plague. Conferring as our representative throughout the 2-week session, and credited with much of the success of this historic meeting is the State Department official on whom we next focus. He is our Ambassador to the Organization of American States, John C. Dreier.

Ambassador JOHN C. DREIER. Yesterday morning the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 21 American Republics gathered in the great Hall of the Americas in the Pan American Union and signed the final act of their meeting of consultation. The first to sign was the ranking Foreign Minister, Dr. Manuel Tello, of Mexico. The 20 other Foreign Ministers followed in order, the last one being the host to the meeting, our Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson.

Two weeks ago the foreign ministers gathered in Washington at the invitation of Secretary Acheson to consider the common problems of our 21 countries in the present grave international situation. There were three big subjects on the agenda: Political and military cooperation, the problem of internal security against subversive activities, and emergency economic cooperation. Yesterday it was apparent that the determination of the foreign ministers to resolve these common problems and set forth the policy of our American family of nations in this crisis, had met with outstanding success.

Thirty-one resolutions were adopted as a result of the 2 days of work—and work it was in capital letters. On one of the last nights the group labored until 3 o'clock in the morning. And the next night they worked until 6 o'clock in the morning, in order to finish their task on time.

In the political and military field the American foreign ministers made clear that our 21 countries stand united today in the finest tradition of inter-American solidarity. Reaffirming their desire to live and work in peace, they nevertheless laid plans for more effective military preparation for the defense of our continent. They also again indentified their governments with the larger purpose of the United Nations to establish a rule of law and justice in the relations among nations throughout the world.

In dealing with the subject of subversive activities within the Americas, the foreign ministers set forth the main lines to be followed for the purpose of controlling fifth-column activities. They also agreed on the need for increased efforts to improve living standards and to strengthen fundamental human freedom in order to fortify the faith of our peoples in their democracy.

Economic questions occupied a large part of the discussions. It was recognized that the emergency in which we find ourselves imposes special problems of production and supply. The needs of defense programs must be met, while measures have to be taken to prevent any unnecessary dislocation of the economics of our 21 republics. The economic resolutions adopted by the Foreign Ministers deal with production of strategic materials, with the allocation of scarce goods, with measures to combat inflation, and a number of other related subjects. They embody the basic inter-American principle of fair treatment to all—the sharing of sacrifices so that all may share in the benefits to be achieved.

The decisions of the meeting of Foreign Ministers are in themselves important to the future of every one of us, uniting as they do the efforts of the 21 American Republics. However, as Secretary Acheson pointed out in his closing remarks, the manner in which decisions were reached there is also of great importance. For in this meeting, the American nations have again demonstrated the validity of their great system of cooperation based upon principles which commend the loyalty of every one of them.

The highly satisfactory results of this meeting of consultation are eloquent evidence of what can be accomplished by nations working in a sincere desire to merge their national interests in the larger goal of a world in which peace, freedom, and prosperity can be achieved.

Mr. McCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary, this, then, against the background of Battle Front Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your thirty-second Battle Report, Washington.

John Alltucker, Educational Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with much regret in the Times Herald of Vallejo, Calif., of the retirement of John R. Alltucker as superintendent of schools of Vallejo.

For 24 years he served the Vallejo school district, the last 10 as superintendent. Vallejo is really a Federal city. The major industry is the Mare Island Navy Yard. In 1940 Vallejo had a population of 20,072. About that time Mare Island Navy Yard was being expanded rapidly until at the end of the war there were over 42,500 workers in the yard. The city of Vallejo grew to about 80,000, but the boundary of the city was not enlarged. The school population grew about like the population of the city. Vallejo had a staggering problem to handle the education of its enormously increased school population.

Lanham Act funds helped build some schoolhouses. Mr. Alltucker, loyally and vigorously supported by the board of education, handled the job of providing education for the increased school population. The intellect and the character of John Alltucker was impressed upon many a pupil of the Vallejo schools during the 10 years he was superintendent of schools. Somehow, under the administration of John Alltucker, they received as good training as they would had they lived in normal cities. Part of the reason was that the superintendent had undying faith in our public-school system, and his board of education had faith in the ability of their superintendent to give every child that came into the Vallejo schools during this wartime period an opportunity to get an education, the birthright of every American child.

I think the board and the superintendent still are wondering how the job was done, but it was accomplished.

Later the wartime pressure relaxed some, but not nearly as much as was expected when the war ended. A large population still remained in Vallejo. Some of us thought that since the schools had been built by the National Government to take care of an educational war emergency and, since Vallejo had done this magnificently, the sensible thing would be to turn the schools built with Federal money over to Vallejo and other similar cities, on the promise that they would continue to be used for education. With a group of my House colleagues I tried to bring this about and introduced a bill to accomplish such transfers. We submitted testimony on the matter to the Public Works Committee. I was fortunate in getting Mr. Alltucker to come before the committee and explain the situation in Vallejo, which was similar, but perhaps more aggravated, to what it was in many other war towns. He made a great witness. He thoroughly explained the problem; he was able to give answers to all the questions put to him and in every way he made an excellent showing. Naturally, I was greatly pleased that Mr. Alltucker, my constituent and friend, had made such a good impression. However, the Public Works Committee took the view of the Public Works Agency, that these schools should be sold to the local school districts. Nevertheless, our hearings brought the price down to practically a nominal amount and the thanks for this result is due to Mr. Alltucker more than to any other person.

John R. Alltucker is a true educator. He is unassuming, frank, friendly, and modest. He is continually thinking of how he can improve the opportunity for education for the pupils under his jurisdiction. He never took the attitude that Vallejo was the only city that had an acute problem in education. He recognized that others had similar situations. His relations with his Congressman were most cordial and friendly. He never made any unreasonable requests. His conduct was such as to make his Representative in Congress want to "break his neck" to do something for John Alltucker. Vallejo is to be congratulated on getting and keeping a man like him for 24 years. The board, including all members of it while he was superintendent, are to be congratulated on working so cordially with Mr. Alltucker and supporting him so loyally in working out the problems presented to the board during the trying war and postwar years.

His administration of the schools, in a manner that gave every war worker in the Mare Island yard the feeling that his children were being properly educated, raised the morale of these fine workers. This may account for the many awards that Mare Island and its workers received for their fine accomplishments.

McNeil Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Paul J. Squier, warden of McNeil Island Penitentiary, in the State of Washington. The article points up the very fine work being done at that institution:

MCNEIL ISLAND—EMERALD OF PUGET SOUND

(By Paul J. Squier, Warden, United States Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash.)

The oldest, the most far-flung outpost, the only prison in the continental United States for which a navy is a necessity. McNeil Island stands out as an unique institution.

Before the State of Washington had come into being; before the Bureau of Prisons was organized; McNeil Island was a facility of the Federal Government for housing offenders. It was the United States marshals' jail, serving the great Northwest Territory. It became a part of the Federal prison system in 1909.

In the early days, when law enforcement consisted of the simple expedient of hanging or shooting a culprit when caught, rehabilitation was but a word in the dictionary. Prevention by detention was the most progressive method and, as early as 1875, mutineers from the sea, outlaws, and malefactors involved in illicit Indian traffic, were taken in clinker-built dinghys across the cold, tide-driven waters of Puget Sound to the island, 3½ miles out, where 27 acres were purchased and the first buildings erected.

Conditions were primitive. According to old records, the bath line for many years, took place in a wooden barrel, in water heated over hot rocks. Wood was the only fuel. Weather conditions, however, were temperate, running from an average summer high of 71.8 to a mean low, in wintertime, of 35.4. There was much rain.

Today, situated about 15 miles from Olympia, Wash., to the south and an equidistance from Tacoma to the north, McNeil Island receives inmates from an area extending from the icy wastes of the Alaskan Territory to the hot Mexican borders of southern California.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

From its original holdings, the Government institution has grown until today it encompasses the whole of McNeil Island, an area of about 7 square miles or 4,400 acres.

By 1924 a population of 400 had already cramped living conditions and made additional area necessary. In 1926, in return for Federal timberlands, a transfer of the local school section was made to the institution. In this region, located some 3 miles inland from the main buildings, the penitentiary farm came into being the following year.

Nearly a decade later, the Government purchased the complete island and today we have a main institution with a normal capacity of 900 men (but with a present population of around 1,040), a large hinterland being constantly developed, and a McNeil Island Camp with a normal capacity of 250. The island has become a complete world of its own, self-contained and slowly approaching self-sufficiency.

Living quarters for inmates at the main institution are provided by three cell blocks, an honor dormitory and an admission and orientation unit. The modern hospital has a capacity of 80 beds. A 700-seat auditorium, built by the inmates, is one of the finest in the prison service. There are administration offices, school units for both academic and vocational classes, chapels, cannery, powerhouse, laundry, library, shipyards, and shops of various kinds.

Efforts toward improvements and more efficient facilities are constant and continuous. For example, the main kitchen is now undergoing extensive renovations. A new air-conditioned bread-room will reduce stale bread to a minimum and allow for the proper cooling of breakfast rolls and other bakery goods which develop pan taste when handled without the proper facilities.

The power plant is being enlarged and modernized, eliminating the ever present danger of power failure from the mainland. A Diesel motor of 800 kilowatts has recently been installed, and preparations are now under way for the installation of a new 1,200-kilowatt turbine.

The old, inadequate system of securing water from deep wells and springs was discarded in 1937 when the Butterworth Dam and reservoir were completed and the pumping system put into operation. The water from Eden Creek is filtered and pumped either to the camp, which has two steel tanks with a total capacity of 550,000 gallons, or to the concrete reservoir above the main institution which has a capacity of 680,000 gallons.

A second dam is now in process of completion and will insure an adequate supply of water for the expanding domestic, institutional, irrigative, and industrial uses. In order to derive multiple benefits from one operation, 100 acres of now almost impenetrable swamp will be changed by the dam into a placid lake, nestling in tranquillity below the evergreen forests. Thus is utility served without the sacrifice of beauty.

THE M'NEIL FARM CAMP

Supplanting the penitentiary farm, the McNeil Island Camp came into being in 1943, coincident with the closing of the camps at Dupont, Wash., and Kooskia, Idaho, due to curtailment of activities brought by the war and need for conserving staff manpower.

About half of the commitments to McNeil Camp are short-termers from the courts, and half are received by formal transfer from the main McNeil institution. Population during the past year has ranged from 280 to 355. The two institutions are most closely integrated, and are, of necessity, complementary—the camp furnishing a large proportion of fresh food, and the main institution furnishing services not available at the camp.

Prior to the war, the penitentiary maintained a farm population of 90 to 150 inmates, who worked at the farm and were housed and fed there in a modern dormitory, consisting of three squad rooms, housing 50 men each. The original dormitory and culinary unit and office space comprise the heart of the present unit. There are now three additional cottages of the war-time surplus variety which house 50 men each. In most respects, policies and functioning are according to commonly approved camp practices. However, this camp is unique in the Federal Prison System in that the officer personnel and all funds are provided through the main institution. There is excellent cooperation between the farm group, the camp administration, and the main institution—administrative, custodial, mechanical, and culinary departments.

The future holds some very interesting possibilities for the camp at McNeil Island. Orchard and berry development will play an important part n the farm economy and should contribute substantially to the cannery operation as well. Continued land development as recommended by the Soil Conservation Service, will contribute to the self-sufficiency of the dairy through more abundant pasture and hay, and enable us to establish and operate an economical beef venture. Close cooperation with the cannery will enable us to conserve surpluses and meet more and more of the steward's off-season needs. Our timber operation will some day become so important that its value can scarcely be overemphasized. The various elements should blend into a closely woven program to give the balance and unity which a prison farm should have.

Out of a total of 4,409 acres, the farm has slightly less than 1,000 acres of cultivated land. Perhaps 2,000 acres can best be considered forest land, since a fine stand of young fir in general. A recent soil conservation survey indicates about 600 acres favorable for production may be cleared and put into cropland. Land clearing is a sizable job, with tremendous fir stumps to be uprooted and burned before plowing can be started. Land clearing does provide productive winter work for the inmates and is a stabilizing influence on the work program. Practically all the acreage yet to be reclaimed will be devoted to pasture, forage, and small grain production—three of our most pressing needs.

The orchard and berry program is quite ambitious, with 300 acres devoted to this feature. Two hundred acres of this total represents young orchard that will need several years to reach full productivity. At that time about 65 acres of old orchard, scattered about the island, will have passed their usefulness and will be removed. This will leave a solid block of over 200 acres of productive fruit to effect the maximum operating economy. This orchard can be irrigated with facilities now available and should give good production in a few more years. Tree fruits being grown include apples, peaches, prunes, sweet and sour cherries, pears, and apricots.

The garden operation is quite sizable, with up to 80 acres devoted to it. Most of this land is irrigated with portable equipment from permanent underground installations. The chief handicap to the garden operation is unfavorably contoured land, a condition to

be improved by clearing and developing adjacent areas.

The hog and poultry features provide pork and eggs to fill institutional requirements. Yearly pork production is around 500 head.

The dairy unit on McNeil Island has developed from a mediocre beginning, with grade animals purchased from here and there, to a herd of 67 high-grade milking cows. The first bulls with any important background used in the herd were loaned by the Department of Agriculture and came from the Huntley, Mont., experiment station. In 1940, a bull was purchased from Carnation Farms, and since that time several others have been obtained from the same source. Then, too, three bulls were supplied from our own institutions: one from La Tuna, and two from Terre Haute.

In 1940 the herd reached its highest average production, and was at the top of the list for the institution dairy herds.

During the war years, and since, production has been declining, due to the feed situation and the shortage of money for purchase of feed. The only purchased animals in the herd have been the bulls, until recently, when, through the efforts of Director Bennett and Warden Squier, nine purebred heifers were bought from Carnation Farms.

INDUSTRIES

Our industries are presently composed of four units: a cannery, a furniture-repair shop, a pallet shop, and a shipyard. A year-round average of some 20 percent of the inmate population is employed in this work.

The largest of the industries is the cannery—both in number of employees and in investment. Approximately 67,000 cases of canned goods have been prepared during the past year. The major part of this pack has been for the Army, and the balance has gone to our own institutions and to other Government agencies. The dehydrator is in a semiseparate unit.

The cannery is in operation about 7½ months of the year, and work is maintained on two shifts for a considerable portion of that time. In off-season, only about one-fourth as many men are employed in maintenance, repair, and shipping.

The pallet shop, which is the second largest industry, is presently working on an Army contract. This is operated on a piecework basis and peak production is 685 pallets in 1 day. Twenty-five thousand, 4-foot by 6-foot heavy equipment pallets have been completed in the past 6 months, involving the using of over 2,000,000 board feet of lumber and a large quantity of hardware.

The furniture-repair shop is engaged in refinishing office desks and chairs for the Army and for other Federal offices.

The shipyard is probably the best known of the island's industries. During the war three tugs were built for the Army, and later a tender was built for Alcatraz. More recently, the yard has been used to repair boats for the Coast Guard, and boats and barges for the island's navy.

INMATES

The inmate population is a heterogeneous group. Ages vary from 17 to 80 years, and sentences from 1 month to life-plus-60-years. Analogous variance obtains with regard to degrees of intelligence and culture. For example, recently one inmate chose to sleep on the floor and apparently did not know what a pillow was for until he became acclimated. Practically all professions are represented; the most rare is that of school teacher. The Negro population has increased over 400 percent since 1941, due to the influx of military prisoners and to shifting population. Our Eskimo population is increasing, but they present fewer problems than any other racial group. Only five of our present N. M. V. T. A-law violators are other than white. Commitments are largely from Washington, Oregon, and California.

EVENING ACTIVITIES

The year 1941 marked the beginning of the first attempt at an organized recreational program. Prior to this time various cliques almost completely monopolized the playing areas and consequently the bulk of the population was left with no alternative but to walk around the yard. A softball and an outdoor basketball league were formed and eventually developed into the present-day set-up wherein two leagues are in play. These are: Major league of eight teams in basketball, softball, and volleyball. The minor league of four teams is comprised of those lesser-skilled individuals who thus are given an opportunity to play with men of their own ability.

The drill hall, previously utilized for officers' training, was renovated and made available for winter-months activities. Basketball standards, punching-bag platforms, standards for volleyball courts were installed and, over a 6-year period, have finally evolved into a complete 6-month winter-program period. This area is utilized by the inmates from 12 noon to 8:30 p. m. during the regular workweek, and from 12 noon until 4 p. m. on Saturdays and Sundays. The use of this indoor area has been a splendid morale booster for all types of inmates, as a well-balanced program for both active and nonactive men is carried on by the recreational division.

Inmate committees work with the recreational officer and the officials in charge of the institution and thus promote cordial, well-received programs.

Visitors have been very favorably impressed with the sportsmanship shown by both players and spectators. Inmate officials have received words of praise for their work and the combined efforts of both inmates and officials has left a pleasing impression on the outsider.

Next to radio, the library with its 10,000 volumes and 48 magazines has the greatest number of participants. Each inmate has the opportunity to avail himself of the library at least three times a week, since it is open for 8 hours each day. Magazines are mostly distributed by request, usually about 75 a day. Books taken out average 300 to 400 an evening. Vocatfonal training is given in bookbinding and marbling. The second evening period is devoted to selected study groups, a great books discussion circle, and to the debating team. The actual debates with neighboring collegiate or high-school teams invoke a hearty interest and frequently attract an audience of several hundred inmates.

The auditorium is the scene of daily events such as church activities and the motion-picture shows (which make their appearance on every week end and on holiday occasions), as well as for vocational classes on Wednesdays, and for orchestra and choir practice; and on special occasions it is used for boxing matches or other activities such as outside lectures, debates, inmate shows, etc. It is also the usual meeting place for the personnel for regular or special lectures or discussion groups.

Evening school is likewise divided into two periods. Classes are conducted in the afternoon as well, but those are primarily for inmates with a full-time or half-time school assignment. The program is ambitious and entails academic, vocational, and avocational aspects. Most classes are held on alternate evenings, so a wider range may be offered. The supervisor states that less emphasis is being placed on the formal school-room type of class and that the trend is more toward vocational training and correspondence study. Correspondence study has more than tripled during the past 6 years. Some 8,000 lessons embracing more than 75 courses from 6 major sources have been completed during the past quarter.

The inmates have appreciated some innovations in the activity program. Our hinterland is especially fruitful in raising small colleges, and the education department has capitalized on their teacher-training and sociology departments to the extent that four of the students now take admission interviews, one teaches classes in sociology-psychology, and one compiled statistics for college credit.

Hobby-shop activities have rapidly increased in scope and number of participants. It is supervised by a custodial officer under direction of the education department. Twenty-one inmates are now engaged in flytying, 12 in leather work, 7 in weaving, 7 in woodwork, 1 in plastics, and 1 in art. The excellence of many of these products indicates that the avocations could be transformed into vocations and become the means of earning a good living.

PERSONNEL AND ORGANIZATION

Time is a commodity with which the administration is not too well supplied and, consequently, there is an ever-present emphasis on speed and efficiency. Organization is the keynote. Training and the time factor are under constant consideration.

For example—the McNeil Island fleet. Gone are the days of haphazard schedules, antiquated lapstreaks, and seagoing guards. Today, a highly trained group of maritime officers handles the 24-hour-a-day activities of passenger boats, freighters, tugs, power barges, and ferry service.

Boats arrive and leave in a steady stream: A freighter with a load of apples from eastern Washington or leaving with a cargo of canned goods for Alcatraz; a power barge loaded with lumber for the pallet crews; tugs bringing in scows piled high with Army salvage from Seattle; and, in between, the continuous clocklike runs of the passenger boats bringing in the shifts, business representatives, and new inmates.

These passenger boats alone excite the imagination. They must meet deadlines every hour of the day and most of the night. In spite of weather, unforeseen incidents, and other emergencies, they leave on the minute and return on time.

Boats have beached in heavy fogs and fast-running tides; bows have been smashed, striking submerged "deadheads" on stormy nights; there is the constant threat of broken log rafts and heavy Puget Sound traffic in high winds and rolling seas. Yet, to the credit of able and alert maritime crews, never has a boat been lost nor has a serious accident occurred in the thousands of McNeil Island runs.

The engineers and construction units are another example. Trucks, tractors, graders, bulldozers, and other heavy power equipment tune up every morning for another day of purposeful activity. Survey crews and office draftsmen work at top speed to keep ahead of the dam construction, the building, and the opening of new projects.

An intricate and strategic network of roads, guarding 14 miles of shoreline, must be kept in constant repair. Docks must be kept in first-class condition. To save time and money, the construction units have erected and run their own sawmill, organizing logging crews to keep them supplied with material from the island timberlands. A forestry unit has planted hundreds of young seedlings with the long view of a permanent forest crop.

All this business is run in close cooperation with the shops—the machine shops, which manufacture and supply new for old and broken parts; the auto shops, which keep the motor pool ready and running; the carpenter shops, which fill quick orders and needed repairs.

Over all this interlocking industry is a crack custodial force to see that the main purpose of the institution is not lost in the

press of business; and educational and classification groups to foster rehabilitation—to get the right man into the right place. Finally, under one administrative head an effort is made to see that these widespread activities function smoothly, without conflict or friction, synchronized into one smooth-running organization.

All this is accomplished with a personnel of 250 employees, 75 of whom live with their families in modern homes on the island, about 25 in an up-to-date officers' quarters. The rest commute from Steilacoom, Tacoma, or adjacent areas. On the side, the island residents find it expedient to maintain a cooperative store, a filling station, and a part-time garage. Local organizations sponsor a well-rounded religious, recreational, and social activities program for all ages.

And so McNeil Island continues to function down through the years, growing, experimenting, changing with the times in its attempt to meet the needs of the Nation, striving to be of service to society, a credit to the Bureau, and an important and purposeful part of the United States Government.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, President Samuel N. Stevens, of Grinnell College, has given a good deal of thought and study to the deferment of college students who pass the difficult aptitude tests, and his analysis of the matter is very worthwhile. I, therefore, ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include President Stevens' memoranda on the subject of protecting the national health and safety by permitting men to continue their education and not engage in military service until their program of study is completed. President Stevens' remarks follow:

1. This is not class legislation. A study was made with the cooperation of eight other colleges and universities of the economic backgrounds of the students in the colleges. These students come from families with incomes that range from $2,000 a year to over $100,000 a year. The median salaries fall within the range of between $3,600 and $5,000. Reports from the Department of Labor indicate that even in the field of industrial wages the averages today are within this range. Consequently, since the people in school involve economic backgrounds that are almost identical with the students in high school and the prospects generally it cannot be said that postponing military service of a college student is class legislation.

2. Education is not a luxury. It seems apparent from many of the discussions which have taken place that American people at times look upon higher education as a luxury which can be ignored or thrown out whenever an economic or political crisis arises which makes stresses and strains on our manpower. I am sure that you agree with me that there are no problems in our modern social economy which have remained as simple in structure or solution as they were in the early part of this century. It makes no difference how we deal with technicalities of production or distribution or with the problems of social control or with the problems of international policy. At every point the need for enlightened historically sound, scientifically accurate judgments is so pressing as to almost take on the nature of an emergency. We cannot expect to maintain world dominance economically or to give world leadership operating from an educational framework that is as obsolete as the horse and buggy is when seen in terms of whole plan.

We need in the national interest more and better leadership. We need men capable of arriving at sound social, political, moral and technical judgments. There is no substitute for processes of higher education. Russia recognizes this fact and systematically has her brightest and best men do intensive study at the university level. England recognizes this fact for England knows that her loss in world leadership is due in no small part to the thousands of her brightest men who were allowed to die on Flanders Fields. England today is poverty stricken for leadership because the men who might have reached the stature of national leaders in her economy are no longer alive. The loss was unnecessary. She no longer makes this mistake. Examine England's methods of deferring her men and you will find that she sees to it that her brightest and finest brains are not only given an opportunity to become educated before they enter the military service but are not permitted to enter military service at all. They serve the national interests by preparing themselves to carry great loads of great responsibility, after the present generation of old men has given up and passed out of the picture.

3. The national emergency does not require the sacrifice of educational growth and development for boys between 18 and 24 at the present time.

The Defense Department has consistently misled the American people in regard to this matter. I personally believe that the manner in which the American people have been misled by the Defense Department is almost immoral. I recognize the fact that the vast appropriations which have been asked for and freely given would never have been made possible had it not been for the induced crises stirred up by military leaders and encouraged by our executive department. It has yet to be demonstrated that any one of the services is in a position to adequately clothe, arm, and train the men now under their control.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF W. D. JOHNSON, VICE PRESIDENT AND NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS, IN OPPOSITION TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

My name is W. D. Johnson. I am a vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America. I reside in Washington, D. C., and I maintain an office at 10 Independence Avenue. The general headquarters of the Order of Railway Conductors is located in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The Order of Railway Conductors was organized July 6, 1868, and is the second oldest railway labor organization in the United States.

As a representative of the Order of Railway Conductors, I am fully authorized to appear before this committee and file this statement in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Our opposition to this project dates back for approximately 20 years.

We are not opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway project merely from the standpoint of railroad employees, regardless of the fact that if this project is constructed, many conductors will be adversely affected. In addition to our interest as railroad employees, we are very deeply concerned as taxpayers, both State and Federal. We are, therefore, at a loss to understand why the Federal Government should be urged by a few individuals to appropriate more than a billion dollars of Federal funds to be used to subsidize the construction of a water-transportation system that cannot in our judgment be justified by the widest stretch of imagination, particularly so from the standpoint of national defense.

The records show that our present transportation systems are fully adequate to meet present and future transportation needs even though there would be a substantial increase in both freight and passenger traffic. Therefore, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway will simply mean taking away from present transportation systems tonnage that they are capable of handling and transferring it to another system. This is merely "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

In World War II, the proponents of the St. Lawrence project pleaded national defense, the same as they are doing at the present time. However, we have successfully fought two World Wars without the St. Lawrence project and I feel confident we will come out victorious in the present conflict without this added means of transportation.

It has been estimated that it will require from 7 to 10 years to construct this project. I am, therefore, wondering just how we will be able to carry on and meet the transportation needs during the interim period of construction. If we are able to carry on and meet the needs during the construction period, why can't we carry on after the project is constructed? In other words, if the future security of our great country is dependent upon the construction of a project that cannot be put into operation short of 8 or 10 years, I fear that our security will be destroyed long before the project is constructed, so why consider an expenditure of over a billion dollars of Federal funds for the construction of a nonessential project.

During World War II, the American railroads handled 97 percent of all organized military traffic and 90 percent of all war freight. Railroad management and employees were highly complimented by the President and other high-ranking officials for the efficient service rendered. It has been said many times by those in authority that if the railroads had failed to render prompt and efficient service, we would have suffered defeat in World War II. However, regardless of this outstanding transportation record, special effort is being put forth to deprive the railroads and the employees traffic that rightfully belongs to them.

I recall that General Eisenhower, on his return from his inspection tour abroad, stated in substance that our foreign allies are not inclined to give up, but on the contrary, they are eager to carry on provided they are supplied with the necessary implements of war. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be far more profitable and effective to use the vast sum of money that would be required to construct the St. Lawrence project to provide the necessary implements of war and get them in the hands of our allies at the earliest possible date.

I know that the engineers for the proponents have estimated the cost of construction of this project to be less than a billion dollars. However, past experience will show

that the cost of construction of water projects far exceeded the estimates submitted and I daresay that the St. Lawrence project if constructed will not be an exception to the rule.

Railway employees are deeply concerned with respect to our national defense. They have no desire whatsoever to do anything that would in any way retard our defense program. We, therefore, feel that our opposition to the St. Lawrence project is fully justified and will prove to be helpful instead of harmful.

Let me say in conclusion that our job as American citizens is to face realities and to strengthen and support our basic industries. This is no time to waste our money or efforts in the furtherance of experimental dreams. I, therefore, sincerely hope that this committee will render an unfavorable report on this project.

Military Careers of Former West Point Football Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article written by Walter Stewart, one of the country's recognized sports writers.

All of us watch with interest the progress of outstanding football players at West Point during the course of their preparation for service as officers in the regular Military Establishment. It is but natural that we lose sight of their excellent reputations as they leave West Point, because in the course of things others must take their places in the public eye.

Coach Blaik, in a conversation recently, gave me some very interesting figures about the military service of recent well-known graduates. I communicated that information to Mr. Stewart and indeed he has paid a great tribute to these fine soldiers. His article follows:

Anyone thoughtless enough to angle a sneer toward football at West Point will have to lick the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, a belligerent solon equipped with a built-in left hook and a grand pair of hands. We can't understand why anyone this side of the Kremlin would care to launch such a sneer, but our able and industrious lawmaker is prepared to kick in the teeth behind it.

Armed with the statistics of heroism, Congressman DAVIS strikes a deep bell tone from the heart of sporting America as he reports that.

1. Of the last nine captains of Army football teams, three have been killed in action. One of these three was our town's John Trent, the immortal warrior without fear and without reproach.

2. Since 1936 a total of 177 football lettermen have graduated and 95 percent have catapulted into service under fire.

3. Twenty percent have earned the Purple Heart for blood spilled in combat and 6 percent have been slain with faces set hard toward the enemy.

This is a record written in gore and guts and agony. It rates top brackets in football's hall of fame—in mankind's hall of fame. The backs and linemen of the United States Military Academy are a peculiar brand of tiger—a tireless and sacrificial type somewhat set apart from the average candidate for commission.

THE HARD WAY

Hours of practice are strictly limited and boiler-sized heads of steam must be jammed into these time capsules. Hard driven the cadets come out of the showers drained of energy and designed for an early rendezvous with the sack. But bed is a long way off—stiffly dug-in behind a rampart of textbooks. To reach it, the cadet must pierce an outpost line of higher mathematics—plow through a pulverizing fire blanket of bridge stresses before he crashes head-on into the final wall of resistance—the technique of fire control, English literature, and advanced Spanish.

Have you ever sought to concentrate upon a puddle of type when your brain sagged with your spine—when your shoulders quivered beneath the heavy anvils of fatigue? Well, we have—and no slight pressure is involved. Yet the football forces of West Point must keep in academic step with students who reach the study hour in comparative bright-eyed eagerness.

Of course football is nothing but war with the gloves on—the finest conditioner for a harsh and thankless profession. Yes, a cadet must flog his mind into stride when fatigue claws at his bowels—when cleated bruises freckle his hide and clean sheets wait a stride from the study table.

THE RUTHLESS PARALLEL

So the circumstances will be identical some fire-torn night when he crouches in the shifting shadows of a ruined cottage with a map spread across his knees and a flashlight quivering in his grubby paw. But this time the corporate life of a battalion, a division, an army is balanced upon the clarity of his thinking.

He is tired now—bone-tired and fighting back the tide of sleep which reaches out to engulf him. It is at this point that commanders strike with devastating skill, or see their units cut up and go back for reclassification. And the old fullback or tackle, toughened in heart and body and spirit, is the most likely candidate for success.

Yes, football is war with the gloves on—follows the same principles of tactics and strategy. As laid down by the military scientist, Von Klausewitz, one of these principles brings major attacking forces into contact with minor defensive units of the enemy. And what else is double teaming in football? On the defense, you seek to deploy and maneuver in such a manner that the foe will be unable to overwhelm you by massing at the critical point of assault.

Football offensives must blend air blows with ground power, and so must the winning general. You cannot advance the ball unless you are adept at feinting at one point and striking at another—building apparent strength at the flank and hitting up the center. The flag is pushed forward in the same intricate fashion.

Intelligence is equally vital on both fields. Scouting reports vary in detail, but the essentials are the same. What is the probable enemy intent and what are his capabilities? Where are the crevices of his defense? With these facts at his elbow, coach and commanding officer assess them endlessly and sketch flexible plans.

But men do not react precisely to the lines drawn upon a map or a blackboard. The foe has beefed up left tackle by overshifting, or moved artillery to saturate an area intelligence had described as a favorable avenue of approach to the jump-off. So one of the alternate plans must be adopted and put into immediate operation. The change must be made under full pressure and without losing momentum—a cruel task for a quarterback or regimental commander.

And for solid proof, read the roll call of glory—Army football men who moved on to the fire-swept slopes where games are played for deadly keeps. Eisenhower, Bradley, Stillwell, Neyland, Sultan, Patton, Gearhart, O'Donnell, Hobbs, O'Hare—a brilliant, surging listing.

So as long as we operate efficient and sharply striking football teams at West Point we'll have a hard corps of brilliant combat officers. Many of those who formed that doomed 6 percent failed to make the All-America while they played at the Academy. They waited a few years.

Sanctions Against Chinese Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FRANKFORD LIONS CLUB,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 18, 1951.

Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
Representative Sixth District, Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT: Your news letter dated March 26, 1951, in which you advocate that sanctions be placed against the Chinese Communists unless they withdraw beyond the Korean borders, in which case our troops, Air Force and Navy, would assume a noncombatant status pending their replacement by other occupation forces from all the peace-loving nations of the world, was read at the last meeting of this club.

In the belief that this Nation should take a definite stand and adopt an understandable policy with respect to the Chinese Communists and the Korean situation, we wish to inform you that a resolution was unanimously adopted by 112 members of this club in support of House Resolution No. 173, providing for sanctions to be approved against the Chinese Reds, but before they are used, the United Nations is to call for a cease-fire, involving the withdrawal of the Chinese beyond the Yalu River, followed by the U. N. recommendation for guaranteeing an independent Korea within protected boundaries.

Sincerely yours,
LIONS CLUB OF FRANKFORD,
By JAMES E. EMBERY, *Secretary.*

America for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement sent to me by the

members of the Third Medical Battalion, Third Infantry Division, now in Korea:

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

Frankly, we, the fighting men in Korea, are more worried about the Communists at home than the Chinese we are facing. At least here we are on even terms. We are both armed. But our families back home cannot defend themselves against the many sneaky tricks of the Communists in their midst. Further, we feel the sentences imposed on those Commies accused to date have been far too lenient, and in addition, we cannot see them enjoying the sanctity of our jails. The American taxpayer, including us over here in Korea, are getting fed up paying for trials and retrials and appeals and the upkeep of these undesirables in our jails.

We wish to offer to the American people a plan for ridding our country of those who don't seem to like our form of government at absolutely no cost to the taxpayers. Will all people at home insist that all those who don't like our Constitution, including the likes of Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis, Paul Robeson, Alger Hiss, Harry Gold, and the many others who have betrayed us, and those who always seem to be ridiculing the American way of life, insist again that these people be deported from the United States. We suggest these rodents be sent over to Korea and turned over to the military, who will see to it that they are given safe conduct to the thirty-eighth parallel and presented to their Chinese comrades. The cost of this project will be borne, and with great enthusiasm, by donations of the fighting men in Korea.

Send them over to us and we will do the rest. How about it, all you good people back home? Let us save and keep America for Americans.

MEMBERS OF THE THIRD MEDICAL BATTALION, THIRD INFANTRY DIVISION, APO, 468.

"A United States Air Force Mission With the Atomic Bomb, What It Looks Like, and How It Is Delivered"—Jim Berryman, Cartoonist-Illustrator, the Washington Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if anyone has ever successfully analyzed the elements of education in art, music, economics, scientific and technical subjects, commerce, labor, agriculture, trade, finance, law, medicine, the humanities, and other subjects which constitute some of the facets of an able, well-rounded and successful cartoonist.

I have seen men like Tad Dorgan, Cliff Berryman, John McCutcheon, and Herb Block, impart a more fluent, legible, understandable, and factual story with a few brush or pencil strokes—in a cartoon—than most persons are able to express in a 1-hour talk, and on almost any subject.

In addition to a thorough understanding of the classical arts and sciences, of the intricate problems of psychology, sociology, and the humanities, a good cartoonist must at the same time be endowed not alone with a lively imagination and well-developed, indefinable sense of humor, but an even deeper-seated realization of the most serious problems of life.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if this world has ever had two cartoonists endowed to a more marked degree than has characterized the internationally known and beloved Clifford Kennedy "Cliff" Berryman and his equally distinguished son, James T. "Jim" Berryman.

The work of the late Clifford K. Berryman intrigued this Nation for more than a half a century. The Berrymans—father and son—were not only both winners of the Pulitzer prize, but both were president of Washington's famed Gridiron Club of writers and cartoonists Jim Berryman is now the president of the famous Gridiron Club which satirizes public officials at two large dinners each year. He has long been both a magazine illustrator and a writer, specializing in the popular presentations of technical subjects, and made a considerable number of drawings, both for the United States Navy, Army, and the United States Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that every man, woman, and child, in these United States could read this splendid article by our good friend, Jim Berryman, entitled "A Mission With the Atomic Bomb, What It Looks Like, and How It Is Delivered," as reproduced in the Washington Star, last evening.

Mr. Speaker, it would be like painting the lily for me to try to explain the wonderful piece of writing and illustrations done by this great artist-writer.

At long last we have a factual report as to just what we might expect to happen when the United States Air Force B–36 or a B–50 travels alone to its target devoid of fighters and as a single, lonely package of destruction.

Jim Berryman said yesterday when I talked with him:

"Congressman, I wrote and illustrated this article simply to enlighten the average man, woman, and child—to give all of them faith and courage in what we in America have done and can do—to protect our American way of life if and when any eventuality arises that might make it necessary to protect these shores.

"After seeing what Gen. Curtis LeMay has in hand, I am satisfied that the American internal defenses are not going to be wrecked by a murderous attack from the heavens as they were at Pearl Harbor because General LeMay is not letting his Air Force be caught like a lot of sitting ducks."

Mr. Speaker, that Americans everywhere throughout the country and particularly the children in our rural sections whose teachers daily read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may gain an inkling of but one phase of what is being done by the United States Air Force to secure our lives, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I extend my remarks. I desire to include within my remarks a brief statement made by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force, and a wonderfully illustrated article accompanying it, the same written by Jim Berryman, cartoonist and illustrator for Look magazine, as reproduced in the Washington Star, where we in Congress almost daily see and enjoy his work:

STATEMENT FOR LOOK BY LT. GEN. CURTIS LEMAY, CHIEF OF THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The primary objective of the military forces of the free world is peace. Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter has defined the mission of air power in this connection as being one of the most important means for preventing war and establishing a world of peace.

The role of Strategic Air in this is one which is very clear and seriously held by us in the Air Force Strategic Air Command. We feel that by having our strategic bombers in the highest possible state of readiness, we are serving as a most potent force to deter any aggressor. We also are serving as a force which can help win the victory should war come in spite of the most earnest efforts of the leaders of the free world.

The officers and airmen of the Strategic Air Command understand the terrific responsibility which is theirs. The ability to deliver atomic weapons gives us a power which is enormous, but we are firmly dedicated to using that power toward the preservation of the peace and security of the free world as we know it.

The news article was as follows:

FLYING AN ATOMIC BOMB MISSION WITH SELECT B–50 CREW—STAR CARTOONIST BERRYMAN MAKES THE FIRST SKETCHES AND WRITES THE FIRST STORY OF HOW AIR FORCE BOMBER DELIVERS WORLD'S MOST LETHAL WEAPON AND RETURNS

(By James T. Berryman)

They said it was a dry A-bomb run. But it seemed live enough to me in the pressurized B–50's forequarters at 30,000 feet altitude. For only a bulkhead door separated the navigator and me from the atomic bomb's cradle in the 60-degree below zero temperature of the bomb bay.

Man's most destructive weapon lies rigidly fixed in its launching position. At the attack unfolds, the navigator occasionally glances at the grotesque bulk of what he calls "The Thing" through a circular-glass peephole in the bulkhead. This is probably unnecessary, for the bomb is immovable until it is released automatically by the magic of electronics. This ghastly weapon is preset when the B–50 rises from the earth on its fateful mission.

I think I am one of the few civilians, and surely the only cartoonist-illustrator, to have flown on a simulated A-bomb mission. The security-conscious crew of the B–50 looked at me with goggle-eyed wonder when Lt. Col. Harry E. Stengele, wing commander of the Ninety-sixth Bombardment Squadron, announced to them that I was authorized to go on their mission, sketching pad, pencils, crayons, and all. This was at Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.

SEEKS TO SCOTCH RUMORS

I was there because Maj. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, deputy chief of staf. on Operations for Atomic Energy—and once a cartoonist at West Point—thought a cartoonist illustrator could tell a big part of the A-bomb story without giving away any vital technical information to your enemies.

He said, "I believe it is high time some of the ridiculous stories circulated about the A-bomb be killed and buried once and for all. I've even heard rumors that hundreds of thousands of American people fearfully believe that an enemy agent could board a Hoboken ferry toting the bomb in a zipper bag and blow Manhattan clear over into Brooklyn."

An enemy agent about the size of the legendary Paul Bunyan, strong man of the north woods, would find it a strain to carry the A-bomb fitting into the B–50 (No. 8117) on which I flew as supercargo. I don't say there aren't smaller bombs. But this type, which is the standard 1951 model, is a whopper.

BOMBER LOWERED OVER CARGO

It is towed out by tractor to the waiting, fueled B–50, all 10,000 pounds of it shrouded under canvas like a bulbous corpse. The big, 99-foot-long bomber has been lifted by its nose by a crane and rests back almost on its tail at an 18- or 20-degree angle. Ground crews surround "the thing" like ants and shove it on its easy-riding dolly under the belly of the bomber, just below the gaping bomb-bay doors.

The shrouds come off as the bomber is slowly lowered over its cargo by the crane which has held up its nose. A hydraulic lift draws the bomb up into its launching position in a supporting nest of four triangular braces. Big set screws are turned down by hand until the bomb is rigid in its carriage. Then the bomb-bay doors snap shut with force enough to cut a man in two.

And there on the airfield's concrete apron, her wings spanning 141 feet, lies this ominous silver-gray lady, pregnant and ready to deliver.

While the specifications of the bomb are classified, it is possible to describe it in general terms. I do not, in fact, know the exact specifications.

APPROXIMATELY 20 FEET LONG

The bomb, I believe, is approximately 20 feet long and 9 or 10 feet in diameter. It is about the bulk of an average-sized living room.

Unlike conventional bombs, this weapon is bulbous, not tear-dropped.

The men call it "the thing," or "the panic," the "ostrich egg," or just "the bomb."

A drenching rain slapped our faces as we left the briefing room of the Ninety-sixth Bombardment Squadron to board the 8117.

JETS FAILED TO PIERCE WEATHER

Above the storm, a crewman said: "Boy, what a beautiful night. Those damned fighters never will find us now." That was my first news that fighters would be out after us as we winged toward target X. The jets never got up. They were locked in by weather, that wonderful, awful weather.

Target X is a city. I cannot say what city. It is one of a number of cities closely approximating the characteristics of a Russian city or cities earmarked for attack if the United States Strategic Air Command ever has to make its great strike. The crew of the No. 8117 know now where it will go if R-day ever comes. The B–50, work horse of the strategic air command, and heavily armed, can bomb at 30,000 feet, traveling at 350 miles per hour in all kinds of weather.

Each B–50, equipped with atomic bombs is a bomber force in itself, by World War II standards. It packs the punch of a 500-plane raid. Under typical conditions, the B–50 travels alone to its target.

There are hundreds of these SAC work horses. I believe there are hundreds of bombs. There are also a few hundred of the "select" type of crew with which I flew, and several more hundreds only a little less skillful.

Inside the 8117, as we clambered on, it was like a superelectronic workshop; a maze of dials and instruments beyond imagining. Every man of the 10-man crew had a steady, excruciatingly detailed task.

We headed for target X and it was all business. These atomic-bomber men are not kids. They are in their late twenties and early thirties, most of them family men, and they are deadly serious. There is little of the kidding over the plane's intercom, as among the bombers of the last war. That "Thing" in the rear compartment has a sobering influence.

Target X was roughly 1,300 miles from the take-off. Later I looked on the maps and found that there are many bases available to the United States Air Force less than 1,300 miles from vital points in, let's say, Russia.

It was, they said, a routine flight. To me it was magic journey through a nether world of gray-green haze interspersed with violent storms.

WAS AUTOMATIC OPERATION

Tension increased as we approached target A. This was a full dress radar automatic operation.

As the target was approached, control of the great B–50 passed out of the hands of its pilots into the hands of our radar navigator. He was Major Sharpe, of Moran, Tex., 33-year-old father of a 3-year-old son and a 6-year-old daughter.

Major Sharpe is known among the crew as a "bad boy" because he has to sit in a corner. Directly before his eyes is the radar scope. On his right hand in the little corner is a fantastic panel of dials and meters. The same on his left hand.

The radar scope is Major Sharpe's eyes. He sees on it the pattern of the terrain over which 8117 is traveling. Its center is round, like a pie, and two lines mark out a wedge of the pie. Radio beams bounce against any metallic objects on the ground, and reflect back through night and storm to make the pattern on the radar scope. The wedge is important. When the two lines, closing like a pair of shears, come together, the A-bomb plunges out of the bomber's belly and heads for the target through the darkness of night or the gloom of the overcast.

As target X spread its points of light on the radar scope, Navigator-Bombardier Capt. Milton Timothy, 32, announced into the intercom: "Approaching I. P." This meant that the plane was approaching the initial point from which the bomb run would be made.

"Aircraft on gyro," said Maj. Leslie R. McKee, 31-year-old atomic commander of the 8117. "Radar bombardier in control." Major Sharpe now had control of the plane. He had become "Mr. Atomic." His job was to make adjustments in the automatic gyropilot control which would bring together the closing scissors blades on the radar scope and put the plane on its target. He was checked over the intercom by Captain Timothy in the nose of the plane, and as Major Sharpe became "Mr. Atomic," the flight engineer, Lt. Merle Bare, already busy at his controls, now became a human rheostat. Under his skilled hands, the ship had to maintain the exact speed and altitude to coincide with Major Sharpe's electronic and radar calculations.

Major McKee and Lieutenant Colonel Stengele, in the pilot's seats, sat and waited, all the while checking and rechecking the instrument panels before them—the true air speed, functioning of the engines, wind velocity, etc.

The story of these hushed 4 minutes was being told on a time gage before the eyes of Radar Navigator Sharpe and on the radar scope as the two lines came together. The time gage ticked off its last second and the lines came together at the same instant.

This was the instant of the A-bomb's release. Something over 40 seconds later it would have exploded over its target at the exact height for which it was set.

DIRECT HIT INDICATED

In this case 8117's lethal cargo was not dropped. If it had been, the plane, rid of its 5-ton burden, would have lurched forward and up. It would have been 4 to 5 miles away when the atomic blast came.

Radar impulses showed that this test run of the A-bomb discharge technique had scored a direct hit.

"How accurate are bomb drops," I asked. "Well," said one of the officers, "suppose you were the manager of a big strategic warehouse in the Urals. Suppose you had a ground-to-plane short wave. You might hear the buzzer, and it would be on your wavelength." And we would say, "Here's that A-bomb you ordered, Mr. Voronovsky. Do you want it on the front step or in the back yard?"

After we wheeled away from the target we headed for our refueling point. I wasn't prepared for the huge air tanker which appeared over us. The connecting link between the planes was actually fired from a boom gun into our plane's opened refueling hatch. We took on thousands of gallons of gasoline in such a routine fashion that it seemed like pulling up to a ground pump.

This operation has changed the whole nature of our strategic air attack.

General LeMay and his boys carry a terrific wallop. I am convinced there are also a good many bombs tucked away in some very convenient spots.

We wheeled back to the air base over water. It was a comfort to see through one break of the clouds a tiny green island below us with wide, shining concrete runway covering the length of it. This could be home some day for a crippled B–50.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is an Age-Old Scheme That Is Not New to the American People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway is one of the several New Deal hobbies inherited by the Fair Deal spenders that cannot be masqueraded as a defense emergency project, according to the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune in its issue of February 20, 1951. The editorial follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SCHEME AGAIN

The old St. Lawrence seaway scheme, which bobbed up again in Mr. Truman's legislative carryall, reappeared briefly before the Mississippi Valley Association at its St. Louis meeting. A proposal to endorse it "in the interest of the national defense emergency" was promptly rejected and the association thereafter reaffirmed its opposition for reasons frequently stated and considered sound and sufficient by the country and Congress over a long term.

The only new talking point of its advocates was that presented at the St. Louis meeting—that the project's adoption would be "in the interest of the national defense emergency." Since it would require years for completion, the present defense emergency would be long gone before any aid from the St. Lawrence project could be available. And since material and labor costs have winged their way to a new and fantastic "high" since the diameter of the hole this St. Lawrence business would make in the National Treasury has been estimated carefully, most Americans feel that total cost, condemned as excessive years ago, would be practically prohibitive now when our Federal debt has attained cloud-touching proportions and the essential needs for defense must be supplied at a cost so prodigious that it worries all intelligent folks.

The St. Lawrence seaway scheme is one of the several New Deal hobbies inherited by the Fair Deal spenders that cannot be masqueraded as a defense emergency project. Congress, wrestling with the hugely difficult problem of financing our defense necessities, should lighten the overload by deleting the nonemergency items camouflaged into the administration's emergency spending plan to give it the appearance of another "squander spree." The costly St. Lawrence scheme is one of the obvious deletables.

Dean Gooderham Acheson Shifts His Stance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last November the Secretary of State directed his scornful remarks against Senator TAFT, who had demanded a reexamination of our foreign policy. A gale of public wrath is blowing the Secretary now, and he is conveniently shifting his stance, as Mr. Felix Morley points out in Barron's this week. Members are invited to read this important article which I shall insert at this point:

REEXAMINATION IS HERE—AS THE MACARTHUR TRIUMPH MOUNTS, MR. ACHESON SHIFTS HIS STANCE

(By Felix Morley)

Even before General MacArthur reached Washington the Truman administration was reeling under the impact of his triumph.

Last Wednesday night, as the Bataan was winging east from San Francisco, Secretary of State Acheson sought to patch some crumbling sections of his foreign policy. Speaking to the Women's National Press Club, the Secretary tried to make it appear that he welcomes what he euphemistically called "discussions" of his leadership.

"These discussions," said Mr. Acheson, "make up the national mind and focus the national will." Out of them "comes a national agreement upon conclusions, produced by the innate common sense of the American people when they have heard all sides and have come to the point of decision."

Listening to these fine phrases, some of the Secretary's audience pinched themselves, to be sure they were awake. It was recalled that only 5 months ago, on November 17, Mr. Acheson made his sarcastic reexaminist speech, directed at Senator TAFT's post-election statement that our foreign policy must be reexamined.

On November 17 Mr. Acheson retorted: "We need to look at this reexaminist and see what kind of a person he really is." The Secretary then compared him with a farmer, "who pulls up all his crops to see how they have done during the night." Having "put our hand to the plow," concluded Mr. Acheson, "does it make sense to say, 'I want to reexamine our programs?' "

Now Mr. Acheson answers that question in the affirmative. He says we have not yet "come to the point of decision." He agrees—belatedly now—that there is a great debate on foreign policy and says that reexaminists play an invaluable role therein.

Like Hamlet before him, Dean Gooderham Acheson knows a hawk from a handsaw when the wind of popular sentiment veers sharply. When it is blowing as strongly against those in office as is the case in this country today politicians accept what they cannot prevent. Secretary Acheson's job is in jeopardy. A recantation could save it, at least temporarily. So he too is thumbing a ride on the bandwagon of reexamination.

With General MacArthur's address to both Houses of Congress last Thursday this bandwagon really began to roll. For that address, noble in conception and beautiful in delivery, was also a deeply controversial document.

The former Supreme Commander in the Pacific told Congress that "the whole epicenter of world affairs" is rotating back to Asia. State Department policy has been based on the assumption that Western Europe is of far greater importance to the United States.

General MacArthur asserted that Chinese imperialism, rather than communism, is the immediate problem in Asia. This does not accord with present thinking in the Department of State.

General MacArthur never once mentioned the United Nations, acclaimed as the foundation stone of State Department policy. But the general did pointedly emphasize "the malicious gossip" which undermined the strength of Chiang Kai-shek. Most of the criticism thus characterized has emanated from, or has been inspired by, the Far Eastern Division of the Department of State.

The general further says flatly that "decisions in the diplomatic sphere" necessary to achieve a Korean settlement have not been made, and that his appeals for such decisions were distorted. It is the duty of the Department of State to make diplomatic decisions, and General MacArthur's charge of distortion cannot, in simple justice, be left unanswered.

Finally, the general asserts that the Joint Chiefs of Staff shared his viewpoint about both the strategy and tactics of the Korean campaign. To this the Department of Defense, on Thursday night, gave a strangely evasive reply, saying merely that the Joint Chiefs of Staff concurred in President Truman's decision to relieve MacArthur of his command. That is no answer to the point the general makes.

The cumulative importance of General MacArthur's assertions are given great political substance by the character of the receptions given him in San Francisco, Washington and New York. The old soldier himself may conceivably fade away, though at the moment it looks as though the fade-out will be very gradual, and is far from imminent. Regardless of his future as an individual, however, the issues MacArthur raised before Congress must be explored by Congress. And, as Secretary Acheson has been prompt to realize, they involve reexamination of a very searching nature.

This scrutiny, in the first place, will be in executive session, probably before the Senate Armed Services Committee sitting jointly with the Foreign Relations Committee. The hearings will, of course, involve detailed testimony from General MacArthur himself, but others are certain to be called.

It is already apparent that the inquiry will go back of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, to examine both the basis and the direction of our postwar policy toward China. General Marshall will have to take the witness stand again, not only as present Secretary of Defense but also as President Truman's special envoy to China in 1945–47.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, whose report on Korea has never been made public, will be another expert witness. So, in all probability, will be Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who early in 1945 so strongly resisted the proposals to furnish the Chinese Communists with American arms and money. There are several former and present officials of the Department of State who are likely to be questioned in this connection.

If the Republican plans work out, former Defense Secretary Louis Johnson will be another star witness. And, of course, Mr. Acheson will eventually be summoned to answer the MacArthur charges, and to fill in some of the omissions which are so glaring in the white book on China compiled by the Department of State nearly 2 years ago.

The nature of the public response to General MacArthur, as much as the controversial nature of his address to Congress, insures a thorough and overdue inquiry into the conduct of our far-eastern policy, from Yalta on. It is even suggested that Alger Hiss, as one of the original architects, should be temporarily released from the penitentiary to give evidence.

That acid proposal is on the extreme side. But it helps to illustrate the temper of some Members of Congress following the MacArthur address. Administration spokesmen admit that they have no hope of choking off the comprehensive reexamination now shaping up. Their efforts will be to justify, rather than to conceal, a record of which so much is still brushed under the rug.

The decision to have the coming hearings secret is undeniably wise. For some of the disclosures promise to be sensational and some of the testimony is certain to be bitter. And while it is vital for the public to know the background of our present troubles, too much distraction from the confrontation of those troubles as they stand today would be deplorable.

After all, we have an army fighting against great odds in Korea, and many other hostages to fortune that demand concentrated attention all around the globe.

Deceiving the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, what the American people demand is not only justice to them but also fair play and justice to our fighting forces in Korea. There is a unanimous sentiment on the part of the people throughout the United States in favor of the position taken by General MacArthur with reference to affairs in the Far East.

The people are in no mood for political trickery with the security of our Nation involved, and especially with the lives of our fighting forces who are now paying a heavy death toll for the Truman fiasco.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1951:

John O'Donnell in the New York Daily News provides the information which explains General MacArthur's statement to Congress that the measures he proposed for ending the Korean war in the shortest time and with minimum loss of life were fully shared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Pentagon did not reply to that statement. It merely stated that the Joint Chiefs joined with Mr. Truman's civilian advisers in supporting the dismissal of MacArthur.

APPEASEMENT PLANNED

Mr. O'Donnell makes clear why no reply is possible. He states that last January 12 the Joint Chiefs formally approved the military measures urged by MacArthur for bringing the war to a conclusion. MacArthur's report, with their endorsement, went to Secre-

tary of Defense Marshall, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, was then united in support of the MacArthur recommendations with General Collins, Army Chief of Staff; General Vandenberg, Air Force commander, and Admiral Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

"Marshall, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and—on their advice—President Harry Truman embalmed that MacArthur dispatch in deep official secrecy back 3 months ago," O'Donnell states. "The shameful reason was that Acheson and Marshall during those days were discussing with the British and French the idea of appeasing the Commies by turning over Formosa to the Red China regime, kicking the Nationalist China representative out of the U. N. to make way for a Kremlin satellite, and so preserve by paying blackmail British trade with Communist China, the crown colony of Hong Kong, and the tottering French colonial empire in Indochina."

As O'Donnell observes, the only security involved in the suppression of these facts is the political security of the Truman administration. This is another instance in which the New Dealers have endeavored to deceive the American people. It is of the same pattern as the calculated confusion and deceit employed to mask administration moves which brought down the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor.

Many other examples of resort to subterfuge and deception readily come to mind.

There was the wartime suppression of the dramatic story provided by Lt. Col. William E. Dyess of the death march on Bataan, in which Dyess was threatened with court martial if the facts were published. The administration's fear was that an outraged American public would demand, with a single voice, that it prosecute the neglected war in the Pacific with utmost energy to effect the speedy rescue of suffering American prisoners, instead of using the American war machine to abet British imperialism in Africa and further British aims in Europe.

CONSPIRACY STILL EXISTS

The administration still is in conspiracy with England. It used to allot its favors impartially between the English and the Russian imperialists, as in the days when Alger Hiss was planted in Roosevelt's State Department, when Roosevelt himself was making fantastic concessions to Stalin, and, later, when the Achesons, Lattimores, and Services were joined with General Marshall in selling China into Communist hands.

British control of our State Department, through Acheson, is no disfavor to Stalin. England, placing its Asiatic possessions and trade above honor, leads the United Nations in the efforts to appease communism. General MacArthur was sacrificed to the English, but in Moscow the removal of the foremost antagonist of communism has caused rejoicing equal to that in London.

Any pretense that secrecy is justified in relation to the administration's scandalous treatment of General MacArthur is cockeyed. In an administration as hospitable to foreign influence as Truman's, and as leaky of secrets, both Russia and England have access to all of our information of every kind. Only Americans are kept in ignorance.

We Must Put Freedom First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, edited by an outstanding figure in American journalism, Maj. Frederick Sullens:

WE MUST PUT FREEDOM FIRST

Within very recent weeks the American people have taken some urgently needed steps to avert present danger; steps showing that as a Nation we now know, deep in our hearts, that we have never been in greater peril; steps showing that at long last we are facing up to the central fact of our time. We face the fact that the Soviet Union—in its drive for world conquest—threatens the security of our homes and even our very hopes for the future.

One proof that we are emerging from both our historic isolationism and from our complacency is that the Congress the other day passed an unprecedented measure authorizing the sending of American troops to Western Europe for the purpose of assisting the free nations of that area in their defense against any possible Soviet onslaught.

So much, then, to our credit. Yet it remains to be seen whether we recognize the full extent of our danger, how pressing it is, and how intense it is. Certainly we haven't yet made our position clear on three issues of transcendent importance.

First of all, while the Congress has made tremendous appropriations for preparedness, they have not yet levied those extra taxes that will enable us to come close to a pay-as-we-go fiscal policy. Yet unless there is willingness on the part of the Congress to impose and willingness on our part as taxpayers to accept the hardship of those taxes today, we cannot expect that tomorrow we can control or even arrest a serious inflation—an inflation that would destroy our ability to build up our own military might, since it would sap the economic health and vitality upon which our military might be based.

The masters of the Kremlin would like nothing better than to see us wreck our economy through uncontrolled inflation. This would be for them the cheapest of all victories. Moreover, a serious inflation in the United States would swiftly make itself felt throughout the entire free world. It would, for example, nullify one of the Marshall plan's major accomplishments—the defeat of inflation in Western Europe. In 1948, financial chaos prevailed in most Marshall plan nations. Today they have reached financial stability. That stability would be shattered if American prices continued to climb. Further increases would threaten Europe's economic recovery and its own rearmament program. This would be another very cheap victory for the Communists. A conquest at no cost.

In the second place, if we are to act as if we were genuinely aware of our danger, we must have national unity not as a lip-service platitude but as a working reality. Lack of unity is an enemy within, a sixth column, sowing doubt and confusion and even paralysis. One practical test of our unity is the kind of backing we give to General Eisenhower in his immensely difficult and delicate job of unifying the military defenses of the Western World. And let's not forget that if he succeeds in his great task in Europe he will be helping immeasurably to bring us in America security and relief from crisis spending.

Another practical test is the backing we give to General Ridgway in his new post as commander in chief of the forces of the United Nations in Korea. His is a tough task and the fate of thousands, of tens of thousands of American boys, depends on how well he meets it. We must not let even honest differences of views as to the action in dismissing General MacArthur embarrass General Ridgway because if it does, if there is a let-down of morale on the fighting front because of quarreling on the home front the cost will be reckoned in blood.

Another practical test as to our unity is in the field of foreign policy. If our foreign policy is to be effective, the Republican and Democratic Parties must cooperate, must move forward together toward a common goal. When we Americans address ourselves to the world we must speak as the voice of the Nation and not as that of a single party. We must rise above partisanship. The vote of every Senator and Congressman should register his individual conviction as an American rather than as a Republican or a Democrat. There should be no such thing as a Republican foreign policy or a Democratic foreign policy. There should be only an American foreign policy, which in turn must be in tune with the foreign policies of all of our friends and allies who are sharing with us the hard and difficult task of thrusting back Communist imperialism, whether in Europe, southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, or South America.

Central to that foreign policy is a recognition of the interdependence of the free world. In resources, material, intellectual and spiritual, the free nations as a group have an overwhelming advantage over the Soviets and their satellites. The problem is one of mobilizing of those resources. Some of the resources of the free world are located in underdeveloped areas. That is one reason why we should help the people in these areas to help themselves. But there is a more compelling reason. These people yearn for a life in which there is some dignity and some comfort. The Communists promise them such a life. They are not interested in communism as an ideology—only those things which communism falsely promises. Actually they ask for little and need little; better seeds for better crops; some fertilizer; a steel plow in the place of a stick. If through a sensibly and economically operating program of the foreign aid we can continue to win friends and help strengthen the free world, we will have made an investment which will pay off magnificently. Benjamin Franklin said it a long time ago—but it is worth recalling now: "We must all hang together or assuredly we will all hang separately."

In the third place, if we are genuinely aware of the fact that the chips are really down in this conflict now going on between the free world and the Kremlin, we will again bring up for early consideration the enactment of a law establishing universal military service. It is the one move in the period immediately ahead that will insure not only an adequate pool of trained military manpower but also keep the cost of our defense establishment at a figure which we can live with. Right now the average American private is paid about $3.00 a day plus allowances for dental care and the like. Make no mistakes about it. He needs it. He needs all of it. And as long as we keep on drafting men who are the sole support of young wives and other dependents, we should continue the present rate of pay.

But we won't have to draft men in their middle twenties, men who have already served their country, if universal military service is adopted. Not only that, but it is only through universal military service that we can build up a defensive strength so impregnable that it can hold off Communist aggression. You know how it would work. At the age of about 18 all male Americans—meaning all regardless of their I. Q.—before they have assumed family obligations, would go into Armed Forces training establishments for, say, a 2-year hitch. They would be given good care and food and clothing, enough pay for incidental expenses, perhaps a dollar a day. By the way, a Turkish officer gets a dollar a month. At the end of the training period our men would be released from their boot camps or air bases or cantonments. They could return to their jobs or they could continue their schooling. At the same time they would become members of a well-trained Reserve whose very existence would eventually enable us to reduce

the size of our standing Army. This training for war in time of peace or even in time of a so-called localized war such as the one now going on in Korea does not come easily to us Americans. We are antimilitaristic by instinct. However, we can manage to survive only if we recognize the scope of the catastrophe that awaits us if we fail to do everything, no matter how unpleasant and painful, that we can do to make and keep ourselves strong.

We have always known that to win a war we had to wage war with boldness, vigor, and above all a sense of dedication, but we have not wrapped our minds around the fact that to win a peace we must wage peace with boldness, vigor, and above all a sense of dedication. If we are willing to take that fact to heart and wage peace in that manner and on the same four fronts—the military, political, economical, and psychological—the Kremlin is waging its cold war, the Soviets haven't a chance to win either a cold war or a hot war.

And we can be sure that if the Kremlin thinks it hasn't got a chance to win a hot war, it isn't going to start one. If we are mature enough and have stamina and staying power enough to go the entire course, we can confidently expect that—within the next decade or less—we will not only have thrust back the present danger, but also will have laid the groundwork for the first durable peace with freedom that men have ever known.

Press Misleads Public on Views of the Vatican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many pro-Trumanites in their desperate effort to justify the President's dismissal of General MacArthur tried to make the public believe that the Vatican endorsed the President's action.

The fact is that one Giorgio Luigi Bernucci, an Italian news columnist, merely expressed his own personal views about the President's action in a column which appeared in Osservatore Romano, a newspaper published in the Vatican City.

Little publicity, however, was given to the statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service which explained this fact.

I include here the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet, a Catholic weekly, April 21, 1951:

PRESS MISLEADS PUBLIC ON VIEWS OF THE VATICAN—QUOTES OSSERVATORE WRITER ON GENERAL MACARTHUR AND DRAWS FALSE CONCLUSION—HEADINGS PROVED HOAX—COLUMNIST DOES NOT REPRESENT PAPER'S VIEWS; NOR IS PAPER OFFICIAL

At least one press association, many daily newspapers and many broadcasting stations caused confusion among the public last Sunday. The issue related to President Truman's ousting of General MacArthur.

First page headlines in one daily asserted "Vatican paper backs Truman step in MacArthur case as aid to peace," another stated the Pope had decided against MacArthur, while some radio commentators—Drew Pearson, to mention one—said the Vatican backed the dismissal of the general.

The Associated Press was responsible for most of the misleading dispatch from Rome, which said that "the MacArthur case was removed from the international plane to one essentially domestic by the dismissal, said the Vatican newspaper, which usually reflects the opinion of Pope Pius XII. The newspaper noted that President Truman's decision might even be against his own popularity."

This first comment on the issue in Osservatore Romano was written by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci.

It then quoted Bernucci as stating the President was right and the general wrong. In the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune Bernucci was called an editorial writer, but in the Daily News and other papers he was referred to as a news commentator.

SERVES AS COLUMNIST

The facts in the case are that:

1. Neither the Pope, the Vatican, or Osservatore Romano expressed any opinion on the ousting of General MacArthur.

2. Count Bernucci is merely a columnist on Osservatore and his observations are only his own.

3. Osservatore is not the official organ of the Vatican save when it carries an official Vatican pronouncement which is labeled official.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service on Wednesday issued a brief statement on the misrepresentation. It follows:

"Over last week end there appeared in Osservatore Romano an article making reference to the removal of General MacArthur. The article expressed the opinion that the dismissal of the general could be regarded as a step indicating a desire for world peace.

"General press accounts said that Osservatore Romano itself had made these observations and reference was made to editorial comment by Osservatore Romano.

"Osservatore Romano, while published in Vatican City, is not the official organ of the Vatican, except to the extent that from time to time it runs a column containing official Vatican pronouncements, always under the same heading, so that those familiar with the paper know that unless the material appears under this heading, it is not official.

"Actually the MacArthur comment was contained in an article which appears regularly twice a week in Osservatore Romano and is written by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci.

"This regular article does not contain Vatican official views, but the views of the writer. It is headed Acta Diurna, and undertakes to review various news developments around the world. We are informed that in this instance, definitely the comment on the MacArthur case was the writer's own, and does not necessarily represent the views of Osservatore itself."

The Woolen and Worsted Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

BOSTON OFFICE,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Enclosed is copy of letter sent to Senator MAYBANK by our Research Director Solomon Barkin, which is self-explanatory. I believe that after you have had the opportunity of reading it, including the analyses of the machinery in the United States, you will agree that the granting of exemptions as mentioned is most discriminatory, especially in view of the present conditions prevailing in the woolen and worsted industry and, particularly, as it exists in Massachusetts at the present time.

I know you will be keenly interested in this matter because of the prominent position that woolen and worsted mills have in the Commonwealth.

May I hear from you regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,
J. WILLIAM BELANGER,
Director.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 16, 1951.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Joint Committee on Defense Production,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: We are very much interested in the hearings now being held before your committee on the provision for accelerated depreciation privileges to industries. Our attention has been drawn to a grant of a certificate of necessity to manufacturers in the woolen and worsted industry, where we are sure this privilege should never have been extended. The granting of this exemption represents a violation of every principle announced hitherto as a guide for the review of applications for this special tax benefit.

It is reported that the Peerless Woolen Co., of Rossville, Ga., and the woolen plant of the Hardwick Woolen Mills, of Cleveland, Tenn., both owned by the Hutcheson family, have been granted tax benefits for the construction of plants valued at $4,213,000. The benefit is reported as 60 percent of the cost of these installations. These plants are reported as being designed for the production of melton, kersey, and flannel fabrics.

The benefit cannot be justified as necessary under the regulations issued by President Truman. While these woolen fabrics are required for national defense, there is no shortage of facilities for the production of these materials for national defense.

The woolen and worsted industry now has sufficient capacity to take care of all possible military and civilian needs. Most woolen mills in this industry are prepared to manufacture the three types of fabrics. The construction of these new facilities will only increase the degree of overcapacity in the industry and thereby reduce the opportunities for full and continued employment at existing facilities. The unevenness of employment at the present time, even with the available Government contracts, makes the construction of further facilities with Government aid of highly dubious value. It will undermine sound competition.

The degree of available capacity is illustrated by the attached table, representing the operations in the industry for the last 13 months. It indicates that only about 80 percent of the woolen-spinning spindles and 85 percent of the broadlooms for the weaving of the woolen fabrics are now actually operating. The operating woolen-spinning spindles are running 86 percent of a full 40-hour week. The operating woolen and

worsted broadlooms are now running 88 percent of a full 40-hour week on the first shift. The second-shift woolen spindles are only running three-quarters as well as the first shift and the third shift only one-third as much as the first shift. In the case of the looms, the second shift is running only 90 percent as well as the first shift and the third shift only 40 percent as well. The large unused capacity and the idle mills in the industry can be utilized for military production without the addition of new production capacity.

This exemption is ill-advised and injurious to the well-being of the woolen and worsted industry. It will cause further loss of opportunities of employment to the workers already in the industry and create a demand for new workers who may be more properly used for more urgent military production. Your committee should analyze this case immediately and seek to develop a policy wherein such ill-considered action by a governmental agency is not permitted to occur.

Sincerely yours,

SOLOMON BARKIN.

Machinery use in relation to capacity—woolen and worsted industry, January 1950 to January 1951

A. WOOLEN SPINNING SPINDLE—WOOLEN MILLS

Period	Spindles			Weekly hours machinery operated		
	In place	In operation	In operation percent of in place	Percent first shift operated of 40 hours	Percent hours operated of first shift	
					Second shift	Third shift
1950—January	1,157,095	887,022	76.7	83.4	70.6	33.2
February	1,155,159	876,183	75.8	87.5	71.4	34.0
March	1,147,311	876,372	76.4	83.2	70.6	34.5
April	1,144,829	871,332	76.1	87.3	70.0	33.7
May	1,144,057	895,773	78.3	91.2	70.9	35.2
June	1,139,007	919,512	80.7	88.9	73.8	38.6
July	1,137,531	930,120	81.8	80.8	73.0	36.9
August	1,122,225	928,704	82.8	97.7	75.1	39.6
September	1,121,876	910,097	81.1	89.3	75.5	40.1
October	1,088,819	895,284	81.5	95.4	76.0	45.4
November	1,086,360	870,332	80.1	84.1	73.0	34.8
December	1,076,776	842,116	78.2	85.7	72.4	35.3
1951—January	1,066,482	848,487	79.6	85.7	75.1	35.7

B. BROADLOOMS

Period	Looms			Weekly hours machinery operated		
	In place	In operation	In operation percent of in place	Percent first shift operated of 40 hours	Percent hours operated of first shift	
					Second shift	Third shift
1950—January	34,576	27,546	79.7	88.8	86.7	34.0
February	34,724	27,192	78.3	89.6	87.7	34.8
March	34,655	27,096	78.2	86.8	87.8	35.0
April	34,584	26,877	77.7	88.4	88.4	36.3
May	34,536	27,174	78.7	89.5	86.8	37.6
June	34,502	27,719	80.3	88.5	86.8	38.6
July	34,473	27,704	80.4	78.2	85.8	37.9
August	34,219	28,006	81.8	94.7	87.2	39.8
September	34,234	28,748	84.0	89.4	88.8	40.2
October	33,812	28,675	84.8	95.2	89.1	40.0
November	33,687	28,557	84.8	90.1	89.5	38.3
December	33,546	28,025	83.5	88.8	90.7	38.6
1951—January	33,165	27,870	84.0	87.7	89.3	39.7

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce; Facts for Industry—Wool Manufactures.

Tragic Disunity in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of Wednesday, April 25:

TRAGIC DISUNITY IN GOVERNMENT—LACK OF LEADERSHIP IS OBSTACLE TO COOPERATION EVEN BETWEEN ELEMENTS WHICH FAVOR SAME WORLD POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

The state of disorganization and disunity in the American Government today is indescribably tragic.

The lack of leadership is a manifest obstacle to cooperation even between those elements which favor the same international policy. The White House has failed signally to keep foreign policy out of politics and has accentuated a deep cleavage between the two major parties.

For, whether President Truman intended it or not, he has, in effect, decreed that the minority party in America must be prevented from knowing the facts about the Government and particularly the facts about our war operations.

Though it will be repeatedly denied, the truth is that the principal offense of General MacArthur was in answering a letter from Republican leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN. Apparently members of the armed services hereafter must not answer any letters from Congress except those from Democrats.

Two Democratic Senators—DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and LEHMAN, of New York—take the position that the letter which General MacArthur wrote in answer to one from Representative MARTIN was an act of military insubordination and was in disregard of the civil authority of the United States.

This is a strange view for two men to express who are supposed to be liberals and who spend a good deal of their time denouncing the Hitler and Stalin concept of a single political party. Evidently as Senator DOUGLAS told his constituents, General MacArthur had no right to reply to Mr. MARTIN'S request for his views. Senator LEHMAN cites the letter to MARTIN specifically as a ground for dismissal of MacArthur and says thus the "civil authority was challenged."

Evidently the Congress of the United States is not a civil authority—or at least the Republican Party isn't a part of it. Yet in Korea the sons of Republicans are being killed, just as are the sons of Democrats.

There is no hope for unity when two important Senators adopt the view that it is a violation of the military code of the United States to communicate with Members of Congress who happen to be in the minority party and for the latter to make public the letters they write—not on military details, but on broad policy questions.

The letter to Representative MARTIN was a routine answer to what appeared to be a routine inquiry. General MacArthur had said the same things publicly many times before and also in his official reports. But because the press emphasized the incident, President Truman chose to make an issue of it, though he could just as well have ignored the affair and sent for MacArthur so as to argue out the differences, if possible, in a personal conference.

What is more serious is that there are influential members of the Democratic Party who actually believe that America today is and must be governed by a single person. They include in the power of the Presidency the right to stifle discussion and they insist, in effect, that members of the armed services are not to be permitted to say anything publicly which is at variance with the party line as proclaimed by the President or his advisers.

If the minority party has any assertiveness at all, it will accept the challenge and bring the real issue to the attention of the country. It concerns the fundamental right of the American people to get the truth of what is happening in the making of public policy.

The American people do not even know how MacArthur was dismissed and by whose recommendation. An effort has been made to give the impression that the Joint Chiefs did it. Actually Messrs. Acheson, Rusk, and Harriman—the foreign-policy command—are primarily responsible for influencing the President to fire MacArthur forthwith. When the congressional committees put every member of the Joint Chiefs on the stand, as they inevitably must, they will learn that there is no record of military insubordination and that differences of policy alone led to the political decision by Mr. Truman to make a change in command in the Far East.

It is because the Democrats have insisted on distorting the issue and have continually tried to pin a warmonger label on General MacArthur—very much as the Communists do to most Americans nowadays—that the bitterness on Capitol Hill is increasing instead of diminishing.

The National School Lunch Program in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following letter and report from the Rt. Rev. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock, diocesan superintendent of schools, archdiocese of Boston, Mass.:

ARCHDIOCESE OF BOSTON,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Boston, Mass., April 23, 1951.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I am enclosing an opinion which has been issued by the attorney general's office here in Massachusetts and which, I believe, is of considerable importance. I shall be grateful if you find it convenient to read it, then perhaps file it for use when the occasion may arise.

With every best wish, I am

Yours most sincerely,
Rt. Rev. CORNELIUS T. H. SHERLOCK,
Diocesan Superintendent of Schools.

MARCH 26, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. DESMOND, JR.,
Commissioner of Education.

DEAR SIR: You have requested my opinion as to whether the forty-sixth article of amendment of the Constitution of Massachusetts prohibits the board of education of the Commonwealth from entering into an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States governing the operations of the national school-lunch program in Massachusetts.

You have asked two specific questions which are phrased as follows:

I. "Does the board of education have the authority to agree to section 5, of the proposed Federal-State agreement for the benefit of children attending nonprofit private schools as well as public schools in the Commonwealth?"

II. "Would it be permissible for the Commonwealth to expend moneys appropriated or authorized to be appropriated by the Commonwealth in providing lunches for children attending nonprofit private schools as well as public schools in accordance with the proposed Federal-State agreement, governing the operation of a school-lunch program in Massachusetts under the provisions of the National School Lunch Act?"

In answer to question number 1, it may be pointed out that section 5 of the proposed agreement follows the provisions of section 7 of the National School Lunch Act relating to the apportionment and payment of funds to the various States.

The authority of the board of education to represent the Commonwealth in carrying out the provisions of the act was delegated by the legislature by statute 1948, chapter 548, page 1, which reads as follows:

"The board of education is hereby designated as the 'State educational agency' to represent the Commonwealth in dealing with the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States in carrying out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act as enacted into law on June 4, 1946."

The National School Lunch Act clearly contemplates that the State educational agencies designated in the several States shall in general enter into such agreements not only for the benefit of children attending public schools, but also for the benefit of children attending nonprofit private schools within the States as well.

The question has previously been raised, however, whether the educational agency so designated in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts could in conformity with amendment XLVI of the Constitution of Massachusetts disburse Federal funds apportioned to the Commonwealth under the National School Lunch Act to nonprofit private schools as well as public schools within the Commonwealth.

This question was answered in the affirmative in 1947 Opinion Attorney General, page 17. See also 1943 Opinion Attorney General, page 74.

It would appear that no novel constitutional question is raised in question No. I. My answer to that question is in the affirmative.

In answer to question No. II, I submit the following:

The forty-sixth article of amendment of the Constitution of Massachusetts, section 2, reads as follows:

"All moneys raised by taxation in the towns and cities for the support of public schools, and all moneys which may be appropriated by the Commonwealth for the support of common schools shall be applied to, and expended in, no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is expended; and no grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized by the Commonwealth or any political division thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any school or institution of learning, whether under public control or otherwise, wherein any denominational doctrine is inculcated, or any other school, or any college, infirmary, hospital, institution, or educational, charitable or religious undertaking, which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and superintendence of public officers or public agents authorized by the Commonwealth or Federal authority or both, except that appropriations may be made for the maintenance and support of the Soldiers' Home in Massachusetts and for free public libraries in any city or town, and to carry out legal obligations, if any, already entered into; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society."

An analogous question arose heretofore in 1936 in Massachusetts under a proposed act entitled "An act providing that pupils in parochial schools shall be entitled to transportation to and from said schools in the same manner as pupils in public schools," and also under a proposed act entitled "An act providing for the transportation of parochial and private school pupils to and from school" in 1936. In an opinion given by the Attorney General at that time it was said:

"The intended benefit sought by the proposed legislation, upon which you seek my opinion, is a benefit intended for children attending parochial and other private schools, as distinguished from a benefit intended for the schools themselves. * * * The end sought by the legislation has no relation whatever to the founding, maintaining or supporting of private schools. * * *

"I am therefore of opinion that there is no constitutional objection to either." (1936 Op. Atty. Gen. 40).

With this opinion I agree.

Similar reasoning decided the almost identical problem when it was presented in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U. S. 1), decided February 10, 1947. That case dealt with a situation where a New Jersey statute authorized its local school districts to make rules and contracts for the transportation of children to and from schools by bus. The town acted pursuant to this statute, reimbursing certain parents for bus transportation of their children to parochial schools. It was contended that this violated both the State and Federal Constitutions. The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals held that the statute violated neither the State nor Federal Constitution. On further appeal the United States Supreme Court, affirming, said of the practice of furnishing transportation to children attending religious schools, at page 17:

"Moreover, State-paid policemen, detailed to protect children going to and from church schools from the very real hazards of traffic, would serve much the same purpose and accomplish much the same result as State provisions intended to guarantee free transportation of a kind which the State deems to be best for the school children's welfare. And parents might refuse to risk their children to the serious danger of traffic accidents going to and from parochial schools, the approaches to which were not protected by policemen. Similarly, parents might be reluctant to permit their children to attend schools which the State had cut off from general government services as ordinary police and fire protection, connections for sewage disposal, public highways and sidewalks. Of course, cutting off church schools from these services, so separate and so indisputably marked off from the religious function, would make it far more difficult for the schools to operate. But such is obviously not the purpose of the first amendment. That amendment requires the State to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the State to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them."

And further, the court said at page 18:

"The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools."

A similar matter arose in Louisiana where the issue was whether an act of the State of Louisiana which authorized the State to purchase books for school children, including private school students as well as those attending the public schools, was constitutional. In upholding the act the Louisiana court said:

"The appropriations were made of the specific purpose of purchasing school books for the use of the school children of the State, free of cost to them. It was for their benefit and the resulting benefit to the State that the appropriations were made. True, these children attend some school, public or private, the latter, sectarian or nonsectarian, and that the books are to be furnished them for their use, free of cost, whichever they attend. The schools, however, are not the beneficiaries of these appropriations. They obtain nothing from them, nor are they relieved of a single obligation, because of them. The school children and the State alone are the beneficiaries.

These words of the Louisiana court were set forth verbatim in the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Cochran* v. *Board of Education* (281 U. S. 370), which affirmed the Louisiana opinion that the purchase of school books for private school children out of State funds was not unconstitutional.

The cases above cited constitute a class of cases generally recognized today as matters incidental to the private-school education of children, with reference to which the State may exercise the appropriation power without violation of any constitutional mandate. Appropriations to insure the safety of school children in journeying to and from private as well as public schools are held to fall within the domain of the public safety; appropriations for the furnishing of adequate school books to school children in private schools as well as public schools are recognized as part and parcel of the public pro-

gram of education. Inescapably it follows that the national school-lunch program, embracing private as well as public-school children, is a vital part of the Nation's public-health program. Private-school children, equally with public-school children, are entitled to share in the benefits of such programs designed to advance the public welfare.

The benefit is a benefit obtained by the children as distinguished from a benefit to the schools. The schools do not receive any aid or support. The fact that the money is paid to the school as reimbursement, after the school submits its vouchers and necessary papers for its expenditures, is of no consequence. The vital point is that the school is only a conduit of funds benefiting the pupil. Mere reimbursement of the school for funds expended in furnishing lunches to its pupils is not aid to the school itself as distinguished from the pupils. The school treasury is not benefited or increased in any way, nor is this in any manner support or maintenance of private educational institutions out of public moneys as prohibited by the Massachusetts Constitution, amendment XLVI.

I therefore answer your second question in the affirmative.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS E. KELLY,
Attorney General.

The Late Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as an extension of my remarks two editorials from outstanding Mississippi newspapers eulogizing the late great Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

They are A Statesman Gone, from the Greenville Delta Democrat-Times, and Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Patriot and Statesman, from the Jackson Clarion-Ledger:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss.]

A STATESMAN GONE

In the death of United States Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan, Republican, the Nation is mourning the loss of one of its ablest and most efficient statesmen.

His death came when one of his dreams, the North Atlantic Pact, was becoming a reality, and another of his dreams, world amity lay shattered in the acrimonious debate over the MacArthur-Truman episode.

The 67-year-old GOP leader, who was revered by Democrats, too, died in his sleep from a malignant tumor which he had ignored in his intensive efforts in behalf of the Atlantic Pact.

Had his health not failed, he would have easily been the Republican candidate for the Presidency and belief is general that he would have won the election hands down, for none there was to dispute his ability as an outstanding statesman of modern times.

An Arthur Vandenberg as President of the United States would have advanced the cause of universal cooperation many decades, and raised the tobogganing prestige of this Nation many notches.

All the Nation, therefore, feels his loss keenly.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger]

SENATOR ARTHUR VANDENBERG, UNITED STATES PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

It is doubly tragic, and a double loss to the Nation, that Senator Arthur Vandenberg's death should have occurred at the height of a crisis and a controversy which show the Nation, both the people and their representatives in Washington, to be more evenly and more bitterly divided on foreign policy than ever before.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg had not been able to participate in Senate sessions for more than a year before he died Wednesday. But his voice could still be heard from his sickbed, and his wise and patriotic counsel was available to his colleagues and to the administration.

Death has silenced that voice. Death has blocked any further extension of that wise counsel. Death removes from the United States Senate one of the Nation's few veritable statesmen, and paves the way, perhaps, for the seating of one more partisan politician.

Senator Vandenberg's stature as a statesman was recognized by the Nation. It was recognized and respected by the leaders of his Republican Party, including those who conscientiously and consistently disagreed with him on many fundamental questions. Only the shallow-minded, the violently partisan, and the irresponsible ever ridiculed Senator Vandenberg's knowledge of foreign affairs, his opinions, or his abilities. And his sincerity was unquestioned.

Senator Vandenberg was almost entirely responsible for the degree to which bipartisan support of the Nation's foreign policy, and bipartisan participation in its shaping, was obtained during the past four critical years. He was, for example, largely responsible for Senate approval of the North Atlantic Pact, which would probably have been rejected but for his efforts and influence.

In this new and exceedingly grave crisis and controversy over global foreign policy in general and policy regarding the Far East in particular, the great Republican statesman's influence and counsel will be sorely missed. The Nation needs it more than ever before.

For it still is true, as he contended last January in urging essential unity in facing the Communist threat: "We cannot stand a deadlock in foreign policy until 1952. Many patriots hold divergent views, but we must strive for the greatest possible meeting of loyal minds as swiftly as possible. This is the way to stop a war, or win it."

We hope that this appeal and warning echoes often in the Senate, sounds clearly above the partisan clamor, above all the political fuss, and fustian, above the contentions of the extremists and the ranting of the demagogues, as the United States Senate debates the issues and reaches the decisions on which our Nation's survival may depend.

Meantime, the Nation honors and mourns a patriot and a statesman, Arthur Vandenberg, Michigan Republican, but an American first of all.

Did Truman-Acheson Pass Buck to MacArthur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann entitled "Agreement and Disclosure." In his searching analysis of the controversy between Truman and MacArthur he points out some interesting facts and raises important questions. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE

If, as the earlier reports indicate, the expected Communist offensive has now begun, it is reassuring to find that General MacArthur's view of the outcome is in agreement with that of the Pentagon. They are agreed in thinking that the offensive can be contained in the central region of Korea. "We could hold in Korea," said General MacArthur only last week in his address to Congress, "by constant maneuver and at an approximate area where our supply line advantages were in balance with the supply line disadvantages of the enemy. * * *"

There is agreement also, we may be sure, with his view that though the offensive can be contained we can "hope at best for only an indecisive campaign with its horrible and constant attrition upon our forces if the enemy utilized his full military potential."

The disagreement begins only after the general and the Pentagon have agreed that, while we can defeat the offensive, we cannot by limited war obtain a military victory. The Pentagon, as General Bradley has made clear, prefers a military stalemate to the risks of seeking victory by removing the limitations on the war. General MacArthur prefers the risks of an unlimited war to an indecisive campaign of attrition.

The disagreement is not, therefore, about the battle which is now being fought. Assuming, of course, that the Soviet Government does not intervene directly or indirectly in far greater force than it has thus far, all are agreed in believing that the present battle will be a defensive success, but that it can be no more than that. The generals could all be mistaken, but, if they are mistaken, all the generals will be mistaken together. There is no dispute among them about the present battle. All of them in a position of command—the Joint Chiefs, General MacArthur, General Ridgway, and General Van Fleet—are publicly on record that our main position in central Korea can be held and the offensive stopped, and that this can be done—unless the enemy is heavily reinforced by the Soviets—without taking controversial measures which would expand the war beyond Korea.

The story by Mr. Anthony Leviero, of the New York Times, about what happened at the Wake Island conference on October 15 is an extraordinary disclosure—all the more extraordinary because of what it reveals about the attitude of the President, who must have approved giving Mr. Leviero access to the highly classified documents. Its extraordinary disclosure, I submit, is that the President thinks he can hold General MacArthur responsible for our being surprised by the Chinese intervention in Korea.

Mr. Leviero's story says, "President Truman, as the 10 conferees sat in the aviation hut, asked General MacArthur about the possibilities of Chinese or Russian intervention. General MacArthur said he saw little chance of this." The serious aspect of this is not that General MacArthur was mistaken in his judgment about the intentions of two foreign powers. The serious thing is that the President relied on the judgment of the general in a matter which belongs squarely within the responsibility of the Department of State.

It was Secretary Acheson who was responsible for advising the President as to the intentions of China. It was Secretary Acheson who had daily contact with all the diplomats and with all the information services of this and the other governments that had any

access to Peiping and to Moscow. At Wake Island the President should not have been the one who asked General MacArthur to decide whether China would intervene. He should have been the one who told General MacArthur what his and his Secretary of State's judgment was on this critical point.

General MacArthur's comment on the matter is very interesting indeed. It was in the statement given out for him by his military secretary, General Whitney, on Saturday: "The question was basically a political one, involving decisions made in Peiping and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence * * * as far as I know neither the State Department nor higher intelligence agencies of the Government had the slightest evidence to warn of such a decision. Certainly no such warnings were given to MacArthur. To the contrary, all appeared to discount the possibility of such intervention at that stage."

If this charge can be sustained in the coming investigation, it will throw much light on the crack-up. For it will show how the President and his Secretary of State encouraged, indeed invited, General MacArthur to assume responsibilities which, though not his responsibilities, but their responsibilities they were failing to meet.

The investigation will also make clear that if at Wake Island in October the question of Chinese intervention was basically a political one and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence, then today the question of Soviet intervention and whether the general's recommendations to Congress would bring on world war III is also basically a political one and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence.

Truman Reaping the Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some people are not disposed to be overcharitable toward Mr. Truman's removal of General MacArthur; note the following:

Mrs. Walter H. Jensen, of Sioux City, Iowa, unloaded her feelings on President Truman, and was kind enough to send along a copy of the telegram to me. Here it is:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since you believe in firing those who do not see eye to eye with you in the way to settle the Korean situation, please fire my son, Marine Pfc. W. I. Jensen, 667061, FPO, San Francisco, Calif.

"He is one of your so-called Marine policemen. He doesn't see any sense in going to Korea, maybe to die if the source of supply for the Commies is left intact. Out here in these parts we don't kill rattlesnakes by stepping on their tails. Maybe you think my loss and grief will be less if he dies in your 'contained' war than if he dies fighting an all-out war on the Commies.

"Please recall Walter at once as he doesn't believe in your and Dean Acheson's method of fighting Commies. Incidentally, my son was a Marine reservist in his second year of prelaw college when you called him up in October, with no delay for him to finish the semester, no tests to gain deferment. He just went in when he was called.

"If my only child dies, don't try to ease your conscience and send me any medals. Since you are an old artillery officer you know what you can do with them. And get Dean Acheson to help you.

"I send this with full knowledge that you are Commander in Chief, but also a vindictive man. But go ahead and dish it out. My son is a Marine and can take anything a former Army artillery officer can dish out. I just read a magazine article about what a good hater you are. I am a good hater, too. I wouldn't vote for you again for an $8,000 pastel-blue mink coat.

"Yours, until next election.

"P. S.: Margaret sings here Saturday night, April 21. I thought sacrifice like charity begins at home. Why isn't she in Korea singing for the GI's?

"If they don't like her long-haired singing she can carry bedpans. That doesn't require any special training. Neither does it bring in $1,500 per bedpan.

"Don't write me any nasty letters as I get riled up about my only kid, too, as well as all the other poor guys in Korea."

Crop Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Progressive Farmer of April 1951:

CROP INSURANCE: OUR NEXT GREAT FORWARD STEP

More and more this seems clear to us: Crop insurance is the next great forward step needed to put southern agriculture on a sounder business basis.

Any crop requires financing. The money may come from banks, PCA, FHA, or from one's own funds. Regardless of the source, one expects to get it back and a little bit more. If the funds are borrowed, there's interest to pay and usually extra collateral is required to protect the lender in the event of a crop failure. Why not have insurance against crop failure?

No lender would think of making a loan on a house unless it could be covered by fire insurance. Nobody would finance the purchase of an automobile unless it was covered by insurance. Yet most loans for crop production have been made without insurance protection even though the danger of crop failures is always serious.

Crop insurances gives liquid collateral in case of crop failure. That means it turns the crop loss into cash dollars. It pays off all or part of the crop loan. It makes it unnecessary for the lender to carry the farmer another year. It prevents the unscrupulous lender from selling out the farmer's implements or land to satisfy a debt. Crop insurance lessens risks to both borrower and lender alike. And as risks are lowered, interest rates and loan charges will drop accordingly.

Let's consider the four primary types of lenders on farm crops and how crop insurance works:

1. Landlord: Without insurance the landlord stands to lose both his interest in a crop and his advances. If both he and the tenant have insurance, he gets protection from both hazards.

2. Banks: Many banks require an endorser or cosigner for loans. But if general crop disaster hits a section, the endorser may not be able to pay the note. An insurance policy backed by the Government is better security.

3. PCA and FHA: These agencies take liens on crops, work stock, and implements as security. But in case of crop failure they must either carry the farmer another year or take away from him the very tools he needs to make another crop. These agencies now require crop insurance in disaster areas and urge it in others.

4. Time merchant: He usually makes part of his advances through open accounts on his books. When he has to borrow himself, banks usually allow him only about half credit for these accounts. Crop insurance policies are better collateral.

A good friend of ours is a peach grower. For years he carried hail insurance with one of the insurance companies in that line of business. Ordinarily he shipped about 55 carloads of peaches. But 1 year he decided he'd drop the innsurance and spend that money for fertilizer for a young orchard. That's the year the hail struck. As a result he shipped only 5 carloads of poor peaches instead of 55 carloads of good peaches.

Tobacco is a costly crop to grow. But it's nothing uncommon to get $1,500 to $2,000 per acre and more from it. We've seen valuable fields of tobacco completely riddled by hail or drowned out by continuous rains. Much of it wasn't protected by insurance.

Cotton, too, is a costly crop to produce and getting more so. Chopping, hoeing, and picking costs take heavy toll. Then there's the all-season fight with its hosts of insect pests. The costly fight is continuous from the time the seed are treated to prevent damping-off until the defoliant is applied to make the leaves fall off and let the sun shine in to prevent the big green bolls from rotting and to facilitate picking.

The more costly a crop is to produce, the greater is the need for insurance.

Every subscriber lucky enough to live in a crop-insurance county—and every renter who shares in an insurable crop—should contact his county PMA office this week. Act now and make your family safe from disaster or crop failure in 1951.

Effect of Recall of General MacArthur on the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Washington Star, dated April 12, 1951, by the brilliant columnist Constantine Brown. I should say to the Senate, Mr. President, that few, in my opinion, are more profound on foreign affairs than this distiguished columnist. In this colunm Mr. Brown calls to our attention facts which should be known to every American. I should say that when Mr. Brown writes, "not officially confirmed" he means that this fact is being kept secret from the public.

Constantine Brown, probably more than any other columnist, has warned the United States regarding the situation

of Japan for a long time. On January the 16th of this year he told us:

The possibility of Russia committing an aggression again Japan is more in the minds of responsible officials today than in the past—the Soviet has an impressive submarine fleet and an adequate air force which has not yet been in action.

I remember that on December 6, last, he wrote in his column that there were 15 Russian divisions on the Siberia-Manchuria border, four of which were airborne. At that time, as of now, the information that four Russian-trained Japanese divisions were in the perimeter of Japan was a frightening fact for the thinking of the American people. I feel that Columnist Brown has done a great service to the American people in keeping us advised of the facts in the far-eastern theater. I believe the Senate and America will enjoy reading this column.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY OF JAPANESE SHAKEN—SMOULDERING INTRIGUES MAY FLARE OUT INTO OPEN NOW THAT MACARTHUR IS NOT ON PEDESTAL

(By Constantine Brown)

Nobody can challenge President Truman's constitutional authority to "break" General MacArthur. But the wisdom of the move can be seriously questioned. The repercussions of this latest decision of the President may have more far-reaching and world-wide consequences than he and his advisers seem to have anticipated.

There will be much partisan speaking and writing about the domestic political repercussions of General MacArthur's dismissal. They are of little importance as far as the security of the Nation is concerned. Whether Mr. Truman's action will further diminish the chances of his reelection 18 months from now is, in the present grave crisis, of only minor importance.

What is vitally important is the effect the summary dismissal may have on the Japanese people and on all the other nations of the Far East.

We are not yet at peace, technically, with Japan. General MacArthur, with his genius for a "show", has impressed the rank and file of Japanese people who, in their oriental way, placed him on an even higher level than they did their own Emperor before the war.

General MacArthur was infallible to them. He, and not the troops with him, represented America with all its power. The Japanese masses are hardly aware of the existence of President Truman, Congress, General Marshall, and Secretary of State Acheson. General MacArthur was it.

The unprecedented prestige of this one man permitted us to move practically all of our occupation forces from Japan when the Korean war broke out. The 75,000,000 Japanese remained quiet and orderly after our four divisions were sent to Korea, not because they were loyal to America, but on account of the veneration for the supreme commander.

The Communists failed in their few attempts to take advantage of the departure of the occupation forces. That was because the conqueror was still in Tokyo. Then suddenly, overnight, the Japanese people heard that their hero was made of clay, that somebody far away in Washington was able to fire him, just as if he were a mere official in a Japanese prefecture.

A peace treaty with Japan has been negotiated but has not been concluded. To all intent and purposes Japan is still an occupied country and must be kept in submission by the United States. All the passions and intrigues that have been smoldering but never came to the surface during General MacArthur's tenure may break into the open now.

There are reports—not officially confirmed but emanating from official sources—that some four Japanese divisions, organized from prisoners of the old Kwantung army and trained for the last 5 years in Siberia, have recently been placed in southern Sakhalin by the Soviet high command.

It is only a short hop from Sakhalin to Hokkaido. There are indications that these free Japanese may wish to liberate their country, Moscow style. So long as the Japanese people stood loyally by the United States, personified for them by General MacArthur, this threat might have been only military. But now that he has been toppled from his pedestal, the activities of Communist cells on the largest island, Honshu, may become a real threat.

There is no telling how much support the Communists, backed by a military force of their own kin, may now receive to make Japan into a satellite. Until a peace treaty has been formally signed the authority of the Tokyo government with its own people is only a reflection of the prestige of the Supreme Allied Commander.

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the new commander, is one of the ablest officers in the American Army. But in Japan he is not the symbol of America which General MacArthur used to be. Mr. Truman's impetuosity and feeling of frustration at the attitude of the former allied commander may destroy the careful and constructive work done by General MacArthur, a work which was near to completion.

Production and Marketing of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of reading a radio address delivered by our colleague the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama, over WSB, Atlanta, Ga., on Saturday, April 21, 1951.

In briefly summarizing the problems which now confront the cotton producers as a result of the unworkable ceiling established on the price of raw cotton, Mr. ROBERTS has pointed up one of the major problems facing our economy today. His address is a forceful example of the fine work he is doing on behalf of the farmers of the South and as such to the benefit of the entire economy of our Nation.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. ROBERTS' address as an extension of my remarks:

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to discuss briefly a matter which is close to all of us here in the South. I do not believe that there is a man, woman, or child in any of our Southern States who is not affected in one way or another by the production and marketing of cotton.

During recent years there has been a gradual change-over from cotton to dairying, beef cattle, and diversified farming. This has left our farmers less dependent on cotton production, but it is still one of our leading money crops. It is contemplated by Government officials that during the coming year there will be a demand for the largest cotton crop in the history of this country.

Despite this unprecedented demand the Office of Price Stabilization, under the direction of Mr. DiSalle, has seen fit to place a price ceiling on raw cotton. This order would mean that the maximum price that farmers would receive for their cotton would be 45.76 cents per pound.

This, of course, at first glance, seems like a fairly reasonable price for cotton. It must be remembered, however, that production costs have risen tremendously during the past few years. The price of fertilizer has advanced by leaps and bounds; there is an increasing scarcity of labor due to stepped-up industrial activity and new openings for jobs with national-defense installations. Recently insect infestation, mainly boll weevils, has drastically lowered cotton production and increased the cost by making it necessary for the farmers to spend large sums for poison and dusting equipment. Inflationary prices and high labor costs have advanced the price of farm machinery and equipment to an unreasonable level.

Thus, we see that what at first glance seemed like a good, substantial price for cotton does not look so enticing to the farmer who must make heavy investments and then gamble on favorable weather and a successful fight with the boll weevil. Let us assume, however, that by good management and good fortune, and despite high production costs, our farmers are able to produce a record-breaking crop. What assurance have they been given that the ceiling price of cotton will not be rolled back and despite their efforts they will end up losing money once again? This seems to be a little item that has been overlooked by the Office of Price Stabilization.

With this in mind action is being initiated to assure the farmers of a minimum price for their cotton in keeping with production costs. The Office of Price Stabilization has been requested to issue a statement to the effect that the prices will not be suddenly rolled back in the event that a heavy crop is harvested.

Further assurance of a reasonable price could be given by adopting a policy of stockpiling whatever amount may be produced over and above the present needs. The Government has embarked on a program of stockpiling strategic materials to cope with the increasing but uncertain demands of an expanding national-defense program. Certainly it cannot be denied that an ample supply of cotton is absolutely essential to our defense effort. A policy of this nature would not only insure the farmer a reasonable profit on his crop, but it would also make certain that our defense effort would not be hampered by a subsequent crop failure.

I feel that this is a sound policy and in keeping with the best interests of the southern farmers who made such a splendid contribution during World War II and who stand ready now to produce whatever is necessary to cope with any emergency.

Abandonment of National Security for Cheap Partisan Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming aware

now that President Truman has abandoned all responsibility for our national security and is playing the cheapest type of politics with the lives of our men on the battlefield in Korea.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an article by David Lawrence which appears in the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1951:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

NEW SECURITY COUNCIL URGED, WITH MILITARY EXPERTS ON IT

Is anybody in the Government really thinking about the over-all problems of security of the United States? There is no law on the statute books and no agency of the Government which can give an answer to this question and yet it concerns vitally the safety of the American people against attack and against defeat in war.

Theoretically, it is the military departments which have the job of protection—they have the instrumentality—but actually today in America the military cannot make policy or assure security.

Theoretically, the civilian authority is responsible—but there is no such institution in Washington today which is concerned exclusively with the task of safeguarding the security of the United States.

Theoretically, the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief, is looked upon as the man responsible for the Nation's security. But he does not and cannot give his whole time to the job. Indeed, there is no specific mandate of law which allows the military men to make the policies that are so closely related to military security.

This amazing defect in America's governmental structure was on the minds of some of our military men during the last war and they thought that, by establishing a National Security Council, the United States would at last have a board or agency which could make long-range plans for the security of the country. But the present law does not include any military men in the set-up of the Council.

The members are the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

JOINT CHIEFS LEFT OUT

Yet this all-important agency, with not a single member giving full-time attention to the work, has the tremendous duty of executing the following mandate as expressed in the National Security Act of 1949:

"It shall, subject to the direction of the President, be the duty of the Council—

"1. To assess and appraise the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President in connection therewith; and

"2. To consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith."

The National Security Council hardly ever met before the outbreak in Korea and has met only occasionally since then. Until just recently it didn't have a full-time director or a staff.

American policy, as it relates to our security, has been the subject of considerable debate in Congress these last few days but there is no evidence that an American long-range policy to safeguard national security was ever resolved by the National Security Council.

What is more distressing, moreover, is that the principal military advisers of the Government—the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—have no statutory connection with the very agency that is supposed to be responsible for safeguarding the security of the United States.

Apparently what has happened is that President Truman has abdicated his major responsibility for the security of the United States and has allowed the Department of State, under the vague heading "Foreign policy," to determine what ought really to be determined by the military officers of the Government. The safety of America is assured or endangered today only as the Department of State may decide an issue. The amount of military forces to be raised or the use of those forces, and even the weapons such forces shall use and whether they shall attack or stand still and allow our Armed Forces to be bombed are policies decided by the Department of State.

THE CIVILIAN AUTHORITY

This is the civilian authority which so many prominent Democrats in Congress are espousing today, but which they will not espouse very long when their constituents eventually learn that military men have really nothing to say under our statutes about the policies that mean protection or weakness in our security.

General MacArthur has raised some substantial issues. He is supposed to have been unable, according to Mr. Truman, to give wholehearted support ot the policies of the United States and the United Nations. Yet there is nobody in the White House or in the executive departments or in Congress today who can define those policies and show what they were or when they were approved by any statutory body charged with that responsibility. All that can be shown is that a few meetings of the National Security Council were held by members who gave incidental attention to it in connection with their numerous other duties.

What America needs is a National Security Council with military representation on it and one that will be above any one department of the Government. Three full-time civilian members of outstanding ability should be added. The Secretary of State should, of course, be on it and civilians should dominate it. The State Department, however, should not be the sole maker—as it is today—of important policies directly bearing on the future security and safety of the United States.

MacArthur's Strategy of Strength in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of April 20, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S STRATEGY OF STRENGTH IN ASIA

We think the American people will agree with the fundamental logic of General MacArthur's position, so far as it concerns the war in Korea. He summed it up in his dramatic address to Congress in these words: "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision. In war there is no substitute for victory."

This is not to say that there need be complete acceptance of his five-point strategy to throw the Communists out of Korea. Certainly we need not subscribe wholeheartedly to his global policies, which include the division of our limited strength to counter the division of Communist strength all over the world. The grand strategy of the global campaign must remain in the hands of civilian authorities—the President, Congress, and the free countries in the United Nations.

There has been a diplomatic failure to avert and to end the Korean war. No one—not President Truman, who removed MacArthur from his commands, nor the U. N. diplomats who call him a warmonger while refusing their shares of men and munitions—has proposed an alternative to the military strategy advanced by MacArthur. Hence, his military advice will be carefully considered by the people, if not by the Truman administration. It is based on these facts:

War was forced on us when the Communists invaded South Korea, a United Nations protectorate. The United States already has suffered more than 60,000 casualties, and the nation we sought to liberate lies devastated. Red China refuses to negotiate a peace. Our casualties will go on without end if we continue to fight a limited, defensive campaign on the Korean Peninsula, while the enemy gathers his strength in his mainland sanctuary without hindrance by American air attack.

On behalf of the American and Allied soldiers fighting for a free world in Korea, with only a remote possibility of victory by Chinese withdrawal, General MacArthur proposes:

That the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria be neutralized by aerial bombing; that our economic blockade against China, now ineffective, be intensified; that a naval blockade be imposed against the China coast; that restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and Manchuria be lifted; that the Formosan armies of the Nationalist exile, Chiang Kai-shek, be loosed against the Reds on the mainland with logistical support from the United States.

In the last recommendation the general goes beyond the boundary of military strategy and involves himself in American national policy in the Far East. In doing so he he is inconsistent. In the earlier part of his address MacArthur explained and clarified the causes of oriental unrest; the rejection of a dictatorial government; the striving for a better life which left the Chinese open to the rise of Communist control.

Then, in the name of Korean victory, he proposes American aid to Chiang Kai-shek to restore the old dictatorship in all of China. We cannot accept this as national policy, even if such action were not almost certain—decpite MacArthur's denial—to involve the use of American ground forces in the military morass of continental China.

But General MacArthur, with masterful oratory and persuasive diction certain to make a terrific impact on American minds, basically advanced a policy of strength—a policy the Asiatics and the Kremlin would understand and respect—in contrast to the policy of weakness maintained by the United Nations and the Truman administration both before and after the start of the Korean war, and with the single exception of our intervention against the North Korean Reds. We come back to the question: Who has a better military program?

Without bitterness, but with the assurance of his great knowledge of the Orient and of war in all its phases, General MacArthur brought the challenge to the Presidency, the

Congress, and the American people. It is: Stand and die; or attack and win. Continued Chinese aggression in Korea—a spring offensive reported building—would leave no other course. And Congress gave him a standing ovation when he noted that his views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, "including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

His powerful presentation of the Korean problem renews the hopes of the people for an early solution and the honorable achievement of our goal: The liberation of all Korea from Communist invasion and the restoraton of free, elective government to the Korean people.

Deferment of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter I received from Dr. E. B. Norton, president of State Teachers College, Florence, Ala., containing a timely commentary, to which I invite the attention of the Members.

Dr. Norton is one of the outstanding educators of this country, and his vast experience makes his observation of even greater importance at this moment.

The letter follows:

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Florence, Ala., April 13, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: It seems unfortunate that so many editorial comments, so many of the pronouncements of columnists and of radio commentators, and so much of the public debate concerning proposals for deferring college students have centered around a false assumption and, indeed, an irrelevant point in the debate.

It does not seem fair either to the administration or to the Congress or, for that matter, to either the Armed Forces or the selective service, nor does it seem fair to either colleges or college students, to infer that the operation of proposed draft procedures for the deferment of college students would create an intellectual aristocracy by exempting college students from their military service obligations.

It shatters the morale of college students who are earnestly seeking to prepare themselves for life as well as for improved service to their country to know that they may be considered as dodging the draft, or as acting otherwise than in the national interest when they remain in college. It is especially obnoxious to them to be thought of as asking special exemptions, because of intellectual ability or economic fortune while less fortunate brothers and acquaintances will be required to don uniforms merely because they lack either the mental capacity to do college work or the financial ability to maintain themselves in college.

This does not seem to be a quick, positive, complete, all-out mobilization for prompt military victory in a declared war. This seems to be a long drawn-out, indefinite mobilization to meet many very critical situations in world affairs including possible military fronts not yet determined.

To take the necessary steps to insure an adequate, continuous flow of trained manpower for competent leadership in the Armed Forces and in all of the critical aspects of our highly complex national life should not be considered as simply showing favoritism to some particular group of young men who may have been fortunate enough to enter college and capable enough to do satisfactory work. If it is in the national interest, not only to permit but actually to encourage all potential college students to get as much college education as possible before entering the Armed Forces and then to perform their full military duty, then let us put the argument on that basis. If such is not in the national interest, then let's face the issue and induct students as promptly as they may be needed and place them where their services are most needed.

The red-blooded, patriotic young men whom I know as students in college will be willing to stay there to equip themselves more fully for better and greater service to their country if they are convinced that it is in the national interest as well as in their own personal interest to do so. They will be very unhapy over remaining in college if the general public gets the idea that by doing so they will be shirking their duty and pushing over onto someone else less fortunate and less capable the responsibility for meeting a military crisis.

In an enlightened country whose very form of government and way of life depend upon moral, intellectual, and spiritual foundations laid definitely by the processes of education, our people should consider what the disruption of educational institutions over a long-extended period of mobilization might mean, not just to those institutions but to the welfare of the country as a whole.

In the official debating and voting on the question of deferments of college students I hope that you will help to keep the issues clarified, and that, regardless of the decisions concerning the appropriate assignments for college students, there may not be involved any impugning of the motives of colleges or of college students regarding a patriotic desire to serve where most needed.

Yours sincerely,
E. B. NORTON, *President.*

A Study in Contrasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit quotations from General MacArthur's address to Congress, and quotations from President Truman, given to a writer for the New Yorker, for publications in that magazine. These quotations are for comparison and contrast:

A soldier's farewell (Gen. Douglas MacArthur): "The issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration. * * * You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our effort to halt its advance in Europe. * * * While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea, that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound one. * * * The above views have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff. * * * I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty."

President Truman speaking: "There was one columnist who wrote some lie about my family when I was in the Senate, and instead of writing him a letter I called him on the phone, and I said: 'You so-and-so, if you say another word about my family, I'll come down to your office and shoot you.' He hasn't printed a whisper about them since. I'm saving up four or five good, hard punches on the nose, and when I'm out of this job, I'm going to run around and deliver them personally."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Project and United States Steel Needs," from the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of March 10, 1951, and an editorial entitled "A Seaway and Mistaken Economics," from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of March 10, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT AND UNITED STATES STEEL NEEDS

The Nation's growing need for steel to match its defense effort may force the adoption of the controversial St. Lawrence waterway project. One of the oldest issues in Washington, it has been recommended by every President since Harding without result.

The project is making it possible for ocean ships to travel from the St. Lawrence River through all the Great Lakes and to construct a 2,200,000 horsepower electrical plant at Massena, N. Y. At present the system of rivers, canals, and lakes is too shallow and too narrow in places to allow the deeper draft ships to enter from the ocean.

Secretary of Interior Chapman has given the project a push in stating that the Nation needs a better transportation route to the iron ore fields in Labrador, situated on the St. Lawrence River at the eastern tip of Canada.

The Labrador ore has two attractive characteristics. It has a high content of iron and it lies close to the surface of the ground.

And Labrador's strategic position is appealing. If hostilities break open, the ore fields are within the continental limits of the Northern Hemisphere, and the ore could be transported through the chain without fear of submarines.

Proponents of the project, which include Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—feel that the additional electric power from the dams would stimulate the operation of aluminum and other industries in the Northeast.

And further, it is argued that the alternate water route will alleviate the approaching crisis in rail transportation.

How much would it cost? There is disagreement on that.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association says: "The project would cost only $556,000,000—$192,000,000 for power and $374,000,000 for navigation. All of this will be liquidated by power revenues and navigation tolls."

The Association of American Railroads says it would cost more than that and that the taxpayers of the United States and Canada would be underwriting the deal.

If the project fits into the emergency picture as Wilson says, then the gentlemen on Capitol Hill had best speed things up. The system won't be effected overnight, and we don't want to be in the midst of construction if and when Uncle Joe pulls the trigger.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 11, 1951]

A SEAWAY AND MISTAKEN ECONOMICS

A man who knows his way in the history of the world's supplies of minerals, ores, and how best to use them asks this newspaper a question it cannot answer. How, the engineer asks, will the United States maintain, in the longer future, its industrial supremacy if access to the vast Labrador deposits of high-grade ore is made difficult or practically impossible?

The questioner was thinking of the refusal of the American Congress to have any part in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. The problem, and it is one of vast economic importance to the American people, may roughly be summed up as follows:

In the late 1930's, American steel companies invested a good many millions in the iron-ore possibilities recently discovered in Labrador near the Quebec frontier. Now the 300 or more miles of railway is about completed from the mines to the Bay of St. Lawrence. The natural, reasonable method of transportation from that point southward is by the proposed seaway. Canada now seems determined to build this waterway, without United States aid if necessary, but if she does the Canadian Government thinks American importers should pay a toll for use of the canal. Such a charge would radically change the economic prospect apparently visible when the original plans were made.

United States iron ores, of high grade, are rapidly reaching the stage of exhaustion. The glories of Mesabi Range in the Northwest are becoming legends. Short sight could gravely injure the American steel industry and its related industries. Or a huge economic, social, and industrial project in ore and in water transportation could be at the least long delayed in fulfillment. And the prime cause would be the same apprehensions which mistakenly met the building of the Panama Canal with prophecies of doom for the railroads. Now it is power utilities and the railroads that join in helping to thwart the St. Lawrence seaway.

Dismissals From the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "State Department Ousts 55 as Security Risks," published this morning in the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT OUSTS 55 AS SECURITY RISKS

(By John Fisher)

Fifty-five persons were removed from the State Department as security risks last year, secret testimony to a congressional committee disclosed last night.

Of these, 54 were homosexuals and forced to resign, it was learned. The other was discharged as a security and loyalty risk. This brought the total removed during the 3 years ended December 31 to 144 homosexuals and 14 other risks.

In addition, four other sex perverts have been requested to resign this year.

M'CARTHY SUBSTANTIATED

This information, furnished the House Appropriations Committee in closed session and just released, substantiated charges by Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, and other congressional critics last year that the State Department had been infiltrated by persons who may be tempted to betray national security, despite administration denials to the contrary.

The Tydings "whitewash" committee named to investigate MCCARTHY's charge didn't even delve into the presence of homosexuals in the Department despite knowledge Soviet espionage has used such perversion as blackmail to extract secrets.

Members of the appropriations committee demanded data on loyalty and security risks in connection with the State Department's request for $283,566,476 in funds for the next fiscal year, an increase of $12,173,329 over the current year.

FOUR CASES PENDING

"We treat homosexuals as security risks," Carlisle H. Humelsine, Deputy Under Secretary, told the committee.

He said 4 cases are pending, an additional 11 persons are under investigation, and 2 individuals are under suspension on other grounds awaiting a final decision on dismissal.

Humelsine vigorously denied charges in a recent gossip book on Washington that State Department funds have been used to provide visiting dignitaries with immoral escorts.

Other testimony disclosed:

1. Intelligence had warned all concerned government agencies for a long time of the possibility of invasion by North Koreans, such as occurred last June 25.

MAC ARTHUR STAND SUPPORTED

2. Assistant Secretary Dean Rusk said "we are determined not to allow Communist aggression to succeed in Korea" and "our objective is to prevent Formosa from falling into the hands of a regime that is hostile to the United States." Strangely enough, these are objectives stated by General MacArthur and for which he was fired. Rusk praised MacArthur for his Japanese policy.

3. Rusk also admitted the fighting in Korea constitutes war, not the police action claimed by President Truman.

4. There are approximately 250,000 American ground, air, and Navy troops involved in Korea, including seven divisions of ground troops.

PROPAGANDA MAGAZINE FAILS

5. The Department spent $630,717 to send 50,000 copies of the propaganda magazine Amerika to Russia for distribution by the Soviet news agency under Government agreements, but the Russians returned 30,000 copies unsold. The Department even had difficulty giving them away free in other countries.

6. The Department requested $1,000,000 for entertainment allowances abroad, an increase of $325,000 over this year.

Conditions in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed by an article which appeared in the April 19 issue of the Democrat, of Flemington, N. J., embodying a letter to the editor from Theodore A. Marks. Mr. Marks forcefully reminds us in his thought-provoking observations that in the present crisis we can ill afford to neglect our responsibilities to agriculture.

In the hope that the letter will be read by every Member of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEES CALAMITY AHEAD FOR AGRICULTURE AND THE NATION

NEW MARKET, N. J., *April 12, 1951.*

To the EDITOR OF THE DEMOCRAT:

The following words are right out of the mouth of Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture:

"No other major segment of our economy went through such a severe economic setback. Net income realized by farm operators dropped from almost eighteen billion in 1947 to about sixteen and five-tenths billion in 1948; about fourteen billion in 1949 and about thirteen billion in 1950."

You will see from these figures that agriculture lost a net income (I say net) of over ten and one-half billions in 3 years. Who lost this ten and one-half billions in 3 years—the 4,500,000 farmers, small and large, in the United States, and you must not forget that during those 3 years every other branch of the economy of the United States increased every year.

Add to the above losses another two billions which might possibly cover the losses sustained by farmers in the November 25, 1950, windstorm, the loss of 10,000 beef cattle in Florida during the freeze of February 1951, together with tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, and frosts, and you will wonder how any farmer can continue in business.

Mr. Brannan also said:

"Prices of many farm commodities have very little relationship to consumer prices. Several examples give this picture clearly:

"The cotton in a shirt now selling for $3.50 to $4 probably did not bring the farmer more than 30 cents.

"A 16-cent can of tomatoes represents about 3 cents of gross income to the farmer.

"The corn in a can retailing at 19 cents brought less than 2¾ cents to the producer.

"Onions which were selling in stores in November for 5.7 cents a pound had been sold by the farmers for a little over 1 cent.

"When milk leaves the farm, it immediately goes into a distribution and processing system that almost doubles its price in a few hours.

"The wheat in a loaf of bread that sells for 15 to 16 cents brings the farmer only about 2⅔ cents. It is interesting to note

that the retail price of bread has gone up 1.7 cents a loaf since June. If this were due entirely to a rise in the price of wheat, it would mean that wheat had gone up $1.12 a bushel. Actually, the farm price of wheat in January was only 16 cents a bushel higher than it was before the Korean outbreak."

In any other line of business when one man loses another gains, so all these losses must have been passed on to others. Did the nonfarm consumer receive any of it? The answer is very little. The middleman and big business received nearly all of it. If it were possible for all the farmers of the United States today to give away everything they produced the ultimate consumer would be benefited very little, and in time the result would be the same as mentioned above. But just as you never miss the sunshine until the shadows fall, so the time will come when—and come it will and very soon at that—when you, the consumers, will either have to pay a whole lot more for the food you buy, and some things you will not even be able to buy.

Farmers and their families are quitting the farms every year at the rate of a half million. The farm population today is 28,000,000 but the growth of the country is over 2,500,000 yearly. In 5 years the population will have increased 15,000,000—equivalent to the population of Canada. With fewer farmers and more mouths to feed you will see what is facing us.

For example take milk. The amount of milk now being produced has been dropping every month for the last year. Farmers are selling out and those who remain are decreasing their herds because they can get better prices, proportionately, for their cows than to feed them and produce milk. If we should have a drought and you can get milk next fall for 30 cents you will be lucky.

The carry-over of the stock of wheat in the United States at the present time will be the shortest we have had in years, and the new crop will be—from present estimates and my personal observation—less than it has been in a generation. In addition, farmers are showing a don't-care attitude because while prosperity exists all around they have never received any part of it.

It is true that farmers are getting today more than they did at the start of the Korean war in June 1950, but from November 1948 until May 1950, the price of all farm commodities had dropped, some as much as 33⅓ percent. Farm prices at that time in a good many instances were back to the level of 1939, whereas all other branches of industry had been increasing during that time, so when prices started to increase in June it found the farmers receiving very little for their products while industry being unionized never gave up anything, but in reality got more. Even at the present time farmers are not receiving as much as they did in November 1948 while industry has had six wage increases.

Notice the next time and you will see comparisons start from the Korean war in June 1950. Somebody is covering up something.

Now you may be tempted to ask how can any business like present-day farming continue to exist? Behind the answer to this question lies the greatest worry confronting the Nation today—in one word, "starvation."

At the present time, when farmers see they cannot make ends meet, they simply quit and go into industry. This they are doing by the thousands weekly. Our present head of the United States Department of Agriculture knows as much about farming as a mocking bird knows about law. He believes the cheaper he prices the farmers' products the better it will be for the nonfarm consumer, not figuring that what might be fun to him is death to others, and so the available supply of food decreases daily.

We have on hand at the present time only enough food to last us until the end of this year, and if we were ever to go to war with Russia, their saboteurs would see to it that nothing is harvested. So in our present emergency and with the same conditions hanging over our heads, possibly for all time, we should have national underground pantries bulging with storable food to last for at least 3 years instead of at the present time until December, and no chance of replenishment if a real emergency should overtake us.

Mr. Brannan has made a bankrupt of agriculture and would not be tolerated in the smallest business anywhere in the United States longer than the first year, according to the results accomplished by him. Why should 152,000,000 people see starvation staring them in the face and still continue with the source and cause of forthcoming disaster?

THEO. A. MARKS.

The Truman-MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the Truman-MacArthur controversy, broadcast from Station WWL in New Orleans, La., on Tuesday, April 24, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, since my last report to you over this station, General MacArthur has presented his views to a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives. It was a drama-packed session, the equal of which I cannot recall during my many years of public service. Senators and Congressmen, as well as scores of high-ranking Government officials and visitors in the galleries, listened intently to each word that fell from the lips of the general. Except for the frequent outbursts of applause, everyone remained quiet, almost breathless, and one could hear a pin drop during the entire proceeding. And as the veteran commander of our Asiatic forces brought his speech to a close, the audience was visibly moved—many a tear was shed as MacArthur announced that after 52 years of military service, he was now, like the old soldier in the Army ballad, ready to close his military career and just fade away.

Unquestionably, the general was at his best and delivered a most impressive speech. Many of you, I am sure, heard it over your radios, and have seen rebroadcasts over television. The immediate reaction in Washington to the Asiatic policy advocated by MacArthur was, as might be expected, fairly evenly divided. Many Republicans endorsed his proposal to carry the war to the Chinese mainland, while most Democrats advocated caution and a further exploration of the world political implications involved by such action.

For my own part, I have tried to view this problem objectively, without emotion, or bias or prejudice, but with a high sense of duty. From the very beginning, I have expressed the view that President Truman was clearly within his constitutional rights in removing MacArthur from the far eastern command. And further, that the General's insistent encroachment into the field of foreign policy, in advocacy of a program which was contrary to that laid down by his Commander in Chief, constituted an act of insubordination which should not be glossed over. It is my view that MacArthur deliberately precipitated his own dismissal in an attempt to bring to a showdown the deepseated divergence between his views on the far eastern policy and those held by the administration. In this he has been successful. His dramatic appearance before the Congress has touched off a spirited, and at times, heated debate that will reverberate through the halls of the Senate and House of Representatives for months to come. Forgotten are the "troops to Europe" issue, the "fortress America doctrine," as advocated by President Hoover, and other controversial issues. All interest is centered now on the one burning question: Should we carry the Korean war to the Manchurian and Chinese mainland in the hope of achieving a quick victory, or should we continue our present policy of endeavoring to limit the conflict to the Korean peninsula, and make every effort to attain a peaceful settlement without appeasement?

This question has weighed upon my mind for days and weeks, in fact for months. It has been uppermost in my thoughts ever since the Chinese stealthily marched into Korea and, by the commitment of a relatively small portion of their countless hordes of manpower, snatched from our forces a victory that was almost within grasp. My resentment at the actions of the Chinese Communists was just as strong and burning as that of every other loyal American. Our country has never before been placed in a position where it could not immediately strike back at any aggressor who attacked our soldiers. We have never been prone to present the other cheek when slapped in the face. It is but a typically American reaction that we should want to immediately press the battle home to our new foe. I confess that I have felt and still do entertain that desire. I am sure that most of you feel the same way. The wonder to me has been that the American public has been able to exercise restraint for so long a time.

Why, then, has not President Truman, who is as loyal and patriotic an American as any of us, taken action long ago to strike back at Manchurian and Chinese bases? Why have not our Joint Chiefs of Staff—all loyal, patriotic Americans, and every inch of them a soldier—precipitated long before now a showdown with the Chinese Communists? I do not profess to know what is in the minds of these able military men, but I am satisfied that all of them are guided solely by the one purpose as enunciated by President Truman in his radio address of last week: "To avert the tragedy of an all-out war with China, which in turn, would inevitably lead us into world war III."

This, then, is the basic point at which MacArthur and the President have parted ways. It is the point at which I, too, must part with MacArthur, irrespective of my admiration for him as a soldier and as an administrator. Whether or not our present policy in Korea will prevent another devastating world conflict remains for the future to decide, but I have made my decision to support the President and our Joint Chiefs of Staff at this crossroads in our history only after weighing dispassionately the present position of our Nation in the world political picture.

Militarily, and if we consider only the Asiatic theater, MacArthur may be right. Certainly many of his recommendations with respect to the Asiatic war coincide with my own. I have long contended that we should at all cost hold on to Formosa and not permit it to fall into enemy hands. It forms an integral part of our Pacific defense system, and as MacArthur points out, it completes the circle of military bases which make of the Pacific our outer line of defense. I believe that we should arm the Nationalist forces on Formosa, but unless and until the occasion presents itself and we are prepared

to wage all-out war with China, we cannot undertake to transport them to the Chinese mainland.

With respect to the proposed Chinese blockade, I have advocated for many months that our Government make more insistent demands upon our allies to cut off completely the flow of goods to the Chinese Communists. I can see no sense in some members of the United Nations fighting the Chinese in Korea, while trading with them through the back door. Along with this, we should take steps to make more effective our blockade of the Chinese coast, thereby reducing the war potentiality of the Chinese Reds' armies.

As for the fourth point mentioned by MacArthur—that we should remove restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria—I believe that in view of the presence of Chinese troops in Korea, this might be done without provoking an all-out war with the Chinese Communist government.

These, then, are the four steps which MacArthur states he urged upon Washington and which, according to him, were agreed to by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. You will note that, with the exception of using Chinese Nationalist troops in an assault upon the Chinese mainland, the recommendations are confined to reconnaissance and blockade operations. I have long felt that we could undertake these steps without committing ourselves to open warfare with the Chinese on Chinese soil.

Although many commentators have stated that MacArthur in his speech charged that his advocacy of bombing Manchurian and Chinese bases had the prior approval of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, I find no basis for the statement. The general stated only that the four steps which I have just outlined, and which do not include the bombing of Manchurian and Chinese bases, "have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

In a radio forum discussion of the Far East controversy in which I participated this week, one Member of Congress argued that by following MacArthur's recommendations we can put an end to the constant attrition of our manpower on the Korean battlefields. If I thought that carrying the air war to Manchurian and Chinese bases, plus the use of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan troops, would accomplish that purpose, I would not hesitate to support such an undertaking. We would all welcome a relatively easy way out of our present dilemma. But what of the consequences if and when we take these bold steps? I believe that the American people should be fully apprised of the implications involved, and for that reason I shall welcome a full debate in Congress on the subject. I am confident that when all of the facts are before the public, and upon sober reflection of what such precipitate action might lead to, much of the mass hysteria that is evident today will disappear.

Let us examine more closely the possibilities—perhaps I should say probabilities—that will confront us should we assist the Chinese Nationalist forces in invading the Chinese mainland from Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek reputedly has some 600,000 men on that island. Assuming that we can equip them properly without depriving our own forces of much-needed arms and ammunition, and that we succeed in landing them on the Chinese mainland, or on Hainan Island, whichever is the objective, is there any guaranty that they can hold on after they have landed? What if the Chinese Red armies threaten to push them into the sea? Will we stand idly by and let them be annihilated, and thereby incur the eternal scorn and damnation of the Orient, or will we go to their rescue? All of you know the answer. We would throw every man, every ship, every plane that we could muster into a heroic effort to save our allies, and a bloody, never-ending struggle between our boys and the Chinese hordes will have been joined.

I well remember the historic statement of Winston Churchill on February 9, 1941. That was in the early part of World War II, when the United States was still neutral, but England had her back to the wall as a result of France's capitulation. On that occasion Churchill said to the United States: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." Yes, we furnished the tools, but we also had to finish the job. Later, after Pearl Harbor, Churchill made another statement that will go down in history: "We have lost Singapore, but we have won the United States over to our side." We ended by not only sending tons of supplies, but more troops than all of our allies combined.

There is considerable similarity in our positions then and now. In effect, Chiang Kai-shek is saying to us, with MacArthur in accord, "Give my men the arms and land them on the Chinese coast, and we will do the rest." I cannot forget that this same leader, and these same men, supported by hundreds of thousands of other Chinese soldiers, were once before on the Chinese mainland. Although they started out with control of most of China, they eventually were cut to pieces by Red armies.

As I have stated, there can be no advance guaranty that a landing by Chiang Kai-shek's men on the Chinese coast will be successful, and in fact, its feasibility seems highly questionable. It is my firm belief that we would be courting disaster if we encouraged and participated in such a risky venture. In the long run, we would be drawn into the conflict on an all-out scale, and our casualty list would dwarf the present losses in Korea. We must remember that Stalin would like nothing better than to see us become embroiled in an interminable, costly war of attrition on the Chinese mainland, for then his plans for undermining the democratic nations of Western Europe and Asia could proceed with little fear of interference from us.

In weighing the relative advantages and disadvantages of enlarging the Korean conflict, we must take into consideration also our position in the United Nations Organization. Whether we like to admit it or not, our Nation is no longer a free agent in reaching major international political decisions. If we expect the cooperation and backing of the other free nations of the world, we must consult with them before reaching decisions, and our actions must be supported by a majority of the members, otherwise we will bring about the collapse of the entire structure for world peace that we have so patiently built up since World War II. And with the death of the United Nations will go our chances of preventing the spread of communism over the Eurasian, African, and Australian continents. We may as well face reality; we cannot do the job alone. While many point out that the major part of the burden in Korea is being borne by us, and for that reason we should have a free hand in dealing with the Chinese, still we cannot evade the fact that events in Asia profoundly affect all of Europe. Inescapably, our Western European allies will be drawn into the conflict should Russia come to China's aid, and they will bear the brunt of any fighting on the western front. MacArthur admitted in his speech to the Congress that events in Asia cannot be divorced from Europe, yet at no point did MacArthur mention the United Nations, or the possible repercussions that might develop among our European allies should his views about the Korean war prevail.

It is significant, too, that MacArthur hedged considerably in his statement regarding the possibility of Russia's entering the war should we follow his advice. He said, and I quote his exact words: "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves." He may think that the Russians will remain neutral, but he goes no further than that. No doubt he still remembers Red China's intervention in the Korean war. Had MacArthur anticipated that the Chinese Communists would intervene at that time, he certainly would not have permitted his troops to be caught like rats in a trap among the icy mountains of northern Korea, with tenuous supply lines and inadequate reserves. In simple words, MacArthur guessed wrong about the Chinese last fall, and there is a strong possibility that he is guessing wrong now about Russia.

I refuse to believe that any considerations other than the welfare and future safety of our country have influenced the President and his military advisers in resolving the current controversy. They alone have in their possession all of the facts regarding our own military strength, the strength of our allies, and—to the extent that our counterintelligence has been able to provide—the strength of our enemies and potential enemies. The course that they are following in Asia is not appeasement. It is no more than an honest, sincere effort to avert a death-struggle between ourselves and Soviet Russia. If we cannot avert this costly, devastating conflict, at least we must try to choose the time and place for it.

I have faith in Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Collins, Vandenberg, and Sherman. They are all mature, able, experienced military strategists and they alone are in a position to plan our Nation's military strategy. I shall follow closely the hearings now being conducted by the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, which are meeting jointly to hear testimony from our Defense Secretary and the Chiefs of Staff. A great deal of their testimony will of necessity be confidential. There will be much information of highly secret nature that they cannot even impart to the committee members. I am confident, however, that the two committees will bring to light the views of our military leaders on the MacArthur proposals. I shall present to you in subsequent broadcasts as much of this information as I am permitted to divulge, and in the meantime I urge all of you to be calm. Do not permit your emotions to stifle your better judgment on this vitally important question, but let us all be patient and await the development of the true facts before we reach definite conclusions.

Remember, I need your advice and counsel. Your constructive criticism is appreciated.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me to the people of Pennsylvania on April 23, 1951, entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 39."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 39)

(Text of broadcast by United States Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

Since I talked with you 2 weeks ago momentous events have taken place.

The American people have been shocked into realizing the grave dangers we face from a confused and uncertain foreign policy.

While the whole world awaits the final outcome of the sudden and shocking dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur I am confident that the United States will benefit from the investigation and open discussion of our policy in the Far East.

It is good to bring out into the open the many vital questions that have been worrying every one of us because we were denied full knowledge of the facts.

During all the developments which led us into armed conflict in Korea the people have been kept in the dark.

The Members of Congress have been kept in the dark, despite the pretense of the Truman administration that we were acting in accordance with a bipartisan policy.

Now, to some extent, the situation is being revealed.

General MacArthur's appearance before the joint meeting of Congress brought to a climax the most eventful week in many years.

In all my long experience in public affairs I have never witnessed a more spectacular uprising of resentment and indignation than that which followed the dismissal of General MacArthur.

Let me review briefly what transpired here in Washington when the news of President Truman's action was made public at 1 a. m. last Wednesday a week ago.

Most of the Members of Congress were unaware of what had happened until morning. But it didn't take long to find out that only one thing was being talked about.

There seemed to be a feeling that a great tragedy had occurred. As I traveled to the Senate Office Building I noticed small groups standing about, reading newspapers, obviously intent upon the one big news item of the day.

In the corridors of the Senate Office Building similar groups were discussing what had occurred. Many expressed their opinions in strong language. No one seemed able to get down to work. The atmosphere was thick with gloom.

When I stepped into my office all four telephone lines were busy. Calls were coming in, not only from all parts of Pennsylvania but also from distant points throughout the country. I had calls from military associates and civilians from San Francisco, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Calif., San Antonio, Tex., and several points in Florida.

Telegrams began pouring into my office. Practically all of them called for the impeachment of the President, the dismissal of Secretary Acheson, and the reinstatement of General MacArthur. Many demanded that General MacArthur be summoned home to report to Congress.

All day long the telegrams kept pouring in. They continued the next day and the next. As the flood of telegrams subsided letters were delivered to my office by the thousands. In all I received more than 1,500 telegrams and approximately 15,000 letters and post cards.

Out of all these 16,500 communications less than 100 approved the President's action in stripping General MacArthur of all his commands in the Far East.

At this point let me express my appreciation to those who have wired or written to me.

It is my custom to acknowledge promptly all communications from constituents. It will be difficult, however, with my limited staff, to make individual replies to the heavy volume of telegrams and letters I have received relative to the MacArthur dismissal. If you do not hear from me I am sure you will understand the reason.

The galleries of the Senate Chamber were jammed when the session was called to order. The corridors were filled with people. There was an air of suppressed excitement which broke into cheers and applause from the galleries when Senator JENNER, of Indiana, in a speech, denounced the President for his action and called for his impeachment. Vice President BARKLEY, who was presiding, rapped sharply for order and warned the galleries that applause is in violation of the rules of the Senate.

That evening President Truman went on the air in defense of his action.

On Friday the Senate Armed Services Committee, in executive session, voted to conduct an inquiry into the military situation in the Far East and the facts surrounding the dismissal of General MacArthur. The committee is made up of seven Democrats and six Republicans. The vote for the investigation was unanimous.

The next scene took place at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner where 5,300 of his faithful followers paid $100 each to hear President Truman charge that everyone who agrees with him is a patriot and those who disagree are playing politics. It was a highly profitable dinner. It brought over $400,000 into the campaign fund of the Democratic Party.

This was followed by the unanimous action of the House and Senate, inviting General MacArthur to address a joint meeting of the Congress.

The enthusiastic reception which greeted General MacArthur on his return to his native land after an absence of 14 years was a real tribute to his greatness as a soldier, statesman, and diplomat. The tremendous ovation he received here in Washington, from Republicans and Democrats alike, gave assurance that patriotic appreciation of our Nation's heroes still lives in the hearts of our people.

Those who have defended President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur contended that he was exercising his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

In my opinion there can be no question that the President has a legal right under the Constitution to do what he did. But when we talk about the constitutional authority let me point out that President Truman in his radio address abandoned the use of "police action" and frankly called the fighting in Korea a war.

Thus he officially acknowledged that a state of war exists between the United States and Communist China. Sixty thousand American casualties confirm that fact.

Mr. Truman knows that the Constitution specifically provides that Congress shall have the sole power to declare war. Yet he has not come before Congress to ask for such a declaration and the authority to prosecute the war.

In the same address the President said that we are ready at any time to negotiate for the restoration of peace in the Far East. He declared we will not engage in appeasement.

But while he was saying that Great Britain, through her foreign minister, was suggesting a negotiated peace by admitting Communist China into the family of the United Nations, turning over Formosa to the Communists, and recognizing the Chinese Communist Government as a partner in drafting the peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. Truman laid great stress on his aims for peace, declaring that the objective of his policy in the Far East was to repel attack and to restore peace.

But instead of helping in the cause of peace the military plans he outlined actually removed the greatest factors that might restrain further aggression.

In effect, he made it clear that the Communists in Manchuria and China need have no fear of attack on their home soil—that there would be no bombing raids to destroy their property, their supply lines, or bases. Mr. Truman gave assurance that there would be no invasion of China by the Nationalist forces now on Formosa.

With these assurances why should the Communists want to negotiate a peace? What kind of military strategy is it that tells an enemy that he can retreat safely behind a boundary line to reform, regroup, and resupply, while our boys wait for their return?

What kind of military strategy dictates that air power can be used only to defend troops but not to destroy the bases from which the enemy launches his attack?

Mr. Truman had high praise for what he called collective action among nations in Korea as a workable means of resisting aggression.

But the fact is that while we have 250,000 ground troops in Korea no other member of the United Nations has more than 5 percent of that number. Most of them have contributed no soldiers at all; some have given token help only.

Mr. Truman reported that there are signs that the Communists are building up their ground forces and air strength for a new mass offensive. He expressed the hope that this new attack would be turned back but he gave no indication that our troops are being reinforced to meet this attack.

I shall not discuss the President's speech at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner because that was purely political.

The question that is in the minds of many Americans is the extent to which the removal of General MacArthur was influenced by other nations.

They are wondering how much of Mr. Truman's foreign policy is dictated by secret commitments and demands from abroad.

It raises the question of whether the appeasement of those foreign countries was worth more than unity at home.

Five years and seven months ago General MacArthur took his place at the head of the Japanese Government as Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers.

He had absolute power over a conquered people, a proud people, who worshipped their Emperor as a god.

General MacArthur faced a difficult task but through his outstanding ability he succeeded in gaining the respect and confidence of the Japanese people and was winning them to a free way of life.

Previous experience in the Philippines prepared General MacArthur for his distinguished service in Japan. He not only developed the Filipino military force but he taught the people the ideals of the United States.

General MacArthur's fame will go down in history, not only as one of our most brilliant military leaders, but as a great statesman and diplomat.

Regardless of whatever justification the President may have thought he had, the dismissal of General MacArthur was a brutal, irresponsible, and uncalled for procedure against one of the greatest Americans who has given a lifetime of distinguished, heroic, and patriotic service to his country.

If we are to have peace in the world it will be established on strength, not on weakness.

It will not be achieved through appeasement. It cannot be bought through doubledealing or secret betrayal of innocent people in the hands of Soviet tyranny.

So long as communism conspires behind the iron curtain to enslave the world there can be no compromise with Moscow.

So long as the Red dictators look upon the United States as their ultimate target for destruction we must fight aggression with every weapon at our command.

To restore peace we must fight to win. Half-way measures will not preserve the American way of life.

If our objective in Korea is anything less than victory over the enemy we should bring our boys home before more precious lives are lost.

General MacArthur has been working for peace. Now a great wave of political propaganda has been started to picture him as a warmonger. But I know the American people will not be deceived. They realize from tragic experience that appeasement of aggressors is encouragement to war.

General MacArthur was building a road to peace. We must be resolute in our determination to complete that road.

This is Ed Martin, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Senator Blair Moody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, a freshman Senator has come to the Senate with the particular good wishes of the people of Rhode Island and of Brown University, where he studied and made a distinguished mark both in athletics and in scholarship for 4 years. I had the opportunity of making his friendship then because we were members of the same college fraternity. Since then we have always been friends. It is with particular gratification that I find that the Providence Journal on April 25, 1951, published an admirable editorial relating to Mr. MOODY's selection to be Senator from Michigan. I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BLAIR MOODY

BLAIR MOODY was always a man to surprise his associates. A natural athlete, hefty, speedy, and a dangerous adversary, he won letters at Brown in three major sports. Since an athlete is not always noted for his skill with books and in the classroom, he caused a lifting of eyebrows when he was named a Phi Beta Kappa scholar for attainment in studies. It was presumed he would make a career in teaching, with coaching as a sideline, and his sojourn at Moses Brown seemed to bear this out. But again he surprised by showing up as a reporter—and a good one—for the Detroit News. He had not majored in English at Brown, which was then the gateway to newspaper work, and the English majors of his time at college were surprised at his choice of occupation. But the greatest surprise, even to his intimates in Washington newspaper work, was his appointment by the Governor of Michigan to succeed the late Arthur Vandenberg as United States Senator. If his past surprises are a criterion, he should make the Senate—and newspaper fellows—sit up and take notice in the eminent position he now enjoys. His many friends around this community wish him well—and more surprises.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "MacArthur Practices an Adroit Deception," by Mr. Robert L. Riggs, of the Courier-Journal Washington bureau, which appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of Sunday, April 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR PRACTICES AN ADROIT DECEPTION—WITHOUT REALLY SAYING IT, HE PLANTS THE IDEA THAT TRUMAN FORCED THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF TO GO AGAINST THEIR BETTER JUDGMENT IN KOREA

(By Robert L. Riggs)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—You get a measure of the political adroitness of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the success he has had in making it appear that President Truman has overruled the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As a result of his speech to Congress, MacArthur has many people convinced that the Joint Chiefs and he are in complete agreement that the way to fight the Korean conflict is to help Chiang Kai-shek invade China and to bomb beyond the Yalu River in Manchuria.

He has created the belief that he and the four members of the Joint Chiefs all disagree with Truman; that the Joint Chiefs haved bowed their necks to the President in order to save their jobs, while only he is courageous enough to accept ouster from command in order to save his country.

A PICTURE CREATED

He has created a picture of Truman, under the domination of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, cracking the whip and forcing obedience from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

It is a tribute to MacArthur's finesse that he has painted this picture of cringing military leaders without ever saying that they have been lashed into submission.

He has led the country to believe that the four staff chiefs are on his side and against Harry Truman—without ever saying that that is the situation. He has made it appear that, if they had his courage, they would be just as insubordinate as he has been.

Yet he has said no such thing. What he did say was that the Joint Chiefs share his thoughts on the best way—from a military point of view—to bring about victory in Korea.

FACT OVERLOOKED

What he failed to mention is that they reject completely his belief that to carry out his military propsals would not involve us in full-scale war with China, and probably with Russia.

In one degree or another, it is likely that most military people—as well as nonmilitary people—share some of MacArthur's views on the way to achieve victory in Korea.

Of course, it would help our fighting men in Korea if 600,000 of Chiang's men poured onto the Chinese mainland from Formosa and set up a second front. That is, it would help our soldiers in Korea if Chiang's people showed any greater disposition to fight the Communists than they showed when they were on the mainland before.

Of course, it would help our troops in Korea if our Air Force could drop bombs on Chinese troop concentrations across the Yalu River. That is, it would help our men unless it caused the Chinese and Russian Air Force, which has let our ground troops pretty much alone, to retaliate.

These questions of military movement undoubtedly find little disagreement between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs. It would be reasonable to assume that both Truman and Acheson would agree that those proposed moves would—if certain other things didn't happen—bring quick victory.

THE CONTROVERSY'S NUB

But there is no reason whatever to believe that any of the Joint Chiefs agree with MacArthur that Chiang's invasion of the mainland and our dropping of bombs beyond the Yalu would fail to bring Russia into the war.

There you have the nub of the entire controversy between Acheson, Truman, and the Joint Chiefs on one side, and MacArthur, Herbert Hoover, Robert A. Taft, and Kenneth S. Wherry on the other side.

The conflict is over the political decision, as distinct from a military decision. Yet there are times when military factors are important parts of political decisions.

One small boy may decide, as a matter of tactics, that he can whip another lad. But it is a matter of strategic importance for him to know whether or not the other boy's big brother is going to appear and join in the fight.

It is equally important for him to know if his neighborhood gang will be behind him if the other lad's big brother appears.

MacArthur is virtually ready to give a guaranty that Red China's big brother in the Kremlin won't join the attack if we move against the Chinese mainland. As he puts it, the Soviet Union "will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves in Korea." In other words, Russia will not necessarily intervene if we join up with Chiang and send our bombers into Manchuria.

SHERMAN "MUTTERED"

It is well known, and probably will be emphasized before congressional hearings next week, that the Joint Chiefs have reached a different conclusion. They believe Russia may intervene if we take the course advocated by MacArthur, and thus set off a new world war.

On his political decisions, as opposed to strictly military theory, the Joint Chiefs have been out of sympathy with MacArthur for some months. It is an open secret that Navy Chief Sherman has muttered that had MacArthur been an admiral instead of a general, he would have been relieved of command long ago.

MacArthur's predictions as to what Russia and Red China will or won't do if we extend the fight come at a time when he is not in very good standing as a prophet.

He was a lot more positive, in October, about his prediction of what the Red Chinese would do in Korea than he was this week about what Russia would do.

He assured his superiors last fall that if he pushed the United Nations forces up to the Yalu River, his move would not bring the Chinese into Korea.

HENCE WAKE ISLAND

Washington knew, of course, that Chinese soldiers were concentrated by the thousands across the border in Manchuria. The Pentagon feared that a sweep of Allied forces from the 38th parallel to the Yalu would bring those hordes into Korea.

That was why Truman flew to Wake Island to confer with MacArthur.

It was at that conference that MacArthur assured the President the Chinese would not intervenue in Korea—just as he now is assuring the country Russia would not intervene.

It was, of course, a brief time after MacArthur gave Truman the Wake Island assurances that the Chinese troops were swarming into Korea.

On the question of helping Chiang Kai-shek invade the Chinese mainland, MacArthur told Congress—as TAFT and other followers of that school have been saying for a long time—that such a venture would not involve American ground troops.

As MacArthur himself phrases it, "no man in his right mind" would favor sending American troops to invade China. But what he does advocate is that we give them "logistical support."

COULD WE QUIT?

This means, presumably, that we not only would provide Chiang's men with guns and tanks, but that we also would ferry them from Formosa to the mainland.

It means, presumably, that we would keep the sea lanes open to Formosa by use of our surface fleet, and that we would provide the air cover needed to get the invaders onto the beach.

If we take the MacArthur thesis at its face value, this country would be expected to wash its hands of the enterprise, once we got the troops and their supplies ashore.

But, of course, having sunk millions of dollars in equipment, having committed a large part of our Air Force and a goodly portion of our Navy to that enterprise, it is hard to believe we could wash our hands of it without assuring it success.

If, as predicted by many, Chiang's soldiers should fold up in the face of the Communist armies, once they got to the mainland, there would be, so the argument goes, no way for us to avoid taking over the whole affair.

Having set out to put Chiang back in power, this country, the anti-MacArthurites declare, would have to see him through to the end, regardless of how many ground divisions of American troops the action would require.

THE BIG QUESTION

The Pentagon and the White House are convinced they have plenty of arguments to answer everything MacArthur said before Congress, though no one has any illusions the administration can put on so good a show as the general staged.

The administration—as well as the MacArthur-Taft-Wherry spokesmen—will have full opportunity to present arguments in hearings which begin next week.

The question, of course, is how well can the administration counteract the effect of MacArthur's dramatic appearance? Can it show the flaws which it insists are contained in the MacArthur theses?

If it hopes to do so, it will have to overcome the present tendency for military leaders to duck into executive sessions of committee hearings every time they discuss delicate matters.

If the country is to be swayed by Gen. George C. Marshall, by Bradley, by Vandenberg, and by Sherman, they will have to talk to the congressional committees with as little inhibition as MacArthur displayed before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congres. And they will have to talk on—not off—the record.

Editorial From the St. Louis Star-Times on the Address of General MacArthur to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in all the mass of comment on General MacArthur's address to the Congress last week, an editorial in a great St. Louis newspaper, the Star-Times, is of special interest and merit because of its thoughtfulness and cool judgment in evaluing and analyzing what the general said. I commend this fine editorial to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS

All Americans, regardless of party or opinion, should feel gratitude to Douglas MacArthur for the elevated level upon which he kept his address to Congress yesterday. In the angry mood of the hour the general could have done incalculable harm by feeding the flames. In spite of the intensity of his feelings, which he communicated to his audience, he tried not to do so. He tried to stick to issues and to have them resolved on the highest plane of national interest.

The very dignity of his demeanor, however, makes it more difficult for the American people and their Congress to take the next step: to separate the issues from the personalities involved, the highly popular and dramatic martyr-hero and the President who fired him. Nevertheless, this must be done.

With much that General MacArthur said yesterday it is impossible to disagree, particularly his estimate of the present military situation. His confident and masterly presentation of the purely military situation was in sorry contrast to the administration's indecisive and confused handling of the political situation since the Korean involvement, though, of course, this does not mean that General MacArthur has the political answers either.

As he said, the military situation in Korea is now a stalemate. The American people share MacArthur's anguish and anxiety as the casualty lists grow longer. These now exceed 60,000 and no end is in sight.

MacArthur said, "While I was not consulted prior to the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea, that decision, from a military standpoint, proved a sound one." This statement is proof that Truman committed the United States to war in Asia without consulting the general in charge of that area, the man with the responsibility of winning the war. Perhaps, as MacArthur said, it turned out to be a correct military decision, at least until the Chinese Communists entered it. But MacArthur's testimony proves conclusively that Truman committed this Nation to a major war without full military consultation, just as he did so without a congressional declaration of war.

But the question is, what should be done now? The administration is taking the chance that a political settlement might be reached in Korea without enlarging the theater. It must be recognized frankly that this chance might not win. The Red Chinese have little hope of driving the U. N. forces out of Korea now unless they get considerable air support from Russia. If they get that air support and begin to advance, the U. N. forces may have no choice except to be driven out or to strike against the bases in China.

Douglas MacArthur doesn't want to continue taking that chance. He wants to take a different chance. He advocates four steps: "(1) The intensification of our economic blockade against China, (2) the imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast, (3) removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and of Manchuria, (4) removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa, with logistical support to contribute to their effective operations." An interesting omission is his former recommendation for bombing centers in China.

General MacArthur said that it was his understanding "that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff." This amounts to a charge that the views for which MacArthur has been criticized were held also by the President's chief military advisers. The fact on this point should be made clear.

Military considerations, of course, must be balanced with other considerations. General MacArthur said yesterday, "War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision." True. But what is victory in the Korean war? Would victory in Korea have any meaning or value if it triggered off the general war it is being fought to prevent?

MacArthur mentioned this and dismissed it briefly. He said, "the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves." This is certainly true. But the assumption that the Soviet Union will not honor its obligations under the Sino-Russian mutual assistance treaty of 1950 is not one to be made lightly. General MacArthur does not know what the Russians will do. He may be guessing wrong, just as he did when he judged that Red China would not intervene in Korea. His statement that the Chinese Communist intervention was "not contemplated" is an admission that he guessed wrong, because President Truman implied that he relied upon MacArthur's assurance on this point.

Another huge question is whether the United States could use Nationalist troops on the mainland and limit its aid to what General MacArthur called logistical support. Such support would have to include sea transport with supply and air cover. What would happen if the Nationalist soldiers proved as ineffective as they did before being driven off the mainland? Could the United States then avoid doing what MacArthur said "no man in his right mind would advocate"—sending our ground forces into continental China?

This raises the question of the effectiveness of Chiang's forces on Formosa. MacArthur complimented the Nationalists' government of that island, a view which is not borne out by the reports of dispassionate observers. The failure of Chiang's government and armies on the continent cannot simply be attributed, as the general seemed to try to do, to malicious gossip. How many of Chiang's 600,000 men are well trained, fit, and even moderately well equipped? How much and how long would it take to prepare them for a continental invasion? After they landed, would the United States be committed to restore Chiang to rule over the half billion Chinese whose misery and discontent MacArthur described so well? These are just a few of the facets of the problem that must be considered.

After yesterday's drama loses some of its punch, the American people and their Congress should do a lot of hard-headed questioning of the assumptions and arguments of both General MacArthur and the administration. MacArthur ended his speech by saying that he, like the old soldier of a ballad, would now just fade away. This is one thing that one can say with confidence isn't likely to happen. But it would be good if much of the emotionalism of the past 10 days would fade away. It would be particularly helpful if two treacherous words would just fade away. One of them is "warmonger." The other is "appeaser." General MacArthur isn't a warmonger because he frets against the stalemate in Korea. President Truman isn't an appeaser because he is striving to avoid the expansion of the Korean war into a larger war.

General MacArthur Favors Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur reaffirmed his support of statehood for Hawaii again on April 17 upon leaving Honolulu for the mainland.

The general's reference to this subject came in the course of his farewell address.

Under unanimous consent, I incorporate in the RECORD an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 17, telling of this occasion. It is as follows:

MACARTHUR FAVORS STATEHOOD; LEAVES FOR WELCOME AT SAN FRANCISCO

(By Moray Epstein)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur left Hawaii this morning with a warm farewell from 3,500 persons at Honolulu airport and his expressed hope to see the Territory become a State.

Rested and refreshed from their 33-hour stop-over, the general and his party took off in their plane *Bataan* at 9:30 a. m.

They are scheduled to arrive at San Francisco's municipal airport at 6 tonight, Hawaiian time.

Then will begin an expected tumultuous welcome from coast to coast.

All during the 10 minutes he was at the airport this morning, the general was genial and smiling.

As his car stopped on the runway about 15 feet from the visitors' enclosure, people behind the fence began to applaud.

He said his farewells to a line of top military officials—with a smile and a handshake for each—was introduce to Duke Kahanamoku, then was surrounded by newsmen.

General MacArthur looked around, allowed each radio announcer to identify himself for their broadcasts, then spoke.

HEART-WARMING WELCOME

"The welcome of Honolulu was heartwarming and marvelous in every way," he said. "In behalf of Mrs. MacArthur and all the members of the party, I thank you.

"We will not forget. When we meet again, I hope Hawaii will be a full-grown State of our beloved country. Aloha."

Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, close personal friend of General MacArthur, laughed, "I just want to say 'California, here we come.'"

The little group broke up and General MacArthur went to where his wife was standing. They turned to face the people behind the fence, and waved as a hundred camera shutters clicked.

WAVE FAREWELL

Everyone headed for the plane. The passengers went aboard with the MacArthurs last. There was a pause as the family stopped just outside the door to turn and wave a farewell.

Then they were inside and 2 minutes later the *Bataan* moved away to the east end of the field for its take-off.

An unexpected switch in plans Monday night moved the departure time ahead half an hour and shifted the point of take-off from Hickam Air Force Base.

A Navy spokesman today gave two official reasons for the airport change.

WANTED PUBLIC ADMITTED

1. The *Bataan* had to take off from Honolulu Airport because it requires a longer runway than is available at Hickam.

2. General MacArthur said he wanted the departure to be open to the public as much as possible.

Honolulu police officials assigned enough officers to the airport to maintain order and many compliments were heard from spectators, newsmen, and others for the way in which civil authorities handled the departure.

In addition to Mrs. MacArthur and their son Arthur, the *Bataan* carries as passengers seven military and personal friends of the general, all of whom arrived in the plane.

First stop is San Francisco. Arrival is scheduled in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday night to give General MacArthur time to get ready for his talk to Congress the following day.

THEN TO NEW YORK

Then after the congressional hearing, General MacArthur will leave for New York.

Advance reports of the receptions planned for the general tell of an exuberance of excitement in the big cities he will visit.

The general was received in Honolulu Monday with warm and sincere greetings.

There were rounds of applause along the route of his tour of Honolulu Monday afternoon.

There was flag waving and handkerchiefs, smiles were everywhere. But on the whole, it was a reserved welcome, more of an expression of respect than adoration.

Fourteen motorcycle policemen, 12 security police, 100 dismounted policemen—1 at each intersection on the route—and 10 transportation officers, made the tour go without a single hitch.

MORE THAN FOR PRESIDENT

More police officers were assigned to the tour detail than were used during President Truman's visit 6 months ago.

Everywhere along the road from Pearl Harbor to Punchbowl to the University of Hawaii and back to Pearl Harbor via Waikiki cars and busses were stopped to permit the procession to pass without delay.

Along Kapiolani Boulevard cars were stalled in a double row for a mile and a half.

MORE THAN ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND SEE

Police Capt. Alfred S. Harper estimated that close to half the population of Honolulu—more than 100,000 persons—lined the roads on which the general's party traveled.

The first stop after the nine-car caravan left from the Makalapa guest house where the MacArthurs stayed was in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl crater.

Army enlisted men stood at attention 50 feet apart along the entrance road to the cemetery.

The general's car stopped quickly in front of the cemetery flagpole. He pulled himself out, took a 4-foot orchid wreath from an Army aide, and stepped up on the raised platform around the base of the pole.

General MacArthur leaned the wreath against the pole, took a step backward, and stood stiffly in military salute.

For nearly a full minute he and other officers nearby held their salute.

When the general lowered his arm the several hundred persons watching the ceremony began to applaud.

TRIBUTE TO DEAD

General MacArthur stepped away from the pole, and, with a look of regret in his eyes, moved to the edge of the platform.

"I did not know the dignity of their dead," he said, slowly and deliberately to the newspapermen and photographers standing there.

"But I do know the glory of their death."

Then he walked to his dark green convertible with the five-star general's flag standing up from the front bumper. The caravan continued around the outer cemetery road up to the lookout pinnacle and back out of the crater.

Next stop was at the University of Hawaii, where more than 5,000 persons waited to see the general receive an honorary doctor of civil law degree.

But before the academic ceremony in Arthur L. Andrews Theater, the general went with University President Gregg M. Sinclair, Governor Stainback, Federal Judge J. Frank McLaughlin, and other dignitaries to the president's office.

ENROLLED AS SHRINER

There, Hosmer Rolph, potentate of the Aloha Shrine Temple, presented the general with an honorary life membership in the order.

He handed General MacArthur a red fez hat of the organization and the general put it on briefly.

After signing Dr. Sinclair's guest book the general and the group began to form the processional line to go into the stadium for the doctorate award.

Afterward, General MacArthur walked to his car, followed by the others in the tour party. And as his car moved out of the university gate, he turned to a group of Filipinos standing nearby.

"Mabuhay," he waved to them.

"Aloha," they shouted in return.

STOPS FOR SPECIAL LEI

There was only one more stop before the tour ended. On Kam highway just before Puuloa Road the caravan stopped for several minutes so that Mayor Wilson and members of the Honolulu Board of Supervisors could present the general with a lei wrapped in ti leaves.

As to the question of who provided the open car in which General MacArthur rode, the answer is that the Navy found it for him at the Waikiki U-Drive Co. It was a dark green 1951 Cadillac convertible.

The general—or the Navy—didn't pay any charge for it, incidentally. It was donated.

Gen. Charles G. Dawes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gen. Charles G. Dawes," published recently in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. CHARLES G. DAWES

A great many people will remember Charles G. Dawes as the man who blew up a congressional investigation by pounding the table and shouting "Hell 'n Maria."

The fact is that General Dawes was a public servant and a statesman of high order.

Long after he retired from public life, we sat in a little group where the discussion turned on international affairs and General Dawes spoke from the experience of having been Ambassador to Great Britain and the head of the American delegation which took part in the negotiation of the Dawes plan, one of the landmarks in the settlements after the First World War. We recall one of his statements.

"Successful international negotiations must begin," he said, "with the representatives of each nation having uppermost in mind the interest of their own nations. Along with that there must be the determination to adjust those interests to the common good of all."

We wondered then and we still wonder if the position of this country and of the world would not be better if some of our later day negotiators could have absorbed that advice.

Disaster in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, a prominent Chicago citizen and a veteran of World War II, now commanding the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade of the Illinois National Guard, answered the question, "Why MacArthur did not return." Having served under General MacArthur in the Pacific during World War II, and author of On the Eve of Victory With MacArthur, General Klein has time after time stressed MacArthur's great devotion to his country and his refusal to return until his job was done.

Now, after devoting a lifetime to the interests of his country, the great general and patriot, MacArthur, has been relieved of his command before his job was done.

General Klein aptly describes the feelings of all true Americans when he stated, upon being informed of General MacArthur's dismissal:

Not since Bataan has this Nation suffered a greater humiliation. We needed General MacArthur's leadership then—we need it now. The country is with him, and his vindication is assured.

The article written by General Klein entitled "Why MacArthur Did Not Return" follows:

WHY MACARTHUR DID NOT RETURN

Recent developments in Korea have solved the so-called mystery in connection with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's determination to remain at his post in Tokyo. In my report On the Eve of Victory dispatched by me in August 1945 from Manila to the War Department for publication in the Army and Navy Journal, I stated that MacArthur would come home only if and when his job in the Far East was finished.

Two things are obvious: One, that General MacArthur alone understood that his job was not finished; and two, that he alone foresaw today's events in Korea.

Now, at the impressive age of 70, the supreme commander is resolved to make sure that our men who gave their lives at Guadalcanal, Midway, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa, on the Normandy beachheads, at Anzio, and the Bulge, did not give their lives in vain.

Ever since the surrender of Japan, the American people have sought an answer to the question, "Why doesn't MacArthur come home?" He will return when his job is finished and when he is able to report to the American people, "mission completed."

A Faithful Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an Oakland, Calif., volunteer Federal worker spent a few days in Washington. He is a sufficiently remarkable man that his activities merit comment. He will be 90 years old during the present month. His name is John A. Davis.

At the outbreak of World War II, Mr. Davis was 81 years of age. Although he was active and alert both mentally and physically, he could not find employment because of his age. Desiring to assist his Government, he volunteered to contribute his services to the Office of Price Administration. Because he had 15 years of experience as a village postmaster his services were gladly accepted and he was placed in charge of the mail room of the Price Administration office. At the conclusion of hostilities he continued to perform the same service for the rent-control office and is still working at that office daily at the age of 90.

During World War II and the postwar period he has contributed more than 15,000 hours of service to his Government without compensation therefor, notwithstanding the fact that he does not have an independent income and must live frugally.

In commenting on his work for the Government, Mr. Davis has stated:

I have been pleased to render this service because it has given me an active interest during the later years of life; it has shown that older men and women can render real service to the Government and to private enterprise in case they are given an opportunity to do so. I am glad that provision has been made to take care of the aged, sick, and destitute, and I am happy that they are no longer sent to poorhouses. I believe that the greatest service that could be rendered to older folks by the Government, State, and people of the communities in which they live would be that of giving them an opportunity to earn their own living. Through my contributed service, I have had an opportunity to use my head and my hands and I have an interest in life that has kept me healthy, happy, and active.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis has been commended by many for his fine public service. I wish to add my commendations and thanks for the good work which Mr. Davis has done.

Veterans of Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team Told Good Citizenship First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the text of a speech made at the eighth anniversary banquet of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team at Waikiki Lau Yee Chai, Honolulu, Hawaii, on April 7, by Masato Doi. It follows:

The years have flown, and it is 8 years now since the occasion arose out of which grew the bond which binds us today. The crisis called forth the man; the response was not wanting. We knew then that no man is an island unto himself.

In a few weeks, as we watch the film "Go for Broke," we shall relive those years which saw us in the thick of battle. To each of us will return the strenuous times in the dripping heat of Shelby and the rugged hills of Italy. Perhaps we shall even smell the acrid stench of death and powder. And we may feel again that sense of impending danger about us. Before each of us will rise the faces of those we can see no more.

And there will be happier memories. The spicy, rollicking adventures which belong only to a soldier on furlough, the sudden gleam which lights a ragged Italian infant's eyes at the sight of a candy bar, or the pleasant friendships made with simple French families.

Above all, there may swell within us a deep pride as we recall our part in the fierce and valiant struggle to maintain a free world.

But, for most of us, that day of combat in the field of screaming shells and chattering guns is past—at least for a time. What remains is the continuing obligation to realize that way of life which was so bravely defended.

We were then citizens rising to meet the call of duty; we are now citizens still, though with a record of achievement under fire. Though the character of our obligations may have changed, the fundamental duty remains the same—the duty to live up to the promise of America. True, for us there was the peculiar task of proving our right to unsullied citizenship; but let us not forget that proving that point was only a part of the larger fight to be able to return to a community where we can live a free and full life.

Battle is not, never was, never will be, an end in itself. It is the cause for which the sword is borne that counts. And what good the heroic deeds of war if the reason for those deeds turns out to be but a hollow dream?

Four years have now passed since the incorporation of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club. We were formed not only to preserve the memory of our fallen comrades and to keep intact the strong bond

forged in the heat of battle, but also to continue the high traditions of the combat team in our activities in the community. The first flush of exciting organizational work is done. The community has responded generously to our appeals; the memory of the war years was not forgotten by it. And the club is now on firm foundation.

But we stand at the threshold of a critical period. We are the decorated Captain Hero come home to his former life as Plain Joe. Other days are come, and other heroes are born. And as a club, this fact strikes us full in the face. This is not to say that the record of the war years is a useless shadow. There are none who would take away from the glory inscribed in blood by all the veterans from the islands. But the laurels of the past are sandy ground on which to rest the promise of the future.

The task before us individually lies in the difficult and oftentimes onerous job of active and voluntary participation in the life of the community. The only reward may be an inner satisfaction of a life richly and freely lived. But it was for this opportunity to so live that so many of our comrades gave their lives. And we are yet too young to pasture like an old war horse.

It needs but little thought to see that the distinctive mark of the American way of life to which we pledged ourselves is that it is built on choice. Indeed, it was to be able to return to a society of choices that we "shot the works." But what good the fight if the opportunity to choose be not grasped?

This past week has brought splendid and encouraging news that statehood for the Territory may not be far off. Though already great, then more than ever will the significance of the ballot come to the fore. Then more than ever will there rest upon us the duty to keep faith with the dead and wear the mantle of unlimited citizenship with the distinction with which we served in war. As individuals, let us shoot the ballot with the same unerring accuracy and vigor that we shot the bullet.

Our organization is pledged "to honor and esteem the supreme sacrifice made by the deceased comrades." What better way to realize this aim than to foster and encourage an active awareness among the members to all community processes. The Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans' Club is not and cannot be a partisan political group. This is far from saying that its hands are tied on vital issues of the day. To let them go unnoticed is to live outside the life stream of the community. Perhaps the mark of valor may not mean the wisdom of ages, but surely the badge of the veteran signifies a serious and mature mind. It is not only our privilege but our obligation to use this great asset for the benefit of the community.

The past week has also brought portents of gloom. High figures talk in terms of approaching war and wholesale destruction. Already we see more of Hawaii's youths don the apparel of combat, and once again we look into the face of sorrow bent over a hero's grave. But disaster may strike closer and strike harder. Who more fit to meet this consequence than he who has already braved the bursting bombs?

I repeat again from John Donne that "no man is an island unto himself." Words more apt could not have been spoken of a group such as ours. The very heritage we bear is grounded on that concept. And the heritage points the star to which we must cling. If the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team has gained the respect and admiration of the community from which it sprang, it has done so only because it served a cause with valor. If the Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club is to retain that respect, it can only do so by clinging to the high tradition of unselfish sacrifice set on the battlefield.

Of course, the life of the club is not that of the lighthouse which fails to shine on itself. It cannot be that if it is to have a strong and active membership. And a weak and crumbling structure serves no purpose—to itself or others. The intricacy of life today compels the individuals to look in unfamiliar nooks for answers. The club must hold its resources ready to aid the member to find them. No job can be too small, and none too big, for the club to tackle for its membership. In past years, the club has successfully carried on intensive athletic and social programs. A job referral system is in operation. Blood-bank benefits have and will continue to relieve the unfortunate. And contemplated activities include forums on practical matters of interest, and financial aid to members in need. These benefits, and others as the need arises, must be extended in order that the club remain a virile unit.

Thus the future of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club lies in "going for broke" both in extending tangible benefits to the membership and in participating in community affairs and serving community needs. Practical wisdom dictates the first; mature reflection compels the second.

I close with this parting word: We are pledged to uphold the high tradition of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team. Assuming the name Four Hundred and Forty-second in itself casts upon us a trust to live up to the record. Our heritage tells us that the key to the future lies in the realization that we are citizens first and veterans second.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent statements on the food-for-India proposal.

One of the statements has been issued by the committee on international policy of the National Planning Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization, devoted to the study of public-interest questions. A list of the officers and sponsors of the organization subscribing to the statement on India is attached.

The second statement for insertion in the RECORD is addressed to the Rules Committee by the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, headed by Mr. Louis Heaton Pink, an outstanding and high-minded citizen of my State.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDIAN CRISIS

For the first time the Government of India has officially approached the United States for assistance in procuring grain needed for the food crisis in India. India's situation is precarious. The Government of India must prevent further deterioration of the standard of living if India is to maintain its economic and political stability.

India, a newly independent republic in Asia, remains noncommunist and antitotalitarian. Its per capita income is, however, desperately low—estimated at between $50 and $60 a year. Many of its 350,000,000 inhabitants are poor, underfed, ill-housed and inadequately clothed. Its standard of living has declined 16 percent from prewar levels. Aggravating this situation, the people of India are now faced with mass suffering and starvation due to the lack of food grains.

I

Food grains comprise the bulk of the Indian diet. The government of India has carried on a grow-more-food campaign designed to make India self-sufficient in food, to reduce the drain on its foreign exchange resources, and to free its limited resources for procurment abroad of goods needed for essential development to prevent further deterioration of its economy. Grain drawn from surplus producing areas in India is distributed through the rationing system to the deficit areas. The additional amount needed in the deficit areas is imported by the government of India. India's rationing system is one of the largest and most effective in the world. Ration prices are substantially below market prices. The ration system currently supplies additional food grains to 125,000,000 people, 45,000,000 of whom receive the "full" ration and the remainder a "partial" ration.

Last year the Government of India imported slightly more than 2,000,000 tons of food grains for distribution through its rationing system. It was hoped that import requirements would be less in 1951. In the summer of 1950, however, the prospects for good harvests which would be consumed in 1951 first dimmed and then vanished. Earthquakes, floods, droughts, and locust plagues cut domestic production of food grains by 6,000,000 tons. As the result, India was faced with a need for greatly increased imports of food grains from abroad. It is estimated that in 1951 over 9,500,000 tons of food grains are required to maintain the meager ration and to extend it temporarily to new areas. About 3,500,000 tons of food grains can be procured domestically for rationing purposes, leaving over 6,000,000 tons to be obtained from abroad.

India is purchasing 4,000,000 tons of food grains from countries all over the world, ranging from Pakistan and Burma to the United States. But it does not have the available foreign exchange for the remaining 2,000,000 tons. On December 16, 1950, Madame Pandit, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, officially requested aid in obtaining this amount from the United States Government.

II

Indian food consumption seems pitiably small by comparison with our standards. The average Indian caloric intake is put at 1,760, a figure lower than the internationally accepted subsistence level of 1,800; while the comparable figure in the United States is 3,244 and in Japan 2,050. For lack of grain in the ration-distribution system, grain rations were recently reduced from 12 ounces (approximately 900 calories).

Two million tons of food grains would be the ration requirement for 23,000,000 people for a year. In terms of the avarage caloric intake, 2,000,000 tons of food grains would represent the total food intake of about 15,000,000 people in India. If the 2,000,000 tons of food grains are not forthcoming, it will not mean that 15,000,000 people will be without food while all others receive the average amount, since the grain shortage will fall upon all recipients under the rationing system. Rather, it might be said that 15,000,000 units of starvation or deaths by starvation will be distributed over the total population, receiving food rations. The consequence of such action will be to weaken a larger part of the population by malnutri-

tion. Resistance to disease will be less and a great number of people will die, indirectly if not directly from starvation.

The people of India have looked to the west—to the United States—for aid in their time of crisis. India's very existence as a democratic and independent country may well be dependent upon our response to this request. While the Government of India has been emphatic in its control of communism in that country, the Communists have taken advantage of every opportunity to play upon the poverty of the Indian people. They are not missing this opportunity presented by the hunger of the people.

III

India is expending its foreign exchange in the procurement of food grains. It has resumed trade with Pakistan and in so doing has advanced over 300,000 tons nearer the goal of 4,000,000 tons which it is purchasing from abroad for 1951. It proposes to pay the ocean freight charges on the additional 2,000,000 tons.

On February 12 the President addressed to the Congress a message proposing emergency food aid for India. In view of the urgent need for assistance, he proposed that funds be appropriated immediately for 1,000,000 tons, deferring appropriation of funds for the remaining 1,000,000 tons until the situation has been further clarified.

Careful consideration of the appropriate terms upon which aid should be extended would involve investigation of India's ability to pay for the additional 2,000,000 tons of food grain in terms of India's economic position in coming years. In considering terms of aid, it must be recognized that the grain would not generate foreign exchange which could be used to repay the aid.

Since World War II, India's foreign-exchange earnings have been inadequate to meet import requirements. This has been true, despite the fact that, over most of this period, India has exercised rigorous import controls and has held consumption to relatively austere levels. India's international balance of payments for 1951 will probably show a small deficit, allowing for trade with Pakistan and India's payment of ocean freight for an additional 2,000,000 tons of grain. While India has met past trade deficits by drawing upon accumulated foreign-exchange assets, totaling about $4,900,000,000 in 1946, these assets have shrunk to less than $1,800,000,000 as the result of trade deficits, devaluation, and the partition of what was British India. This sum includes an estimated minimum requirement of $1,000,000,000 for currency backing and working capital.

If India is to halt economic deterioration, it must carry out its present plan for essential economic development in the shortest possible time. India's program to prevent further economic deterioration calls for a 6-year effort from July 1, 1951. This basic program (under the so-called Colombo plan) requires a total expenditure of almost $4,000,000,000, or an average of about $650,000,000 a year. While this is large in absolute terms, it is scarcely more than enough to assure maintenance of present low standards of living. Approximately $1,700,000,000 (about $290,000,000 a year) of the programed expenditures must be in foreign exchange. Drawing against reserves and utilizing current savings will provide about $100,000,000 annually, leaving a gap of around $190,000,000 annually in foreign exchange, which will have to come from abroad in the form of loans.

Already India owes $100,000,000 to the International Monetary Fund and $62,500,000 to the International Bank. It is estimated that an additional $1,250,000,000 of foreign capital is invested in India, involving substantial annual service payments. Consequently, India will have great difficulty in servicing fully the annual increment of about $190,000,000 in foreign loans needed for the program. The cost of the additional 2,000,000 tons of food grains needed by India is placed at $190,000,000. It is obvious that if India has to borrow this amount in order to obtain the food aid, the burden of loan service which would be imposed would cut heavily into the size of the development program which India could undertake.

India's present need for emergency food aid is in addition to its need for a 6-year program. The former serves to emphasize the need for halting the downward trend in India's standard of living so that India will be able to withstand possible emergencies in the future. In view of the urgent need for a development program and the critical nature of the time, it is important that India's present plan not be deterred. A loan to purchase this emergency requirement of food grains would prejudice India's ability to carry out its 6-year program and, thus, would strike at the stability desperately needed by India if it is to remain democratic.

IV

It is the considered judgment of the Committee on International Policy that the American people should respond promptly and in a spirit of Christian charity to the appeal from India for grain to feed her starving people. We do not believe that the welfare of this country will be served in any way by conditioning our response to political objectives or to recent differences of opinion expressed in the United Nations. On the contrary, we feel that hundreds of millions of Asiatics, both inside and outside of India, will regard the action which we take on this matter as a sure sign of our future intentions in the Far East.

We averted starvation, unrest, and the rise of communism in Europe by our bold and generous actions under the Marshall plan. We cannot afford to ignore the threat of starvation, unrest, and communism in India. We cannot afford to fail to take those limited actions which are asked of us to help the Indian Government meet this tragic situation. And in providing the funds necessary for the grain requested, we cannot afford to ask India to accept a loan which will delay her desperately needed development program by 1 year.

It is recommended that receipts in India from the sale of grain given by this country should be set aside as counterpart funds. The United States Government can properly ask to have the equal voice in the expenditure of these funds that it now has in the use of the counterpart funds of European countries participating in the Marshall plan. In this way, we can, in effect, use twice our appropriations for food for India: First, to feed the starving and, second, to aid India in her much needed economic development program.

Members of the NPA Committee on International Policy adopting this statement are: Frank Altschul, chairman, chairman of the board, General American Investors Co.; Louis Brownlow, vice chairman, Washington, D. C.; Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America; John F. Chapman, vice president-publisher, McGraw-Hill International Corp.; Charles C. Colby, professor of geography, University of Chicago; George P. Delaney, international representative, American Federation of Labor; Alvin E. Dodd, honorary president, American Management Association; John Kenneth Galbraith, department of economics, Harvard University; Carter Goodrich, professor of economics, Columbia University; Luther H. Gulick, president, Institute of Public Administration; Joseph D. McGoldrick, McGoldrick-Baldwin; Philip E. Mosely, department of public law and government, Columbia University; Charlton Ogburn, New York City; Lithgow Osborne, president, the American-Scandinavian Foundation; Clarence E. Pickett, honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee; Michael Ross, director, department of international affairs, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Theodore W. Schultz, professor of agricultural economics, University of Chicago; Wayne Chatfield Taylor, consultant, Economic Cooperation Administration; Robert West, special consultant to the Secretary on Migration, United States Department of State; David J. Winton, chairman of the board, Winton Lumber Co.

CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC UNION,
New York, N. Y., April 23, 1951.

To the Rules Committee, House of Representatives:

The Citizens Conference on International Economic Union earnestly urges that you release to Congress for action the bill providing 2,000,000 tons of grain for India, which has been before you since March 5.

We urge that the United States do the right and obvious thing by seeing that this grain gets where it is needed as promptly as possible. It is of prime importance that Congress does not weaken or destroy the virtue of our act by trying to make this assistance a matter of barter, or a loan instead of a grant, or subject to political conditions which would make it difficult or impossible for India to accept this needed help.

There is no question of the great need; much of the land of India which produces grain and rice has gone dry. Floods and earthquakes intensify the problem. No one questions that millions suffer from hunger. Informed sources report that the famine will probably equal if not exceed that of Bengal in 1943. It is admitted that we have sufficient grain in storage and can afford to send the 2,000,000 tons asked for without injury to our economy.

India has bought all she can get with the exchange which is available, from the United States, Australia, Canada, and other nations, but it is not enough. If India had the means or the dollar exchange she would undoubtedly prefer to buy grain, rather than ask for it on special terms. Prime Minister Nehru properly deprecates too much outside help since it means you do not strengthen yourself. But because India faces a crisis Nehru joins his people in asking for a grant from the United States.

Former President Hoover, experienced in aiding people in need, says that this is not politics, but Christianity. It is also an expression of our good-neighbor policy, to which we are rightly committed. Undoubtedly the majority of both parties in Congress will vote for this aid if given the chance.

It is intended that this grain be distributed by the ECA, experienced in such matters, under regulations similar to those used in Europe. There is no danger that our aid would be wasted or abused. The Government of India, while one of the newest in the world, has long years of British training behind it and has already demonstrated not only its interest in democracy but its capacity for administration.

The Committee on Rules will render a great service not only to India but to the United States, and to international cooperation and good will, if it promptly reports the bill before it, so that Congress can take action in the interest of India and of our relations with Asia and the rest of the world.

CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC UNION,
LOUIS H. PINK, *Chairman.*

More Information on India's Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto the text of an interview with Madame Pandit, India's Ambassador to the United States, regarding India's policy by the distinguished editor, Dr. Manfred George, published in the German-English newspaper, Aufbau, on Friday, March 30, 1951. This newspaper enjoys wide circulation and makes a distinct contribution to American democracy. It brings to bear upon our national and international problems the experience and intellect of many who have experienced the Nazi totalitarianism and lived through it, to help us to deal with modern-day Communists and other totalitarians:

The United States is rich, richer than many of its citizens know. India is poor, poorer than many people all over the world imagine. They think only of maharajahs and the luxury of their courts, of the legends and stories of rulers and princes.

This India has been disappearing; another India, slowly freeing herself from colonial rule, has taken her place. The new India is independent and proud, but poor, terribly poor.

Since the United States lost China, India is our most valuable remaining ally in Asia. We do not want to go into the problems of Asia in this connection, as they are very similar to those confronting us in Germany. India is a free country. Although close cooperation between two free and democratic countries such as the United States and India seems a matter of course, Congress has very ungraciously delayed the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of grain for India's starving population.

Certain circles in the United States have been disappointed by the attitude taken by Prime Minister Nehru. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH recently pointed out that although India repeatedly voted against us in the United Nations, she has voted more often for us. Yet, it is her latest vote that is being remembered. Senator SMITH, of course, is for India. But her statement reports the attitude that prevails among, unfortunately, certain Members of the House and Senate who advocate the policy of "do ut des"; they cannot tell humanitarian measures from political bargaining, and they feel that India must pay for 2,000,000 tons of grain by complete political subservience.

Close cooperation between the United States and India is one of the prerequisites of world peace; the jungle of misunderstandings between the two great nations must be cleared away. For this reason, I have asked the Indian Ambassador in Washington, Mme. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, to grant Aufbau the following interview.

In the waiting room of the Indian Embassy in Washington there is a picture which immediately attracts the attention of the visitor. It is the portrait of a man with intelligent and radiantly warm features—of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Republic of India. Like Gandhi, Nehru, and the present mistress of the Embassy, he has shared the fate of those who fought for India's independence. He suffered privations, and he spent years in jail. But his face does not show any bitterness; it reveals warmth, clouded by worry, and kindliness, shaded by sorrow. It is the face of India.

Facing a petite, grey-haired woman with a warm smile in the Ambassador's office, we thought of the day when the sister and close collaborator of India's Prime Minister clashed with General Smuts in the United Nations.

"When you scored your great victory over the policy of discrimination in South Africa in your capacity as leader of the official Indian delegation to the United Nations," we reminded her, "you delivered a speech before the General Assembly in which you said: 'We move in spite of difficulties toward a closer cooperation and the building of a world commonwealth. * * * The peoples of the world look with satisfaction to their fulfillment. Let us realize that human emotions and the needs of the world will not wait for an indefinite period.'

"At that time, the entire world seemed to share these feelings. Yet it now looks as if the Governments of the United States and of India were much farther apart than their peoples would like to see. May I ask a few questions about the misunderstandings which apparently have caused this situation?"

Answer: "Certainly. But don't forget that I am speaking only as the Indian Ambassador, and not for Prime Minister Nehru."

Question: "Do you think that there has recently been a shift in Indian public opinion which is unfavorable to the United States?"

Answer: "There has been no shift of any appreciable scale in Indian public opinion unfavorable to the United States. India is a democratic country and has a free press. The opinions and criticisms expressed by Indian newspaper editors do not always represent either the views of the government or the sentiments of the people. Similarly, it may be agued that editorial comments in some United States newspapers do not represent the views of the Government or the sentiments of the American people. Nevertheless, it is true that in recent months there have been misunderstandings as a result of apparent divergencies in the policies of the respective governments in relation to specific issues; for instance, the recognition of the government of new China. But these misunderstandings are trivial when viewed against the basic identity of interests as well as aspirations of the two peoples. This misunderstanding is also partly due to lack of information on which sound judgment can be based. The efforts of the United States State Department to secure congressional approval for the grant of food to aid India constitute the most eloquent testimony to the underlying bond of friendship which characterizes the relations between the two governments."

Question. "When Prime Minister Nehru recently called for the support of South Korea, he stated that 'the West lacked in subtlety and took the wrong approach to the mind and hearts of Asia.' Do you also think so, and to what did the Prime Minister specifically refer?"

Answer. "I believe the Prime Minister's reference to the lack of subtlety in the West's approach to the minds and hearts of Asia was of a general nature and did not cover the entire ground of East-West relationships. The Prime Minister has often spoken about the vast changes that have taken place in Asian countries in recent years and are bound to take place in the future, and has often stressed the fact that the understanding of Asia is one of the major tasks that confront western statesmanship. I do not know if the Prime Minister had any specific issue in mind when he made the statement quoted by you, but if he did, the reference could be to American policy in regard to the recognition of the People's Government of China."

Question. "I understand that 'western imperialism' is one of the most hated ideologies in Asia. Given the fact that the so-called imperialistic nations are pulling out of Asia, is she not bound to come under the influence of Soviet imperialism, in transforming her colonial countries into independent states? Will the Asiatic countries be strong enough to uphold their newly won national independence through social reforms, or are the social revolutionary forces stronger than the national forces?"

Answer. "It is, in my view, wrong to assume that the gradual withdrawal of imperial control from Asia will create a political vacuum which can be filled by communism alone. In fact, nationalism is today a much stronger force in Asia than communism. But nationalism is a political idea, and it does not fill empty stomachs. Asian nationalism, therefore, requires to be fortified by economic aid provided by those who are in a position to do so. The bad economic situation in many Asian countries recently liberated from imperial control should not be ascribed entirely to the fault of the peoples of those countries. Centuries of exploitation have laid the economy of those countries prostrate and have grievously circumscribed their power of recovery. The leadership of these countries is genuinely interested in the economic welfare of their peoples in a democratic and peaceful manner. Only thus can the forces of social disruption and violent agitation be held permanently in check. It is the feeling of Asian peoples that the United States is in a position to fortify the forces of nationalism by rendering them material aid in their economic difficulties. A lasting alliance between American democracy and Asian nationalism can thus be forged."

Question. "Although communism is unpopular in India, there seems to be sometimes lack of apprehension that it could possibly endanger India, or any other Asiatic nation. Is this correct, and how will and can India protect herself against communism?"

Answer. "There is an awareness in India of the possible dangers of communism and it is for this reason that the government is straining its resources to the utmost to better the economic condition of the country and raise the living standards of the people."

Question. "Is there any other way in which you combat communism?"

Answer. "We fight the idea. While we do not suppress the Communist Party as such, we punish those individuals who abuse the freedom granted them under the new constitution."

Question. "Aside from India, are there any other Asiatic nations strong enough to develop so-called third forces and act as buffers against the two great world powers?"

Answer. "India does not look upon herself either as a third force or as a buffer state between America and Soviet Russia. India wishes to remain on the friendliest terms with the United States, as she does also with other countries."

Question. "Considering Korea which is of deep concern to the entire world—if morality has to choose between two evils—between war or appeasement—which in your opinion is the lesser evil?"

Answer. "The alternatives in my opinion are not between war and appeasement, but between war and peace through conciliation. If India believed in appeasement, she would not have voted in support of the U. N. resolution branding North Korea an aggressor."

Question. "Some western circles find it extremely difficult to correlate their views and recent developments in Asia. Let me just refer to some statements made by General MacArthur which I think rather controversial. He spoke of the necessity of a strong will in the approach to the oriental mind. Which, in your opinion, is the main difficulty that must be overcome in this respect?"

Answer. "I do not think there are any great difficulties. It seems to me that the West will have to give up its old concepts of Asia, and to acknowledge the fact that tremendous changes have taken place. One cannot look at the problems of Asia with the eyes of yesterday. New independent states have come into existence. What the west needs, is a fundamental change of attitude, a change of heart, so-to-speak. Mainly, however, it will have to deal with Asia on terms of equality."

Question. "To sum up with a basic question: Which, in your opinion, is the basic difference in the attitude toward world peace between the mentality of India, or rather, Asia, and that of the West? Which—if any—is the common ground on which the two can meet, and how can such a meeting pave the way for an understanding with Russia?"

Answer: "This is a difficult question to answer in categorical terms. I think India's sympathies in the East-West cold war lie fundamentally with the West. India is opposed to totalitarianism and dictatorship, but her approach to the problem has such wide social and economic implications that no satisfactory solution can come out of global atomic warfare. Ways and means must therefore be constantly sought for securing a meeting ground between the two hostile camps. It is the Indian view that this quest should not be given up under any circumstances, and we feel that it is not yet too late to achieve this seeming miracle."

We then discussed general problems of Asiatic policy. In particular, I referred to two resolutions now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives; one, submitted by Congressmen JAVITS and RIBICOFF, suggests the foundation of an organization for far-eastern economic cooperation, a kind of Marshall plan for Asia; the other, which has the support of eight Republican and Democratic Representatives, advocates a Pacific pact for the common and mutual defense of far-eastern territories along the lines of the Atlantic Pact.

According to the Ambassador, India is deeply interested in any kind of cooperation; however, Madam Pandit feels that there are no prerequisites for the military side of such a pact, as the stature of the nations concerned is too unequal. She also pointed out that the ground for such close cooperation has been laid by history with the strong political, cultural, and philosophical ties between the peoples in question. Practical outlines were sketched at the India Relations Conference which was held in New Delhi several years ago. Similarly, the Colombo plan very actively contributes to the political and economic reorientation of Asia.

We left the Embassy with a feeling of deep satisfaction. This was a representative of a nation destined to play a leading role in world politics, who seemed to combine the wisdom of Asia with the liberal humanism of the west. This was a woman—with an entire nation standing behind her—so deeply concerned with the ideal of peace that she did not allow herself even the shadow of a doubt that peace could not be preserved.

Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following item by the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service which appeared in the Tidings, Los Angeles, Calif., of Friday, April 20, 1951:

NO OSSERVATORE VIEW ON MACARTHUR GIVEN

Last weekend there appeared in Osservatore Romano an article making reference to the removal of General MacArthur. The article expressed the opinion that the dismissal of the general could be regarded as a step indicating a desire for world peace.

General press accounts said that Osservatore Romano itself had made these observations, and reference was made to editorial comment by Osservatore Romano.

Osservatore Romano, while published in Vatican City, is not the official organ of the Vatican, except to the extent that from time to time it runs a column containing official Vatican pronouncements, always under the same heading, so that those familiar with the paper know that unless the material appears under this heading, it is not official.

Actually, the MacArthur comment was contained in an article which appears regularly twice a week in Osservatore Romano and is written by Giorgio Luigi Bernucci.

This regular article does not contain Vatican official views, but the views of the writer. It is headed Acta Diurna, and undertakes to review various news developments around the world.

The NCWC news service has been informed that in this instance, definitely the comment on the MacArthur case was the writer's own, and does not necessarily represent the views of Osservatore itself.

Time for Americans To Speak Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tidings of April 13, 1951:

TIME FOR AMERICANS TO SPEAK UP

The time has come for every American to speak up and help save his country, Father Bernard J. Hubbard, S. J., said here Tuesday night.

Lecturing before 4,000 persons in Shrine Auditorium at the very moment when the news of General MacArthur's dismissal was breaking, Father Hubbard characterized the general as "the greatest living American today."

"More than external aggression I fear internal cancer," the 63-year-old Jesuit explorer told his audience in reviewing United States postwar policies.

He described Dean Acheson, George Marshall, Owen Lattimore, and Alger Hiss as "architects of disaster."

WORSE BLUNDER

These men, said the Alaska veteran, "have already made a worse blunder than losing Asia by becoming spiritually and mentally underprivileged" and refusing to admit their blunders.

"Marshall," he declared, "is now just part of a machine. He is neither physically nor mentally the man he was several years ago."

Included in the lecturer's criticism of what he termed the "internationalists" was Ambassador at Large Philip Jessup "who shouldn't be at large."

The Jesuit authority on Alaska and the Arctic declared that America's major postwar errors were:

1. Refusal by the administration to permit Gen. George Patton to accept the Nazi surrender on grounds that such a surrender was to be received by the Russians instead. "This was the first appeasement," said Father Hubbard.

2. The Marshall mission to China which attempted to force on Nationalist China a coalition to the Communists.

YALTA INCIDENT

Referring to Yalta, Father Hubbard alleged that General MacArthur had sent a personal emissary to President Roosevelt there with the recommendation that Russia under no condition be allowed to enter the Pacific war.

The emissary was prevented by Alger Hiss and others from seeing the President and delivering MacArthur's recommendation.

Further errors which the lecturer attributed to the State Department included its refusal to utilize a total of 27 divisions of European patriots in exile who have a stake to fight for. These include Hungarian, Czech, and Polish soldiers with their officers.

He assailed the Department's refusal to permit use of 22 Spanish divisions, soldiers who have defeated communism in battle. If use of this total of 49 divisions were permitted, many of our 18-year-olds would be saved.

CASUALTIES QUESTIONED

The Jesuit priest questioned the accuracy of official Korea casualty figures, citing a high-ranking but unnamed private source which held that as of December 29, 1950, American casualties were already 60,000.

Other straightforward observations by the gray-haired weather-tanned priest were:

"I do not fear world war III if we teach China a few lessons. After all, there are troubles behind the iron curtain too."

"If we started war tomorrow the Russian Army would revolt. I have good reason for saying so. * * * The Russians, further, do not have enough petroleum to undertake a war." Father Hubbard said Russia's Baku oil fields were going dry, new wells were not producing anything, and consequently the Soviets had taken to exploratory drilling in the Arctic tundra.

As for any Russian threat to Alaska, Father Hubbard said no military operations against the Territory have any chance of success because of the morass, vast wilderness, and impossible conditions.

The Present Administration and the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "The Treason of 'Liberalism,'" written by Forrest Davis and published in the Freeman for February 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TREASON OF LIBERALISM

(By Forrest Davis)

The definitive word on the administration's funk over its unacknowledged war

was spoken the other day by a visiting cattleman. A plain man from the plains, unversed in the polemical subtleties of Capital shop talk, he found himself amidst statesmen from his own range country at a noggin party on Capitol Hill. What he heard caused this booted and usually self-contained man growing agitation. The company agreed that the President's attempt to smuggle Fair Deal socialism into his back-breaking defense budget was a piece of immature chicane. It was agreed that the administration's global military policy was so fantastically distorted that we could lose the war of the west before George Catlett Marshall discovers that Mao Tse-tung, not Chiang Kai-shek, is the enemy. It was suggested that the administration, by seconding Great Britain's ignominious project for a cease-fire parley with the enemy over Formosa and Japan, had betrayed an inner weakness signifying a profound malady of the spirit. At this point the cattleman broke into the practiced phraseology of his hosts, drawling with deadly earnestness:

"I reckon the time has come to take this Government away from the boys and hand it over to the men."

The cattleman could be forgiven for supposing that he had been whisked unaccountably to Lilliput. Events since last June have, in truth, dwarfed the chief men of the administration. Why, the visitor was asking, must a resolute people with its terrible swift sword still undrawn, immeasurably strong in field and factory, be so feebly yet so refractorily led? Why must our chief of state be so palpably unequal to his task, mistaking pugnacity for strength of character, mistaking Congress for the enemy, sheltering himself behind a timid, evasive United Nations; hearkening so uncritically to far-eastern defeatists and a London brazenly ready to violate the unity of the west to serve its abject appeasement of the common enemy in China? Why must the President still be advised on the highest levels by the friend of Alger Hiss and by the pessimistic, procrastinating septuagenarian General Marshall, sunk in reverie and failing to spur the arming of America as he had, when vigor and conviction were on him, in 1941?

Yet an inventory, no matter how explicit of our rulers' weaknesses and follies comes short of giving us a true understanding of what ails our Government in an hour of high destiny. The answer to the moral confusion, the flabby tone, the unwillingness to meet with a knightly spirit our appointed task of manning the marches of the west against the barbarian, lies deeper than personality. Should not the debilitating malaise which gives to life in Washington its sense of negation, empty of honor and dignity, be diagnosed as a failure of the liberal spirit? Is it not the prevailing political liberalism of the midcentury, that potpourri of indiscriminate do-goodism trending into statism and Marxism and blending so indistinguishably with treason, that is the deepest enemy of the traditional America and the west? It is this liberalism which, since World War I, has under the guise of welfare surrendered society after society into black reaction.

The unnerved, indecisive liberal socialism of Prince Lwow and Kerensky, instead of standing the implacably malign Lenin before a firing squad, allowed him to seize power and go on to blight a whole era with a senseless, murderous political adventurism known as communism. So it was with the liberalism of Weimar, shrinking from the decapitation of Hitler and the Communist traitors and ending in nazism. It is liberal socialism that has produced the unrecognizably neurotic Britain, disloyal to the West. Above all, it is liberalism which, motivated to whatever degree by treachery, has cost us China, has enfeebled our offensive spirit and blunted our strategical judgment about our vital interest in the western Pacific. That liberalism, preached with the fervor of a Byzantine heresy by glib intellectuals tired of the west, unequal to its overwhelming culture, eager to efface the masses whom they fear in the Leviathan state, is, I submit, behind our defensive faltering before the senior totalitarian state.

There is a deceptiveness about the facade of affairs in Washington. The administration calls men to the colors, it busies itself with a gradual, somewhat grudging mobilization of the economy. Intent on Europe first, it quarrels with its critics, evading the grim lesson that our No. 1 strategical problem is the western Pacific; that, if we lose Japan, we lose Alaska, and Europe. The administration still bristles at suggestions that it root out the fifth column that has demonstrably betrayed us. It hesitates to summon the people to make a cause out of the war that has been forced upon them. Where is our dedication, where our determination (as in the case of our determination to destroy Hitler) to rid the world of the wicked men in the Kremlin, to free the peoples, including their own, whom they have enslaved, so that the world may return to peaceful ways?

In a sense not too remote, the troubled observer may be reminded of the contrast between reality and semblance in the Petrograd of 1916. The ministers of the provisional government went through the motions of ruling mother Russia; they dispatched troops, they issued manifestoes, yet all they did was misdirected. And, while foreign diplomats reported the government secure, the conspirators at the Smolny convent forged their iron coup unmolested.

We are indebted to Leon Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolution for a description of the paradoxically normal scene as Russia drifted into ruin: the great bureaucracies of empire functioning, trams running through the dirty October snow, guards mounted at the winter palace, the ballet, the theater, the schools, the cafes, the shops pursuing their wonted course. The press, from Tsarist to Bolshevist, appeared as usual on the morning after Lenin had appropriated the strategic centers with no recognition of that cataclysmic occurrence. We do not face insurrection, our extremity is presumably less grave, yet it may be legitimately doubted that our rulers are nearer the core of reality than the uncomprehending statesmen and citizens of Petrograd in its final hours of freedom.

The great bureaucracies of Washington function, the trolleys run, but the somnambulism is broken only by strong, heartening utterances in Congress and an occasional lonely journalistic voice. For, if the behavior of the administration's chief men is definitely disturbing, the chorus of their journalistic mentors and spokesmen is downright frightening. The administration organ, the Washington Post, cravenly advises the Government to buy off Mao Tse-tung with Formosa. Walter Lippmann and Marquis Childs, Post columnists, warn their friends in the Government to accept Communist command of China as a fait accompli which must on no account be questioned.

True it is that the Post has invariably upheld the liberal abandonment of China, unfailingly sought to shield officials accused of subversion. In the voluminous lexicon of liberal journalism there is no word for treason. It is true also that Mr. Lippmann is an equivocal Mercury and Mr. Childs brings to world problems the dewy ardors of a sociology instructor or a Sri Nehru. Yet these journalists exercise enormous sway in the upper reaches of the administration and, with Drew Pearson and the fratres Alsop, are the chosen instruments through which the propaganda of Secretaries Acheson and Marshall reaches the public.

To top all this, the Alsops recently disclosed a state of mind amongst the administration's leaders so shocking that in ruder times it would have called out the fury of Congress and people. What they noted was the bitter fact that these highest functionaries were hoping that our beachhead in Korea will be untenable. The leading men of our Government, the Alsops were saying, hoped for the defeat, humiliation, and death of our forces and the forcible abandonment of our only position on mainland Asia. How defeatist, we are entitled to ask the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, can you get?

There is, of course, a direction to all this scuttle: the unwillingness to free MacArthur to wage war in the enemy's back areas, to take offensive action against Communist China, to arm our long-suffering friends, the Nationalist Chinese; to make the martial Japanese our allies, to face up to our grievous peril and our real opportunities in the Far East. To draw our strength and attention away from the western Pacific, mastery of which contains Soviet power on that flank, shielding Alaska and the homeland, is prima facie in Soviet interest.

The Kremlin knows, if the administration does not, that the loss of the western Pacific would be almost, if not quite, as calamitous for us as the loss of Western Europe. (See Why Stalin Needs Asia in the Freeman of January 22.) What has happened, among other things of lesser import, is that the "liberal" world, to which belong the administration, the British Socialists, Nehru, and much of the seaboard American press, long ago decreed that the Soviet world should have China and be undisturbed in possession. Worse than that in moral terms, under a hypocritical cloak of inconceivable impertinence, the "liberal" world pretended that the welfare of the Chinese masses would be somehow advanced under the murderous Soviet terror.

Where did this "liberal" commitment to Chinese communism cross the line into treason? How near does this corruption reach into the heart of the government? Where in all this sorry situation is the President? It is freely supposed in Washington that Mr. Truman is ruled in matters of high policy by Acheson and Marshall, as in domestic questions such professional "liberals" as Max Lowenthal instruct him. If the protractedly juvenile Louis XIII had his Cardinal Richelieu and Father Joseph, Mr. Truman, it is said, has his eminence rouge in Acheson, his eminence grise in Marshall. The character of Mr. Acheson's "liberal" statesmanship was exhaustively treated in the Freeman of last December 11. The stages by which the President's gray eminence advanced from professional soldier to "liberal" statesman merit an equally close study if he is to remain in public life. (The persistent reports that Marshall is to give up the Defense Department are often coupled with the prediction that the President is to place him in an even more intimate relationship to national policy as his personal chief of staff.)

Although General Marshall's attitudes to the major strategy of World War II earned him the "friendship" of Stalin and Voroshilov (see p. 783, "Roosevelt and Hopkins" by Robert E. Sherwood) and constitute a provocative pattern from the second-front agitation to the prolongation of the Japanese war, it is sufficient unto the day to remember that his postwar mission to China was perhaps the most disastrous piece of diplomacy ever undertaken by an American. When General Marshall went to China the Nationalists (as Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault reviewed the situation in his Way of a Fighter) were everywhere victorious and bade fair soon to end Communist military power in China. When General Marshall departed 15 months later, after imposing a truce, opening the Kalgan Pass, denying further military assistance to Chiang Kai-shek and demanding Communist inclusion in the government, it was apparent that the Reds were to have China. While

it would be as bizarre to suggest that the general was actuated by improper motives as to accuse a most reverend archbishop of secretly practicing heresy, yet he must bear equally with the President and the red eminence the blame for the Chinese statecraft that has brought us face to face with Soviet power in Asia. If it is our fate to redeem China from Bolshevism, as I believe it to be, how can we ride that river with General Marshall?

Left to himself, Mr. Truman is without doubt as sincere and uncomplicated a patriot as the Midlands produce. Had he more acumen, more familiarity with dialectical mendacity, and greater self assurance in the field of ideas, he might very well have seen through the gigantic "liberal" imposture over China, the hoax of "liberal" agrarianism. The honest Missouri farmer in him, if unnetted in the "liberal" web, would have rooted the potential quislings from his administration and would have been affronted by the infamous Tydings investigation. Such a Truman would not have lost China.

If it is a national misfortune, it is no less a personal tragedy that the epochal issues of these times have been crowded upon Mr. Truman. If no man ever brought fewer gifts to the Presidency, no President ever less sought the office in the first instance. We recall with retrospective pathos the scene at the Chicago convention when, munching a hot dog, the unambitious Senator from Missouri heard with incredulity, aversion and, it may well be, foreboding that he had been chosen to run with the already stricken Roosevelt.

My own recollection goes back to a spring day in 1944 when, at the end of a lengthy private talk with President Roosevelt at the White House, he let it be known by indirection that he would run for a fourth term. His reasons, which strike us with a wry irony these days, were summed up in his candidly avowed belief that no other American was qualified to carry the country through the war and the coming peace. Mr. Roosevelt discoursed upon his own qualifications, his unique familiarity with the conduct of the war, with the great world of international affairs and, owing to frequent visits and many personal friendships there, with Europe. It was no secret that he was contrasting his competence with that of his prospective opponent, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, a rival whom he affected to hold in lighthearted scorn as a young upstart in world matters.

"We can't, you know," Mr. Roosevelt recapitulated, "we really can't have an ignoramus for President."

In his work, "Roosevelt and Hopkins," Mr. Sherwood recalls another painfully prophetic incident of the 1944 campaign. Helping Mr. Roosevelt write a speech, the author proposed that they use a recent observation of Winston Churchill's that the United States now stood "at the highest pinnacle of her power and fame." This the President vetoed, explaining, to Sherwood's mystification, "What Winston says may be true at the moment but I'd hate to say it because we may be headed before very long for the pinnacle of our weakness" (sic). We are all the losers because Mr. Sherwood, as he confesses, improvidently failed to inquire what lay behind the astonishing utterance. Mr. Roosevelt was an extraordinarily complex human being with deep intuitions. Did he at the moment possess second sight? Was he being clairvoyant about the inability of the "liberal" mentality to contain the Soviet menace? Did he apprehend that his own world policy would inevitably plunge us into confusion and decay? In a presentiment of his own approaching death, did he suffer a twinge of compunction over the succession? Or was there perhaps a premonition of the dire consequences recorded in "Lalla Rookh," when

"Treason, like a deadly blight
Comes o'er the councils of the brave
And blasts them in their hour of might?"

Mr. Roosevelt left the American people a number of legacies, among them Mr. Truman. Another is the United Nations, a typically frivolous liberal improvization; a pretentious and, as it now turns out, a dangerous instrumentality of world order foredoomed, as was apparent to any penetrating mind in 1945, by the utter irreconcilability of the two worlds, free and slave. Still another Roosevelt inheritance is the policy of surrender to the Soviet Union in Asia. At Teheran and Yalta the President restored to Stalin what the Czars had lost in 1905, ascendancy in Manchuria.

It is true that Mr. Roosevelt, exemplifying the divorce between rhetoric and reality too frequent in his career, did not intend actually throwing China to the Communist wolves. Sumner Welles, writing in the current Foreign Affairs, quotes him as observing during a pre-Teheran conversation in 1943 that "a stable China, recognized as one of the great powers, would be a barrier to Soviet ambitions in the Far East and serve as a centripetal force in Asia." This would also, Mr. Roosevelt reasoned, be of the "utmost value in limiting the effects of the revolutionary tidal wave already looming in the Far East." If only Roosevelt the strategical thinker, not Roosevelt the suitor for the bloodstained Stalin's good opinion, had prevailed at Teheran and Yalta.

The late President had an easier time of it with his war than Truman with his. The "liberal" Roosevelt could prosecute a wholehearted war to spare the world nazism because "liberalism" single-mindedly hated nazism. The "liberal" Truman finds his reluctant will to wage war on the Bolshevik motherland hampered by all sorts of psychological reservations because toward nazism's hideous parent, bolshevism, the liberal is at least subconsciously of two minds. In practical terms, he thinks himself against bolshevism in Europe, while encouraging it in Asia.

The failure of the liberal to safeguard the towering edifice of the west at this stage is not so much because of vacillation, a crisis of nerves or bewilderment in his choice of values but because, in embracing the welfare state, he is compromised with evil. He has looked upon the face of evil and found it half good. How can he save a truly liberal, fluid, traditional society which he has sworn to destroy from Socialists, no matter how brutish, in whom he finds mirrored his own desire for the all-encompassing state that inevitably consumes the individual? If one fears for his country he scarcely dares contemplate the contrast between the clear-sighted, cunning, and remorseless stratagems of the thuggerei of the Kremlin and the shallow, halfhearted, and ambivalent statecraft of Washington and London.

So it is that at the pinnacle of our weakness so many distressed Americans have come deeply to mistrust their Presidential leadership. The unprecedented volume of their mail since early in December to the White House and the Hill bespeaks their conviction that there is something rotten in Washington. If the intelligentsia is baffled and distraught, the people are not. They are liberals in the old sense. For three and a half centuries they have been operating a welfare society—not a welfare state. If Mr. Truman will forgive a gratuitous piece of advice, it is this: Why not give up the unreliable liberal intellectuals and throw in with the people?

The introspective gray eminence revealed, while launching his Marshall plan at Harvard some time ago, that he was troubled by his reflections on the Peloponnesian wars wherein the democratic Athens went down before the totalitarian Sparta. In his musings on the fate of Athens he must have encountered the brilliant and perfidious Alcibiades, who betrayed his country. May I suggest that a fitter subject for the meditations of an old soldier—and of the President of a country entering a war of hemispheres—is that stern patriot Cato the Elder. If Alcibiades was a liberal, Cato was a Tory. Besides identifying the enemy of his country and his culture, Cato exhibited no patience with the liberal innovations being lugged into his society by the Greeks. (Read Russians for Greeks.) In a time of trouble there is something comfortin,, about the simple patriotism of an upright Tory.

Behind the tumultous verbiage of these days there is one fundamental question for an American to answer: When this war is over do you want the writs to run from Washington, or Moscow, to the ends of the earth? It will be one way or other. The Tory answers that question without hesitation.

It was in the Cato vein that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) spoke in mid-December in a speech far too little regarded. Senator JOHNSON is chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee. He said:

"Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World? That is a question which we still have it in our power to answer. If we delay longer we can expect nothing but darkness and defeat and desolation. If we answer the challenge with courage and confidence, and with the ability of which we are capable, we can, I am sure, triumph over our foes."

At this hour, when we are experiencing history at its most intense, the Congress, on both sides of its aisles, is affording a leadership worthy of its best traditions. If the President cares to turn to and fight a war, he might profitably draw upon that source of strength. Why not draft Senator JOHNSON for Secretary of Defense? And if he wants a Secretary of State who understands the question of Asia, there is Senator PAUL F. DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) who, although a practicing liberal, transcends that aberration when he allows the marine of his World War II days to take possession of him.

Privilege of Statehood Requested by Soldiers From Hawaii on Korean Battle Front

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to present a letter from Maj. Bert N. Nishimura, United States Infantry, that was written late in March while he was serving on the Korean battle front. The author of this letter is a native-born American citizen of the Territory of Hawaii who has served in the Korean action since the outset and also served in World War II.

The letter addressed to "Mrs. President" speaks for itself, and is as follows:

SOMEWHERE IN KOREA.

DEAR MRS. PRESIDENT: The other day a group of us was seated around a hutment

stove. We were discussing the inequalities and injustices surrounding some minor military matter. The icy wind sweeping down from the Manchurian wastes and the spasms of homesickness probably accounted for the universal agreement among us warriors now stranded in Korea. All of a sudden someone suggested we write our complaints to our various Congressmen. We thought that a capital idea, so we retired to our corners to begin our epistles.

While mentally arranging my thoughts so that my letter would not sound too incoherent I stumbled upon a gigantic blunder. I had no Congressmen to whom to write.

No Congressman to whom I could address my complaint.

No Congressman who could represent me and my gripes on the Senate or the House floor.

This was catastrophic.

This was more horrible than taxation without representation. This was downright un-American. This was discrimination.

I could write to our honorable Delegate from the Territory, who is a good personal friend, and he could take it to the floor of the House. When it comes time to vote, however, he will have to remain silent. He could tramp the Senate Chambers and speak informally to the elected representatives, but he cannot cast a vote. He can speak. He will be heard. But he cannot vote.

This is the reason I am addressing this letter to you, Mrs. President.

We, who were at Pearl Harbor when the first bombs fell that fateful December morning in 1941 and whose blood flowed red, are Americans who cannot write to our Congressmen because we have none. We who stormed hill 609 at north Africa and were repulsed at Cassino in Italy have no one to vote "aye" or "nay" in the congressional halls of our great Nation. We whose brothers are buried beneath neat white crosses in the National Cemetery at Punchbowl in Hawaii after having fallen forever in the lonely atolls of the Pacific and the wooded hills of France cannot cast a vote to help elect the chosen head of our great Nation.

Our parents came from the far corners of the world—the warm shores of the Azores, the islands of the Philippines, the Continent of China, the dimunitive land of Japan, the mountainous ranges of Korea, and are offsprings of the seekers of liberty from the tyrannies of Europe. We attended the schools of democracy. We early learned to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States. We swatted a baseball on the diamond, chewed gum, and ate hotdogs in the bleachers, and we raced our hot rods on the streets of our native lands. We bowed our heads in reverent prayer, each free to worships the God of his own choosing. We are Americans, were taught Americanism, and are living as Americans.

In this far-off heretofore little-known peninsula of Korea our men are bearing arms in defense of American principles. The names belonging to these men represent Americans of all racial origins—Thurston, Medeiros, Kealoha, Smith, Torres, Takamura, Wong, Kim, Du Montier, and MacAllister. These men are a United Nations themselves.

Hawaii has been waiting for a long time to attain statehood. America was fighting against the principle of taxation without representation when the Sandwich Islands were discovered by Capt. James Cook in 1778. The traditions of Americanism, brought into the islands by the missionaries in 1820, were nurtured and given meaning in the years that followed. In 1900 the Territory of Hawaii became an integral part of the United States, by choice and election of the people. Fifty years have passed since Hawaii entered into apprenticeship for statehood. During that period two wars have been fought, the second so that nations may be permitted to choose their own form of government without undue influence and interference from without. Now, we are joined with other freedom-loving nations in stopping aggression which threatens to engulf the entire world.

Hawaii has made her choice. Hawaii has indicated her desire to become the forty-ninth State. She has fulfilled her obligations. Her citizens have demonstrated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, their capacity to discharge the full responsibilities of citizenship. They are entitled to the privileges of full membership in the Union of States.

Mrs. President, I could write to the honorable Delegate from Hawaii. He has reiterated these statements so often he knows them by heart. I could write to Mr. President, but he is engulfed with the problems of state, of the world, of civilization. That is why I am addressing this to you.

Write to my Congressman? I cannot. I have none.

As we were discussing, a group of us men now fighting in Korea * * *.

I have forgotten why we were going to write. It has become unimportant now. It is trivial. It has become another passing gripe of a war-weary lad. I was there on December 7. I was there in Italy and in France where I saw my comrades fall. I was there in Japan when the tenets of democracy were being preached during the occupation. Now, I am here in Korea.

Before this is over, may I, will I, have a Congressman to whom I can refer my silly little gripes?

BERT N. NISHIMURA,
Major, Infantry.

The $64 Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 23 issue of Freeman:

CAN WE ESCAPE FROM VICTORY
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is a fact of tremendous historical irony that America's survival as an independent world power depends on the speed with which it can escape from the consequences of its victory in the late war. This victory has become a trap deadlier than the one which the Chinese Communist troops almost closed around the Marines in the wild hills of North Korea.

Never in history has a great war been fought for so many demonstrable illusions. Never has retribution for succumbing to illusions been so swift and so terrible.

It was an illusion that Chiang Kai-shek was worth backing to the limit against Japan—and not worth raising a finger for when he was threatened by the Kremlin-sponsored Chinese Communists. It was an illusion that these Communists were nice agrarian reformers, Jeffersonian democrats who scarcely knew there was such a place as Moscow. It was an illusion that the totalitarian threat to America could be banished by helping the oldest and largest totalitarian power in the world swell far beyond its legitimate ethnic and historical frontiers.

It was an illusion that a combination of appeasement and personal charm could melt away designs of conquest and domination that were deeply rooted in Russian history and Communist philosophy. It was an illusion to believe that a powerful Soviet Union would play the role of cooperative do-gooder in a shattered and impoverished Eurasia. It was an illusion that a curtain of dollars would be a counterweight to a curtain of iron. It was an illusion to believe that the balance of power could be destroyed in Europe and Asia without setting the stage for world war III.

The fruit that is harvested from seeds of illusion is always bitter. How bitter may be judged by one startling, simple, incontrovertible fact. Only if we succeed in reversing virtually every major aim and decision of Franklin D. Roosevelt, only if we make a rubbish heap of the assumptions of Teheran and Yalta, Cairo and Potsdam, is there a prospect that we may breathe free from the nightmare atmosphere of terror that has descended on us since the Korean debacle.

It has now become a commonplace for men in the highest and most responsible official positions to say that we are in a far more dangerous situation than we were at any time during the Second World War. Winston Churchill recognized this almost 3 years ago when he wrote in the introduction to his memoirs of the war: "We lie in the grip of even worse perils than those we have surmounted." (What a commentary on the hollowness of the victory that was celebrated in 1945.)

During the intervening 3 years the situation of the free world has deteriorated catastrophically. China has been lost to implacably hostile Communist rulers. The Soviet Union has broken the American monopoly of the atomic bomb. The Kremlin has felt strong enough to heat up the cold war appreciably. Until 1950 no army, in the postwar period, had marched across a clearly defined frontier. Soviet methods of aggression had been indirect: The support of an exhausting civil war in Greece, the blockade of the western sectors of Berlin. Along with these active steps went the methodical consolidation of Communist police-state terrorist methods of rule in the East European satellite states and the routine incitation to internal strife, sabotage, and treason in all non-Communist countries.

The Politburo in 1950 felt sufficiently confident to throw first its North Korean satellite, then its Chinese satellite, into open large-scale warfare. No one can know how long it will be before armadas of Soviet airplanes take off on missions of destruction, before Soviet tanks begin to roll into Western Europe, Yugoslavia, Turkey, or Iran. But the breathing space may be uncomfortably short, far shorter than the span of several years which has been comfortably reckoned with by our military and diplomatic planners.

The Korean crisis in a swift blinding flash showed a picture of appalling American national weakness. The greater part of the United States combat army suffered defeat, not at the hands of the Red Army, but from a Soviet dependency with a fraction of Soviet war potential.

By one of the ironies of the calendar the Red Chinese attack on American and other U. N. forces in Korea closely coincided with the ninth anniversary of Pearl Harbor. The toll of casualties was much heavier in Korea than at Pearl Harbor. The speech which Wu Hsiu-chuan delivered at the United Nations simultaneously with the unleashing of the offensive in Korea was more abusive, threatening, and truculent than the Japanese note which was delivered in Washington at the time when Pearl Harbor was bombed. But no Cordell Hull arose to tell him off.

After Pearl Harbor the most severe critics of Roosevelt's foreign policy recognized that there was no alternative except to fight back. The war service of such prominent isolationists as Charles A. Lindbergh, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Hanford MacNider, and Philip La Follette was outstanding.

But the reaction to Red China's Pearl Harbor was pitiful in its weakness. The United Nations, instead of promptly branding the Peiping regime as an aggressor and a war criminal, devoted all its energy to thinking up schemes of appeasement that could be passed off as something else.

The United States refrained from the most obvious effective measures of self-defense: Bombing of Chinese military, industrial, and communication centers, acceptance of Chinese Nationalist troops as full allies, prompt rearming of the Japanese. If the fiction of Chinese volunteers could be maintained, why not Japanese volunteers on the other side? And Korea is far more essential to the security of Japan than it is to the security of the United States.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, leading the fight to beat down Senator KNOWLAND'S proposal to appropriate funds to aid Chiang Kai-shek, posed the strange question: "Do the Senators want an all-out war with Red China?"

Some of the hard-pressed men on the Hungnam beachhead might be pardoned for asking what the Senator's idea of an all-out war is. If throwing hundreds of thousands of men into a concerted offensive designed to destroy the U. N. forces is not all-out war, words would seem to have lost their meaning.

To appreciate the full measure of United States humiliation, imagine that, after Pearl Harbor, we had pleaded through an intermediary for a cease fire with Japan. Or suppose that Great Britain and France, after the fall of Poland, had asked Hitler for a cease fire. The French had a word for this last suggestion. They called it "le Munich sanglant," the bloody Munich. It is the immense political and moral disaster of a bloody Munich that the United States and the United Nations assumed when they failed to react promptly and decisively to the challenge of the Chinese Communist attack.

The most respectable excuse for this bloody Munich is an ominous confession of weakness in the face of dire peril. It is argued that the bombing of Chinese bases would provoke the intervention of Soviet air and naval forces and perhaps touch off undisguised war with the Soviet Union. Because our battered forces in Korea represent the greater part of our combat army, so the argument runs, we should try to buy time at almost any price. But there is a double edge to this argument.

If we must refrain from normal measures of self-defense in the face of Chinese Communist aggression, for fear of provoking Soviet attack, is not any move calculated to build up American national power likely to provoke such an attack? We have been blackmailed in the Far East. We are being blackmailed in Europe with the threat that the Soviet Union will not tolerate the long overdue rearmament of free Germany. Tomorrow this method of blackmail may be extended to the point of suggesting that any strengthening of our own Armed Forces will be regarded as provocative in the Kremlin and will not be tolerated. Once a nation starts down on the slippery slope of appeasement, or surrender to blackmail, it is hard to know where the process will stop.

The tragic irony of our present plight is that it stems directly from measures which the Roosevelt administration held up as goals of victory, to be achieved by the sacrifice of American blood and treasure. Eight of the more important of these measures, and their consequences, may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. The two chief characteristics of Roosevelt's policy toward Germany were the unconditional surrender slogan and the Morgenthau plan. Design of the first was annihilation of Germany as an independent power. Purpose of the second, even as watered down in the Potsdam Declaration and the early occupation regulations, was the economic strangulation of Germany by the destruction or drastic limitation of many of its important industries. It was assumed also that Germany would be completely and permanently disarmed.

But the conditions of 1950, only 5 years after the Carthaginian peace that was sketched in outline at Potsdam, forced the United States to plead with the Germans to consent to be rearmed, with some restrictions. I have never talked with a military expert who considered Western Europe defensible without the use of German ground forces.

However, after they have seen their military leaders indiscriminately branded as criminals, their war potential systematically destroyed, their country left defenseless, except for a thin screen of occupation troops, the Germans are understandably cool toward the idea of assuming the risks and burdens of rearmament except on a basis of full political and economic equality.

2. Another total victory that has worked out badly is the destruction of the Japanese Empire and of all Japanese armed force. The new Japanese constitution, written in General MacArthur's headquarters and translated back into Japanese, solemnly renounces the use of force in international relations. But so long as this admirable idea is not shared by the masters of the Soviet Union, and of Communist China, east Asia is as indefensible without the participation of Japan as Western Europe is without the full association of Germany.

A Japanese army, keeping the historic watch against Russia on the Yalu or, better yet, on the Amur, would be a godsend to the harassed military planners in the Pentagon today. Had Korea and Formosa been left in some form of association with Japan, with provision for more liberal administration, Japan, checked in its extravagant design of ruling all east Asia, could have resumed its useful role as an element of check and balance against Russian imperialism and Chinese communism. And the United States need never have been sucked into Korea at all.

Our peace plans, in Europe and in Asia, were sadly deficient in the cool horse sense of old-fashioned diplomats like Castlereagh and Metternich and Talleyrand. How these men would have laughed at the naive assumption that nations could be divided into aggressor goats and peace-loving sheep.

3. We are now trying to escape from one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter: The right of any of the Big Five powers to veto enforcement action. It soon became evident that the UN was condemned to futile impotence, because the Soviet veto could be and was used to mask aggression not only by Moscow, but by any of Moscow's satellites.

The most serious move toward checkmating Soviet aggression, the North Atlantic Pact, was made possible only by stretching to the limit elastic article 51 of the Charter, which affirms "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense." Action by the U. N. in the first phase of the Korean conflict was only possible because of the Soviet boycott of the Security Council at that time. This tactical error probably will not be repeated.

So an escape route from the rigid rules of the charter was provided by the Acheson plan. This permits the Assembly to make recommendations for action against aggression, in the event that the Council is unable to function because of the veto. Here again there is an attempt to get away from a false assumption of Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and San Francisco: that the Soviet Union would be a reliable cooperator for peace.

4. The tangled confusion about the disposition of Formosa represents another attempt to escape from an ill-advised wartime decision. Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo in 1943 signed their names to a moralistic declaration that "all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

Despite the immense strategic and economic value of Formosa, Truman and Acheson, up to the outbreak of the Korean fighting, professed to feel bound, in the light of the Cairo Declaration, to let the Chinese Reds take over Formosa, if they could launch a successful invasion. This gave Wu Hsiu-chuan one of his best talking points, as one could judge from the amount of space devoted to this subject in his speech before the U. N.

How much better, from the standpoint of American interests, if the Cairo statement had never been made and the disposition of Formosa left over to the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan. Here again there has been an attempt, although a rather clumsy and half-hearted one, to back away from victory and toss Formosa into the lap of the United Nations.

5. A decision of Yalta and Potsdam which we certainly would wish undone was the arbitrary mutilation of the normal ethnic frontiers both of Poland and of Germany. By annexing the eastern half of Poland and then assigning German territory east of the Oder-Neisse frontier to Poland Stalin acquired several trump cards.

He gave the Polish people, oppressed and pillaged as they are in other respects, a stake in the maintenance of the status quo, for fear of losing the ethnically German lands which were assigned to Poland. And by thrusting some eight million destitute German refugees into bomb-wrecked, overcrowded West Germany the Soviet dictator created an enormous source of chronic social unrest and discontent, a serious handicap for the reconstruction of West Germany.

6. One of the many evil deeds of Yalta, the consequences of which are still plaguing us, was the agreement to hand over to Soviet vengeance Soviet citizens in western zones of occupation. General Vlasov, leader of the strongest anti-Communist movement which developed during the war, was the most conspicuous of many victims of this inhuman policy.

Some students of the Russian problem believe that the best hope of averting a third world war lies in a revolt of the Soviet peoples against their Communist rulers. This hope would be considerably brighter if from the beginning the western powers had given asylum and encouragement to anti-Communist refugees, instead of sending them back to death or concentration camps.

7. Inept negotiating by the late John G. Winant and General Eisenhower's failure to accept Churchill's suggestion and push on to Berlin in the last days of the war led to a most disadvantageous situation for the Western Powers in Berlin. The western sectors of the former German capital are an island in the sea of the surrounding Soviet zone. Both the occupation troops and the German population of west Berlin, which ranged itself courageously on the side of the west during the blockade, could be submerged overnight by a Soviet surprise attack.

8. Spain, from the beginning, was excluded from the United Nations and a Soviet-sponsored resolution in 1946 called for the withdrawal of ambassadors from Madrid. For this discriminatory attitude there was never any basis in morals or expediency.

A United Nations comprehensive enough to include Stalin's Soviet Union could scarcely exclude Franco's dictatorship, which is certainly preferable to a people's democracy on the Polish, Czechoslovak, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Hungarian, or Chinese model. It represents no threat to American security. It has been resolutely and consistently anti-Communist. It disposes of a substantial, if

poorly equipped army. It controls one of the most strategic positions on the Continent of Europe.

Yet it is only very recently that the inescapable logic of the cold war has been recognized and that some hesitant, tentative steps have been taken toward including Spain in a European defense picture.

So virtually every assumption on which the war was fought and the peace was shaped has been proved a fraud and a hoax. Almost every major decision taken during and after the war has turned out to be an extremely bad security risk. America's overriding problem today is to escape from the reckless misuse of victory.

One cannot reasonably attribute our present plight to any exceptional cunning of our enemies. The Communist design of world conquest is one of the most open conspiracies in history. How much better our position would be today if the men responsible for guiding our foreign policy during the last decade had believed Lenin when he wrote:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

Or Stalin, when he pronounced the dogma:

"It is therefore the essential task of the victorious revolution in one country to develop and support the revolution in others."

Or William Z. Foster, when he told a congressional committee:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States (and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises) that government will be not a capitalistic government, but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Or Mao Tse-tung, when he declared as recently as July 1, 1949:

"To sit on the fence is impossible; a third road does not exist. * * * Not only in China, but also in the world, without exception, one either leans to the side of imperialism or to the side of socialism. Neutrality is a mere camouflage and a third road does not exist."

But during the war and for some time after the war the men in high places in Washington, with a very few honorable exceptions, preferred to hug illusions that were based on a compound of ignorance and wishful thinking. Maybe Lenin and Stalin didn't really mean what they said. Maybe Stalin was at heart an amiable character, handicapped by a somewhat unreasonble Politburo. Maybe the Chinese Communists were not really Communists at all. Maybe.

Then came the brutal shock of Korea. Now we are desperately trying to retreat, to escape from a victory that was so appallingly misused that it was becoming a deadly trap. But will we have time to repair the abysmal follies of Tehran and Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam? Can we accomplish what the wise old Greeks said was impossible: to make the past as if it had never been?

No one can answer these questions with absolute assurance. But it is an imperative of American national survival to escape as fast as possible from this trap of an abused victory and a bungled peace, to get rid of the evil consequences of Roosevelt's foreign policy as fast as we can.

Toward the end of the Civil War a northern soldier, viewing the tomb of John C. Calhoun in Charleston, observed: "The whole South is the grave of Calhoun."

Perhaps a time will come when historians will write:

"The whole free world, including the United States, became the grave of the disastrous illusions of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Who Is Letting Our GI's Down?" written by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, and published in the May 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS LETTING OUR GI'S DOWN?

(By Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander, the American Legion)

In the light of such distractions as basketball scandals and crime investigations, the public sems to be foregetting that we are engaged in a war. Not a "police action" as certain propagandists would have you believe, but a full-blown, bloody war in which we have a quarter million soldiers committed, and have already suffered close to 60,000 casualties.

Apart from the South Koreans themselves, most of the men fighting this war are Americans. We can kid ourselves all we want about this being a great United Nations offensive, but as usual in these vast international projects it's the American people who are carrying the burden, and, South Koreans again excepted, it's our boys who are doing most of the fighting and dying. I know because I've just seen much of the Korean battle front.

I've found out something else. The men overseas are beginning to get the idea that someone or something is selling them out. They feel they've been forced out on a limb and the limb is being sawed off.

KILL OR BE KILLED

Contrary to the notions of some of our heavy thinkers safe in the States, our men in Korea do know why they are fighting. In fact, they know it a lot better than some of our self-styled intellectuals at home. Since it is a matter of "kill or be killed," they are fighting for their lives. It's just as simple as that.

In this respect they're one up on the confused thinkers safe in the United States who are still arguing that we ought to give the murdering Chinese Reds a place in the United Nations, and who deplore any attempts made to curb the activities of traitorous Communists within our midst. Those stateside experts safe at home can't grasp the obvious fact that the Communist is out to kill Americans, individually and collectively. The GI has learned this the hard way.

The GI is a step ahead of these people in another way. Knowing that you can't argue with a Communist, and being well aware of the treachery of Reds generally, he is disgusted that so many of our leaders have permitted themselves and this mighty Nation of ours to be tied down by parliamentary Lilliputians in the United Nations.

Our present-day Benedict Arnolds may glibly argue that it is necessary to keep Chiang and his armies blockaded on Formosa, but these arguments make no sense to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who have to do the fighting and dying. They see in Chiang's vast armies a way of saving some of the 250 American lives that are being needlessly sacrificed each week because certain furtive people expound that Chiang isn't the right sort of person, and therefore we cannot accept his aid. Our fighting men are not impressed by these false prophets because they haven't forgotten that these same people not long ago were lauding Mao's murdering hordes as "agrarian reformers."

For the life of them—and life is meant in a very literal sense—they can't understand why our State Department and the United Nations make it necessary for them to be slaughtered by Red armies which swarm down on them from territory which our own heads of Government make sacrosanct. Our fighting men have the simple idea that in wartime when the enemy tries to kill you, you are entitled to pursue him till you've caught him and done away with him. The influential meddlers who keep maneuvering our men into untenable positions don't seem to understand this, possibly because they've never been required to face danger themselves. To them, this sort of impasse is something to be placed on the agenda of the United Nations, to be argued at leisure in comfortable surroundings.

Agents of the Kremlin, sitting in the councils of the United Nations, in Washington and elsewhere, must laugh up their sleeves at our utter idiocy. But you may be sure that our GI's are not amused. They see the picture as clearly as the Soviet agents do, but, unlike our stateside leaders, they see the results of this criminal skullduggery in the blood they shed and in the mangled corpses of their buddies.

What they cannot understand, though, is the strange apathy of the people back home. As they listen to radio reports of what is happening thousands of miles to the east of them, they are puzzled. Isn't the American public aware of what is going on? Don't they realize that their sons and husbands and sweethearts are fighting a ruthless enemy who has them at a terrible disadvantage, thanks to stupid or traitorous advisers and inept diplomacy?

MUST SHAKE OFF APATHY

In Korea I saw many caskets, waiting to be moved on the first lap of the long voyage home. Is this the only thing that will awaken America? Do thousands more boys have to lay down their lives needlessly, before an aroused public demands that our fighting men be given an even break?

It is high time that all America snapped out of its apathy. Certainly, it is deplorable that crooks are bribing basketball players; no one one wants to take the public's attention away from grafting politicians and syndicates of gangsters; and let's not overlook transactions involving pastel mink coats and fancy fees for influence. But let us not be diverted from the fact that our No. 1 problem today is a struggle for our existence.

Let's simplify it so we won't continue to be mixed up by those masters of confusion who got us into this mess. Regardless of diplomatic niceties, we are at war with Soviet Russia. The simple and undeniable proof of this is that the Kremlin could stop this bloodletting tomorrow, if it so desired. Russia is using the Chinese, the North Koreans, and others to do her fighting for her. In our own United States Stalin has thousands of stooges doing his bidding. These people are working as diligently for the murderers of the Kremlin as any units of the Red Army or the Soviet secret police.

Aiding these unspeakable traitors is a much larger group. Some of them are almost but not quite full-fledged Communists; others are poor, deluded people who fancy themselves as intellectuals, liberals, or what have you. Some of these characters maintain that they abhor communism, but by their confused thinking and acting they serve as the Communists' best friends. Indeed, in some ways they are even more dangerous than admitted Communists since at least we know where the Communists stand.

These are the people--the avowed Communists and their feather-headed friends—who have got us into the most dangerous predicament in the Nation's history. And not only have they got us into jeopardy, they keep making our position worse. Now anyone can understand why the out-and-out Communists do this—whether they be Mao's brutal "agrarian reformers" or the traitors who call themselves American Communists. But what few Americans can understand is why people who presumably are not Communists continue to peddle a line that has proved disastrous, and has sent thousands of Americans to their deaths. It is even harder to understand these people when it is considered that they have worked themselves up to high positions in Government, teach in our great universities, write for important publications, and have the facilities of great radio networks at their disposal.

CONFUSED THINKING

It would be foolish to say that all or even most of these people are Communists. But it would be equally fallacious to believe that, because they are burdened with Phi Beta Kappa keys and academic honors, they are equally loaded with honesty or common sense. In many cases they are befuddled folk who are educated far beyond their capacity, but they are looked up to as "experts" and "advisers" by others who should know better. In some cases these people have a fuzzy notion that the world's problems will be solved if we scrap our own system of government and turn ourselves over to an all-powerful world government. Others feel that we can make some sort of deal with Stalin, if only we let him have his way. Still others, and there is quite a school of this thought, are convinced that we should defer to the British Foreign Office in our dealings abroad, and ought to ape the British by establishing a socialistic government at home.

The best you can say for such people as this is that their patriotism is of a negative nature.

Years ago, in the time of our Revolution, another American gave his allegiance to a country overseas. The name of that man, Benedict Arnold, is now reviled and scorned by American patriots. But today, there are many among us who have injured this country far more than Benedict Arnold, and from segments of the soft-headed public these traitors actually get ovations when they make a smirking appearance before the very people they've sold out.

EXPOSE FALSE PROPHETS

Curiously, the mental make-up of such sell-out artists is such that they will never concede that they were wrong. So they keep bulling their way through, shamelessly trying to explain the unexplainable. But after all, it isn't their neck. Let more thousands of American soldiers, sailors and marines be sacrificed, so long as the ego of these unspeakable characters is not damaged.

Since these people haven't the sense or the grace to stop their meddling, I call on Americans generally to demand that they be thrown out of any place where they can exert any further influence on the conduct of the war. If they are in Government, or if they are still advising those in Government, the public must raise such an outcry that even the most apathetic politicians will have to take action to break their death-grip on their jobs. If they are poisoning the press, the speakers' platform or the airwaves, they must at the least be answered, point for point, and those responsible for giving such people a forum must be held strictly accountable by the American people. The time is long since past when we can afford the luxury of listening to false prophets, fools or traitors.

The GI has been let down not just by those characters in high places, but by all the rest of us who have tolerated them and permitted them to become powerful. Now it is up to us. It is time to let the war be fought by our military people, not by politicians in Washington or the United Nations, or by others who have axes to grind and influence enough to get themselves an audience.

If we can keep these erstwhile experts out of the present war long enough for the United States to win it, we can consider ourselves lucky. That's the first job we have to tackle here at home. I can assure you that our military leaders know their job, and so long as they are allowed to fight the war without restrictions imposed by stupid people, traitors or politicians, they'll do all right. Further, they'll do the job with the least cost in American lives.

But so long as the stateside busybodies continue their meddling, the best we can expect is a stalemate. Maybe, for reasons of their own, our busybodies want it that way. But patriotic Americans ought to begin asking themselves what about it. Their sons and brothers in Korea are certainly asking themselves a lot of questions, and I for one would not want to have to answer to them at some future date.

Symington: A Faithful Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bitter controversy, it is heartwarming to see the services of a good and faithful public servant recognized. I believe the appointment of W. Stuart Symington to head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is such recognition of faithfulness, ability, and loyalty to the Nation.

Mr. Symington is a man of great personal integrity and unchallenged ability. His appointment is a guaranty that the tasks of the RFC will be carried out in the light of the highest public interest.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks, the following editorial from the Daily Metal Reporter of April 20, 1951:

SYMINGTON'S APPOINTMENT TO RFC AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

President Truman's appointment of W. Stuart Symington to head the Reconstruction Finance Corporation comes like a breath of spring into an atmosphere where the air has been none too pleasant or too healthy.

Symington's personal integrity, his keen business acumen, his record of achievements in the other executive positions that he has held in the Federal Government, have gained for him the admiration, the respect, and the confidence of businessmen, Congressmen, and Senators, irrespective of their political leanings. One thing is certain, that with Symington as the head, there will be no scandals in the RFC and the agency will function as a well organized and efficient business enterpise should.

One of Symington's greatest assets is that he has never curried political favor. Consequently he is under no obligations to return such favors. He has not sought office as a means of personal gain. On the contrary, during the years that he has held public office, he has made great personal sacrifices, and he has done so because of his strong sense of duty and patriotism. That Symington did not seek the new post to which President Truman has appointed him, is evident from his letter of acceptance in which he said that it has been his personal desire since 1949 to return to private life. However, "because of the grave world situation," he wrote the President, "if you believe I can serve you and the country in this new position, I would be most honored to accept the appointment."

If the public's confidence is to be restored in the RFC, if this agency is to render the services for which it was originally created, there is no one better qualified to be its chief than Mr. Symington. His appointment to the job is a natural. Before entering the Government's service, he was a successful manufacturer in St. Louis. As head of the War Assets Administration following World War II, as Secretary of the Air Force, and as Chairman of the National Securities Resources Board, he established and enviable record for himself and the departments he headed. Being a man of vision, a great organizer and as a practical businessman, he insists on all the facts before reaching a decision, and then stands ready to face anyone who may challenge his decision. He has done this in the past and he may be counted on doing so again in his new job.

Because the RFC has been mismanaged in the past is no reason for believing that it has outlived its usefulness. Symington is the man to breathe new life into the agency and make it a vital force in the economy of the Nation. The President is to be congratulated on his selection.

The Defense Production Act and Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the challenge to city consumers in food prices rising higher than prices generally is a real one. The prospective reenactment of the Defense Production Act must, if it be realistic, deal with this question. When the act was first considered, I sought to amend the very section which gave special consideration to agricultural commodities in the knowledge that the city consumers were bound to face food prices rising more than the general average as a result.

I hope very much that it will be possible to find a suitable solution which will not have a disastrous effect on the long-standing agricultural policy of our country and at the same time be cognizant of the fundamental problem of the families with moderate incomes who live in the cities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorials from the New York Times on the subject:

[From the New York Times of April 19, 1951]

NO ROOF FOR FARM PRICES

Officials of the National Farmers Union have announced their opposition to any change in the Defense Production Act which would place farm prices on the same basis as others for purposes of over-all price control. Headed by James G. Patton, their president, these officials called at the White House and

urged Mr. Truman to continue the provision in the emergency law which exempts farm commodities from ceilings if they are selling below either parity or the level prevailing just before Korea.

The arguments advanced by the Patton group, like most of those put forward to justify this inexcusable provision of the law, virtually answer themselves. "The freezing of farmers at subparity income levels," declared Mr. Patton, "might very easily make it impossible for them to produce needed increases in food and fiber supplies." Taking farm prices as a whole, there is nothing that is subparity about them. On the basis of 1910–14 as 100, farm prices in the aggregate had a purchasing power ratio in March of this year of 111.

In terms of comparative income the farmer is even better off. Mr. Patton points out that the net income of farm operators declined from $17,800,000,000 in 1947 to $13,000,000,000 in 1950. But in 1947 the head of the farmers union has, of course, selected a completely abnormal year. It was a year in which no more expansibility was left on the supply side in agriculture and when heavy domestic demands coincided with correspondingly heavy postwar relief demands from the rest of the world. We can best get a measure of the abnormality of 1947 by noting that the $17,800,000,000 net farm income figure to which Mr. Patton refers represented an increase of practically 300 percent over the last prewar year, 1940. In the same period, by comparison, the total national income rose by only 144 percent.

What Mr. Patton is arguing for is not parity of farm prices and farm income as a whole, but a guarantee of parity for each and every farm commodity before it becomes subject to the general application of the law. This attempt to extend the parity concept under cover of the defense emergency suffers from two transparent weaknesses. In the first place, its advocates, while urging parity for commodities selling below that figure, ignore the logical sequel of that proposal, which would be to demand a roll-back to parity of those commodities selling above parity. But even more important is the fact that this proposal ignores the whole function of price freezing, which is to break the continuity of the spiral of prices and wages. Obviously no such effect can be achieved by halting the rise in half the prices in the country while permitting the other half to continue their advance.

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1951]

THE FARM BLOC'S TURN

When does the taxpayer's turn come to stage a demonstration in Washington and threaten a walkout on the defense effort?

Union leaders—the United Labor Policy Committee—put on such a show 2 months ago, and it has paid off handsomely. Now the farm bloc in Congress apparently has decided that if a demonstration such as labor's can pay such a quick dividend it would be a good idea to put on a show of its own. The House Committee on Agriculture, therefore, has opened hearings which feature a parade of witnesses testifying in favor of that section of the Defense Production Act which provides that farm commodities be specifically exempted from the treatment accorded commodities in general under price controls.

Two things are especially worth noting about these hearings before the Agriculture Committee. The first is that they have no legislative function. They are strictly in the nature of a show. In an opening statement Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, said that they had been prompted by "an avalanche of propaganda in the press and radio to the effect that farm prices are responsible for the unreasonable increase in the cost of living."

The second point is that the administration itself has provided the principal performer in this publicity performance in the person of the Secretary of Agriculture—and this despite reports that the President is going to send a message to Congress today on the subject of farm prices. Mr. Brannan was the first witness called by the committee, and he offered statistical support for the farm bloc's thesis.

Mr. Brannan's statistics add nothing to the controversy except to show that one can prove anything with figures if he is permitted to choose his own points of reference. When it is set up the parity concept Congress chose as normal, the period 1910–14, although the country had never in its history up to that time enjoyed any other 5-year period comparable pricewise to this, the golden era of American agriculture. Now, however, Mr. Brannan has decided that 1947, the peak of the explosive inflation that followed the war, was the real normal. Which is like saying that prices on the New York stock exchange were normal in the late summer of 1929.

In any event, the issue here is not a matter of statistics. It concerns the simple question of whether all prices are to be frozen under the defense emergency laws or all prices except farm prices, and it concerns the equally simple question of whom the administration represents in this inflation debate—the farm bloc or the Nation as a whole.

The Great Debate of MacArthur Versus the Constitution Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 13, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that few Members of the Congress missed the sparkling editorial in the New York Herald Tribune dated today, April 26; but to make sure that it has the full circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include the editorial, under leave, as a part of my remarks. I wish to emphasize that the Herald Tribune is a genuinely Republican newspaper, brilliantly edited, and reflecting the virtues of contemporary journalism and, if such there be, of the Republican Party.

The text of the editorial follows:

INDIRECT DISCOURSE

Since the President has a two-star general installed as military aide in the White House, it is perhaps natural that MacArthur should have installed a two-star general of his own to operate from the publicity office of the Waldorf-Astoria. Apparently, Major General Vaughan is more often seen than heard; Major General Whitney, on the other hand, is heard thunderously by millions who do not see him. It is still doubtful whether one officer is any more of an asset to his chieftain than the other.

While Olympian silence has reigned on the Waldorf's thirty-seventh floor, General Whitney, busily functioning as oracle in the publicity office, has been getting the foot in the mouthpiece with singular regularity. In a press statement on Saturday, insisting that to foresee Red China's intervention last fall was "quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's field intelligence," he cut the ground from under MacArthur's present contention that the Soviet Union will not intervene—a similarly political matter which must equally be beyond reach of MacArthur's information and responsibility. At Monday's press conference, the Whitney pronouncement that MacArthur had not the faintest idea of why he was relieved could serve only to put MacArthur in a ridiculous position. The Tuesday press conference not only brought the evasion of a question on the ground that "I am not going to expose General MacArthur's hand in its entirety"—with its inept implication that the general is engaged in some kind of hidden game or intrigue—but also the citation of the Biblical passage on Christ's reply to the doubting Thomas, which suggests implications so extraordinary that one hesitates to pursue the subject further.

In the far depths of the Pacific, the official spokesman, informed sources, authoritative quarters, were doubtless convenient media of contact between the general and his public. Here, in the rough-and-tumble of American public life, where the people are accustomed to get their leadership at first hand, one suspects that the general himself will soon come to question their utility. General Whitney's press conference yesterday seemed somewhat subdued.

LETTER TO MY CONSTITUENTS

Mr. Speaker, I am including also the rough draft of the letter I propose to send to my constituents who wrote to me on the subject of the great debate between General MacArthur and the Constitution. I include this, not out of vainglory, but at the urging of a highly placed official who felt, and very kindly said, that the message, subject as it is to final revision and condensation, was worthy of wider circulation than in the Nineteenth District of New York. I do want to be explicit in saying that before this letter actually goes in the mail it will be shorter and smoother.

With that qualification, the letter follows:

DEAR FRIEND: You are one of hundreds of residents of the Nineteenth Congressional District of New York who wrote to me regarding the relief of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his commands in the far-eastern theater of operations.

To those of you who approved of the President's wise, decisive, and courageous action in removing General MacArthur before he had done any further damage, I offer my congratulations. You demonstrated a sturdy devotion to the democratic principles of representative government; you showed your immunity to the temptation to follow the glamorous but false political gods of military dictatorship.

To those of you who wrote to me in support of General MacArthur, I speak in sorrow and disappointment.

I hope that you will review your words. I hope you will consider carefully and decide in mature deliberation if you really are ready to desert the Constitution of the United States and the democracy we all profess to love and defend.

Above all, I hope that you will think long and carefully of what it would mean to precipitate an offensive war against Communist China or Soviet Russia, or both. We are 150,000,000 people, already beginning to run short of our once bountiful supplies of natural resources.

Of our allies, we could scarcely count firmly on the support of more than an equal number of productive individuals, and somewhat less than an equal amount of natural resources and manufacturing facilities. We would be pitted against a foe capable of mustering 750,000,000 people, and deficient only in technological facilities.

That would mean unending years of total warfare, in which we would serve nothing but the war machinery. Our material comfort, our liberties, our politics, our religion would be sacrificed to destruction; our young men and young women would be under arms; our farms and factories would be manned by the very young and the very old; our toll of dead and wounded would be heartbreaking and suicidal.

General MacArthur's real accomplishments in a lifetime of military service speak for themselves; he needs no deification now, for he has proved himself an able soldier and an able administrator.

When, however, he arrogates to himself powers of policy making which are reserved by the Constitution to the responsible elected officials of our Federal Government—the President and the Congress—and to the President's Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense; and when, not content with this assumption of authority he openly flouts the directives of his Commander in Chief, his usefulness has ceased and he has laid himself open to suspicions of insubordination and disloyalty.

There are certain facts which must be remembered in attempting to judge the farflung struggle of the Western World for the minds of men.

The first fact is that this is the year 1951; for better or for worse, we cannot turn back the clock, nor can the United States evade the responsibilities and duties which accompany power and authority.

The second fact is that we are governed by a written Constitution which has guarded us against civil or military tyranny over a period of nearly two centuries; and the constitutional reservations have been strengthened by statutory enactments. The struggle for freedom can never end, for when there is no conflict there is no freedom.

The third fact is that the free world is fighting every kind of political enslavement. It is as pointless to oppose the authoritarianism of communism and accept fascism (by any name) as to fight fascism and accept communism. Ideological chains of political or economic slavery are made no lighter by changing their names.

The wisdom, the propriety, and the necessity of President Truman's action are attested by the approval of the world's greatest leaders in every field: by prime ministers of other countries, by national delegations to the United Nations, by the Pope, by our own most distinguished national leaders, and great independent newspapers.

I am certain that upon mature reflection those of you who have offered support to General MacArthur in terms running all the way from mild criticism of the administration to vicious and libelous attacks on President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and Secretary Acheson will realize that no other course lay open to the President as far as General MacArthur's overt actions were concerned.

This does not by any means close debate on the foreign policies of the United States. These issues are and must be open to unending review and debate. Of all the alternatives which our Government might choose, it seems to me, on the record, it has followed that which is most realistic and tenable in Asia. I continue critical of the appeasement of fascism in Europe and Africa.

I hope you will always feel free to write to me on any subject relevant to the public business. When I am forced to use a form letter, bear in mind it is only so that I can carry on the duties you have given me, and that I read your letters with attention and with gratitude for giving me the benefit of your views.

Fruits of "Unity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Garet Garrett, Fruits of "Unity," which appeared in the January 22 issue of the Freeman:

FRUITS OF "UNITY"
(By Garet Garrett)

"Let there be unity," says the voice of panic. "In unity there is strength." But there is the voice of danger saying, "Many are the strong that have perished before us. There may be unity for national suicide."

Unity has no gift of seeing. It may be blind. It has no wisdom in itself. It may be both valorous and stupid.

We have had unity, seldom entire, of course, but to a degree never before imagined in a democratic republic. There was unity enough for measures short of war, reinforced by the image of Hitler stepping across the Atlantic to conquer the Americans, although as it turned out he could not pass 30 miles of English Channel to finish the British when they were prone after Dunkerque.

Then for fear of disunity there was complete unity for the war itself. And whatever may have been one's suppressed thoughts at the time, or the afterthoughts since of revisionists like Beard, victory was its own justification. It was much more than physical victory. The torch of civilization had passed to the hands of a romantic people who dreamed of universal peace and brotherhood and wanted nothing else for themselves from their day at Armageddon.

At the end of the war the United States was incomparably the great military, economic, and moral power in the world. Its word was final. It had only to say no, and there could not take place anywhere in the earth an act of aggression. To whatever it said yes, that was a gilded thing and people held forth their hands to receive it, unable at first to comprehend such generosity and yet in a little while taking it for granted and demanding it as a right, because the Americans were so rich, the British Socialists saying that as capitalists the Americans were under a necessity to give their surplus away to save themselves from drowning in it. Reporting to the President in 1945 the Chief of Staff said: "The security of the United States now is in our own hands."

How long ago was that? Five years.

Has it been for want of unity that in 5 years we have lost not only our authority in the world but control of our own destiny? Has it been for want of unity that terror now gripes the entrails of our cities, fear is the theme of Government propaganda, and we talk of survival?

Think back a little. Was it in the first place for fear of disunity that Roosevelt reversed American foreign policy and recognized the Soviet dictatorship, and then permitted Stalin's agents to create cells of treason in the executive agencies of Government? That was in time of what we believed to be peace, and although it was very embarrassing when Stalin went over to Hitler, his agents nevertheless continued to sit in the councils of American Government, up to policy-making levels. All embarrassment ceased when Hitler turned on the Russians. Then Stalin became our preferred ally, with priorities in lend-lease dictated by Harry Hopkins, who, in the words of President Roosevelt, got along with Stalin like a house afire. Those who knew better wrote books about it afterward, but while it was going on there was silent unity. To criticize Stalin was an offense against unity.

So then later it was not want of unity that obliged the Roosevelt government, nor the Truman government that succeeded it, to embrace Stalin as a peace-loving collaborator in the postwar world, to betray into his hands our ally China, to give him all that part of Europe that lies now behind the iron curtain, and to put the American neck into a noose at Berlin. For 2 years more Stalin was Mr. Truman's good old Joe, who sometimes behaved badly because he was the prisoner of wicked men in the Kremlin; and as for Stalin's agents in the executive agencies of Government, people who kept talking about that were hysterical, to say the least of them, and at the worst they were enemies of unity and played a game with red herrings. He was not worried about communism. Let nobody else worry about it.

Since there was nothing to worry about, it would be safe to disembowel the Military Establishment, which was done, to make more funds for the welfare state. The Navy went into mothballs, the Army was demobilized, the Air Force was wrecked—and there was unity for all of that.

Then Mr. Truman's official economic advisers turned the people's attention to the fascinating bauble of perpetual boom, to be maintained by scientific inflation; and there was unity for that.

Meanwhile our efforts to save Europe from chaos had been frustrated. The Socialist Government of Great Britain had devoured a loan of $4,000,000,000, with no benefit but an increase of appetite. It was perhaps wrong to try doing this thing piecemeal. So the Truman government invented the Marshall plan to do it all at once. If the countries of Europe would get together, add up their estimated deficits for a series of years, and send us the bill, we would pay it.

And in this at first there was no thought of filling peoples' bellies to keep them from going Communist. That came later. At first Russia was expected to come in, like everybody else; she was invited. But the Kremlin declined to come in and forbade her satellites to come in, for no reason given at the time.

For all of that there was unity. We lived with the hynotic fiction that the conduct of American affairs abroad was above politics. Was there not a bipartisan foreign policy?

Thus the country was conditioned and prepared to lose the cold war. Although we did not know it, the cold war was already lost when in 1947 the Truman doctrine was announced, by the President alone. The immediate occasion for it was that the British Government had suddenly thrown Greece in our lap, fairly sure that we would not let it roll on the floor. And they were right. This might have been handled as a limited commitment to help Greece repel Communist aggression, and it might have included also Turkey; but no. It had to be done with a grand gesture. It had to be something bold and brave, and something at the same time that would shrewdly serve a political end. Apparently by that time Mr. Truman had become aware of Communist aggression in the world as a fact; but that was not all. He was aware also that softness toward Soviet Russia had become a serious political liability. Now, therefore, he would do it properly. That is how it happened that what might have

been a limited adventure in the Mediterranean world came to be clothed in the Truman doctrine.

In his message to Congress asking for the means to aid Greece and Turkey he declared that the United States hereafter would act to stop totalitarian aggression anywhere in the world. He did not explicitly say Russian aggression, but there was no mistaking what he meant; there was no other kind of aggression to stop.

Well, there was unity for the Truman doctrine, too. Its terrific total implications were almost entirely ignored. Mr. Truman himself could hardly have been aware of them. One of the few who saw them clearly was Dr. Virgil Jordan. This, he said, was in fact a declaration of war upon Soviet Russia. The Russians would so understand it. Therefore, go on with it. Say to the Russians, "You go home, and we will come home and let people alone"—and say it at once while we still had sole possession of the atomic bomb. He said these things before a dinner of distinguished persons at the Waldorf, and his words were received with horrified and unbelieving silence.

The consequences of the Truman doctrine were these:

1. For the first time in history a sane nation had assumed unlimited political, economic, and military obligations in the world—and it had done this with no premeditation whatever and no appraisal of the possible cost in terms of its own resources. However, if you ask, "How shall you weigh your resources against an unlimited liability?" the answer is that you cannot do it. And that's the point.

2. In a world at war, or about to be at war, a nation had abolished its frontiers—for if you are going to stop aggression everywhere, where is your frontier?

3. We had thrown away the first prerogative of a militant nation, which is to choose its battleground—to say where, when, and on what terms it will fight. The power of initiative was delivered to the enemy. The aggressor would be able to name the time, the place, and the conditions, as we were to find out later to our sorrow.

4. The Atlantic Pact, by which we undertake to put both equipment and fighting manpower into Western Europe for the defense of countries that have not really made up their minds to defend themselves, and might sooner appease the Russians than become the battleground of a Russo-American war.

Our one incurable weakness is manpower. We are only 150,000,000 people. We are 100,000,000 fewer than the combined people of those European countries that expect us to defend them against the Russians. Therefore, as any tenth-grade boy would know, we should avoid meeting Stalin's Asian and Eurasian hordes on the ground. Nevertheless, at last the Truman government was maneuvered into accepting war on the worst terrain in the world—as in the tube of a funnel, with the Chinese hordes pouring themselves in at the top.

As we may now recall, there was unity behind Mr. Truman when he made the decision to enter Korea. He expected the country to be thrilled, and it was. The decision was consistent with the Truman doctrine, morally obligatory thereunder; but people were as vague about what it was going to mean as Mr. Truman was, or as they had been about the implications of the Truman doctrine in the first place.

What Mr. Truman thought was going to be a "police action" turned into a war that in 6 months had already cost us half as much as the cost of our total exertions in World War I; it turned into a war that dangerously stripped the home base of its defenses, leaving the country, in the words of Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, without the strength to defend itself against attack; a war in which we found ourselves swapping American lives for Asiatic lives; precisely the kind of war we could never win, said Hanson W. Baldwin—"a land struggle on the Asiatic Continent in a theater where no decision is possible against the hordes of Asia."

The enemy had picked the place, had chosen his own time, had named the conditions.

Now mobilization: There must be unity for that. Certainly there will be unity for that. It is the sequel, and imperative. And yet the people may be permitted to ask, What is this mobilization for? The President says it is in order "that the full moral and material strength of the Nation may be readied for the dangers which threaten us."

Everybody perceives the dangers that threaten us, including one that Mr. Truman cannot see, namely, the self-admiring, grimacing incompetence of that same leadership which has cost us the world and our authority in it, which has involved us in these perils, which continues never to doubt its own rightwiseness, and still demands of the people unity.

How shall these dangers be met? It is no answer to say, as Mr. Truman says, that we must make ourselves strong enough to meet them. Five years ago we were strong enough. As we build up our military strength again, what shall we do with it? Mr. Truman does not say. So far as the people know, there is no plan. Therefore, they are asking: Shall we go on in Asia, swapping American for Asiatic lives; and if so, to where? Shall we come home; and if so, to what? Shall we forget Asia, or appease the enemy there, and put our strength in Europe, as the Europeans say we should, trusting that if it comes to final war with Russia our boughten European allies will not go out from under us?

In any event, how shall this country recover the power of initiative, so that it will be able to say where and when and whom it will fight? Is there a plan for doing that? If we cannot do that, then we shall not get back control of our own destiny. The Kremlin will deploy our manpower and dispose of our resources; the Kremlin will determine the size of our military budget and the condition of our internal economy.

We know the taste of humiliation. It is strange and exceedingly bitter. But worse than anything else that has happened to us is something that now we are doing to ourselves. We are talking of survival. A nation with a world of its own, supreme custodian of a hemisphere embraced by oceans, having an industrial power of its own roughly equal to that of all other peoples combined, so rich that the next richest country is by comparison poor—that Nation talks of survival.

A Senator asks: "Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight, the last fading hour of light before an endless night shall envelop us and all the Western World?" These sickly words, hag-ridden by fear, so perfectly expressed the mood of the Senate that everybody forgot how they would sound, echoing around the world, in the ears of both our allies and the enemy.

Survival is a false and craven word. There may be many questions in the crucible but survival is not one of them, except we put it there ourselves. This Nation, said Lincoln, must endure forever unless it commits suicide.

Let the supreme question be one of alternatives, such as, for example, the alternative to create in this hemisphere a military power the like of which the world has never seen—dedicated to American defense, with assistance only to other nations who may be going our way, and only to these upon lines definitely demarked, which we mean to hold by our own strength.

The strength of a giant is in his own loins. Yet the mightiest giant may be bled to death by many unrequited wounds, not one of which by itself would be mortal. This American giant, for all his wonderful armor, may be dangerously tied by Asiatics who climb on his tanks and tear at the doors with their bare hands. He may be bled in another way by allies who take more than they give and want even more. He has already wasted more blood than he could afford to lose by walking backward into traps and fighting the bear where the bear is not.

The compulsion to this folly is the tragic theme song of our foreign policy. Everywhere we must go on doing it, and in order that we may go on doing it we must make blood faster and faster.

If only we were trading blood with the enemy, that would make a kind of heroic sense. But the enemy, with much more blood to spare than we have, is saving it. Fighting the enemy in Asia, we kill Koreans and Chinese—no Russians. As we help the French fight him in Indochina, or the British to fight him in Malaya, we help them to kill natives—no Russians. Recently the country shuddered at the thought that to meet a Russian-prepared Communist demonstration in Berlin we might be obliged to kill teen-age Germans. Again, no Russians. What did the Berlin air lift cost the Russians? Nothing. In 6 months the war in Korea cost us more than $10,000,000,000. What did it cost the Russians?

Even yet we but dimly comprehend the nature of the intelligence that is acting against us. It is perhaps the first absolutely free principle of evil that was ever set free in the world—free because it is bound by nothing, not by its word, not by conscience, not by its own people, not by any moral sense whatever, not by its own ideology, which is a weapon, nor by superstitions such as did once somewhat restrain the barbaric horde. This intelligence has outthought us, outwitted us, outmaneuvered us, in both diplomacy and battle. With Machiavellian cynicism it has exploited our fundamental faith in the decency of all people.

Yet voices are heard among us intoning the intellectual idiocy that this is a struggle for the heart and mind of mankind. There is an ancient proverb which says that people may be so stupid as to baffle their own gods.

The Court Rules on the Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the California State District Court of Appeals has found unconstitutional the so-called anti-Communist affirmation required by the University of California regents.

The order of the regents of the University of California requiring members of the faculty to take an oath or make an affirmation that they were not connected with Communist Party or Communist-front organizations rocked the State of California.

I think the Alameda Times-Star editorial is an excellent one and expresses the thought of a great number of the people of California. The editorial follows:

THE COURT RULES ON THE LOYALTY OATH

It is a pleasure to see that the State district court of appeals has found unconsti-

tutional the so-called anti-Communist affirmation, required by the University of California regents.

Wholly aside from the matters of academic rights, constitutionality and allied questions, the ruling is important because it strikes hard at the affirmation which would have been of direct benefit to any Communists who wished to infiltrate the university.

Though it has been said countless times by this paper and many others, we say again that a prime weapon of the Communists is the lie. It is a mandatory weapon or instrument for them whenever the situation demands. And when they can lie under oath it is all the better in their eyes for the simple reason that a lie under oath is obviously an egregious lie and, because of the conditions surrounding it—the solemnity and all—it is consequently much more likely to go undetected.

But the ruling of the court yesterday will unfortunately not be enough. The matter may very well go to the State supreme court.

And even if that body upholds the lower court, there is still the matter of the constitutional amendment demanding a loyalty oath which has been passed by the legislature for submission to the voters in the general election of 1952.

Don't Throw the Baby Out With the Bath Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pamphlet on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

THE RFC MAKES MONEY

Because of the publicity attendant on the present investigation many people have received the impression that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through the years has not been a sound banking institution. The record, however, refutes this impression. The record of the RFC, over the years, is a good one. The RFC has made over 600,000 loans averaging $35,000 each. The total sum which has been loaned is about $21,000,000,000. The above figures include the financing of mortgages on veterans' houses carried out after the war. Losses and reserves for losses amount to some $200,000,000. The RFC has earned in interest and other income $1,400,000,000. Of this amount over $300,000,000 has been paid to the Treasury as dividends and the remainder is being utilized in RFC's lending activities. The taxpayer has thus profited by $600,000,000 from the operations of the RFC.

It should also be particularly noted that over 90 percent of the business loans made by RFC are to small business enterprises in amounts of less than $100,000. In 1950, a total of 5,506 of these small loans were granted. Of this number, 4,904 were for under $100,000. Almost 3,000 were for under $25,000. This is a record not to be disregarded.

THE RFC AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

1. Defense lending program under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

2. Defense-related lending program under the RFC Act, as amended.

3. The entire Government synthetic rubber program under the Rubber Act of 1948.

4. The entire Government tin program under Public Law 125, Eightieth Congress.

5. The entire Government abacá program under Public Law 683, Eighty-first Congress.

Draft Deferment Policy for College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Ralph Cooper Hutchison, of Lafayette College, which was made in defense of President Truman's Executive order establishing a college student draft-deferment policy based on high scholarships:

THE DRAFT DEFERMENT POLICY FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

(A reply to President James B. Conant, Harvard University, and President Harold W. Dodds, Princeton University, by Ralph Cooper Hutchison, president, Lafayette College)

Despite the well-reasoned statements of the President and General Hershey, the distinguished university presidents Dodds and Conant still insist that "a system of calling up all members of an age group who are physically fit is in accord with American ideals of democracy." They deplore the deferment of college men with high qualifications, a deferment which is only to prepare these men for more effective service in the Armed Forces. This insistence is distressing because these university presidents are taken by the public to speak for American education. They themselves make no such claim but their very eminence and distinction serve to create that impression.

American democracy has never claimed that all men should be regimented in the same pattern, do the same thing at the same time, assume the same precise responsibilities in an emergency, or be enslaved by equalitarian socialism. American democracy has, on the other hand, insisted that each man should do his part, that part for which he is best fitted, and in the time and manner which best serves the needs of our Nation and our society.

We are in what is either an all-out war or a protracted mobilization calculated to prevent world war. For the winning of either and the establishment of world peace, we know we must have unprecedented industrial production. This conflict may be won by the nations achieving the greatest scientific progress based upon the soundest and most extensive research. The fire power so produced and the transportation to be developed will require the finest and most mature skills for their strategic use. Moreover, it is clear that the ideological aspects for this conflict may be the dominant force and the determining factor. As none before, this will be a contest of production, science, research, skill, and leadership in action and ideas.

This means that any immediate expedient which cuts off the development of such skills and leadership is suicidal. First and primary consideration in planning for victory and for the successful preservation of our freedom should have been the unhampered and uninterrupted training of scientists, production men, medical men, engineers, and qualified leaders for the Armed Forces and for the civilian programs. First measures on the part of politicians, militarists, citizens, and educators should have preserved that thin red line of training of the best students available. First compulsion should have been that these men be required, not permitted, to continue their preparation for maximum service in this war.

The statement of these university presidents to the effect that the colleges and the college students do not want preferential treatment is correct. But it should make no difference to us what the colleges or the college students want. This mobilization economy should be planned intelligently for the attainment of victory for the forces of freedom. Students qualified and able to study should be prepared for their greatest ultimate usefulness to the Armed Forces. When they are ready, they should be put where they are most needed. This is more nearly the true ideal of American democracy.

To insist, for example, that a brilliant medical student should delay his training for 2 years or more to carry a gun when he might otherwise go on to the completion of his medical and surgical skills is a stupid interference with the sound prosecution of war itself. It will not hurt the student concerned, but it hurts the Nation. And it is unfair to the men who will be in the front lines, deprived thus of one more desperately needed surgeon.

The confusion in Congress and in the colleges is due to the fact that there has been no clear recognition of the primacy of education for the winning of the war. Apparently university presidents are afraid of their own truth, for they, above all others, have failed to enunciate this need for trained men in a great national emergency. Devices for popularity with the voters, the public, the labor unions, the newspapers, and with Government officials have obscured our national vision.

It is time that everyone lay aside political considerations and concern for popular acclaim and think straight through to the defeat of our enemies and the enemies of free nations. It is time that we insist on the immediate, uninterrupted, and increased training of doctors, surgeons, engineers, scientists, researchers, and leaders for all phases of military and civilian activity.

This can be done without impeding the mobilization for the present conflict. Let's get away from this silly debate over socialistic equalitarianism, turn every man to his own task—even the student—let us push ahead, win this war, beat down this surge of human enslavement, and so establish peace on the earth. Such a program is much nearer to the true meaning of American democracy.

Ex Malo, Bonum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., of Saturday, April 14, 1951:

EX MALO, BONUM

Now that the quite understandable emotional crisis has passed in regard to the dismissal of General MacArthur it is possible to approach the subject with something like

equanimity. There are, of course, many more questions involved than any quick survey can possibly consider and the somewhat various reactions to the news has made it plain that in some minds at least the separate issues are quite inextricably commingled. This has not contributed noticeably to either clarity or rationality.

The two principal questions to be considered deal, first, with the matter of the general's dismissal and then, secondly, the consideration of his policy for the Far East. While they concern, to be sure, the same man, the questions are nonetheless quite distinct and deserve separate comment.

Concerning the actual dismissal, political analysts had long since understood that a situation in which a commander in the field saw fit to argue and publicly with the general policy of his superiors was an utterly intolerable one. Very few who consider this question in its single self can come to any conclusion save the one that actually resulted—the subordinate would be forced to capitulate. It is to the credit of the Chief Executive that he had the courage to perform, however reluctantly or belatedly, an action which was to be so obviously an unpopular one. The simple and unavoidable conclusion about the dismissal of General MacArthur is that it was inevitable.

The second question which concerns the general's policy for the Far East is quite another matter. It is clear at once that his theories on what is best for America in the Asian area are distinctly different from those of the administration and the State Department; it is equally clear that he is dissatisfied with the present American (and U. N.) policies there which he considers at the very least to be inadequate. Since General MacArthur is an experienced observer of the Asian picture his observations are worth more than passing consideration. All the more true is this when we reflect on the most unfortunate history our present planners and their predecessors have had in understanding that part of the world. Mr. Marshall's unhappy visit to China and his present prominence in administration planning allow the thought that we may still be following a policy which events themselves have discredited. If our Asian policy needs revamping it will best be accomplished by experts (of which General MacArthur is one) and not by field commanders under orders from their superiors (of which the general was so lately one). While the general can be easily, and rightly, dismissed (or relieved), his ideas on the Far East must be studied and critically analyzed.

It is more than likely that the general's return to the United States will permit the first full-dress discussion of American foreign policy in Asia and for the first time, too, allow administration officials as well as the general to present their views on the formation of a sound policy for the future. What seemed at first to be high-handed politics, or just simple tragedy, may in the end prove to be the beginnings of rationality.

Budgeting and Accounting Problems of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article by Herman C. Loeffler, a member of the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on budgeting and accounting problems of the Federal Government. The article was published in the Quarterly National Tax Journal of March 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALICE IN BUDGET LAND

(By Herman C. Loeffler)[1]

Federal budget and appropriation practices have long since developed Alice-in-Wonderland overtones of unreality and confusion. They are badly in need of basic reforms. * * *

DEFECTS IN CURRENT PRACTICES

Appropriations based on obligations

The initial and traditional stages of preparation by the departments and agencies of their annual spending requests make good sense. The organization units formulate their desired work programs in the light of social, economic, political, and many other developments and needs. Wherever possible these programs are divided into proper work units. The work units are then multiplied by estimated costs per unit, thus developing proposed expenditures relative to the budget year.

But from here on, the Alice-in-Wonderland conditions start. The controlling financial statutes require that proposed expenditures be translated into so-called obligations, which [are] the total dollar amounts required to make the arrangements which are necessary as a practical matter to accomplish a work program. They consist of the full commitments to obtain desired services by hiring people and to obtain commodities and other objects by the letting of short- or long-term contracts, usually limited by statute to a maximum life of 3 years.

The result of this requirement is that although the proposed work programs of a Federal agency may be identical for two successive years, the obligations requested of Congress as proposed appropriations to accomplish these programs may be quite different. Why? Assume that in the first of two identical annual work programs of a Federal agency for successive years, obligations were incurred to cover a relatively large number of 2-year contracts in their entirety, and that in the following year few multiyear contracts were included because the expiring contracts were available from the prior year to supply required goods and services. Under this assumption the agency might have the same $10,000,000 work programs in both fiscal years 1949 and 1950, although requiring an appropriation of $12,000,000 for the first year as contrasted with an appropriation of only $8,000,000 for the second year. Under these circumstances, appropriations of course cease to indicate the scope of agency work programs.

This example is much simpler than the conditions existing in practice, particularly in those departments and agencies which carry on many construction projects for which 3-year building contracts are frequent. In these cases computation of an annual appropriation requires that two deductions must first be made from the estimated amount of the actual annual construction to be accomplished, in order to adjust for those expenditures in the budget year which will be met from the unused portions of multiyear contracts awarded in the two prior years (unliquidated obligations carried forward) and still available for expenditure. Further, the appropriation for the proposed construction program must be increased by two additions in order to provide for expenditures occurring in the two subsequent years under the long-term contracts which are to be let in the budget year.

The upshot of these adjustments is that in determining the size of the appropriation for a given construction program, consideration must be given to work involved during a total period of 5 years. The amount of the appropriation may therefore give no indication whatever of the actual amount of work to be done in the fiscal year.

Expenditures not comparable with appropriations

This Alice-in-Wonderland confusion is of course equally bad in connection with the actual expenditures under annual appropriations. As has been indicated, annual appropriations include, in addition to adjustments for carry-overs between years, the total contracts to be awarded in the fiscal year, without regard to the longer period over which expenditures under those contracts may be spread before they are completed. The annual expenditure reported by an agency therefore has no relation to the year when the contracts were let or other obligations were incurred to obtain the necessary current deliveries.

Imagine trying to exercise sound judgment in preparing budgets under this theoretical background. Using the simple example already given, the agency would report expenditures of $10,000,000 each in fiscal years 1949 and 1950. Since $12,000,000 was the first year's appropriation, the agency had presumably been very economical and had underspent its allowance. In the second year, however, it had supposedly broken the law and seriously overspent by the same amount. Of course, both of these conclusions are entirely incorrect.

In many agencies, annual appropriations provide only the annual salaries of those employed, plus quarters and small amounts for travel and the like, so that there is practically no carry-over between years. The above difficulties are therefore either nonexistent or relatively inconsequential. In other agencies, however, notably those letting contracts for big building operations, the reverse will be true; very heavy carry-over will occur between years because of the multiyear contracts in effect. Other agencies will lie between these two extremes. The difficulty is that one never knows to what degree the annual expenditures reported for an agency are comparable with the appropriations voted for it.

Lack of cohesion in budget document

As to this never-never land of fiscal planning and control under practical operating conditions, let me comment very briefly on the resultant serious problems for the annual Federal budget document. That huge tome of telephone-directory size contains an immense amount of valuable data laboriously prepared after much discussion and planning by the Federal agencies and then gathered and reshaped by the Bureau of the Budget to fit into the President's program.

It is a fact of great importance to the whole democratic process that this large collection of very important financial material scares off many interested persons. Some of this negative reaction undoubtedly stems from the fact that the basic design of the budget document is so faulty. It starts with some 200 pages of Presidential budget mes-

[1] The ideas expressed in this article by Mr. Loeffler are his own and not to be construed as those of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with which he became associated as a professional staff member in early 1949. For years he was active in research work on problems of local government in New York, St. Louis, Boston, and other cities. Starting in 1941 he served 8 years with the U. S. Bureau of the Budget, mostly as one of the Assistant Chiefs of its Fiscal Division.

sage and summary tables, prepared quite exclusively on an expenditure basis so that the programs proposed in the budget may be fitted into economic and financial developments in national affairs of the present and near future.

Incredible as it may sound, that material is supported—of necessity under existing law—by over 1,000 pages of densely packed and unrelated detail on the obligation basis which must be used for appropriations. The result is that the document has an unbelievable lack of internal cohesion.[2]

* * * * *

Accounting controls a factor

The reader may wonder why responsible officials have so long clung to the present confused procedure. In part that hesitation is probably due to a myriad of technical and perplexing details which departures from traditional methods would raise in the far-flung and complicated operations of the Federal Government.

More important, however, is undoubtedly the fact that the present system lends itself to easy accounting controls to prevent overspending of appropriations. Thus, each appropriation is set up as a control figure over an account when it is voted. The account is then cumulatively charged with a variable mixture of expenditures as they occur—of current expenditures such as the regular payroll and of the full amounts of multiyear contracts as awarded, regardless of their expiration dates beyond the close of the fiscal year.

At the end of the fiscal year, the residual unobligated amount is by law then no longer available for further obligation. But the obligated balance is carried forward, usually for 2 years,[3] so that as the unfinished contracts and other obligations are completed, expenditures are cumulated against the original obligations which were entered in the accounts to provide for each full contract to maturity.

In this simple fashion eventual overspending of any appropriation is prevented regardless of the mixed sequence of long-term and short-term transactions with either slow or rapid subsequent rates of liquidation * * *.[4]

PROPOSED THREE-WAY PROGRAM

Many laws control Federal transactions and finance * * *. One of these, dating from 1874 * * * requires that "the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all unexpended balances which shall have remained upon the books of the Treasury for two fiscal years, to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."[5]

The second statute, the so-called Antideficiency Act of 1905, provides that "no executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expand, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by the Congress for the fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriation. * * *".[6]

These two statutes are primarily responsible for the confusion which has been briefly discussed. It is proposed that they be modified by three statutory amendments. These amendments are by no means the original ideas of the author. They also reflect the findings of various writers on this subject who have developed different aspects of the thesis underlying this article. Moreover, the proposed statutory changes are in line with the fiscal methods successfully used in Canada and Great Britain.

The following three-way program would replace the present loose and inadequate annual control by Congress over the operations of Federal agencies through appropriations based on obligations, with a proposed annual control which bases appropriations on expenditures. From such an "annuality" concept would arise many benefits of better budgeting, of a cohesive budget document, and of reports which the public can understand and which the Congress can really use for controlling the annual expenditures of the executive agencies.

* * * * *

I. LAPSING APPROPRIATIONS AND OBLIGATIONS

On each June 30, lapse all annual appropriations and all unfulfilled obligations against them, thus, without exception, limiting the availability of each annual appropriation to those goods which are actually delivered and those services which are actually rendered up to the end of the fiscal year. As to permanent appropriations (which are undesirable because they escape fresh budget consideration and readjustment each year), it is proposed that the amounts thereby made available in successive fiscal years be treated as if they were individual annual appropriations. * * *

* * * * *

The essence of budget planning should be the translation of the proposed actual work program of each agency for the budget year into estimated dollars of expenditure. Once approved or modified by the Congress, these dollar amounts ought then to become the simple, understandable basis of control for each annual appropriation.

Instead, as has been indicated, there must now first be deducted from such amounts the obligations of the two prior years which it is estimated will be liquidated as expenditures in the current year. Then there must be added the "extra" amounts of long-term new obligations to be incurred against current appropriations although they will not be liquidated until the two subsequent fiscal years. The comprehensibility of such a process is obscure, to put it mildly.

In past years the Budget Bureau has prepared at the request of the House Appropriations Committee, but has not printed for general public circulation, a complicated and extended tabulation which bridges the gap between the disparate part I expenditure and part II obligation bases of the budget document. It shows for each proposed appropriation the proposed expenditures for the budget year ahead and the carry-overs at the beginning and end of that year. * * *[7]

The proposed lapsing provision would have the very great advantage of giving Congress direct control over both the amount and purpose of spending within each fiscal year, through appropriations based on expenditures. As things now stand, the carry-over to a later year of part of the obligations incurred against prior years' appropriations makes it possible for an agency to use up more of those obligations carried forward than had been anticipated, and therefore for the agency to spend at a more rapid rate than Congress had in mind when the relevant appropriation was considered and enacted.

Prevent wasteful last-minute obligations

Of importance also is the fact that since appropriations are based on obligations, unobligated balances of an unexpected size will arise in some agencies as the end of the year approaches. These balances should become savings. Instead, they are a source of possible waste and extravagance. The agencies are now prone to use them to incur last-minute obligations for delivery over future months of rugs, typewriters, motor equipment, and other items which were not part of the original budget plan.

Such abuse is also possible but probably would be of much smaller scope under the proposed expenditure basis of appropriations. The reason is that the unobligated surplus to be used up as the fiscal year matures would usually be revealed too late to permit entering purchase orders and also obtaining delivery thereunder of these last-minute purchases by June 30.

Other benefits of annuality

If the proposed lapsing provision is adopted, the question of obligations will drop out of part II of the budget document because both parts will then be on an expenditure basis. Cohesion will be introduced between parts I and II by standard tables which will present a simple, uniform comparison, first in summary and then in detail. This simple, standard, 3-year comparison will show actual expenditures for the last completed fiscal year, estimated expenditures for the year underway, and proposed appropriations (that is, proposed expenditures) for the budget year ahead.

The new basis would permit easy follow-up and control of the financial aspects of a work program as presented in successive budget documents. Thus, the actual 1950 expenditures for each agency's program, as reported in the 1952 budget document, could be directly compared with (figures for the same year in earlier documents). * * *

This proposal would also make possible an important start toward budgeting Federal capital expenditures. For that purpose, simple tables would be feasible showing (a) actual expenditures, by years and cumulatively, from the annual appropriations voted in prior years to implement each multiyear contract authorization (see point III below); (b) the estimated expenditure during the current year; (c) the proposed expenditure during the budget year; and (d) the residual amounts required to carry contract authorizations to completion, for which annual appropriations must still be voted.

Such capital-budget data would show how far "Uncle Sam has incurred and paid off outstanding mortgages." This very important information is now inextricably mixed in with current appropriations. Surely the financial deliberations of the Congress on new projects would be greatly improved by this much more adequate progress data on authorized projects underway.

---

[2] The budget document transmitted to the Congress on January 15, 1951, considerably modifies a former important summary table in an effort to bridge the gap between the expenditure approach of the budget message and the immense supporting obligation detail required by law. To that end the modified table continues the usual six columns of both appropriation and expenditure figures for the three fiscal years covered, then adds eight new columns to trace the degree to which annual expenditures are based on the later liquidation of obligations incurred against prior year appropriations. This painstaking exercise is of doubtful usefulness and unfortunately falls short of meeting the criticisms which motivate the action program proposed in this article.

[3] Actually, under a 1949 statute, unused parts of appropriations are continued as available for paying claims and judgments approved by the General Accounting Office until the statute of limitations takes effect.

[4] It is a great pleasure to indicate a recent basic change promulgated for agency accounting by the General Accounting Office on June 1, 1950 (Accounting Systems Memorandum No. 7, May 2, 1950). The new system permits relegating present accounting for commitments and obligations to memorandum accounts, so that the primary basis of accounting may be the expenditure controls which this article argues would have many beneficial effects in Federal operations. This development has possibilities of far-reaching significance.

[5] 18 Stat. 110.

[6] 31 U. S. C. 665.

[7] See footnote 2.

The proposed expenditure approach would make possible for the first time the legislative budget stipulated under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That act was designed to control total expenditures during the year ahead, but the obligation basis of appropriation makes it impossible really to limit expenditures specifically * * *

Likewise, appropriation controls on an expenditure basis would for the first time permit the making of a meaningful table of receipts from and payments to the public. Increasing importance is being placed on this approach in various quarters. * * *

II. NINETY-DAY RESERVES, ETC., TO PAY CLAIMS AND TARDY BILLS

Authorize each department to set up temporary reserves from expiring annual appropriations to pay tardy bills for goods and services actually provided up to the end of the fiscal year, which are rendered within 90 days after June 30. Use special single appropriation to pay billings delayed more than 90 days.

Many Federal agencies operate over huge areas and distances—on a world-wide basis in the case of the State and Military Departments in particular. Even under normal peacetime conditions, therefore, creditors cannot always render bills promptly for goods which have been delivered or services which have been rendered in the closing days of each fiscal year. After the bills are received, some time is required to prepare checks in payment. Finally, further time elapses while the checks are being cashed and cleared by the banks.

It has been testified by experts that the printing process of the Government Printing Office involves up to 90 days of delay in billing; travel, communications, supplies, rents, and utilities introduce delays ranging up to 75 days, and transportation items up to as much as 140 days. In the latter cases, the railroads must not only assemble all freight bills but must then work out the amounts due each participating railroad. * * *

It is suggested that early in July, 90-day reserves be set up in departmental accounts from expiring appropriations to pay anticipated tardy bills submitted for goods actually delivered and services actually rendered before July 1. This length of period seems adequate to meet anticipated tardiness of all except a very small proportion of the bills for the year's transactions. At the same time this period leaves another 90 days before early January during which (a) the Treasury Department can assemble final figures on total actual departmental expenditures for the year ending June 30, and (b) the Budget Bureau can incorporate the actual data in various comparisons in the budget document before it is transmitted to the Congress.

* * * * *

Treatment of bills over 90 days late

After the conclusion of the above 90-day period, there arises the problem of what shall be done with tardy bills received thereafter, including the judgments and claims certified by the General Accounting Office.[1] * * *

The departments might be allowed to absorb some or all of items below $500 each from their appropriations for the following year, or a simple solution would be to vote a single annual appropriation to a central account in the Treasury Department to pay all amounts billed more than 90 days late. * * *

* * * * *

Where accrual accounts are installed in the departments, adjustment can be made for * * * changes in inventories during each year. The exact role of accrual accounts in the Federal scene must be worked out, however. On the revenue side they cannot follow State and local practice too closely because the Federal tax liabilities of individuals, unlike individual tax liabilities on local real estate, are usually not known in advance. As to expenditures, the accrual accounts will be open to serious basic criticism if they weaken or obscure clear, simple congressional control through annual appropriations in the current year for goods actually delivered and services actually rendered in that current year.

* * * * *

III. CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS SUPPORTED BY APPROPRIATIONS

Use contract authorizations exclusively rather than only occasionally, as at present, to provide for multiyear programs. Require that each multiyear contract which is awarded shall contain a clause specifying that until the work is completed annual amounts of expenditure thereunder are to be wholly contingent on the size of the successive annual appropriations voted by Congress.

The latter provision has long been followed in the important construction contracts of both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Present construction contracts may cover 2 or 3 years of work, thus permitting more labor-saving devices to be used by contractors for the large projects and thereby bringing about lower bids. Large multiyear contracts are equally feasible under the proposed system, but Congress may subsequently reduce annual appropriations, and it is to be expected that contractors will submit higher bids to take care of this eventuality. It is felt that this loss is justified in order to give flexibility to Congress to adjust construction programs to impending booms or depressions. Flexibility could also be achieved by specifying in each contract the amount of work to be done in each of the years covered as specified in the original work plan. * * *

Under present multiyear contract awards, the public benefits if favorable weather conditions or other good luck permits a contractor to make the new facility available sooner than was anticipated. But there is a natural sequence of operations in the erection of a large building, for example, and but little speeding up is feasible as the work moves from excavation to construction of foundation, floors, and walls, to installation of internal equipment. Steel, concrete, and other supplies arrive on prearranged schedules from their separate places of manufacture, perhaps over limited railroad or highway facilities. The employment of different types of skilled and expensive labor must also be planned in advance.

Under such circumstances any great speeding up of the completion of large contracts because of favorable conditions seems improbable. To the extent, however, that there is early completion of contract work, supplementary appropriations could be voted between January and July if a project is moving ahead more rapidly than had been anticipated. Or the annual appropriation might actually be designed to provide for completion of work under contract in the shortest possible time, assuming the most favorable conditions. In the latter case, the Bureau of the Budget would be directed to hold back in nonexpendable reserves any amounts not spent because of delays.

The latter proposal is also a solution for the difficulty of estimating construction and other multiyear costs far in advance. The problem here is * * * one of reducing the amount available * * * by appropriating for average or good conditions, and then holding back proper amounts in reserves if poor conditions develop.

* * * * *

JOINT ACCOUNTING PROJECT

Good work has been done in recent years to improve Federal accounts through the joint voluntary accounting project of the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department. It does not seem, however, that those agencies are well-advised in compromising with adaptation via accrual accounting to adjust to an obligation basis of appropriations, rather than supporting an expenditure basis of appropriations to bring about adequate reform of budget and accounting procedures.

* * * * *

The members of the joint accounting project can render a great service to the Nation by urging Congress to adopt the three-way program here proposed to meet the difficult problems which arise. Anything short of this fundamental approach will fail to clear up the Alice-in-Wonderland conditions prevailing in Federal budgeting and other fiscal practices.

[1] See 63 Stat. 407, of 1949.

Legislation To Protect Members of Armed Services and Government Employees From Reprisals Because of Congressional Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced a bill designed to assure members of the Armed Forces and other officers or employees of the Government who can offer pertinent and constructive testimony that they can speak the truth without suffering the fate of Admiral Denfeld on account of such testimony before congressional committees.

This bill would make it a violation of law for any officer of the Federal Government to dismiss or otherwise discipline a Government employee for testifying before a committee of Congress.

Next week Congress will begin hearings on our far-eastern policy, the conduct of the Korean war, and the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President. As we look into these vitally important issues, it is essential that every witness testifying before these committees have complete freedom from reprisals when he is given an opportunity to tell what he knows. The issues to be discussed at these hearings vitally affect the lives of all of our people and are essential to the security of the Nation.

We have too much at stake to permit foreign policy and military strategy to be established on the basis of half-truths and the suppression of testimony.

We must provide protection to witnesses who are members of the armed services or employees of the Government. Unless we provide such protection, the scheduled hearings will amount to no

more than a whitewash for administration policies—past, present, and future.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate by the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and others.

I hope that all of the Members of the Congress will give careful attention to this important legislation which will help to assure us of obtaining all of the facts necessary to reach crucial decisions on the important matters now affecting the security of this country.

The Importance of Individual Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, over the past week end there was held at Hood College in Frederick, Md., a convocation which not only was a notable occasion in the long and splendid history of this fine institution, but which deserves to be ranked among the important educational contributions to security and democracy in this critical area.

With the defense of democracy as its theme, the convocation presented in impressive fashion the religious, moral, and social concepts of democracy, as we are privileged to know it in this country, to a degree that undoubtedly will leave a lasting impression upon all who had the opportunity to participate. The entire program was under the excellent direction of Dr. Andrew G. Truxal, the learned president of Hood College.

The addresses made during the convocation exercises were noteworthy, indeed. Among the speakers was the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH], whose topic, the Importance of Individual Thinking, was developed intelligently and convincingly. The excellent address of the Senator from Maine was in thorough accord with the scholastic atmosphere in which it was delivered.

Another who contributed to the importance and the success of the convocation was Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense, whom I had the privilege of presenting to the gathering.

It is very much in order, I believe, to offer sincere congratulations to the general chairman of the convocation committee, Mr. R. Paul Smith, of Hagerstown, one of the leading and most respected businessmen of the western part of our State. To say that the convocation, under Mr. Smith's able direction, gave evidence of outstanding vision with regard to the educational and moral needs of the moment, and that it was a complete success, is to state but a simple truth. He and all those who constituted with him the convocation committee deserve the utmost recognition and the thanks of the people of that whole area for a job well done.

Because the thoughts expressed in the address of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine are so pertinent to present-day educational conditions that they deserve to be brought to the attention of our people in all sections, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL THINKING

You young women are on the threshold of the finest years of your life. Make the best of those years—not only for yourselves, but for your families, your friends, and your country as well. Make better use of those years than has the generation preceding you.

Give the young women who follow you a heritage of peace instead of the world of suspicion, aggression, treason, character assassination, and moral delinquency that has been thrust upon you by the older generation that has preceded you.

Show them the way to think—the way to control emotions instead of being controlled by emotions. Lead them away from the emotional idolatry of personalities that so beclouds our national thinking today. Lead them away from bitter cynicism and hatred of those with whom they differ in opinion. Show them how to disagree agreeably and with constructive respect.

Help them to realize that this wonderful country of ours is greater than any individual woman or man—and that its fate, destiny, and security should not be made a political football to be kicked around by clashing personalities greedy and envious of political power.

Your generation can do this. It is your destiny—the greatest challenge with which you are faced. You can meet that challenge—you can fulfill your destiny—regardless of what individual role you play in the years to come, whether in the home, in the church, in business or in public office.

There is an old slogan that you can well respect and ever keep before you. It is the slogan of "Stop, look, and listen." But I want to add something new to that slogan and I propose to you the slogan of "Stop, look, listen, and think." If you ever think you have been wrong and want to change your mind—do it and admit it. That's the sign of a big person.

One of the basic causes for all the trouble in the world today is that people talk too much and think too little. They act too impulsively without thinking. I always try to think before I talk.

Don't misunderstand me. I'm not advocating in the slightest that we become mutes with our voices stilled because of fear of criticism of what we might say. That is moral cowardice. And moral cowardice that keeps us from speaking our minds is as dangerous to this country as irresponsible talk. The right way is not always the popular and easy way. Standing for right when it is unpopular is a true test of moral character.

In short, I urge you to think well and deeply before you talk—but once you have made up your mind, don't hesitate to speak your mind. As long as you speak your minds, dictators and demagogues will never take control of this country.

There will always be demagogues—and there must always be people with enough moral courage to stand up and speak out against such demagogues and expose and defeat them, before they get so many unthinking people swallowing their untruthful propaganda that our country is surrendered to them because we were too lazy to do our own thinking and too cowardly to speak our minds.

Instead of making a speech to you today, I would rather think with you. Instead of saying just so many words in catchy phrases and consuming so much time, I would rather just "think out loud" with you, try to get my simple points across as briefly as possible and stop. I would rather say fewer words more slowly so that they can sink in mentally than to try to crowd in the maximum number of words in any lengthy speech.

And I fully acknowledge that what I say is nothing new to you nor anything that you couldn't say yourself. But it is well for all of us to review the fundamentals that are so basic and obvious that too often too many of us take them for granted.

The importance of individual thinking to the preservation of our democracy and our freedom cannot be overemphasized. It is too often overlooked and neglected.

But when we use the word "think" just what do we mean? To think is to exercise the faculties of judgment, conception, or inference—to put our common sense into action. When the German people defaulted their thinking to Hitler, they surrendered their freedom. When the Russian people defaulted their thinking to Lenin and Stalin, they surrendered their freedom.

Too few people in this country realize that too many people in this country are defaulting their thinking to demagogues and that we are closer to surrendering our freedom than most of us are willing to recognize and admit. When we accept the statements and proposals of demagogues because we are too lazy to think and test their statements and proposals, we can blame no one but ourselves for subsequent events.

But thoughts, to be effective, must be disclosed. We must have confidence in our opinions and cherish the belief that they will guide others as well as ourselves. We should so proceed as to merit leadership and then not be timid about accepting it.

It is the articulate majority that rules a democracy. But the articulate majority does not always represent the real majority. Quite often the real minority by thinking out loud makes itself the practical, effective articulate majority. For proof of this one need only look at the presidential election figures where he or she will find that usually the victorious candidate and party not only have small margins of victory but poll considerably less than 51 percent of the eligible electorate.

There is too great a tendency to regard elections as just a lot of politics and a popularity contest in which candidates and political parties indulge in name-calling that they themselves do not believe and forget just as soon as the election campaign is over.

Elections are more than just intense politics and popularity contests. In elections we should vote for policies on vital issues, for the candidates are merely symbols and media of action.

Elections are times when we establish a policy of Government for the next 2 or 4 years—a policy that public officials whom we have elected are to follow. Therein lies the importance of maximum voting, for in our two-party system maximum voting is the greatest possible assurance of effecting the will of the majority, of giving full vitality to democracy.

There is a tendency to set women off separate from men when we think about these aspects. I don't like that—I don't like it simply because women are citizens just like men and have the same responsibilities of citizenship as men do. The simplest and most direct way to state my attitude is in three words—women are people.

So that, I am inclined to accept the theme of woman's role in the defense of democracy with the reservation that the broad role of women in the defense of democracy is no different from that of men.

Women, just like men, have the role of voting, of thinking, of articulating—of taking a stand and expressing their beliefs. They can play that role in participating in forums and public discussions. They can organize or affiliate themselves with articulate groups that represent their views. They can help get out the vote.

The articulate action of a citizen, whether man or woman, must be constructive—must seek to improve—to build instead of tear down and destroy—must be preceded by serious and responsible thinking. Criticism unaccompanied by positive proposals of substitutes for that criticized indicates lack of informed thinking on the part of the critic.

The broader sense of the concept of the role of women in the defense of democracy is that of the citizen doing her most for the preservation of democracy and peace by (1) independent thinking, (2) making that thinking articulate by translating it into action at the ballot boxes, in the forums, and in everyday life, and (3) being constructive and positive in that thinking and articulation.

In the more narrow sense of the concept—the concept that makes a distinction on the basis of sex—the most important role of the woman in defense of democracy is her traditional role as homemaker.

I wish that there were more women holding top positions in our democracy. I wish there were more women in Congress—more women in top positions in the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

But in that wish I regard the role of homemaker for women as being far more important than the role in public office. For surely the very backbone of our democracy is the family and the home in which the family lives. As long as the family home structure of our Nation is firm and sound, our democracy will be firm and sound and well defended.

Since woman is the homemaker—the keeper of the home—she is the key individual of our democracy at the "grass roots" level. In that respect woman is the primary and basic governor of our democracy, for our governing starts right in the home. Woman molds the citizens of tomorrow in the rearing that she gives the children.

Yes; the first and original governor in our democracy is the woman. Woman administers the home. She sets the rules. She enforces the rules. She metes out the discipline and the justice for violations of those rules.

In other words, women, in their own way, like Congress, legislate the rules—in their own way, like the executive branch, enforce and administer the rules—in their own way, like the courts, interpret the rules of the home.

Some of you, I hope, will enter public service. I hope that more women do inject themselves into their Government, for certainly our Government needs more of the home put into it and less of the Government in the home.

But whether you enter public service or not, there is no finer role that you can play in the defense of democracy and our American way of life than that of wife, mother, and homemaker. Run your homes and raise your children in the very best traditions and fundamentals of our American way of life.

But don't restrict yourself to the home to the extent of exclusion of any interest or participation in public affairs and your Government. For if you do that, your indifference to your Government and to your full citizenship will be reflected in your children who grow up imitating you.

In short, in the years that you are about to enter you can do far more than you realize to make this a better country—to keep it the wonderful democracy that it is, to preserve our American way of life.

You don't have to ask anybody but yourself how to do it. And there is no one who can do it for you. It is your individual responsibility. More important, it is your free and cherished right. Don't let that right die for lack of exercise.

The most precious thing that democracy gives to us is freedom. You and I cannot escape the fact that the ultimate responsibility for freedom is personal. Our freedoms today are not so much in danger because people are consciously trying to take them away from us as they are in danger because we forget to use them.

Freedom may be an intangible, but, like most everything else, it can die because of lack of use. Freedom unexercised may become freedom forfeited. The preservation of freedom is in the hands of the people themselves now, not the Government.

Prolonging Korea Stalemate Laid to Democratic Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Prolonging Korea Stalemate Laid to Democratic Leaders," written by David Lawrence and published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON

(By David Lawrence)

PROLONGING KOREA STALEMATE LAID TO DEMOCRATIC LEADERS

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Is anybody here really thinking about the 350,000 American boys in Korea? Speeches galore are being made in Congress, but so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, there isn't the slightest evidence of any policy on the part of its leadership in Congress or the White House to bring the Korean war to a successful conclusion.

Instead, the idea of a stalemate which shall keep American troops engaged indefinitely seems to be accepted as the policy of the administration. There is to be no effort to strike back at the enemy by air or to require that allies who are members of the U. N. should cease giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

It was the Democratic administration which ordered the troops into Korea without ever asking for a resolution of ratification by Congress. It is the same administration which now is committing the American forces to an indefinite period of fighting without a chance of using maximum force against the enemy.

So far as the American forces in Korea are concerned, they have been deprived of the opportunity to use the customary tactics or rules of war.

It is one of the oldest rules of international law that when an enemy force makes an attack, it can be pursued to the bases from which it came.

The Democratic Party in Congress, however, takes the position that these rules must be ignored and that the American forces must continue to take punishment day after day for fear of offending our U. N. allies or Russia.

United States entitled to leadership

The American people have a right to expect leadership from the Democratic Party, which is in control not only of the White House but of both Houses of Congress as well as the Department of State.

Yet, today the United States Government sits idly by and allows one of its allies—Great Britain—to ship through Hong Kong munitions of war that are being used by the Communist Chinese.

The United States also sits idly by and maintains friendly relations with and even appropriates money to governments, such as India, which are doing everything they can to oppose American policy. Not a single regiment of Indian troops has gone to the aid of American forces in Korea.

The Congress is asked to be humane and furnish wheat to India, but is the Government of Nehru humane? Hasn't the Government of India done everything it could to take the side of Communist China—an enemy of the United States—and isn't it the Indian Government that is really responsible for the privations of the Indian people rather than those who decline to send funds or food?

The United States sits idly by, too, and allows the legal fiction to be spread that this is a war between the United Nations and the Communists when, in fact, Britain and other U. N. governments maintain friendly relations with governments actually engaged in war against us.

Fear wins no wars

One Government which is a member of the United Nations—namely, Nationalist China—is prevented from aiding our troops in Korea. Within the last few days it has been announced that a military mission is going from America to help the Nationalists to defend Formosa against attack. If American munitions and military personnel can do this, they can help the Nationalists to reach the mainland, as General MacArthur recommended.

But how does the American Government justify its own course in arranging now for the defense of Formosa when the British Government and other U. N. governments do not concur at all in the American policy toward Formosa?

What kind of U. N. policy is it which forbids one of its own members to obey the call for reinforcements in Korea? And what kind of U. N. policy is it which permits its principal members to trade with the enemy and to carry on diplomatic relations with the enemy government?

These factors make it logical to expect that the Democratic Party will have to explain is position and record on all this some day. It cannot pose as the "peace party" when in fact it has become the party that has allowed the Korean war to be prolonged instead of being brought to a quick conclusion, as could be done if General MacArthur's recommendations were followed.

Fear never won a war and public expressions of fear recently by Democratic Party

spokesmen may well invite further attacks from the enemy, just as the ill-fated pronouncement in January 1950 by our Secretary of State that Korea wouldn't be defended may have encouraged the Communist aggression in June 1950.

How To End Korean War Yet Win Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "How To End Korean War Yet Win Peace," which was published in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., on Tuesday, April 24, 1951:

HOW TO END KOREAN WAR YET WIN PEACE

As key Senate committees prepare to take up an inquiry into United States foreign policy, these vital factors stand out as conditioning aspects of the search for a wise and sound global program:

1. Because of tragic errors of the past, we are limited in our efforts for the future. It is not so much a matter now of agreeing on the best course. Unfortunately, there is no such course. So we must content ourselves with determining the least objectionable of a number of faulty courses.

2. The towering and heroic figure of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, together with the cavalier manner in which this military genius was dismissed has threatened to put an unfortunate emphasis upon the emotional plane and to make difficult a dispassionate, logical approach to the problem.

This has not been the general's fault. The summary way in which he was shorn of his duties provided the spark which lit this Nation-wide display of hero worshipfulness. And the administration, in what has come pretty close to being a smear campaign directed against the general, has succeeded in fanning the blaze.

Part of the blame for this bobby-soxer approach to the matter at hand must also be attributed to some Republicans, who have sought to capitalize upon the genuine and deep-seated respect the people have for this great American.

3. The administration, having failed to anticipate accurately the depth of the public's feeling in the matter, has been placed in the uncomfortable position of fighting, with its back to the wall, an unpopular engagement in which personalities rather than issues are getting far too much attention.

Such an uneasiness over being at bay is not conducive to logical presentation of facts, and encourages excessive use of tactics unworthy of the serious issues at hand.

4. Finally, the administration, if it is to avoid a public confession of its earlier fundamental errors, may choose to commit new and equally grave mistakes out of the necessity of preserving partisan strength, or at least of hedging against a too severe breaching of party armor.

In this respect, the President and his advisers have inexpertly boxed themselves in. They cannot very well go forward along lines advocated by General MacArthur, for they have fired him for pressing this course. They cannot go back along the road of appeasement, as advocated by Great Britain, for they themselves have foresworn this retreat, in their efforts to breast the wave of public adoration of MacArthur the hero.

That leaves them only the sad choice of trying to stand still, an alternative in which we expect the Chinese and the Russian Communists will be extremely uncooperative.

Indeed, the weakness of the United States politico-military position in the Far East today is that it cannot be characterized as a policy at all—but rather as the lack of one. Like Charles Dickens' Mr. Micawber, we are "waiting for something to turn up." And that, short of surrender, is no way to win a war—or a peace, either.

Despite these four very real and very unfortunate difficulties, the way must be found to a positive policy which is the least faulty, to a policy by which the war in Korea can be brought to an honorable and speedy conclusion, to a policy which gives the greatest hope of restoring peace, to a policy which can lead eventually to a logical program for insuring the security of the Western World while at the same time coming to an understanding with the Soviet world which will permit the two halves to live together, if not in complete harmony, at least outside the shadow of imminent war.

Admittedly, that's a mighty big order. And it, too, has a major flaw, just as has President Truman's idea of a "limited war" in Korea. That flaw is the refusal of the Communist world earnestly to seek peace, or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

It takes two to make war. It also takes two to make peace. And we only kid ourselves, and do our noble cause a major disservice, if we conclude that our cold-war-hot-war enemy desires real and lasting peace in Asia, in the Middle East or in Europe.

We have contended that the Truman-Acheson policy vacuum in Korea is faulty. We hasten to add that the program General MacArthur favors is more or less faulty, too. That's what we're trying to get at. Nothing we can do will be completely right. Some things will be less wrong than others.

Much was made by an administration source over the week end about the entry of the Chinese Communists into the Korean "police action." General MacArthur is quoted as having assured President Truman at the Wake Island conference that the Chinese Reds would not enter the conflict, that he could wind up the Korean campaign about Thanksgiving time and that at least a division of United States troops in Korea could be spared for European duty by early January.

We have yet to hear General MacArthur's version of this historic meeting last October 15 and we shall withhold comment on it until that time.

But this fact remains, and it cannot be controverted:

When we entered Korea militarily after the surprise attack by the North Koreans across the thirty-eighth parallel—a move that was made, incidentally, without consultation with Congress, which constitutionally has exclusive power to declare war—we took a calculated risk.

It might be added here, parenthetically, that the President ordered troops into Korea without prior consultation with General MacArthur, whose job it would be as a military man to fight the campaign decided upon by the diplomats.

Once we committed troops to Korea, we rank the risk that Communist China would enter the fray. There may have been good reason at the time to doubt that the Chinese Reds would get mixed up in it. But we didn't know for sure. We did know—or should have realized—that if Mao decided to get in we couldn't keep him out.

As it developed, Mao did move into Korea. Whether he intended to do that all along, or changed his mind when it became obvious that we would lick the North Koreans, we don't know. He's there now, at any rate.

If we follow General MacArthur's program, we may wind up fighting Russia, too, not only in the Far East but in Europe and the Middle East as well. Nobody knows.

Saying Russia necessarily won't move in, as General MacArthur told Congress, is nothing more than a guess. Russia might get into it—and we might as well face that possibility. Russia might get in even though we don't smack Red China by air.

In a very real sense Russian involvement has been a possibility ever since we went to the South Koreans' aid, just as Red China's involvement was. The Truman-Acheson policy vacuum in Korea is no guaranty either that the Kremlin won't strike.

The basic weakness of the MacArthur viewpoint is this: What do we do with Korea—or that piece of it we finally capture—once we win?

We may even force the Chinese to pull back across the Yalu. We might even be able to achieve the United Nations original goal in Korea—to unify the country and to restore it to the Koreans under a democratic form of government.

But unless the U. N. keeps thousands of men in Korea for a long time to come, and arms that defense army to the teeth, there will be nothing to prevent the Chinese from repeating the whole sorry aggression after our boys go home.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson was right (although there are some things a government can't and shouldn't say officially) when he observed that Korea was a military liability. It still is. It will continue to be, even if we kick Mao out of that tragic land.

We went into Korea in the first place because of a high moral principle, to conquer aggression and to halt Red imperialism by force of arms. That was a noble sentiment, and it was supported generally in this country.

But the United Nations has abandoned that goal. The U. N. membership has quietly but firmly failed to provide enough military stuff, just as the U. N. has failed to supply the diplomatic and political guts, to do what it set out to do in Korea.

In a very real sense, our allies have let us down. As a result, we have concocted this senseless Truman-Acheson formula for seeking to limit the war. You can't limit war. You either win wars, or you lose them.

You can commit your men to a criminal meat-grinder proposition in which you trade one pint of American blood for 20 pints of Communist blood. But in the end you succeed in doing nothing but spilling blood.

Furthermore, under such a program, which requires a willingness to see the Korean campaign seesaw across the narrow peninsula for months, years, maybe, you make it inevitable that the folks back home eventually will demand that the whole sorry mess be ended, one way or the other.

General MacArthur wanted to try to end the war, in what looked to him to be the shortest possible time and with the least additional loss of American lives. He was fired, because that isn't the way the Truman-Acheson script calls for things to go.

But there is one other way. It won't be popular immediately. It won't be strictly moral, from the standpoint of high principle. It won't be totally right. But we think it offers the greatest percentage of rightness and the lowest percentage of wrongness. It's the least of a number of larger evils.

Here's a rough outline we toss out as the basis for discussion—intelligent, unemotional discussion, we hope.

1. Get out of Korea. Announce in advance that we are laying down a broad radioactive belt behind which our forces can stage an orderly withdrawal and through which the Commies cannot advance to prevent evacuation of our men, our equipment, and our allies.

2. Take with us South Koreans, military and civilian, who don't want to stay behind. (We don't know where we could put them, but that could be worked out through the U. N.; it's a U. N. baby.)

3. Proclaim a Monroe Doctrine for the far Pacific. Draw a line and say to the Commies, in Peiping as well as in Moscow, cross that line and atomic eggs begin to fall on you, brother—but fast.

4. Make certain the Commies clearly understand this line, among other places, specifically protects the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, New Zealand, Australia. Work out defense pacts at once with the people of these areas.

5. Announce boldly that, by their aggressive tactics, both Red China and Red Russia have forfeited any right to expect to help write the Japanese peace treaty. We trusted them when we agreed to let them in on the peace with the Japs. They (the Commies) have violated that trust. Therefore, those bets are off—but good.

6. Let it be known that we will veto Red China's admission to the United Nations Security Council, until Peiping proves by her deeds, not by mere words, that she is capable of taking her place with civilized countries of the world, that she can be trusted not to fracture the peace in ruthless aggressive imperialism.

7. Admit that we have failed to do what we set out to do in Korea—primarily because the United Nations got cold feet and would not face the risk of world war III that have been part of the Korean affair from the very beginning. Say that we are pulling out of Korea because we aren't willing—alone—to shoulder the blame of bringing on world war III, if it should start over our moves to win an indecisive victory in Korea—indecisive, that is, in terms of our global determination to keep the free world free.

This is a positive program. It is aggressive. It is one on which we could achieve unity among ourselves here at home. It is one on which we could achieve unity among a vast majority of the 60 nations of the United Nations. It is a policy that says what we mean—for the first time in months.

Admittedly, there are major flaws inherent in a policy which pretends to be positive, yet starts out being negative. But, we submit, in light of the mistakes of the past, the program is less faulty than the present Truman-Acheson policy vacuum.

Finally, this get-out-of-Korea plan is not appeasement. It is frankly admitting temporary defeat, yes. On the other hand, the only other way to get out of Korea—short of military victory over Communist China, and perhaps Russia, too—requires real appeasement: The promise of giving the Commies something (Formosa, a voice in the Jap Peace Treaty, a seat in the U. N.) to buy them into agreeing to a cease-fire and a phony peace.

Under this proposal, we lay down the terms, not the Commies. And those terms would be tougher than we could extract from Mao in anything short of licking him on the mainland of China.

We seriously recommend careful study of this get-out-of-Korea suggestion as the least evil way out of this mess. For by it, we could preserve permanently the peace and security of the Western World in the Pacific—and in the Atlantic community of nations as well.

Conference To Fight High Prices and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on inflation and mobilization adopted at a special conference of the Liberal Party on April 19. This conference was attended by 925 delegates representing labor, veterans, civic, consumers, community, and liberal organizations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON POLICY ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE TO FIGHT HIGH PRICES AND INFLATION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL OF NEEDLE TRADES, THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1951

World peace depends upon the maintenance of economic, military, and moral strength in the free world. The backbone of such strength is the United States.

America's ability to fulfill its world mission is seriously threatened by the growing price inflation. Inflation adds unnecessary billions to the cost of military defense. Inflation imposes unbearable costs on the people of Europe and Asia in their efforts to obtain American goods. Inflation undermines the living standards of the American people, thereby weakening the working and fighting morale of the Nation. Inflation is an ally of communism.

The rapid inflation, since the beginning of the conflict in Korea, is based on an artificial scarcity, created by scare buying, speculation, stockpiling, accumulation of inventories. Although this artificial price boost is now leveling off, the long range impact of our mobilization needs must create real scarcities. Uncontrolled, this scarcity will mean new and great price rises, a prolonged period of steady inflation.

The immediate effect of this inflation has been bloated profits for a few at one end, and endangered living standards for the millions at the other end. Corporate profits in the fourth quarter of 1951 stood 75 percent above the previous year. Select corporations, producing basic commodities, topped even this unprecedented high in profits.

For the consumer, the threat to his savings and his living standards was reflected in the rising price indexes:

The cost of living has gone up more than 8 percent.

The price of food has gone up more than 11 percent.

The price of semimanufactured wholesale goods has gone up 24.7 percent.

In the same period, more than half the nonagricultural workers in America received no pay increases. Of those who did get any increase in 1951, the majority were between 6 to 8 percent.

These inequities have been multiplied by the inequities of the tax structure. Corporate profits, after taxes, have risen 50 percent since last year. Loopholes in the present law cost Uncle Sam billions of dollars annually. The salaried and wage worker faces increased income taxes and new sales taxes.

The basic responsibility for the failure to control inflation lies in the presently inadequate Defense Production Act, passed by a business-minded Congress.

The act exempts food prices from controls.

The act provides no means for rent controls.

The act exempts manufactured products from quality control.

The weakness of the act has been aggravated by the weak and lop-sided use of the powers bestowed on the President and the mobilization agencies. At present the core of the control regulations is a retail percentage mark-up on a climbing wholesale price level. This is merely a legislation of inflation.

While prices rise rapidly and profits rise even more rapidly, the mobilization agencies have sought to freeze wages, leaving the great mass of Americans no means of catching up with the inflationary trend.

The present Defense Production Act expires on June 30, simultaneously with the expiration of the present almost meaningless rent-control legislation.

This conference, representing delegates of consumer, civic labor, community, fraternal, veterans, and liberal organizations, calls upon the citizens of New York City to rally for a new Defense Production Act to halt inflation.

This means power to impose tight rent controls.

This means power to control farm prices, while guaranteeing farm income through proper subsidies.

This means dollar-and-cents ceilings on manufactured goods, with provisions for quality control.

Simultaneously, the tax structure must be revised to place the burden upon those best able to bear them. This means absolute opposition to any national sales tax. This means stepped-up corporate and excess-profits taxes, both as a means of financing necessary Government expenditures and as a way of cutting down on huge slush funds now engaged in speculative enterprise. To curb speculation we propose credit controls.

Until such time as a new act is written, this conference calls upon the mobilization agencies to establish dollar-and-cents ceilings and to roll back prices in basic industries and distributive trades now showing superprofits.

To enforce this program, this conference calls upon the administration to reorganize the mobilization agencies so that a full and equal voice be granted to labor, the farmer, and the consuming public, along with business, right through the entire mobilization structure.

To realize this program, this conference calls upon its assembled delegates, through their organizations, to communicate with their elected representatives and the President of the United States for the above program to check inflation and to establish an equality of sacrifice in America's great effort to maintain peace and freedom in the world.

RESOLUTION ON PLAN OF ACTION ADOPTED AT CONFERENCE TO FIGHT HIGH PRICES AND INFLATION HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL OF NEEDLE TRADES, THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1951

In order to effect real price control, tight rent control, and a vigorous check in profiteering, we recommend the following plan of action:

1. Adoption of appropriate resolutions by the various organizations represented at this conference.

2. Sending of such resolutions to President Truman, Senators Lehman and Ives, all New York Congressmen, majority and minority

leaders in both Houses of Congress, to Charles Wilson, Eric Johnston, and Michael DiSalle and to the United Labor Committee.

3. Initiation of a card-writing campaign by the members of the various organizations, to be addressed to their local representatives in the National Government, as well as to the various appropriate Federal agencies.

4. Sending of delegations by the various organizations to legislators and administrators in order to urge adoption of the measures and actions recommended by the conference.

5. Wide distribution of the four-page folder leaflet prepared by the committee that arranged the conference against high prices and inflation, or of similar leaflets, in order to educate and arouse public opinion.

6. Organization of neighborhood rallies by the organizations represented in this conference, cooperatively, if possible, and singly, if necessary.

7. Writing of letters to the press by the delegates as individuals in order further to arouse and organize public opinion.

8. Stimulation of public opinion by the use of radio and other channels of communication.

9. Encouragement and organization of consumers' boycotts by housewives against flagrant abuses or profiteering with regard to prices and profits.

10. Publicizing by the various organizations of actions taken by them for real price control, tight rent control, and against profiteering.

11. Sending of an appropriate communication to the United Labor Committee solidarizing this conference with their efforts to stem the tide of inflation.

Motion that in order to carry out more effectively the plan of action outlined above and to correlate the separate activities of the participating organizations it is urged that each organization, wherever appropriate, identify itself with this conference.

Motion that this conference against high prices and inflation call upon the government of the city of New York to utilize the department of markets to keep prices down and to serve as a pacemaker in pushing control over prices.

Motion: Be it

Resolved, That this conference against high prices calls upon the city of New York to reinstitute the bureau formerly existent in the department of markets for the purpose of utilizing the radio, newspapers, and other media of communications to disseminate information to make price control more effective and to combat inflation.

An Emergency Federal Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD specific recommendations of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce. These recommendations are the result of the considered thinking of the most qualified men in Kansas on Federal taxation. The Kansas State Chamber of Commerce believes that the recommendations contained in the enclosed emergency Federal tax program are realistic and sound in every respect. I submit them to the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EMERGENCY FEDERAL TAX PROGRAM—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FORMULATED BY THE FEDERAL TAXATION COUNCIL REVISED AND ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS APRIL 13, 1951

INTRODUCTION

The Nation's program for defense is threefold: First, organizing and training an extensive military establishment; second, developing our industrial potential to maintain our superiority in arms; and third, protecting our national economy against the inflationary pressures which are a concomitant of a rearmament program. To fail in either phase would mean the loss of freedom and our American way of life.

We must guard ourselves against two major dangers in our defense effort: First, our defense needs should be carefully studied and should not be of excessive scope; second, once the required scope is determined, the program should be carried out with efficiency and minimum waste.

To build the effective military establishment required, without incurring colossal waste, will call for the most careful study and planning. To outproduce the Communist aggressors will demand the full use of available capital and the cooperation of all our people. To defeat inflation will require austere self-denial on the part of every citizen and the various echelons of our Government, Federal, State, and local as well.

GENERAL POLICIES

Therefore, we believe that the following eight points should be laid down as general policies:

1. The President's recommended spending budget of $71,600,000,000 for the Federal fiscal year 1952 should be critically examined by the Congress. Substantial reductions in nondefense expenditures should be made. Among the areas in which large savings should be effected are public works, foreign aid, subsidies, grants-in-aid, and loan programs; and there are others. Where necessary, amendatory legislation to achieve these objectives should be enacted promptly. All new domestic spending programs must be scrutinized with especial care.

2. Appropriations and authorizations for those purposes deemed essential, including defense, must be subjected to scrutiny with a view to eliminating waste, inefficiency, and duplication. It must also be borne in mind that many governmental services that might be construed as essential in peacetime are entirely unnecessary or are considerably less essential in time of national emergency.

3. It is fundamental that the budget be balanced immediately. If, after eliminating all nonessential expenditures and reducing less essential ones, the 1952 budget is not balanced, then—and only then—additional revenue in an amount sufficient to attain this objective should be raised.

4. In framing such tax legislation as may be found necessary to balance the 1952 budget, consideration should be given to levying those taxes which will least impair the productive capacity of the country. Individual income and corporation taxes have already been increased to meet the emergency. Excise taxes, in marked contrast to individual and corporation income taxes, have not been increased in the last few years. Excise taxes are traditionally a major feature of our revenue system. Excise taxes, if wisely levied, are much less inflationary than other types. They can be made a temporary source of large revenue without being oppressive. Therefore, we believe that excise taxes should be expanded as the major, if not the only, source of such additional revenue as may be required.

5. If expansion of the field of excise taxation should not suffice to balance the 1952 budget, then the yield of the individual income taxes should be increased.

6. The Congress should, however, complete the program, well started in the Revenue Act of 1950, of subjecting to the corporation tax the incomes of all organizations which engage in business in competition with those which are taxed. Government-financed enterprises, cooperatives, and others still enjoy unfair tax advantages which should be eliminated without injury to the legitimate purposes of such enterprises.

7. By economies in operation and by increasing postal rates in those classifications which now show operating losses, the Post Office Department should be made self-sustaining; also, all franking privileges should be discontinued.

8. While Congress has carried out some of the recommendations of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch (popularly known as the Hoover Commission), it has still before it the majority of those recommendations whose enactment will result in the greatest economies and efficiencies. Congress should tolerate no further delay in translating these recommendations into law.

SPECIFIC MEASURES

Excises: The present selective types of excise taxes should be extended and expanded so as to place the burden insofar as possible on those best able to pay and on such products as are most competitive with the defense program. Any increases in tax under this proposal should not be levied on any items which, before the effective date of the imposition of such taxes, have left the possession of the person obligated to pay the tax.

The imposition of a Federal general-sales tax or defense-excise tax, either at the retail or the manufacturer's level is opposed, even if food products were to be exempted. Such general sales taxes would hit hardest those least able to pay; would be inflationary in application, particularly so if applied at the manufacturer's level; would greatly burden millions of retailers in their accounting procedures if applied at the retail level; if once adopted, would likely become permanent in the Federal revenue scheme and thus in future years impinge upon sources of revenue available to the various States governments; and would not create a sufficient tax consciousness in the mind of the taxpayer, particularly if imposed at the manufacturer's level.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

In seeking increased revenue from income taxation, we recommend first that the enforcement powers of the Bureau of Internal Revenue be strengthened by providing stiffer penalties for deliberate and negligent underreporting of incomes.

If expansion and extension of selective-excise taxes, increased income from more rigid enforcement of income-tax laws, and decreased Government expenditures for nondefense functions, wherever possible, do not produce sufficient revenue to meet prospective Federal budgets, we recommend across-the-board increases in individual income-tax rates as will be least discriminatory and most feasible for the general economy.

Ayer Award Came Through Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Johnstown Democrat, a newspaper in my congressional district, has been awarded first honorable mention for excellence in typography, presswork, and makeup by the judges of the twenty-first annual exhibition of newspaper typography. The Johnstown Democrat won its award in the classification for newspapers of the 10,000 to 50,000 circulation class. Judges were Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania; Merle Armitage, art director of Look and Quick and president of the American Institute of the Graphic Arts; and J. L. Frazier, editor of Inland Printer.

With the receipt of this national honor the Democrat has rounded out a complete cycle of best of all accomplishments in newspaper circles. They have received previous recognition in such fields as photography, editorial writing, features, public service, and general news content.

I congratulate John James, the editor; Walter W. Krebs, the owner and publisher; and L. W. Barnes, general manager; together with all of the heads of the other departments, all of the employees and personnel working for this newspaper. They all deserve a "well done."

The editor, John James, has written the following editorial, which I believe expresses fully the sentiments of the newspaper and the people employed by it:

AYER AWARD CAME THROUGH TEAMWORK

The Democrat shares with its readers today a pardonable pride in achievement.

This newspaper is fortunate to have won first honorable mention in the annual F. Wayland Ayer competition for excellence in typography, presswork, and make-up, in the 10,000–50,000 circulation classification.

Every newspaper in the Nation was eligible to enter the competition. Eight hundred did.

The Ayer cup went to the Daily News-Tribune of La Salle, Ill. To the News-Tribune go our sincere congratulations.

In the 10,000–50,000 class, the Democrat took first place. We share honors with the New York Herald Tribune, which captured similar recognition in the over-50,000 classification.

Through the years the Democrat has won its share of recognition—for excellence in news reporting and photography, for outstanding coverage in the mining and aviation fields. Some judges have found that the Democrat's editorial page merits a second look.

But these are departmental honors, and as such they represent only one facet of any newspaper's excellence.

The Ayer recognition, one the other hand, represents teamwork in which every department has shared—from the topside to the apprentice who one day may head this organization.

The recognition the Democrat won this week represents the appreciation of skills that no one man, not even one department, could ever hope to master.

Purely for the purpose of the record, let's tick off a few of the credits that are due.

Before any award for excellence could be won by any newspaper in any community there must be a willingness to risk capital in a venture that history has shown to be one of the most uncertain. That capital has been provided—to the tune of several million dollars as represented in the investment in the Democrat, one of a group of enterprises serving this community with distinction.

Behind that must be executive and administrative ability to translate the dollars and cents of the investors into a product of community service. Theirs is the job of bringing into clear focus the contribution each department makes to the end product. In the case of the Democrat, they are Walter W. Krebs, publisher, and L. W. Barnes, general manager.

In the production departments, where ideas and know-how find their way onto the copy paper from which the cold type is set, credit goes to Pat Malloy, managing editor, and Carl M. Gillespie, advertising manager. Sharing the spotlight in the news department are Saul W. Spiegel, city editor; Newton Georg, telegraph editor; James H. Torr, sports editor; Glenn Sease, mine editor.

The contributions of the mechanical departments in the production of a prize-winning newspaper are major. Chief of the Democrat's composing room is Aloysius Karcher. In charge of the Democrat's pressroom is John H. Mock. Head of the engraving department is R. Wayne Schrott.

But these department heads alone could not have produced an Ayer prize-winning newspaper. They have been supported all along the line by loyal and conscientious workers who as a well-coordinated team have enabled the Democrat to achieve such national recognition.

Finally, full credit must be paid to the hundreds of advertisers and the more than 26,800 readers who have found this newspaper to be a profitable and informative meeting place that has come to represent an important phase of the American way of life.

We of the Democrat thank the Ayer people for the recognition they have given us.

We recognize the high standards the future imposes upon us, if we are to meet the challenge of 1951.

All of us hope to be able to produce in the coming years the kind of a newspaper our readers have a right to expect.

Predicting and Interpreting the 1950 Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Louis H. Bean is recognized as one of this Nation's foremost authorities in the field of election statistics. He gained Nation-wide recognition in his 1948 prediction that President Truman would be reelected. Dr. Bean is always willing to have his predictions reviewed following an election.

Following is an abstract of a talk given by Dr. Bean regarding the 1950 elections:

The 1950 congressional election offers an excellent example for discussing my part of this series of lectures, How To Predict and Interpret Elections. But it should be looked upon only as an example. In applying the art of statistical analysis, expectation and interpretation to past and future elections, it should be borne in mind that every election is dominated by different problems and features.

Some of you may recall my statistical analyses of past congressional elections, made before the Korean war and published many weeks before the election of November 7. These studies were intended to show how the two major parties appeared to be lined up in the spring and summer of 1950 before the big guns of the political campaign opened up.

They pointed to certain possible results if one assumed no major abnormal developments in domestic or international affairs; that is, if one assumed a normal midterm election. They indicated what might normally be expected if the two major parties conducted their campaigns as usual.

What were these norms or standards as I laid them out in my book the Mid-Term Battle? How do the actual results differ from those of a normal midterm election?

For the House of Representatives, I pointed out that normally the Democrats, as the party in power, stood to lose 25 to 30 seats. They actually lost 27. We are, therefore, justified in looking upon the over-all results in the House as about in line with normal expectations. This means that as far as the 435 congressional races are concerned, they were not much influenced by the new political climate that the Korean war brought on after June, or that such new influences as did develop managed to cancel out in the aggregate.

The make-up of the Eighty-second Congress is 54 percent Democratic compared with 60 percent in the Eighty-first Congress. The 235 Democrats elected in 1950 should be compared with the results in other midterm elections, if one wants to see where the Democrats stand in the political tide that turned up after 1946. Here are the comparable numbers of Democratic Congressmen elected in other years:

1934	322
1938	262
1942	222
1946	183
1950	235

The Democrats in 1950 came out statistically stronger than in 1946 and 1942, but not as strong as in 1938. In some States, such as Connecticut and Pennsylvania, the Democrats actually succeeded in preventing the traditional midterm decline in their percentages of the votes cast. In these two States the Democrats on a midterm basis are stronger today than they have been since 1934, and if the Pennsylvania vote had been as near to normal as the Connecticut vote turned out to be, the Pennsylvania Democrats might have reelected their Senator.

There were two other major facts I pointed to in connection with the 1950 midterm election of Congressmen. One had to do with the region where most of the losses were likely to occur, the other had to do with the size of the vote—with political apathy as a factor in the probable outcome.

Since most Democratic losses in 1946 occurred in the Northeast—in the States stretching from Massachusetts to Missouri—and since most of the 1948 gains also occurred in this industrial area, I suggested that this would again be the main battleground, with the center of losses in the Pennsylvania and Ohio districts. And so it was, except that the center of losses turned out to be Ohio-Indiana instead of Pennsylvania-Ohio.

With regard to the size of the vote, I emphasized the fact that in 1948 there were about 10,000,000 "lost" voters—those who had failed to vote. This is just on the basis of the voting trend of the 1920's and 1930's and

not on the basis of the total of over 93,000,000 eligible voters. (On the latter basis, the total of "lost" voters was over 45,000,000.)

The point of these turn-out figures is to show that with the Democrats as the party in power, the larger the turnout the larger the number of victorious Democratic candidates. Specifically, I pointed out that had the total vote in 1948 been 10,000,000 greater, it would have meant 20 more Democratic seats in the House.

The 1950 results sustain this view. It is now possible to say that had the national turnout in 1950 been normal, the Democrats might have minimized their losses and possibly have come through with an actual gain in control instead of the normal shrinkage. This may surprise those who were misled by the many stories about the large vote in this year's election. It was not large—only fair.

The standard I laid out for a normal midterm vote in 1950 was around 48,000,000 (2,000,000 greater than in the 1948 Presidential election). The latest count gave the total as 40,000,000. This is not quite the apathy of 1946, but it is apathy enough and, as usual, it is mostly apathy on the Democratic side. Here is the simplest illustration I can offer:

Year	Total vote	Democrats elected
1946	34,000,000	188
1950	40,000,000	235
1948	46,000,000	262

A larger total vote still means a larger number of Democratic Congressmen, and if the 1950 vote had been not midway between the very low total of 1946 and the low total of 1948 but had reached forty-seven to forty-eight million, the Eighty-second Congress would have larger Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate.

For the Senate, my analysis pointed to a normal midterm loss of 3 or 4 Democratic seats, accompanying the loss of 25 to 30 seats in the House. As you know, the loss was five. While not far from the expected, based on a normal midterm election, actually, it is the result of several surprises.

Judged largely on a statistical, traditional mid-term-voting basis, with little consideration given to personalities and issues, the Republican senatorial opportunities in 1950 seemed to be in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Idaho, and Nevada. The Republicans were checked by a fairly large vote in Connecticut; they failed to capitalize on their statistical opportunities in Nevada, but won in Idaho, Pennsylvania, and Illinois. In the last two States the Republican victories may be traced to Democratic apathy among metropolitan voters—look at Pittsburgh and Chicago as examples.

The Democratic opportunities for senatorial gains were fewer. They were limited to Missouri and possibly Colorado and Ohio. The Democrats won in Missouri, succeeded in narrowing the Republican margin in Colorado, but missed in Ohio by a mile—again, in part, because many Democratic metropolitan voters stayed away from the polls. The real senatorial surprises, of course, were in the Democratic defeats in Maryland and Utah, and to a lesser degree in California. Except for these two or three, even the overall senatorial results would be normal for a midterm election.

The reasons for the surprises in the senatorial races have yet to be fully analyzed statistically. The same, incidentally, may be said also for the gubernatorial surprises of the Southwest—where three Republican governors were elected in addition to the two in Connecticut and Maryland. The task is not a simple one if you do not care to—and you shouldn't—accept the usual and ready generalizations. For full understanding it is necessary to actually probe far below the surface for what was done and what actually happened in such key States as Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Utah, and California. That calls for some rather close analytical work in unscrambling the complexities and interrelationships in our political body. This is essential if we are to see the way the great amount of information and misinformation was made to flow through our social and economic nerves, veins, and arteries, and actually influenced voting last November, particularly in metropolitan areas.

Even before the reasons for these senatorial surprises have been satisfactorily analyzed, the question is being asked: "What do they mean for 1952?" At this stage, obviously, it is anybody's guess. With the world full of diplomatic and military uncertainties, it is foolish to assume that things political and economic will remain as they are until 1952. But, by way of summarizing the two central features of the 1950 election (the normal midterm character of the results in the House and the few surprises in the senatorial races), it can be said that had we had a Presidential as well as a congressional election last November 7, we would have seen another Democratic victory of the proportions of 1948.

The 1952 outcome will, of course, depend on the domestic and international issues that prevail 18 months from now, on the business and agricultural conditions then, on the candidates chosen at the national conventions, on campaign strategy, and on turn-out or voting interest. How these factors will shape up is not too clear this far in advance. They serve to give a cloudy appearance to the so-called statistical crystal ball. But I expect this cloud of uncertainty to lift as we approach 1952, so I would suggest that you preserve for future use some of the lessons you may have learned from the political statistical analysis I have presented to you.

Turkey's Place in Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ankara Government Worried," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Evening Star of April 27, 1951, dealing with the place of Turkey in the defense program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANKARA GOVERNMENT WORRIED—AMBASSADOR ERKIN CALLED HOME FOR CONSULTATION AS UNITED STATES FAILS TO INCLUDE TURKEY IN DEFENSE PLANS

(By Constantine Brown)

The slowness of the State Department to include Turkey in any kind of formal defense program has led to Ankara's order to its Ambassador here, Feridun Cemal Erkin, to return immediately for consultations.

The Turkish Government is worried. It borders Russia on the east and Moscow's satellite, Bulgaria, on the west. Thus, Turkey is more directly threatened by Kremlin aggressiveness than any North Atlantic Pact nation.

In spite of that immediate threat the Ankara Government has rushed to Korea 10,000 of its best soldiers, whose fighting ability has won the praise of General MacArthur and all top-ranking American officers who have been in Korea.

The Turkish Government has drawn the attention of Secretary of State Acheson to the fact that the country is exposed to Soviet aggression and has suggested that it be included in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This was turned down by the French and British Governments. Since the veto power exists in the NATO, there was nothing that the State Department could do. The refusals by London and Paris were final.

The Ankara Government since last October has proposed a mutual assistance pact between the United States and Turkey on the pattern of those which that country has had with France and Britain since 1939. Ankara stressed the fact that the Turkish people—and Turkey is a democracy where the government cannot ignore public sentiment—while determined to fight to the last ditch, are concerned over the reluctance of America to pledge all-out assistance in the event of Soviet aggression.

In a speech at Philadelphia last Thursday, Ambassador Erkin expressed his government's views by saying: "The Western European Union has been based on an artificial separation of free Europe into two distinct segments. Consequently, one part of free Europe only has been extended the privilege of being admitted to the pact, whereas the other part has been left outside of the arrangement."

Ankara's many representations to the State Department have remained without positive results. The top officials of our Government have been considering the situation sympathetically for several months, but that was all.

Meanwhile, the threat of a third world war has been increasing and Turkey is in the first line of fire. Since French and British opposition to inclusion of Turkey in NATO could not be overcome, Ankara insists that a regional pact between America and Turkey be concluded at the earliest possible moment.

The Russian propagandists already are trying to take advantage of the reluctance of our Government to commit itself to a mutual assistance pact by telling the Turkish people that the United States wants their manpower as cannon fodder, but is not interested in any actual commitments for her defense.

Ambassador Erkin stated in Philadelphia that: "Turkey is the vital key to the whole Mediterranean area; the solid wall which stops the armies of aggression from descending toward the Arab countries and the Mediterranean, the plug which stops communism from rolling toward the south. The collapse of Turkey would mean the loss of the Mediterranean and would affect adversely American security."

These views have been expressed even more forcefully by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in executive hearings before the Armed Services Committees of Congress.

"Only a strong free Europe supported by the United States can secure peace," the spokesman of the Turkish Government added. "But today free Europe is not strong and free Europe is not complete."

Besides this vital political angle, Turkey is worried about the little support it receives from us in the economic field. Because of her strategic position Turkey has been forced to spend since 1939 as much as 55 percent of her budget for national defense. Until 1950 she was able to meet the deficit by domestic and foreign loans and by increased taxation.

The assistance given Turkey by the Truman military aid program and by the ECA has helped to some extent. But as the international situation deteriorated Turkey had to make greater sacrifices for her military program.

Victory in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 27, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann, distinguished Washington journalist, which appeared in the April 22 issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Lippmann warns:

Great victories can never be won cheaply, but only by sweat, blood, and tears. The great wars which must be waged in order to win great victories should not be begun in the illusion or under the pretense that they are little and easy wars.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
PROGRAM FOR A VICTORY

The crucial portion of General MacArthur's speech came, of course, when he talked about Korea. He had recommended, he said, six measures which were designed to support our forces committed to Korea and to bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless American and allied lives. These six measures, he told the Congress, would bring victory and in war there is no substitute for victory.

General MacArthur's program for a victory arrived at with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless lives is strenuously opposed by all our fighting allies in Korea and it has been rejected by the President and his civilian and military advisers. That is not because the opposition consists of people who would not like to have a victory and to save lives and to end the hostilities as quickly as possible. The opposition comes from those who do not believe that General MacArthur's program will do what he told Congress it would do. They do not believe that the six measures he named can bring about that victory over China which he talked about.

The six measures for victory are to bomb Manchuria, to do air reconnaissance of China's coastal area and Manchuria, to intensify the economic blockade which is already partially in effect, to impose a naval blockade of the China coast, to send reinforcements to Korea, and to give logistical support to Chiang for operations against the Chinese mainland. General MacArthur argued that these measures would defeat China. Why? Because "China is already engaging with the maximum power it can commit." General MacArthur thinks that these measures may not bring Soviet Russia into the war because the "Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

Thus General MacArthur is assuming that the Air Force can bomb China, that the Navy can blockade China against Soviet and other ships, that the Navy and Air Force can organize and support invasions or raids by Chinese infantry from Formosa, but that Red China can do no more in reply than she is now doing, and that Soviet Russia will not necessarily do more than she is now doing.

This is a remarkable series of assumptions to make. Severally and jointly these assumptions amount to saying that the United States can wage war against China, which in another passage he described as "a new and dominant power in Asia," and that nothing more will happen to us, indeed that less will happen to us, than is already happening to us in Korea.

If the general is right in his estimates and calculations as he gave them to the Congress, then this would be the cheapest and easiest victory over a great power in the history of warfare. No wonder Senator TAFT is enchanted with the prospect of so big a victory with such a little war.

At each stage since June 25 we have done what General MacArthur wishes to do once more: We have promised ourselves big and glittering results with what, as the event showed, were quite inadequate military means. On June 27 the President committed "air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support." On June 30 he authorized the use of "certain supporting ground units." The supporting ground units soon became most of the American Army as it then existed. On October 8, having defeated the aggressor south of the thirty-eighth parallel, we entered North Korea and began the march to the Chinese and Soviet frontiers. This we said to ourselves was the end of the war—nothing would happen while we mopped up the defeated army in North Korea.

Now we are being told that nothing will happen, except that we shall of course be victorious in Korea, if we bomb and blockade and invade China. Each time it was going to take only a little more military action to obtain great and glorious results. Only sea and air power, then merely some supporting ground units, then nothing but a mopping up action against a defeated enemy, and now no war, and not many casualties, but only some bombing and some blockading and some transporting and arming of Chinamen. Then victory, for which there is no substitute in war, will be ours.

Great victories can never be won cheaply but only by blood and sweat and tears. The great wars which must be waged in order to win great victories should not be begun in the illusion or under the pretense that they are little and easy wars.

It is not fair to the American people to permit them to think that one of the famous generals of our age believes that the wretched war in Korea can be ended victoriously and soon by a few measures which, it would seem, would cost the American people very little.

MacArthur Removal Indicates Internal Ailment in American Foreign Policy, Says Legion Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a statement by Jerome E. Host, department commander, the American Legion of Wisconsin, which appeared in the May issue of Badger Legionnaire.

Mr. Speaker, both General MacArthur and Commander Host are members of the Alonzo Cudworth Post of the American Legion, in Milwaukee, where today MacArthur is a distinguished guest. Mr. Host speaks the sentiments of most Wisconsin Legionnaires, and his statement is a great tribute to the deposed Supreme Commander in the Pacific, Wisconsin's outstanding citizen.

MACARTHUR REMOVED—HOST MAKES STATEMENT

Following the announcement of President Truman's removal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from all of his Far East commands, Department Commander Jerome E. Host issued the following statement:

"In my mind the removal of General MacArthur, shocking as it is, is merely the ugly visible blemish that indicates the internal ailment in American foreign policy. It proves tragically that we are in grave danger of losing our sovereignty as a Nation, since seemingly the theory of appeasement and subjugation of United States interests to the interests of Britain and France has permeated the entire thinking of the State Department.

"I believe that the removal of General MacArthur will strike a mortal blow to our prestige in Asia, and will certainly make no contribution to what the American Legion supposed was our ultimate goal in Korea—the containment of the advance of communism. Weighing the benefits of the President's action against the irrevocable harm, my only conclusion is that the United States and the United States interests must inevitably suffer greatly.

"It is my fervent hope that public opinion will rise in a great swell to decry the mockery of sacrificing American lives and American self-respect in an effort to meekly follow the bidding of Britain to the detriment of our own welfare.

"Britain's amazing proposition that Formosa be given to the Chinese Reds as a free gift, and that the Chinese Reds be given a voice in the Japanese peace treaty is part of the same pattern that led to General MacArthur's removal. His principal crime, as I see it, is that the general chooses to resist the attempts to make the United States subservient to a group of alleged allies who eagerly accept billions of American dollars but refuse any substantial military assistance. It is tragic that this fierce protection of American values should result in his dismissal.

"Equally tragic is the fact that reaction to the President's decision has descended to the political arena, where one political party blindly accepts his action and the other bitterly opposes it. Surely the significance of the removal of General MacArthur is a matter above partisan politics."

Alaska Feels Pinch of Its Winged Heels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, air service in Alaska is the lifeline of that country and of such importance that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues articles by Louis R. Huber, noted and authoritative writer on Alaskan problems. Mr. Huber, a special cor-

respondent for the Christian Science Monitor, reports in these articles certain facts and statements that I believe have not had publication elsewhere:

SAFETY DEVICES AID FLIGHTS IN NORTHLAND

SEWARD, ALASKA.—In the early days of flying in Alaska, a bush pilot was carrying a passenger from Seward to Anchorage.

"The pilot picked the wrong passage through the Chugach Mountains and, instead of flying through, we found ourselves headed straight for the end of a blind-alley canyon," related the passenger afterward.

Crash?

No, the pilot merely performed an Immelman—zoomed his plane straight up, back in the direction he had been coming from, and winged over.

"We flew back out of the canyon, found the right passage, and flew on to Anchorage," said the passenger.

Tales of derring-do have long been told of Alaska's intrepid bush pilots. Bob Reeve, who is now head of his own scheduled airline flying from Anchorage out over the Aleutian Islands, once was sitting on a glacier in his Fairchild—engine running, luckily—when a williwaw whipped down, picked him and his craft up, and dumped them over a 5,000-foot ledge.

"I managed to gun the engine and get the plane out of a spin when it was only 200 feet from the rocks below. Then I flew out as if nothing had happened," he says.

Hairbreadth escapes occur less frequently today. Forty-four Civil Aeronautics Administration stations are scattered over the entire territory. Their emergency landing fields, communication services, radio beams, and weather-reporting facilities enable all aircraft to fly with as much safety as in the States.

An added safeguard to Alaska flying is the work of the United States Air Force's Tenth Air Rescue Squadron.

Activated in 1946, it had, up to the end of September 1950, flown a total of more than 1,000,000 "million miles" and nearly 10,000 mission hours.

More than 1,500 individuals were rescued or received assistance from the Tenth during this period.

Its base is Elmendorf Air Force Base near Anchorage. Its equipment includes helicopters, liaison-type planes, C-47's, gliders, C-54's, B-17's with lifeboat-dropping facilities, bush airplanes, and a variety of land- and snow-traveling vehicles.

Col. Bernt Balchen, famed Arctic flier, was the Tenth's commanding officer during the period in which it grew to its present efficiency.

Though now reassigned to other duty, Colonel Balchen is one of the strongest boosters for Alaska as the air crossroads of the world.

With Maj. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., then commanding general of the Alaskan Air Command, he flew nonstop across the North Pole in 1949 in a C-54 to Norway, and then back via the Pole to Washington, D. C.

AIR SERVICE CALLED INADEQUATE

(By Louis R. Huber)

SEATTLE.—Ever since barnstormers junked their Jennies and began flying with a serious purpose, Alaska has been the land of the airplane—but now the Territory's winged heels are pinching.

The northland's great attachment to aviation is not an accident. Distances greater than those of the West, mountains higher than any others on the continent, impassable summer tundra, and lung-freezing cold make it so.

Because of these, Alaskans fly at least 15 times as much as people in the States, and depend on airplanes for a large share of their freight needs.

Civilian landings and take-offs at Anchorage, the central air hub, stand about tenth in the Nation, and rival those of New York City, Chicago, St. Louis, and Los Angeles.

FLOATPLANE SYSTEM

Southeastern Alaska, with its Norway-like fjords and rugged coast line, has a floatplane system unequaled elsewhere in the entire world.

Three scheduled and a varying number of nonscheduled airlines link the northland with the States and the Orient. Sixteen internal scheduled airlines and about 80 bush pilots fly daily in the Territory.

The internal operators—Alaska's very own—fly everything from Cubs and helicopters through Bellancas, Stinsons, Norsemen, DC-3's, C-46's, and DC-4's. The total of these commercial aircraft operating entirely within Alaska is well above 200.

For Alaska's 128,000 people, this is (not counting privately owned, military, and naval planes) about 1 aircraft for every 50 people. None of it is luxury flying, either; it's serious business.

COMPLAINTS CITED

"If you took airplanes away from Alaska," one veteran northern airman told me last summer, "the place would fold up in 30 days."

He was right, of course. The hauling of people, mail, and freight by air is the most important activity in the northland. Nevertheless, Alaskans feel that aviation is falling short of its capabilities.

Here are samples of their complaints:

Golden North Airways of Seattle and General Airways of Portland—both nonscheduled outfits—recently were ordered to stop flying because their trips were too regular and too frequent.

FOUR PARTS LISTED

Alaskans say this doesn't make sense. The nonscheduled airlines springing up after World War II, they point out, brought Alaskan air-freight rates down from 90 to 15 cents a pound, and passenger fares, Seattle to Fairbanks, or Anchorage, from $125 to $60.

Sitka, the first capital of Alaska, wants a direct airline connection with Seattle. Sitka had such a connection when Totem Air Service, a nonscheduled outfit, flew between the two cities. But when Totem applied for scheduled certification no action was taken.

Last January in the Eskimo settlement of Kotzebue on the Arctic Ocean, Judith Bailey, of Noatak, waited 5 weeks for transportation to White Mountain, where she was to enter school.

She had cash fare ready to pay, but a local bush pilot could not carry her. It was illegal for him to do so because a scheduled airline served White Mountain—but only when it was profitable for it to fly a DC-3 there.

NO GENERAL TRANSPORT

Alaskan aviation is divided into four parts: (1) Bush pilots, smallest of northern operators but nonetheless important; (2) internal scheduled (certificated) airlines, most of them made up of former bush pilots; (3) nonscheduled or irregular States-to-Alaska carriers, 90 percent of them World War II Air Force veterans competing intensely using war-surplus transport aircraft; and (4) the scheduled States-to-Alaska operators.

Two of the four are not complaining about anything: they are the scheduled operators, both internal and States-to-Alaska.

The other two, however—the bush pilots and the "nonsked" States-to-Alaska flyers—exist in constant concern either of being gradually choked out by Government restrictions, or of being suddenly ordered to stop flying because they are held in violation of regulations.

"It wouldn't be so bad if Alaska had other means of transportation, such as are available in the States—railroads, busses, and highways," says Alaska's Gov. Ernest Gruening.

"But in Alaska there is, for all practical purposes, only one mode of transportation—the airplane. The Civil Aeronautics Board never has taken this into consideration, and keeps on trying to regulate Alaska flying as if were in the States."

Alaska's Delegate to Congress, E. L. BARTLETT, questions the entire philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Act, passed originally in 1934 by Congress as a reform from abuses of those days.

As to safety, the present nonscheduled airlines flying to Alaska have never had a fatal accident; the scheduled airlines have had several bad crashes.

REPORT ASSAILED

For its part, the CAB maintains it has had the best interests of Alaska and Alaskans at heart.

"The Board has been fully aware of what aviation means to Alaska," says Edward E. Slattery, CAB's public-information chief in Washington, D. C. "The Board has expressly recognized the Territory's dependence on the bush pilot, frequently making special provisions to permit the continuance of their services."

When it comes to the nonscheduled carriers, however, Mr. Slattery points to the Alaska Service case—the CAB's own study of air service from the States to Alaska—and says, "That is the answer to a great portion of the problem."

The Alaska Service case began with hearings in Alaska in the fall of 1948. Late in 1949 William F. Cusick, a CAB examiner, submitted a 118-page report on it, recommending that two scheduled airlines be allowed to provide passenger, cargo, and mail service to Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks.

Alaskans at once attacked Mr. Cusick's report as utterly unrealistic, and inadequate for dealing with Alaska's air problems.

The final decision on the Alaska Service case, meanwhile, still is awaited. It must have the approval, before issuance, of President Truman. This is a hopeful circumstance for the irregular carriers.

"EVERYTHING BY AIR"

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA.—"Up in Alaska, full loads of eggs, fresh meat, produce—things moving from distributor to market—have been going by air as the normal method of transportation.

"It is the first large-scale true air-freight service to be established anywhere in the world. In the States, we may move expedited packages by air freight; in Alaska we carry everything that way."

That was the statement of Amos E. Heacock, president of Air Transport Associates, a nonscheduled States-to-Alaska airline, before a congressional committee last year.

He appeared as spokesman for the Independent Air Carrier Conference of America—the association of nonscheduled airlines—in hearings on bills providing for separation of subsidy from air-mail pay to the scheduled airlines.

Manufacturing Opportunities in the Southeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Southeast is growing rapidly as a market for all kinds of manufactured products.

Alabama is rapidly becoming a cattle country. No State is better suited to livestock. No State has greater potential markets for livestock and dairy products than that afforded by Alabama cities.

The same factors that make Alabama a great livestock State—abundant acreage suitable for grazing, 50 inches of annual rainfall, and a 10-month growing season—also ideally suit it to the production of livestock feed.

The production of feed requires lime, fertilizers, high-quality seeds, and feed-mixing equipment.

The expanding livestock production is leading to the establishment of those manufacturing plants that process livestock products. The market for such products is at home.

As a part of my remarks, I include a recent article by Robert W. Kincey, published in the Birmingham News:

SOUTHEAST MANUFACTURING SURVEY DISCLOSES THERE IS READILY AVAILABLE MARKET IN AREA

(By Robert W. Kincey)

The men who buy the goods point this out in the first of a series of surveys on what the Southeast needs to manufacture or produce to more nearly supply its own needs:

"The one fact we find repeated over and over in making this survey of manufacturing opportunities in the Southeast is the readily available market here for great quantities of all kinds of manufactured goods."

In the first current survey, which deals with agricultural and dairy products, the significant statement is made early in the report that urban centers in the Territory consume far greater quantities of these goods than are produced within the area.

And that fact, probably to be pointed out again and again as the committee takes up other commodities, is the peg upon which it hangs the need for further output in a program to build and sustain regional economy.

Of the total of agricultural production in the Southeast, it is reported, nearly one-third is consumed on the farm for various human and animal needs.

Says the survey in part:

"Industrial research in the South, expanding as never before, is at work on projects in cotton, cottonseed products, tobacco, peanuts, citrus fruits and other agricultural products.

"Such efforts will bring forth new goods, new services and new industries and do much to improve the standard of living and to provide jobs at good wages."

Placing new emphasis upon a point now generally recognized in the South, the committee lists livestock as one of the most important sources of total farm income, and as one of the region's fastest growing industries.

Value of livestock on the farms in the Southeast in 1949 was listed at $1,298,000,000. The section is listed as a natural livestock area by virtue of its abundant acreage suitable for grazing, ample rainfall, and the long growing season.

And by the same taken, production of livestock feed is ideally suited to the Southeast.

"The trend in recent years has been upward with respects to both quality and quantity of livestock. This is a significant fact and represents definite progress in a most desirable direction," the report says.

The purchasing agents whose business it is to buy most advantageously while taking into account regional economy and the opportunities involved to build that economy, find:

"In addition to the spendable income it (the livestock industry) creates, and the effect of that income on local markets for a variety of end goods, it also creates an activity which supplies a long list of materials for further processing into end goods.

"As an indication of one of the ways in which markets and raw materials are involved, the following may be of interest:

"Development of permanent pastures requires the use of lime, fertilizers, and high-quality seeds. Production of hay offers unusual opportunities for artificial drying equipment of both the semicommercial and individual farm type.

"This involves the moving of large quantities of air and therefore represents a substantial market for forced-air motor-driven equipment in medium to large sizes.

"In addition, there is a market for milling equipment used in the preparation of mixed feeds. Locally produced ingredients can be converted into animal and poultry feeds for nearby markets and those markets have all the appearance of exceptional enlargement in the years ahead."

The report lists a partial number of manufacturing operations whose principal raw materials are livestock products.

They include:

Locker plants and other dressed-poultry operations, incubator and brooder operations, egg-grading and packing plants, albumen glue for bottle caps and egg shells for feeds, pillow, cushion, and comforter stuffing, whole milk, cream, butter, ice cream, evaporated milk, and products of cheese plants, tanning plants, soap factories, and many others.

Covered also are field crops, nurseries, and related subjects.

The report emphasizes that the drying, freezing, and canning of fresh fruits and vegetables in the Southeast has never been fully developed.

Specific information is available from planning boards, departments of commerce, power companies, railroads, chambers of commerce, banks, and elsewhere throughout the region.

Truman Policy Vacuum Springs a Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "Truman Policy Vacuum Springs a Leak" which was published in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., on Wednesday, April 25, 1951:

TRUMAN POLICY VACUUM SPRINGS A LEAK

The Communist hordes of Asia—better than half a million strong—have for the third time poured across the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea.

This new offensive, which Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway says "may well prove decisive," apparently is designed, again in General Ridgway's words, "to drive United Nations forces from Korea, or to destroy them, regardless of the further destruction of his own troops."

This is what we have been waiting for. Strange to say, the enemy offensive is part of the Truman-Acheson policy vacuum in which we are fighting in Korea a "limited war" that in its first 9 months cost America more battle casualties than the first full year of World War II.

Speaking to the Nation by radio and television April 11, the same day President Truman announced the discharge of General MacArthur, the Chief Executive announced this negative program for Korea:

"The United Nations forces have put up a tremendous fight in Korea and have inflicted very heavy casualties on the enemy. Our forces are stronger now than they have been before. These are plain facts which may discourage the Chinese Communists from continuing their attack.

"* * * The free world as a whole is growing in military strength every day. In the United States, in Western Europe, and throughout the world, freemen are alert to the Soviet threat and are building their defenses. This may discourage the Communist rulers from continuing the war in Korea—and from undertaking new acts of aggression elsewhere.

"If the Communist authorities realize they cannot defeat us in Korea, if they realize it would be foolhardy to widen the hostilities beyond Korea, then they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression.

"A peaceful settlement may then be possible. The door is always open.

"Then we may achieve a settlement in Korea which will not compromise the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

"* * * Defeat of aggression in Korea may be the turning point in the world's search for a practical way of achieving peace and security."

Well, the Chinese Commies have not been discouraged from continuing the war in Korea. They are hitting our boys with everything they have. The Truman-Acheson policy vacuum already has sprung a leak.

So now the second step in Mr. Truman's may-if policy goes into effect—if they (the Chinese Reds) realize they cannot defeat us in Korea * * * they may recognize the folly of continuing their aggression."

Then—on the basis of that great, big if—the third step—"a peaceful settlement may then be possible * * *."

We submit, this is no foreign policy. It is the total absence of one. Furthermore, already it has started to fall apart. For it was predicated on the pious hope that the Commies may have been discouraged, a hope they proved false this week with their new offensive.

Is there any greater chance that the remaining may-if hopes in the Truman-Acheson policy vacuum will come to pass?

But General Ridgway doesn't seem to share his commander's naive faith. General Ridgway only yesterday said the new offensive seems to be "another major effort by our Communist enemy to drive United Nations forces from Korea, or to destroy them." That does not sound like a peaceful future for Korea—now or for some time to come.

Faced with that kind of a determined enemy, common sense condemns President Truman's Pollyanna approach, hedged in between the words "may" and "if." Either we must fight back with everything we have—even at the risk that the war will spread, a risk we took in the beginning—or we must get out of Korea, draw an atom-bomb line and tell the Commies they'd better not cross it—or else.

Export of America's Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of an address I delivered last Saturday afternoon by tran-

scription for broadcast from Station WGN in Chicago. The subject of the address was America's Exportation of Her Great Enterprise Genius. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT OF AMERICA'S FREEDOMS

How can we—you and I—as citizens help to contribute to the future peace of the world?

That is a vital question, as I'm sure you'll agree, particularly in this critical stage of world affairs—with war or peace hanging in the balance.

One answer to that question which I am proposing to my listeners today is this: Let us all help to export America's great freedoms, her great values—political, economic, and moral—throughout the world.

RELATION OF THIS THEME TO CURRENT CRISIS

Now, what do I mean by export and by the term value?

And just how does this whole idea fit in with the current crisis? How does it fit in, from a general standpoint, with the approach that has been suggested by our great American hero, Douglas MacArthur, of whom we of Wisconsin and of all America have shown ourselves to be so rightly proud? Yes, just how will this idea of exporting our values be of real help in the cause of peace?

Well, my friends, you will recall that in the early days of America's history, the nations of Europe exported to this new continent manpower in the form of waves of immigration. Europe also sent us goods and materials with which we built homes, stores, factories and so forth.

With the passage of the years, the American people grew until the twentieth century they had attained leadership in every phase of international relations: economic, military, political, and basically spiritual.

With the twentieth century, America became the greatest exporter in the world. You could find America's sewing machines deep in the heart of darkest Africa. You could see American mousetraps throughout the world. But, unfortunately, while we had done a superlative job of exporting our physical goods, we had not shipped abroad the great spiritual concepts which have made America the Nation that she is. Now, what are those concepts?

BASIC SPIRITUAL IDEALS

1. The concept of man's individual dignity, the concept of the sacredness of man as a child of God.

2. The concept of freedom to take one's chances, to gain profit or to experience loss, without Government intervention.

3. The concept of faithfulness to one's spoken and written word of fidelity to one's contracts.

4. The concept of a government of limited rather than of unlimited power: a government divided among three coequal and coordinating branches: Legislative, executive, and judicial.

Now, my friends, as we look about the world today, we can see that the world desperately needs, and in many instances, hungers for these concepts. I don't mean to say that we want to make the world over in our own image. We recognize that every nation has its unique background, its history, its culture, its tongue which it prides. Every nation wants to be sovereign and independent. The day of imperialism is ended.

But we have learned in times past that if we do a good salesmanship job of selling American values, we can create good will and friendship among all peoples. We can help them to help themselves. They can raise their economic standards, they can achieve the home front cooperation which we have enjoyed. There can be an end to the bitter civil disturbances which have played havoc in so many countries.

NATURE OF EXPORT CRUSADE

What I am proposing today, therefore, is a great export crusade, a crusade for spiritual achievement, rather than mere material progress. Who do I propose to embark on this crusade? I suggest not the Federal Government nor State and local governments, but the genius of American private-enterprise system. I mean the genius of our companies, our unions, our clubs, our associations; I mean everyone of us.

For example, I would like to see private business organizations, through the International Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, intensify their effort to help sell American concepts abroad.

I should like to see the great organized labor unions—the CIO, the AFL, and the independent unions—sell American concepts to foreign labor unions, to a greater degree than they ever have before.

I should like to see America's churches intensify their efforts in cooperation with their brother denominations abroad and through the great interdenominational church channels.

I should like to see the veterans' organizations of America, the farm groups of America, and so on down the line intensify their efforts to sell the American concepts of freedom, initiative, enterprise, fair dealing.

Lastly, I should like to see the American people carry on a great letter-writing crusade, a crusade such as many of them embarked on prior to the crucial Italian election several years ago, which ended in a great victory over communism.

Now, my friends, all of us know that there are a great number of active international organizations—church, veterans, labor, and business groups—now underway. But I say that these organizations have not realized their fullest potentialities.

Of course, I don't want the American members of those international groups to assume that they can "take these organizations over." On the contrary, as in our experience in the United Nations, I think that we must act as equals and as partners in each of these groups.

However, I do want Americans to recognize their mission, a mission to inject the virus of free enterprise in the body politic and economic of foreign countries.

WORLD HAS WRONG PICTURE OF US

It is important that this be done? Why? Because the world conceives of America as materialistic in its approach, as exclusively interested in the almighty dollar. To be sure, the Voice of America has done and can do a constructive job to show foreign peoples that Soviet Russia has painted false pictures of us. Nevertheless, it will take a great export crusade if we are to change the world's basic view of the typical American.

EXAMPLE OF PHILIPPINE UNREST

Even in a country like the Philippines, which has been America's ward and which on a July 4 similar to our own Independence Day we freed—even in a country like the Philippines there is apparently considerable misinterpretation of America's basic approach. As a result there is today in the Philippines a force known as the Huks, a tightly disciplined, well indoctrinated military force whose units considerably envelop the capital city of Manila. Those Huk units are responsible for a whole wave of assassinations, terrorism, destruction of towns, etc.

If, however, we were to export to the Philippines American concepts in a better way than we have done before, I think that we could help change the conditions which have bred hatred and discontent, and which the Huks have fanned into active rebellion.

Now, I do not want anyone to think that we cannot learn in turn from foreign peoples. On the contrary, the American people have constantly signified that they can learn and are eager to learn about the best values of foreign lands. Exports must be a two-way street, with imports also.

If you believe in this idea of an export crusade, I hope that in your organization, whether it be labor, business, fraternal, veterans, church, etc., you will speak to your officers and your fellow members.

DON'T OVEREMPHASIZE MATERIAL VALUES

I do want to stress one word of caution in our contacts with foreign peoples. Let us be careful that we are not boastful about our material values to a world two-thirds of those people are barely subsisting on a poverty diet. It is completely inappropriate for us to boast about our refrigerators and deep freezers to people living on the edge of starvation. Moreover, many of our concepts are such as not to be capable of being understood by the average foreign man in the street, unless we convey our concepts in terms that each people will understand, based on its own language and culture. In other words, we shall have to become so familiar with the backgrounds of each people, that we will know how best to speak to them.

The great common denominator which every people can understand is the concept of America's faith in a divine creator. The spiritual plane is in fact the most effective plane on which we can contact foreign peoples, and at the same time it is the most powerful plane on which we ourselves can realize our birthright. Material remedies for spiritual problems will not be adequate to the challenge of this age. We need a spiritual answer to the basic spiritual problem of our times.

American genius has helped to create the atomic bomb, the jet plane, the supersonic missile, and a thousand other modern devices. Let our great genius harness itself to the task of creating spiritual bonds between peoples. Let us give light that each people will find its own way. Let's radiate that light through the Communist darkness. Let us keep the American lighthouse burning through the night so that it can be seen by every ship in the storm-tossed sea.

Right now, America is watching with great anxiety reports from the battlefront in Korea, as our own and allied forces meet the shock of the onrushing Chinese offensive. But you and I know that if, perhaps in past years, America had been able to better sell her concepts in China, in Korea, and elsewhere in Asia, we might to a considerable extent have avoided the critical situation which now faces us.

MAC ARTHUR REPRESENTED GREAT VALUES

When Douglas MacArthur originally entered Japan, after the surrender, he came not just as a conqueror, but as a superb exponent of American character, American integrity, American spiritual devotion, American fair dealing. Douglas MacArthur in turn sold those virtues brilliantly to the 83,000,000 Japanese people and to most of Asia. Such personal and national salesmanship abroad is what is so needed today. Men like Douglas MacArthur can and must be earnestly urged to continue to help us in this great task of leadership.

But remember, my friends, you and I can't sell a product unless you and I have three things:

(a) Knowledge of the value of our product.

(b) Confidence in ourself and the institution we represent.

(c) Knowledge of our customer.

Well, folks, if you believe in this export crusade become active in the organization of your choice. Emphasize the importance of their international work. Emphasize the

need for more foreign contact through letters, through personal meetings, through conventions so that we can get to know the world better and so that the world can get to know us better.

WE NEED DYNAMIC ENTHUSIASM

First, however, let each of us seek a better understanding of our own way of life so that we will really know the commodity that we are trying to sell. Let us become reinvigorated with the great values of the American scene, the values of this constitutional Republic. Let us gain enthusiasm for our salesmanship job so that we can do the sort of job that is characteristic of a dynamic America.

Let's get busy on this export crusade because on it, in considerable part, may depend the future peace and freedom of the world. This doesn't mean that we should forget our other obligations. We must, of course, be adequately prepared in a military way. We must get to the bottom of the facts insofar as the far eastern controversy is concerned. We must hear America's great Gen. Douglas MacArthur testify regarding the series of events which led up to the President's ill-advised action in dismissing him. But we must also be active on this spiritual front.

CONCLUSION

Thank you for your kind attention to this broadcast. I hope that each of us may carry on his responsibility as I have humbly submitted it to you today. Let's export America's great values. Thank you.

MacArthur Insists Issues Are Global

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Issues Are Global, MacArthur Insists," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, April 20, 1951. The editorial is based on General MacArthur's address to the Congress on April 19 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES ARE GLOBAL, MACARTHUR INSISTS

In his dramatic appearance before the Congress of the United States yesterday, Gen. Douglas MacArthur insisted that the fight against communism is of global scope and that Asia is just as important as Europe.

MacArthur declared:

"You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe."

Relative to the fighting in Korea, General MacArthur said he was not consulted by the President previous to the decision that sent American troops into that conflict, but "that decision, from a military viewpoint, proved a sound one."

General MacArthur denied very emphatically that the course he proposed for continuing the war against the Communists called for the use of "our ground forces" in metropolitan China, stating:

"While no man in his right mind would advocate sending ground forces into continental China, and such was never given thought, the new situation (participation of the Chinese Reds in the war in Korea) did urgently demand a drastic revision of strategic planning if our political aim was to defeat this new enemy as we had defeated the old one."

That decision, he asserted, was not forthcoming.

The general then reiterated the four points he has voiced before:

Economic blockade against Chinese to halt shipments by Great Britain and even the United States of needed materials into that country.

Imposition of a naval blockade on the Chinese coast.

Removal of restrictions preventing the bombing of bases of the Chinese Reds.

Use of the troops of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, about 600,000 strong now stationed on Formosa.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson have opposed such procedure.

Meanwhile, General MacArthur said our forces are being depleted by attrition in an aimless war.

Victory is the goal of war at all times, he asserted.

The appearance of General MacArthur before Congress was one of the most dramatic in the history of the Nation. Admittedly a great military leader and statesman, he had been stripped of his commands in the Far East.

With the courage of a true soldier, he appeared before Congress to give an accounting of his brilliant leadership in the Far East. He did it with dignity and without rancor or bitterness. Despite his 71 years and the stress and strain of recent days, he stood erect and resolute.

One admirer declared he symbolized "The American Eagle."

No leader of recent history has displayed similar courage. He refused to abandon his conscientious beliefs and the course he believed right. He chose to sacrifice position, a truly heroic gesture in this era of expediency, appeasement, and lust for power and material gain.

General MacArthur has increased in stature and esteem by the manner in which he has conducted himself in a crisis so important to the Nation and its people.

American Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Times-Herald this morning, April 30, comes the following:

A SUPINE CONGRESS

Senator TAFT stated the plain truth when he said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by their conduct in the MacArthur affair, had proved themselves politically subservient to the administration. His implication that the Joint Chiefs are political stooges was disputed by Senator FULBRIGHT, the Arkansas Rhodes scholar, who gave the usual proof that he is more English than American.

General MacArthur, in his Chicago speech, made it plain that the English and the United Nations are running America's foreign policy. FULBRIGHT, as an American Laster, is of course, for both. It is no help to the country that such a man should be in the Senate.

Senator TAFT said that the recent address of General Bradley, challenging MacArthur's recommendations for Korea, had been "written, in effect, by the State Department." It is certain that the speech was submitted for inspection there, and that Secretary Acheson, who is at least as loyal as FULBRIGHT to England, found it to his satisfaction.

The British, as is now established, were instrumental in getting MacArthur fired, fearing that the positive military measures he advocated would alienate Communist China to the detriment of British colonial and trade interests. It has also been said that the British hope to exploit MacArthur's removal as chief of the occupation of Japan so that they could disrupt the Japanese economy and kill off a trade rival.

In these devious moves, it might be expected that Acheson, with his empire parentage, would follow the British line. It is equally clear why FULBRIGHT should do so, for as the recipient of an English education through the largess of Cecil Rhodes he was subjected to those influences which Rhodes deliberately set about using his fortune to create.

In his will, written at the age of 24, and repeated four more times within 20 years, Rhodes directed that his fortune be used to establish "a secret society, the true aim and object whereof shall be the extension of British rule throughout the world, * * * and * * * the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British empire."

While services to England are to be expected from Acheson and FULBRIGHT, it is more surprising that the principal body of American military leaders should become a mere political appendage of the administration in the advancement of British policy. It is even more surprising that a Congress grown supine should barely voice a protest.

Instead of rebuking these anti-American forces, Congress has given the Pentagon everything that it has asked—divisions for an army to be placed in Europe for England's protection, a 24-month draft, and now, through House approval, an additional $6,400,000,000 in military appropriations, raising the total so far this year to almost fifty billion.

Meanwhile, as General MacArthur asserts, the "slaughter of America's sons" continues in Korea. As in World War II, when he commanded in the Pacific, that area has been relegated to the position of a neglected front, while all efforts again are designed to carry out the same basic program laid down in concert with the British for that war: "To give strong support to the United Kingdom in Europe."

Minority Leader MARTIN'S recent stalwart actions in the MacArthur affair provide Americans with a ray of hope. He realizes, it is plain, that the function of an opposition is to oppose. Under his leadership less resolute Republicans may recover their courage.

The Government's Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an address delivered by me before the Pennsylvania Greeters Association, Chapter No. 41, at the George Washington Hotel, Washington, Pa., on April 23, 1951, discussing General MacArthur's address to Congress on April 19, and our Government's policy in Asia.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to meet with your fine group.

The splendid hotels of our country are a typical product of the American system of free enterprise.

You have developed the highest standards of hospitality and good will through competition in providing the kind of service the people appreciate.

Fair competition, operating under freedom of the individual, is the American way. It has made the United States the greatest country in the world.

Today we are engaged in a great struggle to maintain the greatness of our Republic. Heroic young Americans are giving their precious lives to preserve our freedom and to safeguard the American way of life.

The tragic and desperate situation in Korea overshadows everything else in the hearts and minds of the American people.

Make no mistake about it. The people are aroused as never before. They realize that the dangers we face today will grow ever more menacing unless the leaders of our Nation adopt a course of action that will insure victory.

When I left Washington, D. C., yesterday I had received more than 30,000 telegrams and letters, and hundreds of telephone calls, denouncing the Truman administration for the dismissal of General MacArthur.

Many of the messages demanded that President Truman be impeached, and that Secretary Acheson be dismissed.

The letters and telegrams began arriving immediately after the President's midnight decision was announced removing General MacArthur from all his Pacific commands.

General MacArthur's magnificent address before the joint meeting of Congress touched off another barrage of telegrams and letters. They are still pouring in. Almost unanimously they express strong support of General MacArthur's program in the Far East.

In all my long experience in public life I have never witnessed such a tremendous outburst of public indignation.

To my mind General MacArthur voiced the sentiments of the American people when he said:

"In war, there is no substitute for victory."

But, my fellow Americans, those who influenced the President in his action against General MacArthur, offering their substitute for victory.

They offer appeasement.

They propose to buy off the enemy.

They would pay the price imposed by the Communist dictators.

They would surrender Formosa to Red China.

They would invite the Communist government of China into the family of nations.

And finally, they would admit representatives of Chinese aggression to the conference formulating the peace treaty with Japan.

That is what socialistic Great Britain wants.

It is what Communist China wants.

It is what Moscow wants.

It is not what the American people want.

These are the disgraceful, un-American proposals against which General MacArthur is making such a valiant protest.

It may be fortunate for the United States and the world that his clash with the Truman-Acheson policies have brought the issues out into the open.

For the first time in his brilliant career as a military leader MacArthur was fighting a war without hope of defeating the enemy.

Why was he bound and shackled by restrictions contrary to all sound military strategy?

Why was he forbidden to bomb and destroy the supply lines, troop concentrations, and air bases north of the Yalu River?

Why were the Communist forces given all the advantages of military initiative?

Why were they left free to withdraw to a safe sanctuary—to reinforce and resupply—and to renew the attack any time they saw fit?

One answer was given by President Truman in his radio address of April 11. He said, and I quote:

"So far, by fighting a limited war in Korea we have prevented aggression from succeeding and bringing on a general war."

No longer does he call it police action in support of the United Nations. Oh, no; now it is a limited war—an undeclared war—a war without action by Congress—the only branch of our Government which, under the Constitution, has the power to declare war.

Early last week the Chinese Reds, armed, equipped, and trained by Communist Russia, launched their most massive offensive of the Korean conflict.

They hurled 700,000 men against our forces on a front of almost 100 miles.

Why were they able to do this?

Only because they had complete assurance that they would not be molested while they built up their strength in the safety of Manchuria.

The attack was not unexpected. On the contrary, every military observer knew it was coming. President Truman knew it was coming.

In the radio speech to which I have referred he used these words, and I quote:

"In Korea itself, there are signs that the enemy is building up his ground forces for a new mass offensive. We also know that there have been large increases in the enemy's available air forces. If a new attack comes I feel confident it will be turned back."

But he did not say that our troops were being reinforced to meet the attack or how it would be turned back.

Our fighting forces could do nothing but wait until they were hit by the first shock of the enemy's onslaught.

How many American boys must die before we can achieve the so-called negotiated peace that Mr. Truman so earnestly hopes for?

So far as I am concerned I place more confidence in the position taken by that great soldier and diplomat, General MacArthur, whose words I quoted earlier and now repeat:

"In war there is no substitute for victory."

One of the high lights of General MacArthur's address was his statement that his military views have been fully shared, in the past, by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

More than a week has passed since General MacArthur made that statement. But so far no one in the Pentagon, no one in the State Department, no one in the White House, has challenged or even questioned its accuracy.

Instead, the whole power of the administration has been directed toward an attempt to smear and discredit the great soldier who has given 52 years of distinguished service to his country.

Directed by the White House, scores of investigators have been turned loose to search the records for every single bit of material that might be used to discredit General MacArthur.

In all our history no military leader has ever been given such shabby treatment by any President—not even given the customary opportunity to bid farewell to his troops. But his high place in the love and esteem of the American people was enthusiastically demonstrated by the tremendous ovations he received wherever he appeared.

Five years and seven months ago General MacArthur took his place at the head of the Japanese Government as supreme commander of the Allied Powers.

He had absolute power over a conquered people, a proud people, who worshipped their emperor as a god.

General MacArthur faced a difficult task but through his outstanding ability he succeeded in gaining the respect and confidence of the Japanese people and was winning them to a free way of life.

Previous experience in the Philippines prepared General MacArthur for his distinguished service in Japan. He not only developed the Filipino military force but he taught the people the ideals of the United States.

General MacArthur's fame will go down in history, not only as one of our most brilliant military leaders, but as a great statesmen and diplomat.

You will recall that General MacArthur in closing his address to Congress said:

"I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty."

That statement brings out what I consider one of the finest qualities of General MacArthur. He lives and works with an abiding faith in God.

It is not generally known that after he assumed control as supreme allied commander he made numerous requests upon various religious denominations in the United States to furnish him with more and more Bibles for distribution among the Japanese people.

He knew that if they were to rebuild their nation upon American ideals they would find guidance in the eternal truths of the Holy Bible—the source and inspiration of American freedom and independence.

Suggestion by Hon. Harold E. Stassen for Reconciliation Between the President and General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a couple of days ago Hon. Harold E. Stassen addressed a letter to the President of the United States suggesting a reconciliation between him and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stassen's letter and an editorial on the same subject from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, April 30, 1951, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1951.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: For the good of America please permit me to respectfully suggest that a reconciliation be brought about between you and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. If the disagreement runs its bitter course to the end, whatever its outcome may be, it can do no good for our country. The grave world situation requires above all the building of greater strength for America with which to face the world-wide threat

of Communist imperialism. In this you are both agreed. The issue of peace and war must be above personalities or partisanship if America is to exercise constructive leadership among the free nations.

I therefore ask with humility that you consider extending an invitation to General MacArthur to meet and confer with you. I have not spoken to him but I am certain from my knowledge of him for many years that he would at once respond.

Regardless of past differences, I think you would agree that his advice would be very helpful now and in the months ahead on the problems relating to Japan, to Asia in general, and in the building of American armed strength.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. STASSEN.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 30, 1951]

TO HEAL THE BREACH

The significance of Mr. Harold E. Stassen's appeal to President Truman and General MacArthur to meet and reconcile their differences does not lie wholly in its effect upon the two principals. The reaction to Mr. Stassen's proposal, interspersed though it was with some of the intransigent bitterness that marked the first stages of the controversy over General MacArthur's dismissal, shows how broad and deep is the desire to reknit the Nation's frayed unity and to resolve differences rationally and as Americans.

The differences are real and they are very important. They will be thrashed out in the forthcoming congressional hearings and in public debates; it is too much to expect that the discussion will not be attended by further confusions and further exasperations. No one would wish to see the dispute pushed out of sight, or a pretense of unity used to obscure it. The main question is whether the subject is to be dealt with in terms of blind emotion as a head-on clash of irreconcilable elements or as a serious problem over which Americans disagree in good faith but in respect to which they have a common objective and a common will to attain that objective.

If Mr. Stassen's suggestion could be carried into effect, it would do much to contribute to a lessening of tensions. It would be reassuring to the many Americans who were less perturbed by the President's exercise of his power in dismissing General MacArthur than by the manner in which it was done and who found it difficult to understand why the friendliness of the meeting on Wake Island should be succeeded by the curt message to Tokyo and the chilly separation in Washington. It would appeal, too, to the growing sentiment which Representative DEWEY SHORT expressed when he said, "We must stop fighting one another and fight the common enemy."

Whether or not a meeting between the President and the general is possible, a meeting of minds in America is imperative. There must be a delimitation of the precise areas over which there is a genuine dispute and a recognition of the dangers of permitting the controversy to become entangled in nonessentials or allowing it to become a ragbag of all the discontents of a troubled generation. If the real questions are allowed to emerge clearly, if they are studied calmly and with a single eye to the welfare of the Nation, many of the divisions which now plague America will vanish. Every citizen, whether he is thinking out the issues in the White House, the Capitol, the Pentagon, or while riding in the subway to his job, shares the responsibility for achieving that goal.

Acheson and MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial entitled "Acheson and MacArthur," which appeared in last Saturday's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON AND MACARTHUR

The President fairly bounced with self-confidence when he faced the reporters Thursday at his first post-MacArthur press conference. It was probably his most successful parley. Without a doubt he has shared the fears of the Allies lest General MacArthur take action bringing on a general conflagration. The relief he now feels after cutting the Gordian knot was unmistakable. Whether the dismissal was wiser than recall—and then, in case of disagreement, dismissal—will continue to be argued. But the MacArthur speeches, coupled with the antic performances of General Whitney, General MacArthur's press secretary, appear to have justified the summary dismissal in many minds that thought differently a couple of weeks ago.

With that over, the President reaffirmed his confidence in Secretary Acheson, and in the process seemed to be echoing the die-hard Republican line that in regard to China, Acheson represents the opposite policy to MacArthur's. Not for a moment can we admit any such view. To imply that if you are against MacArthur you are for Acheson is totally to distort the intrinsic situation. Secretary Acheson, contrary to the current propaganda on both sides of the debate, is more parallel than antithetical to MacArthur on China, and, we might add, much less candid and forthright. In Chicago, General MacArthur, in the intoxication of his welcome, moved sensibly closer to an all-out war position; Acheson's policy is to get this country into the same kind of sticky involvement with mainland China, only by the back door.

This was shown on Wednesday in the State Department announcement of the Chase mission to Formosa—so reminiscent of the fatal Barr mission to Nanking in 1945, which blew up so badly in the administration's face. The event marks the officially acknowledged end of the neutralization of Formosa policy. That policy has shaded into the initial MacArthur policy of defense of Formosa which got MacArthur originally in hot water. But there is something more significant in the administration's conversion. All the indications up to and including the Wednesday notice are that the administration's Formosa policy is also shading, as MacArthur's did before it, into an interventionist policy in behalf of the guerrillas on the assumption that they are Chiang Kai-shek's supporters. In other words, MacArthurism is continuing to drag the Achesons on its coattails. It is important to get the distinction and the implications straight.

The blunt fact is that the most important post in Mr. Truman's administration is filled by a man who does not enjoy general or congressional confidence. This, in view of the foreign business about to be put up to Congress, in view of the rival leadership that MacArthur is unmasking, is a serious matter to the administration and to the country alike. It stems, of course, from Mr. Acheson's public expressions about Alger Hiss, especially his public citation of a compassionate passage from the Bible which, in the light of Alger Hiss' refusal to come clean, was singularly inappropriate. Since then, whether because of the criticism he then invited or not, Secretary Acheson has seemed to be striving to appease the most vociferous of his critics, that is, the most reactionary of MacArthur elements in the Republican Party. All, of course, to no avail. On the contrary, the appeasement has had serious results. First, it has produced almost an abdication of civilian leadership which has permitted MacArthurism to thrive. It has put the administration, secondly, in a position where it has the same difficulty of explaining its policy as the people have of understanding it.

The metamorphosis of Mr. Acheson in this aspect (as in other aspects) of foreign policy has alienated a segment of Mr. Acheson's party. They see no prospect of any far eastern settlement under his auspices. They see him hogtied by popular suspicion. At home as well as abroad he is a political deadweight. Foreign policy in his regime has become merely a carbon copy of Pentagon strategy without regard to policy or principle. A military man has to think in terms of war tomorrow, but not the diplomat. Otherwise a nation would be condemned to close all avenues to a self-enforcing peace, and to stop thinking in terms of reconstruction as well as preparedness. We are convinced that the two preoccupations can go together, but we see no sign that Secretary Acheson feels the same way.

Secretary Acheson seems to be aware that his stock is badly depressed throughout the country. At any rate, he is said on at least half a dozen occasions to have submitted his resignation to the President, only to have him reject it. For the good of the country, as well as to enable the administration to make a fresh start in effectuating a contra-MacArthur policy on China, he should insist on his own retirement, or his transfer to a useful field of endeavor. The President should have at his elbow a Secretary who can capitalize his own influence as well as one with a topnotch mind. It is unfair to the President's overburdened office that he should shoulder the embarrassment of having a Secretary who, far from being an influence, is a drag. For, apart from his own need for relief, there is the country to consider, a country which is constantly frustrated in the quest for basic unity by the President's unwillingness to put his own house in order.

General MacArthur's Pronouncements on the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alternatives in Korea," published in the Oil City Derrick on April 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTERNATIVES IN KOREA

Right or wrong from a diplomatic and political point of view, General MacArthur's pronouncements on the Korean war have served to emphasize once again the utter confusion that marks the views of the Washington administration and the United Nations Assembly regarding a firm and resolute far eastern policy.

In advocating the bombing of Communist bases in Manchuria and use of Chinese Nationalist troops stationed on Formosa to open a second front against Red China, MacArthur has brought a storm of protest upon his shoulders from capitals throughout the western world.

Now the hatchet men of the Truman administration and those of other nations, particularly England and France, are out to scalp the general or at least to subject him to public reprimand.

Perhaps the general is out of bounds in issuing pronouncements on questions that are preeminently political. Perhaps he has overstepped his authority as a military commander in public presentation of his views without the consent of his superiors.

But let it not be forgotten that General MacArthur has been cast in a difficult role. His is perhaps the toughest military job in the history of modern warfare. He has been forced to fight a war that is strictly limited for him and his United Nations forces, but is not limited for the enemy who enjoys the advantage of superior numbers and a privileged sanctuary in Manchuria. He literally has one hand tied behind his back while his foe is permitted to swing freely with both mailed fists.

And now the general faces the added grim outlook of a massive spring offensive by the Chinese and North Korean Reds, this time with the possible benefit of a considerable power in the air provided by Soviet-supplied planes now massing in Manchuria. What could happen to a vastly outnumbered United Nations Army which lacked undisputed control of the air is grounds for grave fear.

MacArthur repeatedly has warned that unless United Nations policy is changed, the Korean war undoubtedly will settle into a costly stalemate. He takes the position that the conflict can be brought to a successful end only by removal of the restrictions on the forces under his command.

The United Nations, on the other hand, has opposed any extension of the conflict for fear of Soviet involvement and loosening of the forces that would ignite the spark of world war III. The U. N. has worked incessantly for a cease fire in Korea and an end of the conflict by negotiation. But every effort to halt the fighting has been turned down by Red China and it is hard to visualize any change in the stand of the Peiping government so long as U. N. forces are restricted in their operations.

Common sense dictates that no sane American can favor steps that arbitrarily would plunge the Nation into another world war. Likewise, it is hard to crystallize sentiment in favor of continuing the conflict on the present basis with the steady whittling away of American lives. Already the casualties of United States forces in a conflict which Mr. Truman still refers to as a police action are nearing the 60,000 mark.

There must be no let-up in the efforts of this Nation and all free nations to bring about an early end to the hostilities in Korea. But in event of failure to achieve a settlement through a negotiated peace, it would appear that the only alternative to a long and costly stalemate is a decision by the United Nations either to get off the peninsula or to undertake the effort necessary to achieve victory and the goal of a unified and free Korea.

War in Korea Profitable for United States "Partners"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "War in Korea Profitable for United States 'Partners,'" written by Larry Rue, and published in the April 22 issue of the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR IN KOREA PROFITABLE FOR UNITED STATES "PARTNERS"—ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS SELLING TO RUSSIA

(By Larry Rue)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, April 21.—The Korean war has been quite profitable to Britain France, and other Atlantic Pact nations which have been doing business with Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain.

Statistics compiled here show that the British have more than doubled their exports of tooling machines and other strategic material to the Soviet Union. These machines are important for the armament industry and few here doubt that they are now producing weapons for use against American soldiers in Korea.

France, too, has been doing a thriving business, particularly with Czechoslovakia. In a last-minute effort to curry favor with this satellite state, France resumed dismantling of critical electrotechnical and tooling machines in the French zone of occupation. The machines are being turned over to Czechoslovakia.

BIGGEST IN EASTERN EUROPE

The biggest armament plant in all of Eastern Europe is in Czechoslovakia. It is the Skoda works, now turning out all types of heavy war weapons on Russian account. The machinery, which has been removed from German plants around Baden-Baden, can be used to make accessories for war machines Skoda is now producing for the Communist armies.

Dismantling of 41 German tooling machines was ordered by the Czech restitution mission in Baden-Baden on the ground that this equipment originally was taken from Czechoslovakia. Despite the fact that most of the factories from which the machines were taken were damaged heavily in the war, the owners were able to produce receipts showing that the machines had been paid for in full and never had been subject to requisition by the Wehrmacht.

BLOW AT SCHUMAN PLAN

The French by allowing the Czech Communists to weaken the economy of West Germany in order to strengthen their own war potential have aroused suspicion as to where their hearts are in the struggle between communism and the western world.

The dismantling also has strengthened the already formidable Socialist opposition to the Schuman plan, calling for the integration of the coal and steel industries of the Western European countries, on which United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy has based his chief hopes as a basic solution to the age-old difficulties between the French and the Germans.

Moreover, it throws a monkey wrench in the Atlantic Pact plans for Western European defense by building up resistance to West German participation.

SWISS FIRMS BIG BUYERS

Besides the British and the French, other Atlantic Pact nations have made huge profits since the Korean war by selling to the Soviet Union all kinds of raw materials needed by the armament industry. This business picked up tremendously everywhere after war started in Korea. The material sometimes goes through two or three hands before reaching Russia.

Swiss firms have been big buyers for Russion account; so have Dutch and Belgian firms. This is one of the reasons why it has been so difficult to break up the increasing illegal trade between East and West.

In Bonn it was announced recently that Britain in 1948 sold tooling machines worth $240,000,000 to Russia. In 1949 this trade was stepped up to $480,000,000, while in 1950 tooling machines worth $1,350,000,000 were delivered to the Soviet Union by England.

AUSTRIAN A KEY SMUGGLER

France has been getting large orders for special electric technical equipment from Czechoslovakia. It was in order to keep this trade that the French agreed to take machines the Czechs want out of German plants.

The American licensed Der Tagesspiegel of Berlin recently published nearly four columns of details about smuggling transactions involving war plants in East Germany and Russia. The Tagesspiegel reported that Swiss, Swedish, Belgium, and Dutch firms have been doing business with an Austrian named Johann Haselgruber, said to be the key person in a huge smuggling ring which operates entirely for the Soviet Union.

The Tagesspiegel also wrote that annually at least 100,000 tons of steel being shipped to West Berlin firms disappears behind the iron curtain. South of Helmstedt, the official check point between East and West Germany, at least 3,000 tons of tooling machines, special steel, tools, and high frequency motors have been smuggled into the Soviet zone every night, this paper asserted.

SEND BARS FOR GUNS

Cockerill, a Belgium concern, is said to have delivered 7,400 round steel bars for making machine gun barrels as well as 2,500 large steel bars for big artillery barrels. Other ammunition from Belgium, which was shipped to Russia, included 6,200 pistols with 200 rounds of ammunition for each one. The Swiss firm of Oerlikon, manufacturer of an automatic machine gun, delivered a big order of such guns to Haselgruber, the Tagesspiegel reported.

The paper deplores that steel rails, made in West Germany and delivered to Rotterdam, were sent to Russia and were used to connect the three Soviet atomic centers in the republic of Tanna Tuwa, north of Mongolia; that special Belgian steel flows into Soviet armament centers and ready-made German guns have appeared on the Korean front; that Belgian and Swiss made weapons, German and Belgian tools, and German, Swiss, and Swedish machines are strengthening the Soviet armament potential.

"That West German steel is illegally exported to the Soviet zone while the West German Volkswagen plant cannot operate for lack of steel is a scandal," the paper concludes.

Foreign Policy and Domestic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Republican 21 Club of Massachusetts, at Worcester, Mass., on April 28, in which I discussed the foreign policy and domestic administration of the United States Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., REPUBLICAN 21 CLUB OF MASSACHUSETTS, WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 28, 1951

HIGH LIGHTS OF THE SPEECH

1. The administration has made tragic errors in foreign policy, notably in neglecting our own defenses and in not developing enough truly effective allies to relieve our men of carrying such a major part of the load of combat.

2. In contemplating the dismissal of General MacArthur, we are struck by the unbelievably summary manner in which it was achieved. No one seriously denies that the civil power in a democracy must be supreme, but I feel strongly that the showdown need never have come and that, when it did come, it was dealt with in a way which was utterly uncalled for. It seems to me inexcusable that the President never called General MacArthur to Washington for consultation. Actions which are so crude and so impulsive shake one's confidence profoundly, for how can one have faith in a Commander in Chief who so obviously cannot command himself? It is for this reason, I think, that the reactions which I have had from the public in Massachusetts have been so overwhelming. Of all the hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received some spoke of the far eastern question and some spoke about the civil power being supreme over the military. But none endorsed or praised the bungling and lack of foresight which has characterized this administration. In my experience in public life, I have seen nothing like it. The President has allowed the foundation of confidence on which his great office rests to be eaten away by the political termites who surround him. The President should promptly arrange for the United States Government to have the benefit of General MacArthur's wise counsel and should invite the general to render this added service.

3. Trade in war materials with Red China or Soviet Russia is nefarious and must be stopped.

4. Republicans should draw the issue on the administration's poor judgment and low moral tone, concentrating their attack on inflation, on the RFC, and the crime scandals and not mix up the success of the Republican Party with American military security.

TEXT OF THE SPEECH

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans—and fellow Americans, for I speak to you tonight in both capacities.

We meet tonight as citizens who are thoroughly aroused by the lack of foresight and general incompetence of our national leadership; who are determined decisively to rid ourselves of this administration in the coming year, and who are also determined that until the time comes that we can throw them out, we will surmount our problems here at home and present a united front to our Communist opponents.

Looking back over the past:

We have seen the national leadership in 1945 fail in its duty to proclaim the need of Armed Forces strong enough to give us influence for peace, thus countenancing the disintegration of our Armed Forces and losing the chance to organize the peace.

We have seen the negligence which permitted the destruction of billions of dollars worth of equipment which we badly need today.

We remember the Yalta Conference, from which so much tragedy has flowed, particularly for the valiant people of Poland.

We point to the stupid decisions such as that which made the city of Berlin an island completely surrounded by Soviet territory.

We remind our fellow citizens of the mental lethargy, amounting virtually to a betrayal of trust, which resulted in the Soviet empire growing after World War II until it encompassed about one-third of the world's total area and population before we finally started to wake up.

We think with bitter emotion of June 1949 when we withdrew our two divisions from Korea and announced that the United States defense line ran from the Aleutian Islands through Japan and the Philippines, inferring that the line of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea was not essential to our defense. This was the action which created the vacuum and thus encouraged the Communist invaders to step into the vacuum. I cannot rid myself of the idea that it did not have the approval of our military authorities. There is no doubt in my mind that if these two divisions had stayed there, 6,000 miles from home and close to the Soviet border as they were, that there would have been no aggression in Korea. But we hauled down our flag, and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that we have paid a heavy price in blood and treasure for this miscalculation. It is one mistake which we must not repeat in other parts of the world—notably in Europe—in the future.

We who are Republican Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee said last summer with the approval of the late great Senator Arthur Vandenberg:

"In the Far East, we were persistently led to believe that Chinese communism was only a great agrarian reform movement. After half a century of cordial relations in the Far East, and especially with China, with all its troubles and difficulties, in about 1945 we were suddenly faced with a change of policy which is difficult to understand unless we evaluate the subtle betrayals of China at the Yalta Conference.

"This conference sabotaged the assurances given to China at the Cairo Conference of 1943, where also the future freedom of Korea was pledged. The Yalta agreement turned over to Stalin the control of Manchuria and Outer Mongolia and the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur. This was part of the price we paid for the unnecessary token participation of Soviet Russia in the war against Japan, one of the consequences of which was the division of Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel.

"Our far-eastern policy, growing out of these events, consistently temporized with and capitulated to the ruthless demands of the Communists, dominated by Moscow. Under it the Kremlin was, in effect, given a green light to grab whatever it could in China, Korea, and Formosa. This was never a bipartisan policy. It was solely an administration policy."

To this statement we added these words: "Never again must we allow ourselves to be caught, as we were when Korea was invaded, in a position where our failure to foresee the possible implications of our basic foreign policy will result in our being inadequately prepared to carry out that policy in time of crisis."

We concluded with the statement: "In this crisis there can be no politics as usual." But it is glaringly clear today that our advice was not taken.

Then we think of the disloyalty, foreign penetration and betrayal of trust which existed in 1945 when several thousand secret documents were stolen by the Communist editors of a so-called magazine named Amerasia, which resulted in a mere slap on the wrist to the parties who were thus guilty of aiding the Communists at a time when our men were still in combat in the Pacific. We condemn the fact that several thousand unscreened persons came into the State Department at the stroke of a pen in late 1945 and early 1946. All these things must be ruthlessly investigated and the disloyal persons cleaned out and punished.

The aim of foreign policy can be simply stated: it is to preserve peace and, if the struggle against communism should turn to war, to have effective allies—for the tragically simple reason that the sons of American mothers must not be forced to bear the full load of combat alone. On both counts the administration does not deserve a high mark. We have not organized peace nor do we have allies which are as effective as they should be—and could have been—if foresight had been shown after the end of hostilities in World War II. In Korea in particular we should certainly take advantage of whatever help we can get—among others, effective non-Communist Chinese from whom we ought to be able to obtain help without loss of American manpower or without entangling political alliances. In Europe it means that in addition to the help of the North Atlantic Treaty countries and former neutrals such as Spain and former enemy nations such as Germany, we should organize the help of the many non-Communist stateless men whom we would like to have on our side. All of these young men would help our soldiers to bear the load of combat so that American men would not have to do it alone.

As the Senator who introduced the first bill on this subject in 1947, I said on the floor of the Senate last year that if we had embarked on this policy at the end of hostilities in World War II: "there would be today both in Europe and the Far East foreign troops of great combat effectiveness." And I added: "Unfortunately the Soviets interested themselves in the possibility of using alien soldiers long before we did and we are paying a big price for this in Korea at this moment." And I said in July, the day of the Korean aggression, "we must not do this job alone. We must galvanize our allies and make sure that they work with us in building military strength."

Certainly the administration record in this respect has been a grave disappointment. Not only was there great resistance to the legislation which I sponsored to authorize the enlistment of these stateless young men in our services; but even when the bill had become law last June, providing for a modest total of 2,500 aliens, the administration dragged its feet in carrying out the law. I heard only recently of a man who had been a captain in the Polish Army, a professional soldier with 12 years' service, an expert artilleryman and a man with a wife and two children, who offered his services at one of our embassies abroad, saying that he was willing to join the United States Army as a private soldier in order to fight against communism in Korea. He offered his services and received a mimeographed letter saying that he could not be accepted because he did not have a visa to enter the United States. In the first place, this response was illegal because the new law which the administration was ignoring specifically authorized

the United States to accept the services of a man like that. In the second place, he did not want to come to the United States. He wanted to go directly to Korea to take part in the fighting. In the third place, the reply was stupid and is all too typical of the lack of understanding and lack of imagination about the world situation which characterizes so much of official Washington today.

Yes, the administration record has been a disappointment and so—I say to you frankly—has been the record of many—though by no means all—of the member nations of the United Nations. There are nations which do not hesitate to remind Americans that it is fair for the United States to make a large financial contribution to the United Nations because we have more dollars per capita than any other nation. But to this argument must be added the far more poignant truth that our manpower per capita is no greater than that of other nations of the world. This is undoubtedly the rock on which the United Nations is most likely to founder. When an aggression occurs and the rank and file of members of the United Nations fail to put up military manpower in proportion to their population, the faith of the American people in the United Nations collapses. All honor, therefore, to the nations which have, by their manpower, eased the load of combat for us in Korea. Other nations should follow their example.

Another step which would shake confidence in the United Nations to its foundation would be the admission of Red China. The United Nations is founded for the purpose of resisting aggression. If a government can be admitted to membership in the United Nations simply by committing aggression, then the whole concept becomes an immense and tragic absurdity.

Let me say that equally tragic are the thoughts which come to mind at reports of shipments of war materials to Red China and the Soviet Union. Whether these shipments come from American or other sources, they help the enemies of our soldiers and of our allies. I speak as a long-time friend of the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall plan when I say to the nations of Europe that there is nothing which can more surely jeopardize American enthusiasm for the North Atlantic alliance than reports of this nefarious trade with the enemy, than the shouts of delight coming from abroad over General MacArthur's dismissal, and the recent dispatches which speak of making Red China a party to the Japanese treaty and of handing Formosa over to the Communists.

In contemplating the dismissal of General MacArthur, we are struck by the unbelievably summary manner in which it was achieved. No one seriously denies that the civil power in a democracy must be supreme, but I feel strongly that the showdown need never have come and that, when it did come, it was dealt with in a way which was utterly uncalled for. It seems to me inexcusable that the President never called General MacArthur to Washington for consultation. Actions which are so crude and so impulsive shake one's confidence profoundly, for how can one have faith in a Commander in Chief who so obviously cannot command himself? It is for this reason, I think, that the reactions which I have had from the public in Massachusetts have been so overwhelming. Of all the hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received some spoke of the far-eastern question and some spoke about the civil power being supreme over the military. But none endorsed or praised the bungling and lack of foresight which has characterized this administration. In my experience in public life, I have seen nothing like it. The President has allowed the foundation of confidence on which his great office rests to be eaten away by the political termites who surround him. The President should promptly arrange for the United States Government to have the benefit of General MacArthur's wise counsel and should invite the general to render this added service.

The tragic past is, therefore, clear. Although by no means desperate, the future is grim. General MacArthur's departure adds enormously to the difficulty of getting any kind of an agreement to end the Korean war. We are placed in an unhappy situation in Korea—and elsewhere—because in 1945 we gave up our own military strength and the strength of others who could help us. Until we regain the initiative which we threw away in 1945, we cannot expect a satisfactory solution in Korea or anywhere else. This takes time. We must demand increased efforts at building military strength, both for the sake of our men in Korea and for the sake of durable peace.

In the meantime, we must remember that many of the problems which we will have to confront are not as simple as they look the first time.

For example:

We must challenge those who demand an "all-out aggressive war" against any country by asking them the question, "What with?" The answer to that question is that our preparedness has been so neglected for so long that we are not now in a position to undertake sustained and general aggressive war against anyone.

While Asia is critically important, the greatest concentration of industrial power outside of the United States and the U. S. S. R. is in Western Europe—and the possession of industrial power wins wars. As General MacArthur so wisely inferred, we have two fronts—a western front in Korea and an eastern front in Europe. We as citizens must always look at American security as a whole. Europe and Japan are two ends of one Soviet empire. The Soviet military threat, as General MacArthur said, is a global threat. We must not meet it by piecemealing and frittering away our strength, notably our knock-out punch—the strategic air force. We must not wear out and use up our first team against their second team. We have done this too much already insofar as our Army is concerned. We must not commit our main force until the Kremlin commits its main force.

Our effort at one end of the Soviet Empire should help our effort at the other. Certainly one of the many great things accomplished by the heroic service of our men in Korea is that it has furnished the foundation of confidence on which military strength is being built all over the world. Their action gives us time to get ready—just as the forces of General MacArthur brought us precious time at Bataan 9 years ago. We should make maximum use of this precious time, just as we did in 1942. The action of our men in Korea is like that of the heroic boy in the story who kept his finger in the dyke.

In the field of foreign policy Republicans have a good record of achievement in the Eightieth Congress, about which so many untrue things have been said by the leaders of the party now in power. It was the Eightieth Congress which enacted: the law which set up the Marshall plan, which has saved Western Europe from communism; the Greek and Turkish aid bills which have been such a magnificent investment in human courage and fighting ability; and the Vandenberg resolution which resulted in the North Atlantic Pact which is now being so effectively implemented under the able leadership of General Eisenhower. This is a record of Republican foresight and intelligence in foreign policy which should be an inspiration.

Fellow Republicans, there never was a time when the American people needed the two-party system more than they need it today. There never was a time when there was a greater usefulness for that wonderful system which enables the citizen to draw the issue, fix the responsibility, and get a change in his government.

Our duty as active Republicans is to try to draw the issue where it ought to be drawn. That issue ought not to be drawn on the question of whether we should or should not put the Chinese Nationalists ashore in China; we need not get involved in technical questions of strategy and tactics in order to discharge our duty as active members of the opposition party. The issue should not be drawn on the question of whether we should keep our strategic air command together as a unit or whether we should divide it up and piecemeal it all over the world. We should not base our campaign on an argument as to whether the civil power should or should not be supreme over the military or whether Europe is more important than Asia. I was glad to hear General MacArthur say that these strategical issues "reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration." We must, therefore, not seek to mix up the success of the Republican Party with the security of our country.

The issue should be drawn on questions which are both less technical and much more fundamental—to wit: The judgment and the moral tone of those at the head of our Government. We as active Republicans must not seek to make foreign policy the issue. In fact, it is a pity that already the legitimate political issue arising from the scandal, corruption, and low moral tone of this administration has been somewhat beclouded by arguments on world strategy which do not belong in politics.

We can point to so much: Not only to all these blunders in the field of foreign policy and national defense, but particularly to the crisis which faces so many American families caused by the fact that the dollar you get today can't buy as much as the dollar you got a little while ago—to the oldest of political tricks which pretends that you are giving everybody a raise in pay and then, by monkeying with the value of the dollar, causes all the prices to go up much faster than the citizen's income is rising.

We can point to the timidity in Washington today in dealing with certain politically influential lobbies who want to support the prices of certain products regardless of what happens to the consumer.

We declare that a farm policy ought to try to increase the production of the food which you and I like to eat and like to get at a reasonable price, but that there has never been any bill pass Congress which made it more attractive or cheaper for a man to produce steak.

We can point to the disorderly floundering which is going on in Washington now so far as price control is concerned and to the need for intelligent and courageous leadership which can mete out justice to all elements of the American community and which can end the present atmosphere of every man for himself. Who in high office today appears to be thinking about the interests of the general public? I have written to Eric Johnston and to Price Administrator DiSalle calling attention to what is happening to the cost of living in this country, but all I have had so far is words. All the news that comes out of the Economic Stabilization Agency is political talk. There is plenty of talk that nobody is going to dare to step on the toes of certain selfish lobbies. There is a good deal of talk about who is going to have the say in appointing all the different job holders who are supposed to enforce the Economic Stabilization orders throughout the country. There are stories of disagreement between various administration politicians as to who is going to have a chance to put his friend on the payroll. I have even heard it said in Massachusetts that they are using

the Economic Stabilization Agency to construct a political machine for the 1952 election. But I have heard nothing which leads me to believe that the consumer in Massachusetts is going to get a real break insofar as food and clothing and fuel is concerned.

Then we must denounce:

The waste of the taxpayer's money by the RFC.

The low moral tone which exists in official circles, only the surface of which has been scratched by the famous mink coat incident.

The whole idea that there should be Government banking operations at all, if these consist chiefly in helping somebody who can't get along in ordinary business or of lending money to make votes for a party or an officeholder or of helping some cheap chiseler who manages to ingratiate himself with a few politicians.

We can recall what the Hoover Commission task force said about this—something which interests me because I was the author of the bill which created the Hoover Commission. That report said "direct lending is not normally a proper function of the Federal Government," and said that the best way to get rid of these scandals was to get the Government out of private enterprise.

It was this same Hoover Commission which set up the first far-reaching attempt at Government economy ever undertaken. That was done in the Eightieth Congress which, you may remember, was so much maligned—the Eightieth Congress which saw the Federal budget balanced for the first time in 17 years—and not balanced at the expense of anyone needing help.

In addition to the bungling and lack of foresight which has distinguished our foreign policy, we should point to:

The revelations of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee which proved so eloquently the urgent need for an utterly ruthless housecleaning; and the unholy alliance between politics and crime which has resulted in an intolerable condition in which law-abiding citizens who are struggling to make both ends meet must pay heavy taxes while racketeers make huge sums in illegal ways.

All of it—crime, scandal, inflation, and foreign policy—are symptoms of the same disease—the disease of incompetence in government.

Fellow Republicans, this is perhaps the most fateful moment in our history since the dreadful division in the Civil War. We must not whip ourselves into such a state of frenzy and anger at each other that we have no indignation left with which to face our Communist opponent. While resolving to remove this administration let us never forget that today, tomorrow, and next week we will be living in dangerous times. We must, therefore, hope that the administration, weak and inadequate though it is, will do at least some things right and that when they do we, as patriotic Americans, will cooperate. If ever there was a time when we needed a Nation united on its attitude toward Communist imperialism it is now.

There is nothing fundamentally the matter with America. In fact, there is nothing so bad in this country that a thoroughgoing housecleaning in Washington won't solve. We are a strong Nation. We have great industries. We have strong and resolute people. We have great military leaders of proven worth. We have inspiring institutions and ideals. We can still avoid total war. We can only be defeated if we decide to defeat ourselves. If we are united behind a competent leadership there is nothing that can stop us.

On the Republican Party next year will descend the solemn responsibility of providing the leadership behind which the American people can in the future unite for victory and peace. As active Republicans, you and I have a special responsibility to nominate worthy candidates and then to work hard to elect them in November 1952. As American citizens we have, between now and election day, the duty to work with all our fellow citizens for a strong America. Thus will we best deserve their confidence.

Factors Affecting Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by Paul C. Johnson, and published in the Prairie Farmer of April 21, 1951, under the caption "This business of farming—Washington is worried." The editorial relates to the farm-labor shortage and other factors entering into a possible decrease in agricultural production.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS BUSINESS OF FARMING—WASHINGTON IS WORRIED

There is real alarm in Washington that Corn Belt farmers may not be able to turn out the production in 1951 that the Nation's planners had hoped for. The recent pep meeting in Des Moines is a result of this alarm.

PMA committeemen are really put on the spot by this Washington pressure. They are expected to go down the road for more production. This comes on the heels of instructions to reorganize the old USDA councils as county mobilization committees and induce draft boards to see that there is at least one able-bodied man on every family farm.

The draft is a hot potato in any community. PMA chairmen in some counties have chosen to ignore the Washington instructions and keep their hands completely off draft matters. Many draft boards are very sensitive about interference.

But when committeemen go down the road to talk more acreage and bigger plantings, they will find labor shortage is the bottleneck. The draft has already cut deep. The attraction of high city wages will cut deeper. Our productive capacity on Midwest farms has already been hurt.

Prairie Farmer has pointed this out repeatedly ever since last summer, but people who should carry responsibility in these matters have chosen to believe that nothing can happen to farm production.

Anyway, greet your committeeman with a smile. His is a tough job. Representing the Government is not always peaches and cream. Anything you can do to increase production is definitely to the good. That is, if you do not upset your soil conservation plan.

As this is written the Washington battle over price ceilings on farm products is really tough. Price stabilizers have been trying to establish ceilings below parity, but farm organizations have been equally determined to defend the parity principle. There may be a compromise that would set parity levels once a year instead of letting them creep upward with each increase in farm costs.

The seesawing back and forth on livestock price ceilings may have settled down by the time you read this. It looks now like a flat ceiling on hogs, with the ceilings on carcass beef by grades. This would prevent packers from bidding up cheap cattle, as usually happens when there is a beef shortage.

A lot of signs point to a shortage of milk in the next year or two. Many dairymen are throwing in the towel and turning to easier kinds of farming. Too much grief getting labor.

The bureaucrats' medicine for such a situation is, of course, to pay a subsidy instead of letting a scarce product seek its own price level and thereby correct its own scarcity. This patent medicine will probably be tried again to stimulate dairying.

The live-poultry market in the Chicago area has been in a stew because WLS has sought to revise price quotations in cooperation with the USDA reporting service. It has been alleged the trade is in the habit of publicly proclaiming one price and then paying poultry buyers a premium over and above that price. WLS is insisting on quoting a price which includes the premium to give a fairer idea of what the birds are bringing in Chicago.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 30, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a special dispatch to the Hartford Times, which enjoys the largest circulation of any newspaper in Connecticut, from Mr. Joseph P. Lyford, the Hartford Times European correspondent. In this article we have a penetrating analysis of our problems here in the United States as they were seen in Rome, Italy, on April 12, 1951. Mr. Lyford has a long and remarkable background as journalist and political analyst upon which to base his observations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Joseph P. Lyford)

ROME, ITALY.—During the past week, the United States dollar skidded from 670 to 650 lire. By way of explanation, the proprietor of the money exchange on the Piazza di Spagna simply shrugged his shoulders and said "MacArthur."

His reaction is one of many indications of the tremendous interest with which politically minded Italians are following developments in the MacArthur case. A more substantial evidence of this preoccupation are Rome's dozen newspapers, which have devoted heavy type and several columns of front-page space daily to the general's recall.

This pronounced reaction to the MacArthur affair is somewhat of a departure from Italy's ordinarily brief and comparatively unexcited treatment of political events which frequently cause severe public agitation in the United States. This is partly because the Italian, by the very nature of his multi-party government, has had a greater opportunity than an American to become bored with the average political eruption.

But the removal of General MacArthur has stirred the Italian public as few United States political events have since the war. It has also brought forth some interpretations from Italians which should be illuminating to Americans who are perhaps too close to the sound and fury in Washington to compre-

hend fully the impact of the MacArthur dismissal on other parts of the world.

The chief reason for Italian interest in the matter is the fact that Italy is analyzing the MacArthur controversy primarily in terms of its bearing on United States policy toward Russia in Europe.

The feeling here, as expressed by Premier de Gasperi, who has strongly supported President Truman's step, and by Italian newspaper correspondents, is that a MacArthur plan for an all-out war in China would mean that Europe—and Italy in particular—would become secondary considerations in the United States world campaign to stop communism.

Thus General Eisenhower's effort to build a strong European defense could not but suffer seriously. A two-front war in Asia, it is felt, would simply amount to a positive and irrevocable declaration by the United States that it has chosen China, rather than Europe, as the place to resist Russia. Certainly MacArthur's two-front statement was a shocking revelation to those who are trying to rally the Western European nations into a mutual defense bloc.

Neither Italy nor any of the other Western European countries now looking to Eisenhower for leadership consider that Russia would follow the United States lead and commit itself to a show-down in China. Rather, the Soviet Union—if it has decided on war this year—would allow the United States to deploy itself against Red China, and then Soviet tanks would get their orders to roll into Yugoslavia, Iran, Germany, or Italy—or all, simultaneously.

This helps to explain why General MacArthur is regarded with considerable fear in Italy, although his military accomplishments are given their just due. MacArthur, who has no record of military or diplomatic dealings with Europeans since World War I, is considered as looking at the world crisis solely in terms of his own theater of operations, without regard to the effect of his policies on the fate of anti-Communist nations on this side of the iron curtain.

There is a historical background, too, for Italian distrust of the general and for the generally favorable comment which President Truman's action has received here. Italy has had considerable reason to fear the power of military men who embark on political voyages. The lessons which Sulla and Caesar taught the Romans and the more recent example of Marshal Badoglio have deeply imbedded themselves in the mind of the educated Italian.

It is no surprise, therefore, that Italian journals of all political complexions have nicknamed MacArthur the "proconsul." The sobriquet conveys a great deal to the Italian public. Subsequent developments in the MacArthur case, particularly his invitation to appear before the combined Houses of Congress, and the plans for an elaborate homecoming supplement the Italian conviction that here may be a modern Roman triumph in the making.

It is not a distrust of generals per se that has colored Italian opinion about General MacArthur. It is, rather, the fact that, in contrast to other United States military leaders, MacArthur has spoken at increasingly frequent intervals on important matters of public policy in advance of Washington's decision on such matters. Suspicion also stems from the belief that MacArthur, as Japan's supreme ruler for several years, has given many indications of an arbitrary and dictatorial temperament.

The Italian attitude toward General Eisenhower is in significant contrast. With the obvious exception of the Communists, who have attacked him continuously since January, the Italians regard Eisenhower with affection and admiration. The reasons for his popularity are the direct opposites of the reasons for the distrust of MacArthur: Eisenhower has always been identified with Europe's destiny, he has kept aloof from politics, and he has achieved results by obtaining the cooperation of his allies rather than by dictation.

These factors explain in large part why Italian public opinion is with President Truman. The domestic political tempest in the United States over MacArthur's recall does not seem to be regarded seriously here. To quote the conservative newspaper Il Momento, the affair is "simply a new opportunity for the Republican Party to attack the White House."

Actually the President has established himself more firmly here by his action. For one thing, he has singlehandedly thrown the left-wing press into confusion. The political observer for the right-wing newspaper Il Messagero writes from Switzerland that, in hailing MacArthur's removal as a "victory of the popular movement for peace," the Soviet propagandists have "for the first time been forced to give President Truman credit for at least one peaceable intention."

This same correspondent notes that the MacArthur case has given rise in Communist countries to "an insidious suspicion that the United States Government wants peace."

Whatever the troubles of the Soviet propagandists, however, General MacArthur's removal has been a source of profound relief in Italy. The question remains, however, whether or not the "proconsul" may not be an even more potent influence in the United States now that he has been freed from the military service which nominally restricted his right to make public political utterances. The answer to this question is being anxiously awaited in Italy as elsewhere in Europe.

Proposed Increase in the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two very important documents recently placed before the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on S. 677, a bill to increase the strength of the Marine Corps and to make the Commandant a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These are the statements of Hon. John Nicholas Brown, former Navy Assistant Secretary for Air, in favor of enactment of S. 677, and a letter from the former Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN

My name is John Nicholas Brown and I come from Rhode Island. I served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air from November 1946 to March 1949. I appreciate this opportunity of offering testimony in behalf of Senate bill 677, which has two sections and, if I may, I shall make brief comments upon each.

The first section is intended to give statutory authorization for increasing the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps to include 4 divisions together with 4 supporting air wings and to place a ceiling of 400,000. At this point I could well discuss the percentages and proportions between the various armed services. Important as these mathematical computations are, I shall, if I may, confine my remarks to the underlying philosophy which I presume motivated the introduction of this legislation.

Let me state at the outset that in my opinion he United States Marine Corps must never be thought of as a second army. Not only would this be unnecessary duplication but would be completely contrary to the basic function and purpose of the Marine Corps itself. When, then, is this peculiar function which the Marine Corps is called upon to assume in the total of our national defense? I need only cite here the statements contained in the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 79th Cong.), as amended by the Eighty-first Congress in Public Law 216. Outside of the minor functions of providing security detachments for the protection of naval property and for similar service on naval vessels, the traditional and fundamental function of the Marine Corps is to organize, train, equip, and maintain "fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign. * * * In addition, the Marine Corps * * * shall perform such other duties as the President shall direct." The purpose, therefore, of the Marine Corps is to provide amphibious forces and, in so doing, to represent within the whole complex of America's armed defenses that component which at all times shall have the highest degree of readiness.

Since we are an island power and since the continental land mass is in fact limited by the two major ocean areas of the globe, our first contact with an enemy presumably must be across a sea. It is this margin between sea and land that is the special province in warfare of the Marine Corps. Amphibious operations, therefore, become of peculiar importance to the United States. Indeed we have received witness to this fact in Korea. Furthermore, it is highly desirable that a corps of specialists in this all-important first phase of warfare be sufficiently large so that it can provide the maximum effectiveness.

It is unnecessary for me to explain to this committee the difficulties involved in amphibious operations. Indeed, I do not feel myself competent to discuss the technical aspects. I know, however, that in the United States Marine Corps we have the most highly integrated component because their specialty is that warfare which must be undertaken at the junction of land, sea, and air. It happens also that throughout our history this force of specialists in amphibious warfare has developed to the highest degree a special morale factor which is the pride and the glory of the United States Marine Corps. I cannot explain exactly how this has been achieved. The long line of heroic exploits, the burning faith in the importance of the Marine Corps itself, and the voluntary submission to rigorous discipline have produced a devotion to duty which through the years has lead to the display of a type of courage which makes all of us who are not marines very humble.

It is, therefore, this highly integrated force which has traditionally been the first to get under way when a police action has been called for. Of how many men should this specialized fighting force consist?

Numbers are relative. In times of peace naturally the Military Establishment is diminished. I submit, however, that the American people need the service of a relatively large Marine Corps and should not be bound by any false relationship with the numbers in other branches of the armed services when the question of placing ceilings upon their number arises. The Marine Corps today is limited to 204,029. The ceiling for fiscal 1952 will be limited to 175,516. I submit, gentlemen, that America can well use 400,000 marines without in any way creating

a second army or without transgressing the bounds set by law or by any agreement as to the function of the Marine Corps itself.

Furthermore, it so happens that in the creation of what might be looked at as a larger readiness force the taxpayer will be purchasing initial defense at its cheapest for over the years the Marine Corps has cost the taxpayer the least of any of the service branches. To put this idea in another way, let me say that the percentage of fighting marines, compared to those in units for their support, is far higher than in the Army. I say this with no intention to make invidious comparisons but rather to point out that the Navy supplies in large measure the Marine Corps' logistic support. Therefore, the taxpayer obtains the maximum fighting force for initial operations with the minimum of expense. I understand Senator DOUGLAS has placed in the RECORD of last Friday figures to substantiate this point.

I should like to comment for a moment upon the administrative aspects of the Marine Corps and the Navy Department.

During my service as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air the Marine Corps came directly under the Secretary of the Navy. As you know, it maintains a separate headquarters; its procurement is arranged for by its using mostly the Army for equipment and the Navy for medical and legal services, as well as the Navy Bureaus for other items. But my point is that, except in the person of the Secretary of the Navy himself, since the Marine Corps is within the Department of the Navy but not of it, there is no one whose day to day duty it is to supervise and also to represent the Marine Corps. It happens, therefore, that in the vast complex of the Department of Defense, the Marine Corps plays a lonely role.

Let me state quickly that this has certain advantages. The very smallness of the Marine Corps in relation to the other services has been in some measure its strength. I do not believe the increase proposed in this legislation, namely, approximately doubling the present size of the Corps—would, however, affect this point. Indeed when in World War I the Marine Corps was 486,000 men, it in no way suffered loss of its splendid fighting morale. But I do think that, offsetting the advantages the Marine Corps enjoyed in this particular, there are also disadvantages and for this reason I have come to support section II of this legislation which places the Commandant of the Marine Corps on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Certainly one of the sound principles of administration is to have committees as small as possible. A three-man board, consisting of the chief military officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, would, therefore, seem logical yet under the amendment passed by the last Congress there is now a chairman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, making a total of four. Actually in number the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not been increased over their original number due to the fact that during the war and after the President exercised his right to appoint his own Chief of Staff. You will remember of course that Admiral Leahy made a fourth member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff originally. I do not consider that adding a fifth member should disturb us from the point of view of making unwieldy this most important of our military boards.

But there are other and more compelling reasons which lead me to favor this scheme. Up to this time I have not mentioned interservice rivalries because I believe that, by and large, these so-called rivalries have received far too much attention in the public press. Actually, the differences between the armed services stem from wholly sincere convictions on controversial points. Certainly dead uniformity we do not want. Yet the balance of judgment, the ability to see the over-all picture, the wisdom which comes from knowledge of problems of the individual services are very difficult to obtain from those who are representing what they sincerely believe to be the interests of the Nation as represented by their respective services. It seems to me, therefore, that the inclusion as a member of the top level of a man whose specialty is that margin where land, sea, and air meet would greatly strengthen our military counsels. The Commandant of the Marine Corps could provide a kind of balance, since he combines in his special knowledge naval doctrine, the initial stages of land warfare doctrine, and tactical air support doctrine.

In closing, let me summarize by saying that readiness, the capacity to move anywhere immediately, and become effective, is always needed, and at the present juncture of events is especially necessary. This is the daily bread of the Marine Corps. It does not seem to me too much to insist by legislation that the United States Marine Corps be doubled in size and its Commandant given added responsibility in the highest military circles.

Let me express to you again, gentlemen, my thanks for giving me this opportunity to testify.

LETTER TO SENATOR DOUGLAS FROM GENERAL VANDEGRIFT, FORMER COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, IN SUPPORT OF S. 677

LYNCHBURG, VA., *April 16, 1951.*

DEAR MR. DOUGLAS: It is with pleasure and interest that, in response to your request, I send you my views on your bill (S. 677). As you know, I have only been prevented from appearing personally, because of the pressure of private affairs. I am pleased, however, that you had an opportunity to hear, in person, the views of my friend and predecessor, General Holcomb.

Of the two sections of your bill, section 1 (which seeks to provide an effective present-day organization for the Marine Corps), seems almost beyond argument as to its objectives. Those who remember the six excellent Marine divisions of World War II—created from a far smaller mobilization base (17,000 enlisted in 1939) than we possessed last June—will hardly feel that the four Marine divisions and four air wings provided by this legislation will unduly tax the Marine Corps or result in watering down the quality which, after all, is our priceless ingredient.

And the ceiling of 400,000 marines which section 1 contains should effectively dispel any though or rumor that the Marine Corps seeks to constitute itself "a second land army." We have never at any time entertained such designs, and I can think of nothing more disastrous for the Corps than to attempt to exceed its natural limits. These limits, I think, we determined empirically in World War II, and I should look with apprehension on any plan even for an ultimate Marine Corps larger than six divisions.

It is on section 2, which would seat the Commandant as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that I imagine debate will center.

During my term as Commandant, I gave deep and frequent consideration to this question. During the anxious days which preceded passage of the National Security Act of 1947, it was sometimes suggested to me by friends in Congress that I should seek to have included in that act a provision which would seat me on the Joint Chiefs. I knew from General Holcomb that President Roosevelt, whose judgment in naval and military matters was unsurpassed, offered to nominate the Commandant of Marines as a JCS member; I knew also, of course, that the war President had been thwarted in his wish by the then Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It was intimated by Members of Congress that the Commandant should be seated on the Joint Chiefs by provision of the National Security Act. My relationships within the Navy Department, both with the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, and with the Chief of Naval Operations, my old friend, Admiral Nimitz, were of the highest type. I then enjoyed, as 17 Commandants had enjoyed before me, unrestricted access to the Secretary of the Navy, and the thought was unheard of that any officer within the Department could question that the Commandant was directly responsible to the Secretary of the Navy for our administration and efficiency. So it seemed to me, working closely with high officials who recognized the historic status and authority of the Commandant's office, that no extensive benefits would derive from a seat on the JCS at that time and, conversely, that additional burdens might result.

Since that decision, I have had many occasions, both in and out of office to regret it.

Under the process of unification, it has become inevitable that the powers of the individual departments have withered as those of the Defense Department have increased. Where it was once satisfactory that the Commandant enjoy direct access to the top of the Navy Department when important decisions affecting Marine Corps matters were shaped, he now finds, increasingly, that vital policy measures affecting the Marine Corps reach decision not in the Navy Department but one level higher, in the Defense Department. Most of these stem from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it now seems clear to me that the Marine Corps cannot carry out its statutory functions under the Unification Act without representation at that level when matters of Marine Corps interest are discussed. In this connection, I find it illogical—considering how our unified defense machine has evolved—that, of all the four services entrusted with statutory functions in the National Security Act, the Marine Corps alone does not enjoy a voice to speak for those functions in the councils of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I cannot in any way agree with the view advanced before your committee that sufficient matters of Marine Corps interest do not come before that body to warrant the presence of the Commandant. One has only to look through the statutory functions of the Joint Chiefs to refute such a statement.

Thus, I find myself in complete agreement with this legislation. I endorse its organizational provisions not so much because they would aggrandize the Marine Corps, but because I believe that in these distracted times the country can use four marine divisions, just as one of our two divisions—my old division, and yours—is now being so well used in Korea.

I endorse the Joint Chiefs of Staff provision for two reasons. First, it provides insurance to the country that an effective Marine Corps can continue in existence. Second, and more important, it makes available in our highest military councils the professional skill, the cross-service experience, and the cojoint talents of the Corps of Marines.

Faithfully yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT,
General, United States Marine Corps
(Retired).

Treatment of West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Germany Treated Like Stepchild," by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY TREATED LIKE STEPCHILD—MOST NATIONS IN EUROPE TODAY ARE ENGAGED IN TRADE WITH RED CHINA AND ITS MOSCOW MASTERS

(By Constantine Brown)

Chancelor Konrad Adenauer is a shrewd man. He announced at Bonn last Sunday that the West German Federal Republic was willing to join all other Western European nations in a plan to stop all western trade with Communist China. He feels himself on safe grounds since there is hardly a nation in Europe today which is not engaged in a relatively remunerative trade with the far eastern aggressor and its Moscow masters.

Hong Kong and Singapore are doing a land-office business with the Chinese. West Germany is not doing badly either. Last week the German freighter *Mai Rickmers* was intercepted by Nationalist gunboats while en route to Shanghai with a cargo of vitally needed radio equipment, medical supplies, and other strategic materials. The ship's cargo had been cleared from Hamburg by the Allied High Commissioners' deputies. Consequently, insofar as the Bonn Government was concerned, the shipments were legal. But while the Nationalist destroyers and gunboats dare to interfere with a German vessel, they would run into real trouble if they challenged the rights of ships flying Allied flags.

Moscow is now wooing Western Germany. It ignores the Bonn Government which is being described as a stooge of the western capitalists. It is appealing directly to the German masses and industrialists.

Soviet-financed corporations have been organized in Western Germany. They make possible a thriving export business with the iron-curtain countries. German goods are being shipped in transit to Allied or neutral countries whence they are transshipped to the east.

The Soviet propagandists' bid for a free reunion of Eastern and Western Germany is not based on ideological arguments. They point out to the German industrialists and the millions of workers that while the industrial west will never permit a genuine revival of the Reich's industrial power, Russia needs it. The Soviet-European satellite countries cannot supply the great needs of half a billion people in China, they say. These markets can be Germany's for the asking. The industrial west, the propagandists say, is afraid of Germany's potential competition. The west, they say, seeks only Germany's manpower as cannon fodder against the U. S. S. R. They refuse even in this emergency to grant Germany full sovereignty In one of the many pamphlets which are being distributed by the million in the west, the spokesman for the Kremlin state: "The British and the French Governments have denied the American proposal that Germany organize an army of her own. They still insist that millions of young Germans serve in small units in their own armies under the command of the conquerors."

Thus with appeals to the nationalistic feelings of the German people and at the same time declarations that the German workers can find lasting employment in industries which will have much of the Far East at their disposal, the West Germans are urged to shake the western yoke and join their free brethren in the east. The Red agitators say that Russia will then see that a new Germany is given ample opportunity to develop herself nationally and economically. It also will guarantee that Germany would be spared the destruction of a third world war.

The Bonn Government is fully aware of the trickery of this propaganda and is doing its best to offset it. But unfortunately neither London nor Paris has done anything constructive in recent months to deny by deeds the contentions of Soviet propaganda. In spite of the military arguments of General Eisenhower to equitably stabilize the situation in Western Germany, the British and the French Governments, confronted with a difficult internal situation, have maintained their previous position of treating Germany as a stepchild in the European-defense set-up.

Cheap Politics and False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter from Walter R. Mybeck, director of the Division of Public Works and Supply of Indiana. He reveals in this letter an example of the short-sighted and blind economy which we have witnessed in some of the reductions on appropriations which in the end will cost the American public far more money than the apparent saving in this year's budget.

The Appropriations Committee had already reduced the $300,000 item for surplus property utilization in the Federal Security Agency before the House, and the Committee of the Whole reduced it by $200,000, which will practically eliminate the department's program of utilizing surplus property.

This so-called economy cut was cheap politics, not economy. Indiana is only one of 48 States penalized by practically abolishing this Government department on surplus property.

STATE OF INDIANA,
DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SUPPLY,
Indianapolis, April 26, 1951.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: We have just received word that an amendment to the appropriation bill which reduces an item of $300,000 for surplus utilization in the Federal Security Agency to the amount of $100,000 has passed the House with a very close vote and that the full committee of the Senate will report the bill the first of the week for action by the Senate.

Indiana participated in this program to the benefit of tax-exempt educational institutions as well as hospitals and other local agencies. This participation has not only benefited these agencies in securing needed articles for the continuance of the schools, but has meant a great savings from the dollar-and-cents point of view. The agencies receiving these articles were able to secure much-needed equipment.

The general thought in the average citizen's mind, during a discussion of surplus property, is that the article in question is surplus from World War II. This idea is not correct as the United States Government has at all times a surplus of items either in the salvage category or in a usable condition, although obsolete for use by the armed services.

Large quantities of these items occupy valuable warehouse space that might be utilized to better advantage in providing proper storage for more current items now useable by the Armed Forces.

We have had participating in Indiana 840 elementary schools, 720 high schools, and 22 colleges. Since 1946, these various participating agencies have received property valued in excess of $5,000,000, cost to them being only the handling charges which represents according to our records the total value of the article. While we could have given you complete detail of the amount each of these institutions received, we feel that it would be too voluminous, requiring too much time for you to study.

We would like to point out that our State schools and universities, which include Indiana University, Purdue University, Indiana State Teachers College, and Ball State Teachers College, have been the recipients of these benefits. Taylor University, a tax-exempt school located at Upland, Ind., was able to equip a complete scientific laboratory. Had this program not been in effect this school, due to scarcity of funds, could not have equipped this laboratory.

Anything you may be able to do with respect to restoring this cut in appropriation, I feel sure, will be to the benefit of all our schools, colleges, and hospitals in Indiana.

Respectfully submitted.

WALTER R. MYBECK,
Director, Public Works and Supply.

Public Assistance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have expressed my unequivocal opposition to the Truman administration's program for the socialization of our free productive American way of life. However much they may try to conceal it, there should be no doubt that the real purpose of those who advocate such programs as compulsory health insurance, such as advanced by Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing, is to convert this country into a socialized state.

It has come to light that the Federal Security Agency continues to circulate a pamphlet, first printed in 1945 and reprinted in 1949, which advocates the un-American tenet: "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state." That statement clearly discloses the concealed purpose of the Administration. It is an objective with which we cannot compromise. It is an objective the administration disclaims publicly but which it continues to pursue.

In order that our people may know exactly what has been taking place and be constantly alert in preserving their rights, I am inserting in the RECORD certain correspondence between the American Medical Association and Federal Security Administrator Ewing. It speaks for itself. I am hopeful that the American people will not allow themselves to

be lulled into a feeling of assurance that this fight against a socialized medicine and a socialized state has been won. It has only begun. The same program will be revived in other forms and by various means. The objective remains the same.

The correspondence follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1951.*

EDITOR, JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

Chicago:

My attention has been called to the president's page in March 31 issue Journal American Medical Association. It quotes sentence from what you mistakenly call a current pamphlet, describing it as Mr. Ewing's directive. Any reputable scientific periodical verifies statements before publication. Elementary check would have revealed that pamphlet was written and issued in 1945, some 2 years before I became Federal Security Administrator. Checking would also have revealed that this pamphlet is not being currently distributed by Federal Security Agency, and has never had remotest authority as directive. Since you profess to be a scientific magazine interested in truth I suggest you retract the statement as publicly as it was made in the first place.

OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator,
Federal Security Agency.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association of March 31, 1951]

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

A MONTHLY MESSAGE

Imitation, they say, is the sincerest form of flattery, and the medical profession can accept as a tribute to its campaign against compulsory health insurance the fact that so many members of the opposition have taken up the cry that they, too, are opposed to socialized medicine. Perhaps the gentlemen protest too much. Certainly not many persons take them seriously. Millions did not during last fall's elections, and today some of the most outspoken socializers are sitting on the sidelines. The public's magnificent response to medicine's crusade against socialistic legislation has forced those who would regiment us all under Federal bureaucracy to attempt concealment of their real purpose.

I think you will be interested, therefore, in a bit of light, cast from Oscar Ewing's Federal Security Agency, which illuminates his true aims. The following directive appears on page 7, chapter 4, of a current pamphlet issued by Mr. Ewing's "Bureau of Public Assistance," titled "Common Human Needs," and subtitled "An interpretation for the staff in public assistance agencies: Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure. Further comment, I think, hardly is necessary.

Mr. Ewing's directive, however, does emphasize the fact that our task has not been completed—that socialism remains a basic tenet of the administration program, despite grave and far-reaching implications of the international situation. Despite the fact that millions of Americans, through more than 10,000 National, State, and local organizations have publicly and officially repudiated them, bills calling for a Federal program of compulsory health insurance have been reintroduced in Congress. What is needed now is a continuing flow of resolutions from groups of all sorts and sizes, giving Congress unequivocal evidence that the people back home do not want any part of socialism. To achieve this, we are accelerating action on the local, the grass-roots level. We know, from the results of last October's advertising campaign, that the people of Main Street will respond. There is great work—and a great deal of it—to be done, and I am completely confident that the State and county societies and auxiliaries, and physicians acting individually, will do it well.

In this connection, I am deeply gratified to see how many State and county medical societies are employing professional public relations men, or setting up their own public relations departments. Already, 23 State State societies employ full-time public relations men. Many, in addition to their own staff, employ professional counsel for the larger tasks that arise periodically. The development of better public relations at the local level is one of the finest moves medicine could possibly make.

Physicians did not seek their present prominent position in the public eye. It was forced on them by the planners of the welfare state, who saw in the medical profession the first victim of their program of socialization. But like the boy who didn't intend to fall into the creek, we physicians have profited by the experience.

We have learned to swim, so to speak. We have seen demonstrated in dramatic fashion the basic assumption of our democracy—that when the people are given the facts, they decide wisely. Wherever the effort has been made to keep the public informed, the rewards in better understanding and increased cooperation have been great. Our enemies still may hate us, but our friends know us better and like us more.

In this third year of our National Education campaign we have reached a point where a little constructive, personal evangelism is called for. We all know the therapeutic value of mutual understanding and confidence between physician and patient. Just the other day a letter came to compaign headquarters from a physician in Minnesota. That letter outlined a thoughtful and thorough plan for enlightening the public as to just what it means to be a physician. It would be of immeasurable value to the medical profession if that sort of initiative and creative thinking about our relationship with our patients and our fellow citizens could become an integral part of all our lives.

ELMER L. HENDERSON, M. D.
LOUISVILLE, KY.

CHICAGO, *April 11, 1951.*

The Honorable OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.:

We have your telegram of April 3, protesting a reference in the Journal of the American Medical Association, to a pamphlet issued by your office titled, "Common Human Needs, an Interpretation for the Staff in Public Assistance Agencies," from which I quoted the following passage, "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in a democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

We note your denial of responsibility for the pamphlet on the grounds that it was published in 1945 before your tenure as Administrator of that office. This denial, as you request, will be duly reported in the Journal. You are correct in assuming that as a reputable scientific periodical it is the habit of this Journal to verify statements before publication. The facts concerning my reference are these.

The pamphlet in question was reprinted for distribution by your office in 1949, when the public record indicates you were in charge of the Federal Security Agency, its publication and its directives to employees. Five copies were received in the mail here last week, which indicates certain currency still. These all carry the imprint, "Government Printing Office, 1949." The fact that the report was first printed in 1945 would not seem to alter the further fact that you apparently have thought well enough of it to have it reprinted in 1949.

We would suggest that if you wish at this time to disavow the principles expressed in the pamphlet, you will wish to do so in a formal statement to Congress, for as recently as February 26, this year, it was protested on the floor of Congress as a grave misuse of taxpayers' money to disseminate wholly un-American philosophies.

In case it was without your knowledge that your office was reprinting and distributing such un-American directives during your tenure, you may wish to issue a public statement disclaiming responsibility for the material. If so, we shall certainly be glad to be helpful in giving such a statement further distribution through the Journal, for the medical profession will be sincerely interested in any such action.

ELMER L. HENDERSON, M. D.
President, American Medical Association.

CHICAGO, *April 10, 1951.*

The EDITOR, THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

Dr. Henderson's answer to my telegram of April 3 is merely a continuation of the misleading statements contained in the President's page of the March 31 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. Pamphlet in question was not reprinted for distribution by my office in 1949 or at any other time. Federal Security Agency has made only one distribution which was in 1945. Since then, occasional copies have been mailed out by Agency in response to specific requests. Learned for first time from Dr. Henderson's answer that pamphlet has been reprinted by Government Printing Office for sale by Superintendent of Documents. I refuse to be held responsible for actions of Federal Security Agency taken before I became Administrator, or for actions taken by Government Printing Office, or other Government employees without my knowledge. The statement to which you refer is as objectionable to me as it can possibly be to Dr. Henderson, and his attempt to make me responsible for it is a blow below the belt for which you and he should apologize.

OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency.

APRIL 13, 1951.

The Honorable OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.:

I have in hand your wire concerning my recent reference to a Federal security agency pamphlet which carries the statement: "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state et cetera."

You say that occasional copies of the pamphlet have been mailed out by your office since your tenure there but that you refuse to be responsible for such distribution.

You state also that you refuse to be held responsible for actions of the Federal Security Agency before you became Administrator, or for actions taken by Government Printing Office or other Government employees without your knowledge.

As you know, the pamphlet carrying this viciously un-American pronouncement is be-

ing distributed currently under the imprint of your office, and carrying the printing date 1949 when you were in charge there. As you state in your wire your own office mails these pamphlets out on request.

You state however that the pronouncement concerning the socialized state is wholly objectionable to you. If this is the case, I would suggest in all kindliness that the reasonable manner in which to clarify your own position would not be in telegrams to the Journal of the AMA but first by asking the Government Printing Office to cease reprinting and distributing the material attributed to your office.

Second that since it is without your knowledge that your office is distributing the material, your staff be instructed accordingly.

Third that since your office's circulation of these socialistic principles first came to light in the United States Congress, that your responsibility for it be denied there, in order that your true position be clear not just to the medical profession but to the lawmakers of the Nation.

We do appreciate your difficult position and are gratified to be advised that such a malevolently un-American pronouncement is not subscribed to by you. This correspondence will be published in the Journal.

ELMER L. HENDERSON, M. D.,
President, American Medical Association.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1951]

PRINTED ORIGINALLY IN 1945—FSA PAMPHLET TEACHING SOCIALISM ORDERED DESTROYED

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing has ordered destroyed all copies of an FSA pamphlet assailed by the American Medical Association as malevolently and viciously un-American.

Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, president of AMA, charged in a telegram to Mr. Ewing that a passage in the pamphlet advocated state socialism. Mr. Ewing disclaimed responsibility for the pamphlet and disavowed the passage to which the AMA objected.

The 132-page pamphlet was a manual for social workers written and first circulated by the Federal Security Administration in 1945 before Mr. Ewing became administrator.

After Mr. Ewing took over, the Government Printing Office was authorized by FSA in 1949 to print another 5,000 or so. They were for sale by GPO at 35 cents each and Mr. Ewing's office occasionally sent them to persons who asked for copies.

The offensive material spotted by Members of Congress and the American Medical Association appeared in a discussion of the "rights" of adults to relief and social security assistance. It read:

"Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in a democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

Mr. Ewing telegraphed a protest to the AMA on April 3, stating that the pamphlet had been printed in 1945 and no longer was being circulated.

On April 11, Dr. Henderson replied to Mr. Ewing that he was mistaken because the AMA had received in the mails within a few days 5 copies of the pamphlet all dated as having been printed in 1949.

FSA said the author of the pamphlet was Charlotte Towle, temporarily employed by the agency when she wrote the pamphlet. Miss Towle was connected with the University of Chicago School of Social Work.

Jane M. Hoey, director, FSA bureau of public assistance, wrote the pamphlet foreword. She continues in that position under Ewing's administration of FSA.

The Indian Bureau Has No Constructive Over-All Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that every Member of this House appreciates the great responsibility we have in deciding how far to go in approving the budget proposals of the thousand and one governmental departments, bureaus, and agencies. The grand totals are staggering, and I must admit that I am greatly confused as I try to fathom requests for funds to carry on their duties. Indeed, I feel strongly that I also have a duty to the taxpayers who after all must foot the bill. The fact is that "authority and responsibility are inseparable." As the elected representatives of our people we have the authority to consider and then to pass judgment upon the budget proposals of the various departments and agencies. Likewise, we are responsible to the public from whom the taxes must come to pay the bills which make up the proposed budget.

It is very hard for me to act intelligently upon the issues before us without more information as to the real necessity for the enormous demands of the Indian Bureau, which totals some $71,000,000. I note that according to the committee's report, they have approved $65,000,000. To my way of thinking, our job is similar to that of the renowned physician who, when called upon to operate upon a patient, stated that he would first have to make a complete study of the ailments of the patient, and thus learn the basic cause of his condition. Only after such study could he decide upon the wisdom of an operation. This Congress is again called upon to approve the annual budget from the Public Treasury for this Federal agency, the Indian Bureau, and yet, we do not have sufficient facts on which we can intelligently make a logical decision. I have examined the Committee Report No. 339 just released, and also the hearings just made available, and I am confused about approving this Indian Bureau Budget. The hearings on the Bureau budget starts on page 223, part 1, and end on page 300. The hearings are concluded in part 2, pages 1227 and end on page 1268. To me, it was interesting to note that the House Committee on Appropriations—on Interior and Indian Bureau—appointed special investigators to study and review "the entire subject of Indian affairs." That report is dealt with at length in the hearings, starting on page 225, part 1. Commissioner Myer was asked numerous questions regarding the wide scope of criticism directed by this special committee against the whole basic Indian Bureau management. To be more specific, the whole report constitutes a severe indictment against the Indian Bureau as such.

Yes; Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the physican or surgeon who is now called upon to perform the far-reaching "operation," if we will but examine this report and its recommendations, is pretty well equipped as to where to operate. When we go to the taxpayers and call their attention to the fact that we have fixed their taxes at a certain figure; that they, yes, every man and woman, must pay to the Government what we set out to sustain our hundreds of bureaus and agencies for the coming year—and the grand total runs into scores of billions—we find the average citizen asking us, Just why are these taxes necessary? And our answer is that the Indian Bureau wants $71,000,000 for the coming year. You and I know of the adverse criticism that has come from practically every committee of Congress and from scores of clubs and individuals who have made it their business to study and examine this Indian problem. We also have listened to some of the Indians who have come here to voice their criticism of their intimate experiences under this Bureau. And I feel that we should call upon other Indians to give us first-hand what they recommend should be done to "save the patient." Our hearings are too one-sided; for this year, I understand, we have heard directly from no Indian. I recall that last year, a delegation of upstanding Indians, from California, I believe, got a hearing and protested about giving the Indian Service any funds to keep it going in that State. Their arguments have been most convincing, because our subcommittee completely agreed with those Indians and eliminated the more than $2,000,000 asked by the Bureau, which would have liquidated it in that State. However, the Senate reinstated most of the Bureau's demands and it is now even asking us to allow the Bureau to carry on for another 3 to 5 years.

THE INDIAN BUREAU HAS NO CONSTRUCTIVE OVER-ALL PROGRAM

No modern business firm would approve the confusing and headless plan in its management such as we have had across the years under the guise of helping the Indian to qualify for citizenship responsibility. One has to but read the report of this special committee to appreciate the frightful and wasteful program of the Indian Bureau. For instance, one of our able committee members, in discussing this special report with Commissioner Myer at the hearings starting February 19, 1951, commented that there appeared to be "no real policy in mind by top-level management" and that "it indicates that apparently there is no place in the entire organization, including the people in the field, where they are able to handle, or are interested in handling, many of these problems." These are the comments of a member of our Committee on Appropriations made to Commissioner Myer after he had examined the special report. Charges have been made for many years that the Bureau spends a great share of the funds provided in carrying on duplicate agencies of the States and counties where Indians reside.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN'S RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN 1947

Numerous comments have been made in the RECORD about the testimony of the then Acting Commissioner, Mr. William Zimmerman, made under oath before a Senate committee in February 1947, about his answer to an appeal by certain Indians when they demanded immediate release from Bureau wardship. Acting Commissioner Zimmerman responded by agreeing that some 10 prominent groups of Indians should be released from such wardship control. Mr. Zimmerman had been Assistant Indian Commissioner for 15 years at the time, and surely must have known considerable about the Indian problem. Although that recommendation was clear-cut, and made some 4 years ago, I do not see any definite program coming from the present Commissioner that he agrees that those 10 groups of Indians should be removed from Bureau control at this time. No; he speaks of "gradual independence of Indians from the supervision from the Bureau of Indian Affairs." The maze of plans and of directives and studies and similar excuses coming from the office of the Commissioner further confuses the problem. I am of the firm opinion that the time is ripe to perform that operation.

THE JOHNSON-O'MALLEY ACT OF 1934—A DEFINITE PROGRAM

After many years of careful study by leading authorities and students of Indian conditions, the Congress passed the Johnson-O'Malley Act on April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596), under which authority the three major Indian problems could have been solved. The Indian Service has apparently failed to become enthusiastic about the law, for it has not in my opinion in the 16 years it has been a law, taken advantage of its possibilities. Its original supporters claimed that it meant the end of the Indian Bureau as such, for all the main problems of the Indian—education, welfare, and hospitalization—would be taken over by the States. The act provided that the Secretary could make contracts with the various States under which they would assume full responsibility in these specific fields of Indian services, and the Congress would appropriate whatever funds were found to be necessary. Such grants by Congress were to be made to the States, not to the Indian Bureau. If this act had been followed as intended, the present Indian problems would have been solved. For further information on this matter, I recommend the reading of an article appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Eighty-first Congress by Senator HUGH BUTLER, May 15, 1950, under extension of remarks.

THE WHEELER-HOWARD ACT OF 1934

It has been my opinion for several years that the Wheeler-Howard Act sponsored by John Collier, who became Commissioner in 1933, and somehow approved by the Congress, has undoubtedly done more to set our Indians back than has any other one act in Indian history. Today, I believe, it is universally condemned; it has not helped the Indian as it was claimed by its sponsors. It actually sets up a separate government of the area where Indians resided on their reservations and instead of Indians being assimilated into American citizenship as we all must agree is the solution of their problems, such Indians who could not remove themselves from its control, now find themselves depending on the Bureau—they actually surrendered their real liberties as citizens when they accepted the advice of the Bureau and approved the act. I commend the words of my colleague, Mrs. BOLTON, for her remarks on this matter.

INDIAN BUREAU ACCOUNTING—A "STEPCHILD"

In the field of accounting, the special investigating committee, also made a careful study, and likewise censured the lack of sound planning in this important field. Like all investigations into the activities of public officials, when one touches the finances, the manner in which public funds are spent, the most important problem is discovered. This is especially true, in my observation, regarding this Indian Bureau. On page 234 of the House subcommittee hearings on Indian Bureau budget requests, a member of the committee, commenting on the investigators' findings, stated:

> They point out that the Bureau has given lip service to the principle that its activities were pointed toward the eventual withdrawal of Federal supervision over Indian activities, but that the accomplishments have been nil. They are somewhat inconsistent toward the end of the report when they get down to California, where they seem to go along with the thought that that they are trying to get out of California.

At no place do I find any constructive program showing the Commissioner is now ready to recommend the immediate removal of Bureau control over any of the groups or bands of Indians in the list recommended by Acting Commissioner Zimmerman 4 years ago. I am ready to act now, leaving the so-called land and related questions to a special committee. Let us release the Indian immediately from this nightmare of wardship, and every one of his other problems can and will be solved.

The Man They Call a Warmonger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, as General MacArthur noted in his address before Congress, there are those who have attempted to brand him as a warmonger. In connection with that infamous accusation, I reread with interest an old newspaper clipping of an Associated Press report dated June 18, 1942. Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert the item in its entirety:

> "I am a soldier * * * but I am prouder to be a father."—Douglas MacArthur.
>
> NEW YORK, June 18.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur cabled the National Father's Day Committee today that while he was proud to be a soldier "I am prouder, infinitely prouder, to be a father."
>
> Chosen by the committee as "Outstanding American Father of 1942" MacArthur replied:
>
> "Nothing has touched me more deeply than the act of the National Father's Day Committee. By profession I am a soldier and take pride in that fact, but I am prouder, infinitely prouder, to be a father. A soldier destroys in order to build. The father only builds, never destroys. The one has the potentialities of death, the other embodies creation and life. And while the hordes of death are mighty, the battles of life are mightier still. My hope is that my son, when I am gone, will remember me not from the battle but in the home repeating with him our simple daily prayer, 'Our Father Who Art in Heaven.'"

Father of American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Saturday, April 28, 1951:

HORACE MANN

While Moscow is preparing to honor their national hero, Lenin, on May 1, American schools and colleges are making ready to celebrate the birthday of Horace Mann, father of American education, on May 4. The comparison between the beliefs and ideals of these two men is exceedingly great, for the first of the two opposed free thinking and free speech, while the other opened the door of learning for countless American boys and girls.

Born in humble circumstances at Franklin, Mass., on May 4, 1796, Horace Mann's life story reads like that of an Alger hero. How he rose above material handicaps to secure his own schooling, finally graduating from Brown University in 1819, has been an inspiration to many.

Realizing the shortcomings of the schools of his time, he sold his law books, locked his office door, and set out to improve the schools of the Commonwealth. As the first secretary of the board of education, in 1837, he began to pioneer for a more democratic form of education than had hitherto been enjoyed. Horace Mann regarded education as a preparation for life and believed that no education was complete without art, music, physical education, and hygiene, in addition to the traditional formal subjects taught at that period in American history. Believing that "common schools cannot prosper without normal schools," he established the first normal school in America for the training of those who wished to teach. Today we realize that we cannot have an adequate supply of well-trained teachers without teacher-training institutions.

Schools throughout the country are putting into operation those principles of education which Horace Mann set forth over a century ago, many of which we take for granted today. Just as Horace Mann believed "that teachers not only be better paid but also that they receive higher social considerations," so teachers today are working for professional salaries and prestige which becomes the dignity of the profession.

Those who are fortunate enough to live in Massachusetts can avail themselves of the privilege of visiting Horace Mann's birthplace at Franklin and those places which he frequented while he was actively engaged in education in this State. It is fitting that the statue of a man who established the ideals of education for an entire nation

should stand at the entrance of our statehouse in Boston and to serve as a reminder that educated thinking should govern the principles and actions of those who operate the government of the Commonwealth.

May we hope that some day the teachings of Horace Mann supplant those of Marx in those parts of the world where liberal education and teaching is suppressed.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Case for the Seaway," published in the Miami News of March 26, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE FOR THE SEAWAY

Congress at this session should stop dwadling on the St. Lawrence seaway and authorize this project which has suddenly become critical to the national defense.

In the past years there was ample economic and diplomatic justification for the project. It would increase the output of power. It would make a navigation channel from the Atlantic to the Great Lake ports. It would strengthen the economic and political bonds that tie us to Canada, our peaceful, useful, and cooperative neighbor to the north. We have been letting an important resource lie fallow, and there is no excuse for that.

If one scratches the surface of the arguments that have kept Congress immobilized on the seaway since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the objections amount to this:

The seaway, if built, would create competition for the railroads. It would create competition, or the threat of Government competition, with the power companies. It would divert some sea traffic from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and a few other Atlantic deep-water ports. It is the mobilization of private interests, interests that run counter to the national interests, that has blocked the seaway up to now.

But now the national interest in the building of the seaway is stronger than ever, for the seaway bears heavily on the needs of national survival.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three tables entitled "Exhibits A, B, and C," making certain comparisons between tax rates and benefits under the social security and railroad retirement systems, and showing the gross discrimination existing against railroad employees as compared with their friends who are under the social-security system.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A.—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax payments—a comparison*

Year	Social security tax rate on $250 maximum earnings per month or $3,000 per year and total cost		Railroad retirement tax rate on $300 maximum earnings per month or $3,600 per year and total cost		Rail workers paid—		
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1937	1	$30	2¼	$99	3.30	$69	230
1938	1	30	2¼	99	3.30	69	230
1939	1	30	2¼	99	3.30	69	230
1940	1	30	3	108	3.60	78	260
1941	1	30	3	108	3.60	78	260
1942	1	30	3	108	3.60	78	260
1943	1	30	3¼	117	3.90	87	290
1944	1	30	3¼	117	3.90	87	290
1945	1	30	3¼	117	3.90	87	290
1946	1	30	3½	126	4.20	96	320
1947	1	30	5¾	207	6.90	177	590
1948	1	30	5¾	207	6.90	177	590
1949	1	30	6	216	7.20	186	620
1950	1½	45	6	216	4.80	171	380
14 years [1]	-----	435	-----	1,944	4.47	1,509	347

PRESENT TAX RATE ON $300 MAXIMUM PER MONTH OR $3,600 PER YEAR

1951	1½	$54	6	$216	4.00	$162	300
1952	1½	54	6¼	225	4.168	171	316
1953	1½	54	6¼	225	4.168	171	316
1954	2	72	6¼	225	3.125	153	212½
1955	2	72	6¼	225	3.125	153	212½
1956	2	72	6¼	225	3.125	153	212½
1957	2	72	6¼	225	3.125	153	212½
1958	2	72	6¼	225	3.125	153	212½
1959	2	72	6¼	225	3.125	153	212½
1960	2½	90	6¼	225	2.50	135	150
1961	2½	90	6¼	225	2.50	135	150
1962	2½	90	6¼	225	2.50	135	150
1963	2½	90	6¼	225	2.50	135	150
1964	2½	90	6¼	225	2.50	135	150
1965	3	108	6¼	225	2.08	117	108
1966	3	108	6¼	225	2.08	117	108
1967	3	108	6¼	225	2.08	117	108
1968	3	108	6¼	225	2.08	117	108
1969	3	108	6¼	225	2.08	117	108
1970 (and after)	3¼	117	6¼	225	1.93	108	93
20 years [2]	-----	1,701	-----	4,491	2.64	2,790	164
34 years [3]	-----	2,136	-----	6,435	3.01	4,299	201

COMPARED WITH SOCIAL SECURITY—RAIL WORKERS PAID

[1] From 1937 through 1950, 4½ times more.
[2] From 1951 through 1970, 2½ times more.
[3] From 1937 through 1970, 3 times more.

NOTE.—Tax rates and maximum earnings used in this exhibit were taken from subch. A (social security sec. 1,400); and subch. B (Railroad Retirement sec. 1,500); of ch. 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, from 1937 through 1950.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT B.—*Social-security versus railroad retirement benefits—a comparison*

Year	Social security, maximum possible	Railroad retirement, maximum possible	Rail workers received—		
			Times more	Dollars more	Percent more
1937	(1)	$1,440	0	$1,440	0
1938	(1)	1,440	0	1,440	0
1939	$1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1940	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1941	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1942	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1943	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1944	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1945	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1946	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1947	1,020	1,440	1.41	420	41.1
1948	1,020	[2] 1,584	1.55	564	55.1
1949	1,020	1,728	1.69	708	69.4
1950	[3] 1,280	1,728	1.35	448	35.0
14 years [4]	12,700	20,880	1.47	8,380	67.0
			Times less	*Dollars less*	*Percent less*
1951	1,800	1,728	0.96	$72	4.0
1952	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1953	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1954	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1955	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1956	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1957	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1958	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1959	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1960	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1961	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1962	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1963	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1964	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1965	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
1966	1,800	1,728	.96	72	4.0
16 years [5]	28,800	27,648	.96	1,152	4.0
			Times more	*Dollars more*	*Percent more*
1967	1,800	2,016	1.12	$216	12.0
1968	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
1969	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
1970	1,800	2,016	1.12	216	12.0
4 years [6]	7,200	8,064	1.12	864	12.0
34 years [7]	48,500	56,592	1.16	8,092	16.6

[1] No benefits until 1939.
[2] 20-percent increase, July 1, 1948—before, $720; after, $864; total, $1,584.
[3] 76⅔-percent increase, Sept. 1, 1950—before, $880; after, $600; total, $1,280.

COMPARED WITH SOCIAL SECURITY—RAIL WORKERS RECEIVED

[4] From 1937 through 1950, two-thirds more.
[5] From 1951 through 1966, 4-percent less.
[6] From 1967 through 1970, one-eighth more.
[7] From 1937 through 1970, one-sixth more.

NOTE.—Maximum benefits used in this exhibit were taken from the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act—both, as amended, from 1937 through 1950.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, research director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT C—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*

	Social security 1950	Social security 1951	Railroad retirement 1951
Maximum retirement benefits possible:			
For old age	$45.00	$68.50	$144.00
Wives	22.80	34.25	0
Husband and wife	68.40	102.75	0
Dependent child	22.80	[1] 51.38	0
Total	(91.20)	(154.13)	144.00
Maximum	85.00	150.00	144.00

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.

EXHIBIT C—*Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly benefits—a comparison*—Continued

	Social security 1950	Social security 1951	Railroad retirement 1951
Average retirement benefits:			
For old age	$26.00	$48.30	$82.73
Wives	13.00	24.15	0
Husband and wife	39.00	72.45	0
Dependent child	13.00	24.15	0
Total	52.00	96.60	82.73
Maximum survivor benefits possible:			
Aged widows	34.20	51.38	40.97
Widows with children	34.20	51.38	40.97
Children	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
Total	57.00	102.76	68.29
Maximum	85.00	150.00	109.28
Parents	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
Average survivor benefits:			
Aged widows	20.62	36.58	29.63
Widows with children	20.83	34.59	27.63
Children	13.03	27.82	17.05
Parents	13.64	36.71	16.68
Maximum lump-sum death benefit	273.60	205.50	437.04
Credit for military service performed (World War II)	None	160.00	160.00
Disability insurance benefits	None	None	(2)
Amount a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits	14.99	50.00	25.00
Old-age retirement benefits to a husband	None	(3)	None
Survivor benefits:			
To a widower	None	(3)	None
To the widow, and every former wife divorced, of the individual	None	(3)	None
Retirement wage credits after age 65	(4)	(4)	None
Maximum monthly retirement annuity awarded at age 65:			
After 5 years of coverage	42.00	65.80	24.00
After 1½ years of coverage	40.80	(5)	7.20

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.
[2] Occupational and total disability.
[3] Effective Sept. 1, 1950.
[4] Wages count toward benefits regardless of the worker's age.
[5] $80 (after Jan. 1, 1951 and not before June 30, 1952).

NOTE.—Benefits used in this exhibit were taken from the Social Security Bulletin (December 1950 and February 1951), and the Railroad Retirement Board Monthly Review (March 1951).

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four tables entitled "Exhibits D, E, F, and G," giving additional comparisons between the social security and railroad systems, indicating that railroad employees do not receive as much for the money they pay in taxes, as do those working in jobs covered by the social security system.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Dependents' benefits are more important than retirement benefits. So long as a man is still alive, he may be able to continue working and support his family, or if he has been successful he may have been able to accumulate something to help him out when he retires. Dependents' benefits are primarily intended to take care of cases where the breadwinner dies relatively young and there must be some provision to take care of his wife and children.

Social security versus railroad retirement monthly survivor benefits—a comparison

	Social security		Railroad retirement, 1951
	1950	1951	
MAXIMUM SURVIVOR BENEFITS POSSIBLE			
Aged widows	$34.20	$51.38	$40.97
Widow with children	34.20	51.38	40.97
Children	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
Widow and 1 child	57.00	102.76	68.29
Widow	34.20	51.38	40.97
And 2 children	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32
	22.80	34.25	27.32
Total	79.80	137.01	95.61
Widow and 3 or more children or 4 or more children	21.25	37.50	27.32
	21.25	37.50	27.32
	21.25	37.50	27.32
	21.25	37.50	27.32
Total (prorated equally)	85.00	150.00	109.28
Maximum	85.00	150.00	109.28
Parents	22.80	[1] 51.38	27.32

[1] 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT E. FOUR TIMES 1½ PERCENT EQUALS 6 PERCENT

One rail worker pays 6-percent railroad-retirement tax. One industrial worker pays 1½-percent social-security tax. Therefore, one rail worker pays as much tax as the combined tax of four industrial workers.

Social security provides four industrial workers and their families with retirement and survivor benefits as compared to railroad-retirement benefits received by one rail worker, for whom there are no family benefits until after his death.

Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax rates and monthly benefits, by fiscal year, 1950–52

	Social Security		Railroad Retirement
	1950	1951–52	1950–52
Tax rate (percent)	[1] 1½	[2] 1½	[1] 6
Cost per month	$3.75	$4.50	$18.00
Cost per year	45.00	54.00	216.00

[1] On $250 maximum earnings per month.
[2] On $300 maximum earnings per month.

Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax rates and monthly benefits, by fiscal year, 1950–52—Continued

	Social Security			Railroad Retirement
	January to August, 1950	September 1950 to June 1952	July 1952 and after	1950–52
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 1 worker and his family:				
Old age	$45.60	$68.50	$80.00	
Wife	22.80	34.25	40.00	
Husband and wife	68.40	102.75	120.00	
Dependent children	[3] 16.60	[3] 47.25	[3] 30.00	
Total	85.00	150.00	150.00	$144.00
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 4 workers and their families	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	600.00	
Maximum survivor benefits possible: Widow and 3 or more children	85.00	150.00	150.00	
Or 4 or more children of 1 deceased worker				
Maximum survivor benefits possible to 4 families of 4 deceased workers [4]	85.00	150.00	150.00	[5] 109.28
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
	85.00	150.00	150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	600.00	

[3] Prorated equally.
[4] 4 widows and 12 or more children, or 16 or more children.
[5] 1951 ($108.32 in 1950; $110.24 in 1952).

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT F

Under the Social Security Act, recently revised, the average monthly earnings of a qualified individual is all that is necessary to quickly determine the amount of retirement and survivor benefits.

Under the Railroad Retirement Act, the formulas used appear complicated and difficult to remember. The average rail employee seldom knows the amount of his retirement annuity until after receiving his first check. Similarly, his wife and/or children, have little or no knowledge of the amount of survivor annuities due them, until after his death.

Basically, the social security simplified formula (determined by taking 50 percent of the first $100 of total earnings, and 15 percent of the balance, up to $300 per month) could be adopted and applied to figuring benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Because the average rail employee today has a vague knowledge of benefits due him and/or his family, the social security simplified formula could appear on the reverse side of employee's stub (Form BA6) annually received by each rail employee, showing total months of service and wages from 1937 to date. This could keep him constantly informed as to benefits he and/or his family may receive.

Social-security ver us railroad-retirement annuity formulas—A comparison based on $200 average monthly earnings, after 20 years of service

Credit for service prior to 1937	Social security, 1951		Railroad retirement, 1951	
	Retirement annuity formula			
	(1)		(2)	
			2.4 percent of the first $50	$1.20
			1.8 percent of the next $100	1.80
			1.2 percent of the balance ($50)	.60
	50 percent of the first $100	$50.00	Total	3.60
	15 percent of the balance ($100)	15.00	Years of service	×20
Old age	Primary benefit	65.00	Annuity	72.00
Wife or husband	1/2	32.50	None.	
Dependent child	1/2	32.50	None.	
Total		130.00		
	Survivor annuity formula			
			40 percent of the first $75	$30.00
			10 percent of the balance ($125)	12.50
			Total	42.50
			Add 1 percent for each year after 1936 in which employee was paid at least $200, 15×42½ cents	6.375
			Basic amount	48.88
Widow	3/4	$48.75	3/4	36.66
Widower	3/4	48.75	0	0
Parent	3/4	48.75	1/2	24.44
First child	3/4	48.75	1/2	24.44
Other children	1/2	32.50	1/2	24.44

[1] None. Average monthly wages are counted from 1937 to time employee reaches age 65.
[2] In addition to average monthly wages from 1937 to time employee reaches age 65, service before 1937 may also be counted. Average monthly wages for the years 1924 through 1931 are used for each month of service before 1937. Total years of service cannot be more than 30 until after Jan. 1, 1957, when prior service credit will be discontinued

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

EXHIBIT G. DO RAILROAD DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS JUSTIFY A COST OF FOUR TIMES MORE THAN SOCIAL SECURITY?

The total cost of railroad retirement (including disability insurance), 200 percent more; (without including disability insurance), 300 percent more than the total cost of all benefits provided under the Social Security Act.[1]

Social-security versus railroad-retirement benefit distribution and cost analysis per $100 of earnings—a comparison

Railroad retirement, 1951	Benefit distribution [1]	Cost	
		Percent	Per $100 of earnings
Pensions and retirement annuities	$0.49	(x6)	$2.94
Disability annuities	.25	(x6)	1.50
Survivor annuities	.25	(x6)	1.50
Administration	.01	(x6)	.06
Total	1.00	6	6.00
Social security 1951		1½	1.50
Dollars more paid by rail employees			4.50

[1] Source: P. 6, file FRM-1-1, Feb. 17, 1947, mimeo bulletin issued by Office of the Director of Research, Railroad Retirement Board.

NOTE.—Of each $6 paid by rail employees, $1.50 (total cost of all social-security benefits) is allocated to disability annuities. By comparison to social security, rail employees pay 3 times (200 percent) more taxes for pensions, retirement, and survivor annuities, and 4 times (300 percent) more taxes when disability annuities are included.

Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

[1] No disability insurance benefits provided under social security.

Confidence in the Chiefs of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. The article discusses the danger of the publication of secret papers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

In view of what appears to be coming in the great inquiry which begins on Thursday we must ask ourselves what is going to happen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They face the fact that there is now to be published an only somewhat expurgated version of their most secret papers. When they wrote or approved these papers they believed that these papers would not be published—that they would be confidential for themselves, their lawful superiors, and the commanders in the field to whom they issued instructions.

There is no need to guess now about what the publication of these papers is going to prove about the best way to conduct the Korean war. But one does not have to be a prophet to see what the precedent now being set is going to do to the conduct of the United States Government.

We, that is to say the administration and the opposition and everyone else so far as I can see except a few stray dissenters, have accepted the theory that an officer, who disagrees with his orders, may by challenging the integrity of his lawful superiors compel them to open up all their files to the inspection of Congress. According to this theory the congressional investigators are the judges of what shall or shall not be published. What they decide to publish is to be treated as the evidence in a popular debate which is to pass upon the integrity and the competence of the men responsible for the defense of the Nation.

This is the theory which we are about to make into a precedent. It is being done, some say, in the name of the sacred right of the people to know all the facts. They are, I believe, profoundly mistaken. If this theory goes unchallenged, if what is about to be done is accepted as a precedent, as one of the legitimate usages of our constitutional system, the effect will not be to give the people access to the truth. The effect will be to conceal, to disguise, to falsify the truth that is given to the President, and to the Congress, and to the people.

Once the precedent is set, it will mean that no paper in the files of the Government can be considered truly confidential. Today, the arbiter of what is and of what is not confidential happens to be Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia, an able and judicious man. But if Senator RUSSELL can browse around in the papers of the Chiefs of Staff and be the arbiter as to whether they have a right to say that this paper is too secret to be published, then his successors will also be the arbiters.

Senator RUSSELL is a Democrat who will not wish to injure fatally a Democratic administration. But his successor might be one who did wish to do just that, and he might insist, therefore, upon publishing the very documents which Senator RUSSELL has not published. Thus all the Chiefs of Staff, and I might add all other responsible officials, are on notice from here on out that some time or other any document they sign may be published in whole or in part, in its context or out of its context.

What will this do to the Chiefs of Staff? Approximately what it would do to a boy writing to his girl, to a husband writing to his wife, to a business man writing to his partner, or to Senator TAFT writing to Senator WHERRY, if they felt sure that their letters were going to be published—most probably at the moment when they would cause the maximum embarrassment. Letters written with a knowledge that they may be published will be the kind of letters that are written for publication. They will be phonies in that they will say what will look as well as possible in print. The effect will be to make the formal papers of the Government a false front which does not reveal, which in fact is designed to conceal, the truth. This is already the character of some of the paper work in the Government; it is written with an eye to the headlines which will be used when and if it is published, and what the official really thinks has to be ascertained by calling him on the telephone or asking him to lunch. But this kind of disintegration has not presumably become characteristic as yet of the papers that deal with the issues of life and death, with the military security and the high policy of the United States.

But if this evil precedent is set, that is just what will happen to these papers. They will be written for publication and they will

be addressed not to the vital interests of the United States in the long run but to the passions and the prejudices and the ignorance of the moment. The papers will not be worth reading if they are written for publication. In fact they will be worse than useless in that they will not be honest.

Those who think that the right of the people to know can be met by destroying the rules of confidence and publishing anything and everything should ask themselves why they think it right, why they believe it to be part of the very substance of liberty, that some relations shall be privileged and not opened to publicity; the relations of husband and wife, of lawyer and client, of doctor and patient, of priest and his charges. Why do we protect these relationships? Is it not in order to protect our liberties? In Government the relationship between the civil power and the military, between the President and his lawful military advisers, the Joint Chiefs, is as sensitive and as critical as any of the private relations that we protect. On the integrity of the relation between the President and his advisers may depend the life of the Nation. That relation must be destroyed, it will be destroyed, if the privilege of confidence is taken away.

Proposed Investigation of State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion Executive Committee of the Department of Indiana, together with the opening remarks of Department Commander Jack McIntyre at the emergency meeting on April 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The American Legion executive committee of the Department of Indiana in a special meeting on Thursday, April 12, after hearing a full report of Don Wilson, Clarksburg, W. Va., chairman of the foreign relations committee of the national organization of the American Legion, adopted the following recommendations as a matter of policy of the Department of Indiana:

1. Insist that an impartial committee of the Senate or House conduct a careful and impassionate investigation of the State Department and that Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, be immediately replaced, so as to give the American people a feeling of confidence in their Government's foreign policy.

2. That a demand be made upon Congress to enact laws that this Nation will make no export or loan to any other nation who sells war materials directly or indirectly to any nation who directly or indirectly is engaged in combat against American troops, or who threatens violence by word or deed in its dealings.

3. To request of the Congress, action to prevent our State Department and/or the President from giving Formosa to the Red Chinese.

4. To request of Congress that it make appropriations of moneys for Nationalist China, so that they can continue to build a strong military force and to discourage Soviet and Red Chinese aggression, and provide by such action safeguards of administration that will insure that this money will be spent wisely and economically.

5. To request that Congress enact a law providing penalties, by fine or imprisonment, for any officer in Government charged with carrying out Congress' will, who intentionally failed to do so, and urge strict enforcement of present statutes.

6. To request of our Congress that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be invited to make a public report to the joint sessions of the Congress of the United States for the benefit of those bodies and all American citizens. The Department of Indiana deplores the fact that partisan politics has been injected in the issuance of the present invitation.

7. To request of Congress that they instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations to emphatically oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations, and to use the veto power, if necessary, to prevent such admission. That the people of this country request of the United Nations that it immediately take steps to become a United Nations in actuality and stop the Communist aggression fast spreading over the free countries of the world.

8. To request of Congress that it refuse to appropriate any money to carry out any treaty obligation, the terms of which have not been approved by the Senate as provided by the Constitution of the United States.

9. To enact a program of universal military training and insist that Congress desist from the political bickering which to this date had delayed and impeded its passage.

In addition to the above recommendations, the committee endorsed the following statement of National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., in which he urged the following:

1. Use of the Chinese Nationalist troops to fight the invading Communists.

2. Bombing of Red jump-off bases in Manchuria.

3. Blockading of Chinese ports to cut off flow of supplies.

"These measures are necessary to save American lives. They are military decisions, not political. * * * Unless General Ridgway is permitted to do the things MacArthur was forbidden to do, there can be no genuine United Nations victory in Korea."

OPENING REMARKS OF INDIANA DEPARTMENT COMMANDER JACK MCINTYRE AT THE EMERGENCY MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WHICH WAS HELD THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1951, AT DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS

Members of the executive committee, first I would like to state the purpose of this meeting. It has been called for the reason that a policy of the Department of Indiana must be formulated in regard to the present crisis. I regret the use of the term "MacArthur Crisis" in the news releases. This meeting shall be for the purpose only of establishing our policy for the guidance of the department and the various posts of the department.

The American Legion must never be labeled as a group used for political purposes. I remind you that our constitution specifically states that the American Legion shall be absolutely nonpolitical, and shall not be for the dissemination of partisan principles. I trust that you will govern yourselves accordingly in any discussion which may follow. The demand for a statement of policy of this department comes from the people of the State, from the rank and file members of our organization, and from the various posts of the department. The American Legion has long been looked to as one of the leading organizations of this country. The people of this State desire to know our policy. Under trying days that we are now facing, we should definitely state our attitude. The unity of this country must be one of the chief purposes of our organization.

Our organization has long advocated strong national defense. Such a defense must be supplemented by a proper and understanding foreign policy. It is our duty as a part of the national organization to express our feelings and our recommendations to the national organization for consideration.

In the past few days, too many people have made hasty statements without due consideration of the problems involved. There is a great need for a constructive and an understanding expression of the problems facing the United States today.

We are fortunate in having with us tonight Donald Wilson, chairman of the National Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion, to review and explain many of the problems facing us as a country, and to review action taken in the past by the American Legion regarding foreign policy.

The question of the right of the President to discharge General MacArthur is entirely without the province of our department. That question need not arise at this meeting. I would class it as being of a political nature and would feel justified in ruling such discussion out of order.

Our purpose here tonight must of necessity be to develop a clear understandable statement of policy and recommendations to the people of the State of Indiana and to all others concerned. The demand for our answer has been great, and it being a matter of policy, I felt justified in calling this special meeting.

You are the representatives of the Legion in your area, and I know that you speak for the Legionnaires you so represent. May the discussions and the decisions reached from such discussion be solely for God and country.

The Soldier and the Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Soldier and the Statesman"; I also ask to have printed in connection with this editorial another under the subhead "The great debate," both being published in the April 28 issue of America. The second editorial discusses the controversy over the removal of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOLDIER AND THE STATESMAN

All professions have their dangers, all general truths have their fallacies, all spheres of action have their limits, and are liable to improper extension or alteration. Every professional man has rightly a zeal for his profession, and he would not do his duty towards it without that zeal. And that zeal soon becomes exclusive, or rather necessarily involves a sort of exclusiveness. A zealous professional man soon comes to think that his profession is all in all, and that the world would not go on without it.

We have heard, for instance, a great deal lately in regard to the war in India, of political views suggesting one plan of campaign, and military views suggesting another. How hard it must be for the military man to forego his own strategical dispositions, not on the ground that they are not the best—not that they are not acknowledged by

those who nevertheless put them aside to be the best for the object of military success—but because military success is not the highest of objects, and the end of ends—because it is not the sovereign science, but must ever be subordinate to political considerations or maxims of government, which is a higher science with higher objects—and that therefore his sure success on the field must be relinquished because the interests of the council and the cabinet require the sacrifice, that the war must yield to the statesman's craft, the commander in chief to the governor general.

Yet what the soldier feels is natural, and what the statesman does is just. This collision, this desire on the part of every profession to be supreme—this necessary, though reluctant, subordination of the one to the other—is a process ever going on, ever acted out before our eyes. The civilian is in rivalry with the soldier, the soldier with the civilian. The diplomatist, the lawyer, the political economist, the merchant, each wishes to usurp the powers of the state, and to mold society upon the principles of his own pursuit. (From an address to the students of medicine of the Catholic University of Ireland by John Henry Newman, rector of the university, November 1858.)

The Great Debate

If anything were needed to prove beyond all question that the discussion of public issues has reached a low ebb in the United States, it is the furor over the removal of General MacArthur. Emotion, half-truths, unsubstantiated reports, and extremely fragmentary information have been fused in the fire of smoldering resentments and frustrations into a strange alloy that passes for public opinion.

In the first place, it is hard to see how the President of the United States can allow a military commander in one theater to preempt executive control over our foreign policy. As Cardinal Newman wrote nearly a century ago, military policy must remain subservient to political control. Political control must remain in the hands of civilians elected through established procedures of popular control of our Government. The President of the United States, in conjunction with Congress, is responsible to the people of this country for our foreign policy. When a military commander, no matter how skillful or successful, attempts to usurp the authority of the President and of Congress, the only possible course for the President is to remove him. Otherwise we would have anarchy.

General MacArthur, after all, is not the only military figure who might exploit his popularity to try to wrest from the President control of our foreign policy in its military aspects. General Eisenhower, for one, has just as much right to try to assume the driver's seat. On hearing of MacArthur's removal, Ike said that a man accepts certain inhibitions when he dons a uniform. General MacArthur apparently found it impossible to accept such inhibitions. In that case he should have resigned instead of precipitating the present confusion. After resigning he could have had his say.

All informed observers readily admit that the President certainly acted within his constitutional authority in removing General MacArthur, and acted with good reason. They add, however, that the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of MacArthur's policy, as contrasted with the one we have adopted, is still debatable. This is true. But the reasons for sticking to our present policy, instead of making substantial changes in it, have not been sufficiently set forth.

Foreign policy demands continuity. No policy will work if we spend several years laying its groundwork, spend billions and billions of dollars to put it, so to speak, within scoring distance, and then drop it for a new policy—a new policy for which no similar groundwork has been laid and for which, quite possibly, no similar groundwork could be laid.

We have a foreign policy, one which was summarized in these pages ("United States foreign policy: 1945–50." America, January 27, 1951). This policy was set by our elected officials. It embraces the United Nations, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact. The United Nations is important chiefly because the Charter enunciates principles accepted by almost the whole world (at least verbally) and accepted in reality by the vast preponderance of the peoples of the world. A United States foreign policy based on the Charter has the maximum support from other nations which any United States foreign policy can have.

The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact are, generally speaking, United States-sponsored policies originated to make up for the incapacity of the UN to achieve international security. They were all adopted and implemented over a period of 4 years, after our political, economic, and military authorities had decided that our national security depended on keeping the nations of Western Europe free and strong.

This we have done. Militarily, Europe is only beginning to produce the divisions needed to ward off a Russian attack. But the economic and political strength necessary for a military build-up has been achieved. It has been achieved in accordance with a well-thought-out plan and at heavy expense to the United States.

Let's stop a moment to consider what we have in Europe. First of all, some 260,000,000 people—people whose traditions of political freedom and culture are similar to our own. Secondly, an industrial capacity so great that if we can keep it on our side we can outmatch Russia's capacity to produce the armaments essential to military victory. Thirdly, an enormous military potential, now being activated, plus air bases from which we can strike to stem a Soviet attack.

Contrast this situation with Asia. For one reason or another, we have built up next to nothing out there. It is extremely doubtful whether we could ever have built up much. Despite its teeming populations, Asia lacks effective political organization. It lacks industrial development. Its primitive and sprawling economics and political societies—with the exception, perhaps, of Japan—defy any attempt on our part to make reliable allies of its peoples. No nation in the Orient today can be built into a formidable military power within the next few years. From no terrain in Asia can we knock out Russia, if it comes to that. We could knock out the cities of Red China, but this would not destroy Red China. It would leave a mass of rural Chinese able to carry on guerrilla warfare endlessly.

Our present military armament is limited. We cannot pour much more of it into the Far East without weakening our ability to operate effectively in Europe. If we conquered the cities of Red China, where would that leave us? Russia would still be intact. It could probably move into Western Europe with ease. We would have lost allies who can play an extremely important part in the eventual defeat of Russia, and we would have gained practically nothing of value in the Far East. We are already punishing the Red Chinese in Korea so severely that they are shooting their seriously wounded. All available buildings are being requisitioned in the cities of China to care for the thousands of other casualties. The chances of our causing dissension and perhaps revolution on the mainland are improving daily.

We have nothing to fear from Red China. Soviet Russia is the foe we have to fear. Russia would probably like nothing better than to see us divert our at present limited power into an all-out war with China. It may be true that we could bomb Manchurian bases without getting into an all-out war with either Red China or Soviet Russia, but the odds are against it. The time may come when we shall have to take the chance. But the longer this decision can be postponed, the better.

We have nothing to lose by building up our military power and that of our allies so that we can use it where we, and not our enemies, think it ought to be expended. The impatience of a commander to be allowed to destroy the enemy facing him in the field is understandable. But the over-all decisions have to be made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Hearst and other lion-baiting press can scream as loudly as they want. If we are careful not to alienate our European allies, the reason is that our military leaders, as well as our political leaders, are convinced that a quick victory in Korea can come too high.

Robert's Rules of Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, some 75 years ago Maj. Henry Martyn Robert, of the United States Corps of Engineers, published a book which has been of the utmost significance ever since in the public and civic life and activities of our country. His work, Robert's Rules of Order, has been the stand-by of legislators and citizens alike during three-quarters of a century, in their efforts to conduct public and civic gatherings in accordance with orderly procedures.

At the time this splendid publication was first issued, the author presented 1,000 copies to leaders in various activities of national life. Now, in connection with the issuance of the seventy-fifth anniversary edition of the Rules of Order, and in recognition of the fact that all of Major—later General—Robert's children have at one time or another lived in Maryland, it has been my very good fortune to receive a copy of this new edition, with the compliments of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr., daughter-in-law of the author, and a woman of outstanding attainments.

Appropriately termed, in a New York Herald Tribune editorial of recent date as "Democracy's Best Seller," the publication has been purchased by citizens and organizations to a total of 1,500,000 copies since its publication in 1876.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Herald Tribune be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Democracy's Best Seller

A New England town meeting has often been called the best exemplification of democracy in action. And town meetings or other deliberative asemblies where the will of the majority rules and the right of a minority to be heard is respected owe their

orderly procedures to a book which Maj. Henry Martyn Robert, of the United States Corps of Engineers, began to think about in 1863, worked over 14 years and finally published on February 19, 1876. The Library of Congress has recently held an exhibit celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of what might be called democracy's best seller. For Robert's Rules of Order has sold 1,500,000 copies since its publication date.

Brigadier General Robert died in 1925. His interest in the purpose and accomplishment of his book was fond and lifelong. He saw it become a classic of parliamentary procedure. In accepting last April from his widow manuscripts and other papers showing the growth of the "rules," Librarian of Congress Evans spoke of the way in which the work of General Robert had helped "democracy express itself in terms of decision, action, and result." It was accurate appraisal and just praise. Wherever men gather in large or small numbers to practice their faith in the right of free men to discuss in large or small degree community decision and action, they owe their rules of harmonious debate to the pages of Henry Martyn Robert's genuinely monumental manual. The copyright on Robert's Rules of Order runs until 1971. But the claim to fame of a young Army engineer will last much longer in the democracy whose orderly expression and just bounds he did so much to establish.

Foreign Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, of the American Legion, of Marion, Ind., regarding the Asiatic policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion pledges this organization to foster and perpetuate 100-percent Americanism, and through its national department and district leaders, schools, contests, and distribution of educational literature, and the zeal of its members the American Legion has been waging a constant fight against communism; and

Whereas in the course of events, there has been a trend in the foreign policy of the United States Government toward appeasement and recognition of world Communist elements as evidenced by recent congressional investigations, the United States Government's foreign policy toward China, and the refusal of our Government to allow blockading of Communist Chinese ports or the bombing of Communist Manchurian bases in the war in Korea; and

Whereas these aforesaid events exemplify a foreign policy pursued by the United States Government in direct opposition to the spirit of the preamble of the constitution of the American Legion by appeasing and recognizing Communist elements whose admitted purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States by force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, of the American Legion, Department of Indiana, declare that the spirit and creed of the American Legion can best be promoted by demanding that the foreign policy of the United States embody the following directives:

1. That the United States Government not recognize the communistic Chinese Government.

2. That the United States Delegates to the United Nations work against and vote against admission of Communist China to the United Nations, and in the event it shall become necessary that the Delegates of the United States to the United Nations exercise the veto power of the United States for the purpose of preventing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

3. That the island of Formosa never be turned over to Communist China.

4. That the Manchurian bases of Communist China be bombed by the United Nations forces fighting in Korea if deemed necessary by the Far Eastern Command.

5. That Nationalist China manpower be utilized in the war against the Communists.

6. That Communist China not be permitted to take part in the Japanese peace treaty.

7. That the United Nations forces in the Far East be permitted to blockade the Chinese Communist ports; be it further

Resolved, That Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, Department of Indiana, demand the resignation of the present Secretary of State of the United States Government and his aides and counselors responsible for the present United States foreign policy; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting of Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, Department of Indiana, and that copies thereof be forwarded to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, Representative JOHN V. BEAMER, National, Department, and District Headquarters of the American Legion, and to the members of the press.

Approved and adopted by special meeting of Byron W. Thornburg Post, No. 10, American Legion, Department of Indiana at Marion, Ind., this 13th day of April 1951.

WILLIAM IRELAND,
Post Commander.

Attest:

RAYMOND HEVNER,
Post Adjutant.

General MacArthur Underestimates Fanatical Faith of Chinese Communists, Says Marquis Childs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, April 27, 1951. The article entitled "The Error of Easy War," follows:

THE ERROR OF EASY WAR
(By Marquis Childs)
EXAMPLES IN HISTORY

Confronted with the dynamic of communism since 1917, the West has reacted with a series of errors that add up to something close to disaster. Those errors seems to me to have grown primarily out of repeated underestimation of the force of communism as an ideology, as a godless religion, as a system of capturing the hopes and imagination of millions.

In the long tragedy of errors two stand out with glaring conspicuousness. And what is more they suggest that a third blunder arising from this same underestimation will be made if some powerful people have their way.

The first error lay in the effort of the British with a little help from the other allies, to put down the Bolshevik revolution after the end of World War I. Intelligence reports indicated widespread disaffection in Russia directed at the little band of conspirators who were beginning to apply the techniques of a new tyranny.

These reports, which were substantially correct, led the British to believe that by backing certain Cossack generals and sending in an expeditionary force the revolution could be put down and the threat to the stability of all Europe brought to an end. But the means used for this objective were pathetically small. The expedition sent to Archangel was a mere handful of men and the Cossack generals were so discredited that they rallied little or no support behind them.

If the western allies had been prepared to send in a force of several hundred thousand trained and experienced men, the response of the Russian people might have been different and the shaky Bolshevik regime overthrown. In the war-weary west a force of that size and cost was out of the question. So the net result of the feeble and futile intervention was to leave a heritage of resentment and suspicion among the Bolsheviks and disillusion among those who had hoped to see the regime toppled over.

The second fundamental error was also, in my opinion, due to underestimating the force of communism as an ideology fanatically bent on world conquest. The mistakes of Yalta and Potsdam at the end of World War II derived from Roosevelt's belief that Soviet Russia would be willing to live side by side with the western powers in a peaceful world. It was in the hope of gaining Soviet confidence and cooperation that concessions were offered the Russians both in Europe and in Asia.

Roosevelt sincerely believed that he would win them around and only at the very end of his life was he at least partly brought to a sense of the realities by certain insulting messages from Stalin. The only small gain in this was that the rest of the world could not help but be convinced that America had done everything possible to get peaceful cooperation with the Soviet Union and that therefore the blame must be on the Russian side.

In his speech to Congress, General MacArthur included a review of developments in China in the past 50 years in which, incidentally, he made no mention at all of Sun Yat-sen, who was the principal leader of the revolution against the feudal regime of the Manchus. Then he said:

"There is little of the ideological concept either one way or another in the Chinese make-up. The standard of living is so low and the capital accumulation has been so thoroughly dissipated by war that the masses are desperate and eager to follow any leadership which seems to promise the alleviation of woeful stringencies."

This once again, it seems to me, underestimates the fanatical faith of the Communists in China who are seeking to weld an iron grip on the Chinese masses. Consequently, it encourages a serious underestimation of the task to be accomplished if communism is to be overthrown in China.

The long-term national interests of this country and of Asia may well coincide with such a goal regardless of its cost. But it

cannot be won on the cheap and easy. It would call for military preparation far in advance of anything now planned and would in turn mean a resolution and determination on the part of the American people which would persuade us to accept continuing sacrifices and restrictions.

To try to do it on the cheap and easy could be expected to produce the results that came out of the feeble, half-hearted efforts to suppress the Bolshevik revolution in 1919 and 1920. America's friends in China, and they are undoubtedly numbered in the millions, would be made disillusioned and resentful. The Communist regime in Peiping would be strengthened.

It is revealing that many of the Republicans who have flocked around MacArthur's banner are those who have sought to curtail the draft, to put a ceiling on military manpower, to impede plans for the defense of Europe, and to cut military appropriations. They are seizing on what they think is a cheap and easy way to bring the war to an end with a sudden and miraculous victory.

General MacArthur has held out no such promise. Since he has advocated strength everywhere, it must be deeply disturbing that his words should give aid and comfort to men who seem to want to scuttle America's position in the world.

Decoration of Paul W. Ward by President Auriol, of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in connection with the recent visit to Washington of President Vincent Auriol, of France, a distinguished honor was conferred upon Paul W. Ward, a member of the Baltimore Sun Washington bureau, who has specialized for a number of years in international affairs.

By authority of President Auriol, Mr. Ward was designated as a Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor, the citation listing it as a token of appreciation for an outstanding service to the cause of freedom and peace in the journalistic field.

Other newspapermen well known to Members of the Senate and to the people of this area generally who were accorded a like honor by President Auriol were James B. Reston, of the New York Times, and Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., of the Washington Post.

The people of Maryland were particularly pleased at the designation of Mr. Ward. Although still comparatively young, he has covered many of the world's important political developments here and abroad during the past critical 10 years.

The account of his award which appeared in an article in the Baltimore Sun suggests in all-too-brief fashion many of the important matters throughout the world which Mr. Ward has recorded for the Baltimore Sun. His excellence in the field of international reporting won for him in 1948 a Pulitzer Prize for a distinguished example of reporting of international affairs.

In these days when proper dissemination of information throughout the world is so important to the attainment and preservation of peace, objective reporting of international affairs is of the highest importance, and Mr. Ward and the other gentlemen mentioned are to be highly congratulated on the recognition that has been accorded them in this important field.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Baltimore Morning Sun of March 31 be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL WARD MADE CHEVALIER OF FRENCH LEGION OF HONOR

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Paul W. Ward, member of the Sun's Washington bureau and specialist in international affairs, was notified today of his designation as a chevalier of the French Legion of Honor.

The award was bestowed by authority of President Vincent Auriol, of France, now visiting in Washington, "as a token of appreciation for your outstanding services to the cause of freedom and peace in the journalistic field."

Mr. Ward is in Paris covering meetings of the Deputies who are trying to arrange a conference of Big Four Foreign Ministers—Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States. He received notice of his decoration in a cablegram from Henri Bonnet, French Ambassador to the United States.

TEXT OF MESSAGE

The notification message stated:

"The President of the French Republic has instructed me to inform you that you have been named chevalier in our national order of the Legion of Honor. This award is granted to you on the occasion of President Auriol's visit to the United States as a token of appreciation for your outstanding services to the cause of freedom and peace in the journalistic field."

Similar honors were awarded to James B. Reston, of the New York Times, and Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., of the Washington Post.

A member of the Sun staff since 1930, Mr. Ward, 45, has devoted more than half of that time to writing of world politics in Washington and abroad. In 1948 he was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for a distinguished example of reporting of international affairs.

The Pulitzer award was given in recognition of a series of articles on life in the Soviet Union, written in 1947 as a result of inquiries made by Mr. Ward while he was covering extended sessions of a foreign ministers' conference in Moscow that year.

Although nominally attached to the Sun's Washington Bureau since 1933, Mr. Ward has spent a great deal of his time abroad. From 1937 to 1939 he was the paper's London correspondent and was at that post when the Nazis started their sweep across Europe.

RETURNS IN 1940

After the British and French declarations of war he spent considerable time in France, reporting the progress of the conflict from various vantage points. He returned to the United States in 1940.

In Washington Mr. Ward makes the State Department his base of operations. He covered the Dumbarton Oaks Conference of 1944, where the ground work of the United Nations was laid, and in 1945 followed through with coverage of the San Francisco Conference where the world organization actually was born.

Mr. Ward covered the meetings of foreign ministers in Paris in the summer of 1946, and in New York in December of the same year. In 1948 he spent 2 months in Italy, reporting the parliamentary elections of that year. He was on that assignment when notified of his Pulitzer prize award.

REPORTED ON UN

In 1949, Mr. Ward was back in Paris again to report a meeting of Big Four foreign ministers, and in 1950 he was in the French capital for North Atlantic Treaty discussions. Through the years since the United Nations began to function he has spent much of his time at United Nations deliberations in Lake Success and Flushing Meadows, N. Y.

Mr. Ward is a native of Lorain, Ohio; a graduate of Middlebury College, and lives with his wife and their two children in Chevy Chase, Md.

Secrecy in MacArthur Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Secrecy Is Blunderers' Refuge," by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRECY IS BLUNDERERS' REFUGE—ADMINISTRATION SEEKS ONLY ITS OWN SECURITY BY CLOSED HEARINGS IN MACARTHUR CASE

Secrecy and suppression are the refuge of the incompetent and the blunderere in government. Publicity, with everything put on the table, is the enemy of scandal and abuse of power.

These principles apply equally to military and civilian affairs.

The Kefauver hearings proved the point conclusively.

The decision to carry on in secret the investigation touched off by the President's arbitrary removal of General MacArthur is, therefore, serious error which can only increase the distrust that the American people feel now about the administration and the Democratic Party, which is in control of the Government.

It is a curious thing that the Democrats voted solidly for secrecy and the Republicans voted for open sessions of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The only excuse for closed sessions which has a semblance of logic is the claim that there are secret directives of a military nature, the texts of which ought not to be revealed for security reasons.

The principal security reason, of course, is the security of the democratic administration. It is doubtful if there is a single document now in the records really needed for the hearings which could give military aid to the enemy if made public. The habit of recent years in Washington is to put the "top secret" or "classified information" label on anything or everything that might cause a bureaucrat annoyance or put him on the defensive.

The ends of a legitimate safeguard or secret information can be served by paraphrasing the documents so that the enemy will not be able to decode anything they may have picked up heretofore of our secret messages. Once this paraphrasing is done—and it is being done nearly every week in some form with respect to diplomatic exchanges—there is no real danger in the publication of the information.

But in the event that a document emerges or is referred to in the open hearings which could be the source of military information, all the presiding officer at the hearings has to do is close the hearings for an interval at that point until that particular document is examined in secret. Whereupon the open hearings could be resumed.

The procedure decided on by the Democratic majority in the Senate Armed Services Committee will be to hold secret hearings and then allow a transcript to be edited and the edited version will be issued to the public.

The newspapermen will have to buy the transcript from stenographers, paying about 40 cents for every 150 or 200 words of testimony. The press will have no opportunity to observe the demeanor of witnesses. The delay between the time the testimony is given and the time the transcript will be available for publication may be hours, if not days. Meanwhile, the reporters will ask both the witnesses and the members of the committee what happened, and will get paraphrases and condensed versions which may or may not be influenced by the prejudice of the Senators who give out the information.

The press does not as a rule reproduce an exact copy of what has previously been paraphrased in the first dispatches. The end result is that a hearing of profound importance to the safety of the American people, involving past actions and the evolution of our foreign policy as well as our military policy, will get to the public for the most part in fragmentary and confusing form.

General MacArthur himself declined to specify how he wished the hearings to be held—whether they should be open or closed. He took the position that he, as a witness, really should not express an opinion and that it should be left to the committee to decide. This was a wise approach because the committee intended to vote for closed sessions anyway. The pressure from the Pentagon is to keep from the public as much information as possible would should that the military men concur even in part with General MacArthur. There is such fear in the Pentagon of getting in bad with the civilian or political side of the Government that officers prefer not even to discuss the MacArthur affair.

So it all boils down to the fact that, while America is suffering casualties in Korea due to a policy of limitation which General MacArthur has questioned, the American people are not going to get the full story of the reasons why the civilian authority in Government has substituted its own opinions for the judgment of competent military men in the field.

The Plasterer's Glee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article taken from the March 1951 issue of the Plasterer and Cement Mason, an official organ of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Association of the United States and Canada. The poem follows:

THE PLASTERER'S GLEE

We are a band of plasterers,
We beautify man's home;
Without our magic art
Oh, say, what would be Greece or Rome?

It was Hiram Brave, a widow's son,
God's temple did adorn,
And the plasterer's trowel
Made it seem as though of beauty born.

The Sistine and the Vatican,
St. Peter's majestic dome,
Were by the plasterer's trowel
Prepared for the grand cartoons of Rome,
Until a Titian, a Raphael, and an Angelo in glorious frescoes shine
That might be said to be born of the brain of Jove Divine.

The splendors of our Cap'tol,
And of the Taj Mahal,
The Parisian's pride—fair Notre Dame,
And London's grand St. Paul,
Are to the plasterers' art accredited.

The plastic art by God to man was given that so might man's enlightened heart cemented be to heaven.
Then glory be to the plasterer art,
So beautiful and bright;
It cheers both man and woman's heart,
With life, with love, with light.

We meet upon the level,
We part upon the square;
In union sweet our true hearts beat,
And joys and sorrows share.

We are a band of plasterers,
By love's cement united;
By the trowel and not the sword
Our brotherhood is knighted.

National Defense Requires Full Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, April 29, 1951, I was privileged to address a very fine group of citizens in Brooklyn organized as the Committee of Brooklyn Gaglianese, which is headed by our distinguished colleague the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO. This organization is presently engaged in furthering a very laudable project, the construction of an orphanage for the homeless and orphaned children of the Sicilian community Gagliano Castelferrato, in Italy.

Among the prominent guests at the dinner arranged by this organization, which took place in the Hotel Towers in Brooklyn, were the following: the Very Reverend John A. Flynn, president of St. John's University, who delivered a very inspiring and thought-provoking address regarding the international situation; Rev. Cyril F. Mayer, vice president of St. John's University; Rev. Giuseppe Grippaldi, director of the orphanage in Sicily; the Honorable James Amadei, member of the New York Workmen's Compensation Board; the Honorable Austin G. Cocuzza, former assistant district attorney for Kings County, who was general chairman; and Mr. and Mrs. Charles L'Episcopo, Angelo Manno, Joseph Di Stefano, Salvatore Abramo, Domenico A. Abrama, Mariano Fiorenza, Anthony Fagone, Guiseppe Muscolino, and many other prominent citizens of Brooklyn.

Since the greater part of my address was devoted to a discussion of international affairs and is, therefore, of general interest, I am placing it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my colleague, Congressman ANFUSO, who as a freshman in the House of Representatives in Washington is doing such a masterful job, has indeed been very kind and gracious in his introductory remarks about me. I appreciate the opportunity to address my many friends who have foregathered here. I know of the magnificent work you are doing for the orphans in Italy, a humanitarian endeavor which is very close to my heart.

I love children, as we all do. I love their carefree laughter. I love their innocence and their simple approach to life and its problems. My only regret is that we have not been able to build a happier world for them where they could grow up as dignified citizens and healthy human beings. In this country, however, we are fortunate that we have made considerable progress in this respect, and we have been able to help people in other countries.

It is for this reason that I admire the work you are doing in raising funds for the construction of an orphanage in Italy, modeled somewhat along the lines of our own famous Boys Town, in Nebraska. A project of this nature is, in my opinion, truly laudable, not only in terms of the humanitarian motives which inspire them but also in terms of the reservoir of international good will and understanding which they are bound to make manifest between the people of this country and the people of Italy.

What is particularly pleasing to me is that my very good friend, the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO, is taking such an active part and is doing such splendid work toward the realization of this worthy project. I think this is a very fitting occasion to pay tribute to him for his untiring efforts in furthering the cause of this project. Congressman ANFUSO deserves the highest commendation for his endeavors to establish a home for underprivileged children in this Sicilian community, which is located in one of the less developed areas of Sicily where housing and educational facilities are inadequate and the standard of living is low, despite the fact that the people there are hard-working and industrious.

Besides performing a humanitarian service, the establishment of this orphanage in Sicily, with the help of private American funds, can make a real contribution to the cause of the promotion of friendly relations between the people of the United States and the people of Italy. In these trying and tragic days, when it has become necessary to supplement formal methods of international relations with the informal amenities of human relations, the proposed orphanage will serve to foster good will and a constant reminder to the young and old of Italy that their hopes and aspirations are ours, too.

I should like to turn now for a brief discussion of international affairs, since these affairs affect us as citizens of the United States. Our country is faced today with problems which are greater in scope and significance than any it has encountered in the 175 years of its existence. It is difficult for us to evaluate the historical importance of the times, because we are living in this era

which for us is still very much a reality, and also because of the lasting tension which threatens the peace of the world. We are very likely heading into a period of greater tension and new crises which threaten not only to disrupt world peace, but to enslave the whole free world, perhaps for decades to come.

It is extremely important for us, therefore, as peace-loving and freedom-loving citizens, to be fully informed and thoroughly acquainted with these problems. The decisions we are called upon the make during this tense period and the plans we are formulating will determine the sort of world our children and grandchildren will inherit. What we do today will determine whether future generations will be able to live in peace and freedom tomorrow.

The history of mankind is sometimes described as a history of continuous welfare. Although this statement has the element of truth in it, it is a cynical way of interpreting human history and the progress of civilization. During the last two centuries peoples and nations have not been fighting wars for the mere glory of it, rather can we say that the conflict of ideologices has often developed beyond its bounds and resulted in warfare and bloodshed. Basically, the struggle of mankind has developed into a struggle between two irreconcilable ways of life: Freedom and human dignity versus enslavement and the oppression of humanity. We can also put it another way: Are we to be Governed by justice or enslaved by force?

We can find many notable examples in history to illustrate this point. The French Revolution and the American Revolution were milestones in the struggle of freedom against enslavement. The Civil War in this country about 90 years ago was a struggle against slavery. The First and Second World Wars were a struggle of the forces of freedom and democracy against the forces of evil and human oppression.

After experiencing two devastating wars in our lifetime, we are faced with the prospect of a third world war which threatens to engulf all humanity. Sometimes we have the feeling that we stand helpless in the face of events and decisions over which we have no control. Actually, however, this is not a new experience in American history. Nearly a century and a half ago, when the United States became embroiled in the War of 1812 against its wishes, Thomas Jefferson made this very timely observation: "Experience has shown that continued peace depends not merely on our own justice and prudence, but on that of others also." Jefferson also voiced some very keen comment on the question of war which, in my estimation, deserves to be brought to the attention of all Americans as the message of one of the founders of this Republic and the father of American democracy. In discussing war and the alternative of war, this is what Jefferson said:

"All men know that war is a losing game to both parties. But they know also that if they do not resist encroachment at some point, all will be taken from them, and that more would then be lost * * * by submission than resistance. It is the case of giving a part to save the whole, a limb to save life. It is the melancholy law of human societies to be compelled sometimes to choose a great evil in order to ward off a greater."

Robert A. Vogeler, the American businessman who was released yesterday from a Hungarian prison after being confined by the Communist regime of that country for 17 months, put it this way: "You will never know what freedom is until you lose it."

Unfortunately, the path to peace and freedom is not easy to travel, because we live in an age of great happenings and equally great controversies, which keep us in a continual state of anxiety and worry. Witness all the fire and fury around the MacArthur issue, the turning of citizen against citizen, the denunciation of our leadership by people who have lost their heads, and the condemnation of our foreign policy by people who are not acquainted with the facts and have thrown all logic to the winds, not realizing that the fate of our Nation and the future of western civilization are more important than the fate of an individual.

It is the old problem of getting an informed citizenry which will seek the facts and evaluate the truth. Free and open discussion of our national problems are imperative in a democracy. Only by understanding these problems and clearly realizing our aims can we hope for democracy to survive; otherwise, we shall become quivering reeds in every storm of emotional controversy in which, in these trying times, we are caught so often.

I have reached the conclusion that one of the most important contributions that you and I, as individuals, can make to preserve freedom and safeguard peace is to help develop an informed and enlightened public opinion in this country. The whole world is looking to us for guidance toward a peaceful world of law and order. But if our own ranks are rent asunder by confusion and controversy, how can we expect our allies and the bulk of freedom-loving humanity to have confidence in us and to help us preserve peace and freedom? We must rely upon our allies for all that they can offer in the common defense, and we must in turn give them complete assurance that the United States will be ready to defend the free world, should such an emergency arise.

The question of world peace is a task for whole nations. Harsh criticism of our Government and impatience with the workings of the democratic process of government only contribute to the confusion in the public mind and result in great disunity of our people and loss of American prestige in the eyes of the world. This is one luxury we can easily forego in times such as these.

In the great conflict of ideologies which is now raging throughout the world, it is not enough for us merely to be against something, but to indicate to the world in unmistakable terms what we are for. At the time of the American revolution the people of this country were struggling for freedom, for equality, and for the inalienable rights of man. These ideals are still timely today, only we would add also the preservation of American values, the safeguarding of the democratic way of life, the dignity of the individual, and the maintenance of human rights.

This is not a time for bickering and fighting among ourselves. This is not a time for shirking our responsibilities and obligations. We must have sincere and full cooperation in our national life. We must work together as a team, and not at counterpurposes; otherwise, we shall be lost. We must continue to build the defenses of our country, but at the same time we must also continue our best efforts in the great endeavor to build a free and peaceful world in which we and our neighbors may live in contentment and security.

The defense of our country depends on the whole American people. In the long run, it is the people that count—all the 150,000,000 people of the United States—to champion the cause of peace, freedom, human progress, and a safer world for us and our children.

If there is any admonition or advice the people of this country need at this time, it is contained in the words of advice which Hamlet received from his mother in that great Shakespearean tragedy, when she said to him: "O gentle son, upon the heat and flame of thy distemper sprinkle cool patience."

If we could only remain calm and discuss our problems with more light and less heat, we shall find that we can achieve greater unity of purpose and better results for our country and ourselves.

"Fighting in Korea Is for the Preservation of Life, Liberty, and the Right to the Pursuit of Happiness for All Freemen"—General Van Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, April 28, 1951, entitled "Van Fleet's Inspiration":

VAN FLEET'S INSPIRATION

Courage, faith, humility—these are the qualities that stand out in General Van Fleet's first message to his troops. In simple language the new commander of the Eighth Army in Korea has brought encouragement to his soldiers in the face of the Chinese onslaught. He has done more, however, than praise the skill and determination of the United Nations forces and cite their superiority in all but numbers. With a directness which gains additional eloquence by the fact that it comes from the battlefield, he has summarized the larger issues in the fighting:

"You are fighting to stop armed aggression and maintain peace not only in Korea but in your respective homelands. This renewed battle is for the preservation of life, liberty, and the right to the pursuit of happiness of all freemen. These are fundamental in the rights of man—the rock upon which our civilization is founded—and they are the first rights which communism denies its own people.

"The time has come when all men of the free and decent world must steel their souls to face the desperate, bitter, and uncompromising battle with armed Communist aggression. Our strength rests on the solid foundation of belief in God and the rights of man rather than on the will of dictators, imposed through cruelty and complete disregard of human rights."

Even in the grimness of war, these words are inspiring to those who hear them, the more so because, as the troops must know, they spring from a deeply religious nature. They tell a lot about the character of a man who uttered them, and they carry a conviction borne of fighting experience and spiritual toughness which must show to the soldiers in Korea that their commander has the quality of leadership.

One Hundred and Sixth Birthday of Mrs. Martha Hiatt, of Moravia, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the vast strides made in medical science during the last century, together with higher living standards, have contributed in making the life expectancy of an individual longer. However, even in these

times, few live to be much older than "three score years and ten." So I am sure all Members of the House will be interested to learn of the recent one hundred and sixth birthday of Mrs. Martha Hiatt, of Moravia, Iowa. She has lived in Appanoose County, which is in my congressional district, for 99 years. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to mention these facts:

Mrs. Hiatt was born in Randolph County, N. C., April 26, 1845, and in 1852 moved to Iowa with her parents, a journey by covered wagon which required 3 months. In 1864 she was married to Mr. Oren Hiatt and she is the mother of 11 children, 5 of whom are still living. Her oldest son is 84 years of age.

All of her life Mrs. Hiatt has been active, and while she is in frail health at this time, she is looking forward to enjoying the spring weather when she can be outdoors and she even has made plans to visit relatives this summer.

Through the years Mrs. Hiatt has kept up an interest in world affairs and has voted in nearly every election since women's suffrage. She voted last fall.

Mrs. Hiatt's life has not only been long but also useful, and she is proud of the wonderful family she has reared. She enjoys talking about her children and grandchildren and has 47 direct descendants.

So unusual is it for one to live to be 106 years of age that Mrs. Hiatt's picture appeared yesterday on television on the Ted Mack show, the American Family Hour.

MacArthur Ouster May Alter Military Concepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky from the New York Journal-American of April 22, 1951:

MACARTHUR OUSTER MAY ALTER MILITARY CONCEPTS

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

The dramatic dismissal of General MacArthur from the supreme command in the Far East, though momentarily bewildering, may prove a blessing in disguise. Its most important result may be to bring about a bold reappraisal of our country's military concepts and leadership in line with its true strategic position.

Certainly such a reappraisal is desperately needed and cannot be much longer evaded if we are to head off catastrophe. The demand for it is implied in every one of the General's controversial pronouncements.

There is reason to surmise that he deliberately risked his personal status in order to force some grim facts upon the public mind.

The Korean tragedy is the product of confused foreign policies, which in turn rest on an unrealistic estimate of our military capabilities. MacArthur knew this better than anyone, for he had been compelled to fight an old-style land war in a limited and primitive theater of operation against overwhelming odds.

CHANCED RECALL

He is far too intelligent not to have foreseen the possibility of his own recall for talking out of turn. But he chanced it as a patriotic duty. He had to choose between this deep sense of obligation to the men in Korea and the Nation, and the consequences of overstepping the bounds of protocol.

As commander in the field, MacArthur saw the likelihood of a military debacle unless his hands were untied to strike at the privileged sanctuary of the enemy. He saw the critical value of imposing a second front on the Chinese Communists by unloosing a Nationalist offensive.

The debacle, in his view, would have been due to decisions in Washington and Lake Success, but the major blame would have been loaded on his shoulders. The brilliant record of a great soldier would have been tarnished.

CAN JOIN GREAT DEBATE

In a sense he is fortunate that the recall came in time to prevent this. More important, however, is the fact that he can now join the great debate on national strategy. He can do his share in helping to lead America out of the blind alley of archaic thinking in the Pentagon.

MacArthur, of course, is not the first military leader to stake his career in opposition to official policy in the interests of national security as he saw it.

There was Gen. Billy Mitchell in the twenties; there was Admiral Louis E. Denfeld in 1949. Whether they were right or wrong—and I think the admiral was wholly wrong—these men acted out of patriotic convictions.

FOUGHT FOR AIR POWER

Mitchell believed our military set-up would be calamitous unless air power was recognized as a service on a par with the Army and the Navy. He provoked a court martial by openly challenging his superiors.

It was said at the time—as now in the MacArthur imbroglio—that he should have resigned first and spoken out afterward. But we know that in our country an issue must be dramatized; that a resignation does not focus public attention like defiance and punishment.

Mitchell, Denfeld, now MacArthur prove that our military leaders are Americans first, officers second. When sincerely convinced that the country is in danger they do not hesitate to stick out their military necks.

THE PEOPLE DECIDE

This is all to the good. In a democracy basic strategic decisions are ultimately made by the people through their elected representatives. Individual acts of technical insubordination are sometimes essential as an appeal to the highest authority—the American people.

MacArthur has learned through the bitter experience of the last 9 months that a fundamental reorientation in military thought is essential. His recall obliges all Americans to take part in the process.

Unhappily, peace still has to be guaranteed by force. But if it is force of the wrong kind it cannot perform this job. On the contrary, fallacious strategy—the acceptance of an enemy challenge in the wrong place with the wrong forces—can only lead to war.

At best it brings a stalemate from which there is then no way out except humiliating retreat or a full-scale conflict.

IDEOLOGICAL BATTLE

The world is today in the throes of an ideological struggle on a global scale. Orthodox military concepts, in which the conquest of a piece of territory by foot soldiers is the goal, no longer apply.

Different strategy and tactics, revolutionary application of forces and weapons, are called for. But military minds steeped in traditional warfare are unable to grasp these new conditions.

MacArthur is a unique exception. My personal contacts with him in Tokyo on several occasions have convinced me that, compared to other ground generals, he has the broadest understanding of the implications of air power. Whether his successors will be able to deal with the new military equation remains to be seen.

AIR FORCE VITAL

In Asia the odds on the ground are so tremendous against us that our success depends on the effective use of air forces. Though the brunt of the casualties have been borne by soldiers, Asia—in any conflict involving the United States—can only be an arena of air operations if we are to win.

We can never hope to overcome the astronomic superiority of enemy numbers on the surface unless we obtain and exploit freedom of air navigation. But when we obtain such command of the air we can impose our will upon the enemy without the use of ground forces.

If a change had to be made in the Far East command, the supreme post should have gone to an airman. Now that the Communists are throwing air force into the scales, the air phase must become increasingly decisive.

INSURES GROUND-WAR BIAS

The ability to smoke an enemy out of fox holes will hardly tell the story. Generals Ridgway and Van Fleet, gallant soldiers both, are of the Marshall school, and their promotion is almost a guaranty of ground-warfare bias, with air power held more and more to an auxiliary role.

MacArthur's deeper appreciation of the air factor was indicated in a recent informal interview which did not get the attention it merited. Speaking to British Lt. Gen. H. G. Martin, he said that the Chinese lacked an industrial potential—oil, rubber, food.

Consequently, "the United Nations forces had only to blockade their coasts and smash their tenuous railway system to reduce them quickly to impotence."

To airmen this view makes strategic sense, of course. It comes close to what they urged in reference to Korea as the one effective alternative to mile-by-mile ground war to which generals of the balanced-forces school were committing us.

AIR-NAVAL BLOCKADE

Though MacArthur referred to "bombing," his proposal, if carried out by airmen, would amount to a combination of air siege and naval blockade—the strategic use of air and sea power as a strangulating application of military force.

That sort of blockade and siege can be made effective without use of ground forces, except perhaps in occupational roles after the enemy's will to resist has been broken. It is the strategy that could and should have been employed in Korea from the outset.

That a ground general of MacArthur's age is able to come close to such a revolutionary proposal seems to me a striking measure of his stature. Fortunately, his views will be even more sharply stated now that he has been relieved of his command.

The Real Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Tuesday, April 24, 1951, entitled "The Real Threat," which follows:

THE REAL THREAT

General MacArthur touched on the possibility of Soviet intervention only briefly in his speech to the Congress. While it was lucid on the problem of Red China, the address nearly overlooked the crucial Soviet question.

MacArthur believes, according to his speech, that the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its action with our moves like a cobra—our moves, in this case, being the bombing of Manchuria and blockades as proposed by the general.

"Any new enemy will more likely strike whenever it feels that the relativity on military and other potentials is in its favor on a world-wide basis," General MacArthur says. All of which means that only the enemy knows when he will strike.

At one time General MacArthur was confident that the Red Chinese would not intervene in the Korean affair. Other leaders thought so, too, but they were proved wrong. MacArthur now admits that China is engaging with the maximum power it can commit.

Either General MacArthur is so confident that the Soviet Union would not intervene that he passes lightly over the subject, or he is uncertain of the possibility and stays away from the subject. Whatever his situation, the prospect of Soviet intervention is, at the moment, the most important issue, and it cannot be passed over.

Were we certain the Soviet is not yet ready, we doubtless could do as MacArthur suggests and bomb Red China. But if we do, we must be prepared for the very likely prospect that the Soviet will change its passiveness to a terrible activeness, even as did the Red Chinese. In his intense concentration on the problem at hand—Conflict with the Red Chinese—General MacArthur may have overlooked the possibility of Soviet intervention that is the real threat in the Far East.

Brooklyn's Welcome to Senator Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Brooklyn was host to a very distinguished visitor on Monday, April 23, 1951, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator from Tennessee and chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. Senator KEFAUVER addressed the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the eastern district of New York at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, which is located in the district I represent. Some 1,500 persons attended this meeting. Later that same evening Senator KEFAUVER addressed another 1,000 persons at Midwood High School at a meeting under the auspices of the Brooklyn Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

It was truly a memorable and eventful evening for all those who attended either of these two meetings and heard the distinguished Senator speak. I was privileged to spend the whole evening with him from the time of his arrival and to accompany him to the various gatherings which the citizens of Brooklyn arranged for him. I met Senator KEFAUVER at the airport, and we proceeded from there to the Brooklyn Club, where a dinner was given in his honor by the Federal Grand Jurors' Association.

Present at the dinner were the following honored guests: Federal Judge Edward A. Conger, of the southern district of New York; Frank J. Parker, United States district attorney of the eastern district; Irving H. Saypol, United States district attorney of the southern district; Brooklyn Borough President John Cashmore; District Attorney Miles F. McDonald, of Kings County; District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, of Manhattan; Morris J. Solomon, commissioner of jurors; and United States Marshal Eugene J. Smith. They were singled out for special greetings and introduction at the annual meeting later.

Anthony W. Fitzgerald, counsel for the association, then presented a general report on the importance of the association in the life of the community and the work of the various committees. During the course of his address, Mr. Fitzgerald made the following interesting observations:

Under our American system of justice, the grand jury is the bulwark of the ordinary citizen, the honest law-abiding citizen, against an unjust or unfounded accusation of a crime. Under our American system, I repeat, no man can be dragged into court on a trumped-up charge—or without cause; nor can any man be brought to trial capriciously by an overzealous or venal prosecutor.

The distinguished aggregation of Federal and district attorneys on my right must bear witness to the statement that no man can be tried for a capital or other infamous crime without having first been indicted by a grand jury. A majority of our States—and all our Federal courts—require that 23 fellow-citizens of an accused must first hear and weigh the evidence against him before he can be brought into a trial court for any serious crime.

How different our American justice from the so-called justice—better, mockery of justice—in Communist and Communist-dominated countries, where judge, jury, prosecutor—and even the defense attorney have only one purpose, to convict the accused, or—as they put it, to make him "confess."

Those 23 persons constitute what is known as a grand jury and their qualifications illustrate the fairness of our American system, for they are required to be an intelligent cross section of American citizens, not chosen by fear or favoritism but subject to a very solemn oath by which they acknowledge the existence of God and swear to hear and weigh evidence without prejudice, without hope of political favor—without fear.

Of such is the grand jury composed; of such individuals is our Federal Grand Jurors' Association composed. Our members are, in all truth, a cross section of average intelligent America. Permit me to quote to you a short excerpt from the preamble to our association constitution as revealing clearly our goals:

"To impress upon all persons that it is the duty of grand jurors to weigh all facts and evidence presented to them; That they must inquire into all facts, whether or not clearly brought out by the prosecution, so as to judge fairly the person brought before the grand jury for indictment; That they should accept their choice as grand jurors as an honor and a patriotic duty."

Those stirring and sincere words, ladies and gentlemen, reveal better than any halting expressions of mine, the heart and soul of this association, the credo which governs our every action, our every effort.

This association—and its component committees—is not an aggregation of busybodies, of do gooders, of pests who plague busy public officials. Rather, like the grand jury itself, it is a group which wishes to learn and then to teach to others those essentials of citizenship and patriotism which today, more than at any other crucial time in the history of our Republic, are so necessary if we are to continue to exist as a free Nation under God.

Raymond A. Young, president of the association, delivered the annual report of the president, from which I quote the following timely remarks:

One thought crosses my mind as I look upon this vast throng; and that thought is how wonderful it is to live in America, with our right to such freedom of assemblage as we have here tonight, without compulsion, without the dictatorship of some bureaucrat forcing us to come here, without fear.

As our counsel has remarked, this association is in a sense the extension, the complement, of the grand jury itself. Our ideals, our goals, our standards are identical with those which every grand juror learns and adopts when he first enters the grand-jury room (in our Federal building)—loyalty to country, devotion to the cause of justice, protection of the innocent, punishment of the guilty.

Out of almost 100 Federal districts in this country, there are only 2 which have associations such as ours. We have been told the value of the grand jury itself; the FBI or other agencies may bring in evidence; a competent district attorney may prepare the case, but it is the grand jury who must hear and weigh the evidence against an accused and bring him to trial.

Since associations such as ours extend the work of the grand jury itself in educating the public, surely there is a crying need throughout our country for many more Federal grand jurors' associations, extending from coast to coast, and carrying out the same purposes as we here in the eastern district strive to do.

We pledge ourselves here tonight to aid any Federal grand jurors' group in the formation of an association so that they, too, may become a strong factor in their own communities. For it is our sincere belief that the grand jury and grand jury associations are a powerful weapon against crime and communism in this country.

The oath of office and the induction of the board of governors and the officers for 1951 were administered very ably and in a most charming manner by Chief Judge Robert A. Inch of the eastern district. Appointed to the United States district court in 1923, Judge Inch is one of the most beloved jurists that has ever graced the Federal bench and in every sense a judge in word and deed.

Inducted as members of the board of governors of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association were: Calvin A. Davis, Howard G. Launsbach, Erik Marcussen, Marshall L. Ong, Cornelius S. Zeuner, Vincent F. Donohue, James J. Gannon, H. D. McKeige, David M. Newman, S. Thomas Pearson, William E. Breul, Jr., Robert W. Drummond, Robert Elliott, Jr., Edward F. Hannigan, and Samuel C. Sander. The association's new officers for 1951 are: Raymond A. Young, president; Walter Davidson, first vice president; George Devoy, second vice president; Charles A. Barkie, third vice president; Byron D. Forster, secretary; Harry J. Smith, treasurer.

A special word of commendation is due to Charles A. Barkie, chairman of the program committee, and to the members of his committee, for a well-planned and most successful evening.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who was the principal speaker of the evening, made an excellent impression on the capacity audience at the Brooklyn Academy of Music. He paid public tribute to District Attorneys Miles F. McDonald, Frank S. Hogan, Frank J. Parker, Irving H. Saypol, and to me as the representative of this district in Congress.

From the Academy of Music we drove to the Midwood High School, where Senator KEFAUVER delivered his second address of the evening, this time discussing the international scene and the Atlantic Union. Our very able colleague, Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana, also addressed this gathering and acquitted himself with eloquence and distinction. The meeting at Midwood School was presided over by the well-known County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, and County Judge Louis Goldstein also spoke.

Brooklyn will long remember the visit of Senator KEFAUVER. He made a great many friends among our citizens and left a lasting impression on Brooklyn. In order to fully complete my account of his visit, I am placing in the RECORD a news item and an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, April 24, 1951:

RACKETEERS RUN 76 LEGAL BUSINESSES, SAYS KEFAUVER—SEES COLOSSAL TAKE FROM UNITED STATES CITIZENS

United States Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, here in Brooklyn last night for a doubleheader speaking engagement, termed colossal the amount of money taken from United States citizens by racketeers with legitimate business connections.

Addressing the annual meeting of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association of New York's eastern district, KEFAUVER declared that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, headed by him, has compiled a list of 76 legitimate enterprises operated by such figures.

"Everything you wear or eat costs extra," he said, in a situation where racketeers bring with them into business "methods of intimidation and coercion which give them unfair advantage over their competitors."

The Senator told the capacity audience gathered in the Academy of Music that the people of Brooklyn "have much to be thankful for. One of the most outstanding jobs of turning the spotlight on crime and corruption has been done right here in Kings County by your grand jury and District Attorney McDonald."

PRAISE FOR M'DONALD

He said he wanted to pay the people of Brooklyn "the highest compliment" for supporting McDonald during the early days of the rackets probe when the district attorney was under critical fire.

He also paid tribute to Manhattan District Attorney Frank S. Hogan and United States Attorneys Irving Saypol of the southern district and Frank J. Parker of the eastern district. Saypol and Parker were present on the dais.

Senator KEFAUVER said he saw "very positive signs that America is undergoing a moral awakening. I do believe something has been started to give us a cleaner and more decent government."

Hailing the institution of citizens' crime committees, such as the one recently established in New York, KEFAUVER announced that similar organizations have been created in "35 or 40 States during the past few months."

The Senator outlined some of the recommendations his committee will make in an effort to minimize crime on a national scale. He said the group will recommend prohibiting the transmission of gambling information. A tightening of deportation regulations will also be urged in order that the heads of certain gangs can be deported.

The committee will also recommend improved income-tax laws, he asserted, to force racketeers to report the sources of their income and file statements of net worth. A further recommendation will be improvements in the laws covering the sale of alcohol.

He also said the committee will suggest securities and exchange regulations whereby owners and directors of large corporations will be required to make their names a matter of public knowledge.

More than 1,500 persons attended the meeting, which was preceded by a supper at the Brooklyn Club. Presiding at the meeting was Raymond A. Young, president of the association.

Among those on the dais were Federal Judge Edward A. Conger of the southern district, United States Commissioner of Jurors Morris J. Solomon and United States Marshal Eugene J. Smith, both the eastern district, Borough President Cashmore and Representative LOUIS B. HELLER.

OFFICERS INSTALLED

Senior Judge Robert A. Inch of the eastern district installed Young and the other officers for 1951. They were Walter Davidson, first vice presedent; George Devoy, second vice president; Charles A. Barkie, third vice president; Byron D. Forster, secretary, and Harry J. Smith, treasurer.

From the academy, Senator KEFAUVER was driven, with motorcycle escort, to Midwood High School, Bedford Avenue and Glenwood Road, where he addressed almost 1,000 persons attending a meeting of the Brooklyn chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

Presiding over the meeting was County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, who introduced the Senator as a "homefront general."

Senator KEFAUVER said he could see no way of preventing a third world war, a "push-button affair," other than through international cooperation. He warned, however, that the United States would have to give up its "piecemeal system of alliances."

Asserting his belief that the people of the country are in favor of international cooperation, he suggested that if the United States had been more active in world cooperation at the time of the League of Nations it might have helped avert World War II.

"We can't go on fighting aggression by ourselves in a haphazard fashion," the Senator said. "We can't beat aggression if we are fighting the Chinese in Korea while our friends are doing business with them in Hong Kong."

Senator KEFAUVER said "Stalin has a federation of nations on his side which he can call upon when he needs them. This federation, formed by force, would not have the moral strength of a volunteer federation among free nations of the world."

Among those on the dais were County Judge Louis Goldstein, Representative HELLER and Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana.

The Senator made joking comment on the big "KEFAUVER for President" sign which hung from the balcony of the school auditorium with a Confederate flag.

KEFAUVER, HERE, MAKES STRONG CASE FOR FEDERAL UNION IN CURRENT CRISIS

Senator KEFAUVER came to Brooklyn last night for a much different reason from what he had during his last stay in this city. However, there was a similarity between the two visits—each was aimed at a form of crime.

His first visit attacked the criminal element in this Nation and did much to instruct the country as to the extent and seriousness of the danger.

His visit last night was concerned with international crime—the crime of allowing a disunited free world to face the organized menace of the communistic bloc of nations. Senator KEFAUVER spoke in behalf of the Atlantic Union resolution, which he introduced in the Senate some months ago.

He urged once again the passage of this resolution, which calls upon the President to convene the nations which signed the Atlantic Pact to explore the possibility of forming an even greater amalgamation—a federal union.

The Senator asked this Nation to continue the orderly revolution begun by our founding fathers when they created the first and most successful federal union by joining the Original Thirteen States. This is a great and far-reaching goal and worthy of exploration, as we have said in the past.

Only a few days ago, General MacArthur recalled for Congress a passage from his address on the occasion of the surrender of the Japanese:

"Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, our Armageddon will be at our door."

This is the prophetic consideration upon which Senator KEFAUVER bases his adherence to the hope for an Atlantic Union. When the world is in such great danger, again it becomes reasonable to state that the Atlantic Union venture is worth exploring. We hope that the Senate will not disband this year without giving the proposal its most serious study.

Trade and Service Unions Protest Freeze on Low-Wage Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative statement by Hugo Ernst, general president of the Bartenders and Hotel Employees International Union, recently appearing in the Catering Industry Employee publication:

TRADE AND SERVICE UNIONS PROTEST FREEZE ON LOW-WAGE WORKERS

(At the suggestion of Hugo Ernst, general president, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, a conference of A. F. of L. international unions in the trade and service industries, was convened in Washington, D. C., March 19, 1951, to consider the impact of wage controls on the 15,000,000 workers in trade and service industries and to work out a joint program for the defense of the living standards of these workers. General President Ernst, who served as chairman of the conference, made the following statement as a basis for discussion. The statement was unanimously endorsed by the conference.—EDITOR.)

In proposing this conference of unions in the trade and service industries I did so because I have become increasingly convinced that the millions of workers in our industries are being totally disregarded in the discussions and developments since the beginning of wage stabilization.

There is cumulative evidence for this conclusion. Since the January 25 freeze there have been several modifications of the original freeze order—all designed to meet the needs of unions and employers in the basic industries, none providing relief for the millions of workers in service and trade.

MINE, AUTO RAISES O. K.'D

Thus the first modification, General Regulation 2, extended the freeze date from January 25 to February 9 to legalize the mine workers' wage increase.

Another basic modification, General Regulation 8, relaxed the 10-percent formula under General Regulation 6 to legalize cost-of-living escalator clauses only in those cases where such clauses were already in effect on January 25. Obviously General Regulation 8 was designed to satisfy the CIO auto workers, since, with few exceptions, this was the only large union with contracts containing cost-of-living escalator clauses.

Two subsequent modifications—General Regulations 9 and 10—were also designed to meet certain special needs in basic industry.

NO RELIEF FOR SUBSTANDARDS

Although the United Labor Policy Committee on January 11 raised the basic question of substandard wages with the Economic Stabilization Agency, nothing has been done on this point, except that:

1. General Regulation 3 was issued to legalize adjustments under existing Federal or State minimum-wage legislation. For workers in service and trade, who are outside the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, this regulation means that all they can hope for to eliminate substandards are existing State minimum laws, which provide such wages as 55 cents an hour for non-tip hotel and restaurant workers in a State like Ohio, or 55 cents for building service workers in a State like Massachusetts. There are many other examples of what General Regulation 3 means in practical effect.

2. General Regulation 6, which holds wage increases down to a maximum of 10 percent above the January 1950 base, obviously perpetuates the low, substandard wages which now exist in the service and trade industries.

I repeat, nothing, absolutely nothing, has been done to get at the problem of substandard wages which exist in our industries. And these low wages will become more and more substandard as living costs rise while the National Wage Stabilization Board gives its attention exclusively to the problems in basic industry.

FIFTEEN MILLION OUT IN COLD

The problem of workers in service and trade is of major importance. First, because of the number of workers in these industries, and, second, because of the grievously low wage levels which now exist.

There are 15,000,000 workers in all branches of service and trade—as many workers as there are in all manufacturing industries combined. These 15,000,000 workers account for one-third of the total employment in all industry outside of agriculture. Most of these 15,000,000 workers are unorganized—which is one of the reasons for the low wages which exist.

WE'RE NOT EXPENDABLES

Whereas manufacturing industry is 80 to 100 percent organized, whereas coal mining, construction, railroads, etc., are almost completely organized—the service trades are only 20 to 39 percent organized. This, perhaps, is one reason why the National Wage Stabilization Board has paid so little attention to our problems. But this is a major reason for the problem of substandard wages—to which the Board must pay attention. Fifteen million workers with their families are a lot of people—their living standards are important. These people are not to be considered expendable in the current mobilization drive.

Contrast the wage levels of workers in other industries with those of workers in service and trade, and you get some idea of the problem of wage substandards:

Average hourly earnings in manufacturing are $1.51 an hour; in coal mining, $2.01 an hour; in railroading, $1.54 an hour; in construction, $2.04 an hour. (Labor Department figures for November 1950.)

But in service and trade—the average for all branches of retail trade combined is $1.20, and in such service industries as hotels, laundries, and cleaning plants only 80 cents, 88 cents, and $1.03 an hour, respectively.

But even these averages are misleading. Whereas under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act a 75-cent minimum is in effect, in service and trade workers are dependent on State legal minimums as low as 40, 50, and 60 cents an hour, and in some States no legal minimums exist at all.

TEN PERCENT ON 40 CENTS AN HOUR

Of what good is a 10-percent cost-of-living adjustment to a trade or service worker now getting a 40-cent rate? Such an adjustment does not even begin to correct for substandards. Obviously the Wage Board must set some figure as the dividing line between what is, and is not, substandard, perhaps $1 an hour, up to which wage increases should be legal without prior Board approval and without reference to other stabilization formulas.

OUR WAGES LAG FAR BEHIND

No flat percentage adjustment is enough in itself to cope with the wage problem in our industries. Service and trade workers have fallen behind other workers so far as their wage levels and living standards are concerned. For example:

According to Labor Department figures for November 1950, laundry workers averaged $35.82 a week. Expressed in purchasing power of 1939 dollars after adjustment for price inflation, the average laundry worker earned $20.28 a week compared with $17.69 in 1939, a net increase in real earnings of only $2.59 a week in 11 years, without allowing for the effect of taxes.

Manufacturing workers, on the other hand, earned $62.38 a week, or $35.31 in 1939 purchasing power, compared with earnings of $23.86 in 1939. Thus their real earnings have increased $11.45 a week. While real earnings of coal miners even before their last wage increase have risen $17.76 a week.

What is true of the way laundry workers have fallen behind workers in basic industry is true also of hotel workers, and of service and trade workers generally. Their earnings simply have not kept pace with the rise in over-all American productivity, with the result that millions of workers in our industries today are barely able to subsist.

SUBSISTENCE WAGES

At today's costs, the Labor Department estimates that a worker's family of four persons needs $75.50 a week to live on a minimum standard of decency in Washington, D. C.; $70.17 in New York; $67.76 a week in Midwestern Kansas City; $73.23 in San Francisco.

But in November 1950 the average American hotel worker made $34.66 a week; the average laundry worker, $35.82; the average worker in a cleaning and dyeing plant, $42.68; and the average worker in retail trade, $47.84.

This shocking disparity between what workers in trade and service now earn and need to have to live decently, the shocking disparities between wages of workers in our industries and in the rest of the American economy—must be narrowed. Substandards of living must be eliminated. We cannot have a healthy economy able to meet the demands of defense if one-third of all nonagricultural workers live perilously close to, or below, the level of subsistence.

We are faced with other problems, to which the Wage Board has given no attention, beyond freezing us entirely out of the picture. Take the 40-hour-week question, for example.

WE NEED 40-HOUR WEEK

Under normal collective bargaining, service and trade workers in unions like ours have slowly been negotiating contracts providing time and one-half for the sixth day. Most of these workers today still get straight time for the sixth day. Now comes the Wage Board. Its regulations bar us from getting time and one-half for the sixth day—except as an offset against the 10-percent cost-of-living formula under General Regulation 6.

This is a gross inequity, when we consider that most other workers—even on the railroads—now get time and one-half for the sixth day. During the last war Presidential Executive Order 9240 permitted the negotiation of new contracts allowing time and one-half after 40 hours. Today no such provision has been made under wage stabilization.

LOW WAGE WORKERS HURT MOST

Taken as a whole, the wage stabilization program is plainly discriminatory against the 15,000,000 workers in service and trade. It discriminates against the very workers whose wages are lowest, whose living standards are being most hurt by rising living costs.

Pressed between rising living costs and substandard wages in our industries, workers will look actively for employment elsewhere. They will be drawn out of service and

trade to plants where higher wages are paid, to the favored industries. Our employers will be unable to compete with these industries in holding their labor. Service and trade employers may want to raise wages and grant other economic inducements to their workers, but the character of the stabilization program is such that they will not be able to pay enough to hold their people. Unable to hold their workers, and to get replacements because of substandard wages, many of our employers face bankruptcy.

In effect the stabilization program discriminates against small business for the benefit of big business monopoly, because service and trade are made up of relatively small employers, and workers will be drawn away from these employers to the corporation giants in basic industry.

BLOW AT SMALL BUSINESS

Is it the purpose of the mobilization program to put small enterprise entirely out of business? Small business is at the basis of the free, competitive enterprise system. Is that system to be destroyed at the direction of the big business monopolists now running the stabilization program to suit themselves?

This is a serious question. That same question is being raised by many small-business men, was in fact raised just recently before the manpower subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee. Many small-business men have complained to that committee that present policies are forcing them to the wall by driving their key personnel to big business with its higher wage rates and defense contracts.

$1 MINIMUM DEMANDED

Obviously one answer is to end the discrimination against the trade and service industries by allowing them more freedom in raising wages. A high enough minimum—$1 or more—to eliminate substandards would help hold workers in these industries.

I don't know what all the answers are, but I do think that we in the service and trade unions need to think about these problems. I submit no one is going to bother about our needs, our problems, unless we make ourselves heard. And as a basis for further discussion this morning, I therefore make the following recommendations:

PROGRAM FOR JOINT ACTION

1. That the service and trade unions represented here today appoint a special committee to present our special problems to the National Wage Stabilization Board;

2. That the United Labor Policy Committee be requested to accept on that committee two representatives of the service and trade unions to participate in all policy discussions with the National Wage Stabilization Board, the Economic Stabilization Agency, and the Office of Defense Mobilization;

3. That the National Wage Stabilization Board be requested to create within the Board, on both the national and regional levels, a special tripartite Trade and Service Stabilization Commission to provide proper consideration for workers in our industries;

4. That, on the initiative of the internationals here represented, regional and area interunion conferences of local unions in trade and service be called to discuss ways and means of protecting the rights and living standards of workers in our industries before the regional wage stabilization boards. We must not forget that policy questions decided on the national level must be applied on the local level, in the cities and regions, and it is here that flexibility in the wage program on a case-by-case basis can be secured if our local unions are coordinated through appropriate machinery to get that flexibility out of the regional wage boards.

New Price Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, April 27, on the new price order:

NEW PRICE ORDER

The manufacturers' general ceiling price regulation is designed to correct the inequities of the January 26 price freeze. It applies to about 75,000 manufacturing concerns, some of which have raised their prices excessively—that is, increased them to an extent not justified by the post-Korean rise in labor and materials costs. Their ceiling prices will have to be lowered. On the other hand, in cases where prices have lagged behind post-Korean cost increases and the freeze order has prevented profitable operations, ceiling prices will be raised. The ceiling price in each case is the highest base-period price of a commodity (the base period being April 1 through June 24 or any one of the three preceding quarters), with adjustments for subsequent increases in the cost of labor and materials.

Wholesalers and retailers will also be required to reflect changes in manufacturers' prices. Similar regulations covering manufacturers' prices, applicable to various industries having special problems, will soon be issued and calculations required under the present order will be repeated in the near future to allow for the impact on costs of the regulation itself and other OPS regulations. For it is not practicable, as the price-control officials explain, for each producer to postpone calculations until other ceiling prices down the line have been determined.

Price control is a slow process, necessitating extensive preliminary study and involving a mass of paper work for the concerns affected. But so far as a layman can judge, the OPS is going about its herculean task in a systematic way and doing its best to correct the unavoidable inequities of the price freeze. The result will not be spectacular, although Price Stabilizer DiSalle thinks the new regulation will result in a reduction or roll-back in the general level of manufacturers' prices. At any rate, it will curb profiteering price increases, and pave the way for eventual replacement of general ceiling price regulations by specific dollars and cents price ceilings, thus making the task of enforcement much easier.

A Time for Reflection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rocky Mountain News of April 25, 1951:

A TIME FOR REFLECTION

It would be well if there could be at least a 48-hour moratorium on public statements incident to the MacArthur controversy—a period that could be devoted to serious study and reflection by everyone concerned.

This country is at war, and let's not forget it.

This is grave and awful business.

The present is not a time for hysteria, smear campaigns, or personal recrimination.

General MacArthur has stated his case, and he did it with dignity and restraint, abusing no one.

The questions he raised are not issues in a political campaign but matters of vital concern to the American people. They should be regarded in that light—and not as an attack on the Democrats or as political ammunition for the Republicans.

President Truman has been temperate in what he has had to say on the subject, and his side of the controversy deserves thoughtful consideration.

The overriding question with which we are concerned is Communist aggression—and whether the measures we have adopted are adequate to meet the challenge.

This demands a searching examination of the American position in all parts of the world, by the appropriate committees of Congress.

One of the MacArthur critics says the general will be asked why he believes Russia would not move elsewhere—say in Iran or Europe—if the Korean war were expanded by bombing the Red supply bases in Manchuria.

What could be more ridiculous than to pose such a question, that only the Kremlin can answer?

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who knows the Russians better than most people, believes Russia will go to war "only in accord with the program which has been developed by its leaders, and even then only if conditions are propitious."

It also is his opinion that our present superiority in atomic weapons may suffice to prevent war with Russia for the time being.

That is an informed guess, based on sound military considerations. But mere guessing isn't going to help us.

The immediate problem is how best to get out of the war in Korea in which we are presently involved, and then how to prepare against the larger war which threatens.

Quickening events on the Korean front may decide the issue there. Bullets speak louder than words, and bullets may determine whether the advocates of limited war were right or wrong.

Meanwhile there must be no lag in the preparations to meet a bigger war.

Those who say we will be ready to meet a Soviet attack by 1953 offer small comfort in face of the possibility that it may come sooner than that.

Instead of talking in terms of 1953, or even 1952, we should be asking ourselves how much more can we do right now, and during the remainder of 1951.

General MacArthur knows war as few Americans do. His views can be of great service to his country in this emergency, if the Democrats and Republicans will forget their differences long enough to hear him out.

Our other military leaders also should be heard, particularly those who know Asia and the Pacific area.

But the emphasis throughout should be on the immediate situation and the war which may come—not on past mistakes which cannot be recalled.

Asia has been the neglected front, to be sure. But what can be done now to make the best of a bad situation?

What areas can be saved that are vital to American security, either because of their

geographic position or their natural resources? What manpower is available to support an anti-Communist position? Would our resources be spread too thin by attempting to defend both oceans?

These are among the questions to be examined, in the search for a balanced, adequate defense program. What has been done belongs to history.

Houston American Legion Post Supports MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted at a special meeting of Houston Post, No. 52, American Legion, supporting the position of General MacArthur on far-eastern military policy and calling for an investigation of the State Department and the removal of Secretary Acheson:

"Be it remembered that pursuant to the request of the commander, Department of Texas, that each Legion post determine its opinion on the following questions, to establish a policy of the Department of Texas on foreign affairs, Houston Post, No. 52, at a special meeting of 300 of its members, on Thursday, April 19, 1951, at 8 p. m., did answer as follows:

"(a) Should the United States continue the delaying war confined to Korea only? Answer: No.

"(b) Should we blockade the China coast with our Navy? Answer: Yes.

"(c) Should we furnish equipment to Chiang Kai-shek for an invasion on the mainland of China? Answer: Yes.

"(d) Should we bomb the Manchurian bases? Answer: Yes.

"(e) Do we believe in the foreign policy as outlined by General MacArthur or do we believe in the foreign policy as outlined by the President in his radio broadcast, April 11? Answer: MacArthur; and further

"Whereas the State commander additionally points out that an undeniable crisis, perhaps the most ominous in the history of the United States does exist; and

"Whereas this crisis has been occasioned by the continued muddling in the field of foreign affairs by President Truman and Secretary Dean Acheson, culminating in the firing of General of the Armies MacArthur; and

"Whereas General MacArthur has proved in the highest possible measure a full and complete knowledge of Asiatic problems as evidenced by the success of his military and civil administration of Japan and other assignments handed him involving the Far East, in contrast to the innumerable mistakes in the European theater: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by this post that in addition to the above answers to questions submitted by the department commander,* That it is the sense of this post that the Department of Texas should reaffirm the resolution passed by the national convention of 1950 calling for an investigation of the activities of the State Department and of the Secretary of State and calling for the removal of Dean Acheson from that office. And further, in recognition of the fact that food and certain materials of war which we believe are being utilized to the detriment of our efforts in Korea, are reaching the Chinese Communists via several foreign nations which are receiving the same from us through various agencies of our Government that the recommended blockade of the China coast include all ports of entry irrespective of nationality or interests; and be it further

"*Resolved in expansion of question 4 submitted by the department commander,* That General MacArthur's recommendation No. 4 involving logistical support to Nationalist China's efforts should be complied with strictly; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the department commander in compliance with his instructions as contained in his directive and that a copy be sent to each of our Senators in Washington, to the Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, and to General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur."

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolutions adopted by unanimous vote at special meeting of American Legion Post, No. 52, Department of Texas, on Thursday, April 19, 1951.

JOHN L. COMPTON,
Post Commander.

Attest:

D. G. DAVIDSON,
Adjutant.

Communist Rule in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest Communist rule in Poland

Whereas the people of Poland are being deprived of religious and political freedom and are being subjected to indirect coercive methods of government and are the victims of Communist subjugation by an outside power, namely, Soviet Russia; and

Whereas these people in the vast majority are thoroughly imbued with democratic ideals and are opposed to totalitarianism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to protest the present communistic rule in Poland and the subjugation of the Polish people by an outside power, namely, Soviet Russia; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 5, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 10, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Future of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a memorandum to the President and the Congress of the United States prepared and accepted by the executive committee of the Slovak League of America on April 25, 1951:

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

As Americans of Slovak descent, we are naturally interested in, and vitally concerned about the future of Slovakia, the land which our forefathers and the succeeding generations of Slovaks have inhabited for the past 1,500 years.

The recognition of the inherent and God-given right of the Slovak nation to freedom and independence cannot concern us less than the recognition by the United States of this same right granted other nations of the civilized world.

The United States, we have been told over and over again, has never opposed the aspirations of any people in Europe to determine by their own free choice the state of form of political organization under which they wished to live. On the contrary, we have been repeatedly advised by responsible people in Government that self-determination has been a fundamental principle of President Woodrow Wilson, and that our Government has not departed from that policy even in the case of the Slovaks.

But the fact is that the principle of self-determination for all practical purposes, never did apply to the Slovak nation, and its inherent right to freedom and independence was not and still is not recognized or respected by the United States Government.

The Slovak League of America, the civic and cultural institution of Americans of Slovak descent and outspoken champion of the rights and liberties of the Slovak Nation, again strongly urges the Government of the United States to recognize and respect the right of the Slovak Nation to freedom and independence and to offer such moral, political, and material support to patriotic representatives of the Slovak people in exile, namely to the Slovak National Council Abroad, as is offered to other representative nationality groups of the nations behind the iron curtain.

The Slovak Nation is not a young or a new nation. It is in fact one of the oldest nations of central Europe, and it is a Christian nation.

As Americans, we firmly believe in the principle of the inalienable right of all men and all nations without exception to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If that is the belief of the people representing the United States Government at this time, they must manifest it clearly and concretely without fear of equivocation in all departments and agencies of Government. The United States must make it unmistakably clear that it does not and shall not recognize and favor any representatives of the Czech or Slovak nations who do not recognize and respect the inherent right of the Slovak people to freedom and independence.

The Slovak Nation, forced behind the iron curtain by Dr. Edward Benes and the victorious United Nations, and its representatives in exile are not willing to toil and sweat, to suffer and die to regain positions for bankrupt, professional politicians, even

though they are favored by the United States Government and the governments of other democratic countries. But they are most willing to suffer and sacrifice their lives for the ideals of real democracy and freedom.

The Slovak people at home and in exile are anxiously waiting to hear the Government of the United States tell them clearly and unequivocally whether America intends to recognize and respect their right to freedom and independence.

For the past 10 centuries the Slovak people were dominated by nations and political systems that tended to destroy the foundations of their national structure, nay their very national existence. The Slovaks have been and still are persecuted and exploited by aliens who are hostile to their national and religious traditions. Today they are enslaved by the proponents of the ruinous ideology of godless communism which they had consistently rejected and resisted openly for over a hundred years. The Slovaks find themselves in this terrible predicament through no fault of their own. They had no choice in the matter. The irony of all this predicament still seems to be favored by the United States Government and other democratic governments.

The Slovak Nation has had its fill of the political system represented by Czechoslovakia and, presently, by the Czech National Socialists, other Czech groups, and the so-called Czechoslovaks in exile. The Slovak nation has had enough of Zenkl and Papánek, Ripka, and Lettrich and their ilk, who reminds it so much of Gottwald and his followers.

We state most emphatically that we consider it immoral and undemocratic to give moral, political, and material help to people who have in the past denied the right of self-determination to the Slovak nation and who, even today, proclaim that the Slovaks have no right to freedom and independence. They are the so-styled Czechoslovaks, the pseudo-democrats, who have used and abused—and are still using and abusing—American democracy for their own interests and are compromising the good name of the United States.

We strongly urge the resolution of the Czechoslovak question for once and for all time. American interests and the interests of the democratic world at large are ill-served by supporting bankrupt Czech politicians and former Red collaborators who propagate the fiction of a united Czechoslovak Nation. The Government of the United States and all other democratic governments of the world must recognize the fact that has been so apparent to both the Slovak and the Czech peoples for quite some time—the Czechs are not and do not want to be Slovaks, and the Slovaks are not and do not want to be Czechs.

If it is the policy of our Government to refuse to recognize the Slovak Nation and its patriotic representatives in exile; if our State Department is determined to continue a policy which threatens the very existence of the Slovak Nation; if the persons in the United States Government are determined to force the Slovaks under the rule of the Czechs, then we believe the Government of the United States should in justice inform the American public accordingly.

As Americans, united in the Slovak League of America, we plead for the recognition of the fundamental rights of the people we are descended from. Those rights are predicated in the elementary principle that all peoples, wherever they may be found and however few their numbers, are morally entitled to speak in the council of nations, there to defend their rights to survival and self-fulfillment. The right of self-determination cannot be exercised vicariously; liberty is not exercised by proxy. In the peaceful and orderly reconstruction of the world, all peoples must have a voice in the determination of their futures, their destinies. The Slovak Nation must not be excepted. A just and lasting peace can become a reality only if the fundamentals of democracy, the principles of right and justice, are applied to all nations and denied to none.

The Slovak League of America, representing an overwhelming majority of organized Americans of Slovak descent, earnestly appeals to the President and the Congress of the United States of America not to fail the Slovak Nation in this hour of peril and persecution. The recognition of the inherent and God-given right of the Slovak Nation to freedom and independence will give aid and comfort and hope to the oppressed millions behind the iron curtain in Slovakia and added initiative to thousands of her patriotic sons in exile. The recognition would also serve the best interests of America and the rest of the democratic world. The Slovaks have fought against the plague of communism for over a hundred years and today are determined to resist and fight it more than ever before.

The Slovaks, however, need encouragement in this their darkest hour from the United States and the other democracies. They are in the fight against communism primarily because they still firmly believe that godless communism is the greatest evil humanity has ever been exposed to, but the Slovaks are also vitally interested in their own freedom and independence.

To tell the people of Slovakia that they must resist communism in the name of Czechoslovak democracy, or in the name of the Czechoslovak Republic, or in the name of Dr. Edward Benes—such propaganda is all wrong. Nay, it is immoral and undemocratic. Such propaganda only tends to drive the Slovaks into despair and, therefore, into the arms of Stalin, whose agents are ever on the alert to use such propaganda to their own advantage against the United States and the other democracies by telling the Slovaks that western democracies are not interested in Slovak freedom and independence. It is no secret that Moscow is ever ready to have her agents in Slovakia proclaim the independence of Slovakia and incorporate her into the U. S. S. R.

The Slovak League of America strongly urges the United States Government not to abandon the principle of nationality—the ethnic principle—in the case of the Slovak Nation. We sincerely believe it is a more effective weapon against communism and all totalitarian systems than the A-bomb. The United States and the other western democracies must not fail the Slovak Nation in its darkest hour.

APRIL 25, 1951.

For the Slovak League of America:

P. A. HROBAK,
President.
FRANCIS HRUBOVSKY,
Secretary.
FRANK J. GURCAK,
Treasurer.
MICHAEL REHAK,
JOSEPH G. PRUSA,
PAUL JAMRISKA,
Dr. PETER P. HLETKO,
Executive Committee.

As Reason Replaces Emotionalism Opposition To Starting Big War Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an excerpt from Frank Edwards' broadcast of April 30, 1951, over Mutual Broadcasting System, which follows:

About 2 weeks ago I asked you folks a question: Should we invade the Chinese mainland? Some irate listeners wrote to tell me that no one was even thinking about such a thing—a statement which has been disproved by subsequent events. One general and several Senators have all advocated the use of American fliers and sailors as our contribution to taking part in an invasion of China by Nationalist troops. Senator CAIN, Washington Republican, presented a resolution asking Congress to declare war on China.

My listeners sent in more than 96,000 replies to the question: Should we invade the Chinese mainland?

The first 16,000 ran about 5 to 1 against invasion. By the time we had reached the 60,000 mark the score was running 7½ to 1 against invasion of the Chinese mainland.

And we noticed this very interesting aspect of the poll: After Senator CAIN's pronouncement asking for war with China—the cards postmarked after that date ran heavily in opposition to CAIN's proposal—the final 30,000 cards ran 30 to 1 against invading China.

The count showed that the tide of opinion among my listeners gained momentum as time went on. As reason began to replace emotionalism, perhaps we might say, the flood of cards showed an increasingly heavy opposition to starting a big war to get out of a little one.

To all those who so kindly took time and trouble to cast their votes by postal on this very important issue, my sincere thanks. It is a rare privilege in our times to be able to express your opinions with complete freedom and without fear. Most of the people of the world do not have that privilege—others who have had it have lost it because they never used it. Freedom is strongest and healthiest when it is kept in action.

Proposed Legislation Relative to Persons and Corporations Doing Business With Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to publish the names of all persons, firms, and corporations who are doing business with Communist countries and to bar them from doing business with the United States Government or with any agency thereof

Whereas the Government of the United States is in the process of preparing itself against aggression by Communist countries; and

Whereas there are certain persons, firms, and corporations which continue to do business with such Communist countries and to provide them with essential materials of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such actions as may be necesary to publish the names of all persons, firms, and corporations which are

doing business with Communist countries and to enact legislation barring such persons, firms, and corporations from doing business with or entering into contracts with the United States Government or with any agency thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth send forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 5, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 10, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Ten Honest Politicians—Liberty Awards, Eighty-second Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, recently 10 Members of Congress were honored by awards from Liberty magazine. It gives me real pleasure to include the tributes paid to these outstanding citizens and legislators in Liberty:

TEN HONEST POLITICIANS—LIBERTY AWARDS, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Today Congress legislates more, spends more, and has greater influence on the fate of people the world over than any similar body in history. How worthy are the 531 Representatives and Senators who have so much power?

Liberty spotlights 10 outstanding, honest politicians in the Eighty-second Congress. There are others who merit inclusion, but these 10 are leading examples. They are not just politicians who keep out of trouble and in office; they are dynamic and outspoken. They are not the hacks who have made the words phony and politician interchangeable.

These lawmakers were picked because Liberty believes they all sincerely try to serve the people—though they represent varied, conflicting viewpoints. The 10 deserve respect because they have risked their political necks for principles, and have been able enough politicians to win elections without selling their souls. They are in the tradition of Teddy Roosevelt, Al Smith, FDR, and LaGuardia. Some are straight party men, some are independents, but be they regulars or mavericks no boss casts their vote and the only strings are to their conscience.

Here are sound reasons why these meet the test—and why some others failed to qualify:

They refuse to be errand boys for pressure groups or front for special interests.

By investigation and study they know issues and know why they vote the way they do. By becoming experts in special fields they provide leadership for the rest of Congress.

They are not fanatics nor are they troubadours for funny money, pie-in-the-sky, panaceas and give-away programs. Serious and sane, they put in twice as many hours as most of their constituents.

You never find them wrapped in a sanctimonious cloud while hatchet men run around doing dirty political chores for them. Their left hand knows what their right hand does, and both hands are clean. They don't "yes" the little people privately and vote against them on the floor.

They never use congressional immunity to say anything they wouldn't repeat to your face.

They are not glamour politicians wracked by lust for publicity. Surrounded by prima donnas they are team workers, ready to act even if a colleague gets the credit.

They would rather be right than President—and it is entirely possible that some of them may be both. All are good material.

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York, has won more political successes than any living American. After a brilliant record as governor, he refused to regard the Senate as retirement. Serving a 1-year term in 1949, LEHMAN became a "young Turk," rallied less energetic Democrats to the Fair Deal, and helped put over the DP bill. When a crude measure to control subversives (McCarran Act) was introduced shortly before election LEHMAN waged a hard, lonely fight. The majority, convinced it was suicidal to object, shamefacedly passed it. Last fall LEHMAN diligently explained to the voters that the real issue was the bill of rights. He ran a million votes ahead of his party. "When you take a risky stand to defend a principle," he says, "you may lose votes temporarily but you establish a reputation for independence. If you're building a political career, it's reputation and the general impression that count most."

Representative HUGH MITCHELL has, at 43, an elder statesman's distinction of having been Democratic Senator from Washington and now serving the House. Had he not championed necessary but unpopular price controls in 1946, he could have saved his Senate seat. Today the voters say they are tired of big real estate and banking influences and would like MITCHELL back in the Senate. Either MITCHELL or his colleague, HENRY JACKSON, will run in 1952.

First to propose a Columbia Valley Authority (similar to TVA), a champion of middle income housing, MITCHELL is respected as a leader with a long view. He will win his finest laurels in the international field if he can put through his plan for a Pacific Marshall plan. "Democracy must become a shattering force in raising the hopes of millions in Asia," he declares. A Mitchell plan might avert a war by removing the cause. He intends to fight for it.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, in his sweeping campaign for reelection last fall, closed each speech with these words: "I don't want anybody to vote for me who doesn't want me back to Congress a free man—absolutely free to exercise my judgment on the merits of an issue in accordance with the facts as I find them. Also, I don't want a single isolationist vote; isolationism offers you a war you can't win."

A skilled tactician, MORSE piloted the world court measure through the Senate, generaled the fight against Taft-Hartley, and now keeps a sharp eye on power-greedy brass hats.

MORSE believes his party has a genius for snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. In 1947 he warned Republican bosses that if they neglected public demands, they would wake up the morning after the 1948 election to find the Democrats in. Which is exactly what happened.

Representative CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, though warned by old-timers to let sleeping dogs lie, insisted on making his maiden congressional speech a challenge to JOHN RANKIN's anti-Negro anti-Jewish tirades. A Republican, CASE firmly believes "people will never join our party in the South until we Republicans offer an alternative." CASE works "for a party that keeps its doors open to all groups; we must avoid being a class party."

Labor is enthusiastic over his stanch fight against antiunion curbs. His conservative Republican constituents, a little breathless keeping up, respect and reelect him solidly. Weekly he discusses issues with them, currently emphasizing practical steps for international cooperation. Should his party ever switch to CASE's brand of Republicanism it might win some astonishing victories and CASE would rise as a national personality.

Senator JAMES DUFF, of Pennsylvania, explains why his political obituary keeps reappearing: "Because I play table stakes." He'll gamble everything rather than trim or compromise. This independence dates to his service as a Bull Moose elector for Teddy Roosevelt. His first act as Pennsylvania's Governor was to throw the manufacturer's association "fix" man out of his office, and set up a vast water project "cleansing the filthy cesspools so that now you can see a silver dollar 5 feet down." Trying to purify the Republican Party, DUFF was crushed when the Grundy machine steamrollered Dewey's nomination in '48. He took the issue of Grundyism to the people and humiliated the bosses. He feels his party can talk Presidential candidates only "after developing a sound political philosophy." DUFF, who fights TAFT's isolationism and regards Dewey as a "lip-service liberal," might be the man.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, looks back to 1921 "when I introduced a law in the State legislature making it an offense to wear disguises for the purpose of terrifying anybody." He thinks this blow against the KKK the proudest risk of a career packed with battles against predatory bullies.

As co-author of the Robinson-Patman Act his name is a milestone in antitrust law. Last year he led an aggressive fight against "basing points," a device by big steel companies to raise steel prices by charging customers for nonexistent freight.

Few Congressmen are equipped to deal with the lawyer lobbyists of corporations and cartels. The public must rely on wise WRIGHT PATMAN to protect it, and keep small business and free competition alive. Had he made a deal with the oil companies the political escalator was waiting for him—but PATMAN would rather be right.

Representative HENRY JACKSON, 38-year-old Democrat, of Washington, has spent 10 impatient years in Congress struggling for more electric power, more production, more industrial development, more things for more people at less cost.

As a congressional watchdog on atomic energy he stoutly defended civilian director Lilienthal against efforts to smear his efficient administration. JACKSON angrily labeled Senator HICKENLOOPER's bumbling charges "a carnival of confusion" and insisted this vital project be free of political and military interference.

A keen constitutional lawyer, JACKSON fights Communists without destroying individual liberties. A great champion of labor, he wants resources exploited, not people. In Washington State they would like him as governor, or to send him to the Senate if his colleague HUGH MITCHELL isn't the candidate. Wherever he serves, he'll be doing a job for the people.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, is the voice of the South. Called an unreconstructed Georgian by liberals he likes to point to free lunches for United States school children and the farm security program as proof that he has political know-how while others talk.

He was the southern bloc's choice against Truman in 1948. The Dixiecrats bolted to hold a separate convention, but RUSSELL refused their nomination, preferring to remain a regular Democrat, thereby saving his party from collapse. He may be compared to Henry Clay.

A popular orator he refuses "to play Dixie on the heartstrings." In 1936 he trounced

Gene Talmadge in an acrid campaign and today at 53 he is the Senate's master parliamentarian, an adroit and powerful lawmaker. While RUSSELL gallantly shields old traditions he also champions profound measures which hasten the day when Southern attitudes will be extinct.

Representative JACK JAVITS, Republican, of New York, keeps winning in Tammany's bailiwick. He thinks his party could win everywhere if it adopted his zealous strategy of "the feasible alternative. Not just opposition but come up with some positive answers." He is one of the few Congressmen who has not wavered on civil liberties at home and who opposes alliances with Fascists abroad. While working to speed wheat to India he said "fighting communism must involve economic and spiritual forces as well as military."

JAVITS feels he makes his real impact speaking. On countless TV, radio programs and forums he explains issues and answers questions. Appearing outside his district he often sparks a community to make demands which help put something through Congress that no amount of debate or politicking could do. He says "the public really holds the whip."

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, but for her enemies, would merely be known as the first woman to enter the Senate strictly on her own merit. Last year she issued a "declaration of conscience"—a clarion call for Congress to make a stand for decency. Leveling fire on Senator MCCARTHY, she denounced efforts to turn Congress into a forum of hate. Those who hoped to ride to a Republican victory through the selfish political exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance and intolerance winced under her seething indictment. The MCCARTHY bloc is now sharpening knives for vengeance against Mrs. SMITH.

With her New England conscience the Senator combines a sincere human approach which has given Maine an effective Washington advocate. She likes to have major issues thoroughly discussed at home before voting on them. In Maine, frankness is a political asset.

Banks' 1950 Profits Are Greatest Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, April 30, 1951:

BANKS' 1950 PROFITS ARE GREATEST EVER

Bank profits in 1950 were the greatest in history, Maple T. Harl, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), said yesterday.

Reports from the 13,446 FDIC-insured commercial banks showed net profits after taxes amounted to $937,000,000, a 13-percent gain over 1949, he said, adding:

"Stockholders of the banks shared directly in this prosperity, with record dividends of $391,000,000, or 42 percent of net profits after taxes."

The profits after taxes, Harl said, represented "an average of 27.72 percent on basic common capital and 8.51 percent on total capital accounts, the highest rate of profits since 1946."

The FDIC Chairman described dividend payments to common stockholders as equivalent to "a direct return of 11.45 percent on this stock, the highest dividend payment in the history of the Corporation (FDIC)."

"On May 12," Harl said, "we will cross the threshold of the eighth year in which there has been no receivership of an insured bank, nor a penny's loss to any depositor in an insured bank. This represents an all-time record for depositors' safety in this Nation."

He declared that loans—which the Government has lately been trying to stem for anti-inflation purposes—reached at the end of 1950 the highest point ever up to that time.

The loan rise accounted for most of the gain in bank earnings—gross current operating earnings were an unprecedented $3,931,000,000—as the average rate of return on loans advanced slightly to 4.34 percent.

Total income from loans rose 14 percent over 1949 to a $2,008,000,000 total, while interest on United States Government securities was practically unchanged at $1,015,000,000.

Address of Justice William O. Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT SUTTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, very graciously accepted an invitation to address the general assembly, in joint session, of the State of Tennessee. Under permission heretofore granted, I insert Justice Douglas' remarks in the RECORD. His observations are very interesting and most enlightening indeed. I am sure that the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will greatly enjoy the expressions of our eminent jurist:

ADDRESS OF MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 22, 1951

TENNESSEE ACROSS THE WORLD

The invitation to address the Tennessee Legislature is an honor I will always cherish. The distinction has special value to me because of the ties I have to this Commonwealth. They are not ties of birth or residence. They are in part ties of friendship with members of this body, with Tennesssee lawyers, with Tennessee fishermen and hunters, and with a long and illustrious line of Senators and Representatives to the Congress. The list is too long to mention; but you will appreciate the quality of these friends and their enduring nature when I say that the Dean of them all is Cordell Hull, of Carthage.

By reason of her distinguished sons, Tennessee had a hold on me long before I ever walked her ridges or explored her lakes. Tennessee so far has given the Nation three Presidents—Andrew Jackson, James Polk, and Andrew Johnson. These were special heroes of mine. Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson were men of tough fiber who believed in democracy and would fight its opponents to the death. Polk too had a special claim to my affections. It was Polk who saved the Pacific Northwest (and the special part of the old Oregon Territory which is my home) for the United States.

In later years I came to identify Tennessee with distinguished lawyers and jurists. I knew Grafton Green, the late Chief Justice, and was privileged to call him a friend. Five Tennessee lawyers have served on the Supreme Court of the United States: John Catron (1837-65), Howell E. Jackson (1893-95), Horace T. Lurton (1909-14), Edward T. Sanford (1923-30), James C. McReynolds (1914-41).

Each of these men, true to the character of his State, was a strong individualist with values to which he was as devoted as Andrew Jackson was to his. These men helped give the Court the quality of independence which has distinguished its long history.

Recorded history could produce many more examples that are illustrative of the strength which Tennessee has given the Nation. During the journeys I made the last two summers into the villages of Asia I learned what hope Tennessee has given the world.

It may come as a surprise even to Tennesseans to learn that the word "Tennessee" is well known all the way across from the Mediterranean to the Pacific. To millions of people in that area the word is, indeed, the symbol of a new order, a new way of life—security and independence for themselves and their children.

They know about Tennessee because they have heard of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is the Tennessee Valley Authority that fits their needs and will solve many of their basic problems. The TVA can also be utilized as one of the major influence to turn back the tide of communism which today threatens to engulf Asia.

The country I speak of is the vast underbelly of Russia that extends from Lebanon and Syria on the west through India on the east. Its geography tells in part the interest of the people of the region in the TVA. The Lebanon Mountains rise from the Mediterranean and form a high barricade where moisture collects. This range once covered with juniper, pine, and the famous cedars of Lebanon is now mostly bare. The Lebanon Mountains extend south and become geologically the Mountains of Judea where Jerusalem sits. Judea too has long been shorn of trees.

East of the Lebanon Mountains some 20 miles is the Anti-Lebanon range guarded over by Mount Hermon of Biblical fame. This range is also mostly deforested. The Anti-Lebanon runs south to form the Mountains of Moab, where Moses is buried. Moab like Judea has been scrubbed clean of trees. In between Moab and Judea runs the Jordan.

East of the Anti-Lebanon is Damascus, an oasis that sits on the edge of a vast desertic steppe running 461 miles to Baghdad, Iraq. It is an empty domain where anyone but a Bedouin would get lost and die of thirst.

Baghdad sits in between the Tigris and Euphrates and not far north of their confluence. It is the center of the ancient Mesopotamia. Beyond it to the east 200 miles are the Zagros Mountains which form the western border of Persia. These are high mountains, rising 15,000 feet. On their east are high plateaus and basins broken by minor ridges that run to Afghanistan and Pakistan and finally to India.

All of this vast domain is practically treeless. In ancient days the interior was rich in oak and juniper. Now one can ride horseback for days on end and see no trees except date orchards in Iraq or peaches and apricots in Persia or such poplars as may have been planted in a village. The region is treeless because of the goat. But for the goat new forests would have grown when the old ones were cut for lumber and charcoal. The goat, however, ate the seedlings. Unrestricted grazing and uncontrolled cutting of trees produced erosion the like of which Americans have never seen. The trees are all gone; the grass is going; hundreds of thousands of acres have been despoiled.

The result is that rains and snow water run off in torrents, washing top soil away. Some parts of this inland empire get only 20 inches of rain a year; and it is mostly wasted. Other sections, such as portions of India, are heavy with rain; but it too comes and goes in a roar. There may be 40 to 60 inches a year; and yet no water is left for the growing season.

To the people of this area TVA means the harnessing of floods, the storing of rain water and the installation of modern irrigation systems. Everywhere I went people asked, "Why can't we have a TVA?"

A Druse chieftain south of Damascus inquired about it. I was asked about it many times as I traveled the length of the Tigris and Euphrates. Below Baghdad I saw 50,000 people homeless by reason of a flood. They, too, had heard of the TVA and wanted one for themselves.

In Persia I traveled the length of the Zagros Range—from the Russian border in the north to the Persian Gulf on the south. In practically every valley I heard the same plea, "We need a TVA."

In New Delhi, Nehru, Prasad, and other high officials of India spoke enthusiastically about their many projects of reform. Yet their eyes lighted up the most when they mentioned India's four new TVA's that come into operation in 1951 and the great TVA on the Kosi River (still in blueprint) that will overshadow anything we in America have ever known.

Yes, the Tennessee Valley Authority has caught the imagination of all the people across this broad belt of Asia. They think of it as a device for insuring crops in a land where crop failures mean death from starvation. TVA also means to them increased productivity of the land, new forests, the end of erosion, modern methods of farming.

TVA means more than this. The Middle East and southeast Asia are areas which have long been exploited. Huge profits have been taken out of the region; few profits have ever been left for the social and economic development of these countries. Some foreign power has for centuries bled those nations white. The TVA is a community project whereby the benefits accrue to all the people, not to a few promoters. Some call this socialism. But the people of Asia are not bothered by labels. It is the result that counts; and one thing they like about TVA is that it is a device which avoids exploitation of the many by the few.

The TVA is even more than that. It represents an idea that at this juncture of history can be utilized on behalf of civilization against the threat of totalitarian communism.

If we are bold enough to make this device an instrument of our Asiatic foreign policy, we can take the political initiative away from Soviet Russia, turn the tide, and win country after country for the democratic cause. The reason the TVA can have that profound and revolutionary effect is due to the character of the problem that confronts Asia.

We in America are apt to think of Asia in terms of teeming millions who live in squalor and who are doomed to stay there. Poverty, lack of medical care, and illiteracy are, indeed, the first to meet the eye of the newcomer to that area. But the future of Asia is bright if we will only study its potential. And the alliance of Asia to the democratic front can be steadfast, if we heed the warnings and sponsor liberal political groups rather than reactionary ones.

The rock bottom of Asia's problem is landlordism. By and large the governments of Asia are of the landlords, by the landlords, and for the landlords. India under Nehru is an exception, for Nehru is splitting up the huge estates and distributing the land on an installment basis to the peasants. Persia under Razmara can easily be another exception. The recent announcement by the Shah of Persia of the sale of the Royal lands to the peasants points the way.

In this part of the world the land for centuries has been owned by a few. The rent is usually on shares. It runs as high as 80 percent of the crop. The tenant is customarily in debt to the landlord on loans paying interest of 20, 40, and even 100 percent. So his actual share of the crop is often much less than 20 percent. He is bound to the landlord throughout all time. His grandsons will be serfs just as he is and just as his great-grandfather was.

A few men may own a whole nation. It is not uncommon to find one man owning 100, 200, 600 villages. The profits are exported abroad or at least not reinvested in the villages; the life of the villages goes on as it did centuries ago; men and women live in squalor under an extortionate tenancy. There are no schools, no doctors, no first-aid centers. The peasant has about concluded he has no escape from his tenancy except by revolution.

There are grumblings in every village I have visited across this broad belt. Revolution is brewing. It's the kind of revolution the stalwart sons of Tennessee once brewed. If we in America knew the facts and appreciated what was at stake, we would be on the side of these miserable tenants. We would help them make their revolutions. We would help them make their revolutions in the pattern of our own American Revolution.

Unfortunately, we do not do that. As a result of a combination or circumstances, we are mostly signed up on the side of the landlords. In Asia change is certain; but it is not necessarily a change to communism. To Asiatics we appear to be against change. We strive for stability in governments when there can be no stability. We aline ourselves with the status quo; and as a consequence America becomes identified in the eyes of the peasants of Asia with the forces that hold them in their eternal serfdom. Soviet propaganda about America, these peasants often told me, is proved to be correct. We talk democracy and peace and in our foreign policies support persons and governments and policies that make democracy and peace impossible in Asia.

This criticism of America is not fair; we intend no such consequences. It is, however, a product of our wholly negative attitude. In our foreign policy we are merely anti-Communist. We have not become identified in the eyes of the peasants of Asia with their aspirations. The opposite has in fact been the case. We have been so violently and relentlessly anti-Communist that we have rushed to the support of every group that opposes Soviet communism. That has put us in partnership with the corrupt and reactionary groups whose policies breed the discontent on which Soviet communism feeds and spreads. Thus we have ended up as allies of some of the worst foes of the peoples of Asia.

It is easy to reverse the trend. We can begin by utilizing the idea of the TVA as the political instrument for remodeling the economy of Asia. Take the Tigris and Euphrates as an example. Today 200 men own and control Iraq. Three million five hundred thousand people are the poverty-ridden, diseased, and illiterate employees of this group. A TVA on the Tigris and Euphrates could rather quickly alter this condition. If a TVA were constructed, it could provide the conditions which would transform this poverty belt into a prosperous area. It could create an economy based on a democratic rather than a communistic foundation. If a TVA is built, American capital will largely build it. We therefore can attach conditions to it—conditions similar to the ones that settled our own West and that prevented for all time the ancient problem of landlordism from haunting this Nation. The basic condition is that every man who works the land shall own it and that no man shall own more than say, 30 acres.

This undertaking would have profound effects on both the problem of the standard of living in this area and on the problem of population. It would at once spread the dividends of increased production among the broad base of the peasants and lay the foundation for medical care, schools, and all of the other necessities of healthy village life. It would, moreover, supply the largest part of the answer to the population problem. Iraq today has 3,500,000 people; Persia, 16,000,000. With proper land utilization Iraq could support 40,000,000; Persia, 100,000,000. We think of India as overpopulated. Her 400,000,000, located on tired and saturated land, seem to us to create an insoluble problem. Nehru, however, is convinced that India is underpopulated; and after seeing India's potential I am inclined to agree. India's TVA's can greatly increase the fertility and productivity of the earth. India's TVA's can start vast industrial projects. India's future is bright. Her natural resources are great. She has, for example, richer iron deposits than we ever knew in America. Her electric power potential is unequaled. There is no reason why India cannot enjoy as high a standard of living as our own.

If America sponsored the kind of TVA in Asia that we sponsor at home, the political tide would soon turn our way. Deep in the hearts of each of Asia's peasants is the desire to own land. He wants to be able to fence it, to call it his own. Land ownership is a real passion. The Soviets know it. In the propaganda which they beam to Asia or spread by word of mouth, they do not talk of collective farms. Instead they promise every tenant his own farm. While the Soviets are talking, we of the Western World can promote actual projects. We can be the promoters of living TVA's in this entire area which will make the farmers the landowners.

Today the peasants in these countries have little to fight for. Today they will not form armies of strength and determination against Soviet communism. They will not rise up and fight for their landlords. They have been too long exploited. They cannot be expected to form reliable armies in defense of the system which has held them in their lowly estate. They must have ideas of freedom for which to fight. Those ideas must be concrete and specific. For example, once the Communists in China changed from Marxist slogans to agrarian projects that caught the imagination of the peasants; they began to march to victories. People are the same the world over. Armies that fight to the bitter end are armies that fight for ideas. The aim of the Soviet influence is to produce native armies that will fight for the projects of Soviet Russia. There is no reason why the democratic world cannot do the same. Our task is in many respects easier than Russia's. For in Asia, Russia is the much-suspected neighbor whose Marxist philosophy has precious little appeal even to the masses.

If the peasants of Asia are given personal stakes in their countries, they will rally in defense. While they will not rise up and fight for their landlords, they will rise up and fight for their own. Only when those conditions exist can we build security in that area.

We of the Western World have sacrificed our strength in Asia because we have been purely on the defensive. We let China go communistic, because we attached no conditions to the $2,000,000,000 we advanced to Chiang Kai-shek. If we had insisted on reforms as a condition of our help and supervised the expenditure of the great wealth we poured into China, the chances are China would not be Communist today.

To date most of the funds we have spent in Asia have been wasted. In spite of our expenditures the democratic world has been

growing smaller and smaller. The truth is that we cannot save the world from communism by dollars. We can, however, save it from communism by a liberal, aggressive, positive program of reform.

The TVA is a great political invention of the century. It has made Tennessee a word with revolutionary overtones the world around. Tennessee is today a word that inspires millions of Asiatics to the hope of a better life. The concept of water control and land utilization which the TVA embodies can become the solvent of the main problems of Asia. The idea of the TVA can become even more than that. It can be made the major influence for obtaining in Asia a verdict against communism and for civilization.

Appearance of General MacArthur Before House Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES T. PATTERSON IN CONNECTION WITH HIS INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE APPEARANCE OF GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN PUBLIC HEARING

The awful enormity of military operations in Korea has strengthened my conviction that it is the duty of Congress to determine that American lives shall not be lost needlessly in this conflict.

A half-informed Congress can accomplish little more than an uninformed Congress. It is ridiculous to assume that the scheduled hearings before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate will resolve the extreme doubt which many Members of Congress have as to the wisdom of the present course of action in Korea. Further, executive sessions will serve to increase that doubt beyond reasonable proportions.

Feeling that now is the time to take the American people into our confidence, I have proposed by resolution that the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall, upon completion of the Senate hearings, conduct a full, open public inquiry to which General MacArthur and Defense Department representatives will be invited to testify. It is expected that invitations would be issued to Secretary Marshall, Secretary Acheson, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as to others with special knowledge of our policies, both diplomatic and military, in Korea and on the continent of Asia.

The future security of the world depends upon the wisdom of our decisions. Personalities have no place in those decisions. The Congress is desirous of being fully informed and acting upon the information obtained.

Vehement attacks upon the President of the United States and upon General MacArthur, both in and beyond the confines of the Congress, make it mandatory that we hear both views as to the conduct of military and diplomatic operations in the Far East. The American people have split terribly over recent events, and despair instead of hope has pervaded our Nation. The people sincerely want to believe in the principles which brought our forces to Korea. They sincerely want to have us, as a nation, resist aggression. And, above all, they want to secure a just peace and an enduring one so that their children and their children's children shall not have to make war with despots.

I trust that my resolution will be adopted by the House and that the Armed Services Committee will conduct such an inquiry in the same nonpartisan manner in which all other deliberations of the committee have been held.

The Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BLAIR MOODY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Adding Machine Co., at the annual Michigan congressional dinner, held in this city on April 30 last. The address was on the subject of the free-enterprise system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Detroit is about to celebrate its anniversary of 250 years. But, let no one say the city is old. Look at the headlines. They tell of the need for strength. And to whom does the Nation turn?—to young and dynamic Detroit. In World War II, without partisan interest, we fulfilled our commission, and we will fulfill it today.

Upon all of us, gentlemen, now rest new and grave obligations. There was a time when the typical company president was totally absorbed in the single purpose of running his own business. He had no extra curricular activities. He did not preside at community chest luncheons. He did not appear on television. He did not mount the rostrum at this association meeting or that convenion. He was not an airline commuter. He could be found in town and at his desk. And patient vice presidents had no reason to remind him that the company was in business to make a profit.

Why do we leave our desks and apply ourselves to problems outside the immediate commission of our boards of directors? In a free society, there is no escape from social responsibilities. And this is true for all of us, whatever our job. The citizen who will not dirty his hands with politics soon gets a brand of politics which is plenty dirty. He gets what he deserves and it may be he gets dictatorship.

Similarly, corporations ignore at their peril the world beyond their board rooms. For the problems of the world certainly will not pass the corporation by. The impact of taxation, social security, labor legislation, and banking policy on our daily business is clear and direct. But in the broader issues of foreign trade, of peace and war, of the ideals and purposes of a free society—in all of these too, the corporation as the representative unit of our economic system is inextricably mixed.

It may be right to call a corporation a legal fiction; but within its gates, millions of Americans spend most of their waking hours. To them, it is far from fiction. It touches intimately their homes and families. It is a factor in local affairs. Its representatives spread its influence across the country, and often, through subsidiaries or agents, to the world overseas.

The corporation is not an organ of the state, but surely it is an organ of society. On Government rests a broad jurisdiction. But the corporation, too, has rights. It, too, has its appro,riate sphere of action and its indispensable functions. These two, Government and industry, are not contestants in a struggle. They are partners in a common cause; that of the fulfillment of the individual man. And if this purpose is not pursued in harmony, it cannot be achieved at all. Tonight, therefore, here in Washington, before my colleagues of Michigan industry, I am encouraged to make a few remarks on our part in that elusive harmony.

Let me begin, gentlemen, by saying that we must first be aware of our own place in society. To determine this is not as easy as it seems. If we manage to snatch a few moments to look up some things people may have written on this subject, we meet with violently contradictory assertions. The Wall Street Journal and the writings of a Sinclair Lewis, the publications of the Chamber of Commerce and various professors of social science bear witness to a mutual dislike.

As someone has suggested, if one were to take one's opinion of American business enterprise from the Broadway stage, one could only conclude that it is a noxious form of skullduggery practiced by offensive heels. Though this unfortunate picture may be discounted as perhaps the normal relationship between "creative artists" and those doing the housekeeping, nevertheless, there is one fact which deserves some thought. Beyond its own journals, American business has a bad press. I am concerned with the bitter critics to be found in the highly influential academic and literary fields. And I am concerned with the ineffective response we have been making to this threat.

I use the word "threat" carefully. For if capitalism is to survive, it must do more than produce a greater and greater flow of goods and services. It must also win the acceptance and more, the loyalty, of the broad community. Unless the average citizen is convinced that our system is compatible with and encourages personal expression and fulfillment, he will search for alternatives. People may vote us success by buying our products, but that is small consolation if they then go to the polls and vote us out of business. Capitalism is the means to abundance; but if it is ideologically inadequate, it will die.

It is true that businessmen have not all become angels. Some are still battling the tide. But undoubtedly we have reached a large measure of industrial democracy. And our urgent task is to show the connection between these contemporary facts of business and the purposes of a free society—not by platitudes, far less by slogans and commercials; but by consistent, cogent, and tireless demonstration.

I am not going to attempt to draw a syllabus for an educational program. But this is perhaps an appropriate place to indicate certain prerequisites. Surely, the first is to understand those to whom we speak. Neither a thousand full-page spreads nor a torrent of after-dinner speeches will have the slightest effect unless we know what interests the listener. And of one thing I am sure, as Fortune magazine recently reminded us, abstract apologetic ads for free enterprise leave Joe Doakes cold.

The louder we proclaim its virtues, possibly the more suspicious he gets. Unctuous generalities about the corner drug store and Abraham Lincoln do not add up to the individual American dream. And over-simplified readings of economic history do not come within a mile of the desires and aspirations

of the average man in the shop. It is time we gave a much-needed rest to the vague and negative words "free enterprise." I am not always sure I know what they mean, and I am sure that even after a million dollar advertising campaign, Joe Doakes doesn't.

Free enterprise in the sense of a broad freedom to buy and sell without a complicated apparatus of controls, certainly existed once. In this freedom America grew rich and great. But an elementary course in history is enough to show that, in this growth, great achievements were associated with grave abuses. And these abuses were bound to bring decisive modifications in the system.

So free enterprise has given way to a mixed economy in which management is to a large degree limited by public policies—and as we know only too well, this system has also developed its crops of ills.

The average American is not interested in business apologies. He does not want a course in the American system. * * * Interpretations of the past may be interesting enough, but he will ask what do they do for him now. Whatever free enterprise was, he will judge the system by how it works today; not in the ads, but in the machine shop and at the desk. Frustrations or suspicions in the factory or the office will not be resolved by offering the contemplation of abstractions. It is an elementary truth that the worker is interested first in his own welfare—and understandably so. Hence, I am inclined to agree with Governor Dewey that he does a poor service to his party who uses welfare as a term of abuse.

I am trying to be frank, gentlemen. For we must face the fact that the influence of businessmen in the community has been slowly declining. The great majority of people have looked elsewhere, to the Government or the labor unions, for the fulfillment of their aspirations to a better life.

As one piece of legislation has followed another, limiting the discretion of management, we have retreated to our associations and committees. And from them—at least it seems to the onlooker—we have looked out to fire broadsides at each successive project that others may put forward.

Inevitably, we have created the impression that we are obstructive and negative. Others have their inventory of proposals for reform; but we, it seems to many, do not even admit the problems.

It is time for us all to look at the problems of the Nation—not as management or labor, farmers or professional men; but as citizens. Perhaps this is easier said than done. But God knows that our society—and I speak of government, business, labor, and every segment of that society—will perish unless we recapture a capacity for disinterested action. I am not suggesting, then, a bigger and better lobby. But I am proposing that we participate to a greater extent in the formation of public policies; not just as watchdogs or critics of other proposals, but as the sponsors of practical measures to meet the problems of the day.

Indiscriminate opposition to programs, which to the average man appear to be designed for his benefit, is a sure way to lose public confidence. And yet we must admit that this has sometimes been the business attitude to major pieces of legislation.

Important acts affecting business are placed on the statute book without business participation and over business opposition. And those individual enactments in the end add up to the transformation of the economy.

It might have been better in some cases, and I am thinking of such examples as the Federal Reserve Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, and the Social Security Act, if we had accepted the need and participated fully in the writing of legislation.

We are not opposed to the aspirations of the common man. We are all common men, and we believe with all our hearts that a thriving capitalism is the best and greatest means to personal fulfillment. We do not believe that our system is perfect. But we must be sure that we are taking the initiative in the ceaseless search for development and improvement.

Here perhaps the greatest difficulty is the assumption that these aspirations can all be satisfied tomorrow. If all or even a majority of the unexecuted proposals for social welfare were in a brief period implemented by corporations or governments, our system would certainly collapse under the burden.

The great discovery of Socialist governments abroad has been that national resources are limited, and that for even nationalized undertakings, profits are desirable and even essential. Meanwhile, we are confronted with the tasks of reconciling these deeply established expectations with the requirements of the engine of production.

At Burroughs, we plan for efficient production; but we also endeavor to make a better place to work. And, indeed, the two objectives are inseparable. We must recover a lost intellectual initiative. We must make our proper contribution to the problems of the community and the State. We must get back into the stream of history.

The American economy remains the most productive in the world. It still has the stimulus of individual intiative. It is sparked by vigorous competion. It is dynamic. In it, new ideas are born and can rapidly become great industries.

We are not surprised that such vigor should bring its problems. Industrial relations, full employment, balanced international trade, the clash of progress and security, are but a few. But in the final analysis, the American economy meets the test. It is the envy of the entire world. Hardly a worker in Naples or Belgrade but would exchange his dwelling in Europe for a tent in Bay City. A Sears-Roebuck catalog is a book of wonders in Yugoslavia.

America has provided wide opportunities and reasonable security, and it is built on a concept of individual human dignity. If we have failed in communication, if we have encouraged suspicions, if we have not related our efforts to larger social purposes, then, in the words of the proverb—rather than abuse the darkness, let us light a candle.

Is Red China or Red Russia the Main Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of the House to the following article by Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times. Mr. Reston is one of our most excellent writers. His article merits careful study.

IS RED CHINA OR RED RUSSIA THE MAIN ISSUE?—"GREATER DEBATE" HAS POSED A QUESTION WHICH THE NATION MUST DECIDE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Next week's foreign policy debate on Capitol Hill is likely to center around two statements made this week, one in the Senate by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican of Ohio, and the other in Chicago by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

1. The United States, said the Senator on Thursday, "mustn't be stopped" from adopting General MacArthur's program "by any possibility that the Russians may come into the war."

2. "However great the effort," said General MacArthur, "to distract attention from the main issues by introducing into public discussion extraneous and irrelevant matters, the fundamental question still remains the same: What is the policy for Korea?"

Last month, in the troops-to-Europe debate, Senator TAFT was arguing against sending large American forces to Europe on the ground that might provoke the Russians to make war.

His argument now, however, is that the United States can adopt the MacArthur program of bombing Manchuria, blockading the the China coast, and opening a second front in South China with Chiang Kai-shek's troops without worrying about the possibility that the Russians would retaliate.

MAC ARTHUR'S POSITION

General MacArthur implies much the same thing. In his first speech, he at least considered the possibility that the Russians might come in if we followed his policy. He also conceded that our strategic problem was global, and that to consider the problems of one area without considering the problems of all other areas was to court disaster for the whole.

Since then, however, while the general atmosphere has become less tense, the attack by President Truman's opposition has become no less severe. "Our objective," said the general in Chicago without clarifying whether he meant Communist China or Russia, "is victory over the nation and men who, without provocation or justification, have warred against us."

"What," he kept asking, "is the policy in Korea?" That, he said, is the "fundamental question."

The administration, of course, does not believe at all that Korea is the fundamental question, or that the defeat of Communist China is the fundamental question, or that victory in the Far East can be achieved by defeating China, or that such a big victory can be achieved cheaper than under the present policy.

It believes the Soviet Union is the fundamental question. It believes the survival of the United States and its principal allies in Europe and Asia is involved in that question. It believes Korea is an important but secondary part of that question. It does not want to risk a war of survival with 20 divisions against Russia's 300, and it does not want to risk that war in Manchuria.

The paradox of the present situation is that General MacArthur and, to a surprising extent, Senator TAFT are now urging President Truman to adopt a literal interpretation of the Truman doctrine while Mr. Truman, having learned a little more geography and suffered a little more from history in the last 4 years, is now insisting that that doctrine must be interpreted rather carefully.

The general is saying that we should block the expansion of communism wherever it occurs, and especially in Asia, for if we don't, he argues, its expansion in one area will weaken our defense against it everywhere. the administration, however, now rejects so simple a strategy and argues more or less as follows:

1. The United States must do what it can to block the expansion of communism throughout the world, but it must risk an atomic war to do so only when areas vital to the security of the United States are at stake, and only when it is strong enough to wage such a war with the support of dependable allies.

2. A Soviet conquest of Western Europe, Japan, or the Middle East would directly

jeopardize the security of the Western Hemisphere. It would tip the whole world balance of power in Russia's favor if any one of these things were to happen, and particularly if the industrial and brain-power resources of the Ruhr and the rest of Western Europe were at Moscow's disposal.

CAUTION NECESSARY

3. Therefore, in allocating our limited forces, and in planning our strategy in Korea, we should do nothing that would threaten our defenses in more vital areas, or bring about a world war which neither we nor our allies are prepared to wage.

This is not an easy policy to follow, or even to explain, but the administration is prepared to defend its present limited-war policy in Korea and its rejection of the MacArthur policy on a number of different grounds, including the following:

(a) The limited-war policy gives the United States and its allies time to rebuild their defenses.

(b) The limited-war policy not only uses up men and material slower than a bigger war, but it gives us time to develop a whole range of atomic weapons for use on the battlefield, and a variety of important antitank weapons as well. There was a lot of talk about these weapons just a year ago—far too much talk, as officials here now agree—but important developments have taken place in the last year toward the production of atomic artillery, atomic-guided missiles, and various other weapons.

(c) The limited war in Korea has been far more damaging to the enemy than it has been to the United Nations.

(d) The Communists started out to seize South Korea. It has been denied to them. They started out to test our will to resist, and they have discovered that we will fight them, 6,000 miles from our home base if necessary. Moreover, if, as both General MacArthur and the administration believe, Korea was merely the first step in a campaign of Communist imperial expansion, the limited war there has denied them, not only South Korea, but the much more fruitful conquests of Southeast Asia.

COALITION HELD TOGETHER

(e) The limited-war policy has held the Allied coalition together, maintained our treaty obligations both to the North Atlantic nations and to the United Nations itself.

(f) Moreover, the limited-war policy enables the Allies to retain the initiative in the deployment of their armed forces. So long as the demands of the Korean war do not greatly exceed present requirements, the Allies can slowly build the defenses of key areas such as Western Europe, Japan, and the Middle East, but once the Red army is committed to battle, then the initiative in the deployment of forces rests, not with the Allies, but with the far larger forces of the enemy.

The administration does not, and cannot promise victory as a result of this limited war. The most it has been willing to imply is that if the UN forces can contain the present Chinese Communist offensive, then it may be possible to negotiate an honorable settlement. And even this hope is probably not so real as officials here make out.

Thus, a limited war for an unlimited time is not an easy thesis to argue. It is against the tradition and temperament of the country. It is complicated. It rests, at least partly, on the necessity of maintaining common cause with the British, the French, the Canadians, and others, who have not done as much to defend the common cause in Korea as they could have done.

Moreover, the thesis is being put forward by an administration which has made grave miscalculations of Soviet intentions in the past and which is now again at a low ebb in its popularity.

Finally, the opposition, in contrast, has a simple thesis and a glittering and eloquent hero to present it. He cannot prove that he is right, but the administration cannot prove that he is wrong, either, and it merely has a casualty list to place against his promises of relief.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADVANTAGE

Thus, the general has retained a psychological advantage in the argument so far. He is the one illustrious American public figure of his time who has been relieved for over 10 years of the embarrassment of having to answer questions in public. He has been free to attack and retreat, either into his embassy in Tokyo or the "privileged sanctuary" of the Waldorf towers.

For the past 10 days, too, he has been favored not only by his simple and plausible argument, but by the natural and proper adulation of a grateful populace for a great soldier.

Now, however, he must not only assert his eloquent themes from a platform, but he must answer the questions he himself has raised:

What makes you think that the Russians will not retaliate if we do as you propose?

What sources of information do you have about Soviet intentions?

How would you carry on the battle against communism in Asia or Europe without allies and their bases?

Since you guessed wrong about the Chinese Communists coming into the war, isn't it fair to question your judgment about what the Russians will or will not do?

How could we defend Japan or Western Europe with our present forces if they were attacked in retaliation for our attacks on Manchuria?

How can you stop the slaughter of America's sons by making the war bigger?

Is Korea really the main issue, or Red China—or is it not the Soviet Union?

When these questions have been answered, then the people to whom he has appealed will be in a better position to judge whether they wish to adopt his proposals or reject them.

Resolutions Adopted by Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this critical period of our Nation's history, it is gratifying and heartening to note that the women of our Nation have not lost sight of the need for good citizenship, law observance, and law enforcement.

They realize, as we all realize, that particularly in this period of stress and danger, the country cannot afford to give ground in the slightest degree to the criminal element and to those who would for financial gain debauch the character, morals, and decency of our people, particularly the younger generation.

As an evidence of the concern of the women of our country over these important matters, I insert herewith two resolutions adopted on April 4, 1951, by the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled. These resolutions were officially certified to me by Mrs. T. A. Maxwell, president, and Mrs. Gartha Peterson, chairman of the federation's department of legislation.

The above-mentioned resolutions follow:

Whereas the increase in narcotic addicts among young people has become a matter of deep concern to many parents over the Nation and to the United States Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics; and

Whereas the Bureau of Narcotics has only 200 men to cover the entire United States; and

Whereas the Bureau gives as the main reason for narcotic trafficking and the resultant addiction to narcotic habits, the light prison sentences given to dope peddlers, and is urging a minimum sentence of 5 years for any second offense, and at least 10 years for a third offense; and

Whereas young addicts tend to associate with criminals and become active criminals through the need to secure narcotics: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled go on record as approving a strengthening of the narcotic law through increasing the penalties for persons convicted of selling narcotics; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Georgia delegation in Congress, and to the Governor of the State of Georgia.

This 4th day of April 1951.

Mrs. T. A. MAXWELL,
President.

GARTHA PETERSON,
Chairman, Department of Legislation.

Whereas the revelations of the Senate Crime Investigation Committee have shocked the whole country and have shown all too clearly that graft, gambling, bribery, and organized crime are eating at the very foundation of this Nation's democracy; and

Whereas such conditions could not have come into existence but for the condoning of disrespect for law for the moral callousness of too large a segment of our population nor without the knowledge and, at least, the tacit consent of the authorities and the law enforcement officers; and

Whereas our Government and our way of life are threatened unless there is a return to honesty, decency, and respect for law, and to the once high moral standards which made this country great; and

Whereas we recognize that adequate laws are necessary but not the sole answer to the problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled this 4th day of April 1951 call upon our Federal, State, county, and municipal governments to see that such additional laws as are needed to cope with the underworld be speedily enacted, that the guilty be brought to the bar of justice and punishment be meted out; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the authorities and law-enforcement officers to see without fear or favor, that the laws are observed; be it further

Resolved, That the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs pledge its cooperation and best efforts to a program of improving moral conditions by improving people, ourselves first; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the members of the Georgia delegation in Congress, to the Governor of the State of Georgia.

Mrs. T. A. MAXWELL,
President.

GARTHA PETERSON,
Chairman, Department of Legislation.

An Historic Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "An Historic Address," which appeared in the Arizona Daily Star, under date of April 24, 1951. In my opinion, it is an excellent evaluation of General MacArthur's speech:

AN HISTORIC ADDRESS

While praise cannot be too lavish about the historic address that General MacArthur made last week in Washington, the wonderful thing about it is the way it demonstrated so dramatically the perfect functioning of the American democratic process.

Since in nearly every American there is a bit of the rebel, General MacArthur's conduct in challenging Presidential policy is something that is bound to happen from time to time. Correctly the President disciplined him; but correctly also, Congress invited him to speak before its two Houses in a joint meeting.

There on the one hand we saw that President acting to restrain a military commander of widespread popularity. On the other hand we saw the Congress, which is the legislative branch of our Government, acting on its own initiative, not only to honor one of our great military leaders, but to allow the country to be informed fully from the lips of a man whom the President disciplined.

The lesson in that process is one in which all of us, admirers as well as critics, can take pride. Each person, or office, has its power checked; yet out of all the differences of opinion that process permits to be expressed, our Government goes on, and each of us from the lowest to the most exalted is free to have his say, too.

What more can we ask of life than such a privilege?

That is freedom, despite its defects, performing successfully before a world where during the past 20 years freedom has been steadily losing out.

Behind the eloquence of General MacArthur's address was the experience of a lifetime, and thoughts which he had been resolving for many years. Although he spoke only from notes, he had been writing that talk for years in his mind.

Those who have talked with him in recent years heard numerous familiar words. His anxiety over the destructiveness of modern war; his love for the Philippines and admiration of his work there; his pride in the reconstruction of Japan; his hatred of communism; his military estimate of what our new frontiers are; his opinion on Formosa and the role of Chiang Kai-shek represent an expression of his soul as well as his mind.

But so did he reveal some of his weaknesses. When he said that the object of war was victory, the soldier in him was speaking. He did not realize that we Americans have won two great world wars, but have failed to win the political successes, as distinguished from victories, for which wars should be waged.

His exasperation over the apparent stalemate in Korea, and the failure to use Chinese Nationalist troops, again represent the soldier speaking, and an unjustifiable contempt for the slower and more laborious processes of political methods.

His call for what would amount to a world military campaign against communism—in China as well as in Europe—brushes aside too hastily the possible wisdom of keeping our commitments within the limits of our strength and limiting the scope of the present war in Korea.

Fortunately, now that General MacArthur has had his say, the public debate will move with more speed toward a decision. Whatever is done now will have an open public record behind it and therefore a united country. We have that much faith in the democratic process, which has been so dramatically staged before our own eyes and those of the world.

Spencer A. Canary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to include two editorials on the life of Spencer A. Canary, former editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio; one from his good neighbor, the Defiance Crescent-News, of Defiance, Ohio; and one from his beloved paper, the Daily Sentinel-Tribune:

[From the Bowling Green (Ohio) Daily Sentinel-Tribune]

GOOD NIGHT, SWEET PRINCE

Those among us whose lives have spanned the last five to eight decades will probably agree with our late editor, S. A. Canary, that it has been a privilege to have been a part of life during the era in which he lived, baffling though so often the social, economic, and industrial changes have been.

To keep pace with those changes and to accept the responsibility of editorial leadership in this community during the last 43 years required the complete loyalty of a man who spent his life in the interest of others.

"He was a man, take him for all in all, I shall not look upon his like again."

Whether readers agreed with his editorials or not, they held a deep respect for his opinion because no word was written without long study and consideration of a problem or without comprehensive reading.

The expression that an institution is but the length and breadth of the shadow of one man is very true in the case of the policies of the editorial staff of the Sentinel-Tribune.

The late editor loved this community and this paper as though they were his children. His guiding motto in editorial work and in contact with people was Charles Reade's "Put yourself in his place," "Very little matters very much."

He often voiced a philosophy of "Don't take yourself too seriously—the world will go on without you." Along with that was a self-restraint practiced daily in which he tried not to criticize anyone before 9 o'clock in the morning because of a desire to be better adjusted to the problems of the day by that time.

Bowling Green has been most fortunate in the kind of men who have lived here during the past 75 years. Spence was one of many whose sacrifices of time, money, and effort have made this city the outstanding community that it is today. It is not possible to name them all without omitting many who deserve places in the community hall of fame.

But those men, whose vision, self-abnegation, industry, and community ambition gained for this city the Bowling Green State University, the H. J. Heinz Co. plant, and other industrial, cultural, and civic benefits that have helped Bowling Green to grow from a village into a city of 12,000 people, performed services for which the people will be eternally indebted.

No little part of this constant change for the better was influenced by the late editor. He was the confidant of leaders of both political parties, although his pen spoke with strong Republican convictions. His opinions were respected by Members of Congress and were often printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His advice was sought and gladly offered in countless problems on local, State, national, and world-wide scale.

Above all, Spence practiced love and charity toward his fellow men. His benevolences, tendered always in deep humility and tenderness without even his closest friends being aware of them, were countless.

Yes; the world will go on without him. The Daily Sentinel-Tribune continues to progress forward with plans for greater service and improvements ahead, but the philosophy he developed will continue to characterize its columns and the community is better for his having passed this way.

"Good night, sweet prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

[From the Defiance (Ohio) Crescent-News]

MAUMEE VALLEY LOSES A VALUED LEADER

Death of Spencer A. Canary, of Bowling Green, takes from the northwestern Ohio scene a man whose influence in behalf of constructive enterprises will long be felt in this region. As editor of the Bowling Green Sentinel-Tribune, he played an effective part in promoting the best interests not only of his home community but the entire Maumee Valley.

Mr. Canary probably was known personally to few people in Defiance, but he was a sincere friend of this city. In his more active days he was a frequent visitor here, and one of the most ardent advocates of giving proper recognition to Fort Defiance and all other ground hallowed by the achievements of Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne and his illustrious colleagues.

A keen student of history, Mr. Canary never could be accused of living in the past. He did contend that youth can never properly appreciate the American heritage of freedom and opportunity without a knowledge of the forefathers' hardships and sacrifices. The Maumee Valley is blessed as are few regions with important materials of American pioneer history. Spencer Canary insisted that those materials be employed by the schools, the press, and every avenue of communication to teach the basic lessons of Americanism and democracy.

Mr. Canary never tired of emphasizing the fact that without the campaign of Gen. Anthony Wayne, the history of Ohio and the entire Northwest Territory, comprising six present States, probably would have been far different—a barrier State under Great Britain with the western boundary of our country at the Allegheny Mountains. And in support of one project for which he was an effective champion, he once wrote:

"What greater appreciation of what General Wayne did for America could the United States show, and what more useful, enduring, and patriotism-inspiring memorial to him could it devise than a parkway along the trail which he and his men so wearily trod and which countless motorists would traverse in the years to come?"

The Anthony Wayne Parkway in its eventual development will be the fruition of one of his most cherished objectives.

Nearly two decades ago, Spencer Canary's work and influence were powerful factors in preserving for the public rather than for private benefit important stretches of Maumee River frontage. He served as president of the Maumee River Scenic and Historic

Highway Association and for many years was a member of the Fort Meigs Memorial Commission. He was a member of the editorial board of the Northwestern Ohio Historical Society. He was the moving spirit in creation of the Wood County Park Board which has accomplished much of value to this entire area. Even after physical disability forced curtailment of his former strenuous activity, he responded without hesitation to many calls for help in projects of area-wide interest.

Spencer Canary will be missed not only by his fellow townsmen but by a host of others who regarded him as a first citizen of the Maumee Valley.

Formula for History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following editorials which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News.

The first, Formula for History, which appeared in the April 13, 1951, edition; the second, MacArthur Pleads a Potent Case, which appeared in the April 20, 1951, edition; and the third, Internal Security at a Snail's Pace, which appeared in the April 25, 1951, edition.

The editorials follow:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 13, 1951]

FORMULA FOR HISTORY

Two highly skilled American generals were maneuvered into false positions in the history of World War II by inept and eccentric decisions made in the State Department and, presumably, approved by the White House.

In a running battle with the politicians, which has been climaxed by his dismissal from the Far East command, General MacArthur has made certain the same thing won't happen to him. When the chronicle of this war is written in perspective, his obdurate resistance to administration Asiatic policy—whether it turns out that he was right or wrong—will not be a clouded issue. It is on the record that he felt so forcefully that he was executing a bankrupt policy he exceeded military proprieties in political statements and courted banishment as his dissent.

The first example of an able military man being euchred into an untenable position by the diplomats, which General MacArthur may have had in mind, is that of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, commander of Allied troops in Europe in the last war and now Supreme Commander of North Atlantic Treaty forces there. Headed full-tilt for Berlin in the closing days of the war against Hitler, the Eisenhower forces were brought to an abrupt halt by orders from Washington. General Eisenhower was to allow our stanch allies, the Russians, the glory of entering the conquered capital first and without provision for an allied corridor into the city. He was resigned and laconic about it. "A political decision," he said.

The result of that snap political decision is that when Germany was carved up and Berlin zoned, the Allies found themselves isolated in an island in the city with no communications corridor connecting with the outside. When the Soviets choked off supply routes through their sector, the expensive airlift was brought into being to keep residents in the free zone alive. It would never have been necessary if the Russians hadn't been handed every concession they asked for by the State Department politicians in an expansive mood.

Second victim of similar murky decisions at the political level was Gen. Mark Clark when he was American High Commissioner in Austria. He hasn't been as reticent about it as General Eisenhower and recounts his troubles in his book, Calculated Risk. His first taste of devious diplomatic maneuvering, which impaired his command of the area, was when the zones of influence were being defined. In the original plans, agreed to by Russia, he maintained full command of a vital transport route along the north bank of the Danube. "A grevious error," said the Soviet to Washington, which appeared horrified that this important territory was under American aegis. Without a syllable of consultation with General Clark as commissioner, Washington agreed to extend the Russian zone to include the critical strip and a part of upper Austria.

General Clark cites another instance of bizarre State Department usurpation of his authority—the case of the captured Yugoslav barges. He had orders to keep them for bargaining purposes. The Secretary of State's office wired him, as he writes, "Return those barges to the Yugoslavs or else." He did. Everywhere he turned in an effort to administer his command effectively he was hobbled by similar arbitrary orders, execution of which played into the hands of Soviet Russia.

General Eisenhower kept quiet and didn't hit back. General Clark sat out his mission but took out his frustation in print. With their experiences in mind—and what American military man isn't aware of them?—the less inhibited General MacArthur has taken good care that if United States and UN policies bring disaster in Asia he has lodged his protests and advanced alternatives, though it cost him one of the greatest military commands in warfare's history.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 20, 1951]

MACARTHUR PLEADS A POTENT CASE

Gen. Douglas MacArthur used the magnificent forum at his disposal Thursday not to take a bow, but to plead a case. He pleaded it eloquently, dramatically, and effectively. He left the issue sharper, the debate angrier, and the Nation decidedly more impressed than when he arrived. On all counts, it was one of the most moving and historic speeches it has been this generation's privilege to hear—and see.

It was a soldier's report, but with tremendous political overtones. Confining himself to a "military estimate" of the Asiatic conflict he had just left under curt dismissal orders from his Commander in Chief, General MacArthur pulled no punches and wasted no words in pressing his view of what it will take to salvage military victory out of the Korean stalemate.

Nor was the Capital's emotional tension eased when he bluntly hinted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would fully share his "military estimate" if they were politically free to do so. It was that one bombshell remark, perhaps more than all the rest he said, that threatens to put his dismissal—indeed, the whole question of what to do about Asia—in a startlingly different light.

Until then, it had been represented that this was not merely MacArthur versus Truman, but MacArthur versus the Joint Chiefs—not only a field commander's difference with his civilian Commander in Chief but one respected soldier's opinion against that of other soldiers, having perhaps a broader, more global responsibility. But if it must now be accepted that the MacArthur view of how "to bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of lives" has been "fully shared" by "practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff—then we do indeed have a case calling for the sternest congressional scrutiny of a civilian executive authority that would dare to ignore and to silence such counsel.

General MacArthur's reference to the Joint Chiefs was qualified in only two particulars—that they shared his view "in the past" and "from a military standpoint." Possibly they have since rejected it on other counts, perhaps that the world political repercussions would more than offset the military advantages. This is the implication of the hasty retort Thursday night that the Joint Chiefs had all advised his dismissal.

Be that as it may, the MacArthur speech has unquestionably put the Joint Chiefs on the hottest political spot of their lives, and we may be sure they will be haled before the congressional military committees to explain precisely where, how, and why they would modify the MacArthur prescription for waging the Korean war.

Close rereading of General Bradley's Chicago speech on behalf of the Joint Chiefs of Staff last Tuesday shows, significantly, that he did not directly contradict the MacArthur viewpoint. He gave the closest thing yet to a military justification for the strategy of stalemate; he made strong answer to those who would abandon Korea, and he said, without elaborating, that action which would enlarge the war is "contrary to our best interests." But as to waging that war more effectively, he said only that it should be limited "if at all possible" and that "the confinement or extension of the area of combat is in the realm of diplomacy and international politics."

General MacArthur does not disagree. What he had asked repeatedly was new decisions "in the diplomatic sphere." He has flatly disavowed any idea of all-out war in Asia, but felt that military necessity made these measures essential once the Chinese Reds committed their full strength: (1) Intensification of our economic blockade; (2) imposition of a naval blockade; (3) removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance, and (4) removal of restrictions on the Chiang Kai-shek forces on Formosa "with logistical support to contribute to their effective operations." Without such measures—and with reinforcements denied him—General MacArthur told Congress he had made it clear to his superiors that the military position of his command "forbade victory." At best "we can hope for only an indecisive campaign with its terrible and constant attrition upon our forces."

This, to be sure, is not the first time a field commander has been under such frustrating wraps. MacArthur himself was in that condition during most of the Pacific war, when that theater was purposely subordinated to the European. But that was in truth a strategic decision by military men waging a global war. This one, by contrast, appears to be a strategic decision imposed on the military on the basis of international politics. If General MacArthur's understanding of the Joint Chiefs' military views is correct, it means that these have been changed or overruled for political or other reasons about which the bewildered public can only guess. When Congress brings them to light—as it now most surely will—the explanations had better be good. General MacArthur has raised an issue that will not be downed by dismissals, deceit, or double talk.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of April 25, 1951]

INTERNAL SECURITY AT A SNAIL'S PACE

Remember the McCarran Communist Control Bill—and the great urgency about getting it on the statute books?

That was last summer, and the fifth column would have us by the throat if Congress didn't act at once. There was an election coming up and everybody had to be more anti-Communist that everybody else.

So the McCarran bill went roaring through over a Presidential veto, and with scarcely a handful of dissenting votes. If there were flaws in it, they could be fixed later, but time was of the essence. Or at least so it was represented then.

That, as we say, was late last summer. The bill became a law 7 months ago. It gave every Communist-action and Communist-front organization 30 days to register voluntarily. The month went by. Nothing happened. Another month went by. Then the President appointed the Subversive Activities Control Board, which the law created to compel reluctant Red outfits to register if they don't do it on their own initiative. At the same time, the administration formally petitioned the new board to require the Communist Party, U. S. A., to register as a Communist-action organization.

That was 5 months ago. Chairman Seth Richardson of the Subversive Control Board promised there would be no hysteria, no undue haste. He indicated the hearings would be protracted. How right he has been.

This week—7 months after the law was passed; 5 months after the petition was filed—the hearing on the first case finally began. But the Communists promptly challenged the whole proceedings. Their grounds: the Richardson board hasn't even been confirmed yet. The point has dubious legal merit.

But it's a fact that these nominations have been before the Senate since November—and there has been no action, either confirming or rejecting them. That's how big a hurry the Senate is in to get this law properly implemented—the Senate that just couldn't wait to perfect the law last September, because time was of the essence.

And what of the board? Confirmed or unconfirmed, is it now at last going to give the Commies their day in court, and make its ruling?

Not on your life. This is just the beginning of the hearing. It will continue, board sources indicate, for probably 3 months if not longer. After that, there presumably will have to be time for consideration before it is determined whether the Communist Party is a Communist-action organization and thus compelled to register.

Why? you may well ask. Is there some question about the Communists being Communists? Well, the law defines a "Communist-action" organization as one which "is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign * * * organization controlling the world Communist movement * * * and operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement."

So, you may wonder, isn't it pretty obvious that the description fits the Communist Party, United States of America, on all counts? When it comes to singling out one of the devious Communist fronts or other hidden organizations, maybe the proof will be harder to come by. But this petition is directed against the Communist Party itself. Why should it be so complicated?

Why, indeed? If this was the urgent piece of internal-security legislation it was represented as being last fall, why has the Senate waited 5 months to consider the nominations of the board named to implement it—and why has the board waited 5 months to begin a drawn-out hearing on so elementary a question as whether the Communist Party is in fact a Communist organization?

The only answer that suggests itself is that both Congress and the administration were playing tawdry politics with the fifth-column problem last fall—and they still are. The law contains a lot of unrealistic "monkey-business," particularly in its registration procedures. It needs to be rewritten in a forthright manner so that it will be, in truth, an internal security law. Instead, it is being sabotaged by delay and by buck-passing efforts in both Congress and the administration to lay the blame on each other.

Wedge of Despotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 25 entitled from the "Wedge of Despotism":

WEDGE OF DESPOTISM

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and the officials who have been supporting him in his defiance of the United States Court of Appeals have been given additional time to show why they should not be punished for contempt. The court has proved to be lenient. Obviously it is reluctant to penalize high officials of the Government—except as a last resort. Yet the court has made unmistakably plain its grave concern over the course the administration has followed in the Dollar case, and everyone who believes in law and order may well share that concern.

The inescapable fact is that Secretary Sawyer and his associates have continued to exercise control over the stock of the American President Lines in spite of the court's order that it should be returned to R. Stanley Dollar and his associates. Various aspects of the case have been before the Supreme Court three times and it is now before the Court of Appeals for the fourth time. The courts have held in unmistakable terms that the stock in controversy belongs to the Dollar interests—that the old Maritime Commission which took it as a pledge had no authority to acquire outright ownership. Yet the executive arm is still resisting this judicial decision. The fact that the Commerce and Justice Departments are acting in this matter under direct orders from the President only makes their defiance of the courts the more outrageous.

"We have the spectacle of a Government which proclaims its adherence to law as the governing force among men," said the latest opinion by Judge Prettyman, "not only refusing for 6 years to submit to its own courts its own claim to private property derived from a purely commercial transaction, but endeavoring by every device to thwart and defeat the judgment of those courts after it has been rendered." The question is not, as the court says, one of high policy. It concerns merely the ownership of a commercial property. The Government should be the first to acquiesce in the judgment of its courts in such a matter even though officials may continue to believe that an injustice has been done. Instead, it has continued its defiance by means of instigating an unseemly conflict between two courts."

The only ground on which the administration has to stand is the fact that the United States in its sovereign capacity was not a party to the case that the courts have decided. After the claim of its agent holding the stock failed, the Government asserted in effect that the stock belonged not to the Dollar interests or the Maritime Commission, but to the United States. But the stock has never been in the Government's name. How could the Government have gotten legal possession of it if the Maritime Commission had no authority to acquire it? The present claim is obviously a quibble designed to frustrate the settled judgment of the court. We do not see how it could be upheld by the courts without making a mockery of the processes of justice.

Undoubtedly the Department of Justice is entitled to pursue its flimsy claim in another court, if it wishes to do so. What is inexcusable is that it used its "quiet title" suit to obtain from a Federal judge in San Francisco an injunction preventing transfer of the stock on the company books and preventing the Dollar interests from voting it. In reply to this, Judge Prettyman says that the injunction could be properly used to prevent Mr. Dollar from selling or transferring the stock (now adjudged to be rightly his) until the Government's claim has been finally settled. But it would be a strange distortion of justice to give a mere unadjudicated claim pressed in a lower court precedence over a finally adjudicated right in a higher court. Such a holding Judge Prettyman cogently says, "Would mean chaos and the complete collapse of every semblance of orderly judicial process, a consummation to the irreparable damage of the public interest."

Regardless of whether the officials responsible for carrying out the President's law-flouting orders are punished for contempt, the administration ought to get itself off this hook. The first step obviously should be to ask the San Francisco court to modify its injunction so that it would in no way clash with the judgment of the court of appeals here. The second should be the surrender to the Dollar interests of all the rights incident to their ownership of the stock as already finally determined by the courts. Then the administration could pursue its flimsy claim without placing itself in the position of a trickster or pretending to be above the law. The big issue here is respect for the judicial system and that ought to transcend the financial gains or losses involved even in the minds of disappointed official litigants.

The American Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 1870 for the protection of the bald eagle in Alaska. A great deal of interest has been shown in this legislation from individuals and organizations interested in the conservation of wild life and particularly in this bird which is immortalized on our great seal.

Mrs. Inez E. Moore, of Valdez, Alaska, has shown particular interest in H. R.

1870 and, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks, her poem entitled "The American Eagle," as follows:

THE AMERICAN EAGLE

I'm the bald eagle, a bird of prey.
I forage for food, God made me that way.
I try not to kill any more than I need,
For unlike human beings, I've never learned greed.
My only weapons are beak and claws
While man is protected by all sorts of laws.
Just lately he placed a price on my head
Two fifty for those who would bring me in dead.
He calls me a predator, a bird of prey,
But what about man, just any old day
With traps, guns, and dogs, he uses no reason,
Takes more than the limit and oft out of season.
In liberty's name and the sake of fair play,
Get busy and pass some protection today.
—*Inez E. Moore.*

Admiral Badger: His Ships Come Out of Moth Balls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "Admiral Badger: His Ships Come Out of Moth Balls," which appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 16, 1951.

I believe that the following article is adequate testimony to the very excellent job that Admiral Badger has done in reactivating the naval defenses of our eastern sea frontier. He has taken a difficult task by the horns and has successfully completed a job, not only in the best interests of our national defense but in the interests of the taxpaying public as well. Congress should take its hat off to Admiral Badger and his staff.

The article follows:

ADMIRAL BADGER: HIS SHIPS COME OUT OF MOTH BALLS

A phantom fleet, more than 2,000 naval vessels of all types, rode at anchor at 8 bases. Victory-flushed veterans of the Second World War, they were moored in long gray lines at Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf ports, robbed of their crews in the great scramble to disarm and demobilize which followed the end of hostilities.

It was not America's first phantom fleet. After the first war, another United States fleet had been tied up. Its crews had been cut to 10 percent, carrying on a losing battle against the greatest enemy of ships—rust. Low Navy budgets and the elements had done a good job of decimating this fleet. Much of what remained had been scrapped by international agreement.

But as the last war drew to a close, Admiral Ernest J. King and the Navy looked for a way to avoid the mistakes of 1918. Their answer was the Atlantic and Pacific reserve fleets—a great armada zippered away in rustproof cocoons against the evil day of a future war.

Double trouble: For Navy scientists, the problem was twofold: (1) To develop a technique which would vanquish rust; and (2) to make the process such that the reactivation of the laid-up vessels could be accomplished in an absolute minimum of time. To make seaworthy the overage destroyers which President Roosevelt traded for British bases in 1940 had taken months. The Navy realized that this margin of time might not be ours in any future hostilities.

The solution was at once simple and effective, a combination of plastics and moth balls. In order not to dismantle the ships, practically everything topside was left intact, sheathed in plastic or aluminum cocoons and blisters. Below decks, each reserve vessel was made airtight. An artificial lung was installed which pulled the damp air from the ship, passed it over the "moth ball"—silica gel, a crystalline substance which removed most of the moisture—and pumped dehumidified air into the ship's interior spaces. A mixture called thin film was applied to nonpainted surfaces.

Good buy: For moth balling the 2,036 vessels in the reserve fleet, and for maintaining it between 1946 and 1951 while it lay inactive, the taxpayers shelled out $213,000,000. It was money well spent. The original cost of these vessels was $12,863,500,000. To replace them today would have cost $26,994,500,000. In fact, maintenance cost 60 cents per $1,000 of material—one-half percent of the naval budget—"the cheapest insurance policy in history," the Navy boasts.

When the Korean war exploded on the world last June 25, the mothball fleet was ready. Vice Adm. Oscar Charles Badger, who holds the dual command of the Atlantic Reserve Fleet and the eastern sea frontier (covering 40 States and the coastline from Maine to Texas), was ordered to begin reactivating his ships.

As the wheels went into motion, ships to be demothballed were designated. In days, new skippers, other officers, the chiefs, petty officers, and seamen were reporting for duty. Dehumidifiers were removed, ventilating systems put into operation; quarters for officers and men were opened up. So well had the mothballs worked that in many cases even mattresses were ready for immediate use.

A "history ticket" had been attached to every piece of equipment, describing exactly what it required before it could be put into use again. In 30 days' time per unit—"activation time is 30 days, whether it's an LST or a carrier like the *Tarawa*," says Admiral Badger—the ships began coming to life again.

Fast action: Returning ships to service at a steady clip of about 2 a day, the Navy could point last week to 381 reactivations since Korea: 13 aircraft carriers, 2 battleships (the U. S. S. *New Jersey* and the U. S. S. *Wisconsin*), 2 heavy cruisers, 77 destroyers, and destroyer escorts, 13 submarines, 31 minesweepers, 7 patrol vessels, 236 amphibious, and auxiliary types.

So efficiently did the job proceed that many of the landing craft used at Inchon by the Marines had come from a mothball base in Texas. In the case of noncombat vessels—transports, tenders, and so forth very little was needed to put them in shape. Some aircraft carriers needed deck bracing to accommodate heavier planes and jets.

"Most of these ships require only minor modifications to bring them up to date," says Admiral Badger, "and in general these involve electronics."

Back to action: The cost for this mammoth job will total $120,000,000—less than 2.5 percent of the replacement cost. The individual cost per ship depends on its size and on its state of repair at the time of mothballing.

The cost of improving demothballed ships varies greatly. An *Essex*-class carrier the most obsolescent of all ships being reactivated, requires almost as much work as building a new ship and costs almost half what a new carrier would. The battleship *New Jersey*, on the other hand, came out in 37,000 man-days, where it took 2,500,000 man-days to build. This speed has permitted the Navy to increase its fleet strength by over 75 percent in a few months.

Because the United States has built only one submarine, the *K–1* "killer," since the last war, all the new strength in these critical, long-range eyes and ears of the Atlantic Fleet must come from the mothball fleet at New London, Conn. There, huddled in gray, tent-caterpillar-like clusters on the Thames River, some forty-odd sealed submarines have been returning to service.

At the rate of one a month, Rear Adm. S. S. Murray, commander of the Atlantic Submarine Fleet, has stepped aboard the revitalized subs to welcome them back to duty. When, in the 12-above-zero weather last February, the U. S. S. *Bang's* long-dormant engines were started up, they caught the first time.

Energy in person: When the time came to demothball the phantom fleet, the job fell to Admiral Badger, who had been responsible for maintaining the ships and keeping a scrupulous guard against invading rust and decomposition. Energetic and incisive, Badger in appearance belies his 60 years.

In the last 11 years of peace, war, and cold war, Badger has taken exactly 16 days of leave. He works long hours and keeps two staffs—one for the Atlantic Reserve Fleet, the other for the eastern-sea frontier—going constantly. Pacing both staffs, he is apt to explode over anyone who falls behind.

Admiral Badger believes the moth-ball fleet to be one of the greatest contributions to the security of the country that the Navy has ever made. In any future war, he feels, the country will face critical material shortages. The key to victory will be in what he calls the "true economy," the economy not of dollars but of labor and materials.

Badger realizes that comparisons between the $200,000,000 it would cost to replace the U. S. S. *New Jersey* and the $200,000 it cost to reactivate it emphasizes dramatically the work he has been doing. But the real worth of the moth-ball fleet, he insists, is in conservation. The ships he has been caretaking represent 7,500,000 man-years in terms of labor. The saving in steel, now in critical supply, is also astronomical—21,864 tons of carbon steel and 4,033 of alloy steel for an *Essex* carrier alone.

(In addition to these savings, other metals in short supply are liberated for other defense purposes. These are, according to Rear Adm. Homer N. Wallin, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, aluminum, nickel, lead, zinc, and copper. Wallin points out, too, that since Korea it would have been impossible to build up from scratch the reinforcements contributed by the moth-ball fleet even if the Nation's entire productive capacity had been put to the task.)

Problem solver: Badger notes that hundreds of plants, untold tons of steel, vitally needed radar equipment, and armies of workers would have been diverted from other production had the moth-balling process failed.

Although the job of reinforcing and supplying the fleet may be difficult, Admiral Badger is accustomed to tough assignments. He had plenty of them during the war. In 1942, he was largely responsible for the Navy's antisubmarine campaign at the height of the U-boat attacks on the convoy lanes. Later, as director of the logistic plans division of the Navy, he helped solve the complex supply problems of the Navy's two-ocean offensive. As the last war drew to a close, he was back in actual combat commanding the heavy striking forces of the Third Fleet.

In 1944, when every one of his bases and drydocks was working around the clock to get the fleet ready for the Palau campaign, the U. S. S. *Tennessee* and the U. S. S. *California* rammed each other in mid-Pacific.

Stateside shipyards estimated that it would take 4 months to repair the vessels. With characteristic energy, Badger flew in welders, ship fitters, and mechanics from all over the Pacific area. In 3 weeks, the two ships were back in operation.

Never say No: Today, Admiral Badger runs the vast eastern sea frontier and the Atlantic Reserve Fleet with the drive and precision of a fighting commander afloat. "We have a great naval base here that can do any damn thing," he says, pointing to the map which delimits the 2,000,000 square miles of his command. "The personnel is wonderful. There's just one thing I insist on. When the fleet at sea wants something, no one says 'No.'"

Last week, as the hibernating ships continued to be ripped out of cocoons in Philadelphia, Portsmouth, Charleston, Green Cove Springs, and New London, Admiral Badger's command was living up to his word. From Maine to Texas, no one was saying "No."

Chelsea Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered at the dedication of the Chelsea housing project, Chelsea, Mass., on Saturday, April 28, 1951:

After a day's work, it is so good to go home. When all is said and done, that is what we live for.

The privacy, comfort, and conveniences of a home that is the center of family life—this is the greatest of all incentives.

When a young man and a young woman start going together it is not long before they are planning to marry and set up housekeeping and create a family of their own.

Not in a dark, unsanitary and broken down tenement, but in a clean, bright housing unit constructed to meet the needs of modern life and designed to please and encourage those who dwell within it.

There are a few landlords and tenants who seem to think that any shelter will do as long as it keeps out the rain and the cold. They forget that houses grow old just as people do. If the house is not cared for, it will suffer from the wear and tear of living and become a burden to its occupants. An aging house that is allowed to fall into disrepair and is not renovated over the years to keep pace with the rising standard of living will degenerate into a fire trap and become a menace to health. And the woman who has to live in it most of the day knows better than anyone else that the roof and the walls and the floors do not make a house. It must be constructed in such a way as to make her housekeeping easy so that her husband and children will be glad to come home to the sanctuary that shows the results of her loving care. In that she finds one of her real fulfillments.

In the world of today where many confused and tired people have surrendered their initiative to an all-powerful state, the United States remains as the one, sure rallying point for those who believe that men can adjust their differences. We are lucky to live in a society that is flexible enough to overcome any social or economic problem without sacrificing human rights.

Housing is one of these problems.

It was a problem that was ignored during the first third of this century.

As towns and cities grew the dwellings in the center of communities began to decay. Private owners failed to reinvest part of their profits to maintain these properties. In some cases they were getting a diminishing income in relation to raising taxes. Broken-down tenements became the breeding place of disease and crime and social tensions.

It was too late then for private builders or realtors to do anything about it. We could not expect them to exhaust their money in tearing down old rental units and erecting new ones for the low-income groups that could not pay the rents necessary to cover such an investment.

We had neglected the spreading slums to such an extent that small and private groups could not cope with the menace. Only the Government was big enough to tackle it. Which it is doing, proving that under our system we can devise new techniques to overcome our difficulties without concentrating too much power in the Federal Government.

This local project is proof of that fact.

The city of Chelsea, like any other American city, did not have the financial means to undertake such a responsibility in addition to its other burdens. Through the medium of the State government, which, in turn, receives grants-in-aid from Washington, there was engineered a team-work approach to the problem. The blueprint has become a reality. The costs of building and maintaining this development are well in hand. And the people of Chelsea, through their own housing authority, retain control of it in a wholesome and democratic manner.

Private enterprise, aided by local, State, and National agencies, is reducing the overall housing deficit. When we look back to the shocking conditions of a few years ago, we may be proud of the progress that we have made. Recalling those conditions which still prevail, especially in the larger cities, we should redouble our efforts until all slums are torn down and in their place are built the dwellings that are fit for Americans. After that, we must adopt a long-range plan of maintenance and replacement to prevent the slums from ever befouling our cities again.

In 1933 the country was faced not only with the problem of stopping wholesale foreclosures on homes and farms but with a great volume of unemployment. The construction industry almost came to a standstill because so many people either had no income or very little income. In 1933 total dwelling units under construction declined to a level as low as 10 percent of the peak year, which was 1925. The population was increasing, but we were falling far behind in providing adequate shelter for the growing number of families.

By 1940 the census revealed that out of 37,000,000 dwelling units in the United States 16,000,000 required extensive rehabilitation or outright replacement. Even though more houses were built and necessary repairs completed since then, the situation is still not as good as it should be. The 1949 Senate Banking and Currency Committee computed the United States housing need, and concluded that we would have to produce between sixteen and one-half and seventeen and one-half million dwelling units by 1960 in order to keep up with the demand.

At the end of World War II the Nation was confronted with a very serious housing shortage. The low pulse of building activity during the 1930's, the curtailment of residential building in order to conserve critical materials that were needed for the weapons of war, and the war's impact upon the rise in marriages and new families caused a serious gap between the supply and demand of housing.

Prices of homes rose 50 to 100 percent above 1941 levels, with the greatest increases in low- and medium-priced dwellings. Those who occupied rental units were spared sharp price hikes because of the Rent Control Act, even though this worked a hardship upon some landlords. Preparatory to the homecoming of millions of veterans, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was passed, authorizing, among other things, the guaranty of GI loans to veterans to purchase, build, or improve homes.

Meanwhile there was increasing concern that in the attempt to meet one emergency after another—a deep depression, a great war, and an acute housing shortage—fundamental long-term considerations affecting the housing of the American people were likely to be ignored. After many hearings on the matter the Federal Housing Act was passed in 1949. It established new forms of Federal financial assistance to help cities eliminate slum and blighted areas, it extended Federal financial aid to private enterprise, and it set up a research program seeking to improve methods of construction. Inspired by this direct attack upon the problem, many States established cooperating programs to extend the gains, and Massachusetts was a leader among them.

The public agencies had to step into the breach because the failure to provide for all segments of the population has been a long-standing fault of the housing industry. They provided for some, but neglected others until the neglect overwhelmed them. The slums which exist in every city are proof that private enterprise alone cannot meet the needs of the lower-income families. Even the middle-income group is having its troubles. Nearly 70 percent of American families had incomes below $4,000 a year as of June last year. And this was the minimum needed to buy the cheapest of housing. Even adjusting for fluctuations, building costs have been rising over a long period of time. In 1948 they were 129 percent higher than in 1939, while the general cost of living for the same period had gone up only 75 percent. And all costs have gone up still more since the outbreak of war in Korea.

Under these compelling circumstances, public housing was the only answer. And what are its purposes? (1) It wants to make sure that every family can obtain the minimum requirements for decent, safe, and sanitary housing; (2) to work toward the goal where as many families as possible get better than the minimum requirements; (3) to develop the housing program as a definite contribution to a higher United States standard of living. We have the necessary physical capacity, and now we need the planning that in spite of temporary defense priorities will never lose sight of the fact that we must constantly improve housing for the middle- and lower-income groups. For this contributes to the morale and the general welfare that is basic to our national progress. And it is the duty of government—whether it be local, State, or Federal, or by the cooperation of all three—to promote that general welfare.

Public housing, even in its young record, is doing just that.

What kind of dwellings did American families escape from thanks to public housing? Let's look at those who were first liberated in 1946.

Fifty-eight percent of their former habitations were structurally a menace to health and safety.

Sixty-two percent had no inside private toilets.

Sixty-nine percent had no private bath.

Forty percent had dangerous or inadequate cooking facilities.

Sixty-four percent had dangerous or inadequate heating.

Forty-nine percent had inadequate daylight or ventilation.

Furthermore each former dwelling failed to meet at least four of the nine minimum standards for passable housing.

Where these good people would be living, if they had not been rescued by a government determined to eliminate the slums, is not hard to imagine.

They would be back in the substandard dwellings that would be 5 years older and a greater danger to their health and their safety. And their sons, many of whom are now fighting for all of us in Korea, would not have the fine faith and courage that is animating them today.

They know that their Government will not let them down in those areas where private enterprise cannot do the job.

Which brings us to that quality of balance wherein a free society demonstrates its genius in meeting and solving hard problems.

We must provide every freedom and every opportunity for private enterprise to build enough safe, healthy, and efficient living quarters for all Americans. The postwar building boom is catching up with the housing demands of most people.

But when it fails to produce for those folks who do not make enough money to buy or rent privately constructed dwellings then the people through their government must get on with the job.

You and your fellow citizens, both in this city and in the larger community of our Nation, are working out the balance between free enterprise and government that will protect our society from the mistakes of the past and the extremes that may threaten us in the future.

May I congratulate your city fathers and your representatives in the State government for the foresight and sound leadership responsible for this 128-apartment unit which is a credit to your city.

The Chelsea housing project that we dedicate at these exercises is clear evidence that we as a people are continuing our progress.

How Hard It Must Be for the Military Man To Forego His Own Strategical Dispositions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the national Catholic weekly review, America, dated April 28, 1951, contains a very timely reprint of a portion of an address by His Eminence the late Cardinal John Henry Newman nearly a hundred years ago on the supremacy of civilian authority over the military:

THE SOLDIER AND THE STATESMEN

All professions have their dangers, all general truths have their fallacies, all spheres of action have their limits, and are liable to improper extension or alteration. Every professional man has rightly a zeal for his profession, and he would not do his duty toward it without that zeal. And that zeal soon becomes exclusive, or rather necessarily involves a sort of exclusiveness. A zealous professional man soon comes to think that his profession is all in all, and that the world would not go on without it.

We have heard, for instance, a great deal lately in regard to the war in India, of political views suggesting one plan of campaign, and military views suggesting another. How hard it must be for the military man to forego his own strategical dispositions, not on the ground that they are not the best—not that they are not acknowledged by those who nevertheless put them aside to be the best of the object of military success—but because military success is not the highest of objects, and the ends of ends—because it is not the sovereign science, but must ever be subordinate to political considerations or maxims of government, which is a higher science with higher objects—and that, therefore, his sure success on the field must be relinquished because the interests of the council and the cabinet require the sacrifice, that the war must yield to the statesman's craft, the commander in chief to the governor-general.

The Mysteries of the Van Vliet Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THE MYSTERIES OF THE VAN VLIET REPORT—A CASE HISTORY

(By Julius Epstein)

On July 3 and 4, 1949, the New York Herald Tribune published two articles by this author on the massacre of Katyn. Katyn is a little hamlet, west of Smolensk, U. S. S. R., where more than 4,000 Polish officers, prisoners of war on Soviet soil, were killed during World War II.

The two articles analyzed the massacre and gave a brief summary of all the circumstantial evidence available at that time. The evidence produced, clearly points to the Soviets as the perpetrators of the crime.

Among the letters the author received was one from Mr. Harry Thomas Schultz of Hanover, N. H. Mr. Schultz' letter contained the following two paragraphs:

"I am curious about one omission in your excellent discussion of the subject. You make no mention of the American and British officers who were flown from prison camps by the Germans to the scene of the killing in April or early May of 1943.

"I am sorry to be vague about dates and names, but we all resisted German pressure so strongly at the time that I have no records of the incident and must depend upon my memory. In April 1943, I was held at Oflag IX A/Z, Rothenburg-on-Fulda, when two Americans, Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet and Captain Stewart, and at least one British officer, Lieutenant Colonel Stevenson, R. A. M. C., were taken to Katyn. After their return they refused to answer any questions from any one for fear of playing into the hands of the Germans, but they might now have some valuable information to give."

Mr. Schultz' mention of Van Vliet's name turned out to be an invaluable help in the search for truth about Katyn. Immediately, a thorough search was launched to locate Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. At last the American committee for the investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc. (which was formed under the chairmanship of Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland, as a result of the two articles in the New York Herald Tribune) succeeded in locating Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. A letter was sent to Van Vliet. He answered briefly, saying that he was in no position to give any information about his visit to Katyn in 1943. It was evident that Van Vliet acted under instructions from the Pentagon. Therefore, the Katyn committee asked one of its friends in Congress, Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, to get in touch with the Pentagon. DONDERO complied with the committee's request. On October 6, 1949, he wrote the following letter to the Director of Military Intelligence:

"Gentlemen: Some time ago I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the murder of several thousand Polish officers, probably by the Russians.

"It has recently come to my attention that certain British and American officers were taken to the scene of the execution of these men while such officers were prisoners of the Germans.

"It has been rumored that at least two of the American officers were Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., and a captain Stewart, otherwise unidentified.

"It is quite possible that a committee will be formed to investigate the matter officially (the committee which had already been in existence at that time was officially incorporated on November 15, 1949.—J. E.) and the purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not the above-named officers have made a report on this matter and, if so, whether such report is available. If so, I would be very much pleased to receive a copy of the same."

It was not before October 19, that the Pentagon answered. On that day Maj. Gen. S. LeRoy Irwin, Director of Intelligence, United States Army, and a member of the General Staff, wrote the following letter:

"DEAR MR. DONDERO: Reference is made to your letter of October 6, 1949, in which you request information on a report of the Katyn massacre. The Intelligence Division has recently acquired a report on this subject, which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations of the German exhumation of the Polish graves at Katyn in 1943. The report is classified and therefore cannot be released at this time.

"In the event this report is declassified, it will be a pleasure to furnish you a copy.

"Sincerely yours,

"S. LEROY IRWIN,
"Major General, GSC, Director of Intelligence."

Representative DONDERO answered on October 31. He wrote General Irwin: "For the life of me I cannot conceive why Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report on the Katyn affair should be classified." He asked the Pentagon for an explanation of the reasons that impelled the Department to classify the report, 6 years after the event.

On November 8, 1949, General Irwin answered DONDERO's letter. He wrote that "the report contains certain highly sensitive information the premature disclosure of which would be extremely unwise in view of the current international situation. The Department of the Army believes it inadvisable to release the report."

This rather evasive and, as we shall see later, untrue and silly answer caused the indefatigable DONDERO to write to the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson.

On January 9, 1950, DONDERO wrote to Johnson. The Secretary responded on January 18. I quote from his letter:

"Of the two documents you mention, the only one which we have in the Department of Defense is a report, prepared in the Army General Staff. This report is an accumulation of information from various sources and, although its preparation has been commonly attributed to Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet,

he collaborated in its preparation only to the extent of reviewing its contents.

"It is my understanding that you have previously requested the Army to release this report to you and you were informed that since it contained highly sensitive information, its release by the Army was considered unwise. However, shortly before I received your letter, Secretary of the Army Gray raised with me the question of its release. No decision has been reached as yet concerning this matter but I hope to be able to give a definite answer to your request at an early date.

"With kindest personal regards,

"Sincerely yours,

"LOUIS JOHNSON."

From this moment on, it took the Defense Department exactly 8 months to release the Van Vliet report together with a memorandum to the press which reveals that everything General Irwin and Louis Johnson have written was absolutely untrue and that a hardly imaginable confusion and know-nothing about the well-established basic facts about Katyn existed—and probably still exists—in the Pentagon. The documents will tell the whole story.

The Department of Defense released a whole dossier on September 18, 1950. The dossier was composed of a memorandum to the press, the proper report written by Van Vliet, and some letters pertaining to the report as well as of a memorandum by Stanley S. B. Gilder, captain, EAMC.

It is important to notice that on September 18, 1950, neither Louis Johnson nor General Irwin were in office in their respective positions as Secretary of Defense and Director of Military Intelligence, United States Army.

The Van Vliet report itself is of utmost importance in various respects. First of all, because Van Vliet bluntly states: "I believe that the Russians did it. The rest of the group that visited the site stated to me that they believed that the Russians did it." And he adds: "Captain, now Major, Donald Stewart, EA, can be asked to verify this. I don't know his present address. He is Regular Army."

Second, with the release of this report, our Government indicates for the first time that it does not any longer believe in Stalin's lies about the German guilt. This is of tremendous importance in view of the fact that the Government, through its Office of War Information, disseminated for years Stalin's lies about Katyn, and our present Voice of America has always rejected to tell the world the truth about Katyn. This persistence in not telling the truth about Katyn went so far that the Voice even forced Count Joseph Czapski, one of the few survivors of the Russian massacre of Polish officers, to omit any mention of the word and the facts of Katyn when he was invited to broadcast in Polish to his Polish brethren.

It is not the purpose of this article to deal with the special merits of Van Vliet's report, but to reveal the mystery and confusion which surrounds this document as far as the Defense Department is concerned.

As the memorandum to the press reveals, the Van Vliet report released on September 18, 1950, is not at all the Van Vliet report as it was written on May 22, 1945. This original report mysteriously disappeared, notwithstanding the fact that it was classified "top secret" and locked up in a safe in the Pentagon. The report now released is a second one, written exactly 5 years after the first one was dictated in General Bissell's Pentagon office.

This second Van Vliet report, addressed to Maj. Gen. F. L. Parks, Chief of Information, United States of America, starts with the following two paragraphs:

"1. Pursuant to your letter of 26 April, 1950, I am personally typing this report of my recollections concerning the Katyn case. I am retaining one carbon copy for my personal file.

"2. Since 5 years have elapsed since I made the first report to Major General Bissell, this report will have to omit some details such as names which I have forgotten. In order to assist in locating my original report here are the circumstances under which it was made:

"On 22 May, 1945, General Bissell discussed the case with me alone in his private office in the Pentagon for about 20 minutes. He decided that it was important and directed his civilian female assistant (secretary? stenographer?) to go with me to a closed room across the hall and take dictation. I dictated my report, she typed it up and we added the photographs as inclosures. The general read the finished report, directed that it be marked "Top Secret" and filed. He then dictated the letter directing me to silence, and had me sign a copy of it in his presence. He explained the importance of my remaining silent, gave me my copy of the letter and thanked me."

PENTAGON VERSION

The Memorandum to the Press, not written by Van Vliet but by an official in the Pentagon, states the following:

"A memorandum written by an American officer concerning a visit which he made to the scene of a World War II atrocity involving the massacre of thousands of Polish Army officers in Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, in western Russia, has been declassified by the Department of the Army and is herewith made available for public dissemination.

"Decision to declassify the memorandum was made after numerous congressional and press inquiries as to its availability were directed to the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense.

"The memorandum was written by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., who, while a prisoner of war of the Germans during World War II, was taken to Katyn by his captors and shown the corpses and graves at the site of the massacre.

"Shortly after he was liberated in 1945 Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet dictated a memorandum on this incident for the Department of the Army. Inquiries concerning this memorandum, which was classified, were made to the Department starting in the late months of 1949 and continuing through last week. In answering the first queries, the Department of the Army mistakenly indicated that it was in possession of a report which had been based in part on the observation of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. Such was not the case, this fact being discovered after the original requests had been answered.

"When this error was discovered, a search was instituted for the Van Vliet memorandum, so that consideration could be given to the question of whether it could be declassified and released to inquirers.

"When it became apparent that the memorandum could not be found immediately, the Chief of Information of the Department of the Army wrote to Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet, on April 26, 1950, requesting him to submit a second memorandum on his visit to the Katyn graves. Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet submitted a detailed second memorandum on the same subject dated May 11, 1950, which has now been declassified and is being released.

"Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet is at present on duty in the Far East Command.

"The Secretary of the Army, after having had a thorough search made for the original memorandum by the Department counselor, has directed the Inspector General to continue the search and to report any findings of the investigation to him.

"Should the original report be found it, too, will be released.

"The search for the original memorandum up to now has disclosed that on August 21, 1945, Maj. Gen. Clayton Bissell, then Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, of the War Department, wrote the following letter to Mr. Frederick B. Lyon, then Acting Director of the Office of Controls of the Department of State.

"'DEAR MR. LYON: Transmitted for the information and file of the State Department is Report on Katyn, by Stanley S. B. Gilder, captain, EAMC, British medical officer. This report supplements statement of Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., forwarded to General Holmes, May 25, 1945, and generally substantiates all material facts in Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report.

"'Sincerely,

"'CLAYTON BISSELL,

"'*Major General, GSC,*

"'*Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2.*

"('One enclosure: Report on Katyn by Stanley S. B. Gilder, captain, EAMC.')

"The General Holmes referred to in this letter is Brig. Gen. Julius C. Holmes, who at that time was an Assistant Secretary at the Department of State and who is presently the Minister attached to the United States Embassy in London.

"The Department of State has no record of having received the memorandum of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet on May 25, 1945, and the Department of the Army has so far found no receipt for it and no covering letter of transmittal. The only letter sent on May 25, 1945, from General Bissell to General Holmes was on another phase of this subject, and it contains no reference to transmitting the Van Vliet memorandum. General Holmes has been reached with reference to the matter and does not recall ever having seen Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's memorandum, though General Bissell remembers having sent it to him.

"Maj. Donald B. Stewart, who is mentioned in Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's memorandum, and who was the other United States Army officer present on the visit to Katyn in 1943, concurs generally with Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. Major Stewart is now stationed at St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Tex., in connection with ROTC training.

"The memorandum of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet and enclosures thereto follow, together with the memorandum of Captain Gilder, British medical officer, which was enclosed in the letter of August 21, 1945, from General Bissell to Mr. Lyon and the distribution of which the British have authorized following their declassification of the paper."

THE ESTABLISHED FACTS

Therefore, the following facts are well established beyond the shadow of any doubt. (They all follow from the Government's own press release):

1. That Van Vliet dictated his report on May 22, 1945, in General Bissell's office in the Pentagon.

2. Van Vliet dictated the report to a female assistant to General Bissell.

3. There was obviously not a single carbon copy or photostat of the report made.

4. The report was immediately marked "top secret" by General Bissell.

5. The report was filed as a "top secret" document and locked up in a safe.

6. The report was forwarded on May 25, 1945, to General Holmes, Assistant Secretary in the Department of State.

7. The Department of State has no record of having received the report.

8. The Department of Defense has not found any receipt from the State Department nor any copy of a letter of transmittal.

9. The report disappeared completely and mysteriously.

10. The report was not in the possession of General Irwin, Director of Military Intelligence, when he wrote on October 19, 1949, to Representative DONDERO that his department had it.

11. The report was not in possession of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, nor has

he ever seen it on January 18, 1950, when he wrote to DONDERO that the Department had a report reviewed by Van Vliet.

But this list of horrifying facts does not at all exhaust the list of mystifying confusions in the Pentagon. When they became known through the Government's own press release, Representative DONDERO was shocked and wrote to the new Secretary of Defense, General Marshall. General Marshall referred DONDERO's letter to Mr. F. Shackelford, Department counselor, who answered DONDERO in a letter of October 6, 1950. In view of the importance of this letter which reveals another series of facts, characterizing the mess in the Army's intelligence department, Mr. Shackelford's letter is produced in full:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Secretary of Defense Marshall, as you know from his acknowledgment of October 5, 1950, to your letter of September 28, 1950, has referred to our attention the matter you raised concerning Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr.'s first memorandum on the Katyn massacre.

Gen. S. LeRoy Irwin in his reply on October 19, 1949, to your letter of October 6, 1949, referred to a Katyn massacre "report * * * which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations." In making this statement he erroneously thought that a study entitled "Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre" was based in part on information supplied by Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. This was not so. Instead the supplementary report was an independent and detailed study made by a Polish committee which at no time has consulted or conferred with Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. This study, dated October 1947, supplemented an earlier more extensive report prepared by the same committee entitled "Facts and Documents Concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign," dated February 1946.

The mistake in concluding that the supplementary report was in any way based upon Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations was not discovered until some time after General Irwin's letter to you of October 19, 1949. In the course of carefully examining the supplementary report, which was not clearly labeled as to its origin, for the purpose of determining whether or not to disseminate it, it became apparent that it was a report of a Polish committee prepared entirely independently of any observations of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet. Upon this discovery the files of both the Army and the State Departments were exhaustively searched for Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's memorandum dictated on May 22, 1945. When it could not be found the Army's Chief of Information asked Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet to prepare another report. The lieutenant colonel's eight-page memorandum dated May 11, 1950, was declassified and distributed along with a press memorandum of the Department of Defense on September 18, 1950. We furnished you with a copy of that memorandum, together with enclosures, on that date, and for your convenience are enclosing an additional copy with this letter.

The two very detailed reports entitled "Facts and Documents Concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign" and a "Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre" were marked "For private circulation only" and have not been publicly distributed.

Sincerely yours,

F. SHACKELFORD,
Department Counselor.

(One enclosure. Press release of September 18, 1950.)

ADDITIONAL FACTS AND A FEW QUESTIONS

From this letter the following additional facts evolve:

12. Gen. LeRoy Irwin mistook the Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre with the Van Vliet report.

13. General Irwin believed that this supplementary report was made by a Polish committee.

14. General Irwin, Director of Intelligence of the United States Army, believed that another study, entitled "Facts and Documents Concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign" and dated February 1946, was prepared by the same committee to which he ascribed the supplementary report.

15. General Irwin did not know that both documents were released not by a Polish committee but by the Polish Government in Exile (London) in 1946.

16. General Irwin did not know that both documents, prepared by the London Poles, represent the basic material on Katyn and that they were edited by Professor Heitzman, an eminent Polish scholar and the greatest living authority on Katyn, now living in this country.

17. General Irwin did not know that both documents have been used again and again by many writers who wrote on Katyn and that therefore it was utmost folly to classify them as "top secret" as was done according to Irwin's letters to Dondero.

These are the facts.

The following questions arise:

1. Who was the "female assistant" to General Bissell who took dictation from Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet on May 22, 1945?

2. Why was not a single carbon copy or photostatic copy made of the report?

3. Who locked up the report marked, "top secret"?

4. Who forwarded it to General Holmes, Assistant Secretary of State in the Department of State? By what means?

5. Why did the forwarder not ask the State Department for a receipt?

6. Where is a copy of the letter of transmittal, or was there no letter of transmittal? If not why?

7. How is it possible that the Department of Defense has the memoranda on Katyn, released by the Polish Government in Exile in London, and does not know what they are? How did they get those documents, well known to many hundreds if not thousands of writers, journalists, and scholars all over the world, without ever knowing who sent them to the Intelligence Department?

8. How did it come about that the Military Intelligence Department obviously classified those reports from the London Poles already in 1946 as "top secret," while it is a fact, that everybody interested in them could obtain them from the London Poles?

9. Who is responsible for this mess in the Department of Defense as revealed by the mysterious disappearance of the original Van Vliet report and the unbelievable confusion concerning the memoranda issued by the Polish Government in Exile?

10. What is our Military Intelligence, financed with millions of dollars from the taxpayers' pockets worth, when such a situation can prevail?

11. Who got fired?

These are some of the questions which must be answered.

To get the answers, a congressional investigation should start immediately. The Senate Armed Services Committee, under its new chairman, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, should do the job—and a thorough one.

Anglo-American Amity Faces Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham from the Boston Sunday Herald of April 29, 1951:

ANGLO-AMERICAN AMITY FACES TEST
(By Bill Cunningham)

Careless writing and radio news handling recently made it appear that Winston Churchill had endorsed the MacArthur side of the Truman-MacArthur controversy. That doesn't chance to be the fact, and in view of what Britain's great war leader really was driving at; his words need to be examined and his intent understood.

His flattering reference to General MacArthur, the first made in public by any Briton, was incidental to one of his characteristic slaps at the British Labor Government. His chief concern wasn't the fate of MacArthur, but the deterioration of Anglo-American relations, which he blamed on the British party in power.

This occasion was a brief 8-minute address he delivered at a meeting of the Primrose League in Albert Hall. So far as taking sides in the MacArthur controversy is concerned, Mr. Churchill explained that's exactly what he doesn't want to do. Scheduled for some while now to deliver an address at the University of Pennsylvania a week from Tuesday, the former British Prime Minister announced he was canceling the address for two reasons. The first is because of the current crisis in the affairs of the British Labor Government, which may give the Churchill-led Conservatives their long, eagerly awaited chance to bring it down.

The other reason, he said, is because he feels he "should not become involved in the MacArthur controversy on United States soil." His main target in the short address was "the mismanagement and incompetence" of Prime Minister Attlee's Labor government, and he said one of the worst effects has been the loss of intimate contacts between Mr. Attlee and President Truman.

REFERENCE TO GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

From that, he went on to say: "A wave of irritation is passing across the United States, and the isolationist forces there are glad to turn it upon Great Britain." Then came the reference to General MacArthur.

"The reproaches," he said, "against General MacArthur—that great soldier and great statesman, as his settlement of the difficulties with Japan after the war have proved—indulged in by Mr. Shinwell (British Minister of Defense) and even so staid a Minister as Mr. Chyter Ede (Deputy Prime Minister) enable those who do not like us in the United States to suggest that His Majesty's Government have had something to do with the General MacArthur dismissal.

"I cannot believe there is the slightest truth in this. Mr. Truman is not only the President of the United States, he is also the Commander in Chief, and no one outside the great Republic, now bearing nineteen-twentieths of the whole weight of the war in Korea, has the slightest right to interfere between him and his officers."

This really could be interpreted as an endorsement of President Truman. Calling General MacArthur "that great soldier" is

only acknowledging history, and the former British Prime Minister qualified his use of "great statesman" by citing the resurrection of Japan as his principal proof.

More interesting than his estimation of MacArthur is his statement that the United States is carrying nineteen-twentieths of the Korean burden and therefore no outsider has any business trying to pass judgment on what the United States Commander in Chief does to any of his officers. This seems to be another way of saying the Korean action is strictly an American affair, in fact if not in terminology, and that whatever the United States wants to do about it is the United States exclusive business.

That's probably the bald facts of the case, too; but we over here have been told and have been trying to believe that it was and is United Nations business.

If that's not the case, why fire MacArthur? What he wanted to do was fight it out with no holds barred and get it over with. So far as the record goes he was fired because the other member nations were afraid to, and because our own administration agreed with them. Now, in the words of Mr. Churchill, at least, we're told it's really our business and nobody else's.

NO WAVE OF IRRITATION IN UNITED STATES

His main point, however, is the wave of irritation passing across the United States and being turned upon Great Britain by the isolationist forces there. It's to be doubted very much that that's a fair statement of the facts. There's no wave of irritation being turned by any isolationists. There is blank inability of the average American to understand the British position, if Britain has a position.

Britain endorsed the general United Nations program of trying to oppose the spread of communism wherever it moved, yet Britain was the first to extend formal recognition to the Red Chinese, and while British soldiers are dying beside ours in Korea, the British Government has openly sponsored the seating of the Chinese Reds in the United Nations, and the cession to them of the island of Formosa.

While officially denouncing Russia, Britain has continued to do business with Russia, and while actually fighting the Red Chinese, a whopping business in rubber, tungsten, and other strategic materials is being done through the British port of Hong Kong with the Red Chinese, and probably Russia herself. This is disguised and denied in various ways, but all one needs do to get the real information is to talk with returning missionaries, businessmen, etc., who have been thrown out of Red China by way of Hong Kong.

One said to me the other day, "Business in Hong Kong and Singapore has never been so booming. Even the coolies now wear leather shoes." I gathered that latter was the ultimate in general prosperity.

Added in with all this has been the British abuse of MacArthur as a war leader, who was was leading too hard. This is no wave of irritation. It's simply a wonder that's been growing for months—wonder as to where the British stand what they're trying to do, whether they're with us or against us, and what kind of people they can be when they freely commit their sons to die while doing business with the enemy those sons are supposed to be, and are, fighting.

For all this, there are no open evidences of strong and general anti-British feeling here. On the contrary, from a strong evidence coming the other way, the anti-American feeling in Britain seems to be at its highest, at least since the mid-twenties when the British were disavowing their first World War loans. Anti-Americanism has been so general in Britain that some of the British themselves have now undertaken to fight it. That even goes for some of the British newspapers.

If there isn't strong anti-American feeling in the country, how else are we to account for a specimen such as this? It's a copy of the Sunday Mail of April 15, featuring a, for British papers, long article entitled "Stop Envying America." This was written by a professor of political science at Peterhouse, Cambridge, named Denis William Brogan, and since the gentleman studied at Harvard sometime during his career, he apparently has set up as an authority upon America. At least the blurb says "he has published a number of books on America."

TIME SOME HONESTY WAS INTRODUCED

But one of the most interesting things about the article is what amounts to an editorial set above it in heavy type. Officially this is an ad, set five columns wide above the piece to call the reader's attention to it, but behold its content. Its heavy headline says, "It's Time We Had Some Honesty."

Then it proceeds, "It is time some honesty was introduced into our attitude to the Americans. It is time we realize there are only two powers in the world nowadays capable of taking independent action. One is Russia, the other is America.

"To this new and humiliating thought, many British people have failed to make any proper adjustment. They detest Russia, but they are only reluctantly enthusiastic about America. There may be reasons for the reluctance, but, with some people, the reason is no more than an old-fashioned confusion of envy and malice.

"The confusion can only become worse if it is not brought out into the open. On their side, the Americans are weighing up our worth in plenty of penetrating argument, some of it of the chip-on-the-shoulder variety. It is time we had some argument on our own side of the Atlantic. The writer of the article below is a man who has spent the best part of his lifetime studying America and the American people. He provides a starting point for some candid thought."

That last seems to be a fair enough statement. Professor Brogan begins by saying it's obvious, since the recent British budget message, that Britons "are going to be forced to give up some of our hard-earned gains of the past 5 years." They'll be lucky, he says, if they can keep from going backwards economically "and this suspension of progress is due to a world situation that is not of our making."

Other than Russia, he says, the only power now capable of independent action is the United States, and while, he says, it is easy to say, "A plague on both your houses," in practice that means a plague on the American house. If the British want a whipping boy, he says, America is far more available than distant and currently little known Russia.

Of America, he says, they know a great deal because "no people was ever less adept at keeping a secret, nor had more passion for washing dirty linen in public and so providing 'neutralists' with the opportunity of saying it is six of one and half a dozen of the other."

If the British want a scapegoat, he says, America is a natural.

MORE PERMANENT CAUSE OF RESENTMENT

But, says he, there is another and more permanent cause of resentment. He boils this down to the fact that we are richer. It is possible, and perhaps probable, that we can stand the cost of rearmament without lowering our standard of living, whereas the British cannot, "and we naturally resent that."

But resentment, he says, is not argument and it is not a policy. It is not an argument, he says, "to think that America owes us money or goods because 'we fought for her' while she was neutral. We didn't. We fought for ourselves."

While it is true, he says, that they fought for a world in which America would be safer, "if that entitles us to send in a bill to the United States of America, what about the bill to Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, and Ireland?"

"The money," he says, "the Americans are spending on armaments, nylons, cars, and chewing gum, even on 2-pound steaks, is their money. They earned it and they have been extremely generous spenders of it. But envy is a very human emotion and some envy must be allowed for."

He says the "more respectable emotion which can feed anti-American feeling is alarm. It is not only that Americans love washing their dirty linen in public—they love talking loudly."

Then he goes into trouble loud-mouths have caused, recalling the rantings of Hitler and Mussolini. This is all by way of winding up to take a swing at General MacArthur, whom he hereby inferentially places in their class. The British are not "totally comforted," he says, "when American politicians and, still more, American generals conduct high policy by loudspeaker plus television.

"It is not merely a matter of taste," he continues. "When something has been shouted, it is hard to return to more moderate policies and more subdued voices. Too much American policy seems to be made for the headlines, to be designed to compete for public attention with Danny Kaye or the latest arrests in the world of amateur sport."

And then he really gives it to the general. "Of course," he says "of all talkers, the one who alarms us most is General MacArthur * * * Piano, viano, as they say in music, and one may assume the former professor of moral philocophy in the University of Glasgow, His Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, would say that, too, if he had a free hand.

"It's not merely a question of noise. Behind the noise there is, on the American side, the conviction that, on any showdown, the United States will have its way." Then he says he feels if there is a showdown the rulers of the Soviet Union will have every reason to regret "having, like the Messrs. Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, underestimated the power of the United States of America."

COLD COMFORT FOR THE SURVIVORS

That, however, he says, will be cold comfort "for such of us as survive the lesson." He thinks, he says, "we are going to live for a long time in a world of cold war." The power of independent action of the British Government is limited, he says, and it will stay limited. The British economic level will remain below that of the United States. Americans will continue to talk loud.

But, for all this, he says, it will continue to be to the interests of the Soviet Union to divide the British and American peoples. There'll be ups and downs, he says, but "it would be a mistake to take too seriously any given incident, even the appointment of an American admiral to the command of the NATO fleets * * *"

Thereafter he trails off into a humorous effort concerning "the sinking of the Oxford boat under American direction," referring to the recent swamping of the Oxford shell in a race with an American coxswain in command. It doesn't seem to have much to do with the rest of his message * * * but why such a theme as this if our classic allies aren't quietly, but actively hating our guts? And what do we do now, such being the case?

Day in and day out, I read as many different newspapers as anybody and I haven't seen anything to match this in any American journal.

Mr. Churchill seems to have his antibusiness the other way round. This entire subject of great importance—who's really with

us and how far—may shortly be subjected to terrific strain. Specifically, the subject of our British relations may get its hardest test.

The MacArthur interrogation before the various congressional committees are about to begin. Political maneuvering of the Pearl Harbor investigation variety may succeed in clouding the facts and blanking the record. I chance to know, however, one fact those pressing the investigation are going to try to prove.

They're going to try to prove that Britain forced the firing of MacArthur, and the eventual appeasement of the Red Chinese with the threat to wreck the North Atlantic Defense Pact unless these things were done. I don't know that it can be proved, but unless the signals are changed, that's the way the play will go. Bitter insiders claim that's what happened, and that's what Mr. Churchill was trying to scotch with his remarks in Albert Hall.

Information of that nature, seemingly, would have to be wrung from Mr. Acheson if information there is General MacArthur possibly knew nothing about it. He was simply doing his best to get a military conclusion out of a war which was handed him, as he said, without his being consulted. The sellout, if any, took place behind his back.

If that fact is established, Mr. Churchill had better hurry on over. Possibly the keenest of the Britons, he's already worried, as his recent words clearly attest. His passing praise of MacArthur may not have been too incidental either. He may figure that, in the long run, he might be doing business with the general. Mr. Churchill is probably one man who could. He and MacArthur have much in common, including the ways they've been treated.

The Tuna Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, recently certain newspapers in Washington have ridiculed certain budget requests by the State Department for funds to be utilized in connection with the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. I am sure that this action is the result of a misunderstanding concerning the purpose of this commission, which was established by convention between the United States and the Republic of Costa Rica, which on August 17, 1949, received the ratification of the United States Senate and came into force on March 3, 1950.

This convention had the unanimous support of the Pacific Coast States and all factions of the United States tuna industry, including labor, management, and vessel owners.

The convention and the establishment of the joint international commission are considered to be strong and essential steps forward in promoting the peaceful development of the tuna industry by reducing the international friction which has been occasioned from time to time during the expansion of the industry into the high seas off the coasts of nine Latin-American countries.

The United States industry not only fishes tuna in the high seas off the coasts of these several countries; it takes the live bait, which it requires for its fishing, within the territorial waters of these countries. Each vessel does this under individual permit from these countries, paying about $2,000,000 a year for bait-taking permits.

The Latin-American countries have been understandably worried lest such an intense fishery for bait in their territorial waters would exhaust resources which they do not use themselves now, but may wish to use in the future. These worries have also extended to the possibilities of exhausting the supplies of tuna off of their respective coasts.

These worries have been concretely expressed in the form of regulations, policies, and inhibitions in several countries, which are inimical to the development of the tuna industry. These regulations, policies, and inhibitions are not based on scientific research because none of these countries have trained fisheries scientists to survey the situation. Consequently, their regulatory steps have been related to local political action and not to scientific necessities.

All of this has, in the past, contributed to incidents involving United States fishermen and officials of these countries, creating irritations in the relationship between the United States and the Latin-American countries involved.

Until the signing of this convention, these irritating incidents were increasing in number as the tuna fleet and its activities expanded. Upon the signing of this convention and establishment of the Commission, the international tensions surrounding the tuna fishery relaxed markedly because the Latin-American countries believed that there was now to be established a vehicle for the determination of scientific facts upon which regulations can be based in order to prevent an exhaustion of the bait and tuna fisheries.

The function of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission is to determine scientifically if there is, in fact overfishing, with consequent waste in either the bait fishing or the tuna fishing and to determine when and where it occurs and to recommend to the governments involved measures to be taken to prevent overfishing wherever it may occur.

Under the convention each country agreed to pay its share of the joint expenses of the Commission in proportion to each country's use of the resources involved.

The industry itself is prevented from financing the costs of the Commission's work for the following reasons:

First. The Commission is an intergovernmental undertaking. There is no legal way by which its work can be privately financed.

Second. The research must be done by perfectly impartial scientists or its results will not be accepted by the Latin-American countries. If it is done by scientists in the employ of the industry, no amount of persuasion will convince the Latin Americans that the research is being conducted impartially.

Third. The recommendations for regulations, if any are required, will have to be joined in by representatives of the countries through whose waters the resources migrate. Regulations which do not cover the entire range of the resource are useless. None of these countries are apt to adopt recommendations made solely by the United States industry, by the United States, or by one of its neighboring countries. If they do not have an equal hand in directing the research, the analyzing of its results, and the framing of any regulations resulting therefrom, they will be suspicious that the research, analysis, and regulations are biased in favor of the framers. The bait fisheries, all lying within the territorial waters of these countries, can be studied and regulated only by the country in which it lies or by an intergovernmental body to which has been delegated such power.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Dr. Donald P. Loker, general manager, High Seas Packing Co., San Diego, Calif., taking issue with the Washington newspapers ridiculing the request for appropriations for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. I believe his discussion of the Commission and its purposes will be enlightening to my colleagues:

HIGH SEAS TUNA PACKING CO., INC.,
San Diego, Calif., April 27, 1951.

Hon. CECIL R. KING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KING: I am informed that the Washington newspapers of yesterday carried articles based on hearings of the House Appropriations Committee which referred to the study of the "love life of the tuna" in a manner designed to poke fun at the tuna industry.

I would appreciate it if you would call to the attention of your fellow Congressmen that this great industry is not a proper subject for ridicule. The tuna fishery is the most valuable fishery that the United States possesses, and it makes the fishing industry the fourth most valuable industry of the sovereign State of California.

The many thousands of men and women in California, Oregon, and Washington who are gaining their entire livelihood from the catching and processing of this nutritious food, and the additional thousands scattered through every State in the Union who make a living by wholesaling, retailing, and distributing this food to the Nation will not appreciate the levity with which these newspapers, and possibly some Members of the Congress, are treating the serious problems of this vital food industry.

This industry has grown by its own efforts without soliciting or getting one cent of Federal aid. The $125,000,000 which we have invested in the vessels, canneries, etc., which produce tuna, we have taken out of the sea itself and plowed back into the industry. It has not come out of the Federal Treasury.

If the vast subsidizing structure of the Department of Agriculture were taken from under the beef and pork industry of this Nation, that industry would collapse overnight. If the United States Fish and Wildlife Service were to cease operating tomorrow it would make no noticeable difference to the tuna industry. Yet, last year we produced $100,000,000 worth of food and marketed 11,000,000 cases of delicious, nutritious, boneless, skinless tuna meat in this country—enough to provide three and one-half cans for every man, woman, and child in the

Nation. This is not an effort which should be held up to ridicule.

We have not heretofore asked aid from the Federal Government and we would not do so now if there were any way in which we could handle our international problems by our own efforts.

Nearly our entire production comes from the high seas south of the United States border. We fish off the coast of nine Latin-American Republics. We fish for bait, in the territorial waters of most of these countries, under permits which we have to buy from these countries, and for which we pay high prices.

For 15 years we entreated our Department of State to negotiate treaties such as the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Convention. It was not until the accumulation of our problems in several countries began to threaten the friendly relations between the United States and these countries that we could get the Department of State to act. When they did we gave every cooperation. We aided in the negotiation of the treaty; we urged the ratification of the treaty by the United States Senate; we pushed for the passage of implementing legislation through the Congress; we have thrown open the confidential records of our vessel operations and cannery operations to the Commission's staff; we have provided an advisory board from the industry to aid the Commission in its serious tasks; we have given largely of our time and money to aiding this most worth-while project; and now we find that we are being held up to ridicule before the Congress and the Latin-American Republics.

The treaty received the unanimous consent to ratification by the United States Senate. The implementing legislation passed the Congress last fall without a dissenting vote. We understand the Department of State was authorized, because of the urgency of the problems, to use funds already appropriated to its international contingency fund to get this Commission's work under way pending the approval of regular appropriations this year.

The Commission held one meeting in California and a second one in Costa Rica. A plan of research was prepared and approved; a budget to cover these activities was approved by both Governments. The Government of tiny Costa Rica sent its check for its complete share of the Commission's joint expenses to the Commission. The United States sent a check for $12,000 as a first installment of its $59,000 share of the Commission's joint expenses.

The Commission hired a top-notch scientist to direct its investigation. The Director hired a secretary and one assistant and made plans to hire other scientists to carry out the investigations which are so urgently needed.

But no more money of the United States share of the expenses was forthcoming. Through some hanky-panky between the Department of State and the House Appropriations Committee these funds have been held up. We cannot understand why this has been so. The President and his Bureau of the Budget have given their approval to the urgent nature of this work. So has the Department of State. So, we thought, had the Congress to a man.

But now the Commission has run out of money even before it has been able really to get its work started. And in 2 weeks' time it will have to fire its skeleton staff for lack of funds to pay their wages. We have been held up to ridicule before the Latin American Republics, and so has the entire Congress.

The treaty which the entire United States Senate approved is being vetoed by lack of funds. The Commission which the entire United States Congress approved is being strangled for lack of funds. Solemn international commitments made by this Nation to a sister republic are being welched on. No action that the United States could take would be more damaging to this industry than that which it is now doing: to make a bargain with one of our sister republics and then fail to keep it.

Other Latin American nations are closely watching this situation and already the repercussions have begun to set in. Two weeks ago, Panama refused two of our vessels permits to take bait during the regular bait season, and these two vessels, after going 800 miles out of their way to get this bait, have to wander off elsewhere to some other country. Panama does not want its bait resources damaged; Panama has no scientists to determine whether damage is being done or not. Therefore, Panama is just closing its bait grounds to us until impartial investigations are made.

The Nation cries for meat; the Navy wants our ships; the Navy is using our vessels and crews to help guard the Pacific approaches of the Panama Canal from Ecuador to Mexico. Yet the great puissant United States cannot find the paltry $47,000 remaining of its committed share to keep this Commission running and help this industry keep afloat.

I hope—and that hope is shared by the entire tuna industry—that you will bend every effort to see what is holding this money up and to investigate why this industry is being ridiculed instead of aided in the Nation's Capital.

From the standpoint of our international problems, it would have been much better that the treaty had never been negotiated than that it should be allowed to fail. But now that the treaty has been put in force, the Commission activated, and the research started, it is disastrous to us to have the whole thing cast acide. The repercussions on our industry of this welshing by the United States Government is going to be that we will be hurled back into a welter of diplomatic engagements damaging to us and to United States relations with those governments, and which we cannot handle.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD P. LOKER,
General Manager, High Seas Packing Co.

Wide Support Given to World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following public-opinion release from George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion. The poll which he conducted shows that the world-government idea has wide public support.

In analyzing the results of Gallup's poll, there might be some critics of world government who will try and make capital of the fact that only a minority had a clear-cut idea about the meaning of world government before being polled. I think that the answer to this objection is the fact that a poll on the familiarity with the Marshall plan revealed that while two-thirds knew it had something to do with aid to Europe, only 14 percent could define its objectives. This is true of virtually any specific foreign-policy measure, and probably will be in the forseeable future. This poll does not, of course, indicate that the people are crying for or demanding world government, but it does seem reasonable to conclude that they will accept the first steps in that direction.

Being one of the sponsors in this year's Congress of the world-government resolution, I am more than gratified to see the results of Gallup's poll. I might call attention to the fact that this year I sent my annual legislative questionnaire to about 25,000 constituents in which was the following question: "Would you be in favor of our Government taking the lead in the further development of the U. N. into a world federation capable of enforcing world law?" I have tabulated the first 1,000 returns on this question and the results show that 82 percent of those answering the question are for the idea as compared to 18 percent against.

Dr. Gallup's poll follows:

PRINCETON, N. J., May 1.—The world government resolution which has been introduced in Congress has considerable popular backing throughout the country, judging by interviews on the subject, with a balanced cross section of the Nation's voters.

Those better informed about the world government movement are more in favor of it. But even among persons not previously familiar with it, Gallup poll interviewers found considerable support for the idea of strengthening the United Nations to make it a world government.

Approximately two-thirds (64 percent) of all voters questioned by the American Institute of Public Opinion had some idea about the meaning of the term "world government." However, only a minority could explain the term with any precision.

Thirty-six percent were unable to give any meaningful definition.

All persons, whether they had previously heard of the term or not, were then asked: "Do you think the United Nations should or should not be strengthened to make it a world government with power to control the armed forces of all nations, including the United States?"

Yes, it should, answered 49 percent.
No, it should not, declared 36 percent.
The others, 15 percent, were undecided.

When compared with a survey on a similar question conducted in 1946, the above results indicate no great change of sentiment on the world-government issue.

INFORMED APPROVE

Those better informed in today's survey—the ones who were able to give a reasonably correct definition of the term "world government"—approve the idea by the following vote:

Make U. N. a world government, said 53 percent.
Leave it as it is, answered 37 percent.
The remainder, 10 percent, were undecided.

In the last session of Congress approximately 110 Members of the House of Representatives pledged themselves in favor of the resolution.

RESOLUTION TEXT

The resolution introduced in Congress by a number of representatives and supported by the World Federalists reads as follows:

"That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into an organization of such defined and limited powers as are essential to the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law to prevent aggression and to maintain peace."

Another group, the Atlantic Union Committee, favors a more limited type of world government made up of the Atlantic Powers, whereas the world federalists would open the door to all countries.

The National Home Garden and Home Food Preservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, just a word in behalf of the National Home Garden and Home Food Preservation Program, sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. Gardening in any year is one of the most useful and satisfying of human avocations. It is to be regretted that so many American citizens are deprived of the opportunity to learn by experience more about the soil and the plants from which they derive their daily food. It is good to think that millions of us have space on farm or in back yard where we can cultivate some vegetables and fruits, good for our bodies, and some grass and flowers and shade trees which renew our spirits and our faith in those simple beautiful things which are not too expensive for most of us to own or create with our own hands. We all recognize that the home is the very center of the American way of life. That it should be attractive outside as well as in, goes without saying. And when a garden also makes a contribution in wholesome food it adds to the sense of permanence, security and justifiable pride in American citizenship.

There is particular need for emphasizing home gardening and home food preservation this year arising out of the uncertainties of the time. No one knows how great or how small the food supply will be at the end of the crop year in 1951. No one can predict with certainty the character of the demand and the distribution of fruits and vegetables as they might be affected by military needs and transportation exigencies. Gardens and pantries are very practical storages of food against emergencies. Modern techniques of preservation, including home freezers, low temperature locker storages, pressure cookers, improved home canning instructions and equipment, and the storage of several kinds of fresh vegetables and fruits in cool basements and earth pits, are good ways to insure against possible shortage.

Home gardens, intelligently handled on good soil are important money savers, for low-income families particularly. Naturally, the advantages increase with the size of the family. Some impressive figures showing possible returns from home gardens recently appeared in the March and April numbers of two of the largest nationally circulated magazines—Better Homes and Gardens, and McCall's.

At least five other national magazines with a tremendous total circulation have featured home gardening with very important articles—House and Garden, Life, Look, Country Gentleman, and American Home. The Saturday Evening Post and Life also gave prominent space recently to the achievements of prominent seed concerns in the world of flower growing. All these things reflect the tremendous and growing interest of Americans in the art of gardening both for food and for beauty.

During World War II, the Union Pacific Railroad surveyed some 20,000 employee gardens in each of 2 years and concluded that if the vegetables grown and used had been purchased in the Kansas City wholesale markets they would have cost between $100 and $120 per garden.

It has come to my attention that there is a disposition in some quarters to play down the importance and value of a home-garden program and to regard home gardening as it now stands as adequate for our needs. At the height of the victory garden program the country had 20,000,000, perhaps as much as 22,000,000, gardens—Gallup polls. Extension workers and garden leaders think the number was not over 55 percent as many in 1950; some think about 50 percent. There is no justification for officials or civilian organizations to be complacent with the effectiveness of their programs in the fact of such a steadily falling home-garden effort. In the face of a sadly decreased wheat crop and widespread unfavorable weather conditions this is no time to relax our efforts to produce food on either farm or garden.

Higher food production goals have been set for 1951 in the interest of national defense for such essential cereals as corn and spring wheat and for tomatoes, peas, and sweet corn for canning. In view of the fact that home gardening labor is voluntary and takes no manpower from industry, that it is good for those who engage in it from about every angle one can think of, and that it cultivates a taste for vegetables which reflects itself in larger sales of commercial vegetables, there should be nothing but enthusiastic support for such a program.

I like the emphasis which the program lays on food preservation and use because it encourages many people in cities and towns who have no opportunity to make gardens, to freeze or can vegetables and fruits, and thus become participants, to their own advantage, in the effort.

Many of our political and military leaders think the world will live in a state of tension for several years. A continuing program of self-reliance on our individual production and conservation powers is in the national interest, a program that teaches school children and adults alike the fundamentals of food production, the essentials of sturdy independence of character and intelligent application of heart and hand to winning their daily bread, if necessary, in the event that disaster ever requires them to do so as a matter of survival.

The Menace and Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles Malik, the distinguished author of the following timely discourse, has just succeeded Eleanor Roosevelt as chairman of the United Nations Committee on Human Relations, of which she was chairman for five consecutive years.

Newspaper reports recently related that the Soviet Union member of said Commission was the only member who did not vote for Mr. Malik to succeed Mrs. Roosevelt.

A reading of the following, by Dr. Malik, will make clear why the Soviet spokesman did not care to have Dr. Malik head up this very, very important United Nations Commission.

I commend to your attention the utmost consideration of the article and due emphasis by every Congressman of its analysis and conclusions.

It follows:

CONCERNING COMMUNISM: THE MENACE AND THE CHALLENGE

(By Dr. Charles Malik, Minister of Lebanon in the United States, delivered July 26, 1950)

I

Communism is orginally a doctrine about reality, an ideal, and a call to action. Today, however, it has transported itself into the domain of concrete reality. For communism is now the principle of being of a great power and of a solidly organized group of nations under its hegemony. It is also the ideal and cause of a world-wide movement. It controls the life of about one-third of the globe, formally and directly. At least another one-third of the world determines its ultimate policies in terms of communism, albeit negatively and by way of reaction. Thus between themselves, the Communist and the non-Communist camps—both equally, though in opposite ways, functions of communism—constitute the totality of the effective agents of today's world.

What a difference, then, between the reality of communism today, which affects the life of the whole world, and the reality of communism a hundred years ago, when it was, to all appearance, no more than a bold cry in the wilderness. When Marx and Engels launched their wild attack on all known and existing patterns of life, the opening words of their Manifesto—"A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of communism"—were by no means a description of an existing situation; but today, exactly a century later, these same words are more than completely fulfilled. It may indeed have been only a spectre then; but today the spectre has taken on formidable concretion.

And yet, the dangers latent in communism need not have awaited the developments of this whole century to be fully realized; they were already there, in the pages of the Manifesto, for the whole world to read, decades before communism had at its disposal the world's most organized war machinery.

At the outset of the two half centuries that have just elapsed, men failed to realize the full character and magnitude of the chal-

lenge of communism mainly because their sight was concentrated on the political and the quantitative. Due to its infinitesimal physical dimensions, the spiritual significance of communism simply eluded men's vision. Those who did read aright the signs of the times—and they were very rare—solitary and suffering figures like Kierkegaard and Dostoyevsky—did so because their visions penetrated beyond the outward dimensions of events and grasped their inner spiritual and intellectual significance. Today, however, those who see only the political, social, economic, and military threat of communism miss its true challenge as pathetically as did their predecessors. For both see out of focus; both are so impressed by the physical weakness or strength of what is essentially a spiritual revolution that they lose sight of its real character.

II

Communism is a thoroughly consistent system of thought. From its basic and initial metaphysical premises, its all-comprehensive materialistic conception of reality, to its interpretation of human-social-historical reality, dominated by historical economic determinism, to its amoral view of human action, determined in its motives, directions, and worth only by its serviceability to the cause of world revolution—communism presents the spectacle of a tightly knit, rigid system of thought, permeated through and through, in its presuppositions, structure, and conclusions, by the spirit of metaphysical monism, ethical and axiological relativism, self-centered, autonomous humanism, impersonalist collectivism, historical dynamism, and militant atheism.

Communism is predicated on the emphatic rejection of God. The whole order of the spirit is rejected; self-subsistent spiritual beings are denied, while the spirituality of corporeal beings, like man, is reduced to a function of their physical existence. The Communist denial of God and the spirit is militant. Communism goes beyond agnosticism, beyond passive atheism; it assumes the form of aggressive and militant atheism. For God is not merely an illusion, but a harmful illusion, ingeniously utilized by priests and bourgeoisie for their own interests, and therefore combated by communism in the name of the class interests of the proletariat.

With the abolition of God goes the abolition of the absolute in any form. There is no absolute truth which man seeks and knows. There is no absolute good which man strives for, which eternally judges of man's actions and intentions and very being. Everything is relative—in its origin, being but a product of the material conditions of human existence, as well as in its form and function, being always subordinate to the interests and desires of classes. The good, the true, the beautiful, thus relativized, are ruthlessly subjectivized beyond any hope at a healthy, corrective relation to an objective order above the whims and interests of man.

The conception of man in communism is accordingly disfigured. Severed from his divine origin and divine destiny; denied the spiritual principle which gives his reason access to the truth, which endows his conscience and will with the craving for the good, which empowers his heart to love; imprisoned hopelessly in this world of strife and frustration, here to center all his hopes and here to erect his paradise—Communist man, thus despiritualized and depersonalized to the highest degree, is pathetically dehumanized. He is but a passing shadow of no duration, a fragment of no intrinsic or ultimate worth, a function of the striving of his generation for a more productive existence. Man's natural and inalienable rights are thus superseded by privileges bestowed by the collective; man's personal, intrinsic dignity is made to rest upon and emanate from his status in and contributions to the community; man's freedom—freedom of thought, freedom of being, freedom of self-achievement—is rendered conditional upon and utterly subservient to the whims and the interests of society.

From the point of view of world peace what is important about this doctrine is its entrenchment as the official monolithic philosophy of one of the two great powers of the world today. This power, whose capital is Moscow, has inherited the vast realms of the former Russian Empire, including its autocratic totalitarian organization. It has annexed to itself further millions of square miles and further hundreds of millions of human beings. Marx and his followers gloried in the fact that they were not only describing history—they were determined to take history into their hands and change it. Next to the bourgeoisie, it was the philosophers who mainly described events from the outside who were the targets of the Communists' sharpest shafts of ridicule. From the very beginning communism was one of the crassest lusts for power the world has ever known.

The actual, historical, political enshrinement of communism in the Russian-Soviet state meant a total concentration of all origination in the hands of the government. Everything flows from and is licensed by the government. Thus there are no independent free sources of thought, creation, activity; the assumption being, as Mr. Acheson remarked not long ago, that the government, which is the source of everything, is made up of gods or demigods, or at least supermen who know the truth and can never err.

Thus communism is not only a total doctrine which is at absolute variance with the deepest persuasions of the West; it is—and this is its importance from the viewpoint of war and peace—a total state. Nor is it just a total state living by itself; it is an aggressive state, absolutely determined to spread its outlook, its system, its power, throughout the world, not indeed under conditions of fair and free competition with other systems and outlooks (this very concept of fair and free competition would of course be the object of vitriolic sarcasm by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin), but by force and subversion and every conceivable subtlety.

Communists usually offer one aspect of their teachings to a group or an individual, that aspect which appeals to the interests of the group or the temperament of the individual in question; to the underprivileged masses, it is equality and security and what they call economic justice; to the peoples fighting against colonialisms, it is emancipation from their imperialist masters; to soft pacifists, it is attacks against warmongers and petitions for world peace; to oppressed races, it is racial equality; to the cosmopolitans, it is the supra-national world-scope of communism; to the intellectuals it is the lure of the ideal of equality and justice; to the liberals, it is what they call the struggle against fascism. Now, so far as they go, these partial emphases of communism have each a germ of truth. But they are not the whole truth about communism; they are not the essence of communism. Nor can the abstract good in them stand up, white and radiant, outside the dark shadow of the whole system.

These various aspects of communism are offered as a bait, cunningly prepared to suit the victim, to be followed gradually but steadily by larger and larger doses of the whole system and to be consummated, once the victim is well on his way toward complete capture, by rigid discipline. This seems to be in the general pattern of Communist infiltration: one-sided appeal to all-round subjugation. But communism is in reality a compact totality of spirit and values and premises, every one of which essentially partakes of the character of the whole. The greatest danger inherent in communism is not its total evil and falsehood which is likely, once communism is viewed as a whole, to be rejected even by common sense, but rather the isolated streaks of good and truth which enter into the fabric of the whole and which, viewed in abstraction, may ensnare the weak and innocent.

III

Superficially, communism is a revolt against the capitalist system, an antithesis to the bourgeoise civilization of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, characterized as it has been by nationalism, individualism, imperialism, politico-economic liberalism, free economic enterprise, private ownership of property and of the means of production, representative government, and the rule of law.

This is, of course, partly true, although it can be shown that the Soviets are absolutely imperialistic, that in the United Nations they have insisted on nothing more than on the principle of national sovereignty, and that so far as the private ownership of property and of the means of production are concerned, the passage of these things from the private ownership of a few individuals—subject always to the inevitable correctives of free competition and to the social and economic scrutiny of the public and the government—to the monopoly of the state, which is subject to no judgment whatsoever above itself, this passage is not a sure mark of progress.

Be that as it may, the point I want to make now is that communism has much more in common with its antithesis than it realizes. Though a revolt against what it ambiguously calls capitalism, communism is more profoundly a completion, a culmination, a passage to its logical conclusion, of that movement of European secularism and self-estrangement of which the age and civilization of capitalism is but a product, in fact perhaps an intermediate and transitory stage. Their opposition takes place on common grounds. For behind the opposition between their respective systems of organizing the modes of production and exchange, behind the difference in their patterns of social and political organization, behind the antithesis of their conceptions of social dynamics, there lies a basic disturbing kinship of outlook. It is the kinship of their common underlying economism, their common worship of the economic man: half-hearted and perhaps unconscious, yet, nevertheless, all-pervading, in the one case, and militant and elevated to the level of a creed in the other case. It is the similarity of their common autonomous humanism: their preoccupation with human affairs, their concentration on man's life here below, where material interests are uppermost and material prosperity the supreme good—a concentration which in the one case overshadows and in the other case entirely supersedes the eternal, the spiritual, the transcendent. It is finally the similarity of their common impersonalism: in the one case, within the context of an atomistic, self-seeking, closed and windowless individualism, in itself opaque to love and suffering and sacrifice and responsibility and social solidarity; and, in the other case, within the context of an absolutely soulless collectivism in which the person's independent existence is denied, his freedom, his dignity, his worth being all made derivative from the leviathan which is his state.

IV

This then is the theory and actuality of communism in general and this is the character of its dialectic within the secularism of the present western epoch.

The question therefore arises: Can there be real peace, with communism so entrenched and so determined? Can the West get along

with this sort of thing? Is the oft-repeated notion of peaceful coexistence a real possibility?

My answer to all these questions is categorically in the negative. Obviously I cannot get along with one whose whole being not only contradicts mine, but is bent on destroying mine. Therefore, when anybody in the West says or has said simply, "we can get along with communism," then one of four propositions is true: (1) Either he is a Communist himself; (2) or he is an appeaser; (3) or he does not know what he is talking about, namely he does not know the nature of the thing with which he says he can get along; (4) or—and this is the most grievous thing—he does not know the supreme values of his own heritage which communism has radically rebelled against and desires to extirpate.

For I assure you it isn't only your soldiers in Korea who are embattled today: It is the highest attainments of mind, spirit, and being of the last 4,000 years.

The question therefore is not "Can we get along with communism? Can we arrange a modus vivendi between the two worlds? Can we bring about a peaceful coexistence between them?" This question, in my opinion, is perfectly stupid. For the West, if it knows itself and if it knows communism, must come to the obvious conclusion that it is absolutely impossible to get along with communism.

What then is the question?

The question is: Whether it is possible to induce, and how to induce, the necessary modification in Communist theory and practice whereby the West then can get along, not indeed with communism as such, but with the Russians. This is the supreme question of the present generation.

The answer to this question as to the ways and means of inducing in communism the necessary changes which will enable Russia and the rest of the world to live together in peace is, in my opinion, the following:

1. The non-Communist world must feverishly look after its own defenses. It is absolutely stupid of the West or of anybody in the West to assume that where communism could intervene and could get away with it, it would not intervene. Therefore the non-Communist world must be strong enough to counteract any possible Communist intervention. Communism will never be induced to change its nature so long as it only passes from success to success. This is an absolutely necessary condition; but it is purely negative.

2. The West must stand, energetically and consistently, precisely for those political and economic conditions whose absence has been a contributing factor to the spread of communism and to the growth of the other corrosives of western civilization.

This means promoting real democracy, at home and abroad, where the people can freely and actively determine their own government. A situation in which the west preaches and practices democracy at home, while at the same time allying itself with autocratic reactionary regimes abroad, where there is no freedom or participation of the people in their own government, is at once unhappy and unstable.

It means further that the West must share the material goods of the earth with the rest of the world in greater liberality. It is impossible for western civilization to defend itself against communism so long as between Moscow and Washington there are teeming billions of human beings who have never known anything except poverty, privation, and the ever-present menace of starvation, and to whom Moscow means, truly or falsely, that an end will be put to their eternal misery. It is impossible for western civilization to defend itself against the onslaught of communism so long as the standard of living in the United States is ten to a hundred times higher than what it is throughout Asia, and so long as the United States and the rest of the West do nothing effective about it. In my opinion, the present financial implications of point 4 must be multiplied literally a hundred times before anywhere near the preliminary conditions for counteracting the Communist challenge on the material plane can be fulfilled. This is no sentimental act of philanthropy; this is a genuine feeling of human solidarity in a magically contracted world. There is no getting away from the fundamental spiritual law: to retain the enjoyment of your liberties and goods, you must liberally share them with others. In that way alone can you pentrate and overcome that penumbra of neutrality which seems today to be encasing the Soviet world.

3. But the penetration must go further: it must reach the Russian mind, Senator BENTON'S program toward this end is of the utmost importance. But, frankly, here again the outlay must be multiplied at least by 10, and the propaganda used must not only aim at the truth in the narrower sense of conveying to the Russian mind a true picture of the real conditions in the Communist and the non-Communist worlds, but in the deeper sense of eliciting the common humanity and the common spirituality which subsist between Russia and the West. In this connection it is tragic that the importance of Greek Orthodoxy has not been sufficiently appreciated in the West. But Orthodoxy has molded the Russian spirit for a thousand years, and the stupid veneer of Marxist materialism will never displace it. This does not mean that the faithful will in an emergency turn against their government: no, the Russian will always die in defense of holy Russia. But it does mean that looking beyond the emergency, Greek Orthodoxy is the only existing community of spirit between Russia and the West. This is a fact of the greatest possible significance for the future. I must add that Western Christianity must approach the Eastern Orthodox Church in a spirit of contrition and Christian charity. I assure you you can learn a lot from the wonderful riches of the Orthodox Church.

4. Unless a civilization is sure of its ultimate values, its military, economic and political defenses will sooner or later be weighed and found utterly wanting. Civilizations have perished not so much because they have been materially weak, as because they lost their soul and ceased to have a fighting faith in themselves as bearers of light and being to the entire world.

The absolute necessity for military, political, and economic preparedness at the present time cannot be overemphasized. But precisely because the needs in these fields are so incontestably overpowering, there is a grave danger that the great requirements of the spirit will be unduly lost sight of.

The greatest task of the Western World at the present moment is, concurrently with its military, economic, and political preparedness, to articulate adequately what it ultimately stands for. The basic values of western civilization must be brought out and proclaimed in all clarity, conviction, and boldness.

It is not true that men fight best in self-preservation. This may be true of animals, but certainly it is not true of men. Men are primarily moved by ideas. Grant them a certain vision of the truth, and they will rise to pinnacles of heroism utterly unattainable by those who live and die only to preserve themselves. Men live by faith. Grant them a fighting faith whereby they are sure that the values they believe in are supreme, and they will move mountains.

Communism provides a fighting faith. But the Western World has a fighting faith that is infinitely deeper and truer than this primitive faith of communism. Only this western faith must be rediscovered, reactivated and reaffirmed. The greatest service that can be done to western society today is to reawaken it to the positive faith of its fathers.

The West, with the Atlantic community as the central core, is the integral heir of the Graeco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-Mediterranean-European humane tradition. For 4,000 years profound and sustained interaction between diverse peoples and cultures resulted in this wonderful synthesis. There is no similar cumulative richness of spirit, no comparable internal conscious reflection, anywhere else in the world. Communism has cut itself away from, and rebelled against this tradition, and all in the name of material progress; and it is this act of self-separation and rebellion that is going to mean its undoing in the end. Once this residue of faith is reactivated and proclaimed, once the deposit of the ages is known and loved and believed in, then western man will realize what is at stake in the great spiritual contest of the moment, and there will be no limit to the level of joyful sacrifice and quiet self-confidence to which he will rise.

I shall therefore now suggest in barest outline what I believe to be the elements of the western faith, the basic findings of the last 4,000 years, findings which mankind can overlook or rebel against only at its supreme peril.

1. There is an objective truth to be sought and found, a truth about nature, man, society, history and the final things.

2. There is thus a natural law and order to which we must submit if we are to be happy.

3. There is an hierarchy of being, an order of values, a higher and a lower in the scale of things. Good consists of rejoicing in and obeying this order; evil, in trying to subvert it.

4. Human reason, thoroughly disciplined in the cumulative positive tradition, is perfectly adequate, by free and critical inquiry, to discover this truth, this law, and this hierarchy.

5. Man is free to be or not to be in the truth. He is free to rebel against nature. But as surely as the night follows the day, if he rebels, he will have to pay a heavy price by way of suffering and death, even unto the third and fourth generations.

6. Our freedom of thought, conscience, and decision is something absolutely sacred. It is by this freedom that we share in the perpetual act of creation. Take this freedom away from man, and he is immediately dehumanized.

7. The other person is never a means only, but always also an end. Therefore his humanity must be respected.

8. The human person does not exist for the sake of society and the state: on the contrary, society and the state exist for the sake of the human person.

9. History is not all in vain; we do not start all over again. There is a real, positive heritage accumulating itself for 4,000 years. This heritage of truth and being is the most precious thing in the world.

10. There is a God. He is a living person. He created heaven and earth and has authentically revealed Himself in history. His essence is love, and therefore He both suffers and has suffered for our sins, and always forgives.

11. The intellectual and spiritual principles in man are supreme over any other principle. Thus our primary duty is to seek

the kingdom of God and His righteousness. The material is derivative from the spiritual.

12. Man—you and I in the first person—is destined to eternal life. Our present life is a mockery and a hopeless unintelligibility without reference to the next.

This body of doctrine is the soul of the West. It is what has made the West to be itself. It is a permanent acquisition of the human spirit. I believe heaven and earth will perish, but this deposit of truth and certainty will never pass away. This is the fighting faith of the West, this is the standard under which alone the West can be true to itself. And if a life-or-death struggle is forced upon western civilization, this is the ensign of truth in whose name alone it can fight and conquer.

People must realize the ultimate things that are in the balance. For what is ultimately in the balance is not this or that government, not this or that economic system, not this or that person who happens to be in power today, not the home and the hearth and the children, but the dearest persuasions and certainties of the last 4,000 years. What is under ruthless attack is nothing short of reason, order, nature, truth, freedom, human dignity, history, God, love, and the higher things. It is these matters, without which there would never be light and culture in Europe and America today, that are systematically undermined, ridiculed, denied, conspired against. There is a determined attempt to see that they are eradicated from the surface of the earth. When people take in the concrete significance of their beleaguered heritage, it is impossible for them to remain any more in doubt: They will rise to the highest pitch of certainty and resolve.

The tragedy of the present moment is that many people have lost faith in this priceless intellectual and spiritual heritage of the west. They worship alien gods. The present crisis is fundamentally one of faith, faith in the abiding values which have been culled from the sweat and tears of the ages. And, therefore, the battle is as much against this widespread loss of faith within the Western World itself, as against the foreign enemies. In fact, there would be today no foreign enemies at all if faith in the spirit and the mind had not weakened. The fundamental battle is against cynicism, uprootedness, self-estrangement, and despair.

VI

I do not believe the real issue of the second half of the twentieth century to be either communism or the rising East; I believe the real issue of our times is whether America, having completed the tremendous century-old task of taming and integrating a whole continent, will now turn, with the same zeal which characterized her material adventure, to the intellectual and spiritual foundations of her own life, to the end that, rediscovering and reaffirming them, she might mediate them to the whole world. I also believe America could not in reality perform this task except by being absolutely faithful to her Christian tradition, without which she herself would have been impossible in the first place.

I think, therefore, there is a prayer which one—whether an American or a non-American—must utter today:

May the United States accept with boldness, but also with humility, the role of leadership which God has assigned to her;

May she discharge this role with honor, determination, humor, fairness, and absolute good will;

And may she draw from her deep Christian heritage the necessary strength, the necessary vision, the necessary sense of destiny, the necessary joy, for the wonderful task of the moment.

A Polish Volunteer Freedom Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a timely article written by Dr. Karol Ripa that appeared in the Polish Daily News of Chicago, on April 7, 1951:

A POLISH VOLUNTEER FREEDOM CORPS

Whereas one can with all probability foretell, that Soviet Russia will not, for many reasons, provoke a world war in the current year, one can affirm, that—unless with a great loss to the West—to avoid war—will be impossible.

Gigantic rearmaments with the exclusive purpose of a maintenance of peace must lead to a general tension and—according to many examples taught us by history—end in war. Unfortunately now there is no other issue out of the situation, if the Soviet danger is to be averted. It is a bloody revenge for the errors and failures of the past, when the West had been in a position under the shelter of the American monopoly of the atomic bomb and by way of a firm and decisive policy—to force Moscow to concessions and to save the peace of the world. It is too late now. It is time to realize this and to disperse the illusions, that by some miracle we shall be spared the decisive contest with the aggressive camp. "We are arming to defend to the last man the imperiled freedom of the world." This is what should be proclaimed by the authorities of the Western World. Meanwhile the people continue to be told that "we are arming, since this is the only way to defend peace." The hour is sure to come when the world will suddenly be placed face to face with a dreadful reality it was trying to escape from, and it will not at that moment be sufficiently and psychically prepared to sustain the colossal sacrifices, tribulations and sufferings, the new war must bring to humanity.

There are in Eastern Central Europe over 100,000,000 of people, who, against their will, have been subordinated to pro-Soviet regimes. They are the natural allies of the West. But what has been done to win them for the cause to explain to them, that the mistakes of Yalta belong to an irreparable past, but that the Western Powers will help them to regain their freedom? Nothing positive has been done in this respect. To the contrary, some of the responsible western politicians have been suggesting now and again, that peace could be saved by provoking revolts in those countries (so much affected by the fate already) in order to keep the future enemy occupied in quashing those revolts. It is to be expected then, that the eastern-central European nations will have to sacrifice themselves once again and expose themselves to bloody reprisals by the Bolsheviks, in order to save for the West a peace, which for themselves would mean stabilization of their slavery.

News came to this station from Poland of the adverse impression which was caused there by an article of the Times of January 29, 1951—adequately interpreted by the Soviet propaganda—which contained the following declaration of Mr. Jackson, president of Free Europe, an organization intended to help the people beyond the iron curtain: "If we keep the Russians busy with the people they have already conquered by holding out a genuine hope of freedom, we can perhaps prevent the march across Western Europe." The harm done in Poland by declarations of this kind excels by much all a most intensive Soviet propaganda could achieve there. Nothing that could be said later could adjust it. There arises a very harmful atmosphere of mistrust and disbelief, to change which will be extremely difficult.

Within the past few weeks there has been much news and rumors in this country and in Europe as well, about a plan to create out of the Central European refugees a volunteer freedom corps, to form part of the European army.

This station made inquiries among many Polish ex-servicemen and among the members of the Polish Combatants Association in Great Britain. This, in general lines, is what WFJL has gathered in this matter:

The majority of the Polish refugees abroad consider themselves as political émigrés who, in token of a protest against the subordination of their country to the rule of pro-Soviet agents, refused—after the war—to return to Poland. They are all impatiently waiting for the moment when it will become possible for them to take an active share in the liberation of their country from her present yoke.

On the other hand, the experience of past years, the appeasement, which since 1943 has been displayed by the Western Powers with regard to the Polish problem, the lack of any sign in the present period of international tension, for a change of their policy, all this has been causing among the Polish refugees a feeling of uncertainty and of a mistrust for the policy of the West. These feelings have been accentuated by the favorization of Germany to the detriment of Polish interests by the United States and Great Britain.

The problem of the Polish western frontiers on the rivers Oder and Neisse is, irrespective of the political character of the Warsaw Government, most vital to all the nations, and there is not and cannot be any division of opinions in this matter.

This is the reason, why a great part of Poles living abroad—in spite of their hostility with regard to the Soviets and their desire to fight against them—make political guarantees a condition of their active share in the military preparations for the creation of a European army. The Poles have been demanding an official guaranty: that there will be no other Tehran or Yalta, i. e., a forsaking of the interests of Poland, to save those of the great powers and affirmation by the American and British authorities, that Poland would be given necessary help to regain her freedom and independence. The Polish emigrees, who could set up quite an imposing corps, would prefer to fight in their own army units and are definitely against any schemes of foreign legions. There will evidently be volunteers for military service in any form, but such offers will come rather from individuals, than from the emigration as an organized whole. The very existence of Polish divisions at the side of the Western Powers would have a great psychological bearing on the youth in Poland and cause mass desertions from the Rokossowsky's army.

There is still another problem, of which Washington should be reminded. The Polish legal government-in-exile had in wartime been recognized by all the Allies and even Soviet Russia (1941–1943). In July 1945, the Western Powers withdrew their recognition of the London Government and proclaimed the Warsaw administration imposed on the country by Moscow, as the legal government of Poland. Up until now the great Western Powers continue to recognize the Warsaw regime, completely ignoring the Polish Government-in-exile, residing in London. (The

latter is still officially recognized by the Vatican, Spain, Ireland, and Lebanon, and semi-officially by a number of South American states.) When it comes to an armed conflict with the Soviet bloc, Washington and London will have to withdraw their recognition of the Warsaw regime and the question will arise then: Whom will they consider as the official representative of the Polish nation? The problem of the Polish Government-in-exile will automatically come to fore then. It was one of the problems which General Anders had discussed during his recent visit to the United States.

If the project for the creation of a Volunteer Freedom Corps is not to become another source of disillusionment for the Western Powers, it is imperative to let it remain pending until the settlement by America, Great Britain, and France of all political matters connected with the latter. Otherwise, it will meet with the same fate, as did the plan for the rearmament of Germany. When all preparations are complete, it will prove, that one item has been overlooked, i. e., who are to be volunteers of the "Freedom Corps"?

This is not, however, the only matter requiring a prompt settlement. It will be necessary, at the moment of the outbreak of war in Europe, to provoke in the countries of Eastern-Central Europe some risings, which would paralyze the Red army's lines of communications in the rear. According to reliable news from behind the iron curtain, the organization at the moment of Soviet aggression against Western Europe of a wide scale guerrillas, will also be made dependent on a previous settlement by the Western Powers of the fundamental political problems. In regard to Poland the most fundamental problems concern Poland's future and her frontiers.

All plans concerning an organization now of an armed rising against the Communist regime have been categorically rejected by the Poles, who are certain, that no positive results could be achieved by it, except cruel reprisals of the regime against the youth.

And so, to sum up: The problem of the Volunteer Freedom Corps needs, in the case of Poland, some political preparation and a definition of the Western Powers' program, concerning the future of the east central European countries in case of war—and concerning the future frontiers of Poland.

Briefly speaking, the refugees are ready to do all they can to help liberate their countries, but they refuse to be considered as mere "Kanonenfutter" as the Germans used to say years ago in regard to conquered nations.

The first step of the Western Powers, which would help tremendously to the organization of a Polish Volunteer Freedom Corps—should be an immediate withdrawing of their recognition of the Warsaw Rokossovski's Regime, demanded by the Polish-American Congress and by 98 percent of Americans of Polish descent. The so-called consulates of that regime are nothing but agencies of the Soviet Russian Politburo. The sooner they disappear from this country, the better for the common cause.

Mrs. Carolyn L. Bull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I pay tribute to Mrs. Carolyn L. Bull, a lovely lady in our community, who has just celebrated her one-hundredth birthday, and include the following news items from the Press-Review regarding her:

SHE HAS SEEN AND DONE ENOUGH TO FILL MANY ORDINARY LIFETIMES SINCE 1851

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

Carolyn L. Bull, who has been keeping company with Father Time for the past century, is a sprightly little woman with a boundless sense of humor and an unlimited capacity for concocting epicurean delights.

The humor inherent in Mrs. Bull admittedly blossoms from her take-it-easy philosophy for longevity, which she is eminently qualified to expound. Her flair for creating savory recipes stems from an 80-year practice, dating back to the days of open hearths and potbelly stoves.

Last Friday, when Mrs. Bull became a centenarian, she welcomed relatives and friends to her modest home at 3354 Country Club Road. She indicated that neither her radiant disposition nor her love for the kitchen would diminish in the next 100 years.

LIVED THROUGH CIVIL WAR

Mrs. Bull, who was born in Philadelphia in 1851, 75 years after her great grandfather, Richard Stockton, signed the Declaration of Independence, has experienced and accomplished enough to fill many ordinary lifetimes. She lived through the Civil War, witnessed the blizzard of 1888, saw the first electric light, the first horseless carriage, the first motion picture, and the first radio.

One of the first residents in the Country Club area to bring television into her home, Mrs. Bull today is an ardent televiewer, staying up each night until 11 o'clock to watch the wrestling matches.

"The wrestlers give me ideas on how to handle the men around this house," states Mrs. Bull, flexing the muscles of her 70 pounds. The men she refers to are her 80-year-old husband, Henry, a retired post office official, and her "adopted" son, Stanley T. Bell, a retired shipping lines executive, who came to live with the Bulls 35 years ago.

NEIGHBOR OF GENERAL SHERMAN

Mrs. Bull, who was a next-door neighbor of the Sherman brothers, William T. and John, when her family moved to Ohio in 1862, knew both the General and the Senator very well. She also knew General Ulysses S. Grant, and when he later became President, Mrs. Bull visited him in the White House.

Her acquaintance with the famous figures of history doesn't end with these. Mrs. Bull, a lover of music all her life, particularly opera, had known Melba, Adelini, Patti, Caruso, Tetrazzini, and other greats.

For more than 75 years Mrs. Bull has tried her own hand at accomplishments on the piano in her living room, and her influence and encouragement have prompted her husband to write a number of songs. One of these, "The Letter Carriers Waltz," is being arranged presently for the Post Office Department 75-piece band.

WON RECIPE PRIZE

Mrs. Bull's favorite subject of course, is recipes. Last year, at 99, she won first prize of $100 in a Nation-wide contest sponsored by the Campbell Soup Co. for her tomato sauce recipe. The president of the company paid a personal visit to Mrs. Bull's home to present her with the award, which had been doubled by the company when they found out her age.

At the time she received the award, Mrs. Bull said, "When I started cooking, people ate much heavier meals than they do today. But even then, flavor was very important, especially with men."

Another thing that was very important with men years ago was the unwritten law that a woman's place was in the home. But Mrs. Bull would have none of that bullheadedness.

She studied stenography, mastered the subject, and at 17 got a job as the first woman reporter in the Ohio State Legislature. She was a Republican then, and she is a Republican now. But last year Mrs. Bull accidentally voted for a Democrat for the first time in her life. The candidate was young James J. O'Brien who was elected to the State Assembly from the ninth assembly district.

POSED WITH CANDIDATE

Mrs. Bull was persuaded by Francis W. Murphy, the leader of the district, to pose for a picture with O'Brien during his campaign, and the photo appeared in a daily newspaper. The candidate appealed to Mrs. Bull, and she exercised her constitutional right at the poles in what she terms "the proper fashion."

Besides her interests in cooking, music, and politics, Mrs. Bull has an exceptional fascination for travel. Though she was born too late to have been a passenger aboard her cousin Robert Fulton's steamboat *Clermont* in its trial run on the Hudson in 1807, Mrs. Bull has done a lot of traveling on steamboats and has toured Europe extensively.

Her journeys in the United States have also been widespread. Among her most memorable trips was the one on which she rode the first sleeping car, a three-decker equipped with kerosene lamps and upholstered in red plush. Mrs. Bull's present mode of travel is by automobile, which she enjoys tremendously.

COUNTS DAYS TO SUMMER

Right now she is counting the days to summer when she will be riding again on the scenic Merritt Parkway to Woodbury, Conn., to the country home of her niece, Miss Elizabeth Grimes, a daughter of Mrs. Bull's youngest sister.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Bull will be kept busy answering the hundreds of telegrams and letters of congratulations heaped on her by friends and well-wishers on her birthday. Commenting about the heartening messages contained in these dispatches, Mrs. Bull says, "This encouragement is wonderful, and it boosts me along. But I'm not going to get unduly elated about it."

Mrs. Bull is restraining her emotions because no sooner will the fanfare surrounding her own birthday diminish, she will be plunged into preparations for another birthday celebration. "Thaddy," a brown-hued male Dachshund, who is described by his owner as a "man of action," will be celebrating his fourth birthday this week.

Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bitter debate and disunity, marked more by their revelation of how quickly too many people jump to conclusions without thinking, and how eagerly some try to advance selfish interest to the detriment of national security, it is most refreshing to find an example of thoughtful, objective reporting.

Much public hysteria has been generated, deliberately I believe, by some speakers, politicians, columnists, and commentators. But a great public service is being rendered by others in these

fields who have refused to be swayed by temper or prejudice.

One of the best examples of this most commendable type of comment and reporting has been given by Edward R. Murrow, of the Columbia Broadcasting System staff. I repeat here a part of a radio newscast he made on CBS at 7:45 o'clock on the evening of April 24, 1951. These statements are so important and well made that I feel they deserve to be made a part of the permanent record in the great debate known as the MacArthur-Truman case. The excerpts are as follows:

General MacArthur returned home a week ago tonight. I don't suppose anyone will ever bother to count or weigh the millions of words spoken since then. (Many of the words, on both sides, wouldn't weigh very much anyhow.) If you will study the list of Senators who have been sounding off on both sides, you will find that with few exceptions those who have rushed so eagerly into this fray, armed with such meagre facts, have been those Senators whose terms have 4 or 5 years still to run. Also, I think you can count on half of one finger the number of elected Representatives who have said publicly that they have changed their minds as a result of the debate. To a considerable extent the seconds have occupied the ring, with the principals—the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the State Department and General MacArthur—remaining in the background, occasionally passing to the seconds a document, or a hint of future disclosures, with which to belabor the opposition.

It may be interesting to recall or prove that General MacArthur was wrong about the Chinese coming into the war if we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel. It is altogether proper for the general's spokesman to point out as he did today, that this was a decision that had to be taken in Peiping, beyond the range of the general's field intelligence. And that the State Department and the Joint Chiefs should have been better able to assess the possibility of Chinese intervention. It adds a little fuel to the fire for administration spokesmen to reply that if Peiping and Chinese intentions were beyond the realm of the general's intelligence, then maybe Moscow and Russian intentions are even more obscure to the general and his advisors.

But all this doesn't get us much forwarder.

A week from Thursday hearings will begin before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Spokesmen of both parties appear to believe that the hearings should be public, insofar as that can be done without jeopardizing real military security. Public or secret probably doesn't matter very much, since secret testimony has a habit of leaking, and being distorted in the process. Maybe our best hope of maintaining security is that the Russians will be confused, as most of us will be, as to what actually transpires. The Joint Chiefs of Staff will present a document setting forth their differences with General MacArthur. The general's spokesman hints that he, too, has documents. And no doubt a lot of unofficial documents will be drifting about like the waste paper during General MacArthur's parade here in New York. (And, incidentally, who was responsible for the disaster at Pearl Harbor?)

I would like to suggest that this debate isn't really about whether or when the Joint Chiefs agreed with certain of the general's purely military recommendations. It doesn't really have anything to do with whether the general was fired in a summary, unfair fashion, or whether he is a genius, or merely an arrogant and insubordinate commander. At bottom the argument doesn't revolve around Acheson's qualities of judgment and leadership, or lack of them, or whether the Republicans are to be labeled warmongers or the Democrats appeasers. All of these arguments and labels may well be trampled underfoot by the march of events. For this argument is really a very simple thing that generally goes under the name of survival, and how we are best, or most likely, to secure it. We are fighting a bitter defensive action in Korea right now. The outcome is still in doubt. We are on the defensive against aggressive world communism everywhere. We have allies that may well one day become powerful. We sought those allies, not because we loved them, but because we needed them. They would not go with us in an extension of the war into China. Maybe they were wrong. But that is the fact.

We and our allies are trying desperately to rearm—to recover the ground we lost in our folly at the end of the late war, when we misjudged the nature and the imminence of the Communist threat. We and our allies are not yet prepared to meet and repel that threat by force of arms. It has been the assumption of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that a stalemate in Korea might make negotiations with the Chinese possible. It has likewise been the assumption of our Government that our increasing power, and that of our European allies, might eventually make some world-wide accommodations with the Soviet Union possible. Both assumptions may be false. But if they are, then surely it is to our advantage to fight with allies rather than without them, and on ground and with weapons of our own choosing. I know of no military man who would advocate that the mainland of Asia is the ideal ground for such a conflict. And if it comes it will not be fought for the reputation of Harry Truman or the glory of Douglas MacArthur or the justification of Dean Acheson—it will be fought for survival.

This widespread, frantic questioning of our policy and our leadership is inevitable, and probably healthy, for as Euripides said: "Nothing is of more service to mankind than a prudent mistrust." But as the debate lengthens and tempers shorten we might remember the words of John Collins, who said: "Half our mistakes in life arise from feeling where we ought to think, and, thinking, where we ought to feel."

Protest Against Roll-Backs by American National Cattlemen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the American National Cattlemen's Association regarding the beef roll-back order recently announced by the Office of Price Stabilization, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding this order.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the American National Cattlemen's Association which I would like to read to the Senate:

"The promises which Eric Johnston gave you a few weeks ago that no serious roll-backs were contemplated are now proven false. I hope you and other Senators interested in the cattle industry will hound Johnston and DiSalle to rescind the orders just issued which are extremely discriminatory as no other industry has been subjected to similar treatment. If DiSalle by a stroke of the pen can write off $700,000,000 worth of the inventory value of cattle in this country, the figure he himself had used, then truly we have a police state. This is not price control it is confiscation of property and the Senate should refuse to extend title IV of the Defense Production Act beyond its expiration date June 30. There will be an entirely chaotic situation in the meat industry if the DiSalle orders are not rescinded."

That telegram is signed by Mr. F. E. Mollin, executive secretary of the organization.

I would like to call particular attention to this statement in the telegram: "This is not price control—it is confiscation of property." That statement is absolutely correct. The price-control authority given to Mr. DiSalle has been deliberately used to destroy millions of dollars in values of the inventory of the livestock men of this country. Evidently this authority is being used to confiscate the wealth that has been created by one group of the population and devote that wealth to the benefit of another group.

Mr. President, on the basis of this beef roll-back order, I am about convinced that Mr. DiSalle does not understand the elementary facts about how the American economic system operates. He does not even seem to realize that the price received for something must cover costs of producing it. Thousands of farmers and livestock men in my State will suffer a heavy out-of-pocket loss on every head of cattle they had on feed today unless this order is rescinded. Many of them who are carrying their stock on borrowed money are likely to be bankrupt. That is the practical result of this order.

This order indicates that the Price Administrator does not realize that no producer can continue to operate at a loss. By issuing this order, Mr. DiSalle has made it absolutely certain that there will not be enough meat for consumers. The telegram that I read stated: "There will be an entirely chaotic situation in the meat industry if the DiSalle orders are not rescinded." That statement is not exaggerated in the slightest. I believe we can be sure that unless these orders are changed drastically and sharply, we will have meat rationing within a few months.

Just yesterday I had a phone call from a cattle feeder in Nebraska, who told me that feeling was running so high against the order that a thousand farmers from just one county were ready to conduct a protest march on Washington. He asked me what I thought of the idea, and I believe I persuaded him to put off any such action until Congress had had a chance to take a hand in the matter. But I can fully understand the sentiments of those farmers when they are told that they must take an actual out-of-pocket loss on every head of cattle that they have on feed.

Mr. President, I am sure the people of my State realize the necessity for sacrifices, but they are not willing to take it lying down when they see Government agencies used and misused to give advantages to other economic groups at their expense. They have come to realize that farmers have been made the target for a movement to push farm prices down, freeze parity, and inflict roll-backs on livestock producers—at the very time when other groups are receiving increases of 10 percent or more. They expect their representatives in Congress to see to it that they get fair treatment, and I believe they are perfectly justified in expecting fair treatment.

Mr. President, the price-control authority expires in less than 2 months, and I suggest that Congress take a good long look at the manner in which this power has been exercised before voting any extension.

Labor's United Approach Toward World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, announcement by the Honorable Maurice J. Tobin, our distinguished Secretary of Labor, that the CIO will join with the A. F. of L. this year for the first time since 1946 in designating labor representatives on the United States delegation to the annual international labor conference, will be of interest, I feel sure, not only to Members of the Senate, but to every citizen interested in the progress of labor.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Department of Labor regarding the aims and activities of the International Labor Organization toward the improvement of conditions throughout the world be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIO TO PARTICIPATE IN ILO CONFERENCE

The CIO will participate with the A. F. of L. as labor representatives on the United States delegation to the annual International Labor Conference, for the first time since 1946, Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin announced today. The conference will meet this year in Geneva on June 6.

The A. F. of L. will nominate the worker delegate, the Secretary said, and the CIO will join the A. F. of L. in nominating advisers to the delegate. Each organization will have an equal number of advisers.

The ILO, the oldest major international organization, was established in 1919 by the Treaty of Versailles to raise the standards of workers throughout the world. Samuel Gompers was a leading figure in founding the organization. It has 62 member nations including every major country except the Soviet Union. The United States joined in 1934.

"This is another significant step," the Secretary said, "In American labor's united approach toward world affairs. In 1949, the A. F. of L. and CIO were prime movers in forming the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, free labor's answer to the Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions.

"Through the ICFTU the United American Labor movement is cooperating with its democratic counterparts in 59 countries to raise standards of living and promote the legitimate interests of free trade unions everywhere, in an all out effort to defeat the forces of communism.

"This agreement to work together in the ILO is another milestone on the road toward international labor cooperation. The ILO is one of the most effective international instruments for building the economic and social foundations of world peace."

The ILO is unique among international organizations in that employers and workers participate in the activities of the organization on an equal footing with governments.

Each member nation is required to select employer and worker representatives in agreement with the national organizations of workers and employers, and in the conference they speak and vote in accordance with the views of their respective organizations.

Two delegates, representing governments and one each representing employers and workers are authorized from each country.

In emphasizing the vital role of the ILO in the world today, Secretary Tobin stated, "communism feeds on conditions of poverty and misery. In attacking the source of such conditions and helping eliminate them, the ILO is making a direct contribution toward the strengthening of democracy and freedom. It has become one of the most important international instruments for achieving the social and economic objectives of free peoples everywhere. These objectives are the necessary foundation of a durable and lasting peace. Anything we do to strengthen the ILO and our participation in it is in the interests of the United States."

Recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial entitled "General MacArthur," which appeared in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal on Saturday, April 14. This Journal has been one of the most conservative in our country. It was established during the War Between the States. Personally, I have read it for over a third of a century, and I believe its calm discussion of the case of General MacArthur deserves to be read and studied by all the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

After more than half a century of military service, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has been relieved of his command. President Truman is not one to countenance opposition placidly and it cannot be denied that he has been provoked by his far-eastern commander. General MacArthur, on his part, has not been one to acquiesce quietly in policies he believed prejudicial to his country. There are ample evidences of this in General MacArthur's long public service. In the thirties when the administration's early economy program sought to reduce the strength of our pitifully small Army, General MacArthur, while Chief of Staff, defied both President Roosevelt and Budget Director Lewis Douglas and worked successfully for the retention of what he considered the irreducible minimum of personnel strength. President Roosevelt doubtless was irked, but the result was to the benefit of the United States. When General MacArthur subsequently was assigned to the Philippine Government as a military adviser, he welcomed the duty as an opportunity to build a strong bastion for our civilization in the Far East. Two years later, with his task just getting underway, President Roosevelt ordered him to take command of the Second Corps Area, then considered the senior Army troop command. Again, the General thwarted his superiors by applying for retirement. Because he had completed 32 years of active service since his graduation from the United States Military Academy, he had a legal right to retirement, so orders to that effect were issued and his recall nullified. He continued with his task in the Philippines in the service of the Philippine Commonwealth. Events justified his efforts to build up the defenses of those islands and to give the new nation the organization with which to fight. With the outbreak of war in the Far East and his recall to active duty in command of the Allied forces there, he never ceased to attack aggressively the enemy, whose tactics, characteristics, and capacities he knew so well, nor did he cease to urge upon Washington, to their visible irritation, the necessity of strengthening his small forces. Again, so great was his progress that his theater, though it had been given consideration secondary to Europe, combined with Admiral Nimitz's central Pacific forces and drove the Japanese to defeat only a few months after the fall of Germany and before the planned diversion of strength from Europe had reached the Far East.

In the general's continued insistence upon what he considers the best policy, he is doing what he thinks best for his country. He has a superb knowledge of people and politics and it cannot be said that he did not foresee the outcome of his course of action. He may well have pursued it to produce a result he felt preferable to acquiescence.

The President said that "full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy." By his action he has boldly opened the way for just such a vigorous discussion. He has laid his case before the people in his statements and his radio address (reported in full text in this issue of the Journal). General MacArthur will return to the States and plead the wisdom of his course. There can be no question as to the sincerity of either. President Truman is perfectly honest in expressing his admiration and respect for General MacArthur's outstanding services to the Nation. He would like to have MacArthur continue but he is more determined that his policies be accepted and respected. General MacArthur is equally adamant in his determination that if there must be a war its conduct should be governed by military concepts. In the final analysis the people, through their elected representatives and by the weight of their expression of public opinion, will decide the ultimate course.

It would appear that the President could have achieved his objective by measures less extreme than relieving General MacArthur of his commands. More precise and complete directives might have been issued to him months ago. A firmer attitude could have been taken earlier and efforts made to reach a clear personal understanding. Even at this late date the President might, for example, have ordered his field commander to Washington for a conference, which would have had the effect of demonstrating to the world the President's authority as Commander in Chief and have emphasized his determination that his policies be pursued.

While the loss of MacArthur's active service is serious and cannot be discounted, the Nation is fortunate in the knowledge that there is no dearth of strong and able leadership in our Armed Forces. Through peace and war, at home and overseas, Generals Ridgway and Van Fleet have demonstrated their capacities for the new responsibilities which have come to them.

There is and will be no relaxation of our pressure upon the enemy in the field nor will any dissent weaken our forces. This may surprise and puzzle the peoples behind the iron curtain, but it is the way and strength of American democracy.

Keeping Faith With Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keeping Faith With Thrift," which appeared recently in the Topeka State Journal.

One barometer of economic weather is how much money people try to save. It is encouraging to note that in Kansas thousands of our citizens are participating in the purchasing of United States Savings Bonds.

Savings bonds purchased in Kansas totaled over eight and one-half million dollars in the month of March, and approximately twenty-three and one-fourth million in the first quarter of this year.

It is most encouraging to note that there are still some people who believe in thrift and industry. This is especially true at a time when the world seems to be punch drunk in a period of inflation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING FAITH WITH THRIFT

One barometer of economic weather is how much money people try to save. One index of savings is the continuing purchase of United States savings bonds. It is interesting to see what Kansas counties are doing.

For the month of March, if we take the counties with total sales of series E, F, and G bonds topping one-quarter of a million dollars, the ranking is in this order: Sedgwick, Shawnee, Wyandotte, Cowley, and Reno. Series E bonds are the big item, accounting for approximately 80 percent of March sales (70 percent in the first quarter of 1951). Savings bonds purchases in Kansas totaled over $8,500,000 in March, and approximately $23,250,000 in the first quarter.

Although total sales for the first quarter are down from a year ago, one significant development is noted. According to State savings bonds headquarters here, there is a continued gain in payroll savings participation nationally. "This is reflected in a sharp rise in the number of $25 and $50 series E bonds purchased," says the latest report. "For example, the number of $25 bonds purchased in January increased 18 percent over January last year, and $50 denominations gained 9 percent."

The continuing emphasis seems to be on bond purchases through payroll savings arrangements, through which wage earners set aside regular amounts for savings out of paychecks.

What does that mean?

Regular and rising purchases especially of low denomination E bonds must mean the wage earner's impulse to save is strong and determined, despite rising taxes and living costs which make saving more difficult. He is still bent on saving something, even if this may mean buying more of the smaller $25 and $50 bonds and fewer of the larger denominations. His saving through purchases of United States savings bonds also must represent his continuing financial support of his country.

As one leading Topeka banker said to us recently, the wage earner deserves more credit than he generally gets for this financial support of his Government through payroll savings. We agree. And we agree with the thought that if the worker thus keeps faith both with his Government and with the ideal of thrift, his Government owes him a great deal more than it is doing to preserve the value of saved dollars.

In these trying days, with inflation's hand in his pocketbook, the wage earner is able to save only by virtue of the most careful management of his finances. He makes an effort. If that saving helps his Government while it helps him to build a degree of self-started security, his Government owes the same careful management of its finances. Even more, it owes a constant, conscientious vigilance to keep inflation from defeating the very purpose of careful management.

The saver, the worker, has not only a right to expect but a right to demand those considerations from his Government. The Federal Establishment can best support its necessary pleas to the people to invest in United States savings bonds by supporting the necessary worth of United States dollars.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Congress has not declared war. We are not legally at war anywhere on the globe. President Truman has not declared war. He is the guardian and protector of world peace.

I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a dispatch by Jim G. Lucas, correspondent of the Washington Daily News, which describes the "peace" our foreign policy has achieved in Asia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON CENTRAL KOREAN FRONT, May 1.—This is the kind of story no man enjoys writing. Maybe it shouldn't be written.

You see, I spent the day in front of our lines helping pick up our dead. They told me I shouldn't go. They said I'd be shot at and there'd be mortars, and they were right. I didn't want to go.

But I went because I wanted to know more about war's pay-off—about those who don't come back until someone goes after them.

TRY TO FIND 'EM

Bill Leblanc, Graves Registration sergeant from New Orleans, said he didn't know what to expect when we started out.

"One of the worst things about retreating," he said, "is that you can't bring back your dead. We try to find 'em."

Soldiers shy away from Graves Registration people. They call its men grave diggers. Every man in the unit has the same nickname, "digger." The soldiers make the Graves Registration the butt of all sorts of crude jokes.

"That's because they're scared; because they know it's this way all the time," Sergeant Leblanc said.

EDGED INTO DITCH

For the first 8 miles nothing happened. Pvt. Antonio Pantohin, of Honolulu, at the wheel pushed steadily ahead. The road was jammed with trucks, tanks, artillery, and kitchens. Twice we were edged into a ditch.

After a while traffic thinned. At mile No. 11 mortar shells dropped behind us.

At mile 19 we arrived at a battalion command post. Our truck moved off the road into a rice paddy. Three blanket-wrapped bodies lay beside another truck.

LETTER STILL UNOPENED

We jumped out and quickly went to work. The first was a thin-faced, good-looking boy of 20 or 21. He'd been shot through the side, bled a lot. We emptied his pockets. A lighter, a package of Camels, a Gruen Curvex bracelet, and a letter from home—still unopened.

You do what you can—and find yourself getting sick inside. Here a kid who was alive when you ate dinner last night; a kid who picked up a package of Camels intending to smoke 'em and never got to break the seal; a kid who probably wanted to wait until he could read that letter where no one could see how much it meant.

The next wasn't more than 18. He still looked like a choir boy. Maybe he used the cuss words soldiers use because it made him feel like a man, but if he did they must have come awkwardly.

A mortar did it to him. If he'd lived he'd have been a quadruple amputee. His legs and arms were gone. The body was still warm.

SAME ODDS AND ENDS

His pockets produced the same odds and ends—a package of Lucky Strikes, another of Old Golds, a lighter, a ridiculously decorated wallet with a 10, a 5, and 3 ones, a package of Star razor blades. And the inevitable letters from home.

The third was an older man, who obviously died in pain. His right arm was thrown over his head. Froze there.

Our work was just begun. The Chinese had ambushed an aid station 7 miles up the road less than an hour ago. They killed the doctor and grenaded the wounded. One ambulance had escaped but after moving a mile toward safety it had been machine gunned.

The driver was killed. A wounded man sitting beside him pushed the body from the cab and came on in.

FOUND DRIVER

There was no traffic. For more than a mile we ran a gantlet of mortar and rifle fire. But we kept going.

After 6 miles we found the driver. There was no time to go through his pockets. We put him in back of the truck and kept going.

"Keep your eyes peeled for that aid station," Sergeant Leblanc said. "It's just off the road."

We found it. Every man began loading dead. Time was precious.

DEAD DON'T SCARE

"Fifteen," the sergeant said finally. "That's our load."

We turned and headed back. A rifle bullet tore into our truck. Fortunately it hit a dead man. The dead were the only ones who weren't scared.

Five hours after we left we got back. A dozen or more soldiers—silent, grim-faced, tight-lipped—stood and watched as we unloaded. They seemed angry, almost as if they blamed us for what they saw.

"You get used to it," Sergeant Leblanc said. "We know they hate us at times like this. Can't blame them. We stick pretty much to ourselves. We don't worry about that. What worries us is that there are still

more up there. Want to go again this afternoon?"

I still don't know whether this story should be written. It isn't pretty. But this much I do know; until you've seen it you don't know very much about war. Because this is the payoff.

Tribute to the Minnesota Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have written to the president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, expressing my confidence in the farm people of my State who are members of that organization.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 2, 1951.

Mr. EDWIN CHRISTIANSON,
President, Minnesota Farmers Union,
Willmar, Minn.

DEAR MR. CHRISTIANSON: It has come to my attention that wide circulation is being given in Minnesota to statements reflecting upon membership of the Farmers Union.

I consider this to be unfair. There is simply no doubt but that the rank-and-file membership of the Minnesota Farmers Union consists of patriotic citizens. Minnesota farmers are good Americans and I want you to know that I resent any reflection upon them.

To farmers, communism has no appeal. Minnesota farmers, well aware of what has been done in Russia and the satellite countries to those engaged in agriculture, see no attractions in the Communist program.

I think the Farmers Union of Minnesota is doing an excellent job in promoting better farming practices and improved conditions for farm families. This attests to the truly American character of your purposes.

I want to repeat the public statement which I made on September 16, 1950, as follows: "Many of our finest and best citizens of Minnesota are members of the Farmers Union."

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

Questions for MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as the Senate Armed Services Committee begins the hearings on those questions which led to the removal of General MacArthur from his position in Korea, many questions will occur to citizens which they would like to see asked.

Among others there has been a splendid letter to the Washington Post suggesting certain questions for General MacArthur. It was written by Elton Atwater, associate professor of political science at Pennsylvania State College. I think the questions are worth preserving, and I trust that during the hearing when General MacArthur appears they may be presented to him in the hope that a complete answer on these questions may be given to the American people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS FOR MACARTHUR

General MacArthur's belief that his objectives for the Far East can be achieved by only a limited war with Communist China and by relatively little additional cost to the United States seems to overlook many pertinent factors. Before anyone accepts this theory, he would do well to consider the following questions. Members of Congress, in particular, who are concerned lest their role in foreign policy be further diminished, should seek answers to them.

1. The general said in his message to Congres, "In war there is no substitute for victory." Does he mean by victory a settlement of the Korean problem along the lines recommended by the United Nations last fall? Or does he mean the destruction of communism in China or in Asia as a whole?

2. If one assumes, for the sake of the discussion, that he means the settlement of the Korean problem, what then is his purpose in recommending the invasion of the Chinese mainland by Chinese Nationalist forces with logistical support from the United States?

3. If the second question is answered by saying that the invasion of the Chinese mainland would create a second front and thereby increase the likelihood of a Communist defeat in Korea, it at once poses the following question: If these operations should succeed in forcing the Peiping regime to accept a Korean settlement along United Nations lines, what do we then do about Chiang Kai-shek's forces which are fighting on the Chinese mainland with our support? Do we abandon them after a Korean settlement is achieved, or do we continue supporting them?

4. Would Chiang Kai-shek ever start his troops on an invasion of the mainland if he thought we would abandon him as soon as the Korean war ended? Could we afford politically to abandon him once we had helped him start his operations?

5. If, as would seem likely, the answers to question four are "No," then does not General MacArthur's program actually commit us to a virtually unlimited intervention in a renewed Chinese civil war?

6. How many allies could we count upon for such a program? What would be the political effects of such a program upon the peoples of Asia? Is not Chiang Kai-shek generally discredited in their eyes?

7. Could the Chinese Nationalist forces now on Formosa gain a complete victory over the Chinese Communist forces with only naval and air support from United States?

8. Would the Soviet Union be able to permit such a victory over communism in China without intervening? In this connection, one might recall that when General MacArthur's "victory" in Korea was almost complete last November, the Chinese Communists entered the war.

9. Is it not reasonable to assume that if the United States or the United Nations undertake "limited war" against Communist China, the Soviet Union, which has an alliance with Peiping, will extend "limited aid" to that regime?

10. If the Soviet Union should give "limited aid" to the Peiping regime, would we not find that our hands were still "tied behind our back" because we would have no authority to bomb Soviet supply bases in Siberia, just as we now are tied by lack of authority to bomb north of the Yalu River?

11. How, therefore, can General MacArthur's concept of victory be achieved without ultimately involving the Soviet Union in the conflict and precipitating a third world war?

12. General MacArthur appears to see no alternative between complete victory and what he terms "appeasement." What does he mean by appeasement? Does he use it synonymously with the term, "negotiation"? Does he rule out all possibility of some form of settlement in which both sides get something and give something?

ELTON ATWATER.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.

Gratitude to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very excellent editorial written by R. F. MacPherson, editor of the Wyoming Eagle, and published in the April 20 edition of that paper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few years ago we saw one of the guys who won the war. We were down at the Union Pacific station when a train came in. The usual crowd was around the station when he arrived. His father and mother were there to meet him.

He didn't look like a hero and he didn't make a big fuss like he was one. He was on crutches and he wasn't used to them. He had some difficulty getting around.

One leg was missing.

He acted sort of embarrassed, like he didn't want to be noticed or fussed with. After the first greetings he seemed anxious to get out of there, to get away from the crowd, to get in the car and go home.

No brass bands, no flags, no fireworks.

After all, Cheyenne was his home town. He had to begin to figure out ways and means of getting on in the world, to face the fact that it might not be so easy—with a leg missing. As he left the station a man many of you know remarked: "There goes the guy who won the war."

They may be seen everywhere—these guys who won the war. They're not all like the veteran we saw on Seventeenth Street in Denver a while back. He had a child by the hand and a young woman, undoubtedly his wife, was leading him by the arm.

He had on colored glasses. He was blind.

But he was smiling and able to be happy. Not much to be happy about, according to normal standards. But he was alive and surrounded by loved ones, and if he felt that life had been cruel to him, he didn't show it. He'd make out. Ovations meant nothing to him.

They're not all like that, thank heaven. Out of the thousands upon thousands who shipped out to foreign battlefields, not many came back crippled. Not many, comparatively speaking, lost arms and legs and eyes, or were otherwise shot up.

So many bore wounds that could not be seen, and of which they do not speak. They

do not like to talk about the emergency treatment in first-aid stations, the agonizing trips to base hospitals, the careful probing by skilled surgeons, the constant care of top-flight doctors. These men who won the war don't talk about the blackness of the darkness that hung over their pain-ridden beds, the despair, the uncertainty, and of the long weeks or months that would elapse until they could return home.

Then there is the multitude whose bodies do not show a scratch, but whose minds are filled with memories that are as painful as wounds. It may have been a plunge through the waters to the beach under a hail of bullets. It may be memories of a bayonet charge, of hand-to-hand combat, of flame throwers and bursting bombs.

It may be thoughts of a crouching prowl up a dirty street, with enemy snipers in windows or on housetops. Or it may be memories of endless time spent in dugouts, in muddy ditches, in endless rain, in freezing weather, and of the nights on the front lines when a machine gun might spit death and a hand grenade would explode and blow a head off.

They are the men who knew how to take orders, even if it led to death.

It's hard to describe a thing a person has never seen or felt, a thing which those who won the war refuse to talk about. News dispatches tell of an encounter here or there, and photographers have picked out some of the more gory scenes that portray the horror—and the glory—of war. But not one-thousandth of 1 percent of the individual acts of heroism, of bravery beyond the line of duty, of fear and agony and hopelessness will ever be described or photographed or recorded.

And when it was over and the men returned, it was singly or in groups. Rarely, and then only momentarily, was the return a matter of public recognition. They came back and picked up the threads of their broken lives, nursed their wounds, and carried on in the best way they could.

Occasionally one would wear a pin or possess a bit of ribbon to indicate that he was one of those who won the war. But he didn't brag. Most of them dropped off the train and were swallowed up by the crowd. That was their triumph.

We see by the papers that they've been having monstrous celebrations in San Francisco and New York. They were celebrating victory in a war that never has ended, celebrating a peace that never has been attained. No doubt they were magnificent spectacles. The salutes, the bands, the flags and bunting, the cheers, the crowds.

Somehow we wish the armless, the legless, sightless, and otherwise injured veterans had been there to participate—to receive the plaudits of the multitude. Somehow, we wish the maimed veterans in the many Army, Navy, and veterans' hospitals could have been transported to Market Street and to Broadway to be so signally honored. Those whose return had been barely noticed.

But perhaps these men who won the war did not want it that way. They know that taps have not been sounded for the war in which they fought. They know their sons and brothers are in Korea today, enduring the same terrors of mind, the same agonies of body, the same hopelessness which they and their comrades endured. They know, that but for the grace of God, other millions will tread the same lonely, miserable, discouraging path they trod. Some of them who are in hospitals may be fearing the day when a boy from Korea will come in and say, "Move over, let me lie down."

Perhaps they choose to wait until peace is won and life is made secure for all. Some may think all this celebrating is premature, out of time, inappropriate, when we appear to be on the verge of an even more bloody massacre. How, they may figure, can there be a triumph when there has been no real triumph?

One of these days, whether you live in Chugwater, Hanna, Pine Bluffs, or some other Wyoming community, you will have an opportunity to put on a one-man celebration. Go down to the station when a veteran is to arrive from Korea. He may not be decked out with gold braid, brass hat, or ribbons. He may not be minus a leg, an arm, or an eye. But if he's from the front lines he's had it.

Meet him and greet him. He is an American fighting man—the man who has won all of America's wars. You won't have to go out of town to see him.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from a young American Army officer in Korea. There is nothing I can add to the picture it gives of the disillusionment of our men fighting in the "peace" in Korea.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO, JAPAN, *April 10, 1951.*

MY DEAR MOM AND DAD: You may think it peculiar that I should take precious leave time to write such a letter as I intend to write, but I've wanted to do so for some time and feel strongly enough about it to give up time even more precious than these 5 days. I write these things to you because I know they could never be published and I know that you can quote your son-in-law's personal letters to anyone you please. Of course, what I feel and what I say may never make a particle of difference, but I wouldn't be a true American if I didn't feel and say these things.

Let me precede my remarks by saying that I'm on 5-day leave. About 2 weeks before I came over here and the day before we began our big push to the parallel, several of my men came to me and asked me what they were fighting for in Korea. As a company commander, I thought it my responsibility to give them cause, so I tried. But I became hopelessly involved. I became involved because the reason wasn't clear cut to me. Then they asked me, "If I'm going to fight Chinese tomorrow, why can't we bomb their Manchurian bases tonight?" Again, I had no answer and yet these same men were expected to face Chinese bullets the next day.

We are told that there is no end in sight to the war. No new troops have been committed since the Chinese entered. Are we fighting for time to rearm? If so, why can't we be told. That is incentive. American soldiers won't buy an endless war, not even with rotation. They may see their buddy taken prisoner one day and realize there is no hope for his recapture. American soldiers don't understand that and yet they are expected to give their utmost.

When I first came over here, I wrote that I had no cause. I'm yet to find one. Of course, I'm a professional soldier. I'll fight because I'm ordered to do so, but our Army is not a professional one and it has to be told why.

About 3 days before I left to come over here we began an offensive which carried us about 3,000 yards across the parallel. In 2 days my regiment suffered 180 casualties which is a very high percentage. Men asked me, "Why are we crossing the parallel? We can't bomb China so we can go just so far and then we'll be pushed back." They're right. Sometimes, even I get so hopelessly muddled that I cannot see a clear path. Of course, I realize that it has to be done and by doing my darndest I may prevent some casualties.

Rotation will help. It will give a man something to look forward to. But it isn't the something which makes him the best possible soldier. Selfishly, I'm looking forward to rotation much more so than I am to engaging or killing Commies, because it means relative safety and reunion with my family. (This lad has been in Korea since September 1950.) Now, if I, an officer, look at it that way, how does Private Doaks see it? You can see what you've got. Maybe I'm different, but I doubt it.

How strong my will would be if I felt I were fighting for the U. S. A. How strong would be the will of the average GI if he felt the United States and not the United Nations were controlling the military operations.

We keep hoping our politicians and newspapers voice hope that the Chinese will negotiate. How can they be so stupid? How can they negotiate when Russia is behind them and why would Russia want them to negotiate? It's all so plain and so foolish. How? Please tell me how Truman can talk of maintaining the peace when there is no peace? How can they talk of preventing a war when there is already a war?

The MacArthur Phenomenon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The MacArthur Phenomenon," written by Frank Hanighen and published in Human Events. Mr. Hanighen warns us:

The MacArthur phenomenon poses the question: Can a leader so warmly acclaimed by the masses continue to confound the machine?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR PHENOMENON

What is the meaning of this extraordinary phenomenon—MacArthur's capture of the American people? For that is obviously what has happened: The populace, spurning the elected leader, turns enthusiastically—in this strange sort of democratic imperium of ours—to the homecoming proconsul. But why? Is the popular vision romantic, beholding the general as Ariel descending to displace what for some time has been Caliban? Perhaps. But it is probably much more complex than that.

The times are troubled. A combination of angry discontents—about taxes, controls, mismanagement at home and abroad—have been distilled by the advent of MacArthur into a resounding protest against the incumbent administration and is alchemized suddenly into cheers for the general. Possibly,

at first, MacArthur had little to do with it. Four months ago his stock was low. But—almost like a law of physics—as the prestige of Truman descended, MacArthur's mounted. Something like that happened. We are not sure—for this historic phenomenon is difficult to analyze and may provide arguments for historians for years to come.

There is another way of looking at it. About two decades ago, the ruling business class was ousted and a revolution begun. For nigh on two decades, the new ruling class, the intelligentsia and their allies among the politicians, has shaped foreign as well as domestic policies. By skillful techniques of thought control, and by juggling the two balls of "security" and "foreign danger," the intelligentsia have held the masses and maintained themselves in power. So skillfully have they moved, indeed, that the masses have been lulled to accept the most incredible foreign adventures. But, finally, Korea—the ultimate of these adventures—arrived. And, through its tragic futility, the people have come to see it for what is is: the reductio ad absurdum of our foreign policy.

But how was the protecting shield of thought control pierced? Well, some 250,000 "press agents" in uniform in Korea wrote home and told their story. Meanwhile some magnificent crusades in portions of the press helped, to which were added some persuasive voices from Capitol Hill; and finally plain common sense among the peoplie struggled to the top. Thus was the propaganda web of lies broken. In short something like that helped create the extraordinary phenomenon of the hero's return.

But where is all this going? Will it "fade away"? It is not likely to fade soon. It may set off another revolution to replace that of the last two decades. Or, on the other hand, the highly organized machine of idea control of the intelligentsia might capture, or at least alter it. That machine has beaten the business class for 20 years and may do it again. Its greatest advantage is that the business class has failed to create its own intelligentsia, its own ideas and its own machinery for propagation. Why that is so—is quite another story. Meanwhile, the MacArthur phenomenon poses the question—can a leader so warmly acclaimed by the masses continue to confound the machine?

Enhancement of Ship Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ship Enhancement," which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I hope the Members of the Senate will heed the warning contained in the editorial, and restore the House amendment when the third supplemental appropriation bill comes before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIP ENHANCEMENT

The Senate Appropriations Committee has lost a chance to prevent a recurrence of the outrageous mulcting of the Government that took place in the artificial enhancement of ship values during the Second World War. The committee has stricken out of the third supplemental appropriation bill an essential clause suggested by the Maritime Administration and approved by the House. This clause would forbid the payment of sums in excess of the price originally paid to the Government, plus depreciated capital improvements, for vessels sold by the Government and later repurchased or requisitioned. The purpose is to prevent the Government from being stuck for emergency-inflated values of ships which in many instances had been sold to private operators in the first place at absurdly low rates.

A particularly flagrant example of the kind of enhancement the clause is designed to prevent took place during the war. One vessel built by the Government during World War I at a cost of $1,966,000 was sold to a private operator in 1932 for $49,000, or approximately $5 a deadweight ton. Before the Second World War the owner collected mail pay and later an outright operating subsidy of some $139,000. In 1941 the vessel made one lend-lease voyage under Government charter for which the owner collected $326,000. Subsequently the ship was lost at sea, and the Government paid the owner as total loss insurance no less than $727,000, or approximately $75 a deadweight ton. In other words, the owner's profit from the charter and the insurance payment, exclusive of subsidies, was $1,005,000 on a single antiquated ship.

The Comptroller General has spoken out repeatedly against this kind of abuse, and the Maritime Administration deserves full credit for promoting a reform to safeguard the taxpayers' interests. What good reason can there be for depriving the Government of this check against profiteering? We hope that the full Senate will take a close look at the issues and restore this necessary protection.

The War in Korea and the MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two reprints published as a public service by the International Latex Corp. One reprint published in the Washington Post for Friday, April 27, 1951, includes an editorial entitled "Get the Facts" which was originally printed in the Christian Science Monitor, and an editorial entitled "General Dawes," which was originally printed in the Wall Street Journal. The other reprint, published in the New York Times for Tuesday, May 1, 1951, contains an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Van Fleet's Inspiration," and an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Today's Global Struggle."

All of these editorials share a common timeliness, and it is, in my opinion, a distinct public service on the part of International Latex Corp. to bring to the attention of the American people these expressions of informed opinion on current issues.

There being no objection, the reprints were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET THE FACTS

(An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor)

Isn't it time to call a halt to the guerrilla war over the MacArthur dismissal? We are thinking not only of debate between inflamed and half-informed partisans of the President and the general but of publicity raids by their aides. The unofficial release of official information that at Wake Island the Korean commander was sure China wouldn't come in was, in our opinion, offside. So, too, it seems to us, was General Whitney's complaint that his chief still hasn't the faintest idea why he was dismissed.

The two principals in this unfortunate controversy have stated their positions frankly. Mr. Truman said he had come to the conclusion that the general could not give his wholehearted support to the policies of the United States and the United Nations. He further defined these policies as bent on restricting the war if possible to Korea. General MacArthur had publicly objected months ago to orders which barred the bombing of Chinese bases. Before Congress he pleaded eloquently for more aggressive measures, indicating that he considered present policies appeasement.

The two cases have thus been laid out. The next step should be a show-down before a congressional committee where the whole background of the dispute can be bared. These hearings should be aimed primarily at hammering out a firm policy in the Far East. It will apparently be necessary to go into the reasons for the dismissal, but we trust there will be no smearing on either side.

The hearings should be held as soon as possible, for until they are held there is danger that partisan, biased, inflammatory statements will keep the guerrilla war going. Smearing will be less easy before a committee where smearers can be questioned and exposed. Certainly more satisfactory explanations of the basic differences between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur are urgently needed.

The situation calls imperatively for less heat and more light. The light may come from committee hearings or from events in Korea. Until it comes, violent partisans on either side may well reflect that new facts or events might change their position. If the Communists should switch from the defensive to the offensive in the air, there would be few advocates of continued restrictions on U. N. air forces. If trouble should break out elsewhere, particularly in Iran or Yugoslavia, there would be few advocates of extensive war in China.

GENERAL DAWES

(An editorial in the Wall Street Journal)

A great many people will remember Charles G. Dawes as the man who blew up a congressional investigation by pounding the table and shouting "Hell 'n Maria."

The fact is that General Dawes was a public servant and a statesman of high order.

Long after he retired from public life we sat in a little group where the discussion turned on international affairs, and General Dawes spoke from the experience of having been Ambassador to Great Britain and the head of the American delegation which took part in the negotiation of the Dawes plan, one of the landmarks in the settlements after the First World War. We recall one of his statements:

"Successful international negotiations must begin," he said, "with the representatives of each nation having uppermost in mind the interest of their own nations. Along with that there must be the determi-

nation to adjust those interests to the common good of all."

We wondered then and we still wonder if the position of this country and of the world would not be better if some of our later-day negotiators could have absorbed that advice.

VAN FLEET'S INSPIRATION

(An editorial from the Washington Post)

Courage, faith, humility—these are the qualities that stand out in General Van Fleet's first message to his troops. In simple language the new commander of the Eighth Army in Korea has brought encouragement to his soldiers in the face of the Chinese onslaught. He has done more, however, than praise the skill and determination of the United Nations forces and cite their superiority in all but numbers. With a directness which gains additional eloquence by the fact that it comes from the battlefield, he has summarized the larger issues in the fighting:

"You are fighting to stop armed aggression and maintain peace not only in Korea but in your respective homelands. This renewed battle is for the preservation of life, liberty, and the right to the pursuit of happiness of all free men. These are fundamental in the rights of man—the rock upon which our civilization is founded—and they are the first rights which communism denies its own people.

"The time has come when all men of the free and decent world must steel their souls to face the desperate, bitter, and uncompromising battle with armed Communist aggression. Our strength rests on the solid foundation of belief in God and the rights of man rather than on the will of dictators, imposed through cruelty and complete disregard of human rights."

Even in the grimness of war, these words are inspiring to those who hear them, the more so because, as the troops must know, they spring from a deeply religious nature. They tell a lot about the character of a man who uttered them, and they carry a conviction borne of fighting experience and spiritual toughness which must show to the soldiers in Korea that their commander has the quality of leadership.

TODAY'S GLOBAL STRUGGLE

(An editorial from the Christian Science Monitor)

The United States could use another Charles G. Dawes in his prime right now—perhaps a score of him.

Not because he was an unusually able businessman and banker and a generous and perceptive philanthropist. The country has a number of men like that.

Not altogether because he was a public servant of versatility and caliber. Although not many men in any period have filled so many posts so capably: comptroller of the currency under McKinley, chief purchasing officer for the AEF under General Pershing, coauthor with Owen D. Young of the "Dawes plan" for German reparations and European recovery, Vice President with Calvin Coolidge, and ambassador to Great Britain under Warren Harding.

The country could use him because with the strength of all these qualifications he brought to American political life a vigorous independence of thought and speech and a lively partisanship which through a whole-souled forthrightness carried himself and others above the level of the petty. He was never the weak but always the generous adversary.

He broke with the Republican organization in 1919 to support the League of Nations. Fed up with "Monday morning quarterbacks" in Congress, he charged them with trying to show how they could have won the war against the Central Powers "at a 20 percent discount." In answer to a hostile question he blasted at his inquisitors, "I'd have paid horse prices for sheep if the sheep could have hauled artillery."

"This," said he, "was not a Republican or a Democratic war; it was an American war"—a truism which should be obvious enough to everybody (but apparently isn't) as applied to today's global struggle.

Farm Price Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Parity on Trial," written by Alfred D. Stedman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY ON TRIAL

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Fortune magazine now adds a new target to the familiar one of communism. The new target is farm-price parity, or equality with general price-cost levels. Fortune fumes that Congress should knock out the legal principle and let Federal Government power be used to hold farm-price ceilings below parity. It rages that parity is "one of the most shameless samples of special privilege ever written into United States law."

Fortune, when it cools off, might condescend a fresh look at the new versus the old target. For parity and communism are distant strangers. As targets, they're much too far apart to be hit by even a Fortune broadside.

This is especially interesting right now when across the Pacific the land-hungry folk of China, aflame with revolution, are tools and victims in the hands of Communist dictators.

For by contrast, among American farmers who are protected by parity and doing well, the trends are in a deep and true sense conservative. But in the troubled 1920's and stormy 1930's, when farm prices and banks were crashing and farm foreclosures soaring, the trends ran enough the other way to give the jumpier ones of Fortune's readers the heebie-jeebies.

Then, along with farm credits and other aids, the much-maligned principle of farm-price parity was written into law. And things on the farm have been different than before. After World War II, farm prices sagged but didn't crash. Speculators didn't get rich quite so easily buying farm stuff for the rise after slumps. Farm tenancy and foreclosures stopped increasing and waned. Farm living improved. Sure, parity was just one of many factors in this. And sure, its legal definition needs bringing up to date. But if parity were really so awful as Fortune says, this country would have gone to the dogs long ago, instead of getting better.

And now in the presence of our farm prosperity, communism does not thrive here. It won't take root and won't grow in American farm soil. Among our farmers, Communists are as scarce as white blackbirds. They're a foundation of democracy. Why shouldn't they be? After all, the democratic principle of parity and equality is still part of the law of this land.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Last Decoration," written by Judge Kenneth E. Shaw, and published in the Newport Guardian of April 19, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST DECORATION

Shortly after midnight on April 11, 1951, America's most distinguished soldier, statesman, and citizen received his final decoration. He had previously received every military honor, ribbon, and medal possible for a grateful Nation to bestow. His had been a lifetime of devotion to the Nation he loved. For his measureless service and limitless love of country he was now about to be further honored by those whom he had served so well. Thus it was that at 1 p. m. he was awarded the medal of coup de grâce as America's grateful tribute for faithful services rendered to his country beyond duty and beyond price.

No Shakespearian tragedy could have rivaled this event for stark-naked realism. It is midnight, a time when human endurance and intelligence are at the lowest of levels. The potion is prepared. The debate is short. The vote is taken. One by one little black balls fall into the box on the table. The deed is done. The award is voted. It is announced to the press so as to reach American homes at dawn, traditional hour for execution of a hero. Thus the anchor rock against which the Communist hordes have beaten in vain has been torn loose from our Asiatic defenses. The man who would not turn his back on Alger Hiss had turned the knife in the back of one of the greatest living Americans.

The award was made by President Truman who had devoted his career to giving away things. Having presented our wealth to Europe, our manhood to the United Nations, and our leadership to Acheson, President Truman presented to Gen. Douglas MacArthur the coup de grâce, as a fitting climax to his long series of tragic and pathetic Presidential blunders. The little man had finally written another letter.

What was the general's crime that he should die at dawn? Was it his unparalleled service to his Nation in three world wars? Was it his immortal defense of the Philippines? Was it his matchless civil administration of postwar Japan that through sheer excellence of execution stands without parallel in more than a thousand years of recorded history? Was it the reverence and respect for America he had instilled into the hearts of all Japanese and other still free Asiatic peoples? Was it his deep concern for the welfare of the sons of his country who were fighting and dying in a nameless conflict 10,000 miles from home?

It could be because his voice, resonant with years of experience in Asia, dared to differ with the architects of Munich and Yalta. It could be because he wished to end the spectacle of American youth dying in the mud and ice of Korea in a conflict which, if the United Nations could prevail, would last as long as America had sons to die. It could be

because he felt the overwhelming responsibility for the 10,000 American youth who would never return to their homeland and the hundreds of thousands more who might be left in Korea as a sacrifice to the gods of appeasement.

This attempt to still the voice of Douglas MacArthur recalls the familiar vision of Hitler burning books in an attempt to bury truth by destroying the means of disseminating it.

The boiling fury and rage in the hearts and minds of Americans is not spontaneous emotionalism. It is a measured hatred of an act perpetrated against one, who, more than any American now living, represents the fiber and core of a free and independent Nation.

The removal of General MacArthur has shaken the very cornerstones of this democracy. It has shaken morale as no other event in American history. His voice was a signal beacon of hope and courage shining through the dark recesses of confusion and despair in Washington. We may have lost a great general in the field, but we have gained a great champion at home.

The Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from Señor M. Mora Doldan, leader of the exiled youth of Paraguay. This young Latin American is shocked at the dismissal of General MacArthur for expressing his opinions to his fellow citizens in a country where, he had believed, principles were respected more than high office. He believes our Latin-American friends will not send more soldiers to Korea because they do not trust our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUENOS AIRES, *April 12, 1951.*

SIR: I regret very much that I cannot express to you my ideas, which I share with many other Latin Americans, in your language, thus putting you to the inconvenience of procuring a translation. I realize that the time which you are able to give to this translation is very limited, but I think it is necessary that you receive the thoughts of a Latin American.

In the Senate you so valiantly pointed out the possibility of the existence of "Communist infiltration." That I believe and so do many others, because otherwise the continuous breakdown of North American foreign policy could not be explained. The Russians have imposed their standard on Berlin. In the United Nations they do as they please, and they withdraw and return and enter and leave. Nobody is able to stump them. So many mistakes have been made that the nations of South America—the North American reserves—refuse to send soldiers to Korea. This in itself means an important warning to you, and the adoption of a policy of isolation would be even worse as it would present the Russians with an opportunity to spread communism that much faster in these countries. North America must go to our part of the world today as a loyal friend and not as someone who is interested (in getting something out of us). The delaying tactics of the Russians ought to be energetically curbed. It ought to be clearly shown that democracy, that is to say, freedom and justice, are what is being fought for. In nowise and in no place ought the American vestpocket-size tyrants to be aided, and loans to the governments which do not respect the norms of those freedom-bringing principles must be refused.

This is the only way in which the people will go to the defense (of others) in whatever corner of the world. The bad governments will be able to send people, that is to say, soldiers; but they will never be able to send men. North America must never enter into pacts with Russia when such action might impair the principles of her democratic doctrine, and must at all times consider first whether or not, if she takes a certain decision, she will thereby affect the others. Your foreign policy ought to be zealously guided by moral principles, not giving in an inch.

Thus, those of us who defend the democratic way of life will be able to say: "Here is the example." Examples have at all times triumphed over nonapplied theory.

Mr. Truman's decision to depose General MacArthur is the most unfortunate decision of our time. Without considering the damage to the morale of the soldiers in the Korean war, it will affect world sentiment, serve as a powerful weapon for people of Communist belief since it has already become impossible to voice views against the President, in a country where facts of this sort ought to serve in order to show that principles are respected rather than offices (posts). General MacArthur still has as a citizen the right to think along with or against the President, as, although he is a military man, he is now fighting not merely soldiers but a whole system which affects not only his troops but the entire world.

I believe that whoever may be in charge of foreign policy of the war ought to permit at all times the "total application" of the western way of life; that is to say, life within a democracy without strings attached. Sooner or later, total war will come, and it is better for North America to depend on men than on unconvinced soldiers. In order to bring this about, the whole western world must lead the democratic way of life as planned. The leaders of the democratic world must be a living example, day by day, acting with sincerity and unselfishness.

The European war was fought to give the people freedom—however, where is freedom today?

Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc., to be sure, watch the steps of North America and Russia with keen interest. They, as we, will vote for the side which shows the trait of humanity. They will vote for the policy which is based on facts. For that reason, North America must watch her foreign and domestic policies more than ever.

As an example, I wish to cite my own country, the Republic of Paraguay. There are 700,000 Paraguayans outside of the country and 600,000 within the country. Can you believe that that is good government? I guess you will say "No." However, North America has been aiding and will continue to aid that government. Can you believe that we Paraguayans, not yet Communists, will go to the defense of North America? To be sure, very few will go convinced that they are fighting for an ideal. Furthermore, I must add that in Paraguay there are five women to each man. This brings up a number of social problems of which the Russians are glad to avail themselves.

Do you remember China? No one thought that she would be Communist today. She was not aided; support was withdrawn from her. The same thing is happening in South and Central America.

Mr. Senator, the writer of these lines is a Liberal, a member of the Liberal Party of Paraguay, and today a candidate for the presidency of the Liberal Youth in exile here in Buenos Aires, Republic of Argentina. I gave you these data so that you may have an idea that this opinion is not merely a personal one but the result of close contact with the men in the street, with the misery and grief of many Paraguayan families.

Please accept, dear Mr. Senator of the United States, my best wishes and hopes for seeing more men such as General MacArthur in places of leadership of North American affairs, for the good of your country and of the world.

Sincerely yours,

M. MORA DOLDAN.

Wedemeyer Demoted for Being Right by Those Who Were Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

PROPHET SANS HONOR

In July 1947, President Truman sent Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer to the Far East with orders to appraise the political, economic, psychological, and military situations—current and projected—in China and Korea.

This was designed as a fact-finding mission to provide a base for future American policy in that area.

General Wedemeyer was instructed to report "your estimate of the character, extent, and probable consequences of assistance which you may recommend, and the probable consequences in the event that assistance is not given."

The requested reports and recommendations were made to the President in September 1947. Subsequent events have revealed their accuracy and foresight. But it is one of the tragedies of history that these reports were suppressed until they were no longer of value in determining American policy.

And, instead of being rewarded for distinguished public service of the highest degree, General Wedemeyer was demoted from his position on the Army General Staff to a relatively less important field command.

The Wedemeyer reports, which presented plans to save China and Manchuria from communism, were suppressed until July 1949. The report on Korea was denied to the public until yesterday. It contained this warning:

"The Soviet-equipped and trained North Korean people's (Communist) army of approximately 125,000 is vastly superior to the United States-organized constabulary of 16,000 Koreans equipped with Japanese small arms. * * * The withdrawal of American military forces from Korea would * * * result in the occupation of South Korea either by Soviet troops, or, as seems more likely, by the Korean military units trained under Soviet auspices." Those units, General Wedemeyer said, maintained active liaison "with the Chinese Communists in Manchuria."

This was written nearly 4 years ago.

To meet this threat, General Wedemeyer recommended a native force in South Korea, "sufficent in strength to cope with the threat

from the North," to prevent the "forcible establishment of a Communist government."

Since 70 percent of the Korean population was in the American occupation zone south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the manpower advantage was in our favor, if we had used it. But the sound Wedemeyer proposal was ignored, and, when the predicted invasion began, American troops had to be rushed to the scene because sufficient South Korean troops were not available.

The State Department was responsible for this decision.

Because of its private war with Chiang Kai-shek, the Department had decided to abandon China to the Reds. To be consistent in that position, it also chose to abandon Korea. When that decision was reversed, Americans had to do the fighting. This was the pay-off on the State Department's disastrous flirtation with Mao Tse-tung's "agrarian reformers."

Government Agencies Have Altered Their Estimates of Potential Traffic and Revenue on the St. Lawrence Seaway To Promote Their Arguments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the arguments of proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are so contradictory as to make the proposal appear absurd according to the following article appearing in the April 30 issue of the New York Times:

SHIFT IN ESTIMATES ON SEAWAY IS SEEN—LOCAL GROUPS ATTACK FIGURES OFFERED AS TO PROBABLE REVENUES AND TONNAGE

Government agencies in the forefront of a decades-old campaign for the St. Lawrence seaway have "arbitrarily" altered their estimates of potential traffic and revenue on the seaway to promote their arguments, it is charged in a comprehensive brief on the subject filed yesterday.

The West Side Association of Commerce, Inc., in a 7,000-word study endorsed by 10 other civic associations and chambers of commerce in this State, declared that the arguments of proponents were "so contradictory as to make the proposal appear absurd." The brief was filed with the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, which has conducted hearings on the project in recent weeks.

The New York Board of Trade joined these groups in voicing its opposition to the proposed project. In a 300-word statement also filed with the House committee, the board declared that to proceed with the seaway would be pouring "incalculable sums of American dollars down the world's most enormous drain."

Maintenance of the Port of New York since last May, the statement read, has cost $500,000,000. In comparison, it continued, ultimate costs of the St. Lawrence seaway would run into the "tens of billions." In New York alone 10 percent of the population would be directly and adversely affected should the project be completed, the report asserted.

STUDY REQUIRED 2 MONTHS

James W. Danahy, vice president of the association, said the study took 2 months and involved research through 2,600 pages of testimony before Congress. It is in the form of rebuttal testimony, employing figures used by the Department of Commerce and other agencies and groups that have pressed for the seaway channel.

Analyzing alleged inconsistencies in seaway traffic estimates, the association said that the Department of Commerce's own figures on seaway business started out at 25,000,000 tons annually, as of 1941 computations, and that the Department, as the debate progressed, had "raised its sights" steadily to the point where Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer offered an "indicated" potential traffic from 57,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons a year.

The latter estimate came after a tolls-paying and self-supporting feature was added in 1947, and it "became obvious to the Department of Commerce that the seaway could not be made to appear self-supporting" on the old tonnage estimates, the brief declares.

CAPACITY ESTIMATE RECALLED

Mr. Danahy said that the 25,000,000-ton estimate had been made originally by the Corps of Engineers, as a full-capacity figure, based on the Welland Canal lock system.

On the question of revenue from tolls, the brief "speaks of the amazing spread in the estimates of proponents" on grain and ore traffic. Toll revenue estimates by grain experts have ranged from $4,000,000 to $15,000,000 annually.

"The Department of Commerce gives an estimated potential traffic of iron ore as 30,000,000 to 37,500,000 tons, but George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., and also president of Iron Ore Co. of Canada, which controls the Labrador ore, stated that the first ore shipments from Labrador would start in 1956 and would reach 10,000,000 tons in 8 years," the brief continues. "He made no estimate of any subsequent increase. From what source will the other 20,000,000 to 27,500,000 tons come? Certainly not from Venezuela, whose ore is being shipped to Philadelphia and Baltimore for eastern steel plants."

The association brief also attacks the seaway project as needed for national defense, quoting a number of military experts on the high requirements of men and material to defend the sea route and on the ease with which it could be attacked.

On the effect of the seaway on United States shipping the association reminded Congress of authoritative figures showing that only 364 or 365 United States vessels with full loads could use the project and of a Maritime Commission report that 5,194 foreign-flag vessels had a draft of sufficient shallowness to permit passage.

Another antiseaway review to be filed with the congressional committee was made public in New York yesterday by Ira U. Cobleigh, representing the New York Towboat Exchange and the Harbor Carriers of the Port of New York, comprising more than 100 small business concerns providing vital towing and barge services in the port of New York.

Mr. Cobleigh called the project a billion-dollar boondoggle and a king-sized Passamaquoddy. New York, with 400 deepwater piers, 500 miles of water front, 8 railway terminals, efficient labor forces, and billions of dollars in water-front improvements and highways, handled 70 percent of the American military cargo in World War I and 60 percent of Europe-bound war goods in World War II, he declared.

Under the St. Lawrence seaway plan, he warned, New York would be expected to "slow down and stand by" for 7 months of the year when the seaway would operate ice-free, and then "resume full blast" for the 5 months when ice closed the St. Lawrence. No port could operate under such impossible conditions, he added.

A Southerner at Heart, of Good Old Southern Stock, Tom Heflin Was Born After the War Between the States and at a Time When the Clashing of Sabers, the Rattle of Musketry, and the Roar of Cannons Had Hardly Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of our great Southland in particular and the American people in general were advised Sunday of the passing of one of the most beloved men that ever served this Nation in the Halls of Congress.

The Honorable Senator James Thomas Heflin, who served with us here in Congress for more than 20 years, has now gone to that bourne from which no traveler ever returns.

Mr. Speaker, howsoever we may differ in our creeds, be they religious or political; howsoever we may differ in our race, the country of our origin, or the color of our skins, the heritage of our birth, or whether we be rich or whether we be poor, all contemplative-minded men will agree that Tom Heflin spoke from the book of life as it was given him to see and as he saw it.

Of a certainty, I did not agree with everything that Tom Heflin said or did any more than does any Member of this Congress sitting on either end of the Capitol necessarily agree in toto with what any other man says, or believes, or does, in the Halls of Congress.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were times in which I felt a wide divergence of thought between myself and my almost life-long friend, the announcement of whose demise was dispatched to me as the dean of the Alabama delegation to Congress from the little town of Lafayette in Alabama.

Permit me to reiterate that while I did not agree in toto with what Tom Heflin or any of you all might say, I loved him as a friend, respected him as a great American citizen, and would fight to my death for his right to speak what he held to be the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Heflin was a southerner at heart, born of good old southern stock in Randolph County, Ala., in 1869, after the War Between the States, and at a time when the clashing of sabers, the rattle of musketry, and the roar of cannons had hardly died.

A great student of history, Tom Heflin was an educated and cultured man.

He was a graduate of the Southern University at Greensboro, Ala., as well as of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, at Auburn, Ala., and was admitted to the practice of law when but 24 years of age.

One needs no lively imagination to understand the experiences of a young man of 24 living in that era while serving as mayor of the little town of Lafayette in which he died.

His was a long and an honorable career. Mayor of Lafayette in 1893 and 1894, register in chancery from 1894 to 1896, he resigned as chancellor to become a member of the Democratic State executive committee, on which he served from 1896 to 1902. He then became a member of the State constitutional convention in 1901, was elected secretary of State in Alabama in 1902, and then elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-eighth Congress in 1904, wherein he served in eight succeeding Congresses, or until 1920.

Mr. Speaker, I need not recall to you the day that Tom Heflin quit his seat here in this House, and announced himself as candidate for the United States Senate, to fill the place vacated by another great son of Alabama, the never-to-be-forgotten and beloved John H. Bankhead, the first.

In a special article written by Edward T. Folliard, special correspondent of the Washington Post, Mr. Folliard said, in part:

For years the tourists who came to Washington asked to see Senator Tom Heflin just as surely as they asked to see the White House, the Washington Monument, or the Lincoln Memorial.

A big fellow, 6 feet 2 inches tall, with amazingly blue eyes, he presented the appearance of an old-school southern colonel, wearing a starched shirt, stiff collar with flowing tie, a white vest, a cutaway coat, and striped trousers.

Never at a loss for words, he could talk for hours, and often did. As a story-teller, he was without a peer on Capitol Hill. It was this gift that did much to keep Tom in Congress for nearly 40 years. * * *

One of his most important economic crusades gave rise to Senator Tom's fight against W. P. G. Harding, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. The Senator charged that Harding's policies had caused a depression among the cotton farmers. Starting this fight when he was a Member of the House, he continued it when he went to the Senate in 1920, and while he did not succeed in having Harding removed, nevertheless, Harding was not renominated to the Board when his term expired.

From one of the oldest and most respected newspapers in Alabama, my own home-town paper, the Mobile Register, I quote below an editorial appearing in the April 24 issue:

FORMER SENATOR HEFLIN

In his long career in public life, former United States Senator J. Thomas Heflin, who died Sunday at the age of 82 years, attracted many ardent followers and created many severe critics.

Whatever history's ultimate appraisal of his career, he was one of the most picturesque figures who ever served in Congress. This characteristic and his rich gift of oratory gave him a bearing in debate which few colleagues equaled.

When "Cotton Tom," as he came to be widely known, was in the height of form as a debater on Capitol Hill in Washington or a stump speaker in politics back home, he was a spellbinder. Whether one warmly agreed or violently disagreed with what he said, none must have denied that he was a picturesque orator of ability.

Although not an active political factor in Alabama for a number of years, a figure as colorful as he was, who served in Congress as long as he did and became the political storm center that he did is not soon forgotten. Death itself will not cause such a man to be soon forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I can see Tom Heflin now as I saw him more than 40 years ago—huge, friendly, helpful—a good friend and a foeman worthy of any man's steel.

The memory of Tom Heflin, his service to his congressional district as well as to the State of Alabama in the Senate of the United States, will live forever enshrined in the hearts and memories of all southerners as long as our South survives.

Difference Between MacArthur's Views on China and Those of His Republican Supporters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 26, 1951, which points out that the views expressed by General MacArthur on China are not in conformity with those of any of the self-proclaimed Republican authorities on the Far East:

STATE OF THE NATION—MACARTHUR'S VIEWS ON CHINA

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—All of us have been so quick to see General MacArthur's differences with the administration over foreign policy that we have overlooked two places where he startled his Republican supporters by agreeing with the administration.

One place was where he said that "the President's decision to intervene in support of the Republic of Korea * * * proved a sound one."

Far more startling was General MacArthur's estimate of the why and wherefore of what is happening in China.

It has been Republican doctrine for some time now that Communist China is a Russian puppet; that we must look to Moscow to find the hand which pulls the strings in Peiping; that we are dealing in China with another manifestation of Russian communism.

It has been State Department theory for an even longer period of time that the new regime in China is more the product of native forces than of Russian manipulators and that there is a chance worth preserving for future possible exploitation that the leaders in Communist China are more Chinese than they are Communist.

Note what General MacArthur said on this subject:

"At the turn of the century under the regime of Chang Tso-lin efforts toward greater homogeneity produced the spark of a nationalist urge. This was further and more successfully developed under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, but has been brought to its greatest fruition under the present regime to the point that it has now taken on the character of a united nationalism of increasingly dominant, aggressive tendencies.

"This has produced a new and dominant power in Asia which, for its own purposes, is allied with Soviet Russia but which in its own concepts and methods has become aggressively imperialistic. * * *

"There is little of the ideological concept one way or another in the Chinese make-up."

General MacArthur did not proceed from this basic theory to the same conclusions which State Department policy makers have drawn from it, but the theory is close to that of the State Department. In fact, General MacArthur's words go further than the State Department ever has gone in identifying the political complexion of today's China as being native nationalism rather than international communism.

In State Department doctrine nationalism is only an important element which might at some time become dominant. In MacArthur theory nationalism is the dominant element and Red China's leaders are associated with Soviet Russia momentarily only because "their interests are at present parallel with those of the Soviet."

I think it is accurate to say that the MacArthur view as expressed in these passages is closer to the Owen Lattimore view than is that of the State Department. The MacArthur view is certainly poles apart from the theory formulated by Dr. Walter Judd, by Alfred Kohlberg, by Senator Knowland, of California, by the Henry Luce publications, and by such others of like persuasion who have molded Republican thinking on the subject.

The question left behind by the MacArthur theory is whether it is sound strategy for the United States to expand the area of its war with China. If China is a Russian puppet, then making more war on China would in theory weaken Russia. But if Red China is a vital independent nationalism, then does it follow that it is wise for the United States to engage an increasing amount of its own military strength in war with China while Russia sits on the sidelines growing relatively stronger as the United States grows relatively weaker?

General MacArthur appears to regard nationalism in China as a reason for more war with China. The State and Defense Departments incline to think that the MacArthur theories are in themselves reasons for avoiding more war with China and attempting, rather, to drive wedges between Chinese nationalism and Russian imperialism.

But the political fact remains that General MacArthur has taken two positions which run counter to the recent trend of Republican thinking and give the administration more comfort than it had expected from the general.

The Far Eastern Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Provo Sunday Herald and an article by Frank C. Robertson, both of April 22, 1951:

KNOWN FACTS FAIL TO SHOW CHIANG COULD BE MUCH HELP

Another great debate, this time over far-eastern policy, is getting under way. Calm reason and respect for fact ought to play a larger role in this public discussion than was true in the troops-for-Europe argument.

As an example, take the case of Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the Chinese Nationalist forces based on Formosa. The notion exists among many Americans that he commands

a large, fairly well-equipped army which is in a fighting mood and needs only a signal from the West to jump into Korea or invade mainland China to help us bring the Korean war to a speedy end.

It is virtually suggested that American lives are being wasted through failure to tap this reservoir of trained military manpower close to the fighting scene.

What are the known facts?

First, though some estimates of Chiang's army run as high as 800,000 men, most military observers put the figure closer to 400,000. This is not a big army, but it is larger than the American force now in the field in Korea.

The Nationalist Army is not well equipped. Chiang's chief American adviser, Admiral Charles Cooke, retired, former Seventh Fleet commander, several months ago guessed it would take $250,000,000 in equipment to outfit this force for combat. With prices still spiraling, the cost unquestionably would be higher today. It might hit $300,000,000.

The morale of Chiang's troops is pretty much an unknown quantity. Though supplied with a lot of American equipment, his forces fighting on the mainland right after World War II did not acquit themselves well against the Chinese Reds. The present army has been held together on Formosa with difficulty over a 2-year span. It is not battle-tested.

It is wholly possible that with adequate equipment this army might give a good account of itself. But there is no way of knowing that in advance. Those who assure us the Nationalists would fight successfully are guessing, since no facts exist on the matter.

Let's suppose we should give the word to Chiang to invade China proper. He has no air force worthy of the name and no fleet of consequence. Only the United States could provide the necessary sea-air cover to protect a mainland landing. And since air operations would necessarily involve bombing shore installations, troop concentrations, communications, and other facilities, it is hard to see how such assistance could do anything but immerse this country in a wider war with China.

Russia, of course, has a mutual defense pact with China. No one not inside the Kremlin knows whether she would honor the obligation to assist Mao Tse-tung if we gave Chiang the sea-air cover for a mainland assault.

Senator TAFT says such an attack would not bring in Russia and lead to general war. One wonders how he can know what the Soviet reaction would be, unless he is privy to Stalin's secrets. Obviously, since the defense pact exists, a very grave risk would be taken of precipitating a big war.

This is not an attempt to decide whether we ought to take that risk. That is for the American people to decide, acting through their elected representatives. But at least they should make their judgment in full knowledge of what is involved, and in full appreciation of what sort of instrument Chiang's army might be in a wider fight against communism.

Nothing known up to this moment suggests that Chiang would be ready to fight quickly, or guarantees that his forces would fight well, or assures us that his entry would shorten the far eastern war rather than lengthen and broaden it. It is the facts, and the facts alone, that lead to this conclusion.

THE CHOPPING BLOCK

(By Frank C. Robertson)

General MacArthur has long been accused of having an "emperor" complex. If true, the fawning adulation of the multitudes whipped up by the little stirrup bearers of press and radio must confirm him in his belief that he is bigger than the President of the United States, the Constitution, and the United Nations together.

The cleverly worded broadcasts and columns by the MacArthur worshipers contrive to make the charge, without actually saying so, that MacArthur was discharged because he wouldn't play ball with the Communists, and the innuendo is that the President and the State Department are in sympathy with communism. Millions of unthinking people have accepted that, with the result that this Nation is torn by more internal bitterness than at any time since the Civil War.

If the stirrup bearers want to divide this Nation to make way for a dictator, the "man on a white horse," and end forevermore our democratic form of government they have done their job well. They have said without qualm that President Truman, the State Department, and the General Staff should have resigned their authority under the Constitution, and allowed the policies of this Government to be shaped by General MacArthur alone.

They have ignored the fact that MacArthur's discharge was recommended by such men as Generals Marshall, Bradley, Collins, and Admiral Sherman. They have ignored the fact that MacArthur's views run counter to those of another great popular hero, General Eisenhower. They have scoffed at the idea that we would have anything to lose if the other nations in the United Nations turn against us because they cannot swallow MacArthur's determination to force another world war.

Is it that they really think MacArthur is infallible and indispensable, or are they using him to build hate against the administration so that their lords and masters can come to political power? The little stirrup bearers, the columnists, and radio commentators who are whipping the public into frenzy would not even be noticed if it were not for the cynical figures of TAFT, MARTIN, and WHERRY, and a few others behind them.

Nothing like it has been seen in this country since the days of Andrew Johnson. Yet time has proved that Andrew Johnson was right and his traducers wrong. Time and history may say the same thing for Harry Truman.

What about this man MacArthur? No one denies that he has been a great soldier. No one denies that he has done a good job in Japan. But that does not make a demigod. So, too, have Marshall, Bradley, and Eisenhower been great soldiers. MacArthur had no more to do with winning the war against Japan than did Admiral Nimitz, yet he got all the glory by the simple means of maintaining a staff of press agents to glorify MacArthur, and a rigid censorship to suppress anything unfavorable to him. You read of many brilliant officers and their achievements in the European theater of war, but how many can you remember who fought under MacArthur? Had Eisenhower adopted MacArthur's tactics you wouldn't have known of the generals under him either. The simple truth is the man has glorified and dramatized himself all through his career until he has come to believe that he is indeed greater than his Government. We are asked to forget or deny that he ever made a mistake, and to believe that we have only to believe in MacArthur to be saved.

Americans have always fought shy of a military government. Now the threat is upon us. We have a great military machine, whose officers are accustomed to obedience without question. If we get universal military training taking all our young men at their most impressionable age they can be easily indoctrinated just as was the youth of Germany. Our FBI could, without too much trouble, be made into a gestapo. Did you, for instance, happen to read about the way the reporters and photographers were pushed around by the military in Honolulu the day MacArthur arrived? That was not MacArthur's fault, but it is a small wind showing what could happen once we establish the doctrine that a general is superior to a president.

It boils down to the question of who is wiser: George Washington, or Fulton Lewis, Jr.?

Two years from now some Republican will likely be elected President—unless MacArthur is installed as emperor before then; and if the same tactics being followed by certain influential Republicans now are adopted then we may all find ourselves being asked this question: "Did you ever vote for Harry S. Truman, or did you ever have any affiliation with the Democratic Party?" If the answer is "Yes," we shall probably be shot or imprisoned for treason.

Hon. Stuart Symington Has Earned the Respect of Congress and the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently nominated and the Senate has unanimously confirmed the nomination of Mr. Stuart Symington as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I can think of no citizen who would take with him to such a new position more public confidence than Mr. Symington, whose record of public service has been almost without parallel in recent history. Mr. Symington's service to the Government and the public has included, among other positions, the secretaryship of the Department of the Air Force and the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Development Board, and in each capacity his native ability and high devotion to duty has been most evident and apparent. His newest appointment will result in a great restoration of public confidence in the RFC as an important Government agency which, of late, has suffered from the exposure of certain malpractices. It is expected that Mr. Symington will restore to the RFC the full public confidence of this great agency of our Government.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent column by Mr. Bascom Timmons, which appeared in the April 21, 1951, issue of the Nashville Tennesseean. This article is a succinct biographical sketch of Mr. Symington's accomplishments, and is also a tribute to him as a capable Government official.

The article is as follows:

SYMINGTON EARNS RESPECT IN CAPITAL—ST. LOUIS INDUSTRIALIST FORGED AHEAD AFTER HE WAS PROBED IN 1943

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON—Some men step off the witness stands of congressional committees embarrassed, criticized, and frequently condemned, but W. Stuart Symington, new head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation not only took the quizzing in stride—he walked away smiling, warmed by the praise of the investigating group, which happened

to be a subcommittee of the old House Military Affairs Committee.

That was back in 1943, when the House committee was following the lead of the special Truman war investigating committee in the Senate in turning up war profiteers. Investigators for the House committee thought they had found something in the operations of the Emerson Electric Co. of St. Louis, working on huge contracts for Navy plane turrets, which looked like profiteering. So Symington, president of the company, was called to Washington for investigation.

By the time the committee finished with him, he had made such an impression that committee members congratulated him and apologized for any aspersion which might have been cast on Emerson's operations by the investigator's erroneous report.

FOR A TOUGH SPOT

That seems to have given "Stu" Symington his entry into official circles. When Missourians came into special favor under President Truman, he tabbed Symington for one of the really tough spots—chairmanship of the Surplus Property Board, where it was charged that political influence was playing a big part in the disposal of war left-overs. When the board became the Surplus Property Administration, Symington's friends hailed him as "the first man in history to run a hundred billion dollar second-hand store."

His experience there in bringing some order out of the previous chaos offers a possible parallel to his RFC job, where he is asked to straighten out the Government loan agency after a sorry exhibition of political finagling.

He is principally remembered as Surplus Property Administrator for his opposition to acquisition by big business of surplus war plants. He tied into other steel companies on the operation of west coast plants by Henry J. Kaiser, a newcomer to the field, and ruled that Aluminum Corp. of America should not have the $700,000,000 worth of Government war built aluminum plants, because that would give Alcoa a monopoly. The force of this gesture was diminished when some of the small competitors said they could not compete with Alcoa without Government subsidy, and the big corporation got about what it wanted.

HEADS RESOURCES BOARD

Symington also gave veterans' emergency housing a postwar start by authorizing the transfer of surplus land, materials, and equipment which could be used in housing projects to State and local governments undertaking such construction. When the War Assets Administration pushed SPA aside, Symington moved up to become Assistant Secretary and later Secretary of the Air Force. He is now Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, an agency in which he has not shown to best advantage because most of its functions were transferred elsewhere.

Born to wealth, handsome, athletic, and extremely personable, Symington seems to have been unusual for his independence, which resulted in his being fired from jobs twice by members of his own family because he criticized their business methods, and his ability to combine good business management with excellent labor relations.

He took over Emerson Electric when it was in financial straits, and entangled in labor troubles. When he had straightened out the financial situation, he took up the labor side, where he was dealing with the Communist-ridden CIO United Electrical and Radio Machine Workers of America—since reorganized by CIO, with expulsion of the Communist officers. The St. Louis organizer for the union was a Communist named William Sentner. They managed to get along well enough that the Emerson plant was described as "the only war plant in St. Louis that has had no labor trouble." Emerson went from a small business to a fairly big one, employing as many as 7,000 wartime workers.

In the conservative industrial atmosphere of St. Louis, his profit-sharing plan, which he called "a balanced industrial democracy that works," proved startling at first, but it gave him a high production record. During the war he was tapped for governmental missions abroad as an observer for the Office of Production Management, which moved him another step toward Government officialdom.

JOHNNY-COME-LATELY

Old time Democrats call him a Johnny-come-lately, recalling that he supported Thomas E. Dewey for the GOP nomination in 1940, and later voted for Wendell Willkie. His first Democratic vote was for Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1944. In 1924 he married into the arch-Republican Wadsworth family, of New York. His wife, Eve, daughter of long-time Senator and Representative James W. Wadsworth, Jr., took up night-club singing for a time back in the twenties—they called her a "society chanteuse."

"Stu" Symington's public career was temporarily held up several years ago by a severe attack of hypertension, necessitating extensive surgery. But now he shoots golf regularly in the low seventies. His autobiography lists two widely separated alma maters—Yale, where he was a big man on the campus, and International Correspondence Schools, from which he took business courses.

If the St. Lawrence Seaway Should Become a Reality It Will Strike at the Very Heart of Our Industrial Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, continuing my opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, I appeared before the House Committee on Public Works on April 30 and made the following remarks:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank this committee for giving me the opportunity to appear before you to express my opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I am sure that every member of this committee knows of my opposition to the project, not alone this year, but dating back to the late thirties when I became a Member of Congress. I have left no stone unturned to arouse opposition to the St. Lawrence project because I feel it is not in the best interest of the country from any standpoint.

As a Representative in Congress from the central Pennsylvania area, I am conscious that not only is the great State of Pennsylvania adversely affected by the St. Lawrence project, but the neighboring Middle Atlantic and seaboard States are affected likewise. In a few words, if the proposed project should become a reality it will strike at the very heart of our industrial economy and in addition destroy the jobs of thousands upon thousands of good American citizens.

It is needless for me to consume the time of this committee by rehashing the testimony that has been presented in support of or against the St. Lawrence project. For years it has been before Congress and experts have testified on every conceivable phase of the proposal. The results are that you have volumes of past testimony as well as the arguments for and against the proposed waterway during the present hearings.

I have followed the hearings very closely, and in my opinion, the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have not justified its construction. In a few words, I base my convictions on the fact that—

1. With our country staggering from the effects of a huge national debt and taxes at a point where they are proving punitive, this is no time to attempt to saddle the American taxpayers with an expenditure that may run from millions to billions of dollars.

2. Recognizing that we are in the midst of an emergency that may throw us into a third world war and with our national resources being strained to build an adequate national defense, this is no time to divert manpower and materials for a project that cannot possibly be completed within a period of from 5 to 7 years. Our energies should be applied in the preservation of our national economy.

3. The proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are taking a selfish viewpoint when they seek to establish a waterway and power project that will benefit Canada in particular, and only 15 percent of our own population at the expense of 85 percent of the American taxpayers. These advocates of this international ditch and Government-subsidized power project have completely turned their backs on literally millions of Americans who will be affected adversely by this twin project.

4. The assertion that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is vital to our national defense is without foundation. When I make this statement I have in mind the question of iron ore, hydro power, shipbuilding facilities, etc., etc.

To the contrary, instead of this project being necessary to national defense, the twin proposal would create a project that could not be defended in the event of an all-out war. Therefore it will not strengthen our national defense, but in fact will add to the job of defending ourselves.

Gentlemen, those are my convictions, and to supplement my views I should like your kind permission to insert at this point copies of my several radio speeches and other statements that I have made in outlining my opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. In conclusion I wish to express again my appreciation for the privilege of appearing before you and of stressing the sincerity of my views. I hope that when you vote on the proposed legislation that your decision will be of a negative nature.

The MacArthur Controversy, and Tribute to the Late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent editorials from the May 5 issue of America, national Catholic weekly review. I congratulate the editor for his brilliant analysis in the editorial en-

titled "An Unbalanced Strategy," which discusses the MacArthur case. I congratulate him further for his penetrating insight, in his editorial entitled "Senator Vandenberg's Greatness," into Senator Vandenberg's crucial role in the development of our foreign policy from January of 1945 onward.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNBALANCED STRATEGY

When General MacArthur delivered his eloquent address before the joint meeting of both Houses of Congress on April 19, he opened with this plea:

"I do not stand here as advocate for any partisan cause * * * I trust, therefore, that you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as solely expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American."

This was certainly the least the general could ask of a country he had always loyally, and through long periods even gloriously, served during 52 years in the United States Army.

From the point of view of the editors of America, it seems to us that our readers should also do us the justice of receiving what we have to say about the general's report in the same nonpartisan spirit. Let us say immediately that here, as in most matters of public policy, we are not trying to express the views of anybody but ourselves. The only contribution we can make is to try to analyze the question, on which all our editors are agreed, in the light of the world-wide political, economic, social, military, moral, and religious factors to which we devote, week by week, whatever abilities and knowledge we may possess.

1. General MacArthur argued that if we knocked out Red China, we would effectively thwart the threat of world communism. He did not show how this strategy would provide a defense for this country against Soviet Russia. We have ourselves published a great deal on communism in the Far East, and do not, we think, underestimate the importance of that vast area. But we cannot see, from what the general said, how Soviet Russia itself can be defeated in the Far East.

The fact remains that there are other areas whose importance must at least be discussed before a reasonable judgment can be rendered on the delicate balance of our foreign policy. The first of these is Western Europe. The nations of Western Europe, as Paul Hoffman, former administrator of the Marshall plan, declared in Chicago on April 20, outproduce Russia in coal, steel, and electrical power. At least since 1947, and even since 1940, our foreign policy, studiously designed after a careful canvass of all the areas of the world, has been hinged on Europe. We won a smashing victory in the last war by putting Europe first, over the objections, it will be recalled, of General MacArthur. We lost China after the war, partly through our own mismanagement, partly through the unmanageableness of that ocean of humanity.

Then there is the Middle East, the source of 75 percent of the oil Europe needs and of 20 to 30 percent of the oil this hemisphere uses. Anyone who reads the newspapers knows that Soviet Russia may try to pluck that prize any day now.

2. General MacArthur made no attempt whatsoever to prove that we could at present wage a full-scale war in both the Far East and in the European-Middle East theater. Labeling as "defeatism" the opinions of those who think we cannot is hardly an argument. If we cannot, we must make a choice, and make it in full view of all the factors involved in both areas.

3. As for Korea itself, very great doubt exists, which he did nothing to dispel, that the steps the General suggests would bring the early "victory" there which he seemed to promise. His whole case depends on his statement: "and the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves" on the Korean front. That is the nub of the problem—not to expose ourselves anywhere to Russian intervention that will catch or throw us off balance.

If Russia has any sense it would "mesh its actions with our moves," though not "necessarily" in the Far East. If it did, the bottom would drop out of the MacArthur strategy, and of our whole strategy of national security.

"In war there is no substitute for victory." How true. But the Korean war, or even a full-scale Red-Chinese war, is not the real war we must make sure to win. We might better pull out of Korea, were that necessary, than jeopardize our defense against our real enemy—the Soviet Union—who cannot be defeated in Asia. Of course, if he can, we are wrong.

As in the last war, if we can first take care of our major foe wherever he applies his full strength, we can thereafter take care of our lesser foe anytime we choose. The only fatal mistake we could make would be to try to reverse this strategy.

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S GREATNESS

Tributes to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, who passed away in his sleep on April 18, were spread over 16 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They attest to a bipartisan conviction that a truly great statesman had passed from the United States Senate.

Senator Vandenberg's claim to greatness rests upon a long succession of truly notable contributions packed into five critical years, from 1945 to 1950. If ever we win through to an enduring peace, we shall owe our good fortune in no small measure to the unremitting and laborious statesmanship he lavished on its foundations.

That labor began with his celebrated Senate address of January 10, 1945. Convinced that "world war III would open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate," he courageously renounced what he had called his insulationism. He called for maximum American cooperation to make the basic idea of Dumbarton Oaks [the proposed world-security organization] succeed. President Roosevelt promptly appointed him to the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference on the U. N. Charter. On October 4, 1948, the Senator ascribed to Republican initiative what had been in reality his own personal accomplishments in 1945:

"The word 'justice' never once appeared in the main body of the original draft. The idea of justice as the only basis of lasting peace was written into the Charter—and repeatedly—on Republican initiative."

But this was not all:

"So was article 14, without which the Charter would freeze a static world without hope of overtaking the mistakes of yesterday. So was article 51, which makes possible effective 'regional arrangements' which are of such vital current importance."

The Senator early developed, and later sold to Secretary of State Byrnes, his "get tough with Russia" attitude. He told one of our editors that at San Francisco, where he engaged in an 8-day duel with Molotov over article 14: "I pounded the table as hard as Molotov did, and he seemed to respect me for it."

As soon as it became clearly evident that the U. N. could not attain its collective-security purposes, the Senator devised his famous Vandenberg resolution of June 11, 1948. When approved by the Senate by a decisive vote of 64–4, it paved the way for the Atlantic pact, which was signed just a year later.

Another contribution he made, again in line with his principle of regional arrangements as supplementary to the U. N., was his support of the Rio Pact for Hemispheric Defense in 1947. Sumner Welles has credited him with saving the inter-American system.

The bipartisan foreign program which has succeeded best—the Marshall plan—owes a great deal to Senator Vandenberg. In the spring of 1948 the strongest opposition came from those who would not accept the Administration's proposal that it be administered by the Secretary of State, a political official whose economic wisdom Congress doubted. Vandenberg had the Brookings Institution devise the plan which Paul Hoffman, an exceptionally able businessman of free enterprise convictions, has administered with almost sensational success.

Arthur H. Vandenberg's patriotism, indeed, was heroic. He deferred too long, out of zeal for his country's welfare, submitting to surgery. Grieved as we are at the loss of this spirit who soared high above partisan considerations, we thank God for his greatness and pray for the repose of his great soul.

Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saginaw (Mich.) News of April 25, 1951:

HANDLING OF POINT 4 CAN BE DONE SENSIBLY

Representative GEORGE MEADER, Michigan Republican from Ann Arbor, has proposed a bipartisan commission to study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped areas under President Truman's point 4 program and to formulate plans and recommendations from time to time. It would be a continuing commission, composed of 10 members named by the President, six from private life and four from the executive branch of the Government, two Senators named by the Vice President, and two Representatives named by the Speaker of the House. In each category, not more than half could be from the same political party.

Representative MEADER would apply point 4 money in the traditional American way—to help the peoples of the underdeveloped areas to help themselves, rather than to try to do it for them. He makes a strong argument for such treatment of point 4 funds:

"Let us reaffirm our faith in the economic and political philosophy upon which this Republic was founded. Let us believe that the liberation of the forces of the human soul which conquered our own wilderness and harnessed the forces of nature for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity can likewise be employed for the benefit of peoples who only now are emerging from the shackles of feudalism and slavery. Let us act in that faith. With humility and anxious to absorb the many advantages of the culture of the peoples whose material lot is less pleasant than ours, let us offer to contribute the pioneering, courageous, enterprising spirit which is our inheritance. But let it be the voluntary and spontaneous contribution of the American people in a self-sustaining, mutually beneficial economic movement.

Let us not admit decadence and impotence in the free enterprise system through engaging in state-owned, tax-supported proprietary activities reminiscent of the totalitarian socialism we abhor."

Representative MEADER's plan calls for the creation of conditions in the underdeveloped areas that will attract private investment, not merely the hand-out of American public money, at the expense of American taxpayers. It is opposed to the practice of making loans to foreign governments, which tend to put those governments into private business, in competition with private businessmen, and to drive away private investments.

Willis H. Hall, secretary of the Detroit Board of Commerce, pointed up the danger in loans to foreign governments when, on his return from a trip to South America, he urged the United States to sell more machinery to South American countries. He quoted President Peron of Argentina as saying that the United States is giving too much money to foreign governments. Peron was quoted as saying, "When this is done, the money is used mainly for political purposes." Dictator Juan Peron certainly should know what he is talking about when he talks of this matter.

Administration reaction to Representative MEADER's proposal will be interesting to watch. If the administration is sincerely anxious to help underdeveloped areas, it is difficult to figure a better way.

But if the administration is more anxious just to spend American money, keeping control of that money for use where it feels it will do the most political good, and promoting socialistic development in those areas, rather than the American enterprise system, it will hardly show any interest in a bipartisan commission.

If that is the administration's idea of point four, it will prefer to turn its administration over to Dean Acheson, as President Truman recently announced his intention of doing.

Defense Minerals Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, as you know, during the past months the importance of our own strategic minerals has been greatly emphasized by world conditions. Recently I was appointed chairman of a special Subcommittee To Investigate Strategic Minerals, and largely attended hearings were conducted at Ely, Nev., and Phoenix, Ariz. I am submitting my opening statement made at the Ely, Nev., hearings to the Members of Congress for their perusal:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER S. BARING, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., CHAIRMAN

It is a great pleasure to be in Ely, the center of so many small mine activities, and I hope to make many friends here.

As you all know, I am a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, formerly known as the Public Lands Committee. Among other things within our jurisdiction is mining legislation and to some extent, through special subcommittees, the policing of the Government agencies dealing with mining and the defense minerals program.

A flood of mail in both the House and the Senate indicates dissatisfaction with the way the defense agencies and especially the Defense Production Administration is handling the emergency program. Small and marginal miners particularly are complaining. Certain programs which operated with reasonable satisfaction during the last war have been ignored and the Government has launched out on a completely new track which does not seem to be getting results. We want to know from the miners themselves; why.

Chairman JOHN R. MURDOCK of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, knowing my long-standing interest in mining and especially in the small and marginal miner, has appointed me chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the emergency minerals program and to devise legislation to supplement that of the Defense Production Act which now does not seem to be getting results.

The subcommittee wants you to tell your story for the record so that it may be taken back to Washington and the brass hats responsible confronted with what you miners think of what I call the do-nothing program.

I want to point out that our committee has discussed this matter with the Interior Department since 1948 and has made what we consider to be constructive suggestions based upon the experience of the last war. Our suggestions not only have gone unheeded but have been ignored. The Defense Production Act was signed early last September. We thought that the agencies would be all ready for D-day. Congress shelled out $600,000,000 as a little capital to start them in business, of which mining should have a share.

A new agency, the Defense Minerals Administration, was set up within the Interior Department. The resources and personnel of the Bureau of Mines and the USGS was put at its disposal. The staff estimate for DMA through to June of this year is 134 people plus, mind you, the available staffs of the Bureau of Mines and USGS. It is estimated that the overhead of DMA to March 31 will have been over half a million dollars. In the fiscal year 1951 it will spend money for overhead at the rate of more than a million dollars a year of which something over $900,000 will be for salaries.

It is nearly 7 months since the program was authorized by the Congress and, although I could go into the results in detail, I have not the time here—we came to hear you, not me; I will give you a few figures: Already there have been piled up in Washington about 850 applications for various kinds of aid, of which perhaps 600 are for financial aid. The balance are for procurement contracts and certificates of amortization.

To date—and the Government representatives can correct me if I am wrong—no application has been certified by DMA for a loan and not 1 penny has been disbursed.

DMA has certified to the Defense Production Administration 11 purchase contracts and to date, according to a letter from Administrator Boyd to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, only one contract has been signed by the General Services Administration of those certified and that one is for tungsten. Clearly, something is wrong. Where the fault lies within the agencies is up to us to discover by means of hearings in Washington. What we want to know now is how you are faring, how you like the program, and what you think should be done about it.

Senator MURRAY, who has had a vast experience with Government mineral and metal programs, thinks there is a reasonably clean-cut solution. That entails new legislation. I have joined with Senator MURRAY in the so-called Murray-Baring bill, copies of which you have.

I am glad to have with me Bill Broadgate, for many years technical consultant to the Senate Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals Industry and a director of your own small-mines organization. Bill was with Senator Scrugham when Jim headed a similar subcommittee, and he participated in past hearings all over the country on this subject.

Dr. Boyd tells us, "Although there has been agency discussion with respect to a premium bonus or incentive-payment system, such a system is not authorized under Public Law 774 (Defense Production Act) and consequently the DMA has not been in a position to recommend specific changes in this direction."

We feel, therefore, that now is the time to fill that deficiency, hence the Murray-Baring bill.

The so-called fifty-fifty exploration program now has been O. K.'d by Secretary Chapman, but the Bureau of the Budget has not as yet furnished the funds. I do not like this program. I wonder if you do? I like the program which we had under the 1946 act and this, with modifications to bring it up to date, has been incorporated in my bill, H. R. 2862. The old program showed real results and this one should do better.

I have one piece of good news: A special application form for mining has been approved and is at the printers, so you will not have to bother with the present 12-page monstrosity.

I do not believe in the present DMA policies in certifying procurement contracts. I think if we want the ores and minerals we should be willing to pay the price to get them out and buy them in any quantity, however small, at a figure within which each mine can live, but without giving windfalls to low-cost producers. The small and marginal miner is the backbone of the West and it is time we started him digging.

There is no reason why, 30 days after the Murray-Baring bill is signed into law, Nevada mining should not be buzzing with life and activity.

Tell the subcommittee your story in your own words, frankly, and let us have your suggestions as to how the small and marginal miner can best contribute to the emergency effort—if the Government will let you. Later, if you wish, I shall explain the working of the Murray-Baring bill if there are any parts you do not understand.

We are fortunate enough to have with us today from the Government, Mr. J. L. Hoffiund, chief counsel of Defense Minerals Administration to represent Dr. Boyd, the Administrator.

Also Capt. H. C. Maull, Jr., who spends all the stockpile money for the Government. Captain Maull is Acting Director of the Purchase Division of EPS, the Emergency Procurement Services of the General Services Administration, which does most of the Government buying. All mineral and metal contracts have to pass his scrutiny. Incidentally, he was a lifelong friend of our beloved Jim Scrugham. Captain Maull is a red-tape cutter from way back and I have heard it said that if he had 20 brothers like him in the Government, things would really hum.

With Captain Maull is Mr. Robert Bradford, of this GSA region; Mr. Otto Kline, of the Denver GSA region; and Mr. Thurtell, who is liaison man between GSA and DMA.

If there are any other Government officials present, please identify yourself for the record.

These gentlemen are here to answer your questions and I ask that they stay a few minutes after the hearing so that any of you who wish to discuss your problems with them may do so. I may call some of them to the stand later to discuss their programs.

I would now like to make special commendation to my good friends of the White

Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines. They have always stood by me in all mining situations. A year ago they held another meeting for us here, which was a very fine meeting. We got some very good testimony, and I certainly want to thank you gentlemen of the White Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines, and in particular Cecil E. Geraghty, for the very good work which they have always done.

I have already said plenty at this time, and I don't have a thing more to say except that I really believe that you have been doing a swell job. There is one thing that I do know. I know that whenever we call on you to testify, you are always ready to answer. I want you to know that that is something that we really appreciate out here in Ely.

Smash the Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New Leader. The article deals with Red fifth column operating in democratic countries, particularly France. The author, E. V. Yourievsky, is a veteran Russian Socialist who was employed by the Soviet Government as an economist and was one of the authors of the first Soviet 5-year plan. He has been a refugee in Western Europe for many years.

The article follows:

SMASH THE TROJAN HORSE

(By E. V. Yourievsky)

The United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia have taken a number of measures against the Communist fifth column. In England, the general secretary of the transport-workers union, Arthur Deakin, spoke of the necessity of banning the Communist Party, which is not a party, like other parties, but an organized conspiracy against the country and the English people. And Prime Minister Attlee commented on the Sheffield congress of the so-called Partisans of Peace: "There are limits to our patience. The time will come when we must slam the door in the face of those who wish to burn our house down."

Sentiment in favor of restricting the Kremlin party's freedom of action has finally manifested itself in France, too. At the last congress of the Radical Party, even Edouard Herriot burst out: "There is plenty of room in Russia. Let the Communists go there before we declare war on them." The idea of restricting the Communists is also evident in the proposals to change the French electoral system, now based on proportional representation. The changes might well reduce Moscow's delegation of 167 deputies in the French Assembly. But even if the Communists only had 90, or 50, delegates, the basic question of their party's freedom of action would remain.

A weak-willed democratic credo prevailing in this country has made the Communist Party sacrosanct, at least till recently. Take Le Monde, for example, the best democratic paper in France, which categorically rejects any restrictions upon the freedom of the Communist Party. Even though it is well aware of the party's character and aims, Le Monde wrote:

"The essence of democracy lies in the fact that it grants liberty even to those who, like the Communists, make use of liberty in order to destroy it. This conviction is neither naiveté nor weakness, but an expression of the most profound faith in man. It is the faith that, if good and evil, truth and falsehood, contend with the same weapons (i. e., with equal freedom) good will triumph in the end."

The philosophy expressed in this formula leads straight to the religion of Leo Tolstoy, the idea of nonresistance to evil. Asked once what he would do if thugs broke into his house to murder his children, Tolstoy replied: "All I could do would be to try to convince them that it would serve no purpose and was wrong." The Russian religious philosopher Nicholas Berdayev has commented that it is quite easy to show that if one does not oppose evil with force, evil always triumphs, but Tolstoy rested his hope on a historic miracle and, in the name of faith in the miracle of God's direct intervention, proposed to risk the destruction of society, the state, civilization, the destruction of the world which was based on falsehood and violence.

Obviously, Le Monde does not believe in such salvation by the intervention of providence. Even the devout François Mauriac does not believe in it. But if one does not equate the risk of the destruction of society with the risk of losing a game of poker, then the democratic credo of Le Monde's editors—and others like them in the west—is wretched counsel for these days. A man who sings the abstract tune that the Communists, even though they are dedicated to murdering freedom, must be granted complete freedom, is, subjectively, in his own estimation, a gallant knight of democracy. Objectively, he may be its gravedigger.

THE DAY-TO-DAY ISSUES

What are the real questions which arise today in democratic countries subjected to Communist pressure, like France? Here are several:

1. Can a democratic government admit to its ranks officials who, as Communist Party members, must promote by every possible means the disintegration of democratic order?

2. Can democratic nations tolerate judges who are so frightened by the thought of possible Communist accession to power that they either acquit Communist lawbreakers or else pass ridiculously small sentences?

3. Must a democracy concerned with its defense tolerate propagation of the doctrine of military insubordination? At the trial of the saboteurs who tried to wreck the aircraft carrier *Dixmude*, the theory was advanced that soldiers and sailors are subject only to the dictates of their own convictions, not to any requirements of military discipline. The Communist Party expounds this doctrine quite effectively in Toulon—an arsenal and naval base.

4. Communist detachments have converted nationalized enterprises into virtual party bastions. Injecting unrelated political demands into economic demands calculated to produce inflation, the Communists use them to maintain pressure on the Government at every pretext. Strikes in the gas and electric stations, for example, to say nothing of the water-supply system, create a tremendous impression. Must a democratic government unconditionally recognize the unlimited right to strike in the most vital public service industries?

5. France has placed a detachment of volunteers at the disposal of the U. N. in Korea. The Communist press urged the crews of the steamers *Tafna*, *Athos*, and *Pasteur* not to transport them. Can a democratic government tolerate an atmosphere of terror so great that such volunteers beg that their names be kept secret lest their families be subjected to attacks and threats by the Communists?

6. French troops are fighting in Indochina against Stalin's protégé, Ho Chi Minh. A French Communist Party representative goes to see the Vietminh dictator, travels all over his territory, and then returns to write articles in the French Communist press extolling the achievements of Ho's troops, who, happily, are now capable of mauling a considerable number of French.

Since French Communist leaders have made it plain that they will aid the Soviet aggressor in every way in the event of war, the French Government has been setting up a civilian defense organization to protect public buildings, railroads and highways, combat sabotage, and aid in tracking down parachutists. No one will dare join this organization—we will kill these "militiamen," the Communist press hints broadly. It elaborates this point with a cartoon showing Defense Minister Jules Moch (who proposed the militia) trembling with fear before the corpses of Laval and other "militiamen" dangling from scaffolds.

Is this sort of freedom of the press tolerable?

7. The Government knows full well the location of the Communist Party "center" which receives orders from Moscow, spreads lies on a grand scale, and prescribes techniques for subversive activities. Protected by the parliamentary immunity of the deputies who make it up and enjoying complete freedom, this center expands and reinforces its power with every passing day. Must the Government confine itself to punishing underlings (like the port workers who refuse to unload war matériel) while timidly bypassing the center itself?

WHAT OF SOCIAL REVOLUTION?

These are the questions which arise daily in France. Yet when it comes to actively fighting the Communists, a misconception of the nature of the struggle often prevents many western politicians from generating effective action. This misconception was well illustrated by two recent articles in the weekly Populaire-Dimanche. The author, a secretary of the French Socialist Party, calls the Communist Party an organization of lies, espionage, treason, sabotage, and tyranny—but is opposed to banning it. He says, first, that the existing laws are adequate; second, that suppression would martyr the Communist Party and finally, that the chief weapon against Stalinism is not repression but political, social, and economic reforms which, so to speak, immunize the people against the Soviet virus. The realization of the aggregate of major socio-economic reforms is called by this writer the social revolution. "The struggle against the Stalinist fifth column," he insists, "requires this social revolution."

Undoubtedly, reforms carried out boldly and in time—not in Syngman Rhee style or in the anemic liberal fashion observed in Italy—can undermine the chances of some dictators, although it must be observed that it will not undermine those who arrive in Soviet tanks. But when one speaks of "revolution," one should remember that the entire world is caught up in a whirl of technical, cultural, social, economic, and political changes. To the leadership of this world-wide revolution, two systems, two world outlooks lay claim.

It is a great mistake to think that the struggle for such leadership is between a moderate, social reformist, liberal-socialist philosophy and another which is moving in the same direction, but is genuinely revolutionary, broader and bolder, and does not hesitate to use coarse, plebeian methods. It is a mistake to think that the difference between them can to any degree be compared with that which once separated Aristide Briand and Eduard Bernstein from Karl Liebknecht and Jules Guesde.

The division between the two systems actually springs from the fact that Lenin's attempt to create socialism by force led to the complete, nightmarish degeneration of the entire undertaking and to the establishment of the system we now call totalitarian. The difference does not lie in the contract between "moderation" and "revolutionary spirit," or in the fact that they destroy private property and plan their economy ruthlessly while we do it differently, but in a basic difference in attitude toward the individual, toward human life.

SHAW SAW THE DIFFERENCE

Bernard Shaw was one of the first to understand this. After a visit to Russia, he rapturously wrote that "she has turned upside down the most important established and fixed standards." She had banished, as a superstitious prejudice, the utterly worthless, false idea of the supposedly sacred value of human life and the human personality, replacing it with a purely "utilitarian" approach to man. The right to life by no means belongs to every person, but only to those who can "justify" their existence to the state and its rulers. And the latter, Shaw explained with obvious approval, are chosen by nobody in Russia; they choose themselves, finding themselves the most worthy to be the power group.

When it appears that an individual cannot "justify" his existence to this power group of supermen, displeases them, is superfluous and useless to them, annoys, frightens, or upsets them, "he must be rooted out of society like a weed." And the judgment "must be swift."

Without the slightest revulsion, Shaw described how an agent of the Cheka comes to the doomed man, claps him on the shoulder and says: "This way, citizen." And the "weed" is rooted out.

"A considerable part of the secret of Russian communism's success," Shaw concluded, "is explained by the fact that, henceforth, every Russian knows that, if he doesn't make his life a paying proposition (from the point of view of the state, that is) he will lose it."

Shaw's article, printed in a British Communist organ in 1932, was later translated and published in Pravda. One Soviet journalist has recounted that Maxim Gorky, upon reading the manuscript, became terrified and "started to groan," but Stalin ordered it published without any editorial remarks. This is understandable. Shaw, who was not a nonconformist for nothing, clearly understood what "the immortality of the developing Stalinist revolution" consisted of, what it had "turned upside down," what was the basis for the dark gospel of Stalin. The Stalinist revolution, as it moves onward and develops dialectically, must lead to something similar to Orwell's ghastly Nineteen Eighty-four.

Some of the features of the other revolution can be seen in Scandinavia, America, France, and the British Commonwealth—sometimes only in fragmentary form or in blueprint, in various spheres and in variant forms. What underlies all of these variants is the attempt to develop the idea of the value of the individual. At first inculcated by religion but later secularizing itself, this idea has established itself as an incontrovertible categorical imperative. No one who repudiates it can call himself a democrat.

While revolution of the Stalinist type, overturning the entire social structure of nations, is, of course, social revolution, it is in its essence counterrevolutionary. Spiritually and politically, it is a throw-back to centuries ago, reversing the clearly charted direction of development. At the bottom of every act of the Kremlin and its minions abroad lies—both consciously and unconsciously—a monstrous view of man. This is the abyss dividing the two types of world-wide revolution.

Lenin considered the peaceful coexistence of capitalism and socialism impossible. He was mistaken, as the close harmony between not completely capitalist America and not completely Socialist Britain indicates. But what is truly difficult to imagine is the peaceful coexistence of Ahriman and Ormazd, good and evil, a system which exalts the individual and a system which denies the individual. With totalitarian despotism aspiring to world mastery, a clash between it and democracy is inevitable. One or the other antagonist must disappear. And the victor will not be he who is morally superior, but—to tell the sad truth—he who proves physically stronger.

Our French writer says: Let us carry out reforms and social revolution, and we shall triumph. But he shuts his eyes to the fact that the projected Atlantic armies cannot halt the enemy if, in their rear, on the territory of the democracies, the Communist fifth columns are permitted to operate freely. To supplement the Atlantic military pact, there must be an Atlantic political pact by which the democracies concertedly paralyze the Communist parties. Democracy that is not dying, that believes in itself, that wishes to live and to fight for its ideals, must eliminate the Communists before it is too late. In the interest of our self-preservation, the Communists must be deprived of the freedom to murder freedom. We must destroy the Trojan horse before it destroys us.

A Few Samples of Letters From Constituents re General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting just a few copies of letters received from constituents, all dealing with the firing of General MacArthur. The people are aroused and indignant.

DELAVAN, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE SMITH: This small town today has the hush of deep and unspeakable grief. The knowledge that our one and only American hope, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been fired, leaves us shocked, void of hope, of patriotism, of a future for our sons and their sons.

All the fine, the good things we have taught our children to be, stand for naught. We American mothers and fathers must now admit to them that courage, decency, education, and honesty are of little use in the America of today.

We must now teach them to use their wits, seek gold and power above all else, and always say "Yes" to the man higher up whether he be a Costello, an Alger Hiss, or a pajama-clad President.

My father wrote a song when I was small called Land of the Free. My brother and son were brought up on it. The chorus went like this:

"America, fair land of mine, home of the just and true,
All hail to thee, land of the free, the red, the white, the blue."

What has happened to this wonderful country?

May God help you in your office. May He help us all from this dark day forward.

Very sincerely.

KENOSHA, WIS., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I must finally break my long silence. Are you going to keep still to the firing of our great and honorable General MacArthur, a general we admired so much for his work, his work in Japan in getting the wheels going again without much slaughtering? I will never forget the slaughtering of all the German generals that only had to do what their Government asked them to do.

Why must England and France come and tell the Americans what to do, and who is doing the bleeding in Korea? The French or English? The confidence in our Government is going to go if you, the Congress, don't do something about it. The boys are dying on the battlefields, and in Washington they steal and betray our country. What a crime. Why fight the dictators if we have one ourselves in Washington? Oh, if God only would clear out that rat hole.

Yours very truly.

JANESVILLE, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

The Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: The list of people signing this letter are all voters, and they represent mothers who have sons in Korea and Japan, sweethearts and sisters of boys in Korea and Japan, mothers of boys who will be called in the near future, and last but not least, women who have lost their sons and husbands in the Korean war.

We feel there are no adjectives strong enough to express our dismay and agitation at the dismissal of General MacArthur, a man who has always thought first of his country and not of politics.

We wish to protest his dismissal and ask that you, as a Representative of the people of Wisconsin, protest it and that you urge Congress to invite General MacArthur to appear before that body and give his views. It is time the American people had something to say about the Korean affair; the boys are dying, but still, according to our President, we are not at war. If that is so, then let's bring the boys back home, as life is anything but pleasant in Korea.

Our Congressmen and Senators have hearts, but if they do, how can they talk politics, play politics, and fritter away not only the minutes but the hours, while poor American boys die, and, as a crowning affront, dismiss the man upon whom they relied? It is time the State Department is cleaned up and if, as we read in the papers, the majority of Members of Congress do not approve of the way the State Department is handling matters, then let's do something about it. Now.

General MacArthur has served his country long and well, and we wish him to continue; we have confidence in him. We are relying upon you to help us put MacArthur back at the helm, and we believe our faith and trust in you is not misplaced.

Sincerely,

(Signed by 31 women.)

RACINE, WIS.,
April 12, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am very much oppressed at the removal of General MacArthur from his command in Korea by a very incapable man like Mr. Truman. It has brought great tragedy to our country. I salute General MacArthur as the greatest military leader. I have always had great faith in him as a Christian leader working

daily between his conscience and his God. I am looking forward to some truthful words from his lips which we do not get from the New Dealers in Washington. My greatest desire is for you to do your best for the impeachment of Acheson and Marshall along with Truman.

Very truly yours.

KENOSHA, WIS.,
April 15, 1951.

To Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH:

We, the undersigned American voters and taxpayers of the First District of Wisconsin, demand the reinstatement of MacArthur and impeachment of Truman and Acheson. Truman got us into the Korean war without first talking things over with the highest military officials.

He makes more fuss over a critic who does not like his daughter than he does over a war he started. He wants to send troops to Europe where there is no war instead of to Korea where they are badly needed.

We don't care what the British like or want. They are not running this country. They would have been lost if not for our help. They don't care about us, all they want is our money. Beggars can't be choosers.

In Truman's 6 years of office he never once fired a crook but our best general was removed and given a dirty rotten deal. We resent the manner in which it was done. It is a shame to lose a man of the ability of MacArthur.

I have a brother in Korea who has been wounded and my husband is in the Navy in Korean waters. Let Truman and Acheson take their places and send our men back.

We don't want a long, dragged-out war for the next 20 years. We want an end to all this and MacArthur had the right idea to end it for us.

Our only hope now lies in Congress. If the majority of Members of Congress betray their country then we are lost indeed.

Thank you.

KENOSHA, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In keeping with my avowed policy of liberalism, I have waited before communicating with you until President Truman spoke tonight to see if he could convince me that he was acting correctly. After listening to him and following reaction around the world and in our own country, particularly that of the Communist Party here, I now feel more qualified and justified in writing.

To use the President's own terminology, I believe we should impeach the "——— ——— ———" for "asinine" actions and decisions.

Top level policy (?) has too long been formed by men like Acheson and Marshall whose judgment, particularly on far eastern affairs, has long since been repudiated. A thorough house cleaning is imperative.

The present question is not who will control who—military or civilian—but who is right and who is wrong.

Impeachment of Truman will not solve all our problems but the people's voice will have been heard and much benefit will result.

Yours very truly,

WALWORTH, WIS., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The persons in our Government have exposed themselves. Now is the time for us as Americans to stand and fight against these forces that are ruling our country, that are slowly undermining our security and jeopardizing our American way of life.

I feel that MacArthur should be reinstated and that those in Government positions should be exposed and replaced, including Dean Acheson and President Truman. This tragedy should not be overlooked, but it must be used as an opportunity for exposure and removal of all those who are Communists or those sympathetic to communistic ideas or any form of corrupt government.

Don't fail us in this hour of need. Let's have a shake-down in all Government offices.

Sincerely.

RACINE, WIS., *April 11, 1951.*

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the infamous action of Harry S. Truman in discharging General MacArthur, I urge and pray that you as our representative will take such action as will bring about the impeachment of Harry S. Truman and Dean Acheson.

If you could of been in Racine today and heard the voice of the people you would feel that any action taken by you would be sanctioned by your constituents.

Very truly.

MacArthur, the Christian Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Dr. Dale Crowley, Washington's radio minister, over Stations WOL and WEAM, April 20, 1951:

MACARTHUR, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

(Address by Dr. Dale Crowley, Washington's radio minister, over Stations WOL and WEAM, April 20, 1951)

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14:34.)

On getting a close-up of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and being held spellbound by the matchless eloquence of his classic and challenging address before the joint meeting of Congress and to all America and the world by radio and television, I find myself increasingly proud to be an American. And since General MacArthur is one of the greatest living exponents of true Christianity, I am more grateful than ever to be numbered among the people called Christians.

For the stupendous tribute being paid this outstanding hero we are devoutly thankful, not merely because he is so eminently worthy of the same, but because General MacArthur is indeed the living symbol of the highest and best in American manhood and in sturdy Christian character. Through the years this soldier-statesman has occupied a lofty place in the esteem of his fellowmen. Today he occupies an even more exalted place in our esteem.

This fact I desire to emphasize: The qualities of character which make Douglas MacArthur the man that he is are Christian qualities. In his personality certain traits of character are prominently displayed. In the first place, we see the spirit of modesty and humility. Not once have we seen a spirit of boastfulness or braggadocio in this great man and, yet, there are few men on the world horizon today who would have as much to boast about in terms of sheer achievement as Douglas MacArthur. He is indeed a worthy exponent of the Christ whom he worships, who emphasized that the first mark of discipleship and of Christian leadership is that of humility.

Then, too, we think of the quality of Christian charity so prominent in the life of this distinguished citizen. Charity toward all men, even his persecutors. If there would be justification for a spirit of vindictiveness toward those who had wronged him, we think it would be in this case. But not one note of rancor or bitterness or harshness or abusivensss or unkindness proceeded from the lips of General MacArthur. There has been manifested a refreshing air of gentleness, a spirit of total charity and brotherliness, not only in his words, but in his very manner.

The spirit of compassion, also, shines out in the life of this man. One could almost feel his heartbeat of sympathy and love for the soldiers, sailors, and marines under his previous command, now left behind to carry on in Korea. In his love for the Korean people, also, General MacArthur expressed his deep feeling of sorrow and compassion. We were reminded of the statement concerning Jesus, of whom it was said "He was moved with compassion on them." In living touch with Christ, this beloved general possesses, in a very marked degree, this spirit of compassion.

Fidelity is another magnificent quality so pronounced in the life of this soldier-statesman—fidelity to duty. A true Christian will ever be faithful to the task at hand. To every assignment given General MacArthur through the years, he has set his hand to the plow, and his face toward the goal of accomplishing that task, however huge and however impossible those tasks have seemed to be. His faithfulness to his country in a service rendered at a time when he might have elected to retire to private life in comfort and ease, is indeed one of the crowning examples of loyalty to be written into the biography of this great citizen. And when we think of his faithfulness to the Japanese during his six epoch-making postwar years as their counselor-champion, our sense of appreciation of this man soars to new heights. "Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee the crown of life." Truly General MacArthur, the Christian, has won the right to that crown.

Righteousness is the principle on which this towering citizen established his life. Many years ago he became an humble follower of Christ and since that time he has sought sincerely to follow only the course of right. He hates iniquity and hypocrisy. He believes that truth is the criterion, the standard by which all things must be tested. He deplores cheap political chicanery, dishonesty, and duplicity in dealings. General MacArthur is ever forthright, candid, sincere. This is indeed a rare quality nowadays; but it is a character trait belonging to those who walk and talk with God. As with individuals, so with nations, the inspired words of King Solomon may be repeated with renewed accent: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." May God in heaven restore to the leadership of America this much-needed moral and spiritual quality.

Other peerless qualities we could mention in the symmetrically developed character of this great American. Time fails us to comment on his matchless courage, his patience, his graciousness, his Christian dignity, and other traits. But what we are saying is that this great personality is what he is because, first of all, he is a Christian. We prefer to exalt Christ rather than to exalt the man,

MacArthur. We desire to emphasize that Christ is the true standard of manhood. It is because General MacArthur is a Christian and because he believes the Bible and walks in the light of its precepts that he is the moral giant that he is.

We need, my friends, as never before in this country, the type of Christian statesmanship and leadership as that which is exemplified in the person of this five-star American general—Douglas MacArthur.

Amendment of Reorganization Act of 1949 To Permit Rejection of Presidential Reorganization Plans by a Simple Rather Than a Constitutional Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1951, I introduced H. R. 3261, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that reorganization plans could be rejected by either House of Congress by a simple majority vote rather than a constitutional majority.

A former member of this body, Clarence F. Lea, now director of governmental relations for the Transportation Association of America, has contacted me indicating his support, and that of his association, of the provisions of H. R. 3261. I believe the views of former Congressman Lea, and the resolution of the Transportation Association of America, should be called to the attention of the entire Congress in connection with its consideration of H. R. 3261.

For that reason, I have asked leave to insert in the RECORD Mr. Lea's letter to me of April 26, 1951, and the accompanying statement of the Transportation Association of America:

TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1951.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Thanks for your note of the 11th.

I commend your presentation of your proposal to require only a constitutional majority for the disapproval of a proposed reorganization plan. The provisions of the Reorganization Act in effect count deceased Members, in case of vacancies, and absentees as voting in support of the Executive order. This, of course, is an absolutely untenable provision.

Our association has committed itself to support the repeal of this provision of the Reorganization Act.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE F. LEA.

ARGUMENT IN BEHALF OF THE PROPOSAL OF TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA TO AMEND THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Hoover Commission made a commendable effort to perform a real service for the country. It proposed worth-while reforms to avoid duplication, increase efficiency, and streamline the many departments within the executive branch of the Government. The Reorganization Act of 1949 provided the implementing legislation.

On March 13, 1950, the President submitted 21 plans to Congress under the procedures set forth in this act. Under the terms thereof all 21 plans would automatically become effective in 60 days unless rejected by either one of the two Houses of Congress through veto of a majority of its authorized membership.

Before a branch of Congress can act on a reorganization proposal, it is necessary that a Senator or Congressman introduce a resolution to veto. Regardless of the subject matter of the plan, all such resolutions to veto are heard by the same committee of either the House or Senate—the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. After hearings, this committee may or may not report the resolutions, either in the affirmative or negative. Then, still within the 60-day period, either the House or Senate must act or the plans become law.

The authorized membership of the House is 435. Therefore, a minimum of 218 Members must be present, and if a plan is to be rejected not less than this number must personally cast their votes for veto.

The authorized membership of the Senate is 96. It would be necessary that at least 49 Members be personally present and all voting to sustain a veto.

THE CONSTITUTION

Under section 5, article 1 of the Constitution, a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business. A majority vote of the quorum present is sufficient to pass the most important laws enacted by Congress.

Under section 6 (A) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, a plan transmitted to Congress goes into effect by the very nonaction of that body, as above described. Under this provision, if 51 Members were present in the Senate and 48 of them voted to disapprove a plan, it would nevertheless be sustained. It would become the law of the land. Yet, if the content of a plan were presented as a bill, it would, under the Constitution, become law after approval by a majority vote (of a quorum) of each House—or would be defeated by a majority of the quorum present.

CONGRESS ABDICATES

Under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949, Congress not only denies its regular committees the jurisdiction over the problems for which they are established, but it abdicates the most fundamental of all powers—the duty, under the Constitution, to legislate by rule of the majority. The act invites greater centralization of power in the hands of the President, which is the path to totalitarian government.

ACTUAL EXAMPLE

On May 22, 1950, the Senate voted 37 to 36 in favor of a resolution to veto plan 9—relating to the Federal Power Commission. A quorum was present and a majority of one voted to disapprove the plan. Nevertheless it became law, because of the failure to secure 49 votes. Actually, there were 73 Members of the Senate present and voting.

In effect, the absentees—and deceased Members of Congress—are computed as if voting in favor of a Presidential recommendation—without any actual vote whatever on their part. If a Member of either House wishes to avoid taking issue with the President, all that he would have to do is to stay home or take a trip.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

Plan 21 provided for the transfer of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce—and for its reorganization. It was maneuvered through Congress because little defense of the Commission was possible, yet in principle and effect the plan was the same as plan 7 referring to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Because plan 21 was the most difficult to defeat, an appendix was attached thereto settling up an Under Secretray of Commerce to deal with all transportation—creating a new activity and new executive control of transportation. Of course, if this appendix had been attached to plan 7, which was defeated, we would not now be burdened with still another bureaucratic agency dipping into the supervision and control of transportation.

While the association has not yet reached its conclusions as to whether the promotional phases of transportation rightly belong in the executive branch, certainly if it found such to be in the public interest, it is questionable whether transportation—now the largest segment of the economy—should be subordinated to a division of some governmental department.

DANGEROUS CENTRALIZATION

Let us quote from a statement submitted by the Honorable Clarence F. Lea, director of government relations of this association, when he appeared before the Senate in opposition to Reorganization Plan 7, which was vetoed in May 1950, by a vote of 66 to 13.

"In 32 years of service in the House, under six different Presidents, I have observed a constantly increasing centralization of power in the Federal Government. One Executive after another has sought increased powers under claim of more effectually discharging his duties. In fact, this tendency of Congress to place accumulated powers under the control of the executive department is an evolution of 120 years. Today, the President of the United States has more power than any other executive in the world, with the sole exception of Stalin.

"I recognize that in the main this increasing accumulation of power has not been solicited by the executive departments for what they regarded as illegitimate purposes. It represents just a natural inclination of nearly all men to crave more power."

SUMMARY

Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, Congress abdicates its powers to legislate for and in behalf of the people of this country on matters of government organization.

The established committees of the House and Senate are bypassed with no opportunity for hearing before these groups which are constituted, under normal procedures, to deal with the subjects covered by reorganization plans.

In view of the association's experience in connection with the 21 plans submitted to Congress by the President in 1950, we submit that the Reorganization Act of 1949 is a grave threat to economic freedom and our democratic processes. Amendment of this act, as set forth in the resolution on page 4, should be given first consideration by all leaders and by the two political parties. In its present form, the act should never be tolerated in a popular form of government.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The Hoover Commission, after long and painstaking study, submitted important recommendations designed to improve efficiency and economy in government. The board of directors of the Transportation Association of America commends and supports these aims.

Subsequent to that report, Congress enacted the Reorganization Act of 1949, abdicating to the Executive much of its affirmative responsibility for legislation, and setting up procedures which establish dangerous precedents in the democratic process.

The Transportation Association of America is concerned in these procedures because

several of the reorganization plans already submitted, and the likelihood of others in the future, affect directly national policies of transportation and its regulation. The association is concerned also because numerous proposals being submitted to Congress bear little or no relationship to the Hoover Commission proposals.

The board of directors of the Transportation Association of America deplores the unfair procedures and dangerous precedents of the Reorganization Act of 1949, and declares that—

Whereas under the terms of this act, such Presidential plans, when submitted to Congress, automatically become law within 60 legislative days unless disapproved by a resolution supported by the votes of a majority of the authorized membership of either House of the Congress; and

Whereas this act fails to require the consideration of such plans by the committees of Congress which ordinarily have jurisdiction over the problems embraced in the proposals; and

Whereas such procedures require that absentees and deceased Members ot Congress, where there are vacancies, be counted as in favor of such Presidential plans, thereby circumventing the majority rule of democratic government; and

Whereas the board of directors deplores practices which permit the enactment of legislation by Executive decree: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Transportation Association of America urges the Reorganization Act of 1949 be amended to provide that:

(a) Any Presidential plan shall be referred for consideration to the regular committees of Congress which have jurisdiction over the basic laws affected by the proposed changes; that such committees shall have the right to propose amendments thereto in accordance with the established practices of Congress;

(b) Full opportunity shall be offered to the public to understand the issues involved through regularly scheduled hearings by the several committees to which such reorganization plan or plans may be referred;

(c) The time limit of 60 legislative days shall be increased; and that

(d) The adoption or rejection of any Presidential plan shall be subject to established rules of Congress by which a majority vote of a quorum present shall govern.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed concerning the grain-for-India bill, particularly some recent implications.

The recent speech of Premier Nehru, as reported in the New York Times of May 2, which I have made a part of my remarks, touched upon the question of help from this country in the form of grain and other foodstuffs to alleviate anticipated famine. The Indian Premier indicated very plainly that his country would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it." While I do not understand what he means by "political strings," it is clear from the tone of his address, as well as from contemporary news articles from New Delhi, that Indian opinion regards certain conditions in the proposed relief bill as so obnoxious that the Government of India had decided not to rely any longer on 2,000,000 tons of United States grain and was recasting its food-importing policy.

According to this special article in the Times, direct from the Indian capital, a large section of parliamentary opinion favors rejection of American help if it materializes ultimately, although the government is not yet committed to a policy of outright rejection of United States help.

It would seem clear that India objects particularly to the conditions in the pending bill, which would require India to distribute American grain without discrimination as to caste, color, or creed, those provisions which require full and continuous publicity in India for American assistance and those which permit unrestricted inspection of distribution by officials of the United States Government.

Communist China, despite its present war commitments, has agreed to supply India with additional rice and grain. Negotiations are underway with the Soviet Union for 500,000 tons of wheat in exchange for shipments of jute from India.

I can well understand the position of the Indian Premier, who does not wish to bind his nation politically or render it subservient to nations which may furnish economic relief. But, from the American viewpoint, it would be desirable, I think, that we attach certain conditions to any assistance we render.

First, we should want to be assured of the friendliness of the nations we help and their willingness not to exhibit actual enmity in international relations, or bind themselves to the policies of hostile, or potentially hostile, countries.

Secondly, we should insist upon careful official inspection to insure proper and equitable distribution and appropriate publicity respecting the origin of the food shipments. In the past, the Soviet has made a practice of relabeling shipments of food and other commodities from the United States of America and then distributing them in various countries giving the people to understand that they are benefactions from the Soviet Union.

Thirdly, we should always keep in mind our own needs for essential foodstuffs and necessities, as well as existing requirements of the Korean war, the Atlantic Pact military program, and ECA for shipping and transportation.

Fourthly, and this point should be first, we must always keep before us the principle of extending meritorious and emergent help and assistance to impoverished, suffering and afflicted peoples whenever we can, responsive to the Christian doctrine of furnishing charity and succor within our own means and capacity.

It may well be that grain to India at this time, while commendable from the humanitarian viewpoint, would lay down a precedent upon which other afflicted or economically weak nations might well rely. It should be recognized by the Congress, as it is by the American people, and as the dictates of prudence and common sense so amply justify, that this Nation, great and powerful as it is, cannot, under any circumstances, assume the burden of feeding the whole world or any considerable part of it. There are definite limits to our humanitarianism and our charity and we of the Congress must make sure that, in our understandable and most commendable zeal to help other nations, we are not, by our lavish gifts and benefactions, weakening our own Nation and economy. Such action would conform to the Soviet master blueprint.

If I were to support the Indian grain bill, in any respect, I should, for the above stated reasons, do so with utmost reluctance and certainly under safeguards and conditions already written into the bill. However, Premier Nehru's speech has certainly done much to clarify my viewpoint because I certainly do not intend to vote for any measure that will put my country in the position of forcing charity and relief upon nations which would label generosity as intrusion and implied bribery and cause resentment and misunderstanding abroad.

If these nations wish to take up the Soviet cry of imperialism and reaction and dictatorship against the United States, it is their privilege but I have no intention of condoning or yielding to such an attitude and I certainly will insist upon voting in the Chamber to uphold the prestige, self-respect, greatness, and security of our own beloved Nation.

[From the New York Times of May 2, 1951]

NEHRU BARS FOOD WITH ANY "STRINGS"—SAYS INDIA WILL NOT BARTER FREEDOM OF ACTION—UNITED STATES BILL IS CAUSING RESENTMENT

NEW DELHI, India, May 1.—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru declared today that India, though grateful for help, would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it."

Reviewing the food situation in a nationwide broadcast, he added: "We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action even for something which we need so badly."

Indian opinion strongly supports Nehru's view. Every important newspaper published today official and parliamentary reactions to the speech by Mr. Nehru on Sunday in which he expressed a similar view.

FOOD POLICY BEING RESHAPED

According to the newspapers, the general reaction was that the conditions in the United States Senate bill on aid to India were so obnoxious that the Government of India had decided not to rely any longer on 2,000,000 tons of United States grain and that the food importing policy was being recast. A large section of parliamentary opinion, according to reports, favored rejection of American help even if it materialized ultimately.

An official of the Food Ministry said these reports were rather speculative and that Government was not committed to any policy of outright rejection of United States help.

Strong exception has been taken to three conditions in the Senate bill. These would require India to distribute supplies obtained

locally or imported without discrimination as to caste, color, or creed, give full and continuous publicity in India for American assistance and permit unrestricted observation of distribution by Americans.

Officials here expressed the view that all three conditions in the Senate bill were being voluntarily observed, but that writing them into an agreement was objectionable. Meanwhile the food problem has been placed on a "war footing" and is being dealt with by a special Cabinet subcommittee that meets every day.

AIMS AT SELF-SUFFICIENCY

In his broadcast the Prime Minister warned his countrymen of the "dangerous consequences inherent in constant dependence upon outside help for food."

"We have sought help from abroad and we shall continue to do so under pressure of necessity," he said.

"But we can never function with the freedom that we desire if we are always dependent in this matter on others. It is only when we obtain self-sufficiency in food that we can progress and develop our politics."

Famine as it is understood by the people does not exist to any wide extent at this stage, he said, adding, "but the specter of famine certainly hovers over the land." He said he emphasized the need for intensification of internal procurement measures and for starting urgently a number of public works to increase the purchasing power of the poor.

Communist China has agreed to supply India immediately with 50,000 tons more of rice, according to information received from Peiping, an official of the Food Ministry said today. This is the second agreement concluded with China within the last 4 days. Last week it was announced that Peiping had agreed to supply 50,000 tons of milo sorghum grain.

At the same time the Chinese Government has made arrangements to ship the 100,000 tons of grain as speedily as possible and officials here expect consignment by early July—when the crucial period for Sihar starts. Both transactions, officials said, form part of a deal with China for 1,000,000 tons of food grains for which negotiations are being carried on in Peiping.

The Indian Government will shortly resume negotiations with the Soviet Embassy here for 500,000 tons of wheat offered by Moscow in exchange for jute.

Marines Plugged Gap in Allied Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times for May 2, 1951:

MARINES PLUGGED GAP IN ALLIED LINE—RESERVE UNIT RUSHED INTO THE BREACH STAVED OFF DISASTER WHEN CHINESE STRUCK

KOREA, April 27.—Now it can be told that the Marines staved off disaster when the Chinese ripped a 10-mile gap in the Allied line.

A United States Infantry division held on one side of the gap while the Marines held on the other. And the British Twenty-seventh Brigade absorbed the frontal impact of the break-through drive, and halted it.

But when the Communists unleashed their offensive, it was the Marines who were rushed up.

When the Chinese aimed the Sunday punch of their April 22 offensive at the middle of the Allied line the South Korean Sixth Division collapsed. Through the gap south of Kumwha the Chinese poured units of three full-strength corps toward Kapyong and the Seoul-Chunchon Highway.

THREAT TO BIG PART OF ARMY

Had they reached it they could have sliced southwestward toward Seoul and cut off a big part of the United States Eighth Army or forced it into a hasty and costly retreat. But they failed.

The marines, with the South Koreans on their left, were advancing slowly northwest of Hwachon when the Chinese struck. The South Korean cave-in left the marines with their left flank flapping in the wind.

The first battalion of the First Regiment, which was in reserve, was routed out of sleeping bags in the middle of the night and sped by trucks up the bumpy roads to stem the Chinese onrush.

The first of the first of the first, as the men of the battalion call themselves, pulled up to Horseshoe Ridge late Monday. The advance elements of the Chinese hit before the marines were in position. A little way back down the road the "red devils" of the artillery set up shop.

The Communists struck straight up Horseshoe Ridge, but were beaten back. Then they swirled around the flanks and cut off the battalion. All night the enemy machine guns on higher positions around the ridge raked the hill. Mortars dropped like rain. Sometimes the Chinese wedged into the marine positions. When they did, they died there from marine grenades and pistols and bayonets.

FIRE AT RANGE OF 5 YARDS

After a lull the Chinese attacked again.

"Ready on the left, ready on the right, range 5 yards, commence firing" a marine shouted.

Failing to break through, the Chinese dropped into trenches a few yards in front of the marine positions and threw grenades. The "red devils" fired their 105's point blank at Chinese reinforcements moving up.

Finally the first battalion got orders to break out. The marines loaded their dead and wounded in the jeeps and trailers, and started out. The battalion permitted the Fifth and Seventh Regiments to pull back to safety. Then the first and the two other battalions of the First Regiment took up protective positions to the south along the Chunchon-Hwachon road.

While they were blunting the main drive, the two other regiments fought gradual withdrawals under constant pressure. Later in the week, the marines withdrew toward Chunchon because of the threat to the west end of the line, and to break off contact with the Chinese in order to set up a new defense line.

Repudiate Yalta and Potsdam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from Human Events:

REPUDIATE YALTA AND POTSDAM
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The private arrangements between the leaders of the Big Three powers are the nearest equivalent of a peace settlement after the Second World War. These arrangements were concluded between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill at Tehran and Yalta, between Stalin, Truman, and Attlee at Potsdam. And no major peace settlement in recorded history has broken down so completely so fast.

Any American who would advocate today that this country carry out the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam would reveal himself as either a sympathizer with the Kremlin or an incurable ignoramus in foreign affairs. Almost every important decision at these conferences now stands revealed as a major national security risk. We find ourselves in the position, at once tragic and ridiculous, of trying to escape from the trap which we helped to set for ourselves by acquiescing in a peace settlement that was both a denial of all the ideals for which the war was professedly being fought and an abandonment of some very vital considerations of American national security.

There have been many cases when nations endeavored, with more or less success, to escape from the consequences of defeat. The United States for several years now has been presenting a less familiar spectacle: a nation trying to escape from the consequences of a military victory so badly botched and bungled politically that it has been little less disastrous than a defeat. It is a saddening proof of the power of the standardized cliché thinking and unwillingness to consider questions on their factual merits that the legend of Franklin D. Roosevelt as a wise, farsighted statesman should persist, in the face of the visible collapse of the peace settlement on which he staked his political reputation.

It is interesting to consider what our prospects would be in the global struggle, hot and cold, with the Kremlin, if the specific provisions and the spirit of the Yalta-Potsdam agreements continued to dominate our foreign policy. The United Nations, of course, would be completely stymied by the veto power conceded to its charter members.

We should be committed to maintaining the disarmament of Germany and Japan, thereby destroying any chance of creating effective counterweights to Soviet power in Europe and in Asia. We should be obliged to keep the German economy in an unprecedented strait-jacket, with the alternatives of starvation for some and dire poverty for almost all Germans or huge subsidies from America to maintain a tolerable living standard, in view of the restrictions which Potsdam prescribed for German industry and trade.

We should be required to return fugitives to the Soviet Union, thereby ending any possibility of a political and psychological warfare aimed at driving a wedge between the Soviet peoples and their Communist rulers. We should be committed to trying to overthrow the Franco regime in Spain, while accepting as permanent allies the more sanguinary Communist dictatorships in Eastern Europe.

II

The Yalta Conference between Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill took place in this Soviet Crimean resort from February 2 to February 11, 1945. It represented the high-water mark in the Roosevelt administration's policy of trying to get along with Stalin by giving him everything he asked for and throwing in a few additional concessions for good measure. Alger Hiss, the only member of the American delegation at Yalta who received punishment after participating in the signing of an instrument that is at the root of many of America's present difficulties,

must have been satisfied with the results of Yalta.

For the chief of these results was the confirmation of Stalin's domination both of Eastern Europe and of east Asia. Held without the presence of any Polish representative, this conference sanctioned a grotesque mutilation of Poland's natural boundaries. Almost half of Poland's prewar territory and about one-third of the Polish population were transferred to the Soviet Union. Supposedly as compensation Poland was promised substantial additions of German territory, inhabited by a population that was ethnically solidly German.

Although the communiqué which was issued after the end of the Yalta meeting was full of pious professions of respect for the Atlantic Charter, the ideal of national self-determination which is implicit in the first three clauses of the Charter was trampled underfoot. There was no semblance of a free plebiscite of the people concerned about the transfer of Polish territory to the Soviet Union, of German territory to Poland. These unprincipled annexations were accompanied by a mass uprooting of people from their homes—an act of singular inhumanity which will poison the atmosphere of Europe for an indefinite future.

The betrayal of Poland at Yalta was matched by the betrayal of China. Without consulting or even informing any representative of the Chinese Nationalist Government, Roosevelt fatuously bribed Stalin to intervene in the war against Japan by promising that the Soviet Union should receive the Kurile Islands, South Sakhalin, Outer Mongolia, and, most important of all, a preferred position in Manchuria, richest and most industrialized area of China. The Soviet Government was given the naval base of Port Arthur at the southern tip of Manchuria, a right of joint operation of the Manchurian railways, and a special position in the trade of the largest Manchurian port, Dairen. The Russian imperialist position which existed before the Russo-Japanese War was restored.

It was no accident that Manchuria, overrun and occupied by Soviet troops, became the assembly point and main military base for the Chinese Communist conquest of China. One can hardly measure the ultimate prospective cost of this development in American lives and resources.

Yalta authorized the dismemberment of Germany, the use of German slave labor as reparations, and made the United States party to a twentieth-century fugitive-slave act. It was agreed that the United States should undertake to repatriate Soviet citizens in its zone of occupation. For some time this ignoble agreement was carried out and Soviet political refugees were handed back to death and concentration camps.

III

The Potsdam Conference, held from July 17 until August 2, 1945, was a sequel to Yalta in its contempt for the Atlantic Charter and its abandonment of the American interest in an economically stable and viable Europe. It authorized "the transfer to Germany of German populations or elements thereof remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary." This placed a final seal of approval on an operation comparable with the worst Nazi atrocities in its cruelty and its far-reaching disastrous social and economic consequences.

This was the driving from their homes, without compensation or any opportunity to remove their property, of some 14,000,000 Germans and people of German ethnic origin. About two-thirds of these unfortunate human beings lived in the German provinces east of the Oder-Neisse frontier line. The others were people of German stock whose ancestors had, for the most part, lived for centuries in the Sudetenland region of Czechoslovakia, in Poland, Hungary, and other countries of eastern and southeastern Europe.

The mass deportations were carried out so brutally that most students of the subject believe that as many as 2,000,000 human beings perished in the process, and, as every visitor to postwar Germany knows, the presence of many millions of embittered, destitute, uprooted people creates a political, economic, and social problem of the first magnitude.

Besides sanctioning these ruthless deportations, the Potsdam Conference drew up an elaborate blueprint for the economic vivisection of Germany. It called for the complete prohibition of many industries in Germany and prescribed arbitrary sharp restrictions on the output of others essential both to the reconstruction of Europe and to Germany's capacity to earn its national livelihood. It authorized the dismantling of many German industrial plants.

While the Potsdam Declaration did not embody all the vengeful folly of the Morgenthau plan, it did create many roadblocks for German recovery, which only started after the decisions of Potsdam in the western zone were scrapped or drastically modified.

IV

There would be several advantages if the Senate, or both Houses of Congress, would pass a resolution formally repudiating both the Yalta and the Potsdam Agreements. There would be every justification for such a step because the Soviet Government has consistently disregarded the pledges (in these declarations) which it found inconvenient to keep.

The Yalta communiqué, for instance, promised "free and unfettered elections in Poland," and it was agreed at Potsdam that Germany should be treated as an economic unit and that democratic parties should be encouraged. But the only national election held in Poland, in 1947, was a fraudulent farce, in the opinion of all the foreign correspondents who witnessed it, except the representatives of Tass, the official Soviet news agency, and the now defunct PM. The Soviet zone from the beginning was sealed off from the rest of Germany and democratic parties have long been completely suppressed there.

Both Yalta and Potsdam were horrible examples of irresponsible secret diplomacy. Formal repudiation of both these instruments, with their immoral and inexpedient provisions, would be an assurance against any relapse into a policy of appeasement. It would be a tardy atonement to the pro-western Poles. It would give the Germans a much stronger reason for siding decisively with the west by showing that America does not accept the morality or the legality or the finality of the Oder-Neisse frontier. It would be a useful move in the necessary effort to escape from a victory so appallingly misused as to be almost indistinguishable, in some of its consequences, from defeat.

Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s, Recent Nation-Wide Radio Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a tabulation of answers to the 16 questions on Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s, recent Nation-wide radio poll. These answers were received in my office by telegram, letters, and postcards from my constituents in the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois. I am happy to present this tabulation as a part of the RECORD:

1. As of today, would you vote for Harry Truman for President? Yes, 4; no, 1,274.

2. Should President Truman be allowed to continue to receive the $50,000 tax-exempt salary recently voted him by Congress? Yes, 22; no, 1,257.

3. Do you believe that Congress should continue investigations such as the one into RFC loans and the Kefauver crime hearings and extend those investigations into other activities of the Government? Yes, 1,268; no, 12.

4. Are you in favor of keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State? Yes, 11; no, 1,264.

5. Do you favor the United Nations being in final control of United States troops in Korea or elsewhere? Yes, 56; no, 1,229.

6. Should Chiang Kai-shek be permitted to send his Nationalist armies against the Chinese Communists? Yes, 1,261; no, 19.

7. Do you feel confident that Europe will fight to the end against communism? Yes, 55; no, 1,222.

8. Do you approve of the proposed continuation of economic, along with military, aid to North Atlantic Pact nations? Yes, 161; no, 1,131.

9. Would you favor a requirement that nations receiving military or economic aid from us must agree to stop trading with Russia, Communist China, or any other iron-curtain country? Yes, 1,258; no, 20.

10. Do you believe President Truman's statement that all Communists and Communist sympathizers have been weeded out of the Government? Yes, 3; no, 1,271.

11. Are you in favor of a permanent peacetime program of universal military training? Yes, 465; no, 805.

12. Do you believe President Truman is making a sincere effort to cut out unnecessary Government spending? Yes, 6; no, 1,272.

13. Should wages be controlled along with prices? Yes, 1,191; no, 92.

14. Should the Government prevent strikes in time of war emergency? Yes, 1,219; no, 58.

15. Are you in favor of calling General MacArthur home for a report to Congress on the far eastern situation? Yes, 1,256; no, 81.

16. Are you in favor of impeaching President Truman? Yes, 1,258; no, 20.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that my constituents generally are shown to be inherently opposed to the policies of the Truman administration. While this possibly is not an entirely true picture of the sentiments of the people in my congressional district, it does show the thinking of an average constituency at the present time.

So many American citizens have asked for impeachment proceedings to be brought against President Truman and Dean Acheson that I feel obligated to make a few remarks regarding this question.

First, we must consider that impeachment proceedings would be very difficult to accomplish, if not impossible, due to the political composition of the present Congress.

Secondly, if impeachment proceedings were possible against either President Truman or Secretary of State Dean Acheson, would the state of the Nation

be improved by bringing such proceedings? I think not. Even though executive officers are removed from office, we have been shown that the same old deal remains in existence. In some cases where New Dealers have been removed from office, we have gotten more leftish individuals to replace them.

It appears to me that the only way we will ever effect a return to the high standard of government established and promulgated by our forefathers is through each and every citizen exercising his or her right to vote.

Now is the time for every eligible voter in the United States to firmly resolve to use that precious right of suffrage at each opportunity which presents itself in the future.

NATO in Cross-Currents in the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from today's New York Times:

ABROAD—NATO IN CROSS-CURRENTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The question of Mediterranean defense—who shall command it, how far it will extend—has become a matter of great concern and controversy among the members of the Atlantic coalition. When Foreign Minister Schuman was in this country with President Auriol he complained to Secretary Acheson that France had been left out of British-American discussions of an area in which the French have a paramount interest. The United States, we were politely reminded, should be well aware of the stake of France in the Mediterranean since we depend on her territories in north Africa for air bases.

The British and Americans, in their turn, are arguing about whether the supreme command in the Mediterranean should be given to a Briton or an American. After the uproar over the appointment of an American to the Atlantic command it was thought that the southern post would go to a British admiral. But a great many other claims and considerations must be weighed before the choice is made. The nations living in the Mediterranean—France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, not to mention Spain—are factors in a problem even more complex than the North Atlantic organization.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The decision on the Mediterranean command hangs on many unanswered questions: Shall the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which already takes in two Mediterranean powers, France and Italy, be extended to the whole area? Or shall it be supplemented by a Mediterranean Pact, linked to NATO by an over-all strategic plan? Yugoslavia wants aid, and in addition to grants for military materials is about to have her budget deficit underwritten by the United States, Britain, and France. But Tito is dead set against joining any alliance. Turkey and Greece, on the contrary, strongly desire to be admitted into NATO. They know they have armies stronger than those of many western nations to contribute to the defense of Europe, and they are dissatisfied to have no voice in strategic decisions they are expected to carry out.

One thing is beyond question: "No war with Russia could be won," says the London Economist, "without the Western Powers controlling the Mediterranean." As soon as the strategists began to plan on a practical basis it was inevitable that they should recognize that defense on the Elbe or the Rhine is another Maginot line unless a strong guard is placed on the Mediterranean flank.

At present Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia have the strongest forces in being this side of the iron curtain. The Turks argue, with reason, that Russia would not invade their country merely to subdue Turkey or control the Dardanelles. The strait, they point out, is merely an entrance to another sea as closed and landlocked as the Black Sea. Thus, since an attack on Turkey would be an overt move in the war for the world, the Turks must be regarded as front-line soldiers and treated as part of the general defense force. Both Turkey and Greece are convinced they should be in NATO, and the opposition to their inclusion they attribute to Western Powers who fear they will receive less military aid if the arms are spread too thin.

These fears, if they exist, touch the heart of the western dilemma. Foreign critics of our racing productivity in arms protest that it is eating up raw materials to the detriment of the production systems of our allies. Critics at home of our "extravagant" build-up of NATO demand more men, supplies, and arms for the Asiatic front. Both sets of critics want the impossible—more delivered at different places, with less dislocation of the normal economy.

But if the United States is speeding production, perhaps too regardless of the economic consequences to other nations, it is because there is not enough military equipment to go around and the front is too long to be covered by any available force. To distribute guns and planes and tanks as widely and quickly as possible, they have to be produced as rapidly as possible.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

The best way to create a global defense against a global danger is to organize all free peoples into a common front against Soviet aggression. This is what the United Nations tries to do, but cannot do effectively while the aggressor is a member. The alternative is a regional defense system like NATO, which is already so important that its first problem is whether to limit or widen its scope. The question raised by the powers in the eastern Mediterranean—powers directly on the line of march and actually better prepared to fight than their western neighbors—is hard to answer. It is evident that the defense of Europe depends on the Mediterranean as well as the Atlantic States. But what of the weak and imperiled nations of the Middle East? Would they have to be included, too?

One solution of the immediate problem would be to set up two Mediterranean commands and to form a Mediterranean pact closely associated with the Atlantic Pact under an over-all board of strategy. It goes without saying, in any case, that the tough and willing soldiers of Greece and Turkey should receive their full share of arms and that their leaders should participate in planning on the top level. As the difficulties and complexities of integrating a multinational defense effort emerge into the light of day we begin to see that NATO is only the core of an economic, political, geographical, and moral structure of measureless dimensions.

A Call to Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A CALL TO PATRIOTS

Americanism.

People who have forgotten what real Americanism is have rediscovered it with an almost holy frenzy since the return of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to this country.

For General MacArthur speaks in the style of the old-time orators; he speaks in the American way, with a genuine and sincere Americanism as the basis of his talks.

Since the inception of the New Deal in 1932 and its subsequent and continuing interest in foreign affairs, Americans have, by and large, forgotten what a proud thing it is to be an American.

We have all of us become, to a greater or lesser extent, internationalists. Our thinking has been tinctured with considerations of England, and Russia, and France, and China, and Italy, and Germany. How will Argentina react? What will Tito think? Will this irritate the Kremlin?

Now comes a man onto the stage of American life with the strides of a giant, and he brings Americanism back to us. He who has been away from this Nation for 14 years comes home and gives us elementary lessons in American patriotism. He tells us things we never should have forgotten. He explains for us the American point of view—a point of view that we have had colored with the dim and uncertain light of internationalism for lo, these many years.

General MacArthur is so obviously right that we, the people, are surprised that we did not see the world the clear way he sees it, for so many years. For he looks at it simply, as an American.

These are Americans fighting and dying in Korea, he reminds us. The other nations with token forces are willing to let the Korean war continue its indecisive way—but who is paying the heavy penalty, the terrible price? Americans are. We are paying in the lives of our young men, in crushing tax burdens, in a disrupted civilian economy.

Americans, decide what is best for America—and then let your Government know that that is what you want done. This is the message brought home by General MacArthur.

He has reminded us that thinking of America first is not treason to the rest of the world. He has reminded us that as Americans we have a glorious heritage of freedom and independence which we must retain. He has reminded us that when Americans are dying in a war being fought by American men and with American dollars, it is up to America to decide how that war shall be terminated.

He has reminded us that our first duty is to our country, our country—not the rest of the world.

He shouldn't have had to remind us of these things. We should have remembered them and kept them alive and shining in our national life.

But as a result of General MacArthur's return, as a result of his recalling us to our native Americanism, there has been a tremendous reawakening of the American

spirit; of the American tradition; of the American ideal; of Americanism.

General MacArthur has done his country the greatest service within his power. He has awakened it to its own glory.

Sinclair Weeks Sees MacArthur in "Sacrifice Bunt" for United States Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an article by Sinclair Weeks which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald of April 15, 1951:

SINCLAIR WEEKS SEES MACARTHUR IN "SACRIFICE BUNT" FOR UNITED STATES GOOD

(By W. E. Playfair)

President Truman's action in "firing" General MacArthur has given Russian communism a big boost—for the moment.

But the removal by the President of the man who knows the most about the Far East problems may have collateral benefits in that it may force the development of a policy with respect to Asia "that makes some sense." It may thus have a boomerang effect on Truman.

This is the opinion of former United States Senator Sinclair Weeks, who makes the suggestion that MacArthur may have made a "sacrifice bunt" for the good of the Nation.

CALCULATED RISK

"I believe it possible," he says, "that the General, wiser than most men, particularly insofar as the Far East is concerned, may very well have taken a calculated risk to the end that this country and the American boys fighting and dying in Korea might still have a chance."

"As far as the actual removal of MacArthur is concerned," Weeks says, "no one questions the right of the President of the United States to remove a general officer from his command. But it seems to me that people who stop here miss the point.

"As president of a business organization I can discharge half my vice presidents, but if I take such action capriciously I am not doing the company, its owners, or employees any good. And my hasty, ill-considered action must be taken into account when any judgment is formed as to my own capacity. So we must look at President Truman's action with respect to all its implications.

"When you consider the power vested in the Commander in Chief, you have to admit that possibly MacArthur, having strong views and deep-seated convictions on the Far East problem, might have done better to hand in his resignation, and come home to express these. Presumably he will do that now, anyway.

"But, in the meantime, great damage has been done to American prestige and the boys on the firing line in Korea have not been and are not now being, well served.

SEES NO COMPARISON

"Some people have, and I think thoughtlessly, compared the removal of MacArthur with that of McClellan by Lincoln. There is no comparison. MacArthur was in no sense a field general. To be sure, he was charged with responsibility for the Korean operation, but in essence he was a great pro-consul, the administrator of the former Japanese Empire, concerned with matters of high policy and over-all strategy, concerned most of all with arresting the progress of communism in Asia.

"And what a job he has done. We have spent billions to build up Europe to stop the advance of communism in the west. MacArthur had only a fraction of that amount, yet he arrested communism in Japan, and he would have done so in China had his views been taken into consideration."

At no time in history, Weeks says, has a commander faced a task such as has confronted MacArthur and his field commanders, Walker and Ridgway, in Korea.

REDS UNIMPEDED

"When before," he asks, "have any military operations been conducted in such a manner that your enemy has been given free play to bring up men, material, ammunition, and supplies without any sort of interference until he had crossed a certain line?

"How many American boys have been killed or wounded because the Truman-Acheson leadership has forced them to fight a powerful enemy with one hand tied behind their backs?

"And how much longer are we to carry on the fiction that we are not at war with Communist China? The 9,000 dead, 60,000 wounded, and the 250,000 Americans still fighting in Korea—these are on-the-ground witnesses. Who do they think they are fighting if not Communist China, and they are fighting with two strikes on them and in a manner in which no troops were ever before asked to do battle."

SOCIALISTS AT WORK

I have suggested that the Russian Communists must be very happy over this incident. MacArthur's official body was hardly cold before our Socialist friends in Great Britain proposed that Communist Russia be brought in to help negotiate the peace treaty with Japan, and proposed that Formosa be handed over to Mao—while 13,000 of their fellow countrymen are fighting in Korea.

"How must the British soldier feel standing up to the hordes of Chinese Communists thrown at him and witnessing the spectacle of his government playing on the side of the enemy?"

Weeks does not agree with MacArthur's detractors, who charge that he deliberately disobeyed orders. His view is that MacArthur obeyed orders "but put on them his own interpretation as to their effect." If the entire incident results "at long last" in a constructive approach to the Far East problem, it may be a blessing in disguise.

"Meantime," Weeks says, "I deplore any political approach to this incident, this tragic result of the mishandling of a situation which never should have been allowed to come to such a stage. This is of truly national concern and of very vital interest to every American, regardless of party."

Communication From Naval Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this House, and particularly those who have served in the Armed Forces, will read the naval communication printed below. If you had received such a notice, would you not believe you were no longer associated with the Organized Naval Reserve, active or inactive?

The sailor was recalled in September 1950 and has been unsuccessful in his attempt to receive another discharge. His wife, two children, and mother-in-law who depend on him for support are very confused. Can you blame them?

UNITED STATES NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER,
Akron, Ohio, June 20, 1950.

From commanding officer, Division 9-15.
To Reinhart Klingenstein, Akron, Ohio.
Subject: Naval Reserve clothing issue; return of.
References: (a) BuPers Manual, article H-8706; (b) NRMAL No. 5-50 of January 6, 1950.
Enclosures: (1) Clothing list; (2) page 9 entry.

1. Your association with the Organized Naval Reserve is being terminated for non-attendance at drills.

2. By authority of references (a) and (b), you are hereby informed that you are required to return to this activity all Government property now in your possession. Enclosure (1) indicates the Government property in your possession.

3. You are hereby ordered to return said property or its monetary value to this activity at once. Your attention is called to enclosure (2), which is a copy of the page 9 entry to be made in your record (by authority of reference 2), should you fail to comply with this letter.

J. M. GIBADLO,
Lieutenant Commander, Commanding Officer, Org. Surf. Division 9-15.

A. Lincoln and H. Truman—Two Views on Bossing Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an interesting article by Mr. Leslie Gould, comparing President Lincoln's high respect for the dignity of the courts with President Truman's flouting of them.

Comparisons are always odious, and this comparison is odious to our present Chief Executive.

[From the New York Journal-American of April 30, 1951]

A. LINCOLN AND H. TRUMAN—TWO VIEWS ON BOSSING COURTS

(By Leslie Gould)

Here's the way two Presidents of the United States have acted when asked to exert the power of their office to overrule decisions of the courts. Abraham Lincoln and Harry Truman.

Lincoln's views were expressed in a letter involving a court decision on California land titles. He wrote on June 1, 1863:

"I must repeat now in writing what I have told Mr. (George Fox) Kelly (agent for California settlers) verbally, that the courts, and not the President, must decide questions of land titles.

"There may be some questions in regard to preemptions, which, by law, are to be decided through the Department, with appeal to me, and when such a case shall come regularly to me, I shall hear it. But I must now say, once and for all, that mere vague assertions that the decisions of the courts are fraudulent, with appeals to me to reverse them, cannot be entertained.

"A. LINCOLN."

Now, we come down to the present and Harry Truman. The courts have ruled stock control of the former Dollar Line, turned over to the Maritime Commission at the time of a $7,500,000 loan, was only pledged and should be returned to the former owners—the Stanley Dollar interests—since the loan has been repaid with interest.

The Supreme Court has refused to review this decision, which in effect affirms the lower court position—that the stock belongs to Stanley Dollar.

Instead of accepting this decision of the courts Harry Truman wrote his Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer:

"Accordingly, you are directed to continue to hold this stock on behalf of the United States. All appropriate action should be taken to assert and maintain the Government's rights as owner of this stock.

"Very sincerely yours,

"HARRY TRUMAN."

For defying the court, as directed by the President, Secretary Sawyer, some of his subordinates and attorneys in the Justice Department are facing contempt citations.

Charles Eberstadt, who specializes in old and rare books with his brother, Lindley, sent this reporter the Lincoln quotations, saying:

"The answer of Abraham Lincoln to this question (a President's right to overrule the courts) is so forthright and truly American in spirit that I am happy to give you permission to print it in full if you should wish to do so."

Interior Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, May 1, when I was addressing this body in regard to the Gary amendment which strikes out the appropriation to build a transmission power line between Buggs Island Dam and Langley Field, I quoted certain statements made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] when he addressed this body on April 24. Inadvertently, there was left out of the RECORD one statement which was made by the gentleman from Virginia. The statement is on page 4400 of the RECORD of April 24, 1951, and is as follows:

Mr. GARY. Well, I made a proposition right here on the floor that has never been made and that is that the company will accept the cheapest contract that is in existence in the entire United States that has been approved by the United States Government.

This statement was made during Mr. GARY's discussion of his amendment and was an assurance to the Members of this body that VEPCO would wheel power from Buggs Island Dam in accordance with his statement above and I knew that the Members would want to know this before voting on this bill and I want to have this statement of Mr. GARY's called to their attention again before voting on the bill now up for consideration.

Keep Our Party System As Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a speech I delivered over radio station WHAS, Louisville, Ky., last Sunday night:

KEEP OUR PARTY SYSTEM AS IS

I am very grateful for this opportunity to discuss a most timely question. Ever since the beginning of our country's history, the problem of political parties has been with us. George Washington disliked the entire idea. He believed that partisanship was dangerous. There have been others who shared his views. But the political system grew up in our country because it is a vital part of any free republic. We must have strong political parties because we must have a vigorous opposition in any free society. The only way to crystallize this kind of opposition is through well-organized criticism. The constant knowledge that national leadership is always subject to change prevents tyranny and protects freedom.

I am sure that all Americas agree to these fundamentals. But ever since 1948 there has been a great deal of talk about realining our political system. When the Dixiecrats took their walk out of the Democratic Party, there were loud cries of fear. Many folks believed that this defection would lead to the possibility of electing a minority President, at that time or in the future. We have had many third-party movements before. In fact, we have had elections with many more than three parties on the ballot in a large number of States. But by and large, there have been only two parties of importance since the first election in our history.

If we go about the process of realining our political parties, it would probably be along the line of a so-called conservative and a so-called liberal division. Nothing would be worse for the country. In the first place, we would be involved in an unrealistic and meaningless quarrel over definitions. Who are liberals? Who are conservatives? Are the left-wingers who want our Government to take over and run everything liberals? They like to call themselves by this name, but there are many of us who regard every extension of Government authority into private fields as an approach to the same forms of tyrannical government that our ancestors came here to escape. And what do we mean by conservative? There are people in both political parties who regard themselves as seeking to conserve the American tradition. Others label the same folks by other names, and not all of them are friendly.

As our political parties are established today, there is room inside each of them for disagreement. I regard this disagreement as healthy. It is true that now and then we grow confused because we do not share completely the views of our fellow Republicans or our fellow Democrats, but it is a healthy form of intellectual confusion. Inside the Democratic Party there are men whose ideas vary tremendously on everything from civil rights to foreign policy. We have similar variations in the Republican Party. But it is just this kind of flexibility within the political organization that makes it possible for our Government to govern.

If we had completely opposite points of view, whenever we had a change of administration, we would be staging a revolution. Nothing would be more disastrous. In the long run, a realinement of our parties would lead inevitably to the same kind of splinter parties that have made stable government almost impossible in France. For there would be hundreds of thousands of Americans who could not find their views represented by either a right-wing or a left-wing group. They would not be able to resist the temptation to form shaded organizations to speak for themselves. Today they find it possible to join within the Republican or Democratic Parties in an effort to influence the decisions of these major organizations. I believe that this is good for the country.

We have seen how this works in practice. Basically, each political party is a temporary coalition of many different viewpoints. In 1948, the Republican Party named as its candidate the man regarded as most capable of welding their coalition into a victorious unit. The Democrats, torn by conflicts inside their organization, did the same. We lost; they won. But in each case it was a blending of opinions. Not everyone was satisfied with the choice at either convention. But the choices were in each case a compromise of many conflicting viewpoints.

This represents our form of political organization and our form of government at its best. The two-party system as we know it is a flexible, workable device. Far from being a liability, its ability to absorb many viewpoints is an asset.

When we look back over the history of our country, we see that time after time, the political parties have adopted views which would have been regarded as unthinkable only a generation earlier. This kind of adaptability would be retarded by any effort to reshape the parties.

At this stage in world affairs, I say, "Don't start rocking the boat." If we think there is confusion now, imagine what would happen if we began to play games with our political organizations.

We have had the world's most effective Government because responsibility has been easy to fix in a two-party system. If we begin to monkey with the machinery, we run the risk of dumping the passengers into the drink.

Let's keep the Democratic mule and the Republican elephant. They may be stubborn; they may never forget; but they've pulled us out of many a world crisis. I'm for keeping them in harness. They sometimes get out of the traces, but they're good and strong and they're pulling our way.

Medal of Freedom Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Claire Phillips, the second woman in the United States to be awarded a Medal of Freedom, is a resident of my congressional district. She is now visiting Washington for the first time to attend the premiere of the picture based on her experi-

ences in World War II and upon her book, Manila Espionage.

I include as a part of these remarks an article which appeared in the Evening Star, May 1, discussing Mrs. Phillips' record of outstanding achievements in behalf of our country during World War II. The article follows:

WOMAN, ONCE DOOMED AS SPY, SPENT $50,000 IN PRISON AID

Claire Phillips, World War II American spy, hopes Congress and the Supreme Court will reimburse her for $50,000 she spent in medicine and food for American prisoners in the Philippines. Meantime, she has been selling cosmetics door to door to make a living.

The former spy, who used her theatrical background to good advantage to get information from high Japanese officials in Manila, was rescued by American forces after she had been condemned to death.

When she arrived in Washington yesterday, she had her first reunion with Lt. Col. Charles C. Young, who carried Mrs. Phillips, too weak to walk, out of the Japanese prison in Manila.

At that time Colonel Young was with the First Brigade Cavalry Division. He now is Chairman of the Board of Review in the Judge Advocate General's office.

Mrs. Phillips posed as an Italian national and operated a night club patronized by Japanese officers. She sent information out to guerrilla and American forces, and smuggled food and medicine to American prisoners.

This is her first visit to Washington, and she said she plans to appeal personally to Congress for reimbursement for the money she spent. She has written a book, Manila Espionage. The premiere of a movie based on her experiences is scheduled at Keith's Theater May 16.

Mrs. Phillips is a native of Portland, Oreg. She is the second woman in the United States to be awarded the Medal of Freedom, presented for her spy work in the Philippines. Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Defense Secretary, was the first.

Cheap Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is currently considering a rule for H. R. 3293—the migratory agricultural labor bill—the House will be called upon to consider this legislation soon. This problem of migratory farm workers is the most pressing domestic social problem in the United States. I urge the Members of the House to secure copies of the recently published report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor by calling the White House and also to read this editorial from the Washington Post of today:

CHEAP FARM LABOR

The Senate is now about ready, after 3 days of debate, to come to a vote on Senator ELLENDER's bill for the recruitment and admission to the United States of Mexican agricultural workers. The bill was framed and studied by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before the recently issued report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor became available. It ignores, or flouts, the most important recommendations of that Commission. Indeed, Senator ELLENDER's bill, if enacted, would serve merely to perpetuate shocking conditions in the agriculture of the Southwest that do grave injury to American and to Mexican farm laborers alike. Senators CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, and LEHMAN have rendered valuable service in exposing the evils and inadequacies of this legislation. We hope that the amendments they have urged will prevail.

Senator CHAVEZ's action on the measure merits special commendation. Many of the big growers in his home State of New Mexico want to see it enacted without any changes—because they want the Mexican peons who can be brought in under contract to harvest crops and then sent back where they came from. The justification for bringing them in is that an adequate supply of American farm workers is not available. But the fact is, as the President's Commission made clear, that there are plenty of domestic workers available if the growers would only give them decent wages and decent working conditions. The importation of poverty-stricken Mexican peons in years past has operated to drive down farm wages and to reduce a million American farm workers to a state of homeless, rootless migrancy.

The Mexican Government now insists—altogether properly, in our judgment—that certain minimum conditions be met by the growers for the care of contract workers brought in from Mexico. Equivalent conditions, and priority in consideration, should be given to domestic workers. In addition to this, responsibility for determining whether foreign workers are actually needed should be vested directly in the Secretary of Labor and not left to the discretion of State and regional directors of employment security; the latter are simply too susceptible to the pressure of the big growers. And, finally, there ought to be a stringent prohibition against the employment of so-called wetbacks—Mexicans who came into the country illegally. Without such safeguards, the Ellender bill would serve, as Senator CHAVEZ charged, to "bring back the things which Lincoln did away with" and to "bring about peonage in my State and in certain other areas of the United States."

The demand that such safeguards be included in the bill implies no hostility to Mexican immigrants and no desire to keep American growers from obtaining all the labor they need. But the misery of the Mexicans must no longer be exploited to the disadvantage of themselves and of hungry workers on this side of the border.

America's International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the South Central Business Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., April 24, 1951:

Amidst the tumult and shouting on the Potomac, the outpouring of the spirit that General MacArthur has inspired from the mountains to the seas, the powerful presentation he made of a specific determined policy for America, the unescapable fact remains that the decision is not in our hands alone.

The first step in the solution of the problems confronting us is the selling of our partners in the United Nations—and now particularly Great Britain—on the full dimensions of the issues involved. We are in a situation where the action, if it is strong, must be concerted.

In the First World War, Woodrow Wilson had a definite end in view in developing the League of Nations.

Ultimately his objective was destroyed because Great Britain believed it was still possible to go it alone and to maintain the British Empire by her traditional balance-of-power diplomacy—when she no longer had the power to exert the balance.

The outstanding example of that was Great Britain's neutral position when Japan seized Manchuria in 1931. The League of Nations branded Japan an aggressor. President Hoover was willing to support the League by joining in imposing economic sanctions. Great Britain refused to join up in any attempt to give validity to the first great challenge to collective security in maintaining peace in the world. As a result the League of Nations failed to follow up its resolution branding Japan as the aggressor by imposing economic sanctions and thereby laid the ground work for World War II.

History is repeating itself with the British Foreign Minister Morrison's statement urging unconditional surrender to the Red Chinese after the United Nations had branded them as the aggressor. Only this time instead of the Japanese killing Chinese in Manchuria the Red Chinese are killing American soldiers in Korea.

As long as Foreign Minister Morrison's statement stands uncorrected by Prime Minister Attlee, the British Government is in the position of giving aid and comfort to our enemies to continue the fight in the belief that in the end they can win.

By his statement the Foreign Minister has made a negotiated peace more difficult. Instead of enhancing the prospect of peace, Minister Morrison has enhanced the spread of war.

I can't believe that Minister Morrison reflects the true views of the British people in proposing unconditional surrender in Korea. After all, because the Foreign Minister went haywire, we ought not to brand a whole people as stupid. I believe the worst thing that could happen to the free peoples of the world would be a complete split between England and America.

Certainly the English—who have had one tragic experience with the results of appeasement in 1931—on the record will realize the dangers inherent in such a policy.

In World War II, Franklin Roosevelt did not have a well-defined end in view. As a result the only victor was Russia.

I see very little evidence of thinking ahead of the Korean war. No one knows what our foreign policy is—except it is to marshal the free peoples of the world in stopping aggression wherever that occurs. But the national administration is not doing a good job of selling that policy either at home or abroad.

The United Nations' army in Korea—composed almost entirely of Americans—under the military genius of General MacArthur—has twice fought its way back to the thirty-eighth parallel.

While that army—outnumbered 4 or 5 to 1—was winning victory after victory on the field of battle—our State Department was losing round after round to the Kremlin.

I applauded the President's courage in deciding to stop the Red aggression in Korea.

Although I pointed out that he had practically invited the Communist invasion by his previous statements and those of the

Secretary of State that Korea was beyond our defense perimeter.

As I have repeatedly said, I believe he was right in reversing himself in stopping the evil of aggression where it broke out again. I believe that with vigorous and prompt support from the United Nations it will save the world from a third world war. But we must have that support.

British Foreign Minister Morrison's proposal for unconditional surrender to the Red Chinese completely and fundamentally changes the international situation—if that is to be the policy of Great Britain. That has to be cleared up forthwith. It is not enough for our State Department to announce our disagreement with the British. We must know if Minister Morrison has stated their future policy.

We are at the present time going it too much alone. We are being stabbed in the back by our fearful friends desiring a temporary profit at our expense.

We are confronted with the serious fact that other members of the United Nations—besides England—are too much in sympathy with the Red Chinese.

We are confronted with the tragic fact that our supposedly allies in the United Nations are making profits hand over fist supplying the Communist satellites with rubber, steel, and petroleum, while accepting from America economic and military gifts.

They are playing the old game of both ends against the middle and we are in the middle.

The United Nations refuses to act on the economic sanctions resolution thus making its action branding the Red Chinese as the aggressor a mere gesture—as did the League of Nations in the case of Japan in 1931.

But that does not mean that the United Nations should be abandoned as a complete failure.

It means that we have a problem there in public relations. It is the same problem in its essence that the President has with his fellow citizens—or a governor has with the people of this State—or the leaders of the countries making up the United Nations have with the peoples of their countries—most of whom, after all, are in a more exposed position than we are.

The United Nations in theory was in the nature of a partnership to maintain peace. The fact that it is not working out that way does not mean we should break up the partnership.

It does mean that we have got to do a better job in public relations.

I said last July:

"The President might well consider setting up a bipartisan policy advisory committee—with real Republican representation from the Congress—to draft a statement of our over-all, long-range foreign policy. The trouble is that a large part of the world does not understand what we are trying to do—and that is equally true of American citizens."

We have assumed the role the Soviet spokesmen were playing in the United Nations was obstruction.

It is time to wake up that it is more than that. Partly because of the skill of the Soviet representatives in the United Nations and partly because of the ineptness of our Secretary of State and our representatives in the United Nations, the Soviet has gained a sympathetic ear in many free countries—among people not yet lined up—to its fantastic plea that America is the real aggressor by interfering in a civil war in Korea.

I know of only one way to judge a man in any line of endeavor and that is by the results.

No one can deny that under Secretary of State Acheson's political leadership, the Soviet has been steadily gaining in support from non-Communist sources for its grotesque arguments that America does not want a diplomatic settlement in Korea or elsewhere—but is working for a show-down with Russia in world war III.

America has consistently lost in the diplomatic area under the inept leadership of Secretary of State Acheson.

To the peoples of the world, the firing of General MacArthur had a greater range of significance than it did to the American people.

The world put two interpretations on General MacArthur's dismissal.

1. It meant that we were going to concentrate all our strength in defense of Europe.

2. It remained for British Foreign Minister Morrison to "let the cat out of the bag." He interpreted the President's sudden move as meaning at last we were ready to publicly accept the British policy of unconditional surrender in Korea.

Coming in the midst of the furor following General MacArthur's dismissal, Foreign Minister Morrison's proposal was most disturbing. He said that peace should be made in Korea based on the admission of the Red Chinese to the United Nations—that the Red Chinese participate in the writing of the peace treaty with Japan—and that we turn Formosa over to the Red Chinese. Our State Department disavowed the Foreign Minister's sensational proposal. But that does not go far enough or deep enough. If Minister Morrison's statement stands, it would be unrealistic to ignore its dangerous implications.

Heretofore England has refused to endorse our decision to defend Formosa. But she has carefully avoided an open split with America over that issue.

But now there is an open break between the American and English Governments.

Despite the immense sacrifices we are making, the unescapable fact is the political situation is progressively worsening.

All this makes the dissension over troops to Europe just a beginning of the great debate over our foreign policies instead of the end.

We must realize that, like it or not, America's international policy will, in the end, be determined by the support or nonsupport their receive from other countries. For the first time in all our experience we have got to "sell" not only our policies but ourselves to other peoples. That is a new situation for America. The quicker we all understand it, the better it will be for us.

To understand our situation involves some knowledge of the theories which the Stalinists use in determining their foreign policies.

In the first place they are following the ideas and policies of Lenin and the Communist International on tactics for world conquest.

When Lenin realized that he could not overcome without force the resistance to bolshevism in Western Europe, he turned attention to the Far East and the colonial countries of the Near East and Africa.

He decided that the free countries could best be undermined by attacking their weakest link—the colonies—by exploiting the racial and national aspirations of peoples.

He believed that once the rulers of the Kremlin succeeded in gaining control of the millions who inhabit Asia, the world would be ripe for conquest.

The rulers of Russia have closely followed that international policy.

The conquest of China by the Communists is, therefore, a factor of the greatest magnitude to all the peoples of the world.

We share responsibility, as do other countries, for the success of the Stalinists in China.

Our failures in Asia have piled up and threaten us now because those responsible for American policies were ignorant of, or ignored, the universal nature of communism, and minimized the outlook and objectives of the Kremlin rulers.

The Kremlin rejects the ethical and legal codes we believe in. The rulers of the Soviet repeatedly have said that war between their system and the free peoples of the world is inevitable.

The rulers of the Kremlin, therefore, have kept Russia on a war footing ever since they seized power.

In other words, the Stalinists think they know where they are headed; while in the United Nations there is disunity, friction, and no singleness of purpose.

The Stalinists boast that that situation tips the scale in favor of their eventual victory.

To accept the inevitable failure of the United Nations is to accept the Stalinists' views. If we do that, it would be like walking off the field and allowing the game to go by default.

The free peoples of the world are too much inclined to accept the Stalinists propaganda that in their camp alone is unity and singleness of purpose.

As a matter of fact, the Stalinists fundamentally are more divided than the free peoples of the world. The annual "purges"—a soft word for murder and assassination—are the proof of the greatest opposition to the rulers of the Kremlin within their satellite countries, and even Russia itself.

The rulers of the Kremlin may know where they are headed. But they are having great difficulty in persuading a lot of the people in their areas to follow them.

Disunity among the free peoples of the world does not begin to approach such magnitude that it must be suppressed by slave camps and the assassin—which are the bases of Stalin-the-cruel rule.

I repeat what I have said elsewhere—that by reason of the great difficulties both of material and disunity, Stalin is not in a position to wage an all-out world war against a united free peoples of the world headed by such a formidable foe as the United States of America. It is too much of a gamble at this time. They hope to cash in on their efforts to weaken the opposition by division.

The policy of communism is built on gaining by fishing in muddy waters.

The Stalinists are past masters in the art of economic and psychological warfare.

Stalin hopes to win by attrition. But also he hopes to make us pick the field of decision now. Then he can make his plans accordingly.

I believe it is a great mistake to give too much emphasis to either Asia or Europe as the seat of the vital fight—when it's global. Of course, as of today, it is Asia, for the simple reason that is where the first armed aggression on a large scale has occurred since the organization of the United Nations.

I do not believe the pending full-scale investigation by the congressional committees of our military policies should mean that even in executive sessions—which are never secret—the general staff officers should be expected to telegraph—as it were—their punch to the enemy by revealing all their military plans.

In conclusion, I quote once more from my July speech:

"Cooperation for the sake of the Nation is a two-way street. As our national leader, the President should initiate it. In this critical world situation he should call the Republican leaders in for consultation, not after a policy is decided but as a cogent factor in its decision."

I do not believe the President is doing a good job of setting the right example. I believe there is too much ham acting by both Republican and Democratic leaders.

We need desperately by those in high authority just plain common patriotism—the kind of patriotism of our boys in Korea.

You can call that trite and sappy if you want to. This—if ever—is a time when

genuine, unselfish, farsighted leadership is desperately needed.

The American people yearn for a resurgence of the faith of their fathers in government—by men of integrity and principle who, like MacArthur, are willing to be thrown on the junkpile for their convictions.

Bombing of Manchurian Air Bases Has Always Been Contemplated in the Event of Use of Enemy Air Power From Those Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article entitled "China Bomb 'Trigger' Set—JCS To Act if Necessary," from the Christian Science Monitor of April 26, 1951, which makes clear that the bombing of Manchurian air bases "always has been contemplated under several possible contingencies, one of which would be the use of enemy air power from those bases against United Nations ground troops":

CHINA BOMB "TRIGGER" SET—JCS TO ACT IF NECESSARY

WASHINGTON.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal does not rule out the bombing of enemy air bases in Manchuria under several possible contingencies which might develop in Korea.

On the contrary, the bombing of such bases always has been contemplated under several possible contingencies one of which would be the use of enemy air power from those bases against United Nations ground troops.

There are other possible circumstances which would cause the United States to change "the ground rules" now operating by tacit agreement of both sides in the Korean War. Under those tacit rules the UN air forces do not bomb beyond the Yalu River and the Chinese do not bomb Allied troop concentration, Allied supply lines, or Allied air bases.

ENEMY MUST CHOOSE

That the door is open to such a change in the ground rules is something the Government here, particularly the military high command, wants everyone to understand fully. That is the reason why President Truman was asked to read at his April 26 press conference a paragraph taken from his own radio speech of April 11. The paragraph reads:

"The Communist side must now choose its course of action. The Communist rulers may press the attack against us. They may take further action which will spread the conflict. They have that choice, and with it the awful responsibility for what may follow. The Communists also have the choice of a peaceful settlement which could lead to a general relaxation of tensions in the Far East. The decision is theirs, because the forces of the United Nations will strive to limit the conflict if possible."

The most important phrase in the above paragraph is "if possible."

So long as it is "possible" the United States Government has no intention of taking any steps which would expand the war in Korea. But there could come a time when a number of different events would combine to make it no longer "possible" for this Government to exercise the restraint which it has shown to date.

READY TO RETALIATE

It is axiomatic, and has been so all along, that enemy bombing of our bases in Korea, Japan, and Okinawa would bring immediate retaliation against Chinese air bases in Manchuria. The same goes for the safety of our troops. Until the present there has been no significant enemy air attack on our ground forces. If at any moment the enemy does use his air power against our ground forces, the retaliation would follow automatically.

One of the causes of friction with General MacArthur was that the general was not given the power of discretion to decide at what moment the ground rules had changed. Washington always insisted on keeping the trigger here. It would be pulled under certain conditions, but the Pentagon reserved the right to do the pulling.

The general had asked for authority to make such decisions himself in February. It is known now that on February 28 the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff gave him detailed instructions governing his actions which specifically reserved to Washington the power of final decision on any extension of hostilities. He was told precisely what type of defensive action he would take under every conceivable set of circumstances. After taking such defensive action, he was to report to Washington. The JCS then would tell him what to do.

LIMIT TO RESTRAINT

The phrase "if possible" is bounded by circumstances other than just enemy air action against our forces in Korea. The details are secret. The Pentagon has no intention of telling the enemy the conditions under which certain measures might be taken. But it can be surmised that one of the limits on American restraint is time.

There is a major offensive under way now against our troops. This is the third time the Chinese Communists have put large forces into battle in Korea. This is the third time that the United States has met Chinese Communist intervention without striking back at China directly. The purpose of restraint is to avoid expanding the war. But there comes a time when the repetition of such enemy action becomes intolerable.

The American Government could not possibly resist the pressure of public opinion for retaliation if the process were to continue indefinitely. The Chinese Communists should understand that this third major offensive of theirs is probably the last that will take place under the present ground rules. At the end of this one there must either be a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem or the scope of the war will of necessity expand.

A Saint on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an extremely interesting and learned article bearing the provocative title "A Saint on Capitol Hill." This article was written by Brother Leonard Farina and was published in the Lamp, November 1950.

Brother Leonard is now studying at the Catholic University and is a member of the Society of the Atonement. The article follows:

A SAINT ON CAPITOL HILL?

(By Leonard Farina, S. A.)

In Statuary Hall of the Nation's Capitol there stands a bronze statue of a Franciscan friar, Junipero Serra. Of all the excellent monuments in that impressive hall, there is none more eloquent than that of the fiery little apostle of California. The sculptor, Ettore Cadorin, captured the all-consuming spirit of the missionary in this bronze life-size work. In one quick glance, Serra's life and works are exposed. Firmly grasped in his right hand, raised as in peaceful benediction, is a rough wooden cross, his guide and his light; gently cradled in his left hand is a miniature of the Mission San Carlos Borromeo, his headquarters and final resting place. To both Catholics and non-Catholics it comes as a surprise to discover the statue of a religious there amidst flaming orators, dignified statesmen, and brilliant military men. It is almost out of place; yet, it is not.

Statuary Hall was created by the act of July 2, 1864. A place was set aside, the old Hall of Representatives, wherein each and all States were invited to place "Statues in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof, and illustrious for their historic renown or for distingushed civic or military service such as each State may deem worthy of national commemoration."

California had not taken any action on this until in 1927 the legislature of the State set up a commission to select the two Californians to be thus honored. It was no surprise when Junipero Serra was nominated. He had always been respected and esteemed as the pioneer of Californian history. The centennial of his death was observed as a legal holiday. Memorials had been erected in his honor throughout the State; a heroic-size one in Golden Gate Park and another at Monterey, this by Mrs. Leland Stanford. There was no doubt of his historic renown. El Camino Real, marked today with the mission bells which sang of Christ, readily testifies to this fact.

It was on July 16, 1769, when the victory of freedom was coming to a close along the Atlantic seaboard, that the 55-year-old friar established the first mission, San Diego de Alcala. In the 15 years that followed, of the 21 Franciscan missions, which have become as sun-bleached adobe gems in the green coronet of the California countryside, Serra himself established 9 of them. Their Spanish names are like a lyrical litany of favorite saints. There is San Diego de Alcala, founded on July 16, 1769. San Carlos Borromeo de Carmelo, Junipero's headquarters and the mission closest to his heart, was erected on June 3, 1770. On July 14, 1771, in an oak-covered valley of the Santa Lucia Mountains, Padre Junipero blessed the large cross which was to be the beginning of the Mission San Antonio de Padua. The fourth station was set near the Rio de Santa Ana on September 8, 1771, and was was dedicated to San Gabriel Arcangel. A year later San Luis Obispo de Tolosa was established in the Valley of the Bears. Then came two more in 1776: San Francisco de Assisi on October 9; San Juan Capistrano on November 1. Santa Clara de Assisi, the now famous college of Santa Ana occupies the site, was founded on January 12, 1777. The last mission of the administration of Serra was that of San Buenaventura on March 31, 1782. It was left to his confreres to complete the remaining 11 stepping stones of Christ the King in His journey to the Indians.

One minor problem before Serra's statue could be placed in Statuary Hall in accordance with the act of July 2, 1864, was that of citizenship. Born in the tiny village of Petra on the picturesque Island of Majorca on November 24, 1713, and baptised on the same day Miguel Jose—the young Serra in accordance with Franciscan custom changed his name upon the day of profession of vows, September 15, 1734, to Junipero—was Spanish through and through. He had come to California with a military expedition in the name of the King of Spain and his missions were sponsored by his Spanish brethren. At best, he was only an adopted citizen of the State. A similar problem had faced the State of Wisconsin when they wished to place a memorial to Pere Marquette in Statuary Hall and it required an act of Congress to solve both, legally both priests were considered citizens of the States they had unwittingly helped build.

Long before his death on August 28, 1784, at the Mission San Carlos Borromeo, a short distance south of the city, overlooking the beautiful Rio Carnelo, Serra was regarded as a saint. Fray Junipero's love for the Indians burst forth from his love of Christ and like his Master, the lowly and miserable were his precious ones. He had little care for his physical person, but was only eager to spread the word of Christ as he had been commissioned to do. Weary and burdened with age, after performing the prodigious task of administering the sacrament of confirmation to 5,307 persons, special faculties being granted for that purpose, Serra had to fight against the encroachment of the civil authorities upon the rights of the church. Undaunted, he continued his fight until the very day of his death.

While California was in the midst of the celebration of the sesquicentennial of his death, Father Augustine Hobrecht, O. F. M., was named vice postulator for the cause of the humble friar. He was succeeded by Father Eric O'Brien, O. F. M., who completed the opening phase of the investigation and armed with 7,500 documents, most faded and in Spanish, in August 1950, went to Rome, there to continue the work for the long hoped for and prayed for canonization of Fray Junipero Serra, "Apostle of California."

Thus it is, while Serra spent himself in toil for His sake, he helped to clear the ground for a great State; while California reveres him as a fervent pioneer, perhaps they have placed the statue of a saint on Capitol Hill.

Leva's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

LEVA'S SERVICE

Assistant Secretary of Defense Marx Leva has exhibited a rare combination of enthusiasm, patience, and skill which will be a challenge to his successor. Mr. Leva, who left the Government yesterday to enter private law practice, was in a sense the engineer of unification. A close friend and adviser of the late Secretary Forrestal, he became special assistant to the Secretary of Defense when Mr. Forrestal assumed that responsibility in 1947. In his capacity as general counsel of the Defense Department, Mr. Leva framed the first unified legislative program, and it was under his expert guidance that the necessary strengthening of the Unification Act was accomplished in 1949. He continued to give meaning to unification during his service as Assistant Secretary, first under Secretary Johnson and then under Secretary Marshall, and it was this high caliber of work which the junior chamber of commerce recognized when it named him the outstanding young man in Government for 1949. In the words of one of his Pentagon associates, "He is going to leave a big hole in this building."

Segregation in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, dealing further with developments in respect of the Executive order of the President, the directive of the Secretary of Defense, and the directives of the respective armed services for equality of opportunity and treatment, there is appended hereto a report received from the Assistant Secretary of Defense on advances in the utilization of Negro manpower in the Army. The appended report follows an inspection made at Fort Dix, N. J., on March 2, 1951, by me in company with Hon. CHARLES R. HOWELL in whose district Fort Dix is located. We found—and so advised—that the integration of white and Negro troops for training which had recently taken place at Fort Dix had had excellent morale effects and had not involved any of the difficulties and problems which it had always been claimed would arise from such integration:

SUMMARY OF ADVANCES IN THE UTILIZATION OF NEGRO MANPOWER IN THE ARMY

GENERAL

Since the close of World War II the Army has continuously and vigorously implemented principles of equality of opportunity and treatment for Negro personnel. It has endeavored conscientiously to carry forward the principles laid down by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense for the efficient utilization of all military manpower. Policies have been reviewed and modified as experience warranted, with a view to developing a broader base of trained personnel, both officer and enlisted, than existed in the past. The information contained herein is intended to represent a résumé of progressive advances made as a result of experiences pointing toward greater efficiency of the Army.

SUMMARY OF ADVANCES

Recreational facilities

(a) Clubs and messes: The Army has adopted policies which assure the full use of any club, mess, or recreational facility located in public buildings to all eligible military personnel without regard to race. This applies to all recreational facilities including officer and enlisted clubs.

(b) Post exchanges: Exchanges and branch exchanges may no longer be designated for the exclusive use of any particular race. While exchanges and branches may be allotted to some specific areas or units, personnel are not restricted to their use but may use any other exchange or branch on the post.

(c) Theaters: Negro personnel are permitted the use of any theater on the post. Army motion picture theaters may be allocated to serve certain areas or units but no theater or performance in any theater is denied any group or individual because of race.

(d) Transportation: Busses, trucks, or other transportation owned and operated by the Government or by a governmental instrumentality are available to all military personnel regardless of race. Restriction of personnel to certain sections of such transportation because of race is not permitted either on or off the post regardless of local customs.

Enlistment and reenlistment without restrictions

Enlistments and reenlistments: Qualified Negroes may now enlist in the Regular Army under requirements equally applicable to all races without restrictive quota limitations. Individuals satisfactorily completing a period of enlistment may reenlist under procedures applicable to all eligible personnel regardless of race.

Equal opportunities for promotion without regard to race

Enlisted: Negro enlisted men hold a percentage of non-commissioned-officer ranks which compares most favorably with the over-all grade spread of Army command enlisted personnel. Among Negro personnel on December 31, 1950, approximately 1.8 percent were master sergeants, 3 percent were sergeants, first class, 8.1 percent were sergeants, and 19.2 percent were corporals.

Officers: The selection of Regular and non-Regular Army officers for promotion has operated without racial consideration. Prior to June 1950 there was only one Negro colonel in the Army. Today there are four. In addition, 17.5 percent of all Negro majors and 10.5 percent of all Negro captains on active duty have been selected for promotion to the next higher grade since September 1950.

Selection to attend schools without racial consideration

Enlisted: From the basis of restrictive quotas allotted to a limited number of schools, the Army has gradually opened up every segment of its military schooling system to Negroes. It has abolished racial quotas for school selection and prescribed selection of qualified personnel without regard to race or color. In early 1948 it commenced the selection of qualified Negroes for attendance at Army school courses, producing skills in which Negroes had not previously been utilized. Today of all enlisted students receiving military schooling, Negroes represent approximately 8 percent. This compares with 3.4 percent of a year ago.

Officers: Enrollment of Negro officers in schools has steadily increased. For example, Negro enrollment in comparison with total enrollments was 1.9 percent in 1947, 2.26 percent in 1948, 3 percent in 1949, and approximately 4 percent in 1950.

Training divisions and schools operate on an integrated basis

Training Divisions: In 1949 Negro enlistees were assigned to segregated units at Fort Dix, N. J., and at Fort Knox, Ky. In little more than 1 year the Army has completely changed this picture so that today the training divisions located at Fort Jackson, S. C., Camp Breckinridge, Ky., Ft. Riley, Kans., Ft. Ord, Calif., Camp Chaffee, Ark., Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., and Camp Roberts, Calif., are operated on an integrated basis where Negro personnel work, eat, and are quartered together with white personnel. The training divisions at Fort Dix, N. J., and Fort Knox, Ky., are in the process of a change-over from partial segregation to nonsegregation. This change is presently nearing completion.

Schools: The training, housing, and messing of all enlisted and officer personnel in attendance at Army schools are accomplished without regard to race or color.

Negro units are organic parts of larger white units

In January 1947 the Army assigned an infantry regiment, a field artillery battalion, an engineer combat company and a medical collecting company, each comprised of Negro enlisted personnel, as organic elements of the Twenty-fifth Infantry Division. This was the first step toward integrating Negro units with larger white units. Unit integration has vastly increased and today Negro units are organic elements of the following larger white units:

Second Infantry Division: An infantry battalion, a medical platoon, and a medium artillery battalion.

Third Infantry Division: An infantry battalion, an armored artillery battalion, a heavy tank battalion, and a medium artillery battalion.

Fourth Infantry Division: An infantry battalion, and an AAA AW battalion.

Twenty-fifth Infantry Division: An infantry regiment, a medium artillery battalion, and an engineer combat company.

Eleventh Airborne Division: A medium tank battalion, an airborne infantry battalion, and a medical platoon.

Eighty-second Airborne Division: An airborne infantry battalion, an airborne AAA battalion, and a medium artillery battalion.

Second Armored Division: A heavy tank battalion, an armored artillery battalion, and an engineer bridge company.

First Armored Division: An armored artillery battalion, an armored infantry battalion, and an engineer bridge company.

Third Armored Cavalry Regiment: An armored cavalry battalion.

Negro National Guardsmen are not removed from units

Negro members of National Guard units ordered into active military service from States with laws precluding segregation in the State militia are not removed from the units in which they have enlisted and trained, unless they possess specialities urgently required in other Army units. Similarly white personnel in such units are retained therein.

"All of Us Know the Aggressors in the Kremlin Would Glory in a Depression in the United States, Then They Could Lure the Unemployed With Fantastic Promises—Inflation Can Precipitate a Depression, Therefore, It Must Be Defeated"—Dr. John R. Steelman

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again the National Broadcasting Co. in its program Battle Report, Washington, turns its cameras upon Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, and such of his "guests" with whom he made arrangements to make televised reports to the American people.

Among those whom Dr. Steelman brought to the television screen was the Honorable Dean Rusk, of the United States Department of State, who discussed, frankly and candidly, some of the problems present in the Korean situation, as seen from the viewpoint of those charged with the administration of the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Rusk was very factual in his approach to the question. While admitting there are several methods of attack which might be followed in order to bring the Korean war to a close, at the same time he pointed out the hazards that would attend the pursuit of some of the methods that have heretofore been indicated.

In his talk, Dean Rusk said, in part:

Those who make the decision to extend hostilities beyond Korea would be completely irresponsible if they did not take into full account the element of general war, with all the destruction and loss of life which would be involved.

A second easy thing to think about is an immediate withdrawal from Korea. That, too, would lead to disaster. Korea is not the only object of the appetities and ambitions of Communists' conspiracy. We could not solve anything by abandoning Korea. Who would be the next victim? And the next? And the next? Have we so soon forgotten Adolf Hitler? Each bite was to be the last. Do you remember the trail which led from Manchuria and Ethiopia to Pearl Harbor? To abandon Korea would be to abandon the United States.

In closing his statement on the television last Sunday, Dean Rusk said:

We do not serve our cause if, in this great democracy, we destroy our unity and undermine our strength, or if we lack the patience and the maturity we shall need as we move to meet the tests ahead.

The brillant talk made by Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor on the military training program certainly gave one a tremendous fund of knowledge with respect to the training that is afforded all members of the Armed Forces in order to successfully contest with the enemy in the field—bring victory to our standards while incurring a minimum exposure to hazard on the part of those who are fighting for our cause.

This, the thirty-third Battle Report, Washington, was particularly marked, as Dr. Steelman stated, by the picture painted by Mr. Robert McCormick, one of NBC's ace commentaries, who had just returned from Europe.

Mr. McCormick's narration was pictorialized by the marvelous photographs taken by the Jones brothers, and brought a living picture of conditions in Italy to the television screen with great fidelity, which made one feel he had looked upon the actual scenes himself.

Mr. McCormick's description of the spring military maneuvers in Italy gives concrete evidence that it will profit the free nations of the world to have Italy on their side in any possible struggle against the communistic hordes. He told, incidentally, of the Italian Air Force, of their armored tanks, and particularly of the manpower as expressed by the work of the Alpini battalion supported by their mountain artillery batteries.

Mr. Speaker, altogether it was as lively, enlightening, and as educational a program as was ever presented. Again, in order to bring the thirty-third Battle Report, Washington, to the attention of every Member of this House, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I insert the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The thirty-third Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers, was as follows:

President Harry S. Truman: "The change in the commands of the Far East means no change whatever in the policy of the United States. We will carry on the fight in Korea with vigor and determination in an effort to bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion."

Mr. MCCORMICK. Washington, where President Truman this past week sent out the orders that relieved General MacArthur of his military command, and Korea, where despite the change, the same troops battle against the same enemy in the same way.

Today, Battle Report brings you our sixth exclusive teledocumentary on Europe, the voice of General Ridgway, a report from the G–3 of our Army, and a top-official statement from the State Department on our policy in Korea. But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, during the past week, the controversy about the change in the military command in the Far East has been blazoned in headlines all over the world. Denunciations have been bitter. Praise has been lavish. There have been charges and countercharges. But, in spite of all the clamor, there is one point upon which every man, woman and child in the United States is in agreement. We do not want war. We seek a world of peace in which men everywhere are free to seek happiness in their own way.

But, the task of building such a world cannot be done by government alone. It is a task in which every one of us must share.

As an example, let us consider the battle against inflation. All of us know that the aggressors in the Kremlin would glory in a depression in the United States so they lure the unemployed with fantastic promises. And, inflation can precipitate a depression. Therefore, it must be defeated.

Every one of us has a well-defined job in this battle. All of us are consumers. We have the final decision on prices. If the consumer says "No" there can be no sale. He keeps his money and by so doing he helps to reduce prices and thus to increase the purchasing power of his dollar. This is not the time for keeping up with the Joneses.

This afternoon we have with us the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dean Rusk. In the light of the developments during the past week, Mr. Rusk's report will be of vital interest. Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, so-called G–3 of the Army, has recorded the story of how our forces all over the world are kept supplied with the tools of war.

Last week we brought you what was undoubtedly the latest film report on the Italian Nation to be seen in this country. Documented by NBC cameramen, the Jones brothers, and narrated by Robert McCormick, who made a special trip to Europe and has just returned, it reported to you on the Italian people, economy, and government. Today we continue that teledocumentary. We present now part 11 of Battle Report, Italy, an exclusive report on Italy's armed forces, again narrated by one who has seen it all with his own eyes, Robert McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. "Restricted," that's the word for this dock area in the bay at Naples. For it is here that American ships unload weapons from the United States to strengthen the Italian armed forces. Yes; though Italy's over-all armed might is limited by

treaty with the postwar Allies (including Russia), it is, nevertheless, getting this help from us up to the treaty limit as a partner in our North Atlantic Treaty Organization and cofighter in our fight against communism. This is the steamship *Charlotte Lykes*, out of New Orleans, with a cargo of 40 millimeter AA guns for the Italian Army. And on hand with Italian officers to see it unloaded are representatives of our Military Assistance Advisory Group—MAAF, as it it known in Naples—the American organization charged with helping the Italians to put this equipment to proper use. I invite you now to trace, as I did, how such United States military aid runs like a power-giving bloodstream through the Italian armed forces.

At the Italian air forces base at Naples, we saw 18 United States F–51 fighter planes turned over to the Italian air force. On hand to inspect the planes (and seen here chatting with the Italian commanding officer) was Col. Zeth McKee, of our own Air Force, one of several MAAG air force officers now on duty in Italy. Commander of an F–51 group himself in the war, McKee helps the pilots don their chutes, gives them a few knowing last-minute instructions, and then, wishing them luck, stands back to watch them take off in the new American planes that spell a mightier Italian air force.

Not only the Italian air force but also the Italian Navy is being buttressed with American help. Here at Tarranto we saw a navy ship being rebuilt with United States equipment—these seamen are installing fire-control devices. This month, to add to the strength of their fleet, three American destroyers sailed into this same harbor.

At the Ministry of Defense in Rome, United States officers sit frequently with Italian officers to discuss how best Italy might be rearmed to defend herself and the free world.

This is the first time such a conference was ever open to newsmen or the camera, and we of Battle Report were impressed with the frank discussion of all problems. The spirit we found at work here was strictly "let's do it."

One of the most heartening evidences that it will pay to have Italy on our side in any future encounter came when we visited Italy's famed Bersaglieri in the midst of their spring training program. Brigadier General Berti, who commands the brigade we saw, explains the problem of the day to United States Army Col. Phillip Pope, a MAAG officer on an inspection trip. Once squared away, the mock battle begins.

F–51's, born of United States aid, roar over the field to strafe "enemy" positions. Then, as the Bersaglieri open up far to the rear with American artillery, we saw them give a convincing demonstration of the meaning of their name—"sharpshooter"—as well as their unique tactics, for the Bersaglieri function as a mobile infantry and are famous for moving on the run in or out of formation.

These are General Sherman M–4 tanks, all from America. To give the battle realism, the tanks are "buttoned up" with their crews protected inside. Guns fire air bursts over them as they advance to simulate enemy fire. Behind the tanks advance the armored artillery firing, followed by Bersaglieri foot troops.

About that distinctive headgear: I asked about that; in fact tried to get one with no success. It's a type of priest's hat—black, with a black cock's plumage on top. No one knew very much about its exact origin. But they did tell me that the first unit of the Bersaglieri was formed in the Piedmont region in 1836 under the Savoy regime. War may have changed radically since 1846, but you may be sure that the Bersaglieri are prepared to give as good account of themselves today, in 1951, as they were famous for over a hundred years ago.

More maneuvers. This time, an Italian artillery regiment we found at Bracciano in north Italy. This one is using all United States equipment, including these huge United States-made 115-millimeter guns.

We sent them these "spotter" planes, too. They are being introduced for the first time to the Italian Army, for liaison and observation work. Here they're on a spotting mission for the Italian artillery. The "spotters" have done their duty, the artillery opens up with everything they have, "just like United States of America."

But it was high up in the Alps where we got our biggest thrill. Yes, filming the world-famous Alpini, the troops that fight on skis. The Alpini were organized in 1872 for the mountain defense of the Italian Alpine frontier. And you can take it from me, they're still leaving tracks in the snow that spell top-notch power. No common soldiers, these. To get men who know the mountains, these troops are recruited from the hardy frontiersmen of the mountainous areas. Tradition says these are the sons of fathers who were Alpinis before them.

An Alpini battalion is generally supported by a mountain artillery battery. Under our military-assistance program, they're being provided with our modern infantry weapons and taught how to use them. Yes; here in the scenic mountains of northern Italy near Odessa we saw, I think, the Italian Army at its best. The crack Alpini—spirit and moral high—among the finest of the world's mountain troops.

Before we left Italy we sought a professional appraisal of how well our military-aid program is arming that country against our common enemy. We found it when we turned our cameras on Brig. Gen. Norman H. Schwarzkopf, Director of MAAG in Italy, and Gen. Efisio Marras, Chief of Staff for the defense of Italy. We leave our last words on Italy to them.

General MARRAS. General, I express again our gratitude to the American people and I thank you personally—you, General—for your cooperation and our gratitude for our officers for what you do for our army.

General SCHWARZKOPF. General, you mentioned that another ship is unloading. This will be additional equipment for the Alpini and Bersaglieri and the Arietta brigade. I'm very glad to see this equipment coming in. Thank you for your friendly expressions, General. We find it a great pleasure to work with you and I feel that the work that we are doing here is cementing again the friendship between Italy and America. I hope that our assistance in this military-aid program will do a great deal to bring Italy up to the point it deserves and desires in the family of nations.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Seven months ago, Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who succeeds General MacArthur, appeared here with us in this studio on Battle Report. Fortunately, we have a recording of the talk he made then—words that are even more important now than they ever were. As he assumes his new command, we bring you once again—against the background of the conflict in Korea—the voice of General Ridgway.

Lieutenant General RIDGWAY. This period of our history is critical—critical, not just for days or months—critical not as we have been accustomed to view crisis—a situation, however, acute, to which by sudden emotional upsurges we can rise, and by sudden bursts of extraordinary energy, surmount. This is not that sort of crisis. It is one which may long continue, presenting us through the years, as it presents us at this moment, with problems of decision as basic and far-reaching in nature as any a free society has yet encountered. We do not know how long we shall be compelled to live as Soviet enemy No. 1, marked for attack by war or subversion at times of his choosing. We do know now—Korea ripped one mask aside—that there will be no quick and easy solution, no short-cut to our objective.

Mr. MCCORMICK. General Ridgway on the choice that faces us all.

Lieutenant General RIDGWAY. We need superior numbers and types of weapons as we never needed them before. We can't have them and unlimited luxuries too. We must choose between differing values. We need men and women in our ranks. We cannot have them, and an undisturbed economy too. We must make that choice through the years ahead.

Mr. MCCORMICK. General Ridgway, on the need of the men he led in battle in Korea, for support from home.

Lieutenant General RIDGWAY. They see (our troops), as they pray you see, that only so can we hope to attain the goal for which we fight—an honorable and lasting peace.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thus, the words of General Ridgway. And as he prepares to turn his troops over to Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, the war goes on. In the west-central sector the Hantan River is bridged; two full Chinese divisions, which had been opposing its crossing by American and Turkish troops, suddenly pull out. And the battle grows even more furious in the air as our troops on the ground continue to advance slowly behind tremendous fire power. To rigorous training like this, you can give thanks for every mile of our advance in Korea. Charged with the over-all responsibility of seeing to this training is a man to whom responsibility is certainly no stranger. Commanding general in World War II of the One Hundred and First Airborne, which he led in the invasion of France—the DSC for his heroism there—he later became our military commander in critical Berlin. He serves now as Assistant Chief of Staff, G–3. Ladies and gentlemen, Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

Maj. Gen. M. D. TAYLOR. I would like to say a few words about the military training program which is being conducted throughout the country. If I had a title for what I am about to say, I think it would be "More sweat—less blood." The surest way to be impressed with the seriousness of the military training, I believe, is to talk to some of the trainees whom you find in our camps and stations. I think that a few words with them would assure you how seriously they regard this business of preparing for war.

These young soldiers can tell you better than I can of the long hours spent on the target range, on the combat course, and the marches across country, for the purpose of conditioning their bodies. To them this is a deadly serious school, because they know that before too long they may be called upon to deliver on the battlefield. I don't have to say that war is a complex business and becoming more so year by year. As we give bigger and better machines and equipment to our troops, it requires better men to manipulate them successfully.

It is the tremendous importance of the human factor in warfare that makes it so necessary that our modern training be tough and realistic. We must begin with the individual soldier and make him a competent member of the fighting team. Then we must weld him into the smaller unit, the squad, the platoon, the company, those units which really bring victory or defeat. Finally, we must then fix the smaller units and put them into the regiment and divisions where we have the entire team of weapons which reaches from the large cannon to the emblem of the infantrymen. Now we know also that psychological aspects of preparation for battle are fully as important as the mechanical. It is another thing to create a man who can carry that weapon into action and continue through the hazards of the campaign. I would say that the objective of our training from a psychological view is to make the individual soldier feel in battle that he has been there before. If our train-

ing brings our military units into their first action without the feeling of strangeness which engenders panic, then we are sure that we will soon have a battle-hard unit. I have seen many detachments in their first engagement and it is always easy to spot the unit that is adequately trained. The men fall into position readily without hurry but with a briskness which indicates the confidence they have in themselves and in their comrades. Our weapons fall into action without delay and soon the formidable battery which they are able to create through their fire is leveled against the enemy. It is just like football teams. You do not see, however, the long hours of work, the weeks of sweat that have preceded that successful engagement. So I would say that we must have more sweat on the training fields to have less blood on the battlefields.

Mr. McCORMICK. While the biggest jet battles in air combat history took over the Korean news headlines this week end, the patient foot soldier pushed persistently ahead. Enemy resistance along the entire front ranged from light to heavy. In Yongpyong flame throwers were brought into play to flush the Communists from their bunker-type emplacements. On the central front light gains were reported. And all was comparatively quiet on the eastern front, where the Republic of Korea troops are holding the line. And so until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "teledocumentary," including a special report on our jet patrol over the east-west frontier in Europe, this, then, against the background of Battle Front, Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your thirty-third Battle Report, Washington.

Disloyalty in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick from Station WMAW on April 10, 1951, regarding an investigation into disloyalty in the State Department.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS I SEE IT

(By Frank Kirkpatrick)

On the front page of your newspaper tonight is the story that one of Senator Tydings' innocent people has been suspended from duty under the loyalty procedure of the Navy Department. His name is Brunauer.

You will recall that Senator Tydings headed a committee last year which was supposed to investigate the loyalty of State Department employees. Mrs. Brunauer is employed in the State Department and before that was an official of the American Association of University Women. Both Mrs. Brunauer and her husband loudly cried to Tydings that they were being smeared by JOE MCCARTHY.

And, in this connection, I just cannot get excited over the fact that somebody printed a composite photograph of Senator Tydings and Earl Browder. And I'm beginning to wonder why so many editorial tears are being shed in Milwaukee over Tydings and the cookies he whitewashed. Maybe tonight would be a good time for us to take a look at the record of the Tydings investigation. Here's a page that looks interesting.

In the witness chair is the former Director of Investigations of the Office of Strategic Services of the Army. He is telling about how he entered the offices of the notorious Amerasia magazine and found the evidence against an espionage agent. Keep in mind that this was early 1945, during the war, and before we knew there was an atomic bomb. I quote Mr. Bielaski's sworn testimony.

"Mr. BIELASKI. I went on back to the two rear rooms—the one on the right was the office of Phillip Jaffe.

"All over the top of his desk were documents that had been photocopied and were drying. There must have been—oh, I will say roughly 15 or 20 documents.

"About the time I started to look at these things, Oleson came in. He had been assigned to the library, which is a large room, and he said, 'I think you had better come in the library. I have something to show you in here.'

"So, I went in the library. Their table, as big as this, was covered with documents [and] an envelope in the middle of the table was there, and written across the top of it cater-cornered was the name 'John Hersey.'

"Senator TYDINGS. John——

"Mr. BIELASKI. H-e-r-s-e-y. The author, I presume.

"Senator TYDINGS. At least the name is right.

"Mr. BIELASKI. The names are identical, and it was not an envelope, to my mind, that was addressed to him, but as you might write your name on an envelope belonging to you.

"The envelope was open on the table, and there were quite a few of these documents that had John Hersey's name written on them, too.

"I was, of course, noplussed after seeing all this stuff. Oleson said to me, 'You haven't seen anything yet. Let me show you what's in the envelope.'

"So, he opened the envelope and pulled out about, I would say, a dozen or 15 documents. When I started to look at them, he said, 'Wait a minute—you are looking at the wrong place; look in between them'; and here in between these documents we found six typewritten documents—and all six of them were marked 'top secret.' Before I went back I looked these documents over in the Hersey envelope and of the six, I remember only two, remembering the meaning of the titles and one of which I have a general recollection. The first one that I recall was a document, as I say, marked 'top secret,' which dealt with the units of the Japanese Navy, subsequent to the Battle of Leyte——

"Senator TYDINGS (interrupting). And it showed the disposition——

"Mr. BIELASKI. It showed them by name and the ports where they were hiding and if they were disabled—that was the general tenor of it. The other documents——

"Senator TYDINGS (interrupting). Was that in the brown envelope in the center of the table?

"Mr. BIELASKI. That was in the envelope, mixed in between these other documents.

"Senator MCMAHON. Do you know what Hersey was doing at that time?

"Mr. BIELASKI. I do not.

"Senator MCMAHON. You don't know what occupation he had?

"Mr. BIELASKI. No. I know what he had shortly after that. He went on a trip to the Far East, but I don't know where he went.

"The second document was one which was headed, to the best of my knowledge, the bombing program, or strategic bombing program for Japan; and, it said in effect that the targets would be the principal industrial cities of Japan.

"The third document which I remember, and of which I do not remember as much as I wish I did, had to do with a new bomb, which I thought at the time was merely a piece of ordnance. I recall that it was marked "A" bomb, but was merely a capital A with quotation marks on each side, and it didn't say atomic, and as I had no knowledge of the atomic bomb, it meant very little to me and didn't mean anything to me until several months later.

"Senator GREENE. What was the nature of the memorandum about the A bomb?

"Mr. BIELASKI. That I don't know, sir. I have racked my memory time and again to produce more. I don't know whether it was a progress report or a plan report or what. I remember my reaction to it because it seemed to me just a bomb, an A bomb as compared to a B bomb or a C bomb or a D bomb.

"About that time we happened to pull the office door back and I discovered behind that door a very large bellows suitcase. I had the lockman immediately open that, and that was stuffed so full of documents that we just dropped everything. I have tried to estimate since, with the help of the men who were with me, how many documents we saw there, and at luncheon the other day we agreed it was a conservative number to say there were 400. I didn't believe that anybody would believe me if I made a written report on what we saw and what we did, so I decided to take enough with me to show them what we had found, and then there would be no possibility of their denying it.

"We had documents there from every department of the Government except the FBI. Every document I saw was stamped with the mail receipt stamp of the Department of State. All those that I saw, also, were marked with a paragraph. I cannot read it exactly to you, but it was to the effect that 'The possession of these documents by an unauthorized person constituted a violation of the Espionage Act,' and it quoted the paragraph and so forth of the act.

"Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Bielaski, as I get it now, these documents, many of them originated in different departments of the Government, but they had been received at the State Department?"

"Mr. BIELASKI. Yes, sir."

That's the end of my quotes of the testimony of an investigation which Senator Tydings and Senator McMahon and Senator Green said did not show any evidence of disloyalty in the State Department. And, since Senator LODGE has been put on the United Nations delegation, he, too, seems to have recovered from any indignation he once felt.

And John Service, who was involved in this Amerasia case and who confessed to giving documents to Jaffe, the confessed espionage agent, he has been promoted and is today a foreign officer in the State Department.

And, now, do you remember the name John Hersey in Mr. Bielaski's testimony? Are you curious as to what has happened to him? Well, I don't know what happened to him, but last Saturday night I was reading a current story on President Truman. It is the kind of story that any reporter in America would give his right eye to get permission to write. It is the kind of story that involves going for walks with the President, going swimming with the President, talking confidentially with the President—it is the kind of story that seldom can be written about a President until after he is dead, because in allowing the story to be written, the President has to show favoritism to the man who writes it.

And the man who goes walking and swimming with the President—and who is favored to write this story? His name? John Hersey.

And the three little monkeys who speak no evil, see no evil, and hear no evil about Communists, reign supreme.

Premise of Our Global Strategy: Strong Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the illuminating piece by Mr. James Reston in last Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Premise of Our Global Strategy: Strong Allies." May I suggest that this premise is largely overlooked by General MacArthur in his presentation of his own viewpoint to the American people?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREMISE OF OUR GLOBAL STRATEGY: STRONG ALLIES—ADMINISTRATION IS BOUND TO CONSIDER FACTS WHICH MACARTHUR IGNORES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—The big questions raised by General MacArthur's speech in Congress are not whether we want what the general wants but whether we are prepared to risk what he is prepared to risk and whether we are prepared to risk it alone.

Almost everybody wants the advantages of total victory over the Chinese Communists without the disadvantages of total war, but is this possible or even probable?

General MacArthur thinks it is. He believes that if we bomb the enemy's supply bases in Manchuria, impose a sharp naval blockade of the China coast, use Chiang Kai-shek's manpower in the struggle, and send major reinforcements of our own to Korea, we can knock Communist China out of the war without too much risk of the Soviet Union coming in.

This part of the argument is a question of judgment, or rather of guesswork, about how the Russians would react. General MacArthur was wrong about what the Chinese Communists would do, but in this case he may be entirely right. It might be possible merely to launch this policy and get away with it. It could be that, if the Russians were told explicitly that we were going to end the Korean War, and that if they intervened we would hit them with everything we had, they would stay out.

RISK IS REJECTED

The administration concedes that this is possible. It puts the odds at about fifty-fifty on the success of such a policy, but it does not think these odds are good enough, for if the bet goes wrong the result is the third world war.

The Government here is not ready for any such risk. Despite all the talk about mobilization and rearmament the United States has barely been able to meet the requirements of the limited war in Korea; it is just beginning to get enough manpower to relieve some of the Army foot soldiers there. Our own "privileged sanctuary" in Japan, to say nothing of this "sanctuary" of the privileged, is still wide open to attack, and the four divisions promised for Europe are still not ready.

If the Russians cooperated, of course, everything might be all right. They might not retaliate. They might recognize our blockade of China and not try to run their ships through it; they might not retaliate by bombing our souces of supply in Japan or the United States, and in that event the MacArthur thesis would be a triumph, like Inchon. The trouble is that if it failed it would be a disaster far worse than the miscalculation of last November.

The feeling here is that no one government has the right to take such a risk in such circumstances, even in the name of its own people, let alone in the name of a whole coalition of nations.

OTHER NATIONS CONSIDERED

As long as there is any reasonable question about any policy of ours leading to a third world war that would hit many other nations as well as our own, officials here have been bound to ask themselves, first, whether we were prepared to take the gamble ourselves, and second, whether our allies were prepared to gamble with us.

In the case of the MacArthur thesis, the answer has been "no" in both cases. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are undoubtedly willing to increase the risk in Korea a little, and some officers in the Pentagon undoubtedly approve the MacArthur thesis 100 percent. But the Government as a whole rejects it, and our Allies will not even discuss anything more than economic sanctions, and probably won't agree to much of that.

Thus if the forthcoming debate is to avoid what General MacArthur called the "pitfalls of unrealism" it must deal with the hard fact that if we follow the MacArthur policy we shall have to do it before this Government thinks we are ready, and we shall have to do it without the approval, and probably without the support of our allies.

There is no effective way to fight an all-out war against the Soviet Union without the approval and support of our allies. There is no way to retain the support of Japan, or to complete the defense of the Pacific, or to align ourselves with the rising peoples of Asia and its islands without these allies.

UNITED NATIONS IGNORED

The general himself illustrated these facts, though he managed to get all the way through his speech without ever mentioning the United Nations. He spoke warmly of the cooperation of the Japanese people, but how long would that cooperation last if the Japanese thought we were seriously considering a policy which would bring about retaliatory bombing of the Japanese islands?

The General wants a peace treaty for Japan. He wants us to retain permanent military installations there, but we cannot implement a peace treaty for Japan without the cooperation of Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, and we cannot maintain effective military installations in Japan against a hostile population.

Nobody knows better than the Japanese how few soldiers we have in their islands today, or how vulnerable our present Japanese installations are to attack from the Russian bases in Sakhalin. In these circumstances would the Japanese favor a policy of extending the war to Manchuria before we are even in a position to defend our own planes on the Japanese air strips, let alone the Japanese people?

Similarly, the General wants us to maintain a global policy. "To consider the problems of one sector oblivious to the problems of another is to court disaster for the whole," he told the Congress.

To maintain a global policy, however, it is necessary for us to have bases in north Africa, in France, in Britain, and in various other places around the globe. In fact, even to protect the ocean approaches to the United States, it is necessary to have bases in such places as Iceland, Greenland, and the Azores, which do not belong to us.

LACK OF EXPLANATION

General MacArthur did not explain how these things were to be done without the cooperation of a large number of allies. He did not tell the Congress how it was possible to use our strategic air power against the Soviet Union without the help of these allies, yet he developed a thesis which he knew to be unacceptable, not only to his own Government, but to the entire allied coalition.

Moreover, his strategy for fighting the Chinese Communists was strangely at variance with his analysis of the political and social developments of the Orient. Prime Minister Nehru of India would agree almost entirely with what the General said about the profound nationalistic feelings of the Asian peoples, and so would the British Foreign Office, but they could not possibly be farther apart from him on how to deal with this new nationalism.

There is widespread approval of General MacArthur's statement that the Chinese Communists are not mere puppets of Moscow, but are playing along for the time being for their own selfish purpose. But most people who think Peiping is not a satellite of Moscow, as General MacArthur clearly indicated it was not, believe that the thing to do is to limit the war against Peiping as much as possible. The general, however, argued that on the one hand there was a vital new force of nationalism afoot in Asia, and that we had to adjust our policies to this important fact, but he said this in a speech designed to bring about a major air and naval war against the very power that is the most obvious symbol of that new oriental nationalism.

MINIMUM OF GROUND TROOPS

Finally, the general implied that we must try to develop our defenses with a minimum of ground troops and expense—and in his speech before the DAR, he added a minimum of regulation, too. But how are we to keep our ground troops and our defense budget at a minimum without the cooperative defense effort of the French, the British, the Canadians, and the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty?

All our present strategic calculations are based upon their contributions, not only of bases, but of many more trained and equipped men than we are planning to throw into the pool. Their contributions are certainly not going to be made, however, in support of policies which they do not approve.

The fact that General MacArthur is opposed by his own Government and the governments of the whole free world does not, of course, prove that he is wrong.

The definition of objectives is easy but reaching decisions on the means, when the fate of the Republic and the whole free world is at stake, is something else again.

Maybe the country wants to send major reinforcements to Korea, as the general has requested. Maybe it really is fed up with the untidiness of this half war, and would rather risk the total clash. But the price of the battle has to be weighed as well as the rewards of victory.

For just as the general could not answer when his troops asked him why surrender military advantages to the enemy in Korea, so the Government will have to answer for the consequences of its acts.

The government that extends the war and produces a world-wide clash is in a much more serious position that the government that moves cautiously in concert with its allies. For if the Government is wrong now in its limited-war policy, it must merely answer to General MacArthur and its other critics at home. But if it adopts the MacArthur policy and fails, then it must answer to the whole world and to history.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick, on April 16, 1951, regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS I SEE IT

Good evening.

Let's talk about the issues back of the dismissal of General MacArthur. To fully understand the far-eastern situation you need to look at a map of Asia. As you look at the islands which make up the Japanese Empire, you will see that the peninsula of Korea is like a spearhead pointed at Japan. To the north is the island of Sakhalin. To the south is another large island called Formosa. And a little southeast of Formosa are the Philippine Islands.

Japan, as a nation, fought China late in the nineteenth century to protect herself against the dangers of attack from Korea, or from Formosa. She acquired these territories. She was still threatened by the island of Sakhalin and threatened by Russia, through Russia's control of certain ports in China. So, in 1905 Japan fought and defeated Russia. Japan got the ports and she got the south half of the island of Sakhalin. If you will look at a map you will see why Japan had to do this, because if unfriendly powers held Sakhalin, Korea, and Formosa, Japan would have enemies on every side of her, except the east.

When we defeated Japan in 1945, General MacArthur was made the administrator of 84,000,000 of people. One of his jobs was the reformation of Japan, but another of his jobs was to defend Japan, since we had disarmed her, leaving her unable to defend herself. Even a school boy looking at a map would understand that our policy must be to make Japan into a nation friendly to America, so that our Pacific defense line would lie across the Pacific, not on our own west coast. And that was MacArthur's job. How successfully he has done this job was shown yesterday when 2,000,000 of Japanese stood in tears while their conqueror took off to answer to a ward heeler from Kansas City.

MacArthur's job had been made difficult for him even before he took over. Sahkalin on the north secretly had been given to Russia at Yalta. Manchuria, for all practical purposes, was also given to Russia at Yalta, and so were the Chinese ports of Darien and Port Arthur. That weakening of our defense line was done even before we defeated Japan.

Now, keep in mind that our State Department destroyed a friendly government in China and aided the coming to power of the Communists. In early 1950, this was our situation in the Far East: We had Russia occupying all of Sakhalin; we had a Russian satellite government, armed by Russia and directed by Russians, occupying the northern part of Korea. To the west of Japan the Red Chinese, our enemies, held the mainland. Also to the west, holding the ports of Darien and Port Arthur, were the Russians. To the south of Japan, the island of Formosa was occupied by the friendly forces of the National Chinese Government.

So, the State Department, following its policy of betraying American interests to create a Communist world, announced that South Korea could fall to the Communist North Koreans. The State Department would approve no arms for South Korea and even when Congress voted aid, the State Department held up the shipment of the supplies. Chiang Kai-shek, on Formosa, was fighting the Red Chinese on the mainland; but he was also having to fight the State Department. Acheson formally objected to the blockade which Chiang Kai-shek was enforcing against the mainland of Red China; and the Secretary of State made it clear that we would not defend Korea and that we would not help in the defense of Formosa. Perhaps I can recall this to you locally by suggesting that you may remember an editorial of the Milwaukee Journal. In discussing this the Journal sarcastically asked the people of Milwaukee if they wanted to go to war for Formosa.

Then, following the Communist line, the State Department, the spring of 1950, began propagandizing the American people to sell us the idea of seating Red China in the United Nations and in the Security Council.

As Assistant Secretary of State, McDermott, put it to me and I quote him, "Yes, it is our policy to seat the Red Chinese, but we cannot announce it until the American people are ready for it."

To military men, however, the actions of our State Department were most serious. They realized that this meant the complete destruction of our Pacific defense line. If Korea and Formosa fell it meant that we could not hold Japan, and an unarmed Japan could not defend herself. So, in quick succession we would lose Korea, then Formosa, probably the Philippines next, and, last of all, Japan. This would destroy our Pacific defense line and give the Communists an additional 125,000,000 people. Most important it would give the Communists the great industrial plant and manpower of Japan.

Standing in the way of the Reds and their State Department collaborators was only one man—Douglas MacArthur.

In June 1950, Defense Secretary Louis Johnson and some of our military men visited the Far East. They returned on June 24. They went to the White House to make their report and it is generally understood that they convinced the President of the dangers to America in the policy of the State Department. The American people were not told what took place at this meeting; but the Communists knew what happened, as the Communists have known every detail of what happens in our Government and particularly the White House since 1945. So, the Communists moved to take by force what they had expected to get by default. This was too raw for even the President. He thereupon ordered a token defense of South Korea. But, he was careful to tie the hands of the commander in chief of our forces in the Far East, General MacArthur. And to reassure the Red Chinese he sent an American fleet to protect the Reds from the anti-Communist Chinese on Formosa. Since then, the State Department has sought a new formula to surrender our defense line, a formula by which it can keep faith with the Reds.

Louis Johnson, our Secretary of Defense, was fired, and hatchet man Marshall took over.

Then, our State Department manufactured a lot of excitement about Europe. This has worked before. Our minds were kept on the Berlin blockade while the rug was pulled from under Chiang Kai-shek. Don't forget that.

It has continued to be State Department policy to give Korea and Formosa—and eventually Japan—to the Reds.

It was and still is State Department policy to seat Red China in the Security Council.

It was and is State Department and Russian policy to give control of the Security Council to the Communists. There are just five permanent seats in the Council: Russia holds one; France, which is more than 50 percent Communist controlled, holds one; Britain, which has a Communist for Minister of War, holds one; China holds one; and we hold the fifth. Add it up, and figure what happens when the Red Chinese are seated.

But the State Department and the Communists have had one man who has foreseen and blocked several of their moves. That man is MacArthur.

MacArthur knows that the boogyman of a powerful Red China is just State Department hokum. He knows that if Chiang Kai-shek is given aid; that, together, we can finish off this Far East mess—with the probability that the anti-Communist Chinese can regain control of their country.

So, the State Department early this year tried to put together an appeasing peace. You surely remember. Mr. Truman repeated most of the terms just the other night. But this was rejected by the Reds. At the time I did not understand why the Reds refused to accept as a gift from Mr. Acheson what they were fighting to gain. Now, I understand—like Hitler, their terms become harsher. Their new price includes the man they most fear in all the world—Douglas MacArthur.

I repeat what I've said before. This is not an issue of a general versus a President. It is not an issue of more war or less. It is not an issue of Republican versus Democrat as the President tried to make it Saturday night. The issue is the security of America versus its betrayers.

Good night.

Jewett, Ohio, Welcomes New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the progressive villages in my district is Jewett in Harrison County, Ohio. Some weeks ago I met with the Jewett Chamber of Commerce to discuss with them the possibility of obtaining industries to locate in this village. I am inserting with these remarks a short outline of some of the advantages the village of Jewett could offer to industries which might desire to locate there:

The Jewett Chamber of Commerce wishes to advise industries that we have available sites suitable for industrial location.

Jewett is well serviced by the main lines of both the Pennsylvania and the Nickel Plate Railroads. We are located on State Routes 9 and 151, and within 4 miles of United States Route 22.

There is available an unlimited supply of coal. Electrical power is supplied by the Ohio Power Co. Gas is supplied by the Natural Gas Co. of West Virginia. We have also an excellent supply of good water.

Jewett also has available excellent fire protection facilities, fine churches, and a superior school system. We have a large community park with a baseball diamond, tennis courts, and a community building for public meetings.

There is also available a reservoir of unskilled labor both male and female within the immediate vicinity.

Interested parties please contact George Telfer, industrial development committee, Jewett Chamber of Commerce.

United States Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by Frank Kirkpatrick on April 15, 1951, regarding United States policy in Asia.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good afternoon, since last Wednesday morning, most of us have not thought or talked about anything except the tragic situation which has been exposed by the dismissal of General MacArthur. And, of course, I have talked on this subject during the past week. There have been many requests that I repeat Friday's night's broadcast for persons who did not hear it. So, here it is:

I refer again to the MacArthur dismissal. This is not a conflict between a great, but subordinate, military man and the President of the United States. This is a conflict between a great servant of the American people who happens to be a soldier, and a conspiracy within our Government to help advance world communism.

If the American people fail to recognize this, and fail to understand the shocking truth of what their Government has been and is being used for, their present anger will be expended on superficialities. Make no mistake, this involves the dismissal of a general who stood in the way of surrender of our Pacific defense line—a dismissal demanded by the Soviets and their British collaborators, as evidence that Acheson and Truman can deliver their pledged aid for world communism. Already, today, the British have demanded that the Red Chinese move into Japan.

Tragically, one of the great sources of our national strength is also our greatest weakness—that is, our supreme faith in our two-party system.

For generations our political dissatisfactions have found expression in throwing out one party and putting another in power. We have done this periodically with the complete confidence—amounting to smugness—of a people who know that both parties are basically American, differing only in superficial details as to how to approach a given problem. We have correctly been indifferent to the occasional third-party movements. But, this supreme confidence in our two-party system has blinded us to the possible dangers of an infiltration of one or both of those parties. And, much of our press on which we depend for news is so organized that it is largely an unwitting instrument for continuing the fiction that we have only Republicans and Democrats.

The fact is that there are men in positions of influence in both our major parties whose aim is the use of those parties to accomplish world communism. For the most part these political Trojan horses have operated in the Democratic Party, because it has been the party in power; and because it has shown a greater willingness to accept plausible arguments for both real and fake social reforms. But, the Republican Party has not been without its wolves in sheeps' clothing. In fact, Wendell Wilkie was pretty well captured by the same kind of people who control Truman.

If this is true, we must be on our guard against letting anyone fool us into thinking this MacArthur episode is a partisan political fight. Both Republicans and Democrats must understand exactly what this action means, and the Democrats, particularly, should understand the issue. If the Democrats fail to do so, their great party can be wrecked; or, what would be worse, completely captured and used as the instrument to keep pro-Soviets in power.

Whether you usually vote Democratic or Republican is immaterial; you must know that what I am saying is true. Your reason will tell you it is true. Don't accept my opinion, and don't accept others' opinion either; but look at the factual record and apply your ordinary common sense.

Here are the high spots of that record:

1. The people and the governments of China have been our great Asiatic friends for a hundred years.

2. This friendship was and is so strong that even a pro-Communist State Department official, writing from China in 1944, was forced to say: "No government can survive in China without the blessing of the United States."

3. Earl Browder, the one-time Communist leader in the United States, testified under oath last summer that State Department policy and the Communist Party policy on China became the same in 1942 and that he—Earl Browder—was called to the State Department and given the message confirming this change, to transmit to the Red Chinese that this would be future policy.

4. The American people were not told about this change in policy however; and even our Ambassador to China was not so informed. Patrick Hurley, the United States Ambassador, was allowed to keep up the fiction of cooperation with the legal government of China, but his pro-Soviet staff had their own secret orders.

5. At Yalta, in February 1945, Mr. Hiss, Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Stettinius, with Mr. Roosevelt, secretly sold out the Chinese Government to the Communists. They betrayed Poland at the same time; and this betrayal was made public, because Stalin wanted Poland right away. But Stalin did not move on China until he was sure Japan had been knocked out. So, the betrayal of China was kept secret. The part of the Yalta agreement which betrayed China was kept secret for 2 years.

6. Up to this point, Mr. Truman was not responsible for betraying China. But, don't think Mr. Truman didn't know about the policy of betraying China to the Reds. Maybe he didn't know about Yalta, but he did know the rest, because Patrick Hurley told him so. When Hurley resigned on November 26, 1945, his resignation contained these warning and prophetic words—I quote: "We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communists' armed party to decline unification * * * unless the Chinese Communists were given control. The weakness of the American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. There is a third world war in the making. * * * The war that is now in the making is not even intended to defend or establish democratic ideals. * * * A considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally, as well as specifically, in China. * * * Make no mistake, Mr. President, America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interest."

That was said to Mr. Truman in November 1945, by a man who could not conceivably have any political or personal reason for speaking anything but the truth. And, the men he named as betrayers of this country are still in our State Department.

7. What did Mr. Truman do? On December 15, 1945, less than 3 weeks after he had been given the facts by Ambassador Hurley, Truman issued a statement on policy toward China, practically ordering the National Government to take in the Communists. And, to make sure the Government of China understood him, he said, "United States support will not extend to United States military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife."

8. Not content with telling the President of China to bring the Chinese Reds into his Government, Truman sent Gen. George Marshall to China to bring the Red Chinese into power. When Chiang Kai-shek resisted and told Marshall that he was betraying China to the Reds, Marshall stopped all aid to China—and on December 18, 1946, President Truman made it clear to the Red world that it could take over. Said appeaser Truman, "No weapons which could be used in fighting a civil war were made available."

9. Thereafter, Mr. Truman was repeatedly warned of the dangers he had brought to America by his China policy, so, on July 9, 1947, Mr. Truman sent Lieutenant General Wedemeyer to China to make an appraisal of the situation. He instructed General Wedemeyer to recommend to him what action he, President Truman, should take.

Wedemeyer was not sent by General MacArthur. He was not sent by the Republicans in the Congress. General Wedemeyer was a man selected and sent to China by President Truman. Now, let's see what President Truman's own emissary had to say to him after his survey.

Wedemeyer reported, among other things, "The bulk of the Chinese are not disposed to communism and they are not concerned with ideologies. * * * Although the Japanese offered increasingly favorable surrender terms during the course of the war, China elected to remain steadfast with her allies. * * * (This fact should be considered in any criticism of the Government of China.) * * * Indirectly, the United States facilitated the Soviet program in the Far East by agreeing at the Yalta Conference to Russian reentry into Manchuria and later by withholding aid from the National Government. * * * Prompt action is necessary to prevent Manchuria from becoming a Soviet satellite. * * * Gradually, it has become apparent that there remains a world power presenting even greater dangers to world peace than did the Nazi militarists and the Japanese jingoists. * * * It may be said that the American mediation effort (that is, Marshall's mission) has been to the advantage of the Chinese Communists and conversely to the disadvantage of the National Government. * * * At this time a policy of no assistance to China would be equivalent to cutting the ground from under the feet of the Chinese Government. Removal of American assistance without removal of Soviet assistance would certainly lay the country open to eventual Communist domination. It would have repercussions in other parts of Asia, would lower American prestige in the Far East and make easier the spread of Soviet influence and Soviet political expansion—not only in Asia, but in other areas of the world.

That report was made to the President on the 19th of September 1947, by his own observant adviser. And what happened to this report? It was forbidden to be made public. And who forbade it to be made public? George Marshall, Acheson's stooge Secretary of Defense, testified under oath late last year, "I ordered it suppressed."

10. But Mr. Truman had still other warnings of what would happen. On November 9, 1948, the President of China pointed out to the President that China had signed a treaty with Russia on the advice of the

United States and that Soviet aid given to the Chinese Communists was wrecking his country. Within the same week the Ambassador to China, Mr. Stuart, sent to the State Department a warning from the President of China, which said in part, "In case China should be subjugated by the Communists the third world war would surely follow, and mankind would once again be precipitated into a tragic disaster."

But within the same week General Marshall now became the Secretary of State, with Acheson and Jessup as his advisers, said that to help China would be, and I quote his exact words, "To embark upon a quixotic venture."

Thereafter it was announced by Acheson, in early 1950, that we would not defend those parts of our Pacific defense line made up of the Korean Peninsula and Formosa. But our military leaders saw that this also meant the eventual abandonment of Japan and the Philippines to the Reds and our withdrawal to Hawaii and our Pacific coast. Less than 12 hours before the attack on South Korea last June these military men evidently convinced the President of this fact. This secret leaked out, and the North Koreans marched. The rest is history.

There are the highlights of the record of the creation of Red China—not as I see it, but as it is. Red China is a creation of Hiss, Acheson, Stettinius, Marshall, and Truman. And when their creation and their betrayals threatened to destroy America's defense line of Japan, Korea, Formosa, and the Philippines, MacArthur stood firm against further betrayals. Thereupon the Reds in and out of Government demanded his head. Mr. Truman delivered—because, in my opinion, he was pledged to deliver.

Good afternoon.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The MacArthur Week, by George E. Sokolsky, broadcast on April 22, 1951, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President technically disgraced Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He dismissed a general in the field in the course of battle. He dismissed the general suddenly, in the dark of night. He dismissed him without hearing or trial. He dismissed him for insubordination.

Then a phenomenon occurred which requires keen study and analysis. Let me put it to you this way:

We speak of this country as a democracy which, of course, politically it is not. It is a representative republic, in which the people control their Government through five elected officials, the President, the Vice President, two United States Senators, and one Member of the House of Representatives. To these are given specific duties, obligations, responsibilities, and authorities by the Constitution. What is not designated to them is reserved to the States and the people thereof. Limitations upon government are clearly stated in the Constitution.

In a true democracy, the people directly set the policies of government; in a representative republic the people control the government indirectly by stated elections.

Various steps have heretofore been recommended to make our system of government more democratic, such as the referendum and recall. Some of these have been tried locally, but they have in no manner altered the basic character of our representative government.

Therefore the MacArthur Week, starting at 1 a. m. on Wednesday morning, April 11, and lasting until about 5 p. m. on Friday, April 20, represents an important political phenomenon. It is democracy at work.

I shall take you through this process step by step:

On Wednesday, when the public rose to read their newspapers, they read that the President had suddenly and with finality dismissed Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The politicians of both parties felt that it was too bad. The Republicans were more angry that the President had dismissed General MacArthur in disgrace than that he had been recalled. The Democrats formed ranks because they realized that the President had pulled a boner, that he had acted the boor.

All this had nothing to do with whether General MacArthur was right or wrong, whether he had been insubordinate or had obeyed the instructions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whether his program for Asia would or would not extend the war.

It was a normal response of decent human beings to a crude procedure against a man who had devoted 52 years of his 71 to the service of his country.

So the people acted. The President, every Senator, every Congressman, every newspaper editor, every columnist and commentator suddenly found himself snowed under a mass of letters and telegrams on the subject of MacArthur.

This was a spontaneous, unorganized popular response. For instance, I was awakened to the news during the night; throughout the morning of Wednesday my telephone was tied up to answer the simple question: "What can we do?" I began to receive checks—which we are, of course, returning—from persons who wanted to contribute to a fund to honor MacArthur. There was no committee, no organization, no leadership; there was only action by the people.

Even by Wednesday night it was clear that the people were in some manner overruling the Government.

Many politicians believed that it would pass over quickly; that it would be a single shout and die down.

The demand by Thursday had grown into a terrific ground swell and it centered on MacArthur appearing before a joint meeting of the Congress to state his case.

This the Democrats, under pressure from the President, rejected. Their first compromise was that he would appear before a senatorial committee in secret session. This Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, who took the lead in the matter in Congress, rejected as not good enough.

By Thursday the ground swell was so great that it was no longer a question of MacArthur's disgrace, it was rather a question of defending the President and the Democratic Party.

President Truman immediately took to the radio to defend his course—that is, on Wednesday night—but he could not stem the tide.

It was then that the Republicans and Democrats tangled over the question of the forum that would be afforded the general. MacArthur himself was no part of this quarrel. He maintained a dignified aloofness. The Democrats then offered a meeting in the Library of Congress, which JOE MARTIN rejected as not good enough. He threatened to hire a stadium for a forum.

Thursday, Friday, Saturday, the people spoke as they had never before done in this country. The popular emotion was a response to many things: to the Communists and homosexuals in the State Department, to the shame of our cities as evidenced by the Kefauver committee, to the mink coats and deep freezes, to the corruption in the RFC, to the Fulbright committee's investigations, to the President's letters, and to the President's intimate friends, to the coterie of Missouri fixers that surround him.

In a way, these questions overshadowed the MacArthur dismissal. But nothing overshadowed the fact that more than 10,000 Americans had been killed in the stalemated Korean War.

On Sunday, General MacArthur left Japan on the *Bataan* with his wife and son. It was reminiscent of his departure from Bataan in an open boat, with his wife and son. The Japanese wept at his departure. Even the Emperor broke all precedents and called on MacArthur to bid him farewell. America responded with an unmistakable demand for a hero's welcome. The rest, you have witnessed.

This should be understood by the delegates to the United Nations, by the Russians, and the British, and the Indians: The stupendous reception given to General MacArthur by the American people is democracy at work in this country.

The American people overruled their Government. President Truman could dismiss General MacArthur; he could not disgrace General MacArthur. The citizens demonstrated that in this country the authority of government rests with the people; that it is for the people to decide who is to be honored and who is to be disgraced. And they decided.

There is a further point to be made concerning all this:

We have for many years now become accustomed to regarding the President as more than he is in our system of government. This was due to three causes:

1. The personal charm of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

2. The despair of the depression and the fright of the war.

3. A propaganda build-up, which has cost the American taxpayer an enormous amount of money, designed to publicize favorably the Executive and reduce the authority of the congressional branch of Government.

The effect of it has been that we have been getting government by experts, working in secrecy and facing Congress and the people with the results of their private actions which would no longer be undone. Most Americans now realize that the secret agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Postdam, and other conferences brought on the Korean War, forced upon us remobilization of our industries and of our sons, and a wartime budget in what the politicians call peace.

The people regard their country as in peril.

This, then, is what the demonstration for Gen. Douglas MacArthur means in its broadest and impersonal aspects.

Recognizing the high regard of our people for MacArthur, they nevertheless spontaneously sensed that this is a way to emphasize to the President that the people are displeased, frightened, and angered and that they want a change from the policies pursued and the methods employed by the administration not only in our foreign relations but in domestic affairs.

And it is also a warning to Great Britain—to Great Britain more than to any other country.

Most Americans believe that the prime factor in the removal of General MacArthur has been the constant and unseemly British opposition to him.

From now on we shall have an American policy in the Far East. The British can do

what their interests require them to do—but so shall the American people. Anybody, the President or the Secretary of State, who thinks otherwise, will find an American public opinion that has rediscovered its power and authority.

This is democracy at work.

The political issue that Douglas MacArthur raised is: Who is telling the truth—the President or Douglas MacArthur? The President says that MacArthur acted without authority; MacArthur says that his program was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Up to this moment, General Bradley has not denied that the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved MacArthur's program for Asia.

Until this is cleared up, it remains a controversial and troublesome question in American life. Our people dislike liars—they need to know who lied in this vital matter.

Soviet Cultural Influence in North Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Dr. Harvie Branscomb, the chancelor of Vanderbilt University, who is Chairman of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, has been kind enough to send me a copy of the fifth semiannual report of the Commission, dated April 6, 1951. The Commission was created under the Smith-Mundt Act to advise both the Congress and the Department of State on the progress of our international educational exchanges.

I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD one section of Dr. Branscomb's latest report, a section dealing with Soviet cultural activities in North Korea.

Last summer, testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee on my Resolution No. 243, I asked how the Soviet Union had been able to whip up the emotions of the people of North Korea to the point where tens of thousands of their boys were flinging themselves against our machine guns. I cited as at least a partial answer the power of the Pyongyang radio, and other instruments of Communist-controlled propaganda. Now Dr. Branscomb assembles the evidence on the enormous scale of Soviet cultural penetration in North Korea, as distinct from its activities in radio, pamphleteering, posters, and the handling of the news.

I am not introducing Dr. Branscomb's material because of its retrospective value. The North Korean instance is a test case on how Soviet propaganda works, and as such is applicable to many areas of the world. It is a warning to us of the nature and scale of the Soviet thrust which we must counter and overcome.

Think of it, by 1949, 1,300,000 North Koreans, out of a total of 8,000,000, were enrolled in Korean-Soviet culture societies, in 105 branches. One hundred and nine special Russian-language schools were established. In 1949 alone some 500 Soviet books were translated into Korean, 2 of them attaining distribution totaling 537,000 copies. During 1949, 209 Soviet films were imported into North Korea. In 1948, 70,000 lectures and concerts were given by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in Korea, and an even greater number were given in 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACHMENT

SOVIET CULTURAL INFLUENCE IN NORTH KOREA

The predominant role of the Soviet Union in North Korea is reflected in North Korean education and culture. During the period of Japanese rule, mass education of the Koreans was neglected, artistic creativity was repressed, and literature, drama, and art were limited to a select few, mainly Koreans educated in Japan. The educational and cultural void enabled first the Soviet occupation forces and then the North Korean regime to foster Soviet culture among the mass Korean people through the educational system and through the encouragement of mass appreciation of Soviet literature, drama, and art. Until the past year, however, lack of facilities limited the scope of the educational and cultural program. Since then there has been increased activity in both programs.

Most aspects of Soviet cultural imperialism are carried out through official channels. The programs are facilitated by the Economic and Cultural Agreement of March 17, 1949, which states:

"The contracting parties shall in every way develop and consolidate the relations which have been established between them in the spheres of culture, science, and art."

The objectives of the Soviet educational and cultural programs are publicly supported by the North Korean Government leaders, who have avowed the superiority of Soviet culture and have encouraged the spread of training in the Russian language, the influx of Soviet educators into the schools, the translation, publication, and reading of Soviet literature and the cultivation of Soviet artistic works.[1]

The educational and cultural programs projected to encourage assimilation of Soviet culture are implemented mainly by the Ministries of Education and Propaganda. In addition, there are special organizations charged with the responsibility for the propagation of Soviet culture. The Korean-Soviet Culture Society is the indigenous agency primarily responsible for the Soviet cultural program. In the fall of 1945 the society had a membership of about 3,700, with only 20 branches. By May 1949 the membership of the society was over 1,300,000, with 105 branches and 20,000 units. Among the activities of the society are the translation and publication of books, the publication of a newspaper and a magazine, and the making of arrangements for lecture tours, concerts, theatrical performances, etc.

There are, moreover, certain Soviet organizations that direct the flow of materials and Soviet representatives to the Korean-Soviet Culture Society and to other indigenous organizations. Among these are the Soviet culture houses and several propaganda outlets under the Soviet Embassy; the Soviet Information Bureau and Soviet libraries; the Soviet Motion Picture Export and Import Society (a branch of the Soviet Ministry of Cinema Industry); and the TASS News Agency.

Soviet influence on the educational system

A primary objective of Soviet educational policy is the teaching of Russian as the second language in North Korean schools. The Ministry of Education has reportedly decreed that Russian will be the only required foreign language in Korean schools. In order to train middle school teachers and Government employees, 109 special Russian-language schools have been established. There are reported to be 1,580 graduates of these special schools already. A Russian Language College has been established in Pyongyang. Reliable reports indicate that the Russian language has been added to the curriculum of other colleges and universities. In addition to Russian training, courses on Marxism, Soviet history, literature, art, and other aspects of the Soviet civilization are offered in North Korean schools.

Soviet influence over the educational system is further manifested through the assignment of Soviet scholars and professors to teach in North Korean colleges and universities, short visits of other Soviet academic personnel, and the provision of Soviet textbooks, teaching and training manuals, experimental apparatus, and literary works on both an advanced and an elementary level. It is reported that 13 of the original members of the teaching staff of Kim Il Sung University were Russians. Since July 1948, more than 30 well-known Soviet scholars have visited the various Korean institutions of higher learning to assist in their educational programs. Soviet engineers also visited Korea to provide similar assistance in industrial and agricultural fields.

The Soviet Union has also brought Korean students to the U. S. S. R. for educational training in the natural sciences, humanities, public administration, engineering, and other technical fields. More than 600 such students, both men and women, are currently in the Soviet Union, and recent reports indicate that many more students are expected to go to the U. S. S. R. These students, upon their return, are expected to assume positions of responsibility in the Government and political organizations and to form a nucleus for the Communist intelligentsia in North Korea.

Cultural assimilation

Assimilation of Soviet culture is sought not only through Soviet influence over the educational system but also through dissemination to the general public of a wide variety of translated Soviet publications; the performance of Soviet motion pictures, plays, music, ballet, and the like; the exhibition of Soviet creative works; and the visits and lectures of Soviet writers, artists, and other cultural representatives. In the field of publications, from the time of the Soviet "liberation" up to 1948, 72 books (with a total of 770,000 copies) were published in North Korea, most of them translations of Soviet literature and technical books. In 1949, some 500 books were translated; copies of the History of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of the U. S. S. R. and Stalin's Collected Works alone totaled 537,000. In addition, two

[1] Typical statements propounding Soviet cultural superiority are:

"In order to develop the important educational culture, it is the most pressing popular aspiration to study and absorb broadly the advanced Soviet educational science, and to consolidate more than ever the everlasting imperishable good will between Korea and the Soviet Union. * * * Soviet educational science occupies the highest place in the world as the means to develop culture and the weapon for the realization of a Communist society." (Pyongyang radio broadcast on October 26, 1949, of a speech by Paik Nam Un, Minister of Education.)

"Only by absorbing the advanced Soviet culture will we be able to develop our national culture further. Therefore we must intensify our efforts to absorb more vigorously the advanced Soviet culture so that we may develop our national culture to a higher level and make ours a rich, powerful country." (Pyongyang radio broadcast on October 19, 1949, of a speech by Pae Chong Son, Vice Minister of Culture and Propaganda, on the necessity for the absorption of Soviet culture.)

daily newspapers are devoted primarily to Soviet writings; one published by the Korean-Soviet Culture Society and the other by the Soviet Foreign Culture Association. Finally, there is also a weekly publication of the Soviet Foreign Culture Association and a magazine published by the Korean-Soviet Culture Society.

In the nonpublication fields, there are numerous examples of Soviet cultural penetration. During 1949 more than 209 Soviet films were imported into North Korea and shown in both urban and rural areas. The State Theater at Pyongyang, established on January 9, 1947, is reserved for the performance of Soviet plays and for concerts by Soviet musicians and dancers. Its limited facilities, however, permitted the production of only eight plays in 1950. Finally, almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in 1949, and an even greater number were given in 1949.

Comments on MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Arthur Bliss Lane, dated April 17, 1951, and published in the New York Times on April 19, 1951, regarding the dismissal of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON MACARTHUR

AWAKENED NATION SEEN

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the universally general discussions which are taking place on General MacArthur's dismissal there is too much emphasis on the personal note (i. e., who is right, Truman or MacArthur?) and too little attention to the basic problem involved, our national security.

In evaluating the situation we should keep in mind the events not only since June 1950, but since 1943, when General Marshall as Chief of Staff argued in favor of bringing the Soviet Union into the war against Japan. On good authority I learn that MacArthur then opposed bringing the Soviets or Great Britain into the far-eastern phase of the war on the correct ground that we were capable of winning it alone and that our allies would undoubtedly wish to impose conditions when the victory was won. (I do not need to remind your readers that MacArthur has in the recent crisis been pilloried by both the British and Soviet press.)

The Marshall mission to China, which had as its aim and result the introduction of Communists into the Nationalist Chinese Government, the suppression of the Wedemeyer report, the Acheson statement of January 1950, setting forth the policy of the administration on Formosa, were all steps leading to the inevitable: the elimination of the man who consistently stood for the protection of American interests and prestige and who reportedly was not consulted on the Korean adventure.

It would indeed be presumptuous on my part to pretend to read General MacArthur's thoughts or motives which led to his dismissal. But I feel sure many of us believe that his dramatic separation from his command, damaging though it may be to our standing in the Far East, will accomplish something which even General MacArthur could not have accomplished had he remained in a position subordinate to his Commander in Chief: the awakening of the American people to the enormity of the danger in which we now lie.

Fortunately there are democratic and constitutional steps by which the disaster lurking behind the danger can still be averted.

ARTHUR BLISS LANE.

WASHINGTON, *April 17, 1951.*

To Halt Inflation, the Genuine Remedy Is the Gold Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Maj. Hamilton A. Long, that was reprinted in the February 1946 issue of Great Lakes Banker, Journal of Illinois Bankers Association, explaining in nontechnical language the decisive importance of restoration of the gold standard:

NO THERMOMETER, THEREFORE NO FEVER?

(By Maj. Hamilton A. Long)

INVITING TROUBLE

If a patient with a fever should smash his thermometer, he would thereby neither reduce his fever nor protect himself against fever and illness in the future. He would only be asking for trouble.

Those who blamed the gold standard for our economic ills and considered it an agent for evil are like the patient who blames a thermometer for his fever. The gold standard is essentially a device for testing the state of a country's financial health by measuring public confidence in the credit of the government—paper money and government bonds, in the credit of banks, bank deposits, and notes—and in credit conditions in general. The gold standard is like a thermometer. It is a device which cannot do any harm and can be very useful to all the people of a country—of our country.

HOW THE GOLD STANDARD WORKS

When a country is on the gold standard, its government promises to keep on hand, as security behind its paper money, an amount of gold equal to a stated percentage of that paper money. The government also promises that it will exchange a specified amount of gold on demand for each unit of its paper money. If the gold standard were functioning in this country today, anyone could exchange paper dollars for gold dollars at any time.

When this public confidence is shaken, the people demand gold in exchange for paper money. By doing this they show their disapproval of the conditions which created lack of confidence. It is a warning to their public servants to take corrective action. On the other hand, when the people allow the gold to remain in the government's possession, it is tangible proof of their confidence. This is the way the people use a functioning gold standard to safeguard their country's financial health and their own welfare.

When the people demand gold in exchange for paper money, the government usually takes corrective action in an effort to restore confidence before its gold supply is seriously reduced. If, however, the conditions which created lack of confidence cannot be readily corrected, and the people continue to demand gold, the government usually goes off the gold standard. It stops redeeming paper money in gold. By such action the government officially acknowledges the existence of these conditions and the difficulty of correcting them. This focuses attention upon these conditions and puts public officials under pressure to take corrective action. When these conditions are finally corrected and public confidence is restored, the government can then return to the gold standard by again redeeming paper money in gold upon demand.

The gold standard works the same way in every country, regardless of the amount of gold exchangeable for a unit of paper money, regardless of the fact that this amount may be changed by the government from time to time.

NOT A "CROSS OF GOLD AND CROWN OF THORNS"

As the gold standard is simply a device for measuring public confidence in the soundness of Government credit, bank credit, and credit conditions in general, it cannot be held responsible for the state of these factors. Under no circumstances is it sensible to blame the gold standard for our economic ills. The old political slogan that the gold standard is a "cross of gold and crown of thorns" for the people is as absurd as it would be to say that a thermometer is a cross of mercury and a crown of thorns for a patient.

COMPARATIVELY LITTLE GOLD IS ENOUGH

When a country is on the gold standard, all bank depositors cannot at the same time withdraw their deposits and exchange their paper money for gold. There is never enough gold available to make this possible. For example, in 1929, when this country was on the gold standard, our total bank deposits were over 12 times the amount of our gold supply. This great excess of deposits over gold supply always exists. In the case of a great country like ours, total bank deposits far exceed the entire world's gold supply. The fact that the function of the gold held by the Government is simply to serve as tangible evidence of public confidence is a basic reason why it is not necessary for a country to have an amount of gold equal to its bank deposits in order to be on the gold standard.

A THERMOMETER TAKEN APART

The basic elements of a functioning gold standard are (1) a law fixing the gold content of the standard currency unit; (2) a supply of gold; (3) the practice, sanctioned by law, of redeeming paper money in gold upon demand. When a Government stops redeeming paper money in gold the other two elements become useless in measuring public confidence in credit conditions—just as a thermometer taken apart becomes merely mercury and glass which are useless in detecting fever. Since our Government will not now redeem paper money in gold upon demand, our present enormous gold supply is useless in testing the state of our country's financial health.

NO SIN OR CRIME

No sensible person would assume that he has no fever just because he has no thermometer. Likewise, no sensible person should assume that our country is in good health financially just because we have no functioning gold standard.

It is, of course, no sin or crime for this country not to be on the gold standard with a standard gold dollar like the one in use in 1932, or with a standard gold dollar containing a different amount of gold. However, this is only part of the completely accurate proposition.

JUST COMMON SENSE

The other and more important part is this: It is equally true that it is not absolutely necessary for a patient to have a thermometer, but if he has one he is likely to be better off because it will help him to know his condition and act to safeguard his health.

A country which does not take advantage of the proved usefulness of the gold standard is at best following a highly dangerous course. It is only common sense to learn by experience; and we in this country have had enough sad experiences to provide us with ample lessons.

NOT WORTH A CONTINENTAL

Take one example alone. In the early days of our country, a type of paper money called Continentals was in use. This money was not redeemable in gold, so there was no limit upon the amount that could be issued. There was a great depression then; and more and more of these Continentals were printed to help pay Government expenses in order to avoid facing the unpleasant and unpopular task of heavily taxing the people to balance the budget. Finally, so many of them were issued that the public lost faith in their value; and Continentals became practically worthless. Today, over a century and a half later, "Not worth a Continental" is still a popular synonym for worthlessness.

CONTINENTALS, GREENBACKS, AND OTHER DEFICIT FINANCING

If a country is not on the gold standard in a time of economic depression and government expenditures far exceed tax collections, there is an almost irresistible temptation for the government to use its credit to finance its deficits instead of collecting enough taxes for this purpose. This is done by printing and issuing paper money which is not redeemable in gold (whether greenbacks or paper money of some other color makes no difference); or by adding to the public debt through printing and issuing government promises (bonds and notes) payable in future years; or by both methods. The first method is currency inflation; the second, credit inflation.

This deficit financing is easy to start, easy to carry to excess, and extremely hard to stop. Stopping it becomes increasingly unpopular the longer it is practiced. Gradually such an easy-money, easy-borrowing policy wins wider and wider popular acceptance, even among those who utterly condemned it at the beginning. The situation is aggravated by the fact that it is impossible to know with certainty just when such inflation must be stopped if financial collapse is to be avoided. In such a situation, political leaders are tempted to spend more and more freely and to create larger and larger deficits when they are being met—temporarily—simply by using the printing press.

TODAY'S BILLIONS UPON BILLIONS

Consider our own case today. A billion dollars now sounds commonplace. The prewar doubling of the national debt, as a result of a succession of annual deficits of billions of dollars, was viewed by most people and public officials without alarm, even with indifference. A few years previously, however, when deficits began to occur, even a hundred million dollars sounded like a huge amount of money. Everyone would have been shocked then to know that the subsequent astronomical deficits were to be incurred. This illustrates the chief danger of deficit financing through inflation—the readiness with which the people and their public servants gradually come to view, with growing complacency, its increasing use—the readiness with which they again and again invent new excuses for it and repeatedly revise their definition of the danger point in their eagerness to follow the temporarily easy path just a little while longer.

The public debt's wartime jump from $45,000,000,000 to about six times that figure, with multibillion deficits still continuing despite the war's end, makes this matter one of critical importance to the people as a whole.

The fact that a country is on the gold standard does not prevent the Government from meeting its deficits for a while by inflation of credit or of currency or both; but it does keep the people and their public servants keenly and continuously aware of the dangers involved. A functioning gold standard provides the people with an effective instrument for calling a halt to such deficit financing. It is the best safeguard the people can have against the evils of inflation. As a practical matter, it seems to be their only dependable safeguard.

AN EASY, SAFE STEP

Other countries could not withdraw enough of our gold to force us off the gold standard, because today we have over $20,000,000,000 in gold, several times as much as we need. When on the gold standard we never had over five billions in gold and usually much less. Other countries could withdraw two-thirds of our gold and still leave us far more than we ever had when on the gold standard—much more than we need now for this purpose.

In fact, we have far too much of the world's gold supply for our own good. It is greatly to our interest that other countries have sound stable currencies based upon gold. Our real problem, therefore, is how to help them get a large part of our gold for this purpose.

All that is needed to return this country to the gold standard is an act of Congress requiring the Treasury to redeem paper money in gold upon demand and specifying the amount of gold to be exchanged for each paper dollar. When this has been done, the people of our country will again have a functioning gold thermometer.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a testimonial statement on the occasion of the approaching fifteenth anniversary of the Public Affairs Committee, which is also being celebrated by the publication, in conjunction with the American Red Cross, of the pamphlet Blood—Your Gift of Life. I am glad to pay this tribute to the significant contribution this committee has made to our democracy by its publication of 175 different pamphlets which have now run into a circulation of nearly 17,000,000 copies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE'S FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY AND ON RELEASE OF ITS ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH PAMPHLET, BLOOD—YOUR GIFT OF LIFE, IN COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

In a few weeks one of the country's most unusual publishing ventures celebrates its fifteenth birthday. Fittingly enough its anniversary publication will be issued in conjunction with the American National Red Cross blood program. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to this venture because it typifies all that is best in the American tradition.

The organization is the Public Affairs Committee which this month will begin distribution of its seventeen millionth pamphlet; pamphlets which have come to be recognized as giving reliable, simply stated, down-to-earth facts on important subjects, and which people can use in their homes, schools, churches, clubs, and forums.

As its anniversary pamphlet the committee is publishing Blood—Your Gift of Life, and in a foreword to this anniversary pamphlet E. Roland Harriman, president of the American National Red Cross, pays tribute to its timeliness and calls for the full support of every American for the blood donor program "in the interest of better national health and greater national security." This is the one hundred and seventy-fifth pamphlet to be published at a price people can afford to pay by the Public Affairs Committee, a nonprofit educational organization that stands alone in the field of popular education in important subjects.

The Public Affairs Committee was born in the midst of the depression when everybody was talking about America's social and economic problems, but very few knew the facts. A great deal of research was being done, but for the most part results were buried in the technical journals and were not finding their way to community leaders. How to bridge that gap, how to bring vital information to all Americans in readable form without dogma was a problem met by a group of outstanding economists, political scientists, and educators. Chiefly responsible for the organization of the Public Affairs Committee was the late Raymond Leslie Buell, then president of the Foreign Policy Association, who became its first chairman. Other founders included Luther Gulick, director of the Institute of Public Administration; Harold G. Moulton, of Brookings Institution; Evans Clark, of the Twentieth Century Fund; Lyman Bryson, of Columbia University; and the late William Trufant Foster.

In the spring of 1936 the committee began printing its widely recognized and accepted 32-page pamphlet. The first year the committee congratulated itself on having distributed 100,000 pamphlets at the cost price of 10 cents each. Now more than a million pamphlets a year go out to the public even though costs have increased to 20 cents apiece.

Today, the 175 titles dealing with health and family problems, education, and social studies are available in libraries, bookstores, and schools. They are used by organizations to obtain the latest information about subjects in their field of interest. The pamphlets have been carefully chosen to meet the needs of the times. A year or so ago, when the threat to the American way of life became a paramount national issue, the committee published a pamphlet, What About Communism? by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the Pulitzer prize historian. Immediately after the war it published Rebuilding Europe—After Victory by Hiram Motherwell of the Columbia Broadcasting Co. During the war, when the Armed Forces were in need of a basic pamphlet dealing with race and inter-group relations, the committee published The Races of Mankind, by Ruth Benedict of Columbia University, which itself sold almost one million copies and has since become a little classic in this country with movies, books, scientific exhibits, filmstrip slides, musical comedy, Sunday school programs, and even popular songs and recordings based on its simple story of social anthropology.

A number of distinguished pamphlets on personal economic and social problems have also been issued by the committee. Pamphlets like Facts and Tips for Servicemen, Building Your Marriage, Loan Sharks and Their Victims, and How to Adopt a Baby have been read by hundreds of thousands of people. In the field of health and science, pamphlets on polio, heart, cancer, diabetes, TB, cerebral palsy, arthritis and rheumatism, teeth and alcoholism have brought to millions the latest scientific information in a form easily understood.

The success of the pamphlets can be measured by the high opinion in which they are held. Universities, churches, civic groups, educators, statesmen, industrialists and publishers have paid tribute, at various times, to these objective and informative pamphlets.

Testimonials have been received by Public Affairs Pamphlets from universities as far apart geographically as Columbia in New York, Stanford in California, Xavier University in the East and Occidental College in the West. Church groups ranging from the Protestant Episcopal Church to the Southern Baptist Convention have extolled these pamphlets.

The American Jewish Committee, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Kiwanis International, the National Urban League and the Garden Club of America have all made enthusiastic comments about the pamphlets issued by this remarkable educational committee. The very diversity of the groups cited shows the wide scope of material covered by these inexpensive yet informative publications.

One of our former, beloved and respected colleagues, the Hon. Arthur Capper, once wrote:

"I have just received the complete set of copies of Public Affairs Pamphlets issued by you. You have rendered a great service to agriculture and to our country. I intend to keep these pamphlets on file in my office for future reference."

Ernest Minor Patterson, president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, wrote:

"One of the most valuable media of public education in America today is the pamphlets published by the Public Affairs Committee. To all students of social science they are a most effective supplement to the ponderous presentations of the specialists for the specialists. The Public Affairs Committee is to be congratulated upon the vivid and effective manner in which the topics in successive issues are being treated."

Robert Sutherland, director of the Hogg Foundation in Texas, wrote:

"Your committee is rendering such an excellent service that we want to cooperate fully, calling it to the attention of everyone with whom we work."

J. L. Blair Buck, coordinator of teacher education, Virginia State Board of Education, wrote:

"We make effective use of your pamphlets in our schools, and we value their objectivity."

The Reverend Edward A. Cahill, executive secretary, World Churches Organization, said:

"It is pamphlets such as yours which must be given widespread circulation if American democracy is to be cleaned up here on the home front and the basis laid for a full-fledged American participation in the building of the new world of the future."

Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, whose valued help and wisdom is known and appreciated by all of us, is on record as stating:

"The Legislative Reference Service receives your pamphlets regularly and we find them very useful."

Testimonials have been received from eminent leaders of business and industry who read and use these valuable pamphlets. Among them are Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines; Eli Lilly, chairman of the board of the famous pharmaceutical house bearing his name, and Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the board of General Motors (one of the world's greatest industrial corporations) and founder of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

What kind of committee is the Public Affairs Committee? Who decides what shall be published? How reliable are its pamphlets? The answers are worth noting. The small group of economists, educators, and political scientists who first formed the committee in the mid-1930's have since grown to 26 eminent members. Included among them are doctors of medicine, representatives of universities, the churches, business and organized labor, as well as social sciences. As a committee they have no program of their own to promote, no one school of thought. In fact, their constitution specifically says: "The sole purpose of the committee is educational. It has no economic or social program of its own to promote."

WHO SELECTS THE TOPICS OF THE PAMPHLETS?

The first step in publishing a Public Affairs pamphlet is to select a topic. I have learned that the original suggestion for this may come from a member of the committee or from its staff, from organizations initiating the research, or from users of the pamphlets. These recommendations are studied and are turned over to the organization's board of directors at its bimonthly meetings. The board of directors of this committee is in itself an unusual group in the sense that it has not been drawn from big names to impress people, or because of organizational connection or financial standing. The board consists of people who are informed about the best social and economic research going on in the country and who are competent to judge it. They are definitely not of any one school of thought. But this one thing they do have in common, a great interest in seeing that important social and economic facts reach the largest number of people. The board weighs each proposal for a pamphlet. It decides its present-day importance and relevance to the committee's program. It is the board that decides what subjects should be dealt with.

HOW RELIABLE ARE THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS PAMPHLETS?

From the information I have about the committee, I believe the editorial work on each pamphlet is as careful as it can be. The author selected is recognized as an authority in his field, whose work shows his ability to write analytically and objectively on important issues. To make certain that all of its pamphlets are accurate in fact and reflect the high standards of scholarship in their interpretation, a careful system of checks and balances has been set up. All the manuscripts are submitted to a panel of from 15 to 25 experts chosen by the board to represent a diversity of opinion. On the basis of comments from these experts the manuscripts are thoroughly revised to eliminate doubtful or inaccurate statements, and to present controversial issues adequately, honestly, and objectively.

Before publication the revised manuscripts are again reviewed, first by a subcommittee and then by the Public Affairs Committee as a whole. From these comments final revisions are made. The success of this procedure has been demonstrated in the 15 years that Maxwell Stewart has served as editor. From its first pamphlet to the present, the accuracy of none of the factual statements in a Public Affairs Pamphlet have been challenged by specialists in the subject matter. In subsequent editions, of course, full advantage has always been taken of new knowledge. Pamphlets on current issues in which there is interest are usually brought up to date.

A good many of the Public Affairs Pamphlets are cooperative ventures, with the committee seeking out as many as possible of the groups working successfully in a particular field for advice and criticism in the preparation of the pamphlets. For example, the anniversary pamphlet Blood—Your Gift of Life is prepared in cooperation with the American National Red Cross. A recent pamphlet on heart disease was prepared in cooperation with the American Heart Association. Other pamphlets have been done with the American Genetics Society, the National Association for Mental Health, the Conservation Foundation, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Conference of Christians and Jews. In fact most pamphlets are prepared in close cooperation with the national agencies most directly concerned.

WHO SUPPORTS THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE?

The committee's money, I understand, has come from two sources: grants from educational foundations and sales of the Public Affairs Pamphlets. The initial organizing grants were made by the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, and beginning in 1937 the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation made grants annually for more than 10 years. Since 1943 aid has been received from the Carnegie Corp., Marshall Field Foundation, and the Twentieth Century Fund. The great bulk of its support, however, remains with the people who have bought 17,000,000 copies of the committee's publications.

In surveying the work of this outstanding organization, it is worth noting that pamphleteering has always held a high place in the American tradition, starting with the birth of our Nation and coming down to the present.

As our means of communication expanded, as national publications tended to dominate the field of written thought, as books became a major force in the intellectual life of our country, the place of the pamphlet tended to become obscured. It is difficult to think of another organization which can approach the inspiring record of the Public Affairs Committee in keeping alive the tradition of the American pamphlet—the forceful, intelligent, informative approach to vital subjects at a price so low as to be within the reach of virtually every person.

On this fifteenth anniversary, it is proper to extend to the Public Affairs Committee, its board of directors who have so wisely guided its policies, its staff and its readers the well wishes of all who believe that informed discussion is a cornerstone of successful democracy. I am appending a list of its members to indicate the broadly representative character of this committee.

May it continue its job of popular education in the democratic spirit for many years to come.

THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mark Starr,[1] chairman; director of education, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, New York City.

F. Ernest Johnson,[1] vice chairman; executive director of the central department of research and survey of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

Erling M. Hunt,[1] acting secretary; professor of history (and head of the department of the teaching of social science), Teachers College, Columbia University.

Beulah Amidon,[1] treasurer; associate editor of Survey magazine.

Ethel J. Alpenfels, associate professor of education, School of Education, New York University.

---

[1] Board members.

Eleanor C. Anderson,[1] formerly industrial secretary with the Young Women's Christian Association.

C. Ward Crampton, M. D., a prominent physician.

Robert E. Cushman, Goldwin Smith professor of government and head of department of government, Cornell University.

Thomas D. Dublin, M. D.,[1] director, National Health Council.

Samuel H. Flowerman,[1] director, department of scientific research, American Jewish Committee.

Roma Gans,[1] professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Sidonie M. Gruenberg, adviser on children's books, Doubleday & Co.

George T. Guernsey, associate director of education, department of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Howard Henderson,[1] vice president, J. Walter Thompson Co.

William L. Holland,[1] secretary-general, Institute of Pacific Relations.

S. M. Keeny, formerly director of association press, YMCA, and now on leave with the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund.

Harry W. Laidler, executive director, League for Industrial Democracy.

Robert P. Lane, executive director, community chest of Allegheny County, Pa.

Alfred McClung Lee,[1] department of sociology, Brooklyn College.

Kay W. Levin, labor educator.

Robert M. MacIver, chairman, department of sociology, Barnard College.

John Godfrey Morris, picture editor, Ladies' Home Journal.

Walter E. Myer, director, Civic Education Service.

Ernest G. Osborne,[1] professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Robert H. Reid, executive assistant, National Education Association.

Walter R. Sharp,[1] chairman, department of government, City College of New York.

[1] Board members.

Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 I called the attention of the House to the attempt of Fascist-minded groups in behalf of that monstrosity in the field of taxation, which seeks to repeal the sixteenth amendment—the income-tax amendment to the Constitution of the United States—and supplant in its place the obnoxious millionaire's amendment limiting taxes under our Federal laws to 25 percent on incomes, gifts, and inheritances. At the time I spoke to the House, I had been reasonably assured that the attempt to cram Senate Joint Resolution 7 through the Ohio Legislature petitioning the Congress to call a convention to submit this utterly indefensible proposal to the States for ratification had been definitely defeated. I am now informed that the resolution is still under consideration at Columbus, although the legislators have indicated they are not in sympathy with the objectives of this resolution.

We must ever be watchful, if we on the ramparts are to steer the Nation through the mine fields of financial and economic chaos. During these dark days, we must ever keep lit the sacred torch of liberty. The ratification of the millionaire's amendment would be a major calamity. It would with one fell stroke destroy our financial and economic system. The savings bonds bought by the little people would be so much papier mâché, and in the ensuing disorder, the money barons, like the robber barons of old, would be in the driver's seat, and representative government, as we know it, would disappear like the dying embers of a forest fire. All that we hold dear, all that we have worked for, and our boys have died for, would become a cruel mirage and the hopes and dreams of all our good, solid American citizens would wither and perish.

We must defeat this foul thing, this millionaire's amendment, if we are to survive as a nation. Twenty-two States have passed this resolution which, if approved by 32 States, will force this Congress to call a convention for the submission of this outrageous proposal to the States for ratification. It is, therefore very encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that an attempt is now being made in the New Jersey Legislature to repeal the action of that body taken in 1944, petitioning the Congress to submit the millionaire's amendment to the States for ratification. Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8 presently before the New Jersey Legislature would rescind the action taken by New Jersey 7 years ago. All liberty-loving groups are supporting this resolution, and I hope it will be passed so this stepping stone to disaster will be removed in this fight to preserve our economic order and our sacred liberties.

College Education Put Within Reach of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Wilmington College News, Wilmington, Ohio:

COLLEGE EDUCATION PUT WITHIN REACH OF ALL

WILMINGTON, OHIO, May 2.—A small Ohio college here has provided an answer for critics of college student draft deferment policies which have been called unfair to young men from families of limited means, because a qualified boy may be deferred only if he can afford the expense of a college education.

While the Nation has been debating the issue, Wilmington College has been busy setting up a new kind of work-study program which will enable students to earn virtually all of their college expenses. Under this earn-while-you-learn plan, a college education is available to every qualified young man regardless of his financial resources.

Established to help insure the Nation a supply of trained leaders for tomorrow, the program opens up an untapped source of potential leadership by putting higher education within reach of all who are willing to help themselves.

In announcing this program, Dr. Samuel D. Marble, visionary young president of Wilmington College, explained that the plan was inaugurated on an experimental basis last fall, and that the results have been more than gratifying. Approximately 100 students are now participating in this project and are getting invaluable employment experience as well as an income sufficient to cover their basic costs of tuition, room, and board.

Now that the idea has proven itself to both the college and the cooperating industries and business firms, it will be expanded this summer and fall with opening for 200 more young men and women, Dr. Marble said.

In operation, the plan provides that two students hold down one full-time job. One does the work on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday and attends classes on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, while the other student paired on the job has just the alternating schedule. The students are paid by the cooperating firms at the same rate as full-time workers, and have the advantage of living in dormitories on the campus and enjoying all the privileges of full-time resident students. While the majority are employed in industry, the student is free to select any course of his choice.

Students in the program can complete degree requirements in four calendar years and graduate with their classes holding not only a college degree, but in addition the equivalent of two full years of work experience.

Far-Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Not Much Help" appearing in the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky., on April 23, 1951:

Another great debate, this time over far-eastern policy, is under way. Calm reason and respect for fact ought to play a larger role in this public discussion than was true in the troops-for-Europe argument.

As an example, take the case of Chiang Kai-shek, leader of the Chinese Nationalist forces based on Formosa. The notion exists among many Americans that he commands a large, fairly well-equipped army which is in a fighting mood and needs only a signal from the West to jump into Korea or invade mainland China to help us bring the Korean war to a speedy end.

It is virtually suggested that American lives are being wasted through failure to tap this reservoir of trained military manpower close to the fighting scene.

What are the known facts?

First, though some estimates of Chiang's army run as high as 800,000 men, most military observers put the figure closer to 400,000. This is not a big army, but it is larger than the American forces now in the field in Korea.

The Nationalist army is not well equipped. Chiang's chief American adviser, Adm. Charles Cooke (retired) former Seventh Fleet commander, several months ago guessed it would take $250,000,000 in equipment to out-

fit this force for combat. With prices still spiraling, the cost unquestionably would be higher today. It might hit $300,000,000.

The morale of Chiang's troops is pretty much an unknown quantity. Though supplied with a lot of American equipment, his forces fighting on the mainland right after World War II did not acquit themselves well against the Chinese Reds. The present army has been held together on Formosa with difficulty over a 2-year span. It is not battle-tested.

It is wholly possible that with adequate equipment this army might give a good account of itself. But there is no way of knowing that in advance. Those who assure us the Nationalists would fight successfully are guessing since no facts exist on the matter.

Let's suppose we should give the word to Chiang to invade China proper. He has no air force worthy of the name and no fleet of consequence. Only the United States could provide the necessary sea-air cover to protect a mainland landing. And since air operations would necessarily involve bombing shore installations, troop concentrations, communications, and other facilities, it is hard to see how such assistance could do anything but immerse this country in a wider war with China.

Russia of course has a mutual defense pact with China. No one not inside the Kremlin knows whether she would honor the obligation to assist Mao Tse-tung if we gave Chiang the sea-air cover for a mainland assault.

Senator TAFT says such an attack would not bring in Russia and lead to general war. One wonders how he can know what the Soviet reaction would be, unless he is privy to Stalin's secrets. Obviously, since the defense pact exists, a very grave risk would be taken of precipitating a big war.

This is not an attempt to decide whether we ought to take that risk. That is for the American people to decide, acting through their elected representatives. But at least they should make their judgment in full knowledge of what is involved and in full appreciation of what sort of instrument Chiang's army might be in a wider fight against communism.

Nothing known up to this moment suggests that Chiang would be ready to fight quickly, or guarantees that his forces would fight well, or assures us that his entry would shorten the far-eastern war rather than lengthen and broaden it. It is the facts, and the facts alone, that lead to this conclusion.

Who Said There Is a Shortage of Iron Ore?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial taken from the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of February 27, 1951, reveals a possible 4,000,000 tons of iron-ore deposits available at the Steep Rock mines in Canada.

The railroads are there and so are the ships to transport the ore to the mills, which means that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is unnecessary.

The editorial follows:

WHAT OF STEEP ROCK ORE?

The New York Herald Tribune appears to have done a little surveying of its own regarding the North American iron-ore outlook, a matter which the Truman administration has stressed as of the greatest concern in connection with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. Cabinet members and others under influence of the administration represent that unless a seaway is constructed for transportation of Labrador-Quebec ore the steel mills on the Great Lakes won't be able to continue operations for many years more. They say that the ore of the Mesabi Range is running out and there are no near deposits on which these mills can draw. But the Herald Tribune tells a different story. Here is what it said in an article Monday:

"The little town of Atikokan in Ontario bids fair to become the seat of one of North America's greatest iron-ore-mining operations. The Steep Rock mines, 6 miles from Atikokan, may be developing into another Mesabi right before the eyes of this ore-hungry country. Prominent Canadian mining engineers, who recently made an exhaustive study of the new Step Rock potential, believe the ore in this area may extend to a depth of 4,000 feet. They maintain that the immensity of this discovery—a possible 4,000,000,000 tons of iron deposits—is not realized even in Canadian mining circles. This would compare with Mesabi deposits (reserves and used) of 2,500,000,000 tons."

Ore is now coming out of Steep Rock at the rate of 1,200,000 tons a year, and the company operating there "has under active development a new mine which will raise annual output to 4,000,000 tons. The Canadian National Railway has a 147-mile line running from the deposits to Port Arthur at the head of Lake Superior. "The ore-loading dock there may be tripled," says the Herald Tribune, "and 25 new ore-carrying ships may become necessary." Thus the delivery of Steep Rock ore to steel mills on the Great Lakes would be a matter of a few hundred miles. On the other hand, ore from the Labrador-Quebec region would have to be transported 360 miles by rail to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and more than 1,000 miles by water to reach these same mines.

The spokesmen for the Truman administration have chosen to ignore the Steep Rock deposits, but these ought to be taken into account by Congress as it considers the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, one which cost more than $1,000,000. Remember it will be necessary to deepen every harbor on the Great Lakes to accommodate the ships which are expected to provide service through the seaway.

Mitbestimmungsrecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in Fortune magazine of April 1951:

MITBESTIMMUNGSRECHT

On January 25 American industry discovered the specter of mitbestimmungsrecht. It was the day that West German Chancelor Adenauer yielded to the threat of a general strike in the Ruhr Valley and agreed to a proposed law granting the workers codetermination or, legally, a 50-percent share in the management of the steel and coal industries of the country—the largest in Europe. The National Association of Manufacturers, in a letter to the German consul general in New York, condemned the plan and warned that "American investors are watching the developing situation with increasing concern." Editorial voices were also raised in opposition.

In actual fact, however, the issue was settled 4 years ago when the British military occupation established codetermination in 80 percent of the west German steel companies. Given the history of German cartel machinations, such a move was almost inevitable. It was the price that ossified European capitalism was paying for a long series of mistakes. The question raised at Bonn on January 25 was whether this established system would be written into German law. In the decision the unions won a 30-year battle.

In 1919 German labor won the right, under the Weimer Constitution, to establish "works councils" in which employees had a voice in setting wages and plant working conditions. After Hitler fell, the occupation authorities in the three western zones revived these works councils (law No. 22) as the basic labor law of military occupation. However, this was now too pale for German unions. Pointing to the fact that many of the Ruhr industrialists had financed Hitler and other reactionary political groups, the late Hans Boeckler, Socialist head of the West German Trade Union Federation, declared that "money must not be allowed to become the basis of political power and to cause another disaster." Codetermination was a move to end this power.

In the British area the old steel cartels were decentralized and 24 new companies created in their stead. The occupation authorities acted as trustees for the stockholders. In 1947 the Iron and Steel Control, as the trusteeship was called, agreed to a codetermination scheme.

In Hesse, within the American zone, the state passed a codetermination law for industry in that area. Similar steps were taken in Württemberg-Baden and Bavaria. But these actions were nullified by General Clay, who ruled that they went far beyond the intent of law No. 22. Clay suspended the new laws until the federal constitution of the new German Republic should be promulgated. Later (April 1950), however, United States occupation authorities relented, and in Hesse and Württemberg-Baden codetermination was allowed.

The parliamentary situation in January arose when the Allied High Commission ended further control of the coal and steel industries and announced that the companies were being returned to the owners. In the absence of a law providing for codetermination, the trade-unions feared these gains would be abolished. Hence the threat of the general strike.

But why did Adenauer capitulate? The singular political fact is that codetermination is not only a Socialist demand. (Some Socialists, in fact, oppose it, fearing that the scheme will be a barrier against full socialization of industry.) Much of the backing for codetermination has come from Catholic labor and from the left wing of Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party. Codetermination is for them a cardinal element in Catholic social theory. In September 1949, the Seventy-third Catholic Social Conference, held in Westphalia, declared, in startling language:

"Catholic workers and employers are agreed that the right of co-determination for all workers in social, personal, and economic questions is a natural right in the order intended by God, to which right corresponds the obligation of coresponsibility

for all. We demand that this right be established by law." This statement by a quasi-official Catholic body has been cited throughout Western Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

Catholic labor, which today accounts for roughly 40 percent of the German Federation of Unions (a merger of the pre-Hitler Christian and Socialist unions dictated by the occupation authorities), is solidly behind codetermination, and this pressure was an important force on Adenauer.

The codetermination scheme, as presented by the Adenauer government, calls for more than equal participation by labor in plant management. It provides, virtually, for the syndicalist organization of industry. At the head of the steel and coal industries is a senate of six members, appointed by the government, three on the suggestion of the trade unions and three by those members of company boards who represent stockholders. The senate acts as umpire in any deadlock over the selection of managers in individual companies.

Each individual company is ruled by an 11-man board of directors. Five men (one of whom must be a "public" person) are nominated by the stockholders. Five are nominated by the union. The eleventh is chosen by the other ten, but he must be approved by at least three members each from the labor and stockholder groups. Under the board of directors are three operating officials, two for production and sales, nominated by the stockholders' bloc, and the labor manager, nominated by the unions. However, a two-thirds vote of the board is necessary for confirmation of each official; hence the labor group maintains an effective veto on all three. Production plans are drafted by the board and the three-man managerial staff. But all policy decisions—allocations between dividends and wages, plant expansion, sales methods, and so forth—are decided by the board.

The codetermination scheme, as blueprinted by Bonn, gives tremendous power to the top union leaders. Under the law, only two of the labor directors come from the plant, one is a "public" person, and the other two are named by the national union. Such a system will strengthen the move to industry-wide bargaining.

The German codetermination scheme may arouse an appetite in American unions for similar plans here. The CIO has long favored "industry councils," which in conception, if not in detail, resemble the German version. Its convention endorsements written by an ardent socialistic Catholic, John Brophy, have been applauded by many Catholic prelates. Archbishop William Walsh devoted his invocation sermon at the 1948 CIO convention to this theme. Catholic labor papers, in fact, citing Socialist regard for British nationalization as extreme, are claiming codetermination as their own.

What the Jews Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, appended are two reviews, one from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle and one from the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, of the recently published book What the Jews Believe, by a distinguished clergyman, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, Rochester, N. Y. This essay has aroused such deep interest that I trust a reference to its purport and content will be of interest to the Members and encourage reading of the whole book.

The above-mentioned reviews follow:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of April 15, 1951]

RABBI BERNSTEIN'S NEW BOOK REVEALS KINSHIP OF FAITHS

One of the little books that seem certain to exert a profound influence on American thought, if not on the thinking of the remainer of the world, is What the Jews Believe, by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, Rochester.

Published this week by Farrar, Straus & Co., of New York, the little volume of only 100 pages contains within its covers a summary of the basic facts concerning that religion which, by sheer spiritual power, has enabled the Jews to survive through thousands of years of misunderstanding and persecution by more numerous neighbors. Readers familiar with the Bible will recognize at once the close religious kinship between Judaism and Christianity. Indeed, it is evident, from the interest created by the condensed summary which appeared in Life magazine, that already a great deal of misunderstanding has been swept away through Rabbi Bernstein's presentation of the principles and practices of the Jewish people.

With the appearance of the new book, which is a more complete statement of the case than was possible in magazine space limitations Rabbi Bernstein's interpretation of the Jewish faith becomes available, in handy, popular form at a price ($1.25) within the reach of the average reader.

Without question, What the Jews Believe is one of the most significant books of this era, of the greatest importance to both Jew and Christian, enabling each to understand not only the other, but themselves as well.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of April 1, 1951]

CLEAR, INFORMATIVE

WHAT THE JEWS BELIEVE, BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN

A modified draft of this book appeared some weeks ago in the magazine Life and is said to have caused more comment and resulted in the receipt of more mail than had occurred since the magazine was founded.

It is not surprising that it should have attracted so much interest among people of the Jewish faith, and of other faiths as well. It is as clear, informative, and impressive a statement of the religious beliefs of the Jewish people as has ever been compiled. Certainly there is nothing in modern times that approaches it in the graphic, succinct, and memorable way in which it states the basis of the religious convictions of a great and religious people.

Each of the Jewish holidays and festivals is taken up in order and there is a clear exposition of all of them that should be most helpful to anyone who reads this volume.

There are chapters on the holy days, the Jewish year, Succos, Chanukah, Purim, Passover, Shavous, and Am Yisrael Chai which make it clear why people of the Jewish race throughout so many hundreds of years have observed them and treasured them as a racial and spiritual heritage of supreme value and comfort.

C. M. S.

Baby Chick Industry Faces Serious Economic Dislocation If S. 1335 Is Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Parks, of Altoona, Pa., chairman of the transportation committee of the International Baby Chick Association appeared before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on May 2, 1951, in opposition to Senate bill 1335.

Mr. Parks, speaking for the baby-chick industry, made a strong statement in opposition to S. 1335 and warned of the evil effects that will follow should the proposed legislation be approved.

Mr. Parks' statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert Parks. I am general manager and part owner of the Parks Barred Rock Farm, Altoona, Pa. Our farm has specialized in the breeding and hatching of poultry for more than 5 decades. We produce approximately 500,000 chicks annually, 90 percent of which are shipped to farmers and hatchery-men via parcel post.

I am here today in behalf of 5,000-plus poultry hatcherymen and breeders who are fellow members in the International Baby Chick Association. Bulk of the membership of our association resides and operates within the United States. I am chairman of the transportation committee.

We estimate that association members produced approximately 75 percent of the 1,250,000,000 chickens hatched in this country last year. Over 92 percent of all the chickens raised in this country today are purchased as day-old chicks from commercial breeders or hatchers.

Of this total, we estimate that 50 percent moves from the hatchery to the farm via parcel post. Another 40 percent is delivered locally by the hatchery or picked up at the hatchery by the farmer. The remaining 10 percent moves via railway express and air cargo.

It is the opinion of our members that S. 1335 fails to improve upon postal service, will add to its already large deficit, and will serve no purpose other than to force the cream of the less than carload parcel business away from the post office and into the hands of the Railway Express Agency. The facilities of the Railway Express Agency are not considered adequate for general use by our industry.

While there are provisions in S. 1335 which will enable our industry to continue to ship chicks in much the same manner as we are now doing, S. 1335 is looked upon by us as an opening wedge in a drive to drastically impair the parcel-post service.

Our industry would find itself undergoing a serious economic dislocation in such an eventuality.

The development of the commercial poultry hatchery industry can be traced to 1916 when the Post Office Department first accepted chicks for mailing via parcel post. The economy of the industry has been based on this service.

The benefits have not been one-sided. In addition to the regular parcel-post rates, we pay a special handling fee of 25 cents on every parcel shipped. This fee is estimated

to account for 50 to 75 percent of the Post Office Department's total income from special handling fees.

The ability of the farmer to order chicks for delivery via parcel post has enabled him to obtain breeding stock from the Nation's outstanding flocks. It has been a tremendous factor in boosting the average annual production per layer from only 90 eggs in World War I to more than 162 eggs now.

Taking into consideration the many changes that have taken place in our transportation system in the last 10 years, including the elimination of numerous local trains and local stops, our industry still considers parcel-post service to be generally satisfactory. There are rough spots occasionally, but we usually can smooth these out in conferences with postal officials.

It should be apparent to all that S. 1335 spells reduced service, less efficiency, and higher shipping costs for business in general. It means inefficiency, more clerical detail, and less income for the Post Office Department.

S. 1335 means hatcheries served by first- or second-class post offices, for example, must carefully check the type of postal service accorded each customer in preparing his order for shipment. Shipments going to customers served by first- and second-class offices but not on RFD or star routes, must travel in single unit boxes of 100 chicks each.

As a matter of fact, the safety-type boxes with over-all dimensions of 73 to 78 inches could not be used at all in filling such orders. The standard winter-size chick box measures 72 inches. The larger sizes, however, enable us to ship chicks with greater freedom from over-heating or smothering en route, the principal travel hazard.

The employees at the first- and second-class post offices will face added clerical duties, too, for they in turn must recheck what the hatchery shipping department has done with respect to determining whether the customer is served by a first- or second-class post office.

All of this adds up to a tremendously inefficient operation. Delays will surely occur. A missed train often means a 24-hour delay, and a 24-hour delay frequently means a bad loss.

The damage does not make itself known, in many cases, until after the chicks have been fed for several weeks. Thus, everyone stands to lose—the hatcheryman, the Post Office Department, and the farmer.

Insofar as we have been able to determine there is nothing in S. 1335 that will help the Post Office Department overcome its deficit. It probably will aggravate the problem. Denied the right to carry packages weighing in excess of 20 pounds beyond the second zone, it will lose a lucrative portion of its volume. It doesn't cost the Post Office much more to carry a 40-pound parcel for which it receives $3 into the sixth zone than it does to handle a 5-pound parcel for which it earns about 50 cents.

If S. 1335 is enacted, postal facilities will remain unchanged. There will be about the same number of post offices and terminal facilities. The number of employees will hold at or above the present level, but the utilization of these facilities and personnel will decline. The per-unit cost of handling parcels will go up.

It doesn't take a crystalgazer to see the end result—higher and higher rates on all remaining parcel-post business.

This is exactly what has happened on railway-express business. Rates have been shoved higher and higher, and the good customers still using the service find themselves penalized for doing so as they are called on to absorb a larger portion of the operating expense.

Once again the International Baby Chick Association wishes to voice its opposition to S. 1335 and any other measure which threatens to curtail our use of the parcel-post service.

The economy of our entire industry has been tied in with our ability to deliver chicks via parcel post almost since the very start of the service. Our industry is not a Johnnie-come-lately using the service as a temporary expedient.

We are one of the oldest, largest, and most consistent users of parcel post. It's a life line for us. We see in S. 1335 something that tends to upset the pattern of service in the immediate future.

Of even more concern is the feeling that it is a forerunner of greater curtailments and restrictions in years to come.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, those of you who have been receiving letters opposing the Echo Dam project in Utah will find information of interest to you in two items which I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. The first is a letter which I have received from Mr. Frank Ward, secretary of the Colorado River Development Association, which points out a number of errors in the Interior Department project planning report on the Colorado storage project and participating projects. Echo Dam is one of the key dams in the Colorado storage project.

I should like also to place in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Ernest Untermann, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History, to Dale E. Doty, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. In this letter Dr. Untermann seeks to correct certain erroneous reports which have been published about the pending destruction of geological values by the proposed dams.

And finally, I should like to place in the RECORD a clipping from the Salt Lake Tribune which tells how the Utah Federated Artists, at first opposed to the Echo Dam project because they feared it would endanger scenic values in the area, found after a first-hand study of a special committee that this was not true, and voted to approve the project.

The above-mentioned follows:

COLORADO RIVER
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, April 14, 1951.

Hon. REVA BECK BOSONE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOSONE: The Colorado River Development Association has carefully considered the Colorado River storage project and participating project, upper Colorado River Basin, more clearly identified as Project Planning Report No. 4-8a.81-1.

We respectfully submit herewith the comments of said association.

As to the details of the construction of the 10 storage projects, we highly commend the Bureau of Reclamation Director of Region 4, Mr. E. O. Larson, for the magnificent manner in which he has presented this report. We also highly commend Commissioner Michael W. Straus for his visionary recommendation to the Secretary. We approve the order of construction, viz, Echo Park Dam, Flaming Gorge Unit, Glen Canyon Dam, Navajo Unit, and the White Water Unit.

The recommendation that the Secretary of the Interior be granted authority to operate recreational facilities at the project sites is approved and highly recommended by this association.

The recommendation that the projects be built and operated in conjunction with State water conservancy districts is highly commended.

We take the following exceptions to statements made by the National Park Service:

1. The request of the National Park Service for $25,000 per annum for 3 years to excavate "important dinosaur sites within Echo Park and Split Mountain Canyon" should not be allowed for the reason that there are no such sites within this area. Mr. Ernest Untermann, Director of the Utah Field House of Natural History (the only man who has completely geologized the monument) emphatically states there are no dinosaur remains in this area due to the fact that the formations of the area are a hundred million years younger than that of the formation wherein the dinosaur remains are normally located.

2. The statement by the National Park Service that "Utah State Highway No. 44 runs from Vernal while unimproved roads lead southward from Greenriver, Wyo." is an indication of the National Park Service lack of information of this region. The road leading south from Wyoming is a greatly improved road over half of which is paved, the other half of which will be paved this year to the Utah border.

3. The National Park statement that "It is surmised that the reservoir and construction activities would destroy or damage a number of archeological sites," is another indication of the Service's lack of information and this paragraph should be removed from the report because the Park Service themselves have stated in another portion of the report "it is not known whether an archeological survey of the site has been made."

4. The National Park statement paragraphs 1, subparagraph 1, and subparagraph 3 on page 39 are misleading for the reason that they tend to impart the information that the National Park Service has restored the Dinosaur National Monument to its original state as far as grazing and agriculture pursuits are concerned. This is not so. They have not interfered with either. The statement in subparagraph 2 is misleading because it established facilities in the area for proper recreational use and administration of the area. The buildings in the area were constructed by the CCC boys. There has been no new construction since that time. The so-called museum is lined with a material resembling gunny sacks upon which hang crudely painted signs.

5. On page 44 of the National Park Service statement it states that U. S. No. 30 runs through Vernal, Utah, while Highway 30 runs through Greenriver, Wyo. This is a transposition and should be changed.

6. In the report of the Fish and Wildlife Service, last paragraph on page 10 and first and second paragraphs on page 11, we take exception to the following statement, that the reservoir would create more rough fish than could be taken for sport. Representatives of the Colorado Fish and Game Commission and the Utah Fish and Game Commission believe that the Echo Park Reservoir will become a great sport-fishing area, second only to Lake Mead, and that the river below the dam, because it will become a clear stream of water, will become an excellent trout-fishing area for as much as 50 miles below the dam site.

The statement that the reservoir would seriously reduce the deer wintering area and

that it is doubtful if the remaining range could maintain the present deer herds is pure imagination and is not based upon any facts. The director and other members of the Colorado Fish and Game Commission, representatives of the Utah Fish and Game Commission, sportsmen of the area, Mr. Ernest Untermann, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History, all concur that the reservoir will not have any adverse effects upon the present deer herd, but that a benefit will actually arise in that the water will rise in the canyon so that the deer will be able to secure drinking water without climbing down the sheer side of the canyon walls.

We sincerely urge that the above statements be carefully analyzed and corrected.

This association unanimously supports the project plan and urges the immediate construction there.

Very truly yours,

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
B. FRANK WARD, *Secretary.*

Approved:

B. H. STRINGHAM, *President.*

UTAH FIELD HOUSE
OF NATURAL HISTORY,
VERNAL STATE PARK,
Vernal, Utah, April 15, 1951.

DALE E. DOTY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOTY: Thank you for your letter of April 6 in which you inform us that item (a) which appears on page 47 of the National Park Service portion of the project planning report, Colorado River storage project and participating projects, Upper Colorado River Basin, December 1950, should have read: "To excavate two important fossil sites in Echo Park and Split Mountain, respectively, * * *," instead of dinosaur fossils.

With your kind indulgence and without, I hope, appearing difficult and cantankerous, may I clarify something for the record?

My sole interest in this controversy and in the controversy over the proposed dams in Dinosaur National Monument is to give factual data and, insofar as possible, to avoid any ambiguous statements which might confuse or mislead the public, or be seized upon by any group for the purpose of misrepresenting the true facts. For these reasons I feel that the above mentioned item (a) represents an unfortunate choice of language and would have better been stated as invertebrate fossils instead of merely fossils. This is particularly true when item (a), in the full report, requests $25,000 annually for 2 years of study, plus an additional $20,000 for a museum in which to exhibit the fossil material. This makes the fossils of Echo Park and Split Mountain look very important indeed, in the eyes of the lay public, an importance which facts certainly do not warrant.

I readily concede that the planning studies of the National Park Service in Dinosaur National Monument are none of my affair. I am again only concerned with giving exaggerated importance to an area which does not warrant such special attention, and which infers a value which does not exist. Item (a) creates the impression that great values may be inundated by the dams in Dinosaur National Monument and gives the opponents of the dams new fuel with which to create a smoke screen of bias and misrepresentation.

Let me give you the facts concerning the Split Mountain and Echo Park invertebrate fossil areas:

At the Dinosaur National Monument hearing of April 3, 1950, in discussing the fossils of the area, I said, in part, "A few marine invertebrates will be covered in Carboniferous (Paleozoic) formations in Split Mountain, Whirlpool, Lodore, and Yampa Canyons, but are abundantly represented in the canyon walls, rims, and elsewhere in the monument and on the outside." The abundance of this invertebrate material, in identically the same formations with identically the same members present as in the canyons, is adequately illustrated by the fine Paleozoic fossil localities in other areas of the monument. Some of the more outstanding of these are: Round Top, Martha Peak, Tanks Peak, Bear Valley, Thanksgiving Gorge, East Cactus Flat, Douglas Mountain, Zenobia Peak, Wild Mountain, Harpers Corner, and Jones Hole. To single out Split Mountain and Echo Park for special study, as though some great scientific values were about to be lost, seems to us, utterly ridiculous. In the immediate vicinity of Dinosaur National Monument, but outside its boundaries, are other excellent Paleozoic fossil localities. Diamond Mountain, Lena Peak, Brush Cheek Mountain, and Taylor Mountain are but a few of these. All these areas, both inside the monument and outside its boundaries, are far from any river beds and are wholly unaffected by any dams in the canyons of the monument.

In addition to having mapped the geology of the entire monument, Mrs. Untermann and I have made special studies of certain areas and have publications covering this work. The first of these, Geology of Green and Yampa River Canyons and Vicinity, Dinosaur National Monument, Utah and Colorado, G. E. and B. R. Untermann, appeared in the May 1949 issue of the Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. It deals with the stratigraphy and fossils of the area. The Morgan Formation of Whirlpool Canyon, Green River Dinosaur National Monument, Uintah County, Utah, G. E. and B. R. Untermann, appeared in the December 1949 edition of the Oil and Gas Possibilities of Utah, issued by the Utah Geological and Mineralogical Survey. This paper is a comprehensive study of the Morgan Pennsylvanian beds giving a detailed description of its 104 members and the marine invertebrate fossils they contain. Fossil identifications were made by Drs. Lloyd G. Henbest and James Steele Williams, of the United States Geological Survey, with headquarters in the National Museum. Drs. Henbest, Williams, and John B. Reeside, Jr., all of the United States Geological Survey, and Dr. G. Arthur Cooper, of the United States National Museum, as well as Dr. Christina Lochman, a Cambrian specialist, all contributed to the fossil determinations of the first paper mentioned above. Stratigraphy of the Split Mountain Area, G. E. and B. R. Untermann, appeared in the Guidebook to the Geology of Utah, No. 5, which was published by the Utah Geological and Mineralogical Survey in 1950.

I mention the above publications to show that studies have already been made of the areas which item (a) of the National Park Service report lists as worthy of special consideration. Also that the diagnostic fossils are known to the scientists of the United States Geological Survey and the National Museum and that geologic determinations have already been made on a basis of these identifications. Also that the same formations and beds are present in rank profusion throughout the entire area. Paleozoic exposures are so common that threatened inundation in a limited area need be no cause for concern.

Very sincerely yours,

G. E. UNTERMANN.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of March 21, 1951]

ARTISTS GROUP TO SUPPORT DAM PROJECT—ECHO PARK'S BEAUTY, VALUE ENHANCED, CLOSE STUDY SHOWS

A proposal that the Utah Federated Artists join other aesthetic and conservationist organizations in opposing construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument Friday resulted in a report strongly endorsing the project.

Lynn Fausett, president of the federation of art societies of the State, said a special committee had been named to investigate the project as a result of a motion at the last convention by Miss Mabel Fraser, associate professor of art at the University of Utah, that the federation go on record opposing the project.

HEADED COMMITTEE

Instead of taking action at that time, Miss Fraser was made chairman of a committee to investigate the proposed project, which has been subjected to a barrage of criticism from groups in the East interested in preserving aesthetic, scientific, and scenic values. But after a first-hand study, the committee submitted a report to the executive officers which prompted them to approve the project. Highlights of the report follow:

1. Fossils: Not affected. Are miles away from the project.

2. Geology: Well represented in other canyon walls.

ARCHAEOLOGY STUDIED

3. Archaeology: Area to be flooded already studied and explored.

4. Biotic values: Well represented throughout monument area.

5. Economic values: No minerals or oil occur in monument.

6. Inspirational values: No inspirational values will be lost, since principal trout streams and majestic canyon walls are outside the area to be flooded. The area will be opened to public observation by the project.

7. Ice jams: Ice jams, which have proved so dangerous to bridges and holdings along the stream, can be regulated by the dam.

8. Economic security: Water power would unlock many of Utah's natural resources and enable more of her people to find employment at home. The water is badly needed.

The Parson Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article entitled "The Parson Speaks Up," by Rev. John A. Bolen, pastor of the Methodist Church, Van Buren, Mo., which was taken from the Current Local, of Van Buren, Mo.:

THE PARSON SPEAKS UP

(By John A. Bolen)

I am never worried very much about public opinion among people who will do some thinking for themselves. People who allow somebody else to do their thinking for them are the people who stir up the most trouble in society. Some people, thriving on prejudices and excited by hullabaloo, are always ready to climb up on somebody's band wagon. More often than not, it is the wrong wagon.

Take, for instance, the big fuss about General MacArthur. In this instance there are two band wagons. Of course, in the interest of the best citizenship, each of us should sooner or later come to have a definite opinion or set of opinions in this matter.

However, I believe that we ought to be willing to wait until all the excitement is over. If we could clear all the political hogwash out of the way of our thinking, that would be a distinct advantage. Granting that this may have elements of both right and wrong in it, the fact remains that it is largely a matter of partisan politics, and I hope that all of us have the gumption to know that partisan politics may stink to high heaven.

As a parson, I have always prayed that I might be blessed with an intelligent congregation. That sort of congregation is infinitely more pleasant to work with than a crowd of people who are lacking in intelligence. So far, with the very least exceptions, I have been fortunate in this respect. People do not necessarily have to have college degrees in order to be intelligent. In fact, all of us know many intelligent people who did not finish high school and many other intelligent persons who did not get through grammar school. However, academic training provides intelligent folk with some real advantages.

The core of my argument is: We should do our own thinking and not be stampeded by somebody else's bush beating and flag waving.

A Bit of Hard Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, cold analysis eventually breaks through and always survives emotionalism. Walter Lippmann has been doing an excellent job on that score in the so-called MacArthur-Truman controversy. Another of his down to earth, unemotional, but factual, contributions appears in today's Washington Post in his syndicated column, as follows:

A BIT OF HARD FACT

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is a bit of hard fact, in no sense a military secret, which is not often mentioned though it is of the greatest possible importance to an understanding of the real issues.

That bit of hard fact is that American strategic airpower cannot be brought to bear effectively against the vital centers of the Soviet Union except with the consent and active collaboration of Great Britain and France. I do not believe that anyone can dispute the truth of this statement. The bomber fleet does not now exist, and could not be constructed in any near future, which can attack in force the Soviet heart-land from bases which are under American sovereign control.

Strategic air war against the Soviet Union cannot be conducted with any prospect of being decisive from the Pacific side, that is to say from Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and Alaska. The distances are prohibitive for any sustained assault. To the nearest and by no means the most important industrial area the round trip from Japan is about 5,000 miles. The vital centers of Russia are in the Urals and in European Russia. They cannot be attacked seriously from the Pacific side. They cannot be attacked seriously across the polar ice. They can be attacked seriously only from the European side. But that attack cannot be delivered now, or in the foreseeable future, except from bases under Britain and French sovereignty.

This is the hard fact which has to be taken into full account by anyone who wishes to judge responsibly the issues that are now being debated.

The use of the British and French bases, though it would be indispensable if we were at war with the Soviet Union, cannot be taken for granted under any and all circumstances. The bases do not belong to us; the bases in both British and French territory could not be used unless and until Britain and France had declared war. It is by no means certain, it cannot at all be taken for granted, that they would or could declare war against the Soviet Union in Europe if the Soviet Union confined its action to the Far East. We must remember that the North Atlantic Pact has nothing to do with the Far East.

I am not suggesting or implying that our British and French Allies would not stand by us if we ourselves were the victims of plain aggression in the Far East. I believe they would stand by us. But I mean to say that we must not count upon their support if, against their strong objections, we involve ourselves in a general Asian war. They are bound to hesitate to involve themselves in such a war. For if the war is in Asia and if the Soviet Union does not attack in Europe, how sure can we be, how sure have we a right to be, that the French Parliament would vote for a war that invited an invasion, or that Britain would choose to begin a war in which she might receive the first atomic blow from the Russian side. How would Senator TAFT vote if he were an Englishman and a member of the House of Commons, how would he vote if he were a Frenchman and a member of the French Assembly? We shall be prudent and wise if we assume that the instinct of survival will act very powerfully in Western Europe; and that the people of Western Europe are not likely to stake their very existence on the soundness of General MacArthur's ideas.

We must not deceive ourselves about the genuineness of this condition of affairs, and shrug it off by ascribing it to leftism, to fellow travelerism, to defeatism, and to neutralism. The recent French governments have been as cooperative as it is possible for any French Government to be. Yet they have had to cut down on the facilities they intended to open up to us. At that one can make a very good surmise about what is really happening among the French people by looking at the position now taken by General de Gaulle in his bid for power. His slogan is "Security against the adversary (Russia), independence with regard to the Allies (America)." And then to make it sure that no Frenchman misunderstands him, General de Gaulle has demanded "an alliance and not a subordination" and he has denounced "the encroachments (that is, our bases and facilities in France and in north Africa) now incurred through the weakness of our regime."

Thus General de Gaulle, who leads the French nationalist and fiercely anti-Communist movement, is making it plain as he runs for office that he does not regard the Atlantic Treaty in its present form as finally a settled matter.

Our alliances in Europe are not yet consolidated, and what is going on here these days is subjecting them to a fearful strain. Perhaps the agitation would become subdued, perhaps the discussion would become more temperate, if more people understood that the crack-up of the alliance would be tantamount, or very nearly so, to the neutralization of our strategic air power as a global force. Were the European bases to be closed to us, our air power would be reduced to a regional instrument incapable of being deterrent or decisive.

CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker News of April 21, 1951:

WE DO CARE

When Americans face that eternal question, "What can I do to make this a better world?" they might take a look at the statistics on CARE and behind the figures see a heart-warming picture of good neighbor policies at work.

CARE recently marked the shipment of the ten millionth package abroad. In 5 years the American people, through this agency (Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.) have sent the equivalent of 26,000 head of cattle, 100,000 pigs, 32,000,000 cups of sugar, flour for 33,000,000 loaves of bread, 360,000,000 cups of coffee, 56,000,000 quarts of milk. They have added new items, such as coal, seeds, plows, toys, medical equipment, and most recently a tool package for gardening in India and Pakistan.

From countries all over the world grateful praise has come for lives saved, burdens eased, children given a decent chance. CARE packages have been delivered by camel and airplane, on foot, and on elephants. Each package has been a tangible bit of American generosity, a practical proof that the people of this country are kin with the peoples of all the world.

More directly personal than Marshall plan aid, more workable than point 4 programs, CARE has been since the war perhaps the most potent instrument for building up American prestige, for counteracting the propaganda designed to show us as selfish, unfriendly penny pinchers. Here is aid freely given and directly to the point of need, with no questions asked, no strings attached.

The need continues urgent. America, having started this unique humanitarian agency, cannot let up now. Packages are still being made up at CARE's great storehouse in Philadelphia. Information will be given gladly by CARE headquarters at 20 Broad Street, New York City.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cincinnati Enquirer, an analysis of the results of a poll of that newspaper's readers on the subject of the MacArthur dismissal:

MISTRUST IS SHOWN TOWARD PRESIDENT IN POLL OF READERS—FIVE THOUSAND VOTE ON MACARTHUR ISSUE AND ALMOST ALL SAY TRUMAN BUNGLED

(By Donald Urban)

Cincinnati area Enquirer readers once again have expressed their disapproval of the

Truman administration. In the second of two readers' views polls taken by The Enquirer, persons returning ballots showed unmistakable mistrust in their President's policies.

Unlike the survey of a month ago which covered a number of important questions of the times, such as the troops-to-Europe issue and wage and price control, last week's poll was limited to but one subject—the MacArthur dismissal.

So intense was the public interest in this controversy that some 5,000 people took the time and went to the trouble of filling out and mailing in the questionnaire ballots which were printed for 3 days in the Enquirer. In the previous general survey, which also ran for 3 days, the number responding was 1,610.

Statistically, the returns showed some interesting trends.

Most astonishing of these trends, of course, were the answers to the first question—"Did President Truman do the proper thing in removing MacArthur?" Only one reader in every 11 answered this query with a "Yes," while 92 percent said, "No; the President did not do the proper thing."

FIRST QUESTION DRAWS "NO'S"

The first question was the only one on which the "No" answers outweighed the "Yes." On No. 2 through 4, the "Yes's" had it.

Question No. 2 read, "Did General MacArthur have a right to express a personal opinion on our military policy in Asia?" Coincidentally, the percentages on this question were numerically equal to those of question 1. The difference arises in that they were reverse; 92 percent of the Enquirer readers returning ballots saying "Yes." Hence, 11 said the general had a right to express an opinion for every 1 who said he didn't.

Only 6 percent of Enquirer readers are willing to trust President Truman's judgment on Asiatic policy. Ninty-four percent, however, would go along with General MacArthur on far eastern policy in answer to the third question on the public opinion survey, "Would you be more willing to trust MacArthur's judgment on Asiatic policy than Truman's?"

"Has President Truman hurt our position in Asia by this move?" It was believed that he did by 93 percent of readers returning ballots. This means that only one person in 13 felt that the status of United States prestige in the Far East remains unchanged following the General's removal.

OVERWHELMINGLY FOR MAC ARTHUR

General MacArthur received overwhelming majorities on each question. The first and second by 11 to 1, the third by 15 to 1 and the last by 13 to 1. But by digging deeper into the statistics, other interesting facts can be uncovered.

Twenty-nine percent of the people who voted "Yes" on the first question, favoring President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur, said "Yes" to the second question, too. In other words, this 29 percent felt that President Truman did the right thing but that the general had a right to express a personal opinion.

Equally paradoxical are the 29 percent answers to the third and fourth questions. Of that group sanctioning the administration's action, 23 percent said they would rather trust General MacArthur's judgment on Asiatic policy than Mr. Truman's. An interesting fact—they approve of Mr. Truman's removal of General MacArthur, but they would feel safer if General MacArthur were back at his old post.

Possibly the most astonishing is the 17 percent who approved of President Truman's action yet feel that the Chief Executive hurt our position in Asia by this move. Seventeen percent of the people voting "Yes" on the first question voted "Yes" on the last one, too. It would be interesting to see how this group reconciles their two answers.

CONVERSE BALLOTING IS SLIGHT

For the benefit of the skeptics who feel that by the clever use of statistics any argument may be proved, we show that the converse of the above calculations is infinitely smaller.

Only 2 percent of those voting "no" on the first question voted similarly on the second. Only one person in every 49 felt that Mr. Truman did not do the right thing and that General MacArthur did not have a right to express an opinion.

"No's" to both one and three would have given, "No, Truman did not do the right thing, but I would trust Truman's judgment more than MacArthur's on Asiatic policy." The people who said this amounted to 0.7 percent.

The smallest statistic figured was 0.03 percent. This applied to those who voted "No" on both questions 1 and 4. The 0.03 percent said, "No, Truman did not do the right thing, but he hasn't hurt our position in Asia by this move."

What this survey proves, this writer does not attempt to say, and refers readers to today's editorial page. The survey was not conducted by scientific pollsters or based on the so-called random sampling method. It was, however, an effective and interesting poll of public opinion in the Cincinnati area and Ohio Valley Members of Congress will receive copies of this newspaper.

Influence Here Enables British To Ship War Goods to the Soviet and Red China

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling the attention of Congress and the country to the action of Great Britain in shipping strategic war materials to China and the Soviet.

Congress passed an act in September 1950 prohibiting economic and financial assistance to any country whose trade with Russia, including Red China, is found contrary to the security of the United States.

Arthur Sears Henning, in a news item published April 30 in the Times-Herald newspaper, of Washington, D. C., says upon this subject:

INFLUENCE HERE ENABLES BRITISH TO SHIP WAR GOODS TO SOVIET—CONTACTS THAT CAUSED MACARTHUR FIRING PAVE WAY TO EVASION OF TRADE LAW

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

British Government influence in Washington, which brought about the dismissal of General MacArthur, is being manifested in numerous other matters, according to congressional investigators.

One is the shipment of war materials by Great Britain and other Atlantic Pact countries to Russia and Russian satellites, which has reached gigantic proportions.

PAID FOR BY UNITED STATES

In many cases, the materials have been furnished to the exporting European countries by the United States under the Marshall plan. As a result, American taxpayers are paying for the materials and equipment being used to shoot down American soldiers in Korea and to prepare Russia to do likewise if world war III should come.

To British influence is ascribed the failure of the administration to enforce the act of last September 27 forbidding economic or financial assistance to any country whose trade with Russia or her satellites, including Red China, is found contrary to the security of the United States. Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri, urged President Truman in a letter on March 9 to enforce this law. The President made no reply.

BRITAIN SELLS TO RUSSIA

In his letter, the Senator said he had been informed by the Commerce Department that Britain sold nearly $330,000,000 worth of machine tools to Russia last January alone.

KEM also cited the report that Italian factories aided by the Marshall plan were speeding products for Russia and that a Soviet economic party was in Genoa to expedite delivery of electric cranes and thermal-power stations from two factories that were Marshall-plan beneficiaries to the extent of $1,625,000.

The scandal of the arming of our actual and potential enemies by our allies was aired in the Senate with repercussions in the British Parliament.

A member of the British Government stated that there would be no cessation of the trade to which the Americans objected. The agitation did result, however, in a British announcement last week that the export of steel and other potential war materials from Hong Kong to Red China is being embargoed. This is only a trickle compared with the flood of shipments of war materials by Britain to the Soviets through Western Europe and other points on the vast Russian perimeter.

TO RUSSIA VIA CHINA

Russian imports of natural rubber before World War II averaged 35,000 tons a year. In 1950 they bought directly about 85,000 tons, most of it from British Malaya. In addition, 38,000 tons of Malayan rubber went to China, and 44,000 tons to British Hong Kong to be transshipped to the Soviet Union. Another 22,000 tons went to Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

China has no way of using rubber in manufacturing, so for 1950, 189,000 tons went to Russian industries as against 35,000 tons in a normal prewar year.

Russia also took 42,500,000 pounds of wool in 1950 and 2,000,000 pounds of cotton, 700 tons of tin. Practically all this from British and Commonwealth sources.

Little Czechoslovakia got 13,127 tons of copper from Belgian Congo in 1950, 7,000 tons of zinc, 1,100 tons of lead, all from Belgium.

The Belgians sold Russia more than $8,000,000 worth of machinery and machine tools and equipment in 1950.

The British shipped $28,000,000 of machinery and machine tools to the Soviet Union in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, just what is the administration trying to do? Knowing that Great Britain is engaged in feeding Red China and Russia with war materials, why do we not follow the law and end all economic and financial assistance to Great Britain?

Are we not permitting our relations to continue with a country which is giving aid and comfort to our enemies? Soon Congress will be asked to make more appropriations available to Great Britain and if any Member of Congress votes for this kind of appropriation, are they not guilty of treason? We can give aid and comfort to the enemies of this country, but if we do we are guilty of treason. Is it not just as much a treasonable act

to give money to a country that will at once use it to give aid and comfort to our enemies, when we know that country is trading with our enemies?

This is the third time I have presented this matter of trade with our enemies to the Congress. At this moment, the matter of that trade is heated argument in Parliament. The charge that I have made against Great Britain of trading in strategic war materials with our enemies is now admitted in Parliament.

The September law referred to reads as follows:

SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interest of the United States.

This act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951."

There is one loophole in this law and that is that this trading must be found by the National Security Council of this country to be contrary to the security of the United States. Under this law we cannot make the finding that trade is being carried on with our enemies—the Security Council must make the finding, and unless that body does that, are we to sit here with our arms folded while Great Britain supplies Red China and the Soviets with rubber and steel? This law clearly forbids our giving any economic or financial assistance to those countries so trading with our enemies. Now when more appropriations are asked for for Great Britain, are we to extend that assistance in face of the admitted fact that Great Britain is so trading with our enemies? For one, I am not going to wait until the National Security Council finds that such trading is contrary to the security interests of the United States, but I will act now—with all this evidence before us—and not vote one nickel to Great Britain.

No Member of Congress can find the least possible excuse for extending aid economically or financially to Great Britain. To now extend this aid in the face of the admission of Great Britain would come within the definition of treason against the United States.

The Victory We Seek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the speech made by Ambassador Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, at the New York State convention of the Grand Masters of the Masonic Order, Hotel Statler, on Tuesday, May 1, 1951, entitled "The Victory We Seek":

THE VICTORY WE SEEK

(By Ambassador Warren R. Austin)

"Come now, and let us reason together." (Isaiah 1: 18.)

Our friends around the free world who want to rely on our leadership are listening.

Our adversaries whose totalitarian tactic is divide and conquer are watching.

Let us not conceal our fundmental unity by a smoke screen of explosive dissensions. Let us reason together as Americans sharing a common purpose—peace and freedom—for ourselves and for others.

In that spirit, I want to discuss with you two questions underlying the global struggle for peace with freedom. That struggle the free world is determined to win. What, then, is the victory we seek? What will it take to win it?

Our country is now performing as a member of the United Nations a leading role in the first collective use of force to repel an armed attack.

On June 25 the Communist attack on Korea required the United States and the United Nations to choose between resisting the aggressor or submitting to aggression. There was no other choice.

The Security Council acted promptly and with unity. It called for an immediate cessation of hostilities and for the aggressor to return to the line from whence he began his invasion. At the same time, it called upon all members to support the United Nations policy and to refrain from assisting the North Korean authorities.

If the invader had heeded the Security Council, the victory we seek over aggression would have been won then and there. But Communist imperialism continued to activate its first step through puppet armies. The Communists were seeking far more than the capture of the Republic of Korea. Their objective was conquest by force of country after country. Therefore, their strategy flaunted the Security Council. They could not advance their plan without discrediting the United Nations.

The decision of the Security Council that collective action ought to be taken by member states marked the departure of civilization from the way of Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Sudetenland, and Munich.

The risk of acting had to be weighed against the consequence of not acting. Experience warned us that it would not be peace, but a series of new aggressions, capitulations of the weak before the mere threat of attack, disintegration of free world collaboration, and death to the idea of collective security. We could foresee the fatal miscalculation by Communist imperialism leading to the step that would be resisted, whatever the cost. And then, the cost in lives and destruction would be astronomical.

The free world hailed the decision to act in Korea. Today there is wide agreement that it was a sound decision from every standpoint.

Let us keep clear what that decision was, and why it was taken. Fifty-three governments, members of the United Nations, voluntarily and spontaneously supported it; 15 nations quickly put forces into the field and Ethiopian troops are now arriving; 41 states contributed supplies and material aid.

These contributions have not been poured into a vacuum of policy. Every one of the nations who have declared their allegiance to the United Nations' action have given that allegiance to a policy they have carefully examined and then determined to support.

The policy of the United Nations in regard to Korea is clear, positive, and consistent.

The political objectives of the United Nations in Korea have been set forth for all the world to see since 1947. Those objectives have been repeated and reaffirmed at each annual session of the General Assembly—in 1948, in 1949, and again, on October 7, 1950.

The military objectives of the United Nations were declared in the Security Council resolutions of June 25, June 27, and July 7, 1950.

Always, until the end, protection of the lives of the people of the Republic of Korea and aid to them in the preservation of their liberty inspires the United Nations.

The intervention of the Chinese Communists in Korea has not been ignored by the United Nations. The additional policy required by this new fact was set forth by the General Assembly in its resolution of February 1 this year.

All these resolutions represent United Nations policy. Because that policy has been consistent from the very beginning, the essence of these resolutions can be summarized and stated briefly.

Militarily, the objective is to repel the aggression and restore international peace and security in the area.

Politically, the objective is to establish a unified, independent, and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea.

We will adhere to both these purposes.

The United Nations has not declared, nor has it ever been asked to declare, that the political objective must be achieved by military means. In fact, the emphasis has been quite the contrary. The policy of the United Nations has been—and should always be—to achieve its political objectives, by pacific settlements.

The United Nations does not exist to conduct war, but to stop it—by peaceful means, if possible; by united force, if necessary. In our allegiance to the United Nations, this is a fact we must never forget.

Even in branding the Chinese Communists as aggressors, the United Nations, in a resolution sponsored by the United States, held open the door to peaceful settlement.

That resolution of February 1, 1951—a resolution which is today exactly 3 months old—expressed both United States and United Nations policy. I think it is worth recalling today.

It affirmed the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression.

It called upon all states and authorities to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea.

And it affirmed that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea, and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means.

Those are policies—clear, definite, and positive policies—which we need to keep in mind in judging developments in Korea.

In October, the forces of the original aggressor were, in large part, defeated and destroyed. This was a major triumph over aggression. It was and remains a triumph for the free members of the United Nations.

Then, the Chinese Communist leaders launched a new aggression in a last minute effort to prevent such an overwhelming triumph for peace. We defeated the first aggression. We will defeat the second.

Up to tonight the two aggressions by Communist imperialism have failed to achieve either of their immediate objectives: (1) The North Korean puppets to occupy the Republic of Korea; (2) the Chinese puppets to drive United Nations forces off the peninsula.

The gallant action of our boys and their comrades in Korea has done more than deprive the Communists of their immediate

objectives. It has served notice that Communist imperialism will encounter collective resistance wherever it attacks.

This same notice was given by the General Assembly in its resolution of November 17, 1950, entitled "Peace Through Deeds," in which 50 nations formally determined that for the realization of lasting peace and security it is indispensable that prompt, united action be taken to meet aggression wherever it arises.

While we continue the struggle to fulfill our objectives, let us not devaluate the glory of the sacrifices already made by our men in Korea by discounting what they have gained. Their achievements have inflicted calamities upon the Soviet grasp for empire and world dominion.

The Korean conflict has unmasked the Soviet's phony world-wide peace offensive.

It has exposed the Soviet designs for conquest on the installment plan.

It has upset the Soviet timetable for new conquests on the Korean pattern.

The Korean conflict has rallied the first collective force and action behind United Nations principles.

It has stimulated the United Nations to develop new machinery and better methods for meeting future threats.

It has brought the free world to a new peak of unity in the United Nations.

But, most important of all:

The Korean conflict has alerted people all over the world to the imminent dangers of Soviet aggression.

It has strengthened the will of nations to stand together and resist aggression.

It has aroused the free peoples to the necessity of mobilizing their strength for defense, and may thus have saved civilization.

These accomplishments make the stakes in Korea very high, and the need for sober and responsible weighing of policy very great. We must not be panicked into making a fatal error at this crucial stage, an error which might lose all that we have gained and precipitate the world war we are trying to prevent.

The Chinese Reds and their supporters are taking tremendous risks in a desperate attempt to blast the collective barricade from the path of aggression.

The hope of dividing the councils of the defenders gave the Communists their only chance of eventual success. The growing controversy over tactics stimulates their hope of destroying the United Nations. Their present offensive seems to be timed for its impact on a state of confusion and dissension in the ranks of the free.

The victory they seek is the breaking of our unity in this country and in the free world. They hope to isolate the United States from its friends and allies. They hope by persistent pressure to split us asunder over questions of tactics to counter their manuevers, and make us lose sight of our global strategy.

The victory we seek is possible. It will not be easy, but it will be infinitely less costly than general war. It depends on strength, unity, and cooperation.

If these are the essential elements for victory, let us determine to close ranks and present an unshakable world front to the forces of aggression. Let us reason together to find the best way of acting together.

Certainly we can disagree and try to persuade each other of the soundness of our opinions. This can be done in perfect freedom of discussion. We do it all the time at the United Nations. But we must not arm our arguments with canes to beat the rightness of our views into each other's heads; or engage in battles of invective and denunciation. The Soviets have tried it for 5 years with this result: They have convinced nobody and isolated themselves from everybody. Let us not follow that bad example.

I have not talked tactics in this short discussion. Rather, I have tried to keep my eye on the grand strategy by which we hope to stop aggression where it started, discourage its attempt elsewhere, prevent the spread of war, restore peace where it is broken, and make the free world secure by collective action. These are the terms of the victory we seek.

We know from the bitter experience of the past 5 years that victory involves far more than the defeat of an enemy. Therefore, I repeat that the fight to stop aggression in Korea is a fight to prevent it everywhere else in the world. The aim is not to settle political issues by force, but to prevent the aggressor from imposing a settlement by force.

The aim is not conflict without limit, but peace without appeasement. That is the victory we seek.

City Folks and Meat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "City Folks and Meat Prices," which appeared in the Bozeman Daily Chronicle of April 27 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY FOLKS AND MEAT PRICES

City folk in the East seem to have a strong impression that they could be eating steak dinners for a dollar a throw if those greedy ranchers out in the West weren't gouging them.

Every day or so some urban commentator waxes indignant over the high cost of food. And nearly always his little tirade winds up in a blast at the farm bloc, which he pictures as a sinister gang of congressional bumpkins busily conspiring to woo the hayshaker vote.

These lambasters of the sunburned Shylocks, when they talk about food costs, usually think in terms of animal products. They seldom are outraged by what they have to put out for a good mess of diced carrots or cornmeal mush. What concerns them mostly is meat.

It's a pity, they point out, that a farmer can't be content to set a humane price on his livestock, so city people who aren't situated so they can keep their own sheep will be able to buy lamb chops without mortgaging their cars.

All this only goes to show how little some people know about the processes that bring them their daily nourishment. The truth is that the farmer doesn't set the price on his livestock. He takes what he can get for it. There is nothing that would please him more than to be able to sit down and figure out how much money, labor, and talent he has invested in his sheep and then decide that he will charge so much a pound for them.

But that isn't the way it works. The farmer is engaged in a colossal gambling enterprise that makes the underworld syndicate racket look like Sunday school turkey raffles. And the percentages are by no means rigged in his favor. He risks his chips in the open market and backs his own judgment against the whims of consumers the world over as well as the weather.

No law compels anybody to pay him what he thinks he ought to get for his sheep or hogs. The consumers decide how much they are willing to pay for lamb or pork chops, and that sets the price of sheep and hogs. If the consumers can't get pork chops for what they are willing to pay, they can always decide to buy hominy or something instead. But if the farmer isn't willing to sell his hogs for the offered price, he can't decide to sell corn instead. He decided to raise hogs months before, and it's too late to back out now. If he doesn't want to take what he can get for them, all he can do is keep them for pets. And hogs make very expensive pets.

If good steaks cost so much that only those on Government expense accounts can afford them, why cuss the farmers? He is one of the few who are doing something sensible to hold food costs down. He works by the sun, not the whistle—sometimes two 40-hour weeks a week. He is producing lots more meat now than he did before the war, with less help.

That would bring prices down if we weren't eating 10 pounds more per head this year than we were then.

Training of Airmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Critical Situation," written by Mr. Charles A. Parker, and published in the Civil Air Patrol News of April 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRITICAL SITUATION

That the fixed-base and/or flying service and school end of the flying industry is being torn to pieces is evident on every hand and that definite need exists to replenish the airman pool through federally sponsored training is shown in the following:

THE MILITARY AND DRAFT

Recall to active duty has already depleted the ranks of other-than-airline aviation to a serious extent in the pilot category alone. The draft is also making serious inroads in all classes of personnel.

THE AIRLINES

Air carriers are looking for pilots; also for mechanics. They are reaching for the fixed-base operator and his personnel, with this end of the industry being robbed of personnel. Their advertisements are on airport bulletin boards. Their hiring agents are at operator meetings. Their advertisements appear in aviation publications.

EXECUTIVE AIRCRAFT USERS

According to a statement by a key member of an association involved with this category, they are looking for skilled multiengined and instrument-rated pilots. Vital defense and mobilization transportation by these people is facing a curb.

AERIAL DUSTING AND SPRAYING

Reports are received that this activity has been cut into seriously by both the military and the draft. Such pilots cannot be trained or replaced overnight. The California Legislature recently found the situation so acute that they passed a resolution directed to Selective Service and the military ecnouraging every consideration of pilots in this category. Vast acreages and food supplies will be jeopardized if this continues.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

These industries are attracting all classes of personnel from fixed-base aviation with expanded activity and high pay scales. Persons with mechanical skills in particular are being drawn into defense work. Who will replace them? Airports are closing. The sponge is being thrown in by the operators.

AIR FORCE CADET CONTRACT SCHOOLS

Contracts with only four schools so far exist, yet these schools are already experiencing difficulty in obtaining qualified instructors. What of the additional contracts to come? In addition, public funds are being wasted on cadets in such schools who start training on T-6 aircraft—$1 out of every $3 thrown away, as per Gen. George Kenney, USAF. Prescreening of such cadet material is positively needed to save the biggest part of this dollar, as well as to help preserve existing civil training resources.

THERE WILL BE NO AIRMAN POOL LEFT

Fixed-base aviation is fast melting away. With this are going many airports. This means that civil defense resources are going—the training resource is going—vital fast direct taxi and company transportation service is melting—agriculture will suffer.

Here are the things that civil aviation schools should be doing immediately irrespective of the still greater basic need for a widespread program of aviation and flight indoctrination among the youth of the country in the lower age levels.

1. Refresher courses created for airline and executive user needs, instrument and multiengine ratings or development of such ratings from existing or former commercial pilots.

2. Refresher and development courses for aerial applicator pilots.

3. Refresher and finishing courses for instructors for the AF Contract Cadet Schools and for the civil school facility as well. Note that the expansion of ROTC to include flight training with civil schools that appears certain to come will create a new demand in this category alone. Notable is the fact that in World War II the first shortages developed in the instructor category.

4. Prescreening of AF flying cadets for economy.

5. Development of mechanic skills to feed all phases of activity through the aviation trade school.

If the airman training legislation now pending, which is designed to meet the civil and military needs of the country, were law, the above situations could be met by cooperative planning, evaluation of shortages, and estimates of future requirements, by CAA in connection with appropriate agencies of Government, industry and the military. Necessary training programs could then be established.

The question is heard, where are the GI trainees? This is easy to answer. Some have become established in other activities. Others have returned to military service. Many have already lost ratings and proficiency or were never able to obtain instructor, multi-engine, or instrument ratings under arbitrary and crippling VA restrictions. Neither did they have, nor do they now have, the money with which to purchase such ratings or obtain refreshers. Many could be brought back to replenish the civil pool through the program pointed out here under an airman training act if it were law.

If these are the conditions at a stage no further along than mobilization is at the present, what will be the situation as the tempo of mobilization increases or should we ever reach a fateful "M" day?

Principal conclusion from all this is that early hearings on the airman training legislation, S. 507 and/or the House version, H. R. 1521, must be held by the House and Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees and every effort be made to create this legislation as law.

Ships Aiding Reds Mortgaged to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ships Aiding Reds Under United States Mortgage," written by Helen Delich, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPS AIDING REDS MORTGAGED TO UNITED STATES—CHINESE COMMUNIST PRODUCTS CARRIED TO WEST EUROPE

(By Helen Delich)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Eight ships currently involved in a single movement of grain and grain products from Communist China to Western Europe are under mortgage to the United States Maritime Commission.

Seven other identified vessels engaged in this transaction were purchased from the United States for cash by Greek-Panamanian and South African interests.

The remaining 12 freighters named in the consignment are registered as British and Russian.

LOSS PUT NEAR THREE BILLION

Since the 15 American-built Liberty-type ships were sold under the Ship Sales Act of 1946, they were embraced in a scathing attack made Wednesday by Senator WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, on the legislation. At that time, he pointed out that this Nation had lost nearly $2,800,000,000 in these sales.

Then the Senator noted that the British had permitted seven Nationalist Chinese ships under mortgage to the United States to be taken over by the Communists in Hong Kong and Singapore, and added:

"It would be interesting to know how many more of the ships which have been sold to foreign operators are today being utilized to transport goods in trade with Communist countries."

ARRANGED BY HUNGARIANS

The vast single transaction of approximately 380,000 tons of soybeans, maize, wheat, beans, etc., from China to Europe was arranged by Hungarians in London.

Shipping circles hint that these same freighters are carrying strategic general cargo to Dalny, Taku Bar, Tsingtao, and Chinwangtao—all Red China ports—to discharge before loading grain.

It is believed that the general cargo or the income derived from it is being used to pay Communist China for the grain. Informed sources here state that the exact nature of the general cargo cannot be determined, but presume it contains items sorely needed by the Asiatic countries battling United Nations troops in Korea.

GRAIN FLOWS IN FROM UNITED STATES

At the same time, grain and its products from the United States are flowing into the same Western European ports under the Marshall plan and other aid programs without any cost to these countries.

The freight rates on the grain from China to Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg, or Gdynia range from $25.50 up per ton, considered favorable for the shipowner or charterer.

Exporters and importers assert that this particular transaction typifies cargo movements and the use of ship-sales vessels in the over-all international trading picture.

The 8 ships under mortgage are part of 100 Liberty freighters sold on credit to 75 individuals and firms with the backing of the Greek Government in 1947. These ships specifically were to be used in Greek foreign commerce to help rehabilitate that nation.

Many of the owners live in New York and are associated with various shipping firms under as many varied foreign flags.

The mortgaged ships are the steamship *Costantis* (formerly *Harry Leon Wilson*), sold to the Pateras Bros.; *Nicolas* (*William N. Byers*), sold to A. & J. Ch. Mavrophillippas & Ch. N. Pateras; *Pinios* (*Robert L. Hague*), Athena Maritime Co., Ltd.; *Themistocles* (*Frances S. Barton*), Ionion Steamship Co., Ltd.; *Nicolaou Georgious* (*Frederick Tresca*), Mrs. Z. Nicolaou and family; *Konistra* (*Edwin L. Kodkin*), Thomas N. Ephiphaniades; *Annastassios Pateras* (*Betty Zane*), Dimitris Annastassios Pateras; *Panaghia K.* (*Albert A. Michelson*), Andreas G. Caravais.

CASH-PURCHASED SHIPS

The cash-purchased Liberty carriers are the *Atlantic Seamen* (*Samuel W. Williston*) and *Atlantic Wind* (*Henry M. Robert*) to the Atlantic Maritime Co., of Panama; *Liberator* (*James B. Aswell*), to Compania Naviera Pan-Americana; *Enterprise* (*Charles Dauray*), Cia Naviera Pomerosa, of Panama.

The Northern Steamship (Pty.) Ltd., of Johannesburg, South Africa, paid cash for the *President Pretorius* (*James B. Hickok*), *President Steyn* (*John G. Nicolay*) and *President Kruger* (*John M. Palmer*).

Instruction of Young People in Affairs of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a good

idea expressed to me from Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y. On a voluntary basis, Mr. Kress was of much help in the Senate Crime Investigating Committee's work. He suggests that some arrangements should be made, preferably through a voluntary patriotic association, to make available to the splendid young men and women who are visiting our Capitol a short talk about the meaning of some of the things which they see here as it relates to better citizenship.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 15, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I believe we could do much more in this country than we have been doing in the schools, churches, and homes to build character and citizenship in the boys and girls who will be the men and women of tomorrow. I believe tremendously in the youth of this Nation; that they mean well, that their hearts are right, that they want to be fine, good citizens of a fine, good country. The great and serious interest displayed by young people throughout the Nation in the Senate Crime Investigating Committee hearings was to me a very encouraging indication of the fundamental integrity of our young folks.

The question in my mind is whether we older people, we who call ourselves the leaders of this Nation, are doing all we can, and are fully meeting our responsibilities to give our boys and girls the leadership, guidance, and assistance necessary to help them in their honest desires to become good citizens and real Americans.

Right here in Washington are we doing all we can in this direction? Everyday now, and for all the rest of this month, the corridors of this Capitol are overflowing with boys and girls from all over the country—bright young students at perhaps their most impressionable age. They come to Washington, visit points of interest, and leave. But our Government neither takes them by the hand nor speaks to them.

Couldn't we do something better than this? Couldn't we have a speaker from the Government, or from the American Legion or some other patriotic organization, meet each group of these junior citizens as they visit the Capitol, speak to them briefly, explain to them what good citizenship means, and how it, and it alone, has made this great country possible? A speaker to give them a few inspiring words and thoughts which they will keep in their hearts always, associated with the memories of their visit here—a speaker to tell them that Washington is really theirs, that tomorrow they will inherit it from their fathers and mothers—that here in Washington, despite the sensationalism of headlines from time to time, there are good, honest, sincere, hard-working Government officials, Congressmen, Senators, and judges working faithfully and earnestly as true Americans to keep and protect that priceless heritage of American citizenship safe and secure until these young Americans are ready to take over the grave responsibilities of carrying on.

Couldn't we arrange to do something like this, so that all these fine, intelligent boys and girls who are flocking through the Capitol corridors every day now, do not go away empty-handed, without any message of welcome, encouragement, or inspiration?

Can we say we are fully doing our part here in Washington if we miss this opportunity to help in the job of building good citizenship in the youth of today?

Sincerely,

CHARLES KRESS.

OPS Roll-Back of Beef Prices Unfair, Unworkable, and Confiscatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me by the House today, I am including a copy of a telegram from the members of the Flint Hills Farmers and Livestock Growers Emergency Association, expressing opposition to the roll-back of meat prices ordered by the Office of Price Stabilization.

This message was sent as the result of a meeting of approximately 800 farmers and livestock men in my immediate vicinity. Nearly all of these people are farmers who handle comparatively small herds of cattle, and who depend upon the farm and livestock for their living. These people are, after all, the backbone of our country. They are among our best citizens. They do feel that the order of the OPS is not an order of stabilization, but of discrimination, demanding that they accept a lower price on the market for their product than what it is really worth. The telegram reads as follows:

EMPORIA, KANS., *May 4, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This evening in Emporia at the initial meeting of the Flint Hills Farmers and Livestock Growers Emergency Association, the 815 members present gave their unanimous approval to the following resolutions. You are urged to give them your most vigorous support.

1. *Be it resolved,* That the roll-back of beef prices as ordered by Office of Price Stabilization be reconsidered since it is unfair, unworkable, and confiscatory for the farmers, livestock growers, and businessmen of this important cattle-producing area. We submit that it is also detrimental to agricultural and related industries of the United States.

2. *Be it resolved,* That you use your utmost efforts to see that in the forthcoming discussion of the Defense Production and Mobilization Act, and especially article IV of that act, the interest of labor, agriculture, and industry are fairly and fully discussed; that, if it be considered necessary to extend or rewrite this act, you are urged to see that an equitable and workable agreement in which the time element necessary to carry on the normal livestock program, which in this community is from 9 to 15 months, is arrived at. This group would like specifically for you to see that should it be considered necessary, after due consideration by the Congress, to impose controls on any one segment of the economy that they be applied to all groups of industry, labor, and agriculture and not any one segment by itself.

MEMBERS OF FLINT HILLS FARMERS AND LIVESTOCK GROWERS EMERGENCY ASSOCIATION.

The Federal Government's Part in Airport Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by me before a meeting of the American Association of Airport Executives in Minneapolis, Minn., on Monday, April 23, 1951:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S PART IN AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to you who bear the day-to-day responsibilities and headaches of managing the Nation's airport facilities. As a member, for some years past, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives—which committee, as you may know, among its other duties considers Federal legislative matters pertaining to aviation—I believe that I have gained some appreciation of your problems and of the importance of our airport facilities to the successful functioning of air operations as a whole, particularly in these difficult times when increasingly greater demands upon aviation facilities are being made.

While I am going to center my comments this evening [afternoon] on the Federal Government's part in airport developments, I fully recognize, as you do also I am sure, that the Federal Government is and can be only one of the partners in expanding and improving the Nation's aggregate of available airport facilities. The part of the local community sponsors, and of you as the operating executives actively on the job, determines more than anything else how well the airports function as an indispensible arm of aviation. To you must go much of the credit for what has been and is being accomplished.

ESSENTIALITY OF AIRPORTS

It has aptly been said that an adequate system of airports is the essential "taproot of all aeronautical activity." Obviously, the finest and swiftest aircraft which man has been able to devise can serve no useful purpose, aids to safe navigation in the air are by themselves pointless, and the most expertly trained flying personnel is helpless and futile unless the port facilities are available which enable the planes to take off and to reach safe landings at their appointed destinations. It is only by means of adequate airport facilities that any community can become a significant part of the stream of air commerce.

These altogether self-evident observations would require no particular mention were it not for the notable fact that throughout most of the history of aviation up to the present the development of adequate airport facilities has tended rather persistently to lag behind improvements in other aspects of aviation's growth and progress. If this be true, as it has been recognized to be by many who are interested in the sound and balanced growth of aviation and air commerce, it becomes important to consider how existing and prospective airport deficiencies can be overcome and how the responsibilities, financial and otherwise, for the necessary improvements should appropriately be divided among those who are concerned.

EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

It may be helpful to note very briefly the background of airport developments in this country. For more than a decade prior to World War II, the Federal Government, under various work-relief programs, had provided the greater part of the funds spent for the construction of airport facilities. The local communities and sponsors were required, however, to provide the sites as well as to assume the costs of airport maintenance and operation. Considering the lack of experience in airport planning and design in that early period, and also the fact that these airport projects were more often than not hurriedly conceived and carried out as emergency measures to provide employment, it is not surprising that many of the facilities proved to be poorly located, designed, and constructed. To a large extent it may well be true that, under the circumstances then existing, future airport needs could not have been very clearly foreseen. But at least we do know by hindsight that a large part of the airport expenditures made in the decade of the thirties failed to produce facilities of lasting value. In any event, the mistakes that were made provided some needed lessons to guide subsequent developments.

Beginning in 1941 and continuing through the war period, airport construction had to be geared into the war effort, with priorities limited strictly to those facilities which would contribute most to military requirements and the national defense. Under the DLA (defense landing area) program in World War II a total of 535 municipal airports were constructed with Federal funds. As before, the municipal sponsors were expected to furnish the sites and, except for direct military operations, to bear the continuing costs of operation and maintenance. Thus, throughout the first 15 years of Federal participation in airport development, emergency conditions prevailed which dictated the essentials of the programs which were undertaken.

THE POSTWAR PROGRAM AND LEGISLATION

After the conflict, wherever possible these war-built facilities were converted to civilian use, even though in many instances they were not wholly suited for such purposes. Nevertheless, the war undoubtedly accelerated the growth of airport facilities, even as it stimulated the advancement of aviation generally.

At the present time there are some 2,100 municipal airports in this country. Counting all types of landing areas and strips there are, of course, many more than this—altogether about 6,500—but most of this total number are suitable only for the smaller aircraft, local operations, and emergency landings when circumstances require. Many of these existing airports have been established since the close of the war and most of them have been substantially improved or enlarged in recent years.

In 1946 the Federal Airport Act was adopted (Public Law No. 377, 79th Cong.). For the first time under this act provision was made for a sustained program of airport construction directed primarily toward the development of a national system of airports designed to meet the needs of civil aviation. Prior to that time, as I have mentioned, Federal airport aid had been extended mainly in connection with emergency programs, first of depression and then of war.

The 1946 act authorized the appropriation of $520,000,000 to be spread over a 7-year period on the basis of matching grants to sponsors of public airports in the States and certain of the Territories. No restrictions as to the classes of airports eligible for Federal assistance were specified, apportionments as between larger and smaller airports being left broadly to the discretion of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The act did provide that the funds be spent in accordance with a national airport plan to be formulated and revised as necessary by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Good airports do not spring into being overnight. They require, as you well know, careful planning and working out of financial problems. For these reasons, and also because the initiative in airport development still must come from the local community sponsors, the program envisaged by the 1946 act started and gathered momentum rather slowly. Even so, appropriations for the first 4 years totalled $157,000,000 through the fiscal year 1950, or at the rate of nearly $40,000,000 a year.

At this point I should like to refer briefly to amendatory legislation affecting the airport program which Congress has enacted in recent months. The first of these amendments, which became effective on September 27, 1950 (Public Law No. 846, 81st Cong.) extends for five additional years beyond June 30, 1953, the period during which the $520,000,000 authorized by the 1946 act may be expended. This extension should enable the public airport sponsors to proceed carefully with their plans under assurance of continuity in the availability of the Federal funds which are provided.

The second airport amendment to which I refer became effective on January 9, 1951, under Public Law No. 912, Eighty-first Congress. Heretofore, the Federal Government has borne only 25 percent of the site-acquisition costs for airports, whereas usually the Federal share in other respects has been 50 percent of construction costs. This restriction as to the financing of sites apparently hampered some communities in getting desirable airport projects under way and, perhaps more important, was contributing in some instances to the selection of poor locations and the building of airports on too small an acreage. On the other hand, communities which were farsighted in selecting the best available sites, even though more costly as to the required original outlay, were in effect being penalized by the 25 percent restriction. It was widely felt that, because of the basic importance of suitable location and adequate size, the Federal Government should not weigh the scales against sound long-run airport economy. Consequently, under Public Law 912, the Federal Government now bears the same portion (50 percent) of land costs as it can pay of other developmental costs. As I understand it, many administrative and legal difficulties in distinguishing between land-acquisition costs and other costs have also been eliminated by this change.

NEED FOR INTEGRATED AVIATION FACILITIES

One of the greatest aviation needs now, it seems to be agreed, is for more deliberately considered integration of aviation facilities. By such integration I mean, for example, that sound airport planning requires account to be taken of associated changes which are occurring or are in prospect with respect to flying equipment and air-navigation facilities. This problem is of particular importance to you as airport managers because it is the airports in many instances which are now, and threaten increasingly to become, the limiting bottlenecks to further aviation advances.

Especially from the standpoint of safety and dependability of flying, we can all of us heartily applaud the great strides which have been made recently in the development of an improved all-weather common system of air-traffic control under the so-called SC-31 program, which was initiated on the basis of the report in 1948 by the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics and which is planned for completion by 1963. Already it is apparent, however, that this common system of air-traffic control, which is expected to cost the Federal Government considerably more than $1,000,000,000, cannot yield its full potential of benefits to aviation unless there are geared with it corresponding improvements of airport facilities.

The importance of this integrated airport problem is high lighted with emphasis and clarity in the report of the Air Coordinating Committee on Air Traffic Control and the National Security, published last December. That report states that under the common system of air-traffic control now coming into being the terminal area traffic capacities per instrument runway will be approximately doubled and that this increased traffic capacity, when compared with anticipated increases in traffic demand, will eliminate the delays, cancellations, and bad weather unreliability that currently cost the airlines alone millions of dollars annually. Military traffic also will be enabled to move into civil airports or civil traffic to operate into military bases with equal ease, since simplified common procedures will be in use.

It is not at all difficult to see what this means with respect to the adequacy of airport facilities on the ground. The stepped-up activity and greater traffic flow potential into the terminal area will shift the bottleneck to the surface of the airport itself, whereas in the past the major bottle neck in the movement of air traffic was in the air because of cumbersome procedures of navigation which made it possible for only a few aircraft to complete approaches and to land at an airport in an hour.

The report of the Air Coordinating Committee finds that even today, with present traffic-control capacity, many of our airports have reached the saturation point and cannot handle the increased traffic which the common system will make possible. Unless the advantages of this improved navigation system are to be nullified in large part, therefore, airport design and development must keep pace and airports must be recognized for what they are—integral parts of the air-traffic-control system.

FEDERAL ROLE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Airports, I don't need to tell you, cost money and often the necessary funds for improvements are not easy to come by. This raises directly the question of what are the relative shares and areas of appropriate responsibility for the financing of airports as between the Federal Government and the local sponsors. Is the present arrangement satisfactory, as provided under the Federal Airport Act of 1946, or should there be some shifting or realinement of burdens in one direction or the other? Is there need for a classification of airports which would limit eligibility for Federal assistance to certain categories?

To these important questions I have no pat answer or conclusion, but I do think that it is both possible and desirable to indicate certain existing conditions which have a bearing on those questions. As in so many other ways the requirements of national defense and security must have first consideration with respect to airport developments and their financial support, and for all that we are able to see now this is likely to be so for an indefinitely long period.

I mentioned earlier that under the terms of the 1946 Federal Airport Act no limitations were placed upon the kinds or classes of airports which could be assisted with Federal funds. The Federal Government, under this program, has been providing about 50 percent of the cost of the smaller, as well as the larger, airports. Generally, the airports of class sub-1, class 1, and class 2 are suitable only for private-owner aircraft and

small transport planes. Under the airport program launced in 1946 and down to June 30, 1949, such small airport projects accounted for almost one-half of the projects for which grants had been committed, and they accounted for approximately 14 percent of the allotted Federal airport funds.

According to the national airport plan—1950—as projected last year by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for a 3-year period, there were found to be 5,093 locations at which airports should be constructed or improved in order to meet existing or anticipated demands. The estimated costs of this 3-year program were $928,000,000, of which the Federal share would be $445,700,000 and the sponsors' share $482,300,000. Of the 5,093 airport projects covered by this survey, more than 75 percent pertained to class 2 or smaller airports, and they would account for over one-third of the projected Federal expenditures.

It seems more likely now, however, that many of these contemplated smaller airport projects will have to give way on grounds of essentiality to requirements of the national defense, insofar at least as financial assistance from the Federal Government is concerned. Since the 1950 national airport plan was first announced, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has reviewed its entire airport program and has eliminated nearly all of the small projects. The aim now is to concentrate on those larger projects which are most essential from the standpoint of the defense effort in the emergency.[1]

Whether this may represent a permanent shift of emphasis with respect to the scope of Federal airport aid is not yet clear, but it does indicate an awareness that in the present circumstances, at least, Federal funds for airports should not be spread so widely or thinly as to defeat the essential purpose of the Federal Airport Act—to develop a system of airports having real national significance.

There appears to be considerable sentiment favoring such limitation as a matter of permanent Federal policy. This does not mean, of course, that the smaller airports of more localized significance are not important or should not be built. In emergencies, they may, like nearly all of the Nation's facilities and resources, be called upon to serve a defense purpose as well as to provide local community service. It seems true, nevertheless, as the Aviation Development Advisory Committee has well emphasized in its report on America's Civil Air Power, dated August 28, 1950, that many small airports will suffer attrition in the coming years unless these airports have the full support of the communities they serve.

The issue then is where to set the limits of appropriate Federal financial responsibility in terms of the interest of the Nation as a whole. Unless the Federal Government were to assume a greater and greater share of the financial burden of airport development—both large and small and those of more localized as well as national significance, we must continue to rely mainly upon the initiative and financial responsibility of the local community sponsors.

As a final word, I should like to stress the importance of increasing airport revenues in order to realize in greater measure their financial self-support. This objective is of prime importance, it seems to me, with respect to all airports whether large or small, and it is in the real interest not only of the local community sponsors and the Federal taxpayers, but of the airline companies and other users of the airports as well.

[1] Federal Airport Act, hearings on S. 1281 and S. 2875 before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 81st Cong., 2d sess., August 29, 1950, p. 33.

Economic Stabilization and the Attitude of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Does Labor Act That Way?" by Edwin A. Lahey, who has specialized in the field of labor. The editorial appeared in the April issue of Extension magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DOES LABOR ACT THAT WAY?
(By Edwin A. Lahey)

(In the present confusion over the wage-price controls, it is difficult for the layman to clearly understand the issues. We have asked Mr. Lahey who, in his long writing career, has specialized in the field of labor, to tell us how things look to him as we go to press.)

Labor leaders have hopped from one crisis to another since the economic-control agencies began to take shape in Washington.

It would be easy to gather the impression, as one reads the crisis bulletins, that labor leaders are screaming for special advantages for their members before the cement sets.

This is far from the truth. As we slip into a controlled economy in this country, an analysis of the basic fears of the labor leaders would seem to be in order.

The protests of A. F. of L., CIO, and independent union leaders against the more popular blueprints for control stem from a real concern for the family welfare of workers in every strata. Only time can tell whether their fears are justified, but the union leaders are apprehensive because they see a long period of economic controls ahead of us, with two grave dangers looming up.

1. That under a rigged waged control, social benefits separate from wage rates will be whittled down, or arrested in their normal development.

2. That under the stress of the mobilization fever, Congress may be stampeded by control officials into passing a universal service act for civilians; which will end voluntary society as we know it.

The restlessness of the labor-union officials is firmly rooted in their own experience. They all served on committees and boards that administered Government controls in World War II. They know on the basis of their own experience that if they were in the seats of the mighty, they could devise a wage-control machine full of loopholes, and a price-control machine with no loopholes.

But labor leaders are not in power. President Truman has vested the vast powers of the National Defense Production Act in the hands of business executives, industrialists, and financiers.

A trade-unionist does not assume that a business executive, an industrialist, or a financier is any less patriotic than himself. Neither does he assume that any of these types is less human than himself.

Consequently, the labor leaders have viewed the whole development of the control agencies with the suspicion that the men in charge were rigging up price-control machinery with loopholes, and wage-control machinery with no loopholes, the opposite of what labor leaders might be tempted to do if they had the vast powers of the Federal administrators.

The first draft of a wage-control rule by the Wage Stabilization Board headed by Cyrus Ching confirmed these suspicions and produced a real revolt, in which the three labor members of the nine-man Board walked out.

The three public members and three industry members of the Wage Stabilization Board had determined, over the running opposition of the labor members, that wage increases of 10 percent above the rates prevailing on January 1, 1950, would be permitted to compensate workers for the increased cost of living.

The Board also voted that "fringe benefits" would be frozen, pending "further study." Meanwhile, any "fringe benefits" would have to come out of the 10 percent general wage increase permitted in the order.

The freeze of "fringe benefits" was the thing that induced the labor revolt.

This term is a misnomer and for this reason the unrest of the labor leaders has not been clearly understood.

A "fringe benefit" is anything outside the basic wage structure. In recent years of collective bargaining, the area of "fringe benefits" has been expanded to new horizons, so that today the "fringe" on the economic rug is very wide and runs all the way around, instead of just at the ends.

Pensions, health, welfare, and hospital plans, paid holidays, vacation time, regional wage differentials—these are some of the vastly important aspirations of labor that come under the innocuous head of "fringe benefits."

If the southern wage differential were eliminated tomorrow, such action would cause an economic earthquake, but it would come under the title of a "fringe benefit."

If the workers in auto and steel negotiated a pension increase to a minimum of $200 per month at 65, it would be a "fringe benefit" of tremendous cost to industry, and a tremendous blessing to older workers.

Similarly, it would be a "fringe benefit" if private industry pensions were "vested." The "vesting" of existing pensions is the next great hurdle for the unions in the mass-production industries. When a worker in a noncontributory pension plan leaves his employment today, he generally leaves his pension rights behind him. When these pension plans are "vested," the payments made by a company into his pension account will remain credited to him when he changes employers.

This specific issue of the pension rights of a worker who shifts employment will soon assume major proportions, as the flow of defense orders brings about the involuntary transfer of many workers from one plant to another.

Quite naturally, labor leaders are not willing to stand by and see this and other "fringe issues" dropped into the deep freeze of economic controls "pending further study."

Labor economists are quite willing to concede that a worker's hourly wage rate should be subject to control in an inflationary period, assuming that there is some relation of wage rates to price movements.

But they will not admit the justice of completely freezing "fringe benefits," or of the suggested method of taking these "fringe benefits" out of an allowable increase in wage rates.

On their behalf, it should be said that it is difficult to see the inflationary effect of slight increases in pension and hospital insurance payments, or an increase in paid holidays or vacation time, such as labor might be able to negotiate in collective bargaining with employers.

The second fear of the labor leaders, over the development of manpower mobilization policies inimical to the family welfare of

union members, is perhaps remote, but none the less real.

The A. F. of L., and CIO, and the nonaffiliated unions strongly urged in the beginning of the mobilization effort that Secretary of Labor Tobin remain in charge of all manpower policies, as orginally intended by President Truman.

But, over the vigorous protests of his labor friends, the President reassigned the manpower authority of the National Defense Production Act to Charles E. Wilson, the over-all boss of the mobilization effort, who, it can be reasonably assumed, did not give up his post as president of General Electric until he was assured by Mr. Truman that he would have complete powers to mobilize the industrial and civilian manpower resources of the Nation.

The labor leaders fear not Mr. Wilson, but his manpower advisor, Gen. Lucius Clay, whom they regard as an exponent of universal service idea, a concept that comes naturally to a military man.

The frightened union officials feel that in the black despair of another Pearl Harbor Day, it would take only a suggestion from General Clay to Mr. Wilson and then to Congress to clamp this Nation under the regimentation of universal service, in which men, women, and children would be told when and where to report for work.

Mr. Wilson tried manfully to quiet the apprehension and stem the revolt of the labor leaders in Washington.

While his deputy, Economic Stabilization Director Eric Johnston, sought a way to woo back the labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board, Wilson himself sent a mollifying letter to the United Labor Policy Committee, offering to accept one of their members as his own counsellor in mobilization work, and reminding the labor leaders that the "effective employment of manpower in the mobilization program is not solely a labor problem."

Maybe the labor leaders are seeing things under the bed, we can't say for sure. But as we pointed out in the beginning of this editorial, the labor boys had plenty of experience in economic mobilization in World War II, and ought to be able to recognize a cold deal when they're getting one.

Letter Written by a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, when we hear one story from our Speaker telling us about the imminence of war and, at the same time, in the other body we find Senator CONNALLY stating that war is not likely this year, you can see how we in Congress think that most information is put out for propaganda purposes. The people throughout the country are subject to the same thoughts, and many of us doubt the stories being released from the battle front. Therefore, letters written by the boys to members of their families really give us the best picture of what is going on in Korea.

I am inserting a letter written by a marine to his brother-in-law, which not only gives us an idea of what the boys are thinking but graphically describes what they are going through:

MARINE FIGHTER SQUADRON, *April 14, 1951.*

DEAR STEW AND BETS: We are all so upset about this MacA. deal we are sick. Hope the American people have the gumption and good sense to do something about it. MacA. is the only leader in the United States in my mind with guts. The only thing in the world the Commies respect is force, and he is the only leader we have who threatens them with it. It is apparent to us out here that this Commie deal is a war to the finish. I'm sure it must be to those in the States—except our State Department people. Why don't the people do something about it? Why should we not utilize the CN troops and why not bomb the Manchurian bases and MSR? They are worrying about getting in an all-out war with China and we are already in one. We are just leaving the time of the knockout blow to the Reds. Their build-up in North Korea is fabulous and in Manchuria it's undoubtedly greater. We could stop it if they'd let us, but they won't. That means they will annihilate us here, or we'll give them everything over a treaty table that our people have suffered and died to protect. During the last 3 weeks the AA has gotten so bad we have had to completely change our tactics. All this build-up could have been prevented if we'd opened up on the Manchurian borders and we have had to sit idly by and watch it happen. Don't believe what you read in the papers. This situation is far worse than our position in the Philippines, etc., in 1941. Certainly our leaders have access to our intelligence reports, and I cannot understand their thinking. I hope MacA. blows the lid off when he hits Uncle Sugar—and I believe he will. I'll stop sounding off. It's just that we all have a very hopeless feeling about the future of our country.

I did some flying while we were in Yokosuka. I took some boys to Itami and we picked up four replacement aircraft. Boy, are they junk heaps. We are flying equipment now, Stew, that you wouldn't fly in the States. Our mechanics and ordnance men are working around the clock to keep our planes in good enough repair to maintain a schedule. They are doing a bang-up job. After we got to Tokyo with our planes we still had a little time to play. Tokyo is really State-side, only cheaper. I had 2 days there and it was really fine. The people stationed there are fat as a goose—scotch and sodas 18 cents at the Australian officers' club, and everything else on the same scale. Seems funny to see automobiles, etc., again. No wonder our occupation forces went to hell. Anyhow, we had a couple first-class parties and everyone was relaxed, hung over, etc., when we pulled out for the zone again. We had been hit very hard the last couple of days of operation prior to going to Tokyo, so everyone was ready. I've virtually been on the wagon out here so far, but most of the boys were on their butts. We went back to our regular operating area on the west coast and only operated 3 days. Boy, the activity had stepped up. We all got shot up—I got shot up two hops of there and we had three planes shot down. Two of the boys were picked up O. K. and our skipper was killed. His plane was hit and he tried to make the coast, but it started burning. He jumped and was picked up later that night by helicopter, but he was dead. It was a great loss to our squadron and to the Marine Corps—he was a wonderful C. O. and we all felt very bad. We had so many planes beat up we couldn't make the flight schedule and we returned to Yosiho. We stayed there 1 day, had the skipper's services and I got drunk along with everyone else in the squadron. The services were over at 1500 and I was aboard ship at 1800 to assume the duty and was loaded enough to be sick all the next day on the way to the east coast. We've been operating with an English carrier and they have a good bunch of boys. They've had some bad luck—lost a pilot a day since we came back out here. The first day we operated out here we had 12 planes shot up out of 30 launched and 1 shot down. Sumner went in the water off of Wonsan and was picked up by a helicopter off a cruiser. When he got aboard he found Jeff Harp (a pilot who was in our squadron before we went carrier-based). He's been picked up the day before for the second time. One boy was hit in the cockpit and had superficial wounds in the back.

We finally decided that the Chinks had successfully countered our tactics to the extent we'd have to change ours. We did change and we've been doing O. K. since—pick up a few holes, but nothing too rough. We are getting a few replacements, but they are just about keeping up with our natural attrition. We've had three boys relieved this month that had been shot down and were through flying for a while, and we've picked up five replacements. They say, however, that there are a couple large replacement drafts coming out the next 2 months, so we are still hoping to get relieved in June. The squadron morale hit a low point a while back, but with encouraging news about relief, it seems to be getting pretty high again. I'll have a hundred missions by the end of this month, so you can see some of the boys are getting sort of tired. I was high man last quarter and I'm not tired, but some of them are.

The only thing that upsets me is I'm afraid we are doing all this for nothing and that Truman and Acheson and the others will give away everything we are fighting for. We've all just been sitting here talking about it and I guess that's why I can't get it out of my mind.

We are getting up at 3:30 a. m. every morning and next cruise we'll probably get up at 3 a. m. I slept all afternoon yesterday and 'til 8 a. m. this morning because we are replenishing this morning. I really feel rested. This carrier life is so much better than land based that every time I feel low I just think about Kimpo, Wonsan, Yonpo, etc., and I feel real good.

Surely miss Janet and the kids. Surely is going to be fun to see them again. Lord but the kids must be growing up. We've got some new 21-year-old replacements that really make us feel old. Let's face it, we aren't getting any younger. Sure hope I can get back to work soon, but I doubt if we'll make it. Surely wish I had a house and was settled in one place, but I guess that's out—probably get tired of it anyway. Janet is happily settled in her house and I'm very happy about that. For the first time in my life I'm anxious to be home and help around the house, etc. I want to take Janet on a nice vacation—nothing fancy, just to get away. Then try and be a little more help around with the house and kids. I've always used all my energies toward my vocation and getting ahead as a breadwinner, but that doesn't seem as important to me anymore. Our lives are fouled up and will probably continue to be fouled up to the extent that long-range planning, etc. is sort of a waste of time I'm afraid.

If we could just get a change in administration I'd feel a lot different. If I had the money I'd feel like being a politician—I guess I sound like one today.

Dorothy and Jack undoubtedly had a nice trip. I hope it wasn't all business with Jack. Just at the time when he should be able to start relaxing a little, it looks as if he will be busier than he's ever been before. We've got a lot of building to do all over the world, and it's going to have to be done pronto. I can't help but worry Janet and kids a little, being in Los Angeles, but I'll be home soon. She has a lot of friends around there and seems to be having a pretty fair time. Clem is about to go into business for himself, and apparently has a pretty good deal set up. He wants me to try and get out of the Marine

Corps when I get home to go into it with him. Three of my old bosses have written me offering me jobs, and they all sound swell, but I just wonder what's the use of working my butt off again, just to be called back in the service in a year or two again. If I'd gotten further along in construction I'd be worth more to the country in that capacity, but, unfortunately, the best I can offer them is an aircraft jockey. Life, I guess.

Please pardon the B. S. Sometimes it helps just to blow off a little. We've had a swell cruise, and I haven't a kick in the world. My family's well and happy, and I'll be home soon.

I loved your pictures and letters. Lots of love.

BERT.

Test Comes Now on Asia Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill from the Boston Sunday Globe of April 29, 1951:

TEST COMES NOW ON ASIA POLICY—RESULT OF DESPERATE FIGHTING IN KOREA MAY HELP SHAPE UNITED STATES COURSE AS MACARTHUR AND DEFENSE CHIEFS PRESENT VIEWS TO SENATE COMMITTEE

(By Charles A. Merrill)

Gradually the trumult and the shouting dies. The renowned "old soldier" who has come back from the wars may not fade away, but henceforth he will play a more normal role on the American scene, and will be accorded more rational treatment by the public. The mass hysteria honoring the general, so fascinating on the television screen for the millions unable to be present, already seems like a dream dimly etched on our memories. Our attention has shifted back to that corner of the world whence the general flew home to us. TV does not yet reach that far. But the headlines spotlight events in Korea of more importance than the career of any individual. Our seasoned young soldiers on the Asiatic front—our few to whom so many Americans are debtors—together with their UN allies, have again been struggling against a Red tidal wave. Lieutenant General Ridgway, the new supreme commander, warns us that this battle may prove decisive.

If the latest attack by Chinese Communists, shall turn out to be the long-anticipated Red offensive, it could settle the argument here at home over American policy in the Far East.

NO TV DRAMA

As emotion subsides, the issue is being clarified in the public mind. The MacArthur idea is that an effort should be made to end the Korean conflict quickly. He thinks he might have accomplished this if (1) he had been permitted to bomb the Manchurian supply bases; (2) if American planes were dispatched to bombard coastal areas on the Chinese mainland; and (3) if our Government had sent aid and given the go-ahead to Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa for an attack on Communists in China. This, says the general, plus reinforcements in Korea, might turn the trick. He thinks it improbable that Soviet Russia would involve her forces in retaliation. The administration replies that, quite aside from its determination to keep the civil authorities in control of foreign policy, it considers the MacArthur program too great a risk. Presumably, this is the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They do not believe it wise to commit our forces to a full-scale Asiatic war. They hope to limit the Korean conflict. We are playing for time to build up our defenses in Western Europe. Furthermore, have our Allies not made it clear that they will not support any such plan as MacArthur urged? Are we ready alone to take on Red China and Soviet Russia, plus her European satellites?

Within a few days, according to present plans, the conflict of views will be aired before a combined Senate committee. Presumably, General MacArthur will outline his ideas in detail, and answer questions. Defense Secretary Marshall and General Bradley, our top military planners, are expected to follow. Out of the huddle something definite should emerge. The American people should be kept informed on the proceedings. But it is to be hoped that the Senators will not be tempted to stage a full-dress TV drama. This was highly useful in the Kefauver crusade which sought to rouse public opinion against corruption. But histrionics will hardly help our foreign policy makers in framing a defense policy. The committee should be concerned with the past only insofar as it helps illuminate the road ahead. And surely, great caution will be in order for security reasons.

MAN WITH PLAN

The acclaim for General MacArthur, almost as ardent in Chicago and Milwaukee in the past week as it had previously been in Washington and New York, is typically American. He rated it on his record. His long absence from the country added to the glamor. But there was more to it than this. Though the whole episode was made to order for certain political master minds, there has up to the present hour been nothing in the general's conduct to encourage those few reckless followers whose attitude seems to imply: "Who does i' the wars more than his captain can, becomes his captain's captain." In large part, the story seems to be that the appearance of this vivid personality, under rebuke by his superiors, offered an opportunity for a growing public mood of discontent, frustration, uneasiness, and resentment to express itself. Only a few years after the end of World War II, the American people are again in trouble. The casualty lists are coming in. The planning of youth for peacetime careers is once more interrupted. Prices soar, and so do taxes. Worst of all, this time the objective seems obscure, nor does there seem to be any end in sight. A magnetic radio voice or TV personality is lacking to rally the people. Even if there were such it might not prove persuasive in a period when we are neither wholly at peace nor fully at war. To appreciate this, we have only to recall that, even under the vibrant leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the lower House of Congress fell only one vote short on a motion to empty our training camps a few months before Pearl Harbor. Now, in this hour of perplexity, appears a picturesque figure, experienced in war and postwar maneuvering. He not only has charm. He has a program, and he is articulate.

This may be the explanation of the public reaction to General MacArthur. But it does not supply the answer to the complex problem of security for our country and the preservation of our common heritage, western civilization.

MASS KILLING

It may lift our spirits to remind ourselves of the substantial agreement among us that our quest is for peace. There is little dissent from that. Any other idea, now that science has removed all physical barriers on the earth and placed in the hands of man instruments for mass slaughter, would be sheer madness.

There are many reputable observers who believe that we can avoid an all-out war. Speaking in London, President Conant, of Harvard, though warning that Western Europe must be made defensible as a deterrent to possible rashness in the Kremlin, sees hope, perhaps a decade hence, of disarmament and peace—"a free world secure in its own frontiers, a Soviet with vastly diminished ambitions and pretensions." Mr. Paul Hoffman, former ECA Director, expresses similar views in an article, just published in book form, captioned "Blueprint for peace."

President Truman says the major aim of his administration is to avoid another global war. And though he may differ on the method best calculated to bring peace, General MacArthur himself evidently believes full-scale war would be suicidal. As he reminded Congress, he has not on the record been a warmonger. About a year ago, shortly before the Korean outbreak, the general told C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, in an interview in Tokyo, "The scientists of the world have developed to such an extraordinary degree the processes and ways of accomplishing mass killing that war is no longer rationally a means of settling international problems. Its destruction has become so great that there can be no victor. * * * The public realizes all too well in the terms of the last war that there can be no real victor in a future war. The Russian masses are probably just as opposed to a shooting war as are the people in the western countries.

BIG WARS NOW

We sometimes forget that until relatively modern times, war did not touch the lives of the majority of the people, except in the region where it was fought. In both ancient Rome and medieval Europe, dependence upon citizen soldiers became impractical, and professional armies were raised to fight wars which, measured in modern terms, were restricted. The first compulsory military service law in history was promulgated by leaders of the French Revolution. The Prussian militarists introduced universal peacetime training, and converted Europe into an armed camp. Thus it has remained since 1870, and as we have learned to our sorrow, an explosion over there is a chain reaction from which there is no escape for us.

Wars no longer have their origin in the struggle of capitalist states for markets and sources of raw materials. Civilization has evolved beyond that. Two aggressive, totalitarian revolutions, first the Fascist, now the Communist, the later worldwide, have disturbed the peace.

The western countries—and if the truth were known, probably the people of Soviet Russia, after 16,000,000 casualties in World War II—have no stomach for an atomic conflict. In the first flush of revolutionary triumph, Red Chinese leaders have perhaps indoctrinated their armies with martial fanaticism for Asiatic conquest. But this can hardly be true of mankind generally. If the Russian desertions to the Nazis in the last war mean anything, the Soviet rulers will hesitate to lead their people into another conflict.

The danger signals are up. We cannot ignore them. Another flareup, like the Korean struggle, might spread. But our best chance would seem to be to play for time, to build strength and use it for peace.

Results of the fighting in Korea may well shape our course. If the Red attack is stalled, the hour should be propitious for the UN to find out if the Chinese Reds have had enough. To have checked Communist aggression in that area might prove a turning point in the midcentury struggle to save the peace of the world.

The Navajos' Problem as They See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE NAVAJOS' PROBLEM AS THEY SEE IT

DEAR FRIEND OF THE NAVAJOS: The following comments and sentiments of the Navajos are given you at the request of their leaders, so you may better understand their feelings, desires, and needs at this time.

Our organization is endeavoring to assist them in their many problems toward the goal of attaining their rightful place in American life and citizenship.

We bespeak your continued interest and assistance in this undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

NAVAJO ASSISTANCE, INC.,
BERT POUSMA,
Managing Director.

Before we were taken captive by the United States in 1864 we lived on the land which lays between four of our sacred mountains, namely, Mount Taylor, near Grants, N. Mex.; San Francisco Peaks, near Flagstaff, Ariz.; Laplata Mountains, in southwestern Colorado; and Mount Baldy, near Alamosa.

This was a large land and a good land, containing open plains, mountains, valleys, and meadows. There was grass and trees, lakes, springs, streams, and water holes. We had our farms, orchards, sheep, goats, and horses. We had a good living.

About 200 years ago the Spanish came to our country and said that we would have to obey them. Then in 1823 Mexico said they were our boss. In 1846 the United States took our land from the Mexicans and told us we belonged to them. Why these nations, which had so much land of their own, had to fight about our land and take it way from us is hard for us to understand.

When the United States soldiers came, they said we would have to stop fighting and stealing. Most of our people did not believe we had to obey these strangers so kept on doing the same as they did before. Then the soldiers burned our fields and orchards and killed our animals. When we finally didn't have anything to eat, we were forced to bring our women and children to the white man's fort, so that we wouldn't starve. That was in the spring of 1864.

Then they took all our people on a long march of about 400 miles from our homeland to Fort Sumner, N. Mex. Our women, children, and old people suffered much on the way, and we all reached Fort Sumner practically naked. We were hungry and cold, tired and sick.

While we were in exile at Fort Sumner, Washington appropriated $100,000 for our relief, but we didn't get much relief. Some of our white friends heard about this and there was an investigation. This revealed that we were given only $30,000 of relief supplies, and that some bad white men got away with $70,000. We realized that dishonest people were taking things that were intended for us. Sometimes they would walk us around a building and count us twice, so they would get more supplies for us, but we didn't get it. Then we tried to fool them by raising the number of persons shown on our ration tickets so our families could get enough to eat, but they found out about it and made different kind of ration tickets that we couldn't change.

We had old tents to live in. There wasn't enough wood to keep us warm, and, because we didn't have enough blankets or clothes, we suffered from the cold. However, we worked hard and willingly did what we were told to do, constructing buildings, unloading freight, and so forth. The soldiers and officers reported that we were very good workmen.

In our homeland we were used to a roving life, but at Fort Sumner they made us live in 12 small villages and work on little farms. The bad water and poison weeds killed our livestock. The water also made us sick. Dry weather and bugs killed our crops. Many people died.

We were hungry, sick, weak, and discouraged, and then a worse thing happened. In the winter of 1866–67 smallpox came and killed many of our people. The dead were quickly buried, but the graves were not made deep enough. We saw coyotes come and dig up the bodies of our loved ones, and we were too sick and weak to do anything about it. We believe the coyote brings evil. That made us feel doubly unhappy and afraid. We wanted to get away from that place. Many of our people escaped and went back to our homeland. Some of our girls, in order to get enough to eat and warm clothing, ran away to little towns and lived with white men or Mexicans. We longed for our homeland where we could keep our families together and provide food and clothing for them.

We begged for permission to go back to our own country. We were willing to agree to anything, just so they would allow us to leave that awful place where everything went wrong during the 4 years that we were compelled to stay there.

Then in 1868, a treaty was made. We were permitted to leave Fort Sumner, but not yet permitted to go to our former homes. We were instructed to go to Fort Wingate (near Gallup, N. Mex.).

After the long walk from Fort Sumner to Fort Wingate, we were again naked and hungry, but they didn't give us enough to eat. The treaty authorized purchase of 500 beef cattle and 1,000,000 pounds of corn for our sustenance in the winter of 1868–69. Some of that cattle and corn was not given to us. We never got enough food and clothing. We ate prairie dogs, rats, and field mice, roots, wild plants, seeds, and tree bark.

When it became too crowded at Fort Wingate, they took some of our people to Fort Defiance, Ariz., but we weren't yet permitted to go to our former homes. We had to loaf around and wait for the 15,000 sheep and goats which the treaty said we would receive, but which were late in coming.

The animals finally came in the winter of 1869–70. We were given about three sheep for each member of the family, also some seed and a few tools. We were sure glad to get them. Now we could leave and go to work. We took good care of the sheep and goats. We worked hard and did all we could to eke out a living so that the Government wouldn't have to help us. In 1887 an investigator said that $700,000 was due our people for appropriations made by Congress for implements, seed, and stock, which we never received.

Our sheep and goats increased. Our people increased. We soon realized that we needed more land for our animals and that we were shut out from most of the land that we had before we were taken into exile. The best of our old streams, springs, and lakes were excluded. We needed all the land and water back again that was our homeland between our four sacred mountains.

As early as 1875 some of our head men went to Washington and pleaded for more land for our people. We did not understand that the treaty cut us down to such a small area.

In 1886, when the Apache Indians were on the warpath and the United States soldiers had difficulty in subduing them, our people were asked to help. While Indian troops were being formed, our chiefs met with the commanding officer. They said: "We are willing to help you. Our men will go to fight for you. They will leave their homes and loved ones. They will leave their people. They may not come back. They would like to have their children provided for by giving them our old homeland east of here that was taken from us. That is the heart of our country. That is where our heart is. That is what our children should have." The commanding officer replied: "We will do that." But that promise was not kept, and our children still have no land.

Small parts of our original homeland were given to us from time to time, but not nearly enough for our increasing people and animals. Some of our land was taken for the railroad. They were given a lot of land on both sides of the track which was built in the early 1880's. They leased that land to white cattlemen, and we were chased off. White and Mexican homesteaders came on our land, threatened us with guns and burned our hogans. Our best farm land is now occupied by white men and Mexicans. Our best grazing land is now controlled by white cattlemen. The good things were taken away from us, and evil brought into our country by bootleggers, gamblers, and prostitutes. We obeyed the treaty in not harming others, but no protection was given us against others harming us. We were commanded not to scalp anyone, but it seemed that no one cared if outsiders came in and skinned us alive.

In spite of disappointments, we did the best we could with what land and water we were allowed, and increased our sheep from 3 per person to an average of over 30 per person. It takes 50 per person to make a decent living, such as the white people call a minimum living standard. We had visions of the time when we would reach that standard and could afford a house, proper food, and clothing, and all the other things we saw the white people have, and which we wanted for our wives and children, to make them well and happy.

But then, just when we were getting along pretty good, the Government said there was too much sand from our reservation going into the Colorado River, and would fill up Hoover Dam. We said, "Give us more land and water like we have been asking for. Give us back all of our old homeland. Then there will not be 'soil erosion from overgrazing.'" But they would not do that. Instead of giving us more land and water, they came to our homes and first took away our goats, which we needed for milk for our children and for meat to eat. Then they kept on cutting and cutting our goats and horses and sheep until we now have an average of only about seven per person. Many families have none at all.

When this treaty was made in 1868, the Government told us: "Take good care of your sheep. Then they will increase, and sometime in the future you will have enough to take good care of your families." We did just what they told us, but then, when we were getting enough sheep to take care of our families, they made us get rid of them. It made us angry and discouraged for them to treat us like that. We hadn't done anything wrong. We obeyed the treaty. We followed their instructions. We worked hard and saved. Sheep are our heart. They are our life. They took our heart out of us. They took our life away from us. We were helpless, disillusioned, and discouraged. Hunger and sickness increased. Many of our people, especially the babies and little children, died. Tuberculosis increased rapidly on account of undernourishment.

The Government said they would give us plenty of work on the reservation that would more than offset our loss of income from

the sheep. They made flowery promises of giving us work building schools, dams, wells, and irrigation projects. But those promises were not fulfilled. Some families had to eat the few sheep they had left and were then dependent upon relatives. Mothers, too sick or weak to bear more children, died and left many orphans.

The Government said they would give our needy people relief but, even though there were thousands needing help, they gave small checks and a few supplies to only a small number. The relief supplies lasted only a few days, and sometimes they skipped a month or two. Then the needy were again dependent upon their relatives and friends and consequently all were undernourished, as there was not enough to go around.

Three thousand six hundred of our boys were in the Second World War. They were good soldiers. Their families received allotment checks and could buy baby food, canned milk, and other necessities for their babies and small children, but when the war stopped and they didn't get those checks any more the children had to go back to their old poor diet, and many are undernourished and sickly. More than half of our children die before they reach school age.

Our people need assistance. What we would like best of all is the fulfillment of promises made us. Then we would have more land and water, so that we could have more sheep and goats and farms. Now, instead of that, we are compelled to leave our homeland to go to work in beet and vegetable fields and on railroads far away from home and kin. We appreciate the efforts to help us get work, but they do not seem to realize that this is breaking up our families, as in many cases we cannot take our little children along; also crippled and sick and old and blind persons, who need our help, must be left behind. The railroads will not take families, so fathers must leave home for months. Sometimes the wife or baby dies, and he does not know about it until he comes home many days later. Many of our men who go away to work are taught bad things by the white, black, and Mexican men and women, who take advantage of their innocence and ignorance. As a result, disease and drunkenness is increasing. Some of our girls working far from home are learning to lead bad lives. When the fathers are away for a long time the mothers, children, sick and aged are not properly protected and cared for. The off-reservation work is seasonal and menial, and there is no future for us in that class of work. The breaking of families is contrary to all American and religious principles. It is having a very serious effect upon our children as well as the parents, and especially upon the older unmarried boys and girls.

We need the kind of work that will make it possible for us to keep our families together and support them, have a decent home for them to live, dress our children properly when they go to school, buy proper food for our babies and little children, take care of the sick and crippled and old people, become respected American citizens. When they decreased our sheep, they promised us much work, building schools, roads, irrigation projects, dams and wells, and thus providing those desirable improvements which we so badly need. Those betterments will make it possible for us to again become self-supporting. Although their cost might be considered high, it is only a small percentage of the value of the land and the income which was taken from us.

We need education. In the treaty of 1868 the Government promised us a school and teacher for every 30 children of school age, but today there is school room for only 8,000 of the 24,000 children of school age. Sixteen thousand of our children cannot go to school. As there is not enough good land for them to make a living on the reservation, and as they are not being given an education so that they can take care of themselves off the reservation, what will become of them?

In 1933 the Government promised, in addition to improving the seven boarding schools in existence at that time, to build seventy community-day schools with laundries and shower rooms, a doctor and nurse, and agents who would be ready to help us in our many problems. That made us very happy, as we wanted our children to be given an education without being sent far away from home and kin. We also needed the health and home-making services promised. But it was just another promise that was not fulfilled. At present we have a total of 60 schools, of which 9 are closed, and several others cut to 1-room capacity. Actually we are getting less than half of the school benefits promised, and the doctors, nurses, and agents promised have not been provided.

The schools are not operated for full term. Reservation schools are kept closed until off-reservation schools are sent their quota, and are closed before the school season ends. We would like to have all our own schools filled to capacity and operated full term before sending our children hundreds of miles away from home. Many parents wonder whether it isn't useless to give their children the present irreguar education. We see public schools and mission schools on and adjoining our reservation where children are given full-term standard course of education, and cannot understand why this is denied our children in Government schools.

We need hospitals. Sickness and death rate is extremely high on our reservation, but six of our hospitals are closed and others not fully utilized. All the hospitals should be opened and operated to full capacity. More hospitals are badly needed; also tuberculosis sanitaria.

We need doctors and nurses who have our health and welfare at heart. There is never enough medical help to take care of our sick people. For many years we have been asking that our girls be given nurses' training in Navajo service hospitals. Then we would have our own nurses. But this request was not granted and now the need is more acute than ever, and our people suffer.

We need homes. There is much sickness and suffering on the reservation because our people can afford only log and mud hogans to live in. We would like to improve our living quarters for the health and welfare of our wives and children.

We need water wells. In many cases we must haul water in barrels on wagons many miles, from unsanitary sources.

We need dams and irrigation projects. Good farm land was taken away from us, and, as it is apparent that it will not be returned to us, the best possible use should be developed on what we have. Besides the many desirable small projects, there is a large San Juan River project which would give work to thousands of people and bring lasting benefits to our country. We hope Congress will appropriate the money for these improvements as soon as possible.

We need police protection. For years we have been pleading for law and order on our reservation; also for protection against unscrupulous outsiders. Bootleggers, gamblers, prostitutes, and other evil persons take advantage of the ignorance and innocence of our people, but very little protection is afforded us either on or off the reservation. We may not defend ourselves as we are treaty-bound never to do white men any harm.

We need the advice, encouragement, and assistance of all who have our welfare at heart. So many promises have been made and broken that we don't know who or what to believe. We need true friends who try to understand our condition and will help us to help ourselves.

We greatly appreciate all the fine assistance given us by our friends over the country and hope that you will continue to help us until we reach the goal of finally providing for our children the opportunities and privileges which we so ardently crave for them.

Approved:

SAM AHKEAH,
Chairman,
ZHEALY TSO,
Vice Chairman,
Navajo Tribal Council.

New York State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include for the RECORD a summary of the report of the committee on Federal legislation of the New York State Bar Association, adopted at its seventy-fourth annual meeting, January 26, 27, 1951, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

To the New York State Bar Association:

Said Huey Long: "When fascism comes to this country it will come disguised as anti-fascism."

Instead of fascism, socialism has been creeping up on us under various names and guises. It is being administered to us in small sugar-coated doses. It is always camouflaged as being something for the "public welfare." The result has very aptly been called socialism by default.

Former President Herbert Hoover says we are now on the "last mile" toward complete socialism in America.

This report will deal mainly with just one camouflaged proposal that is before the Congress, seeking to socialize medicine in our country. It has become the fashion in Washington never to call a measure by its true name. Ugly things are given pretty names to catch the votes of the unwary.

Now, the regimentation of the great medical profession in America (and let us not forget that we are next on the program) the extension of the clammy hand of Federal bureaucracy into every sick room in this Republic, most certainly is a major step in the direction of the Socialist state as they have it in England; and most certainly is an ugly thing and a vicious thing. Yet, one of its sponsors calls it a health measure and a Congressman calls it health insurance. One may well wonder whose political health they are trying to insure at the expense of the public.

Now let us take off the mask camouflaging this measure so that we may see it for what it really is.

In order that we may recognize the measure as socialistic we should define socialism. According to Karl Marx, socialism, very briefly and simply put, is government management or ownership of a nation's economics and the refusal by the government to the individual the right to manage his own affairs. Socialists, Communists, and fellow travelers always think in terms of compulsion. They abhor the American brand of constitutional liberty.

So now they want to impose upon us, through this measure before Congress, compulsory medical insurance.

At the very outset let us analyze the so-called reasons given by them for this proposed measure. Only then we shall see how unfounded and shallow these "reasons" are;

and if the reasons advanced for the proposed legislation fail, then the proposed legislation fails with them.

It seems that suddenly the state of the Nation's health becomes a matter of grave concern to the authors of the measure. Is there really an emergency confronting us? How serious is the condition of the Nation's health that it should evoke such drastic socializing of medicine and the medical profession? Let us see.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.'s statistical bureau is one of the most authoritative sources of information on the Nation's health. We are going to let the bulletin issued by the bureau answer these questions.

Four of the most common and dangerous diseases that afflict children are whooping cough, measles, scarlet fever, and diphtheria. The bulletin gives us two comparable 5-year periods, 1931–35 and 1944–48, both years inclusive. How eloquently they speak for free medicine.

During that period whooping cough declined 77 percent, scarlet fever dropped 92 percent, and diphtheria and measles fell 73 percent. Says Dr. Williford T. King, economics professor emeritus of New York University:

"That is, in the last 5 years the chances that your child might die from one of these ailments was only one-fifth as great as in the first half of the 1930's. Does this marvelous improvement show that there is something radically wrong with the existing medical system?"

Now, let us see what has happened to expectancy of life of the new-born babe. Fifty years ago the average expectancy of life of a baby girl was 51 years; a baby girl born now has a life expectancy of 70 years.

To the contention that the poorer elements have not received the benefits in health improvement as have the more well to do groups, that being the main argument for socialized medicine, the bulletin gives a still more eloquent answer. It shows that while 50 years ago a colored girl baby's expectancy of life was 35 years, in 1946 it was 61 years. Here it may be pointed out that the colored baby's gain in expectancy was 7 years more than that of her white sister. Such are the disadvantages to the poor under private medicine.

But they say that the poorer States do not have good medical care as the larger States. As that great American, Al Smith, used to say: "Let us look at the record."

The poorest State in the country probably is Mississippi and the richest is New York. Government figures show that the death rate in Mississippi in 1919 was 12.3 but it declined to 9.2 in 1946, a drop of 3.1 points. During the same period the death rate in New York dropped from 13.9 to 11.1, a decline of only 2.8 points. Much less than the decline in the poorest State in the Union.

But, one may ask, by what process of reasoning does one conclude that socialized, political, bureaucratic medicine can serve the people more efficiently than private medicine, spark-plugged by private enterprise.

The experience of 5,000 years of human history is against this contention. So is the experience of England. Sir William Y. Darling, a member of the Parliament of Great Britain, while in this country, warned us against the socialism of England. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Some of the nostrums of my home country have been freely discussed, and some have been practiced in the United States here and in Canada, and elsewhere. They are to the effect that the State can do something better for you than you can do it for yourself.

"Before I go back to my country with its shilling's worth of meat a week, its declining standards of life, its business desperately entangled, please let me tell you, my friends in the United States and Canada, that the road Great Britain is traveling is the road you should not travel. The experience is not worth while. It is a road which has led to the degradation and lowering of our human standards in which you and we believe.

"There is an old saying that few people in the world can learn anything except from their own experience. It is hoped that the American people will learn from this experience without having to pass through a similar ordeal."

Now, let us take a glance at what this so-called health measure bill is proposing to do.

It is not insurance in the real meaning of the word. It proposes a new tax to support a Government regulated and politically controlled medical system, with doctors, dentists, nurses, drugs, hospitals, and, last but not least, patients, goose-stepping under it. This vast Bureau will collect the tax, control the money, set the rules, determine the nature, quality, and quantity of medical services, direct doctor and patient participation, thus dominating every citizen's medical affairs, even the most intimate doctor-patient relationships. Whether one needs or even gets medical care or not will depend entirely upon the whim or pleasure of some bureaucrat. Thus the American people are not even having their cherished privacy in the matter of their medical affairs, with the local administrative boards, patterned after the British system, in possession of all the records. Recently the British Housewives League protested bitterly the resulting local gossip over family medical records. Do the American people want that sort of thing in America?

Nor is this thing new. It is an importation from Europe. Most certainly, it is not native to America. The original author of the bill, Senator Wagner, was still a child in Germany when Prince Von Bismarck originated the thing which the social planners are pleased to call "health insurance." But the great Iron Chancelor of Germany was more frank about it. He said it was a method of subduing the people, so he called it a golden chain around the necks of the workers. Look at the German worker today. He gave up liberty for the promise of security. Now he has neither. The Italian and Russian workers have had the same experience. We are also beginning to hear the rumbling from the workers of England.

It was Benjamin Franklin who said that "those who give up essential liberties to gain temporary security deserve neither liberty nor security." Here we may add that history shows that they invariably get neither.

This compulsory health insurance measure will put the "golden chain" (fool's gold) of Bismarck around the necks of the workers of America.

We doubt very much that the American people want to go à la Bismarck. However that may be, one thing is certain: It is a cruel fraud upon the people to attempt to put over this costly socialistic cradle-to-the-grave scheme at a time when they are too preoccupied to look at the price tag, both in treasure and loss of liberty—especially when the Nation is already burdened with an indebtedness and incurred obligations, direct or indirect, of over $300,000,000,000.

In private voluntary insurance companies the worker can obtain real health insurance at much less cost and at the same time remain free. If at any time he wants to cancel it, he can. But he cannot cancel this cradle-to-the-grave insurance. Like all socialistic schemes, it is compulsory. It is here where he exchanges his liberties for the mere promise of security. He gives up his liberty to spend his money as he sees fit. Under this measure, he will give to the politicians a lifetime check-off on his pay envelope. They will control the moneys which he otherwise would have used for medical care, and with this control will come the inevitable graft, followed by third-rate medical service. Not only that, but he will lose the right to choose his own family physician. Some politician will do that for him. That is the record.

Also note this: The great insurance companies of America weathered the last depression just about 99 percent. This in contrast with about 3,000 municipalities and 1 State that defaulted on their government obligations. Even Uncle Sam repudiated his solemn obligation to pay his creditors in gold. Says former Congressman Sam Pettingill:

"If the worker goes in for this womb-to-the-tomb insurance, he not only handcuffs himself for the rest of his life; he doesn't even leave his boy or girl a free choice. They, too, when they begin to work, will have to cough over to the State. The worker of today would vote Government check-off against the bread and butter of his unborn children at a time when conditions may have totally changed."

Besides the destruction of personal liberty the material cost of the measure will be staggering.

The best estimates of tax economists range from 5 to 15 billion dollars. No one knows exactly. Its sponsors say they do not know. It is a step in the dark. Only a babe in arms would want to go in the dark, especially in matters of expenditures.

Tax estimates range from 6 percent to 10 percent on every pay check up to $4,800.00, half paid by the employee and half by the employer. The self-employed would pay the whole amount. Here is exorbitantly high price for low quality medical service. For instance, no American would tolerate the low quality of medical service available to the average Englishman under compulsory health insurance. Yet, the British system went in the red over $200,000,000 in 9 months of operation. It will take many millions in new taxes, not only in Britain but also here in America, to make up the deficit. For let us not forget that the American taxpayers have been underwriting socialistic England since its inception.

Statistics show that it would require 1,500,000 clerks, bookkeepers, administrators, collectors, and so forth, on the Federal payrolls to administer compulsory insurance. What a waste of medical dollars.

There is no need for this waste. Over 55,000,000 Americans now have voluntary health insurance in private insurance companies and organizations such as the Blue Cross plan. This guaranteed medical, surgical, and hospital care costs about on the average of $2.50 a month for the individual and $5.50 for a family, irrespective of size.

Thus the evidence is clear that compulsory insurance proposal is economically unsound in that it entails staggering burdens financially, politically vicious in its implication of regimentation of the most intimate personal affairs of the citizen and replete with freedom-destroying potentialities. What then, is the real objective of this socialized medical program, especially since our great insurance companies are well able to supply all needed insurance? We shall let Mr. King tell it:

"Clearly the aim is the same as that of communistic programs everywhere. Namely, to make the diligent and the competent pay for the care of the lazy and shiftless. The thrifty, efficient, hard-working man who has about two children and earns $5,000 per year, is asked to pay into the health fund twice as much as his happy-go-lucky, ne'er-do-well neighbor who has six children and earns only $2,500 per year. This is the crux of the whole matter. The proposed program is the very antithesis of the basic principle of a free society—namely that every tub should stand on its own bottom. It is obvious Marxism in a new disguise."

The whole social-insurance scheme is based upon the morally indefensible Socialist theory that individuals are entitled to things that they themselves have not earned and

on the politically vicious expedient which teaches that society owes everyone a comfortable living whether or not he repays society by doing his fair share of the world's work.

The American people should get clear in their thinking one simple truth: That a social planner in Washington does not in any way differ from one in Moscow or London. They are Socialists at heart and therefore enemies of the basic liberties of man.

Have the opponents of this socialistic measure an American program more efficient? They have. Exactly as owners of cars once proved negligent are required to take accident insurance, the American plan is to require health-insurance policies in a similar way. We shall again let Mr. King explain it:

"Since President Truman and the American Medical Association agree on objectives it is a pity that they do not unite to back the most logical and least expensive procedure for assuring that everyone will be properly protected, and that the ne'er-do-wells will not be allowed to sponge their care from the diligent. Let Government require every income recipient to purchase from one of the numerous private organizations in the field a policy giving himself and dependents adequate coverage. Let it be the function of Government to see that premiums are paid when due—when necessary compelling deductions from wages and salaries—and let Government stop there. This program would call for no elaborate new machinery, would interfere but little with individual freedom, and would preserve American competitive enterprise. When this road is open, why take the trail running down into the co-collectivist bog?"

If the supporters of this bill were really sincere in their concern for the "little fellow" as they say they are, here is a real program which will not cost the taxpayers a penny. Under the pretense of doing him good they are taxing him to death. The real picture shows that the Federal Government is making this little fellow, the small man, smaller every day. To quote the words of Hon. James F. Byrnes, former Supreme Court Justice and Secretary of State.

"If the 'little fellow' sends a message by telephone or telegraph he pays a tax. If he travels by railroad or bus he pays a tax. If he buys an automobile, the sale price includes a tax. When he buys gasoline or oil he pays a tax. If he buys cigarettes, he pays a tax. If he goes to a football game or baseball game, he pays a tax. If his wife buys a pocketbook or cosmetics, she pays a tax, and if his children go to a movie, they pay a tax.

"The average working man must work 47 days a year to earn the money necesasry to pay his taxes to the Federal Government. That is almost 1 day out of every week. If the new programs now seriously proposed should be adopted he will have to pay in taxes the equivalent of his wages for an additional 20 days, making 67 days he will work each year for the Government instead of for himself and his family. That is what the Federal Government is doing to the little fellow.

"If the spenders really want to help the little fellow, they should allow him to keep more of the money he gets for his labor to spend as he pleases, instead of having it taken from him and sent to Washington, to let bureaucrats spend as they think it should please him.

"Men intoxicated with power will never voluntarily surrender the power to spend the money of other people. Human nature does not change. The Government will not repeal a single war tax now being collected unless forced to do so by public sentiment."

This is what the social planners in Washington are doing to the little fellow. Will the little fellow ever wake up?

There is something else they are doing to the little fellow. Let us quote their patron saint, whose doctrines they are following, as to the inevitable result of the policy of taxation sponsored by them. Said Karl Marx:

"There is only one way to kill capitalism * * * by taxes, taxes, and more taxes."

Can it be possible that these social planners may, after all, be deliberate in their taxing policies? Perish the thought.

Your committee feels this fight for liberty is peculiarly the function of the bar. Former President Holman, of the American Bar Association, recently subscribed to the same view. He said:

"No movement in the history of the world for the improvement of man's conditions and the establishment of justice among men has ever succeeded without the influence and leadership of great and courageous lawyers. Yet lawyers generally are likely to devote themselves to the championship of individual freedoms and private rights and are not inclined to act together against trends in law and government, which actually imperil individual liberty and private rights. They often fear that group action on their part may be interpreted as political—as taking a position for or against a program of a particular political party."

Your committee has no such fears and in this fight it is simply standing by the philosophy stated by Theodore Roosevelt:

"There is no sport in life so rewarding as a hard fight for the right."

In closing may we leave this one thought with you. The question before us transcends in importance every other question now before the American people. It is the question of liberty. It is a challenge to the bar to summon the people to again hear and heed the thundering voice of Patrick Henry that there is something much sweeter and infinitely more important than life itself, that there is something much dearer and more fundamental than peace, and may we add, there is something much safer than security, and that something is liberty. The liberty of the individual, as a citizen of a free country and a free child of the eternal God.

It is therefore recommended that the New York State Bar Association adopt the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the New York State Bar Association hereby approves and adopts the report of its committee on Federal legislation; it is further

"Resolved, That the proposal of socialized medicine would be destructive of the essential liberties of the American people and should be defeated; it is further

"Resolved, That the officers of this association, its executive committee, its committee on Federal legislation or any subcommittee thereof, be and they hereby are authorized on behalf of the association to do and cause to be done all things necessary or appropriate in pursuance of these resolutions.

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD MARLOWE,
Chairman.

What Should Our Message Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress and all policy makers in our Government who are directly or indirectly affiliated with the United States information and educational programs, the following statement, "What Should Our Message Be?"

This statement, which was prepared by several leading social scientists, consists of notes on a positive program for United States Information Services abroad. In my opinion, this statement represents one of the clearest, most concise, and constructive analyses of our propaganda problem that has ever been written.

As such, it deserves the special attention of Congress and all public officials:

WHAT SHOULD OUR MESSAGE BE?

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The purpose of this memorandum is to help policy makers and those responsible for United States information and educational programs, both domestic and foreign, to clarify the fundamental, long-range goals of their programs, to specify our positive purposes, and thus to have some consistent basis for our day-to-day activities.

While we believe that improved facilities for getting this country's message to the people of the world are badly needed, we believe it is even more important to be clear as to what this message should be. It must, among other things, be so designed that it will put the Soviets on the defensive. It must also ring with a practical idealism.

In preparing this memorandum, we have tried to take into account the most modern scientific interpretation of "human nature," the philosophical basis of communism, the current Soviet practices, and the full implications of democracy as a concept to which this country subscribes.

The statement here puts the problem of what our message should be in general terms. Obviously the specific context to be used in different cultures and with different population groups at different times should be worked out with area specialists and could, as suggested in the strategy notes at the end, be guided by protests of various appeals.

A. WHAT IS THE REAL DANGER TODAY?

Today, more than at any other time in the world's history, the most important thing in the world is in danger—the human being, you, us—whoever you are, wherever you may live.

Men and women everywhere are threatened by conditions which make it difficult or impossible to work out their own destiny.

The threats to human beings assume various forms in different parts of the world; millions of people, especially in Asia, are faced with the age-old problems of survival which they are eager to solve—the problems of food, shelter, clothing, and prevention of disease. Millions of people are thwarted in their struggles for self-improvement; attaining higher standards for living from the soil, the forests, the mines, the shops, and factories; reducing illiteracy; wiping out corruption and exploitation; attaining a greater participation in social and political life.

Men and women everywhere are being denied the chance to develop as human beings should develop. People don't want to be pushed around like toy soldiers. Man is a living, human, joyful, and suffering being. He has his own problems, and he solves them in his own way.

Men know they are not equal, but they believe they deserve equal consideration. They deserve the right to be different, the right to be themselves. These are fundamental, inalienable rights that are biologically determined, not mere political slogans.

Human beings have the capacity to choose. The opportunity to exercise this capacity of choice characteristic of man cannot be denied him without violating his very nature. This inviolable freedom of personality is the foundation for the structure of individual rights and social obligations.

Furthermore, we know that human beings are value seeking. Men strive for order

and dignity, for worth and goodness, for beauty and truth. While none of us ever has or ever will see these values, they are still more real to us in our experience than the things we do see. They constitute our most gratifying experiences. The basic asset of values is that you can take them with you. And it is characteristic of man that he is never satisfied with his lot, that he has the capacity and the desire to emerge to higher, more satisfying levels of choice and experience.

What is in danger today is not only man's physical survival but the hopes and aspirations of men in all parts of the world. Their plans and dreams of a better life are in danger, their chances of attaining greater security, their chance to participate in directing their own destiny, their opportunity to develop according to their own talents and interests. The meaning of life is going to pieces.

In short, what is in danger is the concept of man. Our goal should be to uphold the integrity of the human being at any cost. For the human being is the building stone cast away by some of the architects of our time. Yet human beings are the very cornerstone of a well-founded structure of humanity.

B. WHY IS MAN IN DANGER?

A new and powerful enemy is out to destroy the dignity of man, to destroy those values of man's spirit that make him human.

Here are a few of the basic tenets of communism and some of the practices of the present Soviet regime which we must keep in mind as targets.

1. The individual is not important. The human being like you, like us, just isn't important at all in the mind of our new enemy. The human being's choices are restricted, someone is spying on him from morning till night. If he is suspected of having an idea of his own, he is likely to be torn from his home, never to return.

In those areas of the world dominated by the Soviet regime, we find men living under a system which is frozen in a set of words they are forced to believe. The Soviet regime claims that its system is dynamic. In reality it is static, stifling real change and progress. This system is ruthlessly on the defensive, afraid of its own people unless they all fit the same mold, unless they all sell their souls to the state and its rulers. The Soviet regime is afraid to let its people believe in God.

Under this regime no differences of opinion are tolerated. Any person, any idea contrary to those of the regime must be exterminated. There is no compromise, no pity, and any means are used to achieve the fixed and invariable ideas of the ruler.

This Soviet regime has created a fiction of the mass man. People are turned into groups or social molecules whose shape is determined by their number. The life of the individual in all its manifestations is subordinated to a low common denominator of a class interest.

This mass man is mechanically united only by external interests with all others. Because the inner life of man is so infinitely differentiated, it is merely a stumbling block for the realization of mass man. In order to turn individual man into mass man, it is imperative to exterminate the individual soul, the individual personality, which is the root of the unique human being. For the mass man needs no personal thought, no personal feelings, no personal judgments.

Hence man is called upon by the Soviets to give up his individuality so that he can be turned into a spare part, an interchangeable screw, a "social machine." The supreme goal is a purely quantitative combination of mass particles, a mechanized world which is to contain nothing but soulless machines obedient to the will of a few. Man is simply a number in a mass of statistics.

But we know it is a travesty of human life to regard man as an automaton. It is scientifically wrong. Modern astrophysics and physics, with giant telescopes and ultramicroscopes, have discovered that from the biggest star to the smallest atom every particle that constitutes matter has an individuality of its own. Modern biologists and physiologists have proved that each living cell leads its own individual self-centered life, that the principle of individuation is the basic trait in organic nature.

Since the mass man created by the Soviet regime cannot tolerate individuality, a whole system of devices has been created to destroy individuality. What is labeled "justice" is secret and arbitrary. There is a network of political espionage, even high officials and the commissars of the people are kept under constant observation.

In every respect the secret police of the Soviet regime constitutes a continuation of the last relics of medieval despotism. It is difficult for those who live in a free society to understand what this means, sometimes even to believe it. Some honest progressives who know nothing of Soviet conditions or Soviet politics may still hail Communism as a gospel of salvation containing a promise of a freer and better future for mankind. Such people must remember that Soviet citizens are not even allowed to ask what their efforts are for, are not allowed to ask why this or that policy is imperative.

2. The concept of materialism: The present Soviet regime is putting into practice the idea of Marx that material conditions completely determine man's ideas, beliefs, and hopes. Ideas are viewed only as reflections of what is outside man himself. Thus human life becomes a mechanical process, in turn determined by the mechanical processes of economic life. For the Marxists and the present Soviet regime, all science, art, religion, and ethics are forced to obey the law of economics.

All of this is scientifically outmoded, is old fashioned in terms of modern scientific knowledge. For modern science in all fields—in physics, in chemistry, astrophysics, psychology, biology—agrees that the individual organism does not follow mechanical laws blindly but seems to play an active role in shaping its own destiny. Modern science regards materialism as an outmoded superstition. The Soviet regime denies the fact of individual creativeness which all modern science confirms.

3. Destruction as a method: The present Soviet regime believes that any means or methods are good if they accomplish the ends the regime has in view. This separation of means and ends can only be justified in a society if the individual human being is not taken into account. For if the individual personality is taken into account, if we ask what life is for, then our means and ends are inseparable, are a part of each other, and no means are justifiable which thwart the development of personality and the attainment of human values. Only by leaving out the welfare of the human being can the means of destruction be justified.

The present Soviet regime follows Marx' dictum that "the hope of the spirit is its alliance with violence." To be sure, violence and destruction are always excused by appealing to some higher principles. Class warfare is a fundamental law. Enemies must be ruthlessly annihilated. Individuals must be destroyed if there is even the slightest suspicion that they will not follow blindly the regime's demands.

This tyranny of destruction is maintained at a high level in all those vast areas of the world which our new enemy now controls. Tyranny is enforced with the most modern weapons so that a mere handful of people can keep millions of other human beings under complete subjugation and terror.

Such is the doctrine of destruction. But we know from the history of revolutions that they destroy one set of static ideas only to replace them with other static ideas. We know from modern biological research that if we try to change the course of genetic development by force, we do not get constructive changes which lead to a new higher order species, but we get, rather, freaks and misfits.

Both history and science show that if we completely destroy existing forms of cellular or social life, we destroy the possibility of flowing in any direction. We destroy our base line.

The arbitrary destruction of any class of individuals, of original or deviating personalities, destroys along with it the possibility of more rapid advancement for all people.

4. The new Soviet imperialism: During the last hundred years, nationalism has gained a powerful place in the ideas of man. The idea of nationalism has become almost a religion. The Soviet regime is exploiting the national self-interest of people to lure them into its own sphere of influence and eventually to dominate and exploit them for Soviet ends.

The Soviets have grasped the implications and quickly realized that they could be successful only if they took into account the new strong nationalistic tendencies, especially in Asia. And so, as often before, they have shifted their international party line for reasons of expediency and have now come out as champions of "revolutionary nationalism." Temporarily they are soft-pedalling Marx's idea that the words "national" and "bourgeois" are synonymous. And they will continue to soft pedal this idea until the Communists in these newly formed nations are strong enough to hold and maintain their power in all parts of Asia.

Furthermore, the Communists are smart enough to realize that in these countries progress can come about only in step-by-step fashion. They realize that after people in a given colonial area have shaken off their former lords, the next step for them is the feeling of national pride. Thus we see that the present Communist regime in China is even more nationalistic than the Nationalists they replaced. The Communists in these areas proclaim that national and social liberation are two aspects of the same process.

5. State capitalism and its consequences: While there is much that can be said against competitive capitalism of the United States brand, there is even more that can be said against state capitalism as practiced by the present Soviet regime. For the Soviet brand of capitalism is much more sweeping than the United States variety. In modern Russia an all-powerful state machine is the instrument of capitalism. Hence all the evils of capitalism are magnified. The state is able to exploit manpower to a much higher degree than the most capitalistic trust in the United States could even dream of.

It is important, therefore, that people everywhere be shown that the destruction of private capital does not abolish capital itself but only funnels it into fewer and fewer hands with greater exploitation possible if the people lose control of the government.

6. The fate of working people: The present Soviet regime claims that it holds the key to the salvation of the working class, the toiling masses. It must be stressed that the Soviet authorization collectivism has resulted in a monopoly of power where there is no freedom left for the individual worker—no freedom to choose his work, no freedom to quit his work, no freedom to bargain for better wages or working conditions. The worker has become a tool, a cog in the great state machine.

7. Soviet education: The aim of education in a Soviet-dominated area is the creation of useful Soviet citizens who believe what they are taught and do what they are told. Once the basic tenets of the Soviet regime are

accepted, there are ready-made answers for everything.

All education is so organized that no one may exceed a state-approved amount of knowledge. Soviet rulers do not want to run the risk of speculation and doubt about the wisdom of the state. They do not want personal opinions. Even personal criticism of capitalist warmongers, Wall Street imperialism, etc., are undesirable. For all that is to be said about the evils of capitalism has already been said by the gods Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Personal argument or elaboration of their themes is considered heresy.

Therefore teachers are expected to preach, not to teach. They preach a new religion which they present as a science.

8. Destruction of human values: In the Soviet regime, personal values must become party property. The party decides what experiences constitute the good, the true, the beautiful, the decent, the worth while.

In the past, the center of life was religion. The word religion comes from "religio" meaning to be related to something higher. In the Soviet regime, an individual belongs to a party, and "party" derives from "part." To belong to a party means to believe in a certain part or aspect. It is partiality instead of totality.

Under the Soviet regime, the party is the state. This means that the part has swallowed the whole. To follow the party line, means to align oneself with the party that has usurped the whole. The totalitarian doctrine of the Soviet regime demands that man and human freedoms become State property. In the Soviet regime, the ideal of totality has deteriorated into totalitarianism. This means an enforced totality instead of one freely adopted.

In this enforced absence of conflicting ideas and loyalties, an individual under the Soviet regime may gradually develop an emotional security. But his emotional security is that of a robot equipped by the State with a synthetic outlook on life. The State trains him with some skill and imbues him with the faith that he is doing his part to bring about a Communist paradise everywhere.

This robot security has the effect of chaining people down instead of pulling them up. It is based on blind faith; it makes for the suicide of man's characteristics through freedom from freedom, through relieving man of the burden of choice and the responsibilities and satisfactions that come with choice. It creates a spiritual vacuum, an inability to meet new situations. Under the Soviet regime the only measure of man is his working capacity. Ethics and morality are completely subordinated to what the leaders think is in the interest of the class struggle. Lenin wrote, "We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class struggle of the proletariat."

We might well compare the attitude and pronouncements of Soviet leaders with the convictions and statements of the great teachers and leaders of all ages.

Lao-tse and Confucius proclaimed charity as the basic rule of life. Christ said: "Love your enemies, bless them that persecute you." But Lenin declared: "It does not matter if three quarters of mankind is destroyed; all that counts is that ultimately the last quarter should become Communist."

Buddha proclaimed: "Man shall conquer anger by love, evil by good, avarice by generosity, and the liar by truth." Lenin preached that the only means of dealing with opponents was to smash them. Gandhi declared: "The duty of a human being is to diminish hatred and to promote love." Stalin on the other hand pronounced: "You cannot defeat an enemy without learning to hate him with all your soul."

Tolstoy considered love as "the highest and only law for human life." Lenin decreed: "The hate-laden cry of rage is our only delight."

Jefferson said: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And Emerson concurred: "For what avail the plough or sail, or land or life, if freedom fail." But to Lenin "Freedom is a bourgeois prejudice." It is rather doubtful whether men like Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln, who came out for freedom, can be termed as bourgeois.

9. The fiction of "scientific socialism" as used by the Soviet regime: All Soviet goals and Soviet practices are masked under the cloak of the modern god science. The principles under which the regime operates are called laws—dialectical laws. Hence the Soviet citizen is made to feel that if things are happening according to a scientific law, there can be no argument. But the judgment of modern science denies the validity of the laws these Soviets label as scientific.

C. WHAT ARE WE INTERESTED IN?

All of our information programs should be permeated with the sincerity of our realization that the United States is one of the few areas in the world where the struggle for physical survival and economic reconstruction are not now the paramount issue. Furthermore, people in this country have the opportunity to participate in the formation of national policy.

As a consequence, we see that it is largely up to us to do what we can to rescue the concept of man—offering help and holding out hope.

Since we are not primarily burdened with problems of survival and reconstruction, it is up to us to remind men and women everywhere of the standards of value associated with a good life. These standards must be universal enough to appeal to all men and to win all: Chinese, Indians, Hungarians, Brazilians; merchants, fishermen, mothers, clerks, scientists, etc.

These standards should serve as a compass which could direct men in any culture toward those goals that are common to human beings as such from whatever position they may be in now, from whatever basis, whatever system of government, whatever level of culture or political development they may have now.

Our job is, then, to provide faith in the possibility of achieving these universal standards—a faith that people can feel sure enough about so they can use it as a basis for evaluating political leadership and not blindly follow idols. Our standards must give them an answer to the question of "what for?"

We have pointed out that values are things people can take with them. Man's greatest security comes from faith in his values. What people ought to expect of their political leaders, then, is that they keep governments as living and growing organizations for the realization of human values.

If we can help people everywhere clarify the goals of human living, we can then point out to them that the job we are trying to do and the job we must all work together on, is much more than the job of saving any particular system or form of government that any of us happen to have at the moment. Systems of government, whether they be capitalism, communism, or socialism, must be viewed as methods of living together which have been worked out and accepted by different people at different times for reasons which are historically clear.

The solution of man's problem now, that of saving himself from an enemy who would destroy his very nature, will not be achieved merely by substituting one system for another system. What is needed is a clear statement of the goals for which all people are striving. Then people can choose and develop whatever social techniques, public or private, appear best suited to the achievement of these goals.

We must constantly recall to people and to ourselves, all the great values which were created in the past in order to establish and defend the value of man. We must show that those who bid us forget the past, rob us of our spiritual heritage. What we know about the meaning of life is not a modern discovery, it is not the new look of a passing vogue. The values of life have been established by experiences that reach back thousands of years. They are the net profit of the accumulated wisdom of innumerable cultures. No individual, no group, no nation, no system has a monopoly on wisdom.

We must point out that different freedoms are needed in different cultures today, and that we must not try to impose on people one set of freedoms they do not want for other sets of freedoms they do want.

People in different parts of the world have learned to want different freedoms. What means a lot to some doesn't mean much to others. Instead of trying to convert other nations to adopt fully our point of view, our "way of life," we must rather attempt to avail ourselves of the specific national genius of each country in order to fit our concepts to the needs of that individual country, without in the least compromising with our goals.

We must show that freedom is not an end in itself, but that the quality of freedom is measured by what a person does with it.

We must make it clear that freedom involves great personal responsibility, that there is no such thing as freedom from freedom if men are to be themselves and to develop as nature has prescribed. Freedom is not license but the responsibility for the realization of human values.

We must recall that men in western democracies have evolved codes of laws, including the protection of personal freedoms through the right of trial by jury, to guard themselves against arbitrary rules that might be set up by the state or other self-constituted authority.

The fact of man's increasing interdependence on other men, because of our technological development, exchange of goods and ideas, etc., must be emphasized and the consequences made clear. We see that suddenly in the course of history we have all been made neighbors. We see that many of the things we need for an abundant life are produced and manufactured by others, just as the things we produce and manufacture are needed by them. It must become apparent that each individual can achieve his own purposes only insofar as he takes into account and respects the purposes and goals of other people whom his behavior affects.

In the long run, no one individual can do what he wants to do unless other people are allowed to do what they want to do. Hence the necessity of international laws, internationally enforced. The very fact that we have established personal contact with the people of all nations, cultures, colors, and creeds has changed the vague notion of "mankind" and has confronted people everywhere with attitudes which call for wide horizons, understanding, and charity. This we all have to learn and practice if the idea of one world is to become a reality.

Among other things, we must show that our loyalty to our own country does not make us disloyal to our fellowmen in other countries. We should work for the common use of the world's resources, for a commor flag to fly with our own.

We must constantly emphasize our interest in the Russian people and the people of the satellite countries, clearly and constantly distinguishing between the Soviet regime and the dictatorships in satellite countries on the one hand, and the people who live in those areas and their national symbols on the other hand. We must indicate to

them that all of us share common purposes as human beings. We must show them that we are willing to make sacrifices to help them concretely.

We should make it clear that this position of ours is not a trumped-up idealism for propaganda purposes. It is, rather, the most hard-headed, yet the most enlightened, kind of realism. We know that in helping them we help ourselves. It turns out that this hard-headed realism is one which can only be achieved by practicing the Golden Rule.

Since we believe that individuals are the most important things in the world, and since we see that individuals are now in danger, we unhesitatingly accept the ideals of democracy. We do this because democracy pledges itself to regard the individual as sacred. That is its keystone. That is why nations everywhere say, "We stand for democracy." That is why the Soviet regime is exploiting the slogan "democracy" for its perverted and distorted aims.

D. WHY OUR DEFENSE PREPARATIONS?

People want peace. Grasping this better than we have, Russia has beat us to the peace offensive. It strengthens her position not only behind the iron curtain but also abroad, especially in Germany, our first and unwilling line of defense in Europe. The Russian peace offensive has trapped many honest people everywhere.

We can recognize that while we still have to defend ourselves against those who do not yet see what is best for them, for us, for everybody, that huge armaments and defense preparations are not goals in themselves. Instruments of war are old-fashioned, outmoded instruments which most men never want to use.

We must make it clear that we know war is wrong. We know it is wrong to kill people, to hurt them, to starve them, to destroy their homes and their factories. We must make it clear that we oppose the trend by which war is in danger of becoming an end in itself.

And yet we know there are some things worse than war—the slavery of bondage of our bodies, our minds, our souls. Hence we must resist all threats of Soviet imperialism and domination wherever they may be found. For, as Daniel Webster said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

What we are fighting for, then, is time for people to see in their own experience that if we will act together we can raise our levels of security, can increase the range of our satisfactions in peaceful ways. We are fighting for time so that we can show people that ideas and institutions should be judged according to the way they affect individuals, that every happening must be judged from an individual point of view.

We must stress that the time we are fighting for is also a time which we feel must be used by the genius of each national group to work toward the common goal of humanity in its particular way according to its customs and its own traditions. Otherwise there can be no lasting success and progress for them or for us.

We also want time to demonstrate to the people in Soviet-dominated areas that the so-called scientific foundations on which the Soviet regime bases its policy are essentially unscientific and reactionary.

We want time to demonstrate the falsity of the assumptions on which the Soviet regime operates—assumptions which they have taught people to believe by refusing them the right to complete information. Among the wrong assumptions now expressed by the Soviet regime are:

1. The assumption that the contradiction between capital and labor is bound to grow. (Precisely the opposite seems to be the trend in the United States.)

2. The assumption that the proletariat will be increasingly oppressed and that monopoly capitalism will attain increasingly greater profit. (Again, exactly the reverse trend is found in the United States.)

3. The assumption that capitalism will become increasingly more imperialistic. (This is belied by recent events such as the British withdrawal from India, the Marshall plan, etc.)

4. Ever-increased rivalry between capitalistic states for colonial areas. (Witness the role of the United Nations here.)

5. The assumption that the proletariat will revolt spontaneously in increasing measure. (This is not occurring in western countries.)

6. The assumption that there will be an increase in the hatred of capitalistic countries for Socialism in any form. (But note our basically good relations with England, with the Scandinavian countries, and with Yugoslavia.)

7. The assumption that there will be an increase in the resentment of the proletariat of preparations for defense or war against Soviet socialism. (This is belied by the fact that the workingman in the United States is just as cognizant of the threat the Soviet regime has for him as anyone else.)

We must constantly show that the Soviet regime has not kept promises to workers but has only made them slaves; it has not kept its promises to peasants and farmers; its appeals to intellectuals, scientists, and artists have been tricks which have stifled their talents and creativity and forced a complete disregard of scientific truth and of universal human values.

We must also stress that our defense preparations are to give us time to work out some of our own problems. We must be frank in acknowledging that in spite of the high standards we have so far achieved, there is still a good deal of housecleaning to be done in our own country, i. e., slum clearance, racial discrimination, etc., and that we are engaged in this housecleaning. We should also indicate that through the United Nations we are concerned with methods of banishing vestiges of capitalistic imperialism at the same time we try to keep colonial peoples from Soviet enslavement

We must make it clear that our whole point 4 program is one designed to help people help themselves. We must make it clear by our deeds as well as our words that we refuse to say to anyone, "Here is bread if you will think the way I do—if you will do as I say."

These are the fundamental reasons why we are determined to defend ourselves and other people who are still free of Soviet domination from the new enemy that confronts man.

The time we are fighting for is time to prevent world war III altogether. It is not merely time to postpone the day of its outbreak. If we can make this point clear, it should provide people with hope, replacing the current despair of those who wonder what's the use of all their effort anyway.

E. WHAT WE OUGHT TO REMEMBER

We must make it clear that we do not want to impose; we do not want to destroy. We oppose only those who would impose and who would destroy to achieve their ends.

We must make it clear that neither we, nor any other nation or group, have a patent on democracy. We should make it clear that whatever has proved good in socialism can be adopted by men without at the same time selling their souls and forfeiting their individuality. We must make it clear that whatever has proved good in capitalism can be accepted by men without sacrificing their security and destroying their own chances for self-development.

We must make it clear that we are not out to save any particular form of capitalism or any particular form of society, but that we are concerned only with the rescue of man who stands in mortal danger. We do not want to force on people anywhere what the people in any one country happen to think is best. For we know that change is the rule of nature and human nature and we have faith that in the distant future men will create social and political organizations which will better provide for the lot of the individual and for lasting peace than any system devised to date.

We should try to point out that we do not regard democracy as an end in itself. To consider democrac, as an end in itself is to kill human life by reducing it to a single dimension. This is the mistake the Nazis made, the mistake the Soviets are making today.

It is what we do with our democracy that matters; it is what we do with our freedom that matters.

If we are to avoid blunders, to avoid insulting people, we must make every effort to understand the national and cultural bases within which these people operate and take these fully into account, capitalizing with complete sincerity and without any condescension on the national genius and the cultural pride found in almost every land.

To remember about Europe: An information program for European countries can only be successful if it takes into account the European concept of the United States. While this concept may strike us as wrong, the assumptions behind it are there, and we must do what we can to change them before we can make any headway.

We must understand that, while Europe is battered, it is not defeated. The people in Europe feel that they are caught in a vise, and they are likely to resent imposition by the United States just as they resent sovietization.

The European outlook on life is basically different from that of the United States. Europeans see the United States as a utilitarian country where everything is measured by practical success. This concept is foreign to most Europeans, who are likely to regard man primarily as an individual who thinks, feels, and lives, not as a person who merely produces. Thus the European has a relatively disinterested attitude in the material luxuries of life.

The stress in Europe is laid more on culture than it is on civilization. Europeans know from experience that culture creates civilization, while civilization never creates culture. Europeans view the United States as a civilized country in a technological sense, but are likely to feel that the United States is lacking in the cultural values necessary for spiritual leadership. Therefore, it is most important to convey to Europeans information concerning our cultural values, showing them that we believe in such values, and that efficiency, productive capacity, and "success" are not our only yardsticks.

Europe is also unsympathetic to the tenseness of the United States pace, to our hustle and bustle. For example, Europeans enjoy "wasting" their time in "idle talk." For they believe that the time isn't wasted and that the talk isn't idle. The replacement of Viennese coffee houses by snack bars is symbolic of our "eat and run" attitude and is likely to go against the grain of the Austrian spirit.

We must reexamine what we are offering to the people of Europe. Are we offering liberalism and democracy wrapped in an optimistic package? This approach would be doomed to failure. For Europe has been disillusioned. The ideas we are offering Europe were born in Europe in the eighteenth century and then transplanted to the United States. Now we are bringing these same ideas back as a new promise of hope to Europe, without regard for the fact that the experiences of the European people in the

last 200 years have steeped them in skepticism. Europe has seen the perversion of Socialist promises of equality into dictatorship, of global promises being broken and perverted into global wars fought on European soil. The United States has escaped these historical disappointments, and therefore retains the optimistic faith which most people in Europe have lost. While we believe in our promises, Europe is doubtful.

When we deal with Europe we ought to realize that Europeans are not children who can take only sugar-coated pills. Europeans have come to accept struggle and suffering as an essential part of life. This is doubtless one reason why Marxism had a certain appeal to many Europeans since Marxism does not promise any easy evolutionary progress.

We must not promise peace and ask for rearmament, for Europeans will doubt our honesty. We must not promise free enterprise and stress the necessity of a war economy, for Europeans will doubt our sincerity. We must not ask for sacrifices and then try to disguise them as favors. We must choose our words carefully, for Europeans are wary.

We must take into account the virility of European nationalism and remember that there are still relatively few people in Europe who can conceive of a United States of Europe. The strength of nationalism in Europe may be illustrated with reference to what happened to the concept of socialism which started out as an international concept. Almost immediately the idea was monopolized by nationalistic tendencies: in Italy socialism was perverted by Mussolini to fascism, in Nazi Germany to national socialism, in the Soviet Union into nationalist bolshevism. The present Titoism and recent splitting off of French and Italian Communist leaders who are motived by nationalism and who resent Soviet imperialism further indicates the trend.

At this time, therefore, the wise course of action would seem to be to bolster nationalism rather than to weaken it. For if communism can be broken up into various national brands its danger to the world as a whole will be considerably decreased.

In short, if we want to deal successfully with Europe, we must see her the way she is and the way she sees herself—not the way we want her to be. We must know each country's history, its prides and prejudices, and we must act on this knowledge.

What to remember about Asia: If we want to deal successfully with Asia, we must realize, as the Soviets have, that the main driving force in Asia is an upsurge of nationalism. The Asiatic approach to the world and its problems is a consciously nationalistic one.

And we must realize, as the Soviets have done, that if we want to win the people of Asia as our friends, we must help them on their level, not on ours. There is no use sending machinery which the people of Asia do not know how to use. If we send machinery, we must send along experts who speak the language and who understand the minds and the problems of the people they are going to work with. What we send and how it is to be used must be decided with their full participation and initiative. If we can do this and make them feel that we are trying to help them to help themselves, we will dispel their present distrust of us and of foreign intervention and we will thereby debunk the falsehood of the Soviet-inspired myth of United States imperialism.

People in Asia believe that we are trying to impose a form of government and a culture without regard to their own needs.

People in Asia believe that we think they are an inferior race and that their cultures are below our own. Educated Asiatics tend to look on western culture as young, immature.

Since the people of Asia are struggling for survival, they are not ready to appreciate our emphasis upon mechanization, on mass production, and so forth. For example, in those areas of Asia where fertility of the soil makes the going easier, people still do not believe in working for more than is needed.

People in Asia have seen the United States talk democracy and then actively aid imperialism and dictatorship.

People in Asia have seen the United States talk private enterprise and at the same time exploit Asiatics.

If we want to deal successfully with the people of Asia, then we must not only understand them as they are, but understand how they see us.

F. WHY THIS MESSAGE; WHY ALL OUR MESSAGES?

People everywhere are being deluged by propaganda. They are being asked to believe certain claims, to support certain ideas, to rally around certain slogans.

We are simply trying to tell other people how we see things. We, as a people, are trying to communicate with other people as individuals, as fellow human beings. We are trying to present a point of view as we honestly see it now—a point of view we honestly believe, a point of view we are trying to work out in actual practice.

The people in our own country and in all areas not dominated by the Soviet Union have free access to information, to facts, to current events. If we distorted these in any way for propaganda purposes we would destroy the confidence of the millions of people in our own land and abroad who are concerned with communicating with each other and working out better ways of living. We are not so stupid as to resort to the technique of the big lie, which may prove temporarily successful for the dictator, but which history shows eventually ends in disaster for him and his followers. We believe with Lincoln that "truth is generally the best vindication against slander."

We realize that the people in our own land and in other lands will be willing to make personal sacrifices only if they believe in the goals they are trying to attain. Above all, we realize that these goals must be goals for individuals themselves, not meaningless abstractions. Men everywhere will sacrifice comfort and material security if they believe this will preserve their integrity and their inner security, or if by such sacrifice they can attain the integrity and security they do not have now.

We believe that people everywhere are trying to do their best as they see it, and that all of us can do better for ourselves and for each other if we can communicate to each other our needs and aspirations, our hopes and fears, and work peacefully together for those goals common to all men.

The goals we subscribe to have not been arrived at hastily. We have consulted the most advanced scientific men in all countries where men can think honestly. We have also studied what the great religious prophets and the wise men of different ages and countries have said, and we find that they, too, support what we believe to be the goals of life.

With these goals in mind, it is up to each individual, each group, each nation, to decide what is best; to decide what is right. The decisions men everywhere make today are terribly important—maybe more important than the decisions men have had to make anywhere, anytime.

We realize that there are millions of people in Soviet dominated areas who are not free to choose, who cannot do what they really think is best and right without losing their lives. We want them to remember that even if their own rulers may be against them, against anyone who wants to develop as an individual and be himself, that there are millions of people, millions of fellow human beings and fellow citizens of the world outside Soviet dominated areas, who are ready to work with those people inside the Soviet areas whenever the opportunity permits. We want to hold out hope to those who are helpless and persecuted.

Our chief difficulty in communicating with people in Soviet dominated areas is not one of geographical boundaries. The greatest obstacle is not the iron curtain which tries to shut out truthful information about the rest of the world. The greatest difficulty is rather to pierce the iron mold into which the minds of Soviet citizens have been cast for the last 33 years through no fault of their own.

For this reason, our message must have maximum plausibility. And we must repeat our message over and over again if we are to break this iron mold.

None of us can sit back and indulge in mental speculations about what we should do. Leisurely times have passed. The hour has struck and it is time for action.

What we are trying to do in our communications is to show people everywhere why we feel that the purposes of the Soviet regime are completely inimical to the purposes of human beings as such, and why we uphold the dignity of the individual, the freedom of people to choose and make decisions for themselves. Our communications must show the possibility of self-development at the same time the physical needs and standards of living of people everywhere are raised as they should and must be.

While it is important to act, it is even more important to know why we are acting, what we are acting for. The quality of our action depends upon the quality of our purposes.

G. WHAT, IN BRIEF, IS OUR MESSAGE; OUR CREDO?

We believe that human beings everywhere are born with common needs and aspirations; that chief among the characteristics of man is his ceaseless desire to improve the quality of living; that this requires freedom from want and freedom from fear, together with freedom to choose and freedom to help shape his own destiny; that any group, nation, or ideology which attempts to impose a fixed way of life on other individuals is committing a crime against human nature and the spirit of man; that it is the responsibility of all people everywhere to help their fellow human beings create whatever conditions they feel hold out the possibility of making their living more abundant according to their own cultural heritage.

We believe in the perfectibility of man.

We believe that we and others will achieve a better society only when we and they become better men.

We believe that if action is kindled by charity and love, it can never be wrong.

All this we believe.

Only by acting on these beliefs will we be able to live more abundant lives ourselves. In a world where each of us depends on so many others, the chance for any of us to be increasingly free of want, free of fear, free to choose, free to be ourselves, depends on the chance of others to be equally free.

STATEGY NOTES

1. To solidify our position, concentrate especially on the people of the world whose minds are not already in iron molds, i. e., those who share some of our traditions, goals, assumptions, and hope.

2. A criterion for each message used by the United States Information Service (whether broadcast, leaflet, etc.) should be: If someone asked a person who had heard a VOA broadcast, and so forth, the question "What did it say?" could the listener tell him? That is, was the message clear, unambiguous, simple, pointed, plausible, not easily distorted?

3. It is possible by means of pre-tests on small samples of a population to determine in advance what particular context for our information and education programs will be most plausible and most effective. Such tests are relatively simple to conduct on people not now living within the Soviet sphere of influence and some information concerning the best arguments to use with persons who are in iron curtain countries might be obtained by careful interviewing of displaced persons, etc. The use of this method can greatly aid us in pointing up our message to specific cultures and in no way implies that we are being artificial or untruthful. It means essentially that, like a good general, we are trying to determine weak spots before we put on our major offensive.

4. Use irony where possible. Don't pay the tribute of taking everything the U. S. S. R. says and does seriously. Make use of cartoons.

5. Seek slogans, watch for phrases that catch hold, repeat them often. But choose slogans with great care since people have been deluged with them.

6. Avoid words spoiled by Soviets. Describe what the names are naming.

7. Accompany, supplementally, Voice of America, etc., abroad with a Voice for America at home. This should be a short, 15 to 20 minute weekly report to the people telling them how things stand, giving the "what for's" along with the "how-to-do's." If possible, this should be done by the President. If not, possibly by a neutral voice with State or Cabinet backing, etc.

(NOTE.—The ideas expressed in this memorandum can be documented with evidence from many sources. We could, for example, give the opinions of outstanding scientists that the Soviet conception of "materialism" is now regarded only as a superstition. We could cite the views of leading scientists concerning the importance of values in human life. There is ample evidence that Soviet totalitarianism is contrary to the development of the individual personality. This statement was written in the hope that it would prove useful. Since the writers believe it should stand on its own feet, they feel that the addition of their names is irrelevant. If you can use it in any way, they will be happy to have you use it. It is common property.)

The Need for a United States Medical Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention and consideration of my colleagues in this House a bill which I introduced on May 2. I want to explain this bill as briefly as possible. I am hopeful enough to believe that the proposal it contains will arouse widespread interest in this legislative chamber, as well as in the country at large, to warrant prompt and early adoption of the proposal.

My bill, H. R. 3931, calls for the establishment of a United States Medical Academy, along the lines of the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The purpose of this bill is to increase the number of physicians and dentists who would be available for our Armed Forces, for the United States Public Health Service, and for other governmental activities requiring medical service.

Through the establishment of this medical academy we shall not only help to eliminate the shortage of doctors which exists in the Federal Government, but we shall also help to remedy the serious shortage in the country as a whole. At the same time, the creation of such an institution would insure a new source of specially-trained and readily available nucleus of medical men in Government services around which the necessary expansions could be undertaken in times of emergency, without straining and draining the supply of medical men.

All of us are acutely aware of the doctor shortage today, which was serious enough before the outbreak of the war in Korea, but which has grown considerably worse since then due to the crying need for doctors in the Armed Forces. Nearly a year ago, in June 1950, the Army called for 2,167 doctors who were needed immediately to help meet the new emergency resulting from the Korean crisis. Since then Congress has found it necessary to provide for a draft of doctors. The Department of Defense has set a new and increased goal for men in uniform, which will require an additional 4,000 doctors to meet the needs of our expanding Armed Forces for proper medical care. Less than 10 days ago, on April 23, the Defense Department asked selective service authcrities to draft 1,202 physicians during the months of July, August, and September. If it continues at this rate, how can we avert a disruption of our civilian medical services?

Needless to say, that we are determined our Armed Forces should have the best possible medical care. But we should be equally concerned that the families of men in the service, their parents, wives, and children, are not deprived of the medical attention which they must have. It must also be remembered that our cities may someday become enemy targets and be exposed to enemy attacks from the air. In the event of such attacks, or in the case of serious epidemics or other emergencies, we must be fully prepared to render medical care to the civilian population over and above the normal civilian needs for such care.

Only a short while ago, Dr. Howard Rusk, Chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee in the National Security Resources Board, warned that we can expect a shortage of 22,000 doctors in this country by 1954, only 3 years from now. A year ago we knew we needed more doctors. Today we are faced with the stark reality of desperately trying to stretch inadequate manpower to meet the needs in a time of national crisis. Must we wait until it is too late or until the health situation in the United States is dangerously impaired before we take any effective action?

I submit that even without the urgent need brought about by the present crisis, it is necessary for our Government to establish as soon as possible a United States Medical Academy. Let me emphasize that this proposal is not one arising entirely or solely out of the present emergency. On the contrary, the emergency merely accents the need for action which we should have taken long ago.

Throughout our history medical officers in the armed services—unlike the military officers who have been graduated from West Point or Annapolis—had to subsidize their own medical education and training. Why should it not be possible for the Federal Government to train the doctors it requires for its medical services at Government expense, in the same manner it trains a nucleus for our military staffs? Indeed, a medical academy would add a new complement of doctors each year to meet Government needs. It would also, I am convinced, enable military medicine to acquire a professional career status which it deserves, and it would unquestionably serve as a very encouraging factor in the development of new fields of medical knowledge.

Military medicine, as we all know, has some special problems. It must be concerned with the human factors inherent in military service in the Arctic region and in the tropics. It must study physical problems which arise from jet-propelled planes, or in submarines. It is concerned with mass training, global war, and the use of unconventional weapons. Moreover, it has another important distinguishing feature which is sometimes overlooked, namely, preventive medicine—the problem of keeping men and women fit for service and of maintaining adequate health and sanitation measures. Most medical schools today properly put major emphasis upon diagnosis and cure of disease, frequently at the expense of courses in preventive methods and techniques.

These special medical problems of the military are merely noted here without specific recommendations as to the proposed Academy's curriculum, of course. Clearly, they represent fields of specialization. Just as clearly, the basic courses offered in the Medical Academy would duplicate the courses given in every good medical school in the country. Graduates of the Academy would be trained first as doctors and then as specialists.

Mr. Speaker, we should have built such a medical academy a long time ago, because the Armed Forces need it, the Government health services need it, and the country needs it. Today we must be moved by extremity and urgency to establish such a school so that the Federal Government can, in the future, assume its fair share and responsibility in helping to supply the doctors it must have for its own services, in peace as well as in war.

The proposed legislation contains the following major provisions:

First. It creates the United States Medical Academy along lines similar to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy.

Second. Appointments to this Academy would be made from all congressional districts, Territories, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, 8 from each State at large, and 132 from the United States at large.

Third. Candidates for admission would be at least 20 years of age but less than 25, graduates of a college or university or the equivalent, citizens of the United States, and of good moral character.

Fourth. The course of study would include the following subjects: anatomy, physiology, chemistry, hygiene, surgery, obstetrics and gynecology, pathology, bacteriology, and diagnosis.

Fifth. Graduates from the Academy would remain in Government service for 5 years.

Sixth. All employees of the Academy would be paid in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 and would be subject to the provisions of the civil-service retirement laws.

Seventh. The Academy would have a Superintendent appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 10 years, and a Board of Visitors with prescribed pay and minimum duties.

I am hopeful this bill will receive due consideration and early approval of the committee to which it was referred and the subsequent approval of Congress.

American Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the period May 12 through May 19 is being observed once more as National Defense Week, at the conclusion of which will be celebrated Armed Forces Day, on May 19. This year, as in several past years, it has been my pleasure to contribute for this occasion an article to the official magazine of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States. This article is published in the May 1951 issue of the Reserve Officer. Its subject is a long-range program for American preparedness.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article by printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPAREDNESS: TEMPORARY FLURRY OR LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, senior United States Senator from Wisconsin)

What is one of the greatest psychological handicaps to adequate American defense—to a comprehensive reserve program, to thorough preparedness?

The answer is the tendency of our people to fluctuate between the two mental extremes of optimism on the one hand and pessimism on the other hand in our attitude toward international relations and the problem of peace. Because of that tendency, we swing like a pendulum from the extreme direction of pacifism to the extreme direction of militarism. We are an "off-again, on-again, in-again, out-again" people in this respect.

Observers looking at America's history have long noted that after every war in which we have been engaged, there has been a tremendous psychological let-down, a frantic effort to demilitarize, to be done with the messy and costly business of preparation for future possible war. It is only natural, perhaps, that we should be guilty, if you can call it that, of overhasty demobilization after war.

The average American boy is not raised with the idea that he should spend his days perpetually lying in filthy foxholes with insects biting him, with rain pouring down, with the accumulation of weeks' dirt on his body, with shells (live or dummy) bursting around him, and an instrument of death in his hand. The American boy is raised for baseball, football, 4–H Clubs, Boy Scouts, and the peaceful pursuit of happiness.

We have always regarded war as an occasional detestable operation which a nation should get over with as quickly as possible and then promptly forget about in the interest of everybody making a good living in civilian life and enjoying the better things. We, with our unsurpassed standard of living, with our superb comforts and conveniences, with freedoms unknown anywhere else in the world, naturally do not like to think about the possibility of a permanent state of mobilization, of continual tension and preparedness.

KOREA FLUCTUATIONS

But every once in awhile some dramatic event occurs which serves to awaken us out of our lethargy. In 1941 it was the Japanese dive bombers blasting Pearl Harbor. In 1950 it was the North Korean troops pouring down over the thirty-eighth parallel. Each of these sharp events has served to reverse our total thinking. In the instance of Korea, there was a temporary state of near panic and hysteria. It was believed that the firing of North Korean artillery was but the prelude to a deafening roar of Russian guns in the near future and so frantically we started to build up our armed forces and to undo much of what we had done in the rosy alls-well-with-the-world period following September 1945.

In the ensuing months, the fortunes of the Korean war fluctuated back and forth. Every time it loked as though we were "out of the woods," so to speak, and as though American fighting men had once more triumphed, there was a feeling of let-down and an itch to bring the boys home and forget the whole dismal experience. Then, some bad news would come from Pyongyang or from the Kremlin or from Lake Success or from a satellite state or from Iran, and once more we would be plunged into an extreme state of near panic. Back and forth, we would go from optimism as to a bright, peaceful future to blackest pessimism as to the inevitability of a third world war.

Always, when the war clouds seemed to disappear, we would start to wonder why we were spending so much money for training men in destruction and for armaments, when obviously the same outpouring could build schools, hospitals, playgrounds, and a thousand other types of community improvements all over this land. Then, when the war clouds would start to regather, we would hastily appropriate billions to make up for lost time.

We as a people have been historically guilty of this "blow hot, blow cold" attitude of being down in the dumps one day, and riding high in the sky the next day.

STRATEGY OF COMMUNISM

Yet you and I and all thinking Ame[illegible]s should recognize today that what we need instead of these extreme variations is a steady determination to be prepared for every emergency. We need National Defense Weeks and a national defense psychology 52 weeks a year. What we need is a firm recognition that the strategy of Russian communism in the long run is committed to the downfall of the American way of life. So, whether or not Soviet diplomats smile at us one day, whether or not they figuratively pat us on the back of the head and whisper sweet lullabies to us, whether or not Joe Stalin comes out with one of his "peace is definitely possible" talks should make comparatively little difference. We need to recognize that so long as Russia is controlled by a handful of men committed to a fanatical, godless creed and to the whole cult of ruthless power, we have no alternative but to arm wisely, soundly, and on a continuing basis. I do not mean that we should not observe closely changing trends; but I do mean that we must perceive the total pattern, not merely the day-to-day changes.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

We need to lay the firmest foundations for a broader reserve system, founded on justice, fairness, equitable compensation, decent rights and benefits. The Reserve is still the backbone of America's defense. We need, moreover, to pursue other elements of a long-range strategy. Let me suggest several points in such a program.

1. We must continue to follow an intense policy of all-around penetration of the Soviet Union and its satellites. This means making more effective an expanded Voice of America program. It means OSS—like shipment of considerable quantities of saboteurs, arms, and ammunition to dissident elements behind the iron curtain. It means stirring up so much trouble on a continuing basis for the Politburo that it will not be so sure of its home front so as to commit troops to a foreign war. It means exploiting every weakness within the internal fabric of Russian society—economic, political, and social. A recent Foreign Relations Committee print which I helped arrange for spells out quite clearly the areas of internal Russian tension on which America can capitalize.

2. On a long-range basis, we must adequately train our manpower. The Senate has wisely laid the basis for universal military training to take effect when world conditions will permit the present Selective Service System to be replaced. I am hoping that the House of Representatives will follow suit.

I can understand deeply the contrary feelings of countless educators, clergymen, Parent-Teacher Association leaders who question the advisability of UMT. To them I have said and have written this: One of the greatest sins that we can commit is to some day send American boys into battle unprepared. There is not a single Reserve officer or enlisted man who reads these words who does not know one or even a dozen instances where wonderful buddies died in the opening stages of battle because they did not have the most elementary idea of how to survive in modern combat. It is incredible that with all our magnificent American training techniques we should find our boys engaging North Korean or Chinese peasants who know how to use modern weapons better, who are more expert in infiltration tactics, who are better night fighters, than are our own modern youths.

3. A third element of long-range strategy is a broader integration between the Armed Forces and the industrial genius of the American free-enterprise system. By that, I mean that there must be a continuous closer collaboration between every phase of American industry and experts of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, so that the latest inventions can be fully utilized for improvements in technological warfare.

We have been so concerned about developing better refrigerators, better automobiles, better washing machines that we have not produced the vastly improved tanks, mortars, jets of which we are capable. I am not saying that we cannot be proud of some of our improved weapons, but you and I know that it is a fact that the Korean war found us with pretty much the same weapons as we used in World War II, often with comparatively few important improvements.

4. The Armed Forces themselves figure in this long-range strategy insofar as their own attitude is concerned. Having suffered from periods of appropriations "feasts" and then "famines," they have not always demonstrated a continuing awareness of their own responsibility in the use of the funds allocated to them. Every once in a while some dramatic instances come before the public view in which there has been a shocking extravagance on the part of one of the services. Such instances merely serve to sour the public on pouring more and more billions into the hands of our military, naval, and air chieftains. This is a most unfortunate situation, because it is important that the people and the Congress have the highest faith in our military leaders. But they, in turn, must justify that faith.

5. We must talk "cold turkey" among ourselves and to the Russian insofar as our negotiations with them are concerned. There is no use of our vacillating like a weather vane in dealing with fellows like Gromyko and Vishinsky. We must impress upon them of course that we definitely do not desire war and do not think war is inevitable between our two peoples. But at the same time, we must acquaint them with the fact that appeasement is definitely out. We must indicate that we, too, have a long-range strategy in terms of winning the world for the free way of life through our point 4 program, through the Voice of America and through every other instrumentality available to us. The Russians have seen how inconstant we are and they are trying to steer us away from a long-range program of steady, stern actions and talks.

6. Since Russia respresents the greatest single problem insofar as the future peace of the world is concerned, I urge that we mobilize our finest brains in terms of a complete mastery of the Russia dilemma. I want us to have experts in every phase of Russian and satellite life—in their languages, in their cultures, in their military science, in their economics, in population, in geography. We have seen how Hitler during his regime had great masses of specialists become intensely familiar with every single area of the world. We should do likewise in both military and civilian spheres, encouraging private industry to fully cooperate. After all, American salesmanship has spread American products throughout the world, and it is only natural that we should make the fullest possible use of the great body of knowledge that has been built up by businesses throughout the world and by their salesmen and other representatives.

It is incredible that we have so few language experts, for example, who even understand the diverse foreign tongues, much less the varying foreign cultures and peoples.

By these and other methods I trust that we can lay the firm basis for a long-range strategy for victory of the free and peaceful way of life. It will cost money and energy, but far less money and energy in the long run than the "now you see it, now you don't" approach.

We want neither extreme optimism nor pessimism—but realism. We want neither pacifism nor militarism—but strength, courage, and justice. We want preparedness not as a temporary flurry but as a part of well-planned, permanent strategy.

Resolution Passed by the New York City Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of New York, which was introduced by the Honorable Edward Vogel, who represents the councilmanic district which is coterminous with my own district. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution 402

Resolution urging the New York congressional delegation and the New York Senators, IRVING M. IVES and HERBERT H. LEHMAN, to request the proper agencies of the Federal Government to issue top priorities for construction of school buildings now and during the immediate future of this emergency

Whereas as it appears from a report in the New York Times, March 19, 1951, that, "Because of a shortage of construction materials this country's huge school-building program is in danger of bogging down. School systems everywhere are finding it increasingly difficult to continue with their building plans.

"The situation is especially acute in New York, where a $100,000,000 building program is endangered. Officials do not know whether they will be able to complete the 34 schools now under construction, or whether they can continue with the 31 scheduled to get under way this year. A school that burned down 2 months ago will not be rebuilt for some time to come because contractors cannot get the necessary steel for another 10 months.

"A Nation-wide survey conducted by the New York Times indicates that educators are convinced that unless the schools receive some form of priorities for steel and other needed materials, the construction will slow down or come to a virtual standstill"; and

Whereas the survey conducted by the New York Times reports:

"According to educational authorities, the amount of steel required for school construction is only a fraction of the total used in defense industries. Dr. J. L. McCaskill, coordinator of the National Conference for Mobilization of Education, consisting of leading educational organizations, estimates that construction for schools would take about 175,000 tons of steel a year. This is two-tenths of 1 percent of the total steel produced in the country"; and

Whereas Dr. J. L. McCaskill, coordinator of the National Conference for Mobilization of Education reports:

"It is quite possible that many children will not be able to enter school simply because there will be no available classroom space for them. The damage to the educational program will unquestionably increase the inequality of educational opportunity in America to alarming proportions"; and

Whereas of the situation in New York City, Charles J. Bensley, chairman of the board of education's building committee, said that unless the Federal Government provided the needed priorities to continue with construction, the city's huge program would be completely lost. He warned that "unless we put our school-building program on a par with munitions, democracy will be undermined."

"In recent months," he said, "contractors have begun to shy away from making bids. Of the 34 buildings under construction from the 1949–50 program, some are almost ready to open, while others still have a long way to go. These buildings are estimated to cost $50,000,000, and will seat 36,000 children.

"The 1950–51 building program, calling for 31 projects at a cost of $70,000,000, would supply an estimated 30,000 seats.

"Educationally speaking, this will be a lost generation unless the appropriate authorities wake up and immediately grant the priorities needed to build our schools," Mr. Bensley declared.

A similar warning came from Dr. William Jansen, New York superintendant of schools. Dr. Jansen said the effect of the sheel shortage was already being felt in the school system. About 2 months ago, he said, when public school 11 in Woodside, Queens, burned down, its 750 children were placed in nearby schools. The school cannot be rebuilt because the contractors cannot get the necessary steel for at least 8 to 10 months.

"Unless we can get the steel, our building program will bog down completely," Dr. Jansen warned. "It doesn't seem wise to have such conditions at this time. Our schools should not be left to fend for themselves without some priority rating"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of New York, hereby strongly urges Hon. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization and the Defense Mobilization Board, to grant a top priority rating immediately for school construction, and it is further

Resolved, That the Council of the City of New York, urges the New York Congressional Delegation and the New York Senators IRVING M. IVES and HERBERT H. LEHMAN to request the proper agencies of the Federal Government to issue top priorities for construction of school buildings now and during the immediate future of this emergency.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of New York are indebted to Councilman Vogel and his colleagues for this action on their part.

Prime Question Unanswered: How Do We End the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, certainly history will record the dramatic events of the past 2 weeks among the most far-reaching since the close of World War II in their effect on the survival of the United States of America and the cause of freedom everywhere.

In all the emotional outburst of a nation shocked by a tragic turn of events, we must not lose sight of the fundamental questions involved if we are to salvage what we can from the error-strewn policies of the Truman administration and ultimately set a proper course toward peace and victory.

This constructive procedure is supported with clarity of expression in an

editorial published last week by the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, the largest newspaper in our congressional district. Under permission granted by the House, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of every Member of Congress. It follows:

PRIME QUESTION UNANSWERED: HOW DO WE END THE WAR?

The thrills and excitement of General MacArthur's great day in the East have shifted to the Middle West to be continued in Chicago Thursday and Milwaukee Friday.

As the fury of the fighting mounts in Korea, however, we are still faced with the cold realization that we still have a war on our hands.

President Truman's and Secretary Acheson's speeches have sought to make what they call a limited war appear akin to peace. But American troops are still being killed in Korea.

To the 10,000 Americans who have been killed, to the 250,000 men still there, to their families, and especially the Koreans themselves whose homes and country have been ravaged, the war now raging is as unlimited as war ever gets.

The risks of extending the war first to Red China and later to Red China's ally, the Soviet Union, were just as great on June 25, 1950, when Mr. Truman began the war.

Since that time, the choice between a little war and a big war has depended upon the Communist powers solely, not upon the United States. The same is true today.

The fact of the war's existence and that it has to be disposed of one way or another cannot be brushed aside by talk of peace when there is no peace.

General MacArthur's proposals for ending it by military means are based on two beliefs:

1. Red China is already engaging the maximum power it can commit, and,

2. The Soviet Union will more likely strike only when it feels that it has military and productive preponderance on a world-wide scale. He does not believe Russia thinks it possesses that preponderance now.

He advocated:

(a) A more intensive economic blockade of China.

(b) A naval blockade of the Red China coast.

(c) Unrestricted aerial reconnaissance—he did not specify unrestricted bombing—of China's coast and Manchuria.

(d) Removal of the blockade of Nationalist Chinese on Formosa and supporting them with arms and supplies if they attacked the mainland.

The State Department blocked these. General MacArthur was informed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the State Department was ready to announce that with the clearing of South Korea of Red Chinese, the United Nations was ready to discuss a settlement. He was ordered to mark time at the thirty-eighth parallel, without any advance beyond that point by major forces, until State Department had had time to negotiate for a settlement.

The few weeks sought for negotiations have passed and nothing has happened. No new proposals have been made. Reports are that Peiping has even refused to receive neutral diplomats eager to find a basis of settlement.

So the questions that cost General MacArthur his leadership are still unanswered. His removal has settled nothing. We still have a war on our hands and the initiative remains, because of restrictions on our forces, with Red China and the Kremlin. It is clearly up to Mr. Truman and Acheson to produce a workable solution.

Mr. Speaker, when General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur spoke from the rostrum in this House, he spoke from the heart of a great American to the heart of a great America. His counsel, if considered, may become his greatest contribution in a lifetime of distinguished service and military triumph.

The men—and the events—precipitating the sudden turn of events that brought America's last great living military hero home from the wars should be forgotten for the moment in order to restore a unity of purpose for this Nation still engaged in a bitter war thousands of miles away and threatened by a ruthless enemy entrenched on a global front.

This must be done for the reasons cited by the General himself when he told the Congress and the country:

> The issues are fundamental and reach quite beyond the realm of partisan consideration. They must be resolved on the highest plane of national interest. I trust you will do me the justice of receiving that which I have to say as expressing the considered viewpoint of a fellow American. I address you with neither rancor nor bitterness in the fading twilight of life with but one purpose in mind, to serve my country.

None who heard him, and none who read his words, could doubt the deep sincerity of the man who until little more than 2 weeks ago stood as the very embodiment of American opposition to forces of communism arrayed against his country. It is not necessary to attempt comment at length on the text of his report to the people he has served with such distinction. His words received earnest attention, and they should be subjected to careful study. The petty issues raised by petty men should not be permitted to cloud the larger issues at stake.

It has been argued, and conceded, that the President can remove his military commander in the field. It is argued, and admitted, that in the twin fields of civilian and military authority, the civilian power is supreme. But these are not the principal issues at stake. To look at the matter in that light is to miss the larger question.

This is the question which disturbs the minds and lies close to the hearts of millions of Americans. Are the present policies of this Government policies which really serve the best interests of the Nation? In the face of actual war, and the mounting threat of even greater conflict, are we adhering to a course which serves the dual purpose of contributing most to the prevention of war and to our survival if total war should come? General MacArthur disagrees with the policies and he believes the policies which we have adopted, and which the President says will not be changed, can lead us only to disaster.

This is not a conflict that can be resolved by petty sniping at General MacArthur, by smear campaigns generated in the discredited State Department, or by calculated snubs from the General Vaughns and others of like stature. Neither can it be solved by the country-wide emotional outburst against President Truman. The orderly processes of representative government must be followed, and preserved, or the freedom we are fighting for abroad will be lost in dissension at home.

No one understands this better than General MacArthur. So it is not surprising that he addresses himself solely to the task of presenting his views, views that should have been sought and obtained long ago. It was in perfect keeping with his character that he prefaced his views with the flat assertion that he did not serve the purposes of politics or political parties, and that he entertained no political ambitions.

Now the people have heard the general's views. Let the political pygmies chip away at this marble shaft of faith if they must. Now it is for the people themselves to make the decision. Now it is for them, through their Government, to answer the questions raised by present events and future potentialities.

Personalities are not important. Only the issues are. The general himself endorsed this in his moving farewell by recalling this soldier ballad of the day he entered the military service of his country over 50 years ago: Old Soldiers Do Not Die, They Simply Fade Away.

General MacArthur is very much alive. The Nation—and the free world—trusts he will not fade away. But what must not fade away is American determination and American faith in the fundamental principles on which this country was founded and grew to power. It was founded as a Christian Nation devoted to the preservation of human freedom, with authority—and strength—stemming from the people themselves. Has time robbed us of that devotion to principles and devotion to God? If it has not, the people themselves will fix the proper course. And that course will lead to victory for the men still locked in battle. It can lead to a preservation of the peace they will win. That is the hope that must never "simply fade away." If it does, the hope of this Nation—the cause of freedom everywhere—will fade with it.

Poland's Constitution Day Has Lesson for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this is Poland's Constitution Day—the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the free constitutional government which Poland no longer enjoys.

For the people of that unhappy land it is a day of sorrow. For the people of the United States it should be a day of shame.

The European war against Nazi Germany was precipitated over the issue of the independence and territorial integrity of Poland.

The Pacific war against Japan was precipitated over the issue of the independence and territorial integrity of China.

America contributed mightily and decisively to victory against both enemies.

Yet, today both Poland and China are enslaved by communism, their independence is destroyed, their territorial integrity is violated, and their liberties are ruthlessly denied.

Most incredible of all is the guilt which American leadership shares in this double betrayal of human freedom.

At Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, as well as by subsequent policies and actions, American leadership sought to buy Stalin's favor at the price of the independence and integrity of both Poland and China, and at the price of our own honor. Such promises as we received, in return, from Soviet Russia were broken almost as soon as they were given.

True, none of the international commitments and agreements which accomplished this double betrayal has ever been ratified by constitutional processes. At the same time, however, it must be acknowledged that none of those commitments and agreements has even been repudiated by constitutional processes.

Meanwhile the United States today finds itself inextricably involved in the consequences of these betrayals of freedom.

Today we should reread, with penitence and foreboding, the grim words of Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address:

> Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said: "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

This may be too stern a doctrine for a generation which has come to put more faith in opportunism, expediency, cleverness, and appeasement than in the simple moralities which underlie freedom.

Yet this is the lesson of Poland's Constitution Day for Americans, tardy though we may be in heeding it.

It is the lesson that there can be no hope for peace, or for the preservation even of our own liberties, so long as we permit our leaders to barter away other people's freedom, whether they are the peoples of Poland or China or Formosa.

It is the lesson that truly "nothing can bring us peace but the triumph of principle."

The Great Alliance of Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject the Great Alliance of Free Men, by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, at a banquet of the regional conference sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations, Inc., in Los Angeles, Calif., on April 30, 1951. In his address Mr. Harriman urges support of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty, and cooperation with other nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT ALLIANCE OF FREEMEN

(By Hon. W. Averell Harriman)

During the past months our country has been engaged in a series of debates. All kinds of things have been said on all sides of every question. Some would even have us believe that we are all in a state of confusion. Some contend that we have no policies, that we are drifting aimlessly. Some are attempting to distort the true purpose of our policies. Much of what is said is irrelevant; much is even irresponsible.

Of course, in our democratic way we should debate all issues, but at a time when our country is in grave danger we should conduct these debates for the sole purpose of gaining a clearer understanding of the issues.

Tonight I want to try to cut through the fog of unreality. I want to talk about the things we face and how we are dealing with them.

I spent a good deal of time in Russia during the war and I had an unusual chance to learn something about the Russian people and their rulers in the Kremlin.

When I came home 5 years ago, I was gravely concerned over the dangers that were developing from the Kremlin, and I was afraid that we would not face up to them until it was too late.

Well, we have faced up to them. I think the American people have been magnificent during the past 5 years. They have supported unprecedented measures. Never in the history of our country, or in the history of any country, has a nation in peacetime taken such wise and effective steps in dealing with so many varied and complex problems.

In 1945 I had come back for a brief visit, just after the death of President Roosevelt, and I vividly remember the first encouragement I got. It came from President Truman. It was the first time I had met him. I found that he was already alive to the indication of the trouble ahead with the Soviet Union. He had carefully studied the records of President Roosevelt and his last messages to Stalin. He was already much concerned by the duplicity of the Kremlin and was determined to stand firm against the Kremlin schemes. As a result, he has been prepared to take prompt and vigorous steps in dealing with the Kremlin threat. No President has in peacetime initiated so many unprecedented and far-sighted measures and actions for our national security as has President Truman.

In our wartime relations with the Soviet Union we had two fundamental objectives. Of first importance was to keep Russia as an effective fighting ally. We also wanted to use this new relationship to find a way of working together for peace on a live-and-let-live basis. People in this country and all over the world had hopes that this could be accomplished. The British and American Governments were well aware of the difficulties in attaining this objective.

During the war, Roosevelt and Churchill made every effort to talk things out with Stalin in order to arrive at some workable understanding on the basis of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

When I was in Moscow there were indications that the Kremlin had two approaches to their postwar policies. In the many talks that I had with Stalin I felt that he himself was of two minds; one emphasized internal reconstruction and the other external expansion.

On the one hand they were discussing possible understandings with us which might result in increased trade with and loans from the West for the reconstruction of the terrible devastation left in the wake of the war. This would mean soft-pedaling for a time at least the Communist designs for world domination—much along the lines of the policies they had pursued between the two World Wars.

On the other hand, they were treating us in many ways as potential enemies. There were indications that they would take advantage of the Red army occupation of neighboring countries to maintain control, and they were supporting Communist parties in other countries to be in a position to seize control in the postwar turmoil.

The men of the Kremlin chose the second course.

In October of 1945, I went to see Stalin at his country place in Sochi in the Caucasus. After two long nights of arguments over the disagreements we were then having, he as much as told me in a moment of anger that he had decided to go his own way. As time went on, the imperialist plans of the men of the Kremlin became increasingly aggressive. They broke the agreements they had entered into. If they had carried out these agreements the world would be a different place today. They used the occupation of the Red Army to set up puppet governments. They established a network of subversion all over the world, inciting disorders and insurrections and exploiting weakness wherever it exists.

The one great thing, however, accomplished by our constant efforts during and since the war to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union was that they establish our moral position before the people of the world. Had these efforts not been made, many people would still be wondering whether we and not the Kremlin were to blame for the tensions that have developed.

The United Nations has provided the forum through which the designs and the duplicity of the Kremlin have been made crystal clear. The United Nations has been the medium through which the free nations have been drawn together. It is the medium through which the United States has been able to give leadership. And when it came to shameless aggression against the Republic of Korea, it was the medium through which we rallied 53 nations, all of the free nations, to face together this attempt to use force for conquest. We had built better than we knew. Never before in the history has there been such unanimity of world understanding and world opinion.

This was no accident. Step by step our policies had built strength and confidence among the free nations. As the Kremlin plan of action unfolded, we had helped other countries to resist and turn back aggression. We helped Greece put down Kremlin-inspired civil war. We have helped Western Europe to rebuild its economic life and suppress Communist subversion.

We took leadership in the organization of the North Atlantic Treaty. In a manner unprecedented, we have gone out to deal with the threat to our security at its source; we have not waited until it came to us. And let no man think it would not have come to us. Western Europe would not have survived Kremlin domination if it had not been for our prompt and imaginative action. With control of Europe the industrial capacity available to the Kremlin would have practically equaled ours. We might have faced an unmanageable situation. Instead today we are combining the potential of the North Atlantic community in the development of collective defense forces under our great Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

In Korea we have faced force with force. We have learned from the bitter experience of the events which led to World War II

that aggression must be dealt with at the very beginning or it will encourage further aggression. We are showing the Kremlin that the free world will not tolerate the use of force for conquest, that freemen have the will and ability to resist. Our action in Korea is giving confidence to other peoples who are under pressure that they can maintain their independence. We are destroying the myth that the Chinese Red armies are invincible. We are upsetting their timetable of attack in other areas of Asia.

But it is not our aim to bring on another world war. Our aim is to limit the conflict if we possibly can and deal with it successfully within Korea. In the meantime, we are converting our tremendous economic resources into military strength and are helping our friends and allies do the same. Before long, the free world will have the military strength to meet any threat with confidence. When we are strong enough, the Kremlin will not dare undertake further aggression.

As I say, we are using every means at our command to prevent another world war. No man with any understanding of history can say that there can be victory in a general war. There can be nothing but chaos and disaster. But there can be victory—and glorious victory—in preventing another world conflict. And that is the clear aim of American policy. Every step we have taken has this objective. Let no man take us off this course.

I want to discuss some of the alternatives that are being put forward with respect to Korea.

Some would have us abandon Korea. This would be an invitation to further aggression and we would soon find ourselves fighting elsewhere. Or, any idea that we can obtain a solution by buying off the Chinese Communists through appeasement and giving any reward whatsoever for aggression is unthinkable. In view of the misrepresentations and false statements that are being made about the policies of our Government, I want to state in the most emphatic terms that President Truman will never engage in appeasement or reward aggression. He rejects any such idea and so do all his advisers. This has been said time and time again. Thirdly, there are those who would involve us in a wider war in order to end the present conflict in Korea. Yet they have not explained how, when, and at what cost this wider conflict could be brought to a successful conclusion. They are ready to have us lose our allies with all of the world-wide consequences that would result. And they are ready to risk a total war. They say this is the necessary way to solve the Korean situation.

You remember the talk during the Greek civil war. People said that we were bogged down in Greece—there could be nothing but a stalemate. "How could the fighting be brought to a successful conclusion within Greece?" "We should either abandon Greece or carry the fight across the borders and attack the Communist bases in Yugoslavia." And yet the struggle was won on Greek soil. And don't let us overlook the fact that now Yugoslavia is joining the ranks of those who are resisting the Kremlin. We heard the same sort of thing during the Berlin airlift. There were those who could see no end to it. We were told either to get out or have a show-down.

In these cases, we pursued the same kind of determined and yet restrained policies that we are now pursuing. We must always remember that although the menace of war comes from the Kremlin, hasty and ill-conceived action on our part can lead to grave consequences. I would like to recall to you the words of Winston Churchill from his recent war memoirs:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to * * * seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. * * * How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands."

No one can foresee the future. Our men are joined in desperate battle in Korea. They are inflicting frightful casualties, estimated at the equivalent of the better part of a Chinese division a day. They are fighting to force the Chinese Reds to abandon the aggression. They are fighting to prevent the untold horrors to us and all mankind of another world war. Let all Americans give them their support. Let us pray for their success. It is shocking that some question the good faith of our allies who are fighting with us.

Let us think back a few years.

In 1940, the Greeks refused to appease, and faced alone invasion against overwhelming odds. The British came to their assistance with the small forces they had available in the Middle East. I was in Cairo in the spring of 1941 when the British troops returned from this honorable but unsuccessful expedition. I know the risks they took and the sacrifice they made to support their ally. Threatened as the Greek people still are, they have sent a token force to Korea. It is a token of their determination to stand with the free nations against aggression. It is a token of honor.

The Turks, under a similar threat of aggression at home, have sent a brigade which has won the respect of all.

The French have been fighting Communist aggression in Indochina for 4 years and have now 150,000 troops engaged in that conflict. Yet they have sent a small force to join us.

The British were quick to send their Pacific fleet and then troops, although they too are engaged against the Communists in Malaya.

A total of 13 nations have sent forces according to their situation and others are preparing to join. Although the preponderance of the forces is ours, we are not fighting alone in Korea. There have been times when other nations have fought alone. I was in England during the year when the British stood alone against the full force of Nazi power. The men and women of Britain stood firm with courage and determination. They took pride in the feeling that they were fighting not only for themselves, but for the freedom of other nations as well. Korea is a vital part, but only a part, of the world-wide struggle in which all free nations are engaged.

Let no man try to tell us that there are any safe or easy short cuts. The years ahead will be difficult. To achieve our objectives we must do many things that will mean many sacrifices. Military strength alone is not enough. Neither military strength nor political stability can be attained without an expanding economy in the free world. America has been the exponent of the concept of an expanding economy with increased productivity. It requires know-how and capital—these we must help to provide. We are all interdependent. The industrial countries need adequate food and increasing quantities of raw materials. The new nations of the east will need the know-how and economic assistance to expand production and to give promise for a decent life for their people. It is only on this basis that there can be political stability.

The resources of the free world are today vastly greater than those of the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Atlantic community alone has about three quarters of the heavy industry of the world, and over 400,000,000 of the most inventive, skillful, and productive people. But the life of the free world cannot survive if it is dismembered limb by limb. We Americans understand this. Strong as we are, we cannot survive alone. But we must use our strength to cement the unity and strength of the free nations.

We are engaged in a great enterprise—the building of a great alliance of freemen for human welfare and mutual security. With the success already achieved, we can have faith that the free nations working together can build the necessary strength and stability to withstand external aggression and internal subversion alike.

Don't let us either underrate or overrate the Soviet capabilities. Don't let us underrate their ruthlessness and determination; their skill in the techniques of subversion and in creating and exploiting weakness; their conviction that they are destined to dominate the world. They believe that freemen cannot stand together; that freemen cannot rule themselves; that free nations cannot be united, but will fight among themselves.

But we should not overrate the strength of Russia on which their operations are based. They are maintaining vast military forces by imposing a terrific burden on their economy and their people. You really have to go to Russia to understand how backward it is. The people have never known what we would consider a decent life. Men and women have to work hard and long hours for very little. But their equipment and organization are so poor that the productivity of industry and agriculture is far behind that of the West. After 35 years of rule, the Kremlin has not been able to gain the loyalty of the people. Stalin himself once admitted this when he told me during the war that the people were "fighting for their motherland, not for us." By "us" he meant, of course, the Kremlin. Russia is ruled by fear. The Kremlin fears the people, and the people fear the Kremlin. Whenever we hear of purges, it is an indication of internal tension. The unhappy people of the satellites crave only to be freed from the iron hand.

As the free world grows stronger, pressures will increase behind the iron curtain. The defection of Yugoslavia was primarily caused by the success of the Marshall plan. Tito saw that there was nothing to hope for but exploitation from the Kremlin in his alliance with Russia. With the improvement of conditions in Western Europe, he wanted economic association with the West. As the free countries become stronger and stronger, their very strength will act as a magnet on the enslaved peoples. There is a brittleness in any dictatorship, but one can never know when it will be strained to the breaking point.

The policies which we must follow have been laid out. We must pursue them unflinchingly.

Our men are fighting in Korea tonight to do their part in preventing another world war and to preserve our freedom. We must face the future, and the long future, with the same courage, determination, and perseverance. I am convinced that we can succeed, and I believe we will succeed.

As I have said, the American people have been magnificent during the past 5 years. It is inconceivable to me that anyone can defect us from our course. The job ahead is even more difficult. But the success we have already achieved in our endeavors gives promise for the future.

Let us not be confused by men of little faith in America's capabilities who say that we can't afford to do the things we clearly must to safeguard our security. Let us not be confused by those who are impatient and would lead us to take reckless steps. Let us not be confused by those who have no under-

standing of the strength of the great association of free nations that we are building. Let us closely examine what is being said so that we will not be misled by those who are distorting and falsifying the facts.

The wise statesmen of both our political parties have laid out the road to follow: Support the United Nations and its action in Korea; support the North Atlantic Treaty; vigorous and rapid action to rearm; aid to our friends and allies to equip adequately their military forces; work with other nations for an expanding world economy; help the new nations of the east to attain political and economic stability; and strive with all our strength to prevent another world war.

Of first importance is to attain unity of purpose at home for the world-wide struggle. We can then give effective inspiration and leadership for unity in the free world. In the great alliance of freemen we are building, we can have faith that we will rid the world of tyranny, that we can maintain peace, and that freedom will prevail.

First Anniversary of Frank Pace, Jr., as Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently we passed an anniversary which I believe should be noted in the RECORD. April 12 marked the end of the first year of Frank Pace's service as Secretary of the Army. To my mind, it was a year of accomplishment of the highest order.

When Secretary Pace took over his duties in April 1950, the Army was still suffering from an era in which the Nation believed it could safely reduce its armed strength. All of the services suffered from that false belief, but the ground forces were hit the hardest of the three.

Mr. Pace gave the Army the type of leadership that was needed to launch the expansion program. During his year in office, the ground forces have doubled in strength, and a gigantic procurement program has been launched smoothly and efficiently.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secretary Pace's Year," from the April 7 issue of the highly respected Army-Navy-Air Force Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY PACE'S YEAR

When Frank Pace, Jr., took the oath of office as Secretary of the Army, on April 12, 1950, it cannot be said that the service was overly enthusiastic. In his previous position as Director of the Bureau of the Budget, during a period of economy, his diligent pursuit of those duties often conflicted with the interests of the forces of national defense. Happily for the country, however, both Mr. Pace's attitude toward the Army and the Army's regard for him have been modified greatly during the year he has been in office. In fact, there is now a great admiration, one for the other. Although Mr. Pace took over his position at a time when the Army's strength had suffered from an era of penny-pinching, he gave it real leadership and skilled administration through the Korean crisis precipitated only 2 months after he took over. During his year the Army has doubled in strength. A huge expansion and procurement program has been put under way smoothly and capably. Those who have worked closely with Mr. Pace admire particularly his ability not only to organize, but to use an organization efficiently. He is not an independent executive sternly running affairs his own way—he is part of his own organization, guiding it and using it. It is a recognition of this capacity of Mr. Pace's that has led the other Secretaries to choose him, even though he is not the senior member in service or years, as their chairman in the Joint Secretaries Organization, which he played a part in creating and which has quietly accomplished a great deal toward making unification work more smoothly and effectively. Mr. Pace is keenly aware that the success of an organization depends upon the individuals composing it. It is not unusual for him to call an officer informally and tell him that his Secretary is aware of a job well done and appreciates it. The fighting men should know that the project to establish a schedule of combat pay has had his earnest and diligent backing and that the delays which have beset it have not been of his making. Because he is modest and self-effacing, the country at large is probably not conscious of the part he has played in our defense build-up. But the service knows and has come to regard him highly for it.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the administration is naive indeed if it entertains delusions that the people are not aware of the real issues involved in the firing of General MacArthur.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Frank W. Ahrens, of St. Louis, to the editor of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which appeared in the April 29 issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPAGANDA FED FOLK

To the EDITOR:

I, too, have read your recent editorials on the MacArthur, Asiatic, European situations, et al., and have read your editorials over a long period of years; also those of other papers. I wonder why editors and columnists seem to think it necessary to speak patronizingly to their readers.

No one, I think, may question the President's prerogative to dismiss MacArthur; one may question the wisdom of it.

MacArthur has not said he advocates the United States engaging in a war in China. The people of this Nation are being fed the same type of propaganda in behalf of England that they were fed in World War II in behalf of Russia. Some of us were far ahead of Roosevelt and his entourage then, as we are of Truman and his now.

We are not hysterical; we have pondered policies of recent administrations at length; we have reared our children to be loyal, upstanding, useful citizens, and we are sickened by the continuing stupid blunderings of our State Department in foreign policies—policies that bring about situations, as in Korea, where our sons are set up like tenpins to be bowled down by unnumbered Asiatic hordes, with nothing but stalemate in view, unless we seek the ultimate end of war—victory.

We agree with MacArthur, that Russia will go to war when and where she thinks it opportune; further, we think she does not now desire to do so, with the many internal problems she has on her hands. Regardless, though, we feel it better to meet the issue squarely now, and that we should have done so long since.

It would be interesting, indeed, to know percentagewise, the number of men that we have in this Korean mess, as compared separately by nations with the number of those of our "friendly" associates in the United Nations, and likewise, as to casualties, including deaths separately.

There comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue—that time is long since passed.

FRANK W. AHRENS.

Thought Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, a timely editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 1. We are rapidly indoctrinating this country to the Hitler-Goebbels techniques of controlling public opinion. Just this week I listened to a Government employee up in the military service remark that local civic organizations were being used to direct public thinking. What possible purpose can the Government have in the direction of public thought except as a means of supporting New Deal projects on a socialistic basis. The editorial follows:

THOUGHT CONTROL

A committee of Congress, established for the avowed purpose and investigating and, if possible, discrediting persons and organizations opposed to the administration's socialistic program, demanded that the Committee for Constitutional Government reveal the names of those who had purchased quantities of its books for subsequent distribution.

The committee, which was headed by the late Representative Frank Buchanan, was particularly anxious to find out who had purchased copies of the Road Ahead in which the author, John T. Flynn, exposes the socialistic influences which are behind the so-called Fair Deal's domestic program.

Quite properly, we believe, the request for this information was refused by the Committee for Constitutional Government through its executive secretary, Edward A. Rumely. Any citizen can walk into a store and buy a book without having some Government snooper asking him why he bought it and what he intends to do with it. So why should a citizen who buys 10 or 100 copies of the same book for distribution to his friends, employees, or mere acquaintances be subject to such harassment?

The Buchanan committee, however, cited, Rumely for contempt of Congress. He was recently convicted before a Federal court in the District of Columbia.

Rumely based his refusal to produce the records on constitutional grounds, namely, the guaranties of freedom of speech and press and of freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. Moreover, he held it was not within the province of the committee, which was presumably investigating lobbying, to demand the names of the purchasers of books published by his organization.

But the Buchanan committee defined lobbying as "any attempt by individuals or group to influence Government decision." This prompted Editor and Publisher to ask: "If the court declares publication of a book is lobbying, then how long before magazine and newspaper articles are included?

"Here is an organization that happened to be registered as a lobbyist. Is the court going to declare because of that, it cannot publish opinions on legislation without revealing who else might subscribe to those views by buyng the book? Are then other publishers of similar views in books, magazines, and newspapers going to be required to register as lobbyists?"

The Rumely conviction is to be appealed. The higher courts, we hope, will take a broader view of the implications in this case. For if the conviction were sustaned, the way would surely be opened to the imposition of thought control regulations under which some Government agency would assert the right to harass and intimidate persons who read literature opposing Government programs.

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two articles by Mr. George Sokolsky.

One, under date line of May 3, explaining England's stand in Asia; the other, under the date line of May 4, showing how the simple methods employed by both England and Russia have never been seen through or understood by those in charge of our foreign policy:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 3, 1951]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

A byproduct of the MacArthur situation must be an investigation and restudy of our relations with Great Britain. For no matter how it is sliced, Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a victim of the constant pressure of the British upon our State Department and President to have him recalled. Now that he has been officially humiliated, his program is being officially adopted, even to the extent of giving Chiang Kai-shek $80,000,000.

The British attitude toward General MacArthur was in no manner a personal antipathy. MacArthur's attitude toward the Korean war ran counter to the British attitude, and they got their man.

But the American people have never had, from their own officials or the British, an explanation of precisely what the British position toward Asia is and why. Lewis W. Douglas, who is the foremost protagonist of British policy in this country, tried to explain it at the recent Associated Press luncheon. But what he said clarified nothing except that the British sought to keep India within the Commonwealth and, therefore, sacrificed both China and the United States to that purpose.

Mr. Douglas gave no explanation as to the morality of such a position nor did he quiver that such a course has already cost the lives of 10,500 of our sons.

This also appears in the picture and cannot be ignored: British policy in China since 1842 has always been to recognize the de facto ruler of an area, even if that ruler was in rebellion against the established and recognized government. The theory was that trade must go on.

This was one reason why the British rather than the Japanese and Russians were the most disliked foreigners in China for a century. The Chinese assumption was that the British were always seeking to keep China divided and weak. In the great boycott of 1925, the object of the Chinese was to bring the British to heel, and when by 1927 they could show an appreciable success in that enterprise, the authority of the British Empire was damaged, its prestige in Asia was demolished.

British policy in China has been and is mercantile policy. It is dominated by the great firms, Jardine, Matheson, the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corp., the Chartered Bank, the P & O, the British-American Tobacco Co., and the shipping lines. These and other firms and the manufacturers who supply them have, in recent years, in effect been a cartel headed by Jardine's. They represent a huge investment and are paramount in empire trade.

They are willing to trade with anyone who can pay. This is, granted, a short-sighted policy, for when the Chinese Communists no longer need them, they will cast them aside. But who, on the other hand, can guarantee how long Soviet China will last and what its policies will be 10 years from now? Therefore, why not go forward with trade as long as possible and wherever it is available?

If the British can hold their east Asian trade profitably, great losses elsewhere may be offset. But this is to be observed, namely, that the British will never be able to trade in areas held by Chiang Kai-shek, for he will know how to impose a boycott on British goods, similar to the one he imposed between 1925 and 1927. Therefore, if Chiang Kai-shek is restored anywhere to the mainland, it will be American traders who will benefit.

Throughout World War II and thereafter, it has been British policy to keep American traders out of Asia. They regarded that as their sphere and even took the position that if the United States wanted to restore Great Britain, we ought to be sympathetic to their trading aspirations. Our State Department has on the whole been sympathetic to this British point of view, as I have pointed out on several occasions, particularly in connection with such products as pottery and chinaware.

The British therefore have been pursuing an advantage in the Communist antagonism to the United States and in stimulating the antagonism of the Indians toward us.

This is not altogether speculative because events and forces clarified since June 25, 1950, have established this pattern of activity. Even to this day, British trade has continued with the Chinese Communists, British military goods being delivered to them for use in Korea, not only against Americans but against the British contingents there.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1951]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Alfred Kohlberg has a wicked, almost a sardonic sense of humor. He is the China lobby that the State Department talks so much about. But he is not registered as a lobbyist because he represents only himself, American citizen, and merchant, who gives of his time and money to good causes, one of them being a constant fight against communism.

So, Kohlberg noticed that the large foundations, looking for ways to expend inherited money, have been setting up institutes and such in our universities with the object of fixing it so that Americans will understand the Russians. He had not noticed that anybody was spending a dime on getting the Russians to understand the Americans. Apparently, that is unnecessary as Americans need not be understood by anybody. In fact, nobody is making any partciularly significant effort in that direction.

So, Kohlberg got the idea that he might go to Russia to see for himself and also maybe to tell a couple of Russians what goes here in the United States. Having no official position, being just a little American who pays his taxes and votes at elections, Kohlberg applied to the Russian Embassy for a blank on which to apply for a visa to the Soviet Union.

He got an answer, which I herewith quote in full:

"DEAR SIR: Your letter regarding your trip to the Soviet Union has been received. Although we comprehend the importance of this visit we regret to inform you that we are not in a position to assist you in this matter. Persons desiring to visit our country for private purposes have normally to enter the Soviet Union as tourists through the travel agency 'Intourist.' During the war this organization discontinued its work and has not resumed it up to the present time. Thus, your trip to the Soviet Union will become possible after the Intourist agency resumes its functions.

"Very truly yours,

"N. SAVCHENKO,
"Chief, Consular Division."

As there is no Intourist agency nobody can go to Russia except an official. Now, all these people who say there is no iron curtain have been made liars by Mr. N. Savchenko, who says there is one. It was pulled down for Americans when the Intourist travel agency left the United States.

Incidentally, that is a new dodge in international relations, the use of a travel agency to control the visits to a country. Soon, nobody will be able to visit China because there is no Chinese travel agency here, or Poland or Czechoslovakia for the same reason.

Kohlberg thinks the Russians are hard to understand. I do not think so. They do things simply. It is their simplicity which is confusing.

For instance, take their war in Korea. They direct it. They provide the arms, munitions, and experts. They arrange for the Chinese to come in after the Koreans are defeated, and for the Mongols and Buriats to come in after the Chinese are defeated. But Russian troops stay out. Therefore, the Russians are not in the war and Americans are warmongers. Nothing could be simpler.

Had we used Chiang Kai-shek's army of 600,000 as they used Mao Tse-tung's army, we would have been able to say that we are not at war but Chiang Kai-shek is at war. Could anything be simpler?

Similarly, the Russians wanted to get rid of MacArthur. Did they do anything about it? Not at all. That would have been too

obvious. They stirred up the Indians, who stirred up the British. The Indians made an issue of MacArthur, and the British did not want to offend the Indians as Lewis Douglas told us at the Associated Press luncheon. He seemed to think that nothing mattered but keeping India in the British Commonwealth, not even our more than 10,500 dead sons. So the British put the pressure on Acheson, who put it on Marshall, who put it on Truman, who gave MacArthur the skids.

Could anything be simpler than that? Russians are not hard to understand. Anyone who has had a small girl in his household who knows how to play daddy off against mama ought to be able to understand a Russian. It is as childish as that—but it always works because papa loves Baby Snooks.

Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and testimony of Thomas Stack at hearings on railroad-retirement bills:

My name is Thomas Stack. I reside at 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. I am president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., a chartered organization under the laws of the State of Illinois, as a nonprofit educational group comprised of union and nonunion employees subject to the Railroad Retirement Act. We are the largest pension group in the country, with membership on 312 railroads and affiliated bureaus; 90 percent of our organization being members of the various crafts of the brotherhood.

I will try to cite the need for congressional action to remedy an act known as the Railroad Retirement Act that has become obsolete under present economic conditions; it has completely broken down. When the act was created in 1936 to become effective January 1, 1937, it was strictly a retirement system that was looked upon with pride by workers on the railroad, as it promised them security in old age. The tax rate was only 2¾ percent on payrolls up to $300 per month. This tax rate has now increased to 6 percent, and under the present planning will reach 6¼ percent of the payrolls up to $300 per month next January. This is matched by a similar amount by the carriers, so that there is paid for the account of each employee 12 percent monthly by payroll deductions to a system from which they will receive little or no benefits. Those who reach the age of 65 years, which is at present the retirement age, will not and cannot afford to retire on the meager pension they would receive, which would not suffice to give them subsistence during their declining years when medical care and sufferings attributed to age cause an added burden and strain on their financial conditions.

Recently the retirement board concluded their 1950 annual survey and attempted to show with charts and figures that the retirement system was still a success—giving the helping hand to a large segment of our population.

The average annuity or pension received today by the railroad employee is $83.38 per month, with less than 1 percent of the employees receiving the present maximum of $144 per month.

Now let us take a look at the survivor benefits carried under the same report. There are 72,700 aged widows who average $29.53 per month; there are 13,500 widowed mothers who average $27.41 per month; 44,900 children of deceased employees who average $16.93 per month; and 1,100 parents of deceased employees who average $16.53 per month. Are these figures anything to brag about when we have a 50-cent buying power on the present dollar?

In 1938, 1 year after the act went into effect, there were 38,000 employees over the age of 65 years who still continued to work; in 1950 we have 88,800 employees—or an increase of over 50,000—who are over the retirement age and still cannot afford to retire under present meager pensions they would receive, and if you will refer to page 14 of the said report you will find that 843 annuitants returned to work on the railroads as they could not meet their obligations on the small annuity they received. You gentlemen are familiar with the increased cost of living, but let me cite for the record a report from the United States Bureau of Labor statistics regarding the increase in cost of necessities of life between 1937 and November 15, 1950—released on January 12, 1951:

	1937	Nov. 15, 1950	Percent increase
Food	105.3	209.5	99.0
Wearing apparel	102.8	195.0	89.7
Fuel, electricity, and refrigeration	100.2	143.7	43.4
House furnishings	104.3	202.3	94.0
Miscellaneous	101.0	160.5	58.9

Those figures show an increase in living costs of at least 71 percent between 1937, when our act was formulated, and November 15, 1950.

Now, the retirement board always advise that they work on actuarial basis to protect the solvency of the fund. When the act originated it was based on a $3,500,000,000 payroll, which was the maximum payroll in 1937, and it was on this payroll that future obligations were figured. Last year the payrolls on the railroads were $5,030,000,000, and with the increase in salaries early in 1951 the payroll may reach $6,000,000,000 in 1951, so not alone has the tax which averaged 3 percent on the employee and 3 percent on the railroad during the first 10 years of operation doubled at the present time, but the payrolls of the railroads also have doubled which is prima facie evidence that the money or revenue taken in by the retirement board has also materially increased without additional obligation other than the 20-percent increase in pensions given to our employees under the Eightieth Congress, which was the first pension adjustment ever made under the system.

The retirement board still points out that they took on some 48,555 pensioners who paid nothing into the fund and gave them a pension. The average age of these men when taken over from the corporate payrolls was 74 years. There are some 6,960 still living with an average age of 86, but death is rapidly taking its toll and some 2,000 are dying each year, which satisfies the retirement board with the obligation they assumed; there is no longer a drain on the fund.

The railroad employee justly feels that he is either paying too much for what he receives, or is not getting sufficient benefits for what he pays. This Congress must do one of two things—either increase benefits and streamline the act to be useful and operated in the interest of those who pay the freight, or materially reduce the cost more appropriately with the small benefits derived from its operation.

In my capacity I have my hand at all times on the pulse of the rail worker. I have spent some 38 years with the industry myself. I receive thousands of letters on this subject of retirement from every State in the Union and possibly every railroad center of the country. My interests are not selfish and I do not recommend an exhorbitant increase for the widows or survivors when I know that the employee pays the bill and should receive first consideration. The retired worker should be our first consideration.

Two Great Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "Two Great Leaders," which was published in the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa., on Monday, April 30, 1951:

TWO GREAT LEADERS

Last week, in London, Winston Churchill said:

"We meet in a grave hour for our country. I cannot recall any period in my long life when mismanagement and incompetence have brought us into greater danger."

That statement was made by the man who took over the direction of Britain's affairs at the time of the Dunkerque evacuation, when Britain's fortunes were at their lowest ebb in the long history of that country. Now Churchill implies that even greater dangers may confront the British people.

"At home," said Churchill, "prices and taxes go up and up, abroad the influence of Britain goes down and down. In every quarter of the world we are regarded by our friends with anxiety, with wonder and pity; and by our enemies, including some of those countries we have helped most in the past like Egypt and Persia, we are regarded or treated with hostility or even contempt.

"Not one of them is so weak they cannot spare a quip or even a taunt for Britain. It is hard to believe that we are the same Nation that emerged from the great war respected and admired throughout the grand alliance for all that part we played, for a long time alone, in the defense of the cause of freedom."

We can well understand Churchill's complaint, for to a great degree it echoes our own. Less than 6 years ago the United States was the most powerful and respected nation in the world. Now it is daily insulted by the Soviet Union, which it saved from disaster in the world war; nations, like India, demand gratuities from us as the price of toleration, but trade respectfully with Red China and Red Russia; Europe declines to move in its own defense unless we provide the arms and many of the men; and in Korea we are hard pressed to turn back the assault of a country with incomparably fewer resources—aside from manpower—than our own.

What has brought this about in so few years? Our productive power is even greater than it was at the end of World War II. The courage of our citizenry is surely no less. Our ingenuity in every field has not deteriorated. We possess a preponderance in the most destructive weapon the mind of

man ever conceived. The moral justification of the war we are fighting in Korea has been attested by half a hundred nations. Yet we have somehow lost the respect of the world.

It is full time for those who speak for America to speak firmly, as our Government should. They have been so bewitched by the plausible word "peace" that they neglect other words like dignity and courage and self-respect. There will be no peace in the world, we think, until those in charge of our affairs understand that peace cannot be bought by Marshall plans and point 4 programs and weak yielding to the bluster of the Kremlin tyrants.

That is the message MacArthur has brought to America. And the response shows conclusively that it is the message the United States has been waiting to hear. MacArthur and Churchill reflect the ancient traditions of their respective countries, and speak to the deepest feelings of their people. It would be well for the governments of both lands to listen attentively.

President Mistaken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of April 28, 1951, one of the largest papers published in Michigan.

It is evident that the President is completely in error and uninformed. Although the mistake is small, it further shakes the confidence and faith of the people in the President. The editorial mentioned above follows:

WHITE HOUSE INTELLECTUAL

President Truman's press agents have created a role of scholar and historian for him. This provides no end of fun for the country's professors of history and others who know better.

They are aware that no man, much less Harry Truman, can have such a letter-perfect familiarity with the manifold subjects on which he has latterly taken to holding forth. His performance, which has been impressive of the more google-eyed among Presidential biographers, obviously calls for a concentrated, specific briefing just before he erupts a new load of false erudition.

But whoever looks up the President's material ought to be a little more legible when writing out the notes. Still likening his misadventures with those of Presidents of the past, Mr. Truman told reporters they should read Lincoln Fires a General. The only book anyone can discover with a title something like that is Lincoln Finds a General.

From that he passed to the squabble between President Polk and Gen. Winfield Scott. Here his intellectual ghost didn't read far enough when picking material with which Mr. Truman could dazzle reporters. The whole text makes Scott out a man who had done a large work and merited large treatment. Whereas in dealing with the Polk administration, which Mr. Truman apparently was pointing to as paralleling his, the book says "there was nothing large about the administration * * * the confines of mediocrity hemmed it in."

It is contemptibly cheap pretending to be a profound scholar and lecturing to others as an authority. What the gag is we do not know but it makes the President increasingly ridiculous.

CARE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus of March 27, 1951:

CARE

Any American who ever received a letter of thanks from a recipient of a CARE package in Europe will understand something of the meaning of this splendid nonprofit organization which has completed more than 5 years of service. Ten Million Ambassadors is the title of a new booklet about CARE; that's the number of CARE packages sent abroad in the 5 years.

During the years following 1945 when the World War ended CARE brought food, clothing, books and other supplies to millions in Europe who not only suffered extreme privations but lacked hope and morale so essential in rebuilding broken economies. A major force behind this voluntary good will movement was that people's minds and spirits in war-shattered areas had to be revived and given new life. They very thought that someone cared, someone across the ocean, did as much for the recipients as the food and clothing. Letters received from countless families breathed that message of thankfulness that someone did care.

While the economic situation in many European areas is notably better in 1951 than in 1945, there is a wide field in which CARE and other voluntary assistance groups can and must continue to function. As Director French, of CARE, writes there are still millions of "homeless, hungry, and bitter children all over the world" and "millions of sick and despairing men and women who need our help." CARE is only a drop in the proverbial bucket in meeting the need in areas where most of the population goes from the cradle to the grave without knowing the experience of a full stomach, but it is a factor and an important factor in holding back the flood of hunger and despair.

It is and has been entirely voluntary. People who send their money to CARE do so out of the fullness of their hearts, because they have compassion on their fellow man. Their gifts are gestures of good will which register among people of any race, color, or creed.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, May 4 is a great day in the history of Rhode Island.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago today Rhode Island took a bold and very courageous step when it adopted its declaration of independence of England.

Under leave already granted me by the House, I include as a part of my remarks two articles on Rhode Island Independence Day which were written by members of my staff. They follow:

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Naneen M. Wendler)

This year marks the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the independence of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. On this day, May 4, all Rhode Islanders within the State and those throughout the country will join publicly or within their hearts to realize once again the full significance of Rhode Island Independence Day in this year, 1951.

We invite all of our friends to unite with us in voicing anew our esteem of those forefathers who valiantly brought into existence the Rhode Island declaration of independence.

We of Rhode Island are proud to observe our State's independence 2 months ahead of the date of our Nation's adoption of self-government, on July 4, because we can enjoy a twofold opportunity to promulgate our respect to the leaders of the American Revolution and to Roger Williams, our own champion of religious liberty and the true democratic government.

While in Massachusetts, Roger Williams' profound thinking and his determination to establish and fulfill his principle of separation of the church and State brought threats of his deportation to England and he fled to the nearby shores of Rhode Island, founding Providence, the capital city of our State, and becoming the first settler of Rhode Island.

Roger Williams is a man to remember among many men who fought against immense odds for their freedom and ours, and imbued their descendants with an intense regard for those achieved privileges that have kept us strong and enduring against many enemies.

This earnest man's resolute spirit and his love for his fellowman, English or Indian, had a pronounced effect on his contemporaries. These men sought to establish in Rhode Island a colony based upon civil and religious liberties, a doctrine foreign to the laws integrated in the charters of other colonies under English rule.

One of the heroic patriots of that era was Jonathan Arnold who, as the author of the Rhode Island declaration of independence, is worthy of our admiration as one who served zealously in the cause of freedom of thought in politics. Jonathan Arnold distinguished himself as a great statesman in the general assembly of the colony of Rhode Island. An eminent descendant of Arnold, now a United States Senator from Rhode Island, is the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, a great-great-grandson, to whom Rhode Island is very much indebted.

After various intercolonial wars and conflicts with royal authority, the decisive step came on May 4, 1776. On that historic day the people of Rhode Island through their general assembly, and in opposition to the majority of the Thirteen Colonies, adopted this formal resolution renouncing allegiance to the British crown.

The general assembly by adopting the Rhode Island declaration of independence truly represented the people of that great State. This step was but the beginning of what has proven to be a government free from the control of others assuring the protection, safety, and happiness of the people.

Thus our people from the very first stage of the State's existence believed in repre-

sentative government and in the exemplification of faith in the common man.

The wishes of the people of this colony for self-expression and self-control far exceeded the one concession—protection of religious beliefs—granted them in 1663 by King Charles of England. This royal charter, however, proved a primary victory for the colony and is the oldest constitutional charter in existence.

The Rhode Island declaration of independence was accepted by the Continental Congress 2 months after its inception as a model for our National Declaration of Independence.

The same qualities of courage and perseverance that have upheld the tenets of both of these illustrious documents are synonymous with the fortitude displayed today by the people of this Nation in the present crisis and will remain enduring for whatever other crises we may meet.

Rhode Island's generation of today is fully aware of the magnificent traditions that continue as valuable inspirations to us and we are especially honored each year to invite one and all to join us in our annual declaration in memoriam.

Let us keep in mind the impressive words contained in article I of the Constitution of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations:

"In order effectually to secure the religious and political freedom established by our venerated ancestors, and to preserve the same for our posterity, we do declare that the essential and unquestionable rights and principles hereinafter mentioned shall be established, maintained, and preserved, and shall be of paramount obligation in all legislative, judicial, and executive proceedings.

"SECTION 1. In the words of the Father of his Country, we declare that 'the basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and alter their constitutions of government; but that the constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.'"

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Edward W. Heroux)

On the 4th of May 1776 the Rhode Island Assembly was truly the representative of the people, and the members of the legislature that adopted the resolution renouncing allegiance to the British King proved themselves faithful followers of Roger Williams. Like him, they were not afraid to take the initiative in leading the way to freedom.

Since that time Rhode Island has grown and progressed in historic achievements, in wealth, and in people. Though the State is small in area, its people are most hospitable.

Roger Williams was a believer in democratic government and rule by the people. He beckoned the spirit of freedom of thought in all things, religious and civil, and out of his ideas there developed a proud sovereign State. The stern puritanic spirit of New England never penetrated the State of Rhode Island. Rather, the dominating spirit is one of congeniality and resourcefulness. The beliefs and hopes of Roger Williams that "no person shall be in any way molested for any difference in matters of religion and every person may have and enjoy his own judgment and conveniences in matters of personal concernments" are still alive in our hearts.

Rhode Island still maintains the original principles of its founder, Roger Williams, in faith, in freedom of speech, in religious liberties, and in a democratic form of government.

In all the educational institutions of our country today there are evidences of the principles and rules that Roger Williams entertained and introduced to his followers.

American boys this very day are giving their lives to preserve the freedom and liberty that fills the heart of every American.

Ten Million Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ten Million Ambassadors," which appeared recently in the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier.

The editorial calls attention to the great variety of assistance CARE has sent to Europe during the past 5 years and the significance of these gifts as ambassadors of good will:

TEN MILLION AMBASSADORS

Not many of us, probably, could say if asked that CARE stands for Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., but in the past 5 years the American people have sent 10,000,000 CARE packages to relieve suffering in all parts of the world. These gifts, we may be sure, have been eloquent ambassadors of good will. The CARE organization has signalized the fifth birthday by issuing an illustrated report.

General MacArthur says: "All the world knows the work of CARE in Europe where millions of life-giving packages have been distributed since the end of the war. The work of CARE in Japan, and now in the Philippines and Korea, may not be as well known in America, but this work, too, is a matter of gravest import if we are to continue to live in a free and democratic world. I highly recommend the work of CARE and urge its continued support by all Americans."

After World War I, Herbert Hoover's relief service had operated a type of package service to individuals abroad. CARE was born on November 27, 1945, as the child of 21 American organizations working in foreign relief after World War II.

CARE packages have contained not only food and clothing, but a great variety of other supplies, according to the most acute needs at various times and places. As a special measure to save the children of Europe, three new CARE packages—infant food, baby food and baby layettes—were early introductions and single-content packages of flour and lard were set up. Knitting wool, household linen, milk powder, textiles, seeds and many other necessaries followed. To help food production in the East, even plows and hand tools were sent. A Princess Elizabeth wedding gift campaign brought $80,000 in CARE packages distributed to needy widows in Britain. In recent years, CARE in cooperation with UNESCO has provided more than a million dollars worth of books and scientific equipment to more than 400 universities, medical schools, libraries and other institutions in 25 countries. These institutions are training doctors, engineers, farmers and others to help their own people.

Have we crossed the divide and is CARE no longer needed? The executive director reminds us that peace is not yet here. "There are still homeless, hungry and bitter children all over the world. There are still millions of sick and despairing men and women who need our help.

As President Truman has said, "The bridge which you, with the support of the American people, have forged across the two oceans needs to be maintained not only for the purpose of succoring human life but also for interpreting the American role in the world community."

A Couple of Questions for the Probers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial entitled "A Couple of Questions for the Probers," which was published in the Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., on Wednesday, May 2, 1951:

A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS FOR THE PROBERS

Senate committee hearings on United States foreign policy—with special emphasis on the Far East—get going tomorrow with Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the first witness.

Unless General MacArthur specifically requests it, Thursday's session will be closed. Subsequent hearings, at which members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other Government officials will testify, likewise will be conducted behind closed doors.

That is just as well. If the members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, sitting jointly, are to learn anything significant, it would seem to be obvious that precautions must be taken to avoid spilling all our secrets to the Commies.

The public, obviously, has a big stake in what goes on behind those closed doors. But the public has a bigger stake in the tragic consequences of the wholesale disclosure of military and diplomatic secrets—because they vitally affect the security not only of our fighting men, but of the Nation as a whole.

In an attempt to balance these considerations, a plan has been worked out whereby a transcript of the proceedings will be released to the press at the close of each session. That transcript will have been combed for information which properly must remain classified.

We sincerely hope that neither political party will regard these hearings in any narrow, partisan sense. These are matters which rise above political considerations. As we go into this inquiry, we should regard ourselves as Americans first and as Democrats and Republicans second.

We hope, however, that the necessary precaution of censorship will not be used as the vehicle for a white-wash or a cover-up, designed to protect either side. Both parties are represented on the investigating committees. Each must regard itself, in a sense, as the watchdog of the public interest.

It would be a mistake, moreover, to funnel this inquiry into the narrow confines of a MacArthur against Truman-Acheson valley. Personalities are the least important of the many vital problems that must be gone into.

In this connection, David Lawrence, editor of the United States News and World Report, has drawn up a number of challenging questions for which answers conscientiously ought to be sought.

"Let us have all the truth about the Attlee-Truman conference," suggests Mr. Lawrence, writing in the current issue of his magazine. He continues:

"Why did our President agree to allow Great Britain to continue to give aid and comfort to Red China?

"What kind of an alliance have we with Great Britain which permits her to ship war supplies to Red China while American boys are being killed with those munitions of war by the Red Chinese? [EDITOR'S NOTE: It was disclosed this week in the British House of Commons that Great Britain had exported goods worth more than $3,500,000 to Communist China during the past 3 months. The

president of the British Board of Trade said there is 'no generally accepted definition of strategic materials,' but among the exports listed were such items as iron and steel manufacturers, vehicles (including locomotives, ships, and aircraft), electrical goods and apparatus, and chemicals, drugs, dyes, and colors.]

"What kind of support has India or the Arab countries given to the recent U. N. resolution that brands Red China as an aggressor?

"What has British diplomacy been doing to frustrate United States policies in the Far East?

"Is the dismissal of MacArthur at the behest of foreign governments an evidence that membership in the U. N. means submission by the United States to the dictation of other governments without so much as a formal vote in the U. N. to put each nation on record?

"What U. N. policies * * * did General MacArthur fail to support? When and where were those policies adopted? Can we find anywhere in the public record a statement of those policies of the U. N.? And, if done in secret, by what authority has the President of the United States made such agreements with foreign governments without submitting them to Congress?

"Why has the U. N. become a hotbed of collective treason to its own resolutions? Great Britain, by continuing her recognition of the Government of Red China, has made a scrap of paper of the resolution of the U. N. which branded Red China as an aggressor. Why does Great Britain continually propose that the aggressor be rewarded with a seat in the U. N.?

"Why did the United Nations call upon its members to supply troops to aid Korea and yet refuse to accept the troops of the Nationalist Government of China which has a seat in the U. N. and is a lawful member of that organization? Is that U. N. policy?

"Why do Great Britain, India, and other U. N. members disassociate themselves from our President's order of last June to the United States Navy to defend Formosa?

"Why, when our Government now sends a military mission to Formosa to train troops of the Nationalist Government for defense of the island, is there no U. N. support for that move or any proposal from America that our U. N. allies join in that mission? What kind of a U. N. policy is this?"

These additional questions come to mind:

"Did the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff ever agree with General MacArthur in his recommendations for the military conduct of the campaign in Korea? If so, when did the Joint Chiefs of Staff shift its ground? What considerations prompted the change of view?

Does Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg still believe, as he wrote in the Saturday Evening Post last February, that "isolating the battlefield from reinforcements is the prime function of tactical air, and I am simply stating the military fact that air power was rendered practically inoperative when the U. N., in an effort to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Communists, halted offensive action at the Yalu River. * * *"?

What is the record of protests—through official channels—from General MacArthur to the American State Department's abandonment of Chiang Kai-shek while the Generalissimo still was fighting the Communists on the mainland of China?

What is the record of the United States State Department's moves which would have strengthened Russia's hand in Japan during the period General MacArthur so successfully administered the affairs of that enemy land? In the light of what has happened in China since then, is it logical to conclude that the situation in Japan might have been tipped against us, as it was in China, had not General MacArthur largely nullified State Department policy by virtually ignoring Russian demands for an important voice in administration of the islands?

Despite General MacArthur's admitted success in his role of United States proconsul in Japan, why was he removed from that post (which easily could have been divorced from his Korean duties) at the very time arrangements were being pressed for a peace treaty with Japan?

The Pentagon has announced that the President, in relieving General MacArthur, acted on the unanimous recommendations of his civilian and military advisers—including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Was this unanimous consent the result of a formal meeting, or did the White House call the President's advisers one by one and ask, "You think General MacArthur ought to be fired, don't you?"

The summary dismissal of General MacArthur—without precedent in military history for one who had served so long and so faithfully—deprived him of the right to take formal leave of his troops, or to address a message to the Japanese people. Was this method of dismissal also approved by the President's civilian and military advisers—including the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

What circumstances surrounded the declassification of the top-secret report of the Wake Island meeting between President Truman and General MacArthur? By whose authority was the document released to the New York Times? In that report General MacArthur is said to have assured the President that the Chinese Communists would not enter the war. Did not Secretary of State Acheson express a similar view only a few weeks previously? What did State Department intelligence reports indicate concerning the possibility of Chinese Red intervention?

Was Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asked by the White House to make his Chicago address a day or two before General MacArthur arrived to speak before Congress? Was that Bradley speech cleared by the State and Defense Departments?

What is the whole story of the report of Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who recommended 5 years ago that we give Chiang military aid and direction—a policy that now, belatedly, is being followed on Formosa? Why did the administration ignore General Wedemeyer's warning that Korea was threatened with Communist invasion?

On January 5, 1950, President Truman said in an official statement: "The United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa." What has led to the change in the administration's policy?

On January 12, 1950, Secretary Acheson said, in a speech at the National Press Club: "[The United States] defense perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus * * * from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack." This line of defense did not include Korea. What is the Joint Chiefs of Staff's judgment as to the probability of this Acheson statement having encouraged Communist aggression against Korea?

In June 1949, at a congressional hearing, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were asked individually whether the Chiefs of Staff advise the "withdrawal of troops from Korea at this time." Each answered affirmatively. Thirteen months later, when President Truman ordered United States troops back into Korea, were the Joint Chiefs of Staff consulted prior to the move? If so, what was their recommendation? If they urged a return to Korea, how do they justify that position with their earlier recommendation that we get out?

On March 20, 1947, Secretary Acheson testified at a congressional hearing: "The Chinese [Nationalist] Government * * * is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years." How was it possible that our State Department could have been so ill-informed? How does Secretary of State Acheson account for his own overconfidence of the Nationalists' military might in light of his later insistence that Chiang's collapse was inevitable, and that United States policy must be to seek to force a coalition of Chiang's forces with those of the Chinese Communists?

What is the full story of General Marshall's mission to China? Is it true that he originally agreed with a Military Establishment recommendation that we should aid Chiang with arms, and that he later ditched this assessment of the situation and swung around to support the State Department's view that Chiang should take the Communists into his government?

Has the full story of Yalta, Tehran, Cairo, and Potsdam been told? Are there any secret agreements which have not yet been made public?

Have we made any secret commitments not to use the atom bomb or atomic shells or projectiles without prior approval from the United Nations or the military missions of nations with troops in Korea?

How far are the Joint Chiefs of Staff permitted to press, in foreign policy conferences at the White House level, the military realities involved in politico-military decisions? At what point are they forced to surrender to the view of the diplomatic branch?

Would it not be wise to have United States Marine Corps represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

What assurances have the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they will not be subjected to reprisals if they tell the investigating committee the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Is it possible that the example set in the ouster of Admiral Denfeld might not serve to seal the lips of the military men?

How can Secretary Acheson account for the fact that virtually every move we have made in the Far East in the last 5 years has resulted in a strengthening of the Communist cause? Is Secretary Acheson completely satisfied that some of our fatal steps have not been engineered by pro-Communists within the Department? There was one Alger Hiss, against whom Mr. Acheson refused to turn his back. Would Mr. Acheson care to state categorically that there are not others?

Out of Our Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear the hackneyed phrase "What can I do?" as an excuse for doing little or nothing. All too seldom we hear the phrase, "Well done, my good and faithful servant," which stands at

the opposite pole. I should like to call to the attention of the Members a procedure which dissolves this paradox, and commits the heart to its charge of doing good. We are all aware of the simple letters "CARE" which shall be writ large in the annals of man when we all have gone to our last reward. We are all aware of the great humanitarian uplift of civilization involved in the 21 different organizations which have done so much in the name of Christian charity. Below is an editorial accounting of this organization and the inestimable contribution which it has made to the alleviation of the ills of man and his suffering. I add my "well done" to CARE and to the many peoples who originated this Christian idea and brought it to function. I commend the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colo., for bringing it so concisely to the fore, and recommend it to all as proof of living our religious heritage which has had so much to do with the progress we have made in this world.

The editorial from the Daily Sentinel of April 15, 1951, follows:

OUT OF OUR ABUNDANCE

Ever since World War II came to an end, in fact before its close, Americans have been contributing to different organizations dedicated to the relief of misery in war-torn nations. One of the most well-known of these organized Good-Samaritan groups has become familiar to Americans under the name of CARE (representing 21 different organizations working for relief).

Because so many of us have been contributors to it we believe our readers will be interested in some portions of a CARE report recently released. Herein we find that our dollars have helped send 10,000,000 packages abroad—ten million ambassadors of good will, they may rightly be called. Through this package service Americans have shipped the meat equivalent of 26,000 head of cattle, 100,000 pigs, 230,000 canned whole turkeys and 230,000 plum puddings; 32,000,000 cups of sugar; flour for 33,000,000 loaves of bread; 23,000,000 pounds of butter, margarine, lard and cooking oil; coffee enough for 360,000,000 cups; 45,000,000 cups of tea and equal number of cups of cocoa; 56,000,000 quarts of milk; 26,000,000 bowls of rice; 1,680,000 cans of baby food and chocolate equaling 220,000,000 candy bars.

To this almost fabulous list of food supplies may be added great amounts of soap, blankets, shoe soles, towels, buttons, coal, plows, tools, books, nursing bottles and medical supplies. On the clothing side, we note that 426 miles (not yards) of woolen cloth, and 204,000 sweaters, scarves and pairs of socks have gone to warm the cold in many nations around the world.

Tragically, the need for such services as CARE has been rendering does not lessen. Each year since its organization more countries have been added to its lists, until now boxes with the welcome word CARE on their sides go to every continent. Korea is the latest war-victim beneficiary—but we fear it will not be the last.

Americans have a right to be proud of their postwar record of giving to the foreign needy. They would, on the other hand, have cause for deepest shame had they not shared their abundance with all these unfortunates. And the extent of the abundance with which our land is blessed may be realized from the fact that in all this giving we have actually deprived ourselves of nothing, but gained intangible rewards that cannot be measured.

Catholic Action Follows the Way of the Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the prize-winning oration for girls by Miss Nancy Jones, of the Academy of the Holy Cross, in the twentieth annual oratorial contest sponsored by the Catholic University Conference of Clerics and Religious held at the Catholic University gymnasium on April 15:

CATHOLIC ACTION FOLLOWS THE WAY OF THE CROSS

(By Miss Nancy Jones)

Scientific progress, outward evidence of social advancement, and the calendar mark the year 1951. Yes, centuries of time have altered the material scene, but time can never affect the spiritual. It is the atomic age, an era of jet-propelled speed reflected in the minds and bodies of men. The physical and mental make-up of the man of 1951 would be an improvement over that of Neolithic man, but the spiritual capacity is still the same—its purpose is still to know and love God. The accelerated pace of the twentieth century, perhaps, attempts to omit that part of man's construction which cannot be improved by experiment. Only a privileged few have the power to realize that the most important part of man—the soul—is immortal—it has always been—it will always be. It is the task of this privileged group to find the key to slowing down those absorbed in the atomic age for a picture of what they are missing. Finding this key is a continual search and it takes the spiritual scientist centuries back into history. The hope of this age lies in the kingdom of Jerusalem in the eyes of a carpenter from Nazareth. His life story offers abundant examples to those who desire lessons in Catholic action. His life is a tragedy that can never be equaled, but it is a tragedy that ends in a glorious triumph of Easter. His way—the way of the Cross—is the only way for those who would change the world!

It begins in a garden and the agony is at first not from physical pain, but from mental torture—it is the ever haunting suggestion of the "easy way out." It is a familiar story to you when faced with obstacles, ridicule, suffering. "Let this chalice pass from me."

You find it hard to face failure—you find it hard to forego a passion—you find it hard to accept humiliation. Is your answer one of hatred, bitterness, or despair, or is your answer as His was—"Not My will, but Thine be done"—accompanied by a ready acceptance of whatever the Father sees fit to send?

The poor, lacerated, thorn-crowned Christ looks with pleading, tear-dimmed eyes over the whole world. Are you he who condemns Him? Is it your denial of legitimate authority that crushes His as you seek to gain control of power, satisfaction of selfish whims, or the admiration of a fickle populace?

Or are you another Simon of Cyrene whose shoulder helps to bear the weight of the Cross? Is it your strength that lessens the ponderous weight of sin? Catholic action speaks louder than words. Your individual movements to give a hand to that which is all good can effect a united effort in your home, in your school, and your community.

In your home by the cheerful acceptance of tasks, by the avoidance of arguments, by contributing your share of all that makes for the happiness of every member, by encouraging family prayer, and family participation in the sacraments.

In your school are you another Simon by encouraging faithful observance of rules, by earnest and concentrated study, by participation and wholehearted support of every project, by helping those less gifted intellectual and social pursuits?

And in your community do you lead others by word and example to a fuller share of the mystical body of Christ by advancing parish activity, by strictly abiding by community laws?

As you follow Christ on His way to Calvary, your good example may attract a number of the on-looking crowd to the eternal riches of Catholicism.

Jesus falls—one, twice, thrice, and yet He rejects the warmth of the earth, slowly and deliberately returning to His feet. Is your battle of the spiritual over the material so perseveringly fought—the struggle against the warmth of earthly possessions? Can you rise as determinately above the intolerance of race and creed; can you place your feet in the bloodstained steps of the Divine Leader and put away the allurements of the world to accept the wood of the Cross that leads to eternal salvation?

Jesus encounters the minority of the passionate mob who believe. Again always ready to meet those who ask His help, He stops to comfort the weeping women. He who has been dragged through the very depths of humiliation and anguish; He who bears the crucifying weight of our sins, stops to think of others. "Weep not for Me, but for yourselves and for your children."

Perhaps you are having a hard time, perhaps everyone is against you, perhaps your allowance or income is small—so long as there is anyone in need, you have a divine responsibility to care for him, to pray for him, to comfort him, to contribute to his relief, directly or indirectly. The lay apostle must put the interests of God before those of his most earnest desires.

Or are you one of the jeering throng? Spineless, weak, unable to say "no" to the taunts of many? Your singular "no" echoing in the hearts of those attracted to good could initiate a positive stand against the jeers and outrages of communism. Your Catholic action could be and should be a shield against the words that drive the nails into the hands of the Saviour. Your "no" could be the Catholic's ringing answer to the iron curtain.

Patience, humility, fortitude, love—the very essence of these as He hangs from the cross, His arms outstretched to encircle and forgive. All powerful, omniscient, and yet He perseveres in the complete injustice of it. He died that you might live. Each one of us must die to himself that Christ might live and wax beautiful in the lives of others. Catholic action is in your hands, the responsibility is yours to accept as did the good thief; singular among many. The good thief found the truth. He was shown it by Him who is the way, the truth, the life. He found it because he stood alone. Can you stand alone in the face of immodest dress, drinking, and sinful conversation? Can you by the purity of your life influence others to recognize the true Christ and claim a remembrance in Paradise?

The road to Calvary is long—it is the span of a lifetime—your lifetime. It is a road that has been traveled down through the years, every minute, every second by those

who have pledged themselves to take up Christ's work and to win all to His standards.

In the very first years of Boys Town, one evening Father Flanagan stood watching the setting autumn sun radiate the sky, and as he did so, he saw a sturdy young lad carrying a crippled boy in his arms, "Isn't he heavy, son?" he called. "He ain't heavy, Father, he's my brother."

This story, I think, is the twentieth century's reality of the cross. It is inspiration for all of us—individuals, families, communities, and nations. You as Simon must look to all as your brother and in reaching out a helping hand, lift the burden of your fellow men regardless of creed, color, or social standing. The way of the cross—your way—is the way of Catholic action.

Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 28, 1951, the southwest regional conference of the Pennsylvania Federation of Young Republicans was held at Johnstown, Pa. This conference was attended by over 300 delegates, representing a 22-county area of southwestern Pennsylvania. These young people, the leaders of the future, heard an inspiring address by the Honorable HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, Representative in Congress from the Second District of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of his address:

My fellow Americans, it is a particular pleasure for me to be with you here in Johnstown tonight. The honor of being able to share in this Southwest regional conference of Pennsylvania Young Republicans is one which I deeply appreciate.

As a former State chairman of the Connecticut Young Republicans, it is certainly inspiring for me to see you in action. I congratulate you for the effective way in which you maintain your organization, not just in the heat of the campaign, but in the long "between times" when the most valuable political work must be done.

I am especially happy to come to an area which is so well represented in the Congress of the United States. I can speak with both affection and pride of my Pennsylvania colleagues JIM VAN ZANDT, of the Altoona district; JOHN SAYLOR, of the Johnstown district; LOUIS GRAHAM, of the Beaver Falls, Butler County district; JIM FULTON, of the South Hills district; BOB CORBETT, of the North Borough district; HARMAR DENNY, of the East End Wilkinsburg district; CARROLL KEARNS, of the Erie-Sharon district; LEON GAVIN, of the Oil City district; ED SITTLER, of the Uniontown-Somerset district; and AL BUSH, of the Fifteenth Pennsylvania District.

Their splendid record as representatives of the people furnishes the opportunity for all of us to take a mead of pride in them as products of an active, hard-hitting, Young Republican organization.

Nor can I pass by the opportunity to say a word of the admiration which forward-looking Connecticut Republicans have, as have Republicans throughout the Nation, for your own vigorous, dauntless, and, above all, sound and sincere Senators ED MARTIN and JIM DUFF.

I come from a district where the election of a Congressman has been a nip-and-tuck proposition for most of the past 50 years. During the last 18 years only one Congressman from my district has ever been elected to succeed himself, and then only once, although three of us have been elected for two terms, but not consecutively.

You will appreciate, therefore, that my own campaign for reelection necessarily begins on the very day after I am first elected. There isn't any "me too" formula that works in the Second District of Connecticut. I must also add, that the people are too smart to go along with any blind and unreasoning opposition that is merely the outs against the ins.

I personally do not rely too much on political rallies, although, naturally, along with all political candidates, we have to take them in stride. I believe that as a party we must carry our Republican message more directly to the people.

During the past campaign, I called personally on thousands of men and women. I talked with them individually and in small groups.

I called upon housewives in their homes, and arranged for some of them to hold small informal meetings at which I talked in a conversational way, not a speech-making way, about their many problems. I learned, first-hand, of many of the things they were thinking about, of many of the things that were bothering them. Incidentally, each housewife received a Seely-Brown potholder as a reminder of our visit. I gave away 15,000 of these holders in person. Election night proved that my friends had taken heed of the slogan printed on each holder, "Make a note, remember to vote for SEELY-BROWN for Congress."

I am telling you these things about my own district, only because I am sure that you are greatly concerned about making the Republican Party the party of the majority of the people, and in making 1952 a Republican victory year. I believe my own experience as a candidate and as a Congressman may be of some help in this effort.

I am firmly convinced that, without the voting support of the women in my district, I would not have been elected. I believe that in every district, if we are going to elect a Republican Congress and a Republican President, we must convince the women that our Republican Party has the program and the candidates who are best qualified to give them that which they seek most from their Government—some assurance of peace and prosperity, and an aggressive regard for the lives and the livelihood of their families.

Right along this line, while we are talking about getting the voting support of the women, I would like to make an additional comment. I think we have been giving more lip service than sincere effort when it comes to admitting women to full partnership in the day-to-day activities of the Republican Party on every level. I fear we have been too backward about recognizing their qualifications and availability for many more positions in the party and in the Government than they are filling today. And I can say that, with no fear of being misunderstood, because my opponent last fall happended to be the only woman on the congressional ticket of any party in the last election in Connecticut.

Do you remember back to the election campaign of 1946? The Republican Party made a big mistake that time. Not about the slogan that summarized the thinking of so many thousands of people: "Have you had enough?" The votes on that election day told that most of the people believed that they had "had enough" of the Truman administration. So they elected a Republican Congress. Unfortunately, too many Republicans considered that election as a mandate to order a detour from the pathway of progress.

That attitude was a grievous mistake, a fatal error from the standpoint of the immediate fortunes of the Republican Party—worse, indeed, than the feeble and futile "me-too's" to which the people have so emphatically turned deaf ears in the last three presidential elections. So that when the 1948 election rolled around, the electorate did a little mental arithmetic saying nothing from nothing leaves—nothing—and returned Truman to office with a Democratic Congress. You ask—but why dwell on that?

We had better dwell on it. We had better give careful thought and make a careful analysis of the detailed returns of at least the last three elections. If we do, surely we can learn some things that will help us in the next one.

During my house-to-house campaign last fall—and I use the phrase literally—I found that the people without exception were sorely distressed about the way things were going in our Government. The war in Korea, into which we blundered, the threat of world war III, the inflation that always keeps rising prices several steps ahead of wage increases, the squandering of the billions that had been appropriated to provide the military preparedness that, when the need came, we didn't have—all these aroused the fury of the people, made them lose confidence in the Democratic administration; but at the same time, they had their doubts about the ability of the Republicans to do any better.

Well, for those who are in office, it is up to us to prove that the Republican Party does have the leadership and the program that will give to our Nation strength and unity and the opportunity to enjoy our freedom. I can say very truthfully that we have many good men and women on the Republican side, both in the Senate and in the House. We have powerful voices and able leaders outside of Congress. We need the help of all of them to make everyone in the party realize that the problems we must deal with are problems of 1951 not of 1898; that the war we must try to prevent is world war III, not the Spanish-American War. We've got to get rid of those whose great weakness is that for them the past has never stopped being the present.

So far as I am concerned, I consider my own best campaign procedure for election to the Eighty-third Congress, and the way in which I can serve my country and my party best, is to be just the best Congressman from the Second Connecticut District that I know how to be.

I don't consider that this means spending all of my time with my ear to the ground. Of course, I want to know at all times what the people of my district are thinking about. I want to know what's bothering them, what their problems are; and, if the last 2 weeks are any indication, I am certainly sure they'll continue to let me know, by letter and by telegram, and frequently by personal contact, how they feel about matters of current attention in the Government.

So that this won't be a one-way proposition, I propose to let them know, just as directly and as simply as I can, what I am doing in Washington, and why. For that purpose, we are publishing, from my office, the Seely-Brown Newsletter, which goes out every 4 or 5 weeks thus far, although soon it may be more frequently, to explain the

matters of current debate, or of administrative action; to report how I voted upon each item of legislation, and a detailed explanation as to why I voted as I did; and to furnish, in the same style that those syndicated columns do, short tidbits of news to give the inside story on some items of interest.

These days of the Eighty-second Congress have been exciting times in Washington. In spite of the clashes of tempers and of emotions, that have attracted so much attention the country over, it is my opinion that we are closer to national unity to meet the crisis we are in, than presently appears. We have lost a great statesman and a great Republican, in Senator Vandenberg, who, in his days of strength, was an instrument in proposing and trying to bring about, without very much cooperation from the White House and the State Department, I might add, a real nonpartisan foreign policy. I use the term "nonpartisan" advisedly. Too many, when you speak of a bipartisan foreign policy, think it has to mean saying "Yes" to a bad administration program, with the formulating of which they have had nothing to say. By nonpartisan, I mean the product of the best judgment of the best minds of those in both parties, in the interest of national unity and the best interests of our country. Our policy abroad, whether for Asia or Europe, must be nonpartisan in conception, direction, and implementation.

This is one of the most pressing needs in Washington today. We could learn something valuable from our British allies on this point. Churchill and Morrison, Tory and Laborite, may fight savagely in Commons on the muddy footprints of socialism as it affects the lives of every Britisher; but when it comes to foreign affairs, they speak in unison as Englishmen.

The $100-a-plate Democratic speakers sent out from Washington are calling the Republicans "the war party" now. They're evidently adopting the old strategy of the prize ring: A good attack is the best defense.

We must face the uncertainties of the future without bitterness and without rancor, as General MacArthur so well said in his historic address at the joint meeting of Congress. He summarized for the Congress and for the people of this Nation, the facts, most of which were well known, about the decision which we must make regarding the situation in Asia. The President makes the foreign policy, and he is responsible for the political situation; and he is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and thus is in full charge of the military situation, as has become painfully apparent, not only by the exercising of his authority by the removal of MacArthur, but also by his making a political stooge out of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley.

How, then, can the Republicans be "the war party," for going along with the recommendations of MacArthur, for steps to end the fighting in Korea with victory for the arms of the United Nations?

Need I remind you that the war started under a Democratic administration—as did World War I and World War II. But then it wasn't supposed to be a war, but only a police action; and perhaps that is why the President, as General MacArthur said in his speech to Congress, didn't consider it necessary to consult the supreme commander in the area affected, when military intervention to repel aggression was decided upon.

Except for the removal of our military strength in Southern Korea beginning in January 1950, the aggression of June 1950 couldn't have taken place, and no police action with 60,000 casualties would have been necessary.

Except for the mothballing of our aircraft carriers, and the practical dismantling of our Armed Forces under Secretary Louis Johnson's idea of economy, we could have stopped the aggression in Korea, before Red China could get into the picture. You will remember that another great commander was removed—Admiral Denfeld—because he told Congress he thought it was a mistake not to build the superaircraft carrier that Truman and Johnson had scrapped after the keel was laid. They broke Denfeld, but the carrier is being built now. We could have used it to good advantage, if we had it now.

They removed MacArthur, called him a warmonger, but it looks already as though at least two of the four steps that he recommended in Asia are about to be carried out—the strengthening of the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa and an economic blockade of Communist China. The Army is sending a military mission of 100 high-ranking officers to help the Chinese Nationalists, which may be just the beginning—and the British, so a dispatch from London says, are ready to needle the United Nations to invoke economic sanctions against Red China.

The point I would like to make, especially in the situation pertaining to war or peace which we face in the world today, is that no event—no act—stands by itself. Each is a part of a chain. Most of the troubles that we in the United States face today—the overhanging threat of world war III; the indecisiveness when thousands of lives are at stake—are part of a chain that began with bungling in high places in the administration in Washington.

In closing, let me say that our unfortunate policies of the past have brought us now to the brink of world-wide disaster. We are entering a long period in which we must subject ourselves to many restrictions which we as a people would not tolerate in more peaceful times.

All of us in every walk of life—in every profession or calling—must ask this question: "Am I going to lead in the scramble for the self-protection of my own special interest, or shall I stand up and dedicate my thinking, my action, and my prayers to the protection of my country?"

Stern policies lie ahead. As a legislator, it is my responsibility to insist that these policies be considered carefully in committee and the issues debated freely, fully, and without partisanship on the floor of the House.

Stern policies can be effective only if the public understands fully the reasons why these policies are needed. The people of our Republic have never been afraid of the truth.

The time is now. Our very survival is at stake.

I Want Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by a former Member of the House of Representatives and former Ambassador, the Honorable Herbert Pell:

I WANT PEACE

(By Herbert C. Pell)

(I know how easy it is for an ignorant politician to yell "Communist" when he is at a loss for an answer or desirous of covering himself with a smoke screen. That is why I write this personal note. I should be among the first to be destroyed by communism. I am nearly 70 and have never been in business. I have lived all my life on invested property as did my father and mother and my grandparents and most of my greatgrandparents before me. Economically I represent everything to which communism is hostile. I am one of the comparatively few Americans every one of whose ancestors became a citizen of the United States on July 4, 1776. I have always loved and enjoyed liberty. Since the day of my first effort in politics I have worked for personal freedom for all. I have lived in totalitarian countries and loath what I saw there. I know that a Communist government will inevitably degenerate into a totalitarian autocracy which is the opposite and the implacable enemy of everything I have enjoyed, of every material policy that has served me, of everything I have respected and of everything I have loved.)

I am for peace. I am for minding our own business. I am particularly opposed to a policy which boils down to an effort to impose American ideas and customs on other nations. This does not mean that we should not recognize the duties and responsibilities of our position.

We must properly understand the situation of the United States. This country is the leader of the free world which is a very different thing from being the free leader of the world. We are the first of a group of associates. We cannot act as the owner of slaves, as the paymaster of hirelings or as the dominator of satellites. The nations on our side are weaker and poorer than we are either because they are smaller or because they have suffered more, but they are not slaves, servants, or sycophants; they are free nations and can be led by their willing consent or not at all. We cannot treat them as tools to be broken in our interest. When we assume the burden of leadership, we assume at the same time a responsibility for the interest of those whom we lead. We cannot offend their conscience or sacrifice them for our own gain.

Are we to rush by ourselves all alone on a course of military adventure without the assistance, without even the sympathy of other nations which might have supported us in a less dashing policy. It is, of course, true that a leader must lead but another essential of leadership is to have followers. We cannot wisely ask the world to look to us for guidance if we obviously intend to consider no counsel but our own. The career of the Kaiser and of Hitler, as well as the example of Stalin should have taught us to consider the inevitable end of the largest and strongest lone wolf.

Intelligently we must recognize that the United States cannot be alone in the world. It cannot long remain prosperous in a company of ruined nations. So much is obvious. For a good many years to come, the core of individualist economy—if that economy is to survive at all—must be a prosperous United States. It is manifest that we cannot as a Nation continue as the leader and the bulwark of a civilization based on the assumption that peace is the normal condition of mankind if we persist in a policy of military adventure or turn ourselves into an armed camp.

If the United States is to be the first Nation of the future, if we are entering on the American century, let us hope—and do what we can to make it so—that the period of our leadership will be a period of peace, amity, and prosperity rather than a time of subordination for the world under the rule of a people themselves oppressed by the tools of their dominance.

Peace is not always easy to maintain: At the present moment its maintenance is and will be for sometime extremely difficult. As Governor Dewey once said, "We must wage peace."

Twice in our time we have seen that total war (and there is really no other kind possible) decides nothing, settles nothing, answers nothing, and leads to nothing. Winner and loser, both are vanquished. Is there a single nation on earth that got, by any imaginable system of accounting, a net gain out of either of the two wars we have lived through?

War is not a natural thing. It is the bankruptcy of leadership. It is the final and glaring proof that the governors of the world are not fit for their positions. Hatred of a foreign and unknown country is a drummed-up thing, and above all it is no essential part of patriotism, any more than hatred of your neighbors is an essential part of family love.

Peace is the only possible base for our civilization. It was built on peace and without peace it will die. War will ineluctably end the customs and the outlook and the way of life, the ideals and the national purposes which we inherited from our fathers to be held as a sacred trust for our children.

The inevitable result of war will be the complete destruction of everything that we value and the cutting of the taproots of democracy in the world. Manifestly with the effective end of prosperous democracy in the United States all freedom on earth must inevitably perish.

Can we afford to antagonize all other countries which normally would support us?

I have lived in totalitarian countries; I have seen independent nations lose their spiritual strength. I suggest an illustration which may at first appear unimportant. When I was a boy I traveled a great deal in Italy before the first war. I remember going to cafes in the summer, where the people sat around in groups up to a dozen at a table, all talking freely. I don't suppose 1 conversation in 20 had anything to do with politics. In 1938, I drove my son from Naples to Vintimiglia. The people still sat outside of cafes in summer, but they were at tables of two or three and their conversation was in whispers. Again, I believe that only a small proportion of these conversations were political, but the habit of fear controlled the minds of the people.

War will certainly destroy many forms of private property and of private investment and will practically annihilate all private business. From five to ten million at least of the best and most effective workers will be withdrawn from peaceful production. From fifteen to twenty more will be forced to devote their energies to the manufacture of articles of war. This will come pretty near to cutting our productive labor force in two. War priorities will reduce the manufacture of automobiles, houses, electric goods, roads, schools, hospitals, and everything else that we consume to the lowest possible level.

I have lived in countries where just this thing happened. I have gone through cities which I remembered as prosperous and active and found them like ghost towns with empty shops, hungry people, no traffic and above all, no hope and no liberty.

Another war with its crushing taxes will certainly mark the end of capitalism. Private capitalism depends on private investments and private investments depend on the willingness of people to forego present pleasures for future security and income. When my father forewent the expenditure of $100, he thought he was getting $5 a year for the rest of his life and $5 a year to be divided among his descendants for an indefinite time. Today the Government takes a great part of this return for income taxes and a lot of the capital in inheritance taxes. The result is that people will be less willing to save; less willing to give up present enjoyment for a much smaller ultimate gain. In the meanwhile factories must be erected; houses must be built; electricity and water supplied to new developing districts. Where is the money to come from? As these are necessities of life, it must obviously come from the State, which means socialism, and the administration of an increasing part of our economic structure by the Government.

It is quite certain that the Government will be obliged willy-nilly to do much more than this. It must direct the energies of the people into the canals which it will select. A man will not be able to build a hotdog stand or toy shop unless he can get materials allocated to him by the Government which practically means permission to go into the business, and he will not be allowed to do so, if the Government believes that a drug store or a fountain pen factory are more needed. With this extension of Government control of the economic lives of the community, there will inevitably come a system of censorship and the loss of all freedom of expression. We will be further and further from that idea of American liberty once expressed by an unknown cowboy, who said that he wanted to be able to look any man in the eye and tell him to go to hell.

Shortages inevitably mean rationing and rationing means Government control. But things will, and everybody knows it, go much further than that. With insufficiencies everywhere, the allocation of every short supply must be—or at least certainly will be—in the hands of the Government. Officials—wise or unwise—probably good men but not all-knowing, will have to decide what buildings shall be erected and what goods are to be produced. This is so obvious that no one can suggest any other policy. If there should be, as in the case of war there certainly will be, not enough steel to go around it would be obscenely indecent to allow one man to build himself a yacht merely because he could outbid the community.

There will be no field day for labor. There will be no overtime and no holidays taken at will when pockets get full, no shopping around for pleasant profitable or interesting jobs. Labor will be drafted in an all-out war and the workman will have no more freedom than the soldier. He will go where he is sent and do what he is told and get what the Government chooses to pay him and whatever that may be, it will not buy him very much.

All the improvements in labor conditions which I have seen coming in the last 50 years—many of which I fought for during the course of my career—will fall like trees in a hurricane. Strikes of laborers in factories will be as impossible as strikes of soldiers at the front. Anyone who is willing to think for 5 minutes must know all this and nobody thinking for a month can suggest anything else. I have seen this in other countries and I do not want to see it here.

Independent thought, independent expression will be crushed. The self-respect of free and thoughtful citizens will be destroyed by the continued knowledge that it is only at their own risk that they dare whisper any criticism of the elected officials of the Government. These would be the consequences of a great war.

Today, does any sane person believe that a conflict with Russia will mean anything but mutual destruction and ruin? Do we hope to overrun Russia as Germany was overrun and occupy it as Germany was occupied, and then build it again, as we are doing Germany and Japan into something very like what it was before? What do we plan to do with a victory?

It is manifest that a war with Russia will end in a collapse of common exhaustion. The representatives of a shattered Russia will meet the emissaries of a worn and exhausted United States and devise a means by which both can survive without continuing mutual slaughter and destruction. Is there any person in the world who imagines any other result possible?

Thirty years ago we tried to establish a democracy in Germany. The Germans are an educated and industrious people, accustomed to cooperation, but having had no experience in the workings of a democratic government, they were unable to maintain the structure of freedom and found themselves like the man in the Bible whose devil left him and returned with seven other spirits worse than himself. Are we going to make this same mistake again in dealing with Russia?

We are often told that we cannot negotiate with Russia. The Russian Government will not keep its word. Its guarantees and solemn promises mean little or nothing. Does any sane person believe that after wrecking the Russian Army, destroying the structure of the Russian Government, there will emerge from Russia a group of negotiators of greater integrity who will be more desirous of keeping their agreements and, what is equally important, will have the power to enforce them at home?

It would be absurd to imagine that such a negotiation would be an easy or routine affair.

Russia has experienced enormous changes in the last 30 years; it is certain that the course of change is not yet run. The centers of political power and economic interest are far from fixed. We cannot expect a treaty with the government of such a country to endure very long—the best that can be sensibly hoped is imperfect and temporary, but even a temporary calm will allow the billows raised by the earthquake of war to subside a little, and every bit of calm makes stronger the settlement and integralization which can be the foundation of something more solid.

Our negotiators will be in the position of Eliza crossing the river. Pursued by bloodhounds, she arrived at the Ohio. She jumped on a floating piece of ice which could give her no prolonged footing, but was at least solid enough to provide a place from which she could leap to a second and a third, hoping that a fourth would drift along and that eventually she would arrive on hard ground. The temporary security of a cake of ice, even though it only deferred ultimate disaster, kept open the possibility of at last reaching land. It was better than bloodhounds or cold water. She would of course have preferred to cross by a bridge or ferry boat, but no boat or bridge presenting itself, she took a poor chance rather than accept inevitable failure.

I am perfectly certain that our system—the American system which everybody knows and which no one can accurately define—is, of all social structures existing today, the one which is most capable of development; most able to maintain itself; and especially that it can with the fewest and least dangerous repercussions alter its course to meet the strains of changes in the social and economic balance. After all, it has lasted without fundamental alteration for a century and a half, which is more than can be said of any government in the history of the world—even those which like the British have accepted basic changes in time to avert bloody revolution.

One of the things which we have most certainly learned from history and from our own observation of Mussolini and of Hitler is that dictatorships are impermanent affairs. The only possible opposition to an autocrat is revolution. Therefore, it does not take long for every criticism to be suppressed as revolutionary. In a short time we hear of such absurdities as "capitalistic biology"—a recent Russian contribution, which shows that truth can always outrun satire.

Germany, in 1930, was as far ahead of the world in the study of atomic fission as is the United States today. After only 8 years of

Hitler's government, the old and well integrated scientific world of Germany was shattered, and when called on to develop the atomic bomb, its disorganization was such that no effective progress could be made.

No dictatorship has ever been able to provide for an orderly succession of power. A dictator does not dare to make use of the best and strongest men. He fears that they will be intriguing for his place; that is why every dictatorship is weakened by sycophancy, nepotism, and bureaucracy.

Bodies can be enslaved; intellect can only be suppressed.

That is why I believe that time is on our side. In spite of crises and economic waves, which Communists believe will overwhelm us, it seems to me that if we hold firmly to real liberty and strive to extend it, it will be we, and not the worshippers of organization, who will most thrive. In the long run a people which controls its government will outlast a government which owns its people.

Our only peril comes from within ourselves; we may forget that our strength is liberty, and liberty is our strength. Thirty years ago I put into a Democratic State platform this phrase: "If the rights of the meanest and the most unpopular are traversed, the rights of all are in danger." Liberty cannot be a private possession, nor can it long be partial. It is universal and entire, or it will soon be nothing.

The real difficulty lies in the fact that the negotiators on both sides fear disapproval by the politicians at home. You can't buy a second-hand bicycle without some bargaining. The offers gradually come together, but there will never be any agreement if the seller fears he will be hanged as a traitor if he accepts a dime less than the original demand, and the buyer knows that he will be pilloried as an appeaser if he raises the bid by a quarter.

I do not know how it is in Russia, but in the United States today every person who dares to express the obvious fact that compromise is better than the best conceivable result of any possible war—which is the real belief of thinking Americans—finds himself attacked and stabbed on all sides by men sitting safely in public offices, who know very well that come what may, they will be safe from any enemy. Here, there, and everywhere you hear them shouting against compromise, calling the world to witness that their only desire is to shoulder a musket and face the wicked foe. It is only the superior quality of their patriotism that prevents them from selfishly indulging this wish. They must for the good of the Nation remain in public office while they cheer on the envied heroes.

Every radio blares hatred for the simple reason that it is profitable to do so. A radio commentator is paid according to the number of people who will listen to him, and particularly according to the number of hearers he can attract who are stupid enough to believe that Thing-a-bob Soap, or Somebody's Toothpaste, or What's-his-name's Breakfast Food is better than any other on the market, simply because it hires a brighter comedian or a more exciting commentator.

As such people obviously will not think clearly in their own interest when buying soap, toothpaste or breakfast food, it is extremely doub'ful if they will be willing to devote any serious thought to the public interest. They prefer phrases like "the best wash by gosh," or "hustle builds muscle" as guides to spending their own money, and want very little more for the formulation of their opinions. It is manifestly easier to excite such an audience than it is to force it to comprehend the simplest of reasoning.

This is why so many of the widely-heard commentators devote themselves to exaggeration and fear, and as far as I know, not one of them to advising calm consideration and certainly not one who dares to suggest asking the community to think for itself and answer the question—what we expect to do with a victory when we get one at enormous cost.

They have the effrontery to attack as cowards all who disagree with anything they shout.

The whole thing is contemptible. How much courage does it take for a Congressman or a Senator to yell for blood? Does a district attorney show a high quality of bravery when he howls against compromise? Right or wrong, no question of courage is involved. How much courage does anyone think it would take for me, 67 years old, living on an ample income quietly in the country, to clamor for gore, to demand the sacrifice of a million men 40 years younger than I am and then end my heroic address with a bitter note of regret that my years or my grapevines prevent me from joining the brave boys whom I envy. Such words do not come from the mouths of heroes or of patriots, but from the lips of self-seeking politicians hoping to ride into office on a wave of excitement that will conceal their own shortcomings. I have been in politics for 40 years. I was a Member of Congress 10 years before the oldest soldier drafted was born, and I know.

Most of the political shouters think they are backing a winning horse—that's all. Loathsome insects gather round anything that is rotten. Twenty-five years ago thousands of American politicians attacked the Catholics to get the Klan vote. Today they follow McCarthy. Twenty years ago they said as they drank their bootleg liquor, "There's one more election in prohibition." Today safe behind desks they think that war and hatred will keep their snouts in the public trough in 1952. It's as simple as that.

I am not one of those who appeal to fear, fear, fear. I say hope, hope, hope. In a speech which President Franklin Roosevelt prepared just before his death, he referred to "the impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killings of peoples." We must hold to the old principles of our country which do not include fear of change, or mass terror, or dread of the future, or looking back to a golden age which is past forever. The people of this country need calmness and courage—not excitement and terror drummed into them by self-seeking politicians.

This is certainly a time for thought and not for emotion. In the most literal sense of the words I ask you for God's sake—for the sake of God, for the sake of your country if not for your own—to think.

I am for peace. I am on the side of the angels of God who sang "Peace on earth, good will to men." They were not popular with those who filled the inn and crowded Mary into the stables, but they were right all the same.

Why not negotiate now, while the young men are still alive?

Make It Easier on Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in that we cannot forget that the world goes on even when we are having dramatic and important debates on policy overseas and, to some extent, policies at home, I should like to call attention to an editorial from the Durango Herald-Democrat, of Durango, Colo. This editorial brings into sharp focus a current maneuver or move which has as its purpose the realinement of political affiliations within our country. After many years, conservative Republicans are wooing the lady they not only scorned but cast out in the brash period of their youth; or, simply stated, some northern Republicans are making advances, apparently with consent, toward some southern Democrats. For the moment, no comment seems necessary as to the chance of success nor to the devious chain of casual factors which have led to the establishment of relations on an official level between the grandsons and granddaughters of one-time Hatfields and McCoys. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a clear expression of the essentials of this courtship:

MAKE IT EASIER ON VOTERS

Senator Karl Mundt, South Dakota, Republican, and a handful of his party colleagues are trying to promote a new political alinement. They want the GOP and southern Democrats to join forces for the 1952 Presidential campaign.

The main ideas behind this move are these:

1. On most domestic issues, and even on some foreign ones, the Republicans and southern Democrats are kindred conservative spirits. The evidence of that is the Congressional Record, which reveals that the two groups vote together frequently in a sort of loose, informal coalition.

2. The promoters of a more formal tie-up believe that without it the election of a Republican as President will continue to be extremely difficult, if not impossible. They reason that a Democratic nominee who starts with the solid South in his pocket has an almost decisive advantage these days.

Mundt and his friends have stirred up a complex question. It's as important to the Democrats as it is to the Republicans. With their southern strength, the Democrats have been able in recent elections to retain the Presidency, and in all but 1946-48 to keep their hold on Congress.

Yet the existence of the division between the southerners and the northern Truman Democrats prevents the victorious party from carrying out the program of the administration. Domestically the President gets very little of what he wants. In the foreign field, he has the southerners with him on his most vital demands, but more and more they are veering away from him here, too.

What it amounts to is that the Democratic Party functions as a real unit only in campaign periods. In 1948, of course, even that wasn't true, for the Dixiecrat revolt brought considerable defection from the regular party ranks.

At all other times, the Democrats break into two distinct segments. And the administration wing of the party is, practically speaking, a minority which can get programs enacted only at the sufferance of its opposition.

It's an accepted fact that the Republicans and the southern Democrats rule Congress. They have the votes to block anything they wish, or to put across any legislation. They fail only when their coalition weakens.

Thus for the most part the conservatives are in the saddle, and yet they do not govern. That is, they do not control the White House.

A political realinement which would draw battle lines more clearly might seem highly desirable if it promised to end this virtual impasse in government. But there are many angles to the problem—too many for brief discussion here. More than a few United States political experts think it's really best that America's major parties remain as they are—a mixture of conservatives and liberals on both sides.

Whatever comes of MUNDT's coalition plan, the ordinary citizen has a right to hope for two things in the campaign of 1952. He ought to be given a clear choice between two reasonable alternatives in policy. And he should be able to feel that the winning party has the strength in Congress to enact into law the program it offers the people.

Truman-MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am including as a part of these remarks an editorial entitled "Truman-MacArthur" written by the editor of the Mount Vernon Daily Herald, published in Mount Vernon, Wash., in its issue of May 1, 1951. The editorial follows:

TRUMAN-MACARTHUR

The Truman-MacArthur controversy over far-eastern political and military policies, brought suddenly to a head by the recent firing of the five-star general by a President who is regarded by countless millions of Americans as a far lesser light despite his high office, is steadily heading into deeper waters. Casting personalities aside, which should be done in justice to both aggressive men but which is extremely difficult to do, it is clear that MacArthur's return home and his historic address to Congress, bluntly criticizing the administration's foreign policies, and President Truman's stubborn determination to force his own views on the country, are swiftly driving us toward climactic national decisions. Public opinion may demonstrate as it is doing in no uncertain terms but Congress, as the parliamentary branch of our Government, will do the deciding.

Naturally, the Democrats, with some notable exceptions are rallying to a partisan defense of the head of their party in order to retain political power. Leaders who have opposed Truman politically again and again in Congress, now sensing danger of a complete party upset at the next election, are defending the President, Secretary of State Acheson, General Marshall, and other high brass, regardless of their own personal conscientious views. This is of course the danger and hazard of all representative government. General MacArthur is a Republican and his great influence and popularity constitute a menace to Democratic control, hence the Democrats have trained every party leader gun possible against him. In his speech before Congress and on different occasions since his return, he has told his audiences that he is not in politics and he has sought to appeal to the country on a non-partisan basis.

War is a common leveler. Foreign and military policies, vitally affecting the lives and fortunes of every one of us, should not be debased by political arguments and objectives. We do not all agree on governmental policies but most of us would rest content, if we were reasonably confident that Government were honest, fair, efficient, and devoted to the general welfare. In grave emergencies and national crises, involving bloodshed, painful sacrifices, high taxation, our country's future, we have a right to expect and demand bipartisan control of Government. The Truman government has given us none of it but has relied on small majorities in both Houses of Congress to force through whatever policies it chose.

President Truman is not entitled to public confidence on his record. He and his State Department and other advisers have bungled our Asiatic policies, brought us into a bloody war that gets us nowhere, turned over our diplomacy and military control to United Nations, involved us in a plan to finance and protect all of Western Europe and other large sections of the world, bled us white with excessive taxation, and finally kicked out our greatest military leader in the Pacific and the only tested statesman we have there. Winston Churchill, who doesn't pass opinions loosely, on his arrival here last week, proclaimed MacArthur as a "great soldier and a great statesman," the latter based on MacArthur's remarkable handling and restoration of Japan. Certainly President Truman cannot substitute for him or replace him with a man of equal caliber.

Senator TAFT, naturally a conservative, party leader of the 46 Republican Senators, last Friday launched a full-scale drive against the Truman conduct of our foreign affairs and military policies in a fiery 2-hour speech. He laid it on the line without mincing words and appealed to his fellow Senators to drop their politics and vote as they think best for the general welfare of their country. He wasn't seriously interrupted either because TAFT is undeniably one of the ablest and soundest Americans in Congress and usually knows exactly what he is talking about and is competent to back up his statements. Again yesterday he crossed bats with Secretary of State Acheson, whose removal he demands. We are headed toward the valley of decisions and the test in Congress is not far off. The field of argument is narrowing down to facts and proof of facts.

MacArthur is scheduled to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday. The Democrats are still moving heaven and earth to hear MacArthur behind closed doors and using the customary excuse that information of benefit to the enemy might result from a public session. The real reason is that they fear MacArthur's blunt, independent statements and opinions and want to edit and censor the testimony before it is given to the American people. MacArthur is not a moron or a child. He knows better than any member of the committee what information should remain secret for military reasons. He is willing to testify at a public session and has so stated, but he also acknowledged that the committee's course is up to the committee.

What MacArthur says is of vital, if not tragic, importance to every citizen. He has been gagged once by our President, who should never try it again; neither should Congress. In view of General MacArthur's remarkable popularity, as shown by the vast demonstrations for him from coast to coast, nothing could sound the death knell of the Democratic Party under President Truman any more decisively than efforts to belittle and suppress MacArthur's statements and opinions. He bears a message to us from across the Pacific, where he has just concluded 14 years of brilliant service as a soldier and a statesman. We want to hear every bit of it and reach our own conclusions as free Americans.

Peace Rally of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, May 2, 1951:

FIVE THOUSAND CATHOLIC WOMEN OF STATE STAGE PEACE RALLY OF PRAYER

In a stirring peace rally of prayers as a counterdemonstration to the Communist May day show of force, more than 5,000 members of the State Catholic Daughters of America lifted their voices at Mechanics Building last night in a recitation of the centuries-old rosary.

The large main hall of the building became a flower-bedecked cathedral as the ancient solemn Latin phrases of the benediction, and prayers and hymns resounded through the hall.

Archbishop Cushing, principal speaker, urged the women, who came from as far as Springfield, Provincetown, and Pittsfield, to pray for peace and to explore "some of the legal means by which peace may yet be organized on the face of the earth."

The services opened with a procession of more than 50 clergymen in white and black vestments, with 8 monsignori and Archbishop Cushing in the rich purple of their office.

The platform, backed by gray and yellow curtains, was banked with flowers, and a large white altar stood in the center.

Following the procession and the singing of hymns, Rt. Rev. Charles D. McInnis, pastor of the Church of the Presentation, Brighton, led the women in the recitation of the rosary.

Helen McGillvray, chairman of the rally, escorted by presidents of junior courts, crowned the statue of the Blessed Mother. Catherine Ann Dwyer, State regent, led the women in the act of consecration and dedication.

The rally ended with a pontifical benediction. The Massachusetts Catholic Daughters of America senior and junior choirs sang, under the direction of Rev. James J. Keating.

URGES WORK FOR PEACE

Archbishop Cushing, in his sermon, declared, "it is time that we respond to the call of the Holy Father for courage and clear thinking in the cause of peace; courage to break with outmoded patterns of the past, clear thinking to choose among the proposals for fashioning the future.

"To this end I urge that peace plans be made the principal subjects of your study and discussions in round tables, reading circles, study clubs for the months, perhaps the years that are ahead," he told the women.

Speaking of the efforts of Pope Pius XII for peace, and his clear leadership in proclaiming God's will and the church's prayer for peace, the archbishop said:

"Small wonder, then, that within the month the Holy Father has praised with warm and pointed tribute a group of people who have braved frequently intemperate criticism in order to explore, valiantly and with eager vision, some of the alternatives to war, some of the legal means by which peace may yet be organized on the face of the earth."

ONLY WAR HAD BUDGETS

He pointed out that hitherto only war had been organized; only war had budgets behind it; peace has been left to fend for itself—and even honorable efforts to organize peace were held suspect.

"I myself have frequently felt bound to speak in warning against excessive zeal or impractical dreams in the direction of too hasty acceptance of certain peace schemes," he continued.

"We have all been vigilant against the exploitation of human desires for peace by the disloyal or the anarchist. No one has been more vigilant in this respect than the Pope himself, and all right-thinking men must be grateful for the resolute, clean-cut manner in which the Holy See repudiated the dishonest Stockholm peace pledge and like pretended pleas for peace which are really invitations to the chaos that is communism.

"But we must be no less grateful for the clear foresight and forthright courage with which the Holy Father commends honest persons who dare depart from old familiar ways in order to discover, if God permits, whether new ways of world organization may not bring us the peace of which we have been defrauded to date."

In time of war, he said, prepare for peace. "Then is the time to direct all the alertness of our minds and the energies of our hearts toward the consideration of better ways than war—of higher levels than the battlefields—of more permanent methods than military campaigns as the means of securing our defense for the future and promoting prosperity in peace. These, as the Pope reminds us, will not come in a day and may not come in a lifetime, but come they will, nonetheless."

CUSTODIANS OF MORAL CODE

No group on earth has a greater stake in the achievement of a just and lasting peace than the Catholic Daughters of America, he said.

"As Catholics you are custodians of a dogmatic creed and a moral code which comprises the very heart of western civilization.

"As Daughters of America you are heirs of a way of life which, however imperfect, however open to healthy criticism and deserved rebuke on occasion, still represents the fairest and most enviable combination of spiritual riches and civic advantages.

"Both Christian civilization and the American way of life are in danger. And there is nothing that a devastating war would destroy which is more precious to you than these blessings to which you are bound by the twin virtues of religion and patriotism, the Catholic civilization and the American civil tradition."

The Catholic Daughters of America, he continued, "demand of their political and military leaders that they make common cause in the work of achieving peace, that they put aside armament races, universal permanent peacetime military conscription programs, balances of brutal power, and all the other age-old instruments of war.

"They demand a chance to venture, with caution, of course, but above all, with courage into new roads and new ways which God's providence is opening before us; ways of charity, of prudence, prosperity, and peace."

The cynic is wrong, he said. "Peace is possible. Peace under law is practical. The organization of the world for peace is as feasible as the organization for the peace of a city, a commonwealth, a nation, or a continent—provided only the same moral motives be operative; the same good will be present; the same graces receive the same cooperation. Peace will come because Christ has promised it."

American Mother of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article from the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., under date of May 1, 1951, setting forth the signal honor that has been bestowed upon Mrs. Mary Martin Sloop, of Crossnore, N. C., a most intelligent and splendid citizen of my district, by the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation, an organization devoted to the welfare of mothers and children. This most worthy organization has designated her as the American Mother of 1951.

The article is as follows:

Mrs. Mary Martin Sloop, of Crossnore, N. C., a 77-year-old doctor known as the Grand Lady of the Blue Ridge for her work with mountain children, was named today the American Mother of 1951.

Dr. Sloop was picked by the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation, an organization devoted to the welfare of mothers and children.

She is the wife of a country doctor, Dr. Eustace H. Sloop, and since 1911 has been practicing medicine with her husband.

She also founded Crossnore School for Underprivileged Children and has been credited with bringing good roads, modern farming methods, religious tolerance, a hospital and dental clinic, and vocational instruction to Avery County, N. C.

She has two children, both doctors. Dr. Emma Sloop Fink, herself a mother of three children, practices at Crossnore School, and Dr. William Martin Sloop runs a dental clinic for charity cases in the county.

The American Mothers Committee for North Carolina, which nominated Dr. Sloop for the national honor, wrote to the national committee: "She is considered by thousands of friends as the first citizen of North Carolina."

The North Carolina committee said more thn 5,000 letters were written in her behalf, including letters from governors, Senators, and other leaders outside North Carolina.

Dr. Sloop was 1 of 52 mothers nominated by committees in every State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, may I add to this brief presentation on the very worthy career of Dr. Mary Martin Sloop that she is recognized by the people of North Carolina and especially the mountain people as having made a masterful contribution to the development of the education and general improvement of the living conditions throughout a wide section of North Carolina.

I have had the privilege of visiting Dr. and Mrs. Sloop at their home in Crossnore, and found by personal acquaintance that their life's work was ideal and that they were unsurpassed by any two people within my acquaintance in the high type of Christian service they are rendering our State and especially the western part of North Carolina. Their influence among the mountain people was most impressive and the school that they established was perfectly remarkable in the advanced progress it had made in a comparatively short period of time. I had the privilege of attending the sessions of the classes in the school and can bear personal witness to the fact that the young people of the mountains were being given a type of vocational instruction that is unsurpassed anywhere in the Nation.

It is most encouraging that in the selection of Mrs. Sloop as the American Mother of 1951, that the fine organization making the selection has continued to follow the rule that this honor should go only to those who have served their community or Nation in some outstanding way or through some outstanding service.

Mrs. Sloop, by her remarks when she was notified that she had been so signally honored, showed the high character of the person upon whom the distinction was bestowed. Her accepting words being:

I appreciate it more than I can say. I feel tremendously humble. My work was made possible through the wonderful help I had, the type of children—mountain children—that I had to deal with.

Squall or Tidal Wave?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, There is no doubt in the mind of any patriotic citizen that instead of the MacArthur "squall," there has been a "tidal wave of patriotism" which has already swept the country.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Felix Morley entitled "Squall or Tidal Wave?"

SQUALL OR TIDAL WAVE?

(By Felix Morley)

Though startled by the public response to General MacArthur, the more important henchmen of President Truman are not yet deeply disturbed.

They think that the popular manifestations are just a flash in the pan. They think this storm will quickly pass, and that summer skies will smile again on Harry and all his mink-coat entourage.

Some go further. Here in Washington they argue that by giving a good show, MacArthur is really helping the President. The demonstrations are seen as a safety valve, through which the mob blows off steam that might be explosive if bottled up.

That judgment, based on a wholly cynical view of human nature, could be correct. It may be that Americans, like the Romans in the days of their decadence, are now primarily interested in bread and circuses. It may be that millions of jobholders will never really bite the hand that feeds them and

that MacArthur's return, in retrospect, will seem what the French call a divertissement.

Such a conclusion comes naturally to those who for over 18 years have increasingly assumed that the American people will meekly acept whatever the White House orders. When one considers how Americans have been cozened during these years—"again, and again, and again"—it would not be surprising if they should now once more slip back into that apathetic acceptance of guileful promises on which executive tyranny has ever based its Machiavellian build-up.

Yet there is something about the reception of MacArthur that really worries the bureaucrats, the Fair Deal columnists, the "intellectuals" and all those who cluster round the fringes of the welfare state.

There is anxiety in Washington because MacArthur promises nothing. He does not even ask to lead us to a promised land. He gives no assurance of peace, and even less of prosperity. He merely says that we are in a desperate fix—and people cheer him to the echo in response.

Here is a political anomaly, by current American standards. Washington at Valley Forge could call upon his ragged soldiers for ever greater sacrifice; Lincoln, with the Union tottering, could face up nobly to disaster; Churchill, with Britain's back against the wall, could call for blood and sweat and tears. But that is not the Democratic way of winning votes; that is not the Truman and the CIO technique.

Could it be that Americans are not really as interested in personal security as Mr. Truman thinks? Could it be that they are really ready to make sacrifices for the ideals that President Roosevelt put in mothballs 18 years ago? Could it be that Douglas MacArthur with his natural dignity and unaffected eloquence, really comes closer to the common man than all the condescending duplicity of the State Department?

Those are the questions that have been raised by the return of the general whom this administration has vainly sought to humiliate. He cannot give the answers. But the people will. It is for us to decide whether this is all just an emotional outburst, as the White House hopes, or actually the beginning of an American renaissance.

Periodically, in history, great waves of moral regeneration originate among the common people of this earth. If the conditions are right, and the provocation serious, these waves build up, roll on and eventually sweep the beaches clear of the garbage and refuse with which political tourists have littered the clean, white sand. And then, as after a squall, the sun comes out again.

The White House is betting that MacArthur has not launched a tidal wave. In this, as in other estimates of the American character, it could be wrong.

Price Controls on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some resolutions passed by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, at their regional meeting held in North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, the OPS order imposing ceiling prices on beef just will not work. It will penalize the livestock industry, dry up the source of supply, and cause black markets to flourish. The wisecracking DiSalle, who is the Price Stabilizer, may have the order working on paper, but there will be little or no meat at the counters.

It is my opinion the proper committee in the House ought to consider the resolution which was unanimously adopted in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry May 2. It reads as follows:

Whereas the promulgation by the Office of Price Stabilization of ceiling price regulation 24, imposing ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale, to become effective May 9, 1951, has resulted in livestock producers rushing their cattle to market before they are finished to their best marketable weights; and

Whereas such premature marketing will result in a loss of meat for consumers; and

Whereas the feeders who produce much of the meat supply will suffer severe losses; and

Whereas the announcement of further roll-backs in beef prices will have the effect of continued early marketing of meat animals; and

Whereas such continued early marketing and the resulting reduction in meat production will cause a severe famine leading to early rationing in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, That said ceiling price regulation 24 establishing the proposed ceiling prices on beef sold at wholesale be rescinded without delay.

Mr. Speaker, if the DiSalle order is permitted to stand, it will mean rationing, and perhaps an attempt by the administration to go out on the ranges and bring the cattle in to market. That was suggested during the OPA days. Some of these orders coming out of the Office of Price Stabilization sound more and more like the orders devised by Moscow.

The resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association follow:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PROGRAM

To the fundamental American principles of democracy, as expressed in our two great declarations of American principles—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America—we enthusiastically give our eternal allegiance. Those principles are America. They brought about the development of this country to the greatness that has been hers.

We abhor all efforts to take from us any one of the principles that make our country. We condemn every one and every effort to destroy or injure any one of these principles.

The current international crisis and the national emergency resulting therefrom is being felt by every individual and every home in the country. This serious problem confronting every American must be met with foresight, with fearlessness and with sound common sense.

Our Nation is preparing for a state of total mobilization for war; American boys are giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea. Yet with international diplomatic negotiations in full swing, a stalemate of power, politics appears to have been reached which may continue for years to come. Such a situation, if prolonged indefinitely, may tax the strength of this Nation beyond endurance unless a definite long-range policy is established by our Federal Government which will set up a sound and practical goal for which we must strive.

The productive ability of America under the free-enterprise system in all fields of endeavor stands today as the real bulwark against the aggression threatening our freedom. The American people can maintain this position only so long as the economy of this Nation remains strong. We cannot continue to make other nations strong by programs which will make our Nation weak.

On the home front we condemn waste and extravagance in our Federal Government; we oppose the principles of price controls, subsidy payments and other governmental regulations not compatible with our American way of life.

We, therefore, petition the Congress and the President of the United States to outline a policy and to establish certain definite principles indicating the extent to which this Nation will attempt to control through military influence: (1) The protection of this Nation and the hemisphere against aggression; (2) to prevent the growth of communistic influence throughout the world; and (3) a program consistent with the economic stability of the United States over a long period of time.

We believe this will contribute to the complete support of our citizenship and to the lasting protection of our freedom.

Attest: This is a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the regional meeting of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in session at North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951.

THE NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
W. A. JOHNSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

RESOLUTION NO. 2—CONTROLS

Whereas this country has, during the past few months, again entered upon a period of governmental controls over civilian life and economy; and

Whereas the experiences undergone during the similar period of controls throughout the wartime are still fresh in our minds, we now express our beliefs and our position upon these questions injected into our lives by the system of controls; and

Whereas we know, as we have always known and as experience has demonstrated, that the livestock industry is one element of our economy that is not susceptible to Government controls because they are neither practicable nor enforceable. And we further know that such efforts to control will certainly result in disruption of supplies and a disgraceful black-market conditions; and

Whereas, we know that not only is it impractical to establish or attempt to enforce ceiling prices on live animals but any effort to follow such a route would inevitably injure and retard production—and increased production is one of the two principal answers to the major questions; and

Whereas the other principal answer is economy in Government. To stabilize our economy, unnecessary expenditure of public funds by the Government must be stopped; and

Whereas, foolish regulation, such as the contemplated prohibition of calf slaughter, allocations and the threat or inspiration of rumors and threats of such regulations must be stopped. Every such regulation or threat is an obstacle to increased production and an influence toward reduced production when the opposite is the desired goal: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association is opposed to Government controls on our industry, as they are not only completely unenforceable but lead to confusion and shortages.

Attest: This is a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the regional meeting in session at North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951, of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association.

THE NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. JOHNSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—RANCH AND FARM LABOR

Whereas it is an obvious fact that the production of livestock is an essential industry because from livestock comes meat, leather, pharmaceutical supplies, and other strategic materials requisite to the success of the vast programs being undertaken by our country and the essential character of our industry must be recognized by the Government just as is every other industry engaged in the production of strategic materials; and

Whereas the adoption by this country of a program of military training and the mobilization of men for such military service creates a serious question affecting the ability of our industry to produce livestock in quantities required by the Nation; and

Whereas although we do not request or expect any special or particular treatment or consideration, we do request and expect treatment of our labor problems on the same basis as is accorded all other strategic industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association respectfully requests the Federal Government, the State, and the Selective Service Board, in its administration of the laws, present and to be adopted, relating to military service, give due consideration to the character of the work being done by men in our industry and that essential key men be not withdrawn from their important, strategic work for military service, just as such consideration is given to similar men in other strategic industries.

Attest: This is a true copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the regional meeting in session at North Platte, Nebr., April 26, 1951, of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association.

THE NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. JOHNSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

The Last Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Edna Lonigan from the last issue of Human Events.

This article shows what sinister forces are at work in our Government and poses the question: Can the citizens themselves overcome these highly organized forces of evil?

The article follows:

THE LAST PHASE
(By Edna Lonigan)

I

General MacArthur's triumphant journey from Tokyo to the Halls of Congress is a political earthquake. But the line of cleavage is not between Republicans and Democrats. It is between the people and the mysterious entity called the Fair Deal.

The Truman administration started out as an era of good feeling. Those who did not like the New Deal were glad we had a homespun Missouri Democrat in place of Roosevelt. They liked his looks, his midwestern accent, his unexpected dignity in dealing with Congress, with the press, and with the chiefs of foreign nations.

The new President took up the task of international conferences where Roosevelt dropped it, and then, after Potsdam, said what most Americans wanted to hear, that he would go to no more such meetings.

But it soon became apparent that he followed Roosevelt's policies, and he clashed with Congress over price control.

Disillusionment with Soviet Russia set in and, when England announced that she could no longer support her commitments in Greece, we took over, under the Truman doctrine, promising to oppose military force with force, if any nation was threatened by the U. S. S. R.

The Greek-Turkish program changed rather suddenly into the Marshall plan for economic—not military—aid to all Europe. That evolved into a military alliance, then into arms for Europe, and finally into the plan to send troops to garrison duty there. But though we spent billions, Europe remained helpless against Communist assault.

Meanwhile China fell. We evacuated Korea, and announced that Formosa was not important to our defense line in the Pacific. Plans were made instead to extend the Marshall plan to a billion people in Asia and Africa. Then the Communists moved in to fill the military vacuum we had left.

The President decided to enter the war. After bloody fighting the general who had snatched victory from defeat was summarily dismissed. An outraged people bore him in triumphal procession half-way round the world. The President was booed in a Washington ball park.

It does not make sense.

II

Obviously something is needed to explain this strange performance—something more than mink coats, deep-freezers, or Pendergast politics.

There is a simple explanation. It is to be found in a speech of Earl Browder's which is reprinted in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in March 1944.

Browder told the American Communist movement it was to abandon the Communist Party and set to work, especially through the trade-unions, to form a mass organization with members throughout the United States.

The PAC under Sidney Hillman carried out the plan laid down by Browder. Of course, 98 percent of the trade-union members did not suspect that the Soviet Government had planned their organization, their policies, and even their publications.

The purpose of forming this mass organization was to build national unity, to preserve the gains of Tehran. It was to unite everyone—workers, farmers, managers, even financiers—in a drive on the Fascists and defeatists, those who doubted that the alliance with Soviet Russia could continue into peacetime.

Stalin and his advisers realized at Tehran that Roosevelt was dying, and that they must choose his successor, and get him elected, or they would lose all the gains the Hisses and others had won. The Soviet leaders also knew that Roosevelt had smashed the Democratic Party, and that whoever mustered the strongest political power could take it over and run it, under the old symbols.

The Communists then built up a network of local political machines in each congressional district, formed first about the labor unions, but gradually drawing in intellectuals, farmers, women, and religious groups. This was the familiar Popular Front, with which the Communists had softened up France under Blum, before the Nazi-Communist attack.

Truman was chosen as candidate for Vice President by Sidney Hillman, at the suggestion (according to Jonathan Daniels in his recent book A Man of Independence) of Max Lowenthal, who had known the Senator from Missouri for years through congressional investigations of the finances of the railroads.

The organizers of this coalition were ordered to abandon their revolutionary slogans and to concentrate on uniting all groups except the reactionaries, in order to better destroy the enemies of unity with the U. S. S. R. Their particular hates were Hoover, Farley, Byrnes, Forrestal, and—MacArthur.

William Z. Foster reported to the Cominform early in 1950 that this plan had succeeded far beyond all expectations. Its followers included members of all religions, all social classes.

This pattern of the popular front is the only concept that will explain the strange history of the Truman administration. If you examine our foreign policy, our unusual military ineptitude, each of our Presidential and congressional campaigns, the vagaries of our labor leaders, and the spread of defeatism and enervation in our literature, the pieces all fit. They fit the military needs of the Soviet Union, to divide us, to sow defeatism, and to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

III

The American people have not had a government of their own since 1945. They could not get anything constructive accomplished in foreign or military affairs because they had no government to do it for them.

Their Government has been captured from within, by a few secret agents in key positions, as Norway was captured by a few Nazi agents placed in key positions by Hitler before his armies struck.

It is time we stopped talking of our present Government with words that apply only to an American Government. We need a new language to describe the Government we have today.

We do not have a President in the American sense, because there is no longer a balance between executive and legislative power. The office has grown until it doth bestride the narrow world like a colossus. We do not have departments or bureaus in the American sense, because Congress does not define their duties or set limits on their power. In a government by law, it is essential that the legislature, which does not benefit by adding bureaus or extending their power, should create and define all government agencies, as Madison pointed out in the Federalist Papers. We do not have a budget or appropriations in the American sense. When money is managed by the Government, all figures are lies.

Our present-day Government is like a great banyan tree, towering high above everything, and sending arms out to start new roots in organizations we still think of as private—the labor unions, colleges, women's clubs, churches, foundations, and business associations. This combine of public and private agencies, directed by a small inner group, now has almost complete control over the flow of news, ideas, and discussion in the press, movies, radio, and moving pictures, and the press of private organizations. It does not crudely forbid freedom of discussion. It merely jams the press and other media with banalities written or whispered by its hired ministry of enlightenment.

The American people never thought about how to manage such a combine. They did not know it was operating under the outward signs of their own kind of government. The Soviet leaders knew. They knew in 1943 they must take it over before we woke up.

IV

Defeat and total eradication of the Popular Front party in the United States is the first condition for any hope of peace, or of survival of the United States as a nation.

The opposition party so far has suffered only heartbreaking defeats. They are like Thor in the German fable, who put forth prodigious efforts to eat all the meat in the trough faster than his opponent, only to find his opponent consumed meat and bones and the trough itself. Thor did not know he was fighting not a mortal, but Loki, God of Fire.

The Popular Front in the United States cannot be defeated by any normal political strategy or party policy. It is a military organization to be defeated only as any usurping government is defeated by organizing the resistance.

Until a few weeks ago, the people were apathetic or cynical, there were no visible leaders, and all communication was blurred by the Government's propaganda skill.

Suddenly the President dismissed our foremost general; the people poured a tidal wave of letters and telegrams upon Congress. MacArthur's course led straight as an arrow to the Waldorf Towers, from which Herbert Hoover had been valiantly trying to arouse opposition to the sell-out of our country. Now we have an aroused nation and potential leadership.

The line of political cleavage is now clear—between a foreign policy that fits Soviet military needs and one that puts American security uppermost. At home the same cleavage runs between a governmental pyramid the Soviet agents can penetrate, and the simple American Government that foreign agents cannot manage. Congress has in the power of the purse the means to tear down the Bastille.

The Truman administration will use every ounce of its tremendous power to discredit MacArthur. They will try to break his heart as they did Forrestal's. Will they win? As Not Merely Gossip asked last week, Can leaders and the people together defeat the machine?

The answer turns on one fact. In the resistance every fighter counts. No one else counts. Every editor, every reporter, every clergyman, every club officer, every man in the street, must take his place in the ranks and do what is nearest him to win this battle.

If we fail—.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am privileged to include therewith an address by Brig. Gen. G. S. Meloy, Jr., delivered before the Sumter Guards, Charleston, S. C., on April 21, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, there is no military organization in this Nation with a more illustrious background than that of the Sumter Guards. Named for the distinguished Thomas Sumter, this organization has proudly and with honor lived up to the tradition of this hero's name. The Sumter Guards have borne the scars of every war in which our country has been involved, and today some of its membership are fighting beside other Americans in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, it was justly fitting that a hero of the Korean campaign address the guards on the occasion of their recent anniversary—an illustrious soldier, a great leader of men, and one bearing the scars of the Korean conflict, General Meloy. The general knows of the conditions existing over there, he knows of the thoughts in the minds of the soldiers and officers alike of this war. He shed his blood in Korea. Mr. Speaker, he has spoken with distinction, with authority, and as a great representative of a member of the greatest fighting team in the world. I take pleasure, therefore, in inserting his remarks, as follows:

KOREA

It is with many misgivings that I take on a job of trying to pinch-hit for Congressman RIVERS. I know you are disappointed that he is not here and he is sincerely sorry he is unable to come and asked me personally to express his regrets and apologies for having to fall out so suddenly.

As you know, public servants cannot always have a choice of appearances. Congressman RIVERS' job right now demands his presence in Washington, and he knows you prefer to have him perform his duty where he is most needed and will therefore excuse his absence.

In a talk like this I am always puzzled as to exactly what a particular audience is primarily interested in about Korea. Are they interested in a straight-out discussion of the various phases of military action; are they interested in what Korea itself is like, or are they interested primarily in how their own particular sons, brothers, husbands, or sweethearts get along in Korea? What is he up against? Questions that have been asked in previous talks seem to indicate that there is more interest in Korea and what it is like, and what our Army is like, and how our soldiers and sailors and airmen are existing in Korea than a straight-out military discussion, so I will try to discuss these last items. I shall, however, be glad to try to answer such questions as I may if you want to ask them at the end of the talk.

Taking these items in order the outstanding feature of Korea is its misery. It is hard to describe, and I guess these people have been living in misery, by our standards, for so long now that they probably do not know their misery. They run around barefooted in weather that would freeze us and I often wonder if they knew before we arrived that they should be cold. This misery is everywhere. The country is poor. The bare necessities of life are on a submarginal basis. Tomorrow's food is a problem that faces each individual in Korea each day. This misery has a direct bearing on the morale of the troops. If it were not for the inherent ability of the American soldier to accept hardships in his stride and even joke about it on occasion, the effect on the morale of the soldier would be pronounced. Just as a sample of what I mean, even in the rare instances when a soldier can avail himself of a rest period and get out from under fire he has no comfortable, pleasant place to go and relax. There is no place in Korea he can escape this national misery.

The Korean Peninsula is about 500 miles long and, roughly, about 150 miles wide, about the size of Florida. The comparison ends there. It is chuck-full of mountains. There are a few places which may not be truly mountainous, but even in these so-called flat places the flatness is relative, since here there are small abrupt hills which have a decisive influence on the tactical situation. Each of them can and do become critical tactical features. You have probably heard enough about how grave an obstacle the mountains are; how they influence the capabilities of our fighting forces and confine our maneuvers. One example shows how decided this is. Many a company attack in Korea is on a one-man front, due to the limitations imposed by the terrain.

Communications in Korea as far as roads and railroads are concerned are surprisingly good, although in very limited supply. They were built by the Japanese during their years of occupancy and have a definite military pattern, which, unfortunately, the Chinese and North Koreans have seen fit to avoid where they can. They could make this fighting a lot more convenient for our team if they wanted to.

Some of these roads and railroads are engineering marvels. The defiles and passes through which these roads and railroads go are challenges to the best engineering talent. As an outstanding example of railroad engineering, there is one place near Wonju where the railroad bed goes through a complete 360° spiral tunnel in order to climb over a pass.

Climate: You probably have some rough idea of the extremes of climate in Korea. You read about heat prostrations last summer. It was real heat, make no mistake. Salt tablets were a must in this humid, muggy heat. Suddenly our armies were thrust into a bitter winter condition. Fortunately, advanced planning gave them clothing and equipment to withstand this weather. Even so, the first subzero temperatures was almost as tough to face as the enemy night Banzai attacks.

Along with the new disadvantages of fighting in Korean winter came certain advantages. The rice paddies were frozen solid. Tanks, artillery, and trucks could get off the roads for better employment. Snow on the ground made it a lot more difficult for the Chinese Communists and North Korean Communists to take advantage of their natural ability at camouflage. Our planes could spot them with more facility, particularly the light planes from the artillery. Enemy casualties were inflicted in greater numbers.

The enemy's clothing was not satisfactory for the damp, wet cold of Korea. When it became wet it froze, and on occasions they had to break off the fight due to this one thing. Of course, winter brought disadvantages and hardships to us too. Daylight was at a premium. The nights were long and afforded the enemy greater opportunity to execute his characteristic night attacks. You could count on good visibility only from about 8 a. m. to 4:30 p. m. It became habitual for our forces to kill all possible during daylight hours and button up in tight perimeter for a fight for survival during darkness.

Medical care: Proper medical care became increasingly difficult. Wounded individuals who under normal conditions could be easily evacuated would die of shock in the severe cold before they could be evacuated to a warm-up tent. Other minor wounded cases would become severe cases from frostbite just because they couldn't give themselves the little extra care needed to prevent such a calamity.

What about this Eighth United States Army we have in Korea? You undoubtedly have read or heard repeated sensational stories as to cowardice, panic, abandonment of wounded, etc., by our forces. I want to say right now that these stories are the rare exceptions just as in the other wars the United States has fought. One of the great-

est points of honor with a soldier is never to abandon his wounded if humanly possible.

As a matter of fact, I think when you consider the fighting conditions and adversities, the strangeness of the enemy, his unexpected battlefield diversions, the difficulty of identifying him and separating him from friends and refugees on many occasions, your Army has earned and merits all the praise you can bestow upon it. Individual and collective heroism has been an outstanding feature of your fighting forces ever since the Korean conflict started. Members of my old regiment, for instance, by the first part of November had earned 12 DSC's and 1 Medal of Honor. Eight were posthumous. That doesn't bespeak cowardice. I could go on at great length refuting these sensational reports which I feel are doing a disservice to home front morale. I know these stories are destructive to the soldiers' morale primarily because they don't understand them nor do they understand what they may have done to cause the remarks. Taken alone they are destructive and not constructive reporting. I do not advocate concealment of human frailties which have always existed. I ask only credit where credit is due and criticism of an objective and constructive kind.

The Second Division has come in for its share of unfortunate criticism and yet facts show that the heroic stand the Second Division has made on two different occasions has made possible the extrication of the Eighth Army from two desperate situations. The Twenty-third Infantry of the Second Division in one fight near Wonju was credited with the destruction of two Chinese divisions. This doesn't bespeak cowardice.

Your Eighth Army in Korea now is probably the finest combat force the United States has ever had. Lest you think I am prejudiced—I am—I would like to read a little statement about the army by Mr. S. L. A. Marshall. Here is what he says about it:

"I am frank to say that in my 34 years of knowledge of the American Army, I have never seen men who used their weapons as efficiently, who go into battle as nonchalantly, who take their losses as magnificently and who develop as much fire-power as the troops that we've got today in Korea. They are the best I have ever seen and I don't think we'll ever have anything better under the sun. I just wish that our people as a whole could begin to understand the resurrection of the old American fighting spirit under the conditions of the Korean battlefield."

The Eighth United States Army now fighting is stronger than it has ever been. It is better grouped, better supplied, and better equipped than ever before. The current fighting of the Eighth Army is as nearly a conventional offensive as the terrain permits. The offensive is a deliberate, cautious, forward movement with the avowed determination to destroy the enemy and at the same time maintain maximum security and minimum casualties for our own forces. The Eighth Army's morale is high, its confidence is high, and its battle wisdom is superior.

Morale as you know fluctuates with the tides of battle. Even at low ebb the morale of our soldier is an inspiring thing. He has questions even as you have questions. Back in late December and early January his big question was, What is the score? General Ridgway gave him the best answer I have ever heard and since you probably have some of those questions in your mind I would like to read parts of his answer to his troops to you:

"The real issues are whether or not the power of western civilization, as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands, shall defy and defeat communism; whether the rule of men who shoot their prisoners, enslave their citizens, and deride the dignity of man shall displace the rule of those to whom the individual and his individual right are sacred whether we are to survive with God's hand to guide and lead us, or to perish in the dead existence of a Godless world.

"If these be true, and to me they are, beyond any possibility of challenge, then this has long since ceased to be a fight for freedom for our Korean Allies alone, and for their national survival. It has become, and it continues to be, a fight for our own freedom, for our own survival, in an honorable, independent national existence.

"In the final analysis, the issue now joined right here in Korea is whether communism or individual freedom shall prevail, and, make no mistake, whether the next flight of fear-driven people we have just witnessed across the Han River, and continue to witness in other areas, shall be checked and defeated overseas or permitted, step by step, to close in on our own homelands and at some future time, however distant, to engulf our own loved ones in all its misery and despair."

As I said, the morale and esprit of the American soldier under the adversities and hardships of combat is inspiring. I will never cease to get stimulation and inspiration from it. The further forward you go in battle the higher that morale is, and the guy right up under the guns catching all kinds of hell probably has the firmest, strongest, and highest type of morale. He is a comfort and a tower of strength to his commander. I have never seen him have anything but an optimistic view, regardless of the situation, and when you have one of those boys say to you, "Quit worrying, colonel, we can take care of these ———," the biggest worry of the commander is: Am I doing right by that fellow; are my judgments and decisions to his best interest. You can't help but feel humble in the face of your responsibilities to this American soldier.

Naturally, his world is a small world. He is constantly faced with hardships and adversities and death, but he isn't tormented by the added worries imposed on a higher commander. He accepts with understanding these hardships; he jokes about them; he kids and rags his buddies about them. A new unit coming in is always told they better send a battalion in to take over a job a platoon has just been doing. His battle testing has proven that he can take it; that he can dish it out and that the pal on his right and left can do the same. There exists a perfect comradeship; a mutual confidence in each other; a respect and team play that you will find no place else except on the battle front. That comrade lasts forever.

I know I am fumbling for words to express my admiration and heartfelt respect for this American fighting man. I can't describe it, but I know in my heart and I want to assure you that he has got what it takes, and don't worry about his ability to dish it out. His worm's-eye view of the battlefield is best illustrated by a story from the One Hundred and First Airborne Division after their heroic stand at Bastogne.

That, in brief, is the picture of the morale of this Eighth Army, and I don't think it will ever come apart at the seams so don't worry about it.

The third item you would like to know is how that brother, son, husband, or sweetheart of yours lives. Well, he is living a rugged life, outdoors, good weather and bad, hot or cold, rain, snow, or sunshine, and he has good clothing, and he has it with him, but he doesn't carry any more with him than is absolutely necessary. He knows that his own individual mobility and the amount of ammunition that he carries means more to his continued livelihood and well-being than anything else. By choice, he frequently carries extra ammunition rather than a blanket.

It is surprising, not surprising either, considering the fact that he is an American, but his ingenuity in providing himself such personal comforts as he can is outstanding. He can dig a hole in the ground and put a roof over it and line it and live in it and keep warm and dry where you wouldn't believe it possible.

He is being well fed—hot meals, chicken in the foxholes, is not unusual. When he doesn't have hot food he knows why, but he has this excellent food with surprising regularity under the most difficult terrain conditions. In fact, he almost has too much food.

He has the finest medical care in the world. Our medical record in Korea is outstanding. Statistics indicate that 98 out of every 100 men who reach hospital care are saved. This would be an outstanding record even with the superior communication facilities which exist in the United States, much less under the communication hazards which exist in Korea.

A bath unit is always available someplace in the regional areas. Since we as a Nation take more baths than any other people in the world you can see what a fine morale factor this is. The American soldier doesn't like to stay dirty, and he will take a bath if he can even with the enemy shooting at him.

Mail service is excellent. Only once, to my knowledge, has it broken down and that was during the evacuation from Hungnam. You can probably give me an individual case where the mail service seemed unsatisfactory. But I can probably show you that the individual concerned had moved around so frequently that in spite of all efforts delivery of mail to him has been difficult.

I hope I have covered some of the things you would like to know about Korea, and what it is like; what our troops are like, and how they live. As I said if there are particular questions unanswered I will be glad to answer them either from the floor or individually later on.

There is one final thought, admonition, or whatever you choose to call it, I want to leave with you. Having recently returned from the Far East Command, I perhaps am overly conscious of a complacency and apathy that seems to exist here at home toward the grave peril which threatens the United States. Our blood pressure seems to fluctuate with the military situation in Korea. Stalin and the other leaders in the Kremlin would like nothing better than to see us fall back into a business-as-usual attitude. One of his many offensives against our democratic way of life is to lull us into a false sense of security so that at a time and place of his own choosing he can really clobber us. Make no mistakes—we are communism's No. 1 enemy.

America is in grave peril. It is immediate and it is real, and the danger comes from a single source—communism. This threat from communism is insidious because in so many ways it is not obvious, and because its fighting threat right now is so many miles away that the great gravity of our peril is not immediately before us. We can't afford to lower our guard for a minute, and we should all be praying to our God that the shooting war will stay a long ways from our borders, and that never will any of you people sitting right here be forced to flee as terrified refugees down the roads of our country pursued by a ruthless Communist enemy. The privileges we enjoy here in the United States must be guarded and defended to be preserved. We can lose all we cherish by default if we aren't careful.

The records show the Sumter Guards have never defaulted in their duty to their country.

Stop Rising Prices and Black Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing fear throughout the entire country that the price-control situation is getting out of hand. Millions of families, particularly in the low-income group, are clamoring for decisive action and effective control of the cost of food and other essentials of life. We must give our people the fullest measure of economic protection before it is too late. We cannot allow our economic system to become undermined.

The problem of price control has been of great and continued concern to me ever since the start of the Korean war. I had hoped that legislation would be enacted whereby the price line would be held firmly, but by now it is common knowledge that the price and wage-control law enacted last year is seriously defective in many respects. I have waited patiently for genuinely effective legislation which would serve as a real weapon against the steadily rising cost of living. I thought it would be no more than fair to give the new agency, entrusted with price stabilization, an opportunity to get itself organized and show what it can do.

Frankly, I was dissatisfied with the legislation enacted last year and I am still dissatisfied with it today. I did not believe then that it was strong enough to stem the tide of rising prices, and I do not believe so today. The fact remains that due to the restrictions and limitations of the law, particularly where it concerns the problem of food prices, the price stabilization agency has not been able to obtain concrete results in the way of controlling the situation, let alone a rollback in prices to pre-Korean levels. Generally, I am in accord with the program of broad controls proposed by President Truman on April 26, except in certain respects where I believe the President's program does not go far enough in trying to check high prices.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are for the most part wage-earners. They are hard-working, law-abiding citizens. I have talked with a goodly number of them in recent weeks and found that only in a few rare cases have they received any wage increases during the past year. On one occasion, I asked my wife to invite about 15 housewives, representing a fair cross-section of the district, for a chat at my home concerning the problem of the high cost of living. I found that all of them bitterly complained of the situation and of the difficulties they encounter in coping with this problem.

A check of statistics on the cost of living and wages, as measured by official Government agencies, will show that the cost of living index has been increasing more rapidly than the wage index. But we must not also overlook the fact that there are millions of people whose incomes are fixed in the form of set salaries, pensions, or annuities, and that these people are being seriously affected and their standard of living is being cut down considerably. In fact, one need not make a lengthy study of price and wage statistics to become convinced of the continued rise in prices and the diminishing quantity of goods we are able to purchase for our dollars these days. Just speak to any housewife, any shopper in the grocery store, any wage-earner paying the family bills.

As prices continue to creep steadily upward, we are being told that by midsummer or fall it is hoped that prices may become "stabilized." Even if this should prove to be so, it will be of small comfort to the housewife struggling to make ends meet because it merely means that prices will be stabilized at existing or higher levels. Actually, what the country needs is a rollback of prices to the level existing in June of 1950.

I am firmly convinced that the time is ripe—in fact, long overdue—to correct past mistakes by enacting and maintaining a system of price control that would serve as a real economic protection for the people of this country. We talk about helping people all over the world attain a certain degree of economic independence and happiness—a cause with which I heartily agree—but let us not ignore the economic interests and problems of our people as well.

Much as we dislike controls, whether political or economic, in our democratic way of life, it is clear, however, that under the present emergency we cannot escape controls entirely. In times of great peril to our Nation, we would be derelict in our duty if we failed to do everything in our power to insure the safety of our country and the security of its citizens. Economic dislocations of a serious nature are as detrimental in their effects on ultimate victory, as are losses on the field of battle. When an entire economy is adversely affected, as is the situation now, the Government must use its authority to keep prices down in order not to sap our economic strength, our vitality, and our well-being. The future economic stability of this country and, for that matter, the future of the entire free world, depends upon our ability to successfully stop the march of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I am today introducing a resolution to roll back prices to the level of June 1950. There is too much profiteering going on now, which, in turn, is leading to a revival of the black market. Let us take the necessary precautions before it gets entirely out of hand. It is high time that we make it clear to those engaging in such nefarious acts that the public-be-damned attitude of quick profits and black-marketing are unsound economically, morally, or patriotically. Such acts are immoral and repulsive to our innate sense of decency and to our American way of life.

We have an obligation to the people whom we represent here. It is our responsibility to enable the people of this country to live a healthy and secure life in a free society—free also from economic chaos and instability. Through the establishment of effective price controls we shall afford our citizenry the fullest measure of economic protection against greedy chiselers and profiteering parasites. Delay only helps the hoarders, the black-marketers, and all those who stand to benefit by weakening the most valuable asset this country possesses—the people of the United States.

"Reds Win Greatest Victory," Representative Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a statement by Congressman RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, of the Tenth District of Illinois, which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American of April 12:

REDS WIN GREATEST VICTORY
(By Hon. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—At 1 a. m. yesterday Russia and Communist China, after failing to break America's defense line in Korea, scored their greatest victory of the Korean campaign right here in Washington.

This crushing defeat, that hits all Americans alike, is the result of the President's action in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur from command in the Pacific and relieving him of all active military duties.

There is no question what the reaction of our people will be after the initial shock of Mr. Truman's announcement.

Neither they nor Congress will stand idly by while the most tragic mistake in American military policy since the cashiering of Gen. Billy Mitchell takes place. Communists here and abroad will be delighted.

The removal of General MacArthur from Japan, where he has won the affection and respect of our recent enemies, seriously jeopardizes hope for an early and effective peace with the Japanese and at the same time removes from Tokyo the greatest enemy of Soviet encroachment in the Far East.

European chancelleries will be pleased, because the ouster of our great military strategist, whose exploits in the Pacific in World War II can never be forgotten, plays into the hands of England's Labor Government's foreign policy.

There will be temporary joy in the inner clique at the White House, where Dean Acheson now apparently has cinched the role of President in chief and dictates every move of the nominal Commander in Chief who used his authority to retire the heroic commander of our forces in the Orient.

While there is no question of the President's right to retire General MacArthur, under the strict interpretation of the law, his action is as serious as if President Lincoln had removed Grant while the Union troops were in front of Richmond or if the Continental Congress had ordered George Washington to turn in his sword during the tragic winter at Valley Forge.

America's enemies, including many of its so-called allies, are having their hour of triumph right now. They are warned to enjoy it to the utmost while they can because the wrath of the American people is certain to make itself felt in world-shaking terms that will show the present administration that this time it has overstepped all the bounds of decency and common sense in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

No Time Should Be Lost in Amending the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in support of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, first, let me express my appreciation for the opportunity of appearing before you this morning.

As some of you know, I represent a heavily populated railroad district in central Pennsylvania. Without fear of contradiction, on a percentage basis, it is my belief that I have more active and retired railroaders in my congressional district than any other Member of Congress. In the city of Altoona, Pa., alone, out of a population of about 85,000, it is common knowledge that a great percentage of the wage earners are employed by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

With the convening of the Eighty-second Congress I, like many other Members of Congress, introduced bills designed to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase benefits to not only annuitants and pensioners but also to widows and other survivors. These bills were among some fifty similar measures that had been pending in the Eighty-first Congress and which have been reintroduced in the present session.

It may surprise you when I say that I have retired employees and survivors of deceased employees in my congressional district who are actually hungry and living under conditions that you and I would find repugnant to the American way of life. These people are the victims of a frozen income over which they have no control. Congress, as custodian of the Railroad Retirement Fund is obligated to provide relief to these people through sound amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the average age of the disabled and retired annuitant is 70.2 years and the pensioner 81.9 years; while the average of the widow is 72.8 years. The average monthly benefit received by the annuitant is $82.81 monthly; the pensioner $70.80 monthly; and the widow $29.59 monthly.

Keeping in mind the present scale of benefits, it may be well to look at the cost-of-living figures as furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. As of November 15, 1950, or about 6 months ago, the cost of living had increased 71 percent over the cost of living in 1937, the year the Railroad Retirement Act became effective.

For an illustration, food had increased 99 percent, wearing apparel 89.7 percent, rent 24.3 percent, fuel, electricity, etc., 43.4 percent, house furnishings 94 percent, and miscellaneous 58.9 percent. As I stated, prices of every-day commodities have increased during that period.

While these increases in the cost of living were mounting during the period from 1937 to 1951, the recipients of railroad-retirement benefits received but one increase—the 20 percent granted by the Eightieth Congress. The widows, however, received no increase.

It may be well for me to remind you at this point that the 1937 or 1939 dollar is not the same dollar in value that these retired railroaders or their survivors receive today. It can truthfully be said that they are the victims of not only the high cost of living, but an inflated dollar.

I am fully familiar with the actuarial studies made from time to time regarding the solvency of the railroad retirement fund. While conflicting information has been received as to the ability of the fund to stand an increase in benefits, it is the general opinion that the fund is capable of absorbing a reasonable increase when you take into consideration the increased income of the fund, resulting from increased wages and high employment in the railroad industry.

In appearing before you this morning, I am mindful of the fact that you are surrounded by experts who have given and will give testimony on every phase of the Railroad Retirement Act. I am not here in behalf of any particular bill, because I have no pride of authorship, but am only interested in amending the Railroad Retirement Act so as to relieve the distress that prevails today among annuitants, pensioners, widows, and survivors of retired railroad employees.

No time should be lost by Congress in taking action to relieve the plight of these deserving Americans. Therefore, I hope that you will report favorably the best possible bill liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act, and at the same time maintaining the solvency of the retirement fund.

In conclusion, the eyes of thousands of retired railroaders and their survivors residing in my congressional district, are focused on the Congress of the United States, hopeful that we, the representatives of the American people, as custodian of the railroad retirement fund financed solely by the employer and employee, will take prompt action in amending the existing law.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

PATERSON, N. J., *April 12, 1951.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: These must be busy days for you. Enclosed is a copy of a letter to the President of the United States. This is the first time I have ever written to any President, but I hope that millions of Americans will do so and that you will have a part in organizing such an effort so that the ideas of the people will be registered with the President.

I believe that the Congress should give General MacArthur a hearing and do everything possible to restore him to his command in Tokyo where he has done such a marvelous job.

Very best wishes to you.

Yours very truly,

JACOB STAM,
Counselor at Law.

APRIL 12, 1951.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my humble opinion, Gen. Douglas MacArthur should be restored to his command in Tokyo. I cannot help but compare the situation in Germany and in Japan. There comes to mind years of bickering with the Soviets in Germany; constant advantage to them; the Berlin airlift; poor progress; unsettled conditions. By contrast General MacArthur has wonderfully controlled Soviet and Communist attempts to take charge in Japan. In my opinion, he has done a masterly job, both in Japan and in Korea. He should be restored; he should be given a free hand, not only by the United Nations, but especially by our Government.

That authority should include the right to encourage and help Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and to direct the activities of our long-time Chinese Nationalist friends against the Chinese Reds.

My brother and his wife were put to death by the sword wielded by young Communist bandits in China in December 1934. I volunteered for service and served in the First World War for almost a year. Our oldest son served in the United States Navy for 2 years and was badly burned and wounded on a destroyer off Okinawa. Even as you, Mr. President, we know something of the cost of war, and because we live in a God-blessed, free land feel it right to urge this course of action upon you.

I would not close, Mr. President, without assuring you of my prayers for you and to say that I frequently asked my family, associates, and friends to pray for you in accordance with Paul's word to Timothy as it is written down at I Timothy 2: 1-4:

"I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

With best wishes for your health and happiness, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JACOB STAM.

Vermont State Legislature Opposes St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Vermont State Legislature defeated a resolution in favor of immediate construction of the St. Lawrence

seaway. In doing so Vermont joins the long list of State legislatures who have refused to sanction the construction of this international ditch commonly called the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The action of the Vermont Legislature is described in the April 19 edition of the Enterprise and Vermonter published at Vergennes, Vt. The editorial follows:

VERMONT NOT ALONE

The real purpose of the resolution favoring the St. Lawrence seaway, which the Vermont House defeated last week, has not been widely publicized. According to reports current around the State House, this resolution was designed as political ammunition to be used by Senator AIKEN in the fight to enact legislation authorizing this billion-dollar project in the United States Senate.

If the resolution had passed, Senator AIKEN could have said that his State through its legislature approved the project. Now he will be in the position of a Senator advocating a project which his State, through its representatives has refused to approve. The result is bound to weaken the Senator's influence on the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

It is interesting to note that Vermont is not the only State, whose legislature has acted on this highly controversial project. On February 28 of this year, the House of Delegates of Maryland passed and sent to both Houses of Congress a resolution requesting the United States Congress "not to enact any legislation or make any appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway."

Can the Traffic in Strategic War Materials With Our Enemies Be Stopped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker—

SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

This act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951." (Approved September 27, 1950.)

The above law provides that power to say whether or not these transactions with our enemies are detrimental to the security of the United States rests with the National Security Council. That Council is composed of Harry Truman, President; Alben Barkley, Vice President; Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; and George C. Marshall, Secretary of Defense.

As soon as it was definitely known in this country that Great Britain was trading in strategic materials with the Soviet Union or Red China, this Board, headed by the President, should have acted. That it has been known for months is common knowledge in this country and now Great Britain admits it in Parliament. But still no announcement that this action is detrimental to the security of the United States has been made by this National Security Council. The law passed September 27, 1950, is meaningless unless this Council acts. The blame for this unlawful action on the part of Great Britain is now definitely fixed on the shoulders of our own National Security Council.

The President says he wants to end the war in Korea, but if Great Britain can trade in strategic war materials like rubber and steel, with the apparent consent of the United States, this war will not end and the materials now going to Red China will be shot right back at us and thousands more of our boys will die. What reason can this Council give for this stupid action against the security of the United States?

The administration pleads for unity—they say our people must not be divided, but the people of the United States are not dumb and they never can be united behind a bunch of administrators who can see nothing wrong with England's selling rubber and steel to Red China.

MacArthur's plan of blockading the China coast was rejected by the President and it seems clear now that if any such blockade had been inaugurated, England would be the first nation caught in the net. Apparently Acheson could not stand to see England held up to the nations of the world as a nation of perfidy and dishonor, and the only out was to fire MacArthur.

The United Nations is showing signs of putting an embargo on this material to Red China, but it is shameful to see the top officers of this Government fail to put a stop to this criminal business, when they have the power to make a declaration.

Under these circumstances, does the President think he can get more appropriations from Congress to assist Great Britain? If he can, this Congress is as dumb as many people think it is.

State Aid Frauds Total 1 Out of 15—Two Thousand in Illinois Surveyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following article taken from the Chicago Daily News of April 30, 1951, which points up the need for a prompt enactment of H. R. 2738, that I introduced February 19, or one of the identical bills, H. R. 3341, by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON], or H. R. 3768, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]:

STATE AID FRAUDS TOTAL 1 OUT OF 15—TWO THOUSAND IN ILLINOIS SURVEYED—THREE-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS YEARLY INDICATED

(By Jay McMullen)

One of every fifteen cases on the State's aid-to-children and general relief rolls was found to be a definite fraud, a survey by the A. C. Nielsen Co. indicated Monday.

The Nielsen Co., market research firm, found in a survey of 2,032 sample cases that—

State-wide ineligibility in the $36,000,000-a-year general relief program amounted to 6.7 percent.

In the $23,000,000 annual aid-to-dependent children program, ineligibility was 6.4 percent.

These figures include only clear-cut cases of total ineligibility, according to Art Nielsen, Jr., administrative vice president of the firm.

They do not include many cases where recipients were obviously receiving more money than they were entitled to under their relief budget.

Nor do they include those in which the level of spending indicated income not reported to welfare officials, said Nielsen.

"Even if we suspected that the case was ineligible, we did not class it that way unless we had some definite proof," Nielsen added.

"The ineligibility figure would have been somewhat higher if we had counted these," he continued.

"We found it a common circumstance where we suspected something but couldn't prove it."

However, Nielsen said, "we feel the program is well administered, even if we did find places where it has slipped."

Nielsen pointed out that the Illinois Public Aid Commission already had removed some of the ineligible cases involved by the time the Nielsen Co. investigators started their job.

The survey covered cases on the relief rolls in January.

Nielsen and Warren Cordell, also a vice president, conducted the survey on behalf of the public aid commission.

They will submit a report on their findings to the commission by Monday, May 7. It will include the following major reasons for ineligibility: No evidence of need; unreported resources, primarily from employment; relatives living in the home who should contribute to the support of the family.

Cordell said the firm's 75 investigators who made the 2-month survey found many welfare recipients were making no attempts to support themselves.

"Their level of ambition is so low they get by on their public assistance," he said. "Many are living in filth."

On the other hand, Cordell emphasized that many of those on the rolls are really in dire circumstances. He cited the case of a man who draws a $12-13-a-month food order and who was found living in a piano box on a dump heap.

Projection of the survey figures would indicate that the taxpayers lose around $3,000,000 each year in definite ineligibility in the two programs.

The aid-to-dependent-children program is run by county welfare offices under supervision of the public aid commission.

General relief is administered in Chicago by the Chicago welfare department and down-State by the township supervisors.

Nielsen reported that after the survey started in Chicago it "caused a flurry of housecleaning" down-State by the township supervisors.

"They had already knocked some off the rolls," he said.

"Investigators found that more often than not the case worker had been around to see the recipient just ahead of them."

However, Nielsen explained that cases on the rolls in January of this year were investigated and included in the statictics whether they had been cut off the rolls or not after that time.

The township supervisors came in for special criticism from investigators.

Many were found to be carrying their "relief offices" in their hats. Many so-called records on clients were mere slips of paper.

"Some had no records," Nielsen said.

Nielsen praised both the Cook County welfare department and the Chicago welfare department for their administrative methods.

"Records in Cook County were thorough," he said. "We think they're doing a conscientious job."

"General relief rolls in the Chicago welfare department were complete, if not as up-to-date as the county's," he said. "Case workers had the information, but for economy reasons only make official notations every 6 months."

"We saw no signs of any more leniency among Cook County workers than among those down-State," he added.

Figures on ineligibility varied little between down-State and Chicago.

General relief, down-State, 7.1 percent; Chicago and Cook County, 6.5 percent. Aid to children, down-State, 7.1 percent; Chicago and Cook County, 5.9 percent.

There were 36,000 general relief cases in the State, involving an estimated 81,000 persons; and 23,600 ADC cases with 84,300 persons.

Cordell said "investigators learned one of the great difficulties in the way of proper administration of relief is the impossibility of setting up a clear-cut definition of need."

Cordell found that some of the families surveyed had been on relief most of their adult lives.

"They don't know anything else," he said.

In one general relief case a crippled woman had been on the rolls 19 years, another woman 14 years.

RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me previously, I should like to insert into the RECORD the following article by Mr. J. Webb Saffold:

RFC

(By J. Webb Saffold)

Judging from the evidence brought out by the Fulbright committee of Congress investigating the RFC loan mess, those initials now stands for rackets for conspirators, and have so stood for some years behind the backs of the people where money was wasted or stolen. The RFC should have been abolished after the depression of the thirties which spawned it, but no emergency agency of the Federal Government that offers opportunity for juicy jobs and free access to the people's pocketbook is ever abolished except by laws especially passed for that purpose. Just try and get such a law passed through Congress under the "Snare Deal" bureaucracy.

The RFC was created by—then—President Herbert Hoover for the one purpose of loaning money to banks that would otherwise fail. It was a temporary expedient and served its purpose, but it was never intended to be misused as a free-for-bingo racket. No banks are failing now, on the contrary, they are bulging with money to loan all over the country, so much so that the Government has had to tighten credit rules in an alleged gesture to prevent more inflation. The one business of Government is to govern, not to horn in on the legitimate field of private business, and one thing is certain as death and taxes; if your Government stays in the loan business you will have corruption in both Government and business.

A former member of the "Snare Deal" Justice (?) Department has organized a committee to fight the abolition of the RFC because he says it will be a death blow to thousands of small-business enterprises. Why should it? If these small-business enterprises cannot negotiate loans on their merits from private banks only too willing to loan them money, why should all the people of this racket-ridden Nation loan money on unsound propositions? What sort of hand-out "Snare Deal" socialism is that? As long as you have a Government loan pool you will have a long list standing in line waiting to get in on the gravy. That means you will have the 5 percenters and the influence peddlers doing a land-office business for lush fees and you will be a party to more corruption paid for with your money.

Three balls, hanging over a Government doorway, look very bad to the people who are taxed unmercifully to pay for the plunder. A total of the multimillions lost for us by the RFC might shock you especially in the face of mounting taxes. In fact a grand total of the people's money wasted regularly by Government spending would stagger you if you could know it, but there is little chance that you ever will. And all this slimy sludge is red meat for the Russian propaganda mill.

It isn't only the loan seekers or suckers who walk into the clutches of the Washington fixers who get rooked for $100,000 fees. From where I sit it looks as if this entire Nation is in a Washington fix to the tune of one hundred billions and much worse. When this flying-saucer inflation crashes in a "Snare Deal" superdepression, we the people will lose our American way of life and our freedom, and that is no fantastic impossibility. Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilizer, says: "Inflation is as great a threat to us as Russia."

In theory, ours is a Government by, for, and of the people, but this is only in vote-getting election oratory. In factual practice, it is a Government, by, for, and of the socialistic "Snare Deal" politicians and you do not have one word to say about how your money will be squandered after it has been extracted from you in ever-rising taxes. Things like this RFC mink stink are the handwriting on the walls of our political Babylon on the Potomac. They mean that unless the people of this Nation clean house in Washington from top to bottom and do it now there will be no house left to clean, and Stalin will move in and take over the site.

Then the initials RFC will stand for "resigned for communism."

Put Freedom First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address given by Otto A. Seyferth, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the first general session of that great body on April 30.

It has been a great honor for the Ninth District of Michigan and especially the city of Muskegon to have the national Chamber of Commerce select as its President one of our own residents. We are especially proud of the able and effective manner in which Otto Seyferth has fulfilled his duties in that post. I have known and respected him for over 25 years and my high regard for his integrity was confirmed by the great speech which he delivered last Monday. As a forthright appraisal of our way of life, it can be read by all Americans with real benefit.

The speech follows:

The dramatic scene with which we have opened this convention served to emphasize two things. Two things of importance to us at this moment.

First, that our institutions, our prosperity, and our whole way of life are based upon the fundamental concept of human freedom.

Second, that these concepts were fostered and dreamed about and written into our fundamental documents by men of affairs—by businessmen.

In late years there has developed a tendency, fostered by so-called intellectuals, to ascribe to men of business only low and sordid motives. The falsity of this superficial attitude is attested daily by the public service and the self-sacrifice which businessmen make in defense of freedom. Historically, it is also attested by the fact that it was busy men of affairs who laid the foundations for our freedom.

It was Franklin, a printer, a capitalist, a man of many commercial interests; it was John Hancock, merchant on a large scale; it was George Washington, a busy planter and dealer in real estate; it was Alexander Hamilton, a brilliant banker and financial genius; it was Livingston, and Gerry, and Mason—and so on and on through a long list of men who were busily engaged in large affairs of trade and commerce and industry.

It was these men who were not only motivated by lofty ideals but who set forth those ideals in practical terms for you and me in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

And, finally, it was these same men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor so that you and I might enjoy the priceless boon of freedom.

It has been my privilege to serve as your president during a year of stress and uncertainty. I came to this moment, grateful for the privilege of serving, and inspired anew by a belief in this institution, and by a strengthened devotion to the cause of freedom.

It is fitting that our theme for this assembly should be put freedom first. That strikes to the heart of all our efforts, and goes to the fundamental matter of the attitude each of us has toward freedom, the conviction each of us holds as to the place of freedom in our lives.

Is it first—or is it secondary to other things? If it is secondary, then we are not free.

Every person in this great Nation would choose wisely, you and I would choose wisely, if we knew we were faced with the choice between freedom and slavery. If we knew. But this we often do not know. Day by day we make decisions which vitally affect our freedom—without knowing or understanding that it is freedom truly that is at stake.

We take freedom for granted, because we were born free.

Indeed, we are so free that we scarcely understand the meaning of freedom. It is our natural habitat. We accept it as we do the air we breathe, the water we drink. We do

not marvel at the air—until through some accident we face suffocation. We take water for granted—until we are perishing of thirst.

And so with freedom. We accept it, we enjoy it, we waste it—and sometimes we lose it.

Freedom cannot be taken for granted. It must first of all be earned. Then it must be zealously guarded. It must be held high in our hearts, as a sacred thing. It must be worked for; it must be sacrificed for.

And it must never be translated into terms of privilege or benefit. When a people begin to ask "What does freedom get me? What can I get out of it? What does my government do for me?"—then that people is on the way to losing its freedom.

We read much these days of crime and corruption. Some of it is due, no doubt, to normal human depravity—to greed, to ruthless disregard for the rights of others. But some of it stems from our widespread modern adoption of an ancient fallacy—namely that somebody, some undefined force or power—the world or the government—owes us something.

The world owes us a living; the government owes us an education, or medical care, or free insurance, or special privilege.

So we phrase a new and degrading philosophy. The old adventurous desire for opportunity becomes dormant. The pioneer spirit that raised this country generation by generation to higher and higher levels—the spirit of git up and git—is being replaced by the new, regressive philosophy of lie down and take.

Where in all the present confusion and clamor is there one clear, confident voice, reiterating the age-old doctrines of thrift, and work, and pride of craftmanship?

And yet over and over again the annals of human experience have shown that freedom is not what people get; it is what they give. To receive one must first give.

When people demand and accept material considerations at the hands of the State, their freedom is reduced in proportion to the so-called benefits conferred.

A bread-and-the-circus concept of Government leads finally to bankruptcy of freedom and to the eclipse of human rights within the black shadow of dictatorship.

But "you can't eat freedom." So goes a current cynicism, uttered by those who believe that it is a function of the State to insure the economic welfare of every citizen.

You can't eat freedom, they say—and by the same token you can't eat faith and honor and decency; you can't eat the consolations of religion; you can't eat beautiful music; you can't eat the glory of a sunset; you can't eat belief in the goodness of God.

You can't eat most of those deep promptings of the spirit which are the real mainsprings of human endeavor and progress. But life would be a bleak and sorry thing without them.

As a practical matter, in passing, let it be noted that as to the question of eating, always and everywhere men have eaten best in countries and epochs where they had the greatest freedom, and worst when they were most governed and least free. Sooner or later the bread of the state is the bread of bitterness.

I am thinking, however, not of the actual hunger that arises from want or privation, but of the false hungers that beset us—the hunger for special privilege, for so-called benefits, for synthetic honors, for inside information that may lead to gain, all secured, not through normal creative and competitive processes, but by special legislation or bureaucratic dispensation, often obtained through pressure, which favors one group, one class or one section, more than others.

And whether that group be labor or agriculture or business or any other, the principle is wrong, the practice is dangerous.

When government becomes a mere focal point for a struggle between mutually antagonistic elements of the economic and social structure of a nation; when the test of political success is not, what can I do for my country but rather, what can I wrangle for myself—then the safety of the Nation is insecure; and the foundations of freedom are weakened.

For the essence of freedom is, first of all, solvency, and second, equal treatment, equal justice, for all. To the extent these are impaired or disregarded, the strength of a nation is lessened and freedom itself is rendered less secure.

Solvency. When the free and riotous spenders of other people's money hear anyone speak of governmental solvency they are apt to scorn him as a mere money grubber who is concerned only with keeping down taxes.

A case can be made, of course—a good, sound, defensible case—for keeping taxes in a proper relationship to our ability to pay and the ability of the economy to absorb their impact. But that is not my concern at the moment.

I'm speaking of solvency now as an emblem and a guaranty of freedom. My concern is that the people of this country be brought to realize that continued deficits lead either to bankruptcy or inflation, and that in either case the dollars they have worked to earn and save will shrink in value or become worthless.

When that happens, liberty will also shrink, for freedom is tied to solvency, and solvency is tied to the value of our money.

There once was a man named Lenin. He would qualify, I suppose, as an expert on the technique of destroying governments. He once wrote out a formula for the overthrow of a government like ours—and the very first step, he said, is to debase its currency.

Keep that in mind, please: If you want to destroy a nation, first destroy the value of its money.

Lenin knew the relationship between solvency and freedom. Dictatorships are simply receiverships. When a government is insolvent, then like any other institution that is dependent upon fiscal management, it is ripe for receivership. But among governments receivership takes the form of dictatorship.

Freedom therefore, we can clearly see, is tied to solvency. If we put freedom first we will be concerned about the state of our finances and the value of our currency—not merely as fiscal affairs, not merely as a matter of higher taxes, or of profit and loss, but because they are the very emblem and the foundation of freedom itself.

But do we really place freedom first? Or are we more concerned about other things?

Businessmen who run to Washington for help when they are in trouble, who expect the Government to make loans at lower rates and upon security private bankers would not dare to accept because of the very restrictions that have been placed upon them by the Government—are they concerned first with freedom?

Industrialists who hire Washington lawyers of alleged inside influence, and let them expend extravagant sums, or "loan" thousands of dollars to purchase mink coats for the White House employed wives of supposed insiders, all for the purpose of wangling Government money for private—do such men put freedom first?

The labor leader who says that government is merely a mechanism for getting things done, and who uses political power and political pressure to secure advantages, not necessarily for those who labor, but for himself as a labor manipulator—does he put freedom first?

The agricultural groups who demand that their industry be treated as a perpetual charity case, with prices artificially supported at arbitrary levels through subsidies that are paid for out of the Public Treasury—do they put freedom first?

The school teacher or superintendent or college president or professional agitator who aids the States in shirking their duty by working for Federal hand-outs to education; hand-outs that can result only in the long run in ruinous Federal controls upon academic freedom—do such people put freedom first?

The very large number of people who seek and accept subsidies from the Federal Government, either directly or indirectly, thus helping to add to the burden of debt and insecurity—do they put freedom first?

The politicians who see in a national emergency not an occasion for the exercise of statesmanship, but only an opportunity for making political capital for themselves or their party—do they put freedom first?

All these questions, ladies and gentlemen, lead to another one—a deeper one. I refer to the question of national morality.

The indifferent attitude we exhibit toward freedom is but an outgrowth of our attitude toward one of the essential ingredients of freedom, which is the integrity and honor and elemental decency of the citizens of a country.

What has happened to us? That we still possess the valor of our revolutionary fathers, our fighting men are demonstrating daily in the hills of Korea. But what of our moral fiber?

Of course it has for many years been set the worst possible kind of high-level example. When we elect men to high office, we realize that they are still men, subject to human frailties and prone to error, like all the rest of us.

But we expect, and we have a right to expect, that such men will honor their office. We expect, and we have a right to expect, that they and their employees and their families will set for the Nation an example of decency and dignity and devotion.

When that fails, when grabbing for the fast dollar becomes standard procedure in high places through the formative years of a whole generation, something happens to the moral tone, to the ethical sensibilities, of a people.

When people are taught that the world owes them a living, that if they do not succeed it is somehow not their fault but some one else's, and that some one else must be punished and have his property taken away from him in order to compensate the unsuccessful—when this happens, all under the guise of legality, another nick has been hacked into the fine edge of our moral perceptions.

All this, and more, has been happening. What is the result?

The result is that we seem as a people to have grown callous to moral issues.

If scandalous revelations are made regarding one of the Government's top financial agencies, indicating the use of improper influence by persons closely connected with high authorities, it is shrugged off without condemnation.

If there is revelation of the wholesale and shameless protection of racketeering in many of our larger cities, the country shrugs its shoulders at another amusing bit of political villainy.

In the name of heaven, how much longer shall we go on at this moral level?

If we are to put freedom first we must start by putting first those elements of character upon which freedom rests—and these are decency, and honor, and integrity, and faith.

We need, and need desperately, a new moral awakening. We condemn the Russians for their materialism—and yet we ourselves have for many years now been living in a largely materialistic atmosphere.

To be an American citizen was once a cherished end in itself. Now we measure the value of that citizenship in terms of material advantage—in terms of so-called

social benefits, in terms of subsidies, in terms of hand-outs, in terms of special privilege.

This is not to decry social benefits, nor to discount physical comforts. Indeed, it is of the essence and nature of our political and economic system that it supplies more of the good things of life—the material things, I mean—to more people, and at less cost, than any other system in the world, now or heretofore, through all recorded history.

The fruits of freedom and of production prove that statement. Men fix their own levels under our system, in accordance with their endowments and their willingness to work. The opportunities are wider, the rewards greater, and life is more free and full here under our system than under any other system or in any other country known to man.

My quarrel in what I am here saying is not with those who would better the physical lot of mankind, but with those who would make of material things the be-all and end-all, the touchstone, so to speak, of political and economic life.

They forget that it was written: Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

I want to assert solemnly, here at the inaugural session of this great convention of businessmen, that what this country needs desperately in this hour of its history is to get back to God.

This Nation was founded upon moral and religious principles. The literature of our revolution was no hodgepodge of dialectic materialism. It abounds in sincere and eloquent professions of faith.

Our deepest convictions with respect to political freedom and economic opportunity have always gone hand in hand with a profound sense of dependence upon the divine will.

Our deep-held concept of man's brotherhood under the Stars and Stripes of freedom has always been part and parcel of our belief in God's fatherhood and the mystic symbolism of Calvary.

Now we have drifted away from that standard. Faced with a materialistic philosophy that opposes ours, we have ended by adopting many clichés out of the very doctrines we detest.

For many years now the professional cynics and the self-professed sophisticates, terms which usually mean simply men without principle, for many years such people have been working to instill a breakdown in the moral values of a dubious and frightened generation.

And as a result we are reaping the whirlwind of indifference and disregard when the very foundations of our national safety are threatened.

But despite all this I am not an apostle of despair. There is too much latent decency and common sense in the American people for us to allow ourselves to be submerged in what can be, what must be, only a temporary wave of materialism.

Already there are hopeful signs of a moral awakening. Some people are shocked and angry and morally aroused. The pendulum of cynic indifference may well have swung so far that it needs but a touch to send it swinging the other way. Here at the mid-century we may well be at a pivot point in time that will mark the lasting, spiritual rebirth of a great nation.

May heaven grant it. If ever there is to be peace and stability in the world, there must be a mighty America, an evil-hating, God-fearing America, clothed in the armor of decency and righteousness, and holding the sword of faith. There can be no peace without a vision of the Eternal.

American freedom is a spiritual tradition—born, nurtured, disciplined, and sustained not alone by economic systems, not alone by political parties, not alone by the devotion of good citizenship, but by God himself, working through the hearts of men seeking truth.

As a keynote to this convention, and as a call to our deepest moral convictions, I hold up to you the twin ideal, one and inseparable, of God and human freedom.

In our moral attitudes, in our judgments upon ourselves, in our aims at human progress in a troubled world, let us get back to God.

In our political concepts, in our great task of keeping and preserving the finest set of values ever vouchsafed a people under self-government, let us put freedom first.

Dilatory Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following for insertion in the RECORD:

DILATORY DEFENSE

(By M. A. Hollengreen, chairman, Committee on Government Relations, president, Landis Tool Co., before the forty-ninth spring meeting of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill., May 3, 1951)

It is hardly necessary for me to remind any machine-tool builder of the fact that a modern war or defense program requires an enormous number of new metalworking machines of all types.

The record of World War II, still fresh in our memories, amply substantiates that statement. In 1940 the United States had installed in all of its vast metalworking industry, 1,247,000 power-driven metalworking tools. These figures, as it happens, do not include presses, shears, and brakes.

In the 6 years from 1940 to 1945, inclusive, beginning with our own defense program in 1940 and the needs of the war program in late '41 and subsequent years, the United States machine-tool industry produced 1,093,000 metal-cutting machine tools. In other words, the Nation practically doubled the number of machines in its metalworking plants in order to produce the weapons that were necessary to win World War II.

If we take into account the fact that the machines produced during the war were far more productive than those already installed in American industry, it is clear that we actually more than doubled the metal-cutting capacity of this Nation in order to win the war.

The industry met this enormous demand by practically doubling its output from year to year. Thus in 1939 the output was $200,000,000, which was the best year the industry had had to that date. This production was required by the expansion of airplane engine builders at home, in France, and England. In 1940 with the impetus of the American defense program, the industry more than doubled its output to $440,000,000.

This first expansion is not too difficult to attain, as you know. It means instituting a second shift on the bottleneck machines in the plant; it means working full time and it means diluting the skilled labor force with some learners.

In 1941 the industry almost doubled its output again, going to $775,000,000. We were beginning to subcontract then, to run two full shifts, each operating overtime, and to add substantially to the machine tools and plant capacity in the industry itself.

In 1942 we reached the amazing output of $1,300,000,000 and in 1943 almost duplicated the performance with $1,180,000,000. By that time the greatest demand of the war program had been met and in 1944, output fell off to about $497,000,000. Note, however, that this is still more than twice the output of any peacetime year.

Even in 1945 the industry was called on for a production of $423,700,00.

At no time during the war period, due to the fact that our industry actually went to war almost 3 years before Pearl Harbor, did the backlog of unfilled orders of the industry exceed 12 months' production. As the demand increased, the capacity of the industry kept step with it. Nevertheless, even in those days we were subjected to some very savage criticism as being the bottleneck of the defense program.

In view of this tremendous need for metalworking machines as part of a program of national defense, it should be perfectly obvious to anyone, whether inside or outside of the machine-tool industry, that the production of machine tools is literally the foundation of a defense effort.

But we do not need to go back to the experience of World War II. This industry now has a backlog of unfilled orders equivalent to 18 months' production at the present rate of output. Practically all of this is for the defense program. Firm orders that are being held by machine tool builders, who are afraid to accept them, probably amount to another 5 months' production. And machine tools for many defense projects are still to be ordered.

Unfortunately, this industry dwindled in size after World War II. The demand for machine tools fell off steadily from 1946 to a low in 1949. In 1947 we produced $306,000,000 worth of metal cutting machine tools. The competition of the enormous Government surplus dumped on the market at 15 cents on the dollar began to be severely felt by the industry and output went off to $288,000,000 in 1948. In 1949 it was only $249,150,000.

If we correct this figure for the increased cost of materials and consequently the higher price of machine tools, it will be seen that we produced about the same number of machine tools in 1949 as we had in the depression year of 1938.

The first few months of 1950 were better for those of us who were getting orders for the new designs of the automobile industry. Yet in June 1950, many machine-tool builders were working 30 or 40 hours a week and had laid off all of their men up to the veterans of 13 and 14 years' experience. The situation had been highly competitive, with over 40 companies changing hands and over 20 of them going completely out of existence. This represents an extremely serious loss of capacity in the industry. Employment in June 1950 was only 37,700 wage earners.

The industry is now shipping at the rate of about $540,000,000 per year. But if we correct for the value of the dollar, we find that this represents about half of the number of machines we shipped in 1940—the year before Pearl Harbor.

The inability of the machine-tool industry to meet the needs of the present defense programs is not only due to loss of capacity but due to the following obstacles:

1. Difficulty in holding trained men—and in employing new men.

2. Difficulty in getting materials and components without a blanket priority.

3. Great delay in securing certificates of necessity to permit the 5-year amortization of investment in additional facilities.

4. Lack of money to finance a larger inventory and increased manufacturing facilities.

5. Worst of all: uncertainty as to the price ceiling on machine tools.

The first thing the machine-tool builder needed was to increase his hours and then to hire more manpower. I need hardly tell you what he found. He found himself in competition with the producers of civilian goods who were expanding their plants, with

new defense plants that were starting up in various parts of the country where machine-tool builders are located, and he found that they were in position to pay wage rates 50 percent or 100 percent higher than those that he can pay. In many cases his utmost efforts resulted in his hiring fewer people than he was losing, so that instead of gaining manpower he lost manpower week by week and month by month. The men he loses are trained men, the only men or women he can hire are untrained. That situation still persists.

The second thing the machine-tool builder needed was material. He had for 4 years been depleting his inventory, because of declining demand, and because of the highly competitive conditions within the industry. As a consequence, your Government relations committee consulted Mr. Harrison on October 2, shortly after he was appointed Administrator of the National Production Authority. Mr. Harrison felt that the priority regulation No. 2, which was about to issue, would amply meet the needs of the industry. In that he was mistaken.

The priority order provided that the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission could authorize the use of a DO (defense order) rating and that their sources might extend that rating, but for production materials only. As an afterthought, the order did provide that with the permission of the contracting officer the contractor or subcontractor might apply this rating to machine tools, but only to an order for a machine tool which threatened to become the bottleneck of the entire program, and this was restricted to a certain maximum dollar value of purchases. This dollar limitation was quickly exhausted by the Defense Department and its prime contractors, and as a consequence the orders placed by the sub and sub-subcontractors of every degree came to us unrated, although they were for the defense program.

The industry had civilian unrated orders which had to be completed because they were already in the process of manufacture. It had unrated orders for the defense program. It also had a rapidly growing number of rated defense orders. According to regulations it could buy material with a rating only for part of its production.

This, as we pointed out to Mr. Harrison and his associates repeatedly, just does not work in a machine tool plant. A machine tool builder, for the most part, builds his machines in lots. He buys a quantity of material and fabricates it in the best quantities for production efficiency to reduce his costs. He does not know on whose machine this part of a steel bar will eventually be used as a shaft. He cannot go to a steel warehouse and say "send me a ton of steel, 60 percent rated and 40 percent unrated."

Your committee made the obvious suggestion that machine tool builders should be given a blanket priority for the purchase of materials as they were in the defense program that preceded World War II. Actually, a blanket priority was made available to us in September 1940—over a year before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Harrison stated that machine tools are no more essential than pots and kettles and pans. He said that if machine tool builders got a blanket priority everyone would want it.

He later expressed the opinion that as a Nation we have more machine tool capacity to cut up materials than we have materials to cut up.

The refusal of the National Production Authority to give this essential industry a rating is especially hard to understand in view of the fact that the industry only uses about two-tenths of one percent of the Nation's steel production, a little over 1 percent of the antifriction bearing production, and even smaller portions of other scarce materials. Giving the industry a blanket priority would have no visible effect on the materials shortages in the Nation.

Your committee then persuaded Mr. Harrison to appoint a Machine Tool Industry Advisory Committee, which would submit a report on the condition of the industry. This advisory committee first met on October 25 under the chairmanship of Mr. H. B. McCoy, Assistant Administrator for Industry Operations of NPA. The advisory committee was asked to confirm its verbal recommendations to Mr. McCoy in writing and submitted a formal report on November 8 to Mr. Harrison and Mr. McCoy. The subcommittee or task committee had further meetings with Mr. McCoy on October 20 and December 13. The full committee met with Mr. Harrison and Mr. McCoy on December 28.

About the only outcome of these discussions was the decision to reinstate pool orders like those which we knew during World War II and of which I shall speak at greater length later on.

Your Government Relations Committee then tried to bring a clear understanding of this emergency to the Armed Services, to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay, who was at that time associated with him, both of whom we saw on February 22 of this year. Mr. Wilson commented that the machine-tool industry is only one of about 7,000 that are having trouble.

Only in some of the uniformed services did we find any conception of what this Nation has to do in the way of machine-tool production to make its defense program a reality.

The machine-tool builder still does not have a blanket priority with which to buy materials for the great expansion of his inventory and of his output. He is in competition for scarce materials with some of the largest industries on the face of the earth, and he has frequently held dozens of finished machines on his assembly floor, unable to ship them because on one he lacked a limit switch, on another he had no hydraulic pump, and on another no sheet-steel guards, etc.

Let it be clearly stated, as all of you know, that a machine-tool builder who buys raw materials for a lot of machines, cannot possibly successfully operate under the priority system that has been set up and which is now in force. He cannot place purchase orders that are partly rated and partly unrated because his sources can readily deliver all of their production to customers whose orders are entirely rated. Yet under Order M–1, 30 percent of the machine tool builder's output is for unrated civilian and foreign orders. He will be expected to continue the shipment of machines on unrated orders.

The controlled materials plan will help him only in his purchase of steel plate, bars, castings, and forgings. On all his other purchases he still has this jumbled priority situation.

The combination of manpower shortages and the absence of a blanket priority for raw materials has effectively checked the expansion of this industry and these difficulties still persist. How about expansion of plant?

Congress has made provision for certificates of necessity which are to be issued to those industries who must expand in order to play their proper part in the defense program, but for some reason the application of machine-tool builders have received very scant attention at the hands of the gentlemen in charge of this procedure. An application filed on November 16 finally issued on April 12, 5 months later, and even as recently as the beginning of April we were informed that Mr. Manly Fleischmann, the present Administrator of the National Production Authority, was making a study to decide whether or not the machine-tool industry is essential in the defense program.

For the most part these certificates permit the 5-year amortization of only a fraction of the facility, that is from 65 percent to 85 percent, on the theory that the facility will have a residual value after the defense program is over. You can readily understand why the incentive hardly makes a strong appeal to a machine-tool builder when there is so great a delay in getting constructive action from Washington. Certainly no machine-tool builder is safe in going ahead if he is using his own money in the expansion of his facilities until the certificate of necessity has actually been issued to him. In November 1940—over a year before we entered the Second World War—certificates of necessity were available for 100 percent of the capital invested in the expansion of machine-tool facilities.

The next thing the industry needed was money. After this highly competitive period, machine-tool builders who experienced the exactions of the excess-profits tax and renegotiation during World War II had very little financial strength with which to face these new and greater responsibilities. The answer to that problem has not yet been found, except to the extent that every machine-tool builder can borrow from his own commercial bank. The pool contracts that have been issued do not give him 30 percent cash with order as was the case in World War II. The Comptroller General has ruled that a commercial bank that loans money on the proceeds of a Government contract as security, will be responsible for any arrears in which the borrower might fall with regard to the United States Treasury in future years. So the banks are refusing to make such loans. Your committee has discussed this problem with officials of the Federal Reserve System, who are sponsoring legislation to eliminate this recourse against the commercial bank. This legislation is still pending.

The General Services Administration has offered its cooperation in guaranteeing loans made by commercial banks, but when a machine-tool builder has borrowed money from a bank and then wants to make a second loan guaranteed by the Government, the banker refuses it for the simple reason that the guaranteed loan would then take precedence over the original loan, and the banker's own unsecured loan would become a junior obligation.

One thing has been accomplished and that is to start the process of sending pool contracts to machine-tool builders. Unfortunately, the RFC being in disfavor, the matter was referred to the General Services Administration. This department of the Government had no funds in its budget for this activity and got $100,000,000 from the emergency funds of the President. But the General Accounting Office insists that they must have on hand funds equal to the face value of the pool contracts issued. So they can issue contracts only to a total value of $100,000,000, unless an appropriation now pending in Congress is passed.

It is hoped that eventually 75 percent of the machine-tool industry will have pool orders. The General Services Administration has said quite frankly that it is not their policy to pay cash with the pool contract.

In World War II the Defense Plant Corporation of the RFC advanced 30 percent cash with pool orders. Failure to do so at this time will make the pool order of very little value to machine-tool builders. In many cases they cannot finance the increased inventory needed to expand their production.

Our friend, Mr. Marshall Smith, Director of the Machinery Division of the National Production Authority, who will report to you at this meeting, can give you additional information with regard to pool contracts.

The nature of a pool contract is widely misunderstood. In fact, even Mr. Jesse Larson, Administrator of the General Services

Administration, does not understand it. In a news release issued when the first pool contracts were mailed he said that these contracts will result in a pool or reserve of machine tools that can be drawn on by contractors when they need machine tools instead of waiting for the machine to be built. As all of us know, the pool contract will be cut back if substitute customers are not found for the machines.

Very few machines were actually taken by the Defense Plant Corporation under the pool orders of World War II. Those pool contracts cost only a fraction of 1 percent of their total face value.

It is not intended to build up a pool or reserve of finished machines.

A pool order is an underwriting of a certain number of machines. You put them out at the end of your production schedule, which for most of us would be about 20 months out. They may then be assigned to rated or unrated orders received after April 1, 1951, or the date of the pool contract, whichever is later. To the extent that unrated orders may be given machines from the pool, they acquire a priority, which means that by the time you start work on your pool order machines, about 18 to 24 months from now, you can buy all of your materials with a priority. It is nice to know that your worst problem will be solved a year and a half from now, if you are not particularly concerned about the defense of the Nation.

Pool contracts do have the advantage that if the bottom drops out of the defense program and some of these machines are in process of manufacture and have not yet been assigned to substitute customers, you will not suffer any serious loss as your manufacturing costs will be defrayed by the General Services Administration.

The industry will appreciate pool contracts—when they are finally issued to the companies that will get them—but be it clearly stated that they do not solve the industry's material problem. Giving a machine-tool builder a pool contract that will help him 2 years from now is like giving a drowning man a towel.

One serious problem connected with the pool contract is the fact that appendix A, which lists the machine tools to be built, puts the machine-tool builder in the embarrassing position of being offered a very large order for machines at a price which is to be controlled by the Office of Price Stabilization, since no machine can be billed to the Government at a higher price than the legal ceiling. In other words, he undertakes to make the machines but he doesn't know what the price is going to be and he is not going to be allowed to set the price himself; someone else is going to do that for him.

This leads me to another great problem of the industry—and that is price. The general price ceiling announced on January 26, 1951, provides that your ceiling price is the price at which you delivered a machine between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951. Unfortunately, the machine-tool builder delivers a machine very long after he quotes on it. Some of these machines were quoted on in early 1950, some in late 1949. These quotations may have been based on price lists established in 1947, 1948, or 1949. This general price ceiling therefore constituted a roll back of from 3 month to 3 years, depending on the period of delivery in that plant on that particular type of machine and what the date of the price list was when the quotation was made, or the order taken.

Your Government relations committee has had meetings with Office of Price Stabilization on January 9, March 21, March 29, and April 13, and we are still working hard to try to arrive at a price ceiling which may reasonably be applied to the machine-tool industry. It is expected that an order like the CPA Regulation 136 covering all machinery will be issued next and that this will have a 30-day period of grace. In other words, the machine-tool builder will not be compelled to conform to that order for 30 days after the date on which it issues. Within that period of time, it is our hope that a regulation applying only to machine tools, like OPA 67, can be written.

The great difficulty is that the Office of Price Stabilization insists that we must begin in all of these orders with the basic principle of rolling back prices to pre-Korea, that is to June 1950. This plunges the machine-tool builder back into an obsolete cost-price ratio which guarantees substantial losses.

However, the Office of Price Stabilization will permit the addition to these prices of actual dollar increases in costs, but only of certain items of cost. You must understand that other items of cost may not be included, for reasons that I do not understand. For instance the following increases in items of cost may not be considered: Added insurance; duplication of jigs, fixtures, and patterns in order to increase output; increased clerical help, except as included in factory labor, campaigns for bond sales, Red Cross, etc.; multiple shift operations; training new help.

Overtime premiums, shift premiums, and the much higher costs that result from subcontracting, may eventually be allowed. These items are under discussion. There will probably be restrictions on them. There seems to be a feeling in Washington that they might be indulged in to an excessive extent, thus increasing over-all costs and the resultant prices.

As you know, the industry cannot produce the machine tools needed in a reasonable time without subcontracting. The distribution of part of the load to many small metalworking plants that can make parts, or subassemblies, or complete machine tools, is definitely in the national interest. It will not only increase machine-tool production, it will lessen the number of men laid off in American industry because of the defense program.

In May 1941 machine-tool builders had already closed subcontracts to build 44 types of complete machine tools, to say nothing of the hundreds of subcontracts to make parts and subassemblies.

Yet the Office of Price Stabilization is trying to find some basis for restricting the extent of our subcontracting.

Under the impact of this price philosophy machine-tool builders, to an ever-widening extent, feel unable to accept orders, because they already have an average 18 months' backlog of unfilled firm orders and they realize that they do not know today at what prices these orders must be delivered. Due to the philosophy the Office of Price Stabilization is trying to apply to the machine-tool industry, practically every company in this industry could be subjected to heavy potential losses if not outright bankruptcy.

Machine-tool builders to an ever-widening extent are reluctant to quote for exactly the same reason, and to an ever-growing extent are telling their customers, "I will give you this price for estimating purposes, but I will have to confirm or amend it later on when I know what my ceiling price is going to be."

Above all, gentlemen, let me point out to you that the importance of this appalling situation is not that it inflicts a hardship on the machine-tool industry.

The importance of this situation is that we are engaging in a colossal bluff and trying to threaten Russia with a defense program that is little more than words. The very foundation of that defense program is not being laid.

The importance of this situation lies in the fact that our failure to increase the output of machine tools is jeopardizing the very safety of the United States and its future survival as a free Nation.

Government Requisition or Purchase of Privately Owned Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr.:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP. BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS RE H. R. 3880, INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1952

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., assistant general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., of Mobile, Ala. This statement is being submitted for your consideration in connection with H. R. 3880, the independent offices appropriations bill for 1952.

Waterman Steamship Corp. was organized in 1919 under the laws of the State of Alabama. Waterman and its affiliates own at the present time 45 dry-cargo, C–2 type, war-built vessels purchased from the United States Maritime Commission under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. Most of these vessels were purchased from the Maritime Commission approximately 5 years ago. They are operated in both the domestic and foreign trades of the United States. Waterman does not have an operating-differential subsidy, nor does it have any vessels that were built with the aid of a construction-differential subsidy.

The purpose of this statement is to express our views with respect to a provision in H. R. 3880 which, if passed by the House and concurred in by the Senate, we respectfully submit would result in a serious and unfair economic injury, not only to our corporation, but to the entire American merchant marine.

Commencing on line 5, page 49, and running through line 13, page 50, the House bill includes a provision which would limit the amount which may be paid by the United States to the owner of any vessel which was previously sold by the United States, in the event the United States should at any time in the future requisition or purchase the title to such vessel, or charter it for Government use. The amount which the United States would be permitted to pay for any such vessel is restricted to the owner's depreciated book value thereof. If the cost of the vessel should be fully depreciated, this could result in the owner receiving absolutely no compensation for the requisition or use of his vessel.

Our company respectfully submits that it is extremely unfair and unreasonable for the Congress to enact any legislation which would attempt to direct and limit the payment for privately owned property taken for public use by any agency of the United States, particularly in the manner proposed by the provision of H. R. 3880 referred to above.

The Ship Sales Act of 1946 became law on March 8, 1946, more than 5 years ago, and after the Congress had deliberated and carefully considered such legislation for many months. Hundreds of vessels have been sold under the provisions of that act to both citizens of the United States and to foreigners, upon equal terms and conditions, and at the same prices. The Ship Sales Act, under which all Government-owned, war-built, surplus vessels were sold,

contains no provision similar to that proposed by the House in H. R. 3880. Such a limitation as proposed in the House bill was considered by both Houses of Congress at the time of the enactment of the Ship Sales Act and was rejected. Waterman Steamship Corp., in reliance on the provisions of the Ship Sales Act, has invested almost $50,000,000 in vessels sold thereunder and have, naturally, assumed all the ordinary business risks inherent in the investment of so large a sum of money. Most of our ships were purchased shortly after the enactment of the Ship Sales Act, and it seems grossly unfair and unreasonable at this time, 5 years later, to impose an arbitrary provision such as is proposed in the House bill, which is bound to have the effect of beclouding the title to all vessels sold to citizens under that act.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, provides in section 902 for the payment of just compensation to any citizen whose privately owned vessels are requisitioned by the Government. This section of the 1936 act has been law for more than 15 years and has stood the test of World War II and the scrutiny of the courts of the land in those instances where resort to the courts has been necessary. Certainly there should be no such radical change in that provision of the law by writing into an appropriation act legislation of the nature included in H. R. 3880. The "just compensation" referred to in section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is in accord with the requirement of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that citizens shall be paid just compensation for any private property taken for public use. There is a serious question as to whether or not the provision in H. R. 3880, here discussed, does not contravene this requirement of the Constitution, and if this provision is enacted into law, it can only result in inviting inordinate litigation in the courts of the United States.

It is true that section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides that in those cases where vessels are built with a construction-differential subsidy, the owner or purchaser thereof shall be paid therefor, in the event the United States requisitions or purchases such vessels, the depreciated construction cost thereof. However, this is a provision of law that is a contractual prerequisite to the construction of a new vessel whereby the Government pays part of the construction cost. It is not at all applicable to the situation intended to be covered by the Ship Sales Act of 1946 whereby large numbers of war-built vessels built for specific wartime uses were to be disposed of, and which vessels were not designed in accordance with the desires of any particular operator or for any particular use other than war use. As pointed out, one who purchases a vessel with a construction-differential subsidy enters into an agreement at the time the sales contract is executed, agreeing that in consideration of receiving a subsidy, that if the United States requisition the vessel at some later date, the owner will receive only his depreciated cost as just compensation therefor. But, in that situation the purchaser obtains title to a new vessel and one that is designed especially for his particular needs. Furthermore, the vessel would not come into existence at all but for such a contract. The Ship Sales Act was entirely different, as it was intended, among other things, to establish an orderly manner for the disposition of an extremely large number of war-built surplus vessels.

The latter act does not impose a condition that the purchasers of vessels thereunder must agree to terms similar to those required by section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, and those who purchased vessels under the Ship Sales Act are entitled to rely on the good faith of the Government that the terms and conditions under which those vessels were purchased shall not now be changed or modified.

As already pointed out, in addition to the many hundreds of war-built surplus vessels sold by the Government under the Ship Sales Act to American citizens, many other hundreds of the same type vessels were sold under that act to foreigners at the same prices and upon the same terms. Vessels which have been sold to foreigners cannot now be made subject to the provision incorporated in H. R. 3880 with respect to the compensation to be paid citizens for vessels, if requisitioned for title or use, inasmuch as the vessels of foreigners are not subject to requisition by the United States—and hence, the enactment of this legislation would seriously and unjustly discriminate against United States citizens as opposed to foreigners who purchased the same type vessels under the same circumstances. In this connection, it should be noted that section 6 (b) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 provides:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States, except in accordance with subsection (a), or upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States."

It is obvious that if the provision of the House bill here discussed is enacted, the result will be that vessels sold under the Ship Sales Act to foreigners will have been sold on terms and conditions considerably more favorable than were similar vessels sold by our Government to its own citizens.

To our company it is grossly unfair for the Congress to attempt by ex post facto legislation to change the terms and conditions under which surplus property was purchased from the Government in good faith by its citizens and with the risk of large capital investments.

Risking a large capital investment in the purchase of vessels, the purchaser thereof is entitled to enjoy the benefits of any appreciation in value to the same extent that he takes a risk in the depreciation of the market value thereof.

If the provision in the House bill becomes law, it is bound to result in placing a cloud on the title of every vessel sold under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to United States citizens, and, even though the United States never finds it necessary to requisition or purchase such vessels, the sales price thereof on the open market will be greatly affected by the shadow which will follow the vessel constantly thereafter.

It seems palpable that if the proviso under discussion be enacted into law the whole fundamental theory of just compensation will be emasculated in this instance. The effect of the provision attempts to deny to the courts the inherent constitutional duty to determine just compensation in accordance with settled principles of law, and will eliminate from consideration all of the factors involved in measuring just compensation, save one. With due respect, this company submits that the courts must of necessity conclude any such legislation runs counter to the Constitution.

The Senate Appropriations Committee on April 30, 1951, reported out H. R. 3587 (third supplemental appropriation bill for 1951). An identical provision to that included in H. R. 3880 and here discussed was provided in H. R. 3587 as passed by the House, however, the Senate committee, after hearings thereon, deleted the same provision from H. R. 3587. It is hoped this committee will take the same consistent action and delete the language in H. R. 3880 commencing in line 5, page 49, and continuing through line 13 on page 50.

Address of Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, delivered a startling speech last evening to the Washington Chapter of the Providence College Alumni at the Wardman Park Hotel. It was on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the independence of Rhode Island and, in my opinion, was one of the finest addresses touching on Rhode Island history that it has ever been my privilege to listen to. His address follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AT A DINNER OF PROVIDENCE COLLEGE CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 3, 1951

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Attorney General, Senator PASTORE, Congressman FORAND, Congressman FOGARTY, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, and fellow alumni of Providence College, it is a great satisfactoion to be able to address you in this fashion and I thank you in behalf of myself and my colleagues in the Congress for the honor you do us in giving this dinner here tonight. It is good to be with you again as I have been on a number of other occasions. I have many friends whom I highly respect to whose mental and moral development Providence College has contributed greatly. I follow with interest new developments at the college. There seem to follow in quick succession something new every year. Now we all look forward to many Providence College men going to the defense of their country as officers because of the training they will receive under the ROTC unit which will be established at the college next September.

Tomorrow, May 4, will be a great anniversary, of significance not to Rhode Island alone, but to this whole country of ours. In fact, if we stay here after midnight, we then can say today is that anniversary. I hasten to assure you that I shall not keep you here that long, though it is an anniversary worthy of a hearty and prolonged celebration.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago on May 4, 1776, a declaration of independence from the British Empire was officially adopted by the legislature of its smallest colony, with the longest name, the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. This was just 2 months before the Federal Declaration of Independence, and, since Rhode Island is still very much alive, constitutes it the oldest sovereign State in the Western Hemisphere. Think of the audacity of that little colony which thus singlehanded defied the greatest power then on earth. Its courage was rewarded in that the defiance was successful.

This was the crowning act of a series of events which also give Rhode Island a unique place in the American Revolution. Rhode Island contributed one of her sons, Esek Hopkins, as the first commander in chief of the American Navy and another of her sons, Nathanael Greene, as the major general who, next to Washington, commanded the American Army. It is, therefore, with State pride that we celebrate this anniversary of the declaration of independence, and perhaps I may be pardoned if I

add with personal pride that it was my great-great-grandfather Jonathan Arnold who drafted that courageous and historic document and moved its adoption in the General Assembly.

It will help us to understand better the significance of this action if we look back for a short while on the founding of our State, which in itself has a place in the immortal experiments of mankind. As we look around our troubled world today, we find added reason for paying homage to Roger Williams who carried on that lively experiment. The experiment has been, if not entirely successful, at least successful beyond the dreams of any of his contemporaries.

He lit a beacon which needs to be kept lighted to guide the erring steps of nations, some of which are wandering far from the principles our founder laid down as the true essentials of good government.

In a sense, Roger Williams himself produced America. Where but in Williams' concept of government and society do we find expressed the fundamentals on which our democracy is based? It was Williams, and he alone who, of all the leaders in colonial America, envisioned the ideal society which we should seek here—which, in truth, has been sought ever since.

In establishing Rhode Island, Williams created a community not to be confused with its neighbors. Rhode Island never was on the same basis as its fellow Colonies. Some of those Colonies were founded in the interest of business. Others were founded merely because of religious differences. Only in Rhode Island was there a forthright attempt to establish a new kind of religious and governmental society—one which rejected European political systems and all the remnants of them which persisted in all the other Colonies.

Williams was directly responsible for this establishment of a true democracy. He was the first to clarify, and the first to incorporate in fact, the principles of a democratic government. Here men were regarded as equal; here the "natural rights" of man were recognized; here the consent of the governed was essential to the government; and here, not least of all, authority recognized the right of rebellion.

All of these principles are challened today, not only passively by those who do not agree fully with them, but actively by those who set up a form of government in direct denial of these rights. These rights are challenged actively now more than at any time since they were enunciated by Williams. That spirit of Williams was the spirit of Rhode Island and became the spirit of America. It is for America, this land of the free, to keep that beacon shining. It calls for many sacrifices in the future. It is worth all of those sacrifices. Unless we are ready to make them, we renounce our heritage; we are faithless to our glorious past. Let us therefore gird up our loins to fight if necessary for the fundamental principles on which the State of Rhode Island was founded. Roger Williams not only proclaimed these principles. He was the first who put them into practice in an actual human experiment. The experiment was at the time called a "lively experiment." Let us resolve not to abandon it as dead, but to carry it on to its complete fulfillment.

The principles of Roger Williams on which our State was founded distinguished it from all the other Colonies and gradually became an American tradition, which had spread far and wide through America by the time of the American Revolution.

The years leading up to that revolution were troubled times for the little Colony of Rhode Island. The break became wider and wider between the mother country and the various Colonies, but nowhere did the love of civil liberty manifest itself more clearly, and nowhere was it incorporated into deeds earlier than in Rhode Island the birthplace of religious liberty. It was our general assembly which adopted the first resolution denying the right of any other power to levy taxes upon the colony. Our Governor was the only one who refused to take oath to support the Stamp Act. Our citizens committed the first overt act of violence by destroying the British sloop *Liberty*, at Newport. Our citizens occasioned the first bloodshed when burning the British schooner *Gaspee* at Providence.

It must be remembered that all the Colonies did not favor independence so early as Rhode Island did. It must also be remembered that all the people of Rhode Island itself did not act in unison in supporting the leaders whom we now revere. There were seven of the Colonies who protested against independence as late as March 1776, namely, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, compactly situated together, North Carolina in the South, and New Hampshire in the North. It must also be remembered that this declaration of independence by Rhode Island was not the first indication of her desire for independence. The resolution the Rhode Island General Assembly passed on the Stamp Act on December 16, 1765, was nearly equivalent to a declaration of independence. It refused adherence to any tax laws but its own. In fact, this independence as to tax laws dated back to the year 1732–33 when the colony in its petition to the English House of Commons first proclaimed the principle "no taxation without representation," and this as you remember became the war cry of the Revolution.

The attack on the *St. John* in 1764, the burning of the Maidstones boat on Newport Common in 1765, the capture and destruction of the sloop *Liberty* in Newport Harbor in 1769 all were indications of the growing popular feeling against England.

Between these dates Governor Ward in a letter to his son wrote, "These Colonies are destined to an early independence and you will live to see my words verified." He was the Governor, alone of all the governors of American Colonies, who refused to take oath to support the Stamp Act. These and many other acts against the authority of England were far in advance of what occurred in any of the other Colonies, and the declaration of independence was a climax of a whole series of statesman-like moves toward the Revolution which Rhode Island helped to bring about.

Some 2 years before this Declaration of Independence, Rhode Island made the first unofficial suggestion for a permanent Congress of American Colonies, and the first official call for a Continental Congress was voted at a Providence town meeting 3 days later.

About a year later, Commodore Abraham Whipple was placed in command of the first colonial Navy and in a sharp action defeated the British frigate *Rose*. This was the first naval action of the Revolution and the origin of the Continental Navy. There were so many privateers who sailed out from Narragansett Bay that Providence was given in England the nickname of Hornets' Nest.

Rhode Island contributed in every way to the Revolution both in men any money. As a matter of cold fact, there were only 4 States which contributed as much as Rhode Island in spite of her small size, and in proportion to population none could compare with her. Look at the States bordering on this city of Washington: Maryland, with four times as large a population as Rhode Island, contributed only two-thirds as much; Virginia, with eight times as large a population, contributed only one-half as much.

I might go on and on with a number of honorable firsts which can be claimed by Rhode Island, but I shall only mention one more. Rhode Island not only gave the Continental Navy its first commander in chief, but also gave the Continental Army its greatest leader under Washington, namely, Nathanael Greene, who served with him continuously for the 8 years of the war a glorious record of winning campaigns though losing battles.

Traditions connected with the founding of our State and later with its Declaration of Independence are a moving force in themselves. It is important for us to keep alive the remembrance of days such as this, to recur to their incidents and to draw inspiration from their example. The value of tradition to the citizens of a community like ours is real. The influence of tradition is good. Especially now, when the character of the population in our community is changing, it is important to emphasize our traditions, and a special duty devolves upon the descendants of the original stock to transmit to newcomers that patriotic enthusiasm which helps us all to live up to the obligations of citizenship. Those who have bidden goodby to the old home in the old country should realize, now that they have chosen here a new and lasting home and country, that here also land and sea are haunted by traditions no less picturesque than those of the old world. There is a work-a-day Rhine and there is a legendary Rhine. So there is a Narragansett Bay churned by the paddle wheels of excursion boats and there is a Narragansett Bay lapping the dream shores of happy-hunting grounds. Tales of heroism and daring can be found in our picturesque Rhode Island history to match any in the annals of old England. There should be awakened in Providence a civic pride comparable to that in antique Athens, or in medieval Florence or Nuremburg, or in modern Paris. They make an appeal to the eye of the lover of beauty. But the city of Providence, the home of Providence College, makes an even greater appeal to the heart of the lover of freedom. And it is as true now as in the day of Alcaeus that stones and wood cannot be fashioned by artisans to form a state, but where there are men who know how to take care of themselves, there is a state, even without cities or walls.

The Decisive Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Wednesday, May 2, 1951:

COMMUNISTS PAY PRICE

For the Communists the current price of Korean real estate is 1,875 casualties per mile.

The deepest Red penetration in the current offensive is 40 miles. The United Nations high command in Tokyo figures the enemy has suffered 75,000 men killed, wounded, and captured since the start of the attack. That figures out to 1,875 casualties per mile.

A United Press dispatch from Tokyo says there is far more at stake in this battle than appears on the surface. The Communists struck the U. N. lines on April 22 with a "first wave" of about 300,000 men. One out of every four of those men now is out of action, and the battle is not over.

"If the expected second attack by a fresh 300,000 men is repulsed as bloodily," writes

UP War Correspondent Peter Kalischer, "it may well dislocate the entire Communist plan for the conquest of Asia. It will also give the Russians something to think about in Europe. The terrible punishment suffered in the last 9 days has brought the Chinese up against the hard facts of military life."

There is a general feeling that if the Russians decided to start world war III in Europe they would sweep to the English Channel in a couple of weeks. It is understood Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower dissents from that viewpoint provided he has enough weapons and airplanes. He thinks a sturdy delaying action could be fought and that it might be possible, with a comparatively small force, to hold a bridgehead in western France from which the allied powers could reconquer the continent.

The same principle would be applied in that battle as is being applied today in Korea—firepower versus manpower—with the difference that the Russians would have more and better equipment than the Chinese Communists.

That is why Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway said that the present battle may well be the decisive one in Korea. He did not explain his reasons, but they are obvious in the face of the Communist casualty rate. A stunning defeat for the Chinese Reds would cause plenty of thinking in Peiping and, more important, Moscow.

Peiping would ask itself whether there was any point in sacrificing any more men when the over-all objective—driving the U. N. army out of Korea—was becoming more distant by the day.

Moscow would ask itself whether it was worth while to pour any more guns and planes down the drain.

If those two questions arise, there might be a negotiated peace.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. John T. Jones, director of Labor's Non-Partisan League. This letter deals with the universal military training bill and presents a viewpoint that is generally overlooked today in the hysteria and confusion that has been engendered over the building up of our Armed Forces. It is well that we should stop, look, and listen before we adopt a measure which is so far-reaching and runs counter to all of our American concepts.

The letter follows:

LABOR'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1951.

To all the officers and members United Mine Workers of America, Greetings:

Your attention is called to the passage of Senate bill No. 1, the universal military training and draft bill, passed by the Eighty-second Congress. It is now in conference between committees of the two Houses and will be returned for final vote in the near future.

This bill is a momentous one. It deals with the individual life of every young American. It decides who shall be obligated by law to give up a normal life as a free man, don a military uniform and obey without question the commands of a military caste, who will possess the power of life and death over each inducted citizen. It takes the 18-year-old boy away from the influence of the home, the church, and the school. He will be trained to kill and destroy during a period of life when his character is being molded. He will cease to till the land, man the mines and mills, go to school. For six formative years, he will be under military control. He will be unable to enter business, accept a permanent job, marry, raise a family or build a home, except at the risk of having his plans disrupted, his home life broken up, and his business ruined by the orders of a dominant, ruthless military caste who, until now, has had no place in the peacetime American way of life. This bill will form "a poor man's army" since every prospective college student will take an examination prepared by the military and be exempt from service by the local draft board, at their option.

This law cannot go into effect until a period of peace and tranquillity settles upon the land. Experts predict 10 years of unsettled existence for this Nation. So why the great rush for universal military training? Because the ruthless military mind behind this totally foreign legislation is taking advantage of the average citizen, his worry, his feeling of insecurity and general lack of knowledge, to jam down his throat this despotic, totalitarian power. This power can be exercised at any moment to sweep away every vestige of individual liberty and put every young man in America at the arbitrary disposal of the military Mussolinis who rule with an iron hand.

The United Mine Workers of America have opposed universal military training ever since our union was formed. The sons and grandsons of those pioneers in the labor movement are surely no less determined to defend their precious liberties than their forefathers. One by one we are losing our freedoms in the name of expediency. We are forgetting that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

The House bill provides that 6 months hence, a universal military training bill written by a commission, shall be studied and approved by the Armed Services Committee and submitted to the House for consideration and debate. Every local union and every member of the United Mine Workers of America is asked to write their Congressman requesting him to oppose any conference report which contains universal military training legislation.

Fraternally yours,
JOHN T. JONES, *Director.*

Henry Wallace Advised China Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, how large a part, I wonder, did Henry Wallace play in the disastrous American policy decisions regarding China—particularly those made by President Truman late in 1945?

I believe it would be highly enlightening to the American people, and entirely relevant to the broad issues of the present far eastern situation, to have the answer to that question.

In his testimony on the opening day of the current hearings being conducted by the other body, General MacArthur testified that as far as any consultation on the future of China by Washington authorities, outside of the legislative branch, the answer is in the negative; my views have never been required.

More specifically, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] asked:

Has the State Department ever consulted with you when they were sending General Marshall or General Hurley, or sending the others over there?

General MacArthur's answer was:

None whatsoever.

Questioned by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, General MacArthur offered these views:

It is my own personal opinion that the greatest political mistake we made in a hundred years in the Pacific, was in allowing the Communists to grow in power in China.

I think, at one stroke, we undid everything, starting from John Hay, through Taft, Leonard Wood, Woodrow Wilson, Henry Stimson, and all those great architects of our Pacific policy.

I believe it was fundamental, and I believe we will pay for it for a century.

Asked what he would have done or advised under the circumstances that existed back there in 1945, General MacArthur replied:

I would have given such assistance to the conservative government of China as to have checked the growing tide of communism. A very little help and assistance, in my belief, at that time, would have accomplished the purpose.

Thereupon the senior Senator from Wisconsin asked specifically about the efforts, launched in 1945, to effect a coalition of the Chinese Nationalist Government and the Chinese Communists. He asked General MacArthur:

Would you have sought to have gotten those two forces together? Would you have amalgamated the Commies and Nationalists, have gotten them together?

General MacArthur's response was as emphatic as it was brief:

Just about as much chance as getting them together as that oil and water will mix.

As I reminded the House in an address on April 16, 1951, General MacArthur "is no Johnny-come-lately so far as recognizing the menace in the Far East," or so far as his views on the coalition policy adopted in 1945 is concerned.

I recalled that in 1947 General MacArthur had said to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], during the latter's visit to Tokyo:

Our failure to help the government of China effectively at the end of the war, with its otherwise insuperable problems, particularly the Communist rebellion, will turn out, I fear, to be the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States. For the first time in our relations with Asia, we confused the paramount strategic interests of the United States in that area with an internal purification problem in China.

In his current testimony General MacArthur recalled that he had also given his views, in written form, to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the spring of 1948 at the committee's invitation. I quoted this statement at length in my April 16 address. I now repeat just one

paragraph, since it is the crux of his appraisal of the American blunder in the Far East:

The international aspect of the Chinese problem unfortunately has become somewhat clouded by demands for internal reform. Desirable as such reform may be, its importance is but secondary to the issue of civil strife now engulfing the land, and the two issues are as impossible of synchronization as it would be to alter the structural design of a house while the same was being consumed by flame. Friendly and searching as our interest may be in the reformation of China's institutions and practices to bring them closer into line with our own concept of liberty and justice, and right and wrong, the maintenance of China's integrity against destructive forces which threaten her engulfment is of infinitely more immediate concern. For with the firm maintenance of such integrity, reform will gradually take place in the evolutionary processes of China's future.

This is the counsel of General MacArthur, in 1947 and 1948, given when it was solicited by a Member and a committee of this House. But what about the executive branch and the Department of State late in 1945, when the fatal policy of attempted coalition of Nationalists and Communists was being forged? We know that they did not solicit General MacArthur's counsel. Whose counsel was sought?

You will recall that Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley resigned late in 1945 in indignation, charging that—

The professional Foreign Service men—

That is of our own State Department—

sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the Nationalist Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

In the interim between the resignation of General Hurley and the assignment of General Marshall to China to work for "unification" in that country—including in that unification the Chinese Communists who were specifically mentioned in the President's instructions to General Marshall—to whom did the President of the United States turn for counsel? Not to General MacArthur, certainly. The identity of all of his advisers at this critical, interim stage of policy making is obscure, but here is one significant clue:

At that very time a responsible national news magazine reported:

Commerce Secretary Wallace, who went on a special mission to China in 1944 for the late President Roosevelt, has been a constant adviser to President Truman on Chinese relations since the Hurley explosion. It was Wallace who first tried to get Chungking and the Communists together.

Now precisely what were Henry Wallace's qualifications for this role of "constant adviser to President Truman on Chinese relations"?

Well, as already indicated, he had gone to China in 1944 on a special mission for President Roosevelt.

Henry Wallace was in China exactly 4 days on that trip. Thereupon he became an expert on Chinese relations.

Mr. Wallace was accompanied on this 4-day study of wartime China's problems by John Carter Vincent, director of the Far Eastern Office of the State Department.

We have no record of the counsel which Mr. Wallace gave President Truman in those crucial decision-shaping days of late 1945. But from two sources we do know something of Henry Wallace's views and conclusions—or confirmed preconceptions—regarding his trip to China.

In January 1950, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] made public a summary of the Wallace report which he had received from Mr. Wallace.

Here are a few noteworthy extracts.

Mr. Wallace said that principal topics discussed with President Chiang Kai-shek included:

Chinese Government-Communist relations, in regard to which Chiang showed himself so prejudiced against the Communists that there seemed little prospect of satisfactory or enduring settlement as a result of the negotiations now under way in Chungking.

Need for reform in China, particularly agrarian reform, to which Chiang agreed without much indication of personal interest.

Mr. Wallace drew some conclusions:

Chiang, at best, is a short-term investment. It is not believed that he has the intelligence or political strength to run postwar China. The leaders of postwar China will be brought forward by evolution or revolution, and it now seems more likely the latter.

Our policy at the present time should not be limited to support of Chiang. * * *

We can, as an alternative, support those elements which are capable of forming a new coalition, better able to carry the war to a conclusion and better qualified for the postwar needs of China.

Then Mr. Wallace made a recommendation which unquestionably is the germ of tactic which President Truman, a year and one-half later, in December 1945, incorporated in his instructions to General Marshall. Wallace wrote in his 1944 summary of his report:

The emergence of such a coalition could be aided by the manner of alloting both American military aid and economic aid, and by the formulation and statement of American political aims and sympathies, both in China and in regions adjacent to China. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 599.)

Compare this with the following from President Truman's letter—December 15, 1945—of instruction to General Marshall upon his appointment as special representative of the President to China:

I desire that you endeavor to persuade the Chinese Government to call a national conference of representatives of the major political elements to bring about the unification of China. * * *

It is my understanding that there is now in session in Chungking a Peoples' Consultative Council made up of representatives of the various political elements, including the Chinese Communists. The meeting of this council should furnish you with a convenient opportunity for discussions with the various political leaders.

* * * Particularly you may state (to Chiang Kai-shek and other Chinese leaders) in connection with the Chinese desire for credits, technical assistance in the economic field, and military assistance (I have in mind the proposed U. S. military advisory group which I have approved in principle), that a China disunited and torn by civil strife could not be considered realistically as a proper place for American assistance along the lines enumerated. (United States Relations With China, pp. 605-606.)

There is another, and in some respects more revealing, source of insight into the "realistic" qualifications which Henry Wallace possessed as an adviser to President Truman, particularly so far as his estimate of communism in China was concerned. This source is the "Summary Notes of Conversations" between Mr. Wallace and President Chiang, June 21-24, 1944, found in pages 549-559 of the China White Paper of August 1949.

Here are some of the more enlightening excerpts:

He—

Chiang—

said that the Chinese people did not regard the Communists as Chinese, but regarded them as internationalists, subject to the orders of the Third International. Mr. Wallace mentioned the fact that the Third International had been dissolved but President Chiang indicated that the situation had not been altered by that fact (pp. 552-553).

He—

Chiang—

said that the Communists desired a breakdown of Chinese resistance against the Japanese because this would strengthen their own position. Mr. Wallace expressed amazement at this statement. President Chiang admitted that the Communists desire the defeat of Japan but that they were now convinced that this defeat could be accomplished without Chinese resistance. They therefore hoped for the collapse of the Kuomintang prior to the end of the war because such a collapse would enable them to seize power, whereas, if the Kuomintang continued in power until peace the Communists would have no opportunity to supplant it. President Chiang referred to the clever Communist propaganda to the effect that they were not tied to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that they were in fact nothing more than agrarian democrats. As a mattter of fact, the Communists follow the orders of the Third International. The Chinese Government cannot openly criticize the Communists for their connection with the Third International because it is afraid of offending the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Mr. Wallace referred to the patriotic attitude of the Communists in the United States and said that he could not understand the attitude of the Chinese Communists, as described by President Chiang. President Chiang said that this difference in the attitude of the American and Chinese Communists might be explained by the fact that there was no possibility of the American Communists seizing power, whereas the Chinese Communists definitely desired to do so in China (p. 553).

Thus did the hard-headed battler of the Communists since the 1920's try to lead the visionary Wallace by the hand to a better acquaintance with the facts of life. He did not get far. Wallace commented, later in the same conversation, and "if, as President Chiang stated, the Chinese Communists were linked

with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, then there was even greater need for settlement" (p. 554).

The following day, according to Vincent's notes, Wallace took the tack with Chiang that "we are not interested in 'Chinese Communists' but are interested in the prosecution of the war." In that connection, Vincent adds a significant parenthetical note:

He—

Wallace—

and Mr. Vincent had decided upon this line of approach the night before in order to avoid further lengthy discussion of the Communists per se.

Even so, Mr. Wallace did not keep Chiang entirely away from the subject. The Generalissimo complained with obvious justification:

Much pressure has been brought to bear by the United States Government to have the Chinese Government reach a settlement with the Communists but the United States Government has exerted no pressure upon the Communists (p. 555).

To which I might add that Chiang, in 1944, "hadn't seen anything yet," along that line.

Mr. Wallace offered the gratuitous advice to Chiang that "there should be no situation in China which might lead to conflict with the U. S. S. R." At the same time he explained that the United States could not be expected to be a party to negotiations between China and the USSR, which takes on the character of a masterpiece of irony in view of what President Roosevelt subsequently agreed to, in the way of the betrayal of China, less than a year later at Yalta.

Mr. Wallace also gave Chiang the benefit of his wisdom on the subject of communism. He said, according to Mr. Vincent's notes, that "insofar as the Communists have power and influence it is due to economic conditions," and Mr. Vincent chimed in that "the best defense against communism in China was agrarian reform."

On the way to the airport to see Mr. Wallace off, President Chiang gave him his estimate of the Communists:

He—

Chiang—

feels that the Chinese Communists are not men of good faith. Their signature is no good. He would not like to see the President blamed for Communist failure to carry out commitments. The Generalissimo is a true friend who knows the Chinese Communists through and through and thinks that no matter what the Communists say they will do, it will not be carried out in which case the President's prestige would suffer a great loss. The Generalissimo wants the President to know that the conflict between the Communists and the Central Government is not like that between capitalism and labor in the United States—the situations are not analogous (p. 559).

The President then, of course, was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Judging from the decisions made by his successor, President Truman, and by the policy of appeasement toward the Chinese Communists carried out on Truman's instructions by General Marshall, Mr. Wallace, as constant adviser to President Truman in those critical decision days of late 1945 did not convince Mr. Truman of the soundness of Chiang Kai-shek's counsel. We know, of course, that Mr. Wallace wasn't convinced himself.

It is a curious sequel to this ill-fated relationship between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Truman in the China-policy-shaping days of late 1945, that when, as Chiang had predicted, his prestige began to suffer loss through the faithlessness of the Chinese Communists, Mr. Truman undertook to pretend that he had never favored including Chinese Communists in the Chinese Government.

The New York Times for March 12, 1948, quoted the President as saying, at a press conference, in answer to the direct question that if it was or had been American policy to favor inclusion of Communists in the Chinese Government "it was news to him." Yet the day before the same newspaper quoted Secretary of State Marshall as saying that the United States Government still favored broadening the base of the Chinese Government to include Communists.

Of such confusion and contradictions, was born our present tragic situation in the Far East. How lamentable that Wallace-Marshall-Truman shaped the decisive policy in 1945, when no one in the administration thought to consult General MacArthur.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article that appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on May 3, 1951:

POLISH INDEPENDENCE DAY

May 3, 1791, is a date comparable in Polish history to July 4, 1776, in American annals. Just 160 years ago today Poland's Constitution was reformed by men of vigor, character, and capacity in its Diet who took advantage of favorable international developments to do away with its old, out-moded government.

The death of Frederick the Great in 1786 loosened the bonds of the alliance between Prussia and Russia. Russia undertook with Austria a war against Turkey, and Russia at the same time was attacked by Sweden. Prussia invited Poland to forsake her Russian alliance and offered to place 40,000 at her disposal.

But these advantageous external developments were useless so long as Poland was hampered by her anarchical constitution. The strong men in the Diet, taking advantage of an Easter recess when the malcontents were out of town, demanded reforms. King Stanislaus exhorted the deputies to accept the new constitution, and a brand-new era dawned for the Poles.

The change converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy. Invidious class distinctions were abolished. The towns got full administrative and judicial autonomy and a certain measure of parliamentary representation. The peasants were placed under the protection of the law, and their serfdom mitigated. Absolute religious toleration was established.

While Poland has seen many sorrowful days in the years which have intervened, 1791 stands out as a red-letter year in her history. Here in Lynn residents of Polish birth or descent will celebrate the anniversary Sunday with appropriate ceremonies. Their fellow citizens of good will will join with them in their prayers for a brighter day for their valiant homeland.

Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by George Kosciusko Weaver, who resides at 621 North Main Street, Louisburg, N. C., and is a member of the senior class of the W. R. Mills School, Louisburg, N. C. This essay is entitled "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped," and it won second prize in the contest conducted by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped. This contest was entered into by representatives of the high school students in 34 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and there were five awards. Each of the other four awards were won by young ladies, but the second award, which consisted of a trip to Washington and $400, was won by Mr. Weaver, the splendid high school student of Louisburg, N. C. These students visited Washington on Friday, May 4, 1951, and received the awards at the United States Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By George Kosciusko Weaver)

Listen, America. May we have a moment of your time? A moment is all we ask, but it is truly a crucial one. Interrupt your daily routine, and listen to what we have to say. We assure you, you will not regret it. We are the voices of the physically handicapped. We speak in many tongues; we abide in many locales, and we ask for but one thing: To be given a chance—a chance to prove our worthiness and capabilities. We will do the rest.

You might ask, "Who are the physically handicapped? How can I help them if I do not know who they are?" You have only to look around to see us. Some of us are war casualties. Some have been disabled in accidents, some because of illness. The young man down the street who lost a leg in the war is one of use. The pretty but crippled young girl who had infantile paralysis is, too. We are at least 7,000,000 strong, and day by day we are increasing the working force of the United States to new heights. Rehabilitation agencies and groups are go-

ing a long way in enabling us to become competent and skilled workers, but much still remains to be done. A little encouragement and reassurance from you can go a long way in reinstating our pride and helping us to find the position that is congruent to our abilities.

Many of us are bewildered and fearful because of indifferent reactions on the part of our fellowman upon learning that we are handicapped in some manner. You can show your faith in us by giving us a chance for equal employment. This would help in giving us release from mental anguish, from an acquired feeling of inferiority, and from being called the "tin cup" brigade. To refuse us this may mean total destruction of our very life, for we will remain broken in body and spirit. Give us a chance at this thing called happiness. If you are interested at all in the welfare of our country, the well-being of its citizens, you are interested in the employment of us, the physically handicapped.

Some of us have been given this chance. Have we not proved our proficiency in many walks of life far better than expected? Our high output and efficiency records have equaled that of the unimpaired and excelled it in many places. We ask only that you take our records and study them carefully. Study them closely so that you may realize that we are just as capable of turning out excellent work as the nonhandicapped worker. After all, we are actually disabled only when our disabilities hamper us in performing the duties of a certain job. Analysis of our problems can easily determine which jobs we are capable of handling and which we are not. You must realize that in order to utilize the full potentiality of the Nation's working population, our talents and abilities must not be lost because of prejudiced and biased opinions on the part of the employers and employees. When we can do a job well, we are no longer considered handicapped as far as that job is concerned.

You have no doubt seen our slogan: Hire the Handicapped, It's Good Business, and have probably asked, Why should I hire the handicapped, when I can get all the employees I need from the ranks of the unimpaired? The answer to this question is obvious. Take another close look at our records. You will see that we have proved outstanding in the ability to adapt ourselves to existing requirements. We have an excellent record in carefulness and safety. We have demonstrated our proficiency in productiveness; our reliability and regularity record equals that of any working force in the Nation. These facts substantiate beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is good business to hire the handicapped.

If you are still a bit incredulous about our records as a whole, why not look at the individual ones? Your local rehabilitation agency will be more than glad to supply you with countless case histories of successful restitution which later led to profitable employment and happiness. Among our forefathers, you will find many notables who had some serious physical handicap but who overcame it to leave their footprints on the sands of time. Was not Milton blind, Edison and Beethoven deaf? As for our contemporaries, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the greatest leaders our country has ever had, was crippled by infantile paralysis. Helen Keller, one of the greatest among women, became deaf and blind at a very early age. In overcoming her handicap, she has inspired many who otherwise probably would have never tried.

Many of us do not realize what is being done for our benefit. In this respect, it is the duty of the community to show those who are discouraged and disillusioned that a genuine effort is being made by the ones who understand our problems to locate a job adapted to our specific talent and ability. There are an estimated 6,000,000 of us who are employed while there is an estimated million who are not, but who are willing and who could be added to the working force of the Nation through better training and rehabilitation facilities, suited to the individual. Open the door of opportunity to us, and do unto us as you would have us do unto you were the tables turned and you were physically handicapped.

Why not give us this chance? Take our interests at heart and grant us the privilege of taking our rightful place in the community, State, and Nation. It is the people's way. It is the American way, the democratic way; and most important of all, it is God's way.

The Basic Pay of Commissioned and Enlisted Personnel of Our Armed Forces Should Be Regulated in Accordance With the Cost-of-Living Index

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced House bill 3991 to provide that the basic pay of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of our Armed Forces should be regulated in accordance with the cost-of-living index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

The bill provides that the President shall examine annually on May 15 the status of the cost-of-living index in relation to the pay scale as established by Congress October 1, 1949. Whenever the President finds that the cost-of-living index has risen above or fallen below the cost-of-living index of October 1, 1949, in excess of 3 percent, an adjustment in the basic pay of all members of the armed services shall be made as of July 1 of the calendar year in which such determination is made. In other words, the adjustment in pay scales is not retroactive.

When Congress passed the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and made it effective October 1, 1949, it represented the results of a comprehensive study by Congress and a similar study by an all-civilian commission appointed by the Secretary of Defense in 1947 and commonly called the Hook Commission.

It was found by the Hook commission after an exhaustive research into wages paid by industry of comparable jobs and taking into consideration the economic condition of the country during the summer of 1949 that the pay scales for ranks and grades of our Armed Forces were away out of line and needed adjustment. As a result, the Hook Commission presented to Congress pay scales that it felt were fair and equitable to all concerned. In submitting its recommendations the Hook Commission informed Congress that it felt that the spread of the pay scale was as sound at that time as it was possible to make it. At the same time, it was pointed out that as the country's economic condition changed from time to time, a flat percentage increase or decrease across the board to all concerned should be applied to pay and allowances so as not to upset the spread of pay scales as finally agreed upon.

Before Congress enacted into law the recommendations of the Hook Commission, it followed the cost-of-living index and reduced the proposed officers base pay 5 percent and enlisted personnel's base pay by 2 percent. Subsistence allowance was also reduced by $3. In other words, before the recommendations could be written into law the cost of living dropped with the result that the proposed pay scales were adjusted accordingly.

Since the Career Compensation Act of 1949 was approved by Congress, there has been a considerable change in the economic condition of the country. The cost-of-living index published monthly by the Department of Labor shows a decided upward swing since the fall of 1949. The following comparison between the index of August 1949 and February 1951 plainly shows the status of the take-home pay of the members of the military services in regard to the economic position of the country:

Table (furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U. S. Department of Labor)

	Over-all	Food	Apparel	Rent	Fuel, electricity, refrigeration	House furnishings	Miscellaneous
August 1949	168.8	202.6	187.4	120.8	135.7	184.8	154.8
February 1951	183.8	226.0	202.0	134.0	143.9	209.7	169.2
Percentage rise	11.6	7.8	11.0	6.6	13.5	10.5	

A study of the above table reveals that since the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the over-all average cost of living increase is 9 percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

Keeping in mind that military personnel are located by and large in congested areas the cost of living percentages would reflect even greater changes for them because of shortages of housing, and so forth, which tend to increase rates due to the congested area conditions. Then, too, frequent moves of the service family tend to cause their expenses for house furnishings to be greater than the average, when they have to more frequently set up housekeeping in new locations. This factor also influences the miscellaneous category which shows an increase of 10.5 percent.

When taking into consideration these additional factors one can readily see that the over-all cost-of-living increase for service personnel could be estimated in the neighborhood of 10 percent to 12 percent for the categories listed above.

Practically all forms of transportation, both local and national, have increased a great deal in cost during this period. A major point the Hook Commission took into consideration in their study was the Armed Forces income-tax exemption which was repealed effective

January 1, 1949. The Commission took this loss of exemption into account so that no member of the Armed Forces actually took a cut in his over-all salary. Since the enactment of the Career Compensation Act, the withholding tax rate for Federal income tax has been increased from 15 to 18 percent. This results in a decrease in the take-home pay not contemplated by the Hook Commission, while at the same time the cost of living has steadily increased.

It is common knowledge that the cost-of-living index is used as a pattern for the pay of personnel in private industry and on that basis several pay increases have been granted since 1949. Yet, to date no consideration has been given to living expenses of military personnel.

I hope that my bill, H. R. 3991, will receive immediate consideration by Congress so that those men and women who serve in our Armed Forces will be given the same consideration as accorded those who work in private industry.

The American Pretzel

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to your attention that Wednesday of this week will mark an important anniversary in the industrial and social life of my district and, in fact, of the entire Nation.

May 9 marks the celebration of the creation of what has virtually become a national institution—the American pretzel, which is 90 years old this month.

Actually, I might point out, the pretzel is many centuries old, dating back to earliest religious rites. But the commercial pretzel, a tribute to the heralded American ingenuity and business acumen, was born in the tiny town of Lititz, Pa., in the Ninth Congressional District in 1861.

Like so many things American, the pretzel has its roots in many cultures. In ancient Rome, the pretzel symbolized victory in battle; while in the early monasteries it meant the crossed arms of prayer. To us it is a symbol of our ability to synthesize basic ingredients into a product vastly superior to its ancestors. Incidentally your early pretzel was known in Italy as "brazitella" and in Germany as "brezel."

But all these early pretzels had a life span of only one day. They were baked in the corner bake shop, and were eaten only by people close to the bakery. It remained for an American to invent a formula which would keep pretzels fresh for days and weeks and even months. And it took American businessmen to carry the pretzel to every home, to establish the pretzel as a part of our everyday lives.

Never sneer at the pretzel, nor discount its impact on the economy of the Nation. Munch instead for a moment on the fact that approximately 100,000,000 pounds of pretzels are made and consumed in the United States each year. One hundred million pounds of pretzels, more than the total displacement of our largest battleship, the *Mighty Mo*, the U. S. S. *Missouri*.

A plaque will be unveiled on the N. D. Sturgis pretzel plant, where, in 1861, an itinerant baker revealed a secret formula he had devised to make commercial pretzels. Almost like a symbol of American resourcefulness, like a Johnny Appleseed, this unknown baker planted the seed of the American pretzel at Lititz, and then quietly moved on.

From that seed grew the international pretzel industry, which has carried the pretzel to us all.

As a supplement to these remarks, I would call to your attention the following chronological account of the development of the pretzel to its present culinary perfection. And for more tangible evidence concerning this Pennsylvania Dutch delicacy I would invite you to help yourself to the pretzels which will be placed in the cloak rooms and on the tables in the House dining rooms through the courtesy of the National Pretzel Bakers Institute. You will find them to be a delightful version of an old twist. The above-mentioned follows:

FACTS ABOUT THE NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRETZEL

The inhabitants of the hamlet of Lititz, Pa. (population 5,500), will devote May 9, 1951, to the American pretzel. On that date Lititz will step back to the year 1861, when the first commercial pretzel was baked in a Lititz oven.

Schoolchildren, businessmen and other burghers of Lititz will participate in the holiday. Gov. John S. Fine and other State dignitaries, and show-business figures, will join descendants of the first pretzel baker in the observance of the humble start of an international industry.

As the culmination of the ceremonies, a plaque, dedicated by the National Pretzel Bakers Institute, will be unveiled on the N. D. Sturgis pretzel factory, site of the first commercial pretzel. The marker will be unveiled by Linda Herr, 6, and Robert Spickler, 8, great grandchild, and great-great grandchild respectively, of the first pretzel baker.

Following is the Lititz legend: The first skirmishes of the Civil War were being waged when a wanderer strolled into the tranquillity of the picturesque Pennsylvania Dutch community of Lititz. The vagabond, his sack slung to a stick over his shoulder, stopped at the tiny shop of baker William H. Rauch, and requested a temporary job. "I'm a wandering man," he explained, "I don't know how long I'll stay." Baker Rauch wiped his flour-covered hands on the apron that covered his round belly, and smiled, "Stay as long as you like."

And so, the itinerant baker went to work for Rauch, making, among other delicacies, the light, flavorful pretzels for which the Pennsylvania Dutch were famous. But, as wonderful as they were, these pretzels became stale after 24 hours.

Baker Rauch fed his transient employee the good, wholesome upstate Dutch dishes. Most of all, Rauch offered his hobo baker the warmth and hospitality of his home. Finally, however, the urge to move on forced the wanderer to leave. In gratitude, the vagabond baker showed old man Rauch a formula he had invented to make pretzels that would stay fresh; pretzels that could be made in quantity and sold days later.

But Baker Rauch did not appreciate the value of the secret formula. He gave the formula to his apprentice, Julius Sturgis. Sturgis then established the first pretzel factory in the world on Main Street in Lititz. This historic plant is still in operation producing the pretzel that made Lititz famous.

From this inauspicious beginning, from the gratitude of a vagabond baker, grew the pretzel industry. Today almost 100,000,000 pounds of pretzels are baked each year, baked with the secret formula presented to Baker Rauch 90 years ago.

The origin of the humble pretzel is shrouded in antiquity; it has been traced back through prereligious associations to basic life symbolism. The first neopretzels were made to celebrate the worship of wheat as a giver of life.

In an approximation of chronological order: the pretzel is believed to be a descendant of the Hebrew bagel; it was a symbol of victory in battle to the ancient Romans; used for healing and in burial ceremonies; as a symbol of prayer to the medieval church, and for the observance of the New Year in middle Europe.

In the ancient monasteries, the pretzel, representing the crossed arms of prayer, was given to children as a reward for the successful completion of their catechism.

It was used by the medieval bakers guilds as the honored badge of their trade. And it was proudly emblazoned by Emperor Frederick of Prussia after the bakers rescued his armies from a major defeat in battle.

There are two derivations suggested for the name pretzel. One begins with the Latin "bracellus," meaning "armlet"—to the Italian "bracciella"—to old high German "brazitella"—to the middle high German "brezel"—to dialect "bretzel"—to the current word "pretzel."

Another source traces the name back to the Latin "pretiola" meaning "small gift," which the monks would offer to worthy child students.

The pretzel, at one time, was so integral a part of the church procedure that a Roman Catholic ban once prohibited its usage in any other connection.

However, after many centuries, the pretzel became even more inextricably associated with the Bavarian beer hall. Beer and pretzels were a pair rivaling ham and eggs, or moon and June.

It was the Germans who brought the pretzel to the new continent. As early as 1613 pretzels came to America, to the new community of Germantown, in Pennsylvania.

From 1613 to 1861 pretzels were almost exclusive to the Pennsylvania German communities. The major reason for their restricted usage was their impermanence. Pretzels had to be hand-rolled and twisted, and baked either in a home oven or at the corner bake shop. They had a freshness span of only 1 day.

But then, the tramp visited Lititz, and devised the formula which made pretzels available to the world.

From the original pretzel factory belonging to Julius Sturgis, apprentices carried the pretzel formula throughout up-State Pennsylvania, where some 70 percent of all pretzels are still made; and thence to Ohio, Michigan, and other States.

Still, pretzels were associated chiefly with beer, until the appearance on the pretzel panorama of Harold H. Moss.

An ex-clergyman turned pretzel publicist, silver-haired, blond-browed Moss devoted himself with truly religious zeal to the homely pretzel. Single-handedly, Moss carried the pretzel out of the beer hall.

Moss sold the nation on pretzels and ice cream. He invented pretzel variations like the pretzel stick, chocolate-covered and peppermint flavored pretzels. He foraged through the kitchens of the Pennsylvania Dutch communities and came up with pret-

zel soups, pretzel salads, pretzel soufflés and pancakes.

Another great stimulus to pretzel sales was the advent of the pretzel-twisting machine. A serious shortage of pretzel-benders was imminent in 1938 when the mechanical twister made its welcome appearance.

From a poundage in 1938 of 52,000,000, Moss and the machine twister lifted pretzel sales to the present figure of almost 100,000,000 pounds.

In addition, 92.2 percent of all pretzels are now sold in groceries, delicatessens and school cafeterias.

After a long, long journey, the pretzel has finally found its way home.

Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks during general debate on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1952, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the fine cooperation of the other members of the subcommittee in conducting the hearings, in writing the bill, and passing it through the House. Mr. GORE, of Tennessee, and Mr. ANDREWS, of Alabama, are veteran members of the Appropriations Committee and have had much experience as members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee. Their assistance has been indispensable. Their service to the Nation and to their districts is outstanding. Their judgment is always excellent; their sense of fairness is always present. On the minority side, we have such outstanding old timers, so to speak, as Mr. PHILLIPS, of California, and Mr. COUDERT, of New York. Mr. PHILLIPS is the ranking Republican member and he does an outstanding job. He is always courteous, polite, and at all times knows all the facts and figures in every proceeding. His district and the entire State of California and the Nation can well be proud of him. In this subcommittee which deals largely with bipartisan commissions, very little partisan politics is indulged in. Mr. COUDERT brings a wealth of business experience to the committee. His ideas and good judgment always carry great weight with the other members. We have for the first time on our subcommittee, even though they are old members of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. YATES, of Illinois, and Mr. NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire. Mr. YATES is brilliant and hard-working. He has taken a most active part in conducting hearings and writing the bill. He has added much balance to the committee. Mr. COTTON, of New Hampshire, has a wealth of what we Texans call common horse sense and is an outstanding credit to all of New England and to the great State of New Hampshire which he so ably represents. All of us like him and admire him.

Much has been said on the floor of this House today about the provision on pages 49 and 50 of the bill under "Maritime activities" relating to payments by the United States on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss of vessels.

The tabulation which follows shows for a small number of ships chosen at random by the Maritime Administration the acquisition cost to the owner, the amount paid by the Maritime Commission for charter hire, and the amount paid the owner when the ship was sunk. It should be noted that more than 750 such ships were lost during the war. Following this tabulation is a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dealing with the same subject matter.

[T/c—Time charter. B/b—Bare boat]

Owner and ship	From WSA charter	To WSA charter	Rate per month	Total charter hire paid	Year built	Year acquired by owner	Estimated cost to owner	Date lost	Amount paid for loss
Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc., *Alcoa Leader:*									
MC	Dec. 13, 1941	May 13, 1942	$37,560.00						
WSA T/c	May 13, 1942	May 16, 1942	32,800.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Dec. 1, 1943	31,800.00	$1,048,469.73	1919	1940	$210,000	June 30, 1944	$435,307
T/c	Dec. 1, 1943	June 10, 1944	33,040.00						
T/c	June 10, 1944	June 30, 1944	27,600.00						
American Hawaiian Steamship Co., *Pennsylvanian:*									
T/c	Feb. 2, 1942	May 16, 1942	40,191.25						
T/c	May 16, 1942	July 13, 1943	42,735.00	825,192.77	1913	1943	715,786	June 30, 1944	565,910
B/b	July 13, 1943	June 30, 1944	13,329.25						
American South African Line, *Lancaster:*									
T/c	Feb. 17, 1942	May 16, 1942	43,425.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Dec. 30, 1942	46,320.00	507,563.93	1918	1940	305,688	Dec. 30, 1942	863,295
American West African Line, West Kebar: T/c	May 25, 1942	Oct. 29, 1942	37,149.00	226,767.69	1920	1928	231,508	Oct. 29, 1942	640,500
Grace Lines, Tachira: T/c	June 8, 1942	July 12, 1942	21,411.00	47,865.98	1920	1937	45,600	July 12, 1942	256,200
Isthmian Steamship Co., Chickasaw City: T/c	May 30, 1942	Oct. 7, 1942	40,000.00	195,297.71	1920	1920	864,471	Oct. 7, 1942	731,250
Luckenbach Steamship Co., Lena Luckenbach:									
T/c	Feb. 4, 1942	May 16, 1942	40,621.35						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Dec. 1, 1943	43,259.10	1,217,402.96	1920	1922	332,565	June 30, 1944	662,429
T/c	Dec. 1, 1943	June 30, 1944	40,937.88						
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., *Louise Lykes:*									
T/c	May 2, 1942	May 16, 1942	43,424.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Jan. 9, 1943	45,784.00	391,507.42	1941	1941	1,263,304	Jan. 9, 1943	1,191,552
Matson Navigation Co., *Honomu:*									
T/c	Mar. 22, 1942	May 16, 1942	38,400.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	July 5, 1942	40,960.00	129,615.45	1919	1937	127,562	July 5, 1942	768,000
Waterman Steamship Corp., *Antinous:*									
T/c	Apr. 14, 1942	May 16, 1942	38,500.00						
T/c	May 16, 1942	Sept. 24, 1942	41,000.00	233,164.08	1920	1931	86,436	Sept. 24, 1942	772,000

	Built	Dead-weight tons	Year acquired	Estimated construction cost	Estimated cost to owner	Charter hire— From—	Charter hire— To—	Rate of hire per month	Total charter paid
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.: Volunteer:									
Dry cargo, MC	1918	11,850	1937	$2,151,566.67	$101,049.42	Nov. 28, 1941	Aug. 8, 1942	$53,325.00	
WSA T/c						Sept. 6, 1942	Dec. 1, 1943	47,400.00	
T/c						Dec. 1, 1943	Aug. 29, 1944	44,100.00	$1,769,846.09
B/b						Aug. 29, 1944	Apr. 19, 1946	14,812.50	

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1951.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of today requests my comments on the following provision carried in the appropriation for maritime activities of the Department of Commerce on pages 49 and 50 of the Independent Offices appropriation bill, 1952, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations:

"No money appropriated by this or any other act may be used for the payment to the owner on account of the purchase, requisition, or loss for which the United States is responsible of any vessel previously sold by the United States in an amount in excess of the price paid the United States depreciated as hereinafter provided, plus depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel, subsequent to such sale by the United States: *Provided*, That, in the case of any vessel the price of which has been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as

amended, the payment shall not exceed the statutory sales price of such vessel as of March 8, 1946, depreciated, plus the depreciated cost of capital improvements made on such vessel subsequent to such date: *Provided further*, That in the case of a bona fide purchaser for value, the payment may equal but not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hand of such purchaser determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code. If any vessel previously sold by the United States is chartered or taken for use by the United States, the charter hire paid for bareboat use of the vessel shall not be based on a value in excess of the payment permitted under the preceding provisions in case the vessel were purchased by the United States. Depreciation under the preceding provisions shall be computed in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax purposes, or, in the absence of any such schedule, depreciation shall be computed at the rate of 5 per centum per annum. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, neither the Secretary of Commerce nor the Federal Maritime Board shall determine, for any purpose whatsoever, a valuation for any vessel previously sold by the United States, except in accordance with the preceding provisions."

An identical provision was included in the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1951, H. R. 3587, as passed by the House, but was stricken from the bill when reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. That provision was submitted by the Maritime Administrator at the request of your subcommittee in order to apply to all cases of vessels sold by the United States, and later reacquired by the Government, the principles of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, limiting the amount to be paid by the United States through purchase or requisition for vessels on which a construction-differential subsidy was paid. I am aware that the provisions of section 802 require the limitation on the price to be paid by the United States in event of reacquisitions to be written into contracts executed by the former Maritime Commission, whereas many of the vessels to which the presently proposed limitation might apply were acquired from the Government without such provisions in the contracts. Thus, the present limitation represents a belated attempt to remedy what I have felt was a basic defect in the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Notwithstanding the potential legal and constitutional questions which might be raised, it is a laudable effort to conserve the taxpayers' funds in a field where past history has shown that the interests of the Government have suffered in transactions involving the disposal of ships by the Government at depressed prices and the later payment by the Government for acquisition, charter, or loss of the same vessels at much higher prices.

Time does not permit the ascertainment of the aggregate amounts involved in such cases. Certain of those cases were referred to by you on the floor of the House yesterday. Others have been the subject of reports to the Congress by the General Accounting Office incident to its examinations of the accounts and records of the former Maritime Commission.

The following two cases are representative of what has happened in the past and what will happen again unless some limitation can be established on the amounts to be paid by the Government upon reacquisition of vessels previously disposed of by it:

The first company purchased 23 vessels built by the Government during 1919, 1920, and 1921, at an estimated cost to the Government of $41,421,000. The company's cost of acquisition was $1,570,000. The book value of the vessels at December 31, 1941, was $982,000, and the former Maritime Commission's estimated world market value at December 31, 1938, was $2,170,000. The Commission chartered all these vessels for varying periods during World War II and paid effective bareboat charter hire of $7,162,000. Ten of the vessels were sunk, and for those 10 vessels the owner received insurance of approximately $4,910,000, most of which was paid by the Government. Two of the vessels were requisitioned for title in 1945 for $640,000. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $1,570,000, was $12,712,000.

Following World War II, the same company bought 26 vessels, most of which were built in 1944. The cost to the Government was $74,835,000, of which $3,434,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $24,720,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,056,000, leaving a net recovery to the Government of $23,664,000.

The second company acquired nine vessels built in 1919 and 1920, at a cost to the Government of $13,739,000. Those vessels cost the company $529,000. Their book value at December 31, 1941, was $343,000, and the former Maritime Commission's world market value December 31, 1938, was $755,000. All nine vessels were chartered to the Government during World War II and effective bare-boat charter hire of $1,707,000 was paid by the Government. In addition, the owner collected insurance of $2,852,000, most of which was paid by the Government, for five of the vessels which were sunk, and $789,000 for two of the vessels requisitioned for title by the Government in 1944 and 1945. Thus, the amount received by the owner for the use, loss, and taking of vessels, for which he paid $529,000, was $5,348,000.

This second company after World War II bought 7 vessels built in 1944 and 1945, at a cost to the Government of $32,034,000, of which $10,276,000 was for national-defense features. The basic sales price to the purchaser was $7,513,000 less class and reconversion allowances of $1,797,000, leaving a net recovery by the Government of $5,716,000.

It should be emphasized that the foregoing cases are not isolated ones. However, they should be sufficient to indicate that the Government, which inevitably sells its vessels in a buyer's market and buys them in a seller's market, needs every legitimate means to minimize the resulting financial disadvantages.

Naturally, representatives of those interests which would be affected by the operation of the proposed limitation have argued strongly against it. They have raised doubts in the minds of conscientious legislators who have expressed those doubts in debate. It is fully recognized that the provision, while binding on the Maritime Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the General Accounting Office, would be open to construction in court actions. Concerning the constitutional point of just compensation, I can only restate the traditional position of the General Accounting Office—and to my mind the only sound position that can be taken by the Office—that it does not exist to question the constitutionality, but to carry out faithfully the mandates of legislation enacted by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Wholesale Price Index Reveals Inflationary Trend Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news bulletin for May 3, 1951:

WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX REVEALS INFLATIONARY TREND CONTINUES

The damage being done to the whole domestic economy by the continuing inflation, and the consequent loss in purchasing power of the dollar is clearly revealed by a study of the fluctuation in the wholesale-price index for commodities in general, all considered necessary to the proper and efficient functioning of our economy.

The respective price index for selected years based upon 1926 equals 100 and the relative purchasing power of $1 is shown by the table which follows:

	Wholesale price index	Purchasing power of dollar
1890	56.2	$1.779
1896	46.5	2.150
1900	56.1	1.782
1904	59.7	1.675
1908	62.9	1.590
1912	69.1	1.447
1916	85.1	1.175
1920	154.4	.668
1924	98.1	1.019
1928	96.7	1.033
1932	64.8	1.543
1936	88.8	1.237
1937	86.3	1.158
1938	78.6	1.272
1939	77.1	1.297
1940	78.6	1.272
1941	87.3	1.145
1942	98.8	1.012
1943	103.1	.970
1944	104.0	.961
1945	105.8	.945
1946	121.1	.825
1947	152.1	.657
1948	165.0	.606
1949	155.0	.645
1950:		
June	157.3	.636
July	162.9	.613
August	166.4	.601
September	169.5	.590
December	175.3	.570
1951: March	184.0	543

Government deficit spending appears to be the largest contributing factor to the continued inflationary rise in wholesale prices.

Submerged Lands, House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Members of this House, that I be permitted so to do, I am privileged to present to your attention very important in-

formation with reference to the tideland oil or submerged lands and some of the situation as relates to my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

Now there is pending before the Senate Interim Committee Senate Joint Resolution 20 by the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. This measure is commonly known as the interim tidelands bill and its companion measure in the same text, in the House is House Joint Resolution 131. It is by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of Judiciary.

It is well known that former United States Senator Sheridan Downey, of California, was several weeks ago retained by the city of Long Beach to represent its position in the tidelands matter to those interested and to Congress. On April 30, 1951, this distinguished citizen, representing Long Beach City, brought to me the following text of a proposed amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20, which text I personally delivered the same day to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interim Committee, presently considering Senate Joint Resolution 20. The text is as follows:

It is hereby provided that all the area off the coast of California in San Pedro Bay landward from the Federal breakwater and landward from a line extending from the eastern end of said breakwater due east to the shore line is hereby recognized as and declared to be inland waters.

My extemporaneous statement made before the O'Mahoney Senate committee on February 21, 1951, contains my discussion there made, but in addition thereto, I confirmed the fact that the city of Long Beach did not then and does not now claim anything seaward beyond the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach. Here is the text taken from the Senate committee hearings:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLYDE DOYLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, certainly I would be remiss if I did not state briefly that I very much appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of this committee and members of the committee in inviting me to sit at the committee table during these hearings. You did so at the last session of Congress at similar hearings, and I appreciate your repeating the courtesy.

There are here in the room, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, certain distinguished citizens from my home city of Long Beach that have been sent by my city across the continent to appear at these hearings to add weight, at least by their presence, to the position of my home city on this important subject, and I would like the privilege of just presenting them to the committee. It will only take about 30 seconds, and I am sure they would be honored by being so presented, and I am sure the committee would be glad to see them personally.

So if I may have that privilege, first I have the honor to introduce the Honorable Councilman Keller, chairman of the oil petroleum committee of the city council of my city, and also a petroleum engineer.

Emmet H. Sullivan, a member of the harbor board of my home city of Long Beach, and Mr. Amar, harbor manager of my city, and we think the best harbor manager of one of the greatest harbors in the country.

I will be very brief. I feel that the record is fairly well complete, as the chairman has said, on most of the material points that could be presented at such a hearing as this. Furthermore, our very able city attorney is here again, and I will yield what time I might otherwise take in his favor and in favor of the deputy attorney general of my State, who is also to testify this afternoon.

As a member of the Seventy-ninth Congress I filed for the State a quitclaim bill representing the State theory of ownership of tidelands. I believe the record will show that I filed my bill before the Attorney General filed his suit against the State of California. I filed only after conference with the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, and with the then Attorney General, Mr. Biddle.

At that time before the suit was filed, I registered objection to the proposed suit, and I urged that no accounting be asked of my State or of my city of any oil royalties received by either the State or the city on the grounds that my city had received its tideland grants in good faith from my native State of California in 1911; the State of California dealt in good faith when it made the grants and when it made the oil leases; and also that when my home city had contracted its oil wells on tidelands for production purposes that it had dealt in good faith.

We passed a quitclaim bill in the House of Representatives in that Seventy-ninth Congress. I think there were only 11 votes against it. I was one of the Members of Congress who voted to override the veto of the President of the United States of that bill.

Again in the Eighty-first Congress I again filed what we term, what this committee terms, the quitclaim theory for the State of California and other States, and I again supported that theory by appearing before the House committee, and then by appearing before this committee during your important hearings in the month of August 1950.

I also appeared in the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress in behalf of passage of the quitclaim theory bill for the State of California and the city of Long Beach.

And now in this session of Congress I again filed the same bill that had been approved in the last session of Congress by the House Judiciary Committee and for which a rule was granted by the House of Representatives. The text of that bill was the same as the Walters bill of the last session of Congress and the same as the Walters bill this session of Congress.

My resolution was H. R. 58, filed January 3, 1951, and I believe was the first bill filed in the House of Representatives, at least numerically, representing that theory.

I, of course, am in support of the Walters bill in the House of Representatives.

The City Council of Long Beach, the city harbor board, the city of Long Beach, forwarded to me recently under certification of the city clerk, copies of Resolution No. C-12838, dated February 6, 1951, registering opposition to Senate Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131.

I, therefore, and because I also as Congressman feel that that was the consistent position for the city of Long Beach to take under the circumstances, oppose the two resolutions just named by me.

As I said, the city attorney will register the arguments. I will not take time so to do.

I do wish to say that I have here Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 by the Assembly of the State of California registering objection to Senate Resolution 20. I wish to file that with the committee, and also Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4.

The CHAIRMAN. This material may be received and made part of the record.

(The following resolutions are those referred to.)

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coastal States

"Whereas until recently it was generally recognized that all of the coastal States owned a belt of land beneath navigable waters adjacent to their coasts; and

"Whereas in 1947 the Supreme Court of the United States held that those lands were not owned by the States and that the Federal Government rather than the States has paramount rights in and power over the 3-mile belt of land; and

"Whereas the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court was to divest the States of valuable oil rights; and

"Whereas State ownership of the 3-mile land is not inconsistent with the Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore the ownership of the 3-mile belt of land beneath navigable waters adjacent to the coasts of the coastal States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of a coastal State in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to lands beneath the navigable waters adjacent to the coasts of coastal States

"Whereas a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States refutes a long recognized claim of the coastal States to the 3-mile belt of land beneath the navigable waters adjacent to their coasts; and

"Whereas the effect of this decision was to divest those States of valuable oil rights; and

"Whereas ownership of such land by the coastal States would in no way interfere with Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities; and

"Whereas if it is possible for the Federal Government to secure the ownership of such lands on the basis of its contentions before the Supreme Court, there is a danger that the ownership of all State lands in other States as well as in the coastal States will be jeopardized; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California, has, by resolution, memorialized the Congress of the United States to enact legislation necessary to restore this land to the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the legislatures of each of the States are urged to adopt a resolution similar to that of the California Legislature; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislature of each of the States is requested to transmit to the Legislature of California copies of any resolutions adopted or notice of any taken relative to the subject matter of this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the legislative bodies of each of the States."

Mr. DOYLE. In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I reserve the right to file a short statement in addition to this brief by me?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed. The committee will be very glad to receive it.

(NOTE.—The supplemental statement filed by Congressman DOYLE appears in the Appendixes.)

Mr. DOYLE. The resolution by the City Council of Long Beach, referred to, and the

harbor board, referred to, on February 6, 1951, was incorporated by me with appropriate remarks by myself on February 13, 1951, at page A748 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix.

I wish again to renew my appreciation for the courtesy of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman DOYLE, as physical proof of the fact that your presentation to us last year has not been forgotten, I hold in my hand a copy of a photograph of Long Beach which you were good enough to present to the committee at the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 195 last year.

This photograph, an enlargement of which we also received and which I have sent for in order to be exhibited here, contains a representation of the line of demarcation fixed in the stipulation between the State of California and the Government of the United States. It also shows the limit of the bay as defined for the purposes of the cases of *United States* v. *Carillo* (13 Federal Supplement 121). It shows also a third line much farther seaward running from Point Fermin to Newport Beach. This line cuts off a part of the city of Long Beach itself, and from my way of thinking would be utterly and completely unfair to the city of Long Beach.

I want the record to be clear, however, that nothing in this bill curtails, or fixes, I should probably say, the boundary of the inland navigable waters. The greatest care was taken in drafting the bill to make certain that it would not in any way fix that line. The fixing of the line will be made either by way of the decision of the Supreme Court after the master's report has been received or in permanent legislation eventually passed by the Congress.

I am sorry that the enlarged map is not present in the room, but I will hand this down the line so all the members of the committee may see it.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to thank the chairman for that statement. I know, Mr. Chairman, you made a similar statement at the hearings before this committee last session of Congress when I questioned the propriety of that proposed line.

Mr. Speaker, I have also made further extensions to remarks on this same important subject at other points in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I respectfully call your attention thereto; including part of the testimony by City Attorney Irving Smith, to whom I yielded some of my time.

Submerged Lands—House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present more of my testimony before the Senate interim committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator of Wyoming in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 20, on February 21, 1951. This and other extensions of remarks in this RECORD by me should be read together. The text is as follows:

SUBMERGED LANDS

Senator LONG. Could I ask the witness whether the line here on the picture outside the proposed Government line——

Mr. DOYLE. That, Senator LONG, is the Federal breakwater.

Senator LONG. And I take it that the proposed line proposes to take for the Federal Government approximately half the land inside the breakwater—in fact possibly more than half.

Mr. DOYLE. More than half, Senator. Further, the fact is that the corporate limits of my city, which is a municipality under our State law and a city of first class, extend out at every point at least as far as the Federal breakwater and in two or three places slightly beyond the Federal breakwater; in other words, approximately 3 miles out.

With reference to what the chairman said, I call your attention to the fact that the Government proposed line here [indicating] is at Gaviola Avenue. That is the landward end, and leaves 3 miles and almost 4 miles of municipal beach and municipal water which could be leased by the Secretary of the Interior if he wanted to under this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Congressman, you are mistaken about that on two grounds. First, this line which is denominated the "proposed line" is only the line of the stipulation.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Government has never proposed any such line. No person has made any representation to this committee to the effect that that should be the boundary line. It is not a proposed line. That line, according to all of the information I have received, was drawn in the stipulation merely for the purpose of putting on the landward side all of the wells that have been drilled there. It is my information that there is no well in the Long Beach Harbor on the seaward side of that line. But I have tried to make it clear that so far as the chairman of this committee is concerned, and I would judge from the expression of other members of the committee, there is nobody on this committe who even dreams that that line of the stipulation should be regarded as the boundary of the inland navigable waters. The boundary in my judgment must be much farther seaward. It certainly should not be permitted to cut off any part of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I just urge to your attention very briefly two points on that.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you agree with that or not?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, Mr. Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. What the chairman has just said?

Mr. DOYLE. I do. As far as I know, that is a fact.

Senator ANDERSON. Then why is it called the Government-proposed line?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, that is the farthest south line, or the line out the farthest in our harbor which the Government is willing to accept.

Senator ANDERSON. As part of the stipulation?

The CHAIRMAN. As part of the stipulation?

Mr. DOYLE. Manifestly, Mr. Chairman, at least the whole corporate limits of my city was an inland bay, and all these years——

The CHAIRMAN. My understanding about it, sir, was that that line was drawn not for the purpose of fixing a boundary but for the purpose of defining the line on the landward side of which were all of the wells that have been drilled. It was a line of convenience and not a line of determination of boundaries?

Senator SMATHERS. May I ask a question?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Senator SMATHERS. Did the people of California propose that line there?

Mr. DOYLE. We did not.

Senator SMATHERS. Who proposed that line?

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the city attorney?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. IRVING W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I believe I should clarify this because of the lack of information. That is a Government proposed line. The Justice Department petitioned the Supreme Court in the California case that they fix this segment of the California coast line as the final line of the inland waters at San Pedro Bay and ocean front at Long Beach. And the Attorney General for California, Mr. Mattoon, I am sure will bear out and supplement that with documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, let the Chair interrupt so as to clarify again. Mr. Smith is testifying with respect to the lawsuit. Now what he says about the lawsuit is correct. I am talking about the legislation, and I want to make it as clear as clear can be that, so far as the sponsors of this legislation are concerned and according to my judgment as far as the committee is concerned, that line has never been drawn. It means nothing to us, and nothing in this bill is intended to fix that line or to control the right of the city of Long Beach to areas seaward of that line. We are taking nothing away from it in this legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I make one brief observation though? Of course, the fact that that was proposed by the Government in the lawsuit as the permanent line is the cause of fear on the part of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. Naturally. I can understand that and I am doing my best to allay that feeling.

Mr. DOYLE. One further point so that you realize that the city council and the harbor board have more than just ordinary causes of fear, and that is this: That within the last year the harbor department of my city asked the right of the Federal Government to dredge just adjacent to this proposed line, outside, for the purpose of getting land to fill a pier inside the proposed line, and the Federal Government refused the right of my city to dredge in our own municipal harbor contiguous to the Government proposed line to get land to fill a pier area within my corporate limits on the ground, Mr. Chairman, that the dredging would take place outside the Government proposed line in this lawsuit. And now, therefore, we come before you, as you realize, with the real ground, we feel, of fear. Furthermore, we are dead anxious to have that point clarified at the earliest possible date, and Senate Joint Resolution 20 doesn't, as the distinguished chairman said it couldn't, because it is an engineering problem.

But we again insist—and this will be my last statement—we again insist that the least that can be done, and I think the chairman has made it clear for the committee that there certainly should be no opposition to all the corporate limits in the city of Long Beach being understood to be exempted from any inclusion of less than an inland bay. Clearly it is an inland bay and should be exempted for purposes of legislation.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if it is the chairman's interpretation that the bill before us is broad enough in its terms to support the claim of these gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not deny the claim, not at all. And I say for myself, and I know Senator Anderson agrees with me, that nothing in this bill is intended to divide the city of Long Beach.

It is obvious from looking at this photograph that the line of the stipulation, here called the Government Proposed Line because it was so proposed in the lawsuit, touches the shore at a point which is apparently well within the corporate limits of the city. There are houses which run right down to the beach on the seaward side of that line. I think it would be absurd to hold that those houses on the seaward side of that line were actually on the open sea. They are not on the open sea, they are on a bay.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether these gentlemen have proposed an amendment that would skirt the controversy but broaden this particular situation?

The CHAIRMAN. Not yet.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement in favor of my time going to the city attorney unless there are some questions.

Senator LONG. May I suggest to the witness, Mr. Congressman, and I believe you will agree with me, that there is nothing particularly wrong about the Federal Government or the Solicitor for the Federal Government claiming everything he can for the Government. I believe his statement yesterday was to that effect, that it was his duty to claim for the Government everything he could claim to which the Government might have some claim. That does not necessarily mean it is just or belongs to the Government just because the Solicitor claims it for the Government.

Mr. DOYLE. Senator, granting that is true, I am not willing to grant that even the Solicitor of the United States shall make a claim that has no basis in fact or merit, and that is what he did when in this lawsuit he claimed this Government-proposed line, manifestly the whole corporate limits of my city, of the bay. And the least he could have offered to stipulate to, in my judgment—and I am a lawyer, too—is the corporate limits of my city.

Senator ANDERSON. You have done pretty well in the Supreme Court so far, have you not?

Mr. DOYLE. No, not with regard to my city.

Senator ANDERSON. But you are saying he had no merit behind anything he is contending on this thing.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't say that, Senator. I said he had no basis in fact or merit so far as my city is concerned in my judgment.

Senator ANDERSON. Let me ask this: Your city and other groups worked hard to defeat the legislation in August of 1950. Do you think the position of your city and these other States was improved by the defeat of that legislation and the subsequent act of the Supreme Court?

Mr. DOYLE. Senator, it is a long look ahead, and I do not feel qualified.

Senator ANDERSON. I am wondering if you improved your position and if you will improve your position by defeating this bill. You are quite obviously determined to defeat this resolution as well, and that means the impounding of money has to go on, and the taking of money and putting it away in a fund; whereas under the terms of this Texas and Louisiana could get some use out of it. What do you really hope to get by the defeat of this legislation?

Mr. DOYLE. Let me answer it this way: Suppose the master in chancery comes out as to my city and reaffirms the Government-proposed line, as a permanent line.

Senator ANDERSON. Then it will be too late for legislation, will it not?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you think it will stop litigation?

Mr. DOYLE. It will not stop litigation. We will go on with litigation for years if the master in chancery comes out with that.

Senator ANDERSON. If somebody else is getting the money, litigation will not help you too much, will it? I mean from a practical standpoint?

Mr. DOYLE. No, if our private interests drill up against our Long Beach city limits and drain our oil pool, within our city limits.

Senator ANDERSON. You would concede under this resolution you have a chance for fair treatment; do you or not?

Mr. DOYLE. It depends on how it might be amended.

Senator ANDERSON. You do not believe, as it stands, there is a possibility of fair treatment?

Mr. DOYLE. My city attorney and the harbor board and the city council have objected to it; they have so informed me.

Senator ANDERSON. I understand they have objected to it. They objected to the resolution of August 1950. But you do not believe that under the terms of this, without amendment, there is a chance for the city of Long Beach to be fairly treated?

Mr. DOYLE. Not a fair chance; no. I would rather have it in writing to be reasonably sure.

Senator ANDERSON. Anybody would, but you are in the midst of a controversy; are you not? You are now tied up in court. Here is a way that says in the interim we can proceed and try to protect each other's interests. Do you think it better to stand back and say, "We don't want anything in the interim"?

Mr. DOYLE. I think we can get something better than this, Senator Anderson.

Senator ANDERSON. Through what?

Mr. DOYLE. We can get quitclaim legislation.

Senator ANDERSON. You tried to pass it in the Seventy-ninth, Eighty-first, and now in the Eighty-second. Do you honestly believe it will pass in the Eighty-second?

Mr. DOYLE. I believe it is worth trying in preference to having the uncertainty of this legislation.

Senator ANDERSON. There are bookmakers who have been down before the Kefauver crime committee who will give you odds.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not a good gambler, but I am willing to take a chance.

Submerged Lands, House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present more of my testimony before the Senate interim committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 20, on February 21, 1951. At other points in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this day, I have also inserted testimony by myself and City Attorney Smith. These four extensions of remarks, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, by me, should be read together. The text follows:

SUBMERGED LANDS

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. May I first, Senator MILLIKIN, say to Congressman DOYLE, who has made a very excellent presentation here, both last year and again today, that no authority is given by this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior to lease one single acre of submerged land to which the city of Long Beach lays claim without the consent of the city of Long Beach. We sought to make this as clear as printed language could make it.

In response to Senator ANDERSON, you said you would like to have it in writing. We have offered it to you in printing. The Secretary of the Interior cannot, under this bill, lease any lands which are beneath inland navigable waters without the consent of the city of Long Beach if there is a controversy about it.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I will defer that to my able city attorney, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the intent, and I hope you will accept it as the statement of the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. I will accept it on that basis.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MILLIKIN.

Senator MILLIKIN. Would it be opening up a Pandora box of difficulties in other directions if this thing were made clear so far as this particular point is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. No; there is nothing sacred about this language.

Senator MILLIKIN. Printed words on paper do not mean anything sacred, and these gentlemen say they are not satisfied, and if we could satisfy them without opening up everything else all along the line——

The CHAIRMAN. I know there is no possibility of that.

Senator MILLIKIN (continuing). Let's satisfy them.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had been in here when the hearing started, you would have heard the statement of the chairman. I am merely trying to allay fears which are expressed upon the basis of nothing contained in this bill. I am trying to make it clear that this so-called proposed line set forth in that photograph means nothing to the sponsors of this bill; and, so far as I know, there is no member of the committee who regards that as the seaward boundary of the inland navigable waters of Long Beach.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, I simply repeat that if, without destroying the essential symmetry of what we are trying to do here, you can put some language in to allay the fears of these gentlemen, let's do it. That is what we are here for.

The CHAIRMAN. Why, of course. The Senator has worked with the chairman of this committee for many years, and he knows certainly that nobody is more willing to accept amendment than is the chairman.

Senator MILLIKIN. To that I heartily subscribe. I am not posing any point of resistance to the chairman at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Good.

Senator MILLIKIN. It is only because the chairman made it so clear that these gentlemen were not intended to be restricted by this composite line in this photograph that it occurred to me we could make it additionally clear with perhaps some happy language.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Congressman DOYLE.

Mr. Matoon.

Senator MALONE. Are you through with this witness now?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator MALONE. Could I ask a couple of questions?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Senator MALONE. I am glad to see you here, Congressman.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Senator MALONE. What was the condition as far as the leasing and the rentals before the Supreme Court decision in relation to Long Beach?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the city of Long Beach—and perhaps my city attorney, who will testify, can give you more of the technicalities of it—but the city of Long Beach does not lease its wells. It contracts its wells, which is quite different than most municipalities in most States. The royalties by reputation—and the city attorney can give you the exact figures.

Senator MALONE. I am not asking for the exact condition but just generally.

Mr. DOYLE. They are very high, probably the highest in the country by reputation. The harbor board of my city is under our charter rated as an independent, semi-independent municipal body, with power to lease any oil properties for the city, as a department of the city. In other words, our city council does not even have to approve the contract and the activity of the harbor board.

I am sure that is correct. If I am incorrect in any detail, I want the city attorney to correct me.

Senator MALONE. It does not matter much about the detail. Just give me the general picture.

Mr. DOYLE. The general picture is that under the charter the city harbor board, representing the city, has power to lease or contract and develop the wells, and it has adopted the policy of contracting the wells at the very handsome royalty figures. That was the condition, Senator MALONE, before the Supreme Court decision.

Senator MALONE. In other words, the oil was considered an asset of the city, primarily?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. And in making contracts with the contractors you had worked out a system so that the royalties secured by the city were very high; is that true?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. About how high did it run at the maximum or minimum? Just generally speaking, then we can get the details.

Mr. SMITH. Our net is more than 60 percent.

Senator MALONE. More than 60 percent. That is a little higher than it runs almost anywhere else.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. Where did the Supreme Court decision as it is now leave you?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, as I understand it, we are going ahead. We are still operating on the same basis; but, on the advice of our able city attorney and action of the board of harbor commissioners, the royalties are being impounded. We have, I believe, approximately $100,000,000 in escrow at this time.

Senator MALONE. That is a good deal of money for any city; is it not? Now, Mr. Doyle, what happens under this bill? Could you just generally give me what happens now if this bill passes as it is now written?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Senator, I would yield in favor of my city attorney who has come thoroughly prepared after studying it exhaustively to give briefly an answer to that question.

Senator MALONE. Well, Mr. Doyle, do not try to be accurate, and allow anything to stand corrected in detail; but, generally speaking, what is the picture?

Mr. DOYLE. All right. Of course, in the first place, it is very obvious that if this bill passes in its present form, it still will be necessary to have a permanent line fixed so far as the city of Long Beach is concerned. The present line leaves approximately 4 miles of our beach and 9,800 acres of our corporate water within our own municipality uncertain as to who will take jurisdiction—whether or not the Federal Government will or whether or not it will leave all or any portion of that in the corporate limits for control by the municipality. That, of course, is a continuing hazard in our judgment.

The other thing is this: That under our procedure in the State of California, unless the municipality has fee title to all the land within its corporate limits, it definitely limits the functioning of our municipality in all matters. We naturally cannot issue, for instance, a bond issue, I take it, that would be passed by bond attorneys unless we have fee title to all the land within our corporate limits.

Now, this resolution still gives to the Federal Government the paramount right, whatever that means, within a portion of our corporate limits unless the municipality and the Interior Department get together. I mean it leaves the Supreme Court decision right where it is so far as part of our corporate limits are concerned.

Senator MALONE. Now what would be the condition if the so-called quitclaim bill that has been proposed a couple of times—and we did pass it but could not muster enough votes to pass it over a veto—if that were passed, what position would you then be in?

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, that, I presume, if the quitclaim was adequate, would put the city of Long Beach within its corporate limits in its original position of undisputed ownership, domination, and control and paramount right, whatever that is, within our corporate limits for all purposes. It would permit, for instance, our harbor department and our city council to build out into this water area more docks and wharves.

Our harbor board has proposed, I am informed, as will show on this map, a harbor development contiguous to the Government's proposed line of approximately $65,000,000, and we have the money to do it, because our municipal treasury has the money.

So, a quitclaim would clarify the whole title subject so we could issue bonds; we could build substantial facilities any place within our corporate limits. Now we cannot, of course; we would not dare to.

Senator MALONE. In other words, if I get your explanation correctly, Mr. Doyle, it would put you back where you thought you were in the first place?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. And you could continue your normal operations?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Senator MALONE. This is in the field of conjecture, and one man's guess is as good as another's. But you are in a position now that I used to be when I came from Nevada. I had to kind of guess what the Congress was likely to do. What change do you think a quitclaim bill would have to pass after this bill has passed and is sort of on the way and taken for granted and deals are made under it? Do you think we are very likely to pass another bill?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I do not know, assuming that this resolution did pass, whether the psychology of the members would be such as to realize it was only intended as an interim bill and there were major decisions that still had to be made or not.

I would say this, Senator Malone: If an interim bill passes without making dead sure that all of the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach were turned back to it for full domination and control, naturally we would have to oppose anything less than that.

Senator MALONE. You oppose this bill. But suppose it were passed. Let's just take it for granted it would pass for the moment for that purpose. Then what chance do you think we would have of later legislation restoring your original position?

Mr. DOYLE. I think it would reduce the chances of passage. I would assume, unless it was made very, very clear to all the Members that I am thinking of in the House of Representatives, that this interim did not take care of the total problem.

Senator MALONE. We have precedents here. We are still operating under interim or temporary legislation, temporary Executive powers, that were passed 10 years ago. I am a little bit disturbed about passing a bill called an interim bill. We still have the temporary buildings that were built for World War I down there, had them for World War II, and still have them for world war III. This interim thing gets me down sometimes.

Mr. DOYLE. You see, Senator, the thing that causes us to have great mental hazards is that ever since the appointment of the master in chancery, or the referee, on lines out in California, there has been virtually no action. I mean the referee has not yet made any report as to Long Beach, and so we are held up as an important municipality in everything that municipality should be free to do in its harbor or beach front. Even now I understand that he has passed out the information that it may be a considerable time yet before he is able to give a report as to Long Beach.

So, I would say, answering your question very frankly, that I would think that, unless the Members of the House, especially as I know some of them, had it very clear to their attention that this interim bill, if it passes, did not meet the total problem, psychologically it would limit the possibilities of passing a quitclaim.

Senator MALONE. Thank you very much for a frank statement. I remember you very well and your red-headed district attorney. I am looking forward to him taking the stand. Thank you.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, if someone can answer it, what was the vote in the Senate and what was the vote in the House the last time we had a quitclaim vote?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not recall. We will check it and put that in the RECORD.

Mr. MATTOON. The voting in the House was 257 to 29, almost 10 to 1. The vote in the Senate was never reached on the floor for the reason that it was voted with a favorable recommendation out of the Senate Judiciary Committee just 2 days before the adjournment, when the convention in Philadelphia was held, at which convention there was a resolution favoring its adoption.

Senator MILLIKIN. There were two conventions there. [Laughter.]

Submerged Lands, House Joint Resolution 131 and Senate Joint Resolution 20—Remarks No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I am this day offering four extensions of remarks on this same important subject. Nos. 1 to 3 include my testimony before the Senate interim committee. No. 4 includes certain questions directed by committee members and certain answers to said questions by City Attorney Irving Smith, of Long Beach, Calif. These four extensions of remarks all relate to the same important subject and should all be read and studied in order for you to obtain a balanced picture of how very meritorious it is that all of the inland waters of Long Beach within the Federal breakwater lines be declared as inland waters in any legislation dealing with this important submerged or tidelands question.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF IRVING M. SMITH, CITY ATTORNEY OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no reason to apprehend that the State of California would attempt to exercise any authority that it does not now exercise with respect to the operation of lands that are clearly the property of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You have none?

Mr. SMITH. We have no difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. With respect to wells which are landward of the line on this map, which you have presented to the committee,

is there anything in this bill which takes away from the city of Long Beach the right to operate as it has been operating the lands landward or the areas landward of this so-called Government-proposed line?

Mr. SMITH. Not as I read the bill. I believe not.

The CHAIRMAN. That accords with my own belief. So then it is your testimony to this committee that if this bill were enacted into law the city of Long Beach would have all of the rights that it now possesses and exercises with respect to every well which has thus far been drilled for or on behalf of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. SMITH. That is right. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. So the only question, then, is with respect to possible wells on the seaward line, first of the so-called Government-proposed line, and then, secondly, on the seaward line, seaward of the exterior boundary of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the city of Long Beach assert any claim whatsoever to any area beyond the exterior seaward boundaries of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. SMITH. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is your testimony to this committee that, so far as the city of Long Beach is concerned, it will be perfectly content to have its title confirmed first to all lands landward, all areas landward of the Government-proposed line, and, secondly, all areas landward of the exterior seaward limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that will completely protect the city, as far as the city's direct interest in this issue is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the city of Long Beach set up any claim to the pot of gold that is seaward of this area?

Mr. SMITH. The city of Long Beach has no interest other than the general interest as a city of the State and as citizens of the State, of course, but aside from that the city has no interest other than that in this 13,000 acres that the State conveyed to us within our corporate limits, as shown upon this map. Of course, we have no claim to any deposits or anything else outside those boundaries.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very glad to have that testimony; I think it is explicit, it is direct, it is clear, and nobody can have the slightest doubt of what the position of the city of Long Beach is.

I will say again, so that it may be clear in the record, that my own opinion is from the examination of the photograph which was presented to this committee last year and from the examination of this map that the so-called Government-proposed line is too narrow in the sense that it is too far landward.

In my judgment, it does not accurately define the exterior boundaries of the inland navigable waters of this bay. In my judgment, the line should be very much farther seaward, and unless there is information of which I am not aware, which has not yet been presented to me, I am ready to say now that so far as I am concerned, it seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. SMITH. Senator, you make us very happy.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will convey that information to those who represent the State of California, perhaps you can make us all happy and perhaps we can get a settlement of this controversy.

Mr. SMITH. We wish that that could be put into law. We appreciate your statement, Senator. We would like to have it put into something of finality that we can act upon.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the committee will be very glad to consider the adoption of appropriate language to do precisely that thing. So that there may be no doubt now of the accuracy of the testimony which was given here at the outset on behalf of the Government by the Solicitor General and the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, I want to read from the stipulation which was filed in the California case in the Supreme Court, which was signed by and on behalf of the Government by the then Attorney General Tom C. Clark, and by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and by and on behalf of the State of California by the then attorney general, Fred N. Howser.

This stipulation says, appearing on page 21 of the Hearings on Submerged Lands, held by this committee under Senate Joint Resolution 195, during the month of August, last—and I read from the stipulation:

"Whereas the precise location of the '3-mile marginal belt' has not yet been determined, and it is the belief of the parties that further proceedings may be necessary in order to determine the line of demarcation between the '3-mile marginal belt,' and the tidelands and the inland waters of California (including ports, bays, and harbors) not claimed by plaintiff in this case; and

"Whereas the court has not yet entered a decree in the above-entitled case; and

"Whereas the immediate situation can be clarified and further conduct of this litigation expedited if a number of inland waters can be specifically excluded from the claims of the plaintiff in this suit;

"Now, therefore, it is stipulated and agreed by the parties through their respective counsel as follows:

"1. The following areas are not claimed by the plaintiff in this litigation:

"(a) That part of San Francisco Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Diablo, Marin County, Calif., to Fort Point, city and county of San Francisco, Calif.

(b) That part of San Diego Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Loma to Zuniga Point, on the southwestern end of North Island, San Diego County, Calif."

This next affects the city of Long Beach:

"(c) That part of San Pedro Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Fermin in a northeasterly direction through a point 300 feet due south of the southeasterly extension of the Navy mole and breakwater to the line of ordinary low tide in the city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

"2. It is understood that the lines described in this stipulation are approximate only and do not represent surveyed lines.

"3. The foregoing descriptions of San Francisco, San Pedro, and San Diego Bays are without prejudice to the right of California to claim that the lines separating said bays from the '3-mile marginal belt' lie farther seaward than the lines herein described and that said bays include larger water areas than herein described.

"4. It is further stipulated that this stipulation is without prejudice to the rights of either party to claim that any other waters within the State boundaries of California constitute bays, ports, harbors, or inland water or marginal sea, as the case may be."

Mr. Smith, do you agree with my interpretation of that stipulation, that by it the Government of the United States bound itself not to claim any of these wells on the landward side of that line?

Mr. SMITH. I believe that is the effect of this; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that it also confirmed to the State of California the right to claim any areas on the seaward side of that line?

Mr. SMITH. That was reserved to the State.

The CHAIRMAN. That was reserved. So that the position of the Government of the United States in this California case was clearly intended to confirm to the city of Long Beach every well that has been drilled by or on behalf of that and to confirm to the State of California the right to claim that the boundary of the inland navigable waters was much further seaward than this so-called Government-proposed line?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it was not a Government-proposed line, was it?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in my statement that the line drawn here deviates a small bit at one end from the stipulated line you read, since that was not a surveyed line. This line is the line proposed by the Department of Justice in proceedings before the master.

The stipulated line is an unsurveyed line, as stated in the stipulation, whereas the Government-proposed line is a surveyed line which ran 800 yards due east of the Point Fermin lighthouse instead of the Point Fermin lighthouse, as was the case with the stipulated line, through the same axis of 300 feet due south of the southeasterly extension of the Navy mole and breakwater to the low-tide mark in the city of Long Beach, there being that variation turning on that axis by reason of the beginning point change.

This brings us in closer inshore at Long Beach at Gaviota Avenue instead of the line shown in the stipulated line, and that is why I requested our engineers to put on this map the proposed line instead of the stipulated line, because that would not have been so correct.

The CHAIRMAN. By the use of the phrase "proposed line," you meant to indicate the line which has been presented to the master?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no hesitation in saying that for my part again that line, whether presented to the master or whether the line described in this stipulation, is altogether too close to the beach of Long Beach, and because it almost cuts the beach line of the city of Long Beach in two, it seems to me to be obviously unfair to the city of Long Beach. Does that make you any happier?

Mr. SMITH. Well, if that could be put into something, Senator—we appreciate your remarks—if it could be finally wrapped up into something that we could act upon; yes. I would merely like to say this in conclusion.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I ask whether San Diego has submitted any proposed amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. San Diego?

Senator MILLIKIN. Long Beach.

The CHAIRMAN. No; they have not.

Senator MILLIKIN. Why don't you give us something you think should be put in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There has been some discussion, Senator, of amendments which would attempt to confirm the line set out in the stipulation.

Senator MILLIKIN. I heard the chairman make some suggestions, but it occurred to me that we could crystallize the whole thing from the standpoint of Long Beach if they will offer something they think will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the bill should be clearly amended so as to obviate any confusion that might exist. The bill was drawn for the purpose of protecting the city of Long Beach and any other city that might be engaged in controversy over the actual line of boundary of a bay or inland navigable waters. There is no doubt in the mind of the chairman—and it has been expressed to him over and over again on behalf of the Government—that the Government does not and will not claim inland waters anyway, and certainly will not claim inland waters in any bay. The problem is to define the boundary, the seaward boundary of those bays. This committee has not had an opportunity to do that.

Senator MILLIKIN. I may ask whether the Solicitor General or his representative is here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't believe that a representative is. If there is a representative of the Solicitor General here, will he rise?

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to ask: Is there any objection to the theory expressed by the chairman of this committee of amending this thing so as to make it clear that the city of Long Beach continues its past jurisdiction over its own areas?

Mr. VAUGHAN (Robert H. Vaughan, Department of Justice). Senator, I am not sure that I can speak for the Solicitor General as to the entirety of the proposal here. The chairman correctly stated the position of the executive branch as set forth by us before the court. We do not claim inland waters. There is before the court the problem of defining what is the seaward limit of those inland waters right in this area.

Senator MILLIKIN. But is there a problem of defining the limits of the city of Long Beach?

Mr. VAUGHAN. The problem of defining the limits of the city of Long Beach is not before the court; but when the court draws the line separating the inland waters of San Pedro Bay from the open waters of the Pacific Ocean, that may or may not affect the limits of the city of Long Beach.

Senator MILLIKIN. Would there be an objection from the Solicitor General if this committee were to make amendments to the pending bill to clarify the situation of Long Beach along the lines suggested by the distinguished chairman? Would there be any objection to that?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MILLIKIN, perhaps Mr. Vaughan is not authorized to testify with respect to that.

Senator MILLIKIN. I don't want you to exceed your authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Without consulting the Solicitor General.

Senator MILLIKIN. We can make inquiry of the Solicitor General. I do think the observation is in order—and I say this most respectfully—that the Government made other claims and has taken other positions which in the course of time it has reversed in this very subject matter with which we are dealing.

I have complete sympathy, therefore, with the position of these gentlemen from Long Beach and with the chairman's position that the rights of Long Beach, if we can do so, should be set out explicitly to protect against a possible further change of direction by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course. The fact that the chairman and the Senator from New Mexico joined in presenting this bill is in itself testimony of the desire of the two sponsors of this bill to do precisely that thing. What I have been endeavoring to do this morning has been to clear away a fog of confusion which has been raised about the effect of the legislation as it now stands.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think the distinguished chairman has given what should be some very heartening statements to the city of Long Beach, and I gathered from what the Senator said he would have no objection if appropriate language can be found to make that explicit in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I am searching for appropriate language; yes, indeed.

A Letter Answering Farmer's Requests for Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

DEAR FRIEND: I know that you're working hard on the farm these days, and we're working hard in Washington, too.

I wish I had the time to tell you everything that's going on here and discuss all the problems we're facing every day. But I've been so busy I haven't been able to write to you for over a month. From now on I'll try to let you know every 2 weeks or so about the things happening here that affect you.

If you've checked into buying a car lately, or had a friend do so, you've probably found out that the fifth tire—the all-important spare—wasn't included in the deal. The reason for this is the rubber shortage, since most of the raw rubber lately has been channeled into war production.

Last week, however, the National Production Authority, one of the new defense agencies here in the Government, and a busy one, too, I might add, cut by 10 percent the amount of rubber available for passenger car tires. But at the same time, the amount for truck, trailer and farm equipment tires was increased by 10 percent.

So you won't have to worry about getting a new tire for that tractor or truck or other farm vehicle. NPA announced too that we will continue to have 100-percent production of trucks.

You know, the wheels are really turning at the synthetic rubber plant at Institute. If we can get them going all over the country like the plant in West Virginia we can have a fifth tire even on passenger cars.

The Labor Department here has issued a new list of "critical occupations." These are the jobs your local draft board is advised to consider eligible for deferment. The new list includes farm operators.

Did you know, too, how much the value of your farm has probably gone up in the past year? An Agriculture Department report that just came into my office says that farms in West Virginia went up 11.5 percent in value between March 1950 and March 1951. A survey of real estate reporters showed that a third of them expect the prices to keep climbing, while only 5 percent expect them to go down.

The Suppression of the Wedemeyer Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, military security, of course, frequently requires that the public be denied access to the contents of official reports. The political security of a party in power or, more accurately, of the inner clique in control of a party in power, should never be made the excuse for suppressing a document prepared with great care by an able and distinguished expert in his field and submitted in sincerity and good faith to his superiors.

If heed had been paid to the recommendations of General Wedemeyer, it now appears almost certain that the Korean conflict would have been avoided without surrender of any of our basic principles, but with a saving of thousands of lives and untold suffering and sacrifice.

Like so many of the other horrible mistakes of the past, we can constructively use them now only as object lessons for the future to prevent a repetition of blunders and to force a more thorough study by those in authority of proposals advanced by experienced and qualified experts who are completely without political or partisan motive and are actuated only by a genuine desire to see that the country they love steers a sensible course in the conduct of its military and foreign policies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a penetrating editorial on the suppression of the Wedemeyer report from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle.

The editorial follows:

THE WEDEMEYER REPORT, UNHAPPY SUPPRESSION

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer told his Government in 1947 exactly what would happen in China and Korea if we withdrew troops from those areas. The report was suppressed, its recommendations overridden by diplomatic decisions. We wrote off China to the Reds, we got ourselves involved in a seemingly endless war in Korea. Had we continued occupation of southern Korea, the Reds in the north probably would not have attacked.

Even now only a portion of the Wedemeyer report's content is revealed. To us the incident throws light on two issues—secrecy in Government, the fallibility of diplomacy.

Above all it raises this question: Having flouted Wedemeyer's prophetic report, will the Government be safe in flouting the recommendations of General MacArthur for prosecuting the war in the Orient? The State Department is shown to have erred sadly in its judgments as to China and Korea. It could be just as far off base in its toying with current crises.

Had Wedemeyer's advice been followed, the Russians would have known from the start that they would have had to fight Americans if they violated the thirty-eighth parallel. We would have been spared many casualties and would not now be waging a war of indecision.

In Europe we have a similar situation. Russia proposes that all foreign troops leave Germany. To us that would mean taking the troops home. To Russia it would mean piling forces up on a nearby border, ready for an attack as soon as the way was clear. Fortunately, we have shown no sign as yet of acceding to Russia's scheme. But the Wedemeyer incident certainly points to our need of building up strength and so placing that strength that Russia will have no doubt as to whom she will have to fight if she breaks over the line.

As to secrecy in Government, haven't we had enough? It is quite clear that much of the smoke-screening is set up to protect individuals and the administration rather than the Nation as a whole. We see no reason for the early suppression of the Wedemeyer report. Our security was not threatened by it. But our security certainly is threatened right now because the report was not accepted at face value. Had the public known what the general recommended, it might have forced the administration into more forthright action.

Lives, property, and freedom are the stakes today. It is not pleasant to think of them as being tossed around in a giant poker game in a locked and heavily curtained room. Obviously some items in the Wedemeyer report might require secrecy—items such as quantity and disposition of soldiery. But those are technicalities. With or without them, this report if opened for the world to read, might have served to keep the peace.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include there in a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Toledo memorializing the Congress to initiate and support legislation giving to employees of the Post Office Department a cost-of-living increase in their pay. I am in agreement with this resolution which is as follows:

Whereas one of the most efficient departments of the Federal Government has always been the United States Post Office; and

Whereas the loyal and industrious employees of this Department have not the usual means for the enforcement of demands for higher wages; and

Whereas it is universally recognized that the cost of living has increased tremendously: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Toledo, That it is the sense of the Council of the City of Toledo that post-office employees are entitled to a cost of living increase and that the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, the Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER, the Honorable FRAZIER REAMS, and the Honorable GEORGE BENDER should be and they are hereby respectfully urged to initiate and support legislation in the Congress of the United States to grant post-office employees a cost-of-living increase in their pay.

Adopted: April 30, 1951.

OLLIE CZELUSTA,
Mayor.

Attest:

CARL F. DIEFENBACH,
Clerk of Council.

Congressman Doyle Urges Constituents To Communicate Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 5, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, since my extension of remarks dated March 7, 1951, beginning on page 1319 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have received a number of communications to the effect that the information therein set forth, and the manner in which it was related, is considered of real value. Also some Members of this great legislative body have thanked me for reducing the important subject matter to that compact and convenient form.

Mr. Speaker, the development in our domestic and international situation ever since March 7, 1951, together with the importance that constituents know to whom to write and where their communication should be addressed, has made me conclude that I should emphasize my objective by sending out a goodly number of my extension of remarks of March 7, 1951, to constituents. I believe we in Congress, should always emphasize to the attention of the thousands of Americans whom we have the honor and responsibility of representing, the fact that their considered opinions are not only important, but that we seek such considered opinions, and the facts supporting them. I think we ought to emphasize the fact that considered, clear, analysis and clear thinking of folks at the local level of American citizenship, is very important and is an integral and powerful part of the functioning of our democratic processes through our representative form of government.

It is often said, that most Members of Congress do not personally read their daily mail, but I know so many Members who do take the time and patience to personally read their mail, that I am sure that the impression that letters written to Congressmen are ineffectual or unnoticed is not really a fact. For myself, Mr. Speaker, these more than 5 years that I have now been Representative from the Eighteenth District of California, I have habitually read the first-class mail and letters which have come to my office. Nor do they have to be addressed "personal" or "private" in order to have my personal reading. I have found my personal reading of all these letters a great source of contact with the thinking and problems of the citizens at home. We should encourage the folks to think things through—clear through. We should encourage them to transmit the benefit of their patriotic thinking to us, as their Representatives.

Unequal Cost Cutting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, despite the excellent work which the House did last week in reducing many of the items in the independent offices appropriation bill, it is submitted that even more drastic action must be taken, if we are to meet the challenge of maintaining a sound economy in the face of unprecedented expenditures for military purposes. One approach to this problem is suggested by the bill, which 10 of my Republican colleagues have joined me in introducing, to reestablish the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union urging action on this proposal.

The editorial follows:

UNEQUAL COST CUTTING

Funds for 27 Federal agencies covered by one appropriations bill were cut 10 percent by the House Appropriations Committee.

This is a saving—on paper—of $665,000,000.

Much as we applaud the saving, we can neither defend the percentage method of reducing Federal spending nor see in it more than a bird-shot attack on the swollen budget.

A flat percentage cut in agencies penalizes the most thrifty to the same extent as the most wasteful. By cutting the fat off one, it may starve those on a lean diet. Continued year after year, the net effect would be that budget requests would not be honest estimates of true cost, but cost plus the percentage the bureau chief guesses will be cut off.

Further, cutting Federal spending on the scale necessary to get us safely through the present emergency requires more than paring here and there. It requires lopping off of whole agencies and abandonment by the Federal Government of many wasteful functions.

The problem is to decide which ones. Representative KENNETH KEATING's bill offers the most hopeful means of deciding. He proposes that the Hoover Commission be recalled to list nonessential functions and agencies. This is the right means of significant and real Federal economy.

What Is Appeasement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the word "appeasement" is being used rather carelessly these days. Those who are interested in trying to avoid another devastating war run the risk of being called appeasers or isolationists. It is reassuring to those in Congress who have supported a program to strengthen forces not only for peace but also for preparedness to read the following editorial from the Charlotte News, an outstanding newspaper, under date of May 5, 1951, which, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks:

THE CHARGE OF APPEASEMENT

The word "appeasement" has been bandied about so loosely that it now means just about what the user chooses it to mean. As The New York Times sagely observes:

"If we do not immediately bomb troop concentration points in Manchuria, it is appeasement. If we do not immediately set up a blockade of Chinese ports (and presumably fire on British and Russian ships attempting to enter those ports), it is appeasement. If we do not provide air cover for an (probably preventive) invasion of continental China by Nationalist Chinese troops, it is appeasement."

In its strict sense, the verb appease means to reduce to a state of peace, to pacify, to make quiet or calm. Since Munich it has taken on a much less pleasant connotation. It has come to mean the abject surrender to an aggressor's demands, thus increasing the probability of new and bigger demands.

Now the appeasement label is being hurled against the administration that bolstered the military power of a Soviet-threatened Turkey; that aided Greece to fight off the Communist guerrillas; that stood up to Russia with the Berlin blockade; that used the Marshall plan to save Italy and France from Communist election victory and to restore Western Europe's productive capacity; that initiated and brought to fruit the Atlantic Pact; that appointed General Eisenhower to head the European army and gave him air, naval, and ground troops; that has just negotiated for long-term bases in Greenland;

that met the challenge of the North Korean invasion with all the limited forces this Nation then had at its demand; that put through a plan to enable the United Nations General Assembly to act when the Security Council was blocked by the Soviet veto; that isolated Formosa and kept it cut of Communist hands; that poured materials and military advisers into Indochina when that nation was threatened; that launched a tremendous preparedness program in this Nation; that has tried to send grain to India to prevent those starving millions from turning to Moscow for aid in their hour of grave need.

Paradoxically, the label—uttered with scorn and derision as an epithet—is being used most blatantly by those in the Congress who have fought, at almost every step, the administration's program for meeting the world-wide challenge of communism—who opposed the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, who fought against troops for Europe, who called the Korean decision "Truman's war" (until General MacArthur pronounced it a sound military decision).

The Truman administration may be guilty of many sins and many errors. It has not, in the past 5 years, been guilty of appeasement, and no volume of vituperation by the Johnny-come-latelies of the United States Congress can make that charge stick.

Notable Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the month of May by tradition and observance is the outstanding month of the year for labor. With this in mind, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Brooklyn Tablet. The editorial explains itself and serves to bring to mind the valiant and splendid efforts of the Catholic Church to bring social justice to the workingman. It follows:

NOTABLE ANNIVERSARIES

May 15 will be the sixtieth anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's famous encyclical on the condition of the workingmen and the twentieth anniversary of the encyclical of Pope Pius XI, Forty Years After, which supplemented and reviewed the teaching of Pope Leo XIII. A public forum, over which Archbishop Molloy will preside, will be held in our diocese on May 6, to commemorate these anniversaries. The speakers for this occasion will be Rev. R. A. McGowan, director of the social action department, NCWC, and Hon. Maurice Tobin, United States Secretary of Labor. In many dioceses throughout the country similar observances will be held.

Properly attention should be given in a significant public manner to the commemoration of two of the most notable historic documents which have influenced modern thinking in the direction of the betterment of the lot of the working classes. Communists, liberals, Socialists, and left-wingers have for so long held themselves up as the champions of the working people that the profound and lasting influence of these papal pronouncements has been ignored and neglected. The truth that the Popes have been far in advance of their times in the championship of the rights of the workingman and the parallel truth that the Popes have laid the ground work for the advances made by the laboring masses in recent years should be proclaimed from the housetops.

No document, secular or religious, in modern times, can match the concentration of thought, the sweep of vision, the vigor of expression and the clarity of enunciation of basic sociological principles contained in the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. The later encyclical of Pope Pius XI is a brilliant confirmation of the doctrines of Leo XIII and a perfect development and complement of the Aerum Novarum.

With rare foresight and courage, Pope Leo XIII and his successor, Pope Pius XI, fearlessly opposed the ideas and the practices of the new liberalism which dominated the thinking in the industrial field before the turn of the century and down to the present time. The changeless principles of Christian morality were adapted, explained and applied by Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI to the new conditions which the industrial development and expansion of modern times produced. Through these documents Catholic social teaching has become a very important part of the heritage of the entire human race.

Under the inspiration of these documents, priests, teachers, and laymen, both employers and employees, have been inspired to take an active part in the restoration of the social order. For all the growth of materialism, the spiritual idealism of these encyclicals has not diminished. Actually the turbulence of our times has only served the more strikingly to emphasize the bankruptcy of materialistic solution of social problems and to enhance the value of Christian social principles in practice.

Today the slave labor of Soviet Russia and her satellites, the decline in the general standard of living in the Communist and Communist-dominated countries, the general deplorable lot of the working masses under Communist rule is the best proof of the utter incapacity of materialism to solve basic social problems. On the other hand, wherever, to any degree under the inspiration of the principles enunciated by Pope Leo and Pope Pius, Christian social teaching has been put into practice, the condition of the masses has been bettered immeasurably.

The celebration of these twin anniversaries should be the signal for renewed effort on the part of all Christians in the industrial field to put into practice the teachings of these two major encyclicals. Only through Christian social justice as proclaimed by Pope Leo and Pope Pius is there hope for industrial peace, harmony, and prosperity. Only in Christian social justice is there real hope for the working masses and for the solution of the vexatious problems which keep our present world in constant turmoil.

Resolution of the Goodfellow Sunday School Class of the First Baptist Church, San Angelo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution which is both timely and significant. If a sufficient number of the people would but follow the example of the sponsors of this resolution, there would indeed be peace on earth and good will among men. The resolution with its preamble follows:

Realizing that God holds in his hands the destiny of men and nations, and believing that God's message to his people of old, when he said, "If my people which are called by My name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land," can be relied upon today as an inviolate promise just as when it was given to the Hebrew people: Therefore be it

Resolved, as follows:

1. We, the members of the Goodfellow Class, pledge anew our faith in God and our allegiance to His cause.

2. We pledge ourselves, each individually, to pray each remaining day of this year, 1951, for a revival of a deep Christian spirit in our church and in all Christian churches of the United States.

3. Believing that if our Nation and the world are to be spared the terrors of a destructive world war, it must be by God's intervention, we pledge ourselves, and call upon all Christians to join us in praying each remaining day of this year, for our political leaders that they may be guided by God's spirit to do the things that would lessen and not increase the terrible confusion now existing in international affairs, and in praying for all Christians in all countries dominated by atheistic communism, and for the non-Christian citizens of those countries, to the end that there may be a great Christian awakening in those countries and around the world, so that men of all nations can live together on this earth as friends without war or threat of war.

Alaska's Scenic Grandeurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, attention is called to the fact that that season of year most popular for viewing Alaska's scenic grandeurs is at hand. By steamship, by airplane, and by automobile, Americans will again turn northwest this year to have their first, second, or third looks at our great northern Territory. For Alaska has so much to offer that many find one trip all too short. The fact that Alaska is a defense outpost will not cause anyone to defer a vacation journey. This is the subject of an editorial which appeared in the Alaska Weekly for April 20 and which is reprinted here:

SAFEST AND MORE INVITING

Nothing said in this editorial should be construed as antagonistic to the development of adequate civilian defense measures in Alaska nor as belittling Alaska from the standpoint of an extremely valuable defense outpost. Civilian defense organization and training are as important to Alaska communities as they are to any and all communities of the United States * * * no more so, and no less. And, we might add that even after reading the excellent article recently appearing in Colliers over the signature of Father Hubbard in which the "Glacier Priest" characterized the idea that

Russia might attack Alaska as stupid we continue to believe that adequate defense of Alaska is vital to national security.

But what we do not believe is that there is any possibility of Russian attack on Alaska in the immediate, nor even in the foreseeable, future. Russia is far from ready to start a war of aggression by invasion of United States territory. No authority on the subject, military or diplomatic, has voiced the slightest apprehension of such action on the part of the Soviet, in the near future.

She is very busy in the Far East and with the withdrawal of General MacArthur will be still more busy. She has some uneasy satellite nations on her hands in Eastern Europe, Tito is making things uncomfortable for her and daily causing her to lose face in that quarter, her eyes are on the rich oil fields of Iran, and if the master minds of the Kremlin should feel strong enough to start an all-out war with the United States by a surprise invasion their precious bombs would not be wasted on Nome or Anchorage but on the industrial centers of the Atlantic seaboard.

All of which is inspired by the fact that we do not subscribe to the scareheads and the thoughtless chatter which could, and will, if not checked, rob Alaska of the annual tourist traffic so vital to the economy of the Territory.

There won't be any black-out in Alaska this summer and there won't be any atomic bombs dropped on Alaska cities nor any submarines in the gorgeous waterways, nor any Russian sharpshooters on the forest-clad mountainsides that skirt those waterways. The thousands of lakes and fishing streams which make Alaska a sportsman's paradise will not be Red-infested because there are very few, indeed, of the home-grown variety.

No Territory under the American flag offers more to attract the tourist and no Territory under the flag is safer for that vacation trip you are thinking about for this summer.

As we indicated at the outset of this editorial common sense dictates the organizing of civilian defense and the further strengthening of the Armed Forces. The people of the Territory are taking care of the one and the military of the other, and no one we have heard of in Alaska, either in civilian or military circles, is at all panicky.

We therefore suggest that there be considerably less war-scare ballyhoo and a great deal more constructive effort to convince the traveling public that Alaska is still the most inviting summer playground in the land and as safe, if not a bit more safer, than Atlantic City or Miami Beach.

General MacArthur's Appearance Before Senate Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Good Beginning," which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, which commends the conduct of the hearings before the joint meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I call particular attention to and join in the deserved tribute paid to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is presiding at the hearings.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD BEGINNING

At the end of the third grueling day of hearing testimony from General MacArthur, Senator RUSSELL complimented the general and every Member of the committee on the fact that these exhausting interrogations have been conducted in complete courtesy and in the highest dignity. The sessions were long. The atmosphere of the hearing room was intense. Issues of the most vital concern to the Nation were combed over—issues that have become deeply entangled in politics. Yet both questions and answers have been kept on a plane of temperate pursuit of facts and opinions. And we have Senator KNOWLAND'S word that very little of what was said behind closed doors was censored from the record released to the public.

While Senator RUSSELL generously praises General MacArthur and members of the committee for this performance, a large share of the credit should obviously be laid at his door. As chairman, he has presided with tact, dignity, and restraint that were a good example to his fellow committee members. It now remains to be seen whether he and his fellow committeemen can keep the remainder of the hearings—in which controversial figures in the Government service will appear—on the same high plane.

Mexican Labor in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is absent on official business, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What About Slave Labor in United States?" published in the United Mine Workers Journal on April 1, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT SLAVE LABOR IN UNITED STATES?

Some of our Senators and Congressmen, as well as alleged social leaders, go into raptures every now and then about slave labor in Russia and other geographical areas of the world—some of which are controlled by our allies.

Occasionally the staleness and sameness of the news reported by our metropolitan newspapers prompts an editor to rediscover slave labor on our home front.

A three-column story by Gladwin Hill in the March 25 issue of the New York Times rehashes the illegal entry of Mexicans across our southwestern State borders for employment in agriculture and other hard-labor-tasks. Hill estimates the annual trek at 1,500,000, with an undetermined number of "Commies" included.

While the story is a rehash of factual information of long standing—known to our Government agencies for 30 years or more—it, nevertheless, pictures anew the seemingly deliberate blinking at the slave trade by our State and Federal Governments to serve large agricultural interests which have, in turn, been faithful contributors and supporters to the political forces which blink the illegal entries.

It is nothing new for a columnist to point out that this slave Mexican labor "depresses the general standards of wages and working conditions below the accepted American levels. Instead of supplementing the domestic labor force they undercut it, taking jobs from tens of thousands of native citizens, farm and urban workers alike."

The recruited Mexican slave labor, working long hours and living in hovels, is contracted to big employers in sizable numbers—the contractor receiving from one-fourth to one-half of the measly contracted wage.

Conservative estimates place the minimum at 2,500,000 Mexicans in partial or full slave-labor status in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, and as many more to be furnished as desired.

It is for the exploiters of this slave-labor horde that southwestern Congressmen and Senators fight all price fixing and controls which would result in a reasonable price for raw cotton.

Yet, year after year, at planting and harvesting time, the Departments of Agriculture—State and Federal—heed the pleas of the slave-labor employers to permit more and more alleged limited migration, which the agricultural interests insist is necessary to crop growing and harvesting, and which, in turn, multiplies the illegal immigrants who become permanents.

We have had all kinds of investigations during the last 25 years to ferret out the guilty ones in this illegal traffic, but nothing ever seems to really be done about it.

The Rockefeller interests utilized about 15,000 Mexican laborers in the southern Colorado coal fields from 1912 to the successful unionization of Colorado coal mines.

Other mining interests employed slave-labor Mexicans in New Mexico and Arizona.

During the Colorado coal strike of 1913–14 UMWA officials discovered that 50 percent of the heads of Mexican families involved had made illegal entry into the United States—all planned and supervised by labor agents of mining companies.

Nearly all of the big-shot industrialists and economic writers are harping on slave labor around the world—and, at last, the UN has agreed to take up the study.

We doubt it, but if there is any basis of fact in the belief that the UN is capable of bringing about an end to slave labor, we suggest that our United States bureaucrats—who seem to have such unlimited faith in the UN—insist upon our Mexican slave-labor problem being added to the agenda.

Letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 15, 1951.

DEAR FRIEND: While we strive for victory in Korea, we must also make ourselves strong on the home front.

Will you therefore join me in the battle against the high cost of living and against the enemies of the people?

We must keep the Stars and Stripes flying and our economic ship of state out of troubled waters.

Let me know whenever you wish to express your views and opinions.

I pledge to you my strength to help the folks back home, your boys in service, our veterans and older people.

Don't be afraid of the Commies. Write me any time I can do you a favor.

With kindest regards, I remain

Your Congressman,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Replacement of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Basic Issues Obscured," written by Hanson W. Baldwin and published in the New York Times of Monday, May 7, 1951.

Mr. Baldwin points out, now that we have had a second look at General MacArthur's position on our far eastern policy, that "the man must be separated from the issues, and emotion from logic," factors which in many instances obscured the heart of the debate. Mr. Baldwin indicates that General MacArthur recognizes that the problem is global, but so far has declined to assume any responsibility for its global aspects. Instead, he concentrates solely on our position in Korea and the Far East.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "The Basic Disagreements," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Who Is the Enemy?" published in the Washington Post of May 7, 1951, which bear on the same basic problem.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1951]

BASIC ISSUES OBSCURED—SWEEPING STATEMENTS BY MACARTHUR KEPT SENATORS FROM RESOLVING POLICY DISPUTE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's testimony before Congress last week produced few facts that were not already known, and again tended—largely because of the general's own statements—to confuse the man and the issues and to obscure logic by emotion.

This was, perhaps, inevitable—given the manner of man that General MacArthur is. Accustomed to sweeping generalities and exalted phrases, he rarely speaks in precise terms or in exact definitions; he issues edicts.

Moreover, although some of the questioning was fairly searching, the basic issue of whether or not General MacArthur's prescription for victory in Korea would tend to bring about that victory and would promote the security and welfare of the United States was not by any means resolved.

In part this was true because of General MacArthur's own personality; a man of unlimited ambition and unlimited ego, he brushed aside some questions of major import to concentrate only upon the one aspect that interested him, and that he knew would have the most emotional appeal to the country.

Again and again throughout his testimony he reiterated, with all the skill that William Jennings Bryan once used in his famous cross-of-gold speech, that it is "not only the dust that is settling in Korea; it is American blood." The blood of American boys was the general's final argument, and even the hostile questioners knew it was a potent one.

AN EMOTIONAL ARGUMENT

Yet the weakness of this argument was that it was emotional; no American wants the bloodshed to continue. Yet nowhere in the testimony was there any careful, detailed, and logical evaluation of whether or not—from both the military and political viewpoint—we would save blood and lives by following the policy advocated by General MacArthur, or whether more blood of more Americans would be shed by taking such a course.

And General MacArthur himself, who so aptly pointed out in his speech to Congress that the problem was global, refused to assume the responsibility even of an opinion as to what effect the policies he advocated would have throughout the world.

"My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be an authority on these things," the general said. And yet, inescapably, by his own actions, and by the emotional reaction of the American people that role—the role of global authority—has been assumed by General MacArthur.

If a careful and precise analysis of the issues raised by General MacArthur is to be made—and particularly if the court of public opinion, where General MacArthur has made his appeal is to judge adequately—the man must be separated from the issues and emotion from logic.

This will be difficult, for many of the American people, indignant at weak leadership, frustrated by administration mistakes, have conceived an almost idolatrous worship for General MacArthur and have reacted to his propsals with an emotional hysteria rare in our history. Letters received by this correspondent indicate a great emotional involvement by many Americans in the present dispute.

NOTES TOCSIN FOR VICTORY

One writer—Albert J. Bates, head of a real estate and insurance business in Hazleton, Pa.—writes, for instance, that General MacArthur sounded a tocsin for victory:

"Let us cleanse ourselves. Let us rededicate ourselves. And cleansed, let us remember we are a great race, that we give orders, that we do not take orders. And if any power anywhere will challenge us, let us sweep them before us like chaff! Forward! I lead you to death and to victory! What greater privilege have you than to die for your country. * *

"Ah yes, neatly suppressed was a call like that of Napoleon to his army—'Soldiers of France! I lead you to glory'"

Mrs. Thomas D. Rambaut, of Wyckoff, N. J., writes that since "I heard the terrible news (of General MacArthur's relief) on the radio, General MacArthur has been enshrined in my heart along with George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Winston Churchill.

"Nothing can dethrone him, not even the horrible smear campaign that Truman and Acheson and Marshall and Bradley will instigate. Not even when they refer to his ego and call him god. For he does indeed have the attributes of God; he is kind and merciful and firm and just. That is my idea of God."

And Frederick S. Hammett of Provincetown, Mass., writes:

"Why don't the 'big brass' (the Joint Chiefs of Staff) be American, be loyal to their colleague (General MacArthur) and defy the bankrupt haberdasher and the traitorous State Department who and which would sell us down the river to Great Britain, Europe, and the Communists?"

Letters such as these, which are typical of many that Americans have written to their newspapers in the last few weeks, illustrate the degree of emotion and hysteria that have obscured the issues. It is well for such Americans—among them, General MacArthur himself—to remember that he is, after all, just a man. As Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, recalled in a speech in the Senate last week, Scipio—who also had great power and adulation—kept a slave at his shoulder to remind him constantly:

"Remember, O Scipio, thou art but human."

Separation, therefore, of the man from the issues and of emotion from logic is essential if any careful appraisal is to result from the present hearings. The principal topics and subtopics which have been and should be discussed at the hearings can be grouped under the following general headings or issues:

1. The circumstances surrounding General MacArthur's relief; the reasons for it; the manner and timing of it.

2. The issue of civilian versus military control in peace and in war.

3. The objectives of war; the issue of limited war versus unlimited war, etc.

4. The past history of, and facts concerning, the Korean war.

5. The present military-political situation in Korea and the Orient, and its relationship to the world picture.

6. The alternative courses of action we might follow in the future in Korea and in the Orient, and the effects of these alternative courses upon the world situation and the safety and security of the United States.

This examination—like any attempt to examine the future—obviously involves to some extent speculative judgments, and therefore this topic also must include a subtopic—an examination of the validity and wisdom of the past judgments (both military and political) of General MacArthur and of his opponents.

Each of these topics should be fully explored, but obviously the second and third, and the fifth and sixth topics are, by far, the most important to the future of the United States and the world.

[From the New York Times of May 5, 1951]

THE BASIC DISAGREEMENT

Out of the flood of words produced by the Senate hearings on the dismissal of General MacArthur there emerge three basic differences of opinion which are at the bottom of the controversy and from which other differences derive. These basic differences, which for the moment obscure the wide area of agreement between General MacArthur and the administration—on such vital points as the necessity of resisting Communist aggression everywhere, preserving the United Nations, and giving "the fullest protection and assistance" to Europe—may be summarized as follows:

1. General MacArthur, by his own repeated declarations, undertakes to speak only as a former commander in a local theater of war concerned solely with the means of ending this particular conflict and therefore willing to take the risks of a general war in order to win a speedy victory; the administration, on the other hand, is compelled to take into account all the military, political, and moral factors of a global struggle which we still hope to win without a general war. General MacArthur admits the global nature of the struggle, and he likewise admits that

the decisions on how to wage it must be made by the Government, which alone has the authority and the necessary information to make such decisions—authority and information that are beyond the reach of a local commander. But he insists on the measures he proposes while disclaiming responsibility for their consequences on either the global struggle itself or even the future of the countries directly affected by his proposed measures.

2. General MacArthur advances the thesis that once war has broken out the "balance of control" must be put in the hands of the military, and that no political considerations should handicap the latter in winning such a war, while the administration holds that in peace or war the civil government remains supreme.

3. General MacArthur maintains that, while all soldiers should carry out orders, they have the right to disagree, and in such cases have the right and the duty not only to submit their own views to their superior officers but also to take the issue to the public for ultimate decision. Anything less than that, he says, would be "gag rule." The administration holds the contrary view.

It is on the basis of such considerations that General MacArthur now proposes that the American Government issue an ultimatum to Communist China to come to terms on a cease fire and the cessation of aggression in Korea—with refusal to comply with such an ultimatum to be regarded as a declaration of war. What is more, while expressing the hope that the United Nations would endorse such a step, he urges that, if necessary, the United States act alone.

In making these proposals General MacArthur assumes that Communist China is militarily and economically weak and can be easily defeated, and that Soviet Russia will stand idly by while the biggest of all Communist conquests is snatched from her hands. But while he is rather positive about the first assumption, he is not so certain about the latter and admits that a wrong guess regarding it might lead to a larger war than the one he is seeking to end. Moreover, he is less than precise as to what the ultimatum would imply. In one passage of his testimony he urges action in accordance with the January recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who proposed an economic blockade of China, preparations for a naval blockade, air reconnaissance over Manchuria and the Chinese coast, and use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops, about whom General MacArthur is more optimistic than the Chinese themselves. In another passage he demands bombing of enemy bases in Manchuria. And in still another he speaks of putting pressure on Red China's distributive system, which one Senator interpreted without contradiction as meaning the smashing of the tenuous Chinese railway system, carrying the war to the Soviet border.

We believe that the hazards of such proposals become evident from the mere recital of them. That there have been grievous mistakes in American policy in the Far East in recent years is equally evident. But, despite this mistake, we cannot afford to risk a break with our allies by pursuing a course of action which might well bog us down in an unlimited war in Asia.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1951]

WHO IS THE ENEMY?

In most of his testimony before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees General MacArthur, in spite of his prior insistence upon his global view, has been careful not to step out of his role as a theater commander in the Far East. For example, he persistently resisted Senator FULBRIGHT's efforts to draw him into a discussion of the wisdom of aiding Yugoslavia. At one point he declared, "The last impression that I would want to give is that I pose as an expert on world affairs." To Senator MCMAHON he said, "Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area." Yet some of his testimony extended not only beyond the confines of the Far East where he has been stationed for the last 14 years, but also reached into the sphere of political policy-making. We have in mind especially his definition of communism as the enemy against which we are arming and fighting.

Senator MCMAHON remarked, "It is obvious that we agree they are our main enemy—that the Soviet Union is." General MacArthur replied, "I didn't agree to it. I said that communism throughout the world was our main enemy." Later on Senator FULBRIGHT asked the general what he meant by communism and evoked this exchange:

"General MACARTHUR. Communism has many various factors. The great threat in what is called present communism is the imperialistic tendency or the lust of power beyond their own geographical confines. It is their effort to enslave the individual to the concept of the state. It is the establishment of autocracy that squeezes out every one of the freedoms which we value so greatly.

"Senator FULBRIGHT. I had not myself thought of our enemy as being communism: I thought of it as primarily being Russia, an imperialist Russia. That is what interests me.

"General MACARTHUR. In that concept, Senator, I disagree with you completely.

"Senator FULBRIGHT. Well * * * it seemed to me, you do not fight communism with a gun. It is sort of like sin, we are all against sin; you do not fight sin with anything tangible. Communism is an idea, but what really bothers us is when people start to shoot.

"General MACARTHUR. I think you do fight sin with very practical weapons, and I think we are fighting communism with very practical weapons."

If our enemy were merely communism we could abandon the rearmament program and embark upon a world-wide effort of peace, freedom, and economic and social rehabilitation. We should have only the communistic idea to combat and it could best be met by the spread of progressive democratic ideas. The tragedy of the present day is that the power-drunk men of the Kremlin are not willing to engage in such a bloodless contest. When persuasion has failed, they have resorted to terror and military force to impose communistic dictatorships upon unwilling peoples. Obviously it is the warmongers in the communistic movement that are our enemy.

The weakness of General MacArthur's position is that he draws no distinction between the aggressors who are in control of Russia and China and the wider areas of the world where communistic ideas prevail. Such a policy would be a mistake if for no other reason than that it would tend to drive Tito, with his thirty-odd Yugoslav divisions, back into the arms of the Kremlin. But there is also a more important reason for keeping the distinction clear. Any designation of communism as our enemy would carry with it an implication that we intend to try to wipe out communism by force of arms. Such a crusade would cost millions of lives and inestimable treasure and in the end would probably stimulate communism instead of suppressing it. General MacArthur has emphatically ruled out from his military proposals in the Far East any such American campaign. His emphasis has been upon a decisive blow against Communist China to compel that regime to give up its aggressive course in Korea. Obviously no such limited objective squares with the definition of communism in general as our enemy.

Because of his notable influence in Congress and the country, we think General MacArthur should not let this conflict in his testimony stand. People and legislators must think clearly about who our enemy is before they can hope to achieve a meeting of minds as to how the enemy shall be met. It is not merely a question of semantics. Rather it goes to the heart of the world problem of preserving freedom of thought and of economic and social organization on one hand and of suppressing aggression on the other.

Necessity of Faith in God in Nation's Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the ladies of the Sunday school class of the Nicholasville, Ky., Baptist Church, emphasizing the power of faith in solving the problems of our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NICHOLASVILLE, KY., *April 30, 1951.*

The Honorable THOMAS UNDERWOOD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday the ladies of the Sunday school class in the Nicholasville Baptist Church, 42 in number, compared the conditions existing at the time the children of Israel were commanded to enter the Promised Land with conditions as they exist today. When the Israelites came up from Egypt under Moses they sent 12 men to spy out the land. Ten of these men were cowards and said that the cities were walled and the inhabitants were giants and they could never overcome them. Two of the spies, Joshua and Caleb, reported that the cities were walled and the people were giants, but they had faith that the land could be taken at God's command.

The Israelites had a democratic government, so the majority ruled, and the result was that they wandered in the wilderness for 38 years—because they did not trust God.

Now the United States was founded by Christian, God-fearing people, and God is depending on us to destroy His enemies, the Communists, so that His people can obey and worship Him. We have been to the thirty-eighth parallel twice and now we are wandering back again, losing our boys and the boys of other nations. It could be that we will be in the wilderness for 38 years, because of lack of faith. David did not have all the planes and other war material that we have when he went out to meet Goliath, only a small rock and God. Jericho fell at the blowing of trumpets because the people obeyed and had faith. They had no war material.

We have the same God today that the Israelites had, and we are asking you to read this letter to the Senate, and to use your leadership to have this Nation go forward and destroy the enemy of God's people and restore to this country the sacredness of our motto, "In God we trust."

Very truly yours,

SALLIE STEELE TAYLOR
Mrs. Sallie Steele Taylor.

Appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur Before Senate Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles relating to the recent appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur before the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, the first entitled "MacArthur and the True Picture," by David Lawrence; the second entitled "Shows No Signs of Fading Away," by Constantine Brown, both published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1951]

MACARTHUR AND THE TRUE PICTURE—GENERAL DECLARED TO HAVE PUT UNITED STATES POLICY IN PROPER FOCUS; SUGGESTION OFFERED THAT TRUMAN SHOULD MAKE AMENDS

(By David Lawrence)

A breath of fresh air has swept across the country in the person of a man who, without bitterness or rancor, rises above the petty and the irrelevant to state honestly his convictions on a highly controversial subject of national policy.

What General MacArthur has accomplished by his 3 days of testimony and by his ready submission to cross-examination is to put the whole question of our military policy in a true perspective.

Not a word of resentment did he express against the President or anyone else. He brushed aside with a simple statement of facts the many misrepresentations of his position which critics have flung at him.

Nobody can truly claim the right to state General MacArthur's position hereafter unless he has read the 150,000 words of testimony covering the 3 days of hearings.

This correspondent has read every word of it and is amazed at the number of things that have been written about the general or his proposals which simply are not true. The atmosphere here is so surcharged with political tactics and with the polemics of partisanship that it is refreshing to find a spokesman who, without regard to how his remarks jibe with the speeches of Republican or Democratic leaders in the "great debate" of recent weeks, states with candor and frankness what he really believes.

People may differ as to whether he has the right proposals and whether they should be adopted but, after reading the testimony, one is more puzzled than ever that the President should have listened to the smears of the "palace guard" and tried to destroy the reputation of one of the world's greatest soldiers, if not one of her most dynamic statesmen.

The same man who wrote out in longhand on his plane the historic speech to Congress and then read it without glasses, the same man who, though 71 years of age, sat for 9 hours a day for three successive days and faced a barrage of questions from the Senate's best interrogators, won spontaneous praise from Republicans and Democrats in the committee. The tribute by Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the end of the final session on Saturday is significant. He said:

"General MacArthur, I wish to state to you that the 3 days that you have been here with us are without parallel in my legislative experience. I have never seen a man subjected to such a barrage of questions in so many fields and on so many varied subjects. I marvel at your physical endurance. More than that, I have been profoundly impressed by the vastness of your patience and the thoroughness and the frankness with which you have answered all of the questions that have been propounded.

"We have certainly drawn freely on your vast reservoir of knowledge and experience, not only as a great military captain, but as a civilian administrator of 80,000,000 people."

One wonders how such a man could have been summarily dismissed. One finds nowhere in the official record the slightest evidence that he disobeyed a military command or failed to fulfill the highest traditions of our military service. One wonders if President Truman will not be inspired when he has read all the testimony to show the same courage that he showed when he apologized to the Marines for an intemperate remark. For the instinct to redress a wrong is the mark of courage and spiritual understanding. General MacArthur cannot be restored to his command, of course, but the unworthy manner by which he was abruptly relieved can still be expunged from the record by an act of Christian atonement.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1951]

SHOWS NO SIGNS OF FADING AWAY—MACARTHUR'S EXHIBITION OF VITALITY DURING LONG QUESTIONING GIVES LIE TO REPORTS THAT HE WAS TOO OLD TO CARRY ON

(By Constantine Brown)

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was only a headline name to the man in the street until he showed himself in person to the American people. He was a controversial figure with as many fans as critics in this country. His detractors spread the word during the last 2 or 3 years that whatever he had been in the past he no longer is today. He was freely described as a man who was actually fading away mentally and physically. Only last July a high official told this reporter that General MacArthur should be replaced by a younger man as commander of the forces in Korea.

"He is not able at 71 to take an active part in the campaign; moreover, when you have a 'God complex' in your younger days, you actually believe in it when you reach MacArthur's age. And that is dangerous for the prosecution of the campaign."

Since the five-star general arrived in this country and particularly since he testified without interruption before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees all these rumors have been belied. While much younger men were exhausted at the end of the long continuous hearings, General MacArthur was rested and fresh and bore unflinchingly the brunt of questioning by 26 Senators—a number of whom were set on trapping or embarrassing him.

He brushed off some of the "political" questions as having no relation to the scope of the hearings, and answered unhesitatingly the pertinent queries. There has been no debate in the memory of man which gripped the country more than the MacArthur investigation. The ousted supreme commander has gained a greater stature since he returned than his most ardent admirers ever anticipated.

One inescapable fact is that we are at war with the Chinese Communists in Korea. The other, which General MacArthur has brought out forcefully, is that we are fighting a half-hearted defensive war which costs us tens of thousands of casualties because we don't dare throw all our available might against the enemy.

He has been pressed to answer whether an all-out attack on the enemy's bases in Manchuria whence the Reds feed their armies in Korea with manpower, arms, and ammunition would not precipitate a third world war for which some legislators maintained we are nearly prepared. General MacArthur replied that if Russia is determined to fight us, it is immaterial what pretext she will use—if she needs any pretext at all. But his considered guess is that Russia is not prepared for an all-out war in the Far East because of logistic consideration. It is more difficult for her to transport men and weapons overland over deficient railways and bad roads than it is for us who are carrying them in ships across the great expanse of the Pacific.

When we entered the war in Korea last June our strategists in Washington realized that we were taking a calculated risk. It may have been a minor risk, but the elements of involvement with China and the U. S. S. R. must have been in their minds. Yet the decision was made to accept that risk. But when General MacArthur urged, after the Chinese Reds entered the war last November, that they should also be defeated with the means available in the Far East, the military and the political planners in Washington and at Lake Success refused to expand that calculated risk in the face of the general's arguments that victory was within our reach if his recommendations were followed. The military planners at home are said by General MacArthur to have bowed to the political arguments of the diplomats.

For reasons of security some parts of General MacArthur's testimony were deleted. But there are reasons to believe that the former supreme commander is not particularly impressed with the war potential of China. Besides the fact that the Chinese industries are not capable of a sustained effort and the losses of their best trained armies have been very great, China is actually in a state of near civil war at the present time.

According to the admission of the Peiping government itself upwards of 1,500,000 active guerrillas are fighting the Peiping administration throughout that vast territory. There is a lack of food which verges on general famine; some of the trusted provincial officials are about ready to become "warlords" on their own, under the Communist mask.

So long as China fights on one front alone, she will be able to continue the war of attrition against us. But the day her forces are harassed by the Nationalists from Formosa and she is subjected to aerial attacks from the Allied air forces, the situation may change radically and Russia is unlikely to do much about it.

H. R. 88 for Safety in Gas Transmission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 29 I placed in the Appendix information which had been assembled at my request by the Federal Power Commission with reference to the history of

explosions of gas transmission lines. It was noted at that time that this information was not accurate or complete. Since then I have been attempting to secure accurate information from the several companies, and now I am in a position to furnish certain corrected data. I am glad to make this available to the membership at this time, particularly since the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Commerce have filed favorable reports on H. R. 88.

The information available at this time follows:

Information received concerning line breaks on interstate pipelines as of May 7, 1951

Pipeline company	Location of line break	Date of line break	Number of persons—		Size of line (inches)	Comments
			Injured	Killed		
Atlantic Seaboard Corp.	Rug River, W. Va.	Feb. 21, 1947			20	Coupling failure and emergency sleeve failure due to strip-mining operations.
	Various locations	Nov. 21, 1949 to Dec. 30, 1949			26	7 pipeline weld failures out of 38,000 welds in the line; and 1 fracture in buckled joint of pipe while testing after construction.
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	Northeastern New Mexico	Apr. 18, 1942			22	Wash-out caused by floods. No fire.
	Pueblo County, Colo.	Aug. 19, 1946			22	Pressure test. No fire.
	do	Sept. 1, 1946			22	Do.
	Lincoln County, Colo.	Sept. 30, 1948			20	Do.
	Las Animas County, Colo.	July 16, 1948			22	Defective pipe. No fire.
	Haskell County, Kans.	May 7, 1950		1	16	Pipe ruptured by bulldozer by outside party leveling land. Bad fire.
	Arapahoe County, Colo.	Dec. 30, 1950			10	Pipe ruptured by bulldozer by outside party leveling land. No fire.
Interstate Natural Gas Co.	Near Ferriday, La.	Feb. 20, 1942			22	2 joints blew out.
	Near Foules, La.	Mar. 14, 1942			22	Leak at coupling.
	Near Ferriday, La.	Dec. 27, 1943			22	
	do	Mar. 19, 1944			22	
	Natchez, Miss.	Dec. 19, 1944			10	No. 2 line pulled apart by anchor of Coast Guard cutter.
	Near Ferriday, La.	Jan. 5, 1945			22	
	Near Wilkinson, Miss.	Feb. 22, 1945			22	
	do	Feb. 11, 1946			22	
	Near Ferriday, La.	Mar. 1, 1946			22	2 joints blew out.
	do	Mar. 10, 1946			22	
	Near Swartz, La.	Jan. 21, 1947			22	Do.
	Near Wilkinson, Miss.	Jan. 28, 1948			22	Pipe became separated at coupling.
	Near Swartz, La.	Mar. 23, 1948			22	Pipe raised and separated at coupling.
	Natchez, Miss.	Aug. 12, 1948			10	No. 4 line.
	Near Wilkinson, Miss.	Nov. 19, 1948			10	No. 2 line. Washed out.
	do	July 3, 1949			10	No. 3 line. Washed out.
	Natchez, Miss.	May 8, 1950			10	No. 8 line. Washed out.
	Near Foules, La.	Jan. 3, 1951			22	Pipe separated at coupling.
Michigan Gas Storage Co.	Marion, Mich.	Nov. 30, 1947	(1)	(1)	(2)	Explosion during construction at compressor station. Weld broke. Gas ignited. Considerable damage to station.
Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America.	Near Knoxville, Iowa	July 4, 1936	(1)	(1)	24	Severe lamination in steel plate.
	Near Sheffield, Ill.	Feb. 13, 1938	(1)	(1)	24	High water table—peat and unstable soil—wash out at coupling.
	Near Red Oak, Iowa	Aug. 20, 1938	(1)	(1)	24	Lightning collapsed pipe 5 feet west of girth weld. A 65-foot section pulled out of couplings at each end.
	Indian Creek, Nebr.	Sept. 15, 1941	(1)	(1)	24	Flood—washed out 80-foot section between 2 couplings.
	Near Washington, Iowa	Jan. 13, 1943	(1)	(1)		Cross-over No. 70. External groove cut in wall of 8-inch bypass riser by contractor's equipment.
	Near Corning, Iowa	May 3, 1944	(1)	(1)	24	Excessive strain on pipe due to soil stress. Pipe pulled out at coupling.
	Near Pringle, Tex.	Aug. 30, 1945	(1)	(1)	26	Break occurred due to groove in inside surface of pipe parallel to longitudinal weld.
	Near Station No. 22	Jan. 26, 1950	(1)	(1)	26	Electrolysis caused by nearby oil well.
Northern Natural Gas Co.	Louisville, Nebr.	Oct. 23, 1940			8	Road grader struck line.
	Ellinwood, Kans.	Apr. 30, 1942			26	Flood.
	Waseca, Minn.	July 15, 1945			18	Line split under pressure test.
	Ventura, Iowa	Aug. 10, 1946			16	Do.
	Rosalie, Nebr.	Dec. 10, 1947			18	Line failed under pressure test.
	Bushton, Kans.	Mar. 18, 1949			26	Break due to corrosion.
	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Apr. 26, 1949			14	Defective weld.
	Clifton, Kans.	May 10, 1950			26	Failure due to corrosion.
	do	July 2, 1950			26	Do.
	Hooper, Nebr.	July 11, 1950			20	Do.
	Fremont, Nebr.	Mar. 8, 1950			16	Break due to flood.
Ohio Fuel Gas Co.	Portage Township, Wood County	June 12, 1946			10	Weak joint of pipe blew out.
	Laurel Township Hocking County	Aug. 12, 1946			12	Line blew out 3 times during stress test to operate at higher pressure.
	Good Hope Township, Hocking County.	Aug. 17, 1946			12	Defective joint of pipe.
	Alexander Township, Athens County	Sept. 1, 1946			18	Faulty pipe.
	Marseilles Township, Wyandot County.	Nov. 23, 1946			10	External corrosion weakened a joint of pipe.
	Berne Township, Fairfield County	June 23, 1947			10	Road contractor tore hole in line.
	Washington Township, Jackson County.	Sept. 5, 1947			12	Faulty joint of pipe.
	Range Township, Madison County	Nov. 25, 1947			12	Weak joint failed.
	Madison Township, Franklin County.	Feb. 4, 1948			16	Faulty weld in a joint of reconditioned pipe.
	Mifflin Township, Wyandot County	Feb. 8, 1948			10	Faulty pipe.
	Good Hope Township, Hocking County.	Feb. 13, 1948			12	External corrosion weakened pipe.
	Berne Township, Fairfield County	Aug. 13, 1948			20	New construction, blew out while under stress test.
	Mifflin Township, Wyandot County	Aug. 16, 1948			10	Split in pipe opened.
	Benton Township, Hocking County	Aug. 29, 1948			12	External corrosion caused a joint to fail.
	Good Hope Township, Hocking County.	Sept. 9, 1948			20	New construction, blew out in a defective wrinkle bend while under stress test.
	Monroe Township, Richland County.	Sept. 27, 1948			12	Joint of pipe failed while under stress test.
	Mount Gilead Township, Morrow County.	Oct. 14, 1948			16	New construction under stress test. Top half of 1 joint blew out.
	Clear Creek Township, Warren County.	Oct. 19, 1948			18	New construction of reconditioned pipe being stress-tested, blew out 6 times.
	do	Nov. 4, 1948			18	New construction of reconditioned pipe under hydrostatic test, blew out 7 times.
	Jackson Township, Richland County.	Nov. 24, 1948			16	Contractor laying new 20-inch parallel line.
	Chester Township, Meigs County	Nov. 27, 1948			18	Landslide pulled line apart.
	Benton Township, Hocking County.	Dec. 1, 1948			12	Faulty piston gate between high- and low-pressure systems opened and blew out the lower-pressure line.
	Waterloo Township, Athens County.	Feb. 20, 1949			18	External corrosion at a coal blossom weakened pipe.
	Green Township, Clark County	Sept. 27, 1949			16	Stress testing new construction—defective pipe ruptured. Reconditioned pipe used.
	do	Sept. 29, 1949			16	Stress testing new construction—break occurred in an overbend. Reconditioned pipe used.

[1] No details available.
[2] Compressor station.

Information received concerning line breaks on interstate pipelines as of May 7, 1951—Continued

Pipeline company	Location of line break	Date of line break	Number of persons—		Size of line (inches)	Comments
			Injured	Killed		
Ohio Fuel Gas Co.—Con.	Mifflin Township, Ashland County	Jan. 25, 1950			18	Contractor's heavy bulldozer damaged line prior to stress test, causing line to fail under pressure.
	Amanda Township, Fairfield County	Oct. 31, 1950			18	Pipe ruptured at 3 locations during stress test to operate at higher pressures.
	Chester Township, Meigs County	Nov. 12, 1950			18	Landslide caused coupling failure.
	Wilson Township, Clinton County	Nov. 21, 1950			8	Stress testing new construction before placing line in service.
	Troy Township, Wood County	Dec. 10, 1950			16	Contractor's back-hoe excavation ditch skidded in soft ballast, weakening line, and causing it to pull out of couplings.
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.	Centralia, Mo	Dec. 8, 1949	(1)	(1)	(2)	Break in "tee" fabricated at time of original installation in 1930.
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.	Union County, Ark	May 8, 1947			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Grant County, Ark	Jan. 11, 1948			20	Do.
	White County, Ark	Jan. 17, 1948			20	Do.
	Pike County, Ind	Mar. 18, 1948			20	Damage to buildings settled for $18,000; due to defective pipe.
	Pulaski County, Ark	May 9, 1948			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Near Seymour, Ind	Nov. 19, 1948	18		(2)	Explosion in compressor station causing $1,000,000 damages.
	Near Batesville, Ind	Jan. 18, 1949	2		(2)	Power failure caused fire in compressor station with $200,000 damages.
	Adams County, Pa	Feb. 9, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Jennings County, Ind	Mar. 4, 1949	1		20	Defective pipe caused property damages of $26,000.
	Craighead County, Ark	Apr. 2, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Noble County, Ohio	May 6, 1949			20	Do.
	Butler County, Mo	May 18, 1949			20	Do.
	Do	May 24, 1949			20	Do.
	Grant County, Ark	June 26, 1949			20	Do.
	West Chester, Pa	July 15, 1949	1	2	24	Explosion blew up cover plate where men were working.
	Johnson County, Ill	Oct. 5, 1949			20	Nominal damages caused by defective pipe.
	Montgomery County, Pa	Dec. 14, 1949			20	5-inch crack in field weld.
	El Dorado, Ark	Nov. 25, 1948			(2)	Valve failure. No damage.
	Noble County, Ohio	Jan. 20, 1950			20	Defective pipe caused explosion with $12,000 property damages
	Pulaski County, Ark	May 17, 1950			24	River eroded causing pipe to pull apart.
	Perry County, Ohio	May 19, 1950			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
	Near Beallsville, Ohio	July 1, 1950			20	Explosion ripped up 24 feet of pipeline.
	Near Jasper, Ind	July 10, 1950				Nominal damages.
	Butler County, Mo	July 15, 1950				Do.
	Nevada County, Ark	Aug. 8, 1950			24	Corrosion leak. Nominal damage.
	Adams County, Pa	Sept. 12, 1950			20	Explosion occurred after hydrostatic testing.
	Near Colonia, N. J	Spring, 1950			20	Line breaks occurred during testing section of pipe between Raritan and Rahway Rivers.
	Oran, Mo	Jan. 13, 1951	5		(2)	Failure of drip-trap. $30,000 damages.
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line.	Wadley, Ala	Sept. 20, 1950	(?) 3		30	Serious fires, some people injured, caused by explosions during testing. Property damage inconsequential.
	Chatham, Va	Nov. 2, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
	Little Rocky Hill, N. J	Nov. 25, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
	Culpeper, Va	Nov. 22, 1950	2		30	Explosion during line testing caused great property damage.
	Norristown, Pa	Nov. 23, 1950	2		30	Do.
United Fuel Gas Co	Near Charleston, W. Va	May 9, 1946			10	Line blew out.
	Near Glenville, W. Va	Dec. 2, 1946			16	Check valve blew out.
	Near Harold, Ky	Jan. 15, 1948			20	Cap blew off a header on river crossing.
	Near Kenova, W. Va	Feb. 15, 1948			10	Line blew out in Big Sandy River.
	Near Peach Orchard, Ky	Apr. 10, 1948			20	Line blew out between Peach Orchard and Chestnut Gate.
	Near Clendenin, W. Va	Sept. 3, 1948			20	Line blew out during pressure test; 1 joint of pipe. Blew out again during test; 1 joint of pipe.
	Near Beaver Creek, Ky	Dec. 24, 1948			20	Line blew out between Beaver Creek, Boldman, and Betsy Lane Hollow.
	Near Laynesville, Ky	Dec. 20, 1948			20	Line blew out in Arkansas Branch.
	Near Charleston, W. Va	....do			10	Line blew out above Bream Bridge.
	Near Nitro, W. Va	....do			20	Suction header at Kanawha compressor station blew out.
	....do	....do			20	Discharge header at Kanawha compressor station blew out.
	Near Clendenin, W. Va	Nov. 4, 1950			20	Line blew out between Uler and Walnut.
United Gas Pipe Line Co	Dallas County, Tex	Dec. 18, 1944			18	Break caused by split in pipe; nominal property damage.
Virginia Gas Transmission Corp.	Hazel River, Va	Jan. 14, 1948			20	Header failure caused by defective pipe.
	Upperville, Va	Oct. 16, 1950			26	Failure of pipe during testing; split 20 feet long.
	....do	Oct. 17, 1950			26	Failure of pipe during testing; 40 feet blown out of ground.

[1] No details available.
[2] Compressor station.

Message of Frazar B. Wilde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a message sent by Frazar B. Wilde, president of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., to that company's policyholders. I am so impressed by Mr. Wilde's grasp of the problems facing our Nation and his commonsense analysis of these problems that I would like to have his views receive wider circulation. The letter follows:

In a discussion of the year's results at Connecticut General, it seems not inappropriate to give you our thoughts on the serious and important problems of our world situation which mean so much to all of us in so many different ways.

The threat to peace and freedom which is facing free nations throughout the world is without parallel in modern history. The long period of peace hoped for after World War II has not been realized, and the situation has deteriorated to the point where the United States and other members of the United Nations are involved in undeclared war to suppress Communist-inspired aggression.

This confronts us with a most difficult problem. Our aim must be to try to localize the conflict and, simultaneously, to pursue every possibility of accomplishing a fair international understanding through peaceful means. Diplomacy alone, without adequate force behind it, will inevitably be ineffective. Dictatorships feed on aggression; they respect only armed power and then only if they are sure such power will be used. To promise that we will use the atomic bomb only if the enemy first uses it against us would put all of us, military and civilians, at a great disadvantage for which there seems no justification. If we are to preserve our way of life, we must be prepared to fight for it without hesitancy.

National unity of purpose and action is essential. To reach national conclusions we do have to have full discussion. Fair and informed criticism is helpful. Unfair and ill-considered criticism of those charged with the operation of our Government will only serve to weaken us internally and promote a lack of confidence in us on the part of other free nations throughout the world. We should all be prepared to face the inevitable fact that, whether or not there is total war, the steps we must take will be costly ones and will have to be paid for. The success we anticipate in securing peace does not have to be gained at the expense of losing our way of life by permitting it to be destroyed through inflation. Inflation is a danger which we can control through our actions as individuals and by supporting positive action on the part of our Government.

Because the basic cause of inflation lies in the existence of more effective buying power

than the normal value of goods available for purchase, the problem has to be attacked on both sides. There must be restraints imposed upon buying power and there must be an increase in supply. Wage and price controls may be of some temporary help, but they cannot do the job by themselves. They are attacking the effects of inflation, not the underlying cause.

The most effective answer to inflation is more production. This answer cannot be made immediately available and therefore it must be viewed as a deferred solution. Until we have increased our plant and put the increased plant in operation, we simply cannot have both guns and butter. Therefore, civilian goods must for a while shrink in supply.

We can restrict spending by a severe program of tax increases. This is a vary unpalatable remedy for all of us. There is, however, no escape from it if we wish to control inflation. If we don't control it, we will pay much more in the end through inflated prices.

We can ask our Government to curtail its expenditures, particularly those items in the budget which may properly be postponed. There are always large sums representing projects which might be desirable in times of peace but which we don't absolutely need now. We can even ask our representatives to scrutinize the military budgets. We do not care to take any undue risk of lacking the most modern equipment and enough of it. The facts of life are, however, that it is frequently found that the procurement policies of the Armed Forces are not so efficient that we can relax our scrutiny in that area. There is a tendency to overbuy many items, which adds nothing to present effectiveness. While we want to be completely armed, there is nothing sacrosanct in the military budgets.

Credit extended by lending institutions should be restricted because one of the primary causes of inflationary pressure is the expansion of buying ability created through credit.

There are other steps which should be taken, such as scrutiny of the country's agricultural program. Overemphasis on agricultural aid, such as excessive parity prices and loan values, can be highly inflationary because they affect the prices of groceries in the cities which in turn leads to demand for higher wages.

We as individuals can help the situation to a greater extent than many realize. We can avoid buying anything which we do not actually need now, and resist temptations to buy beyond current income through borrowing and through other credit means. All of us who have a hand in production of goods can strive for maximum output, and those of us who manage businesses can resist price increases. We can remember that demands for increased wages without increased output or subsidy from Government will hurt all of us—there are no "other people" in our Nation.

Very importantly, we should all attempt to add to our savings programs. When we put money into United States savings bonds, savings bank deposits and life insurance, just that much less money will go into the market in competition for the limited supply of goods presently available. The money saved becomes available for financing defense production.

These steps attack inflation at the source. If they were taken, in sufficient degree, the danger would be eliminated, and the disastrous inflation spiral would be stopped.

There are, of course, those areas which we cannot directly control as individuals, such as Government programs, spending, and monetary policies. Some are Federal. Others are State and local. We can, however, in our democratic form of government, control these areas through government if enough of us want to do so. Senators and Congressmen often maintain offices in their constituencies for the purpose of finding out how the people they represent feel on current issues. If this is the case where you live, go to see them. If you can't contact them personally, write them a letter. State and local officials are almost always available, or letters can be written to them. Our representatives in Government can carry out our wishes only if we let them know what those wishes are. They will know they have our backing in carrying out strong, positive measures to combat inflation only if we tell them so.

F. B. WILDE,
President.

MacArthur Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Rolland Peters, editor of the Pratt Daily Tribune, entitled "MacArthur Before Congress." While the editorial was written previous to the general's testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees, I think it is most timely.

The Nation is fortunate in having a man of knowledge, integrity, and sincerity at a time when we need leadership with courage, character, and conviction.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR BEFORE CONGRESS

History will have to record whether America was right or wrong in whatever direction she moves today in her war in Korea and her disputes with Russia. General MacArthur has his own definite ideas of what should be done; President Truman and Alger Hiss' friend, Secretary Acheson, have theirs. And Britain has hers. So do the European countries. The White House and the State Department have, as before, sided with Europe. They sided in with Europe against their own general in Korea, the most experienced military leader of the age. Because General MacArthur persisted in airing his views the five-star general of 52 years' experience in military work was fired by a former World War I infantry captain.

Yesterday the general went before Congress and once again told the country what he thought should be done in Asia. Right or wrong, he deserved the attention of all of the American people because he was speaking then as an American and not as head of the Korean forces. But the man who fired him was observed to walk to lunch during the time General MacArthur was speaking. This was the height of discourtesy on the part of Mr. Truman toward a man who has done so much for the country of which Mr. Truman is President.

The general was most gracious and gentlemanly throughout his talk. He said what he had to say. He struck a couple of severe blows at the Truman crowd, and yet he did so like the gentleman that he is. One of the most significant things that he said was that his program had had the approval of practically every military person including the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Bradley is Chairman of that Staff. Only 3 days ago General Bradley publicly sided with the Truman administration in the dismissal of General MacArthur in a way that was intended from all indications to humiliate the general.

Perhaps General Bradley can explain why he shared the deposed general's views and then turned over to the Truman side. He owes this explanation to the American people. Two points outstand in the MacArthur talk. First, it was the speech of a man sincere in everything that he said, and second, it was the speech of a man who knows far more about the Far East and the military than many Harry Trumans and Dean Achesons put together.

The welcome to America that is being accorded General MacArthur surpasses anything that has ever before been accorded to any one. Back of all this is the American people's appreciation for what he has done for America and faith in his sincerity and integrity and an expression of disgust over the manner in which his brilliant career was ended by a politician who listened to other politicians and to foreigners in Europe. If the American people had today the faith in their administration that they have shown in General MacArthur, we would not be as confused as we are and we would not be as apprehensive as we are. The Trumans of Washington have cried "emergency" and "crisis" so long and so often that people generally have come to look upon their cries like the boy who cried "wolf" when there was no wolf. When the wolf appeared no one paid any attention to him and the wolf killed the sheep. The greatest thing that could happen to America today would be for the people of America to have an administration which they could look to for sound and sensible leadership and an administration in which they could place their faith. We do not have this under Harry Truman.

Protecting the Bald Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of these remarks a letter written by Bernice Marshall, chairman of conservation, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, and president of the National Life Conservation Society, which was published in the New York Times under date April 23, 1951. The letter follows:

PROTECTING THE BALD EAGLE—PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION ADVOCATED TO SAVE BIRD FROM EXTINCTION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Many fine organizations in this area have sent letters to Congress endorsing H. R. 1870 to extend protection to the bald eagle in Alaska, which bill was introduced by Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, in the House.

Among them was the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs with a membership of approximately 200,000. The supporting resolution was passed at a large convention of the federation.

The National Life Conservation Society has conducted an active campaign in favor of this needed legislation. So also have Sorosis, mother of women's clubs; Daughters of Ohio, Congress of States, Natural History Club, Bronx Women's Clubs, Washington Heights Club, and many other clubs. This shows

that a large number of thinking people are alarmed over the awful slaughter our national emblem in Alaska.

What small damage the bird may do is certainly not enough to justify the bounty of $2 on every bird killed. The Fish and Wildlife Service office in Alaska reports that bounties were paid on 4,320 eagles during the calendar year 1950, almost double the number for 1949. The bald eagle is not a prolific bird. How long does anyone think it can survive this slaughter?

Alaska wants statehood. She should therefore show some respect for our national emblem; as we do here in the States, though I must confess we were much too slow in getting protective measures established. Every patriotic citizen, every conservationist who cares about its survival should get behind this legislation and tell our representatives in no uncertain terms that the shameful killing of the bald eagle must stop.

Do we Americans want to see our splendid country represented on our great seal by an extinct bird, that we ourselves have exterminated?

BERNICE MARSHALL,
Chairman of Conservation, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, and President of the National Life Conservation Society.
NEW YORK, *April 23, 1951.*

Minnesota's Ore Reserves Still Ample

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, all of the phony propaganda being dished out by the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway to the effect that Minnesota's iron-ore reserves will be depleted in a few years is debunked by the following article written by Lewis S. Patterson for a St. Paul, Minn., newspaper on March 18, 1951.

The article by Mr. Patterson follows:

MINNESOTA'S ORE RESERVES STILL AMPLE

(By Lewis S. Patterson)

Just what is the status of the iron-ore mining industry in Minnesota?

Is the old champion, which for 50 years has supplied the Nation's steel mills with as high as 80 percent of their raw materials, really on her last legs?

What is the meaning of Friday's announcement that in 15 days 55,000 tons of 54-percent ore had been taken out of a new open pit near Camp Ripley.

To answer these questions it is necessary to examine the testimony over the last 6 years of the experts and of others possibly more interested than expert.

When it was announced at the end of World War II that the State had dug up more than a third of a billion tons of ore for guns and tanks, there were those who said it was best that the people realize the old champion was about through. And that future plans be based on this realization.

Examination today, however, of testimony given in a committee meeting here and a Federal or State commission there—though not decrying the desirability of planning—does not bear out the pessimists.

The facts are that Minnesota today can spot any other known ore area in the world a billion tons and still walk off with the steel crown of the champion.

In a freight-rate hearing conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission in Duluth in June 1947, it was brought out that the Lake Superior region still had 2,000,000,000 long tons of ore—1,500,000,000 of it in Minnesota, the rest in Wisconsin and Michigan. And that 1,500,000,000 tons was said to be in the Mesabi, Vermillion, and Cuyuna ranges.

Shortly after that Dr. G. M. Schwartz, director of the Minnesota Geological Survey, began flying over the northern part of the State, with his "doodlebug" detector. When he had put all the charts and figures together, he announced on separate occasions that the magnetometer indicated vast new ranges west of the Mississippi never explored. He cautioned that drilling and digging should be undertaken to determine the exact richness.

The Pacific Isle Mining Co. of Hibbing announced Friday that it had made such an exploration in open pit digging between Randall and the border of Camp Ripley. Below 50 feet of top earth it ran into ore running 54 percent in content, comparable in richness to the famed Mesabi, which runs to 60 percent in its best ore.

Below the 54 percent ore at Randall, mining company spokesmen said, are millions of tons of 40 percent ore. Mixed with the higher grade after washing operations to bring up content percentage, they believe, it will yield 50 percent ore such as is shipped from the Mesabi pits.

Now back to that 1,500,000,000-ton estimate in 1947. As has been pointed out, that was for the three explored ranges—the Mesabi, Vermillion, and Cuyuna.

The estimators weren't thinking of the unknown quantity west of the Mississippi then or of taconite.

Yet today Reserve Mining Co. plans to sink $7,000,000 this summer in a taconite plant at Babbitt, Minn., up in the Superior National Forest.

So there you have 1947's 1,500,000,000 tons, plus vast new ranges west of the Mississippi plus taconite.

How, then, does Minnesota compare with the much-talked-of fields in Labrador and Venezuela? When the excitement of the new discoveries there had cooled, it was estimated each area had about one billion tons of ore.

Do mining companies expect to rush there for ore? Yes, they say. Do they expect to drop Minnesota? No.

What is the plan, then? This:

The mining companies have indicated they expect to take some ore from Labrador, some from Venezuela, some taconite, to mix with Minnesota's rich ores. In that way the heavy drain on the latter will be cut down. For this reason: If there's a war, it might be difficult to ship from Venezuela and it will be nice to know there's plenty at home.

Thus, the experts indicate Minnesota likely will still be wearing the crown in the year 2000.

The MacArthur Ouster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 12 I stated in a speech to the Congress that the MacArthur ouster reflects the people's worry about our foreign policy. I might add that the MacArthur ouster also reflects the growing conviction in the people's minds that the acts of many of those in the executive branch of the Government have aroused resentment, not because these acts have been illegal, but because of their immorality.

This latter thesis has been very ably presented by Mr. Hal O'Flaherty, director of the Chicago Daily News foreign scrvice, in an article published on April 27, 1951. The article is as follows:

BEHIND THE CHEERS—MACARTHUR FRENZY CALLED ANSWER TO MINK COAT MORALS—ANGER AT GOVERNMENT DECAY COMES OUT IN PUBLIC ACTS

(By Hal O'Flaherty)

General MacArthur's homecoming has created an emotional disturbance across the Nation that requires analysis and, if possible, rational explanation.

Newsreels now showing give a connected story of the general's departure from Japan, his arrival at San Francisco and his appearance before Congress. The dramatic quality of this warrior's return is unique.

Public frenzy such as MacArthur's return created cannot be explained simply as a nation's love for a war hero.

Nor can it be attributed to revulsion against the President, who acted wholly within his constitutional rights in firing the general.

Around the desks where news is handled a conviction is growing that the abrupt dismissal of MacArthur is connected in the public mind with other acts by the executive branch of government that have aroused resentment not because they were illegal but because they were immoral.

MacArthur's dismissal followed closely upon the heels of the great debate on the sending of new divisions to Europe.

The President unquestionably has the right to order American troops to any place in the world, but Congress asked whether he had the moral right to do so.

According to a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the famous case of devaluation of the dollar, the American Government, which includes the executive branch, has the sovereign power to commit an immoral act. The devaluation was labeled as immoral but not illegal.

Fresh in the public mind are the revelations of many other acts closely related to the executive branch of Government, that were immoral but not illegal.

The $9,000 mink coat deal was immoral, perhaps, but not illegal.

It was immoral, but not illegal to harbor 5-percenters in the White House; to appoint incompetents to high public office; to try to force Congress to ratify any wish or whim of the Executive.

Public memory is not so short that it has forgotten other Executive acts that were plainly immoral but not illegal.

The attempt to pack the Supreme Court; the subsidizing of masses of the population; the substitution of a sham security in place of individual freedom.

More recently, the executive branch of Government has been engaged in the broad decisions regarding the conduct of the war in Korea.

From June 1950 up to the present moment, these decisions have been taken by the President.

It was he who ordered MacArthur into Korea before the United Nations had voted permission.

Today, it is the President with perfunctory reference to the United Nations who is directing the war in Korea on strategic lines that General MacArthur asserts cannot bring victory.

Again, the question arises as to whether it is immoral but not illegal to send American forces backward and forward across Korea with only stalemate as the end result.

Back of the plaudits for General MacArthur may be the desire of common people for some degree of participation in the decisions of Government through a Congress that is a reality and not the relic of American democracy.

Senator Kefauver's Stature and Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of May 2 under the caption "He meets the challenge." The editorial, which is reprinted from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Evening Sun, pays just tribute to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the magnificent work done by him in connection with the so-called crime committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE MEETS THE CHALLENGE

The Binghamton Sun modestly claims to be the only up-State Republican newspaper. In politics we have always been stanchly Republican. But of late years we have been greatly troubled by a challenge which has arisen in this Nation—an ugly, formidable challenge which transcends party politics.

This challenge is whether clean, honest, decent government shall survive, or whether big-time crime, big-time corruption, and unscrupulous uses of public office—aided by public apathy—shall go on poisoning the lifeblood of America until it is too late for help.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, a Democrat, of Tennessee, has courageously and resolutely stepped forth to meet that challenge. In this great fight he deserves the grateful support of every newspaper and every decent citizen, regardless of Democrat or Republican Party affiliation.

Throughout the Nation there has been of late a growing public uneasiness, and feeling of disgust and distrust, over the many startling revelations of "boodle" politics in Washington—of immoral use of high public office, of the "legal" plundering of public funds, of a cynical lack of frankness (even good faith) by the Government toward the people, even in such important matters as foreign policy. The public is beginning to feel that it has not been told the truth by the Government—that the Government today holds too many men of low principle in high places. When the people lose their faith in the integrity of their Government it becomes indeed a grave and dangerous situation for democracy.

Amid the whole sickening mess of broken public trust, of big-time crime and its hideous partner, corruption, Senator KEFAUVER stands out like the highest peak of his own Tennessee mountains—not just as an able, fearless, determined Senator, but also as a symbol of the hopes and best ideals of all good citizens who want to save America.

The Senator has dramatically shown the country that something must be done, and can be done. He is furnishing the necessary leadership. By intelligent and skillful use of publicity, radio, and television he has successfully dramatized the sordid picture of big-time crime and corruption, and driven the shocking lesson home to the decent citizens of every community.

Senator KEFAUVER has proven to the American people that clean, honest, decent government can be had—but only if public opinion demands and insists on it. By his own resolute courage and honest effort Senator KEFAUVER has performed a great public service not only for the people, but also for the United States Senate because he has so forcefully demonstrated that the citizens of this country can still have faith that the Senate can be relied on to rise above party ties and political expediency to fight such an internal national menace as we now face.

Senator KEFAUVER is a great American, a great Senator, and a great man. We wish we could add also that he is a great Republican. But Tennessee being what it is politically, he probably would not be in the Senate if he were Republican—which would be something of a national calamity. So New York and all the other States, Republican or Democratic, are mighty grateful to Tennessee for giving ESTES KEFAUVER to the United States Senate.

We fervently hope to hear more and more of Senator KEFAUVER taking a leading part in national affairs in the future. He is young, able, strong, honest, and fearless. God knows that is the kind of leadership America—and the world—needs today.

Shall We Bomb Manchuria?—View of a Top Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, realizing that the ultimate decision regarding war in Asia may well affect the lives of seven or eight million American boys and reach into practically every home in the country, I am including with this extension of my remarks the views of Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger. General Eichelberger was commander of the Eighth Army from 1944 to 1948 and participated in the New Guinea, New Britain, and Philippine campaigns in the Pacific. In addition, he was commander of occupied forces in Japan during 1946–48. General Eichelberger, who was born in Urbana, Ohio, was one of the thousands of sons of the Buckeye State who made an indelible mark for themselves in the Pacific theater during the last war.

His article in Newsweek magazine follows:

SHALL WE BOMB MANCHURIA?—VIEW OF A TOP AUTHORITY

(By Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, U. S. Army, retired)

Since the Chinese intervention in Korea last fall, it has been my fixed conviction that Mao Tse-tung must have received certain promises from Stalin before committing his troops against the United Nations in Korea. In the last analysis, Mao was entering an undeclared war against the United States. It is hard to believe that he would have taken such a step unless assured of Russian support should the conflict be broadened beyond Korea.

We don't know what commitments the Soviets have made to Mao. But we do know that they are in a position to give the Chinese support—disguised or otherwise—with air power, with submarine, and with troops. And we do know that the treaty of mutual support between China and Russia can be invoked to provide a legal basis for such support. So far, however, the Russians seem to have been reluctant to supply much aid to the Chinese, except for the Soviet-built planes which dart across the Yalu and back again. The Chinese ground forces apparently have little or no Soviet equipment. But the appearance of Russian tanks in the ground fighting could make a great difference and the intervention of Red planes over the battlefield and of Red submarines against our supply lines could be decisive.

What action on our part would bring about Russian intervention? It is my belief that bombing the Red bases in the privileged sanctuary of Manchuria would cause the Soviets to enter the war in Korea and that this would also probably herald the beginning of the third world war. Certainly preparations are being made, not only for defending Manchurian bases but also for putting a Red air force in Korea. This is proved by the construction and improvement of airfields all over Northern Korea.

What would be the effect of Soviet air intervention only (leaving out of consideration the submarines and ground forces)? First, take the lads doing the fighting. No doubt they resent the fact that we are not able to bomb across the Yalu and hit the enemy where he comes from. But, at the same time, these lads have been spared being bombed and strafed as they fight against superior numbers. Since December, our battle losses have been consistently lower than those of the enemy with consequent improvement in all ranks in immediate battle contact. All this might be reversed if the enemy had air support.

Second, take the effect of Soviet intervention against our own privileged sanctuary—Japan. Throughout the Korean war the Japanese have realized all too well that we have been fighting their fight across the Sea of Japan. They have natural fears inspired by the presence of powerful Red forces on the island of Sakhalin and on the Asiatic mainland. Most Japanese now hope for an early peace treaty, including the right of rearming ground forces for the defense of their own shores. The Japanese need time, above all, to build their defenses on land and to coordinate them with the air and sea defenses which we will provide.

Third, take the matter of time itself. Is it on our side? A few days ago it was my privilege to visit the plant where the world's fastest global bomber is made. I left with the hope that we can hold off the third world war by every legitimate means until that assembly line and a hundred others can produce the war material which will deter the gentlemen of the Kremlin from total war or spell defeat for them if they force war upon us.

Was the Decartelization Program in Germany Sabotaged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the failure of decartelization of cartels and combines in Germany, I include a short statement and article

showing how our own representatives have failed to carry out the provisions of the Potsdam agreement in effecting decartelization. There is no doubt in my mind but that certain of our big corporations have connections and are interwoven with these cartels and are responsible for the failure of the decartelization program. Not only will the failure of the program cost our country millions and millions of dollars, but I also feel that within a few short years these cartels will be directed against the best interest of our country. I respectfully urge that the membership read my statement and the article which I have included.

The reservoir of world-wide good will toward the United States is now being gravely threatened during these days of international crisis. To conserve that good will and to strengthen our ties with our most reliable friends abroad, is the surest way to enhance freedom's battle against totalitarianism.

While it is my firm conviction that the democracies must be strong militarily, the American people would be misreading the lessons of history if they laid undue stress on the military factor without giving prime consideration to moral and economic factors which must in the long run determine the future of the free world. Are we applying these lessons of history as regards Germany?

Powerful voices have placed a premium on the rebuilding of Germany's military potential as though this were the key to peace and the strengthening of the free world. How else can one explain the complete failure to thoroughly denazify Germany? The retreat from the original policy to root out those aggressive elements that caused so much ruin and misery to the world was recently dramatized by the decision of the American High Commissioner to commute the sentences of 89 leading German war criminals including that merchant of death, Alfred Krupp. All of these criminals had received fair trials. Their cases had been reviewed by General Clay. He found no reason to grant clemency. Yet the American High Commissioner helped pave the way for the return to power of these powerful Hitlerite forces.

Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, who was chief American prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials, in denouncing the McCloy commutations said:

> We are engaged today in a mortal struggle to suppress the menace of communism in the west and undermine its freezing grip on the east. By these commutations we have added a powerful new weapon to the Kremlin's propaganda arsenal and it will not be long before we feel the sharpness of its edge and the power of its thrust.

Among those whose sentences were commuted were the criminals responsible for the Malmedy massacre where hundreds of American GI's were murdered though they had been taken as prisoners of war during the Battle of the Bulge. In the cases of Maj. Gen. Otto Ohlendorf and Lt. Gen. Oswald Pohl, who, together with their henchmen, were responsible for the extermination of millions of people, the American High Commissioner, while lenient in some instances, admitted that Pohl and Ohlendorf could not receive any special treatment. Their guilt was too patent. Yet these murderers, through legal ruses, are endeavoring to thwart justice.

American leadership in world affairs cannot rest on political expediency. We cannot bargain with the former enemy by whitewashing their crimes and restoring the alleged honor of the German soldier without at the same time forfeiting our right to speak for the free world. Indeed, it is my considered judgment that political bargaining with the Germans can only increase their contempt of the Allies and in particular of the United States. It is sheer folly to believe that the Germans are wedded to the west as opposed to the east. There is nothing in German history which proves that the Germans have been a bulwark of western civilization. On the contrary, they have been the instigators of all recent wars. They are completely dedicated to the Pan-German dream of Deutschland Ueber Alles.

They will gladly bargain with the west as they are doing today and extract one concession after another, but when the chips are down who will dare to say that we will find them as a bulwark against communism? The Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939 should be a stern reminder to those who play fast and loose with America's security. To strengthen Germany's war potential and to enable her to regain economic mastery over Europe, would seriously undermine our position in the world.

The peoples living on the periphery of Germany including our allies, have a deep-rooted fear and suspicion of Germany. These attitudes are not transitory. They are rooted in the history of the past 100 years. Shall we sacrifice our most reliable friends in Europe for short-term expediency? This is the question that must be answered by the American people.

The sharp deterioration of our position in Germany and the consequent strengthening of Communist propaganda is seen by the abysmal blunders with regard to the smashing of the German cartels and trusts. Everyone in Europe knows the predatory character of these huge giants which provided the bone and sinew of Hitler's war-making power and tried in every way to hamper American production during World War II. They were slated to be broken up and their rulers were to be prevented from ever again holding positions of economic power. But as with denazification and the war crimes trials, powerful influences have succeeded in sabotaging the decartelization program. As early as 1948 former Secretary of the Army Royall assured the American people that the pernicious cartels in Germany had been abolished. But as late as October 14, 1950, the United Press reported as follows:

> The retiring chief of the United States Marshall plan for Germany said today that the Western Allies have failed to break up the huge cartels that helped Hitler wage war.
>
> "The program of decartelizing and deconcentrating West German industry has not been successful so far," Robert M. Hanes said in an interview. "Practically no German industry has been decartelized or deconcentrated. * * *
>
> "Cartel-smashing has been attacked bitterly by West German industrial and governmental leaders, including Chancelor Adenauer." (From UP, Frankfurt, October 14, 1950.)

How can one explain the fact that the huge trusts and cartels in Germany are still thriving? Was it by sheer chance or ignorance on the part of those who were responsible for decartelization? The record shows this not to be true. It is in this connection that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, an article entitled "Was the Decartelization Program Sabotaged?" This article appeared in Prevent World War III, a bimonthly magazine published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III—Part I, November-December 1950. This article cites personalities and goes into great detail with regard to the decartelization debacle.

Anyone who reads this article cannot help but come to the conclusion that the decartelization program was sabotaged by a preconceived plan foisted upon our military government by powerful cartel figures in the United States. The failure in decartelization is a clear mirror reflecting how far we have traveled away from our original policies in Germany. It is a warning to all Americans that the sacrifices of World War II were in vain. In inserting this article I want to say that I have every confidence in the work of the Society for the Prevention of World War III which is sponsored by men and women motivated by the highest sense of patriotism. The society's work in keeping the American people informed is a tribute to their understanding of the issues and the grave responsibilities facing our Nation today.

Only last week I read reliable reports of the ever-growing power of the Nazis. Then, this morning, came press dispatches of two elections held yesterday, one in Germany and the other in Austria. In both, Nazi-like parties gained large numbers of votes, 11 percent in one election and almost 20 percent in the other. Our failure to press the decartelization program has encouraged rather than discouraged the enemies of democracy to return to power. The article follows:

WAS THE DECARTELIZATION PROGRAM SABOTAGED?

PROFILE NO. 1: RICHARDSON BRONSON

Richardson Bronson became chief of the decartelization branch of military government in 1947. During the war he was an Army colonel ferrying troops across to Europe.

He began his military government work as deputy I. G. Farben control officer, in which position he was subordinate and responsible to James S. Martin, chief of decartelization. Bronson had no training in antitrust work, although he was a lawyer; and was very frank in stating to his subordinates that his background had been with big business and that his sympathies were there too.

Bronson became I. G. Farben control officer in which position he developed a plan for turning over the various units set up under I. G. Farben breakup plans to German trustees who would administer and run the properties until finally disposed of to new and independent owners. The series of "independent" units which Bronson set up were legal fictions, since they were in

fact neither units nor independents. The scheme was a temporary stop-gap to take the pressure off the persistent demand for positive action.

Although Bronson was administratively responsible to Martin, in reality he took his orders from his superiors in the Economics Division, Lawrence Wilkinson, Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., and eventually Phillips Hawkins. In common with his superiors, he was unalterably opposed to breaking up and deconcentrating German combines, and never concealed his antagonism to the program of the decartelization branch. While still subordinate to Martin, Bronson told Johnston Avery and Creighton Coleman, assistant chiefs of the branch, that he was glad he had nothing to do with decartelization, since he had always been on the side of big business and did not believe in breaking up German combines.

The principle behind the establishment of "independent" units to replace the Farben combine was the policy that these units should not be bigger than were absolutely necessary to carry out efficient production. It would appear that this principle was not adhered to. Actually, the biggest plants of Farben were grouped into one unit under a single trustee. All of the plants in Hoechst, for example, were placed under one trustee and operated as a unit. The Hoechst complex constitutes one of the biggest pieces of Farben property. The aim was not efficient production, but to safeguard the interests of the former owners of Farben who, through their influence, both on the Americans and on the German trustees, were able to prevent any dismemberment of the cartel. The trustees of these units were trusted functionaries of the company, many of them former high Nazis, who were retained in their positions because of their alleged know-how. These trustees knew how to cater to American occupation authorities in order to accomplish their aims of safeguarding their property from liquidation.

Bronson conducted long conferences with various officials in search of a formula which would circumvent the Allied Control Council Law 9 seizing I. G. Farben property. This concerned the method whereby ownership would be transferred to new owners. It was a convenient piece of juridical maneuvering to which Bronson offered no opposition. The whole history of the liquidation of Farben clearly shows that the top officials did very little to carry out United States policies. And this also applies to Bronson.

The net result of Bronson's tenure as I. G. Farben control officer was the gradual emergence of the old power of the Farben cartel, with production policies under nominal direction of the American officials, but actually in the hands of the same crowd which guided Farben throughout its nefarious history.

The turning over of the German chemical industry by John J. McCloy to the Germans was only the logical consequence of an existing state of fact.

The fact that former Nazis were back in control of Farben was admitted by Bronson's colleague, Myron S. Maupin, who was appointed by Bronson to succeed him as Farben control officer when Bronson moved up to the position of decartelization chief.

Maupin was little concerned with the breaking up of the Farben empire. Testifying before the Ferguson committee, Maupin admitted that many of the present officials of Farben were former Nazis and justified their employment on the grounds that all he was interested in was production, and those Nazis knew how to produce.

With the announcement that the "independent" units of Farben would not be sold to the public as originally planned, the final step was taken by the American occupation in abandoning plans for the elimination of this source of resurgent economic power of the German cartels.

When Phillips Hawkins moved up from assistant chief to chief of decartelization he picked Bronson to succeed him. Bronson and Hawkins were close personal friends—Bronson was best man at the latter's wedding—and the fact that Hawkins was the son-in-law of Draper, the military-government economic adviser, was particularly attractive to Bronson.

Hawkins selected Bronson for the job of decartelization chief, because he could rely on Bronson to follow his orders and hew the line. As an administrator of the program, Bronson showed a lack of interest in breaking the cartels. The promises made to his staff to undertake any particular action were never kept. He always sought reasons for his lack of action. Bronson would call for the submission of proposals against a particular combine, but after receiving them would completely ignore them, while the staff would be involved in some internal reorganization or shifting of responsibility. A favorite technique for avoiding action would be the shifting of the responsibility for recommendations from one staff member to another. Projects such as the Bosch and Siemens deconcentration orders went through innumerable individuals, each obliged to review the data and come up with some new recommendation. Proposals for deconcentrating the Siemenswerke, the giant electrical trust, for example, were ready as far back as 1946. Yet more than 2 years later, Bronson assigned an entirely new set of individuals who did not know the material to undertake a new study of the combine.

Bronson never fought for any part of the decartelization program, and when he was publicly accused in March 1948 by 19 members of his own staff of revising basic United States policy, he failed to justify his position. Nor did he try to defend United States policies before his superiors who used him to promulgate this arbitrary change of policy without any explanation whatsoever. Quite the contrary, Bronson told the staff to be "good soldiers" and obey their superiors. Martin, however, fought back and defended the United States interests.

Bronson's testimony before the Ferguson committee shows his true character. He affirmed to the committee the possibility of deconcentrating the Henschel locomotive combine although he himself earlier had informed the staff that Henschel was not to be deconcentrated.

Bronson's performance before the Ferguson committee is an example of the man's ability. As described by Francis Laurent, one of the assistant chiefs of the branch, Bronson, "because of his poor memory and lack of understanding of the issues was not well qualified for the conduct of negotiations, and was unwilling to compensate for his shortcomings. While work on the Henschel case was in progress he undertook to conduct negotiations with his British opposite but did not ask the persons who were familiar with the case to accompany him. On two occasions he brought back reports of agreements which were at variance with reports which came to us from the British side. The resulting disagreements were extremely embarrassing."

In testifying before the Ferguson committee, Bronson gave a misleading picture of the results of the work of the decartelization branch. Thus, in December 1948, he told the committee that the decartelization program had reached a point "where it could go in either direction," that no fait accompli had been put over. He made these assertions in the face of known facts that back in March 1948, General Clay had already jettisoned the whole, decartelization program with his famous "rule of reason" theory under which heavy German industry was practically exempted from any decartelization action.

In a letter to the Ferguson committee, dated March 31, 1949, Bronson attempted to defend his record and told the committee that hearings on Bosch, the great auto accessory combine, were being finalized. The record of the Bosch case does not bear this out. Under orders of Clay, he had removed from the Bosch recommendations its vital parts dealing with the planned severance of the Eisemann Co., which was Bosch's chief competitor before it was swallowed up by Bosch in 1924. Bronson ordered Eisemann to remain a part of the Bosch combine. In addition, Bronson, acting under Hawkins' instructions, changed other sections of the Bosch determination order, particularly the patent and foreign subsidiaries parts. The net effect of these changes was to allow Bosch to retain control over its patents and to permit Bosch to reestablish itself as an international cartel.

In connection with Bosch's efforts to regain its international cartel position, Bronson, unofficially, conducted many private conversations with a General Wilson, who was acting as Bosch's representative in Germany, and who was the head of the International Products Trading Co., which the Bosch combine established in Switzerland for the purpose of building up Bosch's foreign exchange, without the embarrassment of submitting their dealings to the scrutiny of military government. The contract signed with Bosch by the IPTC was executed with Bronson's approval after consultation with Hawkins. The Bosch-IPTC contract was a clear violation of military government law 56 of decartelization. It is typical of Bronson's conduct that in discussing this deal between Bosch and Wilson before the Ferguson committee, Bronson expressed annoyance at Wilson for "barging" into his office at all times and "interfering" with the work of the decartelization branch. Notwithstanding the illegality of Bronson's action in pushing through the contract, notwithstanding all of the actions involved in watering down and making the Bosch decartelization ineffective, Bronson informed the Ferguson committee in March 1949, that everything was getting along fine with regard to the decartelization of Bosch.

Bronson's role in furthering the contract between the International Products Trading Corp. and Bosch was prejudicial to United States interests.

In the case of the Siemenswerke, Bronson told the committee that the whole Siemens question was being examined by the United States-United Kingdom Bipartite Board. He accused other witnesses before the committee of not knowing the latest achievements of the Decartelization Branch.

He didn't tell the committee that this was the *n*th time the deconcentration of Siemens, the electrical combine, was being considered and that nothing would come out of this consideration, for the simple reason that he knew that no action against Siemens would be undertaken.

In his statement to the committee, Bronson pointed to the abolition of the business licensing laws of the German State Government as one of his major achievements, but he did not tell the committee that the enforcement of the regulations abolishing licensing was practically nonexistent and that the slight criticism leveled against the German officials was hardly calculated to force these officials to carry out the Military Government policy on licensing.

He pointed to the fact that the Germans were considering fair-trade legislation. Such legislation has yet to be passed. Nowhere does Bronson point to the major failures of military occupation in carrying out the decartelization program. He says nothing about the Henschel case even though he himself had told the committee several months earlier that some action on Henschel was contemplated.

Or take the case of the United Ball Bearing Works—the VKF combine. This was a

Swedish affiliate of SKF and represented a virtual monopoly in Germany, with the exception of a small independent concern—Kugellager Fischer. Since the United Ball Bearing Works was a foreign-owned company, Military Government dismantled the Fischer plant as part of the reparations program, thus creating a complete monopoly for VKF.

The decartelization staff, therefore, prepared a series of recommendations for deconcentrating VKF. Under pressure of the Economics Division headed by Wilkinson, all action on VKF was suspended and a solution was offered which consisted of having VKF turn over to Kugellager Fischer some of its obsolete machinery for the production of ball bearings. On specific instructions of Wilkinson, Bronson held off all action to deconcentrate VKF, although this firm would have remained a monopoly within the meaning of law 56 even after the turning over of machines to Fischer. Subsequently, General Clay killed all action on VKF.

The same pattern of action can be discerned in relation to other combines. Bronson would tell his staff one thing and proceed to act in another way behind their backs.

Notwithstanding this record, Bronson had no compunction in telling Creighton Coleman, a member of the decartelization branch, that he knew more about decartelization than anyone else.

The above record speaks for itself. Let the reader judge for himself, too.

More About the Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein copy of a letter from F. Shackelford, Department Counselor, Department of the Army, to Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut.

This letter, written on April 21, 1951, deals with a subject which is something of a mystery to the American people. It follows:

APRIL 21, 1951.

Hon. JOHN LODGE,
Governor of Connecticut,
Hartford, Conn.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR LODGE: Your letter of March 12, 1951, to the Secretary of State has been forwarded to the Department of the Army so that we may give you the Army's comments on those portions of the article by Julius Epstein, enclosed with your original letter, which primarily concern the Army.

The Army has been unable to uncover any evidence which indicates the specific person who "locked up" or had custody of this document. I should prefer not to reveal the name of the stenographer to whom Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet dictated his report since she is naturally upset by the publicity which had been accorded this episode with which she had no connection aside from transcribing the report. However, if you think her name will serve any useful purpose, I shall be glad to furnish it to you, preferably on a confidential basis.

No copies were made or retained of the report apparently for the reason that it was believed to be of primary interest to the State Department alone.

General Bissell has stated as his best recollection that the report was informally passed to Mr. Lyons or Mr. Holmes of the State Department. There is, however, no record of this transaction and if a record was made or if there was a letter of transmittal or a receipt, none of these can be found.

With reference to the documents entitled, "Facts and Documents concerning Polish Prisoners of War Captured by the U. S. S. R. During the 1939 Campaign" and "Supplementary Report on Facts and Documents Concerning the Katyn Massacre," they were given to General Bissell when he was attaché in London by Lieutenant General Kukiel, a member of the Polish Government in London. General Bissell forwarded them by letter dated December 1, 1947 to Gen. Telford Taylor, who at that time was in Europe as Chief of Counsel for War Crimes. General Taylor in turn sent these documents to G–2 on August 4, 1949, just prior to his relief from active duty. These documents were not and never have been classified by the Army, but have been handled on a classified basis because they were labeled "For private circulation only" when received from the Polish Government in London. The confusion in the identity of these documents resulted from careless research and improper labeling of these Polish documents by two civilian employees of the Department of the Army, who have been reprimanded for this carelessness.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

F. SHACKELFORD,
Department Counselor.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I was greatly interested to see that two great and influential Catholic periodicals of national circulation, Commonweal and America, have come out in support of the President's policies in the controversy with General MacArthur. The reasoning of these two publications on the MacArthur issue is very cogent, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "The MacArthur Ouster," from the April 21 issue of America, and the editorial entitled "No End in Sight?" from the April 27 issue of the Commonweal.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From America of April 21, 1951]

THE MACARTHUR OUSTER

From almost any angle you look at it, the storm now swirling around General MacArthur is deplorable. What remains of our national unity is in danger of being destroyed by the supercharged lightning flashes of emotion generated by personal and political partisanship. We discern but one hopeful ray in the lightning-riven clouds: if the controversy can be brought under control and carried on calmly on the basis of the issues involved, it may become the last great debate on United States foreign policy

The one Herbert Hoover touched off 6 months ago, apparently settled by the Senate's troops-to-Europe resolution of April 4, dealt largely with our policy for Europe. Our far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was not formally debated in the Senate. The MacArthur incident, for better or worse, has made such a discussion inevitable. We can only hope that it will be productive of a renewed national unity.

Already, as Walter Lippmann observed in the curious case of Senator TAFT, there is confusion as to what General MacArthur meant in his now celebrated letter to Congressman MARTIN. The General, as the columnist pointed out, wanted more than permission to bomb Red China's Manchurian bases and to use the Formosa forces of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese mainland. The General wanted permission to wage all-out war against China. Contending that the global conflict with communism has already begun, the General argued that it could be won by defeating Red China. The way to save Europe, he wrote in effect, is to defeat communism in Asia.

That involves an almost complete reversal of our present policy. The United States and its allies have long since decided to concentrate on Europe while diverting the necessary minimum to prevent a Communist sweep in Asia. The fundamental issue is therefore clear-cut. Shall the United States abandon its present efforts to safeguard Europe and devote its resources chiefly to a full-scale war with Red China?

Those who join General MacArthur in an affirmative answer to this fateful question should not overlook these considerations:

1. If we decide to join the issue in Asia, we shall have to go it alone—our Atlantic allies, the Asian-Arab nations and the Latin-Americans will not support us.

2. Attacking China in the belief that the USSR will not come to her aid is not a calculated risk—it is the wildest sort of gamble.

3. Our big strategic bombers, on which we now rely to deter Russia in the West, will be relatively ineffective in China. If we contemplate using them for atomic bombing, let us reflect that such bombing would have little military value, would infuriate all Asia and might invite Russian retaliation. Thus there is no hope of a short and cheap war.

4. Our long-neglected tactical air force is still woefully unready for a major conflict.

5. Even if Russia did not intervene in China, she would be powerfully tempted to take over an almost defenseless Europe, including Britain, acquiring thereby tremendous war-making potential.

6. If we tempt Russia into a war for which we are still unprepared offensively, we shall expose our people to destruction, since our home-defense system, both military and civil, is pitifully incomplete.

7. As the President emphasized in his address to the Nation on April 11, our present policy is designed to avoid world war III. Though it may fail, it furnishes a hope lacking in the MacArthur approach.

If these considerations are put forcibly to the American people, we believe that the last great debate will not be prolonged as its predecessor was, and that our people, finally satisfied that we are on the only course open to us, will then settle down to the supreme task of ensuring their security.

[From the Commonweal of April 27, 1951]

NO END IN SIGHT?

Shortly after General MacArthur was dispossessed of his Pacific command, and while the resulting uproar was still running at high tide throughout the country, the general's supporters gave vent to their anger by badgering the President, demanding to know what he planned to do next in Korea now that he had removed MacArthur, who had become, in the eyes of many American news-

paper readers, the paternal and protective figure of anti-Communist law and order in the Far East. It was a troublesome question to ask Mr. Truman because, as everyone knew, there appeared to be no end in sight for the war in Korea. It seemed then, as it still does, that things might go on there forever as they are now, with the Chinese feeding battalions of Asiatic manpower to the waiting muzzles of UN guns and with neither side able to accomplish its objective; under these conditions the United Nations would be unable to restore order and establish the conditions of political independence throughout the whole of Korea, while the Chinese would be unable to push us off the peninsula. General MacArthur, so his followers argued, at least had an end in view; he was willing to extend the Korean War to the rest of Asia and fight the showdown battle there.

Behind the general's reasoning in this matter was his opinion that "the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest" on the battlefields of Asia, and we should, therefore, "join the issue thus raised" in Asia. To the President and his military advisers this advice of MacArthur's was, and is, highly questionable because they feel that at this time Asia is really the secondary front and is being used by Russia as a deliberate decoy; an examination of the broader issues involved in the Korean war leads one to understand the very sound reasoning which compelled the President to reject MacArthur's view.

Like the Berlin blockade and the recent war in Greece, the Korean war has, of course, to be looked at as a local incident in a geographic sense only; in every other way it is an international affair, one episode in the over-all struggle between the Soviets and the free world. There is, really, no permanent solution to the Korean war on a local level; there may be a local victory or a stalemate, as there was in Berlin and in Greece, but the underlying and all-pervading world tension will not be dissolved by this local decision alone, any more than it was dissolved by what happened in Berlin and in Greece.

CORE OF HOPE

It is necessary, then, to keep an over-all strategy in mind at all times and not to let any one local incident get out of hand and distract attention from that strategy. Our over-all plan, worked out over the past 5 years, is largely based on a serious weakness in Russia's ability to wage a world war against the West: That weakness is her lack of sufficient supplies of two of the most vital raw materials of war—steel and oil. The western plan is to do everything possible to keep Russia weak in those commodities as long as we can and to build up our strength in the meantime to such a point that the Soviets will not risk a world war.

Now Russia can get both oil and steel when she wants them in neighboring countries, and it so happens that to do this the Soviet military machine will have to face westward, because the oil is in Iran and the steel is in the German Ruhr. But here the West holds the trump cards at the moment. Because of the Atlantic Treaty alliance of nations, we have—or we will have in coming months, if the Atlantic preparations go forward speedily—air bases in Europe and in the Mediterranean from which we could, in the event of a world war, blast the oil fields, the Ruhr, and, most important of all, the faulty lines of rail and road communications between these points and Russia, thus denying the Soviets the very steel and oil supplies they would be seeking.

Since it is quite obvious that what the Soviets need and want most of all at this time lies in the European sphere and not in the Far East, the administration, in the interests of concentrating our defensive strength in the West where it is needed most, has based its foreign policy primarily on the Atlantic Treaty, hoping to preserve the hard core of our defense and of our striking power in Europe and in the Near East, and hoping at the same time to cripple Russia's ability, in terms of oil and steel, to wage a world war. Our intention is in this way to forestall a world war altogether by making it too great a risk for Russia to take.

THE GREAT DECISION

We know now that General MacArthur did not approve of this strategic plan; under his command, the local aspect of the Korean war was getting out of hand, so far, at least, as our over-all strategy was concerned. MacArthur's policy would have meant diverting much more of our power to Asia, a diversion which, in the minds of the President's military advisers, would have left us desperately weak in Europe and in the Mediterranean, consequently making it immeasurably easier for Russia to move against Iran and Germany in quest of the oil and steel with which she might eventually wage total war against us. Russia would then have won the great advantage of having secured the resources she needs while spreading our defenses thin around the world, and we in turn would have committed the blunder of not having concentrated our power in the one most decisive theater of war.

Such, in its broadest scope, is the background of the present dispute between General MacArthur and the Government; this is also the background of the recent foreign-policy debate, set off by the Republicans, on the question of whether or not to make Europe the first line of defense. In Korea, the administration itself created the foreign-policy issue anew for the Republicans because it had a hard but necessary decision to make: It had to limit the war to Korea, whatever the military disadvantages, in order to preserve our over-all strategic plan for resisting Russian world conquest.

It was a hard decision to make because in local terms there is no end to the fighting in sight. But that does not mean that we are not working toward any end at all; as in Berlin and Greece, if we hold on resolutely in Korea, we may very well force the Soviets and the Chinese to come to terms, because where global strategy is concerned we will have held tight to our bargaining advantages. We will, in other words, have forced the Soviets to negotiate or to give up the fight, as they have done before, because they will have been maneuvered into too dangerous a position, as they have been before.

NOT INEVITABLE

If, as an end to the war in Korea, we look on this prospect as a distant end indeed, it is only because we have forgotten, or never fully realized, what we have given lip service to, which is, that the struggle against Soviet communism will be a long and terribly hard thing for all of us, whether we believe in the insanity of an aggressive, atomic massacre or a steady and strong resistance combining all the spiritual, military and material resources we have, in the hope that a nonviolent solution can in time be found.

It may be that our hope of averting world war III by limiting the war in Korea will not prove successful. That is something that is not entirely up to us. After all, what we are trying to do in Korea is an extraordinarily difficult and delicate job; we are trying to defend the moral principle of collective security against unlawful aggression without provoking an atomic war. In this regard we believe it is utterly misleading to say, as Senator TAFT said the other day, that [Mr. Truman] "has involved us in a major war which today has no purpose whatsoever." We do not agree with the Senator that an inviolable moral right—the right of collective security—can be worth fighting for in June but is not worth fighting for in April.

The war in Korea must, then, be seen as part of our over-all foreign policy, which is designed with a very definite end in mind: and that is, to forestall world war III, without abandoning our moral rights and without appeasing Russia; we are trying to do this by concentrating our power at the point of maximum effectiveness in Europe, while at the same time upholding the moral framework in the United Nations in Korea.

No one can absolutely guarantee the success of this or any other foreign policy in meeting the complex and crushing situation facing us now, but certainly the present policy is the most reasonable one open to us and the best hope of maintaining the peace; as Pius XII said only recently, we need to remember that "nothing is lost by peace, everything can be lost by war."

And that, in the last analysis, is what all the MacArthur controversy comes down to. To have taken the general's advice about using "maximum counterforce" in China would have led almost inevitably to world war III, whatever he may say now about limited measures and limited risk. To Mr. Truman and his advisers, world war III is not inevitable and so they have decided to limit the war in Asia, hoping to limit war everywhere while we still have the chance to do so by following resolutely the strategy decided upon.

We support the President wholeheartedly.

Four Hundred Reds Needle Vets To Stir Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement appearing in the Detroit Times, Detroit, Mich., of August 29, 1949, showing conclusively the design and technique of the Communists to destroy our country and way of life. Here a former Communist, John T. Pace, tells the story in unmistakable language which everyone can understand:

HOW 7,000 BONUS MARCHERS WERE DUPED: 400 REDS NEEDLE VETS TO STIR RIOTS

(By Howard Rushmore)

CENTERVILLE, TENN., August 29.—Hoping for bloodshed and violence, the Communist Party agents working within the ranks of the bonus marchers used every Red Fascist trick to get President Hoover to call out the army in 1932.

And when he did and General MacArthur put down the Communist bid for revolution without firing a shot, Red Fascist wrath was directed against these two great Americans—a raging "smear" campaign that has lasted for almost two decades.

John T. Pace, now a deputy sheriff in this quiet Tennessee town, but in 1932 a Communist leader of the left-wing section of the bonus march, said:

"I was told over and over again how much Stalin was interested in this campaign."

The ex-Communist, after recalling he arrived in Washington in June as leader of 1,000 veterans from the Middle West, said:

"Although I had been named by the Communist Party as leader of the left-wing group, I did not make a move without consulting Emmanuel Levine.

"Even before I lead the marchers into Washington, I had been told by my Communist superiors that Levine was the boss.

"The first day I arrived in the Capital, I was told to report to Levine in a secret office he kept in the city. I was given ample funds for cabs and other expenses."

REVOLUTION THE AIM

"Levine, a veteran Communist agitator, told me Moscow regarded this bonus march as a real propaganda opportunity to bring about revolt and hatred against President Hoover.

"Levine said the 'veterans have some Fascist misleaders who don't want violence—your job is to keep them stirred up and our party must take over.'"

Pace said a Communist International representative in New York was in daily touch with Levine and that Levine told Pace:

"Here's your chance of making a name for yourself with Stalin."

According to Pace, Levine kept a scrapbook of newspaper stories and photographs of all Communist rioting. Said Pace:

"The scrapbook was a record of our agitation and was sent to Moscow to show Stalin what we had done.

"We had only about 400 Communists among 7,000 veterans, but we controlled every action.

"Two hundred Communist from New York, some veterans, joined us. At Levine's command, I led a delegation of several hundred Reds down Pennsylvania Avenue to seize an abandoned Government building near the Capitol."

PROVOKE THE COPS

"Under Levine's direction, we planned this seizure carefully. We knew that it was illegal but, when I brought up this point, Levine said 'we'll provoke the cops and get some action.'"

"What kind of action?" I asked.

"He looked at me sternly and said, 'Comrade Pace, in every revolution some workers must die.'

"Levine said the 'CI rep' (meaning the Moscow agent in New York) wanted violence because President Hoover would then be forced to call out the Army.

"Once the Army steps in, we'll have a full-scale revolution going," Levine told me. "That will provide excellent propaganda against Hoover and we can agitate from coast to coast and recruit thousands of veterans to the party."

After Pace's group had seized the Government building, Levine told Pace to lead marchers into areas which had been ruled "out of bounds" by police.

These areas invaded by the Reds included the White House.

Pace continued:

"Levine instructed me: 'Keep picket lines around the White House. Make speeches denouncing Hoover. Get yourself arrested. It will all make good publicity.'"

INSPIRED VIOLENCE

Meanwhile, Pace kept in touch with his subordinates in the ranks of the Red section of the "Bonus Expeditionary Force," as it was called. He said:

"We sent Communists into Anacostia flats where several thousand legitimate veterans, led by W. W. Waters, an anti-Red, were camped.

"They did not want violence, so Levine told me to provoke it. I sent Communists into their ranks with orders to throw bricks at cops and even at our own Red marchers to provoke trouble.

"Waters didn't fall for our Communist tactics, but we did succeed in bringing over several hundred of the legitimate veterans to our building. We recruited some of them into the party."

Pace said Levine also ordered continuous propaganda among the veterans "about the Soviet rule and how the Red army was the best army in the world."

Parades, demonstrations, and minor riots were organized each day, Pace said, and added:

AT WHITE HOUSE

"The Communists drew up a program that ran like clockwork. So many were to be arrested each day. We were to defy police efforts to evict us from the buildings we had seized.

"I led demonstrators in front of the White House and, after the police had warned me a dozen times, I was arrested.

"Levine had told me such an arrest could also be utilized for propaganda. I spent 6 weeks in jail and the Communists stirred up a national campaign of martyrdom on my behalf.

"I was in jail when General MacArthur drove the Reds out of the Government buildings, but word was sent to me through Communist agents that the Moscow 'rep' was proud of me and would meet me in New York when I was released."

MacArthur's Forthright Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every patriotic American can fully agree with the views expressed by David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune of May 7, 1951. Under leave to extend, I am inserting Mr. Lawrence's remarks:

MACARTHUR TESTIMONY CALLED ANSWER TO CHARGES OF CRITICS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—A breath of fresh air has swept across the country in the person of a man who, without bitterness or rancor, rises above the petty and the irrelevant to state honestly his convictions on a highly controversial subject of national policy.

What General MacArthur has accomplished by his 3 days of testimony and by his ready submission to cross-examination is to put the whole question of our military policy in a true perspective.

Not a word of resentment did he express against the President or any one else. He brushed aside with a simple statement of facts the many misrepresentations of his position which critics have flung at him.

Nobody can truly claim the right to state General MacArthur's position hereafter unless he has read the 150,000 words of testimony covering the three days of hearings.

STATES WHAT HE BELIEVES

This correspondent has read every word of it and is amazed at the number of things that have been written about the general or his proposals which simply are not true. The atmosphere here is so surcharged with political tactics and with the polemics of partisanship that it is refreshing to find a spokesman who, without regard to how his remarks jibe with the speeches of Republican or Democratic leaders, in the "great debate" of recent weeks, states with candor and frankness what he really believes.

People may differ as to whether he has the right proposals and whether they should be adopted but, after reading the testimony, one is more puzzled than ever that the President should have listened to the smears of the "palace guard" and tried to destroy the reputation of one of the world's greatest soldiers, if not one of her most dynamic statesmen.

The same man who wrote out in longhand on his plane the historic speech to Congress and then read it without glasses, the same man who, though 71 years of age, sat for 9 hours a day for three successive days and faced a barrage of questions from the Senate's best interrogators won spontaneous praise from Republicans and Democrats in the committee. The tribute by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, at the end of the final session on Saturday, is significant. He said:

"General MacArthur, I wish to state to you that the 3 days that you have been here with us are without parallel in my legislative experience. I have never seen a man subjected to such a barrage of questions in so many fields and on so many varied subjects. I marvel at your physical endurance. More than that, I have been profoundly impressed by the vastness of your patience and the thoroughness and the frankness with which you have answered all of the questions that have been propounded."

TRIBUTE TO MAC ARTHUR

"We have certainly drawn freely on your vast reservoir of knowledge and experience, not only as a great military captain, but as a civilian administrator of 80,000,000 people."

One wonders how such a man could have been summarily dismissed. One finds nowhere in the official record the slightest evidence that he disobeyed a military command or failed to fulfill the highest traditions of our military service. One wonders if President Truman will not be inspired when he has read all the testimony to show the same courage that he showed when he apologized to the Marines for an intemperate remark. For the instinct to redress a wrong is the mark of courage and spiritual understanding. General MacArthur cannot be restored to his command, of course, but the unworthy manner by which he was abruptly relieved can still be expunged from the record by an act of Christian atonement.

Communist Smear of General MacArthur Bonus March—Leader Exposes Red Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein excerpts from the Detroit Times, Detroit, Mich., of August 29, 1949, containing a statement of the deliberate and well-planned smear by the Communists of former President Hoover and General MacArthur.

Every American should read the Communist technique used to divide and conquer America.

The excerpts follow:

BONUS MARCH LEADER EXPOSES RED SMEAR OF HOOVER

(By Howard Rushmore)

CENTERVILLE, TENN., August 27.—A 17-year-old smear campaign against former President Hoover and General MacArthur today was branded a Communist plot by the

one man in the United States who knows the complete inside story.

He is John T. Pace, soft-spoken native of Tennessee hill country who was commended by the Communist International for his revolutionary leadership of the bonus march on Washington in 1932. He was a Detroiter at the time.

It was Pace, a secret Communist Party member, who was assigned by Moscow to whip up a propaganda campaign of hatred against Mr. Hoover and General MacArthur after the march had ended.

Using the technique of the "big lie" long before Hitler and Goebels copied the device for Nazi purposes, the Communists accused Mr. Hoover, our only living ex-President, and General MacArthur of killing World War I veterans.

Pace, a wiry little man who twice was arrested for his inciting to riot during the days of the bonus expeditionary force, is now a solid citizen of this drowsy little community.

NOW DEPUTY SHERIFF

He is a deputy sheriff, hard-working farmer, and chairman of the Americanism department of the American Legion in the county.

Pace is no longer a Communist. He quit communism 3 years after the bonus march and since that time has battled the Reds as zealously as he once served their cause. He says:

"I feel responsible, in part, for this often-repeated lie about Hoover and General MacArthur.

"I've never told this story before, but I think it's about time, and the only reward I want is the knowledge all veterans and everyone will know the truth about two great Americans.

"I led the left-wing or Communist section of the bonus march.

"It was ordered by my Red superiors to provoke riots.

WANTED BLOODSHED

"I was told to use every trick to bring about bloodshed in the hopes that Hoover would be forced to call out the Army.

"The Communists didn't care how many veterans were killed.

"I was told Moscow had ordered riots and bloodshed in hopes that this might set off the revolution.

"My Communist bosses were jumping for joy on July 28 when Washington police killed one veteran.

"The Army was called out the next day by President Hoover and didn't fire a shot or kill a man. General MacArthur put down a Moscow-directed revolution without bloodshed and that's why the Communists hate him even today."

Before Pace and the Communists moved in on the "BEF" at Anacostia Flats along the Potomac, the "bonus march" was an effort by American veterans to win what they considered just and reasonable demands.

Later Pace continues:

"When the bonus march first started, the Communist Party's official line was to ignore it."

IN DETROIT THEN

"I was in Detroit when the movement first spread. I had moved there a few years before from Tennessee and joined the Communist Party in 1931.

"In those years, the party's national membership was about 3,000, most of them aliens.

"Because I was a native American of old southern stock, the Reds jumped at recruiting me when I fell for their line about the Communists being able to solve the depression problems.

"Early in 1932 when veterans started their demands for a bonus, the Communists sneered at them and called them reactionary.

"However, when the veterans in Wayne County scheduled a bonus march on city hall, the district committee of the Communist party called an emergency meeting to discuss the situation.

"I was a member of the district committee and I agreed the Communists should infiltrate the veterans and take over the campaign.

"Some of the other Reds were against this plan, arguing that the veterans were 'Fascists.'"

REDS LEAD MARCH

"However, five of us were given permission to take part in the legitimate veterans' demonstration at city hall.

"We five Communists took over the march and I made a speech at city hall, urging all veterans to register for a bonus march on Washington.

"More than 400 signed up. I was named the commander of the march.

"The Detroit Communists were jubilant at my success and wired national headquarters in New York for further orders.

"The answer came back for me to lead the veterans to Cleveland where the party would have other delegations ready.

"I was to report by long distance phone to a secret number in Washington to 'Comrade Levine.'

"I was given a pocketful of money and told to go ahead.

"So about 500 Michigan veterans under the leadership of five well-heeled Communists took over a freight train and headed East.

"The Communist Trojan horse of the bonus march was on the move."

MACARTHUR CITES SERVICE IN EXPOSE OF SMEAR

Informed that The Detroit Times was exposing the 17-year-old Communist "smear" directed against him, Gen. MacArthur today cabled from his Tokyo headquarters:

"I shall read the projected articles with much interest. Any action taken to tear down the facade of communistic hypocrisy and expose the insidiousness of its smear technique and viciously false propaganda is a distinct service to the American people.

"GENERAL MACARTHUR,
"Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers."

A Man's Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there are times in the history of any people when their security, survival, and actual existence are tested in every phase of their lives. The strength of a nation is determined by the true characteristics of its people. The moral and ethical code is recognized as the characteristic which gives strength to us as a Nation and people.

In these trying and troublesome days, it is only appropriate that we as a Nation and people strengthen our moral and spiritual life as we emphasize more and more the importance of the character of our people and the high standards we must maintain as a Nation. We are reminded more and more that our basis of strength and existence had its origin with those qualities of the founders of this Nation.

A striking and impressive discussion on one of these truly traditional characteristics was given by Col. T. H. Barton, chairman of the board of the Lion Oil Co., in a recent issue of that company's monthly publication. As this message is so appropriate and realistic in our personal and national life, under unanimous consent, I include in in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

A MAN'S WORD

"His word is as good as his bond." Back in grandpa's day that was an oft-heard phrase. It described a man of good reputation—a man whose integrity and moral rectitude were unquestioned—a man of stature in the matter of personal ethics.

It was not unusual in grandpa's day for two men of good reputation to close an important business deal on the strength of a clearly stated, verbal understanding of each man's responsibilities. In those days a firm handshake and the momentary meeting of two pairs of level eyes cemented a contract more firmly than any written document ever devised.

How often do we hear that phrase applied today? Seldom, if ever, I daresay. It seems that the "positive" phrase, affirming man's integrity, has given way to a "negative" phrase of admonition. Who, today, has not been advised always to "read the small print" in a legal paper?

I deem this trend from "positive" affirmation to "negative" admonition as significant and dangerous. The trend is significant because it denotes a departure from the sound ethical standards of grandpa's time which indicates, in turn, a weakening of our individual sense of moral code.

Such a change is dangerous because the weakening or dissolution of the moral or ethical fiber of a man or a nation can lead only to destruction. Read your history books and learn for yourselves what happened to the Roman, Greek, and other great civilizations when the people of those nations became morally corrupt.

We are living in an age of great confusion and uncertainty, but there have been many such eras in the world's history. Wars and economic upsets have come and gone and will come and go again and again. New wonders of science will continue to alter the pattern of our lives, as they have in the past. These things are not too important in the over-all scheme of things. It is important that we realize this one fact: If we, the people of America, hope to survive and to maintain our position as the most advanced nation in all history, we must never for any reason permit a degeneration of our individual integrity or a weakening in any manner of our standard of natonal ethics. Our standard of ethics, based on Christian morality, and as practiced individually and collectively, is the strong fiber from which all of our success as a nation and as a people has been woven.

Let the ethical standard—our morality—deteriorate and our Nation will come apart at the seams just as surely as the Kingdom of Judah disintegrated thousands of years ago when it failed to heed the same warning that rings in our ears today.

Let each of us cast from our mind the idea that success depends on "reading the small print" and return again to grandpa's standard of judging our fellow man and of living our lives on the basis of a man "whose word is his bond."

Let us resolve collectively, that the ethical stature of our Nation shall be strong and sound in the eyes of the rest of the world, to the end that, through our Nation and its example, peace and happiness shall prevail on this earth.

Moscow Thanks Bonuseer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement appearing in the Detroit Times, Detroit, Mich., of August 30, 1949.

For the first time in two decades a former Communist, who was a leader in the bonus march on Washington, tells the inside story of this Moscow-inspired incident.

Let every American read this confession of this former Communist leader of the delegation from Detroit, Mich., which made up a part of the bonus march. After doing so, he will understand the design of Russia, even before we recognized that government, to divide and destroy the United States.

The article follows:

MOSCOW THANKS BONUSEER

(By Howard Rushmore)

CENTERVILLE, TENN., August 30.—The current Communist "smear" of former President Hoover and General MacArthur—an attack echoed by New Dealers, pinks, and Russia-firsters for 17 years—originated in a secret Red meeting near Union Square in New York City in August 1932.

At that meeting, the leader of the left-wing section of the bonus march was complimented for his successful "revolutionary activities" by the representatives of the Communist International.

And this veterans' leader was then sent by Stalin's agent on a well-financed national tour to spread hatred against Hoover and General MacArthur.

IN JAIL DURING RIOT

John T. Pace, now a deputy sheriff and a violent foe of the Communist Party since he quit the subversive group in 1935, tells for the first time of this Moscow-directed smear.

In an exclusive interview, the former Communist said:

"I was in jail when the other Communists deliberately led a riot against the Washington police who attempted to evict them from a Government building they had seized.

"From other Communists I learned that the Reds had thrown bricks at the cops, used clubs on them and, in self-defense, the police fired, killing one veteran who, ironically, wasn't a Communist.

"Then President Hoover ordered out the Army and told General MacArthur to drive the Reds out of the building and back to Anacostia Flats."

Pace said that before he had been arrested, Emmanuel Levine, his Red boss, had declared:

"We want the President to call out the Army—then we'll have a real revolution going."

PLANS ARE UPSET

"But MacArthur did the job without firing a shot and, acting under Mr. Hoover's instructions, prevented any violence," Pace recalled.

"That sent the Communists at each other's throats, for our orders had been to provoke all the violence possible."

Pace, immediately after he was freed, was ordered to New York. He said:

"I was told to come to an address near Union Square. It was a highly secret meeting and plenty of the big-shot Communists were there, including Browder, Foster, and Stachel."

(Earl Browder, former secretary of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Reds; and Jacob Stachel, now educational director of the Communist Party.)

PRAISED BY HIGHER UP

"Levine and I made reports on the bonus march and our work in Washington," Pace continued.

"Then a squat, dark-haired man was introduced to us as the 'CI rep' (Communist international representative).

"This man complimented me for my work. Speaking with a thick Russian accent, he said Moscow was pleased with my working-class leadership.

"He told me that CI wanted me to make a national tour, speaking in every State to agitate against President Hoover and General MacArthur.

"This Moscow agent said I was to refer to Mr. Hoover as 'the murderer of American veterans' and MacArthur as 'the tool of the Fascists.'"

Pace said he had no doubt of the "CI rep's" influence, for Foster, Browder, and the rest of the big shots were scared to death of him and kept saying "Yes; comrade" and almost bowed to him.

The Moscow agent, Pace added, told him to stress the fact that the troops had been responsible for killing veterans.

"I knew that MacArthur's men didn't fire a shot, but I had at least one commissar with me during all my speaking tour to see that I followed instructions," Pace said.

"The 'CI rep' also told the party leaders to arrange my speaking tour under the auspices of the Workers' Ex-Servicemen's League, a Communist front group."

CLEVELAND MEETING

Pace said he made the tour and arranged for a convention of Red veterans in Cleveland that fall. He continued:

"Almost every day I received instructions from New York to call Mr. Hoover and General MacArthur every name in the book.

"The list of names ranged from 'Fascist murderers' to 'Wall Street butchers' and some unprintable ones.

"The Communist press joined in the campaign. Hundreds of thousands of pieces of literature against President Hoover and MacArthur echoed the line of the 'CI rep.'

"I have never seen such an active smear and even at the time a devoted Communist, I got a little sick of the lies that appeared in this propaganda."

ORGANIZES NEW MARCH

At party orders, Pace called a convention of the league in Cleveland that fall and organized a second bonus march on Washington, under complete Communist control.

"This failed miserably but it carried out the smear of Mr. Hoover and MacArthur," Pace said.

"However, Communist leaders told me the campaign was successful.

"They were happy when the parlor pinks took up the smear against the two great Americans and even today the Reds boast that the propaganda drive of 1932 carried on by the Communists turned the Nation against Mr. Hoover."

BACKS HOOVER ACTION

Now active in the American Legion and a speaker before dozens of patriotic groups, Pace said:

"On the basis of my personal experience, I want to repeat again and again that Mr. Hoover took the only step he could have taken to avert a bloody revolution right here in Washington.

"And General MacArthur, by evicting the Reds without firing a shot, took the wind out of the Red propagandists who had ordered me to provoke bloodshed and violence.

"Even today we find such prominent persons as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt echoing the old Communist propaganda against these two great Americans.

OUTSMARTED REDS

"It's about time Americans examined the facts. And the facts are that both President Hoover and General MacArthur outsmarted the Communists and the Reds have never forgiven them."

Pace, who quit the Communist Party in 1935 while living in Detroit, said he was "willing at any time to repeat my story" to any "group of Americans who value truth above character assassination."

"And don't forget," he added, "Lenin, leader of the Russian revolution, told Communists 30 years ago to use the lie whenever necessary as long as it helped the Red cause.

"Mr. Hoover and General MacArthur have been victims of a highly organized, well financed Communist lie for 17 years.

"I hope my story gives them benefit of the truth."

Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a group of political-science teachers who reside in Berkeley, Calif., have had the courage to speak out on the subject of General MacArthur's removal.

Their joint statement makes sense. I urge my colleagues to read it and ponder over what they have to say.

CONSTITUTIONAL

EDITOR: It is General MacArthur, not President Truman, whose actions have imperiled the basis of our constitutional system. The Declaration of Independence, in listing its complaints against George III, contains these words: "He has affected to make the military independent of and superior to the civil power." That was one of the issues which made our forefathers decide to create a new Nation and organize a new system of government. The Constitution of the United States, over whose drafting George Washington presided, declares with unmistakable clarity that the President is Commander in Chief. All military officers swear an oath of allegiance to the Constitution, which automatically requires their obedience to the directives of the President. To argue for or to act upon any other view is to be subversive of the Constitution. Policy in international relations is determined in our country by the officials whom the people elect and send to the Congress and to the White House. It is not to be determined by Army, Navy, or Air Force commanders.

This principle holds good irrespective of the party in power for the time being. It would apply with the same force if the President were a Republican and a military field commander were a partisan of the Democrats. Indeed, it was precisely this situation which confronted Abraham Lincoln, and he met it in precisely the same manner. To hold otherwise is to lay this Republic open to the dangers of Caesarism, and to discard 25 centuries of political experience in the Western World. We, the undersigned

teachers of political science, including both Republicans and Democrats, stand by this fundamental principle of democracy and of the Constitution: that civilian authority must always be paramount over military authority. Considering the facts that are of public record, we think that the President, who has sworn in his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, was left with no alternative but to dismiss General MacArthur.

Peter H. Odegard, Frank M. Russell, Charles Aikin, Victor G. Rosenblum, Joseph P. Harris, T. A. Bisson, Julian Towster, Joseph D. Lubin, Henry L. Janssen, Glenn Tinder, Jr., George A. Lipsky, Dwight Waldo, Yosal Rogat, Samuel C. May, John W. Baker, Rogers Hoffman, Robert Hayton, Hans Kelsen, Rhoten A. Smith, Ivan M. Ponedel, Christopher Dyer-Bennet, Lloyd Fisher, Leslie Lipson, Robert Scalapino.

BERKELEY.

Korean Policies Must Be Reckoned in the Lives and Shattered Bodies of Our Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, May 5, presented a strong editorial on the General MacArthur case. I commend it to all Members:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S CASE

Two days of testimony by General MacArthur point to one conclusion—the hearings are not going to end in a clear-cut decision, one way or the other, in the dispute over our Korean policy.

The controversy has boiled down to a difference of opinion. And the conflict of opinion revolves primarily around the question of Soviet intentions. Since the parties to the dispute do not know what the Russians intend to do, the prospect is that the Senate hearings will be inconclusive. When they are over the people will not know a great deal more than they did before, and there is little likelihood that many minds will have been changed by the arguments, pro or con.

This is not to say, however, that the hearings have accomplished nothing. They have served to clarify General MacArthur's real position, and as they progress it is to be expected that other points of view, notably that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will be brought into sharper focus. This, at least, will be some gain.

General MacArthur has effectively disposed of the petty snipers who have been taking pot shots at him. He is not the comic-opera strategist that they have tried to picture him as being.

General MacArthur begins with one central, undeniable fact: We are at war in Korea. American boys, and boys of other nationalities, are being killed and wounded there every day. If the fighting is to drag on inconclusively many thousands more will forfeit their lives. So General MacArthur wants to try to end the fighting. He wants to use all, not just a fraction, of the military power at our command to this end.

The risks? He agrees that there are risks. He thinks that Red China is already fully committed in Korea, and can do no more damage there. He concedes that to attack bases in Manchuria, or to blockade Chinese ports, might bring the Russians into the war. But that risk, as he correctly points out, was inherent in our decision to go into Korea. We assumed that risk then, and General MacArthur believes it is both morally and militarily wrong to sacrifice the lives of thousands of young men in an effort to avoid that risk, or to minimize it, now.

He thinks we are faced with one of two situations. If the Russians have not decided upon war with the west, a full-scale effort to win the Korean war is not going to bring them into the conflict. On the other hand, if the Russians have decided upon war, an attack on Chinese bases might speed up the Soviet timetable and bring them openly into the struggle a little sooner. General MacArthur balances the risks, and says he would take that gamble in an effort—which he believes would be successful—to bring the Korean war to a speedy conclusion. In summary, he does not believe we should let the fear of a possible bigger war keep us from fighting and winning the savage, bloody war that we are already in. That is an attitude which makes sense.

General MacArthur also disposed of some of the ridiculous charges that his armchair critics have brought against him.

His objective in using all of the means at our disposal to end the Korean war would be to drive the aggressor from Korea and discourage him from renewing his aggression. He believes that we have the military power now to do this—that by bombing, blockade, etc., we can so cripple the Chinese capacity to wage war in Korea that the Communists will have to get out of that country and stay out. He emphatically repudiates any thought of invading and conquering China. That is the bugaboo that is raised by his critics whenever an attack on Manchurian bases is proposed. But there is all the difference in the world between ending the aggression in Korea and conquering China. And General MacArthur has made it clear that what he advocates is the former; that he is wholly opposed to any such scatter-brained undertaking as the latter. And why is not that position sound? If we can fight a limited war to hold a bloody line somewhere in Korea, why can we not fight a limited war to make it impossible for the enemy to stay anywhere in Korea? Because the Russians might come in? Which is better—to take that risk, or to accept the certainty of scores of thousands of additional casualties in an indefinite stalemate?

General MacArthur then amplified his views with respect to the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa. His use of this force would be a limited one. He thinks it would serve as a threat to the enemy, and that it might be used for diversionary purposes—to take pressure off the UN troops in Korea. He does not contend that it could defeat the Communists if put ashore on the mainland, and he thinks the Nationalist Chinese commanders should decide in what ways their troops can be most effectively employed. But if General MacArthur had his way, they would be used. In one way or another, the troops on Formosa would contribute what they can to the common fight against the common enemy. And why not?

The general, in his 2 days on the witness stand, has not gone unchallenged. For the most part he successfully met the critical questions. He has disavowed any intention of slighting Europe to fight in Asia. Instead, he says that we must be prepared to meet and turn back the threat of communism wherever it appears.

It was in this connection that Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, asked the $64 question—the only critical question that makes much sense. Senator MCMAHON's view is that we are not ready for war with Russia, but that by 1953 we will be ready. The Senator thinks that if the Russians should attack soon, our casualties—both military and civilian—would greatly exceed any losses which may be incurred in a continuing limited war in Korea. And he wanted to know whether General MacArthur believes that continuance of the Korean war on its present scale is justified as a means of buying time.

In substance, General MacArthur's answer was that he would accept that risk, that the urgency of winning the war in Korea and stopping the slaughter there—a slaughter that otherwise is certain to go on—justifies us in assuming the risk that the Russians may attack, although he does not think they would do so merely because we stepped up the scale of the Korean fight.

This doctrine of buying time by pulling our punches in Korea is one that should be given a little thought.

The big hole in it is the assumption that the Russians, if they have decided that war must be the eventual arbiter, would let us have the necessary time even if we were to abandon Korea entirely. But assuming for the sake of discussion that the Russians have not decided upon war, or that they might be foolish enough to wait until we are armed to the teeth in 1953, there still is something to be said about this doctrine.

If we actually are buying time in Korea, we are paying a terrible price for that time. It is a price that must be reckoned, not in dollars, but in the lives and shattered bodies of our young men. Perhaps it is necessary to pay this price. Because we have been fools in recent years, because we have recklessly neglected our military arm despite the clearly revealed hostile intentions of the Russians, it may be necessary to ask American boys to give up their lives in Korea while we retrieve our blunders. But if this is the case, if this is true, we should be striving day and night to close the gap, to make up the lost ground in the arms race. But we are not doing that. Nobody in this country is being required to sacrifice much, if anything. Labor walks out on the mobilization program, and does not come back until it gets what it wants. Businessmen gather their record-breaking profits. The politicians continue to play the political game—if anything, with a greater vengeance than before. If we are really buying time with the Korean war, we are not using that time to the best advantage. We are wasting the precious hours that are being bought with the lives of the young men on the firing line. And that, in the simplest language, is a crime—a crime that should lie heavily upon our conscience.

Increases in Natural-Gas Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the increased rates for natural gas in Wisconsin and two editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have before me two editorials from the Milwaukee Journal on the critical subject of

Public knowledge of the details of congressional business, and of the personalities involved, can be a great force toward raising the level of competence among Congressmen and the decisions they make.

The overwhelming argument in favor of televising Congress is this: pepole will take a far greater interest in their Government—and have a far greater understanding of public issues.

Did you know that the total number of eligible citizens who vote today in congressional elections (between Presidential years) is only about 40 percent of the voting population?

COULD BRING OUT THE VOTE

In the 1950 congressional elections, only 42,324,232 out of 98,641,000 voted. Even Presidential elections bring out only a little over 50 percent. A recent survey showed why: 62 percent of all nonvoters complained they did not know the candidates well enough to make a choice.

But our 100 television stations and 3,000 radio stations could bring Congress t practically every one of our 45,000,000 families.

One wise political columnist says that the next President of the United States will be the man whom the public judges best fit—after watching him on TV.

For the first time in our history, every American may soon have a chance to watch or hear his Government at work. A whole nation may sit in the galleries of its own Congress.

Third Anniversary of the Founding of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of two addresses delivered last night by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself at the celebration of the third anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, at Carnegie Hall, in New York City, May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR IRVING M. IVES

It is an honor to be with you at this celebration of the third anniversary of the State of Israel. I was also privileged to be with you at the first and second commemorations. I no longer consider myself a guest, but rather a confirmed participant in a historic event, in the shaping and bringing to life of which I took part.

Americans feel a deep kinship with Israel. It is true that many States have gained their independence in recent years with the moral and material assistance of the United States. Even now American soldiers are shedding their blood to protect one of these states from aggression and to preserve its independence. Yet, none of these new nations is so intimately related to America in common ideals as is Israel.

The dream of restoring the ancient land of Israel to the dispersed, homeless, and persecuted Jews had challenged the imagination of Americans for many generations. Our statesmen, reflecting the mind of America, advocated the restoration of the Jewish Nation and encouraged those who toiled for the realization of that great dream. American diplomacy and American technology and American resources contributed a major share to the mighty task of creating and developing the proud Republic of Israel. It is only natural, therefore, that we look with keen satisfaction upon the amazing progress achieved by the Jewish people in the cherished land of their fathers.

When we think of Israel, our minds turn to the Holy Bible and to the prophets of that ancient land which provided the world with the never-failing bulwarks of faith and morality. The Jewish religion which is based on the dignity and equality of man was the forerunner of the modern doctrine of the inalienability of human rights and indeed of liberty itself.

Today these great spiritual fountainheads from which spring the common purposes of all free men are under attack. The lamps of culture and freedom throughout the world are being snuffed out one by one. It is therefore fitting on this occasion to turn our thoughts once more to the land of Israel to find in its symbolic resurgence the new faith that is needed to meet the new and greater obstacles that lie in the path of freedom.

It is significant that Israel was reborn in the pangs of a world struggle against a marching conqueror who is striving for world dominion and the extinction of human liberty. We defeated the tyrants in a war which cost the Jewish people one-third of their total number; and we thought peace was assured with the destruction of nazism. We were mistaken.

Once more the world is threatened by aggression and a brutal marching dictatorship. Another flood of aggression has been let loose upon humanity. A new totalitarian religion, not unlike that of vanquished nazism, is again threatening to engulf the world in darkness and in servitude. Again free nations are compelled to man their ramparts in defense of their independence, and indeed their very survival.

Under these chaotic conditions, when fear and suspicion stalk the streets, it is imperative that we keep proper perspective and do not lose sight of the basic aim of our struggle, which is the preservation of the essential dignity of the individual and the corrollaries of justice, freedom, and equality that emanate from that great Hebraic religious concept.

We must beware of becoming entangled in the ideological net of the cynical Soviet philosophy that the end justifies any means. We must guard our basic liberties and our religious concepts of right and wrong. We must avoid the easy temptations and the ephemeral benefits of appeasement. Careful in the choice of partners in this struggle for democratic survival, we must not permit the wolves to don sheep's clothing and surreptitiously to sneak into our ranks as codefenders of liberty. We should have learned our lesson by the sad experiences of the last war. I refer to the tragedies of Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

The incipient resurgence of nazism is a matter of grave concern to every American. Our policy toward Germany must be scrutinized and reexamined constantly, lest we too fall victims to Soviet cynicism.

Democratic statesmanship must possess the capacity of penetrating analysis, of farsightedness, and of broad realism. Unfortunately, our State Department is not blessed with these qualities and its patent failure fully to appraise the critical importance of the Middle East, and particularly the role Israel can play in that area, is indeed disturbing.

Our chief exertions very properly have been directed toward Europe and toward the Far East. Yet, it would be a grave mistake to minimize the Middle East and to rule it out as a potential danger zone. For it is the Middle East where our defenses may be threatened and outflanked. The danger signals from Iran are ominous and must be heeded by our Government.

The Middle East with its vast natural resources can well become the critical nerve center in the conflict between the East and the West. It is the gateway to three continents. The strategic lines of communication which link together the continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia cannot be held unless that region is protected from attack. Last, but not least, the godless Communist rulers must never be allowed to conquer and rule the land which was the cradle of religion and the source of faith to humanity. As a great moral principle, the Holy Land must be stoutly defended from Soviet aggression. We have little time to lose in mending our Middle East defenses.

The Soviet Union cunningly strives to undermine our position in that part of the world by creating disturbance and chaos. It is utilizing the internal weaknesses of the social order and the backwardness of the region to create an atmosphere of hostility toward the democracies and to gain allies among the native population for its sinister plots of conquest and enslavement. The Kremlin is also manipulating the inner conflicts of nationalist groups to retard the political and economic integration of that area and to prevent it from becoming a barrier to Soviet designs.

Our Government's point 4 program aims to remedy the social and economic ailments of the Near East. Though a just and wise policy, there may not be sufficient time to put it into effective operation before the Kremlin may strike.

There is only one country in the Middle East which has demonstrated its readiness and willingness and ability to serve as a spearhead for the defense of the western democracies in that part of the world. That country is Israel. Israel by its history and the character of its people is a natural ally of America and of the Western World. Israel, through its technique and industrial know-how and the zeal of its people, can serve as an effective base for the western armies in time of war. Israel does not suffer from the fatalism and the social and economic maladjustments with which other Middle East states are afflicted. Already the Kremlin agitators have found it futile to attempt to disrupt the national life of the Jewish state and thereby to weaken its resistance to their schemes. The love of the Israelites for their land and their devotion to freedom make them a natural and reliable ally in any crisis. The thrilling military performance of the young Israelite Army, which recently astounded the world, is assuredly a calculated deterrent for any aggressor. Israel, then, is the only pillar of reliance in that critical sector of the world and it should be fully utilized by the United States and our allies.

It is for this reason that I am sponsoring the grant-in-aid bill to give Israel $150,000,000 for the purpose of strengthening her economy. The Israelite state is now performing the miraculous task of receiving, housing, feeding, and integrating hundreds of thousands of uprooted Jews who, but for the advent of Jewish statehood, would have been sentenced to political death. The fulfillment of this program and its daring projection is truly a great historic achievement; and while it has saved human lives and fortified the security of the Jewish state, it has also served the interests of America and the entire free world. For every Jew brought to the shores of Israel, however weakened his physical condition, is nonetheless a potential soldier and defender of the west.

The $150,000,000 which we propose to grant to Israel will be devoted to a great humanitarian and national endeavor. At the same

the reckless increases in natural-gas rates which have been imposed on the people of Wisconsin. I have previously commented on this matter on the Senate floor, pointing out the possibility that it may be necessary to introduce a resolution for a thorough investigation of this whole situation in order to prevent a further price gouging of the people.

This week, numerous distinguished officials of the State of Wisconsin, including our Governor, the Honorable Walter Kohler, Jr., and the mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, will be in town to confer with Chairman Wallgren, of the FPC. It is my earnest hope that out of that discussion may come a mutual agreement on ways and means of protecting the public interest, instead of allowing it to be further damaged.

I send the two editorials to the desk for printing in the RECORD.

I want to emphasize that I do not feel that we should allow our preoccupation with foreign affairs to divert our attention from the fact that millions upon millions of Americans in the low and middle income brackets right here at home are practically at wits and trying to make ends meet. Each day my office is literally flooded with appeals from these hard-pressed folks who set out in great detail their family budgets and who ask how they can be expected to pay the rent, buy clothing for the children, buy nutritious food for the family, and still meet rising prices.

Bureau of Labor Statistics data shows Milwaukee to be the highest cost of living area in this country, and the Phillips Petroleum Co. is apparently determined to help keep Milwaukee in that spot.

It seems to me that the Congress has an obligation to fulfill its promises particularly to the families of men fighting in Korea.

I ask my colleagues to think about the plight of a typical wife with one or two youngsters whose husband is fighting abroad and who finds that the serviceman's allotment barely covers subsistence needs. But whether or not our people have boys or relatives fighting in Korea, they are entitled to protection from being gouged.

The State of Wisconsin has a great tradition of preventing the arbitrary use of power in either public or private hands. If the Phillips Petroleum Co. expects to run riot without the public officials of Wisconsin taking remedial action, it has another think coming.

I have sent my comments as printed in a previous issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Mr. Eric Johnston of OES and Mr. Michael DiSalle of OPS, asking them to reply as soon as possible on what they and their staffs propose to do about this aspect of the stabilization problem. I have also brought my comments to the attention of Chairman Johnson of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, whom I may ask to launch an investigation of this situation. Such an investigation has been widely urged throughout Wisconsin; but I hope it may not prove to be necessary, in view of all the other staggering responsibilities on the Congress. But if we must have such a probe, I for one will strongly demand it.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

IS THE FPC PLAYING FOOTSY?

Senator WILEY has told the Senate that the Federal Power Commission "is playing footsy with certain private interests" in the Phillips Petroleum Co. natural gas rate case.

No other conclusion could be drawn from the FPC refusal to end almost 3 years of delay in giving Wisconsin a hearing on charges that Phillips is charging too much for gas at the wellhead.

The FPC has opened itself further to the charge of playing footsy by granting Phillips a hearing on whether the commission has jurisdiction over Phillips' rates, jurisdiction spelled out in law and court rulings.

Senator WILEY made two appeals in the interest of Wisconsin consumers. First he asked the FPC, for the umpteenth time, to reconsider its refusal to hear Wisconsin's pleas. Then he asked Eric Johnston, director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, to have his staff investigate the effects of the drastic increase in natural gas rates on the inflationary spiral.

These requests are worth making, but the record of the FPC in the Phillips case does not promise much hope for action.

There would appear to be more hope in another step Senator WILEY is considering. If something isn't done to give Wisconsin a hearing, the Senator will ask that a Senate Interstate Commerce Committee subcommittee "investigate the background of the Phillips company's dealings with the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., as well as related natural gas operations."

If the FPC doesn't move quickly to give Wisconsin its hearing we recommend the Senator's proposal for an investigation. Wisconsin consumers, in the words of Senator WILEY, "are being gouged." An investigation seems to be their only recourse against the game of footsy the FPC is playing with the natural gas producers.

WHAT'S THE COURT DECISION FOR?

Mon C. Wallgren, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, has helped verify the Wisconsin and Milwaukee contention that the FPC is giving consumers the run-around in the Phillips Petroleum Co. natural-gas-rate case.

The FPC has stalled hearing Wisconsin's claim that Phillips charges too much for natural gas. The FPC first wants to decide whether it has jurisdiction over Phillips' rates—jurisdiction Wisconsin insists the FPC has by law and precedent. Wallgren, in a letter to Governor Kohler, gives substance to Wisconsin's position. He writes:

"The Supreme Court decision in the interstate case (331 U. S. 682) indicates that the Commission does have such jurisdiction."

But, he adds, Phillips doesn't think so, so the Commission will give Phillips a hearing.

Why? What good are law and court decisions if the Commission is going to start the jurisdictional fight from scratch in each case that comes before it?

The rate case has already been delayed 2½ years. Is Phillips to be allowed to delay it further? Is the FPC going to carry out its job of protecting consumers or continue to give in to natural-gas interests on an issue that even the FPC admits was settled long ago?

Let's Televise Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the question of the broadcasting and televising of House sessions is currently under considerable discussion. I have proposed this in a resolution, House Resolution 62, which is the subject of Discharge Petition No. 3. Appended is an article from the May 6 issue of the Sunday magazine Parade, found in the Washington Post and other papers throughout the country, considering this subject:

LET'S TELEVISE CONGRESS

(By Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, Twenty-first Congressional District, New York)

A leading newspaper told its readers the other day that I was in favor of removing Congress from the closet and placing it in a goldfish bowl.

That's an excellent summary of my bill (H. Res. 62) which proposed the televising of debates in the House of Representatives. Radio broadcasts would be authorized, too.

I got the idea from the enormously successful televising of United Nations debates. The face-to-face arguments between the Western leaders and the Soviets have been the greatest lesson in foreign affairs our people have ever had.

To clinch any question of doubt about the impact of television, along came the hearings of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee under Senators KEFAUVER, TOBEY, and their colleagues. For the first time in history, such hearings were brought into millions of homes.

There are about 10,000,000 television sets in the United States today and new ones are being installed at a rate of 750,000 a month. With this potential audience there seems to be no good reason why we should not televise Congress. Not the day-to-day proceedings, which are often dull, but the big battles over important national issues.

There is a lot of opposition to my bill in Congress, however. Arguments that have been made against it are: (1) It might develop a snooping camera; (2) it might emphasize absence of Members from the floor when they are elsewhere doing necessary work on committees; (3) it might cause debate to deteriorate into "ham acting" and demagoguery, with senior Members "hogging the floor."

But when I introduced my resolution last January 12, I said I was seeking the maximum amount of public information—not a snooping camera to catch Members off guard. Under House rule 35, televising and broadcasting of House debates would be at the discretion, and under the control, of the Speaker.

LEGISLATORS WOULD BE ON THEIR TOES

As for "ham acting," Senator TOBEY feels with me that TV would, on the contrary, cause Members to choose their words and concentrate their efforts with even greater care—knowing that they were being televised.

My own opinion is that debate will become more concise and clear—so that it will be understandable to the vast audience.

And as for absences, I think citizens would pretty soon be able to judge general performance. They would learn for the first time the vast amount of work Congressmen have to do both on and off the floor. They would discover, too, that it is whether, and how, Congressmen vote that really counts.

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments made against my bill is that under congressional immunity, unfair charges made against groups or individuals get immediate and enormous circulation. However, it seems to me that it might work the other way around to protect the rights and reputations of citizens.

Members who take advantage of their congressional immunity from libel would be judged on the spot for their unfairness. Senator WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, suggests a code of fair play to protect persons mentioned unfairly on TV or radio.

Suggestions already advanced in Congress for self-discipline—perhaps even opening the courts to aggrieved individuals by permitting damage suits—will get greater consideration.

come in spite our tears and our prayers, one of its primary objectives will be the control of the Near East. The tremendous oil resources and the strategic military location of that area dictate such a conclusion.

The progress and stability of the entire Middle East is what the United States desires. Thinking men generally concede that the best way to protect its wide areas of backwardness and dearth from chaos and decay is to encourage there the development of industry and agriculture through the modern methods which have been applied so successfully in the United States. Furthermore, repeatedly we have assured the Arab States that we want to promote friendly relations with them. We know that by helping Israel to help herself we are assisting all of the Near East.

In these circumstances one can hardly estimate the advantage to the United States to have a close and dependable friend in the Middle East. In America's crusade to establish and maintain world-wide peace we need to nurture this strategically determined friendly little country.

The Arabs as fellow Semites, claiming Abraham as a common ancestor, must reconcile their differences with the Israeli people. In fact, since our common enemy sits by like a deadly cobra ready to strike, all freedom-loving people must band together and put aside their relatively petty differences. Israel can become the workshop for the common defense of the Middle East. Israel, because of its fast-increasing industrial capacity, can become the cornerstone of their common interest to move forward in war or in peace.

Most unfortunately Israel's neighbors look upon her rehabilitation as a heterogeneous element disturbing the Arab unity. They have two major fears: political expansion and economic expansion. They fear that sooner or later Israel is bound to burst out of its existing frontiers. They support this view by pointing to the great immigration program predicted for the future.

Since most of the Arab countries are mainly agricultural, having a rural population and using out-of-date methods of production resulting in an appallingly low standard of living, they are worried on the economic front that Israel will dominate the Middle East through her awakened industries. A broader and more realistic outlook would develop a far different conclusion. Israel with her westernized modern industrial and agricultural economy which can only subsist by finding new markets for its products through the adoption of improved standards of living in the whole Mediterranean area must be regarded as the friend and not the enemy of that impoverished land. The political leaders of the Arab States are making a serious blunder if they think the Middle East is destined to continue forever its role of destitution and human misery. The hour of awakening for a sleeping giant has arrived.

Temporarily Israel has had to import heavily but her economy has touched bottom and slowly she is on the way up. In 1949, for example, all fertilizer had to be imported; in 1950, production was begun from imported raw materials; in 1951 Israel will produce all the fertilizer she needs; and in 1952 she will be an exporter of fertilizer.

The same encouraging picture is reflected in other fields. Her agricultural program is moving forward rapidly—desert, swampland, and rocky hillside are being reclaimed. In their traditionally bold spirit of adopting scientific methods the Jews have expanded their farming operations with emphasis on diversified crops and the growing of citrus fruit, an important export item. As a result, agricultural production while not keeping pace with the rapid increase in population is making important headway and will continue to improve as irrigation water is brought to the sun-parched lands and barren wastes. Something like 18 percent of the Jewish working population is engaged in agriculture, forestry and fishing. Here in the United States approximately 14 percent of our gainfully employed are found in these pursuits.

Industry too has taken a great spurt since independence day 3 years ago. Foreign industrialists have been encouraged to build branch plants there. Notable among these is the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. which has constructed an automobile plant in Haifa, and Philco Corp. which is turning out 40 to 60 refrigerators in an 8-hour shift. The entrance of General Tire & Rubber, and the Ford Co. is further evidence of this salutary trend. Recently our Government concluded its point 4 program agreement with Israel which will permit the setting up of specific projects for the training of Israeli technicians.

The plain fact remains, however, that the economy of Israel has been subjected to such a severe strain by reason of the vast influx of immigrants that its productive capacity has not been able to keep pace with consumption. Its financial burden has been heavy. Additional capital is urgently needed to strengthen its economy. That is why I joined with my distinguished friend and colleague, New York's fearless and forward looking leader, Senator IVES, and 34 other Senators, in the sponsorship of Senate bill 1247 which provides for financial grants to Israel. That legislation is in response to the formal request submitted to our State Department by the Government of Israel. If we are successful in securing its enactment, it will make possible the purchase of materials for desperately needed housing units, grains, cotton, petroleum, hides, and other raw supplies required by the mills and factories which when processed into consumer goods will halt the dangerous inflationary pressures which are arising there. The $500,000,000 bond issue soon to be floated in the United States is a mighty sound investment for Americans and will give Israeli industry the financial support it must have to get under way. The conception of this bond issue is one of the boldest and most constructive things which has happened to the Near East in recent years. Every cent of it is dedicated to production because its sponsors realize that through production only can Israel remain free and prosperous.

Since Israel's capacity to produce has not kept pace with its vast increase in population, its imports far outstrip its exports. Its foreign trade deficit is huge. In 1950 exports paid for only a little more than one-seventh of the imports. Although agriculture increased its output by 75 percent in two and one-half years, the import food bill alone ran up to $70,000,000. As a result the people have been compelled to accept an austerity program that is much more severe than that experienced in Great Britain.

Nevertheless the State of Israel has come a long way in 3 years. I extend my heartiest congratulations to all who have helped to make this possible. The Jewish people, with their indomitable courage, faith in Jehovah's far-seeing vision, and tenacity of purpose, these people who have the Holy Bible and Christianity to the world, have built a citadel of freedom and have staked out a claim for democracy and right living in the very cradle of civilization. The democracy which the American Zionist wants to preserve there had its birth with the tribe of Abraham and Isaac.

We should not expect the ills which beset the human race to be cured over night. There will be heartaches and suffering. But in spite of the bewildering complexities that engulf us and the darkness of despair which hangs over the world, if we are patient and use the intelligence which the Creator has bestowed upon us, everything will work out all right. It is fortunate for the world that the rebirth of Israel came when it did.

The new Jewish state has emerged from its cocoon of long preparation the tragic time in history when the world is undergoing cataclysmic changes. Life is intricate and insecure. Every nation on this earth is in more or less of a general turmoil. World problems are so baffling that some despair that we shall ever solve them. Through the creative genius of our great scientists and engineers we have developed and harnessed forces which have great power for good or for evil. But these forces have not been brought into focus and balance with the world's slower economic progress. Science has outrun the social and political processes.

Nevertheless in these trying days, especially when we recall that entire nations are being ground to bits under the iron heel of a godless dictatorship, it is comforting to have a people happy at work building a strong vibrant democratic society on nineteen centuries of ashes and futility.

An inspired citizen of Israel and world statesman David Ben-Gurion, uttered these symbolic words of noble purpose: "In assuming its place within the family of free nations after so many centuries of aggression and exile, Israel is determined to support to the best of its capacity every measure which strengthens world peace, promotes understanding among peoples and insures the rights of men and equality of nations."

It is with this noble expression and broad, sensible and realistic outlook with which I associate myself tonight when I extend my warmest greetings and heartiest commendation to the Zionists of America and the world and to the peoples of Israel; and repeat my conviction that this free-thinking, cooperative and independent state will prove to be a tremendous factor in restoring sanity to a mad world and in preserving world peace through many, many generations.

The Defense of the Farm Against Biological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, if and when the possibility of biological warfare becomes a reality, it will probably be directed in a coordinated pattern with poisons and germs against people in the centers of population on the one hand and with pests and diseases aimed at the crops and livestock of the farmers on the other hand.

Biological warfare can be considered as a special weapon of war, and it is well to presume that our potential enemies know quite as much about it as we do.

Also it is well to realize that a strong defense can be built against it.

I include as a part of my remarks the following article from the April 1951 issue of Farm Journal, written by Richard Gerstell and Claude Gifford, entitled "It Could Hit Your Farm Tonight":

IT COULD HIT YOUR FARM TONIGHT

(Our farms would be a prime target for attack in the event of biological war. This accurate and realistic article prepared by the Farm Journal should be read carefully

time, it will serve as an investment in the security of the United States and of those who follow our leadership in the fight for freedom.

I am most hopeful that the grant-in-aid bill will pass as submitted to the Congress and I pledge you I shall do my utmost to see that it does pass.

I should also like to emphasize that I do not consider the granting of this money as the limit of our assistance in making Israel strong. Wise statesmanship and sound strategy dictate a closer link between the preparedness of America and Israel for the defense of our common heritage of freedom. In fulfilling this necessity I suggest that our Government approach the State of Israel diplomatically for consultations relative to the defense of the Middle East against Soviet aggression. The American military position would seem to dictate the granting of military aid to the Israeli Army in the form of modern weapons so as to make it a real and formidable force for securing peace and tranquillity.

We have reached a dangerous position where anything can happen. We cannot leave the security of Israel to chance. We must not, through our negligence, invite a second Pearl Harbor or a second Korea. The wise course is to be prepared; for only prepreparedness can halt the hand of aggressor.

The first step in preparing the defense of the Middle East is to move decisively for the conclusion of a formal peace between the Arab States and Israel. The present unsteady armed truce between Israel and the Arab States is fraught with danger, for the slightest spark may start a conflagration to the detriment of our own interests. The Kremlin agents hope for a renewal of the war between Israel and the Arabs and for an opportunity to intervene. The Kremlin is intent on preventing the economic stabilization of the Near East. The Arab boycott of Israel and the Egyptian blockade of the Suez Canal preventing the flow of oil to Israel are already causing serious dislocations to the economy of the whole region and are playing directly into the hands of the Soviets. Who, I ask, shall take the leadership in correcting these conditions that lead to strife instead of peace, if not the United States?

The Government of the United States is confronted with a mighty challenge. Will it assume the leadership to defend the Holy Land, dear alike to Christian and Jew, from the godless hand of communism. It is my ardent hope and prayer that we shall meet that challenge and I pledge my unstinting support of every effort to meet it.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

ISRAEL THE HOPE OF A MAD WORLD

It is indeed a very great privilege to celebrate with you the third anniversary of the rebirth of the world's oldest and yet youngest nation. Someone has said there are three Israels, the Israel of the past, the Israel of the present, and the Israel of the future. Historically that may be true, but spiritually there has been and there can be but one Israel. Measured in things spiritual, and things spiritual alone are endowed with everlasting continuity, Israel stands foremost in the family of nations. The most beautiful and enduring religion was revealed to man in this very old and this very new state. In my very early childhood my Christian mother taught me that one day, known only to God, the exiled Jew would be returned to his ancient home. I rejoice that in our time this spiritually important event was destined to take place. I shall not attempt to analyze the deeply religious implications of the formal return of Judiasm to the ancient scene of its sacred and glorious triumphs.

Suffice to say the burning desire for tranquillity and justice and the unshakable courage and faith in God which inspired the noble men and women who have pioneered in this return to the ancestral-home movement, had to succeed. They are building a new and better society of freemen, and in doing so they are using as their yardstick the ideals of the Jewish Bible. To me it is unique and praiseworthy that this program is being carried out voluntarily and through the democratic processes and not under the whiplash of any of the arbitrary or tyrannical processes so common to crusades. Accordingly, this great and noble experiment deserves the full support of people the world over. I commend and congratulate the Zionists for their vision, their faith, and their perseverance.

Birthdays are excellent occasions for taking stock of situations; of looking back to see where we have been; of acknowledging one's failures; and of dreaming and planning for the days ahead.

The inspiring story of Israel offers new proof of the powers of the creative spirit of a people who hold fast to deep religious conviction. All who are familiar with past and present Israeli history must believe it to be the prologue of a resplendent record of prophecy endowed achievement. Victor Hugo once said that no army can withstand the strength of an idea whose time has come. It is only 3 years since the State of Israel proclaimed its independence thus ending the British mandatory regime. In these 3 years Israel has striven successfully to earn a place of leadership among the other States in the Middle East. Today, few will question the fact that she will continue to play a significant political role in this backward but vital region.

In 1948, when Israel's independence was proclaimed, almost its entire southern half, neglected for thousands of years, was a sun-beaten waterless desert and wasteland. There was not a pound of coal, not a drop of oil, not an ounce of available iron in all Israel. Forests were cut down centuries ago, and practically every stick of wood had to be imported.

When the British left the state was without a government, without an army, without a police force, without trained civilians to run the country. Temporary officials to exercise what authority was necessary were literally recruited from the streets.

This was the grim picture that greeted the people of Israel on their day of independence. It would be hard indeed to imagine a more formidable challenge than that which faced this community.

But inspired and sustained by the promise of Jehovah to the faithful, they did survive this initial chaos. Instead of contemplating failure they rolled up their sleeves and they proceeded to put into effect and to carry out a constructive program of restoration and rehabilitation.

Thirty years previously, when the victorious nations at the Versailles Peace Conference pledged their support in the establishment of a Jewish state, Palestine had a Jewish population of only 65,000. On independence day in 1948 the Jewish population had swelled tenfold to 650,000.

Successive and continuous waves of immigration have boosted this total, until today there are more than 1,200,000 Jews and some 175,000 Arabs in the State of Israel. It is a tiny land of only 8,100 square miles, not larger than New Jersey. Newcomers are arriving at the rate of nearly 20,000 a month, an influx which will add another half million people by 1953. This would be a phenomenal population growth even in a much larger, better established, and more productive community.

These home seekers come by boat and chartered plane and from every corner of the globe, and from every walk of life; craftsmen, merchants, artists, scientists, peddlers, or just plain misfits. Most of them are penniless, and many have undergone such harrowing experiences that their health and spirits are broken. Some 63 countries are represented by them. In small packages and bundles they brought their pitifully few world belongings. They have a common religious faith, but not a common language. Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion well said: "Israel is not a melting pot; it is a pressure cooker."

Israel has taken "the world's tired and poor and huddled masses yearning to be free" and has given them a home. In this "in gathering of the exiles," she faces the task of the transformation of an overwhelming urban population into one properly balanced between towns and villages. A largely unproductive society must be trained to be productive, and peoples from all countries of the world must be integrated into one nationalized and cooperative enterprise. The problem of blending these pitiful and persecuted remnants of the Jewish people into a homogeneous community is indeed difficult. But the spirit of the leadership in the new Israel is strong. With a faith that man with God can do the impossible, they have entered into their almost hopeless task with great enthusiasm and full assurance.

Along with the other almost insurmountable problems must be added the jealousy and hostility of unfriendly neighboring states. Indeed, the first year was characterized by a military struggle for sheer physical survival. Israel was considered defenseless against neighboring armies trained and equipped by a European power, yet the newborn State with an undying faith in its right to live and to pursue its life according to its own dictates rallied fiercely against superior armed forces, drove them from her borders, and, God be praised, did survive.

With the challenge of aggression behind her, the central theme became the struggle for international recognition. Membership in the UN was important because this young state wholeheartedly believed in the principle of collective security and international cooperation. All of us rejoiced when Israel became the fifty-ninth member of the United Nations. Too, it is a source of great pride to all of us that the United States was the first to grant official recognition to Israel as an independent nation.

The real riddle of Israel's future, however, is whether her political and military victories can now be crowned with economic success. It would be folly to underestimate the grievous problems which remain unsolved before the spiritual aspirations of the Jewish people will be fully realized.

Israel's big headache is to reduce the tension existing in its relationship with the various neighboring Arab states. Tension is perhaps inevitable in the wake of the war which Israel was compellel to fight against aggression to assure its independence. The current border incidents between Syria and Israel cause concern in many quarters because of the explosive nature of world conditions. We must give her every assistance within our means to resolve these differences with justice, firmness, and dignity. At a time when the world is badgered with actual and potential military and political crises, few things could be worse than the outbreak of hostilities between Israel and its neighbors. The only gainers from such a catastrophe which well might set the entire Middle East aflame would be the men of the Kremlin and their forces of international subversion and aggression.

It is important to the world that Israel remain a free and independent democracy. The Middle East today is the fever spot. Without any question, this whole area is of incalculabe importance to the Allied Powers. When world war III comes, and may God grant it may never come—but if it does

by every farmer"—Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator.)

(By Richard Gerstell and Claude Gifford)

Let's suppose that some morning this year, or maybe next, you go out to the barn and find one or two of your cows drooling at the mouth and looking strangely sick. You call the veterinarian, who takes one look and says: "Foot-and-mouth disease."

How could that be? How could foot-and-mouth germs possibly get to your place? The answer is that agents of an enemy government may have brought them in. And on that day—if it ever happens—biological war will have come to your farm.

Let's hope that it never happens. But let's not think that it can't.

Biological warfare—sometimes called germ warfare, or BW for short—could start tonight. Not just in cities, with poisons and germs directed against the people crowded together there, but on farms, with pests and diseases aimed at our crops and livestock.

The enemy might try to sneak in foreign pests and diseases long before a shooting war—in hopes that he could whittle down our food supply, and undermine our strength for a long struggle. So don't think that BW has to wait for the shooting to begin.

This is not something to become hysterical about. It's true that there has been wild talk about wiping out whole cities and entire crops with poisons, insects, and diseases. But the facts are, BW is just another special weapon of war—and not a new one by any means. There's a defense against it.

Our best defense is to be prepared to detect any new insects or foreign diseases quickly, and be ready to stamp them out fast. And the better prepared we are, the less likely the enemy is to try biological warfare, or to make much headway with it.

Actually, nature is constantly waging her own biological warfare against our crops and animals. And to fight back, we have built up a tremendous arsenal—bigger and better than anywhere else in the world—of insecticides and medicines for use against bugs and diseases. Our farmers have more skill and know-how in using them, and more equipment for doing it. We have more and better veterinarians, entomologists, crop-disease men, and other scientists.

Because of our better defenses, an enemy would think twice before he started BW, and invited us to strike back. We could wage a pretty terrible biological war ourselves if we had to.

Fortunately, farm people aren't likely targets for germ attacks on human beings. They are too scattered. Germ raids, and possible insect attacks, on farms would be directed mostly against livestock and crops.

Where would raids likely begin? Probably in hatcheries, stockyards, sales barns, feed-mixing plants, railroad terminals, and other centers where large numbers of animals pass through on their way to farms. That's more likely than attacks against single farms.

Other possible targets are commercial laboratories where serums, vaccines, and other medicines are made.

On the crops front, the targets would include seed houses, fertilizer-mixing plants, and places where spray materials are made.

You may think that we have about every imaginable livestock disease now. If so, you were never more wrong. Some of the worst animal plagues on the face of the earth are still outside this country. They might be brought in any time. For instance:

Rinderpest, an Asiatic cattle plague that kills nearly 100 percent of the animals it strikes. Foot-and-mouth disease, an infection that spreads like wildfire. (It's a miracle it hasn't crossed the Mexican border.)

Glanders, an Old World disease of horses and mules that is highly fatal to humans unless it is recognized early.

Fowl pest and foreign strains of Newcastle disease, probably the two most destructive poultry diseases in the world.

Accidental outbreaks could be serious, too. Look what happened in 1914 when foot-and-mouth disease got a month's start in Michigan. It spread to the Chicago stockyards, and went out to 22 States before it was halted. More than 3,500 herds had to be slaughtered—172,222 animals in all—at a cost of nearly $6,000,000 for indemnities to owners—and those were 1914 dollars.

In Mexico we've spent $90,000,000, and fought the disease with hundreds of inspectors and veterinarians for 4 years, and still haven't completely stamped out the disease.

We've had fowl pest in this country once (in New Jersey), and just last March Asiatic Newcastle got into a California establishment through a shipment of game birds from Hong Kong.

Want to know what that disease was like? It killed 41 of the 42 chickens on that place. Thanks to a quick diagnosis, it was stamped out before it spread to other farms.

These experiences show that spotting a dangerous disease or a new insect early is the key to a strong defense. Scientists believe that the Japanese beetle got at least a year's start on us; even then we probably could have wiped it out completely by spending $50,000. We didn't and we've got the beetle in 28 States today. Very likely we could have backed the gypsy moth off our map with a few thousand dollars if we'd got at it when we discovered the pest. Now it has spread all over the northeastern United States.

Here's what biological warfare could mean to growing crops. Government entomologists say that there are literally hundreds of crop pests and diseases that have never reached our shores. Some are as bad as any we now have, or worse.

How could these diseases or pests be brought in? By smuggling them across our borders; by dropping them from enemy planes; by setting loose foreign rusts, scales, and blights in our fields, and by scattering over larger areas the diseases and pests we already have. It wouldn't be too hard to do.

One man with a few test tubes full of rust like the new 15B which attacks wheat could spread a little all the way from Mexico to Canada, and within a year or two we could have a new scourge all over the Great Plains.

Some of the more serious insect pests which might be used against us in biological warfare are the Mediterranean fruitfly, the citrus blackfly (just across the border in Mexico—see the September 1950 Farm Journal, p. 34), the Oriental fruitfly, and seed weevils that attack legume seeds. There are many others.

What is our Government doing to protect us against BW?

They have been working on it since the beginning of World War II. You didn't know it, but at the peak of that war 4,000 men—including some of the Nation's top scientists—were investigating ways to protect us against germ and pest attacks.

From that work came a new toxoid that will protect you from botulism, the deadliest type of food poisoning; a vaccine that gives animals reasonable protection against rinderpest; and a wealth of information about "plant growth regulators," some of which has been put to use in peacetime.

Our present line of defense is this:

It's up to the Armed Forces to cut off attacks by planes or germ-filled missiles or shells.

The FBI is on the look-out for sabotage and undercover raids.

The USDA watches for foreign diseases and pests at our borders, ports of entry, and our international airports. That work is still pretty much on a peacetime basis.

The rest is up to civil defense. There we are making a start—but only a start. We are still largely in the "we've got to do something" stage.

Special courses in trouble-making animal diseases that the enemy might use have been given to 25 USDA veterinarians by the Bureau of Animal Industry. These vets are located in key spots around the country—one could get to your farm or ranch in a matter of hours if needed. But we need to train a lot more veterinarians and pathologists—25 are not many. And we need to do it right now.

And consider this: With foot-and-mouth disease within a day's drive of the Mexican border, we've fiddled around for 3 years about establishing a foot-and-mouth laboratory. We need such a place, under our control, where we can study foot-and-mouth and other virus diseases—a place where we can develop and produce vaccines if necessary.

(Contrary to public belief, we haven't even settled on a location for such a laboratory. The whole thing was snugly bottled up by the Appropriations Committee in the House—and has stopped there.—Editor.)

Meanwhile, the rinderpest vaccine that we and the Canadians developed during World War II probably has been lost. The BAI admits to that.

What else could we expect? We and the Canadians developed the vaccine on an island in the St. Lawrence River. Then we pulled out after the war. With no place close at hand to continue studying the disease, and with no control over the way the vaccine was made or protected in other parts of the world, this valuable vaccine strain—as far as anyone knows—was frittered away and eventually disappeared.

The SDA could do a more thorough job of inspecting materials coming in from foreign countries—if it had the money. But it hasn't. In the year ending this July, the Bureau of Animal Industry will have spent about $373,653 for inspection and quarantine of animals and animal products—less than half a million dollars to protect a $15,000,000,000 livestock industry. With this the BAI must watch all our ports and borders except the Mexican border. The regular budget for this same work for the next year, starting in July, is only $100 more than last year.

Wouldn't it be good insurance to use some of our huge defense sums for strengthening this work—and for building an animal disease laboratory?

Also, we need a disease and pest reporting system that can work quickly. We've needed it for a long time. Last summer when the hog-cholera variant broke out across the corn belt, Farm Journal tried to find out how many cases there were, and where they were. No one knew. Veterinarians and officials—including those in the Bureau of Animal Industry—could only guess.

In all probability we need more men looking for sabotage in centers where livestock, feeds, seeds, medicines, insecticides, fertilizers, and the like are either being manufactured or on their way to farms.

Those are some of the problems confronting the civil defense people and the United States Department of Agriculture as they plan for better defenses against bacterial war. They are planning to set up State organizations, which in turn will help to organize units in your local community. Their jobs will be to pin down raids and stamp them out.

You have a part to play, too. Local government defense agencies may call on you to (1) help spot and stamp out accidental outbreaks or possible bacterial war raids in your neighborhood; and (2) help prevent attacks or accidental epidemics by keeping raid-proof conditions on your farm. Here's what they may ask you to do:

If you notice anything of importance that's out-of-the-ordinary in your fields or garden, notify your county agent, or phone the local

civil defense office. If members of your family get sick from what you believe may have been polluted water, food, or milk, report it to your doctor. If any of your poultry or livestock get suspiciously or seriously sick with a strang disease, call in the veterinarian.

It will be up to you not to get excited over little things—too many calls would put too big a load on local defense officials. Ask your local defense people to find out, then tell you, the sort of thing they want you to look for—then if you have good reason to suspect a germ raid, act quickly.

Sometimes you may be called on to give an animal, or some of its blood, for laboratory examination. This might save you and your neighbors big losses by detecting a disease early before it has a chance to spread.

In case of an emergency, you might be called on to help out with inspection, quarantine, vaccination, and possibly with slaughtering infected animals. Also with cleaning and disinfecting contaminated areas.

The second big task the Government may ask of you is to keep your place "raidproof." This is nothing more than using good everyday farm practices that will make it hard for disease to take hold and spread. How? Well, local defense officials may suggest this:

Ask strangers to keep away from your flocks and buildings; select your part-time help carefully; keep handy the phone numbers of your veterinarian, county agent, local civil defense officials, and State police. Get all the "shots" suggested by your local health authorities; keep prepared feeds in ratfree, covered bins that can be locked at night; do as good a job as you can of killing off rats, mice, fleas, lice, stray pigeons, and flies. Don't let dead animals and poultry lie around; watch everything for first signs of illness; feed cattle away from public roads if possible; in emergencies, keep wells covered and the pump house locked.

They also might suggest that you buy poultry and livestock only from definitely reliable sources; buy animals that have been immunized against the more common diseases; keep new stock separated from old stock until diseases have had time to show up. Disinfect pieces of equipment that come with, or have been used by, new stock; disinfect shoes and boots when leaving quarantine pens; buy only recognized medicines and feed stuffs, and those from trusted places of business with a good name; and keep yourself in good health.

That is the story on biological warfare. It is entirely possible. It might start tonight, this year or next, or it might never start. The possibilities are frightening only if we get panicky; and only if we do not understand what might happen and what to do. If we do understand, and are well organized, we can meet any attacks successfully and bottle them up. Just putting the damper on accidental outbreaks will be worth every ounce of effort.

One thing is sure: we need far better protection than we have, and we need it now. See that your local, State, and national defense set-ups get moving.

Remembrance of Richard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, many of our young men are being killed in Korea in this terrible war. Every now and then, it strikes close to our home districts, emphasizing the awful tragedy of death.

Mr. William McManus, of Owego, N. Y., is the grandfather of the late Sgt. Richard McManus, son of Mr. and Mrs. Maurice McManus, of Vestal Center, in my district.

Sergeant McManus was killed in action in Korea on February 12 of this year.

I am including a poem written by Sergeant McManus' grandfather in memory of him:

REMEMBRANCE OF RICHARD

The sun was sinking in the west
Where fell its lingering ray
Upon a Korean battlefield
Where a dead soldier lay
Wrap the flag around him boys
And gently lay him down
Where the sun will shine next day
So coldly on that mound.
Gather all around him boys
And offer up a prayer
For his dear old Mother and Father far away over there.
We know he did his duty: and did his duty well,
Alas, in the saving of a comrade, poor Richard fell.
No more will he see his native land
He'll roam its hills no more
So gently wrap the flag around him boys
For our hearts are heavy and sore.
Now gather all around him boys
And offer up a prayer
For all of his beloved ones far away over there.

VA Letter Hits Bottom on Readability Meter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the May 5, 1951, issue of the Vet-Times, a national newspaper of veterans' affairs published in Washington, D. C.:

VA LETTER HITS BOTTOM ON READABILITY METER

WASHINGTON.—Gobbledygook?

The Veterans' Administration has it—and bad. Don't take our word for it. Ask Dr. Rudolph Flesch, readability expert, labeled "Mr. Fix-it of Writing" by Time magazine.

Dr. Flesch came to town last week with a VA letter in hand. After reading that horrible example of gobbledygook, he had a Department of Agriculture seminar audience rolling in the aisles.

Here's Dr. Flesch's story: Several months ago a GI in Korea wrote VA about possible GI bill training after discharge. He got a 2-page reply that was (1) completely unintelligible, and (2) did not answer the question.

The GI appealed to Dr. Flesch, believing the readability expert could surely decipher it. No soap. Dr. Flesch couldn't make head nor tail of the letter. He wrote VA seeking the answer to the GI's question. He got virtually the same answer. Neither he nor the GI to this day know what VA meant.

Dr. Flesch, Associated Press consultant for 3 years, devised a measurement yardstick to test readability. A newspaper story will generally test between 60-70. The VA letter—hold your breath—tested minus 13.

You can't go much lower, or at least Dr. Flesch hopes not. He declined to reveal the specific gobbledygook, feeling a confidence would be violated. He said, however, that it would have been much better had VA merely replied, "so sorry." The GI would then have a clearer idea than he now does, holding VA's gobbledygook letter.

Dr. Flesch, a New York University professor, believes the country is being drowned in gobbledygook. The cost to the taxpayers is staggering, he asserts.

He speaks with somewhat more authority than an observer. Dr. Flesch had the painful duty of translating OPA price directives into readable language 5 years ago. That service convinced him that the Government was a huge structure of paper.

His booklet, How Does Your Writing Read, published through the Civil Service Commission, has helped. But he believes the 53,000 copies distributed is just a drop in the bucket.

The real solution, he believes, can be achieved through establishment of basic writing standards. Such standards—properly tested and adhered to—could sizably dent United States gobbledygook, Dr. Flesch claims.

He pointed out that the Agriculture Department's extension service has made the most strides. A readability unit is helping the Department improve its letters and publications.

Dr. Flesch maintains not only written letters, but reports, bulletins, and memorandums need improvement. And he had a word to say about Government press agents. He said that while the press had made great strides in improving readability, Government PRO's hadn't kept up.

He is the author of The Art of Plain Talk, which has sold over 90,000 copies. A new book, How To Test Readability (Harper & Bros., $1) went on sale recently. He also wrote the Associated Press writing handbook.

While serving as consultant for AP he told writers not to use more than 19 words to the sentence. He told a Vet-Times reporter the same thing.

We don't know about AP, but this story meets his standards.

Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Admiral Ross T McIntire, Chairman of the President's Commission on National Employment of the Physically Handicapped, on behalf of this organization recently sponsored a Nation-wide essay contest open to all high school students in the States and Territories. Thirty-four States and Territories responded.

Miss Sylvia Doyle, a senior in the Colorado Springs High School, was the Colorodo winner, and went on to win fourth

place in the nationwide contest, the subject of the contest being "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped."

Because of the excellence of the essay written by Miss Doyle, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where Members of Congress may have opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(Essay by Miss Sylvia Doyle, of Colorado Springs, Colo.)

Fifty years ago the handicapped individual had little opportunity to lead a normal, self-supporting life. He knew he would always be a burden either to his family or to society. In more recent times, possibly as a result of two wars which left many veterans disabled, we are becoming increasingly aware of the problems confronting the physically handicapped, and are making attempts to help them find a useful, productive place in the business world. Now that society realizes there should be equal opportunity in employment for the physically handicapped, it is necessary to establish the meaning of the word "equal" in this connection. One who has lost an arm cannot plan to become a musician or a surgeon, nor can a blind man expect to succeed as an accountant. Obviously there cannot be equal opportunities in all types of employment, but in this case is meant equal opportunities for positions where the physical defect can be ignored or overlooked in consideration of other more important qualities. Naturally the field of employment is limited for the handicapped, depending on the nature of the disability, but no one can be qualified to fit every job, and some compatible position can now be found for almost every disabled worker.

Today there are many veterans' agencies, trade and State schools that can teach the physically handicapped to succeed in the jobs for which they apply. A person will compensate for a physical defect by developing himself in other ways. For instance, most blind people have their senses of hearing and feeling sharpened to an unusual degree; a person paralyzed below the waist or without lower limbs will develop powerfully strong arm and shoulder muscles, while one without arms or hands often becomes adept at using his feet for writing, painting, or various kinds of manipulation. Therefore in the field requiring specialized skills for which he has been trained, the handicapped are sometimes physically better qualified to handle the job than most people would be. In order to compete with the normally fit they may have to do more intensive practice and persevere harder to achieve their goals, but as a result they are usually better workers; their records in ability and efficiency are high. A firm employing handicapped workers is not necessarily being philanthropic. The slogan "Hire the Handicapped—It's Good Business," makes sense.

In order to help the physically handicapped and to make employers realize they are good business prospects, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week has been established. Its aim is to advance the cause of these disabled people, who don't want charity or pity, who don't want to be coddled, but simply desire an equal chance to work on a competitive basis in the industrial world.

These physically handicapped people are equipped with courage, stamina, and alertness. They often develop talents that would have lain dormant if they had not been disabled. Recently in a veterans' rehabilitation hospital a group of partially paralyzed boys staged a combination circus and vaudeville for their fellow patients. Because they had such a wonderful time practicing and presenting it, and because the show was such a grand success, the boys put it on for other hospitals. Although they had no previous experience in entertaining, they have now made it a career. It is fascinating to watch the way they maneuver their wheel chairs through formations similar to the complicated dance routines of a musical comedy as they sing appropriate songs. There is a separate act in which a man rides his wheel chair over a high wire. With wit, courage, and hard work these boys have made a worth-while place for themselves despite their handicaps.

Of course few can belong to such a troop, but for those handicapped people who simply want to enter the business world, many more fields are open than is commonly supposed, as additional firms are learning that these people make dependable employees. Various departments of our Government also take on qualified handicapped persons when possible. The deaf may be used in shoe shops, restaurants, dry cleaning establishments, and printing offices. When jobs for the blind are mentioned, most people think of broom making or of conducting concessions in post offices, but there are numerous other opportunities open for the sightless. Those with musical ability may become piano tuners or play in bands and orchestras. Like the deaf, the blind can work successfully at printing and run certain types of machines in manufacturing plants. For a time two different blind couples ran grocery stores in a Colorado town which also boasts a successful blind lawyer. Handicapped people with artistic ability can compete easily with others in most fields of art, either free lancing or in connection with industry. Lame and crippled workers can take many kinds of jobs not requiring much moving about. These few positions mentioned are picked at random from the many to show the broad scope of opportunity for these people.

Finding good employment prospects is naturally a harder task for the handicapped than for the able bodied, but it is by no means too great an obstacle. Prejudices against hiring them are being overcome as business takes on more and more such employees.

The physically handicapped labor under many problems that the great majority of people do not. They are often sensitive and bitter about their condition. We owe it to them not to give them too much sympahy, not to give them work simply because they are unfortunate. They deserve the American right to get ahead on their own initiative; they should accept the competition of the rest of the world just as others do. Only in this way will they have a chance to lead normal, happy lives, as they surely have an equal right to do. It is to the advantage of all to keep these people self supporting in jobs won on a competitive basis. Business should take an interest in them because of their ability, not because of compassion. Handidcapped people who are self supporting are, for all practical purposes, no longer handicapped.

These people don't want pity—they want only the same chance others have to make something of themselves. They aren't asking for a handout—they're asking for a chance to handle a job for which they are qualified. They would like to be tested as others are; it is their privilege by right of birth as human beings. Surely we owe this much to the physically handicapped as well as to all mankind.

Proposed Shipment of Wheat to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives have both taken affirmative action on a proposal to provide 2,000,000 tons of wheat for the people and the Government of the Republic of India. These measures await favorable action on the part of both the House and the Senate. The hour is late. The specter of mass starvation hangs like a cloud over the land of India. The Government of India has appealed to our Nation for assistance. It is fitting and appropriate that we should quickly respond in a spirit of American generosity, Christian compassion, and fraternity.

When the wheat-for-India bills are debated in the respective Houses of the Congress the arguments in favor of the proposed legislation will be documented and clearly outlined. During the past weeks throughout all areas of America voices have been raised in support of wheat for India. Religious leaders of all denominations have challenged Protestant, Catholic, and Jew to join in this crusade against hunger.

The Reverend Leland Stark, rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, April 29, 1951, delivered a sermon entitled "Lazarus at America's Gate." Within the confines of this splendid sermon are to be found the summation of all arguments in support of this proposal. We are deeply indebted to the Reverend Stark for his understanding, his brilliant presentation, and his challenge to Christian action. I ask unanimous consent that his sermon of April 29, 1951, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAZARUS AT AMERICA'S GATE

"There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus, full of sores, who desired to be fed with what fell from the rich man's table; moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. The poor man died."

So says Jesus in His telling of the story of Lazarus, the poor man, and Dives, the rich man, and everything indicates that Lazarus died of starvation within sight of the sumptuous tables of Dives, the rich man. The sores on the body of Lazarus, of which Jesus speaks, were probably those ulcers which frequently spread over a starving body, and Our Lord's reference to the dogs who came and licked the sores on Lazarus' body suggests that he was too weak to beat off the unclean beasts of the street, who, far from being like our dogs, were ferocious, unclean mongrels who may well have been waiting for Lazarus to die so that they could attack his body. That sort of thing frequently happens in famine-ridden areas of the world.

It wasn't that Lazarus was asking Dives, the rich man, to go hungry on his account; all that Lazarus wanted were those bits of bread on which well-fed orientals, in lieu of using napkins, wiped their fingers. But this rather meager and uncertain diet evidently did not contain enough calories, and Lazarus died.

Before I come to the application of this scripture to a contemporary situation, I feel constrained to intrude a personal observation. Those of you who have known me these nearly 3 years I have been your rector know that not once before in that period have I used the privilege of the pulpit to speak directly on impending congressional legislature. Normally it is out of place in the pulpit. But occasionally there comes before America an issue to which the Christian gospel has so direct and obvious an application that the pulpit remains silent only if it is cowardly evasive. So I speak to you now as a Christian minister to Christian people on a matter to which the Christian gospel directly applies.

Come back now to the words of Jesus. "There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus, full of sores, who desired to be fed with what fell from the rich man's table."

My friends, I say to you that Lazarus lies today at America's gate—a Lazarus in the person of millions of people of India who are threatened with starvation, and this very week there come before Congress bills providing for a loan, or half-grant and half-loan, of 2,000,000 tons of wheat for India in order to stave off that famine which otherwise may take the lives of millions of people.

The general facts of the matter are so well known I shall mention them but briefly. India has high hopes of becoming self-sufficient in its food supply by next year, but last fall a series of natural calamities—drought in this area, torrential rains in another, locuts, and crop disease, and even earthquake—resulted in such a decimation of India's food supply that millions of people are now threatened with famine. The Government of India has already imported as much gain and rice as it can from elsewhere, but life or death for millions is now directly dependent upon the 2,000,000 tons of wheat provided for in the wheat-for-India bills that are scheduled to come before both Houses of Congress this very week.

As everyone knows, America can lay hands on that much wheat and can spare it without any American going hungry. We always raise more than we can eat in this country. Out in the breadbasket of the Middle West, I myself have seen grain and corn actually heaped on the ground and exposed to all weather simply because the granaries and elevators were already choked to capacity.

Why don't we see to it that India gets the grain, then? Well, in a less complex period of history we probably would, purely on the basis of Christian humanitarianism, but today every move on the international scale carries political connotations and must be made with reference to the global struggle between communism and the free world so that if India is going to get these 2,000,000 tons of wheat from us—either by grant or by loan or by half-grant and half-loan—we must satisfy ourselves that this move meets our humanitarian and political conditions.

And that is a valid consideration. If, for instance, it were the people of China whose Government was applying for 2,000,000 tons of wheat, we would have to let political considerations override humanitarian ones because China unhappily is now our enemy.

And here we come to the nub of the matter. From our point of view, India's political position is suspect. In the struggle between communism and the free world, India is politically on the fence, in some cases for us and in other cases against us. Many Americans therefore, not a few of them in the Halls of Congress, feel that unless India comes into this struggle wholeheartedly on our side, we ought not to help them with the food they need. Other objections are also raised along that line, and the upshot of it is that there is likely to be a real battle in Congress over whether India gets the needed wheat for her people, and the opposition to India is so sizable and so strong that America, through its Congress, may actually say no to India's starving millions.

Let us for the moment put aside any considerations of Christian compassionateness and look at this problem purely on the basis of American self-interest. Admittedly, India is trying to straddle the international political fence, but that being the case, ought not we to do everything we can to get India to come down on our side of the fence rather than to push India over into the Communist side? China with its 450,000,000 people is already on the Communist side—are we not interested in keeping the next largest Asiatic power—India with its 280,000,000—from going Communist too? Isn't that just elementary common sense?

If you thought for months of some way by which India's friendship could be won, could you think of a better way than to save millions of her people from starvation? And if you thought for months of some way by which India could best be alienated from us, could you think of a better way of alienating that nation from us than to say in effect, "Let them starve to death for all we care." Suppose Congress by saying "No" to this bill were to say that very thing in effect—what would the result be?

Well, suppose all of us lived in the south of India, and we were caught in the famine. Day by day we would be growing weaker, gradually passing that invisible line between malnutrition into actual slow starvation. As average, simple, poorly educated Indian people, we would not know much about political issues between communism and the free world. By this time we wouldn't know much more than that we were hungry—desperately, gnawingly hungry—and even worse would be to watch our children with their bloated, empty bellies. We have been told America has more food than it needs and that the American Congress is considering sending some to us. But then week after week after week drags past without the matter even coming up to the American Congress. Then when it finally does, week after week passes of seemingly endless debate, and those among us who can read the newspapers tell that those debates are seldom relieved by any note of compassion. We find this hard to understand from a country that has prided itself on being a follower of the One who taught His followers to feed the hungry. Then the blow falls—America through its chosen representatives says "No" to us.

Somehow—let us say—some of us survive. All of us have seen loved ones die terrible deaths, and we could do nothing for them. What is now our feeling toward America? Is it now one of affection? Do we now feel attracted to its ideals? Do we look upon America now as the champion of the right, as the proponent of the doctrine of the brotherhood of man? The moment you and I put ourselves in the place of the Indian people, we know what their reaction will be if America, with the power of death or life for millions in its tongue, says "No" to the starving.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that the Communists are already shrewdly exploiting the advantages we have yielded to them by our unconscionable delays. Right now—so an official of the Indian Embassy admitted to me last Friday—representatives of India, probably frantic by now (as well they may be) that we may turn down their pleas for wheat, are in Moscow and Peiping. Already Red China has sent them some rice in exchange for India jute, and they are negotiating now for a million tons of grain from Red China. As yet no decision has been made in Moscow. Believe me, it will be one of the turning points of history if Red China and Soviet Russia were to come forward with offers of the needed grain so that India, rightfully anxious that we may say "no" to her, could then withdraw her request for our wheat—then there won't be much question as to which side of the fence India would come down on, is there?

Some folks say that there is no danger of Red China and Soviet Russia giving India the needed grain because neither country has any surplus. That is very true. But don't we know enough about the wily ways of totalitarianism to know that they would not hesitate to take it from their own people if they felt that India could then be captured for communism? Furthermore, they would capitalize on it. I can almost hear what they would say: "America," (they would say to India) "that home of bloated capitalists, with such surpluses of grain they don't even know what to do with it all, wouldn't even loan you food—much less give it to you—out of their surplus. They were going to let you starve until we Communists came along" (they would say). "But Communists really practice the brotherhood of man, and poor as we are, with no surplus of food in our lands, we sacrificed in order to share with you what little we had because we could not stand by callous and indifferent and watch you starve. America has proved by its heartlessness that they care nothing for you; we have proved our friendship for you by our self-sacrifice." So the Communists would say of us.

And what could we say? How could we answer that? If we say "no" to India now and if someday the 280,000,000 Indian people fall like China into the Communist net, then we know that we can write all of Asia off as lost. And if that happens, the awful truth will be that in large measure we shall have carved the calamity out for ourselves by our own heartlessness and by our incredible short-sightedness in the face of the most elemental demand of the Christian gospel, to feed the hunrgy.

Don't anyone think but that America is this moment under the judgment of God. They are looking at us—now look into their faces if you can. Men who once stood straight with self-respect now looking at you out of eyes that burn with the haunted look of cornered beasts; women stretching out bony claws that once were smooth and soft like the hands of your women; children with fearfully distended stomachs gazing uncomprehendingly out of pinched and tiny faces.

"I was hungry and ye gave no food," said the Lord Jesus Christ in His account of the great judgment. And those to whom He said it, looked at Him in amazement: "When saw we thee an hungered * * * and did not minister unto Thee?" they protested. "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." And then Jesus Christ uttered the most awful words that can ever be uttered, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment."

I can claim no special knowledge of history, but I can think of no other time in history when our national self-interest and the call of Christian compassion have so closely coincided as in this matter. To be sure, in the complex of global problems, this particular one is a relatively small one. But a small key can unlock a huge door, and sometimes the solution of a small problem is the key that unlocks the door to the solution of a great problem, and it could even be that providence is proffering us the key to the very heart of Asia. Certainly, at the very least,

seldom if ever have our own national self-interest and Christian compassion so cordially walked hand in hand.

There may be those in this congregation who, believing that what has been outlined does represent the Christian position, are now asking the question, "What can I personally do about it?" Let me give two quick answers to that question.

First, as indeed some of you have already expressed yourselves to me, if you feel that you wish to do something over and above what—pray God—our Government may ultimately be doing, you may then welcome the knowledge that you can send monetary gifts to the Indian Ambassador for the purchase of wheat. Or, of course, the clergy of this church, as we often do in one cause or another, will be glad to see that anything handed or sent to us will reach the right place.

Second, while most of us in Washington are disenfranchised citizens, most of us personally know Congressmen, and it will be worth any amount of trouble to talk to them or write to them or telegraph to them to bring the knowledge of our deep concern. That knowledge may help them reach a Christian decision.

"There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and who feasted sumptuously every day. And at his gate lay a poor man named Lazarus."

America, in the name of Jesus Christ, don't let him die.

H. R. 88, a Bill To Prescribe Safety Requirements for Natural-Gas Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with consideration of H. R. 88, I am glad to make available to the membership the following reports of the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Commerce:

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION ON H. R. 88, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, A BILL TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO PRESCRIBE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURAL-GAS COMPANIES

The Federal Power Commission is of the opinion that enactment of H. R. 88 would be in the public interest. This bill would authorize the Commission to prescribe such requirements, restrictions, and conditions with respect to the construction, extension, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the interstate transmission of natural gas as in its opinion are necessary to the promotion of safety.

Natural gas is a highly inflammable and fugacious commodity. Unless the gas is closely contained and properly handled in transmission, it becomes an agent which may endanger both life and property. This fact has been illustrated by the damaging explosions which have occurred on interstate natural-gas transmission lines in recent years.

At the present time there are no Federal or general regulations governing the construction or operation of interstate natural-gas transmission facilities. Some States have enacted rules and regulations, in the nature of police regulations applicable to interstate pipelines. But scattered and nonuniform regulation of segments of large-scale interstate operations cannot be effectual or satisfactory. Comprehensive and uniform regulations are required.

The only standard guide now generally available for construction and operation of natural-gas transmission facilities is the Code of Pressure Piping which was published in 1942 under the sponsorship of American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and approved by the American Standards Association. Although there have been several minor revisions of that code since 1942, it does not provide adequate standards for modern high-pressure transmission pipelines. Nor is its observance compulsory.

The natural-gas industry in the last few years has been engaged in a tremendous expansion program. Most of the pipelines constructed during this period—as well as those now proposed—are designed to operate at high pressures ranging up to 970 pounds per square inch, and more. And some of such pipeline mileage has been, or will be, constructed through densely populated areas in close proximity to homes and other buildings. This construction is being performed without adequate safety standards, including rules such as those which would prescribe the depth of the pipeline in inhabited areas, its proximity to homes or other buildings, and the media to be used in testing pipelines. There are no provisions of this nature in the above-mentioned ASME Code of Pressure Piping. There should be such regulations to provide the maximum of protection to the public.

Regulations governing the operation of pipeline facilities also are needed to provide minimum safety standards which would serve as a guide to operating companies.

The Commission believes that substantial benefit will result if it is delegated specific authority to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies, as provided by H. R. 88.

The Commission does think, however, that it should not also be made responsible for the enforcement of safety regulations. The inspection of the thousands of miles of natural-gas pipelines which are constructed yearly would present a project of such magnitude as to require manpower wholly disproportionate to the benefits which probably would result and the continued policing of the operations of all natural-gas companies would be an insuperable task. Furthermore, if reasonable regulations are promulgated, there is every reason to believe that companies would adhere to them in their own interests.

The Commission recommends that H. R. 88 be enacted.

Respectfully submitted.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
MON C. WALLGREN, *Chairman.*

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 2, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in further reply to your request of January 5, 1951, for our comments concerning H. R. 88, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies.

H. R. 88 would amend section 7 of the Natural Gas Act by adding thereto a new subsection which would authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements with respects to the transportation facilities of natural-gas companies.

In view of the rapid increase in mileage of interstate natural-gas pipelines, and in view of the public-utility nature of natural-gas transportation facilities we would have no objection to the enactment of this bill. This new authority would appear to be consistent with the regulatory powers exercised by the Federal Power Commission in the natural-gas field, and would appear to be desirable from the standpoint of protecting the public.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report. If we can be of further assistance, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. S. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

General MacArthur Opposes a Decision Now on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, our greatest general, Douglas MacArthur, made it plain last week before the Senate committee that he believes it unwise to pass a universal military training bill at this time.

General MacArthur declares this scheme needs more study. He also urges that a decision be delayed until the present emergency is over.

Americans everywhere are hoping that Congress will heed his message on this vital matter.

The following excerpt from the Senate hearings carries most of his testimony on UMT:

Question. Since we are living now, and will continue to live for years to come, in a world of uncertainties, I wonder if you do not think that some system of universal military training which would guarantee that all of our young men would be made available for service, and they would be trained young men, should be invoked so that when the Nation was threatened we would be prepared?

MACARTHUR. As I said, Senator, I am for preparedness, and the maximum preparedness, and the maximum utilization of all our resource.

Now, whether universal military training accomplishes that fact would have to be pretty carefully considered by me.

There are other demands upon our manpower. Whether the total effort to train these great masses of millions of men, whether in actual combat those men would go into the niches for which they have been trained, I don't know. I have not studied the bill. I have not studied the potentialities of it.

WAR BASED ON INDUSTRY

It is not a question, I think, that can be settled by merely whether you are for or whether your are not for it. I am for the utilization of the total manpower that we have.

But whether the program of universal military training all youths along practically the same line, which I understand is the point considered, whether that will reduce and produce (sic) the greatest military effectiveness, I would not attempt to say until I had studied the problem very, very thoroughly.

I believe the greatest possible consideration has got to be given to the demands of industry. I believe that if you are going to prepare the youth, that you have got to understand that modern warfare has as its basis industry.

I believe that you have got to understand that the money that is involved is not limit-

less; that you have got to get the maximum efficiency for every penny you spend.

WOULD DEFER DECISION

Now, I would not have the slightest hesitation in completely approving that, if I thought that was the best way to get the effectiveness.

Now, at the present moment, of course, this is a future plan you are working on; at the present moment, as I understand it, it is not applicable. There are other and more acute demands.

I should advise most seriously, if I were considering the problem, that I would wait and get through with the emergency that faces us now, and then on what has resulted and what exists then, I would sum up the facts, and make my decision.

If universal military training is the best way to do it, I would unhesitatingly advocate it. The question is the survival of the Nation, and I believe it is every citizen's duty to give that need in time of necessity that is required by the Nation.

JOHNSON. General, do you have any recollection of ever having recommended or advocated universal training of our young men?

MACARTHUR. Oh, yes. I not only many years ago when I went to the Philippines requested the Philippine Government to try to organize it for the blow that was manifestly certain to come, but the first thing I did was to introduce universal military service as far as I was able to accomplish it.

JOHNSON. I mean, as it applied to this Nation.

MACARTHUR. I am quite sure that 25 years ago had we had universal military service, the whole situation would have been different.

It is my belief that had we been prepared before either of these World Wars, there was a very excellent chance that they would not have taken place.

The only thing I address myself to, any doubts that I would have, is as to the efficacy on the military potential that the country could produce.

PHILIPPINE SITUATION DIFFERENT

Now, over in the Philippines, the situation was entirely different. They didn't produce anything; everything was supplied to them.

What was necessary there was to get the manpower to use what was supplied to them; so, there was no question there that universal military service was the proper thing.

Before the First World War, and the Second World War for that matter, industry hadn't assumed such an important part as it has now.

I believe that thing should be carefully studied, Senator, after we get over this present crisis that exists; and, if the best method at that time is for universal military service, as producing the maximum efficiency—like Abou Ben Adhem, my name would lead all the rest.

Endorsement of H. R. 88

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H. R. 88, on which I have requested an early hearing by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have received the following letter. It is most encouraging to receive the support of Transcontinental, which has the biggest single natural-gas pipeline installation in the country.

TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE CORP.,
Houston, Tex., May 3, 1951.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Thank you for your letter of April 30, together with the Federal Power Commission report on your H. R. 88.

Transcontinental favors this legislation. While I do not want to be specific about other companies, I know that there are other natural-gas transmission systems that likewise favor what you are attempting to do.

We would like to have your committee set hearings on this bill as early as possible and get the ball rolling.

With all good wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CURTIS MORRIS,
Vice President.

Let's Do Our Own Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include, and commend to the attention of the membership of this august body, an editorial by J. J. Jachowicz which appeared in Local 1344 News, published by and for members of local 1344, USA–CIO.

This editorial is entitled "Let's Do Our Own Thinking," and the recommendations which it contains are very appropriate at this time when so many persons throughout the land have been neglecting to use their reasoning faculties. If our Nation is to remain strong, and cope with the challenge which history has thrust at us, we cannot allow emotionalism to rule our actions. The times are perilous, and require steady nerves and calm thinking. The enemy who faces us has given much time to planning the course which he is pursuing. We cannot hope to thwart his plans through actions motivated by emotions alone—our course must be based on reason and experience.

A nation is only as strong as its people. If the people become irrational in their actions, the nation is doomed. Let us think before we speak, and think before we act—let us do our own thinking.

The editorial follows:

LET'S DO OUR OWN THINKING

(By J. J. Jachowicz)

The importance of individual thinking to the preservation of our democracy and our freedom cannot be over emphasized. Too often we let the others do our thinking. Just what do we mean by thinking? To think is to exercise the facilities of good judgment, conception, or inference—to put our good common sense into action.

Any one person who first acts or speaks before he thinks is this country's worst enemy—he is as bad as the person that has other people do his thinking. * * * When the German people defaulted their thinking to Hitler, they surrendered their freedom. When the Russian people defaulted their thinking to Lenin and Stalin, they surrendered their freedom. We must learn to control emotions instead of being controlled by emotions. We must stay away from emotional idolatry of personalities that so beclouds our national thinking today. We must keep far away from bitter cynicism and hatred of those with whom we differ in opinion, we must disagree agreeably and with constructive respect.

We must realize that this wonderful country of ours is greater than any individual woman or man—that its fate and security should not be made a political football to be kicked around by clashing personalities greedy and envious of political power. Too few people in this country realize that too many people in this country are defaulting their thinking to demagogs and that we today are closer to surrendering our freedom than most of us are willing to recognize and admit. When we accept the statements and proposals of demagogs because we are too lazy to think and test their statements and proposals, we can blame no one but ourselves for subsequent events.

The articulate action of a citizen must be constructive, must seek to improve, to build instead of tear down and destroy—must be preceded by serious and responsible thinking. We must do our utmost to preserve our democracy and peace by: (1) Independent thinking; (2) making that thinking articulate by translating it into action at the ballot boxes and in everyday life; and (3) being constructive and positive in that thinking.

Is It Un-American To Be Fair?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a little article from Newsweek magazine of May 7, 1951. While I hold no special brief for the British, I do believe in being fair, and I do not think the families of the 900 dead and missing men from the Gloucestershire Regiment could be much comforted by some of the unfair criticism that has been thrown at the British. This criticism is largely by American politicians who care not what happens to their country or its friends so long as they can gain political advantage. I, too, have criticized British politicians in the past and may do so if I think it warranted in the future, but I have never deliberately distorted the truth and said the British will not fight. I think the following article will show that they will:

ONLY THE GLOUCESTERS

The Chinese "threw everything at us except dragons," one Briton of the Twenty-ninth Brigade gibed last week, when the Reds waded the waist-deep Imjin River on the moonlit night of April 22. By dawn the Gloucestershire Regiment's 257-year-old First Battalion, nicknamed The Slashers, which stormed Quebec for General Wolfe and wears the Sphinx for battling Napoleon at the Nile, was trapped atop Hill 235.

For 80 harrowing hours the Gloucesters battled against 16-to-1 odds, against gnawing hunger, against burning thirst, against

sleeplessness, killing a dozen Chinese for every Briton. They ran out of ammunition, but they waved away Flying Boxcars lest any airdrop by mistake fall to the Chinese only 35 yards away. Their radio remained reassuring up to the last message. "Batteries running down. Still holding out." Only after the United Nations withdrawal from the Imjin had been made good did their commander, Lt. Col. J. P. Carne, order his companies to break out to safety, while he, a chaplain, and a doctor, stayed with the wounded.

As the 100-odd survivors of the 1,000-man battalion trickled back to the U. N. lines, Brig. Tom Brodie, commanding the Twenty-ninth Brigade, wrote in the records of the Gloucesters: "Only the Gloucesters could have done it.".

Great Debate Is Marked by Many Paradoxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following article by Mr. James Reston, special correspondent of the New York Times:

GREAT DEBATE IS MARKED BY MANY PARADOXES—MACARTHUR IMPRESSES MANY OF HIS FOES AND RAISES QUESTIONS FOR FRIENDS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur succeeded in doing one thing this week that nobody thought was possible—he managed to shake some of the prejudices of both his supporters and his detractors in the Senate, and he left most of the Senators both a little more impressed and a little more perplexed than they were when he arrived.

He disappointed and yet impressed his detractors because he proved to be a skillful witness—quick, clear, eloquent, and independent in his judgments, sometimes bitterly opposing the administration's views and then again supporting the administration.

At the same time, he both wowed and depressed his most rabid supporters because, while he hit the administration hard, he often used arguments which contradicted the pet themes of Senators TAFT and WHERRY, and once even refused to confess dark suspicions about Secretary of State Acheson.

AGAINST THE RULES

This, of course, is against the union rules in Washington. If a man is against the administration he is expected to be against everything it supports, except the Constitution. Also, he is expected to be loyal to, or at least considerate of not only his own prejudices, but the prejudices of his supporters.

The general, however, probably because he has been away so long, did not always comply, and in the process he illustrated both the emotional appeal of his arguments and the element of paradox in the whole controversy.

Two arguments ran through his voluminous testimony, both expressed with great passion, both having great emotional and political appeal for Senators: First, that nobody had any right to buy time in Korea with the blood of his young fellow-countrymen, and, second, that if it was victory the Senators wanted, he could get it for them wholesale.

Since the devil you know is always worse than the devil you don't know, this argument won powerful support, particularly since the general testified to the weakness of the Soviet transportation system and the vulnerability of Red China to economic, naval, and air blockade. But the element of paradox kept coming into his argument as the hours went along, and this element disturbed many of his most faithful supporters. For example:

(1) The general said it was the responsibility of the administration to decide last year on whether Communist China was going to intervene in the Korean war. A theater commander, such as himself, had only limited opportunities to make an estimate of any such decision, he testified. Yet he did not hesitate to base his proposal for the bombardment of Manchuria on his own estimate that the Russians would not intervene—an estimate not shared by the administration.

(2) The general proposed a strategy in the Far East which he conceded might bring about a major war, though he guessed that it would not, but at the same time he conceded that global strategy was not his responsibility, that he did not know the details of United States or allied preparedness, of Soviet strength in Europe, of the Soviet atomic bomb stockpile, or even of our own atomic development.

NO ATTACK ON RUSSIA

(3) It was imperative, the general said, that once you get into a war, you destroy the enemy's capacity to make war upon you, but he shied away on various occasions from any suggestions that we should attack the Soviet Union, which is the source of the enemy's effective war-making capacity.

(4) He bitterly criticized the administration's limited war policy in Korea, yet he proposed a limited war of his own: No United States land battles in Asia, no attacks on the Soviet supply routes, etc. Nor did he explain what he would do if by attacking Manchuria the war were merely pushed deeper into Asia, with Soviet territory instead of Chinese territory being used as the Communists' privileged sanctuary.

(5) Communism, he said, was the enemy, but he refused yesterday to identify the Soviet Union as the center of that world conspiracy. Indeed, he based a great part of his argument on the thesis that, while the Soviet Union and Red China were in a limited partnership for the present, the center and decisive enemy in Korea was the Peiping regime.

(6) The center of Soviet industrial strength, he testified, was in European Russia, and it was important to have bases from which that strength could, if necessary, be attacked. Indeed, allies, he agreed, were useful, but he outlined a policy for the Far East which he agreed was opposed by all our principal allies.

(7) Moreover, one of his main complaints, shared by the whole committee, was that the allies were not doing enough to help us in Korea. Yet he insisted that if we expanded the war in the Far East, our allies would go along just as they did when the Korean war broke out. Leadership was what they needed, he observed.

(8) Finally, though he has repeatedly testified in the past that the President and only the President could make great decisions of policy involving the military, he rested his argument on the thesis that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were in "substantial" agreement with him (though they disagreed on bombing Manchuria and did not pass judgment on the political questions involved in the President's decision to oppose the MacArthur strategy).

This element of paradox runs through many other aspects of the debate as well. The general was dismissed, not because he differed with the administration's strategy, but because he carried his differences over the head of his Commander in Chief to the people. Yet this aspect of the matter was minimized in the Senate hearings.

The general has been noted in the past for the discipline of his command, though he insisted this week that all officers should have the right, if they disagreed with their commanding officers, to carry their disagreements to the public.

STRIKING PARADOX

As a matter of fact, the most striking paradox of all is that the general comes out of this week's testimony as the most enthusiastic supporter of the most ambitious interpretation of the Truman doctrine and is being opposed by President Truman for doing so.

Communism is the enemy and wherever it shows its face we should attempt to meet it, he testified. Moreover, he insisted (while still protesting that he did not know the details of our preparedness or our allies' or the Soviet Union's) that we should meet it in Korea in accordance with his strategy, without the Western Allies, if necessary.

One ally we would have in that event, he felt sure, was Chiang Kai-shek and his Chinese Nationalists, and between us, he concluded, "victory" in the Far East could be won.

The general would not be drawn into discussion of the cost in manpower and dollars of opposing Communist aggression everywhere in the world. All he would say was that he was for adequate preparedness.

Thus, the general left many of his supporters with the unhappy feeling that he was more internationalist than the Truman administration, more willing to take risks, more ready to place the country on a war footing than many of his backers are.

At the same time, the administration was equally disturbed by the end of the week because of the personal impression the general had made and the emotional appeal of his proposals to end the slaughter.

Early this week there was a tendency among administration supporters here to dismiss the general's great popular successes in New York and Chicago. Wait, they said, until he has to submit to the hard give-and-take of questions and answers on the Hill. Now that the questions and answers have taken place, however, the administration is not so sure.

PERSONALITY VERSUS LOGIC

In any conflict between a great personality and a logical argument the outcome here is never very sure. General MacArthur was an impressive witness. The members of the Foreign Relations and the Military Affairs Committees, with the outstanding exception of Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, hesitated to go much beyond the $32 questions. They found many vague areas in the general's thinking and developed various inconsistencies in his testimony, but they had no answer to his persistent references to the casualty lists in Korea.

Moreover, the contacts between the State Department and Capitol Hill have been so poor now for so long that the administration's case for the limited war is not even understood by most of its own supporters in the Senate.

General MacArthur thus moved into something of a vacuum himself. He is benefiting not only from his own illustrious record as a soldier and proconsul in Japan but from the decline in the prestige of the civilian branch of the Government, and particularly of the Department of State.

Thus, the final paradox of the situation is that, while this started out as a debate on the civilian control of the military, the administration will now depend, in its rebuttal, not on the first civilian Cabinet officer, Secretary of State Acheson, but on the mili-

tary: General Marshall, Gen. Omar Bradley, and, if the going gets too tough, on General MacArthur's former aide, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Address of Hon. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have from time to time been troubled by the distinctions, if any, between treaties and executive agreements. Many of us have also been concerned by the implications of article 9 of the North Atlantic Pact. Indeed, there has been in another body a great debate about constitutional rights and duties under this treaty. In a fairly wide reading on this subject, I have seen nothing so informative as the address delivered on April 26, 1951, by my friend and colleague, the Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, before the American Society of International Law. The text follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER TO THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, APRIL 26, 1951

Three years ago you did me the honor of inviting me to appear before you to discuss the relationship of the House of Representatives to some of the more pressing international problems then pending before Congress. At that time I pointed out the increasing importance of the role which the House was inevitably called upon to play in the international scene chiefly because of the many economic or fiscal matters being dealt with by international agreement which could only be implemented under our Constitution through legislation initiated in the House. At that time I was concerned by the problem of educating the House to deal appropriately with such matters when at best only 6 percent of the Members, namely, those serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, could be expected to sit through the long, intricate hearings upon which final decisions had to be made. That problem is no less acute today than it was 3 years ago. If anything, it is more acute. Prior to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, fiscal and military matters in the international field were assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee and the Military Affairs Committee, respectively. These are now referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

All of you are of course conscious of the fact that our economic and our military participation in international affairs is becoming increasingly important. This means that the House of Representatives must more and more be consulted and counted upon for informed action to implement and make effective the international agreements which may be entered into by the Executive. What then should be the role of the House with respect to responsibility for approving of those agreements in the first instance?

It is my contention that any international agreement entered into by the Executive which requires ultimate implementation by the Congress as a whole should, in the first instance, be approved by the Congress as a whole. To call such an agreement a treaty and submit it to the Senate alone as a treaty gives effect to the constitutional safeguard of requiring a two-thirds affirmative vote by the Senate, but completely overlooks the fact that the House of Representatives has withheld from it the educational process which must inevitably accompany any form of approval of that treaty, and likewise places upon the House of Representatives the burden of responsibility of initiating necessary legislation for implementation, with no initial voice in its approval.

The question as to whether or not an agreement should be submitted to the Congress in the form of a treaty or of an Executive agreement requiring congressional action by joint resolution or as an Executive agreement entered into without approval of the Congress is a matter of Executive judgment. In my opinion, however, that Executive action, in the absence of any constitutional change with respect to the approval of international agreements, should follow very simple lines. First, any international agreement which does not require any implementation but which provides for a departure from the existing status quo as between our country and any other country or countries should be submitted to the Senate alone as a treaty. Second, any international agreement which merely clarifies existing agreements without altering their substance should properly be considered Executive agreements requiring no approval by the Congress. Third, all international agreements which require implementation on the part of the Congress to become effective should be submitted to the Congress as Executive agreements requiring formal approval of both branches by joint resolution. I specifically suggest a joint resolution rather than a concurrent resolution because a joint resolution has the force of law, having been signed by the President after the action of the Congress, whereas a concurrent resolution is an act of the Congress alone.

The executive branch of the Government has, to a certain extent, followed the course which I have suggested in a number of international agreements which required implementation. As I recall it, the original UNRRA legislation (Public Law 267, 78th Cong.) is an excellent case in point. Before submission, administration leaders discussed with legislative leaders in the Congress the question of submitting our ratification of United States participation in UNRRA in the form of a treaty or a joint resolution to be approved by both Houses of Congress. The latter method was decided upon, in view of the fact that ratification by the United States in the form of a treaty would have still required implementation by both Houses of the Congress. The matter of financial contribution to UNRRA could, of course, not be made effective by treaty, but had to be dealt with by both houses of Congress. During the Eightieth Congress, the United States became a member of, and assumed international responsibility in, the International Refugee Organization (Public Law 146, 80th Cong.), the World Health Organization (Public Law 643, 80th Cong.), the revised International Labor Organization, the ILO instrument of amendment (Public Law 843, 80th Cong.), the Caribbean Commission (Public Law 431, 80th Cong.), the South Pacific Commission (Public Law 403, 80th Cong.). In addition, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Congress, through both Houses, exercised its power to bring about United States membership in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank (Public Law 171, 79th Cong.) and in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Public Law 174, 79th Cong.)

However, there has been a notable exception to the practice followed by the executive with respect to agreements which require implementation. I refer to the North Atlantic Treaty. That treaty was never given consideration by the House until the question of its implementation arose, and in that implementation there are still certain gaps to be filled on which I personally believe that the House should take action. I refer specifically to the very controversial one with respect to the sending of troops to Europe to be placed under the command of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The North Atlantic Treaty in its major provisions is clearly not a self-executing treaty. Whereas certain general pledges are made in articles 3 and 5, article 9 is the article which makes provision for the manner in which the implementation of those pledges shall be furthered. In order to refresh your recollection, the text of article 9 is as follows:

"The parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented to consider matters concerning the implementation of this treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5."

You will note that the council set up in the article merely has the power to consult, and that the defense committee provided for can only make recommendations. Thereafter, each contracting nation must take action under its constitutional system upon the specific recommendations.

There is only one specific recommendation which has been made public and then been acted upon by the United States. That is the recommendation with respect to the appointment of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. Although the same recommendation provided in some detail for the organization, command structure, and general operational procedure for an integrated NATO force, for security reasons, this document is secret. But the President's letter to General Eisenhower designating him as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, as well as operational commander of all of the United States forces in Europe, the Eastern Atlantic, and the Mediterranean was made public on December 19, 1950. That letter made it clear that General Eisenhower would serve in two capacities. It likewise provided in the third paragraph, and I quote:

"Subject to overriding requirements of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, the mission's routine employment, training, and administration of these forces will continue to be handled through command channels heretofore existing."

That paragraph makes it clear that General Eisenhower, as the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, can in his own discretion override General Eisenhower as commander of the American forces in Europe and hence, in his capacity as a commander on behalf of the 12 participating nations under the North Atlantic Treaty operate under certain circumstances free from the chain of command which leads to our own Commander in Chief, namely, the President of the United States.

I do not want to stress this point unduly, but I think that an objective consideration of it will indicate that a serious constitutional question may be posed as to the right of the President to alienate American troops from his own command without congressional approval. In view of this doubt, it would appear to me to be important that both branches of the Congress should specifically give their approval to whatever assignment of troops may be made to this command.

I am reinforced in this belief by the steps which have already been taken by the Congress in implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty. In October of 1949, the Congress passed Public Law 329 of the Eighty-first Congress, known as the Mutual Defense

Assistance Act of 1949. Let me read you the first section of that act:

"SEC. 101. In view of the coming into force of the North Atlantic Treaty and the establishment thereunder of the Council and the Defense Committee which will recommend measures for the common defense of the North Atlantic area, and in view of the fact that the task of the Council and the Defense Committee can be facilitated by immediate steps to increase the integrated defensive armed strength of the parties to the treaty, the President is hereby authorized to furnish military assistance in the form of equipment, materials, and services to such nations as are parties to the treaty and have heretofore requested such assistance. Any such assistance furnished under this title shall be subject to agreements, further referred to in section 402, designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area and to facilitate the development of defense plans by the Council and the Defense Committee under article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty and to realize unified direction and effort; and after the agreement by the Government of the United States with defense plans as recommended by the Council and the Defense Committee, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance therewith."

This section anticipated the development of defense plans by the Council and the Defense Committee under article 9 by making certain goods and services available to the nations party to the North Atlantic Treaty even before specific recommendations had been made by the Defense Committee. The act then went on to detail the amount of money that was authorized, the purposes for which that money should be spent, the areas in which it was to be spent, and the types of equipment and services which could be furnished. Under section 406, it specifically gave authority to the President to assign civilian personnel of the Armed Forces to any agency or nation for the purpose of enabling the President to furnish assistance under the act, and authorized the employment of technical experts and engineering consultants not to exceed 15 persons at any one time, also to implement the act. Furthermore, section 405 went so far as to permit the Congress by concurrent resolution of the two Houses to terminate assistance to any nation under the act. Public Law 621 of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, which was passed in July of 1950, reiterated the principal provisions of the 1949 act, but made provisions for further detailed implementation.

My point in referring specifically to these two acts is that both of them were initiated in the House of Representatives and that both of them went into meticulous detail with respect to the method by which, under article 9, matériel of war of all kinds including civilian personnel and technical experts could be furnished by the President in implementation of article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty. However, no reference whatever was made in these acts with respect to the assignment of troops by the President, and it certainly appears to me to be an absurdity that the Congress should be called upon for detailed authorization with respect to inanimate objects and specialized personnel, but should not be called upon to take action with respect to combat manpower.

It is true that the Senate has passed both a Senate resolution and a concurrent resolution approving of the sending of four divisions to Europe to be placed under General Eisenhower's command, but from present indications, it would appear as if the executive does not feel it necessary to get House approval to such a resolution. The concurrent resolution was passed by the Senate on April 6, sent to the House, and referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. No hearings have yet been held on it, nor is there any indication that any such hearings will be held. In my opinion, this is a serious mistake. A mistake which may lead to serious difficulties.

No one can deny that the House of Representatives has a constitutional duty to initiate appropriation bills and must participate with the Senate in passing legislation to raise troops. Ten days ago, when the bill for the raising of additional troops through selective service and universal military training was before the House, an amendment to prevent the use of the troops raised under that bill from serving in the European theater was defeated by the small margin of five votes. It was an amendment which could, of course, only apply to men hereafter raised under the terms of that particular bill. However, an appropriation bill making an appropriation for the Armed Forces for the coming year will soon be before us. Without any question an amendment will be offered to that appropriation bill which would limit the use of the men provided for therein to the military service in such a way as to prevent the sending of troops to Europe without the specific consent of the Congress. There is, in my opinion, a very real possibility that such an amendment will be adopted. And if it should be adopted and concurred in by the Senate, the whole question as to the sending of troops to Europe would remain unresolved and would have to be considered de novo by the Congress. For this reason, it would seem to me to be a much wiser procedure for the House to be called upon to act on the Senate concurrent resolution at the soonest possible moment in order that this issue may be resolved.

While I have spent considerable time in examining the relationship of the House to the North Atlantic Treaty, I have done so only for the purpose of reemphasizing my original contention that the North Atlantic Treaty, as well as any other treaty which requires implementation, should be submitted to the Congress as an agreement requiring joint action by the two branches. Too many uncertainties with respect to the action which the House might take arise if the latter is not called upon to act when policy is first made. If I am correct in this conclusion, then I believe that unless executive procedures consistently follow the course outlined, it would be wise to consider seriously a constitutional amendment making such procedure mandatory.

The Marvel House Mother's Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent statement by Mrs. C. E. B. (Blanche) Ward, organizer of the League for the American Home and Marvel House, Inc., whose address is 1214 Carnegie Hall, New York City:

MOTHER'S DAY MESSAGE

The French skeptic, Voltaire, emphasized the mother's dominant place as the source of spiritual life when he said, "My mother made it impossible for me to be a Christian but Wesley's mother made it impossible for him to be anything else."

Dr. Henry C. Link, of the New York Psychological Center, similarly stresses the mother's conspicuous function as guide in the child's development of faith. He declares, "The strategic time is when the child is too young to understand but not too young to accept." That malleable period when he unconsciously absorbs everything around him, and subconsciously tucks it away for conscious adult use.

If modern psychology can be trusted in its assertion that the permanent bent of a child's life is determined before it is 2 years of age, then the early home atmosphere and training provided by the mother with her sympathetic insight, is a nation's most priceless possession.

Mrs. Compton, having received the degree of doctor of laws for her successful motherhood in the rearing of her four famous children, when besieged by reporters for her formula, laughed, "Formula? Just the Bible and common sense."

The American heritage of freedom and Christian civilization hang upon the acceptance and practice of this fundamental conviction. Napoleon when asked by his advisers, "What can we do to make a stronger, more invincible France," replied, "Train French women to be good mothers."

We should pray that our legislators may consider these ponderous facts when determining their most pregnant, far-reaching policies, and make their appropriations accordingly. All any nation needs is men and women with good hearts and minds. For nothing can ever go so ill with a nation that character cannot cure it.

Universal Military Training Fails in England—Generals Are Cursing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, before this Congress goes further toward the goal of the militarists, UMT, it should study the record of conscription in England.

In England now, as in France, Germany, Italy, and Japan in past decades, UMT is a one-way street to disaster and national decline.

Military conscription was initiated in England in 1947.

Already it has become a millstone around her neck, threatening to sink her both militarily and economically.

This judgment, Mr. Speaker, is not mine. It is the expert appraisal of B. H. Liddell Hart, famous British military analyst.

Captain Hart is described by General Guderian, chief of German armored forces as "the best analytical brain in the world."

Gen. George Patton declared, "I have been nourished on his books for 20 years."

I urge Members who want America to be effectively defended to read Hart's latest book, Defense of the West.

In the following passage from that work, Hart sums up the colossal failure in England of universal military training:

When the National Service bill was introduced in 1947, almost all the generals welcomed it and gave it their blessing. Now

they are cursing it. The way that expert opinion has swung around is most remarkable.

It was natural that they should favor it in principle, since it promised a larger army than could possibly be raised by the voluntary system, and seemed likely to remove many of the problems of recruiting and organization that had been a worry in the past.

But the experience of peacetime conscription has changed their views, and led them to see that it produces more problems than it solves—and worse ones. The now common note of condemnation is testimony to the common sense of present-day generals.

Whatever the theoretical advantages of conscription, in practice it is ruining the efficiency of the army, and proving fatal to its readiness to meet an emergency.

The attempt to work a mixed system, combining short-term conscripts with long-term regulars, is failing in both ways.

Conscripts cannot be trained in 18 months, or 2 years, to the high grade of skill required for modern warfare. By the time they are trained even to an employable level, so little of their period of service remains that their employment is bad economy.

It swells the bill for transportation out of all proportion to the service they render—the estimated cost of movements is $31,600,000 for 1950–51 compared with $5,600,000 before the war.

At the same time the mixture heavily handicaps the training of the regulars and their effective utilization. A very large proportion of them are absorbed directly or indirectly in the training machine for the conscripts and in caretaker jobs at home and overseas.

The enlarged size of the army has much increased the scale of administrative duties, and regulars are naturally called on to undertake these. In sum, far fewer than before the war are available for incorporation in fighting formations.

That means Britain has, in effect, a much smaller force available to meet an emergency than she had in 1939. With so few formations, commanders and staffs cannot get adequate practice in exercises with troops—so that even the force Britain has cannot be properly trained. Worse still, it cannot be adequately equipped—because the money that is needed for new weapons is swallowed up in paying for useless mouths.

Pay alone absorbs $238,000,000 of the money that is being spent on the army. In 1939 it absorbed only $33,600,000, yet pay rates were proving more attractive to recruits than they are now.

As the value of money has depreciated, however, it is fairer to put the contrast in terms of percentages of the total cost of the army. Pay now absorbs nearly 30 percent of the army's budget, compared with 8 percent in 1939. But pay is only part of the ordinary cost of maintaining a soldier, irrespective of the army's operative equipment and more permanent requirements.

This mere man-maintenace cost (pay, food, clothing, carriage, and other supplies) absorbs nearly 60 percent of the army's budget, compared with 30 percent before the war. On the other hand, scarcely more than 10 percent is now given to the provision of warlike equipment, whereas in 1939 nearly 40 percent was devoted to it.

These figures show how little security value Britain is getting for the present immense outlay. They make it clear that Britain is maintaining the most uneconomic kind of army.

If the number of men were cut down, a much larger percentage of the money could be devoted to military equipment without any increase in the budget. That would also release more manpower for industry, and thus help Britain's industrial effort. With a smaller number of men, if they were all regulars, a large number of fighting formations could be produced, ready for action.

Conscription is a millstone round Britain's neck—threatening to sink her both militarily and economically.

Mr. Speaker, will America learn the lesson before it is too late?

France, Germany, Italy, Japan—and now England—have become victims of universal military training.

Again I challenge the proponents of UMT to present some credible evidence that its evil consequences elsewhere will not follow in America.

The Truth Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a timely editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, May 6, 1951:

THE AWFUL MYSTERY THAT EXPLAINS ITSELF

Piece by piece, clue by clue, the most terrible and suspenseful detective story of all time continues to unravel before our eyes.

The latest chapter in this blood-spattered tale is, of course, the case of MacArthur now coming to the light in spite of all frauds and maneuvers.

THE RAW DEAL HAS CRASHED

When the President fired the general in the dead of night those short few weeks ago, the whole world was shocked to an alert. A President does not suddenly, at 1 a. m., send for the newspapers and announce that he has cut himself off from the ablest man he has ever met.

That is, no President in a sound condition does such a thing.

The firing of MacArthur, taken with the manner of his firing, made a basic fact plain to everybody from the Politburo in the Kremlin, to the boys in the back room of the late Charley Binaggio's Democratic vote-stealing emporium in Kansas City.

Vast and profoundly important internal explosions are shaking the Truman gang loose from its grip on the governmental power.

The Raw Deal's pitch for the moment after Mr. Truman's midnight brainstorm was the smear that MacArthur had been relieved of duty because he was not only insubordinate, but incompetent.

That foul effort was hardly begun before the Congress, in response to national demand, invited the supposedly disgraced and broken insubordinate to come before it and say something.

THE POWER OF HONESTY

And so he came and spoke and told his story in words that brought tears. Why? Because dignity and candor and honesty of spirit are so rare in this city at this time that men cannot bear their presence without emotional anguish.

We are so long, now, poisoned by the press agent's flash and the phrase maker's twisted version, that for a citizen of powerful character and powerful mind merely to rise and speak the truth as he sees it, is to dislocate everybody's system of behavior.

When MacArthur had finished his address to Congress, that would have seemed enough in itself to jar the last sleeper awake.

But now following has come his smashing point-by-point in the Senate testimony that has been forced out into the light—once more against all the artistry of men long skilled at smothering the truth that hurts.

Thus, we have the running record of the general's testimony and with it, too, the cheap and narrow, penny ante attempts of such cross-examiners as Senators MCMAHON, FULBRIGHT, and KEFAUVER, the Chattanooga goo goo.

It is a devastating exposure. For it does happen, now and then, in spite of all the snide denials of shallow minds, that a human being turns up who fits the title, "hero."

MacArthur's calm, unhurried, unshaken fidelity to the truth in the record tells all who read it why he is one who fits the title. Heroism is not mere insensibility to whipping bullets.

Heroism is also the power of the soul to stand calm against every dog in the pack snapping at your heels, for that which you can show to be the right.

Thus, the MacArthur text is worth the reading, to help you understand a hero.

But even more than that, it helps you understand the burden of death, desolation, and ruin the United States of America, of 1951, is brought to carry because three Presidents of the United States have been failures.

THREE PRESIDENTS WHO HAVE FAILED

The historic fact is that Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, each in his hour of decision, did not understand his job or would not live up to it.

Karl Marx was an insane political adventurer of the nineteenth century Europe who preached that all the world must be destroyed so it could be rebuilt in the image of nothing human. The short title for this was called communism.

Marx was a triviality in the politics of the world until Woodrow Wilson, with the help of like-minded men in Britain and France, failed the moment of power after the war of 1914–18. That let communism come to world significance in Russia.

In 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt saved world communism from collapse first by recognizing the Soviet Government of Russia and then by allowing Communists to penetrate the Government of the United States so far that even yet we do not know all. Alger Hiss is but a surface symbol of the hidden total.

Again, in the war of 1939–45, Roosevelt let communism harvest victory at Tehran and Yalta.

Truman, as soon as he took office, began at Potsdam the unrelieved succession of blunders that now has Americans dying in Korea and the best American soldier of our time, with relentless courage, dynamiting the truth out into the light at last, here in Washington.

The truth is coming out. And it is awful to behold.

Penalty for Hiring Wetbacks Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD two articles from the New York Times, on Sunday, May 6, 1951, the first by Mr. Gladwin Hill, who is doing much to arouse the Nation to the need for a

better farm-labor policy, and the second by the North American Newspaper Alliance:

PENALTY FOR HIRING WETBACKS HAILED—EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES GIVE QUALIFIED BACKING—POLICY WOULD REVOKE CONTRACTS

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, May 5.—The inauguration this week by Federal officials of a get-tough policy in regard to the employment of illegal Mexican aliens on western farms received hopefully favorable, although qualified, responses from both employer and labor quarters.

The employment of the Mexican wetbacks who cross the border illegally in numbers responsibly estimated at upward of 1,000,000 a year, although generally tantamount, to harboring a fugitive from justice, has been held to be not a prosecutable offense under present law. But such employment by farmers who also use legally contracted labor from Mexico is a violation of the United States-Mexico agreement covering the temporary importation of Mexican nationals.

However, the practice of employing low-paid wetbacks (so called because they wade across the Rio Grande), often alongside of legally contracted Mexican labor, is widespread in the Southwest. Up to now it has been ignored officially as far as the international agreement was concerned.

CAMPAIGN OF ENFORCEMENT

This week the United States Employment Service announced its intention of starting, in collaboration with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, a vigorous campaign to enforce the agreement and penalize farmers employing wetbacks by revoking their contracting privileges. Mexican labor is hired under contract to make up for purported shortages of domestic citizen farm labor.

B. A. Harrigan, secretary of the Imperial Valley Farmers Association at El Centro, 15 miles north of the border, said, "We'll have to watch and see how effective the new program is."

Although the association has a nominal policy against wetbacks employment, it has been one of the principal targets of recent complaints on this score.

"If they can get this program on a workable basis, we'd prefer legal labor any time." Mr. Harrigan said. "We've always been for a legal labor program, but the processing has been too slow to fill our requirements."

PROCESSING OF APPLICATION

He said it had taken from early January to mid-April to process a recent application of the association for legal contract labor, by the end of which time the need for it had passed.

"We've made up our minds," he said, "to sacrifice crops rather than go out and scream about this."

Dr. Ernesto Galarza, vice president of the National Farm Labor Union, AFL, which has been campaigning against wetback employment as discriminatory against citizen labor, said:

"The union expects that the new policy of law enforcement on violations of the Mexico-United States farm labor agreement will begin here and now in the Imperial Valley.

"The record shows that the Federal agencies responsible for these obligations have exercised very loose discretion as to how much they would let the corporation farmers get away with."

Glenn Brockway, United States Employment Service regional director in San Francisco, said the rigorous inspection of farms to be launched immediately would constitute a formal investigation of complaints made last February against the concern of O'Dwyer & Mets, a leading vegetable company. Keith Mets is president of the Imperial Valley Farmers Association, and Frank O'Dwyer, his partner, is a brother of William O'Dwyer, United States Ambassador to Mexico. About 300 wetbacks were apprehended on their ranch, and the Farm Labor Union demanded that, under the international agreement, their contracting privilege be revoked immediately.

This was not done, the ensuing interval having been taken up with a preliminary investigation by the Employment Service. Details of the investigation have not been made public.

Dr. Galarza indicated this week end that the Employment Service's apparent intention of dealing with the O'Dwyer & Mets concern only on the basis of current employment conditions would not be considered satisfactory by his union.

DEPORTATIONS RISE TO 580,000 A YEAR—RATE IS 50 TIMES THAT OF 10 YEARS AGO—DRIVE ON ILLEGAL ENTRIES ALSO STEPPED UP

WASHINGTON, May 5.—The United States is yearly deporting 50 times as many aliens as was the case 10 years ago. In the drive to bolster internal security it is also stopping a record number seeking to enter the country illegally, the ratio being six times that of 5 years ago.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, according to A. R. Mackey, Acting Immigration Commissioner, deported in the past year nearly 580,000 aliens, roughly double the total of the previous year. He stated that arrests of those seeking entry totaled another 470,000, which also was almost double the total of the preceding year.

In addition, he said, 154 aliens were free under bond pending court determination of their deportability on subversive charges. About 200 others were under arrest on similar charges, he added.

Smuggling of aliens went on along the seacoasts and along the Mexican and Canadian borders, he declared. The Mexican border, he added, was the avenue for thousands of European aliens being smuggled in as Mexicans seeking migratory farm work.

European aliens inevitably succeeded when they sought to cross the Mexican border, he asserted, factors being a thin border patrol and illegal entry of Mexicans that had reached such proportions that it is now comparable to an invasion.

The Commissioner said that the crush of those seeking entry, legally or illegally, had been terrific since the end of the war and that the trend was still upward.

He stated that, in the past year, immigration officers had boarded 60,000 arriving ships and 87,000 airplanes in the drive to cull out the undesirables and the ineligible.

"All indications point to an anticipated increase in the number of attempted smuggling operations," he warned.

Korean Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. Mr. Baldwin is known throughout the world as one of our best-informed writers on military affairs. The article appeared in the New York Times yesterday. It is an excellent analysis of the Korean campaign. Many persons have alleged that we were guilty of faulty troop dispositions last fall when the enemy forced us into a rapid retreat. I note that Mr. Baldwin is of the opinion that the enemy's success at that time was due in part to our mistakes, including our faulty troop dispositions.

The article follows:

CHINESE ARE REPULSED BUT BATTLE ISN'T OVER—ENEMY IN KOREA SHOWN TO BE UNABLE TO CARRY ON A SUSTAINED OFFENSIVE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Communist spring offensive in Korea took a breather last week as the enemy regrouped his forces, possibly for a resumption of the defensive, or a second blow.

The balance sheet of battle after the first round in the long-anticipated drive was, so far, in our favor, but there was unending fighting ahead, and the enemy had scored some gains. The enemy accomplishments in the first 2 weeks of attack were:

1. Maximum advances at points of deepest penetration of 30 to 35 miles. In part our retreat was clearly attributable to enemy breakthrough, or enemy pressure, but in part it represented a planned rolling with the punch.

2. Clearance of all UN forces, except in a small sector near the east coast, from North Korea. This retreat south of the thirty-eighth parallel—though unimportant militarily—is of potential significance psychologically and politically if the enemy should soon prove willing to negotiate an end to the war on the basis of the status quo in Korea prior to last June—something that seems unlikely.

3. Severance by the enemy of the Seoul-Chunchon lateral road—not by any means vital to our defense but useful for supply purposes—and capture of Chunchon, important road junction and pivot in central Korea, for possible further offensive operations.

PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

4. Emphatic reassertion of the Chinese Communist combat and psychological superiority over the South Koreans. The breakthrough of the enemy on the central front was against a South Korean division. As an officer puts it: "A very unusual thing is happening in Korea. The South Koreans now fight very well, indeed, when they are opposing North Koreans. But just let one lone Chinese come at them, with possibly the intention of surrendering, and the South Koreans break and run like hell. I suppose this is a throwback to the centuries of oppression which the Koreans suffered under the Chinese. Also they know that the Chinese have no mercy on anyone, themselves included."

5. The imposition of fairly heavy casualties—killed, wounded, prisoners, and missing—on two South Korean divisions, the Fifth and Sixth, and on one British battalion and a few American smaller units.

UNITED STATES-UN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

These enemy gains to date were, however, in no sense decisive and they were more than balanced by United States and UN accomplishments:

1. Seoul, unimportant militarily, but of some significance logistically and of considerable importance politically and psychologically if the enemy should contemplate cease-fire negotiations, was still in our hands at the end of the first phase of the enemy's offensive.

2. More important, our Army was still intact, it had fought a canny retirement; the enemy had failed to trap or destroy any portions of it.

3. The enemy offensive was still far short of what might have been its ultimate goal—the ejection of UN forces from Korea; in

fact, this goal at the week end was not even in sight.

4. For limited and indecisive territorial gains, the enemy's losses had been very large—possibly between 40,000 and 70,000 total casualties since the attack began 2 weeks ago. Although casualties in some South Korean and a few small UN units were high, the over-all casualties of United States and UN forces were small; the ratio was probably at least 10 to 1 in our favor.

From this balance sheet to date of the results of the enemy's spring offensive certain conclusions can be drawn.

A NEW UNITED STATES ARMY

Perhaps the first and most important one, which has been increasingly obvious ever since Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway assumed command in Korea in January, but which deserves restatement, is that the United States troops now fighting in Korea are a far call, indeed, from the inexperienced, undisciplined units that were first committed to Korea last summer. We now have an army in Korea of which Americans can be proud. It has two great factors of superiority to the enemy—superior firepower and superior mobility—and, of course, an element inherent to both these factors—a far more ample supply system. This has enabled us to meet and, so far, defeat, the enemy's numerical superiority of about 2½ to 1.

Our superior firepower is primarily attributable to our artillery and airpower; our superior mobility is due to our far more complete motorization, and to the fact that we are no longer road-bound as we once were, but have now developed the "goat-legs" necessary for the cross-country mobility essential to Korea. We still, of course, have weaknesses and some units are superior to others. One of the weaknesses is our failure to exploit or utilize adequately all intelligence sources; our combat intelligence still leaves much to be desired.

The greatest weakness is still the South Korean army, an army now 10 divisions strong (about six of them at or near the front), which must be used, despite its weaknesses, if a line across the Korean peninsula is to be held.

IMPORTANCE OF MORALE

Another potential weakness, which may be magnified by time, is United States troop morale. Excellent now, after a low point in December and January, it cannot be expected to remain at the same high level if the war drags on indefinitely, if the front—as it eventually will be—is affected by the dissensions at home, and if the rotation system, which has been started, does not progress rapidly. The difficulty will be, as far as the latter point is concerned, that Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, new commander of the Eighth Army, is in a damned-if-he-does-and-damned-if-he-doesn't position. To keep morale up, rotation is important, but if rotation is practiced on the scale projected—the replacement of some 500 veterans a day by men from the United States—the combat efficiency of the Eighth Army is likely to decline, at least temporarily.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from the spring offensive to date is that the enemy is unable, even after a long period of preparations, to mount and maintain a sustained major offensive in the face of our superior firepower and mobility. The attack at the end of April was the heaviest yet delivered against the UN forces in Korea and the first major all-out offensive since the Communists struck us in late November and early December.

The enemy successes last fall, it is now apparent, were due not only to their superiority in numbers, but also to our faulty troop dispositions and to our own mistakes; and our retreat on the west coast was more precipitate and extensive than it need have been. It may well be that the enemy will commence a second phase of his spring offensive at any time, but on the other hand his defensive and cautious attitude last week indicated the possibility that he has temporarily shot his bolt.

AIR FORCE HELD BACK

As a possible corrolary to this conclusion, one may also reason that the enemy today is no more anxious to extend the war in Korea than our administration is. His failure, so far, to commit the 800-odd planes of the Chinese Communist Air Force to unlimited support of his attack indicates (a) awareness that this air force is still weak and not prepared to support adequately (without direct Soviet help) Communist ground troops; (b) understanding that an all-out air attack upon our ground troops or bases would eliminate the "privileged sanctuaries," which both sides—due to mutual air restraint—have enjoyed; (c) comprehension that such air attacks would provoke a less limited war and might lead to unpredictable consequences; and (d) a possible decision to keep us fighting indefinitely in Korea but not to try to expel us.

STRATEGY OF ATTRITION

These last conclusions, however, are purely tentative and, of course, subject to future change. There long has been general agreement that about the most damaging strategy the Communists could undertake would be a strategy of attrition, rather than an attempt, at unlimited cost, to push us out of Korea altogether. However, the enemy probably realizes that if his spring offensive fails to accomplish more decisive results than it has yet done, and if the fighting settles down to unending attrition, a reconsideration of our entire strategy in Korea and of the means we might take to bring the war to an end, is inevitable, particularly in view of the MacArthur attacks upon the administration's policy.

General Viewed as the Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD this article by Dorothy Thompson, which is very cryptic but right to the point. I even suggest you read the current issue of the American Mercury:

GENERAL VIEWED AS THE FATHER—PEOPLE DESPERATELY FEEL THE NEED FOR PROTECTION—LEADERSHIP LACKING IN WORST CRISIS OF HISTORY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The current American Mercury has an article on the business career of President Truman, which if it is not true is sizzlingly libelous, and which, if it is true, is a further terrifying revelation of the state of the Union and its leadership during the worst crisis in the history of this Nation, and of western civilization.

Like others, we have speculated on the reasons for the extraordinary, even hysterical, popular demonstration accompanying the return of General MacArthur.

We do not know, but we doubt that this demonstration has much to do with the obvious controversy. Every poll has shown that the Korean war is profoundly unpopular. On the direct issue—that of extending the war or restricting it—we would guess that the people want less, rather than more war, and anyhow, on the ostensible issue the quarrel between the President and the general is, in our opinion, more apparent than real. But the ostensible issue does not account for the emotional upsurge greeting the general. It is a more complicated mass phenomenon.

The American people feel that there is "something rotten in the State of Denmark." They have had unrolled before their eyes and ears revelations of errors and misdemeanors unique in American history: Of secret international agreements whose deadly seeds now bear their poison fruits; of spies, native and alien, who have penetrated into state secrets with the utmost ease and sometimes with the collusion of high officials of Government; of brazen collusions between gangsters and police officers; of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds to reward political henchmen—scandals reaching right into the White House.

There is an immeasurable crisis of confidence. The people are outraged in every moral instinct, and wounded in their pride, at a moment of great reverses in a war they never sought.

Into this crisis comes a man about whom there has never been a hint of corruption. While all this has been going on, he has been serving his country, with bravery and honor. He had no part in any of the conferences that have produced the poisoned fruits. Among all the victors he was the most magnanimous; of all the postwar administrators the most admirable. For 14 years he has not set foot in America, but wherever he stood has been America—and many cannot find America at home. He exudes independence—the most traditional American characteristic. He looks the way Americans picture the ideal American man. He bears himself with ease and dignity. He is aloof among backslappers, but without superciliousness. In his speech there is an echo of the old schoolbook texts that have formed part of the American subconscious. As he rides through the streets, with his young son at his side, shy but poised, he is the picture of a father who neither unfairly punishes nor spoils.

I submit that in terms of public response, the matter of whether his opinions are right or wrong is negligible. The throngs cheering themselves hoarse are not responding to an opinion but to a personality. They hold him responsible for no ills; his life has not been devoted to money; they are confident that he would never betray, nor cheat, nor lie, nor behave dishonorably. They cannot imagine him surrounded by crooks and 5 percenters. In the Augean Stables he appears godly and clean. They feel him to be morally admirable, at a time when they feel morally debased, in a collective sense of shame.

He is, to use a psychological term, the perfect father image to a people who have begun to feel that they are not the legitimate sons of their present political fathers—and who desperately feel the need for protection.

New York Times Disagrees With General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, let me call attention of the Members to a very interesting editorial which appeared in the

great New York Times on Monday, May 7, 1951:

DEBATE IN WASHINGTON

Quite apart from any personal or partisan issues, the opening sessions of the Senate hearings and General MacArthur's testimony have paved the way for a searching debate on our policies in the Far East. The atmosphere in the Senate committee room has been grave, as it should be. Momentous questions are being posed. General MacArthur has made a substantial contribution to the tone of the hearings by his sense of decorum and his forthrightness. Similarly, his questioners thus far have kept the hearings on a high plane and have reflected the temper of the thoughtful public in an earnest search for truth and judgment.

The general has repeatedly made plain his preoccupation with the events of the Korean battlefield. Those events themselves give additional significance to the testimony that is presented. During the past week the first phase of the present Chinese Communist offensive has spent itself. The character of the attritional defensive war that is our official policy has been admirably illustrated. In a limited sense, as General Van Fleet has pointed out, this phase of the operations has been victorious. That does not mean, unfortunately, that there is in sight any early end to the hostilities.

The debate, whose groundwork has been laid by General MacArthur, must necessarily resolve about the ways and means by which such an end can be achieved. General MacArthur makes it quite clear that he believes that a limited extension of operations will bring that early end. This belief is based on the willingness to accept the risk of formal Soviet intervention and the conviction that such intervention is less likely than many persons fear.

We are unable to concur in these basic beliefs and assumptions. It has not been made convincingly clear, as far as we are concerned, that extended air operations and a naval blockade of Communist China would materially shorten the war or reduce to any appreciable extent our grievous casualties. Likewise, the possibility of formal Soviet intervention is, in our judgment, a graver risk than it appears to be in General MacArthur's calculation.

Similarly, we cannot accept a course of action that would almost certainly estrange us from our major allies. To accept the Korean struggle as a United States operation rather than as an operation of the United Nations would be to destroy all the advance that has been made toward the concept of real collective security. It is quite true that we bear the brunt of the collective action but we dare not, unilaterally, deny its collective character.

With General MacArthur's appeal for tightening the economic ring on Communist China through the imposition of embargoes we are in entire sympathy. There is no excuse for strengthening an enemy that is making war on us, even if our military action in return is limited in scope. So long as we are being shot at it is common prudence to provide no bullets to the enemy.

The Senate hearings are clarifying the question of the equipment, training, and use of the Chinese Nationalist force on Formosa. This force has been organized thus far for essentially defensive purposes, and it is our present policy, wisely, to aid in this effort. It is not seriously argued that the Chinese Nationalists are now in a position to undertake an invasion of the Chinese mainland. The issue in the present debate is whether this force could and should be used for diversionary purposes.

The very sharpness with which the testimony has pointed up real differences in opinion and judgment has also made it possible to see clearly that what is really being debated is tactics rather than grand strategy. There has been no suggestion in these hearings of a retreat to any insular American "fortress." There is no hint of abandonment of our vital obligations in Europe and elsewhere in the world. There is agreement that we must resist Communist aggression. There is, on the other hand, sharp disagreement as to the best means to employ in that resistance in one specific theater of operations. That disagreement can be the means of bringing about the broad exploration of our policy, the correction of some mistakes and the building up of closer integration and greater strength.

What's Ahead: Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very enlightening debate on the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, April 6, 1951, between the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The subject was What's Ahead: Peace or War?

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD: PEACE OR WAR?

ANNOUNCER. Good afternoon, it's time again to join the American Forum of the Air. Today the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion on the vital topic What's Ahead: Peace or War? Here with us today to discuss this problem is Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who says: "Peace can only be achieved through bipartisan unity at home and cooperation with other free nations." And Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington State, who says: "The indecisive and futile course of action in Korea could lead to a global war."

And now, here is your moderator, who 23 years ago, founded the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. General MacArthur's dramatic and exciting testimony before the United States Senate has focused the spotlight of world attention on American foreign and military policy.

The great debate is on again—in the Congress, in the homes, in the schools, and on every street corner. Everyone asks, "What's ahead: Peace or war?" We pose this vital question to our two distinguished guests, Senator KERR, who has been one of the administration's leading spokesmen on the MacArthur issue, and Senator CAIN, who is the author of two opposing Senate resolutions—one calling for a declaration of war against Communist China, and the other calling for withdrawal of all American troops in Korea.

Now, gentlemen, I would like to open today's discussion with a quote from an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Point of No Return," appearing in the May issue of Reader's Digest, America's leading magazine. He says, "World war III can be fought. There is no prospect whatsoever that it could be finished. Nothing is so certain, no prophecy is so sure, as that once world war III started it would spread like a prairie fire and would become an uncontrollable, inconclusive, interminable complex of civil and international wars."

Senator CAIN, would you care to comment on Mr. Lippmann's views?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, the first public statement I ever made when I left the Army at the end of World War II was that if civilization was to live, war must be abolished. I could not agree with Mr. Lippmann's contention more, but I am completely convinced our present national policy and international policy in Korea can but lead to more war, to more blood, to more death, to more futility and frustration, to more tragedy, and, finally, to complete appeasement.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR.

Senator KERR. Mr. Lippmann has said that world war III can be fought. There is no doubt about that, but I think world war III can be avoided and I think that we are following the policy which has the best chance, first, to avoid world war III; second, to win it, if it is forced upon us. I do not agree with Mr. Lippmann that if world war III is forced upon us, it will mean the end of our country, or of our civilization. Nor can I agree with my distinguished friend here that the present policies of our Government, which in the main have been worked out on a bipartisan basis, lead to confusion and appeasement. On the contrary, they lead to the suppression and prevention of aggression, and that alone—that alone—is what will prevent world war III.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, there are a number of things that I want to say in my own right with reference to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma. I want to ask him, What is the administration's policy in Korea?

Senator KERR. I will be glad to give that to the Senator.

Senator CAIN. Please do.

Senator KERR. The administration policy in Korea: First, to punish the aggressor, to limit the conflict, to prevent its spread, to bring an honorable settlement as soon as possible, to remember that Russia is our No. 1 enemy, that the prevention of world war III is our No. 1 objective, and that the passage of each 24 hours is another victory, first, in the avoidance of world war III; second, in the building of greater strength.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, I think it was on the 27th day of June 1950, more than 10 months ago, that the United States of America and 52 other free nations of this world, members all of the United Nations, signed a solemn resolution that their mission in Korea was to be that of expelling the enemy, whoever that enemy might be, from Korea, and making of Korea a free, a united, and a self-controlled nation. That mission to which the United States lent its name, its power, its prestige, and its courage, has never to this minute been changed, but I will tell you what has been changed: Our administration in the middle of a war has changed its policy. No longer are we Americans together with our Allied friends determined to repel and expel an enemy from Korea, as was our initial determination; but now we have decided to resist aggression. Aggression is bent and determined to destroy freedom in its entirety from the face of the earth, and now we free people, according to what Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, has just said, are content and satisfied to resist an aggressor who is determined to overrun us;

and I say, from my point of view, I think it is an impossible attainment to undertake.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR.

Senator KERR. In resisting and stopping and punishing the aggressor, we do not undertake nor must we ever permit ourselves to be forced into the posture of bringing on a bigger war and a greater conflict in the name of achieving victory in the lesser conflict. Our purpose is to restore peace. Our purpose is to punish aggression. Our purpose is to prevent aggression. And that we can best do on the basis we now operate, rather than on the basis either as proposed by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, to declare war on China, on the one hand, or pull out and abandon Korea on the other.

Moderator GRANIK. Which of those resolutions do you want to comment on, Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, at the moment I want to say that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has not told the American audience why the administration seeks to change its mission in the middle of the war. The answer to that is relatively simple—there is no answer for it. ROBERT S. KERR has said that we set out now to punish the aggressor.

Senator KERR. I said, "We set out first to do that." We still seek that. That was our objective and that is our objective.

Senator CAIN. These good people here are entitled to all of the facts in this tragic bloodbath in which we are now engaged in Korea. Admittedly, we punish the enemy, and we punish many badly with what we have and under the restrictions which are imposed upon men, many of whom today are dying because they do not have a proper chance to die for themselves. But the testimony in the last 3 days before the joint committee of the United States Senate is that already there have been suffered in 10 months a million battle casualties and more than a million casualties among civilians, a total of more than 2,000,000 casualties in ten short months on a narrow corridor and peninsula known as Korea. I ask anybody to point out to me, if they can, where, in the annals of all history, there has ever been so much blood shed, and can they give me one simple, solid answer as to how we are ever going, in high moral and principle terms, if you please, to carry out our mission of making Korea free again if now our sole determination is to keep from being thrown back in the sea by resisting on or about the thirty-eighth parallel. History has no parallel to this fantastic situation.

Senator KERR. If this is a one-man discussion, say so; otherwise let me give the people the facts. There has been terrible tragedy in Korea. There is terrible tragedy in Korea. But what, I ask the Senator from Washington, would it be if this Nation became involved in an all-out war in the mire and the jungle of China. Certainly, there is tragedy in Korea. Certainly, there is bloodshed. But its purpose is to prevent a greater conflict. Its purpose is to punish the aggressor, repel the aggressor, and restore peace. That is the reason why today the Koreans support this effort with fanatical loyalty and devotion. That is the reason that they pray God that the United Nations will not leave there until they have restored peace and unity in Korea, and that is the reason that the people around the world hope that that awful bloodbath will not be visited on the rest of the world. One atomic bomb, one atomic bomb raid in this country, which could easily come about by reason of our pushing the war into China, as advocated by General MacArthur, or the Senator from Washington in his resolution to declare war on China—one atomic bomb attack—could bring to our own country and our own citizens 10 times the bloodshed that has taken place in Korea, and it is to prevent that, Mr. Granik, that we are punishing the aggressor; it is to prevent that that we refuse to permit the spread of the conflict if we can prevent it; that is the reason that we oppose those who would provoke a greater more terrible war.

Senator CAIN. Ten months ago in June the administration was very brave and very bold. It set out to repel an aggressor from Korea. Ten months later that aggressor, many Americans, and many of our allied friends throughout the world are scared to death. They say if we carry the war on to our enemy, all kinds of possibilities may happen. Why, if that is their present decision, did they not take the time to think 10 months ago, when every risk and every hazard to which they make reference today was clearly and apparently and obviously present in front of all of us? The Senator from Oklahoma says that we seek to carry war to the jungle, and I think his words were "in the mire of China." He can find no scrap of testimony or evidence from any authoritative source that that is the desire of any among us, who seek only to defeat the enemy in Korea and carry out our declared intentions last June.

Senator KERR. I would not know what else would be in the mind of one who seeks to declare war in China. I could not know what else would be in the mind of General MacArthur when he said, "I would issue an ultimatum to China that if she did not cease fire we would regard it as a declaration of war." I would not know what else was in the mind of General MacArthur when he seeks to send the troops of Chiang Kai-shek on to the continent to open up a second front. I would not know what else was in the mind of General MacArthur when he said, "Let us bomb the bases of interior China." We must not lose sight of the fact that our objective is peace—not war. We must not lose sight of the fact that to win the peace we must limit the conflict as much as possible and fail and refuse to provoke the conflict into that global structure, which is the thing we all fear and dread and are determined to prevent.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN, would you care to comment on your resolution?

Senator CAIN. Senator ROBERT KERR and I are both very serious and very sincere in our contrary points of view and the American people ought to listen to everybody they have a chance to these days. I feel that to continue to fail to carry out our mission in Korea is to provide the greatest incitement and the greatest likelihood I could possibly define of the coming of world war III because do not fail to bear in mind that 53 nations 10 months ago said that collectively we are going to stamp out the fire of aggression wherever it may crop up, and now our first incitement, our initial undertaking, is taking place in Korea.

Moderator GRANIK. Would you declare war on China? How far would you go?

Senator CAIN. Speaking for myself, we have been heavily engaged in one of the greatest major wars in all history, and particularly with Red China since November of last year. If a man wants to recognize the obvious, certainly, I think if he is a Member of the Congress of the United States, he ought to be willing to declare war in order that as a Member of Congress he can have something to do with the management of that war. I am a sturdy Republican, a very positive one, but I do not criticize the President of the United States for what I sometimes think is mismanagement when I, as a Member of the Senate, have not had an opportunity to assume any responsibility for the management of those undertakings. Of course, I would declare war.

Senator KERR. Not even Senator CAIN would say we went to Korea to declare war on China. We went to Korea to avoid war with Russia. The only way I know of to carry out an objective is to carry it out, and the only way to do that is to know what it is, and not what it is not, and therefore we must not lose sight of the limited objective in Korea by casting the god of war out yonder to another and different and violently opposed objective, which would be not only becoming involved in a world-wide struggle, but deliberately provoking it ourselves.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN.

Senator CAIN. We did not go to Korea to declare war, as Senator ROBERT KERR says.

Senator KERR. On Red China.

Senator CAIN. Wait a minute. We went to Korea to get rid of our enemy at that time. On, I think it was the 28th day of November, Red China entered that war against us and our allies, and since that time they crossed the Yalu River, the United States has been opposed, and our allies in Korea, by two enemies—the North Koreans and the Red Chinese—and we still have our initial mission of repelling that enemy and restoring freedom, and the greatest people who suffer today, sad as our tragedy today is in America, and Great Britain, France, and Turkey, and the rest, are the Koreans. More than a million of them have died in this accordion war that not only has gone up and down that peninsula four or five times, but Senator ROBERT KERR is the last man to tell me how many more times. It is going to go up and down until the Chinese either give up, or until they offer terms at the peace table unrelated to the conflict in Korea and out of which comes appeasement on the part of free people.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. No matter how many Red Chinese are in Korea—and I remember back yonder about the last of November MacArthur said that before they struck us there were about 60,000 of them, and after they struck us he said there were a million of them. He was just as badly in error in the second instance as he was in the first. But, regardless of how many there are, it is not 2 percent of their available manpower, and if we went into China, if we carried the war to China, if we declared war on China, if we issued the ultimatum to China, then we ourselves would be deliberately provoking the all-out war with all the manpower of China, not 2 percent of it, as we now have in Korea and where we have the opportunity to punish them sufficiently to where they themselves will either seek or accept responsible peace and refrain from aggression, but if we ourselves carried it to them we would open up that which Walter Lippmann described so dramatically. While I do not agree with its pessimistic finality, I do realize that it would be terrible beyond all description.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer that?

Senator CAIN. Mr. KERR knows there are many answers for some of what he has said just now and he knows that I have them. He talks of intelligence and by inference condemns General MacArthur when we know that intelligence to be effective cannot be collected by the commander on his immediate front but comes out of the chancelleries of the world and through our Central Intelligence Agency over here. It is for those who are in authority to send intelligence to the commander, and BOB KERR ought to know that.

Senator KERR. Those who would expect that from MacArthur do not know MacArthur.

Moderator GRANIK. The first question? Go ahead, sir.

Colonel SMITH. I am J. R. Smith, a retired Army colonel. My question is addressed to Senator KERR.

Ever since 1933 there has been constant appeasement of Soviet Russia by our administration and State Department. Now Socialist Britain is also favoring it. Do you believe such tactics insure future peace for the United States?

Senator KERR. I do not believe either statement. I am positive that appeasement is destined to failure, whoever practices it. But anybody who thinks that we are appeasing in Korea certainly does not know what is going on and, as I said awhile ago, I do not agree with the man's premise, I deny and I defy and I decry appeasement by this Government at any time, at any place, for any purpose.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. You want me to answer that?

Moderator GRANIK. Yes.

Senator CAIN. I could not agree more with Colonel Smith, who made that statement. All we have to do, in other words, is to look at statistics, which are important occasionally. How many Communists were there on the face of the earth in 1945? How many more are there today in the Far East than there were in 1945? How many have been added since the Secretary of State went out into the Far East to force and require a coalition government between the Communists and the Nationalists? You could no more do that than you would make oil and water mix. Of course, I think there has been appeasement.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. I am amused at the statement of the Senator from Washington that by reason of the fact that there are more Communists today it necessarily follows that we have appeased them. I want to say that the farmers in Oklahoma have been fighting the green bugs all my life and there are more of them this spring than I have ever known.

Senator CAIN. Then that is just as little a compliment to the management that you exercise in Oklahoma as there is in the State Department.

Senator KERR. That is a recognition of the fact that green bugs are like Communists.

Senator CAIN. Please talk about China.

Senator KERR. That was not what the question was.

Moderator GRANIK. Another question?

Mr. GETTELSOHN. My name is Bernard B. Gettelsohn, a manufacturer. My question is to Senator CAIN.

If your resolution on declaring war on Red China is adopted, will we have the full support of the members of the United Nations?

Senator CAIN. That matter must be decided in the future. So far, there has been an unusual—I find it difficult to understand why, because I think they, collectively, and that includes us, too, are likely to commit collective suicide. But the free nations of the world, those who are supposed to be engaged with us in Korea, have either been very reluctant in their contributions or, thus far, have not contributed anything at all. I believe in working with all the free nations of the world, but it is a two-way street, and if we seek and want to live, the time has come when there must be equal contributions from equal partners.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator KERR.

Senator KERR. We know that we would not have our allies, we would not have the American people. They do not want to declare a war on China. That would be the way first not to commit collective suicide, because our allies would refuse to join us in that self-imposed hara-kiri.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question.

Mr. HAWVER. My name is Carl F. Hawver. I am employed in the Capitol, and I have spent some time in Russia. This question is addressed to Senator KERR.

Can we reasonably expect true peace under any conditions short of defeat of the communistic stronghold in Russia?

Senator KERR. We can expect true peace when we and our allies have reached that stage of collective strength that Russia recognizes that to attack us is suicide for her. When we have achieved that unity and that collective strength we can compel the Soviet before the bar of world judgment. We can compel peace with responsible guaranties, and only, however, from the position and foundation of that united strength that will enable us to be in position to back up what we say and compel them to back up what they say.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, I think there is a chance for peace with Russia, and on the face of the earth in the future, but that peace can only come when the aggressors, imperialist Communists everywhere in the world become totally convinced that the collective forces and determination and spirit and courage of the free people are sufficiently strong to make any war undertaking unlikely. It is for that reason I keep my chief preoccupation on the initial undertaking of freedom to stamp out the fire of aggression on the basis of the way in which we are presently and have been going for 10 months. I think that world war III is very, very likely, and I am sad about it.

Senator KERR. I am glad Senator CAIN based his hope for peace on that collective strength when the collective forces are strong enough because that is the structure that we now have in a small way; that is the structure we must build; that is the structure we must keep.

Moderator GRANIK. Another question?

Mr. LEVY. My name is Warren Levy, New York City.

Senator CAIN, you have asked for a declaration of war against Communist China.

Senator CAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEVY. Are you actually willing to risk a war with Soviet Russia through such a declaration?

Senator CAIN. I am much more interested in winning the war, young man, in which we are engaged as an individual citizen of this Republic. As an individual Member of the United States Senate, I think we ought to declare war, but, what is much more important, for that imparts a moral question, we ought to get on with winning the war in which we have, and now are, engaged in and in which more than 2,000,000 people in 10 short months have been destroyed in one way or another.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for summaries, Senator KERR?

Senator KERR. In answer to the question, What is ahead: peace or war? I believe that if the American people will truly work, it can be peace. However, this cannot result from wishful thinking. It will not come about by accident. Bernard Baruch has said, "To win the peace, we must wage the peace." Paul G. Hoffman has said, "I contend that we still have the opportunity to avoid a general war, if we begin at once to wage the peace with imagination, boldness, and a sense of dedication."

The late Senator Vandenberg, who made one of the most heroic efforts for peace of all times, said, "Pearl Harbor ended one era. Hiroshima began another. Therefore, none of us can face the facts of life and deny that a nation hereafter can defend its peace alone. The peaceful nations of the world must defend their peace together. They must covenant in advance against the aggressor of tomorrow."

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Senator KERR.

Senator CAIN, may we have your summary, please?

Senator CAIN. Mr. Granik, 53 United Nations began a crusade of faith and hope last June, 10 months ago. They announced to the world that they would restore freedom to free men and women and childfen in Korea. This declaration electrified and gave new hope and faith to enslaved people everywhere. In 10 long, bloody months that hope and faith has largely turned to doubt and fear because the United Nations have failed to carry out their stated determination in Korea. I believe down deep inside that if we fail to restore freedom in Korea that freedom everywhere throughout the universe will stand in peril of being completely destroyed in my own lifetime. The challenge of the future lies in the present, which is today, in Korea, where we must do so much more, and our allies too, than we have undertaken to grapple with in 10 long months of war.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on What's ahead: peace or war? Our speakers have been Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington.

General MacArthur's Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to the New York Times for an excellent summation and analysis of the testimony of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. The following article appeared in the Times on Sunday, May 6, 1951:

SEVEN ISSUES—MACARTHUR RAISES THEM

At 10:18 last Thursday morning General of the Army Douglas MacArthur strode into the Senate caucus room on Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C. After a few preliminaries, Senate guards cleared the room of all outsiders. Members of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees took seats at a long walnut table. Other Senators crowded around. Then, in answer to a question by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, General MacArthur began to testify.

What followed on Thursday and through Friday and yesterday added up to one of the most extraordinary episodes in American history—an episode fraught with grave meaning for the United States and much of the world. In those 3 days General MacArthur spelled out a bill of particulars against his Commander in Chief, President Truman, against his military superiors, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and against the structure and execution of American foreign policy. His testimony—and the heat and emotion that his personality generates—made the other great debate over troops to Europe seem like a minor political disagreement.

By late yesterday, most of General MacArthur's testimony was in. The administration—through the questioning by Senators who support its point of view—had developed the main lines of the administration rebuttal. That rebuttal will be fully developed this week when the Joint Chiefs of Staff give their testimony.

The dramatic hearings in Washington took place against a grim background in Korea.

There, the Chinese Communists—whose intervention in the Korean war was the touchstone that set off the debate in Washington—brought their spring offensive to a climax. The offensive was beaten back and at the week end the front was stabilized, but all signs pointed to another bitter-end effort by the Chinese to throw the UN forces out of Korea.

THE SETTING

The roots of the MacArthur debate run deep. The controversy ranges over the entire conduct of America's far-eastern policy since World War II. Its bitterness has mounted rapidly in the 10 months since the outbreak, in Korea, of actual warfare in the Far East.

The fundamental argument of the Republicans in the debate is this: The administration's far-eastern policy has been weak all along. The State Department's softness toward communism paved the way for the Communist conquest of China and encouraged the Communist aggression in Korea. Now the administration is making victory in Korea impossible by shying away from strong countermeasures against the Chinese Communists.

The fundamental position of the administration is this: The Communist gains in the Far East are the outgrowth of historic forces which the United States could not entirely control. Communist aggression must be resisted, but if possible the Korean war must be limited, lest the west's capacity to defend the more vital theater of Western Europe be imperiled. Enlargement of the Korean conflict might lead to world war III, for which the United States and its allies are not yet prepared.

This was the context in which the controversy came to a head 25 days ago, with President Truman's abrupt dismissal of General MacArthur from the Korean command for publicly attacking administration policy.

The formal arena of debate is an investigation of the MacArthur affair by the Senate's combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees—altogether 25 men, 14 of them Democrats, 11 Republicans. In preliminaries to the hearings last week there was maneuvering for advantage by both sides in the debate.

MAC ARTHUR'S SUPPORTERS

On the MacArthur side Senator ROBERT A. TAFT threw his full support behind the general's policies. The general's aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, said General MacArthur intended to take his case to the country by making "as many public appearances as possible." On the administration side Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Warren Austin, Republican and chief American delegate to the UN, entered strong defenses of the President. Mr. Truman said he was confident the people would support him when all the facts were known.

From the combined committees there came the first of the many documents that are expected to figure in the controversy. On Tuesday the committee released a report, held secret for nearly 4 years, on a 1947 mission to Korea by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. The Republicans say the report supports their case, since General Wedemeyer warned in 1947 of North Korean aggression. On Wednesday the committee released a record of the talks between General MacArthur and Mr. Truman at Wake Island last October. The administration says the record supports its case, since General MacArthur predicted at Wake that the Chinese Communists would not intervene in Korea.

When the hearings opened Thursday the atmosphere in the caucus room was solemn. The Senators were elaborately polite with the general and with each other. Most of the questioners began with tributes to his record. The general, smoking his pipe, was calm and dignified. He frequently made little speeches, with flashes of the MacArthur rhetoric. Occasionally he displayed emotion, as when he spoke of the bloodshed in Korea.

The line of questioning was clearly partisan. On the whole the Republicans—ALEXANDER WILEY, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, HARRY P. CAIN—put questions which brought out General MacArthur's long service in the Far East, the abruptness of his dismissal, the difficulties of his assignment in Korea. The Democrats—BRIEN MCMAHON, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, ESTES KEFAUVER—questioned him searchingly. Mr. KEFAUVER was soft-spoken but insistent, in the manner that became familiar during his recent crime investigation. Mr. MCMAHON was on the offensive. His terse questions seemed to nettle the general. Mr. MCMAHON, on his own initiative but with the administration's good wishes, had worked 4 days with his staff drawing up his line of attack.

In this atmosphere the Senate inquiry floated back and forth over the entire range of issues in debate.

THE ISSUES

Out of the mass of testimony—well in excess of 100,000 words by late yesterday—there emerged seven great issues between General MacArthur and the administration. General MacArthur threw down the challenge on those issues; the line of questioning by Senators supporting the administration indicated the essentials of what the reply to the general will be. These are the issues, and the indicated answers:

1. General MacArthur took the position firmly that his responsibility was that of a theater commander and that responsibility for decisions on global matters was not his.

Despite the general's disavowal of the global view, he recommended stern measures be taken against China. This program was based on two assumptions: First, that the policy he recommended would bring quick victory in Korea, and, second, that it would not necessarily bring Russia into the war. These assumptions underlie the second and third issues.

2. General MacArthur argued that the present stalemate is intolerable, and that steps toward decisive victory in Korea must be taken now. The indicated answer is this: That the program might not bring victory at all, but instead might embroil us in a long and major war with China.

3. General MacArthur argues that Russia would not shape her decisions on whether to make war against the West on the basis of what happens in the Korean war. The indicated answer is this: That we must not take any risk of precipitating world war III in which Russia would strike at the European bastion.

The question of the risk of Russian intervention led to the exploration of the fourth issue:

4. General MacArthur said that the enemy was communism all over the world and not Soviet Russia. The indicated answer is this: That the main enemy is the Kremlin, and that all action must be determined on the basis of the best way to resist that enemy.

THE OTHER ISSUES

These fundamental differences lay behind the other issues that came out sharply in the testimony:

5. The general said that his proposals should be adopted even if our allies objected, though that might mean we would have to act on our own. The indicated answer is this: That a prime Russian objective is to isolate us from our allies and that we must not allow that to happen.

6. General MacArthur said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's highest military authorities, agreed in essentials with his program. The indicated answer is this: That the Joint Chiefs, taking the Korean war in the context of the global political and military considerations, disagree strongly.

7. General MacArthur said that he had the right to go over the head of his military and civilian superiors and appeal to the judgment of the people. The indicated answer is this: In the nature of military duty an officer must carry out the orders from his superiors to the best of his ability.

Here in detail are the background and the high lights of the testimony on these seven basic issues:

1. GLOBAL STRATEGY

The background: Administration policy is to combat communism by concentrating defenses in key areas. The administration's position is that in carrying out its policy it must plan and act on a world-wide basis, that any move in one part of the world must be considered in the light of its effects on other parts.

In his speech to Congress on April 19 General MacArthur said "the issues are global, and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector oblivious to those of another is to court disaster for the whole." Nevertheless, in the remainder of his speech, he laid all his emphasis on Asia, and did not once refer to other areas threatened by Communist aggression.

The testimony: Democratic Senators, particularly Senators MCMAHON and KEFAUVER, doggedly pursued the question of allocating America's strength on a global basis. This exchange took place with Senator MCMAHON:

Question. "General, * * * I am thinking, if this war (against Russia) has to be fought, about the total and complete victory * * *. Now, general, do you think that we are ready to withstand the Russian attack in Western Europe today?"

Answer. "Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I don't pretend to be an authority on those things."

About the bomb

Senator MCMAHON, who is chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, directed this line of questioning to the atomic bomb:

Question. "Have you any intelligence * * * about Russian potentialities in * * * atomic weapons?"

Answer. "Very little."

Question. "Have you sought to get that information."

Answer. "Not at all."

Pursuing the question, Senator MCMAHON asked:

Question. "I want to find out how you propose in your own mind to defend the American Nation * * *."

Answer. "That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator * * * the Joint Chiefs of Staff * * * are working day and night for an over-all solution to the global problem. * * *"

Question. "Have you thought about the possibility of the Russians launching a surreptitious attack on the United States and its vital production centers through atomic sabotage?"

Answer. "In a general way only. Once again, that isn't my theater of responsibility, Senator."

2. KOREAN STRATEGY

The background: From the beginning of the war the administration position has been that the Communists' aggression must be fought within Korea. The policy is to exploit the UN's great advantage in fire power, inflict a bloody toll from the Communist forces, blunt their will to fight, and thus hold open the possibility of a peaceful settlement. The administration stands firmly against what General Bradley calls the proposals of dissatisfied and impatient strategists.

All during the war General MacArthur has protested these policies. In his speech before Congress he spelled out his demands. They

are: To destroy by bombing the Communist bases in the Manchurian sanctuary; to lift the restrictions on use of the Nationalist troops on Formosa; to throw an economic and naval blockade along the China coast. In his testimony last week he made an important addition. He said he would have served Peiping with an ultimatum saying that if the Communists did not promptly accept a cease-fire they would put themselves at war with the UN.

The testimony: As to bombing Manchuria, this exchange took place:

Question. "You said if you had been permitted to bomb [the Chinese Communists] before they crossed the Yalu"——

Answer. "If I had been permitted to bomb them before they crossed the Yalu, Senator, they would never have crossed. * * *"

As to Chiang's troops, this was part of the General's testimony:

Question. "What [do] you think is the real strength of the Generalissimo's forces on Formosa?

Answer. "The Generalissimo has probably in the neighborhood of a half million troops. The personnel is excellent. * * * Their material equipment is spotty. They lack artillery. They lack trucks. * * * My own estimate would be [that] after the material [American aid] was there, that those troops would be in very good shape * * * within 4 months."

Question. "How should Chiang's troops be used?"

Answer. "Such a decision should be left to their commander [Chiang]. The possibility of a huge amphibious force landing all that crowd on the mainland might not be feasible."

As to a blockade of China, the General's testimony included this exchange:

Question. "Isn't your proposal * * * the same strategy by which Americans achieved victory over the Japanese in the Pacific?"

Answer. "Yes, sir. In the Pacific we bypassed them. We closed in. * * * The supplies for the maintenance of the Japanese armed forces ceased to reach Japan. * * * Now, the problem with China is quite similar. * * * It is an economy of poverty, and the minute you disrupt it you will turn great segments of its population into disorder and discontent."

Again and again General MacArthur stressed that his proposals would end the Korean "stalemate" and the "slaughter" of American soldiers. He said: "Where does the responsibility of that blood rest? This I am sure—it is not going to rest on my shoulders. * * * I shrink * * * at this continuous slaughter of men in Korea. * * * If you go on indefinitely, you are perpetuating a slaughter such as I have never heard of in the history of mankind." He denounced the "inhibitions" on American air and sea power as "appeasement."

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts Republican, raised the question of whether General MacArthur's proposals would work. This was the exchange:

Question. "If the * * * steps which you recommended do not bring the action in Korea to a successful conclusion, what do you recommend should be done next?"

Answer. "Senator, I would wait and see."

Strong challenges to General MacArthur's specific proposals for Korea policy are expected this week, when Secretary Marshall, General Bradley and the Joint Chiefs state the administration's case.

3. RUSSIA'S COURSE

The background: The Truman administration feels there is a grave risk that the Soviet Union might enter the war if the strong measures against her Chinese ally, particularly the bombing of Chinese bases, are taken. The fear is that such action might bring the Moscow-Peiping alliance of 1950 into play. That alliance says that if Japan or any country allied with her attacks either treaty member the other party will immediately render military or other aid with all means at its disposal. General MacArthur in his speech before Congress on April 19 said that the "Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

The testimony: The questioning of General MacArthur at first concerned Russia's capabilities. In answer to a question by Chairman RUSSELL, General MacArthur said: "The Soviet in the Far East * * * is dependent for * * * support almost entirely from European Russia. * * * [The Tran-Siberian Railway] line is strained to the very utmost now to maintain on a normal peace basis the forces which the Soviet maintains in Siberia."

What would Moscow do?

Senator MCMAHON pressed questions about how Russia might react if the MacArthur policy were carried out:

Question. "I am to understand * * * that you discount the danger of Russia coming into the war * * * if we should bomb bases in Manchuria?"

Answer. "There is no certainty that Russia will come in. There is no certainty that she will not come in. There is no certainty that anything that happens in Korea will influence her. * * * You have to take a certain degree of risk."

There was discussion of a statement by General MacArthur, as it appeared in the documents on the Wake Island conference between the President and the general that, "We are no longer fearful of their (Peiping's) intervention."

Question. "You did not believe at one time that the Communists of China would come into the conflict in Korea?"

Answer. "I doubted it."

Question. "They did. You now doubt that the Soviets (will enter the war if we attack China). If you happen to be wrong this time and we get into all-out war, I want to find out how you propose in your own mind to defend the American Nation against the war?"

Answer. "That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator."

4. THE MAIN ENEMY

The background: The administration regards the Soviet Union as the chief menace. The argument is that Russia, with its combination of nationalist expansionism and military power, poses the immediate danger of the fall of Western Europe, whose industrial strength would turn the world balance against the free world. In this view, Peiping is closely allied with Moscow at the moment but there remains at least a hope that a wedge can be driven between the two Communist allies.

The MacArthur view is that the danger is communism, wherever it is. In his view communism breeds imperialism in any country, and therefore the Russian threat does not take precedence over the Chinese threat.

Testimony: Senator MCMAHON had this exchange with the general:

Question. "Who is overwhelmingly the main enemy * * *?"

Answer. "Communism—in my opinion."

Question. "General, where is the source and brains of this conspiracy?"

Answer. "How would I know?"

Question. "Would you think that the Kremlin was the place that might be the loci?"

Answer. "I might say that it is one. * * *"

Question. "Would you say it was * * * the main place?"

Answer. "I think world opinion would so locate it."

In questioning by Senator FULBRIGHT there arose the question of Yugoslavia, Communist but anti-Russian, which is getting American aid. This was the exchange:

Question. "I thought of (the main enemy) as being Russian, an imperialist Russia. * * *"

Answer. "I disagree with you completely."

Question. "If the country * * * in fact is antagonistic to (Russia), then I do not see why, such as in the case of Yugoslavia, it is not to our benefit to assist them. * * *"

Answer. "I have expressed my belief, Senator."

5. OUR ALLIES

The background: This issue of our relation with our allies arises out of a fundamental tenet of the administration's foreign policy: that world peace and American security depend upon collective security. The State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe the United States needs the manpower and the industrial strength of our allies to help contain Communist agression, and therefore we must seek to preserve—if possible—a united policy front with those nations fighting with us in Korea and our partners in the Atlantic Pact.

Some opposition leaders strongly dissent from this policy. Many Republicans have also been critical of the U. N. role in Korea, charging that while the United States did most of the fighting, other U. N. members were ready to appease the Chinese Communists. They resented the strong representation our U. N. allies have made against any bombing of China, and opposition to our Formosa policy.

It has been widely believed that General MacArthur shared these views. In his address to the joint meeting of Congress, he made no mention of the United Nations; and in the letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, which led to his recall, he complained that here we fight Europe's war with arms, while the diplomats there still fight it with words.

The testimony: Administration supporters closely questioned General MacArthur on this issue. This exchange took place with Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Question: "[Your] theory that we could win a quick victory * * * simply by * * * bombarding the [China] coast cities and in establishing blockade would * * * indicate we would proceed alone and not with any help from the other United Nations?"

Answer: "I can give you no testimony about the United Nations, Senator."

Question: "What would be your expectation?"

Answer: "My hope would be * * * that the United Nations would see the wisdom * * * of that course, but if they did not, I still believe that the interest of the United States * * * would require our action."

Question: "Alone?"

Answer: "Alone if necessary."

On Friday, when Senator MCMAHON pressed this line of inquiry, the General modified his position somewhat:

Question: "I am sure, General, that you do not underrate the importance of having our allies with us."

Answer: "I would say indubitably it is advantageous for us to have all of the allies that we can get. * * * We have plenty of allies, but the numbers of them do not contribute in the same generous and noble way in which we do."

6. THE JOINT CHIEFS

The background is that the administration maintains that all of the actions taken by President Truman—including the dismissal of General MacArthur—had the full support of the Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and their chairman, Gen. Omar Bradley. On April 17, General Bradley stated: "Any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests and, by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security."

General MacArthur told the joint meeting of Congress on April 19: "From a military standpoint, [my] views have been shared fully in the past by practically every military leader concerned in the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff." Senator TAFT has said, "The Joint Chiefs are absolutely under the control of the administration and their recommendations are what the administration demanded that they make."

The testimony: The key document introduced to support General MacArthur's contention was an extract from a report dated January 12, 1951, which the Joint Chiefs of Staff had sent to the Secretary of Defense. This was how the report was introduced at the hearings:

Question "(Senator RUSSELL). Every member of the committee wishes to develop just how the controversy (over your recommendations) arose, whether it was through a formal request or through discussion with (the Joint Chiefs) * * *."

Answer. "The position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and my own, so far as I know, were practically identical. On January 12 the Joint Chiefs of Staff presented a study to the Secretary of Defense embodying these conditions."

General MacArthur then read out of a four-paragraph extract from that report in which the Joint Chiefs proposed: An economic blockade of China, a naval blockade depending upon circumstances, and removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance over China and on operations of the Chinese Nationalist forces.

Senators RUSSELL and MACMAHON apparently did not agree that the extract from the report proved that the Joint Chiefs supported MacArthur. Senator RUSSELL pointed out that the General had recommended bombing the Manchurian bases. It was also noted that the UN forces were badly battered last January and evacuation was being discussed. This exchange took place:

Question. "There is quite a difference between reconnaissance and attack, is there not? * * * Did the Joint Chiefs ever suggest that [the Chinese] bases be attacked?"

Answer. "Not that I know of."

Senator MCMAHON implied that the report contained conditions which have not yet been disclosed.

Question: "There is certainly the possibility that [the J. C. S. report] was based upon the contingency of a forced evacuation of Korea. That possibility existed, didn't it, General?"

Answer. "That possibility existed; yes, sir."

7. A SOLDIER'S DUTY

The background: The Administration contends that General MacArthur, as a subordinate, was required to carry out the orders of the Joint Chiefs and of his Commander in Chief without public protest, and that he openly and repeatedly violated his orders. For example, the General was twice ordered not to make any public foreign and military policy statements until they had been cleared by Washington. Yet last March he wrote a letter to House Republican JOSEPH W. MARTIN which called for a reorientation of U. S. military policy—a letter which was made public by Mr. MARTIN without objection from General MacArthur.

General MacArthur maintains that he has always followed orders to the letter. Through his aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, he has said the President gave him carte blanche to say "anything he wished" about the Korean war and that he did not have the "faintest idea" why he was dismissed.

The testimony: Senator MACMAHON tried to draw out General MacArthur on whether or not it was his place to challenge his military superiors.

Question: "Assuming for the sake of discussion that subsequent testimony brings out real differences between you and the Joint Chiefs * * * would you then be prepared to admit that the Joint Chiefs' judgment is better than yours and that the American people would be well advised to follow the judgment of the Joint Chiefs? * * *"

Answer. "If [my recommendations] disagreed with those of higher authority, the question of the judgment of that higher authority is not within my hands. * * * That is a matter for public opinion."

Question. "Do you consider, General, that it comes within the province of a theater commander to register publicly with persons in political life, or out of it, for that matter, his differences of opinion while he is still in active charge of the theater?"

Answer. "I believe the theater commander has the responsibility of registering his views as he might see fit, if they are honest views and not in contradiction to any implementing directives that he may have received. * * *"

Question. "Do I take it that you would defend the right of a brigadier general on your staff to give his opinions as to the policy that was proceeding or that was being proceeded with by the Government of the United States?"

Answer. "I wouldn't have a brigadier general or anyone else on my staff that didn't freely and frankly give me his opinions. * * *"

Question. "No, General, we are not talking about the same thing, I don't think. * * *. What I was raising was the question of advisability, if not the propriety, of any subordinate military officer to take his differences of opinion, on a Government policy, when he is in the military chain of command, to people in political life. * * * [For example, your] letter to Mr. MARTIN."

Answer. "It seems to me that the American people are entitled to certain basic facts. * * * I do not believe in the gag rule, if that is what you are talking about. * * *"

Question. "General, you are not going to, by that statement, without a mild dissent from me, place in this record that I am in favor of what you choose to denominate as 'the gag rule.'"

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the House recently reduced funds for the Voice of America. As evidence of the fact the funds should be reduced, the following article by Fulton Lewis, appearing in the Times-Herald, May 3, 1951, is presented:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

It may come as a surprise to you, but as taxpayers you have been investing millions of dollars in an organization that breaks laws, violates all the basic principles of good business operation, and is bossed by individuals with no previous experience in handling large numbers of people or huge sums of money.

Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, and his aide, C. M. Hulten, appeared before the House Appropriations Committee recently and presented a picture of ineptness, mismanagement and disregard of congressional instructions. They run the Voice of America, successor to Elmer Davis' weird wartime office of war information.

Barrett and Hulten are angling for something like $115,000,000 so they can convince the rest of the world that the United States is kindly toward it.

In private business both would be cashiered in 6 months if they wasted stockholders' money the way they toss our tax dollars around.

For instance, despite explicit orders from Congress, they hired 116 additional employees for the management branch of the Voice at a time when an efficiency report labeled the office overstaffed. They wasted $70,000.

In August the Voice started to film a two-reeler called U. N. Aids the Republic of Korea. Seven months later the film was still incomplete, despite the expenditure of thousands of dollars and the use of hundreds of people who apparently just shuffled the film from department to department. By the time the so-called propaganda experts, Barrett and Hulten, got through with it the war in Korea had moved so fast the two-reeler was obsolete.

The Voice is supposed to sell the United States to Russian and iron-curtain country citizens. There is no positive evidence that the Voice ever actually reaches any of these individuals, although there are schemes afoot to put radio propaganda transmitters aboard merchant ships and on remote mountain peaks. The main trouble seems to be that the Russian peasants not only lack radios, but also lack electricity to run them if they were made available.

Actually, broadcasts to iron-curtain citizens are secondary to the Voice. Most of the talking has been to Americans. This baffled House Members, and they quizzed Barrett and Hulten in detail.

They found out that from July 1, 1949 to January 30, 1951, a total of 364 speeches were made in 29 States, including Washington, D. C., by Voice people.

This led Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, New York Democrat, to remark to Barrett:

"So far as your problem is concerned, I had no idea that you were in the speech-making business to Americans at a time when there should be a lot of speeches and broadcasting directed to those outside the country and behind the iron curtain."

In all, 114 people took part in propagandizing the United States about the Voice, some speaking more than once. Of course, those on the Federal payroll got paid for their gabbing and most, although Barrett was vague about it, got travel pay while touring the United States to convince citizens that peace is impossible unless we fill the foreign air waves with gabble.

Besides diverting funds to pay unauthorized help, the Voice managers diverted cash for building projects. Such activities are violations of authorized Government procedures, to say nothing of being contrary to sensible business practices.

Both Barrett and Hulten are full of imaginative plans for the Voice. Yet neither one, according to their own admissions, has any idea what is going on in their agency. They set up regulations and issue orders calling for progress reports on multi-million-dollar construction projects, but field managers simply ignore them. This failed to trouble either Barrett or Hulten.

On the basis of their own testimony, a conservative estimate is that in private business practice Barrett and Hulten would shove a normal corporation into bankruptcy in 6 months. If we really want to fix the Russians, we ought to lend Barrett and Hulten

to them. In 6 months the Kremlin propaganda machine would be off the air, and we'd all enjoy the silence.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the subcommittee now studying the 1952 appropriations for the State Department will consider these facts, and take all steps necessary to stop these highly improper acts.

Witch Doctors in the Upper Colorado River Basin States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since the timely demise of the central Arizona project bill, certain figures in the upper Colorado River Basin States have carried on a wailing bee over the casket, and have conducted themselves in a manner that leaves their professed sorrow open to grave suspicion.

The Arizona bill (H. R. 1500) was mercifully exterminated in the House Interior Committee by a vote of 16 to 8. The large majority of committee members believed that the legislation contained legal questions that should be answered through litigation before further consideration by the committee of the proposed project.

During the coma in which the Arizona bill lingered, not a single upper basin State doctor appeared at its bedside to minister to it. Yet, immediately after its death, at least two upper basin doctors rushed into print with cries of horror and remorse.

The licenses of these upper basin medicine men should, therefore, be examined with a critical eye. Do they represent the true attitude and policy of all the people of the upper basin States?

Let us consider this situation.

The bill's corpse was not cold before Arizona apostles, in the guise of Attorney Charles A. Carson and Gov. Howard Pyle, scurried up to Denver, calling loudly for aid and comfort. They found it in the hogans of John Geoffrey Will, secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and Judge Clifford H. Stone, the Colorado member of the commission.

For years these two star-gazers of the upper basin waterways—Will and Stone—have built ill-advised careers on a hate-California platform. Now they saw another fine opportunity to cry out despairingly that California had dealt upper basin progress a mortal blow by leading the successful fight against the fantastic Arizona project.

Shortly thereafter Arizona and Colorado newspapers were carrying headlines stating that four upper basin States had decided to back the defunct Arizona project, and would join in a fight against California.

Aside from the fact that this story was a falsehood, the question must be asked: "What have the upper basin States to gain in a hate-California campaign inspired by professional fanatics like Will and Stone?"

California is not seeking a fight with the upper basin States. California sincerely seeks to make friends in the upper basin, and wishes to formulate a program that will benefit all States of the Colorado River Basin.

The assertions made by Will and Stone that California has designs on a share of Colorado River water belonging to the upper basin States are utterly idiotic and are completely refuted by California's long-established record. These untrue statements are issued only for the purpose of deceiving the people of the upper basin. I feel certain that the upper basin States will not be hoodwinked into believing something that is not only utterly false but could not possibly be accomplished under the law.

The fact is that four upper basin States did not agree to back the deceased Arizona project. Contrary to the stories issued by Will and Stone, the representatives of Wyoming at the Denver conclave refused to endorse a resolution approving the Arizona project.

Wyoming's State engineer, L. C. Bishop, pointed out that approval of the Will-Stone resolution "would be at the request of Arizona for use in its fight against California."

Mr. Bishop stated, as reported in the Wyoming State Tribune of April 29:

> We have consistently avoided taking sides in this controversy and especially so in this instance where only Arizona was heard.
>
> It was my opinion then, and I am still of the opinion, that a resolution such as this only adds fuel to the fire and in the long run accomplishes no good purpose and, in fact, might prove detrimental to Wyoming's interests.
>
> Attorney General Harnsberger, my legal adviser, and Austin P. Russell, my engineering adviser, were in full agreement with the action taken (by Wyoming) at the Denver meeting.

Will and Stone sought to conceal Wyoming's attitude from the press. Nor did they tell their listeners that the Tax Foundation in Washington, D. C., the New York Tax Foundation, the Wyoming Taxpayers Association, the Oklahoma Public Expenditure Council, the National Grange, the American Federation of Labor, and countless other important national and State organizations, including the Nation's leading industrialists, bankers, and manufacturers have exposed the Arizona scheme to mulct the taxpayers of this country of billions of dollars to aid a few selfish landowners in central Arizona.

I believe the true statesmen of the upper basin, and in all reclamation States, will look with suspicion on men who advise them to bet on a scratched horse. Witch Doctor Carson and Radio Crooner Pyle enlisted the aid of Will and Stone because they knew that Will and Stone would tub thump for any proposition, regardless of its truthfulness, aimed at California.

These Arizona promoters are the mouthpieces of big landowners who despoiled Arizona's water resources, and now as the economic bloodhounds close in on them, want the Nation's taxpayers to bail them out with gifts of billions of dollars.

I feel sure that the upper-basin States will beware of charlatans who are among them, mouthing false propaganda that would lead all western reclamation into a sickness from which it might never recover.

Marshall Gives Aid and Comfort to the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in Monday's testimony before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the other body, the following colloquy occurred between Chairman RUSSELL and Secretary Marshall:

> Senator RUSSELL. Now, General, as a military man with distinguished service to your country over a long period of years, I would like to get your professional opinion as well as your views as Secretary of Defense as to whether or not the Chinese Reds can be driven out of Korea and Korea pacified without the implementing General MacArthur recommends?
>
> General MARSHALL. When you use the expression "driven out of Korea," I assume you mean all of Korea, both north and south.
>
> Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir; I mean to carry out the original directive of the United Nations.
>
> General MARSHALL. I should say that if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available, and with our situation where we visualize no considerable reinforcement of the United Nations army, that they could not be driven out of North Korea, and I have my own doubts as to whether the actions recommended by General MacArthur would bring the conflict to a victorious end.
>
> I am afraid, in my own opinion, that it might result in a great increase in casualties without a decisive finish, but that is his view to the contrary as the theater commander * * * [10 lines deleted].
>
> Senator RUSSELL. Wait a minute, do you mean to say, in your opinion, there is doubt even if we do bomb them whether they could be driven from there?
>
> General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator RUSSELL. Is that what you wanted to state?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is what I wanted to state. You can get into the details of this with the Chiefs of Staff. * * * [Thirteen lines deleted.]
>
> Senator LODGE. But you have no objection to having your belief stated that in your judgment the bombing of the Chinese bases would not bring victory?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

Subsequently this testimony was given:

> Senator RUSSELL. I understand, then, that you recommend a continuation of the present policy in Korea rather than adopting General MacArthur's proposal?
>
> General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir. I must add to that, of course, that if the Chinese Communists with at least equipment support from the Soviets and maybe more

support carry the war to us outside of Korea [deleted], then we have to retaliate.

Mr. Speaker, I again call attention to one particular sentence in the testimony of Secretary Marshall quoted above:

I should say that if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available, and with our situation where we visualize no considerable reinforcement of the United Nations Army, that they could not be driven out of North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, ordinarily the proper thing would seem to be to reserve comment on this testimony until it was all in, until the record was complete.

But this is no ordinary situation.

This is not merely a reaffirmation of the purpose and intent to conduct a limited war in Korea, dubious as such a purpose and intent—and dubious as the public statement of such a purpose and intent—seems to me to be.

This is an announcement and an acknowledgment of defeat.

This is an announcement and an acknowledgment of failure to accomplish the mission assumed and undertaken when American forces moved into Korea.

This is an announcement and an acknowledgment of the impossibility of accomplishing that mission.

This is the bald admission that the enemy—the Chinese Communists—"could not be driven out of North Korea."

Moreover, this is not an announcement and acknowledgment of failure and defeat made in the secret councils of state, but an open proclamation of that determination and conclusion by the head of the Department of Defense of the United States.

By this incredible statement, Secretary Marshall proclaims from the housetops the inevitability of defeat and the impossibility of victory.

He proclaims it not only to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States, and not only to the people of Korea and to our allies—for whose continued support he professes to be so solicitous—but he proclaims it to our enemies, in North Korea, in Communist China, and in the Kremlin.

Most appalling of all, Secretary Marshall proclaims the inevitability of defeat and the impossibilty of victory to the brave American men fighting in Korea while, at the same time, offering them no promise of respite from their deadly stalemate.

The crime goes even farther. Marshall's statement details for the benefit of the enemy the specifications for his victory when it says "if the Chinese Communists continue in force in North Korea with the potential of additional reinforcements that might be made available." Thus succinctly is mapped out for him—the enemy—the sure path to his own triumph.

This is incredible. It defies comprehension. It staggers the imagination.

But there it is. The record is clear and unmistakable.

Think of the psychological, military, and diplomatic implications of that statement. The aid and comfort thereby given the enemy in North Korea, in Communist China, and in the Kremlin is beyond computation.

Now, at least, the American people can understand in some small measure the sense of betrayal experienced by the Chinese Nationalists when this same Marshall, along with Acheson, Wallace, and Truman, and others, stabbed them in the back.

Now, at least, the American people can understand in some small measure the sense of betrayal experienced by the people of South Korea more than a year ago when American officials publicly proclaimed that Korea was outside of this country's perimeter of defense.

Now, at least, the American people can understand in some small measure the sense of betrayal experienced by the people of Formosa when Mr. Acheson publicly announced in December 1949, that this island had no strategic importance and that the American people should be prepared for its surrender.

This time it is the American people themselves who are betrayed by the public proclamation of the counsel of despair and defeat.

How farcical becomes the administration charge that General MacArthur was the offender by reason of his public statements.

How farcical—how tragically farcical—becomes the professed anxiety over the possible betrayal to the enemy of military secrets in the course of the current testimony—for what graver, more fatal military or diplomatic secret is there than this alleged fact of impotence, failure, and dismal defeat?

What more tragic example could there be of straining at gnats and swallowing camels?

This is not appeasement.

This is abject abasement, abandonment, and abdication.

This is confirmation of the fact that continued silence and acquiescence on the part of General MacArthur would have meant his acceptance and identification with the cause and course of treason.

Whatever else may be developed in the course of the present hearings now becomes mere trivia. Except as it may serve to expose the assent of others to this same counsel of despair and defeat, any additional testimony becomes an inconsequential and unimportant detail.

Whether or not we consent to talk with Communist China about diplomatic recognition is of little significance against the background of General Marshall's statement. What could diplomatic recognition add to the recognition which Marshall has so gratuitously extended to Communist China by his incredible acknowledgment of Communist China's assured victory in North Korea? And in the face of this acknowledgment, what strength or firmness of position remains for America in any future bargainings with her enemies?

The choice before the American people and the Congress is clear-cut and unmistakable.

The choice is supine acceptance of this counsel of defeatism, and of the right openly to proclaim such counsel, or the impeachment and removal of General Marshall and of all others in Government who subscribe to and share in this counsel.

God give the Congress of the United States the courage to do its clear and inescapable duty.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, to the National Society Magna Charta Dames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of addressing the members of the National Society Magna Charta Dames at their annual meeting here in Washington. That organization has the noble purpose of keeping forever alive and maintaining the principles of human freedom set forth in the Magna Charta, principles which have meant so much to mankind since the year 1215. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I was invited to address this distinguished group at your luncheon meeting today, I did not know, of course, that the date would coincide with the appearance of General MacArthur before the joint meeting of the Congress. I am sure, however, that in view of this later development, you will forgive my tardy arrival here.

When my esteemed and dear friend, Mrs. J. Hamilton Lewis honored me by extending such a cordial invitation to be with you today, I was most complimented and was happy to tell her that I would be glad to try to make a small contribution by coming here today and saying a few words on a subject to which I cannot do full justice, so broad and far reaching is its substance and so myriad its implications. Mrs. Lewis contributed immeasurably, in the tradition of so many fine American women, to the distinction and achievements of her husband, the late Senator J. Hamilton Lewis, one of the few men to represent two great States of the Union in the Congress of the United States.

When I received your gracious invitation, I went back and reread the 63 chapters of the Magna Charta, that memorable document wrested by the barons from King John on the plains of Runnymede. Your society is one of few which is dedicated to that great charter of human rights and liberties. Your membership is drawn from women who are the real leaders in the civic, governmental, and social activities of our Nation. It must be a source of real inspiration to all of you gathered here today in common purpose to know that you are helping to further and preserve in the American tradition the concepts of individual rights and human dignity which were set forth so fully and so clearly in that brave declaration.

It is perhaps axiomatic that great leaders and great concepts somehow arise in times of urgent need to preserve civilization as we know it and to reestablish decency in the world. Certainly the Magna Charta was such a concept. It arose out of the hearts of a

people bowed under tyrannical and unendurable oppression, but this final revolt might well have remained for generations a seething resentment without open rebellion had it not been for the flagrant and arbitrary flaunting of individual worth by King John.

Similarly, our American Bill of Rights, the cornerstone of our democracy, was born out of revolt against tyranny and abuses foisted upon the colonies by the King. It was the final sense of outrage and the insurrection of the colonists which led to the establishment of a free nation.

Neither the principles of the Magna Charta nor those of the Bill of Rights were easily obtained merely because they had been proclaimed. Nor were those principles easily won in other parts of the world or in other periods of man's history. Indeed not. From the time of the ancient Greeks, men have fought and died, sacrificed, and suffered for the convictions which they held dear.

This is something which we Americans frequently forget. We have become so accustomed to taking for granted our guaranties of personal liberty that we often overlook their devious and difficult development over the centuries. We forget, too, that freedom as we know it, is unheard of in many parts of the world—lands where the people have always lived in the shadow of oppression and dictatorship. Perhaps this gift of freedom which we Americans hold so lightly would be more precious to us if we paused now and again to remember these things. Perhaps we would guard more carefully against hypocrisy and discrimination and suppression and other abuses committed in the name of freedom if we would stop to recall how dearly it was won.

The founding fathers of our country were only too familiar with the burdens of tyranny down through the ages. They had not forgotten how they suffered and fought against the injustices and absolutism of the monarch, and it was their resolve to establish a set of rules for government by the majority, but which also should provide safeguards for the welfare of the minority. With struggle and privation and death still fresh in their minds, they drew up and adopted the first ten amendments to our Constitution known as the Bill of Rights, which guaranteed to all people the fundamental freedoms on which our democracy is based, and which have been strengthened and reaffirmed over the years in the Halls of Congress and in our courts of justice.

The first attempt to violate this constitutional guaranty came in 1798 when the newly established United States was expecting war with France. The Federalist government, encouraged by public indignation over the XYZ affair, passed a number of repressive bills including the Sedition Act. The resentment of the general public to such legislation was one of the prime causes for the fall of the Federalist Party in 1800, and for its disappearance from national politics.

Although numerous prosecutions were made under the act, and although its constitutionality was challenged, none of the cases ever actually reached the Supreme Court for final determination. Fortunately, the act expired with the party that adopted it. When Thomas Jefferson was elected President of the United States, he pardoned those who had been convicted under the Act and were still imprisoned, and some years later Congress appropriated funds for the families of men who had been incarcerated.

The challenge to the Bill of Rights which was met successfully by the people of this country in 1800 has been repeated at other times during our history as a Nation. The guaranties contained in article I, freedom of speech and of the press, have been threatened repeatedly by repressive legislation, but the American system has always stood fast, a mighty citadel, a shining example to the rest of the world.

Today a new threat hangs over the free world. The threat of Soviet imperialism is more than a dark cloud. It is a real and powerful menace to the liberty which we Americans—we who are privileged to live in this blessed and challenging twentieth century—have taken for granted. We must guard this boon of freedom even more zealously, confronted as we are with this real and present danger, lest the lights go out all over the world and mark a swift return to the Middle Ages and to the tyranny—and oppression—and darkness—that held mankind in bitter bondage and arrested all progress and striving and hope.

In our democracy the dignity and worth of each human being is supreme. Our society strives to afford each individual the greatest possible opportunity to reach his highest fulfillment. The forces of totalitarianism despise and hold for naught each of us as individuals of worth and integrity, and deny that we are endowed by our Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In their concept the state is supreme. Human beings are expendable and must serve the state as it directs.

Freedom of religion, freedom to seek truth, no arrest without a warrant, no arbitrary search and seizure, trial by an impartial jury, free elections, government by law, right of contract—all of these guaranties contained in our Bill of Rights are part of the American tradition. But the evil and fanatical forces of totalitarianism deny the existence of God and the rights of man. Theirs is a government by edict and decree, without consent of the governed. Theirs is a government of state controls. Everyone is subservient to the state and information is distorted to serve the purposes of state propaganda. The Politburo dictators who guide the destinies of this international banditry believe in their own infallibility and must be obeyed, not only in act but in thought, under penalty of death without the right of trial.

This malignant cancer of communism, spreading insidiously over the free world, must be met with all the resourcefulness and courage and determination of which we are capable. Our industrial potential and our military might are daily growing more powerful, but our greatest strength lies in our resolve to defend our freedom with all the vigor at our command and to help others to attain it.

To do this we must be united in fact as well as in purpose. We must strive for nonpartisanship in our international policies. Assuredly there will be differences of opinion, but in America, thank God, these differences can be resolved by hammering them out on the anvil of free and open debate and discussion. Ours is a common goal. We must not only fight for it abroad, we must cherish it and work for it at home.

The threat of the Soviet Union is a menace to our liberty, but here in our own country we have a menace to our livelihood. I refer to the growing danger of inflation. If our national economy is not kept sound and healthy we shall be faced with a serious break in our armor as we face the foreign forces that would enslave us. It is everybody's business to stop inflation, for if the value of the dollar is permitted to decline and decline, the future worth of our savings, our insurance policies, our pensions, and much more is at stake.

Before inflation can be stopped, there must be sacrifices—the same kind of sacrifices that we are so willing to make in a fight for the human rights which have been held so dear down through the centuries. All of us will have to make sacrifices in meeting the bill for higher taxes—an inevitable burden in our mobilization for national defense, but those who work for a living must also have a firm assurance that their goods and services are not to become a source of enrichment for profiteers.

Inflation is a thing about which all of us must do something—something more than just talk. It is up to the leaders of Government, industry, and finance to pull together in a patriotic, economic program that will make sense to the millions who must be called upon for voluntary cooperation and national devotion.

In our patriotic zeal, we must not lose sight of the fact that any act that threatens to cut across our constitutional guaranties of civil liberties threatens the basic premise of our democracy—that in the average individual man and woman resides the security and the hope for the greatest experiment ever conceived in the mind of man. If we relinquish the fundamental concepts set forth by the Magna Charta and guaranteed by our Constitution, even though we dominate the world militarily, we will have lost the heart, the essence of liberty, freedom, and justice under law.

It has been a high privilege for me to come here today and to join with you in the renewal of your dedication and fidelity to the Magna Charta. Animated as all of you are by the highest and most lofty principles, I know that you are determined to do your full share as mothers, wives, and daughters to maintain our freedom and security, not only by words but by setting examples of citizenship in your daily lives. Our free Government was not built by lip service alone and will not survive by it. There must repose in the hearts and souls of all of our people the conviction and determination to sustain it and to live up to our highest principles of unselfish service, honor, and integrity under God.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles relating to the war in Korea, the first entitled "China Reds Have Not Shot Wad," by Constantine Brown; the second entitled "United States Surrendered Independence," by David Lawrence, both published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA REDS HAVE NOT SHOT WAD—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS IN KOREA, FROM GENERAL RIDGWAY DOWN, KNOW ENEMY STILL CAN DELIVER MAJOR BLOWS

(By Constantine Brown)

While our strategists and policy makers debate with a wealth of arguments whether the administration's policy of containing the enemy in Korea or the MacArthur plan of dealing the enemy a determined blow would be our best course, the men in Korea wonder what the enemy will do in the near future.

Everybody from Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway down to the buck privates is convinced that the enemy has not shot his wad yet. They know that he has the capability to deliver major blows with his reserve power. Many officers in Korea believe that the recent spring offensive was nothing more than a probing attack in force, to find out what we have and what we are up to.

In the last 10 days the Reds themselves have broken off contact, after engaging less than half the force at their disposal. All these military actions raise a number of questions in the minds of our commanders in Korea. Those responsible for the security of our forces are concerned as to where and in what force the Chinese will use the sizable air forces which they now have available.

There are many conjectures on this score. Is the Red high command planning, by any chance, a new Pearl Harbor in Japan, while our Air Force is intent on supporting the ground forces? Will that air force be used to protect the supply lines after the renewed offensive succeeds in pushing southward? Will it be used for an all-out assault when the ground force attacks are stalled? Or are the Russian-trained Chinese generals planning a sizable airborne operation in our rear?

All these are puzzling questions. The intelligence services report large concentrations of troops behind the present lines. They also report a continuous build-up of war materials and there is sufficient information that the Reds do have an air force which, while unable to maintain a sustained effort, could do much damage in one surprise blow.

Where that blow may fall is anybody's guess. What seems certain, however, is that there is no more idea in Peiping of an equitable settlement of the Korean problem now than there was a few months ago. It is still all or nothing as far as the Chinese puppets are concerned. By that is meant the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, the admission of Red China to the United Nations; surrender of Formosa to the Peiping government; and participation of the Reds in the Japanese peace treaty. Unless these conditions are met, there is no disposition on the part of the Mao Tse-tung government to listen to the soft voices from Lake Success.

We talk glibly about the punishment we are inflicting on the Reds. It is true that they have suffered about 750,000 casualties so far. But China has a population of nearly a half billion people and China is fighting on only one front—Korea.

So long as our present strategy continues Red China needs only a thin curtain of police troops on her long coast line. The support which Peiping is reported to have promised Ho Chi Minh, the Indochinese Red leader, can be delayed. It is far more important for Chinese-Soviet plans that they make a serious effort to defeat the U. N. forces in Korea than to help the Viet Minh win a victory over the French. Defeat of the United Nations forces would settle the question of Asia, regardless of what western forces remain in Malaya and Indochina.

The Chinese know as well as we do that in view of our commitments elsewhere there are few American forces available to reinforce the allied armies in Korea. Our casualty list amounts to about 6,500 men a month, or the equivalent of four divisions since the outbreak of hostilities last June. They know that of the available forces in the United States, four divisions are in process of being sent to Europe.

The offensive-defensive strategy, which was used frequently during the last war in the Pacific, seems to have become a permanent line of action. The Chinese realize that so long as that military concept is forced on General Ridgway in Korea, their chances of success are unimpaired.

The war of attrition can hurt us more than it hurts them.

United States Surrendered Independence—General Marshall's Testimony Shows 350,000 Soldiers Were Abandoned to Whim of Foreign Cabinets

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary Marshall's testimony is in many respects even more sensational than that of General MacArthur.

For it tells the American people for the first time that they have completely lost their independence of military action in the midst of a war in which 350,000 American boys are engaged.

It tells that decisions made by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are vetoed in secret by other governments without an opportunity for the public opinion of the United States or of the world to be apprised of the facts.

It tells that, although the United States has contributed the bulk of the troops in Korea, the 13 governments which have contributed token forces decided to deny us the right to apply the military doctrine of pursuing the enemy—known as hot pursuit.

It tells that the United Nations has appointed the United States as agent to conduct the military operations but that the agent cannot perform those military operations without continuously obtaining the consent of these allies.

It tells that the United States, though conscious of the importance of an economic blockade to stop strategic materials and munitions from getting to the enemy, has not succeeded in persuading the principal U. N. countries now involved in that trade to stop it, even though 10 months of war in Korea have elapsed.

It tells that all these troubles and friction between the United States and its allies were never communicated to General MacArthur except in the vaguest terms.

It tells, by implication, that the famous 13-nation declaration which was supposed to bring about a negotiation of a cease fire was never sent to General MacArthur and that only a brief message saying some such announcement was planned went to him on March 20 last.

It tells that the United States Government at present opposes the entry of Red China into the U. N. and opposes turning Formosa over to Communist China but that the United States Government is nevertheless willing to discuss these subjects as matters for negotiation with the Red Chinese when they agree to a cease fire.

It tells that the United States will adhere to that policy but it doesn't tell whether the United States will use its veto to turn down such a reward for aggression or will merely bow to the will of the U. N. countries eventually, as it has done on some of the military measures proposed to the U. N.

It tells that General MacArthur carried out his military instructions as Far East commander and did not violate any military orders but that his public statements—his letter answering a Member of Congress, Representative Martin, and his interviews answering questions that were asked by the press concerning military operations—were distasteful to the President and his advisers and really caused his dismissal.

It tells that only four men sat in with President Truman and recommended summary dismissal of General MacArthur—Messrs. Acheson, Harriman, Bradley, and Marshall.

It tells that the Joint Chiefs favored a replacement but did not have anything to do with the form of dismissal. It doesn't tell whether the Joint Chiefs were told that the President was displeased with General MacArthur's statements and was considering a change in command.

It tells that the summary dismissal was decided on suddenly as a means of preventing General MacArthur from making any further statements to the press and from developing a sort of "cumulative affair" of publicity. This has since come about anyway with probably more cumulative statements and hearings than anybody ever imagined.

It tells that the Secretary of Defense of the United States does not believe the enemy can be driven out of Korea, but he hopes they will withdraw after their offensives fail. He doesn't think bombardment of Manchurian bases will chase them out either, though he concedes that diversionary operations such as a blockade and other military efforts in southeast Asia may cause them to tire of their effort to stay in Korea.

It tells that in a moment of great crisis—when MacArthur's troops were being pushed back last December after Red China entered the war—the U. N. allies became frightened and began to limit the operations of the U. N. troops, especially in fighting back in the air.

It tells that instructions went to General MacArthur forbidding him to bomb even two big distributing centers in North Korea which were 35 miles below the northern border of the country and well within Korea itself.

It tells that, despite General MacArthur's titles as supreme commander in Japan and U. N. commander and commander in chief of the far eastern forces, Secretary Marshall regarded General MacArthur as just another "local theater commander," without the latitude of expression to comment on military events that General Eisenhower had or Admiral Nimitz had or General MacArthur himself had during the last war, and without even the right to engage in psychological warfare in his own theater of action because it might offend U. N. allies.

There are many more things revealed, the significance of which will become apparent as the hearings continue. But none is more vital than the revelation that America, although contributing the bulk of the military forces and the supplies, has surrendered her independence of action and her leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets.

Committee Draft of the Republican Platform for Current Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the draft of the Republican platform of New Jersey for the current year which I obtained permission to have printed in the RECORD today is as follows:

To Delegates of the 1951 Republican State Convention:

Pursuant to the provisions of R. S. 19: 5-6, the resolutions committee of the Republican State convention herewith submits its tentative platform.

This is a preliminary draft subject to amendment at the next session of the convention on May 10.

TENTATIVE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1951

The Republican Party of New Jersey offers its candidates for the State legislature against a background of solid accomplishments without equal in the history of our State.

Under the leadership of Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, the Republican Party for the past 4 years has carried forward a program of sound, prudent, progressive legislation so ably begun in 1944 by the Republican administration of Gov. Walter E. Edge.

It is a record of pledges kept, of cooperation between executive and legislature, and of full emphasis at all times upon the welfare of all of the people.

Two years ago, by reason of the adoption of the new State constitution, the citizens of New Jersey were afforded the opportunity to approve the Republican administration then in office. Such approval was voted by the people despite a campaign of misrepresentation by the Democratic Party without precedent in this State. We call attention to the fact that the Democratic Party has given evidence that it intends, once again, to wage a similar campaign in an effort to wrest control from those who have served our State so well.

The Democratic Party is now directing criticism to some legislation of the past few years in complete disregard of the fact that its members voted for much of what they now condemn. In the true fashion of political opportunism, the Democratic Party now, as in the past, seeks to be all things to all persons. It has proposed vast new spending programs while criticizing present State appropriations, yet all the while it is compelled to admit that New Jersey, under Republican administration, has the lowest per capita State tax collection in the Nation.

It is proper to ask how the Democratic Party proposes to carry out its many and varied spending proposals without foisting a State income tax or a consumers' sales tax, or both, on the people of New Jersey.

The Democratic Party has revealed itself to be a party without responsibility, and must be judged accordingly.

In contrast, the candidates of the Republican Party go before the people with this record and program:

1. Civil defense: Under Republican leadership, New Jersey has taken first place among the States in establishing a civil defense program. This has been attested to by the award of Freedom's Foundation, by the Federal Director of Civil Defense, and by the Council of State Governments.

Our compacts with neighboring States are an outstanding example of mutual assistance in this vital matter.

We pledge our efforts to continue and expand this program.

2. Taxes: We shall seek to maintain New Jersey's advantageous tax position. To that end we shall continue to resist the imposition of an income or sales tax.

3. Highways: No State has faced greater problems of highway transportation than has New Jersey, not alone because of its areas of dense population but also because of its unique position as a corridor between two of the Nation's greatest cities, and none has moved more swiftly to meet this challenge.

For the past several years, under Republican administrations, New Jersey has carried on the greatest highway program in its history.

The New Jersey Turnpike, one of the great engineering achievements of our day, was conceived and is being built by a Republican administration, and will soon be in operation.

A major part of route 4 parkway has been opened; others are under construction.

Traffic relief for our cities, such as the Trenton Freeway, has been a prime objective.

Nevertheless, the need for even more immediate relief is apparent. We must approach with courage the solution of the terrible traffic problem which, particularly in our urban areas, threatens the economic strangulation of the State.

Therefore, we urge thorough study of various proposals for highway construction beyond the extent of present appropriations from current revenues.

4. Law enforcement: We pledge our continuing support to the further development of law enforcement in all its aspects.

Establishment of the department of law and public safety, under provisions of the new State constitution, has resulted in the strengthening of law enforcement in all our counties.

Where defects have become apparent, they are being swiftly corrected on the initiative of the attorney general.

5. School aid: (a) State aid for schools is now at an all-time high. Since 1946, under Republican administrations, it has increased 548 percent.

(b) This record has been achieved despite repeal of the annual $16,000,000 State school tax on real estate and the turning over of $5,000,000 in annual railroad taxes to the municipalities.

(c) Under successive Republican administrations, minimum salaries of school teachers have been increased from $1,200 annually to $2,500 annually.

(d) We shall continue to improve the school system and, within the limits of available State revenues, give additional aid to school districts.

6. New industry: (a) During the past 4 years, more than 3,500 new industries have located in New Jersey. This year, more than one-third of all money expended in the Nation for industrial and other research is being spent in New Jersey.

(b) We shall continue to improve the economic climate of our State so as to attract additional industries to New Jersey.

(c) We have recognized the need for additional water supplies for New Jersey and shall continue our efforts toward that objective.

7. Agriculture: New Jersey farms enjoy the highest cash income per farm-acre in the Nation. We shall continue to assist agriculture by our support of research at the agricultural experiment station at the State University and by the development of our State road system.

8. Labor and employment security: Under Republican administrations, New Jersey has set the pace among all States in legislation beneficial to the employee. Our employment security insurance programs should be revised upward to offset the burdens of an inflationary cost of living. Our mediation service continues to function with unsurpassed success to the benefit of both labor and management.

We pledge our continuing support of these and related programs.

9. Institutions, welfare, and health: (a) A $25,000,000 institutional building program, initiated by a Republican administration, is under way. We have achieved great progress in improving the condition of the unfortunate wards of the State. We pledge our continuing efforts in their behalf.

(b) We pledge a thorough study of our many welfare systems to the end that they may be carried on with maximum efficiency and economy.

(c) Great strides have been made in the development of our State health services, as most recently exemplified by legislation for the creation of consolidated health districts. Efficient administration of the State department of health has achieved striking economies which have permitted creation of many new long-needed services. We pledge our support to the improvement of our health program.

10. Medical college: We favor and will support the establishment of a State medical college.

11. Pension and public funds: Our Republican administration, through creation of a division of investment in the department of the treasury, has greatly strengthened the State's investment procedure, with substantial gain to the State's treasury, pension, and other funds. We shall continue to support this program.

12. Civil-service and State employees: Development of our civil-service system has been a major objective of Republican administrations. We shall continue our efforts to adjust the salaries of State employees to meet rising living costs.

13. Conservation and recreation: The Republican Party has consistently supported programs for the conservation of the State's natural resources, the development of its resort areas, and the needs of sportsmen. We shall continue to do so.

14. Motor vehicles: During the past year the Republican administration sponsored legislation for a much-needed revision of the State traffic code, including a realistic revision of the speed laws. Further development of safety programs to reduce the death toll on the State's highways will have our support.

15. Legislative procedure: We recommend the immediate adoption, in the legislative process, of the committee system whereby frequent public hearings will be held, bills reported either favorably or unfavorably, and the committees' reasons therefor made a matter of public record.

16. Economy and efficiency: Adoption of the new State constitution now recognized as a model for all States, has made possible annual savings of more than $2,000,000 in the operation of State agencies. By maintaining the lowest State budget of any comparable State, the Republican Party has demonstrated that prudent, progressive government without loss of essential services can be attained.

17. The courts: An antiquated judicial system has been transformed under Republican leadership into what today is admittedly the Nation's best system, founded upon sound principles, swift in its operations, bipartisan in nature (in contrast to the partisan Federal system), and free of political interference.

18. Civil liberties: Under Republican leadership laws have been enacted guaranteeing to the people of New Jersey greater civil liberties than those enjoyed in any other State.

19. Veterans: Under Republican guidance New Jersey has been first and foremost in providing benefits of housing, rehabilitation, and employment and business opportunities for its war veterans. This program has already been extended to veterans of the present national emergency.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

The present Democratic administration in Washington stands condemned as completely lacking the capacity for leadership necessary to meet the grave problems confronting us at home and abroad. Through its tragic performance, it has jeopardized the security and freedom of all our people.

The present Democratic administration has countenanced, and indeed encouraged, the destruction of morality in public affairs almost beyond precedent.

The present Democratic administration has sought to impose upon the American people vast new spending proposals, with a resultant increase in the tax burden, at a time when necessary expenditures for national defense require prudence in the everyday affairs of government.

We condemn particularly the refusal of the present Democratic administration to extend the bipartisan foreign policy to the Far East, with tragic results. We seek peace, not war. Toward that end we must strengthen, rather than weaken, our association with the forces of freedom; and we shall not sanction the appeasement of the Communist forces which seek to destroy freedom.

In the conduct of our national affairs, we stand for these basic principles:

1. Reduce the size of the National Government.

2. Reduce the cost of the National Government.

3. Restore to the individual States their proper sovereignty over taxes and territory.

4. Restore a sense of decency and integrity in Washington.

CONCLUSION

No citizen today can escape responsibility for government—be it at the National, State, county, or municipal level. Wise, honest, economical government is the concern of all. For the past 7 years New Jersey, under Republican administrations, has enjoyed that kind of government.

The Republican record is clear. On the basis of that record, and on the principles set forth in this platform, the Republican candidates for the legislature merit the confidence, support, and votes of the people of New Jersey.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID VAN ALSTYNE, Jr.,
Chairman,
ALFRED C. CLAPP,
GERALDINE L. THOMPSON,
FRANK W. SHERSHIN,
WAYNE DUMONT, Jr.

MAY 3, 1951.

The Stake in the Future of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following statement made by me Sunday, May 6, 1951, Ellenville, N. Y., under the auspices of the American Financial Development Corp. for Israel—State of Israel bonds:

THE STAKE IN THE FUTURE OF ISRAEL

I think that if all speeches I made on Israel were put end to end, we would have enough for a kite to fly all of us to Jerusalem.

Long before I visited Israel the principles of Zionism had caught my imagination. The dynamic force which was to lead the children of Zion home again was to me one of the most stirring dramas of our time.

When the State of Israel was proclaimed 3 years ago—less 1 week—it was as if the sparks of a star were shooting out in all directions to bring the news to the world. I was at the Israeli Embassy—then the Jewish Agency—in Washington when the news came that President Truman had recognized de facto the Government of Israel. I shall remember forever the cries of joy that spontaneously burst forth, the tears that spilled uninhibitedly from all who were there, and then the silence as eyes, eloquent with the vision of a promise fulfilled, watched the raising of the Israeli flag over the building on Massachusetts Avenue in our Nation's Capital.

Then I visited Israel in October 1948, during the time of the second truce. What I saw there fed the fuel of my excitement. What I saw there was not propaganda, was not the effusions of a public relations writer. This was it. This little country, no bigger than our own State of New Jersey, of some 600,000 population, was battling a coalition of seven Arab countries, was forming a government, filling posts from that of Prime Minister all the way down the line to that of customs official. They were building the Burma Road which saved the people of the new city of Jerusalem from destruction. Reception and rehabilitation centers for the immigrants arriving at the rate of 25,000 a month dotted the countryside. At the same time they were building houses, irrigating the soil, exploring the Negev, and with it all they were writing books, singing songs, performing opera, and making music. I had never experienced its like. Here were a people beset with every hardship you can name, and yet here were people fighting, working, singing, marching, building, creating, and telling jokes.

Amazing and incredulous. Had I not seen it, I would not believe it were possible. Hope, courage, ingenuity, and sacrifice resided in every person I talked with from the newly arrived Yemenite to the military commander. And enthusiasm. They had not yet themselves absorbed the fact that the State of Israel is a State in its own right, independent and free to work out its destiny. Greater than the enthusiasm of a bride in her new home, here was the joy of living I had never encountered before.

So I have talked and talked throughout this country, trying to tell what I saw. I talked to American officials again and again and again pointing to Israel as a triumph of American principles. Was it not wonderful for us that democracy facing the foes of totalitarianism should find its expression in a region of the world which had never even heard the word before, let alone understood what it meant?

I have talked at fund-raising campaigns for the Jewish national fund, for the United Jewish appeal, for Hadassah, for Youth Allyah, reciting the hardships in Israel, reciting the plight of the immigrants trying to reach the heart of American Jewry.

But today I speak on a different plane. Today I speak not of the infancy of the state, but of its maturity, its coming of age. Today I speak of Israel's first bond issue, its independence issue in the sum of $500,000,000. It is this issue which marks the dignity of Israel. It is this issue which will ultimately release Israel from the status of being looked upon as a philanthropic venture. The dollars with which you buy Israeli bonds will be your dollars, returned to you in dollars plus interest.

This will be the dollar of production. The bond issue has one purpose and one purpose only; that is, the economic consolidation of Israel. It will not be used for food, for clothing, and the like. It will be used for industry and power, for agriculture, for transportation, and it is this production which will bridge the gap between imports and exports. The dollar which brought the immigrants out of the DP camp and from the ghettos of North Africa is not what the bankers call the productive dollar. This is the dollar which has its return in human satisfactions, but what Israel needs now is the dollar to build up her production in terms of industry and agriculture so as to satisfy her domestic and her foreign markets.

For example, presently Israel pays vast sums of moneys for food which is the greatest single item of import to Israel. Through these borrowed dollars of the bond issue, Israel will create a state of agricultural self-sufficiency within a period of 3 years so that the tremendous sums paid for imported food can be subtracted from the debit side of her trade ledger.

Israel can and will do it. Mind you, 275 new agricultural settlements have been established in the last 13 months as against 225 which were established over the previous 60 years. This ability to achieve agricultural self-sufficiency was recently understood by the loan of $135,000,000 from our own Export-Import Bank to Israel.

In the industrial field Israel will expand her existing industries and create new ones. Already a network of commercial treaties, markets, and contacts exist with Turkey, with Greece, Italy, and Western Europe. It is an indisputable economic fact that Israel has no scarcity of markets. It is rather of problem in limitations of production.

Let it be remembered that Israel has one of the most favorable geographical positions in the world. Her ports and airfields are at a point where three continents meet. It is both a center of world commerce and an ideal warehouse and assembly plant for Asia. With the availability of technical skill which only Israel has in the Middle East, firms like Kaiser-Frazer, Philco, and others have invested heavily in establishment of factories in Israel. Today Israel is engaged in such industries as diamond cutting and polishing, the manufacture of precision instruments, machines, tools, munitions, agricultural machinery, and automotive parts, chemicals, and pharmaceutics, textiles, and clothing, printing, leather—to name a few.

In July of 1950, 65,024 were employed in industry, exclusive of handicrafts and the number of industrial enterprises reaching a peak of 300,355—an increase of 42 percent since May 14, 1948. The wool and leather industries particularly expanded into mass production operation.

Let us look at a few of its other developments. Since the establishment of the State of Israel, its merchant marine has grown from 6 ships to 30 ships; from 14,000 gross tonnage to 95,000 gross tonnage. Israel has its own airline—El-Al—which maintains regular flights between Israel and England, France, and other countries. Twelve international airlines use the Israeli airport's facilities.

Israel has a growing tourist industry. In 1949, 22,000 tourists visited Israel. This number increased by 50 percent in 1950.

Today Israel exports citrus fruits, and by-products, diamonds, woolen products, apparel, chocolates and sweets, cotton products, pharmaceutical products, wine and liquors, essential oil, and other industrial products.

Let me quote a few words from the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, who in referring to Israel's achievements in the economic field, said:

"This record of progress in agriculture and industry is particularly noteworthy in view of the complex and difficult problems which Israel has had to face during this period. The very fact that domestic output of needed commodities has been steadily increasing has had a stabilizing effect on the economy of the new nation. The citizens of Israel have confidence that their growing national production will effectively safeguard the economic integrity of their state. And we who have watched the achievements which have been made to date can share in that confidence."

Israel's development in 3 years has been an amazing and exciting record. If you go back far enough in the history of our own United States, you will find that people of Europe questioned whether finance should send money into the wilderness that was then the United States. Surely we can say safely that those who did had no regrets. If we look at other countries which are small in area, but which have utilized the skill and wit of their people together with their geographical situation, the size of the country, you will find, was no barrier to stability and security.

I cite the example of Switzerland, a country with few raw materials, Holland and the Scandinavian countries. Here small populations within small areas have secured for themselves economic strength which far, far larger countries have been unable to achieve.

Israel has absorbed over 500,000 people within 2½ years. If we use the same proportion with the United States in terms of population, it would be as if the United States had absorbed 120,000,000 destitute refugees in 2 years. In fact, the United States never in any single year increased its population by more than 3 percent. Yet Israel at the end of 1954 will have increased its population by 200 percent within a period

of 5 years of unrestricted immigration. And Israel was able to do this with its political, economic, and social institutions still standing firm and expanding.

The source of Israel's pride in maintaining her open-door immigration policy is also the reason for the dollar gap which purchase of the moneys realized from the sale of bonds will bridge. This mass immigration to Israel is the most unique in history. World Jewry has sent tens of thousands of immigrants to Israel. I don't believe it is as well known a fact as it should be that out of the total sums which have been spent on the direct cost of the immigration of Jews from outside to Israel, the Israeli community itself has furnished two-thirds of the cost. Only one-third of the financial means for the transportation and absorption of immigration has been provided by the entire Jewish people of the world, including the Jewish community in the United States.

There have been those who questioned this open-door policy. Yet that is the central theme of Israel's national life, the object for which it was founded.

As Ambassador Eban so eloquently put it: "The doors must remain open. The people of Israel who once had to stand by, passive and inert, while millions of their kinsmen were consigned to the slaughter house and the crematorium, while they had no power to intervene or to rescue through lack of any prerogatives of statehood, will never allow that situation to recur, now that the capacity of liberation lies in their hands. Whatever the burden and whatever the cost, however cruel the encroachments upon existing standards of life—in all conditions and in all circumstances, the policy of unrestricted immigration must be maintained. Israel dares not accept the responsibility for whatever may befall Jews who seek immigration and are denied it."

International tensions increase. The iron-curtain countries play a cat-and-mouse game with Jewish inhabitants who seek to go to Israel. Now the passport is granted. Now it is withheld. Dangers increase daily for Jews residing in the Arab countries. If Israel's doors were to be shut against them, she will have failed in her pledge to the Jewish people the world over. From Yemen and Iraq, from North Africa and Iran, the Jews have come in wave upon wave, choosing freely the life in Israel which to them spells out an escape from the discrimination and the degradation in which they and their past generations have lived in Israel. They are irresistibly drawn to Israel as the homing pigeon to its final destination.

No other country in the world has ever undertaken a project of this magnitude, and Israel has carried on, as I said before, developing the country in all its aspects despite the staggering problems the immigrants have brought with them.

This should be the source of greatest pride to Jews—Israel is an ideal in action, combining vision and practicability. Israel has given the world a new definition in the meaning of absorptive capacity of the country and elasticity of its borders. Physically the boundary lines are set, but within these boundaries the expansion is limited only as the will of its people is limited—only as science and planning are limited.

If there are any of us skeptical of the final redemption of the bond issue, let me point out that Israel cannot afford not to pay its debts. Israel, by its bond issue, is on trial before the world, a world not entirely friendly to Israel. If she fails to repay her indebtedness, her standing as a nation among nations will be shattered. This Israel knows, but she also knows that all the factors are in her favor, not in her imagination alone but actually and factually.

Israel desperately needs these dollars, but Israel does not come abegging. She asks that you lend your dollar to be repaid to you with interest in 12 or 15 years, according to which type of bond you buy. Nor does she ask that you lend your dollar and deprive yourself of its earning power. Israel wants the dollar to go to work for her and for you.

There are two impelling reasons for those of us here tonight to invest in Israeli bonds. At no cost to ourselves and with profit, actual money profit, we serve ourselves as Americans and as Jews. As Americans we cannot for one single moment lose sight of the fact that a democracy wherever it exists sustains and strengthens democracy everywhere. A democracy in the Middle East—a democracy alive with skills, techniques, machinery—is a vital part in securing world peace. Only one such democracy exists in the Middle East, and that is Israel. If Israel fails, then the enemies of democracy will point to its failure as conclusive proof that the principle of democracy as expressed in a democratic form of government cannot bring security to itself and to its people. If Israel fails, it is that much more grist to the Communist propaganda mill.

Let us not underrate the significance of Israel in the clash of ideas. The failure of Israel will be one of the biggest blows against democracy.

As Jews, Israel's failure will endanger the stature of Jews wherever they may be. The accomplishments of Israel, socially, economically, and on the battlefield, have raised the stature of Jews everywhere. It has been put this way: The world will look at the Jewish people, and every single non-Jew will look at every single Jew, in accordance with the success or failure, the credit or the deficiency of the State of Israel, which is the only collective expression of the Jewish genius in modern times.

Whether we will it or not, whether it suits our individual preference or not—the fact still remains that the judgment of the world in favor or against the Jewish people will derive from the success or the failure of Israel.

The investment in Israel is an investment without risk. Your collateral is the existence of the state of Israel—her people, her resources, her ingenuity, her skills, and her unbelievable accomplishments in the three short years of her life as a nation. Your return counted out in interest-bearing dollars can be accurately measured, but your return in the expansion and security of democracy and in the security and the dignity of Jews all over the world cannot be measured. Your investment is your stake in the future for yourself, for your children, and your children's children, and for Israel, and her children, and her children's children.

Recent Soviet Pressures on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is a background summary issued by the State Department on this subject. It shows the vital importance that the Kremlin attaches to Germany and explains why the Communist representative at the conference of the four-power deputies in Paris to prepare an agenda for a four-power conference is emphasizing so much the German issue.

At a time when our foreign policy is being reappraised it is also important to note what the Communists are after in Europe as a clue to their general designs on the free peoples.

The State Department summary follows:

RECENT SOVIET PRESSURES ON GERMANY

The people of the United States and of many other countries are awaiting the outcome of recent correspondence between the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, on one hand and the U. S. S. R. on the other. This correspondence, initiated by the Kremlin on November 3, 1950, is concerned with proposals for a four-power conference. The original Soviet proposal would have confined discussions to the question of German demilitarization, with the Prague declaration of October as basis for negotiations. The Allied Powers rejected the Prague declaration as a suitable basis for negotiations and have maintained throughout the exchange of notes that the issue is not Germany, but the underlying causes of international tensions throughout the world, and that to limit the discussions to German affairs would be inadequate and unrealistic. In its most recent note, of February 5, the Kremlin conceded that the Prague declaration did not necessarily have to be accepted as the basis of discussion but repeated its former statement that the first and foremost consideration of the conference should be the total demilitarization of Germany; it considers possible the discussion of other questions—on certain conditions—and has no objections to a preliminary meeting in Paris to arrange an agenda.

Without agreement on the agenda, there would be little point in having a conference. Even with agreement on the subjects to be discussed, it would be an extraordinary conference that could resolve such differences as have already produced a war in Asia. By their very nature, the Soviet notes have aroused serious doubts that the Kremlin actually wants a conference. Why, if the Kremlin sincerely wants to resolve differences and improve east-west relations, does it use the diplomatic note as a medium for recriminations and charges that have no factual basis? Past experience and current intelligence have made the United States skeptical of the Kremlin's good faith.

KOREA: A CASE IN POINT

Recent history offers Korea as a case in point. In June 1949, in accordance with a proposal from the Kremlin, the United States withdrew its occupation troops from the southern Republic of Korea; the United Nations checked on the fact of the withdrawal. In December the Kremlin announced that it had withdrawn Soviet troops from the northern People's Republic but refused to permit the United Nations to verify the statement. Six months later the Communist North Koreans invaded the Republic of Korea. From the sidelines, the U. S. S. R., officially a member of the United Nations, consistently supported the aggressors, and, by virtue of Soviet manipulation, the Communist North's invasion of South Korea became overnight United States-inspired aggression by South Korea against the Soviet-dominated People's Republic.

SOVIET TACTICS IN GERMANY

The German people were quick to perceive analogy between their position and that of the Koreans. In the event that they might overlook the resemblance, the U. S. S. R., from the very beginning of the Korean war, linked Germany with Korea. By June 27, 1950, 3 days after the invasion of South Korea, Soviet propaganda media were informing the German people that Korea was a test case for the planned American attack

upon the German democratic republic. Within a few days, Soviet-controlled press and radio had built up the legend that the United States had planned a new world war and that American intervention in Korea was a part of a design to establish a ring of military bases around Asia as a preliminary to attacking Manchuria, China, and the U. S. S. R.

Since the early days of the occupation of Germany, the U. S. S. R. has sought to discredit the western powers—the United States in particular—with the German people. In July 1946, the U. S. S. R. charged the United States with having reduced German reparations with intent to rearm Western Germany. Since that time, Soviet propaganda has reiterated periodically and with ever-increasing volume the accusation that the United States is remilitarizing Germany. While hurling these charges at the United States, and occasionally at France and Britain, the U. S. S. R., under pretense of forming a "people's police," has been engaged in training substantial paramilitary forces in East Germany.

Last August, Moscow-trained Deputy Minister-President Walter Ulbricht, of the East German Government, speaking before an East Berlin convention of the SED (Socialist Unity Party, the Communist Party of East Germany), uttered a clear call to sabotage in Western Germany, exploiting the beating that U. N. forces were currently taking in Korea as prophetic of what would happen to them and their puppets in Western Germany in the near future. To be precise, he instructed West Germans to hinder militarization, boycott goods and food imported from the United States, defy all Bonn and Allied High Commission orders, find out where armament production was planned and then foment strikes among the workers, fight attempts to create a West German army, prevent showing of American films, and introduction of American dances, oppose all steps favoring the Schuman plan, the Marshall plan, the Council of Europe, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, support the East Zone German Democratic Republic, and be ready to take up arms for the Soviet Union.

Throughout the summer preceding the fixed October elections in the east zone, Soviet fear-propaganda burgeoned. An industrial police force attached to the United States Army in the American zone to perform service functions became "the core of a new and powerful West German army." From unkown sources came the figure of 287,000 for the existing man strength of such units and 30 for the number of divisions planned. For Communist propaganda purposes, a listing by the Federal German Republic of war materials subject to import control by the Military Security Board became a list of weapons that the Federal Republic had agreed to import at the expense of West German economy. West Germany, so the Soviet warning went, was clearly going to become a battleground for warmongering, imperialistic America and her satellites, the hour was later than the Western Germans thought, and the only hope of escaping such a fate lay in joining forces with the peace-loving U. S. S. R.

The September 19 communiqué of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, calling an end to a state of war with Germany, removing a number of restrictions, and approving a mobile Federal police force of 30,000 for Western Germany, raised protests in the U. S. S. R. and a few questions in the minds of the German people. To some of the latter the authorization of a Federal police smacked of militarism. Some considered it a sensible precaution in view of the frequent forays by east zone rioters into the west; many feared that the formation of a Federal police would provoke attack from the east. Talk of remilitarization and participation in the West European army increased nervousness. Western guaranties of defense in the event of attack from the east had a somewhat hollow ring in view of the disparity between the 175 divisions that the U. S. S. R. was reported to have on tap behind the iron curtain and the scant half dozen divisions immediately available to the western nations if the U. S. S. R. should suddenly decide to move into the west.

Once the "Unity" SED ballot had been endorsed by all East Germans who wished to avoid the charge of being "uncooperative," the U. S. S. R. held an East bloc conference of foreign ministers in Prague under Molotov's chairmanship in October 21 and 22. Out of this conference came a four-point communiqué that blasted the rearmament of Western Germany as if it were an accomplished fact and called for an all-German "peace" industry, a peace treaty plus withdrawal of all occupation troops, and the formation of an all-German council to prepare a provisional government for a reunited Germany. Five months earlier, on May 26, the Allied High Commissioners had forwarded to General Chuikov, their counterpart in the Soviet Zone, proposals of the three foreign ministers for achieving German unity. The proposals were for free all-German elections for a national assembly empowered to frame an all-German constitution, the elections to be held under international supervision and on the basis of an electoral law embodying bona fide democratic principles. To date General Chuikov has made no reply, and the Prague conference ignored the fact that such proposals had been made. The program developed at Prague was just about what West Germany had been predicting as a follow-up of the fraudulent October elections. The pattern emerging bore an unpleasant resemblance to the Korean pattern: "unity list" elections under Soviet supervision; proposal for the withdrawal of occupation troops. Would Communist invasion of the non-Communist zone come next?

Moscow followed up the Prague ultimatum with rejection of the much earlier British, French, and United States protest against the formation of the East Zone paramilitary forces. It was at this point that the Kremlin asked for a four-power conference on the demilitarization of Germany, just in time, so the free German press suggested, to influence the American November elections.

While awaiting the response to the proposal for a conference "to bring peace to the world," Soviet propaganda played up the Prague program for all it was worth, painting in lurid colors the fate of Western Germany should it fail to support the program; West Germany would become a wasteland; brother would kill brother; taxes would soar; German families would be thrown into the streets to provide housing for McCloy's new divisions; American gangsters would loose upon Germany the same horrors that they were currently visiting upon Korea; peace-loving German men, women, and children would be shot, hanged, or crucified, and such German youth as escaped that fate would deteriorate rapidly under the influence of American jazz and Coca-Cola. The triumph of the SPD (Social Democratic Party) in the November elections in the Laender of Western Germany, even though the elections cost American-zone Communists their seats in Parliament, was hailed by the National Front (a Communist-cover organization developed in the east zone and designed to appeal to West Germans, to promote unification on Soviet terms) as proof that the West Germans were wholeheartedly behind the Prague program and unification according to Soviet ideas. The timing of the arrival of American troop reinforcements and some British tanks for the Allied sectors of Berlin inspired the Soviet slogan of "tank elections" for the free elections held in west Berlin on December 3.

In response to the edict of the Second World Peace Congress, held in Warsaw in November, the East German puppet government issued a so-called Law for the Protection of Peace providing penalties of 5 years to life imprisonment for any German—East or West—who spoke or wrote war propaganda, and the death penalty for any guilty person who worked for the benefit of other governments. It was a handy law under which any German—wherever he might live—who opposed the National Front could, if apprehended, be gotten out of the way. In some instances West Germans were kidnaped in broad daylight on the streets of the west sectors of Berlin and spirited away into the Soviet sector. Following closely upon the prohibition of freedom of speech and press were measures compelling East German families to send their children to the state schools and charging the Labor Ministry with supervision and control of all out-of-school activities of the young, thus making absolute the control of the Communist Party over East German youth.

After the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Council on December 18 and 19, the National Front did not fail to exploit the fact that the Chinese Communists had the UN forces on the run in Korea to prophesy that West Germans, should they accept the Brussels decisions, would be inviting the same fate as the Koreans were currently suffering—the fate that the Germans themselves had suffered in 1945 as a consequence of Hitler's leadership.

FACTORS TO BE REMEMBERED

The North Atlantic Council agreed at Brussels that there should be one German division for every five non-German divisions in the unified European defense force if the people of Western Germany were willing to participate. As yet the Western Germans have not indicated their willingness. Since the U. S. S. R. insists that the Western Powers are rearming Western Germany when they are not and that the Soviet Union is not arming Eastern Germany when it is, the idea of limiting a conference with the Western Powers to the subject of demilitarizing Germany—or even making this issue the principal subject—is absurd. For purposes of the conference, Russia prefers to ignore the fact that there is a war in Korea and another in Indochina and that those wars and the tensions created by them are related to Communist versus democratic differences.

Reliable reports indicate that Russia's satellites have increased their armed strength since the outbreak of war in Korea and that the U. S. S. R. has 35 fully armored or mechanized divisions in East Germany and Poland alone and virtually limitless manpower within its own borders. Reports reveal also that the Russians have now restored the rail lines which they had dug up and taken away from Eastern Germany shortly after the surrender. These railways, in the event of war with the Western Powers, would be the supply line from Russia proper through the Soviet zone of Germany.

On January 15 of this year, the SED in Eastern Germany launched a large-scale purge of its oversize membership. Party cards have been called in, and every holder is obliged to submit to a personal and comprehensive examination on the fine points of doctrine. In accordance with the promises of Deputy Minister-President Ulbricht, the weak links in the Soviet chain are being eliminated and the Communist-trained Free German Youth (FGY) will be used to replace questionable fellow travelers and opportunists.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on May 3 I had hoped to be able to make a few remarks in honor of Poland's Constitution Day, but the hearings before the combined Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services prevented me from being on the floor to make this statement. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement which I planned to make on May 3 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

As we fittingly observe once again the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, we recall that the Polish people, first defenders of the Christian faith against the Mohammedan Turk and the first defenders of Christian freedom against the totalitarian Nazi, symbolize for freemen everywhere the spirit of noble resistance against the godless forces of evil.

We Americans revere and cherish our Constitution, but no less so do the Polish people, and it is therefore fitting that we ever keep sharply separate in our minds the very fundamental differences existing between the freedom-loving Polish people and the government that purports to represent them. During my service as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations last autumn, I saw at first hand those who call themselves the representatives of the Polish people. I heard these so-called representatives of the people of Poland day after day heap insults on the forces of decency, sneer at democracy, and mouth their robotlike echoes of the Kremlin party line. Knowing the Polish people as I do, it came forcibly home to me how very important it is that we keep reminding ourselves how utterly unrepresentative are these cynical and insincere puppets of the true Poland and the principles of the true Polish Constitution, whose anniversary we observe here today.

"Polonia Restituta"—the inspiring words which adorn the medal with which the Polish people honor their friends—are words which recall to the masters of the Kremlin that although they may have temporary political dominance over Poland, they will never be the masters of the soul of Poland. The words "Polonia Restituta" are both a warning and a hope for the future.

Crime, Corruption, and the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night, Monday, May 7, it was my pleasure to deliver an address at a banquet given by the Citizens' Union of New York. The theme of the dinner was Crime, Corruption, and the Community.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS IN COMBATING CRIME

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

Mark Twain used to say that everyone complains about the weather, but no one does anything about it. So, too, for a long time in this country, a lot of people have complained about crime, worried and moaned about crime. But, very few people have bothered to do anything constructive to eliminate it.

SALUTE TO CITIZENS' UNION

Among the exceptions have been outstanding civic organizations like your own Citizens' Union. I salute every individual who has been associated with this and similar civic organizations—for example, with voluntary citizen crime commissions from coast to coast. You can and should feel a deep sense of pride in the fine job which you have been performing.

TODAY'S CRIME IS BUSINESSLIKE

In Washington our Kefauver crime committee is now 1 year old.

What have we learned? A lot of things. One of them is that the gangster of 1951 uses the most up-to-the-minute, streamlined methods of 1951. The "tommy gun" of the 1920's and 1930's has largely been replaced by less deadly "typewriters" and by adding machines. Modern crime is a scientific, skilled business, operating with machine-like efficiency.

ANTICRIME GROUPS VITAL

Well, what are we going to do about it? I say: Organize further against it. In politics, there is an old saying that "it takes an organization to defeat an organization." It takes an organization devoted to crime prevention and crime curbing to smash organizations devoted to spreading crime. It takes an organization—consisting of men and women of the highest integrity, men and women who have no political axes to grind—to help smash crime.

GREAT CRUSADE NEEDED TO ROUT TERMITES

I have been with the crime committee across the length and breadth of this country, from Washington, D. C., to Kansas City, to Las Vegas to Los Angeles. The more I see of crime and corruption, the more I recognize that it has been so effective in undermining the very foundations of our society that it will take an overwhelming drive to rout out these termites.

THE FORCES WE OPPOSE

When you and I fight organized gangsterdom today, we are not simply fighting ruthless, power-seeking criminals—some of whom possess very keen intellects. We are fighting their high-powered lawyers and shrewd certified public accountants as well. We are fighting their "public relations" experts who have spread about the criminals an aura of respectability and even a romantic charm.

In addition, we are fighting other forces that are even stronger, the force of public apathy, of indifference and cynicism. Let me amplify that point.

CYNICISM—A DANGEROUS TRAIT

Sometimes the man in the street reads newspaper stories on the existence of crime, and he says to himself: "Oh, well, all those politicians are crooked. There is nothing that can be done about it. The criminals control everything. What's the use of voting?"

Well, I say that if the average man in the streets has that unsound approach it is the worst possible thing that can happen. Cynicism never got any man anywhere.

There is an old Chinese proverb that says "It is better to light a single candle than it is to curse the darkness." You people of the citizens union have been lighting candles, shedding light on crime and corruption. Elsewhere in America other civic organizations have been doing likewise.

TYPES OF CRIME STUDIED

Now, in spite of all of the instances of evil which I have found, I am certainly not discouraged. But make no mistake, I have seen plenty of instances. I have seen the story of mobsters infiltrating into legitimate business—auto companies, laundries, vending-machine businesses, hotels.

I have seen the sickening narcotics situation—particularly as it affects teen-age youth—one of the most dastardly conditions conceivable.

I have seen evidences of the dreaded Mafia, the sinister organization whose terror binds together the eastern and western crime syndicates. I have seen evidences of the infiltration of criminals into basketball and boxing.

HOODLUMS WITH FINANCIAL INTEREST IN PRIZE RING

I might, incidentally, say that we have only touched the surface dirt, insofar as the infiltration of hoodlums into prize-fight management and promotion are concerned. There simply are too many criminals owning this or that percentage of too many boxers—some of whom are presumably the ablest fighters in their weight division. The situation is enough to give a very bad aroma to professional prize fighting, even though only a very small number of criminal individuals is involved.

I say it is a shame that sports or any other legitimate field should have become poisoned to such a tremendous extent with the criminal influence. I am indeed hoping that the various types of business and sports activity which have been infiltrated by the mobsters, if only in part, will do their best to help clean up their own shop.

Yes; I have seen these and other evidences of organized crime. I have seen public officials whose salaries were $5,000 or $7,500 a year, but who suddenly blossomed out with net worths of $100,000 and more. I have seen, as you have, evidences of pay-offs being reported everywhere from the cops on the beat to city hall.

I HAVE FAITH IN MEN

And yet, as I have said, in the face of all this, I am not discouraged, and not disheartened. I am not one of those who believe that man is fundamentally evil. I am not one of those who think that sin must go on and on. I believe that man spiritually is a child of God and was meant for joy, abundance, for beauty, for cleanliness, and not for their opposites.

NEW YORK HAS TREMENDOUS CHALLENGE

To be sure, the great city of New York, the great jewel in the Empire State has a tremendous problem. We of the Crime Committee have only shown in the limited time available a tiny percentage of the crime and corruption here, that could have been exposed, based upon the extensive leads in our files.

It is a fact of course that our Crime Committee could not continue investigating indefinitely either in New York or in any other single community. Our aim has been to show the pattern of crime, on the basis of which we would recommend constructive legislation. We are a legislative committee, and legislation, rather than criminal chasing, as such, is our job.

FAIR NAME OF NEW YORK MUST NOT BE SMEARED

I am firmly convinced that just as New York has bred a good many criminals, so New York will develop in turn, and has

already developed outstanding leaders of law enforcement who will curb the criminal element. The distinguished folks who are on the platform with me tonight are men of that caliber. As a matter of fact, it was a New Yorker, Mr. Rudolph Halley, who performed so brilliantly as our chief counsel for so long.

Yes, from out of the loins of the great city of New York will come the solution of New York's problems.

Great jurists of the caliber of Sam Liebowitz on the Kings County Court or Harold Medina and Irving Kaufman on the Federal district bench—great judges like these—will do their part.

And so I say to you, there is absolutly no justification for anyone's smearing or vilification of the fair name of the great city of New York.

DON'T PASS THE BUCK

Friends, we of the Federal Government are eager to help you meet your own problem. But remember, you yourselves have the basic job to do. Don't pass the whole buck to Uncle Sam in Washington.

The real answer to crime is not in the next fellow or in the next level of government. The attitude of "Let George do it" is not the answer to crime. The real answer is in your action and mine, as citizens in our communities; in your heart and mine.

OUR JUDAIC-CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Yes; the basic answer to crime is a spiritual rededication on the part of all men, a reawakening to the basic principles that made this Nation great—to the principles of honesty and integrity and fair dealing.

It is up to you and to me to help cleanse the great temple of America. The entire tradition of our country beckons us to the task. After all, practically all of us are heirs to the Judaic-Christian religion which teaches that man is sacred, that all men are brothers and God is their Father.

CRUSADE MUST NOT TARRY

I repeat, as I began, the subject of crime should not be like the subject of the weather. We can and must do something about crime. And what we do must be on a local and on a continuing basis.

I emphasize "continuing."

I urge you not to become smug and complacent when you read that this hoodlum or that one has been deposed and has been thrown in jail, or that an income tax lien has been slapped on him.

Don't become smug or complacent when you read that such and such a number of arrests have occurred, or that such and such a number of indictments have been handed down. These statistics may not tell the whole story.

They may be very encouraging, as I believe they truly are in New York. But in many areas such news is not only inconclusive, but sometimes is even misleading.

There can be arrests without convictions or substantial counts. Criminals guilty of the worst offenses often get away with an equivalent of a $5 parking ticket.

There can be indictments, but they may not necessarily end in the people's triumph in the highest courts.

The point I am making is that it is a long, long battle—this war against crime. Let's not quit in the second or third inning. Let's not allow apparent victories in early skirmishes to puff us up with complacency.

GANGSTERS EXPERT AT LYING LOW

Remember that the gangsters of this country have learned to weather many previous "reform storms." Let's prove to them that we are not going to allow this great reform wave, this moral crusade to die down. It is your continuing job and mine, because it is your country and mine.

CONCLUSION

As I conclude, there comes to mind the words of a poet who prayed "God give us men." And, so I say to you "God give us men with the fire of patriotism in their souls; men eager to burn out the dross and leave the gold.

"God give us men, eager to serve their fellow men, eager to cleanse the body politic and economic of our society—to cleanse away those who have defiled it. God give us men."

Thank you.

Employ the Physically Handicapped—Essay Contest Won by Miss Mary Ann Owen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 8, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, Miss Mary Ann Owen, high-school student of Bridgeton, N. J., has been selected the top winner in the national Employ the Physically Handicapped essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Miss Owen, whose entry was adjudged best among those submitted by high-school students from 34 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, will receive a $1,000 cash award and a trip to Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a copy of Miss Owen's superb article entitled "Equal Opportunity in Employment for the Physically Handicapped."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

2315 MAIN STREET,
Randolph, N. J., January 13, 1951.

Mr. JAMES A. WILSON,
843 Tenth Street, Randolph, N. J.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I understand that there is a vacancy in your establishment for a linotypist. If you have not employed anyone, I should like to be considered for the position.

In 1948 I was graduated at the age of 17 from the Kenmore High School, where I was trained for working in the printing shop. Immediately after graduation I was employed by the Daily Times as a linotypist, working there for 13 months. Then seeking adventure and wanting to serve my country, I enlisted in the Navy. In July 1950 an experience I like not to think about caused the amputation of both my legs. While recuperating in the hospital I took bedside lessons in English. I concentrated in punctuation, spelling, and word breakage, all of which would be beneficial to me in my work. Having mastered the use of my artificial limbs and knowing your establishment has the new mixer-type machine, I feel I am capable of filling your vacancy. If no galley boy were available to change magazines, I would be willing to do straight body type work.

If you would be so kind as to grant me an interview, you can reach me at my parents' home, 2315 Main Street, Phone RIt. 6-3843.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS R. MOSS.

Mr. Wilson placed the letter on a pile with others to be filed away. No handicapped in his business. Oddly enough, he found that the next letter contained literature from the United States Department of Labor concerning the physically handicapped. A quick glance and that too was put aside. A caption on one of the pamphlets caught his eye, "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities."

That evening when Mr. Wilson arrived home for dinner he found an unexpected guest. It was a lifelong friend of the family whom he had never considered handicapped though she had had to use crutches since she was 11 years old. She shared with her host and hostess the good news that she had been asked to head the mathematics department in her school. Here was a woman who reached her goal through perseverance. Her 100-percent attendance record for a period of 20 years was enviable. She had earned respect and admiration from all who knew her and had become a light to others because of her continuous ccurage and self-reliance. Mr. Wilson realized this visit was certainly a coincidence, having received that application just that day. Those words, "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." "No, no," he thought, "I can't have a handicapped man in my business."

After their friend had gone, Mr. Wilson picked up the evening newspaper and read of a dinner that had been given for a man who was retiring after 40 years of faithful service at the Fisher Dye Co. During his youth an illness had caused the loss of his right arm. He had adapted himself quickly to the situation and went on working with all the vim and vigor of an unimpaired. He had been the best dyer and never had had an accident in all the years on the job. "Handicapped workers are more careful; therefore safer workers," he read.

Mr. Wilson put down the paper. "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." Sweat began to form on his brow. No, no, he never could employ a handicapped in his business. Greatly puzzled and disturbed, he went to bed.

Restless and bothered, he thought of his friend Sam, who, in spite of having injured his back, was not discouraged. His business flourished, and it became one of the most prosperous establishments in town. Why? Because he had been eager to prove that his impairment was not a handicap.

"Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." Then through his mind like a parade came all of the people he had ever known who were handicapped, nagging, gnawing at him. All the qualities which the unimpaired worker presented flashed across his mind. "Consider their abilities, not their disabilities—consider their abilities—." Only from exhaustion he dropped off to sleep.

Waking early in the morning, Mr. Wilson left for the office. He immediately had to find that literature he had received yesterday. Surely facts would back him up why he should not employ the physically handicapped.

Workmen's compensation insurance rates? No; an impaired worker did not raise the rates. Facts proved that these handicapped persons were more productive, careful, adaptable, regular, steady, and capable if placed in their proper classification. The Selective Placement Bureau properly placed handicaps. No, handicaps couldn't be placed haphazardly, but with thought and understanding they could be and should be placed where they were fitted. Why, it even costs less to rehabilitate an injured worker than it does to support him; thus, taxes would be less.

"Consider their abilities, not their disabilities." Suddenly Mr. Wilson saw the light. As though a great weight were lifted from his mind, he called Miss Cole, his secretary, "Please get Mr. Thomas Moss on the phone for me. His number is RIt. 6-3843."

What Should Be Our International Economic Policy in a Period of Rearmament?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a speech by George A. Sloan, chairman of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., March 26, 1951:

It is indeed an honor to appear before this distinguished group and to explore with you some of today's economic problems with particular reference to international trade and policy in a period of rearmament.

* * * * *

The free world is faced with a grave crisis and perhaps its greatest challenge to survival. We must develop—and we have made a good beginning—the strength of the free nations to counteract the aggressive moves of communism.

A foreign economic policy, by definition, should be the true reflector of the world we live in. Let us for a moment, therefore, examine the world at midcentury.

The paramount objective of our foreign policy should be the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace. It should include friendly cultural intercourse among nations as well as mutually advantageous trade among nations.

* * * * *

Today, more than ever before, we Americans are called upon for an expression of national unity, for a sense of purpose and for a decisive spirit. Unity must start at home in our foreign dealings, especially our international economic relations.

Nearly 6 years ago the United States was at its prime of strength as a world power. No one doubted this strength. Today there are doubts about our leadership and policy in many capitals of the free world, in London, in Paris, in Rome. Actually, the power of the United States has not diminished to warrant such doubts.

The Soviets have made two major gains. They have swung China into their orbit and they are said to have the atom bomb. On the other hand, the United States has made tremendous gains. Since Korea there is more of a spirit of unity. Production, economic growth have been our determining factors. Korea has awakened many of those who did not previously visualize the antagonism in the Soviet system.

The Western World, especially Western Europe, is better off today than in any period since the end of World War II. Western Europe has turned from an area disorganized by the effects of war into a smoother-flowing economic and political community. While not completely recovered from devastations and dislocations, the most difficult part of the Western European reconstruction task has been achieved.

* * * * *

The world continues to consist of the "haves" and the "have nots." You may ask, "have or have not what?" And my answer is have or have not freedom of access to the world's raw materials (as promised in the Atlantic Charter to victor and vanquished alike)—have or have not the freedom to own, to use, and to risk the mechanical means of production—have or have not the right to the just rewards of their honest labor—have or have not the right to determine and to control their own destiny as free men—because they are denied their rightful opportunity to utilize nature's endless bounty for their own well-being and individual happiness.

Human misery in the Western World is certainly much smaller now than it was in the nineteenth century. That this was possible in spite of two World Wars is sufficient answer to those who claim western civilization is in decay. Notwithstanding the postwar poverty of Europe and the rest of the world, the West as a whole is richer in kind and in spirit than ever. But the situation in many friendly countries still presents a challenge to the United States if the spread of communism is to be held in check.

* * * * *

A transformation so swift as that of the last 10 years cannot be experienced by a relatively young nation without mistakes in action and without moments of doubt. It should be most reassuring to all of us who believe in the freedom of the individual that our system of democracy always induces self-doubt. The current congressional debate on foreign policy is a true indicator of this.

Surely, America's future depends on how widely and how wisely it carries out the responsibilities of leadership. The central point must be the unification of the free world in the face of aggression and threats of aggression. Each member of the free world acting alone is too weak to counteract these threats or to resist attack. Not even the United States standing alone can be powerful enough for self-defense. Acting together, the free nations by moral standards and productive achievements will bring about the currently lacking balance of power. In all these endeavors our basic aim must always remain the same: The maintenance of peace but without sacrifice of freedom.

The fear of what the next moves of the Soviets and their satellites will be is inherent in the policies and the thinking of free peoples everywhere. Hearings before congressional committees, debates before the House of Commons, discussions in the French Parliament—all are influenced by the foremost consideration of what the next moves of the Soviets may be.

With the free world in a twilight of war (which we hope will brighten rather than darken in due course by our own actions) the challenge is even greater. We have to superimpose a military economy on a civilian economy in the hope that the least amount of belt-tightening will be necessary. This situation brings with it an inflationary tendency.

Actually, the foremost enemy of the Western World, at the present, is inflation. We must stop putting fuel on the flame, while, at the same time, feebly trying to put out inflation's flame with a sprinkling can. Either we all—and I mean all—make the necessary sacrifices now to stop inflation or we will be faced later with the reality of making much bigger, if not total, sacrifices.

* * * * *

Inflation is Stalin's best ally. Next to Soviet imperialism this is the most difficult problem facing America and our friends abroad.

This then is a bird's-eye view of the world we live in. It is the setting on which we must apply our foreign economic policy.

The first question that now arises is: What should be our short-range, our immediate, international economic policy?

Development of strength at a rapid pace to offset the military power of the nations in the Soviet orbit is, I should think, objective No. 1. The plans are becoming better defined. They are being carried out by the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington on the American level and the Defense Production Board under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Businessmen are and should be the prime policy movers of these efforts. And, industrial operations, as can be witnessed so well in Detroit, are carrying the production effort.

I am confident that rapid rearmament of the non-Soviet world will—within a short period—create superiority of political, economic, and military strength on our part. Such a state of conditions would make the Kremlin stop, look, and listen before embarking on other diversionary invasion movements. The Western World must concentrate its efforts for the next 2 or 3 years on harnessing its resources for defense.

In the process of rearmament, some distortions in production, prices, and trade already have become apparent. Resources that would otherwise be available to civil consumption and investment in the promotion of freer trade and raising standards of living have been transferred to military needs.

* * * * *

The free world cannot go on focusing exclusively on being strong enough to wipe out aggression before it actually occurs. At some point, whenever the Kremlin will decide, there has to come a break in the international tension. At some point the success of the free world will be measured not by self-preservation efforts, but by our ability to expand economic capacity to such an extent that we can offer to both our own people and the people in the underdeveloped areas increased standards, both material and moral, that dictatorships of any kind are in no position to provide.

In the knowledge of this important factor, it stands to reason that the free world must move forward to expand its productive facilities, its economic strength, its scientific knowledge. So we therefore come to objective No. 2:

We cannot withdraw behind a protective curtain of isolation because for many vital commodities the United States is dependent on external resources. Of the 15 basic minerals, the United States is relatively self-sufficient in only 6: coal, petroleum, iron, sulfur, phosphate, and potash. In the case of iron, various ferro-alloys must be imported before steel can be made. The automobile industry in Detroit is well aware of the fact that 100 percent of tin, chrome, and cordage fibers are imported. Ninety-two percent of our manganese and cobalt, 73 percent of tungsten, and 34 percent of our yearly requirements for lead are mined outside of the United States. Our foreign economic policy must be based on a full realization of these facts. In order to make their economies most productive, the countries of the Western World need an adequate and equitable supply of required raw materials together with a flow of essential consumer goods.

To assure an adequate supply of strategic raw materials for all countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), and the other non-Soviet nations it is necessary to have in permanent operation joint allocation boards, eliminating thereby the inflationary effects of free market competition for scarce material. The price effects of such an uncontrolled rush for materials is imposing severe strains on the economy of some countries, including our own.

It is gratifying to know that a start in the direction of international allocation and procurement of materials is now being made.

The current sessions of the raw material commodity groups in Washington are one way of controlling this weakness. It is essential, however, that private channels be assigned, wherever possible, the responsibility to carry out this raw material goal. Also, an international arrangement like this should be maintained only for the period of the emergency. Then it is imperative that free market competition must be reinstituted.

* * * * *

The United States Government should immediately clarify the raw-material situation so that there will be an end to the kind of vacuum that seems to persist in Washington. Instead of the many overlapping agencies in the field now, there should be one Government agency—possibly ECA—in sole charge of the temporary allocation and procurement of raw materials.

* * * * *

Three notable and informed sources lately have proposed that the proper exercise of our foreign economic policy demands the consolidation of all the scattered efforts within a single governmental agency. Headed by a man of outstanding ability with public acceptance, this agency should have the equivalent of Cabinet status.

First, there was the Gordon Gray report, rather outdated at this time because it was originally conceived before Korea. Then, the speeches and writings of our own United States Council Executive Committee member Paul Hoffman (who certainly knows this problem first-hand and can speak with feeling about administrative foul-ups in the Government). And finally, we are confronted with the recent report of Nelson Rockefeller's International Development Advisory Board. (This report, though its other recommendations require careful study before we can determine whether businessmen should endorse them is unqualifiedly correct on the demand for a single agency.)

The Hoover Commission in many other fields has pointed out the waste and inefficiency and stupid duplication of much of our administrative structure in Washington and abroad. Here, in the field of foreign economic policy, is a situation ripe for a Hoover Commission approach.

These then are some factors that make up our short-range foreign economic policy.

* * * * *

If the free nations of the world do not succeed in avoiding economic maladjustments—if they fail to establish an environment in which communities can advance materially and spiritually—there is always the danger that the people will be driven into communism. Only by our performance can we hope to contain the advances of communism. Take the example of the Chinese. The Chinese farmer who has accepted or even welcomed communism as relief from the misery, oppression, and corruption of his lot will learn in time that the promises of the Communists are hollow. Collectivism will soon take back the land made available to him. The cancellation of debts, which was made possible through liquidation of the money lender, will be replaced by oppressive taxes. Communism will soon become a yoke.

But, communism has never yet been eliminated in any country where a Communist regime obtained power. We must act, therefore, before the cancerous growth of communism can spread.

An economic strategy for peace should certainly include a drive to reform traditional modes of production and distribution and increase sharply the productivity of men and machines. This is one way to meet threats of foreign aggression and international collapse. One of the major steps in that direction is to demonstrate the adaptability and flexibility of the American productive system to our European friends. Fortune magazine, in its February 1951 issue, made quite an essential point in this respect: "United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world for getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary," said Fortune, "to suggest the means: there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchanges of all sorts."

* * * * *

In the United States the living standards and working conditions of the average citizen have shown constant and remarkable improvement. In Europe this has not been true. There are many reasons for this, including the trend to socialism and the emphasis which European capitalism places on an out-moded cartel system. Many European businessmen dislike competition. I think there is great danger in this state of mind. We must distinguish between capitalism which works for the few and capitalism which works for the many. The trend of European capitalism has been away from a sense of responsibility to the community. I am sure the morale of people of Europe would rise if they could identify European capitalism with a positive rather than a negative policy.

Today many ardent anti-Communists abroad are suspicious of the motives of American capitalism. By explaining the true contribution of American capitalism to the world in terms of the gains of the individual working men and women I am sure we as businessmen will develop our most successful weapon against Soviet propaganda. This should be a major component of our foreign economic policy.

We must win people as well as diplomatic and military battles if we hope to stop communism. Communism has been making progress in other countries under oppression and poverty. Our long-range international economic policy must keep in mind that a removal of these conditions is an obligation. The Communists have imagination, boldness, and courage—all couched in a fanatical devotion to a cause. We can reply with far more effective boldness and courage.

It is significant that I am speaking to you on the same day that in Washington the foreign ministers of the 21 American Republics are opening their deliberations on, among other things, how the raw material and productive resources of the Western Hemisphere can be stepped up.

Point 3 on the agenda of the sessions is the following:

"Emergency economic cooperation: (a) Production and distribution for defense purposes; and (b) production and distribution of products in short supply and utilization of necessary services to meet requirements of the American Republics and measures to facilitate insofar as possible the carrying out of programs of economic development."

As we understand it, the Latin American countries are asking such questions as: Can a reasonable market be guaranteed after the emergency for expanded Latin American production? Will we (Latin Americanos) be able to obtain sufficient technological know-how from the United States to expand production and increase standards of living? The question of additional American capital investment will also be on the minds of our friends from below our southern borders.

We are asking the Latin Americans to expand raw material production for the current defense program. And the Latin Americans are determined, as we understand it, to bargain for a position where the gains made during the emergency would be of benefit after the emergency is over.

As part of our long-range foreign economic policy, there should be an expansion in the investment of private companies abroad. Many American companies that have invested in subsidiaries and affiliates abroad have had satisfactory experience with the exception of transferring earnings to the United States. Naturally, we must do all in our power to convince the Government that the obstacles to foreign investments, such as double taxation, lack of convertibility and other similar controls, be corrected so that American business will have incentives to take its dollars abroad.

Private investment going abroad is a desirable way to fortify the economies and raise the standards of living of foreign countries. It is a most effective countermove to the conditions that breed poverty and oppression. Private foreign investment would also relieve the taxpayer of the burden of providing through his Government direct assistance and grants to other nations. When private capital goes abroad it brings with it American know-how and managerial skill and thus directly contributes to the welfare of the recipient nations.

But we must be realistic: Congress should provide much of the necessary encouragement by passing legislation deferring taxation of earnings on foreign activities of American companies until they are brought home. At the same time bilateral treaties must be concluded to assure the transfer of earnings to corporations in capital exporting countries and to eliminate double taxation.

* * * * *

In summary, our foreign economic policy, both short-range and long-range, should embrace the following:

1. Establishment and maintenance of just and lasting peace as our paramount objective.

2. All-out drive to stop inflation in every part of the free world.

3. Increase of efforts to develop, procure, and allocate raw materials internationally—to be maintained for period of emergency only.

4. Development of non-Soviet world's strength at rapid rate.

5. Administration of all United States aid efforts under a single agency.

6. Enlightened and active United States world economic leadership.

7. Planning by business today beyond emergency period.

8. Fulfillment of business' role with enlightened cooperation by governments in making possible an extensive flow of foreign investment abroad.

These ideas reflect the discussions at the International Chamber of Commerce and the United States Council; they also reflect discussions with government leaders in many parts of the world.

In the past the United States has followed a short-sighted course in our foreign economic relations. We sought and rejoiced in the expansion of our foreign trade. But we were reluctant to accept the fact that it lacked a healthy balance and that it was being sustained by loans and grants that in the end would be too great a burden on foreign debtors, not to mention our own taxpayers.

We claimed repayment of war debts which prejudiced prospects of solvency of private industrial development which we ourselves were encouraging.

It is a challenge to the American business community to learn from our mistakes and to act accordingly.

We would be right in risking much on the faith that economic improvement and development, widely shared and achieved by cooperative efforts, will make it more likely that the free nations will stand together. The ultimate result would be that at some day in the future, the Soviets will realize the futility of their efforts in undermining the free nations and suspend their struggle for world domination. We must be ready to work in this direction and to rise above the problems of the day and plan as business statesmen.

The Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony given by the Honorable Sidney McMath, Governor of Arkansas, before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Saturday, April 21. Governor McMath's testimony is so illuminating that I am taking this means of calling it to the attention of the House of Representatives for study and consideration. Governor McMath's record both as a Marine veteran and as the head of his State administration is ample proof of his integrity and his devotion to his State, his country, and the Marine Corps. I also would like to say that I have requested Chairman VINSON to call for a hearing on the bill introduced by some 70 Members to raise the strength of Marine Corps to not to exceed 400,000 and to place the Commandant on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is my hope that Governor McMath will again testify at that time.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. SIDNEY MCMATH, GOVERNOR OF ARKANSAS, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE, SATURDAY, APRIL 21

I appreciate the courtesy of this committee in permitting me to appear and express my opinion in favor of Senate bill 677 which would increase the strength of the Marine Corps to four combat divisions and four combat wings and give this branch of the service representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

You can imagine how humble I feel testifying here following the testimony of military experts and taking issue with them on a matter involving military policy. It is comforting to know that in this country a citizen can entertain a difference of opinion with that of our generals on military policy. (I understand that there is sometimes a division among the generals themselves on policies affecting the safety of our country and the conduct of the war.)

I hasten to state, however, that I do not appear here purporting to be in any sense an authority on military affairs. I am here as a private citizen who has a natural interest in any measure that bears upon the security of this country and affects our ability to meet our commitments and responsibilities as a member of the United Nations.

Naturally, having had the privilege of serving as a marine, I have a strong attachment to the Marine Corps and share that sense of loyalty to the organization that is characteristic of all marines.

It is not necessary for me to review the glories and triumphs and traditions of the Marine Corps. Their battle performance is known and respected by every citizen. The accomplishments of the Marine Corps (on the battlefield) in no way detracts from the heroic deeds of the other services.

Historically the Marine Corps has had a mission in protecting the interests and defending the security of the United States. It has never failed in its assigned task. Frequently, however, its job has been made more difficult—unnecessarily difficult by restrictive policies limiting the size and strength and organization of its combative force.

The Marine Corps continuously, so it seems, has had to fight for the privilege of fighting. One would expect that some day it would be recognized (by those who formulate military policy) that the Marine Corps has a definite role in our military operations and that it would be strengthened accordingly. But this is not the case.

During the early 1930's, an effort was made to abolish the Marine Corps. This effort failed and the Marine Corps was able to continue its existence and by 1939 reached a strength of 17,000 officers and men. These officers and men were skilled, experienced, professional soldiers. It was from these officers and men that cadres were formed and the Marine Corps expanded to six hard-hitting and extremely effective divisions that performed so valiantly and skillfully and with such devastating results to the enemy during the Second World War.

I for one was confident that it had been established beyond any doubt that the Marines had a military function and purpose that justified a strength of at least four permanent divisions. The shooting had hardly stopped, however, until the old movement to abolish the Corps was revived with renewed determination and vigor. The advocates of this policy denied that they wanted to destroy the Marine Corps, but had their decisions been carried to their natural conclusions, this would have been the result. To reduce the Marine Corps to a few battalions organized into landing teams would be to destroy the combative force of this branch of our fighting service. The natural and ultimate result of this action would be to reduce the Marine Corps to ship's detachments and shore patrols.

Those of our leaders who have advanced this policy are imminently qualified and honorable men. Some of them rank among the greatest military men of our history. In fact, history will rank some of them with such illustrious names as Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee. But because of their training and background and experience, they have the traditional Army view of the Marine Corps. They say, in so many words, that we do not need a second Army, and that is very true. But what we do need (and it seems to me that this has been so clearly established that I hesitate to mention it)—what we do need is a combative force organized, trained, equipped, indoctrinated, and steeled for amphibious operations, and for crushing comparatively small, aggressive forces, that if left undefeated would grow and expand their conquest.

The Marine Corps has traditionally been organized, trained, and indoctrinated for the difficult and specialized task of executing amphibious operations. The history of the Pacific operations in the Second World War relates how, in a number of instances, the Marines attained killing efficiency in this field. The Navy-Marine amphibious team has been used effectively in the Korean campaign. I would suggest to this honorable committee that the views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur be obtained on this question. General MacArthur (more than any other Army officer) during the Second World War and in Korea, has had opportunities to use Marines on the ground and in the air in landing operations. I dare say that General MacArthur would have welcomed even two Marine divisions supported by a corresponding number of air wings during the initial phases of the Korean conflict.

If the Marines had consisted of a ship's detachment and a corporal's guard, there would have been no Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Okinawa, or a Peleliu, nor a number of other battles that brought our air arm within effective striking distance of Japan and provided advanced bases for the fleet.

On the other hand, if the Marine Corps had consisted in the beginning of the Second World War of four combat divisions supported by four air wings, the decision at Guadalcanal would never have been in doubt. The movement up the Solomons and through the Gilberts and other Pacific islands would have been greatly accelerated.

If at the outbreak of the Korean conflict the Marine Corps had been a combat force of four divisions (with four air wings in support), the tactical situation would have no doubt been different from the beginning. The Army would not have been placed in a position of having to send most of its trained personnel to fight a comparatively small war at the expense of its build-up for a possible major conflict. I dare say that today the trained officers and men in the Army now committed in Korea are still badly needed as cadres for expanding our Army ground forces to the size and strength required to meet the principal threat to our security which lies in the European theater.

Amphibious operations, limited landing operations, acting as a police force for the U. N., these should be the primary missions of the Marine Corps. Present world conditions, our operations and commitments to check aggression and preserve the peace compel us to prepare for the day when there may be other Guadalcanals, Bougainvilles, Pelelius, Okinawas, and Koreas. In such an event it would be most comforting if we had in the field ready for immediate action four Marine divisions supported by four air wings. This would be a combative force more equal to the mission that belongs to the Marines. At the same time, the Army ground force could for the most part, at least, husband its strength in the build-up for the main event.

To insure that the Marine Corps is organized and strengthened and trained for its specialized task, it is necessary to have the Commandant of the Marines, who is in direct command of the Marine Corps, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I have heard it said that no one favors Senate bill 677 except Congress and the people. Certainly the people with whom I have discussed the question are heartily in favor of a strong Marine Corps which asks only the right to fight and the right to help plan the campaigns to which they will be committed.

I am confident that Congress will reflect the will of the majority of the people by taking favorable action upon this bill.

War Not Inevitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that war is not inevitable, that we should not always live in an atmosphere of fear, created to make successful some political maneuver, is emphasized by an editorial in last night's Washington Evening Star which reads as follows:

MACARTHUR ON WAR AND PEACE

However debatable may be the stern military course advocated by General MacArthur to drive the Chinese Communists from Korea, his views on war itself are plainly the views of a man of peace. More than that, as set forth in his congressional testimony, they constitute an eloquent appeal to the reason and sanity of governments everywhere—an appeal that ought certainly to be pondered long and hard by the re-

sponsible authorities in all the capitals of the world, particularly in Moscow.

To begin with, General MacArthur has emphatically dissociated himself from that bleak and potentially dangerous school of thought—it exists in many lands—that is resigned to the inevitability of a titanic, world-engulfing armed struggle revolving around Russia and the United States as the prime antagonists. He rejects such a notion as defeatism of the worst kind—a despairing acceptance of the pernicious fallacy that peoples and governments are helpless before the so-called wave of the future, instead of being themselves endowed with the means and power to make and shape history according to their own free will. In his judgment, another global war is very definitely not inevitable. Indeed, he seems almost optimistic in suggesting that the realities of our age promise to compel mankind to move—no matter how haltingly or argumentatively—toward the establishment of a permanent peace.

General MacArthur's optimism—if it may be called that—is based chiefly on the sound belief that the great masses of the world, including the Russian masses, are invincibly against war. They are against it because, as he says, it has been developed to a point where it places every man, woman, and child in the front line of battle, exposing them to horrors beyond the limits of human endurance. Science has revolutionized the meaning of space and time. It has wiped out the former protective value of land distances and ocean barriers. It has compressed the whole earth into a relatively small neighborhood, and the various peoples living in that neighborhood, being well aware of the change, are as one in their desire for peace. In that respect, according to General MacArthur, they are far ahead of their leaders, and their massed opposition to war offers the greatest possible hope that there shall be no war.

Moreover, wholly apart from the way the masses feel in all countries, General MacArthur has drawn some encouragement from this fact: That every government—even the Soviet dictatorship—must be profoundly sobered by the realization that atomic weapons and similar scientific developments are so appalling in their potentialities that there is good reason to believe that war "is inherently a failure now" as an instrument for the settlement of international disputes. It ought therefore to be done away with entirely. No power really can profit from it. On the contrary, another global conflict (which would be much worse than the last one) would very probably result in catastrophe for victors and vanquished alike—the "suicide of modern civilization." In sum, as General MacArthur has put it, there would be such an abomination of destruction and annihilation, such a desolate aftermath of woe and upheaval, such sorrow and revulsion everywhere, that the only happy people would be the dead people.

Accordingly, assuming that the men of the Kremlin are sane, assuming that the leaders of other nations are sane, and assuming also that no government anywhere can ignore a mass public opinion that is fervently anxious for peace, General MacArthur has taken the affirmative view that it is still possible, and perhaps even probable, that the world can "establish the mechanics to carry out the will of the common people that war shall be nonexistent" from here on out, permanently.

So speaks the soldier and great commander who has been maligned on both sides of the iron curtain as a "warmonger." His chief message to the Nation and the world is that peace, not war, should be inevitable. Moscow papers please copy. General MacArthur's views on this point reflect the most urgent hopes of all humanity—a humanity that realizes, along with him, that time is running out on civilization's last chance to avert a cataclysm that only mad men can welcome.

Hail the President on His Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer respectfully my congratulations to President Truman on the occasion of his sixty-seventh birthday which was celebrated yesterday.

The crises which have followed so rapidly in the past years up to this very day would have been sufficient to shatter a man of lesser breed. His are not the weak knees which buckle under the storm of oppression. His is the conviction that ultimately the right will prevail. And so it has been with each occasion which has tested the mettle of our President.

Let it not be denied that he is a man of intense courage; and, as has been so well said, "a man with courage is a majority." With resiliency of well-tempered steel, he springs back into act each time he is put to test. Because of his humanity, because of his very humaness, because of his courage, long after others have "faded away" our President, President Truman, will have taken his place in American and world history as a man in the service of his country who withstood the tempest of the times with integrity, unyielding determination, and courage. He is not the man to be turned around with each new wind. As Jefferson, as Jackson, and as Lincoln, Presidents who had to stand firmly before the unwarranted blasts of criticism living in an era of great emotion tension, so history will deliver the final judgment in his favor.

We offer our congratulations to the President and wish him well, indeed.

Seven Decisions by the Truman Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seven Great Decisions," by Ralph McGill, which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on May 6 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN GREAT DECISIONS
(By Ralph McGill)

These be times when the national voice is all but drowned out by the Tower of Babel at Washington. It is a time when some even seem to think its subversive to support the Government of the United States, surely a strange and dangerous doctrine.

In the vacuum of leadership there is, unforunately for the sake of balance, only the voice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And the more he talks the more it becomes clear that, while he is without doubt a great military man, there is grave doubt that he knows how wisely to use that greatness.

Yet, the whole panorama of the great debate serves to point up one of the most ironic features of it—namely, that the chief failure of the Truman administration is not failure of its foreign policies of the present or the past, but a painful and embarrassing inability to state the amazing success of those policies in terms the people will understand.

Let us begin by recalling the patriot Arthur Vandenberg, who grew out of isolationism to statesmanship and whose life is best illustrated by some of his last words. "I want very much to live," he said, shortly before his death, "so that I may come back to the Congress and try to do something for the next generation, not the next election." He made possible a bipartisan foreign policy. It has been this policy, agreed to by a majority of the House and Senate, a fact the people and even the Congress forget, which has been, and is, the Truman or administration policy.

SEVEN DECISIONS

The Truman administration, carrying out a bipartisan foreign policy, has made seven great decisions. They have changed the course of history. They have thus far avoided war. They have kept communism outside the great industrial regions of Europe and of Asia.

Let us take them one by one and ask of ourselves what would be the state of the world if a single one of them had not been initiated and pursued.

1. Russia was strongly opposed in 1946 when she had troops in the northern area of Iran, and proclaimed the Republic of Azerbaijan, forcing her to withdraw from the drive on middle-eastern oil fields—a drive which was tied in with the political surge into Italy and France.

2. We saved Greece and thereby Turkey when the Truman doctrine was proclaimed for Greece and when General Van Fleet, now commanding in Korea, put down the Communist armies there in a long and bloody campaign which was for years a stalemate without any seeming end. Imagine if the Communists now held Greece and Turkey.

3. The Marshall plan, without any doubt, stabilized the economy of Western Europe and prevented Communist political victories.

4. The Atlantic Pact added to this strength.

5. We did not evacuate Berlin, but endured strong pressure and by Gen. Lucius Clay's drama of the airlift, forced the Russians to abandon a blockade they never meant to lift.

6. We intervened in South Korea—an intervention even General MacArthur called sound.

7. We made good our promises on the Atlantic Pact by providing General Eisenhower's leadership to organize.

RESULTS

Each of these decisions was of vital importance, and they have produced tangible results which have been of enormous benefit. But, since the Truman administration is unable to state its case, and because it has allowed the shoddiness and petty cheapness, best illustrated by Gen. Harry Vaughan, to tar and discredit it, all this really magnificent accomplishment is ignored.

Its success is hidden by that query: "How will we end the costly stalemate in Korea and save the lives of our men?"

The Korean war is but another attempt by the Soviets to test us, to find the weakness in our armor. It follows the test in Greece, in Italy, France, in Yugoslavia, and Berlin. The war in Korea is not like any

other we have fought. The end there is not necessarily military victory, but to show the Soviets we will fight and oppose them, if fighting is required. In other tests they have retreated when they were sure of that.

We must not allow the MacArthur issue to disunite us from that purpose. He may be right. He may be wrong. But, the fact is we have nothing for which to apologize in our bipartisan policy.

Tribute to the United States Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tribute to the Marines," which appeared in the New York Times of May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE MARINES

There was not a dissenting vote cast on Friday when the Senate authorized an increase in the Marine Corps to 400,000 men. This singular unanimity makes it plain that the vote was more a tribute to the corps than a precise estimate of needed combat strength. The level set in the measure is permissive, not mandatory, and the actual size of the corps will be determined later on when the required appropriations are made.

There have been some strong technical objections to a large increase in the Marine Corps numbers. It is an elite body of troops, kept so by its selectivity and its unusually rigorous training. It ought not to be just another army. In this connection, the Senate has acted wisely in taking out the original proposal to place a Marine Corps representative on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and putting Joint Chiefs representation on a purely consultative basis.

Support for the measure, with the exception of this Joint Chiefs matter, indicates the feeling that these technical objections are not overriding if the corps is raised merely to the level of four full divisions and four air wings. In addition, there was the obvious desire to give the Marine Corps a sense of security as against possible future whittling down at the behest of other services or of a civilian agencies not entirely in sympathy with some of its activities. Such a sense of security within the branch of service is valuable to morale.

Beyond these factors, however, is the simple fact that the Marine Corps has given a magnificent account of itself on occasions whose number is beyond memory. If it has been boastful at times, it has had a fixed habit of making its boast good. The very toughness of its training has played a part in keeping up a great tradition of intrepidity. There is no denial that its esprit de corps is unrivaled. The Senators found an agreeable way to recognize that fact when they cast their ballots.

There is a further consideration. The nature of possible warfare, with its global emphasis, has changed. There will be, in the event of general hostilities, large assignments that the Marine Corps is uniquely trained to fulfill. The demands upon it will necessarily be heavy and we have been taught by experience to believe that it will not fail them. It has seemed prudent, therefore, to make provision for an expansion that can be vitally valuable.

No Entangling Alliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Evening Star points out editorially that when General MacArthur testified before the joint Senate committees he had no entangling alliances with any politician or statesman; praised him for his patriotic, independent stand.

The editorial reads as follows:

NO ENTANGLING ALLIANCES

As General MacArthur leaves the witness stand, it is perfectly clear that he is not serving as a front man for anyone. Whether one agrees with him or disagrees, the General has called the shots as he saw them.

When he conferred privately with Senator TAFT and Herbert Hoover in his hotel quarters there was the usual flurry of excitement in the more excitable circles in Washington. The suggestion was put forth that General MacArthur was conniving with these Republican opponents of administration policy that he could be expected to carry the ball for them when he appeared before the Senate committee.

But General MacArthur has done nothing of the sort. He described the continental defense theory of Mr. Hoover as the gravest possible mistake. And he said that any legislative limitation on the size of forces to be used overseas, for which Senator TAFT fought hard during the troops-for-Europe debate, as "silly."

General MacArthur did not dispute the power of Congress to prescribe any policy it wishes. But he spoke out strongly against the wisdom of attempting to substitute a legislative or political judgment for military judgment in military matters. "I should say," he told the committee, "that the advice of professional experts should be weighed carefully indeed, and, unless there are specific reasons to the contrary that can be elucidated with reason, that their advice should be accepted."

This, as applied to military questions, is sound counsel. It will be a good thing for the country if General MacArthur's Republican admirers take it to heart.

Mr. Speaker, would it not be well for the Nation to follow in his footsteps and avoid involvement in the affairs of other nations, followed the course chartered by our Constitution?

Threat of a War With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Warning Taken Lightly," by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star of May 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN WARNING TAKEN LIGHTLY—PRESIDENT HAS ERRED BEFORE IN MANY STATEMENTS DUE TO LAPSE OF MEMORY OR POOR BRIEFING

(By Constantine Brown)

President Truman, referring in his speech last Monday to the possibility of an all-out war with Russia, pronounced the ominous words "even if we win."

This doubt of victory would strike the Nation hard if it were not for the fact that in the past the Chief Executive has made other questionable statements, due probably to poor briefing.

Thus, on December 18, 1946, when asked at a press conference if he were urging the Chinese Nationalist Government to accept Communists in the cabinet, he replied that this had been our policy all along.

On March 11, 1948, at a similar conference Mr. Truman was asked whether it was still the policy of this Government to include the Communists in the Chinese Government. This time he replied that he did not know that that was ever the policy of the Government and added that if it was it was news to him.

These conflicting answers unquestionably were due to a lapse of memory or to poor briefing. Similarly, on June 1, 1950, the Chief Executive, who has at his disposal the most complete intelligence reports, said that the world was closer to peace than at any time in the last 5 years.

This statement was made only 3 weeks before the North Koreans began their aggression. Warnings about their impending action were reaching Washington from all quarters. And it appears certain that the Central Intelligence Agency, which submits to the Commander in Chief daily top-secret reports about world developments, had fully reported the ominous situation in Korea.

Last July Rear Adm. Roscoe Hillenkoetter, then Director of that Agency, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that his organization had kept pace with the growing danger of the Communist attack in Korea since the previous fall and had been so informing the responsible top officials of the Government. There is no doubt that the President was among the first to receive that substantiated information.

These errors would give us cause to wonder whether the Chief Executive was correct last Monday night when he defended the administration's refusal to accept General MacArthur's solution of ending the war in Korea with every military means at our disposal.

There seems to be no doubt that the U. S. S. R. could bomb American cities. But the question raised by the ousted Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific was whether Moscow is determined to start a world war now or in the more distant future.

If the Russian leaders have decided to strike now—and only the 14 men in the Kremlin know what they intend to do—it is immaterial, according to General MacArthur, whether we make a full offensive in Korea or whether we continue the present strategy of containment and attrition.

They will choose their own theater of operations wherever they believe the most effective success can be attained. If in the evaluation of America's strength they consider that a sneak air attack would prove advantageous, they will carry it out, regardless of whether we give them an excuse.

If the Red general staff feels that our retaliatory powers would make victory doubt-

ful, they will adopt toward China the same policy which they adopted toward the Greek guerrillas after Mr. Truman ordered full support of the legitimate Greek Government.

Treaties and pledges are meaningless to the Kremlin unless they can be turned to the advantage of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Truman, who appears to have decided to take over even more active command of the Armed Forces than President Roosevelt did, must have overlooked the one and only strategic axiom of war; victory cannot be won on the defensive.

Military strategy has changed frequently through the ages. New weapons and new methods of war, involving not professional soldiers but all the inhabitants of belligerent countries, have necessitated these changes. But the age-old axiom, that you cannot win on the defensive never has changed.

Shoe Worker Protests Government Grab of His Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *May 6, 1951.*

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please read this clipping, and what do you think of this smart trick? Most of us shoe workers don't make enough money to live on the way work is now.

We try to buy bonds, but if anything like this happens we won't be able to buy bonds. If some of those "big brains" down there get more money than they need, let them save it. Well, there are a lot of us that can't just make it go any more.

Let them think up an idea to force rent and coal prices down. They are the highest in history and still going up.

When one has to pay $60 a month for an attic room and heat them yourself, you can't save on the salary we get.

Let Mr. DiSalle try to do something about that instead of some of his other jokes.

Respectfully,

A. B. J.

Shall We Have Allies or Face Reds Alone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shall We Have Allies or Face Reds Alone?" written by Carroll Binder, which appeared in the May 6, 1951, issue of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL WE HAVE ALLIES OR FACE REDS ALONE?

(By Carroll Binder)

There are just two ways in which the United States can face its Communist foes during the critical years ahead. It can line up a maximum number of allies or it can stand alone.

If the United States is prepared to fight Russia, China, and their satellites without the help of other nations or the use of overseas air and sea bases, which alone would enable it to strike effectively at the principal sources of Soviet power, it does not need to take account of the views of other nations.

If the United States expects to have access to bases and strategic materials controlled by Britain, France, and other free countries and if it expects their armed forces to fight alongside its armed forces in case of war with the Communists, it must take account of their views in the conduct of its foreign relations and its military policy.

President Truman, the State and Defense Departments and a majority in Congress have been following a policy of cooperation with other free nations to safeguard our peace and security. In conformity to that policy the United States threw in its lot with the United Nations, financed the Marshall plan, promoted the North Atlantic defense pact, and the hemispheric defense pact.

That is still United States policy. Since General Douglas MacArthur indicated last week that he "very definitely expects to come out in the open" to win public support for a fundamentally different policy it is imperative that the American people understand the true import of the opposing policies.

A brief article can touch upon only a few aspects of the complex issues involved in the MacArthur proposals. This article will deal with aspects which until last Thursday had been played down in MacArthur's presentations but which should figure largely in attempts to calculate what would be in the true national interest. That is the attitudes of other free nations toward the MacArthur concept and proposals.

No government except the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa and perhaps the Philippines credits MacArthur with the political and military wisdom with which he is credited by a considerable section of the United States Congress and people. Virtually no other government except Chiang's is prepared to risk its peace and security on the gamble MacArthur urges the American people to take in the hope of achieving a quick and relatively inexpensive victory over the Communists.

Some of these governments respect MacArthur's military brilliance. Many pay tribute to his contributions to allied victory. But they do not trust MacArthur's guesses about what would ensue from adoption of his policies for extending the war in Korea with a view to thereby ending it more quickly. Moreover, some of these governments show disquieting signs of beginning to lose trust in the Government and people of the United States as they see how much support MacArthur's proposals are apparently gaining here.

These foreign reactions may be repugnant to a great many Americans. It is more important to note that they exist than to register resentment at the rest of the free world's unwillingness to share American hero worship or blindly entrust its peace and security to us.

Most of the countries we would like to have stand with us have had their own political generals. They have been rocked by enthusiasms and antagonisms such as now rock the United States. The countries we care most about do not now believe that national policies should be shaped by political generals, least of all by a general who is as bent on going his own independent way as MacArthur appears to them to be.

MacArthur's stock in these countries declined sharply when he failed to take any notice of their contributions to the war in Korea in either his address to Congress or his Chicago address. The former United Nations commander used to speak glowingly of the U. N. but he made no reference to it in his first major pronouncements on his return to the United States. In his testimony before congressional committees on May 3 MacArthur said, in answer to a question, that the U. N. and various nations which contributed their troops to Korea, were splendid in every respect, but that tribute came late and was lost sight of in the 55,000 words of questions and answers.

MacArthur had previously offended many U. N. members by his visit to Chiang Kai-shek, his remarks on Formosa to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, his disregard of British and Indian information and advice about the intentions of the Chinese Reds and his persistent campaign to obtain a free hand to enlarge operations against the Communists. Earlier MacArthur had annoyed some of those countries by the arbitrary manner in which he conducted the occupation of Japan. They felt they had a right to be consulted about basic policies because of their contributions to the defeat of Japan and their interests in that part of the world.

MacArthur's great contributions to the defeat and rehabilitation of Japan and to the conduct of operations against the Communists in Korea may entitle him, in the opinion of many Americans, to greater acceptance than he enjoys among our allies. The limited contributions of other countries to the operations in Korea may dispose many Americans to believe that American views, particularly MacArthur's views, should be accepted by other countries.

The fact remains that other countries do not accept MacArthur's views about how best to resist communism and are beginning to fear that the United States may accept MacArthur's views.

The corollary of this fact is that the United States cannot count upon any government except the Chiang Kai-shek regime to help it cope with what may ensue from abandoning the policy of dealing with the Korean and other crises in cooperation with the U. N. Perhaps the Philippines and a few other small countries would go wherever MacArthur policies may take the United States if those policies should be adopted.

But a large part of the free world would consider any enlargement of the war which might ensue from adoption of MacArthur's policies solely an American responsibility. The same countries which told us an approach to the Yalu River by MacArthur's forces would bring Red China into the war tell us extension of the war as MacArthur proposes would bring Russia into the war.

Any free countries which would try to remain neutral while the United States and Russia and Red China fought such a war would risk subsequent domination by Russia. Some countries seem disposed to consider that risk less than the risk of becoming involved in hostilities which might arise out of adoption of the MacArthur plans.

It would be a tremendous gain for the Communists if the free world should ever be brought to the verge of having a make such a terrible choice. It would be a tremendous gain for the Communists if the United States becomes sharply divided over whether to follow the MacArthur policies or continue working through the U. N. for ending the hostilities in Korea and achieving collective security.

Yet this is what the issues raised by MacArthur seem to be heading us toward. It is possible, of course, that things would work out as MacArthur believes they would if his

policies are substituted for the present policies. If Red China caved in under American attacks and if Russia defaulted on its treaty obligation to go to the aid of Red China, the United States perhaps could get along without help from allies. It could afford to be isolated as MacArthur said Thursday he is prepared to see it isolated in pursuit of his aims.

But that is a far bigger gamble, in my opinion, than is involved in the present policy of trying to achieve peace without appeasement in Korea and in seeking security in collaboration with other freedom-loving nations. If a general war breaks out despite our efforts to avoid it, we will have the help of potent allies in fighting it. We will be able to bomb vital centers in Russia from bases in Europe and Africa which would permit maximum use of our strategic air power. For these and other reasons I hope the United States will reject the MacArthur proposals and continue to seek peace and security in collaboration with like-minded countries.

U. N.'s Lack of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Traveler, Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

POLICY VERSUS NO POLICY

One thing has become crystal clear even at this early stage in the MacArthur hearings—the United Nations did not provide that degree of support for the Korean war which was morally and practically required by its own undertaking.

From first to last since November 9, 1950, when the Red Chinese invaded, the U. N. has been in moral rout. Infected with the suicidal impulse that killed the old League of Nations, it has shrunk back from its own assertion of legal and moral principle.

Before aggression, the U. N. has withdrawn further and further into its own framework of timidity. It wasn't until February 1 that the General Assembly voted to name Red China an aggressor.

Having uttered the word, the U. N. has failed even to embargo the shipment of strategic war materials to the Red Chinese. Here is an action that could have been taken with no risk of extending the war. It is an action that each U. N. member of the free world should have taken on its own authority. Britain just yesterday acted to cut off this trade.

Yet it was the clear duty of the U. N. to enforce such an embargo upon its members. The United States has submitted such a proposal to the U. N.'s "Additional Measures Committee." And there it lies, unacted upon.

General MacArthur cited figures from the United States Consul General in Hong Kong showing that in three short weeks war materials to the value of $40,000,000 cleared that port for Red China.

The U. N. has seemed to be stampeding for a Dunkirk of its own at such a craven pace that its forces were forgotten in the field. It is precisely in such a vacuum that bold proposals like those of General MacArthur are conceived and find acceptance. It is in such a vacuum that death becomes bitter, disgust rises, and we find converts to such an extreme view as that of MacArthur when he urged that if necessary we go it without allies.

If the American people were following MacArthur toward what many believe to be a dangerous abyss, it was because other leadership was silent. We have rejected an able general, and one of the paramount reasons was to retain our allies. MacArthur's policies were too risky for them and, perhaps, for us. But it should now be made emphatic that we do not intend to turn from one of our own leaders who was ready to assume maximum risks to tolerate allied policies that will not even halt trade that is killing our soldiers.

One thing upon which MacArthur and administration spokesmen now agree is that we are in mortal danger too pervasive for trade-as-usual, business-as-usual, or politics-as-usual.

The U. N., as a major contributor to American confusion, had now better clamber back out of its storm cellar and demonstrate that it can rekindle the flame of effective collective action. We can't reject MacArthur's policy for the U. N.'s lack of policy.

What U. N. Policies, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for May 4, 1951:

WHAT U. N. POLICIES, MR. PRESIDENT?

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman gave as his public reason for dismissing General MacArthur an alleged failure on the part of the general to give wholehearted support to the policies of the United States Government and of the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties.

What policies? What official duties?

The Nation today is in an inquiring mood. So is Congress. The President, in the interest of truth, should make available every piece of information on the subject and should himself break precedent and go before committees of Congress and testify.

For only by interrogating the Commander in Chief and the head of our civilian authority can we get at the truth authoritatively. He alone is responsible. Embarrassed or incompetent subordinates cannot answer. This is not the time to hide behind the precedents of a horse-and-buggy age which say that a President never goes before a committee of Congress.

If, however, Mr. Truman declines to testify in person before a committee, he has no valid reason for withholding from the American people answers to the questions Congress may ask in writing in order to get the facts about his policies and U. N. policies.

Let us have all the truth about the Attlee-Truman conference.

Why did our President agree to allow Great Britain to continue to give aid and comfort to Red China?

What kind of an alliance have we with Great Britain which permits her to ship war supplies to Red China while American boys are being killed with those munitions of war by the Red Chinese?

What kind of support has India or the Arab countries given to the recent U. N. resolution that brands Red China as an aggressor?

What has British diplomacy been doing to frustrate United States policies in the Far East?

Is the dismissal of MacArthur at the behest of foreign governments an evidence that membership in the U. N. means submission by the United States to the dictation of other governments without so much as a formal vote in the U. N. to put each nation on record?

What U. N. policies, Mr. President, did General MacArthur fail to support? When and where were those policies adopted? Can we find anywhere in the public record a statement of those policies of the U. N.? And, if done in secret, by what authority has the President of the United States made such agreements with foreign governments without submitting them to Congress?

Why has the U. N. become a hotbed of collective treason to its own resolutions? Great Britain, by continuing her recognition of the Government of Red China, has made a scrap of paper of the resolution of the U. N. which branded Red China as an aggressor. Why does Great Britain continually propose that the aggressor be rewarded with a seat in the U. N.?

Why did the United Nations call upon its members to supply troops to aid in Korea and yet refuse to accept the troops of the Nationalist Government of China which has a seat in the U. N. and is a lawful member of that organization? Is that a U. N. policy?

Why do Great Britain, India, and other U. N. members disassociate themselves from our President's order of last June to the United States Navy to defend Formosa?

Why, when our Government now sends a military mission to Formosa to train troops of the Nationalist Government for defense of the island, is there no U. N. support for that move or any proposal from America that our U. N. allies join in that mission? What kind of a U. N. policy is this?

Mr. Truman cannot have it both ways—he cannot claim that the civilian authority was disregarded by General MacArthur and at the same time fail to define for the other branch of the civilian authority—the Congress—what are the policies that have supposedly been ignored.

Let us be done with the smokescreens raised by politicians in Congress who have come to the superficial conclusion that the MacArthur episode is just a case of military insubordination. That's an explanation which will not satisfy the mothers and fathers and other relatives of the 60,000 American boys who have been killed or wounded in Korea, and of the many more yet to be added to the casualty list.

There must be an American concept in the Democratic Party. It cannot condone the perfidy of our allies and yet make it a crime for the military commander of the U. N. to plead for orders to permit him to strike back with maximum force at the enemy in the field.

If the Democratic Party in Congress cannot forget its partisanship while American blood is being spilled in Korea, if its leaders and spokesmen insist on ignoring the blunders of an administration which has played politics with the rules of war governing the pursuit of an enemy, then the Democratic Party is doomed to extinction. It will then become known in history as the "peace at any price" party—the party that ordered American youth into Korea and then forsook them.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me entitled "Happenings in Washington—Program No. 40." This broadcast was made on Monday of this week.

There being no objection the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 40)

TEXT OF BROADCAST BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

One of the best things that has happened in our country in a long time is new, active, and vigorous awakening of interest in public affairs.

In many ways the people have been brought closer to their Government. It has been proven beyond any doubt that when the people are informed they will swing into action. They will demand good, honest, decent government. They will fight to preserve the ideals which are the foundation of the American way of life.

In recent broadcasts I have discussed the Kefauver committee investigation into organized crime, racketeering, and the corruption of law-enforcement officials. I have discussed the Fulbright committee hearings into favoritism and political influence in RFC loans, leading right into the White House.

I have told you about the overwhelming wave of public indignation over the dismissal of General MacArthur and the widespread condemnation of the Acheson appeasement policy in the Far East.

Today I want to talk to you about another investigation that is going on. It has been pushed into the background by the MacArthur controversy and the other Senate hearings.

But it deals with the most evil and most dangerous thing in the world today—communism.

As you know I have fought communism hard whenever and wherever I found it. I was in this fight back in those complacent years when it was exceedingly unpopular. We who warned against the dangers of communism in those days were ridiculed and smeared as crackpots, alarmists, and Red-baiters.

Today the American people are better informed. They recognize communism as a godless conspiracy to destroy freedom in the whole world—including the United States.

There is need for still more information. Some startling facts have been coming out here in Washington. But they have not received the attention they deserve.

You know, of course, that the House Committee on Un-American activities has resumed its probe of communism in Hollywood. I want to help get these hearings into the limelight of public attention where they belong.

Some big names in motion pictures have appeared as witnesses.

Some have given remarkable testimony. Others have defied the committee. They have refused to answer its questions on the ground that to do so would be self-incriminating. They have claimed the protection of the fifth amendment of our Constitution against self-incrimination.

Well, I trust to the good sense of the American people. They know how to evaluate a man who refuses on ground of self-incrimination to say whether he was ever a Communist. They know how to evaluate witnesses who refuse to say whether they would bear arms for this country in case of war with Russia.

I want to call your attention now to some of the witnesses who did cooperate.

I refer to the screen stars, Larry Parks and Sterling Hayden; the director, Edward Dmytryk; and the screen writer, Richard Collins. Others, of course, will come forward at future hearings.

Each of the four I have mentioned admitted he was formerly a Communist in Hollywood. Each of them told how they came to their senses. They awakened to the menace of communism and quit the party. Each came before the committee and made a clean breast of it. They gave all the information they could to arouse the American public. And they named other leading writers, actors, and directors in Hollywood as Communists or former Communists.

Some people in Pennsylvania may ask: "Well, what about it? What harm can a few Communists do out there in Hollywood?"

That is what I want to explain to you.

But, first, I want to make one thing very clear. Although the Communist high command made a definite drive to control the movies for its own wicked purposes, that drive failed. The vast majority of our motion-picture workers in Hollywood have always been decent, patriotic, anti-Communist Americans.

Unfortunately, not all of them understood the real nature of communism. Without realizing what they were doing some followed the lead of Communists in certain activities.

Some joined Communist-front organizations, without realizing they were becoming cat's-paws for Moscow. Some in Hollywood joined the party itself. They were tricked by that false label called liberalism.

About 30 years ago, Lenin—then the Russian dictator and the head of the world Communist movement—laid down an interesting policy statement. He said that the movies were perhaps the most important of all mediums for propaganda. He pointed out that millions of people in every country go to the movies regularly and could be influenced by what they saw on the screen.

So he set up the principle that the Communists must control what appeared on the motion-picture screen.

In this country a drive got under way. In the late 1920's and the early 1930's, Communist organizers moved into Hollywood and started the first party cells there. They recruited both creative workers and skilled labor in the studios.

They were out to get control of American movies so that they could sneak Communist propaganda into pictures and keep anti-Communist material out of pictures. The basic and ultimate purpose was to poison the minds of 150,000,000 Americans who buy 90,000,000 movie tickets every week.

There was a second purpose. Many people in Hollywood earn very large salaries. They could be good sources of funds for the party.

A third purpose was to gain prestige for their various organizations, drives and causes, by using the names of popular film stars.

For a considerable period, the Communists made progress on all three fronts. And all this time the American public was completely unaware of what was going on. Commissars ran the party in Hollywood. They got their orders from the national headquarters in New York which, in turn, took its orders from Moscow.

Mind you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, this is information that now comes from former active members of the party in Hollywood.

For 15 years the Communists dominated the Screen Writers Guild. This is the closed shop union to which every man and woman who writes movie scripts must belong.

One of these writers admitted before the committee that he paid Communist Party assessments of about $160 a month for several years. That's just one individual. Multiply that many times and you get some idea of the financial support that came out of Hollywood for communism all over the United States.

Witnesses disclosed that the grip of communism on this union was not broken until it was exposed by the House Un-American Activities Committee in October 1947.

You may remember how that committee was smeared and attacked at the time. Many honest, self-styled liberals joined in those attacks. Yet, witnesses today admit the attacks were all secretly directed by Communists. And they admit that if it hadn't been for that investigation, the Reds might still control this important union.

The truth is coming out now. It is important to know the real facts.

You may not recall it, but in 1945 and 1946, Hollywood was torn by a terrible series of strikes in the studios. It appeared to be a jurisdictional row between two groups of unions. Now former Communists, appearing before the committee, have admitted that those strikes were Communist-dominated and conceived. This, it turns out, was the secret drive of the Communists to get control of the studio labor unions.

The attempt failed—but it was a close call.

In order to smuggle Communist messages into pictures, the party needed a solid chain of control of the unions—the skilled labor, the writers, and the artists. It never got that control. But you can see how important it was and the effort that was made.

Today the danger has been removed. The motion-picture industry is on its guard to prevent any Communist taint.

The attempt to influence American thinking by motion-picture propaganda was only one step in the Communist program. The same objective was behind their infiltration into labor unions, schools and colleges, professional organizations, minority groups, youth movements, and even the churches.

You know how deeply they penetrated into the organized labor movement, gaining complete control of some unions. Fortunately, under the leadership of such men as William Green and Philip Murray, the patriotic spirit of the American workingman was aroused. The danger was recognized, and, with some exceptions, Communists no longer hold important positions in organized labor.

Communist agitators have been active on every college campus, spreading their poisonous lies among our young people. They have misled some teachers and writers of textbooks into accepting the Red party line.

There are Communist groups among lawyers, doctors, and the clergy.

The Communist philosophy has attracted many who regard themselves as intellectuals. It has gained support among some people who have inherited wealth and lead an easy way of life.

Worst of all has been the infiltration of Reds, pinks, and fellow travelers into places of trust and importance in the Government.

Some of you listening to me may have knowledge of communism in your own community. Some of you may be former members who quit when you realized that it was

a vicious conspiracy to overthrow our country and make the United States a vassal state of the Soviet Union.

You can prove your patriotism and good Americanism if you will go to the nearest FBI office and supply all the information you have. Our Government needs every bit of information that will help protect the safety and security of the United States.

You may know something that the FBI is not yet aware of. If so, you should come forward. The Red conspiracy against our land goes on night and day.

Remember it goes on not only in Hollywood. In our Government it caused men like Alger Hiss to turn over secret documents to the Russians. It transformed scientists into traitors and caused them to betray atom bomb secrets to the Reds.

Americans cannot sit back and relax. We must be constantly vigilant against the Red menace in our own midst.

We must sell Americanism.

An understanding American soldier sold it to the people of the Philippines and when America was in serious trouble the Philippines stood loyally by us.

Five and a half years ago he went into Japan as a conqueror. Immediately he started to preach American ideals.

In this discussion we should remember that Japan is an old and proud country. They worshiped their Emperor as a God. In the very short period of 5½ years they were accepting the ideals of our country.

When that great American left that country a few weeks ago, 2,000,000 people turned out to pay him tribute.

If General MacArthur could do such a marvelous job, we Americans here at home should do even a better job.

We can sell America. Let us all get busy and do it.

This is Ed Martin, speaking to you from the Nation's capitol. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Ambassador from Australia, Mr. Norman J. O. Makin, at the international Christian leadership luncheon held in the Vandenberg room, Senate restaurant, on the 29th of March last. The subject of the address was The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator FLANDERS and Christian friends, it is fitting that we should meet in the room named after a man who has shown such great leadership and fine qualities of statesmanship. At this time he is to be especially remembered with earnest sympathy and appreciation. Our prayers would be that he should be afforded progressive renewal to good health.

The subject which I have been asked to introduce to your notice is The Opportunity for Christian Leadership in the World Today. The opportunities are so obvious that really no persuasive powers of mine need to be employed in establishing the truth as it stands.

I suppose every age and period has its moments of accounting and of feeling that the present is not as good a time as those that have passed, and that there is a certain moral deterioration and lack of what is nothing more than downright common honesty. Yes; that is true of the world today, but I think that the present period is no worse than any former time. The reason why at times possibly we think it is is because we are nearer to current happenings and are consequently more susceptible to their effect, whereas when we read of similar incidents as a part of history we do not give them the same attention.

I should like to emphasize that until the end of time we shall always be confronted with the great problem of good and evil—of choosing the good and fighting against the evil. There were some truly terrifying conditions that men of Christian faith had to meet in past times—persecutions, inhumanities, conditions of slavery, the evils and terrors of misjudgments and their penalties. One could continue on with an indefinite list which, when compared with conditions of the present day, would show that we must not be in despair.

Nevertheless, I recognize there are situations at the present time which present a grave challenge to those of us who cherish the faith and living ideals of Christianity. There is a feeling of bewilderment at the tide of events. This is where we must—as did the Apostle Paul—challenge the evils of the day. We must convince men—no matter of what degree or state—that there is but one answer to the world's problems—and that is Christ.

God's salvation, which was made possible to men through those solemn incidents which we have but recently commemorated over this Eastertime, is such that the world must learn that it is through Christ alone that the right way is found. All our problems become clear, all our bewilderments and fears melt away, in the light of the divine message.

The Apostle John reveals a remarkable phenomenon about light. It is not comprehended by the darkness. He said, "The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not." There is a loneliness about darkness. How tragic that men should prefer to walk in darkness when they could have the light. I have been greatly attracted by the words of a citizen of Virginia, Mr. J. J. Rives, who has said: "I will not stagger in darkness when it is my privilege to walk in the light of God."

So that the Apostle John could say: "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." There is a light in the darkness, and the opportunity is there for us of Christian faith to lead men to that light. This is true leadership, but I warn you, it is not popular.

My own observations after a lifetime of experience and association with the highest offices of the world constrain me to say that Christ is the way, the truth, and the life, but men generally do not recognize this. Whatever light we may have is desperately needed.

As we look around we are amazed at how few there are who can take up the responsibilities of leadership. Responsibility and onerous duties are shunned today. I was reading only a few days ago of a prime minister on the other side of the Atlantic who was having the greatest difficulty in finding men with the essential qualities for the responsibilities of administration. It is all too rare a gift in the make-up of man. We are so apt to evade responsibilities and to steer clear of making vital decisions. What we need is some of the impelling, dynamic, evangelistic force of Christianity, which will convert an unholy world to a righteous cause.

All too long have men of evil been allowed to exercise their powers and assume authorities of which they are undeserving—and quite unfitted to take up. They seem to hold millions of people in a servile subjection of one form or another.

Let those of us of Christian faith leave a mark of equal intensity upon this period of our own time. Let future generations observe that in the midst of sorely distressing conditions there sprang up a revival of Christian leadership to a purer and better way of life. That, gentlemen, is the central theme of our mission here today. To give Christian leadership will not be easy; it has never been easy; it has never appeared successful. You may recall that contemporary historians barely mention the name of Christ, our leader, but His power has been felt by millions, and it is available for us today. There is no lack of opportunity. The opportunity is there. Where are the men to take it up?

I would just briefly refer to an incident of the last war, when Mr. Churchill, who personified the great leadership of a great people, could calmly paint a picture of light without shade. What a wonderful example of faith and courage in adversity.

Let us remember the period when the people of Israel lost their leader, Moses. A young man named Joshua rose to the leadership. One of his first statements was: "Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

The Wedemeyer Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "A Ghastly Mistake," published in the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., on May 2, 1951. It has reference to the delay in publication of the report by Lieutenant General Wedemeyer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GHASTLY MISTAKE

There is no longer need for anybody to wonder why President Truman and the State Department fought so hard to prevent the publication of the report which Lt. Gen. Wedemeyer made in 1947 on conditions in Korea. The theory that the document was top secret and should therefore be kept from the people now turns out to have been all bosh. The real reason for the official attitude is to be found in the fact that once again the administration is revealed as having ignored the opinion of experts and as having listened instead to the voices of those who for their own purposes wanted the country to play ball with the Communists.

As the contents of the report are now made public it is shown that General Wedemeyer 4 years ago predicted with uncanny accuracy what was going to happen in Korea. He warned the Government that the Soviet Union was training the Communist North Koreans and that it would send those forces against the South just as soon as the United

States could be induced to withdraw its own troops. He also urged this country to create an American-led and American-equipped army of South Koreans that would be strong enough to cope with the potential invaders.

Inasmuch as General Wedemeyer made this report after his return from a special mission under the President's direction it passes all understanding that it was promptly and permanently pigeonholed. The only logical explanation is that the friends of the Soviet were on the march in the State Department at the time and prevailed upon Mr. Truman to forget the whole thing. Those were the days, you know, when Stalin was "good old Joe."

That the administration's refusal to follow the advice it received in 1947 was a ghastly mistake is all too evident. It is a failure that has cost thousands of American lives and embroiled us in a situation out of which there is no foreseeable road.

Northwest Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very interesting letter from Mr. Ed Craney, of the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters, and also the expressed opinions of Members of Congress and the public from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. I am sure that the House will find this material of great interest.

The letter follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST BROADCASTERS,
Spokane, Wash., April 27, 1951.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Representative From Montana, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MANSFIELD: During February, Mr. Clay Osborne secured from you on our behalf a personal, tape-recorded interview expressing your conclusions about six of the basic international and domestic questions of this year.

Additional interviews exploring the identical questions were secured from 17 other cooperative Senators and Representatives from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

At the same time staff interviewers in our station-cities of Portland, Spokane, Missoula, Butte, Bozeman, Great Falls, and Helena obtained recorded sidewalk interviews from average Americans expressing their opinions about these same questions.

The answers from Washington and from the Pacific Northwest Main Streets were then incorporated in a series of 6-day-per-week quarter-hour public-service programs generally titled "Do You Agree?" This continued throughout 6 weeks, the entire 6 days of each week being devoted to a single one of the six questions asked.

The schedules of release by stations and times were as follows: KXL, Portland (10 kilowatts), beginning March 26, 5:45–6 p. m., Pacific standard time; KXLY, Spokane (5 kilowatts), beginning March 19, 11–11:15 p. m., Pacific standard time; Z Bar Network, Montana (five stations), beginning March 19, 10:45–11 p. m., Mountain standard time.

Additionally, we offered the complete series of the programs to Stations KIDO, Boise; and KRNR, Roseburg, Oreg., for release to the areas of their coverage at their discretion.

The standard opening and closing used for each of the Do You Agree? programs is enclosed for your information.

Question by question, the following is the weekly tabulation of answers for members of Congress and the public:

QUESTION

Do you believe that communism and capitalism can coexist in the same world?

ANSWERS	*Congress*	*The public*
No	4	68
Yes	3	15
Possible but not probable	6	--
No opinion	1	2

QUESTION

In your opinion should the United States be committed to police actions like Korea anywhere in the world at the discretion of the President?

ANSWERS	*Congress*	*The public*
No	16	57
Yes	2	30
No opinion	--	2

QUESTION

In your judgment should Japan be allowed to rearm?

ANSWERS	*Congress*	*The public*
No	2	29
Yes	16	70
No opinion	--	7

QUESTION

Do you believe that emergency legislation, restrictions and regulations threaten Americans with the loss of traditional freedoms and forms of constitutional government?

ANSWERS	*Congress*	*The public*
No	8	44
Yes	10	38
No opinion	--	13

QUESTION

Do you consider the United Nations a success or a failure, and should the United States stay in or get out?

ANSWERS	*Congress*	*The public*
U. N. a success	10	48
Failure	8	14
No opinion	--	15
United States stay in	17	62
Get out	1	7
No opinion	--	8

QUESTION

How do you think inflation ought to be halted and controlled?

ANSWERS	*Congress*	*The public*
Remove controls	1	1
Increase controls	6	16
Roll back prices-wages	5	9
Increase taxes	4	3
Sounder fiscal policies	11	6
Increase production	4	1
Stop buying	--	7
Cut taxes	--	1
Stop hoarding	--	1
Cut labor costs	--	1
Less foreign spending	--	1
No opinion	--	21

To the best of our knowledge, this survey of feeling and opinion is the first of its kind ever undertaken in the spirit of genuine public service and information by American broadcasters.

We believe that you may find the final results most interesting and informative.

It was your willing assistance and fine cooperation that was most responsible for the excellence of the programs, and you have the gratitude of the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters for enabling us to provide a service both unique and informative.

And you and your cooperating colleagues have my personal thanks as well.

Sincerely,

ED CRANEY.

DO YOU AGREE?

Standard opening: "Do you agree?"

Do you agree with your elected Representatives in Congress on the vital issues confronting the Nation and the world?

The Pacific Northwest Broadcasters' stations believe that you, the general public, would like to know the answers. To do this, the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters have interviewed people in all walks of life in the cities represented by the "XL" stations: Portland, Oreg.; Spokane, Wash.; and in Montana: Missoula, Helena, Great Falls, Butte, and Bozeman.

In Washington, D. C., the "XL" reporter asked the Representatives and Senators of the four Pacific Northwest States—Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana—the same set of questions as those answered by the public.

The first voice you hear will be that of our reporter speaking to you transcribed from the Nation's Capitol in Washington, D. C.

Standard closing: "Do you agree?"

Do you agree with your Senators and Representatives in Congress on the vital issues and questions of today?

This program is designed to find the answer. To do that, the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters have interviewed people in all walks of life in the cities represented by the "XL" stations, and have also asked identical questions of the Senators and Representatives from the four Pacific Northwest States: Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

The question asked on today's program was

Heard transcribed from Washington were Senators ——— ——— and Representatives ——— ———.

Listen tomorrow at this same time for the next in the Pacific Northwest Broadcasters' special public service series:

Do you agree?

Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this House a new book entitled "The Communist Trail in America," by Jacob Spolansky.

In the book, the author points out that the Communists in the United States conducted an organized campaign against newspapermen and commentators and that Mr. Walter Winchell was the only one against whom the Communists carried out a systematic attack for a period of years. The excerpts from the book, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are a fine tribute to Mr. Winchell and show

that the Communists consider him a formidable enemy.

It is gratifying to learn that Walter Winchell's ceaseless efforts in the battle against communism are recognized. During the past months, some of my colleagues and I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of articles written by Mr. Winchell. However, very little has been said about him up to this time. I am pleased to have this opportunity to describe him to you as an eminent writer, columnist, and champion of human rights. Yesterday, he was named as winner of one of the "Michael" awards of the Academy of Radio and Television Arts and Sciences, as "best consistent radio news commentator." Also, we must not overlook his sincere and unselfish endeavors in the interest of the public good. The May 22, 1951, issue of Look, which reached the public stands on May 8, 1951, carried a story about Walter Winchell and his interest in the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund Crusade, and I am also inserting that story in the RECORD.

Because he is so widely read and heard, Walter Winchell's thoughts, words, ideals, and campaigns for the right, are brought to the attention of millions. In these dark days when we face the reality that our enemies would destroy us from without and within our Nation, Walter Winchell stands out as the No. 1 enemy of communism. His fearlessness, his attacks upon those who would undermine our democracy, arouse our admiration. I consider him a great fighter for liberty, freedom, and Americanism.

Walter Winchell, patriot, is performing a splendid service for our Nation, and I am happy publicly to acknowledge that service.

From pages 81–83 of the Communist Trail in America:

In his Sunday night broadcasts, Walter Winchell told of the secret Communist gatherings at which strike strategy was laid out. Because he had excellent sources of information, he was able to startle the Communists by quoting, nearly verbatim, just what was transpiring at these secret sessions. Winchell described the minute doings of the conspirators and even reported the way in which they boasted of their success in particular plants then gripped by strikes.

Writers and commentators who exposed them were given the slander treatment. Literary gentry, friendly to the Communist cause would be enlisted in the all-out effort to blacken and defame him. To squelch Walter Winchell, however, colossal preparations were needed—Winchell was a formidable enemy. Not only had he mercilessly pummeled them through the years, but he was rubbing salt into their wounds by reporting every word and gesture at their clandestine sessions. The time had come for vengeance.

To erase Walter Winchell and his diatribes, a special conference was called in an obscure Chicago meeting room on April 8, 1941.

Extra precautions were taken to insure that absolutely no one except the trusted hierarchy was admitted to that room. Credentials were checked and double-checked to prevent any intruder from slipping in. Yet an undercover operator did manage to sneak in. The Communists, we learned from him, were furious over Walter Winchell's success in pointing his accusing finger at them and were determined to punish him.

The meeting, called at the insistence of Robert Minor, national secretary of the Communist Party, was presided over by Pat Toohey, then State organizer for Illinois. Toohey got to the point immediately. "We've got instructions," he said, "to start a campaign to take Winchell off the air. Nobody needs to be reminded how important that job is." This was the plan: Hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of letters were to deluge the radio network and Winchell's sponsor, all protesting his attacks upon an innocent political party. Organizations, thousands of them, some real but most of them fictitious, were to join to fight Walter Winchell's persecution.

"Above all," Toohey warned, "the name of the Communist Party must be kept out.

"The protests should seem spontaneous and real."

The scheme elaborately drawn up, was doomed to failure because Winchell exposed it before it got under way. His information about the Communists was accurate to the last detail—powerful ammunition.

Following is the article which appeared in Look magazine:

WALTER WINCHELL FOR THE DAMON RUNYON CANCER FUND CRUSADE—HE'S USING HIS UNIQUE INFLUENCE OVER A VAST AUDIENCE AS OFTEN FOR PUBLIC GOOD AS FOR PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT

Twenty-seven years ago, a brash young ex-vaudeville actor named Walter Winchell began to write a daily newspaper column in New York. He delved into fascinating but oft-neglected corners of the big city, mined its night clubs, theaters, and Broadway hangouts. He had a flair for colorful language, unique skill at coining catchy phrases, and an unerring eye for the interesting and unusual. His paragraphs, an instant hit in New York, were syndicated across the Nation.

In 1932, Winchell started an uninterruped series of Sunday-night news broadcasts with the same fresh, breathless approach which marked his column. Skillful use of the techniques of reporting and showmanship has won for him an audience now estimated at 25,000,000 readers and 35,000,000 listeners.

Through the years Winchell never has forgotten that his public wants to hear about the basic things of life—call it gossip if you insist. Births and marriages, for example, and divorces and romance brawls, hi-jinks in society, the red feather in a lady's hat, wisecracks in Lindy's. He has given the American language such words and phrases as "communazi," "infanticipating," "everynitem," "Reno-vated," "scrumunist," and "New Yorchids"—and his fascinated readers love it.

While covering his Broadway beat, he has invaded a wider field with notable success. Six months before Munich, he reported that Hitler would get away with his bloodless coup. Fifteen months before the announcement, he predicted F. D. R., long a Winchell hero, would seek a third term as President. He wrote in 1941 that Russia would fight Hitler to a standstill; in 1944 that a second front would come that year; in 1945 (at the San Francisco Conference which set up the U. N.) that a vast and perhaps unabridgable chasm had developed between the United States and Russia. Eighteen months before Washington announced the Russians had an atom bomb, he said they would develop it—and when.

Winchell did not stop at reporting but came up with vigorous policy opinions. He lashed out at the Nazis long before World War II and was scolded in Washington for realistic opinions about the Russians as that war came to a close. Two years ago, he shouted that 70 air groups were necessary for the safety of the Nation, even while administration spokesmen said we needed only 42.

On December 10, 1946, Winchell found a new cause, one which has absorbed much of his interest and boundless enthusiasm. On that day his friend, Damon Runyon, died of cancer. The following Sunday, Walter went on the radio and asked for "a few bucks to help fight cancer." The result was startling. Money began to pour in and Winchell was forced to set up the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund, which has, to date, received $4,700,000 in contributions and disbursed $3,748,170 in grants to hospitals and institutions for cancer research. The Runyon Fund is unique in that not one dollar goes for expenses of any kind. Winchell, the fund treasurer, and columnist Dan Parker and Leonard Lyons, president and vice president, pay all their own expenses. Office space and help are donated.

Walter Winchell says now of the Runyon Fund, "It's the only real thing."

Peace Bid MacArthur Upset Held Foredoomed Anyway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by James Reston, appearing in the New York Times of May 9, 1951, which points up the injustice done to General MacArthur in holding him responsible for the failure of the efforts, undertaken in March by the administration and the United Nations, to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict. In fairness to General MacArthur, as the article well points out, it should be said that his offer to negotiate with the enemy directly in the field "did not really lose a very hopeful chance of negotiating peace."

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, May 8.—The testimony of Secretary of Defense Marshall has created one impression that is regarded here by persons familiar with the circumstances as unfair to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

This impression, induced in large measure by the headlines in this morning's papers, was that General MacArthur last March had spoiled a good chance to make peace with the Chinese Communists.

The facts of General Marshall's statement were as follows. He testified that President Truman had planned last March to make a public appeal to the Chinese Reds for peace in Korea. He said that the terms of this appeal were being negotiated with the other nations having troops in Korea, and that, on March 20, General MacArthur had been advised of these facts.

General Marshall then recalled that, after General MacArthur received the notification from the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the forthcoming peace appeal by the President, he (MacArthur) had issued a much tougher peace appeal of his own, minimizing the power of Red China and implying that if Peiping did not make peace the United Nations could bring about Red China's military collapse.

ABANDONMENT OF EFFORT CITED

"At the time the foregoing statement [MacArthur's] was issued," General Marshall said yesterday, "the clearance of the proposed

Presidential declaration with the other 13 nations having forces in Korea had very nearly been completed. In view of the serious impact of General MacArthur's statement on the negotiations with these nations, it became necessary to abandon the effort, thus losing whatever chance there may have been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict."

This last paragraph was the source of almost all the news leads in this morning's papers. Thus the New York Times headline this morning was: "Marshall says MacArthur upset peace move." The Herald Tribune's: "Marshall says MacArthur upset peace plan." The Washington Post's: "MacArthur's bid to Reds hurt peace chances, Marshall says."

As a matter of fact, however, there was very little confidence in this Government or among the representatives of the other nations who were discussing the President's peace appeal that it would do any good. The negotiations on the peace appeal went on here. They were based on a draft paper presented to the 13 other nations fighting in Korea by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and the general attitude among the negotiators was that the peace appeal probably ought to be made but probably wouldn't impress Peiping.

GENERAL CRITICIZED FOR ACTION

General MacArthur's own peace appeal, coming in the middle of the negotiations for the Presidential appeal, was a great embarrassment to the United States Government, no doubt. The negotiators of the other governments concerned did not understand how it could happen that the State Department would enter into protracted negotiations with them on the precise words to be used in the Presidential appeal and then find its own military commander beating the gun with a totally different proclamation without even asking his own Government, let alone the United Nations.

Moreover, there was some feeling within the 14-nation committee here that, in his peace appeal, General MacArthur had scoffed at the Chinese Reds, demanded their unconditional surrender and thus placed the Peiping regime in an unreceptive mood to negotiate.

The point is, however, that, while he embarrassed his Government and angered his allies, General MacArthur did not precisely ruin a good chance to make peace because nobody here really believed there was a good chance to make peace. He "upset a peace move," all right, as the headlines this morning properly said, but it wasn't much of a move, and the negotiators knew it at the time.

There were two reasons why the negotiators were not inclined to believe that the President's appeal would get anywhere: first, the Chinese Communist offensive was pretty well organized by that time, and second, the draft of the President's statement actually offered the Chinese Communists less than the terms that Peiping had rejected in January.

For example, the five principles contained in the January peace appeal of the United Nations, which were supported by the United States, specifically mentioned a willingness on the part of the United Nations and the United States to discuss the question of the future of Formosa and the question of the representation of China in the United Nations.

NOT IN RUSK MEMORANDUM

The Rusk memorandum, which was to be the basis of the President's peace appeal, did not, however, mention these two points. It was a most general statement of war aims, ending with a vague statement that an end of the war in Korea would lessen the tension in the Far East and facilitate discussion of other far eastern questions.

Indeed, in their observations on the Rusk memorandum, some representatives of the 13 nations concerned noted the absence of the references to the future of Formosa and China's representation in the United Nations and observed that the proposed Presidential statement seemed to be something of a retreat from the January peace offer, and therefore less likely to be acceptable to Peiping.

In fairness to General Marshall, he merely said that the MacArthur peace appeal had lost "whatever chance there may have been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict."

But in fairness to General MacArthur, it ought also to be said that, while his appeal of March 24 was generally regarded as perhaps his most flagrant assumption of civilian authority, it did not really lose a very hopeful chance of negotiating peace.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Will Waste Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, should the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project be authorized 23,600 men will be needed for the construction of the proposed navigation and power works in the International Rapids section of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project alone.

The figure of 23,600 men does not include the number required for work on the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, the deepening of the harbors, or the Thousand Islands section or the all-Canadian part of the St. Lawrence River.

In addition a much larger number of men would be involved in the transportation of material and equipment for the project.

Converting the 23,600 men into work days we find that to construct the International Rapids section alone it would require 111,355 man-years of work.

To support these estimates the following information was submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on June 13, 1947, by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

EMPLOYMENT

It is estimated by the Labor Department that the International Rapids section project would create the following man-hours of employment:

At site:	
Skilled	36,207,000
Semiskilled	13,774,000
Unskilled	32,495,000
Total	82,476,000
Off site:	
Skilled	46,415,000
Semiskilled	60,717,000
Unskilled	33,093,000
Total	140,235,000

If completed in 4 years the Labor Department estimates the average number of employees at the site as 11,150, carrying from 5,400 a month in the winter season to 23,600 a month in the summer season.

If completed in 6 years the Labor Department estimates the average number of employees at the site as 7,440, varying from 3,000 to 16,900 a month.

It should be noted that these figures apply only to the International Rapids section of the project. They do not touch the big all-Canadian job between the International Rapids and Montreal. They do not touch any of the work in the Great Lakes region.

Presumably, the figures labeled "off site" include the production of construction materials and equipment and their shipment to the site.

If figured at 2,000 working hours per year per man, the above figures are equivalent to the following:

	Man-years
At site	41,238
Off site	70,117
Total	111,355

And this is only a piece of the job, not the whole "seaway."

(NOTE.—From p. 395, record of hearings, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, 80th Cong., 1st sess., S. J. Res. 111.)

Artificial Limbs

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain a little to the House the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs, which will take charge of the demonstration in the caucus room of the old House Office Building at 10 o'clock, Thursday, May 10. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and I have spoken of it several times. The group has coordinated the efforts at research work on artificial limbs performed at the laboratories of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and the contractors of the Veterans' Administration. I might add the list of some of the laboratories currently participating in the program, because some of the Members have little laboratories in their districts. Again, I want to remind the House that civilians who need prosthetic appliances will benefit by this research work as well as the veterans—and there are thousands of them in the United States also.

In April 1945 the National Research Council established the Committee on Prosthetic Devices for the purpose of administering a research and development program in the field of artificial limbs.

This committee conducted a very extensive program until June 1947 when it felt that sufficient work had been accomplished to permit the workers to concentrate on certain avenues of approach. At its own recommendation, the Committee on Prosthetic Devices was dissolved and the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs was formed to continue the work.

Accordingly, the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs was formed and since

July 1, 1947, this group has coordinated the efforts of the research work on artificial limbs performed at the laboratories of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and contractors of the Veterans' Administration.

The laboratories currently participating in the program are located at Army Prosthetics Research Laboratory, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C.; Oakland Naval Hospital Limb Shop, Oakland, Calif.; Army Air Forces Aero-Medical Laboratory, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio; University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; New York University, New York City; International Business Machines Corp., New York City; Vickers, Inc., Detroit, Mich.; Prosthetics Testing and Development Laboratory, Veterans' Administration, New York City; Sierra Engineering Co., Sierra Madre, Calif.

Many other firms such as Northrop Aircraft, Inc., and the Goodyear Rubber Co. have contributed much to the program.

The Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs also acts as a review committee which indicates to the Veterans' Administration when, in its opinion, a new device or technique has been sufficiently developed for distribution to veteran beneficiaries.

In addition, it serves as a consulting body to the VA in reviewing proposed contracts, projects, and budgets, concerning artificial limbs and related subjects.

The one individual who deserves more credit than anyone else for the progress made to date is Gen. F. S. Strong, Jr., who has acted as the Executive Director of the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs since July 1947.

General Strong, upon returning from World War II where he served in the Alaskan, European, and China-Burma-India theaters, had intended to take a well-deserved rest, but instead has devoted his energies to directing this program to its present point of success.

Col. Robert L. Allen, Gen. Edward Greenbaum, Judge Robert Patterson, Mr. Tracy Voorhees, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, Dr. Paul Klopsteg, Dr. Robert R. McMath, Dr. Roy McClure—who passed away several weeks ago—and Dr. Philip Wilson, have all given a great deal of assistance to the program.

World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, an unusually significant conference of world proportions is to be held in our country next month. I refer to the World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations which will take place at the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Mich., June 1 to 12, 1951.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Information of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that the Mackinac conference will play an important role in helping us to clarify the global objectives of democracy and in finding effective means for telling democracy's story compellingly and winning the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three documents in connection with this Mackinac conference. They are a statement by the chairman and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs sent to leaders prominent in public life abroad; a statement of welcome issued by all the members of the Michigan delegation in Congress; and a message from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to labor leaders abroad.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 1, 1951.*

As members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, we wish to add our support to the invitation extended you to attend the World Assembly for the Moral Rearmament of the Nations at Mackinac Island, Mich., June 1 to 12, and to the welcome already issued by our Michigan colleagues in Congress.

Your presence in the United States, together with other distinguished leaders from Europe and Asia, can do much to focus the attention of the American people at this time on the positive steps that can be taken everywhere to answer the ideological threat of world communism. We need such a demonstration of united strength in the field of inspired moral leadership, without which our common military, political, and economic efforts to save the free world will certainly be less effective.

We are impressed with the practical evidence of what such active moral leadership has accomplished to establish democracy as a working force in danger areas that affect the future of your country and ours. We recognize the opportunity this assembly offers to proclaim to the world an inspired experience of democracy based on moral standards and the guidance of God which is the greatest bulwark of freedom.

We look forward to welcoming you on the occasion of your visit.

Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.
Representative JOHN KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.
Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS.
Representative CHARLES A. EATON.

WELCOME BY MICHIGAN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Michigan Members of Congress have joined in welcoming top-ranking political, military, industrial, and labor leaders from five continents to a world assembly for the moral rearmament of the nations to be held at the Grand Hotel at Mackinac Island, Mich., from June 1 to 12. Representatives from Western Europe and the Far East will join with delegates from South Africa, South America, Australia, Canada, and the United States to consider the steps necessary to give democracy the strength to win in both the east and the west at the same time.

"The event looms as one of major significance," said Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and other members of Michigan's congressional delegation in a joint statement issued from the Senator's office in Washington today welcoming the assembly to their State. "Michigan is honored to be linked with a global struggle to reassert the effective strength of moral standards and the worth of every man under God's guidance. Our spiritual strength as well as our material strength must be mobilized to meet the universal threat of godless Communist materialism."

Headed by Representative ROY WOODRUFF, of Bay City; dean of the Michigan delegation in the House, congressional signatories to the statement include: JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Port Huron; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Royal Oak; JOHN D. DINGELL, Detroit; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Saginaw; CHARLES E. POTTER, Cheboygan; CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Allegan; PAUL W. SHAFER, Battle Creek; WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, Flint; JOHN B. BENNETT, Ontonagon; GERALD R. FORD, JR., Grand Rapids; GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, Detroit; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Grosse Pointe Park; JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Dearborn; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Hamtramck; GEORGE MEADER, Ann Arbor; RUTH THOMPSON, Whitehall and Muskegon.

Following his appointment to succeed Senator Vandenberg, Senator BLAIR MOODY stated on the Senate floor, "I am delighted to make it unanimous by adding my own warm support to this welcome."

A number of Cabinet Ministers from Europe are expected at the Mackinac assembly. Both Chancelor Konrad Adenauer, of Germany, and Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, of France, have credited moral rearmament with a major contribution to Franco-German unity. The Danish Foreign Minister, Ole Bjorn Kraft, said at a recent meeting in Copenhagen, "This is a world movement with a world answer which will play its part in shaping the future." Consultations with these men and other Cabinet Members in Italy, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries have pointed to the value of a gathering in America at which evidence can be massed and developed of how MRA is "turning the tide of communism."

Delegations from the Far East, including a delegation of 65 Japanese leaders and others from Nationalist China, Burma, and India are preparing to come. The head of the All-India Posts and Telegraphs is already on his way. Gen. Ho Ying-chin, from Formosa, and Mr. Sisato Ichimada, the governor of the Bank of Japan, have expressed the desire to attend.

The intensive work of moral rearmament following the assembly at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington in January has led to important developments which make this world assembly of special timeliness. British leaders have noted the successful averting of Communist efforts to tie up London and Scottish docks in a general strike last month. The Red strategy was frustrated, according to the Communists themselves, by MRA-trained dock workers from London and Glasgow, who took part in the Washington conference.

French workers from the Red Belt factory area of Paris who were present in Washington, played a similar role in preventing a general strike in Paris at the time of General Eisenhower's visit this winter.

Large-scale national campaigns have been held after conferences with government leaders in France, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, Holland, and Belgium in connection with the launching of the book The World Rebuilt, by Peter Howard. This book reporting "the true story of Frank Buchman and the men and women of moral rearmament" has already sold 200,000 copies and a further 150,000 are in printing.

June 4 is Dr. Buchman's seventy-third birthday, and in this year of his nomination

for the Nobel prize will be a special focus for world-wide interest in moral rearmament.

In addition to the delegations from overseas, there will be strong American representations, especially from those industries in which, as in National Airlines, MRA has been the means of bringing a new era of understanding and of saving millions of dollars.

The full text of the statement by Senator FERGUSON and the Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives follows:

"We of the Michigan congressional delegation take great pleasure in directing the attention of our fellow citizens to the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament, which is to be held in Michigan, at the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, June 1–12, 1951.

"Moral rearmament has been described as 'a world force having as its principal objective adequate preparedness of free nations for the ideological conflicts in which the world is now engaged.'

"That is an objective which challenges the interest and imagination of all of us who believe in the strength and guidance of God. We believe that material forces alone cannot assure permanent peace, security, and tranquillity among nations and among people. We who believe in God see that our spiritual strength, as well as our material strength, must be mobilized to meet the universal threat of godless Communist materialism.

"Every nation of the world is being invited to send representatives to the Mackinac conference. The event looms as one of major significance, and Michigan is honored to be its host, as the name of our State is thereby to be linked in the eyes and minds of leaders in many lands with a global struggle to reassert the effective strength of moral standards and the worth of every man under God's guidance."

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN TO LABOR LEADERS IN EUROPE AND ASIA

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 4, 1951.*

The chairmen and ranking members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the United States Congress, and the Michigan congressional delegation have joined in welcoming national leaders from abroad to the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament, at Mackinac Island, Mich., June 1–12, 1951. The American labor movement warmly supports this welcome and expresses the hope that you and others of our trade-union brothers from Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the Americas will attend this gathering and so contribute to the new world of liberty and justice we all desire.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Home Town Reporter in Washington, Walter Shead, WNU correspondent, which was taken from the May 4, 1951, issue of the Thayer News, Thayer, Mo.:

THE HOME TOWN REPORTER IN WASHINGTON

(By Walter Shead)

GREAT DEBATE NOT OVER

It seems that the great debate in Congress over foreign policy is not over; it is just getting started.

But what is hard to understand is this: During more than 3 months of debate, the Republican leadership in Congress opposed sending troops to Europe on the theory that to do so would arouse the Russian bear to the point of war, that it was a calculated risk that should not be taken and that our main line of defense should be the Western Hemisphere.

And almost overnight this same band of leadership has switched from a Western Hemisphere defense to demands for an aggressive war on Red China which would take a million American boys and all the planes and ships and guns we could muster to send across the Pacific.

The rhyme or reason in this thinking is certainly not clear, and the only interpretation which can be placed on such a metamorphosis is politics, pure and simple. The Democratic administration was for sending an army to serve under General Eisenhower in continental Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact, so politically the Republican leadership must oppose, and they did, but lost. The Democratic administration was opposed to making any aggressive war on Red China, seeking to confine the fighting in Korea, so the political thing for Republican leadership to do was to oppose it, so they are opposing, some going even as far as asking for an immediate declaration of war.

What has happened to the proposal of ex-President Hoover, to withdraw behind our two oceans? What General MacArthur thinks about this is not even important insofar as this Congress is concerned, for the simple reason that what he says before a joint session or before any congressional committee will not change a vote one way or another. Minds already are made up beforehand. Does any one believe for a minute that anything General MacArthur might say would change the minds of such Senators as TAFT, WHERRY, JENNER, CAIN, and KEM? Nor do you think they will heed for one instant whatever General Collins, or Admiral Sherman, or General Bradley, or General Marshall will say, or what General Vandenberg or Admiral Nimitz or even General Eisenhower might say on the subject in these committees?

What has happened is unfortunate, particularly for General MacArthur, and it is unfortunate for the country, for it is having the effect of driving deeper and deeper the wedge of disunity into the marrow of the Nation, and it is permitting politicians to make a scapegoat of MacArthur, when the general's return should mean only a tribute to his military feats of valor.

MacArthur deserved honors

General MacArthur, setting foot on United States soil for the first time in 14 years deserved all the adulation and honors heaped upon him by the American people. A lot of it was overdone, but that is the characteristic American way—do it up brown if you do it at all.

But after all the shouting dies down and the emotional hysteria has worn off, remember the man who withstood most, and who exhibited the most personal courage and just plain guts in this whole affair, was the present occupant of the White House, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

Truman clears the way

And it was the President who cleared the way for MacArthur's formal congressional appearance, and it was the President who canceled his own public appearances so there would be no counterattraction to MacArthur's day in court in Washington, and permitted Government offices, the schools, the whole town to turn out to greet the general on his return after 14 years abroad in the service of his country.

President Truman is now at his lowest ebb of popularity. If you are interested, however, watch his popularity barometer start climbing. His two most recent talks to the American people were more forceful and contained more plain common American horse sense than any in many months.

Shades of Nuremberg—How Blindly Must Generals Follow the Leader?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Felix Morley in Barrons for May 7 indicates that our military leaders are concerned about the effect of the Nuremberg trials and the principles enunciated there in the event we are engaged in another full-time all-out war. On several occasions I have taken the floor to condemn the Nuremberg trials and as time marches on, these views are corroborated by events. I commend this article to all Members of this body:

A NICE POINT—HOW BLINDLY MUST GENERALS FOLLOW THE LEADER?

(By Felix Morley)

(The Sphere of Obedience: "With the doctrine of immunity of a head of state usually is coupled another, that orders from an official superior protect one who obeys them. It will be noticed that the combination of these two doctrines means that nobody is responsible. Society as modernly organized cannot tolerate so broad an area of official irresponsibility. There is doubtless a sphere in which the defense of obedience to superior orders should prevail. If a conscripted or enlisted soldier is put on a firing squad, he should not be held responsible for the validity of the sentence he carries out. But the case may be greatly altered where one has discretion because of rank or the latitude of his orders." Statement of Mr. Justice Jackson, approved by President Truman, June 7, 1945.)

Although nobody likes to emphasize the subject, it is apparent that the shadow of the Nuremberg trials overhangs and darkens the momentous inquiry into the Korean war which opened in Washington last Thursday.

The Nuremberg trials, it will be recalled, were prosecuted under the terms of an agreement signed in London on August 8, 1945, by representatives of the United States, France, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia. This charter established an international military tribunal empowered to try enemy officials and officers defined as war criminals. It was on the basis of this and subsequent four-power agreements that many German and Japanese military men were later executed, or given drastic prison sentences.

Article 8 of this London charter established a wholly new principle in international law. It said: "The fact that the defendant acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior shall not free him from responsibility."

Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson was the chief American architect of

this charter. In his first report to President Truman, before affixing his signature in London, Mr. Jackson sharply criticized the obsolete doctrine that orders from an official superior protect one who obeys them. He said that officers of the German general staff could claim no immunity on the grounds of having obeyed governmental orders.

Since then, many jurists have called that conclusion fallacious both in law and logic. Lord Hankey, the distinguished British Privy Councillor, has perhaps been especially critical of the Nuremberg theory that military officers are legally responsible for wrongful acts by their civilian superiors.

Speaking in the House of Lords, on May 5, 1949, Lord Hankey said that Mr. Jackson's argument confronts the individual with an impossible dilemma between duty and conscience.

Lord Hankey added that the precedent established at Nuremberg troubles the (British) fighting services considerably. One has only to talk confidentially with high ranking American officers now in Washington to realize that it is troubling them today, perhaps far more than their British colleagues.

Placed in an impossible dilemma between duty and conscience, General MacArthur chose the path of the latter. It can be effectively argued, as administration spokesmen are asserting, that it was not the general's privilege to reason why. It was his duty to fight the undeclared war in Korea in whatever manner the President of the United States, acting in concert with the United Nations, might decree.

But this same President had earlier endorsed and proclaimed as national policy the theory of Justice Jackson that a military officer should be brought to trial if he obeys civilian orders which can later be characterized as criminal. In his opening statement as chief of counsel for the United States, at the Nuremberg trials, Mr. Jackson said:

"None of these men before you acted in minor parts. Each of them was entrusted with broad discretion and exercised great power. Their responsibility is correspondingly great and may not be shifted to that fictional being, 'the state,' which cannot be produced for trial, cannot testify, and cannot be sentenced."

During the course of the Nuremberg trials, Mr. Jackson went a good deal further than this generality.

In cross-examination of Marshal Goering, former Commander in Chief of the German Air Force, Mr. Jackson obtained the admission that the German people were not consulted when Hitler decided to make war on Soviet Russia. This was to emphasize the criminal irresponsibility of the Nazi leadership, and the consequent culpability of individual German generals in following that leadership.

In his book on The Nuremberg Case, Mr. Jackson quotes and emphasizes the key admission made by Goering under cross-examination: "The German people were not asked. They were notified of the fact and of the reasons for that fact" (war against Russia).

Republican Senators have been digging into this testimony recently, because of a certain analogy with our undeclared war on Korea, in which the American people also were notified of the fact and of the reasons for that fact after and not before hostilities.

There is a growing disposition to summon Justice Jackson to testify at the Senate inquiry, to determine whether his theory of individual responsibility for questioning dubious executive orders would not wholly justify every pronouncement and action by General MacArthur. It may be added that nobody is more anxious to have this point clarified than the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The sentences passed on German and Japanese generals, for blindly obeying orders from their governments, are not being recalled to justify these cruel and ruthless men, nor out of any desire to take a partisan advantage in the present congressional inquiry.

Some of our most important military leaders believe that this issue of the limits to military loyalty underlies the whole rumpus that has followed General MacArthur's dismissal. It is argued that whatever else the investigation may accomplish it must definitely determine whether the traditional loyalty of the military to civilian leadership is still binding. At Nuremberg the Truman administration, through the agency of Justice Jackson, went far to argue the contrary.

There is no question that the Republicans have a very important point here, and not less important because in the planning of the hearings it has so far been held in reserve. But where there seems to be a disposition to overplay the cards is in the Republican anxiety to have these hearings public.

The demand that the testimony be on the record is understandable, in view of the great public interest, the pervading anxiety as to our foreign policy, and the vital importance of the investigation. But this last factor also provides the conclusive argument for the approved procedure of taking the testimony in executive session, then releasing everything not held back by a competent security check.

For the security of the Nation is literally at stake, not only in respect to confidential military information, but even more as to such vital questions as the responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President, of the President and Secretary of State to the Congress, and of individual generals and their subordinates to the Chiefs of Staff. These are not issues that can properly or profitably be discussed in open forum, under the strain of television and partial quotation.

Except for the secrecy of its deliberations the Constitutional Convention of 1787 would certainly have broken down. Today, it is a question of saving the Constitution then so carefully and skillfully designed. The complete frankness incompatible with klieglight publicity is no less necessary now.

United States Policy in the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Korean Policy Doesn't Add Up to Appeasement," which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of Sunday, May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN POLICY DOESN'T ADD UP TO APPEASEMENT

To persuade Congress and the American people to adopt his far eastern policies Gen. Douglas MacArthur is seeking to create the impression that the United States and the United Nations have no policies.

MacArthur further endeavors to create prejudice against present United States and U. N. policies by characterizing them as "appeasement"—a word which has evil connotations when correctly used. The deposed far eastern commander tells the bereaved and those who fear their loved ones may become casualties that lives are being squandered by present attempts to limit and end hostilities. He implies that if he has his way lives will be saved and victory will be assured.

MacArthur utters his criticisms and offers his solutions with such an air of absolute authority that many are disposed to accept them as gospel truths.

Whatever a man of MacArthur's brilliance and long experience says is worth considering carefully. He is, however, a human being and all humans, MacArthur and the Tribune's editors not excepted, are subject to error. His views and ours need to be checked against other views just like everyone else's.

The risks are too great to warrant taking chances by hasty adoption of any policies, however categorically and persuasively propounded.

Now United States and U. N. policies may be less wise than they should be. But they are carefully considered policies even though MacArthur says he does not know what they are and that they do not exist.

The United States and the U. N. do not accept the proposition that all-out war with Russia is inevitable or that if such a war comes it would necessarily result in a quick and total victory for the United States and its allies.

MacArthur may be of a different opinion but he cannot rightly argue that this does not constitute a basis for a policy.

The United States and the U. N. believe that more lives would have to be expended and free institutions will be more jeopardized by deliberately enlarging hostilities in the Far East than by trying to bring existing hostilities to an early honorable conclusion. We know that limited hostilities are costly. MacArthur contends that his "positive plan" would be less costly but he cannot prove that contention. Others equally well situated to make such calculations believe the contrary.

It is an abuse of the word "appeasement" to apply it to an unwillingness to bomb troop concentration points in Manchuria so long as the Communists do not use their air or submarine power against U. N. forces in Korea. Who can say how many lives have been saved by such limitation of hostilities? Who can say how many would be expended by our deliberate enlargement of hostilities? Who can say whether prospects for a negotiated peace are enhanced or diminished by such a policy?

Is it "appeasement" if we do not immediately set up a blockade of Chinese ports? Is it "appeasement" if we do not facilitate an invasion of continental China from Formosa which many experts at least as well acquainted with China as MacArthur believe could not succeed without large-scale American participation?

The real test, as the New York Times points out, is the effectiveness of given measures. "Will they, if taken, actually shorten the war in Korea? Or will they broaden and prolong the war by bringing Russia openly into the fighting? Will they alienate us from our allies in other parts of the world? And, if so, will they cost us more than they will profit us? These questions involve deep political and military judgments. It is not 'appeasement' to choose the area in which we wish, if necessary, to employ our maximum military effort."

Under questioning by Senators last week MacArthur indicated that he had not taken very much account of the global aspects of the problem of surviving in freedom in advancing his proposals for victory in the Far East. The President, the State and the Defense Departments have given careful consideration to global aspects in deciding what should and should not be attempted in Korea so long as the enemy does not enlarge the hostilities.

Before abandoning those carefully formulated policies for MacArthur's policies the Nation should at least weigh carefully what others think it stands to lose as well as what MacArthur thinks it stands to gain.

And, as is pointed out elsewhere on this page, we had better be prepared to go it alone if we abandon the collective approach to security and elect to seek security by MacArthur's methods.

An Awakening America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received on April 27 from Mr. Lloyd Osborn Coulter, of Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H. It is an unusually penetrating analysis of the situation which confronts America. He has given me permission to make his views available to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FITZWILLIAM DEPOT, N. H., *April 25, 1951.*
Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There comes a time in the life of every citizen when he is impelled to write pro bono publico to his Senator. In my case it is a sort of emotional prophylaxis which may well prevent apoplexy or assault with intent to inflict bodily harm on the nearest Democrat.

Since opinions are likely to be mere intellectual accidents if reached outside of experience, I will explain my right to mine in a sentence or two at the end of this letter. But first, the proposition I wish to put to you.

The American people have one right which transcends all others—to achieve their own destiny. The great debate is really whether that right should be thwarted, perverted, and abandoned.

The stiff breeze stirred up by the Kefauver hearings and the hurricane sowed by the MacArthur firing are clearly and simply protests by an awakened electorate against the cynical, wasteful, and morally atrophied domestic administration, on the one hand, and its stubborn "Wrong Way Corrigan" foreign flight, on the other.

Since we have survived, and will survive, worse corruption than the posthumous Pendergast rash of deep-freezes, mink coats, RFC loans, and municipal party roots fertilized by the Mafia, we can leave this domestic problem to be dealt with by the evolution of public conscience. Our foreign orientation is the graver problem; immediate and critical.

The governments of Europe—and I am not speaking of the refugees from its political, economic, and social system who pioneered and developed this country—have looked upon this country as a milch cow from 1492 to 1951. The earliest came for gold and silver and the later for colonial trade. All ruthlessly exploited the natives, Indians or colonists, and quarreled with each other over the spoils until the founding fathers, led by Washington, Bolivar, and the resolute rest threw them out.

Until the discovery of America, Europe faced east whence a trickle of wealth seeped into the coffers of its feudal bandit-rulers and a small class of city bankers and merchants, without touching the calloused palms of the peasants. England was a negligible island of six or eight million sheepherders whose royal treasurer sat on a sack of wool. After Columbus, when the galleons, heavy with American plunder, rolled to Iberia, Drake and his successors changed all that. From that time forward American wealth, directly or indirectly, voluntarily or reluctantly, underwrote the development of European nationalism, mercantilism, and imperialism and financed all of its major wars from that of the Spanish Succession to World War II.

Our founders recognized the venality and chronic quarrelsomeness of Europe and counseled against all entangling alliances with it. Monroe and others, down to Wilson, held the course. The American people, trustees of a great new concept of freedom and justice and humanity, faced westward and carried the banner of western civilization to the Pacific and beyond assimilating Louisiana, California, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines by purchase or easy conquest from their European masters in the process. Nowhere have we been guilty of predatory colonialism. After removing the senile clutch of Spain from Cuba and the Philippines we contributed heavily to their sanitation, education, and economy and voluntarily withdrew. After the Boxer Rebellion we alone, of the nations involved, exacted no extraterritorial grants or concessions. We canceled most of the reparations debt after World War I, and plowed back into Germany and Austria in the way of public and private loans more than the undefaulted tithe we collected. Through the Red Cross and the Hoover Commission we fed and clothed them and, unlike our allies, divided no territorial spoils.

After the last war in which victory was purchased with American blood and American resources, we undertook to rehabilitate our late enemies and support our late allies through a thousand private and public methods ranging from United Polish Relief to CARE and the European recovery program. All this while we were being hypnotized into underwriting a new imperialism and a new war in the making at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

Never in history have any people contributed so much of their substance to avert famine, disease, and disaster everywhere in the world as the Americans. Never has a people dealt so fairly with their neighbors or so generously and constructively with their foes. Yet we have won no solid friendship, no deep respect in Europe. That is, of course, except as a source of profit to her traders and a prop to her wobbly governments, always threatened with some new conqueror. Nine out of ten Europeans, including the British, secretly resent and despise us as a nation, though they may like some of us well enough as individuals. They suspect our motives and impugn our methods except where these parallel their own immediate and selfish interests. They will even use our tax dollars and the products of our industry to trade with, and appease, the common foe, as the British are doing with the Chinese Communists in Hong Kong and Singapore and with steel shipments to Russia, while they demand that our first line of defense shall be their bankrupt homelands, not the area where we are already engaged in a life-and-death shooting war with communism.

You would think that after Churchill (as his memoirs all but brag) and Stalin had conned us into practically turning our back on the Pacific enemy who had attacked us in 1941 and, for the next 2 years throwing most of our weight against the European enemy who had attacked them, we would be more than a little critical of their blandishments. But Truman and Acheson seem to be even more easily hypnotized than Roosevelt and Hull.

One man—MacArthur—has had the courage to try and restore the American people to their destiny; to turn their backs on Europe and to continue to march toward the Orient where now the crucial battle against the Communist despotism is being waged and where a great and new civilization is stirring and with our help and friendship will arise. Lattimore, Hiss, the Amerasia cabal, the eastern bankers, and the Groton tradition abetted by the lobbying of Washington's European embassies have hog-tied Acheson and the big-city foreign language vote has subverted Truman and a lot of the northern Democrats. But there are encouraging signs that the American people may, through the great debate, once more become the arbiters of their own destiny rather than go broke trying to revive Europe's.

I hope and believe that you will support our Government's return to sanity with all means at your disposal. You could render our country no greater service.

Yours sincerely,

L. O. COULTER.

P. S.—Oh yes; about my bona fides: I fought with the French, British, and Americans in World War I, spent 13 years in France, Germany, north Africa, and England between 1921 and 1935. Though not a Son of the American Revolution my grandpappy was one of Sherman's Bummers.

L. O. C.

Twentieth Annual Americanization Day Celebration in Jersey City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, VFW, initiated Americanization Day in Jersey City, N. J. Ever since 1931 it has continued to sponsor and support the Americanization Day celebration in that city. From small beginnings, the celebration has grown to be one of the largest and most inspiring of its kind in the United States.

On Sunday, April 29, under sunny skies, 30,000 people, most of them veterans of wars of the United States, members of various veterans' organizations and their ladies' auxiliaries, marched before tens of thousands of others who gathered along the route for the purpose of witnessing the stirring parade.

The reviewing stand was, as usual, located in Pershing Field, where the parade terminated.

Prior to the arrival of the marchers at Pershing Field, a speaking program was carried on and concluded. The speakers, who addressed the thousands assembled before the stand in Pershing Field, included Hon. John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City; Hon. William Flanagan, deputy mayor of Jersey City;

Hon. Alexander F. Ormsby, former common pleas judge and past national commandant Marine Corps League; Commander Raymond Clyons, Hudson County American Legion, Department of New Jersey; Rev. Phillip E. Dobson, S. J., director, St. Peter's College of Industrial Relations; "Smokey" Graves, supreme commander, Military Order of Cooties; Mrs. Florence Stark, past national president of VFW Auxiliary; Mrs. Carrie Brady, president, VFW Auxiliary, Department of New Jersey, and myself. The principal speech of the day was delivered by the honored guest, Charles C. Ralls, national commander in chief of VFW of the United States.

Guests included Admiral Leland P. Lovett, USN, retired; Maj. Gen. I. V. White, chief of staff of First Army; Capt. T. S. Dunston Conde, USNR; and Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski, Representative of the Thirteenth District of New Jersey.

The general chairman of the great celebration who has served in the same capacity for many years was Mr. George A. Thornton, Sr., of the Clinton E. Fisk Post. The grand marshal was Commander August Hanniball, Jr., Department of New Jersey, VFW of the United States. Among the aides of the grand marshal were Capt. Francis X. Burke; Lt. Stephen R. Gregg; Sgt. John W. Meagher and Sgt. Nicholas Oresko, all wearers of the Congressional Medal of Honor. The parade chairman was Donald D. Kemp, Sr.; Angelo "Pat" Menendez, past commander of Fisk Post and public relations director for the parade, was master of ceremonies at the reviewing stand announcing the arrival of and identifying each unit of the parade as it passed the stand.

The audience was held in rapt attention during the splendid address of Commander in Chief Charles C. Ralls, which is appended herewith:

ADDRESS BY COMMANDER IN CHIEF CHARLES C. RALLS, JERSEY CITY, N. J., SUNDAY, APRIL 29, 1951

This afternoon is the VFW's finest hour. The mammoth parade today, under the sponsorship of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is the culmination of a patriotic ideal—the perfect expression of true loyalty to our Nation and our flag. It is the twentieth annual Americanization Day celebration in Jersey City.

The members of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post and all VFW members in this outstanding city can be justly proud of their patriotic contribution to this historic observance. As commander in chief of the VFW, I can assure them that their comrades throughout the country recognize and appreciate the importance of Americanization Day. As a privileged spectator at this year's observance in Jersey City, I can testify to the esteem and admiration which they have earned for the Veterans of Foreign Wars among their fellow citizens.

The Americanism program established 20 years ago by the VFW in Jersey City as a simple, practical demonstration of loyalty to the ideals which are the foundation and strength of our country has developed into a national loyalty-day celebration. Proof of the inspiring character of this program—if such be needed—is recorded for history in the appearance yesterday of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur on the reviewing stand for the loyalty parade in New York City. This was a tremendous tribute to the farsighted, unselfish determination of VFW members in Jersey City during the past 20 years to acclaim publicly their proud heritage as Americans.

It is encouraging and gratifying that this demonstration of sincere devotion to our Nation and the freedoms it offers which began as a local ceremony here has now been accepted by all of our citizens. At the same time, the need for such a public rededication of faith in our Nation, our form of government, and our fellow citizens has never been greater.

In this period of national crisis, loyalty should above all else mean unity. The Veterans of Foreign Wars established Loyalty Day as a visible means of opposing Communist May Day demonstrations. We wanted to show that a free people are just as willing to stand up and be counted as the subversive force of communism and its fellow traveler elements. We wanted to prove that Americanism and loyalty to our Nation and our flag are more than an ideal. They are a living reality that gives strength to our Nation and courage to our people.

This year, however, moral strength and physical courage to meet and repulse the naked assault of Communist military aggression are not enough. For the war in Korea has produced a byproduct of dissension that threatens the security of our Nation. The singleness of purpose and determination that characterized our national defense program after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea has been shattered by the dismissal of General MacArthur. America has been split into two foreign-policy camps. The division of our people is one of the most serious in the history of our country because it transcends the normal, necessary two-party political system. It has solidified the seemingly all-out convictions of patriotic Americans who sincerely believe that their conflicting courses of action are each best designed to protect the security of our Nation.

Loyalty does not mean the blind, unquestioned acceptance of a political philosophy. It does demand that we stop acting as martinets controlled by irrational, unintelligent emotionalism. Loyalty this year must imply hard-headed intelligence and patience.

Americans pride themselves on being the world's foremost realists in the field of business. We're giants of industry and infants in international relations. Whether we like it or not, the United States is the leader of the freedom-loving people and democratic nations of the world. We must point the way toward freedom, prosperity, and peace. But we can't do the job alone.

I don't think there is any question of the loyalty of Americans in our life and death struggle against the godless forces of barbaric communism. All of us recognize the threat to our own democratic way of life which this tyrannical force poses. All of us are determined to defend our freedoms against aggression. But the fight can be lost while we battle among ourselves as to the best means of guaranteeing the security of our Nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars does not expect that the serious military and international policy differences represented by President Truman and General MacArthur will be immediately reconciled. We do not ask that the basic conflicts be forgotten. But we do demand that the American people, through their elected representatives in Congress, stop viewing these differences in terms of political expediency, and evaluate the conflicting policies with only one common thought in mind; the security of our beloved country.

At this very moment your comrades and mine are fighting and dying in Korea in an heroic defense against the most savage Communist onslaught of the entire war. Their actions will be recorded in history as the most inspiring expression of loyalty, the most perfect example of Americanism. To them, however, this afternoon's parade and other loyalty demonstrations throughout the country this week end will seem a hollow mockery unless they can help bring from division and chaos the unity and direction which our Nation so desperately needs.

For 20 years the members of Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post and other Veterans of Foreign Wars posts in Jersey City have led the way in proving to their fellow citizens and to the rest of the world that Americanism is an unselfish, intensely practical way of life. They have demonstrated by actions that regardless of race, color, creed, or political beliefs Americans are united in their love of our country, loyalty to our Government, and gratitude for the blessings of freedom we all enjoy.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the 1,200,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars look to their comrades in Jersey City for inspiration and guidance in this hour of national crisis. We have always been strengthened and inspired by the resurgence of patriotism that follows your Americanization Day celebration. Today we seek from this observance a rebirth of faith in the inherent intelligence, courage, and determination of our people—a return of confidence in the willingness of our elected Government leaders to put aside personal, political differences, and to work for the common objective of adequate national security.

This essential objective cannot be achieved within the Federal Government if the American people continue to isolate themselves in a vacuum of personal opinion and refuse to study and understand sincere conflicting views of their fellow citizens. A bipartisan foreign policy is the byproduct of legislative give and take. But it is directly dependent on the unselfish, objective actions and expressions of each American. A truly effective national defense program is predicated on the willingness of our citizens to suffer the inconveniences and sacrifices which will be demanded for the welfare of all our people.

Loyalty to your Nation is like loyalty to your closest friend. It does not shrink or falter in adversity. It is unyielding and unquestioning. This analogy is entirely proper today, I think, in view of the fair-weather attitude of many Americans concerning our military, economic, and political international operations.

Last June congressional leaders, veteran and civic organization officials—indeed, virtually all responsible individuals in America—hailed the action of President Truman in sending United States forces to the defense of Korea. Today many of these same forgetful individuals are charging that the President had no constitutional authority to effect this action and are even urging that American forces pull out of Korea. Confusion and conflict, if permitted to continue, may also jeopardize the North Atlantic Pact, our economic-assistance program, and other aspects of our total military, political, and economic fight against Communist aggression.

I am not for a minute arguing that any or all of these programs are infallible, that they constitute an absolute guaranty of the security of our Nation, or the preservation of peace. However, I would point out that the North Atlantic Pact, the military assistance program, and ECA were approved by a majority of our elected representatives, that they constitute the official policy of our Government, that they need and deserve our loyal support.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is humbly proud of the opportunity it has had to sponsor such inspiring loyalty programs as the twentieth annual Americanization Day celebration here in Jersey City. We are sincerely grateful to the thousands of patriotic Americans who unselfishly participated in this program. This example of complete, unhesitating cooperation for a common ideal can be prophetic. It proves that Americans are united in their love of our country.

I pray that this bond of unity can be forged throughout the length and breadth of our land as a lifeline to which each of us can turn when the emotional, political storm of confusion and conflict, of indecision and hostility threatens to engulf us.

Americanization Day 1951 can be a turning point in our Nation's history. At the very least it can remind us that we are first and always Americans—and incidentally Democrats or Republicans, internationalists, or isolationists. If the Veterans of Foreign Wars can accomplish this essential objective, then our highest purpose will have been achieved. For we desire only to instill in the hearts of all Americans a deep, abiding devotion to their Nation, respect for their Government, and faith in their fellow man.

We are confident that if these ideals prevail, the future of America as a free Nation under God will be secure.

What's An Appeaser?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 5, 1951:

WHAT'S AN APPEASER?

Heard all too frequently in these troubled times is the epithet "appeaser" hurled bitterly in the heat of the great debate, and in its very bitterness giving a new and scornful meaning to the word.

The scornful meaning stems from the pathetic efforts made by British and French statesmen to gain time in which to rearm their countries to meet the belligerent threats of a dictatorship. The word was then twisted to mean indulgence in abject conciliation which proved ineffective and only served to sacrifice and betray the interests of other and weaker nations.

It may be found profitable if unpleasant for every good and patriotic American, regardless of their convictions or snap judgments, to practice complete self-appraisal and make an honest confession of principles and viewpoints. Most important is the primary concern of approaching the MacArthur controversy with an open mind.

These are the questions: Are the American people prepared to carry through the extraordinary sacrifices in men and money they know we must make if we become involved now in an all-out war? If they are so prepared to jump into an all-out war in Asia do they feel that their efforts should be redoubled if the Soviet attack is launched against Europe as well as Asia?

Do they believe that the United States should "go it alone" in Asia if the other members of United Nations decline to share in a tougher American policy? Do they believe that Red China is acting on its own initiative or that the Soviet Union is directing the campaign in the Far East?

Alternatively, do they believe that aerial reconnaissance of Manchuria and China, economic blockade of Red China, assistance to enable Chiang Kai-shek to invade the Chinese mainland, and an ultimatum to the Chinese Reds will not involve us in an all-out war in Asia, or that, if these measures do bring on an all-out war we can still emerge victorious?

On the other hand, do they believe that while the ebb and flow of battle near the thirty-eighth parallel gains time for the nation to rearm and for Europe to rearm, that national policy should be bent to delay involvement in a total war effort?

Remember that all these considerations have been propounded and positive opinions given by men who are taking unyielding stands on both sides of the controversy. Remember that the individual citizen will be committed to either moral bankruptcy or to a supreme war effort on a scale undreamed of if the wrong answers are given. Remember that all the men of high rank involved in this controversy are patriotic Americans whose convictions have the motivation of doing what they believe best for our country, and that if extreme peril faced the Nation they would discard their private ambitions to serve their country as best they can.

And now—finally—the definition of appeaser will take on yet another meaning, that of one too cowardly to undertake to do the right thing for this Nation because it involves sacrifices of one kind or another. It is the individual citizen who must decide what is an appeaser.

A Letter From Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper column written by me:

[From the Ford Gazette and Frankford Dispatch of May 4, 1951]

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

No mere Congressman, serving by your say-so and returnable at your will every 2 years, can assume a superior air even if he could. But all the MacArthur to-do shows a large segment of your America and mine on an emotional binge that had better burn out or else. Or else we can scrap the military judgments of men like Generals Marshall, Bradley, and Eisenhower, whose decisions really did far more to achieve victory in World War II than did those of the military figure who has recently been taking the bows. Meantime we hear there will be a searching through into Yalta and past. Again FDR is being disinterred. In the mad thirst for power, it is forgotten that Mussolini and Hitler ever strode the peacock path of history's stage.

It does not matter that MacArthur alone of the top brass has always had an eye on political possibilities. At this crossroads of civilization it is not of great concern which political party and certainly not which candidate wins what election. In this field day of politics we can jolly well debate ourselves out of existence. MacArthur is not worth that. Let us parade him and forget him as the man who made the problems of good people like Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and Bradley infinitely more difficult as he concluded his military career. If you do not believe there is a lot of screwball thinking in this emotional binge, get a load of the opinions of some people that the speech MacArthur made before Congress was "epoch making, finest in our time," etc. No political figure could get away with the blatant baloney which concluded his speech. It was about his West Point days and the then current barrack-room ballad, An Old Soldier Never Dies; He Just Fades Away—"so I will just fade away," said the general, as though he were the soul of humility. He just fades away to the accompaniment of the joint meeting of Congress and endless luncheons in his honor, together with parades and miles of ticker tape. This gave the emotional drunk just the comedy relief it required for many of us.

Now, let us get a lot of first things first, including the American tradition that we do not want any general pushing around our civil authorities. Meantime we must face the fact that the war potential of Europe and its steel plants are more important than Asia; also, that the aging general has been cooped up on an island to a degree where he did not even get around Japan and left headquarters only for a few visits to the Korean sector. Whatever his worth in World War I, we have a brand-new military crisis coming up and a lot of responsible people do not believe the MacArthur policy should direct our operations in it. Now, let us rid ourselves of this hang-over and get back to work. Until we face the problem of our survival realistically, we are not entitled to the foolishness which recently took place.

Cordially, your Congressman,

WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Congressman GREEN expresses his own views, which are not necessarily those of this paper.)

MacArthur's Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 7, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S OPINIONS

Although the evidence is incomplete in the case presented by General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, his main theme is developed and is subject to valid criticism. The thoughtful citizen is left with a distinct sense of unease and a feeling that the distinguished general has not produced the facts to back up what he believes to be best in our present situation and strength for the Nation.

His seven main contentions, although affirmed with sincerity and obvious ability, are in conflict and assailable as opinions or theories not supported by solid and irrefutable facts. He has repeatedly said that he was a theater commander, concerned with direction of operations in this theater and not well enough informed on global and international affairs to give an opinion.

He finds the stalemate in Korea intolerable and advocates steps to hurl the Red Chinese forces out of Korea, but he argues that such steps would not impel the Soviet Union to take an active part in the struggle and precipitate world war III. In his view the enemy is not the Soviet Union, but communism all over the world.

Even over our allies' objections the United States should go ahead with his proposed plan for dealing with Red China, the general says, and, in his own defense says that the Joint Chiefs of Staff considered an identical plan early this year. Finally, he says he has the right to go over the heads of his superiors and take his case directly to the American people.

To these conclusions and opinions he has every right—but the troubled citizenry, looking for absolute and convincing facts do not find in his brilliant arguments, his masterful duelling with words in the Senate hearings or his conclusions, the conviction they must have if the MacArthur views are to prevail.

While disavowing expertness in global strategy he has undertaken to give global advice. He has offered no convincing proof that the Soviet Union would not attack and launch us into world war III. Indeed, his opinion does not seem to justify even the taking of even a calculated risk. Many wonder, as well, at his statement that the Soviet Union is not the enemy, but that world communism is the foe. The two seem to be synonymous to the average citizen.

Going it alone and ignoring the views of our allies may very well achieve what the Soviet Union has been striving for all along—splitting the United States away from its Western European allies. Obviously the Joint Chiefs of Staff, weighing all the possibilities on a global scale, have considered a variety of plans in the past, but it is also obvious that the kind of improvised military planning which our unpreparedness has made necessary cannot be welded to any particular plan until we are strong enough to plan for victory.

As to going over the heads of his superiors even the doughty general has admitted that President Truman had the right to relieve him of his duties. Moreover, he is too much the professional soldier to come our flatly in opposition to the chains of command without which there can be no discipline. General MacArthur seems to have accepted in his own mind that in taking his case to the people he had destroyed his usefulness to the Nation as a military commander, and now undertakes to persuade the Nation out of patriotism that we are embarked on the wrong course.

The tragic consequences of this rift in public opinion and solidarity of effort is yet to be reckoned.

Lying Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following came to my desk just as I was coming over to the House. Drew Pearson seems to be running true to form, still venting his spite.

The release follows:

[Special bulletin, southern California Republican women, Los Angeles, Calif.]

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

"Herbert Hoover supports Earl Warren," says Drew Pearson, but what does Herbert Hoover say to southern California Republican women?

Drew Pearson, long noted for his peculiar interest in California politics and political figures, particularly in Republicans, has done it again.

In his column, published locally on April 30, Drew Pearson first devotes a couple of paragraphs to describing his version of Republican leaders playing hide-and-seek with Gen. Douglas MacArthur through the corridors and telephone booths of the Waldorf-Astoria. But, according to Pearson, the only Republican who "caught up" with the general was Herbert Hoover.

And, says Pearson, this is what Herbert Hoover seriously whispered into the ear of MacArthur: "Are you interested in politics, General?" And MacArthur, says Pearson, told our ex-President: "No."

Now, quoting directly from the Pearson column:

"Hoover then gave MacArthur his own ideas about the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1952 and went all out for Gov. Earl Warren, of California. Hoover unhesitatingly described Warren as the best qualified man on the entire GOP horizon. Not given much to enthusiasm, Hoover almost waxed enthusiastic about Governor Warren."

Pearson then adds a postscript to this astonishing new twist to the old "smoke-filled hotel room" type of Presidential nomination by pointing out the fact that the California Governor will be remembered by the voters as having "run" on the Dewey ticket back in 1948, and "that he (Earl Warren) has been almost as popular with the Democrats as with the Republicans in California."

Then came the parting-and-typical "Pearson" touch. He said: "and unlike TAFT, he (meaning Earl Warren) would probably get some labor backing in a national election." Well.

We southern California Republican women don't believe all we read, or in these days, even see or hear, and especially not Drew Pearson's reporting, so we did the logical thing and sent a wire to the office of Herbert Hoover. The reply speaks for itself.

"MAY 2, 1951.

"SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN WOMEN:

"I have your inquiry as to some statement of Drew Pearson that Mr. Hoover is supporting a particular man for President. Mr. Hoover has taken no part in such politics for some years and obviously any statement of this kind is untrue. Mr. Hoover does not believe this source should be credited by anybody.

"BERNICE MILLER,
"Secretary to Mr. Hoover."

Here you see a dramatic and very personal example of the vicious tactics of a certain school of reporters and radio commentators who thus diabolically contrive to confuse and mislead the unaware and uninformed Republicans among us by sly innuendoes, half truths, and implied guilt by association.

Here you see in vivid action this technique which has been, is, and will continue to be used in attacks upon the honorable men—the real American statesmen of our Nation. The one who has been with us, patient, wise, giving his beloved Nation and his party well-considered advice when called upon to counsel or to serve, and the one who also has been with us, fighting in the United States Senate—sometimes almost alone—for the preservation of each and every truly American and Republican Party principle and ideal, and the other who has just come back home to us after years spent in honorable and gallant service in the military force of America and in the administrative office which he handled and conducted so well that he left a once-enemy nation in tears at his departure.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mayfair Times of April 26, 1951:

[From the Mayfair Times of April 26, 1951]

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

Most of the professional soldiers I know do not vote and neither do their families, if they live with the officer. In this way they hold to the tradition that we do not want a political Army or Navy. With the former co-Emperor of Japan it is different. Douglas MacArthur has always cherished the idea of being president. That's what makes his return to this country exceedingly amusing when we watch the behavior of those coy potential candidates among the Republicans. Stassen, the great educator, has been ever voluble on all possible occasions and concerning everything. But he maintains a silence about MacArthur on television and just smiles a rather sickly smile through his well-known teeth. Dewey suddenly needs a rest in Bermuda and TAFT, whose getaway is not so easily accomplished, is a match for the FBI in his elusiveness. Only JOE MARTIN, who has no Presidential ambitions, is left to stage-manage the appearance.

Somewhere along the line I hope to ask questions in the Armed Services Committee of the House, of which I am a member. Among these queries would be the following: Why was it so easy to follow a directive to gas-bomb veterans, their wives and children at Anacostia Flats upon order of President Herbert Hoover or Secretary of War Patrick Hurley, and yet so difficult to follow Pentagon orders? What would you have done to a subordinate when you were Chief of Staff if he violated or ignored the spirit of one of your orders?

When you were flown out of the Philippines and you said "I will be back." Your walking through the surf at Leyte was front page in every newspaper in the world. Is it not true that you had practically nothing to do about paving the way for your return? I would like you to say it because a lot of Americans do not properly realize Admirals Nimitz and Halsey, the Marine Corps in its capturing of key islands, and Hap Arnold's Air Force accomplished the job for which you took the bows. Admit it openly so that brave and competent leaders, living and dead, can at long last receive a credit they deserved and which you do not. Is it not also true that the only reason you received the Japanese surrender was that you were senior officer in the theater? Are you aware that here, too, some quick thinkers among Americans might get the notion that you brought about that surrender aboard the mighty *Mo*, whereas, you contributed practically nothing to it?

What means did you take to keep informed on a possible Korean situation before it broke and do you think that you handled it well? What caused you to issue the boys "home by Christmas" statement, and do you realize it has been the most seriously damaging event to the morale of the free world? Do you realize that if the military situation had not been corrected by General Ridgway that history could well have recorded you as one of the colossal military false alarms of all times? As former superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point, you were once a specialist in training young men. Why were those poor kids in Japan left so untrained that they threw down their arms and ran? Was there n.t as much room for training in Japan as in the Academy on the Hudson? Finally, what makes you think you were as qualified to judge the relative importance of the European and Asiatic theaters to American defense and that of the free world as the White House and the Pentagon which are constantly getting up-to-the-minute news reports and spot news?

These are asked as I doff my hat to a great division commander of World War I. If we

could only judge some men by one inning instead of the whole game.

Cordially, your Congressman,

WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Congressman GREEN expresses his own views, which are not necessarily those of this paper.)

Trading With Aggressor Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, 72 Republican Congressmen joined in a letter to W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President on foreign affairs. The letter sought answers to questions in connection with the United States and members of the United Nations continuing to trade and do business with aggressor nations and their supporters. The Congressmen also inquired if economic sanctions were being considered.

The text of the letter follows:

JULY 31, 1950.

Mr. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRIMAN: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, all are deeply conscious of the critical situation that currently confronts our country. We are well aware of the realities that compelled the administration to draw a line and demand that the series of aggressive acts that threaten the world peace be met with force.

The United States, and most of the member states in the United Nations, are today committed to repelling an act of aggression that seriously threatens the world peace, not merely in Korea, but in other sections of the world. We have considered, and support in principle, the steps recommended for mobilizing our country against these contingencies.

We have noted with a great deal of concern that while we have acted to resist the aggression in the case of North Korea, and are preparing to resist similiar acts of aggression and threats to the world peace in other quarters of the world, we still continue to trade and do business with the "seconds" or supporters of these same aggressors or potential aggressors. Why?

Cannot this trading with these countries be stopped under existing legislation and authority granted to the President?

Has the question of economic sanctions been considered?

It is our feeling that it is not enough to merely offer armed resistance to the aggression of North Korea and her supporters. We suggest that there exists no justification for continued trade on a business-as-usual basis with governments supporting the North Koreans.

Does the President at the moment have the authority to apply economic sanctions against these countries?

Will a request for legislation to provide the necessary authority be made?

Has the administration considered submission to the United Nations of a request for economic sanctions against the aggressor, future aggressors, and their supporters? The United Nations Charter, article 41, specifically authorizes complete or partial interruption of economic relations.

We would greatly appreciate your acknowledgement and reply to this letter and the questions contained therein.

Sincerely,

ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; BEN GUILL, Texas; DONALD L. JACKSON, California; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan; JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., California; GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; WALTER NORBLAD, Oregon; DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Massachusetts; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio; MERLIN HULL, Wisconsin; WESLEY A. D'EWART, Montana; JACK Z. ANDERSON, California; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming; FRANK FELLOWS, Maine; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Michigan; HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon; PAUL W. SHAFER, Michigan; HAL HOLMES, Washington; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; CLARENCE E. KILBURN, New York; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan; HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Indiana; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Massachusetts; CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey; HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., Pennsylvania; CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Oregon; JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware; NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire; ROBERT HALE, Maine; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Michigan; DANIEL A. REED, New York; NORRIS POULSON, California; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts; JOHN TABER, New York; W. STERLING COLE, New York; ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; WALT HORAN, Washington; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York; JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan; ROBERT F. RICH, Pennsylvania; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa.

Cross Road in Eternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Robert L. Lang, Jr., pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Altoona, Pa., in his sermon of April 29, 1951, provides much food for thought in our quest for a solution to the problems confronting this Nation.

Reverend Lang's sermon follows:

CROSS ROAD IN ETERNITY

It is time for Americans to come down from their comfortable but unreal dream world, and to face reality. The text is written in the first chapter of James, the twenty-second and the twenty-fifth verses: "But be ye doers of the Word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. Whosoever looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

Several years ago Dr. Charles A. Beard coined a number of laws of history. Perhaps the truest of them all was this: "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power." There have been numerous examples of the truth of this law in modern times. Napoleon, Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, all were destroyed because of their intoxication with power. But Beard's great law of history applies not only to individuals. It applies to nations, too. I am going to tell you about Rome.

When the city of Rome expanded her power, 2400 years ago, to include the whole Italian peninsula, her people believed in and practiced the highest ideals of citizenship. They were devout in their observance of the religion of their day. They were honest, morally unimpeachable, noble in their thinking. Politics was a thing of highest honor. Rome's star shone like a beacon over a world of discouragement and defeatism. And the strong assurance and moral strength of Rome's citizens were reflected in Rome's armies, for her soldiers, living up to the high ideals of the home folks, were as fine as any warriors the ancient world ever knew.

Those soldiers brought Rome glory, and the greatest empire of antiquity. In their stalwart strength, resting upon a home base of sincere and noble citizens, they added to the Roman crown jewels such as Egypt, Carthage, Tunis, Tripoli, Spain, Syria, Judea, Galilee, Germany, Gaul, and Britain. Victory was sweet. Caesar, Pompey, Antony, and Brutus returned from battle to receive the plaudits of the Roman throngs. Rome was strong, and growing stronger every day. Ah, yes; but whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power.

And so it was with Rome. Victory and power did something to the Roman citizen. We see it first in the members of the Roman government, who became selfish, and jealous, and corrupt, and crude. But we see it soon enough in almost every citizen who tramped the Roman pavements. For the wine of national success and prestige intoxicated the soul of the everyday Roman. He neglected his gods. He forgot the arts, the good, the beautiful, the true. He buried his morals, personal, political, and international. He became a creature who did only one thing well, and that was to live off the bounty of the state. His chief delight came to be gladiatorial bloodshed. He loved every vice, and flaunted every virtue. Mad with power, the home base of the Roman armies became a great center of private and public corruption.

And the inevitable happened. The spirit of Rome's citizens invaded her armies. What was the use of fighting when no one any longer knew or cared what they were fighting for? Why obey discipline, when all discipline was dissipated at home? Discontent, disheartened because the foundation was cut out from under them back home, the Roman armies lost their fighting spirit. And so it was not long before Attila, the Hun, the scourge of the north from out the steppes of Russia, had cut the empire to ribbons, and the barbarian Goths had captured, sacked, and burned the very capitol of the Caesars, Rome, once the sapphire of antiquity. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad with power." When the citizens of a nation become intoxicated by the spirit of success and invincibility, the days of that nation are numbered.

I declare unto you today that it is time for Americans to do some serious thinking. You need only read history to see that in America history is repeating itself. Only a relatively few years ago the representatives of thirteen little colonies pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to a venture of freedom. Because those men and the citizens they represented lived by their sacred honor, America became a great Nation. Her people were religious. They believed in Almighty God, and they tried to live it. Politics carried a heavy and an accepted responsibility. Men and women were concerned that their Government carry out their own high ideals. The cause of righteousness and decency inspired every fighting man from Bunker Hill to Iwo Jima. And America emerged from the Second World War the strongest Nation on the face of the earth.

In the few years which followed, America properly became the warehouse of those whom she had supported in battle. Britain, France, Turkey, Greece were able to remain free, and some of them able to survive, only because of the life lines from American fields and factories. America also became the blood bank, and again properly so, of her former enemies, as Japan, Italy, and Western Germany were given transfusions and set on their economic and political feet, and were taught for once the truths of simple decency which make for great nations.

Yet in those last few years, something was happening in America herself. Something which did not need to happen. Something which should not have happened. Something which has brought this Nation to a great crossroad. For the common citizens of this Nation drank the wine of military victory and economic plenty. Our people feasted on the meat of prestige. They imbibed the potions of wartime morality, and easy-money luxury. In short, Americans became mad with power. And it is still true, "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad with power." Oh, we have said, "That doesn't mean us. It can't happen to America." But it does mean us, and it is near enough to happening right now that we simply must be aware of what is going on.

The corruption of our society, of our integrity, and of our officialdom has not yet, thank God, cut the foundation out from under our forces fighting for righteousness and freedom. It was grand to hear 10 days ago from the general of the army that they are still fine in every way. But we here at home simply must face the facts which the last month has thrown flatly in our faces. The home country and the home people, people like you and me, have gone mad, and no army can long continue to fight for righteousness and freedom when righteousness and freedom are dead symbols in the heart of the common man and of his government.

Let us frankly face the picture we have seen of ourselves in recent weeks—and it will be our fault alone if we fail to see the picture, and therefore fail to learn its lessons, and if we therefore have to bear the consequences. The picture is not nice. Americans have come to be a dishonest people. We have read and heard and seen some of the events unearthed by the Kefauver investigation. If you paid any attention to those events at all, and you should have, you were shocked by the vice, the graft, the dishonesty, the immorality which extend from the czars of the underworld down not only into our colleges and universities—and you ask, "Why support Christian education?"—but which send their tentacles into every town and hamlet, including our town, and in many, many of our homes, including some of yours.

Yet we need not have been surprised by those revelations. We have known those things were happening on a local scale for years, and we never paid any attention. We never insisted that our officials act. We all did some of the same things ourselves. We tried our best to beat the rationing system during the war. We still seize every opportunity to get something for nothing. We are delighted when our pony wins, or when we can find a punchboard or slot machine, and it pays off. Our clubs raise their money by raffles, and we send our children out on the street to sell chances for the school, and we have made ourselves believe it is all right because, as we put it, "It's all for a good cause," which means almost any cause must be good. And some of us would even like to bring that sort of thing into the church. We all try to get to know somebody who knows somebody, so we can get our piece of the pie a little cheaper. And we have tried to justify ourselves by saying, "All of life's a gamble, so why not live like it?" Well, perhaps for you life is a gamble, and if so, I'm sorry—but it's true, life just can't be otherwise, unless, of course, you really believe in God. But the everyday honesty and integrity and sacred honor of the American people is dead. And the big-time gamblers didn't kill it. You did, and I did. We everyday Americans did. And if it wasn't for us the big shots would never have had their chance. The real blame for these horrible conditions rests on our town, and on our homes, and on our souls, and on us.

We could speak of morals. They are lousy, with everything which that crude word suggests. But again it was not the house of ill-fame, which get sometimes into our papers and are a must for every really popular novel, which sabotaged America's morals. It was the deeds done in the dark not only by America's boys and girls, but also by America's fathers and mothers. And when startling revelations of American immorality blow across the news, and when your children have difficulty finding decent magazines with decent pictures at the store, just remember where the blame really falls. It falls on your town, and on your street, and perhaps on your house, and on you.

The last weeks have also brought a terrific indictment against our Government. As I told you almost a year ago, at the very outset of the Korean war, if Christianity is to be preserved in our world, our Nation must preserve it, for no other country has either the power or the will to do so. It has just been made plain that our Government does not have the will to do so, either.

I do not pretend to know who is right in the current dispute over the Far East. The facts are too confused, and we have not been told enough of enough of them. But I do know we are in a war, and you people who have sons and husbands in training camps and in Korea know that we are in a war. And I also know that no army in the field can successfully wage war unless its government back home is sure of what it intends to do, and has sharp ideas as to how it is going to do it. It was proved by the Duke of Wellington, and by Marshall Foch, as well as by General MacArthur, that when the home government is unable to understand the situation with which it is faced, then the military commander is absolutely forced to make his own decisions—and if George Washington had waited for the Continental Congress to act, there never would have been an America in the first place. At least the Continental Congress remembered its sacred honor, and didn't act like a spoiled child.

Our present Government, and most other Americans, never have understood the seriousness of what has been going on in the world the last 20 and more years. It does not believe the truth history proves, and of which the Russians boast, that we are dealing with an enemy who is completely pagan, and who therefore will use, and is using, any means at all, including lies, double-talk, two-facedness, and atomic war to gain control of the whole world; an enemy who is keenly aware that if he conquers the United States he has conquered the one nation which is holding the rest of the free countries of the world together. In that ignorance, General Marshall delivered China deliberately to the Communists, in his report on China 2 years or so ago. In that ignorance, and in questionable innocence, Dean Acheson supported Alger Hiss. In that ignorance President Truman recalled the only man who, regardless of where he is right or where he is wrong, is the only American who both knows what is actually going on in the Far East, and whom the Russians definitely fear. In that ignorance we would follow our pink-tinged allies and appease the enemy still further by betraying unto him Formosa, and presenting him with still another seat in the United Nations from which more swiftly he may cut our throat. And appeasement is merely capitulation without a battle, and making oneself even weaker for the battle which is sure to come anyway. We should have learned about 13 years ago that we can't win wars with umbrellas.

But it is all too easy to blame the Government. We cannot blame the Government for not facing reality when we citizens, who actually are the Government, have persistently refused to face reality ourselves. We were the ones who didn't care to have our dreams shattered by reality. We screamed for disarmament in 1945–46, in spite of the warnings of Eisenhower and others. We urged the dismantling of our national defenses and the dismembering of our Armed Forces. We were the ones who did not want to pay taxes, and who scoffed at the idea that anyone would dare oppose us. We were the ones who enjoyed ourselves in the postwar world, and who spent recklessly, and who lived recklessly, and who refused to be serious about anything. We were the ones who took the goings-on in Moscow and Washington as a joke. Instead of standing in our watchtower looking out to protect our freedoms, we exploited and abused them. We have been mad with our power. Corruption, immorality, dishonesty, the will to appease and the unwillingness to meet reality have reached up from almost every home on every street of every town, and that's how they got into the Capitol of the land. And whom the gods of history would destroy, they first make mad. Rome lives again, here. The forces among the citizenry which undermined Rome's armies and efforts are all too surely present in the hearts and lives of our own people. And the power of the godless barbarian from the north is already quivering to be unleashed. And until and unless we Americans in our homes and in our hearts get back to the sacred honor of Americans, no power on earth can stop that pagan horde.

I wonder how we came to be this way? James tells us in his old Epistle. He said long, long ago, "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." There is how we came to be so dishonest, so immoral, so uncaring, so mad. We were content to be hearers, not just our officials, for they would have to do, if we did. But you, and I, and millions like us all over America have come to our churches on Sunday mornings—yes, 1 hour a week was all we could give to it—and we have heard God's word, on which our Nation and our souls are founded, and then we have gone out and promptly forgotten about it and lived in our lives as if neither God nor His word existed. James even tells us just how we have done it: Like a man seeing his face in a mirror, seeing the promise reflected there, the fine character, the noble features, and concluding therefore he was successful and fine and

noble, yet only deceiving himself, because he went out into life and forgot the promise, the character, and the nobility to live like a scum. Just so, we have heard God's words of life. God has told us how to live alertly, cleanly, purely, honestly, truly, eternally. But merely having heard, we have thought we had already accomplished God's requests, and thereby we deceived ourselves. For having heard, we have forgotten all, and become mad with the spirit of our time. Well, we have had our warning. "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

But far more important to us is this question: How do we escape from this situation, before our moral and spiritual disease infects our Army, as it has our Government; before, in our intoxication we, like Rome, fall before the pagan from the north? Do not snort at that question. Those who laugh at reality live only to die in their folly. We stand today at a crossroad in eternity. Either we give ourselves to be used by God as His instruments for the preservation of freedom, of decency, of Christianity, or else God will let us die in our insanity and raise up in some other land another people to be His servants. How do we find the right road? How do we escape from our current madness?

James tells us. It is all in God's Word, you see, if we will only hear, and do. James says, "Who so looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and lives in it, and is not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed." Now the law of liberty is merely the law of God, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. James is right. If we will look for once earnestly into that law, and accept its truth; if we will not just hear and forget it, but hear it and live it, in honesty, in strictness, in purity, in alertness, beginning with the little things of everyday life, if we will be doers who actually live the law of God, we shall be blessed. We shall be blessed because God never forsakes those who give their hearts and lives to Him. He who is on the Lord's side, by the power of the God within him is victorious.

The desperate situation in which we stand today won't be solved by seeking a complicated solution. The right road to the kindom of God on earth won't be found in the halls of legislative debate and investigation. The situation will be solved and the road to the kingdom found first of all by you, in your church pew, in your heart, in your life, in your home, in your city, and at last in your country as you become a doer of God's Word, and actually begin to live in God's purity and alertness and honesty and truth. And the solution can be found and the road to the kingdom chosen no other way.

We have had our warning. God has given it to us, perhaps for the last time, in March and April 1951. This is no word of doom. It is a word of challenge. We are on the verge of dissipating it in the mere madness of hero worship. Heroes do fade away. They even die. God never does. Only those die who hear His Word and forget it. But those, even at the very crossroad, who look again to God's perfect law of liberty and live in it, and are not forgetful hearers, but doers of God's work, they and their Nation shall be blessed. The way to the right roads to peace, security, and eternity begins with the most simple thing in all the world—obedience to the Word of God. In our current madness it will be difficult for us to take the simple road. But it is the only road which doesn't lead to obliteration. The decision must be made and made today. Tomorrow may be too late. The decision is America's to make, and you, my people, are America. The making of the decision begins with you. Be ye doers of God's Word.

Non-Russian People of Soviet Union Our Potent Ally in the Overthrow of the Stalin Regime

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, about half the people in the Soviet Union are non-Russian. They include 40,000,000 Ukrainians, 10,000,000 Byelorussians, and more than 50,000,000 other peoples—such as Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Georgians, Tartars, Armenians, and Turkestanians.

Both the Russian and the non-Russian people in the Soviet Union suffer from the Communist terrorism, but in addition the non-Russian peoples suffer as minority groups trod upon by the aggressive and imperialistic policies of the Communists in the Kremlin.

The underground Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Georgian, and other resistance groups are already an active force against the Communists. Other groups are most eager to strike a blow for freedom when the time is opportune. It is these groups that can be in the vanguard of the fight against imperialistic Soviet communism.

The American people have always been ready to assist the downtrodden and oppressed. To set forth more clearly these feelings of the American people and in order to give a new direction to our foreign policy, I introduced into the House on April 17, 1951, House Concurrent Resolution 94—a resolution to assist the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union in their struggle for liberation from their present Communist enslavement.

The resolution expresses the friendship of the American people with the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, and their conviction as to the rights of these peoples to their basic freedoms and to self-determination. The resolution expresses the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the non-Russian peoples and requests the President to make no further agreements with the present Soviet regime which in any way strengthens or maintains its power and to explore methods whereby the American people and the United States Government can assist the non-Russian people in their struggle for liberation.

If the United States properly takes advantage of this basic Soviet weakness by strongly encouraging these nationalities in opposition to the Communist imperialist regime, we may well be able to avert world war III.

If, nonetheless, total war should be precipitated by Communist recklessness, our victory may depend on the support of these non-Russian peoples living along the vulnerable edges of the Soviet empire.

In formulating a practical program of assistance to these oppressed peoples, America is in a potentially fortunate position since we already have within our borders various American political groups which can offer advice and assistance, such as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Lithuanian-American Council, The American Latvian Association, The Estonian World Alliance, and the National Committee of the Byelorussians, Georgians, and others.

In formulating this resolution, I have been greatly assisted by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, who is president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and executive vice president of the Federation of Americans of Central and East European Descent.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 94, which was referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is as follows:

Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 in the following words: "* * * that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men—deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness"; and

Whereas the American people believe these principles are universal and apply to all men everywhere, at all times, and under all forms of government; and

Whereas these principles flow from certain essential truths, among which are—

That the Creator is the Author of every human being and the Source of his rights and that neither the state nor any other human agency has jurisdiction to exploit any human being or violate his rights;

That the state is a servant to mankind and not its master and may not pervert its administrative and police powers so as to make of them a weapon to violate human rights or to terrorize the people;

That there is a brotherhood of all men but only under the Fatherhood of God; and

Whereas communism wears a humanitarian cloak and poses as the messiah of social justice but in reality has given rise to the most reactionary regime of our time based on barbarism and slavery as a result of its immoral doctrine founded in malice setting man against man, class against class, and all men against God; and

Whereas communism thrusts itself beyond civil government and political philosophy, claiming the whole man, denying all spiritual values, denying his inalienable rights, and seeking to transform all human beings created by God in His Image into soulless biological units, to be fitted into a military and economic machine designed for world revolution; and

Whereas communism, although not native to Russia, was adopted by a small, ruthless Bolshevik minority which by treachery, deceit, brutal force, and terror subverted and destroyed the freedom gained by the Russian people in their democratic revolution of February 1917; and

Whereas imperialist communism, from the base of its dictatorship in Russia proper,

did later occupy by brutal military aggression the proclaimed Democratic National Republics of the independent Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Kuban Cossack, Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijanian, North Caucasian, Finno-Karelian, Tatar, and Turkestanian peoples; and

Whereas imperialist communism has in crass disregard of the wills of these peoples enforced on them the unnatural structure of the Soviet Union, as later on the Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Moldavian, West and Carpatho-Ukrainian peoples, and tyrannizes all of the afore-mentioned peoples, together with the Bashkirs, Uzbeks, Kirgizes, Buryat Mongols, Chuvashes, Dagestans, Kabardinians, Komis, Maris, Mordovians, North Osetians, Tatars (Volga), Udmurts, Yakuts, Abkhazes, and Kara-Kalpaks, under a regime of colonialism and inhuman exploitation; and

Whereas imperialist communism, during and after World War II, applied genocide on the peoples rebelling against its dictatorship and annihilated the Volga German Republic, the Crimean Tatar Republic, the Chechen Republic, and the autonomous region of Karachev, scattering their population over the Asiatic Arctic; and

Whereas imperialist communism is systematically applying to all the non-Russian nationalities, both within the Soviet Union and without the Soviet Union, Stalin's Russification program, aiming at the destruction of all national organisms and their cultural peculiarities by creating one Soviet nationality, with one Soviet language and one Soviet culture; and

Whereas communism after consolidating its imperialist gains succeeded until recently by means of false propaganda, deceit, police-state methods, and hermetically sealed frontiers, in keeping the non-Soviet world largely ignorant of the plight of these non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union and, in turn, keeping the peoples within the Soviet Union in ignorance of the true nature of conditions existing outside its borders and particularly of conditions in the democratic world; and

Whereas communism has taken the lives of tens of millions of human beings in the Soviet Union (notably the liquidation of about five million Ukrainian peasants in 1932–33 and the Lidice-like massacre of Ukrainians in Vinnitsia in 1937–38) including a vast number of the members of its own armed forces (other than in the late war), and has enslaved the peoples—

By robbing them of their farms and transforming them into landless agricultural robots;

By chaining workers to their factories and transforming them into homeless industrial robots;

By depriving intellectuals of freedom of creative work and thought and transforming them into voiceless ideological robots;

By submitting vast numbers from all classes, both men and women, old and young workers (industrial and white collar), peasants, and intellectuals, to the subhuman conditions of concentration camps in uninhabitable areas and transforming them into a nameless host of more than fifteen million state slaves;

By the uprooting and dispersal of minority groups;

By practicing genocide upon national groups, including the Jewish population, within the Soviet Union and making the Soviet Union a burial ground of nations; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying the institution of the family in the Soviet Union by an enforced collective way of life, by inordinate control and indoctrination of the children, and by setting members of the same family against one another through fear and terror; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying religion in the Soviet Union by fostering atheism, by ridiculing and persecuting the sincere religious expression of the people, by perverting religious instincts in the hearts of the young, by murdering the representatives of religion, by destruction of places of worship and the abolition of religious institutions (as the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the 1920's and the Ukrainian Catholic Church in 1945), by tolerating only religious services subservient to the state, and by deifying the leader of the Red regime; and

Whereas imperialist communism has by force and deceit conscripted into the Soviet Army overwhelming numbers of peace-loving non-Russian peasants, workers, and intellectuals whose genuine anticommunist and anti-imperialist sentiments have been amply demonstrated by numerous acts of self-determination, revolts, and resistances (such as: 1918–20—the courageous defense of the independent Ukrainian National Republic against Trotsky's Red Army; 1926—the Georgian revolt for independence; 1928–30—the upsurge of Ukrainian "Titoism" led by Skripnik and others; 1937—the plan to overthrow the imperialist Communist regime led by Marshal Tukhachevsky, General Yakir, Colonels Prymakiv and Kryvoruchko; 1938—the spontaneous creation of the independent Carpatho-Ukraine; 1941—the heralded declarations of Ukrainian independence in both Lviv and Kiev at the outbreak of the Red-Nazi conflict; 1941–42—the willful mass surrender of over 2,000,000 Soviet Ukrainian troops to fight for the independence of their homeland; 1943–present—the extensive underground resistance of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, cooperating with the Lithuanian, Slovak, and Polish undergrounds, against the Nazi invaders and now against the Communist imperialists, achieving a deep infiltration into the multinational Soviet Army); and

Whereas communism by making false and appealing promises, in an atmosphere of ideological black-out in the Soviet Union, perverts the patriotic fervor of a certain number of young idealists, who have a genuine desire to serve their respective peoples, and exploits it for an antihuman conspiracy; and

Whereas communism in order to extend still further its tyranny concentrates its efforts on promoting artificial hostile feelings between the friendly and peace-loving peoples within the Soviet Union and the people of the United States and of other free nations whose basic aspirations as human beings are identical, and who have no real conflicting interests; and

Whereas imperialist communism not satisfied with the early subjugation and exploitation of these millions of people in the Soviet Union has already forced Marxist-Stalinist tyranny on the more recently free and independent nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and initially Yugoslavia which still follows the Communist ideology, and in the words of the United States Supreme Court Justice Jackson in the recent case of *American Communications Association* vs. *Douds* (339 U. S. at p. 429), "the international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'état, and terrorism and assassination."; and communism has conquered China and is in the process of attempting to subjugate Korea, Tibet, Viet Nam, and Malaya, and seeks eventually to enslave free men everywhere with the openly professed aim of establishing the World Soviet Union; and

Whereas agreements made by any one or more of the free nations with the Communist regime that now enslaves the peoples within the Soviet Union strengthen materially and morally the position of said regime, weaken the resistance to Communist tyranny, and dim the hopes of these peoples for liberation; such agreements with said regime being used by it only to its advantage for the purposes of accumulating additional strength and to the disadvantage of every other country seeking honorably to compose differences with it; it being one of the prime techniques of communism to disregard truth and honor and to ignore agreements whenever opportune; and

Whereas, in contrast to the treacherous fifth columns that operate in the free countries of the world to enslave them to imperialistic communism, there exists among these non-Russian peoples, who constitute about one-half of the population of the Soviet Union, an active and extensive underground system led by the Ukranian Insurgent Army, which, if offered the encouragement and positive aid of the free peoples of the world, will enable them to liberate themselves and overthrow the imperialistic Communist tyranny and help place mankind on the path of peace instead of plunging it into the holocaust of a third world war; and

Whereas past tragic mistakes in the policies of certain of the free nations, including that of the United States, toward the Communist regime in the Soviet Union and a failure fully to understand the true nature, extent, and the enormity of its aggressive designs have substantially contributed toward placing said Communist regime in a position where it now is a clear and present danger to world peace and the free progress of mankind compelling the United States and other free nations again to undertake a vast program of armament expenditures; and

Whereas, while we rearm with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peace, we are determined to defend our freedom; and

Whereas rearmament alone coupled with an attempt to compose differences with the Communist regime by treaties and agreements leaving undisturbed said regime and its present enormous conquests of aggression will, over a period of years, place a crushing burden of armaments upon the free world that eventually could well, of itself, destroy freedom; and such agreements and treaties would tend to stabilize said regime in its conquests and give a benediction to a way of life that has declared war on all human nature under its control; and

Whereas the world cannot long continue to exist half slave and half free: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people with the different peoples within the Soviet Union—the millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, and the other non-Russian peoples between whom and the American people there are innumerable ties of kinship, and concerning whose mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice there has always been an alliance; that the American motives for these aspirations and this alliance lie deep because the United States of America was founded and has been built largely by the oppressed peoples from all countries.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, solemnly pledges that the common struggle against imperialist communism in which this Nation, together with other free nations, is now engaged is not directed against those who have been misled by communism through no fault of their own but against those who have misled them; that those who have unwittingly served the small clique in control of the Communist regime or in countries captive to it should not fear vengeance, provided they break off with communism; and that the American people recognize the right

of the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union and of the countries now held captive by said Communist regime to bring to justice their oppressors who are leading them into another world war that will mean destruction of many more millions of lives and of many cities, homes, and the countryside within the Soviet Union.

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress of the United States hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union have the right of self-determination (including the right of any of the nations within the Soviet Union to determine its own form of government and also the right to form a free federation of whatever choosing), based on the free and effective expression of popular will, namely, that no nation can be deprived of territory by force and that no nation can keep territory by force, and, by free election, to be governed by their own consent.

(b) It is further expressed to be the firm conviction of the American people that these non-Russian peoples as well as the Russian people within the Soviet Union have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which in World War II they together with other people, shed their blood, among which freedoms are—

(1) the right of peasants to their own land, to work it as they see fit, and to dispose of the fruits of their labor as they see fit;

(2) the right of workers to select freely the type and place of their employment, and to obtain equitable wages and decent working hours and conditions through the organization of their own truly independent trade unions;

(3) the right of intellectuals to freedom of scientific and artistic creation, to freedom of cultural intercourse with the whole world, and to the establishment of educational, scientific, and cultural institutions, independent of state control;

(4) the right of political prisoners of all classes to immediate liberation and aid in rehabilitation;

(5) the freedom of religion, of speech, of thought, and of the press, and freedom of each national group to use its own language and kind of alphabet;

(6) the right of the people peaceably to assemble, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures;

(7) the right of the people to life, liberty, and private ownership of property; the right of an accused to a speedy and public trial in accordance with principles of law and justice;

(8) the freedom of movement within the country and of travel abroad and upon the high seas, together with the freedom to engage in commerce and pursuits of private enterprise and in all peaceful activities;

(9) the freedom of families from the Communist way of life and from undue state interference and control, and of parents in the education of their children;

(10) the freedom of the armed forces to defend the legitimate interests of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union, the right and obligation of the armed forces to protect the people from the Communist tyranny, and the freedom of the armed forces from being used and augmented by the Communist tyranny into an aggressive force both against its own people and against peaceful nations.

SEC. 4. To give meaning to their historic friendship for the multiple national peoples within the Soviet Union, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for an early liberation of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union from their Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing about that liberation at the earliest possible date, the President of the United States is hereby requested—

(1) to make no further agreement and no commitments to the present Soviet regime that would tend in any way to maintain, stabilize, or further extend its power over the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union;

(2) to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which, among other things, recognizes the essentially evil nature of the Communist regime bent on the destruction of the United States and of the free world and takes cognizance of the paramount imperialist character of said regime in its enslavement of over 80,000,000 non-Russian peoples occupying the broad peripheral area of the Soviet Union from the Baltic to the Black Sea to the Far East Pacific.

(3) to explore the methods whereby our representatives in the United Nations may urge that body to assist the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union who resist serving as cannon fodder in the imperialist ventures of the Kremlin, to obtain liberation from their present enslavement and exchange for their present representation in the United Nations a true representation that can work for, rather than obstruct and undermine the efforts of all peoples of the world, for the first time in human history effectively to lay down a true foundation for lasting peace and the undisturbed permanent coexistence of peoples;

(4) to explore methods whereby the American people through their Government, and by private means with Government assistance and otherwise may offer material aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and other peoples within the Soviet Union and people in the Communist-dominated countries.

Letter From a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a copy of a letter received by a mother who has a son fighting with the marines in Korea. I have deliberately omitted the names for fear of reprisal.

Mr. Speaker, after reading this letter, Members of Congress will wonder how we can possibly justify the administration's policies in Korea today. MacArthur is right, but his voice is like one crying out in the wilderness, all at the expense of our boys who are dying in Korea:

"LIKE A HERD OF SHEEP BEING LED TO SLAUGHTER," MARINE WRITES

From the pen of a marine comes the best first-hand description of the Korean war the reporter sees. The young marine returned to the front April 13, according to the latest word from Korea, fully recovered from a leg wound suffered in earlier action.

Around Mason, Korea was, in early April, the prettiest John had ever seen it. Rice fields made it green, and cherry blossoms were in full bloom. But of the war he penned:

SAW MASSACRED CONVOY

"If you could see some of the massacres that have taken place over here. At one place, about 20 miles south of the thirty-eighth, I saw the remains of a whole convoy of American soldiers. Evidently attacked by overwhelming forces, they didn't have a chance. Many were killed in their trucks and jeeps. Such scenes are common in Korea, but the worst is yet to come.

"Our intelligence reports the North Koreans and Chinese have 63 divisions in North Korea, with an unlimited supply of replacements. How hopeless it all seems. Our forces are but a fraction of that.

"[The politicians] say the men are fighting and dying over here to prevent world war III. What in h—— do they think is going on right now?"

SACRIFICE IN VAIN?

"Every time I see a replacement come in, in my mind I compare them to a herd of sheep being led to the slaughter—or a truckload of hogs being taken to the stockyards. For a man to sacrifice his life for such a cause makes life itself seem quite in vain."

Earlier, while still aboard the hospital ship, he wrote:

"I am listening to hillbilly music. Eddie Arnold is singing Tomorrow Never Comes. Isn't it the truth? They'll send me back to the States tomorrow—but tomorrow is always just beyond reach.

"The situation here doesn't look too good. The Commies are preparing to pour everything within their reach into the spring offensive. Suppose by the time I get back up front it will be hell. Hope I get hit soon after I get up there. You see with two Purple Hearts (or a still one) we get back to the States. For my next wound I'd even settle for a loss of a leg. It would be worth it to get out of here.

"You know, mom, a person has many more lives than a cat. A cat has only nine; I died many, many times up in those mountains. For example: One afternon our squad was crossing a ledge. There was a sheer rock wall on one side of us, a 2,000-foot drop on the other. The enemy, on another mountain 200 yards away, opened up on us with machine guns. We had no place to go."

UNITED STATES MACHINE GUNNERS TOOK OVER

"Then, for about 5 minutes (until our own machine guns found them) they fired steadily at us. Shells chipped rock all around us. I remember how I turned my right side toward them, to give more protection to my heart. Some of the darndest things run through a mind. You tell yourself, 'This is it.' It's funny how a man prepares himself to die.

"On another afternoon mortar shells were hitting all around us. We all thought our numbers were up. I looked about to see how the rest were taking it. All were lying around. Some had their arms over their heads, as if that would protect them, but most were lying face down. I imagine each was praying in his own way, for we had no protection whatsoever.

"I said to myself, 'Well, John, this is the end of the line!' Suddenly I sat up, calm as hell, and pulled out some poems I had been working on, and read them over. It seemed to give me courage of some kind. I don't know what made me do it, but evidently a person will do strange things under such circumstances.

"I am reading a book, 'Return To Religion'—a very good book, in my opinion. You know, Mom, sometimes I get to feeling that I'll never get back home. I've been away so long and so many things have happened that it just seems as if God didn't intend I should come back.

"Life gets pretty dreary here aboard the hospital ship. Saw the sun yesterday, for

the first time in 3 weeks. Spring is in the air. In the distance mountainsides, with their rice fields, are starting to get green. Makes me sort of homesick. Suppose fields back there are getting green, too. Won't be long before farmers will be working in the field.

"Will try to write the State Line Country Club. Have received their package. I think it was really nice of them. Seems the package followed me from the Philippines, to Japan, then on to Korea. I kept moving around so much it was a long time before it caught up to me.

"My Sharon Reporter is taking a long time to reach me. I am now receiving last December's issues. Even letters seem to take longer than they should. Yours are taking a month to get to me. Hope to be seeing you before Christmas."

Nurses Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of May 7, 1951:

NURSES ARE NEEDED

In almost every occupation the law of supply and demand determines the income possibilities. If many persons are qualified to engage in it, the demand for their services slacks off. If, however, it is the other way, would-be employers crowd one another in the effort to engage someone who can carry out their wishes. Such a situation is likely to raise the compensation.

A condition of this sort is met with in boom times in most of the trades. When the number of carpenters is decidedly less than the demand, it is likely to cost more to build a house or even to repair a fence. The same is true of many other skilled trades. There are labor unions which limit sharply the number of young men admitted as apprentices.

In two of the learned professions, the law and medicine, it looks very much to the outsider as if those actively engaged are disposed to narrow admissions. There are many law schools in the country, but, when it comes to receiving graduates as members of the bar the way is straight and narrow and few there be who manage to get through it.

As for medicine, the number of schools, where young men or young women are trained to deal with the ills of the flesh, show small disposition to increase, although it is common knowledge that there are many persons in this country, rather close to half of them, beyond the reach of prompt and modern medical service. There are some few physicians who worry about this, but most of the profession seem undisturbed by the shortage.

It might be supposed that nurses would have an attitude similar to that of doctors of medicine, but that is not so. Instead, the organized trained nurses of the United States, and also of many other countries, are so deeply disturbed about the lack of competent members of their profession that they are seeking to commend their calling to others so that this shortage will be in the way of disappearing.

Here in Boston the National League of Nursing Education is holding its fifty-fifth assembly this year on the theme, Education for Nursing Service. Last November a committee representing six national nursing organizations reported a shortage of 65,000 professional nurses below the minimum requirements for civilian nursing service. In this estimate, no allowance was made for urgent military and civil defense needs.

During World War II there were at one time 65,216 nurses in military service. To meet all the needs and to take care of normal population growth 58,000 nurse students must be admitted annually to basic nursing schools. In the year 1950 only 44,200 new ones enrolled.

Meeting this week in Boston there are to be about 2,000 nurses, educators, and students, deeply concerned that this serious gap between supply and demand be closed. Of course they are eager about recruiting for their profession, but in addition they are bent on having good education for those interested in enrolling in schools where nursing is taught. They want both more nurses and better nurses.

One matter that interests them exceedingly is a measure now before Congress, the Bolton bill (H. R. 190). Like many other forms of training the cost of giving adequate nursing education has advanced decidedly. Endowments do not yield so much as formerly. Construction of new buildings and their proper equipment has become more expensive. Leaders of the profession are convinced that Federal aid is necessary to guard and maintain the health of the people of this country.

The measure was introduced by Representative FRANCES BOLTON of Ohio, who is herself the founder of a school of nursing and is now serving her sixth term in Congress. She has the confidence of the nursing organizations. Her plan would supplement existing income and the resources of nursing schools, to help with the cost of instruction and to build new schools. Scholarships for qualified students in need of assistance, to aid research and to promote recruitment, would be included. An annual appropriation of $5,000,000 is asked for construction and equipment. The amount for scholarships would be determined annually by Congress. There is more to the proposal, but the essential purpose is to begin to relieve the shortage in order that the rest of us may be properly cared for when our health needs it. Good nursing is quite as important as proper care by physicians.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the May 7, 1951, issue of Newsweek concerning the great St. Lawrence seaway and power development, entitled "Canada Wants Action":

SEAWAY—CANADA WANTS ACTION

Like spring, the long-delayed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project was busting out all over Canada last week. Unlike spring, it brought no smiles to Canadian faces.

In London, Ontario, former Ontario Premier Gordon Conant said it was time to put the seaway on an "or else" basis, that Canadian newsprint, nickel, iron, and defense cooperation should be horse-traded for United States approval of the seaway. In Winnipeg, United States Ambassador Stanley Woodward salved Canada's slow burn with assurances of congressional approval and an early start. In Toronto, Ontario, Hydro Commission Chairman Robert Saunders suggested Woodward was talking through his hat. He disclosed that he had received discouraging news indicating no approval from Congress until 1952 at least.

History: For almost 20 years now, United States congressional committees have annually dragged a bill providing for the deep waterway and power development from its pigeonhole, blown the dust off, and exposed it to the public eye and the attacks of Washington's powerful antiseaway lobby of eastern United States railroad, canal, barge, port, and shallow-draft shipping interests. The bill then goes back into the pigeonhole.

As the House Public Works Committee closed hearings on the seaway this week, history seemed ready to repeat itself, and Canadians, who have been talking the project for half a century, were fed to the teeth. The seaway now promised to be the biggest break in Canadian-American relations since the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Proponents of the seaway call it essential both for power and navigation; opponents call it boondoggling. New York State, Ontario, and Quebec—the three largest industrial basins on the continent—face power shortages. In Ontario, demand is running a phenomenal 25 percent higher than last year. For it and New York, the 2,200,000-horsepower potential of the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence is the only block of undeveloped power left.

Ore route: As for navigation: The last war was fought off Lake Superior's Mesabi Range—iron ore moved from the open-pit mines along a submarine-free route into Pittsburgh. But the Mesabi is drying up. The nearest new source is Ungava in northern Quebec. Deepening the present 14-foot ship channels in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence to 27 feet would see millions of tons of iron ore laid down cheaply in Pittsburgh within 5 years.

United States Commerce Secretary Charles Sawyer, Charles Wilson, Dean Acheson, George C. Marshall, and Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman paraded these facts before the House committee without visible effect. Seaway opponents were more impressed with a statement from Chapman that Canada was preparing to proceed with an all-Canadian route, for which the United States would pay in tolls. The antiseaway lobby countered that Canada was bluffing. Saunders flew to Washington last week to assure committee members this was not the case.

Naval Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 8, marked the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of naval aviation.

On May 8, 1911, the Navy Department, at the direction of the then Secretary of the Navy George von L. Meyer, of Boston,

placed an order for the Navy's first two aircraft with the Curtiss Co., Hammondsport, N. Y. The date of that significant event has been chosen as the official birthdate of naval aviation.

How unimpressive a start for so important an element of our national defense. During World War II Navy aircraft flying from our mobile, fast-moving carriers were hammering at the Japanese homeland while our ground troops were still many hundreds of miles away. Our fast carrier task forces were able to hit the enemy from one spot and hit him again within 24 hours from another spot 800 miles away.

During World War II naval aircraft accounted for more than 2,333,597 tons of enemy shipping, including 172 Jap combat vessels, 62 German subs, and 447 merchant vessels. Our naval aircraft destroyed 15,401 enemy aircraft.

Naval aviation has given new mobility and new potency to sea power. Along with radar, aircraft have become the "eyes" of the fleet as well as its Sunday punch.

Mr. Speaker, time does not allow me to enumerate the heroes of naval aviation. They are too numerous. Their deeds of technical achievement and heroism are well known to a grateful citizenry. I hope that we may never become unmindful of them.

Naval aviation has many facets. Perhaps the feats of Navy land-based operations and the operations of flying boats at sea are not so well known as the achievements of carrier-based aircraft. But all are important. On this day we honor all naval aviators—whether they fly single-engine or multiengine aircraft, whether they fly from the deck of a carrier, from a land strip, or from the surface of the ocean itself.

Because of the ever-increasing size of multiengine, long-range bombers, the role of the seaplane or flying boat becomes more important. In order for them to operate against the enemy's homeland or in an enemy's home waters, it is not necessary first to build long and costly landing strips at advance bases. Seven-tenths of the earth's surface is water. The flying boat operates from water.

Then, too, there is the all-important job of protecting our shores and our shipping from enemy submarines. This is one of the jobs of naval aviation—both carrier-based and shore-based.

To the credit of naval aviation is a long list of technical accomplishments in aircraft development, operating techniques, and mechanical research. The Nation is incomparably stronger and the aviation industry more efficient because of naval aviation. And yet there are those who would have scuttled naval aviation. It was not so long ago that steps which would ultimately have had that effect were initiated. Fortunately for our national safety they were never consummated.

Once again in Korea naval aviation has proved its versatility and indispensability. Many of our ground troops fighting there are alive today because of the advanced techniques of close ground support developed, perfected, and practiced by Navy and Marine Corps pilots flying from Navy carriers.

Of particular pride to the Navy today is the efficiency of the air group attached to the carrier U. S. S. *Boxer* in Korean waters, flying daily strikes against the enemy. This unique air group is composed entirely of Naval Reserve aviators who, only a few weeks ago, were civilians. Most of the men are veterans of World War II who, after discharge, retained flight proficiency while members of the Navy's famed Weekend Warriors, flying with Reserve squadrons near their homes. Thus, when the Navy again needed their services, it took but a short period of indoctrination and the entire carrier air group was ready for combat.

In one branch of national defense we are paramount. No potential enemy or combination of potential enemies can at present challenge us in this proven and indispensible element of modern warfare: Naval aviation. Russia has a larger army than we have. China has more manpower. The nations behind the iron curtain are alleged to have an air force which equals ours. But no nation on the face of the earth possesses the versatile, effective, and proven weapon which is ours in naval aviation and the fast carrier task force. Our security as a nation demands that we retain that superiority. To diminish or dissipate it would not only be foolhardy; it would be fatal to our national defense.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it fitting that we pause briefly today to pay a much-deserved tribute to the men of naval aviation, to the aircraft they fly and maintain, and to the ships they sail. Their achievements are legion and their heroism and ability second to none. To them and to their service, I say: Well done. Good sailing and happy landings.

The Late Honorable Thomas J. Halsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, may I call respectful attention of the House of Representatives to the passing from mortal life of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Thomas J. Halsey, who represented the Sixth District of Missouri in the Seventy-first Congress. Mr. Halsey departed this life on March 17 at the home of his son, Herbert Halsey, at Westfield, N. J.

I am sure that Members of this body with whom the late Mr. Halsey served, will remember him as an industrious, kindly man. He was particularly interested in the problem of the farmers, since he was reared on a farm southeast of Holden, Mo. For most of his active life he was a merchant and businessman in Holden. For about 25 years he was associated with the Holden Mill & Elevator Co.

Congressman Halsey, whether in his brief public service or as a private citizen, had the respect and esteem of all his neighbors, his friends, and the wide circle of citizens who knew him.

A Star Descends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 6, 1951:

A STAR DESCENDS

The MacArthur debate has revealed a contradictory and confusing side of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT that neither his admirers nor detractors believed he possessed.

The Ohio Senator was riding a high tide of public and political esteem before the general's dismissal. In the early stages of the tumult about MacArthur everyone generally overlooked and discounted thoughtless remarks made in the heat of the event. This included the "impeachment" cries which went up from the Republicans who look to TAFT for leadership.

No doubt Senator TAFT would have been the choice of a good many anti-Truman Democrats in 1948 had the Republicans chosen to nominate him instead of Dewey. TAFT's firmness of position in the past, his outspoken but usually fair views and his unimpeachable personal reputation were the kind of solid things all thinking Americans admire.

We have the suspicion that many Democrats outside of his home State of Ohio were secretly hoping that he would win reelection to the Senate in 1950. It seems a great many Democrats inside the State held the same opinions and voted that way judging by his great victory margin in that election. This he accomplished against great opposition.

In view of his former record, it is doubly strange to witness Senator TAFT's performance in the past several weeks.

Senator TAFT baldly declared that he opposed the United States entrance into Korea. He made the statement before the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington a little more than 10 days ago.

This is much in variance with what he publicly stated a few days after President Truman's decision to send aid to South Korea.

On June 30, 1950, the Associated Press reported that "Senator TAFT offered unqualified support for the President's move." TAFT's own words in the news report were: "Once you are into anything like this, you must go all the way."

What has caused TAFT to change his mind? The answer is obvious. Senator TAFT has clutched the publicity appeal of the MacArthur furor and is hanging on for the political popularity ascent which he thinks it will bring him. How unlike the TAFT of former days.

Another backfire hit the Senator when he attempted to single out Secretary of State Acheson for sole blame in the MacArthur removal. While swinging that cudgel, Senator TAFT took a swipe at General Bradley in the process, alleging that Bradley and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were stooges of Acheson but that the whole debate resolved itself into an Acheson versus MacArthur fuss.

General MacArthur chilled that one by telling the Senate hearing, "I have never attributed to him (Acheson) in the slightest degree the decision of the President to replace me."

As to the Bradley angle, we can see nothing wrong with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Acheson being in agreement on their global military and political policies. It would be a sad state of affairs if they were not.

Senator TAFT advocates full support of all of MacArthur's policies, including the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops. Yet, the Senator in floor debate last week brought out the point that the Communists found Chiang's armies as soft as mush when Red Chinese forces invaded. Is there any reason to believe that the same troops aren't still soft as mush?

But the most hopeless sidestepping and backfilling was TAFT's demand that the mobilization budget be cut by $20,000,000 and draft target lowered by 500,000, while at the same time embarking the United States on all-out aggressive tactics against China. These steps Senator TAFT advocates while maintaining that we cannot be deterred by "any possibility that the Russians might come in."

This kind of thinking and these public utterances force us to recall Senator TAFT's foresight on August 1, 1941. On that day he said:

"I cannot understand that the situation is more perilous today than it was a year ago."

Four months later we were in World War II.

Problems of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address that I made on the evening of May 7, 1951, at the Civil Defense Conference in Washington, D. C., relating to the multitude of problems facing governors and mayors relating to putting into operation adequate civil-defense programs.

At that time I pledged my wholehearted support for further legislation and appropriations designed to make civil defense a sound and strong copartner with our military defense effort, and that so far as legislation and appropriations are concerned, the Federal Government should take the lead.

In an interview with the representatives of the American Municipal Association I further said:

That while its success starts with the individual and thus through our local and State government up to the Federal level, the Governors of our States and mayors of our cities are justified in looking to the Congress for leadership in this important field of defense of our national security and that they should depend upon my support in the Congress of the United States for any further legislation and additional appropriations necessary to protect our citizens against possible atomic attack.

My address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, MAJORITY LEADER, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT CIVIL DEFENSE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 7, 1951

Congress has paid close attention to the grave and complex problems of civil defense which confront us as individuals and as a Nation.

Early in 1950 the Congress began its series of intensive hearings to get to the heart of the civil-defense problem that America must face if it is to survive in the event of another war in which atomic, biological, and chemical weapons may be used against us. During the course of these extended hearings by both the House and the Senate, a great deal of testimony was heard from many sources. The mayors and the Governors of several States gave us the best of their thinking on the problem as they see it. Representatives of the general public, atomic scientists, military experts, and the working staff of the executive branch of the Government on civil defense each contributed their share of testimony.

Once the Congress had grasped the magnitude of the problem that faces us in civil defense, it drew up a comprehensive law to meet the situation and our present danger. At the close of the last session of Congress, the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 was passed by both Houses of the Congress with but a single dissenting vote. This act granted wide powers to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator and his agency and established a basic formula for civil-defense operation from the Federal to the State and finally to the local governments. The almost unanimous passage of that act was unusually significant. It was firm evidence that the Congress recognized the great challenge of civil defense and its place in our security structure. But that recognition must be carried into active effect.

This Congress and the one preceding it have voted wisely many billions of dollars for military-defense purposes, primarily to carry on the undeclared war that resulted from the acts of aggression in Korea.

Congress has met the challenge that faces us by passing laws which place a number of restrictions on the people of the country and our economy. There will probably be more. You can be certain that such action as authority for price control, rationing, stockpiling, higher taxes, and all the rest would never have been passed by Congress unless it recognized the serious need for these actions. In the main these actions are directed at building up our state of military preparedness.

I would like to emphasize that all such actions and the billions we are spending for military defense are not complete, in fact, will be seriously impaired, unless we have civil defense as a coequal partner of the military in the security program.

Primarily, civil defense as it is planned and operated today is the preparedness program of the home front and for the home front as a link with our military services. It is a necessary part of our national defense, and of the self-preservation of our people and of our Nation.

It must be painfully evident that it would be incomplete to have the finest Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world and no adequate civil-defense program.

Since our cities will be the primary targets in an atomic war, they must be protected to the limits of our ability. We could lose a war in a hurry if the home front crumbled under the weight of an atomic attack. In any event, a sudden successful attack would place us at a serious disadvantage.

We must face the fact that totalitarian governments carry out the surprise attack; democracies do not.

For these reasons civil defense must take its place quickly in the minds of all of us as a sound and strong copartner with our military defense effort. If that fails to happen, we can pay a sorry price for it should war come again.

The American people should realize that the price we pay for preparedness, heavy as it may be, is the premium we pay for defense and protection in the event of war. It could be the premium we pay to avert war and to bring about peace.

We should pray and hope for the best, but prepare for the worst.

The attack, as we hope, may never come, but who can tell. Only Stalin.

It therefore follows as a matter of logic and necessity that we should prepare ourselves now.

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend his remarks, the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] has inserted in the RECORD untruths, which he could not make, and did not make, on the floor of the House. I would most certainly rise to a point of personal privilege except for the fact that to do so would take up the time of the House for a personal matter, thereby delaying for that long the important legislation now scheduled for consideration. His remarks might be libelous if made without the cloak of official privilege, and I defy him to waive that privilege.

He has taken parts of articles and even parts of sentences out of context, thus distorting them by omission and innuendo—a device frequently employed by those who have no regard for truth. The remarks he made on the floor were full of untruths, but by using the privilege of revising and extending his remarks, he avoided the objection that every Member would have felt had such added and changed remarks been made in the presence of Members.

I would move to expunge the remarks of the gentleman, if it were not for the fact that I believe that they should remain in the RECORD as evidence of his manner of thinking and of his tactics. These tactics are becoming all too prevalent. But I can assure the gentleman they will not deter me from fighting for what I concede to be right, or against what I concede to be wrong. During the many years that I have been one of the primary targets of the Communists and other subversive elements in California, I have become accustomed to the type of "smear" now being attempted by the gentleman from California, who has no doubt had expert assistance in drafting his personal attack on me.

Every Member will note the gentleman has even stooped to the belittling of my military record, which includes 2 years in New Guinea in the Philippines, although he himself entered a political office for

the first time in 1943, when to do so provided him with an exemption from the draft and the privilege of devoting almost all of his time to the practice of law, which we all know was exceptionally profitable during the war years when so many of us who were lawyers had voluntarily entered the Armed Forces. This is the gentleman who now heaps abuse upon our military leaders and those of us who served honorably under them.

In 1939 and 1940, while I was heading the California Legislature's investigation into subversive activities, and while the Communists and Nazis and their cohorts were using their smear tactics against me, and even holding threatening mass demonstrations in front of my home, I would like to inquire of the gentleman just what he was doing to stop the subversive forces in California. Did he fight as hard then as he did when he fought our enemies during the war from his sanctuary in the California Legislature?

Mr. Speaker, I have neither the time nor inclination to devote my energies to an explanation of what I think of the gentleman, who has obviously devoted much time and energy in an effort to personally vilify me, because of my exposé of the tactics he employed against our military leaders and our proposed national security training program, which has since been approved by our Committee on Armed Services and a majority of the Members of this House. I will simply say that the gentleman has resorted to untruths, and to demonstrate my point, I am asking that we include in our RECORD parts of an official report on Communist activities, which I wrote and filed with the California Legislature in 1940. I was, of course, flattered, as I believe anyone under the circumstances would be, when the Republican controlled 1950 legislature ordered my report reprinted for redistribution. The report, which I wrote 11 years ago, is the best refutation I know of to the untruths spoken by the gentleman. I ask that the following excerpts be included at this point:

REPORT OF ASSEMBLY RELIEF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE ON SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES, HON. SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY, CHAIRMAN

Mr. Speaker, your committee authorized and empowered by House Resolutions 9 and 29 to investigate subversive activities in the State relief administration respectfully reports as follows:

SECTION I

Fifth columns

The world has recently been shocked by the deadly effectiveness of subversive organizations working within such nations as Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium. Organizations of foreign-directed termites, commonly called fifth columns have demonstrated their ability to paralyze the defenses of victimized nations while cooperating with outside aggressors. It is evident that a relatively small organized force can render a whole nation helpless by coordinating its activities with forces driving from the outside.

The great masses of the people are always completely unarmed and unorganized. When confronted with an organized and disciplined group, they find themselves helpless. The Communist, or Bolshevik Party, has already demonstrated the ability of a small organized group to overthrow a government when that government is in a state of crisis resulting from either internal conditions, or the necessity of defending itself against outside forces. It is difficult to realize that the Russian branch of the Communist Party had a membership that included only an infinitesimal part of the population of Russia, when it successfully captured control of the government of that country and commenced its dictatorial domination over millions of Russian people. Those who scoff at the dangers of Communist activity in this country unknowingly befriend persons engaged in a treasonable conspiracy, because such scoffing tends to lull the populace into a state of false security which hinders effective work calculated to stop the march of fifth columns.

Communism versus Americanism

The Communist Party is bent upon overthrowing the American Government in order to substitute a dictatorship for our democracy. These traitors probably do not have the power to accomplish this objective today without outside assistance. But they are preparing to strike whenever we face a crisis of sufficient gravity to weaken our resistance. As part of our national defense we must stop them before they are able to attain sufficient strength to accomplish their objectives.

Stalin and Hitler

Protected on the east by an alliance with Stalin, Hitler's hordes have been freed to concentrate on the destruction of once peaceful and independent republics. If Hitler and Stalin can destroy the democracies of Europe, there is grave danger that their lust for power may soon attempt to span the Atlantic. In this event, it is imperative that we face these hordes free from the treachery of traitorous Nazi and Communist termites who would not hesitate to stab us in the back and our defenses from the inside. The fate of nations like Norway and Denmark should teach us the necessity of curbing treasonable conspiracies existing within our country.

Duty of Americans

Those who believe in democracy have a right, and it is their duty, to defend that democracy from enemies both within and without. Those who believe in the Constitution of the United States have a right, and a duty, to see to it that subversive groups are not permitted to subvert constitutional rights, in order to bring about their destruction. The Communists and Nazis, who are today screaming for protection of their constitutional rights are at the same time completely ignoring the obligations which such rights entail; namely, the duty of protecting and upholding the Government provided for in the Constitution. Those who demand protection under the Constitution in good faith should be willing to support the entire Constitution, rather than to pick out and support only the provisions of which they approve, and under which they claim privileges.

In the SRA

Your committee has been amazed at the extent of Communist infiltration into the State relief administration. Under the cloak of this branch of State government, Communists have found their way into widely separated areas of the State. In these areas, they are engaged in carrying out a well-planned scheme to undermine State government. Some of the strategy employed by them is quite apparent. It follows very closely the pattern laid down by the founders of the Communist Party and it parallels to a great degree the strategy of the Communist Party in Russia—with allowances made for the differences in the problems faced by the party because of the differences in the two nations.

In the Communist Party Manual on Organization, hereafter referred to as the Manual, Comrade J. Peters said:

"As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a socialistic Soviet republic in the United States, for the complete abolition of classes, for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the classless Communist society. * * * Our party realizes that certain conditions must exist before the outworn capitalistic system can be overthrown. What are the conditions? Comrade Lenin answers this question, '* * * for revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or at least a majority of the class-conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; secondly, that the ruling classes be in a state of governmental crisis which draws even the most backward masses into politics, * * * weakens the government and makes it possible for the revolutionaries to overthrow it rapidly'."

Crisis awaited

The Communist Party is simply awaiting a crisis. Through its efforts in the State relief administration, it is endeavoring to aggravate the present conditions brought about by unemployment in California and in the Nation. It is attempting to do this by maliciously endeavoring to increase relief costs to such an extent that taxpayers will be unable to carry the burden, and all relief will thereby be jeopardized. Under the guise of aiding the needy, the Communists are actually carrying out this program calculated to eventually deny relief to the destitute. They want to cause unbearable suffering. Such suffering is useful to them in their revolutionary agitation.

Dominated by Russia

It is evident that the Communist Party is not endeavoring to engage merely in the advocacy of the theories of socialism or communism. It is rather determined to force its will upon a majority of the people of the United States, whether or not they are ever willing to accept it. Instead of being an advocate of mere theories, the Communist Party is part of an international organization dominated by Russia, and bound to carry on activity beneficial to that nation, irrespective of the effects such activity may have upon the nation in which the party members live, and to which they pretend to give allegiance.

The international character of the Communist Party is well outlined in a Communist Party membership book for the year 1933. The first paragraph in said book reads as follows:

"A member of the party can be every person from the age of 18 up who accepts the program and statutes of the Communist International and the Communist Party of the United States of America, who becomes a member of a basic organization of the party, who is active in this organization, who subordinates himself to all decisions of the Comintern and of the party, and regularly pays his membership dues."

This official party book demonstrates very well the fact that the Communist Party is not an ordinary political organization. It is, rather, a disciplined army of "termites." In describing the principles upon which the party is founded, the book says:

"Acceptance and carrying out of the decisions of the higher party committees by the lower, strict party discipline, and immediate and exact applications of the decisions of executive committee of the Communist International and of the central committee of the party. * * *

"After a decision has been adopted at the congress of the Comintern, the party convention, or by the leading party committee it must be carried out unconditionally, even if some of the members or some of the local organizations are not in agreement with the decision. * * *

"The strictest party discipline is the most solemn duty of all party members and all party organizations. * * *

"He who weakens, no matter how little, the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during the period of dictatorship), effectively helps the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (Lenin).

In this same official book under the heading, "What is the Communist Party?" appears the following:

"It incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle, basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class, the party personifies the unity of proletarian principles, of proletarian will, and of proletarian revolutionary action." (From the program of the Communist International.)

An army on the march

The party manual referred to above also discusses discipline under the heading, "Why do the Communists attach so much importance to discipline?" It says:

"How can an army fight against the army of the enemy if every soldier in the army is allowed to question and even disobey orders of his superior officers? What would happen in a war if, for example, the general staff orders an attack and one section of the army decides to obey and goes into battle; another thinks it is wrong to attack the enemy at the time and stays away from the battle; and a third section decides to quit the trenches and retreat to another position instead of going forward?

"Let us take an example from the class struggle. The district committee decided that a demonstration should be held against police terror and gives directions to the sections to mobilize the whole membership to get the greatest possible number of workers to the demonstration. The date and place of the demonstration are set by the district committee. One section, after receiving the decisions, works out plans to mobilize the masses, and activizes the whole section to work for the demonstration. Another section does not think the issue is very important and neglects to mobilize the membership; a third section decides that the time set by the committee is not the best one and instructs its members to mobilize at a later hour; and a fourth section decides to come at an earlier hour. What kind of a demonstration would it be? What would workers think and say about such a party?

"Our party cannot lead the masses if there is not unity in action. Unity of will and action can be achieved only if all of the members of the party act as one—are disciplined. If each party member should decide which decision of the party he wanted to carry out; if each member would carry out only those decisions which he liked and ignored those with which he disagreed, it would be impossible to lead the masses in a struggle against capitalism. An army with that kind of leadership would be defeated."

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that the Communist Party describes itself as a disciplined army bound to follow the program given to it by the Communist International irrespective of the nature of that program. This is completely unlike the American concept of political parties. It explains the meaning of the term "fifth column," which accurately describes the fact that the disciplined army working within a nation, is an integral part of that army of invasion, with whom it is bound to cooperate when directed to do so. This Communist discipline, when understood, explains the success of the Communist Party in organizing demonstrations such as that fostered by Labor's Non-Partisan League and the Workers Alliance in Sacramento on February 25, 1940.

Workers Alliance demonstration

There is no doubt that the so-called Workers Alliance march on the State capitol was, in reality, a Communist political demonstration, of the type used by the Communists, as part of the revolutionary training of the masses. Evidence adduced before the committee establishes the fact that letters directing Workers Alliance members to march on the capitol were sent out from the State office and signed by the State president of the Workers Alliance, Mr. Alex Noral, who not only admitted his membership in the Communist Party, but also exhibited his official membership book. This is only one concrete example of the disciplined activity of many similar Communist-organized and directed demonstrations, which have been prevalent in California in recent years. It is worthy of note here, that similar demonstrations were employed to protest lay-offs of unnecessary SRA personnel, by the Communist-controlled union to which many members of the relief staff belong.

Deception used

The Communist Party is today endeavoring to deceive the American people into believing that the party is not international in character, foreign directed, or planning to overthrow the American Government by force and violence. The Communists are afraid that legislation may be passed by the National Congress outlawing all political groups advocating force and violence as a means for bringing about changes in government. Therefore, the deceptive strategy of the Communist Party is aimed toward making it appear that the Communist Party does not fall within that classification.

Many fooled

Many people have been fooled by this Communist scheme because of their failure to realize that the party is a disciplined army of termites. This army, at any given time, may not advocate immediate revolution, because its whole strategy is directed toward building organizations from undercover until sufficient strength is attained, to make success of forcible action practically certain. The fundamental principles of the Communist Party are not always divulged to new recruits, unless they have responded to discipline and Communist education to such an extent, that they can be trusted to keep concealed the revolutionary intent of the Party. Your committee has heard the testimony of former Communists, some of whom were in the party only a short time, and never fully understood its true purposes. Others were heard who ranked high enough in the Party to be informed relative to its real, underlying, revolutionary character.

The whole history of the Communists proves that they would never hesitate to lie in stating their immediate or ultimate objectives, just as the termites in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Belgium pretended to give allegiance to their governments before the day for open betrayal arrived. Such termites in America are lying and hiding their real intent. They are awaiting an opportune moment to execute their nefarious schemes by sabotaging our defenses, or seizing control of our Government.

The "History of the Communist Party, of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)," edited by a Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and authorized by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, shows very clearly that the Bolsheviks have never hesitated to make use of illegal methods or any manner of deception. It should be remembered that the Communist Party is part of the same international group which called itself the Bolsheviks when plotting the Russian Revolution.

In the official history, the following quotation makes this point clear:

"Lenin proposed that the Party of the Bolsheviks should be called the Communist Party, which was the name given by Marx and Engels to their party. This name was scientifically correct, for it was the ultimate aim of the Bolshevik Party to achieve communism."

Even the present Communist Party constitution in which much deceptive working is employed to set forth the ostensible intent of the Communist Party reads as follows:

"That is, by the establishment of socialism according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International."

Some parts of this constitution can only be understood by one who has studied Communist strategy. For instance, in the constitution of the Communist Party, the preamble says:

"It is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation and the preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions."

To understand this language one would have to know that the Communists teach that the historic mission of the working class is to lead a revolution for the purpose of establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat. Such dictatorship is to the Communists, "the necessary and logical conclusion."

Vigilance needed

During this period of world crisis, it is most important that the American people be not lulled into a tolerance of Communist organizations by their false claims of devotion to American democracy. America is a capitalist country in which citizens have a right to own their own homes and other property which they may acquire legally and hold subject to the right of Government to levy taxes upon such property, or to take it for public purposes by paying compensation therefor. The Communist Party advocates the destruction of all capitalist countries. In order to destroy capitalism, they feel justified in setting up a dictatorship and in ruthlessly stamping out all persons who disagree with them by murderous purges or otherwise.

Communist theory

The official history of the party referred to above and hereafter referred to as the official history, discusses the Communist attitude toward revolution in the following language:

"Marx and Engels discovered the laws of development of capitalist society and proved scientifically that the development of capitalist society and the class struggle going on within it, must inevitably lead to the fall of capitalism, to the victory of the proletariat, to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Marx and Engels taught that it was impossible to get rid of the power of capital and to convert capitalist property into public property by peaceful means and the working class could achieve this only by revolutionary violence against the bourgeoisie by a proletarian revolution, by establishing its own political rule—the dictatorship of the proletariat—which must crush the resistance of the exploiters and create a new, classless, Communist society."

This is the theory upon which the Russian dictatorship was established and upon which the Communists justify the total destruction of all rights of free speech, press, assemblage, and religion in Russia.

Would destroy Constitution

Today we find the Communist termites in America demanding the right to use privileges guaranteed by the American Constitution, in order to work for the destruction of our Constitution and the right that it gives all of us, to disagree at all times with our Government, so long as we express our disagreement in a manner within the framework of the Constitution. The Communists yell loudly for their constitutional rights. They completely ignore the fact that exercise of these rights necessarily places upon one the duty of defending the Constitution, and the American Government against its enemies—both within and without the Nation.

The Communists in Russia tolerate no difference of opinion and they would tolerate no difference here, if allowed to seize power. They justify such intolerance on the grounds that they know they are right. But our American form of government is based upon the tolerance of disagreements, that are expressed peaceably in campaigns calculated to win the support of a majority of the people. Those successful in attaining power in our Government are nevertheless bound to defend the rights of others to differ with them, so long as no forcible effort is made by those who disagree, to impose their will upon the majority in the manner advocated by the Communist Party.

In the official history, the following quotation illustrated the Communist attitude in Russia toward the liberties which they demand in America:

"In order to consolidate the Soviet power, the old, bourgeois state machine had to be shattered and destroyed and a new, Soviet state machine set up in its place. Further, it was necessary to destroy the survivals of this division of society into estates and the regime of national oppression, to abolish the privileges of the church, to suppress the counterrevolutionary press, and counterrevolutionary organizations of all kinds, legal and illegal, and to dissolve the bourgeois constituent assembly."

In the above quotation, the term "counterrevolutionary," referred to the activity of those who opposed the Bolshevik Revolution.

Under Communist government where the state is everything, and the individual nothing, government is not restrained by the necessity of collecting taxes from the population in order to carry on its activities. There is no balance between public and private ownership.

There is no right to strike under Communist government because strikes are considered acts against the government. This fact is completely ignored and concealed by the Communists who work within the American labor movement telling workers that a Communist government would be beneficial to them. Political demonstrations such as those organized by Communists in this country would not be tolerated by a Communist government. Such demonstrations would be classed as counterrevolutionary, and persons found engaging in them would be promptly and effectively liquidated.

Communist hypocrisy

These examples of the destruction of individual rights under the Communist government of Russia, are set forth here to direct attention to the hypocrisy of the Communists and their accomplices in this country, who set themselves up as the guardians of American civil liberties and constitutional rights. The framers of the Constitution never intended that it be interpreted, so as to grant a license to destroy the Government, to tools of foreign aggressors. The right to rely on the Constitution for protection should include the obligation to use the privileges granted by it in good faith—and good faith is something the Communists cannot honestly claim.

The sugar-coated program of progressive reforms openly advocated by the Communist Party is simply a flypaper calculated to win support from the unwary in order to lead them down the road of desecration and destruction which is communism. The same tactics were used in Russia by the Bolsheviks. Their official history says at one point:

"The petition was discussed at workers' meetings where amendments were made. Bolsheviks spoke at these meetings without openly announcing themselves as such. Under their influence, the petition was supplemented by demands for freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of association for workers * * * an 8-hour day."

Of course, these demands were made before the Communists seized control over the government and stamped out all of the rights of others which they had so vociferously demanded for themselves.

Fear of reprisals

Few persons who have left the Communist Party have had the courage to speak out against it. This results from fear of reprisals by the comrades who have no respect for laws. This results also, from the fact that persons who have left the Communist Party are often so ashamed of ever having been part of it, that they fear exposure. In this regard it is interesting to note that the Communists, themselves, hold the threat of exposure over their members at all times, as a matter of discipline. The Communist constitution says on this point, "or members whose actions are detrimental to the party and the working class, shall be summarily dismissed from positions of responsibility, expelled from the party and exposed before the general public."

Communists in the State relief administration have used as a smoke screen for their activities a CIO union called the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. Such use of legal organizations is an old tactic of the Communist Party. By hiding behind what appears to be a labor organization, and by using as "fronts" non-Communists led into such an organization, they are able to screen their activities. The Communists then endeavor to make it appear that attacks on them are attacks on a labor union.

Communists control SCMWA

Your committee knows that the leadership of this SRA group is communistic. In order to deny this fact, when questioned before the committee, these leaders would have to perjure themselves. For this reason, they devised the strategy of hiring attorneys, in every case either Communists or known sympathizers, who in purporting to represent the best interests of all members of the so-called union, made it clear to all of them that they should not answer questions relative to communism. This meant that Communists and non-Communists alike, who were members of the so-called union, would refuse to answer questions relative to communism. This saved the Communists from the necessity of being the only ones forced to refuse to answer in order to escape exposure or possible prosecution for perjury. Non-Communists were thus used as a screen.

The record shows that your committee constantly advised members of this Communist-controlled organization, that if they were not Communists they should answer the questions frankly and not be dupes for Communist hoodlums. But the typical Communist discipline was already so well inculcated into the minds of the members of this organization, that only a few had the courage to defy their leaders by stating to the committee that they were not Communists, and they did not believe in communism. Those who did testify were dismissed from the union for so doing. In contrast to the attitude of the disciplined members of this so-called union were all of the other witnesses who came before the committee, in every case without attorneys, and in every case with a willingness to answer questions put by the committee relative to communism.

* * * * *

Communist infiltration

This analysis of the Communist tactics employed in Russia when their status was comparable to their current status in the United States, explains the presence of Communists in so many American legal organizations formed to foster progressive reforms. This shows, also, that the interest of the Communists in these organizations is not an honest interest in the things for which the organizations stand, but rather, a desire to use the opportunity afforded by work within such groups, to establish contacts helpful in the dissemination of agitational propaganda, used by the Communists in preparation for the overthrow of our Government.

In a further discussion of this tactic, the official history says:

"In this difficult period, the Bolsheviks set an example of how legal work should be combined with illegal work.

"It is evident that that example is being followed by the Communist gangsters in the United States today through their activities in the SCMWA and similar groups."

The official history said further:

"The Bolsheviks wanted to create a new party, a Bolshevist party, which would serve as a model for all who wanted to have a real revolutionary Marxist party."

It is also evident that this model is now being copied by the Stalinists in the United States. At another point in the official history in describing illegal activity the following appears:

"The conference noted that the most important rule of Bolshevik tactics in periods of retreat, namely, to combine illegal work with legal work within the various legally existing workers societies and unions, was being observed in all localities."

Communist newspaper

One of the important phases of Communist activity is the publication of a newspaper for purposes other than mere dissemination of news. The confidential Communist Party Guide issued from the State headquarters in California described the People's World as the Communist newspaper of California. The official history quotes Lenin as saying:

"A newspaper is not only a collective propagandist and collective agitator, but also a collective organizer."

In publishing the People's World the California Communists demonstrate once more the fact that they are simply following the pattern laid down by Lenin and others, and successfully followed by the Bolsheviks in Russia. As a matter of agitation the People's World often writes articles describing suicides by the unemployed. Of course, it always blames lack of work for these actions, whether or not the actual facts so indicate. Just as you would expect, the official history in describing the work of the Bolshevik paper, Pravda, said:

"Pravda often reported cases of suicide of unemployed and starving workers who had lost all hope of ever finding jobs again."

Another statement by the Communists in their official history showing the importance they attach to a newspaper and the uses they can make of it is very interesting:

"Pravda helped to organize the mass actions of the proletariat at the time of a big lock-out in St. Petersburg in the spring of 1914. When it was expedient to declare a mass strike, Pravda called upon the workers to resort to other forms of struggle such as mass meetings in the factories and demonstrations in the states. This could not be stated openly in the newspaper, but the cause was understood by class-conscious

workers when they read an article by Lenin bearing the modest title, 'Forms of the Working Class Movement,' and stating at the given moment strikes should yield place to a higher form of working-class movement * * * which meant a call to organize meetings and demonstrations.

"In this way, the illegal revolutionary activities of the Bolsheviks were combined with legal forms of agitation and organization of the masses of the workers through Pravda. * * *

"Pravda stood in the center of the struggle for the party principle, for the building up of a mass working-class revolutionary party. Pravda rallied all the legally existing organizations around the illegal centers of the Bolshevik Party and directed the working-class movement toward one definite aim * * * preparation for revolution * * * in the Pravda editorial office was concentrated a large share of the organizational work of the party; here meetings were arranged with representatives from party nuclei; here reports were received of party work in the mills and factories; and from here were transmitted the instructions of the St. Petersburg committee and the central committee of the party."

Pravda of California

Evidence adduced before your committee together with an analysis of articles appearing in the People's World shows conclusively that this Communist propaganda organ is simply the Pravda of the California Communists. It is doing the identical work here that Pravda did in the preparation for the Russian revolution. Communist Party members are constantly admonished to support and obtain subscriptions for this Communist propaganda paper.

The People's World was much in evidence around the offices of the State relief administration investigated by your committee. Members of the SRA staff openly solicited subscriptions for it during working hours. It was posted on the bulletin board daily in some offices, and in others, copies were left on tables where they could be conveniently picked up by members of the staff.

During the hearings of your committee, this Communist paper printed scurrilous attacks upon members of the committee. It consistently distorted the facts and resorted to deliberate lies. The committee found that a large percentage of the members of the SRA Communist-controlled union subscribed to this paper. Some of them testified before the committee that they considered it the only truthful paper in California—and this in spite of the fact that the People's World acclaimed the Russian invasion of Finland. It clumsily changed its policy to pro-Hitlerism when the Stalin-Hitler alliance was made, although before the alliance it was loud in its condemnation of the Nazis.

Attack preparedness

The People's World has recently devoted much space to attacks on the American preparedness program and the work of J. Edgar Hoover. To find such a subversive newspaper openly and widely supported by members of the State relief administration staff affiliated with the SCMWA is shocking and disgusting. No one not sympathetic with the Communists could read this propaganda sheet without resenting the rank distortion to which it stoops. It is not a newspaper in the American sense at all. It is the central organ in California of the international gangsters in the Communist Party.

Subversive organizations have been greatly aided in carrying out their international conspiracy in this country by the laxity of our laws, designed to curb treason and foreign espionage. Law-enforcement agencies are the hated enemy of subversive groups. They constantly carry on a campaign for the purpose of discrediting all agencies of Government created to check on subversive groups.

The successful sabotage of European democracies by these international gangsters has caused our National Government to invoke the services of the G-men in the Department of Justice, in order to ascertain the extent of plans for sabotage or overthrow of the American Government. The FBI under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is a department of which every American is proud. Nothing could be more reassuring to patriotic Americans than knowing that the G-men are on the trail of the international gangsters working here in America. On the other hand, nothing could strike more fear into the hearts of subversive elements than being cognizant of surveillance by Mr. Hoover's G-men. In view of these facts, it is not surprising that in recent months the Communists have embarked upon a scurrilous smear campaign, intended to discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the Department of Justice.

Smear methods

As is usual with these despicable vermin, they are not attacking Mr. Hoover on the grounds that he is checking on subversive activities, but rather they are pretending to see in his work an attack on labor unions. In other words, the subversive groups are once more attempting to hide behind American labor, once more proclaiming that their civil liberties are in jeopardy, once more screaming that constitutional rights are being violated, once more conducting a typical scheming, underhanded smear campaign, all of which is planned to do just one thing—that is to carry out the Communist program of smearing everyone, and every organization that conducts a fight against their subversive machinations.

Naturally the Communist-controlled SRA union has been called upon to do its part in the "smear Hoover" campaign. The fact that this campaign originated with the Communist Party is not open to doubt. Every piece of Communist literature published in recent months has carried analogous attacks on the FBI. For instance, a May Day pamphlet recently issued from the National Communist Party office in New York said:

"The Bill of Rights is being trampled under foot by the Dies Committee and FBI. Attempts are made to curb and cripple the trade unions. Antiwar fighters, especially the Communists, are being persecuted and jailed."

Another Communist May Day pamphlet written by Louis Budenz says:

"In Detroit the plug-uglies of J. Edgar Hoover—who learned his lessons from the strike-breaker and labor spy, William J. Burns—have shown their true, hideous faces."

* * * * *

False peace stand

In recent months, the Communists have endeavored to maintain connections with the masses by setting themselves up as the champions for peace. Any thinking person should easily see through this smoke screen. The Communists are yelling for peace because this offers a convenient method for carrying on propaganda against the Allies and in favor of the Hitler-Stalin Alliance.

They have hit upon a clever slogan, "The Yanks are not coming." This slogan is being publicized in practically all Communist literature just as is the attack on the FBI. Under the guise of a demand for peace, the Communists are fighting the American preparedness program which has the support of all informed and patriotic Americans. The subversive groups want to keep America weak. They would like to see us fall prey to the Hitler or Stalin war machines. They would like to see us unable to defend ourselves if attacked by their international gangster cohorts. They would like to keep us unable to prevent sabotage perpetrated from the inside. They would like to see America make the same mistake, that many nations of Europe made, when they sought peace through unpreparedness.

Unfortunately many Americans are today being fooled by the fake peace propaganda of the Communists. As part of their program the Communists are carrying on a vicious attack against President Roosevelt in which they condemn him for being more friendly to the Allies than to Hitler. As usual, the Communists pretend to see in the realistic and necessary American preparedness program, an attack on labor unions. In fact, this subversive group, which has reduced lying and deception to a fine art, can be expected to find an attack on labor unions in most anything. So the "Yanks are not coming" and "Stop Roosevelt's war policies" are being added to the current slogans of the international gangsters.

In the People's World handbill favoring the Patterson slate referred to above, among the charges against the New Deal are the following:

"Tremendous boost in war appropriations; sale of military secrets and airplanes to Allies; Roosevelt administration no longer neutral—assists Allies."

If Stalin and Hitler were being assisted they would not complain.

Cripple legitimate unions

An official Communist May Day circular offers a fine example of propaganda condemning American aid to Finland, and showing the utilization of the slogan, "The Yanks are not coming" by this group:

"Under the hypocritical slogans of neutrality and aid to the democracies by methods short of war, big business and the Roosevelt government have lifted the arms embargo, and turned America into an arms factory for the Allies, opposing the ending of war, and doing everything in their power to spread it. Through this and similar measures such as loans to Finland and the Scandinavian countries, through diplomatic intervention and other aid to the Finnish White Guards, American imperialism has already taken a long step toward dragging the American people into war. * * * Attempts are being made to curb and cripple the trade-unions. Antiwar fighters, especially the Communists, are being persecuted and jailed. * * * The workers organized in the CIO, AFL, and railroad brotherhoods, the young people through the American Youth Congress, the toiling farmers, and the Negro people through the militant organizations, are daily expressing their opposition to the war and hunger program. The slogan, 'The Yanks are not coming' has become the rallying cry of millions."

A strikingly similar combination of the slogan "The Yanks are not coming" with the anti-Finnish propaganda is contained in a SCMWA bulletin. This bulletin also contains the typical Communist propaganda against the Allies. It says:

"'The Yanks are not coming' was the slogan selected by the 117 official delegates from 53 counties. * * * Britain and France's encouragement of the invasions of China, Ethiopia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and their nonintervention in Spain, indicates that the ruling classes are not particularly interested in maintaining democracy. The recent great amount of propaganda about Finland and the contributions of Italy, England, and other nations, of planes and credits to that nation, did not stem from love of democracy but from the desire of capitalist nations to provoke a war against the Soviet Union, a Socialist nation."

SRA Communists

The Communist group in SRA has flooded the State offices with propaganda following

the Communist Party line. In fact, the State relief administration has apparently become a spearhead of the entire Communist propaganda campaign in California. This phase of the so-called union's activity will be considered again below.

SECTION II

The chameleonic Communist Party line ofttimes results in a change of immediate policy, but the long time objective, namely, the setting up of a dictatorship, never changes. The necessity of making changes to coordinate with new policies of Soviet Russia is a great handicap to the Communist Party consistency. During the years when the Communists regarded the Nazis as enemies of Soviet Russia, they propagandized against the Nazis and organized groups such as the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League through which to carry on such activity. The People's World and other organs of the party during this period could not think of vile enough names to call Adolf Hitler. In an official Los Angeles County Communist publication issued in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Los Angeles County Communist organization, and written before the Hitler-Stalin pact, the following statement appears:

"In the name of the Communist Party of the United States, Earl Browder and William C. Foster, general secretary and chairman, respectively, have written to President Roosevelt and to all Members of the Congress of the United States, pledging the party support of President Roosevelt's peace policies as approved by the majority of the American people."

At another point in the same publication, it says:

"In this period of war crisis, when Hitler and the Munichmen are spreading their hideous destruction, the military defense of our country becomes a key factor for national security."

The program of the Communists as set forth in this publication listed as its twelfth plank the following:

"Full official city and county support of President Roosevelt's peace policy of collective security, cooperation of all local law-enforcement bodies with Federal services for detection and prosecution of all agents and spies of Nazi, Japanese, and other Fascist governments in local aircraft and fishing industries."

The ink was hardly dry on this publication when the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed. During their campaign against the Nazis, the Communists had believed that Soviet Russia would conclude a pact with the Allies against Hitler. When the world was stunned by the agreement between Hitler and Stalin, the Communists fumbled for several days without knowing how to explain the unexpected turn of events calling for the formulation of an entirely new party line.

Stalin-Nazi switch

Stalin had given Hitler the assurance he needed against attacks from the east, in order to make it possible for him to start his campaign of destruction against the Scandinavian countries and the small republics to the west. In explaining their change of attitude toward the Nazis, after the pact was signed, the Communists reached the zenith of hypocrisy. The Russian Commissar of Foreign Affairs in addressing the supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., said:

"It is our duty to think of the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics * * *. Only when it became clear to us that the German Government desired to change its foreign policy so as to secure an improvement in the relations with the U. S. S. R. was the basis found for the conclusion of a Soviet-German nonaggressive pact. Everybody knows that during the last 6 years, ever since the Nationalist Socialists (Nazis) came into power, political relations between Germany and the U. S. S. R. have been strained * * *. Exposing the hullabaloo raised in the British, French, and American press about Germany's plans for the seizure of the Soviet Ukraine, Stalin said, 'It looks as if the purpose of this suspicious hullabaloo was to incense the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible ground.' * * * We have always stood for amity between the peoples of U. S. S. R. and Germany for the growth and development of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the German people. * * * Is it really difficult to understand that the U. S. S. R. is pursuing and will continue to pursue its own independent policy, based upon the interests of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. and only their interests? * * * This pact not only eliminates the menace of a war with Germany, narrows down the zone of possible hostilities in Europe, and serves thereby the cause of universal peace; it must open to us new possibilities of increasing our strength."

No greater batch of lies was ever concocted by the Stalinists than those used in their attempt to justify the Hitler-Stalin pact, and the changes in their propaganda and policies, made necessary thereby. It is difficult to imagine such a brazen liar as was Stalin when he accused Americans of trying to provoke war between Russia and Germany. The fact of the matter was, that his gangsters in this country were busy conducting Nazi campaigns because they feared a possible plan of Adolf Hitler to drive to the east, which drive was described, by Hitler, in his book, Mein Kampf, and which was most certainly not an invention of the American press, as claimed by Stalin.

Molotov's lies

Hypocrisy, Communist style, bristles also in Molotov's claim that the Communists always stood for friendship between Germany and Russia. Molotov told the truth when he mentioned the previously existing strained relations between Russia and Germany. It was obviously these strained relations that caused the Stalinists in this country to carry on an anti-Nazi campaign in the interests of the Soviet Union. It was the end of these strained relations, and the Hitler-Stalin Pact, that caused the Stalinists in America to completely change their position by commencing attacks against American preparedness measures, and also by condemning as "unneutral," those who continued to denounce Hitler, just as the Stalinists did before the pact. This change of policy on their part was brought about solely in the interest of the Stalinist dictatorship even though such interest is directly adverse to the national safety of this country. Molotov lied again when he said the pact was in the interest of universal peace. He knew that the real purpose of the pact was to give Hitler the protection he needed in the east, to permit him to turn his destructive efforts in another direction.

The awkward change of the Communist policy in this country brought about by the Hitler-Stalin Pact is also exemplified in their change of heart relative to Federal investigation of Nazi and Fascist spies. Since the pact has made the Communist and Nazi termites in this country part of the same "fifth column," they now stand together in a campaign to smear the counterespionage work of the FBI which the Communists themselves advocated before the pact. All of these examples add to the abundance of evidence, showing that the allegiance of the Communist Party members is not to the United States. They demonstrate the danger and the foolishness involved in permitting such foreign directed agents to carry on their poison propaganda under the cloak of official positions in the State relief administration. They show the impossibility of relying upon their stated or pretended intentions in determining the real nature of their program.

Not long ago, the Communists carried on an extensive campaign in favor of lifting the embargo on the shipment of arms to Loyalist Spain, giving as their reason the fact that a small nation was being invaded by outside forces. But when the United States proposed to help Finland and to lift the embargo on shipments of arms to the Allies, the Communists scurried to form peace councils for the purpose of denouncing everyone as "unneutral" who advocated the same changes in the statutes which the Communists advocated before the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

Compulsory military training

Another example of Communist hypocrisy is their attitude toward compulsory military training in the United States. In the official history of the party, referred to above, describing some of the measures taken by the Bolsheviks in Russia after they seized power, the following appears:

"Therefore the Congress considered it the fundamental task of the party (Communist) to adopt the most energetic and resolute measures to strengthen the self-discipline and discipline of the workers and peasants, to prepare the masses for self-sacrificing defense of the Socialist country, to organize the Red army and to introduce universal military training."

It is quite apparent that the Communists advocate military training for Russians because they want Russia to be strong. They denounce military training in America because they want America to be weak.

The Communists are now condemning American foreign policy as imperialistic. The proposal of some United States Senators that we purchase certain islands near the Canal Zone is labeled "an imperialistic scheme" by the Stalinists. The sale of arms to the Allies is condemned as a program of the American imperialists. The United States is placed on their list of hated imperialistic nations. As an indication of what might be expected from Communists in this country in case we were compelled to defend ourselves against Stalin or his pal, Hitler, one needs only to turn again to the official history of the Communist Party for a statement of its attitude toward what it terms, "an imperialistic country." It should also be borne in mind that the United States is classed as a bourgeois nation in Communist terminology.

The official history says:

"In opposition to the Menshevik and Socialist revolutionary policy of defending the bourgeois fatherland, the Bolsheviks (Stalinists) advanced a policy of 'the defeat of one's own government in the imperialist war.' This meant voting against war credits, forming illegal revolutionary organizations in the armed forces, supporting fraternization among the soldiers at the front, organizing revolutionary actions of the workers and peasants against the war, and turning these actions into an uprising against one's own imperialist government. * * * Lenin held that the policy of working for the defeat of one's own imperialist government must be pursued not only by the Russian revolutionaries, but by the revolutionary parties of the working class in all the belligerent countries. * * * The Bolshevik Party (Communist) was the only proletarian party which remained faithful to the cause of socialism and internationalism and which organized civil war against its own imperialist government."

Since the United States is now called imperialistic, these quotations may be the basis for determining what the Communist policy might be in case this country faced a crisis. Along this line, the following quotation from the official history is also indicative:

"Lenin always taught that without a revolution of the working class, capitalism cannot be overthrown; therefore, while defining

imperialism as moribund capitalism, Lenin at the same time showed that 'imperialism is the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat.'"

Let persons who scoff at and ridicule the fight against communism in America consider well these expressions of policy recommended for Communists engaged in sabotaging their own nations. The Communists in America, with their dreams of themselves at the head of a Communist dictatorship in America, may be laughed at now by persons who fail to comprehend their insidiousness, but in case of a crisis in America, those who today ridicule anti-Communist activities will find that their apathy to duty has actually aided the activities of traitorous international gangsters.

Army, Navy threatened

It is well known that Stalinists in America are today attempting to extend vicious activity into our Army and Navy. Some of this terminting is on the west coast. The legislature will remember that William J. Plunkert was appointed by Governor Olson to a position as Deputy State Relief Administrator immediately after the Olson administration came into power. Plunkert then commenced a Communist program in the State relief administration and only a storm of protests caused the Governor to dismiss him from the State service. Almost immediately after this dismissal, Plunkert became field representative for an organization similar to the SRA union. It is called the United Federal Workers of America. Its purpose is to organize Federal employees. In a bulletin issued by this organization on November 29, 1939, the Communist activities of Mr. Plunkert are made apparent under the heading "Field representatives report," where it is stated:

"W. J. Plunkert just came back from a trip to Oregon and Washington (State). In Oregon, the WPA State Administrator sent out official notices that he was in town and would speak. The same thing happened at Bonneville Dam and in Seattle. Organization is proceeding at Bremerton Navy Yard, where there are 7,000 Federal employees."

Here we have a known Communist reporting on organizing work among our Armed Forces. This Stalinist, during the period he was with the State, was able to start much of the SRA infiltration that still exists. He offers a good example of the type of official that this administration had permitted to find a place in the State relief administration. The interest of this man in gaining a place in the SRA should be apparent from his present activities. Although he is gone, the SRA is still loaded with Bill Plunkerts. They are effectively carrying on the work in which he was so interested.

Communist gangsters

It cannot be emphasized too often that the Stalinists in America are a disciplined army of international gangsters. Their immediate policies change in accordance with desires of Dictator Stalin. Their plans do not call for actual seizure of power until they are prepared, and assured of a fair chance of success. This strategy also is outlined in the official history where they say:

"The Bolshevik Party was opposed to armed action at that time, for it considered that the revolutionary crisis had not yet matured, that the army and the provinces were not yet prepared to support an uprising in the capital, and that an isolated and premature rising might only make it easier for the counterrevolutionaries to crush the vanguard of the revolution."

Let no one suppose that because the Communists are not uprising now, that they are not planning, preparing, and awaiting the opportune moment to strike at the foundations of American liberty.

* * * * *

Communists direct strategy

The Communist-devised strategy followed by members of the so-called union who appeared before your committee and refused to testify, placed them in a very definite class by themselves. All other SRA employees appeared before the committee without counsel; made no complaints about the questions asked by the committee; and all answered the questions frankly and easily. In some cases the Communists failed to tell those whom they influenced, that refusal to testify constituted a crime under the California penal code. In cases where they did so advise their group, they assured them that the committee would never cause any of the recalcitrants to be prosecuted. But the Communists were wrong in this. After enduring the defiance of the Communist-influenced staff members with patience through an entire hearing in Alameda, only to find the same defiance in Visalia, the committee felt compelled to take action. Your committee felt called upon to defend the dignity of government against this typical Communist tactic of displaying contempt for that which they would destroy. Charges were brought against one of the SRA Communists in Tulare County. They were based upon his refusal to produce records of the Communist group when ordered to do so by the committee. The committee had evidence that outside money had been obtained to subsidize the activities of the SRA Communists who formed the so-called union in order to screen their activities. The financial records of this group might show the extent to which outside subversive groups contributed to its support. For this reason, the records were subpenaed by the committee. The Communist financial secretary of the Tulare local of the Sendo union was convicted on the charges brought against him by a jury in Visalia. His case is now on appeal. Other charges are pending in Stockton and more will probably be brought in the near future.

The committee feels, that it is necessary to deal firmly with the Communists and their followers in the SRA, in order to uphold the laws of the State of California and also to force these subversive gangsters to respect the Government which they despise. Since the prosecution in Visalia, the SRA Communists have apparently decided to revert to the strategy they first employed in testifying before your committee, namely, that which called for the denying of all Communist affiliations, even in the face of incontrovertible evidence.

Gangsters in Workers Alliance

Proof of same as previously pointed out, this Communist group has not limited its propaganda activities to the SRA offices. It is carrying its poison propaganda to the unemployed in accordance with directions of the international gangsters seeking destruction of American democracy. There is much evidence to show that the Communist staff members cooperate with the Communist-controlled Workers Alliance by encouraging relief applicants to join the alliance. Sometimes this was done openly and sometimes by the dropping of an easily understood hint.

The agents of Joe Stalin, czar of all the Communists, have constructed a propaganda network reaching out to the unfortunate and discontented throughout California, reaching out for the purpose of luring them into Communist organizations where the Communists hope to influence them to follow revolutionary leadership. As an example of the propaganda fed to the unemployed by the Communists, the following quotation from a widely distributed Communist pamphlet is notable. Under the heading, "What will a workers' revolution achieve?" a glowing picture is painted in these words:

"With the overthrow of capitalism and the introduction of a new social system, a classless society, there would be tremendous changes and almost unlimited possibilities for advancing the welfare of all. While we cannot give details in advance of this development, the approximate results would be as follows: (1) The abolition of poverty; (2) the abolition of the mass murder known as war; (3) tremendous expansion of production through the removal of the obstruction of profit making, the workers having the opportunity of consuming the bulk of what they produce; (4) the disappearance of panics and unemployment, as in the event of overproduction, the people would simply cut working hours, or take a holiday until consumption overtook production, at least until the surplus was greatly reduced; (5) the elimination of the costs of armies and navies (the burden now paid by the capitalists out of the surplus values exploited from the workers); (6) enormous reduction in crime through the removal of its main cause, poverty, and consequently a reduction or elimination of police, judges, jailers, and other present expenditure; (7) reduction in general waste such as competitive advertising and other nonessentials."

These are but a part of the many promises held out by Communist agents to the people whom they hope to recruit into their army of destruction. The fact that these promises would never be kept is unimportant to the international gangsters who make them, since once they have seized power, they can proceed as they have in Russia, to stamp out all of the liberties of the people, and to liquidate anyone who dares to object to their tyranny. Americans are unwise who laugh at such promises, underestimating their effect on those who find themselves in unfortunate circumstances, due either to inability or economic conditions. It is foolish to fail to recognize the ability of Communists to attract the discontented, by holding out to them promises which they would never attempt to fulfill even if given the opportunity. By such promises followers are gained. As the Communists themselves say in their twentieth anniversary booklet:

"The Communist Party of the United States, although a relatively small minority party * * * exerts an influence upon public thought far beyond the confines of its membership."

In this publication they described some of their activity in Los Angeles in the following words:

"By 1929, the party had gained a great deal of experience in various forms of mass work. In 1930, in the midst of the crisis, the party, together with the trade-union unity league, organized a huge mass meeting of over 40,000 people at the city hall on the question of adequate aid to the unemployed. The demonstrators carrying slogans demanding 'work or wages' were met by more than the usual array of police and although the demonstration was finally broken up, the prestige of the party was lifted immeasurably in the eyes of the working people of Los Angeles."

This latter statement bears testimony to the ability of the Communists to take advantage of a crisis in order to enflame masses of people, and to induce them to follow Communist leadership, even though in most cases, the followers do not know whom they are following.

Trained to smear

Communists are trained in the uses of propaganda. They are experts at "smear" campaigns. In attacking an individual, no lie is too vicious if it serves their purpose. Their "smear" campaign against J. Edgar Hoover; their "smear" campaign against Martin Dies; their "smear" campaign against the members of your committee—all of these and others serve to reveal the web of powerful propaganda contacts which they have spun throughout the United States by a series of steps following the identical pat-

tern now being used in the State relief administration.

* * * * *

Nonpartisan League

Labor's Nonpartisan League was one of the leaders in the third term movement until the Communists turned against Roosevelt. When this happened, it hurriedly rescinded its endorsement of the third term, denounced Roosevelt, termed his supporters reactionaries, and placed itself squarely behind the Patterson slate of Democratic convention delegates. Use of Labor's Nonpartisan League for the launching of a third party, based upon a coalition of groups recommended by the Communist Party, is described in another section of this report.

* * * * *

Charges have been preferred against those witnesses who defied your committee by refusing to answer its questions during the Stockton inquiry. In referring to this, a SCMWA bulletin issued May 10, demonstrates the old strategy of the Communists who can always be counted upon to yell "persecution" and to see their lie factories in motion the minute their activities run afoul of the law. The bulletin says:

"Like a tiger who has tasted blood, the Yorty committee caused the arrests of 19 Stockton union members on charges of contempt of a legislative committee. They were paraded through the waiting room and promptly whisked away in the 'Black Maria' to the local bastille, where they were held pending bail. During the 24 hours required to raise bail, eight of the men were held in the infamous 'Tank No. 1,' forced to sleep on the floor because of lack of beds and denied the right to receive visitors or receive food and smokes sent in by friends.

"Within one-half hour of this incident, the State office of the SRA fired every member cited. The local director, Fred Le Fevre, promptly rehired them. Needless to say, the heat on him has increased as a result of this courageous action. * * *

"The notorious labor-hating police judge, E. E. Breitenbucher, asked the total bail of $9,500 cash or $36,000 property bail.

"Due to intense intimidation by the American Legion, it took some time to raise this fabulous sum. * * * The city of Stockton is preparing to spend thousands of dollars for individual persecution of each union member by jury trial."

Once again in this bulletin, the old Communist gag of hiding behind union membership is in evidence. The fact that the persons who violated the law were members of the Communist-controlled union is used by the Communists to claim that a union is being persecuted. The plain fact of the matter is that a section of the Penal Code is being invoked against all those who violated it without any regard to their membership or nonmembership in any labor union.

* * * * *

Liberties threatened

American liberties and freedom were won at the sacrifice of the lives of many of our forefathers. Subversive elements working in the United States today would destroy the liberties and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution. They would place us under the iron heel of dictatorship along with the other millions of human beings now suffering from oppression. To fight against this is the present duty of every American.

We must not permit ourselves to be fooled by the Communist Party into thinking that it is anything else than a part of a lying, scheming, pernicious army of international gangsters, determined to destroy and desecrate human dignity and civilization. The American people have already been fed with so much propaganda, ridiculing and smearing those who have endeavored to expose the fifth columns that it is difficult for anyone to describe the unbelievable extent to which subversive activities have been carried on in this country without being accused by the uninformed of being either an alarmist or guilty of exaggeration. But real, shocking facts of the situation must be brought home to the people of the United States. Only an aroused and patriotic America can in the last analysis end the march of the fifth column through this Nation. The fight against the fifth column must be carried on with firm and unswerving determination.

Your committee recommends:

1. That a thorough investigation of all subversive activities in California be undertaken as soon as possible.

2. That laws be enacted both by the United States and by the State to force the fifth-column propagandists to march out in the open where their promises and proposals can be judged with full knowledge of what is back of them. Laws must also be enacted to strengthen our defense against those columns of the international army of gangsters which are assigned to duties calling for actual physical sabotage.

3. That constant vigilance must be maintained to detect, expose, and bring an end to, every new phase of subversive activity devised by the marauding international gangsters.

4. That a complete analysis of our educational system be undertaken to determine the cause of its failure to inculcate students with a true appreciation of American democracy.

* * * * *

7. And that most important of all, a sound constructive program of reemployment be determined upon and executed through the cooperation of Government, business, and labor. This is a necessary defense measure. Subversive groups feed the fires of discontent created by economic break-down. Their lying propaganda and promises are doubled in effectiveness during periods of economic uncertainty. The combined intelligence and patriotism of all Americans must cause them to support whatever equitable economic adjustments are necessary to put an end to this scourge of unemployment. Doles are not the answer. Doles and demoralization go hand in hand. The great morale that has always characterized the American people must be safeguarded. The calamity howlers must be met by a deafening roar of American industrial activity.

* * * * *

ASSEMBLY RELIEF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE,
SAMUEL WILLIAM YORTY,
Chairman.

Call Mr. Truman, He Did The Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very timely and thoughtful editorial from the Port Jervis Union-Gazette in my district:

CALL MR. TRUMAN, HE DID THE TRICK

Today the Senate gets another earful of the case of Truman against MacArthur. General Marshall is slated to tell the Senate just what the five-star general has done that merits his firing by the President so suddenly, mysteriously, and unexplainedly. But getting General Marshall in the limelight as question-answerer will not answer the $64 question, which is, and will be, until answered: Why did Truman fire MacArthur so peremptorily and without explanation?

Only the President knows why he took such summary action, jeopardizing the entire international and U. N. activity in the Far East as well as Europe. So far Mr. Truman has kept silent, which is evidently something very difficult for him to do. He is sidestepping the entire matter and leaving General Marshall and others to bear the onus of an act that has brought down the wrath of millions upon his head. Maybe Truman was right—he says to hold our decision until all the facts have been given—but will we get all of them?

So far the facts as divulged by the President and General MacArthur have cast an awfully suspicious cloud upon the administration and its Hiss-Acheson-Marshall-Truman actions. Mr. Acheson said that he stood by Hiss as he had always done; perhaps Alger was a great help to him in his plans; evidently he was, for as the Acheson Man Friday he surely put something over and is still in good repute in the office of Secretary of State. So far we have not heard anything about whether Mr. Hiss' valuable aid is still possible from behind the bars. Hiss suits Acheson, Acheson suits Truman, Truman suits—well, he is helping Big Joe a lot just at present.

Mr. Truman, so quick to answer anyone on any subject from fiat notes to smashed noses, is strangely silent. Let's hear from him on the MacArthur matter.

The United States Still Offers Opportunities for Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, a very dear and personal friend of mine, Mr. Charles Simonelli, has just been promoted by the Universal Pictures Co. as manager of its eastern advertising and publicity department, whose offices are in New York. His career is another example that opportunities for success in this great country of ours and under our system of free enterprise are still open and available to young people.

I have known Mr. Simonelli for many years; I have occasion to see him frequently and I cherish his friendship. I had the pleasure of meeting him through another very distinguished and fine gentleman, the Honorable James V. Mangano, who made his mark in public life. I note with particular pride the heights to which Mr. Simonelli has risen, knowing the humble origin from which he stems and the fact that he was raised in a neighborhood where the ratio of crime has been a matter of deep concern to many people.

Despite many handicaps, Mr. Simonelli continued in his march toward a successful business career. Unfortunately, not all young people are possessed of such strong character and they fall prey to environmental influences. For them the success of Charles Simonelli should serve as an example and a guide.

At this time I am placing in the RECORD a brief article on the subject which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle May 3, 1951, and which reads as follows:

CHARLES SIMONELLI HEAD OF UNIVERSAL'S AD DEPARTMENT

The promotion of Charles Simonelli to the post of manager of the eastern advertising and publicity department of Universal Pictures Co., Inc., is announced by David A. Lipton, vice president in charge of advertising and publicity.

Mr. Simonelli, still on the sunny side of 30 (by a couple of years), is the south Brooklyn ex-newsboy who rose from office boy at Universal to his current position in a scant 10 years. As a youngster he played stickball on Hicks Street, later went to Manual Training High School.

In his new post as head of the New York office of the Universal Pictures advertising and publicity department, Simonelli will continue to serve as executive in charge of national exploitation, the post he held at the time of his promotion.

The eastern advertising and publicity executive staff under Simonelli will consist of Philip Gerard, eastern publicity manager, and Jeff Livingston, eastern advertising manager.

The promotion of Simonelli is in line with the policy of Universal Pictures of promotion from within the ranks. Simonelli joined Universal in 1942. In March 1943, 6 months after he joined the advertising and publicity department, he was promoted to cooperative advertising work. In the fall of 1943 he was placed in charge of all commercial tie-ups for the company. Subsequently, he became a field exploitation representative and was eventually placed in charge of out-of-town openings. In 1945 he handled radio promotion and exploitation in connection with the openings of pictures. In May 1948 he was appointed eastern exploitation manager and in June 1949 he was named executive in charge of national exploitation.

How We Gave China to the Commies on a Silver Platter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the New York Times of September 15, 1950. The facts set forth in the editorial have a favorable, pertinent bearing upon present-day controversy over our Asiatic policies. The Marshall mission to China was a failure and it paved the way for the undermining of our great ally in the Far East. The responsibility is upon Truman, Marshall, and Acheson. The people of the United States should have these important facts.

The editorial is as follows:

HOW WE GAVE CHINA TO THE COMMIES ON A SILVER PLATTER

MARSHALL IN CHINA

General Marshall was called from the height of his successful military career on November 27, 1945, to act as a special emissary of President Truman to China. He was instructed by the President to bring to bear the influence of the United States to effect "the unification of China by peaceful, democratic methods." He was also instructed to work for a cessation of hostilities in North China. His role was conceived as that of pacificator and mediator in a domestic political dispute that had assumed military proportions.

The exact character of the instructions and their precise origin have not been revealed. They had, however, the approval of the State Department and the specific endorsement of the President. General Marshall was also instructed by the President to use the pressure of a possible withholding of American assistance to enforce a mediation effort. The President's letter is quoted in the State Department White Paper as having stated that "General Marshall was authorized to speak to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and other Chinese leaders 'with the utmost frankness' and to state that 'a China disunited and torn by civil strife' was not a proper place for American economic assistance in the form of credits or technical assistance nor for American military aid."

It was presumably in pursuance of this instruction that the previously recommended credits for China were not issued and that eventually the virtual embargo on military aid to Chiang was set up. General Marshall did not institute this policy, although his office carried it out after he became Secretary of State.

It should be remembered that this idea of bringing pressure to enforce a coalition of Nationalist and Communist Chinese was put forth at a time when it was still official policy to believe that it was quite possible to do "business as usual" with any Communists—Russian, Chinese or other. Indeed, in the case of the Chinese Communists it was the official thesis that they were not Communists primarily, but merely Chinese reformers who would gladly join a truly "liberal" government. General Marshall appears to have accepted this doctrine, since he confessed rather ruefully in his public report on his mission to China, January 7, 1947, that the Communists whom he had found to be "irreconcilable" did not appear to be so in the preceding February.

In carrying out the pacification mission General Marshall was able to bring about a military truce with incredible ease. It was announced as early as January 10, 1946. Truce teams were put into the field and after each flare-up a new cease-fire was negotiated. What General Marshall apparently did not realize, and what his superiors who gave him his instructions obviously did not take into account, was that this truce played directly into the hands of the Communists and seriously weakened the Chinese Government. The white paper itself records how strategic points such as Chihfeng, the gateway to Manchuria, and Telun, the gateway to Mongolia, were yielded to the Communists upon General Marshall's appeal to promote mediation.

Similarly, General Marshall offered a plan of integration of all military forces into one national army. The Chinese Government agreed to a reduction of its forces from 151 to 57 divisions and disbanded 160,000 officers and 400,000 men on the presumption that the Communists would do likewise. General Marshall eventually discovered that the Chinese Communists had no intention of giving up any military formations, and it was primarily on this ground that his mission met its ultimate total defeat.

General Marshall left China on March 11, 1946, to report to the President and returned to his mediation on April 18. The efforts at coalition continued to be fruitless, and General Marshall finally reported that they had broken down on the rock of the Chinese Communist walk-out from any further meetings. The President issued his hands-off statement of American policy on China on December 18 and announced General Marshall's recall on January 6, 1947. General Marshall was named to the Secretaryship of State the following day.

The mission to China was based on a total misconception of the Chinese Communists. The mission and the policies that followed it undoubtedly weakened the Government of China and gave substantial assistance to the Communists in preparing them for their ultimate conquest.

Address of His Excellency David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear yesterday a dynamic speech delivered by His Excellency David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister and Minister of Defense of the State of Israel. In order not to detract from its beauty and clarity, I set it forth in full without comment, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY DAVID BEN-GURION, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 8, 1951

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I am grateful for the cordial welcome extended to me by this distinguished assembly of the National Press Club, representing the free press and free opinion of the United States. I do not doubt that the rightful object of your tribute is the people of Israel, whose rise to independence, within the past 3 years, constitutes a unique event in the history of nations.

The modern age has witnessed the rise of many new states, both in the Old World and in the new. Many, such as the states of the American hemisphere and some of the dominions of the commonwealth, were formed through the migration of peoples to newly discovered countries. Once these new communities were conscious of their mature strength, they broke loose from their dependence on the countries from which they had come, or to which they had been subject, and stood on their own feet as free nations. Another category includes those countries which led an independent existence in previous times, but later lost their independence for long periods until they became liberated eventually as free nations, either by their own revolt, or as a result of foreign wars leading to the downfall of their previous conquerors. Such is the modern history of several nations in Central Europe and the Balkans.

The rebirth of the State of Israel is quite unlike either of these two historic processes. The land of Israel is not a newly discovered country; it is one of the most ancient lands on earth. Its history covers a period of 4,000 years, during part of which time it occupied a central place on the scene of world history. The great events which unfolded within its borders live on in the memory of the Jewish people and have also become the heritage of the Christian world.

Nor does Israel belong to the second category of liberated states, which regained their previous independence after long centuries of subjection. Indeed, the people which established our new state had been cut off from the country for 2,000 years. They had been scattered amongst all the peoples of

the world, wandering from land to land. Although there was never a time when the land of Israel was without a Jewish community, the great movement of immigration and settlement which led to the rise of the State of Israel took place in relatively recent times.

The unique character of the rise of Israel is a direct result of the uniqueness of the people of Israel. At the dawn of its history, more than 3,000 years ago, two events occurred which were to mold its character and destiny for all time. The first decisive event was the exodus from ancient Egypt, from slavery to freedom. To this day all Jews in the new world and in the old continue after the lapse of 3,300 years to celebrate that event every year as the festival of Jewish freedom.

The second event was the revelation of the Torah on Mount Sinai, on Israel's journey to the promised land. No book has ever played a role in the history of any people similar to that of the Bible in the life of the Jewish people and, through it, in the life of the Christian and Moslem worlds. For that book transmitted to mankind the supreme moral principles which have still not found their full realization and which mark the only sure road to human survival.

Another factor which molded the character and destiny of the people of Israel was the promised land. This small country which was formerly called Palestine but which the Jews for more than 3,000 years have called the land of Israel is characterized by a geographical position which makes it a bridge between the three continents of the ancient world, and by a topographical structure which combines within a limited area a remarkably wide range of climatic and geographical diversity.

This Book and this country were united in the life of the Jewish people in a way that no book and country were ever joined in the life of any other people. This unity sustained the Jewish people throughout the long days of its exile. The Babylonians and the Romans successively severed the Jews from their country, and the second exile continued for more than 1,800 years; but the Book, which accompanied the people throughout all its wanderings, preserved in its heart the memory of its land and the hope of restoration. They put their faith in the words of the Prophet "I shall gather you together from amongst the peoples and shall assemble you from the countries in which you are scattered, and shall give you the land of Israel." It was this Book which taught the Jewish people not to submit to physical strength based not on justice but on preponderant power alone. It taught them not to despair of the prospect of national redemption, even in times of most acute tribulation.

Few countries in the world have seen as many foreign conquerors as the land of Israel: Egypt and Syria, Babylon and Persia, Greece and Rome, Byzantium and Arabia, Crusaders and Ottoman Turks have fought each other for domination of the Holy Land. But not one of those peoples ever linked its historic destiny with the land of Israel.

Although for many centuries they had been city dwellers, the Jews returning to their ancestral land after 1,800 years devoted themselves first to tilling the soil. They built villages and cities with the sweat of their brow. In place of the many tongues which they had adopted in the lands of their wanderings, they returned to their ancient Hebrew tongue, the language of the Bible. This transformation of an ancient language, not spoken for centuries, into a living vernacular, is another of the unique characteristics of the rise of Israel.

These are some of the features of the State of Israel whose independence we celebrate this week—one of the youngest states, 3 years old, but reestablished by one of the oldest peoples of the world.

Ninety years before the establishment of the State of Israel, a great American Jew, born immediately after your War of Independence, Maj. Mordecai Emanual Noah, declared, "We will return to Zion as we went forth, bringing back the faith we carried with us." This was said in the year 1824. Eight years previously, in 1816, a hundred years before the Balfour Declaration envisaged the establishment of a Jewish national home, the second President of the United States, John Adams, wrote: "I really wish the Jews again in Judea, an independent nation restored to an independent government."

There is no doubt that the echoes of Biblical prophecy reverberated both in the words of the first Jewish major in the American Army and in those of the second President of the United States. For these early American pioneers, building up their vast country, were permeated by the spirit of the prophets of Israel and the sacred Hebrew writings, by the love of freedom and by the impulse to render aid to all oppressed and suffering peoples.

This tradition of American sympathy for the restoration of Israel was never broken. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was issued with the active cooperation of President Wilson. In 1922, the American Congress unanimously expressed its sympathy for the aspiration of the Jewish people to reconstitute its national home. When the State of Israel was founded on May 14, 1948, President Truman, on behalf of the United States, was the first to accord it recognition.

As the man who had the privilege 3 years ago to proclaim the independence of the State of Israel, I am happy to take the opportunity of my visit to this country, my first visit as Prime Minister of Israel to any country outside Israel, to convey through you, the representatives of the press of the country, the profound gratitude which the people of Israel feel toward the American Nation for the constant aid which it has given to us in our struggle for national independence. This support has deep roots in a common spiritual tradition, as well as in the character of your pioneering struggle to build your great country—an enterprise similar in its essence to the pioneering effort whereby we are establishing our small ancient country anew. It is further strengthened today by our common belief in the cause of democracy—a cause that America so strongly sustains by the strength of its own institutions, by its efforts to help defend it wherever it may be threatened, and by its farsighted readiness to render aid to other democratic lands that need such aid to preserve their way of life.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in the 3 years of existence of the State of Israel we have won a war, forced upon us by our neighbors; we have established the structure of our State; and we have brought home nearly 600,000 immigrants. Those are our main achievements. They have been effected by a constructive revolution never equaled, I believe, in so short a period by any country of comparable size.

Our immigration record in these 3 years would, on the American scale, represent an equivalent influx of 120,000,000 people. Great areas of barrenness have been restored to cultivation. Water has been brought to areas where none existed before. Nearly 300 new agricultural villages have sprung up. Foundations of new cities have been laid, and existing cities and townships extended to new dimensions. Our industrial production has risen by nearly 50 percent. Building construction, transportation and all the other branches of our economy have advanced with similar strides.

Our policy is not guided by economic considerations alone. My Government has given deep attention to the social, educational and cultural advancement of our people. The result has been a remarkable transformation of the country and a corresponding revolution in the life of its people. We are welding a people drawn from all the corners of the world into the free unity of a newly revived culture.

We have had massive financial assistance from our brethren overseas, above all, in America, not only to help us absorb our immigrants, but also in the form of investments. We have had the assistance of $135,000,000 in credits from the United States Export-Import Bank for the purchase of machinery and equipment and for agricultural development. We value that not only in itself, but also as a token of confidence in Israel's economic future, and as an indication of Israel's investment potentialities.

Our tasks have not been accomplished without severe difficulties. The effort has made tremendous demands on our people. They have not flinched before them. They have shown a readiness to assume heavy burdens and a severe regime of austerity in their personal living. They have done so in the knowledge that the absorption of immigrants, or, as it is termed in Hebrew, the ingathering of the exiles, is the main object for which the State of Israel has been created and the supreme test by which it will be judged. The hope of the return to the homeland has for thousands of years been kept alive in the heart of our nation. When a third of the Jewish people was exterminated by Nazi barbarity in the most fearful ordeal of Jewish history, that hope was a beacon to the survivors. From that hope the people already in the land drew strength amidst bitter disappointment and, when the time came, the courage to set their lives in the balance against powerful foes.

Today a sharpened sense of insecurity amongst Jewish remnants in Europe, a renewal of persecution in Iraq, and continued indignity in other lands of the Near East and north Africa have strengthened the irresistible force of the tide. As long as there are Jews who are fearful of their future, who lack freedom and dignity in the lands in which they live, or who wish to throw in their lot with their fellow Jews in their ancient homeland, our gates will remain open. In the coming 3 years we anticipate the arrival of a further 500,000 people.

The problems involved in a population movement of such dimensions will be readily appreciated. Few, if any, bring any means of their own. They come from over 50 countries. Most of them bear the recent scars of suffering and humiliation. They must not only be integrated economically, but also merged into the revived national and social life of our people.

To absorb them, all the waste land of Israel must be restored. The great desolation of the Negev, which comprises over half of our territory, the naked, rocky hills of Judea, the swamps of the Huleh, must be reclaimed. Our economy must be expanded and stabilized. We must embark on new irrigation and power projects; and all the natural and mineral resources of our country must be discovered and developed.

While we do all this, we must continue to look to our security, to the continued strengthening of our defense potential. Here our great asset is the spirit of our people. But in the present situation of the world, we must prepare them for any contingency. We have done much in this respect, and are at least twice as strong as we were 3 years ago. But this has necessitated the diversion of heavy financial and other resources from constructive purposes.

In the coming 4 years our plans envisage a total population of 2,000,000; 500 new agricultural villages; 250,000 more housing units.

Toward this end my government has elaborated a development program that calls for the mobilization of about $500,000,000

for each of the next few years. At the close of 3 years we hope and believe that the full stream of immigration will have been productively absorbed and the economy of our land firmly established.

Israel has set itself a target of providing one-third of the required annual amount. But it cannot meet its problems without increased help, in different forms, in aid, in investment, and in technical skill, from its friends and well-wishers.

In the significant area of which Israel is a central part, on the brideghead between three continents and at the gateway between the Occident and the Orient, the future of our young state is an issue of direct moment to the cause of world democracy. For in a region whose peoples for the most part only imperfectly understand the ways and goals of democracy, the progress, in their midst of a people devoted to democracy and scientific effort, will prove to them the inherent capacity of democracy to fulfill their need for a fuller, freer, and happier life. Thus our contribution to democracy, to the defense of freedom, and to social progress lies in the first place in the vigor and success of our own undertaking.

We have always been a small nation. But a people's capacity for moral advancement, the influence it exerts on human thought and achievement, have never been attributes of its mere size. Witness Israel and Greece of old.

Today, after thousands of years of wandering and suffering, we are restored at last to the land of our fathers. We are resolved to be faithful to the ideals that are our heritage. We shall support, to the utmost of our capacity, every measure which strengthens world peace and opposes aggression; which promotes understanding among the peoples, and insures the equality of nations. Our policies, as a free and sovereign people, will be inspired by the universal aims of the United Nations. We shall cooperate untiringly with all who set their faces against enslavement of the souls of men; and with all who cherish the ultimate vision of peace as conceived by the prophets of Israel, that men shall beat their swords into plowshares and "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Santayana Sees Europe as Beyond Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a short editorial that appeared in the Christian Century of May 9, 1951:

SANTAYANA SEES EUROPE AS BEYOND HELP

George Santayana thinks that the United States would simply be throwing away the lives of any of its young men it might send to Europe to defend that continent against communism. From his retreat in a Rome hospice maintained by a Catholic order of nuns where he has lived for years, Harvard's famous philosopher has replied to a series of questions propounded by his publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons. "Europe," he says, "is already a wreck." It would be folly to waste American lives trying to help a weakling. If the Russians should occupy Western Europe, that would not endanger either the United States or the free way of life. Russia, with Europe, Asia, and Africa to handle, would have its hands more than full. As for the Atlantic Pact, it is only a scrap of paper. The military policies based on it do not represent the right way to deal with the epidemic communism now sweeping across Europe. "I think," said Santayana, "that epidemic communism may be left to wither or rather to rot away, leaving genuine communism to be practiced in monasteries and religious fraternities." That final remark opens up an interesting line of speculation. Does it imply that, in Santayana's view, genuine communism and high religion—meaning Christianity—are essentially one? And that the only place in which either, in its pure form, can be put into practice is in a community withdrawn from the hurly-burly of life?

The Area of Agreement With Respect to Foreign Policy in Asia and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is traditional in our country that a great debate like that dealing with the circumstances surrounding General MacArthur's being relieved from his commands in the Far East results in a crystallization of public opinion and leads toward a greater merge of views than before, regardless of which side prevails. The appended editorials show that exactly this is happening. In this situation the best result would be to enable us to go forward with a bipartisan foreign policy in the Far East, a policy which has had such enormous benefits for the country in respect of the United Nations, the European recovery program, the Greek-Turkish aid program, and the mutual defense assistance program.

The above-mentioned editorials from the New York Times of May 9, 1951, follow:

THE AREA OF AGREEMENT

Now that both General MacArthur and the administration have presented the main outlines of their respective arguments in the debate precipitated by the general's dismissal, it is increasingly evident that the areas of agreement between them are far greater than the areas of disagreement. The disagreements cannot be minimized, because they involve not only the problem of how to end the Korean war and the role of the military in determining our policies, but also the critical issue,of whether we should gamble on taking action which might split the free world and lead to an atomic war. But on the broader aspects of the whole global struggle against Communist imperialism the agreements between the administration and General MacArthur are much more complete and far reaching than is generally realized. In fact, they are much more fundamental than are the arguments between General MacArthur and many of his most ardent supporters.

This is convincingly demonstrated by a comparison of the views and policies of the administration with the testimony of General MacArthur at the Senate hearings. Like the administration, General MacArthur holds that "the issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector oblivious to those of another is but to court disaster for the whole." Like the administration, he believes that we should attempt to meet aggression "wherever it shows its face," because "you can't let one-half of the world slide into slavery and just confine yourself to defending the other." Like the administration, he believes that "we should make every possible effort to assist Western Europe in her defense," and that we should do so not only with air and naval forces but also with ground forces, because he believes "that it is the gravest possible mistake in the use of the armed forces of a nation to try to draw the lines of demarcation between ground troops, air troops, and Navy troops," which "are an integrated team."

In keeping with this thesis, General MacArthur warns Congress not to impose "academic or strait-jacket formulas" on the disposition of our Armed Forces, but rather to provide for "elasticity" and to trust the professional advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in whom he has "complete confidence."

There is, again, a wide area of agreement on the fundamentals of the Korean conflict. With the administration, General MacArthur holds that we acted wisely in taking action in Korea, because this action not only restored at one stroke the enormous prestige of the United States but also confirmed to the peoples of the Far East that we are not going to let them slide into slavery. He likewise agrees that the psychological effect [now] of withdrawing from Korea would collapse the confidence, not only of the Far East, in our strength to carry out an obligation we have assumed, but throughout the world. "If we don't go on, I believe we will go under," is his summary of the situation.

There are further important and significant areas of agreement on such questions as the Japanese peace treaty, the necessity of providing economic help to Asia as contemplated by the point 4 program, the need for an economic blockade of China, and finally on the necessity of security provisions in the Pacific, in line with the Truman doctrine. There is even agreement that in view of the global nature of the struggle it is not up to a local theater commander to make global decisions, but that this is rather the function of the higher authorities, who must take into account many military and political factors beyond the realm of a local commander.

Certainly, in the light of all this, it must be clear that there is little support in anything that General MacArthur has said for the neoisolationist elements of the Republican Party who counsel simultaneously economy in armaments with deeper involvement in Asia and retreat from Europe. When the acrimony and the arguments over the detailed issues of the present controversy begin to subside it is more than likely that the broader agreements established by the present debate will prove to be both the lasting results and the justification of it.

NO REWARD FOR AGGRESSION

From General Marshall's testimony before the Senate committees we quote this passage:

"At the time I became Secretary of Defense last September, the established policy of the United States was to deny Formosa to Communist China and to oppose the seating of the Communist Chinese in the United Nations. There has been no deviation from that policy whatsoever. * * * I am confident that the United States will continue to adhere to its present position, namely, that it will oppose any settlement of the Korean conflict which would reward the aggressor in any manner whatever, and it will oppose the attempt of any nation or regime to shoot its way into the United Nations."

To this we say, "Bravo." And we trust, and expect, that when it becomes the turn of Secretary of State Acheson to appear before the Senate committees we shall have, on both these points, a declaration of policy just as clear, just as specific, and just as unequivocal as Secretary Marshall's.

No World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address given by Col. Albert G. Hulett to the annual meeting of the New Jersey Society Sons of the American Revolution at East Orange, N. J., on the 21st of April. Colonel Hulett is national surgeon of the National Sojourners Association and has been active in bringing to the attention of the people all over this country the fallacies of world government.

The address by Colonel Hulett follows:

Fellow patriots and friends, I feel somewhat apologetic in addressing you today because my remarks come so soon after Gen. Douglas MacArthur's superlative address to the Congress, a composition which, I firmly believe, will go down in history, not only as a remarkable analysis of the factual world situation and of the futility of the present mode of approach thereto, but as one of the finest examples of English prose ever to have been written.

Creation moves in cycles, and so does the history of mankind. When anyone looks about him in today's world, he fails to find mankind being guided by outstanding thinkers, statesmen, and leaders (as was true a generation and more ago), but observes that we are in an era of little men wherein the few now living who do qualify to greatness are turned upon, discredited, and cast aside. In my humble judgment, the basic difficulty of today's world and of these United States is the woeful lack of competent leadership, and the horrible fact that we have mistaken astute partisan politicians for statesmen, propagandists for prophets, ignorant folk for wise men, puppets for leaders, and that we appear to be unable at this juncture to correct our errors.

The Bible says, "Where there is no vision the people perish." It is well to keep this formula in mind as we watch events unfold. Perhaps it were better that my topic for today had been world chaos rather than world government, for it is chaos or despotism and slavery which we shall have and not any democratic, voluntary, and orderly government—either at home or abroad in the world—if present trends continue and we shall continue to hearken to the Judases who, for personal gain or the satisfaction of ambitions or of crackpot theories (if not for truly treasonable reasons) would destroy our Government and ourselves and usher our children into that which will be far worse than any crucifixion.

Complete as it may seem to most Christians, I believe another section should be added to the Litany, which should read:

"From zealots, charlatans, and crackpots, and from 'dealers'—new, fair, or double—and their machinations, good Lord deliver us."

Quackery has been a problem of mankind since the dawn of history, although we sometimes mistakenly assume it to be a fairly modern development, stemming from the patent-medicine men, Carter's Little Liver Pills, and Lydia Pinkham. Thus we wholly forget the Tower of Babel, the taboos of witchcraft, the graven images of past civilizations, the worship of Baal, the Greek and Roman gods, and the messianic pretenses of countless charlatans, crackpots, zealots, and power-seekers. Rarely does one such arise who does not attract a considerable following, for all such movements take advantage of a basic human weakness which yearns for quick solutions and painless cures for the woes of mankind, most of which agonies could have been prevented by a little common sense and foresight.

Thus the United States (through its then leaders) committed the tremendously grave errors of (1) the recognition of Soviet Russia and (2) of the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements, from which have stemmed most of our current political agonies. But rather than to admit our mistakes, rectify them by disavowal, and start afresh upon the right premise and along a safe road, we frantically grasp at the nostrum of United Nations in the foolish assumption that, the such hasty attempts at international collaboration have always failed in the past, this will succeed. And now many of our people are, like the Israelites who prostrated themselves before Baal, putting their whole faith in the concept of an immediate and single world government. Such are the antidotes and quack remedies we grasp for the poison we swallowed.

Too late did we return to the bottle and, by rereading the label, discover that it was a deadly and insidious poison we gulped down in our desire for prompt relief from agony. An emetic or cathartic, by extruding that poison, might solve our dilemma—late as it now is—but these are harsh and unpleasant measures, so, despite the foolishness of the attempt, we swallow one quack antidote after another until the treatment becomes more deadly than the original ailment.

What you and I must recognize is that the project for world government, presently advocated and promoted by UWF, is but one of a myriad of remedies now being foisted upon us, any one of which by itself can be lethal to our Government and to ourselves. If we unwisely center our attention wholly upon resistance to any one of them, we shall find that some other has crept upon us and we shall be lost. Happily, the menace of that UWF project is somewhat less acute than it was some 2 years ago when certain patriotic societies, the SAR in the van, awakened to that nefarious and treasonable attack. How the score now stands in that battle may best be gleaned from an article in the current issue of the Bulletin of the Friends of the Public Schools of America from which I now quote:

"It is time that all parents looked carefully into the subject of world government, world federalism, and world citizenship that is being dished up to their children (in schools and colleges). The leading educators, through their organizations, are demanding that world citizenship should be taught from the first grade up through high school and colleges. The proponents of world government are still active throughout the Nation. They are financed with large grants from educational foundations which, in the aggregate, have over a billion dollars, tax free, large sums going to help finance world government.

"Out of 23 States that accepted world government originally, only 10 are left that still stand for it. Those which now stand against world government by having rescinded their former resolutions through efforts of real Americans are: Georgia, California, Rhode Island, Alabama, Louisiana, Tennessee, Missouri, Massachusetts, Colorado, Oklahoma, Oregon, Maryland, and Kentucky—13. The States in which world government resolutions were passed and which have not rescinded are: Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, Utah, and Washington—10. And since this tabulation was made the Assemblies of New Hampshire and of New Jersey have passed rescinding resolutions by huge majorities. Those wherein the proposals were rejected in the legislatures are: Vermont, New Mexico, Iowa, Delaware, New York, Michigan, and Nebraska.

"Thus there is work to do in your schools and in your legislatures if you do not care to become one cog in a world organization where you will have only one vote per million inhabitants; the same as the wild tribes of Africa will have."

(Food for serious thought, is it not?)

This UWF project, and all similar undertakings, are but facets in an over-all conspiracy to undermine us and terminate the very existence of our country and of its privileges and possibilities, the one remaining hope for the whole world, for only the United States stands between the Kremlin and the world conquest it must have to endure. In today's world, mankind cannot exist half free and half slave; it must be all the one or all the other. In the past 2 years wherein I have spoken far and wide and have written extensively thereon, I have frequently been made aware of the growing fear of Moscow which seems to motivate the thinking and planning of governments and of individuals in those countries not yet enslaved. I would stress to you that fears are wise but the present object of those fears erroneous.

What we should fear, what we should "do something about," is ourselves and our own people. No world government proponent, no United Nations zealot, no appeaser, no socialistic schemer, could have gained the ear of the American patriots of 1776, and why? Because they had experienced tyranny; they were of one mind; and they had proven that appeasement, compromise, or surrender to despotism did not work and could not avert disaster.

And, so long as the people of these United States continued to have full faith in, to solidly support, and to practice Americanism, our country and they remained secure. Then, spellbound by the vociferations of internationalists and of aspirants for personal prestige within our midst—and I need not name them for you to know whom I mean—we forgot ourselves and our own security in a foolish and vain endeavor to save the entire world in one fell swoop. The basic philosophy of the Bible was forgotten, wherein it says: "First pick the mote out of thine own eyes ere thou attempt that which is in thy neighbor's eye." That basic formula cannot be bypassed, as our agencies of this date amply prove.

Actually, we are centuries away from the day when the world will be ready for a single world government of voluntary type and democratic form, because that day will not dawn unless and until the races, peoples, and cultures have found a common denominator in their concepts of life, of individual rights, of morals, and of behavior. To attempt world government now is like feeding a table d'hote dinner to a newborn baby, and as certain to precipitate disaster. Yet thousands of supposedly sane Americans, celebrating like morons, are persuaded that now is the time, and that by surrendering our national sovereignty and thus losing our rights, liberties, and advantages, we can change all the world overnight and achieve Utopia.

We might, with profit, recall the admonition that: "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," for I am constrained to infer that a segment of mankind has gone stark, raving mad within the past decade.

What humanity really needs, and especially in these United States, is not world government but sanity. And such is to be achieved not by four-power conferences, not by strengthening United Nations, nor by more agreements, commitments, conventions, bargainings, or police actions, but by being taught to think clearly and logically, and thus to avoid the mass insanity and mob-psychology which prevail today.

For this we do not need psychiatrists nor psychologists, for the disease is not an affliction of individuals but an ailment of the whole body politic. What is needed is clear thinking, courageous and honest leaders whom our people can and will follow along the path of right and of promise. Such do not exist, either in Washington, or Downing Street, in Paris, or in Lake Success, in any appreciable number, and, if existent, they are not in power. Such must be found at grass-roots level for this fateful affliction of the human mind must be met and conquered there. Such is the challenge to you and to me, as patriotic Americans and acknowledged leaders in our communities.

Too often, in current times, when a problem arises, we cry that there should be a law, an agency, or a society, to handle it—thus seeking to excuse ourselves from the endeavor and have the work done for us. The present menace, whose complexities and ramifications I know so well and could outline to you did time permit, cannot be defeated in that manner. It will take the aroused and combined citizenry of this country to preserve these United States; no other means will succeed. The battle has only begun though there are those who—substituting emotions for logic—fondly imagine that peace is just around the corner.

I wonder betimes if the United States Senate would have ratified the Charter of United Nations had it comprehended all that lay ahead? I wonder if either that Senate or you or I then realized that, under article 6 of the United States Constitution, such ratification actually vitiated that Constitution whenever and wherever the dictates of UN might conflict therewith, and made that Charter, with its complex, tricky, and unexplored provisions, the supreme determinator of our destiny? So, herein again, we see that our main fear, our chief menace, resides within ourselves, not in Moscow or in any schemes or projects sponsored by the Kremlin.

A United States peopled by real Americans, firmly resolved to remain Americans, can withstand and repel any attack upon it by any foreign power or ideology. But a United States, divided against itself, and betrayed by Judases or misled by crackpots, is an easy prey for the Communists, and they know it full well. Such is the challenge you and I face today. If we get out and work amongst our own citizens, we need not fear the outcome, as the successive rescindings of the world government resolutions by 13 States and their nonadoption in 6 others clearly demonstrates. But, as surely as tomorrow will follow tonight, another threat—another Trojan Horse—will appear upon the scene, and we must destroy each in its turn.

No war was ever won by purely defensive tactics. We must wage a constructive and aggressive campaign of action if we are to preserve this Nation; and the place to wage that warfare is right at home, not in Korea, or Europe, or Lake Success, but in our homes, our schools, our churches, our civic, patriotic, fraternal, and social organizations, and in our political thinking, voting, and acting.

If all patriots will do this, we shall win and the United States will survive. If we be not willing to do this, then let us, who are about to be enslaved by Moscow, join in a final salute to George Washington, and then set about preparing for our mutual doom.

"We Thrill When We See a Jet Interceptor Fighter Thunder Through the Skies—It Was Probably on the Drawing Boards 5 Years Before It Was Produced, and Its Engine Perhaps Not Even a Reality When the Plane Was Envisioned"—Eugene M. Zuckert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the United States Chamber of Commerce closed its thirty-ninth annual meeting in Washington last week, and my own busy week was made both busier and happier due to the presence in Washington, D. C., of Mr. John Ward, executive vice president of the Alabama State chamber of commerce, as well as other Alabamians, here in attendance at that convention.

One of the principal speakers on the Chamber's program last evening was the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force. In his address of last night, Mr. Zuckert was altogether in character. His talk was interestingly larded with cold financial and statistical facts given with respect to the military cost as well as problems. He pointed out that current developments were, as he said, "made necessary by the world-wide objectives of imperialistic communism and the maturity and ever-growing capability of air power."

Mr. Zuckert not alone evaluated all aspects of a 48-group Air Force as compared to the 95-group—now in the making—but he told of the problems surrounding the training of the increased personnel necessary to the operation of a 95-group Air Force which can only be accomplished by raising the present strength of 411,000 men to a force of nearly 1,060,000 men and fully training them in the use and care of the new and increasingly complicated aeronautical equipment.

Continuing, Mr. Zuckert stated:

We all get a thrill when we see a jet interceptor fighter thunder out of the sky and yet, quite naturally but few know all the miracles that were required to put it there. It was probably on the drawing boards 5 years before the first of its kind was produced—the engine which powers it was possibly not even a reality when the plane was first envisioned—the radar which would permit it to direct its fire to knock down an unseen enemy aircraft was still little more than a dream when the plane began to figure in our planning ahead.

And, in conclusion, Mr. Zuckert said:

Obviously, a significant financial inroad is made because a modern fighting force coupled with American standards of living for our fighting men is a fearfully costly procedure—this is the price we must pay in order to fulfill the basic objectives of our military forces in peace. Further, if war comes in spite of our efforts, we must be strong enough to win the victory.

Mr. Speaker, whenever Eugene Zuckert speaks, every Member of this House can well afford to listen. It was of this distinguished young Assistant Secretary of the Air Force that the Honorable Leo E. Allen, himself a top-flight policy-making Republican Member of this House and ranking member of the Rules Committee, was speaking when he said:

There might be other men in public life who elected to undergo such training and follow such a career as did Eugene M. Zuckert. There is none, however, who has made greater sacrifice of his personal time and fortune in order to translate his learning into action programs that looked to the eventual introduction into Government of the same high standards of business administration that characterize our multibillion-dollar corporations.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the timeliness of this talk by the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert before the United States Chamber of Commerce, and because of its tremendous interest to the Members who sit on both sides of the aisle in this Congress, that under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein the speech which Mr. Zuckert made on May 1 before the United States Chamber of Commerce.

That talk was as follows:

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, BEFORE THE ORGANIZATION NIGHT DINNER OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1951

I have been with the Air Force 5 years and in that time have learned the effectiveness of the local chamber of commerce organizations in reflecting local opinion and, in many instances, serving as the focal point for the direction of community thinking.

For a long time, I was responsible for the Air Force policy on our airfields and other installations. In 1946 and 1947, we were closing bases, and that is difficult to explain to the communities affected. More recently we have been opening bases as part of our expansion program. In an effort to make sure that we have had community backing and that we would get the best for our people in terms of housing conditions, recreation, etc., we have tried to make sure that we were really wanted by the local community. In this effort, the local and regional chamber organizations have played a helpful role. Even when we were closing bases—taking out an industry whose annual payroll was several million a year, these organizations were helpful in explaining the necessities of our situation to the community.

I am indeed impressed with the program which has been developed for your meeting. I am impressed with not only its range and quality, but also the aural stamina it implies.

It seems to me that the most important thing that can be said about our present military job is to realize the complexity of the task that we have undertaken, and some of the significant consequences of the fact that we have started this job and the fact that it is so complex.

Naturally, we cannot regard our military endeavor as some phenomenon isolated from other phases of our national life.

Our military task today is made necessary by the world-wide objectives of imperialistic communism and the maturity and ever-growing capability of air power. The capability of Russian air power is readily apparent from our Korean experience, and, although it is difficult, I know, to think of Russia as having the technical "know how" to match a country such as ours, in the air alone from our observation of the performance of their jet aircraft, for example, we

know that they have devised and produced jet engines which are the equal in performance of any of those produced in this country today.

With that cold fact apparent to us, we cannot afford to hope that they may not have been equally as successful in many other lines of modern warfare. Our military program is our response to the disappearance of geographical security. It is one of the measures that we must take—and look forward to continuing—into an indefinite future.

I wonder whether there is real appreciation of the complexity of building the modern military machine that we believe is a minimum requirement for our protection. Let's, for my benefit, limit our consideration to the Air Force alone. Stated even in bare statistical terms, the size of the job is impressive.

On June 30 of last year we had 48 combat groups and aircraft production insufficient to continue them as modern. We had 411,000 people in uniform and the base structure to support them. Within approximately 2 years from that date, we are expected to raise those groups from 48 to 95, substantially increase our degree of combat readiness, raise our military personnel figure to about 1,060,000 and not only have on our payroll that number of people, but train them on new and increasingly complicated equipment.

As I said, even stated in bare statistical terms—48 groups to 95, 411,000 people to nearly 1,060,000—the job sounds impressive. Actually the job calls for a series of miraculous accomplishments of scientific research, American production genius, and an intricate job of coordination by our military that unites into an effective fighting machinery a vast complex of equipment and trained people and to do this through an organization that has a character and personality which breeds the morale without which the most modern equipment and training would be so much irrelevant effort.

We all get a thrill when we see a jet interceptor fighter thunder through the sky and yet, quite naturally, we forget all the miracles that were required to put it there. It was probably on the drawing boards 5 years before the first of its kind was produced. The engine which powers it was not even a reality when the plane was first envisioned. The radar which would permit it to direct our fire to knock down unseen enemy aircraft was still little more than a dream when the plane began to figure in our planning ahead.

The miracles of production are impressive enough—power plant manufactured perhaps in Massachusetts, some of the radar in Maryland, some of the amazing number of delicate instruments in Michigan, parts of the airframe all over the west coast, all brought together by the manufacturer in California.

Even then the plane would be a useless marvel without a structure of training—pilots to fly it, mechanics for its engines, its radar, and its guns. Some of the training periods take as long as 2 years.

All this is why I say that our modern plane in the air seems to demand a combination of miracles of achievement. Multiply this by the thousands of planes we require for our strategic right arm and our air defense and the full measure of our task—just the Air Force task—begins to achieve its true proportions. And we are just one member of the team.

What does all this mean? Obviously, a significant financial inroad because a modern fighting force coupled with American standards of living for our fighting men is costly.

The true measure of this financial inroad was brought home to us yesterday when the President sent over his budget message to the Congress. This represents a program of approximately $60,000,000,000 for the three services, and it is significant that just under 25 percent of this will be spent for the production of new aircraft. You don't have to do anything more but state these figures and comprehend their relationship to the national economy to realize the seriousness of the world situation today. This is the price we must pay in order to fulfill the basic objective of our military forces—peace. Further, if war comes in spite of our efforts, we must be strong enough to win the victory.

Obviously, also, an endless series of personal sacrifices will be required in order to man the size of establishment we must have, and the reserves to meet the demands of war should it come. We will have to maintain a large force in being at all times because, otherwise, the machinery could not be effectively operated when the need arose.

There are many more consequences of our program for military security but one above all seems to me to stand out. And that is the need for perseverance in our intentions to see this thing through on a sustained basis. I barely sketched the complexity of our military machine, but even from that, it is apparent why we can't turn on and off our support for it like a faucet. The time involved in getting modern equipment and training makes it imperative for our safety that sustained military strength be a part of our national life.

This will become increasingly difficult as the costs become reflected in taxes and inroads into our civilian economy. It will become more difficult if we run into quiet waters in world affairs when the need for a strong right arm becomes less apparent. Sustained support of that right arm is a price demanded by the narrowed world in which we live. If we meet this demand with sustained courage, our allies will be immeasurably strengthened; the plans of those who are counting on us to fail will be shaken. Only with this calm, persevering faith and stern course of action can we hope to realize that dream we all have—peace and a free world.

More About Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial reflects a point of view of the city consumer which farm people and their representatives should know about. City consumers feel keenly the pressure of the present food price situation. I believe that they are very anxious to cooperate in finding a solution, but to stand pat is not cooperation in this instance. The editorial, previously mentioned, is from the New York Herald Tribune of May 9, 1951:

THE FARM BLOC'S OFFER

Anyone who had to do the family's shopping for meat during OPA days must be tempted to think that the farm bloc may be right in asserting that price controls on meat will lead to black marketing. There may even be a temptation to suppose that it is able to offer some alternative anti-inflationary program of its own, a program that would assure the town and city consumer of something better than the pressure of controls or the inequities of secret dealing. For how, the reasonable man must ask, can farm pressure groups so righteously and categorically demand that they alone be exempted from price controls unless they can prove that in their unique case price controls would violate the national interest? The kindest answer that can be made to that question thus far is that if the farm bloc has an alternative program to restrain farm price rises, they have not disclosed it.

What has the farm bloc offered? Free us of price controls, they say, let farm prices rise still more, and we shall give you more meat and other food products. Cancel the ordered rollbacks in beef, they say, and beef will be plentiful. But, we may ask, how high do farm prices have to go before food output catches up with demand? How much higher than 152 percent of parity do beef prices have to go before we get more beef? To these questions the farm bloc gives no answer.

What will happen if we do not accept this bland offer of higher prices? Use price ceilings, they say, and your food supplies will be held back. Do they mean that individual livestock producers will not see profit in making individual sales at prices at least 25 percent above the so-called fair parity price, or do they mean that all elements in the farm-products industry will concert their action in tight coalition to withhold supplies? Retain your regulations on slaughtering, they say, and farmers will kill their cattle behind a tree. Is this a threat of wholesale law violation? If it is not a flagrant challenge to stabilization officials who would attempt to enforce control laws on farming as they are bound to enforce them on industry and labor, what is it? The charitable answer is that it just reflects pessimism about the efficacy of economic controls. But the proper response to pessimism is not a throwing up of hands. It is an exercise of will and ingenuity. Mr. Michael V. DiSalle has tried to meet this test with his slaughtering regulations, rollback orders, and ceilings. Let the farm bloc meet the test, if they can, by devising some practicable alternative. Let us have some better offer than uncertain production and guaranteed price boosts.

Our Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, last year at the annual encampment of the United Spanish-American War Veterans, held at Atlantic City, N. J., the department commander of Iowa, Hon. Lloyd Thurston, was appointed to draft resolutions concerning the domestic and foreign policies of our Government. Mr. Thurston, who formerly represented the congressional district in Iowa which I now have the honor to serve, is an especially able department commander, and he prepared the resolutions that I wish to include in the RECORD, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the resolutions that were adopted by the encampment by an almost unanimous vote. It is thought that these resolutions will prove of particular interest at this time.

Mr. Thurston served as a volunteer in the Spanish War, Philippine Insurrection, and World War I. He served as a distinguished Member of the House of

Representatives for 14 years and was successively a member of the Rules, Appropriations, and Ways and Means Committees.

The resolutions follow:

OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Whereas innumerable persons employed by the Federal Government have been found to be disloyal, some having been guilty of furnishing confidential information concerning the atomic bomb and highly important defense plans to foreign agents; and

Whereas official sources have indicated that there are many thousands of persons, members of communistic or other subversive groups, all to the impairment of the security and defense of our Nation; and

Whereas loyal citizens are greatly concerned about the existence of such disloyal groups and their apparent increasing numbers: Therefore, the following resolutions are adopted for the purpose of emphasizing the importance of this danger to our Nation:

(a) It is with a high degree of satisfaction that this organization commends the recent action of the Congress in laying the foundation to register and segregate Communists and persons who have been shown to be disloyal to our Government. All real Americans applaud the action of these public officials who have placed patriotism above left-wing support;

(b) Likewise, the Un-American Activities Committee in the House of Representatives pioneered in ferreting out traitors and subversives, and, although the executive branch used its great power and patronage time and again to destroy this investigating group, the highest degree of true Americanism is awarded to this fearless group;

(c) Loyalty oaths have been altered by many high officials in the different departments at Washington. Such persons should be dismissed from service. If the appointing power fails to act, the House of Representatives should give attention to this dereliction of duty;

(d) It is with a deep sense of pride that we endorse the courageous attitude of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and American Veterans of World War II in their demand to have the Acheson-Hiss group removed from control of the Department of State. The betrayal at Yalta was and is a scourge to civilization. Giving control to the Russians of all the land around Berlin is another evidence of the perfidy or incompetence of those in charge of this branch of our Government;

(e) Impractical dreamers and radicals have reached such a position of power and influence in Washington that two members of the United States Supreme Court take the stand in behalf of persons who would aid our enemies, thereby disqualifying themselves to sit on appeal of that criminal case which involved disloyalty to our Government, a precedent which may have far-reaching implications and consequences in the many cases of this nature which will likely be presented to this high Court. We assert that the Congress and the American Bar Association should take appropriate action in matters of this character;

(f) The American people were amazed when they learned that the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces asserted that the United States Marine Corps had a propaganda machine almost equal to that of Josef Stalin, probably the most despicable person in current world affairs. We hold that it is a prime duty of everyone having official connection with our Armed Forces to build up the morale and esprit de corps rather than to bring discord and disunity to those who have and who are now serving with distinction and pride to all loyal Americans. In contrast, no marine has ever used the phrase, "Dear old Uncle Joe."

SALUTE TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

Whereas the sudden and unprovoked attack upon South Korea, where our Government only had a small force with light equipment to meet 10 times their number supported by heavy tanks, it was evident that our troops would be obliged to retire until reinforcements could be brought from over the seas; and

Whereas the limited forces of this small army were so skillfully deployed, shifted from sector to sector, to hold back the hordes pouring in from three directions, so that finally the flood was stayed although only a small beachhead remained to prevent another Dunkerque: Therefore be it

Resolved by the national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans in convention assembled at Atlantic City, N. J., September 24 to 28, 1950, That they salute that master of military strategy, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and the gallant foot and air soldiers, the marines and sailors, who under such adverse conditions finally reestablished their lines, and then in true American military precision marched forward, and by their determination, their courage and valor, fully and completely upheld the finest traditions of the American soldier and sailor. Thus again the Republic of the United States and the free nations of the world have been reassured that American genius, civilian and military, when joined and coordinated, can be depended upon to prevent world slavery.

Personal Combat on Korean Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter to the editor, printed in the Indianapolis Star on Saturday, May 5, 1951. This letter, it seems to me, uses the age-old method of telling a story effectively by parable, and points up the present discussion of the U. N. and the United States lack of policy in Korea:

PERSONAL COMBAT ON KOREAN PLAN

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

A few days ago Lum Lynne, a neighbor of mine, a big, flabby, awkward, overbearing scoundrel, made an unexpected and unprovoked attack on me. While he was slugging me furiously and rather effectively with both fists, I was doing very well with one hand—my right hand—behind my back. Once in a while I was even able to gain some ground, although I lost as often as I gained.

Finally Arthur, a meddlesome, insubordinate member of my household, shouted from the window, "Use both hands, Sam. If you do you'll win, and the fight will soon be over."

"Hold your tongue," I shot back. "I'm doing this. If I use both hands he'll get mad and we're liable to get into a fight." "You're already in a fight," shouted the voice from the window.

"Mind your own business," I retorted. "Can't you see it's only a half fight? That's the way I want to keep it. If I use both fists we're liable to get into a whole fight, an all-out fight, and somebody might get hurt. Besides, I don't need any of your advice."

RUSSELL E. TUCKER.

TERRE HAUTE.

P. S.—I did finally use both fists, and I won, but that wasn't in any way a concession to Arthur's advice or point of view, as I was already considering using this plan before he butted in with his asinine suggestion.

Let's Look at Their Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, a Pacific coast weekly, the Argonaut, published at San Francisco, in its April 20, 1951, issue made an interesting and appropriate presentation of the records of President Truman and General MacArthur, as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT THEIR RECORDS

(To avoid rash judgments born of hysteria, it is best to look at the records of the Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces and of the subordinate whom he fired. Conclusions reached after such a search are basically sound. With this in mind, we briefly review the careers of Harry S. Truman and Douglas MacArthur, setting their histories side by side so that they can be compared and weighed fairly.)

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Born April 8, 1884, Lamar, Mo.

Attended public schools in Independence, Mo. Worked for Kansas City Star, 1901; was a railroad timekeeper and bank clerk to 1905.

Rejected by West Point Military Academy for poor eyesight.

Worked on his father's farm from 1906 to 1917.

Entered field artillery school at Fort Sill, Okla., 1917; became a captain of Thirty-fifth Division, AEF, in World War I; discharged a major in 1919 and is now a colonel in the Field Artilley Reserve.

He went into the haberdashery business in Independence after the war. Failed.

He became judge of Jackson County court with the support of Boss Tom Pendergast; attended Kansas City School of Law, 1923–25 (then 39). Did not graduate.

Although still supported by Tom Pendergast machine, was defeated for reelection as judge.

Through the support of the notorious Pendergast machine, was elected United States Senator November 6, 1934; and through support of same Boss Pendergast, was reelected November 5, 1940. Was little heard of except during brief term as chairman of an investigating committee of war expenditures.

In 1944 he ran for Vice President with Franklin D. Roosevelt, being a substitute for Henry Wallace, and only after his name was screened by Sidney Hillman, labor leader.

As Vice President, flew to Kansas City to attend the funeral of Boss Tom Pendergast, ex-convict, in United States Army bomber, saying at the time, "He was my friend, and I stick by my friends."

Became President on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, April 12, 1945, and, among first official acts, attended meeting at Potsdam, where he charmed Joseph Stalin with his piano playing. On his return he was quoted as saying, "I like good old Joe (Stalin)."

February 1946, nominated Edwin Pauley, California oil man, for Under Secretary of

Navy in part payment of a political debt, but nomination was defeated.

August 5, 1948, Truman denounced congressional investigation into Soviet spy ring as a "red herring," renewing his charge even after startling revelations of Whittaker Chambers of "pumpkin patch" files and Alger Hiss' treachery.

Reelected in November 1948, he nominated Dean Acheson in January 1949, a known appeaser of communism and friend of Alger Hiss, to succeed Gen. George C. Marshall as Secretary of State. Then appointed Louis A. Johnson as head of joint Armed Forces, who proceeded to scuttle plans for bigger Navy. But Truman's choice of Senator Mon Wallgren (a discredited, defeated Governor of Washington) as head of National Security Resources Board was rejected by the Senate.

May 9, 1949, remarked "There are too many Byrds" in Congress.

August 11, 1949, Albert Gross testified at Senate 5-percenter hearings that he had sent deep freeze to Truman's Independence home.

Called a Washington correspondent an s. o. b. for his revelations about his aide's (Gen. Harry Vaughan) dealings with 5-percenters.

Threatened to "punch a half dozen newspapermen in the nose" after his retirement.

Sent note to music critic threatening to kick him in a tender and unprintable spot for his criticism of Truman's daughter's singing.

Called Senator FULBRIGHT'S investigation of RFC loans "asinine."

Fired his subordinate, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, because he "failed to support the Government's [foreign] policy," which is a deep mystery to allies and foe alike.

GEN. DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR

This is the man Commander in Chief Truman fired.

Born January 26, 1880, Arkansas. His father was Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

Entering West Point Military Academy, he graduated with highest honors in the school for 50 years in 1903, and since has received honorary degrees from the University of Maryland, University of Pittsburgh, University of Philippines, University of Wisconsin, Harvard, Seoul University of Korea, University of Hawaii, Columbia University, and University of Queensland (Australia) among others.

Starting as a second lieutenant in 1903, he climbed rapidly to the rank of brigadier general in June 1918, and to that of full general on November 21, 1930. In World War I he commanded the famous Rainbow Division (Forty-second).

During First World War he participated in the battles of Luneville, Baccarat, Champagne, Marne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Essey, Meuse-Argonne, and Sedan. He was twice wounded in action in 1918, and was with the army of occupation in Germany from 1918 to 1919.

Returning to the United States, he was made Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Two years later he was sent to the Philippines.

He became Chief of Staff of the United States Army in 1930, remaining until 1935, when he became military adviser to the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines.

Retiring from active duty on December 31, 1937, he was brought back into service on July 26, 1941, when he was named commander of Armed Forces in the Far East with the rank of general.

Before Bataan fell, he was ordered to Australia, and managed to sneak through the net of Japanese warships to that country in a PT boat. It was upon landing in Australia that he made his famous promise "I will return" to the Philippines, something he subsequently did in a brilliant series of maneuvers which included island hopping.

In 1942, he was made supreme commander of all air, land, and sea forces of the Allies in the far Pacific.

As supreme Allied commander, he accepted the Japanese surrender on the battleship *Missouri* in August 1945, and he has remained in Japan as its administrator since that time.

Among the many honors he has received are the DSC (with two oak leaf clusters), DSM (three oak leaf clusters), Purple Heart, Silver Star, Navy Distinguished Service Medal, Bronze Star, Air Medal, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre with four palms, Legion of Honor, Commander Order of the Crown (Belgium); War Cross (Italy); Grand Cross Order of the White Lion (Czechoslovakia); Grand Cross Military Merit (Mexico); Distinguished Service Star (Philippines), and a host of other honors, enough, in fact, to fill this page.

As supreme commander of the Allied Powers in Japan, General MacArthur has hung up an amazing record. About the people, he said: "Of the Japanese people, I can pay no higher tribute than to repeat that they have fully and faithfully fulfilled their surrender commitments and have well earned the freedom and dignity and opportunity which alone can come with a restoration of a formal peace."

If the Japanese people have made this extraordinary progress, it is because of the sympathy and understanding and efficient administration of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Little wonder that they shed tears upon hearing the tragic news of his dismissal.

Can Our Republic Live on a Doctrine of False Information?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Evening Star of May 9, 1951. The doctrine enunciated by Secretary of Defense Marshall in the first paragraph of the article, if it be true, is Russian policy and philosophy, not that of a representative republic such as our forebears established:

AS WAR OF ATTRITION DRAGS ON—MARSHALL ENUNCIATES DOCTRINE THAT THE MILITARY MUST BE LOYAL TO DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

(By David Lawrence)

Secretary of Defense George Marshall has enunciated in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee the astounding doctrine that the minority party in Congress is not entitled to full and truthful answers from officers in the armed services and that, in answering letters of inquiry, officers must be guided by their first loyalty to the Democratic administration, which he calls the "constituted authority."

Under such circumstances, it seems improbable that any testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff or any other military officers hereafter could contain a single word of information which could possibly reflect on the Democratic administration.

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, Republican, endeavored to pin Secretary Marshall down to whether an officer's first loyalty is to his country or to the administration in power, and the Secretary insisted that the only way an officer could express himself when he felt the interests of his country were at stake was to resign from the military service. A man must sacrifice his career if he wants to tell his views to Members of Congress. This will not be good news to men in the fighting services who thought that party politics was not to be considered in relations with their Government—and who had been taught to consider Congress a civilian branch of the Government, coordinate with the executive branch.

More significant, however, in Mr. Marshall's testimony was his revelation of what critics in Congress already are saying is the administration's appeasement plan in the Far East. The Secretary stated that the unification of North and South Korea has been set up as a political rather than a military objective of the U. N.

The same phrasing was used by Secretary of State Acheson in a speech a few days ago to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and, by instruction of the State Department, the same wording also was uttered recently in an address by Warren Austin, American Ambassador to the U. N.

It means that while the United States Government will continue to oppose recognition of Red China and also the turning over of Formosa to Red China, the other members of the U. N. will have to decide the issue. The United States Government, through Secretary Acheson, has already made it clear that no veto power will be used and that America will abide by what the majority of other members of the United Nations wish to do. If they want to reward the aggressor and ease the sacrifices of American troops in Korea, the United States will accept the appeasement.

This means that the 38th parallel may again be the boundary between North and South Korea and that the U. N. will try by diplomacy to get unification but that, if Russia and China refuse to accept it, then, assuming a cease fire has occurred, the fighting will not be resumed. This is because the U. N. feels it is not committed to accomplish the objectives in Korea by military means.

The Marshall testimony has produced a wave of questioning and criticism in the Senate committee. He will be on the stand for several days. He has not yet satisfactorily explained how the administration intends to end the war in Korea or why it now sets up the bogey of Russian intervention in the war when it had no such fear last June at the time the orders went to General MacArthur to land forces in Korea.

President Truman, on the other hand, has, through his latest speech, notified Russia that America is so afraid of having its cities bombed that it will not take maximum steps to stop the aggression in the Far East. Mr. Truman says that, if the United States were to widen the conflict in Asia, "we might well have to go it alone."

Yet that's what has been happening, in effect, since last June. The United States alone—outside of the South Koreans—has been supplying virtually all the troops. The U. N. has refused to send reinforcements. The principal U. N. members have only token representation on the firing line. Instead of winning allies, America has, as a practical matter, been deserted already by its allies with respect to Korea.

The President's speech might be construed to mean that he has lost faith in the willingness of our allies to support our troops in the Far East. As a consequence, the question of withdrawing American troops from Korea is bound to be raised. For, as one Senator said, it doesn't help to point out how many Red Chinese are being killed—what's important is how many American boys are being killed and wounded while the so-called war of attrition drags on.

Pay of Postal Employees

REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the problem that is confronting the postal employees today. Since the start of the war in Korea on June 25, 1950, the cost of living has increased by some 14 points. This has created a very serious situation for employees on a fixed salary basis. Price Stabilization Director Michael DiSalle has pointed out that the cost of living will probably increase another five or six points before it is finally checked. The wholesale price index has increased 17.2 since the Korean war started. This is a very reliable index as to what will happen to the general price index.

Congressman GEORGE MILLER, of California, has introduced H. R. 244, and a number of our other colleagues in the House have introduced similar bills. I hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will start hearings on these bills in the immediate future, and that we will be given an opportunity to take action on them without delay.

The mail I am receiving from my district from postal employees points up the harsh fact that their pay checks no longer cover the necessary living costs. This situation is particularly acute for employees in the lower salary grades. When Public Law 134 was passed in 1945, the five pay grades then in existence were increased to 11. While the employees then in the postal service were given a $400 increase, the entrance salary for those who entered after the effective date of that act remained at $1,700. Due to the many increases in the cost of living since that time, we have passed several other pay bills. The group of employees in the lower pay grades, however remain far behind in their struggle to maintain an adequate standard of living.

As my postal friends know, I have been working for some time to abolish inequities, particularly in the lower salary bracket, by eliminating the first four grades. We were able to get some of the objectives of my bill, H. R. 138, of the Eighty-first Congress, incorporated into Public Law 428, which eliminated the first two grades and allowed a much needed increase in salaries. This does not go far enough to solve the problem.

When Public Law 134 was passed, it was assumed that the recruiting of personnel in the postal service would come largely from youngsters just out of high school. Since World War II, the vast majority of employees entering the postal service have been veterans of World War II. They are men with family obligations. They cannot cope with present prices on the salaries they are now receiving. We must recognize the fact that employees with a fixed salary have suffered greatly. The postal employees are loyal citizens and efficient public servants.

I do hope that we will have an early opportunity to vote on this much needed upward adjustment in salaries for postal employees, particularly for those in the lower grades.

Salary of General Motors President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 26, 1951:

GENERAL MOTORS PRESIDENT IS PAID $626,300 IN 1950, RAISE OF $40,200—WILSON'S REMUNERATION TOPS 62 DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF BIGGEST UNITED STATES AUTO CONCERN, PROXY STATEMENT TO STOCKHOLDERS SHOWS

Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., earned a total of $626,300 in salary, director's fees and bonus last year from the Nation's largest automotive company. This was $40,200 more than his compensation in 1949.

Mr. Wilson's compensation topped the remuneration list of sixty-two directors and officers of General Motors, which was shown in the proxy statement for the company's annual meeting mailed yesterday to more than 450,000 stockholders. The meeting will be held on May 25 in Wilmington, Del.

The aggregate salary, fees and bonus for the group of directors and officers last year was $11,748,172. This compares with $11,154,454 in 1949, when the group numbered sixty-one.

The 1950 remuneration for Mr. Wilson consisted of $201,300 salary and fees; 1,358 shares of the corporation's common stock at an award value of $45.07 a share, for a total of $61,205, and a cash bonus of $363,795. The bonus of the shares and cash is payable in five equal annual installments.

The remuneration last year for the 62 directors and officers, including Mr. Wilson, amounted to $3,643,672 in salaries and fees; 33,995 shares of common stock at an award value totaling $1,532,155 and $6,572,345 in cash bonuses. Their bonus awards also will be paid over a 5-year period.

According to the proxy statement, the first installment of the 1950 bonus awards was delivered on February 23, 1951, when the closing market price of the common stock on the New York Stock Exchange was $50 a share. The remaining four installments will be paid in the next four Januarys.

The salaries paid by General Motors to its 12 top directors last year ranged from $36,100 for Charles F. Kettering to the $201,300 paid to Mr. Wilson. The Internal Revenue Bureau requires payment of $17,060 in taxes on a net income of $36,100 and approximately $157,000 on an income of $201,300 for a single person with no dependents.

Other top-paid directors, their salaries and bonus awards, are:

Albert Bradley, $161,425 salary and $380,000 bonus; Francis Burke, $101,100 salary and $100,000 bonus; Marvin E. Coyle and Harlowe H. Curtice, each $151,000 salary and $375,000 bonus; Frederic G. Donner, $121,070 salary and $320,000 bonus; Ronald K. Evans, $126,825 and $320,000; Louis C. Goad, $121,000 and $320,000; Edward R. Godfrey, $101,300 and $245,000; John J. Schumann, Jr., $91,200 and $180,000; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., $48,600. Mr. Sloan and Mr. Kettering get no bonus.

The proxy statement showed that a proposal will be submitted at the annual meeting to limit salaries and bonuses of each of the corporation's top executives to a total of not more than $200,000 a year. This proposal will be offered by three shareholders owning a total of 162 shares.

In recommending to the stockholders that they defeat this proposal, the General Motors board of directors said that good management is hard to find, and that able executives are entitled to sufficient recompense to offset higher Federal income taxes.

Another proposal to be submitted is that the place of the meeting be rotated among Wilmington, New York City, and Detroit. The board also indicated opposition to this proposal.

A Life Devoted to the Service of Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald of May 5, 1951:

A LIFE DEVOTED TO THE SERVICE OF OTHERS

Perhaps one of the hardest things a human being can do is to maintain over a long period of time a record of unselfish service to others. The light of the ideal is difficult to follow. But some do follow it, undeviatingly and gloriously to the rich benefit of those they serve.

Such a person is Dr. Mary Sloop, of Crossnore, Avery County, whose selection as American Mother of 1951 was announced in the papers Wednesday. For 40 years, now, she and her husband have devoted their lives to what was when they went to it an underprivileged area. She and her husband have brought healing in their medical practice to people who live in a remote area. They have lighted the lamp of learning in the now widely known Crossnore School. They have led in bringing about economic improvement, in finding vocational opportunities suited to the community, and in reforming farming practices.

Choice as American Mother of 1951 is deserved recognition of a devoted woman—devoted to the people for whom she has labored these four decades. Mrs. Sloop has a daughter, a physician who practices at Crossnore, and a son who maintains a dental clinic for the needy in Avery County. In her own life, and in the inspiration she has given others, may be found the qualities which make her indeed a mother to all that region.

One of the secrets of Dr. Sloop's success is revealed in her reaction to the news of this recognition. She is unconcerned about credit for herself—she finds others to whom she gives it for the achievements at Crossnore. In that unselfishness is the basis for cooperation which makes communities and nations great. An unselfish leader is the greatest of community and national assets. Dr. Mary Sloop is such a leader.

Don't Let It Fool You, Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very fine and timely editorial, Don't Let It Fool You, Joe, from the Decatur Daily of May 6, 1951:

DON'T LET IT FOOL YOU, JOE

There are certainly two distinct classes of thought in the United States when it comes to the war in Korea. There are those who believe we are following the wise course in heading off the Communists in Korea. There are those who believe with equal sincerity that we have no purpose in Korea, that that ill-fated country is no place to stop the Communists. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

There are those who believe taxes should be raised so that preparedness can be paid for as we go. There are others who, with equal sincerity, think taxes are high enough and that more should not be piled upon the people regardless of the purpose. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

When it comes to Federal spending, there are great numbers who think the Federal Government could do a much better job of cutting down on expenses. There are those who are in favor of reducing Federal spending so long as it doesn't hit home, they would like to see the reduction made but prefer the reduction to be made in some other part of the country. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

Then this is the day in which everybody is a fair catch when it comes to investigations, anything from big time crime to the fellow who is "probed" to see if he paid the just amount of income tax. Many are in favor of investigations, so long as the investigations are made in the other fellow's safety deposit box. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

What a mighty debate you can get up over aid to Europe, or Asia, or anywhere else outside the country. Some folks have the idea that so long as aid is going in any direction overseas that the folks over there will sit around and wait for Uncle Sam to show up with a hand-out. Then there is the other side of the debating society, showing with equal clarity that the recovery of Europe is absolutely essential to American well-being. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

Louder than the MacArthur ruckus is the great debate about prices and wages. Every pot is calling the kettle black. It's like the old story, which came first, the chicken or the egg. Everybody is quite certain that his theory for controling inflation is correct, that wages went up first and caused the spiral. And there's the other crowd, certain that prices went up first and caused the tightening of the pocketbook. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

Republicans, Democrats, Dixiecrats, the din of debate is terrific, the front pages are loaded every day, for in this country, Joe, everybody has the privilege of shooting off his mouth. But don't let it fool you, Joe.

You see, you head a mysterious crowd of 200,000,000 more or less intelligent people. At least you have been credited with being a mysterious set, but you'll find, if you'll look hard enough, that you're dealing with a mysterious set. That is, mysterious to you and your way of doing things, Joe.

You should be a politician over here in this country for about a year, or a newspaper editor for a while, or a public servant in any capacity. You would find out just how mysterious are the ways of the American people. But until then, Joe, don't let it fool you.

For the American people enjoy fighting among themselves, they have been doing it a mighty long time for that is the democratic way of getting one thing settled in time to start on another. And when they start on you, Joe, they'll settle you, too. So don't let it fool you, Joe.

You may catch them unprepared in the sense that your ignorant millions are prepared, but Joe, the American people have been prepared ever since this Nation was founded. Their love of freedom prepares them to hold you off, and all your millions, and though they may not have as many guns as you have when the thing starts, they'll have more than you have when it ends and they'll beat your brains out because they love freedom and the right to investigate and debate and disagree with each other.

And if you ever take a punch at them, you'll find out that they have forgotten all about debating and investigating and whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat and whether he plays a piano or a bass horn, and that they have one purpose and for that purpose they will give their sons and daughters and all they possess, just to beat your brains out.

So, Joe Stalin, before it is too late, don't let it fool you, for if you do you and your people will regret it to the end of time, all time.

William H. Fitzpatrick Wins Pulitzer Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer prize is the highest award in journalism. It is particularly significant when it is awarded for editorial writing, because it is in this field where the journalist expresses the highest art of his calling and where the fourth estate interprets and analyzes events and happenings in the light of our republican institutions.

Louisiana was signally honored several days ago when Mr. William H. Fitzpatrick, the editor of the New Orleans States, was named as recipient of the Pulitzer prize of 1950 for editorial writing. Mr. Fitzpatrick was so honored because of a comprehensive series of editorials which he wrote on the so-called genocide convention.

In this series which among other things was incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the editor of the States pointed out the far-reaching effect of such a convention upon our own great Bill of Rights and upon our domestic laws, as well as the division of power between our States and the Federal Government.

This series succinctly analyzes the effect of the proposed covenant and indicates that the editor had spent many hours on research and study; and, while Mr. Fitzpatrick is not a lawyer, he handled the subject with the clarity and the comprehension of one well versed in our constitutional processes.

Mr. Fitzpatrick thus takes his place with a long line of distinguished American writers.

I personally am very proud that he has received this award. Mr. Fitzpatrick is a young man. It was my privilege to attend Tulane University with him, and I am certain that all of his friends are not only proud of the award which has come to him but are equally gratified at the great service that he and the States have performed for our country.

Before I learned of his award, I was reading in the Times-Picayune for Sunday, May 6, his column entitled, "Rights and Lefts," in which he told about the visit to New Orleans of last week of Sir Oliver Franks, the British Ambassador. I was much impressed with his column and had intended to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD then. I am doubly pleased to do it now, as one will understand upon reading it his clarity of writing, as well as his forcefulness of expression:

STATES RIGHTS AND LEFTS

(By W. H. Fitzpatrick)

Sir Oliver Franks, the tall, gentle, shy, friendly intellectual who is British Ambassador to the United States, last week put Britain's foreign policy—long range and short—in one clear sentence.

His speeches here in New Orleans were the most important and timely pronouncements any ambassador has made in relation to present-day world events.

And in one of them came this capsule definition of why Britain has suggested the return of Formosa to China and the admission of Red China to the UN:

"Britain recognized Red China because of a fact and not a value."

That, I believe, is the measure of all foreign policy in Britain; it has been the measure for centuries.

Values, moral, philosophical, ethical, must be considered, of course; but facts, the facts as they are and not as they ought to be, are the final decisive factor in the foreign policy of an important ally and friend.

It is necessary, the ambassador believes, that we differentiate between what he called the small sector of disagreement with Great Britain in the whole area of agreement, and in large measure it is talks here were a plea for understanding.

He spoke from his experience as ambassador, a professor of moral philosophy, and permanent secretary of the Ministry of Supply. He left the cloistered quiet of an educator's life to enter government service when World War II began. He knew intimately the charts of the shipping lanes when U-boats were slashing at England's jugular; he was there when lend-lease went in and Bundles for Britain, and when the British loan and the Marshall plan were enacted he was named British Ambassador, the most important gift in his country's giving.

Much of the professor of moral philosophy and much of the secretary of the ministry of supply was apparent in his speeches here. We can accept or reject the British foreign policy in the Far East, but what we cannot reject is his plea for understanding.

The British do not want a war now; it is not that they fear war, but only that they fear the ultimate effects of a war; they fear what it will do to them and to their country.

They know what World Wars I and II cost them: An empire.

The British Empire was a magnificent balance for peace and prosperity for more than two centuries. There was a time when their outposts were safe because the vast power of England was their guaranty. That is no longer the case. Singapore fell in a matter of weeks, and Hong Kong in days during World War II.

I guess it was in 1933 when I first became aware, in a sort of personal way, of the might and spread of England. As an ordinary seaman aboard the *Steel Seafarer*, I went around the world. And every strategic spot we passed, every tip of land that guarded the dropoff of a continent or the entry to a waterway, except the Panama Canal, was owned by or leased to or controlled by the British.

There was a very good reason for this. You can take three United Kingdoms and fit them into Texas and have room enough for Glen McCarthy too. With a kingdom this small, they had to depend upon trade. To keep trade going steadily, peace was necessary. To keep peace, strategic spots were necessary. England did rather successfully for 200 years what we are trying to do in Korea: Control trouble and keep it from spreading.

Britain has been criticized for Sir Oliver's note to our Government suggesting that Formosa be given to China, and that Red China be allowed a seat in the U. N. It has been suggested that England ought to offer Red China Hong Kong, but England needs Hong Kong. England knows she must have trade to survive.

More than 50 percent of its food and goods is imported. Trade is the United Kingdom's lifeblood and the source of its strength. That is a fact that we must realize in our attempts to compare facts with values.

The professor of moral philosophy may have had some qualms about the Formosa note, but the former minister of supply could not have, from the point of view of Great Britain. There is much talk about understanding our enemies; we had better try to understand our friends, too.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a special press release dated May 10, 1951, by the Government of India, Information Service. This is with reference to the proposed emergency assistance by the United States Government to India in the shape of food grains to relieve the famine victims. Since the report of this release in some of the newspapers omits pertinent parts of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's statement, I ask that it be printed in full:

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
INFORMATION SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1951.

Replying to a question in Indian Parliament, May 10, regarding the terms and conditions of the proposed United States food aid to India, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement:

"There are two United States bills to give emergency assistance in the shape of food grains to India; one was introduced in the Senate and the other in the House of Representatives. Both bills have undergone considerable change since they were originally introduced. One of these revised bills has been proposed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the other by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

"The Senate bill allots $95,000,000 for grain purchase in the current year, that is, the year ending June 30, 1951, and authorizes the appropriation of an additional sum of $95,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. This second part of the aid, however, shall not be made available until after further action by the Congress.

"Both parts are divided on a 50-50 basis, half being a grant and half on credit terms as provided in section III (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended.

"Assistance in terms of the bill will be available only after an agreement is entered into between India and the United States. It proposes that this agreement should contain certain undertakings insuring distribution of food without discrimination, publicity to the assistance furnished by the United States, and permission for persons designated by the United States to observe the distribution of supplies in India.

"The House committee bill provides emergency food relief on credit terms only in accordance with the provisions of section III (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended. It authorizes provision of a sum not exceeding $190,000,000 for the fiscal years 1951 and 1952. Repayment of this loan includes payment in goods under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the ECA Administrator and the Government of India. ECA loans are generally for a period of 33 to 35 years at an interest rate of 2½ percent on unpaid principal with semiannual interest payment. In the present case, it is proposed that the interest payment will begin on June 30, 1952, and the payment on principal some years later, which may be from 5 to 8 years.

"Such conditions as are attached to either of these bills are the usual terms embodied in the United States of America legislation providing for economic assistance to foreign countries. In the Senate bill there are certain conditions which do not find a place in the House bill and much would depend upon manner of implementation of these conditions.

"There is a reference to our supplying various kinds of materials to the United States of America in part payment for the grain supplied. We shall gladly supply such materials as are available in India and can be spared by us. But I should like to make it clear that it is a fundamental part of our foreign policy that such material as is particularly related to the production of atomic or like weapons should not be supplied by us to foreign countries.

"In our view there are no political or discriminatory conditions attached to these two bills and therefore there can be no objection on these grounds to our acceptance of either of them. While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide, we would prefer the terms embodied in the House bill which are simpler.

"I should like to express our gratitude to the Government of United States of America for the efforts they have made to send food grains to India. I should also like to express our deep appreciation of the messages as well as offers of material help unofficially received from many citizens of the United States."

Proposed Roll-Back on Price of Beef

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the 10 percent roll-back which has been imposed on the packing houses in order to reduce the price of beef, and the proposals which we understand are about to be made to roll back beef prices another 9 percent before October 1, have brought about a condition among the cattle feeders of the Nation which does not warrant those people feeding cattle so long as this roll-back is in effect. Naturally, the production of beef will be reduced to a great degree and food prices, instead of being lessened, will be increased.

The following letters and telegrams will explain some of the reasons why:

RED OAK, IOWA, *May 9, 1951.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Am taking 185 cattle off grain today. Unable to feed grain under controls considering present costs and crop conditions. Do something.

H. V. FELT.

NODAWAY, IOWA.

GRISWOLD, IOWA, *May 8, 1951.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

This price roll-back on beef has rolled me back $6,000 on 140 head of cattle. In order not getting rolled again I quit. It seems very unfair. Industry with their roll ahead and cutting quality is getting along very well. The beef producer cannot reduce quality. Demands are of this beef be loaded with corn.

B. F. ANDERSON.

FRED SIEVERS & SON,
Audubon, Iowa, May 5, 1951.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: In view of the events which have occurred the past week, I feel that it is my duty, as well as my privilege, to write you as the Congressman from my district. When an order as severe and discriminatory as the price roll-back on beef is issued, it is bound to have opposition from the enormous industry it affects. Considering none of the other phases of beef production, with their added restrictions and problems, I'd like to present my side, as a cattle feeder whose only occupation and source of income is producing pounds of beef for the consumer. It is my opinion that this occupation involves considerable know-how and risk of investment and deserves just consideration.

It is difficult to understand how the CPS economists figure that any industry can stand a price roll-back of 18 percent, which is proposed for beef by October 1, without losing money. The beef producer has not been making excess profits, and unless his costs are reduced proportionately this will bankrupt him. For example, I just purchased, in March, 300 head of high-quality feeder steers at a cost of 36¼ cents per pound. These cattle will not be finished for

market for 6 or 8 months, at least, at which time, under the present set-up, they will be worth about 33 cents top price. If I am forced to market them before this time to escape the lower roll-backs I will be cut down because of the lack of finish and consequently lose money there, too. Cattle of this type are fed for prime meat and are not profitable as short-feds. You can easily see how the many cattle feeders, such as myself, in Audubon County and elsewhere, will be affected. The feeders on every farm have been purchased at record prices, are being fed, and will continue to be fed at high cost.

It looks as if the only result can be a reduced incentive to produce and fatten beef and the marketing of light, unfinished cattle. This in turn means less meat for the consumer, possible rationing, and the return of the old black-market profiteering for some. This is exactly opposite to the purpose of the roll-back, which is more, lower-priced meat.

I shall appreciate your consideration of this matter, and I know you will act as you see fit.

Very respectively,

FRED SIEVERS, Jr.,

MASSENA, IOWA, *May 6, 1951.*

Congressman BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I am writing to you in regard to the price roll-back on cattle which means the difference between a fair price for our grain and labor and a loss at the roll-back price.

We operate 400 acres of good Iowa land and feed twice as much grain as we produce to cattle and hogs.

If we have to take a loss on these cattle that are in the feed lot, we will assure you that we will not replace them until the freeze is lifted.

We are reducing our corn acreage and our hired labor and plan to feed only what grain we raise which will greatly reduce our operating expenses.

This will produce about 40 percent the tonnage of meat we usually produce.

If a meat shortage occurs, we will not consider a subsidy payment to produce more.

Please use your influence to revoke this freeze order.

Yours very truly,

DANIEL E. BOWER.

P. S.—This roll-back in production also means a roll-back in the demand for manufactured goods.

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *May 8, 1951.*

Congressman BEN JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: I feel it is my duty, as a citizen and taxpayer, to write you with reference to the Office of Price Stabilization's new directive, forcing a roll-back on prices of live cattle and dressed meats; also, proposed ceilings.

First, let me state, having spent a lifetime in the production, feeding, and marketing of livestock in a most extensive way, I believe I have acquired a far greater knowledge of the livestock industry than most of the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington. This program, outlined by Mr. DiSalle, will definitely sabotage the production of our livestock industry at a time when production is most essential. The facts are such an act is definitely unworkable and un-American.

Congressman JENSEN, I ask of you, as a Representative of the people of this district, to oppose the reenactment of article 4 of the Defense Production Act, which provides for price and wage control, as it is of the most vital importance that this Nation, the greatest on earth, shall continue to progress with free enterprise and not to have our welfare dictated by any one man or group of men who are seeking control of the entire Nation.

Yours very respectfully,

IOWA FEEDING CO
By F. L. KELLY.

LIVESTOCK FOUNDATION OF OMAHA,
Omaha, Nebr., May 8, 1951.

Congressman BEN JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: In my work here at the Omaha market, I talk each day to 40 to 50 livestock growers and feeders—in the course of a year, to thousands.

In 11 years of this work, first at Sioux City and the past 4 years at Omaha, I have never seen so vast a majority of Midwestern farmers and feeders as resentful and embittered over a Government edict as they currently are over Price Administrator DiSalle's beef cattle and beef price order of April 30.

They are angry and alarmed. They've sent to market many animals not yet ready for slaughter and will send more unless the order is rescinded.

In its May 7 issue, Newsweek magazine carried an inaccurate story on the livestock and meat situation. Enclosed is copy of rebuttal I wired them.

Meanwhile, for the good of the industry and meat consumers as well, please do not renew President Truman's control powers come June 30. He has demonstrated the inability or an unwillingness to use them wisely.

Yours very truly,

HART JORGENSEN

RICHARD M. RUTTER,
Business News Editor,
Newsweek Magazine,
New York, N. Y.:

For a magazine that prides itself on accurate, informative reporting, and which features straight thinkers like Moley and Lindley, your piece on "Slicing the Meat Bill," (p. 63, May 7) is terrifically substandard.

It would appear the author thereof imbibed too deeply of an unlabeled jug containing OPS propaganda. Such as: The Nation's meat industry was in chaos (before the control order). Meat supplies heading for new low. Now a chance to thwart black market. End jag.

For a chaser, try these facts:

1. Prior to first controls on meat prices in January, no channels were short; distribution was normal. And cattle population and cattle-on-feed numbers were at near-record levels and headed higher.

2. Real confusion in the industry did not come till after DiSalle's order of April 28.

3. This week alone (week of April 30–May 4) thousands of unfinished cattle have been rushed to market. Consumers are out millions of pounds in future meat supplies. Packers and feeders alike up in arms over order and holding protest meetings (Washington and Omaha). Consumers not cheering, either, over chance to buy choice sirloin steak come May 20 at $1.14 that last week was advertised in Omaha World-Herald at 89 cents.

4. Shortages of meat, rationing, and black markets now a real prospect—thanks to DiSalle order.

HART JORGENSEN,
Executive Director,
Livestock Foundation of Omaha.

OMAHA, NEBR.

Time Is Running Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News, Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

In the mass of discussion of how to wage war and how not to wage ware against communism, there is danger of losing sight of our prime national objective, which is not to wage war at all. It is to secure a firm international peace.

There is war in Korea, in defense of a principle, out of which, in some manner not now evident, it is hoped peace in that tortured region will emerge. There is the rearmament of Western Europe, part of the growing strength of the free world, designed to convince the Soviet Union that negotiation among equals is in the general interest.

"We are not engaged in a struggle without end. We are engaged in a struggle which has the definite goal of peace," said President Truman in an address last night on civil defense. That it will be a prolonged struggle is obvious. It is a struggle beset with hazards and hard choices, for example, whether or not to limit the war in the Far East to Korea and, if to limit it, then how to end it; whether the maintenance of a high level of armaments is not, of itself, dangerous to peace.

The answers to such questions as these, which affect the survival of the free world and the future of mankind, cannot be given sound, dogmatic expression. Yet peace is larger in scope than the contrivances erected to capture it. It has often been said since the end of World War II that what the world needs is some supreme act of imagination, of statesmanship, of faith that will tear the chains of war from men's feet and permit their best spirits once more to soar.

General MacArthur, a professional soldier, was never more impressive in his appearances before the Senate hearing than when, at the final session, he argued for the abolition of war. Amidst so much of immediate, current importance, the moving eloquence of what he said has escaped general attention.

Effective disarmament is not enough, said General MacArthur. If war is abolished, no armaments will be needed—nothing except arms for police in given geographical areas.

But let General MacArthur himself speak:

"There was great evidence of that in Japan. You spoke of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Japanese people, more than any other people in the world, understand what atomic warfare means. It wasn't academic with them. They counted their dead and they buried them.

"They, of their own volition, wrote into their constitution a provision outlawing war.

"When their Prime Minister, Mr. Shidehara, came to me he said, 'I have long contemplated and believed'—and he was a very wise old man; he died recently—'long contemplated and believed that the only solution to this problem is to do away with war.'

"He said: 'With great reluctance, I advanced the subject to you, as a military man, because I am convinced you would not accept it; but,' he said, 'I would like to endeavor,

in the constitution we are drawing up, to put in such a provision.'

"I couldn't help getting up and shaking hands with the old man, and telling him that I thought that was one of the greatest constructive steps that possibly could be taken.

"I told him that it was quite possible that the world would mock him—this is a debunking age, a cynical age, as you know—that they would not accept it; that it would be an object of derision, which it was, that it would take great moral stamina to go through with it, and in the end they might not be able to hold the line, but I encouraged him, and the Japanese wrote that provision in.

"If there was any provision in that constitution which appealed to the popular sentiment of the people of Japan, it was that provision. There was a warrior tribe which, for centuries, had pursued war, and successful war; but the great concept, the losses, the great lessons the bomb had taught them, had been understood. They were trying to apply them.

"The world should have common sense enough, when it surveys the losses of two wars, to understand that war has become a method of suicide for modern civilization.

"I therefore believe that time is running out on us. I said at the end of the Second World War that we have had our last chance. I believe it and I believe that 99 percent of the people of the world believe it."

The mechanics of abolishing war, as General MacArthur well realizes, are difficult. Through the United Nations, or some other forum, General MacArthur would attempt to get an agreement. The great nations would set the norm for if the four or five great powers should agree to abolish war, it would be impossible for others to start one.

General MacArthur would have the United States exercise its moral leadership through a conditional legislative fiat to abolish war, challenging others to follow. Here is a project on which American opinion ought to express itself, for if war is ever to be abolished, the impulse must come from the hearts of the people. Given that kind of demand, perhaps statesmanship, in a supreme act of imagination, could penetrate even behind the iron curtain and into the darkest places in the world.

John Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 9, 1951:

JOHN KEE

In March 1949 when he succeeded the late Sol Bloom as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative JOHN KEE, of West Virginia, was known to few Americans outside Congress or beyond the borders of his own State. And when death struck him down during yesterday's committee session he was still pretty much of a stranger to the public at large. Yet this quiet, self-effacing man—an excellent lawyer with a keen analytical mind and a gentle spirit that abhorred noisy headline-hunting—was one of the Nation's most devoted servants, a hard-working legislator whose contribution in the international field will surely live on after him as a kind of monument to his name.

For Mr. KEE—a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee throughout all of his 18 years in the House—was an American acutely aware of the dangerous nature of these times and of the problems that the United States had to meet to serve its own best interests. In a unique respect, therefore, he dedicated himself, with a sense of duty and urgency, to international matters. Wholly apart from what he did in the Seventy-ninth Congress to bring about a much-needed reorganization of the Foreign Service, he played a highly constructive wartime and postwar role in helping to persuade his colleagues to enact such historic measures as lend-lease, aid to Greece and Turkey, and the Marshall plan for European recovery.

Although he gave his attention to domestic issues on which he invariably voted in support of the administration, Mr. KEE's overriding and consuming interest was in the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Consistently, both before and after he became the committee's chairman, he strove diligently for united, bipartisan action, and he was in no small part responsible for the fact that it was achieved on some of the most far-reaching international legislation in the history of the United States. No fanfare ever marked his efforts, but he has left behind him a genuinely distinguished record in the service of his country.

Standard Oil Sets Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 26, 1951:

STANDARD OIL SETS RECORD IN QUARTER—NEW JERSEY COMPANY EARNS NET OF $118,000,000, AGAINST $65,000,000 YEAR BEFORE—MEETING AGAIN AT LINDEN—TO TAKE PLACE JUNE 8—SHELL OIL SALES AT NEW PEAK IN PERIOD—OTHER CORPORATE REPORTS

The Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) achieved a new high record in the first quarter, with estimated consolidated net earnings of $118,000,000 after taxes and all charges, according to the report announced yesterday.

In the preceding quarter, ended with December, the company showed earnings of $134,000,000, or $4.42 a share, while $65,000,000, or $2.15 a share, was made in the initial 3 months of last year.

The parent company's stockholders' annual meeting on June 8 will be held again in the boiler shop at the Bayway refinery of the Esso Standard Oil Co. in Linden, N. J. Formal notice of the meeting place was given in the proxy statement mailed yesterday to 220,000 Jersey Standard stockholders. The Bayway building first was used as a meeting place last year, when 1,600 stockholders attended. Shareholders will be invited to inspect the Esso research center, a short distance from the refinery. The latter facility was not yet fully in operation when last year's meeting was held.

Among the various proposals to be presented for action by stockholders at the meeting are a two-for-one stock split, previously announced, an inactive stock option plan whereby up to 300,000 shares could be sold to designated executives of the company and subsidiaries.

Shareholders also will be asked to vote on a proposal under which future meetings could be held either in New Jersey or in New York City. The proxy statement says the board does not contemplate at present any change in the practice of holding stockholder meetings in New Jersey, but merely seeks "greater flexibility."

Address of Hon. Y. T. Pyun, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered at the CARE fifth-anniversary luncheon by Y. T. Pyun, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, May 9, 1951:

You all know that Korea has been unfortunately caught in the global conflict between the world-conquest-dreaming communism and the survival-seeking democracy. She has been caught in the vortex of world disturbance of violence and destruction, quite helpless and unprepared—unprepared except in her indomitable spirit and unswerving determination to die fighting on the side of human freedom. Sometimes I quite dispassionately ask: Had there existed no Korea, would this conflict have been averted? It would have broken out somewhere else, say, in Iran or in Viet-nam or in Burma, or even in India. No matter where the aggression appeared, its nature would have been the same—of Communist global conquest. Any meaningful action on the part of the free world to counteract an aggression of this nature must, therefore, be designed on a global level. No matter where it appears, the aggression must be met firmly and thoroughly with the total weight of the free world. Nothing should stand in our way to a swift and complete military victory. All military half measures should be carefully eschewed, for they are bound to invite further aggression.

We Koreans do not pretend to understand the position so far taken either by England or by India. They look to us like a patient insisting on a "head first" treatment when his hand has been invaded by germs of a deadly disease. We are now fighting England's as well as India's battle in Korea. If we are defeated, the struggle will be carried to their own homes. If we come out victorious, they will have no war at home.

The Soviet Union has deliberately chosen Asia as its first object of conquest. Its very first stroke has been deliberately planted on Korea, a long-coveted strategic point, from which naval operations can be launched to tear up the Pacific traffic of the free world and which will prove an ideal watchtower to keep the whole Orient, including China and Japan, under the domineering glance of the Soviet Union.

To the cool, calculating mind of the Kremlin, the conquest of Western Europe is unthinkable until the vast resources of Asia are consolidated under its domination. The conquest of Asia alone will condition the Kremlin to launch an all-out global conquest. The formula of remedy should appear to be: Balk the Kremlin in the attainment of this prerequisite, and the dreaded thing

will never come off. There is every reason that England, doing away with her local-mindedness, should send more troops to Korea now and that India, too, should start sending them. The weak-jointed dinosaur will recede before nothing but a drawn sword. In an indecision-vacuumed atmosphere alone, the Soviet balloon of threat will wax larger.

The level-headed Stalin knows that he lacks oil fuel, that he lacks such mobility as is known in the United States, and that he lacks even the loyalty of his own people and of those of his satellites. Above all, he is well aware that he will have to go without the American lend-lease this time, which played such a decisive role in his successful struggle against Germany. Nothing short of the fear of provoking the United States-led free world into a general war will stop the Stalinist aggression in Asia. That Iran is now confronted with very much the same situation as has developed in Korea may be said to be the direct result of the restricted and therefore indecisive military action in Korea.

Before I end this general survey of the world situation of which the present Korean war is a local manifestation, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the one unchanging motive behind all the Soviet tactics of playing hot and cold, fast and loose, with the free world, getting it on crisis after crisis and letting it off as often at will is, through series of serious economic dislocations, to create within free nations situations where the Soviet Union can more easily take them over from within. My advice is, therefore, this: Don't you be let down this time; see that the international criminal does not get away unpunished this once, whatever happens.

Now I am coming to relief, at last. Except the few towns of considerable size, located in the area which, from the beginning of the war, has never been harried by the enemy, and which, in area, is not more than one-thirtieth of entire Korea, most of the towns in the bulk of South Korea and the entire North Korea have been taken and retaken by both contending forces and a large number of them have been completely laid waste beyond recognition. Because the United Nations forces have been forbidden to cross the Manchurian border and blow up enemy supply centers, all they have been doing is to pound away to smithereens all buildings and houses that are likely to give shelter to the enemy. Except the few millions who either have remained protected behind the U. N. defense line or have been fortunate enough to filter through it from beyond, the bulk of the Korean people, rendered homeless and uprooted, as it were, out of the soil, wander like clouds over areas made desolate by war and vanish like clouds, exposed to hunger, cold, and man-made demolition. Just think of a full-fledged modern war of hitherto unheard of power of destruction again and again sweeping over such a narrow strip of land like Korea for the last 10 months. Just think of scores of thousands of tons of high explosives smashing up nothing but Koreans. Neither Germany nor Japan, war-torn as they were, can approach the present Korea in stark devastation. The Korean case, in which her allies, in terms of practicalities, seem to have joined hands with her enemies in her own destruction, partly out of regard for her deadly foes, is something tragically unique and unparalleled in human history.

This bleak past lies unrelieved by any immediate bright future. The spring sowing season finds the bulk of agricultural soil untilled and unsowed for lack of work beasts or of farm laborers or of huts that shelter them, or even of seed.

The problems of relief thus posed by a Nation-wide destruction and by an entire nation turned refugees are overwhelming. The united command has been doing all that was humanly possible, but the number of refugees it reached and saved is a mere fraction of the masses who roam homeless and perish as they roam and who perish unseen and unsuccored in remote outlying places. The united command ought not to be expected to attempt relief to the extent of military insecurity. It cannot safely make an outlay sufficient to meet relief demands, either in personnel or in transportation or otherwise. The inexorable demands of military operations, to which the united command is duty bound to give priorities, are apt to make its hands too full for anything like adequate relief for civilians. The need has long been felt for fuller and more active cooperation of all available civilian relief agencies of the free world with the united command and of creation of a far wider opening admitting these civilian agencies more freely into Korea. It is indeed gratifying that CARE plans to make a Nation-wide appeal for Korean relief and spearhead civilian relief activities for the suffering millions in Korea.

In view of the overtaxed military transportation, overtaxed even for military purposes alone, Korean relief, in order to be extensive and Nation-widely penetrating, must be provided with a minimum transportation of its own, both land and sea. Under the circumstances, certain main arteries of land traffic and main harbor facilities are bound to remain exclusive to military purposes. But byways and small ports should be available for relief activities. The civilian relief personnel may need to be men of as much valor as combat teams, very probably of a higher order. They may be irked by the necessary screening exercised by the appropriate authorities. But I do not doubt that the American public once when roused to a very pressing need, will not fail, as it never did in the past, to rise to meet it like one man, sweeping every obstacle or inconvenience before it.

The Korean people are now undergoing a virtual genocide, which should not be unnecessarily complete. The present humanitarian movement you are now setting your hands to, if given momentum promptly enough, will save millions of Koreans who otherwise are doomed to perish. As the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea, I feel I must pay tribute also at this time to the American Red Cross, which so instantly responded to my President's plea for help soon after the invasion of June 1950. I am gratified to learn that the American Relief for Korea Committee is actively engaged in this humanitarian effort to relieve the suffering of the Korean people. I will always remember you in my prayers that God may speed your worthy efforts to instantaneous fruition.

I started out to give you a general view of the Korean situation, and it may not be out of place here to suggest to you the outstanding needs other than that of relief. I will briefly enumerate four more needs without troubling you as to their order in importance.

Korea is badly in need of financial aid, distinct from economic aid, that will go to stabilize her now fast-crumbling finance. It is true that she has a balanced budget, but balanced on paper only. All sound budgets are based on assured national revenues. Almost all the Korean sources of revenue lie shattered and disrupted by the war. A complete measure of rehabilitation alone will restore them, but that is not forthcoming under the circumstances. What was opportunely done for Greece to bolster its finance must be done now for Korea.

Another need for Korea is more arms for the pending military expansion program. We do not object to rearming Japan, so long as Japanese are not brought over to Korea to fight in our place. To say the least, it will help Korean Communists strut as patriots fighting the age-long Korean enemy, and, at the same time, dishearten the ROK forces so as to lower their fighting morale. Nor do we relish the idea of having the Chinese Nationalist troops among the U. N. forces now fighting in Korea, for we know that they can be more profitably used elsewhere, when the occasion arises. What we lack is arms, not manpower. It will be a grievance to Korea, if she is denied the chance of contributing more manpower to the cause of human freedom—the only contribution she can make as far as circumstances allow her now.

The fourth need is for technically training as many intelligent young Koreans as possible. In view of the fact that what scanty trained Korean personnel we had before have been mostly captured, killed, or incapacitated during the present war, any long-range plan for Korea cannot overlook the crying need of an extensive training program, without which any rehabilitation of an enduring nature is impossible. It is wrong to keep them all in Korea. There are not arms enough to go around. Nor are there any munition factories to absorb their energies and make them contribute to war efforts. I personally do not see the sense of letting them rot by slamming the door upon them that leads them abroad for qualifying them for services of no less value to the nation than fighting. Anyway, they cannot all fight.

Against the thousands of Japanese receiving technical training in this country, there are an ever-dwindling number of Korean youths given the same academic benefits, mere dozens for the year. Considering the disparity of technical attainment existing between the two peoples under discussion, the reverse of the ratio would seem fair. The training of Korean industrial personnel should be given more candid consideration. I regard it to be one of the obligations of the free world to train and conserve an adequate number of Korean young men in the industrial way.

Lastly, I call your attention to the peremptory need of perpetuating in the proposed Japanese peace treaty in clear terms the present high seas demarcation between Korea and Japan, known as the MacArthur line. The line was instituted for sound reasons which will grow sounder as Japan gets out of the occupation status. From the immemorial times up to the opening up of Korea for world trade, it was the Japanese fishing boats that incessantly harried and plundered hamlets and towns on the Korean coast, which eventually paved the way for the Hideyoshi invasion, the greatest national calamity known in our history. In future, Japanese fishing boats will probably find it advisable to refrain from downright vandalism, but, if allowed to come close enough to Korean territorial waters, they might easily turn into moving bases for smuggling so as to nip the viability of Korean economy in the bud.

I do personally know of cases where large Japanese fishing boats, infringing the MacArthur line, attempted to butt Korean naval patrols into the sea. It is the established practice with the small Korean fishing vessels to scurry away into safety whenever powerful Japanese ships are sighted on their side of the demarcation, for they know there is always the treacherous sea to bear the Japanese blame of foundering them unseen by law. The abolishment of the line would mean not only stymying the nascent Korean fishing enterprise but also placing entire Korean economy at the mercy of Japanese commercial aggression. While Korea is quite prepared to see Japan restored to its rightful place among the family of nations, she cannot afford to consent to any agreement or nonagreement, for that matter, that leaves open an avenue, through which Japan can

dictate the very subsistence of Korea. Korea cannot be persuaded to forego the only and real safeguard she has against the possible Japanese economic aggression.

To sum up, penetrating relief, economic aid designed to bolster her finance, ample arms for her military expansion, candid training program for her industrial personnel and eternal high-seas safeguard stipulated in an international instrument will certainly help lay the foundation for peace in the Far East.

In Bataan, people from two different races fought their common foe, interlocked in comradeship and common ideals. In the world Bataan called Korea the brave sons of numerous free nations blend their honored ashes in an everlasting covenant of cooperation for one single end—the preservation of free ways of life—which, we fervently hope, will be strengthened with time. Remember that, in this case, there is no world Australia for a military comeback. The free world cannot afford a retreat from this world Bataan.

Korea is a unique exception. Of all small peoples, she is the only one that boldly threw her lot with the free nations, under most unimaginable circumstances of adversity. Proportionately in terms of sacrifice, she has contributed most of all to the cause of human freedom. It may be no more than the widow's mite. But it is also true that she has dedicated all to the cause which she can call her own.

Whether Korea was wise in putting up a heroic fight against communism, alias decivilization, or the now Soviet satellites were comparatively wiser in succumbing to communism unresisting will be eventually decided by the part played by the free world in the wartime relief as well as in the postwar rehabilitation of Korea. If the direction now being pointed to by CARE is persistently and intensively pursued, Korea, I am certain, will stand, not a battered tomb of freedom, but a proud monument enternally bearing witness to the triumph of free human will.

Address of Hon. Lewis Preston Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the address of Hon. Lewis Preston Collins, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, at the Virginia Day Luncheon of the Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., April 5, 1951:

Madame President, Madame Toastmistress, and my friend Mrs. Killinger, you have been very gracious and kind to Mrs. Collins and me; and first, I should like to express our gratitude to you for the kindness and courtesy which you have shown us; and then to this club and to its guests, may I say that the invitation to speak to you today is an extremely flattering one and affords a privilege which I shall long remember, challenging as it is.

What is a Virginian to say on Virginia Day to the Woman's National Democratic Club in the city of Washington which would not be applauded by these, misunderstood and misinterpreted by those, or classed as immodest and egocentric by the others. It is a challenging privilege under such circumstances to be your guest speaker and the temerity with which to proceed arises only out of a consciousness of the broad mind, generous spirit, tolerance and good will of every true Democrat, especially the beautiful, attractive and tender individualistic feminine Democrat. Your speaker feels at home here in this detached part of Virginia, with the kindred democratic spirits assembled here, regardless of the varying and vacillating interpretations of our democratic tenets and of the political and economic philosophy of the party. Such, however, are permitted to Democrats under our unwritten rules and by tacit understanding, in proportion of the number of members comprising the Democratic Party. The privilege so to vary and vacillate and fully to discuss these variables and vacillations is one of the virtues of our party and may prove to be its salvation. It would be a wonderful renaissance if each of us here and now would simply accept the Jeffersonian interpretation of democracy which constitutes the basic concepts striven for in Virginia; pledge eternal allegiance thereto; support a Democratic Party movement to find a nationally prominent Democrat of kindred views—our Virginia views—make him our leader and win against our traditional rival in the conflict now brewing, and which lies just ahead. This would be in keeping with the Democratic way of leadership, its history, precedents, and tradition. Is this provincial egotism—or is it humorous—or is it the product of wisdom? The true evaluation lies with each of you as a Democrat.

A lady from my town moved to western Texas and had resided there for 32 years; finally at one of the clubs, she met a fellow townslady of 40 years' residence; said the Texas lady: "How long have you been here?" The Virginian replied: "For 32 years." The Texan related the 40-year duration of her residence, implying that such duration was required in this city in order socially to qualify for the finals—and flashed a well arched eyebrow for punctuation. The Texan daughter-in-law of the Virginian interposed: "Well, she is just visiting here." So, you see Virginians are expected to remain Virginians always; we can emigrate; and yet we must remain native; this is a congenital propensity, and is so accepted."

Someone has written a book titled "Virginia Is a State of Mind." It is just that. You must not judge us too harshly because we enjoy blackeyed peas and hog jowl on New Year's Day for it is really a splendid delicacy for regular diet and is growing in popularity, and then it augurs good luck as well; the very best is sometimes confusing for a long while and its significance misunderstood; but ultimately the crucible of time will assize truth; for this is the way under an ever-broadening capacity to participate in democratic government; truth is eternal, and so are blackeyed peas and hog jowl.

You should not get angry with us if we still insist that Robert E. Lee did not surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865; for we in Virginia yet believe that the individual and his progress and liberty are the supreme considerations of government, and must be protected against ultracentralization and the tyrannies which follow in its wake to destroy individual liberty and opportunity. In this relation we believe in a division of powers, as a fundamental and enduring counterpoise against tyranny, regardless of interruptions due to political and economic expediency, in liberty's eternal struggle to dignify the individual. We in Virginia flatter ourselves, not unduly I hope, in the belief that Jefferson, Madison, Washington, and other Virginians played a bit of a part in the establishment of our representative democracy under a constitution for a wise purpose. We believe that this purpose was and is the perpetuation of a government with which to insure the largest measure of opportunity and happiness to the individual, free from social, economic, political and religious tyranny. Tyranny has never failed in the long course of history to flow from all forms of government. Thus the founders devised safeguards, under a constitution of limitation and division of power, delegated authority and of insured basic liberties; these considerations are indigenous to Virginia and Virginia clings to these principles which are so much a part of her heritage—and thus a part of herself.

Yes, we in Virginia are old fashioned just like the Virginia lady way out in Texas; even a Texan knew she would ever remain Virginian; and while our Democratic Party may stray far from home for a political visit, we in Virginia have the faith to believe that our party—the party of each and every one of us—will come back home to imperishable, everlasting and immutable political truth, instead of pursuing the easy, expedient and politic way which deludes, deceives and insidiously destroys.

Each of us has the challenge as a Democrat within the Democratic Party itself to regenerate, rededicate and resuscitate the fundamental truths of the Democratic way. Republicans could not do this. Such truths not only constitute the basic philosophy of our Government but embody the yearning of the individual as well, regardless of his or her social, political, ethnological, economic or religious status.

In Virginia we believe in freedom from debt; we believe that government must be run as a private business is run; we believe in buying only that for which we can pay, however enticing the purchase may be. We believe in hard, not soft, dollars; we believe that the life, health and safety of the private individual are above the greed of either management or labor and that public utilities related to the life, health and safety of the individual should be required under State sovereignty to protect life, health and safety of the individual; we believe in honesty in government, and that public office is in fact a public trust demanding morality, personal honesty, ethics and legal responsibility.

The Democratic Party has forever been the party of leadership in the hours of national travail and international crisis; we have had in the past the capacity somehow to preserve the fundamentals of government and yet meet the economic and social trends and tensions which have threatened us. So, today we as a great national party have got to meet our challenge and make the decision whether or not we are going to lead down the road to socialism with destruction of the individual, private enterprise, and the capitalistic system in an effort to equalize material enjoyment under government; or are going to accept the basic philosophy—unchanging and enduring as it is, that the function of government is to guarantee to the individual and private business the fullest opportunity to evolve upward socially, financially and otherwise. This decision is ours to make as a great national party; and if our country is to survive and if we as a party are to survive and remain dominant, I believe in my heart that we shall have to go back to the faith of our fathers some of whom at least came from just south of the Potomac; and there perhaps a modern disciple of these fundamentals and a national leader within our party might be found who could lead us not only to victory but to a Jeffersonian renaissance as well. Thus we as Democrats can again lead in a sorely needed national regeneration.

The pendulum is swinging; and wise political decision and true statemanship indicate and demand our course as a great national party. Shall we accept the challenge?

Will We Forget Iran?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, many of us are greatly disturbed about the apparent lack of any coordinated effort to prevent the Soviet from placing Iran inside the Communist curtain.

I am inserting, under unanimous consent, the following article from the Charlotte News and Observer on our Middle East policy:

THE POT BOILS OVER WHILE CHEFS WATCH OTHER COOKING

(By Joseph Alsop)

ATHENS.—It is easy to sum up the impression of American policy making that is left by a tour in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean. Evidently the men who make our national policy are like distracted cooks confronting an enormous stove covered with dozens of different pots, all bubbling away simultaneously. The cooks only watch the most conspicuous pots—Western Europe, for example. The other pots get no attention until they either scorch or boil over.

Even from the perspective of Athens, it is all too clear that Iran must now be placed in the category of pots that have boiled over, like China in the past. When this reporter left Tehran, the American and British motto was that "time would cure all things, and that in time an agreed settlement of the oil nationalization issue could be arranged with the Iranian Government." Even then, it seemed that time was more likely to produce an explosion than a settlement, unless the Foreign Office and State Department could concert strong preventive measures.

The explosion has now occurred with the political triumph of the National Front leader, Dr. Mohammed Mussadegh, an aged extremist who lives in a private world of violent dreams. With Dr. Mussadegh as Prime Minister, it is pretty safe to predict that one of two things will have happened in Iran within the next few days. Either the British will have moved troops into southern Iran (presumably flying them from Suez) in order to protect their oil properties, or the Iranian extremists will have seized the British oil properties by main force.

In addition, there are signs that Dr. Mussadegh is contemplating a deal with the Soviet Union, and that the Shah, the only relatively stable element in Iranian politics, is again planning to flee. Certainly it is childishly unrealistic to talk about negotiating with Dr. Mussadegh, as Foreign Secretary Morrison has been talking. A minor disaster is the best result that can now be hoped for from the long-neglected Iranian situation; a major disaster, engulfing all the vital region of the Middle East, is all too possible.

Moreover, there is the crucial problem of the Mediterranean command. Until recently, it was thoroughly taken for granted that Admiral Robert Carney would be the Mediterranean commander of the future. Carney even journeyed to Ankara and Athens to discuss liaison arrangements. If Admiral Carney were given the Mediterranean command, he could easily tie in the NATO area in the Western Mediterranean with this area in the Eastern Mediterranean. A British commander, for various local reasons of prejudice and sentiment, cannot possibly wield the same authority.

But the American Chiefs of Staff with unparalleled short-sightedness, accepted the Atlantic command for Admiral William Fechteler. As the British Chiefs of Staff must have realized at the time, this made it inevitable that a British appointment would be regarded as only fair here in the Mediterranean. And it is also troublesome to disentangle this silly mess, and name a British commander in the Atlantic and an American commander in the Mediterranean.

Because of the search for an easy way out, the command problem is fumbled; the Turkish and Greek requests for guarantees are met with empty words; and the Yugoslavs are aided in driblets. Thus, the opportunity here is passing. If suspicion and disgust increase much further at Belgrade; if neutralism gains much more ground at Ankara, the opportunity will simply cease to exist.

On the surface, this sort of missed chance may not seem very grave. In fact, however, the Turks, Greeks, and Yugoslavs represent a potential of 70 fighting divisions. These divisions are in being, and are located on the most sensitive Soviet flank, the flank of the always distrusted satellites. With reasonable equipment and good air support the Turks, Greeks, and Yugoslavs could, in case of trouble, drive to the Danube, threatening the whole satellite area.

In short, throwing away this splendid opportunity in the Eastern Mediterranean will be like passively accepting a gigantic defeat in war. Equally, if the western world loses control of the vital oil resource and strategic positions in the Middle East, this will also amount to a staggering military defeat. And so improvidence, negligence, and the search for the easy way will lead us, by a succession of such defeats, over the brink of final disaster.

Post Office Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

MAY 7, 1951.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MURRAY: I am transmitting for the information of the Committee a signed statement prepared for me by a group of Post Office employes in my District.

In addition to the statement and other communications I have received, I had a personal interview with a number of the letter carriers and clerks when I visited Jackson, Mich., recently. It certainly is clear that these postal employees are a very much aroused over conditions in the Post Office Department, both as it affects them personally in their livelihoods, and in the quality of the postal service at the present time, in which they seem to have a sincere and understandable interest.

As you will note, the authors pull no punches in the description of conditions, and I thought it might be useful to your Committee to have such a frank and forcefully-expressed commentary on the postal service from the point of view of the employees themselves.

Because it seems to me that this statement should have the attention of the entire Congress, I intend to ask leave to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

POST OFFICE CURTAILMENT

A drastic unnecessary step taken by the Postmaster General to blackjack Congress. A public poll on this uncalled-for reduction in service would find many people opposed to it. A service that the country, the Post Office Department, and the employees could well be proud of has deteriorated to the point where we the employees are ashamed of it. The public used to be able to set their watches by the regular approach of the mailman. Under the curtailment service one wouldn't be able to determine the day of the week. Magazines that used to be delivered on Thursday and Friday, are delivered at late as Monday and Tuesday of the following week. Circular advertisements of concerts, and so forth, occasionally delivered after the date the event took place. Political advertisements have been delivered a few days after the election was held. Ads for special sales delivered after the sale was over. Church, fraternal, lodge, and sales meeting announcements delivered after the meeting day had passed. A letter mailed Thursday p. m., in Detroit, delivered in Jackson at 1:30 the following Monday. Result—two people for Sunday dinner that weren't expected.

DIRECTORY SERVICE DISCONTINUED

Letters returned to the sender 1,000 miles away when directory service would have saved time and money. Also would have kept two taxpayers happy instead of disgruntled. A penny-wise and pound-foolish measure.

WINDOW SERVICE CURTAILED

The windows of the post office open at 8 a. m. and close at 5 p. m.—12 noon on Saturday—when do working people have an opportunity to mail their packages, buy money orders, or transact postal savings business?

SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE RATES

The large magazine companies have our school children selling their subscriptions (practically for free) and the Post Office Department delivering them almost for nothing. The amount they pay per pound probably wouldn't pay the transportation expense. On the other hand they have more than doubled the selling price of their magazines and raised the rates on advertisement space. Any mention of raising the postal rates is met by a howl of protest. The loads of magazines has increased to the extent that we aren't letter carriers any more—we are just two-legged pack mules. The public is buying magazines that they don't want and don't read simply to help some school child win a prize. The same public, as taxpayers, complain about the large postal deficit. Mail carriers are burdened down with a load that the public shouldn't have to pay a subsidy on. Let the publishers pay a legitimate rate of postage or deliver their own magazines.

SPECIAL BOOK RATE ON BOOKS THAT ARE NEITHER EDUCATIONAL OR ENTERTAINING

How low can this literature get and still be offered for sale and transported through the mails? Tax money for prisons to house sex degenerates that were inspired to commit rape or murder by this type of Government subsidized reading material

26 DAYS VACATION AND 15 DAYS SICK LEAVE

That amount for some Government employees, but 15 days vacation and 10 days sick leave for postal employees. The argument that the first group needs the additional time because they are working great distances from home doesn't hold water.

Many of these people working in their own home town receive the same as those working thousands of miles from their homes. Perhaps the extra 5 days sick leave are given so they may return home to be sick.

COST OF UNIFORMS

Letter carriers are the only uniformed Government employees that have to pay for their own uniforms. With the price of wool skyrocketing this is, indeed, quite an item on the letter carriers' budget. Letter carriers are the Government's only employee group that contacts all of the public, in fact they are the only contact for a portion of the population. Shabbily dressed, poorly paid, and discontented employees make poor representatives for the United States Government.

EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT BOARD

Representatives of the various employee organizations are only tolerated at the present time. Postmasters and top Government officials can cooperate or not as they see fit. A law should be passed that would create a compulsory employee-management board. Employee morale has been lowered to a great extent by politically appointed postmasters disregarding existing labor relations practices and seniority rules.

Substitute employees are classified Federal employees yet they are not granted the benefit of the 40-hour workweek law, neither do they receive pay for the eight legal holidays as the other employees. (The Government of the United States enforces the 40-hour workweek on private industry.) Our substiutes work as high as 16 hours a day and more than 100 hours a week and never get paid overtime rates.

Employees starting to learn the plumbing, carpenter, machinist, etc., trades have to work 4 years before they earn top wages. Postal employees have to work 23 years before they earn top wages. We are in favor of the three longevity or meritorious grades but feel that 23 years is too long a time to reach the top grade.

Revision of the wording and carrying out of directives in bulletins to the field service from Washington, D. C. Numerous items issued in the Official Bulletin aren't definite, or plainly worded, and the officials in the various offices interpret them differently.

On trip service under the curtailment order have worked herdships on the carrier force. Carriers used to return to the postoffice at noon, but now many of them eat their lunch on a street corner or in business places; some of them have to stop at a private home for toilet facilities. Occupational illnesses such as heart trouble and varicose veins have increased. Carriers comprise only 4 percent of the Government employees but they have 18 percent of disability cases. The amount of personnel turnover is reaching a new high in postal history.

POSTAL DEFICIT

The Post Office Department is a service organization and always has been. Out of 42,000 offices only about 6,000 pay their own way. Would anyone advocate closing the other 36,000 offices? Compare the final cost to the taxpayers of running the Post Office Department with some of the non-revenue-producing departments, such as: Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor. The postal deficit shouldn't enter into the picture when considering wage increases:

TRUCK INSURANCE

The Government does not carry liability insurance protecting the drivers. In case of an accident the carrier driving the truck can be sued. All the Government offers is legal assistance.

EMPLOYEE MORALE

Postmaster General Donaldson once stated that he would make working conditions so that the employees would look forward to each working day in a happy state of mind. He has accomplished just the opposite. Most postal employees face each new day with a gloomy outlook on things in general. Working conditions, under the curtailment order; poor service, causing the public to complain verbally; and an inadequate wage all combined are enough to keep one in an unfriendly mood. Good pay for an honest day's work—serving a satisfied public—under favorable working conditions will put a smile again on the face of the employees and restore the Post Office Department again to the top level as a truly great service organization.

Tribute to a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Philip Slomovitz, editor and publisher of the Detroit Jewish News, from the issue of April 20, 1951:

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT STATESMAN

(By Philip Slomovitz)

Arthur H. Vandenberg was one of the outstanding personalities of our time. Scholarly, well-informed, an excellent speaker, a brilliant organizer, he was held in high regard even by his severest critics. Few men in the United States Senate measured up to him in stature in the last 25 years. It is no wonder that as late as November 1948 President Truman was quoted as stating that he regarded him as the ablest Republican in the Senate.

From his background as a newspaper editor and publisher—a position to which he rose from the coveted beginning as a good reporter for his Grand Rapids paper—he acquired a passion for information on every subject with which he was deeply concerned. As a result, he never committed himself on any issue unless he possessed all available facts in order to be in position to speak with a measure of authority. He was a voluminous correspondent. He never failed to respond to communications—whether they were from critics or supporters.

More than one biography could be written of his life. Every issue he was involved in offers material for a study of his attitudes, his character, his ability to cope with situations. In most cases he rose to great heights in dealing with situations affecting our country.

This commentator knew him intimately and is in position to say that a full-length biography could be written to describe Senator Vandenberg's relationships with Jews and Jewish issues, with particular reference to Zionism, Palestine, and Israel. Our first acquaintance with him was at a meeting of the Men's Club of Temple Beth El at which he captured the hearts of his Detroit audience with his eloquence and forthright expressions on matters of state. It was in the late 1920's. A friendship began in 1930 when we first interested him in the Zionist cause. At that time the Pro-Palestine Federation of America was the active Christian philo-Zionist movement in this country which functioned under the brilliant leadership of the eminent socialist, the late Charles Edward Russell.

Out of the friendship for Zionism grew Senator Vandenberg's interest in other matters—his anti-Nazi stand, his aid in efforts to liberalize legislation for the admission of displaced persons, the leading role he played in securing the ratification of the appointment of David Lilienthal as head of the Atomic Energy Commission in opposition to forces which he believed were anti-Semitic, his help in individual cases involving people who sought refuge in this country, his sponsorship of a resolution in support of Jewish aspirations in Palestine.

In its entirety, the Vandenberg story vis-à-vis Zionism and Israel was not always rosy. There were times when we were impatient about his attitudes. Tense situations arose from time to time. Most of the time his hesitancy in acting in our behalf, as a member (later chairman) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, were due to pressure from the White House, the State and War Departments. When President Truman gave speedy recognition to the Jewish state, he was the first to commend it as the logical and proper step to take.

It would take volumes to describe our experiences with the great Michigan Senator. For more than 15 years it was our duty, at time on an hour's notice, to go to Washington to consult him on Zionist matters. It became necessary for this commentator to keep in touch with him on the Palestinian issue at San Francisco, in 1945, during the formative stages of the international world organization whose charter he helped frame; to keep in touch with him when he represented the United States in Paris, at the sessions of the United Nations, in January of 1946, and constantly to keep him informed about the Jewish position in matters involving the future of our harrassed people in Europe and in Arabic countries and the development of the State of Israel.

The historian will be amazed at the mass of information that came to us from his desks, wherever he may have been—in Washington, in San Francisco, in Paris, in Grand Rapids. There is an especially interesting note describing his conference at his Washington office with David Ben-Gurion on November 21, 1946. Even Ben-Gurion was wrong in an important matter involving the Arabs at that time. There are messages describing his reactions to Zionist leaders. And there are reports about the progress of his efforts in behalf of a Jewish Palestine in the United States Senate. A wire dated December 12, 1945, informed us that the "Foreign Relations Committee this morning ordered favorable report on Palestine resolution which seems to be in satisfactory form," to which was appended the information that "only opposing vote was that of Chairman CONNALLY."

Since it is impossible, in one column, even to scratch the surface in commenting upon the brilliant career of Senator Vandenberg, with special reference to his Jewish attitudes, your commentator desires to make note of only one other matter, involving a local item:

Less than 2 years ago the Morris Schavers, desiring to bring to this country the sole survivor of an entire family, 5-year-old Itzhak, who now is their adopted son, met with obstacles. Itzhak could have been considered Polish-born. In that case he would have to wait 12 years to be admitted to this country from Canada, where he was brought by the Schavers. Senator Vandenberg promptly introduced a bill to declare Itzhak of French origin. Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL introduced a similar measure in the House of Representatives. Both bills were adopted by the two Houses of Congress and were signed by President Truman. That act is on record to the credit of Senator Vandenberg and Congressman DINGELL as an indication of their humanitarian interests.

The good acts of Senator Vandenberg were multiplied a thousand times by his kindly intercessions. He was, indeed, a conservative Republican, especially from the Democrats' point of view. But when he was faced

with issues that called for human considerations he rose above party politics. In all the years that we conferred with him he never—not once—showed the slightest interest in this commentator's political preferences. We were concerned with grave matters involving the security of the Jewish people, and we stuck to this point. On this score he was unselfish and always honorable. If only for this reason alone—which is one of many—we honor his memory as we honored and respected him in his lifetime.

Letter of Col. S. L. A. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Col. S. L. A. Marshall, military analyst for the Detroit News. Colonel Marshall was formerly chief historian in the European theater during World War II, and more recently was attached to a special Army mission in Korea, from whence he has recently returned.

Colonel Marshall's letter to me is self-explanatory, and is intended to clarify the record as regards the attack upon the Army by the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] as having a Prussianized general staff. In the interest of fairness I believe the RECORD should contain the viewpoint expressed by Colonel Marshall as directed to me in his letter of April 12, 1951.

APRIL 12, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: During a House discussion of aspects of our defense policy on April 3, 1951, Congressman WERDEL of California, attacked the Army for having a Prussianized general staff. He then extended his remarks in the RECORD, introducing certain exhibits not alluded to in his speech.

I have that report. I am taking the trouble to make a part way reply to it because, while I doubt that any Member of the House would out of sinister motive attempt to undermine confidence in any part of the Armed Forces, it is altogether possible that the effect might be produced through unsullied ignorance.

It is not my business to defend the Army or its General Staff system. However, in the course of his remarks Mr. WERDEL quoted "an Army officer, Col. S. L. A. Marshall" and turned my words against the Army and the General Staff, by using them out of their historical and written context. I, therefore, feel it a duty to say what I know.

That I am not an Army officer but a reservist is well known to you and could have been ascertained by anyone taking the trouble to examine the Army Register, or for that matter, Who's Who. That simple fact has some relation to the truth or falsity of Mr. WERDEL's general charge against the Army. It is hardly a mark of Prussianism in a General Staff that it will call a civilian colonel to temporary active duty for the express purpose of reviewing Army processes from the inside, saying where they might be modified or corrected toward more perfectly serving national policy and the common interest, and making specific recommendations toward these ends. To my mind, this self-critical attitude within the Army and its acute sensitiveness to the public weal in part answer whether Mr. WERDEL knows whereof he speaks.

The paper from which Mr. WERDEL quoted was classified "Confidential." I don't know how he got it. But being so classified, it cannot be quoted by me, though Mr. WERDEL put parts of it directly into the RECORD. The question of the ethics of his procedure aside, I would again ask about the validity of his judgment. He said with respect to it that the paper "was so startling to them (the General Staff) that they promptly had the report marked 'Confidential' and ordered it locked up." Nothing of the kind happened. I personally had the paper so stamped. Mr. WERDEL knows the nature of the paper; he himself says that he cannot quote it in full because its contents have international implications. Therefore classifying it "Confidential" was routine; I so classified it before others read it. Far from conspiring to suppress the paper, the General Staff gave it more than normal circulation, considering the classification. A second edition was published by the General Staff so that there would be more jogging of thought all down the line. Else, Mr. WERDEL would never have procured a copy. He says the handling of this paper is proof of the Staff's Prussianism; I submit that to any reasonable mind, it is proof of the exact opposite.

But further, Mr. WERDEL says that the paper is a criticism of "present Army doctrine," adding that it challenges the doctrine "as being defeatist in character." To use the most polite phrase which occurs, he is guilty of a terminological inexactitude. The paper was written in April 1948; nothing said by way of criticism within that paper applies to Army doctrine today. Moreover, had the whole paper been quoted by Mr. WERDEL, it would have been recognized not as an indictment of the Army but as an analysis of the extraordinary difficulty in which the whole Defense Establishment was then placed because of indecision elsewhere in the Nation. We then had the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine. But we had made no move to league with Western Europe for mutual defense or to arm our friends or even to get our own military house in order. Rejecting isolationism, we had not yet accepted its only possible strategic alternative—collective security with strength suited to the need. True, I discussed the confusions in our military policy, but only as a reflection of the doubts and contradictions elsewhere in the national landscape which thwarted military planning on any grander scale than we had known in the past. It was argued that if military men could begin to ponder the national problem from its center to the circumference, informing themselves more fully on foreign policy, the better to fashion a military policy in harmony with it, they might assist the Nation to a sound course. The Army had about two divisions in being in this country at that writing. If Mr. WERDEL does not think there was good cause for it to be concerned about its position, his reasoning is not like mine. Again, if he believes that a plea for open-mindedness and sober thought is the mark of Prussianism within an army, his reasoning is not like mine; nor is his knowledge of the German general staff.

In what the press quoted of what Mr. WERDEL said about the Army, the emphasis was placed upon his statement relating to the circulating of a paper written by Gen. Heinz Guderian, of the German army. This is a paper called Unification or Coordination. Mr. WERDEL says that the prime motive behind the publication of this paper is to indoctrinate officers toward the day when the military can take over the control of this Republic; it is difficult to understand how any man can strain his imagination that far. The paper is a simple treatise on military organizational problems as experienced in Germany. It would read as that to anyone save perhaps the character Humpty-Dumpty, who used the word "glory" to mean a "nice, knock-down argument," saying, "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean." In seeking to prove perfidy where none exists, Mr. WERDEL says, "I am advised these studies by the German generals are basic references by those in the Pentagon who believe that the only thing wrong with the supreme Prussian staff was the people who ran it." It happens that, as chief historian of the European theater, I initiated the series of studies among the German generals, though I had nothing to do with the Guderian studies. The policy was promoted simply for the knowledge that it would produce. That is the main way for soldiers to further their education. For the same reasons, whatever we can learn about Russian methods in warfare, Japanese principles of command, or Chinese military indoctrination is to the advantage of the Army. To Mr. WERDEL it might seem better that we keep soldiers as ignorant as Parsifal. I would prefer to believe that the words of Mirabeau Lamar, "Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy," apply to men in military suits, as well as to Congressmen.

No general staff is ever perfect; nor is any other group of individuals. In the Army, now and then, you will meet a potential man on horseback. Occasionally one may get onto the General Staff. But men of the same sort—driven by vainglory and inordinate appetite for power—also get to Congress occasionally. I know of no way under the sun that our society, or any important part thereof, can be purged of such people. The main question is whether thought and motivation are reasonably sound among the majority of those in control. Having had a long and intimate experience with our Army General Staff, I simply wish to add my witness that they are as deeply devoted to their country and as fully committed to the preservation of our fundamental liberties as any body of men in my experience.

Faithfully yours,

S. L. A. MARSHALL.

The MacArthur Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Tuscaloosa, (Ala.) News carried in its issue of Saturday, May 5, 1951, a letter written by Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama to his brother-in-law, Lt. Richard McDonald Payne, serving with the American forces in Korea. The letter is an exceptionally able, enlightening, and challenging statement on the world situation and the danger which faces our country. The Tuscaloosa News captions it "The MacArthur case in light of Marshall's grand strategy."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD. I strongly commend it to Senators, irrespective of what their views may be.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the letter will make approximately three pages of the RECORD at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MACARTHUR CASE IN LIGHT OF MARSHALL'S GRAND STRATEGY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Within recent weeks Dr. Clanton W. Williams, professor of history at the University of Alabama, has addressed several groups in Tuscaloosa and elsewhere, treating the general world war picture brought most directly into focus by the MacArthur dismissal. There has been much demand for the text of this address, by school officials, civic club members, and others. The Tuscaloosa News asked Dr. Williams to prepare a text, and he has done so, in the form of a letter to his 25-year-old brother-in-law, a lieutenant in Korea. As a public service, the News is printing this entire text herewith.)

UNIVERSITY, ALA.,
April 29, 1951.

Lt. RICHARD MCDONALD PAYNE,
Company E, Ninth RCT, APO 248,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MAC: You asked in your last letter what people back here were thinking about Harry Truman's removal of General MacArthur. You said that it came as quite a surprise to you men in Korea. I think it came as a real shock to most of the people throughout the United States of America. Surely the deluge of anti-Truman-pro-MacArthur letters which flooded Washington during the first 2 weeks indicates that the people of the Nation as a whole were deeply disturbed and seemed to be convinced that a great man was being eliminated from a confused scene by a man of relatively small stature.

Deep resentment across the Nation greeted the news. One small indication of that was a poll of my first class (second half of English history) for a show of hands as to whether or not Truman had done right. Only 1 student said "yes"; 6 would not commit themselves; 36 were vehemently pro-MacArthur.

GENERAL RECEIVES WILD WELCOME

We listened to the radio broadcasts of the wild welcomes given the general in Hawaii and San Francisco. I was at Maxwell Field taking a physical examination (which I passed for recall June 1) when the general was making his speech to Congress, but I heard rebroadcasts far into the night. Then the general went on to New York, where 7,500,000 screaming humans cheered him to the skies. Chicago went wild; and last Friday Milwaukee followed suit.

It was extremely interesting to read the various comments about the whole affair, and also to note the inconsistency of the pro-isolationists in Congress whereby they had suddenly thrown all isolation to the winds in the emotional confusion of the hour. Republican DEWEY SHORT, after MacArthur's speech to Congress said, "We have just heard the voice of God." Former President Hoover, who has been advocating desertion of all our allies except Japan and "perhaps" Britain (but not appeasement) said that MacArthur was St. Paul reincarnate. Of course Senator MCCARTHY was given fresh ammunition for labeling as pro-Communists Dean Acheson and others who said MacArthur should have been removed. Senator DIRKSEN admitted in a TV interview that the Republicans were going to use this affair to the fullest. You can imagine how Fulton Lewis, Jr., and other Chicago Tribune people have been going to town. I don't know what a Gallup Poll would show right now, but it is reasonable to assume that Truman's stock is at its lowest. In fact, I doubt that any President since Andrew Jackson, has enjoyed such universal unpopularity as Truman did last week. You may have heard how he was "booed" at Griffith Field.

Regardless of what one may think of Truman and Acheson, surely any objective approach toward trying to evaluate the mess we are in must not stem from personal likes or dislikes or emotion. It must stem from several facts: Fact No. 1: the Communist crusade was going to proceed regardless of who were President and Secretary of State of the United States of America. Fact No. 2: At least 90 percent of the people of this country approved of our action on June 25, 1950, when the Russians sent the Korean Reds across the thirty-eighth parallel. Fact No. 3: Now that the Chinese Reds have made a new war out of the Korean affair, and we can't see where we are going, the Nation has become highly exasperated.

Fact No. 4: The natural reaction was to look for scapegoats. (Here the "outs" struck oil.) Fact No. 5: MacArthur, as any field commander with an immediate military problem before him would do, screams loud and long about the restrictions placed upon him. Fact No. 6: People like me who have loved ones like you caught on a firing line with no immediate goal in view, had a natural impulse to yell to Truman, "Give MacArthur everything he wants." Instead, (Fact No. 7) Truman tells MacArthur to "shut up"; MacArthur refuses and, trying to go over the heads of his military superiors, appeals to the people through the anti-Truman forces in Congress (whether they be isolationists, McCarthyites (Anglophobes, reactionary southern Democrats, or just office-hungry Republicans). Fact No. 8: Harry, whom no one may accuse of lacking guts, fires the General and gives him an opportunity to step forth into the blazing spotlight with all stops pulled. The General takes his cue and little Harry's stock sinks.

And now you face a renewed Communist drive.

OTHER DRAMAS ARE UNFOLDING

All the while there are other dramas being unfolded elsewhere. The MacArthur show is drama No. 1. Yours is drama No. 2. The others are:

Drama No. 3: In Paris Gromyko is stalling around at a conference which is a preliminary conference to a big conference to bring together the Big Four Foreign Ministers. They are supposed eventually to work out a peace treaty for Germany and otherwise settle issues in Europe. We are supposed to enter into a contract with the Russians—a contract which we westerners are expected by Moscow to accept in good faith (like Yalta and Potsdam), when we know that the Russians have no tradition for honoring contractual arrangements, indeed have damned contracts as a bourgeois institution. Still Gromyko has found that our Philip Jessup and the British and French deputies this time are not going to be bullied. They know full well what the Russian game is and they are not going to let the Communists take over the German military and technological potential through diplomatic default. And Gromyko isn't even making much propaganda capital out of this one. Our patient presence there is denying him this.

Drama No. 4: Also in Paris and across Western Europe, General Eisenhower is working feverishly to build a military machine capable of stopping the Russian hordes from taking Western Europe. Whether or not he will succeed is at this moment hanging in the balance. Several things are decidedly in his favor—giving him precious time. One is what you are doing in Asia (see below); another is the Russian knowledge of our growing stockpile of atom bombs and United States strategic air power. Still a third is the Russian hope that the Kremlin may yet take Western Europe by diplomacy and trickery.

Drama No. 5: Meantime, the Communists are busy elsewhere—still trying to sabotage the rearmament of Western Europe—still rattling the sword at Yugoslavia and the Mediterranean—working in Iran to deny the British their middle-eastern oil—working in Africa toward denying us the uranium deposits of the Congo—and continuing to build up their own military machine and those of the satellite countries, including the East German police.

Drama No. 6 lies in what we are doing at home. Despite all the bickering and emotional confusion of the moment, plus the usual amount of cheating and jockeying of certain tunnel-visioned Americans, this Nation is getting stronger by the hour. Given time, we shall have built enough matériel for ourselves, for Europe, and for Asiatics, and all other potential allies. Time is the great factor—time which you and your fellows are helping to provide—time to mobilize our manpower and that of Europe—time to give our scientists those last precious moments before the word is given: "Freeze models. Standardize. Proceed with mass production."

Drama No. 7 is offstage. It is being enacted in the field of atomic fission—the increasing plant capacity—the coming Eniwetok experiments with new A or maybe H bombs—and the continuing feverish research in university and Government labs.

You have to see all of these dramas at once to be able to appreciate fully the one in which you are a participant. And you must see them all against the backdrop of our day in history.

RECALLING A PROPHECY OF 1939

Mind if your old professor repeats some of what you learned in current world history? Do you remember the broadcast I made in December 1939 in which attention was called to the fact that there were three great ideologies abroad in the world: Democracy, communism, and fascism—each a deadly enemy of the other two? I had stuck my neck out then and had ventured to predict that:

"Before this Second World War is over fascism, unable to triumph over democracy, will turn on communism. Consequently, democracy and communism will be erstwhile allies, and shall destroy the power of fascism. Then arising out of the gore will be the remaining two ideologies staring at each other with eyes of suspicion and hatred. * * * Before this century has run its course, one or the other, the Communist International or international democracy, shall triumph. Whether or not it will be the latter will depend in large measure, perhaps wholly, upon whether or not the people of this great democracy shall in the immediate postwar period understand the complex issues it will face and whether or not it will seize its wonted position of intelligent and dynamic leadership in the building of a powerful world government—an international democracy, or return to the self-centered isolationism from which it has not yet emerged."

The only reason, Mac, for harping back to the way things seemed to be shaping up 11½ years ago is by way of getting a long-range view of where we stand as we are moving into the second half of the twentieth century. Some of the predictions then may have been quite presumptuous, but I do not believe it was presuming too much for a historian to express conviction that man would go right on fighting unless there were created a powerful world government (international democracy) with a powerful police force (of which, right now, you are a part).

And it was not presumptuous to accept at face value the pronouncements of intent in the Communist scriptures. You remember that Josef Stalin had written in his Vap-

rosy Leninisma (Problems of Leninism) in 1924:

"The struggle between these two systems will fill up the history of the development of the world revolution."

We could not afford to ignore Stalin's well-written, clear-cut, almost scholarly book (which was being written at the very time that Hitler was writing his rambling Mein Kampf). There in this new testament (Marx and Lenin had written the old testament), Stalin had set forth his doctrine and part of his program of action:

"The goal is (to use the Russian dictatorship of the proletariat) as the base for the overthrowal of imperialism (sic) in all countries. The epoch of world revolution has begun. The faster this country is transformed into a base for the further unfolding of world revolution, into a lever for the further disintegration of imperialism, the development of world revolution will be the more rapid and thorough. • • • The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist powers for a long time is unthinkable. In the end, one or the other will conquer; and until that end comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

STALIN'S VOW TO LENIN'S MEMORY

I doubt that Franklin D. Roosevelt, or Cordell Hull, or Stettinius ever discovered that book, though Alger Hiss may have. I doubt that BOBBY TAFT or KENNETH WHERRY or BRICKER even now know of its existence and if they do, they may be able to shrug it off with some good McCormick statement. But the Great Vow of Fidelity taken by Stalin at the burial of Nicholai Lenin they must know. As late as 1947 it was set forth in bold-faced type in one of Stalin's books:

"In departing from us, Comrad Lenin bequeathed to us fidelity to the principles of the Communist international. We swear to you, Comrad Lenin, that we will not spare our lives in order to strengthen and expand the union of toilers of the whole world—the Communist international."

I can't leave this subject, Mac, without referring to two more quotations from the Communist new testament. The first is from Vaprosy Leninisma. It is the famous Doctrine of Ebb and Flow:

"The epoch of world revolution is a whole strategic period, embracing a whole series of years, and, I dare say, even a number of decades. In the course of this period there can be ebbings and flowings."

All of the above is at the highest echelon—the plane of doctrine and grand strategy.

It is in his second book, the History of the All Union Communist Party, 1936, that Stalin sets forth his tactics (direct and evasive). After discussing the role of the leading detachments (such as the Korean and Chinese Reds) he talks about the strategic reserves, the Red army of the U. S. S. R. itself. He says that he does not intend to throw in his reserves until absolutely required to do so—just when or where he could not then say. Then he adds this significant statement: "A great deal depends upon whether we (the U. S. S. R. itself) succeed in delaying war with the capitalistic countries which is inevitable." (There's that "inevitable" again.)

In this second book also Stalin stated that in the process of world revolution there must be brought under the Kremlin's dictates Germany, China, and India, but he could not then (1936) say in which order their acquisition should occur.

Well, I hardly need tell you what success Stalin has had to date—of how he took all of central Europe—of how in 34 years since 1917, some 750,000,000 humans have been dragged behind the iron curtain—of how well his leading detachments in Asia are doing.

This brings us sharply back to the present MacArthur controversy—back to the rampaging academic and emotional stew of the moment—back to the mess wherein partisan politics for politics' sake, tear-jerking theatricals, exasperation, and latent desire to drop the atom bomb on somebody—that most of us just can't or won't think this thing coolly.

It's something like a football team which through a large part of the game has been on the defensive—just can't move over to the offense. The other team is lining up for the next play and our side is in a defensive huddle, arguing and bickering with the quarterback and the captain. (Our ex-captain (Hoover) is yelling from the sidelines for us to pull back for a grand and glorious goal-line stand—that is, he was until St. Paul came back to us reincarnate.) Of course, though, this is too simple an analogy, for football teams can always look forward to next Saturday or next season. Democracy may have no next Saturday, for this is a game to the death in an atomic age.

CAPTAIN TRUMAN CANNOT INSPIRE

But I must make one more reference to the captain and quarterback analogy. Captain Truman is not an inspiring leader. That's his one big fault: he just cannot inspire the people to full unstinted action. Nevertheless, we did elect him and that's that. Dean Acheson is quarterback in name. He, too, is uninspiring to the masses and he can't handle himself in the rough and tumble of politics. I say he is quarterback in name. By that I mean that the real strategy maker—the coach, who is in position to see the whole game, is none other than George C. Marshall. For my part I have large trust in him and his judgment, and I thank God that he is there and that only a few brickbats are being hurled at him. Only the most partisan politician, only the mose vehement and academically unhonorable, dare to cast aspersions at him.

Secretary Marshall, a voracious reader, has proved himself fully appreciative of the conflict of ideologies—of the marriage of Russian nationalism and Marxist-Leninist-Stalinism. He thoroughly understands the objectives of Joseph Stalin and the Politburo. And Marshall has a well-organized mind, fully capable of seeing the trees fitting into the whole forest. We must remember that he was the leader of the Combined Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the time when communism and Democracy were "erstwhile allies." We must remember that he was Secretary of State when this Nation made its first real defensive moves. He set the grand strategy to which Dean Acheson fell heir. As our current Secretary of Defense he is not completely out of the line of fire of the McCarthyites and others, nevertheless as Captain Harry's and Quarterback Dean's coach he is in fact the nation's leader whose grand strategy is prevailing.

In his diagnosing the strategy and tactics of the Kremlin, one all important fact stands out in his mind. It is so simple in itself, so clear to anyone who can lift his head above the ground mist, that it is really amazing that everyone doesn't see it. It lies in the answers to these questions: "How can the Kremlin ever accomplish its World Revolution without defeating the United States?" "How can the technological power of the United States be matched and overwhelmed?" The answer: "Only by regimenting under communism the technological power of Germany and the rest of Western Europe." "And how can that be done before the threat of United States strategic air and a stockpile of atom bombs."

The Politburo right there reaches a quandary. Some of the Kremlin Bolsheviks must be arguing: "We must move now regardless of the consequences." But at that point they run into the Marxian-Lenin doctrine of "historical determinism" (just wait and the bourgeois institutions will inevitably fall because of their "contradictions.") And they remember Stalin's doctrine of Ebb and Flow; and his determination that Russia, the "base for the further unfolding of world revolution" shall not be endangered; and they perhaps still hear him warning that the Russian "strategic reserves" must not be committed until absolutly necessary. And so we have Dramas No. 3 and No. 5 above.

But suppose Stalin dies and hotter heads take over the World Revolution. Or suppose he decides that now is the time to take Western Europe? After all, hasn't he also said that war between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalistic nations is inevitable? Where does that leave the United States of America at this moment? Where would it leave the world if at the "inevitable" moment the United States of America finds its military strength bogged down in an Asiatic conflict from which it could not extricate itself for bigger things?

MARSHALL'S ADDRESS OF 1948

Do you remember Mr. Marshall's 1948 address at Berkeley, Calif.? There he made a most significant statement. Let me quote it for you. I dug it out of the New York Times files this afternoon. It's in the March 20 issue, page 4, columns 3 and 4:

"Our means are not unlimited—we must not spend our efforts unwisely.

"As a matter of fact, I find the present situation disturbingly similar to that with which I labored as Chief of Staff. • • • For several years I had to withstand heavy pressure from various theaters of operation in the world for assistance, support in the form of matériel, without regard to our then extremely limited resources available in the United States.

"Later, after our entry into the war, these pressures greatly increased in the demand for support to an extent which if met would have rendered us ineffective, I think, on almost every field of action (including) the Western Pacific.

"I find myself in virtually the same position today as I was during those war years and the decisions are just as difficult and equally important. Rich and powerful as we are, we cannot afford to disperse our efforts to a degree which would render all ineffective. Every region has its claims and its proponents and it is therefore necessary to decide on general strategy to be employed, having in mind the entire world situation."

This is the key to the whole confused situation right now. Too bad, I think that the whole American people can't reread that statement. It should clarify many minds and wipe away much of the emotional confusion now pervading the atmosphere. If Mr. Marshall were in position to do so—and he is not—he would repeat this and be even more specific He would tell of the exasperating story of how MacArthur kept up a continuous stream of cables to the Pentagon during 1942-44, wherein the Pacific commander was demanding every day more men, more planes, more ships. Marshall would doubtless admit that it was but natural for General MacArthur to want to get on with his own war. But he would have to say quietly, dispassionately, that it was the Chief of Staff's painful duty to continue to reply that the Pacific Ocean area would have to wait, for the European war held No. 1 priority. MacArthur's magnificent public-relations outfit did not prevail over Marshall and the grand strategy here was fully justified by the course of events.

THE CRISIS OF JANUARY 1947

When Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947, he fell heir to a bad, bad situation. The Yalta and Potsdam contracts had been made and were already being cast aside as "dirty, bourgeois, capitalistic, imperialistic instruments." The United Nations (embryonic international Democracy) had been born crippled and was being used by the Soviet Union for one purpose—to prevent it from becoming an international police power and otherwise the Soviet policy was to divide and confuse the opponents of totalitarian tyranny. When Mr. Marshall became Secretary of State, Iran and Turkey and Greece stood on the verge of Communist conquest; and Italy and France seemed ready to capitulate. Nearly every nation in Western Europe lay economically destitute—begging for bread. The Communists were rubbing their hands in glee.

Well, I won't review all the facts relative to the Truman (really Marshall) doctrine; the Marshall plan and the wonderful work of ECA; of how the Berlin airlift saved Germany; or how Marshall succeeded in getting a reluctant Congress to make it possible to revitalize all of Western Europe and then to awaken a desire among those cultured peoples to live again and to march on toward freedom; of how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was finally brought into existence, the United States of America becoming not only a vital part of it, but, through General Eisenhower, the real leader of it.

The vast difference between Europe of just 3 years ago—flat broke, starving, disconsolate, indigent, lying naked before the rapacious minions of Moscow—and the Europe of today since the Marshall strategy went into effect—back on its feet, unsteady still, but at last regaining its strength, becoming increasingly defiant of Moscow, now fired with hope and determination—the vast differences brought about in these years comprise a wonderful chapter in the history of international democracy in action. It is perhaps the proudest chapter in American history.

Given two more years of continued progress, Europe, with its mighty technological potential and still backed up by the young giant across the Atlantic, the new Europe will not fall into the Kremlin orbit and the world revolution shall not materalize; and perhaps—perhaps even yet—world war III shall not reach the full fury we can envisage.

But again, will the Politburo give the West those 2 years? No one now knows the answer—doubtless not even the Kremlin masters themselves. But they must know that without the technocracy of Europe regimented to their own ends, Marx' historical determinism will one day prove to have been a false doctrine.

And so history at this moment is hanging in the balance. Somehow—in some way—the Politburo must divert American attention and American military strength from the No. 1 priority.

Then, too, Russia as a nation has something else worrying her. The past 50 years have seen the giant China arising as a nation—a people with national ambitions. The one biggest problem the Chinese Nation faces is overpopulation. Eighty-five percent of the people live off the "Good Earth" and there is not enough of it for 450,000,000 unscientific people to eat well from its produce—and the population is growing at an increasing rate. China must some day expand. Where? In which direction? There is but one answer: Into sparsely settled and fertile Siberia.

Russia then must control the government of China. She must try to send China southward. And something else, if possible. What finer boon could befall Russia and communism than to have the United States of America locked for a long time in strength-sapping war with China?

MAC ARTHUR SAW OWN MILITARY PROBLEM

Whether or not MacArthur saw all of this, I do not know. He did see some of it. But he also saw his own military problem and that was absolutely paramount—that and the St. Paul reincarnate factor. And he is entitled to the deep sympathy and admiration of this Nation. And that he is surely getting.

And I would say to him "You should have your every demand fulfilled—but not now—not while there is an all-important No. 1 priority."

But you, Lieutenant, have been asking all through this long letter, the $64 question, "Where does all this leave us guys out here in Korea?" And that is what the Nation is asking of President Truman and Secretary Acheson; and they are not able to answer. I say "not able," not because of their uninspiring personalities, but because of the grand stategy involved, because of the possibility of giving away strategic information, because what they might say could be the very thing which would cause the Kremlin to throw in the strategic reserves—and we simply are not ready to meet that eventuality.

I think I can list a few things for you that might help a little to answer that question:

No. 1: The big conflict between international democracy and the Communist International required that somewhere at some place we had to use physical strength to deter the Communist crusade (or Russian territorial expansion, if you choose). Stalin had decreed it. Korea was it.

No. 2: The fate of the United Nations, the one positive good that came out of World War II in which 22,000,000 humans died—millions of them to win the peace—was hanging in the balance. Had it not acted positively in June 1950, it would quickly have gone the way of the League of Nations which had no police power; and international democracy would have made a terrible capitulation before the Communist International.

No. 3: The whole honor of this Nation was at stake. We had pledged our support to the embryonic democracy of Korea. The eyes of the various peoples, large and small, were fiercely focused upon Uncle Sam in June 1950. And they are still so focused. Would this one-time self-centered, irresponsible giant of the west who had become in recent years the epitome of all that nations aspired to—this arsenal of democracy, the one hope of mankind against an engulfing totalitarian tyranny—would the powerful United States of America act in the interest of morality and justice and freedom and, yes, even in its own long-range interest? Or would he prove indeed to be Uncle Shylock, a cowardly, money-mad, short-visioned egotist? The world got its answer—and it still has that answer. And you are giving that answer in person.

No. 4 is a tough one, but you are big enough to take it. I hate to have to write it, for in so doing I have to castigate my own American people as lacking in statesmanship. It lies in a historical fact: This country has to have its face physically slapped before it will bound into unified action. Woodrow Wilson was a great leader but it took a series of *Lusitanias* to end the great debate of 1914–17. F. D. R. was a great leader but it took a Pearl Harbor to end the great debate of 1939–41. The Korean war—the sacrifices of you guys out there now—is the prerequisite face-slapping we have to have.

MARSHALL'S GRAND STRATEGY PREVAILS

Has the great debate of 1946–51 come to a close? Yes, in fact it has, Mac. Not so decisively as those did in 1917 and 1941. The press is calling this MacArthur controversy the great debate; a month ago they were calling the four divisions to Europe the great debate; 2 years ago they were calling the North Atlantic Treaty controversy the great debate; and 3 years ago there was a great debate over the Marshall plan. But every time our Congress, after giving us a scare, has come through. But the big reason I say the great debate is over is because Marshall's grand strategy still prevails; Europe is still No. 1 priority; we did act decisively last June; we have no intention of appeasing the Asiatic Reds and welshing on our moral obligation to the Koreans and other little democracies; we finally did bolster the wavering United Nations even though our action was left-handed; our face—your face—is being slapped; Truman finally did declare a state of emergency; Congress has voted huge appropriations and is going to vote some sixty billions more soon; the military ranks are being filled as fast as matériel is being provided for them; and while most of that matériel is now going to you and replacements are on the way, we are moving into high gear on the production front.

Given time—time you are helping to provide in Korea—time provided by the Kremlin's indecision in the face of our atomic power—given time, we shall have manufactured the matériel for ourselves, for Europe, and for anti-Communists everywhere, even including the men on Formosa (whether under Chiang Kai-shek and his Kuomintang or some Third Movement—Democracy, I hope).

Let the Reds sing as loudly as they care, to their stirring strain, the Internationale:

> "'Tis the final conflict.
> Let each stand in his place.
> The International Party
> Shall be the human race."

What you are doing—you and your men—is in fact one grand reply: "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Well, Mac, old boy, this has been a long epistle. I hope it hasn't confused you still more. Maybe, if you are now pulled back for another few days' rest, you can find time to glance over this again. I've written at such length to you, a college graduate, because I believe that you must require some academic reappraisal now and then against which your personal courage is braced—not that you haven't got all the fortitude traditional in Young America, plus pride in your world-famous fighting outfit.

You know that mother and Claudine and kids, and your gallant little wife and precious baby are hoping and praying with me that that long-looked-for rotation gets you back to us the same old Mac we love—and soon.

Your fond old brother-in-law,

CLANTON.

The Constitution in Our Everyday Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of my State held an oratorical contest for Negroes. Elnora Sanders, a student of the Manual Training High School, Muskogee, Okla., was the winner.

The subject of her oration was The Constitution in our Everyday Life. Believing the oration worthy of perpetuation, I include it here as part of my remarks:

THE CONSTITUTION IN OUR EVERDAY LIFE

One hundred and sixty-four years ago, there emerged an idea and an ideal, from the minds, the hearts, and the souls of great men, striving to establish an even greater nation. One hundred and sixty-four years ago on May 25, 1787, 55 men of great wisdom and prudence met in Philadelphia, Pa., and drew up the document upon which rests the government of this, the greatest nation on earth today.

These great men of foresight threw out the outmoded Articles of Confederation and started anew. They provided for a legislative body to make the laws, a judicial group to interpret the laws, and an executive department to enforce the laws—three distinct branches of government, all equal in power and all working together, yet, so planned that no one of them could gain supremacy over the others.

These great men had faith and foresight. They had faith to believe that America and its Constitution would stand. They had foresight to see that as America grew and changed, its Constitution would have to be changed also. Thus, they provided that their charter might be amended. There have been amendments to this Constitution—22 to be exact—and there has been great progress mad under this document. At the time our Constitution was written, America was a small nation with an area of only 850,000 square miles; with a population of 3,500,000 people. America stands today a giant Nation of 4,000,000 square miles, and 150,000,000 people of all races, creeds, and colors, rich in every aspect by which a nation's wealth can be measured. But, my friends, all this has not been easily accomplished.

This great document has been tried and tested time and again—during periods of war, inflationary periods and periods of depression, and has inevitably remained the guiding beacon which has led us triumphantly through each crisis. The War of 1812 was one of the first tests of our Constitution. This war strengthened American independence in the eyes of the world. Then there was the War Between the States, the outcome of which proved that this Government, outlined by the Constitution, was far stronger than that of any one State. It made the United States an indestructible union of indestructible States. Later World War I, which was to have made the world safe for democracy, and of course World War II. Three times, since the War Between the States, we have demonstrated to the world that we are a united people and that there is no North nor South, no East nor West, whenever freedom and our beloved land is threatened by foreign forces. My friends, if these principles have proved themselves sound during our many great crises, does it not seem logical that they should be practiced in our daily life?

At no time in our Nation's history have we been so gravely challenged as we are today, to safeguard the principles of human freedom that have made our Nation great.

In a world that is far from settled, where peace is a hope, but not yet a reality, we must understand and renew our faith in our fundamental beliefs; make sure that in our daily living we do not adopt policies which violate these fundamental principles laid down to us in our constitution. What a much better place in which to live this land of ours would be if these same principles were practiced in our daily contact with our fellow men: No North nor South, no East nor West, but freedom and democracy for all. With unfaltering faith we look forward to the day when America's progress will no longer be obstructed by racial and religious prejudice and intolerance.

Our forefathers came to this country for social, economic, and religious freedom. They believed in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness They believed in equality and justice of humanity. Those things came down to us from heaven and are inherent in us from birth. The framers of the Constitution realized these things and wove them into the fabric of our Government. As the Preamble states: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." The flower of American manhood has died in all parts of the world to uphold the ideals of that Constitution.

Upon us, the living, falls the sacred duty to preserve them in our everyday life. Let us keep faith with those American boys of all colors who gave their lives that those principles might live. They would tell us in the words of Lieutenant Colonel McGrae, who died in France during World War I. He said:

"Take up our quarrel with the foe
To you from failing hands we throw the torch;
Be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders Field."

Let us, in our everyday living and dealings with our fellow man, be able to give those heroes "The American's Answer" in the words of Rev. R. W. Lillard, who said:

"Fear not that ye have died for naught,
The torch he threw to us we caught,
Ten million hands will hold it high,
And freedom's light shall never die.
We've learned the lesson that ye taught,
In Flanders Field."

America stands today in dire need of men with dogged determinations who have courage to uphold those glorious ideals of our revered Constitution.

Democracy is not a completed thing. The key to democracy is the persistent struggle to keep alive this idea of freedom and justice, to uphold it and to expand it against every force which would seek to destroy or restrict it. That struggle has never ended, each rising generation of Americans must protect the hard-won gains of the past. We must also move forward by making freedom and justice vital realities in our every-day life. If America is to indoctrinate the rest of the world with democracy, it is only logical for America to indoctrinate itself first. Democracy must mean equal employment opportunities; opportunities to learn and use technical skills and to advance according to the mastery of them. Democracy must mean equal educational opportunities; it must mean justice in the courts of the land. Democracy must mean simply the opportunity for all Americans to share to the full extent of their capacities in the defense of America in war, and in the development of America in peace.

All of this can be accomplished only, if the mandates of our Constitution are enforced.

For it provides as now written, every guaranty of liberty and freedom and of civil rights that any American could desire.

American democracy must not be debased, ridiculed, and laughed to scorn in derision by the rest of the world. This Nation, "conceived in liberty," must rid itself of those infamous practices which are such blatant blemishes on our constitutional concepts of liberty.

The American Constitution is our heritage. It is ours to keep its spirit alive, to put teeth into its mandates, to uphold its ideals daily in our attitudes and all our acts; in all our contacts with our fellow men of all colors—all creeds; in the very thoughts we think, in the very sentiments we express, and in the very air we breathe. It is ours to cherish—ours to defend—ours to preserve in our everyday lives—the Constitution of the United States of America.

Threat to Our Free Press in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BLAIR MOODY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable address on the threat to our free press in today's world, delivered by Columnist Marquis Childs, at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., on May 4, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have honored me in asking me to speak on this occasion which in the long tradition of the School of Journalism has come to have such great significance. I know that in the past it has customarily been an occasion when you have fittingly marked the achievements of American journalism. For these achievements the school and Dean Mott and his predecessors and the men associated with him may take no small credit. With their dedication to the highest ideals of journalism they have contributed much.

But with your permission this evening, I shall make my assignment rather a different one than counting the triumphs of the free press in America today. The time has come when we must examine the base on which all the achievements and the triumphs of a free press inevitably rest. That base is the right of independent opinion for a newspaper, for an editor, and, yes, for the individual in our society who elects to stand alone.

That is at the heart of the concept of a free press. It is no stronger and no weaker than that right. And when it begins to go, when the views of the lowliest individual are suppressed or when he is silenced by intimidation, then all is in danger. If there is one thing we should have learned in the recent past, it is that freedom cannot be denied to some and preserved for others. Even the most powerful newspaper cannot save itself by merely acquiescing in the power of the suppressor.

The reaction of the United States to the death of La Prensa has been a healthy one. The death of that newspaper was like a lightning flash revealing that the sky over this hemisphere, too, was darkened by the menace to freedom that has spread so far across Europe and Asia. There has come the realization and the bell that tolled for La Prensa conveyed a deep and solemn warning for all of us. In John Donne's phrase, "Never ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

La Prensa was a great and free newspaper. Its destruction at the hands of the dictator, Juan Peron, diminishes by that much the heritage of freedom of all of us.

But, if I may say so, there was in some of the comment on the extinction of this great Argentine newspaper, the assumption that this was an isolated event; that this was the evil consequence of the wrong-doing of one man; an unhappy accident in a world otherwise virtuous. I think if we examine honestly the phenomena of La Prensa, we shall find that this is not in fact true. We shall find that it is part of an ominous pattern that goes a considerable way back into the past and that has now extended to this part of the world which had its origins in a desire to escape the tyrannies of the past and to build a new society dedicated to freedom.

It was in August of 1914 that Lord Edward Grey made that fatefully symbolic remark about the lights going out everywhere. Lord Grey was looking out of the windows of 10 Downing Street as London slowly darkened under the shadow of war; a shadow that was to grow deeper and darker even in the intervals when the illusion of peace lulled most of mankind.

We cannot deny here tonight as we look back that the light of freedom as reflected in the free press has grown steadily and consistently dimmer. Even in Russia before 1917 there were periods when sections of the press enjoyed freedom of a kind. And the control of that simpler and less efficient absolutism of the Czars often tolerated opinion that was comparatively independent of the interests of the state. Ironically enough it was through these small chinks that the conspirators were helped, in part at least, in plotting the downfall of that autocracy. These plotters brought into being a far more terrible and ruthless and efficient absolutism which, as we know so well today, compels every human expression to serve slavishly and totally the apparatus of tyranny.

We who have lived under the all too easy conviction coming out of the nineteenth century of inevitable progress extending to infinity through free research and free science can hardly conceive the extent to which the denial of these freedoms has gone. In Russia the tyranny blankets not merely genetics and biochemistry but music criticism, music itself, literature, philosophy. The totality of the human spirit has been bound to the wheel of Soviet communism in a kind of slavery hitherto undreamed of.

All this has been made painfully and frighteningly obvious in recent years. What has not been so obvious are the losses suffered on our side of the iron curtain. We mourned La Prensa, but I wonder if we remember the Frankfurter Zeitung. That too was a great and free newspaper. It, too, was murdered by a dictator far more savage and ruthless than the bumbling Peron.

There have been a whole series of such murders in our time. That is the pattern. It is a spreading darkness and while it may not yet be darkness at noon we can hardly afford any illusions here in the United States about what o'clock it is. For we are not immune from this spreading paralysis.

The potential threat to the freedom of the press at home is very real. And that is above all what I want to talk about tonight. The threat that we confront may not seem to be in the same ominous pattern that has now spread to the Western Hemisphere. But what we should remember is that murder is the final stage and we can see here at home the hatreds, frustrations, conflicts, and confusions that may lead to murder.

The threat to the freedom of our press seems to me to fall into three separate departments. First, there is the insidious and pervasive threat of inflation which has already cut so deeply into the economic base on which the press rests. It is not alone the press but all of our free institutions which may be undermined if the inflationary trend continues unchecked.

Here again history is useful in providing a dire warning. Germany's runaway inflation, wiping out the middle class, prepared the way for Hitler and the Nazis. A great artist, Thomas Mann, in a long short story called "Disorder and Early Sorrow" has shown as only an artist can show how the very foundations of stable existence were taken to pieces.

But the pressure of inflation in the field of politics and morals is shown with special sharpness in connection with the press. The squeeze of rapidly rising costs is being felt particularly by what are sometimes called marginal newspapers. More often than not, these are the newspapers that occasionally express unorthodox or unpopular views. They are the newspapers which may at times support unpopular political candidates. They may occasionally oppose powerful vested interests in the community or in the Nation. If too many of these marginal newspapers are forced out of existence, and we have seen that happen in this country in recent years for a variety of reasons, then we shall come that much closer to a conformist press; we shall come that much closer to a monolithic press resembling in some degree at least the monolithic press that we loathe in totalitarian Russia. The competition of ideas in a free market will be narrowed by that much greater a margin. The whole sense of representation of varying and conflicting views, which is one of the responsibilities of the press, will have been dwarfed.

There are other ways, of course, in which inflationary pressures work toward a narrowing conformism. Survival may be at the cost of surrender; surrendering, that is, independence of opinion in conformity with the fears, the desires, the prejudices, of one minority group or another.

If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that we can see such forces at work today. There are individual newspapers that resist them and I do not need to name them to this audience. But there are other instances in which the pressure has been too great.

It should not be forgotten that the method used for the final destruction of La Prensa was the unreasonable and arbitrary demand of a labor union, a labor union entirely subverted to the purposes of a dictator. Here, too, is an ominous pattern. A press that succumbs to an oligarchy of labor or an oligarchy of industry is no longer a free press.

Let me add, at the risk of repeating what I have said before, that I am not here talking about the virtues of a particular point of view, "liberal," "conservative," or whatever. I am talking about a variety of opinion and its representation in the free press of America. I found myself rarely in agreement with the New York Sun which expressed the extreme conservative point of view. Yet when it went under, its loss was a loss to each and to all of us. As it was put at the time, a voice in the chorus had gone and therefore the chorus was thinner and weaker.

The second form that the threat to a free press takes in this country is more difficult to define and more difficult to discuss. Broadly it may be designated the political threat as compared to the economic threat. In concrete form, this threat has found comparatively little direct expression. Yet nevertheless there are signs beneath the surface that its potentiality is greater than most of us have realized.

Certain direct political attacks on the freedom of the press—on newspapers and on individuals in such a way as to show that the attack was in reality aimed at the concept of free.m itself—indicate the direction in which this danger lies.

* * * * *

This is an attitude that you are either for us or against us and if you are against us, then we do not believe in your right to survive. If this does indeed become a widespread attitude of politicians in this country the free press is gravely threatened. For it is directly contrary to the right of independent opinion.

There is another attitude current among politicians which is also unhealthy from the point of view of a free and independent press. That is the feeling that their views are not given fair representation in the metropolitan press. This, too, is an ancient complaint. But it seems to me to have taken a new and somewhat more active form.

Since the election in November of 1950, I have heard politicians from several States speak bitterly of what they call a "paper curtain." Their complaint is directed not at the editorial page but at the news columns of the newspaper. They maintain that they could get no expression whatsoever of their views, or scarcely any expression, into the news columns. By contrast favored candidates were treated with such generosity that their every word and every publicity release found space in one form or another. One candidate told me that he had counted 27 references to his opponent in one edition of a large metropolitan newspaper which did not refer to him in any way even though he was then actively campaigning for office.

Now I have not investigated these reports. They may reflect merely the disgruntlement and rancor of politicians. But if there is any real truth in them, then the press is in some instances failing in its function of giving fair representation to major political and social groups in the community. And insofar as it fails in this function, the way is opened for political reprisals.

The politician who has grounds for believing that a "paper curtain" was pulled down on him will think in terms of revenge. Or in any event he will scarcely be an eager defender of the rights of a free press. If such resentments grow and are multiplied, the ground is prepared psychologically for radical action that can undermine the relationship between the estates. After all, the fourth estate must exist in balance with the other three estates, each in terms of its own powers and responsibilities.

I do not believe that these are imaginary fears. In my opinion, they go to the root of the relationship of freedom on the one hand and responsibility on the other hand; between the privileges enjoyed by the press and the service to society which is inherent in the very nature of the franchise it enjoys.

This brings me to what I believe to be the third great threat to the existence of a free and independent press. It might be called the threat from within. It is the threat implied in the irresponsibility of a section of the press. Fortunately, this is a small section of the press, although from its vociferousness one would sometimes assume that it is larger than it actually is.

This irresponsibility takes many forms. News is deliberately falsified, distorted, and suppressed. Irresponsible emphasis is given in exaggerated headlines to crimes of violence. No effort is made to give representation to varying views in the community. Under editing that is technically skillful, and even brilliant, some such newspapers present a monolithic front not unlike the face that Pravda and Izvestia present to the world from their privileged sanctuary in Moscow.

Fortunately, as I have said, such irresponsibility is limited to a comparatively few newspapers. But I believe that in their arrogance and in their disregard for the broader interests of community and nation, they do great harm. They tend to feed a popular prejudice that newspaper control and ownership are beyond the restraints that apply to ordinary institutions and ordinary citizens. It contributes to what one hears from time to time about such newspapers to the effect that, "Oh, you can't believe what you see in the paper. It prints only what X or Y or Z wants it to print."

If we are candid we must admit that such prejudices are not uncommon. That kind of prejudice can grow. It can corrode the position in popular esteem of the responsible as well as the irresponsible press.

No institution wielding as great power as the American press wields can long exist if it does not accept responsibility at least somewhat commensurate with its power. It was popular at one time to point to the fact that 80 percent or more of all newspapers opposed the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt in several of his campaigns, and yet, in spite of that opposition, Roosevelt was elected to an unprecedented fourth term in the White House. From this it was deduced that the press of America had no power. This seemed to me then, as it seems to me now, to have been specious reasoning. Roosevelt was a unique phenomena in American politics. All rules went overboard where he was concerned.

The American press does have a very great power. To be sure that that power is used wisely and that it is not dissipated in a time of grave crisis when all our values seem to be crumbling away, it is in my opinion necessary for the press as a whole to take definite and positive steps for its own self-preservation. Let me say frankly that, in my opinion, if it does not do so, then we may see the freedom of an independent press abridged or submerged here in the United States as it has been abridged and destroyed elsewhere. I would like to talk in closing about three fields in which it seems to me most important for constructive action.

First, I believe that some sort of group action will be necessary if the press is to stand up to the political threats and intimidations that seem certain to grow. The moment that a politician sets out to destroy an independent newspaper, that should be the signal for a collective response from the press in America. That response should be overwhelming and forceful not alone on the defensive but also in the offensive. It should be made perfectly clear to the public, not in one community or in one State but in the Nation, that a threat to the freedom of all is intended. That has long been the way of the dictator—to single out individuals to be struck down alone. The example of the individual destroyed intimidates others into caution. In this way a chain reaction is started that means the death of freedom.

In my opinion, some form of group solidarity will be necessary to protect the independence not alone of individual newspapers but of individual newspapermen and women. There must be ever present vigilance to detect the signs of creeping paralysis in threat and reprisal. The press association reporter is told by the politician that he will find a way to link him to communism; that he will report him to his superiors; that he will get his job. So the news report that goes out across the Nation is softened and modified. And the picture of the predatory politician is not put in its proper perspective. That is happening today. If it is not apprehended and resisted by the American press banded together to protect and preserve freedom, freedom may be lost, if not by direct assault then by attrition.

Secondly, it seems to me that some sort of group action is necessary to meet the economic threat to at least a part of the press. Sources of newsprint are being absorbed and monopolized by the more powerful economic units. An independent newspaper suddenly finds that one-third or one-half of its supply has been arbitrarily cut off by the acquisition of the mill that had been a source of newsprint. If this process continues unchecked, we shall see a still further reduction in the number of newspapers and therefore, also, in the variety of viewpoints given expression. Whether any sort of group action can help to insure a more equitable distribution of the available supply of newsprint, I do not presume to say. But obviously if the inequities grow and continue, then the result is not merely a blow to individual newspapers, but to the institution of the press as well.

This matter of the availability of newsprint is, of course, only one of the economic problems which confront all newspapers and particularly those papers that are less prosperous than some. The vise of ever-rising fixed costs is working serious harm on the press today. It is impossible to see where the pressures will stop. But surely one could hope for added strength in meeting these pressures from cooperative action by the press itself.

A third field in which it seems to me essential for some kind of group action raises even more difficult and delicate problems. For many years we have heard discussion of codes of ethics and standards of conduct for newspapers and newspapermen. From time to time these have embodied the finest ideals of both the journalist and teacher of journalism. But they have remained in the realm of the ideal. Any effort to enforce such standards has always seemed to encroach on the fundamental concept of freedom of expression and the right of independent opinion. Perhaps this must always remain a matter for idealistic hope rather than for day to day practice. Yet so long as a section of the press is conspicuously and flagrantly irresponsible, to that degree will there be a grave and obvious weakness opening the way to reprisals directed against all the press by the enemies of freedom.

I have said little about the direct encroachments of Government on freedom of the press. That is not because these encroachments are not very real but because the press itself seems so thoroughly alert to this danger. It was emphasized in the recent meetings of both the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American Newspaper Publishers Association. I have chosen to speak of other dangers that constitute at least as great a threat, in my opinion, not just to one section of the press or to a few newspapers, but to the institution itself.

To ignore the weaknesses that exist today, to pretend that freedom is license, to prefer anarchy over reasonable self-restraint, is to invite disaster. The role of Cassandra is not a happy one and I apologize to you for it. But I have tried to speak tonight out of a deep and heartfelt concern for an institution that has been one of the great bulwarks of free thought in America. It is inconceivable to me that free thought could continue to exist if this institution were to be undermined or destroyed. That is why I want to say once again that it seems to me we dare not ignore the present threat to this institution that we here tonight love.

I do not presume to know whether the press is today organized to carry out or to begin to carry out some of the steps which seem to me necessary to self-preservation. There are great and important organizations of newspaper publishers and newspaper editors. Perhaps within this framework, the requisite responsibility, the vital obligation, may be vested. But I say to you most earnestly that merely to ignore the signs of threat and intimidation, of decline and decay, is to ignore a peril that I believe to be both imminent and deadly.

Caesar Has Gone Mad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following sermon delivered by R. W. Jablonowski, Jr., minister, St. Stephen Presbyterian Church, Fort Worth, Tex., on April 15, 1951:

CAESAR HAS GONE MAD

In discussing the attitude which Christian people should bear toward their rulers, St. Paul admonished: "Render therefore to all men their dues. Tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."[1]

That this has always been the custom in Presbyterianism no one can deny. In observing the belief that the separation of church and state is our time-honored way of life and should be preserved for the welfare of both these institutions, Presbyterian ministers learn early that their calling is to preach the Gospel from the pulpit, and to leave matters political alone. This does not mean that the individual Christian has no obligation to take his religious belief into the political arena, it rather means that he must use his religious conscience and knowledge in the exercise of the political franchise which is his as a citizen.

But the Church cannot afford to remain silent forever. There comes a time in the life of a nation when it is necessary to say with the poet: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and miseries."[2] In the sixteenth century, when it seemed that all progress in Scotland was destined to be lost in the various schemes and manipulations and crimes of Mary Stuart, John Knox did not hesitate to stand in the pulpit of St. Giles' and sound the warning to a confused and uncertain people, and throughout that long and historical controversy the nation reverberated with the voice of the Church speaking out against wrong and corruption in high places and low in the government. So must it be with the Church in our day.

Last Wednesday, and even Thursday, people seemed to be living in a state of suspended animation; existing in a state of mental shock. Something had happened which could not possibly occur. A man whose greatest success has been in machined politics—but whose success in that field has brought him the highest honor which this Nation can bestow, even though he is without question the most diminutive in presidential stature ever to occupy that exalted position—that man had sacrificed the greatest living American military commander to administrative spleen and stupidity. Those who could find voice to speak would say in despairing tone: "What can we do about it?" "Isn't there something we can do?" Somehow, there was little at the moment anyone could do. The man who had acted was completely within his legal rights, he violated no known statute, he had acted entirely in a constitutional capacity by removing from his position of command a general who refused to carry out orders to cease expressing opinions at variance with those held in Washington. The general was determined to act in what he considered the best interests of his country, regardless of the personal consequences involved, a

[1] Romans 13: 7.
[2] Julius Caesar, act IV, scene 3.

proven statesman and administrator who had forgotten more knowledge about the area in which he was working that most people would ever know.

"O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason."[3]

But, really, the American people have no cause for shock, or surprise, or alarm. No new pattern has been set by the action of this week. For a number of months, now, the basic blueprint has been in complete evidence: A government of passion, of intemperance, of instability and irresponsibility has wended its way through shoals that have wrecked many a lesser ship. For month after month, as the garbage of corrupt administration has been slowly brought to the outer air, people have laughed or lamented, denounced or evaded, condoned or lied. This paralysis of governmental morality which has gripped the Nation is a stench in the nostrils of right-thinking people, utterly repugnant to Christian men and women.

No one can say where it all began. Mink coats for White House secretaries, deep-freeze units for presidential aides; 5 percenters; Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to bankrupt corporations on the urging of presidential secretaries; the disgraceful episode of the Australasian immigrant and Harry Vaughan, who, I am ashamed to say, is an ordained Presbyterian elder; domination of politics across the land by gambling interests gnawing at the vitals of the Nation in Miami, in New Orleans, in Los Angeles, in Chicago, in Cleveland, in New York—yes, and in Fort Worth; vile, vitriolic letters on White House stationery and in presidential handwriting directed to people who have exercised constitutional rights in expressing an opinion; epithets worthy of a roughneck hurled in all directions against critics. But these are only symptoms of the disease. They only throw spots of light in the darkness which has settled over the land to corrupt, to corrode, to coerce the moral fiber of a great Nation.

"But yesterday the word of Caesar might have stood against the world; now lies he there, and none so poor to do him reverence."[4]

Internationally, we are only beginning to reap the harvest which we have sown. Harken back if you will to the last days of Israel, a once-proud nation with all the world paying tribute at the feet of its rulers, those last days in which it was felt that any kind of alliance was justified in order to preserve its way of life. Israel made an alliance with Assyria, forgetting God in the interests of materialism and a vague, shadowy, uneasy peace—and an intercharge of ideas began to take place between the two nations. Imported into Israel were strange individuals who began to speak knowingly of the might of Assyria and the benefits which might be derived from the whole world being placed under her rule; new methods of dealing with their fellow Jews were adopted by Israel's people, contrary to the way they had done things since the days of Moses; their Lord God Jehovah was forgotten in the rush to the newer and more exciting Assyrian gods and goddesses; and even a few Jews were found in high places who would push the cause of Assyria to the detriment of the national interests of Israel. Ere many years had passed, Israel had been laid waste by the conquering Assyrian armies under Sennacherib, helped not a little by those same Jews who had been fostering the cause of Assyria in the councils of the government.

Our leaders felt that way, too, in fighting the Axis in World War II, so we spent many hours of radio time and many columns of journalistic lines informing the American people of the wonderful allies which we had acquired and the then President of the United States even told us that religious freedom really existed in Russia. The tragic results of that alliance are only too evident to men and women who have sons and brothers and friends in Korea. Now, in the great global conflict with the communism we fostered—and foster it we did; at Yalta we gave to Stalin territories in Asia which did not even belong to us to give, and rights of occupation over peoples who have been enslaved in the toils of the very communism we seek today to eradicate—now, we seek other allies. We appease Peron in Argentina, as evil a regime in the suppression of its people as Mussolini ever established. We woo Franco in Spain, the worst example of a clerical, reactionary dictatorship. These countries now receive the aid which the United States doles out to all whom it calls its allies in these days of peril, on the rather flimsy ground that any aid we can obtain in fighting Soviet Russia is justified. Now we are acting on the long-discredited principle, at least from the Christian point of view that "the end justifies the means." How long will it take for men to learn that wrong means always leads to a wrong end?

We seem to be traveling down the road to appeasement. We are told that the removal of Douglas MacArthur was to prevent world war III. There are some things worse than war, some things less preferable than death. Somehow, it is inconceivable that any man would still believe in 1951 that it is possible to make a real peace with the Communists, who has no intention of abiding by a treaty any longer than that treaty can serve his nefarious ends. It is certainly an admission of mental retrogression when we consider the China of Mao Tse-tung preferable to the China of Chiang Kai-shek, especially when any school child now knows that Mao's Communists no more represent the people of China than did the corrupt officials of Chiang's Kuomintang. Personally, I would much prefer to trust Chiang who professes Jesus Christ as Lord than a Mao whose god is Stalin.

Rather than live in a world half slave and half free, this speaker's choice is war. Rather than live under communism, this speaker's choice is death. Let me hasten to say that I do not believe for one moment that the principles of communism can ever triumph in a world that is ruled by Almighty God, but that is no guaranty that the United States of America will be the instrument of God to eradicate that system which denies God. God's nation has to abide by God's principles. God's people must be dedicated to the accomplishment of building His Kingdom through the church, as He has commanded. To avert world war III is not to achieve the Kingdom of God, nor will it bring even the achievement of a political Utopia.

"Ye gods, it doth amaze me, a man of such feeble temper should so get the start of the majestic world and bear the palm alone. Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, that he has grown so great?"[5]

The controversy, however, is not between a general and a President, even though this be the immediate issue. This administration has proved itself to be incompetent, impotent, inept, and insensible to the high demands of the offices entrusted to them by the people. One cannot long condone actions which protect the official family at the expense of national righteousness, nor the making of appointments with little thought as to the competence of the appointees to handle the position, but thinking only of the political consequences involved. But, as the administration's actions symbolize the lack of its qualifications, so the administration symbolizes the lack on the part of the people of the United States to claim anything at the hands of a righteous God.

Under our system, the administration is not Caesar—the citizens are. To them belongs the ultimate franchise, and they choose the government they want at the polls.

All our disgust and revulsion in these days can be traced back to ourselves, simply because we have been indifferent, we have been careless, we have cherished tradition at the expense of right, we have been content to ignore a lack of public morality so long as we were not immediately concerned, we have talked one way and voted another, we have failed to insist upon the maintenance of the standards which brought us to our present powerful position in the affairs of men. Could the proven corruption in New York under the administration of William O'Dwyer, now the ambassador of the national administration to Mexico, have existed without the vote of the people putting him in office? Could the present corruption exist in Washington had not the people approved the return of Jackson County, Mo., political hacks to power in 1948? Could the present corruption exist in Tarrant County, Tex., had the people demanded good, clean, honest, efficient, and progressive government from its county and city officials?

We cannot expect to have deals on all sides in local affairs and not have those same tactics which have worked so well on a local basis transferred to higher councils of government, especially when we elect to higher office men who have been trained in that sort of political thinking. We have only ourselves to blame.

Now, back to the questions everyone was asking Wednesday and Thursday. "What can we do about it?" "Isn't there something we can do?" The answer is a ringing and positive affirmative—not to do anything for Douglas MacArthur. That is not necessary. The position of Douglas MacArthur in history is secure. This question will have to be asked in return: "Are you willing to pay the price of good government?" If you are a Christian, your answer must be: "Yes." How, then?

First, this situation demands prayer—prayer of confession, of penitence, asking God to forgive us our selfishness, our shortsightedness, our waywardness, our greed—prayer for guidance in this hour, asking God to lead those of us who exercise the political franchise to use the minds which He has given us to decide between principles and political parties, between statesmen and political timesavers, between right and wrong, and, once the decision is made for political righteousness, to maintain that direction regardless of the wind which may blow from popular opinion.

Second, this situation demands action—positive, constructive thinking; honest and intelligent opposition to the cancer that is eating away at our body politic in the courthouse and in the Nation's Capital; renunciation of the very human tendency to get our share of the largess of public moneys being wasted on every hand; refusal to accept any compromise with the forces of darkness represented in international, atheistic communism no matter where it rears its head, recognizing that global conflict may come as a result, but wisely acknowledging that destruction is the ultimate aim of the Politburo if necessary to achieve its ends; demanding proper use of public offices and insisting upon honest men to occupy them, never acceding for a moment to the pagan belief that "every man has his price."

Third, this situation demands a return of the individual to God and to the things of God—for, after all, the Nation's morality is the sum of the morality of its citizens. When we renounce individual greed, national greed will disappear. When we put personality above personal gain, the Nation will also. When we stop abusing principles for some immediate, practical goal, it will disappear also on the national level. When we really believe in the teachings of our Lord

[3] Ibid., act III, scene 2.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid., act I, scene 2.

Jesus Christ concerning personal daily living, as the church always has taught them—and act on those teachings—the Nation then can claim the blessing of God.

In this darkest and most desperate hour of her history, America needs you—you, with your prayers, your actions for righteousness, your individual return to God and the things of God. God can save America. God can save America through you.

Program of Economic Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on April 27 by Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson. In my humble opinion, this is an address worthy of the close attention of every Member of Congress, for it outlines clearly and concisely this Nation's program of economic preparation. He sets out clearly the necessity for belt tightening on the part of the American people, the necessity for a continuous fight on inflation, and then he shows the answer to efforts which are being made by us and the other free nations of the world, when he states that by 1953 this Nation can be so strong that no other nation in the world would dare to either attack us or continue imperialistic aggressions.

In my opinion, Mr. Charles E. Wilson is rendering magnificent patriotic service to this Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 27, 1951]

TEXT OF WILSON'S DEFENSE PLEA TO THE PEOPLE THROUGH THE PRESS OF THE NATION

(Following is the text of an address delivered by Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel last night at the annual dinner of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association:)

I am particularly glad to address this distinguished audience because the burdens of my job are related to the burdens of yours. This is not just a case of misery loving company.

I have been charged by the President of the United States to mobilize the Nation's economy. But it cannot be done without the support of public opinion, which is largely formed by the free press. Therefore, your job is far more basic than mine.

In the past few years, you have printed millions of words laying down the premise for the mobilization program that now lies before us. That premise is that the free world is in mortal danger, but that it is still possible to save it.

If the people were not convinced of that, it would be impossible for Congress to vote the vast sums now being spent to avert that danger. It would be impossible to reorganize our industrial plants, to conserve scarce metals, to establish wage and price controls, to place restrictions upon credit, and to do all the other things necessary to safeguard our country and the free world in general from the deadly menace that now confronts it.

With the support of public opinion, as marshaled by the press, we are off to a good start. But the mobilization job cannot be completed unless such support is continuous. If the enemy had attacked in New York instead of Korea, there would be no problem. The trouble is that people's imaginations are sharpened only by the immediacy of danger and too often only by brutal disaster. It is our job—yours and mine—to keep our people convinced that the only way to keep disaster away from our shores is to build America's might.

This is not an easy thing to do. When the effects of mobilization are brought home to the average citizen in terms of the price of eggs, or the amount of take-home pay, he is likely to wonder why world affairs should invade the privacy of his own life.

The fact is the relationship is an intimate one and this will become increasingly apparent as time goes on.

NATIONAL FUSION TO AVERT WAR

The problem of public morale is complicated by the activities of some members of the so-called pressure groups. In the long run, such groups—industry, labor, agriculture—tend to balance one another. But in times like the present, when the whole economy is being reshaped, the only pressure that should be exerted is pressure to get the job done, and to make the Nation strong.

I hope the country is beginning to realize that defense mobilization does not mean a choice between big business or big labor, small business or agriculture, but rather a fusing of all the segments of our population in a great national effort to prevent a third world war.

I am hopeful that the new National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy, created by the President, of which I am chairman, will be a helpful means of advancing the mobilization program. This board is made up of eminent men who, I am convinced, will place the needs of the country ahead of the desires of any group.

One of labor's principal demands has been that it should have a man at top policy-making levels in the Office of Defense Mobilization. That was a reasonable demand and I agreed to it. Many weeks ago I laid out the welcome mat.

That welcome mat is still waiting. The door is wide open. The only qualification is the same one observed by my associates and me, namely, that any man who walks through that door must put on a Government hat, with all that that implies.

I don't ask that the labor representative resign from his post in his union, but I do ask that he serve the people as a whole. Acting in that capacity, such a representative could make a valuable contribution to the mobilization program, and I would be glad to have him working with me.

The charge has been made that the mobilization effort is being dominated by a big business conspiracy.

This charge, of course, was leveled against me and some of my associates who have been summoned to Washington to take defense posts.

As for me, I am from big business and I am proud of it. With the exception of time out in World War II, I spent half a century in one industry. When the President hired me for the job, he knew where I came from. I did not come under false pretenses nor did others of the mobilization staff.

A BIG BUSINESS TO BE COMPLETED

I think I know why the President, who himself has never worn such a label, invited some members of big business to come to Washington to help out in the mobilization effort. It is because preparation for war is, to a large extent, big business.

No one expects tanks, planes, and guns to be produced and assembled in little machine shops scattered throughout the country. No, these things come from the mass production lines of huge industries, although we are willing and eager, and are going far out of our way, to have the full participation of small business in this effort. Even Stalin after the last war paid tribute to our mass production methods.

So it is only natural that the President should draw upon the experience, training, and know-how of big business to play a part—but only a part—in the mobilization program.

This is not, of course, to minimize the part small business is playing in the mobilization program. Everything possible is being done to take advantage of the facilities of small business.

For example, National Production Authority's Office of Small Business makes available a regular listing of contracts to 5,000 cooperating offices in the country, such as chambers of commerce, trade organizations, and the like. We seek to strike a proper balance in contracts between small business and big business, with each contributing what it is best equipped to produce.

When I came to Washington I took off my big business hat and put on a Government hat, and so did my associates. We are working for Uncle Sam wholeheartedly and completely, and if we are not, we should and will be fired.

I should like to set at rest another canard—that I reached out and grabbed hold of a huge fistful of power for myself. The fact is that when the President called for me I went to see him and asked him what he wanted me to do. He told me.

I asked for nothing more, but in the interests of good executive practice, I suggested that an Executive order be prepared by the President to cover the job he had outlined, specifically setting forth its responsibilities and authority. He did so. And that's that.

And while I am slaying canards I might as well kill still another one. I read the other day in a New York financial daily an article quoting some gossip or scuttlebutt to the effect that I am going to quit.

There is nothing to this. I have no intention of quitting, and certainly not at the instance of the gossipers. There is a big job to be done, and I mean to see it through as well as I am able.

ROOSEVELT "MIRACLES" RECALLED

As you gentlemen well know, the plan for defense mobilization is to spend $50,000,000,000 a year for 3 years for defense purposes with the least possible interference with the civilian economy.

And we are already well on our way. Since the first of this year orders have been placed at a rate of $1,000,000,000 a week and more. At the end of 1951 these orders will be translated into volumes of end items needed for the war; 1952 will be a year of continuing accumulation. As of 1953 we will be able to meet the demands of all-out war, if need be, out of our production lines.

Then, if any aggressor wants to tangle with us, he would have to be crazy to do so.

I confess I am an incurable optimist—but I think a realistic one—as to America's might and capacity to produce.

My optimism is based upon the production miracles that were worked under our eyes in the last war. When President Roosevelt, early in the conflict, called for the production of 50,000 airplanes a year it looked as if he were asking for the impossible.

Yet it wasn't long before the goal of 50,000 planes had not only been reached, but greatly surpassed. Then the President raised the sights and by 1944 we were actually producing planes at a rate of more than 100,000 a year—nearly 8,500 a month. We at that time had so many that the program had to be cut back.

A similar story can be told with regard to ships. We produced so many ships that,

when the war ended, there were scarcely enough harbors to anchor them in.

And what is true as to planes and ships was also true of many other products needed for war.

Two days ago I had a memorable experience. With a number of others I flew out to Wright Field, near Dayton, Ohio. There I saw some of our newest planes and other weapons and equipment in action. I got an up-to-the-minute account of the development of our airplane production program, both as to quantity and as to quality.

My publisher friends, I can only wish that you had been with me to share with me the warm glow of pride I felt in our American genius of design, development and production.

I can only wish, too, that a certain mustachioed gentleman irom Moscow had been with us. Perhaps he might then begin to cut his ambitions down to size.

A COMPARISON OF ECONOMIES

What we did in World War II, we can now double in spades, if we have to. Production of steel in March exceeded 9,000,000 tons a month for the first time in history. Output of 25,700,000 tons for the first quarter was the largest ever attained during a comparable period.

Only last week Moscow reported jubilantly that it had attained an annual steel production of 27,200,000 tons and it was shooting for a goal of 60,000,000 tons by 1960. By comparison, the United States is now producing at the annual rate of 108,000,000 and is aiming for a production of 117,000,000 tons in the next 2 years.

Russia was delighted to say that its 5-year plan resulted in electric power production of 90,000,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1950. Our production of electricity in the same year approached 400,000,000,000. And this country enjoyed similarly favorable margins in many other fields of production. That's our great strength.

As a sign of what is to come, I am happy to say that the Walker bulldog tank—the first production-built tank of this nature—rolled off the line at the Cadillac plant in Cleveland on March 27. This was three months ahead of schedule. Last December, the factory that produced that tank was filled to the rafters with millions of pounds of surplus beans owned by the Department of Agriculture.

OUR PROMISE OF PROGRESSION

Less than 20 years ago the remark was often heard that our economy had reached the stage of maturity. In the light of what has happened since, that idea has been shown to be preposterous.

I do not refer alone to the huge power of expansion that was witnessed under the impact of war. I refer also to the continued expansion in the postwar period. Instead of the recession that was freely predicted, our economy rose to greater and greater heights.

A few figures tell the story. In 1933, our gross national product amounted to about $56,000,000,000. It was thought then that if we could ever reach $100,000,000,000 we would be in clover. That figure was reached in 1940 and it rose to a wartime peak of $215,000,000,000 in 1945.

By postwar 1949 it was $255,000,000,000 and, at the end of 1950 we were producing at a rate of $300,000,000,000 a year.

In the next 3 years, the gross national product should rise to $345,000,000,000, a figure high enough to provide for all the needs of defense mobilization while, at the same time, preserving a civilian economy at or near pre-Korean levels.

I am often asked what we will do with all our productive capacity say, after 1953, if all-out war does not occur. My answer is that I believe we are still in the pioneering stage, that we are on the threshold of a new phase of the industrial revolution.

Just as no real let-down occurred after the last war, I do not believe a let-down need occur when our mobilization is complete. I believe we can confidently look forward to the use of a very substantial part of these great new facilities that are now being provided.

I think they may be the greatest insurance policy that we could have if the worst happens. If it doesn't, then I believe confidently that we can use them for a better economy, for a better standard of living—indeed, I think for a better America.

So much for the production side of the mobilization picture. I wish I could speak with the same kind of optimism concerning stabilization. Here is where someone should begin passing out the aspirin.

I do not know a finer service to America for the press to perform than in continuing to bring home to the people the dangers of inflation. I do not think it is too strong to say that the country has been attacked by a cancerous growth which will prove fatal unless it is quickly cut out.

I have already referred to the need for putting an end to the price-wage spiral. We all understand why that must be done, but we also understand it cannot be done by one edict in 1 day. The so-called price-wage freeze of January 26 admittedly had many imperfections.

As has been aptly said, it was only the first application of the brakes to a car going 75 miles an hour. It was impossible to bring the car to a dead stop.

It became necessary almost at once to thaw out the order of January 26 to cure many inequities both in prices and wages. But we are attempting to hold the broad general line.

The general manufacturers' order just published establishing new ceiling prices for some 75,000 industrial firms should have a positive, favorable effect. This order requires manufacturers who increased their prices excessively after Korea to roll them back. At the same time, it gives a degree of relief to those who did not apply heavy increases. And it should restore more normal cost-price relationships in industry.

A basic price policy has also been formulated forbidding price increases so long as profits are above the level set in the excess profits tax law, namely 85 percent of profits of the best 3 years in the 4-year period 1946–49. If an industry's profits are higher than this 85 percent, it will have to absorb cost increases and will not be able to raise prices.

We intend to proceed on the basis of the principle that no manufacturer with excess profits will be entitled to an increase in prices.

BASIC LEVERAGE OF TAX RISE

Since last fall, the Federal Reserve Board has taken a series of steps designed to curb inflation. It has restricted housing and consumer credit, increased bank-reserve requirements to the limit of the law, raised margins on stocks to 75 percent of value and it has issued a new type of long-term nonmarketable bond—to yield 2.75 percent—for the purpose of decreasing the amount of money in circulation.

Voluntary committees have been set up to restrict credit. No doubt the board will take further action as time goes on.

It has been correctly said that direct price and wage controls treat the symptoms of inflation rather than its basic cause, which can be simply stated as an excess of demand over supply. A more direct form of attack, therefore, is to drain off excess purchasing power by higher taxes.

As a group of economists points out, in a recently published book entitled "Defense Without Inflation":

"Direct controls are not a substitute for adequate taxation.

"A tax system appropriate for the present emergency must absorb a larger part of the total annual income than did the World War II tax system."

The President has asked Congress to impose additional taxes in the sum of $10,000,000,000, an action which will not only contribute to the pay-as-you-go principle but will help enormously to relieve inflationary pressures.

So, on a variety of fronts, the Government is moving to protect the country from internal inflationary disaster. In recent weeks, there have been some hopeful signs that the rising tide of prices has been checked, but it would be folly if we relaxed for a single instant the battle against this domestic enemy.

I have said that it is planned to spend $50,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years for defense purposes. But if prices continue to rise, this figure, enormous as it is, will not be enough.

CASUALTY RATE IN WAR POTENTIAL

Inflation is an enemy which wipes out our tanks, our guns, our planes, as ruthlessly as any Chinese or North Korean army wipes them out. Already our casualties inflicted by this dread enemy can be numbered in the thousands of tanks, guns, and planes.

For every $10,000,000,000 appropriated by Congress for rearmament, we have lost $2,000,000,000 worth of weapons of defense through inflation of costs. That is a casualty loss of 20 percent.

Any commander in the field will tell you that a 20 percent loss of his equipment in any engagement is dangerous. It will keep him up many a sleepless night until he can get that loss restored.

I can tell you that, as your defense mobilization commander, I have spent many a sleepless night worrying over the high casualty loss already exacted by that dread enemy, inflation.

In one way this domestic enemy is even more effective than our foreign enemy. You can be sure that our gallant and effective soldiers in Korea don't suffer a loss as high as 20 percent of their equipment in any engagement without putting out of action a much larger amount of enemy equipment and men.

But if we suffer a loss of 20 percent in equipment through inflation, we just suffer that loss ourselves without inflicting any corresponding loss—any loss at all—on the enemy.

Suppose we let that kind of thing go unchecked. Very soon the defense program would become too expensive for us to bear or it would have inflated our whole system and destroyed our economic strength.

The people of the United States might well get discouraged under such circumstances and want to call a halt, far short of the minimum readiness for defense that would deter aggression.

And—don't forget—anything short of strength enough to deter Moscow's aggression is catastrophic waste. Better a little more than necessary instead of that tragic too little too late.

In times like these, when most of us can still eat and sleep in safety in our homes and go to regular jobs, how can we get people to act steadily and in time to create the strength we need?

Is it possible really to educate people in advance of hard experience? We must hope that it is, and act with every conviction of that hope.

A DECISION FOR EVERY CITIZEN

In the final analysis, the battle against inflation must be won by the attitude of the individual citizen. He must decide whether he is to do his part grudgingly or magnifi-

cently. He must decide whether the Nation will be greatly patriotic or narrowly selfish.

History shows that the vision of one single individual has often accomplished wonderful things. If a vision of America's destiny and of the sacrifices needed to achieve it can be glimpsed by 150,000,000 Americans, the country faces a glorious future.

I ask Americans to have faith in the program upon which the Government has embarked. I ask them to follow its lead, not blindly, of course, but with a constant awareness of its objectives.

I ask my fellow citizens to do their jobs as well as they know how, to be content with reasonable profits, to be content with reasonable wages and to understand the need for higher taxes and the other measures being taken to stem inflation.

I ask them not to hoard, not to throw money away on things that are not needed, not to patronize black markets.

I ask my fellow citizens to keep in mind always that the sacrifices they are being asked to make to control inflation are small indeed with the suffering—yes, the disaster—that uncontrolled inflation would follow in its wake. It would leave its blight on every doorstep.

But if the Nation can count upon the understanding and cooperation of individual citizens, we can all look to the future confidently and serenely.

The President has just sent a message to Congress asking it to extend the Defense Production Act, which expires June 30, and to strengthen the act in various respects. This law passed following the invasion of Korea provides the basic authority both for the channeling of scarce materials into defense production and for the stabilization of the economy against inflationary pressures brought about by the defense effort.

STEPS FOR EQUALITY IN SACRIFICE

The Presidential message contains a comprehensive analysis of the international situation and what has to be done to prepare America for any eventuality.

In addition to continuance of the provisions of the present act, the President is asking for authority to construct and operate defense plants, to finance essential production at home and abroad, without having to increase price ceilings; to improve administration of price control on food products; to control rents, both residential and commercial, and to restrict credit, curb speculation and increase bank reserve requirements.

It is the central purpose of the President's message to distribute the sacrifices fairly and equitably among all segments of our production.

I hope Congress will give the most careful attention to the President's recommendations, which are designed to give defense mobilization agencies the legal means to carry out their tasks.

I believe the changes suggested in the Defense Production Act will go far toward solidifying popular support of the mobilization program and toward bringing about national unity in the crisis that confronts us.

On the whole, as I look back to what has been accomplished since last June, when the Communists showed their hands in Korea, I am optimistic—realistically so, I trust.

We have already come a long way toward preparing the country against the Moscow menace, and our plans for the immediate future are moving rapidly from the blueprint stage to volume production.

God willing, in 3 years we shall have built America's might and cooperated with our allies to increase the might of the freedom-loving nations, to the point that world peace should be assured.

The job before us is beset with many pitfalls.

It will take restraint and sacrifice, toil and sweat to avert blood and tears.

It will require vision and understanding from every citizen.

But I am confident that the American people have an appreciation of our God-given blessings; that they will do the job demanded by this time of crisis; so that they will live splendidly with liberty and freedom—that they will preserve and extend these blessings for our children.

These things we Americans can do—and will do.

What Are We Building?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was in Daytona Beach, Fla., not so long ago to make a speech on a Sunday afternoon. On that Sunday morning, I attended the interdenominational church known as the Tourist Church of Daytona Beach, Fla.; and while there I observed and listened to the ceremonies in connection with the laying of a cornerstone of a new church building.

The principal address on that occasion was delivered by an old law-school colleague of mine, now a practicing lawyer in Daytona Beach, Fla., Mr. Paul E. Raymond. It was my privilege to have him serve as a member of my staff at the University of Oregon, some years ago. I had not seen him for a considerable length of time prior to my recent visit to Daytona Beach. At that time he gave an address which I found so moving and so keen in its analysis of some of the problems which confront us as a free people, that I now ask unanimous consent to have his address published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE BUILDING?

(By Paul E. Raymond)

As we lay this cornerstone, we might reflect for a moment on what we are building. Is it simply an object of brick, stone, mortar, steel, and wood? Or is it something vaster and more enduring?

We are rather smug about our civilization and our culture, yet in this Nation 1 out of every 20 adults is illiterate. One out of every fifteen is a syphilitic. One out of three belongs to church, but only 1 out of 10 goes to church on Sunday. In 1 year we bought 1,000,000 copies of the Beer Barrel Polka, but we bought only 127 copies of Beethoven's great C-minor symphony. And while we pay 7 of our 10 highest salaries to men in the amusement industry, we have one-half of all of the families in the South needing to be rehoused. People are dying for want of medical attention who ought not to die, and little children are weak and undernourished who ought not to be hungry in this great land of plenty.

To admit of our defects is not weakness. To recognize them and then to remedy them is to become really strong. This is where we need to build. Our basic need for building is well pointed up in a letter written about a year ago by a veteran of World War II. This is what he had to say:

"My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny, and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

"Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles, Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profits, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, Junior wants more spending money. To these I say, Is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains? Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

"All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multipled a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the nations of the world. As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops 'hogging the road' with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world.

"If man wishes peace again, he must remember the great commandment, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God.'"

A peaceful world and a free democracy are dependent, then, upon the building of better men and better women. They cannot be evolved through political sophistry or any magic formula.

During the past half century we have observed two tendencies which indicate that we are not building better people. In the first place, we have witnessed a softening of character. Life has become too easy for too many. Those for whom life is easier have tended to forget their less fortunate brothers. World War II was a joyride for altogether too many people in this country. Pioneer life was hard, but the pioneer was self-dependent; he was charitable; and he had unbounded faith in the values of democracy and religion. He would unhesitatingly sacrifice his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor in their behalf. Where is this spirit today? Where is the spirit of sacrifice? Where is the spirit of giving rather than getting? What has become of our proud spirit of independence and self-dependence? Not long ago Walter Lippmann summed it up in these words:

"Without order and authority in the spirit of man the free way of life leads through weakness, disorganization, self-indulgence and moral indifference to the destruction of freedom itself. The tragic ordeal through which the Western World is passing was prepared in the long period of easy liberty during which men * * * forgot that their freedom was achieved by heroic sacrifice. * * * They forgot that their rights were founded on their duties * * * they thought it clever to be cynical, and enlightened to be unbelieving, and sensible to be soft."

Something has gone out of American character, and we must put it back by building better men and women.

The second tendency we have observed and one which makes our task of building more difficult, is the full sway of materialism. We have much to point to in the way of

material accomplishments which have made life easier and more comfortable. We have electricity and television and air conditioning, streamlined trains and automobiles and superhighways, airplanes and air-foam mattresses. But these conveniences and comforts have led us to assign a primary place to pleasure and comfort and have allowed us to forget the great values of democracy such as religious freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of speech. Where do we derive our pleasures from today? From love of home and family, good literature, great music, and public service well rendered? Or from the racetrack and the cocktail bar?

Our need, then, is not the building of material things, but building to assure the survival of the great intangible values of a Christian democracy. The work of building better people must begin with our youth—our children and our young people. We must set them a better example and instill in them a love and enthusiasm for these priceless principles. We are erecting here a building for the better training of the youth of this community. Through them we shall build better men and better women. We shall build a better citizenship. This is what we are really building as we lay this cornerstone.

Hail, South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in response to requests from several persons, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement containing the words of the song, Hail, South Dakota, adopted March 5, 1943, by the State legislature as the official song of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hail, South Dakota, was written by Deecort Hammitt, a native of the Sunshine State, who was born at Spencer, S. Dak., January 6, 1893. Mr. Hammitt was a pianist, band director, and composer. He directed an orchestra and the Alcester community band for 25 years.

This band played at the World's Fair in Chicago 2 years, the Belle Fourche round-up 2 years, the South Dakota State Fair 2 years, and at the Mitchell Corn Palace, and many other important engagements.

At the Belle Fourche round-up this song was first introduced to President and Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, who had established their summer White House in South Dakota in 1927. Mr. Hammitt received a personal letter of praise from President Coolidge for the composition.

Here are the words of—

HAIL, SOUTH DAKOTA

Hail, South Dakota, a great State of the land,
Health, wealth, and beauty, that's what makes her grand;
She has her Black Hills, and mines with gold so rare,
And with her scen'ry, no State can compare.

Come where the sun shines, and where life's worth your while,
You won't be here long, 'till you'll wear a smile;
No State's so healthy, and no folk quite so true,
To South Dakota, we all welcome you.

Hail, South Dakota, the State we love the best,
Land of our fathers, builders of the West;
Home of the Badlands, and Rushmore's ageless shrine,
Black Hills and prairies, farm land and sunshine (hills, farms, and prairies, blessed with bright sunshine).

General MacArthur's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "General MacArthur's Case," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 20, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S CASE

General MacArthur, before Congress, evoked in support of his views on Korean policy all the emotions aroused by his homecoming and the admiration due to a distinguished military career. He played upon the Nation's feelings. In effect, he asked the Nation, because it sympathized with him, to agree with him. He used his dramatic talents to seek a verdict from a jury gripped by tempestuous passions.

The jury's duty, however, is to reach its verdict the hard way—by reason, by a measured judgment of the national interest. As the passions ebb, it becomes increasingly clear that General MacArthur gave his own answer to himself.

In describing the consequences of China's intervention in Korea, he said a new situation had been created which "called for new decisions in the diplomatic sphere." In recounting his advocacy of military policies to expand the war, he said "I have constantly called for the new political decisions essential to a solution."

General MacArthur said these decisions have not been forthcoming. It would have been more accurate to say that the decisions have been made, in the political and diplomatic sphere where they must be made, and that they have gone against him.

The basic decision was, as President Truman expressed it last week, that "we do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war, not to start one."

The decision was, as General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expressed it this week, that "any recommended course of action which would enlarge the present war is contrary to our best interests, and, by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security."

As he appeared before Congress, General MacArthur was appealing from that verdict of his civilian and military superiors. There had been much speculation that he would disprove the charge of insubordination, but he did not even try. Unlike General Bradley, who said "conduct of foreign affairs is a civilian responsibility," General MacArthur summoned all his prestige to support his own view of how those affairs should be conducted.

Essentially, his view is that the Nation is at war and that "in war there is no substitute for victory." President Truman, General Bradley, and the other responsible architects of policy would agree that in war there is no substitute for victory, but they would deny that the Nation is at war. Rather the Nation is trying to avoid war; it is fighting a defensive battle on behalf of the United Nations, not an offensive war for the total destruction of an enemy. What would be an appropriate military policy for the latter situation is not an appropriate political policy for the former.

General MacArthur sought to give the impression that from a military standpoint the Joint Chiefs of Staff agree with him that Manchuria should be bombed, Chiang Kai-shek landed on the mainland, and China blockaded. Perhaps they would agree if the only considerations were military, but General Bradley has made it more than clear that on a higher plane our foreign policy and our military policy are united on the course of containing rather than expanding the war.

As a soldier, General MacArthur loathes a military stalemate. He wants no less than total victory in Korea. All of us would prefer that, but a Korean victory purchased at the cost of deep military involvement on the Chinese mainland would be no victory. And when it comes to General MacArthur's belief that we could expand the war just enough to suit our own purposes without entangling ourselves in an endless Asiatic conflict, all he really offers in support of that belief is his personal hunch that the Chinese are already fully engaged, and that the Russians would not choose to intervene directly.

It cannot be forgotten that last fall General MacArthur also had a hunch that the Chinese would not intervene. As he was unable then to limit the war just short of the Yalu, why should it be supposed that he could limit it now just on the other side?

General MacArthur has had his day—a colorful, dramatic, emotion-charged day. Now the Nation's task is to get on with the job of building peace. For that we need reason, prudence, thoughtful assessment of the total world problem, and loyalty to a firm purpose that if war comes it shall not be our doing.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that the hundreds of thousands of people throughout the country who are in need of homes view the action of this body on May 4. The vote of 181 to 113, which cut the number of public housing units from 50,000 to 5,000, was a blow to each and every one of these families. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that I cast my vote against that reduction.

The position of the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, and my former classmate, the Honorable Vincent R. Impellitteri, is best expressed in the telegram which I have received from him today:

The drastic cut in the construction of public housing units to 5,000 for the entire country during the fiscal year 1952 and subsequent years, voted by the House of Representatives in the independent offices appropriation bill on May 4, will virtually halt all public housing construction in New York

City under the Federal program. If the bill is not amended, it will delay indefinitely about 15,000 vitally needed apartments in the first 2-year program and 30,000 additional apartments now in preliminary planning stages. The machinery for relating housing construction to the Nation's materials problem exists in the National Production Authority, and we shall accept willingly all cut-backs determined by them to be necessary to defense. The action of the House of Representatives is unnecessary, and we urge that the bill be amended to eliminate the limitations on public housing.

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor of the City of New York.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not only restore the 50,000 units but greatly increase the number, and that the conferees of the House will agree to an amendment.

General MacArthur's Effect on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "Effect of MacArthur," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning, written by W. H. Grimes, the editor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF MACARTHUR

WASHINGTON.—This is an attempt to estimate the effect General MacArthur has had on the policy in Korea and on this country's longer-range foreign policy.

The estimate is based on interviews with men of long experience in official life, who are thoroughly in formed on both foreign and military policy, whose attitude will influence their congressional colleagues and who are neither violently pro-MacArthur nor anti-MacArthur.

For the present the administration will not make any important change in its policy toward Korea; that is, it will continue to try to fight a limited war.

As to the future the prospects are different.

If the stalemate in Korea continues, or if the United Nations forces suffer reverses the administration will be under pressure to adopt General MacArthur's advice.

Regardless of the course in Korea, General MacArthur has influenced foreign policy. There will have to be stronger emphasis on Asia, or at least the appearance of it. And if the nations of Western Europe hold back or seem reluctant to cooperate fully, there may be difficulty in getting Congress to appropriate funds for economic aid to those nations.

Those trends will develop because of the pressure of a public sentiment, which is a surprise to most Members of Congress and which the administration has appeared to underestimate.

The telegrams and letters which followed General MacArthur's recall broke all records for numbers and for candor of expression. So much might have been expected. The unexpected feature is that the communications continue in large volume. And the reaction that usually follows such an emotional surge—and which President Truman predicted—has not appeared.

Two things might change the present prospects.

One would be a favorable military development in Korea or some arrangement for the cessation of fighting.

The other would be the dismissal of Secretary of State Acheson; there would be disposition in Congress and on the part of the public to give a new foreign policy spokesman a chance to prove himself and, for a period, criticism would be withheld or tempered.

Neither development is considered very likely.

It would be distinctly on the side of optimism to look for any early decisive change in Korea.

Mr. Truman apparently intends to keep Mr. Acheson and apparently Mr. Acheson intends to stay. Despite that determination there is an almost unanimous opinion that finally Mr. Acheson must go. But the probabilities are that he will go only after the damage to the administration's policy is well beyond repair.

General MacArthur convinced most of the Senators who heard his testimony that his recall was not necessary. He carried out fully all military orders; no one claims otherwise. He expressed publicly differences with political and diplomatic policy. But there is very good reason to believe that if General MacArthur had been fully informed as to the background and the reasons for decisions, if he had been told of the difficulties under which President Truman was operating, particularly those difficulties raised by the doubts of European nations, General MacArthur would have gone along and probably could have assisted the President. As it was he operated under orders the reasons for which he had only a vague notion.

The other impression that General MacArthur left was that of a man of unusual mental and physical qualifications.

For 3 days he sat continuously from midmorning until evening answering all the questions thrown at him. At no time was he at a loss for an answer and the answer was always clothed in precise language. Never was he led into an inadvertent statement. If all the questions asked of General MacArthur had been given to him 2 weeks in advance of the hearings so that he could have prepared his answers, the answers could have been no more precise than they were.

Only a well-organized mental machine is capable of doing what General MacArthur did and his precision of language stems from ability to think precisely. He asked for no recess of the long hearings and at their end the interrogators were more tired than General MacArthur.

Nevertheless General MacArthur did not entirely convince his senatorial audience that his advice should be followed.

One of the weaknesses of his case was that he conceded that he had the information to pass judgment only on his own theater in Asia. But the advice he offered would, if followed, be likely to have repercussions in places other than Asia. Faced with that, General MacArthur could not offer advice.

The second weakness was the impression of the better informed Senators that the general minimized the capabilities of the Russians in Asia.

General MacArthur's estimate of Russia was based on the judgment that Russian supply lines to the Pacific are not adequate to supply a major military campaign and that the campaign would grow weaker from the day it started. That may be true but it left unanswered to many Senators the situation that would result from a Russian decision to strike a quick sharp blow in anticipation of a quick victory.

Russia has considerable manpower close to Korea. Presumably the supplies and equipment for quick action by that manpower already are there. If Russia should strike in Korea with the aid of air power and submarines and at the same time invade Japan, the Russians and their allies conceivably could trap the entire United Nations army, destroying its base, cutting off its avenue of retreat by sea and leaving it no place to which to retreat.

It was surprising that Senator MCMAHON, who questioned General MacArthur most closely, did not emphasize this possibility, but instead chose to dwell on the possibility of a Russian atomic attack on this continent. In his replies to General MacArthur, President Truman has emphasized that same point of the danger of atomic attack.

No one can say that such a danger does not exist but to many it appears a more remote possibility than the possibility of Russian action in Korea.

Russia, it is argued, might hesitate to start a war with an atomic attack for two reasons. She is inferior in the number and development of atomic weapons. Such an attack would result in the whole non-Communist world immediately uniting against her and cooperating in a retaliatory attack.

But if the Russians judged that they could make a quick and successful grab in Asia without bringing the European nations into the conflict, they might try the gamble. If the Allied Nations were split the United States would not have European bases from which to launch attacks on Russia's vital industries. It could bomb from Pacific bases but the vital industries and installations of Russia would be far distant from those bases.

Whether the Russians really believe they can do this or whether they will attempt it no one outside Russia knows or pretends to know.

But to a great many it seems a more immediate consideration than the danger of an atomic attack.

The testimony of General Marshall has touched this point and very probably the parts of his testimony not made public have developed the point to a greater degree than appears in the parts made public.

W. H. G.

A Report on New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president of the New England Council and also president of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., delivered at the annual New England congressional dinner, held on April 30, 1951, in Washington.

Mr. Wheeler calls attention to the continued good health of the New England economy and its remarkable record of production during World War II and in the current crisis. That is good news for New England, and certainly bad news for its critics, who claim our economy is slipping.

May I, at this time, thank Mr. Wheeler for calling attention to the beneficial nature of the Senate small business clinics

which I recently conducted in Connecticut, at Stamford and Norwich. I started the first of these clinics at Bridgeport last summer, and also last year held others at Hartford and New Haven. As a result, some 60 other small business clinics, attended by 40,000 small, independent businessmen, have been held throughout the country, all sponsored by the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am a member.

I would also like to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the New England Council on securing Mr. Wheeler as its president, and may I congratulate also its other four top executives for what many of my friends, constituents, and business acquaintances say has been a remarkable job in promoting the development of our industries and over-all economy. These men are, in addition to Mr. Wheeler, Robert P. Tibolt, treasurer; H. Ladd Smith, secretary; and Dudley Harmon, executive vice president.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT ON NEW ENGLAND

(By W. H. Wheeler, Jr.)

When I realized that I was expected to make a report on New England at this dinner, I had mixed feelings. It's an honor to be addressing the members of New England's distinguished delegation to the Eighty-second Congress. But it takes a lot of courage to speak for New England. There is nothing presumptuous about a Texan speaking for Texas, or a Californian speaking for California, or a southerner speaking for the South. But let a man attempt to speak loudly for New England, and he is likely to be disowned, if not dismembered.

New England is a region consisting of six States, and nine-million-odd inhabitants. I use that word "odd" advisedly. Webster, an old New Englander, defines "odd" as meaning unusual, singular, strange. Since we are all New Englanders here tonight, let us agree that we are unusual, certainly; singular, always, and strange—well, by the standards of that minority which populates the rest of the country, I suppose we are that, too.

I want to report tonight on New England's current health and problems. And if I happen to slip my small frame into the report from time to time, I trust no one will know the difference.

The present health of our New England economy is good. Our industrial employment exceeds the 1948 peak, and it is continuing to rise. Nonmanufacturing employment likewise has increased. Building contracts for the first quarter of this year are 13 percent greater than for the same period last year, and department store sales are also higher.

New England so far has been awarded about 10 percent of all the publicly announced defense contracts placed since Korea. This is a shade better than our record for World War II, but it must be noted that a good portion of these contracts is accounted for by textile orders—which aren't likely to continue at the same rate for the duration of the defense program.

Many of our smaller industries are suffering from materials shortages for civilian production, resulting from the requirements of the defense production program. We realize, of course, that these shortages are inevitable, and that there is not a great deal the Government can do about many of them. However, all of us can and are doing all possible to bring together the large prime contractors and those small manufacturers who must have subcontracts if they are to maintain normal employment.

The council and other New England organizations have been glad to cooperate with your House of Representatives Select Committee on Small Business in its schedule of hearings recently held in New England. And we have also been encouraged by the work done by the Senate Small Business Committee, which held hearings in Connecticut 2 weeks ago. The efforts of these committees are deeply appreciated by your constituents, I can assure you.

New England appreciated the action of the joint committee of the New England delegation in convening last March 2 a 1-day conference with spokesmen for defense and other agencies of the Federal Government, in which the New England Governors and the New England council were invited to participate. This is exactly the sort of initiative and cooperative action badly needed if our region is to make its maximum contribution in the defense emergency and if it is to thrive and grow in peace time. We hope such meetings may be continued.

One of New England's most serious problems is the number of antiquated plants and equipment in the region. New England needs a production face-lifting more than any other section of the country. For more than 25 years, the council has hammered away at this problem, encouraging industries to modernize and expand their facilities and install new equipment. We have made some progress, but it is a long and slow job.

During the last war I can remember how proud we were of the fact that New England, with only 6 percent of the population, turned out almost 9 percent of the Nation's war production, and did this with less than half of what might have been its expected share of new defense plants. We were proud of this record, and with some justification, since every bit of material and labor spent on plant expansion detracted from weapons of war immediately needed. In a typical Yankee way, we did much with little.

The present situation is different, however. We are trying to lift our national productive capacity for a long pull, even at some sacrifice of the immediate availability of armament. If we fail to expand our productive capacity when encouraged by tax relief from accelerated amortization, we will suffer a great disadvantage in years to come.

To date, 55 certificates of necessity granting such accelerated amortization have been given to New England concerns, covering new plant and equipment in the amount of about $96,000,000. The Government has granted, all told, about 1,000 certificates totaling $4,500,000,000. The $96,000,000 we have in New England is only about 2 percent of this total. Considering that we have over 8 percent of the industrial production, it is apparent we aren't going after and getting what we should by a long margin.

Even if we include the steel mill certificate—and the mill is hardly an ordinary project, nor can we be sure it will be built—the proportion is only a little over 7 percent of the total awarded, and is still far short of what we should be getting. We have got to be more aggressive, all of us, in taking advantage of the opportunity to serve ourselves, and at the same time, serve our Nation.

Last year, you will recall, Mr. Joseph Erickson, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, brought to your attention in his able address certain features of Federal legislation which, on the whole, did not help New England. Among these were the farm price-support programs, which has since been modified by the withdrawal of price supports from eggs, poultry, and potatoes. But the price-support policy on other farm products still works to the disadvantage of New England, by keeping food prices artificially high.

I don't have to point out to you the vital interest our region has in the importation of petroleum products. Any tariff or other restriction on their importation places and added burden on our economy. Venezuela is now the only source of foreign oil open to us at the lower tariff rate of one-fourth cent per gallon. Doubtless that rate also will be increased eventually, and New England, distant from domestic oil supply, will pay a good part of the bill.

Similarly, the reimposition of the duty on foreign copper, suspended during the war, was an act of Congress distinctly not helpful to New England and its thousands of metal-working industries. The recent action of the House and Senate in approving a bill which once more would suspend the copper duty for a period of 22½ months was gratifying, in spite of the fact that it compromises what we would have preferred.

We have been greatly heartened by the progress made during the last 12 months in getting natural gas to our area. New England is the last important industrial area of the country to be served by this fuel. There have been disturbing rumors that it may be difficult to get the steel for completing the necessary pipelines. I am sure we can count on your help to obtain our fair share after military requirements are cared for.

New England transportation interests have appealed the decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission refusing to lower the export rail rates on grain from the Great Lakes to North Atlantic ports, and from New York to Portland. If we are successful in this grain case we may also be able to secure reduction of export rail rates on other commodities and hence encourage the use of our port facilities. In 1950 import tonnage at Boston was 20 times the export tonnage. Lack of export tonnage discourages sailings from Boston and other New England ports.

Our woolen-textile industries are currently facing a difficult situation. Confronted with the fantastic rise in the price of wool, plus the lack of a Government price order adjusted to the realities of the situation, some of our woolen mills have found it impossible to continue to operate and have closed their doors. It is to be hoped that the price-control authorities will not delay further in affording relief to this essential industry, on which so many of our people depend for employment.

Our most serious problem is our need for the basic raw materials which our industries use, but which for the most part are available in New England only at high transportation costs. I have mentioned petroleum, copper, and natural gas, but there are two metals which have fundamental significance, I believe. They are steel and aluminum. Our industries are large users of both metals.

There seems to be no real prospect for New England to acquire an aluminum ore reduction mill because we lack large quantities of very low cost power. But that does not mean we could not have an aluminum rolling mill, provided we can import the raw material at competitive prices. I believe investigation should be made to determine what degree of reduction of the tariff on aluminum imported from eastern Canada would be necessary to bring this about.

I think most of you are familiar with the effort to get a steel mill located in New England, started by the New England council in 1946. On April 20 our New England Steel Development Corp. received the long-awaited Coverdale & Colpitts report on the feasibility of a mill located in New London. The report, paid for by the State of Connecticut, fully justifies our efforts by stating that our market would support a mill in the upper 25 percent of the industry in size, and that there is no inherent reason why it should not operate at New London as successfully as a new mill built anywhere.

The one obstacle is the high capital cost of any new mill, as related to possible earnings at prevailing steel prices. For this reason and this reason only, the report points out that the mill is impractical as a venture by a new and independent company. But the report suggests that it may well be practical for a large existing company against whose excess-profits taxes, at the 77 percent rate, the investment in the mill might be written down in 5 years from $220,000,000 to $85,000,000. This would be possible, of course, only by reason of the accelerated amortization allowed by the certificate of necessity we have obtained. Thus, under these conditions the investment would become comparable to that in competing mills.

There is an interesting point to be made here, I think. The Federal Government in recent years believes it has been following a policy of encouraging and helping small business. It certainly has been keeping big business constantly on the defensive. While there is a strong American tradition for helping small business, the attack on big business, merely because it is big, frequently has unanticipated results, hurting small business. Steel is a case in point. The steel industry, which is big, has been subject to Government attack for a long time, with the result that in the opinion of many it hasn't charged as much for steel as the enormous capital investment requires. Steel expansion, therefore, has been slow, because the capital cost couldn't be justified by the profits to be expected.

So when national survival requires that we get more steel production fast, the Government must grant certificates of necessity, which amount to tax rebate subsidies, in order to encourage new investment. And these, of course, favor the big companies because they are only advantageous if a company has large earnings subject to excess-profits taxes. Even with certificates, the building of a new mill involves considerable gambling on the future tax structure.

This whole problem is worth objective study, I think, because it is obviously one that works to the disadvantage of everyone. It works against small companies who depend on steel, as well as new small steel companies which might be starting; and it makes it difficult for the large steel-producing companies to build mills in areas like New England, where they are badly needed.

We have not, by any means, given up hope of interesting an existing company, and we may well be successful. I can assure you we will leave no opportunity unexplored. We have asked for an extension of our certificate, which expires May 12, and I am hopeful it will be granted—probably for 60 days.

In conclusion, I should like to pay a very sincere tribute to all of you who serve New England in Congress. We men in business sometimes fall into a loose habit of talking about politics as though it were a profession to take a dim and cynical view of. Often I think it would do some of us a lot of good to do a stint of a year or two in Government ourselves. I'm sure it would heighten our respect for you who have the courage to step into the klieg-lighted public arena to represent your constituents and to serve the Nation.

It's a tough job. Every pressure to which you are subjected has its parallel in business life. I'm sure our New England business record of objectivity, courage and unselfishness would do well to equal the outstanding record of the New England congressional delegation. We can pay you no greater compliment than to say to you: You ably represent an area which prides itself on character as its greatest natural resource; and character is needed by the Nation in these days when freedom is on trial.

Necessity of Return to Fundamental Principles of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Presbyterian Historical Society of the Upper Ohio Valley, meeting in the Bethel Presbyterian Church, near Pittsburgh, on its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, May 7, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE PRESBYTERIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF THE UPPER OHIO VALLEY, MEETING IN BETHEL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEAR PITTSBURGH, MAY 7, 1951

I deeply appreciate the honor and privilege of addressing this fine assembly in these beautiful and historic surroundings.

It is a real inspiration to come here on this notable occasion, marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Old Bethel Church.

It would be most inappropriate for me to make a historical address in the presence of such outstanding scholars as Dr. Slosser and Dr. Anderson. They have given a lifetime of study to the history of southwestern Pennsylvania and of our church. They know the subject so much better than I do.

I am happy to be present at the inauguration of such an important project as the publication of a history of Presbyterianism west of the Alleghenies.

There is fascinating reading in the records of the early church organizations of this section. They form part of the glorious story of American growth and progress.

Here history was made by sturdy, courageous God-fearing men and women. They planted and cultivated the seeds of liberty and freedom of the individual. They strengthened the moral and spiritual foundation of our Nation's greatness.

Faith in God sustained them in their lives of toil, hardship, and sacrifice.

The pioneers who came into southwestern Pennsylvania in search of freedom and opportunity encountered high mountains, deep forests, wild beasts, and savage Indians.

Let us look back at those early days. There were no roads or bridges. There were no methods of communication, no utilities, no labor-saving devices, no public schools. There were no housing authorities, no social security, no loans, grants, or subsidies from the Government.

But the deeply religious men and women of all denominations braved the dangers of the savage wilderness with real courage. They were hard working and self reliant. They depended upon their own efforts to build security for themselves and their children.

The large number of churches organized in southwestern Pennsylvania in the late years of the seventeen hundreds was evidence of the vitality of religion in this pioneer area.

To hear the word of God the pioneer worshipers traveled long distances over the narrow frontier trails and forded the streams.

They had faith, vision and confidence. They worked hard and fought bravely, but they worshiped humbly and sincerely.

Their surroundings were simple and rough but the spirit of religion was just as strong as though they worshiped in a great cathedral.

How fortunate we are today that there has come down to us the teachings of the great Presbyterian leaders of those days—Dr. Thaddeus Dodd, Dr. Joseph Smith and Dr. John McMillan. They were men of high sourage, deep religious conviction and fine educational attainments.

They dedicated their lives to the service of God but also they were imbued with the spirit of individual freedom. They believed in the sacred ideals which were given expression in the Declaration of Independence. They recognized that the freedoms set forth in the Bill of Rights are not privileges granted by the Government but are bestowed by God upon all mankind.

They knew that no government can long endure without a strong church. They supported the American principle that the church and state must be separate if individual freedom and religious liberty are to be preserved.

But let me point out now that the church and state are bound together wherever there is freedom. No one can read the pages of history without coming to the inevitable conclusion that free religion is dependent upon free government, and free government is dependent upon religion.

Loss of freedom has always resulted wherever neglect of religion has caused a breakdown of morals and decency. Civic duty and religious duty are interwoven. It must be remembered that the moral standards of government cannot rise above the spiritual and cultural strength of the individual citizens.

We take great pride, here in America, that the sacred principles of tolerant religion are the foundation of our form of government.

In this struggle for independence the founding fathers placed "firm reliance on the protection of divine providence."

The ideals of our Republic are based on the eternal truths of the Holy Bible.

Nevertheless we have reached a time of great peril to American freedom. We are threatened by enemies abroad and by moral deterioration at home.

Evil influences have grown up amongst us that are undermining the moral structure of the United States.

In all walks of life there are men whose lives are ruled by selfishness and greed.

In its report last week the Kefauver Crime Committee revealed a sordid story of Nation-wide law evasion, racketeering, chiseling, and other corrupt products of an unholy desire for an easy way of life.

Organized crime syndicates operate across State lines and are taking from the people an estimated $20,000,000,000 a year.

Sinister alliances between the criminal element and some law-enforcement officers, endanger the lives and safety of our citizens.

Political power wielded by racketeers and gamblers has forced invisible government upon some cities and towns by influencing the election of corrupt officials.

Millions and millions of dollars—taken largely from families who can least afford to lose it, are being used by racketeers and gamblers to purchase political control of many American communities.

Corrupt officials in these towns and cities, bought by tainted millions, have put aside their sacred oaths and submit to the dictates of underworld gangsters.

And the most tragic situation confronting us is that so many of our people accept these dishonest practices as necessary evils—a form of wickedness that we cannot escape.

What is responsible for this attitude?

I think the answer lies in a lack of appreciation of our civic duties and failure to recognize the responsibilities of Christian citizenship.

Too many of our people have forgotten that the true greatness of America is not our material wealth but the spiritual strength and character of our people.

Many of our citizens, who are thoroughly honest in their private lives, are so indifferent to matters affecting the public welfare.

They forget that bad public officials are elected by good citizens who ignore or neglect the basic obligation of citizenship and do not even take the trouble to vote on election day.

Two hundred years ago Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, declared: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Yes; today, as in the time of Edmund Burke, evil will triumph when good men do nothing.

Good men like Dr. Dodd, Dr. Smith, and Dr. McMillan were cast in a different mold. They were not men who could stand idly by and do nothing when government became unclean.

They put all their strength and vigor into the fight for good government. They preached obedience to the laws of God and man. They did not hesitate to become active in politics in order to elect men of upright moral character to public office.

They realized that cleaning up crime and upholding a high moral standard was the job of the local community—not the Federal Government.

They recognized that clean, decent government could not be maintained without adherence to the fundamental principles of religion.

You will recall that during the Whisky Insurrection the farmers of southwestern Pennsylvania banded together to defy the power of the new Federal Government to levy a tax on distilled spirits.

Dr. McMillan took a courageous stand, not only in his pulpit but also in public meetings. He battled on the side of law and order, even though that position was extremely unpopular with the majority of his congregation.

To hold the line for righteousness—in and out of government—we need an army of preachers and active laymen with the courage of Dr. McMillan.

Unless the moral forces of our communities arouse themselves to drive out racketeers and grafters there can be no hope of clean, decent, honest government.

The most effective leadership in that direction should and must come from the pulpit and from the great body of laymen who hold official positions in our church organizations.

The ills from which our Nation suffers today can be overcome if we have a strong, militant church, battling day in and day out, for good, sound, clean, economical government.

I repeat—the church is the foundation upon which our form of government rests. It is the basis of our character as a Nation. It is our hope for a future of national integrity, honor, and justice.

That is why I say that every good citizen, every churchgoer, should take an intelligent, patriotic, and militant part in government.

That means taking part in politics. It means working for the election of men of integrity and high character. It means working to drive out of office every politician whose objective is personal gain and personal power, rather than public service.

It means taking an active interest in community affairs, in State, National, and world problems.

It means arousing public opinion to a higher standard of morality, to inspire deeper respect for the law and to assure confidence in the integrity of our officials and our courts.

An informed and aroused electorate could overnight transform corruption into sound government by turning grafting officials out of office.

Immoral practices which enrich criminals and corrupt officials are cancers on the body politic. They should be removed by criminal prosecutions and ballot-box surgery before the disease spreads further, whether it is found in the Republican or the Democratic Party.

Victory over the racketeers and grafters can be won only if every right-thinking, law-abiding citizen takes an interest in government.

And good government, in our Republic, is the greatest safeguard of individual freedom, including the most precious of all—freedom of religion.

The crying need of the hour is for a great spiritual rearmament, not only in America but all over the world.

If we are to save America and preserve our sacred freedoms we must crusade for a return to the fundamental principles of religion.

With faith, we can strengthen the historic mission of the United States—to lead the world in progress under God for justice, freedom, and peace.

The Voice of America: Echo of "the Voice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as a minor but interesting piece of testimony of the value of the Voice of America broadcasts, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "Echo of 'the Voice'" in last Sunday's New York Times magazine section. May I suggest that this points up the need for the stronger radio facilities requested by the President and the State Department? Unhappily the request for needed funds has recently been refused by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO OF "THE VOICE"

(An anonymous word from behind Hungary's iron curtain reaches this country now and then. Such was the letter postmarked Budapest, signed "A Hungarian who is obliged to conceal his name," recently received here in response to a Voice of America message of good will. Mrs. Margaret Szatmar, of New York, a Hungarian-born American, later read it back over the air in a broadcast expressing the solicitude of Americans for their unknown friends in Hungary.)

DEAR MADAM: At the moment when I am writing this letter I do not yet know how shall I be able to smuggle it out from behind the iron curtain. I would not trust the Hungarian postal service, and the letterbox of the American Legation in Budapest is being constantly watched by the "shock workers of freedom of expression and news gathering." Tonight, as every night, we were listening to the Voice of America. I felt that I must write you because your letter sounded to us as the word of real peace that stems from a human heart. We, here, are hearing all day long of peace. We know it, however, better than anybody else that the loud noises they make are only for the purpose of muffling the clatter of the wolf's teeth.

I am working in a Budapest factory. Many people are working in this factory, and we are having a lot of conversation among ourselves. I can therefore truthfully say that this letter could have been written by any one of my overworked fellow workers. We all feel exactly the same way and hate our oppressors. We all have our hopes in your great and free country. Your freedom-loving people is the last hope of the people of our small country, which has been, in the past, many times betrayed and abandoned by its friends.

You, dear madam, write in your letter that your son soon will become a soldier. Your eyes in motherly anxiety see tragedy ahead. You foresee that your son will be forced to fight our sons. We, too, see this coming. God will forgive us the sin of having prayed that war should come. Our present peace, however, is no peace at all. We cannot speak of peace in this world of hate, fear, tyranny, work for starvation wages under inhuman pressure, without the peace of souls.

Your son must change his home for the military training camp and give up his peaceful constructive life in order to save you and your loved ones and your whole people from the fate that overtook us.

Madam, do tell your son, your acquaintances, and everybody that we, here behind the iron curtain, shall not fight your sons. We don't want to fight at all. We want peace, but not such a peace as we are now having. We want a peace that is similar to that you are having, and not the phony peace of godlessness, of slave-driving, of fear and lies. We see with rejoicing that your country is assembling all the forces of the whole free world against those who are trying to menace the world's peace.

We are unable to do much at the present time. We have no voice. Anyone who dares to raise a single dissenting sound against the prevailing tyranny will forever disappear and will be swallowed up in one of the forced-labor camps of the oriental tyranny that doesn't tolerate opposition. Madam, you cannot exactly judge life as it exists here. The distance between us dulls the sad voice of the oppressed millions. You cannot have full conception of the kind of life our life really is. It is proper and good that you mustn't get a real taste of this kind of life.

We are praying for your sons who are fighting also for our liberty in far-away Korea. We hope that the great strength of your country will banish the reign of tyranny from all over the world. I pray God's blessing for your people, and am sending my love from behind the iron curtain.

Israel's Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the rebirth of the State of Israel is a unique event in world history. We, in this country, take note of this event with a great deal of pride because it was the United States which played such an important

part in the rebirth of modern Israel as an independent state and in helping it during these few short years since its creation.

Israel is now celebrating 3 years of independent existence. It has proved to the world that within this brief space of 3 years it has reached political maturity and it is possessed of an indomitable spirit for the good of all mankind. I am particularly proud of the friendly relations existing between the people of our own country and the people of Israel which is an important factor in helping to make their nation strong and free.

Although the world in which Israel has taken its rightful place as a sovereign state is far from peaceful, the citizens of the new state along the shores of the eastern Mediterranean should feel most deeply the great friendship which is directed toward them by the nations and the peoples of the free world who are encouraged by their achievements in the last 3 years. On this occasion it is worth remembering that these achievements were obtained after much suffering and sacrifice on the part of the Jewish people.

It is for this reason that freedom-loving people everywhere join with the Jews in this country and with the people of Israel in celebrating this memorable event—the third anniversary of the reestablishment of the centuries-old dream of a Jewish national homeland.

The MacArthur Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Another 'Pearl Harbor Inquiry'," by David Lawrence, published in the Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER "PEARL HARBOR INQUIRY"—ADMINISTRATION MUST HAVE THOUGHT MACARTHUR WAS MIND READER 10,000 MILES AWAY

(By David Lawrence)

It's just another Pearl Harbor investigation all over again.

Back in December 1941, General Marshall and Admiral Stark thought that someone had told General Short and Admiral Kimmel what Washington knew about the forthcoming attack through breaking the Japanese code—but nobody did tell them.

Today, it comes out that the President and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and Special Assistant Averell Harriman and General Bradley, who advised that General MacArthur be summarily dismissed, never told him that any of the public statements he had made during the preceding 4 weeks were violative of military orders or any other orders relating to policy statements.

The administration may have thought that General MacArthur, at a distance of 10,000 miles, was a mind reader and as well informed about the state of mind of persons in Washington as were the five men who fired him, but there is not a single bit of evidence in the record after 3 days of testimony to support that point.

In fact, the official record gets worse and worse for the administration in revealing the same kind of bad liaison in the last few months with Tokyo as the War and Navy Departments had with Pearl Harbor 10 years ago.

Not a single word of disapproval went to General MacArthur on December 6 last, when a general directive was issued advising all departments and all persons in the field as well as in Washington to clear policy statements with the departments back home. Although General Marshall now testifies that the administration didn't like General MacArthur's answers to the questions of the press prior to December 6—even though they primarily concerned military matters in his theater of action—not a word of such criticism was ever relayed to General MacArthur. He could as easily have inferred that there were no complaints here.

Not a single word of criticism or of any other kind went to General MacArthur specifically referring to his own statements or pointing out any deviation from policy to him between December 6, 1950, when the general directive was issued, and the day he was dismissed—April 11, 1951.

The now famous letter which General MacArthur wrote in routine fashion, answering an inquiry from Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, was dated March 20, at Tokyo. Although he had written letters to Members of Congress and had talked with them in Tokyo during a period of nearly 6 years and they had made public the views which the general gave them, not a single word of criticism of his relations with Members of Congress had ever been conveyed to him by his superiors in Washington.

When, on March 24 last, General MacArthur addressed a plea to the Chinese commander to agree to a "cease fire," not a single word of the statement or declaration being planned by the Government here—and which it says it was circulating among 13 governments—had been sent to General MacArthur for his information. Actually it is reliably reported that he had prepared his communication to the Chinese commander 10 days before and was waiting for an opportune moment to release it. Likewise, Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the U. N., has since stated publicly that a military commander in the field has a right to address the enemy commander on armistice terms at any time.

The message that was sent to General MacArthur saying the State Department was "planning" some kind of a peace offer to the Red Chinese did not give him any details. It was a speculative message and failed to instruct him not to make any communication on this or any other subject related to it. The home-office manager who failed to keep a branch manager better informed than that on company policy would be the one dismissed in American business today.

Even when the MacArthur statement to the Chinese commander was published, the Joint Chiefs merely asked him a day afterward to be sure and report if any request for armistice came from the enemy commander. There was not a word of criticism or of approval or disapproval sent General MacArthur concerning that statement to the Red Chinese commander.

Secretary Marshall has testified, moreover, that it was an "accumulation" of things that caused the dismissal, but what it looks like is an accumulation of hostile thoughts pent up somewhere in the Pentagon and the White House which came to a head when General MacArthur answered a letter that Representative MARTIN, on his own initiative, made public.

Some Foreign Policy Successes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, even at the expense of repeating the facts which should be well-known to all by this time, I would like to call to the attention of the membership of this House an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1951, which clearly and concisely recapitulates some of the main points and achievements of our foreign policy in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I would particularly like to call this article—which requires mere 3 minutes' time to read—to the attention of those Members who are repeatedly shouting about the vacuum which is supposed to exist in our foreign policy. It may prove of special interest to them, and the record will show, to those who are interested, just how did these Members vote and support the measures and actions summarized in the following editorial:

SOME FOREIGN POLICY SUCCESSES

It is being charged with increasing irresponsibility that the United States has no foreign policy, that our military and diplomatic leaders are "drifting" that we have failed to take a strong stand against communism.

What is the record?

Was the decision to aid Greece a program that stopped Communist aggression in southeast Europe, a policy of "drift"?

Was there lack of action and determination in the Turkish aid program which made that nation a southern bastion against Russia?

Was there lack of imagination and inaction in the Marshall plan, which saved Europe from economic collapse?

Was the North Atlantic defense pact softness toward communism?

Did the Berlin airlift, which bucked the Russian plan to squeeze us out, show lack of courage and determination?

Is our sending American troops to Europe in peacetime a passive subjection to Russia?

Was our decision to stand against Communist aggression in Korea in company with the United Nations appeasement of communism?

Of course not.

All of these program and the decisions which led to them were courageous, bold, imaginative, and clear warnings to the Communist world. Each was the opposite of appeasement. Each hurt communism and hobbled Russia's program for expansion and aggression. Each saved a part of the free world and strengthened the whole of the free world.

Each has had the support of most Americans and the approval of the majority of Congress.

Who made these decisions and took these actions which have no peacetime parallel in American history? The administration—the political, military, and diplomatic leaders of both parties who are still directing our foreign and military policies.

By what logic does anyone believe that men who were capable of such successful and realistic programs and policies should suddenly become inept drifters, appeasers and not deserving of confidence?

These men—again, men who represent both parties—have been a winning combination. They have made errors, of course. But does a baseball manager break up a winning team every time a shortstop overthrows first base or an infielder misjudges a fly ball? Does he throw mud at his no-hit pitchers because somebody suddenly shouts, for no reason at all, that they are winning only in an attempt to lose the pennant?

Of course not. It doesn't make sense, either in baseball or in what today are the most important problems of our lives—military and foreign affairs.

The Lights of Freedom Are Flickering Out, Even in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in Canada, a young man at 18 remains free. He can go to school, get a job, farm a piece of land, join the army, and so forth. He has freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. When World War II ended, conscription was dropped in Canada.

In America a young man at 18 loses freedom. His life is at the disposal of the Government at Washington. Aside from forced military service overseas, our borders become a prison wall. He cannot even leave this country as a permanent emigrant—to seek freedom and his future elsewhere. No passport will be issued to him until he is discharged from conscript army service.

How serious to America is this blackout of freedom? However it may be explained, it is a sobering fact. Millions of our ancestors came to America for one primary reason—to escape from the evils of conscript army service in Europe.

The explanation of conscript military service, known by the sugary title of selective service, is that it is necessary for our national defense. But what is national defense? I have tried to find out what it embraces.

I submitted this question to the Department of Defense: "What area of the earth's surface do the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe United States guns must defend, if our national safety is to be preserved?"

Here is their answer of April 4:

Thank you very much for your letter of March 27 and for the interest you have shown in the problems of our national security.

The question propounded in your letter is one which could not be answered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff since it deals with matters outside the scope of their jurisdiction. As I know you will understand, the task of the Joint Chiefs is a professional one involving all phases of military preparation and strategy. It does not include the making of foreign policy with which your question more or less deals. Once the appropriate governmental authorities have decided that an area of the earth's surface is to be defended by United States forces, it is then that the task of the Joint Chiefs of Staff begins; it would be up to them to decide how that particular area would be defended.

It would appear that your question is one that could be answered only by the Chief Executive in conjunction with officials of the Department of State and the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. HOUSER,
Rear Admiral, USN, Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

MacArthur Knows Asiatic Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "MacArthur Knows Asiatic Mind," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Star today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR KNOWS ASIATIC MIND—GENERAL WAS CONVINCED PRESENCE OF RUSSIAN FORCES WOULD NOT UPSET STRATEGY HE WAS ADVOCATING

(By Constantine Brown)

Administration spokesmen have contended that the strategy advocated by General MacArthur, of hitting the Chinese bases in Manchuria, would be disastrous because it might bring us into a shooting war with Russia. They based their arguments on the existence of a mutual assistance pact between Moscow and her far eastern satellites.

The treaty was concluded in January 1950, at Moscow. The alliance was signed not only by representatives of the U. S. S. R. and China, but also by North Korea. It provides, among other things, for reciprocal help in the event of an aggression by Japan or any other nation allied with Japan.

If Russia had intended to make an issue of the present conflict and intervene, she could have taken the mutual assistance pact as the basis for extending the Korean local war into a global conflict.

Although the Korean armies were smashed and the United Nations forces occupied almost all of North Korean territory last fall, the Soviet forces did not enter the fight. Instead, the Chinese Communists were pushed in, without Peiping invoking the January 1950 alliance, however.

Similarly, it is said now by the supporters of the MacArthur win-the-war strategy, there is little likelihood that the mutual assistance agreement would be brought into play by Russia, if our Air Force were to strike at the Manchurian concentrations and air bases, unless she already has decided that the time is ripe to unleash world war III.

In his testimony before the Joint Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committee this week, Defense Secretary Marshall pointed out specifically that the knowledge of the existence of that alliance between Russia and her two Asiatic satellites was considered when the decision was made against using Japanese troops in the Korean war, even as auxiliaries for supply in the rear.

If this mutual assistance pact, it can be argued now, were not used when the allies occupied most of the territory of one of the signatories, why would the bombardment of bases in Manchuria be the cause for direct Soviet intervention in the war?

Russia remained nominally neutral when the North Korean forces were being destroyed. Is there any reason to believe that she would act differently if Allied planes performed a logical strategic operation in Manchuria? Insofar as Moscow is concerned, the territory of its North Korean ally should be as inviolable as that of her Chinese puppet.

General Marshall disclosed the fact that the Russians have a large ground and air force in Siberia and on the Chinese-Korean border. This has been known, unofficially, for the last 3 months. Last April the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, made some significant allusions to that situation.

But even before Mr. RAYBURN took the floor to announce ominously the concentration of forces "which were not Chinese," this column had reported that some 17 Soviet divisions were massed in that area; that a strong Soviet air force was being assembled for potential support; that among the 17 divisions were at least four paratroop divisions; and that approximately three Japanese divisions, with men carefully picked from the Japanese Kwantung army, had been placed in Southern Sakhalin, a Japanese possession handed over to the U. S. S. R. at Yalta, for a possible attack on Hokkaido, the largest of the northern Japanese Islands.

This intelligence reached Washington early this year from General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo.

There is no question that the ousted commander had considered that situation when he urged that this country and the United Nations take off their gloves in the Korean war.

It appears that General MacArthur, who unquestionably knows the Asiatic mentality and the capabilities of those forces better than do high officials in Washington, did not think that the presence of the Russian forces could be fatal to the strategy he was advocating.

The Crime Problem in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, like other members of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I have noted with tremendous interest an avalanche of editorial comments throughout the country based on Senate Report 307, the third interim report filed by our group.

As one of the authors of the Wiley-Tobey resolution—Senate Resolution 129—extending the life of this committee until September 1, 1951, I have naturally been particularly delighted to note the heartwarming reactions from all over our country to this matter of additional time for the forces of law and order at the Federal level to help local law enforcement groups throughout our country.

ARTICLES ON CRIME PROBLEM

At this time, I have in my hand a miscellaneous variety of comments from the Nation's press both as regards the work of our crime committee and on the general subject of crime itself.

The initial item is an editorial from the Thursday, May 3, issue of the Washington Evening Star. One of the features of this editorial is a presentation of the reasons for my opposition to the idea of a Federal Crime Commission—an approach which has been shared with me by our leading law enforcement officials, including J. Edgar Hoover.

MARQUIS CHILDS' COLUMN

I have in my hand as a second item an article written by Mr. Marquis Childs, Washington columnist, with regard to this third interim report. Mr. Childs' hard-hitting and controversial comments refer initially to the unfortunate leaks and advance publication of committee statements. He has also commented on other phases of the problem including the internal revenue laws, immigration recommendations, and finally he has taken up the matter of a Federal crime commission which he, too, opposes in the interest of American civil liberties.

The third item I have is an editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette which kindly points up the comments which I made regarding the role of the individual citizen in combating crime.

The fourth item is a very provocative column by Mr. Ivan H. Peterman as published in the Friday, March 23, 1951, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer. This article incidentally was reprinted and sent to me by Mr. Moriz Dreyfus, of Philadelphia, as his contribution to greater public understanding of the problem of crime.

ARTICLE FROM FRONT PAGE DETECTIVE

The fifth item that I have is an editorial entitled "How to Get Rid of the Crooks," by the distinguished former chairman of the California Commission on Organized Crime, Admiral William H. Standley. When I was in California with the Crime Committee, in both Los Angeles and San Francisco I heard tremendously fine reactions on the work which had been performed by this California Crime Commission.

We are proud that its former chief investigator, Mr. Harold G. Robinson, was also our chief investigator from the inception of the committee. Today Mr. Robinson is an assistant to Mr. Pat Brown, the attorney general of the State of California. This editorial by Admiral Standley is from the July 1951 issue of the magazine Front Page Detective, issued by the Dell Publishing Co., of New York.

Mr. President, taken together, these articles and editorials furnish an interesting commentary regarding the reactions of the American people to the crime problem. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 3, 1951]

NO NEED FOR UNITED STATES CRIME COMMISSION

The Kefauver committee placed the blame for the "crisis of law enforcement" in America where the responsibility properly rests—on State, county, and municipal governments. Any breakdown of local law enforcement is an invitation to racketeers, hoodlums, and criminals generally to set up shop and take over. There is little that the Federal Government can do about such conditions. The committee is right in contending that the job of cleaning up crime must be done largely by local prosecuting agencies, police departments, and courts. It is surprising, therefore, to find a majority of the committee advocating, somewhat inconsistently, the establishment of a Federal crime commission to make a "continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate criminal organizations throughout the country."

That is a large order for a three-man commission of the type suggested. The commission also would be required to maintain "files and records as a national clearing house of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce." That is even a larger order. Other duties, including liaison between Federal and State anticrime groups, would be assigned to the commission. The crime-commission plan was the only proposal on which there was disagreement in the committee. Senator WILEY dissented from the commission idea for the following sound reasons: (1) A Federal commission might form "the basis for a national-type police force which is contrary to America's traditions and which has been vigorously opposed by all outstanding Federal law-enforcement agencies"; (2) it would result in "unnecessary harassment and interference with Federal investigative agencies"; (3) it would be an "unnecessary and costly superstructure imposed upon the present operating agencies," and (4) it would result in "dissipation of the function on the part of the legislative branch."

A Federal crime commission would encounter difficulties in pursuing interstate crime investigations not met by a congressional investigating committee. State authorities might understandably regard its inquiries as a presumptuous invasion of local law enforcement by the Federal Government.

The Federal crime commission proposal bears a striking resemblance to an ill-advised plan drawn up some years ago for a Federal crime "institute," which, like the commission, would have been an independent agency. That plan was vigorously opposed by FBI Director Hoover for the same reasons that he and Attorney General McGrath have objected to the crime-commission suggestion, namely, that it would tend to establish the Federal Government as an over-all watchdog on crime and might encourage growth of an undemocratic Federal police agency. There is too much tendency now to pass the buck to the Federal Government for crime problems that ought to be handled at the local level. A Federal crime commission would be a convenient vehicle onto which to unload State and city responsibilities.

EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF PRESENT LAWS WOULD GO FAR IN CRIME WAVE

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—So much of the Kefauver crime report has leaked out in one way or another in the days preceding its official release that its contents come as something of an anticlimax. The fact of the innumerable leaks is, incidentally, a sad commentary on a committee created to expose the moral delinquency that enables organized crime to exist in community after community throughout the Nation.

The criminal conspiracy revealed by the committee is a cancer that threatens the body politic. To make it the basis for competitive revelations—a means of building up somebody's political Hooper rating—is to put it on a vaudeville level where we can take it or leave it as just another form of entertainment.

The same thing applies, let it be said here, to the Communist conspiracy. Either it is a thing of deadly seriousness menacing our whole way of life, or it is just another sensation for the television cameras with some birdbrain from Hollywood confessing that at some point he or she was a member of the Communist Party.

The moral indignation generated by the crime hearings should now make it possible to bring about adoption of legislation, most of which has long been recommended. This applies particularly in several fields of Federal law.

Tax laws enforced by the Bureau of Internal Revenue can be strengthened so that gangsters and racketeers cannot with the aid of unscrupulous lawyers, find ways to evade taxes on their huge incomes. The report points out that the Treasury has already moved to tighten regulations to stop some of the raw stuff that the hearings revealed.

Long an urgent need, as the report shows, is increased personnel to enforce both tax and narcotic laws. The Bureau of Internal Revenue as of a year ago had a total of 3,416 suspected tax fraud cases either under or scheduled for investigation with a total backlog of 9,110 cases. Many of the pending cases involve gangsters and racketeers.

The Bureau's staff is inadequate, both in size and skills, to meet this problem. False economy beginning in the Eightieth Congress reduced the Bureau's personnel at the very time when it was obvious that in the wake of the scandals war always brings there would be need for far greater investigation and prosecution than ever before. An effective agent more than pays his own way in ferreting out tax chiselers. As the Kefauver report says, there should be a larger staff and the salary scale should be increased so that agents with greater skill and training can be hired to run down the artful dodgers and their lawyers.

Similarly, immigration laws can be tightened to facilitate deportations of criminal aliens who originally got into this country through fraud and deception. Changes have been recommended by the COMMISSIONER of Immigration and are now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Of the broader proposals involving brand-new legislation, the committee's most important recommendation is to bar the transmission of bets or wagers in interstate communication or transportation. The Federal law now outlawing the transportation of slot machines should be extended, in the committee's view, "to include other gambling devices which are susceptible to gangster or racketeer control, such as punchboards, roulette wheels, etc." But the law on slot machines is of debatable value in view of a provision, insisted on by Senator MALONE, of Nevada, permitting any State to receive slot machines if State law allows them to be legally received and employed in the State.

All such laws are difficult to enforce so long as local communities tolerate gambling on a wide scale. The oversize Federal policeman might have as frustrating a time on the gaming beat as on the liquor beat in the roaring twenties.

The implication in these proposals is that the Federal policeman must grow bigger and bigger. The committee proposes a permanent Federal Crime Commission with a variety of duties. But it seems to me that Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, has most of the arguments on his side in this dissent from the other members of the committee on that recommendation. WILEY suggests that this would be just another costly and unnecessary superstructure imposed on present operating agencies, with the possibility that it might be the nucleus of a national

police force contrary to basic American tradition.

Too often in the recent past administrative defects have been covered up by naming a big-name commission. One may ask here what has been done about all the witnesses who so obviously perjured themselves and showed their open contempt for the committee during the hearings. The Department of Justice reports that of 22 witnesses cited for contempt, 12 have been indicted. Two have been indicted for perjury.

With overcrowded courts and overworked legal staffs perhaps this a fairly good score. But new laws are hardly the answer when so many present laws—local, State, and Federal—are enforced, if they are enforced at all, ineffectively and inefficiently.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette]

WILEY BLAMES CRIME ON CITIZENS' INDIFFERENCE

After listening to big and little racketeers as a member of the Kefauver Crime Investigating Committee, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY says the principal handicap to law enforcement is the "don't care" attitude of the citizens.

WILEY's judgment strikes home wherever we live. In his radio address Saturday, he said, "The whole structure of our home front is being undermined by criminal termites gnawing at the foundations of our economy." He points to the failure of many persons to vote and to a shrugging-off of crimes that do not directly touch them.

"The habit of making a 'fast buck,' regardless of moral scruples, has become a habit throughout the Nation," he warned. "Our whole younger generation has unfortunately been impacted by a widely held cynicism," he added. "It consists largely in a rush for success and for wealth, regardless of consequences to self and to society, a rush for thrills, for pick-ups, for wild jags."

It is to the home as an institution that WILEY points for the answer—the grass roots of America, not in Washington, D. C.

We need only look around us and in our own homes, schools, and churches to see what is happening. It is too late when these cases get into the courts.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 23, 1951]

RICH-QUICK RACKETEERS DEGRADE NATION'S YOUTH

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

Senator CHARLES TOBEY, "the voice of American conscience" raised indignantly against certain Kefauver committee witnesses, has summarized in a question, the wide public resentment against the lush living, easy pickings, and unseemly influence of our big-shot racketeers.

Glaring at Frank Costello during the latter's closing testimony, TOBEY demanded of this one-time immigrant:

"What did you ever do for your country as a good citizen?"

Costello paused, then wheezed: "I paid my taxes."

The hearing room off New York's Foley Square rattled with laughter. It echoed across Manhattan over to Brooklyn and the Bronx, where many have contributed in a small way to Costello's affluence, and it spread across this great, indulgent Nation. That feeble defense of the extralegal millionaire Costello, will go down as a joke of the first half century.

Perhaps we should ponder such things on this Good Friday, which in all Christendom is a time for sober reflection on the greatest sacrifice. It is a time to scrutinize those who never serve, much less sacrifice. And to compare their arrogant records with those who do their duty.

Costello, Adonis, Erickson, Cohen, Guzik, the whole gallery, who have grown rich in one way or another on the American urge to take a chance, must answer one question above all: "What have they done to repay this country?"

It is certainly no boost to discover their sticky collusion with police and politicians, or with such as Charles (Lucky) Luciano, who was bounced out of the country, most unsavory of them all.

It is revolting to discover that through racketeers' contracts, international dope smugglers flourish again, and have invaded our city schools to establish a wide new demand.

It is disgusting to see the names of such swaggering bums constantly mentioned by our chit-chat literati who, despite their limited culture, ought to ignore them on the dictates of simple taste.

It is shocking to see the influence such men have on younger people, who admire their ability to make a pile in a hurry. We have the recent basketball briberies to illustrate. Or kid car-theft gangs now flourishing.

It is bewildering when principals, teachers, even parents confess they cannot guide headstrong youth, who in one way or another are also chasing the fast buck. Youngsters are not particular whether it's by racket or politics, or both, legal or otherwise. The lazier use easy-rich arguments against working or study, declaring if they cannot do likewise there's always Government relief.

It is shocking, moreover, to note the bawdy sympathy, again more evident among the young, for the accused, without much condemnation for evils attached, or the ultimate decadence they've set in motion. Racket riches inspire the urge to live elegantly and at ease, without thought for those to come.

It is this last indictment which seems the worst. It's lubrication on the skid to ruin. It speeds the grand collapse.

Do not think, however, this persuasion is all prevading. By no means. There is a great, silent majority in this country which this Holy Week is finding voice.

They comprise the law-abiding, the dutiful, hard-working, patriotic, and God-fearing. They also happen to be in all sections, coast-to-coast, with roots deep in this America they love. They didn't jump ship and gain citizenship by lying and evasion, then slug their way to unearned wealth without a thought for the new flag and country. This quiet majority lives by brighter ideals, if not the bright lights.

The protests of these have been growing, but until Messrs. Kefauver, Tobey, and Halley turned on the televised report, the call for better living and higher morals was drowned in the applause for jerks. I have said, and repeat again, the period 1945–50 has shamefully disregarded the fundamental decencies, from international levels down to forgetful fools who have ignored the sacrifices of the Second World War.

It is the contrast to those who serve, therefore, which makes today's racket kings seem small. They are shabby in their gaudy eminence, disreputable amid phony glamor. Who are these lush-living tramps? What did they do in the crisis? What contribution to the common good, or to insure the security and happiness of those to come?

The boy plodding toward the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea with a machine gun over his shoulder, he should be rewarded. But who thinks of him, when Virginia Hill is telling how she spent gangster-given thousands? The GI bereft of legs or sight, recuperating in some Army hospital, can answer Senator TOBEY'S question with something that should stick. But those who chase a crooked rainbow have no time to listen. Who wants to hear of Korea now?

Do you wonder that heroes grow cynical? That black markets already are rising in the wake of U. N.'s liberators? That heartbroken first of kin read War Department telegrams, and cry out, "Why?"

To protect the likes of Costello, Adonis, Anastasia, and Gross? Whose answer is not even all the truth, when they mutter:

"I paid taxes."

Don't we all? There is more responsibility to it than that.

[From Front Page Detective of July 1951]

HOW TO GET RID OF THE CROOKS

(By Admiral W. H. Standley, USN, retired)

I spent two and a half years behind the iron curtain of California crime.

The lessons I learned as the head of the State Commission on Organized Crime are being applied with tremendous success in the former playground of mobster Bugsy Siegel.

California is no longer a resort for underworld big wigs. Our gangsters are going broke, and they're leaving our State like a bunch of fire-frightened deer.

Ont of the outstanding examples is Mickey Cohen. He's packing his bags in preparation for a trip to Tucson, Ariz. Mickey says he wants to go there to sell cigars. The truth is that he wants to escape the rigid surveillance of the Los Angeles Police Department.

The startling disclosures of the Kefauver committee have confirmed my belief that crime is organized on a national basis, that the tactics of gangland kingpins are basically the same regardless of geography.

What has been done in California can be done in your community. Our State has provided all America with a blueprint for action, a blueprint which can spell bankruptcy for every racket in the Nation.

Would you like to see your gangsters hop aboard the next train? You can use a very simple persuader that has been around for ages, taxation. We used this method, and it worked.

Have you heard of the mobster who knocked off a stool pigeon and then credited himself with an income tax deduction for the depreciation of his machine gun?

That's just a fable, of course, but it's not as fantastic as it sounds. Every year our State and Federal Treasuries are fleeced of millions of tax dollars by the bigshots of America's crime syndicates. They award themselves liberal deductions for the wear and tear of roulette wheels and swank brothels.

One of our high-class crooks saved himself half a million dollars that way. For 10 years he made other taxpayers bear the cost of hiring the goons that guarded his gambling casino in Gardena.

Racketeers dupe the tax collector by weeping about the high cost of maintaining a legitimate front for their criminal industries. In effect, they have asked the Government to subsidize their crimes. And the most fantastic thing of all is that their request is often granted.

But California is cracking down on the gangsters, hitting them where it hurts most—in the pocketbook. Our State legislature is plugging the loopholes in our income tax laws, and it is sparing no expense in its search for criminal tax evaders.

We took the mothballs out of an old conspiracy statute and made it a felony to be a bookie, gambler, or slot machine king. These boys usually were handled in the courts where we fined people for swearing and spitting.

One of the slimy fish caught in this net was Wiley Caddel. He was sent to San Quentin for attempting to organize a slot machine protection racket in Mendocino County.

The Kefauver committee has dramatically confirmed our discovery that slot machines siphon off $2,000,000,000 of our national income each year, that a large part of this money was used to close the eyes of law enforcement authorities.

Want that money to go back where it belongs, to homes and parks and schools? Try the law. It works.

The mere possession of a one-armed bandit is now unlawful in our State. Four years ago a group of slot machine racketeers arrived in California, in a limousine. Six months ago they left, in a bus.

Bookmaking was once the biggest and best organized racket in California. But that was before our Public Utilities Commission stepped into the picture. It clamped down on telephone and telegraph companies who furnished the services for these racing wires. The Continental Press wire, the major bookmaking service, was virtually driven out of business.

Today the monopolistic aspect of bookmaking has all but disappeared in California. And many of our bookies are now reading the help-wanted columns.

What we have discovered about bookmaking, slot machines, and other allied rackets also applies in such fields as prostitution, abortion, bootlegging, and dope peddling. It's the same story all over America, and the weapons available to the side of justice are ready and waiting.

The boys behind the scenes are running for cover, searching desperately for some place to avoid the national spotlight.

We Californians have made sure they won't find a haven in our State. Can you say the same?

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the responsibilities that devolves upon all citizens is assistance to the physically handicapped, many of whom have suffered their disabilities in the defense of our rights and freedoms. To keep before our people their duties and opportunities in this respect there are held each year essay contests on the local and national level, in which high-school students are participants, and in which the opportunities for the physically handicapped are stressed.

It was my pleasure and privilege to greet the Maryland winner of the prize offered by the Governor's committee to promote employment of the physically handicapped, Miss Margaret Ann Dilfer, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ferdinand Dilfer, of Lonaconing, Md., and a student at Central High School there.

Her prize-winning entry was submitted in the national contest, where it had the distinction of being favorably considered. Inasmuch as this year's contest attracted entries from all the States in the Union, Miss Dilfer deserves a great deal of commendation and congratulations for her success on the national as well as the State level.

In this connection let me pay tribute also to the cochairmen of the Maryland Governor's Committee To Promote Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Mr. L. B. Fringer and Mr. R. C. Thompson, who, together with their committee of outstanding Marylanders, did so much to make the essay contest the success that it was.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay by Miss Dilfer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

(By Margaret Ann Dilfer)

America's greatest assurance of progress is its people—their abilities, their ingenuity, their free procedures for attacking problems, and their mental capacities. All of these human resources must be utilized if we are to maintain the superior standards of our great democratic country. If our wells of mental resources and skills should be left undeveloped. Our country would not reach the highest ideals of living which may be enjoyed by a progressive and democratic country. The handicapped are an undeniable part of this society with any number of diverse skills and abilities to be utilized as part of America's progress.

Hundreds of thousands of workers are unemployed because they have physical handicaps which do not entirely prevent them from doing some type of good work. The problem is—the physically handicapped are not given enough opportunities to prove their abilities to do good work, and as a result many remain as dependent citizens. These Americans have as much right to be independent and self-supporting to their fullest capacities as they have to freedom of speech and freedom of worship.

History shows there have been many famous persons who have overcome their handicaps and climbed the ladder to success. For example, when Franklin Roosevelt learned that he was stricken with infantile paralysis, he dauntlessly said, "I'll fight this thing." Today, the world remembers his achievements, not his physical handicap. There are also other remarkable examples. Helen Keller was able to combat her handicap as she toured the country making speeches to a world she never saw or heard. Theodore Roosevelt had poor health as a youth, but he overcame this handicap and rose to the height of President of the United States. Of course, all the disabled cannot make such remarkable achievements, but many of them could make their mark if only they would be given the opportunities to work to the best of their abilities. If these people could express themselves as a group, I am sure they would reecho the words of Churchill, who said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job."

How, then, can we awaken the workshop of our Nation to recognize the fact that our handicapped are a source of economic wealth, not a liability? An undeniable fact must be faced—national strength is the sum of individual strength. Increased individual production means increased national strength. This cannot be accomplished unless we hire the handicaped. It must be remembered that America will benefit best by the productive power and skill of all, as she grows and prospers. Therefore, the work of the handicapped cannot and must not be disregarded.

Many handicaps, after all, do not permanently affect the individual's skills, intelligence, or initiative—it may increase one's drive for success. True, natural skills are sometimes impaired, or slowed down for a time, and may necessitate a particular type of employment—but their needs are answered by rehabilitation programs which help rebuild impaired capabilities to their maximum usefulness. Then, too, many skills which remain unaltered are discovered and developed to their fullest extent of usefulness. The patience of both the instructor and the handicapped student usually results in a skilled employee who frequently outdistances his normal competitors. Employers can learn this fact only through the experience of hiring the handicapped. They must give these people with impaired capabilities the chance to say, "I accept this job to prove my skill, to earn my way, and to be an active citizen of this great country of ours."

A study made by the Department of Labor surveyed actual work records in 109 plants of 11,000 physically handicapped workers and 18,000 able-bodied workers. It was proven that the handicapped are just as efficient, just as reliable, just as careful, and just as versatile as the able-bodied workers. These records offer substantial evidence to demonstrate that men and women with a history of some handicap can work, and do it efficiently.

It is expensive to deny jobs to millions of handicapped Americans. The cost to maintain a disabled person in dependency must be paid year after year. Thus, the United States citizens are burdened with these expenses because the handicapped are left unemployed. It is estimated that for every single dollar spent to rehabilitate a handicapped individual, the Treasury of the United States gets back a ten-fold return in Federal-income taxes alone. To give jobs to the handicapped, thus will lessen the expenses of the United States citizens. Helping handicapped persons to pay their own way is beneficial, not only to us, but to the handicapped themselves; for it is necessary for them to be equipped with a sense of security which can be obtained only through living productive, independent lives. There are no financial yardsticks to measure the difference between a self-reliant, happy worker carrying his own responsibilities, and a glum, depressed citizen depending on others for everyday needs. Those differences mean more than dollars and cents; they mean happiness, good citizenship, and social usefulness.

Hiring the handicapped need not be an act of charity. Employers may hire the handicapped for the same reasons they hire able-bodied personnel—for their ability—not their disability. The yardstick for measuring the efficiency of the workers is results. It is the results that count.

The key to successful employment is proper placement in jobs which match their abilities. Hiring the handicapped can be likened to the making of a suit to measure. Each disabled person presents distinct problems, the solution of which requires understanding, imagination, patience, and ingenuity. The proper placement of the handicapped in jobs will give the employer as much assurance of results as he may expect from any employee who is placed to match his abilities.

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed the growth of the United States from a debtor to a creditor Nation, from a productive child to an industrial giant, from a world observer to a world leader—an evolvement made possible by the blending of natural resources, unusual spirit, initiative, special industrial skills, and great vision. If our vision and hopes for the future are to be fulfilled, we must utilize wisely every possible material resource—our citizens, our democracy, and our land. Hire the handicapped—they, too, must share in the promise which is America. Hire the handicapped—they, too, are part of America's assurance of progress.

Healdsburg's Adopted Battalion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to have printed three items appearing in the Healdsburg Tribune of recent date. One calls attention to the formation of a Citizens Club in adopting the First Battalion, Seventh Infantry Regiment, of the Third Division; an editorial on the same subject matter; and an article including a letter from Lt. Col. Fred C. Weyand and a letter from the First Battalion in response to the interest of the citizens of Healdsburg.

CITIZENS' CLUBS RESPOND TO FIRST BATTALION WEEK

Adhering to the proclamation of acting Mayor Roy Henderson proclaiming March 25 to March 31 "First Battalion Week" private citizens, clubs, schools, and various organizations responded wholeheartedly in making First Battalion Week a success.

According to Mrs. Fred C. Weyand, chairman of the First Battalion Committee, 24 cartons have already been shipped off to the adopted battalion in Korea and 10 more are packed and ready to go.

During the week various clubs and organizations requested their members to bring specific needed items to their regular meetings. The Healdsburg Women's Golf Club donated pocket-size mirrors, the 20–30 Club sewing kits, the Kiwanis Club towels and wash cloths, the Lions Club handkerchiefs.

The Business and Professional Women's Club have adopted an entire company, approximately 130 men, to whom they will send needed items.

The students at the Healdsburg Elementary School also responded wholeheartedly by bringing to school magazines, pencils, stationery, soap, towels, and wash cloths.

The Healdsburg High School students, as their project, will send news letters to the fighting battalion. Collection date for the letters will be decided shortly.

In addition three battery radios have been donated. One by Edna Walker, another by G. F. Graham, Hollydale Park and the third by Smith Robinson. Tanner Bros., West Street, repaired the radio given by Edna Walker.

Cash donations from Bill Wendt, Harold Vanderhurst, Mrs. Della Lovell, Mrs. R. B. Stevens, students of Lambert School, and Women's Golf Club have also been received.

The American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary and the War Mothers Club will make plans at their next meetings for collection of various articles.

The First Battalion adopted at a membership meeting of the chamber of commerce, March 13 is a part of the Seventh Infantry Regiment, Third Division. The regiment, referred to as the Cotton Balers for the use they made of cotton bales in the battle for New Orleans during the war with Great Britain, 1812–14, were first organized in 1798, mustered out in 1800, and reorganized in 1808, with continuous service dating from that time. As such they are the second oldest regiment in the United States Army.

OUR ADOPTED BATTALION

On March 13 at the general membership dinner of the Healdsburg Chamber of Commerce, a resolution was passed unanimously adopting the First Battalion, Seventh Infantry Regiment, Third Division. This resolution was subsequently sanctioned at the city council meeting of March 19, the acting mayor issuing a proclamation naming this week First Battalion Week.

The chamber of commerce was chiefly responsible for spearheading and corralling to a focal point the adoption as presented to them by Mrs. Arline Weyand, wife of the commander of the First Battalion.

The adoption of the battalion was indeed a fine gesture on the part of the citizens of Healdsburg and much praise for the action taken has been forthcoming. In fact, Nation-wide publicity has been received and a vote of thanks should go to all those who have made the adoption possible. During time of duress, such as now, we believe, it is a faith renewer to have such gestures take place.

However, the work in maintaining and supplying a battalion has only begun. To make this promotional activity the success it deserves, everybody in Healdsburg will have to do their share.

According to Mrs. Fred Weyand, the men who are fighting in Korea need many small items to make them just a little comfortable. Magazines, books, stationery, envelopes, lead pencils, cameras, film, sewing kits, battery radios, billfolds, towels, handkerchiefs, and "snack" items are just a few of the needed articles.

Get those needed articles now and bring them to the firehouse where they will be wrapped and shipped.

Do it now and help make First Battalion Week a rousing success.

DEAR CITIZEN—A LETTER FROM YOUR ADOPTED BATTALION

(Just received is the following letter and brief history of Healdsburg's adopted battalion written in the battalion's own words addressed to the citizens of our town. We are reprinting it here for all to read for the First Battalion is your battalion.—EDITOR.)

MARCH 20, 1951.

DEAR CITIZENS OF HEALDSBURG: I was in the process of writing a formal history of the infantry battalion you've taken as your own but I've discarded the idea. I found, not to my surprise, that this battalion has a mind and heart of its own. It has taken matters into its own hands by writing you a letter which I am enclosing.

On behalf of the men, I thank you for your kindness and generosity. The knowledge of your support has made better soldiers of them—they're trying just that much harder to live up to your expectations.

I only wish you could know each of the men personally, as I do, so you could be as proud of them as I am.

Thank you for your thoughts and prayers.

Sincerely,

FRED C. WEYAND,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry.

I'm an old fighting battalion, the oldest one in the Army. I had my first big fight under Andy Jackson at New Orleans and I've fought in every scuffle Uncle Sam has had since then. I'm proud of it, darn proud. I've been many places since 1812 and I don't guess I've ever had a place I can call home. It has usually been some spot in the world where there's trouble brewing or a lonely post somewhere in the ZI. I don't guess I've had any parents either, 'cause as far back as I can remember my Uncle has taken care of me.

Today I feel like a new-born babe, even as old as I am, because today I found one spot in this world which I can call home and acquired a lot of good people as foster parents. I've been adopted.

I know there's not much use telling you about my past because most of that is written in history books. Sometimes I fight alone but usually with a couple of battalions and together we compose the Seventh Infantry Regiment. We're part of the Third Division and have been since World War II.

I guess I had better bring you up to date about what I've been doing since I first landed in Japan last September. I had only bout 200 GI's then and I was plenty worried. General Mac (Gen. Douglas MacArthur) sent about 1,000 Korean recruits and I trained them like mad for 6 weeks. I kept about half of them, received 200 more GI's, and then I shipped out for Korea along with the regiment.

I went ashore at Wonsan on the 17th of November and proceeded north to Hamhung by myself. The war with the North Koreans looked like it might be just about to wind up but many bypassed soldiers were escaping to the north through the mountains. I was sent to a little place about 60 miles up in the mountains called Saachang to block this movement. I'll tell you frankly, I never did see a North Korean up there but brother, on the 23th of November I saw plenty of Chinese! I was sure surprised because I didn't even know they were in the war until then.

Their Eighty-ninth Division was headed down the valley and I was sitting right in its way. They hit me with everything they had and I guess they did "bloody" my nose a bit, but I stayed and fought them off by myself until December 2, 1950. I found out later that this division was on its way to help cut off the Seventh Infantry Division and First Marine Division. It arrived too late.

I'm mighty proud of that fight but I had to break it off and get out before they cut me off in those mountains. They nipped at my tail getting out but I made it all right. I fought a delaying action on out of the mountains and down to Yongpo Airfield. I held it long enough for the Air Corps to fly the wounded out and then themselves. My job from there on was to protect the left flank of the Hungnam beachhead along the ocean. It was a good fight and I sure rocked the Chinese back on their heels.

On the 24th of December, I too was evacuated from the beach. I didn't like it, but I had my orders. My troops were the last to leave.

I spent Christmas as a guest of the Navy, and I made the most of it. It was good to be clean and warm again, but that didn't last long. Some new guy over named Ridgway (Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway) wanted my punch and wanted it bad. The Navy put me back ashore at Pusan and headed north and back into the line above Chonan. Things were rough over here about then, and the guy calling the plays didn't waste any time finding me a fight.

I'm a "low lander" by preference, and I like the flat plains with the long fields of fire and unlimited observation. Did I get that? No! They put me to work in mountains where no self-respecting mountain goat would be caught.

My fight was for one big hill after another. I ran the Chinese off of them by day, and they came back by night, but I beat him every time. It was rough on my troops, but they never weakened. I didn't stop till I had chased the Chinese across the Han River, and that's where I am now, just south of Seoul. I'm ready to go again, and I like river crossing. The last big one I crossed was in Italy.

Yep! I'm an old fighting battalion, but I've lost a lot of good young Americans over here. They will never march with me again, will never fight with me again, but I know that their fighting spirit will be with me whenever the going gets rough again.

That's the special thing about me, the spirit of my men. Nothing gets them down. They have fought in weather that was 30 de-

grees below zero over terrain that is the worst in the world; it never fazed them. They have been constantly outnumbered 10 to 1; they don't care. They have been shot and shot at night and day; they never flinch. This fighting spirit of my men is the thing that makes me the best darn battalion in the world.

Well, it is getting late and time for me to dig in for the night. I'll most likely have visitors before morning. I feel a lot better now, because I know I have a whole city at home that's thinking of me and praying for me. I'll hit 'em an extra lick or two tonight, especially for you.

Sincerely,

FIRST BATTALION, SEVENTH INFANTRY REGIMENT.

The Wake Island Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by George Sokolsky and published in the Washington Times-Herald today, dealing with the report by Miss Vernice Anderson of a conversation between President Truman and General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

It used to be said of the fire horse that when he heard a gong he just automatically went to the wagon to be hitched.

Automatic responses should be studied carefully by child psychologists, perhaps to make humans more like the obsolete fire horse. A good way to start the training would perhaps be a course in eavesdropping with Miss Vernice Anderson as the teacher, she having scooped the world in doing automatically what parents used to tell children they should not do at all, namely, eavesdrop.

Miss Anderson makes the point when she stood behind a door and listened to the conversation between General MacArthur and President Truman, she did it automatically. She also took down her stenographic notes automatically. She did not destroy the notes automatically but kept them, typed them, and gave them to her boss, Dr. Philip Jessup, of the State Department and the Institute of Pacific Relations, automatically.

That is an awful lot of automatic action for a young lady and represents a high degree of aptitude in the field. She was brought on from Washington to Wake Island apparently to serve orange juice and other liquids, the others not being specified in any of the accounts given, but it might be presumed that automatic bourbon was included. However, that is a matter of speculation and not pertinent to automatic responses, which is the subject of this course of study.

I also would include keyhole peeping in this course for the young. There is nothing in the record to show that Miss Anderson has any aptitude for that. She apparently has cultivated her ears rather than her eyes and is able to hear through walls and closed doors. The peepholers will have to be found elsewhere in the State Department or in Central Intelligence.

Children would gain great knowledge quickly if they could only peep through keyholes, particularly after they had been ordered to bed. It might improve them more effectively than television, which is in the open and therefore evokes no special skills. Automatic peepholing could be developed into a fine art with prizes given each year by the freedoms foundation for those who never fail.

Microphone-placing in flower pots might also help the next generations. They could automatically hear papa and mamma discussing family affairs, but better still, it would build the ambitions of a young man. He could perhaps write on his application for a job in the State Department that he placed microphones in his sister's boudoir when he was 10 and tapped the telephone wires in the house by the time he was 14. That ought to fit him to be an expert on the Far East, to say nothing of the Middle East and Germany.

These things can, of course, become automatic, or what we used to call, second nature. For instance, it used to be second nature for small boys to peephole through the ball park fence. That was second nature, like jumping into a swimming hole or putting a garter snake in a bottle or putting a little girl's hair in the inkwell. Second nature can be something awful if you fail to curb it. Automatic responses possess an additional quality because they require training in some such place as the State Department.

And that automatically leads to some observations concerning Miss Vernice Anderson's boss, Philip Jessup, who is one of the high mucky-mucks in the State Department. He seems to be involved in everything, having come to that department from a professorship of international law at Columbia University and the Institute of Pacific Relations. He has been active in helping the country run its foreign relations, on and off, since 1924, but really did not mature until 1945, since when he has really been a big factor, second only in influence and prestige to Dean Acheson.

He goes to all the conferences and makes speeches on great matters. He has never had any far-eastern experience but purports to be an expert on the subject through his connections with the Institute of Pacific Relations whose files the McCarran committee is now studying. He has generally been identified with those other far-eastern experts whose predilections brought us to our present dismay.

Curious that the eavesdropping Miss Anderson, whose automatic responses led her to take down an off-the-cuff, unrecorded conversation between the President and General MacArthur, should be working for Dr. Philip Jessup.

Paul Wooton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for May 9, paying fitting tribute to a fine reporter:

SEVENTY YEARS YOUNG

There is nothing unique about a lawyers' lawyer or even a doctors' doctor, but there seems to be only one newspapermen's newspaperman in Washington, and that is Paul Wooton. We can think of few offices connected with associations of newspapermen in Washington that he has not held. For three terms he was chairman of the board of governors of the National Press Club, and later president of the club. In addition, he has been president of the Overseas Writers and the White House Correspondents' Association and for many terms was president of the National Conference of Business Paper Editors. For at least 30 years he appears to have had a finger in almost every journalistic pie that has been baked in Washington.

Since the first term of Woodrow Wilson as President, Mr. Wooton has been Washington correspondent for the New Orleans Times-Picayune. For many years he also represented the McGraw-Hill publications and more recently has written a business column. His fellow news writers marvel at how he finds time to turn out his copy between stints of organizing his fellow scribes' chores. We suspect that he has done more than any other person to give the press of this city a sense of corporality. As his friends celebrate his seventieth birthday, we join in saluting him for his good work, which he always does with a smile.

The Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an editorial carried in a recent issue of the Hastings Banner, a newspaper published at Hastings, Mich., in the Fourth Congressional District, by Richard Cook. The editorial is well worth reading. It follows:

The dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from the Far East command is a stunning defeat for the forces of democracy both on the military and diplomatic fronts. It comes as sort of supercolossal Munich that must have "Uncle Joe" chuckling contentedly into his whiskers. It is notice to the world that more appeasement is to be the order of the day in dealing with threat of Communist imperialism.

Neville Chamberlain's house of cards came tumbling down about his umbrella soon after Munich with a reverberation that shook the world. Unfortunately for us, the forces with which our administration is dealing with so little effect are much more tremendous and threatening than Nazi Germany under Hitler.

Does it make sense to remove from duty one of the great military men of our time (and about the only major American statesman to achieve a glowing record in the bleak era of postwar diplomacy) in an effort to bolster the sagging prestige of our Department of State? Why not keep MacArthur and inject some much-needed new blood into State Department leadership? But maybe that is so obviously logical that it just doesn't make sense in present-day Washington.

Consider the record. General MacArthur suddenly thrust into military leadership in Korea under conditions that were almost fantastically impossible, performed brilliantly. In the field of statesmanship, he has made great progress in winning over Japan to the American point of view. A former

deadly enemy has been changed into a possible strong ally in the Far East—a region where we need friends badly. In fact, Japan is about the only major area where United States diplomacy has been outstandingly successful.

Secretary of State Acheson, on the other hand, has been a consistent wrong guesser. The present "police action" in Korea can be attributed directly to his misjudgment of Soviet intentions. American diplomacy in Europe has produced few strong ties (the only reliable ones, at present are Turkey and Greece) despite billions of dollars spent abroad for "reconstruction." Mr. Acheson, despite the theoretically strong position of the United States, has never been influential with foreign diplomats and has not been able to forge sound or desirable alliances. Even the Atlantic nations loosely grouped together for mutual protection do not seem to be greatly impressed by our Secretary of State. Under Mr. Acheson our foreign policy has been vacillating and puzzling both to people abroad and those of us here at home. We have been weak in an era when firmness and strength are needed as never before.

Technically, MacArthur may have been playing tag with insubordination in voicing opinions that verge closely on matters of foreign policy despite warnings from President Truman and frantic pleas from our jittery Department of State. However, the line where politics ends and military responsibility begins can never be clearly defined.

The entire situation in the Far East is very confused and, as the general states, without parallel in military history.

Technically, for example, General MacArthur was serving under the United Nations, not directly under command of the United States, and thus, in theory, even represented Soviet Russia, a member in good standing of the U. N. despite the fact that she is the real power backing the North Korean and Red China armies that the United Nations forces are battling.

Although American casualties have been higher during 9 months of the Korean fighting than during the first full year of our participation in World War II, neither the State Department nor President Truman will admit we are fighting a war—it is merely a "police action" and our enemies, or rather, the lawbreakers with whom we are involved, are permitted to maintain a sanctuary just across the North Korean border where they can, in perfect safety, build up reserves of men, munitions, and supplies to support their armies in the field.

The United Nations are directly involved with Mao's troops. Red China is not a member of the U. N. However, Nationalist China which is a member in good standing hasn't been permitted to supply soldiers even though additional battle-tested ground troops are desperately needed.

Why are we in Korea? Only a little more than a year ago, Secretary of State Acheson declared that the United States was not concerned with Korea. That nation had nothing to do with our security. Our troops were withdrawn. This, of course, amounted to an open invitation to the Communists to move in. But when they did, Korea of a sudden became important. Mr. Truman and the State Department decided to resist under circumstances that couldn't have been much worse for defense forces. Once again we were caught unprepared. The unsound policies of Louis Johnson and the old Department of Defense were quickly brought to light.

Green troops had to fight a type of war for which they had not been trained. Somehow they managed to keep from being pushed back into the sea and then rallied splendidly. The intervention of Chinese troops in substantial masses prevented the close of what might have been "the Korean incident."

Where to now? Are we to fight an indecisive action back and forth across the thirty-eighth parallel—killing and getting killed in the process? Are we to withdraw? Are we to be given sufficient strength for decisive action?

The above paragraphs, we believe, should be given consideration in judging General MacArthur's action.

Some dismiss him as an egotist; some claim he has a weakness for flowery phrases and hunting out the headlines; some believe he is making a bold bid for public acclaim.

Maybe these criticisms are true in whole or in part.

However, General MacArthur is no fool. As a military man he knew the consequences of insubordination; as an individual he was aware of the tendency of Americans to dismiss public idols who have been caught "off base."

Therefore, our own guess is that the general had so much faith in his own analysis of the Korean situation and was so gravely concerned with the indecision and lack of policy at Washington that he felt it his responsibility as a top-flight soldier to disregard normal channels and go directly to the real source of authority—the people of the United States—the "body politic" to which even presidents owe allegiance.

General Ridgway, close-mouthed, brilliant field commander of our forces in Korea, recently issued a guarded statment that backed MacArthur's point of view. Will he, too, be sacrificed to "strengthen the hand" of our State Department.

In our opinion MacArthur is of much greater value to the United States and the cause of the democratic nations than Acheson and Truman combined.

Go It Alone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur has testified that if other nations refuse to accept his recommendations, we should "go it alone." I should like to call attention to two analyses of this phase of the general's argument. The first is a recent editorial from the Washington Post, and the other a column by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Evening Star. They follow:

[From the Washington Post]

GOING IT ALONE

The President rose to the occasion last night in his defense of a limited war in Korea fought by the United Nations. His task was to show that this strategy is superior to General MacArthur's—a broadened war in the Far East fought by the United States and Chiang Kai-shek in alliance. The President, in our opinion, demolished the case in behalf of that kind of nationalistic war. When he said the MacArthur policy would "unite the Chinese people behind their Communist rulers," he spoke in words that both history and common sense attest.

As in other countries, communism, it is reported, is on the defensive in China, but the way to strengthen Peiping's hold on China is the very intervention that General MacArthur proposes. Leave aside the possibility of limiting support for Chiang. The mere fact that this country was actively alined with Chiang would evoke an intense anti-Americanism throughout China. The Chinese are notoriously antiforeign, anyway. They celebrate a round dozen days of humiliation at the hands of foreign invaders or interventionists.

Not only that. After so many years of incessant warfare, they must blanch at the prospect of more and yet more American bombs hurled into their country. More American than Soviet armament is still being fired at our American boys in Korea—American armament that was originally conveyed to the Communists by surrendering Nationalists. It was conveyed in such quantity that the Communists called Chiang Kai-shek during the high point of the surrenders, their "supply sergeant." Yet General MacArthur is proposing, and the administration has given way in part to him, to restore Chiang to that role. It must be bitter tea to the Chinese farmer as he tries to plow his war-soaked fields in intervals of oppression and extortion. If Communist China is as weakened as General MacArthur says, why interfere with the disintegration, and give the Communists a rallying point in American intervention?

It is the past help to the Communist supply sergeant that should have been pondered before new help was sent. It is this past help, and the tribulations of our boys in Korea arising from its impact, that should be pondered before we loose hot words as well as criticism upon our allies for supplying our enemies with strategic materials. Our allies are struggling to their feet after two grueling contests in a generation with a world aggressor. Their full recovery is inhibited by the partition of Europe. In the old days the industrial west traded with the agricultural east in a system which gave Europe a high standard of living. The division has shattered this system, and an all-out blockade in the Far East would deal Western Europe another blow at its economy which it will certainly not sustain as an ally of the blockaders. Western Europe would suffer far more than a self-contained China (when not Russian-contained) from a complete blockade, and so, incidentally, would Japan and every other Asian country. Moreover, Western Europe, seeing the diversion of American naval power, would see their military security jeopardized as well as their economic security.

The President took for granted a knowledge of some of these repercussions of the MacArthur policy. He concentrated mainly upon the assertion of his belief in the policy of going along with the United Nations. He rested his case upon a common policy with our allies. "We cannot go it alone in Asia," he declared, "and go it in company in Europe." He is abundantly right. If there were a break in Asia, there would be a break in Europe, and Europe's bases and industrial resources would then be denied to American arms. To be sure, a coalition policy in waging a limited war in Korea requires patience. But any other policy would, as the President said, be playing the Kremlin game, which is "to drive a wedge between us and the other free nations," as well as to see us get bogged down in Asia.

[From the Washington Star]

GENERAL MACARTHUR AND THE U. N.—FAILURE TO MENTION UNITED NATIONS SEEN AS CLUE TO CURRENT DISPUTE; CAN UNITED STATES GO IT ALONE?

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Sometimes a simple clue will open up a seemingly complex mystery.

As, for instance, the failure of Gen. Douglas MacArthur even to mention the United Nations in his recent speech to Congress.

And now, reinforcing this clue, his colloquy with the 83-year-old Senator GREEN,

Democrat, of Rhode Island, which lights up, like a star shell, the whole mass of testimony before the combined Senate Armed Services-Foreign Relations Committees relating to Korea and Far East policy.

Senator GREEN wanted to know if the United States wouldn't be going alone, without the other United Nations, if we adopted the general's program for lending support to General Chiang Kai-shek's troops to invade China and for bombarding Chinese coast cities and establishing a blockade. The general said he could not testify about the United Nations. When asked about his own expectations, he replied:

"My hope would be, of course, that the United Nations would see the wisdom and utility of that course, but if they did not I still believe that the interest of the United States being the predominant one in Korea, would require our action."

"Alone?" asked the Senator.

"Alone, if necessary," the general replied. "If the other nations of the world haven't got enough sense to see where appeasement leads after the appeasement which led to the Second World War in Europe, if they can't see exactly the road that they are following in Asia, why then, we had better protect ourselves and go it alone."

Alone? In the hard and cruel sort of world today. Alone?

The general, certainly a great military strategist, here seems to reveal a lack of understanding of over-all political considerations, of the essential meaning of the United Nations, itself, which is the reason for our being in Korea, and of the world-wide calculations upon which our policy necessarily must be based if we are to win a world-wide struggle. These include the adherence and support of friends and allies without whose help we could not possibly sustain ourselves.

This common front, which from time to time may require policy adjustments and compromises, is the very essence of collective security. Nor does that mean "appeasement," a word bandied around too loosely of late.

It is not necessary for a general in the field to understand all of this to win battles, and General MacArthur has won battles. But, by the same token, a general who can win battles is not thereby qualified to set himself up to direct policy which must, perforce, go far beyond the area in which he operates. That is what General MacArthur sought to do, and still is assuming to do, without portfolio, so to speak.

The policy-making job is the function of the civilian government which must operate on all fronts in such a world-wide contest as that in which we are engaged. It must take account of the needs and requirements of those fronts, including the political, and meet them in the manner best adapted to the whole problem at hand.

Unwittingly, the general, himself, has confessed publicly to the indictment upon which he was removed and has, simultaneously, offered the final, clinching argument for supremacy of the civilian government over the military. That not only has been our tradition, but in sustaining it, in the past, Presidents have had to confront military figures as popular in their day as the general is in this, and weather the same sort of public uproar.

In other similar episodes in the past, too, there have been Members of Congress who joined in the procession and the outcry to promote political interests, and congressional committees investigating, and efforts to give Congress the reins. But always, in the end, this all has passed.

Now, as to practical considerations of today. What would happen under the MacArthur "go it alone" policy to the stability and energy we have helped to pump into the United Nations so that it stood up and met the first open challenge of aggression? To the friendships we have so carefully built up through the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact which, at the same time have brought economic and military strength to our side? And what would be the effect on the people of China, with whom we always have been friends, if the United States should "go it alone" in all-out war on their teeming cities?

Alone?

Hardly.

Excise Tax on Cigarettes and Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been aroused by the proposal to increase the excise tax on cigarettes and tobacco generally. Tobacco is taxed more than any other commodity with the possible exception of alcohol. Tobacco has been one of the principal agricultural commodities exported from the United States since colonial days. Presently it is the main source of income for more than 800,000 farm families in the United States and Puerto Rico. Tobacco is the product primarily of the labor required to produce it. It is estimated that about 480 man-hours are required to produce an acre of tobacco.

Dr. J. L. Maxton, extension agricultural ecoonmist at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, has made a study recently on cigarette costs and tobacco taxation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an analysis of this study made by Dr. Maxton, which I think is indeed revealing and which I hope will be helpful to the Members of the House in dealing with the proposed increase in tax on cigarettes and tobacco, as in my opinion any further increase in the excise tax on cigarettes will result in decreasing consumption which will disrupt our economy.

The analysis follows:

A recent statistical release by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics gives a general breakdown of the cost of cigarettes from 1926 to 1950, inclusive.

In 1926 the average retail price of a package of 20 cigarettes was 14.6 cents. Of this sum the farmer receives 1.30 cents, the manufacturer and leaf dealer 4.0 cents, distributor 3.2 cents, and Federal and State governments for taxes 6.1 cents.

By 1950 the average retail price of a package of 20 cigarettes was 20.1 cents. Of this sum the farmer received 2.9 cents, the manufacturer and leaf dealer 4.0 cents, the distributor 3.9 cents, and Federal and State governments for taxes 9.3 cents.

In 1950 the manufacturer, leaf dealer, and distributor reecived 40 percent of the retail price of cigarettes, Federal and State governments received 46 percent of the retail price of cigarettes and the farmer-producer received only 14 percent.

Any further increase in the excise taxes on cigarettes by Federal or State governments may be expected to result in decreases in consumption with bad effects to our economy.

The price mechanism is exceedingly delicate. With controls on acreage in the form of acreage allotments and controls on marketing in the form of marketing quotas both the tobacco growers' hands are effectively tied. It hardly seems fair then, with the producers' hands tied by controls, that Federal and State governments should take turns slapping his face with increased taxes on the manufactured product. It is accepted as sound economics that price increases not accompanied by corresponding income increases result in consumption decreases. Many of the cigarette smokers are white-collar workers (not members of any labor union), whose incomes have not been increased in the last year in proportion to their increases in living costs. The only alternative for this group is to go into debt or decrease their tobacco consumption. Since the Federal policy for controlling inflation has been to tighten credit controls their only recourse is to smoke fewer cigarettes or switch to consumption of some cheaper alternative such as smoking tobacco.

Tobacco somehow in the past has become considered as a luxury item. ECA however, considers it a necessity as an incentive good and has shipped hundreds of millions of dollars worth to European, Asiatic, and other countries under its rehabilitation program. In most foreign lands it is a better trading item than food or money itself, therefore is considered a necessity. Frankly, the time is at hand to approach this matter realistically with a full and open discussion on the matter of justification for the taxation of tobacco.

It is a product that lends itself to taxation because of ease of collection. But surely ease of collection of taxes is no justification of itself for taxation. Taxation should be based on income or ability to pay to be fair. The taxes collected from many users of cigarettes are collected from people who are in the lowest-income classes. It would appear that an open airing of the whole matter of tobacco taxes, their justification, the effect on consumption and on tobacco producers and similar considerations is in order. We owe such action to ourselves in the name of progress.

Central Intelligence Agency Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ex-Head Asserts CIA Reports Should Have Gone to MacArthur," from the Washington Star of today. The article deals with a statement by Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, head of the CIA from June 1946 to October 1, 1950, regarding reports by the Central Intelligence Agency on conditions in Korea.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-HEAD ASSERTS CIA REPORTS SHOULD HAVE GONE TO MACARTHUR

HONOLULU, May 10.—The man who once headed the Central Intelligence Agency said yesterday he believed it was Washington's responsibility to supply General MacArthur any available evidence on Chinese Red mobilization in Manchuria.

CIA operations have figured in the hearings now in progress in Washington over the removal of General MacArthur from his commands.

General MacArthur has said Washington failed to report to him on the shift of the Chinese Third and Fourth Field Armies from China into Manchuria.

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, head of CIA from June, 1946 to October 1, 1950, said in an interview that CIA was responsible for reporting such strategic intelligence as Chinese troop movements to Manchuria.

NORMAL PROCEDURE

Normal procedure, he said, was for CIA to report to the President, the National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It would be normal for the Joint Chiefs to advise General MacArthur, he added.

Admiral Hillenkoetter said he did not remember prior to October 1 any reports of Chinese troop shifts into Manchuria. And he added he knew nothing of CIA operations since Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the present CIA chief, replaced him.

The Chinese Reds intervened in Korea in late October.

Admiral Hillenkoetter said CIA had cordial and effective relations with General MacArthur's Far East command up to the time he left the intelligence post.

CAN'T PREDICT INTENTIONS

President Truman told a news conference last week that General MacArthur had denied CIA operations in Tokyo until persuaded by General Smith. General MacArthur, in New York, called that "tommyrot."

Admiral Hillenkoetter said CIA could not be called on to report more than the location and estimate of the capabilities of any Chinese troops in Manchuria.

"To predict the intentions of the enemy, real or potential, you would need a crystal ball," he added.

Free Trade Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of May 9, 1951:

TARIFF TRADE—UNITED STATES WILL SLASH DUTY 25 TO 50 PERCENT ON TENTH OF IMPORTS NOW TAXED—IN RETURN, 15 NATIONS WILL MAKE MINOR CUTS ON TWENTIETH OF UNITED STATES EXPORTS—TV, TULIPS, AND TAXIMETERS

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam has agreed on a new "horse trade."

The United States will cut tariffs on a sizable chunk of our imports from all countries—heavily.

In return, nine countries will reduce their tariffs on United States goods—modestly. Six others agreed to minor concessions.

It figures out this way:

The United States will cut tariffs from 25 to 50 percent on a tenth of all the goods on which we now charge import duties.

In return, the United States will get tariff cuts from the 15 foreign countries on less than one-twentieth of United States exports. Most of these cuts will be trivial.

THIRTY-COUNTRY CONFAB

That in a nutshell is the result of the 30-country tariff conference just ended at Torquay, England, after 8 months of discussions.

One conference paradox: The United States tariff talks with Britain broke down—because the British were unwilling to make any important concessions to us. Yet Britain will be one of the big gainers from United States tariff cuts.

"That's because the cuts we give to one country, we automatically give to every country, even to those countries that won't cooperate," says one official.

Another conference paradox: 16 countries at Torquay announced they were raising some of their tariffs. France, for example, said she was raising duties on 38 types of goods.

Theoretically, these 16 countries made new tariff cuts to make up for the ones they raised. Mostly, though, the concessions they renounced were greater than the new cuts they offered in exchange.

United States tariff cuts will have a mixed effect here.

Consumers will get many goods cheaper, if price hikes don't wipe out the effects of lowered duties. United States producers face hotter foreign competition on the American market.

Cuts by the United States cover thousands of goods across the board. They will range from mop cloths and clothing through raisins and figs to lead, aluminum, machinery, and tobacco. Even the opium duty was cut in half.

DELIGHT FOR TOPERS

Party goers should be delighted. Champagnes will get in a little cheaper. So will French and Italian wines. Also, French laces and perfumes. Canadian whiskeys are included, too—but not Scotch.

If you're a teetotaler, you get in on this too—with a cut on grape-juice duties.

The levy on Canadian caviar was cut in half; on imported orchids also. The foreign-made gold or platium jewelry you might want for a party dress—if you can afford it—will be taxed a little less as it comes in. Metal users from war manufacturers to auto and refrigerator makers will get a little relief.

Duties on key metals and minerals like lead, bismuth, chrome, zirconium, vanadium, and barium will be cut squarely in half. So will tariffs on boron, strontium, thorium, and silicon. Tariffs on titanium, pig iron, ferromanganese, zinc, and aluminum will be cut from 20 percent to 30 percent.

If you're a smoker, these new tariffs may help you, too. The duties on cigars and cheroots will be sliced in half. Unstemmed cigarette leaf tobacco duties will be reduced a quarter.

PISTOLS AND HORSERADISH

If you're more interested in what your wife puts on the table, there are reductions in duties on cheeses, frozen blackberries, grapes, bananas, horseradish, and candied apricots and peaches.

If you're a gardener and like Holland tulips, or narcissuses, tariffs on imported bulbs will be reduced a little.

Then there are cuts on cocoa and chocolate, on Italian matches, on tanning extract, French garters, drawing ink, Korean iodine, lampblack, white lead, mica, German razors, telescopes, swords, and sewing machines—to say nothing of Swedish taximeters, German pistols and revolvers, Turkish licorice. Brazilian plywood, Canadian cream, French post cards, Norwegian fish cakes and acetic acids. Musical instruments and radios and television are included, too, along with a host of other goods, important and trivial.

Many American businessmen are going to be worried by these tariff cuts. There are 50-percent lower duties on many types of clocks and clock movements and parts, for example.

American canners won't be happy about the 40-percent cut which United States diplomats promised on imported canned salmon.

EARTHENWARE AND FILBERTS

American makers may be miffed by the lowered rates in store for Italian earthenware.

American nut growers—who have been complaining about tariffs being too low—won't be happy that United States negotiators promised not to raise duties on imported filberts. American fig, grape, and raisin growers will be bothered about the new low rates on these imported fruits.

American manufacturers are going to be bothered by growing competition from West German exporters. A key to what's coming shows up in the United States tariff cuts won by German negotiators.

The Germans argued for and won lowered United States duties on china, chinaware, drawing instruments, clocks, and on wool yarns and a wide variety of toys. Harmonica tariffs were slashed in half; camera duties a quarter. Duties on some coal-tar chemicals were cut in half. A wide range of German machinery will also get in cheaper.

United States exporters will reap some benefits from these tariff cuts.

If you are an American fruit exporter you'll get a number of breaks. Several countries cut tariffs on typewriters and other office machinery and equipment. Some concessions were made to United States exports of tires, passenger cars, and trucks.

Canada cut tariffs on many types of machinery, and on many iron and steel products. Brazil reduced levies on electric motors and dynamos. Peru cut duties on some electrical equipment. Korea cut tariffs on wheat flour, Norway on some kinds of tractors and grinding, boring, and drilling machinery.

State Department officials say the Americans who export to Canada and Western Germany will be the biggest beneficiaries. Canada seemingly made the biggest concessions of any country on the list—except for the United States, of course.

Officials here say it's not certain when these new tariff rates will take effect. Some will start in June. Others will be put into effect gradually between June and November this year as the conference countries ratify the Torquay agreements. Each of the 147 separate Torquay agreements will go into effect 1 month after the countries concerned ratify.

Letter of Jack Allen, of Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, although I have never had the privilege of visiting the great State of California I have enjoyed making the acquaintance of many California Members in the House of Representatives. I have what I believe to be a rather startling story of interest to all the Members of the House.

I own a small heating company in Akron, Ohio, and am listed in Dun & Bradstreet as its president. I am known to be a successful small-business man and have never been known to be a sucker for fast operators. Nor am I a race-track fan in any sense of the word.

The letter printed below was received in my office in Akron and as stated the writer called collect on the morning of April 26. My efficient secretary there answered the phone and informed Jack Allen that although I was the president of William H. Ayres, Inc., he would have to call me in Washington as I was now a Member of Congress. Mr. Allen replied: "What, he's a Congressman!" and hung up. No doubt he had heard of the Kefauver committee.

I think the Members of the House will be interested in this letter:

ALLEN LEWIS CO. ENTERPRISES,
Los Angeles, April 17, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Akron, Ohio.

DEAR MR. AYRES: On Thursday, April 26, 1951, at Jamaica, Long Island, racetrack in New York, there will be a horse entered which, I have every reason to believe, will be of great interest to you. It is my sincere belief that this horse will win at good odds.

Relative to the above-mentioned transaction, I will take the liberty of calling you on that date collect. If you are interested, kindly accept my call.

Should you desire any further information, feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Looking forward to our conversation.

Yours truly,

JACK ALLEN.

MacArthur Controversy and American Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Lippmann has, in the following article, posed some questions which are certainly worthy of our attention:

THE QUESTION OF AMERICAN DESTINY
(By Walter Lippmann)

This must surely be the first time in all human experience that a people has conducted a council of war in the presence of its actual and possible enemies.

The hearings, to be sure, are not open to television and the transcript of the testimony is being subjected to a certain amount of censorship. But what is being censored must be of little interest, let us say to Moscow and to Peiping, as compared with what is being brought out.

The censor is deleting certain military facts and estimates which, assuming that they are not known, would enable our adversaries to measure more accurately the efficiency of our intelligence services and of their own. The censor is not deleting the conflicting war plans and conflicting political ideals over which this country, and even its professional military leaders, are so bitterly divided. Whatever the outcome of this public council of war—this farthest north in superpublicity, this unique case of open strategy openly arrived at—Moscow and Peiping will know it as soon as we do.

They know what General MacArthur and the Republicans would do if they could get the better of President Truman and the Democrats. They have weeks, perhaps months, to work out their reply in case the MacArthur policy wins out. They know also, more or less accurately, what President Truman intends not to do, if he can rebut the MacArthur party. They can choose to make it hard or easy for the Truman policy; they can play the war to get whatever result they think is desirable, to entangle us more or to entangle us less, knowing at all times as much about our intentions as we know ourselves.

The controversy itself covers a lot of ground and turns on a series of great issues. Some of them are deep and far-reaching. When the general was speaking it seemed at times that there was at issue the very conception of the American destiny. Is the American destiny now an imperial destiny? Or is it the American destiny to be the protector and the promoter of the Atlantic community and of the western civilization which is at home within it?

At the bottom of the whole controversy, which did not begin this year, or last year, but has smoldered on since long before the World War, there is a profound conflict of view about what is the American destiny.

This conflict is older than MacArthur and Marshall and Truman, not to speak of TAFT and KNOWLAND and WHERRY. It goes back at least as far as the Spanish-American War and the conquest of the Philippines. It is not going to be settled soon, and we shall be arguing it for a long time to come.

As we argue it we should realize that it is a great, indeed a noble, controversy. It turns upon whether, like all our predecessors in the days when they rose to power, we must become, and wish to become, the masters of an empire which we rule for our glory and for its benefit—or whether we wish to be the first servants of a community of free nations, all of them the big and the small alike, the heirs with us and the custodians with us of the western civilization which originated in the Mediterranean and has expanded about the Atlantic Ocean.

But though this controversy—the truly great and enduring American debate—cannot be settled and concluded in these hearings, or in the next election, it is, I believe, the necessary context for understanding General MacArthur's views and the opposition to them.

The incalculable risks—incalculable by his own admission—which General MacArthur wishes to accept by making war on China are simply incomprehensible if nothing more is at stake than to bring about a cease-fire in Korea and the withdrawal from Korea of the Chinese—and presumably also the American—armies. The risks that General MacArthur wishes to take become comprehensible only in the context of the general's vision—his vision of the Pacific Ocean as an American lake and of Japan as lying within the sphere of American power and of China, with Chiang restored, brought within the American sphere of influence.

The general's proposal to risk a third world war in order to end war in Korea sounds, when one first hears it, like a case of wishing to burn down the barn to roast the pig. The risks are fantastically greater than any advantage that could be got out of taking them.

But his proposals take on a different look if we recognize that his objective is American paramountcy in the Far East—in Japan, Korea, and China. That would be, that has often been, the kind of objective worth a world war, which empire builders have worked for. But there will be many of us, most of us I truly believe, who think the prospect of such an empire a dreary one, likely to destroy not only American freedom, as we have known it, but also the desire to use power generously, which is so very American.

United States Occupation Policy in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in February General Eisenhower addressed a joint meeting of Members of Congress and established his now famous position on Germany, stating:

I personally think that there has to be a political platform achieved, an understanding that will contemplate an eventual and an earned equality on the part of that nation before we should start to talk about including units of Germans in any kind of army.

Shortly thereafter, I compared the occupation policy in Germany under High Commissioner McCloy with this position in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives raising the subjects of the decartelization and denazification programs and the Nazi war criminals, and again suggested an investigation of our occupation policy in Western Germany as part of our foreign policy. In response to this expression of views I have now received a detailed letter from High Commissioner McCloy, which should be of great interest to all who are concerned about our occupation policy there. The seriousness of the situation is underscored and the dangers evidenced by the success of ultra-Nationalist and neo-Nazi parties in recent elections in lower Saxony and Austria. A firm and knowledgeable occupation policy in Western Germany was never more necessary than now. High Commissioner McCloy has given me his permission to release these parts of his letter and I append them hereto:

UNITED STATES HIGH
COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,
APO 757-A, Frankfurt, April 18, 1951.

The Honorable J. K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of February 8, 1951. Although I have replied to a later letter from you, which reply in part covers some of the material in this letter, I have thought it wise to go over the field covered in your earlier letter in some detail. I am sorry of the delay in answering, but these letters take time to prepare and the pressures have been particularly heavy in the past few months.

On the matter of a congressional investigation, I have already given my views. I still believe that such an investigation would not be in the American interest in the present situation.

Most of the specific points raised in your resolution will be fully reported on at the appropriation hearings in Congress in the next few weeks. They are all fair and important questions, but I think they can be satisfactorily answered either at that time or found in the carefully prepared reports which this office makes quarterly in Germany. As I have said before, it is of the greatest importance in Germany and Europe today that the United States avoid giving the impression of disagreement and lack of clarity about its foreign policy—and this I

believe would be the inevitable effect of the investigation you propose. However, should it be decided to hold such an investigation, this office will naturally do everything to cooperate with you.

Before I go into details of your letter and the speech which you enclose, I should like to make a few general observations regarding the problem of Germany. I have now been fairly directly concerned with United States policy in this country since 1941 when I became Assistant Secretary of War. I think I have gained some understanding of the problems we have to contend with, and I have had some share in the development of the policy to meet those problems. Though in one or another respect there have been changes in policy, there has been no change regarding our over-all objective regarding the extirpation of nazism and the fostering of democracy in Germany. It has been very clearly realized that stamping out nazism is not only a matter of defeating it in a war—it means changing the social and cultural conditions out of which it developed, and creating conditions which will lead to democratic developments.

This I take to be our major objective still. Any policy which forgot what our stake in a democratic Germany is, or which assumed that our democratic objective could be sacrificed to other more expedient aims, would be criminally negligent and dangerous.

This brings me to your letter, in which you place great emphasis on General Eisenhower's report on Germany. You apparently believe that the policy as stated by General Eisenhower is different from the policy of HICOG in Germany. On this, as I indicated in my earlier letter, I am unable to agree with you. The policy of the United States in Germany, as I have understood and carried it out, has from the days of General Clay had as one of its aims what General Eisenhower admirably summed up in the words "eventual and earned equality." The London Conference of 1948, that at New York, and then at Brussels, have all dealt with a Germany progressively regaining her place in the family of nations. The policy expressed by the Foreign Ministers at all these meetings has each time made clear that the progress which Germany makes toward equality depends upon the German people themselves.

The present discussions concerning German participation in western defense are wholly consistent with this policy. It is still our objective to prevent a militaristic Germany from coming into being. It is still a matter of grave concern to us that Germany be a peaceful and democratic nation. We have no need to sacrifice these objectives by proposing that Germany contribute to the defense of the west.

It is true that in some quarters, both American and German, there has arisen a feeling that the present situation is such that the United States is now inclined to "buy" or bid for German participation in European defense at the cost of our democratic objectives. I have taken every occasion to combat this notion in public statements and in practice. By this time, it is not a widespread notion any longer in Germany, though it still seems to be held in the United States, since even the Landsberg decisions were treated in this light by a section of the American press.

I should like to say a few words on this subject too, because in your press release of February 2 you refer to the decisions as though they were related to the political situation in Germany, and the issue of German participation in particular.

The fact is that I appointed the Clemency Board in March 1950, long before there was any thought of German participation. I appointed the Board because I considered it a fundamental principle of American justice that persons accused shall have a right of appeal. I call your attention to the fact that unlike criminal cases in the United States or England, there was no provision for these cases to have further court review for possible errors of law or fact after they had been passed on by the court of first instance.

The Board's report and my own examination of the cases were made entirely in the context of "justice American style," as you put it, and without regard to political pressures of any kind. I am sending you a copy of a pamphlet which we have prepared on the Landsberg decisions. I hope you will look through it. I recommend especially to your attention the introduction to the Clemency Board's report which begins on page 13. I also call your attention to the fact that the Board submitted its report in August 1950, a month before the matter German participation was first raised at the New York Conference of Foreign Ministers.

As for the particular case of Alfried Krupp, I find it difficult to understand the reaction on any other basis than the effect of a notorious name. After a detailed study of this case, I was convinced that Alfried Krupp deserved clemency. Certainly there was reasonable doubt that he was responsible for the policies of the Krupp Co., in which he occupied a rather junior position. I also found it very doubtful that he had any responsibility for the use of slave labor in the Krupp plant. It is true that the name of Krupp stands as a symbol of evil, of the German armaments industry. I was not concerned with a symbol. Instead, I had to decide on the extent of the guilt of a specific individual, Alfried Krupp. Others whose responsibility was greater than his had been given lighter sentences (and had been released) for the same crimes for which he was convicted. Moreover, it was this man's father, not the defendant, who helped finance Hitler and who was the directing force of the Krupp works. I am inclined to think that the son took his place in the dock largely because his father was on his death bed at the time. Certainly he would not have occupied as prominent a place if his father had likewise been tried.

Finally, I should like to say that by reason of the Landsberg decisions, I believe that the true nature of the Nazi crimes, their depth and extent and their motivation, are better known and understood today in Germany than they have ever been. We have sent out 780,000 copies of this pamphlet in Germany. More people have read and thought about the Nazi crimes than ever was the case during the trials, and the latter can no longer be dismissed as merely the law of the victor over the vanquished.

Germany is progressing. It has yet to meet the great tests of its final status. They may not come for 10 or 15 years. The new Government has been in existence for little more than 1 year. Nazis do not control the Government. It is controlled by resistance people, former Weimar people, large representations of labor, Socialists, and Conservatives, but they are far from Nazis and just as fine people as the Liberals. There are on the outer fringes some Communists and some old Nazis. That is the present order of the German Government.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. McCLOY.

School Safety Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this week end the Nation's Capital will be the scene of an invasion by 23,000 of America's finest young citizens.

The young people of whom I speak are members of school safety patrol units throughout the United States.

These boys and girls are carrying out in magnificent fashion a very vital task—the task of guarding the safety of their schoolmates en route to and from school.

They receive no pay. They are at their posts early in the morning and stay until the last each evening. Their noon hours are seldom their own, and they remain on duty even in the most inclement weather.

Therein lies the foundation of good citizenship. Devotion to service to their fellow students without thought of compensation brands these boys and girls as citizens from whom we can expect leadership in the years to come.

I am happy to pay tribute to all these fine young people. I am particularly pleased to do so since 112 of these attending the fifteenth national assembly here this week end are from my own Sixteenth Ohio District.

It is especially fitting that a group from Canton, Ohio, should be here for this assembly, for Mr. Harry Staley, of Canton, was one of the originators of the school safety patrol program.

Mr. Staley, a member of the Canton Automobile Club and the Canton Board of Education, became aware of the need for some type of safety program.

In 1924 he established a system which was widely adopted, and which became one of the primary bases for the School Safety Patrol system in use throughout the Nation today.

I know that Mr. Staley would be very pleased and very proud if he were able to be in this city this week end, for the school safety patrol program has developed into the fine organization which he must have envisioned.

Congress Should Extend Hospitalization, Medical Care, Compensation, and Other Benefits to Korean Veterans on Same Basis as Has Been Provided for World War II Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the House will see fit to take immediate action upon this resolution, House Joint Resolution 257, which the leadership is today proposing in order to extend to our new veterans—the veterans of the Korean conflict—the rights and benefits allowed to veterans of World War II. This is long overdue and certainly to delay further would only multiply the instances of inconvenience and injustice which have inevitably developed.

This resolution would grant to veterans of the Korean war the same rights

and benefits as have heretofore been provided under the law to the veterans of World War II—including hospitalization, medical care and other benefits and entitlements including compensation and pensions, but not including veterans education and training benefits. This latter veterans benefit program is yet to be enacted.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore introduced in this Congress bills to provide Korean veterans with hospitalization and medical care and also compensation and pensions—benefits similar to those provisions of law affecting World War II veterans. I had hoped that action might have been obtained in this regard long before now. Such action has been incumbent upon us for a long period of time and I am most pleased that the sentiment has developed for taking such action and passing this meritorious legislation for the protection of our new veterans. Certainly no debate or long discussion is needed or necessary—this is a case of simple justice to our men fighting in Korea, our new veterans and our future veterans. I commend the leadership of the House in proposing action in this particular. So let us act now.

Should Give Priority to Perjury Prosecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the May 6 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger:

SHOULD GIVE PRIORITY TO PERJURY PROSECUTIONS

Mississippians, with a decent concern and consideration for their State's good name and that of the Democratic Party in Mississippi, welcome the Washington announcement that the records compiled by the Senate committee which investigated charges of sales of Federal jobs in the State are to be turned over to the Justice Department for possible criminal prosecutions of persons involved.

Many of these Mississippians may share the attitude expressed by Postmaster General Donaldson as a witness in Washington when he said: "If I were sitting as judge, I would be inclined to quit those who were forced to buy the jobs and prosecute to the limit those who forced them to make the contributions."

Much of the testimony made it very clear, however, that fair and effective prosecution of any job sellers would be seriously handicapped, if not made impossible, unless preceded by perjury prosecutions to bring out the facts, to determine who lied and who told the truth, who can be believed under oath and who cannot.

Two of the three Senators who conducted the hearings in Jackson declared at their conclusion that much perjury had been committed.

"There is bound to have been some perjury committed," Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, a Democrat, declared.

"There was a lot of perjured testimony," Senator KARL MUNDT, North Dakota Republican, bluntly stated. And he added, "This will be referred to the Department of Justice."

The briefer hearings held since then in Washington have produced more sworn testimony directly contradicting some of that given here in Jackson.

For example: Postmaster General Donaldson is quoted as denouncing as pure falsehood, sworn testimony by Clarence E. Hood, given in Jackson, quoting the Postmaster General as saying that he wasn't taking the job-selling charges seriously because they were made by Mississippi Congressmen trying to regain control of patronage.

"I want to be as forceful as possible," Mr. Donaldson was quoted as saying about Hood's testimony, "but all I can say is that it is pure falsehood."

Washington testimony by Robert M. Moore, assistant to Democratic National Chairman Boyle, also denied sworn testimony by Jackson witnesses.

He denied that he has ever told leaders of the pro-Truman Mississippi Democratic group that it was all right for them to accept contributions for the national committee.

He denied that Curtis Rogers had offered to share with the national committee the proceeds of the Mississippi Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner sponsored by that group.

He denied telling Mrs. C. B. Murphy, of Winona, that she would be reimbursed for refunds to purchasers of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner tickets.

Mr. Moore, in brief, swore that he had no knowledge that contributions were being made by Mississippi job applicants.

The Washington testimony thus contradicts much of the testimony offered at the hearings in Jackson, and much of the latter testimony was so contradictory that the presiding Senators declared that perjury was obvious.

Mississippians would like to see any and all job sellers prosecuted. But just and effective prosecution requires that the truth, the whole truth, be brought out. And that cannot be done until juries in perjury trials decide who lied and who cannot be believed under oath.

Old Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

SONG REVIVED—OLD SOLDIERS' COMPOSER FOUND TO BE LYNN WOMAN

The Library of Congress has discovered that the barracks ballad resurrected to fame by Gen. Douglas MacArthur—Old Soldiers Never Die, They Just Fade Away—originated in a semisacred song composed in 1858 by one of the Singing Hutchinsons of Lynn.

According to a reference librarian in the Library of Congress music division, the ballad that General MacArthur paraphrased in his address before Congress April 19, was originally entitled "Kind Words Can Never Die." It was composed by Abigail Jemima (Abby Hutchinson) Patton.

She was a member of the famous family of troubadours who lived on High Rock. Three generations of the Singing Hutchinsons returned to High Rock after concert tours which took them from Boston's Faneuil Hall to the California gold field. Pioneers of family group singing, they performed for Lincoln in the White House and for McClellan's troops.

John Hutchinson, "the Bard of Lynn," gave the city the land on which High Rock Tower was erected.

It is not known just when the Kind Words song evolved into the Old Soldiers' version. Perhaps during the Civil War, for the Old Soldier song was a favorite with Civil War veterans.

"It is curious," said the Government librarian, "how the chorus has survived without the original verses." Except for a note or two, the chorus of Old Soldiers is the same as when Sister Abby composed Kind Words.

MacArthur—Ridgway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call attention of the House to the following very interesting article by Marquis Childs:

LEADERSHIP BY RIDGWAY
(By Marquis Childs)
HEALING THE SPLIT

The civil war in Washington has pushed the Korean war off the front page. Unfortunately this has obscured the achievement of a general who has proved that he was right by the only test that counts—success in meeting and stopping the enemy.

While he has now transferred his headquarters to Tokyo, the successes in Korea owe a lot to the leadership of Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. To understand this is only necessary to recall the situation prevailing when Ridgway took over last December 26.

The retreat from North Korea had not been halted. There was still talk of disaster. Tentative plans were approved in the Pentagon to fall back to the old Pusan beachhead in the south and then to evacuate American troops from there to Japan, with the remnants of the South Korean army going to Okinawa.

Ridgway was flown out to take over after Lt. Gen. Walton Walker was killed in a jeep accident on December 23. It was one of the darkest periods in the Korean war.

In 5 months the new commander reassembled and regrouped the United Nations forces. He put new morale and new conviction into an army that was pretty well demoralized. As a consequence, the latest Chinese Communist offensive has been held according to plan.

The enemy, in the opinion of Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet, now in command in the field, is preparing another attack. But the same confidence prevails that this time, too, the Red drive will fail. Here is an achievement of the first magnitude, and it should not be lost sight of in the midst of this snarling mess at home.

What General Ridgway has done is further obscured by the stand that General MacArthur takes in his testimony in the Senate

inquiry. MacArthur denies that his forces were dangerously split in the drive into North Korea. He goes so far as to insist that they were deployed exactly right and that he would not change his orders if he had to do it again.

He insists in the same connection that there was no rout, no disorder, as the Eighth Army fell back. This, says General MacArthur, was a planned retreat.

News stories written by combat correspondents on the scene at the time were almost directly contrary to this. Some of these correspondents have since returned to America and in their writings and speeches they repeat that the U. N. forces in Korea were divided in such a way as to invite the enemy into a vacuum in the middle. They say that the liaison between the divided forces was almost nonexistent and they reaffirm what they wrote at the time about the rout that followed the intervention of a comparatively small force of Communist Chinese.

Some correspondents go so far as to say that the initial intervention may have been by a mere reconnaissance force of four to five divisions. After these divisions discovered the true situation, the invasion in mass took place. These same correspondents say that when the orders were issued from MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo to push to the Yalu River, Chinese prisoners were already being taken and that fact reported to Tokyo.

In the light of this contradiction, I should like to make a most earnest recommendation to the Senate committee. Call before the committee under oath some of the able combat correspondents who have seen the Korean war at first hand. I am thinking of newsmen like Stan Swinton of the Associated Press, Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News, and Homer Bigart of the New York Herald Tribune. Other names will occur and it should not be difficult to compile a list of a half dozen who have seen more of the fighting than any general and who have heard at first hand more about the war than any general.

If the committee does this, it will, in my opinion, have a better chance of getting some objective facts than in any other way. The testimony of the newsmen will have nothing of self-interest in it. Most of these men covered World War II or they fought in it. They are as much military experts—for my money, much more so—than the desk generals who too often are surplusage at Army headquarters far in the rear of the fighting front.

These veteran correspondents need not be called on for their conclusions if there is any apprehension lest the prejudice most of them share against MacArthur's headquarters should enter in, although I, for one, would like to hear their conclusions. But let them be asked about what they saw and heard.

If this is an inquiry to get at the truth, here are eyewitnesses who also happen to be trained observers. The committee has a chance to give the public something besides partisanship.

Murder of a Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the attention of the membership of the House to an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times of Tuesday, May 8, entitled "Murder of a Program."

Today we are concerned with preventing the spread of communism and increasing our preparedness effort. The slums are the most fertile breeding places for communism. A man does not care about ideologies when he cannot keep a roof over himself and his family.

The preparedness effort will result in the influx of large numbers of people to the urban industrial centers. They are necessary in order to man the machines which are once again turning out the weapons of war. Unless we have the manpower we cannot make the guns, the ships, or the planes. But how can you induce a man to move to a place where he cannot find a decent dwelling for his family? I say, Mr. Speaker, that those who contend that because of the world situation we cannot afford a program of public housing distort the facts. Now of all times we must push forward with such a program.

The editorial is as follows:

MURDER OF A PROGRAM

Economy, like charity, it becomes increasingly obvious, can be used to cover a multitude of sins. It has just been used by the House to excuse an action that would practically kill off the public-housing program in this Nation.

With more than a third of the Representatives absent or not voting, the House decided no more than 5,000 public-housing units should be built in the Nation this year. That would mean, on an equitable distribution, only 104 units for each of the 48 States. Construction on such a microscopic scale would be senseless. It would be more honest simply to kill off the program and let it go at that.

St. Louis alone has plans for more than 5,000 units of public low-income housing. And the briefest of tours of St. Louis' slums will show that the plans are not overambitious. The cancerous tenements are eating away the very life of the city. They must be replaced, and with housing that the present slum dwellers can afford. Only Government aid, it has been abundantly established, can provide such housing.

It will not do to say that the Nation is in a military crisis and so cannot now afford the "luxury" of adequate housing. This is no luxury. It is at any time a necessity of sound national living. That is even more forcibly true now, when defense production must of necessity depend in large part on provision of good housing for defense workers.

President Truman already had made in his budget allowance for the pressures of military spending. Instead of recommending construction of the 350,000 public housing units that previous congressional action had authorized, he asked for only 75,000 units. So much was a sensible cut. That which the House has made was outright murder of a whole program.

Fortunately public reaction to the House maneuver has been prompt and vigorous. Mayor Darst already has taken the lead in rallying forces from other municipalities to impress on Congress the need for a good housing program. Since the third of the House that was silent on the first vote can still be induced to force reconsideration, his campaign stands a good chance of success.

Certainly it should attain that success. This Nation will be immensely the poorer if it does not.

"Air Force Pilots, Navigators, Bombardiers, Air and Ground Crews, Drilled Relentlessly in Their Jobs, Are Approaching a Readiness for Any Emergency"—Benjamin Welles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there have been times in recent months when it seemed that the survival of the free nations of the world was altogether dependent upon the readiness with which the Armed Forces of the United States could successfully repulse sudden assault. It is still conceded that the United States Air Force B–36 and the atom bomb have long been the sole deterrent against attack by communistic Russia in her lust for power.

It was because of these facts that I was particularly intrigued by an article which I found in the New York Times—carrying a London date line and written by Benjamin Welles, special correspondent of that great metropolitan daily.

The article, headed "United States Air Force in Britain Nearing State of Readiness for Emergency," discloses but a small glimpse at the global defenses being developed by the United States Air Force to take care of every foreseeable emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it was indeed heartening to read just how effectively our Air Force is on the forefront of the fighting lines throughout the world—readied as far as is possible for every emergency—not alone here at home—but abroad as well.

Pilots, navigators, bombardiers, air and ground crews, are drilled relentlessly in their jobs. In the language of Benjamin Welles:

In case of war, United States air fleets could be in action in a mere matter of hours.

Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in this House and the people in general might have a fuller appreciation of the splendid work being done by our Air Force, I include herein the article entitled "United States Air Force in Britain Nearing State of Readiness for Emergency," as reproduced in the New York Times.

That article is as follows:

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE IN BRITAIN NEARING STATE OF READINESS FOR EMERGENCY

(By Benjamin Welles)

LONDON, May 6.—An unpublicized but significant build-up in United States air strength in Europe lies behind the transformation of the United States Third Air Division here into the Third Air Force. The new designation was announced from General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower's headquarters a few days ago.

There are now more than 20,000 United States airmen, ground crewmen, engineers, and antiaircraft artillerymen stationed in

Britain as part of the Western World's defense against sudden aggression.

The promotion of Maj. Gen. Leon W. Johnson's Third Air Division to a full-fledged air command means that the air installations here are approaching a readiness for any emergency.

It is not so much the number of planes as the facilities for those planes that are being increased. Vast runways are being rebuilt to take the landing shock of B–36 or B–50 bombers, gasoline and lubricants are being stored, a radio communications network installed, spare parts stocked, and pilots, navigators, bombardiers, air and ground crews drilled relentlessly in their jobs.

In case of war, say those who know, the United States air fleets could be in action in a matter of hours. The units in Britain could fly from here, while other units could pass through. To handle such traffic, months of intensive preparation are necessary. Such preparations are well advanced.

A "gentleman's agreement" between the United States and Britain makes it possible for United States planes to train on British territory in peacetime. The United States pays for some facilities it uses, the British Government donates others. The basic accord between the two Governments is virtually unwritten.

The vanguard of United States air units came here in 1948 under command of General Johnson, holder of the Medal of Honor and veteran of the raid on the Ploesti oil field of Rumania in August 1943. General Johnson's main task here was to train bomber wings sent over in rotation by the Strategic Air Command. These wings, of forty-five bombers each, spend 90 days or more here, return home for leave, then do another training tour in the Caribbean, Labrador, or Alaska.

GENERAL OLD TO HEAD TRAINING

From now on, the bomber wings in training here will be supervised by Maj. Gen. Archie Old, head of the Seventh Air Division, which has just been set up under General Johnson's Third Air Force. General Johnson is expected to devote most of his time to overseeing completion of installations at a dozen United States air bases throughout the United Kingdom, leaving General Old free to carry out the training.

At present, United States air power in Britain consists of 1 bomb wing (45 to 50 bombers); 1 fighter wing (a similar number of F–84E Thunderjet escort fighters); 20 converted B–29 refueling planes, and a half dozen RB–45 four-jet reconnaissance bombers that will be replaced soon by British twin-jet Canberras.

For the first months of the Korean war the Far East Air Forces and the Strategic Air Force had top priority for United States Air Force planes, men, and materials. Now more men and especially base equipment are arriving here as the United States defenses in Europe grow under the North Atlantic Treaty program.

RELIEVE RAF UNITS

As United States airmen arrive in greater numbers, the Royal Air Force airmen who have been on loan in thousands for the last 3 years to maintain and service the United States bases are going back to their own units. The newly arrived United States Thirty-second Antiaircraft Artillery Group is relieving British brigades from the responsibility of protecting United States bases.

"Without British help in the past 3 years, I don't know what we would have done," a United States air officer said recently. "I know we have been helping to protect Britain by being here—but they have gone out of their way to help us, even when it meant sharing their own limited facilities."

In the coming months, it is expected, United States bomb wings in training may participate in Atlantic Pact air exercises. The Third Air Force is under Lieut. Gen. Lauris Norstad, General Eisenhower's top American air aide, who commands also the Twelfth Air Force on the Continent and will head a still undesignated air force to be set up along the north African coast.

"We don't have so many planes in Europe as the Russians," a highly informed source said recently. "But we're building facilities that will give us a terrific punch if trouble comes. It took months before ground facilities were ready for us in the last war; this time we've learned our lesson."

General MacArthur Would Rather Be Right Than Commander of Korea and Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, at long last one great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has placed devotion to his country ahead of personal considerations. When the General spoke his honest convictions he sacrificed his career as a soldier. Because he dared to disagree with the President, he was removed from his command.

The American people have been aroused by the action by the President in taking immediate reprisal against General MacArthur. They do not approve of the method which the President used even if they agree to his right to remove the General. And the administration is well aware of the temper of the people.

As usual when the administration blunders, the smoke screen is speedily set up. Once again we are warned of the horrors of atomic bombing, a danger of which every American is well aware. And once again the President takes to the air to try to sell himself as the people's champion for peace.

It is ironic to listen to the President as he warns of the results of an atomic war, and hear his words uttered apparently in all seriousness, "I do not want to be responsible for bringing that about."

But who started the Korean war? A review of the facts discloses that it was Mr. Truman who ordered American intervention in Korea, and after that order was issued called upon the United Nations to join the United States in that action. Did Mr. Truman on that occasion have any assurance that Russia would not move? Was not our initial action in Korea a calculated risk, a gamble which has already cost us more than 60,000 casualties?

Mr. Truman hopes that the American people will forget such trivial facts and will accept him as the great proponent for peace. He hopes they will forget that it was his decision that the atom bomb first be used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki thereby setting the precedent for the use of this monstrous weapon of destruction against unarmed noncombatant civilian population.

It is tragic that in this time of national crisis the administration places partisan and personal interests before national concerns. The past blunders of the administration have contributed to the serious situation which we face today, and a look at the record proves this fact.

The following editorial from a recent issue of the Los Angeles Tidings reviews the dismissal of General MacArthur and the facts behind administration policy, and I recommend it for your attention:

THE GENERAL PROTESTS SLOW SURRENDER POLICY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

It seems a pity that a great soldier must sacrifice his career if he wishes to express an opinion on public affairs contrary to that of this Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

At the Yalta conference, Admiral William D. Leahy, President Roosevelt's Chief of Staff, was struck with misgivings over the deliverance of Catholic Poland into the hands of atheist communism, and the creation of a military vacuum in Europe which the Red Army would be tempted to occupy.

Leahy protested to Roosevelt, who replied feebly that it was the best he could do. It never occurred to the admiral to carry his opposition to the American people. He waited to publish it until he had retired from service and was at liberty to write his memoirs.

AMERICA'S WORST DEFEAT

Thus there was no obstacle to that ghastly scene in which Mr. Roosevelt reported to Congress as a triumph what was actually the worst defeat in American diplomacy.

The surrender of Czechoslovakia was offered to Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., by the Nazi commander in Prague. He was forbidden to accept it by General Eisenhower, acting under instructions from Mr. Roosevelt and General Marshall.

Against military advice, the late John G. Winant, Ambassador to Great Britain and American representative on the European Advisory Committee, refused in 1943 to ask from Russia guaranties of free access to Berlin by land and water.

"We can't do that to our gallant Soviet ally," said the Ambassador, with tears in his eyes. But he drove a hard bargain with England for right of passage through its zone from Hamburg to Berlin. He, too, acted under instructions from Washington. Winant took his life after the Berlin blockade revealed the harm he had done to his own country.

General MacArthur had the patriotism to break the tradition, at immense personal cost, in order to bring home to the American public what he considered the fatal policy of the Truman administration in the Orient.

The President and his advisers, MacArthur charged, refused to admit that they had blundered into an all-out war with Red China, and insisted on stalling in Korea at the price of more than 1,000 American casualties a week.

CHARGES BOOMERANG

The Government promptly branded the general a "warmonger," and exalted Truman as a champion of peace. But who started the Korean war? Certainly not General MacArthur. By his own admission, President Truman began it, at the insistence of Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson.

The general was then accused of violating the Constitution, under which the President a civilian, is made Commander in Chief of the Nation's Armed Forces. But the Constitution also limits to Congress the power of making war.

On his sole authority, President Roosevelt waged an undeclared war against Germany,

in the Atlantic, months before Pearl Harbor. Truman followed in his footsteps by initiating a one-man war in Korea which may well prove the prelude to world war III.

What the authors of the Constitution had in mind with regard to the Presidency may be proved from the document itself. Election to the Presidency was withheld from popular vote. The legislatures of each State were to choose their ablest and most patriotic citizens as members of an electoral college which in turn would pick as President the best qualified man in all the Nation.

Not for a moment did they suspect that the party system would enable a President to make himself master of Congress and the Supreme Court; to make treaties, under the guise of agreements, without the advice and consent of the Senate; and to plunge the Nation into war without advice.

PARTISAN INTERESTS PREVAIL

It was not anticipated that Presidents would come to put partisan and personal interests invariably before national concerns; and that in time a soldier, without political bonds, might have the only voice capable of speaking for the country as a whole.

It was that accent of devotion to the national welfare, uttered in simple sincerity for the first time in years, that made General MacArthur's address to the Congress so moving and memorable.

Strange also, to American ears, as coming from a public man, was General MacArthur's stress on religion. Not for a long time had a statesman dared say that our soldiers are "in my prayers always" and that our defenses "must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Quoting from his own address following Japan's surrender, the general recalled that every secular means—including military alliances, balances of power, and leagues of nations—has failed as an alternative to war. He concluded with the truth, familiar to all Catholics, that salvation is to be found only in the regeneration of the individual.

"Basically," he had the courage to declare, "the problem is theological, and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character."

But the pious soldier has been overthrown by the very men who destroyed the missionary movement in China. Through their appeasement of communism, President Truman, General Marshall, and Secretary Acheson surrendered Christianity in the Orient to an ideology which has sworn the death of all religions.

Farmers Again Slapped Hard by Administration Hirelings and Price-Control Antics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, farmers of Iowa and the Nation are now being forced to pay the penalty for some of the procrastination and stupidity that has been all too evident in the price-control set-up.

This latest move to force farmers to take a roll-back in the price of beef cattle is one of the most discriminatory actions yet taken. What other important industry in this country has been ordered to take a roll-back?

Failure of administration hirelings to take action months ago has resulted in empty feed lots in Iowa. This, together with the present wholly unfair control action will result in less rather than more beef on the dinner tables of America. The real chaos in the beef situation is just beginning.

To illustrate, I quote from the following letter received May 5, 1951, from a farmer in the Third Iowa District, who extends permission to use his letter but asks that his name not be used:

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: We have a 280-acre farm in Tama County on which there is a mortgage.

We have fed cattle for years but last fall they were talking ceilings or roll-backs and feeder cattle were so high. We were not in a position to lose money on cattle so therefore we didn't purchase any feeders.

We have hay and corn on hand, 48 acres of pasture plus clover and we still cannot see our way clear to pay the price for feeders when we know there will be nothing in feeding them out.

We have two boys, one is married. We want to do our part, but this situation is most unfair. We have the help, feeding equipment, hay, corn, rough feed, but our yards have been empty all winter and the way this price situation is being handled the grass in the pasture will grow up and fall over this summer.

Can you help get this across to those who are responsible?

———.

Possibilities of Fuel Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two most significant articles recently appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce. The first is an item from Houston, Tex., reporting upon the concern expressed by Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, senior member of the Texas Railroad Commission and a man eminently qualified to appraise the possibilities in this field, and also by Mr. William J. Murray, Jr., junior member of that commission. It is as follows:

FEAR IRAN OIL LOSS WOULD DRAIN UNITED STATES RESERVE CAPACITY

HOUSTON, May 6.—Loss of Iranian oil by the Western World would drain off the little rapidly dwindling reserve producing capacity in the United States, according to Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, senior member of the Texas Railroad Commission.

"Our reserve producing capacity would drop to around 139,000 barrels daily if we are called on to supply Western Europe with the 300,000 barrels daily of petroleum products it now gets from Iran," he warned at a Texas Railroad Association meeting here.

William J. Murray, Jr., junior member of the commission, deplored the fact Iranian oil seemed to be slipping away and said he feared gasoline rationing might result in this country if the United States is required to supply Western Europe requirements that have been met by Iran.

Thompson said that United States reserve capacity has already dwindled to 439,000 barrels daily, "the lowest I've ever known it."

In contrast, last August after the Korean fighting was under way reserve producing capacity of the United States—most of which is in Texas—stood at an estimated 1,113,000 barrels daily, Thompson said. Accelerated output since then has brought the sharp reduction.

Reserve capacity is the amount of additional oil it is estimated could be produced from wells already drilled without causing harm to the wells, he explained.

ABADAN OUTPUT LAGGING

Thompson noted Iran's Abadan refinery, largest in the world with a capacity of 550,000 barrels daily, now is supplying only a comparatively small amount of Western Europe's needs due to recent strife over nationalization.

Eventually, Iranian oil output under nationalization probably will get back to normal, Thompson said. But, he hinted, it would be easily possible Russia might wrest part of the country's petroleum supply through trade agreements without starting a world war.

Thompson said this country would have to continue its feverish search for oil to prevent shortages in the future.

The second is a dispatch from Dallas, Tex., reporting on a recent speech made by the Honorable Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for Defense. He, too, is in an excellent position to appraise the complete situation with reference to natural gas and his warning is timely, even though it is an unhappy one. Certainly the responsibile committees in Congress should consider carefully both these dispaches and leave nothing undone which might contribute to the creation of a disastrous condition in this country. The second dispatch is as follows:

PAD SEES EXTREMELY SHORT NATURAL GAS SUPPLY LOOMING

DALLAS, May 8.—A high Government official warned today that the country faces the "unfortunate prospect" that natural gas "is likely to be in extremely short supply next winter and in the next few years.

"It may be expected that shortages will occur in a number of important industrial centers and in such a way as may adversely affect defense production," Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for Defense, told the natural gas division meeting of the American Gas Association. His speech was delivered by William S. Tarver, PAD assistant general counsel.

PAD, which has authority over natural gas, will have to take steps to assure that the best possible use is made at all times of available gas supply, he said.

PIPE SUPPLY LESS THAN HALF

Brown told the group that the total supply of line pipe available for the months immediately ahead is likely to equal less than two-thirds of the planned usage by gas and oil companies.

"After deducting certain 'must' uses of small-diameter line pipe," he declared, "it appears impossible that the supply of large-diameter pipe for gas and oil transmission lines will add up to more than half of the amount needed before winter to finish pipe lines already under construction."

"We can only hope," he continued, "that increased steel production, further cutbacks in less essential uses, and better definition of

needs through the application of a controlled materials plan, will improve the situation later." (J. E. Goble, president of the National Tube Co., told the meeting yesterday that steel allocations for natural gas transmission lines this year and in 1952 would exceed last year's 2,425,000 tons.)

Brown declared that the availability of materials to produce, process, transport and distribute gas and oil is "small indeed" in relation to the need—"in spite of a most vigorous attempt on the part of experienced gas and oil men in PAD to convince the Governmental authorities holding the materials purse strings of the reality of the demand."

Commodity Credit Corporation Administration Expense Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, since the section of the agriculture appropriation bill containing the Commodity Credit Corporation administrative expense limitation has not been reached, I want to submit for the consideration of my colleagues certain basic and fundamental facts with reference to this item.

In the RECORD of May 9, at pages 5139 and 5140, I submitted data I had been able to assemble at that time from the committee hearings and report and from the monthly reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly that for the month ending March 31, 1951, which was made public on Monday.

I am completely convinced that the amount recommended by the committee, $15,000,000, can and should be reduced substantially without any actual possibility of injury to the necessary operations of this agency.

As I said on Wednesday, the committee is to be commended for having reduced the amount requested from $20,200,000 to $15,000,000, and it is on entirely sound ground when it reported that "this reduction is believed justified in view of the current outlook for agriculture and the probable changes from surpluses to shortages in many of the commodities normally handled by the Corporation."

This positive fact, that the Corporation will not be called upon to incur in the coming fiscal year anything remotely resembling the costs resulting from the purchase, storage, handling, and sale of many of the commodities it has dealt with during the current fiscal year, is proven beyond any possible question by two kinds of evidence.

First, the committee members and, in particular, the able chairman of the subcommittee, brought this out forcibly in their questioning of this Agency's witnesses. I want to quote portions of this evidence from seven parts of the hearings. They are as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Trigg, last year I asked about the employees who do not have any work to do. We were told that you attempt to keep all the folks busy and find something for them to do. Now that we have reached a problem in manpower, why not let some of them go instead of trying to find some made work for them. You are asking here for the same number of employees, the same amount of money to operate the CCC that you had last year when it is evident there is going to be a decrease in the operations carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation. How can we justify a request of that kind to the Congress? (p. 117).

Let me repeat for emphasis the words of our colleague, "when it is evident there is going to be a decrease in the operations carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us just get down to brass tacks. I think you will admit, under the present outlook, that you will not have one-half the volume of commodities for the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you have had this year, will you not?

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot see where the CCC will be called upon to handle a volume this year anything like it had last year, and yet your estimate for personnel and for administrative funds for next year is the same as for this year. I think you ought to reconsider that.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Whether you can or cannot agree is not the point. I am asking you whether you think the estimate is one that we can justify before the Congress. If it happens to be out of line just a little bit, you can come back and ask for additional funds (p. 118).

This latter suggestion is entirely sound and, as I see it, does not run counter to the provisions of the Antideficiency Appropriation Act. In any event, it is a practice which has certainly been followed, and only recently by this very agency.

I call your attention to the estimate by the chairman of the subcommittee that the volume of commodities would be reduced by at least one-half. This has a definite bearing upon the amendment which I intend to offer when this section of the bill is reached.

Mr. WHITTEN. But, as I was pointing out, you will not be handling as big a volume of commodities for one thing.

Mr. TRIGG. Of course, we will not. * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. We should set these figures of administrative expensse knowing today that there is every probability that you will handle less volume. If the situation gets out of hand later, you could then come back and ask for more employees for the CCC (p. 119).

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. Again, I am not suggesting a major reduction in expenses. I am just discussing the difference between $17,000,000 and $20,000,000 or $15,000,000 for that purpose. I think your figures can stand a lot of study for the next fiscal year (p. 119).

Mr. HORAN. I just want to point out that we have revised our thinking, too, up here in Congress, and the Korean war and the defense effort has caused that. The average cost has gone up, and I think that you as taxpayers are looking to us to do what we can to hold down costs wherever we can, to see that any of these items are justified in reality, and I am disturbed about the size and the shape of this particular item. I do not want to do anything to hurt the Commodity Credit Corporation. I realize what it means, but along with the chairman and the rest of this subcommittee, we need your cooperation on this. We want to do what we are supposed to do, but frankly I am still at a loss as to why this item should be increased (p. 132).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. HORAN, I think you have proven our case. The testimony up to this point is that last May and June the Commodity Credit Corporation made a survey and arrived at how much manpower it would take to handle a given volume on a per unit basis. Then they multiplied that by the volume, and they came up with this $20,200,000, which includes the $3,850,000 they are asking for now. They cannot sustain that because they will not have that volume.

Mr. BEACH. It appears that way.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just said it was that. You said last May and June you worked up the unit cost, coming up with $20,000,000. Now, you come up with the same number of dollars, so you are bound to have used the same volume. You may have some difference from one program to another but you are using approximately the same volume in total. You cannot justify it.

* * * * *

Mr. WHITTEN. If you handle much less in commodities you will not have as much work to do as in handling a big volume of the commodities. You have arrived at your total demand for funds by multiplying the unit cost times the volume (pp. 132–133).

May I call attention to the undeniable truth of the statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, that this budget estimate was completely unrealistic, and that it could not be justified. I submit that that in itself properly raises in the minds of those of us who are not members of the Appropriations Committee substantial doubt as to whether the Agency furnished the subcommittee with any kind of yardstick or formula upon which a definite recommendation could be made and defended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities—you cannot have anything like the volume of work through the Commodity Credit Corporation next year that you had this year (p. 534).

The second class of evidence is from the records of the agency itself.

In the data I inserted in the RECORD for May 9 at page 5139 I pointed out that between June 30, 1950, and March 31, 1951, this agency's holdings in butter, cheese, dried milk, and dried eggs had dropped from 677,401,610 pounds to 171,701,878 pounds. I also submitted figures for 16 other commodities showing very heavy decreases in inventories, which is true of the trend of all such holdings. It bears out clearly the truth of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee when he brought out the inherent weakness in the justifications presented by this agency.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the record of the administration expense limitations for this agency between 1938 and 1949, inclusive. In terms of millions of dollars, it is as follows:

1938	0.5
1939	.7
1940	2.0
1941	2.3
1942	3.5
1943	4.4
1944	5.4
1945	7.2
1946	8.9
1947	8.8
1949	8.1
1950	15.4
1951	20.2
Estimated, 1952	20.2

I call attention to the 1949 item of $8,100,000. In terms of the postwar period, and particularly in terms of the excessively large 1948 crops, it might be fairly argued that such a figure could well be used as a measuring rod as against the request made by this agency for the next fiscal year. In any event, surely somewhere between that figure and the $15,000,000 contained in the bill is the clear area within which this House should reach its determination.

The amendment which I intend to propose will be submitted on the basis of these facts and any others that I may be able to develop between now and the time when this section of the bill is reached.

Migratory Farm Labor—H. R. 3283, the Poage Bill, Compared With the Recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3283 is an amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1949, adding Title V—Agricultural workers. Although the President's Commission on Migratory Labor had been holding hearings and investigations for some 6 or 7 months previously and its report was completed early this year, our committee has apparently ignored the work of this Commission and the recommendations it has made. Where it deals with the same matters, this bill is contrary to the recommendations of the Commission.

RECRUITMENT OF MEXICAN WORKERS

Section 501 provides for the recruiting of agricultural workers from Mexico pursuant to arrangements made between the United States and Mexico; for the establishment and operation of reception centers near places of actual entry of such workers into the United States; the provision of transportation for such workers from recruitment centers outside the United States to reception centers, and transportation from such reception centers to recruitment centers at the termination of employment. It further provides for subsistence, emergency medical care and limited burial expenses as may become necessary during such transportation or while such workers are at reception centers. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to assist the free and voluntary negotiation of contracts between such workers and employers and to guarantee the performance by employers of the provisions of such contracts.

Section 502 provides that no workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States to indemnify the United States against loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts, and to reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred for transportation and subsistence.

Section 503 provides that no workers recruited under this title shall be available for any employment in any area unless the regional director of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor in such area has determined and certified that sufficient domestic workers who are qualified for such work are not available at the time and place when needed and that the employment of such Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

The foregoing interrelated provisions are sharply in contrast with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor. The report of the President's Commission places the greatest emphasis on the use of migratory American farm labor. The report says that—

> First reliance [should] be placed on using our domestic labor force more effectively.

They then recommend that no special measures be adopted to increase the number of alien contract laborers above the number admitted in 1950. They recognize that there might be some need for additional agricultural labor than can be recruited within the borders of the United States and recommend that preference be given to citizens of the offshore areas of the United States such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Their fourth recommendation under this heading is that future efforts be directed toward supplying agricultural labor needs with American workers and eliminating dependence on foreign labor.

DISCRIMINATES AGAINST AMERICAN WORKERS

The Poage bill provides for the payment of transportation costs and maintenance during travel of foreign workers from recruitment to reception centers; but there is no such provision for domestic workers. It is left unclear in the bill whether the employer will pay the cost of transportation from the reception center to the place of employment or whether such cost can be deducted from wages; but it is expected that the employer will pay the cost. American migratory workers are not given equal treatment with imported Mexican workers. They do not receive travel expenses and subsistence and medical care of any kind. This prejudices the opportunity to use domestic labor more effectively. The Department of Labor testified that the provision of transportation for American workers would increase the mobility of the farm labor supply and provide more American workers for farm employment.

H. R. 3283 is essentially a bill dealing with the import of Mexican farm labor with some guaranty of fair treatment backed up by the United States. It omits consideration of the problems of mobilization and full utilization of domestic agricultural labor, while the recruitment of American citizens of the offshore areas of the United States is also disregarded. Giving to the regional director of the Bureau of Employment Security the specific authority to certify that domestic workers are not available is not the way to utilize the full manpower resources of the United States because the regional director in an independent status is in no position to determine the availability of workers outside his region, because there should be interregional clearance of available workers, and also because even the most upright men located in particular localities are greatly influenced by the surrounding pressures. The Mexican Government has already stated that it will not deal with numerous separate State authorities. Added to this is the drawback that the low wages paid Mexican imports and wetbacks decreases the attractiveness of these jobs to American workers in many localities.

Regarding the actual recruitment of alien contract labor in American agriculture, the President's Commission recommended that no employer, employer's representative, or association of employers or labor contractor should be permitted to contract directly with foreign workers for employment in the United States, although they may participate in the selection of qualified workers when all other requirements of legal importation are fulfilled. The Commission was so much impressed with the abuses of foreign-labor recruiting and contracting that it recommended that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be the principal contracting agency and that private employers should secure their foreign workers exclusively from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. They specified that, after certifying the need for foreign workers, the United States Employment Service should have no administrative responsibilities in connection with any foreign labor program. The Immigration and Naturalization Service would deliver the imported workers to the farm employers who have submitted the necessary applications and bonds and who have signed individual work agreements. They recommended that in its general supervision of employment of foreign workers the Immigration and Naturalization Service should be authorized to terminate any contract of employment and remove the workers or to refuse to supply any foreign workers to any employer when there has been repeated or willful violation of previous agreements, or when there is reasonable doubt that the terms of the current agreement are being observed.

WAGES

The Poage bill provides for the guaranty by the United States of the amounts owed by employers under the individual contracts for wages and transportation; but it makes no general provision for the amount of wages which must be paid for work performed. The agreement with the Mexican Government is supposed to provide for the payment of wages prevailing in the community for

work of a similar nature paid American workers. There is, however, no machinery provided under this bill for determining prevailing wages or to make certain that they will not reflect the miserable wages being paid wetbacks, and, as a result of the individual bargaining between large-farm operators and unlettered Mexican laborers, any wage agreed upon becomes the prevailing wage.

The President's Commission was keenly aware of these abuses and it recomended that Congress enact minimum-wage legislation to include farm laborers, including migratory laborers, that State legislatures give serious consideration to the protection of agricultural workers, including migratory farm workers, by minimum-wage legislation, that minimum housing standards be established for foreign workers with a simplified agency for administration and enforcement of such minimum standards on the basis of periodic inspections, and that collective bargaining be required on the larger farms.

The Commission's report was very skeptical about the method employed in determining "prevailing wages," which experience shows has been a unilateral employers' agreement of a rate initially offered, which proves too low to attract the needed number of workers. The "labor shortage" might well be the consequence of the low wages fixed before the season opened and the effective going rate had an opportunity to equate the supply of labor with the demand. The Commission stated: "The wage practice in agriculture and the demand for alien labor are directly associated. Alien labor importation cannot be divorced from the practice of fixing an arbitrary wage which does not attract a sufficient number of workers. The wage at which we declare a farm labor shortage to exist is the result of a one-sided wage bargain made by associations of farm employers."

It would seem that at the very least the determination of prevailing wages should be determined by public authority after public hearings and that these determinations be widely publicized to give American migratory workers the knowledge and assurance which would assist in making more American workers available. This much should be required by amendment to the present bill, while some of the other recommendations of the President's Commission would require more extensive legislation.

WETBACKS

Section 504 of the Poage bill provides that Mexican nationals already within the borders of the United States may be permitted to remain and that no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability on any person for the failure of such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment. This provision would legalize the status of Mexicans now illegally in the United States. In contrast, the President's Commission on Migratory Labor recommended that legislation be enacted making it unlawful to employ aliens illegally in the United States. The report recommended that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be strengthened by clear statutory authority to determine if illegal aliens are employed and that statutory penalties for harboring, concealing, or transporting illegal aliens be imposed. They recommended the imposition of a variety of sanctions against the employment of aliens illegally in the United States. The Department of Labor in its testimony submitted before a congressional committee warned that if illegal Mexican workers are employed under this provision, this would ignore Mexico's economic interest, would be incompatible with the international agreement, and would serve as an open invitation to Mexican nationals to enter the United States illegally. A similar provision in the Ellender bill was amended to limit employment to those who entered the United States legally.

H. R. 3283 really does nothing effective about the wetback problem. As recommended by the President's Commission, there should be a clear provision in the bill which would prohibit the use of Mexican labor illegally in the United States, with penalties imposed on American employers who knowingly employ them.

USE OF MEXICAN LABOR IN NONAGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT

Section 508 defines "agricultural employment" to include not only the activities so defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Social Security Act but also such activities as cotton ginning and compressing, crushing of oilseeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonable products.

These latter activities, when not within the area of production as defined by the Administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act, are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Some of these activities, when within the area of production, are exempt from both the minimum wage and overtime provisions, while other activities are exempt from overtime but not from the statutory minimum wage.

Two consequences grow out of this broadened definition of agricultural employment:

First. Some Mexican workers will be employed in activities which heretofore have not been regarded as agriculture.

Second. Where they are so employed, many of them must be paid at least 75 cents per hour and overtime payments must be made where applicable, for it must be understood that broadening the definition of agricultural employment under this bill can have no influence on determining the coverage and applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Thus a small proportion of the imported Mexican workers will be paid on a different basis than the great bulk of the workers engaged in agriculture as defined under the Fair Labor Standards Act. This provision was amended in the Senate to restrict the employment of imported Mexican labor to agriculture, which is exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Need for Safety Codes for Natural-Gas Pipelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with consideration of H. R. 88, which would authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies, I am including the first of a series of articles by Hartley W. Barclay, appearing in the New York Times, on the general subject of the need for safety codes for natural-gas pipelines.

PIPELINE DANGERS STIR WIDE CONCERN—REGULATION OF GROWING NATURAL GAS NET IS INADEQUATE AND HAPHAZARD, STUDY SHOWS—SAFETY CODES CALLED FOR—CITIZENS IN MANY AREAS SEEK STATE AND LOCAL ACTION AS UNITED STATES POWER IS LIMITED

(By Hartley W. Barclay)

Communities in Westchester and other counties near New York have no adequate official safeguards against hazards of new high-pressure interstate natural-gas pipelines now authorized and due for construction soon. Similar conditions exist up-State and in Connecticut and throughout much of the entire country, it was learned in a canvass of safety conditions.

There is no national code enforced by law for assuring safe construction and operation on the $1,000,000,000 natural-gas pipeline industry expansion program, involving more than 40,000 miles of new pipelines in which it is expected that 6,000,000 tons of steel will be used.

In an extensive study of safety aspects of these projects, it was estimated that 28,875 miles of new natural-gas pipelines were authorized for construction up to January 1, while for 15,866 additional miles there were applications pending approval at that time.

CONTROL DEEMED INADEQUATE

Only limited control of the lines is held by the Federal Power Commission. While State public service commissions may have jurisdiction, safety codes do not exist in most eastern States. Budgets, enforcement personnel, inspectors, technical consultants, and requirements for filing plans, specifications, and reports are generally lacking.

To check on current conditions regarding official supervision and legal enforcement of safety rules in interest natural gas pipeline construction and operation, more than 12 National, State, or local regulatory bodies were consulted in the last 3 weeks. Reports from individual pipeline companies were studied, engineers were interviewed, trade and engineering society codes that lack legal standing for enforcement were studied, and officials of communities were questioned.

It was generally conceded by these sources that the safety of high-pressure natural gas pipelines in interstate commerce is not strictly regulated under a national code. In contrast, the construction and operation of less dangerous local gas lines is strictly regulated in most regions, largely by local authorities. In interstate commerce the handling of explosive materials and containers comparable in hazard to high-pressure gas and shipped by railroads is strictly safeguarded by a complex variety of legally enforced rules.

It also was generally conceded that building codes in most municipalities outside New York are obsolete so far as covering construction requirements for high-pressure interstate natural gas pipelines.

A number of locally sponsored "citizens' movements" to press for Federal, State or local safety laws to control interstate high-pressure natural gas pipeline companies are rapidly getting under way in Eastern States and New England.

Engineers interviewed stressed that safety rules for high-pressure interstate lines are not to be confused with safety practices used by local, intrastate gas companies.

SOME OF THE BIG PROJECTS

Some big pipeline companies now holding Federal Power Commission certificates of public convenience and necessity authorizing high-pressure pipeline construction projects in Eastern States include the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Northeastern Gas Transmission Co., Algonquin Gas Transmission Co., Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp., New York State Natural Gas Corp., and Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

Among officials of governmental agencies, those of the Federal Power Commission said that agency had no statutory authority to rule upon safety hazards to local communities resulting from these projects.

At State regulatory levels safety codes are not written out in New York and Connecticut to require regulation by strict standards and codes. Technical employees of the New York Public Service Commission said they thought the commission had no authority over interstate companies.

Cities near New York have just awakened to the fact that they need to enact promptly new safety codes for such purposes. Connecticut has just started to strengthen safety regulatory powers.

There is one important precedent that is considered by engineers as adequate to prove that strict licensing, safety control and regulation by permits can work successfully in protecting public safety. Under the Federal law known as the River and Harbor Act of 1899, builders of structures of all kinds put in navigable streams are required to file plans and obtain permits from the Secretary of the Army. Defiance of a ruling under this law is punishable by fine or imprisonment.

America in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is included a well-expressed editorial on America in the Far East by the Erie County Reporter of Huron, Ohio:

IN MEMORIAM TO THE DEATH OF AMERICAN PRESTIGE IN THE FAR EAST

President Harry Truman, through his action in stripping Gen. Douglas MacArthur of all his commands in the Far East, has made himself a place in history, but we fear it will be an unenviable one. Judas Iscariot also has a place.

This act was the result of demands made on the President by Dean Acheson, George Marshall, and others of their ilk, who should also receive credit for the loss of China to the Communists.

Thus the betrayal of America, which has progressed through Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam has reached another milestone.

The lives of many fine American boys will be the price to be paid for Tuesday's action. But they won't be the lives of sons of the Trumans, Achesons, and Marshalls.

We trust there will be rejoicing in England and Russia. The English will be happy because they can continue their blood-money trade with the Chinese Commies and the Russians can now see ultimate victory in their campaign to take over the entire far eastern theater.

Teamwork in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

EMPHASIS ON COOPERATION

Korea has provided a gripping laboratory test of the whole concept of collective security. For the first time in history 50 nations have joined in a tremendous experiment in cooperation to keep the peace. In the midst of current controversies Americans can gain perspective by recognizing the importance of success in this noble endeavor.

Indeed, the people in each member country of the United Nations may well take counsel with themselves to see whether they are in any respect failing to relate national purposes to this vast international peace project. In much of the debate over General MacArthur's recall Americans have given woefully little attention to the value of keeping U. N. action united. The general says that if necessary the United States should go it alone. This, it seems to us, is a perilous course, but other members of the U. N. should recognize that they have a real responsibility for a situation which has brought such a proposal into serious consideration.

One basic trouble in Korea has been that in the actual hostilities the United States has been so largely going it alone. More than 50 nations voted against aggression; only 15 have sent forces against it in battle. There were extenuating circumstances. Some countries were still too weak and war-torn. Others were heavily engaged against communism on other fronts. Some offers were turned down because of the difficulties in transport, training, equipment, and coordination—particularly in the early months.

But this last reason no longer holds, and General MacArthur is quite right in urging other U. N. nations to supply forces or increase those they have sent. The arrival in the Far East of troops from little and remote Ethiopia (which the League of Nations failed to save) should shame and awaken larger and nearer nations. Several countries far from any immediate necessity to defend themselves should take a good second look at their professed allegiance to U. N. One Colombian gunboat is the sole Latin-American fighting representative in Korea.

From the start this newspaper has emphasized the value of having more nations actively represented in Korea. Every additional U. N. member represented there strengthens by so much the effort to make the operation there not only militarily but morally successful. The Asian peoples are particularly susceptible to the Red propaganda that this is just another arrogant drive by western imperialism. Fifty nations have said in words that it is police action to keep the peace. To be fully persuasive they should join the force visibly.

Aside from the faults in the U. N. Charter which complicate any enforcement action; aside from failures of tact or worse by the United States which alienated certain members, particularly the Arab bloc; aside from confusions which have held most of the Asian nations back; aside from fears of General MacArthur's strategy; aside from honest anti-Communist opinion that the Chinese were thinking of Korea as Americans would of Mexico—the fact remains that U. N. has taken a stand against aggression. The majority of members still are not backing that stand in the field.

Even the United States, while furnishing the bulk of the forces, is not thinking of Korea primarily as a U. N. enterprise. There are ample grounds for disagreement with progress for attacking the Chinese at home, but there can be little ground for failing to support the U. N. in Korea. The world's aspirations are fixed on the possibility of outlawing war—as General MacArthur so eloquently urged. But everyone recognizes that it cannot be done by one nation—that it requires teamwork. Korea offers the practical opportunity.

New York Gets 5½ Cents in Aid for Tax Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if Members of Congress from New York State occasionally seem unenthusiastic about programs of Federal aid for this, that, or the other activities, inherently commendable, it becomes more understandable when such facts are borne in mind as are revealed in the accompanying analysis by Mr. Kermit Hill, of the Gannett News Bureau, published in the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, set forth below under leave to extend my remarks.

We must not, of course, lose sight of the fact that the best interests of the country as a whole must be considered in our appraisal of the merit or demerit of legislation providing for contributions on the part of the Federal Government. Let those Members from such States as Mississippi, however, which receive benefits from Uncle Sam far in excess of the amounts paid by their citizens to keep the Government running, remember the importance of maintaining national solvency just as they expect Members from States like New York and Delaware, who pay into the Federal Treasury many times what they take out, to view with sympathy the needs of the States making modest tax contributions.

Pay-envelope deductions for taxes have just about reached the breaking point for many people. One of the places where we should make substantial reductions at this time is in many of the so-called grant-in-aid programs which are nearly all designed to siphon funds from individual taxpayers, wage earners, and business enterprises of States like

New York and send them, via the Washington route involving the usual shrinkage along the way, to benefit individuals and business concerns in other parts of the country.

The inequality of this situation is drastically illustrated herewith:

NEW YORK GETS 5½ CENTS IN AID FOR TAX DOLLAR

(By Kermit Hill)

WASHINGTON.—New York State got back in Federal grants-in-aid only 5½ cents on the dollar from 7.2 billion dollars in Federal taxes collected there in 1950.

This State consistently gets back one of the smallest returns of any in the Nation, according to official Treasury Department figures.

New York taxpayers paid a grand total of $7,215,467,000 into the United States Treasury last year. The State got back only $399,759,026 through the 76 Federal grant-in-aid programs, which include such things as highway aid, farm payments, research grants, payments to veterans under the GI bill of rights, school-lunch programs, and old-age assistance.

The return figures out at slightly more than 5.5 percent on the tax dollar.

These figures don't include the millions of dollars spent to run the white-collar agencies of the Federal Government in the State.

New York's slim return from its Federal tax payments is in sharp contrast to returns from the Treasury received by some other States.

Those States got Federal funds for gigantic construction projects such as the TVA and similar power developments, irrigation reservoirs, etc., heavily outweighing Federal allotment for public works in this State.

Mississippi, for example, received $1.33 in 1950 for each dollar in Federal taxes collected in that State last year, according to Treasury Department figures. Mississippi taxpayers paid 88.3 million dollars in Federal taxes last year, and got back 117.3 millions through the various Federal aid programs.

Arkansas paid in 105.4 millions in Federal taxes in 1950, and received aid grants from the Treasury totaling 97.6 millions—a 93-cent return on each dollar.

North Dakota received 56 percent of its money back through the Federal aid program. North Dakota taxpayers paid in 52 millions in Federal taxes. The State got back 29.6 millions last year in Federal aid.

Although New York's 5½-cent return on the dollar was almost the lowest in the Nation, it might have been worse.

Delaware paid the Federal Treasury 360 millions last year, but Uncle Sam paid back only 9 millions—a 2½-cent return from each of Delaware's tax dollars.

Strange News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the British Socialist administration has been financed by billions of dollars by our New Deal regime, and in repayment the American citizen-taxpayers are subjected to abuse and ridicule. The British are furnishing Red China with the material to slaughter our fighting forces in Korea. How long will the American people tolerate this scandalous betrayal by our alleged ally?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which was published in the Evening Observer of May 8, 1951, as follows:

STRANGE NEWS

Quoting three items in the same column of another newspaper:

1. "Despite MacArthur's removal, boos and hisses are still greeting newsreels of his stateside appearances when they're shown in British movie houses." The same item says, "MacArthur's ouster leaves Britain and the United States no nearer an agreed far-eastern policy."

2. "London goes Yankee to encourage American tourists to come to the festival of Britain." Just how the British will make the Yankees feel at home in such a postwar attitude of hostility we do not know and cannot guess.

3. A Frenchman predicts: "People will have had enough of Britain after a couple of days. Then they'll scoot over to France."

All of which leads us to the general observation that Uncle Sam's largesse never deprives anyone of any self-respect. The more we give to those in need the more those in need strive to impress us with how much they hold us in contempt.

Or, as some weary American remarked, "Suppose we go to war with Russia, will we be expected to continue to give them lend-lease in order to enable them to fight us? And if not from us, where will Russia get the lend-lease with which to fight?"

Times change. Remember when Churchill said: "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job." He implied that our manpower would not be needed. As we approach world war III we find ourselves providing all the cash and virtually all the casualties. In spite of this some of our recent allies and lend-lease beneficiaries are striving to frustrate and belittle our policies. It is a strange world in which generosity and gratitude are never in balance. The latter diminishes as the former expands. Just let the hard-pressed taxpayers pony up with another billion or two and everyone will hate us, if, indeed, they do not do so already.

State Aid to Defense Production and Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address, State Aid to Defense Production and Procurement, delivered by Sidney A. Edwards, managing director, Connecticut Development Commission, Hartford, Conn., in Miami Beach, Fla., April 16, 1951.

The Connecticut State Development Commission has been designated by Governor Lodge, a former Member of this House, as the State agency to aid small business in every proper possible manner.

Those of us who live in Connecticut recognize the forthright manner in which the development commission has tackled this difficult problem.

Connecticut's 10-point program of industrial mobilization provides a pattern of action that many other States may well wish to adopt and follow:

STATE AID TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION AND PROCUREMENT

(Address by Sidney A. Edwards, managing director, Connecticut Development Commission, Hartford, Conn., at sixth annual conference, Association of State Planning and Development Agencies, Miami Beach, Fla., April 16, 1951)

I feel highly honored to have been selected to discuss this subject which is of such compelling interest to so many of our State planning and development agencies at this particular time.

Unless all signs fail, the matter of defense production and procurement will be with us for many years, even though we may be spared the need for all-out war production.

Many of the agencies represented at this meeting went through the experience of events leading up to our participation in World War II, the war itself, and the period of readjustment to civilian production preceding the present emergency.

Many lessons were learned as a result of that experience, especially the effects of a controlled economy on the operations of the so-called small-business man. Some people seem to think that the small-business man is some rare individual who is different in many respects from the ordinary run of businessman or manufacturer. He may be different, but he most certainly is not rare.

If we take the definition of small business as prescribed by the Federal Government, namely, any concern employing 500 persons or less, and apply this to a small but highly industrial State like Connecticut, what do we find? We discover that rather than being rare small business constitutes 96 percent of all manufacturers in our State, and collectively this 96 percent of Connecticut's manufacturing establishments employ 43 percent of those engaged in industry.

Consequently, if we are to design a program of industrial mobilization for defense production which will aid the greatest number of our manufacturing concerns, we must necessarily give particular consideration to the problems of small business.

It has been our observation that the large manufacturer or the one employing more than 500 persons is generally able to solve his own problems without any great assistance from State development agencies. As a matter of fact, he can usually help us more than we can help him, and part of our job is to secure his cooperation in helping the little fellow.

With all of the talk about helping small business in connection with Federal procurement, and with Congress insisting that the little fellow be taken care of, many small-business men unfortunately have concluded that all they have to do is just sit back and wait for orders to roll in.

Those of us who have seen this work before and recognize the complicated procedures associated with Federal purchasing during an emergency realize only too well how futile any such conclusion can be.

We have all experienced the so-called invitation-to-bid method of Government buying and the discouraging aspects of such transactions. There has probably been more disillusionment attached to that method than is generally known or admitted. The expense involved, as well as the difficulty in securing complete specifications, blue prints, and other information in time to submit an intelligent bid within the period of grace, has been such as to discourage most small manufacturers from even making the attempt.

Federal procurement agencies in general greatly dislike that method of buying

because of its uncertainties and the tremendous amount of red tape involved. As related to the usual size of order placed. Some branches of the Government have abandoned this method completely and others are inclined to do so. It is a safe prediction that within a short time most Federal procurement will be conducted on a negotiated basis.

If that assumption is correct, where does this leave the little fellow? His chances of competing sucessfully with the large manufacturer who is thoroughly schooled in this method of dealing with the Government and has his representatives in Washington; Wright Field at Dayton, Ohio; Philadelphia; or at other buying centers are very slim indeed, and he would be well advised to save his time and money.

The Government purchasing agencies which are held responsible for the delivery of a vast variety of material within a specified period of time cannot afford to and if they can help it will not distribute those orders among hundreds of inexperienced suppliers. Furthermore, it is not in the best interests of our national defense effort that they be compelled to do so.

In spite of any statements to the contrary, the principal interest and activity of such agencies stops at the door of the large prime contractor. To be sure, there are many specialized shops employing less than 500 persons who will and should serve as prime contractors, but in general the average small manufacturer will be well advised to forget about securing prime contracts and concentrate his major attention on making his facilities and capabilities for defense production known to as many prime and potential contractors as possible.

This, in my opinion, is where the State planning and development commissions can render their greatest service to the greatest number. Because of their familiarity with the personnel, character, equipment, and capabilities of the hundreds of small manufacturing plants within their respective States, they are in a better position than any other agency, Federal or State, to make a major contribution to the defense effort and supplement the work of the Federal procurement agencies in getting the over-all job done in the shortest possible time.

I know from experience that the Federal procurement agencies as well as the large prime contractors will greatly appreciate this type of assistance and will cooperate once an effective program is set up.

I also know that many States like Connecticut are hard at work developing such programs and, although these State programs may differ in some details, their objectives are quite similar.

At the risk of repeating some of the points already discussed, I will list here the objectives of Connecticut's 10-point program of industrial mobilization which were adopted by the Connecticut Development Commission last September and briefly describe the procedures and reasons applying to each point.

Please note that this program represents our concept of how our particular agency can render greatest assistance to small business during the present emergency.

1. To prepare Connecticut industry for the unusual challenge of making the greatest possible contribution toward national defense and at the same time meet the present and future demands for consumer goods—consistent with such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Federal Government: The approach which we have used or will use includes the holding of State-wide and regional defense production clinics in cooperation with the various Federal agencies dealing with defense procurement, the issuance of press and radio relases. and special bulletins and news letters to all manufacturers, chambers of commerce, and manufacturers' associations.

2. To establish a central clearinghouse for information concerning Connecticut's various and widely distributed production facilities and make such information available to all Federal procurement agencies: To accomplish this we conducted a State-wide survey of all manufacturing plants last September in order to secure the necessary basic information regarding their capabilities for civilian as well as defense production. The Register of War Production Facilities in Connecticut, now in the process of being published, will comprise approximately 450 pages, 8½ by 11 inches in size. It will contain essential information regarding 2,900 companies which jointly employ 87 percent of all industrial workers in Connecticut. In the metal-working industries, 92 percent of the total employment will be covered. This directory will be distributed to all Federal procurement agencies and the more important prime contractors located in the Northeast.

3. To explore fully the subcontracting possibilities to be found in Connecticut's hundreds of smaller industries and make such information available to present and potential prime contractors, both in Connecticut and nearby States: This calls for a separate survey covering machines, equipment and idle capacity as well as space for expansion. Such a survey is now in progress. The essential information will be transferred to a card index and will be kept currently up to date because such a file will enable our industrial engineers to select all qualified subcontractors who can handle each specific job and convey this information promptly to prime contractors in search of potential subcontractors.

4. To inform Connecticut manufacturers where they may secure advance information regarding Federal procurement contracts to be placed, as well as those recently placed in Connecticut and nearby States: The technique used here is constantly subject to change depending upon such information as may be released by the Federal Government. It is not our purpose to duplicate but rather to supplement any information services which may be available to manufacturers through various sources. We will have no hesitancy in directing interested manufacturers to any such sources, public or private, which we consider reliable.

5. To assemble and make available to Connecticut manufacturers necessary blueprints, specifications, and regulations associated with bidding on and completing Government defense contracts: The assembly of constantly changing regulations is comparatively simple. The procurement of necessary blueprints and specifications is more difficult, especially from Federal agencies. The best source of such information is the prime contractor who is interested in sharing this work with subcontractors. We anticipate no particular difficulty here once the Federal procurement program is stepped up and the demand for subcontractors is increased.

6. To assist Connecticut manufacturers in the location of essential materials or substitute materials through the operation of a central information service: Here again much will depend upon the restrictions placed by the Federal Government and the issuance of priorities or DO orders in connection with essential materials. Such priorities issued to the prime contractor will be passed along to the subcontractor and supplier. At present, manufacturers who have plenty of defense orders are not particularly troubled regarding shortages of essential materials, but those whose principal output is for civilian use will need to study all possibilities of using substitute materials. Such information as can be secured along this line will be assembled and made available to interested manufacturers.

7. To assist manufacturers and potential manufacturers in the location of manufacturing space or industrial building sites: Such information and service is the stock in trade of any industrial development agency. However, unless a special effort is made it can easily become obsolete or incomplete. During the emergency the need for accurate information of this type and having it readily available when needed is particularly acute. Any extra work that can be done to give such assurance will pay real dividends.

8. To fully explore and make available to Connecticut manufacturers information regarding production and/or construction financing: Here again we are introducing nothing new in the way of a service but are attempting to make sure that we are not overlooking any of a wide variety of possibilities which can be passed along to interested manufacturers. Some State and local governments go much further than others in this respect. But even in those States which are fairly well restricted some very ingenious methods of financing have been developed. We propose to keep ourselves well informed regarding any Federal aid which may be available to stimulate defense production and to publicize such possibilities among our manufacturers.

9. To assist Connecticut manufacturers in securing various types of technical or professional guidance incident to more economical and/or more efficient production and distribution: This may be approached in a number of ways but in Connecticut we have compiled a technical-professional roster containing the names of more than 350 engineers and technicians, including members of college faculties, private consultants, those who have been retired because of age, and many presently employed who would be available for part-time work to assist small manufacturers facing technical problems. Applications for such assistance are made through the local office of the State employment service and wherever possible the talents available locally are explored fully before calling on the central office in Hartford. To the best of our knowledge this represents an entirely new approach in helping to meet the manpower shortage, especially in the professional or technical field. Arrangements for reimbursement are left entirely to the mutual satisfaction of the two interested parties.

10. To fully utilize the services and assistance of local public officials, chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, local offices of the State employment service, newspapers, radio stations, and any other agencies or organizations which might contribute to the success of the program: In any program of this type we have always made a special effort to enlist the cooperation of such public or private agencies as we feel have a mutual interest in the success of the program. We are quite willing to share the responsibility as well as the glory if we can get widespread participation in any program of State-wide interest. We are quite willing to be regarded as a stimulating and coordinating agency and if we convince people that our program is their program we shall be satisfied with our performance.

I am sure many of you will recognize in the previous list of objectives and methods several services which are regularly performed by such agencies as ours under normal conditions. This only serves to emphasize their true worth and shows that as reliable working tools under any circumstances they should be kept well sharpened.

When it was learned that Dr. Alfred C. Neal of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston,

who is an associate member of ASFDA and a good friend of many of us, would be unable to appear on our program this afternoon, I suggested to our president, Don Davenport, that the remaining time be reserved for hearing statements from the several States' representatives as to what they are doing to render aid to defense production and procurement in their respective States.

I am quite sure that we do not have all the answers in Connecticut and we should like the benefit of your ideas and experience.

In closing, I should like to add that in Connecticut we feel that the State development commission is not only the most logical but the best equipped State agency to deal effectively with current problems which are plaguing the small-business men of our State and that our ability to help solve those problems can well determine our real value to the State in a time of need.

The World's Gain—Our Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me previously, I should like to insert into the RECORD the following speech by Mr. Charles M. White, president of the Republic Steel Corp., which was delivered before the Transportation Association of America in Cleveland, Ohio:

On July 4, 1776, a New England merchant took a quill pen firmly in hand and inscribed his signature on a document. He wrote it large enough, he said, so that "John Bull can read my name without spectacles and may now double his reward of 500 pounds for my head. That is my defiance."

His act was the climax of months of debate, discussion and argument.

As President of the Continental Congress, John Hancock signed the Declaration of Independence and formally gave birth to a new Nation.

Few more scathing indictments have ever been drawn than were the charges directed against England by the Colonists as they recited the freedoms thay had been denied. Point by point the crimes of the mother country against her harassed colonies were detailed.

But at the very beginning of the Declaration the Congress wrote these words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

The signers of the Declaration of Independence wrote revolutionary principles in this paragraph—principles that are too much taken for granted today. They declared boldly that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were not the gift or grant of a sovereign but inalienable rights endowed by the Creator.

Under this philosophy, the individual, you and I, became important in his own right. He was not the puppet of a glorified bureaucrat or subject to the whim or caprice of any ruler.

Eleven years later, again in Philadelphia, the delegates from 12 States adopted the Constitution. In the preamble are these significant words: "and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

All of our rights and freedoms stem from this great document and its amendments. In it the pattern of our Government was blueprinted. The powers of the Federal Government were defined and limited and all powers not specifically delegated were reserved to the States. The first 10 amendments were quickly added and specifically detailed freedoms inherent to the individual, freedoms not to be taken away or denied by any branch of government. These 10 amendments—our Bill of Rights—are so taken for granted that few even in this audience remember all the provisions which must be kept constantly before us.

Is it any wonder that these two documents became beacons for the liberty-loving peoples of the world? Is it surprising that they furnish the seed from which the tree of freedom grew in many lands?

In Europe, in North and South America, crusaders for freedom risked their security, their very lives to further the cause of liberty. Few of these efforts succeeded at first, but many of them became the foundations on which later and successful efforts were built.

Freedom and liberty became inspiring watchwords as men and women struggled and died for the rights accorded the individual in our Declaration of Independence and in our Constitution.

Yet, though the Constitution proclaimed liberty as one of the rights of man, there were those among its authors who foresaw the ease with which liberty could also be lost.

In the first Federalist paper, Alexander Hamilton warned that the danger to our new form of government lay in the demagogs who would attempt to steal away the liberties of the people under the pretext of helping them. Mr. Hamilton said: "A dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of the zeal for firmness and efficiency of government. History will show us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying obsequious court to the people; commencing demagogues and ending tyrants."

There are those who disagree with the political philosophy of Hamilton, but no one can deny his keen insight into human nature.

Look around the world today. On every hand are the proofs of his penetrating wisdom.

In Russia, in the countries behind the iron curtain, men began as demogogs and ended as tyrants. In England other men began their careers by paying obsequious court to the people. Or, in today's less polished but more forceful language, the people were promised pie in the sky, security without effort, a Santa Claus pack full of presents, with the Government wearing the white whiskers.

But the people of Russia, of England, were not told that they would pay a price—a staggering price—for this tinsel. They were not told that the price was Government interference in the everyday life of the individual; that the price was the loss of liberty and freedom, as sure as the devastating course of a cancer; that the price in Russia was slave-labor camps; that the price was ever higher and more confiscatory taxes.

It is of great concern to us that in our own country recently the symptoms of this same grasping for power have been distressingly evident. Here, too, we find the present Government paying obsequious court to the people.

Here, too, we find the Government trying to be all things to all men. Here, too, we have seen vote-catching plans, dishonest in their design, ballyhooed as the panacea for all our ills.

We have seen group set against group, race against race, one section of the country against another. But recently the people have begun to smell a rat.

Some of you may think that this is not the time to criticize our Government, that in this time of great crisis there should be unity and we should skip politics.

Of course, we must be a united Nation intent on a single purpose—that of becoming militarily strong again.

But we must not let our effort to preserve the freedoms of others result in the loss of our own. We need not accept edicts from on high without debate. We must not export so much freedom that there is little left for home consumption.

We must be vigilant in seeing that temporary suspension of freedom and liberty during this emergency does not become a permanent loss. Even as we fight for freedom abroad we must preserve freedom at home. Let us never say that the operation was successful but the patient died.

As almost the last nation dedicated to the freedom of the individual—certainly the strongest nation supporting that ideal—we have a responsibility not only to ourselves but to those who love freedom throughout the world. We have an obligation to hold high the torch of freedom that we may serve as a rallying point for those who have lost their freedom and want desperately to regain it. But it won't be easy.

We must realistically appraise the entire world picture and weigh the possible results of action—or of inaction—for it seems to be our responsibility to lead.

Whether we like it or not, our foreign relations have become so intertwined with our domestic affairs that in almost every decision we make we remember that one field impinges upon the other.

We are faced with revolutionary communism in Asia, in Europe, in some spots in the Southern Hemisphere, and even in our own midst. The decisions we as a people, we as a government, make to meet this threat will largely determine whether we retain or lose our precious freedoms.

If we do not do enough to stop the worldwide menace of communism, we may find our own Nation engulfed. If we do too much, we may find that we have accomplished that which Stalin long ago predicted—the internal destruction of our form of government by spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

Today perhaps our foremost obligation is that each of us personally understand to the best of our ability the forces that are moving to destroy freedom.

We cannot afford the luxury of being arbitrary in the face of those who differ with us, for I doubt that any single person is either entirely right or entirely wrong in his conclusions on our foreign affairs.

And, even were we right today, what Moscow does tomorrow might demand a complete revaluation.

We all have grave questions in our minds as debate rages in Washington over our foreign policy. Were we right in throwing our ground troops into Korea in the first place? Should we have gone beyond the thirty-eighth parallel? Should we have withdrawn when we found ourselves confronted by hordes of Chinese Communists? If we should finally be successful, will our victory be significant and important, or worth the price of American boys dead and wounded? Similar momentous questions confront us in connection with China and Formosa.

The ramifications of every move we are called upon to make on the European front are so enormous that any sane person hesitates to assume either complete knowledge or complete certainty as to the answers.

This we do know, however: The most sacred trust that we have is to preserve the freedom of our people, of our Government. We can never lay this freedom on the bargain counter. We must forever protect it in our own self-interest, and as an eternal beacon light for enslaved people of other lands as it has been for more than a century and a half.

I have but three conclusions, based upon broad, fundamental principles, as an approach to our problems:

First, I know that each and every attempt to short circuit the Congress as representative of the people in arriving at our decisions is a primary blow at the constitutional safeguards of the United States.

Second, every step that we take must conserve this country's resources and manpower.

Third, those who seek to label as an isolationist any person in or out of Government who dares to challenge the policies of the State Department are also attacking our liberty of discussion.

World responsibilities face us on every hand. We cannot dodge or duck our assignment. But we must keep constantly before us the need for protecting our freedoms here at home.

It is so easy to lose freedom and so hard to regain it.

And what are those freedoms at home that we must guard? Let me mention a few.

We must see that the basic structure of our Government is preserved so that temporary abridgments of our freedoms—the controls and restrictions—can be quickly and easily removed as soon as the need for them has passed.

We must be sure that all such restrictions are spelled out as emergency measures and that new emergencies are not created to prolong these restrictions just for the sake of politics and power.

We must resist restrictions on our rights to express ourselves freely, forcefully, and clearly.

In my estimation, the recent Buchanan committee was an attempt to hamper free speech and action. Its very demand on business for copies of advertisements, booklets, speeches, etc., has thrown a scare into timid businessmen.

If Republic or any other company believes that a Government policy is contrary to public and/or company interest, there should be no hesitation to say so. We may be wrong in our interpretation, but no Government pressure—no real or implied threat—should discourage us from expressing our ideas.

If anything, business should speak more frequently, more forcefully. Business is an important segment of our economic life on which the success of our rearmament program depends, and it has a duty to present its views. No threats of legislation should interfere with this right.

Though this is perhaps not the best time to discuss taxation, I still believe the Government should preserve to the individual the right to spend his own money to the fullest possible degree.

No one is stupid enough to believe that we can fight a war in Korea and at the same time vastly increase our armament program without a heavy increase in Government expense. But as yet the Government has shown no disposition to cut back on nonmilitary expense. We should raise every penny necessary to rearm. Our dollars would have little value if we should lose our fight with communism. But ordinary Government operation can and should be cut sharply. We can't afford pork barrels today. We can't afford to start Fair Deal programs that will cost hundreds of millions. We should declare a moratorium on free pamphlets and services, on construction for nonmilitary purposes, on bureaus which have outlived their usefulness, on subsidies, boondoggling, and chairwarming. Economy in Government is never popular with those who get the ax, but it would reassure the taxpayers tremendously, and might help solve some of our manpower problems. More money for guns, tanks, and planes and less for forms, reports, and red tape—that makes sense.

We must use to the fullest our freedom of expression through the ballot box. Every election in a free country is important, whether it be local, State, or national. By majority vote we citizens set the policies for those who hold office. If they choose to disregard our wishes, we can and should turn them out.

I am not one who believes that only Republicans can intelligently run the United States Government. There are plenty of patriotic and able Democrats, some of whom are in office today. When we vote we should vote for ability first. Unfortunately we have had too many second-raters in office, whose ability to promise exceeds their ability to perform. We need more able men to offer themselves for office in both parties. That gives us freedom of choice—one of the most important freedoms we have.

We must also, and this is important, preserve our freedom of opportunity.

This country became great because the individual American had the opportunity to make the most of his abilities and talents. He could venture his capital or labor and keep his gains, if any.

He could engage in work of his choice and change it whenever he wished.

Because he could profit from his efforts, he was willing to take chances. The result was an expansion such as no other nation has ever seen.

Any encroachment on a man's freedom of opportunity destroys in some part man's progress.

We must fight against bureaucratic red tape and restrictions which discourage men of imagination, courage, and willingness who are willing to work and create opportunities.

The constant warfare carried on by Government against business is far from encouraging. The impression has been given that all businessmen are enemies of society. This is obviously nonsense.

Another freedom we must retain is the freedom to paddle our own canoe.

We have only to look at England to realize how governmental interference in private affairs destroys individual initiative.

When Government takes upon itself a cradle-to-grave program (financed by ourselves), it is too easy to set back and wait for hand-outs instead of making our own way. This cannot produce a strong, self-assured, independent people. We don't help the weak by pulling down the strong.

I do not close my mind to the fact that some must be given help by Government, but this help should be local in nature and be reserved for those who really need it, who are really entitled to it, and not for those who merely ask for it or would like to have it.

These are some of the freedoms we must preserve and cherish.

But freedoms also means obligations. We must continually earn our freedoms, work for them.

What are some of these obligations?

First, there is the obligation to be informed. Too many of us form our opinions haphazardly or repeat someone else's opinion without thought or study.

I grant we can't all be experts in every field but in those which most closely concern us we can and must inform ourselves.

We should study both sides of a question, weigh it, think of the pluses and minuses involved. We should make up our own minds and not let other people make them up for us.

No, we won't always be right but we'll have a much better chance of being right if we do a little homework ourselves. This means a lot of reading, listening, and thinking. Thinking is hard work but in these days of rapid and far-reaching communication both sides of every question are always available if we only look. Take the trouble to look at both sides on the basis of what you have thought out. Don't follow the herd.

We also have an obligation to take an active part in the political life of our country. By that I mean that you must do more than vote and/or send a check to a political party. No, it's a lot more than that.

You must lend your help and counsel. Get in and pitch.

Take part in precinct and ward politics and encourage your employees to do likewise. That's where votes are made. Show by your example how to fight against corrupt and misguided government and support honest and intelligent government. Your government is what you make it and in the end you get what you deserve.

There are many other freedoms and obligations which I might detail to you tonight. But there is a time factor which must be considered.

So let me close with this thought.

Most of us in this audience are well past our youth. Most of us have children. Many of us have grandchildren.

We've had a fine country in which to grow up. Under our system of individual opportunity we have done pretty well.

But will our children and grandchildren do as well? Will they have the same opportunities we had? Not unless we do a better job of thinking and selling our ideas.

Gentlemen, it's up to us. We can't afford to fail. We must fight and win the battle for the preservation of freedom for the next generation.

We must win back what we have lost and carry freedom's banner to new heights.

We must protect and preserve the freedom of this great land of ours so that we can "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

That, gentlemen, is our task. We can do it if we work.

Sequoyah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to an article appearing in the April issue of the magazine the New Yorker entitled "Talking Leaves."

This article dealt with an American Indian named Sequoyah, a full-blood Cherokee, and whose statue is one of Oklahoma's contributions to the Hall of Fame in Statuary Hall.

Sequoyah accomplished a feat which no other living human had done when he invented a Cherokee alphabet which adapted the English alphabet to the Cherokee language. In 1821 he announced that his task was finished and the entire Cherokee Nation, living in Indian Territory, which is now Oklahoma, was swept by excitement.

Mr. Speaker, the article is a valuable contribution to our history, and I include it as a part of my remarks:

TALKING LEAVES

Word that the bulk of Bernard Shaw's fortune is to be used to further the spread of an expanded English alphabet of his invention has prompted us to look up a few facts about an American Indian named Sequoyah who, without the help of a fortune or, for that matter, of any schooling, worked out the written language of the Cherokee Nation. As far as we know, he is the only man in history ever to have done such a thing singlehanded. Starting from scratch, with no knowledge of English or any European language—with, in fact, no knowledge of any language other than Cherokee—he devised an entire, and entirely workable, system of writing, a feat that some philologists regard as one of the most sublime acts of intellection of all time. It's one that might have abashed even Shaw.

Take him for all in all, Sequoyah seems to be one of the most inspiring and attractive figures in our history. He was born in 1770, or a few years earlier, in the village of Taskigi, in what is now Tennessee and was then the land of the Cherokee Nation. His mother was part Cherokee and part Shawnee, his father was a white man who has never been definitely identified but is popularly believed to have been a Virginian named Nathaniel Gist, a friend of Washington's. Sequoyah's English name was George Guess, sometimes spelled Gist or Guest. He was brought up as a Cherokee and, as a young man, became an accomplished silversmith and an excellent painter of animal subjects—two skills theretofore not developed among his people—and is said to have made paint brushes of animal hair without ever knowing that there were already such things in the world. He saw and was deeply impressed by books, which the Indians called "talking leaves," and, refusing to go along with the prevailing Indian notion that the ability to put speech into written form was a divinely ordained perquisite of the white man, determined, along about 1809, to invent a written language for the Cherokees. (He was unaware that a number of missionaries had tried their hands at adapting the English alphabet to the Cherokee language, had found its 26 characters insufficient to represent Cherokee sounds, many of which are made largely with the nose and throat, and had given up the job.) Sequoyah first set out to draw a different picture for each word, but soon realized that more pictures would be required than anyone could possibly hope to remember. After several years, he hit on the idea of using a different symbol for each Cherokee syllable. Copying from an English book, he used most of the letters of the Roman alphabet as symbols and then designed a much larger number himself. He had no interest in how the Roman letters were pronounced; the Roman "D" became the Cherokee "A," the Roman "R" the Cherokee "Tso."

Sequoyah listened diligently to conversations among his fellow Cherokees, and every time he detected a new sound, he made a note of it, scratching his symbols on bark with a knife or a sliver of wood. Eventually, he compiled around 140 syllables. These he winnowed down to 85, which he found the minimum necessary. What he had done was devise a system of notation known technically as a syllabary, which requires more symbols than an alphabet but much less writing, provided the language is low in multiple consonants, as the Cherokee language is.

In 1821 Sequoyah announced that his task was finished, and when he was able to demonstrate that his brand of talking leaves worked just as well as the white man's, the Cherokee Nation was swept by excitement. It took only 3 or 4 days for the average Cherokee to master Sequoyah's syllabary, and within a few months practically the entire nation had become literate.

In 1825, a Cherokee preacher named David Brown, probably a convert to the Moravian faith, completed a translation of the New Testament into Cherokee, and scores of manuscript copies of it were put in circulation. Then the Cherokees decided that it would be fine to have their own newspaper, and in 1827 a Boston firm cast a font of type in Cherokee characters. This, together with a font of Roman type and a press, was shipped to New Echota, the capital of the Cherokee Nation, and soon the paper appeared. It was called the Cherokee Phoenix, and, later, the Cherokee Phoenix and Indian's Advocate. Sequoyah was honored both by his own people and by the white man. He went to Washington in 1828 as a member of the delegation that negotiated the treaty that moved the Cherokee Nation west to what is now Oklahoma—or, rather, had the treaty rammed down their throats. He and the other delegates signed the treaty in Cherokee, instead of merely making their marks, as all other Indians had always done. The treaty noted that the Government was to make Sequoyah a grant of $500. It took 6 years for the grant to arrive, and when it came, it consisted of $150 in cash, plus 22 kettles of salt, 3 saddles, and a small quantity of other merchandise. Sequoyah died in 1843 in Mexico, where he had gone in search of a group of Cherokees who had left the nation years before. In 1907 the Indian Territory voted that it was to be called Sequoyah when it attained statehood. To its chagrin, it got combined with the Oklahoma Territory, and was called Oklahoma instead. The people kept faith as best they could. They saw to it that an Oklahoma county was named for Sequoyah. Furthermore, the giant redwoods of the West were named sequoias in his honor, which is probably better than having a State named after you.

Nerve Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be valuable for the people of this country to know of the development of chemical warfare in recent years and particularly of new gasses which have been discovered. I, therefore, include the following article by the dean of the Florida delegation, my able colleague, Congressman ROBERT L. F. SIKES, printed in Saga magazine:

THE INSIDE STORY OF THE INCREDIBLE WEAPON NERVE GAS

(By Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Member of Congress)

This is the story of the incredible weapon. The weapon whose effect is deadlier than the sting of a hooded cobra. The weapon whose presence cannot be detected by the human senses.

A drop of liquid the size of a dime on exposed skin brings death in a matter of minutes; its vapor inhaled for a few seconds may be fatal. It has no color, odor, or taste; so insidious is its action that laboratory findings after death reveal no trace of it in the body.

Its story is being told now because its war potential, properly applied, may prove greater than the atom or hydrogen bomb.

This is neither fantasy nor science fiction, but cold, hard fact for 1951.

Even its technical name is a secret—we may only refer to it as a nerve gas.

I will never forget seeing the captured German films which showed the gas in action. Tethered goats, munching wisps of hay, were blinking in the sunlight. There was a slight hissing on the sound track. For a moment the goats seemed unaware of the shapeless cloud that was rolling toward them. Suddenly it struck. The goats reacted as though they had touched a charged wire. They plunged blindly, trying to butt their invisible foe. Their backs arched, their legs twitched convulsively. Before they could bleat they dropped to the ground. They were dying in a matter of seconds.

After the war, as a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, I visited the United States Army Chemical Center in Maryland. Here I had a close-up view of the liquid gas—its most lethal state. Except for the slight oily trace around the neck of the two-gallon jar, it might have been so much distilled water. It was hard to reconcile its harmless appearance with its tremendous destructive power.

Since nerve gas is the only chemical weapon which offers a potential enemy a chance for an effective long-range attack on the United States, the wraps of secrecy are now being lifted in part. The public must know what this gas is, what it can do, and what can be done in the way of defense against it. Otherwise panic might result from its surprise use against our cities.

We must also begin to grasp the meaning of what this weapon can do for us, and how it can work a military revolution on any future battlefield.

Nerve gas is revolutionary because, being odorless, tasteless, and colorless, it strikes with little warning. It may achieve its deadly effect before the victim can make a move to protect himself.

It is revolutionary because unlike other gases which strike at the respiratory system, or raise poisonous blisters on the skin, it attacks an essential ingredient of the nerve process itself, interfering with the body's communication lines. Far more toxic than any chemical agent hitherto known, it gains entry to the body not only by being breathed, but through the skin, the eyes, and through the mucous membranes of the respiratory and digestive tracts.

It packs a triple wallop, having some of the effects that would be characteristic of a poison brewed from toadstools (muscarine), cigar butts (nicotine) and curare, the lethal stuff that South American jungle Indians use on darts and arrowheads.

Since various types of nerve gases were developed by the Germans, and huge stocks were confiscated after World War II, their characteristics are now well-known to both our allies and potential enemies. For that reason they are a factor to be reckoned with in the lives of every one of us. Their action is swift—there is little time lag after initial contact. One whiff of high concentration, and you've had it.

In 1937, two German scientists discovered that a certain chemical compound is an essential factor in transmitting impulses between nerve endings, and that once this chemical is destroyed, nerve action becomes inhibited. The brain is no longer able to transmit its messages clearly, physical processes become confused and disorganized, and life becomes a welter of erratic responses. To create a gas which would destroy this vital

nerve chemical became a top-secret, high-priority objective of Hitler's war machine.

The first rumors that something mysterious was afoot began to trickle back to this country in 1940. Various German refugees hinted that the Nazis were in possession of an invisible gas that had no odor and which could penetrate any known gas mask. Lacking supporting data, such rumors sounded like the usual Goebbels propaganda myth.

As time went by and the rumor persisted, Allied intelligence authorities began to take more notice, particularly after an agent delievered a strange-looking German mask to British intelligence in the fall of 1943. This mask covered not only the eyes and mouth, but also the ears. The agent reported that it was being worn in a chemical plant where a mysterious new gas was being manufactured. With this, intelligence officers hastened to put the new gas at the head of their target list, up with the buzz-bomb and the V-2 rocket.

By 1944, the reports were more specific—the gas was two to four times more toxic than anything previously known and was persistent enough to contaminate low ground and woods for weeks at a time. Reports of German experiments revealed that during the initial stages it caused congestion of the chest, severe headaches, nausea, blindness, convulsions and cramps. It was also reported—exaggeratedly, as it turned out—that degeneration of the brain cells took place, and that its victims became raving maniacs.

That the Germans should possess such a weapon, without any counterthreat on the part of the Allies, was of course a serious situation. It was essential, therefore, that the same gas, or a better one, be developed to perfect a defense against it, and to be held in reserve for retaliation.

How we came to develop a counterpart which proved even more deadly than the original is a story as fascinating and as complex as the development of the atomic bomb.

Although many of the details are still secret, it can be stated that Allied intelligence sources not only obtained the German formula but also samples of the mysterious new substance. Only the manufacturing process remained elusive, but in a race against time, our efforts to solve this problem proved successful. So successful that today experts consider the German gas the Model T of a more fully developed chemical arsenal. Without going into any of the secret technical characteristics of the latest types, this is how nerve gas acts:

If only traces of the vapor are encountered there is difficulty in breathing, accompanied by coughing, shortness of breath and a watery discharge from the nose. The eye pupils narrow to pin points, there is a flushed face, rapid pulse and a sensation similar to muscarine (toadstool) and nicotine (tobacco) poisonings. This, the mildest of all exposures—a whiff or two of an extremely low concentration—can be relieved by small doses of atropine. These effects, similar to an asthma attack, we are told, will last "only a few days."

With a slightly larger dose, there is a painful tightening of the focusing muscles of the eye, a drawing pain in the back of the eyeballs, and painful sensitivity to bright light. In other words—a migraine headache plus partial blindness. If larger doses of vapor are breathed, or the liquid absorbed through the eyes, skin, or saliva, the involuntary muscles of the diaphragm begin an aimless flutter, and the victim, be it man or beast, can neither inhale nor exhale, becomes confused and falls unconscious. Blood pressure drops to shock levels, the heart slows to a death march rhythm, and death itself is not far off. Nevertheless, severe as these symptoms are, they can still be counteracted if the victim can be given medical assistance before breathing has stopped. Heavy, prolonged intravenous or intramuscular doses of atropine may completely reverse the clinical picture. As the antidote is administered, breathing becomes relaxed, the stalled heart resumes its regular beat, blood pressure rises, and if massive doses can be continued every few hours for at least several days, the chances of recovery are good.

Even with recovery, however, the central nervous system may be not quite the same, and involuntary spasms of muscle fibers, ranging from facial tics to grand-mal epileptic seizures, may persist.

In mild cases, giddiness, tension, anxiety, sleeplessness, and excessive dreaming continue, while in severe exposures, depression, restlessness, tremor, emotional instability, and irrational behavior may occur. Thus, under certain conditions, the gas may destroy sanity.

Such are the grim facts about nerve gas and what it is known to accomplish.

How can we defend ourselves against it?

Since the gas is colorless and odorless, the only way we can get an early warning of its presence is by a physical or chemical means of detection. An indicator that gives a striking color change, or that registers an electrical alarm would do the trick. Such devices, we are told, have been discovered. Pending their manufacture and distribution in sufficient quantities, however, civil defense will have to rely on the ability to recognize nerve gas symptoms after the attack has occurred. That is why I have spelled them out in such clinical detail.

If there is only vapor in the air, gas masks will suffice. But if the liquid is present, any contact against skin or clothing becomes extremely hazardous. Those who enter affected areas must wear, in addition to a mask, impermeable clothing, gloves, and boots. Rubber gloves and rubber boots will be safe for a half hour if the contamination is light. If heavy, their protection will last only 15 minutes.

Against the nonpersistent type of gas, where the effects last less than 10 minutes, a fair amount of protection is afforded by breathing through a towel or handkerchief soaked in an alkaline solution—such as baking soda or soapy water.

Since the gas strikes with such swiftness, medical treatment must be geared accordingly. Disaster plans call for the injection of atropine as soon as possible, deep into the muscles of the thigh, buttocks, or shoulders of every victim who has serious difficulty in breathing, who is unconscious, or who is in convulsions. Artificial respiration will need to be given in some cases.

From what we know about the stability of nerve gas it can dangerously contaminate exposed foods which have a high water or fat content, especially milk. Dry foods such as sugar, flour, and cereals are relatively little affected. Food in airtight packages is not harmed by vapors, but only sealed glass or metal containers are safe from the liquid.

As for our water supplies, tests show that while the vapors will not seriously affect such large bodies as reservoirs or lakes, the liquid gas is capable of dangerous and persistent contamination of water.

That a determined enemy using such a gas might be able to reduce substantially United States atomic production without ever dropping a bomb or firing a shot is now an ever-present possibility. That the same enemy might paralyze any strategic center is implicit in the very nature of the weapon.

Eighteen years ago, headlines in the New York Times read: "Gas bombs shut stock exchange—Gasping brokers flee knock-out fumes in cooling system."

What happened on that day, August 4, 1933, may be worth reviewing.

The New York Stock Exchange is housed in a large office building at the corner of Broad and Wall Streets. Some 2,000 brokers and employees have access to its trading floor, the size of a college gymnasium. At 12:05 p. m., a slight haze was noticed near the air conditioned grille on the ceiling, near the Broad Street side. Those who looked up saw a thin bluish wisp of smoke shimmering in the light rays coming through the arched windows. It looked like cigarette smoke, but unlike cigarette smoke, which rises off the floor, this smoke was descending.

The employees at the quotation machine on the Broad Street side were the first to sense something wrong. They waited until the haze enveloped them. Then they ran, gasping to the center of the floor. Almost immediately fumes covered the entire area. Brokers and clerks, alike, made a rush for the doors. By the time someone rang the gong for trading to cease, there was no one left to hear it.

As one of the most sensitive trading spots in the Nation's financial structure, the sudden cessation of stock exchange activities threw most of the country's marketplaces into confusion.

Wall Street itself was in a near panic, reminiscent of the bomb explosion of 1920, as the noon-day crowds watched the floor traders burst through the exits into the street, coughing, choking, gasping for breath, with handkerchiefs to their eyes.

A half hour later police discovered that two tear-gas bombs had been released next to the fifth-floor inlet of the ventilating system. The gas, normally used to subdue prison riots, was fortunately nontoxic. The incident itself had been staged as a publicity stunt for an obscure and short-lived one-man political party.

Change tear gas to nerve gas, the perpetrator from an eccentric to a skilled saboteur, the locale from the stock exchange to the Pentagon, Oak Ridge, or any other strategic installation whose crippling is deemed worth the risk, and you can appreciate why, in any future war, chemical weapons may be more decisive than the atomic bomb.

Realistic, not wishful, thinking is imperative for survival. Dare we suppose that a weapon potentially so destructive would be completely ignored by a determined enemy, particularly when its principal attribute is surprise? Make no mistake about it—if and when a nerve gas attack is launched, it will come with great speed and on a scale never before witnessed. We know, for example, that the Soviet Union came into possession of German stockpiles of nerve gas, as well as German technical personnel who had worked on its development and manufacture. We know that the principal German nerve gas producing plants lay within what is now the Soviet zone. So we must assume that as a minimum the Soviets can reproduce the German gases, with the probability that they, too, have engaged in further development and improvement.

The facts about nerve gas are grim enough without indulging in any flights of fancy. There is no need, for example, for anyone to assume that the stratosphere over our cities could be saturated with infinitesimal particles of the new poison which would filter down and kill every living thing. If in the future you read of entire cities being wiped out overnight by this silent weapon, just pass it off as the work of an overheated imagination. After all, there are limits to what this, or any other, unconventional weapon can achieve, and mass annihilation is one of them.

Tests show that nerve gas may be effective up to a half-mile radius from the point of the releasing explosion, but this does not mean that death will come to all within the zone. Ground winds will vary in intensity, and since gas is heavier than air and its flow is downward, those who are above the second floor of any building have less chance of coming into contact with the vapors, although a great deal depends on local air currents in-

side as well as outside any tall building. Gas masks, of course, will give some protection.

The gas may also be placed on its target from the air. It is capable of being dispersed from a high altitude as a spray or mist, and the atomized particles, drifting for miles with the wind, will cause at least mild reactions to those who breathe the vapors. But until a potential enemy acquires an air fleet, or sufficient guided missiles to support a long-range massive attack on the United States, there is only a slim chance of this occurring. However, we cannot overlook the possibility that an enemy might consider the use of nerve gas in conjunction with other ultra-destructive weapons in order to cause the maximum confusion and disruption to the strategic target. The threat of such an attack, causing tens of thousands of living casualties requiring immediate medical attention, must never be underestimated.

It would be dangerous to assume that because World War II saw no use of chemical warfare, any future conflict would be bound by similar considerations. In World War II we adopted a policy that we would not use chemical weapons offensively unless they were used against us—a threat of instantaneous and overwhelming retaliation which we were prepared to make good. United States policy in this respect was voiced by President Roosevelt in 1943, in the following statement:

"I have been loathe to believe that any nation, even our present enemies, could or would be willing to loose upon mankind such terrible and inhumane weapons * * *.

"Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we will never be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies."

Nevertheless, the United States is not signatory to any international covenant restricting the use of poison gas. As recently as 1926, at the Disarmament Conference, the same prohibition was advanced, and the United States Senate refused to ratify the Geneva gas protocol.

Since June of 1950, one of the grimmest battles in American history has been fought in Korea. Greatly outnumbered, attacked by a foe that has thrown in masses of men regardless of losses, our troops have undergone the most bitter trials of war. From this struggle, one aspect now stands clear—namely, our forces, using every conventional weapon, suffered heavy casualties whenever the enemy amassed the manpower to take an objective regardless of losses imposed by our normal ground, air, and naval weapons.

Despite the fact that chemicals, including nerve gas, are better suited to defense than to attack—(one does not contaminate the area into which one proposes to advance)—these weapons were not used, yet they may hold the answer to the still-unsolved problem of the Communists' "human sea" tactics.

Granted that there is a deep-seated repugnance to the use of chemical weapons. Nevertheless, the time has come for the fullest public discussion of the pros and cons of these, or any other weapons which will aid our forces in dealing with an enemy, stronger only in numbers, but numbers capable of winning a decision in a battle limited to conventional arms.

Korea may be the proving ground of a future conflict, just as Spain was in 1936.

If world war III becomes a reality, we may have to throw away the book of rules and use every weapon in our arsenal. It probably will be total war. One day this issue will have to be met. The time to get our thinking in order is now.

Gas warfare has been condemned as horrible and inhumane. The underlying reality is that no warfare is humane. Before rejecting gas as too cruel for use by a civilized nation, let us look at the casualties and suffering inflicted by an accepted weapon—an air bombardment for example.

Consider for a moment what happened in Hamburg, Germany, on the night of July 27–28, 1943, when 16,000 buildings were set aflame, when the air temperature in some city blocks registered 1,472 degrees F., and when between 60,000 and 100,000 civilians perished. I quote from the United States Strategic Bombing Survey's report on the Effect of Bombing on Health and Medical Care in Germany. If you are squeamish, stop right here.

"Soon after the sirens had sounded—a little before midnight on a clear night—the first bombs dropped. The warning was adequate for everyone to go to his shelter or bunker, and thereby evacuate the streets. * * * Incendiary bombs started fires which spread particularly in thickly inhabited parts of the town. In several minutes whole blocks were on fire and streets made impassable by flames. The heat increased rapidly and produced a wind which was soon the power and strength of a typhoon.

"This typhoon first moved in the direction of the fires, later spreading in all directions. * * *

"The heat turned whole city blocks into a flaming hell. * * *

"Literally hundreds of people were seen leaving the shelters after the heat became intense. They ran across the streets and were seen to collapse very slowly like people who were utterly exhausted. They could not get up. Many thus killed were found to be naked. Two explanations have been offered for this phenomenon; that the flames spurted across the street with the speed of a tornado and consumed the victims' clothing, singeing their skins; or that the intense heat made the clothes dissolve without actual fire. The shoes were usually the only covering left on the bodies.

"Most of these people were not burnt to ashes when recovered, but dry and shrunken, resembling mummies. * * *

"In the course of hours the air in the shelters became increasingly worse. Matches or candles did not burn. People lay on the floor because the air was better there and they could breathe easier. Some vomited. Some became tired and went to sleep. Wherever the ventilators were still working they brought in hot smoky air instead of cool fresh air and had to be turned off. Filters proved insufficient to keep out smoke. The apparent safety of many shelters was only temporary as the approaching fire increased heat and smoke.

"Thus the picture changed from hour to hour. Whoever was still able to make his own decision had one of two alternatives—to stay or escape. Many looked into the streets, saw that everything was on fire, decided they could not get through and withdrew to the corners of the shelters. Some tried to get out, and for them it was a race with death among explosions, fire bombs, machine guns, and falling flak. Beside all this, flame spurted through the streets and the wind caught up with many and threw them to the ground. There were screams from victims all around. Many stated that 'the air just didn't come anymore' and breathing became very difficult. Otherwise they did not feel anything, and the rest went on over those who had fallen. One man was observed to fall. He was about to pull himself up with his hands when flames were seen to envelop his back and he burned within 5 minutes without changing his position.

"Only a few reached safety in areas which had not been hit. Some found safety in the bottom of a bomb crater, others found death by drowning in water-filled craters. The only safe refuge in all this time was the water of the canals and the port. Most of those who got there were entirely exhausted. Lips, mouth, and throat were dry. They were blistered on the nose and ears, on the hands and face, and their eyes burned with pain and could hardly be opened after having been exposed to so much smoke. Many collapsed, then lost consciousness and died. Many jumped into the water. Even here the heat was hardly bearable. They took blankets and handkerchiefs and soaked them in the water and then protected their heads and the uncovered parts of their bodies with the wet cloths. But the water evaporated so quickly that this procedure had to be repeated every few minutes.

"In the meantime the burned-out houses caved in. The rubble and debris lying in the street prevented many from escaping. Many of the bodies were lying in the street half-clothed or nude. After a few hours the bodies shrunk to small objects with hard brownish black skin, and frequently to ashes and complete disappearance.

"Carbon monoxide as the major cause of death from aerial bombing was a possibility which few had expected before the war. It is now recognized as a typical 'shelter or cellar death.' Carbon-monoxide death assumed such importance that the high command of the Luftwaffe issued an order to procure statistical evidence. * * * Concentrations up to 95 percent were found in many of the 'shelter dead.' It was stressed at the conference in Jueterborg that the public should not be informed as to the danger of carbon monoxide originating in large-scale fires. In view of the inadequacy of preventive measures only, unrest and even panic would be caused."

After reading the foregoing, I think all will agree that war is inhumane in all its aspects, no matter what the weapons. In the future the employment by our enemies of chemical weapons to achieve a military objective is very likely to be judged solely on the grounds of its military applicability. Our own survival may depend upon our recognition of this hard fact.

There is no point in minimizing the horror of fire raids or of gas. Either can produce widespread death in a matter of minutes unless effective countermeasures are at hand. Yet if we are forced to fight, we may also be forced to use the most effective weapon at our command.

Modern war reveals a trend toward the concentration of immense destructive power in increasingly smaller packages—packages which cost less than the vastly greater number of older weapons needed to achieve equal potency. Experts call this the ABC pattern of warfare—atomic, biological, chemical. Up to now we have concentrated almost exclusively on atomic potentials—in attack and defense. But such a narrow view may not long be sustained. Warfare is more than a matter of cold steel, hot atoms and jet-propelled gun-platforms, especially when we are confronted by the problem of Communist mass infantry attack—the tactic which broke the back of the German army in Russia, and which twice produced a near-debacle in Korea. What happened in Korea is only a foretaste of what may happen in Western Europe should our military leaders continue to ignore the one weapon which may be best suited to defense against hordes.

For whether we realize it or not, nerve gas is capable of permeating the air envelope in which the armed horde moves and breathes. Nerve gas can shoot around corners, creep into foxholes, and ooze into otherwise impregnable strongpoints. The damaging power of high explosive ends when the shell bursts. When a chemical shell explodes, its damaging power only begins—its lethal quality can remain for minutes, days, weeks, or even months.

When a rifle bullet reaches the end of its trajectory and is spent without hitting anything, it is wasted and useless. Combat analysis shows that a great percentage of small arms fire misses its target. Nerve gas, spread out over a far greater area than either shell or bullet, would just be starting its effect. Its deadly molecule remains alive and kicking, moving with bullet-like speed to penetrate the tiniest pores. Gas is like a machine gun that fires a million bullets a second.

Since we have no offensive intentions, the fact that a chemical weapon is often more suited to the defense rather than the offense, is a very important point to be considered. Contaminated ground is denied to the enemy, and his attack is forced into narrow channels which can be covered by rapid fire supporting weapons.

In Western Europe, as in the United States, prevailing winds are from west to east. Any enemy facing us, would have gas clouds blown in his face, including any gas which he released. This is one reason why the Germans were at a disadvantage in using gas, and the same problem will confront any similar army which looks into the west wind.

Furthermore, war demands that we think beyond the moment of conflict to the time when facilities of the war zone must be restored to productive living. The principle of economy of force demands that every unnecessary act of physical destruction be avoided, as the smaller the loss, the greater the victory. This is something which we lost sight of during World War II, when we smashed into rubble the very facilities which, in order to maintain the peace, our taxpayers have paid millions to restore. Chemical weapons subdue personnel without destroying property.

No one can deny the ultra-destructive character of atomic weapons—in that sphere they have no equal. But one may well quarrel with any glib assumption that they can win a war, if by winning, one means the enforcement of a nation's policy with physical destruction held to the minimum, instead of being maximized to the point where war has no victors, only losers. Nor should we assume, because we are fascinated with the atomic weapon, that Soviet war planners fall into a similar error. In fact, knowing that their primary interest lies in the conquest of the physical assets of the world intact, we must assume that they are giving increasingly greater consideration to the use of chemical means to obtain their objectives.

The ideal weapon may be a gas which temporarily destroys the will to fight but does no lasting harm. Such a weapon might make short shrift of any aggressor, and render his defense powerless. Such a weapon properly used, would free the world from fear of destruction and might well save civilization itself from collapse.

This, however, is a glimpse into a future which may be unpredictable. The present demands that we face reality. Nerve gas may never be used against our country; that at least is what we can hope. But no one can be sure. If a nerve gas attack does come, what you have read here will enable you to sense when it is occurring, and may help save your life.

That is why this story is being told.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article that appeared in the weekly bulletin of the Department of External Affairs of Ireland on April 23, 1951:

IRELAND AND WESTERN DEFENSE

In a letter to the British Catholic weekly, the Tablet, Mr. Sean MacBride, minister for external affairs, answers recent criticisms of Ireland's attitude toward western defense contained in a Tablet editorial entitled "Ireland and the Atlantic Pact." The Tablet had commented critically on extracts from Mr. MacBride's speech to the National Press Club in Washington on March 31.

Mr. MacBride writes:

"After quoting my remarks as to the impact on Ireland of Russian and British policies, and my remark that 'both are powers with imperial traditions, and to imperial powers the partition of small nations has always seemed expedient and therefore just', you go on to say that the Communists are addicted to 'a similar line of argument' when they defend their acts of religious oppression by reference to the English Reformation in the sixteenth century. * * *

"The speech would certainly have been an ill-considered one if it had in fact represented 'a similar line of argument' to the Communist one with which you so imaginatively compare it. But, in fact, I was not talking about the English Reformation, or even about Peter the Great; I was talking about the partition of my country, which was effected by Great Britain in 1921 and which is still, in 1951, being maintained by Great Britain. This is not an 'old unhappy far-off thing' but something very modern and, to us, very important. Some English people would rather forget about it. That is quite understandable. It should be understandable also that we in Ireland find it hard to forget about it; to us it is very real present-day fact. In fact, however, many people in Britain, and yourself, sir, apparently among them, do sincerely find it hard to understand that a small nation which has opposed British rule for hundreds of years should object to your continued interference in its affairs. That inability to see our point of view is what I ascribe to your imperialist traditions; I have no interest in those traditions except insofar as they affect living issues in the world today. * * *

"You will, I hope, forgive me if I see in your own editorial some evidence of an imperialistic tradition which is characteristically your own. You say that instead of attacking in principle the partition of my country as I did, I would have done better 'to dwell on the evidence that can be brought forward to support the view that the Catholics of Northern Ireland are the victims of religious discrimination.' Now the Catholics of Northern Ireland are subject to religious discrimination, and 'the evidence that can be brought forward to support the view' that this is so, has, in fact, been brought forward by Mr. Geoffrey Bing in his pamphlet John Bull's Other Ireland, published by Tribune. I may say that some of us find it rather noteworthy that the honorable task of inquiring into this injustice was carried out by Tribune rather than the Tablet. But from our point of view the anti-Catholic discrimination in the six counties, despicable as it is, is not the only matter involved. We would still object as strongly as ever to the partition of our country if the Catholics in the partitioned area were pampered. Ireland would still object because Ireland is a nation, and a nation, as long as there is life in it, will not accept division, whatever the motives and circumstances of the division are. * * *

"THE UNGRATEFUL IRISH

"In your comments on discrimination and on the Dutch affair you are taking, perhaps unconsciously, the attitude which your paper has so often in the past taken toward Ireland. The Irish, for the Tablet, have always been simply a type, and not quite the best type, of Catholic Britons. You and your predecessors have been perennially unable to understand why the Irish are still not satisfied when some new 'benefit' such as the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, or a Catholic Lord Lieutenant, or a squadron of foreign airmen, is conferred upon them. The Irish, I can assure you, will not be satisfied until their country is free and united, a republic of the 32 counties. You would not, I think, find such a demand strange in a case where Britain was not involved. If, for example, Russia were able to inspire the secession to the Soviet Union of areas of France in which the Communists had a majority and adjoining areas which they were able to dominate, you would probably not find it eccentric on the part of the majority of the French nation if they were to seek the reintegration of their country.

"That brings me to the main burden of your article, which is that, in the great crisis of the world today we should forget about a little thing like partition. We are 'in the presence of the Soviet power,' and as long as we are so—which may be a long time—we should subordinate everything to defense; in effect 'freeze' conditions as they are today, however unjust they may be. This was, if I remember rightly, the method by which the holy alliance sought to resist the ideas of the French Revolution. It was natural enough that the doomed aristocratic order should rely on such a system, and if I believed that our democratic civilization was doomed I would agree that the best thing to do was to fight a rear-guard action against a change of all kinds. I do not, however, believe that this is the case. I think that this is a time, as I said in Washington, for the 'free and voluntary' merging of national sovereignties. As you rather grudgingly admit, that has been the tendency of our efforts in the Council of Europe, and also, though this you do not mention, the OEEC. We are trying to move toward that end by all the means in our power, but the means in our power do not include the conclusion of a military alliance with the nation which partitions us, and the guaranteeing of that nation's territorial integrity within our own shores.

"OPEN AND CONSTRUCTIVE DISCUSSION

"The suggestion contained in your last sentence, that there is an opportunity for Ireland to exist as one unit within the framework of the western community, is one with which I am thoroughly in agreement. What I fail to see is how we should be moving to that end by accepting partition in order to enter a military alliance. When, as Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, I was obliged to refuse the invitation of the United States to enter the Atlantic Pact, I explained Ireland's reasons and suggested that a conference of the nations involved and of Irish representatives should be held to discuss methods of solving the problem. I think that you, sir, would be rendering a more real service to the unity of western civilization by influencing English public opinion toward an open and constructive discussion by way of such a conference than you are rendering by the admittedly easier and more habitual work of lecturing the Irish."

In the same issue of the Tablet, Mr. James Dillon, Minister for Agriculture, writes:

"Neither Mr. MacBride nor anyone in Ireland is thinking about the imperialism of Britain in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. They are thinking and feeling about what Great Britain is doing in 1950 and 1951, and what she claims the right to go on doing so long as she is physically able to do so—i. e., occupying the six northeastern counties of our country.

"This is not ancient history; this is not ancient wrongs nor injustice of long ago; it is going on now; and I sincerely hope it will stop, before history repeats itself again, in what, for me, would be the third generation."

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, for a period of many years, Congress has encouraged soil-conservation practices by appropriating funds in order to provide expert advisers to farmers. These funds will be returned by increased value of our most important natural resource—fertile soil. It is very apparent that succeeding generations will inherit a huge national debt; but, at the same time, I sincerely hope they will become heir to land that has not been impoverished by time.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. D. M. Ginn, a leading land conservationist, to Mr. D. W. Fortenberry, his district conservationist, which recently appeared in the Mississippi Conservation News:

STEP BY STEP

Present-day soil conservationists will be interested in the fact that its principals were recognized prior to the turn of the century. We reproduce for the benefit of our readers the following letter written by Mr. D. M. Ginn, of Walthall County, to Mr. D. W. Fortenberry, district conservationist, of Columbia, Miss.:

TYLERTOWN, MISS.

Mr. D. W. FORTENBERRY,
District Conservationist,
Columbia, Miss.

DEAR SIR: The first attempt at soil conservation that I can remember was about 1888 or 1890, but then we didn't know it as "soil conservation," as that word hadn't then been coined.

One T. D. Richmond, grandfather of Thomas and Ray Richmond, began a system of hillside ditches, on what was then known as Leatherwood Creek, using a rafter and plumb bob as an instrument. This method was continued into the early 1900's, and spread to only a very few farmers, until one of my neighbors secured a farm level. We, then, began the ridge-type terraces with a hillside ditch, with no particular rule or system, but every farmer had his own idea, all of which were from bad to worse.

In 1930 a few farmers had a fairly good system, but still carried the water around hills and over natural waterways to a road, land line, or other disposal place. Then, finally, came the wider and extremely high terraces, on which a few of us planted one row. Later a few were widened to three rows when we heard of the Copeland system as a better way of protecting our soil; and too, by that time we had heard of sheet erosion, and had begun to train our water into more natural waterways. However, we had to go from there because we have not conquered soil depletion or reached a state of perfection by any means.

About 1914, we had never thought of cover crops, but a county agent (then known as county demonstrator), G. C. Minges, persuaded me to try crimson clover as a winter cover crop. I secured 100 pounds of seed, which cost about $4, and planted 4 acres, without inoculation, as we had not then learned that there was such fertilizer as inoculation. However, after being red all winter, by March 20, 1915, that had given me a growth of about 6 inches which was turned under and followed with corn. That convinced me that we had found something worth holding to, and the following fall I planted 15 acres to crimson clover with seed costing $5.25 per hundred. Then came World War I, and we forgot cover crops but by that time a few of us were getting a little less shy of county agents. After 1920, we began to listen to them again but we still believed that we knew more about cropping than they.

In 1924, a county agent persuaded me to plant 500 pounds of hairy vetch, it being inoculated, and it did well. Since then I have not been without winter cover crops on row crop land. In 1930, I planted 100 pounds of Austrian winter peas, fertilized with 4–8–4, and planted in rows that gave me a wonderful growth. That same year I planted 100 acres of hairy vetch to be turned under in the spring, and 20 acres in vetch and oats. The oats crop gave a growth of 4 to 6 feet tall and the vetch, of course, reached a height of the oats. That 20 acres was harvested for feeding purposes. All of the new-known varieties of cover crops are good, but I prefer in most instances wild winter (Singletary) peas.

Finally, in late 1941 or 1942, we succeeded, under the leadership of County Agent O. B. Elliott, to organize the Walthall County Soil Conservation District, with you, D. W. Fortenberry, as conservationist. I remember that I met you on your first day in our town, and after exchanging greetings, you began to talk kudzu, and to my knowledge, you haven't let up until this good day, being 7 or 8 years. I finally agreed to put two acres of the abominable stuff in a section of the farm that could be given away or fenced off, if it proved as obnoxious as I believed it would. However, we finished that planting in the spring with about 5 acres in waterways of a 60-acre field, from which planting and later plantings, that field at this time is about covered. In further experiments, we planted wild winter peas in the kudzu, which combination gives us a very satisfactory and profitable grazing crop. On September 10, 1949, we turned 62 cattle to that kudzu field and they made a good growth, having all they needed until November 15. Then in 1950, we gathered from that field more than $300 of kudzu crowns that went to several neighboring counties.

After all, our county has been exceedingly fortunate in getting started in soil conservation fostered by Federal and State at the time we did. They have kept telling us, through you, that soil conservation and better land use must go hand in hand, if we expect to carry out the command to strive daily and continually, that we leave to our posterity a better world in which to live than we found.

I have been told that I am the first man that successfully grew any of the winter legumes in this section and if that is true, I am very proud of the fact that I was instrumental in beginning a program that has meant so much toward better land conservation.

Remembering our pleasant association in the past, and hoping that we, together, may continue to go forward in all phases of soil conservation, I am,

Yours very truly,

D. M. GINN.

Small Business and Inventive Genius Needs Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, small business is the backbone of free enterprise and a fundamental pillar in the structure of our American form of democracy. Its preservation is essential to the free-enterprise system, and every effort must be made to recognize its needs, insure its survival, and encourage its development and expansion.

Today due to the critical shortage of many essential materials which are needed in the defense program, small business is faced with a famine of raw materials which may result in the failure of many small plants—plants which cannot be converted to the production of defense materials or cannot qualify for defense contracts—in the event some allocation of these materials is not specifically designated for the use of small business.

Many of the small-business concerns have long provided a proving ground for new ideas for labor saving devices, household utensils, and many other types of inventions. Many of these have later been utilized by the Nation's great manufacturing industry.

Mr. Don L. Davis, chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry, recently appeared before the House Small Business Committee during the committee's session at Los Angeles, Calif. The following is the statement of Mr. Davis and is an excellent exposition of the position of small business at the present time and the need for special consideration of the problem of material supply for small business:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Small Business, first, may I as an American citizen and spokesman for the Invention Industry express my deep personal and professional appreciation and gratitude for the courtesy extended us in this invitation to appear before your committee. To my knowledge, this is the first time the Invention Industry officially has had an opportunity to have its views heard and recorded by a committee of Congress.

I appear before you today in my official capacity as chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry. The council is composed of the National Association of Inventors, Inc., a trade association of American inventors duly chartered as a nonprofit organization under the State laws of California; the National Gadget Manufacturers Association, a trade organization composed of manufacturers who make new products and registered and duly chartered as a nonprofit corporation under the State laws of California; the National Independent Distributors Association, Inc., a nonprofit corporation chartered under the State laws of Illinois; the Gadget-of-the-Month Club, Inc., an international sampling organization for new products; and Consumers Testing League, a new product research organization. These five organizations comprise the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry.

In my remarks, I will refer to the industry at various times both as the invention industry and/or the gadget industry. Both names are used interchangeably to refer to those millions of Americans engaged in the creation, discovery, development, and distribution of new products and/or gadgets.

The invention industry defines a gadget as "any product which is a labor-saving device of any nature, kind, or description." Webster's dictionary defines a gadget as "anything new for which a name cannot be thought of at the moment." In the invention industry, we contend and history has proved that everything new is first a gadget; when hundreds of thousands of people use it, it becomes a standard staple; and

when millions of people can no longer live without it, it becomes a necessity. The progress pattern, therefore, of any new idea of merit is, first a gadget—then a staple—and then a necessity. We of the gadget industry contend, and as its spokesman if sufficient time were allotted we could prove, that the invention industry has mothered directly or indirectly every major industry in America today. And were it not for the invention industry, these United States, our country, would be a land of farmers. Our place in the world today, our position as a world power is due directly as we all I am sure must agree, to the ingenuity and industrialization of America, and we contend that this very great industrial development and almost limitless power of production is due to industry of all nature, kind, and description which has been conceived and mothered by American ingenuity, created by American inventors, aided and abetted by those fellow Americans who have had and still do have the courage, the foresight, and the vision to pioneer new ideas and new methods.

We of the invention industry contend that the only way for an average American and for an American businessman to make any real money is in discovery, development, and distribution of new products and services. Under our system, and only under our system, thank God, a man with an idea can still become a millionaire overnight.

We believe that it is elementary and fundamental to point out in passing that the giant American corporations today were small businesses yesterday and the future and security of our country lies in the perpetuation of that fundamental system, for example, the encouragement of small business. We all know that it was the horseless carriage that gave us the automotive industry, the inventors that gave us the flying machine which mothered the aircraft industry, the iceless icebox which became electric refrigeration, radio, television, and countless other illustrations.

We understand that the Congress defines small business as companies and organizations employing 500 persons or less. We believe that if that is the popular congressional conception and treatment, that the Congress must realize that the vast majority of small business in America today, and this is particularly true of the hundreds of thousands of persons engaged in or represented by the invention industry, employ an average of 10 or more people. Twenty-five or fifty would be a more realistic national average. Accordingly, the problems of a manufacturer employing 10 to 25 people are vastly different from those employing 100 to 500 people.

From all available statistics and estimates compiled over a period of the last 5 years, it appears that the gadget industry as such is a half-billion-dollar industry.

We do not think it necessary to prove to the committee that all Americans love gadgets, that gadgets are an American phenomena, and that the very word "gadget" is as American as apple pie. There is not an American home whose confines do not house countless numbers of these labor-saving devices, some good, some bad, some indifferent.

We think that it is significant to call to the committee's attention the fact that although our industry has done so much for our Nation, it has received so little attention, consideration, or even recognition as an industry whose activities are so integrally woven into and a part of the national character and lifeblood of America.

One popular fallacy that we would like to correct in the minds of our fellow Americans is that when most people think of invention and development of new products, invariably they visualize the universities' and corporations' labors and think only of scientists, engineers, and the like, working under corporation grants and benefactors' endowments. I do not represent them. The organized gadget industry knows that they represent a very minute percentage of the activities of our industry. When we refer to inventors, we mean the millions of average Americans in all walks of life who have an idea and who have got the guts to back that idea, often with all their resources. No long-haired inventors, no scatterbrains, but the average American citizen who creates an idea, this is what we mean when we refer to inventors and new products. We say "invention is inspired, not hired." We define invention as "man's rebellion against stupidity, against doing things the hard way." We contend that no man or woman can do a job day after day for a number of years without coming up with an individual trick, invention, gadget, or gimmick to do that job quicker and better, faster and cheaper. When that happens, we have invention and the approximately three million patents already issued by the United States Patent Office only represent a small percentage of the millions of ideas, many of them excellent, which have for one of a hundred reasons never had a final patent granted. It is from these sources and from simple American citizens that have come the greatest ideas which have helped make America great. For every Alexander Bell, every Fulton, every Kettering, every Orville Wright, who has received recognition, we know that there are thousands with equally great inventions and for various reasons too detailed to discuss, they haven't been heard from or recognized.

In peace, as in war, citizen lay inventors have made solid and substantial contributions to the national welfare, progress, and security. Proof of that is attested to by the fact that a National Inventors Council was established by a Presidential directive.

It may be curiously significant to the committee that the headquarters of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry and other component members are located in California. For the record, I wish to point out this fact that 34 percent of all the patents issued by the United States Patent Office have been issued to residents of California. The explanation of that fact is that the invention industry has discovered that where there is a high rate of retired people in the area, there happens to be a correspondingly high ratio of invention. It appears that it takes a man almost a lifetime of experience and observation to be able to make things better, quicker, faster, and cheaper.

So much, gentlemen, for background of the invention industry. I hope I have established it in your minds, and now we come to the crux of the problem.

The President has declared an emergency. The National Production Authority have issued regulations, restriction orders, and directives. Steel, copper, aluminum, rubber, plating, nickel, chrome are all on the restricted or banned list. We find that the industry today faces virtual extinction unless we obtain relief. Imagine, if you will, a man with an idea. He gets a patent. He goes to a number of manufacturers and for any of a number of reasons, cannot get the item manufactured. However, he is a man of good judgment, a sound businessman. Maybe he has worked for someone for years, maybe he has retired. He feels his idea is sound. He takes his life savings, or he organizes a company and gets two or three partners or a dozen people interested. Investment may run from as little as two thousand to as high as seventy-five or one hundred thousand dollars. He begins to manufacture. Sometimes he does very well at first; sometimes it is a question of building slowly. Maybe he does the whole production job himself; maybe he has it subcontracted. And then comes the emergency. His subcontractors say they will do all they can for him and they give him only a few parts, or maybe they turn him down because they think they will get some defense orders, or maybe they are grateful to him because he has been a good customer, but they cannot help him very much because their supply of steel or aluminum is drastically reduced. What is this American to do? He has worked hard for the last 4 or 5 years to build his business. It has cost him thousands of dollars to break into the retail market. He has spent money on advertising and promotion, or sales efforts, and all of a sudden, he finds himself with little or no materials and he is stuck right halfway in the middle. Maybe the company has made money, but not enough money to amortize its tooling, its plates, its jigs, and its dies. Maybe they have just begun to show a profit. What are they supposed to do? Close down and go to work in a defense work? Or are they supposed to close up and, like an Arab, fold their tent and steal away. They have made money. They have paid their taxes. They have a set-up that has cost countless thousands, to say nothing of the blood, sweat, and tears that have gone into this business. If I were talking about 1 company, or 1 individual, or even 10 or 100, that would be a different story, but I am talking about thousands from coast to coast to whom these directives from Washington on drastic curtailments mean the end of everything just as though they were living in Russia or Argentina or some other dictator country. What are these people going to do? Gentlemen, they represent a real and very serious problem that I am sure, and I know that our representatives in Congress have too long overlooked. These people are too big and too many to be ignored and yet apparently, they are too small to be converted to defense activities, or at least that seems to be the impression they have received.

Every time a small group of Americans band themselves together to manufacture or sell a new item and they "go broke" because of circumstances beyond their control the personal loss and the individual loss is heartbreaking, but from where we stand we believe that the loss to the Nation is stunning and staggering because these little men, these little people, are the very backbone and the sinews of America. They are the living manifestation of free enterprise. It is from these people that tomorrow will come the General Motors and the General Electric and the other giants of industry. These giants of industry have helped make America great by their industrial production, by their employment to fellow citizens, by their tremendous tax payments. It is from these little people and these little corporations that come the additional pillars which keep this country great. Ignore them, break them, push them aside, and you have broken and forgotten and betrayed and repudiated every principle of American free enterprise. Don't you gentlemen realize that Henry Ford was just a little guy not many years ago, and there are a great many counterparts of Henry Ford here in our industry. As long as an American with an idea still thinks that he can become a millionaire, that's so long as free enterprise will have a deep-rooted, real, and personal meaning to every American working man and woman. In my humble opinion, that is the only American antidote for communism, because history has proved that the only time communism flourishes is when people are wage slaves and every hope for personal profit and personal progress has been dashed and is futile.

Those manufacturers who are larger and who have some equipment and who are in the position to convert to do some defense work are being beat down by the discouraging delays, the endless red tape. Not only that, but the larger organizations keep raiding our manufacturer's staffs by offering higher wages and more inducements.

Being "little people," we have no lobbies in Washington. We have no "ins" with the big boys, and we are too small for even the 5 percenters to be interested in us. Gentlemen, little people can be kicked around just so much. We can stomach just so much. Our patience can last just so much. And then we get mad. That time has now come for the invention industry, and my appearance before this committee today is proof positive that the time has come to quit "beefing" and try to get some consideration for our cause. All of us in our industry have worked too long and too hard, and we've got too much at stake to be put out of business with the stroke of a pen. We give no quarter, nor ask any quarter on our patriotism, but we just aren't going to sit still and see ourselves put out of business for the duration when nobody can tell us or seems to know how long that duration is going to be. If we've got to have a lobby in Washington, we'll get one. If we've got to do the things the way the big boys do it, we'll do it. True, we'll be fighting with pennies and not with dollars, but it is a question now, gentlemen, of survival. It is bread and butter that we want, not cake—just plain bread and butter, and I think you will agree that we've got a right to bread and butter.

Now what do we propose? What's the answer? What can you gentlemen do for us? Anything you do will be appreciated, but specifically we base our hopes upon this one major consideration. Allocate a percentage of materials earmarked exclusively for the development and manufacture on pilot-plant basis for new products. Let us have 10, 25, any percentage so that short of shooting war and an all-out state of emergency, the development and manufacture of new products can continue. Don't let our tools and dies and jigs rust. Let us have just enough material to keep going so when the crisis is over and peace comes again, the little man can still be there. We're not asking for any subsidies; we're not asking for any hand-outs; we're not asking for any grants; we're not asking for anything for nothing. Only for the right and the opportunity to make a living and to pay taxes so we can help in our own way. Let's not make American citizens displaced persons in their own country. Tomorrow always comes. Tomorrow always will come and it is for tomorrow that we all work and sacrifice. Gentlemen, if you could see the blueprints and the ideas that I have seen and that I see every day of my life, you would understand why we of the invention industry are making this plea for survival.

Our industry knows that while yesterday has been glorious and rich, tomorrow is even greater. We have no ceilings and we have many frontiers to pioneer. We want the opportunity and the promise and the tools to make a reality of the tomorrow that every American looks for, works for, fights for, and is willing to die for. Our industry is a real manifestation of free enterprise and our Nation's best barrier against communism.

The invention industry asks that the Congress of the United States give serious consideration to our plight and to enact such legislation or effect such remedial measures immediately so as to give the invention industry the opportunity to work for, serve, and help build a better America. Thank you.

Pay Increase for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition of Minnesota Department, American Federation of Government Employees, in support of H. R. 241, pay-raise bill for Federal employees:

MAY 3, 1951.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned United States Government employees, hereby petition your active support for passage of H. R. 241, the pay-raise bill, which is urgently needed to partially offset our increased cost of living:

Joseph J. Pingatore, Fort Snelling, Minn.; John C. Gray, Fort Snelling, Minn.; John F. Ryan, Minneapolis, Minn.; Edwin Murphy, St. Paul, Minn.; Ella T. Lorentsen, Minneapolis, Minn.; Genevieve D. Stoffes, St. Paul, Minn.; Raphael H. Pezalla, St. Paul, Minn.; Betty J. Bennett, Minneapolis, Minn.; Irene D. Taraba, St. Paul, Minn.; Ruth E. Oleson, St. Paul, Minn.; Mary Jane Kreitlaw, Minneapolis, Minn.; Ruth C. Beninga, Minneapolis, Minn.; Geraldine L. Lindquist, Minneapolis, Minn.; Adele Broghamner, Minneapolis, Minn.; Leona J. Pelava, Minneapolis, Minn.; Leonard V. Bussen, St. Paul, Minn.; Eugene P. Daly, St. Paul, Minn.

B. A. Carey, St. Paul, Minn.; Matthew D. Lanigan, Minneapolis, Minn.; T. Vogel, Minneapolis, Minn.; Allen Wissinger, St. Paul, Minn.; K. J. Shaughnessy, Minneapolis, Minn.; Robert N. Faulkner, St. Paul, Minn.; John N. Willems, St. Paul, Minn.; Frances O. Walseth, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rudolf Zimmerman, St. Paul, Minn.; Melvin M. Lesneau, St. Paul, Minn.; Arthur A. Kloos, St. Paul, Minn.; Ernest M. Swanson, Minneapolis, Minn.; William J. McEvoy, St. Paul, Minn.; J. H. Brody, St. Paul, Minn.; Gerald M. Stevens, St. Paul, Minn.; R. M. DesJardens, St. Paul, Minn.; Martin Holland, Minneapolis, Minn.; Emil A. Zeyereisen, St. Paul, Minn.; George E. O'Laughlin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Homer Gannaway, St. Paul Park, Minn.; William S. Harrison, Minneapolis, Minn.; Frances E. Kiyabu, Minneapolis, Minn.; O. N. McNeil, Minneapolis, Minn.; Louis D. Wegwerth, St. Paul Park, Minn.; W. Sherk, Minneapolis, Minn.; K. C. Carlson, St. Paul, Minn.; E. M. Granstrom, Minneapolis, Minn.; John E. Hinslin, Minneapolis; Ray McCraney, St. Paul, Minn.; John J. Stader, St. Paul, Minn.; J. L. O'Reilly, St. Paul; W. M. Anderson, Minneapolis; Arthur Durrant, Minneapolis; K. W. Osborne, Minneapolis.

Earl Holmes, Minneapolis; S. A. Greenlee, Minneapolis, Minn.; A. E. Saltz, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. A. E. Saltz, Minneapolis, Minn.; Leo P. Motylewski, Minneapolis, Minn.; Allen B. Burt, Minneapolis, Minn.; Ardell Motylewski, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. A. B. Burt, Minneapolis, Minn.; John S. Hoffrue, St. Paul, Minn.; A. F. Decouski, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Isabel Greenlee, Minneapolis, Minn.; Pansy M. Johnson, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Earl Holmes, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Roy Ginnow, Minneapolis, Minn.; William J. Carson, Fort Snelling; Norman R. Lundeen, St. Paul, Minn.; Ruth Stone, Minneapolis, Minn.; Annie Furrier, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mae E. Johnson, Minneapolis, Minn.; LeRoy K. Ginnow, Minneapolis, Minn.; David S. Baines, Anoka, Minn.; Harry F. Masten, Minneapolis, Minn.; Arnold Brooks, Minneapolis; Warren O. Johnson, Fort Snelling; Willis M. Bisenin, St. Paul, Minn.; Alfred M. Larik, Minneapolis; Earl T. Weinand, Minneapolis; Mrs. Earl T. Weinand, Minneapolis; Anthony J. Moser, Minneapolis; Bernadine Moser, Minneapolis, Minn.; Michael N. Bigelbach, St. Paul, Minn.; George R. Dennis, St. Paul, Minn.; Wilfred J. Bonquit, St. Paul, Minn.

Foreign and Domestic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me containing some comments on our foreign and domestic policies, delivered before the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New Mexico, at Hobbs, N. Mex., May 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF NEW MEXICO, HELD AT HOBBS, N. MEX., MAY 3, 1951

SOME COMMENTS ON OUR FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICIES

Recent experiences in the Far East have not been too reassuring as to the definiteness or certainty of our objectives. I will not comment on General MacArthur's being relieved of his command, except to say that in a Democratic State such as ours, the emphasis has always been on civilian control of the Armed Forces. Therefore, regardless of the merits of the case, the assertion of the preeminence of the civilian over the military must be definitely accepted. After all, it is one of the things that so distinguishes us from any of the military dictatorships we have seen rise and fall.

And yet, these differences should be debated in public so that our fellow citizens may know what is transpiring, what is causing the formulation of the policies that you have had to fight for, which others such as you are fighting for in Korea, and which still others will fight for in wars yet to come.

And here I pause to tell you that your organization and other veterans' organizations represent the backbone of America. By keeping before our fellow citizens the necessity of keeping America prepared for emergencies, you are educating our youth. You are directly representative of the American people, for you have demonstrated your patriotism by fighting overseas to protect the shores of our beloved land. If there is any place where no Communist or fellow travelers will be found, it is among groups such as this—a convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of New Mexico.

I am deeply complimented to have this opportunity of addressing you.

Our Korean adventure is not calculated to instill confidence in our Asiatic neighbors, neither as to our military prowess nor our

lack of imperialistic designs. In the ultimate analysis Koreans are fighting Koreans and both the Chinese and ourselves must be regarded as intruders. We need but think of our own War Between the States and the assistance furnished by France and England to the Confederacy to appreciate the fact that only a bitter hatred and a deep resentment can result from this unfortunate intervention on a foreign soil so far distant from our own.

What do we seek to achieve by this foreign adventure? Are we permanently committed to fight the Chinese—all 500,000,000 of them, or as many of them as are Communists? And here let me pause a moment and analyze the significance of what is called communism as it pertains to China. To me it is a misnomer.

What is going on is a revolution of a poverty-stricken and starving people striving for a better way of life—in fact, for their very existence. Their hapless plight gives the Russian Communists the opportunity to exploit this human misery to their own selfish ends.

The ownership of the land is promised by the Communist Party in China.

If you will but realize that the vast majority of the Chinese are tenant farmers who are thoroughly squeezed and exploited by the absentee landlords, guerrilla bands, and war lords, you will understand the intense land hunger that permeates the vast mass of humanity concentrated in China, where floods and famines are regarded as blessings because they decimate the population.

There the theory of Malthus (in his essay on population) is carried into practice. This is his contention: That famines, wars, plagues, and pestilence were necessary afflictions, for otherwise all of humanity would suffer starvation. This he based on the fact that food supplies increases only by addition, whereas the population increases by multiplication. In other words, it is arithmetic progression versus geometric progression.

But what of the effect on us? The Chinese can afford to lose three for one of ours, and when the war is over they will still have many more people than we had at the outset. In the meantime the real enemy in the Kremlin has lost Koreans and Chinese but no Russians. What will we use as reserves should we be plunged in a war with the Soviet Union? Will we have any allies?

We will be far safer to count on ourselves alone and the people south of the Rio Grande, our neighbors who in the last war supplied us with men and so many essential materials of war.

The problem confronting the United States is to maintain satisfactory relations with its Latin-American neighbors and Canada. Long years of doubtful financial, commercial, and political dealings with us, the Colossus of the North, have left upon the Latin-American psychology an indelible imprint of suspicion and even cynicism with regard to any act or policy of ours, even though altruistic.

Beginning with the first Roosevelt to be President and his motto, "Walk softly and carry a big stick," and the imprudent ventures in the Dominican Republic, on down through the years of the development of the good-neighbor policy, the Latin-American people have had little reason to put away their fear and mistrust of us. But the strong efforts of President Franklin Roosevelt to adhere to the policy of nonintervention and to promote cultural understanding between all the peoples of the Americas have actually brought about a more sympathetic relationship.

With the attack upon the United States by Japan, and the subsequent extension of the war to Europe, popular opinion in Latin America, ever mindful of the struggle for liberation that occupied the Latin-American patriots in the early days of the last century, was substantially behind the United States as the champion of individual liberty, freedom of thought, and the right to pursue one's individual destiny with a minimum of governmental interference. Many of the Latin American Republic showed their profound sympathy for our stand by formal declarations of war upon the Axis Powers. Thus was established an identity of interest and a given purpose which brought our sister republics into a much closer bond than had ever been achieved before.

At the end of the Second World War, it seemed indeed, that the United States and Latin America were well on the way to translating the good-neighbor policy into an actual living friendship.

Somehow, however, our Government stumbled upon an unfortunate policy involving interference in the internal affairs of some of our more prominent Latin-American neighbors. Again, suspicion and distrust, doubts and fears beset our neighbors to the south. The good work of the previous decade was largely undone and again the atmosphere was permeated with hostility. Our unfortunate experiences in Argentina have borne bitter fruit and this at a time when we must rely on our neighbors—neighbors who share our hemisphere and who have similar problems, similar aims, and similar aspirations.

There is no blinking at the truth. Shorn of all hypocrisy, sugar-coating and double-talk, the real enemy is the Soviet Union and its evil genius, the Communist Party. Our quarrel is not with the Russian people, certainly not with the farmers or the workers who earn their living as you and I do by the sweat of their brow and their daily toil. Our quarrel is with those who seek to destroy us—those who would bore from within, who would undercut the ground we stand on, those who would foster disunity, promote dissension, make our people, class, race, and color conscious.

Our enemies are aware of the weaknesses that are inherent in our body politic. They strive also to prey upon the fear and distrust, and to exploit the suspicions of our neighbors to the south. They dwell upon these factors in their constant propaganda campaign, just as they incite the underprivileged and substandard humans to strive to improve their lot by force and violence (as at Bogotá) rather than by constitutional means. Their motto is: "Bullets, not ballots."

There has never been any doubt in my mind that our State Department officials have had the best of intentions, even when seeking to intervene in the internal affairs of Latin American and other countries. Nevertheless, however good these intentions may be our own history demonstrates that in our infancy we were quite indisposed to view such intervention with equanimity, nor would we brook it as we achieved maturity.

Our own Monroe Doctrine which had fallen into relative desuetude since our more recent European adventures, and more especially since the Korean incident, stated plainly to all and sundry that the Western Hemisphere was closed to monarchy and to colonization. And we made it plain that we wanted no part of Europe's many wars or the embroilments which follow in their wake.

Nonintervention in the internal affairs of our sister republics is a sine qua non—an absolute condition—to a sympathetic understanding between the northern and southern parts of our hemisphere.

Even though these good intentions have been proclaimed with obvious sincerity through the ages, it has been observed that all too often the altruistic ends and the avowed intent to help others are often but a thin disguise to exploit and use the resources of the state wherein the economic penetration is accomplished.

If we return to our own infancy, we may recall an episode wherein we were made the objects of a similar attempt by one Citizen Genet representing the newly created Republic of France. Upon arrival in the United States in 1793, Genet decided that the painstaking neutrality maintained by the Government of the United States as between the European belligerents was not in accord with the desires of the majority of the American people. Thereupon citizen Genet carried the issue to the people by a series of public speeches, meetings and assemblies. Our Government did not relish this type of internal intervention and promptly requested the recall of Genet. Upon his recall interference in matters of internal concern ceased abruptly.

Likewise, the United States has been quick to resent and in every way possible to prevent any European intervention in Latin-American affairs. Time and again we have taken action as was feasible and was practicable to maintain that territorial integrity and the political independence of our good neighbors.

The War Between the States was hardly over before our Secretary of State, William Seward, notified the French Government that its troops must be withdrawn from Mexico where they were maintaining Maximilian's empire at the point of the bayonet. In 1866 the last of the French troops departed, leaving the ill-advised emperor to face a firing squad at Queretaro.

When Great Britain and Venezuela had a dispute over a common boundary in 1895, President Cleveland, sensing that Britain intended to have recourse to force, announced that this matter should be decided by arbitration. He intimated quite plainly that if Britain used force, the United States would meet force with force.

The record of our protective efforts in Latin America reminds me somewhat of the man who assured the object of his affection that he would protect her against all comers. But when she asked him somewhat demurely, "And who will protect me from you?" he was at a loss for an answer. Actually, no one has protected the Latin-American countries from such intrusions as we consider necessary.

Dollar diplomacy has been so severely and so bitterly criticized that I hardly need dwell on it. One of the best examples is furnished by our immediate neighbor to the south—the Republic of Mexico. For years Mexico has been kept constantly aware of the existence and power of the great financial interests that could make or break a government; and after decades of living within the shadows of fear and economic want, Mexico now has a government representative of the people.

We have but two courses of action: (1) to be good neighbors in our deeds as well as by our words, and to impress upon our friends of the south our sincerity and earnestness of purpose; or (2) we can revert to the policy of intimidation and become again the colossus with the big stick, the policeman of the Americas. No compromise between these two policies appears possible.

Should we fall back into the latter role, we can be the self-appointed guardian of the peace. We can be a twentieth century suzerain surveying our feudal domain to the south, acting as overlord in settling the disputes of our vassals, by the sheer power and force of our economic and military strength. Thus, we will make and unmake governments, create or destroy prosperity, raise or lower the standard of living, establish and disestablish alliances among

the various Latin-American Republics at will, and cast the votes of all of these Republics en bloc, in the councils of the United Nations and other world assemblies.

But there is another aspect. A determination to browbeat the Latin-American Republics will afford fuel for the sparks of communism that already exist south of the Rio Grande. That, coupled with the economic want, the submarginal standard of living which the majority of the people face daily, provide a fertile basis for Communist propaganda. Communists are quick to seize upon these misfortunes; and how are these people to know that the Communist promises of plenty, of total employment, of complete economic security, will never be fulfilled? If we do nothing to help these people, they may well try communism, for what have they to lose?

The billions we are spending in Europe and in the Far East will probably inure to the advantage of the Soviet Union, having as it does the tremendous advantage of geographic proximity. So we build an industrial potential and Russia will probably reap the industrial harvest and use our own machines in the endeavor to destroy us. Would it not be far preferable and infinitely more productive to invest in our good neighbors by raising their standard of living and thus to forestall the Communist promises by actual achievement? Why not make these human beings thankful that they are living under the principles of democracy and that they yearn not for a foreign ideology and a Communist Party line—a totalitarian state.

By developing the resources of Latin America, we are also improving our own economic conditions. Since the Latin-American countries are potentially our best customers, it is to our advantage to assist them to achieve a higher standard of living. The higher the standard the greater the demand for our goods and, therefore, the more profitable the trade. By supplying us with raw materials, which we need, these countries can establish credits which will pay for the manufactured goods exported to Latin America and required for the achievement of a higher standard of living.

With the Latin-American peoples on an economic par with Canada, then our neighbors south of the border would constitute an impressive market which would act as a stabilizing factor on our own economy and aid in preventing the recurrent depressions or economic crises which have been the bane of our people. Furthermore, with this economic development to strengthen them, they would constitute a far more powerful factor in world affairs.

Certainly we should promote a standard of living in Latin America comparable to that now existing in Canada.

By investing our money in the resources of Latin America, we will be creating an industrial reservoir of productive enterprise and of essential raw materials, which will be essential when the war with Russia comes. We will be taking advantage of our geographic proximity, and at the same time, by raising the standard of living prevent the spread of the Communist influence.

On the other hand, years of work will be undone and again the United States will be hated and feared throughout the Americas if the policy of imperialism prevails in place of genuine cooperation by our equals in the society of nations, we will only have a superficial, albeit obsequious subservience of our vassal states.

The pages of history furnish us with a parallel, an illustration worthy of note. During the Napoleonic era, of the grand army of France consisting of 600,000, only 60,000 French marched out of Russia. Where were the rest? Dead or deserted. As soon as it was apparent that victory would not attend the French armies, the Allies departed like the snow under the torrid rays of the noonday sun.

Have we any reason to believe that our Latin-American allies, united to us by fear, would react otherwise? Imperialism does not beget loyalty.

But if we adhere to our good-neighbor policy, we may make sacrifices and we may be called on for financial aid and we may not even be able to persuade our southern neighbors to accept our concepts of democracy, but over the years, we may build a strong and lasting friendship which may serve us well in our hour of need. Remember, a friend in need is a friend, indeed.

Furthermore, our Government will inevitably be subjected to pressure by financial and commercial interests adversely affected by the ever-growing and expanding economic nationalism of Latin America. The temptation will be strong to intervene just a little, or just this once, but intervention marks the end of the neighborly feeling.

Following a century and a quarter of confusion in its Latin-American policy, it is high time for the United States to decide upon a definite and continuing policy toward its sister republics of the hemisphere.

We must accept the fact that these are nations in a world community, entitled to equal treatment before the law. Pursuant to the convention in Montevideo in 1933, we must follow the doctrine that no nation has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

Unless our good faith is shown in pursuing this policy, we cannot hope to count on the assistance of the Latin-American republics in our hour of danger, an hour which may be far closer and far more dangerous than my fellow countrymen care to believe.

Steel Mills Turn to Canada for Ore but Not to the Much-Touted Labrador-Quebec Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article taken from the New York Times, January 21, 1951, reveals that our steel mills are turning to Canada for ore but it is not to the much-touted Labrador-Quebec project.

Every Member of Congress should read the following article because it explodes the arguments of the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway that the Labrador-Quebec project as a source of ore is indispensable:

STEEL MILLS TURN TO CANADA FOR ORE—BETHLEHEM, YOUNGSTOWN SHEET, INTERLAKE CORP. TO EXPLORE STEEP ROCK PROPERTIES

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

In their quest for new sources of iron ore to replace the fast-dwindling prime deposits of the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, heretofore the supplier of about 85 percent of the ore consumed in this country, several leading American iron and steel companies are now manifesting great interest in the properties of Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., in southwestern Ontario, Canada.

Last week Pickands, Mather & Co., a Cleveland management concern, announced that it was negotiating with Steep Rock for an agreement to explore and for a leasing option on 1,000 acres of its vast properties in behalf of Bethlehem Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Interlake Iron Corp., and the Steel Co. of Canada, Ltd.

More than a year ago Inland Steel Co., of Chicago executed a similar agreement with Steep Rock covering another large tract on which it has already conducted some test drilling.

Inland Steel said it is too early yet to tell whether the properties will prove high in ore content. Since there is still some water above the indicated ore body in the Inland area, the company does its testing in winter when the water is frozen and expects to conduct its drilling operations over three winters.

However, Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and chairman of the Steep Rock board, stated recently that the "Steep Rock reserves of high quality iron ore now are known to exceed those of any other range, old or new, on the continent."

Some ore has already come from the properties, but the volume is said to be only a fraction compared with the area's potentialities. The company, formed in 1939, uncovered its ore by draining off the 150-foot-deep Steep Rock Lake, about 140 miles from Port Arthur on Lake Superior. During the last shipping season, its sixth, the company mined about 1,215,000 tons of ore, said to be of very high quality.

Enthusiastic engineers have estimated that at least 1,000,000,000 tons of excellent quality hematite ore will eventually be proved on the Steep Rock properties, now divided into three large ore bodies. They believe annual production could soon be stepped up to 10,000,000 tons.

If this Canadian mine is as rich as its operators believe, it could become an important supplier of various Midwest steel mills, since it would require only a 140-mile railroad haul to available Great Lakes shipping facilities.

Republican Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address on Republican responsibility, delivered by me last Thursday evening in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS ENTITLED "REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY," BY UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES AT THE THIRD ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE, MAY 10, 1951, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

"If the Republican Party will put duty to our country above party politics, I am sure the Republican Party will have the support of the people in the next election."

This is not my statement. It refers to the election of 1952. It comes from a woman who was born, brought up, and educated

in the South, and who has an unusually pronounced Democrat Party background; her great-grandfather served in the Congress of the United States. Her statement is typical of many pronouncements I have been receiving in recent months from disillusioned Democrats and angry independents.

Sometimes, in a supreme desire to capitalize on the weaknesses, the incompetence, and the general rottenness, which pervade the Truman administration, we fail to recognize that there is a vast group of independent voters among the American electorate, who are looking anxiously to the Republican Party for something more than criticism and condemnation of the New Deal. The temptation to follow the line of least resistance is always strong.

Five percenters and deep freezers and Harry Vaughan; mink coats and the RFC scandals; red herrings and Alger Hiss and Dean Acheson; the President's inexcusably abominable treatment of General MacArthur—these are symbolic of an administration which has lost the confidence of the American people. They are evidences of Pendergastism saturating Washington. They provide an illusion of alluring political issues.

But millions of American citizens do not have to be convinced that these deplorable symbols of an administration, which has been derelict in its duty and has betrayed the trust imposed in it by the electorate, are a tragic reality. For many months the newspapers and the radio and television have portrayed vividly the sad estate to which the character of our National Government has sunk.

Millions of Americans have lost confidence in their Government. Among many of them there has been such a growing cynicism toward government itself that they no longer have faith in any of us who hold public office.

Merely to emphasize nowadays the failures and shortcomings of the party in power in Washington can only increase the cynicism and spread the growing lack of confidence in government. It can only aggravate a serious condition and trend which, unless soon reversed, may lead to the eventual disintegration of our American form of constitutional, representative government and to the decadence of our American society.

If I understand the American people, they are no longer in a state of mind to be lured by glittering promises and phony panaceas and the glib talk of demagogues. What they demand now is a political party and political leadership that are honest and forthright and possess common sense and realism.

The American people are fed up with the subsidies and with the extravagance and inefficiency which are part and parcel of the present National Government. As taxpayers they are revolting at the waste of money and manpower in our Federal establishment. As taxpayers and patriots they are willing to contribute whatever may be necessary to the adequate defense of our country and for the effective operation of governmental functions which the intricacies of modern-day society have forced upon us.

But as taxpayers the American people are demanding a dollar's return for every dollar spent. They are demanding that nondefense expenditures be cut to the bone and that every governmental service that is not truly essential to the welfare of the country be eliminated. They are demanding that there be frugality in defense expenditures, including expenditures for the armed services, just as far as the justifiable requirements of our preparedness program will permit.

In short, the American people demand, as well as deserve, a government which is honest and efficient. And they demand a major political party which will put these virtues into practice without turning to reaction in doing so. This is where the Republican Party has its greatest opportunity and faces its greatest challenge since 1860.

We Republicans, solely on the basis of the Truman record, can and should win in 1952. But we can afford to win in 1952 and the country can afford to have us win in 1952 only if subsequently our administration is to show a radical improvement over that which is now in power. Without such improvement victory for us would mean the end of the Republican Party and perhaps the destruction of the two-party system in the United States.

What we need in Washington is an administration possessing the vital qualities I have enumerated. What we need in Washington is an administration which will place the welfare of our country above politics and partisanship. What we need in Washington is an administration with vision and courage and integrity, such as are displayed in the great administration of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in our own State of New York.

We Republicans know that our great party has met these tests of character and capacity in the past. We know that we can meet these tests again. We know that, meeting these tests, not only shall we be victorious in 1952 but our victory will be complete and the performance of our Republican administration will restore the faith of the American people in their Government.

It remains for us Republicans and Republicans everywhere who are active in politics to do the job that can and must be done for the sake of our party, and most of all, for the sake of our country.

Tribute to the Late Senator Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg was a great man. He showed his greatness in many ways. It is said that one trait of greatness is the ability to change one's opinions and views and to admit such changes. If that is a trait of greatness, then surely it was a mark of statesmanship on the part of Arthur Vandenberg, for he shed his deep isolationism to become the foremost architect of our bipartisan foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article I recently wrote about Senator VANDENBERG.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, April 25, 1951]

WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—I shall always remember Senator Arthur Vandenberg. He was an outstanding statesman, a colleague, and a Republican whose views on foreign policy, I shared. But, more, I shall remember him because he was a good friend in whom I could place full confidence in judgment and in telling me the truth.

I vividly recall the day I was sworn into the Senate. Senator Vandenberg as the retiring President pro tempore of the Senate swore me in. His very first act after he relinquished the post to Senator MCKELLAR, the Democrats having taken over control of the Eighty-first Congress, was to walk directly to my seat in the Senate Chamber and offer his personal congratulations to me and welcome me into the "club."

Another occasion stands out in my mind. The Senate was voting on the military assistance program to Europe, a measure designed to send materials, equipment, and technical assistance to the member nations of the North Atlantic Pact. The legislation was to implement the North Atlantic Treaty and to start building real forces-in-being to back up the mutual defense provisions of the pact.

I had some reservations about the bill because the Members of the Senate who were not on the Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee had not been fully informed on the world conditions that prompted the legislation. I went to Senator Vandenberg and told him of my reaction. In response he gave me a full briefing on the facts that had not been revealed outside the two committees. His briefing left no question in my mind as to the necessity for the legislation. I remarked that it was a shame that the Senate legislated so much in secrecy. He agreed.

Those of us who sat beside and talked with Senator Vandenberg during his last few months in Washington knew of the pain that he was enduring. We knew not because of what he said, because he never complained, but rather because of what we could read in his face and the way in which he walked to his seat. He could not conceal the strain.

He was silently carrying not only his own physical pain but the sadness of seeing his wife pass away last June. But his grief over his wife and his pain did not deter him. He saw the North Atlantic Treaty ratified and the military assistance program passed before he gave in to the doctors. He carried a tumor in his left lung for over a year before submitting to surgery. He just didn't have time to take care of himself. He couldn't take out time from his consecrated service to his country, to his people, and to the peace of the world.

We have often heard national leaders called war casualties in as full a sense of the word as soldiers who died on the battlefield.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg was a casualty of peace—not war—as he literally gave his life to his country on the floor of the United States Senate. To those who condemned him fuzzy-minded internationalist, I suggest that they now pause and ask themselves if they have done as much for their country and for peace as Arthur Vandenberg and if they are willing to give their lives as he did.

Television: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Television: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served? delivered by me at the opening session of the Twenty-first Institute for Education by Radio-Television, May 3, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION: HOW CAN THE PUBLIC INTEREST BEST BE SERVED?

(Following is the text of the address delivered by Senator BENTON at the opening

session of the Twenty-first Institute for Education by Radio-Television, May 3, 1951. Although the institute met in Columbus, Ohio, Senator BENTON spoke by closed-circuit wire from New York, where he stopped en route from Washington to New London, Conn., on his way to represent the Senate at the annual visitation day at thet U. S. Coast Guard Academy.)

Mr. Chairman and my friends in educational broadcasting, I want to congratulate Keith Tyler on the steady growth of this institute, which is almost as old as radio, and yet as young as television. I'm grateful to Keith for letting me talk to you out of a loudspeaker—though possibly you won't be—instead of face to face. I would be in Columbus tonight were it not that tomorrow is the annual Day of Visitation when I must represent the United States Senate at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn.

I interrupted my journey from Washington to New London to tell you that today you can be one of the most important groups in the United States. Except for those who are responsible for the formulation of our foreign policy, I don't know any group which could have a greater impact on our country's future. You are tonight poised on the threshold of a great new mansion for the human mind. I want to encourage you to cross it boldly.

I don't need to tell this institute about the power of television, or about its potentialities for education. That would be carrying coals to Columbus—or perhaps I should say, carrying coaxial cables. I wish Congress understood it as well as you do.

The figures are startling—indeed, terrifying: TV receivers up from 7,000 on VJ-day to over 11,000,000 today; that total likely to be doubled in the next 5 years. The number of stations potentially multiplying tenfold by 1956. One hundred million man-hours a day—and woman-hours and boy-and-girl-hours—already devoted to the TV screen. Reading slumping in TV homes. A survey in Stamford, not far from where I live, showing that children spend as much time watching television as they spend in school.

For most of us, a single revealing experience often gives us greater insight than a deluge of figures and syllogisms. I had such an experience with radio in the spring of 1929 in Chicago. I had thought I knew something about radio. I had used radio in behalf of Palmolive and other advertising clients. Then one warm evening, as I walked home from work, I heard the full Amos 'n Andy program through open windows, as I paced block after block through the near north side. It was before the Hooper ratings, so I made my own rating: 13 homes out of 17 tuned to Amos 'n Andy. That was a revelation. I spent the next 8 years doing something about it, for my own profit and the profit of my clients.

My television revelation didn't come until March of this year—until Senator KEFAUVER'S committee hearings were televised.

As chairman of an educational-film company, Encyclopedia Britannica Films, I had, of course, been keeping a watchful eye on television's rise. But the full realization of what television might do as a servant of society came only with KEFAUVER. For me—and, indeed, for most Americans—the television age can henceforward be divided into two eras—BK and AK—before and after KEFAUVER.

Not long after those hearings closed, I was dining in Washington with Paul Hoffman and Robert Hutchins, of the Ford Foundation. We agreed that the greatest finding of the KEFAUVER committee was not that they exposed crime but that they revealed television. Out of that discussion came my decision to call for an immediate Senate study of the role the Federal Government ought to play in developing what Professor Siepmann calls this explosive new instrument—this instrument which can transform and uplift human relations.

Technically, the problem is a single problem. It is the theme of this year's institute: How Can the Public Interest Best Be Served? I shall discuss it in two major parts. Let me first discuss education's own TV stations.

In March the Federal Communications Commission made tentative channel allocations for 209 educational stations. These allocations represented about 17 percent of the hitherto unassigned VHF channels, and somewhat less than 10 percent of the more speculative UHF channels. It took both enlightenment and courage on the part of the FCC to make these educational assignments. The pressures on that agency are immense. But I want particularly to congratulate those of you in Columbus tonight, who, with no prospect of reward other than the satisfaction of doing an important job, banded together to make education's case before the FCC—those who took part in "operation education."

Many educators feel they didn't get all the channels they will need, and I'm not at all sure they asked for enough. In my State, for example, there is only one educational reservation—that one in the ultra-high-frequency range—assigned to Storrs, the seat of the University of Connecticut. I'm told that five of the eight counties in Connecticut will be unable to get the signal from that station, if the station materializes, and that not all parts of the other three counties will get it. Similarly our neighbor, Massachusetts—Massachusetts which is nearly as famous as Connecticut for its educational achievements—has only one educational reservation. We won't be able to elevate the level of Massachusetts, and they can't try to elevate us. New Jersey, the home of Princeton and Rutgers, has no educational reservations. There isn't going to be much ivy on those new transmitters.

Education is slow to adopt innovations. There's no profit-prod toward moving fast. Professor Thorndike once showed that 20 to 30 years elapse between the introduction of a new idea in education and its widespread adoption. Indeed, it has taken us a hundred years to reach our present percentage of secondary school enrollment. This time we aren't going to have a hundred years, or even 30 years. We must start now—this year—this month.

Two taunts are hurled today at the hopeful television educators. One is, "Look what happened to education's AM radio frequencies. Most of them were abandoned." The other is, "Where is the money coming from?"

I do not accept the analogy between radio and TV. Television isn't just a cousin of radio. It is sui generis—a new species. And it is uniquely adapted to education. It adds sight and motion to sound, but it does more than that. As John Crosby points out, television has five times the impact of radio—I believe he used the word "wallop"—but it also requires five times the attention. Attention is indispensable to education. Television can demand it, and grip it as radio never could.

And where is the money coming from? Here I must declare my faith in the American people. They believe in education. They have fought for it. They spend perhaps $5,000,000,000 a year for it today. Once they have been shown the power of educational television, I cannot believe they will deny it to themselves or to their children.

We can all of us be heartened by the fact that in the past several months three foundations have made grants for educational radio and television totaling over a million dollars. This, of course, is "seed-money."

Several State legislatures already have before them appropriation requests in support of educational TV stations. There will be more, as you here make your voices heard. And should not Congress now consider the idea of providing matching grants-in-aid for educational stations, since the national interest is so deeply involved?

I have myself been deeply interested in the idea of subscription radio and subscription television. This idea has tremendous promise, across the whole range of broadcasting. It could provide, within the American concept of broadcasting, an alternative to and a competitor with the system of exclusive reliance on advertising revenue. Whether the subscription technique could be developed as one means of financing educational stations I do not know. It is a possibility eminently worth exploring. One of my former associates at the University of Chicago has advanced the novel idea that colleges and universities might finance their TV stations by televising their football games on a subscription basis. That is a remarkable suggestion to emerge from the University of Chicago, where the football stadium has been converted into an atom laboratory. Imagine football profits being used to finance education rather than baseball, swimming, or track.

Let me turn now from education's own efforts in television to the second major issue: the educational and public service programing done by commercial stations. We don't have to dwell on the depressing history of radio. Let us look not at radio's past but at television's present. One of the most telling exhibits the educators presented to the FCC in January, in making their case for educational stations, was the monitoring study on New York's seven TV stations, covering 1 week earlier that month, made by Professors Horton and Smythe. They found that only 4 percent of the week's programs were what they called informational; of these only one was identified as a genuinely instructional program. As for the evening hours between 7 and 11, they found—and I like this language—that a "clear majority of the time was devoted to entertainment progroms with relatively low or perhaps negative survival value for the individual viewer or for society." Fifty-five percent of this evening time was devoted to wild West drama, crime, drama, sports, quizzes, stunts, and contests.

Professor Seipmann has written—foreboding ly—"We may now be witnessing a peak in television's service to a variety of tastes." I suggest that he get together and compare notes with Professors Smythe and Horton. I have great admiration for the creative talent of commercial broadcasters. But I fear that this talent may be channelled, in television as in radio, into a limited number of stereotyped but salable program formats. And I ask, are there any steps which the people of the United States, acting through the Congress, might now take to divert at least a fraction of that talent into the development of genuinely educational programs carried by the commercial system? Should the Congress now lay out clearer guide lines for the Federal Communications Commission? Can we afford to waste as much time and talent on trivia in television as we have in radio? Can we lay down new guide lines without limiting essential freedom? I pose these questions as worthy of the highest consideration by Congress in terms of the challenge of the television age.

I have framed my Senate resolution so that it invites study by the Senate of such specific issues as the following among others:

1. Should the Communications Act of 1934, which was drawn for radio and not for television, now be amended to spell out the meaning of the phrase, "public interest, convenience, and necessity," particularly with respect to education?

2. Under such a clarification should the act require licensees to devote a portion of their best hours to education?

3. Should the act require, rather than merely authorize, the FCC not to renew the licenses of those who fail to live up to the promises in their applications?

4. Should Congress create an education division within the FCC, or perhaps a national commission advisory to the FCC, to strengthen the hands of that agency and help it gage the educational promises and performance of licensees?

The FCC already has broad powers. But, in view of the pressures it must cope with daily, it cannot be expected to exercise those powers vigorously in behalf of education without renewed support and guidance by the Congress, whose instrumentality it is. The issues are too big, too important, to be left wholly in the hands of a single agency, no matter how competent it may be.

My message to this institute tonight is this: You here have taken the first step—the first of many steps—toward the realization of television's great educational mission. The leadership in the next step—and the next step after that—must continue to come from you. There is no one else who can give it. Only you—as you are inspired by what you are already doing—only you can lead. That means you must learn to be publicists, and promoters, and politicians, as well as educators. It means you must go to work on your trustees, and your school boards, on your State legislatures and your Congress. I and many others can and will help. I wish you would write me your views; or better yet, write to your own Senators, or to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. But it is you who must lead.

Israel's Struggle: A World Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Israel's Struggle: A World Example, delivered by me at a luncheon meeting of Hadassah, New Mexico Chapter, at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on May 6, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S STRUGGLE: A WORLD EXAMPLE

(By Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ)

Before expressing myself on the subject for today's discussion, I should like to make a comment as your Senator about the work of Hadassah in relation to my work in Washington.

I am particularly and keenly aware of the work of your membership acting on its responsibilities as American citizens. It so happens that one of my major assignments in Washington concerns all matters relating to social-security and public-health appropriations. I have found Hadassah in the forefront supporting the extension of social-security benefits and in working for a public-health program. Your membership certainly did a great deal to obtain the passage of the Displaced Persons Act, and I, for one, am most grateful that your membership has always been alert and informed on all civil-rights legislation. Had other groups shown the same intelligent militancy as did Hadassah, back in the Seventy-ninth Congress, we would have had more liberal legislation and poll taxing and lynching would be violations of Federal statutes today.

It is important that Hadassah, no matter how demanding and absorbing the Israel problem is, never diminishes its ardent work in behalf of a better America. You are unique in the fact that you pursue this dual program of activity, and there is no group to take your place in either arena.

Volumes of statistics have been compiled to tell the astonishing progress of Israel in the past few years. Every fact and figure has been marshaled to show how much is being done, but I feel that all of these facts and figures fail to tell the real story. The engineering, the finance, the trade and housing, and agriculture don't explain what has happened nor why. The key to Israel's success—and it is a success—is the human element.

For 80 generations the children of Israel wandered in exile. For 80 generations the yearning and the hope refused to be extinguished. And for 80 generations these wanderers kept alive their quest for their homeland. The great urge to return and reclaim their country was not religious alone—it was a national urge, and it maintained itself in an organized, determined fashion. The orthodoxy of the Hebrew community was not only a way of worshiping God; it was also a discipline to retain political solidarity and preserve the identity of the Hebrew in exile. Always there were certain institutions and practices which were retained and resurrected wherever these people happened to wander.

In the long historic quest you ladies of Hadassah represent the final effort in a great chain of events which helped bring about the Israeli Republic of today. I feel that your work, particularly in the educational and welfare field, in the teaching of children and the support of hospitals, has been right in line with the effort which began 80 generations ago. The fact that you have acted as interpreter and bridge between the Zionist pioneers and the people of America has been your unique and special contribution. I feel that you richly deserve the rewards of being a contemporary of Israel, and I too am proud to have been able to help, in a small measure, to assist in that birth.

I say this to you as fellow Americans—members of a common team who battled for a free Israel for similar reasons. I do not believe in hyphenated Americans. On the other hand I do not believe in Americans without heritage. Every American has been able to claim a heritage, and point to the land of his ancestors. This has been the secret of the melting pot.

But the Jewish-American, rich though his heritage may be, was never able to point to one homeland, as could the Irish, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, and Slav. The Jew faced an international problem, he was identified with trouble, and his children were raised with a feeling of insecurity, that of being in some way identified with a pariah. And then, exactly 3 years ago next week, on the 14th of May 1948 came the declaration of a free Israel, and the Jews in this country and every other part of the world were no longer related to a problem, they were related to a land.

I feel that the establishment of a free Israel Republic was essential for several reasons:

First, it was absolutely necessary to solve the problem of world antisemitism. As long as there were Jews who were persecuted and degraded under law as Jews, it was essential that they have their own geographic homeland.

Second, it was essential for those of the Jewish faith, but who were personally and politically identified with the lands where they lived, such as the Jews of France, Brazil, and America, to be able to indicate that they are Americans, or Frenchmen, or Brazilians, not in exile but as a matter of clear choice. The relation of such Jews to Israel was something to be regarded with sentiment and mutual respect but not as a political or territorial relationship;

Third, there were the displaced persons, whose physical existence and mental health could only be succored by the immediate securing of a home—not a refuge, not a haven—but a permanent home where they could live in dignity.

Fourth, the world needed an example, a powerful and revealing demonstration in human relations. This Israel is giving us today.

Much has been said about what Israel means to the Jews. I shall discuss what Israel means to the world.

Israel is an example which we Americans must observe closely. There are lessons to be learned.

It is my prediction that the genius and energy of Israel will set the pattern for the development of backward and impoverished areas the world over. Israel is our pilot plant.

Since the establishment of the sovereign state of Israel, a scant 150 weeks ago, some three-quarters of a million people have been returned to the homeland, doubling the population. In Israel the land under cultivation has increased by 50 percent. Industry has increased by 40 percent. In 3 years over 18,000 new housing units and 20 agricultural settlements have been set up. Israel inaugurated an airline engaged in internal and international operations. Merchant ships flying the White Star of David are seen in all parts of the world. Israelis will soon be traveling around their country on domestically made motorcycles. The men will be shaving with home-produced razor blades. New methods of refrigeration, radio manufacturing, and even an iron lung will shortly carry the words "Made in Israel."

And to make the difficult task touch on the impossible, all this has taken place while Israel has been in a state of semisiege, surrounded as she is by hostile neighbors.

In this unprecedented development we have the perfect pattern for our own point 4 program. If Israel can go through a 30-years' development in 3, why can't a similar program be undertaken in other lands? I understand that a great deal of interest is being shown by Puerto Rico in Israel's development, since the problems of the two countries are not dissimilar.

Incidentally, the wife of the Governor of Puerto Rico, Senora Marin, is an honorary member of the Hadassah in San Juan.

We have heard Israel's development belittled because it depends on capital and equipment from other countries. If we try to concentrate the development of centuries into 3 years, then it is necessary that enough capital to finance the development be imported to make up for the fact that no new nation in all of history ever had savings to draw on.

The United States of America was a debtor country until 1914. It financed its development by borrowing. This is a simple principle of common sense, which applies to all walks of life. The Israelis are ready to lift themselves by their own bootstraps. The only thing that they ask us to do is to lend them the bootstraps.

For this reason, I wish every success to the half-billion-dollar-bond drive which the Israel Government launched in the United States on May 1. These bonds are

an important investment from an international point of view, for on them will depend the strength of democracy's beachhead in the Middle East. It is obvious that a free, strong and prosperous Israel is the greatest bulwark we can have against communism in that most strategic area of the world.

In the great battle of today, the lines are drawn between the "haves" and "have-nots." Unless the free world finds a dynamic way of lifting the world from feudalism, the Communist will surely march forward, carried on the wave of their false ideology. This is why Israel's struggle is so important to us. If, there, in the land where the prophets once walked, a bulwark of democracy can be constructed, the cause of freedom and civilization will be furthered.

That this will be, I have no doubt.

The new Republic proclaimed to the world that the "State of Israel will be open to immigration of Jews from all the countries of their dispersion; will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all the inhabitants; will be based upon the principles of liberty, justice and peace; will uphold the social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of religion, race or sex; will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience and culture; will safeguard the holy places of all religions and will loyally uphold the principles of the United Nations charter."

These principles can never perish.

Far Eastern Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter entitled "Path to Victory," written to the editor of the Cornell Sun by a freshman at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

I call this letter to the attention of Senators because of the great force of the truth and common sense which it contains.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATH TO VICTORY

After reading the editorial in Friday's Sun on General MacArthur, I think it is time something sensible was said about his far-eastern strategy. Why do I think so? First, let me assure you that it is not because I follow the Republican Party. It is because, like every other American my age, I may find myself in Korea some day soon. And when I do, I don't want to be fighting the one-sided war that's being fought today.

I don't want to be fighting an enemy that is free at any time to step over an imaginary barrier into the untouchable zone of safety north of the thirty-eighth parallel. I don't want to sit there knowing that our supposed allies, especially Britain and France, are freely trading with our enemies, supplying them with the means and sinews of war while Washington kowtows to their wishes. I don't want to fight knowing that enemy factories and installations just to the north cannot even be looked at, and that the thousands of Nationalist Chinese troops ready to open a badly needed second front are unable to do so. Nor does enacting these policies mean total war as Mr. Truman claims, but rather a speedier and more decisive end to the present war.

The very fact that our casualties in Korea have been greater than they were during the first 14 months of World War II proves that this war is a real one, and not at all limited. Also while one rarely hears of any of our planes being shot down in Korea, we have nevertheless lost more planes to enemy fire in this so-called police action than we lost in a similar period at the start of World War II. And while everyone, even the Truman-Acheson contingent, would like to see the end of this war, I do not think it is in sight as long as our enemies receive aid from our allies while we erect neither an economic nor a naval blockade. I do not think an end is possible while our enemy is able to rain his hordes upon us unhindered by a second front undertaken by the Chinese Nationalists. Nor is it possible while our enemy remains invisible behind the thirty-eighth parallel.

There are only three alternatives open to us. The first is to remain in Korea, fighting as we are today. The second is to withdraw entirely. The third is to follow the advice of the world's foremost expert on far-eastern affairs, General MacArthur. To stay in Korea means to continue fighting an extremely costly war, with America obviously holding the short end of the stick. To withdraw is to leave the aggressor victorious. The path to victory lies in the adoption of MacArthur's four-point policy.

The United States Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I spent Friday, May 4, in New London, Conn., at the Coast Guard Academy on the official visitation day for Congress, as a representative of the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of my letter to Secretary John Snyder expressing the appreciation of Representatives MCGUIRE, MORANO, and myself of the hospitality accorded us. It also contains some suggestions for review of academic policy affecting the Academy. A copy of this letter has been sent to General Marshall, because the same suggestions apply to the Military and Naval Academies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
May 10, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Last Friday I spent the day at the Coast Guard Academy in New London. This was official visitation day for the group selected by the Congress. I attended representing the Senate and Congressmen JOHN MCGUIRE and ALBERT MORANO attended representing the House of Representatives.

We had a most interesting day. Indeed I cannot remember a day that was personally more interesting to me since I entered the Senate. The three of us join in telling you what a creditable institution we feel the Coast Guard Academy to be, and what a great credit and asset it is to our State of Connecticut. Admiral Arthur B. Hall, Superintendent of the Academy, together with Captain Roland and other members of his staff in New London, gave us a warm welcome. The cadets put on a great show. Indeed, for me the day could be called a "dream day" of a retired private—a private of World War I—the dream day comes true in middle life, with the admirals in attendance and a parade in his honor.

This letter is to convey to you and your associates the appreciation of Congressmen MCGUIRE, MORANO, and myself, and our congratulations.

Speaking personally, and as a trustee of one of America's great universities, and one of America's leading colleges, I have the following comments which I have transmitted orally to Admiral Hall. I was not able to discuss these views with Congressman MCGUIRE and Congressman MORANO. These comments come out of my long and deep interest in education. Perhaps you know that I served for 9 years as a part time officer of the University of Chicago, which is 50 percent longer than I served as an officer of the advertising firm I founded in New York with Chester Bowles.

The service academies and notably West Point, are widely criticized among informed academic people for their low scholastic standards. They are accused of grevious inbreeding and of scholastic standards far, far below the college standards with which they ought to be compared.

I have no first-hand knowledge of the standards of the Coast Guard Academy, in comparison let me say with the California Institute of Technology or MIT—as technical schools—or with nearby Williams or Wesleyan in the fields of liberal arts. But at a glance I question whether the faculty is not overloaded with officers who are not trained as teachers, and whether the staff is not deficient in the number of teachers who have received the best available advance instruction at the leading universities of the country.

I personally would recommend that a special consulting committee of educators be set up to consult with the Academy on the improvement of its academic standards. With the deepening crisis, and the increasing need for the most highly trained technical personnel in the Coast Guard, as well as in every branch of military service, I would, of course, like to see the question of academic standards reviewed—not only for the Coast Guard Academy—but for West Point and Annapolis as well. This subject is a matter of highest national import. I am consequently sending a copy of this letter to General Marshall so that, through his aides, my suggestion may be reviewed, and, I hope, applied to the Military and Naval Academies.

May I also suggest that this would be an excellent time to review the methods and procedures of selection of the boys who apply for the Academy? One of the young men who is graduating, with whom I had lunch, told me that of his entering class of 150 only 57 were graduating. Later Captain Roland told me that over the years the average percentage of graduates, in contrast to the number entering, ran about 48 percent.

Captain Roland says that something like 10 percent of the entering class drop out in the first 90 days. I would gather that perhaps as many as 33⅓ percent are dropped out by the authorities because they fail to

measure up to the high standards maintained by the Academy. Most of these failures seem to come in the second year, after considerable cost to the Academy and the taxpayers, and many failures are students who quit trying because they don't want to continue.

It is a costly as well as interesting fact that over half of the young men who are selected either discover that they do not like the service, and do not want to adjust themselves to the rigorous discipline and the life, or else are unable to do so.

Now, the 150 boys who entered the present graduating class of 57, were chosen from a group of applicants numbering 700. Yet for the coming year, when I understand that 200 are to be chosen, the applicants number almost 10 times as many—over 6,000. Surely when 200 boys are to be selected out of a group as large as 6,000—there must be techniques for selection which could increase, if not immediately, at least gradually over the years, as better and better te hniques evolve—which could increase the percentage of young men who prove satisfactory and who finish their 4-year course and then carve out their careers in the Coast Guard, careers in the Coast Guard, careers with which they are happy and of which they are proud.

At the University of Chicago and elsewhere many scholars have devoted their lives to the development of criteria for the selection of young men showing aptitude and promise for varying kinds of activities in adult life. I know that much is known about this by the armed services, and undoubtedly by the personnel division of the Coast Guard. I now suggest that this is an excellent time once more to review the matter. Surely there never was such an opportunity as now, with young men of great talent and promise eagerly seeking entance to our three Academies—in far greater numbers than ever before.

Again expressing the appreciation of Congressman McGuire, Congressman Morano, and myself for the splendid reception and hospitality shown us at the Coast Guard Academy, I am

Very sincerely yours,

William Benton,
United States Senate.

Public-Opinion Poll, First Congressional District, West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of March, I conducted a public-opinion poll in the First Congressional District. When I was considering such a poll, I had my staff discuss technique and methods with officials of the Bureau of the Census, whom I consider very expert in sampling. We are all familiar with the accuracy with which the Bureau is able to predict population and retail sales trends through its periodic samplings.

I want to emphasize, however, that the discussions with Bureau officials were strictly informal. I merely sought guidance. I believe procedure recommended was followed to the letter. The poll, however, is my own.

Twenty-six hundred questionnaires were mailed out; one to each sixtieth name appearing on the voting list. Thus the sampling was confined to bona fide adult residents of the district. We made a special check, using Hancock County as a guinea pig, and found that by selecting every sixtieth name from each precinct list, we achieved the proper balance between Democrats and Republicans, according to the ratios in effect prior to last fall's election.

The response to the poll was excellent; far better than we expected. We had about 1 percent of the questionnaires returned by the postal service as not deliverable or forwardable. We enclosed self-addressed return envelopes to facilitate replies. We achieved approximately a three-fourths return.

Of the returns coming in, about three-fourths contained comment. This comment was extremely interesting and it varied. At one extreme was a blank questionnaire, upon which had been inscribed: "Anything you do is all right with me." At the other extreme was the comment: "If Francis Love had been elected everything would be all right."

Mr. Love, a former Member of the House in the Eightieth Congress, was my Republican opponent last fall.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the results of my poll as a part of these remarks. I hope my colleagues find these results as interesting and enlightening as I did. I called attention to early returns on universal military training and drafting of 18-year-olds when the military manpower bill was under consideration in the House last month. It will be noted that the trend has remained unchanged, now that we have completed final tabulations.

I am listing the results of the poll in terms of percentages, since I believe the value of such a poll is in establishing a trend, and for this purpose percentages are superior to mere enumeration.

Some of the trends require a word or two of explanation. For instance question 2 (B) shows 35 percent no comment. Many of those who answered question 2 (A), "Do you favor the drafting of 18-year-olds?" did not answer the question relating to draft of veterans and fathers. Since many constituents indicated either a "yes" or "no" to both, when an answer was not indicated for either, we tabulated it under "no opinion."

The vote on sending troops to Europe also requires explanation. On the questionnaire it is listed as "Send troops to Europe without congressional consent." A number of voters indicated "yes" but scratched "out," so the proposition would read "Send troops to Europe with congressional consent." Such answers were tabulated as "no" answers since I wanted to determine not only the thinking relative to sending troops to Europe, but also relative to the issue of congressional consent.

Actually, then, considerably more than 67 percent of the voters of the congressional district favor sending troops to Europe, but only 67 percent agree that congressional consent is either not required, under the constitution, or not advisable.

Question 7: "Do you favor a national health plan, under which the Federal Government would aid in building hospitals and educating an increased number of doctors" found favor with 57 percent of the voters of the First Congressional District. Admittedly, it was a question on only two phases of the administration's health program. The proposal for national health insurance was purposely omitted. This proposal was a major issue in my campaign for reelection. The Republican opposition, as well as segments of the medical profession, and some pharmacists hit—and hit hard—my support for national health insurance. I met the issue head-on; spoke in its favor on several occasions, and answered the last-minute, desperate arguments by newspaper advertising and radio broadcasts. I was reelected. Therefore, I feel that I know the trend on national health insurance. The other two phases were sidetracked during the campaign, and I took this opportunity to canvass sentiment.

Question 10: "Do you favor the use of the atomic bomb against the Chinese Communists?" Fifty-three percent of the voters say "Yes" and 38 percent say "No." This bare tabulation, however, is not a complete picture. About half those answering "Yes," qualified their answer with a notation "if absolutely necessary," or "if the military say so." On the other hand, about the same proportion of the "No" answers were also qualified, "unless absolutely necessary" or "unless the military say so." Some of the "if's" and "unlesses" left the decision up to General MacArthur.

I believe, therefore, that the true picture of thinking in the First Congressional District, is to use the atomic bomb against the Chinese Communists only as a last resort.

The question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was added only to determine if there had been any change of opinion since the November elections as a result of the two stoppage of work in the railroad industry. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley was a part of my campaign platform in 1948 and 1950. This poll shows that the majority in the first district remain opposed to this law.

Mr. Speaker, this sampling of opinion is a new venture for me. Like my colleagues who have conducted polls in the past, I find it a refreshing experience. It met with favor. While tablulation of the individual comments was impossible, a very great many were prefaced with praise for the project as democracy in action. With the success of this effort, I intend to conduct other samplings as grave and important issues are presented. I feel, too, that the technique of using the voting lists presents a true cross section, with the sampling getting the proper ratio as to political affiliation, occupation, and economic status.

Results of poll, First Congressional District, West Virginia

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
1. Do you believe full wartime mobilization is necessary at this time?	58	35	7
2. Do you favor the drafting of—			
(A) 18-year-olds?	74	21	5
or			
(B) Veterans and fathers?	15	50	35
3. Do you favor universal military training?	81	15	4
4. Do you believe the withdrawal of our troops from Korea would leave Japan, the Philippines and Hawaii open to attack by Russia?	67	28	5
5. In defense of Western Europe, do you favor—			
(A) General Eisenhower's plan—Send troops to Europe without congressional consent?	67	29	4
or			
(B) Hoover plan (so-called)—Have the United States give up its bases in Europe and north Africa and try to defend our country from its own shores?	16	55	29
6. If war comes with Russia would you prefer that the United States—			
(A) Fight on its own shores?	12	50	38
or			
(B) Fight as far away as we can sustain troops?	84	8	8
7. Do you favor a national health plan, under which the Federal Government would aid in building hospitals and educating an increased number of doctors?	57	40	3
8. Do you favor heavy Federal taxes as a device to prevent inflation?	45	51	4
9. Do you believe that price and wage controls are necessary to assure a decent standard of living?	63	32	5
10. Do you favor the use of the atomic bomb against the Chinese Communists?	53	38	9
11. Do you favor, as an aid in fighting Communist aggression—			
(A) Rearming Western Germany?	71	17	12
(B) Rearming Japan?	65	19	16
12. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	64	33	3
13. Do you favor repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?	52	41	7

Regulation of Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "CHAVEZ' Pounding Improves Senate Bill of Regulating Migratory Labor," by Thomas L. Stokes, published on May 9, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAVEZ' POUNDING IMPROVES SENATE'S BILL OF REGULATING MIGRATORY LABOR

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The Senate has made a start toward coping with a recently widely publicized human problem directly affecting the South, Southwest, and West, but also spreading its harmful effects into our whole economy since a cancerous condition in any area ramifies ultimately to others.

This is the problem of migratory farm labor, consisting of importees, legally and illegally coming in from Mexico, and native agricultural workers—"stoop labor"—who year after year follow the crops northward from the South with the seasons. These wanderers were portrayed graphically several years ago, in depression times, in "Grapes of Wrath," by John Steinbeck, who showed how they were exploited. They still are—Mexican and American.

The problem still exists. It is not solved by the bill sponsored by Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, Louisiana, and passed this week in the Upper House. That measure regularizes the traffic in farm workers; it does not tackle the underlying human, social, and economic evils involved, and is not the satisfactory answer.

However, it is much better than the original Ellender bill. That is due chiefly to Senator CHAVEZ, Democrat, New Mexico, who pounded away ceaselessly and got inserted some provisions from his more comprehensive measure drafted along lines recommended by the President's commission on migratory labor and against opposition of powerful big agricultural interests of his State. He had the assistance of a group, including Senators DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois; HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota; and LEHMAN, Democrat, New York.

HOUSE BILL PENDS

The fight now moves to the House where there is pending before the Rules Committee, for the go-ahead signal for House action, a measure sponsored by Representative POAGE (Democrat, Texas), similar to the original Ellender bill. Any attempt to broaden it into a really effective measure will be stoutly resisted by the powerful southern bloc in the House which, like its counterpart in the Senate, is solicitous of big farming interests which utilize this labor and want it as cheap as possible.

The bill has been labeled the wetback bill, a handy designation because it seeks, among other aims, to stop illegal entry of Mexican farm workers who figuratively swim the Rio Grande. The bill gets at this problem by tightening enforcement machinery and imposing penalties on farmers who use illegal entrants. The penalty provisions, not included in the original Ellender bill though in a separate measure of his now before the Judiciary Committee, were added at the instance of Senator DOUGLAS.

The wetback tag is somewhat unfortunate. For the problem goes far beyond that. The competition of Mexican labor, both illegal and legal—the latter brought in under regulations—affects thousands and thousands of native farm workers. Because of the low-wage standard for the Mexican labor competitors, they roam far beyond their homes and travel to the North for months at a time to get better wages paid there.

AIMS OF CHAVEZ

It was the objective of the President's Commission, embodied in the Chavez bill, to provide means to study the whole problem, find out labor needs, determine how far they could be met by local native labor, reduce importations where possible, and stabilize employment by decent pay that would keep labor in its own home area. Another aim, too, would be to improve conditions, sometimes ghastly, under which some of the Mexican immigrants live. For these purposes Senator CHAVEZ proposed a national farm labor board, which, however, was rejected by the Senate.

The southern bloc was defeated in an effort to have labor recruitment under control of State directors—a State's right project obviously favoring local interests with large political influence. Instead it was put under the Secretary of Labor here in Washington. The Southerners, however, did succeed in restricting reception centers to the border and under such cost allowances as to favor southern farmers. Senator CORDON (Republican, Oregon) was defeated in an effort to provide reception centers in other areas to facilitate movement of labor to meet their needs.

The bill is limited to Mexican labor. Attempts failed to apply the standards prescribed to imported labor from other countries in the Western Hemisphere, now arranged by diplomatic agreements.

Contribution of the Farm Credit Administration to Land Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Contribution of the Farm Credit Administration to Land Tenure, by I. W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, at Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, on January 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRIBUTION OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION TO LAND TENURE

(By I. W. Duggan)

I think that it is well that you are, this week, taking a critical look at land tenure in the Southern States. The problems of land tenure are nothing new. In fact, they are of very long standing. I would like to quote from a paper I prepared in 1939. The title happens to be "Cotton, Land, and People: A Statement of the Problem." In fact, I stated the problem rather than trying to answer it.

"Probably one of the most discussed problems in the South is the high rate of farm tenancy. It seems to me, however, that the South's system of tenure, or cropping system, and the credit system have grown up together and are so closely entwined that it is difficult to deal with any one of these problems separately.

"Sharecropping dates back to the War Between the States and is an outgrowth of the conditions following the emancipation of the slaves. The planter had possession of the land, tools, and in many cases, equipment, but no money with which to employ labor. The laborer had no money with which to acquire land, tools, or equipment, or to finance his operations, and was unskilled in any occupation except agriculture. Out of this situation grew the sharecropper-tenant system as we have it today. The need for credit to finance crops made it essential that crops be grown for which there was a ready cash market. Cotton was a natural answer to the cash crop problem.

"The high rate of farm tenancy in the South is too well known to you to require much discussion. It will be sufficient to remind you that 60 percent of all the farmers

in the 10 States are tenants or sharecroppers. The percentages range from 47 in North Carolina to 70 in Mississippi. Despite the heavy Negro farm population, there are 40 percent more white than Negro tenants in the South. Tenancy has shown a steady increase, even during the relatively prosperous years of the twenties. In the State of Oklahoma, for example, which started about 60 years ago as free land to all who would homestead it, we find today that 61 percent of the farmers are tenants. On the average, about 40 percent of the tenants in the South move every year, and over half move every 2 years.

"The credit system of the South with high interest rates has contributed to the tenancy problem. However, providing lower-interest credit alone will not solve this problem. If the income from the farm is not sufficient to pay back the principal, a low-interest rate in itself would not bring about farm ownership. The press of a dense farm population for land tends to lead to the overcapitalization of land values and retards operator ownership."

In dealing with land tenure in the Southern States, one of the first problems we must face is the question of a dense farm population pressing against limited resources. There just is not enough total farm income in the South to support its dense farm population. The average per capita earnings of rural people is unbelievably small. "There is no hope of correcting these ills through the redistribution of the available income, because that income is so small and so inadequate that even if it were redistributed there still would not be enough to go around. The first problem is to increase the total income going to the South so there will be more to divide among its dense farm population." Progress has been and is being made.

However, the cropland per capita of farm population in the South is far too small. In that same paper, back in 1939, I pointed out that in 5 of the 10 States, there were only about 6 acres of cropland per person on farms. The cropland was only about 80–85 percent as productive as the United States average. With that problem it is very difficult to move into a solution of the others.

While improving, the opportunities for farm people to find employment in industry are far too limited. Most of the South does not have industry or the opportunity for off-the-farm employment in proportion to the population equal to other areas. It is important to solve the off-the-farm employment problem in order to increase farm ownership. Two out three farm families who have gotten to own their land or farms have gotten some part of the money from savings they made from off-the-farm jobs. The problem that has to be recognized by this group and brought to the attention of the leaders in your community and State is the importance of having industries developed. And we can develop many industries in the South and raise the standard of living in the South without hurting any other area of the country because there is an opportunity to increase consumption of goods right here in the South if we can get production and distribution of all types.

We also have to recognize that farms change hands every generation. We find in farm credit that a large percentage of the original land-bank borrowers are not the ones who finally pay off the long-term-mortgage loans. This is because the farm frequently goes into other hands during the period of a 34-year-mortgage loan.

Our American family size farm is the cornerstone of democracy; in fact, of the free-enterprise system. It is on the family owned farm that our people develop initiative, self-reliance, and independence. Their habits of work have helped us immeasurably in the battle of production on the farm and in our factories as well. Their self-reliance developed on the farm has been important on the battlefield where our soldiers, sailors, and marines are having to fight so hard. As you know we are fighting a cold, and at times a hot war, to defend the right of individual ownership. The individual family farm is the mudsill of our democracy. If it rots, so does democracy. If we lose the mudsill—if it rots into communism or any other ism—then we lose democracy.

It is becoming, in some ways, much more difficult for young people to acquire farm ownership. To be economic units that will raise the standard of living, farms have to be larger. We are going into mechanization. It is well that we are making progress now throughout the South in increasing the size and efficiency of our farms. It is well that we are doing it more rapidly during the time when we have opportunities in industry for full employment. The increasing mechanization and increasing size of farms require larger capital investments. The average age at which farmers acquire ownership of farms is older than it was a few years ago even when there are mortgages on the farms. It takes much longer even with a few high-income years to accumulate adequate funds with which to make a big down payment.

In New York State a study was made of a group of farms in 1907, 1917, 1927, 1937, and 1947. The study started with approximately 200 farms and ended with about 70. The acres operated had gone from 132 to 191 acres; the number of cows from 11 up to 25. The study showed that the capital per family-size farm required in 1907 for land, buildings, livestock, and equipment $6,365. In 1947 the capital was $23,141. That's four times as much capital required in 1947 as in 1907. The study also showed that receipts from these farms had gone up nine time from $1,495 per farm to $12,722. Receipts have gone up faster than capital investment. Expenses for farms have gone up from $657 to $9,243—14 times. Yes; farming today is a bigger business and more profitable. Farming has always been a gamble and stakes are higher than they ever were 10 or 40 years ago. Money can be made faster on a farm today, and a farmer can lose his shirt faster. If these farmers lost their cash operating expenses every year, they could go 9.7 years in 1907 before they would lose all of their capital investment; in 1917, 7 years; in 1927, 5 years; in 1937, 4.1 years; and in 1947, 2.5 years. Total cash operating expenses are more important today in proportion to total investment than they have ever been. Higher operating costs have changed our whole credit picture for farm real estate. In 1907 if a man owned his farm debt free, he could get what little money he needed for operating expenses by borrowing against his land. A man may own his farm debt-free today and in 2½ years lose it by losing his cash operating expenses. This raises serious problems with respect to land tenure.

We are developing another period of land inflation. There is pressure from groups of people to buy farms around cities. Workers want to get away from the city to do part-time farming to supplement their incomes or lower their cost of living. And they're buying poor land at inflated prices. Then there's the group of people who'd like to get away from the congested cities to enjoy life, etc. They're buying the better farms at inflated prices. Another group wants to get away from the possibility of being bombed out. They're moving out of the cities and also buying the better farms at inflated prices. Then we have the group of people who have accumulated some funds and want to invest in real estate. They're interested in buying land for an investment. I was at Auburn sometime during last winter. The secretary of the farm loan association there reported that he'd had more inquiries from people wanting to buy land than he had had at any time since he has been secretary of the association. There were very few wanting to borrow money—most of them wanted to buy land as investment. As a result, we have land prices going up. In 1920 the index based on the 1912–14 average land values reached a postwar peak and was 177. It was 179 in November 1950.

Inflation and high prices increase the pressure on farmers to raise cotton. Farmers in the South didn't go into cotton originally because they necessarily wanted to. They had to have a cash crop in the beginning. Then with the dense farm population, more productive hours could be put on cotton, tobacco, and truck crops. To keep that population even partially employed they had to produce cotton. With livestock there would have to be larger units and fewer people on farms. It is a problem for other people, as well as agricultural people, to find off-the-farm employment for people who cannot be used on the farm efficiently. We don't want any able-bodied group condemned to a subsistence type of livelihood.

Looking back to farm credit and what we can do, I think you are more or less familiar with it. Farm Credit is composed of farmer-owned cooperative credit units and Government-owned institutions which are serving the cooperative institutions. We have the Federal land-bank system—the oldest unit in the Farm Credit system. There are roughly 13,000 farmers in Alabama who have Federal land-bank loans. Since its organization in 1916, 44,000 farmers in the State have borrowed from the land bank. Today there are 300,000 farmers in the entire United States who are using this system. This is not as many as there could be because many farmers now get credit from other sources such as commercial banks, insurance companies and individuals who almost or actually quit lending during the early 1930's and have now come back pretty heavily into the mortgage lending field.

The 12 land banks and the 1,200 national farm loan associations are wholly owned by farmers. There is not a penny of Government capital now in any of the land banks. All the Government capital has been repaid. It shows that farmers can manage and operate their own credit systems and make a success of them. All we do in Washington is to examine and supervise the land banks and farm loan associations. Our work is somewhat comparable to the work of the Comptroller of the Currency in supervising and examining national banks. The land bank system, of course, sets the pace in making 20- to 34-year loans, on normal agricultural values rather than speculative values. During the depression land bank loans frequently were higher than the actual market prices at that time. In fact in many cases there wasn't a market price. These loans were based on normal agricultural values. Loans are still based on normal agricultural values on the assumption that a loan which is not good for the bank is not good for the borrower; that a loan which is good for the borrower is good for the bank.

There's a field of work for the Farmers Home Administration for farmers who need a Government subsidy because they cannot or haven't reached the stage where they are able to use cooperative credit or other types of commercial credit. In many cases they do not have a large enough down payment to bring the loan down to 65 percent of the normal agricultural value which is the maximum the land banks can loan.

The history of the land banks and farm loan associations has demonstrated that these credit cooperatives are workable; that farmers can work them, manage them, operate them, and capitalize them. The land banks have $260,000,000 of capital and reserves. At the low ratio of 1 to 10 the associations could lend $2,600,000,000 without having to go back to the Government for additional capital. They are in good financial condition

and are able to serve the farmers' needs if land prices can be kept from getting too high. So much for the land bank system.

Now for the production credit system. With 7,200 borrowers in Alabama last year, which is between 3 and 4 percent of the farmers in the State, $13,000,000 in loans were made by eight production credit associations in the State. I am sure you are familiar with this type of production loan. The farmer works out a budget at the beginning of the year in which he asks for the money as he needs it during the year and agrees to repay it as he sells his crops or livestock products. He pays interest on the loan only for the time he is actually using the money which is, on the average, about 6 months. He does not have to pay interest on money which he does not use. On the average, farmers get about four advances and make about four repayments a year on production credit loans. There is about $18,000,000 of Government capital now invested in the PCA's, compared to over $90,000,000 at the peak. So they are rapidly becoming farmer owned, cooperative credit institutions.

The funds production credit associations and the land banks lend are not Government funds at all. The funds they lend are gotten through the sale of bonds and debentures to investors by the intermediate credit banks and the land banks. These bonds and debentures are not guaranteed by the Government. If the issuing banks can't pay them off, the Government has no liability. These banks have always been able to get favorable rates—not as high as the best corporations pay, but not as low as the Government gets its money. Every farmer who gets a loan in Alabama is affected by the interest rates paid by the intermediate credit banks and the land banks.

Sound credit and low interest rates are not enough in themselves to increase farm ownership in the South. They are important and necessary and I think we should have them, but alone they are not going to insure farm ownership of family-size farms. When we have established a definition for an efficient, economic family-size farm, we'll have a better objective in farm credit. If a lender helps a man get located on an uneconomical farm unit, he is going to have to lower the living standards of himself and his family. Then when it comes to the time of recession he'll be disillusioned and the lender will not have done him a service. We must not overlook the fact, however, that the desire for farm ownership must be strong enough so that farm families are willing to cooperate in every way possible to achieve their goal. This cooperation calls for hard work on the part of every member of the family. It frequently means sacrificing the standard of living until the family has built up a farm business and paid off its debts. The need for that spirit of family cooperation holds true just as much today as it ever did, and it will continue to do so in the future. The women probably contribute more to the farm than the men. They are willing to sacrifice and contribute to the productivity of the farm.

Local, State, and Federal agencies can set the rules of the game and help make sure farm credit is available, but in a free democracy none of these agencies can give anyone a farm. The right to own property is the keystone of our democracy and of the free-enterprise system. So long as we have courts to protect this right, we shall always be a free and a great people. That's because the Government guarantees protection of the right to own property. Without this protection the strong and the cunning could take property away from the weak, and they would do it. This key to our democracy was not easily attained and we are not going to give it up easily. Our American family farm has grown and prospered from it. Our democratic system of free enterprise which made this possible is what our Nation is now called upon to defend and to protect.

Norway Gets Its (Home) Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Norway Gets Its (Home) Guard Up," written by Nat S. Finney, of the Minneapolis Star editorial-page staff, and published in the Minneapolis Star of recent date. It is an excellent report on the country of Norway. We have often heard the question asked: "Will the countries of Western Europe defend themselves?" The article affords a good answer to that question.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY GETS ITS (HOME) GUARD UP

(By Nat S. Finney)

OSLO, NORWAY.—Norway has memories that burn, but none burns more painfully than the memory of what happened to the proud old Hansa city of Bergen on April 9, 1940.

On that day 1,500 German soldiers sneaked into Bergen from the sea and took a city of 165,000—a city that, if you go back far enough, had a Viking tradition of winning its fights.

It is difficult for a visitor from America, a country unfamiliar with the bitter taste of defeat, much less the ignominy of occupation, to grasp the tight-lipped resolve of a strong people who have failed themselves as Norwegians did at Bergen.

But sitting across a plain table at the Oslo home guard barracks from Col. Mons Haukeland, commander of the guard, you get the idea that Norway will fight another invader with the guile of a fox and the spirit of a hedgehog.

A discussion with Colonel Haukeland about the guard leads to the conclusion that Norway has learned how to make this northern country the thorniest rose a conqueror might try to pluck. If the Muscovite tries it he can expect to lose a few fingers in the attempt.

The guard, Colonel Haukeland quickly makes it clear, must not be confused with Norway's regular military forces. Norway has agreed to raise four divisions, to train them along American lines, and to have them ready under General Eisenhower's command. These and other units—sea, air, and land—are the regulars. They are drafted men.

Ranks of the guard—soon it will number 160,000—are filled by volunteers for what amounts to lifetime service.

A man or woman can enlist at 17 or 18 in his or her own community, and serves indefinitely. In quiet times resignation will be considered on 3 months' notice; now the notice time is 1 year. Resignations aren't accepted if the service requires any man who asks to be released.

Experience with enlistments to date is that everyone wants to get in and none wants to get out. The problem is to find more equipment to expand, not more volunteers.

But the differences, not the similarities, between Norway's guard and that of other countries make the organization striking. In many ways Norway has borrowed from the experience of guerrilla, underground, and paramilitary forces; and some of the security features of the guard make it seem a political organization.

For instance, members of the Norway guar have personal custody and care of their weapons and other equipment. They are responsible for showing up at secret assembly points within 3 hours, armed, provisioned for 3 days, and ready to move at once.

Colonel Haukeland says with a quiet smile that, so far, weapons have been excellently cared for.

Leaders of the guard have been selected mainly from men and women who served in the wartime underground, and whose reliability and guts are well known both to their neighbors, whom they command, and to the central government. Getting into the guard is a good deal like getting into a choosy private club—you don't make it unless your homefolk know and trust you.

Even so, nothing is written down about where stores of ammunition, heavy weapons, communications posts, etc., are cached; nor is the chain of command for emergencies known to more than a few in each guard area.

Home guard leaders have had experience with gestapo operations, and have no intention of letting their organization be penetrated and betrayed.

Guard members are free to suggest and criticize; they are in fact encouraged to do so by a system of awards for ideas that reaches to the bottom of the ranks.

The home guard is carefully nurturing an offensive spirit. (The word defense is in disrepute.) Exercises and training emphasize the quick, daring thrust at the enemy, and indoctrination preaches the futility of light infantry accepting pitched battles with regular forces and the virtues of chewing an enemy's flanks.

Very few bets have been overlooked by Norway where resisting an invader is involved. This country, where communications are difficult, is a "ham" radio operator's paradise, and some 90 percent of the amateur radio men are communications men in the home guard.

Colonel Haukeland is bothered because his guard is not trained and equipped with weapons that could handle light tanks—which he sagely figures is all an enemy could get ashore over what jetties his groups would leave an enemy.

He'd be a happier man if he had a few hundred superbazookas squirrelled away in Norway mountains, and four dozen batteries of new recoilless rifles cached away where they might do the most good.

But even as things stand Colonel Haukeland is confident Bergen will never fall again to a handful of invaders. He has a home guard outfit in that area—he prefers not to say how many—who'd make things rough for anyone who dared attempt its capture.

Importation of Alien Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I have received regarding the fight I made against the importation of alien labor in connection with the agricultural labor bill. The telegram is from the Citrus Workers and Fruit Processors Union, Local 24473, of Mission, Tex.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAYMONDVILLE, TEX., *May 8, 1951.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are sure that all American citizens of Latin extraction of the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas join the 1,000 members of the Citrus Workers and Food Processors Union of the American Federation of Labor in extending to you our congratulations in regards to the stanch stand you have taken against the importation of alien labor to work in the agricultural fields and allied industries. Your name has appeared daily in the newspapers of this region, therefore those that know about you and all those that have learned to know about you have nothing but admiration for the kind of representation you are giving the people of this country and the kind of representation we only wish we had in our State.

RAUL HERNANDEZ,
President,
BELISARIO GUZMAN,
Recording Secretary,
JOSE L. GONZALEZ,
Financial Secretary,
VENTURA VALADEZ,
Treasurer,
Citrus Workers and Fruit Processors Union 24473, Mission, Tex.

How Come, Comrades?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Come, Comrades?" published in the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW COME, COMRADES?

Several Russian diplomats and their families have set out for home aboard the liner *America* without large part of the baggage they had planned to sail with. The baggage—which some capitalistic longshoremen refused to handle—has been put in a New York warehouse at the request of the Soviet Embassy. It consists of 17 big crates filled with television sets, washing machines, refrigerators, and similar hallmarks of our decadent, bourgeois, imperialistic, warmongering, worker-enslaved nation—a nation which the Moscow propagandists depict as a place where nothing is manufactured except guns and chewing gum and where millions and millions of people are unemployed and downtrodden and barely managing to exist while a few bloated billionaires get richer and richer.

How come, comrades? How come those diplomats wanted to sail away with that kind of baggage? Is not the Soviet Utopia supposed to be the land of peace and plenty, the land where there is no rearmament and where production is concentrated on the task of increasing the happiness, comfort, and living standards of everybody? Why therefore should a Russian have to buy a television set in America? Or a washing machine? Or a refrigerator? Is not there an abundance of such things in the stores of Moscow, or Minsk, Pinsk, Omsk, Tomsk, and Bomsk? A word of explanation, please. What is the meaning of this luggage incident?

Yes, indeed, comrades, how come? Anything to say, Pravda? Got an answer, Izvestia? A lot of us over here pause for reply.

The Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Arthur I. Boreman, publisher, Des Moines, Iowa:

[From the Merchants Trade Journal, May 1951]

THE PUBLISHER'S PAGE

(By Arthur I. Boreman)

During recent months I have made a thorough study of statistical and historical data, and other information regarding Russia's ability or inability to successfully engage in a prolonged, highly mechanized war. I think the information that follows will give you the answer. Because of its importance, I am devoting the entire space to this one subject.

Stalin, himself, explodes State Department and U. N.'s major argument for present appeasement policy of fear and defeatism. Known facts completely refute the claim of the U. N., State Department and Defense Department and White House, that bombing bases in Manchuria, blockade of China, use of Chinese Nationalists and aerial reconnaissance would risk direct intervention by Russia and world war III.

We are told that Europe is Stalin's major objective and our major defense objective. Here are known facts that simply cannot be disputed. Russia flatly and repeatedly refused to declare war (or join in the war) against Japan until Germany was defeated. Stalin said Hitler (and others he named) had made the fatal mistake of battle on two fronts. Stalin repeatedly stated he would never be dumb enough to risk involvement on two fronts. In spite of the fact that his two powerful allies (United States and Britain) were obviously winning the war. Is Red China any such powerful ally? Would Russia risk two-front involvement by direct intervention in Manchuria or China? In spite of any so-called pledge of aid has Stalin hesitated to violate and repudiate solemn written agreements? Anyway, doesn't that pledge of aid apply only to attack by Japan, etc.?

In view of those facts, doesn't it seem as though the U. N., State Department, Defense Department, and the White House should either give to Congress and the public evidence that contradicts and outweighs those known facts, or recognize those facts and accept MacArthur's advice as to what should be done in Korea?

1. It is a known fact that those countries closest to Russia have the least fear of Russia or a major war.

2. Tito: Tito has not only defied, but actually ridiculed Stalin and the Politburo. He has gotten away with it. Russia could easily have taken over that country. Russia did not strike.

3. Oil: No prolonged mechanized war can be successful without oil (and gasoline) and lots of it. Russia controls less than 20 percent of the world's oil supply. The United States and Great Britain control 80 to 90 percent of the world's oil supply. Russia's oil fields that were destroyed in World War II have not yet been completely restored to prewar production. Our available oil supplies have been greatly increased. The Middle East oil fields could and would be quickly destroyed if Russia made a move to get them.

4. Steel: About the same situation exists in steel as in oil. We can expand our steel production immeasurably faster than Russia.

5. Satellites: Russia cannot trust her satellite countries. These satellites would turn on her and tear her apart once the tide turned against her and Russia's rulers know this. Already, sabotage, resistance, and revolt are widespread in satellite countries. In East Germany, for example, five new blast furnaces were started. All of them are now closed down. Obviously sabotage. Miners stage slow-downs. Farmers hide grain and livestock. There is resistance to Russia in every satellite.

6. Internal unrest: No major war can succeed without unity and safety at home. Russian police are completely disarmed when they go off duty. When Stalin reviews the troops, all ammunition is removed from the guns. No member of the Politburo dares go unprotected.

7. Navy: Russia has practically no navy and could not fuel her submarines for very long without control of a much greater oil supply than she has now.

8. Air power: Russia has a lot of fighter planes and they are very good. Here again shortage of oil and steel would be a serious handicap and Russia's rulers know that regardless of the number of planes she may have, she could not successfully wage a prolonged major, mechanized war. Russia has comparatively few long-range bombing planes. She is immeasurably weaker than we are with reference to strategic bombing. This indicates that she has no intention of risking world war III or our atomic-bombing attacks.

9. Soldiers: Russian soldiers fight well on their home soil, but not well away from home. Remember how long it took them to whip little Finland?

10. Autos and trucks: Without our trucks, tanks, etc., Russia would have had great difficulty stopping the Germans. Our productive capacity so greatly exceeds hers that there just isn't any comparison.

11. Geography: Individual initiative, cohesion, coordination, cooperation, and unity are vital factors in a major war—especially one of aggression and away from the home land. What we call Russia is a conglomeration of various parts of Europe and Asia. A many-languaged federation of states with 180 languages and dialects in daily use. There is very little intercommunication or traffic between the different communities and their different traditions, customs, etc., are a terrific handicap in the event of all-out war. A strong country is one welded together with a common language, common customs, and habits. Most of Russia lies north of 45 north latitude. It is a confirmable, historical fact that little wealth or progress is ever made in agriculture or industry that far north. Twenty-three percent of Russia's land is in the Arctic Circle. Her southern border faces mountain ranges and high land which prevent tropical, mois-

ture-laden winds from reaching her soil. Russia's eastern border lies on the Pacific Ocean. Westerly moisture-laden winds blow away and not onto her soil there. Her western border faces open country, but too far from the Atlantic Ocean to receive great benefit from westerly moisture-laden winds. The fact that her western border is so vulnerable to land attack explains her huge land army and emphasis on fighter planes for tactical rather than strategic use. All of this explains why less than 25 percent of Russia's land is arable in the first place and only 25 percent of that arable land can be successfully cultivated and made productive. All of this has a powerful bearing on her ability to successfully wage a long mechanized war away from home and her rulers are certainly well aware of the fact.

12. Research and invention: In all her history, I have been unable to find a single important scientific invention ever to come out of Russia.

13. Greece: We gave heavy military aid to Greece. Russia could have occupied Greece any time she wished. Why did she not intervene? Wasn't the most logical reason for no intervention her fear of world war III and our A-bombs?

14. Berlin airlift: When Russia slapped her blockade on in the hope of driving us out of Berlin, we established our airlift, yet Russia did not dare shoot down those airlift planes or take any action in connection therewith that might involve her in world war III.

15. In spite of Russia's alleged common defense pact with Red China, I am unable to find a scintilla of evidence to support the fear that bombing Manchurian bases would bring one iota more help than she will give Red China without such bombing. On the contrary, Russia has repeatedly broken written pledges, and evidence clearly indicates Russia will not risk any chance of world war III (and our A-bombs) if we bomb those Manchurian bases.

16. All evidence seems to indicate that the Kremlin will continue to use satellites to wear down our manpower and materials; to weaken us economically, if possible. (Long ago Lenin said, "Whoever controls Asia controls the world.") Evidence mounts showing Asia, not Europe, to be Stalin's major objective. President Truman, unintentionally, confirmed this.

17. There seems to be a fear that Russia may make a sneak atomic bombing attack on our cities. The evidence presented here clearly indicates the Kremlin will not do any such thing.

18. It seems obvious Britain doesn't care how many Americans must be killed or maimed so long as her trade with the Reds is not affected.

From the evidence presented here (and much additional available information), it seems clear to me (I believe you will agree) that—

(a) Stalin is pulling the most colossal bluff in world history.

(b) The Kremlin will continue to use satellites to bleed us until their bluff is recognized and called.

(c) Bombing bases in Manchuria will not bring any more Kremlin aid to Red China than they will give anyway and that the Kremlin will not risk world war III and our A-bombs by direct intervention.

(d) Russia is in much greater fear of world war III (and our A-bombs) than even the appeasers in the State Department and/or the Pentagon.

(e) Russia would not intervene if Chinese Nationalists were told to go ahead; if China is blockaded.

(f) The United States can safely act alone without the U. N. approval.

(g) That Asia, not Europe, is the Kremlin's major objective.

What action should be taken now? To me (and I believe you will agree) this and other available evidence clearly indicates that the war in Korea can be quickly ended with unconditional surrender of the present Peiping regime; a complete new Republic of China can be created—a potentially powerful and friendly ally. That this would make world war III impossible.

Here's how it might be done. Fortunately, we now have the most competent, conscientious, patriotic, courageous, and bipartisan Congress in my memory. Otherwise we might be in an even more dangerous position.

It is my belief that—

1. Congress should reopen the investigation of the Amerasia case and the State Department. Examine closely the possible influence on our present appeasement policy because of the long time, very close, and very intimate association between Alger Hiss and Secretary Acheson.

2. Congress can and should force the administration to immediately advise Britain and the U. N. that we intend to give General Ridgway both authority and instructions to bomb Manchuria (using A-bombs if necessary); use Chinese Nationalist troops and do whatever is necessary to bring about the unconditional surrender of the Chinese Reds, at once, either with or without U. N. approval. That appeasement is out of the window.

3. Following the Peiping regime's surrender, General MacArthur (or some one equally competent) should be placed in charge of helping the Chinese people establish a representative and free republic. Do the same kind of job in China that MacArthur has so ably done in Japan.

Before starting the bombing (etc.) of Manchuria, Russia could be warned that any intervention by her would at once bring atomic destruction of her cities. (This warning probably would be unnecessary because it would actually be obvious to her. It is her fear of world war III and our A-bombs that has kept her from action up to now, anyway.)

Immediately following surrender of the Chinese Reds, Congress should demand (and force, as it can through appropriations) that Russia be told (either by the U. N. or the United States, acting alone if the cowardly U. N. appeasers are too frightened to act) to sit down to work out a real world-wide program of disarmament, free international trade, removal of the iron curtain, etc., etc.

Russia would not then dare refuse.

In conclusion, I believe this evidence does clearly indicate that: (1) Russia won't start world war III; (2) we can end the Korean war very quickly; (3) a real start can then be made toward many years of world peace; (4) it seems that only Congress can force the changes in our foreign (and military) policies that will produce these results.

The Wetback Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator CHAVEZ' Battle Over Wetbacks," published in the Parkersburg News on May 4, 1951, discussing the fight I made in the Senate on the so-called wetback issue in connection with the farm labor bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CHAVEZ' BATTLE OVER WETBACKS

Little known to the public, and scarcely making a ripple in the headlines—as yet—Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, is waging a brilliant and courageous battle on the so-called wetback issue, a battle which in reality is to destroy a mushrooming peonage system in the United States.

A wetback is an illegal Mexican immigrant who crosses the Rio Grande to take employment at substandard wages on United States industrialized farms, thus destroying the job opportunities of American citizens, including American Indians of such tribes as the Navajos, the storied Apaches, and the Pueblos, not to mention many of Anglo-Saxon lineage.

Senator CHAVEZ compared the situation to that of the Okies, made famous by John Steinbeck in his book, Grapes of Wrath. The Senator first pointed out that while there are 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 farms in the United States, there are only 125,000 large corporate farms, or "factories of the field," where the imported workers could possibly find employment. "Those who operate the 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 family-size farms," said Senator CHAVEZ, "do not want to take advantage of human misery. On the other hand these vast corporate farms are owned by less than 2 percent of the Nation's farm operators, and produce only 7 percent of the food and fiber products sold on the American market."

The bill now before the Senate, said Senator CHAVEZ, if enacted without saving amendments, would bring back in my State the return of peonage which was outlawed in 1868.

The illegal immigrants, said the Senator, "want to get something to eat, and that is why they are willing to work at stoop labor for 60 or 70 cents a day. It is a pernicious system. But we cannot blame them. They are hungry."

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor recently brought in this report:

"We have long wavered and compromised on the issue of migratory labor in agriculture. We have failed to adopt policies designed to insure an adequate supply of such labor at decent standards of employment. * * * We have impaired the economic and social position of the family-farm operator."

We are strongly inclined to side with Senator CHAVEZ in this matter. We believe him far-sighted and just and striving to right a grievous social wrong. It is difficult to see how any Senator of the United States, gazing about him over the world and noting how the flames of communism blaze up in just such instances of exploitation of the ignorant and the wretched, would want to ignite what could become a prairie-fire in the United States. Therefore we believe Senator CHAVEZ will prevail ultimately, if not now. He will prevail because he is right. American jobs ought to go to Americans first.

Preparations for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and

challenging column on civil defense, written by Mr. Philip Wylie as guest columnist for Mr. Walter Winchell, and published in the New York Daily Mirror of May 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

Mr. and Mrs. United States:

(Today's column is by Philip Wylie, the bookwriter, whose best sellers include A Generation of Vipers and the Disappearance. You've probably met Wylie in the Satevepost (and other mags) via his delightly essays about deep-sea fishing, etc. Readers who still miss Heywood Broun's common sense and word magic appreciate Wylie's. Don't skip through this one, please. Clip and file it away in your pocket or desk—after your neighbors borrow it. Remember Pearl Harbor, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki.)

DEAR W. W.: In the spring days of 1951 I have begun to wonder if the American people have lost their minds. Maybe you can ask them. Any maybe I'm the nutty one—though people like you and me were called nutty before the Second World War and it proved we were right then, while the public was day dreaming, in the main. Here are some questions I wish I could answer.

Since the American people now know that the Soviet has a stockpile of plutonium bombs, why don't they react like people in a dreadful danger—people whose peril will grow less only after they act by the millions in a thousand ways?

The people have been told exactly what atomic bombs are like. They've been told that if they get set to be slugged in their cities they can "take it' 'and cut casualties to one-fifth of what they'd be now.

Getting set for that means a lot. It means 20,000,000 volunteer workers. It means spending billions of bucks to stockpile medicines and drugs, and to reinforce buildings and to arrange and rehearse systems of priority evacuation—beginning with children—and it means preparing the whole landscape around every big industrial city to receive, temporarily, city refugees. It means new fire-fighting equipment, mass produced. It means all sorts of electronic equipment and people trained to run it.

Getting set means more. It means basic training for every man and woman and child in a possible target area. It means bracing the nerves and minds of people likely to be in an A-bomb-hit area for the terrible sights bound to ensue—the burned, the wounded, the fire storms, the naked, the hysterical, and so on.

Getting set means having the stuff and the know-how to save the injured, to rescue the trapped, to douse the gigantic fires. It means, also, being ready to bear the terrible (but not dangerous) after-show of atomic bombs. It means having the guts to go about your business, after a hit, though you know there may be another.

Getting set, moreover, may well mean that no enemy will try to use atomic bombs on city populations. Because a city that's set is a poor target; you can't hurt it badly enough to be worth the try.

But the people I meet in big cities, Walter, aren't doing these things. They don't seem to realize all civil-defense problems differ from city to city and have to be solved locally and, in the event of a hit or hits, dealt with by local people—themselves.

The people I meet are fatalistic. They hope if a bomb comes they'll be the first killed. Some are just going ahead as if nothing were different—which is like letting yourself drown. And others are having a last fling—which, in my book, is damn near treason.

For a time is coming, perhaps is very near, Walter, when we could knock off all the Russian cities—and yet not knock out Russia. We can't reach the vast majority of Russians with atomic bombs—or the Red army—or the Government. Slave state people haven't the communications and transport that lead to national panic. We have.

The Soviets, with far fewer bombs, might quite conceivably so shock and horrify an unready United States of America that our folks would abandon our cities and refuse to go back. Then we'd have to surrender. We can be sure we are strong enough to face those birds on a city-trading basis only if and when the whole 150,000,000 of us are all set and prepared and briefed and rehearsed for the evil show—the show they could start tomorrow.

But what, Walter? A congressional committee puts the nix on the civil defense appropriation bill. In the Senate, a bill to disperse Washington is dropped. Are all those people insane?

They know Russia has the bomb. They know we could get in a war with Russia. MacArthur admits it—even accuses Truman of increasing the danger. The Congressmen smilingly tell you that in the first hours of any war Moscow would vanish. Well, so would Washington, just as sure as the Lord made little apples. So would New York, perhaps; so, surely, would a whole lot of other places. That's what the Soviet A-bomb means.

I remember writing a poem about waking up America in the days when the Nazis were eating a new country a month and you printed the verse. Now the danger is, say, 1,000 times as great, as savage, as terrible. It can be met only by facing the facts and getting braced in all the ways I've mentioned and many more. For if there's a next time, Walter, we're "for it"—and nobody I know is even 1 percent ready to face and to do what he must—to win.

The Japs, used to air raids but unprepared for atomic bombs, couldn't stand them. The Germans were knocked flat by fire storms—a mere side-effect of plutonium bombs. They weren't ready, either. And the British darn near lost their part of the war three different times, owing to air assault. We know we are a gritty people. And if we put our backs in it, we can do anything. But the massive atomic bombing of United States of America without preparation—immense, costly preparation—might be curtains for the land of liberty.

The home front, Walter, is the naked flank of American defenses today. Protecting it is not a Pentagon problem but everybody's business. So why don't we all catch on and pitch in? And why doesn't Congress begin to realize that unless it, too, acts sensibly, there may sooner or later come an instant when the Capitol and the monuments, the Pentagon and the White House just won't be there any more?

This time, civil defense is no clambake; it's the front-line trenches and we're all in them and we better learn how to fight an atomic war or we may one day be looking up our flagpoles at a hammer and sickle—those of us willing to live like that, I mean.

As ever, for freedom,

PHIL WYLIE.

What Allies Are We Afraid of Losing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., of Saturday, May 5, 1951:

WHAT ALLIES ARE WE AFRAID OF LOSING?

General MacArthur, in suggesting we ought to go it alone, if necessary, in order to knock Red China out of the Korean war in a hurry, appears to have astonished some of Washington's too-too liberal internationalists.

And yet his suggestion makes a lot of sense.

To date in this Korean affair, the United Nations boys have been strictly fair-weather friends. As long as things were going well, they stood up to the Commies and resoluted to beat all get-out.

That was when we were fighting the North Koreans alone. But as soon as the Chinese Reds got into the scrap, the United Nations started to drag its feet. And the U. N. has been dragging its feet ever since.

Let's face it. If Great Britain and France hadn't been hanging about our necks, isn't it possible that this MacArthur controversy never would have come up?

It's been pretty definitely established, by this time, that as late as January 12 the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur were in virtual agreement about how the military phase of the Korean affair should be conducted.

Who blocked that program? Obviously, the diplomats—not our own, exclusively, but the foreign offices of our so-called allies.

Our difficulties to date in Korea—and a large part of those difficulties are reflected in the 60,000-plus casualties the United States has suffered—have come as a result of putting our field commanders under wraps.

General MacArthur has testified that when the Chinese Reds started to pour across the Yalu in force, they should have been served with an ultimatum to get the hell back where they belonged, or get the very bedevil kicked out of them.

That's in the American military tradition. Our history books are filled with such classic wartime rejoinders as "Don't give up the ship," "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead," "We'll fight it out on this line if it takes all summer," "Surrender? Never," and "Nuts." To recall only a few.

If General MacArthur had been permitted to reply in kind to the Reds when they crossed the Yalu, and to have plastered them with everything we had from the air, the sea, and by means of diversionary raids on the mainland of China, chances are this war now would be over.

But for seven long month's we've been pulling our punches. Why our Air Force isn't even permitted to bomb certain places in North Korea itself. Meantime, our boys have been going through what General MacArthur calls an accordion action, up and down, up and down, up and down the narrow Korean peninsula. We've been waiting for the dust to settle—and meantime have soaked that dust with blood, American blood.

Why? Because we've been yellow? Because we don't know how to fight? No. Because the United Nations and the principal allies with whom we're associated in this police action are thinking of Hong Kong and other interests in the Far East.

It's nothing short of criminal that our delegate to the United Nations, 7 months after the Chinese Reds entered the war, is only now pleading with our so-called allies to stop shipping critical matériel of war to the very enemy that is killing our sons—and their own.

These fair-weather allies of ours—who've got their hands out for military and economic aid from us in Europe—have only token forces in Korea. Yet they have just as loud a voice—louder, collectively—as we do in calling the military shots in Korea.

Meantime, Harry Truman and Dean Acheson are willing to doom thousands of American boys to a senseless meat-grinder operation in which we trade one American life for 20 Chinese lives in an indeterminable limited war—in the pious hope that some day the Reds will get tired of it all and will consent to talk cease-fire with us.

United States would be a lot better off in Asia today if we'd never heard of the United Nations. The city slickers hoaxed us into a diplomatic poker game and they've been taking the shirt off our back in Korea ever since.

We go all the way with General MacArthur on that score. Why worry about losing our allies in Korea? We never had any to speak of.

Isn't it about time we showed a few characteristic American feathers? Isn't it about time we said to these so-called allies, in effect:

"Look, brother, we've had enough of this fiddle-faddle. This is the way it's going to be. Are you with us? If not, get out of our way. We've got a job to do."

And we'd like to lay a little bet—2 to 1. Those fellows would go along. Because they need us a lot worse than we need them. Lose our allies? Why we couldn't beat them off with a club. (And sometimes, we think, more's the pity.)

"Do as I Say, Not as I Do"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News:

"DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO"

Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, who had long since put a crimp in local public-works projects by clamping down on scarce materials, now asks all States, cities, and counties to "postpone borrowing no matter how worthy the purpose, if the project is postponable."

The new edict seeks not only to curtail those projects that consume priority materials, but all those that create credit and thus feed inflation—including borrowing for soldiers' bonus payments, for sites and rights-of-way for future projects, for funds with which to purchase privately owned utilities, etc.

As anti-inflation medicine, this Spartan prescription makes obvious sense. But it would make a good deal more sense—and be better heeded—if Uncle Sam were leading the way instead of merely issuing the commands.

So far, the Federal Administration itself has not shown the slightest disposition to practice any of the belt-tightening or credit-husbanding virtues about which it economic stabilizers preach.

The President's budget for the year beginning July 1—a budget which he has repeatedly dared Congress to cut—shows most of the Federal credit and public-works programs running in high gear. Many adjustments have been made to give a defense label to programs that were advocated under other guises before the Korean War, but the totals, in most cases, are higher than ever.

Take, for example, the total for civil public works. Actual spending for all these programs was less than $1,700,000,000 in fiscal 1948 and again in 1949. Last year, it came to $2,053,000,000. But the President's 1952 budget asks $3,353,000,000 for these purposes.

Or take the total of Federal credit programs. Last year's new commitments for all types of Federal loans and guarantees came to $11,967,000,000. For next year, the President has asked a total of $13,340,000,000. Some of these loan-expansion programs, to be sure, carry a defense tag. For instance, $90,000,000 for civil defense, and $1,950,000,000 for expansion of defense production. But the biggest items represent continuance of regular peacetime programs. The scandal-ridden RFC is down for $308,000,000 in new lending authority for ordinary loans to business—this at a time when the economic-stabilization officials are pleading with private lenders to cut down on business credit. The Veterans' Administration is down for $3,055,000,000 in new commitments for veterans' housing (compared with $2,518,000,000 in the 1950 fiscal year)—at a time when Mr. Wilson is urging the States to postpone veterans' bonus payments.

The worst thing about this contrast between what Uncle Sam practices and what he preaches, of course, is that it is all too typical of the let's-everybody-else-sacrifice approach to mobilization. As long as the Federal Government carries the big club, the States and cities will probably do what they're told—at least so far as the timing of their public-works programs is concerned. But they would do it a lot more willingly, and with a lot more of the feeling that we're all in this thing together, if the Federal Government showed any disposition to lead by example instead of by command.

Paul Wooton at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the remarks in the RECORD. I wish to call to the attention of the Congress the 37 years service of a distinguished journalist, originally from my district in Louisiana, Paul Wooton, who was honored by the Washington newspaper correspondents on the occasion of Mr. Wooton's seventieth birthday.

The people of my district and Louisiana are proud of the service and stature attained by this fine and able man who through the 37 years of his assignment in Washington has exemplified the highest principles in journalism and has contributed so unselfishly to the success of many a new and young reporter who came to Washington from all sections of the country and who through his solicitious guidance became some of our foremost national newspaper columnists and publishers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in these remarks a copy of an editorial from the Washington Star of May 10, 1951, entitled "Paul Wooton at 70," as follows:

PAUL WOOTON AT 70

The Washington press corps did honor yesterday to "the indispenable man." Paul Wooton, whose 70 years sit lightly on him, had a brithday party.

For 37 years, while the world has passed through one of its most tumultuous periods, Paul Wooton has built a distinguished career in journalism in the Nation's Capital. Friend to Presidents and to statesmen in general, he has most of all been a friend to other newspapermen. With devotion to his profession and a kindness of heart well known to all his colleagues, Paul Wooton has been the wheelhorse in virtually every newspapermen's organization in Washington. It was not inappropriate that one of those who spoke at the luncheon honoring Paul yesterday referred to his "benevolent despotism" and suggested that many of the world's problems could be resolved by adoption of his high principles of human relations.

It is a safe guess that American newspapermen now scattered all over the world were present in spirit at yesterday's party to wish "happy birthday" to one of their best friends and most beloved colleagues.

Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education Established as Tribute to Statesman and Promoter of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the State of Tennessee granted the charter for the Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education. This was a most historic action and was the culmination of many months of endeavor by friends and associates of that great Tennessean, Cordell Hull, to create a suitable monument to the decades of public service and untiring efforts for world peace and accord which this great American has rendered to all mankind.

Formal announcement of the formation of a multi-million-dollar fund for the granting of scholarships to students of other nationalities for study in the United States was announced on the same day by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tennessee. Most regrettably the announcement of the formation of this great foundation has come at a time when the revered statesman continues ill at the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda and as his multitude of friends in Tennessee and throughout the world earnestly hope and pray for the restoration of his health.

The Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education will encompass the ideals for which Judge Hull has dedicated his long and useful life—that is, the attainment of international harmony through the practice of good will and neighborliness among nations. Through the granting of these scholarships, students of other lands may come to our great country to pursue their studies and learn about us at first hand. By the same token we of this country

may become better acquainted with our international friends through association with these unofficial ambassadors of good will. No more fitting tribute to the great Cordell Hull, promoter of peace and good will, could be conceived. The Cordell Hull Foundation will take its place as an instrument of peace along the United Nations and the Pan-American Union whose formation Mr. Hull inspired.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times and an editorial from the Nashville Banner, May 10, 1951, on the creation of the Cordell Hull Foundation. The article is as follows:

Friends and admirers of Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, have established in his name an educational foundation to promote world peace and good will through an international scholarship program.

Formation of the Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education was announced here yesterday by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. He said it was expected that several million dollars would be provided for the project.

Dr. Branscomb, who made the announcement at the Roosevelt Hotel, also made public a letter from the 79-year-old former statesman, who is critically ill in the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md. Mr. Hull, a native of Tennessee, endorsed the program and observed that better understanding and cooperation between nations was desperately needed in the present world situation.

FOUNDATION'S TENTATIVE PLANS

The foundation's program, still in the formative stage, envisions the setting up of scholarships and fellowships that will enable students from the 20 Latin-American countries to study in the United States, Dr. Branscomb explained.

He said that, beginning in 1952, 40 students a year would be brought here—2 from each of the 20 countries. Later it is hoped to offer similar opportunities for European students.

The foundation also plans to carry on studies in international relations at the university center in Nashville, which embraces the schools and colleges of Vanderbilt University, and to send faculty members abroad to study and teach.

Dr. Branscomb made public an incomplete list of trustees of the new foundation, explaining that it would be expanded later. The list included Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas; James A. Farley, former Postmaster General; Warren R. Austin, chief United States delegate to the United Nations; Myron C. Taylor, retired industrialist and diplomat.

Will L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Economic Affairs and Under Secretary of State during Mr. Hull's administration; George A. Sloan, president of the Metropolitan Opera Association; Leo Pasvolsky, director of international studies for the Brookings Institute; Frank Houston of the Chemical Bank & Trust Co.; Henry C. Alexander, president of J. P. Morgan & Co.; Jesse H. Jones, former Secretary of Commerce; and Chief Justice A. B. Neil, of the Tennessee Supreme Court.

Winston S. Dustin, southern radio executive, is executive secretary.

Mr. Hull's letter to Dr. Branscomb was dated April 4 and was in reply to a memorandum from the college chancelor outlining the purposes of the foundation. The former Secretary of State emphasized the need to elevate the standards of political morality and action on the part of our citizens and the citizens of all countries, and added:

"Only through such activities can we hope that men and women everywhere will keep alive and constantly renew faith in the dignity of the individual, in institutions of government founded upon the concept of the governed, and in enduring peace based on freedom and justice.

"These are the abiding values of a truly Christian civilization, and their presentation requires faith in their eternal worth, and stanch determination to uphold them and willingness to make whatever sacrifices may be needed to that end.

"I think it is wise, as you plan, to begin your endeavors in the realm of inter-American problems and relations. The nations of this hemisphere have in common many traditions and aspirations. All of them were born of a passionate desire for liberty and freedom, and all of them face today the fateful challenge presented to mankind by the unspeakable doctrines of communism and of other similar movements directed toward enslavement of the individual by the soulless state."

Mr. Hull also declared that no country or region could be secure in freedom unless an overwhelming majority of mankind move forward together toward the attainment of the noble purposes and principles that are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Dr. Branscomb, who is chairman of the United States Advisory Commission for Educational Exchange, said it was intended that the foundation would perform a comparable service to the Rhodes scholarships. He is a Rhodes scholar.

He explained that the idea for the foundation grew spontaneously from a number of Mr. Hull's friends and colleagues and that the plan had been discussed with both Mr. Hull and Mrs. Hull. He said that eventually a headquarters building, to be known as Hull Hall, would be erected in Nashville.

In his memorandum to Mr. Hull outlining the project, Dr. Branscomb declared that the former diplomat belonged not only to the United States but also to other countries of the free democratic world which his statesmanship has served.

"Your friends, and others joining with them, believe," the communication added, "that the most appropriate monument we could establish in your honor would be a program of international education which would bring together promising young men and women from many countries in a common educational experience."

Dr. Branscomb said the charter for the new foundation had been formally granted yesterday in Tennessee.

The editorial is as follows:

THE CORDELL HULL FOUNDATION

The announcement by Chancellor Harvie Branscomb of Vanderbilt University that the newly established Cordell Hull Foundation will have its headquarters at the University Center here should be a source of pride and gratification to every Nashvillian.

Already the site of numerous educational and religious institutions, Nashville now will have the opportunity to expand further its reputation as an international center of learning. The new multimillion-dollar foundation initially will focus its attention on the education of students from Latin-American countries but later it is expected to broaden its scope and include other countries in its program.

The announcement occurs at a time when the people of this State, the Nation and the entire world are hoping and praying for the recovery of the former Secretary of State, now critically ill.

The project's stated purpose of promoting, by educational activities, better understanding and good will among the peoples of the world and especially between the peoples of the Western Hemisphere is a just tribute to the "father of the United Nations" who contributed so greatly to a better understanding between this Nation and those of South America.

The people of Tennessee have long remarked with pride the skill and vision of statesmanship marking this illustrious career, and the inspiration and influence of his gracious wife upon that career. Their name, their influence, their generosity on behalf of humanity's uplift are perpetuated in this great new enterprise—shared by those having a part in its establishment.

The Cordell Hull Foundation can and will make a major contribution toward strengthening the bonds that already exist between the continents of North and South America. Through its contemplated program of exchange students at Vanderbilt and other schools, it will foster and encourage personal friendships among the students of the various countries and when the students return to their homes, these friendships will go a long way toward increasing understanding and cooperation on the international level.

Nashvillians, especially, are indebted to Chancellor Branscomb and to the other men of vision who conceived this memorial and who played a part in having its headquarters located here. They should be grateful for the opportunity ot take part in its program and should feel an obligation to support the foundation and to share in its work.

Public Power—The Preference Clause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, one of the cornerstones of the Government's so-called power policy is that preference in power sales from Federal multiple-purpose projects shall be given to public agencies, cooperatives, and the like.

During debate in the House on the recently passed Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952, public power supporters declared that the preference provision reflected a philosophy laid down by Congress in 1906 in making it essential for the Congress to build transmission lines to serve preference customers and, in effect, ignore anyone else who might have need for power.

In 1906 the Congress passed the first act which contained a preference provision—the Reclamation Act of April 16, 1906. Section 5 of this act stated that the Secretary of the Interior may lease surplus power from irrigation projects "giving preference to municipal purposes."

This law has been cherished and cited by public power supporters as if it were on a par with the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. Whenever the wisdom of preference provisions is questioned, we are always referred in voices filled with awe back to this law of 1906. It is from this one piece of legislation that all of the subsequent preference provisions have flowed, and today preference has

become the hub of the public power wheel.

What was the intent of the legislators who framed the original preference clause? What were the circumstances that surrounded its inception? The 1906 bill, which originated in the Senate, did not primarily concern power. It provided for the withdrawal from public entry any lands needed for town-site purposes as provided for under the Reclamation Act of 1902.

Apparently the Senate held no hearings on this bill as no transcript can be found. There was little debate on the Senate floor before the bill was passed. It should be noted that neither the bill as proposed or as passed by the Senate contained any preference provision at all. This provision appeared in the bill as reported by the House Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands. However, no House hearings have been located either, so we must assume that no hearings were held by that body. The House report offered no hint either as to the origin or purpose of the preference clause.

This is the law that those who would nationalize our electric industry point to as the basis for preference, the cornerstone of their so-called public power policy. The preference section was only one clause in one section of a five-section bill which in itself did not concern power. This provision was included in a piece of legislation before the Federal Government had an appreciable amount of surplus power available from irrigation or other projects. In 1912, 6 years after the passage of the 1906 act, a report of the Commissioners of Corporation on the subject of Water Power Development in the United States, stated that "a considerable portion of power developed at irrigation projects is utilized for the operation of pumps, and power for commercial use is of comparatively little importance."

During the recent debate on the Interior Department bill the statement was made that Federal power legislation had been approved by the Congress for the purpose of helping all kinds of people. Such legislation should help, not all kinds of people, but all people. In fact I challenge that, with preference as a cornerstone, Federal power legislation does not even help all kinds of people, but only certain people. That this is true can be shown in my own State of Michigan.

It has been estimated that 11 percent of all the power customers in Michigan could be classified as preference customers. If the Bureau of Reclamation built a huge multiple-purpose project in Michigan, only 11 percent of Michigan's customers would be entitled to this power. Although 89 percent of the customers had, through their taxes, contributed to the building of this project, they would be denied any benefit from the project because they happened to patronize the wrong power distributing concern.

This reasoning is all based on a law passed back in 1906 that did not involve power, and on which no hearings were held.

This is the history of the act that first offered the preference idea which in turn has been used ever since as a beacon by public power advocates to light their way toward nationalization of the electric industry.

Editorial Re Rumely Jury Conviction and Freedom of Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying during the last session of Congress, the Hon. Frank Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, in his lifetime made request that the following editorial in the Denver Post for Saturday, April 21, 1951, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of all who might read.

I had the responsibility and privilege of serving as a member of the Select Committee on Lobbying. There is no question in the minds of those who had the honor of working with him that the heavy and diligent work he did on that committee during those months was the cause of hastening his untimely demise.

So now that he has passed on and is unable to personally ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks and include therein the following editorial, it is my privilege and pleasure to do it at the request of his able assistants in his congressional office.

Representative Buchanan sat next to me on the floor of the House of Representatives on the occasion when the distinguished American, General MacArthur, spoke to us at the joint session. It was his last presence on the floor of the House.

At that time he knew of the verdict of the court jury holding Dr. E. A. Rumely guilty of contempt of Congress and spoke to me about it. Even though the jury took only 20 minutes to arrive at its verdict of guilty for Dr. Rumely, Representative Buchanan told me he was awfully sorry to see any American citizen in a legal position where he was found guilty by an American jury of violating American statutes and ordinances. He did not gloat over the fact that Dr. Rumely had been convicted. He did, however, tell me that he felt that a verdict of guilty, arrived at after only 20 minutes' consideration by the jury, justified the vote of the majority of members of the Select Lobbying Committee to recommend to the House of Representatives that he be cited for contempt.

The following editorial speaks for itself:

NO RIGHT TO SECRECY

The jury which convicted Dr. Edward A. Rumely of contempt of Congress reached its verdict in only 20 minutes. The facts in the case were uncontroverted. Dr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, admitted he had refused to give a lobby investigating committee full information on persons who made quantity purchases of books published by the Committee on Constitutional Government.

Dr. Rumely's only defense was based on constitutional legalistic grounds which Federal District Judge Keech found to be invalid. Those grounds will now be tested further in the course of appeals to higher courts.

That the Committee for Constitutional Government is one of the major lobbying organizations of the country seems plain to us. For years it has sought to influence public opinion on matters relating to legislation. It has been on such friendly terms with some Congressmen that it has been able to send out large quantities of literature under free postal franking privileges.

One of the ways of Committee on Constitutional Government finances its activities is through the sale of books. Under existing lobbying laws, the organization cannot accept donations of $500 or more from anyone without disclosing to Congress the source of the donation. The Committee on Constitutional Government has taken the position, however, that if it sells $500 or $1,000 worth of its books to one of its supporters it does not have to reveal the identity of the purchaser.

Whether the book-selling business of the Committee on Constitutional Government—or any similar group—provides a loophole in the lobbying law which should be closed is a question which the congressional committee has been studying.

The powers granted to the congressional committee were broad enough to cover a full investigation of book-selling activities. But, when Dr. Rumely was ordered to produce records of bulk purchases by publicity-shunning supporters of the Committee on Constitutional Government, he refused and sought to invoke the constitutional protection of freedom of the press.

We cannot agree with Dr. Rumely's interpretation of what press freedom means. The right of the Committee on Constitutional Government to publish any books that it may wish to put in print is not questioned in any way. The right of freedom of the press does not carry with it any right to keep secret the names of those who give financial support to publications seeking to influence public opinion.

Postal laws very properly require newspapers to disclose the names of their principal stockholders from time to time. Anonymity in any publishing business could be a dangerous thing. Those who object to Government by unseen forces will approve the action of the court in Dr. Rumely's case.

The Pinkest Cheeks in Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, who advised the President last year that the Chinese Communists were too intelligent to get into the Korean war? Bless his heart, it was Secretary Acheson who told the world that this would never happen, and he put it on television so all could hear and see him.

Ruth Montgomery, in her column D. C. Wash, cites a very interesting, yet

embarrassing, situation within the spats and cane division. I include part of her article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune of May 12, 1951]

D. C. WASH

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—The pinkest cheeks in town this week belong to our State Department boys. They've pulled another bloomer, bless 'em. The spats and cane division was holding one of a series of indoctrination classes for new Foreign Service personnel. To vary the usual lectures about what a wonderful job the Department is doing [hear, hear], the institute officials decided to show a kinescope of a television interview with Secretary Acheson. This was in order to demonstrate what a warm and human fellow the outwardly frosty Secretary really is.

It proved he was human all right, to the blushing consternation of the officials. The kinescope, which had apparently not been previewed by the Department since the dismissal of General MacArthur, represented a television interview with Acheson last fall by three CBS correspondents. In it Griffing Bancroft asked the Secretary whether he thought the Chinese Communists would come into the Korean war. The Cabinet officer emphatically reassured Bancroft against such a possibility, because the Chinese Reds were too "intelligent" to take such a risk.

It's human to err. Practically everybody admits to pulling a few—except President Truman, that is. A handful of the fledgling Foreign Service officers, too new to have been properly indoctrinated, suggested that the embarrassing kinescope ought to be dispatched to the White House. After all, our Chief Executive at the recent Jefferson-Jackson Day political rally shrugged off all blame for the Korean war tragedy by complaining petulantly that MacArthur had predicted the Chinese Reds wouldn't come in.

A General Far Eastern War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD the following comments by Walter Lippmann. They are taken from today's Washington Post:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A GENERAL FAR EASTERN WAR?

It is, I think, clear that one of the determining factors in General MacArthur's mind is that in the Far East the Soviet Union can exert only a small part of its military power. From the main Russian centers of population and of industry the distance to the Soviet Far East is great and the communications are poor.

Russia, seen from Japan, looks and indeed, is, a far less formidable power than Russia seen from, let us say, Paris or Bonn or Trieste or Ankara. The Red army can march against Europe and the Middle East and pick up war industries and supplies as it advances. But in the Far East there are only the comparatively limited forces east of Lake Baikal with their limited local war industries, dependent in case of war upon the vulnerable and inadequate Trans-Siberian Railway.

Moreover, it might even be easier for the United States with its command of the sea and air to build up power based on Japan than it would be for Russia to build up power based on the Soviet Far East and Manchuria.

Thus, a war in the Far East, even against Russia and China combined, would be—provided it was confined to the Far East—a war in which neither side could bring all its military forces—nor even its main military force—into the fighting. The Russians could not bring in their immense army. We, for lack of decisive targets and essential bases, could use only a fraction—and not the most effective fraction—of our sea and air power. A far-eastern war, confined to the Far East, would be a big war. But it would be a limited war. Since neither side could use its whole power, there could be no decisive victory for which it has been said, there is in war no substitute.

But, seen from Japan and Formosa, an interesting case can be made for that sort of far-eastern war. It would commit great American forces to the Far East. They would have priority. Since the war would have to be indecisive, it could not be terminated by the kind of victory without which all is now appeasement. Therefore great American forces would be committed indefinitely in the Far East and a condition of permanent hostilities, without the danger of a truce or a negotiated settlement or any kind of modus vivendi, would be guaranteed to Joe Stalin.

The administration's argument against General MacArthur has been that such a general war against China would almost certainly bring in Russia and that this would mean that the third world war with the atom bombs and the overrunning of Europe and the rest would follow. General MacArthur's comment on this argument was to say that: "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves."

The general meant, of course, that the Soviet might not go openly to war if we bombed the Manchurian bases of the Chinese army in Korea but that even if they did, the Far East is the most important place to fight the war and that this is as good a time as any to have a war with the Soviet Union.

I wonder whether Stalin and Molotov and the rest of them may not be of the same opinion. We cannot know for sure what they think—not at least until the Politburo holds its next public debate on Soviet strategy and high policy—with stenographic reports, only slightly censored, every hour on the hour at 12 cents a page.

One thing I would bet on. The Kremlin has before it a comprehensive report which we are providing for them of what we know and of what we don't know and of what we are thinking and hoping and wishing and worrying about. There is no doubt, I think, that the Kremlin will mesh their actions with ours. The Russians are chess players. As we are now informing them that we shall use either the queen's pawn opening or the Ruy Lopez, they will certainly be fully prepared to mesh their moves with ours when we make our moves.

There are, I believe, a great many bits and pieces of evidence—including Mr. Gromyko's behavior in Paris—which indicate that the Soviet Union may also have come to think that the Far East is the best theater in which to have war break out. For the Soviets the Far East is the safest and the most advantageous place to have a world war break out. In the Far East they have their most powerful ally. In the Far East we have no alliances. The Atlantic Pact does not operate outside the region defined in the pact, and while the British would no doubt join us in a far-eastern war, they are not any longer capable of important military action in the Far East.

In a far-eastern war the Soviet Union cannot be defeated. It cannot even be deeply injured. Thus a war which broke out in the Far East would engage great American forces in a struggle that was certain to be indecisive and interminable. The war would strain, and almost certainly disrupt the Atlantic alliance because France and the Low Countries and the Scandinavian countries cannot be expected to declare war on Russia for the sake of Korea when that means inviting the Red Army to invade them. If the Atlantic alliance is disrupted, if we are at war with Russia without the active support of most of western and southern Europe, we shall fight without being able to use our right arm. American atomic power would be not entirely but in very large measure neutralized.

Therefore it might well be that the Russians may decide that a war in the Far East, and really confined to the Far East, would be the one of all the kinds of wars they could engage in that promises them the biggest advantages at the least cost.

The University of Arkansas and the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter giving a factual account of recent developments at the University of Arkansas. The letter was written by Harry S. Ashmore, of Fayetteville, Ark., and was published recently on the editorial page of the Arkansas Gazette. So many people of the eastern and northern parts of the United States are so ignorant of the developments in the Southwest that I believe it may be helpful to bring these facts to their attention.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AND THE ARTS

FAYETTEVILLE.—Over the years the ancient trade-out by which the city of Fayetteville obtained the University of Arkansas has proved to have both advantages and disadvantages. It would be hard to imagine a lovelier site for a university than this high valley in the Ozarks, and as every scholar knows isolation can be an academic blessing in seasons of political stress and strain. On the other hand, the fact that the university is tucked away in the remote northwest corner of the State, and is not even on the road to anywhere, has kept most of the citizens of Arkansas from realizing how wisely they have been investing their money in recent years.

The latest physical manifestation of growth and change was dedicated this week end as a high point in the Rites of Spring which celebrate the annual burgeoning of academic degrees. It is a fine arts center which is by all odds the most handsome public building in Arkansas, and which has already elicited admiring comment from architects all over the world. A few traditionalists, it is true, have expressed dismay over the contrast between the list, airy structure, sprawling with conscious grace, and the high-shouldered bulk of Old Main across the campus. But they are few, and even the hardiest of them

subside when it is pointed out that the fine arts center cost, on a square foot basis, a little less than half the conventional wing which is under construction at the engineering building.

The center is actually two buildings. The larger houses classrooms, lecture halls, music and art studios, and a music hall complete with pipe organ. The smaller is perhaps the only theater in the world in which more space is devoted to the actors than to the audience. Connecting the two is a glassed-in exhibition hall which is currently housing the finest collection of contemporary art ever shown in Arkansas. An extensive terrace and a small outdoor amphitheater flank the S-shaped main structure.

The genius who created the design for the center is a Fayetteville boy whose class at the university unanimously voted him the least likely to succeed. In the course of confounding that prophecy Edward D. Stone has pursued a career that led him to study at Harvard, won him traveling fellowships abroad, took him to Yale as a professor of architecture, and produced such monuments as the Museum of Modern Art in New York, a Long Island house for Henry R. Luce, and a hotel in Panama. While Mr. Stone has grown both famous and rich (or would have if he didn't have the whimsical habit of spending more than he is paid on such labors of love as the fine arts center) he had somehow failed to acquire an academic degree along the way. The university corrected that yesterday when it made him a doctor of fine arts, a rare degree which a research committee found had once been given to Frank Lloyd Wright, the architect with whom Mr. Stone is usually compared in the professional journals these days.

In the Fine Arts Center Mr. Stone made bold and effective use of common and inexpensive materials like cinder blocks, and laid in glass with a lavish hand. He built, as he always does, from the inside out, starting with the function each square foot of space was expected to serve. This was no mean task, since he had to build around such complex mechanical marvels as the fully equipped experimental stage in the theater, provide on a limited budget perfect acoustics in those portions of the building devoted to music, and see that the painters had plenty of light. His success has earned him not only a degree, but the gratitude of all those who work, study, or visit in the building, and of those who only walk by it, for from any angle it displays an eminently satisfying purity of line and of proportion.

While the university only got around to dedicating it this week end, the center has been in service for several months now. At the moment a student production of The Marriage of Figaro is running at one end of the art exhibit, and The Guardsman is playing a repeat performance in the theater. Attractions of this sort, plus the lure of the building itself, have kept a steady stream of students passing through the great glass doors. The university's president, Lewis Webster Jones, is particularly pleased that many of these are intensely practical people from the schools of commerce, engineering, agriculture, law, and the like who in the past have been given to curling their lips at the arts.

Indeed, President Jones sees the Arts Center as the partial fulfillment of a goal he set for himself when he came to the university 4 years ago. Of necessity he had to devote his first efforts to shoring up those schools and departments which meet Arkansas' immediate need for specialized services and trained personnel. One of his first creations was an Institute of Scientific Research, which has launched into a dozen fields and which, happily, has been able to attract a good deal of private capital to underwrite its activities. He has concentrated much effort on Agricultural Extension Service. He has also labored long and hard over the medical school at Little Rock, and he succeeded in salvaging out of the fiscal wreckage of the last legislative session enough money to finance a new teaching hospital, which Mr. Stone has also designed. But, willing as he is to turn out scientists, technicians, farmers, doctors, lawyers, and businessmen in the largest practicable quantity, Dr. Jones is also determined to see that they receive a general as well as an applied education. The world, he believes, is getting cluttered up with what he calls educated illiterates, people who know all about the cultivation of lespedeza or the most practicable method for removing an appendix, but who have no real understanding of the awful complexities of the age they live in, or the demands it makes upon them as citizens. An educated man, he argues, does not have to be a creative man, but he has to have some understanding of, or at least tolerance for, those who wrestle with the verities.

The Jones influence is visible to even the most casual visitor to the campus. Even with the financial uncertainties that now beset the institution—everybody knows that the faculty is going to have to be cut back next term and some projects abandoned in the wake of the legislature's failure to meet the projected budget—there is the feeling of optimism and excitement common to people who are convinced that they are taking part in something important. Fayetteville has become the sort of place where, on last week end, you could find Erwin Edman, the Columbia University philosopher, sitting under a tree, sans necktie, at the annual Agri Day Barbecue. Professor Edman made a neat symbol; it was obvious that this native of New York and citizen of the world of ideas liked being there, and it was equally obvious that the students and teachers of agriculture who sat with him were enjoying his company.

The university, like the rest of Arkansas, is in a state of transition. There is a good institution of higher education up here in the hills, and with the help of God and the general assembly, there may soon be a great one.

HARRY S. ASHMORE.

Senator Kem's Attitude on Sale of Arms and Strategic Materials to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject Aiding the Enemy, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star. This is a very fine tribute to our able and courageous colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIDING THE ENEMY

Those Senators who insist that any ban on economic aid to countries which sell arms or strategic materials to Russia and its satellites must be mandatory, and not permissive, are entirely correct.

The Senate adopted a similar mandatory provision last year. But in conference with the House it was watered down to a permissive ban. In other words, the administration was authorized, but not required, to withhold ECA aid from countries that were trading with the enemy. The results were nil.

Senator KEM told the Senate on Thursday that he had tried to find out what the National Security Council had done under the permissive arrangement. "So far as my information goes," he said, "it has done nothing but negotiate and consider. Not one gun, not one barrel of gasoline, not one ton of rubber has been withheld from the Marshall plan countries which were shipping materials of that kind to Russia and her satellite nations including Communist China. What the Senate wants, I think, is a definite, mandatory law, with no ground for horsetrading, no ground for discretion, but a definite direction to ECA not to send any materials to Marshall plan countries or any financial assistance if they are shipping materials of war to Russia or her satellites."

The best evidence that Senator KEM is right consists of the fact that last year's discretionary power was never used in any effective way. Other nations, supposedly associated with us in the Korean war, have been doing a lively business with the enemy. This country did the same until last December. The whole record is shameful and disgraceful. It is nothing less than criminal to send boys into a war and then to sell to the enemy any material which can be used, directly or indirectly, to kill them. It can be stopped to a very large extent if the ban, which the Senate has approved unanimously, is adopted. Under no circumstances should there be any retreat from it this time.

Marshall Can't Duck His Responsibility for China Policy—He Was One of Its Architects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Gen. George Marshall had the opportunity to be recorded as one of the great soldiers of the Nation. Those who will write the history will hesitate to so record Mr. Marshall, I am sure. Perhaps his ability and capacity as a military man in the field will not be questioned, but certainly considerable doubt will arise as to his veracity.

Mr. Speaker, to this day, Mr. Marshall would have us believe that he did not remember where he was the night before the bombing at Pearl Harbor. No man in his position, if he was conscious, could have such a lapse of memory. Some day the facts will be known—the truth will out eventually.

When Secretary Marshall was before a Senate committee for confirmation as Secretary of Defense, he testified that he was not a party to writing China policy before he went on an ill-fated mission to China in 1945. On last Thursday, May 10, he again gave the same impression when testifying before a joint Senate committee in the MacArthur matter.

Mr. Speaker, for the second time the Washington Post has called the turn on Marshall's testimony in well-reasoned

editorials. I include as part of my remarks in this connection the one that appeared today. George Marshall should learn to tell the truth or retire from public life.

CHINA DIRECTIVE

Secretary Marshall has again left the impression with the people of America that he was not party to the instructions which he bore to China for his mediation mission of 1945–7. He did the same thing during a Senate interrogation when he was appointed Secretary of Defense. On Thursday he said he presumed Secretary Byrnes and Under Secretary Acheson had a hand in his directive; he was certain that John Carter Vincent had. It seems incredible to us that a man of General Marshall's stature was only an errand boy to China, yet this is the impression he leaves.

Nor does the story as we gathered it at the time bear out this odd construction. It was necessary in late 1945 to hammer out a new policy toward China because of two circumstances. Civil war was on the brink of breaking out, and there was a holler in the country to bring home the 50,000 marines stationed in China. Working papers were prepared in the State Department covering all courses of possible action. These formed the basis of a discussion with General Marshall as the new special Ambassador to China. Secretary Byrnes in Speaking Frankly says this of that conference:

"The Sunday before I left for Moscow, Under Secretary Acheson, General Marshall, and members of his staff met in my office. By the end of the morning's discussion, we had agreed upon the statement of policy that subsequently was approved by the President and released to the public on December 15. Thereafter the President made no change in that policy except upon the recommendation of General Marshall or with his approval."

This statement of policy was the directive about which Secretary Marshall was questioned up till Saturday at the MacArthur hearings.

The directive conveyed through General Marshall an offer of assistance to the national government under Chiang Kai-shek in bringing about a cessation of internal strife and the establishment of a government representative of the contending factions (mainly Nationalist and Communist) in which the Nationalists would predominate. The mission failed. The idea of popular-front governments has since been proved to be a favored ruse of the Communists to capture control. Nevertheless there is no reason to botch history because of either circumstance. This, however, is what has hitherto been happening—in the administration's denial till the present hearings that there was ever any intention of encouraging a coalition in China containing the Communists and in Secretary's Marshall's implication that he had virtually nothing to do with his own instructions.

At the time General Marshall was not only privy to and a coinspirer of his directive; he was enthusiastic about the mission. This was very noticeable midway through his mission when he paid a flying visit to America and addressed the National Press Club. It was equally obvious from the way the mission was handled. Apparently General Marshall insisted upon keeping a kind of state department within the State Department. His own appointee, General Carter, was brought in, and all the Marshall reports came to him, and were then transmitted direct to the President. Thus, whatever the exact truth about the original instructions, the policy for China from the day the general received his terms of reference until he left China was as much the policy of General Marshall as of anyone else.

Fulbright Exchange-of-Students Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as an example of what is being done under the exchange-of-students program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, dated May 7, 1951, from R. Douglas Archer, a participant in the program, who came from Australia to the University of Minnesota, where he is taking postgraduate work in aeronautical engineering.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in this connection, an editorial entitled "Fulbright Scholars," published in the New Orleans States on May 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 7, 1951.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senator,
Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is nearly 8 months since I left Australia to go to the University of Minnesota for postgraduate study in aeronautical engineering. My journey, which covered nearly 10,000 miles, was free. It was a gift made possible by your inspiration and leadership and by the generosity of America.

For me this journey was the opportunity of a lifetime. At the magnificent Minnesota campus I have received very valuable advanced academic training. In addition, I have had time to travel at will within the United States, to wonder at the manifestations of technological progress, to observe for myself habits and customs, the very high standard of living and extensive distribution of wealth, to admire the American sense of moral values and of freedom, and, above all, to see the forms and operation of the institutions of self-government.

I am constantly amazed by the favorable difference between the facts and the impressions of America which I previously had, and what others would have one believe. It has been a refreshing and invigorating experience to say the least. You and your student exchange programme has brought great benefit to me and, as we know, to many thousands of students both foreign and American. I am certain that this is a tremendous force against ignorance, skepticism, and cynicism, and an immense power for extending understanding, hope, and faith in the future. May it continue to do so. May it embrace more young men around the world.

Please accept my sincere thanks.

Very truly yours,
R. DOUGLAS ARCHER,
Teaching Assistant.

[From the New Orleans States of May 8, 1951]

FULBRIGHT SCHOLARS

However much they are obscured by clouds from the battlefield, legislative assemblies, and international tribunals, forces for peace are at work today. These are the long-range forces to which civilization must tie its hopes.

In mind, immediately, is the Fulbright scholarship program now in its fifth year. What it does is to make possible on a scale hitherto inachievable international exchange of students. A basic cause of war is lack of international understanding between races and nationalities. Fulbright scholarships strike at this root of the trouble.

This coming year some 3,300 students of 20 countries will receive financial help in their postgraduate work at home and abroad. Seven hundred of those will be Americans who will go overseas to conduct research, lecture, study, or teach.

Money for the scholarships came from the sales of United States surplus war property left overseas after World War II. Part of the proceeds, in foreign currencies, was bartered for tuition and living expenses for students. All told, the funds were about $140,000,000 and earmarked to be spent over a 20-year period.

Connivance and crookery in the handling of some of the Nation's vast store of war surplus should not be allowed to hide the good to which much surplus was turned under the guidance of neighbor Arkansas' wise Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most thought-provoking statement entitled "My Stand." It was written by Mr. E. S. Weed, of the Marblehead (Mass.) Messenger, and I hope that my colleagues will take time to read it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY STAND

For my own part General MacArthur is the true American. I doubt if there has been more considered, more thoughtful, and more honest testimony given before any Senate committee in our history. I wish to say this, that if we are going to divert from the aims and hopes and purposes, as they have been expressed in all the testimony of General MacArthur, for an uncertain peace, then I for one believe we are moving in the wrong direction.

There is only one answer to all of what the general says, and that is the answer which General Marshall and President Truman have given, that they are buying time in order to save the peace, well knowing the destructive results of a third world war. Both Truman and Marshall believe that time can be bought, while MacArthur believes that it cannot be bought at a social profit.

I have said several times that I am unable to see any difference between the situation which we face now with respect to communism and that which England and France faced in the thirties with respect to Hitlerism. At that time, when Hitler was raging, Churchill said that the issue should be met squarely, that there should be no appeasing and that every minute which passed was a minute added to the assets of the enemy. Chamberlain said then what Truman and Marshall have said. All three have striven for peace fearing a breakdown of civilization in the event of war. The destructive use of

gas in those days was thought to be such as would destroy civilization. And now are there similar thoughts with respect to the atom bomb?

Chamberlain certainly exchanged time for the sake of peace.

I should like to suggest some differences in the picture had Chamberlain continued to buy time for the sake of peace, let us say for 12 months longer than he did. This assumption being a fact, the Second World War would have run its course a year later than it did.

In the winter of 1945, in fact 6 months before the end of the German war the snorkel submarine was put into use, and the speed of the submarine under water, run up to 30 knots. During the month of December 1944, 32 vessels of 10,000 tons or more were sunk in the English Channel within a 10-mile area between Cherbourg and Southampton. I spent the entire evening, the night before Christmas, shuffling the dead from ship to shore, the result of a transport sinking 2 miles from the Cherbourg breakwater. More than 8,000 bodies passed over our decks between 6 o'clock and 1 o'clock in the evening. These submarines would have roamed over the ocean for somewhat more than 18 months. We had no defense except to keep out of sight. What effect would that have had upon the war?

It was in the fall of 1944 when the American armies were on German territory when the first German jet planes with rockets were used. Our armies would have had to face those jet and rocket planes, infinitely superior to our own in the Normandy landing. Would the results have been different?

V1 and V2 were born in July of 1944 and turned against England. Instead of a few months nearly 2 years of V1 and V2 bombings would have been turned on England. Only a fluke stopping of the bombing in 1941 saved the English nation from surrender. Any honest Englishman will tell you that. What would have been the result had V1 and V2 been used in England for 24 months.

I have read thoroughly the writings of Churchill, and of Eisenhower and Bradley. I saw some of the activities myself. Had Chamberlain tried to buy peace for another 12 months there would have been no England and no France and the Power of Hitler would have been far greater than that which the Russians now possess.

As MacArthur has said and as Marshall has said, and as anyone with sense should know, nothing but life can be gained from war. Only a fool would advocate it as an instrument of policy.

The goal of peace should be sought wherever all men know that war is futile. But peace cannot be sought where there are men who do not know or do not care of or about the futility of war.

During the last 20 years there have come into this world groups of people who do not seem to understand that war is futile. Mussolini was one. Hitler was another. And the Russian dictatorship is made up of others. The proof of this is that, well knowing the horrors and the costs of war, they have in fact started a war, and a war in proportion as damaging as the First World War. As long as these kind of leaders are in control anywhere on earth the survival of other people will have to be fought for and should be fought for at whatever cost.

The time we are buying now is as much of an asset to the communistic world as it was to the German world. The Russian nation is in the formative stage, industrially and scientifically. At maturity and lacking the moral values which are held dear by civilized people the communistic program as it is being carried out by the Russian people can and will destroy the civilized world.

The time to act is now.

The Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Petroleum Engineer Publishing Co. entitled "What's Wrong With Being an Oil Company?"

I have received this through the courtesy of Hon. Walter S. Hallanan. The principle expounded in the article could apply to steel, textiles, mining, agriculture, transportation, and many other industries in our country.

The heads of oil companies have also done much for the advancement of culture and religion in our country. In Pennsylvania, the Mellons, as head of Gulf Oil; the Pews, as head of Sun Oil; and the Benedums, as head of a group of companies, have made large contributions for the promotion of health, welfare, good government, and the work of religion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH BEING AN OIL COMPANY?

(By Ernestine Adams)

(We have reached a point where we are fed up with this papa-knows-best attitude of a group that tries to be the advance agent for national socialism. This clique seems particularly to desire a devitalized, clinging oil industry that will put its faith in a bureau and maybe end up with a subsidy. If United States citizens realized the spectacular contributions to the Nation of the oil industry under its own initiative, they would beware of trading it off for the supine, controlled ghost of an industry that the conspiracy of socialism would have them accept. The oil industry has been a silent whipping boy for imagined ills long enough. It's time to look at the record—and what a record.)

I'm getting tired of hearing about those "rich oil companies." I'm getting tired of hearing former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes talk about rich oil companies growing "merrily wealthier out of oil belonging to the whole people," and tired of Columnist Drew Pearson shuddering piously every time he mentions an oil company or an oilman. I'm getting tired of the implication that for an oil company to exist is an affront, and for one to be rich is sinful.

Will someone tell me what is wrong with being an oil company or with an oil company's being rich? How long do you think an oil company would last if it didn't handle a lot of money? It takes barrels of the stuff just to keep a company going.

And who is going to find and produce and process oil if not the oil companies? The Socialist answer is—the Government, but no government yet has been able to build a successful oil industry, although lots of them have tried. The Soviet Government, for instance, has the greatest potential oil resources in the world, and it runs its own industry as you have probably heard. Do you know how much gasoline you would get for your car if all our cars were in Russia and you got a full share of all that was made? You would get less than 5 gallons a year. That's a year—not a week or a month. Now how would you like that? Actually you wouldn't get a gallon because it is all reserved for government and the war machine. In the United States you buy on the average nearly 700 gallons of gas a year for your car and there is no shortage to stop you.

Where do the oil companies get their money? Out of the earth? Oh, no. That's where a lot of people make a mistake. Oil brings wealth only as it is transformed into useful goods. The oil companies get their money right out of your pockets. They coax it out of you with the biggest bargains on the face of the earth. You can have all the gasoline you want and at the world's lowest prices. You can have varnish and insect spray, synthetic rubber and machine oil, nail polish and floor wax. You can have gas in your house and your factory, and if the pipeline doesn't connect, you can have liquid gas in tins to hook on your stove or refrigerator.

You get some products you didn't even know had petroleum in them. It is in your soap and detergents—oh, wonderful oil companies that thought up detergents. It is in your nylons to prevent runs, in your lipstick to keep it moist, in covers of your books to prevent cracking, in your raincoat, your shoes, your medicine, your paper lamp shade, your roof—on and on and on you can go.

In fact, let's face it—you pay the oil companies billions of dollars a year—about $7,000,000,000 last year—for all kinds of things that make it easier to live.

And what do these bloated capitalist do with those buckets of greenbacks, you'd like to know. First they have almost 2,000,000 employees who get the biggest dip into the kitty. Employees get paid better than most, which is as it should be because a lot of them have to have a technical or scientific education and years of specialized training. There aren't many strikes, you'll notice, and the rare ones they have are in the refining industry. In the drilling end things are free and easy. If you go broke drilling dry holes, you may be working for your driller next year. Plenty of roughnecks or roustabouts think they'll have a right of their own one day, and a good many of the high moguls in the industry who look as though they never saw a shovel have dug many a slush pit in their day.

These big wheels get big pay—about on the level with other industries, except that there are more of them. There aren't many automobiles companies, for instance, but there are a bunch of big oil companies and thousands of little ones. The Oil Information Committee says there are 36,000 companies in the industry.

Well, to get on with it, they've got some billions left after paying the help, so they give Uncle Sam his—which means a few more billions. The oil industy pays the biggest tax bill of any industry. In fact, some $3,500,000,000 a year goes for Federal, State, and local taxes levied on the oil industry and its products. This is about 7 percent of all taxes paid.

Yet President Truman calls this gross undertaxation and all the "gimme" boys chime in. What do they want? A crippled industry that has to be propped up by Government subsidies?

If a profit is made—it isn't always—the stockholders get theirs. Since you customers are so steady now, the dividends over the years average up about like preferred bonds. This takes care of several millions more people who have their hands—or money, that is—in the oil business.

THEY DRILL ANY PLACE

With the billions that are left the oil company does as fast a job of getting ahead as you're likely to find. The companies drill holes any place that looks as if it might have oil. They drill as deep as 4 miles, they drill in the desert, in the jungle, in the ocean; the derrick may be standing in sticky

waves of heat or may be covered with thick ice. They drill where savage tribes have wrecked the rig, and where a plane has to bring in the machinery. They got no sense at all. Oil is where you find it, they say. They spend buckets of money. They spend a million and a half sometimes for one hole and get no oil, either. They spend millions just to find out where to put the drill down. They pay some more millions to a million or so other people for the privilege of using their land to drill on. If the drill hits an oil sand, they give the owner of the land a proportionate share of the oil they find.

And what if the oil is next door to the end of the world with no customers in sight? They build a pipeline to the sea or to a refinery, which they also have to build, then build a harbor so the tankers they build or buy can take the oil to you customers. They have to put up a lot of cash before you drive into a filling station and say "Fill 'er up." It may be a year or two before the money begins coming back. It may be 10 years. It may be never.

THEY MAKE ANYTHING

Of course, you have no use for that black crude oil, and so the refining comes in. This process takes tons of crude oil and separates the molecules, then pieces them together to give them a new look. There are plants that do one thing—like separate gasoline from gas, and plants that do dozens of things. There are plants that make powdered sulfur out of gas and plants that only process materials for other plants that make dyes, plastics, explosives, or drugs. There are plants that take out certain wanted hydrocarbons and put the dry gas back in the oil formation to bring up more hydrocarbons, like a dumb-waiter.

A refinery is always expanding, renovating, adding, experimenting, and revising. It has to keep ahead of you customers—it has to provide more gasoline in the summer and more fuel in winter from the same spot and with the same crude oil. The inventions in this line come so fast and furious that you stay in there pitching or go broke. So the oil companies part with a few more billions because they have to keep up. They have to make the best petroleum products possible and make them at such low cost that you can't resist putting out your money.

The companies also hire some of the top scientists to study how methods in the industry can be improved and how better products can be made. They have to have big laboratories and smart technical staffs. They have laboratories that work only on agricultural uses of petroleum and laboratories that test a hundred uses of petroleum in everything from paints to pavements. They spend about one-fourth what all United States industry spends on research.

Since the war, the oil industry has spent $12,000,000,000 making improvements and expanding facilities. In the United States, the oil industry now has an investment of $32,000,000,000, or $200 for each man, woman, and child in the Nation.

Do they expect to make this towering investment pay? In time, yes. And then what will they do with the buckets of dough they will make, these rich oil companies?

WHAT THEY'LL DO

What they have been doing all along.

Drill more wells and find more oil so we won't run short in peace or war.

Build bigger and longer pipelines from fields to refineries and from refineries to customers so the supply is always available.

Construct better refineries to make fancier products that will fill more needs in your life.

So you see why I am tired of hearing about rich oil companies. The people are getting the people's oil and gas resources—more people are getting more than under any other plan ever devised. Several millions of persons are getting benefits from oil and gas operations in wages and salaries, dividends and royalties, pensions and contracts, profits on sales and commissions.

Everyone in the United States benefits from the use of low-cost petroleum products—a use that has launched and shaped our modern life.

The whole world benefits from the fact that oil resources grow in the hands of free enterprise and stagnate under the thumb of government monopoly. The whole huge Communist world has about 9 percent of the world's production of oil—the free world has 91 percent, all developed by individual capitalist oil companies, which spend to good effect the riches we pay them for their goods.

So let us give the oil companies their due and admit they provide us the best service ever given on developing oil and gas reserves and transforming them into useful and vital products. Their service cost is low, too, come to think of it.

Why Farmers Will Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Progressive Farmer, by Charles Morrow Wilson, together with an introduction by Dr. Clarence Poe:

[From the Progressive Farmer of May 1951]

We are here printing the second half of one of the most important articles we have published in recent years—Farmers Will Stop Communism, by Charles Morrow Wilson. Mr. Wilson, a native of Arkansas, whose business in managing large tropical plantations has taken him all over the world, makes this plain—that communism was made especially for city wage earners and hence never can fit the desires of farmers whose highest ambition is to own and love some bit of land as their very own.

Instead of freeing the peasant farmer from slavery to the landlord, communism merely makes him an equally hopeless slave of the state. Senator Borah once said, "Three basic needs of every man are: something to own, something to love, something to worship." Atheistic communism's disbelief in God, in family ties, and in land ownership repudiates all this. Hence I believe farmers the world over will indeed stop communism. But to make sure of this, all America must try to encourage more home ownership, fairer rents, and better farm methods among the poverty-cursed millions we discussed on this page last month. At no great cost farmers cooperative demonstration work such as Dr. Seaman Knapp used to revolutionize southern farming methods could bring new hope and better living for those 1,000,000,000 underprivileged folk in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I commend to all readers Mr. Wilson's second chapter.

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor.

WHY FARMERS WILL STOP COMMUNISM

(By Charles Morrow Wilson)

I believe what I see. Early in 1938 I went to Cuba to learn about sugarcane farming. In Cuba I began to see and learn about what was (and still is) there called communism. It is basically different from the Kremlin line, however much Moscow tries to influence it.

Promptly I heard of Communist headquarters in principal cities in Central and South America—Habana, Mexico City, Kingston (Jamaica), Bogota, and elsewhere. But like so many other newcomers, I observed that the hired help of what was then called the third international was firmly attached to the cities, within easy walking distances of the better barrooms. I learned, too, and at close range, that the overwhelming majority of the Latin Americans who were being called Communists are not that at all.

My first lesson in Cuba was particularly revealing. There had been a great deal of labor strife in the sugar-milling districts back of Santiago. Faced with badly sagged markets, the Cuban Government had dropped sugar quotas to the very floor. The big cane-grinding mills were running only 6 weeks a year. But an attempted Communist seizure of one of the great sugar strongholds of Cuba resulted in a complete flop.

After Cuba I went to Central America, to a succession of banana farms in the hot, green valleys of Guatemala and Honduras, west Costa Rica, and south-coast Panama. Those were the closing 1930's and the beginning 1940's when there were deluges of talk about the Caribbean and South America going Red. The Kremlin branch offices were springing up like ragweeds in April. The radical Toledano labor unions were seeping across many boundaries south of the Rio Grande. Soviet Russia had assigned to the area Comrade Oumanski, an exceptionally able propagandist whom the Kremlin made U. S. S. R. Ambassador to Mexico and Costa Rica. Throughout the entire area, depression, joblessness, and political unrest were altogether too plentiful. The times were distinctly ripe for the Commies, and from their standpoint taking over was a now-or-never proposition.

The Reds failed much more decisively than was generally reported. There are many reasons why they failed. One was that the Communist Party employees were preponderantly incompetent. The U. S. S. R. had some brilliant men; but not enough to go around. Furthermore, Soviet know-how regarding the needs and viewpoints of the tropics is far under par. Marxism, and all the Kremlin gang leaders have been able to do to and with it, which is a great deal, is still an industrial credo for industrial places and cold places. It has never taken real account of the generosity of nature and producing earth.

Soviet brain-trusters have never understood the farmer and his viewpoint either at home or abroad. This preeminent weakness grows more apparent as and where the ratio of farmers to the total population keeps rising.

The United States, like most of West Europe, has become a majority industrial and city-or-town Nation. But as one goes south in either hemisphere, the percentage of farm people keeps rising. About two-thirds of all the Caribbean peoples are farmers. In many parts of South America this ratio rises to 80 percent or higher. About the same holds true for most of Africa and most of the great fertile areas of Southeast Asia.

Josef Stalin has defined communism as a "man-made way of thinking." But farming is the most literal, the most demandingly factual of all the great professions. Throughout most of the world, as in the United States, a farmer remains a very distinctive combination of worker, property owner, executive, and planner. It is impossible, at least up to date, to hatch out any ideology or "ism" which takes care of all these activities in one breath or dose.

I have learned this in many different countries. In my early farming days in Central America, I worked with a farm foreman named Juan Ramirez, who made an exceptionally accurate diagnosis of the way the

great majority of our southern neighbors think about communism. "Here we live in our own world," he said. "Communism like the other foreign "isms" calls to us from another world. * * * As we use it in these countries 'Communist' is mainly a word in politics—what men in office call those who want to be—between elections. But communism, the kind the Russians preach, does not belong in lands such as ours. It is dreamed up for the big cold cities where many poor people can easily starve and where men must work close together in factories and walk on pavements where corn and beans will not grow."

This point of view, as I have learned during nine busy years among farmers from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, represents one of the toughest challenges that Stalin & Co. have to face and answer.

But this very basic viewpoint is by no means limited to the Western Hemisphere. It is a world institution. Quite personally I have followed farmers' viewpoints in an even dozen American nations. In general it is remarkably like our own, and it is overwhelmingly against communism. In general, these Latin-Americans are good neighbors and good and honorable Christian people who truly love the land. Accordingly they have the makings of great farmers. Farming in Central and South America has a long way to go before it overtakes or even approaches ours. But on the whole its gains during the past dozen years have set a world record.

It is well, therefore, for us in North America to look south again. Also southwest and southeast, where at present about half the human race lives. The fact is being pointed out that the peoples of lower Asia, numbering about three-quarter billion, and in Africa, numbering about 160,000,000, have never yet lived well enough to understand what democracy can mean, and that we have not told them effectively what it does mean.

As a firsthand student of farming in many lands I have yet to meet one farmer in any land who is at heart a Communist. In the middle 1940's I went to equatorial West Africa to work on and learn about rubber plantations, coco, oil palm, and tribe farming in darkest Africa where I met and talked with some of the greatest farmers I have ever known anywhere. Some of them are tribal chiefs; the majority are commoners. Some were scholars, graduates of renowned universities of England, the United States, and Europe. Many of them work lands that are owned by the community or tribe. But throughout all my African roamings I never met a farmer yet who is a Soviet-style Communist, or even a reasonable copy thereof.

Three years ago, when the Kremlin was opening its momentously busy propagandizing in Southeast Asia, I made a trip to lower India, Siam, Singapore, and Malaya and briefly into Java and some fringes of Sumatra. In ports and other cities, I heard a great deal about the wonders of communism and the windness of the "comrades" in the cold and distant Kremlin. Here again the propagandists were city slickers bound to the street lights and fashionable bars, but very evidently not inclined to swinging on plowshares or bumping along on tractor seats or viewing and caring about what grows from the good earth. There is great poverty and much human desperation in Southeast Asia, in fact in most of Asia. There are tremendous problems and tremendous faults about lower Asia. There are none that communism has solved or can solve. Ten years ago Communist China was in desperate straits agriculturally. Its farm quandaries are worse today and they are going to be worse tomorrow.

The iron curtain has shut off all dependable news from Russia. But we know that Soviet agriculture, practically speaking, has a truly dismal record.

The important truth stands that the Kremlin gang has not been able to get along with Russian farmers. Also that they have made less than no progress at all in getting along with farmers beyond Soviet boundaries. This reporter has heard and seen a great many things during a busy, far-traveled lifetime. But as yet I have never seen a good farmer anywhere in the world who is actually a Communist. After 45 years of being a farmer, and living and working among farmers, I don't expect to. But I am entirely convinced that what real farmers think and feel will win the world for democracy.

Inland Waterways Face New Demands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Mr. John L. Springer, published in the Washington Sunday Star of date May 13, 1951, as follows:

INLAND WATERWAYS FACE NEW DEMANDS
(By John L. Springer)

Once again the national defense effort is putting pressure on the Nation's transport facilities. And once again a heavy burden is falling on the unsung branch of transportation—the inland waterways.

In World War I the railroads were overwhelmed with shipments. So much war material piled up in freight yards that the success of the war effort itself was jeopardized. In desperation Army engineers began to exploit the almost forgotten inland rivers and canals. The freight bottleneck was broken.

In the early days of World War II Nazi submarines lurking off the Atlantic coast sank so much allied seagoing shipping that desperate measures again had to be taken. Once more shippers turned to the inland waterways and another crisis was averted.

America's watery roads now face new demands. There are 27,500 miles of them—equivalent in length to seven coast-to-coast railroads. Slightly less than half of this total is taken up by the vast Mississippi system, with the 30 navigable rivers and canals which flow into it. The Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico coast rivers make up much of the remainder and the Pacific coast rivers are also a factor. The Great Lakes are not included.

In 1949 these waterways carried an estimated 170,000,000 tons of freight.

Often barges are wired together to form a floating freight train. These barges may carry as much as 3,000 tons of freight each—coal and oil barges, carriers with tier after tier of new automobiles en route to showrooms, ore barges heading for steel mills, barges with assorted cargoes like sand, chemicals, and sugar. Twenty of these barges in a train will measure more than a thousand feet long—longer than the *Queen Elizabeth*.

Paradoxically, shipping by inland waterway is one of the oldest ways of delivering freight in the United States and also one of the newest. In pioneer days, before the days of railroads and trucks, most freight went by water. Those were the days when the Mississippi was jam-packed with traffic.

Then in the case of most of them, weeds sprang high along their banks and silt settled on their bottoms. Almost nobody cared. When the World War I crisis came, however, Army engineers dredged and widened the channels. Since then the inland waterways have increased in their importance to the national economy.

Stop the Shipment of Strategic Materials and War Goods to the Chinese Reds by Our European Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is time drastic action was taken by our Nation to stop the shipment of strategic war material to the Red Chinese by our so-called European allies. Already we have supplied the fighting forces in the Korean war. Little or no help has come from the United Nations. This situation is bad enough, but, it is made even worse by the help that is given our enemies by shipping strategic war material either direct to the Red Chinese, or, indirectly through Russia and its satellites. This situation was brought to the attention of our State Department in the summer of 1950, shortly after the Korean war started, but it has been permitted to continue all of the intervening months. In the meantime we have suffered 60,000 or more casualties. Our first duty is to our American boys. If European nations cannot be depended upon to help us they should at least be required to stop helping our enemies.

I have included as part of my remarks, in accordance with the consent granted, paragraphs 7, 8, and 9 of the Foreign Letter, No. 1673, of the Whaley-Eaton Service, dated May 8, 1951. It reads as follows:

7. Only now are the European allies getting around to banning the sale of strategic, as well as direct war goods, to the Chinese Reds. No successful effort has been made anywhere to halt the smuggling of all manner of critical materials and specialized machine tools behind the iron curtain. Britain has reversed her position in the U. N. on a strategic blockade of China. This is, in part, due to the internal outcry over heavy British casualties in the recent counter-offensive in Korea. The Grenadiers reportedly have suffered 1,000 casualties.

8. A complete and successful embargo on the movement on only a few items into Russia could cripple the Communist war effort. Best information available is that the Soviet does not have sufficient domestic supplies of tantalum, molybdenum, chromium, tungsten, cobalt, or nickel. Without these commodities she cannot produce armor plate, high-temperature steels needed in jet engines, cutting tools, gun barrels, armor-piercing projectiles, much essential electronics gear—in fact, most of the weapons of war. These are the things Russia will pay any amount for in any quantity from whatever source, as well as ball bearings, industrial diamonds, specialized machinery and plans and specifications of the West's newest industrial machinery and techniques.

9. Throughout much of Europe, smuggling is on such a scale as to have the appearance of legality. Even through legitimate trade channels there are still many serious leaks. Both Switzerland and Sweden, of course, are neutral. Many exports, banned to Red communities by the United States, are not banned by other Pact countries. For instance, Russia has on order more than 80 merchant vessels, including oil tankers. Most of them are being built in ECA countries—Allied—shipyards.

Appeasement of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, there have been many loose charges of appeasement during the course of recent discussion of foreign policy. In a recent editorial the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a great newspaper, marshaled a very compact set of pertinent facts which merit attention in this respect. Because of the particular enlightenment it affords at this time I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO MUCH NONSENSE

Commonest of the charges against the Truman administration from the minority party orators these days is that the Government's policy is one of "appeasement of communism."

This complaint is repeated and repeated by opposition speakers who have their eyes on 1952. It is echoed so often that some people may be coming to believe it solely because of the frequent reiteration.

For example, Senator TAFT made it a major part of his theme when he debated foreign policy with Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. In view of the record, the Ohio Republican said that he was afraid the administration was getting ready to "appease" the Reds in the Pacific.

Since there is so much talk of appeasers, appeasing, and appeasement, why not have a look at the facts and see how well—or how poorly—founded the charges are?

After a careful check of the record since Harry S. Truman entered the White House 6 years ago, we conclude that there are five American entries of transcendent importance in the field of foreign affairs. These are the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the Atlantic pact and the stand to stop military aggression in Korea.

Let us examine each briefly and see how it fits in with the charge that the United States Government now is engaged in a policy of appeasement of communism.

1. Truman doctrine: Announced March 12, 1947, by the Executive in a historic address to Congress, it called for $400,000,000 in aid and American military and economic advisers to stop the spread of militant communism in Europe. Particularly Mr. Truman proposed immediate help for Greece and Turkey, then under heavy Soviet pressure. By this doctrine it became the policy of the United States "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure."

Just where is the appeasement in that?

2. Marshall plan: Proposed June 5, 1947, at Harvard by George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State, the European Recovery Act became law December 17 the same year. The enacting session of Congress was one which Mr. Truman called October 23, expressly to consider and pass legislation to help European nations build up their economy so as to resist Communist infiltration and propaganda. The first ECA appropriation was for $540,000,000 to shore up China, France, Italy, and Austria, all then under heavy pressure from the Kremlin and its agents.

Senator TAFT, in the Senate Friday, admitted that the State Department has stood firm against communism in Europe, but argued that "appeasement" has been the policy in Asia. The fact is that our Government in the 4 years after VJ-day gave Chiang Kai-shek loans and grants totaling more than $2,000,000,000. In addition we turned over to Chiang for his fight against the Communists arms that originally cost us more than a billion dollars. As Senator MCMAHON said, we gave Chiang enough arms to equip 89 divisions, and artillery and planes besides.

Just how was that the work of appeasers?

3. Berlin airlift: When the Communists threw a land blockade around Berlin, the Truman administration surmounted it by building an air bridge from West Germany to the American, British, and French sectors of the beleaguered city. Begun June 26, 1948, the airlift of more than 275,000 flights cost the United States some $300,000,000 and the British about $40,000,000. Seventy airmen lost their lives in accidents incident to the heroic efforts to keep the Allied parts of Berlin supplied with wood and fuel. When the airlift was completed, September 30, 1949, it had been in operation for 15 months.

Just how was that a demonstration of appeasement?

4. Atlantic Pact: Made public March 18, 1949, this treaty joined the signatory Atlantic area nations in a common security agreement to last at least 20 years. Members pledged themselves that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all. The parties also declared that they will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. In the event of such attack, all member nations pledged to assist the party or parties attacked forthwith, with armed force.

Just how did that take on the color of appeasement?

5. Korean defense: When the Korean Communists crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, June 25, 1950, the United States took the lead at the U. N. in gathering the strength of free nations against the naked Red aggression. Almost at once American air and naval forces were put on the side of the South Korean defenders. In a few days, American ground troops were sent in. For 9 months the war has raged and more than 50,000 casualties have been suffered by the United States. Only the two World Wars and the Civil War have brought this Nation more battle losses. And tragically, more are still to come.

Just in what way is this appeasement?

These questions, of course, require no answers. This record speaks for itself. Let Senator TAFT and the other 1952 political hopefuls shout "appeasement" all they like. They only measure themselves when they do it.

The Truman administration has its faults—all too many faults. But appeasing communism is not one of them.

To say so is to prate so much political nonsense.

The Foreign Policy Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a very interesting and instructive interview on foreign policy given by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and broadcast over 10 West Virginia radio stations on May 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT ON FOREIGN POLICY FROM RADIO INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE OVER 10 WEST VIRGINIA STATIONS ON MAY 13, 1951

ANNOUNCER. Now, Senator KILGORE, what about the foreign-policy debate?

Senator KILGORE. My firm belief is that the main issue in the foreign-policy dispute is simply this: Can we afford at this time to follow Gen. Douglas MacArthur's military recommendations regarding our policy in Asia or should we continue to pursue our present global strategy? From all of the facts I have been able to obtain—and I might say they come from supporters of both policies—I have reached the conclusion that we should take every honorable step to avoid an all-out war with Red China at this time. This is not an easy course of action. It is one that requires clear thinking, patience, and courage. Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of Defense, set forth his views on this great issue in clear, concise terms. Testifying before the joint meeting of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, he emphasized, and I quote:

"This fundamental divergence is one of judgment as to the proper course of action to be followed by the United States." Then he said: "This divergence arises from the inherent difference between the position of a field commander, whose mission is limited to a particular area and a particular antagonist, and the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President, who are responsible for the total security of the United States, and who, to achieve and maintain this security, must weigh our interests and objectives in one part of the globe with those in other areas of the world so as to attain the best over-all balance."

ANNOUNCER. Senator, I do not wish to interrupt, but judging from the letters from many people throughout the Nation, there is a great question as to where this global policy will lead us in terms of the Korean war.

Senator KILGORE. Yes; I know that some people in and out of the Congress are saying that the administration is following an appeasement policy in Asia. I wish to emphasize in the strongest manner I know how that I disagree completely with that view. By and large this charge comes from officials who have opposed our foreign policy since the end of World War II. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a truly great statesman, was bitterly opposed by many of these same people. In recent days both President Truman and General Marshall have emphasized that "our objective in Korea continues to be the defeat of the aggression and the restoration of peace." In his testimony, General Marshall pointed out that in our efforts to confine the conflict to Korea and to prevent its spreading into a third world war, we stand allied with a great

majority of the members of the United Nations. He reviewed the Korean situation in these words:

"Our efforts have succeeded in thwarting the aggressors in Korea, and in stemming the tide of aggression in southeast Asia and elsewhere throughout the world. Our efforts in Korea have given us some sorely needed time and impetus to accelerate the building of our defenses and those of our allies against the threatened onslaught of Soviet imperialism."

ANNOUNCER. Senator, from all indications, that last statement will be debated vigorously in Congress. What do you think will be the outcome?

Senator KILGORE. First, let me explain that I have always said that I thought a vigorous foreign policy debate—conducted on a basis of issues rather than passions and personalities—would be a fine thing for the country.

I hope that every American will carefully weigh the possible consequences of General MacArthur's policies before reaching a decision on this vital issue. Certainly every American should consider very carefully these words of General Marshall. He said:

"General MacArthur would have us, on our own initiative, carry the conflict beyond Korea against the mainland of Communist China, both from the sea and from the air. He would have us accept the risk involved not only in an extension of the war with Red China, but in all-out war with the Soviet Union. He would have us do this even at the expense of losing our allies and wrecking the coalition of free peoples throughout the world. He would have us do this even though the effect of such action might expose Western Europe to attack by the millions of Soviet troops poised in Middle and Eastern Europe."

In a time of crisis there is a natural tendency on the part of some people to seek some easy way out. All too often we have followed such a course prior to World War II, and I think the consequences of those actions should be clear by now. I pray that we will not get ourselves into the position of going it alone in Asia. I am afraid that if our Nation should decide to adopt that type of program, we would suffer terrible consequences. Let me quote briefly from a recent speech of President Truman on that score. He said: "If we go it alone in Asia, we may destroy the unity of the free nations against aggression. Our European allies are nearer to Russia than we are. They are in far greater danger. If we act without regard to the danger that faces them, they may act without regard to the dangers that we face. Going it alone brought the world to the disaster of World War II. We cannot go it alone in Asia and go it in company of Europe. The whole idea of going it alone is the opposite of everything we have stood for and worked for since World War II. In this way, going it alone in Asia might wreck the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty and the whole system of collective security we are helping to set up."

ANNOUNCER. But, Senator, there is another school of thought—judging by many of the letters to Congress—that charges the administration with bungling and failure in the whole field of foreign policy. Basically, this belief is that we have spent a great deal of money in Europe with little or nothing to show for it.

Senator KILGORE. I disagree completely. I well remember the great cry that the United Nations could not succeed. I well remember the great cry against the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey, and the lesser cry against the North Atlantic Pact.

Since the end of World War II our national policy, shaped by those who have the responsibility for our national survival, with little help from those who sit back waiting for a chance to criticize, our national policy has been shaped in terms of two long-range objectives. These objectives are, in brief, the containment and eventual suppression of Communist aggression, and the prevention, if possible, of a third world war. This has been, of necessity, a global policy. It has had to take into consideration our total resources and what we are able to do on a world-wide scale. It has been a policy which had to be shaped and carried out with cool determination, and with intelligent and informed realism. The first great step was the application of the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey. This policy prevented the Communists from engulfing those two countries. The second great step was the development and application of the Marshall plan.

This program has been very successful. It enabled the democratic nations of Western Europe to thwart strong Communist movements that threatened to take over—not through external aggression—but through internal weakness that grew out of the war. The third great step has been our effort to stem Communist aggression in Korea.

ANNOUNCER. Senator, many letters to Congress ask, Can we afford to continue such a policy? Can we afford to continue pouring out our national resources? Can we continue to build up our Armed Forces without wrecking our economy?

Senator KILGORE. My personal view is that we must not relax. The consequences would be very dangerous. We must continue to build up our defenses; we must continue to strengthen our allies. If we had followed the policies of those who have opposed these great measures, we would today—this very day—be without allies of any strength. We would be living in a world in which the iron curtain had moved ever closer to us, taking over nation after nation.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, for further clarification of one phase of the controversy over General MacArthur, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not My Responsibility," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 5.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT MY RESPONSIBILITY

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON brought out perhaps the most telling point of the MacArthur hearings. When General MacArthur was explaining his view that the Korean war can be expanded without provoking direct Soviet intervention, Senator MCMAHON asked him how he proposed to defend the Nation if his hunch should turn out to be mistaken. General MacArthur replied.

"That doesn't happen to be my responsibility, Senator. My responsibilities were in the Pacific, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the various agencies of this Government are working day and night for an over-all solution to the global problem."

Later Senator MCMAHON, pursuing the idea that an expansion of the war in Asia might lead to a further expansion of it into Europe, asked the general if he considered the Allies ready today to withstand an attack in Western Europe. General MacArthur replied:

"Senator, I have asked you several times not to involve me in anything except my own area. My concepts on global defense are not what I am here to testify on. I do not pretend to be the authority now on those things. When I was the Chief of Staff 20 years ago, that was my problem and I would have answered it. The Chief of Staff or others here are the ones to answer that query, not me."

There is the controversy in a nutshell. A decision to expand the Korean war cannot possibly be taken solely as a Pacific theater decision. Its implications are global in scope, yet General MacArthur is not willing to assume responsibility for the global consequences which might flow from the decision he advocates.

As we have often said, General MacArthur had every right to present privately to his superiors his own views on global as well as theater strategy. He was grievously mistaken in carrying the controversy into the political arena when he was overruled. He displays a heedless lack of restraint when he describes as "all tommyrot" President Truman's statement that the general prevented Central Intelligence Agency from operating in his theater until last January. This report has come not only from President Truman but from other well-informed sources, and the country is entitled to a better answer from General MacArthur than an expletive.

Apart from the methods he has chosen to use, General MacArthur must be judged on the merits of the course he advocates. It is a course of expanded Asian war regardless of the consequences. General MacArthur regards anything else—even the limited war we are now fighting—as appeasement. He believes that war must be total, that war is the ultimate process of politics, and he says plainly that once a nation has gone to war, "you must trust the military" to make the vital decisions.

This is a concept so foreign to the whole American tradition that General MacArthur has done the country a service by explaining so frankly the philosophic background of his views.

Victory in the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial A Will To Win, which appeared in the May 14 edition of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WILL TO WIN

A will to win is a wonderful thing to have in a fight. If you don't have it, as everyone knows from common experience, you are likely to get your ears beat off.

As everyone also knows or ought to know, a will to win is precisely what has been lacking lately in this country. The fashion is to say that it has been lacking in Washington, in the State Department, in the Pentagon, at the White House—and among the other countries of the free alliance. But the lack

goes a lot deeper and has been a lot closer to home than that. Right down to the roots of our country, among the people of the United States, there has been a prevailing lack of a will to win the biggest fight that has ever engaged mankind.

Americans and their Government have had the will to do many things. To fight communism. To resist aggression. To prevent war. To join with other nations in what the President recently called the "high principle" of collective security. But the actions, policies, and purposes expressed in these and similar phrases have not added up to a will to win the struggle with the Communist enemy, whether in Korea or in the world at large. On the contrary they more often than not have been avenues of escape from the very thought of having to win.

Now all that is changing. A will to win—to win the battle in Korea; and to win the world struggle, in its several forms—is unmistakably shaping up in this country. It is shaping up slowly, with all the thought, the care, the hesitations called for by the burdens and the risks involved. But the time is near when a will to overcome the Communist enemy and win the world struggle may fairly be said to be the manifest will of America.

OUR MAIN ENEMY

This growth of national purpose is occurring in a very American way. A vast amount of noise accompanies it, causing some concern at home and much trepidation around the world. At such times faith and perception are needed—the kind of faith that assumes a healthy and fruitful outcome; and the perception to note and heed certain signs and characteristics of American debate which in the current instance point to a beneficial outcome.

One such sign is the emergence of individuals who have come to be symbols of a particular idea. Hitherto incoherent and perhaps unvoiced needs and purposes crystallize around them. Opposing views and instincts crystallize against them. The result, for a time, is violent and seemingly destructive controversy. Pundits and kindred sophisticates deplore the whole process, forgetting that the symbols can be effective only if they represent some trend that is real and strong in the country.

The foremost symbol of a will to win is General MacArthur. At the moment, and by his own doing, he is especially the symbol of a will to win the shooting wars. When he testified in Washington last week the shooting war on his mind was the one in Korea. With brilliance and passion he insisted that this war can be won and must be won. He chose to duck some other points in a fashion which at times seemed very weak and unconvincing, and his enemies no doubt will make the most of the defects. But he carried the day on many, many other points. His biggest point of all—his inclusive point was that "communism throughout the world" is "our main enemy"; that "the total power of communism throughout the world" must be diminished and eventually defeated; and that any objective short of the decisive defeat of the present enemy in Korea can mean nothing but a victory and an increase of strength for "communism throughout the world."

General MacArthur showed, among other things, what a will to win can do for clarity of mind. Billed as a man of inclusive and dangerous certainty about everything under the sun, he turned out to have only two certainties—that world communism is the main enemy, and that the United States ought to win its fights once it gets into them. He refused to be certain that the Soviet Union is the main enemy ("I said that communism throughout the world was our main enemy"). He refused to be certain that the Soviet Union is hell-bent on a general war (so far as he could see, the Soviet Union's own forces are mainly on the defensive). He refused to be certain that the Kremlin is the seat and center of enemy power ("How would I know?"). He refused to be certain that facing the fact of war with Communist China necessarily entails the overthrow of the Chinese Communist Government ("Our purpose * * * is to force China to * * * stop killing our boys in Korea"). He refused to be certain that after a year or two of building up our forces we will be better able to deal with Soviet power than we are now (How can we know, he asked with the wallop of common sense, that the Soviet Union isn't building up faster than we are?).

A VISION OF VICTORY

He refused, above all, to be certain that some of the most respected clichés of the day mean anything.

"Resisting aggression," for instance. General MacArthur said right out that he did not know what it meant, and abruptly suggested that "resisting aggression" means nothing unless the purpose is to defeat the aggressor.

Asked whether he believed in "collective security," he did not reply with automatic piety that he did. Instead he twice asked his badgering questioner, Senator McMAHON, "What do you mean by collective security?" Senator McMAHON meant "a military alliance to keep the peace." Merely by raising the question, General MacArthur left the revolutionary impression that "collective security" may just possibly mean nothing at all—until and unless it means a collective effort to overcome the common enemy.

As General MacArthur knows better than most, the decisive conflict and the decisive victory may be won by the side which is at its best in the nonshooting, or cold war. So far he has chosen to let others bespeak and symbolize the will to win that kind of war. In this respect, a perfect counterpoint to General MacArthur is provided by Paul Hoffman. His war—the war he understands, prefers, and hopes to make the only war—is the cold war. He has just written a book about it, wishfully mistitling it Peace Can Be Won (Doubleday, New York; $2.50). More than any other American in public life, Paul Hoffman typifies the will to win his kind of war and the United States is lucky to have him around. The country would be fortunate if more Americans really understood his vision of victory.

A sign of the times is that President Truman is at last constrained to say that he, too, wants to win. For the very first time in his painful progression from a fixed belief in "no war" to the reluctant recognition of "some war," the President last week used the verb "to win" in connection with the contest for freedom. Referring to recommended measures of military, economic, and political warfare, he said, "All these elements are essential to enable us to win the kind of struggle that the Kremlin has brought about."

In the same document—a letter explaining his latest defense budget—the President nevertheless held forth the same old balderdash of limited necessity and limited national effort. So long as the President and those around him deal in such inadequacies, he cannot expect to have the belief and confidence of the country when he speaks of winning. For leadership, and for the expression of what is right and needful, the country must continue to look instead to the MacArthurs, to the Hoffmans, and to the brave men who are dying without reward in Korea.

Seventy Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Paul Wooton celebrated his seventieth birthday.

Paul Wooton is universally loved in our Nation's Capital.

As the Washington Post pointed out in an editorial, he is indeed a newspaperman's newspaperman. Throughout his long service he has subscribed to the code of honesty and fairness. I have never heard a person question the accuracy of a Paul Wooton story. He has never been too busy to lend a helping hand, to give a word of advice, or to write a line of praise.

When Mrs. Boggs and I first came to Washington, 11 years ago, he and his lovely wife, who has since passed to her reward, helped us find a place to live. His life epitomizes the noble thought that "it is better to give than to receive."

Not only has he brought honor and credit to himself, but he has also added tremendously to the prestige of the great newspaper he so ably represents, the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Mr. Speaker, several days ago my colleague, Hon. FRANK SMITH, incorporated in the RECORD the Post editorial entitled "Seventy Years Young." It was a beautiful tribute.

Hoover Commission Recommendations for the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, healthy criticism is a good thing for individuals and for Government agencies. It is in this spirit, that we constantly try to improve the various departments of Government, that I call attention to the following newsletter written by Mr. Louis F. Fowler, director of the United Business Service, recommending adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations for the Post Office Department:

APRIL 7, 1951.

Here's your first quarter index and a visit over mail service.

I guess this is the first letter I've ever written to you, our clients, where I griped about anything, but when it comes to the present mail service, what else can one do?

Many of you have written me about the poor delivery service of our reports. We use first-class mail, and it is metered to expedite post-office handling.

It has been my privilege to serve off and on on the Postal Facilities Committee of the

Boston Chamber of Commerce, twice as chairman. This, plus the fact that I have kept in close contact with postal affairs for the past 27 years, as we of the United Business Service are among Boston's largest mail users. In fact, the local post office has told us that we rank No. 1 as far as the volume of air mail going out of Boston is concerned.

We have written our Congressmen to get back of the nonpartisan report of the Hoover Commission, which would result in higher efficiency, lower costs, and service to the American public to which they are entitled from their post office. I am sure you will not accuse me of playing politics when I urge you to do the same.

We do not go to press until after the close of the New York stock market on Friday in order to give you up-to-the-minute information. Our presses run at least until midnight Friday, we begin inserting the reports in their envelopes at 7 a. m. on Saturday, and start delivering them to the post office within an hour. This should insure every client receiving their reports the first delivery Monday morning, which is the same time that clients located right here in Boston get theirs; no one can, therefore, under any conditions receive them before the close of the market on Saturday.

In contrast to deliveries here in the United States—we have clients throughout the world—we just received a letter from a client in Switzerland telling us that by air mail he receives the reports on Monday.

We do know, however, because of our close contact with the Boston post office, that our weekly reports are promptly dispatched by them to the airlines and the railway mail each Saturday. We tie them in bundles and deliver them ourselves in regular mail bags to the post office.

We certainly do everything we can to start the reports promptly on their way, so if you don't receive them promptly, I hope you will complain to your local post office. With enough complaints, this present unsatisfactory postal situation should, at least, improve somewhat.

Cordially,

LOUIS F. FOWLER,
Director of Service.

State of Israel: Anniversary Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today is the third anniversary of the State of Israel. Wherever the ideas of independence, liberty, freedom are held as cherished human possessions, Israel's independence day is an event of importance. It is especially significant for us in this country because we had a great deal to do with the creation of Israel. Israeli leaders had not only our sympathy and support but they also had material and financial aid from this country.

This assistance was extended willingly and generously in the knowledge that it was for a good cause—the rescue of a victimized and distressed people and the restoration of their homeland.

In terms of years the history of the Republic of Israel is short indeed, but in terms of sheer accomplishments that brief history is extraordinary. Three years ago, at the time of the Israeli declaration of independence, the area of the country was circumscribed, having only 5,000 square miles with some 600,000 inhabitants. Today its area is more than 8,000 square miles and the population exceeds 1,250,000. The annual rate of immigrants exceeds 200,000. In this task of repatriation and settlement, the Government of Israel has worked most conscientiously. Every effort has been made and is being made to rescue suffering and destitute Jews from European and middle eastern countries. Of the immigrants totaling more than 500,000, about half have come—or fled—from the iron-curtain countries. More than 100,000 were brought in from Arab countries. Out of the "blood, sweat, and tears" the new Republic of Israel is being built as a model of progress and democracy in the Middle East. Let us hope that they will have the peace which is so necessary to the accomplishment of this purpose. Jews have always looked forward to the regaining of their historic homeland. During their centuries-long life in Diaspora they have devoutly cherished this deep-seated hope. Through their persevering efforts and their sacrifices, they have at last attained their goal. Let us hope, on this third anniversary of independence, the Republic of Israel will grow strong and prosperous and become a powerful factor for peace and progress in the Near East.

Teaching the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Congress and the country an editorial written by Robert D. Lynn, editor of the Shield and Diamond, the official publication of the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. In my opinion, it provides some food for thought for all those connected with the great profession of education—whether it be as educators; as school, college, or university administrators; as members of boards of education, or trustees and regents of higher institutions of learning; or as members of parent-teacher associations. It might also be read reflectively by those whose financial contributions comprise the great endowments which enable public institutions to serve a noble purpose. In brief, this editorial points up the fact that it is essential to follow through on the business of education in order to make certain that what is taught is designed to preserve and protect America, and to enrich its blessings, rather than to destroy the faith of our fathers and the capacity to appreciate those things about this country which are fundamentally sound and right.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR, ARE YOU TEACHING THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE?

(By Robert D. Lynn)

Many fine youths have entered our institutions of higher learning expecting our democratic way of life as the routine way and the benefits of our democracy as fruits to be expected and enjoyed without thanks. During their university years they progress a step forward and become vocally critical of various democratic institutions and practices under the learned proddings and cynicisms of many professors who spend the major part of their time destroying rather than strengthening our great democracy.

This is no idle generalization. The results of the general trend in higher education in recent years toward such cynical criticism is graphically illustrated in statements made by several highly intelligent American citizens who have professed to following the Communist Party line. In his profound address before the All American Conference to Combat Communism, United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT, urged that every school in American include in its curriculum one course in "What's Right With America." He graphically indicated the need for such a course by reporting the testimony of Miss Elizabeth Bentley before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Senator MUNDT stated:

"I never want to have to listen again to what I heard from the lips of Miss Elizabeth Bentley, when our House Committee on Un-American Activities was conducting the investigation and I serving as chairman. J. Edgar Hoover says that she is the smartest woman spy ever to work in our country. She had under her domination a young man in the Commerce Department who was passing on the strategic aspect of our export of arms to Russia. One of Miss Bentley's boy friends confessed to the committee that he was giving her money but that it was not for Communist dues; that he was simply subscribing to the Communist Daily Worker for himself and some of the lads over at his rooming house. That was his defense; that is, if such an admission can be called a defense.

"So I asked Miss Bentley one day:

" 'Tell me, Miss Bentley, how in the world did you become an American spy working for the Communist government?'

"Pulchritudinous, pleasant, personable, from a fine old Republican, New England banking family, she had all the advantages of a public school education, a graduate of Vassar and of Columbia—how did she become a Communist?

"She said:

" 'Senator, let me tell you that in all my educational career, grade school, high school, college, and graduate school, I never had a single professor or teacher ever talk to me with enthusiasm about the virtues and values of the American system and without some kind of carping criticism that destroyed the glamor of the whole thing. Each of my teachers had a "yes-but" approach to our American virtues and each found as much to criticize or condemn in our environment as he found to praise. So when a Columbia University professor of mine took me to a Communist cell meeting, I heard a man for

the first time in my life talking about politics, about economics, and about government with a gleam in his eye, with enthusiasm in his voice and with the force of a person who is convinced his way is right. Thus I was an easy push-over and I joined up with the Communists.'

"Whittaker Chambers and others have told us similar stories of how early school training had failed to impress upon them the virtues and values of our American success formula of freedom. As you all know, Alger Hiss was convicted by a jury of his peers here in New York City of perjuring himself by lying about his faithfulness to America and his fidelity to communism which led him to steal secret State Department papers and deliver them to a Communist espionage apparatus of which Chambers was one of the main operatives.

"The question is, who is responsible for Alger Hiss? I don't believe Harvard University can escape all responsibility. I don't believe his mentor there escaped by securing high judicial position either. Columbia University cannot escape all responsibility for Henry Julian Wadleigh. Hiss and Wadleigh were smart young men whose minds became perverted some place in the educational mill. It seems to me that in a college or university there is a responsibility to turn out citizens who are sound and who are right and who are patriots."

This is a serious charge, Professor. Is your teaching today responsible for some future Bentley or Hiss? Do you teach your students to became "citizens who are sound and who are right and who are patriots?"

Gromyko's Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from a recent issue of the Evening Star:

GROMYKO'S BEHAVIOR

For more than a month now, in a dreary grind of dreary sessions, the deputies of the Big Four Foreign Ministers have been meeting in Paris to work out an agenda for a full-dress Anglo-French-American-Russian conference to ease international tensions. But the net result of their efforts to date is nothing, or worse than nothing. Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet delegate, has seen to that. He has been at his ugly best in putting on an act that seems to make such a gathering virtually impossible.

At any rate, it is difficult to see how anything short of a complete change in Gromyko's behavior can save the Paris meeting from blowing up in a way that will end whatever hope may still exist for a big four conference. His threats, his insults, his insolence, his unparalleled invective, and especially his contemptible remarks about our American and allied United Nations forces in Korea have done such violence to the rules of diplomacy and simple, human decency that the western representatives can hardly put up with much more of the same without practicing the virtue of patience to the point of downright silliness. It is all well and good to make allowances for certain types of boors, but when they display their boorishness as if it were a mark of statesmanship, they have no right to be heard with forbearance.

There is no doubt, of course, that Gromyko's snarling conduct conforms with orders he has received from Moscow. He has made himself deliberately obnoxious (he has a personality naturally well suited to the role) because that is the way the men of the Kremlin want him to be. Their exact reason for this is anybody's guess, but the indications are that if they were sincere last November when they first proposed the big four conference, something has since happened to make them change their minds. Quite obviously their Deputy Foreign Minister in Paris is not behaving as if they really wished to hold one. Unless he puts an end soon to his insufferable nastiness, the western delegates ought to pack up their bags and head for home.

Salary Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, May 11, 1951.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In compliance with House Resolution 56, I have the honor to transmit herewith photostatic copy of said resolution.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

House Resolution 56

Whereas it has come to the attention of members of the house that the employees of the United States Post Office Department have not received an increase in pay for some 2 years; and

Whereas the last pay increase, in 1949, was not commensurate with the increased costs of living; and

Whereas all living costs have greatly increased within the last several months, and the salaries and rates of pay of postal employees are not adequate to meet the high costs of living; and

Whereas there now is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill or bills to raise the salaries and wages of postal employees: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respecfully request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide realistic salary increases for postal employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each United States Senator and Congressman from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, May 10, 1951.
WARREN L. WOOD,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Filed 1:20 p. m., May 11, 1951.
EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks one of the most thoughtfully written communications I have received from my constituency. I believe that Mr. and Mrs. Taylor have expressed the views of the average American citizen clearly and concisely. Their summary of the current international situation is similar to many others that I am receiving daily, and I commend their communication to the attention of my colleagues:

MENLO PARK, CALIF., *May 2, 1951.*
Representative JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Your form letter in reply to our telegram re MacArthur has just been received. We appreciate that in your press of business you found time to send even that acknowledgment.

We realize that you may never have the time to read this letter, but since we will probably never have the opportunity to talk with you personally, it was felt that one of us should try to put our collective thoughts into words. This is the first time we have ever written our Representatives in Congress and tried to put our political ideas on paper, so we hope you will find the time to read it—just so you will know that some of us try to think—even in our limited way.

We have talked much pro and con since this furor has arisen, among our family and friends. Our immediate family (both sides) number some thirty men and women. We are the middle groups, in age; in income; old enough to have served in World War II and still young enough to be called for any all-out military action now. Our sons, nephews and some brothers are now in Korea. We will pay for this action both in blood and taxes for years to come, so we naturally give it thought.

First, let us say we realize that any thought of impeachment is out of the question; there are insufficient grounds, and it would be poor statesmanship at this time, even though many hotheads advocate this.

Second, we do not question the President's right to remove General MacArthur—we have all been in one branch of the service or another, and understand very well the rules of military conduct—provided, of course—that a definite breach of such conduct actually occurred. What we do question is the humiliating manner in which this was done—a very poor reward for so many years of gallant and excelling military service.

Third, Democrat or Republican, we feel that this is a time when partisanship should be forgotten, for the good of our country should come before any thought of party politics.

Fourth, we feel our present foreign policy as carried out by our Secretary of State Acheson is definitely not to the good of the country. We do not, and never will believe in any form of appeasement—we question the right of the State Department to cater to the selfish desires of any foreign allied governments, when such desires are obviously motivated by a wish to gather the remnants of an already moth-eaten Empire, and particularly when the several allied governments have shown themselves to be so politically, financially and militarily unstable.

Fifth, the question of the possibility of war with Russia at this time, should General MacArthur's recommendations be carried out—it is, of course, possible, but we do believe highly unlikely. It is true that the Soviet forces are spread over much of the European Continent, but—and this is a big but—those forces must be kept there to keep the subject peoples under control, as we do definitely believe that if the Soviet were to weaken its grip in any way, the people of those occupied countries would rise in revolt and throw them out—much as they did the Nazi forces—and well does the Soviet know this. Therefore, being forced to keep such a large force of arms present in Europe, could they spare much of a force and materials to meet an Asian campaign? It is said we are not militarily ready to meet such a force if loosed—we were less ready on December 7, 1941, but we made it. We have the necessary economic and industrial power to back such a move, and we—speaking for our family—are ready to pay for it if the need arises.

Sixth, how much material is being lost by this policy of constant advance, fall back, advance, fall back now going on in Korea? What does it do to our morale and that of the peoples of the world who look to us for guidance? Every time we fall back, what of our supplies and armament which must be left behind, to say nothing of the men? We know this is all considered expendable—we have heard that before. But is it necessary expense?

Seventh, we have many friends—Chinese-born in this country or not, living in this part of the country but who, nevertheless, have close contact with China. While they do not in many ways care for Chiang Kai-shek they feel, as we do, that the Communist government is not to be borne. Why not permit him to do what he can to assist in this struggle? This is his enemy we are fighting now, as well as ours—is he not an ally? If and when the Communist invasion is driven out of China and the people have had time to adjust to the advances of the postwar world—then it will be time for them to hold a free election and secure the type of government and leader they want, not what is forced upon them.

We realize that this letter is lengthy and there is more we would wish to say if we were able to talk with you—but it does express a large part of our general feeling, and may let you know we do some thinking in the matters now before the people. We realize there is a coming election, but we do most definitely feel that regardless of political party, we must examine closely the record and person of the man who runs for the office of the President of the United States; it is a burden only a very strong and good man could carry and we desperately need such a man. We must depend upon you in Washington to put forward such a man for nomination—we will do the rest.

One last thought: What is there in the Marxist or Communist tenets that leads any thinker to believe that its believers would ever live peacefully side by side with more liberal governments? Does the lion lie down with the lamb? Not in this world.

Thank you for your past courtesies; we hope you will find the moment to read our thoughts.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR G. TAYLOR.

Resolution of United Society of Friends Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a set of resolutions recently adopted by the United Society of Friends Women that were forwarded to me by Mrs. Mary E. Cadwallader, an active member of the organization, who lives in Oskaloosa, Iowa.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE UNITED SOCIETY OF FRIENDS WOMEN, MAY 1951

Deeply concerned by the increasing militarization of our country, we call upon our Government to replace its negative, fearful foreign policy with a constructive program worthy of a Christian nation.

As our forefathers united diverse races, nationalities, and States into one Nation living in peace under law, the central aim of our foreign policy in this second half of the century must be the building of such a community of the world. Without an all-out positive program for world law and world welfare, there is a bleak future for our civilization.

Specifically, we urge that our Government lead in strengthening and changing the United Nations to provide security against attack and war through enforceable "foolproof disarmament" under law.

We urge that money now spent for armament be used by the United Nations to develop the poverty-stricken countries of the world. We would expand the United Nations organizations for refugees, agriculture, child welfare and technical assistance. The Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization especially need to be developed into agencies capable of making a concerted attack on world hunger and disease. We support the efforts of Senators BRIEN MCMAHON and RALPH FLANDERS and Congressmen JUDD and HAYS to bring this about.

We urge that grain be sent by the United States to India immediately as a gift and not a loan. We want our country to share its surpluses generously in Christian love, without political strings attached.

We urge that the United Nations ability to mediate disputes be used and expanded. We urge that the United Nations, which has stopped the fighting in Indonesia and Israel, continue to negotiate the Korean war.

We urge that in the present debate on Korean policy the principles of civilian control over the military be upheld. We deny that the only way to stop a war is to win it. We oppose extending the war to millions of other people.

We oppose the extension of conscription and universal military training. We doubt that such measures and expanding armament will insure peace.

We disapprove of the growing trend toward the garrison state as evidenced by increasing pressure for loyalty oaths, increasing military influence in education, increasing restrictions on freedom of thought, speech and conscience. It is unthinkable that men should be sent to prison in Christian America for conscience sake.

We wish our country to remain an asylum for political and religious refugees. We oppose barriers to immigration based solely on race or national origin. We urge the repeal of the present McCarran Act and the defeat of similar legislation in the future.

Nonphysical Retirements of Military Personnel During the Present Emergency Are Costing the American Taxpayers Nearly a Million Dollars Annually

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the present emergency the American taxpayers are being called upon to spend nearly a million dollars a year on the retirement of military personnel for other than nonphysical reasons.

For the period of 8 months starting July 1, 1950, to March 1, 1951, the total of 1,914 officers and enlisted personnel of our Armed Forces were retired on age or forced to retire. Their retirement pay for the 8-month period amounted to $605,247.38. Many of these persons are in their early fifties and when retired have no difficulty in meeting the physical standards for employment in private industry.

I have just introduced a bill designed to suspend certain provisions of law with respect to retirement for other than physical reasons for members of the Armed Forces. My bill provides in substance that notwithstanding any provisions of law, until June 30, 1954, no member of the Armed Forces shall be compelled to retire or be ordered without his consent to inactive duty for other than physical reasons.

Because of existing law, hundreds of duly qualified officers and enlisted personnel are being retired after 30 years of service or on age. In addition, many senior officers not selected for promotion are also forced to retire.

This practice of retiring military personnel with pay during an emergency, despite the fact they are fully qualified for further duty, is a waste of money and manpower, since it not only requires two men to fill one job, but it also places both of them on the Federal payroll.

For example, the retirement of military personnel often requires the calling up of reserves to fill such vacancies. As an illustration, I know of a Navy captain,

who at the age of 51 years, was forced to retire recently because he failed to be selected for promotion to rear admiral. His pay at the time of retirement was $860.25 and after being retired he received monthly $523.68, which he will continue to receive for the remainder of his life. This officer is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and his education cost the taxpayers of America approximately $30,000. In addition to the experience that he gained during his naval career, he attended several postgraduate schools that added another $10,000 to the taxpayers' bill for his education. The result of his retirement is that after the taxpayers spent $40,000 on his education, at the age of 51 he was forced to retire because he was not selected for promotion to one of the few billets as rear admiral in the Navy. Thus, as a retired captain he will draw for the rest of his life $523.68 monthly.

To replace the retired captain a Reserve commander was called from civilian life whose base pay monthly is $689.25. Therefore the total cost to the Government for filling the vacancy caused by retirement of the 51-year-old captain is $1,213.23 monthly. Keep in mind that before retirement the 51-year-old captain was doing the same job for $360.25 monthly and in a more efficient manner because of his education and experience. Thus, this one example alone discloses a waste of taxpayers' money in the amount of $523.68 monthly.

This retired naval captain is only one of 1,914 officers and enlisted personnel of our Armed Forces who have retired on age or were forced to retire since the beginning of the Korean war. There is no doubt that many of these officers and enlisted personnel have similar case histories to that of the retired naval captain.

The attached table gives a breakdown of the 1,914 persons retired from our Armed Forces for other than physical reasons. By referring to the attached table you will observe that while these 1,914 men were on active duty, the total cost for their services was $805,156.92 monthly. Through their retirement, you have added $605,247.38, so that the net cost to the taxpayers of filling these 1,914 vacancies was $1,410,404.30.

If the provisions of my proposed bill had been in effect when these 1,914 persons were retired, a saving to the American taxpayers would have been effected in the sum of $605,247.38, which represents their retirement pay from July 1, 1950, to March 1, 1951, a period of 8 months.

Assuming that the Armed Forces will retire personnel at the same rate as during the period from June 25, 1950, to March 1, 1951, one can readily see that if my bill, which provides a 3-year moratorium on nonphysical retirements, should become law, the American taxpayers will be saved $2,723,613.21 in a 36-month period.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is making every effort to cut nonessential governmental expenditures to a minimum. If Congress will approve my bill, it will be possible to save nearly a million dollars annually and at the same time eliminate the necessity of calling up Reserve military personnel to replace Regular personnel retired in the prime of life and while qualified and physically able to continue their services to their country.

Officers and enlisted men retired from armed services on statutory age and length of service, June 25, 1950, to Mar. 1, 1951

Pay grade	Rank	Army	Navy	Marines	Air Force	Active-duty pay per month	Retired pay per month	Total of both active-duty and retired pay	Total	Total active-duty pay	Total retired pay
08	Rear admiral [1]		12			$954.75	$716.06	$1,670.81	24	$22,914.00	$17,185.44
	Major general	10			2						
07	Rear admiral [2]		1	1		826.50	619.88	1,446.38	31	25,621.50	19,216.28
	Brigadier general	27			2						
06	Captain		131			698.25	523.98	1,222.23	85	268,826.25	201,732.30
	Colonel	229		5	20						
05	Commander		11			584.25	438.19	1,022.44	129	75,368.25	56,526.51
	Lieutenant colonel	111		2	5						
04	Lieutenant commander		24			513.00	384.75	897.75	139	71,309.00	53,480.25
	Major	87		6	22						
03	Lieutenant		4			411.75	331.31	743.06	54	22,234.50	17,890.74
	Captain	49		3							
02	Lieutenant (junior grade)		1			349.13	261.85	610.98	14	4,887.82	3,665.90
	First lieutenant	12		1							
01	Ensign					313.50	235.13	548.63	3	940.50	705.39
	Second lieutenant	3									
W 4 and 3	Commissioned warrant	12	1	14	1	465.60	349.20	814.80	28	13,036.80	9,777.60
W 2 and 1	Warrant	13		1	12	349.20	261.90	611.10	26	9,079.20	6,809.40
E7	Chief petty officer		70			294.00	220.50	514.50	705	207,270.00	155,452.50
	Master sergeant	315		39	281						
E6	Petty officer, 1st class		3			249.90	187.89	437.79	139	34,736.10	26,116.71
	Sergeant, first class	92		6	38						
E5	Petty officer, second class		2			227.85	170.89	398.74	156	35,544.60	26,658.84
	Sergeant	90		6	60						
E4	Petty officer, third class		1			191.10	143.33	334.43	44	8,408.40	6,306.52
	Corporal	38		4	1						
E3	Seaman					147.00	110.25	257.25	20	2,940.00	2,205.00
	Private first class	17		1	2						
E2	Seaman					120.00	90.00	210.00	17	2,040.00	1,530.00
	Private	17									
E1	Seaman										
	Private										
Total						5,951.93	5,045.11	11,740.89	1,914	805,156.92	605,247.38

[1] Upper half.
[2] Lower half.

Shipyards on the West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in time of national emergencies, when every ship that can carry troops or supplies is required for an all-out effort, the merchant marine and the facilities which care for it are known to all of us to be as necessary a part of the Military Establishment as the armed services themselves. Not only must we have the ships but we must have the facilities that will keep them in operation. Such facilities are not brought into being overnight. There must be organizations of skilled management and skilled men constantly active during normal times and available as a nucleus for expansion when emergencies arise.

It is well, therefore, to take inventory from time to time. On the Pacific coast the present situation is not very good. It is somewhat indicated by the letter of April 24, 1951, which was addressed to me by Mr. Thomas A. Rotell, chairman, and Mr. R. J. Brennan, secretary, for the Pacific Coast Committee for Shipbuilding for National Defense. A temporary and partial remedy for the immediate future is suggested in a resolution set forth in a letter dated April 25 addressed to me by Mr. A. T. Wynn,

secretary of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council.

The letters to which I have referred read as follows:

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE FOR SHIPBUILDING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Oakland, Calif., April 24, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: We have talked, wired, written and, in general, campaigned many times over a period of years relative to the decline of the private yards of the Pacific coast. Recently, a survey was made of employment in the three largest yards of the bay area. The facts obtained, more clearly than any words of ours, illustrate what is happening. The figures are as follows:

The number of employees working as of April 19, 1951, were:

Moore Dry Dock, Oakland	1,400
Todd Shipyard, Alameda	350
Bethlehem, San Francisco	500
Total	2,250

The figures of 1950 after the Korean incident for the same three yards were:

Moore Dry Dock	1,900
Todd Shipyard	2,100
Bethlehem	2,600
Total	6,600

This represents a decline of 4,350—or 65.91 percent in these three yards alone. It means that only 34.09 percent of those working in these yards during the latter part of 1950 are working there today. The figure of 4,350 represents those experienced shipyard workers who are drawing unemployment insurance, or have accepted employment in other industries in this, a time of emergency. Unfortunately, the acceptance of other jobs is altogether too prevalent.

Smaller yards (Triple A Machine Shop, San Francisco) reveal an even more alarming trend. Today 50 are working. Three weeks ago, the figure was 600—a decline of 550—or 92 percent in three short weeks.

It is particularly discouraging when the figures of World War II for the same three yards are noted. These figures are:

Moore Dry Dock	38,000
Bethlehem, San Francisco	18,500
Todd Shipyard (then United Engineering)	7,000
Total	63,500

A comparison of these figures with those of today shows a decline of 61,250—or 96.46 percent. If to World War II unemployment figures were added those of the Kaiser yards, General Engineering, Bethlehem (Alameda), Western Pipe & Steel, Marinship, etc., they would represent a decline of approximately 99 percent. To us, these figures are tragic. Joe Stalin might get comfort from such figures, but not those who are concerned with the security of the United States.

Anything you can do to assist in the correction of these conditions will be deeply appreciated, and thanking you for your splendid cooperation in the past, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. ROTELL, *Chairman.*
R. J. BRENNAN, *Secretary.*

BAY CITIES METAL TRADES COUNCIL,
San Francisco, Calif., April 25, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: The following resolution was passed at the regular meeting of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council of April 16, 1951, and I was instructed to send same to you for your consideration and action. We respectfully request you to give us your views on this very important matter:

"Whereas since 1947 contracts for the construction of only a few small vessels have been awarded the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas recognizing the danger of national defense of a policy of not maintaining well-dispersed shipyards, staffed with a nucleus of skilled workmen, constant efforts have been made to win an allocation of contracts to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas despite the recognition of this principle, agencies of the Government have opposed allocation, contending that in peacetime only a relatively small number of vessels would be constructed, and that any arbitrary division of work would 'destroy the more efficient yards'; and

"Whereas specifically the Maritime Commission said, "The volume of work involved in a wartime or emergency program makes the allocation of work desirable, whereas a peacetime limited construction program does not' (letter from Philip B. Fleming to Schuyler Otis Bland, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, July 6, 1946); and

"Whereas specifically the Munitions Board said 'The proposed allocation would be effective only when applied to a large Government construction program. When applied to the current program, the work may be spread so thin as to put out of business valuable' east coast yards with many years of experience.' (Letter of May 27, 1949, to Schuyler Otis Bland from Maj. Gen. Patrick W. Timberlake, Munitions Board Deputy Director of Staff, Merchant Marine Committee hearings, p. 118); and

"Whereas specifically the Navy said 'Recognition of the fact that there is less than a desirable distribution of shipbuilding throughout the country does not permit the conclusion that part of the existing effort should be transferred elsewhere. Rather should it follow that additional shipbuilding should be fostered, and the industry nurtured to a healthy condition.' (Supplementary statement of Rear Adm. Charles D. Wheelock, Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, made to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, June 23, 1949, contained on p. 122 of hearings); and

"Whereas Congress preparing intelligently to meet this emergency has authorized:

"(1) The construction of mariner-type vessels by the Maritime Board;

"(2) The construction of 170 naval vessels and the conversion of 291 others; and

"Whereas the private yards of the Pacific coast, which built 42 percent of the vessels constructed during World War II, have little work, unstable employment conditions are forcing skilled shipyard employees into other industries in this a time of national emergency: Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, in meeting at San Francisco, Calif., the evening of the 16th day of April 1951,* That the mobilization base be expanded to embrace the private yards of the Pacific coast, the construction records of which were unequaled in World War II; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That—

"(1) The remaining mariner-type construction contracts (10 estimated) be allocated to the Pacific coast yards, 25 already having been assigned Atlantic and Gulf coast yards, and

"(2) That a fair share of the Navy construction and conversion program be assigned to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Maritime Board, the Navy Bureau of Ships, and to all Congressmen and Senators from the States of California, Washington, and Oregon, and the Metal Trades Department, A. F. of L."

Respectfully submitted.

A. T. WYNN, *Secretary.*

Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune of April 12, 1951:

IT'S BIGGER THAN MEN

It is important to make clear in the beginning that this newspaper has not been sympathetic with many of President Truman's actions. We have criticized him—and severely so—on many occasions. As for his momentous order relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from all his commands, however, we agree the President has taken proper and corrective action.

Certainly the decision was one of the most difficult of Mr. Truman's career. It must rank next to his order approving the use of the atomic bomb in World War II.

Undoubtedly the President realized the dismissal of the hero-general would set off an emotional and political bomb at home. He was well aware of the attitude among many Americans—and not all of them in the Republican camp—that General MacArthur could do no wrong. But he also recognized there are issues of higher significance than the future and ambitions of a five-star general.

To those citizens who can see nothing right in the President's action, to those who uphold MacArthur's position without question, we would like to point out that it is an important tradition in this democracy that military authority is subordinate to civilian authority.

General MacArthur was wrong in taking his case to the public over the heads of the civilian authorities and in violation of the orders of his own superiors. Not even a five-star general is bigger than the Government of the United States. It was his duty to present his views or to criticize political and diplomatic decisions, which had been made by our civilian authorities, through proper military channels. As he repeatedly refused to do so, his removal was justified.

To be sure, there is more behind the dismissal than insubordination. At issue throughout the controversy has been the broad question of priority in fighting the world-wide battle against communism.

As he did during World War II, General MacArthur contends it is more essential to crush the enemy in Asia than in Europe. He has been agitating for a big push aimed at the hear of China. Isolated in the Far East for many years and seeing only one side of the world picture, he has been promising, in effect, that in winning an Asian victory Europe "most probably would avoid war."

THE DANGERS OF HIS POLICY

Our Government, our top military leaders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and our allies in the United Nations have rejected the MacArthur policy, which could easily fan the Korean action into a major war before the free world is strong enough to fight such a war. They have opposed the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops and bombing attacks on the Chinese mainland, knowing full well that a general war with the Red Chinese might embroil us in the quagmire of China for decades.

Again, to the MacArthur admirers, and to the Republicans who think that egging MacArthur on against the administration and our top military advisers is sound politics in the year preceding the 1952 presidential election, we say: "Shall we risk a conflagration in the Far East? Shall we follow the MacArthur course and destroy the whole painfully built structure of American alliances?"

Let us remember that Red China and Russia have a mutual defense pact. If we attack China proper, if we send Chiang back to the mainland and follow behind to support or bail him out, the Soviets may well come in. And world war III, which the American people want to avoid and for which we are far from prepared, may be under way.

The President's action has, of course, generated a new and bitter domestic controversy. Tempers have risen. Emotions are inflamed. But the heat of the controversy should not blind us to the fact that we comfort only the enemy when our passions get out of bounds.

Fundamental foreign policy decisions must now be made. If it takes another great debate to decide between the aggressive and dangerous MacArthur policy and a renewed commitment to the primary defense of Europe, let the discussions be conducted honorably, sincerely, and in the best American democratic tradition. In the present hair's-breadth zone of all-out war, this Nation must rise above personal and partisan bickering. Only as we realize that the question of fundamental policy is bigger than either General MacArthur or President Truman can we hope to achieve unity and arrive at decisions which will affect our whole national future.

Increases in Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, while I realize there should be some increase in postal rates, I do not agree that the heavy increase demanded by the administration is necessary or justified. Some very interesting arguments against the administration position are carried in an article in the West Concord Enterprise, West Concord, Minn. in its issue of March 15. I hope the Members will read this article very carefully:

OUR CORNER—STATEMENTS REGARDING INCREASES IN POSTAL RATES

The statement made by President Truman in his message to Congress on February 27, contains certain statements which do not present the situation fairly to either the Congress or the public. The figures in the President's message are based upon Post Office cost accounting figures. Publishers believe these figures to be erroneous because the fundamental and realities of the proper cost accounting method are ignored.

Post Office cost accounting is determined on a weight and per piece basis without consideration of public service factors or priorities. However, these factors are basic and paramount in the operation of the Post Office, because the Post Office is not a business, but is a service to all the American people, and hence cost figures determined as they would be in competitive business are of little value for the setting of rates.

For illustration, according to the Post Office's own records, there are some 39,000 of the present 41,000 post offices in the United States which do not take in sufficient money to pay their own expenses. Ninety-four percent of all post offices are in this category. It is held that this fact is a self-evident indication that the Post Office Department is created primarily for service to American citizens and not as a business proposition.

A further illustration is the Post Office rural delivery service which certainly exists as a service to American farmers. The cost of rural delivery service in 1950 was $152,800,000. Under the Post Office cost ascertainment system, this amount is allocated to the various classes of postal service. But the service is provided by the Government to those who live on rural routes as is provided by the Government to those who live on rural routes as is proven by the fact that the "R. D." was for many years known as rural free delivery. It is primarily for the recipients, not for the users of the mails. This is indicated by there being no higher charge for letter mail to "R. D." addresses than to urban addresses.

These various facts should certainly be considered when the statement is made that first-class mail is profitable to the Post Office, for much of the expense now charged to other classifications is incurred, as indicated, in order to make first-class service possible.

The idea that the Post Office should serve all of the American public on a business basis is not in agreement with the handling of other Government departments. For example, in 1950 there were differences between income and outgo as follows: Interior Department, deficit of about $460,000,000; Commerce Department, deficit of about $668,000,000; Agricultural Department, deficit of about $475,000,000.

Each of these serves mere segments of the population. The Post Office serves everyone.

The President in his message of February 27 gives the estimated net postal deficit for 1952 as $361,000,000, which is less than those just mentioned.

The President points out that the matter of postal rates should be subject to very thorough study. The publishers have been urging such a study for years. It is felt that such a study will prove conclusively that the post office is a service agency of the Government that cost accounting charges should fundamentally be divided into two groups—Government service and business handling—that the first class should be paid for wholly by the Government, as are the deficits in the Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments, and that the costs in the second group should be reflected in the rate structure of the postal service.

For the reasons indicated it is urged that the enactment of the rate increases at this time either be deferred or kept at a very low level, and that the survey which the President suggests should be completed before any substantial rate increases are attempted. It is urged very strongly that this thorough survey of the whole subject of postal rates be undertaken by an independent body similar in type to the Hoover Commission or the committees who in the past have made studies and recommendations in connection with social security.

Cutting of Plywood Tariff Imperils Employees of the Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the American State Department in trade negotiations with 17 foreign nations at Torquay, England, last week agreed to cut by 50 percent the tariff that is charged on plywood shipped into the United States from foreign countries.

By this action, the State Department has imperiled the prosperity and employment of the 35,000 to 40,000 workers who are employed in the plywood industry of the three Pacific coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

The existing tariff on plywood is 40 percent ad valorem—on value. This means that on every $100 of plywood shipped into the United States from a foreign country the foreign supplier is required to pay a duty of $40.

Under the 50-percent reduction in the tariff on plywood, which was agreed to by our State Department at Torquay, England, this tariff hereafter will be $20 on each $100 of plywood shipped into the United States.

AMERICAN WORKERS TO LOSE

Even under the existing 40-percent ad valorem tariff, Canada last year shipped a total of $11,032,465 of plywood and veneers into the United States. Despite the fact that the Canadians were required to pay a $40 duty on each $100 of plywood shipped into the United States they were able to profitably market large quantities of plywood in the United States.

Now, with the tariff on plywood cut in half the Canadians will be in position to market even larger quantities of their plywood in the United States. The bad effects of this sellout of American plywood workers to foreign nations may not be felt immediately, due to the present large demand for plywood, but once there is any slackening of demand, this lower tariff will enable foreign mills to get the business and it will be our American mills that will be forced to close first when any decline in demand occurs.

COSTS LOWER IN CANADA

Costs of labor, stumpage, freight, and taxes are much lower—about 40 to 50 percent lower—in Canada than in the United States.

For example, last summer when I made a detailed study of this problem, I found that American plywood workers then were receiving $1.72½ an hour while plywood workers in Canada were getting only $1.22. The wage rates in both countries have increased since then, but are still much higher in the United States than Canada.

The 40-percent ad valorem tariff on plywood imports compensated for the difference in American and Canadian wages.

By reducing by $20 the duty Canadians must pay on each $100 of plywood shipped into the United States, the Canadians will be able to undersell American mills in the American market.

One of the probable results of this great advantage given to the Canadian plywood industry by our American State Department is that more plywood mills will be built in Canada, with either Canadian or American capital. The Canadian output of plywood, as a result of this lower tariff, is likely to increase by leaps and bounds and within a few years much of the American market now enjoyed by American plants may be lost to Canadian mills.

STATE DEPARTMENT ARGUMENT

The argument of the American State Department for decreasing the plywood tariff is that if the Canadians are enabled to sell more plywood in the United States they will get more American dollars. The State Department holds that the Canadians will spend these additional dollars in the United States to buy automobiles, farm machinery, and other goods.

This will no doubt be to the advantage of the automobile and farm-machinery makers, but it will be hard on the Pacific coast's 35,000 to 40,000 plywood workers, who in the long run may see many of their jobs lost to the lower-wage Canadian plywood industry.

JAPAN COMPETITION POSSIBLE

The State Department's agreement to cut the tariff in half on plywood imported into the United States from foreign countries may result, within the next few years, in Japan getting back into plywood production on a large scale and the shipping of her plywood into the United States.

Japan, prior to World War II, was a big producer of plywood. In 1938, Japan manufactured 1,100,000,000 square feet of plywood which was equal to one-half of the entire production of plywood in the United States for that year.

Japan has large forests, and therefore the raw material from which to manufacture plywood. The wage rate for forest-industry workers in Japan several years ago was 256 yens a day, which in United States dollars is the equivalent of 61 to 81 cents.

If Japan resumes plywood manufacture with labor that costs only 61 to 81 cents a day our American plywood workers, whose wages now are about $2 an hour or $16 a day, cannot compete with this 61 to 81 cents a day labor.

PLYWOOD MAKING BIG INDUSTRY

The Douglas fir plywood industry of the United States is largely centered in the three Pacific coast States of Oregon, Wahington, and California, although there are many hardwood plywood mills in the Southern States, which likewise will be adversely affected by this 50-percent reduction in the plywood tariff.

The three Pacific coast States today have 56 plywood plants, and the number of these is increasing. These plywood plants employ approximately 18,500 factory workers, and a similar number of workers are engaged in supplying these mills with logs, glues, and other materials used in making plywood.

These plants, for the most part, are located in small communities. In many cases a whole community is dependent on a plywood plant for its income and livelihood.

A State Department policy that results in the closure of any of these plants well may result in destroying the economy of an entire town or a whole region.

In my opinion, the State Department by agreeing to reduce the existing tariff on plywood by 50 percent has sold the Pacific coast's 35,000 to 40,000 plywood-industry workers down river.

Communists Have Suffered Serious Blow in Hollywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by L. Edgar Prina entitled "Communists Have Suffered Serious Blow in Hollywood" which appeared in the Sunday, May 13, 1951, edition of the Washington Star. As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I commend this well-written and documented article to my colleagues for their information:

COMMUNISTS HAVE SUFFERED SERIOUS BLOW IN HOLLYWOOD—COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HAS CHOKED OFF BIG MONEY SOURCE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is at the halfway point in its investigation of Red influences in Hollywood. What has been accomplished? What conclusions may be drawn?

One big fact stands out: The Communist Party, its rise to power in the film capital abruptly halted by the 1947 hearings, has suffered a series of crippling blows in the past few weeks.

Despite Hollywood's fight to rid itself of Reds, the testimony has demonstrated clearly that there were plenty of Communist actors, directors, and writers employed in the movie industry as of last February 22 when the Star broke the story of the new inquiry.

More than 60 already have been named as Communists at one time or another, and additional identifications are coming. Chairman Parnell Thomas in 1947 said the committee had "a very complete record on 79 very prominent persons active out in Hollywood."

THREE PRIME REASONS

According to testimony of admitted former Reds, confirming long-time committee contentions, the Communist Party infiltrated Hollywood for three principal reasons:

1. To tap a lucrative source for party funds.

2. To gain prestige for the party by luring big names into front groups.

3. To control the content of films, in order to bar anti-Communist pictures or disseminate Red propaganda. This was to be done by domination of both talent and craft unions.

In the past the Reds have had considerable success on Nos. 1 and 2. But they have fallen flat on No. 3.

Now, in wake of the revelations before the committee, the once fabulous flow of money into the party coffers is expected to become little more than a trickle.

The reason for this is that witnesses who refuse to state under oath whether they are or were Communists, and others identified as Reds, almost automatically become unemployable in Hollywood. Contracts are terminated, wage earners are fired, and gone are the fat salaries.

An indication of the amount of money the Communist Party has taken out of Hollywood was given by Screen Writer Richard J. Collins, a party member for about 10 years and one of the most articulate witnesses yet heard in the inquiry.

Mr. Collins said that, in addition to regular party dues, he, like other highly paid Reds, was assessed a flat 4 percent of his salary.

"I suppose I gave about $185 a month for 3 or 4 years," he added.

Two other top film writers, both identified as Communists, Dalton Trumbo and Lester Cole, together received a total of $382,000 from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer alone in the 3 years 1945–47. A 4 percent assessment would have meant $15,200 for the party.

HIGH FINANCING

When one considers there were several hundred Communists in the movie industry during the war, according to Collins, a lot of party activities throughout the country, from atomic espionage to aid for the tottering Daily Worker, could have been financed from the Hollywood take.

The Reds still have ways of tapping some of the movie gold, however. Screen star Sterling Hayden told how Karen Morley, an actress, attempted to persuade him to become a passive member after he quit the party in 1945.

He said Miss Morley told him he would have to take no part in party activities—just contribute. Hayden refused, but now many "passive" members and fellow-travelers today are contributing to Red causes is something the committee would like very much to know.

During the last few years, because of the cold war and naked Red aggression, it has become extremely unpopular and unprofitable to be a member of a Communist-front group. Even the most gregarious person nowadays checks thoroughly into an organization before joining. Hence, the Communists are finding it more and more difficult to lure "big names" into their front and thereby gain prestige and dollars from innocents and suckers.

Much testimony has been received bearing on the matter of efforts to inject Communist propaganda into films. There can be no doubt that there were attempts to respond to Lenin's admonition that the cinema, perhaps the most important medium for educating and propagandizing the public should be exploited carefully.

But the consensus of former Reds is that this was almost impossible. The reason: the producer, director, stars and front office all had a veto over the script. In other words, there would have to be a chain of Communists or fellow-travelers from the writer to the studio boss.

The party soon realized the difficulties and launched its vigorous campaign to control all unions in the film industry. The idea was simple: Control the unions and you have a powerful weapon to hold over the heads of the studios.

At the height of their power in 1946–47 the Communists dominated the Screen

Writers' Guild and the Conference of Studio Unions. While Reds infiltrated the Screen Directors' Guild and the Screen Actors' Guild, they were in no position to dictate policy in these groups.

Meanwhile, one witness testified that party instructions, as laid down by Screen Writer John Howard Lawson, identified as the Communist boss in Hollywood, were these:

"Try to get 5 minutes of the party line in every picture you write.

"Get it into an expensive scene, a scene involving expensive stars, large sets, or many extras, because, even if it is discovered by the front office, the business manager of the unit, the very watchdog of the treasury, the very servant of capitalism, in order to keep the budget from going too high, will resist the elimination of that scene."

Even this proved unsatisfactory, however, according to Collins, who said:

"Inclusion of several progressive lines per screen play was pushed, but they learned it didn't mean anything unless you had the code book with you. So the program was dropped."

Mr. Collins contended that the only time Communist propaganda gets into films to any appreciable degree is when it jibes with the attitude or opinions of a large segment of the American people.

WARTIME JOB EASIER

As examples, he cited the antinazism theme of certain wartime films and pictures concerned with racial discrimination.

The current hearings also have shown the solidness of 1947 testimony given by Louis J. Russell, senior staff investigator, concerning the Communist affiliations of 9 of the 10 witnesses heard at that time. Mr. Russell introduced what he said were photostatic copies of the Communist Party cards for 7 of the 10. Edward Dmytryk, a movie director and himself one of the Hollywood 10, and other former Reds, identified 9 as onetime Communists.

Twenty-one witnesses have taken the stand to date. Six have admitted past Communist Party membership: Hayden, Collins, Dmytryk, Larry Parks, and Marc Lawrence, actors, and Mrs. Meta R. Rosenberg, former story editor at Paramount Studios.

Fourteen have refused to state whether they were or are Communists, on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. They are:

Anne Revere, Gale Sondergaard, actresses; Howard da Silva, Will Geer, Morris Carnovsky, Victor Killian and Fred Graff, actors; Paul Jarrico, Waldo Salt, Abraham Lincoln Polonsky, Robert Lees, and Harold Buchman, screen writers; Sam Moore, radio writer, and George Willner, writers' agent.

One witness has denied ever having been a Red, althought admitting association with front organizations. He was John Garfield, stage and screen star.

The committee assumes that when a witness refuses to answer questions on communism it is because a truthful answer would be self-incriminating. The Congressmen have developed a technique which points up the issue sharply. For example, when Polonsky was asked whether he was a member of the Silver Shirts, a right-wing subversive group, he answered angrily:

"You know what the Silver Shirts is—it's a dirty Fascist organization!"

The next question followed quickly: "Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

"I decline to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me," Polonsky said softly.

Then the final challenging query: "Can you name a single person who has appeared before this committee and answered truthfully who has been incriminated?"

Polonsky, like all other defiant witnesses, could not do so.

ATMOSPHERE HAS CHANGED

What makes the current hearings so successful, in comparison with those of 1947, is the temper of the times. Four years ago, the committee had documentary proof of the extensive infiltration of Hollywood, but it had no cooperative witnesses.

"I had a dream which became a nightmare that in the event of war with Russia I would be arrested as a friend of the Soviet Union, when, in fact, I was an enemy," Collins testified.

One major reason the cooperative witnesses broke with the party was its totalitarian discipline, the strait-jacket put on independent thought.

"They felt they had the key to all problems," Hayden said. "Everything was predetermined."

"I began to feel like a trained zombie," Collins declared.

"I objected to 'thought control,'" Dmytryk asserted.

These former Reds testified that it was idealism that brought them into the party and idealism that took them out.

Mrs. Rosenberg put her experience this way:

"I was an anti-Nazi and anti-Franco, and it seemed perfectly reasonable to join the Communist Party, which was the most violently anti-Hitler and pro-Loyalist organization in America."

The committee still has to hear at least 20 more witnesses, including a half dozen or so who have been avoiding service of subpenas and these headliners:

Jose Ferrer, this year's Academy Award winner; Budd Schulberg, novelist, whose The Disenchanted currently is a best seller; Abe Burrows, television and radio comedian and writer of Duffy's Tavern and Robert Rossen, director-producer, whose All the King's Men won an Oscar in 1949.

Truman-Acheson Fail To Answer General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to an excellent editorial in a recent issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

In a letter to President Truman in February of this year, I asked among other things:

What is your objective in Korea? Are Americans to go on fighting and dying endlessly and forever with practically no help on the ground from other members of the United Nations? In utmost sincerity, and lacking a definition of your objective, I must again demand that you evacuate our ground forces from Korea. If you think you have a valid reason for continuing the war under present conditions, tell me what it is. I insist the American people deserve more from you than vague generalities and evasion.

It was my contention in letters to the President in January and again in February that the United States could not win a war of attrition against the Asian forces that could be mobilized; that our forces should be evacuated from Korea and followed with an effective sea and air blockade of the Chinese mainland and Hong Kong to stop the flow of war materials to the Communists, meanwhile protecting Japan, Formosa, and other strategic islands.

No reply has been received from Truman in response to either of these letters. It is obvious that the President is as unprepared now as he was in January and February to provide the citizens of this country with information to which they are fully entitled.

As the Waterloo Daily Courier well points out, continuation of this half war is intolerable. Here is the editorial:

WE MIGHT GET IN WAR

Both President Truman and Defense Secretary Marshall have attempted to answer the criticisms of General MacArthur. Their constant refrain is that following the MacArthur policy might get us into war with Russia.

All will agree that possible Soviet intervention must be carefully weighed. Running the danger of war has been inherent in every decision we have made since VE-day. We ran that risk in Iran. We ran it in Greece and in Berlin. And, finally, the possibility that Russia might intervene obviously had to be considered in making the decision to send troops to Korea.

Let us suppose, however, that the administration has authoritative information that Russia will enter the war if the MacArthur policies are adopted. Is it conceivable that the Kremlin would intervene rather than let us win a speedy MacArthur victory in Korea, but would not intervene to prevent a slow Truman victory after many years of fighting and enormous casualties on both sides?

In other words, if Russia intervenes in Korea, she will obviously do so for only one purpose—to prevent us from winning the war there. If the Kremlin is going to fight, it will fight equally hard to prevent a slow Truman victory as a speedy MacArthur victory. The only purpose of war is victory and if Russia proposes to win a Communist victory in Korea she will intervene whether the MacArthur or Truman policy is adopted. It makes no difference.

Perhaps, however, Truman does not propose to win in Korea. Perhaps he and Acheson are still clinging to the forlorn British hope for a negotiated peace following a stalemate. Then the Truman policies become equally intolerable. For in that case American troops are being sacrificed in a gamble that has so far proved vain and from all signs will continue to be so.

For if the administration does not even propose to win the Korean war, then its only alternative is to get out of Korea. It is not defensible to send an army into Korea and then refuse to give it maximum support. The public will not long tolerate continued casualties in Korea when the only objective in view is a stalemate based on the unreasonable hope for a negotiated peace. We cannot engage in a little war and then let it drag on for years because we are afraid an attempt to win it would result in a larger war. If the administration thinks Russia will not let us win in Korea, then it should never have entered the conflict in the first place.

The net effect of Truman's and Marshall's arguments in attempting to answer MacArthur, therefore, is to build up a convincing case for withdrawing from Korea entirely. If the fear of atomic war as pictured

by the President is to deter us from giving full support to our troops in Korea, then we must withdraw from Korea.

Truman and Marshall have not answered MacArthur's arguments. If their conclusions are sound, the only course is to withdraw from Korea entirely. Continuation of the half war is intolerable from any point of view.

Study in Vacuums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, which may serve to clear up some of the confusion which has existed over the question whether or not the administration has devised a policy for the conduct of far-eastern affairs. The conclusion is reached that a principle exists, still unimplemented by any established policy.

STUDY IN VACUUMS

General MacArthur says a policy vacuum exists toward Korea.

Warren Austin, top American delegate to the U. N., replies that there is a clear, positive, and consistent policy on Korea.

Mr. Citizen, trying to resolve these skirmishings in the great debate, may suffer a clear, positive vacuum all his own.

Could the trouble, the confusion, lie in definitions? Could a brief sortie into semantics help Mr. Citizen straighten his thinking? He could start with Mr. Austin's concise definition of policy in Korea:

"Militarily, the objective is to repel the aggression and restore international peace and security in the area. Politically, the objective is to establish a unified, independent and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea."

This, Mr. Austin says, is policy. Now Mr. Citizen might turn from Austin to Webster, and look up the definition of "policy." One of the most common is "a settled or definite course or method adopted and followed." From there Mr. Citizen might flip ahead a few pages and look up the word "principle." Here again several definitions; the one most widely used is "a governing law of conduct * * * settled rule of action."

Now back once more to Mr. Austin's quoted definition of what we're doing in Korea. Is it best covered by the word "policy" or "principle"?

If we are to take principle as a law of conduct, and policy as a definite method, then a good case can be made that we have fine principles in Korea but no policy. Repelling aggression and restoring peace is a generality. It is the diplomatic way of phrasing an old individual right, the right to slap down a bully and keep peace in the home. It is a principle of freedom.

Perhaps Mr. Citizen will arrive at the opinion that policy adds the "how" to principle's "what." He might even decide that there would be no quarrel at all if the administration and the U. N. would change their label of policy to principle and cling to it; then implement it with MacArthur's policy.

American Successes; Russian Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, for clear-cut statement of American foreign policy I commend the reading of the editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser entitled "American Successes; Russian Failures":

AMERICAN SUCCESSES; RUSSIAN FAILURES

President Truman is probably too harried a man to have pondered the fact that after 6 years of relentless, resounding attack, the "event MacArthur" has suddenly brought him the ardent support of a majority of American papers. Like the Advertiser, these newspapers have been incessantly hostile to Mr. Truman on domestic issues, but they consider that in this case he represents right and wisdom. In general the Advertiser has been in good company in its views on the struggle with Russia; our views have been harmonious with such papers as the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Post, the Hartford Courant, the Atlanta Journal, the Louisville Courier-Journal. This is reassuring. Equally reassuring is the fact that our viewpoint is opposite to that of the inexcusable Chicago Tribune and the unpardonable Hearst press.

The following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal is specifically similar to the viewpoint expressed on this page repeatedly:

"It is being charged with increasing irresponsibility that the United States has no foreign policy, that our military and diplomatic leaders are 'drifting,' that we have failed to take a strong stand against communism.

"What is the record?

"Was the decision to aid Greece, a program that stopped Communist aggression in southeast Europe, a policy of 'drift'?

"Was there lack of action and determination in the Turkish aid program which made that nation a southern bastion against Russia?

"Was there lack of imagination and inaction in the Marshall plan, which saved Europe from economic collapse?

"Was the North Atlantic Defense Pact 'softness' toward communism?

"Did the Berlin airlift, which blocked the Russian plan to squeeze us out, show lack of courage and determination?

"Is our sending American troops to Europe in peacetime a passive subjection to Russia?

"Was our decision to stand against Communist aggression in Korea in company with the United Nations 'appeasement' of communism?

"Of course not.

"All of these programs and the decisions which led to them were courageous, bold, imaginative, and clear warnings to the Communist world. Each was the opposite of appeasement. Each hurt communism and hobbled Russia's program for expansion and aggression. Each saved a part of the free world.

"Who made these decisions and took these actions which have no peacetime parallel in American history? The administration—the political, military, and diplomatic leaders of both parties who are still directing our foreign and military policies.

"By what logic does anyone believe that men who were capable of such successful and realistic programs and policies should suddenly become inept drifters, appeasers, and not deserving of confidence?

"These men—again, men who represent both parties—have been a winning combination. They have made errors, of course. But does a baseball manager break up a winning team every time a shortstop overthrows first base or an infielder misjudges a fly ball?"

The Advertiser considers it important to harp on these American successes because of the national propensity for swift commuting between optimism and pessimism. We are disposed to have eyes only for Russia's successes and America's failures. It is in order to consider that time after time Russia has been frustrated or defeated in her aims.

For example, we fume and agonize over the lack of full support from our allies. And this newspaper does not hedge in acknowledging that the response of America's allies leaves much to be desired. But on that basis, Russia has twice and thrice the cause for grief that America has. None of our allies has fallen away as Yugoslavia has fallen away from Russia. That was a massive disaster for Russia. The rebelliousness in the satellite countries is well established.

The anxieties and difficulties of the Russians are immense (as MacArthur brought out). It is not realistic to blind ourselves to Russia's difficulties, any more than it is to became complacent over her advantages.

Russia was more exercised over the delayed opening of a second front in the course of a 2-year period in War II than we are about the instantaneous end of the Korean war. Even the English people grew restless and outspoken, just as we are today. But they had to wait. Rome wasn't built in a day.

We Can't Afford Their Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the May 4, 1951, issue of the Arizona Plain Talk. It certainly speaks for itself.

WE CAN'T AFFORD THEIR STUPIDITY

The matter of getting water for Arizona's farms, and hydroelectric power for its industries is all-important to the future of the State. Yet that matter has been left in the hands of the same people who failed in the past—and who have apparently learned nothing by their defeat.

To begin with, they have not learned that securing the water of the Colorado River cannot be accomplished by hurling accusations against the inhabitants of the sovereign State of California. It can only be accomplished by convincing the remaining States of the Union that we have a thoroughly sound project, on which the better than three quarters of a billion of Federal dollars necessary to make it an actuality would be well spent.

The central Arizona project, as it now stands, is decidedly not a project for which a conscientious legislator could vote the expenditure of a cast amount of Federal money because (see April 27 issue of Plain Talk) over 50 percent of the land within the project's area is owned by a few hundred excess acreage farmers and syndicates. These individuals and corporations, some 420 in all, have not only taken up holdings far larger

than the 160 acres allowed to participants in a Federal irrigation project; but they have put themselves in a position, by sinking wells to the underground basins which the diverted waters of the Colorado would flood, to get water for which they would pay back nothing.

These facts have been exposed on the floor of Congress. What's more, a group of Congressmen recently made an on-the-spot investigation for themselves. As a result, the central Arizona project was killed in committee; and we predict it will never come to life until we in Arizona come to our senses and secure the services of a new organization to put the project over.

But what has happened has evidently made no impression either on the political leaders winking at the irregularities which discredit the project with the rest of the country or the highly paid mishandlers of public relations, with their senseless program of vilification against California.

Both of these groups continue to act as if their managing of this important matter deserves our confidence, not to mention every nickel they can shake us down for. Meanwhile neither of these groups has shown any evidence of a change in their thinking or course of procedure.

Well, do we, the rest of us, want the water, or don't we? If we do, we'd better devise a way to shake off the free riders, and we had better create a public relations plan—conceived on a level of adult intelligence instead of one of childish name-calling—which will sell the project to the 46 States whose votes we need.

Why William Crawford Gorgas Was Elected to the New York University Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege today to obtain unanimous consent of the House of Representatives to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay by Miss Clarice Sanford entitled "Why William Crawford Gorgas Was Elected to the New York University Hall of Fame." Miss Sanford is a student at the Thomas W. Martin High School in Gorgas, Walker County, Ala.

On March 5, 1951, Mr. Martin, for whom the high school at Gorgas was named, expressed interest in the school and its students by offering a prize of $150 and a trip to New York City for the best essay written by a member of the senior class on the subject, why William Crawford Gorgas was elected to the New York University hall of fame. The trip to New York City was offered to enable the student to attend the unveiling ceremony of the bust of Dr. Gorgas to be held at the Hall of Fame of Great Americans on May 24, 1951.

Dr. J. M. Mason, Birmingham; Dr. John Temple Graves, Birmingham; and Dr. J. C. Gladney, of Jasper, were announced as the judges for the contest, and on April 26 they announced Miss Clarice Sanford, of Good Springs, Ala., as the winner, with Miss Barbara Widman as runner-up.

The Seventh Congressional District is proud and appreciative of the honor that has come to Alabama by the election of one of its great sons to the New York University Hall of Fame.

I am likewise proud that one of the finest communities of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent was named for the great Gorgas, whose contributions to mankind in the fields of medicine and sanitation loom larger in their significance with each passing year.

Mr. Thomas W. Martin has performed a fine public service through the years in calling the accomplishments of General Gorgas to the attention of Americans everywhere. His efforts in this direction stimulated Miss Sanford to write her talented essay on Gorgas.

Miss Sanford's essay reads as follows:

WHY WILLIAM CRAWFORD GORGAS WAS ELECTED TO THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY HALL OF FAME

(By Clarice Sanford, Martin High School, Gorgas, Ala.)

Fame cannot be measured. Neither can William Crawford Gorgas' services to humanity. He was great in the eyes of great men and in the eyes of uneducated laborers.

Perhaps yellow fever had more influence in the life of William Crawford Gorgas than of any other person in the world. Indirectly, or in some cases directly, yellow fever caused the major stages of his life to be directed over a path, seemingly well planned by some superior being.

The first part yellow fever played in the life of Gorgas was bringing his parents together. Even before William was born, it seemed the fates were weaving his life around a pattern of yellow fever. In October of the year 1853, an epidemic of this dreaded disease ravaged Mobile, and naturally caused a hurried evacuation of the city. Amelia Gayle moved from there to Mount Vernon away from swamps and yellow jack, and here she met a promising young officer, Josiah Gorgas. After a brief courtship, the two were married, and this daughter of a former governor of Alabama settled down in an aristocratic old house to rear a family.

William Crawford, the first child of the Gorgas', was born on October 3, 1854. Josiah had been placed in command of the army arsenal at Mount Vernon; therefore his son grew up learning and loving army life.

After the Civil War, Josiah Gorgas was appointed president of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn. William grew up at Sewanee. He was a slender, handsome youth, energetic and generally popular. A baseball field seemed to be the place in which William was more at home during the first years of his college life. While his enthusiasm for sports was at its peak, he was an extremely bad student, but in his final year, he turned scholarly. He won the Alabama medal for class leadership, and to cap the stack he began pining for a military career.

Gorgas' father discouraged this ambition, so he went to New Orleans and studied law for a year. He knew from the beginning that he would always detest this profession, and several times during that year he applied in vain for admission to the United States Military Academy. Finally, he decided that the only remaining possibility for an army life was for him to win a degree in medicine and thereby enter the Army Medical Corps.

At that time Gorgas had no interest whatsoever in medicine; his sole goal was the army. With this in mind he set in to learn medicine. His father strongly protested his becoming an army doctor, for next to a navy medical man, he considered an army doctor the lowest form of animal life in existence.

The first 2 years of medical school were mostly financed by the old captain, and during this time Gorgas became casually interested in his medical studies. Casual interest soon changed to enthusiasm, and when his father was no longer able to send funds, he stayed on, frequently hungry. While other students drank and caroused, Gorgas could be found studying.

In June, when he was 24, William Gorgas received his degree as doctor of medicine. At commencement, which was held in one of New York's most handsome theaters, the Academy of Music, Dr. Gorgas was favored with a beautiful bouquet of roses—his first flowers of praise on the way to fame.

One year after being awarded his doctor's degree, Gorgas entered the Medical Corps. The first years of his life as a first lieutenant were spent in typical frontier posts. After disposing of his work as sanitation inspector, hospital work, record keeping, and dozens of other army tasks, he found opportunity for outside fee work. There was plenty of such work due to blizzards, floods, hurricanes, plagues, and, most tragic of all, yellow fever, but usually the fees were lacking.

In addition to the life of a typical army doctor and keeping up his social obligations, Gorgas continued his study of medical science. He probed into this science which had been awakened by such men as Pasteur, Lister, and Koch. William Gorgas was helping medical science to plunge forward, but yellow fever, apparently ignorant of this march of science, steadily increased.

Dr. Gorgas' first real combat with yellow fever was at Fort Brown, Tex. Over 23,000 cases of yellow fever were well on their way when Gorgas finally arrived. There were differences of opinion as to the cause of this disease. Some said a "yellow fever breeze" brought it across the Rio Grande from Mexico; others laid the blame on bananas and oranges; but most everyone agreed on the preventives—mustard seed and whisky.

While doing what he could to relieve the sufferers, Dr. Gorgas met Marie Doughty. She was afflicted with yellow fever, and everyone concerned agreed that it was best to bury such victims as soon as possible after death, so her grave was made ready. Gorgas was also stricken, and while the two were convalescing, they began their courtship. Later, they were married. Thus yellow fever was responsible for another major happening in the life of William Gorgas.

When Gorgas, then known as the yellow fever specialist, was appointed sanitary officer and commissioned to Habana; ahead of him was a real job of cleaning up a pesthole of filth. Already several doctors had put forth theories concerning how yellow fever germs were transmitted, but not a one of them offered a solution. Walter Reed was also sent to Habana, and when he satisfactorily demonstrated that a certain type of mosquito does carry yellow fever germs, it was considered by scientists as merely a brilliant statement. They didn't see how the mosquito could be punished, without having been proven guilty.

To the people of Habana, Reed's discovery came like a sentence of death. To them it seemed just as impossible to banish the mosquitos as it would be to banish the air which they thickened. Were they always to live knowing their enemy and dreading to even sleep? What Reed regarded as accomplishment merely added horror to the lives of the people in Habana.

In about 6 months, Gorgas had made the city the cleanest of all tropical cities. Since it was so clean and attractive, immigrants started pouring in. Yellow fever, seemingly in subjugation, broke out anew with this fresh supply of blood with no resistance. When Gorgas saw that his clean-up campaign had failed to ward off this worst epidemic, he started from a different angle.

The Alabama doctor started studying the disease-carrying mosquito. The sanitation campaign had cleaned up some of the breeding places of the mosquito, but now Gorgas undertook the embarrassing job of going into private homes. Inside buildings was the favorite breeding place of the mosquito. The home inspection did not cause Gorgas to become unpopular, however; instead it brought him nearer the hearts of the group of humanity he was serving.

The second anti-yellow-fever war in Habana lasted about 6 months and was indeed a great success. Just the beautiful, healthful city of Habana and the pride which the Cubans have in the city is a living monument to the work of William Crawford Gorgas.

In June of 1905, Gorgas was sent to Panama where the United States was attempting to dig a canal. The French had failed on this very project because of the yellow fever and other diseases which were far too common. When Gorgas asked the Canal Commission for the necessary materials to launch an attack against disease, they scoffed at his requests for screen wire and oil spray.

The Governor of the Canal Zone, the Chairman of the Canal Commission, and other officials were not reluctant in getting appropriations for coffins, but they did not try to understand why the sanitation committee needed screen wire to clean up the Canal Zone.

While Gorgas and his helpers struggled against all this official opposition, yellow fever was getting the upper hand. As soon as a boat load of workers unloaded, they got a view of a row of coffins, not empty ones, and became frantic trying to get return passage on the same boat.

After what seemed endless delay, help arrived from the United States with more doctors and nurses and the attack on yellow fever began to gain ground, and by September of 1906 it was fairly well under control.

Though the Senators and Canal Commission officials had stamped and declared in a loud voice that the Big Ditch was an impossibility, Gorgas proved that neither it nor he was a failure. The greatest handicap had been the politicians who seemed to think they knew so much about Panama, even though they had never been nearer than Washington, D. C. The feelings of the great doctor must have been a mixture of the pride of a conqueror with humble gratefulness to God.

Even after Gorgas had so nearly completely abolished yellow fever, some of the Commission tried to have him replaced. They did not believe all that nonsense about the mosquito and claimed that every mosquito that Gorgas killed had cost the United States $10. Fortunately, President Theodore Roosevelt refused to carry out the recommendation of firing Gorgas.

The presidency of the University of Alabama was offered to Gorgas, but he declined this offer so that he might carry on as a helper of humanity. Along about this time he received honorary degrees from Harvard, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, and the University of the South.

Gorgas realized that the completion of the Panama Canal had been a triumphant accomplishment, but he could not keep from thinking of the millions of sufferers in other lands. Truly, this doctor had dedicated his life in making the lives of others happier.

Diamond mines had been opened in South Africa, and as is sometimes the case where wealth is involved, greedy operators were cruelly mistreating the workers. Heedless of the needs, diseases, and even deaths of their workers, the operators paid wages on which health could not be maintained. Due to unsanitary housing conditions, unnourishing food, and scanty clothing, the Negro workers were dying of "minus pneumonia." This disease spreads like wildfire, for the Negro is especially susceptible to lung disease.

Months of investigations and hard work soon slackened death's pace, and a Gorgas assistant was left as sanitation director. The British Empire was in charge of the mines, and they, the British, were thankful for the lives of their workers being saved. During this time the elderly doctor was promoted to Surgeon General, and he toured parts of South Africa spreading good will, and good advice. His audiences usually consisted of farmers, and he spoke on sanitation and malaria control.

Since the opening of the Panama Canal meant that people from all parts of the world would be traveling at proximity to the United States, the Americans realized that the whole globe must be freed from yellow fever. The International Health Board made Gorgas director of a world-wide campaign against yellow jack.

Then the United States declared war on Germany, and as Gorgas was a general, he had work to do. Base hospitals were built; sick and wounded were cared for; preventive serums were injected; the doctor was leading a busy, useful life at an age when most men are retired.

Although he had conquered an enemy which killed more men than actual bullets did, Gorgas still dreamed of leading men into actual combat. At the age of 64, the yellow fever specialist said that he still had not realized his full army ambition. He wished that his rank could be reduced from major general in the Medical Corps to brigadier general on active duty at the head of a brigade of Alabamians. He was not a warmonger, however, for about this time one of his aides heard him remark that he wished the war were over. If so, he would go to South America and exterminate the last wisp of yellow fever from the earth.

After the armistice was signed, General Gorgas was retired. When reports of outbreaks of yellow fever came from West Africa, Gorgas was off to the battle. The Harbin Medal for services to mankind, awarded by Belgium, was to be presented to Dr. Gorgas at the International Hygiene Conference at Brussels in 1920.

On the day after Gorgas landed in London, he was taken ill. Being a doctor, he had a fairly accurate conception of his condition, so while lying in bed at Willbank Hospital, he stated quietly that he would fight to the last, though he believed he was dying.

The King of England visited Gorgas at the hospital and in a simple ceremony presented him the insignia of the Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George.

About 4 weeks later, Dr. William Crawford Gorgas died. His funeral was held at St. Paul's Cathedral, and his body was returned to Arlington Cemetery.

William Crawford Gorgas is without a doubt justly represented in the New York University Hall of Fame for Great Americans. Not only has he won the respect and admiration of Americans, but of suffering humanity everywhere in the world.

Rubber for the Wheels of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a very timely editorial published in the Albion Journal-Register, Albion, Ill., last week in which this splendid paper cries out against the shipment of strategic material to Red China through the connivance of the British Government.

I believe this short editorial will be of interest to the Members of the House:

RUBBER FOR THE WHEELS OF CHINA

As the American battle toll this week mounted to more than 62,000 men, killed, wounded, and missing, Great Britain grudgingly announced that it has finally suspended shipment of war materials to Red China. That announcement came only after an exposé of trade relations between England and China shocked all democratic nations, and stirred deep indignation in these United States.

England as a member of the United Nations—is supposed to be supporting the U. N.'s decision to resist aggression wherever aggression appears—even has a tiny fighting force in Korea—but, England and British companies in the Far East shipped more crude rubber into Red China during the first 9 months of the Korean war, than during the whole of 1949.

Number 10 Downing Street is now opposing sanctions against the Chinese Reds. The move to blockade the Chinese coast and ports—one of the strongest weapons against any aggressor—is bogged down in U. N. red tape.

Why?

That's the question the majority of Americans are asking.

Why are our men dying in Korea in a campaign that precludes either victory or a quick and decisive end to the conflict?

Why must American delegates to the U. N. wrangle with other delegations for days or weeks before sanctions against Red China can be made effective?

Why should England, while attempting to dictate U. N. policy, traffic in war materials with the government that is killing and maiming American troops?

Why does the United States—and that means our State Department as well as the Executive—permit the U. N. to vacillate, permit the pinko denizens of Downing Street to traffic with the enemy, permit our men to die while the rest of the world and especially the British empire, profit from their bloodshed?

How long are Americans going to permit a continuation of the Korean fiasco? How soon will they issue a mandate to the White House and to Congress? How soon will they demand that we either fight to win in Korea, or pack up and come home?

How long is it going to take the American people to discover that the U. N. is playing the United States for a sucker? How long must we delay notifying the other U. N. members that unless they support the Korean effort, support it wholeheartedly and with troops and guns and matériel, that we're through supplying the goon squad while they play footsie with the Reds.

It's about time that the United States notified the world that as long as we're furnishing the men, the supplies, and the money, that we're going to make the rules.

The Defense Secretary Makes Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "The Defense Secretary Makes Answer" which appeared in the May 9 edition of the New Haven (Conn.) Evening Register. This editorial is a penetrating and thoughtful analysis of the testimony of Secretary of Defense George Marshall and General MacArthur. I should like to call particular attention to one sentence of the editorial:

The whole MacArthur program of protest appears to us as a very serious mistake and as a major blunder.

The editorial follows:

THE DEFENSE SECRETARY MAKES ANSWER

At the outset The Register wishes to state that it finds itself almost completely in accord with everything that Secretary of Defense Marshall has thus far had to say in stating the political and military program which this country now proposes to follow.

Secretary Marshall has testified that in his opinion General MacArthur's Korean war plans would risk our involvement in an all-out war. He has said they might cause the United States to alienate and possibly lose its European allies. The Register is in complete accord with this opinion.

We might even be franker in the matter and say that Secretary Marshall is in complete accord with us. For in a front page editorial at the time of General MacArthur's sudden dismissal this newspaper urged against any extension of the land war in Asia with realization that this represented but one phase of the global picture.

In that editorial it was advocated that we protect the situation in the west, that we take into consideration the views of our allies in Europe and in the United Nations, and that we must continue to cooperate with them. Failure to do so would weaken or destroy the United Nations effort, both in Korea and elsewhere, perhaps leaving us to act alone. It would tend to break down the Atlantic Pact and lessen the European will to resist aggression.

It is certainly time that the American people cast aside their illusions and realized it is all very well for the United States to assume leadership, but in so doing it must preserve harmony and unity with its allies.

One may well hesitate to criticize General MacArthur too severely. Nevertheless, he seems to have fallen into error through his great enthusiasm for a sweeping victory in the Far East. This might be accomplished. But it also might not unless we threw the major part of our military resources in men and war materials into a supreme struggle in that area—a very serious gamble, the failure of which might lead to disaster to the whole cause of global defense against Communist aggression.

The general took it upon himself to determine military, diplomatic, and political policy from the standpoint of Asia alone. This would be taking a chance, and a very desperate one.

The whole MacArthur program of protest appears to us as a very serious mistake and as a major blunder. As was suggested in our editorial of April 11, nothing has been accomplished except to widen the growing misunderstanding between the United States and its allies and to alienate them, to cool their ardor for further cooperation in Europe, and even to lead to a possible complete breach with them.

Worst of all, the matter of our foreign policy is now being rehearsed in public for the benefit of Russia and Red China. These two countries can now make their plans for the immediate future in view of what appears to be a lack of definite policy agreement between the United States and its allies. This ventilation of our disagreements with Britain, France, and others of our United Nations allies can only be viewed as a serious weakening of our leadership. This is very likely to present new and difficult problems of global security for us and for the United Nations.

Already our actions in the Far East have nearly upset the British Cabinet, causing resignations from its membership, and brought President Auriol on a hurried and unprecedented visit to Washington to assure us that the present French Cabinet crisis will not alter French cooperation. General MacArthur's suggestion that America, in spite of this, should assume world leadership might easily leave us in the seemingly glorious but inconsequential position of leadership with only reluctant and unenthusiastic supporters and followers.

Reorganization of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my colleague, Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, in the introduction of a bill to provide for the reorganization of the Department of State of the United States in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of affairs, both foreign and domestic. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to explain my views regarding the need for such action.

This bill as introduced by Senator CASE has been designated as S. 1389, and was introduced April 26, 1951.

NEED FOR REORGANIZATION

The people of the United States, and possibly many of the people of the world, have lost faith in our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. They no longer have the trust and confidence that is needed in an official who holds the position that Secretary Acheson holds. Especially in times as critical as these do we need someone at the head of our Department of State who not only has the confidence of the people of this Nation, but the people of the world as a whole.

When this situation exists, the people of the Nation look to Congress to bring about the changes they feel should be made in the executive branch of the Government.

There are probably three involuntary methods of replacing an official in the executive branch:

First. Discharge.

Second. Impeaching.

Third. Reorganization of the department.

The first of these methods—discharge—is probably too remote to warrant consideration. The Secretary of State is responsible only to the President, and it is extremely unlikely that the President would discharge the present Secretary.

The second ground—impeachment—is the ground I should first like to have you consider with me. It is my purpose to outline to you the grounds, the procedure, and the evidence that you may be fully advised and reach your own decision, but after my study, I have come to the conclusion that, although grounds for impeachment may exist, the process is lengthy. It would require much time on the part of the House and Senate, and at a time when the fate of the Nation may be hanging in the balance, I wonder about the advisability of such a proceeding.

Under these circumstances, I have come to the conclusion that the better method of accomplishing the purpose of this Congress is to reorganize the Department of State. My colleague, FRANCIS CASE, for many years a member of this body, has developed a program for reorganization which is complete in every detail and which would make for a better and more efficient Department, even though no other purpose were being served thereby.

GROUNDS FOR IMPEACHMENT

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States bearing upon impeachment which might be involved in this study include:

Article I, section 2, clause 5:

The House of Representatives * * * shall have the sole power of impeachment.

Article I, section 3, clause 6:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

Article II, section 4:

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

The grounds for impeachment, stated in article II, section 4, are treason, bribery, and "other high crimes and misdemeanors." The terms "treason" and "bribery" require no definition. Treason, in fact, is defined in article III, section 3 of the Constitution, and the meaning of bribery is well established—Yankwich, district judge, Impeachment of Civil Officers Under the Federal Constitution, 1938, 26 Geo. L. J. at pages 852–853; Third Willoughby on the Constitution, 1929, at page 1449.

The only real question arises as to the meaning of "high crimes and misdemeanors." It has been argued that the phrase comprehends only crimes or offenses under the Federal statutes, the Constitution or the common law. But the view sustained by the better authority is than an offense may be grounds for impeachment even though not a statutory or common law crime—Yankwich, opere citato supra, at pages 853, 860—"a study of English and American precedents in impeachment cases leads to the conclusion that they cover general official misconduct"; from the precedents "it is evident that the interpretation which is placed upon the words 'crimes and misdemeanors' is a broad one; that persons have been impeached and found guilty for acts of misconduct, some of a personal, others of an official character which do not amount to a crime"—Third Willoughby, opere citato supra, at pages 1449–1450; Simpson, Federal Impeachment, 1916, Sixty-fourth University of Pennsylvania Review, at pages 676–695; Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, fourth edition, sections 796–800; First Tucker on the Constitution, 1899, section 200. In Second Watson, opere citato supra, pages 1034–1035, the author declares:

Blackstone says that a crime or misdemeanor is an act committed, or omitted, in violation of a public law either forbidding or commanding it, though crime in a narrower sense is distinguished from a misdemeanor as being an offense of a deeper and more atrocious dye, and usually amounting to a felony.

A misdemeanor comprehends all indictable offenses which do not amount to a felony; as perjury, battery, libels, conspiracies, attempts and solicitations to commit felonies, and so forth. These seem to be the definitions of these terms at common law, but it would be strange if a civil officer could be impeached for only such offenses as are embraced within the common law definition of "other high crimes and misdemeanors." There is a parliamentary definition of the term "misdemeanor," and a modern writer on the Constitution has said: "The term 'high crimes and misdemeanors' has no significance in the common law concerning crimes subject to indictment." It can only be found in the law of Parliament, and is the technical term which was used by the Commons at the Bar of the Lords for centuries before the existence of the United States. Synonymous with the term "misdemeanor" are the terms misdeed, misconduct, misbehavior, fault, transgression.

Suppose the President of the United States should insist upon using the White House for some purpose which would bring moral disgrace upon the Nation and the established rules of civilized society. Is it to be claimed that he would not be liable to impeachment for such conduct because the offense was not indictable under a Federal law? Or suppose he should refuse to perform the duties, or some of them, which the Constitution enjoins upon him? Would it be claimed that he was not impeachable? In *Mississippi* v. *Johnson*, supra, (4 Wall. 475), Chase, Chief Justice, asked, "May not the House of Representatives impeach the President for refusing to execute the laws of Congress?" Suppose the Vice President should refuse to preside over the Senate, or to discharge any of the duties incumbent upon his high office? There is no statute under which he could be indicted and consequently he would escape punishment and would continue to hold his office and embarrass the operation of the Government, but will it be claimed that he would not be subject to impeachment? The managers on behalf of the House of Representatives in the impeachment of President Johnson crystallized the doctrine of impeachable offenses into the following rule: "An impeachable crime or misdemeanor is one in its nature or consequence subversive of some fundamental or essential principle of Government or highly prejudicial to the public interest, and this may consist of a violation of the Constitution, of law, of an official oath, or of duty, by an act committed or omitted, or, without violating a positive law, by the abuse of discretionary powers from improper motives, or from any improper purpose."

The author further states—pages 1036 to 1037:

A civil officer may so behave himself in public as to bring disgrace upon himself and shame upon his country, and he may continue to do this until his name would become a national stench, and yet he would not be subject to indictment by any law of the United States, but he certainly could be impeached. What will these who advocate the doctrine that impeachment will not lie except for an offense punishable by statute, do with the constitutional provision relative to judges which says, "Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior?" This means that as long as they behave themselves their tenure of office is fixed, and they cannot be disturbed. But suppose they cease to behave themselves? When the Constitution says, "A judge shall hold his office during good behavior," it means that he shall not hold it when it ceases to be good. Suppose he should refuse to sit upon the bench and discharge the duties which the Constitution and the law enjoin upon him, or should become a notoriously corrupt character, and live a notoriously corrupt and debauched life? He could not be indicted for such conduct, and he could not be removed except by impeachment. Would it be claimed that impeachment would not be the proper remedy in such a case?

And in connection with the investigation of the conduct of District Judge English, the House Committee on the Judiciary made the following statement in its report—House Report No. 653, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session—as set out in six Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, 1936, section 545:

Although frequently debated, and the negative advocated by some high authorities, it is now, we believe, considered that impeachment is not confined alone to acts which are forbidden by the Constitution or Federal statutes. The better sustained and modern view is that the provision for impeachment in the Constitution applies not only to high crimes and misdemeanors as those words were understood at common law but also acts which are not defined as criminal and made subject to indictment, but also to those which affect the public welfare. Thus an official may be impeached for offenses of a political character and for gross betrayal of public interests. Also for abuses or betrayal of trusts, for inexcusable negligence of duty, for the tyrannical abuse of power, or, as one writer puts it, for a "breach of official duty by malfeasance or misfeasance, including conduct such as drunkenness when habitual, or in the performance of official duties, gross indecency, profanity, obscenity, or other language used in the discharge of an official function, which tends to bring the office into disrepute, or for an abuse or reckless exercise of discretionary power as well as the breach of an official duty imposed by statute or common law."

The committee held, however, that "No judge may be impeached for a wrong decision"—Sixth Cannon's, opere citato supra.

PERSONS AND OFFENSES COVERED

As indicated above, article II, section 4, of the Constitution designates who may be removed by impeachment, and the offenses, including treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors:

Impeachment is a criminal trial. A true crime must be charged, and the jurisdiction of the Senate is neither more extensive nor more restricted than that of the House of Lords in respect to the nature of the offenses charged. * * * Whether a crime ("Crime" is used, not in a technical sense, but as meaning a "criminal act," the chief element of which is the evil, as distinguished from the virtuous intention) does or does not appear can be determined to some extent by decisions of the Senate in cases of impeachment, but is chiefly to be decided by common-law rulings in similar cases; and in new cases we must frequently be guided by the definitions furnished us by writers on the criminal law, as a result of a close study of the cases decided in the common-law courts. (Impeachable Offenses Under the Constitution of the United States, by George Willett Van Nest, American Law Review, June 27, 1882, pp. 818–819.)

INITIATION OF IMPEACHMENT

The sole power of impeachment is conferred upon the House by article I, section 2, clause 5, of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment.

Impeachment may be initiated by charges made on the floor by a Member on his own responsibility. The question of impeachment is one of constitutional privilege which may be presented at any time by any Member of the House, but recognition to raise a question of constitutional privilege must be preceded by a resolution or notice in writing, and a mere proposition to investigate the conduct of a civil officer is not presented as a matter of constitutional privilege, even though impeachment may be contemplated. Impeachment may also be initiated by a memorial containing charges under oath, by a message from the President, by a charge preferred by a State or territorial legislature, and by petition.

Charges always have been examined by the House before impeachments have been voted. After the charge is originally made, it is by resolution referred to a standing committee, or to a special committee for investigation and report. The investigation by the committee may be conducted ex parte, or it may be conducted to permit respondent to appear in person and by counsel to testify, to present witnesses, and to cross-examine. The House of Representatives, when acting in impeachment proceedings, has the power to compel the attendance of witnesses. The investigations are conducted more or less according to the established rules of evidence, but the strict rules of evidence have been relaxed. Upon the conclusion of the investigation by the designated committee, a report favoring impeachment may be referred to the House Calendar or may be committed to the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union. If the latter procedure is adopted, when debate is ended, the Committee of the Whole arises and reports its resolution to the House, whereupon the question is put: "Will the House concur with the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union in the adoption of said resolution?" Usually a record vote is taken, but it is not required.

Managers have been selected by three methods: First, election by ballot, a majority vote being required; second, by resolution naming them; and, third, by resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint. These managers are usually appointed from those in accord with the sentiment of the House and from both parties. The chairman is designated by the managers selected.

After the House has voted impeachment, it notifies the Senate thereof by message.

Upon receipt of message from the House, the Senate adopts an order and sends a message to the House that it is ready to receive articles.

The managers, on the part of the House, present to the Senate the articles of impeachment signed by the Speaker and attested by the Clerk. The Chairman of the Committee impeaches at the bar of the Senate by oral accusation and requests that the Senate take order as to appearance.

The accused may appear in person or by attorney, or he may not appear at all in which case trial proceeds as if a plea of not guilty were entered.

The sole power to try impeachments is vested in the Senate by article I, section 3, clause 6, which reads:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside. And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

On the final question of whether an impeachment is to be sustained, the yeas and nays are taken on each article separately, upon which there must be an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members present.

The extent to which a judgment in an impeachment proceeding may go is set forth in article I, section 3, clause 7, of the Constitution which reads:

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States: but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment, according to law.

GROUNDS AND EVIDENCE

In laying a foundation for any proceedings by the House of Representatives against the Secretary of State for breach of official duty by malfeasance or misfeasance of office, we should have a complete outline of the law and the acts of the Department of State leading up to the present situation—a situation in which we find ourselves engaged in a major war in Korea without United Nations authority, without constitutional authority, and without authority of Congress, a "police action" in which the United States has already suffered some 65,000 casualties, an undeclared war against at least one major power and one minor nation in which the Secretary of State was at least the moving hand in advising the President in his leadership.

The first step in obtaining a background is to find the legal, the constitutional, or the treaty basis for our involvement in Korea. In considering the legal and treaty basis, we turn to the United Nations Charter.

UNITED NATIONS AUTHORITY

The United Nations Charter, setting forth fully and completely the purpose and authority of the organization, membership, and obligations, was adopted by the Congress of the United States in July 1945.

It is the contention of the State Department that such authority as the United States had under the United Nations Charter in sending troops into Korea is under article 39 of the United Nations Charter and the resolution pursuant thereto. Article 39 reads as follows:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I call your attention to this phrase, "and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Article 41 empowers the Security Council to decide what measures not involved in the use of armed force may be employed to give effect to its decision, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. It reads as follows:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

It should be emphasized that nothing in article 41 could be constructed as authorization for the use of armed force.

Article 42 reads as follows:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Attention is called to the wording of section 42 which says, "such action 'may'."

Article 43 provides:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Again I emphasize, "and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

I would like to quote article 44:

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under article 43, invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

This further points out that the "agreement or agreements" had to be made before force could be used.

Article 45 provides:

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of those contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the military staff committee.

I point out the wording, "within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the military staff committee."

THE PARTICIPATION ACT

Although more than 5 years have elapsed since the United Nations Charter has been adopted, neither the United States nor any other member nation has entered into any agreement or agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations, nor has the Congress of the United States had any opportunity to take any steps which might implement the Charter as therein provided, except that in 1949, Congress, by the United Nations Participation Act as amended in 1949, authorized the assigning to the United Nations an amount not to exceed 1,000 noncombat personnel of the Armed Forces.

In order to authorize the President to enter into the agreement or agreements, the Congress in 1945 enacted H. R. 4618 and S. 1580, the same being section 287d of title 22 of the United States Code, which is as follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the

numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That except as authorized in section 287d–1 of this title, nothing contained in this section shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

To further explain the meaning of the charter and the law, at the time of the hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on December 7, 1950, reported on page 23 of such hearings, Secretary Acheson testified as follows in response to questions from members of the committee:

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Chairman, does that mean the Security Council names the number and amounts of troops and equipment we shall furnish the Security Council?

Mr. ACHESON. No. It means that we must work out with the Security Council a special agreement or agreements in which we develop the number of troops, the location, the degree of readiness, etc.; and that when we have done that, and when you gentlemen have approved it, then and only then, are we bound to furnish that contingent of troops to the Security Council; and the President is not authorized to furnish any more than you have approved of in that agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This, then, would be in the nature of a police force which the President could make available automatically, but he would be unable to go beyond that with the unlimited force which Congress would still have to pass upon for unlimited war?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes. Beyond the amount which you have agreed in the special agreement, and the President is not given authority to furnish any additional troops, and whatever happens after that is determined by the ordinary constitutional relations between the Congress and the President.

Let us look at pages 25 and 26 of the same hearings and see the answer Secretary Acheson gave in answer to a question of Congressman KEE:

Mr. KEE. I would like to clear up a question that is in my mind in respect to section 6 (U. N. participation act) that authorizes the President to negotiate special agreements with reference to providing troops and so forth, and the Armed Forces to be provided. The President has negotiated this agreement with the Council, as I understand this, without consulting or submitting the matter to Congress. If it becomes necessary in the course of an emergency, he can proceed to supply the forces agreed upon before submitting the agreement to Congress for action, is that correct?

Mr. ACHESON. This is an important question of Judge KEE, and may I state his question and my answer so that it will be quite clear here. The Judge asks whether the language beginning on line 19 of page 5, which says the President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of the Charter, means that the President may provide these forces prior to the time when any special agreement has been approved by the Congress.

The answer to that question is "No," that the President may not do that, that such special agreements refer to the special agreements which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress, so that until the special agreement has been negotiated and approved by the Congress, it has no force and effect.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a little hard for us to get the meaning of article 42, Mr. Secretary. Will you explain what this is?

Mr. ACHESON. Article 42 says—should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41—now those are the measures short of armed forces—would be inadequate or prove to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, and such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations. Now that is the article under which the international organization puts into effect the police forces which are made available to it under article 43, and the only reason that the President is permitted to make these forces available, after the special agreement has been approved is to carry out the provisions of article 42, to which we are committed by our ratification of the Charter.

Mr. RYTER. That may mean actual fighting, may it not?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes, it may.

Mr. FLOOD. It is also true, is it not, Mr. Secretary, that these occurrences come up only in the case of the breach of the peace or threatened breach of the peace?

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct.

In this connection it is also interesting to note the statement of Sir Gladwynn Jebb, United Kingdom representative to the United Nations, which can be found on page 54 of House Report No. 2495, dated July 11, 1950, in which he said:

Had the Charter become fully into force, and had the agreement provided for in article 43 of the Charter been concluded, we should, of cource, have proceeded differently and the action to be taken by the Security Council to repel the armed attack would no doubt have been founded on article 42. As it is, however, we can naturally only act under article 39, which enabled the Security Council to recommend what measures should be taken to restore international peace and security.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, when reporting the bill to the floor for consideration by the House as a whole, included in their report the following:

At the same time the bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

At the time the legislation was considered on the floor of the House, Chairman Sol Bloom, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in his explanation of the legislation, stated on the floor, and this can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 9, page 12267, the following:

The position of the Congress is fully protected by the requirement that the military agreement to preserve the peace must be passed upon by Congress before it becomes effective. Also the obligation of the United States to make forces available to the Security Council does not become effective until a special agreement has been passed upon by Congress.

In considering this legislation on the floor of the United States Senate on November 26, 1945, Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated, which statement is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 8, pages 10967 and 10968, as follows:

These contracts must be submitted to Congress. When the agreements are made with the Security Council, they must come back here. Senators will have an opportunity to debate them, to offer amendments, to qualify them, and so forth. As to declaring war, that is not a question which is involved here at all. These forces are not exacted to make war. They are exacted as peace forces, to undertake to preserve peaceful nations against aggression and attack. If we wish to go to war, we can still go to war, by declaring war and making use of our entire armed forces. I do not suppose we would hesitate to do it if we felt that the national interest required or demanded it.

Thus it is made clear by the original United Nations Participation Act that we, as an individual member of the U. N., had not in any way committed ourselves to furnish armed forces to the United Nations for use in armed intervention under the provisions of the articles of the United Nations Charter to prevent breaches of the peace or maintain international security.

In 1947 we find that evidence is further presented to the effect that these agreements must be completed before troops or armed forces could be assigned to the United Nations by a speech delivered by Herschel V. Johnson, who was the Deputy United States Representative to the United Nations. Mr. Johnson, in a speech delivered on June 4, 1947—and this speech can be found on page 1143 of Document No. 123, Eighty-first Congress, first session, of the Senate entitled "A Decade of American Foreign Policy." Mr. Johnson said as follows:

One vital organization task remains undone. Article 43 of the Charter imposes upon the Security Council the responsibility for negotiating "as soon as possible" special agreements under which the member states will make available to the Security Council, on its call, "armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security." Until those agreements have been concluded and put into force, the Security Council will be unable to fulfill its responsibilities as the enforcement agency of the United Nations. Chapter VII of the Charter, insofar as it relates to military enforcement measures, will remain inoperative.

Therefore we see that even in 1947 there was no authorization.

On October 10, 1949, the Congress enacted 287d–1 of title 22 of the United States Code, which specifically provided that they could not involve the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The limitations were specific. That legislation authorized the President to detail a total of not more than 1,000 noncombat personnel to a mission at any one time.

In connection with the legislation which was enacted, it is interesting to

note on page 17 of the hearings which were held before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on H. R. 3085, 4497, 4708, on May 10, 11, 12, and 13 of 1949, the statement was made by Mr. Ernest A. Gross, now adviser to Ambassador Austin at the United Nations, as follows:

I think this is even a more important point. Because of the fact that under the Constitution American military personnel cannot be made available to foreign powers or foreign organizations, except by authority of law, it has been necessary, instead of detailing the personnel to the United Nations for service with these missions, to keep them within American control, so to speak, so they would be responsible to and report to the military chief, the American military chief, or to the top American diplomatic official in the area or attached to the commission.

SUMMARY

From a complete research of both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it is a certainty there have been no agreement or agreements entered into between the United States and the United Nations Security Council as provided for in article 43 of the Charter and the Participation Act of 1945. On June 25, 1950, the Security Council had no authority to send any troops to Korea. The President of the United States had no authority to send any troops to Korea under any authority of the United Nations.

HISTORY OF KOREA

According to the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to House Resolution 206 entitled "Background Information on Korea," on page 43 thereof is the statement by our representative to the United Nations on June 25, 1950, which is in part as follows:

At 4 o'clock in the morning Sunday, June 25, Korean time, armed forces from North Korea commenced an unprovoked assault against the territory of the Republic of Korea. This assault was launched by ground forces along the thirty-eighth parallel, in the Ongjin, Kaesong, and Chunshon sectors, and by amphibious landings on the east coast in the vicinity of Jangmung. In addition, North Korean aircraft have attacked and strafed the Kimpo airport in the outskirts of the capital city of Seoul.

Mr. President, I have tabled a draft resolution which notes the Security Council's grave concern at the invasion of the Republic of Korea by the armed forces of North Korea. This draft resolution calls upon the authorities in the North to cease hostilities and to withdraw armed forces to the border along the thirty-eighth parallel.

The draft resolution requests that the United Nations Commission on Korea observe the withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the thirty-eighth parallel and keep the Security Council informed on the implementation and execution of the resolution. The draft resolution also calls upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the carrying out of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

As a result of that report, Resolution 1 was adopted by the Security Council, which resolution is in part as follows:

III. Calls upon members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

On page 45 of the above-mentioned House report appears the statement by the President of the United States on June 27, 1950, which is in part as follows:

In Korea the Government forces, which were armed to prevent border raids and to preserve internal security, were attacked by invading forces from North Korea. The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the invading troops to cease hostilities a..d to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel. This they have not done, but on the contrary have pressed the attack. The Security Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution. In these circumstances I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support. * * *

Accordingly I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. As a corollary to this action I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations. * * *

I have instructed Ambassador Austin, as the representative of the United States to the Security Council, to report these steps to the Council.

It should be noted at this time that the minutes of the United Nations for June 27, 1950, contain the statement of Ambassador Warren Austin as follows:

The United Nations finds itself confronted today with the gravest crisis in its existence.

Forty-eight hours ago the Security Council, in an emergency session, determined that the armed invasion of the Republic of Korea by armed forces from northern Korea constituted a breach of the peace. Accordingly, the Security Council called for a cessation of hostilities forthwith and the withdrawal by the northern Korean authorities of their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel. The Security Council also requested the United Nations Commission on Korea to observe the withdrawal and to report. Finally, the Security Council called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of the resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

The decision of the Security Council has been broadcast to the Korean authorities and is known to them. We now have before us the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea which confirms our fears. It is clear that the authorities in North Korea have completely disregarded and flouted the decision of the Security Council. The armed invasion of the Republic of Korea continues. This is, in fact, an attack on the United Nations itself. The North Korean authorities have called upon the established government of the Republic to surrender.

It is hard to imagine a more glaring example of disregard for the United Nations and for all the principles which it represents. The most important provisions of the Charter are those outlawing aggressive war. It is precisely these provisions which the North Korean authorities have violated.

It is the plain duty of the Security Council to invoke stringent sanctions to restore international peace.

The Republic of Korea has appealed to the United Nations for protection. I am happy and proud to report that the United States is prepared as a loyal member of the United Nations to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea.

I have tabled a resolution which I ask the Council to consider favorably as the next step to restore world peace. That resolution is as follows:

"The Security Council—

"Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace;

"Having called for an immediate cessation of hostilities; and

"Having called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel; and

"Having noted from the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea that the authorities in North Korea have neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn their armed forces to the thirty-eighth parallel, and that urgent military measures are required to restore international peace and security; and

"Having noted the appeal from the Republic of Korea to the United Nations for immediate and effective steps to secure peace and security;

"Recommends that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area."

This is the logical consequence of the resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea adopted at the four hundred and seventy-third meeting of the Security Council on June 25, 1950, and the subsequent events recited in the preamble of this resolution. That resolution of June 25 called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution, and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities. This new resolution is the logical next step. Its significance is affected by the violation of the former resolution, the continuation of aggression, and the urgent military measures required.

I wish now to read the statement which the President of the United States made today on this critical situation. (Statement herein quoted above in part.)

It is unquestioned from the United Nations Security Council minutes that this resolution and the report of the President were tabled at 3 o'clock in the afternoon on June 27. Attention is called to the fact that the statement of the President of the United States which was tabled with the resolution says:

I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

Alhough it is not known the exact time such order was made by the President, it was, of necessity, made prior to 3 p. m. on June 27.

According to the Security Council meetings, when the Council convened at 3 p. m., on June 27, there were tabled two resolutions—the resolution of Yugoslavia Government and the Austin resolution. The Yugoslavia resolution was reported in the New York Times under date of June 28, 1950, as follows:

Today Dr. Bebler said that the Council "after only 2 days of fighting," should not abandon hope that the two sides would enter into negotiations, and introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a United Nations mediator.

According to the minutes of the Council, a recording is made of the two resolutions. The President of the Security Council said that under rule 32, motions

and draft resolutions have precedence in the order of their submission. "Under this rule, I have to put the United States draft resolution to the vote first," he said.

Austin presented this resolution at the time the Council convened at 3 p. m., and that meeting adjourned at 6: 15 p. m. The Council then reconvened at 10: 25 p. m., and it was during the meeting that convened at 10: 25 p. m., that both resolutions were voted upon.

According to the minutes of the United Nations Security Council, there was a lapse of time from 3 p. m., until at least 10: 45 p. m., that night before the Austin resolution was adopted. It should be noted that in the afternoon meeting, Austin read President Truman's statement in which he said, "I have ordered United States air and sea forces," and so forth.

Even if the agreements had been in force, and they are not, President Truman still would have jumped the authority of the resolution by at least 7 hours in ordering American armed intervention in the Korean war.

The next official action taken by the United Nations Security Council was on July 7 when the following resolution was adopted:

The Security Council, having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace, having recommended that members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area:

(1) Welcomes the prompt and vigorous support which governments and peoples of the United Nations have given to its resolutions of 25 and 27 June 1950 to assist the Republic of Korea in defending itself against armed attack and thus to restore international peace and security in the area;

(2) Notes that members of the United Nations have transmitted to the United Nations offers of assistance for the Republic of Korea;

(3) Recommends that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the aforesaid Security Council resolutions make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States;

(4) Requests the United States to designate the commander of such forces;

(5) Authorizes the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating;

(6) Requests the United States to provide the Security Council with reports, as appropriate, on the course of action taken under the unified command.

On July 8, the President of the United States made the following statement:

The Security Council of the United Nations in its resolution of July 7, 1950, has recommended that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the Security Council resolutions of June 25 and 27, make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States.

The Security Council resolution also requests that the United States designate the commander of such forces, and authorizes the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating.

I am responding to the recommendations of the Security Council and have designated Gen. Douglas MacArthur as the commanding general of the military forces which the members of the United Nations place under the unified command of the United States pursuant to the United Nations assistance to the Republic of Korea in repelling the unprovoked armed attack against it.

I am directing General MacArthur, pursuant to the Security Council resolution, to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating.

PRESIDENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

It has been noted in the past that numerous Presidents have sent troops into foreign lands in defense of the lives, the property, and treaty obligations of the United States. However, in this case it should be noted that at the time of entry, there were no lives and no property involved in South Korea. It should further be noted that there was no treaty with South Korea requiring us to furnish them with military assistance, and that under the United Nations Charter and our Participation Act we had not completed the agreement or agreements with the Security Council to provide it with troops. As stated by Herschel Johnson, the United Nations Charter did not become a treaty and binding upon the United States until the agreement or agreements had been executed.

Even though the President in his statement of June 28, 1950, attempted to represent to the American public the fact that he had the authority to send American Armed Forces into Korea under Article 39 of the United Nations Charter and pursuant to International law, it is very clear that neither of these authorities existed at that time, because he had not implemented the Charter under Article 43, and there were no American lives and no American property involved.

To summarize, there is no precedent in the history of this Nation for the President of the United States to involve this Nation in a war, such as that in which it is involved at the present time under the Constitution without a declaration of war or approval by Congress. There is no authority under the United Nations authorizing the action which this Nation has taken, and in the words of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in hearings following the introduction of a resolution to revise the United Nations Charter he stated on page 12 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on February 2, 1950:

For it should never be forgotten that the Charter of the United Nations declares that the first purpose of the United Nations is * * * to maintain international peace and security and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

That is what we agreed to when we ratified the Charter. But due to structural defects in that Charter and to to the Russian attitude, we have failed to realize that purpose.

FOREIGN POLICY

In a brief prepared by the Department of State on the authority of the President to repel the attack in Korea found in Background Information on Korea, page 65, the Secretary of State said as follows:

Thus, even before the ratification of the United Nations Charter, the President had used the Armed Forces of the United States without consulting the Congress for the purpose of protecting the foreign policy of the United States. The ratification of the United Nations Charter was, of course, the landmark in the development of the American foreign policy.

The agreement or agreements had not been consummated with the Security Council, implementing the United Nations Charter, thus the adoption of the United Nations Charter had not, as yet, become a part of the United States policy. On June 27, 1950, when the President ordered American troops into action at least 7 hours prior to the resolution of the United Nations Security Council upon which authority they rely, such action could not have been taken for the purpose of "protecting the foreign policy of the United States under the United Nations Charter."

It cannot be said that the policy of the United Nations with regard to Korea became a policy of the United States, calling for armed intervention with regard to Korea, since Resolution No. 1, which was the only one adopted at the time, calls for only cessation of hostilities, calls for withdrawal of North Korean armed forces, and requests the United Nations Commission on Korea to keep the Council informed. I call your attention to the fact that section 3 says:

Calls upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

The words "in the execution of this resolution" preclude the President or the Secretary of State from claiming that the United Nations called upon all members to render "military" assistance to the United Nations because of the phrase "in the execution of this resolution." The resolution itself covers merely cessation of hostilities and authority to the Commission on Korea, it carefully avoids reference to military assistance to South Korea, and then, since our Government ordered troops into Korea without any recommendation or request from the Security Council, there can be no claim that the action taken by the President was in any manner in support of American foreign policy under the United Nations Charter. The minutes prove that the Security Council has not even considered military operations or the authorizing of any such operations.

FOREIGN POLICY

It should be further pointed out that the adoption of the United Nations charter had no bearing on American foreign policy, because on January 12, 1950, Secretary Acheson stated that our

foreign policy insofar as Korea was concerned was as follows:

Defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus [Okinawa] * * * [and] to the Philippines. * * *

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guaranty is hardly sensible or necessary with the realm of practical relationship. Should such an attack occur—one hesitates to say where such an armed attack could come from—the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the charter of the United Nations. * * * But it is a mistake, I think, in considering Pacific and far-eastern problems to become obsessed with military considerations.

It was not an obsession on January 12, 1950, but on June 25, 1950, it was. On January 12, 1950, we were not to become obsessed with military considerations; today we are obsessed with some 65,000 casualties.

What was the American foreign policy on June 26, 1950? Quoting the New York Times for June 27, 1950, it read as follows:

Rear Admiral Hillenkoetter, Central Intelligence Agency, convinced Senate critics that the intelligence service was not caught by surprise by the Korean invasion. He revealed that the invasion of South Korea was detailed in the Soviet publication, Izvestia, which on June 10, 1950, printed a timetable for uniting Korea under a single parliament.

UNITED NATIONS EFFORT?

On June 29, 1950, on July 3, 1950, and on March 24, 1951, the State Department issued memorandums on the authority of the President to repel the attack in Korea, portions of which are as follows:

All actions taken by the United States to restore the peace in Korea have been under the aegis of the United Nations. * * *

In conclusion, the action of the United States Government in Korea is taken in support of the authority of the United Nations. It is taken to restore peace and security to the Pacific area.

Secretary Acheson at his news conference on June 28 emphasized that the actions of the United States had been taken in support of the United Nations. "After June 25," he said, "all action in Korea has been under the aegis of the United Nations."

The political issues, which General MacArthur has stated are beyond his responsibility as a field commander, are being dealt with in the United Nations and by intergovernmental consultations.

The last statement was released the day General MacArthur asserted he was ready to confer in the field with the commander of the Chinese and North Korean forces to end the war.

All of these quotations indicate an attempt on the part of the Secretary of State to disguise our military actions as those of the United Nations. In contradiction of these I set forth a letter received by me from Secretary of State Dean Acheson under date of April 17, 1951, which sets forth as follows:

I am in receipt of your letter of March 19 in which you pose the general question of the status of United States troops in Korea. This letter will amplify more fully what, of necessity, were rather brief responses to questions asked on March 15 when I had the privilege of meeting with you and other Members of Congress.

The over-all directives under which military action in Korea is being conducted are in the main embodied in three resolutions passed by the United Nations shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. In general, the Security Council resolution of June 25, 1950, determined that the attack on the Republic of Korea was a breach of the peace, called for immediate cessation of hostilities, and called upon United Nations members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of the resolution. The Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950, recommended that members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as necessary to repel the armed attack and restore peace in the area.

On July 7, 1950, the Security Council passed a third resolution recommending that the United Nations members make their forces and assistance "available to a unified command under the United States," and requesting "the United States to designate the commander of such forces." This same resolution of July 7 authorizes "the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of various nations participating."

On July 8 the President of the United States stated: "I am responding to the recommendation of the Security Council and have designated General Douglas MacArthur as the Commanding General of the military forces which the members of the United Nations place under the unified command of the United States pursuant to the United Nations" assistance to the Republic of Korea in repelling the unprovoked armed attack against it.

"I am directing General MacArthur, pursuant to the Security Council resolution, to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of various nations participating."

Pursuant to the Security Council resolution, the forces furnished by the United States and by all other United Nations Members are fighting under their own flags and concurrently under the United Nations flag.

The Commanding General of the forces placed under the unified command reports to the President of the United States through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Therefore, it follows that any military action taken by the unified command is taken in the same manner as military action taken by the United Staets. In the event the United Nations should disapprove actions of the United States Government in its capacity as the unified command, presumably the United Nations could revoke the authority of the United States Government to act as the unified command. However, such action would not affect the relation of the United States forces and the United States commander.

The United States forces supporting the Security Council resolutions are commanded by the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Forces in the Far East (CINCFE). This officer is not an agent of the Security Council. The Security Council has no force of its own, and therefore, it has not designated any commander of such a force. It has recommended that Members of the United Nations render assistance to repel the attack and restore peace in the area, that Members make forces and assistatnce available to a unified command under the United States, and that the United States designate the commander of such forces. No action has been taken which has transformed the United States forces into United Nations forces, and the United States forces have, as well as other forces participating in the effort, retained their identity.

The resolutions passed by the United Nations under which military action is being taken in Korea contain broad directives. No United Nations resolution attempts to give to the unified command instructions as to how military action is to be carried out or to place any limitation on military action taken in Korea to accomplish the objective of the Security Council resolutions "to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area." Thus, the Commanding General of the forces made available to the unified command is free within the framework of directives from the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff to make the necessary decisions to carry forward the military phase of the United Nations action without further Security Council decisions.

IN SUMMARY

By way of summary, there are three involuntary methods of replacing an official in the executive branch of government:

First. Discharge.

Second. Impeachment.

Third. Reorganization of the Department.

I have already stated that discharge is improbable.

I believe I have presented a sound case of misfeasance and malfeasance in office under which the decisions of the courts amount to high crimes and misdemeanors under the Constitution. That such high crimes and misdemeanors are based upon the fact that the Secretary of State of the United States advised the President of the United States to send Armed Forces into Korea without authority of the United Nations, without authority of the Constitution, without authority of the Congress.

With or without authority, this Nation is actually engaged in war in Korea, a war which must be terminated honorably, successfully, and at the earliest possible date. Since this is true and since unity of purpose is essential to the speedy termination of such war, I believe it would be for the best interests of this Nation that no impeachment proceedings, which would disrupt national unity, be commenced. I therefore recommend to the Congress the passage of legislation providing for the reorganization of the Department of State, which I am today introducing in this body and which my colleague, FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, has already introduced in the Senate.

Nazi War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House were terribly shocked recently by the action of our American authorities in Germany who reprieved the death sentence of 21 German war criminals and completely set free a number of others. These reprieves and pardons for outright murderers, who committed the greatest crimes recorded

in human history against millions of innocent and helpless people of all religious faiths and of various nationalities and races, have aroused against us the contempt of all freedom-loving and righteous people throughout the world.

By our action, we are courting a discredited and despised element—discredited and despised even in Germany—and in so doing we are jeopardizing the tremendous moral support we have had throughout the world in our struggle against the destructive ideologies of Nazi totalitarianism. Upright and fair-minded people in this country and all over the world were shocked by this disgraceful action of our officials in Germany and their unwarranted disregard of the decisions handed down by the Nuremberg courts against these war criminals.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting letter which was published in the Christian Science Monitor, May 1, 1951, and written by Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs. This committee, whose main offices are in New York, is encouraging all "action to strengthen national and international organization for security, freedom, and justice," and lists on its executive committee such outstanding Americans as the noted church leader Dr. Henry A. Atkinson; Editor Barry Bingham, of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Russell W. Davenport; Clark M. Eichelberger; George Fielding Eliot; August Heckscher; Edgar Ansel Mowrer; former Ambassador Ruth Bryan Owen Rhode; Gen. Telford Taylor; former chief counsel for war crimes in the United States Military Government in Germany, and others. Mr. McKee's letter follows:

NUREMBERG COMMUTATIONS—WAR CRIMINALS

To the Christian Science Monitor:

The recent commutation by High Commissioner McCloy of the sentences of 79 German war criminals convicted of heinous crimes against humanity is alarming. Among the criminals, of whom 21 now escape the death sentence and 34 are set free, are Nazi officials who planned and executed Hitler's murder program, who directed a campaign of wholesale slaughter in the occupied areas, and who committed atrocities in the concentration camps. These sentences had previously been confirmed by General Clay upon the advice of counsel of impeccable integrity and competence.

The Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, appointed by Mr. McCloy, heard only the lawyers representing the convicted criminals, representatives of the prosecution not being allowed to participate. In recommending the reduction of sentences they nevertheless pointed out that they were "not entitled to grant relief beyond that warranted by mitigating circumstances and fair consideration of individual situations." They further stated that clemency "may be an encouraging example, but a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder would be a mockery. It would undo what Nuremberg has accomplished if in the end we were guided entirely by considerations of sympathy or generosity. Executive clemency does not exist to that end."

But the fact is that these commutations are "a mistaken tenderness towards the perpetrators of mass murder," constitute "a mockery" of what Nuremberg has accomplished, and are dangerous for the following reasons:

1. They tend to throw into doubt the entire basis, procedure, and judgments of the trials conducted by the United States military tribunals at Nuremberg. Although both Mr. McCloy and the members of his clemency board defend the Nuremberg trials, it would have been more appropriate to sustain the results of the trials by confirming rather than by upsetting the verdicts. In granting the commutations expediency appears to have been a factor in seeking the favor of those elements in Germany whose devotion to democracy is suspect.

2. At a time when it is contemplated that Germany be granted greater independence, to reduce the sentences of the perpetrators of inhumanities, many of whom are now able to return to public life, hardly encourages the democratic elements in Germany.

3. The commutation of the sentences of Nazi war criminals has alarmed our allies among the democratic nations of Western Europe and among the believers in democracy in the countries behind the iron curtain.

4. If these commutations were intended to placate German opinion in the effort to make Western Germany a bulwark against the very real threat of Soviet aggression, such a policy of expediency does not accomplish its purpose and leads to other evils. Reports already indicate that the Germans are not satisfied with the extent of the commutations and are urging the release of all war criminals. The United States cannot safely copy the Russian technique of currying favor with former Nazi leaders, for these criminals are basically totalitarians, and hence more sympathetic to the totalitarian East than the democratic West.

FREDERICK C. McKEE,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.
NEW YORK.

Ready in Revolt, Chinese Reds Kill, Starve, and Enslave People of China—Letter Tells of Sufferings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the pertinent facts in a letter which I have received from China. I am eliminating such parts as might lead to the identification of the sender, in order to prevent any retaliation against him.

The letter reveals the deplorable and horrifying conditions in China today. It also reveals why it would be possible, with intelligent guidance, to create a backfire that would end the war in Korea and prevent thousands of additional American casualties; and at the same time, help to save Asia and the world from the Communist threat.

This letter said in part:

Although I am one of the millions who have a definite reason to oppose communism, not only realize there is no middle course to take, but also advocate such antihuman or inhuman slave policy must be done away with. I join you at least in spirit to carry out your brave and wise action. I admire the Americans and I admire you.

As a Chinese and being enslaved by the Chinese Communists, who are themselves slaves of Moscow, I secretly succeeded in getting this letter through and asked a friend of mine to mail it to you.

Innocent people are being slaughtered in China by the thousands in a month. There is no freedom, but fear; no food, but hunger. It is hell. I am an American-educated Chinese and forced to do degrading work by the people's government. I know my fate will be worse yet.

I hope you will try your best to help the central government in Formosa to fight back to the mainland and thus restore freedom to the millions. I think America must wake up before it is too late.

A Great Fermentation Is Taking Place; the Distillation Will Be Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, in which are proposed and answered many questions of national interest vitally affecting the welfare of our country. The editorial writer reaches an optimistic conclusion, to which all all of us hopefully subscribe. It is worthy of wide dissemination.

A GREAT FERMENTATION IS TAKING PLACE; THE DISTILLATION WILL BE UNITY

It should be remembered in all the flaming discussion of the hour that the American people are not as disunited as a stranger might think. It cannot be doubted for a moment that the President and his Cabinet members, the Congress and the Defense Department are governed by the same love of country and eagerness for sound peace that moves the rest of us. It is true that even in America there are weasels and skunks and other unpleasant fauna. They are outnumbered; they can do no lasting harm.

Our differences are in the method of achieving what we all desire. We believe there is a definite weakness in our leadership. We also believe that those weaknesses can be overcome in the democratic way and that eventually we will win through.

Washington is a land of geysers. Excitement, politics, foreign relations, and domestic affairs are in constant eruption. Some of those fountains emit nauseating odors. Others excite awe. Together they lead the more thoughtful citizen to prayerful thought.

The great geyser of the past few weeks was the MacArthur visit. Because that visit sent emotions soaring, because it brought into clear view the basic differences of opinion as to our conduct in the Orient, it was one of the great dramatic events of the years. And because it was so all-encompassing it shed a white light on the confusions and the conflicts which rule in Washington.

Little Alice, if you remember your wonderland, nibbled a bit of cake and shrank so quickly that her chin smacked against her slippers. As our cartoonist shows in an adjoining column, our President has been eating some bitter cake and as a result has lost stature. Alice recovered. Whether the President can find a speedy antidote for his cake is a problem to which he doubtless is giving attention.

MacArthur has one great advantage over the President. He has a definite program for prosecuting affairs in the Far East. The President has none. MacArthur would do something positive. He would move as the British, weak as they are, moved to threaten military action in Iran if that Government choked off their oil supply. He speaks as one knowing the territory and knowing the opposition. He proposes direct action, confidence in victory. That program opposes a weak, wavering, and indecisive course laid out by the administration.

There will be debate and hearings on the subject before we know whether we are to continue in a period of indecision or will take counteraction against the Reds. Unfortunately the choice between the two plans is political at the moment. We are arguing about defense along the party line rather than along the American line.

Mr. Truman lost stature by his treatment of MacArthur. No matter how one argues his rights in the matter, the sacking of the general was a brutal affair. The President compounded the offense by ignoring the general's return to Washington to finish 52 years of distinguished service. Or, worse yet, he sulkily recognized the return by sending his pseudo-military aide to represent the White House.

But there have been other ingredients in the bitter cake nibbled by the President. His sheltering of shady friends. His support of weak advisers. His stubborn defense of ill-advised programs in the domestic field. Because of all these we have no true over-all program. The President says he works for peace and we must believe him. Yet he offers no positive program. He works in secret and snubs the public's interest in the outcome of our difficulties.

As a matter of fact, Washington just now raises more questions than it answers.

Will MacArthur's proposals as to Korea go unheeded? Probably not. Some of them already are undertaken in part.

Will there be a cleaning out of those who have sullied the administration? Probably not; the President still is unconcerned over the misdeeds of his pets.

Will there be a real system of controls? No. Too unpopular.

Will there be a reasonably satisfactory system of universal military training? Yes, thanks to nonpartisan action in Congress.

Will Dean Acheson remain as Secretary of State? Doubtless, as long as he can stand the criticism fired at him from every direction.

Will General Marshall remain as Defense Secretary? Probably as long as he desires to do so. He is surprisingly vigorous. He is admired as a soldier, criticized by many as ineffective in matters of policy.

How about the experiment of a woman as a Deputy Defense Secretary? Anna Rosenberg is an eloquent, able, hard-working person.

What of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? They are brilliant, able fighting men. They have not looked too good in the current controversy because some of them were dispatched as errand boys to support the President against MacArthur. MacArthur may be able to prove that actually the chiefs were in agreement with his own plans on winning a war and a peace.

RFC is being cleared up, but rascals who used it are not being cleared out.

* * * * *

Washington is confused and in conflict. National affairs are mingled in politics. Personalities sometimes are lifted above policy. Yet part of the confusion is due to the fact that a great fermentation is taking place. The scum eventually will be cleared. This still is a great and powerful country, making headway despite all the disturbance. The President has lost stature, but the presidency has not.

We will win through.

Congressman Roosevelt's Views on National Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York, the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., has delivered a most interesting report on national affairs to his constituents in the Twentieth Congressional District in New York City on Thursday evening, May 3, 1951, at a meeting of the Liberal Party at the Cameron Hotel. The following are excerpts from his address:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to the Liberal Party for calling this meeting and giving me the chance to submit to you this interim report on a few of the important questions which confront us.

Since two of the previous speakers have referred to the increase in the sales tax and the revelations of the Kefauver committee, I would like to make clear my position on these two issues at the outset.

First, the sales tax. I hesitated considerably before I wrote my letter to the deputy mayor, Mr. Charles Horowitz, who, you will remember, was my campaign manager in 1949, because I did not want to appear to be interfering in the problems of city government. However, because of the importance of this issue and because of my personal friendship for Mr. Horowitz, I felt that I could not sit idly by. As you know, I was then and I am now deeply opposed to this increase. * * *

The second issue is that of the Senate crime investigation. I recently urged that the three great civic, nonpartisan, nonpolitical foundations, Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, all dedicated to the public welfare, appoint a citizens' committee to investigate the whole field of morality and ethics in the profession of public service, and then recommend a code of ethics for politics. We have such codes of ethics in the medical profession and in the legal profession. However, the only restraints on a public servant are his conscience and the criminal law. Unfortunately, it is apparent that the conscience of some public officials is below par. The establishment of a code of ethics and a commission to enforce it would do much to remedy this situation. * * * In this connection, there is an additional problem, that which involves those who hold office in political organizations, such as the party officials of the Republican, Democratic, Liberal, and other parties. I do not feel that any individual who, either socially or otherwise, is on a familiar basis with the crooks and the gamblers—those people who devote themselves to violating the law and helping others to violate the law—should hold a party office.

This country has never gone on such an emotional jag or enjoyed such complete confusion as it has in the last 2 or 3 weeks. It is probably a good thing. I would like to make clear at the outset that as one member of the United States Navy who served in the Pacific, I have nothing but the utmost admiration and respect for General MacArthur. He is a remarkable military genius. But, unfortunately, the old soldier who is fading away is being replaced by a resurgent politician. This subject requires calmness, objectivity, and courage, because whether we like it or not we are leaders of the free world today. We cannot shirk our responsibility, we must act as an intelligent and mature people. We cannot afford to reach our decisions out of emotion, prejudice, or hate. We must maintain our respect for our civilian leaders and we must give due weight to the recommendations of our military leaders.

I think there are two questions involved in the present problem. First, the right of the Commander in Chief of the United States, the President, to remove any military leader, and, second, the question of our far-eastern policy, keeping in mind its relation to our world policy. We should try to keep these two issues separate in our minds. We must not let any resentment for the way the President carried out his decision impair our judgment.

I have yet to meet a responsible official in Washington who disputes the right and the rightness of President Truman's removal of General MacArthur when it became apparent that the general could not and did not support the policies of the United States Government of which he is a servant. I need not remind you of the basic American doctrine—the superiority of the civilian authority over the military. * * *

The other problem, our far-eastern policy, is far more complex. There are three possible choices. The first is to do what Mr. TAFT and Mr. Hoover recommended last December and January. Pull out of and abandon Korea; don't send troops to Europe; and, as Mr. Hoover stated, set up a Gibraltar ring of island defenses—in short, let the rest of the world go to blazes. That is one choice, it is an extreme. The other extreme, or the second choice is now proposed by General MacArthur, which I would like to take up in detail. It is a rather confusing proposal because he has stated it in separate major documents in different degrees. In his address to the Congress, one of the great oratorical efforts in our history, he proposed a four-point program, a program set forth as a study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

1. Economic blockade of China.

2. Naval blockade of China, or, as the study report said, preparing for a naval blockade in case of certain eventualities.

3. Air reconnaissance of the coastal areas on China and Manchuria.

4. The logistic support for the effective use of the Nationalist troops on Formosa. (Logistic support means supplies. It does not mean air support or naval shore bombardment prior to making a landing.) Naval warfare is not logistic support.

The second phrase "effective use of the Nationalist troops on Formosa," is susceptible to many different interpretations. The effective use might mean the defense of Formosa, or hit-run raids. Or it might mean in the extreme a Normandy-type landing to create a second front in China.

However, in his letter to Mr. JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader in Congress, General MacArthur added two points: First, the bombing of the so-called Manchurian sanctuary of the enemy. In this connection, I might point out that the United Nations forces have been enjoying a similar sanctuary in Japan, and, furthermore, South Korea has not had air attacks from the enemy. But we have enjoyed complete air supremacy in attacking the enemy and his supply lines in North Korea. Certainly the Joint Chiefs of Staff have never agreed to these two additional recommendations by General MacArthur, two additional recommendations which he had made at the time of his removal.

This is a new kind of war in Korea. MacArthur was right when he said that there had never been in all history an alternative to victory in war, but I submit that perhaps civilization has gone one magnificent step forward toward achieving world peace and the settlement of international differences not by force but by law, when we say that our objective in this war imposed upon us by the aggression of first North Korea and then China, our objective is not victory over China,

but our objective is to stop aggression in Korea, and to recreate the independence of that liberty-loving people.

We do not want to invade China. That would be no victory. We want only to stop aggression and restore law and order and peace in Korea. This is the first time in history that there has been a limited objective in war. Perhaps because of this world war III may not grow out of this Korean tragedy.

The second point that General MacArthur failed to mention before the Congress, which he did mention in his letter to Mr. MARTIN, was the creation of a second front on the mainland of China by using Nationalist troops from Formosa supported by our Air Force and Navy. Only recently, Chiang Kai-shek announced in Formosa that the Nationalist troops could not possibly undertake a landing unless they were completely re-equipped by the United States. I believe that out of the 450,000 troops on Formosa, there are only 100,000 combat troops and of these only 40,000 are adequately equipped. Suppose we do reequip the Nationalist troops and suppose they land in China, do we know they would be successful? We started in Korea only using our Air Force and Navy, but when the Korean troops were inadequate to stem the Communist tide, our foot soldiers had to go in. If Chiang Kai-shek's troops start to lose, will our Army then be called on to fight on the mainland of China?

It is very easy for General MacArthur to say that his program will mean a quick end and will save lives in Korea. But in ending the war in Korea, he may be very probably starting a much more difficult war in China. In fact, he may be committing American lives and resources to the morass of the Chinese mainland. Furthermore, he may be running the risk that Russia will invoke her treaty of friendship and alliance with Red China. And we may find world war III upon us before we know it. We may be falling into the very trap which many believe Russia has been setting for us. This program might be the first act of the suicide of the free world.

The third alternative to these two extremes is the middle course—to continue to repel aggression in Korea, to limit the war to Korea. This course is heartrending in many ways. It is difficult to see an end and it requires great patience. It is the course recommended by one of our greatest military geniuses, who also has a deep sense of public service and civilian authority—General Marshall. He was in large measure responsible for the strategy in World War II. He is respected and loved by all Americans. I am confident that the peace of the world can rest in no more capable hands.

It is difficult to predict the future, but I have so often been asked how our present policy in Korea will end that I hazard this guess. I doubt that the Communists will ever agree to a negotiated peace, but they cannot absorb the tremendous losses in men and equipment indefinitely. I think that in the months to come we will find that they will simply retire behind the Yalu River and that we will stop our advance considerably short of this natural boundary, and that the no-man's land between will be tactitly agreed upon by both sides as a sort of buffer zone. For a time, this zone may require policing by our Air Force to give warning of any possible new assault, but the actual land fighting will cease and the work of restoring Korea, her independence and her freedom, may be undertaken by the United Nations.

If my hope is right, we will have stopped aggression and I hope prevented world war III, we will have preserved the authority and prestige of the United Nations, we will have avoided being enmeshed on the mainland of China in support of Chiang Kai-shek and abandoned by practically all our other allies, and we will have maintained the united alliance of the free world.

Arizona Admits Speculators Would Make Millions of Dollars on Proposed Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1950, I addressed the House of Representatives to show how speculators and big landowners would make millions of dollars if the proposed central Arizona project were authorized by Congress. I was bitterly attacked by proponents of the project for my factual disclosures.

The accuracy and truthfulness of my charges have now been substantiated by supporters of the project from within the State of Arizona. On April 27, 1951, the newspaper Plain Talk, published in Phoenix, ran a forceful article under the headline: "Central Arizona project discredited by activities of land speculators."

The complete article follows:

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT DISCREDITED BY ACTIVITIES OF LAND SPECULATORS

The shelving of the central Arizona project was a staggering blow to the economy of Arizona. The disaster, however, should be blamed as much upon the actions of certain citizens of our own State as upon the machinations of California.

As far back as March 8, 1950, NORRIS POULSON made a speech in the Federal House of Representatives which, in our opinion, destroyed congressional confidence in the worth of the project once and for all. It is true that POULSON is from California, but he did not invoke the requirements of that State's large population, its vast industrial needs, etc. Instead he exposed what amounts to a conspiracy on the part of opportunistic farmers and syndicates of Arizona. In effect these, all large landholders, would help themselves to the waters diverted by the central Arizona project, paying nothing for the moisture which would enable them to make fortunes, either from farming their lands, or through selling their acreage at a premium.

The project would permit farmers to have 160 acres serviced with surface irrigation, for which the landholders would pay an adequate fee. But neither the provisions of the project nor any other Federal law governs the use of underground water. As for the new State code, it affects only land bought since 1949, whereas the oversized farms in question were set up before that.

The water diverted from the Colorado River would be brought to the selected areas of Maricopa and Pinal Counties on the surface, but, to quote Representative POULSON, "enormous amounts of this water will flow into underground basins."

Realizing this, the farmers and syndicates in question established what is known as "excess ownership" holdings, often thousands of acres beyond the statutory limitation of 160. They accomplished that by sinking wells hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of feet deep. This was done, as POULSON points out, "in the face of dire warnings that there was no adequate water for such operations."

It was an expensive as well as ruthless gamble with State resources, but the stakes promised to be tremendous—if the central Arizona project could be pushed through before the great pumps started sucking sand. If it was approved, the speculators would have an unlimited supply of water, at a bargain. For while the farmers who complied with the terms of the project would pay high prices to have their 160 acres watered, the operators with the long pumps would have thousands of acres irrigated by water for which they would pay the project not one red cent.

At the time Representative POULSON made his congressional exposé, he was able to report that out of the estimated 628,000 acres in the area, which the Bureau of Land Reclamation reported as having some history of irrigation, 345,000, or 55 percent of the total acreage, were excess ownership holdings. This 55 percent was distributed among only 7 percent of the farms within the project area.

In short, the CAP—at least as far as the farming aspect of it is concerned—would call for the Government expenditure of $780,000,000, over half of whose benefits would go to the enrichening of a few hundred free riders. And these opportunists are already prosperous, or they could not afford the blue-chip ante demanded in this game. The skinny end of the drumstick would go to the thousands of small farmers who would be charged for what the project would offer.

In summing up his case, Representative POULSON said devastatingly: "I can see why the landholders of Arizona want this project, but I cannot conceive of Congress authorizing it." Under the circumstances, we can see no reason why Congress should have done so, either.

Arizona must have the equivalent of the project, but it must be revamped so that it is genuinely designed to benefit the people of the State as a whole, instead of being a grab bag for land speculators. It is preposterous to expect the 46 States not involved in the quarrel over the Colorado to award this State the water of that great river, together with $750,000,000 to implement its use, for the benefit of a few hundred of our already wealthy citizens.

The fact that the people of the State have allowed the central Arizona project to be shaped to satisfy the greed of speculators has given Arizona a stunning setback. It is useless to rage at California, even if its citizens are, not unnaturally, thinking of their own welfare rather than ours. The cold fact is that the project, as set up and presented to Congress, was made to order for indiscriminate speculation.

If we must rage at anybody, let us rage at the exploiters, Arizonians, not Californians, whose conduct went far toward giving our State this crippling loss. We say loss, for we believe that the central Arizona project, as it now stands is not merely set aside, but permanently scuttled.

Meanwhile let us go into a huddle and draw up a bill which will make hard sense to the 46 States whose sympathies for our genuine and critical needs we are trying to win. It must be such a bill, as the central Arizona project now is not, that its background and practical workings will bear the honest inspection of nonpartisan investigators.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, so much happens in such a short space of time that it is easy to forget the headlines of

only a few months ago. Great stress is laid by administration spokesmen on the damage done to Allied unity by General MacArthur's advocacy of his policy for terminating the Korean war. The Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union has republished in an editorial the headline of last November 30 when the President announced to a startled world that the atom bomb would be used in the Far East if necessary to meet the military situation. The decision whether or not to use that ultimate weapon, he said, would be left to the American military leaders in the field, meaning at that time primarily General MacArthur. So far as is known, General MacArthur never advocated such a step. Certainly, whether or not one agrees with all of his recommendations, however, no proposal which he has advanced is calculated to cause consternation and dismay in foreign capitals equal to that occasioned by the President's pronouncement of last November 30.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the above-mentioned editorial, which follows:

Part of the story that shook our allies' confidence:

"UNITED STATES TO USE A-BOMB IF NEEDED, TRUMAN SAYS; SPURS ARMING

"WASHINGTON.—President Truman declared today the United Nations forces will not back down in Korea, and that the atom bomb will be used if necessary to meet the military situation.

"Mr. Truman's firm stand and mention of the most fearful weapon in the world's history came at a news conference.

"The President said that whether the bomb was used was up to American military leaders in the field, but that personally he hoped it would not have to be employed."

The above headline, reproduced from the Times-Union of November 30, bears on the testimony of Secretary Marshall before the Senate committees investigating the summary removal of General MacArthur and our Far East policy.

General Marshall testified:

"By his (General MacArthur's) public statements, he set up a very serious reaction among our allies, which threatened our collective action with them and which threatened our position in the world in relation to this great crisis and which threatened to leave us in the situation of going it alone."

This is the crux of the administration's defense of its humiliation of General MacArthur. Secretary Marshall admits that General MacArthur violated no military orders, but all through his testimony the theme recurs that General MacArthur was out of step with the 13 governments that have furnished one-twentieth of the United Nations forces in Korea.

Time and again General Marshall has expressed grave concern about the reactions of these governments to events in Korea. And time and again he has laid the blame for their hesitancy and distrust of our intentions as agents of the United Nations upon General MacArthur.

We are a forgetful people. But reprinting the headline of November 30 will recall to every reader an offhand statement by President Truman at a press conference that not only shocked the world but strained every tie binding our allies to the United Nations effort in Korea.

The statement was made just a few days after Red China had struck, opening a new war. Every chancellery had the jitters. Spokesmen for every government had to answer questions about Mr. Truman's intentions. Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain rushed to Washington to find out just how far Mr. Truman intended to go. The reaction in this country was just as violent.

A White House statement 3 hours after the press conference attempted, but failed, to repair the damage. It cleared up the President's statement at the press conference that the use of the atomic bomb would be up to the American military leaders in the field, by quoting the law that only the President can authorize the use of the atomic bomb.

Obviously this ill-considered statement of the President on November 30 is not the only factor entering into our allies' reluctance to support decisive measures in Korea. The defection of India, the importance to Britain of Hong Kong, the fear of a European war, the reluctance by some to throw the book at Red China, all enter into it.

But on the point of causing uneasiness among our allies, everything General MacArthur said or wrote was minor compared to the effect of Mr. Truman's outburst of November 30.

Now if the point of recalling the November 30 press conference were merely to say "you're another" there would be no reason to do so. But it seems to us that it illustrates the point that defenders of the administration have become so engrossed in winning an argument that they have drifted into positions unbecoming to the leaders of a nation in time of peril.

Another instance was General Marshall's testimony of Monday. He said General MacArthur's invitation of March 20 to the Red Chinese commander to negotiate an armistice—a time-honored right of every field commander—had cost whatever chance there had been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict.

As James Reston points out in the New York Times, nobody in Washington believed at that time there was a good chance to make peace. President Truman had submitted to envoys of the allies the draft of a public appeal to the Chinese Reds for peace. But numerous such appeals had been made without result, and there was nothing to indicate that a different fate awaited this one.

Yet, General Marshall's testimony went out as implying that General MacArthur had upset a hopeful peace move.

The present hearings, it seems to us, can hardly settle finally the question of who is right in the MacArthur controversy. The events of the next 10 years will be more important evidence on that point. But meanwhile a sound policy in the Far East and sound conduct of that policy are of vital importance.

Let us look carefully to any line of questions in this inquiry that develop these.

The Miracle of the County Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss.:

LOOKING AT THE SOUTH—THE MIRACLE OF THE COUNTY AGENT

(By Hodding Carter)

Wars and politics to the contrary, the destiny of man is decided by what he does with the land. We forgot that for a long time in the South, but we're remembering now.

The people most responsible for the vital change are at the same time among the most overlooked of all the civilian army of Government employees. That army gets a lot of kicking around. Whenever we get angry with our Government—Federal or State or local—we usually begin and end by damning the people on the public payrolls. The indictments are almost always too general and unfair, for in our anger we forget the notable work being done in a thousand directions by so-called bureaucrats. Reminded that this is so, we generally answer that we didn't mean those fellows but just the ones who don't do anything worth while.

That's a long preamble to a pat on the back for the county agents, and especially those who serve the Southern States. Still, it might be a good idea to remember that bureaucracy does include thousands and thousands of devoted men and women, whose sum total of effort means a better life and a more enduring civilization.

But to get back to the county agents. Now in the fullness of spring is the best time to come face to face with their miracle. All any of us have to do, if our memories go back 20 years and even less, is to get in an automobile and drive along the highways and country roads anywhere in the South and compare the present with the past. The trail from yesterday begins with one crop that grew on abused and tired land; today, it is lined with many products of the earth, and the earth itself begins to be strong again.

Driving along that trail, which extends everywhere in the South, the transformation may appear to have been easily accomplished. Yet, on every farm which bears witness to good farming practices has fallen the shadow of a patient, sweating county agent, persevering in his task of bringing southern farmers to their senses and southern farms to life again. Any veteran county agent can tell you of the earlier difficulties; for there was a time, not long past, when the farmers who knew everything except how to make a living would laugh at and deride the young agents and their high-falutin' college notions. They don't laugh now.

The transition from suspicion to full acceptance of the county agent is not yet complete. There are still not enough of them to go around; not enough funds available for them to do all they know to do and want to do; not enough public acceptance of the basic fact that man rises and falls with the land and the way he works it. Many thousands of farms in the South cry out for the county agent's shadow. For some he will come too late; but not for as many as we may fear, for the good earth is durable and can be reclaimed even from the desert.

Today, in the South, we have halted the destructive march toward barrenness; and the men who are responsible are a bunch of fellows on the public payroll. It isn't a bad idea to stop cussing all public job holders for a little bit and say thanks to at least some of them.

Security Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, I have called attention to the importance of maintaining the complete security of our codes and ciphers. These methods of secret communication are vital to the safety of our Armed Forces and our Nation. No traitorous act could

have graver consequences for us all than the delivery to our enemies of the keys to our secret codes and ciphers. This fact places a responsibility upon those who are permitted to see and study classified documents. While it is necessary and proper for the Members of Congress to see classified documents in order to be fully informed, it is also necessary that members, as well as other persons permitted to use such documents, be responsible for seeing that they do nothing likely to reveal the contents of such documents to our enemies.

It seems to me that we are witnessing too much laxity in this regard. In addition to discussing our most confidential military matters in public, we are also failing to insist upon absolute adherence by all persons to the rules intended to maintain the security of classified documents. The Associated Press has discussed this subject in a news story which appeared in the New York Times on May 13. I should like to include it in our RECORD for the benefit of Members who may not have seen it:

HEARINGS INVOLVE SECRET CODES; "CRACKING" A MAJOR PERIL IN WAR—MILITARY CONCERNED LEST OUR CRYPTOGRAPHIC DATA, APPEARING IN PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, MIGHT TIP OFF ENEMY SPIES

WASHINGTON, May 12.—The Senate committee hearings on the MacArthur case have produced bare references to one of the most carefully guarded secrets of the military—its system of cryptography.

In war, or even in peace, cracking the code of another nation can have value equal to the destruction of enemy armies or fleets. Because the United States learned Japan's communications code, it was ready when the Japanese fleet made the costly and unsuccessful strike at Midway Island in World War II.

The term "cryptography" really covers both the use of the code and of cipher transmission machines. Thus, a secret message can be transmitted by a machine that transmits symbols or groups of symbols that are (as the military says) "de-cryptographed" mechanically upon reception of the message.

Or cryptography may be merely the old but still useful system of using letters or groups of letters that have no meaning until a key converts the message into plain language.

Of particular concern to those charged with maintaining the security of crytography systems is the chance that a message sent by cipher may appear, by accident, at a later date in a public document. This would be useful material for an espionage agent who, having picked up from radio or other sources a copy of the coded message, could compare it with the plain-language text and thus crack the code.

Cryptographic messages sent in symbol could be as simple as the gadget used to run a player piano or could be much more intricate—which they are.

The military places the tightest protection not only over the machines and codes but over copies of messages that have been transmitted cryptographically. Regulations require that cryptographic material must be kept "in the most secure storage available and will never be left unattended except when locked in a three-combination safe or its equivalent," decoded cryptographic messages may not even be kept in the same safes with the code used to decipher them.

To prevent code-cracking, material sent cryptographically is paraphrased before being released for use by others than those to whom the messages are directed.

Regulations specify that "routine reports and messages which must be given wide distribution, or the contents of which have been or may eventually be furnished the press" should be transmitted whenever possible in plain language, but that if code transmission is required the text should be paraphrased before being distributed.

Precise instructions for paraphrasing also are set down. The sequences of paragraphs and of sentences in paragraphs must be changed; positions of subject, predicate, and modifiers must be altered; synonyms should be used.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Would Be an Easy Target for Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo (N. Y.) News in an editorial in the issue of April 14, 1951, reveals the vulnerability of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway to an attack by an enemy. The editorial follows:

SEAWAY WOULD BE VULNERABLE

As the hearing of those who are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project progresses before the House Public Works Committee the arguments of the proponents of it, previously heard, begin to sound rather hollow. Far from being an element of defensive strength, as spokesmen for the Truman administration have insisted, opponents make a strong case for an opposite conclusion.

Capt. Willis W. Bradley, United States Navy, retired, former Governor of Guam, gave it as his opinions at the committee hearing that the Great Lakes area had become one of the frontiers most exposed to attack and that a lock canal could not be made resistant either to atomic bombs or to modern conventional weapons. He went on to say that enemy attack can and likely would seriously damage the proposed waterway and thus block ship transit for an undetermined time. Thus it would be foolhardy, in his view, to place dependence for an ore supply in time of war on so vulnerable a means of transportation. Incidentally, Captain Bradley stated that such overseas trade as the 27-foot channel might develop would likely be 100 percent in foreign ships.

As a defense route, the seaway obviously would have to be kept in a state of constant military defense. During the war German submarines were reported in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Russia has many submarines, from which aircraft might be launched for an attack on the locks of the waterway. Thus there would be need of naval forces to protect shipping in the Gulf and the channels approaching the Great Lakes and air forces to turn attacks from the vital locks. The opinion of Captain Bradley seems to be that some of the enemy aircraft would certainly get through to this target. In which case there would be no seaway.

The Truman administration has emphasized that iron ore from Labrador is absolutely essential for full-scale operation of the steel mills on the Great Lakes for national defense. But Big Steel (Bethlehem and U. S. Steel) has shown no interest whatever in ore supplies from that source, despite the fact that it is vastly expanding the facilities of its Great Lakes plants. Chairman Eugene C. Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., told stockholders at the annual meeting last Tuesday in Wilmington, Del., that he did "not think the St. Lawrence seaway is essential to bring Labrador ore to the United States." Moreover, he said that the corporation was developing a process to produce iron from low-grade taconite ore, of which there are billions of tons in and about the Mesabi Range. He indicated that within a year or two Bethlehem would have a practical production from taconite.

Who will believe that practical steel men such as Mr. Grace, who are responsible for private investments of billions of dollars, cannot calculate better than Mr. Truman's Cabinet members what is to the best advantage of their industries? In a business rating who would place the Cabinet members on a par with them? They say that there is no need for a seaway to bring in ore from the Labrador wilderness for their mills, and they ought to know. In the circumstances, it does not make sense to spend perhaps a billion dollars or more for a seaway, one that would become a military zone inviting enemy attacks.

Air Power the Dominant Force in Modern War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a Member of the House has the opportunity to read a literary production by a fellow Member, or—in the case of the article to which I am about to refer—by fellow Members. Indeed, it is not often that Members of Congress, in the pressure of the work at hand, find time to produce a stirring article for a popular magazine. I might add, with some envy, that not all of us are as gifted as the Honorable W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, and the Honorable O. K. ARMSTRONG, of Missouri, who have contributed a timely article on the great lessons of Korea to the May issue of Air Force magazine.

There are a number of other things about the publication of this stirring article that seem to me significant. In the first place, the material for it was gathered by the authors on a trip made during the Easter recess, the expenses for which were borne by the authors and Air Force magazine. It was written in the flush of excitement produced by what they saw on their trip. It is not an official report on an official investigation. It is a personal tribute by two enthusiasic close observers of modern warfare to the power that is the dominant force in Korea, and that is ready for use against aggression elsewhere in the world or for war against Russia.

My colleagues went to Japan and Tokyo, talked with generals, pilots, privates, correspondents, and statesmen. In this article they have listed lessons they had learned as the result of their investigation which may be summarized briefly as follows:

First. This is an unreal war.

Second. Airpower has become the predominant destructive force against ground troops in the field.

Third. Airpower must be the keystone in the military defense structure of the free world.

In spite of the fact that their study of the situation in Korea led to their placing this emphasis on air power, their view is not a prejudiced one. They write that they believe—

Air power must be raised in the national mind above the confusions of interservice strife, above the shackles of an unrealistic and outmoded balanced force concept, and certainly above partisan politics. * * * Our admiration for the job being done by the Army, Marines, and Navy in Korea, and wherever else they may be, is as strong as the next man's. We believe firmly that all three services have a vital role in combating aggression. But we cannot, in all honesty, fail to recognize that air power is the dominant force in modern war.

Their soundly argued conclusion is, therefore, that Congress must assert itself, and raise air power to the position it deserves in our military and diplomatic structure. In short, we must recognize once and for all that air power has revolutionized our old traditional military and diplomatic concepts and is our defensive keystone.

Mr. Speaker, the report of my colleagues is so good, so packed with facts, so strengthened by cogent reasoning, that I shall take no more time to comment on it. Instead, I ask unanimous consent to insert both the report and the informative editor's note which precedes it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report by Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, and Representative O. K. ARMSTRONG, Republican, of Missouri, from the May 1951 issue of the Air Force Magazine is as follows:

THE GREAT LESSONS OF KOREA

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Shortly after the March issue of Air Force appeared with its special report on the air-ground operation in Korea the editor received calls from Congressmen W. J. BRYAN DORN (Democrat, South Carolina) and O. K. ARMSTRONG (Republican, Missouri).)

Independently each Congressman explained that the March issue of Air Force had, for the first time, cut through the confusion and doubt which prevailed on Capitol Hill regarding the role of air power in the Korean conflict.

The magazine report had already provoked unprecedented interest, but to Congressmen DORN and ARMSTRONG it called for more than interest. It called for action. First of all, each argued, it was high time that elected representatives of the people go to the Far East and see the facts for themselves, and then report to the American public.

The idea appealed to the editor, who wishes every Congressman could get closer to the facts of combat air power, and it was consistent with AFA's interest in better government. Further, it suggested an article for Air Force, prepared jointly by these two Congressmen. Let them form a private, bipartisan committee to search out the lessons of the Korean war which might be applicable to Western Europe and other potential trouble spots, and report the facts as they found them.

The Congressmen at their first meeting offered to forsake their Easter-recess trips back home, and further, to split with AFA the $1,500 per passenger round-trip airline fare to Tokyo.

Congressmen DORN and ARMSTRONG made a good team. They are of different political faiths and from different parts of the country. DORN is young, aggressive, and gregarious, an orator in the pattern of William Jennings Bryan, for whom he was named. ARMSTRONG is older and more reserved, a former university professor, an accomplished author and lecturer, and bylined staff writer for the Reader's Digest. DORN had been a member of an infantry outfit in the National Guard, and in World War II had served 19 months as a corporal with the Ninth Air Force in Europe through five major campaigns. ARMSTRONG, an Air Corps captain in World War I, did welfare work in France after that conflict, and had served the American Legion as a member of its foreign relations committee and at the FIDAC congress in Paris in 1937.

The two Congressmen left Washington aboard a Northwest Airlines plane on March 24. Representative DORN returned April 9 and Representative ARMSTRONG, who also visited Okinawa and Formosa, arrived April 16. Their intensive survey of the Far East had included an hour and a half conference with General MacArthur and an interview with General Ridgway. They had appeared before a committee of the Japanese Diet, visited with American Ambassador John J. Muccio and President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea, and had interviewed scores of officers and GI's of all services from Tokyo to the front lines north of Seoul, including Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, commanding the Tenth Corps, United States Army; Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commanding the Far East Air Forces; Rear Adm. George R. Henderson, commanding Fleet Air Japan; Lt. Gen. Frank W. Milburn, commanding the First Corps, United States Army; Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commanding the First Marine Division, and Lt. Gen. Earle E. Partridge, commanding the Fifth Air Force. Congressman ARMSTRONG also interviewed Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault (retired) on Formosa.

Arriving in Washington in the wake of General MacArthur's ouster as supreme commander, the Congressmen were immediately besieged with requests for public appearances. For several days their comments were news, on front pages and on radio and television programs, where they expressed their personal views independent of their Air Force assignment.

We are proud to present the joint report of Congressmen DORN and ARMSTRONG on the lessons of Korea.

REPORT BY REPRESENTATIVES DORN AND ARMSTRONG

From the moment our airliner touched its wheels to the long runway at Haneda Air Force Base near Tokyo and throughout our tour of the Far East, we were both impressed and startled by certain unrealities of the war in Korea.

The war was very real as we stood at the front line north of Seoul and observed the engagement between our doughboys and enemy troops just across the river. The fresh, gaping holes in the B-29 we examined at an emergency landing strip were real enough, and so were the reports of the F-86 pilots we interviewed at Suwon after their return from fighting MIG's over the Yalu River. To the men doing the fighting and dying in Korea, the war is very real indeed.

And yet our mission for Air Force magazine was to search out the lessons of Korea, lessons which might be applied to periphery wars of the future, or war against Russia.

On this basis alone, the first great lesson to be learned from Korea is that this is an unreal war.

In Japan, nerve center of the entire war effort, we were only 350 miles from enemy air bases on the mainland, near enough for our fighter planes, earlier in the war, to conduct combat operations from the islands, as our bombers still do. Despite its vulnerability to air attack, Tokyo reminded us of Washington. Here there was freedom of movement and communications. There were no air alerts or defense drills. Security restructions were temperate. It was hard to believe we were within fighter range of an active enemy.

In Korea the U. N. supply convoys moved freely in broad daylight right up to the front, bumper to bumper on the main roads. Here our combat cargo planes shuttled back and forth between rear areas and the front on precise schedules rivaling those of our domestic airlines. At Kangnung airstrip on the east coast we watched the little T-6 Mosquito planes take off and land on their fire direction missions quite oblivious to any possible danger and quite reminiscent of our hometown private pilots on a fair weather weekend at the local airport. We ourselves participated in the unreality of it all as we calmly observed the battle areas north of Seoul from the vantage point of one of the Army's little unarmed L-5's, and again, even more calmly, as passengers in an unarmed C-47 which circled lazily over a battle zone so we could watch our fighters strafe and napalm enemy troop positions directly below. It was as if we were seated in the second deck of a ball park looking down on a play at third base.

These were luxuries that had come with command of the air, and command of the air had come in the early days of the Korean war. Freedom of movement was taken for granted in Korea. In all-out war with Russia, or even in another perimeter war, this freedom would be lacking because air superiority would be lacking, as General Spaatz has pointed out so forcefully in this magazine—The Airpower Odds Against the Free World, April Air Force.

From the standpoint of both air and surface forces, command of the air is the key to full understanding of the war in Korea. Without it the Inchon landing could not have been attempted. Without it our Navy could not operate freely off the shores of the peninsula. Without it our B-29 strategic bombers could not be employed in direct support of the troops. Without it, these troops could not obtain what General MacArthur called "The greatest air support any ground forces have ever received in any war in history." And without this air support, we heard from one ground man after another, the U. N. forces could not have remained in Korea.

Thus, we early came to the obvious conclusion that the U. N. effort in Korea was dependent primarily on an unreal situation—unreal, that is, in terms of all-out war because it would not prevail in all-out war. This, we determined, was a lesson the American people must learn to understand in all its ramifications, lest they falsely project the Korean experience to other areas of the world, lest they take air superiority for granted and forget that in any war with Russia air superiority would have to be fought for and won before our surface forces could move effectively and safely.

In our repeated inquiry into the lessons of Korea that might apply to all-out war, we were confronted repeatedly with the lessons that have not and cannot be learned in Korea.

This experience brought to mind the criticism that was heaped on Maj. Gen. Emmett (Rosy) O'Donnell, former chief of the bomber command in the Far East, for his reported statement a few months ago to the effect that Korea had provided no real lessons in strategic air warfare. The unfavorable reactions to his remarks seemed, in retrospect, to illustrate the misinformed and misguided thinking which has prevailed in the country regarding the war in Korea and especially its airpower aspects.

For example, the so-called controversy over the jet fighter versus the propeller-driven fighter for ground support operations becomes no controversy at all under the light of full investigation. We spoke with Air

Force and Navy pilots who must live or die with the subject, and found the jet fighter the established favorite for all types of tactical combat work. In fact, our ground troops have enjoyed their immunity from enemy air attack to a great degree because of the unique capabilities of our jet planes. As Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commanding general of the Far East air forces, explained, "Had we been shackled with obsolete, single-purpose, piston-driven airplanes, the air superiority we now enjoy might never have been achieved."

Nor did we find evidence to support the much-publicized controversy over the effectiveness of Marine versus Air Force support of our ground troops. If such a controversy did exist in the early stages of the campaign, as reported, it has vanished with time and experience. The military team in Korea is a unified team. At the Joint Operations Centers, heart of the air-ground activity, representatives of all the four services work side by side in harmony. Marine land-based aviation has, since the start of the war, been under the directional control of this Joint Operations Center system, which handles all close support aviation coordination in Korea. From a C-47 over the bomb line near the east coast of the peninsula we watched Air Force T-6 Mosquito planes lead and direct Marine Corsairs to their targets in a mountain valley just below us. Those who continue to stir up this fallacious Marine-Air Force controversy are sabotaging the service unity that is working in Korea.

Looking back, it seems incredible that so many of our citizens were led so far off the track in interpreting the role of airpower in Korea. The misconceptions regarding this effort surely have been instrumental in preventing a realistic approach of our mobilization effort. It was not until publication of the special report, the Air-Ground Operation in Korea, in the March issue of Air Force magazine that our legislators and the public could properly appraise airpower in this war. The statements attributed to Gen. Rosy O'Donnell, untimely as they may have been, are even more understandable now that we have been to Korea and have witnessed for ourselves the conditions under which our men are fighting in the Far East.

It was General O'Donnell, we believe, who first called public attention to the diplomatic barriers to our military effort in Korea, barriers which illustrate further unrealities in this war. Without consideration of the diplomatic issues involved, it must be reported that the prohibition against our bombing beyond the Yalu River has placed our military leaders in Korea—as it did General O'Donnell—in an impossible tactical position.

On missions against the international bridges that cross the Yalu—their bomb runs by necessity paralleling the river line along the Korean shore—our B-29's are like ducks in a shooting gallery, running along a fixed track with the rifles—the enemy's jets and anti-aircraft guns—trained on them. In full view below are the Red airports from which these jets stage their attacks on the bombers. We watched the B-29's limp home in the soup one evening, and we talked to the crews. We heard them relate with understandable bitterness how they watched the Red jets take off from their Manchurian bases, attack the bombers, and then, after expending their ammunition and fuel, return to base, refuel and rearm, and climb up to repeat their attacks. We heard F-86 pilots who escort the B-29's tell how they must give up the chase against the MIGs when they spot the Yalu River barrier below. From an operational point of view alone, it is both a unique and a disgusting situation.

Our inquiry into the B-29 operation revealed further why the Air Force could hardly be expected to learn lessons about strategic air power in Korea. At the start of the war there were only 18 targets in North Korea that could be classified as strategic—targets such as the Chinnampo chemical and metal plant, the Chosen Nitrogen Explosives Co., at Haeju, the Wonsan oil refinery—and all 18 of these targets were neutralized through B-29 attacks by September 15, 1950, less than 3 months after the beginning of the war. They were neutralized with sporadic attacks sandwiched in while the B-29's were employed predominantly in a tactical role. When General O'Donnell was asked if he had learned anything about strategic bombing in Korea, he could hardly have replied except as he did, in the negative.

On the other hand, the Air Force has learned something about tactical employment of B-29's, primarily because these bombers have never before been in a position to be so employed. The Air Force has learned, for example, that the big bombers can destroy targets no larger than railroad bridges and moving trains. To do this, of course, the bombers must come down to an altitude which makes them, from an operational standpoint, unjustifiably vulnerable to ground attack and fighter opposition. This forbids accurate evaluation of their vulnerability, or lack of it, as strategic bombers.

Another unreal aspect of the war concerns both our air and ground units. The ground troops are by now seasoned fighting men, experienced by the hard knocks of battle, experienced in all phases of ground warfare—except one. They have had no opportunity to gain experience in dealing with hostile airpower. Few of them, from commanders on down, have ever seen unfriendly aircraft overhead in Korea. As a result, camouflage, dispersal, communications security and other antiairpower measures are lacking, simply because there is no need for them. The same situation prevails with our air units. In addition, the Air Force is able to devote such a large segment of its air capability to ground support operations that it is gaining little or no experience about air defense against modern fighters.

The war in Korea is unreal for another reason. To the average newspaper reader, for example, its progress is measured by the amount of terrain won or lost by the U. N. forces. The public can hardly be blamed for using this yardstick, inasmuch as it is the official U. N. yardstick. The stated U. N. objective in the war is to join North and South Korea by force of arms as a prelude to establishment of a unified Korea. This objective places the emphasis on gaining real estate, whereas, from time immemorial, the mission of every military commander is to destroy the enemy's military machine. This military mission prevails in Korea.

General Ridgway's Operation Killer was aptly named. Militarily, the objective is to destroy enemy troops and weapons, with the gaining of real estate only a means to that end. Politically, or diplomatically, it is the end in itself. Thus, in Korea a strategic withdrawal, with heavy destruction of enemy troops accompanying it, is temporarily at least a military gain and a political set-back. The Christmas advance to the Yalu, on the other hand, was a political gain and a military set-back.

In evaluating the success of the military mission, it is necessary to understand the nature of the enemy we are facing. Red China's casualties in the war are estimated in the hundreds of thousands. Everywhere we heard that her hospitals are terribly pressed. No one would venture a guess as to how heavy their war losses must be before Red China's leaders conclude that Korea is not worth the sacrifice. It is generally assumed that her casualties are already greater than a democracy such as ours could tolerate, and quite possibly greater than Russia's leaders would permit. It is true that Russia's casualties at Stalingrad were enormous, but it is also true that losses incurred in defending one's homeland are quite different than losses incurred on foreign soil. With Russia pulling the strings of war without suffering the losses of war, the enemy's casualty rate is perhaps higher than could be expected elsewhere.

However, with Operation Killer the military order of the day in Korea, the weapon accountable for most of the killing must, of necessity, take on special significance. In Korea, the airplane is this weapon. The scope of its destructive power against ground troops, given little consideration in the past, is so great that we must conclude:

The second great lesson to be learned from Korea is that airpower has become the predominant destructive force against ground troops in the field.

The Air Force, repeatedly under fire since World War II for its damage claims, has vastly underestimated the number of casualties it has inflicted on enemy troops in Korea.

GHQ estimates, based on prisoner-of-war interrogation and preliminary field reports, have credited our air power with 47 percent of all enemy casualties in the Korean war—an unusually high figure, based on past war experience. We believe, however, that further evidence will reveal that this figure must be revised upward.

Field reports from Army sources, we learned, now indicate that air attack probably has been responsible for more, and perhaps twice as many, enemy casualties in Korea as ground attack. Whatever the final estimate might be after all the evidence is in, there is no question but that—once air superiority has been attained—air power becomes a far greater destroyer of troops in the field than is ground power.

This new development in warfare is full of meaning.

As long as air superiority is on our side, as long as we have command of the air over our troops, we can exploit this great destructive power so forcefully demonstrated in Korea. Under these circumstances, air power becomes the only hope of offsetting the enemy's overwhelming weight of numbers and his willingness to accept abnormally high casualties.

In Korea it was the prevailing opinion that air power—through ground support—had made it possible for U. N. forces to hold the peninsula. General MacArthur called the air-power effort monumental, and he added, "air power has saved our Army in Korea on numerous occasions." Lt. Gen. Frank W. Milburn, commanding the First Corps, United States Army, told us, "We couldn't have carried on the Korean operation without air power." Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, commanding the Tenth Corps, United States Army, added, "The Air Force has done a splendid job in carrying out its air-support mission. The air-ground team is working most effectively." This was the tenor of comment from ground men all down the line.

But now the airplane emerges, not only as a superior support weapon to assist our ground troops in killing the enemy but, in itself, and by a wide margin, the U. N.'s most productive troop killer. This is a new role for air power.

However, we must be bluntly realistic about the air weapon in relation to our current air-power position. We must consider the second lesson of Korea in reverse.

We know from World War II experience that Russia is a past master in attack aviation. We have the report of Gen. Carl Spaatz, first chief of staff of the Air Force (April Air Force) that Russia is assured command of the air over Europe and Asia for several years ahead, at least; that in Western Europe she holds a 10 to 1 advantage in modern planes and will hold at least a 5 to 1 margin over the free world at the end of 1952.

In the face of these alarming facts, we must consider, first, that Russian air power possesses equal if not greater destructive force against ground troops as the force we have revealed with our own air power in Korea; second, that this destructive force is dependent upon sufficient air superiority to insure command of the air; third, that Russia has this command of the air and there is no evidence she cannot maintain it; and fourth, that under this set of circumstances we must be prepared to accept, in any war with Russia and perhaps in a lesser war, the casualty rates which modern war imposes upon an Army that does not have adequate air protection—the type of intolerable casualty rates which Red China has suffered in Korea.

All this compels us to recognize once and for all that air power has revolutionized our traditional military and diplomatic concepts, and prompts the conclusion that:

The third great lesson to be learned from Korea is that air power must be the keystone in the military defense structure of the free world.

Our policy makers are strangely inconsistent in their evaluation of air power as an instrument of national and international policy. Shortly before our departure for the Far East we attended a conference at which State Department leaders acknowledged, in the course of their comments on the world situation, that our long-range air power provided the only major deterrent to all-out Russian aggression. These same leaders, however, revealed a lack of appreciation for the necessity of overwhelming air power for the protection of our troops in Western Europe. If our diplomats are truly interested in deterrents, as they must be, they couldn't find a better one than the U. N.'s command of the air over Western Europe.

On the other hand, we suspect that our policy makers are more dependent upon air power than they themselves realize. Their dependency on the deterrent effect of our strategic air power, and its resultant effect on national policy, is too obvious to discuss here. We refer to the official policy which confines our forces to Korea, as against the alternative of carrying the fight to the Reds with aerial bombardment of their Manchurian bases. This official policy of containment obviously centers in the hope that we can kill sufficient Communists in Korea to force Red China to give up the struggle and settle on "honorable terms." General Bradley said as much in an address in Chicago on April 17. "Our present objective in Korea," he explained, "is to stop the Communists—to kill as many as we can at the least possible cost to ourselves."

That objective is clear enough. The problem is, it is not being supported, at least not in terms of emphasis in our mobilization effort. As we have pointed out, the airplane is—by a wide margin—our best destroyer of Communists in Korea. Thus, air power is—though not recognized as such—the backbone of our official strategy, as defined by General Bradley. Our policy makers, under their own terms, must depend on it as much or more than those who would send our bombers across the Yalu. Therefore, to support their own strategy—since the airplane can destroy enemy troops in other parts of the world as well as in Korea—one would expect an adequate build-up in air-power development. Surely, an all-powerful United States Air Force should be in the making.

Yet, General Spaatz reports that under prevailing policy an Air Force of only 50 modern groups is actually being produced, and that we have slowed down on our whole air-power build-up. This seems not only inconsistent but a direct invitation to disaster.

Whether you take the stand that the calculated risk involved in bombing Manchuria is too great, or that we must take that risk now as the lesser of two evils; whether aggression, or will hasten it; whether you consider the British Isles a dependable military base, or an expendable atomic target; whether you feel we must stop Russia short of North America, or make our own continent a huge air and sea base for the world—no matter which side you're on in the so-called great debate, the determining factor in your argument must be, it seems clear, the air-power capability of the free world compared to that of Russia.

In view of this, we believe air power must be raised in the national mind above the confusions of interservice strife, above the shackles of an unrealistic and outmoded balanced force concept, and certainly above partisan politics. We must forget the service feuds of the past that still plague us to the point that when the capabilities of air power are cited it is charged that one believes air power can win a war alone; when it is argued that the Air Force must be, in keeping with its responsibilities and destructive power, the major service in our Military Establishment, it is charged that this is disparaging to the other two services. The war in Korea—once it is viewed at close range—dispels all such shallow considerations. The doughboy is delighted that airpower is capable of such destructive force; he just wants to get the job done, he doesn't care how, and get back home. Our admiration for the job being done by the Army, Marines, and Navy, in Korea and wherever else they may be, is as strong as the next man's. We believe firmly that all three services have a vital role in combating aggression. But we cannot, in all honesty, fail to recognize that air power is the dominant force in modern war.

Official thinking in this country is seemingly unaware of the military and diplomatic revolution that is taking place as a result of air power development. In the national interest, we urge that the Air Force Association continue and intensify its aggressive policy of bringing the story of this development to the people. We will urge that the Congress assert itself and raise airpower to the position it deserves in our military and diplomatic structure.

If the war in Korea does not force a departure from the surface thinking that permeates our present military strategy, if it does not lead to full realization that air power is the determining military factor in our foreign policy, if it does not hasten the establishment of a sound air power policy for all the free nations, then much of our military effort in Korea will be in vain, and as a nation we will be judged guilty of gross negligence before the facts of modern war and modern diplomacy.

Exchange of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 15, 1951:

GREATER EXCHANGE OF STUDENTS URGED—ADVISORY COMMISSION'S REPORT TO CONGRESS STRESSES SOVIET METHODS OF INDOCTRINATION

WASHINGTON, April 14.—An expanded State Department educational exchange program to combat Russia's spreading Communist culture was urged in a report to Congress today by the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

Particular stress was laid on Russia's cultural imperialism in North Korea as a prelude to aggression under an economic and cultural agreement made by Russia and her satellite on March 17, 1949. This was cited as an example of what this country should resist through programs tailor-made for the countries in which they are to be used.

Meanwhile President Truman appointed Dr. Margaret Clapp, president of Wellesley College, and Dr. James W. Edgar, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Texas, as members of the Board of Foreign Scholarships that operates the Federal student exchange program. They will serve for 3 years.

More extensive exchange of students, Government officials, labor groups, and youth and professional leaders in all fields was urged with the aim of attaining these three objectives:

"1. To keep alive the spirit of cooperation among the free nations of the world for the purpose of self-protection and progress for all.

"2. To strengthen resistance to communism in countries immediately threatened with infiltration or aggression.

"3. To weaken the forces of communism and diminish its power in areas now under the domination of the U. S. S. R."

"The Commission wishes to make it clear that we do not believe the program has attained its maturity either in scope or definition," said the report.

Signed by the chairman, Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, and his associates, it added:

"The process of adjusting it to the tasks imposed by the Communist challenge will be a continuous one.

"To illustrate, we feel that the reexamination of the content of the presentation made to other peoples, as contrasted with the objectives sought has only just begun. Part of the approach used at one time—the emphasis upon the strength and industrial wealth of the United States, for example—ran grave risks of creating envy and resentment, rather than attitudes of cooperation and friendship."

The commission, however, complimented Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, for giving the program "vigorous and forward-looking leadership."

It is expected that grants for the exchange of persons will exceed 6,500 in 1951, the report said. This Government program is relatively small compared to exchanges made under private auspices, it added. By way of contrast, it reported that 30,000 foreign students were now studying at a thousand American campuses.

In discussing the North Korea infiltration, the commission said the United States program as first conceived had not considered "intensive campaigns for the conversion of whole peoples to the Communist point of view."

"The facts in this instance are so significant that they should be cited specifically," the report continued. "In 1945, some 3,700 North Koreans were enrolled in one or another of the Soviet-oriented cultural societies in that area. By 1949, this number had been increased to over 1,300,000. During the 3-year period prior to 1948, some 770,000 copies of 72 Russians books were published in North Korea. In 1949, some 500 books were translated and large numbers of copies distributed.

"Numerous classes in the Russian language were organized. Almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given in North Korea by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in 1948, and an even greater number were given in 1949.

"In the course of the 5-year period preceding hostilities, hundreds of intellectual, industrial, and political leaders from North Korea were taken to Moscow for indoctrination. This provides a vivid illustration of the Soviet program to misguide and seduce a whole population for violent ends."

Among the books published in 1949, were a total of 537,000 copies of the "History of the Communist Party (Bolshevik)" and Stalin's "Collected Works."

MacArthur's Strategy: Pros and Cons Weighed—Issues Raised at the Senate Hearing and Analysis of Points in Dispute

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Sunday, May 13, carried the following excellent analysis of the MacArthur controversy by its famous authority on military matters, Hanson W. Baldwin:

MACARTHUR'S STRATEGY: PROS AND CONS WEIGHED—ISSUES RAISED AT THE SENATE HEARING AND ANALYSIS OF POINTS IN DISPUTE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Victory through attrition or victory through attack—these were the basic alternatives presented last week to the Senate committees studying the issues presented by the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Although General MacArthur and Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall have been, so far, the only witnesses, the battle lines already have been clearly drawn, and the issues considerably, though by no means completely, illuminated.

The Republicans, critical of the policies we have followed in Korea and the Orient, would probably say with Pyrrhus: "One more such victory and we are undone." And the Democrats, supporting the limitation of the conflict in hopes of ultimate gains, would probably agree with Polybius: "It is no doubt a good thing to conquer on the field of battle, but it needs greater wisdom and greater skill to make use of victory."

The strategy for victory in Korea and the Orient and its relationship to world strategy was the major problem that formed the background of the great debate. How to achieve that victory with the least cost to the United States and how to accomplish the political aims of the containment of communism on a world-wide basis was the subject around which all the questions in the Senate committees' caucus room sooner or later revolved.

General MacArthur stressed again and again that American blood was being shed in Korea, and advocated a course of action somewhat similar to the strategy he followed in the brilliant Inchon operation and later in the ill-fated victory offensive toward the Yalu—a course of great risk in the hope of great gain—and a limited extension of the war in the Orient beyond Korea to force Communist China to abandon the Korean campaign.

Strategy of attrition

General Marshall stressed again and again that it was the opinion of the Pentagon that the course advocated by General MacArthur might cause the loss of more, rather than of less, American blood, and might well involve the Nation in the very thing we are trying to avoid—world war III. A strategy of attrition within Korea—the decimation of the Chinese armies thrown against us, and particularly the destruction of their best troops—offered, he suggested, the best hope for an eventual cease-fire, with a safeguarding of American and allied interests in the Orient and the world.

The principal topics discussed were: (1) air reconnaissance; (2) hot pursuit of enemy planes across the Yalu and bombardment of enemy bases in Manchuria; (3) economic blockade of China; (4) naval blockade of China; (5) Formosa and Nationalist troops and guerrillas; (6) the relationship of Communist China to Soviet Russia; (7) the strength and capabilities of Soviet forces in the Far East.

The MacArthur position, the administration position (insofar as the hearings have revealed them) and an analysis of each of these topics follow:

1. AIR RECONNAISSANCE

MacArthur: "Remove now any restrictions on air reconnaissance of China coastal areas and of Manchuria." (Quoted by the general, as representing his position, from tentative proposals suggested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in January.)

Administration: This, and other courses of action, once tentatively suggested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the darkest days of the Korean war, "were considered inadvisable in view of the radical change in the situation. * * * [This course] would have us, on our own initiative, carry the conflict beyond Korea, against the mainland of Communist China."

Analysis: This issue is minor and represents something of a tempest in a teapot. Extended air reconnaissance is a corollary to extended bombardment and, if we bomb in Manchuria, our "photorecon" planes must have freedom to fly nearly anywhere in the Manchurian air space and probably over the coastal areas—not easily defined—of China. Today—and since the Korean war started—our reconnaissance planes are making daily flights from Okinawa, Japan, and elsewhere along the coast of China from the Yellow Sea to Canton, but have remained over the sea. Inspection and photographs of ports is a daily routine, but detailed close inspection of certain areas is not possible.

Other reconnaissance planes have photographed border areas in Manchuria across the Yalu from great heights. By such means we have had forewarning of a Chinese Communist air build-up in Manchuria and of periodic concentrations of junks opposite Formosa. Present reconnaissance, together with other intelligence sources, should give us ample information to wage a war limited to Korea, but would be clearly inadequate if the war were extended beyond Korea.

2. "HOT PURSUIT"

MacArthur: The pursuit of enemy planes beyond the Yalu to their bases in Manchuria and the bombardment of the enemy sanctuary in Manchuria—including airfields, troop concentrations, supply dumps, and railroads—would, together with other actions, "force China to diminish her effort in * * * Korea."

Administration: The administration early agreed to the hot pursuit of enemy aircraft beyond the Yalu, but because of allied opposition, did not authorize it. Bombing of Chinese bases "would not bring victory," but if there were no danger of bringing Russia into the war we would not hesitate to bomb them.

Analysis: This issue involves a question of judgment as to just how much air power can accomplish. General MacArthur testified that if he had been permitted to bomb across the Yalu prior to and when the Chinese Communists struck us in force in late November, "I haven't the faintest doubt we would have thrown them back."

Air power exaggerated

But General MacArthur told the President at Wake Island before the attack that if the Chinese Communists did attack him his air power would slaughter them. Exaggerated optimism about the ability of air power to interdict completely enemy communication lines has characterized much of the Korean war; yet the enemy, utilizing animal transport, human porters, and moving by night and with great camouflage discipline, always has brought up supplies.

There is, nevertheless, not much doubt that our bombardment of enemy facilities in Manchuria would considerably complicate the enemy's ground campaign in Korea, and might, in time, reduce his ability to maintain troops there. But such a result would be conditional upon three other factors: (1) Increase of the strength of our own Air Forces in the Far East; (2) negligible or limited opposition from the Chinese Communist Air Force; (3) no opposition from the Soviet Air Force.

General MacArthur testified that his program of bombardment might require the addition of perhaps one B–29 group and a B–36 group to the far eastern air forces. No public and official administration estimate of the additional effort needed has been given, but some administration spokesmen fear such a campaign would necessitate the reduction in strength of our strategic air command, which now represents the (atomic) right fist of our world strategy, and of our continental air defense in order to supply enough planes for the broadened Far East strategy.

This would be particularly true if the Chinese Communist air force—now believed to number 500 to 700 planes in Manchuria, including two types of modern Russian jets—should retaliate by active attack upon our bases and ground troops.

Question of sanctuary

If the Russian air force, numbering perhaps 3,000 planes east of Lake Baikal, should intervene, all bets, of course, would be off, and Russia has troops, and planes along the Manchurian railways, which are important to the supply of the sizable Russian garrisons at Port Arthur and Dairen.

The administration makes the point that our planes and troops—as well as the enemy's—have a sanctuary in Korea; we are now relatively free from any serious air attack, and that if and when enemy aircraft intervene massively in the ground battle in Korea or in attack upon our bases, our planes will immediately retaliate by attacks upon Manchurian bases and supply lines.

United States air attacks upon Manchuria would certainly broaden the war. And the military gains achieved would be at the expense of the commitment of greater force to the Orient—with consequent reduction in our strength elsewhere. Such action might also result in development of a major air war—in addition to the existent ground fighting—and consequent deprivation of our troops in Korea of the great volume of air support they are now receiving.

3. ECONOMIC BLOCKADE

There is no material difference between General MacArthur and the administration on this point. The administration's difficulty has been to convince its allies—particularly Great Britain—of the wisdom of such a measure, and to control shipments carried in foreign-flag vessels. Recent United Nations and congressional actions indicate that the way has been cleared for tightening an economic blockade which has long been in effect.

4. NAVAL BLOCKADE

MacArthur: China is "peculiarly vulnerable to the process of blockade. * * * There is no weapon of war in my opinion that is quite as efficacious as a blockade. * * *"

Administration: "It would inconvenience them and in time might have a very serious effect on the stability of the Chinese Communist Government."

Analysis: A sea blockade of an island, or of a small nation with limited land access to other nations, is most effective; sea blockades of great continental nations or of half a continent, like China, are generally far less effective. General MacArthur's point is that naval closure of the sea lanes of communication to China, plus the air bombardment of the Manchurian railroads, would cut effectively the main routes by which supplies reach China. This is undoubtedly true. But naval blockade plus air bombardment would probably never be—at least until months after its inception—more than 50 to 75 percent effective. Other land routes beyond our effective reach are still open to China, via central Asia, via India, via Burma, and Thailand, and by blockade-runners.

Moreover, railroads, once bombed are not necessarily severed; they can be repaired quickly, as Germany in the last war and Korea now, have demonstrated; it would require consistent and persistent large-scale effort to halt traffic.

Even when China was limited in the last war to supplies over the Hump and by the Burma Road, resistance against the Japanese was still maintained. Moreover, China is capable of manufacturing in sizable numbers the small arms, mortars and machine guns which form the bulk of the equipment of her army in Korea, and China has sufficient rice to prevent nationwide famine.

Greater naval forces

Like air bombardments, naval blockade, if it is to be effective, would require a greater concentration of United States naval forces in the Far East—how much greater no witness yet has ventured to guess. It would, like air bombardment, increase the risk of involvement with Soviet Russia; General MacArthur advocated the inclusion of Russian Port Arthur in our blockade cordon. It would increase friction with our allies and with "neutrals," and India, at least, would probably pay no attention to it. Yet, even with the naval force now available in the Far East, a blockade which would greatly cut down Chinese imports could be established.

5. FORMOSA

This breaks down into a number of issues:

(1) *Strategic importance*

MacArthur: "I would insure that Formosa shall not fall into Red hands. * * * If it does, you have not only lost everything we gained in the Pacific war, but you have rolled back our strategic frontier * * * all the way to the western coast of the United States."

Administration: "We did not want [Formosa] for ourselves, but it would be very serious for our line of defense there if it got into hostile hands." The administration has advocated "neutralization" of Formosa and last week General Marshall agreed completely with General MacArthur that it should not be allowed to pass to Communist control.

Analysis: Few military leaders would agree with the extreme statements of General MacArthur about Formosa's strategic importance; in effect he said that if we lost Formosa we lost the Pacific. Yet Formosa was in enemy hands in World War II and even in the darkest days our strategic frontier was never pushed back to the Pacific coast. As General MacArthur himself pointed out in his testimony, our military superiority in the western Pacific is dependent upon sea and air superiority; if we maintain such superiority, Formosa, even in enemy hands, could not be a vital military threat. However, enemy jet planes based on advanced fields on Formosa, would have range enough—unlike the same planes based on the Chinese mainland—to operate against the Philippines, and the political and psychological effect of a Communist Formosa would be very grave in the Philippines and the Orient.

(2) *Chiang Kai-shek*

MacArthur: "I believe that to the average Asiatic, Chiang Kai-shek stands out as the great symbol against communism."

Administration: Inherent in the testimony was some feeling of reserve about Chiang Kai-shek's leadership.

Analysis: Few experts would characterize Chiang in the sweeping terms used by MacArthur, but on the other hand, there are few who can name any Chinese leader to replace him who would command the same power. The issue should not be put in terms of Chiang or Mao, but in terms of many anti-Communist leaders.

(3) *Nationalist armed forces*

MacArthur: These forces are on the whole good, but need United States equipment, training, and logistical support. They should be built up and Chiang Kai-shek, with United States support, should be allowed to use them against the continent of Asia. There was also some discussion of their use in Korea. United States help should never include the commitment of United States ground troops on the China mainland.

Administration: On the basis of reports by "the survey party which was sent by MacArthur to Formosa" the Joints Chiefs of Staff were convinced "that these [Nationalist] forces would not be effective" in Korea. No clear-cut statement is available about how the JHS feel today about the use of these troops against the China mainland, but the United States Seventh Fleet is still acting under orders which prevent Nationalist attacks against the mainland.

Aid to Chiang Kai-shek

Analysis: Gradual modification of our Formosan policy since last summer now has reached the point where mutual defense assistance program aid is being given to the island, and a United States military mission—to administer that aid but not to supervise it or to train the Chinese—is now on Formosa. The checks which prevent the use of the Nationalist Navy, Air Force, and Army against the mainland still, however, exist. If they were lifted, immediate small-scale operations against the Communists would be possible, but large-scale operations are months away and would be dependent for their success upon extensive United States supervision and logistic support. Our present policy of giving aid without supervision is largely useless; the reforms needed on Formosa to make the 500,000 men of the Nationalists effective fighting forces are too major to be accomplished without United States supervision and training.

(4) *Nationalist guerrillas*

This subject was slurred over in the released testimony, but a United States program of aid and organization for anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland of China has been considerably increased in recent months, and there seems to be no difference of opinion about this.

6. CHINA AND SOVIET RUSSIA

MacArthur: Communism, rather than Russia, is the major threat, and Moscow and Peiping are not indissolubly linked.

Administration: Soviet Russia is the main threat. Moscow and Peiping are not indissolubly linked but are close together now, and an attack upon Peiping might further forge this link.

Analysis: This argument seems a quibble. The enemy is both communism and Soviet Russia, but it is indisputable that from a military point of view Russia is the main danger. Psychologically, ideology cannot be defeated by a sword; hence the military measures against Chinese communism which MacArthur advocates would not strike against the main military opponent and might psychologically forge the present link between Moscow and Peiping more strongly.

7. SOVIET FORCES IN EAST

MacArthur: "Their air is not to be discounted * * *. That she [Russia] could get command of the sea * * *, I would be very doubtful of. * * * The Soviet has the capacity to launch a punishing attack upon Japan, but * * * [not] to overrun Japan * * *." There are major industrial and logistic weaknesses in the Soviet military set-up in the Far East. Their dispositions are primarily defensive.

Administration: Figures of Soviet strength were censored, but are nevertheless well known; there are at least 70 Soviet submarines, including some snorkels, in the Pacific; at least 3,000 planes east of Lake Baikal and from 30 to 40 divisions in the same area. There are probably close to 100,000 Russian troops of all types in Manchuria and several hundred thousand others in the Vladivostok area or along the Manchurian frontier. Soviet capability for an offensive effort is not discounted.

Analysis: Any judgments are speculative, but some of the communication and industrial weaknesses cited by MacArthur appear to be dated. They were true prior to World War II, but an improved communication network and industrial facilities have been established in the Far East; there are today, for instance, Soviet submarine-building yards in Siberia. The remoteness of Siberia from the Urals and European Russia undoubtedly would hamper Soviet supply, but there is probably sufficient matériel stockpiled to permit major efforts for some months of war. The Soviet military capabilities, in any case, must be reckoned as initially strong, particularly on the continent of Asia.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The issues obviously boil down to differing judgments as to the efficacy of the measures proposed, the strength of the Russians in the area, and the Communist reactions to these measures. General MacArthur thinks that the extension of the limited war in Korea to a limited war in China would increase the pressure against the Chinese Communist Government sufficiently to force it to make peace in Korea and that Russia would not intervene, though the risk would have to be taken. The administration doubts the efficacy of these measures, fears more than does General MacArthur the possibility of Soviet intervention, and believes that some of the measures might split us from our allies and weaken us in other areas of the world more vital to our global strategy.

Any objective appraisal would probably fall somewhere between these judgments. Bombardment and blockade is not likely to bring about full-fledged open and all-out Soviet intervention, but it very probably would mean the increase of indirect Soviet aid to China, with a resultant increase in the scale of fighting. On the other hand, there is no present indication that Peiping is ready to cry quits in Korea, and there does not appear to be any foreseeable end to the present campaign of attrition.

In such circumstances it seems likely that we must inevitably move, not all the way to the MacArthur program, but toward a less limited war—the imposition of a tighter and

tighter economic blockade, the strengthening of Formosa and the mainland guerrillas, and the lifting of the restrictions that now hamper the Nationalists. But it seems unlikely—and undesirable—that we will, in the near future, bomb and blockade Communist China unless the enemy himself first broadens the war.

In other words, the basic issues of victory through attrition or victory through attack seem oversimplified; neither strategy promises clear-cut victory. For in Korea, as elsewhere in the world, we are engaged in a political, psychological, economic, and military campaign of attrition—with our patience, judgment, firmness, and strength the only factors that stand between us and some future era of greater security and the specter of world war III. We are in for a long pull and a hard pull—and no prescription for a quick and easy cure can change the prognosis.

The Land Where the River Flows North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the great Red River Valley of the North has played an important part in the development of our Nation. Its broad, rich acres produce some of the finest crops in the world, crops which are a basic part of our national economy.

I would like to call to the attention of the Members an article by Mr. H. W. Herbison, which explains the history of the region and its development as a potato center. The article, as printed in the program for the National Potato Conference at Grand Forks, N. Dak., March 20 to 31, follows:

THE LAND WHERE THE RIVER FLOWS NORTH
(By H. W. Herbison)

Where tossed and rolled the mighty waters of prehistoric Lake Agassiz, remaining in the wake of the northward retreat of that great continental ice sheet blanketing the land during the Wisconsin stage of ice invasion, is now an 8,000-square-mile reservoir of soil fertility we call the Red River Valley of the North. Other than the black-land region of the Don in Russia, no strip of land exists quite like it in potential power to produce cereal grains, flaxseed, potatoes, sugarbeets, and legumes in complementary combination with good farm management.

Beginning near Wahpeton, N. Dak., this land-use area extends nearly 200 miles northward in the direction of Winnipeg, Manitoba. In width, it averages about 40 miles (as narrow as 20 miles near its southern boundary and widening out at much as 60 miles during its course toward the Canadian line). More than one-third of it lies within the State of Minnesota; the remaining portion is in six counties comprising the eastern boundary of North Dakota.

The summer visitor is immediately struck with the nearly level topography of the area (ideal for mechanized farming), the rich black color and the depth of its fertile soils.

Climate, past and present, accounts for many striking characteristics of Red River Valley soils and their performance. Comparatively low moisture supplies in centuries past were hardly sufficient to support a general forest vegetation; they were, however, extremely favorable to the growth of numerous grasses. These grasses have been the source of humus imparting the black color to all soils of the region.

While adequate for the accumulation of large quantities of black organic matter in the surface soil, moisture supply of only 20 to 24 inches a year has not been sufficient to leach it to any great depth. Long winters blanket the land with snow to help keep natural surface soil fertility intact for use by plants during the spring and summer months when most of the area's rainfall occurs.

The decade 1870–80 was significant in terms of settlement, public policy, and the development of transportation and markets. The Northern Pacific Railway extended its lines westward. The St. Paul & Pacific (now part of the Great Northern) reached Barnesville, Minn., in 1870. By 1880, Jim Hill was successful in having the Great Northern lines built through the State and Red River Valley. The eastern part of old military reserves was officially thrown open to homestead entry.

By 1883, much of the better arable land of the Red River Valley was already taken up by settlers and its development as an area producing small grains and flaxseed begun.

How large are Red River Valley farms? Average 1950 size of farm approaches 400 acres (all farms). Four hundred and eighty acres appear to be the size most prevalent, interspersed with many half-section farms and a relatively small number which are 640 acres or larger. In gross farm income from all sources, Red River Valley farm operators have averaged a little more than $8,000 in recent years, with the common pattern slightly higher than $10,000.

How about potatoes? Where, when and how do they fit into the land-use picture of the Red River Valley? Historically, commercial potato production came into the land-use picture to stay with the turn of the twentieth century. Before that, ambitious starts were made only to fold up in the face of high freight rates and imperfect knowledge of the potato market.

Early growers sought a row crop that would (1) help to clean up weed infested land for wheat, and (2) another cash crop that could be produced, handled and marketed at a time not in conflict with the production and harvesting of small grains and flax.

Potato acreages grew slowly until new technology following World War I enabled Red River Valley growers to expand commercial production rapidly. By 1919, acreage was only 83,000. By 1929, it had increased to 130,000, then to 140,000 acres in 1940, and finally reaching an all-time acreage high of 191,000 in 1943. By 1945, acreage had dropped back to 175,000 from which 23,460,000 bushels were produced. Since then, potato acreages have tapered off to the lowest level recorded within the span of the past quarter of a century; even so, potato production on North Dakota farms has held right near the 20,000,000-bushel mark in recent years. The same general pattern may be assumed to hold for Minnesota portions of the valley.

What takes the place of displaced potato acres? Sixty-seven thousand acres of dryland sugarbeets are now grown in the Red River Valley (about two-thirds on the Minnesota side of the river). In the southern section of the valley, corn, soybeans, and sugarbeet acreage has expanded at the expense of potato acreage over a period of 25 years. In the northern zone, these other row crops have also expanded but have replaced potatoes to a lesser degree than in the southern zone.

More and more, commercial table stock potato production has tended to concentrate in the northern zone of the Red River Valley where the combination of land, climate, and producer-handler know-how has made for a community of potato men determined to hold and strengthen their position in the potato market place. With a half century of potato experience behind them, an aggressive State seed department on the alert to vigorous seed stocks, a sympathetic research and extension program expanding its service in production and marketing problem solving, and the benefit of land and climate in which potatoes naturally fit into the overall organization and management of the farm—it seems likely that Red River Valley potatoes may continue to be reckoned with in the market place for quite a while.

The valley now has more than 500 trackside potato storage and processing plants, including some of the newest and most modern in the United States. Potato acreage range from 20 to more than 1,000 acres per grower, averaging 50 acres, with a large production of certified seed. Cobblers, Triumphs, and Pontiacs are principal varieties, although many newer varieties are coming into prominence and research goes on constantly to develop others particularly suited to the region.

The future? The Red River Valley Potato Growers' Association, the Potato Research Center, the Research and Demonstration Farm, and the cooperation extended by the land-grant colleges and Department of Agriculture with the potato industry suggests that there will be a future. Accent from here will be on meeting the demands of discriminating consumers and looking well to the costs and marginal efficiency of satisfying consumer demand in our production, harvesting, handling, and marketing policy and practice

With patience, hard work, and courageous planning the Red River Valley seeks an answer to what the future holds for it by 1960 that may be made compatible with the interests of producers and consumers alike. Progress in that direction is now under way.

The Last Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this article by Edna Lonigan speaks for itself:

THE LAST PHASE
(By Edna Lonigan)

I

General MacArthur's triumphant journey from Tokyo to the Halls of Congress is a political earthquake. But the line of cleavage is not between Republicans and Democrats. It is between the people and the mysterious entity called the Fair Deal.

The Truman administration started out as an era of good feeling. Those who did not like the New Deal were glad we had a homespun Missouri Democrat in place of Roosevelt. They liked his looks, his Midwestern accent, his unexpected dignity in dealing with Congress, with the press, and with the chiefs of foreign nations.

The new President took up the task of international conferences where Roosevelt dropped it, and then, after Potsdam, said what most Americans wanted to hear, that he would go to no more such meetings.

But it soon became apparent that he followed Roosevelt's policies, and he clashed with Congress over price control.

Disillusionment with Soviet Russia set in and, when England announced that she could no longer support her commitments in Greece, we took over, under the Truman doctrine, promising to oppose military force

with force, if any nation was threatened by the U. S. S. R.

The Greek-Turkish program changed rather suddenly into the Marshall plan for economic—not military—aid to all Europe. That evolved into a military alliance, then into arms for Europe, and finally into the plan to send troops to garrison duty there. But though we spent billions, Europe remained helpless against Communist assault.

Meanwhile China fell. We evacuated Korea, and announced that Formosa was not important to our defense line in the Pacific. Plans were made instead to extend the Marshall plan to a billion people in Asia and Africa. Then the Communists moved in to fill the military vacuum we had left.

The President decided to enter the war. After bloody fighting the general who had snatched victory from defeat was summarily dismissed. An outraged people bore him in triumphal procession halfway round the world. The President was booed in a Washington ball park.

It does not make sense.

II

Obviously something is needed to explain this strange performance—something more than mink coats, deep freezers, or Pendergast politics.

There is a simple explanation. It is to be found in a speech of Earl Browder's which is reprinted in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in March 1944.

Browder told the American Communist movement it was to abandon the Communist Party and set to work especially through the trade unions, to form a mass organization with members throughout the United States.

The PAC under Sidney Hillman carried out the plan laid down by Browder. Of course 90 percent of the trade-union members did not suspect that the Soviet Government had planned their organization, their policies, and even their publications.

The purpose of forming this mass organization was to build "national unity," to preserve the "gains" of Tehran. It was to unite everyone—workers, farmers, managers, even financiers—in a drive on the Fascists and defeatists, those who doubted that the alliance with Soviet Russia could continue into peacetime.

Stalin and his advisers realized at Tehran that Roosevelt was dying, and that they must choose his successor, and get him elected, or they would lose all the gains the Hisses and others had won. The Soviet leaders also knew that Roosevelt had smashed the Democratic Party, and that whoever mustered the strongest political power could take it over and run it, under the old symbols.

The Communists then built up a network of local political machines in each congressional district, formed first about the labor unions, but gradually drawing in intellectuals, farmers, women, and religious groups. This was the familiar popular front, with which the Communists had softened up France under Blum, before the Nazi-Communist attack.

Truman was chosen as candidate for Vice President by Sidney Hillman, at the suggestion (according to Jonathan Daniels in his recent book, A Man of Independence) of Max Lowenthal, who had known the Senator from Missouri for years through congressional investigations of the finances of the railroads.

The organizers of this coalition were ordered to abandon their revolutionary slogans and to concentrate on uniting all groups except the reactionaries, in order to better destroy the enemies of unity with the U. S. S. R. Their particular hates were Hoover, Farley, Byrnes, Forrestal, and MacArthur.

William Z. Foster reported to the Cominform early in 1950 that this plan had succeeded far beyond all expectations. Its followers included members of all religions, and social classes.

This pattern of the Popular Front is the only concept that will explain the strange history of the Truman administration. If you examine our foreign policy, our unusual military ineptitude, each of our Presidential and congressional campaigns, the vagaries of our labor leaders, and the spread of defeatism and enervation in our literature, the pieces all fit. They fit the military needs of the Soviet Union, to divide us, to sow defeatism, and to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

III

The American people have not had a government of their own since 1945. They could not get anything constructive accomplished in foreign or military affairs because they had no government to do it for them.

Their Government has been captured from within, by a few secret agents in key positions, as Norway was captured by a few Nazi agents placed in key positions by Hitler before his armies struck.

It is time we stopped talking of our present Government with words that apply only to an American Government. We need a new language to describe the Government we have today.

We do not have a President in the American sense, because there is no longer a balance between executive and legislative power. The office has grown until it doth bestride the narrow world like a colossus. We do not have departments or bureaus in the American sense, because Congress does not define their duties or set limits on their power. In a government by law, it is essential that the legislature, which does not benefit by adding bureaus or extending their power, should create and define all Government agencies, as Madison pointed out in the Federalist Papers. We do not have a budget or appropriations in the American sense. When money is managed by the Government, all figures are lies.

Our present-day Government is like a great banyan tree, towering high above everything, and sendings arms out to start new roots in organizations we still think of as private—the labor unions, colleges, women's clubs, churches, foundations, and business associations. This combine of public and private agencies, directed by a small inner group now has almost complete control over the flow of news, ideas, and discussion in the press, movies, radio, and moving pictures, and the press of private organizations. It does not crudely forbid freedom of discussion. It merely jams the press and the other media with banalities written or whispered by its hired ministry of enlightenment.

The American people never thought about how to manage such a combine. They did not know it was operating under the outward signs of their own kind of government. The Soviet leaders knew. They knew in 1943 they must take it over before we woke up.

IV

Defeat and total eradication of the Popular Front party in the United States is the first condition for any hope of peace, or of survival of the United States as a Nation.

The opposition party so far has suffered only heartbreaking defeats. They are like Thor in the German fable, who put forth prodigious efforts to eat all the meat in the trough faster than his opponent, only to find his opponent consumed meat and bones and the trough itself. Thor did not know he was fighting not a mortal, but Loki, God of Fire.

The Popular Front in the United States cannot be defeated by any normal political strategy or party policy. It is a military organization to be defeated only as any usurping government is defeated by organizing the resistance.

Until a few weeks ago, the people were apathetic or cynical, there were no visible leaders, and all communication was blurred by the Government's propaganda skill.

Suddenly the President dismissed our foremost general, the people poured a tidal wave of letters and telegrams upon Congress. MacArthur's course led straight as an arrow to the Waldorf Towers, from which Herbert Hoover had been valiantly trying to arouse opposition to the sellout of our country. Now we have an aroused Nation and potential leadership.

The line of political cleavage is now clear—between a foreign policy that fits Soviet military needs and one that puts American security uppermost. At home the same cleavage runs between a governmental pyramid the Soviet agents can pentrate, and the simple American Government that foreign agents cannot manage. Congress has in the power of the purse the means to tear down the Bastille.

The Truman administration will use every ounce of its tremendous power to discredit MacArthur. They will try to break his heart as they did Forrestal's. Will they win? As "Not merely gossip" asked last week? Can leaders and the people together defeat the machine?

The answer turns on one fact. In the resistance every fighter counts. No one else counts. Every editor, every reporter, every clergyman, every club officer, every man in the street, must take his place in the ranks and do what is nearest him to win this battle.

If we fail ——.

The Coal Industry in the Modern Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, for a great many years, in fact ever since his membership in this body, my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has manifested a great interest in the development of America's natural resources. More especially has he been interested in the great coal resources of this country and of our State. In 1943 he introduced a bill to authorize the United States Bureau of Mines to construct and operate demonstration plants that gasoline can be made from coal and oil shale.

For this work my colleague secured an appropriation of some $30,000,000, and it has now been demonstrated in these plants that gasoline can be made from coal at a cost of 4 to 5 percent more than making gasoline from petroleum.

My colleague delivered an address in Cleveland last evening before the American Mining Congress Coal Show, the subject of his discussion being the coal industry in the modern crisis.

I request unanimous consent that this splendid and informative address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COAL INDUSTRY IN THE MODERN CRISIS

(By Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY)

For the third time in the twentieth century the whole world hovers on the brink of a global war, although the first year of the second half of this century is less than

6 months old. We who have lived in any part of this century need no one to tell us the terrible cost of war in human life and suffering. Veterans' hospitals scattered broadcast throughout the land, in which the soldiers of two World Wars are being treated tell the story of our failure to abolish war. Now we seem to be drifting helplessly toward a third global conflict in which, if it occurs, we know that the great discoveries and inventions of science and technology will be used to destroy millions of lives, to lay waste the habitations of men on every continent, and to cause new soldiers to become patients in these same hospitals and in others yet to be built.

BUILDERS OR DESTROYERS

Is it the destiny of the people of America to participate in such a struggle or have we the intelligence and the will to demonstrate to all the peoples of the world that peace can be achieved? That war can be avoided? And that freedom for men can be permanently established as the way of life for all mankind?

Are we to be builders or destroyers? These questions must be answered by this generation. If the peoples and the leaders of other nations are unable to point the way to peace, must we also be condemned to confess that we are unable to show the world how men can build a permanent peace?

I know of no better forum in which to raise this question than at this session of the American Mining Congress. The answer must be made now because if we turn from building to destroying no one knows better than those who are assembled here that no mind can conceive the measure of destruction which will be wrought if we permit a third global conflict to come. I say there can be no better forum than this because those of you who are assembled here know from personal experience what has been done in the United States to raise the standard of living and security for the people of this country by the intelligent use of natural resources. But you know also what a terrible toll war takes, not only upon the human resources of a nation but upon its material resources. During this twentieth century we have dug the minerals from our hills to scatter them broadcast throughout the world in war. The Mesabi Range in Minnesota was the greatest deposit of iron ore in all the world. Discovered 100 years ago it provided the raw material from which industry made the iron and steel through the use of which this country became the leading industrial nation of the world. Yet, during the 6 years of World War II, we took from those hills one-fifth of all the iron ore that had been extracted from them since iron was discovered there 100 years ago. Millions of tons of the iron and steel made from this ore has been shot away or is rotting away in foreign lands.

Again, in the Korean war we are paying not only with the lives of American soldiers, but we are also paying with American minerals which could be used to build a greater future for this and for coming generations. Instead, it is being used for the destruction of the lives of the soldiers who are involved in the conflict as well as the lives and homes of the noncombatant inhabitants of the Korean peninsula. Approximately 1,000,000 tons of steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, and other minerals that have been fabricated here into bombs and shells and bullets are being showered upon that hapless peninsula, and we know now whatever may be the termination of the war Korea cannot recover in another century from the destruction that has already been wrought in 10 months.

"The anger of man worketh not the justice of God." It is patience, tolerance, intelligence, charity, and, above all, faith in our own ability to use the resources with which nature has endowed us to show the whole world how the builders can in fact abolish the destruction of war.

PEACE THROUGH WISE USE OF RESOURCES

No nation in history was better endowed with natural resources than this, and, because this Nation was founded by men who had faith in freedom, we have made it possible here for the intelligence of the individual to be applied constructively to the utilization of these resources. The ingenuity of the free men who roved at will throughout this continent has achieved the greatest material progress ever registered and has developed here a social culture in which social and economic justice for the individual has been raised to levels never before attained. This has not been accomplished without waste and without sad mistakes. We have not always taken advantage of the opportunities we have had, but the record of what has been done points unerringly to great opportunities yet remaining, if we do not lose faith and surrender to fear.

It was because of my conviction that the future holds vast possibilities for the development of our natural resources in building constructively for peace that throughout my service in the Senate I have been urging better and more intensive utilization of them. It was this I had in mind when in 1943 I introduced the bill to authorize the United States Bureau of Mines to construct and operate demonstration plants to show how liquid fuel can be made from coal and oil shale. These experiments have already proved that the commercial production of liquid fuel is attainable from our huge deposits of both coal and shale that are known to exist in this country. Indeed, it is indicated that gasoline can now be made from coal at a cost of only 4 cents to 5 cents more than from petroleum, and this estimate takes no account of income to be derived from certain byproducts. It is unnecessary to tell this audience what this means for the future of America and the future of the world—provided we can avoid being compelled to use the energy sources with which this country is endowed for the destruction of human life in a third world war.

Of course, the fact that we have this new source of unlimited quantities of liquid fuel means national security in the sense that it equips us to defend ourselves even in modern war against any attack. It means more than that because it enables us to show the world that here in the United States dwells a people who have no design to seize the natural resources of any other people and who have no ambition whatsoever to establish imperialistic control of the world or any part of the world for the exploitation of its inhabitants.

AMERICA THE RICHEST IN NATURAL RESOURCES

It seems to me that the leaders of the coal industry can set a fine example to the leaders of all other industries if by intelligent utilization of our coal resources we can set an example to the peoples of other lands to do likewise. We can prove that there is no ground for fearing that natural resources will be exhausted and the people rendered unable to support themselves. That fear has been entertained by peoples from the beginning of time. Dr. Max Ball, distinguished oil geologist, testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last March, reminded us that in the early days of the Roman Empire the Romans were worried that the copper mines of Cyprus and Spain would be exhausted and that they would be without the essential mineral from which their bronze weapons were made. Here in the United States for more than a generation experts have been predicting the exhaustion of our supply of petroleum, but our petroleum reserves are greater today by far than they were when the first prediction was made early in the century that the Nation would soon run out of petroleum. Even with the increase of our petroleum reserves, the demand for fuel in the United States is so great that it is necessary now to supplement these reserves by greater utilization of coal.

COAL: THE NATION'S BASIC FUEL

Fortunately, no one can predict that our coal reserves will be exhausted, because it is a scientific fact that coal is our largest available source of fuel, that it cannot possibly be exhausted at any imaginable rate of consumption for more than a thousand years, and that within the boundaries of continental United States lie practically one-half of all the known coal reserves of the world. We know that coal is rich in byproducts and that there are many productive ways of using it besides burning it in its raw state under a boiler. It is an invaluable source of chemical products as well as of energy supply, and yet we have been accustomed to hearing the coal industry called a sick industry and we have been accustomed to being told in the press that coal is being pushed out as a fuel. That is not the fact. We are consuming in excess of 100,000,000 tons more coal every year now than we were at the turn of the century and we are mining coal much more efficiently than we were at that time. The people of the United States are using more energy than at any previous time. Our population has doubled in the last 50 years, but the energy resources we have enjoyed have more than quadrupled. We are consuming more coal, more oil, more gasoline, and more hydroelectric power, and every citizen of the United States living today has twice as much natural energy working for him as did the individual in 1900.

Coal pushed wood from the parlor stove, from the kitchen range and from the locomotive during the nineteenth century. It has been finding competition from oil and gas in recent years so that it no longer supplies as large a percentage of the total energy consumption of the United States as it once did, but it is still a most vital source of energy and it can be made more so.

In 1905, 460,000 men were working in the mines producing 315,000,000 tons at the rate of 3.24 tons per man per day. In 1949, 433,000 men were producing 438,000,000 tons at the rate of 6.43 tons per man per day. In 1949 this coal, though it exceeded the production of 1905 by 100,000,000 tons, represented only 39.8 percent of the Nation's energy consumption, as compared with 86.9 percent in 1905. The utilization of coal has not kept pace with the energy demands of the people, but because of its extraordinary nature, because of the products which can be made from it, the opportunity is now presented to the industry to make a greater contribution than ever before to the industrial and economic needs of the people. This can be done without displacing any other energy resource so long as we continue to improve the economic status of the people, for there is no known limit to the demand for fuel and energy which will develop in an expanding economy. Maximum employment and good wages under good working conditions for all workers create an ever-growing demand for all the products of industry.

The greatest handicap that mankind has suffered in all past centuries has been the conviction of some people that there is not enough to go around and that, therefore, the masses of men must be exploited in order that the exploiters may live in luxury and security. It was this fear that brought Mussolini and Hitler into power. It is this fear which builds the slave camps of Siberia.

HUMAN INGENUITY: OUR BASIC RESOURCE

The economic progress of the United States has demonstrated that the fear is utterly groundless and that a future of peace and

plenty awaits all mankind provided only that we unite to improve the utilization of the natural resources with which the planet upon which we live is filled to overflowing. Man has never failed to find, to produce, and to use the resources he needs. When one commodity becomes scarce, human resourcefulness has been able to replace it. This is history. This is the story of science. This is the story of industry, and coal, the inexhaustible deposit of energy, affords the men and women who are engaged in its production and utilization a grand and glowing opportunity to prove how freedom and cooperation can build a peaceful world of progress and justice. Bear in mind that I said freedom. The glory of America is that it has preserved freedom for the individual. The continued development of coal and every other natural resource depends upon the maintenance of freedom for the individual because, after all else has been said about the material riches of the world, the greatest natural resource is the heart, the mind, and the industry of a free man. So I would like to see the progress of the coal industry carried on by the maximum utilization of individual initiative.

THE PLACE OF SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

That is what I had in mind when in February 1948 I introduced amendments to the then-pending tax bill to provide a 27½ percent depletion allowance and accelerated amortization to stimulate the investment of private capital in plants designed to make synthetic liquid fuel from coal. The amendment was not adopted by the Eightieth Congress. I know of no reason why coal used for such a purpose should not have as great a depletion allowance as that granted to any other mineral. I understand that the Ways and Means Committee of the House has tentatively decided to raise the general depletion allowance for coal from 5 to 10 percent, but the social and industrial gains for all the people of the United States will be so great if private capital can be induced to invest in the synthetic-fuels industry that, in my opinion, special consideration should be given to the private investment that may be made for the extraction of oil from coal. I shall offer the amendment again.

When I introduced the synthetic-fuels bill authorizing the Bureau of Mines to construct and operate demonstration plants, it was not intended to be a first step toward putting the Government into industry, but only a necessary step to test the scientific methods by which liquid fuel is made from coal and shale and to conduct the operations that would tend to prove whether or not the product would be competitive commercially. Public research is a benefit to all and the operations of the United States Bureau of Mines in its tests of the possibilities of making liquid fuel from coal and oil shale have justified every dollar which has been expended.

WILL PRIVATE ENTERPRISE DO THE JOB?

The time is here, however, for private capital to act, for coal deposits are to be found all over the country and the public demand will soon begin to arise for the construction of Government plants if private initiative does not take the lead. The public-land States have great coal reserves. My own State, Wyoming, has greater reserves of bituminous and subbituminous coal than any other State and it is only natural that the people of these areas should want to see such resources developed.

The alternatives are plain. We shall have free private competitive enterprise at work making liquid fuel or we shall have Government doing it. We shall have it done locally by the coal industry and by the users of coal putting up their own capital to build the plants, or we shall have the pressure continue to have the Government enter the field.

When the Defense Production Act was under consideration during the last session of Congress, I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in charge of the bill to urge the inclusion of language that would provide Government cooperation with private business to stimulate "the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes, or the production of essential materials" needed for the defense program. The provision was written into the law and it is now possible, therefore, for the Government through contracts for the purchase of materials needed in the national defense to cooperate with private firms and corporations engaged in the production of such materials. This provision of the Defense Production Act, which I urged upon the committee, includes specifically "liquid fuels for Government use or for resale." Thus, it is clear that by the enactment of the synthetic fuels bill, which I introduced in 1943, by the enactment of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and by the consideration which is now being given to accelerated amortization and an increased depletion allowance which I suggested for the first time in February 1948, the way is being cleared for private capital to enter this field. It remains only for private capital to take the initiative.

CENTRALIZED INDUSTRY INVITES ATTACK

There is another consideration which must be borne in mind, namely the great need for the decentralization of industry. The threat of atomic warfare shows how unwise it would be to build new liquid fuel plants in those areas of the country in which heavy industry is already concentrated and which naturally would be the primary target for an enemy in war. Let no one have the slightest doubt that these industrial centers are now pinpointed upon the maps in the Soviet headquarters in Moscow.

The hydrogenation of coal affords a new method of producing critical materials needed in war. We are short of benzine, toluene, as well as xylene, chemicals which are invaluable in the production of explosives and aviation gasoline. Sulfur, another commodity in which the United States is in short supply, and pyridene are chemicals which can be produced as a result of the hydrogenation of coal. The conditions therefore exist in the defense program for the construction of liquid fuels plants. It would be highly desirable and highly intelligent to make certain that such defense plants would be constructed in areas remote from those in which so much of our industry is presently concentrated.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM FOR NEW INDUSTRY

Then, too, decentralization involves the avoidance of concentrated economic control of this great new potential industry. Economic concentration through fiscal or managerial control is another element that stimulates the demand for Government to enter the field. The basic cause of the present international controversy is the conviction of the masters of the Kremlin that the capitalistic world cannot avoid monopoly. Our belief in the American system of competitive free enterprise should therefore impel us to exercise every precaution to make certain that this new industry shall be developed in the American way, namely, that of free competitive enterprise. The acts which have been passed by the Congress and the tax law now under consideration create the opportunity for the construction of needed new plants in regions outside of the concentrated target area and free from concentrated economic control.

Only habits of thought stand in the way. We have been accustomed to have coal shipped in its raw form great distances at great expense to the factories in which it is consumed. How much more sensible it would be to utilize the coal in the area where it is mined, thus avoiding the great expense of our traditional methods of transportation. The synthetic fuels development makes this possible without loss to the transportation agencies. The commodities shipped into a growing community around a liquid-fuels plant would offset the loss of business in the reduction of the raw coal shipped out, and for such shipments there would be substituted the outgoing carloads of the products, gasoline, fuel oils, chemicals, etc., resulting from the hydrogenation development.

Fears of loss arising from progress which charges old habits have never been realized, as the industrial and economic growth of this country amply demonstrates. When the standard of living of the masses is raised, new markets are created for every industry and a liquid fuels plant would be a direct benefit to every other producing or transporting industry. This becomes apparent when it is realized that liquid-fuel plants would operate on a 24-hour schedule 7 days a week and would thus create a huge new demand for the production of coal. It is estimated that a plant capable of producing 10,000 barrels of liquid fuel a day from coal would need a daily mine capacity of about 7,600 tons produced from mines operated not less than 240 days in the year. This development would also make possible improved conditions for the miners for, after all, the human aspects of every industry are paramount in importance. Living standards must be maintained at the highest possible level so as to permit a fuller utilization of the unlimited resourcefulness of the individual.

The first obligation of America in this world crisis is to keep itself strong, and the citizen who would see the American way of life thrive in the present world conflict of ideologies must be able to see that all we are fighting for is opportunity for the individual. The Communist says that the individual cannot, in this scientific age, control either his political or his economic destiny, but must be content to become the pawn of the state. He who would sustain the American ideal of individual supremacy, the principle embodied in the Bill of Rights of our Federal Constitution, the principle which underlies our oft repeated talk about the maintenance of free enterprise, must make up his mind to defend the right of the individual to take advantage of every opportunity that the advance of science and technology provides. If we are to keep America strong enough to become an example to the people of the world, it must be an America in which the individual has this opportunity. It is not sufficient that the citizen shall be politically free. He must also be economically free. This is the great opportunity which is presented to this generation of Americans. We can, if we will, win both political and economic opportunity and freedom for all men everywhere. Men will be free in every nation and on every continent when we show the way. There is no iron curtain that can exclude from any people anywhere the knowledge of the gains that can be achieved for every individual in a nation which enjoys freedom.

They Too Pay Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Swift County (Minn.) Monitor for April 27, 1951:

THEY TOO PAY TAXES

During the past several weeks this newspaper has published a series of advertisements sponsored by the Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., wherein cooperative and mutual corporations have been depicted as being nontaxpayers.

We accepted these advertisements for publication because we feel that the columns of a newspaper should be open to free expression of ideas and opinions whether we are in agreement with those ideas and opinions, or not. It is a fundamental policy, inherent to the democratic institutions of our country.

In allowing free dissemination of ideas, a newspaper also has the responsibility of correcting misstatements of fact and to challenge ideas and opinions which, in its opinion, are detrimental to the public welfare.

In the series of advertisements mentioned, we have a good example of what we mean in the foregoing statement of policy. We published them, but we do not agree with the idea they convey. They are misleading. They convey ideas concerning the tax status of cooperative and mutual corporations that are not substantiated by the facts.

Specifically, these are some of the errors of fact we find:

1. "You pay more taxes because Congress continutes to allow a favored few big businesses (meaning cooperatives) to pay little or nothing."

One of the biggest cooperatives in this area is Midland Cooperative Wholesale. The little or nothing that Midland paid in income, real-estate, and personal-property taxes for the years 1947 through 1949 was more than $800,000. In our own community we have cooperatives that are listed year after year among the highest taxpayers.

2. The cooperatives are called big business.

It is true that regional cooperatives, made up of scores or even hundreds, of local associations, have impressive accumulations of assets and do a big volume of business. But, in the sense that Americans think of it, they are not big businesses. If all the cooperatives in the country were combined, they would not equal, in assets or business volume, the size of any one of a number of giant American corporations. Furthermore, since when is bigness a crime in the American scheme of things?

3. "Congress lets them escape nearly a billion dollars a year in income taxes by granting them special exemptions."

This statement has been flatly contradicted by an investigating committee of the House of Representatives. The fact is that only one-sixth of the cooperatives in America qualify under the law as being exempt from paying income taxes. These are agricultural cooperatives, and the congressional committee found that, in the case of these relative few that are exempt, the aggregate amount of income retained is relatively small. No appreciable amount of revenue would accrue to the Government if income taxes were levied on these amounts. Five-sixths of the cooperatives pay income taxes on exactly the same basis as other corporations.

4. The ads would have the public believe that cooperatives are expanding on tax-free profits.

Cooperatives expand on the savings and investments of their member-owners just as other businesses expand on the invested savings of their owners.

Here in Minnesota we have seen the great advantages that have come to our State and to our communities because our farmers have had the good sense to organize cooperatives. Within the last 15 years we have witnessed electrification of rural homes all over America by farmer cooperatives. By bringing a vitally needed service to rural people, they have enhanced the individual income of farmers, and have provided billions of dollars of business for business people in towns and cities.

The result, income-tax-wise, has been, and will continue to be, a broader base for income-tax levies both for the farmer and the businessman who profits by the farmers' purchases of electrical merchandise and services. Other taxes that any other business pays must, of course, also be paid for all real and personal property the electric cooperative owns. Surely, there is no lessening of tax revenues in a deal like that.

The late J. V. Weber, when editor and publisher of the Murray County Herald at Slayton, saw the issue clearly. He wrote in the Herald of January 31, 1946: "Cooperatives have made great contributions to general prosperity. They have made Minnesota one of the great egg, butter, grain, and livestock States, and through their abiding interest in 4-H Club and similar work, they have made farm life more attractive. They have done a great job; they have saved their patrons money; and they have enlarged the vision of most rural people."

Close to the Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Citizen-News, Hollywood, Calif., for May 11, 1915:

CLOSE TO THE CENTER

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON calls attention to the contrast in the reactions of some people to the congressional investigations into subversive activities.

Congressman JACKSON, from West Los Angeles, is a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In his weekly letter he says:

"Your Representative was verbally flayed this week in an editorial written by Les Claypool, political editor of the Los Angeles Daily News.

"The editorial took exception to the manner of questioning employed by us during the recent appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee of actor John Garfield. The sum of Mr. Claypool's editorial seemed to be that we were persecuting Mr. Garfield and seeking to convict the actor through 'guilt by association.'

"Other complaints have been received recently condemning us for attempting to whitewash Garfield and others. With the Daily News dissenting on the one hand, and a prominent far-right columnist disapproving on the other, it could be that we are close to the center line.

"No protest is made by the liberal wing when an Alger Hiss calls Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and two Justices of the United States Supreme Court as character witnesses in an effort to prove his innocence by association, but mention a long list of Communist-front organizations and activities with which a star, director, or writer has been associated, and immediately there rises to high heaven the wail of guilt by association.

"Some days ago the committee was listening patiently to the arrogant and contemptuous statements of a recalcitrant witness before the committee. He had refused to say anything at all with respect to his association with Communist-front organizations, but he did bridle and fume at the following question asked by your representative:

"'Did you ever belong to a Fascist group known as the Silver Shirts?'

"The witness was vehement in his denial of membership and fairly frothed at the suggestion that he might have held membership in the group. We then asked:

"'Did you ever belong to the Communist Party?'

"The answer to that one was a flat refusal to answer the questions on grounds of self-incrimination and a denunciation of the committee generally and the members specifically.

"'Thought control' about which the antagonistic witnesses make such a great fuss, is a wonderful thing to rant about when questions are asked which might lead to a charge of perjury, but when the sky is clear and no legal consideration bars the way to wrathful answer, stand by for fury."

Congressman JACKSON, it appears, has an excellent understanding of Communists.

De Gaulle in New Bid for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star for May 15, 1951:

DE GAULLE IN NEW BID FOR POWER—WOULD INCLUDE GERMANY IN WESTERN EUROPE DEFENSE IN REALISTIC PROGRAM TO SPEED PREPAREDNESS

(By Constantine Brown)

The stormy petrel of French politics, Gen. Charles de Gaulle, is making a serious bid to return to power as head of the government this summer.

The French elections are scheduled for June 17. All parties are determined to put up a serious fight to reduce the membership of the Communists in the new National Assembly. The Communists in the past have been the largest single political group in the Assembly.

Most non-Communist politicians are fearful of General de Gaulle, who is stubborn and uncompromising in matters of national defense.

At present he is believed to be the only French political leader who can approach the problem of Europe's defense realistically. In conversations with a number of Americans, General de Gaulle appears to present a far more constructive program to hasten preparedness than any other French politician.

He is said to favor strongly the following program:

1. The inclusion of Germany in Western European defense on a far more equitable basis than previous French governments have indorsed it. He is less fearful of a resurgence of Germany's military might. While not discounting German military revival, he believes in first things first.

General de Gaulle apparently is convinced that we shall have a war in a very short time if present conditions persist in Europe. The only deterrent to Russia is a strongly rearmed free world. Diplomatic solutions, attempts at cooperation with Moscow and appeasement in whatever form are no longer of avail and, in his opinion, will result only in an increase of the Kremlin's demands.

The threat to the free world, he says, can be lessened only by a real show of strength and determination to meet force with force. Under such conditions France's fears of its neighbor across the Rhine should be subordinated to the actual advantages which can be obtained by creating a sovereign Germany, which would eagerly join in the West's defense effort.

2. In the same vein, General de Gaulle believes strongly in the inclusion of Turkey and Greece in the Atlantic Pact. His thinking is military rather than political. So far, the French and British Governments—for reasons which are still obscure to the average observer—have prevented these two Mediterranean nations from joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in spite of the pressing requests from Ankara and Athens. This stubborn refusal has given the Turks the impression that the great powers have in mind some appeasement proposal to Russia at the expense of the Turks.

General de Gaulle apparently does not follow the tortuous thinking of the diplomats when he favors inclusion of Turkey and Greece in western defense. The only thing he has in mind is that these two countries combined have trained military forces in being which exceed considerably that of the entire NATO.

3. General de Gaulle is reported also to favor the inclusion of Spain in the Western European defense system. He appears less interested in the totalitarian form of government which exists across the Pyrenees than in its manpower potential.

As a soldier he places political ideologies in time of near war far behind the military necessities of the free world. Spain has never threatened France militarily. Spain is strongly anti-Communist. These two considerations are ample for this Frenchman to believe that the neighbor across the Pyrenees, with an army of some half million men under arms, should not be left out of Europe's defense coordination.

4. General de Gaulle is said to have expressed strongly the view that France and the other western nations are marking time and are not doing all in their power to mobilize their military potential. The politicians who have headed the French Government since the crisis became acute still hesitate to increase the compulsory military service from 18 to 24 months. General de Gaulle is said to be determined to force this increase if he becomes head of the French Government.

These revolutionary views of General de Gaulle will be strongly opposed by the non-Communist parties, which in the past have contributed greatly to the slow-down of French rearmament. Their inactivity has been followed by the other nations of continental Europe, to the distress of General Eisenhower.

While public opinion in the United States has exercised a sufficient pressure to force the administration to change its tactics in regard to European rearmament, the present Governments of France and Britain have been the major handicaps in the inclusion of Spain, Turkey, Greece, and Germany in the defense set-up.

The State Department met the criticism of being too ideological at a time when aggression by Russia may be expected any day by saying that it could do nothing, since Paris and London were irrevocably opposed to further broadening of NATO.

A Cynical View That Doesn't Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Times, of May 10, 1951, is timely because it deals with a subject which is important in the long-range planning for this country. Upstream soil conservation, which has never received proper emphasis because of the stronger pull of funds into the so-called big dams program, must sooner or later be increased if we really accomplish the job we need to do. Also, since so many big dams already have been built, this upstream conservation program becomes more important as it is now needed to lengthen the lifetime of these dams.

The editorial follows:

A CYNICAL VIEW THAT DOESN'T PAY OFF

A considerable number—probably a majority—of the influential citizens of Eufaula oppose the building of the proposed dam near that city. They can't see any percentage in creating what the promoters of the dam call a "silt trap," at the same time putting out of cultivation more than 100,000 acres of their best bottomlands, to begin with, and additional thousands of acres upstream on the Canadian rivers which will be gradually ruined because of the backwater effect of siltation and the flooding of upstream bottomlands. They know that the theory of a sportsmen's paradise on a muddy lake has turned out to be a phony in the Madill-Tishomingo area of Lake Texoma, and will be repeated around Eufaula and McAlester.

The Indian Journal, the Eufaula newspaper, has strenuously opposed the building of the dam in the past, and a few days ago it carried another editorial deploring the bad effects of the proposed project.

However, in concluding the editorial, the newspaper expressed a feeling of despair and cynicism, as follows: "Farming no longer builds big towns, it seems. Prosperity goes to those towns and cities into which the Government pours taxpayers' money, Eufaulans' money, and small towns of this area have seen precious little of it."

This point of view is unfortunate, and should be corrected by a realistic calculation of economic factors.

The soil, over a period of two or three decades and from there on into the future, is the basic resource and economic foundation of all towns and cities, even New York. Ultimately no city can grow if the tributary soil is unproductive. The small town feels the lack of good soil first, but ultimately all communities suffer. Otherwise you might see big cities in the Idaho deserts.

Madill and Tishomingo people were highly elated when the Texoma project was promoted, on the theory that the vacationists and fishermen would make them prosperous. They have been sadly disillusioned. In addition to the failure of the sportsmen's paradise, they now keenly feel the disappearance of the rich bottom lands which used to pour farm produce into their markets.

The spending of Government money for labor, and the priviledge of boarding the labor force during the building of a big dam is like a shot in the arm. It creates a temporary illusion of prosperity, but when the dam is finished, the workers pick up their sacks of potatoes and go away, and the local businessmen find that concrete and steel walls don't buy automobiles, groceries, or overalls. Then it is realized that the most precious resource of all—the soil—has been badly reduced in area, and there is nothing to take its place. There's no guesswork or theory about it—the proposition is as plain as ABC.

No city or town in Oklahoma can afford to labor under the delusion that it can live without a background and tributary territory of good farmland. Any number of instances can be shown to prove that when the soil goes, everything goes. Even the industrialized cities can't take it, for eventually they have to sell their products to other communities that depend more directly on the soil. Shot-in-the-arm prosperity makes pleasant dreams but the hangover is terrible.

The California Eagle, an Old Newspaper With a New Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD some very interesting comments by Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, as reported by Mr. Bob Ellis in the new California Eagle. Along with the news story, I am including an editorial from the new California Eagle printed in the first edition of the paper following a change of ownership which brought in as publisher a very able leader, Mr. Loren Miller, of Los Angeles. The California Eagle is an old paper which, like the legendary phoenix bird, is commencing a new life. It has a new owner and a changed viewpoint.

The California Eagle is devoted primarily to the interests of our Negro citizens, but the new publisher's conception of the role of a newspaper rises above race or class and encompasses all phases of good citizenship. The editorial, signed by the new publisher, is a wholesome and a refreshing statement of inspiring American ideals. All of us who cherish a truly free and honest American press welcome and wish success to the new California Eagle.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Eagle of May 3, 1951]

BUNCHE SAYS: "LIMITED WAR SAVES LIVES"—APPEASEMENT ISN'T PEACE, U. N. MEET TOLD

(By Bob Ellis)

"Don't confuse peace with appeasement," Dr. Ralph J. Bunche warned Presidential Adviser W. Averell Harriman and leading Los Angeles citizens Sunday at a dinner for the Nobel prize winner sponsored by the American Association for United Nations.

While newsreel and television cameras filmed Dr. Bunche before a flower-decked table at Romanoff's Restaurant in Beverly Hills, the director, Trusteeship Council of the U. N. continued quietly: "There will be much less misunderstanding about the United Nations if Americans realize the U. N. is in the business of preserving peace—not peace by appeasement but by means of honorable negotiation."

Admitting that there is a growing dislike for the United Nations in America, Dr. Bunche lashed out at the "blind emotional cynics."

"People must understand," he continued, "that while a war is limited there is a chance to stop it and save lives. The U. N. was able to do this in Israel and in Kashmir and we must continue to try to end the war in Korea."

In what was interpreted as a reference to the MacArthur controversy, Dr. Bunche said: "Victory is not needed in war. There is only a need to stop war." * * *

Speaking calmly, with a slight hesitation before his sentences, Dr. Bunche emphasized, "Fewer lives will be lost in a localized or limited war than in an atomic war. People must understand that and not lose their heads."

"It is in the American tradition to seek conciliation. Negotiation is an honorable word. We must all remember that the United Nations is the last hope of peace in our world."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Eagle of May 3, 1951]

HERE'S WHERE WE STAND

The California Eagle has changed hands. Loren Miller has assumed the position of publisher.

Mrs. C. A. Bass no longer has any interest, direct or indirect, in this newspaper; she has no voice in its editorial, news, or advertising policies. Her staff has been entirely replaced.

This change in ownership will result in a sharp break with The Eagle's immediate past and a repudiation of its stand on many issues.

The Eagle will seek to reestablish the proud position it once held as the spokesmen for the Negroes of Los Angeles and of California.

The primary aim of this newspaper will be to print the truth in its news columns. We shall try to report faithfully and completely what Negroes are doing, what they are thinking, and what is happening to them, and about them.

Out of the belief that realization of democratic ideals offers the fairest promise for complete equality for all citizens in all phases of American life we shall pursue an editorial policy designed to assist in preserving and extending the democratic way of life.

We shall support legislation—Federal, State, and local—which is aimed at wiping our racial inequalities in every aspect of our national life. That means we favor FEPC on Federal, State, and local levels, anti-lynching legislation, anti-discriminatory laws and ordinances of every kind and the full range of measures comprehended in the President's Civil Rights proposals.

We shall support organizations that have as their purpose the realization of democratic goals through removal of racial barriers in the political and economic affairs of America. That means we shall offer unstinted support to the NAACP, the Urban League, the Women's Political Study Clubs and similar groups.

We shall support such institutions as churches, the Red Cross, the YMCA, the YWCA, and kindred groups, which aim at the improvement of the general lot of all citizens.

We shall support Negro business institutions, and all other business or industrial organizations that follow the ideally American practice of offering employment and advancement on the job without reference to race, or religion, or color.

We shall support labor unions out of the belief that Negroes, the preponderant number of whom are workingmen and workingwomen, cannot secure adequate wages and decent working conditions unless they are organized into unions of their own choice.

We shall support candidates for public office whose platforms and records indicate support of the objectives which we endorse.

It is only fair to add that our support of the democratic system will not blind us to its shortcomings nor deter us from seeking its improvement. By the same token, we shall not spare criticism of individuals or organizations when their conduct merits it.

The affirmative program we have just outlined carries with it a pledge of opposition to opponents of our aims.

We shall oppose communism, and oppose it vigorously and with every means in our power, because its triumph would mean the destruction of the democratic system to which we are committed. That means that we shall oppose Communists and their stooges, Negro and white, in their attempts to win converts to their cause, or win political office, or assume leadership in civic and community organizations.

We shall oppose racial discrimination and its handmaiden, racial segregation, and all individuals and organizations which countenance or connive at discrimination or segregation.

Negroes have many problems other than those growing out of their racial status. Like other Americans they are, or should be, concerned with international relations, with adequacy of national defense, with problems of local government, and with social reforms of a general nature.

Laying aside details for the moment, we shall generally support the United Nations, extension of social security, adequate care for the aged, a housing program to afford decent shelter for all, and a military policy based on the realities on the world situation. We shall insist on preservation of the civil liberties guaranteed in the Constitution.

In municipal affairs we shall support every move for better transportation, better schools, and a generally higher level of police protection. We shall support measures to curb juvenile delinquency, and public health programs designed to lower death rates and stay the ravages of disease.

It is plain enough that this ambitious program cannot be realized without the support of the people of this community.

We must have readers.

We must have advertisers—and we can keep advertisers only if our readers respond to their advertisements.

We must have the support of those institutions, organizations, and individuals to whom we have made this pledge of support.

This editorial, then, is both a statement and an appeal.

It is a frank revelation of our aims.

It is just as frank an appeal for popular support.

We have undertaken this venture out of a profound belief that Los Angeles deserves a better newspaper than it has had for the past 2 years. We want to give you the kind of a newspaper that Los Angeles deserves.

If you agree that this city does deserve a better newspaper and that our program as outlined here promises such a newspaper, we urge you to help us realize that goal—by subscribing to the Eagle or by buying it at your nearest newsstand, and by telling your friends about us.

If you're in business we want your advertising, and if you're not you can help us by patronizing those who do advertise in the Eagle and by requesting the firms with which you do business to advertise with us.

We want your frank criticism, too.

We want you to tell us about your problems and what you think we can, or ought to do about them.

Out of the cooperation between the staff, and you as readers, we can together fashion a newspaper that will hasten that good day when the democratic system fulfills its promise of equality for all men.

LORENZ MILLER.

Tribute to Finnish Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me paying tribute to the Finnish maritime industry, and to the sons of Finland, whose integrity of character makes them such outstanding citizens of our country, and of my State of Michigan in particular.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO FINNISH MARITIME INDUSTRY

Recently I was privileged to be among those invited to the harbor in Alexandria, Va., to attend a reception for a shiny new 414-foot ocean-going motorship, the *Finntrader*, here on its maiden voyage from the Republic of Finland. It is a modern, streamlined freighter, with superbly fine quarters for 12 passengers, and capacity for 6,000 tons of cargo. It is owned by Finnlines, Ltd., a subsidiary of Enso-Gutzeit, the largest producer of pulp paper and wallboard in Finland.

It wasn't so many years ago that Finland got started as an independent Nation, following the First World War when it divorced itself from the crumbling empire of the czars. It set up a constitutional government and remains today the only one of the many postwar governments of that day to survive in its original form. All the others have disappeared or are disguised as free units under Communist totalitarianism.

We of America are proud of Finland. We are proud of her fealty to democratic principles; we are proud of her bravery under fire; we are proud of her integrity and honesty in meeting her obligations. It was a worth-while act on the part of the United States to pass the bill, of which I had the honor to be a cosponsor, which diverted future debt payments by Finland on her First World War obligations to the education of students and the interchange of scientific and technical information. That program is proceeding satisfactorily, and the future will show the true and lasting value of it.

To return to this new evidence of Finnish enterprise, the *Finntrader*: It is an eye-filling sight. It rides well, says the master, Capt. Einar Marander. "Our maiden voyage was unique because it was uneventful," the captain explained. He said the ship rode so well that no one got seasick, even those who had never been at sea before.

The ship was launched early this year in Holland, where she was built according to Finnish plans. *Finntrader* was christened by Mrs. Greta Skogster Lehtinen, wife of William Lehtinen, managing director of Enzo-Gutzeit. Mrs. Lehtinen, a noted designer of textiles, planned the entire decorative scheme of the interior of the vessel. Her picture hangs proudly in the main saloon.

The plans of the company, I am told, are to construct three more similar ships. Orders for two have already been placed with Dutch shipyards. The provisional names of the two will be *Finnmerchant* and *Finnvoyager*. These new units in an expanding Finnish merchant marine bring to light the brilliant history of the Finns in maritime annals.

For years, Finnish sailing ships were the glory of the seas. Used in the wheat trade primarily, they were trim and speedy and plied the seven seas before the winds. Some of the greatest sea legends revolve around the tales of these Finnish windjammers.

In the 1850's and 1860's, our own Pacific coast records show that five out of every seven sailing masters in the booming gold-rush trade were Finns. San Francisco named a street for them. The maritime history of the Pacific would not be complete unless we mentioned the fact that two Finnish admirals, in the Russian service, were governors of what is now Alaska in the days before we purchased that territory from the Russians. Their headquarters were at Sitka. One was Admiral Adolf Etholin, called the "builder of Alaska," and the other was Admiral Johan Humpus Furuhjelm. Etholin served in the 1840's and Furuhjelm in the early 1860's.

Now, with Finland as an independent republic, the maritime capabilities begin to show themselves again, and Finland's expanding commerce makes a new start after the disasters of two wars with Russia. Commerce over the seven seas, says President Lehtinen, will be their motto.

We, of Michigan, are proud of the Finnish traditions of personal honesty, industry, and forthrightness, which has made them such valuable settlers in our own countryside and such good American citizens.

Finland, too, can be proud of the record these Finns have made in the New World, participating in and helping maintain our American institutions.

Necessary Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later Congress must face the growing demand that some action be taken to tighten controls on certain of our relief programs, and one of these is the proposition that persons receiving certain public assistance be removed from the protection of secrecy.

The following editorial from the Tusla (Okla.) Daily World points up a lot of public thinking these days on this subject and indicates a strong interest in legislation now pending before the Congress. I present this editorial here because I feel it contains merit:

Two highly controversial bills, which have been introduced in Congress, would amend the Social Security Act to permit States to make welfare department records a matter of public information. The Federal Government pays approximately one-half of the money for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children and general assistance. For States to receive these grants, observance of the Government's order keeping assistance records confidential is compulsory. Several States, however, are considering legislation to publicize the relief rolls. It will require an act of Congress to change the protective phrase of the Social Security Act. Opponents of the proposed legislation contend the indiscriminate publishing of welfare information would be humiliating to the majority of worthy welfare recipients. Supporters of the legislation seem to have the stronger argument. They rightly contend if this information is made public it will help to eliminate the many chiselers and improve the efficiency of State welfare departments. Publicizing the relief rolls would prove extremely beneficial.

German War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated May 1, 1951, addressed by Frederick C. McKee, chairman of the Committee on National Affairs, to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and published under the heading "Nuremberg commutations." The letter deals with commutations of the sentences of 79 German war criminals.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUREMBERG COMMUTATIONS—WAR CRIMINALS

To the Christian Science Monitor:

The recent commutation by High Commissioner McCloy of the sentences of 79 German war criminals convicted of heinous crimes against humanity is alarming. Among the criminals, of whom 21 now escape the death sentence and 34 are set free, are Nazi officials who planned and executed Hitler's murder program, who directed a campaign of wholesale slaughter in the occupied areas, and who committed atrocities in the concentration camps. These sentences had previously been confirmed by General Clay upon the advice of counsel of impeccable integrity and competence.

The Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, appointed by Mr. McCloy, heard only the lawyers representing the convicted criminals, representatives of the prosecution not being allowed to participate. In recommending the reduction of sentences they nevertheless pointed out that they were not entitled to grant relief beyond that warranted by mitigating circumstances and fair consideration of individual situations. They further stated that clemency may be an encouraging example, but a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder would be a mockery. It would undo what Nuremberg has accomplished if in the end we were guided entirely by considerations of sympathy or generosity. Executive clemency does not exist to that end.

But the fact is that these commutations are a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder, constitute a mockery of what Nuremberg has accomplished, and are dangerous for the following reasons:

1. They tend to throw into doubt the entire basis, procedure, and judgments of the trials conducted by the United States military tribunals at Nuremberg. Although both Mr. McCloy and the members of his clemency board defend the Nuremberg trials, it would have been more appropriate to sustain the results of the trials by confirming rather than by upsetting the verdicts. In granting the commutations expediency appears to have been a factor in seeking the favor of those elements in Germany whose devotion to democracy is suspect.

2. At a time when it is contemplated that Germany be granted greater independence, to reduce the sentences of the perpetrators of inhumanities, many of whom are now able to return to public life, hardly encourages the democratic elements in Germany.

3. The commutation of the sentences of Nazi war criminals has alarmed our allies among the democratic nations of Western Europe and among the believers in democracy in the countries behind the iron curtain.

4. If these commutations were intended to placate German opinion in the effort to make Western Germany a bulwark against the very real threat of Soviet aggression, such a policy of expediency does not accomplish its purpose and leads to other evils. Reports already indicate that the Germans are not satisfied with the extent of the commutations and are urging the release of all war criminals. The United States cannot safely copy the Russian technique of currying favor with former Nazi leaders, for these criminals are basically totalitarians, and hence more sympathetic to the totalitarian east than the democratic west.

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.

NEW YORK.

Attitude of British Toward America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The British," written by Bruce Barton and published in the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post-Times of April 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH

(By Bruce Barton)

Dr. George Riley, the famous osteopath, was once invited to meet George Bernard Shaw, a devotee of osteopathy.

They had hardly shaken hands before Shaw burst into bitter vituperation of America.

Dr. Riley stood it for about 3 minutes and then cried out: "Stop that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. How dare you, a man whose food and clothes and roof-tree are principally paid for by the money of American book buyers and playgoers, how dare you say such things about a country and a people of which you are so absymally ignorant. I never knew such impudence."

Shaw shut his mouth. A look of amazement came into his eyes, but with a glint of admiration. He told a friend afterward: "That man Riley is one of the most interesting people I ever met."

Too many British authors and lecturers have accepted our hospitality—often lavish and effusive to the point of servility—taken their winnings and gone back home to write and talk scurvily about us.

Too many of the British people as a whole, jealous of our prosperity, are unfriendly at heart. For years they sold us the idea that, except for the protection of their fleet, we would have been helpless. But they never said from whom their fleet was protecting us; and in our Civil War, when our need of help was most desperate, their seapower, in-

stead of helping us, tried to destroy our merchant marine.

Yet I admire the British. They write the English language better than we—we have no Shakespeare, no Milton. Their administration of justice is swifter, cheaper, and more dignified. In the conduct of foreign affairs they are so much smarter that it just isn't funny.

Indeed, one of my distinguished lawyer friends, a long-time subscriber to the London Spectator, tells me that by reading it he has been able to predict 6 months in advance just what our State Department would do—the British loan, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Lately, Russia has been making our foreign policy. When she lets out a blast, we promptly blast her back. When she nudges the North Koreans into starting a rumpus, we obligingly reply with our whole Army and Heaven only knows how many billions of dollars, while she loses not one soldier or one ruble.

"Dancing to Russia's fiddle is getting us nowhere. We might better go back to letting the British manage us. They know their way around, especially in the Orient, where they operated for more than 150 years at a handsome profit.

"Many of us have another idea—that we ought to have our own American foreign policy. But since, to make any sense, this would have to based on America first, it seems to be out. Every other nation can be for itself first. But not the United States. The mere suggestion is branded 'un-American'."

The Beef Price Roll-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial referring to the beef price roll-back, which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on May 12, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Speaking to his press conference, President Truman said that the beef price roll-back will be enforced. He dismissed the protests of the spokesmen of the livestock industry with the observation that they are like all others who scream when their toes are stepped on. He said that if there is to be a beginning with controls it might as well be right there.

Would that the issues raised by the livestock industry could be put aside so simply. President Truman begs the question by avoiding the issue. The livestock people do not, of course, like to be singled out for this kind of treatment, but the essence of what they are saying is that this attempt to roll back the price of one meat commodity, will not have the result for which the administration hopes.

Beef prices are high because there is money enough in the hands of consumers to buy beef. Unless measures are taken that reduce the pressure of demand, the result of the roll-back will be either to drive the livestock industry into production of other meats, or to divert a large part of our beef production into black market channels.

The consequence of the first result will be that there is less beef, and the administration will be compelled to take the next step, which is rationing, if there is to be a fair distribution of the available supply among all who want it.

The consequence of the second possible result will be that beef prices will remain high, and the existing marketing, processing and distribution system will be disrupted, with vast waste of the various secondary food and byproducts that are produced by the highly developed factory methods of our great packing plants. This is to make no mention of the fact that the highly refined system of Government inspection and grading goes out of the window when the processing of meat animals is diverted from the regular channels into fly-by-night local slaughterhouses in every nook and cranny of the livestock country.

Despite Mr. Truman's bland confidence that the roll-black can be enforced, this second result is the one that is likely to be predominant, though there will also be a considerable contraction in the production, the feeding and finishing of cattle. The Government did not succeed in enforcement during the war and it is in a weaker position for the job today than it was then.

It does small good to denounce some people for going into black market production and slaughtering and others for patronizing such sources of supply, though the denunciation is deserved. Neither does it contribute anything to solution of this problem to say that it is confession of national moral delinquency to point out the probability of a breakdown in enforcement of such price controls, if they stand alone.

The whole point of the protest of the livestock industry is that a beef price roll-back in the absence of basic measures to remove the causes of inflation through drastic taxation, harsh commercial credit control and rigid wage controls, will not work. Treating a symptom, and one isolated symptom at that, leaving a thousand other avenues for excess buying power to take, is doomed to failure.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Seaway and the Waterway," appearing in the Chicago Tribune for May 3, 1951, relating to the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway on the Chicago plans for developing traffic on the Illinois seaway. It is interesting to note that this editorial raises exactly the same points regarding our sovereignty over Lake Michigan as those to which I first called attention in my statement to the House Committee on Public Works on April 12 of this year, which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY AND THE WATERWAY

The Buick Motor Division of General Motors Corp. has announced plans to build a multimillion-dollar plant for the assembly of jet aircraft engines near Willow Springs. The plant will receive its fuel, both coal and oil, by barge on the Chicago sanitary and ship canal.

On the banks of the same canal two huge power plants are under construction. One is the Commonwealth Edison Co.'s $70,000,000 Ridgeland generating station, already in partial operation. The other is the Will County power plant of the Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois near Lemont. These plants, too, will receive their fuel by water.

Industry thus is recognizing the importance of the Illinois waterway, although few persons in Washington seem to know or care that it exists. Administration leaders instead are yammering for the billion-dollar St. Lawrence seaway project, and Secretary of State Acheson, in his testimony for the project, referred to the objectionable diversion of Lake Michigan water into the canal that makes the Illinois waterway possible. Acheson also remarked that the diversion issue was settled by the 1930 Supreme Court decision.

This is what might be expected from Truman's Secretary of State. He would like to see Lake Michigan made an international body of water, even though the lake lies wholly within the United States. Trustees of the Chicago Sanitary District properly retorted that the diversion issue is far from being settled, that it can be reopened at any time by Congress, and that it ought to be reopened.

Chicago has met all the requirements of the 1930 Supreme Court decision, spending many millions of dollars on sewage-treatment works. It is now plain that the diversion limit set by the Court is insufficient for the drainage cana and waterway and that an increase would have negligible effects on water levels in the Great Lakes.

The Lakes-to-Gulf waterway must be protected. One way to do so is to insist that the agreement between the United States and Canada for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway specify that adequate diversion of water from Lake Michigan be guaranteed in perpetuity for operation of the Lake-to-Gulf system.

With such a provision in the agreement, the argument that the seaway project is essential to the national defense would have more validity.

Planning Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated May 10, 1951, addressed by Charles Scott Williams to the editor of the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun, discussing the results of planning on United States foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1951.

To the EDITOR, WILLIAMSPORT SUN,
Williamsport, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Although General MacArthur has retarded some of the policies of General Marshall and the State Department planners, it is imperative that our Nation receive a change of blood, inspiring a change of thought, with an injection of character.

This is the only way we can be successful in abolishing war through world government.

Since these planners have been in power—Russia was recognized by them in the thirties—among other things the following has happened:

1. The Russian Communists have taken over Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Bessarabia, Manchuria, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, part of Germany, part of Finland, Czechoslovakia, and China. We raised no voice of protest, and as to Poland and Manchuria, we cooperated.

2. Our soldiers were halted 15 miles from Berlin to allow the Russians to capture this important city, and our planners scoffed at Churchill's idea of attacking through the Balkans, this would have allowed our Armies to occupy the Balkans.

3. Berlin was divided into zones, with the consent of General Marshall, who was on the scene at that time, and we now have to travel through Russian territory to go to the American zone of Berlin. Insulted, we had to use an airlift to feed our Berlin Germans.

4. We withdrew all support from our friend, Kai-shek, allowed the Communist Chinese, with the aid of Russia, to absorb China. Our General Marshall attempted to get Kai-shek to form a coalition government with the Communists, and when Kai-shek refused to do this, and refused to hand over Manchuria, these State Department planners were angered. MacArthur has said that you can no more mix the Communists and Nationalists, than mix oil and water. Our planners should have known this, as the Russian Communists did not even allow our planes to land on their soil when they were our allies.

5. Russia was given an important part in the Japanese peace treaty, and was handed control of Manchuria, despite the fact that the European war was finished at that time and an early end to the Japanese war was expected. Not a Russian shot was heard in the Japanese war.

6. Our planners put us into Korea, withdrew us, returned us, and now, we, and the South Koreans, representing the United Nations, have to furnish 85 percent of the troops. The other United Nations deal with the enemy.

7. These planners have us involved in a major war within 5 years of World War II, in which we Americans have had casualties as great as our casualties in the first year of World War II; this Korean war has already lasted longer than the time it took the Americans and their allies to defeat the Germans after we landed in Normandy.

8. Our country has spent billions of our national wealth in assisting countries, who now, because of trade, or otherwise, write a set of rules for the Korean war in which we are not allowed to bomb bases of aggressors, nor blockade the enemy. Our Lycoming County has had more casualties in this war than the casualties of many of our allies.

9. Our planners were so negligent that the Russians were allowed to steal the atom bomb and other secrets of the Nation; Communist sympathizers have been allowed in high places.

We are now in worse shape than when these planners began. Perhaps some of them wanted it this way.

Our everlasting thanks must go to General MacArthur. Since he centralized the thoughts of the people on our plight, the following has happened:

1. The British are tightening control of their ports with respect to war material and aid to Chinese Communists.

2. Our Government has publicly declared that Formosa will not be turned over to the Communists, and that America will object to the seating of Chinese Communists in the world government.

3. Military assistance is being sent to Formosa.

4. An airfield near the Manchurian border has been bombed.

5. The Russians have withheld aid to the Chinese Communists in their latest aggression.

It is important that we keep this matter above a party basis. However, no longer can those garbed in the cloak of the administration's past thinking say "This is our course" and expect our representatives, or the people, to blindly follow. Our way of life is based on the freedom of the individual and the dignity of man. It is now time for us to step forward with those who believe in our way of life. In so doing, we cannot besmirch our principles, nor can we think of our own safety while our boys are dying in Korea.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES SCOTT WILLIAMS.

Who Took the Record at Wake Island?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Chicago Tribune under date of May 7:

WHO TOOK THE RECORD AT WAKE ISLAND?

CHICAGO, *May 4, 1951.*

You can take it from a court reporter of 32 years' experience, and some standing, that the young woman who says she took down the MacArthur-Truman meeting at Wake Island is just plain lying

In the first place, no court reporter worth the name would take on such a task as trying to report the verbatim conversations of a flock of men seated in another room, and every court reporter in the United States with 2 years' experience will say the same, and laugh.

In the second place, the most experienced court reporter in the world just wouldn't know who was saying what, even if he could hear what was being said from that distance.

In the third place, it is a well known fact among court reporters that they must be as close as possible to the people doing the talking, and most certainly must have the ability to see the person talking to know whose name to put before a given remark. A distance of 20 feet from any fast talker renders his speech so difficult that an experienced court reporter, if he knew in advance he would be confronted with such a task, would refuse the job, even if he were paid the going rate in Chicago.

How, then, can any one say that a strip of a girl, beautiful, too, just picked up her pencil, luckily had a pad of penciled paper, had no assignment to do the job, is not a verbatim reporter (or she would be a stenographer, believe me), and just out of the sheer love of writing shorthand 100 words a minute beyond her speed, took on a reporting task that no seasoned court reporter in the United States would assume under like circumstances?

Nuts, says every court reporter in America—2,000 of them. And nuts, says every office stenographer in America—100,000 of them. All of us, pros and amateurs alike, would run from the job. But she just thought it seemed the natural thing to do. Say, "stenos" of America, was that the human thing to do?

Who had her lie like that?

A. E. CARVER.

CHICAGO, *May 4, 1951.*

The fact that a State Department employee took notes, unknown to General MacArthur, at the Wake Island conference in October, proves they were attempting to find some excuse at that time to get rid of him.

The stenographer did not just happen to be there, nor just happen to take notes. They planned it that way.

PATRIOTIC AMERICAN.

A Couple of Straws in the Wind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of May 9, 1951:

ABROAD—A COUPLE OF STRAWS IN THE WIND

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Last week when the United States presented to the United Nations a resolution calling for an arms embargo on Communist China the proposal had a cold and critical reception from Great Britain, Australia, and other nations opposed from the first to applying sanctions to the aggressor in the Korean war. These nations were reluctant even to call the Peiping government an aggressor, and their reluctance, paradoxically, was based on the same reasons that impelled the administration to turn down General MacArthur's recommendations to bomb the Chinese bases in Manchuria. They feared it might extend the war and would certainly slam the door on any hope of ending it by negotiations.

Whether or not this hope has been abandoned, the attitude of these Powers has changed in the last few days. Reports from the United Nations indicate that opposition to the resolution has evaporated and that it will probably be passed by the Additional Measures Committee and submitted next week to the General Assembly.

BRITISH TRADE WITH CHINA

At the same time Sir Hartley Shawcross, president of the British Board of Trade, replied to questions in the House of Commons on General MacArthur's charges that great quantities of war materials have been passing into Communist China through Hong Kong. Sir Hartley admitted that both Britain's and Hong Kong's trade with China increased in the first quarter of 1951. He explained, however, that goods of direct or indirect military importance were "totally prohibited," and added that in view of the failure of the good offices committee of the U. N. to obtain a settlement in Korea plans for further action were being discussed with the United Nations, the United States, and the colonial governments that export rubber and other raw materials to China.

There is no question that cutting off commerce with China would be a severe blow to British trade and would endanger the life of Hong Kong as a British colony. But "loyalty to the United Nations must be the keystone of our policy," comments the London News-Chronicle. "If the United Nations should decide to impose economic sanctions on China," says the London Times, "or if, as a result of further negotiations, the British Government and people were finally convinced that no alternative policy was possible, this country would take every step to render the blockade as effective as such a blockade could ever be."

This is a straw in a veering wind. Another straw is the swing toward the American point of view regarding negotiations with Moscow that has developed out of the interminable argument with Mr. Gromyko in Paris. Our reservations on the value of a foreign ministers conference before the west is militarily stronger in relation to the Soviet Union irritated the British and the French. They were convinced that the Russians wished to talk and that our open doubts about the efficacy of "another try" at this time blocked a possible approach to a settlement. We went along, and the American deputy in Paris has cooperated fully in the effort to open the way; he has come up with dozens of suggestions to end the deadlock and made no move to break up the meeting. After 10 wasted weeks, it is the French and the British who are discouraged and talk of adjournment.

American foreign policy has been under such a barrage of criticism at home and abroad that it is pleasant to perceive signs that our allies are edging toward our side in areas where their misgivings about our policy are greatest. We are listening these days to something new in history—a great power arguing with itself, in a loud and solemn voice, about what it will do or will not do in a crisis that involves the future of the world. In the reverberating thunders of this extraordinary controversy, it is just possible that other nations as well as ourselves are learning to understand better the issues and the risks that lie before us all. When the powers that opposed it change their minds about embargoing arms to China, when the British and the French are forced by the Soviet tactics in Paris to agree that Russia is not ready to negotiate any question, it means that time and events have worked to vindicate our policy and bring our allies nearer to our estimate of the world situation.

A COORDINATION OF POLICY

This shift of position is not big enough to close the gap between opposing views. Nor is it altogether the effect of the negative attitude of Moscow and Peiping toward any form of negotiation. The British have been assured by Charles E. Wilson that the United States does not intend to hog all the raw materials essential to keep war and peace production on something like an even keel. Furthermore, they are beginning to be as worried as we are by the steady deterioration of Anglo-American relations.

The continental nations, on their side, are increasingly concerned over the strain between Britain and the United States. The British will have no part either in the Schuman plan or the project for a European federation. Hence, Dr. Stikker, Chairman of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers, begins to talk of a European-Atlantic Union as a way of making Britain the link in a bicontinental alliance. What the signs add up to is that Western Europe is beginning to realize that the Atlantic alliance has to prove itself on both sides of the ocean. To coordinate a multinational policy is as important to its strength as to coordinate a multinational army.

Changing Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for May 14, 1951:

CHANGING PATTERN

The "mores of the community" which have so frequently been made a pretext for the continuance of racial segregation are not immutable. They are undergoing an accelerating change. But change takes place only under the impetus of leadership; it takes place when community leaders have the resolution and intelligence required to break new ground—the kind of resolution and intelligence shown the other day by members of the District Medical Society. The society voted to admit qualified Negro physicians to membership. The action deserves, we think, community commendation.

The exclusion of Negroes from the Medical Society in years past has been a reflection of prejudice where it should be least tolerated—that is, among scientists. And of course the example set by the doctors, precisely because they are so highly respected, has been followed in less enlightened quarters. The change of direction they have now initiated will exercise, we are confident, a powerful influence toward the development of a healthier, more rational community pattern. We hope the doctors will follow it up by efforts to enlarge the meager opportunities for Negro medical students to receive training in local medical schools and hospitals—and so to become qualified for membership in the Medical Society.

Address of Hon. Page Belcher, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Hon. PAGE BELCHER, of Oklahoma, to the Republican National Committee in Tulsa, Okla., May 11, 1951:

I want to join with my colleague, George Schwabe, our national committeeman, Bailie Vinson, and His Honor, George A. Stoner, in welcoming all of you folks to our great State of Oklahoma. We hope and trust that your stay here will be pleasant as well as profitable.

It is more or less a time-honored custom for speakers to open a speech with a humorous story. I am sorry, but in the very limited time that I have at my disposal I cannot indulge in humor. In addition to that, with America facing this terrible crisis, I feel too deadly serious to want to tell a funny story if I knew one. In my opinion, America is facing one of the gravest crises that have confronted this Nation in all of its history. The decisions that are made within the next few months may well determine not only the future of our Nation but the future of the world as well.

That the people of America are fully aware of the seriousness of the situation is demonstrated, I think, by the fact that 2,000,000 communications reached the Members of Congress in the first 72 hours after the dismissal of General MacArthur. Much as the American people resented the dismissal of General MacArthur, I think it was but the final straw that caused a blow-off of steam that had been generating in their minds for many months. As many people wrote to me, "This is the final blunder;" "This is the straw that broke the camel's back;" "I cannot keep still any longer." The American people were already aroused over deep freezes, mink coats, collusions between gangsters and public officials, deficit financing, unnecessary Government expense, lack of integrity in Government, as well as many other things that had tried their patience. Their tempers were aroused.

There are good people in this country who feel that in the interest of unity everyone should submerge his own convictions, and, right or wrong, line up behind the commander in chief. Unity is a great thing, but unity behind the wrong cause has caused the destruction of more nations than any other one thing in the world. There was unity behind Hitler—there was unity behind Mussolini—apparently there is unity behind Stalin. If the signers of the Declaration of Independence had believed more in unity than in the strong convictions which they had that freedom was worth dying for, we would now have Clement Attlee as prime minister, and we would be a part of the British empire. God save the day that we have unity in this country behind an administration that is more interested in the preservation of England's foreign trade with the Chinese Communists than in the safety of the boys in Korea or the preservation of America. If that constitutes unity, may God give me none of it.

Are our boys dying for a cause, or are they dying to protect British commerce with the Communists in order that the Labor Government may continue to buy elections with socialized medicine and Government handouts? Even the common people of Great Britain are getting tired of their Socialist government, and the Labor Party is just hanging on by the skin of its teeth. I heard one man say he was getting tired of hearing the Republicans complain that our allies are doing nothing. I told him the statement that our allies are doing nothing is wrong. Great Britain sold $40,000,000 worth of war materials to the Chinese Communists in 1 month. During a 9-month period in 1950, there were 120,000 tons of rubber sent to Red China. You surely would not say that Great Britain was doing nothing.

The people of America, in my opinion, are crying for courageous leadership. They want a political party with a purpose. They are willing to follow a leadership with ideals, courage, and integrity. I pray that in the interest of saving America the Republican Party will give to the people of this Nation that kind of courage and leadership. The Republican Party has the greatest opportunity in all of its history, not only to win a great victory in 1952 but to be the instrumentality through which the greatest Government ever conceived by the mind of man may be preserved for posterity and the world saved from communism. In my opinion, the Republican Party can win a great victory in 1952 if we as a party are worthy of being entrusted with the future of this country.

The American people want the truth. The American people can stand the truth. The Fair Deal way of winning votes has been with promises. The people don't want promises—they want facts. One of the most peculiar things about the great backing MacArthur has received is that he has promised nothing. He doesn't ask to lead us to a promised land. He gives no assurance of peace, even less of prosperity. He does not promise good prices, full employment, or security. He merely says that we are in a desperate predicament, and people go wild with excitement and cheering.

This is a contrast to the current standards of winning elections, and the Fair Dealers are bewildered. Washington, at Valley Forge, could inspire his ragged soldiers to even greater sacrifice. Lincoln could face up nobly to disaster. Churchill could call

for blood, sweat, and tears. The people following this leadership were fighting for ideals, not Government hand-outs or RFC loans.

Throughout all history great waves of moral regeneration come from the common people. I hope and pray that the leadership of our great party may catch the inspiration and offer the kind of leadership the people hunger for. I hope we shall quit trying to out-promise the Truman administration and will offer the American people honesty in government, sincerity of purpose, and an adherence to Christian principles. May God give us the strength and the courage to provide the leadership which will save this Nation in its darkest hour, to lead it on to greater heights, and to preserve the last and best hope for all of humanity.

Address of Dr. Umphrey Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 2, Dr. Umphrey Lee, president of Southern Methodist University, of Dallas, Tex., delivered a thoughtful and significant address at the annual dinner of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Lee's speech, which follows, goes to the heart of some of the most serious problems this country faces:

The subject of this meeting has to do with our freedom, and no more timely topic could be discussed. You will not think me irreverent or merely facetious if I begin by quoting an old nursery rhyme.

"Little Jack Horner sat in a corner
Eating his Christmas pie;
He put in his thumb and pulled out a plum
And said, "What a smart boy am I."

I do not quote this to criticize young Mr. Horner's production methods, although some might think his extraction process a little crude. The point I would like to make is that he missed the essential fact of his situation.

What young Horner thought was important was, of course, his own action in taking the plums out of the pie. It seems not to have occurred to him that the really important thing was that he had a pie that had plums in it. Literally, he had been handed the plums on some kind of a platter.

I mention this only as an illustration of what I want to say to you. The greatest treasures of this our land are those which this generation did not invent, did not procure and some of which we have not even been able to preserve. If we can stop admiring the ingenuity with which we have been availing ourselves of these treasures long enough to ask ourselves where they came from and how we are going to keep them, we may perhaps do ourselves and our posterity much good. I am not competent to speak to you about the natural resources of this country which have made our material wealth, but I do want to say something to you about some of the spiritual treasures for whose existence we are no more responsible than we are for the coal and the iron and the oil.

One of the greatest of our spiritual legacies is this freedom you have been talking about. It is somewhat disconcerting to look back and see how freedom has developed with us.

The people who came to this country in its founding days were people who wanted freedom, and they wanted freedom because they had had something else. They knew what it was to live under governments which regulated the details of a man's life, which decided what kind of societies he could belong to, how he would earn his living and how he would conduct himself. When we come to consider how we are going to preserve our American liberties, we must recall that our present generation is a generation that has always known our kind of freedom and therefore does not have as great a concern for it as for other things which this generation has not had. We have not had peace. We have not had security—therefore we long for peace and we long for security. If we had, as our fathers, experienced the tyrannies of an overbearing government long enough and in sufficient severity, we might be as passionate for liberty as they were.

Moreover, our fathers who wanted freedom had a chance to find it and develop it in a big country. It is impossible for us today to appreciate what it meant in the first decades of this country's history for a man to be able to move out of one neighborhood into another, out of one part of the country into another, to leave, if he desired, the civilized settlements and go to the frontier. We know, of course, that a man oftentimes did not better his condition but he thought that he could, and the ability to change his conditions by moving was one of the most important things that happened to people in these early days. By moving to a less settled community a man found himself with less inequalities. Birth meant nothing, wealth meant very little since there was no wealth. The kind of liberty that we have now was developed in a country where a man could get up and leave an old community if he did not like it.

The fact that this was a big country meant also that men did not have to live in constant contact with neighbors who might be irritating or dominating. Men prized their independence and resented interference with their private affairs. As the cowboy poet put it, "I like my fellow man the best when he is scattered some."

Our liberty grew also partly because of what our people did not have. One of the greatest of living British historians, in speaking of eighteenth-century England, said that English liberty in that period owed more to the lack of communications than to Magna Charta. Until the latter part of the nineteenth century communities in the United States were so isolated from each other that of necessity they developed an independent spirit and the habits of freedom. One hundred years ago it would have taken so long for a directive from Washington to have reached Texas that whatever local problems the directive might have aimed to settle would have been disposed of before the message reached its destination, supposing that the Texans would have paid any attention to it when it did arrive. No one for a moment suggests that you can have liberty only in a land with poor communications, but the kind of liberty that we have grew up partly because we did have poor communications. No central government can operate in the fashion of modern governments without modern means of communications. And now that we have these means there will never again be an opportunity for communities to develop a spirit of self-government and habits of our kind of freedom unless they have them to begin with.

This country was also favored by the fact that there were large bodies of water on each side of it. From 1812 until this present hour there has never been an invasion by a foreign power unless, indeed, we are to remember one or two crossings of the border by Villa and his bands. We have had our wars, and terrible wars some of them have been, but for almost the entire nineteenth century we were free to deal with our continental problems without foreign interference. What this meant is that in this country men have had a chance to develop their ideas and to form their habits without having now and again to repel some foreign invader who sought to impose a different way of life.

What I am saying is that our liberties have developed under certain peculiar conditions, conditions which will never happen again in the history of the world unless, indeed, some major catastrophe should wipe us all out and we should have to crawl up again from the caves and the jungles toward civilized life. I believe this to be true, but I also believe that we can keep the essential parts of our freedom if we are wise enough and courageous enough. To do this will be difficult because we are not aided by those fortuitous circumstances which aided our fathers. We no longer live in a land where a man can change his situation by moving from one community to another. One community is much alike another now, and while economic reasons may cause a change, there is not much chance that man in moving from one community to another will move into a land of greater freedom and less inequality. Neither is it probable that men in our time can live in such isolation that they are compelled to work out their own problems without recourse to some central government. Nor will ever again on this earth be a people so remote because of natural barriers that they are secure from invasion by predatory nations.

In short, as we have inherited freedoms for which we did not labor, so also, in a sense, did our fathers. It is true that they wanted freedom and worked mightily for it; but it is also true that they found themselves in a land where freedom was the natural way of life. We, their successors, however, live in a world which seems designed to promote dependence, instead of independence, subservience instead of liberty. If, then, the material conditions under which our kind of freedom naturally flourishes—that is, lots of room, poor communications, isolation—are gone, what can be done to preserve this great inheritance? You have doubtless heard much of this specific remedy, that bit of legislation to be passed or to be repealed. Let me respectfully make some observations on certain fundamentals.

When we talk about freedom we usually talk about individual freedom, the right of John Doe to do this or that. Unquestionably, this is central in our liberties, as the Bill of Rights testifies. But this freedom is impossible in any sense which we Americans would recognize without a further freedom: The freedom of John Doe and of Richard Roe and of any other citizens to join themselves together for worship, for instruction, for pleasure, for profit, or for any other purpose not inconsistent with public safety or public morals. The freedom of association, of societies, or—in the technical sense—the freedom of corporations is an essential and absolutely necessary part of our liberties.

If John Doe wants to join a singing society composed only of red-headed men, that is his privilege. If he wants to worship God by standing on his head every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 9 until 10 a. m., that is his privilege, so long as he does not disturb his neighbors. If he wants to join with others to promote the theory that the moon is made of green cheese, that is his business. The right of free association, within the limits necessary for public welfare, is a part of our liberties.

There is no need to pretend that this, or any other liberty is absolute. If ever anyone believed that all restrictions could be removed and some beneficent providence

would make all men just and honorable, it would seem that recent congressional investigations would make such faith a little difficult to hold. In simple truth, no one in this world ever did have absolute freedom.

One of the most distinguished lawyers who ever lived in our city was a man of great humor and some eccentricities. In his old age he was one evening playing some game with his cronies when one of the old men said, "Colonel, I expect we had better be getting home." The colonel assured his guests that they need be in no hurry and the game was resumed. A little while later another old man said, "Colonel, I think we had better be going. Your wife won't want you to stay up so late." The colonel drew himself up and said, "Gentlemen, I would have you know that I am Caesar in my household." Just then the colonel's wife looked around the side of the door and said, "Gentlemen, I hope you will stay just as long as you want to stay. The icebox is in the kitchen and you'll not disturb anybody at all. As for Caesar—he is coming to bed."

Nevertheless, an essential part of our freedom is that the associations to which men belong are supposed to be, insofar as is consistent with public safety and public morals, free. Let me quote from a distinguished Englishman who, nearly 40 years ago, wrote a work that ought to be better known in this country:

"You are not merely John Doe or Richard Roe, but as John may probably be a member of the Christian church by baptism, a Doe by family, an Englishman by race; all three are social institutions which have grown into you. In addition to this, you are a member of a school, an alumnus of a college, a sharer in this club, a president of that, and so forth. All these groups and unions have their effect, and limit and develop your life, make you do, or refrain from doing, what otherwise you would not, and insofar prevent you being a free and untrammeled citizen of the state. * * * It is largely to regulate such groups and to insure that they do not outstep the bounds of justice that the coercive force of the state exists. It does not create them; nor is it in many matters in direct and immediate contact with the individual."

The sense of stability and security which you and your family have does not come primarily from the fact that you recognize yourself to be a member of the American people or the American Nation. The sense of stability and security which you have is largely a result of the fact that you belong to a family, to a club, to a church, to a union, to some voluntary organization which, as the Englishman that I quoted said, is regulated by the state but is not created by the state.

Yet we are neglecting the voluntary societies whether they be business or professional, fraternal or religious, because in this country we are concentrating upon two things. In the first place, almost all that we hear about is the preservation of individual rights. In the second place, we are neglecting the preservation of our voluntary associations because we are thinking of only one voluntary association and that is the association which we call a business organization.

I trust you will believe that it is because of my devotion to American freedom, which includes my firm belief that American business ought to have as much freedom as is possible in our kind of world and with our kind of population, that I say to you this thing: Unless we preserve the freedom of other voluntary associations it will be impossible to preserve free economic institutions. There are simply not enough stockholders in this country to preserve business associations unless they are a part of a larger whole. Let me illustrate.

There are three times in a man's life when he is particularly susceptible to influence—when he is young and ambitious, when he is sick and despairing, when he is old and helpless. There was a time when at each one of these periods a man was relieved by the voluntary action of his neighbors. That time has passed. There is hardly a hospital in this country that is not being built partly or entirely by Federal funds. The aged are now the care of the Government. It seems to be entirely possible that in a short while the entire care of man's bodily wants, when he is sick and when he is old, will be in the hands of Government agencies. I sincerely hope that I am wrong about this, and I hope that our dear friends the doctors will improve their public relations sufficiently that they can convince the American public of the great need of retaining a free medical profession. But it is already true that in sickness and in old age American men and women turn to the state. If the doctors lose their fight, then two of man's neediest hours will be taken care of entirely, not by voluntary associations, but by the state.

I said that one of the times when a man is most susceptible to influence is when he is young and ambitious. I am amazed to learn that most businessmen do not seem to know that in higher education in this country exists one of the greatest strongholds of freedom from governmental control. This country, almost from its beginning, has had a dual system of higher education. Alone among the nations of the world, we have had both State-controlled colleges and universities and privately controlled colleges and universities. It has given us the advantages of a State system and the independence of a private system.

This country began with a dual system; it has continued a dual system. And I find to my astonishment that many people are utterly unaware of it. They think, for example, that the only nongovernmental colleges and universities in this country are first, the Ivy League, secondly, a few small denominational colleges which are preserved for old times' sake. The truth is that 48 percent of all college and university students in America are in institutions not governed by the States, and there was never as much as half of the college and university students in State institutions until after World War II with the consequent growth of existing State institutions and the building of new ones.

The control of our colleges and universities by different groups, some of them semipolitical if not altogether political, some of them by voluntary groups of various kinds, has worked for the betterment of our total education. The interplay between the two groups has been for the good of each, and we do not believe that we shall be the better if this difference ceases to exist. All institutions that deal with the public are subject to pressures. The private institution is subject to pressures from the social system of which it is a part. It is inevitable that institutions which depend upon gifts from people who have accumulated capital or who have earned capacity should make those institutions a little less critical than they perhaps should be of the economic system that exists. On the other hand, the State institution inevitably is subjected to political pressures with which the private institution does not have to contend. But the existence of two kinds of institutions, each taking care of approximately half the college population of this country, is healthy. Many of us believe that it is very helpful for half of the college population to be told that if they desire to outstrip their contemporaries in preparation they must pay out of their own or their parents' pockets for that privilege.

But in education also private enterprise is losing out. With higher costs, with the disappearance of great wealth, and consequently of great patrons of education, and with competition from the apparently boundless pockets of State treasuries, the nongovernmental institution has come upon parlous times. And where can the independent educational institution turn?

On all sides the answer is being given: The State. It may be that the sources of income upon which private institutions have depended will dry up, that there will be nowhere to turn except to the Government. I do not need to attribute any sinister motives to anyone when I say that one of the greatest influences for promoting the spirit of freedom and of independence in this country will disappear when half of all college and university graduates are no longer educated at their own expense and at the expense of a liberal business community, in an atmosphere untroubled by political pressures.

What I am trying to say to you is that we cannot preserve the liberty of the individual without preserving also the liberty of associations, of societies, of corporations. And we cannot preserve just one kind of association. If we bring up the next generation in a country in which health, education, charitable relief, and old age are taken care of by the Government, you need not expect that business will be made a grand exception. You cannot be saved by yourselves. If independent education goes under, if the free professions go under, you haven't a chance.

There is something else that ought to be said. Freedom is expensive business: especially does it exact a high moral cost. Let me try to explain what I mean.

Just before World War II, a distinguished Italian historian said that all society is held together either by iron fetters or by silken threads. What he meant was that there are essentially two ways to have order: One is by the police state, the other is by dependence upon the moral character of a people. If a people agree that they will have elections at certain times, and that they will respect the results of those elections, you can have order without guns and bayonets. If the majority of people voluntarily obey the laws, you can have police to take care of the criminal fringe, and you have order. But there is no middle ground. If you have freedom, you must have true men.

This is why such disclosures as we have had in recent months sicken all those who love freedom. But there is something even more sinister in recent disclosures than the corruption of Government. No man ever sold influence in government unless someone bought it. No government official, no army officer ever retired to take a high-salaried place in some business which had benefited or could benefit by his influence unless that business invited him. If we expect to clean out government we must clean out our own house.

I can speak without restraint to you because, of course, no one within these walls has ever been guilty of business immorality. But decent American business must help change some habits in American society as a whole if we are going to do anything about Government immorality. And it cannot be done by laws alone. The moral climate must be changed. Every dishonest man in this country is helping to destroy our freedom. When we can no longer depend upon men's honesty, then we have no recourse but to the police. In other words, when honor is gone there is nothing left but the all-powerful state.

If we make up our mind in this country that the only question is what is legal, and that any morality that demands more than the law requires is foolishness, then there is no need to complain when some government announces the law of the dictators, that is, that the government is the only judge of what is right and wrong. If we make up

our mind that we can tolerate liars and thieves in business and ordinary society, we need not complain when we get them in Government. The Government in Washington will rarely be better than the government in the separate States or in the city of Podunk; and the Government in Washington will never be more moral than the American home. There is no use in talking about old-fashioned liberties unless we can restore the old-fashioned virtues on which these liberties were founded and on which alone they can stand.

There is nothing lacking in this country but the knowledge of what we want to preserve and the moral character to preserve it. We are supreme in military power, we are supreme in natural resources, we are great in a free tradition. There ought not to be any question of our future. A little more than 34 years ago this country declared war upon Germany and thereby entered World War I. The next morning after we declared war on Germany, a Canadian officer who had been at the front since the beginning of the struggle spoke to some graduate students in an eastern university. The officer was a Canadian novelist whose books are now forgotten. But none of those who heard him that morning will forget his first words. When he came before this little group of students, the Canadian officer said, "Gentlemen, this morning I do not know when the war will end but I know how it will end." If America can be returned to her primitive integrity in business, in Government, and in social life, we may not still be able to predict the time when the present struggle between freedom and slavery will end, but we can know how that struggle will end.

A Crucial Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article entitled "A Crucial Question" which appeared in my hometown paper, the Evansville Courier, in Evansville, Ind., on Sunday, May 13, 1951:

A CRUCIAL QUESTION

In one of the most remarkable and momentous hearings in the history of free peoples and their institutions, the differences and the points of agreement between General MacArthur and Secretary of Defense Marshall, representing the administration, have been clarified.

The area of agreement between General MacArthur and General Marshall is large. Both agree that Formosa should be held at all costs, that Red China should never be admitted to the U. N.

General MacArthur did not join the Hoover Fortress America camp. He stands, it is quite clear, on the internationalist side of Senator TAFT. He has rejected the words of those who say we made a mistake in going into Korea last summer. He grants that Europe is a vital defense bastion and it is difficult to see how his internationalist thinking can be reconciled with the Chicago Tribune which sponsors him for President.

It seems clear enough to us that General MacArthur spoke his own mind in all that mass of testimony and opinion he gave a Senate committee. He didn't fit it into anybody's political pattern.

But the major difference—and that is what all the argument simmers down to—remains between General MacArthur and General Marshall. It is over the immediate conduct of the Korean war. MacArthur wants to widen it and try to knock China out and thereby avert a clash with Russia.

Marshall wants to limit the war, so long as we have control of it, and avoid now a world war which he believes would start in China and spread to Europe quickly, in case MacArthur's program were carried out.

A major point in considering the attitudes of the two men, it is quite clear, stems from the jobs the two men have had to do. General MacArthur's job was in the Orient. General Marshall's has been to consider the over-all picture, with all the factors in the defense of America and the free world before him for continuous appraisal. The limited attitude with which General MacArthur approaches the Asiatic conflict was illustrated in his own testimony. When asked what plans he had in mind to defend the United States in the event his theory was wrong and a widening of the war in Korea brought Russia into the fray, he said that was outside his jurisdiction, or words to that effect.

Some idea of the problems of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—men who are obligated to look at all the factors involved in this perilous period—is found in the report of the research and policy committee of the Committee for Economic Development. This is a group of outstanding businessmen who several years ago set up an organization to carry on research about our greatest problems and make nonpartisan and objective surveys and reports to the people. It has won a great measure of respect.

In discussing some of the economic aspects of achieving North Atlantic security it says:

"From the point of view of European security, the main significance of the Korean war lies in the altered assessment of Soviet intentions which it has necessitated. If the Politburo is willing to induce or allow a larger ally, Red China, to become involved as the aggressor in a large-scale fight with the United States and other U. N. forces, despite a real risk of general war, might the Russians not be willing to resort to armed force to gain their objectives in Western Europe? We can only consider that the Soviet willingness to risk a general war in Europe has increased. Accordingly, the United States must ask itself what costs it must bear, and what risks it must assume, in order to deter, and if necessary to oppose, Soviet aggression against Western Europe.

"The United States could perhaps survive the collapse of Western Europe and its delivery into Soviet hands. This proposal, however, is one which no reflective American can contemplate without dread and foreboding. Even in terms of the coldest strategic calculations, the extension of Russian hegemony over Western Europe would give the Russians access to potential military assets of incalculable value—the vast industrial capacity of Western Europe, millions of trained industrial workers possessing a degree of skill unmatched in the Soviet Union, and many of the best scientific and inventive brains in the world. The fall of Western Europe would open up the prospect of Soviet control of European colonies, dependencies, and affiliated territories in other parts of the world. Considering that American reverses in Korea caused people in other countries to doubt the ability of the United States to halt the spread of communism, it requires little imagination to foresee the strength of the wave of the future psychology which would also sweep the world in the event of the Soviet conquest of Western Europe. The Russians would then be in an excellent position of using tactics of psychological warfare and internal subversion in driving to neutralize or dominate many of the countries remaining outside the Soviet orbit, and thus largely to isolate the United States—strategically, diplomatically, ideologically, and economically."

Thus it is easy to see that General Marshall and the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel that the Korean conflict has increased the likelihood of Russia in the near future committing aggression in Western Europe. And they fear that if we get involved too deeply in the Orient, Russia will strike in Western Europe.

This is the crux of the whole argument between General MacArthur and the administration.

MacArthur already has brought about a stiffening of not only our attitude but the attitude of our allies toward Red China. There is going to be an economic blockade—something that should have been invoked last winter when the Red Chinese entered the conflict—against the Chinese.

But the main argument may be water over the dam next week or the week after next. The Russians and the Red Chinese may decide to widen the conflict on their own. A new Chinese drive is in process of preparation and the U. N. forces are expecting the intervention of a real enemy air force for the first time. If that happens, undoubtedly the orders to bomb Chinese air bases in Manchuria will be given.

So far, under the ground rules both sides have been observing, the enemy air power has been a rather negligible factor in the war. We have had undisputed air supremacy, although it has been known right along that the Russians have several hundred modern planes in that part of the world.

As a result of this second great debate the Russians know everything we are thinking about. They know about our fears and our plans. They know we want to limit the struggle in the Orient until we gain enough time to become stronger and to build up a defense force in Western Europe. For the cold-blooded planners of the Kremlin the obvious course of action would be to strike before we are ready, and get us involved as deeply as possible in other places before moving in Europe.

The only real deterrent to immediate action undoubtedly is still the atom bomb superiority of this country. How long that is to be a sufficient deterrent is a crucial question of our times.

Korean War Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the continued appeasement which is evident in the administration's policies in the conduct of the Korean war.

I use the term "war" advisedly. It is well known that our Chief Executive has described Korea as a "police action." But I maintain that whatever the term applied, the men who are fighting and dying there cannot distinguish the difference. In either case, no matter what we call it, those men still are undergoing the rigors of war, are suffering the miseries of war, and are dying the death of war.

Now, I do not consider myself a warmonger. I am a veteran of World War I, and I know from first-hand experience what war can do to individuals and to nations. To me, nothing is more horrible than war; there is nothing that I dislike more. I do not look with favor upon the necessity of sending young men into battle. This has become necessary through a series of "secret agreements" between our Nations' leaders and those of foreign powers, through a variety of blunders which I will not enumerate here. They have been dealt with in detail upon many occasions, on the floor of this House.

My purpose today is to register my most vigorous protest at the defeatist attitude taken by some of our administration stalwarts in recent statements.

This country of ours grew strong, became one of the world's great powers, through generations of standing on our own feet. We progressed through good times and bad by guiding our own destiny and by building up international prestige through years of painstaking diplomacy.

Early in the life of this Nation, we were warned against forming entangling alliances. In recent years, we have been so entangled in foreign alliances that we have been led to the very brink of national disaster.

Some of these alliances were formed in good faith and with the full knowledge of the American people. Others—insidious ones—were negotiated in secret, without the knowledge of the people, and definitely not to the best interests of this Nation.

We cannot undo what has been done, be it good or bad. Our plight now is one of finding the way out of the maze of entanglements and back to the true course set for the Nation by our forefathers.

This way is not by the appeasement route.

Our leaders tremble in fear that we will affront our former ally, "Good Old Joe" Stalin. They quake in their boots at the reaction of present allies to our national policies. They are afraid of the effect of efforts to bring the Korean conflict to a speedy and victorious conclusion. They favor a stalemate in Korea, a sparring for time—and all the while more and more American boys are dying on bloody battlefields in a foreign land.

Sparring for time, for whom?

Certainly, our national military strength will be increased at our present rate. But so will that of other powers whose design is our destruction. We will be buying time with American lives, time which will be of as much benefit to real and potential enemies as it will to us.

Already we have well begun the course to national bankruptcy, one of the primary objectives of our potential foreign adversaries. There seems to be no inclination, on the part of the administration, to halt this headlong flight to economic ruin. Rather, efforts are being accelerated to continue buying disrespect from foreign nations, supposedly our allies in the struggle for freedom.

Administration spokesmen insist that a firm, victory-seeking policy in Korea will bring down the wrath of the Soviet Union. To that, I say "rubbish." The Soviet Union, if she intends to wage world war III, will do so in her own time and in a place of her own choosing. Only the Kremlin can accurately predict the future in this regard.

It may be that General MacArthur's beliefs, if put into active use, would hasten world war III. Perhaps not. This much is certain: That this country of ours did not gain its strength and international prestige by cowing like a whipped cur, its tail between its legs and licking the hand that struck it. Neither have we been spoiling for a fight. We simply have faced the issues squarely, and met them fairly.

Now is the time to again face the issues, to determine a course which will bring true peace—not one of appeasement and continued waste of American lives. It is all well and good to talk of the tremendous losses suffered by Red China. It is not Red China's losses with which American parents are most concerned. They are concerned, and rightfully so, with the loss of American lives.

In short, I do not like our present administration's defeatist attitude, its fear complex if you will. They are so instilling fear in the American public through statements in the press and on the radio, that public and military morale alike will suffer.

They are afraid the United States will have to go it alone in Korea. Just what do they think we have been doing, in substance? This country has supplied virtually all the manpower and materials involved in the Korean conflict, aside, of course, from the South Koreans themselves.

I call for a reversal of policy, for determination of a policy which will make the fullest use of our resources to speed the Korean conflict to victorious conclusion, with the least possible loss of American lives and expenditure of American means.

I urge a return to the traditional American self-reliance. We owe it to the men who are on the fighting fronts to restore the truly American way of doing things. We must assure them that they are not earning victory on the battlefield only to have the peace thrown away once more. In the past we have won the battles, but we have failed miserably at the peace table. We must not let this reoccur.

National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., Takes Exception to Letter of Comptroller General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter addressed to me by Mr. Frazer A. Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., in which he takes exception to a letter addressed to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee, and inserted by the latter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 7, 1951, by the Comptroller General of the United States:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
AMERICAN SHIPPING, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1951.

The Honorable EDWARD J. HART,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE HART: I have just finished reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1951, beginning at page A2549, a letter addressed to Congressman ALBERT THOMAS (Texas) by the Comptroller General of the United States which is preceded by a tabulation of ships said to have been chosen at random by the Maritime Administration and alleging to show the acquisition cost to the owner, the amount paid by the Government for charter hire, and the amount paid to the owner when the vessel was sunk.

The schedule gives such a distorted picture of the true relationship of the facts that we feel constrained to call the matter to your attention. Without taking each individual item and tracing it through to a conclusion (which we will be happy to do if you so desire) may we point out the basically misleading impression which must necessarily be gained by contrasting the data shown in the schedule.

It would be assumed that the purpose is to demonstrate that a vessel which cost the owner the modest sum stated was chartered to the United States Government for the period shown at a very high rate of charter hire, and that upon loss of the vessel, presumably from war hazards, the owner recovered a relatively large sum.

Nothing is stated to show that these vessels were under "time charter" except the small letters "t/c" which by reference to a line in the heading of the schedule is indicated to mean "time charter." Nothing is stated to show that the term "time charter" means that the vessel owner supplies not only the vessel but a full crew, including its wages, food and sustenance; repairs to maintain the vessel in operating condition; engine, deck and steward's stores, excepting only fuel and fresh water; and overhead management to take care of the procurement of those items supplied by the shipowner. Looking at the rate per month shown, it will be noted that the charter hire rate is slightly in excess of $1,000 per day. At the rate of pay for sea-going wages during the period stated, the daily crew wages would have amounted to almost one-half of that sum without taking into account food, repairs, stores, management costs, etc.

Therefore, if the reader were to assume, as he has a perfect right to do, that the schedule relates the cost of the vessel to a charter hire rental for the same vessel, the conclusion would be enormously distorted.

Further, the schedule shows a column headed "Estimated cost to the owner." The assumption of the reader is naturally that this is the amount paid by the shipowner to the Government for a surplus war-built vessel of World Wars I or II. From my personal knowledge of some of the few ships included in this list, such is not the case. Further, in the case of at least one of the vessels which was purchased from the Government as surplus from World War I, the vessel was bought as part of a fleet of 21 ships with a contract to operate the fleet for a period of 10 years over four trade routes

found to be essential to the foreign trade and commerce of the United States and certified as such by the Maritime Commission. The cash consideration paid by the purchaser was considered by the company (and I was one of its directors at the time) to be only a part of the cost of the vessels. The obligation to run a year-round service over 4 routes with 21 vessels for 10 years was by them considered a very substantial part of the acquisition cost. True, ocean-mail contracts of that period were subsequently secured to equalize at least in part the competitive disadvantage of American and foreign ships plying those routes, but there was no assurance that the operating losses would not substantially exceed the cash consideration paid. While on this point, may I say that it would be a fair inference from the tone of the data supplied by Mr. THOMAS that this was a negotiated deal and that the Government was induced to sell the vessels at a ridiculously low price. The fact is that at least as far as the vessel with which I am familiar is concerned, the fleet of 21 ships and the contract obligations were all put up to public bidding, well advertised in advance, and the Government obtained the highest market value for the property which it was offering.

Now as to the column headed "Amount paid for loss," which is assumed to be the liquidation of the Government's obligation to the owner due to the sinking of the vessel through war risks and hazards. The charter party between the Government and the shipowner for the use of these vessels provided that in the event the vessels were lost the Government was obligated to pay the shipowner the constitutional remuneration of "just compensation." Further, as the date of loss shown will reveal, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was in existence and the so-called enhancement provision, under which the amount so paid is not to be enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use, was in effect, and therefore no war-inflated values could have been or were paid for these vessels. This enhancement clause is a provision which is not applicable by law to any other public property taken by the Government in the course of the prosecution of the war, and destroyed while in the Government's possession. In all other cases "just compensation" value as of the time of loss represents the sum to which such property owner is entitled. As far as the circumstances are concerned, instead of making out a case against the shipping industry, it is possible to show that this industry was discriminated against with respect to the taking of private property for public use.

Mr. THOMAS appears to relate only those factors which tend to prove a predetermined conclusion. He does not say to you that the charter hire rate shown for these vessels was substantially below the rate of hire currently being paid in the world market for similar ships. I would have to check the charter market of the period, but it is my impression that the figure is about two-thirds of the prevailing charter hire rates of the period. He also does not tell you (and it could hardly have slipped his memory, as Mr. BONNER brought it to his attention within the last 4 days) that rather than a showing of excess payments as just compensation for vessels taken for public use, the courts have awarded as to all vessels for the period, and not just the selected few which Mr. THOMAS cares to enumerate, 160 percent of the just compensation values offered by the Maritime Commission but refused by the owner and carried to the courts for determination.

There are a number of instances stated in the Comptroller General's letter which by contrasting the figures shown would tend to alarm the reader. However, as no names of companies or vessels are shown, we cannot give you an accurate statement.

The Comptroller General says that the Government inevitably sells in a buyer's market and buys in a seller's market. This is true, but the cause thereof is interesting. For the reason that we do not maintain an adequate merchant marine to carry our commerce and to provide military auxiliaries for national defense, it is necessary for the Government to engage in gigantic shipbuilding projects of an expensive—yes, extravagant—nature to meet the exigencies of war. Naturally these become surplus at the termination of the emergency and create what the Comptroller General chooses to call a "buyer's market." When the Government requires vessels, it is inevitably a period of international stress. Shipping is one of the first industries to feel the effect of war or preparation for war. Vessels are in demand to assure the accumulation of critical or strategical materials; vessel values and user rates necessarily rise. It is during such times, when these emergencies affect the United States, that the seller's market, to which the Comptroller refers, comes into existence.

The shipping business is necessarily a complicated and technical one. It is difficult for the public and even for many Members of Congress to understand these intricate matters. We have seen the time when they confuse members of the industry itself. It would be greatly helpful if persons who assume the role of critics would be careful to avail themselves of all the surrounding data and to present it in the proper perspective.

In the hope that we may at least make a start toward a frank and forthright understanding of at least some of these matters, we would appreciate it if you would have this communication placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if, in your opinion, it merits it and would serve a useful purpose.

Sincerely yours,

FRAZER A. BAILEY.

Net Working Capital of Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 7, 1951:

NET WORKING CAPITAL UP $5,700,000,000 IN 1950 FOR BIGGEST GAIN SINCE 1947—$75,800,000,000 TOTAL REPORTED BY SEC WITH CURRENT ASSETS AND LIABILITIES RECORDS AT $150,500,000,000 AND $74,700,000,000

WASHINGTON, May 6.—Net working capital of corporations in 1950 increased $5,700,000,000, largest annual gain since 1947, to $75,800,000,000, according to the largest estimate made public today by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Current assets of corporations rose $21,900,000,000 to a $150,500,000,000 record while current liabilities also reached a new high of $74,700,000,000.

The increase in working capital was recorded in the first 9 months of the year, the last quarter showing a slight decline, the report said. Current assets in the last 3 months increased by about $7,400,000,000, but current liabilities increased by a somewhat larger amount.

The increase in current assets in the last quarter of 1950 was accounted for by a $5,000,000,000 increase in inventories a $2,100,000,000 increase in receivables and a $400,000,000 rise in holdings of Government securities.

A $4,300,000,000 increase in notes and accounts payable, a small increase in other liabilities and a $3,200,000,000 addition to Federal income-tax liabilities accounted for the rise in current liabilities in the final quarter of 1950.

In addition to the $5,700,000,000 increase in working capital in 1950, the report estimated that corporations invested $16,800,000,000 during the year in plant and equipment. To finance this combined total of $22,500,000,000 in expansion, corporations secured about $3,700,000,000 from external sources. Net new bond issues amounted to about $2,000,000,000 while stock issues added $1,700,000,000. Internal sources—depreciation accruals and undistributed profits—provided the remaining $18,800,000,000 for corporate expansion last year.

Are the Industry Advisory Committees of the National Production Authority Hamstrung?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter I have just received from Mr. Lyman A. Beeman, president of Finch, Pruyn & Co., manufacturers of printing and converting papers. Addressed to Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the letter records Mr. Beeman's resignation from the industry advisory committee of the Ground Wood Paper Manufacturers, and sets forth his reason for so doing. If Mr. Beeman's experience is typical of the way industry advisory committees are being treated by the National Production Authority, the Congress should indeed determine forthwith whether this situation is ineptness or a studied attempt toward Government dictatorship of business.

Mr. Beeman's letter follows:

MAY 8, 1951.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I have felt great security in your acceptance of responsibility in Washington and I wish to aid you in every way in our national emergency. To discharge this patriotic duty, I accepted an invitation to membership on the Groundwood Paper Manufacturers Industry Advisory Committee of NPA.

This committee met last Tuesday and I was astounded to have Mr. Nathaniel Rafler, Industry committee adviser, refuse committee members, either individually or as a whole, the right to have legal counsel of their own. He furthermore told us we were to have no secretarial, technical or other aid or advice. No minutes of meetings were to be kept, except as the Government chose to write summaries. When protest was made Mr. Rafler told us if we didn't like the conditions he would suggest we resign.

The conditions are such as to make the committee impotent for constructive effort. I could not help but draw the conclusion the National Production Authority had no inten-

tion of organizing its Industry Advisory Committees as honest, fair and efficient aids in administering controls. Since the meeting I have discussed and thought about the matter very carefully and it is difficult to decide whether this situation is ineptness or whether it is a step in a studied attempt toward Government dictatorship of business. In either event it is my obvious duty to resist no matter what the danger to me personally or to our company.

It is, therefore, with great hesitancy and after due consideration I realize the only way I can resist is to resign from the committee.

Very truly yours,

FINCH, PRUYN & CO., INC.,
LYMAN A. BEEMAN, *President.*

The Battle for Peace—Remarks by Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we become so absorbed in the conflicts and the tensions of our day that we forget to look to history for an understanding of them. The present, which leads inevitably to the future, is the product of the past, and not always unlike it. We may turn, therefore, to the past for guidance. History may suggest, when wisdom fails us, how to meet the great troubles that beset us and keep them from becoming destructive wars.

I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the grasp of history consistently displayed by that erudite, philosophic and able man who, to the good fortune of our Nation, serves his country as the Secretary of the Air Force. Recently, in a speech made before a group of educated men, Thomas K. Finletter gave further proof of his knowledge of history, his deep concern with world affairs, and his concept of the task that lies before us. I refer to Secretary Finletter's speech on Thursday of week before last after receiving the Guggenheim honor cup for 1951, presented by the University of Pennsylvania Club of New York.

The events to which Mr. Finletter turned for an illumination of today's events are not, however, ancient. They occurred in Ethiopia in 1935 and in the Rhineland in 1936. Citing them, and the great war that followed them, Mr. Finletter asks:

> Who can say what might have happened, what great precedents might have been established, how aggression might conceivably have been nipped in the bud, and World War II avoided, had the collective power for peace of the League been used on those two great occasions.

The events of today which Italy's conquest of Ethiopia and Hitler's militarization of the Rhineland illuminate are taking place in Korea, but with a difference that is fundamental. The member nations of the League of Nations failed to face up and resist acts of aggression 15 years ago, even though the aggression was committed against one of their own members. Mr. Finletter did not, but might have, referred to the moving and prophetic farewell speech of the Emperor of Ethiopia as he surrendered Ethiopia's seat in the League of Nations and went into exile. As the Emperor predicted, a greater war followed. But the free nations of the world today denounced the aggression in Korea. Through the medium of the United Nations they are fighting to sustain the great principle that aggression is illegal, and that the preservation of democracy as well as peace demands that aggression be suppressed. They are taking positive action to avoid a world war.

Pointing out the differences between the aggression of 1935 and the aggression of 1951, and how we are meeting it, Mr. Finletter said:

> Our military objectives thus are in aid of these two great principles—our search for peace and our determination to be strong until we get it. Particularly is this so in the Korean war. Indeed, it is the fact that this Korean war is not a war of the ordinary type which makes its conduct so difficult and so delicate. For the purpose of the Korean war is peace.

And Mr. Finletter continued:

> The battle for peace in Korea is not yet won. We are in the midst of the most troublesome phase of that great event. How we conduct ourselves and the determination and patience we show will decide the manner in which history will record this great event. The issue of collective action for peace through the United Nations is at stake.

But Mr. Finletter warned:

> It is not just in Korea that military action is playing its part in carrying out these great purposes of our foreign policy. Our large build-up of military forces and the strengthening of the military position of our allies, with the sacrifices that this will require from the American people, also are a part of the bigger purposes of our national policy.

Mr. Speaker, this thoughtful speech by Secretary Finletter should serve to clarify our thinking on problems of gravest concern. Instead of being confused by the debates going on today, we should find in them leaven to raise our hopes, to strengthen our faith, and our determination. The build-up of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force is for the sole purpose of supporting our national policy in seeking peace and in maintaining a position of strength which will most effectively lead toward the achievement of peace.

It is a source of hope, and encouragement for the Nation that the man in whose hands rests the responsibility for the build-up of the Air Force can survey the current unrest, review the present debate and assert:

> There is a chance that our program for peace will succeed.

But it is a challenge to the rest of us, that Mr. Finletter should conclude:

> I believe that we must increase and double our efforts in the search for peace.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of the Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter after receiving the Guggenheim honor cup for 1951.

The remarks are as follows:

I shall talk to you this evening about the Air Force and, more particularly, about the way in which the work of the Air Force is fitting into our over-all policies in international relations.

There are at the moment two main activities of the military services which are and must be closely tied in with our foreign policy.

In the first place, we are engaged in a serious war in Korea, and this war, as I shall try to explain, is of a special kind involving complex and important considerations in our international relations.

Secondly, the Air Force, along with the other services, since the beginning of the Korean war nearly a year ago, has been engaged on a program of major build-up of the basic Military Establishment. The nature of this build-up is one which much be directly related to the aims of our foreign policy.

In times such as these when the country is not in an all-out war for survival—for Korea is not that, no matter how grievous the sufferings in that war—our military operations and planning must necessarily be subordinate to and in aid of our major political objectives.

This is not true to the same extent when the country is engaged in an all-out war (such as World Wars I and II) where there is a struggle to the death, where the issue is survival.

Even in an all-out war it is the Commander in Chief, a civilian, who is the highest authority in the executive branch on all matters, civilian as well as military. But military considerations then assume a particularly high importance. However, they must remain in closest consonance with our international political objectives. The principles for the peace settlement must be drafted. And even during the war there is room for political maneuver such as trying to divert allies from the enemy, to obtain allies for ourselves, to attempt to break the enemy's determination to resist (as in the case of Wilson's 14 points), and politically directed economic measures—all destined to weaken the enemy. In short, military considerations, under the direction of a civilian Commander in Chief, assume much higher importance during an all-out war.

But when the country is at peace, or in a betwixt-and-between time such as the present when we are not engaged in full-out war with our survival at stake, military operations and programs must be even more subordinated to considerations of foreign political policy.

This is especially so at the present time and in the case of our own country. Until recently in history the most that the foreign policies of the democracies hoped to do was to stave off the happening of war for as long as possible and to establish those relationships with other countries which would put one's own country in the best possible position for a war, if unhappily, one should come.

Not until the great American initiative of the League of Nations under Woodrow Wilson did it become one of the tasks of the foreign policy of the free world to seek the permanent and effective elimination of war as an institution.

Indeed, during the period of the family dynasties before the French Revolution, war was but an extension of foreign policy. And unhappily this has continued to be the case with the great aggressors of modern times.

The United States with the position of world leadership which has been forced upon it, fortunately has an entirely different concept. Its purpose is not only to stave off war

for as long as possible and to persuade as much of the world as possible to agree with it in its search for peace, but also our country has, I believe, despite the difficulties that often seem insurmountable, determined to work through the United Nations to seek the elimination of war as a method of handling disputes between the nations.

The United States has not accepted the proposition that all-out war is inevitable. Perhaps you may say we are naive about this. Perhaps, as is sometimes pointed out, we are new at this business of world leadership and perhaps, you may say, that when we get a little older we will acquire the cynicism which has produced the unending series of wars which 6,000 years of history shows.

I do not believe so. I do not believe that we are going to adopt any such cynical point of view. Perhaps because of the protection which we have enjoyed—until recently, until the development of air power—back of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, or perhaps because of something in the spirit of the people of this country, we are going to try to change the rules and to use our leadership at least to make a try, and perhaps to succeed, in establishing a reign and rule of peace in the world.

This, I believe, is the attitude of the country. I do not believe that we are making the sacrifices in Korea with any feeling that these sacrifices will be in vain. Certainly the attitude of the Government is that all-out war is not inevitable, that we are going to do everything we can to get rid of it as a human institution, and that for all the odds against us and the intractability of some nations, we have a real chance to succeed.

This, I believe, is in the American tradition. It is not our custom to say that things are impossible. I believe that we will put the same effort into seeking peace as we have in the terrible sacrifices of war.

Time and again you will find the fact that peace is the primary business of the United States stated in our announcements of official policy. These are not just generalities, pious hopes of unattainable ends in which one does not believe. Specific proposals are made—proposals which when and as other nations are ready and willing to accept the idea, can be a base and a workable agenda for carrying out a regime of enforceable peace.

The record starts with the Atomic Declaration of November 1945, when the President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom and Canada put forward a specific plan for enforced disarmament of the modern weapons of mass destruction.

The record goes on through the United Nations Assembly resolution of January 1946, the Secretary of State's committee report on atomic energy of March 1946, and down to the most recent statement of the President of the United States before the Unied Nations on October 24, 1950, when he proposed the following as an aspiration of our country—an aspiration which could be the greatest gift to civilization one could think of if it were to become the accepted policy of the nations:

"We intend to build up strength for peace as long as that is necessary. But at the same time, we must continue to strive, through the United Nations, to achieve international control of atomic energy and the reduction of armaments and armed forces. Cooperative and effective disarmament would make the danger of war remote. It would be a way of achieving the high purposes of the United Nations without the tremendous expenditures for armaments which conditions in the world today make imperative.

"Disarmament is the course which the United States would prefer to take. It is the course which most nations would like to adopt. It is the course which the United Nations from its earliest beginnings has been seeking to follow. * * *

"Years of effort have served to bring to the attention of all nations the three basic principles upon which any successful plan of disarmament must rest.

"First, the plan must include all kinds of weapons. Outlawing any particular kind of weapon is not enough. The conflict in Korea bears tragic witness to the fact that aggression, whatever the weapons used, brings frightful destruction.

"Second, the plan must be based on unanimous agreement. A majority of nations is not enough. No plan of disarmament can work unless it includes every nation having substantial armed forces. One-sided disarmament is a sure invitation to aggression.

"Third, the plan must be foolproof. Paper promises are not enough. Disarmament must be based on safeguards which will insure the compliance of all nations. The safeguards must be adequate to give immediate warning of any threatened violation. Disarmament must be policed continuously and thoroughly. It must be founded upon free and open interchange of information across national borders."

This is one great line of our policy. Parallel with it is our determination to be strong in a world in which these great plans for peace have not yet been accepted.

But the matter of being strong is one which ties in with and is in aid of the purpose of peace. Our strength is not for aggression. It is to create a military posture which will provide no incentive to aggressors to attack us and may perhaps persuade them that war would be unprofitable and that peace should be put upon the agenda.

Our military objectives thus are in aid of these two great principles—our search for peace and our determination to be strong until we get it. Particularly is this so in the Korean war. Indeed it is the fact that this Korean war is not a war of the ordinary type which makes its conduct so difficult and so delicate. For the purpose of the Korean war is peace.

Let us try to put this action of the United Nations in Korea in historical perspective. I believe that when history is written the obvious comparison will be made between the Korean war and the events of Ethiopia in 1935 and in the Rhineland in 1936.

You will remember that those two events are now regarded as the critical points when the League of Nations had to decide whether it was to go forward or backward, whether it was to become an effective agent for the suppression of aggression or whether it was to become an impotent debating society. The decision was that it was to become impotent. The reason was that it failed to face up to and resist those acts of aggression.

You will also remember how, in looking back, it has been pointed out that determined action by the League of Nations would have stopped the Ethiopian aggression and how the troops of Hitler had their orders to withdraw in the face of determined action by the victors of World War I to enforce the principles of collective security upon which they had agreed; and how this action was not taken. Who can say what might have happened, what great precedents might have been established, how aggression might conceivably have been nipped in the bud and World War II avoided had the collective power for peace of the League been used on those two great occasions.

When we come to Korea I believe that history will look back and say the free world had learned the lesson of the period between World Wars I and II and that when the new Ethiopian and the new Rhineland took place by the aggression of the North Koreans in Korea this time the free nations stood up, and through the medium of the United Nations fought to sustain the great principle that aggression is illegal.

The Korean war has been grievous. Great and heart-breaking losses have been sustained and are being sustained. It is a great trial for this country, which is bearing the heaviest burden, and for our fellow members of the United Nations whose sons also are being killed and wounded in this terrible business.

The battle for peace in Korea is not yet won. We are in the midst of the most troublesome phase of that great event. How we conduct ourselves and the determination and patience we show will decide the manner in which history will record this great event. The issue of collective action for peace through the United Nations is at stake.

We need the greatest patience and the greatest character both for ourselves and our allies if we are to bring this Korean war to a conclusion consistent with the purpose for which we decided to enter it. It is said sometimes that we are an impatient people, that this is not the sort of thing that we can do well. I think that it is probably true, if we fail to state and to recognize our purpose in Korea. But I believe that, understanding the great purpose and the enormous stakes for our country which are at play, we will show the determination and the patience to see the Korean war through and to keep up the fight for peace.

It is not just in Korea that military action is playing its part in carrying out these great purposes of our foreign policy. Our large build-up of military forces and the strengthening of the military position of our allies, with the sacrifices that this will require from the American people, also are a part of the bigger purposes of our national policy.

This build-up is a coordinated effort of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Since I am associated with the Air Force, I shall speak for a little about the Air Force's role and plans in this build-up which is so important a part of our national policy.

Our Air Force has four main commands back of which is all the rest of the Air Force establishment; but it is these four commands who are the active agents, the end product as it were. All of these commands are being built in such a fashion as to fit in with these double purposes of our national policy—to seek peace and to maintain a position of strength which will most effectively lead toward the achievement of that peace.

These four commands are the Air Defense Command, the Strategic Air Command, the Tactical Air Command, and, serving these three, the Military Air Transport Service which provides the great lines of logistic supply by air.

I hope I have made it clear that the Air Force, as well as the other services, is doing its best to fit in and to aid our national policies.

Let me conclude by making two points about all of this great effort. The first is that the maintenance of our posture of defense is expensive and will put a heavy burden on the American economy and on the American taxpayer. I believe that we will have to maintain a high level of military spending until such time as our efforts for peace show results.

Our ability to maintain this military posture, and to pay for it, will require the same characteristics of patience and determination as we must apply in the battle of Korea.

We will have to accept these high expenditures regardless of the immediate variations of the international scene. The maintenance of our military posture must be a fixed and stable policy, not yielding on the one hand to sudden worsenings on the international front, and, on the other hand, not

falling prey to unjustified optimism caused by minor and temporary improvements on the international scene. We will have to make up our minds what kind of a military establishment we want. We must not leave this decision to events or to the decisions of other powers.

The second point I would make is that there is a chance that our program for peace will succeed.

I know that the situation could not look much worse than it is now. But nevertheless I believe that the peoples of the world everywhere are so anxious to get rid of war that there is some chance that in time their will will prevail.

But more than that, even if we were convinced that the situation looked completely impossible it would not be in the American tradition, I believe, once we have determined we want to get this great end of the elimination of war, to make no effort to try to get it simply because it looked hard to get.

I believe we must reject all cynicism in this matter of seeking peace.

I believe we must not think of the odds against us any more than a soldier thinks of the odds against him when he attacks a strong point.

I believe that we must increase and double our efforts in the search for peace.

History of I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from an address delivered by Charlotte Baruth, president of the Charlotte Baruth Association, at a banquet in her honor given by the members of the veterans' service organization which bears her name:

CHARLOTTE BARUTH. You are my true and loyal friends, and I love you with a full heart. Your friendship and teamwork mean more to me than I can describe in words.

The third Sunday in May is almost here and somehow, tonight, I have a feeling that I should say something about the simple fact that we are gathered here in friendly assembly. None of us was forced or coerced to be present. No secret police watches or listens. We can express ourselves freely and without fear.

How fortunate we are to enjoy the seven rights of American democracy: The right to live, work, worship, assemble, petition, speak, and vote.

Throughout history, men and women of purpose and conscience have found ways and means of meeting together, regardless of consequences: witness the catacombs, the hedgerows of Ireland, the ghettos of Europe and Russia's Siberia, all of which have revealed stories of death and worse than death. What a contrast in glorious America.

In this year of grace, 1951, it seems fitting for me to give you a brief history of one example of the American way of life. More than one of our seven cherished rights are demonstrated by a movement which started just before World War II. It has to do with living, assembling, and speaking in this great country of ours.

I might explain to you that I am especially familiar with this movement, if that's the right name for it, because Benjamin Edwards Neal, a long-time friend of the Baruth family, is the one who originated it. We call him Uncle Ben, as does most everyone else.

I want to tell you about how this American tradition started and how it quickly found a place in the hearts of America. First, I'll make a prediction of things to come, based on past records and with the proviso that the weather is clear and warm.

I predict that on the third Sunday of this month, one of the grandest spectacles ever witnessed in the United States will be staged at the Mall in Central Park. More than a million Americans will join in patriotic festivities, renewing their pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I also predict that in cities, towns, and hamlets throughout the Nation, more citizens—big, little, old, and young—will assemble in public places on May 20 than ever before in the history of our country.

To me, this is very significant. In some sections of the world, listening to a radio broadcast can prove hazardous. In contrast, here in America, there will be an outpouring of citizens who will assemble voluntarily; speeches will be broadcast and uncensored; no one will be banished or jailed for expressing his opinion.

The occasion I speak of, as all of you know, as I Am An American Day. The thirteenth annual observance will take place this month. It has already been proclaimed by the President of the United States, by governors and mayors throughout the and.

I Am An American Day is designed to honor new-voting citizens: native-born who have reached the age of 21 and foreign-born who have been naturalized during the past 12 months. Its basic purpose is to impress these new, full-fledged citizens with the seriousness of their obligations in this free country. With the public as witness to their induction, the ceremony is a thrilling and unforgettable experience.

Sponsored nationally by the act of Congress and the I Am An American Foundation, the celebration in New York is sponsored jointly by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri and the Journal American newspaper. In less serious times, the attendance at the Mall has exceeded the million mark. Given clement weather, all attendance records are expected to be broken in this year of decision.

I am sure you will be interested to know how I Am An American Day happened to be born into this troubled world. It so happens that I have had the opportunity of reading excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also from Los Angeles papers where it originated: the Times, Examiner, Herald-Express, News, and the Hollywood Citizen. Naturally, my interest in these background stories was influenced by the fact that our friend, Uncle Ben, is the founder of I Am An American Day.

It was in the prewar era of 1938–39 when the Fascist leaders of Germany, Italy, and Japan were whipping the minds of youth into a frenzy of national fervor and warlike spirit, that Benjamin Edwards Neal (our Uncle Ben who was born in Texas and was then living in California) conceived the idea of I Am An American Day. He felt the need of a campaign to fight complacency and inspire the Nation to a greater sense of patriotism.

Although attention was focused on the new-voting citizens, the observance attracted Nationwide attention and its spread throughout the country is without parallel in our history.

The first I Am An American Day was observed with ceremonies in Hollywood Bowl on June 12, 1939, with the enthusiastic cooperation of local government agencies, church, education, civic, patriotic, and women's groups. Newspapers, newsreels, and radio carried the story to all parts of the Nation.

In early 1940, at the invitation of Senator A. B. Chandler, Mr. Neal, and Edward Arnold, Hollywood's Mr. President, who succeeded Uncle Ben as head of the I Am An American Foundation, went to Washington—not at Government expense—to testify about the first I Am An American Day before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee of which Senator Chandler was chairman. Also a member of that committee was the present ranking minority member, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

The joint resolution, authorizing the President of the United States to issue an annual proclamation setting aside the third Sunday in May as I Am An American Day, was unanimously approved by the Congress, thus converting a local celebration into one of national proportions in less than 12 months. Subsequent growth has been equally unprecedented.

Before leaving the subject of this fine American story, I want to give you two or three side lights. I happen to know that I Am An American Foundation never put on a drive for contributions. The small group most interested took care of the net expenses. And when the invitation came to have the story of the first celebration told to the Judiciary Committee, Edward Arnold paid almost $5,000 out of his own pocket for this expense.

Another interesting side light is the fact that, while Mr. President, or rather Mr. Arnold, was in Washington, MGM called him back to Hollywood for retakes on the ending of his latest picture. For the first time in his life Mr. Arnold traveled by plane and then later returned to Washington by train. Incidentally, when that picture finally was released the original version was used.

In giving the history of I Am An American Day I should also pay tribute to Mr. Manny Strauss, genius of publicity and public relations, who showed Hollywood a thing or two about making news in the early stages of this celebration. Uncle Ben has told me many times that he stands at salute to Emm Ess.

Uncle Ben has told me also how deeply indebted he is to Capt. Watson B. Miller, executive assistant to the national commander of the American Legion, for assistance to him and Edward Arnold in guiding them through the mysteries of Capitol Hill.

Uncle Ben has an album called Book of Good Neighbors which has many interesting photographs of I Am an American events. Especially interesting to me was one showing the page boys of the House and Senate gathered in the Senate reception room with Senate Majority Leader Alben W. Barkley, Minority Leader Charles R. McNary, and Congressman Harry R. Sheppard, who represented the House of Representatives. The expressions on the faces of these page boys as they staged a miniature I Am an American celebration was truly something for the book.

The first network stories about I Am An American Day, even before it became national, were told on News and Views by John B. Hughes and by George Jessel.

I Am An American Day is America's day of rededication. How fortunate we are to have the privilege of saying, "I am an American."

Time To Think and Not Throw Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial comment by

Paul Calvin Payne which appeared in the Presbyterian Life, Philadelphia, Pa., on May 12, 1951:

TIME TO THINK AND NOT THROW WORDS

Out of the suffering of World War I came these lines:

"Now you who live must do
A harder thing than dying is,
For you must think
And ghosts will drive you on."

It is calamitous that decisions on which the future of America and the world depend are being approached in an atmosphere dangerously charged with emotion. Emotional thinking is never clear thinking. As Nehru put it, in an interview with Norman Cousins, "People hardly think nowadays. They throw words at each other."

In an atmosphere supercharged with such emotional tensions, General MacArthur, at the time of this writing, has just given his notable address before the American Congress. Reactions are pouring in by radio and press. As one newspaper put it, "He spoke, as he emphasized, not as advocate of any partisan cause, nor as one pursuing political aspirations, but as an American who is trying to serve his country."

What is all important now is that the issues which he presented be freely discussed and that differing points of view be offered, as General MacArthur himself said, "without rancor nor bitterness."

It is especially important that they be discussed within the church, by thoughtful Christians whose views differ. To rule out such discussion, or to slap it down by labeling as pinks, fellow travelers, or Communists, those whose opinions differ from our own is to leave the discussion entirely to secular interests, who, through radio and press, are currently discussing them with appalling rancor and bitterness and recrimination. It is asking too much to expect wisdom or truth to emerge from such an atmosphere. Under these conditions people don't think; they throw words at each other.

If there is any hope of clearing the air, it rests in the readiness of persons committed to the Christian way of life to discuss these highly charged issues in the full exercise of Christian charity toward others who hold opposing views. We are united in our opposition to the Kremlin and all its works. We want no part of it. Let us not then join in the service of Moscow by allowing ourselves to be divided into opposing camps because of our differences—at the moment, over the methods by which Communist aggressions can be checked. Above all, let us avoid as the plague the temptation to vituperation, for such practice precludes all possibility of any intelligent facing of vital issues.

These issues far transcend personalities, and it is a positive disservice to stoop to attribute sordid motives to the President or to General MacArthur.

The general does not go along with those who have been urging that we "cut our losses and get out of Korea." He differs "from those who would 'scuttle' Europe by withholding troops and retreating to the Western Hemisphere and a few outlying bases."

This does not mean that there are not profound differences between General MacArthur and the administration, but the speech before Congress reduced them to "differences regarding the means of giving effect to principles on which there is agreement."

These differences raise two questions: 1. How deeply should we become involved in military commitment in Asia? 2. What would be the consequences of our taking unilateral military action, contrary to the expressed judgment in the United Nations?

On the first point General MacArthur does not believe that bombing Manchuria would bring Russia into the war, or that increasing our military commitments in Asia would weaken our position in Europe. He characterizes such judgments as "defeatism" and continues, "If a potential enemy can divide his strength on two fronts, it is for us to counter his efforts." He is careful to say, however, "The Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves." Russia, however, is bound by treaty to declare war on any nation attacking China. Also, the general did not think China would invade Korea last fall, in spite of the ominous massing of Chinese forces north of the Yalu.

There is no evidence that military authorities are convinced that we can, as of today, defend Europe if it is attacked. If the bitter choice were necessary, Russian occupancy of the Ruhr would pose a far greater immediate danger to us than continued Communist domination of China. Russia is not now committed on any front. She has complete freedom of action, while we are restricted in proportion to our commitments in Korea. The question as to whether indefinite stalemate in Korea is the only alternative to world war III is one which no one can answer. Nevertheless, if we label as appeasement all efforts to effect any kind of a compromise settlement, we are dangerously near the assumption that, unless all settlements with the Communists can go our way, we are prepared to embark on a third world war.

As to the second question at issue, the policy as of today indicates that the bombing of Manchuria would be opposed by all our friends and allies in the United Nations, and would offer to that body the choice of disruption or surrender to American domination. In either case the result would be calamitous. If it brought on war with Russia, we would find ourselves in a conflict in which we had alienated the sympathies of the rest of the world. The greatest political victory the Kremlin could win would be thus to break up the United Nations and isolate the United States. We dare not let our sense of power betray us into the illusion of omniscience. We must respect the judgment and feelings of the other free nations of the world. In a struggle where power is so evenly divided, our ability to do this may well spell the difference between ultimate victory and defeat.

According to the report just released, General MacArthur told President Truman and other conferees that he saw little chance of Red Chinese intervention in Korea. He believed only about 50,000 or 60,000 Chinese could cross the Yalu River, and if they tried to attack toward Pyongyang, he thought they would be slaughtered. There was talk of getting troops back to Japan by Christmas.

We know, of course, that the general was wrong. The troops didn't get back to Japan at Christmas, and a lot more than 60,000 Chinese Communists have crossed the Yalu River, as our men fighting bitterly at the front today can testify.

Yet General MacArthur is now quoted as saying that the Wake Island reports have "just about as much bearing on the problem of Korea today as would a report on the military operations of Bunker Hill." And his aide, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, has presented the statement that the question of Chinese intervention was basically a political one and quite beyond the reach of General MacArthur's military intelligence.

These statements prompt several significant questions: If Chinese intervention in Korea was basically a political question, is not the question of Russian intervention in case of Manchurian bombing and a second front on the Chinese mainland even more basic politically?

If he should not have been expected to pass on Chinese intentions, why should his predictions now about Russian intentions be classified by Republicans as authoritative?

If his intelligence officers were so handicapped in getting information about the Chinese Communists, how is it possible for the general to be so positive about conditions on the Trans-Siberian Railroad and Russia's inability to "launch any predatory attack from the Asiatic Continent?"

We would also remind all the people that some of General MacArthur's more energetic and emotional friends are trying to work both sides of the street. They say he is both a great soldier—as he is—and a supreme authority on minds and methods in the Far East.

But they also say that if political calculations in his statements go wrong, he is not to be held accountable, for he is a military expert.

The point is that we cannot have it both ways. If the general, in addition to being a wise military leader, is presented as an authority on international politics in Asia, he cannot be relieved of responsibility when his judgment is proved to be wrong, as in the case of Communist China. That is why we say thoughtful Americans must wait for all the facts and information before deciding what is the best course to pursue in the Far East.

Wait for All the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I include an interesting editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, Fla., of May 4:

WAIT FOR ALL THE FACTS

Those Americans who are sincerely desirous of obtaining all the facts regarding our broad policy and military strategy in Korea, China, and the rest of the Far East will not jump to hasty conclusions just because General MacArthur testified yesterday. They will remember that General Marshall, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other witnesses will appear before the Senators.

Moreover, they should set down some of yesterday's statements and predictions alongside other recent statements and happenings. Take this matter of the Wake Island conference.

Second Connecticut March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a most interesting and varied history concerning the famous Connecticut Second Regiment March. It is taken from the May issue of the Connecticut Guardsman which is published monthly by the Information Division of the Adjutant General's Department,

State Armory, Hartford. It is the official publication of the Connecticut Military Department headed by the Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. Frederick G. Reincke, and its editor is Maj. Earl C. Branniff.

As the article outlines, there are two versions about the origin of the march, the first being of more direct concern to Connecticut, and the second implies a condition precedent in order to attend a Presidential inauguration in Washington. The article follows:

SECOND CONNECTICUT MARCH HAS INTERESTING, VARIED HISTORY

The curiosity of a Virginia newspaperman resulted in considerable research and finally a good deal of information on the famous Second Connecticut March. The stirring march, ever the outstanding favorite of Connecticut military and other bands, also is associated with the State. Likewise it has become a popular theme song for several radio programs originating in Connecticut. During the course of the research it also was learned that the music was set to words and was adopted by some high schools as their school song.

Miss Marjorie E. Case, at the Connecticut State Library, found most of the pertinent information about the march and in relaying the information still further light was thrown on the famous musical melody before the report was forwarded to Virginia.

The march was composed by D. W. Reeves and copyrighted in 1877. A copy in the library contained a large picture of a military leader on the outside cover. At first it was thouhgt that the picture was that of the composer and leader of the American band in Providence, R. I. It was learned that he was one of the most outstanding if not the outstanding band leader of his time.

DEDICATED TO SECOND

The picture on the cover, it was later learned, was that of Col. Stephen R. Smith, then commander of the Second Connecticut Regiment, Connecticut National Guard. He was a New Haven man who died in 1889 at the age of 53 after having served as adjutant general of the State. The march was dedicated to "Colonel Smith and the men of the Second Connecticut Regiment."

Information available at the State library indicated that the Second Connecticut Regiment was a fine military organization in those days and had an excellent band; members traveled around to many eastern cities where they drilled and paraded. It also was indicated that the unit also was well known outside of Connecticut.

The militia brigade of four regiments, including the second, spent a week in encampment at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in September 1876 and from news accounts made quite an impression there. Among other excursions of the Second Regiment was one to Boston and Providence in June 1878. It was the opinion of researchers that the march may have been written for the centennial appearance for the anticipated trip to Boston and Providence.

PICTURE DISPLAYED

Warrant Officer Anthony R. Teta, bandmaster of the One Hundred and Second Army Band at New Haven, agreed with the date and name of composer and furnished the information that a large picture of Band Leader Reeves is on display in the bandroom at New Haven and is the source of a good deal of interest on the part of visitors to the room.

Mr. Teta would not disagree with the conclusion reached as regards the occasion of composing the march, but said that he was inclined to go along with another version of the origin of the famous piece of martial music. Mr. Teta said that the other version was to the effect that after a presidential election it was the desire of Colonel Smith and members of the regiment to march in the inaugural parade in Washington. The authority to go to Washington was on one condition and it was that Mr. Reeves would compose an original and stirring march to be played in the parade.

LITTLE TIME

When the condition was made known to Mr. Reeves he had little time left, but according to the same version of the origin, he supposedly sat down, went to work and completed the piece within a week's time.

The election in 1877 was that of Rutherford B. Hayes, following the 8 years of U. S. Grant. So that version could not refer to the Hayes inauguration as the march was popular in 1876. It is doubtful that it could have referred to the inauguration of Grant, because a casual reading of the history of the New Haven Grays shows no mention of a trip to Washington although there is an account of an excursion to Washington about that time.

AT CENTENNIAL

The Gray's publication throws some more light on the subject but not conclusively enough. Included in its pages, however, is mention that the New Haven Grays sought and eventually was given the right to represent Connecticut at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia and was led by the American Band with Reeves as bandmaster, so it is possible that the right to represent the State may have resulted in the condition of the march.

The New Haven Palladium of Friday, September 1, 1876, in describing the departure of the main body for Philadelphia, told of marching through the streets of New Haven to the railroad station. It was in connection with this event that the Second Connecticut March was first mentioned in the volume of the Gray's History. The Palladium story included the following in the parade description: "The streets were filled with friends of the regiment who waved adieu to the departing soldiers. The American Band played the Second Connecticut March which is growing very popular."

WORDS PUBLISHED

In addition to being an outstanding supervisor and teacher of music in the Hartford public schools, the late Ralph L. Baldwin assembled a group of classical selections for use of high school choruses and glee clubs. To stimulate interest in arias, he frequently changed words to produce a lighter and more popular appeal among high school students. Included in the volume in use over 25 years ago was a stirring version of the Second Connecticut March. It apparently was popular with students because some in Connecticut and Massachusetts adopted the number as a school march for use at football games. Some schools used the published words without reference to the particular school in much the same fashion that the West Point cadets unofficially adopted the Sons of Toil and Danger for a contemporary operetta.

While there may be some vagueness as regards some phases of the history of the Second Connecticut March torch bearing members and ex-members of the One Hundred and Second Regiment who maintained that the Second Connecticut is the second oldest regiment in the world, second only to the Coldstream Guards. The History of the Grays however, is a little more modest on the subject reporting in connection with its arrival in Philadelphia that it was "one of the oldest regiments of the Centennial Legion." Organized in 1816, the Second Regiment continued as such until it joined other troops in the Civil War. In 1865, when the Connecticut Militia was reorganized, the unit continued as such until 1917 in World War I when it was redesignated the One Hundred and Second. During the war it was split to form the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth and One Hundred and Seventieth Regiments. The One Hundred and Seventieth was redesignated the One Hundred and Second in 1924 and continues as such today as a part of the Forty-third Division.

Rent Control at Oak Ridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a bill which I have today introduced in the House to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 so as to provide for control of rent charged by the Atomic Energy Commission at Oak Ridge, Tenn. We have all heard of the parent who told his son, "Do not do as I do; do as I tell you to do."

It seems to me that this admonition describes the attitude of the sovereign toward Government-owned housing which the Government and various agencies thereof rent to citizens throughout the United States. I see no justification for rent control applying to property owned by taxpaying citizens of the Nation and not applying with equal force to the Government itself. Since Oak Ridge is located in the district which I have the honor of representing, and since the rents were increased 10 percent there about a year ago and now a new 28-percent increase has been announced, I feel that the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and any substitute therefor should apply to all Government-owned rental property and especially at Oak Ridge. There should be outside independent appraisal and determination of what constitutes fair rental on these Government-owned rental properties and that the usual elements which are applied in determining fair rentals and fair return on investment together with the purposes for which these Government units were built should all be taken into account.

Accordingly, I have today introduced the following bill:

A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 so as to provide for control of rents charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for housing accommodations at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 (1) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (50 U. S. C. App. sec. 1894 (1) (1) is amended by adding after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence:

"The Housing Expediter shall by regulation or order establish maximum rents for all housing accommodations in the vicinity of Oak Ridge, Tenn., which are owned by the United States and rented or offered for rent by the Atomic Energy Commission to its employees."

Strasbourg Seeks a Link With Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of May 14, 1951:

STRASBOURG SEEKS A LINK WITH WASHINGTON

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The old town of Strasbourg has taken on a new animation since it became the capital of the Council of Europe, 2 years ago. It is a border city; the bridge over the Rhine connects France and Germany and the German landscape on the other side is dominated by the incongruously lacy spires of the massive red cathedral. Strasbourg is like the cathedral—a sober, solid place with an overlay of lightness.

But Strasbourg is no longer just a city on a contested frontier. It is a city looking beyond frontiers, a pioneer in a political wilderness. The eighteenth-century architecture still dominates, despite the modern buildings erected to replace the battered shells left by the war—Marshall plan houses, they are called—or to accommodate the European Parliament, but the eighteenth century, heyday of dukedoms, principalities, and little states, is deader in Strasbourg than anywhere else in Europe. So is the Franco-German conflict. Too little stress had been laid on the fact that it was on this bitter boundary, within the month, that West Germany was received into the council and the Schuman plan was endorsed by an 80-to-7 vote. It may be said that the famous Strasbourg clock is the first on the Continent to tell the new time.

THE GOAL OF THE MOVEMENT

So far, to be sure, the Assembly is more a symbol than a real force. In 2 years it has merely turned an idea into an organization, and this organization is without power to legislate or make policy. It cannot take practical steps to bring about the unity it seeks. At the current session it even took a step backward by shelving the plan for federation in deference to British opposition to any surrender of sovereignty. A federal union, on the pattern of the American Union but looser and more limited in scope, is the goal set for the European movement by continental leaders like Paul Reynaud, Paul-Henri Spaak, and André Philip.

There is a great grass-roots feeling for unity, and the plan will not be given up. Much has to be done, however, before it can be achieved, and if the members of the assembly concentrate meantime on concrete measures to break down barriers and develop broad lines of common policy, national frontiers will be leveled by degrees, without frontal attack. In fact, they are being leveled. The enormous difficulties in the way of the Benelux free trade area, for instance, are far from being surmounted, but nobody in Belgium, Holland, or Luxemburg is now willing to go back to the former system.

The three countries in the pool have discovered that their trading and bargaining position is much better as one unit than as three. Instead of losing they have gained economic power. The Schuman plan faces even greater difficulties, but in the long run—assuming it has a long run—the rewards on the economic side alone will more than compensate for the sacrifices.

On the political side, of course, even as an idea the project is like a gust of fresh air in a closed room. The same may be said of the Council of Europe. Obviously it attempts too much, falls into the habit of old parliaments in being too diffuse and too talkative. It discusses forming a European army when it is clear that nothing can be done about it while the western powers are hard pressed to fulfill their obligation to provide forces for the Atlantic Treaty army. And it fails to come to grips with problems it might exert pressure on governments to deal with. One of these is the urgently dangerous problem of the refugees and deportees, piling up in Germany like an ammunition dump waiting to go off.

Nevertheless Strasbourg expresses an impulse that cannot be brushed aside. No one should discount the power of symbols. The arguments that echo in the Council of Europe today don't get far in practical terms, but at least they are on a new them; they drown out the stale disputes of yesterday. For the first time in a century, the scarred old border city is talking about the Rhine as a bridge instead of a dividing line.

AN INVITATION TO CONGRESS

And in tabling the idea of federation for a while the assembly is growing more rather than less ambitious. Saturday, by a unanimous vote, it invited Members of the United States Congress to attend the fall session. The speeches for the resolution acknowledged the moral support this country has given to European union and the resolution itself stressed the advantages of a public discussion of their common problems and dangers between the Representatives of Congress and the European assembly. This is a new idea and certainly has its points as a means of clearing up the misunderstandings that befog the international atmosphere.

But probably another reason is behind the desire to forge a link between Strasbourg and Washington. The feeling is common among continental leaders that Britain is literally behind the times in standing against or apart from the currents that run toward new forms of political cooperation and larger economic mergers, and beyond that lies the belief that Britain will not join Europe because she fears that it will weaken her ties not only to the Commonwealth but to the United States; therefore linking the Council of Europe to the United States is one way of drawing Britain into the circle. Furthermore—and this is the decisive reason—as soon as the nations of Western Europe begin to think seriously of unity they realize that their union is not big enough. The men of Strasbourg are feeling their way to becoming a part of an Atlantic union.

Legislation Affecting the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, delivered before the northeast Ohio district, National Association of Letter Carriers, Wooster, Ohio, May 12, 1951:

It is a pleasure to speak to members of a group that plays as large a part in the lives of all the people as do the postal workers.

Receiving mail is one of the things in life that we look forward to with keen anticipation. I am sure all of you who have delivered mail to the homes of the cities in this area have seen this anticipation. You have seen it in the face of a boy who runs to meet you, eagerly hoping his Hopalong Cassidy genuine pearl-handled revolver is in your bag. You have seen it in the quiet hope of the retired worker who is expecting his monthly check, or the mother hoping for a letter from Korea. You have all experienced the enthusiasm with which you are greeted when that gun, check or letter does arrive. I hope all of you have found satisfaction in that enthusiasm, for each of us must receive something from his job besides his pay.

There is no group of Federal employees as old in point of service to our Nation as the United States postal workers. There is no group of employees in or out of the Federal service who can justifiably point with greater pride to their record of steadfast, loyal, and efficient service to the Nation.

Yours is a history much older than that of the Federal Government itself, for your service existed before the Federal Constitution was adopted. The Post Office Department can trace its history back more than 200 years to the day in 1737 when Benjamin Franklin was appointed postmaster at Philadelphia. Some years later, in 1753, he acquired the lofty title, "Co-Deputy Postmaster General of the British Colonies in North America."

What is more important to us today, however, is the fact that on July 26, 1775, Franklin became our first Postmaster General and went on to lay much of the foundation for the development of the present United States postal system.

In this development over the past half century the National Association of Letter Carriers has played a prominent and important part. In my opinion, the value of your service to our postal system and to our Nation cannot be overemphasized. Since the founding of the association in Milwaukee in August of 1889, you have had twin objectives, namely, service to the American people, and service to your members. These objectives cannot be separated. They are intimately intertwined and in serving one you must also serve the other.

During the 61 years since the founding of your association, very few of your achievements have come easily. One of the first major tasks that the new organization faced was to secure compliance with the eight-hour law for postal workers which Congress had passed in 1888. Strange as it may seem in 1951, it was actually necessary to resort to court action to compel the Post Office Department to grant the letter carriers their rights under the 1888 statute. That the founders of the association had the courage and the determination to assert these rights is a tribute to their far-sightedness and to the firmness of their purpose to build an organization that could attain the legitimate goals of the postal workers.

During the period from 1889 to 1921, your association time and again was forced to overcome the determined opposition of hostile Postmasters General, gag rules which prohibited not only yourselves but all Federal employees from direct contact with Congress through their duly elected representatives, as well as other formidable obstacles. That the association was successful in the long run is illustrated by the fact that in 1912, the Lloyd-La Follette Act, the Magna Carta of postal organizations, was approved.

Since 1921, however, when Will Hays became Warren G. Harding's first Postmaster General, the men who have held this Cabinet position have had a uniformly friendly attitude toward National Association of Letter Carriers. Since 1921, the influence and prestige of your organization has steadily increased. The realization of the need for high morale among post-office employees and that

the administration of the Department calls for teamwork on the part of everyone seems to have become an established pattern during the 30 years since Will Hays set out to correct the shortcomings in employee-Department relationships in the Post Office.

I want to discuss with you this evening some of the bills now before either the House or the Senate which are of interest both to the association and to you as individuals. I say "some of the bills" because up to now at least 50 have been introduced in the Eighty-second Congress which certainly are of some interest to either yourselves individually or to your association as a whole. In the time we have this evening, it would be impossible to consider the provisions of 50 bills, as you well know, but we can and should consider briefly the provisions of the more important ones now before Congress.

H. R. 244 and similar bills give all employees in the postal service who are six grades or more below the top automatic grade in their class a $600 annual increase in salary. Those employees who are less than six grades below the top automatic grade in their class will receive a $100 increase for each grade they are below the top automatic grade. In addition, all employees will receive a 17-percent increase of their new salary rate.

In the case of clerks or carriers (the largest group of postal employees, numbering about 300,000), there are presently 11 automatic grades representing a $100 increase each, and clerks and carriers progress to the next higher grade each year. These grades are reduced to five under H. R. 244. The new salary grades would correspond in salary to the present salary grades of 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, plus the 17-percent increase. Clerks or carriers now in grades below grade five will go to the new grade of the same number, which, under the new schedule, will be $600 higher than at present. Those in grades 6 to 11 will be placed in the new grade 5, which salary is the same as the present grade 11.

A clerk or carrier who today enters the service as a substitute at $2,670 a year would, under the bill, enter the service at $3,825.90. Clerks or carriers in grades 1 through 4 would thus receive an increase of $600 plus 17 percent. Clerks and carriers in the new grade 5 would receive an increase of 17 percent.

Next come H. R. 337 and S. 190. These similar bills revoke the controversial order of the Postmaster General published April 18, 1950, curtailing delivery and other postal services.

There are 13 bills similar to H. R. 337 and S. 190.

In the field of retirement legislation, two bills have been introduced which amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase annuities of retired employees by 33⅓ percent of the annuity they are now receiving, or by $500 annually, whichever amount is smaller. These bills are H. R. 233 and S. 926, and of course are of most interest to postal workers who have already retired.

Another bill on retirement legislation, and perhaps the most important I shall mention this evening, is S. 995. Its provisions are quite technical.

First, it increases the annuities of all employees on the retired rolls by $120 plus $12 for each two full months that have passed since the annuity began and the date S. 995 goes into effect if it becomes law. However, the total increase cannot be more than $360 and the total yearly annuity cannot exceed $2,400. This means that any retired employee who has retired 3½ years would be entitled to the full increase, provided his annuity remained within the $2,400 limit.

Second, S. 995 increases the annuities of survivors by $120 and the annuities of children, in the case where there is one child, to $720. When there are more than one, the amount cannot exceed $1,440.

These first two provisions refer to employees who have already retired.

As to those who retire in the future, S. 995 sets up a new formula for computing the amount of the annuity. This new formula provides for 1 percent of the highest 5-year average salary plus $30 multiplied by the number of years of service. The present law provides for 1 percent plus $25.

Next, S. 995 increases the annuity for children by providing a minimum of $750, but in no case shall the total annuity, where there are several children, be more than 40 percent of the employee's average salary.

S. 995 has an important disability provision. An employee who retires on disability would receive either the amount of annuity provided under the regular formula, if that amount is greater, or an amount equal to either 40 percent of his average salary or the sum obtained by increasing the total service of the employee to the number of years he would have had if the date of separation was at age 60, whichever is the lesser amount.

S. 995 makes a number of other changes in the present law, for example, lowering the optional retirement age from 62 to 60 after 15 but less than 30 years of service.

As I said previously, the provisions of S. 995 are complicated. Nevertheless, it should be of interest to each of you because if passed, the provisions of the retirement law would be greatly liberalized.

Another bill of great interest to those of you who wear uniforms is H. R. 179. It provides an allowance of $100 annually to each Federal employee required to wear uniforms whenever it is impracticable for his agency to furnish them. The agency is also required to be responsible for the cleaning and repair of uniforms, but if this is impracticable, the employee would be given an additional $25 annually.

There are four bills whose provisions are similar to those of H. R. 179.

Two bills of great interest to all postal employees are H. R. 243 and S. 411. They provide 26 days annual leave instead of the 15 you now have, and 15 days sick leave instead of the 10 you now receive.

A bill which is of primary interest to the association is H. R. 571. It provides for the recognition of the right of officers and representatives of Government employees' national organizations representing a majority of the employees of a department, agency, or subdivision, to present employee grievances, to confer with administrative officers on matters of policy affecting working conditions, to solicit membership, collect dues, and so on.

Another bill, H. R. 1353, establishes a minimum space requirement for post-office stations operated in any building leased by the United States.

Lastly, two bills of great importance to every civil servant of the United States Government are H. R. 418 and S. 412. Both these bills provide for optional retirement after 30 years of service.

Just before leaving Washington I discussed some of these matters with Congressman ED REES of Kansas, who is the ranking Republican member of the committee having this legislation under consideration. I think you all know ED REES to be a real friend of the postal workers for Bill Dougherty said not long ago to a group in Washington, "More benefits were received by postal workers during the Republican Eightieth Congress under the leadership of ED REES than at any other time in the history of this country."

I asked Mr. REES why we had not had some action on some of these pending bills in the committee. He told me that although the scheduling of the bills was up to the chairman of the committee, who is a member of the majority party, but nevertheless, it is the custom that such bills are considered after consultation with members of the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget.

He told me that the Bureau of the Budget has not yet acted upon the requests. I think you know as well as I do that the Bureau of the Budget is the right arm of the President and very much under his control. So you can see that the delay, at least until this time, is not the responsibility of the Congress but that of the executive branch of the Government.

To sum up briefly this discussion of bills of interest to postal employees, we have:

1. Bills to raise the pay of postal employees.
2. Bills revoking the Postmaster General's order of April 18, 1950, curtailing service.
3. Bills to increase the annuities of former postal employees now retired.
4. S. 995, greatly liberalizing the present provisions of the retirement law.
5. Bills providing uniforms for postal employees.
6. Bills providing equality in leave provisions with other Government employees.
7. H. R. 571, providing for organization recognition.
8. H. R. 1353, providing for minimum-space requirements.
9. Bills providing for optional retirement after 30 years of service.

In principle, I feel I can support these bills, which will, in my opinion, greatly benefit a very worthy group of loyal Government employees.

In its efforts to improve the lot of its individual members, the National Association of Letter Carriers is doing an excellent job, not only in the field of fostering legislation, but in what I shall call the benevolent field as well. I commend you for your efforts. Your mutual benefit association, your sick benefit association, and your hospitalization plan are all concrete evidence of your determination to be a fraternal as well as an occupational organization. An even more outstanding proof of the fraternal aspect of your organization is the fact that your total of 103,000 members in every State in the Union, in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, is greater than the sum total of regular letter carriers in the United States. That is a very great tribute to any organization. You have every right to be proud of it.

As you well know, an organization can only be as strong as its members are determined it shall be. As I mentioned previously, the fundamental purposes of your organization, as laid down in your constitution, are to represent the letter carriers and to improve the caliber of the postal service. To achieve these objectives, let me urge you to give your association strong, loyal, and continual support. It was founded on high ideals. Its accomplishments are many. It merits your faith, your pride, your devotion.

I, personally, feel that the Post Office Department—and that, of course, means you who are here before me—is doing a remarkable job under the pressure of constantly increasing mail volume. We are all well acquainted with the story of the almost legendary Pony Express which operated between St. Joseph, Mo., and California during a 16-month period beginning April 3, 1860. The Pony Express established for all time the tradition that "the mail must go through." The express was succeeded by the railroad and the railroad has been supplemented by the motor truck and the airplane. Even with all the changes in our civilization, with all our scientific advances, this tradition of the Pony Express still is an integral part of the Post Office. This standard of service has been set over the years, not by the administration in power, not by the Postmaster General, but by the employees of the Post Office themselves. You may well be proud of that standard and of your accomplishments achieved under it.

Third Anniversary of Israel as an Independent State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Israel has been a free nation such a short time, but into those few years it has concentrated a century of progress.

Colonialism and feudalism had kept the Middle East in bondage for so long that life in that area had become just a treadmill where generation succeeded generation with monotonous sameness.

It was then that the Jewish people, fighting to redeem a corner of their native land for their own use—and as a sanctuary in which their persecuted brethren from all over the world might find peace and opportunity—won their independence.

From that moment on, the sluggish East awakened to the fact that the ferment of freedom was working a modern day miracle in the desert, making it bloom with hope and effort and achievement.

We, as Americans, are proud of the remarkable development of Israel which is the most promising child born to world democracy in recent years.

At a time when some other peoples are surrending their birthright of human independence to a gluttonous state, in return for the security that is slavery, it is good to see the Jewish people proving anew that freedom alone can release the creative forces in every individual.

Israel reborn shows the dynamic power of the human spirit when it is liberated. Here is faith at work.

As in the United States, we are prone to point the material evidence first, as the yardstick of development, forgetting the freedom of inquiry and the freedom of action that inspire true progress.

The modern city of Tel Aviv, meaning Hill of Spring, is the showplace of the young Israeli State. In 1909, 66 families founded the new neighborhood of Tel Aviv on the sand dunes north of Jaffa. Today, with the latter incorporated within its boundaries, and nourished by the swelling tide of immigration, Tel Aviv's population has soared to more than 400,000. It is a new city in every sense of the word, with attractive and functional apartment buildings for the average citizen that make us ashamed of the slums in our own American cities.

Some westerners are apt to belittle Israel's magnificent growth against great odds, overlooking the fact that it was deficient in water and wood and virgin soil.

They say it was easy because the Jews were one people and united.

This is not so. In addition to overcoming many economic, political, and natural obstacles, the new nation had to find a modus vivendi that would harmonize conflicting social tensions. The people in Israel have come from all corners of the world, separate from one another in more than fifty different ways. And the problem was further complicated by differences in language, background, and viewpoint. Some of them still suffer from the effects of the physical and mental persecution to which they were subjected in other lands.

In the United States, we measure human progress in terms of development from a normal base. In Israel, there was the prior need of rehabilitation before such progress could be made. That the young nation is succeeding in both, and at the same time, is double proof of its indomitable spirit.

The Jewish people have a great culture, rooted in a brilliant past. But they are not content to rest upon the past like some civilizations that aged and died because they built upon the material rather than the eternal vigor of mind and spirit. In Israel today they are building with all the physical eagerness of youth that also has the wisdom to know how to make the things of life serve the capacities of the human spirit. This is the secret of its liberation. The city of Tel Aviv is the expression of it that meets the eye. But it is within the homes and shops and factories that we see, hear, feel, and share the unfolding story of individual happiness and fulfillment that approximates the goal of brotherhood.

The needs of man himself, in relation to his changing environment, are being given every opportunity in the new society that is being created out of a wilderness.

In the United States, we once had a wilderness of trees.

Now we have a traffic of man-made things, which can become instruments for good or evil, in proportion to the way in which they encourage or retard the yearnings of the human spirit.

Uncle Sam and young Israel are akin. I think we can help one another.

1951 marks another birthday for the youngster, his third and his very own. He will be growing up before we know it. Time to take him into the family business of producing peace and opportunity for all the customers in this world. Israel will be a good partner in that job.

That is what we are thinking as we say: "Happy birthday from our hearts to yours."

Twelve Anti-Red Poles Escape Iron Curtain in Iron Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by the Associated Press entitled "Twelve Anti-Red Poles Escape Iron Curtain in Iron Horses."

Mr. Speaker, further evidence of the effectiveness of the Voice of America can be found in this news report of how the Voice of America reaches behind the iron curtain:

[From the Washington Star of April 28, 1951]

TWELVE ANTI-RED POLES ESCAPE IRON CURTAIN IN IRON HORSES

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, April 28.—Broadcasts by the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Corp. inspired 12 Polish rail workers to flee their Communist homeland in two stolen locomotives and seek refuge in Western Europe, it was learned last night.

With the help of a forged collective passport, the freedom-loving 12 broke through the iron curtain and made a 17-day journey across Germany to Courtrai, Belgium. Not even the Russian border guards in East Germany questioned their credentials.

Five of the escapees have been given asylum in Belgium. The other seven continued on to France.

One of the railroaders, Stanislav Oles, told newsmen this version of the escape:

Two Belgian-made locomotives broke down and Polish officials ordered them sent to Belgium for repairs. Six good Communists were supposed to take the engines, but the 12 nonconformists steamed off in their stead. And with the help of their forged passport and the connivance of a minor railroad official they made their escape without being questioned.

Oles said he and his friends, several of whom had been threatened with arrest for their opposition to the Red regime, had heard about the free-labor organizations of the Western World through Voice of America and BBC broadcasts.

Oles said some 2,500 Polish railroaders are under arrest for antigovernment activity. He added:

"You can imagine how many more are taking part in the anti-Communist underground fight in Poland."

Ballantine Emergency Disaster Relief Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of the incorporation of a Ballantine emergency disaster relief unit into the civil defense plan, of Hamden, Conn., whose authorities immediately pledged the equipment to mutual use by neighboring New Haven.

This pattern, which I am hopeful that other private concerns in Connecticut will follow, was set through the courtesy of the Hamden branch of P. Ballantine & Sons, of Newark, of which Mr. Stanhope B. Healey is manager.

Each truck contains an emergency unit kit consisting of a blanket, a stretcher, a pickax, shovels, first-aid equipment, fuses and flares, storage lights, canvas, lengths of rope, and extension ladders. Ten trucks with this equipment are always on immediate call. A "spot convoy" available in 10 minutes, consists of six closed route trucks and three supervisors' coupes, all manned by personnel experienced in first aid, who will receive

additional training in rescue and evacuation work.

A demonstration by a token unit of five trucks so equipped and manned was held in front of the New Haven City Hall on May 2 and showed how the unit may serve for evacuation purposes or as supply transports, and also how it is convertible into mobile kitchens or first-aid stations.

The value of this plan lies in the fact that it immeasurably strengthens our official civil defense preparations without any added expense to Government.

It solves a specific problem that has long vexed civil defense authorities, hampered by small budgets that made inevitable a shortage of transportation. For whether in Hamden, New Haven, or elsewhere in my district, authorities have found it impractical to provide special vehicles for emergency disasters that all hope may never happen.

Acting for Mr. Healey, George Mahoney, sales manager, and Paul McFarland, operator of the truck fleet, pledged 50 Ballantine trucks to First Selectman Michael J. Whalen, of Hamden, for use in event of a major disaster.

This plan for voluntary cooperation with civilian defense efforts was first formulated a year ago by Mr. Carl Badenhausen, president of Ballantine, after the disastrous South Amboy, N. J., munitions explosion.

I am happy also to report that the cooperation of organized labor in this gesture of cooperation toward our civil defense was pledged by James McGrail, president of the local brewery workers, and Matthew Ruppolo, head of the local teamsters' union.

Now it is my constant hope that necessity will never call this emergency disaster unit into use. But it is also my belief that the better we are prepared, against either catastrophe or a potential enemy, the less likely it is to strike.

Mother's Day, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to deliver the address at the twenty-seventh annual Mothers' Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers which was held at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, on Sunday, May 13, 1951.

The address follows:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the honor of participating in the twenty-seventh annual Mother's Day ceremonies sponsored by such a distinguished organization as the American War Mothers is one of which I am exceedingly proud. Your organization reflects the true spirit of American motherhood, for you symbolize the patriotic service made by the mothers of America in freely offering their sons and daughters to bear arms, and if need be, to die in defense of liberty and justice.

On this Mother's Day, Sunday, May 13, 1951, America salutes you as it pays homage to the mothers of our country.

It is fitting that we set aside one day out of each year, as a reminder of the love and reverence we owe our mothers, and which in truth, we should express every day of our lives.

The name "mother," is one of the most beautiful expressions in the language of mankind, because it embodies the finest personality on earth. When one mentions the name of "Mother," it calls up all the sweet and noble qualities of human life, because from her, radiates all the purest and holiest aspirations of one's nature.

We honor ourselves when we honor our mother. We need the inspiration of her unselfish spirit. We are all nobler for thinking of mother, for paying tribute to her virtues, and for remembering her many sacrifices. No man or woman can afford to get beyond the sway of her gentle spirit, and to keep within its influence, we honor her on Mother's Day.

In our observance, we pause in the hectic struggle of world and personal affairs to eulogize a mother's love—an influence far stronger for right living—than all the world's philosophies, diplomacy, and wars.

In 1914, when Congress approved a joint resolution establishing Mother's Day, it did so on the eve of America's entry into the first of two global wars. Millions in these two great conflicts lost their lives, including thousands of the flower of American manhood. In addition, we expended the resources of our country in opposing the new ideologies that challenged the cherished possessions of all Americans. This challenge is still with us and grows more menacing with each succeeding day.

As we pause on this May 13, 1951, to observe the thirty-seventh anniversary of Mother's Day, we realize only too well, that we are living in a confused and bewildered world. In Korea, American boys are dying daily, while world diplomats tussle with the problem of averting a third world war too destructive to contemplate.

Despite the efforts made to formulate a just and lasting peace, the goal has not been reached, because the hearts of mankind are not yet attuned to the spirit of universal love, which is essential if the family of nations expect to dwell in harmony with each other.

History is replete, with the experiences of nation after nation, who sought power and glory through conquest and subjugation. It is written on the memories of mankind, that the nation that forgot God, and refused to recognize the human dignity of every creature created by Him, traveled the road to ruin and oblivion.

Yet, how short is the memory of man? Regardless of the lessons from history of the utter destruction of ancient empires, our minds were refreshed during the present twentieth century by the fate that befell modern dictators, who have trod the same path to destruction that their counterparts traversed in the dim and distant past.

We erroneously thought we had learned a costly lesson from World War I, but our entry into World War II was a grim reminder that the armistice of 1918 settled nothing, but was truly, as Webster defines the word—"merely a cessation of hostilities."

We are at this moment within the shadows of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier—a hero of World War I whose real identity is known only to God. What a mockery it is to realize that since his heroic death thousands of American boys, just as eager and patriotic, have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom in a second global war; and, at the moment, we can literally hear the sounds of the violent gunfire on the rice paddies of Korea, as thousands of American fathers and mothers receive the dreaded news from the Department of Defense that a loving and devoted son has lost his life in what may prove to be merely a prelude to a third world conflict.

Meanwhile, the quest for peace and understanding among all nations eludes our grasp because those who fashion world affairs have lost their sense of moral values, and insist on decisions that benefit them alone. This moral degeneracy has been nurtured because a godless philosophy has supplanted the Christian idea of love and brotherhood.

There is not a mother worthy of the name, regardless of her racial origin, who has not counseled her children as to the difference between right and wrong. This sound advice has been given in various tongues since time immemorial, but interpreted the same the world over, as the eternal characteristic of every mother—the intense desire to see her child develop courage, resourcefulness, and virtue. These lessons she has taught her child from infancy, whether she may have been lacking in formal education or the possessor of a college degree. In short, it is the basis of mother love and devotion, and intended as lessons in character building.

Unfortunately, those obstructionists to world peace for the greater part, come from homes where in early childhood they were taught the truths of Christianity. Yes; at their mothers' knees they learned the first prayers of babyhood, and were given additional training in the love and fear of God during their boyhood years. Then as they reached man's estate, they faltered, and embraced the false philosophies that were man-made concepts, and devoid of Christian principles. They were the same philosophies of government, that ancient empires adhered to, and which led them down the road to national ruin. Paganistic in their basic principles, the prime objective is to relegate God to the background, and to ridicule and defy Him.

Is there any wonder, with such an international background of moral depravity, that we grope for a peace that we cannot reach, because of the baseness of men's hearts—the men who literally hold the destiny and the welfare of millions of God's creatures in the very palms of their hands.

Yet, while we pass judgment on the rest of humanity, it is well to remember that we Americans have also departed from the path of right living, and, in doing so, have spurned the teachings that in early life were intended to serve us as a shield against the temptations that we were warned to expect.

We pride ourselves on being the strongest nation on the face of the globe, but are we certain that an inventory of our national strength does not disclose that it is of a material nature and lacking in spiritual values?

It is true that recent reports indicate that there has been a marked increase in the number of people returning to church. This is indicative of the fact that the basic convictions of the American people are rooted in firm ground, but our tendency to become indifferent is an attribute that could easily lead us into serious difficulty.

We practice the virtue of Christian charity to such a degree that we have poured billions of dollars into projects and programs designed to rehabilitate the war-torn countries. These programs, while commendable, are often undertaken while the needs of our own citizens are ignored, especially those who have reached the twilight of life and find the day's burden more than they can bear.

Our indifference is also a matter of national concern, as we witness the exposure of persons appointed to high places in our Government who have succumbed to temptation in accepting bribes for exerting their influence in a questionable manner.

Then, too, we hardly lift an eyebrow as we read of the betrayal of our country by trusted Government employees who, while

in the custody of secret information, have for personal gain furnished such data to foreign agents, and especially to the representatives of a country that poses the greatest threat to our national existence ever recorded.

We are indifferent to the wave of crime that has engulfed us, and which has been accompanied by the revelation that the police department in the greatest city in the Nation is involved. The Nation-wide crime syndicate has invaded various phases of everyday life, and continues to collect billions of dollars annually from the pockets of the rank and file of American citizenry.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, the example of these gangsters has brought a corresponding problem of national significance in the extent of juvenile delinquency in this Nation, which has been traced to refusal, on the part of a misguided portion of our teen-age population, to follow the counsel of their parents.

It is to the credit of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, and to many outstanding leaders in the field of education, that we are being aroused from our spirit of indifference, and brought to realize that juvenile delinquency is a problem that, unless it is solved in a practical manner, can surely serve as a reservoir from which potential criminals may be recruited by the crime syndicate that is no respector of persons in carrying on its far-flung activities.

As we celebrate Mother's Day this year, we realize that there are thousands of good mothers with saddened hearts, because their children have scorned their painstaking efforts to guide their feet along the path of virtue, and instead, have brought disgrace to themselves and those whose love for them knows no bounds despite their wayward attitude.

When you meditate on these observations I have given you, of our laxity as individuals to the happenings around us in our everyday lives, it is not hard to realize that our indifference serves as an incentive for lawless conduct, in every phase of our existence. We are knowingly or unknowingly encouraging practices that endanger our form of government, and that if unchecked will eventually bankrupt us morally and spiritually.

On this Mother's Day, let us face the challenge that confronts us as a Nation by rededicating our own lives to the ideals that our mothers held so sacred, and for which they gave their all so unselfishly.

Let us show our appreciation, our honor and respect, for the memory of the motherhood of America, by caring for the living.

May the blessed memories of our God-fearing, self-sacrificing, and sainted mothers always be an inspiration, and a guiding star in our lives—until that day—when by the grace and mercy of God, we shall meet our mothers in that blessed land, where life is eternal, and from whence no traveler shall ever return.

National Guard Recruiting Program as It Concerns 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter forwarded to me by Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, commanding, New Jersey National Guard. It relates to certain misunderstandings concerning the recruiting program of the National Guard as it concerns youths 18 years of age. Also, as part of the extension of my remarks, I insert herewith two newspaper items, one containing the expression of General McGowan's views relating to this subject, and the other being an open letter by General McGowan to parents of high-school boys answering certain questions existing in their minds.

The above-mentioned follows:

NEW JERSEY NATIONAL GUARD,
FIFTIETH ARMORED DIVISION,
Newark, N. J., March 14, 1951.

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know that you will be interested as a friend of the National Guard and because our recruiting effort might readily be misconstrued, and also because you will want to have the facts in the event you receive any letters concerning the National Guard recruiting program as it concerns 18-year-olds.

In all our recruiting efforts, and especially in the advertisement of which I enclose a copy, I personally insured that no one could feel that we were offering means of avoiding military service. Rather we urge they commence basic military training with the National Guard now, while continuing their schooling.

We have pointed out their rights under existing legislation, to assist them to exercise that choice offered by legislation which, in effect, permits them to choose their own outfit and serve with their friends.

Our traditional volunteer system, to which this country has always clung, has always had to be supported by some form of compulsory military service. But, even though enlistments are frequently brought about by reason of the threat of compulsory service, the choice extended to individuals under current and proposed legislation is a welcome means of avoiding the feeling on the part of the youth of our country that they are "conscripts," but are rather "volunteers" or "selectees."

We of the National Guard have repeatedly urged a phased induction of all the National Guard. We agree with the published views of many Members of Congress that it is hard to reconcile the request by the Department of Defense for induction of greater numbers of our young men, when 250,000 volunteers in the National Guard are available and joined the guard expressly for service in time of national emergency.

The National Guard never has been, and can never become, a haven for draft dodgers.

Sincerely,

D. W. McGOWAN,
Major General, New Jersey National Guard, Commanding.

GUARD CHARGE IRKS MCGOWAN—JERSEY COMMANDER HITS CLAIM SERVICE IS DRAFT DODGERS' HAVEN

Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan, comanding general of the New Jersey National Guard, today took exception to charges made in Washington that the National Guard is a haven for draft dodgers. He said that the important position the guard plays in national defense has been repeatedly stressed by Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff.

Speaking of the Jersey Guard McGowan said:

"The New Jersey National Guard has served in every war of the Republic. During my 34 years of service, it was ordered into Federal service three times—in 1916 for duty on the Mexican border, the following year for service in World War I, and again in 1940 for World War II. And now, for the fourth time, New Jersey units are again in Federal service.

"Units of the New Jersey National Guard distinguished themselves in combat overseas in both world wars. The service these units rendered their country in time of war stands as an indisputable answer to any charges that the National Guard is a haven for these who would avoid service to their country."

AN OPEN LETTER TO PARENTS OF HIGH SCHOOL BOYS

There must be many questions in your minds about the effect of current draft policies on your boy's future; whether he is subject to military service; how he can perform this service; and, how he can continue his schooling—all pertinent questions today. The New Jersey National Guard can supply answers to these questions.

If your son joins a National Guard unit before he becomes 18½ years of age, he is not subject to induction by the draft.

If he is over 18½, but joins a National Guard unit before his local board mails his order to report for his draft physical examination, he will not be drafted under current Department of Defense regulations.

As a member of the National Guard, your son will not be called up for active duty unless his unit is inducted into Federal service. He has an opportunity to get his basic military training while continuing his high school education.

Information on current selective-service policies, and the advantages of National Guard membership, will be presented at a meeting to be held in your local high school during the next 2 weeks, to which all draft-eligible students will be invited. I strongly recommend that your son inquire at your high school about this meeting and that he be sure to attend.

Information is available also at local National Guard Armories every day and evening, Monday through Friday.

I sincerely believe that the New Jersey National Guard offers your son a splendid opportunity to serve his country while continuing his education.

D. W. McGOWAN,
Major General, New Jersey National Guard, Commanding.

Immediate Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following self-explanatory telegram that I have received:

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
Congressional Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

The Massachusetts Congregational Conference having a constituency of 600 churches, 190,000 members, urges Massachusetts delegation in Congress use every effort to have food relief sent to India immediately in accord with the following resolution passed unanimously this morning by the Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society:

"For months India has been in desperate need of grain, because of a critical shortage in her domestic production caused by flood and other factors. Meantime, we have had in storage millions of tons of surplus wheat

which might have been related to the needs of the people of India. On February 12, 1951, President Truman called on the Congress to take immediate steps to send food to India. However, effective steps yet remain to be taken. It is our conviction that American help should be extended to India without delay as an expression of the Christian good will of the people of America to the people of India: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge Congress to hasten the passage of effective legislation necessary for expediting the sending of American grain to India."

MYRON W. FOWELL,
Secretary.

Boys Advised To Look Beyond Immediate Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Walter F. Wright, Jr., a fine, thoughtful young American, a student in the Shaddock School, Faribault, Minn.

His editorial was selected to appear in the school's winter, 1951, quarterly, and is worthy of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Congress, so that many thousands of Americans may read with profit to themselves.

My compliments to the author, Walter F. Wright, Jr.:

ADVISES BOYS TO LOOK BEYOND IMMEDIATE FUTURE

(A sample of the thinking being done by seniors at Shattuck is reflected in the following editorial written by Walter F. Wright Jr. of Onawa, Iowa, which is reprinted from the Spectator of January 24, 1951.)

Each day as we look into the newspapers, it seems that the situation the world is in becomes darker and darker. The threat of another world war looms over us as each day passes. Indeed a third world war seems imminent as shown by the fact that Government officials are mobilizing a force to excel the forces that fought in World War II. At the present time a bill is before Congress to lower the draft age to 18-years.

The youth of America are preparing to enter into a war which may cause many times more devastation and destruction than World War II ever experienced. Many of these young men look upon another war as the end of everything. Some even believe it will mean the termination of life itself. This is, however, a flagrant misconception. An atomic bomb, or even a hydrogen bomb cannot wipe out the population of the entire earth. We should not therefore lose hope that there will be a future. Our future goal should be set now. This world situation must not interfere with plans for the future. The war should be considered merely as an interval between the present and the future.

After the world situation is settled and peace reigns once more over the earth, it will be up to the present generation to lead the world and see that a peaceful world is maintained. This generation will have problems which have never before confronted man. Therefore this is not the time for forgetting what lies ahead beyond the immediate future.

Polish Constitution Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered at the Polish National Home, Hartford, Conn., on Sunday, May 13, which address also was broadcast over the facilities of Station WKNB, New Britain:

Mr. President and members of the Connecticut Polish American Congress, officers and members of the combined societies, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with a feeling of deepest pride that I have returned from Washington to be with this large gathering today, at this fine Polish National Home, celebrating the greatest of all Polish national holidays.

This is an observance of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Coincidentally, today is Mother's Day. I warmly congratulate all mothers on this day especially set aside for honoring them. I, also, extend my deepest sympathy to the large number of Polish Gold Star Mothers of Connecticut who have given our country sons whose lives were sacrificed in the name of freedom.

What, many ask me, is the meaning to the Polish people of May 3, Constitution Day? What, exactly, does it signify since Poland's history goes back more than a thousand years?

Before answering that question directly, let me note that many occasions for celebration arise in the course of each year among our various national groups. Each means something, but not in every case is the meaning behind the celebration solemn and moving.

In the case of May 3, however, it is. The significance of May 3 goes deep, to the very foundation and bedrock of the Polish national tradition. To all Poles this day has the celebrated meaning of our own American Fourth of July.

To all Americans of whatever origin, the meaning of May 3, 1791, should have a solemn and profound meaning because Poland's Constitution was modeled after our own Constitution, which was adopted only 2 years earlier.

In Philadelphia, and Paris, at that time, the problem was to extend liberty. A heritage of regimentation, of a state controlling man's freedom as an individual, had to be abolished. In Poland, in Warsaw, it was just the opposite: to restrain freedom. The old "golden liberty" of the gentry, the unlimited, boundless liberty which is in effect license, had to be given up. In its place a measure of liberty, restrained by order, had to be dealt out to the aspiring and eager middle and farming classes, too long shut out from the benefits of freedom's gold.

The constitution makers of Poland did not dodge the issue. Quickly they performed the task required of them by the peculiar circumstances of Poland's peculiar history. First they proclaimed dead, once and for all, the old, unrestrained liberty. Then, joining hands, as it were, in a mystic union with the constitution makers of our own country and France, they raised the standard of liberty with restraint, of liberty with order.

Here we have the inner, the deep and memorable significance of the constitution of May 3, to which we refer so reverently. In the hour of crisis, Poland had the energy and vision to redeem herself. In the face of every odd, Poland demonstrated that she was capable of going forward, with our own newly emerging United States and with the new France, on the road to modern statehood.

A new Poland was thus forged in 1791, by the hands of a band of patriots. It was a Poland firmly grounded in that principle of liberty with order which is the foundation for our own national life here in the United States.

Proclaim it abroad, therefore, all you who are of Polish origin, that here is the reason for our celebration of May 3 each year. May 3, let it be known, represents a demonstration for all time of Poland's inner, spontaneous vitality, and of her devotion to the great principle of liberty qualified by restraint.

The recognition of equality of all men, the proclamation of religious liberty promised in this constitution, were more than Russia, Prussia, and Austria could tolerate, so these three neighboring countries attacked Poland with full force on all sides. Poland fell in 1795, and was partitioned by its attackers. But, the May 3 constitution kept the spark of spirit and hope alive in the Polish people, because it infused them with a new patriotism and love of liberty.

It was 127 years later, for it was not until 1918 that the people of Poland regained their independence from bondage, their Republic was restored, and with a few technical changes, the new government was set up along the lines of the constitution of May 3, 1791.

Once again Poland flourished as an independent nation, her people enjoying the privileges of democratic living. Not for too long, however, because a happy, progressive, prosperous, free, and independent Poland was blotted out by World War II.

First, Germany invaded Poland and enslaved its people. Then, the Russians took over and made a mockery of freedom and all the principles set forth in the May 3 constitution.

You will say with me that it is unthinkable that Poland should have suffered this fate: betrayal because of idealism. But, to so many here present, and to those within the sound of my voice, the betrayal of Poland and the Polish people who knew in 1939 that in defying the dictatorship of Hitler and at the same moment defying that also of Stalin, is something of which all are familiar.

The 6,000,000 Polish casualties in the war; the heroic deeds of Polish soldiers, sailors, airmen not only in their homeland but from Africa to Norway; in the Baltic, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean; in France, England, and Italy; in every branch of service of our allies to which, at great risk of life in making their escape, they immediately joined up in order to fight back for freedom—all of this effort and sacrifice was betrayed by the infamous Yalta agreement. It happened exactly as the partitions happened. Promises were made by Poland's closest allies that her freedom would be restored. Instead, Poland's allies, outstanding among which was the United States, sold her down the river. It was a crime infinitely more reprehensible than anything that took place in the first three partitions, for at Yalta, we who were supposed to be her friends, committed the deed.

I am daily becoming more convinced that the American people are realizing the enormity of what was visited on the Polish race at Yalta. They are also asking about Tehran and Potsdam. None of these pacts or agreements were ever presented to the United States Senate for acceptance or rejection. The question today extends to the enslavement by communism of China since her independence, like that of Poland, is destroyed, her territorial integrity is violated and liberty ruthlessly denied.

It was in these agreements, as well as by subsequent policies and actions, American leadership sought to buy Stalin's favor at the price of the independence and integrity of both Poland and China, and at the price of our own honor. Such promises as we received, in return, from Soviet Russia were broken almost as soon as they were given. And, while we are at it, we must never forget the people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, who are jailed behind the iron curtain, and the other neighbors of Poland in Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia who once, not so very long ago, also knew the meaning of freedom.

It was Dr. Arthur Coleman, president of Alliance College, whose home has been here in Cheshire, Conn., who said that "If the Constitution of May 3, 1791, had been permitted to perform its work, if the new Poland it created had been left to develop, it is probable the American national strain would never have been enriched, as it has been, by so vast an outpouring of heroic Polish blood. For Poland would have been a good country to live in, and there would have been no need to emigrate in order to find liberty."

From the outline I have endeavored to give you today, there are lessons for Americans in Poland's Constitution Day celebration, tardy though we may be in heeding them. Outstanding is the lesson that there can be no hope for peace, or for the preservation even of our own liberties, so long as we permit our leaders to barter away other people's freedom, whether they are the peoples of Poland or China or Formosa. It is the lesson that truly nothing can bring us peace but the triumph of principle.

Our American determination and American faith in the fundamental principles on which this country was founded and grew to power must not fade away. America was founded as a Christian nation devoted to the preservation of human freedom, with authority, and strength, stemming from the people themselves. I have hope that time has not robbed us of that devotion to principles and devotion to God. If it has not, the people themselves will fix the proper course. And that course will lead to victory for the men still locked in battle. It can lead to a preservation of the peace they will win. That is the hope that must never simply fade away. By our determination to preserve our own liberties and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution, we will keep the torch of freedom burning in the hearts of every Pole who has faith and belief in the freedoms and independence of the May 3 constitution, which he and she looks forward to again enjoying. Such was the intention of the signers of Poland's historic constitution, adopted 160 years ago.

We Agree With Mr. Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., for May 12, 1951:

WE AGREE WITH MR. GAMBLE

Charles E. Wilson, of Scarsdale, Director of Defense Mobilization, appeared recently before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in Washington to outline the progress and suggest amendments to the defense program. So satisfactory to the committee was his testimony, in marked contrast to others upon occasion, that Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont, committee member, said:

"Mr. Chairman, I just want the members of this committee to know I am very proud of Mr. Wilson. He is a constituent, and on behalf of the Twenty-eighth District of New York, we are very proud of the great job he is doing and we hope he stays here during the whole course of this 'police engagement.'"

With that sentiment we are sure not only the Twenty-eighth Congressional District but all of Westchester is in sincere agreement.

And, we do not doubt in the least, so is also a large preponderance of the American people.

Registration of Firearms—Organization of a Hunters' Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a number of excellent sports authorities have voiced their approval of bills H. R. 3023 and H. R. 2897, concerning the registration of firearms and the organization of a hunters' corps to protect the United States. I am grateful for such valued assistance.

In the May 1951 issue of Sports Afield, Mr. Michael Hudoba, managing editor of this large publication, writes as follows:

The Congress has another chance to save the tiny key deer from extinction; that is, should it act promptly on bill H. R. 2897 by Representative WILLIAM LANTAFF, Democrat, Flordia, to set up a wildlife management area in Florida for this unique species.

Pending in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the bill provides a ceiling of $100,000 in establishing the management area. It was the lack of such a ceiling that killed the key deer bill in the previous Congress.

Whether it is already too late to save the estimated 25 to 50 specimens of this unique deer believed to be left is a question. Certainly Congress cannot afford to delay consideration of the measure. The tiny key deer weighs less than 50 pounds, stands about 26 inches high and measures about 38 inches from nose to tail. It is believed to be the stag described by Columbus—the first American deer seen by white men.

A hunters' corps to guard the home front is proposed by Representative EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, New York, in bill H. R. 2237, referred to the House Armed Services Committee. The volunteer army of home-front hunters and sportsmen, designed to strengthen national defense, would be neither in the draft nor armed services but would revolve around local sportsmen's organizations. Army officers would be detailed to assist in coordination of the local programs.

The sportsmen's firearms would be the primary weapons. And here is a negative feature of the proposed legislation: It provides for permits to be issued for such guns. This provision could become a wedge for registration. To prevent this, Representative HALL has introduced another bill, H. R. 3023 (for which see following item).

Ammunition would be made available to this auxiliary force by the Secretary of Defense through regular business channels.

When Representative HALL recently proposed a similar plan as an amendment to the civil defense bill, it was turned down by the Congress (see March report). He said then that the sportsman is the best home-front defense because the hunter is not only a woodsman and good shot, but also is familiar with the local terrain and thus could become a guerrilla defender in case of invasion.

It goes without saying that should this eventuality occur, the American sportsman would know what to do, and do it.

A firearms antiregistration bill (H. R. 3023) was introduced by Representative EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, New York, to supplement his hunters' corps proposal (see above), and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. It would prohibit registration of firearms already issued legally and protect citizens against unconstitutional seizure of private weapons.

Mr. HALL uses strong language against firearms-registration efforts and should Congress pass the bill as written, its words would affirm in statute what most sportsmen have said in their fights against previous attempts to register firearms. The bill reads:

"Whereas during World War II, Nazi-minded officers attempted to pass laws abridging the constitutional right of a private citizen to bear arms; and these same officers started their anti-American program by calling for registration of all privately owned firearms; and whereas our founding fathers wisely incorporated within the Constitution of the United States this inherent privilege of our citizens to protect their hearths and homes by possessing arms; and whereas in the several States, the revival of tyranny is asserting itself in the form of proposals to register all legally issued private weapons with design to eventual seizure of firearms owned by individual citizens; therefore no citizen shall be compelled to register firearms which he is in legal possession of. * * * No Federal, State, or local officer shall have the power to seize firearms belonging to private citizens who legally possess them."

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Is Not Economically Justified From the Standpoint of the Nation as a Whole, According to Gen. W. F. Heavey, of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Gen. W. F. Heavey, representing the Port Houston and Texas Ports Association recently told the House Public Works Committee that the St. Lawrence seaway project if it ever becomes a reality would "rob already constructed channels of much of the traffic which justifies them today."

General Heavey's statement before the House Public Works Committee is commented upon in the following editorial

appearing in the April 10, 1951, issue of the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle:

UNSOUND ST. LAWRENCE PLAN

The proposed St. Lawrence waterway project is, as Gen. W. F. Heavey testified in Washington Monday, not economically justified from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole."

General Heavey, representing Port Houston and the Texas Ports Association at a hearing held by the House Public Works Committee, protested that the project would "rob already-constructed channels of much of the traffic which justifies them today."

The St. Lawrence seaway idea was first advanced as a means of helping Midwest farmers, later as a hydroelectric project. Then national defense became the argument. Now the excuse is for transporting iron ore from Canadian mines to the sea with a national defense slant again.

But, as General Heavey pointed out, the project at the best can only barely be justified as a 27-foot channel. And that depth will not accommodate oceangoing steamers. To make it a 35-foot channel would cost more than $1,000,000,000—and again, at this time just as in 1941, we don't have the men, money, or materials to devote to it while fighting a war and preparing for a possibly much bigger one.

The St. Lawrence project would not create new tonnage. It is almost entirely a Canadian project, geographically. If the Canadians can see where it is economically justified, why don't we do as Raymond Moley suggested on this page Monday—let Canada build it?

The Pulitzer Prize and William H. Fitzpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have most definitely a very personal feeling and interest in addressing myself to the House today on the recent selection of William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, for the time-honored Pulitzer Prize Award for excellence in editorial writing.

I believe that this personal satisfaction which I take unto myself will be readily understood because of my long-time association with the New Orleans States and with Billy Fitzpatrick.

The New Orleans States is the only newspaper in American journalistic history, which has on two different occasions been awarded the Sigma Delta Chi plaque for courage in journalism. The first time that this award came to the New Orleans States I was privileged to have been the city editor of that newspaper. I left the city editor's desk to come to Congress and my successor was William H. Fitzpatrick. From city editor, as my successor, he subsequently became managing editor and editor of the New Orleans States and during this period the New Orleans States was again signally honored by receiving the Sigma Delta Chi plaque.

But Billy Fitzpatrick has gone beyond the achievements of his newspaper and has been acclaimed in his own personal right as the author of the series of editorials on Treaty by Government, which has signalled him out as an individual of ability.

Is it little wonder that I have such a personal feeling in this recognition.

These editorials are not new to the membership of this House. You are already familiar with them because I have previously brought them to your attention and have long ago placed them before you, even before they were brought to the attention of the Pulitzer committee.

It was this series of editorials which inspired me to propose a constitutional amendment to carry out their intent and purposes. I have already announced that I will introduce such a resolution in the Congress. The American Bar Association has in preparation at this time such a proposed amendment and I shall follow the pattern agreed upon by them in formally introducing the proposed amendment. When they are ready I am ready to bring the proposition before the Congress.

I have from time to time brought to your attention many other articles written by Billy Fitzpatrick because I have thought they contained sound thinking and fundamental Americanism.

Do not be misled into believing that in making these remarks and eulogizing this editor, that I have been in full accord with him at all times. I have opposed him most violently on occasions and perhaps may disagree with him in the future, but in doing so there is exhibited the very fundamentals of Americanism which Billy Fitzpatrick seeks to protect in this crusade of his, because crusade it is.

This accomplishment has not been easy. From my own observation I know of the hours and the hard work put into these editorials. They are the result of study and research and the ultimate result has been far more than merely a writing job of presentation.

Since his selection as winner of the Pulitzer prize, Mr. Fitzpatrick has been showered with congratulatory telegrams. It is as it should be. I have been delayed in recognizing him on this forum because of my absence at Eniwetok. Next Wednesday night in New Orleans he will be honored at a testimonial banquet by his fellow citizens. That is also as it should be and I shall have the privilege and honor of personally attending to join in the tribute which is his just due.

If the American way of life, as we understand it, is to be preserved, we need more editors of the type of William H. Fitzpatrick to carry the flag of battle and to sound the clarion call.

The tendency of compromise and appeasement fills the air too much these days. It is the weakness of the era in which we live.

Our need is not for strong men to defend the great structure of constitutional government but for stronger men to preserve the foundation upon which the structure has been builded.

Our need is not for strong voices to shout "Yes," but for articulate voices to make themselves heard when they say "No."

Nowhere are these requisites to be found more substantially than in the free press of this Nation as represented by the men and the women of journalism who are ready and willing to carry the torch for that in which they believe.

Here are some of the things which William H. Fitzpatrick has said and which bear repeating and which will probably be repeated many, many more times in the future:

The people of this country are the inheritors of liberties gained at great cost through the centuries.

These liberties—such as religious freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly, are endangered by such proposed treaties as the Genocide Convention, already submitted by the President to the Senate for ratification, and the Covenant for Human Rights, which is near completion in the United Nations.

These treaties invade the precincts of domestic law.

These treaties reduce the powers of the States while strengthening the powers of a centralized Government.

These treaties strengthen the powers of the executive branch of the Government, thus weakening the historic balance of the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

These treaties, if ratified by the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court, can destroy utterly our Bill of Rights and our form of government.

Here are words and admonitions which constitute more than a Pulitzer Award—they are words and admonitions of warning of things to come lest we take heed.

Think it over.

Leoffler's Friends May Halt Transfer of Public Golf Courses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 13, 1951:

OF PUBLINX COURSES—LEOFFLER'S FRIENDS MAY HALT TRANSFER

(By Thomas Winship)

Friends of local golf czar Severine G. Leoffler, Sr., are confident they can again block the transfer of the public golf courses here to the District Recreation Board.

Leoffler is rounding out his thirtieth year as holder of the profitable golf links concession. Last year he did about $600,000 gross business with the five courses. He receives an $11,500 salary, plus a sliding-scale percentage.

But starting this week, Leoffler faces a new threat to his regime.

A $275,000 fund to buy out Leoffler and transfer the courses to Recreation Board

control is carried in the District budget, now pending before the House Subcommittee on District Appropriations.

This is the first year that the Commissioners have included the transfer money in their regular fiscal year budget request. The Recreation Board would repay the fund to the city government.

The Bates subcommittee concluded the closed hearings on the District budget last Friday. Public hearings for citizen spokesmen are slated to begin at 10 a. m. Thursday.

Representative JOE B. BATES, Democrat, Kentucky, is chairman of this subcommittee and, it was learned yesterday, he has predicted the transfer fund will not be approved, either by his subcommittee, the full Appropriations Committee or on the House floor.

A Republican member of the Bates subcommittee, EARL WILSON, Republican, Indiana, also said the golf transfer item "would undoubtedly be disallowed. I am basically opposed to Government operation of most activities. It is not the American way."

The Bates subcommittee rejected this transfer money last summer, but gave as its explanation the fact that final details of the transfer agreement between Interior and the recreation board had not been worked out.

The agreement now is signed, so the proposed transfer is facing its first clear-cut test.

The Board of Trade's park and recreation subcommittee is scheduled to meet Tuesday to decide finally whether it will recommend the transfer, back Leoffler, or straddle the issue.

The board group is expected to side with the recreation board in this fight because Leoffler and some recreation officials are members of the Board of Trade.

Since 1943, Harry S. Wender, recreation board chairman, and James E. Schwab, board vice chairman, have sought control of the public links as contemplated in the basic law creating the Recreation Commission in 1942.

Among Leoffler's supporters in the current controversy is Joseph C. Healy, a Justice Department attorney from Covington, Ky. Healy told the Washington Post that he is a friend of Leoffler's and an ardent golfer. "For these reasons I have done what I could to help Mr. Leoffler in this matter," he said.

Healy emphasized that he is not Leoffler's attorney; that he is just a supporter.

Healy described himself as a "good friend and great admirer" of Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY. The Veep confirmed his old acquaintance with Healy. Mr. BARKLEY said that neither he nor his office ever intervened in any way in the golf-course issue.

Healy said he sent letters to all Members of Congress last January defending Leoffler's regime as efficient and a money maker for Uncle Sam. This is denied by recreation board people.

Healy said he also has seen BATES on the golf-course question and plans to see him again this week.

BATES said yesterday that Healy has been in to see him twice since January. The first time was a "social call; the second on the golf matter," the Congressman said.

Said BATES: "I wouldn't know Leoffler if I saw him. But they tell me he's turned a profit for the Government. My position last year was simply this: I will not tolerate taking taxpayers' money to pay for a private operation, and then turn it over to a public agency, when a private operation is not costing the Government any money."

The most serious threat to Leoffler's golf-course control was the 1949 House subcommittee investigation of his operations. The inquiry was instigated by Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, South Carolina.

High point of the investigation was a charge by an auditor that his study of Leoffler's company books led him to believe that the concessionaire owed the Government $119,515 which should have been paid during the 5 years preceding 1949. Leoffler denied this and all other charges of irregular bookkeping.

The investigating subcommittee concluded its work by recommending that the golf links be transferred from the Interior Department, which would have put Leoffler out of business.

But a subcommittee-approved bill to accomplish that transfer was dropped when Interior at that point said it would effect the transfer without the bill.

As things stand now, Leoffler holds a 5-year contract (signed with Interior last January) which is subject to cancellation any time up to September 1, 1952, if funds are voted to transfer the courses to the Recreation Board.

The chances of a compromise between Loeffler and the Recreation Board—such as a transfer of the courses to Recreation but still run by Leoffler on concession—are slim, according to statements from both sides.

Wender and Schwab say they are not committed to how they would operate the course, directly or on concession. This will be decided after perhaps a 6-month to a year trial period, they say.

And Loeffler said last night, "I would not run the courses under Recreation for 5 minutes."

Lincoln and Now Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, when the current begins to sweep in increasing velocity or when the waves begin to mount in a wind-swept fury, the wise boatman carefully lays by and considers his course of action that he might safely reach the distant shore. In today's political arena we are aware on every hand of sweeping currents and rising waves of proposed action, yet we are not, as indeed we cannot be when the control of the elements is only partially in our hands, positive as to where these moving forces will lead us if we merely ride the current and bend with the on-rushing wind. All logic and historical evidence then demands that we carefully examine the underlying causal forces of the tempest and the goals which we seek over the horizon. For that reason I am calling our attention to an article by Wayne C. Williams, of Denver, Colo., in which he steps into the calm on the leeward side and carefully goes over the whole situation as his study has enabled him to do. Mr. Williams is an attorney, has served as attorney general of Colorado and also as an Assistant Attorney General for the Federal Department of Justice. He has taken this judicious temperament into the study of history and is the author of books on William Jennings Bryan and Abraham Lincoln. Accordingly, his view of the past is considerably broadened over one who has not done the research necessary to document a book. I cannot expect that all will take his evidence and conclusion carte blanche, but I do believe it constitutes a more sober view than seems popular at the moment and therefore I believe it has value to all, irrespective of conviction on this issue. There is room for divergence of opinion on as high a plane as this article is cast, and I think also that there is much more long-term gain to be had from examination and debate predicated upon the view that a better and more peaceful tomorrow is the end in view of today's deliberation and maneuver. Oriented by this perspective, it becomes possible to stick to unpopular policies which in the long run may bring about the goal of universal peace which in itself will make today's struggle worth while.

LINCOLN AND NOW TRUMAN

The most disheartening page of American history is that page telling of the attacks on Abraham Lincoln, at the crisis of the Civil War. The next most disheartening page is being written now.

This is not the place to retell history, but will any American turn back to the story by Sandburg, or any Lincoln historian, and read again of the fearful abuse, misjudgments, and attacks on the great Civil War President when he dismissed McClellan and struggled to find a general who could match the strategy of the brilliant Confederate generals and save the Union.

President Truman is passing through the same type of ordeal and there are enough parallels and analogies to cause us to pause and consider whether the present attacks upon the principles and policies of the man now in the White House will find justification at the bar of history.

There is every reason to believe that Truman's crisis will be much like Lincoln's and that in the long perspective of history Truman is due for a great vindication. I so predict. Not long ago the President said it takes 25 years for a President's policies to be truly judged and that it had taken that long, or even longer, for Lincoln or Wilson's policies to be correctly appraised. The President never uttered a truer historical judgment.

There are two supreme tests of greatness in a public official, especially as a President:

First, his principles, the goals he seeks. Second, successful leadership in a grave crisis. Apply these tests to Lincoln; how superbly he met them and how steadily his fame rises as the white light of history beats down upon that record.

Now it is submitted that Truman has faced the gravest crises that have confronted any President since Lincoln, and nearly all of them he has faced in peacetime.

What crises has he faced? And what decisions has he been called upon to make.

1. The support of Greece and Turkey against Russia and communism.

2. To join in forming an Atlantic Pact to resist communism and save Europe by helping to arm pact nations and prepare to offer military resistance to communism.

3. To sustain the U. N. by supporting with arms and American forces the Republic of South Korea against Russian and Chinese communism.

4. To defend and preserve the American way of life.

Here, with many minor supporting issues, are the grave and profound questions the President has faced and on which he has made decisions. All other decisions, questions, and issues relate to these fundamentals and must be resolved in the light of these profound issues. If the President, by his course, can prevent a world war and finally demonstrate to the war-thirsty communistic nations that the free world will meet force

with force and stop their aggression, then mankind has turned a page in history and President Truman will stand forth in the annals of mankind as one of the greatest and truest of all American leaders who have ever sat in the Presidential chair.

His goals are clearly declared and no American can misunderstand them. They are to stop aggression, sustain the U. N., and lay the foundations for the future, permanent peace of the world.

Truman will be measured by these goals, by his efforts and measures and decisions to accomplish them, and the fortunes of any general, or any individual, will be but a single item or incident in the vast historical program now being unfolded before the eyes of this present generation.

Tested by these profound goals and plans Truman has made to sustain and accomplish them, we may well look ahead 25 years to see how much can be accomplished and measure Truman by that test, and by that test alone.

What becomes then of this hue and cry, this holocaust of adverse opinion sweeping over the land? Is this not just another example of mistaken judgment, of a capricious impulse, of hot and ill-timed, ill-judged opinion that has taken on the form of a wave that catches up the unsound and ill-formed judgments of many who haven't taken a second, sober thought about what is really involved in this grave crisis?

And do not the use of modern devices for rapidly spreading public opinion and forming too-hasty judgments tend to increase this very uncritical emotional sweep? Fanned by these and by a pure-blind partisanship—that has gone beyond all bounds of discretion and bids fair to test the limits of Americanism, subordinating Americanism to partisanship—are we not now actually seeing a duplication of the terrible mistakes made by mass emotionalism misjudgments exhibited in the Civil War?

One other factor must not be overlooked—the presence in the councils of the President of a staff of unusually sound, capable statesmen: General Marshall, the leaders of the State Department, including Acheson, Kennan, Jessup, Harriman, and a cabinet of sound advisers, all of whom have tested political, economic, and executive experience and international vision.

History will sustain those leaders who have counseled the President.

And let us remember, Lincoln, too, was threatened with impeachment and denounced by his own party in Congress, and that the famous Illinois country lawyer had the clearness of vision and wisdom to see clearly his great goals, and the courage to hold on to his convictions and fight through, despite the bitterest abuse and misrepresentations.

Said Wilson, at the height of his bitterest period of criticism, "Regardless of the effect upon my personal fortunes, I am willing to play for the verdict of mankind."

President Truman has great leaders and great examples to sustain him now.

WAYNE C. WILLIAMS.

Kaiser Steel Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as you all know, I am tremendously interested in the industrial development of the West, and particularly in the industrial development of the great State of California, which I have the honor to represent.

When Henry J. Kaiser began producing steel at his big Fontana plant in 1942 there was doubt in some quarters about how long the operation would continue. In the last 9 years Mr. Kaiser has answered the doubting Thomases. He has fostered one of the modern miracles of American industry. Today Kaiser Steel Corp. has taken its place with the country's 12 biggest steel producers.

I want the skeptics who said back in 1942 that Henry J. Kaiser would never make a success of the steel business to become acquainted with the record of Kaiser Steel Corp.

Earnings after taxes in 1950 were $10,952,583, and the ingot capacity of the company's huge plant has climbed to 1,380,000 tons annually.

Comparison of these figures with those of 26 steel producers listed in the current issue of Iron Age discloses that Kaiser Steel ranks tenth in earnings and twelfth in ingot capacity. Henry Kaiser has once again met the challenge to establish a new company in one of America's most competitive industries. The economy of the Nation, and particularly the West, is reaping the benefit of Mr. Kaiser's foresight and ability.

Mr. Kaiser also has successfully answered those critics of the Government's participation in the building of the Fontana plant by repaying last fall, 20 years before they were due, the balance of $123,305,000 in loans. The Government realized a return of virtually $1.23 for each dollar of its loans to build the west coast steel plant.

The success of Kaiser Steel Corp. in this highly competitive field has not resulted in complacency on the part of its executives. An expansion program is now under way to build an eighth open-hearth furnace and a new tin plate mill to supply the West's concentration of tin can manufacturing plants and food-canning industry. This is evidence that the Kaiser enterprises will continue to spearhead the industrialization of the West.

Privilege of Newspapermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members of this House read with a great deal of surprise the ruling in the case of Leonard Lyons, the well-known columnist of the New York Post, who refused to divulge confidential news sources. Mr. Lyons published in his column several items regarding the spies convicted in the recent Rosenberg atomic spy trial. The decision handed down by Federal Judge John C. Knox, of the southern district, New York, held that newspapermen were not privileged to withhold sources of information.

Judge Knox's ruling was made after counsel for Mrs. Ethel Rosenberg, a convicted spy, demanded that Mr. Lyons disclose the source of certain information he published about her. Lyons claimed professional privilege to avoid such disclosure, but Judge Knox held:

> As a newspaper reporter or a columnist, Mr. Lyons is not entitled to claim his privilege, which is akin to that which exists between a lawyer and his client, a minister and his penitent, or a doctor and his patient. I have gone into the law very carefully, and I find he has no such privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this ruling will adversely affect the freedom of the press. It was always my understanding—and I am sure also many of my colleagues were of the same view—that newspapermen and others dealing with public information have the professional privilege to refuse to divulge their sources of information. In fact, I feel it is their duty in the public interest not to disclose their sources. However, I can think of two types of cases where we should make exceptions to this general rule: First, where the security of our country is involved; second, where there is concealment of a crime.

In the case of Mr. Lyons, neither factor was involved. The items he published about Mrs. Rosenberg appeared after she had been found guilty as a spy and convicted. In my opinion, Mr. Lyons truly lived up to the code of ethics of his profession by refusing to name his sources of information and by upholding the principle of freedom of the press. I wish to commend him for the courageous stand he has taken in the matter. It is my view that the relationship between a newspaperman and his source is as sacred and privileged as that between a doctor and his patient, a lawyer and his client, and a minister and his penitent. This has been our custom and our practice for a long time; and if no such privilege exists under the law—as Judge Knox states—then let us establish this privilege as a legal fact.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the aforesaid, I am today introducing a bill which establishes for newspapermen and others dealing with public information, who are called to appear as witnesses in Federal courts, the privilege that they shall not be forced to reveal the sources from which they obtain their news. The bill provides two exceptions to this privilege: Where, in the opinion of the court, disclosure is necessary: First, in the interests of national security, or, second, to avoid the concealment of a crime. The privilege which would be established under this bill would apply to any person who is engaged in gathering or presenting news, whether for newspapers, periodicals, radio, or television.

From a technical standpoint, the first section of the bill amends title 28 of the United States Code—relating to the Federal judiciary and Federal judicial procedure—by adding at the end of chapter 119 thereof—which deals with evidence and witnesses—a new section establishing the privilege. The bill contains a section 2 which makes a necessary

conforming change in title 28 to reflect, in the table of contents for chapter 119, the new section which is added to that chapter by the first section of the bill.

A very pertinent editorial covering this subject appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on May 14, 1951. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NEWSPAPERMEN'S JUST CLAIM

Newspapermen have long contended that in refusing to divulge confidential news sources they should have the same privilege that now protects the confidential relations between lawyer and client, doctor and patient, clergyman and penitent.

At present, in Federal jurisdiction the newspaperman has no such privilege. This is the sum and substance of a ruling made from the bench this week by Federal Judge John C. Knox "after very carefully going into the law."

Since the ruling is general, merely noting it need prejudice neither the particular case before Judge Knox nor his now postponed decision on whether or not to order the particular newspaperman involved to divulge.

The general ruling itself, however, calls public attention anew to the crass injustice of discriminating against newspaper reporters by refusing them the statutory protection already given doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and nurses when these latter refuse to betray those who have trusted them.

In this State, after two Newburgh newspapermen had been jailed for contempt in 1948, State Senator Thomas C. Desmond and Assemblyman Lee B. Mailler sponsored a genuinely protective measure which the legislature only shunted into the law revision commission for a year's study.

But this commission recommended the next year nothing better than a weakened, emasculated bill which provided that any Supreme Court justice could, on petition and after a hearing, break through the newspaperman's privilege of silence and force a disclosure if the justice deemed it essential to the protection of the public interest.

Even this timid, half-hearted measure, which wasn't worth passing anyway, was defeated as usual with the help of lawyer-legislators who have always balked at seeing this lawyer's privilege extended to cover newspapermen.

Meanwhile, however, in States that already have confidence laws, including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, executives report that such statutes have freed newspapermen to expose waste and corruption in public office, protected sources of information necessary to obtain news, enabled newsmen to help police in criminal matters, and give legal recognition to the code of ethics adhered to by reporters.

The press should never cease its fight to have this reporters' code respected and safeguarded against gags or jail threats, whether in State or Federal jurisdiction. Even Federal Judge Knox may one day have to change his ruling on a newspaperman's privilege.

Your Son and the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Chaplain Patrick A. Killeen, United States Navy, on May 13, over the NBC radio network.

Chaplain Killeen's message, directed to the mothers of America—in particular to the mothers of our marines serving in Korea—deals with the seldom-touched side of the story of our fighting men. It considers their spiritual lives, and its words should impart a note of encouragement into our hearts. For men will only be as strong as their moral spirit is strong; and, if we should judge from Chaplain Killeen's words, our boys in Korea do possess that moral, spiritual strength.

The address follows:

YOUR SON AND THE MARINES

(By Father Patrick A. Killeen, lieutenant, junior grade, Chaplains' Corps, U. S. Navy, Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.)

Today's Mother's Day will be the same wonderful day it has always been. In church mothers will hear themselves justly praised and even compared to the most holy of all mothers—our Blessed Mother. At home, amid the gay flowers and boxes of candy, they will be happy as they see their little John or Judy pledge their love with some inexpensive gift and a great big priceless hug. The new young mother will be happy as she holds her tiny infant in her arms, the evidence of her share in the God-given right of all mothers, to help in His work of creation. She will be happy as she joins all the mothers as they say "thank God for all of this."

In one way, however, this Mother's Day will be a sad one, for the radio and the newspapers give us a very dark picture of the world in which we live. Mothers with sons in service or just old enough to go in will have a heavy, aching heart as they read about Korea; as they see the friendly nations of the world fighting among themselves, while Russia gloatingly works the strings that bring all the godless puppet nations into action against us. It is with these mothers in particular that I should like to visit today to talk about your son and the marines.

At the present time the attention of all those connected with marines is drawn to the men of the First Division in Korea. Any news from Korea seems very close to me at this time, for the towns mentioned in the news releases are not merely names, but rather memories of charred remains of once happy villages. The filth and the mud, the cold and the weariness are all very real, for little more than a month ago I lived with them.

I see now how one-sided a picture we are getting from the newspaper accounts as we read the papers; we see nothing but the grim, horrible side of war which would tend to break the heart of any loving mother. Behind the news of the front page, however, there's a lot that would make you happy, would ease some of the burden from your heart, would make you proud that your son is a marine, as proud as I am to be able to say that I have served with them. I have learned what America can mean to a dying 18-year-old boy and have become a better citizen for it. I have learned how close we can really get to Almighty God on this earth, how utterly simple life can be when we put it all in His hands.

One story never mentioned in the papers that will make every marine mother proud took place on Christmas Eve in southern Korea. We had taken part in a sad but glorious page of our Marine history—the withdrawal from the Chosin Reservoir. We had crowded aboard transports at Hungnam to go to a rest area. Some said we might even go to Japan. Instead, we were unloaded at Pusan and then proceeded to a muddy bean patch and told, "Go to it; that's your rest camp; have a happy Christmas." Those words stung with bitter irony but now, looking back, I can honestly say that I have never spent a happier Christmas.

We set out to arrange for midnight mass in a natural hollow in that bean patch and before we knew it our marines had built an altar from some packing boxes and, by the miracle of Marine secret supply, even had it painted a gleaming white; our canopy was a tarpaulin stretched on a frame made of some lumber borrowed from the galley; our reredos was made of silk that one of the boys found in a native market and for decoration we had some trees brought in from the nearby hills. This was our church where your sons, with their marine spirit, saw to it that in spite of everything and everyone, they were going to have their midnight mass, to pay their homage to the newly born Son of God.

I tried to collect some thoughts for a sermon, but it was rather difficult, for there seemed to be nothing to make that a happy Christmas. As I began to go over the happenings of the past few weeks even the quiet of the tent was broken by the hacking cough of one of our priests who was on the verge of pneumonia from his exposure to the extreme cold. The past came to mind with amazing clearness. Two of our priests lay wounded in hospitals in Japan, one fighting for his very life, wounded as he brought the Son of God to your sons, their marines. One of the clerks, who would be helping us now, lay buried in the frozen ground at Kotori killed at the side of his chaplain. Another boy who would be serving our mass, as he had done every day while we were surrounded, now lay dead up there, killed as he fought to help other marines. These thoughts and many like them were passing through my mind when I heard one lad outside say to another. "We don't have an awful lot this Christmas but I'm sure glad that we can get to midnight mass." These words came like the breath of inspiration, "We had nothing but Christ Himself. What more could we want?" The simple faith of those marines gave me back what I had lost.

At mass, in the clear, crisp, cold light of a brilliant moon about 2,000 marines worshipped their God and Maker and it was my privilege on that night to bring His Body and Blood to every Catholic in that group, to hear them sing their Christmas carols, to give them that thought—they had nothing but Christ, but, having Christ, they possessed all things.

What will be of great comfort to all Catholic mothers is the knowledge that wherever your son goes in the marines your Catholic priest goes with him trying to replace his parish priest as a pastor, confessor, and a guide. In boot camp his Catholic chaplain, who knows his problems, is willing to guide and to help him as he changes from a young boy to a real man, from a civilian to a marine. He has chapels where he not only can but is urged to attend mass regularly. As he goes to Camp Le Jeune, for instance, he must be impressed by the Catholic chapel, which matches any parish church in the country for its beauty. At Camp Pendleton, he can attend mass at the Santa Margarita ranch chapel, one of the earliest of the Spanish missions in California. He has missions similar to the one just finished at Quantico to keep the light of his faith burning brightly.

It is as he goes into combat however, that he learns how close his priest really is. If I say I am proud to have been with the marines, I am doubly proud, and every Catholic should also be proud, of the priests with the marines and all the troops in Korea. The medals and the glory that came publicly to these priests will never be adequate to give them the praise that is their due, but, like the good men of God they are, they're not looking for public praise. Sufficient for

them is the barely audible, "Thanks, Father" from the wounded boy on the stretcher; or the happy sigh from the boy on the line who has just been to confession and received Viaticum and says, "Boy, that makes me feel great"; or the wonderfully simple expression of faith made by my own clerk under fire, "Isn't it wonderful to be in the state of grace."

By the grace of God, last December, when the marines were surrounded in three places, there was a Catholic chaplain in each place and it was at this time that your priests rose to great heights to be with your sons as they needed them most. Isn't it a wonderful, consoling thought that every marine who was wounded and reached a hospital unit had the grace of a priest's presence and received the last rites if he was seriously wounded. To you mothers, who lost your sons in Korea, it must be a comfort to know that every marine who was buried in Korea was buried with the prayers of our holy mother, the church, and in blessed ground.

In so many cases your sons have been a source of pride and even consolation to the Catholic chaplain in the way they profess and practice their belief in God and His church. Imagine how proud the mother would be whose son came to ask me if there was anything wrong if he said seven rosaries in his fox hole at night.

What a wonderful profession of faith your sons made for all to see, at Kotori where every day in a little chapel—three walls of a railroadshed to act as a windbreak, they came and knelt and stood in the freezing cold to attend mass and receive holy communion for what well might be the last time since we never knew what the night would bring.

What a joy to those mothers whose sons came to join in the rosary we said when we would stop to rest during our weary march from the reservoir.

What a magnificent tribute to their parents by those marines who would make a beautifully frank confession in the sight of all as they knelt beside their priest, seated in an open field or behind a jeep. You mothers who have sons in the Marines can read today's headlines about them engaged once again in bitter fighting but you can take comfort from the fact that they are accompanied by their priests and that your boys who left good Catholic homes are doing a magnificent job in keeping their faith and impressing all around them with their real belief in the Catholic church and the teachings of their Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Every day in Korea helped prove the saying that there are no atheists in fox holes but sad experience shows that such is not always the case when the dangers of war are removed. One of the great dangers any marine and your son as he joins them must face is the attitude of indifference to anything that touches on religion. This attitude is common to all service life and it is from this that all our spiritual problems come. This is an insidious, enervating disease that eats away one's principles like a cancer and the unsuspecting soon falls with the terrible crash of compromise. This indifference will show itself to your son in many ways. Not too many people are going to get excited whether he goes to mass or not; he's going to find men listed as Catholics staying in the barracks on Sunday morning. He will find a disregard and often a downright disrespect for the holy name of Jesus and will hear the holy name taken in vain on many occasions. He will find a lack of realization of the seriousness of sins against holy purity; he will find in many cases a complete disregard for the sanctity and goodness of women and marriage. Many signs but all from the same root—indifference.

What can be done to counteract this? I think the answer can be found in the development of respect—a respect of self; for family and friends and especially respect for the church and Almighty God.

This can come easy to a marine for if we look to see just what it is that makes a marine stand out we will see that it is his intensive training whereby the faults and weaknesses of his character are taken away and three principles are woven into the very fiber of his being: pride, love, and obedience. Not the false pride of the hypocrite but a real honest pride in the possession of something wholesome; a manly love that shows itself in the care and concern for his fellow marines; a willing obedience based on the knowledge that authority is something absolutely necessary, something to be respected and not merely feared. I say it is easy for a marine to develop the respect necessary to ward off that dangerous indifference for with a spiritual, supernatural motive he can elevate his basic teaching whereby his pride will generate a wholesome self-respect; his love for others can give him the respect for his family and friends; his obedience can easily nourish a deep respect for Almighty God. With these he has the makings of an outstanding Catholic and that is what many of our marine Catholics are—outstanding.

Self-respect, generated from honest pride can arm the young man against any dangers that he might face. He knows that he is just as important as the next fellow, he knows that he has the right to go to Mass and practice his religion, he knows that he is showing courage when he does what is right. Just as a marine's pride in the corps is a motive whereby he does things a certain way because that's the way the marines do it so, too, he takes pride in his Catholic faith and upholds his principles because that's the way a good Catholic does it. If it's a question of foul language in the barracks his self-respect and pride will give him the courage to let others know what he thinks about it, he won't give in weakly because he knows he is right and will stand up for those rights. If it's a question of bad company or improper action, just as a marine will never let himself be seen in a sloppy uniform, so, too, he will never let himself get mixed up in situations that are against his Catholic teaching.

His love for others can be turned into that respect for his family and friends and with this he won't fall victim to the idea that he can cut himself loose from family ties and with his newly found freedom become completely independent of his family. Oh what a great thing it is to see a lad who lives and acts as if his family were present on the base. If a man learns respect for others he can be strong against all the temptations to sin against holy purity. He will respect the women he meets as he would his own sister and her friends at home and in that way stay clear of the attitude some servicemen have that women are nothing but the playthings for men. If he has respect for his wife that is a real love, how can he ever fall prey to the frame of mind wherein marriage has no sanctity and fidelity is something impossible because men must be men.

As a marine he will develop a deep respect for authority that shows itself in a willing obedience. In the battle he must fight against indifference toward Almighty God, your son will have that respect for authority. He'll be tried with the test of laziness to stay in bed on Sunday morning but he will realize that it is no earthly commanding officer but God Himself who gives the command "Keep holy the Sabbath day." He might toy with thoughts of immorality but again the order is there, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and he summons up a cheerful but strong "Aye, aye, sir." The Ten Commandments and the commandments of the church will be for him the rules and regulations that will guide him if he is to be a good Catholic.

What, then, can be done to help your son as he comes into service and meets this problem of indifference? I say to start now to develop him or rather help him develop in himself a real respect for himself, for his family and friends, and for God and his church.

Yes, on this Mother's Day, there must be many a sad heart but the picture is not as dark as it might seem. There are problems to be faced but we have the means to face them, your sons will be hurled a challenge but with the grace of Almighty God and the proper preparation and care they can meet the challenge and turn it into a glorious victory.

If you are sad today, go to our blessed mother whose motherhood was climaxed by suffering as she watched her Son die on the cross only to have that suffering make her happiness all the more full as she saw her risen Son, the happiness that comes with the triumph of good over evil. With her help you can bear your burden just as your son, with her Son's help, can conquer the evil he must face. Then you, too, can enjoy the wonderful happiness of a successful son.

The Marine motto is very simple, "Semper fidelis"—Always faithful. What a fitting motto for your son as he joins them, always faithful to himself, to his family and friends; most of all, faithful to his church and his God.

Be proud of your son, today, because if he is a good marine you can be sure he will be a good son and a good Catholic.

As you say your prayers on this Pentecost night pray thus for your Catholic servicemen.

Come, O Spirit of Counsel, help and guide them in all their ways that they may always do Thy will, incline their hearts to that which is good, turn them away from all that is evil and direct them by the paths of the commandments to the good of eternal life, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

God bless you and please pray for your chaplains.

Lawrence, Mass., Girl Wins National Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article about Miss Diane Cameron, a 12-year-old eighth grader from Lawrence, Mass., and the distinction she has won for herself and her community. The Lawrence Tribune gave her front-page recognition for her achievement because, although the accomplishment was hers, all her friends and neighbors are also proud that their city has developed such a talented young lady.

In these days of confusion and cynicism in high places it is refreshing to turn to youth and find there the faith that is untarnished. In time their gleaming idealism will be tempered by "the world's slow stain." Somehow we hope and believe that they will not make as many doubtful compromises as some of the tired leaders who preceded them.

Meanwhile youth aspires to honor, being honest in itself.

This we must commend and encourage, for the future of our Nation in a world community. Miss Cameron has ability.

That is obvious. But of greater importance is her character. With industry and integrity she searched for and found and wrote the truth, which a materialistic world needs above all else.

The article follows:

Miss Diane Cameron, 12-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Aime Cameron, 241 Salem Street, has been notified that she has won the first prize of $100 in the national essay contest, sponsored by the National United Spanish War Veterans, according to an official report received from Washington, D. C., by Miss Helen L. O'Connor, of Fitchburg, department junior vice president, and chairman of the essay contest. This prize is the result of 2 weeks of intensive study and research. Typical of any young girl, Miss Cameron plans on buying a new bicycle and some summer finery with her well-earned prize money. If any of it is left after the shopping spree, it will be added to her bank account. Upon graduation in June, Miss Cameron intends to enter St. Patrick's High School and will take the college course in preparation for the vocation of a nun.

This national award will be presented to Miss Cameron at the State convention to be held at Brockton in June. Over the years this is the first time a Massachusetts student has ever won first prize.

Diane's essay, Some Early Experiences of Theodore Roosevelt Which Helped Make Him a Leader During the Spanish-American War, has brought honor to herself, her school, her parents, and the department of the Massachusetts Auxiliary United Spanish War Veterans.

Miss Cameron, an eighth grade pupil of St. Patrick's school, had already merited the first State award and her winning essay was sent to Washington to represent Massachusetts. The State awards were presented at the State meeting of the Auxiliary United Spanish War Veterans in Worcester, April 21.

Miss Helen O'Connor, in opening the program in Worcester, said, "It has been a pleasure to work with these patriotic children throughout the Commonwealth. Five hundred and thirty children from 97 schools responded to my letter with rules from national headquarters. I picked three judges from different parts of the State for the contest. Miss Margaret E. Kielty, adult alien education and Americanization director of Fitchburg; Matthew J. Clark, department junior vice commander of United Spanish War Veterans of Springfield, and Thomas J. Murphy, director of English Rindge Technical High School, of Cambridge, Mass."

"Great Squadrons of Huge Bombers Should Be Ready on a Moment's Notice To Spray Fire Bombs, TNT, and Atom Bombs on Every City in Russia, if Russia Attempts Aggression Anywhere"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions stated on the floor of the House a fact which has now been acknowledged by military authorities everywhere. That is that the armies of the United Nations would have been expelled from Korea months ago if it had not been for the splendid work done by our Air Force. Because of our perilous position in Korea, coupled with mounting international tensions, there should be no let-up with respect to building our Air Force to the present planned strength of 95 groups. The Washington Times-Herald of March 22 carried a very timely article on the subject of air power which, in my opinion, is merely an expression of common-sense patriotism. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of this article:

UNITED STATES THREAT TO BOMB RUSSIA URGED TO HALT RED AGGRESSION—SENATOR JOHNSON CALLS FOR ACRES OF JETS READY AT BASES TO PULVERIZE SOVIET

Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, yesterday urged the United States to serve notice that Russian cities will be pulverized by American bombers from North Africa, Turkey, and Iceland if the Soviets make an aggressive move.

The Senate meanwhile agreed to start voting on amendments to the controversial troops-for-Europe resolutions April 2 and remain in continuous session until the Chamber disposes of them.

At the same time, a bipartisan group of four Senators offered a new version of the Ives amendment which approves the policy of sending troops to Europe—including the four divisions already assigned—and urges fullest collaboration between Congress and the President.

CALLS FOR MORE AIRFIELDS

JOHNSON called his suggestion a foolproof plan to block both Russia's cold-war aims and hot-war threats.

In a speech prepared for delivery during Senate debate on the resolutions, the Colorado Democrat said the United States should reactivate its World War II airfields in north Africa, build new fields in Turkey, and station acres of jet fighters there to assure control of the skies.

He added:

"And last, great squadrons of huge bombers should be ready on a moment's notice to spray fire bombs, TNT, and atom bombs on every city in Russia if Russia attempts aggression anywhere."

ICELAND BASES URGED

Iceland should be used as another bomber base, JOHNSON declared, so these planes can shuttle back and forth dropping bombs coming and going.

The Senator said he guessed Russia would not have 300 atom bombs before 1960, adding that, at any rate, she is far behind America.

Under the new work schedule, the Senate will recess for Easter from today until next Monday, take Tuesday off, and debate the resolutions Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday with a final vote the following Monday.

The resolutions lost one supporter when Senator CAIN, Republican, of Washington, who backed them in committee, announced he will oppose them on the floor.

Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, warned, meanwhile, that restrictions on United States troop assignments will lead to delay, deadlock, and disaster.

Acheson No Appeaser to Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 10, 1951.

I believe that the great Soviet encyclopedia's treatment of our Secretary of State may prove of interest to those persons who have labeled him as an appeaser.

The editorial follows:

ACHESON NO APPEASER TO SOVIETS

Discussing one of our national leaders, the new great Soviet encyclopedia calls him a leader of "aggressive anti-Soviet policy."

With typical Soviet invective, the Communist writer charges him with plotting war against Russia, the "people's democracies" and most of the rest of the world.

The target of this hate is Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, the man whom irresponsible politicians have been attempting to brand as an "appeaser" of communism.

Who's right, Acheson's Soviet or domestic critics?

The argument of the domestic critics hinges pretty largely on the premise that the defeat by the Communists of Chiang Kai-shek's nationalist armies in China before Acheson became Secretary of State somehow makes Acheson an appeaser.

The argument of the Russians is that Acheson deserves much of the credit for the fact that Europe is building an increasingly strong anti-Communist front and that the United Nations and the United States are resisting Communist aggression in Korea.

In our opinion this is one spot in the Soviet encyclopedia that contains the truth.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 last, there appeared in the Asheville Citizen, Asheville, N. C., an editorial entitled "President and General: The Issue Is Joined."

This editorial is so convincing and unanswerable that I think every American should read it.

Weeks later after much testimony has been given on the controversy the editorial stands out like a beacon light ever emphasizing the way we should travel.

More recently in the same paper another editorial appeared entitled "The Return of the Hero." Never have greater words of truth been spoken. This hero will not just "fade away." He will live forever because he is, as the editorial says, "the average hero."

These editorials should be read by every American and I quote them below in full:

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of April 12, 1951]

PRESIDENT AND GENERAL: THE ISSUE IS JOINED

The seat of the Government of the United States is in Washington, not in Tokyo.

The President, elected by the people, is the civilian Commander in Chief in matters of war and peace, as the Constitution directs.

The foreign policy of this country, in tune with the policy of the United Nations, is to contain the Korean war and not to precipitate a world war in Asia.

All these things flow from President Truman's order recalling General MacArthur.

The air at last is clearing.

General MacArthur's brave and devoted service to his country is not to be denied. Neither is it diminished by his recall, for he remains in a true sense a popular military hero to critic as well as idolater. As General Eisenhower said so circumspectly yesterday, when a man puts on a uniform he must not shed his inhibitions. This proved impossible for General MacArthur, for as much as he was a military symbol, so he became a personal, political symbol.

This is intolerable in a democracy. The whole story of MacArthur's tumultuous relations with the President, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and with the policy-makers of the United Nations has now come to light. That story wholly justifies Mr. Truman's action early yesterday morning.

At every point and in every chapter and verse over a period of many months the story is one of conflict. When MacArthur's view could not prevail, he issued statements over the head of his Government and besought or gave an ear to political opportunists. Pomp and circumstance and excessive vanity surrounded MacArthur headquarters in Tokyo, which became all but a sovereign state. Douglas MacArthur slowly became the captive of his own myth.

This was unhealthy. It led to errors of judgment which no man will make unless he regards himself as infallible (which no man is). Some of the consequences are suggested elsewhere on this page by Wallace Carroll, newspaperman and expert on psychological warfare.

But it is not alone the press, nor the politicians, nor yet the more insidious critics with traitorous motive who have found fault with MacArthur. Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, of Asheville, fought all over Asia and knows the world situation from all angles as well as any man. In a speech the other night at Wichita, Kans., he warned that sending the Chinese Nationalists into action in China and bombing Manchuria would precipitate a world war. According to the Associated Press he added:

"America is not prepared to fight a war with Communist Russia, and everything possible should be done to avoid all-out conflict at this time."

The former commander of the Eighth Army is neither running from a fight nor spoiling for one. He is merely being realistic. His testimony is diametrically opposed to what has become known as the MacArthur policy. It is the kind of testimony, from countless men of knowledge and skill, which moved the President to fire MacArthur.

Mr. Truman has behaved admirably in this crisis. His statement dismissing General MacArthur was dignified and logical, free of crimination and personality. The President's instincts are political, and so he must have smarted for a long time under what the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, testified the other day as the effort of those who are "frantically trying to use MacArthur not as an instrument with which to achieve a rational settlement in Asia but as a stick with which to beat the Truman administration."

Lincoln had his McClellan, a disruptive political general who was egged on by northern Democrats. Polk had his Zachary Taylor, who campaigned in Mexico with one eye on the Mexicans and the other on his Whig friends in Washington.

And Truman has had his MacArthur. Yet he did not make the issue now joined a political one. He leaned over backward to accommodate the proconsul in Tokyo. For he knew, as everyone who is reasonable must know, that a foreign policy in this kind of crisis is not the whole product of a President but of many minds—and of many friendly nations.

Now that the people know the facts they will react, we believe, as Americans always react when informed and patriotic. There will be a political storm, and it will be ugly. But it will blow over. The clear air which follows every storm will be the clear air of American unity.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of May 9, 1951]

THE RETURN OF THE HERO

Nine men of the Army have won the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism "above and beyond the call of duty" on the awful battlefield of Korea.

Eight of these young Americans are dead; only Master Sgt. Ernest R. Kouma, a big, blond farm boy from Nebraska, strides among the living.

On Monday Hero Kouma came home. As he stepped from his airplane in San Francisco press photographers trained their cameras on his blushing face and reporters clustered around.

But Sergeant Kouma would have none of this. "Almost painfully embarrassed by the attention"—as one reporter wrote—this "one-man tank corps" of the bloody Naktong ducked his head and fled.

Ernest Kouma, after all, is but an average American hero. Perhaps it is that his profile is undistinguished, but in any case he will not pose for pictures. Why should he? He is an average hero.

Ernest Kouma has nothing to tell the press—on or off the record—and he has nothing to say to a congressional investigating committee. His deeds speak for themselves. An average hero, he followed orders and executed them brilliantly.

Ernest Kouma will not ride in a parade down long canyons of screaming people, dusting the confetti from his uniform as he goes from triumph to triumph. He is an average hero.

Ernest Kouma will go to his home in Nebraska without a retinue of aides and retainers who emit bulletins on the half hour. To be sure, like any other Honor Medal winner, he will rate the first salute of officers of every grade. They will salute the deed, rather than the man, for the sergeant is an average hero among the dozens living and dead.

Ernest Kouma, finally, will retire some day sure in the knowledge that his country is grateful for his singular, selfless devotion. The generals may bicker and compete for place; the cameras may etch on thin and perishable film the ghostly pomp and circumstance of homecoming; the crowd may howl in full throat and strew the pathway of the captain—but the Ernest Koumas go on forever.

For they are the average heroes who slog through mud and dust; who hunch all wet and cold in a fox hole; who pour round on round until the gun barrel is white hot and soft and searing to the touch—the men who march and fight and follow the command and win the battles. The Ernest Koumas are those men, yes.

Save the Republic Before the Symbols Disappear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so much propaganda is being broadcast which is hostile to our form of Government and our way of life, it is inspiring and refreshing to come in contact with people who think American and speak American.

On April 18, 1951, Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, of Huntington, W. Va., delivered an address before the Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution held in Washington, which I hope will be read by people in every section of our Nation.

Mrs. Payne spoke with courage and common sense. It was an appropriate address to be delivered to this patriotic organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, whose members are doing so much to preserve our Government and to perpetuate our institutions.

Under leave granted, I insert Mrs. Payne's address herewith, and commend it to all those who believe in American institutions, as an address worthy of being read and preserved:

SAVE THE REPUBLIC BEFORE THE SYMBOLS DISAPPEAR

(By Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne)

I deem it a privilege and an honor to speak before your congress because you have fearlessly and persistently protected the concepts and precepts of the American way as the founders envisioned and established them. Although attacked by many left-wing groups for your loyalty, you have not faltered in your support of the fundamental principles which made and kept us a nation. Because you are the Daughters of the American Revolution, you can properly sense and evaluate the un-American revolution which has brought us to the very brink of destruction. I salute you for observing, and therefore preserving, the lost art of American patriotism.

Speaking as a mother and teacher I want to be frank, honest, and realistic. As we think together we must accept a sound premise and admit several very obvious necessities. First, unless we understand that there is a well-organized, highly financed plan to overthrow this free Republic, and establish the proletariat of the people, we cannot possibly approach a sensible solution to the planned and planted problems which confront and confuse us today. Under the Communist-Socialist plan to destroy us everything American must disappear from our remembrance and experience; therefore, one of their most effective weapons is the removal or replacing of the symbols of our religious and national history. They are succeeding far beyond our comprehension or imagination. Where are the patriotic pictures, the songs, the devotionals, the pledge to the flag, the atmosphere of reverence and gratitude for America in the schoolroom? Finally, they have reached the symbol which symbolizes all that we are or ever hope to be—the American flag. Do you think it just happened that simultaneously the United Nations flag appeared all over the Nation? No; it was planned that way. Did you ever think you would live to see the day when American judges would rule that any other flag would supersede Old Glory, or that school officials would not know where to place the Stars and Stripes? We must do more than pass resolutions in conventions; we must implement and activate them in our home towns. The U. N. flag should fly in front of the U. N. building, but never over the courts, schools, or public buildings in the United States or on the same pole with the Stars and Stripes. How gullible can we get?

Another successful technique is to call everything by the wrong name. We celebrate VE-day with our troops waiting on the banks of the Elbe while Russia takes Berlin. We called it a cold war and spent millions trying to cover up the fact that it really was a floor show to keep our eyes on the wrong place while Russia swallowed China. We call treason perjury; we call our country a democracy

when the Constitution, the founders, and the pledge to the flag say it is a republic. Can't you see they will soon change our philosophy by changing the American symbols, vocabulary and patriotic experiences? How can we preserve our heritage of freedom for our progeny if we allow them to take down the signs which blazed the trail for us? This problem is more than academic, it is emotional—We either love our country or lose it!

As we face the situation of saving our country we must ask a question. How did this great free Republic lose the American values, names, and concepts in twenty short years? Because we recognized godless Russia and therefore brought forth on this continent a false concept of liberty, borrowed from Karl Marx and dedicated to the proposition that by violating every American principle and tradition—at home and abroad—we could prove that all men are created equal and destined to live in leisure in a welfare world. Those Communist and Socialist experiments have wrecked our security, economy and peace at home, and our friendships abroad. Because we forgot "The rock from whence we are hewn" we are met on battlefields all over the earth to dedicate them to our sons who fought so valiantly and hopelessly in ideological wars they could not win. The prophets of doom who now predict we must always live in war and confusion belie the doctrine of repentance for wrong-doing and are only trying desperately to cover up their sins against this Nation. Must we lose our flag, our rights, and our lives and live in bomb shelters as a penalty for doing good to all the world? No. We can stop the desecration of the faith of our fathers and survive.

Many commitments have been made all over the world in our name, but not for our sake, and our boys must fight with them, for them or about them at the drop of their hat. From mink coats in Washington to 60,000 casualties in Korea the answer is the same—our leaders have lost the American way. Under such circumstances, What can we do for national defense on the home front? We can stop being gullible and become realistic defenders of our own country. Someone asked me in a forum recently if I thought Dean Acheson was a Communist. I answered, from his recent statements I would say he was not, but from his actions many times and his policies in the Far East and his laxity in ridding the Government of Reds, he cannot blame us if we wonder. Why quibble about it. I know and you know all we need to know about Mr. Acheson. We know when he had his face toward Alger Hiss, he had his back to his country. He should be fired.

We can and must stop the indoctrination of the Communist-Socialist philosophy in the schools, churches, clubs, unions, and Government. To do this we must learn the propaganda techniques used in these groups and a few examples will suffice to prove the point. When Hitler wanted to change the philosophy in Germany he immediately took over the schools and changed the textbooks to meet his ideas; Stalin and Peron did the same thing. Do we have a parallel in our country? Yes. Communism and socialism got great and dignified starts in some of our larger universities and they have spread to the land's remotest border. I have sat as student or auditor in many of these schools and I know this is true. Most of our teachers are good Americans, but the small minority of "red-ucators"—because of their aggressive nature and predetermined plan—are destroying the faith in and respect for our form of Government. These teachers are guilty of the sin of commission, but the parents and good teachers are guilty of the sin of omission. We simply did not stop their un-American activities in the classroom and the propaganda is devastating because our children have not had the real American story. They do not parade under their own banner of Communist names and places and announce their purposes; they have far more effective devices. With clever radio, television, and movie scripts, columnists, forum speakers, textbooks, and big names they simply unsell us on our way of life. Down with capital, profits, and free enterprise and up with Russia and Utopia. The condition of our country today proves the power of propaganda as we live in confusion worse confounded, with race trouble here and labor trouble there and trouble, trouble everywhere—all signs of the divide-and-conquer campaign.

More propaganda—we hear it over and over on the radio, in the left-wing press, and in the classroom that disaster, slums, and insecurity breed communism. This is not so—not in America. For over a hundred and fifty years, this Nation continued its progress toward the greatest good for the greatest number. During those years, we experienced as a Nation and as individuals, the whole gamut of human vicissitudes—fire, drought, floods, depressions, and wars, but it didn't even occur to us to turn to communism. Why? Because every American is born with two impervious armors—faith in God and faith in his country. We did not turn to communism because every American is born with his own ladder of opportunity; some are short and some are tall, according to his several abilities as recorded in the parable of the talents, but the ladder is his and it has a top and he is free to scale it. Herein lies the formula for American success based on human dignity and the rights of free men.

Another danger signal—under the guise of social progress and liberal-mindedness the older American histories, which inculcated in us the love of country, the flag, and things American have been replaced by new books dealing with the scientific and objective approach. The idea seems to be to make our children so objective they couldn't have a conviction about anything. Any man or nation that reaches the stature of greatness believes in something and has very deep and spiritual convictions, so we recognize another device to weaken American strength and solidarity. Some books point with pride to the 5-year-plan in Russia and imply that our system of Government has failed because we did not go and do likewise. Even more damage is done to the national morale and patriotism through books on social problems, economics, and political science, some of which present a conglomerate group of case studies and data which prove nothing and leaves the student confused about everything in general and the American way in particular. Whether the teacher realizes it or not, this is just where the Communists want him. The success of the Communist Party in America is not due to the number of their own members actively at work, but to the success they have had selling confused people—good, gullible, Christian people—their false fronts which propagate and disseminate their social and economic ideologies.

Adding insult to injury, progressive education came along, and, disregarding the successful character building found in the McGuffey readers, they advised us to let the children alone—don't cramp their style or personality by telling them right from wrong; even if they can't read or write or spell, they will have experiences. Too many parents and teachers let them alone—and they came home wagging their confusion behind them.

We cannot hope to preserve the love of and adherence to the basic principles which made us "one Nation, indivisible" if our children are taught intentionally, or unintentionally, to doubt the wisdom and demonstration of our form of Government. Typical of the new trends in textbooks which undermines the faith of the next generation are the following quotes: "Free enterprise is dead," "The Supreme Court could and presumably should do away with all property rights," "You cannot level wealth in America until legislation is passed forbidding parents from leaving their inheritance to their children." Furthermore, it is no reflection on the ingenious work of Walt Disney to charge that our sense of values has drastically changed when textbooks replace Abraham Lincoln with the Disney story. We know our institutions and schools are under constant attack by propaganda and indoctrination, therefore, board of education, teachers, and other officials cannot escape the added responsibility of guarding the Republic by carefully investigating the "thought and intent" of the authors and publishers of textbooks and other school material. This assignment is not difficult for the pro-American teachers and officials, and it must be done. Although much of the propaganda is subtle and too many people overlook it or assume it to be an explanation of or formula for "social progress" and "peace," when we check books from the standpoint of the inescapable realities mentioned here, it is easy to determine whether or not they perform the function of ed-ucating or red-ucating. Good American teachers appreciate enlightenment on this subject, and the guilty should be fired; because, if they believe in the Communist-Socialist philosophy it will surely get into their teaching, either by "interpretation" or "design." Many parents ask how they can tell when their children are being indoctrinated. The answer is easy. If your child comes home from school—at any level from primary to university—questioning the success of the American Way and debunking the founders and our glorious history, you may be sure he has the wrong teacher, textbook, or both.

If the schools are to continue to preserve our liberties and our heritage (and who said this was not their basic function), they must teach and practice Americanism—the unadulterated kind of patriotism which sends that intangible elixir of national unity up the spines of every American, of every class, creed, or color, when the stars and stripes appear. Do you call that old fashioned? The Communists want you to do just that, but we know, if we have this Nation, we must continue to love it, and that any subject matter which adulterates these concepts and emotions is subversive. What will it profit the child if he gain all knowledge and lose the opportunity to say with Paul, "I was free born." Parents and teachers must have the courage and patriotism to fight these un-American trends in their own community. We must demand that our schools again become the citadel of American liberty; we must demand that every school put back the symbols which portray our national heritage; we must demand that teachers emphasize what is right about America, thus giving students respect for our past record and faith in the future; we must demand that American history be taught with reverence, because its unfoldment in the minds and hearts of every child is the safeguard against serfdom. Let us be practical. Mr. Stalin knows he can take this country without using the atom bomb, unless we wake up. He can take it with four weapons: tax, spend, indoctrinate, and infiltrate. Why do good, gullible, Christian Americans aid and abet the Communists and Socialists by accepting and using every technique they designate for our destruction? Even Rip Van Winkle only slept 20 years.

Finally, let us realize that we can do the job by turning our attention to the schools, churches, and family life. Unfortunately, too many ministers are also victims of the propaganda and some are even carriers of the venom that will destroy us, because through a false sense of "do-gooders" they have sponsored or helped Communist-front crusades. It would be well to remember that the act of joining your club, union, or even your church, is secondary to the fact that you are free to join it, and it is the fact of your freedom which is challenged today. The

church had better wake up too. Another safeguard—we believe in the wisdom of the founders who warned of political alliances with foreign powers, and practiced the principle of "open covenants, openly arrived at" therefore, we must protect the United States first and we will not be naive enough to join the World Federalists—or any other group that would or could lose for us our vote, boundaries, sovereign powers, or national entity—hoping that by removing the word "foreign" it would save us from the powers that seek to dominate us. History shows that the game of power politics has shifted the balance of power all over Europe and Asia for generations. Allies in one war are enemies in the next, and I wonder if we are contributing most to the brotherhood of man, and the fatherhood of God when we give our name, prestige, and money for foreign wars, based on old hatreds and new excuses. When this country practiced international philanthropy and humanitarian charity we had friends all over the world, but when we became international bigamists and subsidized inefficiency and Socialist experiments, we lost the friends and wrecked the morale of both donor and recipients. If we keep up the practice we will be responsible for our own bankruptcy and a generation of mental dullards and physical sloths.

If the nations are sincerely interested in peace and the principles of freedom we have demonstrated, they should show some signs of emulating them. By precept and example we have shown the way, and the Master said "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." This is the road to peace for a Christian nation, yet we are trying to solve the world's problems through every other means and through an organization which can and has become a medium for spies and saboteurs, but cannot open its councils with prayer.

There are many lost horizons from Valley Forge and Gettysburg to Korea. Since we started making the world safe for democracy it hasn't been safe for anybody, and from the resulting chaos at home and abroad we know by compromise and appeasement we have lost the American path to peace, security, and our constitutional rights as free citizens. If we ever find them again—even at the risk of being called isolationist—we must turn our attention to saving this Republic from the world. This is not isolationism; it is practicing the time-tested axiom, "The light that shines farthest, shines brightest at home."

Progress lies in both directions. The most progress the prodigal son ever made was when he decided to go back to his father. There is lesson here for all Americans. We have certainly spent our substance and our children's future in worldly living and we must get back to American housekeeping. Whether we call it a prior reasoning or horse sense, we must face facts. Just as we do not outgrow the Sermon on the Mount in our spiritual progress, just so, we do not outgrow the wisdom and demonstration of the Constitution and the free-enterprise system. These great principles must be taught in our schools, loved in our hearts, and practiced in our Government if we are to preserve the American concept of liberty for ourselves and our progeny. Wherever we are involved and whatever the sacrifice, it will be in vain unless these objectives are reached, as we strive once again to rebuild a strong defense for one God, one flag, and one country, lest this Nation, as the symbol and demonstration of liberty for people everywhere perish from the earth. Let us resolve to be practical Christians and make our calling and election sure by supporting men and women for office who still believe that the Bible, the Constitution, Ray's arithmetic, and the McGuffey readers made a great and good country, whose people were God-fearing, independent, free-enterprising Americans. Old-fashioned? Yes. So are the Ten Commandments.

The battle lines are being drawn today for the final conflict between Christendom and atheism. It is symbolized by the two stars out of the East—the star of Bethlehem and the red star of Russia. Whatever conflict appears on the scene, whether it be strife between capital and labor or between race, creed, or color, these planned struggles are only the outward sign of the Communist-Socialist attacks on our free institutions. Only the good, gullible Christian Americans, awakened out of their sleep and mesmerism, induced by false propaganda, can save this Nation. Realizing that "the government is upon his shoulders" we must take the human footsteps in our own home town to save the Republic before the symbols disappear.

May we remember at all times to help the world appreciate, accept, and practice the great principles which make freedom and human liberty possible, and may we also remember that our greatest contribution to the world is to keep that light of freedom burning in America. If we fail here, the light of the world dies. Our forefathers left us a great and good land; it is ours—as trustees—"to have and to hold and to love" but, unless we hold it, and teach our children to love it, their children will not have it.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet—lest we 'Americans' forget."

The Church and Modern Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Reverend Philip J. Brown, pastor of St. Mary's Church, Bryantown, Md., on the Washington Catholic radio hour, Sunday, February 11, 1951, on Station WWDC:

THE CHURCH AND COMMUNISM

Communism is an economic and political system based upon the theories of Karl Marx. It holds that society is basically materialistic. To the Communist, economic and not spiritual forces determine the destiny of man. These economic forces currently take the form of capitalism, which, according to Marx, is essentially exploitive. It divides society into two classes, namely, the owners and nonowning workers. Since the owners control the means of livelihood, they are the rulers of society. As such, they live upon the toil of the workers. In their mad struggle to amass wealth they oppress the workers. But this oppression in turn unites the workers into a revolutionary unit resentful of their chains. Ultimately they will be driven to a desperate uprising.

Marx considered this process as inevitable. It was founded on the laws of nature. It was as immutable as the chain reaction which unleashes the force of the atom bomb. Hence the Communist Party would ride on the wave of destiny. It would channel and direct forces which are bound to triumph. Its function would be to enlighten the workers, to prove to them that they are slaves and to lead them to revolt.

When they revolt they will cast aside all the institutions which capitalism used to oppress them. Among these will be religion and morality. Marx considered religion as an opiate or drug which was to deaden the agony of exploitation by promising a better world after death. As an instrument of oppression religion must be fought by the Communist Party.

In the light of this analysis communism was destined to be a world movement. Accordingly, the various parties which embraced Marxism united into a Socialist International. In time, however, difference of opinion arose among the Socialists. The more moderate group retained the name while the extreme revolutionaries called themselves Communists. Their international organizations, the Communist Internationale, is better known by its abbreviated title, the Comintern.

When the Communists seized power in Russia in 1917 Vladimir Lenin took over the leadership of the world movement. After his death Joseph Stalin gradually rose to absolute power. Both of these leaders developed the theories of Marx in the light of modern conditions. They were particularly adept in the strategy and tactics of revolution. The result was a blueprint for world conquest which was detailed and effective.

Their writings made one important distinction which is necessary to an understanding of modern communism. They distinguished between principles, strategy and tactics. The principles of Marx and Lenin are unchanging. They envision an unalterable opposition between capitalism and communism. The conflict is essential to the death. Only one can survive.

Strategy, on the other hand, is a long-range plan which may lead but obliquely to the ultimate goal. Thus, on three important occasions, it was necessary to conciliate the capitalist world. From 1921 to 1928, the Soviet Union wanted a period of recuperation and consolidation. From 1935 to 1939, it desired a united front against fascism. And from 1941 to 1945, it cooperated with capitalist powers against the Axis. At these times, peace with the capitalist world was essential for the survival of communism in Russia.

Tactics are short-range plans which can change rapidly. Thus, the Soviet Union fought bitterly against the Peron government in Argentina. Yet when it suited her convenience she did an about face and initiated friendly relations with the same government. Again in early 1946, Stalin and Soviet press took a belligerent war-mongering attitude toward the rest of the world. But in September 1946, Stalin blandly proclaimed his desire for peace.

Normally Communist parties throughout the world must veer and shift with changing line.

It is vital to understand these distinctions if one is not to be mystified by Communist actions. Communism must be judged at all times by its unchanging principles. Strategy and tactics must be considered in the light of the ultimate goal. Any slackening of opposition because of short-range moves would involve fatal deception.

The Soviet Union today is an absolute dictatorship. Supreme power is concentrated in the hands of Stalin and a small group of his advisers, the Politburo. Under them a few million Communists hold all positions of power and responsibility. They rule mainly by virtue of a ruthless and far-reaching secret police which relentlessly crushes the slightest appearance of opposition. In addition, they have developed propaganda to a point of evil perfection. Soviet citizens are hermetically sealed from the outside world, and their radio, press, drama, and schools indoctrinate their subjects as their rulers decide.

The lot of the worker in Russia today is hard. Poor economic conditions may be excused in part because of the ravages of war. But Stalin's 1946 5-year plan concentrated upon military production rather than output for civilians. What is worse, since man does not live by bread alone, is the denial of freedom. The worker has little choice as to the

job he takes. Incentive systems and speed-up plans drive him at a cruel pace. His trade union is a government agency whose purpose is to increase production and not to present his grievances. No American factory manager today has power over his workers comparable to that possessed by a Soviet manager. And there are the "free" workers, whose lot is better than that of the 15 million slave workers in scattered concentration camps.

The citizen has no real political rights. Voting is but a formality. The formation of an opposition party would mean a visit from the secret police and immediate punishment. Their most merciful punishment is death. More common is the lingering agony of a slave labor camp. There is no appeal from these decisions. There is no trial by jury, no witnesses for the defense, no counsel for the poor victim, no writ of habeas corpus. The result is fear and distrust.

Thus, the utopian dream of Marx has been transformed into a nightmare of exploitaton. Nearly 200,000,000 are toiling at subsistence levels in order to build up a giant military machine. These plans for power have been openly stated and constantly repeated. Hence, military might has been added to the weapons of world communism.

Communist imperialism plans to encompass the world. It is engaged in world-wide activity on several levels. By direct or indirect conquest, we have seen the fall of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, eastern Poland, and Bessarabia. Indirectly the Soviet Union has taken over such countries as "free" Poland, East Germany, Finland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and possibly Austria, mainly by setting up puppet governments, liquidating the opposition and using economic pressure to force them into the Soviet sphere. The same story is true in the Far East in China, Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, and we are all acquainted from our daily press with the death struggle in northern and southern Korea.

Another level of penetration exists where there is a strong domestic Communist Party, such as in France and Italy. Funds and trained organizers are sent into these countries with the hope of overthrowing the existing government. By means of strikes and impossible demands made on these governments, the Communist Party hopes to weaken the authority of the government.

Another level of activity involves Comintern policies throughout the world. By revolt and rebellion in colonial areas, by the isolation of the English-speaking world and by cultivating nations other than British or American, the Soviet Union hopes to weaken the opposition to world conquest.

Through failure to understand the real purpose of the Communist imperialism our leaders in the United States were led to believe that permanent cooperation between our country and the Soviet Union was not only desirable but possible. As a result, in Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, we made disastrous concessions. Unfortunately, in the various departments of our Government, especially the State Department, certain traitors to our American way of life were able to do the bidding of the Soviet Union and it is only recently that our top-level leaders have come to understand the real aim and purpose of Communist expansion.

According to the reliable figures of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the well-informed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Communist Party in the United States is numerically small, with some 55,000 dues-paying members. Yet through tactics of incredible skill they have achieved an influence greater than groups one hundred times its size. Real Communists are fanatics who are personal rebels against social or economic discrimination and injustice. Many are members of minority groups who feel that they are being persecuted. A few are intellectuals or idealists who have been fascinated by the blueprint of a perfect society. The fundamental basis of their power is the strength of a well-disciplined and trained minority which is, at the same time, zealous, courageous, and unscrupulous. They aline themselves with disgruntled minority groups much larger than themselves, such as the members of the Jewish community or the American Negro. Any instance of racial injustice is seized upon and headlined in the Communist press. Strong efforts are made to enlist foreign language groups in the Communist struggle, and in many cases they have been successful. Such organizations as the American-Polish Labor Council and the United Committee for South Slavic Americans are typical. American Youth for Democracy shows that not even our American youth are spared. They are restless in their attempt to control or form women's groups, veterans' groups, and even some religious organizations. The type of Soviet propaganda from Hollywood shows that they have made inroads in the field of movies and entertainment. The formation of front organizations has been for the Communists a masterpiece of deception. Many misguided liberals have been taken in by them, while the real issue of communism has been cleverly disguised or made secondary. The Communists say that they are for democracy, peace, and freedom. What they mean by democracy is shown in the present condition of China where for years we were told that the agrarian reformers were true democrats. Our boys in Korea can tell a different story today. Much could be said of their infiltration in the American labor movement. To the everlasting credit of the CIO where they seemed to make the most headway, the Communist-dominated unions were finally removed from their roster. It took some time before such people as Harry Bridges, Lee Pressman, and their ilk were revealed for what they are.

Thank God, the American people and their leaders have finally awakened to the seriousness of the Communist problem in our country.

What should be our answer to the Communist threat here in our country?

One of the first requirements for checking the menace of communism is to have accurate information. When people know the real truth of communism they will not be so quick to line up with its protagonists. The spread of Soviet doctrine can be stopped only when the truth is known. Lies, half truths and deliberate falsehoods have been the reason for the success of communism. Indeed, one of the spiritual works of mercy is the teaching of the uninformed. To do this, each patriotic citizen must become a zealous apostle, spreading the truth about him, in clubs and social gatherings, and among friends and acquaintances. Communism has gained much strength through the indifference of the American people. The Communists will write thousands of letters to influence public officials and the press, largely because they are the only group heard from. Thus, a very prominent Federal official complained that during the period of appeasement of Soviet Russia, he received enthusiastic support. But when he held out for American principles, all he received was abuse. It is the duty of citizens to write to the press and to their public officials.

Coordinated action of several groups of protesting citizens who value the American way of life will increase the effectiveness of their protests. Apostles of truth can bring out effective unity. If Protestants, Catholics, and Jews together stand for freedom and justice, their appeal cannot easily be brushed aside. These religious groups, together with war veterans would scarcely be called warmongers. A joint foreign-policy declaration by various business groups together with non-Communist labor groups would go far toward killing the effectiveness of the smear campaign of those who are for the Soviet way of life.

For members of the Catholic Church, our position is clear. The words of Pius the Eleventh in his encyclical letter "On Atheistic Communism" give a direction which shows great wisdom and prudence. "Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking."

Many an individual, with no allegiance to the Catholic church, has found this truth through bitter experience. It is interesting to note how many former Communists have finally seen the light and have renounced their errors. On principle, no patriotic American should work with the Communist Party or join any of its front organizations.

Patriotic Americans aspiring to leadership in the labor movement should attend approved labor schools where they will learn how to combat the insidious evils and tactics of communism. It is a well-known fact that Communist labor leaders divert union funds into political activities, neglect their duties, and stir up strife. Intelligent and patriotic leadership must be developed to vote these people out of office. The regrettable fact is that many well-intentioned people in labor have not the patience or stick-to-itiveness to fight in a parliamentary way with these fomenters of strife. Thank God, however, Christianity and democracy alike have never lacked for heroic souls who so loved God and country that they would sacrifice without limit for a cause.

The Catholic church has from the beginning of communism been its implacable foe. The church has been vigilant in proclaiming the majesty of God, the primacy of the spiritual order, and the sway of moral law over the hearts of men. The leaders of the church have called for prayer and penance as weapons against the forces of darkness. The church stands for a just and peaceful social order. Destitution and oppression stimulate a spirit of revolt against society. She seeks justice and peace in all fields of life. In fighting communism, the church is striking a blow for the liberty of man, as well as for her own peace and survival in many countries. In a common cause of human freedom, she extends the hand of fellowship and cooperation to all men of good will, whatever their creed, race, or nationality.

Welcome, Mr. Ben-Gurion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Friday, May 11, 1951:

WELCOME, MR. BEN-GURION

It was a beautiful gesture to show the appreciation of a grateful nation to a martyr to its fight for freedom when Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, placed a wreath on the grave of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, of Brooklyn, at West Point yesterday. Colonel Marcus was killed while serving with the Israeli forces.

The visit here of Israel's Prime Minister has been notable by the warmth with which he has been received by New Yorkers wherever he went. A highlight was the huge rally at Madison Square Garden last night to push the Nation-wide sale of the State

of Israel independence bond issue of $500,000,000.

The Eagle feels sure that it speaks for the people of Brooklyn in extending a warm welcome to Mr. Ben-Gurion and also to his wife, the former Miss Paula Moonvess, of this borough, whom he married while here in 1917. The Prime Minister's visit to America should help to cement the already warm ties between the two Republics and should be a big factor in arousing support for the bond issue on which his nation counts so much.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the May 1951 issue of the Breeder Stockman an article by Henry T. McKnight relating to agriculture. It is well worth reading by both consumers and producers, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS

(By Henry T. McKnight)

Up until recently, farmers have been the most inarticulate group within the framework of our modern society. They've been called pilferers of the public treasury, growing rich at the expense of the consumers who are obliged to pay through the nose for all farm produce. These consumers consider subsidies and price supports mere legalized highway robbery to make the farmers even fatter. Since Korea there have been organized efforts to place the blame for mounting food prices right in the farmer's lap. And in the face of all this criticism the farmer has just "took" it. He's never answered back in force. And so he sank lower and lower in public esteem.

There's a reason for this. Because of the demanding nature of their work, farmers tend principally to their own business. Farmers are community minded private enterprisers. But as a group they've never considered it necessary to go out beyond the community with the story of their production.

Unfortunately for the farmers we are now living in the era of the press agent. Movie stars, labor leaders, politicians scarcely make a move without consultation of their personal public relations advisers. When Korea came along, the press agents saw to it that the movie stars, labor leaders, et al. were all in there pitching to win the cold war. But the farmer tended to his knitting as usual, sought more agricultural production in the face of unbelievable difficulties, and kept trusting that his position in the public mind was secure. But in a world of sophisticated newspapermen accustomed to press releases by the wagonload, it does not pay to hide your light under a bushel. If you have a good cause, you must tell the world about it.

EFFORTS FAILED

Over the years sporadic individual efforts have been made to better agricultural relations with the general public. But the problem has always been to get the different agricultural groups together to present a united front. For instance, the meat people would have one idea they wanted to get across, the cotton people another, the wheat people a third, the co-ops still another. This made for confusion. The results of these efforts were negligible.

But early this year we saw the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, The National Farmers Union, and The National Milk Producers Federation decide to come out jointly, positively, and constructively to tell the story of farm production to the general public via the newspapers and radio. And now representatives of these groups hold a meeting once a month in Washington to which they invite the Nation's top reporters and commentators interested in agriculture. The first conference was devoted to food prices. Reporters received a general release on the subject which was appended with individual opinions of each of the group leaders. The release stated the current farm position and showed that farm prices are not now high by any comparable standard for business or labor. In fact, the release pointed out, if farmers in 1950 had enjoyed the hourly wage of $1.46 received by labor and if they had the same return on capital investment reported for industry, prices of farm products would have been almost double what it was.

Press reaction has been immediate and enthusiastic. One grateful old-timer, for years covering agriculture for one of the wire services, quickly observed that farm groups were just about 20 years late in getting their public relations squared away.

Next meeting was on subsidies. The next on shortages of fertilizers, insecticides, machinery and repair parts. Such citified sheets as the Wall Street Journal front paged the news coming from these meetings, and all over the country agriculture got the full hearing it deserves.

Farm Notes paid a call on Paul Taber, assistant to the national director of the National Grange, and Don Lerch, director of information, to find out how we could be of assistance to create a wider public understanding of the beef cattle industry. We talked of the various programs now under way within our industry, and it was their opinion that in the coming spring and summer months the cause could best be served by holding more and better field days to show the public how we operate.

A glance through the Breeder Stockman shows that several such events are already planned. The more the merrier. Agriculture and the beef cattle industry would benefit immeasurably if one of these field days were to be held in each community this summer.

PROGRAM OUTLINED

Last summer we held such an outing at Cornwell to demonstrate our new Doane pole-frame barn, and if we may venture some suggestions for making a field day a success, they would be these:

1. Keep the field day a simple affair. Remember you have just one function—to show your local public what it takes to produce a beefsteak.

2. Invite a cross section of your community. Don't worry about your neighbors who already know what you're doing. Ask businessmen, nonfarm people, and concentrate your efforts on the housewives. They're the gals who are raising the devil with us because of the price of beefsteak. Most of them will never squawk at a $50 price rise on a television set. But when they're marketing, they hand us the daily insult.

3. Don't hide your light under a bushel. Invite the local newspaper people. Send them information about the affair well in advance, so they can give it plenty of advance publicity. You'll find they'll be delighted to cooperate.

4. Be dramatic. Get up some displays showing what it takes to raise a beef animal for market. Promote your grassland program for what it is; sound agriculture and sound soil conservation. Show rising costs. The consuming public expects you to make a profit. But also show your expenses. This is the item of your farm operation the public doesn't appreciate. Remember, the average meat consumer thinks of you as a country character lying in the shade of the old apple tree with nothing on your mind but a dollar sign. So give the facts of life on production expense.

5. Have a program. A type demonstration using your prize bull as the model is always a fascinating way to show what cut of beef comes from where.

These community field days are always popular. People attending are always glad to spend an afternoon in the country on a good farm. They're in a receptive frame of mind for your public-relations message. And there's a practical matter that's not to be overlooked. Such an event is not only good public relations. It's good business for your farm. If you don't sell some cattle as a result of your field day, Farm Notes will gladly eat its hat.

The Basic Issues of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of a television discussion Sunday on the Basic Issues of Our Foreign Policy, between the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GRANIK. In the great debate raging on Capitol Hill over the Truman-MacArthur controversy many citizens have lost sight of the basic issues involved. The important issue at stake is American foreign policy, rather than the popularity of the President or the general. Just what is the threat to our national life? Can the United States meet this threat alone, or do we need allies? What is the ultimate end of the Korean conflict Is world war III inevitable? Where will our present policy lead us?

Today the American Forum of the Air poses these far-reaching questions to our two distinguished guests.

Mr. Harriman, where does the responsibility lie for the present chaotic state of the world?

Mr. HARRIMAN. The responsibility lies in the Kremlin and the men in the Kremlin. We have to understand what they are about, what their objectives are, and the way they are dealing with their objectives. We have to understand in the first place they were part of the international Communist movement and that during the chaos of World War I they seized control of Russia and they have been operating from Russia as their base since that time. Since the end of the war they have been engaged in a world-wide conspiracy to expand their domination and eventually to take over the world. They believe, eventually, that their way of life must be accepted by other nations. They do not believe that freemen can handle their own affairs. They do not believe that free nations can stand together.

Their subversive tactics penetrate everywhere where there is weakness. They use armed force when they think they can get away with it.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with Mr. Harriman that one of the basic causes of the world situation today directly ties to the Kremlin, but I also believe there is a second basic reason. That reason falls on the shoulders of the administration because of their inability to meet the situation head on. The essence of good government is to foresee the future. In my judgment, that is where the administration in power in Washington has fallen down.

I would change what Mr. Harriman said and say I agree with him on the basic reason for the difficult world situation. It lies in the Kremlin. But I also would add as equally important the inability of our administration all along the line to meet the issues.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I totally disagree with my good friend, Senator BRIDGES. All I ask him to refer to is the record since 1946. In Iran we faced squarely up to the invasion of the Soviet troops and then turned around. We dealt with the threat to Turkey and Greece, and next we developed the Marshall plan.

In 1947 the Kremlin was using the chaos of Europe to press forward and they would have taken over Europe, in my opinion, if it had not been for the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty. We have the initiative in Europe and I defy you to deny that. You cannot foresee everything that is going to happen. You cannot deal with the situation we face unless we and the free world are united.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with a good deal what you say about Europe and I for one have backed the Greece-Turkey aid, the Marshall plan and various other programs in Europe. Let us speak of Europe for a minute.

We have in Europe countries such as Spain. For years now the administration has been closing its eyes and refusing to apply the same principles to Spain. If Russia has a world-wide conspiracy, which I agree, then we should use all the forces available to meet that conspiracy.

For instance, in Europe we are now embracing Yugoslavia and Tito, even though it is a Communist power and a totalitarian power, because they are opposed, for the time being, to Russia. Yet we have turned our backs on Spain, another equally anti-Communist power, although it is totalitarian in character; they are rabidly anti-Russian, anti-Communist. We have failed to follow through.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, you can argue about specific cases. The question of judgment is as to how and when. I do not think the Senator will disagree that there are times when the Senate takes a bit of time to agree on subjects. We have been working in the direction of bringing Spain into the security arrangements. It cannot be done without our allies.

You know the situation between Franco and our allies in Europe. We are trying to help Franco change his ways to some extent and to help his people have a better situation there. The geography of Spain is recognized, but you cannot do everything all at one time. I maintain the administration has been building consistently since 1945 the unity in the free world.

Senator BRIDGES. I disagree completely on the consistency of the approach. One of the fundamental difficulties with this situation is the basic inconsistency of the American foreign policy. We have been tough in places and then we have been vacillating and weak and appeasing in others.

I think that the basic weakness of our foreign policy is its very inconsistency, its failure to follow through.

May I quote, for example, from a State Department publication which I have here. The Department said, on January 23, 1949, for instance, "the Island of Formosa is of no strategic importance," yet the same State Department in 1945 said: "With the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position."

How can the American people, how can the world, follow us when our State Department, which is supposed to be a guiding light in foreign affairs, takes such an inconsistent position?

Mr. HARRIMAN. We have not been inconsistent. It is perfectly true certain people have tried to confuse the American people and the world. The facts of the matter are that Mr. Acheson and others of our Government have pointed out where we were to have bases, where our troops and where our airplanes and naval bases are to be situated.

It has been consistently said Formosa is not one of those areas we asked for the right to have our bases located. We have consistently said if there is attack on any part of the free world, we will support the United Nations action. That is what we have done in Korea. We can quibble as to words, but that has been the consistent policy of the United States Government.

Senator BRIDGES. Here we are fighting a war in Korea—and I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Times dated March 29, 1951, where it talks of the new admiral who took over the Seventh Fleet. He says, "Not only will the United Nations fleet try to block a full-scale Nationalist assault on China, but it will stand in the way of any commando raids. The 55-year-old admiral said he is trying to avert any Nationalist attack on Communist China." That is pretty inconsistent in line with the fact we are in the middle of a war.

The other day I read on the front page of the Washington Post how a veteran who came back wounded from Korea was denied entrance to a veterans' hospital. Why? Because they said he was not a veteran of any war. The 65,000 casualties in Korea, I believe, will not testify to that fact, nor their parents nor their friends, that we are not involved in a war.

Why be inconsistent in our approach?

Mr. GRANIK. Would you care to answer that?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I would say we are in a limited war, but we are doing our best to limit that war. We are being consistent in attempting to limit it and attempting to deal with the threat and the aggression in Korea without involving ourselves in a more general war. And, Senator, no one has told us when or how or at what cost that wider conflict can be brought to a conclusion. You are attacking me; I would like to attack you, sir, on some of the things you have intimated would be wise policy for our Government to follow.

Senator BRIDGES. I am not attacking you; I am attacking the policies of the administration.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I am part of the administration and I am proud of it. I think the record is one, which when the facts are all known, the American people will support.

Mr. GRANIK. If we take issue in extending the Korean conflict in China, how can this wider conflict be brought to a conclusion?

Senator BRIDGES. I think General MacArthur's views are definitely the answer in order to bring it to a successful conclusion. He has presented the only positive program for China.

I listened to General Marshall all this last week. All General Marshall has said, in substance, is that there are three possibilities in Korea: One is the MacArthur proposals which I think he pushes aside as constituting too great a hazard. The other is evacuation, which would mean the extermination of the millions of Korean citizens, which he pushes aside. Third is to continue fighting within the area of Korea, hoping that eventually we will kill enough Chinese Communists so that they will come to terms.

I do not think this is a very positive program. As far as I know this is the only program the administration has for Korea.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I do not think you quite do justice to the testimony of General Marshall. I do not intend to get into that long testimony, because I think it so lengthy you can pick almost any phrase out of it. General MacArthur has said that in his opinion the war can be brought to a conclusion, but he has not yet told us how or at what cost, or when.

General Marshall has tried to explain in the most forthright manner just exactly what we are up against. In his inimitable way he has told us we have a struggle ahead, that he believes this is the way to win it and that he believes we will win it. It is not just killing Chinamen. It is showing the Kremlin that the free world has the will and the ability to fight and to stand up to aggression when it starts, at the beginning. There are many other reasons he has given.

Senator BRIDGES. I have listened very carefully and I could not put my finger on anything, except to substantiate the position which I have outlined.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you believe another war is inevitable?

Mr. HARRIMAN. No. I think if we are determined enough, if we are vigorous enough, if we do not spend our time trying to find trick answers, and if we do not try to carry through with halfway measures, we can develop unity in the free world and prove to the Kremlin they are wrong, that they cannot divide us and knock us off one by one.

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with Mr. Harriman that world war III is not inevitable, but I do believe that we must change our policy if we are to make it fall in such a category.

If I may point out, for example, the position of the administration in regard to the Far East. Mr. Roosevelt, whom Mr. Harriman had a high regard for—sometimes I agreed with him and sometimes I did not—Mr. Hull, who was Secretary of State, felt that if China fell into hostile hands in the country or person of Japan was sufficiently important to this country so that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull were willing to risk a war. They sent the notes which afterward provoked Japan to make the Pearl Harbor attack and bring on the war, to prevent China from falling into hostile hands and jeopardizing the security of our country. If Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull were right in that position, certainly Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson are not today, or vice versa.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Well, it would take us a half hour to debate the China issue, and, as I understand, you are going to shut us off in half a minute. I cannot deal with all of those questions.

I can only say this: That the misery that exists in the East is a breeding grounds for communism, and there is no question about the fact that there was a miscalculation on the part of many people as to the strength of the Communist hold.

We have done everything since that time, and not always with the full support of the Members of Congress, in getting appropriations to help people in the East build strength.

The administration does understand, and our policies are based upon building, getting rid of human misery and developing stability in these countries in the East so that the China situation cannot happen again.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman, how about the charge that we have a collection of fair-weather friends in Europe?

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, that is—anybody who says that does not know history.

I was in England in the year that they stood alone, when the British people faced the great threat of the force of Germany alone. And they fought with determination, and they took pride in the fact that they

were fighting not only for themselves but for others——

Senator BRIDGES. I agree with Mr. Harriman on Great Britain's position at that time. But where I would disagree—we are talking about the present. What is Great Britain's position today, when they continue to furnish war materials to Communist China, used directly and indirectly, kill our boys?

I think we are going through the same period today which we did prior to World War II, when this country supplied scrap iron and steel to the Japs that eventually came back here in the bodies of our own boys. I believe, Mr. Harriman, as you do, in collective security, but I believe it has to be collective along a two-way street.

It cannot be all together on our side of the street. It must come to some extent from over there.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Let me say this: That it may be a surprise to you to know, that is, you may not have had time to look into it, that Britain has not been sending any munitions to China for, I think, the better part of 2 years. There have been many things that have been shut off for a considerable period of time.

There has been a lot of to-do about one subject, which is rubber. But Britain does not control Indonesia. They may have been wrong not to have shut it off from Malaya sooner. But it would have come from Indonesia anyway.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Harriman, I hold in my hand the New York Times dated May 3, and it says the United States will go before the United Nations Sanction Committee tomorrow to call for complete arms embargo against Communist China.

That is unbelievable to me, that on May 3, 6 or 7 months after the Chinese Communists have been fighting us, and killing our boys, that the United States on May 3 has gotten around to going to the United Nations asking for an embargo against these materials. It is just unbelievable.

Mr. HARRIMAN. The facts are, Senator, that most of our friends have been shutting off most of these things up to that time. The question was whether formal action should be taken by the United Nations. There was a difference of opinion. And we are going to get formal action now.

Mr. GRANIK. In a moment we will take questions from the audience.

The first question from the audience? Go ahead, sir.

Captain AUSTIN. I am Capt. George Austin, United States Army. I have a question for Mr. Harriman. How long do we expect to be fighting in Korea?

Mr. HARRIMAN. How can anyone answer that question? It is the hope that our troops that are fighting there will prevent another world war, will prevent disaster that would come to our own people here, and that will force the Chinese Communists to give up the struggle.

It may happen next week. It may happen the week after, or it may happen a month or two from now. One cannot tell because you are dealing with an enemy who is under the dictates of the Kremlin.

It may even split Peiping from the Kremlin, if we handle it this right way.

Senator BRIDGES. May I say just one thing on that? I would answer the question by saying that it may be a long time under the present method of conducting this war with at least one hand tied behind our back, when we are not allowed to bomb even areas within Korea, and when we are not allowed to bomb and attack the Chinese bases and supply lines.

I think we are likely to be there a long time unless we make some appeasing compromise which I hope very sincerely will not be made.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I want to say that there is absolutely no appeasement in the policies of our Government. The question is whether if we widen the conflict, there would not be a tougher situation to end, and the grave risk of getting into a general war without any end.

Mr. GRANIK. Is there another question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am Lyman B. Chamberlain, salesman from Littleton, N. H. I would like to direct the question to Senator BRIDGES, from my home State.

What do you think, Senator, about first seeing to it that this country is sound enough economically before we venture any further in trying to support the whole world in food and arms?

Senator BRIDGES. I think Mr. Chamberlain, that yours is a good question. I think that, fundamentally, unless our country is sound at home, both economically as well as militarily, and I might add spiritually as well, we are in no position to give the free world the leadership which they perhaps have the right to expect from us.

So I would say the first essential is to remain strong at home so that we will be vital enough and virile enough to give the world the leadership which they might expect from us.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Harriman?

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, we must remain strong at home. We are strong at home. It is true that we are having certain difficulties keeping inflation under check, but we have to move forward and organize the strength of the world and give inspiration and leadership to the world at the same time.

I have enough confidence in America's ability to be satisfied that we can bear the cost of world leadership and give our people a fine life as well.

Mr. GRANIK. The next question?

Mr. SANDY. My name is E. J. Sandy. I am a steel man on leave with the National Production Authority. My question is for Mr. Harriman.

Do you consider the Marshall plan aid for Western Europe finished, and did it accomplish its purposes?

Mr. HARRIMAN. If it had not been for the Korean incident, which showed the blatancy of the Kremlin in bringing on a war, and that has now caused a rearmament program in Europe, the Marshall plan would have been finished probably 6 months before the 4 years for which it was scheduled, and at a couple of billion dollars less than the estimated cost.

Europe is now going into a very heavy armament program, and economic assistance will continue for a time in order to help them switch over with the raw materials and the additional factory equipment that they need, and they will need other forms of economic assistance in order to carry out their military production commitments. So it shall become part of the military program.

Mr. GRANIK. We can take another question.

Mr. KERN. John Kern, currently employed in the Senate.

Senator BRIDGES, since we have not declared war, the present administration takes full discretion on the issues related to Korea. In the future, what factors would be necessary to demand a declaration of war?

Senator BRIDGES. I think that we are in an actual state of war today, and I don't like to see it confused with a police action. Certainly, in the history of our country, we have had in Korea the third largest losses that we have had in any foreign war. In fact, we have had more casualties in the Korean war to date than we had in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War combined. So I think it must be classed as a war. I think if you will talk with some of the veterans coming back, they will not be too happy to learn that we are not in a war. We are in a war today.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Of course, we are in a war today. But there have been limited wars in the past. There have been two world wars in recent times, and it is the attempt of our Government to keep it on a limited basis and try to prevent disaster of a world war.

Mr. GRANIK. Gentlemen, it is time for summaries.

Mr. Harriman, would you sum up, please?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I think we have to recognize that although the menace of war comes from the Kremlin, hasty and ill-conceived actions on our part can lead to grave consequences. As it stands today our men are fighting in Korea to do their part to prevent another world war and preserve our freedoms. We must face the future, and the long future, with the same courage and determination and perseverance.

I am convinced that we can succeed, and I do believe we will succeed. As I have said, the American people have been magnificent during the past 5 years. It is inconceivable for me that anyone can deflect us from the course that we have laid out.

Our job ahead is even more difficult, but the success that we have already achieved in our own endeavors gives promise for the future. Let us not be confused by those who are impatient and would lead us to reckless acts. Let us not be confused by those who have no understanding of the strength of the great association of free nations.

The wise statesmen of both our parties have laid the road to follow, and if you analyze it, you would be surprised to find how many of our policies have had the support of the wise statesmen of both our parties.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Harriman.

Senator BRIDGES?

Senator BRIDGES. I think that we are at the crossroads today of destiny in the world, and I think that the free world looks to America for leadership. We cannot give leadership to the free world unless we are strong at home spiritually, militarily, and economically.

Then, with this basis, we must start on a consistent program that lacks the vascillation and the appeasing qualities which have been shown so many times in the past.

Of course, the administration has been right in some instances, but what I complain of is the fact that they are tough in one case and weak in another. I think that this country should give to the world consistent leadership of a positive nature.

It is a terrible thing to have the President of the United States have to go on the radio and say that we are afraid of being bombed today after we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars here at home.

Increased Excise Tax on Housing Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and for the attention of the Ways and Means Committee members, I include a petition of Minneapolis, Minn., residents in my district who, because of the shortage of reasonable housing facilities in the area, have had to resort to the use of trailer coaches for shelter; and 92 such families have requested that I oppose the proposed increase of from 7 percent to 20 percent on their temporary living quarters.

The petition follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 7, 1951.*

Hon. ROY WIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to our attention that there is a bill before the Congress to increase the amount of excise tax on trailer coaches.

Very few of the modern trailer coaches are in the vacationing or luxury class. Today most trailer coaches are used as mobile housing units; in fact, figures show the number of trailer coaches in use as housing units to be in excess of 90 percent of the trailer coaches sold today.

We, the undersigned, are trailerites (dwellers in the modern trailer coaches) and do vigorously oppose such legislation as a form of class discrimination since no such tax is imposed upon one buying a new home. Even though we own our trailer coach, we think this bill unfair to future owners.

Donald R. Shaw, H. S. Swan, J. Scheufeli, V. Kadlec, Wm. Perry, L. H. Ireland, Wm. Duquesne, K. D. Spencer, H. P. Gum, B. W. Minard, C. V. Lance, E. J. Marcoth, Philip E. Call, Cecil R. O'Brien, Lawrence L. Greene.

Art Klingwal, Joe King, F. Brown, John Tritchler, George M. Giorurgen, Albert F. Reed, Jr., Mrs. Donald Kennedy, Mrs. C. H. Spiczka, Mr. C. E. Finman, John F. Finman, Kenneth F. King, Phyllis E. Perry, Norman R. Cooper, James E. Lorton, B. Skytta.

G. Perry, M. G. Carbmell, Jack Clayton, F. L. Truman, Frank Piotnek, Forrest O. Balton, Elmer C. Thompson, J. J. Starf, Orvel K. Johnson, Mrs. O. W. Wilkinson, Richard Spence Taylor, Mrs. Harry McKenzie, Mrs. W. C. Sedeberg, Edward S. Kent, Earl Erpelding, Norma Uber, Mrs. Wm. De Gondarah.

Mrs. W. Van Dill, R. W. Bencop, Mrs. C. R. Camp, Mrs. B. H. Mack, Mr. T. D. Duffek, Mrs. Nana Rosier, Mr. and Mrs. Don Forslund, Mrs. Edgar Hemmingson, Mrs. Lawrence Aubart, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Hedger, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Weir, Lee I. Simonson, Mr. and Mrs. J. Highmark, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pitseknick, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Dalmar, Mr. and Mrs. Donald Erickson, Gust Malmquist, Mr. and Mrs. Bertrand H. Standlund, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Gadbois, John B. Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Post, Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Isaacson, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin J. Mellin, Mr. Floyd Folz, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd E. Horn, Mr. and Mrs. Basil Rice.

Peter Witkowski, Mr. and Mrs. V. F. Houston, Mrs. V. Kingston, Mr. and Mrs. Donald L. Erickson, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Snyder, Mr. and Mrs. Marion W. Fischer, Russell A. Rose, Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Larsen, Mr. C. B. Wheeler, Mr. and Mrs. John Graves, George C. Richman, Mrs. E. W. Zimmerman, M. E. Bailey, Mrs. Ray Thompson, G. E. Flaherty, Mrs. C. R. O'Brien, M. R. Arny, Arthur N. Grorud, Harry S. McKenzie.

Young Lithuanian DP Serves in American Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mrs. Dudley Rhodes Campbell, of Birmingham, Mich., regarding a young displaced person who had been admitted to this country under the Displaced Persons Act, and who, like other displaced persons of draft age, was registered with Selective Service and inducted in the Army.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG LITHUANIAN DP SERVES IN AMERICAN ARMY—THE STORY OF STANLEY AIZINAS

(As told by Elise Hatt Campbell (Mrs. Dudley Rhodes Campbell), of Birmingham, Mich.)

When I saw a picture in the Royal Oak Tribune of Stanley Aizinas eating his last breakfast as a civilian, I thought what an unusual chance the reporter had missed to get a news story of human appeal, for Stanley Aizinas, a displaced person, was leaving for the Army, perhaps to return to the Continent which he had left only 18 months before. His short life, 24 years, had been more than filled with war. I suspect that when he embarked for the United States of America, he thought that life now would be a continuous peace. But it was not to be so. Stanley's army service would be more than worth while, from his point of view, if he could aid his country and others behind the iron curtain to be free of Soviet Russia.

Stanley was born in Lithuania in 1927. He was named Stasys, which is Stanley in English. He was the only son of a Lithuanian Army officer, who died of heart trouble in 1939. Thus Stanley grew up during the glorious period of his country's history, an independent republic for 23 years, beginning in 1918. From a beautifully decorated Easter egg, drawn on a dyed egg with a sharp knife, Stanley left my children a brief history of the tragedy of his country. First the Russians came, deporting almost overnight large numbers of healthy young men for slave-labor battalions. "My turn, I heard, was to come next." Then the big guns of the Germans were heard, the Russians fled, and we were occupied by the Nazis, who promised us everything which we had missed under the Russian occupation. But our hopes were soon dispelled, for the Nazis failed to keep their promises. And when, in 1944, the Russian guns were again heard, and the Germans left us, my mother and I decided to flee. "We could not face a Russian occupation a second time. I was the only boy in our city who had roller skates (my godmother had brought them for me from a visit to her son in the United States of America), and these I greased well, and placed them under oily rags along with my ice skates and skis under a board of the floor in a shed we had in our garden. We just packed a few things and closed the door of our house and took the train for Germany."

At this time Stanley was 17 years old. He and his mother lived on the edge of battle under the usual deprivations of war until the American Army was victorious, and then were placed in a camp for displaced persons, where he not only completed 6 years of high school, but held a number of interesting jobs, such as waterfront director for a summer camp of DP camps. He was also active in Boy Scout work, both in Lithuania and in the DP camps.

Stanley fell in love with a beautiful Latvian girl, Solveiga Gulbis, at one of these summer camps. They had to speak German together, their only common language. And so it came about that Stanley's mother was sent to Canada, but the Gulbis family were sent to Michigan. Stanley had an uncle in Canada, but his heart was pledged to Solveiga, so as soon as he could he found a sponsor in Philadelphia, a Lithuanian-American citizen of 30 years, an uncle of his best friend. His best friend had preceded him to Philadelphia, and in August 1949, when Stanley had been in this country about 24 hours, his friend had him a job in a factory, and he had taken out his first papers.

In January 1950 I consulted a volunteer who worked with the Lutheran Charities to find employment for Latvian DP's in the Detroit area. She told me of Stanley and his wish to get work near Birmingham, so he could be near his girl. I got Stanley a job in a fine new plant in Birmingham, where the president was an unusually public-spirited young man, and he lived with us for about 9 months. He soon had a car, so he could get back and forth to Solveiga's, and they spent all their leisure time together. She was a student at a local college. Her parents were like parents to Stanley; he called them mother and father.

One day Stanley got a letter from his best friend from Philadelphia, the young DP. He had volunteered for service in the Air Force. Later he was sent to Germany and became quartered in the same building where he and Stanley had attended school in Germany.

Stanley had a hard time deciding whether to volunteer or to wait for the draft. He had been attending night school all the fall at Wayne University, and he was very anxious to complete his first semester, if possible. His deepest wish was to complete his college education. I should say that if this had been possible, he and Solveiga would have postponed their marriage until Stanley had become a qualified chemist, his great ambition, for both of them value education beyond mere material accretions. But when the letter came telling him to register he did so immediately, and in the course of events passed his physical, got an A–1 rating, and finally was notified he would be called late in February. Early in February he and Solveiga were married, they had a wonderful reception at Solveiga's parents' house, and he and his bride had a ski trip in northern Michigan for a honeymoon. Then came induction in the Army, this last breakfast scene in Royal Oak, and Solveiga returned to her college.

Stanley was in Fort Riley for his basic training, and was to be placed in the interpreter's corps because of his fluent speech in English, German, and Lithuanian. No doubt he will be sent to Europe, and so will complete the full circle, as did his friend.

Stanley was one of those young men who did everything he touched well, thought deeply about his relationship with his old and his new country, wants nothing better than to build his life on his return completely on an American basis. I hope he and Solveiga will have a chance to work out their life together according to their American dream.

Third Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the third anniversary of the State of Israel, the newest and the smallest state in the entire Middle East. The birth and the sudden growth of Israel is one of the miracles of our age.

Nearly 2,000 years ago when the Israelis were banished from Jerusalem and when nearly all of them sought refuge in many lands, it probably did not occur to most of them that centuries later a new state would be created in their historic homeland by their enterprising and energetic descendants. But the hope for

such a development—a return to the promised land—was kept alive and passed on from generation to generation. Three years ago the dream of 2,000 years actually came to pass.

Many historic events were instrumental in the creation of the State of Israel. The tragic history of the Jews in certain European countries, especially since early 1930's was an important factor. Just as important was the idea of Zionism as evolved by Theodore Herzl more than half a century ago. That idea called for the spiritual regeneration of the Jewish race. But the most important factor, the determining element in the creation of this new state was and still remains, the willingness of Jews to sacrifice their wealth and their lives for the attainment of their most cherished goal. They sacrificed themselves by the thousands; they withstood man-made calamities; and always kept their goal before them.

In the end, when they had to fight against heavy odds, they fought courageously and bravely, and thereby earned their well-deserved independence.

I said the State of Israel is one of the miracles of our age. Nothing short of miraculous is the method by which it is being built up and strengthened. In an area of about 8,000 square miles they already have sheltered more than 1,500,000 Jews. During the last 3 years, the population of this new state has increased annually by more than 200,000 immigrants. Israel has accommodated all Jews seeking refuge. The Government of Israel, with the cooperation and financial aid of Jewish organizations abroad, is endeavoring to assist the distressed Jews in many countries, especially those in Eastern Europe. In this task it has been remarkably successful. Jewish people have been rescued by the thousands, even from countries behind the iron curtain. This is an accomplishment without parallel. It is a demonstration of the determination of the Israelis to help their unfortunate brethren, of their willingness to fulfill their responsibility no matter how great the difficulties.

Israel, today, is vigorous and confident. It reveals all the characteristics of a progressive, democratic state. It is growing stronger and more prosperous and is becoming a decisive force in the politics of the Middle East. I know that my colleagues in the Congress join with me in wishing the State of Israel continued peace and prosperity on this, the third anniversary of their independence.

Correcting the Record on Fred Searles, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 13, 1951, my colleague and friend, Congressman RICHARDS, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Correcting an Injustice to Fred Searles, Jr." The article relates to my criticism of Mr. Fred Searles, Jr., as mining adviser to Charles Wilson, Mobilization Director. It contains a laudatory letter written by Gov. James Byrnes, who is a vice president of the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Fred Searles, Jr., is president. A letter of defense by Mr. Searles is made a part of the article. It is claimed that Mr. Searles was not given a chance to be heard in answer to the criticism of him, and Mr. Searles complains that he was charged with "improper conduct" in his position. He denies, however, that that caused his resignation. I am submitting the following statement to correct the record.

In the first place, Mr. Searles was not denied an opportunity to be heard by the committee.

He was invited to appear before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on April 4, 5, or 6, but he did not appear. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Mobilization Director, wrote a letter to the chairman of our full committee, Congressman MURDOCK, under date of April 3, 1951, in which he stated that Mr. Searles could not be present on April 4 and would not be back in Washington until April 6. Mr. Wilson also said that Mr. Searles had "given up his position as Assistant to the Director."

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, before which Mr. Searles was to appear, was in session on April 6, presided over by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN]. Mr. Searles could have appeared if he wanted to—and for that matter he can still appear if he wants to.

Mr. Searles says in the letter defending himself that I had called for his resignation because of improper conduct in his position. That is not the case. I did not charge Mr. Searles with improper conduct. I charged that he disagreed with the basic objectives and purposes of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as it relates to the encouragement of the production of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

I specifically disclaimed any intention to charge Mr. Searles with improper conduct. That disclaimer was made in the open hearing at the time I called for Mr. Searles' resignation. The following statement appears on pages 39 and 40 of the reporter's transcript of the hearings on April 4, 1951, before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The reporter's transcript reads as follows:

Mr. ENGLE. I am not saying that Mr. Searles lobbyed this particular contract in your agency or used improper influence at all and I am not accusing you of any improper connection with that, either, Dr. Boyd. I want the record to show that; but I am saying—and this is the thing that infuriates me—that at the same time the Newmont Mining Co. was getting a subsidy-loaded contract through the Defense Minerals Administrator, Mr. Searles, was before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and saying that the way to help the domestic mining industry in this Nation is to leave it alone. I think the little fellows out in the country are going to be interested in that kind of information.

Mr. REGAN. That is the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, not the House.

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

I want to make perfectly clear to you, Dr. Boyd, that in this record I am not implying that your agency has been guilty of any impropriety or, for that matter, that Newmont Mining Co. has. All I am saying is that the action of the company is wholly inconsistent, not only here, but abroad, with the testimony given previously, which I say dominates the thinking in this administration with reference to the minerals program.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing, I think, will make it perfectly plain that Mr. Searles was not deprived of a chance to be heard by our subcommittee—and is not now being deprived of a hearing if he still wants it. He simply did not show up when he was supposed to. The committee hearing was not canceled as he says. Further, the record clearly indicates that Mr. Searles was not charged with improper conduct or improper influence. On the contrary, the record shows that I disclaimed any intention of charging him with improper conduct or improper influence.

However, I did charge that Mr. Searles had been appointed as an assistant to the Director of Mobilization, Mr. Wilson, as a specialist, specializing in the minerals program. This is plainly stated in the press release issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization under date of January 3, 1951.

I further charged that Mr. Searles now opposes and has always opposed any assistance whatever in encouraging the exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals. When the Defense Production Act was passed in September 1950 two sections were written into that bill containing provisions which authorize development of our domestic sources of supply of these materials. Further, under the Excess Profits Tax Act passed in January of this year, the Congress allowed special tax benefits to the producers of those critical and strategic minerals and metals. In short, Congress has made it plain in both the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Excess Profits Tax Act that the executive branch of the Government is to encourage the domestic production of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

But Mr. Searles is opposed to encouraging the domestic production of critical and strategic minerals and metals. This has been obvious over a number of years, and more recently on February 13, 1951, was restated by him in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate.

On February 13 Mr. Searles appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY.

On pages 243, 244, and 245 of the reporter's transcript there appears the following colloquy between Senator O'MAHONEY and Mr. Searles:

The CHAIRMAN. Before he answers, may I read this sentence from the letter in which Mr. Searles made his remarks, and which he addressed to me? This is the letter of August 8, 1949: "I am convinced that the best thing the National Government could do to

help the mining industry in this country is to let it alone." * * * All of this, so far as I am concerned, merely raises the question as to what sort of advice you are going to give to Mr. Charles E. Wilson with respect to the development of domestic sources of minerals and strategic and critical materials here in the United States.

Mr. SEARLES. Well, I am going to give him the advice if he can avoid or adopt any policy which would avoid giving subsidies to the development of speculative mining ventures, that he ought to stop. If he can.

On page 228 of the reporter's transcript of those hearings Mr. Searles in answer to the question propounded by the chairman, Senator O'MAHONEY, made the following statement:

I feel now as I did then, that any type of subsidy for the development of mining is objectionable because it does tend to socialize the mining industry.

On pages 262 and 263 of the same record there appears the following colloquy between Senator O'MAHONEY and Mr. Searles regarding funds authorized by the Defense Production Act for use in developing domestic sources of supply:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the simple question is, Do you believe that any action should be taken under that authority through Congress to stimulate the production of domestic minerals in the United States?

Mr. SEARLES. If I had my way, during the period of intensive expansion of facilities and of production of military end items at the top speed, I would stop any such funds from being borrowed from the Government. However, if it is impossible to stop it entirely, then I would do as little as I could.

On page 284 of the same record, Mr. Searles places himself squarely in opposition to a $10,000,000 Government exploration assistance program then being proposed by the Defense Minerals Administration.

Senator O'MAHONEY asked for Mr. Searles' views:

The CHAIRMAN. In the light of our discussion today * * * would you regard an expenditure of that size ($10,000,000) as being unwise or a calculated risk for the purpose of developing domestic sources of these materials, if they exist?

Mr. SEARLES. I would prefer that it be not done chiefly because of the fact that it sets a precedent.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing makes it perfectly clear that Mr. Searles opposes any program whereunder the Federal Government would assist in the development of domestic minerals and metals. He is opposed to the premium price program on the ground that it involves subsidies to the domestic mining industry. He says that will socialize the industry. He is opposed to any loan program, although it is specifically authorized in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

But that is not all. Mr. Searles has consistently since the end of the last war opposed any program to keep the domestic mining industry going. On August 8, 1949, he wrote a letter to Senator O'MAHONEY in opposition to S. 2105, which was a bill pending before the Senate at that time to give very limited assistance to the domestic mining industry. In his testimony before the Senate committee on February 13, 1951, he reiterates that opposition. On February 22, 1949, he wrote to me—I was then chairman of the House subcommittee on Mines and Mining—and opposed similar legislation then pending in the House introduced by the late Congressman Lemke, of North Dakota, and Congressman Russell, of Nevada.

Moreover, Mr. Franz Schneider, who was executive vice president and director of the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Mr. Searles is president, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on June 16, 1949, and advocated cutting the requested appropriation for stockpiling in the amount of $830,000,000. The country has recently been informed through the reports of the Johnson committee in the Senate of the tragic failure of the Munitions Board to carry out the stockpiling program as it should. But Mr. Schneider, who is Mr. Searles' associate in the Newmont Mining Co., would have made it even worse if his advice had been followed.

Now, it must be perfectly obvious to anyone that people with this kind of a philosophy in regard to our stockpiling program and the encouragement of domestic mining production should not be acting as top advisers on mineral policy. They think exactly opposite of what Congress has directed should be done.

As indicated by Mr. Searles, he would advise that nothing be done; that "the best thing the National Government could do to help the mining industry in this country is to leave it alone." I think this record completely substantiates the charge which I made against Mr. Searles, that he is fundamentally opposed to the basic purposes and objectives of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as it relates to the encouragement of development of mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

Aside from this basic disagreement that Mr. Searles has with the program Congress is trying to put into effect, Mr. Searles' position is made even more untenable by the fact that here and abroad the Newmont Mining Co., of which he is president, has been the beneficiary of precisely the same treatment from Government that he objects to here at home for his competitors.

At the request of the Senate committee Mr. Searles provided a list of the holdings of the Newmont Mining Co., of which he is president, both here and abroad, and a list of the companies in which he has official connections. The lists are as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1951.

Memorandum to Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The following is information requested by your committee on the occasion of my testimony on February 13, stating the present holdings and percentage of outstanding stock of companies in which Newmont Mining Corp. is interested; also the names of the companies with which I have some official connection, and designation of that connection.

FRED SEARLES, Jr.

Newmont Mining Corp.—Common stocks owned at Dec. 31, 1950

Company	Shares owned	Percentage owned of total stock issued and outstanding
A. DOMESTIC		
The American Metal Co. (Ltd.)	1,955	0.1
Atlas Mining Co	276,000	73.4
Columbus Mining Co.[1]	38,333	38.3
Carthage Hydrocol, Inc	632	.4
Cyprus Mines Corp	40,625	13.7
Continental Oil Co	261,260	5.4
Creole Petroleum Corp	21,600	.1
East Tennessee Natural Gas Co.	131,087	12.2
El Paso Natural Gas Co	30,690	1.4
Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd	43,329	37.3
Equitable Gas Co	23,000	1.1
Geophysical Exploration Co	75,000	75.0
Getchell Mine, Inc	130,700	8.7
Goldfield Deep Mine Co. of Nevada	2,973,890	20.8
Hecla Mining Co	9,000	.9
Idarado Mining Co	1,336,201	74.2
Kennecott Copper Corp	108,800	1.0
Magma Copper Co	140,658	22.2
New Park Mining Co	46,039	1.6
Newmont Exploration, Ltd	620,000	100.0
Newmont Oil Co	293,236	100.0
Phelps Dodge Corp	153,051	3.0
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp	233,940	6.6
Verde Exploration, Ltd.[1]	87,400	23.5
Western Natural Gas Co	16,500	1.6
B. FOREIGN		
Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. (Ltd.)	2,082	0
Berens River Mines Co., Ltd	1,446,495	72.3
Broken Hill South, Ltd	15,688	
The Consolidated Zinc Corp., Ltd	24,200	.4
Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd	50,890	1.8
Polaris Mining Co	19,900	1.0
Resurrection Mining Co	579,000	33.3
Richmond-Eureka Mining Co.[1]	12,337	4.0
Safari Corp	75,000	50.0
St. Joseph Lead Co	37,254	1.5
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.	31,250	.5
Texas Gas Transmission Corp	27,200	1.2
Tomboy Gold Mines, Inc.[1]	113	17.3
Island Mountain Mines Co., Ltd	584,804	55.7
Mid-African Exploration Co	100,000	100.0
Newmont Mining Corp. of Canada, Ltd	65,000	100.0
Société de Développement Minier [1]	650	65.0
Société Nord Africaine du Plomb	23,887	31.8
Tsumeb Corp., Ltd	1,140,000	28.5
O'okiep Copper Co., Ltd	575,103	56.3
Rhodesian Anglo-American, Ltd	136,501	1.1

[1] Inactive.

COMPANIES IN WHICH MR. SEARLES HAS OFFICIAL CONNECTION

Atlas Mining Co., director and president; American Metal Co., Ltd.,[1] director; Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, Inc., director; Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd., director and chairman of the board; Geophysical Exploration Co., director and president; Hecla Mining Co., director; Idarado Mining Co., director and vice president; Mid African Exploration Co.,[1] director and vice president; Island Mountain Mines Co. Ltd.,[1] director and vice president; New Verde Mines Co.,[2] director and president; Newmont Mining Corp., of Canada, Ltd.,[1] director and vice president; Newmont Oil Co., director and vice president; Newmont Exploration, Ltd., director and president; North Beck Mining Co.,[2] director and president; Northern Empire Mines Co. Ltd.,[2] director and president; O'okiep Copper Co., Ltd.,[1] director; Resurrection Mining Co., director and president; Rhodesian Anglo-American, Ltd.,[1] director; Safari Corp.,[1] director and vice president; Société Nord Africaine du Plomb, director;

[1] Operates outside of United States.
[2] Inactive.

Tomboy Gold Mines, Inc., director and president; Tsumeb Corp., Ltd.,[1] director; Underelil Gold Mining Co. Ltd.,[2] director and vice president.

Mr. Speaker, it is shown by this record that the Newmont Mining Co., of which Mr. Searles is president, operates the Tsumeb mine in Southwest Africa, which has had liberal treatment in the matter of tax depletion and depreciation allowances from the South African Government. On page 241 of that same transcript, Senator O'MAHONEY refers to these tax benefits and depletion and depreciation allowances of a generous nature given by the South African Government:

The CHAIRMAN. First, I want to refer to Tsumeb, in which Fortune magazine tells us the company which you brought to life, had the sympathetic support of tax benefits and depletion and depreciation allowances of a generous nature; what distinction do you make between that sort of support in South Africa, the additional support from the Treasury of the United States, through ECA and counterpart funds in North Africa, and the assistance of the Government of the United States to domestic mining operations in this country? Where is it that one is good and the other is bad?

Mr. SEARLES. Taking, first, the Tsumeb mine in southwest Africa, the liberal attitude on the part of the Government of South Africa was entirely necessary to justify opening that mine, because of the fact that after all taxes in Africa had been paid, we have to pay, on top of that, the usual taxes assessed against any corporation in the United States, so that there is a double taxation there, and a very objectionable form which, if the South African Government had not been fairly decent, would not have permitted the mine to be reopened.

In the case of Morocco, the subsidies there are ECA subsidies, which really are granted to French companies. The Newmont Mining Corp. has been willing at all times to participate in those subsidies by joining the French companies, because of the fact that these are counterpart funds, and because of the fact that in the case of any subsidy, if it is once legalized and put into force, the Newmont Mining Corp. is willing to accept it because it is paying the taxes to create the subsidy, and we have accepted subsidies, not only in North Africa, but in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you actively pursue this subsidy in North Africa?

Mr. SEARLES. Yes. We negotiated with the——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. So it was not merely a passive acceptance of the subsidy.

Senator ANDERSON. It was solicitation, was it not?

Mr. SEARLES. That is right.

It also appears from this record that the Newmont Mining Corp. is interested in a mining operation in North Africa which has had the benefit of something like $4,000,000 in ECA funds.

On page 240 of the same record, Senator ANDERSON asks the following question:

Senator ANDERSON. Let me simplify that by saying did you get help from ECA to open up these mines?

Mr. SEARLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. But you did get the subsidy of ECA funds?

Mr. SEARLES. Yes; continue to get it.

[1] Operates outside of United States.
[2] Inactive.

The CHAIRMAN. And that was paid to the Société Nord Africaine du Plomb, a lead producer, in which Newmont Mining Corp. had an interest?

Mr. SEARLES. That is right.

On page 241 of the same record, Senator O'MAHONEY asks the $64 question when he asked Mr. Searles what distinction he makes between that sort of support in South Africa, the additional support from the Treasury of the United States through ECA, and counterpart funds in North Africa, and the assistance of the Government of the United States to domestic mining operations in this country. Senator O'MAHONEY wanted to know why it is good in one place and not in another. Mr. Searles does not give a satisfactory answer to that question, although admitting that he and his company vigorously pursued a subsidy arrangement in each of these instances. He further admits in this record that the production from these operations (including the North African operation, financed and subsidized by ECA funds) is being sold in foreign markets and not coming to the United States where it is vitally needed.

Senator O'MAHONEY very caustically summarizes the situation on page 244 of the transcript, where he comments to Mr. Searles, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. There is no distinction in principle, sir, between government aid in South Africa to mines in South Africa, and government aid in the United States to mines in the United States; but you are the head, by your own testimony, of a mining company which has properties all over the world. You accept government subsidies and sympathetic aid in other countries, but you want the Congress of the United States to deny it to your competitors in the United States.

Senator O'MAHONEY did not know when he made those remarks that the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Mr. Searles is president, at the very time Mr. Searles was testifying in opposition to any sort of subsidy arrangement for the domestic mining industry, was in fact interested in a subsidy-loaded contract being negotiated through Defense Minerals Administration.

The facts in regard to this transaction appear in the transcript of the record of the proceedings before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under date of April 4, 1951. From this record it appears that the San Manuel Copper Co. of Arizona is to receive a contract from the Federal Government to produce copper. The San Manuel Copper Co. is owned by the Newmont Mining Corp., of which Fred Searles is president. This contract provides for the guaranteed purchase by the Government of huge amounts of copper involving $125,000,000 over a period of 10 years.

The following colloquy between Dr. Boyd, the head of Defense Minerals Administration, and me may be of interest. It appears on page 37 of the transcript of the hearings of April 4 in regard to this contract.

Mr. ENGLE. The price paid by the Government would be a subsidy, would it not?

Dr. BOYD. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ENGLE. All right. One further question: Is it a fact that the San Manuel Copper Co. is a subsidiary of the Magna Copper Co.?

Dr. BOYD. That is right.

Mr. ENGLE. And the Magna Copper Co. is owned by the Newmont Mining Corp. of which Mr. Fred Searles is president; is that right?

Dr. BOYD. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. And so it seems, does it not, that the gentleman, Mr. Searles, who appeared before the Senate committee and loudly debated against subsidies for anyone else was, in fact, going to be the beneficiary of a contract, himself, or through his company; is that right?

Dr. BOYD. That is correct.

As indicated earlier in this statement, I do not charge that Mr. Searles improperly lobbyed or influenced the approval of that contract, or for that matter, that the contract is not a good one and in the interests of the Government. I do not know about that. But I do say that the fact that the Newmont Mining Corp. has secured a contract containing the subsidy principle does discredit the good faith of the argument made by its president, Mr. Searles, against the application of the subsidy principle for the benefit of the competitors of his company here in the United States. In short, Mr. Searles, the president of the company, is arguing that Government subsidies are not good for the mining industry and should not be allowed; that no loans should be made to help in exploration and development of the mining industry as is done for other segments of American industry; but at the same time the Newmont Mining Corp. has been the beneficiary of generous treatment by the government in South Africa, by our own Government in its operations in North Africa, and is currently the beneficiary of a subsidy-type contract approved by the Defense Minerals Administration.

In conclusion, then, I think it is very clear that Mr. Searles has not only advocated policies which are contrary to the clear mandate of Congress, but while arguing against those policies has himself through his own company been the beneficiary of the type of financial assistance from the Government which he opposes for everyone else. For those reasons I felt justified as I did on April 4, 1951, in demanding that Mr. Searles resign or be dismissed. No injustice was done Mr. Searles, and he properly resigned his position.

Loyalty Is the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial commenting on the testimony of General MacArthur and Secretary Marshall, from the Tablet, one of the leading

Catholic publications in America, in its issue of May 12, 1951:

LOYALTY IS THE ISSUE

Over and beyond the current dispute respecting the views of General MacArthur as opposed to those of Secretary of Defense Marshall and the administration, every American places first in mind the welfare of his country. This suppiants debates respecting individuals, political parties, or professional ideologists.

General MacArthur's views respecting peace and the welfare of the Nation may be accepted or rejected. But this is certain: His concern is solely for his country; he spoke without intimidation by any foreign foe; he exuded strength; he breathed confidence of victory; he was free and forthright, not betraying harshness or hiding behind convenient security; he did not engage in personalities; he answered all questions in his field, he kept to the issues and he completed his testimony with his head high.

Secretary Marshall's testimony before the Senate Armed Forces and Foreign Relations Committees is set forth from a different angle. He seems to have a reluctant approach, hampered by apprehension and ever fearful that a politically false move might be made. He is for a limited war, apparently not overconcerned with the loss of American lives; he still appears to be for negotiation with the Chinese Communists, although it is not clear as to what we are to negotiate, for we have nothing to sell except our country and Peiping has nothing to lose since we do not fight upon, or covet, any of her territory. Again, he states bluntly he thinks the purpose of the Communists is "to dominate the whole free world."

Secretary Marshall in his testimony has brought up other subjects which General MacArthur did not touch and which are startling to the American people. Among them are these four:

1. He stated that while serving as delegate of the United States in China, during which time he reportedly indicated that Chiang's defeat was certain and the victory of the Reds inevitable, he never considered the Chinese Reds simple agrarians but believed they were genuine Marxists. If this is true, then Americans wonder why he insisted Chiang take these world destroyers into his government and why he punished him for refusing to follow an order to do so.

2. Equally shocking is Secretary Marshall's testimony that the American people had lost their independence in military action during war. He admitted that decisions made by President Truman and our Chiefs of Staff are vetoed by other governments and the veto is kept secret from the American people. The Secretary of Defense conceded that foreign governments, which have given little manpower and resources to the war, have forbidden the United States to pursue the enemy across a certain line. In addition he asserted that although the United States endeavored to secure an economic blockade to stop war matériel from going to the enemy, the principal U. N. countries have not, after over 9 months, acted in favor of the blockade; in fact, some of the same foreign regimes which give our armies their orders also permit munitions to reach those who shoot our boys. This, then, is the shocking feature: According to Secretary Marshall's testimony, the United States, which supplies the overwhelming majority of men and supplies to the war, has lost its independent control of the situation and surrendered the fate of our boys to the pleasure of foreign governments. The Secretary said General MacArthur's attitude had made the U. N. "uneasy"; one wonders if the thousands of American casualties and the shipping of munitions to the Reds by member nations created any uneasiness.

3. Secretary Marshall gave a turn to the appeasement dispute which must agitate Americans. He asserted, using the same phrase Secretary Acheson pronounced, that the unification of North and South Korea had been set up as a political rather than a military objective of the United Nations. While this would appear to be a new form of objectives in war—and for which Americans are dying—the ominous part is that if this is a political matter it is possible that while the United States will continue to oppose recognition of Red China, and the selling out of Formosa, the other nations—including those who have traded with the Reds—will have to decide the issue. Secretary Acheson made it clear that the United States will not veto admission of Red China to the U. N. if a majority of nations favor it. In other words, there is grave possibility that, despite our great sacrifices in Korea, Red China may still win its objectives, which would be appeasement of the first order.

4. Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire, in questioning Secretary Marshall, asked whether an officer's first loyalty was to his country or the administration then holding office. Senator HICKENLOOPER clarified the question when he said: "There is a book called The Armed Forces Officer that is rolling on the press right now, issued by the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall. I am reading from page 8, so that the record will be clear: 'The service officer is charged only to take a lively interest in all such discussions—that is, about public matters and affairs of the military—and has no more right to condemn the service unfairly than has any other American. On the other hand, he is not expected to be an intellectual eunuch, oblivious to all the faults in the institution to which he gives his loyalty; or to the contrary, that the nature of that loyalty requires that he will use his force toward righting of those things which reason convinces him are going wrong, though making certain that his actions will not do more damage than repair. His ultimate commanding loyalty at all times is to his country and not to his service or superior.'"

Secretary Marshall, whose name was affixed to the recently printed document from which the above quotation was taken, gave this surprising answer, "I had not heard that particular paragraph before. It is a generalization, of course. My own thought would be that it could not be given application in this matter."

Senator BRIDGES then asked whether an officer's first loyalty was to his country or to the administration in power—and he emphasized that General MacArthur had placed his country first. Secretary Marshall said it was to his country. Then the Senator asked the Secretary if a top officer felt his country was being betrayed and was aware of a Communist infiltration in the State Department, what he should do. The Secretary said he should resign from the military service.

In other words, a man must sacrifice his career if he wants to give his views to Members of Congress. His first loyalty is not to the country, to its Constitution, or to his conscience, but to the administration. In fact he cannot even consider Congress as a civilian branch of the Government coequal with the executive branch. He must be a yes-man. Was not this the same attitude Hitler manifested toward his generals?

Throughout the testimony of Secretary Marshall there seemed to be a note of defeatism. President Truman, likewise in his address Monday evening emphasized the weakness, and not the strength of America, as if we were prisoners of our mistakes. His message of fear, because of the Soviet's possession of atomic bombs, and his castigation of the Kremlin's agents abroad, expressed defeatism at its worst. Reliance was placed by the President on the United Nations, yet nowhere was it indicated that the effective membership of the U. N. Security Council is one quarter Kremlin—and that admission of Red China would make U. N. almost half pro-Soviet.

Secretary Marshall conceded General MacArthur, our outstanding general, had been dismissed not for breaking any rule but rather for not following a directive—and even this is not clear, for Mr. Marshall did not convincingly show what directives had been disobeyed and he conceded liaison work with Tokyo was miserable. And he denounced the commander for mentioning the great American losses in Korea; he implied only the losses suffered by the Chinese Reds were of interest to the administration. We believe the American losses in Korea are all important; we want to know how many casualties we have, we want to know how long this war is to continue, we want to know how it happened and who is responsible for the conflict.

These are elementary but important questions. Our loyalty is to our country, our conscience, and our boys at the front.

What the American people need most today is a renascence of faith and fortitude—the faith that comes from loyalty to our principles and ideals, and the fortitude which comes from our strength, determination, and resources. The missing factor in our entire war program—particularly at secret conferences—has been the absence of a moral concept, the failure to invoke ethical principles and the disregard of the value of spiritual mobilization. Patriots of old loved and sacrificed for their country; patriots of today must do the same by opposing the enemy from within as well as from without.

Are We Chickens or Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Eastern Idaho Farmer of May 11, 1951:

ARE WE CHICKENS OR AMERICANS?

What's happened to the leadership of the United States of America? Are we to forget our heritage to quake at what may happen to us if we display courage that measures up to the courage of those who dared fight a war, against great odds, for independence? Are we then servile and obeisant to a power that may be no more than a hollow shell?

Have we forgotten that, if Patrick Henry had urged the necessity of matching England's weapons and England's power before we dared defy her might, there would have been no "Give me liberty or give me death," no Revolutionary War, no free United States of America? Have we forgotten the "big stick" of Teddy Roosevelt? Have we forsaken Woodrow Wilson's concept that peace is worth fighting for? Have we so soon forgotten that within the decade we had the courage and developed almost overnight, the power to fight two wars, across two wide oceans at the same time and humble two powerful enemies?

Are we chickens or are we Americans? Are we to continue to pour our sons' blood into the soil of Korea in a war we can never win and a war that could be the first one we've ever lost because we do not dare to fight for victory? Are we defeatists, afraid to do what we know is right and to risk, however grave that risk may be, the consequences? Are we afraid to face what we've been told again and again is inevitable: a showdown with communism?

Are we forever consigned to the defense? Are we to bleed and die on far fields everywhere in wars in which there can be no victory? Are we?

Not, we're sure, with the approval of the people of the United States of America. If this thing has to be faced—as it does—the American people want to be led by men who have the same courage, faith, and will to win who conceived, fought for, and built the United States of America. We are not cravens to evade a responsibility no matter how grave are the possible consequences of facing it honestly and fearlessly. If we are to be enslaved by fear and threat, there can be no hope, no future. Even the atheistic, slave-labor totalitarianism of communism is better than that.

What we want in the United States is leadership with vision and courage to stand where Americans have always stood: for liberty, for human rights, and with a determination to face anything for them.

We aren't getting that leadership. By that much we today are failing to live up to our proud heritage, failing our boys who are bleeding and dying in Korea in a conflict without purpose and without end. If we are still Americans, it's high time we started acting like Americans again.

Ban on One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Stamp for Brooklyn's Battle Is Baffling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, May 14, 1951:

BAN ON ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY STAMP FOR BROOKLYN'S BATTLE IS BAFFLING

The refusal of Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson to approve the issuance of a special commemorative stamp marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Long Island—or, as it is now more accurately described, the Battle of Brooklyn—comes as a great disappointment here.

The campaign for this recognition has been going on for upward of a year and has been spearheaded by Borough President Cashmore, all nine of Brooklyn's Congressmen, Postmaster Edward J. Quigley and Borough Historian James A. Kelly, who served as chairman of a committee comprised of this borough's leading citizens.

The impression created by Mr. Donaldson that Brooklyn's efforts were somewhat belated is not based on the facts. Separate bills in the interest of this special stamp were introduced in Congress by Representatives HEFFERNAN and ANFUSO last year in more than ample time. As a matter of fact Mr. Cashmore sought such a stamp 5 years ago and at that time he received broad assurances about the consideration a renewed plea would receive for the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary.

The whole position of the Postmaster General seems to us extremely weak. The program was restricted, he said, to four stamps because of present conditions. Why it could not have been just one more is hard to understand.

The choice of the four is baffling. We can understand the historic importance of the one hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Nevada and the anniversary of the statehood of Colorado. Also we can understand the sentimental interest in the final encampment of the United Confederate Veterans and the influence exerted by all the Southern States in such a special stamp proposal.

But what could be the possible excuse for approving a stamp for the anniversary of the American Chemical Society over one for Brooklyn's famous battle is beyond our comprehension. George Washington's military genius was never better demonstrated than here in his successful strategic amphibious withdrawal of his harassed troops over the East River to old New York, where he was able to rally and reform them and carry on to ultimate victory. If his army had been bottled up and captured it might have meant the end of the American Revolution.

The Postmaster General's decision that the anniversary of the American Chemical Society—with all due respect to that eminent and most important organization—is of greater national significance than the great battle fought on August 27, 1776, in what is now the Borough of Brooklyn, is an amazing exhibition of historical values.

A Plan To Help Humanity—The New York Times Comments on a Vitally Important United Nations Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental basis of our struggle against communism must be threefold: Military defense, economic reconstruction and development, and ideological exposition. The improvement of standards of living among the underdeveloped peoples of the world constituting well over half the world's population and living on a standard based on an annual income of $100 per capita or less compared to our $1,700 per capita per annum demands urgent consideration. The United Nations has now come out with a detailed study on the subject which is deserving of the interested attention of every Member devoted as we all are to success in this struggle for the freedom of mankind.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

A PLAN TO HELP HUMANITY

The five United Nations economists who have reported a plan to produce $19,000,000,000 a year of capital investment in underdeveloped countries are not utopians. What they demonstrated was that a vast proportion of the world's population—about a billion and a half persons—are greatly in need of economic aid and could be greatly helped if conditions were favorable. In a 108-page document these eminent scholars took account of the difficulties as well as the opportunities. The great obstacle is that there is no sure peace in the world and that consequently the free countries must spend on armament many billions of dollars that could otherwise be released for constructive foreign investment. This pressure for expenditures for defense is caused by the aggressive activities of a nation which represents itself as the friend of the common man.

The U. N. experts did not suggest that $19,000,000,000 a year be poured out without question by the United Nations or by governments or by private investors. What is actually needed seems to be about $10,000,000,000 a year of capital imports into the underdeveloped countries, of which about 80 percent should go to countries of south central Asia and the Far East. The total sum amounts to somewhat less than 3 percent of the annual incomes of the nations of Western Europe, Australasia, the United States, and Canada. Of course, the United States through one agency or another would be the largest investor.

The economists face up to some of the inherent difficulties of such investments. No country can get ahead economically unless its people are willing to make the necessary sacrifices, which is not always the case. As the report says: "Ancient philosophies have to be scrapped; old social institutions have to disintegrate; bands of caste, creed, and race have to be burst; and large numbers of persons who cannot keep up with progress have to have their expectations of a comfortable life frustrated." The economists dared to suggest that rapid progress in some countries cannot take place until a social revolution has effected a shift in the distribution of income and power. We take it they mean a peaceful evolution such as generally takes place when there is a great technological advance. They may also believe, though they do not explicitly say so, that the fake reforms of communism will have to be counteracted by real reforms encouraged by the democracies. The task will not be too easy. For one thing as the report says, "the technology of developed countries cannot simply be transferred." The new methods of production must be adapted to the customs and temperament of the people who are to use them. On one point the economists are refreshingly optimistic. They believe that under favorable circumstances production can keep ahead of population. They do not suggest that we allow people to die of unnecessary diseases because there is danger that they will be undernourished if they remain alive.

It will be a long time, one would judge, before any program like this can get into full stride, assuming that it is accepted by the Economic and Social Council and implemented, as the economists suggest, by such agencies as the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. But the obstacles are political and psychological, not materia'. If we could have an assured peace, or even an indefinitely prolonged truce, the principles laid down in this report might be used to bring about an enormous spread of well-being and of freedom.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the House the following splendid editorial on statehood

for Alaska and Hawaii from the Christian Science Monitor:

TWO MORE STATES: AND WHY NOT NOW?

Proponents of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska may take some small measure of encouragement from the fact that the Senate insular affairs committee thus early has reported favorably bills to accomplish that end.

Heretofore it has been in the Senate that statehood bills for these territories have expired, the House last year having approved such measures. In matters of population, importance to defense, and rapidity of communication with the mainland these noncontinental areas would seem to qualify for self-governing participation in the union.

Earnest arguments are made against statehood, it is true, but most of these could have been made against present States when they were admitted or even today. Apparently the greatest resistance arises not from questions about Alaska or Hawaii themselves but from apprehension that the four new Senators from these constituencies would help overcome southern resistance to the President's civil-rights program.

This is a narrow base on which to oppose the aspirations of fine groups of people for full citizenship and national responsibility. The decision ought to be made on the merits rather than an incidental effect.

Jackie Robinson, the Pride of His People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, when it first became known back in 1945 that Jackie Robinson, a Negro ballplayer, had signed a contract with a big-league baseball team, it created somewhat of a sensation in the country. For until then Negroes could not be taken into the major league teams, although they were able to participate in other professional sports, such as boxing, basketball, and football.

Jackie Robinson, recognized today as one of the best second basemen in the National League, actually joined the major leagues in 1947 when he became a member of my home-town team, the Brooklyn Dodgers, known affectionately as "dem bums." By joining the Dodgers, Robinson had accomplished more than the mere fact of being the first Negro to break into the major leagues; his acceptance into the ranks of our great national sport automatically erased the "unwritten law" which had kept out Negroes from the big leagues until then.

He has since proved himself to be an outstanding player, a hard hitter, and a respected teammate. His exemplary conduct and his sportsmanlike and intelligent behavior have encouraged other Negro youths to enter this field of sports, so that today nine Negroes are reported playing with teams in the National League and four in the American League, or a total of 13 Negroes in both major leagues.

Robinson also earned the plaudits of millions of people in this country through the movie The Jackie Robinson Story, which struck at the evil of bigotry and racial intolerance. Thus, in the space of a few short years he has done magnificent work for his race, particularly for its youth, whose idol and inspiration he has become. Now he has undertaken a new task to warn teen agers against the danger of using narcotics. He has dedicated himself to that task, which is a great service to his country and his people. The Negroes of this country have all the reason in the world to be proud of Jackie Robinson, just as we in Brooklyn are proud of him.

I am placing in the RECORD two pertinent items from the New York World-Telegram and Sun, one a news article published on April 26, 1951, and the other an editorial which appeared in the issue of April 28. They are as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of April 26, 1951]

JACKIE ROBINSON BEGS KIDS TO AVOID NARCOTICS

Jackie Robinson, the hard-hitting, flashy second baseman of the Brooklyn Dodgers, today offered this advice to New York teenagers who might be tempted to take dope:

"Don't be a sucker, a fall guy. Organized dope rings—real bums—are out to make a slave of you. First, they'll hand you a reefer. Suck the fumes deep for a big thrill, they'll say. Next, a sniff or two of heroin. Then, the needle."

Jackie, idol of millions, drew an analogy.

"The kid who takes dope has as much chance of survival as the swimmer who fights a strong current wearing handcuffs. The dope addict's fate is even worse. A social outcast, his future is mired in the physical and moral wreckage of his own doing."

TO APPEAR AT SHOW

Jackie, praising a realistic, open-air drama titled "Dope," now being presented nightly by the East Harlem Protestant parish on vacant lots, said he will make a personal appearance tomorrow evening at the show "to lend whatever assistance I can to this terrible problem."

The drama, written and directed by Maryat Lee, Wellesley alumna, features original music by Otto Thompson, graduate of the Juilliard School. Its cast comes from the east Harlem area, the literal backyard of the Nation's most vicious narcotics rings.

Actual case histories of teenage addicts' problems provide material for the drama, which has played to more than 5,000 standees since Monday. Thousands of spectators have signed petitions urging the city to provide medical treatment for addicts.

URGES PARENTS TO MEET

Charging that addiction eats at the vitals of the home and community, Jackie said:

"Parents in Harlem should hold emergency meetings and have experts on the narcotics menace address those meetings. Parents should also warn their children of dope's terrible effects upon kids. Save them before they're hooked.

"A detective in Harlem has a cured addict ready to address any interested group on how to cope with the problem. I'll certainly do anything in my power to lend a hand. If groups need any help I'll be available on any off-day of the Dodgers' schedule."

CALLS FOR NO MERCY

While police are doing a superhuman job in trying to eradicate dope rings in Harlem, Jackie said the present crisis calls for even more drastic policing of the area.

"Authorities should move in sufficient numbers of police to rid East Harlem of every dope pusher. Judges should show no mercy on a man who wrecks the lives of whole armies of children. The narcotics peddler today eats at the social structure like cancer. "He should be thrown away for keeps."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of April 28, 1951]

ANOTHER ROBINSON STORY

Jackie Robinson, whose career has been an inspiration not only to youngsters of his own race but to all who are working for racial unity, has taken on a new campaign, that of warning teenagers against the mounting menace of drugs.

He has announced that he will spend such time as the Dodgers' schedule permits in personal appearances and talks to tell the youngsters that "the kid who takes dope has as much chance of survival as the swimmer who fights a strong current wearing handcuffs."

Through the film, The Jackie Robinson Story, the star second baseman struck a strong blow for racial tolerance. In his new role, that of a campaigner to save the youngsters before they're hooked, he has an even more important story to tell.

The Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed to learn that today the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is beginning hearings in connection with the Railroad Retirement Act as amended. It seems to me highly important that this act, which directly affects the lives of so many thousands of Americans, be revised in light of current realities.

The question of pensions for the aged worker, for the disabled worker, and for the widow and children of the deceased worker presents a complex problem in our economy today. Pension plans, both private and public, have had their greatest growth and development during the past 15 years. During the same period, we have witnessed a sharp decrease in the value of the dollar. Measured purely in dollars, an adequate pension 10 or 15 years ago is by no means adequate today.

In objectively approaching the problem of security for the aged, our first difficulty is the lack of any national policy. Some plans, including that for the railroad workers, are actuarily sound, based on current life expectancies. The advancement in medical science which we all hope for and expect may change this picture. The social-security program which covers such a large segment of our society, is obviously not on a sound trust-fund basis and will some day require pay-as-you-go supplements unless it is altered. Because of this situation, we find a sharp discrimination against the railroad worker. He now pays 6 percent of his wage into the Railroad Retirement Fund. His employer matches that payment for a total of 12 percent. Unless corrective legislation is adopted, these payments will go up to 6¼ percent

each next January 1. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2343, to prevent this increase. This bill has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The man or woman covered by social security makes a very much smaller payment, 1½ percent to be exact. This amount, through a gradual increase is, according to present law, supposed to reach 3¼ percent by 1970. However, based on our experience since 1937, the Congress generally freezes the tax rate even though increments have been provided in previous legislation. At present, a man earning $3,600 per year pays $54 per year as social-security tax. The railroad worker with an identical income pays $216 per year into the railroad retirement fund. The average retirement pension for a railroad worker is $82.73 per month, while the average retirement pension under social security for a man is $72.45 and if his wife is living and over 65, this figure is increased to $96.60. The discrepancy between the pensions in proportion to the payments is obvious.

In many of our major industries, such as steel, automobile, coal mining, there are private pension plans, industry-wide or with individual companies, which supplement the social security. The employee's contribution to these plans varies perceptibly. In some cases it is sizable, but in most cases, it is negligible. The cost of these plans is passed on to the ultimate consumer and because of that, is partially borne by the railroad worker and his family, although he is in no sense a beneficiary. Still another large segment of our population, the classified employees of the Federal Government, are covered under an entirely different plan. This plan happens to be on a sounder basis than the broad social-security program.

The problem of how much of the security for the old people of this country shall be financed through a sound trust fund and how much shall be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis is a matter of policy which will require careful and intense study. This policy should be established. A select committee of the Congress may be required to make the necessary study in order to determine the proper policy to be pursued. The studies to be undertaken by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are a step in the right direction. It is the duty of this Congress to eliminate the manifest discrimination which now exists. The railroad worker is not asking to be included in social security, but he is asking for a plan which does not penalize him in comparison to the industry worker covered by social security.

My reason for suggesting a select committee is that these various plans fall under the jurisdiction of several standing committees of the Congress. The Railroad Retirement Act falls to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; the Social Security Act to the Committee on Ways and Means; the Civil Service Retirement Act to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; private-industry plans, indirectly, to the Committee on Education and Labor. It is apparent that in such a situation we are apt to get four different answers to the same problem. For that reason, a select committee for the purposes of intense study seems to me appropriate.

Welcome Back, Colonel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am pleased to include with these remarks the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, May 14, 1951, concerning a distinguished member of a fine family of the Twelfth Congressional District of New York:

WELCOME BACK, COLONEL

It's a pleasure to see one of Brooklyn's war heroes come home from Korea and receive the honors due him. We're speaking of Col. John T. Corley, the most decorated colonel in American history. Colonel Corley is now taking a well-earned rest with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Corley.

He was honored by the Army on Friday when he reviewed the weekly retreat parade on Governor's Island, where he was on staff duty before the war broke out.

He received the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism in combat in Germany during World War II. Then, as if that second-highest military honor wasn't enough, he received another D. S. C. for extraordinary gallantry in Korea. Add to these seven Silver Stars, the Legion of Merit, the Soldier's Medal, four Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart and French and Belgian decorations.

Needless to say, Brooklyn is proud to see Colonel Corley back.

Protect the American Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address I gave before the seventh annual convention of the American Watch Workers Union which convened in Washington on May 14. Nearly one-fourth of the members of this union reside in Lincoln, Nebr., where they are employed in the Elgin plant. I think the American watch industry is in one of the most critical situations we have today, in view of the threatening international situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECT THE AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY

(Address by Senator HUGH BUTLER)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers, and delegates to the American watch workers' convention, I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here with you today.

We are rather proud of the Elgin watch factory that we have at Lincoln, Nebr. A good many people seem to think that Nebraska is all agriculture and no industry. I suppose it is quite a surprise to most of them to learn that we have a plant employing from one to two thousand persons making jeweled watches that are just as fine as the watches made anywhere else in the world. That plant has helped us demonstrate Nebraska's industrial potentialities, and, as I said before, we are proud and happy to have it in our State.

I understand that this is the first time you have held your convention in Washington. I can realize why you have picked Washington for this convention. It is because the fate of the industry you work in and the fate of the jobs of your members may be settled here in Washington this week.

It probably seems strange to a good many of you to have to come to Washington to go before a Government commission and beg on bended knee for the right to make a living. We all like to think of America as the country where no man has to beg another man for the right to make a living. We like to think that in America a man has a right to go into any kind of work that he wants to and to earn a decent wage in that line of work without asking permission of any Government official.

You have found out that is not entirely true any longer. You have found out that your jobs are dependent on the decisions of some few officials in the State Department or the Tariff Commission or other Government agencies. In a good many cases, you do not even know and you cannot find out the names of those officials who make those decisions. All you can find out is that the decisions have been made, and that you have to suffer the consequences.

You men who represent the workers in the jeweled-watch industry have had some bitter experiences. Under this so-called reciprocal trade agreements program, you know what the domestic jeweled-watch industry has suffered as a result of foreign competition. You have tried again and again to make the State Department understand your problem. You have answered every question they had to ask, and you have dug out and presented every fact that could possibly have any bearing on your problem.

It has been a pleasure to have known your president, Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, who for several years now, has been before congressional committees in your behalf. He has done an absolutely first-rate job of presenting your problems and your case. In his last appearance before the Senate Finance Committee, he made, I believe, a more thorough and complete presentation than any other witness we had before us. He had every fact at his fingertips and he answered every question that any member of the committee asked without the slightest hesitation. He did a magnificent job of presenting your problem.

As I said before, you have presented your case again and again to congressional committees and to the State Department and others. You have showed conclusively what these imported Swiss movements are doing to your jobs. In reply, the only answer you have ever received from the State Department was that you have not been seriously hurt.

I believe you men know better than the State Department whether you have been hurt or not. Your president showed us at the Senate Finance Committee hearings that two or three thousand watch workers are out of jobs, at the very time the rest of the country is on a boom.

If your union has not been injured by this Swiss trade agreement, then I don't know what the word "injury" means.

In the Senate Finance Committee hearings, Mr. Cenerazzo gave us very complete and

voluminous data regarding the wage rates paid to Swiss workers in the watch factories over there. It was very important and interesting information. I am sure it was all correct because he has been there, and personally inspected the factories and visited with the workers. He was the only witness we had who could give us the facts on Swiss wage rates. The State Department didn't have those facts, although they should have had them.

I was interested to look through some of the tables on wage rates that he presented and note the comparisons made between the wage rates in the Swiss watch industry and the average rates here in America. He showed the rate per hour for each type of job and then he showed the average wage rate for all Swiss workers. This average rate which included all fringe benefits was 61.1 cents per hour.

Of course, it is not possible for American workers to compete against wage rates like that.

As you all well know, we have a national minimum wage rate in this country for all industry that ships goods in interstate commerce. The rate is 75 cents an hour. That is certainly not a very high wage rate. I don't suppose that there is any worker in the American jeweled watch industry who is paid as little as 75 cents an hour. When I looked through the lists of wage rates for Swiss workers, I didn't see any job that paid as much as 75 cents an hour. About the highest wage paid by the Swiss industry, even for some of the skilled jobs was 60 or 65 cents an hour, according to these tables compiled by our American Legation in Switzerland.

We have only had a national minimum-wage law in this country for about 15 years. Before that time some of the States had minimum-wage laws, but there was no national law setting minimum wages. The State laws on minimum wages didn't work very well, and I am sure you know why. It just wasn't practical for one State to try to raise minimum-wage standards very far above the standards of the other States. Any State that did that would find that sweatshop industries would be established in the low-wage States. Goods would be manufactured in those low-wage States and shipped into the States that were trying to raise their wage standards.

In this country, of course, there is nothing to stop the shipment of goods from one State to another. There was nothing to prevent sweatshop employers from establishing factories in States where the wages were lowest and then shipping their goods all over the country at a competitive advantage. That was done pretty frequently. There had to be a national minimum wage scale, so that there would be fair and equal competition among plants in various States.

You watch workers have exactly that same problem with Swiss competition, only there is no minimum wage to protect you. The wage rates in some of the Swiss factories go down to 14, 16, and 18 cents an hour for beginners. The wage rates for a lot of the jobs of experienced workers are only 30, 40, or 50 cents an hour. That is the kind of competition that you are up against. That is the whole cause of your problem

If the principle of Nation-wide minimum wage is sound, then the principle of protection against foreign low-wage labor is just as sound. If an American manufacturer tried to pay wages at the rates in the Swiss factories, he would be prosecuted in no time by the United States Department of Labor.

There just isn't any doubt that these low Swiss wages are the whole cause of the trouble.

Of course, the State Department may claim that we have no right to tell the Swiss how to run their business. That is true, but we should have a right to say something about it when the Swiss watches come in here at prices far below what American manufacturers can meet.

If the Swiss want to hold their wage rates at a low level, that may be their business. But if they want to send in here the watches made with low-wage labor, then it becomes our business. We have a right to insist that they pay a fair tariff or import fee or whatever you want to call it, that will equalize the cost of production and particularly the difference in wage rates.

In spite of all the State Department propaganda about international trade and international understanding and good will, you can't get away from the fact that this so-called reciprocal trade agreements program is being used to break down the American wage standard, and as a result our living standards.

Now I understand that you are planning to make an appearance before the United States Tariff Commission tomorrow and ask that the United States Government make use of the escape clause in the trade agreement with Switzerland, to get the tariff rates raised to what they ought to be. I am all for you, and I want to wish you the best of luck. I intend to file a brief statement with the Tariff Commission, myself, backing up your position.

I hope you realize that it may not be an easy job to get this administration to use that escape clause in the Swiss agreement.

The escape clause is something that your industry and your union have been working to have put in the Swiss agreement for a good many years. I remember back 4 or 5 years ago when I made a speech in the Senate insisting that the State Department ought to put an escape clause in the Swiss agreement. At that time there was not any escape clause in the agreement, so you didn't even have the right to go to the Tariff Commission and present your case. I made an argument that the State Department could have an escape clause put in on 6 months' notice and that they ought to do so. I believe I convinced most of the people who listened to me, but unfortunately I had too few listeners.

That was shortly after the end of the war. It took the State Department 3 or 4 years to put an escape clause in that agreement so that you could even go before the Tariff Commission and ask them to use it.

As I said before, the escape clause won't be of much help to you unless the administration is willing to use it to escape from the commitments we have made on the tariff on watches. It may not be an easy job to win your case. Up to date, the Tariff Commission has handled 19 applications for escape under the escape clauses in the various agreements. To date they have been willing to take action to protect American producers in just 1 case out of those 19 applications.

That is not a very encouraging situation. I am not trying to discourage you, and I am sure I couldn't if I tried. You men know the problems of your industry, and you know what has happened to the industry and jobs as a result of these Swiss imports. You will have to make it clear to the Tariff Commission just what has happened under this agreement.

The Tariff Commission is supposed to be a nonpartisan agency composed of three Republicans and three Democrats. They are supposed to decide your application based purely on the merits of the case. In other words, they are supposed to sit like judges in a court and grant you protection against imports if they find that your industry has been hurt as a result of this so-called reciprocal trade agreement. They are not supposed to be influenced by political considerations or by State Department pressure or anything of that sort.

In the Senate Finance Committee we have made a real effort to see to it that those appointed to serve on the Tariff Commission are fair-minded, nonpolitical men who will hear a case fairly and decide it on its merits. I don't know how successful we have been. The Senate confirms these appointments, but first of all, the President selects the men, and sends their names to the Senate for confirmation. All of the members of the Tariff Commission have 6-year appointments, which means that they come up for reappointment by the President from time to time. Under those circumstances there may be a temptation for them to think about the political slant of the administration in passing on those cases.

Even after they have arrived at their conclusions, the Tariff Commission does not have the final decision. The President may accept or reject their recommendations. In reaching his decision on that, he will probably consult with members of his Cabinet, including the Secretary of State. Just speaking personally, I am afraid he takes the advice of the Secretary of State more often than he ought to.

That is the problem you are up against. I am giving you some of this background so you will understand why it has been so hard to make any headway. Now that you have gotten a formal hearing before the Tariff Commission, I feel that you have made tremendous progress. I am very optimistic that you will get favorable results.

It happens that you have come to Washington at a fortunate time in more ways than one. Just this week we have up in the Senate a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act for another 2 years. If you have time, I hope some of you will come down to the visitors' gallery in the Senate and listen to the debate.

My own feeling about this particular bill is mixed. There is a temptation to vote against it entirely. Unfortunately, even if Congress refused to pass the bill, it would not restore any of the reduced tariff rates back to the old levels that existed before any trade agreements were negotiated. In other words, we could stop the Secretary of State from making any more agreements by defeating this bill. We could not cancel out the reductions that have already been made by that means. Existing trade agreements, such as the Swiss agreement, would continue in effect until canceled by the State Department.

On the other hand, this bill does contain some real improvements over what we have had in the past. For one thing, it makes the "escape clause" provision a good deal stronger. It attempts to give the complaining domestic industry a much better chance to secure relief from destructive competition through this means. Those of you who have studied Mr. Ceneramo's testimony before our committee realize that the present "escape clause" does not always work too well for the domestic industry that is injured. Our committee has tried to improve on that point in the bill we have up in the Senate beginning today.

There is another provision in this new bill which may be of some benefit to your industry. I take some personal pride in it, since I proposed the amendment in committee at the request of your industry. It is the provision which restores section 516 of the old Tariff Act into full operation.

This section will give a domestic industry such as yours the right to go into court and contest the decision of a customs official in classifying import goods. Your president pointed out to us that a good many imported Swiss movements were only paying the tariff rate on "unadjusted movements," although, in fact, they are fully adjusted when they come in here. If a customs official makes

the wrong classification in that way, it may permit imports to come in at a lower rate of duty. That means that the imports will offer just that much more competition to your own watches.

Some of these changes are rather technical and I don't intend to bore you by going into them in too much detail. The important point is that we have tried to improve the law in any way we could so as to give domestic industries and American workers more protection. The bill is a sort of a compromise. It gives the State Department part of what they have asked and, at the same time, it tries to give domestic industries a little better chance to protect themselves than they have had in the past.

We know that the only kind of a bill we can get through is a compromise bill. If the Congress passed the kind of bill that I would like to see, the President would likely veto it and we would be right back where we were. In fact, I would like to have a bill passed that simply raised the tariff rates on Swiss watches or established a quota. We can't get that through, so we are trying to do the next best thing.

I have appreciated the opportunity of being here with you today and of talking over your problems with you. I have given you some of my ideas on this question, and I hope you won't hesitate to give me your suggestions. Mr. Cenerazzo has never been hesitant about giving us his ideas and recommendations and I respect him for that. I have been pretty familiar with some of the problems of the jeweled-watch industry for quite a while, but this is the first chance I have had to meet with your whole group. You are here fighting for the jobs of your members. You have a tough problem before you. I want to offer you 100-percent cooperation in tackling it. I believe you will solve it because I just don't believe the Tariff Commission, the State Department, and the White House will dare to tell you that your members don't have a right to a decent job at a fair rate of pay.

Thank you for your courtesy and your hospitality.

The British and the Dismissal of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We're All Subject to Each Others' Whims," which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on May 13, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE ALL SUBJECT TO EACH OTHERS' WHIMS

Exchanges between Senators and Defense Secretary George Marshall have refuted mischievous gossip blaming the British for Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal. Marshall and the President have made clear that the decision to recall MacArthur was purely an American one.

It is hard to excuse such an irresponsible canard at a time when it is so useful to the Communists to foster ill will and disunity between the free nations.

Those who do not seem to shrink from isolating the United States from its allies and the U. N. or undermining the morale of the American people now are fostering another dangerous line of talk.

Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, asked Marshall last Wednesday if our arrangement with the U. N. does not mean that "we have virtually lost control of our own 350,000 men in the field."

David Lawrence, a syndicated columnist, previously had charged that "America has surrendered its independence of action and its leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets."

Such talk finds ready listeners in a Nation which, despite its having become the world's No. 1 power, has never wholly rid itself of an inferiority complex developed during the years when the great decisions were made by foreign governments.

Marshall told WILEY that we have not lost control of our troops any more than we lost control of them in Europe though an American was Allied Commander in World War II, just as an American is in command in Korea.

What those overlook who seek to create the idea that our destinies and the lives of our soldiers are at the "whim of foreign Cabinets" is the unprecedented extent to which other free nations have put their destinies and the lives of their soldiers at the whim of American domestic politics.

The United States has never subjected its policies or the lives of its soldiers to foreign leadership to the extent that the British did when they accepted Dwight Eisenhower as their supreme commander in Western Europe in 1942. At that time the Armed Forces of the United States in Western Europe were inferior in numbers and in battle experience to those of Britain. British commanders with more war experience and greater fame than Eisenhower then enjoyed were put under an untried commander. The British later were glad they did but it was hard to do at the time.

The British modified their sovereignty in wartime to permit Eisenhower to function with maximum effectiveness on their soil and again to permit the United States to establish peacetime air bases on their island.

All of the members of the Atlantic Treaty Organization, including France, which is especially sensitive about such matters, have surrendered sovereignty as well as pride to enable Eisenhower to create an integrated Western European defense establishment.

And the 13 other countries with troops in Korea willingly placed them under an American commander. While some of them have not sent as large forces as we would like to see fighting alongside ours, all realized that in entrusting their soldiers to American supreme command they also entrusted us with their national security. The Communists can strike just as hard at a nation with 1,000 troops at war against them in Korea as against a nation with 300,000 troops at war against them.

The way to get more allied troops to line up alongside our troops in defense of collective security is to recognize our allies' right to be consulted about basic policies and give credit for contributions made. To deny our allies a voice in decisions which affect their security as well as ours and to sneer at their sacrifices for the common cause is to treat them as satellites and risk isolating ourselves.

This is not the way most Americans would deal with our allies or the UN and we are glad President Truman in his speech last Monday night and in the letter to General MacArthur published Friday made that clear. "The path of collective security is our only sure defense against the dangers that threaten us. It is the path to peace in Korea, to peace in the world."

We must let nothing divert us from that path.

Attorney General of New Mexico Urges Federal Control of Offshore Oil Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the problem of handling the submerged lands off the coasts of the United States containing vast deposits of petroleum has been of great concern to the people of the United States, and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has been studying the problem intensively this year and last particularly. The committee has before it a measure introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself to provide for interim operation of these petroleum resources under the Secretary of the Interior, so that the United States will not be deprived of production and exploration while Congress is making up its mind upon the final settlement of the controversy which has gone on for the last 8 or 9 years.

As chairman of the committee, I have received numerous letters from all parts of the country with respect to the problem. One of the most interesting of these was received by me today from Hon. Joe L. Martinez, attorney general of the State of New Mexico. Mr. Martinez was formerly upon the staff of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and, like myself and the senior Senator from New Mexico, studied law at Georgetown Law School. I have therefore read his letter with particular interest.

Mr. Martinez not only contends, as I do, that the Supreme Court of the United States was right in holding that the Federal Government has paramount jurisdiction of these submerged areas, but he goes further and contends that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by present law to take immediate administrative jurisdiction over these lands.

The letter from Mr. Martinez is of such great interest that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 14, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have asked my views in connection with the proposed legislation to permit continued production and further development of the mineral resources of the submerged ocean lands.

I have studied the enclosed pamphlet in your letter giving both sides of the controversy and, in accordance with other research in this field over a period of several years, I will outline my views and the results of my studies.

First, the Federal Government has the paramount authority in and is the owner of the so-called marginal sea area, that is, from ordinary low tide seaward 3 miles. The opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of

United States v. *California* made clear the ruling of the Supreme Court. The complaint of the United States alleged that the United States "is the owner in fee simple of, or possessed of paramount rights in and powers over, the lands, minerals, and other things of value underlying the Pacific Ocean, lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark off the coast of California and outside of the inland waters of the State, extending seaward three nautical miles." In the final decree in the California case the Court held that California had no property interest in the marginal sea area and that the United States had paramount rights. It was not, and is not, necessary for the Court to use the words "title" or "ownership." As the Court said in *United States* v. *California:*

"The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner."

In short, the highest and broadest and all-inclusive rights were vested in the United States. And this is as it should be. As the Court went on to say in *United States* v. *California:*

"The Government also appears in its capacity as a member of the family of nations. In that capacity it is responsible for conducting United States relations with other nations. It asserts that proper exercise of these constitutional responsibilities requires that it have power, unencumbered by State commitments, always to determine what agreements will be made concerning the control and use of the marginal sea and the land under it."

It is my opinion that in this marginal sea area national rights must be paramount at all times, and the National Government should not be encumbered with State authority or jurisdiction.

It is mere quibbling to say that the Supreme Court did not vest ownership in the United States. "Paramount rights" include the highest and broadest rights. Furthermore, it is superfluous to point out that the Court clearly held that the State of California, and consequently any other State, has no property interest whatsoever in the marginal sea area—that the States do not own, and never have owned the subsoil beneath the marginal sea.

Second, the so-called States' rights concept is wholly inapplicable and not advanced by its proponents in the best interests of the Nation. There has been tremendous agitation, as you well know, Senator, by some of the individual States in behalf of quitclaim legislation, or other similar legislation giving the States the marginal sea area, and I, as attorney general of New Mexico, have, of course, given very serious consideration to the claims made, or to be made in behalf of the States. As attorney general, it was and is my duty to closely peruse and evaluate the facts and to weigh the consequences. I will answer proposed quitclaim legislation by quoting the statement made by a fellow attorney general, the Honorable A. A. Carmichael, the attorney general of the State of Alabama. His statement was:

"If the Congress made such a gift to the States, it will be tragically derelict in its duty as the highest legislative body in the United States."

In effect, the proponents of the so-called States' rights concept are asking Congress to make an outright gift to a few States, particularly California, Texas, and Louisiana. It is my opinion that the tremendous subsea resources should be conserved and administered in accordance with the national interest and security to the benefit of all of the States. The argument of States' rights is wholly inapplicable. There can be no deprivation of rights if the States had no rights in the first place. The Supreme Court has held that the States never did own the marginal sea area.

The anomaly is that the so-called States' rights concept would benefit only a handful of States; whereas, Federal control could and would inure to the benefit of all the States, without sacrifice of national security and welfare. The tremendous subsea wealth could and would support many national public benefits or projects.

What is behind the States' rights concept? Does it seem logical that land-locked and inland States should be particularly concerned with the rights of a few coastal States, to the detriment of the inland States? And if the States' rights concept is the righteous issue, why is there vehement opposition to any legislation quitclaiming to the States, but reserving the right in the Federal authorities to administer the oil?

Unfortunately, the various pressure groups in behalf of the States, primarily the oil lobby, have shielded their activities in such a way that their real purpose—to control the subsea mineral wealth, particularly oil—has been disguised. It is inconceivable that the general welfare and national security would be benefited by donating the national wealth in the marginal sea to a few coastal States. The welfare of the people in the inland States is no less important than that of whose who reside in a coastal State.

I find no law to support the proposition often advanced that the States have always owned the marginal sea area. All the cases cited can be distiguished and all must be read in accordance with the facts in issue. In the first place, only in the past 10 or 15 years has the issue arisen as to the ownership of the area from ordinary low tide seaward 3 miles. The problem came squarely before the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *California*, and the highest Court in the United States held that the State does not, and did not, own. That should be sufficiently clear for all purposes. Nothing is gained by attempting to quote cases decided some 50 or 100 years ago on a different set of facts. No issue was ever presented 50 or 100 years ago concerning the area from low tide seaward 3 miles. The Supreme Court has spoken in clear and unmistakable terms in the three recent cases involving California, Louisiana, and Texas. I fail to see how there can be any further question. It is my opinion that the decisions in the three cases were well-reasoned and entirely in accordance with the law.

It is my further opinion that the various pressure groups, particularly the oil operators, have grossly misrepresented this problem to Congress. We are told that the oil operators and the handful of States involved are innocent pawns. To my knowledge, the wealth of the marginal sea area is still being drained since the June 1947 decision in *United States* v. *California* under leases from the States or their assignees. Are these innocent parties? Is a party innocent who continues operations on land in which the highest court had held that this party or its assignor or contractor had no property interest? I know of no other case in our history where there has been such flagrant contempt for the decision of our highest Court—I repeat—flagrant contempt for the decision of our highest Court.

For example, it is common knowledge that extensive oil operations continue in California in the offshore area and that the impounding of funds, pending settlement of the final question, is a loose and incomplete process. The State continues to lease to oil companies who are draining the national wealth, some of the leases being to other than the highest bidder, to the consequent loss to the Federal Government. Was there ever such a willful disregard of the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States? Can California or the oil companies leasing or claiming under the State of California claim that they are innocent parties or innocent operators, especially since the June 1947 decision? Why should several States and the particular oil companies drain the wealth that belongs to all the States and the entire Nation? I consider my own State of New Mexico as having a definite interest in the national wealth and resources that surround our Nation in the offshore area. No doubt, Senator, your own State of Wyoming is concerned that the national wealth is drained by a few. In truth and in fact the so-called "good faith" by a few States and some oil operators is both a travesty and an injustice.

Furthermore, I wish to raise this point. The purported good faith of the oil companies is far less worthy of protection than the extreme good faith of private applicants who filed on offshore areas under the laws of the United States duly passed by Congress. I am informed that many of these applicants filed 10 or 15 years ago and have been fighting their battle to preserve their rights singlehandedly. The private applicants filed under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, but because their resources are not extensive, their voice has been drowned by the oil operators and the States. I submit that Congress should give strong consideration to the good faith as honestly portrayed by private applicants, who are for the most part ordinary private citizens, who look to their Government to uphold law and order.

In concluding on this point, it is my opinion that unless there is much clear thinking done in this so-called tidelands question as it particularly relates to a few States and powerful oil companies, there is a strong possibility of a scandal which will dwarf any recorded in our past history. It is a matter for sober thought.

Third, the Federal Government should immediately take over and administer the marginal sea area. Since the decision in *United States* v. *California* in 1947, the statement has been made that there is no legislation or authority under which the Federal Government could act to take over and administer the marginal sea area. The categoric statement is made and apparently never questioned. Congress has always assumed legislation is necessary and must be passed, but Congress has never taken cognizance of legislation presently in effect. May I point out, Senator, the broad, clear provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Every time a statement has been made in regard to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the cry is immediately raised that it is not applicable. But those who raise the cry give no reason for its inapplicability.

It seems very strange that no inquiry is ever made of the applicability of the Mineral Leasing Act—only the complete assumption there is no legislation presently in effect that is applicable. If you will pardon the reference, Senator, the recital in Senate Joint Resolution 20, introduced by you and Senator ANDERSON, states:

"* * * thus making it essential that this resolution be enacted in order to protect the interests of the United States pending the enactment of permanent legislation by the Congress respecting the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf * * *."

The apparent assumption by all that the Mineral Leasing Act was inapplicable led me to investigate some time ago this matter fully. A detailed investigation of this categoric assumption revealed that the entire premise and assumption was based on a very short opinion of the solicitor of the Interior Department. It is my honest belief after much research and thought that the opinion of the able solicitor is not in the slightest supported by law. To be sure, the then Attorney General of the United States gave a cursory approval of the opinion, but rendered no opinion of his own.

It seems unthinkable that the opinion of the solicitor has in effect led to the loss by the United States Government of millions in revenue and has further been the basis of a passive policy by the United States Government as to the billions of dollars of our subsea wealth. But there is even stranger activity no doubt based on and in line with the opinion of the solicitor. For example, in the offshore area off the city of Long Beach, Calif., we find the ill-conceived and illegal stipulated line, entered into by the then Secretary of the Interior and Attorney General. Neither officer of the United States Government has or had the authority to give away the property or rights of the United States, and I believe those in authority in other States should be aware of these facts. The stipulation continues with the ostensible approval of the Federal Government, and the city of Long Beach and the oil operators enjoy for themselves alone the wealth that belongs to the entire Nation. May I refer the Senator to the original surveys in this area of California which clearly show that much of the area landward of the stipulated line is open sea of the Pacific Ocean. The city of Long Beach claims to have an inland water, but an inland water is not made by building harbor installations—and those installation were built with money from the resources that belong to the entire Nation. I particularly emphasize this point, Senator, because you have been quoted in the press as defending the position of Long Beach. It is my belief, Senator, that the stipulated line should be abolished and the entire harbor or offshore area of Long Beach claimed for the Federal Government. But the passive policy of the Federal Government has resulted in Long Beach and the oil companies involved enjoying the wealth from the resources that belong to the entire Nation, including the particular State which you and I serve.

Now let us examine the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Section 1 of the act provides:

"Deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas and land containing such deposits owned by the United States, including those in national forests, but excluding the lands acquired under * * * the Appalachian Forest Act, and those in national parks, and in lands withdrawn or reserved for military or naval uses or purposes, except as hereinafter provided, shall be subject to disposition."

In my opinion, the provision could not be clearer. The applicability of the Mineral Leasing Act to submerged lands is clear and the Secretary of the Interior should and could have taken over the marginal sea area for and on behalf of the Federal Government. The authority in the above act is clear.

In all of this discussion I am not unmindful of the Presidential proclamation of September 28, 1945, and the Executive order of the same date whereby the resources of the Continental Shelf were placed under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Interior "for administrative purposes, pending the enactment of legislation in regard thereto." But again this should be no barrier to the Secretary of the Interior.

Assuming that such legislation is necessary and assuming, as everyone has done, that the Mineral Leasing Act is not applicable, it is clear that the Defense Production Act of 1950 gives clear authority additionally. Very broad general powers are given to the Executive. The act is also broad in its statement of authority given the Executive to delegate to various departments of the Federal Government, and the Secretary of the Interior has the same general powers to conserve and administer the mineral resources of the United States. Unquestionably the Defense Production Act of 1950 also gives the Secretary of the Interior authority under which to act as to all the mineral resources of the United States, including the subsea resources.

In connection with any proposed legislation, including Senate Joint Resolution 20, one very important consideration should not be overlooked. In view of the broad general scope of the legislation presently in effect, any legislation hereafter passed by Congress, including any interim bill, will result in numerous uncertainties and conflicts. It is my understanding, for example, that there are numerous suits pending in the Federal court in Washington, D. C., to test the applicability of the Mineral Leasing Act. The question of the arbitrary taking of property rights and the effect of retroactive legislation will also no doubt be the subject of litigation primarily by private applicants. If the Mineral Leasing Act is declared applicable, and my opinion is that such an eventuality is highly probable, we will then be in a maze of conflicts. Under the aforesaid circumstances, the national interest and national defense can only suffer.

Thus, I have the basis as pointed out for my great concern that the Secretary of the Interior should take action immediately to take over the lands in the marginal sea area. Present draining of the national wealth by a few is not in the best interests of the nation. I feel that my own State has great interests at stake, along with all the other States. The attitude of the Secretary of the Interior and the entire national policy, or lack of national policy, should not be based on the very questionable opinion written by the Solicitor of the Interior Department. The Secretary of the Interior has every right and authority to take over and administer the submerged lands in the marginal sea area for and on behalf of and in the interests of the entire Nation. And this right, in my opinion, is clear under existing legislation, particularly the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended.

Any proposed legislation at the present time will only help those who have shown themselves to be ruthless trespassers attempting to nullify the clear import of the decision of the highest court of the United States; it would aid only those who continue to violate the law—a few States, their assigns, and the oil companies. We can hardly expect the respect and obedience of ordinary citizens of law and order if trespassers are to be rewarded. Furthermore, any legislation will undoubtedly result in further legal action by others claiming rights in the marginal sea area thereby making the picture more cloudy. Meanwhile the trespassers will continue to drain the oil resources of the entire Nation, and attempt to nullify the clear import of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I don't wish to be misunderstood in this matter. The tremendous efforts you have exerted personally, and your committee, in an attempt to reach a satisfactory solution deserve the highest praise, and all who have knowledge of this problem are deeply appreciative. There are various stumbling blocks which cannot be overcome by legislation containing the various provisions that have been proposed, quitclaim and otherwise. It is my sincere belief that the national welfare and security, or foremost concern, can be benefited only by immediate, direct, and forceful action by the Secretary of the Interior in assuming control and administration of the 3-mile belt under presently existing legislation. Only in this manner can the rights of all persons be given due consideration, without sacrifice of the national welfare and security.

With kindest personal regards, and thanking you for this opportunity to express my views in this matter, I remain

Very truly yours,

JOE L. MARTINEZ,
Attorney General.

Reclamation Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by me to the Nebraska Reclamation Association last February, dealing with the recommendations of the special Commission appointed by the President to recommend a national water policy.

It is my information, Mr. President, that the Water Resources Policy Commission, upon completion of its three-volume report in February, submitted to the President the proposed legislation to which I referred in my remarks. It is understood that this was impounded by the Bureau of the Budget pending receipt of comments from the affected Federal agencies on the report. Doubtless some time will elapse before the Congress is advised of the administration's program.

I note that several national organizations have appointed special committees for studying the report and to make specific recommendations on it. Among these are the National Reclamation Association, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the Edison Electric Institute. In view of the scope of the subject, and the inevitable struggle between State's rights advocates as against bureaucracy, it will probably be some months before we shall see the final proposals of the administration.

It is related that several Bureau of Reclamation speakers during the Spokane, Wash., meeting of the National Reclamation Association last November each began by stoutly affirming, "I am a bureaucrat." Webster's New International Dictionary, unabridged, defines bureaucracy as "a system of government by bureau heads, responsible only to administrative officers above them, having complete power over subordinates and, in official duties generally, not subject to the common law of the land." Which side will Senators support?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION POLICIES

(Address by Senator HUGH BUTLER)

About mid-December the Nation was advised by the press that something new had been submitted to the President, by a special commission appointed by him, relating to a water policy for the American people. This seven-man commission was created by an Executive order dated January 3, 1950, and it was declared to be a temporary agency of the President.

The Commission released at this time volume I of its report to the President. This volume contains the findings and the recommendations of the Commission. It is, in many respects, a splendid summary of exhaustive studies based upon the experience of Federal agencies in the fields of land uses,

reclamation, flood control, water transportation, and their byproducts. Some of its recommendations are timely and are deserving of our continued consideration. I commend especially those recommendations concerning the necessity for more basic data and those stressing the importance of watershed management. I am inclined to agree generally with the reference to the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in the selection of agricultural programs. However, I should like to discuss with you some of their recommendations about which I am uncertain and therefore suspicious. I have no knowledge of the nature of the legislation this Commission is now preparing to accomplish the achievement of its policy, therefore let us review the situation as it was developed. Paragraph 2 of the Executive order reads:

"The President's Water Resources Policy Commission shall study, and make recommendations to the President with respect to, Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes to the extent that they are directly concerned with water resources. The Commission shall give consideration in particular to (a) the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water-resources programs, (b) an appraisal of the priority of water-resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, (c) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water-resources projects, and (d) desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources."

It appears that the Commission in some instances failed to achieve the goals in its charter, and in others went beyond the scope of its assignments. These are not necessarily serious faults. But as I read the introduction to the report, it seems to me that the recommendations are couched in such broad phraseology that definite conclusions as to their meaning is very difficult, if not impossible. I shall go into some details. However, let me assure you that any reasonable man, upon reading the whole of the policy as expressed in the 70 recommendations, could readily say that if a new and different policy is not here suggested, the study presented certainly leans strongly toward centralization of authority to be vested in a few men responsible only to Washington.

I will now briefly examine some of the 70 recommendations which make up the policy submitted to the President, confining myself to those that clearly concern the functions of reclamation and flood control. All recommendations are in conformity with certain principles the Commission first adopted, and they named this set of rules a framework. Let us examine this before we discuss the recommendations.

The framework is this: (1) Water resources programs are to achieve regional and national goals; (2) planning water resources works shall be through a single coordinator for each basin or region; (3) the test for the financial feasibility of the works should be standardized by simple rules; (4) all beneficiaries of public works should pay their share of the costs; (5) costs and reimbursements should be lumped together for each river basin, and the merits of individual undertakings should not be controlling.

I point out certain particular recommendations to show the general character and trend of the thinking of the Commission:

No. 1: "As a guide to national investment in natural resources development, all Federal agencies should be directed to judge new river basin programs in terms of a set of clearly defined national objectives established by Congress."

No. 4, in part: "Congress should set up a separate river basin commission for each of the major basins. These commissions, set up on a representative basis, should be authorized to coordinate the surveys, construction activities, and operations of the Federal agencies in the several basins, under the guidance of independent chairmen appointed by the President and with the participation of State agencies in the planing process."

No. 3: "Congress should direct the responsible Federal agencies to submit new proposals for water resources development to Congress only in the form of basin programs which deal with entire basins as units and which take into account all relevant purposes in water and land development. This multiple-purpose basin approach should apply to the whole process by which water-resources projects move from the survey to the authorization and appropriation stages."

Before going further, let us consider what principles we start out with. We have here as clear a recommendation as could be written for a valley-authority type of planning, development, and administration. While local interests may be consulted in the planning state, thereafter, they and their representatives in the Congress are out of the picture. Thereafter, the Congress only appropriates funds and the people pay whatever the separate river basin commissions determine to be necessary to make some repayments of the costs, and to provide funds for the employment of large numbers of investigators and administrators without limit. The question arises, naturally, as to the origin of these principles and recommendations.

On examination, it is evident that the several subcommittees appointed to prepare task-force reports on reclamation, power, navigation, and so forth, were completely controlled by employees of agencies of the Federal Government. Indeed, it is difficult to find in the list of the committee memberships the name of anyone not an employee of the Government. The only way the public had an opportunity to influence the finding of the Commission was through presentations at the half-dozen, or so, hearings held in the country.

I was on the Senate committee that held hearings on S. 555, Seventy-ninth Congress, a bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority. I signed the adverse report on this bill. I relate this to illustrate how sensitive I am to any bills which recommend commissions, administrations, or authorities to operate on an exclusive basis the programs for the development of water resources in the country. It will be specifically proposed by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission that 10 major basins be designated for the United States, each to be supervised by a river basin commission responsible to the President.

Going next to recommendations Nos. 8 and 14:

No. 8: "The orderly formulation of national water resources programs requires the establishment of a Federal Board of Review appointed by the President with the confirmation of the Senate. This Board should perform, among others, the functions of the review agencies recommended in the reports of the Hoover Commission."

No. 14: "Congress should direct all Federal departments and agencies responsible for the development of water and land resources, in cooperation with interested States, to promptly review all existing plans and programs, and to cooperate in preparing coordinated plans for water resources development for the several river basins. Plans already authorized by Congress should remain undisturbed unless this review results in specific recommendations for change."

Now we have the manifesto of the Commission. If a board of review were appointed with the powers suggested, such board would constitute the top level control of all the planning, construction and operation of reclamation, power and flood-control projects in the 17 Western States. Does anyone here have any doubts about it?

Perhaps I am prejudging the policy. In a short time, we will have the proposed legislation of the Commission, and it is hoped that it will be in a form fully understood by the Congress. We have seen an outstanding example of administrative misinterpretation of a simple statute where section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 is given as congressional approval to utility-type contracts with the water users on reclamation projects. I hope we may have the opportunity soon to correct this misinterpretation which is an evasion and nullification of basic reclamation law, both as to repayment and water rights. For this reason we will be obliged to scrutinize any new legislation with particular care.

Recommendations Nos. 25 and 26 are in such form that I am free to admit of ignorance as to what is mean by reimbursement for the various benefits of water conservation projects. No ceiling on repayment periods is suggested. The Congress will want to know about this, and about the controls over a farmer and his properties that may be required by the Secretary of the Interior, the Board of Review, or by the River Basin Commission. Perhaps the recommended legislation will include a section giving to the administration the power to enforce such rules and regulations as it deems proper in order to carry out its objectives. The Congress represents the people and cannot safely surrender its prerogatives to protect their interests. I do not intend to sponsor or to support legislation which will deny the rights of the people in the West to self-determination, and I speak broadly, in the matter of planning, use, and operation, and responsibility in local administration in connection with their own resources of land and water.

The executive department of our Government is rapidly and boldly assuming to itself powers never intended by law, and its stated objective is the valley authority form of river basin government. Would you expect the Water Policy Commission to act in a manner contrary to the plans of the President?

I hope this association will do its part in supporting the resolutions of your national organization, which I considered of sufficient importance to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let us keep, in these troubled times, a clear and definite resolution to extend and preserve local autonomy.

To further and strengthen State rights in both the planning and development of its water resources, I suggest that this association could profitably consider endorsing legislation giving to the Governor, the State engineer, and the attorney general the authority and responsibility in these matters commensurate with their importance. Such legislation might create a commission including an attorney and an engineer, not employees or officers of the State, to pass on project feasibilities, on legalities of repayment districts and their financial capabilities. This procedure would not entail great expenditures and it would serve as a clearinghouse where there would be a guarantee of mutuality between Federal agencies and agencies of the State.

An Awakening America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, well fed, well clothed, well housed, comparatively happy and prosperous, careless and unthinking, in recent years the American people have let the Government get away from them.

Engaged in the pursuit of prosperity and happiness, of the good things of life, all too often complaining, demanding more of the Federal Government, forgetting that the Federal Government has nothing which it does not take first from them, our people have gone along the easy road.

Neither the first, the second nor the third world wars, with all the sacrifices made by those who either volunteered or were conscripted to fight in those wars, made our people conscious of what was happening to their Government and through that Government to them. Waste, extravagance, selfishness, corruption, and criminality—all grew and thrived throughout the Federal Government.

It took the removal of General MacArthur—the patriot who unselfishly for 52 years has given his surpassing talent in the service of our Armed Forces—to awaken them to a realization of what has been happening here. The removal of General MacArthur from his commands in Asia made possible his return to America—has given the American people the opportunity of learning first-hand the situation as it exists in Asia.

If now the people will follow through, heed the advice of Abraham Lincoln, when, on February 11, 1861, at Indianapolis, Ind., he told them, "It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me," our Nation's future will be secure.

Lincoln then added, "I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents' not with office seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Editors, not only within but without the great metropolitan centers, often lead the thought of our people. Permit me to read three editorials. The first is from the pen of Mark P. Haines, who publishes the Sturgis Journal at Sturgis, Mich., and it reads as follows:

A DAY OF DEGRADATION

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, conqueror of Japan, and one of the greatest military tacticians the Nation has ever produced, has been fired. Not since Gen. Benedict Arnold tried to sell out his country in the war that won independence for the United States, has there occurred an event comparable in infamy to Truman's incredible abuse of his power.

Today the American people are stunned and bewildered by the contemptible action of President Harry Truman in removing from his high office a man whose achievements and reputation so far transcend those of the puny man in the White House that it is like a gnat trying to sting an elephant.

Under the Pendergast ward-heeler who tries to act like a President the Nation now touches a new low in political and diplomatic expediency. Ashamed and humiliated this once proud country bows its head in anger and indignation.

It will be a day of rejoicing for America's enemies. Removed from power is the one man of whom the Kremlin is afraid. It will bring satisfaction to the snipers in the United Nations which has never demonstrated any real desire for a decisive victory in the Korean war. From the very first, General MacArthur has seen the Korean conflict for what it really is—the initial move of the Communists to conquer the world.

Handicapped by diplomatic commissars in Washington and with only half-hearted and wholly inadequate support from other U. N. nations he has waged a magnificent war in Korea. Now, with victory in sight, he is removed from command by a disgruntled politician in Washington who has abjectly capitulated to the Reds in the U. N., England, and France. All of the bloody sacrifices that this country has made in Korea are now outweighed by consideration for our phony friends in the U. N.

One ray of hope remains. Douglas MacArthur is free now to return to the country he has served so well. He will be able to tell the American people the true story of what is happening in the Orient. We predict that it will arouse the Nation as it has not been aroused since Pearl Harbor was bombed by the Japs.

General MacArthur has not been fired by the American people he has served so generously. He will live forever as a symbol of our military genius along with Washington, Grant, Pershing, Sherman, and many others.

The time is now at hand for the American people to fire President Truman. It had better be soon.

The second editorial is written by Stanley Banyon, at one time an associate and adviser of Michigan's Senator William Alden Smith, now editor of the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, Mich. Mr. Banyon wrote:

AMERICA BETRAYED

The American tragedy of incompetence and intrigue in the highest echelons of the Nation's Government has come to a blazing climax with the dismissal by President Truman of General MacArthur, as supreme American commander in the Far East.

We refer explicitly to General MacArthur as the American commander, although his formal title has been United Nations commander. That is a misnomer and phony.

There is not now, and never has been, a United Nations worthy of the name. It was and now remains a delusion of addled brains.

Exercising his perogative as Commander in Chief, Mr. Truman dismissed one of America's greatest heroes because that man was compelled by patriotism and conviction to violate a rule of silence imposed upon him.

The Truman alibis will not fool the American people. As a soldier, General MacArthur owed obedience to his superior officer, but there are limits. Washington's foreign policy became so utterly insane that the commander in the field had no moral alternative but to speak out in protest.

For his morality and his courage, General MacArthur has been kicked out. He was discharged by a small-time politician who, confronted with the choice of standing by his subordinate and the American people or bowing to the dictates of a mercenary Britain, gave obeisance to the latter.

If there were any remaining tendrils of confidence in the White House and State Department, they have been destroyed by the President of the United States.

If there remained any hope that order would somehow miraculously emerge from chaos in Washington, it has been dashed.

The people, General MacArthur and thousands of American boys who are fighting in Korea over the bloody ground where their comrades died, have been betrayed.

The dismissal of General MacArthur is the greatest victory ever won by Josef Stalin.

There is joy and gaiety, no doubt, in the Kremlin, because the appeasers of infidel communism have triumphed. British trade has won and democracy has compromised with perfidy.

It will be hollow victory and a short one. The people of America are aroused as perhaps never before in the history of the Republic.

The Truman-Acheson gang must go. It will go into ignoble oblivion, forever disgraced.

It is the Truman policy—if such it may be called—to feed American flesh into the Korean maw, but to guarantee to the enemy that his bases shall be inviolate, his frontiers secure.

It is the Truman policy to accept the dictates of foreign schemers at whatever sacrifice may be entailed.

It is the Truman policy to appease communism in the east and mass America's resources to combat communism in the west.

It is nothing short of idiocy if not worse.

From the dark days of Bataan to the surrender of Japan in Tokyo Bay in 1945, General MacArthur led the forces of freedom back the long, heartbreaking road by land and sea. Because of his genius, Japan was speedily rehabilitated, morally, politically, and economically to become our stanch ally. Under his leadership American prestige rose to its greatest peak in Asia while American prestige and European will to survive ebbed in the west.

Washington condemned General MacArthur to the ill-starred Korean adventure. It refused his appeals for permission to knock out the Reds; it spurned his advice; it withheld from him the freedom of action to fight for victory.

In the darkness of this tragic hour in American history, there still shines the light of hope. The people at last shall know the truth, because General MacArthur is no longer forced to remain silent. He is free at last to return to the United States and to expose our country's plight.

In this climactic hour, General MacArthur has gained stature, and Harry Truman the bewildered has shrunk to pygmy size, a lackey for British socialist-imperialism.

The third editorial appeared in the Times-Herald of Washington the day after General MacArthur addressed the Congress. It follows:

AN AMERICAN SPEAKS

"Old soldiers never die. They just fade away."

But if this was the fade-out of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, it was accomplished in a blinding flash of light.

RING OF TRUTH

No one who heard the general's intensely moving and dramatic oration will forget it. No one will fail to agree with its logic and compelling truth. In a stroke the fumbling debate over America's fumbling course in Korea was ended. The confusion was dispelled. There is nothing any longer to argue. There is no possibility of refutation.

For the country heard a great man, a sincere man, a patriot, speak. In long years it has not heard a voice like that. The

glittering forensics of such a marter politician as Franklin Roosevelt were, in comparison, the sparkle of fool's gold, to catch the votes of fools.

The speeches of President Truman were reduced to the pitiful disclosures of the limits of a small mind.

For General MacArthur spoke, not to win something, but to save the two greatest things in his world—the security and liberty of the United States, and the infinitely precious lives of Americans wearing the same uniform as he. Of these Americans, thrown by Presidential warrant li to the slaughter in Korea without reference to Congress, with its constitutional prerogative of declaring war, MacArthur said:

"It was my constant effort to preserve them and end this savage conflict honorably and with the least loss of time and a minimum sacrifice of life."

HYPOCRISY IS NAILED

But, in this endeavor, their commander made unmistakably clear he was frustrated. If one is in a war—no matter how one may abhor war—the only possible o ject can be victory. When Red China intervened, after MacArthur's forces had totally defeated the original North Korean adversary, he called for reinforcements. He was told none would be forthcoming. He then proposed a series of military measures, none of them envisioning an insane ground war with China. The views he advanced were "fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

"Including the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

What consummate hypocrisy, then, was manifested by General Bradley, when Mr. Truman's chairman of the Joint Chiefs endeavored to counteract General MacArthur's address by publicly declaring, in advance of it, that the views entertained by MacArthur were "contrary to our best interests, and by jeopardizing world peace, ultimately would threaten our security." Bradley becomes a mere lackey for Truman.

But the military measures advanced by General MacArthur were not accepted. His counsel was spurned in "lay circles." What can that mean, except that the Nation's greatest military man was overruled by Truman, by Secretary of State Acheson, by the State Department appeasers who think that Communists can be jollied into good behavior, by the British foreign office, which seeks the preservation of its Asiatic colonial interests and its trade, and by the United Nations, that organization of global Mr. Micawbers, which spends its time, as the Korean conflict goes on and on, always in the hope that "something will turn up."

"The Chinese Communist intervention," said General MacArthur, "presented the fact of a new war. It called for new decisions in the diplomatic sphere to permit the realistic adjustment of military strategy. But," the general said, "such decisions have not been forthcoming."

WAR'S OBJECT IS VICTORY

Truman dawdled, Acheson dawdled, the appeasers thought up suitable bribes which might tickle the fancy of Communist China—among them the surrender of the island of Formosa, indispensable to America's future security—and the British aniped.

"I have constantly called for the new political solution essential to a solution," said MacArthur, for to continue in the course of inertia was to accept a situation which forbade victory and would result in the constant attrition of America's forces.

"War's very object is victory," the general said, "not prolonged indecision."

For all of his efforts to win the war or end it honorably and to save life, the reward the general received was, in his own words, "to be called a warmonger," especially by those foreign elements, particularly British which were forever seeking to discredit and undermine his position—their own stake, through combat participation in Korea, being negligible.

When the State Department appeasers temptingly held out their bribes to the Communist enemy—even to the promise of Formosa, whose surrender, in MacArthur's view, could entail an American retreat to the west coast—his soldiers asked him: Why surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field?

"I could not answer."

HIS GREATEST SERVICE

General MacArthur has put before Congress its duty to the American people, and to their sons in Korea. It is to abandon the U. N. program of drift and delay, the Acheson program of bestowing a loving embrace upon Communist assassins to court their favor, the Truman program of consigning Americans to the meat grinder of a never-ending war, the British program of using the United Nations and our own State Department to hold the arms of the American fighting man while the Reds slug him.

General MacArthur's magnificent appearance was the final service in a career of 52 years of "an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty." Of all his memorable services, this, perhaps, was the greatest.

Importance of United Public Opinion on Public Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 16, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have long been acquainted with the work of an organization devoted to advancing American ideals on the international scene, called the Society for the Prevention of World War III. It had been my intention to address the semiannual meeting of its board of directors in New York City on the 29th day of this month, but because of my official duties as a delegate to the International Labor Conference in Geneva, I shall be out of the country on that date. I therefore ask that the text of the address which I had intended to deliver may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE SEMIANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 29, 1951

In the long run, the lifeblood of a dynamic democracy is nourished by the active participation of all the people in the crucial issues affecting their lives. The shrewdest observers of the American scene have noted that the vitality of our democratic institutions has in a large measure stemmed from the fact that throughout our land there are numerous private organizations sponsored by groups of citizens actively dedicated to the security of our institutions and the solution of our economic, political, and social problems. These organizations provide our people with the opportunity to participate in the life of our country and to ultimately contribute to its security and the shaping of its destiny.

The various representatives of departments of our Government consult with these private organizations from time to time, since they provide our Government with a cross section of American public opinion and thereby enable our officials to formulate policies corresponding to the needs and wishes of the people. These organizations therefore play a vital role in strengthening the hand of Government whether it be in time of peace or of war.

Among these organizations which have come to my attention over the past few years and in which I have been particularly interested, is the Society for the Prevention of World War III. It is a unique organization. Indeed, I do not believe that there is any other group of its kind in this country today. Strange as it may seem the Society for the Prevention of World War III was founded during the latter part of World War II when the fortunes of the Allies were rising and the future of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis was bleak. Yet its founders were farsighted enough to stress the importance of preventing World War III. They were realists, and it was their firm conviction that unless the seeds of World War I which flowered into World War II were destroyed, then the United States and the rest of the world would be confronted with a greater and more devastating holocaust.

As is characteristic with most American organizations and groups, the founders of the Society for the Prevention of World War III came from all walks of life. I am personally familiar with their backgrounds, their complete devotion to American ideals, and their high sense of honor and integrity.

Permit me to dwell for a moment on the identity of some of the founders of the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

Mr. Rex Stout, the well-known author, who served with distinction as chairman of the War Writers Board during World War II, was one of the Society's leading spirits. During the war he took on the task of exposing the propaganda of the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis and his devastating barbs made the Nazis and the henchmen of Hirohito most unhappy.

Mr. C. Monteith Gilpin was another founder of the Society for the Prevention of World War III. Though a lawyer by profession, Mr. Gilpin devoted much of his time to analyzing world events and was a keen student of German militarism.

Mr. Lyle Evans Mahan was the first vice president of the Society. As the son of the brilliant Admiral Mahan, he captured the spirit of his father's concern for American security.

Herbert C. Pell succeeded Mr. Mahan as vice president of the Society for the Prevention of World War III. Mr. Pell is among our most distinguished Americans. His reputation is firmly established not only in the United States but abroad. He is a student of history, a statesman, and a diplomat. Mr. Pell was former American Ambassador to Portugal and Hungary. He was the former vice chairman of the Democratic National Campaign Committee, and, from 1919–21 he served as a member of the Sixty-sixth Congress. His profound understanding of international events was a decided asset to the Society's work. Mr. Pell was the American delegate to the Allied War Crimes Commission, which organization prepared the ground work for the international war-crimes trials. Through his long experiences abroad, Mr. Pell was able to discern the pattern of German aggression long before it became evident to most of his countrymen. I can say without exaggeration that not only the Society, but the American people at large, are fortunate in having in their midst this wonderful citizen and clear thinker.

Among the other members of the Society's council are to be found such distinguished leaders of American thought as Mr. Louis Nizer, nationally prominent attorney, and author of several books, including the much-read What To Do With Germany; Mr. Dean Alfange, formerly chairman of the Liberal Party; Mr. Clarence H. Low, the well-known former treasurer of the Democratic State Committee of New York; Dr. Bernard De Voto, of the editorial board of Harper's magazine and the Saturday Review of Literature; Mr. William L. Shirer, the internationally famous radio commentator, author, and foreign correspondent; Mr. Quentin Reynolds, the universally beloved war correspondent; Mr. William B. Ziff, prominent New York and Chicago publisher; Rear Adm. S. S. Isquith, retired, one of the great heroes of Pearl Harbor; Mr. R. J. Thomas, the respected labor leader; Prof. Mark Van Doren, of Columbia University; Dr. Lewis Mumford, the well-known philosopher and historian; Mr. Richard De Rochemont, producer of the March of Time; Dr. Albert Simard, a founder and leader of that powerful arm of French resistance during the Nazi occupation, France Forever; the Reverend Roelif H. Brooks, respected rector of St. Thomas' Church in New York; and Mr. Morris L. Cooke, the distinguished consulting engineer who has served our Government in a dozen vital capacities during three different wars.

Another of the Society's founders is Mr. Isidore Lipschutz, successful businessman whose experiences in Europe and knowledge of the fundamental forces making for war, equipped him to play an important role in the development of the Society's educational work.

The men who organized the Society were convinced that as a first step toward preventing a new war, it would be essential to eradicate the roots of German aggression. They were fully aware that these roots were deep in the soil of German history. The German impulse to war goes back to the days of Frederick the Great. Later, this militaristic drive enabled Prussia to conquer the rest of Germany and then to inflict a devastating defeat on France in 1870. As we all know, the German drive of conquest did not stop in the nineteenth century. On the contrary, in 1914 Prussian militarism ran rampant spreading death and destruction throughout Europe. Had it not been for the timely intervention of the United States, the dreams of the Kaiser may well have been realized.

The special victim of this aggression has, of course, been our sister Republic of France—the country whose history has, along with our own, so often provided the birthplace for new movements of liberty and freedom. During the Second World War, in connection with my official duties, I had occasion again and again to realize the unbelievable, unjustifiable and inhuman suffering to which the people of France have been put as a result of three wars of German aggression within the last 75 years—and we must look through the eyes of the widows and orphans of France, if we would appraise Prussian terrorism fully as the evil thing that it is.

The humanist traditions of Goethe, Heine, Schiller could not withstand the paralysis of Prussian militarism and its goose-stepping culture. The glorification of war became the dominant theme of those who controlled the minds and the destinies of the German people. It was expressed in the ideology of Pan-Germanism which intoxicated the Germans with the idea that they were the super race and that the German Nation had the special mission to rule the world and to establish the German order everywhere.

As early as 1905, the Pan-German professor, Josef Ludwig Reimer, wrote in his book A Pan-German Germany, "Our race with its culture is superior to all the other nations and races of the earth; for * * * our civilization has reached a height where it incomparably excels and dominates that of all the other nations and races of the earth." This mad boast was repeated by Kaiser Wilhelm II who, in his saber-rattling speech at Tangier in 1905, said: "We are the salt of the earth * * * God has created us so that we should civilize the world."

Germans who had been brought up in the humanist traditions found life in Germany intolerable. Many of them departed, repeating the exodus of German liberals from Germany in 1848. Several of these Germans were associated with the foundation of the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

Two internationally known figures who lived most of their lives as Germans but who also departed from the growing militarism of their native land, were Dr. Emil Ludwig, the noted historian, and Prof. Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, philosopher, educator, and statesman. Dr. Ludwig spared no effort during World War II to counsel the Allies as to the policies they should pursue in the occupation of Germany. His was the voice of experience and many of his suggestions received the serious consideration of Allied officials.

Dr. Foerster who came from an old Prussian family with a long militaristic tradition almost lost his life in his dauntless efforts to put the world on the alert regarding the intentions of the German militarists. Dr. Foerster is probably the leading authority on Pan-Germanism and his works have an international reputation. His numerous books on philosophy and education have been translated into most European languages and his teachings today are applied by German educators.

Professor Foerster's voice was not stilled when he was forced in 1923 to flee from the clutches of the German General Staff. In 1926, when the great powers met in Geneva, Switzerland, to discuss disarmament, Dr. Foerster boldly revealed the plans of the German General Staff to secretly rearm behind the pacifistic mouthings of the German Foreign Minister Stresemann in whom so many western statesmen had confidence. Throughout the 1930's, Professor Foerster warned against the folly of appeasing Hitler and foretold that that policy would only hasten the day when the German armies would sweep over Europe. We Americans owe Dr. Foerster a debt of gratitude for his courageous and sacrificial efforts to alert us in time as to the true intentions of the Nazis and the German militarists. Though Dr. Foerster is 80 years old, he continues to lend leadership and wise counsel, and it is my sincere hope that we Americans shall always take heed of what he says.

These are some of the individuals who helped create the Society for the Prevention of World War III. And as I have indicated, they did so motivated by the highest kind of patriotism. I realize that my description of Pan-Germanism has been brief, and I could elaborate more fully on it. Perhaps the following illustration will make clear just what Pan-Germanism means, not only in terms of world peace but in terms of the security of the United States of America.

I believe that it is not generally known by most Americans that in 1899 Commander Dewey, who later became admiral, reported to the United States Navy a most significant conversation he had held with the German admiral, von Goetzen. This occurred shortly before the battle of Manila Bay took place and at a time when a clash seemed imminent between German naval cruisers and American warships. Von Goetzen told Commander Dewey (and here, so that there can be no misunderstanding, let me say that I am quoting from the official archives of the U. S. Navy Department, record 38 vol. 52, p. 558): "About 15 years from now my country will start a great war. She will be in Paris about 2 months after the commencement of hostilities. Her move on Paris will be but a step to her real object—the crushing of England. Some months after we finish our work in Europe we will take New York and probably Washington and hold them for some time. We will put your country in its place with reference to Germany. We do not propose to take any of your territory, but we do intend to take a billion or so of your dollars from New York and other places. The Monroe Doctrine will be taken charge of by us. We will then have to put you in your place and we will take charge of South America as we wish to. Don't forget, about 15 years from now it will interest you."

The predictions of the German admiral seemed fantastic; yet, as we all know, World War I started 16 years later. How many of our leaders understood at that time the aspirations of pan-Germanism and what a serious challenge they were to our very existence? I do not believe that many did. But the record does show that Admiral Mahan, as early as 1890, understood the real face of German imperialism. In his book, The United States Looking Outward, he wrote:

"All over the world German commercial and colonial push is coming into collision with other nations. * * * It is noteworthy that, while these various contentions are sustained with the aggressive military spirit characteristic of the German Empire, they are credibly said to arise from the national temper more than from the deliberate policy of the Government which in this matter does not lead, but follows the feeling of the people—a condition much more formidable."

These documents were first brought to the general attention of the American people when they were published in the third issue of the Society's magazine, Prevent World War III, in September 1944. These documents and others which the Society has published from time to time show how far back we have to go to understand the forces underlying the upsurge of nazism.

The Society for the Prevention of World War III was never under any illusions with regard to nazism. It did not regard Hitlerism as an aberration or as a passing phenomenon. On the contrary, the Society saw in nazism the twentieth-century expression of the Pan-German drive for world conquest and the subversion of other nations by force, infiltration, and trickery.

Professor Foerster, who, as I said, is probably our outstanding authority on the problem, has reported from time to time the aims of the Pan-Germans. He quoted the Kaiser as stating during the First World War that "Three Punic wars will be needed to crush the Anglo-American powers." He has reported the statements of leading German geopoliticians: "The First World War destroyed France as a first-rate power. The Second World War inflicted deadly wounds on the British Empire, and the third world war will deal the death blow to the United States." Professor Foerster has also quoted Hitler's leading geopolitician and adviser, Haushofer, as telling an American newspaper correspondent, Carlton Smith, "Young men, we think in terms of centuries. In case we should lose this war you may be sure that from the first hour of the armistice we shall prepare for the next war."

Is it any wonder that the people who founded the Society stressed the importance of preventing the recurrence of German militarism? They were well aware of the nature of Pan-Germanism in all its guises, whether it be nazism, supernationalism, or aggressive militarism. The Society has constantly refused to underestimate the intentions of the German master minds. They have never indulged in wishful thinking. That is why the Society's educational program is based on the record of German

history and on the nature of Pan-Germanism.

The Society was determined to inform the people as to the dangers not merely of nazism but of the whole complex of militaristic and chauvinistic doctrines which have saturated the German mind for almost 100 years.

From 1943 to the present, the Society has endeavored to explain and enlighten the American people as to the meaning of the German problem and its relationship to world peace and security. In planning the peace, the Society, on the basis of its studies, suggested that a realistic solution of the German problem would involve the following:

1. That Germany's war potential be whittled down to genuine peacetime needs.

2. That encouragement be given to the development of German light industries.

3. That Germany compensate at least in part in reparations to those nations victimized by her aggressions.

4. That the huge German cartels and economic concentrations be smashed so as to foster the development of genuine free enterprise, something which the Germans have never known.

5. That all the major war criminals who were responsible for the mass slaughter of millions of human beings be apprehended and prosecuted to the fullest extent of international law.

6. That a realistic and thorough denazification program be enforced so as to prevent the same forces which served the Kaiser and then Hitler from regaining positions of power.

7. That German political institutions be decentralized, thereby avoiding the re-creation of a new Reich

8. That all German assets and loot salted away in neutral countries be vested in the allies and allocated proportionately to all the victims of German aggression.

9. That a broad program of democratization be instituted as a first step toward eradicating the superman obsession of the German people.

10. That such institutions and organizations as churches, trade unions, business associations, be encouraged to partake in the development of a truly democratic Germany which could be accepted into the family of nations.

These fundamental recommendations were not out of step with our national interests. On the contrary, they formed the core of American policy in Germany in 1945. This fact alone demonstrates that the Society's educational program was predicated at all times on the basic desire to serve the national interest. Through the years the Society has endeavored through its manifold educational program to enlighten the people on the German problem. The Society's literature, particularly its bimonthly magazine, Prevent World War III, and the booklet, Know Your Enemy, has been widely read and circulated. During the war requests for the Society's regular publications as well as requests for specific research jobs in connection with Army orientation programs came to the Society from military establishments in the United States and abroad. All of this material was provided free of charge. I think it appropriate to read excerpts from some of the letters I have seen from Army establishments which assess the Society's educational work in relation to the Army orientation programs.

Here are some examples:

"[This Society's magazine] is splendid source material for the lectures that my orientation officer and I have been working up, and I am most anxious to obtain a copy. I should be very grateful to learn how I can do so. I should like also to get approximately three copies of Know Your Enemy for my orientation reading room. It is most encouraging to learn that this educational work, so necessary to prevent a recurrence of war, is being carried on. I feel that informing my men on this subject is a vital part of their training." (Letter to Rex Stout, president, Society for the Prevention of World War III; signed by Brig. Gen. Eric S. Molitor, Camp Mackall, N. C.)

"I was much taken by the first-rate analysis of the troop information problem as presented in your October letter to the Secretary of War. * * * I enjoyed my brief visit to New York, the meeting of the writers' board and the opportunity to meet you and some of your friends." (Letter to Isidore Lipschutz, treasurer, Society for the Prevention of World War III; signed by Brig. Gen. C. T. Lanham, Director, Information and Education Division of the War Department.)

In connection with this, it is interesting to note that Brigadier General Lanham incorporated some of the Society's studies in official publications.

"I wish to take this occasion to acknowledge receipt of and to thank you for your literature dedicated to the prevention of world war III. The material was extremely interesting to me and is very vividly and effectively presented. Your line of reasoning and logical conclusions cannot fail to impress all who see it with the scope and importance of your venture. It is one which should not fail." (Signed by Col. Delmar T. Spivey, of the Army Air Corps in Barksdale Field, La.)

"I have been distributing society material to every suborganization in the field artillery school and the field artillery replacement training center as well as post headquarters organizations. I have also checked with other officers and they state my distribution has been their only source of supply. They also praise very highly the type of material you are putting out." (Signed by Maj. Albert W. Holt, post information educational officer, Fort Sill, Okla.)

"A copy of your booklet Know Your Enemy, by T. H. Tetens, has come into my possession. The factual data contained in the text of this booklet is considered of such importance in the conduct of the activities of this office that it is desired that additional copies of this book be obtained for the use of officers engaged in the activities of morale services in this theater. I regret that I have no available budget to procure these booklets but if it is possible I would like to have any number from 25 to 100." (Signed by Col. William P. Scobey, of the North African Theater of Operations, SOS NATOUSA.)

Gilbert C. Ashley, first lieutenant and orientation officer for the Second Parachute Training Regiment at Fort Benning, Ga., wrote that the Society had "exceptionally interesting and educational material for public consumption." In addition, he told the Society that this material would "be incorporated into the general educational program displayed in day rooms, service clubs, and our library."

Capt. Richard F. Eggers, attached to the Information and Education Section, Headquarters, Forty-third Infantry Division, wrote:

"I am taking this opportunity to thank you very much for all the valuable literature that you have been sending us from your organization. Your literature had had a wide circulation and is invaluable."

First Lt. Arthur B. Lawrence, assistant orientation officer at Camp Mackall, N. C., commenting on the book What To Do With Germany, written by Louis Nizer, one of the members of the Society's advisory council, and distributed by the Society, wrote:

"I can say without qualification that it is one of the finest I have ever read on this politically and diplomatically vague subject."

I could go on reading numerous other letters expressing deep appreciation for the Society's educational work. However, I believe the above samples are indicative of the Society's patriotic services which helped to buttress our Army's morale during the most difficult days of the war.

Indeed, as late as January 15, 1948, R. T. Alexander, Chief of the Educational and Religious Affairs Branch of the Office of Military Government in Germany, wrote the Society as follows:

"I am sure that there are many ways in which your organization could be of assistance to our program of education here, either through visitation or direct assistance and advice."

Letters requesting the Society's publications have come from the highest quarters of our Defense Establishment, such as the United States Military Academy at West Point, the War Department, and from the Army War College.

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, former head of the Central Intelligence Group, wrote the Society expressing appreciation for its offer to assist in the "full establishment and operation of the Central Intelligence Group." In addition, he declared his hopes "for the complete success of your own [that is, the Society's] vitally important mission."

Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, of the War Department, wrote the Society a letter, from which I quote:

"I think it is highly important that our citizens maintain an interest in the vital business of establishing a peaceful world, and I have been very much interested in the lively manner in which your Society is doing its part in this enormously important and difficult task."

Col. Herman Beukema, professor at the Military Academy at West Point, wrote the following:

"The material in your magazine is of more than usual interest to the officers of this department and likewise to our cadets. As future officers, the latter can anticipate a long spell of duty in Germany. The manner and effectiveness of their performance will have a definite relationship to the allies' success or failure in salting the roots of World War III."

The Society has also received the warm commendations of many of our civilian officials both from the executive as well as legislative branches of the Government.

In a letter dated August 9, 1945, President of the United States Harry S. Truman wrote to the executive secretary of the Society as follows:

"I am strengthened and encouraged by the fine message received today signed by you as executive secretary and by Mr. Rex Stout as president and the many other citizens associated with you in the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

"These are indeed grave days and the whole effort of serious-minded men and women is and must be directed increasingly to the task of preventing another holocaust such as that which the civilized world has suffered now for almost 6 years. It is well, therefore, that so earnest a group as yours is already working to prevent its repetition."

Owen J. Roberts, then Supreme Court Justice, wrote the Society acknowledging a copy of Know Your Enemy. He said:

"Let me congratulate you on your work for the prevention of another war. Too few of the thinking and influential citizens of the nation are working on this problem. More power to you."

William Power Maloney, assistant to the Attorney General, said of the Society's magazine:

"I received the October Bulletin today and I read it through without putting it down.

"It is a grand job you are doing and one that is vitally necessary in these days when the kind-hearted muddleheads are doing their best to set us up for the third and possibly the last strike."

C. S. Black, Third Assistant Postmaster General, wrote the following in a letter to the Society:

"I have received your letter of March 13 and also your booklet, Know Your Enemy, which I have read with a great deal of interest. The contents of Know Your Enemy

should be read by every thinking person who is concerned with the problem which faces us right now as well as a reconstruction period after the war is won.

"It is my opinion that you have dealt with your subject in a reasonable and logical manner and without any attempt to distort the facts."

From the United States Senate the Society has received praise both from Republicans and Democrats alike.

In praising the Society's educational work, Senator HENDRICKSON wrote the following:

"A cursory examination of the latest issues of your magazine furnishes eloquent testimony to the fact that you have a well coordinated program and that you are directing your enthusiastic support toward the major issue of the world today, and, namely, that of establishing a just and lasting peace."

The former Senator and now Supreme Court Justice Harold H. Burton having received a copy of Know Your Enemy wrote:

"I have received the copy which you sent me of Know Your Enemy. This had come to my attention before, but I am glad to have this special opportunity to take it up and go further with it. I may add that Mrs. Burton picked up Know Your Enemy this morning, read it through and was deeply impressed with the strength and seriousness of the message it presented."

Senator MCMAHON replying to the receipt of the Society's literature said:

"I am anxious to keep up with the facts on Germany's condition and your letter has been a help."

The many articles published by the Society have been extensively used and quoted in the press. Many newspaper correspondents and columnists have also referred to its splendid work. The News published in Lynchburg, Va. (July 1, 1944), recommended that all individuals who were interested in international problems obtain copies of the Society's magazine, Prevent World War III. The newspaper editorial continued:

"So soundly edited is this bulletin, Prevent World War III, that it is difficult to see how its contents can be effectively challenged. The material covers every phase of German culpability at present and in the past.

"We know of no organization better able to guide properly and soundly the thinking of the American people along lines of winning the war and the peace and preventing another world war than the Society for the Prevention of World War III as represented in its bulletin."

The radio commentator Foster Williams devoted an entire program to the Society's work (December 10, 1944). Mentioning the danger of the German fifth column in this country, he said:

"Isn't anyone combating these groups—you will ask? * * * Have they the field to themselves? Is everyone in America sitting back and letting them get away with what they are doing completely unchallenged? No, thank God, there is one organization that is fighting them with all the might they can muster—the Society for the Prevention of World War III."

He further remarked that he desired "everyone who is listening to me tonight to read the literature of the Society for the Prevention of World War II. You owe it to yourselves to be informed on the thing that is second only in importance to winning the present war—the making of a permanent peace."

The Servicemen's Magazine of June 21, 1945, contained the following item:

"The Society for the Prevention of World War III has made reprints of a brilliant study of this highy topical subject by Francis X. C. Balling, associate research professor at the Graduate School of Fordham University. Based on thorough research, Professor Balling's piece gives figures and facts on why Germany should and could be deindustrialized without endangering the livelihood of the German people."

The Independent Star of Indianapolis (January 13, 1946) ran an editorial which began as follows:

"Delegates at the London General Assembly meeting of the United Nations organization will take courage in knowing that help is being mobilized in this country. The Society for the Prevention of World War III has been incorporated and is functioning from a suite of New York offices. It has supporters in all parts of the country. Theirs is a spirit of patriotic endeavor that deserves commendation."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin (August 8, 1946) in reviewing the Society's magazine, Prevent World War III, said:

"The periodic publication of this pamphlet (Prevent World War III) enables us to keep in mind the major premises upon which our European occupation plans were first established and to check the progress or difficulties which are being encountered. This nonprofit organization is working with honest zeal to check the short-sighted sympathy which would aid Germany once again to triumph over her neighbors."

On September 18, 1948, the Denver Post wrote the following:

"In our preoccupation with the Soviet-American struggle Americans tend to forget that there are forces in this country working for the revival of German might, for Deutschland ueber alles.

"The voices of the pro-Germans and pro-Nazis in the United States were stilled by the war, and even now are not yet much more than a whisper. But they are whispering constantly to advocate the rebuilding of the German military machine.

"The most tangible evidence of this appears in the German-language press in this country. A few examples from the bimonthly magazine of the Society for the Prevention of World War III indicate that there is a definite move in America to rebuild Germany—not as a productive nation in an integrated European economy but as a strong military state."

On June 29, 1949, Edward A. Harris, Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, mentioning reports from the Office of Military Government regarding the resurgence of neo-nazism said:

"This report lends weight to the repeated contention of the Society for the Prevention of World War III that nazism is on the rise in Germany and that efforts to democratize the defeated nation have been largely ineffectual."

The Society's educational program and work is quite large in scope considering that it employs a small staff and that it depends on voluntary contributions. For example, the Society established a radio department which presents the Society's educational material in dramatic form. Literally, thousands upon thousands of requests are received for the scripts put out by this department. More than 1,000 schools and 55 radio stations utilize the material put out by the radio department. I have seen many letters ranging from elementary schools to universities praising these scripts which are sent out free of charge.

More than 100,000 books dealing with various aspects of the German problem were distributed free of charge. The Society's literature has a nation-wide circulation. A remarkable booklet, Know Your Enemy, has been distributed in the hands of tens of thousands, not only among the civilian population, but in Army camps both here and abroad. Its magazine, Prevent World War III, also has a nation-wide circulation; its fine articles and studies have been used by well-known newspaper columnists, radio commentators and students of international affairs. Practically every newspaper editor in the country receives Prevent World War III as do thousands of universities, libraries, professional organizations, etc. It is widely read among the American officials in the office of the high commissioner for Germany. Because of the excellence of many of the studies prepared by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, they have often been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In addition to these educational services the Society for the Prevention of World War III has provided many organizations with speakers and consultants who are experts on international affairs. Veterans' organizations, women's organizations, church groups, business associations and trade unions have from time to time consulted with the Society's experts and have used the Society's material. The frequency with which the Society's material is used may not always be obvious in view of the fact that it has never sought publicity. Indeed, it is the policy of the Society for the Prevention of World War III that all of the original material published in its magazine may be reprinted or quoted. The Society is primarily concerned with the security of our people and with the problem of enlightening them with regard to the prerequisites for lasting peace.

It is not without significance, I believe, that the Society's literature is constantly referred to and quoted in the foreign press whether it be in Europe or as far away as Australia.

As I have mentioned, the Society does not harbor any illusions as to the future role of Germany in world affairs. To some extent the Society's assessment of the German problem is summed up by the words of Mr. Herbert Hoover in the introduction to the Future of German Industrial Exports, by H. Herzog, published by Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918:

"Not content with dominion by force of arms, we find Germany plotting for commercial supremacy, with that insolent disregard of the rights of others and that resort to deception that has characterized all her policies since Frederick the Great's reign. * * * For 40 years the Germans have been plotting to realize their dream of Pan-Germanism—eventual world conquest and dominion. For two generations they have been thinking in terms unknown or little understood by an innocent and unsuspecting world * * * deception and fraud form the background of their most important international relations and undertakings. They have made Germany an inherently dishonest nation. * * * Well organized and comprehensive espionage and insidious German propaganda have been at work for two generations to plan the success of German victories. * * * Let the manufacturing, the banking interests, and the laboring and professional classes of all nations be warned in time to devise antidotes and counterattacks to the Machiavellian devices of a class gone mad with lust of conquest, deliberately plotting to fatten itself upon the life blood of other peoples even after the war. Let us consider in making peace what protection we can give to the commercial existence of the freed nations."

This statement by Mr. Herbert Hoover was reprinted in the February-March 1947 issue of Prevent World War III.

From Mr. Hoover's remarks, with which the Society wholeheartedly concurs in its publications, the belief that Germany can be a reliable bulwark in the defense of the west against the forces of aggressive communism is sheer day dreaming. The Society has shown that through the years before and since the war the Germans have played a double game, playing east against west, extracting as much as it could from the present cold war. More than that, the Society has shown that the Germans, given the opportunity, would not hesitate to enter into an alliance with the Soviets against the west.

In its publication, Prevent World War III, the Society pioneered in exposing the Soviet-sponsored Free German Committee, which

had as one of its main objectives the preparation of such a tie-up once the war was over. The Society has published authentic documents showing the close collaboration between the German General Staff and the Russians. In the September-October 1949 issue of Prevent World War III, one of these sensational documents entitled "Germany Looks to the East," revealed how the German General Staff was planning their postwar resurgence based on an alliance with the Soviets, even while pretending that they were the arch foes of communism. This memorandum, written a few days before the German surrender in 1945, was initialed by the chief of the high command of Hitler's Wehrmacht, Field Marshal Keitel and Grand Admiral Doenitz.

In the most recent issue of Prevent World War III, the Society published an extended analysis by Dr. Jean Pajus, entitled "Back Door Trade Between Ruhr Industrialists and the Iron Curtain Countries." In this article, Dr. Pajus cites facts proving that the Ruhr barons who supported Hitler are trying by hook or crook to establish close ties with the Russians and their satellites. Indeed, the Society discloses the amazing fact, which incidentally received scant publicity in the American press, that some of the leading German trusts had recently been advertising in the Communist papers in the western zones. These factual exposés of German-Russian relations are intended to keep the American people vigilant as to the true designs of the Germans. They are intended to prevent the American people from falling into the trap of complacency with regard to the ramifications of the revival of Germany's economic power.

The Society has long warned against the danger of a German-Russian tie-up. Historically, militarists in both countries have long dreamed of the Juggernaut which might be built, by combining German technical resources and Russian manpower.

The obvious facts of geography, and the repeated lessons of history, should warn us that this danger is no mere dream-world phantasmagoria. Level-headed reflection will tell us that it is in fact the one greatest danger which might suddenly confront the free world of today.

Just as the Krupp family of pre-World War II days did "good business," both with the Russians and with the Third Reich, so may Krupp today, newly freed, again do "good business" with both sides, if we permit, in the not far distant future. Only by reducing Germany's economic power to the minimum of genuine peacetime needs, the society maintains, can the danger of a German-Russian rapprochement be safely averted.

Today's back-door trading between Russia and Germany, given the opportunity, can develop overnight into a full-fledged German-Russian combine. This is the grim prospective which the society spotlights.

The possible harnessing of German economy by Russia would of course lose most of its potential danger if Germany's war power were whittled down in advance, for then any eventual alliance between Germans and Russians would not significantly increase Russia's aggressive strength. Such a realistic approach to the German problem, the Society believes, would be the best means of averting the catastrophe of a Russo-German alliance.

The Society has maintained its position against the revival of the German war machine, against the resurgence of nazism and of the cartels, and against the possibility of a Russo-German alliance.

In the first issue of its magazine in May 1944, the Society for the Prevention of World War III carried a sensational secret memorandum attributed to General von Stulpnagel, one of the most influential of the German militarists. This secret memorandum said that Germany must avoid the mistakes of World War II. Von Stulpnagel said:

"In the next world war, which should take place within 25 years, the same mistake must not be made. The principal adversary will be the United States and the entire effort must be concentrated against this country from the beginning. * * * We shall be wrong if we try to conquer Russia, while leaving intact the American industrial potential."

In planning for German resurgence, the memorandum said:

"Our enemies will grow weary before we do. We shall have to organize a campaign of pity designed to induce them to send us needed supplies at the earliest possible moment. Above all, we must hold on to the assets we have deposited in neutral countries. * * *

"The present war will thus have been victorious in spite of our provisional defeat because it will have been a march forward toward our supremacy. * * * We have not to fear conditions of peace analogous to those we have imposed because our adversaries will always be divided and disunited. * * * We must force ourselves to create in the coming peace treaty the germs of future divisions. * * * These are the conditions for victory."

Thus spoke General von Stulpnagel and, as the Society has proven, he is not the only important German general who has expressed such views.

It is the considered judgment of the Society that Pan-Germanism has not been destroyed. A reading of the Society's literature shows that the forces of Pan-Germanism are rising again under new disguises and new slogans.

The reprieves and pardons just granted a large number of important Nazi personages by Commissioner McCloy and General Handy serve only to underline the manner in which we again fall prey to the wiles of German militarism. Why should we have to release from prison Nazi officers who helped plot the massacre of American soldiers? Why should we have to pardon the chief munitions suppliers of Adolf Hitler? There is a certain school of psychiatry which contends that when people get together to do a great crime, they end up with a subconscious desire to exterminate themselves. Perhaps, in the crime that we are now doing, by preparing the way for the revival of German militarism, we are indeed moved by a subconscious motive of self-destruction.

In ending my comments on the Society for the Prevention of World War III, I think it appropriate to quote from the Christian Science Monitor of March 3, 1950. Writing under the title of "Neo-Nazism; Unfinished Business," Mr. Ernest S. Pisko, special writer of the Christian Science Monitor, said the following:

"To remind him of unfinished business of the previous war, Xerxes, King of Persia, had a 'remembrance slave.' The Roman Senate, for the same purpose, had Marcus Porcius Cato. And we have the Society for the Prevention of World War III. * * * Still we must not forget the neo-Nazis. That is why it is useful to give the publications of the Society for the Prevention of World War III a more than perfunctory reading—and file them for reference just in case."

This is a fitting tribute to the Society's work, with which I have been long familiar. I have attended the meetings of this organization from time to time, have spoken to the various officers and experts of the Society, have listened to their brilliant analyses of the German problem. Yes; the Society is a unique organization and so long as our security is threatened, may it endure.

The right to dissent is an old-fashioned American privilege and I know that the Society subscribes to and upholds this basic principle of Americanism. It is, therefore, understandable that the Society should expect that it be accorded the same treatment and respect as it gives to the opinions of others. Those who disagree with the Society's objectives, however, should stick to the issues involved. I say let the people exercise their free choice in a marketplace of ideas. They have always been able to discern truth from falsehood and when an idea runs counter to the needs and interests of our people, it is bound to wither and die. This is the way democracy works. It should be clear, however, that the American people will never support a campaign of calumny and smear which is intended to deliberately confuse the issues and thereby muddy the waters of public information. The people want facts and not fairy tales.

Before ending my remarks I wish especially to add a few words of praise concerning the activities of Mr. Isidore Lipschutz, the man who has served as treasurer of the Society since its inception, and who has, incidentally, been foully traduced in certain publications on account of his patriotic leadership in this fight. Mr. Lipschutz was the first industrialist of importance to see the menace which the rising power of Hitler's brown shirts raised for the world. As early as 1932 and 1933 he personally organized the publication of underground German newspapers, which were printed in Belgium and secretly distributed in Germany, and which provided the pattern for subsequent activities officially engaged upon by the United States and our allies, as the inevitability of war with Germany became clearer.

Because of his anti-Nazi activities in Europe Mr. Lipschutz was singled out for attack in the Stuermer by the war criminal Julius Streicher, who was hanged at Nuremberg.

When Mr. Lipschutz removed his business to America he continued his work for democracy and world peace, and I may say from my personal knowledge that ever since his immigration here he has devoted more attention to the public interest than to his own business.

That his services to his native country and to world peace were generally appreciated is evidenced by the many distinctions bestowed upon him:

In 1931: By special decree of the King of Belgium, the title of "Chevalier de l'Ordre de Leopold" (Knight of the Order of Leopold) was awarded to him.

In 1936: By special decree of the King of Belgium, the title of "Officer de l'Ordre de Leopold II" (Officer of the Order of Leopold II) was awarded to him.

In 1937: The Belgian Red Cross awarded him the Medaille de Merite (Medal of Merit).

In 1938: The French Government awarded him the title of "Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur" (Knight of the Legion of Honor).

In discussing the activities of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, vis-à-vis, the alarming situation confronting us in the world, I have taken some trouble to set forth the origins of this Society and the fine backgrounds of the men who are its leaders.

This seems to me to be pertinent, and especially deserved in view of the bitter attacks which some of these men have had to face, as a result of patriotically standing up for the right.

In times of international tension, like today, it is of the greatest importance that public opinion be well and accurately informed on the grave issues confronting our country. In a democracy, public opinion must and should determine our course; but only ar informed public opinion, supplied with the true facts, can serve as a safe guide. It is our problem, in these times, to distinguish informed and patriotic opinion from propaganda and selfish pressure. Once the true facts are appreciated, our people will be united and resolute in their action.

Three Important Questions Raised by General Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1591

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask three questions.

In his testimony at the MacArthur hearings Tuesday, Gen. Omar Bradley said he believed that the MacArthur strategy would involve the United States "in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy"?

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people are entitled to an answer to my three questions:

First, in those fateful days last June when President Truman decided to put the United States into the Korean war, did General Bradley or anyone else suggest to the President that he might thereby be involving the United States "in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy"?

Second, if and when the next Korean war breaks out—whether in Iran or elsewhere—will the President again arrogate to himself, in disregard of the Constitution and the Congress, the decision as to whether the United States is to enlist in that war also?

Third, in other words, Mr. Speaker, is President Truman to have a free hand to engage in a one-man trial-and-error effort to find "the right war, at the right place, at the right time, and with the right enemy"?

In Praise of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, too often one hears nothing but derogatory remarks for the fair city of Washington which is the seat of our Nation's Government; which by the time they reach the furthermost limits of this great Nation, contain only a very small particle of truth. Such stories tend to paint a dismal picture of this great city and result in a feeling amongst our citizens that it is a place to stay away from, despite the fact that it is a historic spot and one that should be closest to the hearts of our people.

However, Mr. Speaker, every so often a refreshing article appears praising our Nation's Capital and for that reason, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which appeared in the May 16 issue of the Washington Post entitled "In Praise of Washington" written by a man who emigrated to this city to do his share in this Nation's defense effort:

IN PRAISE OF WASHINGTON

I am on leave from the Pennsylvania State College to fill an assignment in the Defense Department. My wife and I and our four small children have been living here in the District community now for about a year. My amusement almost balanced my pique when recently I read Dr. Clifford R. Adams' pronouncement that married couples who live in Washington and hope for a happy home life and a successful marrige should "go and live somewhere else." Since Dr. Adams is my friend as well as my colleague at Penn State, may I gently rebut this frivolous advice.

Cliff, I think that your crystal ball must need a shine, or that your fact gatherers must have been briefing you too briefly, or (heaven forbid) possibly you have been reading a popular dreggy but misleading book about Washington.

To state it truly, Washington adds up to a stimulating, challenging, and satisfying city in which to live. Our Nation's Capital is a beautiful city filled with monumental buildings, great museums, and exquisite art galleries. We have superior music and Broadway theater, even though the latter may be a little late in arriving. If Washington is not the cleanest large city in America, it must compare favorably with whatever urban center has that distinction.

Washington is a city with stately churches of every faith and many congregations find it necessary to hold two services on their Sabbath Day in order to serve all of their communicants.

From village, farm, and metropolis, the Nation sends its most highly trained and competitively selected superior citizens to Washington to serve in its Government. The population of this community has a larger percentage of members of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi than any other American community, including university centers. The IQ curve of the city's public-school children shows more individuals with superior ratings than are found in our population generally or other specific cities.

My work here has acquainted me with many persons in that large segment of the district's population which is comprised of career personnel in the three military services. It is my observation that these families of military folks are unusually stable and and successful, frequently following a proud family tradition of several generations' standing; and their children (contrary to the stereotyped military-brat idea) are well disciplined, gracious-mannered, and happily adjusted boys and girls. It is logical to assume that many equally successful families exist in other large elements of the population such as the Diplomatic Corps, Civil Service careerists, etc.

Even a word of praise is in order for Washington weather. Taking the year as a whole, the climate is pleasant. Admitting a few weeks of hot weather, throughout the year there is more sunshine than cloudiness, and the winters are open and free from the discomfort and inconvenience of excessive cold and snow.

Here then is a clean and beautiful city with a salubrious climate, where the standard of living and the community's earnings are high, where the population is representative of the selected best garnered from the whole country. We submit that a couple unable to make a success of marriage in an environment so favorable physically, socially, culturally, and economically should indeed go and live somewhere else—alone.

DR. PAUL R. BEALL,
Director, Information Division Research and Development Board, Department of Defense.
WASHINGTON.

They Heard You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, though the dismissal of General MacArthur from command in the Far East was the spark which touched off the people's resentment against the policies of this administration, Members of Congress indicate they are not only aware of, but intended to give some heed to, the protests for economy which have been overwhelming them.

For a long, long time Members of Congress have been hearing suggestions from the voters that, if they did not mend their ways and do some of the obvious things which were necessary to bring a little efficiency and economy into the Federal Government's activities which the people were convinced would sooner or later ruin us, they might hear a different protest in November 1952.

The thought has finally penetrated some congressional heads that the people were fully aware of what has been going on. Some Members of Congress mistook charitable complacency for a lack of information and determination.

The MacArthur incident—or, more accurately, the protests growing out of it—convinced these gentlemen that the people were not quite as complacent as some thought; hence, the awakening of the Congress.

May 2 the Congress was called upon to vote on an appropriation bill for the Interior Department. The Department's request for funds had been cut some $39,000,000 by the House Appropriations Committee which sent the bill to the floor. After several days of debate, the House, by amendment, cut the bill another $23,000,000.

Mr. Truman's leadership in the House, amazed at that action, called for a record vote on nine amendments. The vote was taken and on nine separate and distinct roll calls the administration was defeated, the cuts were approved.

The moral: Before the MacArthur incident, the economy-efficiency-minded members would not have had a chance of making even these cuts, which, by the way, are inadequate.

The protests growing out of the MacArthur incident, if continued, will eventually result in other savings, the prevention of additional waste and extravagance and, it is my hope, in the removal of Secretary of State Dean Acheson. He, as I have repeatedly advised you, has acted in the interest of the British Government. His policies, whatever his intention—I repeat it again—have aided the Communist cause.

My record indicates that I do not need prodding on any of the points above suggested; in fact, I have been criticized as being too economy-minded, too inclined to disagree with the Administration, particularly with the State Department's activities.

To be effective, the people's protests should be directed to those Senators and Representatives who, in the past, have supported the socialistic program of the administration, adopted and followed the suggestions of an international-minded State Department.

Here is your opportunity, talk with your friends and neighbors, point out to them where this administration's policies—especially in foreign affairs—are taking us; then, all of you write to those Senators and Congressmen who go along with the New Deal, and insist that they, your servants, do the things you want done.

It is unfortunate that such a protest should be necessary but, because the people have so long complacently gone along with, and, at election time, approved the programs advocated by the preceding and this administration, such a protest seems to be necessary.

Containment of Russian Communist Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, May 15, 1951:

TWO WAYS OF OPPOSING COMMUNISM

Just what does it mean to say that American policy aims at "containment" of Russian Communist influence in the world today? A recent survey by the Council on Foreign Relations indicated that this policy is supported by a large majority of the leading citizens who form its committees in 24 cities. Yet, common observation indicates that the objectives of the policy could and should be more widely understood.

First of all, is the United States engaged in a mission to suppress communism? Over 99 percent of Americans evidently disagree with communism; its theories can be disproved and its practice has shown cavernous weaknesses. Yet, Americans could view communism with relative equanimity if its spread depended on adoption by free consent of self-governing peoples. Its propaganda could be met on the ideological level with assurance, as indeed it must be.

But the nature and doctrine of international communism is to seize power by violence and to exert minority rule through dictatorship. In practice it has spread by extending the power of the Soviet Union, either through direct expansion or through satellites—in either case by various forms of aggression against free governments and the liberties of free men.

It is that aggression, that subjugation of free peoples by violence, which constitutes communism's crime in the world today, just as it constituted the crime of Nazi-Fascist totalitarianism.

And it is that aggression, that expansionism by force over unwilling victims, against which the policy of "containment" is legitimately directed. This does not mean a crusade or holy war to extirpate communism from the earth; eradication of mistaken doctrines must come by other means. But it does signify, in the phrase of the Council on Foreign Relations, that America should "try to frustrate the expansion of Soviet power whenever it shows signs of encroaching upon the territorial integrity" of free nations.

That is something like the distinction drawn by the American Government and by most thoughtful citizens in dealing with communism as a domestic problem. Majority judgment has held against attempting to punish the mere holding of communistic opinions as a crime; but it has supported heartily the endeavor to punish the commission of illegal acts, as in the trial of 11 Communist leaders for conspiracy against the Government.

Most serious students of Stalinist Marxism are convinced that if it is deprived of unfair, coercive, and violent means for its extension it cannot survive. Most of the Foreign Relations Council members believe that the Soviet regime is such that it must expand or lose power internally. If that is true, then resistance to its expansion amounts to resistance to communism itself.

But the distinction earlier stated is still important. It is aggression that is the enemy. It is the attack on other people's lives and liberties that constitutes a ground for war. In the absence of such a casus belli, a military crusade, or "preventive war" against certain people simply because they are Communists or ruled by Communists would become itself an aggression and would forfeit moral stature.

Let's keep the sights on the target. It is aggression that constitutes the international crime. Only a system that can succeed by appealing to intellects and loyalties of free men deserves to succeed. Only such a system can expand, or long endure, if aggression is resisted.

The MacArthur Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which I have received typifies the approach of every citizen who has the interest of our country at heart. I hope that many of our colleagues here will adopt that attitude. If they do we can look forward with hope for, and faith in, the future of this country:

E-Z MILLS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 10, 1951.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: No reply is expected to this letter, because if my judgment is correct it will be merely one of thousands of similar letters you will receive on the same subject. All I ask is acknowledgment so that I may be sure it has been received by you.

During the past months I have not been a supporter of General MacArthur in his controversy with the President. My reason has been that as a manufacturer I have learned through years of experience that anyone directing a large organization cannot do so effectively if he does not have the wholehearted support of his associates regarding his policies.

I am not prepared to go all out for General MacArthur today, regardless of the profound impression his speech to Congress made upon me, for the simple reason that I, like most American citizens, am not in possession of the pertinent facts upon which to make a sound decision.

There is one point upon which I have very definite ideas. General MacArthur has raised questions of differences on basic policy which I feel if not decided correctly will have a very adverse effect on the lives and happiness of my children and their children.

This letter is to urge you to go to the root of this controversy which has developed between the President and General MacArthur and to use your influence to have it decided to the best interest of our country and its people. The subject is far beyond partisan politics, as I know you will agree.

Very sincerely,
SHERMAN P. HAIGHT,
Chairman of Board, E-Z Mills, Inc.

George Catlett Marshall Day at Virginia Military Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address of great wisdom and merit, delivered in Lexington, Va., on May 15, 1951, by Hon. Bernard M. Baruch on the occasion of George Catlett Marshall Day at Virginia Military Institute.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is hallowed ground. Northern and Southern troops fought for the possession of this lovely Shenandoah Valley, and none more gallantly than the students and officers of the Virginia Military Institute.

My father, a Confederate doctor, campaigned in this valley. He had a favorite tale he liked to tell on himself. During one battle, the Confederate troops were thrown into a panic. The Southern commander cried to my father, "Help rally the men!" My father, with a standard in hand, rode among the men shouting, "Rally! Rally, men, for God's sake!" Just then a shell burst close. His horse dashed madly off while father sought to bring the animal under control. Whereupon one of the soldiers nearby shouted, "Rally? Why in hell won't you rally?"

We have come here to dedicate this new arch to VMI's barracks. To our left we can see the arch which commemorates Stonewall Jackson, who taught here, and who was one of the greatest military tacticians of all times. Beyond these buildings is another arch erected to the memory of America's first soldier, George Washington. He not only won us our first victories, but it was he who first cast the mold which shaped the tradition of American soldiering. In an age of military adventurers—Napoleon was only a few years off—George Washington established the role of the American soldier as a servant of peace and a guardian of liberty.

That your third arch should be dedicated to George Catlett Marshall is singularly fitting. He is a living example of the tradition of the civilian soldier which Washington began. VMI's most illustrious graduate, George Marshall is symbolic of the new union of Americans which was demonstrated in the last two world wars and which has banished forever the disunity that made possible the war between North and South.

But this arch, which we are dedicating today, does more than look back upon the past. It also looks out toward the future. In honoring George Marshall we also do honor to a concept which saved the free world once and which can save it again.

That concept was the strategy of global defense. As history's first global strategist, George Marshall was called upon to organize the most stupendous military effort man has ever known. Its climax came in the two greatest amphibious landings upon hostile foreign shores—Normandy in the Atlantic and the Philippines in the Pacific. Each landing half the globe apart, yet conducted almost simultaneously. Think what a host of problems had to be overcome to make those victorious landings possible—assembling the men and weapons, the food and medcal care, the convoys and landing craft, with everything transported across thousands of miles of ocean to meet a D-day schedule.

Today, as Secretary of Defense, George Marshall, perhaps under even more difficult conditions, is called upon to devise the global strategy which will bring us victory in the peacemaking, and avoid the need for any amphibious landings on hostile shores.

When I was asked last March to join in dedicating this arch to General Marshall, I immediately thought of a remark which Gen. John J. Pershing made in 1939. We were to have dinner together. When General Pershing came in he said, "I have just done a fine thing for our country. President Roosevelt asked me who would be a good man for Chief of Staff. I recommended George Marshall."

The years that followed more than amply confirmed General Pershing's confidence. It was General Marshall who organized the means which made possible victories on all fronts.

I wonder how much of the controversy in recent days is really a reflection of the difference between the leader of troops and the organizer. A great leader of troops naturally is zealous in desiring that when his men become locked in battle that every resource be marshaled which might increase the chance of their winning or of decreasing their losses. The very qualities which made him so valiant a leader of troops would make him impatient of any limitations on his action.

But the organizer has to think not only of the men fighting on the one front, but of all the fronts of war and defense. He must weigh each theater and its relative importance upon the scales of a globe-flung strategy. Where to concentrate our forces and where to hold? Will action in one part of the world invite a counterblow somewhere else? What of our allies? Are they prepared or do they need time to ready their defenses? how much can they be hurried?

And what of the American people? How quickly can their strength be mobilized? By how much can they be hurried?

Like those of the troop commander, the decisions of the organizer are also weighted in lives; like the troop commander, the organizer also labors under inhibitions.

Whatever the demands from the commanders abroad, the organizer can allocate only the weapons he has been permitted to procure. He can draft and train only the men permitted under the law. When the commander in the field asks how far he is permitted to go, the organizer must decide first whether the troops and equipment will be available to see the offensive through, without jeopardizing other areas. And if the organizer, looking into the future, a year, or two or three ahead, asks for what he thinks will be needed—and he is turned down, what does he do?

Many issues have become involved in the raging controversy over far-eastern policy. I would not want to seem to be answering or dismissing them. Still, I would like to put forward this one thought of my own—much of our trouble is the result of military weakness.

In our present situation, whatever is attempted on behalf of peace must fall short because of a lack of supporting military strength.

We are trying to enforce a global doctrine of opposition to communism with a Military Establishment which is sorely strained by the demands of only one theater.

Many of the issues—and choices—raised by the controversy would solve themselves if more of America's strength were mobilized. Until we have mobilized, few, if any, of the issues which have been raised can really be solved.

There is strength in unity. But there is also unity in strength.

We—our allies as well as this country—must first grow stronger militarily before we can have a unified foreign policy.

In Korea today we are buying time—no; it is not we who are buying time; it is our young men who are buying the time—for the whole free world to rearm. Are we doing as much as we possibly can with this time? As quickly as we can? That is the question we should be asking ourselves—what are we doing with the time being bought for us at so great a price?

I would be less than frank if I did not say I do not believe that we, as a nation, or our allies, are doing enough. I might add that even if the fighting in Korea is brought to an end, as we all hope, the need to rearm would remain.

But I am straying from the purpose of this occasion. I have known George Marshall since he served as an aide to General Pershing. I have watched him rise and grow as he rose. Always he has seemed to me the very prototype of the soldier-statesman.

In outward demeanor he may appear austere. Yet he is warmly aware of the human side. During the last war he would insist that the members of the General Staff get away from Washington frequently. "I don't want tired men making decisions that affect human lives," he once told me.

Although he had to make many of the decisions of grand strategy, he was always deeply concerned for the welfare of the men and women on the fighting fronts and their families at home. He saw that our troops had the best this country could furnish—in rations and clothing, in medical care and nursing, in equipment and leadership. Before we entered the war some armchair strategists were saying the day of the mass army was gone. The day of the mass army in the old sense of trying to win by sheer force of manpower was, indeed, gone, but not the skillful command of forces of considerable size to maneuver, to strike, and to pursue. This required leadership on an unprecedented scale. General Marshall foresaw the tactics and the strategy that would be needed in case of a world war. I remember his explaining the necessity for training our commanders in handling large numbers of troops. He expanded the scale of army maneuvers in this country to where they covered areas as large as some European countries.

How often have I marveled at the apparent ease with which he has borne his responsibilities. Nor has it been easy for him to unburden himself. At times, I believe, General Marshall has talked quite freely to me of things on his mind. But I can also remember a week end at my place in South Carolina during which he hardly spoke beyond the routine courtesies. General Marshall has been singularly fortunate in his choice—or maybe she chose him—of so charming, gracious, and understanding a wife. Yet there have been times when he couldn't take even her into his confidence.

Both of them now like to tell the story of an incident a few days before our landings in North Africa. It was our first amphibious expedition. Had it been repulsed, the effect might have been disastrous. There was grave fear the Germans might learn of our plans. There was the even more serious question of what the French in North Africa would do. Would they welcome our soldiers, or would they fight them?

The responsibility for ironing out all these problems had been entrusted by the Combined Chiefs of Staff to General Marshall. Finally, all the details were worked out. Our hope for winning over the French was General Giraud, who was to issue the orders to the French in North Africa to lay down their arms.

Noticing how hard General Marshall had been working, Mrs. Marshall arranged a duck-shooting party for him. The night before the duck hunt the General's bedside phone rang. It was the War Department calling with a message from Robert Murphy that Giraud was insisting that the invasion be postponed for 3 weeks or he would be unable to guarantee French support. The convoys were already at sea, 800 ships off the entrance to the Mediterranean sailing under radio silence. Could this vast naval force be turned back? If not, what would happen when they landed in North Africa?

After listening to the message General Marshall said he would be in the office in the morning and hung up. Mrs. Marshall, hearing him, asked, "Does that mean you won't be able to go duck hunting tomorrow?"

"I'm afraid it does," General Marshall replied, "but it's pretty important."

Mrs. Marshall said, "Oh, you think every little thing is important."

General Marshall has worn a soldier's uniform for so long that it is difficult to penetrate to his true qualities. He is a warm friend, a fine fishing and hunting companion. In all matters of national security, though, he strives to be impersonally right, knowing how many lives rest upon the integrity of his military judgments. That integrity won him the complete confidence of President Roosevelt, even when they disagreed; it won him the equally complete confidence of the British, with whom he also had his differences; and it gained him the respect, if not the confidence, of the Russians, who don't even trust their own people.

No one has been more respectful of our civilian institutions and traditions. The one problem which has never been out of General Marshall's mind, these last years, has been how to build a military establishment which would be adequate for our national security and yet be one which the American people will maintain indefinitely, without bankruptcy.

Even before the last war ended, he was worried over the kind of military establishment we would maintain in the after-war period. We talked often of this problem. Always he would hark back to the same conviction—if the American Nation were to survive, we had to break with the old feast-and-famine tradition of military spending, or alternating between frantic all-out mobilization for war and equally frantic all-out demobilization for peace. We had to develop a military policy which we would sustain year in and year out and which could

serve as the enduring foundation for an equally enduring foreign policy. That is why General Marshall has been so insistent upon universal military training.

In this, he and I have been of one mind.

General Marshall impresses one as being so much the good soldier, and yet I know how deeply he has yearned for the quiet of civilian life. At the first chance after the last war ended, he retired to his home at Leesburg. There he struggled with the problems of gardening, with the logistics of weeds and fertilizer. He was called from his gardening three times. Once to go to China on a mission for the President; a second time to serve as Secretary of State; and a third time to head the American Red Cross, dropping that to take on his present responsibilities.

One tree which General Marshall planted in these latter posts is already bearing fruit—the Marshall plan. Other undertakings are still seedlings, of uncertain fruition. For a full measure of his accomplishments we will have to wait for the battle of peace to be decided. The measure of his greatness as a man we already have.

Let me conclude by relating one more incident. One day I noticed a portrait of Robert E. Lee hanging on the wall in General Marshall's Leesburg home. I have always revered General Lee, who lies not far from here. He was to the southern people and their soldier sons what no commander has ever been to any people.

I asked General Marshall, "Tell me what you think of General Lee."

General Marshall replied, "You know he had many offers of enormous sums of money to take commercial positions. He refused them all because he thought he owed a duty to the young men of the South and so he took a position for $125 per month as president of what is now Washington and Lee University."

Sometimes a person will reveal more of himself when talking about others. That response of General Marshall's—the trait of Lee's character which immediately came to his mind—etches an indelible portrait of the man we honor here today.

"Do your duty in all things," General Lee urged. "You cannot do more. You would not wish to do less."

I congratulate you, General Marshall. I congratulate the students and faculty of the Virginia Military Institute, who can justly take pride in the school which could produce a George Catlett Marshall.

I know that the whole free world joins with us in wishing you, General Marshall, continued success in your present task as freedom's global strategist, and that with the peace won, you can return to your gardening.

The St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Utica (N. Y.) Press, on March 17, 1951, with reference to the St. Lawrence project.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Utica Chamber of Commerce is taking another look at the St. Lawrence seaway-power project and we hope it will finally recognize the potential benefits to northern New York and to Utica. The matter is now before Congress in what may be the decisive struggle over that long-planned development. Unless now accepted as necessary to the national defense, the project as at present conceived may never be undertaken.

Congress remained unmoved when the St. Lawrence development was pressed upon it by President Roosevelt during World War II as a means of providing additional supplies of electric power for defense plants in the Northeastern States. But now the project has been given a new angle by the depletion in the last war and since of the high-grade iron ore reserves of the Mesabi Range near Lake Superior. President Truman is asking quick approval of the project on the ground that the proposed 27-foot channel from Lake Superior to the sea is needed to give midwestern steel mills safe and economical access to newly discovered open-pit ore resources in Labrador.

The administration has sent an impressive list of witnesses to testify before the House Public Works Committee that the project is essential to the national security, that it can be made to pay for itself through sale of electricity and collection of tolls from ships using the waterway, and that it will make a mighty contribution to economic development in the North Atlantic area and the Great Lakes basin.

Opponents of the project include railroads, public utility companies, coal operators, shipping interests and port cities along the eastern seaboard which would lose traffic to the waterway. They have not yet made their case in formal testimony but their arguments are fairly familiar. For two decades these arguments have been sufficient to prevent acceptance of the seaway-power project by Congress.

Supporters of the St. Lawrence project admit that resources of the Mesabi-Lake Superior region, on which the steel industry has depended for 85 percent of its ore supply, are far from exhaustion. But all authorities agree that sooner or later there will be a sharp falling off in production. And because of increasing demands for steel, it is estimated by Secretary of the Interior Chapman that by 1960 "we must be prepared to import 40,000,000 tons of ore a year." The National Security Resources Board says that by the end of the present decade "50,000,000 tons must be furnished from entirely new sources of supply."

Steel is important but the power means more to Utica.

Small Business Is Hit by Defense Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the first 2 years of World War II, some 16 percent of the total number of business enterprises were forced to close their doors. The same problems are today facing the small, independent businessmen of the Nation who are faced with the twin spectres of material shortages and a lack of defense contracts. In the New York Times for Sunday, May 13, was a fine presentation of this situation written by Joseph A. Loftus. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS IS HIT BY DEFENSE RATIONING—UNABLE TO GET MATERIALS, MANY FIRMS APPEAL TO GOVERNMENT FOR RELIEF

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, May 12.—Small business is one of the casualties of defense, just as it was in the early days of World War II. Why this should be so, in the face of booming production and the need for still more production, is one of the paradoxes of our economy.

On its face, it doesn't make sense. On closer examination, one finds that some casualties are unavoidable. The problem is one of degree—how to cut the losses.

In the first 2 years of World War II, 16 percent of the small business men of the country were forced to shut shop. Select committees of the Senate and the House are campaigning against a repetition of that debacle, but actual results are in doubt. There is already a suspicion at the Capitol that when the corpses are finally counted this time, the fatality rate may be even higher than it was in 1942 and 1943.

What is small business, and why all the to-do about its survival?

A simple definition of a small business is this: An establishment with fewer than 500 employees. Statistics are kept on that basis. The congressional committees are not rigid about the 500-man ceiling when they seek help for their constituents. In the Congressional view, any business that is not dominant in its field is a small business. That tent would cover some companies with far more than 500 employees—the secondary steel companies, for example.

BROAD BASE OF INDUSTRY

Small business commands so much attention from Congress that one may safely decide it is a politically significant area of our economy. It is numerically important. About 3,670,000 small businesses form the broad base of our industrial-commercial pyramid. It is articulate. The appeals to Congress for information and help have been enormous. Letters reaching the small-business committees ran to 9,000 one day. The average intake is 450 to 500 a day now.

There is an emotional attachment to small business that has made it, to many, the economic symbol of the American way of life. The independent entrepreneur commands a kind of admiration different from that accorded the big fellow who provides mass employment and boasts an efficient assembly line.

In economic actuality, small business is the bulwark against monopoly, the guaranty of a competitive economy. In a wartime economy, as contrasted with today's readiness economy, we need all the productive facilities obtainable. Hence the concern about the liquidation of those facilities now.

What's the trouble? The trouble is a shortage of materials. Take aluminum. There are 18,000 aluminum fabricators. Most of them have sprung up since the close of World War II. They have been making a couple hundred kinds of items for the civilian trade.

Now the military has placed large orders for aircraft. That calls for a lot of aluminum. There is not enough for the airplanes and all the civilian production, too. Small aluminum fabricators cannot make air-

frames. They have had to cut back 35 percent on more than 200 products. They were to be cut back 100 percent on April 1, but the death sentence has been stayed till July 1. By that time new basic capacity may have brought in enough additional aluminum to win for these establishments a stay of execution. If so, the congressional committees will claim credit for saving hundreds of these concerns from extinction by getting delays in the death sentence.

SHORTAGES IN OTHER FIELDS

The story is somewhat the same in steel, plastics, and copper, and other areas. As military procurement was stepped up, material shortages developed in the civilian lines, making the small manufacturer's plight desperate. He turned to Government contracts as his only salvation.

It is clear that the small-business man, by definition, cannot qualify as a primary contractor for a ship, a tank, or a plane. He can qualify as a subcontractor on parts for these products; he can qualify as a primary contractor on many small items.

He did not do so badly, either, as long as the military advertised for competitive bids. But bidding has given way largely to negotiated contracts. That is the little fellow's big gripe—that and the lack of information about requirements and awards.

The small-business man complains that some big companies are expanding their manufacturing facilities to avoid subcontracting. The Senate committee reported a typical instance in which a small manufacturer of cellar doors made of sheet steel could not obtain sheets from his mill. The mill, however, shipped the sheet to its own fabricating plant and sold the manufacturer partially stamped cellar doors.

EQUIPMENT IS WASTED

Not only does that practice increase the cost of the product to the consumer—in this case, homeowners—but the small manufacturer's stamping equipment is idle and represents to him and to the country an economic waste.

The procurement agencies of Government are supposed to discourage expansion of facilities by a primary contractor if subcontractor facilities are available. They assert they have had some success in doing so.

To get a subcontract for a part of a tank, or a gun, or whatnot, the small enterprise has to know who got the primary contract. Complaints were lodged that the security-conscious military were withholding information about the size of primary contracts.

The Munitions Board's own figures show that the dollar amount of contracts awarded to small business dropped from 24.5 percent of the total awards in the fiscal year 1949–50 to 21 percent in the first 9 months of fiscal 1950–51. That means a few big companies, relatively, received 75 to 79 percent of the dollar volume. (From 1940 through 1944, for example, the hundred largest corporations got 60.6 percent of all prime contracts awarded.)

The Munitions Board does not know how much business went to small enterprises in the form of subcontracts and sub-subcontracts, and says it has no way of finding out without installing a costly statistic-collecting system.

The Board says primary awards to small business have been rising steadily month by month in the first quarter of this calendar year. In March the proportion was 25.9 percent. Congressional champions of small business propose to establish a small-defense-plants corporation, like the agency that operated in World War II. Both the Munitions Board and the National Production Authority have advised against it.

In sum, a lot of mechanism is in motion, but the returns are not all in yet.

Republican Band Wagon Will Become a Hearse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release issued by me, relative to certain proposals by General MacArthur and Republican reaction thereto.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Republicans jumped into the MacArthur controversy, thinking it was a band wagon to roll them into the White House in 1952. Now, they jump out because it looks like that old familiar hearse ready to haul them back to the political graveyard.

Yes, even the Republican Party has caught on to the fact that the American people do not want to follow General MacArthur into an all-out war on the mainland of China. These Republican politicians who used MacArthur for all he was worth are now ready to pass him up.

This sudden change of face showed up plainly at the meeting of the Republican National Committee in Tulsa this week end, according to all reports I read and received. As one Washington newspaper headline summed it up: "GOP committee shuns MacArthur's program." And, further, "There is no talk here whatever of a possible presidential candidacy for General MacArthur."

This retreat away from the militant MacArthur was confirmed by another Washington correspondent who wrote (Saturday morning): "There was not so much as a sentence that favored Republican support of the program of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The attitude of the Republican politicians here is that the party ought to benefit all it can from General MacArthur's quarrel with President Truman, but ought not to let itself get into position of being MacArthur's champion. * * * They think this (MacArthur program) is dangerous, politically."

Remember? This is the same Republican Party which has been on such a hysterical, emotional jag during the past month. They wailed loud and long about General MacArthur. Now, they just wail.

Frankly, I have never seen such a demonstration of political avarice and cowardice. I have believed all along that they were playing politics with the security of this Nation. I have believed all along that they had no real convictions about the issues involved in the controversy. This turn in Tulsa certainly proves both. Just listen to what they are saying.

Clarence Buddington Kelland, of Arizona: "I do not believe that the Republican Party should tie itself to the issue of military action as developed between General MacArthur and Mr. Truman."

Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts: "I do not think that the Republican Party should tie itself to MacArthur in this controversy or make a party issue of it."

General MacArthur, however, had boldly declared that his policy differences with the administration would be the issue in the regular referendum occurring next year, as it does—in his words—"each 4 years." I guess MacArthur thought if he got out of their way for President, they could at least stick by his program.

In the presidential push, Senator TAFT was said to be losing ground with the grassroots politicos because of his excessive enthusiasm for the militant MacArthur program. His supporters and admirers at Tulsa expressed surprise and concern over his course.

Yes, those Republicans have frozen up on General MacArthur. I am told that seven Republican governors made speeches, and not one so much as mentioned his name.

Apparently, the GOP
Just doesn't want to be
The "General's Own Part-ee."

The Small-Town Editor and Conditions in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk two editorials from the Ephraim Enterprise, a weekly newspaper published each Friday in Ephraim, Utah, a small town of 1,991 people. The views expressed by Roscoe C. Cox, editor and publisher of this paper, are significant because they show that the small-town country editor is right on top of the important events transpiring in our Nation. This editor, like the editors of the many weekly newspapers of my State, exemplifies the editorial prerogative in its finest tradition—in a manner typified by the late William Allen White. The process by which national issues infiltrate to the grass roots of our communities and are discussed intelligently and with understanding by our small-town editors is one of the most healthy conditions existing in our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two editorials from the Ephraim Enterprise inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE TO, AMERICA?

America, where are you headed?

Many signposts along the way indicate that you are on the wrong track and going ever farther in the wrong direction.

To be frank, America, it seems you have denied the faith and forsaken the God of the founding fathers; that you have dethroned the Goddess of Right and the endeavoring to enthrone the champion might as your present deity.

The founding fathers, the leaders for many generations, Abraham Lincoln, the savior of the Union, all acknowledged God as the King of America.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," states the Declaration of Independence.

Patrick Henry, in urging that all delegates sign the Declaration, pointed to America as the refuge for the downtrodden of Europe, and said:

"But hark! The voice of Jehovah speaks out from the awful cloud. 'Let there be light

again. Let there be a new world. Tell My people, the poor, downtrodden millions, to go out from the Old World—tell them to go out from wrong, oppression, and blood. Tell them to build up My altar in the New.'

"As God lives, my friends, I believe that to be His voice. Yes; were my soul trembling on the wing of eternity, were this hand freezing to death, were my voice choking with the last struggle, I would still, with the last gasp of that voice, implore you to remember the truth—God has given America to be free. * * * In the name of the One who made you, the Savior who redeemed you, in the name of the millions whose very breath is now hushed, as, in intense expectation, they look up to you for the awful words, 'You are free'."

Abraham Lincoln, on leaving Springfield, Ill., on February 11, 1861, to take up his duties as President, expressed his sorrow at leaving and:

"I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail.

"Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

An account of a parade by the American Army the morning of May 7, 1778, after the terrible winter at Valley Forge, tells that "in solemn silence the American Army at Valley Forge united in thanksgiving to Almighty God that He had given them one friend on earth. One theme was universal and it flutters yet in the breasts of millions: 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow.'"

Daniel Webster, in a speech before the New York Historical Society, February 22, 1852, said:

"And let me say, gentlemen, that if we and our posterity shall be true to the Christian religion, if we and they shall live always in the fear of God, and shall respect His commandments, if we and they shall maintain just, moral sentiments, and such conscientious convictions of duty as shall control the heart of life—we may have the highest hopes of the future of our country."

And so it was in the speeches of leaders of all parties. All spoke of God and acknowledged His help in forming and prospering the United States of America. They accepted sincerely the adopted motto, "In God we trust." They believed literally in the prophecy in the last verse of the national anthem, "Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just; let this be our motto, 'In God is our trust,' and the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

But where are we today? The mention of God is not permitted in many of our publicly supported schools. Teaching of religion is tabu in all public schools, yet atheism and communism have been taught both openly and secretly, and the former still is being openly taught in many schools of the Nation.

In place of acknowledgment of divine favors and appeals for divine guidance, many leaders today mention God only by using His name in vain in hurling epithets at someone opposing them.

One of the latest acts of replacing right with supposed might is the ruling made which does not exempt from the draft young men called as missionaries for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Real leaders all over the Nation are pleading for a rebirth of morality and spirituality among the people of America and the world. It is doubtful if any system in the world is so potent in producing lasting spirituality and morality as is the Mormon missionary system. Yet now that system is being subordinated to the draft—another victory of so-called might over right.

Abundant evidence is readily available to show that these missionaries, after spending 2 to 2½ years in church service, have been outstanding in the military organizations of our country. Not only have they lived righteously in the midst of temptations, but they have helped countless numbers of their buddies to live high moral standards not common in the Armed Forces. As the knight of old said: "My strength is as the strength of 10, because my heart is pure," so have these returned missionaries been an outstanding asset to the armed services.

But now the powers that be have said that this missionary training must stop, except as permission might be given by the draft boards.

America, whither are you going? Can you hope to overcome evil with still more evil? Armed might with still more armed might? Remember it has been said "He that lives by the sword shall perish by the sword."

Let's not dry up our fountains of righteousness in our frenzy to rearm. No weapon is so potent against the evils of communism as are Christian standards. Let's be sure these are maintained, lest we in America, though blest with victory in armed conflict, may find that we have lost something even more precious—our ability and desire to champion right.

Surely the words of Abraham Lincoln, written in a proclamation of March 20, 1863, are even more applicable today than then:

"We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

Pity the Poor Businessman

With the imposition of price controls, a mere protective dike against the surging tide of inflated currency and easy credit, we can expect to see the groceryman, the drygoods dealer, the furniture dealer, and other businessmen putting in a supply of aspirin as though to compete with the drug stores. But these merchants will not be stocking the aspirin for sale, but as a relief from the headaches they are now experiencing in trying to go along with the price-control program.

The first headache comes with the receipt of the voluminous and, often, confusing mass of directives, instructions, etc., which pour out uninterruptedly from the various Office of Price Stabilization offices. These require hours of study and cause more hours of worry for the groceryman and others, hours formerly spent in giving better service to customers at the lowest possible prices.

The next headache comes when the merchant tries to carry out the numerous directives which often, to him, seem contradictory, useless, or meaningless. He finds in marking his goods with both the ceiling price permitted by OPS and his own selling price, that the latter is almost always by far the lower of the two. Why, then, the ceiling price, when competition and the grocer's (or other businessman's) natural American desire to give his customers as much in goods and service as possible for the lowest possible price have kept and are keeping prices down? But here again go many hours of labor that ordinarily would be spent in service to customers, care of store, examination of stocks, etc.

Then comes a third headache in making out reports of this, reports of that, triplicate and duplicate reports seemingly without end. "When, oh, when, will I get time to take care of my business so as to serve the wants of my customers?" the exasperated businessman moans.

Then the final convulsion, the one which is liable to blow the top right off that businessman's noggin, will probably come when some politically appointed director, without experience in running a grocery or other store, comes in and starts telling the bewildered manager what to do, what not to do, what he has done wrong—and penalties which might be imposed—what he has failed to do at all, and so on and on and on until the groceryman (or other businessman) is liable to exclaim:

"Here, take my store, stock and all, run it the way it should be run, and I'll go out and get one of those common laborer jobs at a defense project or somewhere else and reap some of those inflated wages without this inflated headache the OPS is imposing on me."

Talk about waste of manpower. When a nation's energies, or even a considerable part thereof, are primarily used up in following directives from bureaucrats, instead of being used for production and service, that nation is on the road to decay. And when increasing numbers of men are taken from useful pursuits to police and enforce the directives, there is another great loss of productive power.

At best controls are but a dike against the flood of inflationary money, credit, featherbedding, etc., created or openly permitted by the same government which imposes the controls.

There are several ways of fighting inflation and every one calls for sacrifice on the part of some portion of or the entire citizenry.

The first and most important step is for the Federal Government to repeal the many inflationary laws and practices inaugurated during depression days to overcome deflation, such as easy credit, abundant currency without solid foundation, hundreds of thousands of Federal employees doing nonessential work or, as was the case of the former Georgia Governor, doing no work at all.

The next move is for States and counties and other taxing units to reduce nonessential expenditures for luxuries which are nice (for some) and to which many are now accustomed but which we cannot afford if we are to go all-out in defeating inflation at home and the Red menace abroad. Some of these luxuries may mean the trimming drastically of some unemployment compensation and of welfare assistance for persons who are perfectly able to work but who gladly accept—and in many cases demand—a living supplied by the sweat and toil of their neighbors.

Another step in defeating inflation must be longer working hours with no increase in pay for millions of laborers. There must be no more wage or salary increases, anywhere, without a corresponding increase in production or service.

Another way to fight inflation will be for people to buy more savings bonds and otherwise put part of their earnings into savings. But, until the Federal Government acts to show it is sincere in its desire to stop inflation, it's going to have a mighty hard job in selling savings bonds. People just don't want to put hard-earned money away in bonds which, when they mature, won't buy half as much as the money invested would have bought.

And finally, we must pay as we go for all defense and preparedness projects. This will mean higher taxes, of course, but if people

feel their taxes are being used wisely and not squandered on unnecessary activities and Government featherbedding, if they feel sure such taxes will help defeat both the Reds and inflation, they are not going to kick a great deal at tax increases.

Yes, to fight inflation calls for the same patriotism, the same sacrifices, the same determination that is required to fight a foe in Korea or elsewhere. And, as men are wounded and even die on that battlefield over there, so is the fight on inflation going to hurt some individuals and some groups here at home. But this inflation fight must be won if freedom is to continue in America. Have we, as a people, enough individual and group patriotism and fortitude to win that battle? An affirmative answer to that question must come very, very soon or America will go over the brink of national disaster.

One thing sure, controls are not the answer.

Policy Based on Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Policy Based on Fear," which appeared recently in the Idaho Statesman, Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY BASED ON FEAR

The administration rebuttal to MacArthur, on the part of the President and the Secretary of Defense, practically guarantees that the continued conduct of the Korean war will be along lines prevailing at present. Main contentions in the administration position could be summarized as follows:

1. China may be defeated, and peace restored, after enough Chinese soldiers have been killed in Korea to convince the Peiping Government of the futility of further conflict.

2. Carrying the war to the Chinese mainland would alienate America's allies, and perhaps bring Russia into the struggle.

3. War with Russia would almost certainly mean devastation of American cities by atomic bombs.

In addition to these points, the contention was made that General MacArthur had destroyed a peace possibility in his battlefield overture to the Red commander, and that his abrupt dismissal had kept him from making farewell statements which would have complicated General Ridgway's task.

The latter two items can be dismissed with the observation that they have not an iota of fact to justify their utterance. The remainder of the administration position can be summarized in one sentence: fear that an attempt to crush the Chinese Reds and end a war of indecision will convince Russia that the hour has struck in which to make its final, all-out bid for world conquest.

There is no denying the possibility of such an event, but its probability, as MacArthur emphasizes, is clearly another matter. Dictatorships, as Hitler proved, go to war when a careful assessment of relative strength convinces them that they have achieved a state of final readiness, with a better than 50–50 possibility of sudden victory—and with a careful attention to the element of planned surprise. No indication exists today that Russian strength has either been pushed to its total limit of war readiness or that its existing supply of military equipment would see it through a world war show-down—keeping in mind the massive superiority of American industrial production.

But always the counsel of the men around the President is to emphasize and overemphasize what Russia could do to this country in the event of a war, with little attention paid to what it would mean for any country to take on the United States in a final struggle for world ascendancy. General MacArthur labeled this attitude "defeatism," and it would seem to be an appropriate term.

A policy based on fear of Russia, rather than one based on actions calculated to make Russia fear this country, is the factor presently standing in the way of making Red China rue the day it asked for war. Pusillanimous actions and minimum assistance from U. N. allies have contributed to this sorry state of affairs, destroying any real hope of a truly unified offensive against a common foe, and laying the dreadful cost of protracted war squarely on the American people.

How long can the Korean war be allowed to continue, while a confused leadership hopes that the light of sweet reason will dawn upon Mao Tse-tung and the remainder of the Chinese puppet prisoners of Russia?

How long can the steadily increasing costs be borne—in lives and dollars?

The time is not too far off, it would seem, when these questions must either be answered, or the validity of continuing a halfway and hopeless conflict must be questioned.

The Korean war can easily drag on for years (as General Marshall himself admits) and in the meantime Russia will grow stronger (never using its own troops) while the United States is bled of its strength. The net result will be to weaken anti-Communist force throughout the world, in Europe and elsewhere, for American responsibilities are far-flung.

If no effort is to be made to knock China out of the war, in the interests of husbanding strength for the inevitable day of reckoning with Russia, then any further conduct of the Korean war appears to be without sound objective. Plainly the role which has been assigned to China is that of tying the United States down in a costly conflict, while feverish effort is being readied for Russia's final bid.

Better the United States should recognize that Korea has been a horrible trap, pull its army out entirely and fall back on Japan and Okinawa, than to keep it forever tied down in a stupid conflict in which it has no decent allied support and in which no final decision is to be sought.

New Sources of Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Sources of Steel" which appeared in the Washington Post, of March 10, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SOURCES OF STEEL

Sponsors of the St. Lawrence seaway have marshaled some convincing arguments before the House Public Works Committee. Among the most impressive is the contention that the seaway, opening the Great Lakes to oceangoing vessels in the Atlantic, is needed to make the rich iron-ore beds of Quebec and Labrador more available to American mills. With the present strong indications that this country will be drawing heavily upon these deposits in future years, it would not make sense to leave the development of the seaway to Canada alone. It is the type of project that preeminently calls for international cooperation.

Of course, the United States is not facing any critical shortage of iron ore. The Bureau of Mines estimates that only 25 to 30 percent of the Lake Superior-Mesabi deposits of 1,750,000,000 tons have been drilled. Other deposits are available in this country, in Venezuela, Mexico, and various parts of Canada. But in this age of steel a nation the size of ours must be forehanded in tapping mineral resources that may be urgently needed in the foreseeable future. Our standard of living no less than our security is dependent upon steel. For these reasons alone there are substantial advantages in drawing upon the estimated 2,000,000,000 tons of ore in the Labrador-Quebec ranges before our domestic supplies are exhausted. The St. Lawrence seaway would also make available by easier shipping methods an estimated billion tons of iron deposits in Newfoundland.

George M. Humphrey, president of the Cleveland company which is now developing huge iron-ore deposits in Labrador, called the seaway a vital necessity when he appeared before the House committee on Monday. It is natural that he should think so. But many others who have nothing directly to gain from the new shipping lanes that the St. Lawrence seaway would afford have come to think in similar terms. And their demands upon Congress are supported by still others who see widespread advantages in the new supplies of power that the project would create.

Beef Roll-Back Is Unfair to the Cattle Feeders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, since the announced roll-back on beef prices, there has been confusion and much misunderstanding. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Max E. Markley, a cattle feeder, to the editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, and published in the May 13 issue of that newspaper under the heading, "Beef Roll-Back Is Unfair to the Cattle Feeders."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEEF ROLL-BACK IS UNFAIR TO THE CATTLE FEEDERS

To the EDITOR:

In the controversy over the beef roll-back order the administration takes the position that the returns to the producer are adequately covered by the parity figures. There is some merit in this argument with regard to the position of the primary producer of beef animal, but parity prices mean little or

nothing in determining the profit or loss in the later or fattening stages of beef production.

Beef production has quite generally passed the stage where one man has the cow herd, raises calves, carries them on until ready for grain feeding, and then fattens them before selling. Now it is usual for one rancher to specialize in the production of weanling calves, selling them in the fall to another specialist who winters these calves on hay and then runs them on grass through the second summer. When these calves are from 15 to 18 months old they are shipped to the central market and so'd to the Corn Belt feeder. Some large feeding operations are conducted upon small acreages close to the terminal markets with all feeds purchased.

It is in these latter stages of beef production that the parity principle does not apply and where the roll-back is creating the grave injustice. To demonstrate, the following shows a somewhat simplified balance sheet of feed-lot operations.

100 choice 800-pound feeder steers at 36 cents	$28,800
Interest 6 months at 6 percent	864
Trucking, commissions, yardage, taxes, etc	1,650
Corn, 5,000 bushels at $1.40	7,000
Alfalfa hay, 20 tons at $30	600
Linseed oil meal, 18 tons at $60	1,280
Labor and power	1,440
Total costs	41,634

With a 1-percent death loss and a 2-pound-per-day gain there will be 113,850 pounds of live weight to sell. To cover all costs the feeder must have a price of 36 cents per pound to break even. At the pre-roll-back price of 40 cents per pound his net profit would have been but $4,554 for this sizable business operation. Under the present order his selling price for high-choice cattle is reduced to approximately 32 cents and this gives him a net loss of over $4,500.

Without the feeder beef supplies would be highly seasonal with an overabundance in the fall and early winter and a dearth during the balance of the year. The total supply would also be very short. The 800-pound feeder steer would yield but 400 pounds of tough stringy grass beef but after 6 months full feed in the lot the yield would be 700 pounds of top-quality tender meat.

MAX C. MARKLEY,
Cattle Feeder.

ST. PAUL.

The Constitution: Worth Having, Worth Defending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a short statement by me, and a copy of the oration delivered by Miss Kay Jon Mildon, the winner of the American Legion Oratorical Contest in my State. I ask unanimous consent that my statement and the oration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and oration were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Not many months ago the hearings before the House Un-American Activities Committee on communism developed that some of the graduates of America's most prominent educational institutions are allowed to receive their degrees without exposing themselves to a single course in American history, civics, or government. It is apparent to many of us that this real gap in the education of some of our so-called educated people is one of the reasons the totalitarian governments have been able to make impressions of their philosophies upon persons who do not realize the true nature of the heritage we Americans have, as a result of the struggle and fighting of our progenitors for our Government and its principles.

I am proud that the schools of my State are teaching history and government to the pupils. The oration of Miss Kay Jon Mildon, of Weber County High School, Ogden, Utah, the winner of the State American Legion oratorical contest in my State of Utah, indicates that she has been taught the real value of our heritage and the importance of our preserving it. I am having the oration printed in the RECORD so the Senate will know the views of this high-school girl on the Constitution, and will know what the schools of my State are teaching the youth.

THE CONSTITUTION: WORTH HAVING, WORTH DEFENDING

(Oration by Miss Kay Jon Mildon)

Man's destiny is progress. Across the centuries each thrust back has been canceled by a longer surge forward. The American Constitution crowned the best of all the ages which preceded it. It was the freedom of Greece and Rome, the Magna Carta, the defense of reason, the search for truth. It was the accumulated declaration of all human dignity.

"We, the people of the United States"—with these revolutionary words the writers of the Constitution introduced an instrument of government launching the greatest adventure in human liberty ever known to man. "We, the people"—our Government in our hands. Here is the true revolution of world history.

The Constitution is a design for independent men. It inspires critical thinking without conformity to any mind or time and lays aside all remorseless limits of inheritance. It dignifies the human spirit and says, "With what you are build your future." William Morton challenges pain and human suffering is eased; Cyrus Field believes the immensity of an ocean is not too wide for words and the Atlantic cable is laid; Benjamin Franklin makes service and wisdom and humor American trade-marks; Henry Ford gives distance a smaller meaning.

Poet and explorer, inventor, laborer, statesman, and architect—here is a legion of free men, each building America in the way he finds best, savoring the magic of the land, pushing back frontiers, justifying a way of life endorsed by the signers of the Constitution.

And a people worked and dreamed. The thing that was they made better. That which was not they created. The sun shone on an empire rising from a people's total genius. The burdens were lifted from men and animals to engines and machines. No unsolved problem went unchallenged. New power and skill brought higher productivity. They call it American know-how. Its other name is freedom.

From a compact of a people with themselves has evolved a state spanning a continent, whose wounds of civil war healed in insoluble oneness of spirit and purpose. There has grown up a mutuality of pride that this sovereign people could achieve so well.

For we are not a unique people except as our opportunities and heritage make us unique. We are the Slav and the Greek, the Norwegian and the Dane; we are the Welchman from the coal mine and the peasant from the field; we are the refugee from tyranny; we are the outcast and the adventurer, but we are freedom too—the product of the circumstances which gave us the power of decision.

We are nurtured where the first instinctive reaction is one of trust, for the protection of the constitution is constant. We can attend to our civic duties and then go about our affairs satisfied that our security is not hourly menaced.

Insecurity and fear are well known in America, but it isn't the pervasive fear of the informer, or the fear of guilt by supposition; it isn't the late knock at the door striking the heart cold. Our fears are tangible and capable of alternatives. They are tempered with the knowledge that extreme cases will be justly served.

Today with ours the strongest state left on the side of Christian civilization, we are confronted with the question, "Is the Constitution worth having, worth defending?" The freedom or slavery of mankind for hundreds of years may rest with our answer. Our time is now.

What are we going to do with our time? One man said, "I give you peace in our time." But men of good will declared peace was not enough. Another grasped for power. It was not enough. What is enough? How shall we acquit ourselves before the tribunal of the future? The noble objectives stated in the preamble of the Constitution have survived a turbulent century littered with the wrecks of governments and constitutions. Those whose footsteps preceded ours across the vast unknown of history have not faltered. They kept faith with destiny.

Let us ask ourselves what duties and obligations are ours and accept them with the same readiness that we do our privileges.

We have the duty, civic and moral, of social responsibility. Our time is now.

Our first civic duty is political insight. Knowing the fundamental concepts of our democracy is the surest avenue to its security. We shall not build it wide enough with ignorance. It has been the recurrent tragedy of history that men who had achieved a measure of freedom have let it slip from their grasp. Justice and liberty do not automatically reproduce themselves. They are born again and again from the vigilance of the people. It must be a realistic vigilance which considers both our limitations and potentialities. We are in need of competence in the basic operation of self-government.

Our second civic duty is action. We must vote according to our most considered conviction. We shall follow the performance of those whom we entrust with our Government and reinstate only those who are faithful to that trust.

It is our third civic duty to pay our taxes honestly. They secure for us blessings which no amount of money can safeguard elsewhere in the world. What price freedom to speak, to read, to hear, and choose? What would you bid for a fair trial, the right of habeas corpus, and property? For how much would you sell your right to vote? What price freedom to worship? What price freedom? The privileges and security we enjoy should be paid for by us who possess them.

And there are other civic duties we must assume. We shall give our laws and respect of observance; we shall serve on juries as called and be willing witnesses in court as the occasion arises; we shall act to seek out those who wrap themselves in the protective cover of the Constitution they conspire to destroy; we shall promote the settlement of disputes by peaceful means which unites our strength or the common welfare.

Exploding in headlines across our daily newspapers is the news which is no longer news—that democracy is in danger. The nations sit like competitors at a game board,

wary of every move, jostling for advantages, real or imaginary. What will happen to the Constitution? The answer will have to come from the actions of common men.

Our social responsibility includes moral duties based on the Christian ethic. The Christian ethic is the tap root of our national greatness. From it our moral code derives its vitality. Let us not assume that we can defend our Constitution without a deep and abiding faith in God, and the fulfillment of our duties in accordance to that faith.

We need to think not alone in terms of our rights but also of the rights of others; not always in terms of what's in it for me, but what can I put in it for him. It is a practical principle which means further that we will insist upon justice and equality for others. The loss of a single right can weaken or destroy democracy. We shall corrupt no man to gain a privilege and refuse corruption to ourselves. We should be as eager to be worthy of success as we are to be successful. We should keep our spiritual and intellectual forces abreast of our material gains. Otherwise the very means we use for self-defense may be self-defeating. The fulfilling of our best possibilities will not be too much. Our time is now.

It is our duty to direct the immense productive energies of America toward the end of poverty and want and the causes of war. We must keep the power of world decisions in the hands of those who love justice and right. Otherwise we may have no Constitution to defend. Our destiny of greatness is ours only by performance.

There are many called upon to defend the Constitution in ways more heroic than words. In places of Government upholding their highest convictions unswerved and unbought. Upon the battlefield there is a price for freedom. In our lives so little altered by the rumble of distant guns it is easy to forget. We must be fortified with our cause. America was built by a people unafraid of the future. It shall be upheld by a people who are unafraid, a people fulfilling their civic and moral responsibilities.

Turning from the last momentous struggle to preserve our freedom we took stock of the miracle of accomplishment, and the price which had been paid. From the peaceful American soil had sprung the giant machines of war, and the valiant hands to use them. Together they went out to explain a free man's love of freedom and his determination to keep it. It came at a price. But there are better ways to measure lives than by their years. These had been spent for the bright coin of freedom.

We are the children of a way of life made possible by the Constitution. The present effort may have to speak even more eloquently than the last to preserve our civil liberties. Our time is now.

Is the Constitution worth having, worth defending? There is only one answer—given in sober dedication.

Yes, America.

American Legion Proposes a Strong, Sound, and Thoroughly American Foreign Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the national executive committee of the American Legion at its spring meeting in Indianapolis has adopted a fighting program against communism. If by some happy miracle the main points of this program would suddenly be adopted by our Government, it would be like a blast of fresh air across the Nation inspiring new life in our decaying foreign policy.

True to its tradition, the Legion plainly recognizes America's foes. The Legion is not fooled by the propaganda of the Communists. It is well aware of the fact that America is in a fight to the finish with communism and that we can afford no compromise with it.

If the Legion program for America were adopted in the main we would be through forever with coddling Communists at home and appeasing them abroad. Childish notions that the Communists may drop their aggressive ideas play no part in shaping this program which maps a path for America's survival.

I include herewith a news item which appeared in the May 10, 1951, issue of the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes, which article sets forth the high lights of the foreign relations resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion:

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF LEGION SEEKS TO BREAK REDS—MAY MEETING ADOPTS AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM AGAINST COMMUNISM AT HOME AND ABROAD—BACKS COCKE IN MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY—WOULD CHALLENGE KREMLIN WITH FORCE—WANTS ACHESON FIRED

The national executive committee of the American Legion got tough May 2–4 at Indianapolis, Ind., when, at its spring meeting, it molded an aggressive program to "break the hammer and blunt the sickle" of communism both at home and abroad.

The first action of the committee backed completely by resolution the attitude and policy voiced courageously by National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of Dawson, Ga., when he came out publicly for the removal of restrictions on military operations in the Korean war. Cocke recently completed an unprecedented world tour, during which he visited 32 countries and traveled 32,000 miles in 37 days. During that period he had conversed with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo. He went to Korea for first-hand battle-line information, spent time with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, and covered pretty thoroughly the European theaters of possible world war III action. The Legion supported its national commander when it reaffirmed policies earlier adopted by the organization seeking the use of Chiang's troops in the Korean war, calling for the bombing of strategic areas in Manchuria, for the blockading of Red Chinese ports, and demanding a defense of Formosa.

The committee, with a few minor changes, went on record in a 36-point resolution in support of the report of the foreign relations commission, headed by Donald R. Wilson, of West Virginia. This long resolution also in large measure reaffirmed Legion policy which seeks to gird this country for a possible global war with communism.

It not only called once more for the ouster of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State, but it also pulled no punches in condemning Great Britain for "trafficking with the enemy" by carrying on trade with Red China.

The committee adopted a series of resolutions presented by its Americanism commission, through A. Luke Crispe, of Vermont, seeking a "get tough" policy with Reds at home. It reiterated by resolution further demands of the Legion, through its security commission headed by Bruce P. Henderson, of Ohio. In all, some 14 commissions and a half dozen committees made strong reports on international and national affairs and dealt with internal organization matters.

FOREIGN RELATIONS DEMANDS

High lights of the Foreign Relations resolution included:

1. Branding of the Soviet Union and her satellites as having embarked upon a course of conduct calculated to enslave the world, characterized by duplicity, savagery, immorality and lawlessness, and condemning their international banditry.

2. Reaffirmation of faith in the ultimate victory of the principles and ideals of the United Nations and rededication to the effort to strengthen this international organization.

3. Reiteration of opposition to United States participation in any form of world federation.

4. We must continue to aid those nations of Western Europe and others throughout the world which have joined with us in the global struggle to destroy the forces of Communist aggression. But we say the time for give-away programs has ended. The Santa Claus attitude of our State Department has not won us fighting friends but has only increased the cries from all over the world for more and more of the American taxpayers' dollar.

5. Limiting, reducing, and discontinuing as soon as possible Marshall plan aid so that the drain on the United States Treasury will be stopped and limiting point 4 aid to offering American technical know-how.

6. We see a growing tendency on the part of the State Department to become an operating department rather than a policy-making agency. Instead of giving away the substance of America in a very unrealistic way, we suggest that the State Department concentrate on the major task of formulating American plans to combat the very real threats to our security throughout the world. • • • We don't have that kind of leadership in our State Department today. To get the leadership required, we must remove the present corps of leaders whose every action has reflected incompetency, indecision, and defeatism. They must be replaced by a corps of realists—men of high purpose and courage—who are not afraid, who have undeviating confidence in American power and ingenuity and who will by meriting our respect, face the future with resolution and faith.

7. Continued strengthening of the military and political effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty organization and the inclusion of Spain, Greece, and Turkey.

8. Strengthening of Western Germany economically, politically, and militarily.

9. Treating Communist China in every sense as an aggressor.

10. Opposition to recognition of Red China by the United States and against seating Red China in the United Nations.

SCORES TRAFFIC WITH ENEMY

11. Calling on Congress and the U. N. to take the necessary steps, including the imposition of a blockade, to stop trading in war materials with Communist countries.

12. Bombing of Communist bases, concentration of troops, supplies, and equipment in China or wherever they may be found to prevent their being used by the forces of aggression to forestall and make more costly the successful prosecution of the present conflict in Korea.

13. Continue defense of Formosa.

14. Remove all restrictions against the use of Chinese Nationalists in fight against Communist aggressors.

15. Speedy conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan.

16. Aid to the fullest extent to the Philippine Government.

17. Creation of a regional defense pact by the free nations of the far Pacific and southeastern Asia.

18. We are practicularly concerned with the precarious geographical location and the strategic and economic importance of Iran and we urge that any attempt by outside influences to take over control of that country be vigorously opposed by the United Nations.

19. Providing grain for India only in exchange for the strategic materials which we need and which they can provide to us.

20. Revitalizing of the Voice of America program and transferring it from the Department of State to an independent administrative and operating agency.

21. Development of guerrilla forces in Communist countries to carry on a campaign of sabotage such as Russia is carrying on against other nations of the world.

AMERICANISM PROPOSALS

Resolutions of the Americanism chairman included:

1. Swift and adequate retaliation against Czechoslovakia for the imprisonment of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis to end the persecution of American citizens by Communist governments.

2. Immediate arrest and establishment of detention camps for 14,000 highly skilled saboteurs now under surveillance and awaiting only the Communist order to unloose violence and destruction.

3. Denial of bail for persons found guilty of subversive acts, pending their appeal.

4. Disbarment of Communist lawyers.

5. Denial of the use of the mails to subversive groups.

6. Full-scale probes by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the extent of subversive infiltrations in defense industries, communications, transportation, Government agencies, the field of entertainment and other sensitive branches of the country's nerve system.

7. Setting forth a five-point sincerity test for recanting Communist and Communist front supporters.

1951 Merchandising and Management Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, May 14, our colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] delivered a fine address before the 1951 merchandising and management conference held under the auspices of the University of Maryland. Through long experience in his present post as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the junior Senator from Alabama is well qualified to discuss the problems facing the 2,000,000 retailers who constitute so large a segment of our economy. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, I am especially pleased to be with you this evening and to have the opportunity to participate in the University of Maryland's merchandising and management conference. One reason is that I believe in times of economic stress the problems of the distributive services do not in general receive the attention they deserve.

In any industrial mobilization program, with its heavy emphasis on production, there is perhaps a natural tendency for manufacturing to be in the limelight. It is regrettable that there is not a more general awareness of the problems and difficulties encountered by retailers. That is why such conferences as this which stimulate discussion and thinking about retailing in a defense effort serve such a useful purpose.

Another reason why I welcomed this occasion to talk with you is because, as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I have a deep and active interest in the problems and welfare of retail establishments, the majority of which, as you know, are considered small business.

No one will fail to agree, I am sure, that our almost 2,000,000 retail outlets form, in large part, the economic backbone of every American community. Our tremendous national talent for production has its fruition when an article of merchandise crosses a store counter into the hands of a consumer.

There can be no doubt that the key factor in our ability to sustain a major and extended defense effort is the continued expansion of our entire economy. This means that we must not overlook a single workable method of maintaining a balance between our military production and the continuance, at as high a rate as circumstances allow, of goods and services for our civilian needs. Achieving that state of balance is one of the most difficult problems confronting the Congress and the executive branch today.

Those officials charged with the management of our mobilization program are trying—and rightly so, I believe—to achieve a rate of armament production which will make us as strong as we need to be militarily, while at the same time they are attempting to minimize the disruptions in our civilian markets. It is really a problem of scheduling. We are trying to avoid a rising curve of military production which would be straight up for the next year or two. If we did that and overloaded ourselves with munitions, and if by then there was no outbreak of a general war, our economy would certainly be strained by the abrupt cessation of military purchases.

Currently, we are spending some $5,000,000,000 a month on military goods. About 8 percent of our productive capacity is channeled into defense production. This rate is expected to increase until, in 1953, about 20 percent of our industrial effort will be on a war footing. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to achieve this goal without the economic dislocations which raised such havoc with small-business establishments during the early years of World War II.

Then, as you will easily remember, many small enterprises become home-front casualties. In 1941, total retail establishments numbered 1,590,000. A year later there were but 1,433,700. In 1943, a further decrease brought the figure down to 1,324,700. In other words, 18 percent—almost one out of five—of our retailers closed their doors between 1941 and 1943.

The situation now, of course, is nowhere as grave as it was during the dark early days of the last war. Let us not on that account, however, become complacent. We must guard carefully against that. For I need not tell you that we are living from day to day with the possibility that the Kremlin may decide at any time to set the civilized world aflame.

One of the prices which as individuals and as businessmen we must pay to make our country strong is a greater participation by Government in the affairs of business. In a word, controls.

Regimentation, as such, is repugnant to all of us. We are now as a Nation, in fact, fighting a war against an enemy who would fetter the bodies and minds of free men. There is probably no one here this evening who does not realize that our very existence depends on our ability so to manage our economy that it will be able to withstand the tremendous pressure we are placing on it.

It was Stalin's predecessor, Lenin, who said: "The easiest way to conquer a country is to debauch its currency." That is frightening truth. The valor of our fighting men will be nullified if we at home permit inflation to sap the strength from our economy. To get out of the shadow of printing-press money we have had to impose price, wage, rent, and credit controls.

Only last week the President stated that there is a better chance during the next 2 years of our controls having to be made tighter instead of their easing off. It looks as though we are going to have to learn to live in a partially controlled economy. I think the best way to do that is to increase our awareness of the objectives of those who have been given the very heavy responsibility of guiding our national economy in the troubled days ahead. Most reasonable men, I feel confident, will be willing to trade, on a temporary basis, a few of their time-honored ways of doing business in order to help preserve our national heritage of freedom.

I realize that the pricing regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization have been a burden to many businessmen. They bear, of course, most heavily on the small retailers, such as hardware-store owners, who must establish prices on hundreds of small items. Admittedly the reporting requirements will at first be troublesome. There are bound to be inconveniences, even possibly some inequitables, in the early stages of any program of national scope. Efforts will be made to correct them, I am sure. And I can assure you that the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee is constantly in touch with the regulatory agencies in an effort to represent the interests of the smaller members of our business community.

Because of my interest in the problems of small retailers, I had recently brought to my attention a suggestion which certainly seems worth exploring. The idea, in brief, is that all retail stores with an annual sales volume of less than $50,000 could be exempted from all pricing regulations. The points made by the advocates of this plan contend that the smaller stores are overburdened with the task of complying with the complicated pricing regulations, especially the time and manpower involved in preparing the pricing charts under ceiling price regulation 7. It is further contended that OPS will have to have a tremendous enforcement staff to check on the approximately 987,000 retail establishments which fall within the group of those doing less than $50,000 business.

Those who favor this small-business exemption feel that the price competition afforded by the larger stores which would be under regulation would force the smaller store owners to keep their prices in line with the ceilings. As I have said, the proposal is interesting and certainly one which our Small Business Committee will look into carefully. It does occur to me, however, that there must be many communities in this vast country of ours in which there are no stores with sales much over $50,000 a year, and these small towns and villages would then, in a price sense, not be in a competitive area.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that, when it comes to combating inflation, we must move on a level which is above the narrow interests of any particular groups. One of the most insidious aspects of inflation is that it gives many persons a false

sense of well-being. This is psychological sabotage in its least detectible and therefore most dangerous form. Wages, income, and profits are high. Everybody likes that. Personal income in March was at the record high annual rate of $242,000,000,000. Despite the wage stabilization order of last January, wages rose for the thirteenth consecutive month.

It is estimated that since March of 1950, the total wages paid by private industry climbed 18 percent. Corporate profits, of course, have more than kept pace with wages, to say nothing of the cost of living index.

It is not to be wondered then, that some harsh economic realities tend to be glossed over by those who are unmindful of the danger inherent in a runaway type of inflation. For instance, the tax bill passed by the Congress last October was designed to raise the Government's revenue by about $4,500,000,000. Since then, spiraling price increases, totaling some $6,000,000,000, have wiped out that gain.

Or to state it another way, rising prices have chewed up $2,000,000,000 out of every $10,000,000,000 that has been appropriated for the mobilization program. As retailers, as consumers, and certainly as taxpayers you should have a very direct interest in your Government's efforts to curtail all unnecessary expenditures in connection with our defense activities. We could afford to buy a great many long-range bombers with the money we have let run down the drainpipe of inflation.

You in the retail trade will probably agree that our wage and price controls have already had a breaking effect on "scarce" buying. I am told that since the first of the year, consumer buying has resumed a more normal pattern. Present heavy inventories have produced price reductions in many lines.

On the subject of pricing regulations and of retail inventories, I recently received an interesting letter from a department-store owner in my own State, which said, in part:

"I don't think you are going to have to worry much longer about price ceilings because the consumer market is glutted with merchandise. Somebody woefully underestimates the ability of industry in this country to produce. Unless something is done, my opinion is that by 1952 it will require the most phenomenal selling effort in history to move the merchandise produced in the factories of the United States."

I do not believe, however, that we can look for a continuation of the present inventory picture. As our mobilization program gains speed in the months ahead, we can almost certainly expect spot shortages in some classes of consumer goods. The military is going to take bigger and bigger bites out of the available supply of materials. It now appears that by July more than half of our steel production will be earmarked for defense and defense-supporting programs. That means that unless we place some curbs on consumer purchasing power, more and more dollars will be competing for less and less goods. That is also why our real battle with inflationary forces is yet to come.

The Congress has started to frame new tax legislation which is expected to raise revenue estimated to be in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000. Taxes, of course, are always painful. But I do not believe that any tax program in the history of our Nation can have a more salutary effect than those which we must raise to finance our present defense effort.

Current taxes provide us with two direct benefits. They help us, in the first place, to keep our rearmament program on a pay-as-you-go basis. The desirability of this, the absolute necessity, in fact, needs no explanation. If we do not foot our defense bill as it falls due, we shall certainly have to pay a higher price for it in terms of skyrocketing living costs and higher defense costs.

Secondly, I think we all by now realize that price and credit controls cannot by themselves effectively clamp a ceiling on prices. The amount of spending money in corporate and consumer hands must also be curbed if we are to avoid the disastrous effects of a widespread buying spree.

If present deliberations on the subject prevail, we as individuals will have our tax rate increased by three percentage points in each bracket. That will provide the Government with slightly less than $3,000,000,000. In addition, levies will be made on your companies to raise between two and three billion.

In the field of taxation I and my colleagues on the Senate Small Business Committee have tried to protect the interests of small independent enterprises. I think our efforts have met with some success. Under the original excess-profits tax, as you will recall, no minimum credit was provided. Now, any company or store earning less than $25,000 does not have to pay an excess-profits tax. In addition, new companies, started since the beginning of 1946, are entitled to a credit equal to their entire industry's average rate of return on assets during the base period.

The exemption for the smaller retailers becomes quite significant when you stop to realize that about 56 percent of all retail establishments have annual sales under $50,000.

No discussion of retailing and our defense effort can be complete, I am well aware, without commenting on regulation W. I can recall that last September, just before this curb on credit was instituted, many businessmen, and especially small retailers, felt that they were going to be badly hurt. I think there was a sense of relief when it became clear that our own installment-credit regulations turned out to be much less stringent than those in Canada, which require 50 percent cash down with only 12 months in which to pay the balance.

We all know that a great part of consumer and business spending since 1950 had been, so to speak, on the cuff. From the end of June 1950, through March, bank loans increased by more than $12,000,000,000. This splurge in credit was almost as much as had taken place in the entire years of 1947 and 1948. There seemed to be a mass impulse for the buying public to dip into savings for current expenditures. From June through March of this year redemptions of savings bonds exceeded bond purchases by over a billion dollars. Savings accounts themselves shrank by three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Regulation W then was a necessary hold-the-line action until such times as we could throw our price ceiling mechanism into gear. The anti-inflationary effect is seen in the reduction between December 1950 and March of this year of $364,000,000 in installment credits.

Softening markets in some consumer durable items have created demands for the relaxation of regulation W. The television industry, for instance, has requested the Federal Reserve Board to ease the credit terms on television-set sales. The industry would like to see dealers permitted to accept old sets to count as trade-ins as part of the down payment or, better yet, a reduction in the down payment from 25 to 15 percent.

At present the Reserve Board is disinclined to tamper with the present terms of the regulation, on the grounds, I am informed, that a firm case has not been made that the credit restrictions alone are responsible for the slacking TV sales.

I do not believe that anyone will disagree that regulation W's bark turned out to be much worse than its bite. The dollar sales volume of department stores, for instance, are substantially ahead of last year's figures, with consumer durable and semi-durable goods seeming to have had the greatest appeal to the buying public. In the District of Columbia for March, the sales index of department stores stands at 249 as opposed to 234 for March a year ago.

On a Nation-wide basis, department-store sales for the week ending May 5 rose 8 percent above the figure for the same period of 1950. Specialty stores recorded only half that gain.

From what we know about the effects of restricting installment-credit buying, I do not think we can reasonably take a harsh view toward regulation W. In fact, I should not be surprised if there are not some small retailers who have actually benefitted from it, at least to the extent that it has placed all sellers on an equal basis. The lower down payment with longer balance periods by which heavily capitalized firms were able to entice customers possibly worked to the disadvantage of smaller firms which could not wait so long for their money on a sale.

I am not at all sure that some action should not also be taken to restrict charge accounts, which can easily be viewed as the installment buying of the relatively well-to-do. In this connection it would perhaps be pertinent to cite another phase of the problem which was brought to my attention recently in a letter from a small appliance dealer in Mississippi.

The letter reads in part: "The Federal Reserve Board is basing their decision on factory sales figures, which represent buying by large well-financed outlets for stockpiling purposes. The large well-financed outlet is also selling the appliances on a 30- or 60-day charge account, knowing full well that the customer cannot pay this in that time. The customer will then go to a bank on credit company to pay the debt in full, and then pay for the appliance without making any down payment at all. A large outlet is also able to put a specific article in the lay-away-plan, which we cannot do."

It seems to me that retailers will directly benefit from the general manufacturers' order, recently issued by the Office of Price Stabilization, to establish new and more realistic ceiling prices for some 75,000 industrial firms. This order obliges manufacturers to roll back those prices which have risen excessively since Korea. We know that price increases have been more on the producer and wholesale level than at retail. For example, the retail price of woolen blankets has increased approximately 25 percent. Raw wool, however, is almost 100 percent more than it was last June. Consumer resistance has made it impossible for stores to match the increase at the producer level. One result is that some stores are replacing wool blanket inventory with less expensive, but more salable, synthetic blankets.

I would like to give you my assurance that the Congress, and especially the Senate Small Business Committee, intends to make the burden of our mobilization program fall as lightly as possible on the smaller business units, whether they be factories, wholesalers, retailers, or operators of service-type establishments.

I think that you may accept as a token of this intent the fact that the Small Business Committee, the chairmanship of which I consider a high privilege, is the first permanent committee created by the Senate to maintain a watchful guard over the interests of our smaller independent businesses.

In addition, the Defense Production Act of 1950, which provides the legislative framework for our war effort, clearly states that it is the policy of Congress to encourage small businesses to make the maximum contribution toward our defense program. It also contains such safeguards as providing that small business shall have representation on all business advisory committees, and that special efforts shall be made for

the expeditious handling of all requests, applications, or appeals from hardships and regulations by small concerns.

The act, moreover, directs the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission to study any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, strengthen monopolies, or in any way injure small business by promoting undue concentration of economic power.

Even so, I am not personally satisfied that we have succeeded in setting up adequate safeguards for smaller firms. In order, therefore, to make as certain as possible that small concerns are given a square deal, I have reintroduced in the Senate a bill now known as the Small Business Defense Plants Act of 1951.

Briefly, the bill provides for the establishment of an independent agency with the authority to make loans to small businesses and to provide many other general services required by smaller companies which must meet the keen competition of big business.

Meanwhile, our Senate committee is trying to fill the gap. For we realize that there are many disadvantages, many instabilities inherent in smallness. These are accentuated in times of economic stress. Our job is to see to it that the rules of fair play are observed. As the momentum of our war effort mounts, business dislocations will create continuous problems for all businessmen.

Some concerns dealing in nonessential lines will undoubtedly suffer hardships. There will be consumer shortages. Do not lose sight of the fact that we must share many of our basic materials with our friends throughout the world who share with us a dread of communistic aggression. We know that we are going to have to shoulder a much heavier tax burden. And business is going to be called upon to operate with many restrictions until the present emergency is past.

These are facts which we shall have to face and live with for an undetermined number of years. It will require sacrifices and much self-discipline. For we are in this struggle for better or for worse. We cannot hope for victory in this struggle for freedom if very many of us fail to accept our full responsibility as citizens and, most importantly, as businessmen.

You, as representatives of retailing, have a vital role to play from now on out. To a considerable extent our civilian economy is in your hands. Our standard of living, our entire American way of life is symbolized by the goods and services you provide. I know they are in good hands.

Need for Full and Careful Study of Various Services to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct attention to the fact that I have introduced H. R. 4079, a bill to establish a Temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind.

At the present time the various Federal programs for services to the blind are being handled by nearly a dozen bureaus and agencies. You can readily visualize the confusion that has developed in the mind of the average blind person seeking guidance and assistance when that person makes an inquiry for help from the Federal Government and does not direct the inquiry specifically to one of the immediate agencies concerned. Days and weeks pass sometimes before a letter finally reaches the correct office for attention. When we realize that Government expenditures for services to the blind amount to approximately $80,000,000 annually and that many other agencies, including private agencies, expend approximately $60,000,000 annually in this important and worth-while effort, it is readily apparent that careful planning and coordination are essential to accomplish the maximum benefits and services intended.

The problems arising from blindness constitute a major social and economic problem in our country. I am told that approximately 30,000 people are going blind in our land every year. We must, therefore, make every effort to plan and coordinate all activities in order to accomplish the maximum benefits and services in meeting this most important problem.

The recent expansion in welfare work supported by taxation frequently raises questions regarding the relationship between publicly supported and privately supported activities in behalf of the blind, specifically in regard to possible duplication or overlapping of efforts. A well coordinated and integrated program should result in maximum services which in no way compete with each other, duplicate or overlap the various efforts. Every consideration should be directed toward making these services more complete and more effective.

As early as 1862, legislation was enacted in this field which has from time to time been supplemented, amended, and added to, without much, if any, reference to any preconceived plan. Future development will probably follow the same lines unless a careful over-all study is made at this time with a view to making recommendations to the President and to the Congress for complete, intelligent, coordinated effort in this important field. Until such a study and recommendations are made, it is doubtful if there will be anything approaching uniform services to the blind throughout the country.

I wish to emphasize that such a study would in no way lessen the need for the effectiveness of national private agencies for the blind, because there is a definite area of opportunity both for private agencies and public agencies on all levels—national, State, and local.

I sincerely believe that the efforts of this national committee would materially strengthen the work for the blind throughout the Nation. I am hopeful that the Members of Congress will give early and favorable consideration to this proposal.

The provisions of H. R. 4079 are as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TEMPORARY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE BLIND

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee for the Blind (in this act referred to as the "committee"). The committee shall investigate and study the entire field of existing Federal, State, and local activities related to the granting of service to the blind, including the history and development of such activities. The committee shall report to the President and to the Congress, on or before January 3, 1953, the results of such investigation and study, together with recommendations (1) for accomplishing greater coordination of and more effective results from such activities, (2) for the attainment of maximum benefits for the blind, and (3) with respect to such other matters as the committee may deem appropriate.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 2. (a) The committee shall be composed of nine members to be appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One individual from the executive branch of the Federal Government;

(2) One individual from the Senate of the United States;

(3) One individual from the House of Representatives of the United States;

(4) One individual from among officers and employees of State governments;

(5) One individual from a national association of professional workers with the blind;

(6) One individual from a national organization of the blind;

(7) One individual from a national research organization for the blind;

(8) One individual from the field of education of the blind; and

(9) One individual from the public at large.

(b) Members appointed pursuant to paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9) of subsection (a) shall be appointed from among individuals who are not officers or employees of the United States or of any State or local government.

(c) Not more than five members of the committee shall be from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 4. Five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) Each member of the committee who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for his services as an officer or employee of the United States, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in him by the committee.

(b) Each member of the committee who is not an officer or employee of the United States shall receive $25 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. The committee shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) The committee, or any authorized member thereof, may, for the purpose of

carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the committee or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the committee or before any authorized member thereof.

(b) The committee, or any authorized member thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the committee, or any authorized member thereof, upon request made by the chairman of the committee or any authorized member thereof.

(c) The committee, or any authorized member thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated under authority of this act. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member. Sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 9. The committee shall cease to exist within 30 days after the committee submits its report pursuant to section 1.

Conditions in Pacific Coast Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my remarks today on the danger to national security presented by the weakened condition of our American merchant marine and the maritime industry as a whole, I wish to place in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, an organization of San Francisco area unions, at their meeting of April 16. This resolution calls particular attention to the disastrous state of affairs now existing in Pacific coast shipyards and presents a program for their betterment. I certainly subscribe to the two recommendations in the resolution and urge that immediate steps be taken to effectuate them.

The resolution follows:

Whereas since 1947 contracts for the construction of only a few small vessels have been awarded the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

Whereas recognizing the danger to national defense of a policy of not maintaining well dispersed shipyards, staffed with a nucleus of skilled workmen, constant efforts have been made to win an allocation of contracts to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and

Whereas despite the recognition of this principle, agencies of the Government have opposed allocation, contending that in peacetime only a relatively small number of vessels would be constructed, and that any arbitrary division of work would "destroy the more efficient yards"; and

Whereas specifically the Maritime Commission said "The volume of work involved in a wartime or emergency program makes the allocation of work desirable, whereas a peacetime limited construction program does not." (Letter from Philip B. Fleming to Schuyler Otis Bland, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, July 6, 1949); and

Whereas specifically the Munitions Board said "The proposed allocation would be effective only when applied to a large Government construction program. When applied to the current program, the work may be spread so thin as to put out of business valuable east coast yards with many years of experience." (Letter of May 27, 1949 to Schuyler Otis Bland from Maj. Gen. Patrick W. Timberlake, Munitions Board Deputy Director of Staff, Merchant Marine Committee hearings, p. 118); and

Whereas specifically the Navy said "Recognition of the fact that there is less than a desirable distribution of shipbuilding throughout the country does not permit the conclusion that part of the existing effort should be transferred elsewhere. Rather should it follow that additional shipbuilding should be fostered, and the industry nurtured to a healthy condition." (Supplementary statement of Rear Adm. Charles D. Wheelock, Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships, made to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, June 23, 1949, contained on p. 122 of hearings); and

Whereas Congress preparing intelligently to meet this emergency has authorized:

1. The construction of Mariner type vessels by the Maritime Board.

2. The construction of 170 naval vessels and the conversion of 291 others; and

Whereas the private yards of the Pacific coast, which built 42 percent of the vessels constructed during World War II, have little work, unstable employment conditions, are forcing skilled shipyard employees into other industries in this a time of national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, in meeting at San Francisco, Calif., the evening of the 16th day of April 1951, That the mobilization base be expanded to embrace the private yards of the Pacific coast, the construction records of which were unequaled in World War II; and be it further

Resolved, That—

1. The remaining Mariner type construction contracts (10 estimated) be allocated to Pacific coast yards—25 already having been assigned Atlantic and Gulf coast yards, and

2. A fair share of the Navy construction and conversion program be assigned to the private yards of the Pacific coast; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Maritime Board, the Navy Bureau of Ships, and to all Congressman and Senators from the States of California, Washington, and Oregon, and the metal trades department, A. F. of L.

Postal Pay Increase Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a self-explanatory newspaper article from the San Jose Mercury-Herald:

FIFTY-FIVE TO QUIT POST OFFICE IN SAN JOSE IF NO PAY RAISE, POLL SHOWS

San Jose Post Office may face a help shortage if Congress fails to authorize a 17 percent across-the-board pay raise under bills pending in Senate and House bills propose raises for all postal workers in the United States, including supervisory.

Cross-section poll of 118 out of 150 San Jose carriers showed that 55 plan leaving the service if Congress does not approve the raise, according to C. C. Renshaw, legislative committee chairman, branch 193, National Association of Letter Carriers. "Twenty-four percent have part-time outside jobs to make ends meet," he said. "Wives of 25 percent also work to help out."

"We are appealing to the public to write California Representatives and Senators urging passage of the bills," said Renshaw. "Pending is Senate bill 355 and H. R. 244. Senate hearings have been held but not even a subcommittee has acted in the House.

"Our survey showed," said Renshaw, "that the average carrier has approximately three dependents, besides his own upkeep. Twenty-three percent rent homes. 16 percent live with relatives, and 52 percent are buying homes. Nine percent were unaccounted for.

"Take-home pay averages $233 a month. Total income last year was $3,200, which was subject to withholding, retirement, and other deductions. On top of that were State and Federal income taxes. Too little remains."

Renshaw said that carriers' starting wage is $2,670 and graduates up to $3,970 after 25 years service, but that the $3,200 is today's average for all. Affected here in wage raise efforts are 400 employees. Clerks are represented by National Federation of Post Office Clerks. Al Gould, W. J. Sheeby, and Clarence Ashford are other members of Renshaw's committee.

Malicious Attacks Against Leaders Reach New Extremes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, during times of prolonged crisis and great emotional stress, some persons have a tendency to lose all sense of balance. From such persons, we can expect some rather uncontrolled outbursts. Our mail is apt to contain, and lately has contained, vicious personal attacks on our national leaders.

We can overlook much of it as the work of harmless cranks. Criticism, calm, or heated, we welcome as signifying a healthy democracy. But we in

a democracy have a limit beyond which our rules of fair play will not allow us to go. One scurrilous piece which came to my attention this week has gone beyond the limit. It reeks of malice and attempts to incite violence.

I do not mean to dignify it by bringing it to the attention of this House. I mention it here only so that the Members can be warned that such material is being distributed, and so they can be on guard against it in their own districts and can make sure that the proper action is taken to see that their constituents are placed on guard against these irresponsible enemies of democracy.

The particular piece which I refer to is one which actually threatens the lives of some members of the present administration. It suggests that the death sentence is the proper reward for their Government service and attempts to class them with convicted traitors.

I know that the Members on the other side of the House will join me in showing their abhorrence of this viciousness. It is true that those on the minority side have directed heavy political attacks at many of the same persons for whom the death sentence is suggested, but I know that I am speaking for all parties when I say that all true and patriotic Americans want to keep our present discussions on a level of decency and honest discussion.

I am turning this vile piece of literature over to the proper Government authorities to investigate the possibilities of taking action. I am doing this, as I give this information to the House, so that we can be on guard against this type of enemy within.

The Story of a State Department Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Democrat on May 16, 1951, entitled "The Story of a State Department Call."

This story which has now been disclosed and carefully documented should be investigated immediately by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to determine who in our State Department should issue orders such as this.

The editorial follows:

INSIDE LABOR—THE STORY OF A STATE DEPARTMENT CALL

(By Victor Riesel)

It can now be disclosed, and documented that a representative of Dean Acheson's State Department recently visited the most strategic waterfront union headquarters in this country—and urged its leaders to have their wharf-working followers refuse to load guns and ammo on ships rushing military supplies to our friends in Europe.

This spokesman for the United States Department of State introduced herself as Edith Cameron Wall. She carried the usual credentials used by Federal agents. In addition, she presented a letter from Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, which, in effect, urged union leaders to cooperate with her.

This conversation took place in the national headquarters of the A. F. of L. International Longshoremen's Association, long a target of the opposition. Through its dockwallopers it controls all ocean traffic to and from almost the entire world.

Lest there be the slightest doubt as to time, place and participants, I record here that the lady (still in the employ of the State Department at this very minute) made this proposal in a talk with husky ILA chief, Joe Ryan, in his private office at 265 West Fourteenth Street, New York City, at about 4:30 on the afternoon of March 13.

Joe threw the lady out, gently, and immediately telephoned top A. F. of L. leaders in Washington. Protests were rushed to the State Department. But labor got no satisfaction—and the lady is on her way to Europe on a special mission starting in Paris.

The best that the indignant Ryan and national A. F. of L. secretary George Meany, could get was a State Department apology—a polite brushoff—saying, so sorry the lady took up so much of your time.

It all began some days after Ryan had made certain that special Italian cargo ships were swiftly loaded with war stuff and sped on their way to Rome's military depots. Ryan had to see to this personally early in March when he was informed that a Communist propaganda spree was growing in Brooklyn, at the army waterfront base there.

Apparently an Italian Commie squad, operating out of its Henry Street catacomb, had spread out among the Italian longshoremen on the military piers and was urging the cargo slingers not to load the Italian freighters.

Joe got out there fast. So did Pentagon officers and city officials, including the mayor. The ships were loaded.

Some days later, Ryan received what he believed was a routine call from one of the many Government officials who seek his union's aid in this war. It was a lady. She was from the State Department and said she also had the Labor Department credentials. She wanted to discuss the union's manpower problems. They got together about 4:15 p. m. There was some technical talk. She saw union records. She revealed she had just returned from Norway—and was going to the other United States ports before leaving on a special mission to France.

Suddenly and sweetly the lady said:

"You have just issued orders to your men to load war supplies. And when I go over to France, the French longshoremen will ask me about their brothers in America and what they're doing. When I tell them that you are going to persist in your policy of sending the cargoes over there, will that not drive them into Communist hands?

"Won't you let me have your word that I can give them practical assurances that you will change your policy on loading these ships?"

Never famous for his shyness, Joe Ryan got slightly apoplectic.

"Listen, girlie," he snapped, "those French longshoremen are in the Communist Party. They went in back on December 4, 1936, when they refused to unload our steamship *George Washington*, of the United States Lines, and you, or your people, know it. They even refused to take off baggage. What kind of a quiz program am I in here? Is this your opinion, or did the State Department send you in here to tell me not to load these ships? You got in here only because of the State Department and I know you've been visiting other waterfront unions."

Startled, she stuttered:

"No; I'm voicing my own opinion."

Joe opened the door, and shouted for his secretary to throw her out before he lost his temper and forgot he wasn't on the docks.

Then the protests were shot to the State Department. But it has refused to condemn her, or dissociate itself from her.

Who sent her? It doesn't seem possible that she could dare to do this without orders from some superior. Who is he?

John Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a beautiful letter from the staff of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to Mrs. John Kee, wife of our late beloved chairman:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
May 16, 1951.

MRS. JOHN KEE,
George Washington Inn,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. KEE: In the passing of our beloved chairman, Judge Kee, all of us on the staff of the committee feel a profound sense of personal loss.

The judge was a great chairman, with an outstanding record of unselfish public service and devotion. But he was more than that to us, however. Despite his heavy and demanding work load, he always found time to take an active interest in us and our problems, and was anxious that we find a maximum degree of happiness in our work. His kindliness, friendliness, and deep understanding made it a simple matter for us to achieve that happiness.

You and your family can be justly proud of, and comforted by, the great and noble reputation he leaves behind.

We wish for you and each member of your family many years of health and happiness.

Sincerely,

Boyd Crawford, Ira E. Bennett, Sheldon Z. Kaplan, George Lee Millikan, Roy J. Bullock, Albert C. F. Westphal, June Nigh, Winifred Osborne, Mabel Wofford, Mary G. Chace, Helen Mattas.

State Department Negotiations Cut Plywood Imports 50 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, our State Department, through its negotiations at Torquay, England, has entered into trade agreements with 17 foreign nations and has brought about a 50-percent decrease in the tariff which now

applies on the importation of plywood into the United States by foreign countries. Under the favored-nations clause, countries not included in this trade agreement may also be permitted to import plywood into this country under the agreements negotiated.

On February 9, 1949, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, I called attention to the fact that we had a threat in foreign-produced plywood to our American industry which, at that time, was employing about 13,000 workers in this industry.

On June 20, 1950, I appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information protesting the contemplated cut in the import levies and called attention to the fact that there were eight Douglas fir plywood and veneer plants located in the First Congressional District, which I represent, and are centered in the counties of Sonoma, Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte. I also pointed out that the average wage existent at that time for the American worker in this industry was $1.725 per hour while, in British Columbia, the nearest to our wage scale had workers receiving the equivalent of $1.10 in United States currency. I called attention to the fact that, in the United States, the man hours necessary to produce 1,000 square feet of plywood cost $23.88; while, in Canada, the cost in equivalent American dollars was $15.18. In the United States, the logs necessary to produce 1,000 square feet of plywood cost $37.50; in Canada the cost in equivalent American dollars was $26.52. I proceeded to give further comparisons of the difference in the cost of production and the threat to this industry should tariff reductions be made.

At that time, the best information I had was that there were some 18,500 men employed in this industry on our coast. The three Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington are the main producers of plywood in the United States, and I am informed now that there are between 35,000 and 40,000 people engaged in these mills and the supplying of material for their operation. New plants have been built and only this week I assisted in the procurement of necessary materials to put into operation the Arcata Plywood Co., located in Arcata, Calif.

Of course, I realize that damage to the industry is not one of immediate concern as plywood is in such heavy demand. However, if this demand for materials eases off, there is bound to be a tremendous reaction in the areas in which these plywood plants operate. In many instances, they become the important source of employment for many people and any slackening of production would adversely affect every businessman in the area.

The tariff agreements entered into at Torquay, England, amount to a 50 percent reduction. Under the present 40 percent ad valorem—on value—of every $100 of plywood sent into this country, a tariff of $40 is levied. The reduction means that, for every $100 of plywood shipped into our country, there would be only a $20 duty required.

Under the present tariff arrangement, there was imported from Canada last year $11,032,465 worth of plywood and veneers. Despite the $40 per $100 tax on this import, Canada was able to compete in the market with American production. Within a few years, it may again be profitable for Japan to engage in the plywood industry as it has in the past. They have supplies of timber and, furthermore, shiploads of our American logs were shipped to Japan for processing into plywood.

I am greatly concerned over this last action of the State Department as I feel that it not only threatens this industry in my district, but it will adversely affect the many thousands of men and women who are employed in this comparatively new and essential industry to northern California. I protest this action and call upon those who are financially concerned to register their protests and to be on the alert that this trade agreement may be rescinded before its evil effects are reflected on the industry.

The extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is still pending before the Senate. When this bill passed the House, we had written into it the "peril point" and the "escape clause." If the Senate approves of this bill as written in the House, we will have some right to insist under the escape clause that we be able to renegotiate if and when our industry is adversely affected.

We must be ever vigilant and watchful if we are to keep our American industry, our laboring men, and our economy from having to face competition created by substandard conditions which they cannot meet.

Federal Tort Claims Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following very interesting article that appeared in the Bar Bulletin, issued by the Boston Bar Association, entitled "The GI and the Federal Tort Claims Act," by Attorney Lenahan O'Connell.

Mr. O'Connell is an able and capable member of the bar and is now assistant attorney general in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has given considerable thought and study to military legislation and has had considerable experience with the administration of the Federal Tort Claims Act:

THE GI AND THE FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT
(By Lenahan O'Connell)

When Congress enacted the Federal Tort Claims Act (which is now 28 U. S., sec. 2672), the public-at-large, in my opinion, did not realize that there would be claims presented to the United States District Court by members of the Armed Forces for injuries arising out of accidents in which they were involved while still in uniform. However, a series of claims were lodged in the several district courts of the United States; and, finally, the Supreme Court granted a writ of certiorari in a case arising from the Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit. It was the case of *Brooks* v. *United States* (337 U. S. 49), where two soldiers, who were brothers, on furlough, accompanied by their father, were driving along a highway and were struck by a Government-owned and operated vehicle, causing one soldier's death and severely injuring the others. The Brooks case opened a new chapter in the realm of claims against the United States. The late Mr. Justice Murphy, who was an active Army Reservist, said quite succinctly: "We are not persuaded that 'any claim' means any claim but that of servicemen." The Court seemed to lay great stress on the fact that Congress must have had servicemen in mind because, under the Federal Tort Claims Act, they made two specific exceptions, namely, claims arising in foreign countries; and, also, claims arising out of combat activities. The Court said that the remedy under the act was an exclusive remedy. However, the Brooks case did leave the door open for further discussion and reasoning by the Court because they said in their decision: "We are dealing with an accident which had nothing to do with the Brooks' Army careers; injuries were not caused by their service, except in the sense that all human events depend upon what has already transpired. Were the accident incidental to the Brooks' service, a wholly different case would be presented."

A most interesting excerpt in the majority opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, denying the Brooks' recovery, is as follows: "If a soldier could sue for such injury or illness based on the alleged negligence of the company cook or mess sergeant, or if soldiers who contract sickness on wintry sentry duty had a right of action against the Government on this allegation of a negligent order given by the company commander, then the traditional grousing of the American soldier would result in the devastation of military discipline and morale."

It should be of interest to the members of the bar that, even if recovery is had under circumstances outlined in the Brooks case, the Brookses are fully protected under all the other remedies afforded to military personnel, if their accident was classified as "line of duty." The Feres decision, referred to below, does not overrule this phase of the Brooks' decision.

Following the Brooks' decision, the several district courts and courts of appeal were in disagreement as to whether any claim should be allowed wherein the plaintiff was a serviceman.

In the Feres case, the New York district court dismissed an action brought by the petitioner to recover for death caused by negligence. The decedent perished by fire in an Army barracks, which the petitioner said was unsafe because of a defective heating plant. The Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, affirmed the dismissal.

The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in the Jefferson case, affirmed a decision whereby the plaintiff was denied recovery where, on active duty, he was required to undergo an abdominal operation and the Army doctor failed to remove a 30 x 18 inch towel marked: "Medical Department, United States Army."

In the Griggs case, the Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, allowed the petitioner to state a cause of action wherein the petitioner alleged that, while on active duty, death was caused by the negligent and unskillful treatment by the Army surgeons.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari in these three cases and they were argued together. The decision is *Feres* v. *United States* (340 U. S., 135). The Court, after a long

decision, came to the conclusion that the Government is not liable under the Federal Tort Claims Act for injuries arising out of or in the course of activity incident to service.

While the Court said they did not think the Congress, in drafting the Federal Tort Claims Act, created a new cause of action, it did not reverse the Brooks case, stating that the Feres case is a wholly different case.

The Court, in writing its conclusions that no new cause of action was created by the Federal Tort Claims Act, stated, "Congress was suffering from no plague of private bills on behalf of military and naval personnel because a comprehensive system of relief had been authorized for them and their dependents by statute."

The Court went on to explain that there is nowhere in our body of law any precedent where members of the armed services were permitted to maintain a tort action for injuries sustained in the military service; and, thus, the act really, in effect, waived immunity from recognized causes of action, and was not to visit the Government with novel and unprecedented liabilities.

The Feres decision leaves a still further question open to members of the armed services and that is: just what, exactly, is an injury that arises out of or in the course of activity incident to service? There are several problems that would be presented, one of which comes to my mind: If a soldier lives outside the garrison and is injured after he leaves the area encompassed by the post camp or station and before he arrives home, is he covered by the Federal Tort Claims Act? It might be of interest for the bar to know that the enlisted and officer personnel stationed at the Army base, Boston, do not have quarters provided for them and must live around the city of Boston; several of them live at the YMCA. What would be the status of a soldier injured by a Government vehicle, after the soldier left the Army base and prior to his arrival at the YMCA?

In view of the large numbers of men we have in the Federal service, now, the problem will multiply, and the courts will be confronted with the fine question: What injuries arise out of and in the course of activity incident to service? As far as the armed services are concerned, when an injury results—unless a man is a. w. o. l.—he is, invariably, marked: "Line of duty." Will this over-all presumption of duty preclude a soldier from presenting a claim under the Federal Tort Claims Act? In the Brooks case, line of duty does not enter into the picture, if a soldier is outside the camp post or station on furlough.

It is the writer's opinion that the Brooks and Feres cases still allow a wide margin of latitude for presentation of claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act because the courts must determine the very fine question of what is an activity incident to military service.

Until Congress definitely bars military personnel, stating that separate legislation covers them, our United States district courts will have an increasingly large number of cases to determine, especially where so many of the married officers and enlisted men live off the military reservations and commute daily; and, on a permanent change of station, use privately owned vehicles for transportation.

The concluding thought in my mind is this: Is a soldier on furlough to have his rights under the Federal Tort Claims Act open to him; and the soldier, on change of station, to be precluded?

I recommend to the members of the bar a very fine article on this subject which appears in the George Washington Review, volume 18, No. 1.

Free Enterprise Is a Producer, Not a Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial appearing April 21, 1951, in the Enterprise-Record, published at Chico, Calif., wherein the importance of the tax bill paid by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to Butte County is graphically disclosed. This could be extended to include every county in the State where facilities of the power company are located.

Private power companies adequately pay their way through the huge tax burdens they carry. Without this source of revenue, it would be necessary for all levels of government to impose larger burdens upon individuals, property, business concerns, and every source from which they derive revenue.

Those who argue that cheap electricity is obtainable only through Government power development, are standing on unstable ground. As private enterprise, power companies not only maintain a high standard of service to their consumers, but have consistently shown a decline in their rates over the years.

Government plants, on the other hand, are subsidized and operate largely tax free. They are not faced with the incentive that comes from competition, so therefore it is reasonable to assume they would render an inferior brand of service.

The needs of our country and the standards we demand, are best served by free enterprise. Government intervention into any field adequately served by private interests tends to produce more waste, extravagance, and confusion—than the good it accomplishes.

The editorial referred to above, is as follows:

ONE OF THE FEW BARGAINS LEFT

George L. Works, manager of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s DeSabla division, has just announced the company's tax payments to Butte County for the 1950–51 fiscal year.

The staggering sum of $1,006,658 (million, that is) was paid into the county treasury for the support of county government, public schools, district taxes, and support of municipalities.

Six hundred and thirty-six thousand nine hundred and forty-five dollars went for the support of county government, $302,229 to support public schools, $47,982 for other district taxes, and $19,502 was paid to the cities.

With figures like these it is not strange that the voters of Redding, in an election last year, voted to renew a contract with the P. G. & E. and turned down an offer from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Works aptly put it when he said, "The significance of these figures is that a business-managed utility company produces taxes instead of consuming them."

There are those that advance the argument that the utility doesn't pay the taxes—that the $1,006,658 the P. G. & E. turned over to Butte County last year was actually paid by the consumers. That in our opinions is stupid (we were going to say asinine but President Truman has overworked the word) reasoning. For, if those who think that way are right, no enterprise pays taxes—not the motor manufacturer, not the oil company, not the farmer, not the corner store. It just collects the money from the consumers and gives Government a part of it.

Reasoning on from this point, it is now clear that we need not worry at all when Government destroys taxpaying industry. Let the Government run the farms, the stores, the newspapers, the factories—everything. After all, if the Government is to supply your power, it could just as logically supply your shoes, your food, and your radio programs, and comic strips. And what have we now? The answer can be expressed in one word. We have communism.

While we are thinking of utility companies and electricity, let us consider the price of electricity as compared to other things in these times of inflation. An article in the New York Times by John P. Callahan sums it up quite well:

"Last week the power and light industry rustled through price index components and underscored the one item that tends downward in the spiral-like consumers' price index. The item, of course, is electricity.

"While the dollar today has less than one-third the purchasing power it had at the beginning of the twentieth century, that depreciated dollar buys more than twice as much electricity as the far more valuable dollar did in 1913.

"Fifteen years ago the average revenue per kilowatt-hour for all the residential electricity used was 5.01 cents a kilowatt-hour. Since then it has dropped to 2.89 cents."

The present average rate for Chico under P. G. & E. is 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour.

That, as Mr. Callahan observed, is good news for the household consumer. And it is good news for the agricultural and industrial consumer, too. On the farm and in the factory, as in the home, electric power is usually one of the smallest items of total operating cost.

Moreover, here is the answer to those who emptily argue that socialized government power development is the only road to "cheap electricity." We have cheap electricity now, all we want of it—and the industry which provides us with it pays out some 20 percent of all its revenues in taxes. Government plants, by contrast, are tax-subsidized, and wholly or largely tax free.

When you push that light button, you're getting a bargain.

The Great Decline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union of April 29, 1951:

THE GREAT DECLINE

To understand the tragic decline in national morality over the last few years it is necessary to look into the political antecedents of Harry S. Truman. For genera-

tions we have looked to the White House for exemplars of moral, ethical, and social standards. Seldom have we been disappointed or disillusioned. But in later years we have witnessed a sort of cynicism in political and civic standards which has been reflected in the indifference toward American idealism on the part of the masses of our people.

It is not to the discredit of Harry Truman that he failed in business; many honorable men have had the same experience. Probably he served capably in his minor capacity as a county judge, a job requiring no brilliant legal talent and involving no heavy responsibilities.

The particular trouble was that this small job was a link tying him with one of the most conscienceless political machines in the United States—the Pendergast machine of Kansas City.

Harry Truman no doubt was almost as greatly surprised to be named as the machine's candidate for United States Senator—with assurance of election by the methods of this machine—as he was to fall into the Presidency. His service as a Senator was mostly undistinguished, but gave him some publicity as head of a committee investigating war industries. Even this negative role was not to his discredit.

His weakness, from the time of his county judgeship to his incumbency in the White House, has been a mistaken loyalty to his political godfather, Pendergast. This trait has colored numerous of his official activities. One of his first acts as President was to "fire" the able Federal district attorney who sent Pendergast to prison. A sequel was his granting of full pardon to some 30 members of the machine convicted of corruption, restoring their voting rights on the eve of a congressional election in which he was backing a favored candidate. A sequel to this sequel was his utter failure to prosecute the machine conspirators who aided his candidate by stuffing ballot boxes and later dynamiting a courthouse vault to destroy the evidences of their crime.

In keeping with this trait of "loyalty," Harry Truman has retained in his intimate service officials of the presidential household who have made grain speculations on "inside information," 5 percenters who have used their White House connections to collect fat commissions; such characters as Harry Vaughan, of deep-freezer fame, and Margolis, the goat for an international graft project. Typical is the "mink-coat scandal" involving influence in the multibillion-dollar RFC.

Now these things may not directly affect the operation of the Government. But they do have immense psychological import.

The low standards of the White House are reflected in the cynicism or indifference of the citizenship.

New B. & O. Railroad Pier at Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of the great free State of Maryland, dedicated a new pier—the largest of its kind on either coast—at Baltimore. This pier, erected by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at a cost of more than $5,000,000 is the finest example of free enterprise at work in the American way for the creation of more business and more jobs for the American people. For a thoughtful and splendid exposition of what this free-enterprise system means to our Nation, I commend the address made by Governor McKeldin.

The address follows:

While great debates rage and greater debates follow about where and when wars should be fought; while politicians, statesmen, near-statesmen, and would-be statesmen fret and fume over the issues; while generals fail, and others rise to take their places, American industry marches on.

Here is the real strength of the United States.

Here, today, in the initial utilization of this great ore pier, is a concrete symbol of that which makes our Nation the greatest, the strongest, and the winner of the decisive battles, whether in war or peace—the free-enterprise system.

We read and we hear that potential legislation of great moment gathers dust in committee-room pigeonholes while personalities clash and bitterness holds sway as some Members of the Congress seek to resolve—and others seek to complicate—the diplomatic and military problems of the times.

But the wheels of American industry, without the shackles of socialization and minus the dictator's regimentation, speed on to build and stock the arsenal which is the best hope for our continued freedom, and eventually, for the freedom of the world.

Allies worry over what they call our disagreements in official circles and enemies rejoice over what they seek to interpret as a lack of American unity within our Government and among our people.

But while the tongues wag and the gloomy prophets shake their heads our muscles grow stronger as we add new facilities and increase our real, free wealth.

It is, indeed, proper and fitting that this pier, the greatest of its kind on either coast, and perhaps the greatest in the world for the importation of ores from other lands, should be located in the great, free-enterprise port of Baltimore. Here, unlike many other ports of the Nation, we have proved that socialization can be avoided in the operation of a port and that competition can be successfully and profitably encouraged.

The erection of this pier here by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at a cost of more than $5,000,000 therefore becomes double proof of the wisdom and success of the free-enterprise system.

This facility will be of the utmost importance to the Nation in its preparations for defense and possibly for war.

It will continue to be of great value to the Nation in the years of peace that we all hope will come as it provides the raw materials for the metals to build a greater and greater America. Aiding with the importation of ores from Venezuela, Liberia, Brazil, and other places, it will help to conserve our own deposits.

If stronger bonds were possible, this new facility would tie this great transportation system—the B. & O.—even closer to the State of Maryland and the City of Baltimore. The State and city owe much to the Baltimore & Ohio, and I believe the officials of the railroad will agree that they like the city and the State. The relationships have been of the best—as they should be. We are proud of this carrier, of its long line of past executives, present executives, and the great body of men who man the engines, the cars, the shops, the maintenance lines, the piers, and all of the great road's facilities. This new pier will add considerably to the payroll and will greatly increase the importance of this harbor.

When we look at this fine pier and think of its use, we must think of the carload after carload of coal that will be brought here for shipment from the port by the same cars that will receive the ore for use in this country.

We must think of the miles upon miles of rail over which the laden cars travel to and from this pier. We must think of the mills to which this ore will be carried, and the new mills that will be built to receive it. We must think of the plants to which the refined metals will go and of the products that they will produce for use in war, in the homes, in the mines, on the farms, in great and little factories. Looking at this pier we can see the beginnings of bridges and skyscrapers, tanks and cannon, plows, bulldozers, hammers and nails, bathtubs, kitchen stoves, and baby carriages.

Yes, this is more than just a great, new pier, modern in type, and highly useful in purpose. It is a symbol of America. It is industrial progress.

We can criticize the politicians, the statesmen, the near statesmen and would-be statesmen, and their great and greater debates. We can take sides with this general or that general on ideas and plans for winning a war or preventing a bigger war. We can ridicule the men at the head of our Government or the men who want to be at the head of it.

But with all its debates, with all its delays, with all its shortcomings, we'll never ridicule the form of that government—the form under which free enterprise is made possible.

A Review and a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Federationist, official monthly publication of the American Federation of Labor carries in its May 1951 issue an article by Mr. James A. Brownlow, president of the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L. The article is entitled "A Review and a Warning." Because of its timeliness, its logic, and the tremendous importance to the United States of the message it brings, I ask that it be printed in full following these remarks.

The review to which the article refers is a review of the wartime and post-wartime history of the American merchant marine in its relation to our foreign competitors. The warning, which Mr. Brownlow voices, is raised against a continuation of present policies which are fast making the American maritime industry a weak and inadequate arm of our national security.

Mr. Brownlow calls attention to a situation the seriousness of which can scarcely be exaggerated. It is a situation which the maritime unions and the maritime industry as a whole have pounded on through the years. The previous warnings were not listened to,

and we paid dearly for the failure to listen. As an example, shortly after World War II and since that time the A. F. of L. maritime and metal trades unions recommended and urged that a large number of ships from the reserve fleet be kept in operable condition at a cost of about $25,000,000. The proposal was shouted down as being "rank extravagance." We have just gone through, and are still going through, the process of pulling those ships out and rehabilitating them at a cost many times higher than $25,000,000. It is about time that Congress and the American people pay some attention to maritime industry and union men who are actually on the job and know the score on these matters. Men who are primarily interested in the security of their homes and families and of the Nation as a whole, rather than in the sacred dollar. There are still people around who, unfortunately, and for some unknown reason, cannot see the relationship between national security and a flourishing American merchant marine. If we do not keep our ships sailing, and our repair yards and construction yards operating, those people will wake up to find that their blindness has cost far more than the sums required to put Mr. Brownlow's recommendations into effect. Those recommendations follow the program I have been fighting for ever since coming to Congress. I hope that the review and warning in this article will make some of us who have refused to see the very real danger it points to sit up and take notice:

A REVIEW AND A WARNING

(By James A. Brownlow)

In 1946 the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor, through its representatives, called to the attention of the Government the need of a sustained merchant marine. During the years following—1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950—this merchant-marine need of the United States was reiterated more emphatically each succeeding year.

The essence of the metal-trades department's support of an American merchant marine might be summed up in these three reasons:

First, the United States should retain its standing among the commercial nations of the world. United States flagships should sail all seas and penetrate all harbors, carrying our exports and imports.

Second, as a Nation we should not allow our skilled shipbuilding mechanics and ship-operating personnel to become dispersed and be deprived of the opportunity to engage in the work in which they are skilled, or our shipyards and other ship-maintenance facilities to become dissipated, deteriorated, and, in many instances, unfit for future use.

The last and perhaps most important reason is that the United States must remain independent of any nation or group of nations in the carrying of our commerce and in maintaining our first line of national defense. National emergencies must never find us again dependent upon the ships of other nations to carry our troops or implements of war.

It would be assumed that two experiences would suffice to impress upon us the magnitude of successive blunders and fully prepare us for future needs. Quite the contrary is true, however. As late as mid-1950 there were loud clamors emanating from some spokesmen for Government that the sacrificing of our merchant marine would aid in the closing of the dollar gap existing between the United States and some foreign countries.

The belief that American products and exports should be carried in foreign bottoms also had its strong advocates. In fact, this advocacy was put into practice to the exclusion of the use of American ships until Congress insisted, by statute, that at least one-half of United States Government financed and provided goods and produce be carried in American bottoms.

With war clouds growing darker each day over the world's horizon, and with hostilities raging in Korea, not so much is heard about the closing of the dollar gap at the cost of the remnants of the United States merchant marine. But it must be confessed that it was incidental that the merchant marine was not wholly obliterated, rather than because of any deep conviction or planned preservation of it as a means of carrying commerce or of national defense on the part of some agencies of government.

We must examine our merchant marine as it is today and face up to the needs of our Nation with the determination that we can be and will be independent of any country or group of countries in the carrying of our commerce during peacetime as well as when we are confronted with war.

Gen. Philip Fleming, then Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, said in 1949:

"There are four essentials to the development and maintenance of shipping services under our flag, adequate for the needs of commerce and defense. These are, first, an active fleet; second, an active shipbuilding and ship-repair industry; third, an adequate training program; fourth, a national defense reserve fleet."

All with an interest in our merchant marine will readily subscribe to the general's statement. But even with him, as Chairman of the Maritime Commission, taking that strong position, there was little done about rebuilding or operating a larger fleet of merchant vessels. There continued the operation under foreign flags of vessels once owned by the United States Government. The repair of these vessels in foreign ports continued, and the United States merchant marine further declined.

This went on until the sad awakening came for the third time, and we found ourselves facing an emergency, one which may well be our Nation's greatest trial.: We are responding by recognizing our need of ships and shipping, of skilled shipbuilding mechanics, and of modern, up-to-date facilities for repair and new ship construction.

Yes, we are even recognizing it to the extent that we are requesting the return of several hundred vessels which we loaned to Russia during the latter part of the last emergency and which we had conveniently forgotten about until it seemed as though they might be used against us.

We are rehabilitating hundreds of vessels of the Liberty and Victory type which have been laid up in rivers and harbors in all coastal areas. There is some activity in the repair yards because of this work, and it is reflected in the employment of skilled shipbuilding and ship repair mechanics.

The administrative branch of Government and Congress have recognized that the recommissioning of old vessels is not enough to fill our needs. They have recommended and there have been enacted statutes providing for the construction of a number of fast cargo vessels. In addition, large sums of money have been appropriated for future development and expansion of our merchant marine.

It must be recognized that present appropriations are inadequate to restore our Nation to its proper place in relation to other nations of the world engaged in commerce. The day of being second or third or lower in the list of nations of the world, and not first, is gone. We must never again be dependent upon the ships of any other nation or combination of nations to carry our commerce during peacetime or our commerce, troops and other necessities of war during periods when we may be engaged in war. We must be and must remain self-sustaining.

We might examine briefly our status in relation to other nations in both shipbuilding and operation. The National Federation of American Shipping recently made poignant comments on present trends as they affect shipbuilding and ship operation. They emphasized that America's multi-billion-dollar waterfront is showing a remarkably large and steadily increasing number of foreign flags flying from the masts of merchant ships and that American flag merchant ship entrances and clearances are steadily declining in American ports.

The total net registered tonnage of all vessels entering and clearing United States ports in 1950 with commercial cargo was 112,466,000. Only 42.7 percent of this tonnage was merchant ships carrying the stars and stripes. In 1949 the figure was 48.5 percent. In sharp contrast, in 1950, of the 102,775,000 net registered tons of vessels entering and clearing United Kingdom ports with cargo, 65.7 percent were of British registry.

The federation study also showed that while vessel entrances into United States ports with cargo totaled 27,500, vessel clearances with cargo totaled only 16,671, a greater imbalance than that recorded in 1949.

These figures indicate a loss of 6 percent carried in American bottoms from 1949.

That the United States is losing ground in the international race aimed at restoration of the world's merchant passenger vessel fleet to its pre-World War II size is becoming more and more obvious.

In a study of world merchant passenger vessel construction, it must be noted that while the stars and stripes flew over 8 percent of the world's passenger fleet prior to World War II, today it flies over only 5 percent. Further, it may be pointed out that while foreign nations are building or have under contract 97 passenger-carrying vessels of close to 1,000,000 gross tons, the United States is building only 2 passenger ships totaling 71,719 gross tons.

Statistics show that at the beginning of 1951 the world's merchant passenger vessel fleet was 75 percent by number and 70 percent by gross tonnage of its pre-World War II level of 1,500 ships of 12,000,000 gross tons. But it is difficult to reconcile the position of the United States when one considers the far better job being performed by other nations of the world in rebuilding their passenger fleets, as evidenced by the fact that, upon completion of present construction, the United Kingdom will have about 92 percent of her prewar passenger tonnage, the Netherlands will have about 78 percent, and France 76 percent. Among the smaller maritime nations, Argentina will have increased her passenger fleet 10 times over her prewar level.

The United States, after completion of ships under construction, will have only 62 percent of her prewar tonnage, or slightly more, relatively, than Italy, which will soon have over 54 percent of her prewar passenger fleet.

Among all the maritime nations of the world, the United States ranks only fifth in the amount of gross tonnage of passenger vessels being constructed and a poor eleventh in numbers of such ships being built. In contrast the United Kingdom is in first place, followed by France, Italy, and Argentina.

These statements point up the peril with which we are confronted as a result of our failure to keep pace with the other nations of the world in proportion to our standing as the first nation of the world.

It is of interest to note that though at the present there are 23 vessels of 516,064 gross tons in some stage of construction or

contracted for in the yards of the United States, 25 vessels of 315,000 gross tons are the recent ones contracted for but not started. In Japan there are 35 seagoing vessels of 240,986 gross tons in some stage of construction.

These comparisons with other nations may bring forth the comment that there is a selfishness predominant which would destroy the merchant marines of other nations and confer the carrying of commerce and the ship construction to the United States. This is a mistaken premise. However, the maritime interests of the United States have not been protected with nearly the same zeal as other facets of our economy have.

We have but to witness the policy being carried out in Germany to see what is happening to our merchant marine.

In April 1949, the Washington agreement, entered into by the military governors of three major nations, provided that up to 100,000 gross tons of tankers, not to exceed 10,700 gross tons each, and 300,000 gross tons of dry cargo ships, none to exceed 7,200 gross tons, be authorized as being adequate for German recovery.

There were many modifications of this program in ensuing months up to April 1951, at which time all restrictions were removed except that the vessels built could not have characteristics which would permit them to be readily convertible for military purposes. At the time of the last agreement, as a result of the amendments from April 1949, the tonnage had catapulted to 650,000 gross tons and will shortly be 800,000 gross tons.

Prior to the last war German merchant ships carried 45 percent of her aggregate overseas commerce. In 1949 her ships carried 19 percent. In 1950 Germany's merchant ships were again carrying 45 percent. In contrast, the United States-flag vessels are currently carrying 35 percent of the United States overseas dry cargo commerce.

This comparison clearly indicates that again foreign nations are progressively increasing their commerce-carrying shipbuilding facilities, while the United States is failing to keep pace.

Further consideration of foreign nations' shipbuilding and operating expansion may well provoke conjecture in connection with the Russian merchant marine. The building of ships for the Soviet Union by nations receiving ECA assistance may well be challenged.

Under trade agreements, nations receiving ECA funds are building freighters, tankers, large deep-sea fishing boats and other vessels to augment the Soviet merchant fleet.

None can object to the expansion of the commercial strength of the Soviet. Neither can we, with good conscience, oppose, except in a competitive way, increased production in the shipyards of Holland, Belgium, Italy, France or any other nation. However, we should voice loud objections if the activities of the shipyards of the above countries are being financed, in whole or in part, by money from the Treasury of the United States.

We question that the Congress of the United States intended to give aid to the shipbuilding and operating companies of foreign countries while, at the same time, it is denying assistance to expand its own shipbuilding and operating facilities.

Neither did Congress intend to build a merchant fleet, far superior to that of other nations, for a country whose objectives are so contrary to those of our own that the differences may be resolved only by armed conflict.

It is imperative that the United States do something more than deplore the status among nations of our merchant marine. We are spending billions of dollars for national defense, including the development of the most highly technical machines of war, much of which development can be and will be used for commercial purposes, and the results of which will become part of our expanding economy during peacetime. This is true of all technical advances which are being made throughout the country with the exception of the Navy, which is solely an agency of defense.

The same cannot be said of our merchant marine. During this period we should be developing fast commercial vessels capable of being quickly converted into troop carriers and being equipped with the latest modern protective devices. These vessels should further be of such type as to enter most harbors, with quick loading and unloading facilities, and of fast turn-around ability. They should be built in such numbers as to replace the obsolete vessels built during the Second World War, which in many instances were built with the expectation that they would pay for themselves if they were successful in making one or two trips.

The day of the convoy is gone. We cannot afford to risk either our troops or our commerce in slow and antiquated vessels. The choice is not ours but is being forced upon us by the rapid development on the part of foreign nations of ever faster and faster commercial and war vessels.

It has been contended that private operators and builders cannot hope, from their own resources, to build and operate these vessels at a profit without some inducement from the Government. This being true, it is the obligation and duty of the Government to aid these operators through subsidies, grants, or other privileges which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with foreign ship operating and shipbuilding companies. Every other major nation in the world subsidizes its ship operating and shipbuilding companies to a much greater extent than the United States does.

There is another most essential reason why we must keep an ever-expanding merchant marine, and that is manpower. A merchant marine is only as strong as its operating personnel, and we cannot afford to have idle-ship operating forces. Men will no longer remain "on the beach" waiting to be assigned to a vessel when other attractive employment is available. It is essential that jobs be provided for these men, or the cost of training new workers will far exceed the provisions being made for those already trained. This will affect not only the operating personnel but also the shipbuilding and ship-repair mechanic.

The shipbuilding and ship-repair industry at its peak employed in excess of 1,500,000 persons. This was exclusive of those employed in the naval shipyards of the country. Today, on the three coasts and the inland waterways, there are approximately 54,000 employed in this industry. This means that the great bulk of trained shipbuilding workers and ship repairmen have gone into other industries. Should another emergency develop, this is not a sufficient number to serve as a nucleus to train the thousands of additional employees that will be necessary.

The metal trades department has long affirmed that shipbuilding and ship-repair work is essential to keep a reasonable number of skilled mechanics in training and available for ship construction and repair work. Also, these must be an equal distribution of new construction and repair yards on the respective coasts of the Nation. We cannot afford, during any national emergency, to have complete concentration of yards or manpower in any one area.

If the United States is to retain its place as the leading nation of the world, one of its most important assets is a strong merchant marine, adequately manned, reinforced by shipbuilding and ship-repair yards employing skilled shipbuilding and ship-repair mechanics in sufficient numbers to assure us of a merchant fleet commensurate with our standing among the nations of the world.

The Defense Production Act and Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 4, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

NATIONAL WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 15, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully call to your attention the enclosed editorial published in the Boston Herald of May 15. We heartily endorse this editorial.

Very truly yours,
NATIONAL WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION,
HUGH MUNRO, *President.*

WHO BUYS WOOL?

The wool trade is greatly concerned at the moment with a proposed amendment to the Defense Production Act which may or may not have anything to do with wool.

Under the act as adopted last year, the Government is empowered to purchase certain critical materials abroad and resell them to private businessmen here, but it is specifically debarred from acquiring agricultural products in this way. The new amendment, proposed, along with many others, by the President last month, would simply remove the agricultural restriction.

The wool men, who are already bruised and buffeted by the Government's mishandling of their problems since the outbreak of the Korean crisis, suspect a new move by the Fair Deal planners to get into the wool act, and they want no part of it.

We heartily sympathize with this attitude. Whatever the actual purpose of the proposed amendment, it should definitely not be used as a means for putting Uncle Sam in the wool business. The situation doesn't call for such drastic measures now and bulk purchasing by Government wouldn't recommend itself as a method even if the emergency were worse than it is.

The system of Government purchase has been tried before, but even where elaborate safeguards have been set up (as in Britain during the war) it has tended to be inflexible and unsatisfactory. Government buyers, no matter how conscientious, simply can't take over the function of private wool men with lifetimes of experience. When you are dealing with some 3,000 different types of wool and market conditions changing by the day and hour, you are either an expert or you are not good enough.

If Congress is wise, it will make certain either that existing safeguards stay in the Defense Act or that new ones, fully covering wool, are added.

The Late Leonce R. Legendre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the House of the sad passing of a great soldier and

patriot and one who has given untold help to his comrades, especially the disabled of all the wars.

Leonce R. Legendre, 56, widely known assistant national adjutant of the American Legion, is dead of a heart attack here.

The two-war veteran who held a series of national American Legion positions over a period of 16 years, was stricken as he left his office at 5:30 p. m., May 15. Death occurred 5 minutes later in Farragut Park, one block from the new K Street American Legion branch headquarters. Watson B. Miller, American Legion official, was present.

Funeral services will be conducted Friday morning at the Church of the Annunciation with burial at Arlington National Cemetery. National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., will lead American Legion representatives and an Army unit from nearby Fort Myer in according full military honors at the graveside.

A native of Thibodeaux, La., and a 30-year member of the American Legion, Legendre was in charge of the organization's national office in Washington from July 1, 1946. He came to the Nation's Capital as chief of contact in that office in 1938, following 6 years as American Legion national field secretary serving Southeastern States. For a brief time in 1940 he was department adjutant of the Louisiana American Legion.

Legendre also was chairman, from 1926 to 1932, of the Veterans' Administration claims rating board for the State of Louisiana.

A lieutenant of infantry with 28 months of service in World War I, he returned to active military duty in 1942. He held the rank of lieutenant colonel, as executive officer of the military district of Washington, in charge of the Capital's civilian-defense program. His active military service terminated in September 1946.

Surviving are his wife, Helen Murphy Legendre, of 4916 Westway Drive, Chevy Chase, Md., and a sister and two brothers, all residents of New Orleans, La.

Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a very important statement by Mr. G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. Mr. Leighty testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on May 14 in support of H. R. 3669, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

I am supporting H. R. 3669 and in my opinion the merit of that bill is very clearly set forth in Mr. Leighty's statement. The advice of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, for whom Mr. Leighty is spokesman, has always proven to be sound in matters of railroad retirement. All members of the House would be well advised to carefully study Mr. Leighty's presentation in order that they be completely advised in the field of railroad retirement.

Mr. Leighty's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF G. E. LEIGHTY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE WITH RESPECT TO AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

My name is G. E. Leighty. I am president of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers and chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. I appear here as spokesman for the association.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association is an association composed of the chief executives of 18 standard railway labor organizations and the president of the Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., which is itself an association of the 7 shop craft organizations who are all individually represented in the association through their chief executives. The organizations represented are the following: Switchmen's Union of North America; the order of Railroad Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers' Association; Railway Employes' Department, A. F. of L.; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union; Railroad Yardmasters of America.

The employees represented by organizations whose chief executives compose the association constitute approximately three-fourths of all the railroad employees.

The association has, and has had for some years, a standing committee whose function it is to watch over the functioning of the railroad retirement system and particularly to develop and recommend amendatory legislation whenever such legislation appears desirable. The committee is under the chairmanship of Mr. George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. In addition to Mr. Harrison, the committee includes Mr. T. C. Carroll, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes; Mr. Michael Fox, president, Railway Employes' Department, A. F. of L.; Mr. J. M. Burns, vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; Mr. William J. Van Buren, secretary-treasurer, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; and myself.

Over a year ago this committee concluded that the need for amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act was imminent. However, it has not been possible to bring to completion an integrated program of amendments until quite recently, partly because the problems to be met were difficult and it took much time and study to find the proper solutions and partly because, insofar as the problems are related to amendments recently made to the Social Security Act, any solutions had to be tentative until after those amendments were enacted and their final content was known.

The bill, H. R. 3669, which is before this committee, embodies the program of amendments which the Railway Labor Executives' Association is sponsoring as the result of the investigation and study that I have described. The bill was prepared by our counsel under the direction of the association, with the assistance of members of the staff of the Railroad Retirement Board and in consultation with interested Members of Congress. Its terms are identical to S. 1347 which has been introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, on behalf of himself and 11 other Senators. Full hearings on the bill have been held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I shall not undertake to present to you a detailed analysis of the bill itself. Our counsel, Mr. Lester P. Schoene, who will follow me as the next witness on behalf of the association, will do that. It is my purpose to place before you a statement of the problems with which we have been wrestling and a general description of the legislative changes which we believe to be necessary to solve these problems. The bill embodies these proposed solutions.

In the forefront of the problems with which we are confronted is the urgent necessity for increasing the amount of the monthly benefit payments both to retired employees and to the survivors of deceased employees. You as well as we are, of course, thoroughly aware of the tremendous increase that has occurred in the cost of living since 1937 when the railroad-retirement system was enacted. When the system was established its benefit provisions were set to bear a reasonable relationship to the cost of living as it then was and to the wage income that employees were accustomed to receiving prior to their retirement. As a result of the increase in living costs and to provide some improvement in the living standards of wage earners, wage rates generally, and the wages of railroad employees, have increased very substantially since 1937. As a consequence relationships of retirement income to living costs and wage rates existing in 1937 have no validity whatever today.

Some measure of relief, so far as retirement benefits are concerned, was attained in 1948 when the act was amended to increase these benefits by 20 percent. That increase, however, was inadequate at the time to reestablish the 1937 relationships and, as you know, both living costs and wages have again increased substantially since that time. So far as survivor benefits are concerned, there has been no increase since the provisions for paying survivor benefits were enacted in 1946. The level of those benefits as of that time was determined not with reference to living-cost requirements or wage rates but rather with reference to the survivor benefits paid under the Social Security Act. The level of those benefits was established in 1939 and was pitifully low even as of that time. Although the level of survivor benefits set in the Railroad Retirement Act was on the average about 25 percent higher than those provided in the Social Security Act, to give some slight recognition to the much higher tax rates paid by railroad employees, nevertheless the level of survivor benefits as so established in 1946 was less adequate to meet living-costs requirements as they then stood than the social-security benefits were when they were established in 1939. There has been no increase in the amounts payable to survivors since they were first established and the maximum benefit a survivor can now draw is approximately $41 a month.

That the amount of benefit payments should be increased no one can doubt. If we felt free to increase benefits to the levels warranted by the increase in the cost of living we would have to recommend much greater increases than those proposed in the bill. Necessarily, however, in a prudently financed system the extent to which benefits

can be increased is limited by the prospective revenues coming into the system. Railroad employees feel very strongly that the tax rates now in effect for the support of the Railroad Retirement system should not be increased. They are now paying 6 percent on their compensation up to $300 per month and will pay 6¼ percent beginning next year. Employees in other industries covered by the Social Security Act until recently paid only 1 percent, are paying only 1½ percent now and the maximum they are scheduled to pay is 3¼ percent many years in the future. It is apparent from these comparisons that any increase in the present rates would make the discrepancy intolerable.

At the same time railroad employees feel equally strongly that the financing of the railroad retirement system must be maintained on a sound basis. Improvements in benefits are therefore limited to such improvements as can prudently be made within the limits of the present financing and such new financing as can be provided without increasing the tax rates.

The problems with which we are confronted are further complicated by the very far-reaching amendments that were made last year in the Social Security Act. The railroad retirement system grew out of and was specifically designed to meet the needs of the railroad industry independently of what might be provided to employees in other industries through the general social security system. It is important to the industry that the railroad retirement system continue on this independent basis to serve the needs of that industry. However, this does not mean that the existence of the Social Security system can be ignored. Benefits under that system have now reached such levels that comparisons unfavorable to the Railroad Retirement system cannot be avoided. At the present time all survivor benefits under the Social Security Act and many retirement benefits exceed the benefits that would be paid for equivalent service under the railroad retirement system notwithstanding the much higher contribution that railroad employees make. We have come to the conclusion that although, it is not necessary that the Railroad Retirement Act provide benefits in all cases exceeding those provided under the Social Security Act, we cannot justify the continuance of a condition in which an individual in railroad service, paying the higher tax rate, derives less benefit from that service than he would if it were covered by the Social Security Act.

The provisions of the Social Security Act give rise also to other problems. The Social Security Act does not in express terms give credit for service rendered prior to 1937, as the Railroad Retirement Act does. However, the formula used in computing benefits is so weighted in favor of those who retire in the early years as in effect to give recognition to prior service. If the same individuals have sufficient service covered by the Social Security Act to qualify for benefits under that act and also receive a railroad retirement annuity based on prior service, they are in effect getting double credit for service with respect to which no tax was paid. Such generosity cannot be justified in comparison with the benefits it is possible to provide to those who make their careers in the railroad industry or in some other industry covered by the Social Security Act.

The railroad retirement system was designed and has always been thought of as being a system covering career employees in the industry. When the system was formulated it was believed that the phrase "once a railroader always a railroader" had practically universal validity. Up to that time there were not available collected individual employment records from which it could be determined to what extent people whose major employment is elsewhere work casually in the railroad industry. Through the maintenance of the individual records that the Railroad Retirement Act requires, that information has become available, and what it shows is very disturbing. It does show that the basic assumption of career employment is correct with respect to the big solid core of employees working at any particular time. However, it also shows that there is always a substantial fringe of casual employees who do not make railroading their career and who in the aggregate over a period of years outnumber many times over, the career employees. The last Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board shows, for example, that 64 percent of the employees in service in 1948 had worked every year after they entered service and half of that group had entered service before 1937. On the other hand, out of the total number of new employees who entered service in 1938, only 13 percent were working in the industry in 1948. The aggregate result of this condition to date is shown by the fact that there are now approximately 8,000,000 individuals who have had some creditable service under the Railroad Retirement Act, although the number employed at the present time averages only 1,500,000 to 1,600,000.

I have already stated the conclusion that we cannot justify paying an individual less benefits for his railroad service than he would be paid for such service if it were covered by the general Social Security Act. However, the Railroad Retirement system cannot serve its primary function of meeting the requirements of the career employees, and also undertake to match social-security benefits for those short-term employees who work casually in the industry from time to time. Furthermore, since these short-term employees are virtually certain to have their major employment under the Social Security Act they are most likely to qualify for benefits under that act. If the Railroad Retirement system were to undertake to pay for such service independently of the employment covered by the Social Security Act there would be an unwarranted duplication of benefits and an unwarranted expense to the railroad-retirement account for the payment of benefits to individuals whose needs the System was not primarily designed to serve.

I have so far discussed the most serious and most difficult of the problems with which we are confronted. I should now like to tell you in a general way how the bill we are asking you to enact meets these problems together with a number of others that I shall develop in the course of the discussion. The bill contains a number of provisions which increase the amount of benefits payable. It provides for increasing retirement annuities by an average of 13.8 percent. The basic formula in the present law for computing annuities requires multiplying certain percentages of the average monthly compensation by the number of years of service. Those percentages of average monthly compensation under the present law are 2.4 percent of the first $50, 1.8 percent of the next $100, and 1.2 percent of the next $150. The bill would change these percentages to 2.8 percent, 2 percent, and 1.4 percent, respectively. The pensioners who were taken over from the railroad rolls at the beginning of the System and are receiving relatively smaller benefits than annuitants would have their pensions increased by a flat 15 percent.

From the changes just described all annuitants will receive a moderate but still substantial increase in benefits. The maximum annuity now payable would be based on an average monthly compensation of $300 per month with 30 years of service and comes to $144. Under the revised formula that would be increased to $165. Of course most employees do not get the maximum and the average is far under the maximum. The average now being paid is approximately $84 and that could be expected to increase under the bill to about $95. Such an amount appears particularly inadequate for an individual who has a wife to support. The Social Security Act has long recognized the greater need of such individuals. We believe the time has come when we should do likewise. The bill consequently provides that when a railroad employee has retired and is age 65 or over and has a spouse who is also age 65 or over the spouse shall be entitled to an annuity equal to one-half of the employee's annuity but with a maximum of $50. We believe that the combination of an increase for all annuitants with provision for the spouse's annuity makes a well-balanced program of recognizing the needs of all annuitants while at the same time recognizing the greater need of the man and wife.

With respect to survivor benefits the method of computation is liberalized and simplified. The new formula would allow 40 percent of the first $100 of average monthly remuneration plus 10 percent of the creditable remuneration over $100. This would provide a survivor benefit of $60 if the average monthly remuneration is $300, the maximum it is now possible to have. The amount so computed is equal to what the benefit would be under the amended Social Security Act on the same remuneration. However, in order to give some recognition to the higher tax rate paid by railroad employees our bill provides that there shall be added to the amount so computed $1 for each year of service on which taxes were paid.

In addition to these liberalized provisions for retirement and survivor benefits, the bill would establish an over-all minimum applicable both to retirement and survivor benefits that in no case shall the benefits paid be less than the benefit or additional benefit that would have been derived from the railroad employment if it had been covered by the Social Security Act. The Railroad Retirement Act as enacted in 1937 carried a similar minimum referring to the original Social Security Act, but that provision became inapplicable when the Social Security Act was completely revised in 1939. Until the last revision of the Social Security Act the level of social security benefits was so low that a restoration of such a minimum was not a matter of great importance. Social-security benefits, now, however, are of such a level as to make it important again to guarantee that no employee shall sacrifice benefits by working in the railroad industry.

The problem presented by the casual employees is met by introducing a 10-year minimum service requirement as a condition of eligibility for either retirement or survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. Provision is made that employees who at retirement or death have less than 10 years of service under the Railroad Retirement Act shall have their railroad service credited under the Social Security Act. They will thus receive under that act benefits based on a combination of their railroad and nonrailroad service, thus avoiding both dupilcation of benefits and a loss of benefits through having been in railroad service. In addition, such employees would continue to be subject to the guaranty now provided that the benefits derived from the railroad service shall not be less than the amount contributed in taxes plus an allowance in lieu of interest. By adjustments between the railroad retirement account and the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund, which I shall refer to more in detail later, the social security system is compensated for crediting this railroad service to the same extent as thought social security taxes had been collected on such employment.

Although the problems to be met which I I have already discussed are the most serious and difficult, there are other troublesome problems with which we are confronted but

to which the solution is more readily apparent. In 1937, the maximum of compensation that is creditable and taxable was set at $300. At that time relatively few employees were making over $300 per month. The ceiling, therefore, did not result in reducing benefits in any large proportion of the cases and did not serve substantially to reduce the tax income. Under present wage scales, however, its effect in both these respects has become much greater. We are proposing, therefore, that beginning with compensation paid after this year the maximum creditable and taxable compensation should be increased to $400 per month. Since there is no prior service obligation in connection with this change and since the annuity factor applied to this additional $100 of compensation in computing the annuity is the smallest of the three percentages this change will result in a net gain to the railroad retirement account.

I have heretofore referred to the fact that the weighting of the social-security benefit formula in effect allows credit for service rendered before 1937. The Railroad Retirement Act expressly recognized such service for persons who held an employment relationship to the industry at the time the 1935 act was enacted. In order to avoid duplicate credit for service on which no taxes have been paid to either system the bill provides that individuals who are entitled to retirement benefits under the Social Security Act shall not be credited with prior service under the Railroad Retirement Act, with the qualification, however, that the resulting reduction in the annuity shall not be greater than the benefit to which the individual is entitled under the Social Security Act.

Under the present law an individual who continues in service after age 65 pays the same taxes on the compensation he then earns as other employees pay, but he receives no credit for that service or compensation in the computation of his annuity. At the time this provision was written it was considered a desirable inducement for the older employees to retire so as to help relieve the unemployment problem. During the last war, however, our problem changed from one of unemployment to one of a manpower shortage and that condition continues. That condition results in pressure on retired employees to reenter service and on employees eligible for retirement to continue in service. When such individuals have not accumulated 30 years of service at age 65 it appears to be an unwarranted discrimination against them not to allow them credit for such service up to the 30-year maximum which applies when prior service is used. The bill therefore proposes that in future awards service rendered after age 65 be credited in the same manner as service rendered prior to that time, retaining, of course, the 30-year maximum where prior service is used.

Prior to the 1946 amendments the Railroad Retirement Act made no provision for survivor benefits as such. However, the act did afford an employee the option, within certain limitations, to take a reduced annuity during his lifetime so as to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse if she survived him, the combined amounts being computed to have a value equivalent to the single life annuity to which the employee was entitled. With the introduction of survivor benefits the authority to make such elections was discontinued but a few such elections are still in effect by reason of action taken prior to 1946. In such cases if the spouse predeceases the employee the employee cannot understand why he must continue to take a reduced annuity even though it is an established fact that no survivor annuity will ever be paid. He feels that by taking the reduction during the period that there was any chance that a survivor annuity would be paid he has paid for the chance that did not materialize. This situation gives rise to bitter complaint that is all out of proportion to the savings that accrue to the Railroad Retirement Account through continuing the reduction after the death of the spouse. The bill therefore proposes that in such cases annuities accruing after the death of the spouse should be in the same amount that would have been payable if no election had been made.

At the present time the only restriction upon retired employees reentering employment is that the annuity is not paid for any month in which they work for a railroad employer or for the last person by whom they were employed before the annuity began to accrue. Under employment conditions existing in 1937 such a provision was deemed sufficient to assure that individuals who applied for annuities at a time when they were eligible to receive them genuinely meant to retire and not simply draw annuities to supplement wage payments. Retirement annuities are meant to support people who have retired and it is an abuse of the system to use them merely to supplement wage income. Under present employment conditions, such abuses can readily occur. We are consequently proposing the introduction, in addition to the existing restrictions, of a work clause like that in the Social Security Act, namely, that the annuity will not be paid in any month in which $50 or more is earned in wages or self-employment covered by the Social Security Act.

I think I have now covered the major subjects dealt with in the bill except the matter of financing. There are a number of changes in detail which I have not discussed but which will be covered in Mr. Schoene's testimony. I stated earlier that the available solutions to our problems were limited by the requirements of prudent financing without increasing the tax rates. We meet that limitation in a variety of ways. In the last actuarial valuation the level of future taxable payrolls was estimated as equal to an average of $4,600,000,000 per year. In making those estimates no account was taken of future increases in wage rates and substantial increases have already occurred. Under present conditions, it is reasonable, and in fact I think very conservative, to estimate the future level payroll at $5,200,000,000, particularly in view of the raising of the maximum creditable and taxable compensation from $300 per month to $400. This revision of payroll estimates has two important consequences with respect to financing. I have already pointed out that the raising of the taxable ceiling in itself results in a net gain. In addition, the cost of benefits based on prior service results in a smaller percentage charge on the payroll when it is spread over a larger taxable payroll.

The elimination of prior service credits for individuals who are entitled to benefits under the Social Security Act also will result in savings to the account. Similarly the more restrictive work clause will result in savings either through the postponement of retirement or through nonpayment of annuities. Likewise savings will result from the introduction of the 10-year minimum-service requirement. The bill contemplates that in the adjustments that will be made between the railroad retirement account and the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund the standard to be applied will be that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund shall be placed in the same position in which it would be if railroad employment were covered by the general social-security system. Since the railroad population is a relatively higher cost segment of the working population than the working population as a whole, the separate maintenance of the railroad-retirement system relieves the general social-security system of obligations more than commensurate with the tax income that would be derived from the collection of social-security taxes on railroad service. It is contemplated that in the adjustments to be made between the two funds the railroad retirement account will be given due credit for what it thus contributes to the maintenance of old-age and survivors protection of the whole working population.

The actuarial experts of the Railroad Retirement Board have made an estimate, in terms of level percentage of payroll, of the cost of the railroad-retirement system as it would be amended by H. R. 3669. That estimate is included in the Board's report to this committee. In making that estimate, account was taken of both the increased benefits and the savings provided by the bill. The experts estimate that the cost is approximately 14 percent of payroll. The tax rate, beginning next year, yields 12½ percent of payroll. The difference between the tax rate and the estimated level cost is, therefore, only about 1½ percent. Taking into account the fact that the cost estimate must be based on predictions extending to perpetuity, it is obvious that such an estimate can at best be only an approximation by which to guide one's judgment. Necessarily as experience develops, adjustments in the system will have to be made from time to time. It is our considered judgment that when the tax rate is within a range of as little as 1½ percent of an estimate cost running to perpetuity, prudent financing does not require a change in the tax rate.

We exercised a similar judgment in 1948 when we recommended and Congress adopted amendments increasing retirement benefits by 20 percent. The estimated cost of the system as so amended was a little over 1 percent in excess of the tax rates. Developments since 1948 have already established the validity of the judgment then exercised.

All our experience under the Railroad Retirement Act, since the very beginning, indicates that our experience with the 1948 20-percent increase is not unique or accidental. We have never yet had an actuarial estimate that was not shown by developments in the next few years to be an overstatement of probable costs. The first actuarial valuation of the railroad retirement account, made as of December 31, 1938, but published in 1940, showed an apparent shortage of 3.6 percent of payroll between the established tax rates and the estimated cost. Without any increase in taxes or reduction in benefits, the second actuarial valuation, made as of December 31, 1941, and published in 1943, showed a reduction of this apparent shortage to about 3 percent of pay roll.

In the 1946 amendments there was included an increase in taxes to meet the apparent shortage disclosed by the first two valuations; but the increase provided was not the 3 percent or more indicated by the valuation, but only 1½ percent. The opponents of the bill argued vigorously that the shortage was at least 3 percent. However, when the third valuation was made as of December 31, 1946, the account was shown to be virtually in balance.

By 1948, estimates then made showed that no increase at all would have been necessary in 1946 to cover any shortage. It was because the 1946 increase of 1½ percent was not necessary to cover previously indicated shortages that it was possible in 1948 to make a 20-percent increase in retirement benefits, costing about 2½ percent of payroll by incurring a then apparent shortage of only about 1 percent. But such an apparent shortage was incurred to provide the 20-percent increase with no increase in taxes. It was recognized, of course, that if costs worked out exactly according to the estimates, or worse than the estimates indicated, some adjustment either in benefits or taxes would have to be made. However, it was our judgment and that of Congress that experience would show the apparent shortage to be nonexistent, and when the fourth valuation was made that judgment was vindicated. Current estimates of the cost of the

present act come to 12.18 percent, as against a tax rate of 12.5 percent, or apparent overfinancing to the extent of .3 percent.

Just to see what would happen if, contrary to all previous experience, the costs of the act as we propose to amend it were to follow exactly the actuarial estimate of about 14 percent, we have had the Railroad Retirement Board actuaries run a projection of the progress of the Railroad Retirement Account on that assumption. I hand you that projection, and would like to have it incorporated in the record at this point. I offer it not as a prediction of things to come but as an indication of the time in which necessary adjustments can be determined and made if developments are worse than past experience leads us to believe. It indicates that for a period of about 15 years the reserve would continue to increase and would then reach a level of over $5,000,000,000 as against the present $2,100,000,000. Even at the end of 40 years the reserve would still exceed its present size. When we bear in mind the numbers of changes that have occurred in the last 10 years we have no reason to fear our inability to adjust ourselves to conditions as they actually develop. Such a program is practical and realistic. The comfort some people derive from precise mathematical equality between the present tax rate and predictions of cost is the comfort of an illusion.

Of course, we do not want to take chances with the solvency of the railroad retirement account. The bill does not propose to take such chances.

If experience indicates that changes should be made, we will have ample opportunity to make them. Neither we nor the Congress have any intention of going out of business in the foreseeable future.

We have devoted months of investigation and study to all phases of our railroad retirement system, including the innumerable amendments which have been suggested, and the proper financing of our system. We have arrived at certain conclusions as a result of our labors. We believe that we have prepared a well-rounded balanced program that meets all the really serious and difficult problems with which we are confronted. We recognize that many of the employees we represent would like to see a considerable number and variety of other changes in the act. Some of these might have merit if they could be considered in isolation and apart from all the other problems with which we have had to deal. We have given careful consideration to all suggested revisions that have come to us. We have had to choose and select and exercise our best judgment in relation to the total situation. In the exercise of that judgment we have developed the program I have discussed with you and we earnestly and respectfully solicit your cooperation in obtaining its enactment.

Obstacles to Exercise of State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 14, 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article entitled "States in Strait-Jackets," by Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, a State senator in Oregon, which appeared in the April 1951 issue of the American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES IN STRAIT-JACKETS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Have the elected officials in your State failed to give you promised improvements? Could be that they're stymied by a horse-and-buggy State charter. Here are some of the fantastic ways our outmoded constitutions can thwart the will of the voters.

Our Oregon Senate Committee on Local Affairs was listening to a delegation of high-school students from Portland telling us how they could not afford to go to college unless a State university was established in their community. The senators were sympathetic. We realized Portland was the only large city in the West without a State university in its environs.

Then from the corner came the dry voice of the committee's legal adviser. "I must remind you gentlemen," he said, "that article XIV, section 3, of our State constitution forbids the founding of any new public institution outside Marion County. Portland is not in Marion County."

This ended the matter. Only a vote of the people of the State could overturn the constitutional clause, and that would be after these particular students had matured beyond their college entrance years. I shall never forget the crestfallen faces of those high-school boys and girls, who had been so eagerly hopeful a short time before.

State government in America today is trussed and bound by a strait-jacket which perils all local sovereignty. This strait-jacket consists of State constitutions so absurdly cluttered with provisions promoted by pressure groups that the men and women under our capitol domes can barely carry out their responsibilities of office. In the vacuum thus created, the Federal Government has spread its heavy domination across the land, reaching into the lives of every individual family.

The Constitution of the United States, which rules the vast breadth of America from coast to coast, contains only 7,500 words. Forty-five States have constitutions longer than this. Indeed, many State constitutions actually triple and quadruple the length of the Constitution which the founding fathers wrote for the whole Nation. Political factions with an ax to grind have discovered that they can by-pass governors and legislatures if they put their pet theories, not on the statute books, but into the very heart of the State constitution.

As a member of the State Senate of Oregon, I have seen vividly how responsibile government can be thwarted by a constitution packed with clauses put there by selfish local interests.

Sometimes executives and judges become exasperated, and the express provisions of a constitution are disobeyed. This sentence is in Oregon's constitution: "The governor shall receive an annual salary of $1,500." At 1951 prices this would barely keep a canary alive, much less a governor. So, in spite of the clear constitutional language to the contrary, Oregon has been paying its chief executive $10,000.

Although the United States Constitution leaves the Federal Government free to pay its officials adequate salaries, State constitutions have not followed this example. They impose heavy shackles on pay scales. These restrictions drive able men out of State governments, with the result that States' rights are further endangered.

Maryland's Constitution, which is three times as long as the national charter, limits the governor to an annual salary of $4,500, which is less than he might earn clerking in a store. The governor of Alabama gets a constitutional salary of $6,000, and that of Oklahoma $6,500. For a time the State of Washington circumvented a pay limitation of $6,000 by bestowing on the governor a living allowance three times the size of his salary.

In the case of State legislators, the pay manacles clamped on by constitutions are even more ridiculous. New Hampshire's senators and representatives receive constitutional wages which amount to $3 a day. Those of Rhode Island are paid a token of $5.

These constitutional pittances, set by ironclad mandates stemming from an era when beefsteak retailed for 15 cents a pound, provide a field day for lobbyists, who need pick up only a few meal checks to win the gratitude of honest but hard-pressed legislators.

Service in State government was once the most direct route to the White House. Five of the past eight Presidents journeyed directly from gubernatorial chairs to a place on the national ticket of their parties—McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Coolidge, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yet despite these historic examples, the trend today is for outstanding men to shake the dry dust of State government from their feet in a quest for a niche in the United States Senate.

Twenty-five present Senators once were governors of their States. Not one former Senator has sought a governor's office. The ex-governors now in Senate service include such famous names as BYRD, of Virginia; AIKEN, of Vermont; BRICKER, of Ohio; DUFF, of Pennsylvania; and LEHMAN, of New York.

"Too many frustrations around here," commented a vigorous Governor of Idaho as he filed for a congressional post in distant Washington, D. C. "Whenever some responsibility faces the State, an outdated constitution prevents us from handling it in the right way."

Numerous State constitutions contain clauses which would be fantastic as mere laws. West Virginia's constitution makes it illegal for an official of a railroad to sit in the legislature. Dating from the rule of George III, the New Hampshire Constitution set the accounts of the State in shillings and pence. The Constitution of Texas calls for five times as many courts and judges as serve the infinitely larger population of Great Britain. California's Constitution goes into endless detail regarding such matters as the length of wrestling matches and the breeding of crustaceans and mollusks.

Occasionally these clogged constitutions are merely funny. But concerted attempts to wedge special privilege into the basic charter of a great State can be sinister and dangerous.

Last November it took the vigorous efforts of California's churches, newspapers, and civic organizations to defeat a constitutional amendment which would have legalized gambling in the most audacious fashion ever proposed in this country. Written right into the amendment were the names of the five individuals who would supervise and license race tracks and slot machines in California. Had the amendment passed, these men would have become the czars of gambling in our second largest State, and the constitution would have protected them from being overruled or held in check even by Gov. Earl Warren himself.

California has had sorry experience with the writing of personal names into its State constitution. In 1948 the electorate adopted an amendment installing a redheaded woman with blue eyes and freckles named Myrtle Williams as director of social welfare at a beginning salary of $12,000. To make sure no other Myrtle Williams would mistakenly be honored, the constitution gave her exact address: 420 Avondale Street, in Monterey Park.

Because Mrs. Williams' name was rooted in the basic charter of the State, neither the governor nor the assembly at Sacramento had full control over a branch of the California government which supervises the

spending of nearly $300,000,000 a year. Constitutional mandates cannot be touched or modified by the highest State officials. A costly special election finally separated Myrtle Williams from her job.

Since its adoption in 1789, the United States Constitution has been amended only 22 times. Yet some State constitutions have been amended hundreds of times, and each amendment is beyond the reach of the governor and legislature. They cannot cross a "t" or dot an "i." "Mine not to question why," said the governor of a western State, as he surveyed a constitution in which one section was longer than the entire Constitution of the United States.

Arizona entered the Union as late as 1912, but 45 amendments have already been plastered onto its constitution. California's bristles with patches, 312 of them. The constitution of Texas has been amended 104 times.

Article XIX of the 63,000-word Louisiana Constitution provides: "August 30, the birthday of Hon. Huey P. Long, now deceased, late Governor of Louisiana, shall be and forever remain a legal holiday in this State."

Not even George Washington's birthday is thus sanctified by constitutional fiat in Louisiana.

Pressure groups have discovered that it is no harder in some States to pass a constitutional amendment than a mere law. This may be why the South Carolina Constitution is poulticed with 192 amendments and that of Oregon with 113. The voter, confronting a ballot the size of a hearthrug, does not notice whether he is enacting a statute which the legislature can change or a constitutional clause which will clutch State government in an immovable vise.

Pension clubs, riding a temporary surge of popular enthusiasm, forced into the Colorado State Constitution a clause setting aside 85 percent of collections from State excise taxes for old-age assistance. A disproportionate share of the Colorado revenue dollar now goes to pensions, but neither the Government nor the legislature can do anything about it. They are bound by their oaths of office to follow the constitution to the letter.

Other State functions have been starved while old-age groups, protected by the constitution, take the first big bite out of the Colorado treasury.

"We know it's wrong," explained a senator at Denver, "but we in the legislature are helpless. This kind of special-interest subsidy has no place in the constitution."

Although ore-rich Colorado ranks first nationally in grants of old-age assistance, it is twenty-third in aid to needy children, twenty-third in general relief for hungry families, and a low thirtieth in average salaries for school teachers. The constitutional bounty enjoyed by pensioners is at the expense of education, for Colorado teachers languish near the botton of all the States of the far West in their rate of pay.

In fact, the highest elective officials of the State of Colorado have comparatively scant authority over their own departments. This is because bureaucrats in the domed capitol below Pikes Peak succeeded in adding to the State constitution a clause which makes them accountable only to an appointed civil-service commission.

The result has been to thwart the will of the people as expressed at the polls. A candidate for governor or secretary of state may be triumphantly elected in Colorado because of popular indignation over a certain public policy, yet he will find himself lacking power to remove the department head responsible for that policy. The Denver Post calls this constitutional autocracy. Even now the Post blames the ironclad Colorado Constitution for preventing Republican Gov. Dan Thornton, a young rancher newly elected in November of 1950, from carrying out pledged reforms in the blundering management of certain State institutions.

Some constitutional provisions actually force reckless and irresponsible government on a State. The Governor of Tennessee is forbidden to sign or veto a bill after the legislature adjourns. Bills automatically die when the assembly goes home. In the closing days of a session they flutter into the Governor's office like snowflakes. There are not enough hours around the clock for the Governor and his staff to read all the measures which he must sign into laws affecting 3,292,000 people. More than one Governor of Tennessee has admitted approving an important bill he had no chance to study or analyze.

"A State constitution that may have been excellent in 1870 is certainly not necessarily excellent in 1950," observes Charles McD. Puckette, general manager of the Chattanooga Times.

Changing conditions create new problems, but many State constitutions seem immobile. The charter of Washington forbids the use of public funds for religious exercises. Inasmuch as public funds heat classrooms and pay teachers, this provision has been held to bar even the reading of the Bible in the common schools of the State. Minnesota cannot use voting machines, because the constitution compels all elections to be "by ballot," although this clause was written before voting machines were ever invented.

I remember sitting at my desk in Oregon's senate, listening to legislators representing less than one-third of the people as they voted down machinery for providing needed school levies in our State's only large city. Under a constitution written before Oregon had one paved sidewalk or electric-light bulb, the city had no authority to govern itself.

In wide-open New Orleans a young reform mayor, deLesseps (Chep) Morrison, tried to clean up the city. He made some progress, but Louisiana's State constitution, longer than most detective novels and just as fanciful, gave the legislature dominated by the Long machine authority to take over the municipal courts and thus balk Mayor Morrison with restraining orders. The New Orleans Bureau of Governmental Research claimed the city was the victim of "botched-up State constitutional provisions."

Is there no hope? Must government in our States continue to decline in prestige and in the quality of its personnel? Must cities dawdle along without real power to provide services for an ever-increasing number of residents?

New Jersey has shown there is hope, plenty of it. In 1942 New Jersey's energetic Governor, Charles Edison, a son of the great inventor, told the people that "State government is the most antiquated, incompetent part of our whole American system."

Edison asked the voters of New Jersey: "Why don't we change our State constitution to make State government conform to the facts of urban life in the twentieth century?"

Edison had found it was impossible for the Governor to administer the vast government he was supposed to head. There were 92 separate State departments, many not responsible to the executive. Some of these officials reported directly to the legislature. They never went near the Governor, who was kept in the dark concerning their budgets and programs. In addition, the legislature was in a constant political dither, for the New Jersey constitution of 1844 compelled the 60 assembly members to run for election every year. On top of all this, the State's highest tribunal, the court of errors and appeals, was composed of 16 judges, making it the largest appellate court in the world.

"Justice by mob," wrote one New Jersey newspaper.

In 1944 the voters turned down a new constitution drafted by some of the State's most eminent leaders. The margin of rejection was 126,521 votes. Mayor Frank (I am the law) Hague, of Jersey City, played a decisive part in the defeat of the new charter. Hague was satisfied with the status quo which prevailed under the constitution of a century before. He got help from some farm and labor spokesmen, who feared their organizations might lose certain advantages if State government were made more robust and responsible.

But Edison kept hammering away at the fact that except for the bill of rights, there is hardly a part of the present State constitution that is not grievously frayed, ripped, or misshapen.

A Democrat, Edison was joined in support of a new constitution by an ex-Republican governor, Walter E. Edge. Taxpayers' groups and the League of Women Voters insisted that economy, like charity, should begin at home. If New Jersey people wanted to save money on local taxes, they should adopt a constitution which would make efficient government possible.

A new governor entered the capitol at Trenton, Alfred E. Driscoll, and carried on the crusade for a State charter that would work. The movement gathered force like water surging through a penstock. Hague's baleful influence was waning. On January 1, 1948, a streamlined State constitution began to govern the affairs of New Jersey's people. They had enacted it at the polls by an overwhelming margin of 470,828 votes.

One of the most important innovations in the modern New Jersey constitution gives the Governor power to appoint the secretary of state and other officials. This follows the United States Constitution, which allows a President to pick his Cabinet. Under anachronistic constitutions in many States, all officials are elected. While fine in theory, this leads to desperate political Donnybrooks which often paralyze government. One need only imagine what might happen in Washington, D. C., if all heads of major Federal departments were chosen at the polls. Could President Truman plan diplomatic negotiations with Secretary of State JOE MCCARTHY?

Gov. Earl Warren was saddled for years with an elected attorney general whom the Governor openly accused of blocking the program of the California Crime Commission. The State of Washington is run by a Republican governor and a Democratic secretary of state, who probably will be the governor's adversary at the next election. This does not make for amity under the marble dome. For 2 years Oregon had a governor and an elected State treasurer, the fiscal directors of the Commonwealth, who were not on speaking terms.

It is not without significance that 48-year-old Governor Driscoll, who has taken the lead in ending this hydraheaded operation in at least one State, now ranks as a potential nominee of the Republican Party for President or Vice President in 1952. A committee for a new constitution in Ohio has recommended following the New Jersey practice of allowing a governor to commission the heads of all major agencies. In 1952 Ohio's votes will decide at the ballot box on the question of calling a convention to draft a new constitution.

The National Municipal League, which has been crusading for better government since 1894, recently drafted a model constitution that could apply to any of the 48 States. The officials of the league, who include ex-Governor Edison, fresh from the battle front in New Jersey, have reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that the bulk of State constitutions are too far gone to be amended successfully. They advocate a fresh start, warning that most State constitutions are serious obstacles to responsible and effective State and local government.

Tennessee's Constitution, to cite one extreme, has never been amended at all. It still prohibits duelists from holding office and names the bygone farm of long-dead Ben Posey as forming the Grundy County line. At the opposite pole, the California Constitution bristles with 312 amendments, some of which set forth rules for the slaughter of steers or the management of the Escondido Water Co.

California's Legislature, well aware of the documentary colossus which sits like the Old Man of the Sea on the shoulders of State government, has created a constitutional revision committee. Tennessee has gone further. In November of 1949 a proposal for a convention to draft a new State constitution was submitted to the electorate. It carried in the cities but lost in the cautious countryside. The result was a slim rejection—62,483 votes for the constitutional convention, 65,417 in opposition. This was far closer than New Jersey came on the first attempt, and Gov. Gordon Browning's forces are expected to try again in Tennessee, which even has a constitutional provision barring ministers of the Gospel from serving in the legislature.

Agitation for new State constitutions is becoming Nation-wide. In 1945 Missouri and Georgia adopted charters which had been greatly modernized, although neither was as streamlined as experts urged. Leading professors at the University of Texas Law School have made a critical study of a constitution adopted during buckskin days when Dallas was too small even to be included in the census. A Texas editor has thus described his State's constitution, in language which can be understood by Texans: "The harness is too small, the strap drawn too tight, the checkrein pulled up to the last buckle-hole."

Kentucky has just done away with a constitutional salary maximum of $5,000, which prevented the employment of outstanding educators and scientists. Florida, Minnesota, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Washington are among other States in which efforts continue to knock off the constitutional handcuffs. Oregon at last has erased a clause, dating from the frontier prejudices of the gold-rush era, which prevented people of Chinese ancestry from owning land or working a mining claim.

But in most States the constitutional strait-jacket remains. If the laces are fraying, it is because voters are demanding that the government closest to them live up to its responsibilities in the atomic age. States' rights will survive in America only if State governments are free to exercise those rights.

World Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during an audience with the delegates to the fourth congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government, April 6, 1951, at the Vatican, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, stated the position of the Catholic Church on world federal government, declaring that such government is in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, striving for peace among nations and peoples of the world, and in harmony with the principles of social and political life founded and sustained by the church.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and heartened by the fact that the Pope has expressed this support of the movement aimed at the attainment of a federal world government, to which movement I have been rendering my full cooperation. Faced with the realization of the limitations of a single nation, or even a group of nations, in the field which embraces the entire globe, and during an era in which the basic power of the universe has been harnessed to a bomb containing within itself the seed of potential world destruction, I have maintained, and still do, that only through the cooperation of all nations can we avert the terrors of global conflicts, and effectively strive for world order, justice, and peace. For that reason, I had lent my support to House Concurrent Resolution 64, proposing the development of the United Nations Organization into an efficient body capable of coping with the problems of international aggression, and of maintaining peace.

The discourse of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, was delivered in the French language, and its English translation, made for the Catholic Mind, which I commend to the attention of this august body, is as follows:

POPE PIUS XII ON WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are very appreciative of the deference you have displayed by this visit and we take pleasure in addressing you members of the World Movement for World Federal Government. We give you cordial greetings of welcome. Our lively interest in the cause of peace in the midst of a humanity so grievously tormented is well known to you. We have given frequent proofs of this interest. That interest, moreover, is inherent in our mission. The maintenance or the reestablishment of peace has always been and increasingly will be the object of our constant solicitude. And if, too often, the results have fallen far short of what our efforts and our acts aimed at, lack of success will never discourage us, so long as peace does not reign in the world. Faithful to the spirit of Christ, the church is striving and working for peace with all her strength; she does this by her precepts and her exhortations, by her incessant activities and by her ceaseless prayers.

THE CHURCH DESIRES PEACE

The church is indeed a power for peace, at least wherever are respected and appreciated at their true value the independence and the mission which the church holds from God, wherever men do not seek to make her the docile servant of a political egoism, wherever she is not treated as an enemy. The church longs for peace, she strives incessantly for peace, and her heart is ever with those who, like her, desire peace and devote themselves to it. She knows also, and this is her duty, how to distinguish between the true and the false friends of peace.

The church desires peace, and therefore applies herself to the promotion of everything which, within the framework of the divine order, both natural and supernatural, contributes to the assurance of peace. Your movement dedicates itself to realizing an effective political organization of the world. Nothing is more in conformity with the traditional doctrine of the church, nor better adapted to her teaching concerning legitimate and illegitimate war, especially in the present circumstances.

It is necessary, therefore, to arrive at an organization of this kind, if for no other reason than to put a stop to the armament race in which, for decades past, the peoples have been ruining themselves and draining their resources to no effect. You are of the opinion that this world political organization, in order to be effective, must be federal in form. If by this you understand that it should not be enmeshed in a mechanical unitarism, again you are in harmony with the principles of social and political life so firmly founded and sustained by the church. Indeed, no organization of the world could live if it were not harmonized with the whole complex of natural relations, with that normal organic order which rules the particular relations between men and men and between different peoples. If it does not do that, then, no matter what its structure may be, it will not be able to stand up and endure.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

For this reason we are convinced that your first concern should be to establish solidly or to restore these fundamental principles in every field: national and constitutional; economic and social; cultural and moral.

In the national and constitutional fields at the present time, the life of nations is everywhere disintegrated by the blind worship of numerical strength. The citizen is the voter. But, as such, he is in reality nothing but one of the units, the total of which constitutes a majority or a minority, which the shifting of a few votes or even of a single one would suffice to reverse. As far as parties are concerned, he is of importance only for his voting value. No concern is shown for his position and role in his family and his profession.

In the economic and social fields there can be no natural organic unity among those engaged in production so long as quantitative utilitarianism, the consideration of maximum profitability, is the sole norm which determines the location of plants and the distribution of work, so long as the concept of "class" artificially divides men in society and there no longer exists a spirit of cooperation within occupational groups.

In the cultural and moral fields individual liberty, freed from all bonds and all laws, all objective and social values, is in reality only a death-dealing anarchy, especially in the education of the young.

Unless the universal political organization rests upon these indispensable foundations, there is risk of its being infected with the deadly germs of mechanical unitarism. We would like to invite those to reflect on this point, precisely from the federalist viewpoint, who dream of setting up a world parliament. Otherwise they would subject themselves to the play of those disintegrating forces from which our political and social order has already suffered too much. They would only finish by adding one more legal automaton to the many others which threaten to stifle the nations and to reduce men to the condition of inert instruments.

MORAL FEDERALISM

Just as, therefore, if it is to be true to the spirit of federalism, the future world political organization cannot under any pretext allow itself to be caught up in the play of mechanical unitarism, so also it will enjoy effective authority only insofar as it safeguards and encourages everywhere the life that is proper to a healthy human community, to a society in which all the members cooperate together for the good of the whole of humanity.

What a fund of moral steadfastness, intelligent foresight and capacity for adjustment this world authority will have to possess, qualities more than ever necessary in those critical moments when, in the face of malevolence, people of good will must resort to its authority. After all the proofs of the past and present, would anyone dare to say that the current resources of Government and politics are adequate? In truth, it is impossible to solve the problem of a world political organization without being willing to leave the beaten path from time to time, without appealing to the witness of history, to a sane social philosophy, and even to a certain divining of the creative imagination.

Therein lies a vast field of work, study, and action. You have understood this and looked it squarely in the face. You have the courage to spend yourselves for this cause. We congratulate you. We express to you our wishes for your good success, and with all our heart we pray to God to grant you His light and help in the performance of your task.

Northwest Iowa Leads in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare privilege and an honor for me to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa in the Congress of the United States. The farming area comprising the Eighth Congressional District is one of the richest agricultural areas in the United States today. Personally, I do not know of another area in the country which can present such a flattering picture for so large an area.

Mr. Frank R. Wilson, information assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Census, has recently prepared a most remarkable statistical picture of this great agricultural area, and the same is included herewith as a part of my remarks.

It should be pointed out that in preparing his statistics, Mr. Wilson included Monona County which no longer is a part of the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa. Aside from the figures relating to Monona County, the 12 remaining counties mentioned comprise the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa.

The statement follows:

The 26,143 farms in 13 Iowa counties of northwest Iowa, of which 12 are in the Eighth Congressional District, have a land and building value of nearly $1,000,000,000, according to computations from the 1950 census. The actual figure on valuations as returned by census enumerators was $979,188,780. Thus, the average value of land and building, per farm, approximated $37,500. Figured in connection with the 4,869,962 acres in these farms, the value was approximately $200 per acre.

Sales of farm products from these 26,143 farms in 1949, the full year prior to the census, amounted to $285,797,318. Thus, the average sales of farm products per farm approximated $11,000 and the sales of farm products per acre were at the rate of nearly $60 per acre.

Of the 26,143 farms, electricity reached 24,222, and facilities for modern living, such as telephones, electric washers, corn pickers, automobiles, and trucks were almost universally available. These 26,143 farms had an average monthly electric bill of $11.73.

This northwest Iowa district contains the champion county of Iowa in land and building values. It is Sioux County whose 2,971 farms were valued at $117,559,499. The second county of highest farm values in Iowa was Kossuth, with over $114,000,000 (with much greater area), and Plymouth County, Iowa, was third with $107,341,785.

Of the $285,797,318 sales of farm products in 1949, Sioux County, with $35,906,956, was second in the State to Pottawattamie with over $37,000,000 of gross farm revenue.

Northwest Iowa farmers market most of their crops through livestock. Of the $285,797,318 gross revenue, $97,123,480 was obtained from the sale of cattle. Hog sales amounted to $92,598,932, and calves brought $5,676,040. Among the 13 counties, Sioux County was first in cattle sales of $14,910,043, but Plymouth County was first in hog sales at $11,649,942. Plymouth County was second in cattle sales, and Cherokee County was third, with Woodbury fourth.

These 13 counties had 1,768 farms whose farm products sales exceeded $25,000, and they had 7,744 farms whose sales ranged from $10,000 to $25,000.

The valuations of land and buildings do not include other equipment on the farms, nor does it include the tremendous volume of livestock. The livestock inventory of the 13 counties included 665,742 cattle and 1,656,319 hogs.

Plymouth County was first with number of cattle with 82,920, and Sioux was second with 78,260. Woodbury had 65,971 and Cherokee 58,249. In numbers of hogs Sioux County was first with 215,450; Plymouth was second with 210,791; Cherokee third with 152,471, and Woodbury fourth with 145,329.

Northwest Iowa farms have high yields and values

[From the 1950 census]

County	Number of farms	Farms with electricity	Acreage in farms	Farm product sales, 1949	Value of farm land and buildings
Sioux	2,971	2,776	478,323	$35,906,956	$117,559,499
Plymouth	2,817	2,758	538,766	32,801,178	107,341,785
O'Brien	1,961	1,810	356,104	22,802,547	88,456,788
Sac	1,985	1,871	364,527	21,108,551	84,340,665
Buena Vista	2,083	1,991	360,024	21,395,576	80,937,048
Lyon	1,920	1,815	364,680	20,051,237	75,985,920
Cherokee	1,798	1,782	357,616	26,310,757	75,402,726
Woodbury	2,873	2,505	520,788	28,082,715	74,787,063
Clay	1,796	1,651	347,520	19,345,651	74,372,360
Osceola	1,306	1,165	251,391	13,194,252	53,867,276
Monona	1,945	1,640	421,147	16,041,567	53,168,520
Ida	1,454	1,343	273,448	18,264,184	52,886,342
Dickinson	1,234	1,115	233,428	10,462,147	40,082,788
Total	26,143	24,222	4,869,962	285,797,318	979,188,780

St. Lawrence Seaway Inspection Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, once again—for the third time—the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway are trying to sell their pet project to Members of Congress through a junket to the area that will be packed full of hospitality.

The Mobile (Ala.) Register in an editorial dated May 5, 1951, calls this air junket unjustifiable and states that if it were submitted to a taxpayer referendum it would be ruled out by a landslide:

The editorial follows:

AIR JUNKET BY CONGRESSMEN

Speaking of last straws, or something of the kind, the congressional committee which has been conducting hearings on the proposed white elephant so-called St. Lawrence seaway has decided to travel by air over the route of the hocus-pocus project.

This sight-seeing aerial junket is planned by the House Public Works Committee as a preliminary to voting on the seaway bill.

"After an hour's discussion at a closed committee session," Chairman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Democrat, of New York, told reporters no objections were raised to taking the trip," the AP relates.

Congressman BUCKLEY meant, of course, that none of the committee members present at the closed meeting objected to the junket. He could not have meant that none of the Nation's taxpayers objected, because the taxpayers were not consulted.

But our guess is that if this contemplated congressional junket and others similarly unjustifiable were submitted to a taxpayer referendum, they would be ruled out by landsides approximately of the size that may hit some of the Nation's junketing congressmen one of these days.

Statement of Clarence B. Randall to the Stockholders of Inland Steel Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the following statement by Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland Steel Co., to the annual meeting of the stockholders on April 25, 1951:

It has been a matter of deep satisfaction to the officers of the company, as I am sure it has been to each employee, that Inland is making such a great contribution to America's rearmament program. Since the outbreak of the war in Korea last June we have had the happy experience of breaking production records month after month. Never have so many new records been made and old ones shattered in such a short space of time. Often a new figure set in one month has itself been exceeded in the next following, and many of the all-time highs reached in March, which were so numerous they cannot be listed here, are already in danger as April draws to a close. Fine teamwork in the company's plants inspired by the vigorous and intelligent leadership of our operating officials has brought this about.

Yet side by side with this magnificent day-to-day production achievement this same operating staff has been driving ahead with the largest expansion program in the company's history, not only at our principal plant, but in those of our subsidiary companies as well. What this means in terms of long hours and devotion to the company's interest must be seen at first hand to be appreciated. We have no reserve of able men who have leisure for new duties. Busy men whose energies were already fully taxed in pressing for added production from our present facilities, have had to take on the added responsibilities of planning and carrying forward the expansion

program. Nor should I fail to mention those good citizens from our sales and other departments who have voluntarily left their jobs here and their homes to serve temporarily in various defense assignments at Washington. Inland is proud of this immediate and effective response to the challenge of the national need. We know that no such sacrifice can equal that of the fine young men who have left us to enter directly into the defense forces.

Yet when a thoughtful American reflects that what is going on at Inland is going on everywhere throughout the country, he cannot help but wonder where it will all lead. No one doubts for a moment that communism must be stopped; our doubts arise when we ask whether we are doing it in the right way. And today the right answer to that question far transcends in importance to our company any question of internal administration. No amount of foresight and sound planning could bring prosperity to the employees and stockholders of the Inland Co. if the planning for the Nation is bad.

We sadly need a reappraisal of our national aims, a clear statement of our objectives. We need to know what we are trying to do, then how we shall do it, and in what period of time.

Take foreign aid, for example. Obviously there is a limit to what our economy can bear in the way of support to that of the whole world. The job we set out to do in Europe is done, and ahead of time. If now a new obligation is arising for the economic support of European rearmament, we in American business are entitled to know the measure of it. Our military advisers must make known the proposed limits of the program, both as to money and as to time, and then Congress, and Congress only, must make the commitment.

Or take our own rearmament program. We in American business are entitled to a clear picture of its magnitude, and again this should be expressed both in dollars and in time. Is what we are doing well conceived and well executed, or are we going about it hit or miss, with uncoordinated agencies buying too much and asking for delivery before it is really needed? The armed services today hold in trust the almost unbelievable capacity of Americans to make sacrifices, and it seems fair to ask that they proceed in an orderly way, with a minimum of waste, toward a clearly understood goal.

Or take the current dilemma of whether our economy can remain free or whether we must start down the tragic path of controls from which no nation has ever yet fully returned. Unfortunately we debate that problem in the dark. Because we do not understand our national aims and because we do not know the measure of our future world commitments, we cannot determine the degree of sacrifice required from each company and each citizen. Instinctively we resist planners who plan solely for the sake of planning. We would resent deeply any attempt to exaggerate a crisis for the sake of imposing controls that would not be accepted otherwise. We react badly to vague emotional appeals, but magnificently to an honest statement of facts, whether they be pleasant or unpleasant.

Or consider the problem of capital accumulation for the expansion of production. The steel industry has been under great pressure from the Government to enlarge its capacity. Yet the same Government proposes to cut off the funds required for that expansion by increasing corporation taxes. They obviously can't have it both ways. Earnings are the principal source of capital for industrial companies, and what is withdrawn as taxes is actually withdrawn from plant expansion.

This document seems a far cry from the customary report of a president to the stockholders of his company, but it reflects the sort of world in which the affairs of the company must be carried on. I believe that judged by normal standards the company is in strong shape, and that its problems are being met with intelligence and fortitude. But I hold the deep conviction that the welfare of the company and its stockholders will in the ensuing year be determined by forces lying entirely outside of the power of your officers to control, and that what Inland and every other industrial company needs most is a reappraisal and restatement of our national aims.

"Without Fanfare, and With a Storage Capacity Equal to 10 Railroad Boxcars, the United States Air Force Giant C–99 Plane Carries 42½ Tons of Cargo 2,600 Miles Nonstop"—United Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, how well I remember as a young man the "lighter than air" airship arguments then advanced—and by noted men—that nothing heavier than air could fly through the air. Certainly, since that day, man has not alone, learned how to travel far but he has also learned how to travel fast.

Mr. Speaker, it is a feat that challenges, if it does not stagger, one's imagination, to take a great mass of iron, steel, lead, copper, aluminum, zinc, tin, and other inorganic and organic substances and energize them so that they fly through the air. It is as equally great a feat to fabricate these materials into a shape that encompasses the cubical content of 10 standard railroad boxcars, load them down with 85,000 pounds of freight and then cause them to fly through the air at prodigious speeds.

I have intended for some time past to address this body and tell of the marvelous contribution that Brookley Field in Mobile is making to national defense and also to tell you all how I have sat in my home and watched the huge C–54's rise off that field and start on their scheduled flights to the continent of Europe.

I shall look forward to the arrival at Mobile of this new giant of the air, the C–99, with its tail five stories high and with the same wingspread but with a 20-foot greater length than a B–36.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the flight of this new plane tells of its ability to carry 400 fully equipped troops and the possibility for the development of the use of this plane in war as well as in peace opens up a whole new concept, not alone of military tactics but of economics and transportation.

All hail to the United States Air Force for its latest feat in developing this great giant of the skies.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all may read the United Press report with respect to the United States Air Force C–99, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein that story as clipped from the Washington Post of May 14.

That article is as follows:

HOLD EQUALS 10 FREIGHT CARS—GIANT C–99 CARRIES 42½ TONS OF CARGO 2,600 MILES NONSTOP

Without fanfare, the largest land plane in the world has been performing remarkable feats of weight lifting for several months, it was learned yesterday.

The plane is the United States Air Force's almost forgotten giant C–99 transport, which steadily has been carrying cargo loads three times those of commercial air freight planes.

Most outstanding of the flights was a 2,600-mile, nonstop trip from Sacramento, Calif., to Savannah, Ga., on which the colossal ship carried 85,000 pounds—42½ tons of cargo. No other airplane has approached that record. On short flights the C–99 has carried more, perhaps 100,000 pounds.

The C–99 is a sister ship of the B–36 superbomber. Only one of the six-engine transports has been built. It was so large that before completion it had to be moved into a huge yard because Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. had no building at San Diego, Calif., that would hold it.

Having the same wing span as a B–36, 230 feet, the C–99 is 182 feet long, 20 feet longer than the bomber. Its tail is 57½ feet high. The fuselage has a volume of 30,000 cubic feet, equivalent to that of 10 railroad freight cars.

On its two decks, the C–99 could carry 400 equipped troops or 300 litter patients.

The Fallacy of the Middle Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Frank Chodorov entitled "The Fallacy of the Middle Way."

This article proves that there can be no meeting of socialism and capitalism and that the world is not big enough for them to live in in peace.

The time has come to choose between the two. England's example is there for us to study and avoid. The article follows:

THE FALLACY OF THE MIDDLE WAY
(By Frank Chodorov)

I

The resignation of Aneurin Bevan from the British Government poses a question for so-called intellectuals who glibly advocate a mixed economy—partly socialistic, partly free. Can it work? Bevan is convinced it cannot. He and his group blame austerity on the mixture. The Attlee regime, they maintain, has failed because it has been too timid, too reluctant to wipe out what is left of capitalism in England.

Bevan is logically sound as a nut. Capitalism and socialism are so antagonistic in texture that there is no way to make them mix. The one is a way of life grounded in the axiom of private property; the other denies the axiom out of hand. How can you have harmony in a social order that accepts the axiom in some areas, rejects it in others?

When you reject private property, as an axiom, you have government intervention

and control. But, a social economy—as distinguished from a Robinson Crusoe economy—is so meshed that it cannot be partly controlled, partly free. When the government undertakes to fix prices it is compelled to fix wages. Intervention in the meat business at the butcher-shop level leads to intervention at the slaughterhouse, then on the farm, and when you follow through you come to the tannery and the shoe business. Each control calls for control of contiguous areas in order to make the previous control work.

Experience has shown that once socialism pokes its foot into the door, capitalism is on its way out. A mixed economy is a temporary concession to capitalistic habits and traditions. Bevan's position is this: since capitalism is doomed, why not be done with concessions and hurry the inevitable along? He is logical.

II

Now, if socialism and capitalism cannot be housed within a given country without causing friction, can there be harmony in a world of sovereign states, some socialistic, some capitalistic? Karl Marx said it is impossible, and the unmixed Socialists have always stuck by their prophet. They sometimes disagree among themselves as to whether evolution or revolution will ultimately wipe out world-capitalism and replace it with world-socialism, but they are unanimous in the opinion that a half-and-half arrangement is untenable. Only American intellectuals profress belief in the possibility.

Again logic is on the side of the Lenins, Trotskys, and Stalins. The world is so thoroughly integrated—economically and physically—that no part can hermetically seal itself off from the rest. For one thing, the natural distribution of raw materials over the face of the globe works against economic isolationism; without iron, the tropics would be hard put, while coffee improves breakfast in the temperate zone. Ideas, too, have a way of vaulting borders, and ideas germinate desires and action.

Socialism is convinced that capitalism—private property—is an evil idea, the worst man has ever thought up; before the ideal society can be realized this idea must be eradicated from the human mind. Within a given country, when the Socialists have got control of its political machinery, the task of eradication is possible of accomplishment; one way or another, the fiction of private property is removed from man's consciousness, and he ceases to think that way. But if the idea rides high in the outside world, it is a constant threat to this process of eradication. That is to say, a casus belli always is present in a world partly socialistic, partly free.

Bevan is reported to have expressed resentment toward America. Were he to entertain any other sentiment toward a capitalistic neighbor he would be ideologically inconsistent. His particular grievance against America is of no importance; so long as capitalism has a toehold here, just so long will English socialism find America an irritant and a danger. There will always be Bevans and issues.

That suggests an unthinkable thought: is it possible that an Anglo-American conflict could arise from the antagonistic social systems? No Socialist would be consistent if he thought otherwise. To be sure, clashes between nations arise from a multiplicity of causes, and their advent is subject to military and political exigencies. In the present world situation, England needs us and we need England, and the pressing interdependence overshadows the friction of conflicting ideologies. The point is that the friction does exist and will continue to exist because socialism cannot tolerate capitalism.

Realistic Russia seems to be pressing for a vindication of this Marxist tenet on the battlefield. England is on our side. Whether she likes it or not, her existence as a sovereign nation, socialistic or otherwise, is dependent on the military and economic help given her by a capitalistic nation. On which side would she be if that help were withdrawn? Ideologically, it would be Russia, but that choice would mean her national liquidation—and that brings up another question.

III

Is international socialism a durable modus vivendi? To repeat, an internal mixed economy is at best a troublesome transition from capitalism to socialism. An international mixed economy is likewise fraught with difficulties. Well then, if all the nations in the world were to embrace socialism could they (a) continue to exist as sovereign nations, and (b) live in harmony with one another?

Socialists have always insisted that war is a product of capitalism, and that when private property is done away with, the political establishments based on private property would wither away, and so would nationalistic loyalties and ambitions. The U. S. S. R. has made that theory look so foolish that the doctrinaires resort to denying its claim to being a socialistic nation. Nevertheless, most simon-pures admit the necessity of introducing socialism on a national basis; first things first.

That simply means that, in the beginning anyway, all socialism must be national socialism—resembling in substance the Hitlerian scheme. When one considers the job of reconditioning people to the new order one realizes why this must be so. To rip out of men's minds the traditions of capitalism, backed by centuries of practice, requires a lot of doing—reeducation, purging, and outright liquidation. It is a task that is proportioned to the size of the nation. It is perforce a local job.

This reconditioning is made difficult by contamination from the outside world. Even if the next-door neighbor also professes socialism, a differential in wages might arise from a difference in natural advantages, and news about it could start a migration of workers. That would upset the controls, just as the free importation of goods must make the regulation of prices a farce. In short, to institute socialism in any one country requires its immunization against all foreign contacts. The iron curtain is a necessary property in a socialistic performance.

But, there is always the problem of the maldistribution of natural resources; in that respect, nature is oblivious of the glories of socialism. Under capitalism, the disequilibrium is righted, though imperfectly, by its intricate system of exchanges. When all the nations of the world have abolished this capitalistic system, how will the coffee of Brazil get to Italy, the turpentine of North Carolina to Tokyo? Doctrinaire socialism has no answer, not one that makes sense anyway. Russian socialism has an answer, and it resembles what the doctrinaires used to sneeringly refer to as imperialism.

Yes, the boys in the Kremlin are the most logical of all Socialists. They know that socialism hasn't a chance if capitalism exists anywhere in the world. They know that separate socialistic nations will be at one another's throats. The only way, then, is to wipe out both capitalism and nationalism at one fell swoop, and to inaugurate global socialism controlled by a single central intelligence.

IV

England's situation, which Bevan's resignation dramatized, is precarious. She hardly gets going on national socialism when her national existence is threatened by the intransigents of the East, bent on fulfilling the destiny bequeathed to them by the Prophet Marx. If they succeed, England will be relegated to a subdivision of world socialism.

On the other hand, what will be her fate if the western capitalistic colossus prevails? The impending struggle promises to leave the world a shambles, making it incumbent on the victor to manage and police it. England will necessarily be one of the policed nations.

In the circumstances, Bevan's proposal that England cut herself adrift from both menaces, so that she can pursue her way toward complete national socialism, is born of despair. Is there no way out for her? Only one escape suggests itself, and that is to go back to the capitalism that, in the nineteenth century, enriched her and gave her strength.

For all the faults of nineteenth century capitalism, its record of achievement compares most favorably with the socialistic and mixed economies of the last 50 years. Production piled on production, taxes were low and the individual was less harrassed. Even its depressions were overcome without austerity, hand-outs, and controls.

In the matter of wars, it is noteworthy that the nineteenth century had no major war comparable to either of the two we have had since 1914. Whatever causes war, it is a certainty that socialism does not bring peace; the evidence is all for the proposition that imbedded in socialism is a prime cause for war.

Perhaps, then, a full measure of capitalism, without mixture, would restore England to vigor and independence. Her productive capacity would certainly improve to the point where she would no longer be a mendicant nation, and the well-being of her people would give pause to the realistic Kremlin. One does not pick on a strong fellow.

That, of course, is what America should do, before the slow poison of a mixed economy brings her to England's plight.

Not Much of an Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me previously, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press on Tuesday, May 8, 1951:

NOT MUCH OF AN ANSWER

The President last night, in what obviously was intended as a reply to General MacArthur, stressed "the awesome and terrible possibility" of an atomic war.

"No matter how good our air defense may be, or how big an Air Force we build, a determined air attack by the Soviet Union could drop bombs upon this country," Truman said.

The best defense against such an attack, he added, "is to prevent the outbreak of another world war and achieve a real peace."

Few Americans will disagree with either statement. But it is possible to accept both without sharing the President's assurance that his present policies will prevent another world war, achieve real peace or win the war we are already fighting.

Defense Secretary Marshall's testimony before the Senate committee yesterday also failed to satisfy on the same count.

That testimony included an apparent contradiction of one of Truman's own assertions.

The President said he had refused to extend the area of conflict in Korea on "the best collective military advice in this country."

Yet General Marshall said he had "urgently recommended" adoption of a proposal by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to permit "hot pursuit" of enemy planes for a stated distance beyond the Yalu River into Manchuria, but we were forced to abandon that plan because the 13 nations allied with us in fighting voted solidly against it.

That seems to indicate that, though the United States is bearing 95 percent of the war burden, vital strategy is being dictated by 13 nations represented in Korea by mere token forces.

These same nations are dragging their feet on the American proposal for economic sanctions against Red China.

"We cannot go it alone in Asia and go it in company in Europe," Truman contended.

Would it be more hazardous to go it alone than to continue to let ourselves be hamstrung, against our better judgment, by so-called allies who insist on working both sides of the street? Can we depend on them in Europe if we can't in Asia?

Some time, some place, we shall have to insist that our friends stand up and be counted. We are losing most of the blood and we have, at least, the right to expect our Allies to stop trading with the enemy, as some of them are doing right now.

If this is the "system of collective security" which the President says we are helping to set up, we should demand that it be replaced by a one-for-all-and-all-for-one arrangement.

Any hitch-hikers who might leave us on such a showdown would be no loss.

Money we are wasting on them could be spent to far better purpose if divided among the nations, including Nationalist China, which are willing to fight.

About all that can be gathered from those portions of Secretary Marshall's testimony made public is that he favors our present course because he believes it less likely than the course advocated by General MacArthur to involve us in war with Russia.

That is conjecture. What is more probable is that we encourage Soviet aggression by official utterances which would lead the Russians to believe that we so fear them and their atom bombs we dare not risk offending them by exerting enough force to end the war in Korea.

If there is a "best way" to prevent a third world war it is to be prepared to win one if it is forced on us—so well prepared to deliver our big bombs on the other fellow's doorstep that he will be as anxious to avoid breaching the peace as we are eager to preserve it.

Our safety depends on swift and adequate preparedness. Let's get going faster.

Meanwhile, Secretary Marshall's self-censorship didn't pass much to refute General MacArthur's opinion that the Chinese Reds can be forced out of Korea by cutting off their supplies.

Praying for Peace With Expectancy of Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following excerpt from a recent edition of the Capitol Gist:

ON PRAYING FOR PEACE WITH EXPECTANCY OF SUCCESS

If one visualizes the millions of men, women, and little children who pray daily for world peace on bended knee or with bowed head, one cannot refrain from joining in praying and working for "on earth peace, good will toward men."

And all may pray—and with expectancy of success, or faith that as a result of the terrible sacrifices, sufferings, and destruction in the U. N. police action in Korea that the world will have learned its lesson and global peace attained.

Then the loss of part of the flower of America's young manhood on the far away hills and mountains and ravines of Korea will not have been in vain and this war-weary world can enter a new era of peace, progress, and plenty for all people on this troubled planet.

Now is the time to put into practice the Christian principles which we profess, and abide by: "Thy will be done."

The Continued Threat to American Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have repeatedly warned of the threat to the American glass industry which is poised by imports from foreign countries, including countries behind the iron curtain. It is obviously impossible for our local industries, maintaining good wages and high working standards, to compete, for example, with Czechoslovakia which does not have comparable wage scales, and is quite indifferent to working standards. Moreover, their production costs are not especially significant since the economy of the country is controlled by the Government, and they frequently export without any real reference to the cost of production, but simply to obtain needed American dollars.

All of this is well illustrated in a recent editorial in the Vineland (N. J.) Times-Journal which is herewith included:

CLOSE TO HOME

In direct contradiction to an occasionally voiced opinion that the average workingman has little stake in national elections decided on international issues, is the distressing situation in the American glassware industry. And in Greater Vineland when the glassware industry is threatened, the circumstances are of vital importance not only to the glassworker whose livelihood is directly affected but to most of the rest of us in the community.

That is why we were interested in a letter passed along to us by our friend Jim Mitchell, international representative of the American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America. The letter was written by Harry H. Cook, international president of the union, quoting a recent Inside Labor column by Victor Reisel in the New York Daily Mirror.

Writing from Cincinnati, Reisel said: "It's here in Ohio that one sees the effect of the Soviet slave apparatus in microcosm. Here the glass struggle is on. And the shrewd Marxist Russians appear to be winning. They're hurting our own glass industry badly. Before war work seeped into the Pennsylvania-Ohio-West Virginia-Indiana glass area some 2,000 of our skilled glass technicians were thrown out of work by Soviet slave competition. * * *

"For some years now, Communist Czechoslovakia had led all the rest of the iron-curtain tribes. In 1949, this land of the Skoda Munitions Works (now grinding out guns for the Chinese Soviet armies) dumped most of the 12,071,991 dozen pieces of hand-made glass that came into the United States. Last year this jumped to 23,668,324 dozen pieces, worth millions of dollars—as the Soviet secret police (MVD) moved in to exploit that land of once free people.

"Add to this the heavy cut glass from Poland, once again popular in this country, and you find that the union's fears are justified. Our own artisans are being forced to abandon a trade for which they trained for years.

"Here is evidence that this trade is a glass-for-guns business for the Russian overseers of Czechoslovakia. Recently a member of the Czech Communist ministry controlling industry called some of his people together and briefed them on the importance of this trade. He was comrade F. Markovic, who said:

" 'Export prices here are not based on production costs but upon the Czechoslovakian need for currency of the country to which the merchandise is being exported.'

"He meant us and the good old United States dollar. Here's what happened. There is an item, for example, which cost American employers $2.12 a dozen just for labor, but the Soviet slave marketeers sell that same glassware for $1.73—complete.

"So cheap is this stuff that it flooded the country and endangered the jobs of 50,000 American workers, some 16,000 of whom are skilled. Just as cheap are the slave glass imports from Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia itself, and Red Manchuria from which the Soviet Chinese armies get much of their steel, coal, and other heavy equipment and fuel.

"The Treasury Department can cripple this trade with just a simple single sentence regulation. But nothing's happening. And won't happen until we make as much noise as we did about the slave crabmeat."

In its issue of last month, the official magazine of the glassworkers noted that 20 percent of hand-made glass sold in the United States in 1950 was imported from abroad—and again the same reason was given; cheap labor.

The issue of a protective tariff or destruction by foreign competition is one that faces not only the men and women who make glassware but many other American industries. War production creates full employment and so the problem is not pressing at the moment; yet the flow of dollars to iron curtain countries cannot be overlooked.

Paralyzed Vet Weeps as 2,500 Cheer His Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald for today:

PARALYZED VET WEEPS AS 2,500 CHEER HIS MUSIC

BOSTON, May 17.—A paralyzed Navy veteran sat in a wheel chair at Symphony Hall

last night with tear-filled eyes as 2,500 persons stood and cheered when the Boston "pop" orchestra finished playing an original composition he picked out with one finger while a hospital patient.

"This is the greatest night of my life," said Robert Grant, Jr., a victim of multiple sclerosis. "This happening to me is out of this world. It just can't be."

CHEERS BRING ENCORE

But it was. The audience cheered his Evening Prayer so long and hard, Conductor Arthur Fiedler had the orchestra play it twice. Again the audience went wild and many swarmed around Grant, who couldn't rise from his wheel chair at a table near the door.

The first time through the music, the 26-year-old veteran sat clutching a sacred heart medal and beaming proudly.

But when the audience gave the religious song its first ovation, Grant became choked with emotion and as the tears flowed, he found it hard to speak.

"The orchestra was tremendous," he said. "This is the kind of thing that just doesn't happen to anybody."

HE JUST PECKED AWAY

Sitting on Grant's left was Mrs. Charles Davidson, the Red Cross Gray Lady at the Cushing Veterans' Hospital in Framingham who encouraged him to try and put his poem to music. The veteran loved music, but never thought of composing.

However, he had plenty of time and pecked away at the hospital piano until he had a melody to fit the words. Fiedler heard about the song, visited Grant and listened to his music. Then he ordered his own arranger to make a full orchestration which was played last night.

Mrs. Davidson and her daughter, Jane, who first sang the song for Grant, both wept as they sat listening to tenor Gene Cox of Boston sing the words that thanked God for all the things he has given mankind.

HIS FATHER ATTENDS

Also present was Grant's father, but his invalid mother could not attend. A recording of the performance was made, but the veteran had to return immediately to the hospital and could not take it with his father to their Cambridge home.

A Dartmouth graduate in the class of 1947 and a former Navy boxer, Grant was surrounded by former classmates and some 250 other veterans and hospital personnel from Cushing. Twenty-five of the patients also were in wheel chairs.

AMVETS Speak Up About United Nations and General Wedemeyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF
WORLD WAR II,
DEPARTMENT OF IOWA,
Atlantic, Iowa, May 10, 1951.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: First we want to congratulate you on your recent victories in Washington in starting the economy drive and in cutting down on nondefense and unnecessary spending in Government.

Also, just in case you may be interested we are enclosing a copy of the resolution passed by the representatives of the veterans of World War II in this southwestern Iowa community. Apparently the men here are becoming quite disgusted with the nonproductive debating work going on in this United Nations assembly, and with complete disregard, apparently, of our men dying daily in Korea. It is time for positive action and a positive foreign policy.

We do thank you for your untiring efforts, though, for honest and efficient Government.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE H. FRIES,
Commander, Walnut, Iowa.
R. G. ROBERTS,
Atlantic, Iowa.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II, ATLANTIC, IOWA, MAY 10, 1951

Whereas the Korean police action is still see-sawing back and forth across the peninsula, costing 1,000 and more casualties weekly (mostly American blood), it is now time to look to the future and study the road ahead. It is noted that the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, is expected to finish drafting the bill of rights for all the peoples of the earth; and

Whereas this bill, described as a guaranty to free speech and a free press is simply an exercise in applied hypocrisy. The bill begins by saying: "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression * * * freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas * * * orally, in writing, or in print * * * or through any other media." The next section of the covenant cancels out the promise. It says "The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may, therefore, be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions"; and

Whereas the covenant on human rights, if accepted by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, would become a treaty, and treaties, under the provisions of the United States Constitution, become the supreme law of the land. "The American Bar Association, at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, expressed grave anxiety that United Nations treaties might thus undermine our bill of rights and transform the Nation into a Socialist despotism. As a safeguard against this, it has been proposed that the United States Constitution be amended to prevent treaties from superseding Federal and State laws." To continue this quotation; "But a simpler and better safeguard would be to get out of the United Nations. The United Nations will never have anything but Socialist ideas to offer because it is dominated by socialism—except when it is dominated by communism": Be it hereby

Resolved by the members of this AMVETS organization, the American Veterans of World War II, meeting this 10th day of May 1951 in a special meeting in Atlantic, Iowa, That in view of the inherent dangers to freedom of speech, freedom of the press and the radio, and even danger to our freedom in religion and worship, and loss of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, we do protest strongly the adoption of these Socialist doctrines, and do urge the United States to get out of the United Nations. It is believed by the members of this organization that we cannot only save our country from the despotism of socialism but also could then offer real assistance to our brave men now fighting in Korea or maybe later all over the world.

Whereas Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer is now separating from active duty in the armed services, and since he has written his report on far-eastern affairs that has proven 100-percent correct, and most likely would have avoided the Korean affair, thus saving some 62,000 American casualties, it is hereby

Resolved by the members of this AMVETS organization, That General Wedemeyer should be called before the United States Senate and before Congress to give this body of our representatives his valuable findings and his opinions on important matters in the Far East, and that this call should be made at once.

GEORGE H. FRIES,
AMVETS Commander,
Walnut, Iowa.
R. G. ROBERTS,
Atlantic, Iowa.

Hon. Eugene Worley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the April 1951 issue of the Texas Bar Journal, the official publication of the State bar of Texas, there is a very interesting article about our former colleague and friend, Judge Eugene Worley, of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. On the front cover of this magazine appears a very fine portrait of Judge Worley.

I know that the members of the House will enjoy reading this article because it tells of Judge Worley's career as a lawyer, legislator, and a member of the judiciary of this country. Of particular interest will be the story of his successful campaign for election to the Seventy-seventh Congress.

It is a privilege for me to recall that I have had a long and pleasant personal association with Gene Worley. Gene and I were classmates at the University of Texas, both of us having received our legal education at the law school at that university. It was there that I also came to know his fine wife, Ann, prior to the time that Gene was fortunate enough to persuade her to marry him.

Later on it was my privilege to join him in the Texas Legislature when he had already completed one term in the house of representatives of that legislature. The two of us had the opportunity of serving together two terms in that body, at the end of which he was chosen by his neighbors and friends to represent them further here. Both of us served in the Navy during World War II. It was, of course, a high privilege for me to join him again here during the Eighty-first Congress.

The article follows:

EUGENE WORLEY: A FORMER CONGRESSMAN, TEXAS LAWYER, IS NOW JUDGE ON UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Eugene Worley, 42-year-old lawyer from Shamrock, Wheeler County, is one of the five judges on the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, Washington, D. C.

President Harry S. Truman appointed him to the court in the spring of 1950.

No stranger in the national capital, Judge Worley first went to Washington in December of 1940 as a Texas Congressman. He began serving in the Seventy-seventh Congress, continued serving as a Congressman until the President's appointment.

There's an interesting story about Congressman Worley's first election. A group of high-school boys and girls helped elect him as Democratic nominee to the House of Representatives in Washington from the Eighteenth District of Texas. Panhandle newspapers in the fall of 1940 said the "Mr. Worley Goes to Washington" Club organized by the young people did more than anybody else in the Panhandle to elect him to Congress.

In April some Pampa high-school students and one 13-year-old junior-high boy organized the club, functioned desultorily for a few months, then realized that their candidate, Gene Worley, might not get into the run-off election in the first primary, July 27.

The "Mr. Worley Goes to Washington" Club went into action. With the president of the student council and players on the football team as speakers, the club members went all over the Panhandle making speeches. A pep squad leader led the cheering every once in a while. Members of the high-school band did their part.

No one was more surprised than the candidate himself. He did not know about the club's plans until the first time his supporters went out to speak for him. They learned he was to speak on the main street in Borger. They went over there, rode a fire truck down the street with the band playing, soon attracted the biggest crowd Mr. Worley had drawn up to that time.

The "Mr. Worley Goes to Washington" Club did their job so well they offset Mr. Worley's disadvantages—no billboards, no radio time. In the first primary campaign the club held 30 campaign rallies in 18 of the 28 counties.

There were 12 other candidates besides Mr. Worley, and he barely got into the runoff.

His opponents failed to realize the importance of "the high-school stuff." They overlooked the fact that the youngsters had 2,000 parents who could vote, even though they themselves were too young to vote.

By runoff time there was a different story. Gene Worley was elected by 7,000 votes and carried 24 of the 28 counties.

And that's the story of how Mr. Worley went to Washington.

Judge Worley sits on a five-man appellate court that gets appeals from the United States Customs Court and from the United States Patent Office. There is only one customs court, seated in New York, but it conducts hearings in all parts of the country.

Decisions of the Customs and Patent Appeals Court can be carried to the United States Supreme Court for review.

Chambers of the Customs and Patent Appeals Court are on the seventh floor of the Bureau of Internal Revenue Building in Washington.

Eugene Worley was born at Lone Wolf, Okla., October 10, 1908, the son of John B. and Idelle (Johnson) Worley.

He was a student at Texas A. & M. College for 2 years, 1927–29, before entering the University of Texas, where he earned his academic and legal degrees.

He was already a member of the Texas House of Representatives when he was admitted to the bar in 1936, and he was reelected twice, serving in the forty-fourth, forty-fifth, and forty-sixth legislatures.

Judge Worley was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1936.

He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Delta Phi Delta, Phi Delta Theta, Methodist Church, Masonic Lodge (thirty-second degree), Odd Fellows, and State bar of Texas.

We Americans Don't Like Aristocracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this timely editorial from the Auburn Parker of Chicago, Ill., issue of April 25, 1951:

WE AMERICANS DON'T LIKE ARISTOCRACY

(By Earl B. Fox, president of Fox College)

We don't like aristocracy of wealth, of blood, or of education. We know that the opportunity of education only for those endowed with a high I. Q. is definitely un-American.

It was Plato who said: "That the purpose of education is to develop in the mind and in the soul and in the body all the perfection and all the beauty of which they are capable." Others have defined education as "an adjustment to environment." To deny this opportunity to all on an equal basis is cruelly wrong. While it is understandable that university presidents and professors are much concerned over the prospective lessening enrollment, poorer athletic teams, etc., we violently take issue with their present solution of this problem.

Since the source of every socialistic scheme that now burdens our industry and clouds our thinking was hatched on our university campuses—it is ridiculous to see these same universities propound such an unsocial idea as draft exemption for those with a high I. Q. It is so out of character.

It was Will Rogers who said, "I have three children, and thank God not one of them is a genius." One's I. Q. is not very important. What he does with it is most important. Give me in addition to one's I. Q. his P. Q., that is, his personality quotient plus his ambition quotient—then and only then—can I give you his coefficient of success. Without an agreement with the Pentagon the universities would have been hard hit. It would have been so bad that some of the professors would have to take jobs in war plants. Maybe that would have been justice. After all, it was the original Brain Trust (composed of college professors and their protégés) that brought about the recognition of Russia. It was this same group that propounded the idea of killing pigs, plowing under young corn and tender wheat. It was this group of Brain Trusters who scuttled the Atlantic Charter and made Russia strong. This proposed plan of I. Q. tests for draft exemption classifies every GI as a moron—poor thanks to those who are giving and will give so much—maybe their all. What effect will this have upon the sincere university student? Will not his educational aims be seriously affected when socially he is blackballed as a slacker, goaded with the guilty conscience of dodging his duty? Can those of us who so highly respect the universities and their glorious traditions of the past stand idly by and see these glories traded for a mess of pottage?

There is no valid excuse for any young man to be excused from the draft. If it's important enough for one to serve, it is important enough for all to serve of that respective age bracket. No young man should be denied the privilege of serving his country in uniform to the maximum of his ability. If he be a IV–F or even subnormal, isn't that sufficient punishment? Must we heap coals of fire upon his head by denying him the privilege of wearing the uniform? We don't dare to deny anyone that right when we will let him vote now or later. The privilege of voting implies definite responsibilities.

True, all can't serve in top capacity, but with proper ingenuity and sufficient effort a job can be located somehow, somewhere, for every man who has the American right of wearing the uniform. We all know it takes nine men to support one in the field. Those who can't serve in the field can, most assuredly, serve behind the men behind the gun. Then if all men go in uniform, does that mean all our universities must close? Where will we get our future scientists, engineers, those for research, teachers, etc.? The answer is very simple. For now we have ample proof that there isn't a single job that our young men are doing that can't be done just as well by the modern American girl.

Unfortunately, we have far too many families that feel that giving a girl an education is not important. (It is interesting to note that no widow ever feels that way.) Since the universities have served their alumni so well, since these college graduates are so financially successful, since they will be happy to express their loyalty to their alma mater, why not appeal to our alumni? Let each alumnus select the right girl from his neighborhood and pay her tuition as a candidate to his alma mater. If that is too big an obligation—and I doubt it—why not the alumni form themselves into groups of 10 as a sponsoring group for only 1 candidate and equally sharing the cost of this scholarship. That not only would take care of all our future needs for well-trained scientists and those of the professions, but also it would fill all our colleges to capacity.

We have ample proof of the loyalty of the alumni. Look at the number of athletes that are well set up in the universities by the alumni. If our services to our former students haven't been great enough to deserve and achieve this cooperation, may God give us courage to say, "We deserve to have our doors closed."

Acheson Trapped by Own Double Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, of all the qualities that are necessary in a member of the Cabinet, none are more important than integrity and adherence to truth. I raise this question today because of an important statement made yesterday by the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, at a press conference. Mr. Acheson was being questioned about his attitude toward letting Communist China into the United Nations. He replied heatedly that he is opposed to admitting Red China. Then, according to this morning's Washington Post, he added:

So far the United States has been successful in convincing the vast majority of countries that it was right in opposing the seating of Communist China.

Other papers quote him similarly.

Now let me recall what Mr. Acheson told a press conference on June 7, 1950—New York Times, June 8—in discussing admission of Red China to the U. N. He said:

We believe each nation must decide for itself how it is going to vote on the question,

and we are not going to try to influence them.

When a matter of truth is involved the facts speak for themselves. Mr. Acheson's own double talk has finally trapped him.

Some More Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent summary of the reasons for MacArthur's dismissal is contained in the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, May 13, 1951. It is precise and to the point, so that even he who runs may read:

REASONS FOR DISMISSAL

Why was General MacArthur dismissed?

Secretary Marshall said there was nothing new about a theater commander getting so wrapped up in his own aims that he was dissatisfied with his orders from above. "What is new," said Marshall, "and what has brought about the necessity for General MacArthur's removal is the wholly unprecedented situation of a local theater commander publicly expressing his displeasure at and his disagreement with the foreign and military policy of the United States."

MacArthur had issued a series of public statements about the heavy American defeat of late November. He was critical of Government policy. On December 6 an order was sent to him from Washington, phrased in general terms to avoid making it too personal, forbidding him to issue further statements without having them approved in Washington.

On March 20 the Joint Chiefs of Staff told MacArthur that the President was preparing an announcement, in conjunction with the United Nations, to the effect that we were ready to discuss a Korean settlement. Four days later MacArthur issued a statement of his own along similar lines, without U. N. approval. This disrupted the delicate talks that Truman was having with our allies, said Marshall, and it became necessary to abandon the projected U. N. declaration "thus losing whatever chance there may have been at that time to negotiate a settlement of the Korean conflict."

Finally and climactically came MacArthur's letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., urging that we bomb China.

"It became apparent," said Marshall, "that General MacArthur had grown so far out of sympathy with the established policies of the United States that there was grave doubt as to whether he could any longer be permitted to exercise the authority in making decisions that normal command functions would assign to a theater commander. In this situation there was no other recourse but to relieve him."

Mr. Speaker, at the same time it would be well for those who are constantly asking, and not expecting an answer, as to what our Formosa policy is, to read the following summary which appeared in the same newspaper the same day:

POLICY AS TO FORMOSA

On the topic of Formosa, Secretary Marshall dealt with two points brought up by General MacArthur.

The established policy of the United States, said Marshall, is to deny Formosa to Communist China and to oppose the seating of Red China in the United Nations. We would not bargain about these points in any talks about a cease fire, said Marshall. However, when negotiations for a final Korean settlement take place, these points will be brought up in the U. N., whether we like it or not. He thought the United States would oppose any settlement which would reward the aggressor in any manner whatever.

On the subject of the use in Korea of the Chinese Nationalist troops now on Formosa, Marshall said MacArthur himself advised against it last July. He thought the 33,000 troops offered by Chiang Kai-shek would be ineffective and lack logistic support. During the alarming period of defeat in late November, MacArthur changed his mind and asked for fifty or sixty thousand Formosa troops, which number he believed were sufficiently well trained and equipped to go into combat. The Joint Chiefs of Staff rejected his suggestion, feeling that past performances of these same troops on the Chinese mainland and current reports on their fitness did not indicate that they would be effective in Korea.

Besides, the Joint Chiefs thought Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa were needed there to protect the island against Communist invasion, and that they would have their hands full if an invasion were launched.

The Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 9, 1951.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANFIELD: Knowing of your deep and continuing interest in Post Office Department operations, I am taking the liberty to point out an inaccurate statement made to you by Postmaster General Donaldson some months ago. Only recently have I been informed that he cast aspersions upon the Citizens Committee's estimates of potential reductions in the postal deficit.

In response to your questioning at the House Appropriations Subcommittee's hearings on the Treasury Department-Post Office Appropriations bill for 1952, Postmaster General Donaldson made the following statement—and others of like character—to the subcommittee:

"It has been rather well circulated throughout the country by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Commission * * * that if we had a modernized and streamlined accounting system $250,000,000 could be saved" (p. 54 of printed hearings).

The Citizens Committee has made an official estimate as to the potential savings which could accrue to the installation of a modernized and streamlined postal accounting system. This was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 17, page A6806, by the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN:

"The measure (the Post Office Financial Control Act, Public Law 712, 81st Cong.), in itself, will not save great sums of money. One million dollars annually is the estimate of the Citizens Committee."

Mr. Donaldson appears to have added $249,000,000 to our estimate of $1,000,000 for potential savings from better accounting in his department.

The Citizens Committee, using specific dollar figures presented by the Hoover Commission and accounting information in official Post Office Department publications, estimated that the current annual postal deficit of $555,000,000 can be greatly reduced as is set forth below.

I. THE HOOVER COMMISSION

The Hoover Commission's estimates were that the postal deficit could be cut by $256,000,000 annually as follows:

Present deficit	*Reductions*
1. Increases in rates for special services	$64,000,000
2. Increases in rates for penny post cards	50,000,000
3. Managerial economies (post offices with receipts over $1,000,000)	90,000,000
4. Economies through modernization of methods and equipment	60,000,000
Deduct annual cost of economy program plus new equipment to effect (3) above	−8,000,000
Current revenue and expenditure estimates indicate a further increase in reduction of $6,000,000 through items (1) and (2) above	6,000,000
Total reduction accruing to Hoover Commission recommendation	262,000,000
Annual deficit	555,000,000
Net deficit after installation of Hoover Commission program	293,000,000

II. SEGREGATION OF SUBSIDIES

Postmaster General Donaldson stated in a letter of February 21, 1949, to Speaker RAYBURN that a deficit of around $150,000,000 represents the cost of official penalty mailing, franked mailing, airline subsidies, and other costs not properly chargeable to the users of postal service.

Total subsidies payment not properly chargeable to operations of the Post Office Department	$150,000,000
Net postal deficit after installation of Hoover Commission recommendations and proper segregation of subsidies (regardless of rate increase on first-, second-, third-, or fourth-class mail)	143,000,000

Following the facts and reasoning above, the Citizens Committee states that, if the Hoover Commission recommendations were fully installed and administered with skill and if the subsidies were properly segregated, the true postal deficit would approximate $143,000,000 annually, not $555,000,000.

At least a portion of this remaining deficit of $143,000,000 might then be met by some increase in rates to special commercial users, as stated by Mr. Hoover in his speech of June 30, 1949.

The estimated annual loss of $435,000,000 on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and foreign-surface mail might more properly be studied against the $143,000,000 over-all postal deficit which would remain after reorganization and segregation of subsidies.

You are free to make such use of this letter as you may wish.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT L. L. MCCORMICK,
Research Director, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

The Story of the Origin of the Milk Bowl in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, down in the Tenth District in Texas, at Gause, I have a friend, Mr. E. C. Weafer, who has furnished the inspiration for a program to encourage the youth of our country.

He and the members of his family are responsible for the Milk Bowl, which provides an opportunity for the "small fry" to engage in junior football in Texas. I think it is a program worthy of the attention of the Members of the House, and therefore call your attention to a reprint from the American Farm Youth magazine concerning pee-wee football in Texas:

THE MILK BOWL, INC.

(By E. C. Weafer, secretary, Gause, Tex.)

Listeners to the broadcasts of radio station WFAA, Dallas, recently heard Ralph Widman, sports director of the station say, "A city is not measured by the size of its buildings, but by the quality of its people. In my books, the biggest city in the world is Gause, Tex., United States of America." Gause, an almost forgotten hamlet in central Texas and almost untouched by the prosperity of recent industrialization, thus reached a point in fame that had been undreamed of as several generations of Gause folks watched first their bank then other businesses disappear.

What was the cause of the revival of the community? It was the Milk Bowl, which was described by Jinx Tucker, sports editor of the Waco News-Tribune as just about the most important sports event in Texas for many years. The Milk Bowl was the first annual bowl game for small-fry players, played at Cameron, Tex., on December 10. All players were required to be under 100 pounds and not over 14 years of age. Two teams of rural youth played, one from Gause, Tex., and the other from San Saba; the final score 20–7 in favor of San Saba. All the features of a big-time bowl were present: play-by-play broadcast over a major station, half-time activities, and other colorful features. Significantly a national manufacturer paid for the radio time, and bidding now goes on for radio rights. NBC tie-ups is in prospect.

The game has resulted in a wave of enthusiasm for junior football in Texas. More than that, it has caused Texas farm folks to take an interest in the extracurricular activities of the schools, and has brought about a study of the recreational and community needs of rural communities. It may soon cause a State-wide, official study and a series of conferences on what may be done in rural Texas to develop community-centered activities for persons of all ages. By beginning with the interest in football, the promoters of the bowl have done more for farm youth than has been accomplished, thus far, by consideration of blueprints for community unification and recreation.

The famous Milk Bowl began in a small way but with a big purpose. The local school had been without men teachers for over a decade. There were no athletics. The passing of the Gilmer-Aikin bill and subsequent raising of salaries brought in men teachers. Soon the cow-pasture campus was cleared and football practice was begun. When the community saw its boys playing in overalls and sweatshirts (many of the people and most of the boys had never seen a football game), a collection was taken for uniforms. Even though several lads were inclined to run the wrong way with the ball and one of them actually did, the country boys played a schedule with city teams, and won smashing victories. Then, Mrs. Weafer, 24-year-old housewife and mother of five children, suggested a bowl game for peewees to Ralph Widman, sports director of WFAA; with the support of that station, the Dallas Morning News, the Waco News-Tribune, and other agencies in Texas, the bowl was promoted and won enthusiastic acclaim throughout the State.

Two significant developments have taken place recently. Several Southwestern Conference athletic directors have indicated willingness to have peewee games played as preliminaries to the regular games of the conference, thus opening the way to the promotion of junior football and rural recreation on an unprecedented scale. Then, word has come from Chicago that the city championship peewee football team of Chicago, coached by the immortal Red Grange and a staff from the Chicago Bears and Cardinals might possibly be available for the 1950 Milk Bowl, so that the best team in Texas would have outside competition.

The Milk Bowl, Inc., a nonprofit Texas corporation is made up of the following people: Joe Moore, for 10 years lead-off man for the New York Giants; Gene Walker, former Texas leaguer; Terry Moore, one-time Arizona leaguer; Gerland Varner, Gause businessman; Ralph Widman, sports director, radio station WFAA, Dallas; Mrs. Myrtle Varner, superintendent of schools, Gause; Eugene C. Weafer, athletic director of the Gause Public Schools.

This all proves to farm youth everywhere that people do not have to live in big places to do big things. Opportunity starts at a young person's front door.

And maybe that Gause has now learned to believe in itself, it can also learn to believe in its land, which can be put to greater productive use following the appropriate kind of studies and the suitable plan of land use.

We farm folks can think "big" and we are people, too.

Evidence, Not Emotions, Prove the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the evidence continues to pile up that President Truman was right and General MacArthur was wrong. I am pleased to incorporate in the RECORD editorials from the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, May 13, and May 17, 1951, as follows:

A MAJOR VICTORY

Secretary Marshall was well justified in pointing out to the Senators one of the most serious consequences of General MacArthur's emotion-charged campaign. It has entangled MacArthur in a position in which, in order to defend his case, he must shout to the world that the Eighth Army is being committed to futile battle in a "vacuum" of policy; that the administration is "buying time at the expense of American blood"; that it is abetting a "dreadful slaughter" of our men without "definite end" and without hope of anything save indecisive stalemate. The effect which these inaccurate, plainly exaggerated but moving phrases might have had upon the morale of the Eighth Army is appallingly apparent. It is even more apparent that this estimate of the situation coming from the late top United Nations commander at a moment when the enemy is counting his losses and debating his next moves, could tend only to incite Peking to one more bloody effort, which our forces might otherwise be spared.

It is difficult to imagine a worse disservice to the devoted men of the Eighth Army. Fortunately, that army has disregarded the self-justifications of its former commander; its morale reportedly stands at a higher peak than ever before, and while MacArthur at home has in effect been encouraging the Chinese Reds to try again, the men in the field have been supplying the Peking dictators with compelling counterarguments that may yet prove convincing.

It is simply not true that the Korean war has been fought in a "vacuum" of policy; or that the policy, very clearly defined, which has been followed can offer nothing save an endless continuation of "dreadful slaughter." In the last 3 weeks the Eighth Army and its associated air and sea elements have won a victory of remarkable, conceivably of decisive, proportions with a minimum of losses. It is not simply that the lines were substantially held. By maneuvering the Chinese into an offensive, the Eighth Army shattered a major effort, built up on a scale which Peking will certainly find it increasingly difficult to repeat. It wrecked many of the best Communist units so thoroughly that the enemy was forced not merely to halt but to break off the action. He has now retreated beyond range of the terrible United Nations artillery; his supply system is in a shambles which leads General Almond to suspect that he may already be "wilting on the vine," while intimations of efforts to bring up armor and air forces in support carry some hint that even a Chinese conscript army cannot indefinitely survive the brutal expenditure of light-armed infantry masses.

The U. N. field commanders warn against another effort, but they are more confident now than at any time in the past. Many wars have been decided by great defensive victories. The strategic consequences of this one cannot yet be estimated, but to assume that they are nothing and bring us no nearer to a conclusion is to fly in the face of military history. The battle in Korea, tragic as it still may be, is of far greater significance than the battle in the hearing rooms of Washington.

THE CENTRAL POINT

The course of the examination of General Marshall last week took in a great deal of territory, from Washington to Yalta. This was inevitable under the forms of congressional committee procedure and the intense interest of the public in all aspects of far-eastern policy. But it would be extremely unfortunate if, in the meanwhile, the central point of the investigation were lost to sight. That is, of course, the policy to be pursued now in Korea.

In this connection, one of the most significant documents produced by the inquiry to date has been President Truman's message of January 13 to General MacArthur. This was not a directive. But the paraphrase released to the public indicates that it was a clear and comprehensive survey of the political objectives of the Korean war—under the circumstances which prevailed after Red China's intervention—as well as the limitations which both political and military considerations imposed upon American policy in Korea. The advantages of continued United Nations resistance in the peninsula, including a fighting retreat from Korea, if that became necessary, were given forceful expression. Equally pointed were the references to the need for safeguarding and strengthening relations with America's

allies and building up the strength of the United States, which acted as a brake upon extending the area of conflict or sending large reinforcements.

It would be impossible, in the light of this note, to allege that the United States does not have a policy in Korea. Many of the objectives stated by the President in those dark January days have already been achieved. The free peoples of Asia have had time to organize—Indochina, for example, has been saved from imminent destruction. Red China's military prestige has been amply deflated. The defense of the West has been stimulated, its unity reinforced. The combination of vigor and restraint foreshadowed in Mr. Truman's message has been of inestimable advantage to America and its associates.

The charge that can be justly leveled against the administration is that it did not make its policy clear and comprehensible to the public. Even with the reservations which diplomacy and the danger of providing too much information to the enemy might require, the fundamental conditions outlined on January 13 might have been told to the American people as plainly and persuasively as they were given to General MacArthur. Had this been done, had there been more candid and effective leadership at home, many of the doubts and confusions which cloud the Korean war need never have arisen.

THE BATTLE IS THE TEST

General Bradley's testimony, so far as it has been allowed to go, has been concise, clear, and distinct with the soldierly qualities of judgment and responsibility which have distinguished this high officer. It has contributed the best brief statement of the case against the MacArthur program—that it would tend toward getting the Nation into "the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time and with the wrong enemy"—so far offered. And it has confirmed the growing evidence that the facts were in certain important respects other than General MacArthur represented them and certainly very different from what his supporters and enthusiasts have too rashly assumed them to be.

As this became more and more apparent the solemn senatorial search for the "facts" degenerated into an irrelevant partisan and legal wrangle which, after occuping half of Tuesday's session and all of yesterday's (with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff kept sitting idly in his witness chair most of the time) is still unresolved. But while the Senators in Washington are thus bringing their inquiry down perilously close to the ridiculous, the Eighth Army in Korea and its associated air and naval forces are again writing the real answers to the real issues of our times in blood rather than in words.

It is still a little unclear as to whether the Communists have actually unleashed their second great effort, or are only stepping up the probing attacks which have plainly foreshadowed it. None of the actions of the last day or two seems to have gone beyond the preliminary give-and-take across what amounts to a no man's land; but no one doubts that another major shock is at most a matter of hours. The American commanders are awaiting it with greater confidence, and in seemingly much more strongly prepared positions, than they enjoyed when the first wave was delivered on April 22. But whatever the outcome, it will be far more significant for all questions of future policy and strategy than anything which can possibly be produced in Washington committee rooms. Valid answers for all the problems being bandied among the Senators—what tactics offer best promise of success, what is the relative strength of U. N. mechanized firepower and Chinese infantry masses, which side is being hurt the most, above all, how the war can best be won—can be read only on the ground by the lurid light of actual battle. As the test again impends, it is not only our hopes that concentrate on Korea and its defenders; it is there also that our best thought and soberest powers of analysis must be directed.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to incorporate in these remarks the following statement adopted by the executive board of the New York State CIO Council:

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT'S ACTION RE MACARTHUR

The executive board of the New York State CIO Council fully endorses President Truman's action in removing General MacArthur from his commands.

In reaffirming civilian control over the military, the President has strengthened a vital democratic principle. In making clear the determination of our country to use its fighting strength most effectively to advance the cause of peace and freedom, he has strengthened our leadership in the world.

The President's action was in the best interests of the Nation and its purposes in this time of world crisis. The artificial storms which are being whipped up by reactionary newspapers and politicians for selfish and unpatriotic purposes cannot obscure that fact.

We are certain that the overwhelming majority of the American people join with us in approval of the President's stand.

Urges Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement concerning amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act prepared for the record of the hearings which are now being held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL W. SHAFER, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MAY 17, 1951

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now finds its possible to consider amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. Along with all other Members of Congress, I am deeply interested in making whatever changes can be made in this act within reasonable bounds of safety.

Since coming to Congress, I have always been interested in the Railroad Retirement Act for two reasons: First of all, inasmuch as the district that I represent contains substantial railroad installations, the welfare of a number of my people is involved. Secondly, I have been keenly interested in the determination on the part of the railroad workers themselves that their retirement system not be a form of socialistic subsidy.

No doubt all of the members of your committee are fully aware of the facts warranting amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. Except to say that my mail indicates that there is a substantial feeling that benefits for widows and children especially should be improved, I will not go too much into detail as to what I think should be done in the way of amending this act; but rather, if you will permit me, I should like to discuss for a moment the independence of the railroad-retirement system, which I have mentioned above.

Railroad employees and railroad management in combination are now contributing 12 percent of their total payroll to the maintenance of their retirement system. Other workers covered by social security, of course, pay much less. There have been complaints that one system costs too much and the other system costs too little. I am not an actuary and, of course, cannot discuss the merits or demerits of these complaints. I seek only to pay tribute to the railroad employees who have historically insisted that they must pay their own way in the field of retirement. No group has resisted the inroads of socialism in a more determined fashion than these railroad employees.

Any of you who are familiar with my record in matters of labor relations will agree that I have acted in an independent manner. There are times when I agree with the labor unions and times when I do not. I am pleased to say to you today that I am in full agreement with the Railway Labor Executives' Association and their sponsorship of H. R. 3669, a bill whose author is the distinguished chairman of this committee. I have, in the past, found the advice of the Railway Labor Executives' Association in matters affecting the administration of the Railroad Retirement Act to be dependable and honest. They are now proposing a bill which will afford relief to widows and children as well as all other classes of beneficiaries under this act. I therefore am pleased to advise this committee of my support of this bill and I hope that it will be reported expeditiously in order that we may jointly move for passage on the floor of the House.

Delaware's One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a newspaper article calling attention to the State of Delaware's one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary. This article appeared in the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News on Tuesday, May 15, 1951. It was written by that well-known Delaware columnist, Bill Frank.

All Delawareans are proud of the glorious history and traditions of the people of the State of Delaware. This article serves as a reminder of the great courage and self-reliance characteristic of our ancestors. Our forefathers were inspired with a vision of keenest foresight and quickly perceived the advantages offered and made Delaware the first State in the Union.

Inspired by great traditions, Delaware continues in the forefront in all fields of endeavor in the great struggle for freedom and human progress under God.

The article follows:

FRANKLY SPEAKING

(By Bill Frank)

Delaware as a State has a birthday anniversary coming up real soon—175 candles,

each one burning brightly and proudly through the years.

For it was 175 years ago on June 15 Delaware—through her representatives assembled in New Castle—declared she was no longer a colony under the domination of Great Britain.

And those representatives also further declared that thenceforth our State was to be a part of the United States of America.

We were no longer to be merely three counties on the Delaware but a sovereign State with its own government.

And, actually, our first chief executive was Caesar Rodney, who was then speaker of the assembly, and he replaced Gov. John Penn of Pennsylvania.

In our State histories and in our various studies of the annals of Delaware, we always point to the date of the landing of the Swedes and the founding of New Castle, etc.

All very important—but this beginning of Delaware as an independent State of its own, with a constitution of its own, isn't discussed as much as it should be.

It was on June 15, 1776, that our Delaware Assembly adopted a Declaration of Rights—before the Declaration of Independence became a fact in Philadelphia.

And later on September 20—175 years ago—a convention of Delawareans adopted our first State constitution.

It was not a long-lived constitution. In many ways it was cumbersome and soon had to be replaced—but the fact is that this first constitution plus the Declaration of Rights breathed the very life of independence and freedom.

And it would do all of us good some day to reread this Declaration of Rights and the first constitution of our State—and realize that it took lots of courage and fortitude for our early leading citizens to subscribe to the principles of those documents.

And, coincidentally, it is interesting to note that the New Castle tercentenary comes on June 16 of this year—the day after the anniversary of our State birthday—and also interesting to note that those momentous events of 1776 took place in New Castle.

The Declaration of Rights of 1776 was quite a document. It started off by saying that all government of right originates from the people, and is founded in compact only and instituted solely for the good of the whole.

It continued to declare the rights of the freedom of worship and free elections, the importance of trial by jury, the importance of a well regulated militia, the freedom of the conscience, and that at all times, the military ought to be under the strict subordination to and governed by the civil power.

The Delaware Declaration of Rights also proclaimed that the liberty of the press ought to be inviolably preserved.

This was no perfunctory declaration. It was not a grandstand show of mere grandiose words. We were at war in 1776—and the affairs of the war were not going too well for the American cause.

Here in Delaware, not all our citizens were in favor of independence; not all our residents were in favor of the War for Independence.

Then, in August of that year, began the drafting and later the adoption of our first constitution.

Prof. John A. Munroe, of the University of Delaware, has written that this constitution was the first to be written by any State through a device now generally considered correct—the election of a special convention for that purpose.

In addition to the articles that provided for the mechanics of operating the State government, there were a number of articles based on broad principles of freedom.

For example, article 25 gave the right of lawmaking to the legislature except that no laws could be enacted that were repugnant to the declaration of rights and the State constitution.

Article 26 in very plain and in simple terms declared that "no person hereafter imported into this State from Africa ought to be held in slavery under any pretense whatever and no Negro, Indian, or mulatto slave ought to be brought into this State for sale from any part of the world."

The first State constitution's provision for free and nondominated elections is interesting.

It declared that no persons should go to elections armed and that no muster of the militia shall be made on election day.

And what was more—the constitution declared that no company of armed men, in the pay of the "continent or of this or any other State, be suffered to remain at the time and place of holding said elections, nor within 1 mile of the said (election) places."

No one religious group was to be given preference over another in this State and no clergyman was permitted to hold any civil office.

And the first State constitution concluded with the statement that certain principles of freedom and rights already enunciated should not be "violated on any pretense whatever."

This certainly was very broad and so worded as to prevent any subterfuge of action.

The historians tell us this was not a perfect constitution, though helping in its drafting were distinguished Delawareans—5 later to become governors; 11 to become judges; 3 to become chief justices, and 2 United States Senators.

Maybe it wasn't a perfect constitution but it did establish and guarantee rights to be secured by the action of Delawareans, determined to abide by them.

This then is the year to be remembered in our State.

Statement of Louis P. Tonoli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the statement of my friend and constituent, Louis P. Tonoli, of Clinton, Mass., president-treasurer of the New England Associated Businessmen, at a hearing of the House Small Business Committee at Worcester on April 25. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members, as the head of a business association which numbers most of its members in the small business class, in business myself until a few years ago, and presently connected with the Van Brode Milling Co. of Clinton, Mass., as a contract negotiator in charge of subcontracting for this firm, I believe I am in a position to offer possible suggestions to this committee.

Van Brode Milling Co. is engaged on Government contracts for the Army, Navy and Quartermaster Corps. Cereals, plastics and packaging of rations are among its activities. Recently we have bid on survival kits of large size, most of which we intend to subcontract. At present we intend to bid on a large contract for life-raft accessory kits. If we gain this contract I shall subcontract metal, plastic and cloth items to about 20 subcontractors.

Having operated a small business and done work for the Government myself, I can appreciate how difficult it is for most small firms to do business with the Government. The owner of a small firm in many cases is manager, workman, and even down to floor sweeper in some cases. It is almost impossible for the small-business man to go to the various purchasing agencies as he should each day if he wishes to know the various items the Government has out for bid. Taking a prime contract is out of the question; in most cases he must subcontract certain items which he cannot produce and he has neither the time nor the knowledge to do this work. They are more than pleased when someone like myself comes to their door with an opportunity for them to bid on certain items of which they have an acquaintance. It is of great help to them when, as in many cases, I have the visible item that can be seen besides the blueprint of the article. No matter how acquainted anyone is with prints, looking over what is to be made is of great help.

The procurement agencies state that it is not necessary for any employment to be made and no agents need be employed to secure a contract. They make mention that a daily synopsis sheet is sent out by the United States Department of Commerce to chambers of commerce and accredited business groups.

This is a step in the right direction and does have a great deal of value. However, unknown to some people, there are many small firms who do not belong to chambers of commerce and associations and even now have no idea of this service. To those who take advantage of this information it is helpful, but in the majority of cases by the time they receive bid sheets the bid opening date is most times a week, sometimes less. It is not possible to then write for the necessary specifications and then check for materials because the time is too short. As a result, even the firms who get the synopsis sheets do not pay much attention to them.

The United States Department of Commerce also issues weekly the awards of contracts of over $25,000. This was a great help to small firms until a short time ago. A firm who was interested in getting subcontract work could check as to who got an award and then could contact the firm who got the contract. I know of some firms who got work this way. However, whether for security reasons or otherwise, the award sheets now make no mention of quantity or dollar value as was announced until a while ago. Most certainly the majority of small-business men of my acquaintance would like the sheet brought out as it was previously. This would be helpful to them they feel.

Speaking for an association and as a businessman, I am interested in seeing that New England gets its fair share of procurement work given out by the Government. Present results to date by individuals and groups have been disappointing.

This condition is comparable to the situation in 1940 through 1942, when for these 2 years the small-business man was forgotten. During this period, nearly 16 percent of the small businesses of the United States closed their doors. We do not wish to see such a condition occur again.

As Chairman of the Board of Selectmen of Clinton, I appeared before the Senate Small-Business Committee in Washington in 1941. Some of my suggestions had merit, I believe, and in 1942 the Smaller War Plants Corporation was formed and did much useful work. This group assisted small firms in obtaining nearly a billion dollars in subcontracts and more than $5,500,000,000 in prime contracts. It loaned more than $550,000,000 to small business with insignificant losses. Over 5,000 of New England smaller plants registered with Smaller War Plants Corporation and received contracts for about $000,-000,000 of war materials.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Either a corporation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation type should be set up or a group of a similar type contained within the National Production Authority under the Department of Commerce to handle procurement opportunities for small business.

2. Adoption of the Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN and Congressman RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH bills. These were introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by the respective Congressmen. House Resolution 941 has been reintroduced in the Eighty-second Congress by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN. It is a bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns and consists of the following:

"That section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section if the agency head determines that such action is advisable in the interest of the national defense in order to make or keep suppliers available for furnishing supplies in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense through maintenance of active research and development, will be served by such action, supplies may be procured on the basis of, and in accordance with, an invitation for bids containing provisions which specify—

"'(1) that a part, not exceeding 20 percent of the total procurement involved, when practicable may be withheld from the successor bidder or bidders for distribution among the small-business concerns, not exceeding five, which submit, as to all or such part of the procurement involved as may be specified in the invitation, the lowest bids submitted by small-business concerns; and—

"'(2) that the part of the total procurement so withheld when practicable may be distributed among such small-business concerns (either by acceptance of the bids made by them or by negotiated purchase or contract) on a basis involving payment to each of a price not in excess of 15 percent above the lowest price paid to a successful bidder.'

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by inserting after '2 (c)', wherever appearing therein, the following: 'or 3 (c).'

"SEC. 3. Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions necessary under section 3 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement."

3. Revision of Public Law 413 to authorize procurement officers to negotiate or to award contracts on a sliding-scale basis so that the small manufacturers may fairly compete with the larger ones whose advantage in large-scale purchasing and multiple-manufacturing processes virtually eliminates competition.

4. Small plants want defense work but many owners realize that they cannot handle big contracts and as a suggestion some system might be set up so that contracts would be awarded to companies agreeing to subcontract the greatest part of the work. Or a contractor securing a large contract would be required to let out certain percentages of a prime contract.

CONCLUSION

The smaller plants of the country showed their worth in the last war. Some immediate effort should be made so that their facilities could be utilized. In the event of an emergency all the manufacturing plants and the manpower of the country is needed.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this able committee and assure you that both the businessmen and the workers of central Massachusetts as well as of New England thank you for including Worcester in your itinerary.

In Asia We Are Reaping as We Have Sown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is an eternal verity that we reap as we have sown. This truth is clearly demonstrated in Asia where we are involved in the Korean war and where the Truman-Acheson policies sold free China down the river. If President Truman, his State Department, and military advisers had not been blind to the truth and facts of a report furnished to the President by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer the tragedy now going on would not have happened, and thousands of American boys would not be in their graves in Korea. General Marshall, who was then Secretary of State, consistently refused to permit the Wedemeyer report to be made public. His conduct resulted in tragedy, and by it he has demonstrated his incapacity to hold public office. He should resign.

Mr. Speaker, the United States News and World Report of May 11 contains an excellent article on the Wedemeyer report, and I shall include certain excerpts from it so that Members of this body and the American people generally may fully understand the importance of that report. General Wedemeyer was sent to China on two missions—in 1945 and in 1947. The first one was as commander of the United States forces with those of free China. At that time he reported the Chinese Communists as real Reds and not agrarian farmers.

In 1947 he went to survey general conditions in China and Korea. Upon his return he made a personal report to the President. This report was suppressed until 2 weeks ago, prior to the appearance of General Marshall before a joint Senate committee investigating the MacArthur case. This unconscionable act has cost thousands of American lives and billions of dollars.

The United States News and World Report has this to say:

The real story (1945) of General Wedemeyer's recommendations on China is far more important than the simple account of his 1947 mission and the suppressed report that now is creating such a stir. The 1947 report was only an echo of his earlier efforts to shift the course of United States diplomacy in China.

In 1945, when in command of United States Army forces in China and also chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, General Wedemeyer had reported that the Chinese Communists, against whom Chiang was fighting, were not democratic agrarians, but real Communists. He predicted that it would be impossible to work out a coalition of Nationalist and Communist forces and that real civil war would follow.

At that time General Wedemeyer described the weaknesses of the Chiang government and said that Chiang could not gain control of China without American aid. But he said that, with the right kind of American help, Chiang could get and hold all of China up to the Manchurian border.

The general did not think that Chiang could win Manchuria. And for that area he proposed a three-power trusteeship, handled by the United States, Russia, and Great Britain.

That kind of help that General Wedemeyer proposed for Chiang called for temporary American cooperation in the civil and military fields of the same sort that the general himself had been conducting for a year on the military level. With Chiang's agreement, there would be reforms in the army and the government. There was no thought of sending United States troops to fight on Chinese soil.

When his old chief, General of the Army George C. Marshall, went to China a few months after the 1945 report to try his hand at conciliating the Nationalist and Communist forces and bringing them together into a coalition government, General Wedemeyer repeated his warning that this would not work and urged that the United States throw its weight back of Chiang.

But by this time the administration in Washington had given up hope of achieving any sort of cooperation from the Chiang regime. The scathing reports of Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, Wedemeyer's predecessor in the China command, still were fresh in mind. There had been too many well-documented reports of corruption in the Chiang government. And in Washington there was still the thought that the Chinese Communists were more reformers than Communists, that they were not tied to Russia.

General Marshall, sick, tired of war, trying to conciliate, cut off help to the Nationalist Government to convince the Communists that he was acting in good faith in his negotiations. Month after month, General Marshall worked patiently. Finally he gave up, went back to Washington and washed his hands of both sides in the dispute.

Mr. Speaker, the above has to do with the 1945 Wedemeyer report and in 1947 General Wedemeyer returned for his last mission being acknowledged as one of the very great authorities on the Far East. I quote again an excerpt from the United States News and World Report:

The Wedemeyer mission in 1947 was one final gesture by General Marshall. He then was Secretary of State, ready to fix a lasting Chinese policy. He sent General Wedemeyer back for a resurvey.

The 1947 report was largely a reiteration of General Wedemeyer's views of 2 years before. He still thought that all of China except Manchuria could be saved from the Communists by giving the right kind of help and advice to Chiang. He still thought of Manchuria as ripe for a trusteeship.

General Wedemeyer proposed a similar government for all of Korea. He found Russia training an army in North Korea, creating a government that was dominated by Communists. He warned that the North Korean army would strike at South Korea after American troops were withdrawn unless a force, officered and controlled by Americans, was developed there strong enough to beat off attacks from the North Koreans.

In Washington, General Marshall ordered the Wedemeyer report suppressed. The decision against Chiang was set. Plans were being made to bring American troops out of Korea. The State Department said it figured that a proposal to take away part of China and put it under a trusteeship in which Russia had a part would not be helpful at that time.

And the distrust of Chiang, with his corruption-ridden administration, ran deep. Thus, China went to the Communists, Chiang

fled to Formosa. And the stage was set for Korea. And General Wedemeyer, his ideas running contrary to top strategy, was shunted to an Army sidetrack.

General Wedemeyer had full confidence that the kind of cooperation with Chiang that he had proposed could be carried out. He has seen how it could work.

General Wedemeyer had replaced General Stilwell after the long and bitter feud between General Stilwell and Chiang had reached such a point that neither of them could endure further contact with the other. General Wedemeyer, the youngest lieutenant general in the Army and the youngest theater commander in the war, was plumped into that irritated situation in 1944.

After the acrimonious disputes of the Stilwell regime, General Wedemeyer was a soothing balm to the Chinese situation. But he found the problem aching and acute. The corrupt officials around Chiang were a constant irritant.

General Stilwell had been convinced that the Chiang regime was corrupt from top to bottom and any swap would be for the better. To a large degree, this view came to prevail in Washington. The assumption was that Chinese soldiers would not fight except under American leadership and that reform by persuasion was not possible under Chiang.

Working carefully, General Wedemeyer brought a change. He announced that lack of friendliness to the Chinese would not be tolerated in his command. As a result of this order, he had to send out of the area two major generals, four brigadier generals, and twelve colonels.

The general broke down the tradition that white men do no manual work in the Orient. American officers greased trucks and slid in the mud to teach Chinese officers how to care for equipment and to take cover. Wedemeyer's liaison team slept on plank beds with Chinese soldiers, rode with them on flat cars.

General Wedemeyer found Chinese troops literally starving. He picked 39 divisions to be American sponsored. These got helmets, canteens, leather shoes, modern training and weapons, vitamin pills, inoculations against disease.

Relations improved. Chinese homes were opened to Americans. Chinese saved hundreds of American lives. Once, 60,000 Chinese farmers left their fields to build an emergency airport. And the Wedemeyer-trained troops (Chinese) began to take on the Japanese and win.

Inspired by the Wedemeyer brand of cooperation, Chiang Kai-shek offered to let the United States undertake a complete reorganization of the Chinese Government. The war was still going on and the State Department shied away from accepting such broad responsibility. In Washington, there still lingered the view that Chiang was not to be trusted. But General Wedemeyer, on the ground in China, said Chiang never once failed to carry out an agreement made with him.

This was the background of relations with the Chiang government upon which General Wedemeyer made his proposal for aid to Chiang against the Communists, with the United States to do a clean-up job on the Chiang regime.

Mr. Speaker, ungrateful politicians, incompetent military leaders who refused to face the facts as contained in the Wedemeyer reports not only ignored the recommendations made in them but they actually sabotaged General Wedemeyer and railroaded him to an insignificant military post in the West; all because he had the courage to report his convictions and to tell the truth as he saw it for the good of his country. The New Deal is today paying its price for the perfidity of its conduct toward General Wedemeyer, a great American, a great general and a military statesman.

Mr. Speaker, summarizing the Wedemeyer report of 1947, the United States News and World Report record the situation as follows in crystal-clear fashion:

WHAT GENERAL WEDEMEYER WANTED DONE IN 1947

In China: United States to bolster non-Communists with arms, military missions, technical aid, but no United States troops to stop Communists.

In Manchuria? A United Nations trusteeship.

In Korea: U. N. to create a government for the whole country; United States to build strong South Korean military forces before withdrawing.

WHAT WAS DONE AFTER 1947

In China: United States withdrew major aid to non-Communists, gradually ended technical and other assistance.

In Manchuria: Communists were permitted to take over without opposition.

In Korea: American troops were withdrawn except for a few training units for a Korean constabulary. No provision for strong South Korean military force.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

In China: Communists took over the whole vast nation, after taking Manchuria. Non-Communist Chinese Government fled to Formosa, which Communists then demanded.

In Korea: Communists built strong military forces, attacked in 1950, started a war in which United States intervened. War has cost 60,000 United States casualties.

Mr. Speaker, here is the record of events which led to the loss of 400,000,000 people—our friends, in China and Korea. Here is the record of failure on the part of the Chief Executive, the President of the United States. In view of this record can there be unity? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the American people will not unite behind leadership which has led from one failure to another, and then into an undeclared war.

Defense Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter received by me from our colleague, JOHN J. RILEY, together with the letter he refers to, from the secretary of the Western Carolina Council, addressed to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope those who voted against the rule, thus prohibiting consideration of the defense housing bill on the floor of Congress, will take note of the tremendous injustice they have worked.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1951.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The various towns in South Carolina located around the perimeter of the Savannah River project being built by the Atomic Energy Commission have organized themselves into a western Carolina council for the purpose of assisting the Atomic Energy Commission and the du Pont Co. in the many problems arising out of this project. Membership is voluntary and the representatives have no other thought in mind other than to help the Atomic Energy Commission meet the problems involved.

As I explained to the Banking and Currency Committee when I testified in behalf of H. R. 1272 (H. R. 2988) there is sufficient private capital to construct the necessary homes with the aid of Government-insured mortgages, but there is presently no way to finance the necessary expansion of water, sewage, schools, and hospitals which are necessary. The school districts and municipalities are already bonded to the constitutional limit.

I want to urge that you give every possible consideration to reporting out favorably a housing and facilities bill which will remedy this situation and like problems in other defense areas.

I beg to enclose a copy of a letter which I have just received from the Western Carolina Council sent to me with the request that I transmit it to you.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. RILEY,
Member of Congress.

MAY 9, 1951.

To the Members of the Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Western Carolina Council, composed of representatives from cities and towns in Edgefield, Aiken, Lexington, Barnwell, Bamberg, Allendale, Orangeburg, and Hampton Counties in South Carolina, desires to call to your attention the following facts:

Due to the location of the Savannah River project of the Atomic Energy Commission in our section, we are faced with many problems. Our communities are unable to handle these problems without the assistance of the Federal Government. Senators MAYBANK, CAPEHART, FREAR, and BENNETT have visited our area and we believe they will support our plea for help. These Senators know that we are doing all that we can to cooperate with the Atomic Energy Commission and the du Pont Co. in the solving of the many problems confronting this area.

Our schools are overcrowded at the present time. Without some assistance we do not see how we can take care of additional children at the beginning of the fall term and estimates from AEC and du Pont officials indicate that we may expect approximately 3,000 additional children in Aiken County alone for the next school year. Now is the time for securing teachers for the next school term. More busses will be needed for transportation as well as additions to buildings. County and State funds are not available.

Our community facilities, especially water and sewerage systems need expansions to take care of the new houses being built and contemplated. The housing situation in each community is critical. Houses are being built by private enterprise, but water and sewerage is essential.

Our hospitals, health, recreation, and welfare agencies are taxed to capacities and are unable to cope with the influx of people without aid from Federal funds.

We have no desire to make money or to speculate on this project. Each community realizes that it has a responsibility to the thousands of good citizens who are coming here to live with us. We want to welcome them with decent homes, good schools for their children, protect their health and welfare and to give them an opportunity to lead normal American lives. Won't you

help us to do this? We pledge our full cooperation.

We hope that the delay in the passage of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 has not been due to politics. These new citizens for whom we seek aid to provide necessary facilities are neither Democrats nor Republicans as far as we know—we consider them simply American citizens who desire to live as Americans should live. We believe that you gentlemen will agree and will do all in your power to secure passage of the necessary legislation.

We deeply appreciate your efforts in our behalf.

Respectfully yours,

SARAH H. BUSCH,
Secretary of Western Carolina Council.

Southern California Faces Severe Water Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, anyone who is familiar with the great Southwest of the United States knows that paramount in the minds of the citizens of the States in that area is always the supply of water. For upon water depends all development and expansion. And upon water ultimately depends the lives of those who live within this area.

The bitter struggle which has developed between Arizona and California over the distribution of the water from the Colorado River is but another chapter in the fight for water in the West. From earliest history the West has seen water as a center for violent controversy. Miners and prospectors hoarded it in their search for gold. Cattlemen fought bloody range wars for control of water rights. And today even with all the modern developments to save, salvage, and store water and to utilize every water source, there is not enough water to supply the needs of the people.

In southern California, the water shortage has reached serious proportions due to the enormous expansion in that area in the last few years. Population in southern California has soared. Industry has grown until the Los Angeles area has passed Pittsburgh as a producer of the Nation's steel supply. The Los Angeles area is the largest production center for aircraft in the Nation, and many other industries are now operated in southern California on a large scale.

But the water table has been going down steadily in the State decreasing the supply for the enormous population concentrated in southern California. Droughts have further depleted the normal water supply, and the present supply from the Colorado River is inadequate to meet industrial, agricultural, and domestic needs. New sources of water must be found and California must now receive all of the Colorado River water to which it is entitled or face serious, even catastrophic, water shortages in the foreseeable future which will curb development and endanger the whole population.

The following is a recent excellent editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News relative to the serious water problem in southern California:

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MUST FIND NEW WATER SOURCES

As a foreword to a great deal more that will be said later on the subject, your attention today is called to the water situation in California.

To put it bluntly, California is faced with a serious water shortage. It is more serious in some places than in others. In San Diego, for instance, it is against a city ordinance to wash your car with city water.

Los Angeles gets its water mainly from three sources: the Owens Valley, the Colorado River, and wells. These supplies will be inadequate for our anticipated and potential development in the foreseeable future.

Many persons believe that the controversy between California and Arizona over water is academic—a sort of political exercise to such face. Such is not the case. Arizona wants more water to serve the central Arizona project. In Arizona it is believed widely that the water for this is vital. In California the project is regarded as more of a series of dude ranches than anything else and the demand for water for it is denounced as excessive and unreasonable.

NEED ALL WE CAN GET

Leaving aside the question of whether the water supply in the Colorado is dwindling we can be certain of one thing: If the population and industry and farming of southern California are to grow they will need every drop of Colorado River water we can get under the basin States compact. If we don't get it, population will cease to increase by immigration and if the birth rate continues it will mean that many persons will have to leave the area in another generation.

As for the wells as a source of supply every one familiar with them knows the water table is going down. In many places where the table seems to remain static the water is being rendered useless, or worse, by the infiltration of salt.

California must face up to its need for water. Even if we survive war, inflation, and natural disasters the future of civilization here is ultimately doomed if we do not find other sources of water than we now have.

There is some talk about converting sea water to fresh water. It is possible, and even feasible, if we could find fuel cheap enough to operate the necessary machinery. But it is not to this source we must turn immediately. We have got to look for other streams to tap. They exist and we will tell you about them later.

STATE ACTION IS NECESSARY

That is not all. Knowledge without action is futile. We must find the means of acquiring the water after we find its source and that is another matter which we propose to discuss over a period of time.

For the immediate present, suffice it to say that we must act. We must act promptly, forthrightly, and seriously. Also, we must act organizationally. The Colorado River Association has done a superb job in its field. The need now goes beyond the scope of that organization. It is an undertaking which must be met on a State-wide basis. The fact that northern California usually has adequate rainfall while the south doesn't is no excuse for being regional.

Failure to act in the near future will mean that water will be the paramount issue within a decade and it could be that lack of water will mean for us what it already means for large areas in China and India.

More Meat and How To Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "More Meat and How To Get It, With a Common Sense Meat Program." It is sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Meat Institute, and other organizations. I ask that it be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD. I understand that the printing will cost about $150 more than the cost of printing the two pages allowed under the rule.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE MEAT AND HOW TO GET IT WITH A COMMON-SENSE MEAT PROGRAM—HELP STOP INFLATION, GET MORE MEAT TO CONSUMERS, HELP MEET THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY, BALANCE AND STABILIZE THE ECONOMY, NOW AND AFTER THE EMERGENCY

(A program for a sound three-way attack by (1) farmers and ranchers, (2) consumers, and (3) Congress, that will halt inflation and help restore sound dollars, sponsored by farm organizations, livestock associations, meat-industry groups, and allied businesses)

SUMMARY

There is no shortage of meat. There is inflated demand. A common sense, constructive 3-way attack is proposed—with directions set forth in 20 pamphlets as numbered below:

I. Farmers and ranchers have eight production goals:

Goal 1. More corn and other feed-grain production.

Goal 2. Stretch feed, produce more meat per pound.

Goal 3. Grassland improvement, for more cattle and sheep.

Goal 4. Hogs, a quick and efficient way to more meat.

Goal 5. Beef cattle; more beef is on the way.

Goal 6. Sheep; produce more of critically short wool and lamb.

Goal 7. Poultry; rapid broiler and turkey expansion continues.

Goal 8. Dairy cattle; provide 42 percent of beef and veal.

II. Consumers must help; the way is shown in goal 9, thrifty meat buying and use.

III. Congress and the Federal administration have responsibility to exercise leadership.

Goal 10. Restore sound money.

To get action and to achieve the 10 goals, there are 10 task forces proposed. The following pamphlets suggest how each of the task forces can strike at the causes of inflation.

11. Task force, farm organizations.
12. Task force, livestock associations.
13. Task force, meat industry.
14. Task force, bankers and other financial leaders.
15. Task force, feed manufacturers and dealers.
16. Task force, crop; fertilizer, seed, insecticide, implement, and other dealers.
17. Task force, transportation companies.
18. Task force, service organizations, leaders and managers.

19. Task force, agencies, United States Department of Agriculture and colleges of agriculture.

20. Task force, press and radio.

The common-sense meat program can be an example of what all parts of our economy can do to help stop inflation and restore sound dollars.

It is a direct, positive attack on this problem, not wasteful and negative.

FOREWORD

Inflation grips the United States. Money is rapidly losing its value. In an effort to check this economic catastrophe, price controls have been imposed.

This is an attack on the symptoms of inflation—not on the causes. Such controls conceal the effects of inflation—and divert attention from what must be done to halt inflation.

Price controls on livestock and livestock products and the economy as a whole are not necessary, practicable, or feasible.

This common-sense meat program is a sound and positive solution to control inflation. It is the way in which farmers, ranchers, and allied industries propose to help. But more production, efficient processing, and marketing cannot alone stop inflation.

Congress and the Federal administration must strike at the causes of inflation and unsound dollars.

Consumers must do their part with thrifty meat buying and use.

It is good common sense to cure the reasons for inflation.

Inflation and meat

There is no shortage of meat, according to past rates of consumption. The average consumption per person in the United States will be 148 pounds during 1951—up 3 pounds from last year.

This amount has been exceeded in only 3 of the last 30 years. More meat is on the way.

Cattle on farms increased 5 percent during 1950; beef cows are up 10 percent to a new record high; calves are up 11 percent.

Hog numbers are up 7 percent—and hogs under 6 months of age on January 1 were up 11 percent from 1950.

Sheep numbers increased 4 percent during 1950.

Feed supplies are large, but production must be further increased to care for the rapid livestock expansion.

Prices of meat are at present levels—not because of a lag in production—but because of record high incomes and free spending of consumers. Wages paid to industrial workers went up 17 percent in less than 9 months following the outbreak of war in Korea.

The population increase is almost 2,500,000 each year.

Expansion of the Armed Forces will require about 1,200,000,000 pounds more meat—1 out of each 20 pounds of meat produced.

Farmers and ranchers will boost meat output rapidly—in the production race to outrun the increased need—and in an effort to meet the inflated demand. Only lack of confidence in future markets, due to man-made regulations, can cause them to cut back.

Obviously, producers must take into consideration the various and numerous business risks inherent in a program of this nature. Such risks may be even greater than they are in normal times.

This production program stresses increased efficiency by the producer. It is equally essential, however, that all of the other members of the meat team, livestock-marketing groups, packers, and retailers, along with allied industries, constantly strive to do an even more efficient job of processing and marketing. All must help.

This program is a common-sense attack on inflation—to restore free prices and markets and sound dollars.

COMMON SENSE MEAT PROGRAM—A SOUND THREE-WAY ATTACK

I. Farmers and ranchers must do an outstanding meat-production job.

Livestock men must assume some extra risks. No one can predict the weather, the trend toward war or peace, the price at market time, or political actions in Washington.

Nevertheless, they must push forward to produce more meat. There must be a genuine effort to meet the larger demand with more and more production.

This does not mean that individuals should risk their financial security—or the future welfare of their families.

It does mean that risk of less profits is justified in the effort to help meet the emergency—on a positive, constructive basis.

This will be accomplished by the full cooperation and help of all their allied businesses and industries. Meat processors, marketing agencies, retailers, bankers, feed manufacturers and dealers, fertilizer companies, implement manufacturers and dealers, transportation organizations and companies, and all others that help produce, process, or sell livestock and meat must help.

The assistance of the press and radio will be indispensable.

The United States Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and all agricultural agencies should concentrate on giving assistance in more meat production.

II. Consumers must be thrifty meat buyers. They should buy the meat that is most available—guidance by seasons will be suggested.

Consumers can buy more of the less expensive—but equally nutritious—cuts, to get more for the meat dollar.

Home storage and lockers may be used to help carry meat from peak production to scarcity seasons. Buying canned and other meats when supplies are plentiful, to be used in higher price periods, is not hoarding but is an aid in maintaining more even prices and meat supplies all year.

Home economists, the press and radio, consumer groups and all stores selling meat must help promote thrifty meat buying and use.

III. Congress and the Federal Administration must strike at the cause of inflation and unsound dollars by—(1) restrictions on expansion of money supply; (2) strict economy by Government, thereby setting an example for business and individuals; (3) pay-as-you-go taxation; (4) limitations on consumer credit; (5) encouragement of individual savings.

This three-way attack by farmers and ranchers, consumers, and Congress will stabilize the economy—now and after the emergency.

SECTION I

More meat must be produced with efficient methods. Farmers and ranchers should grasp this opportunity to supply consumers more of what they want.

Each organization, business, or agency participating in this program will receive suggestions on what to do, how to proceed, and proper timing of actions. Write for instruction pamphlets and suggestions if you want to help.

Every business has a huge stake in stabilizing the economy. Unless inflation is brought under control, the "free choice" system that has made America great may be permanently destroyed.

The action programs are built around the following:

Goal 1. More corn and other feed grain production

Feed must be produced to maintain and expand the meat output. The amount of feed grains produced tends to set upper limits on the amount of meat produced.

Where equipment is available, the use of anhydrous ammonia, or other nitrogenous fertilizers, should be encouraged to boost yields.

Agricultural college authorities state, "The amount of meat we can produce depends primarily upon two things: First, the quantity of feed we produce; and, second, the efficiency with which we feed it."

The critical planting season has already started.

March 1 planting intentions of farmers show only a 1.6 percent increase in the corn acreage over last year—a total of 85,694,000 acres. It will not be enough—far short of real needs.

The United States Department of Agriculture is asking for 90,000,000 acres. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is urging increased feed production to support increased livestock production for national defense.

Keep established rotations and sound crop programs for the long pull but work in more corn now, where practical.

Grain sorghum acreage should be as large as last year.

This is the corn crop of the West—and more grain will be urgently needed in the West.

Farmers intend to plant less grain sorghum than last year—the indicated slash in grain sorghum production is one-half.

This would be a grave mistake.

Strive for as large a grain sorghum acreage as last year. It is production needed to bolster the national defense.

All feed grains will be urgently needed. Corn reserves are being pulled down fast—already higher feed prices are causing some farmers to cut back on hogs and poultry. The major effort on this crop production campaign must be made immediately—and up to July 15.

Goal 2. Stretch feed

(a) This is a basic and continuing program to produce more meat per pound of feed. It will—get more meat to consumers, increase farm production, step up the volume of all businesses, stretching feed is one of the most urgent needs of the Nation.

(b) Making the same amount of feed produce more pounds of meat is even more effective than merely growing more grain.

(c) Look at the various livestock programs for stretch-feed ideas, such as—save every pig; vaccinate and get rid of worms; use pasture to the limit—this is the least expensive feed; balance rations—let county agents, agricultural teachers and feed dealers help; avoid bruising and crippling of livestock, to protect feed investment; feed salt and other minerals; don't waste feed-producing excess fat; kill rats—this is now easy to do with warfarin; each will eat or waste 2 to 3 bushels of feed; cull constantly—get high production per animal; use all feed—byproducts, damaged grains and all of the plants; keep livestock healthy; keep livestock gaining.

(d) The urgency of the "stretch feed" campaign will build up with livestock numbers—and will be extremely acute should drought strike.

Efficient use of feed can add at least 20 percent more meat for consumers and reduce the production costs of farmers and ranchers.

The methods of efficient feed use are well known. The most able producers get high meat output per feed used. Many feed companies and dealers are doing a good job of promoting better feeding.

Stretch feed to the limit for national defense and stability.

Goal 3. Grassland improvement

Every business, farm, and livestock organization should throw its full influence back of pasture and range land improvement—and wise management.

H. E. Babcock, the great agricultural statesman, until his recent death, "beat the drums" for a strong animal agriculture.

A strong animal agriculture builds a strong Nation: (1) Animal agriculture builds the soil; (2) animal agriculture is our best food reserve; (3) animal agriculture is the backbone of the family farm; (4) animal agriculture provides the nutritious foods we need most and like best; (5) animal agriculture is one of our best guarantees for continued prosperity and stability.

Fortunately, the United States Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges and universities in November 1950 jointly announced such a program and pledged:

"The colleges and the Department will work together with all their resources to gain the widespread improvement of the Nations billion acres of pasture, hay land, and range.

"Better grasslands will provide a solid base for the expansion of the production of meat and other livestock products.

"Grasslands improvements will produce benefits in which the participating farmers, the people and the Nation as a whole will share in the near future as well as in the years which lie further ahead."

A 10-point program was announced. These included the following suggestions:

(a) Pasture is cheap feed.

(b) Apply more lime and fertilizers.

(c) Mow weeds and get rid of brush, cactus and other damaging vegetation.

(d) Do more seeding—and use the best grasses and legumes.

(e) Spread runoff waters on the range.

(f) Irrigate more pastures.

(g) Grassland improvement is the effective way to insure carrying the increased cattle and sheep numbers—and to be sure that they will carry heavy weights when sold off of grass.

(h) Even 5 to 10 acres improved pasture per farm will be a tremendous help. Do not seed down productive land needed for feed grain production.

(i) Every rancher should step up grassland improvement and use the grazing management that will produce more beef and lamb for the years ahead.

(j) Farmers should see their county agent and PMA office for details on the grassland improvement program.

Goal 4. Hogs

Hogs are highly efficient and are profitable converters of grain into meat.

Through two litters per year pork production can be rapidly expanded.

Pork output can be expanded quickly with hogs now on farms by feeding to heavier weights as a temporary measure—but don't waste feed by going above 260 pounds.

After September, save grain by selling at lighter weights—about 225 pounds.

All farmers producing hogs should be reached through seasonal information vital to maintaining an adequate and profitable output of pork. In this they must have the assistance of all allied industries and agencies. Here are examples of actions that will pay off in more meat for consumers and increased income to farmers:

April and May is the time to insure a large fall pig crop. More sows and gilts should be bred.

There is currently plenty of corn and with this program there should be no acute future shortages. Hogs raised largely on grass and byproducts should sell well and help bolster the food supply.

"For fattening pigs, all the good pasture they will eat will save 15 percent on corn and 35 percent on protein. For sows, good pasture will save half the feed during gestation for fall pigs." (University of Missouri.)

A succession of catch crops should be planted to stretch-feed grains by providing continuous succulent grazing.

Full feed early spring pigs to sell at high prices when pork is scarce during the July-September period.

Feed balanced rations. Self feeding cuts labor and saves feed.

"Feeding worms in hogs is expensive—when three ears of corn are tossed to wormy pigs, one ear goes to the worm and the other two to the pigs." (Alabama Polytechnic Institute.)

A south Georgia farmer last year produced over 1,000 pounds of pork an acre, hogging off early hybrid corn. The hogs were sold on the high September market. More pork can and should be produced in the South and West.

Farmers, especially those with less than 5 or 10 sows, should, where practical, add more gilts. When enough hogs are produced to make a larger enterprise, the hogs receive more attention—and profits go up on all the hogs. Purchase of any additional feed that may be needed will be profitable—if used efficiently.

Pork is the quick and profitable way to get more meat to consumers to the limit of feed-grain supplies.

Goal 5. Beef cattle

Breeding herds are being rapidly increased—cows up 10 percent over last year. More beef is on the way.

About 85 percent of United States beef is produced without corn. Good quality beef can be sold off grass—it must be accomplished on more farms and ranches.

The major problem will be to outrun the uptrend in cattle numbers with the grasslands improvement program.

"In time of need, two bushels of corn can be stretched to do the work ordinarily done by three in some kinds of cattle feeding." (Iowa State College.)

A big tonnage of beef—rather than wasteful high finish, must be the goal. Feed cattle with a minimum of grain.

Make full use of silage, by-products, corncobs, beet pulp, and other such feeds for putting more weight on cattle.

Supplemental feeding on grass to get larger gains on market cattle this summer is recommended where practical.

Texas A. & M. authorities urge, "Control parasites with special attention to fly control. Use bulls tested for rate of gain. Overcome mineral deficiencies by direct feeding of bone meal or by fertilizing pastures."

Don't hold cows that are too old or uncertain breeders. "Range cows produce their best calves during their fourth to eighth years." (Montana Experiment Station.)

"Expand the production of fall calves. This will reduce death losses and speed up production." (University of Nebraska.)

Expand cow herds in farming areas—especially in the South.

Better feeding in the South is largely dependent on producing better pastures—fertilizing and seeding.

Georgia State College authorities stress the importance of making cattle heavier before selling. Better grade calves especially should be carried to near 1,000 pounds which will more than double the beef from the same animal.

Full use must be made of all practical methods of producing more beef—and at lower costs.

Grow cattle to older ages to get heavier weights, before fattening, where pasture and roughage can be produced to carry more cattle.

Goal 6. Sheep

Sheep numbers, after being cut almost one-half, are now being increased—up 4 percent in 1950.

Such additions to the meat supply will be small for several years. Ewes held off the market for breeding will largely offset extra lambs for market.

More ewe lambs must be retained by both ranchers and farmers. More small farms should have sheep flocks. Flocks of 40 or more ewes should be on more farms.

Sheep fit in with glassland improvement, goal 3, as they help control weeds and need little but pasture and hay as feed.

Consumer discrimination against heavy lambs should be minimized.

Desperately short wool supplies as well as scarce lamb gives a double reason for rapid increase of sheep.

Goal 7. Poultry

For 16 years broiler production has gone up very rapidly. This increase will continue during 1951.

Broilers furnish a quick supply of meat. Large-scale and low-cost production per bird has encouraged expansion.

Turkey production will set a new all-time high in 1951.

Thrifty consumers should recognize that "A large tom turkey gives 15 to 20 percent more cooked meat for your money than a small bird—whether you buy a whole, large bird or half of one." (Washington State College.)

Goal 8. Dairy cattle

Dairy cows give a two-way income—milk and beef.

Dairy cattle make up 42 percent of the total beef and veal supply. This is nutritious and wholesome meat.

The supply of beef can be materially increased by putting more weight on dairy animals before they are sold for beef.

Profitable dairying is practical without major use of feed grains, since 85 percent of the milk production capacity of milk cows can be obtained from good quality pasture and roughage.

Keep all the dairy heifers from high-producing cows. Grow them into big cows. They will produce more milk—and bring more as beef when sold out of the milking herd.

Some low-producing milk cows, especially of the heavier breeds, can be bred to beef bulls—to produce more veal and beef. Artificial breeding associations now have beef bulls put in at the request of milk cow owners. For example all dairymen in Ohio can get the use of beef bulls for their dairy cows.

Cows having been culled from the milking herd should be allowed to fatten on pasture and fed roughage and supplements when profitable to do so before selling. Low-producing milk cows should be culled more promptly and turned into beef to save feed and labor.

Dairy steers, especially from heavy breeds, usually can be grown and profitably fattened on grass—for more beef.

The sale of lightweight young dairy cattle for slaughter should be discouraged. Farmers with extra grass and forage should buy such animals and put on for additional gains—thus increasing the tonnage of beef.

Vealers should be grown to heavier weights before being sold where practical. In areas of low-priced milk this is especially profitable.

Ohio State University dairy specialists recommend, "Feed veal calves to market weights of 180 to 200 pounds. Dairy farmers can profit in beef sideline."

The quick and easy method of selling "bobbie" calves should be discouraged. By growing them into heavy veal calves the meat output is more than doubled and profits are often increased.

More use should be made of calf meals—they can replace practically all of the milk for even young calves.

Dairymen need not give up milk production to market more beef. By management adjustments they can continue in milk production and sell one-third more beef and veal.

SECTION II

Thrifty meat buying and use by consumers will enable them to buy more meat.

This means higher diet levels—better nutrition for more people—and more stability for farmers and ranchers.

It will help stabilize the economy—now and after the emergency.

Each organization, business, or agency participating in this program will receive suggestions on what to do, how to proceed, proper timing of action.

Write for such suggestions if you want to help stop inflation and restore sound dollars.

Goal 9. Thrifty meat buying and use

There is no shortage of meat. There is a great increase in demand for meat caused by more people who have more money and want to spend it for food.

There will be an average of about 148 pounds of meat per person during 1951—more than in any other recent year, except 1944, 1946, and 1947, when the supply was slightly larger. (Kansas State College.)

Guidance in thrifty buying of meat and planning of meals around less popular cuts will help keep prices in line. Housewives can profit by using a greater variety of meat cuts and can add more appeal to their meals.

Farmers do not set the price of meat—it is set by consumers as they bid against each other. Price control will not correct this situation but will bring hardship to both producers and consumers.

Price controls lead to rationing, black markets, disrespect for law, unsanitary practices, loss of byproducts (including insulin and other important new drugs), and less meat for consumers.

There are many sources through which consumers now obtain guidance for thrifty meat buying and use. Two examples of these are:

The National Livestock and Meat Board, which has national coverage through its homemaker's service.

American Meat Institute publicity for newspapers, magazines, radio, and retail advertisements, which regularly carry meat buying and use guidance for thrifty housewives.

We must concentrate on telling food buyers how to be thrifty in making purchases. We must also educate consumers on how to prepare and serve meat in order to obtain its full value. Over 10 percent of the nutrition of meats is lost because of poor cooking methods and poor meal planning.

Less tender cuts of meat are just as nutritious as the tender steaks. "All meat is tender if it is cooked correctly." (Purdue University.)

SECTION III

While farmers, ranchers, allied industries, agencies and consumers work at their jobs of producing more meat and thrifty buying and use of meat—

Congress and the Federal administration have the responsibility to exercise leadership to control inflation.

It is to strike at the cause of inflation and unsound dollars.

All across the Nation there is demand for such action.

Goal 10. Restore sound money

The methods of stopping inflation and the dwindling value of dollars are well known. Prompt and definite action is needed in Washington on: (1) Restrictions on expansion of money supply; (2) strict economy by Government, thereby setting an example for business and individuals; (3) pay-as-we-go taxation; (4) limitations on consumer credit; (5) encouragement of individual savings.

All citizens who have savings, life insurance, bonds, pensions, and other such property should continue to call upon Congress for action. Write your Senators and Representatives.

The University of Illinois suggests to farmers, "Our Government is responsible for inflation. The Constitution of the United States says that 'Congress shall have the power * * * to coin money (and) regulate the value thereof. * * *' But Congress usually does what it thinks the people want."

The University of Minnesota points out that "A life-insurance policy which would have provided $1,000 of purchasing power in 1946 now yields less than $600.

"An E bond purchased 10 years ago matures this year at a higher dollar value but the latter represents less buying power than the original investment.

"The citizen is under obligation to buy bonds. His Government is under obligation to do everything within its power to assure the purchaser that the value of the bonds will not evaporate through inflation."

Inflation must be stopped or much past and future savings will continue to be wiped out. The dollar is worth about 50 cents—savings are worth far less than they were 10 years ago.

Congress must act if the economy is to be stabilized. This will require an aroused public demanding action—to get action in Washington.

Let your Senators and Representatives know what you want done—they want to act according to the will of the people.

Task Forces

Farmers, ranchers, and consumers need as allies all businesses and fellow citizens. All must join the fight on inflation.

This common sense meat program can be an example of what all parts of our economy must accomplish to stop inflation and restore sound dollars.

To that end, 10 task forces are proposed.

The following list of brief pamphlets suggests how each can quickly bring tremendous forces to bear on the inflation and national stability problem.

Request any or all of these pamphlets—then launch out in a vigorous attack on the causes of inflation—not the symptoms.

This is a sound positive attack—not wasteful and negative.

11. Task force farm organizations: Production goals 1 to 8 will be the special objectives of this task force.

12. Task force livestock associations: This task force will combine the leadership of breeders, feeders, and marketing men.

13. Task force meat industry: Goal 9, thrifty meat buying and use, will be a major objective. Processing and marketing must be efficient.

14. Task force bankers and other financial leaders: Inflation is a problem of money and economics. Leadership from finance will be be especially effective.

15. Task force feed manufacturers and dealers: Goal 2, stretch feed, and sound livestock management will be the field of major service for this task force.

16. Task force crop—fertilizers, seed, insecticide, implement, and other dealers: This task force will work on goal 1, more corn and other feed production, and goal 3, grassland improvement.

17. Task force transportation companies: Railroads, truck companies, and individuals doing hauling of livestock, feeds, and supplies are a vital task force.

18. Task force service organizations, leaders, and managers: In this task force will be chambers of commerce, service clubs, farm managers, and others who will help.

19. Task force agencies, United States Department of Agriculture, and colleges: The Federal and State agricultural workers can be depended upon for aggressive help and guidance.

20. Task force press and radio: The assistance of the press and radio is indispensable. Goals 1 to 10 offer numerous service opportunities.

Organizations cooperating to put this common-sense meat program over, include the following: American Farm Bureau Federation; American Meat Institute; American National Cattlemen's Association; American Stockyards Association; Central Livestock Association, Inc.; Independent Livestock Marketing Association; Kansas Livestock Association; Missouri Livestock Association; National Committee of Livestock Order Buyers and Dealers; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Grange; National Independent Meat Packers Association; National Lamb Feeders Association; National Livestock Auction Association; National Livestock Exchange; National Live Stock Producers Association; National Livestock and Meat Board; National Wool Growers Association; Producers Livestock Cooperative; Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association; Western States Meat Packers Association, and other national, regional, and State associations.

"The Story of the Men of the United States Air Force, Daily Flying Their Jets Fully Armed Along the Boundaries of the Iron Curtain, Is One of the Least-Known Stories of the American Defense of Western Europe"—Mr. Robert McCormick

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the echo of acclaim attesting General MacArthur's presence in the Nation's Capital had hardly died before the assistant to the President, the Honorable John R. Steelman, made still further and factual report to the American people on some newer phases of the current problems facing this country. This he did by way of the teledocumentary, Battle Report, Washington, broadcast each Sunday afternoon for 6 months past over the National Broadcasting Co.'s television network and coaxial cables.

The television program Battle Report, Washington, has long since proved itself to be one of the most popular of all weekly news telecasts emanating from the Nation's Capital. On this program, each week, Dr. John R. Steelman presents top-flight officials of the Federal Government to make report to the American people with respect to official matters that come under their immediate supervision.

The statements made by Dr. Steelman and his invited guests are altogether so illuminating that I am taking opportunity of again directing them to the attention of this House.

To make the program even more interesting, some 3 or 4 weeks ago, the National Broadcasting Co. dispatched its ace commentator, Robert McCormick, to Europe. He went to learn, first-hand, the conditions obtaining on the Continent in order that he might bring that report back for the information of the public and use on the Battle Report, Washington, program.

He returned to America some 10 days ago, and, last Sunday, Dr. Steelman presented Mr. McCormick, along with other guests, on the afternoon's program.

Mr. McCormick's presentation of his observations, especially of Air Force activities, is chock full of reader interest as he tells of American jets which—

Every daylight hour of the day, and every day of the week, fully armed, and ready for

action, they patrol the entire United States zone of occupied Germany. The nearest Russian-dominated border only 6 minutes away by air.

The story of these men of the United States Air Force, who daily fly along the boundaries of the iron curtain, is one of the most dramatic and least-known stories of the American defense of Western Europe.

Authenticated by a personal statement made to Mr. McCormick by Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, and the short statement made by Col. John S. Chennault, commander of the Eighty-sixth Fighter-Bomber Wing, Mr. McCormick's story of the splendid work done by the German weathermen and German radio operators, and other technicians, is interestingly discussed by a German radio operator, who said:

I am only one of the typical Germans who like to do my job, and I like to work together with the Americans, and not only the Americans, but the French and English people—and you know what a war can do. And I feel that it is now a time of crisis and we have to stand all together, and I will do my part of the work here in the Air Force. (Excuse me, I have to take now a message.)

Of more than passing interest to mothers and fathers of America was the statement made by Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong, USSAF, who reported as to the physical and moral conditions of the men of our Air Force in the Pacific theater, as well as in Alaska.

Accompanying General Armstrong on a recent visit in survey of these areas was Dr. Elmer Henderson, eminent surgeon and president of the American Medical Association, as well as six outstanding medical consultants.

In discussing air evacuations made in Korea to date, General Armstrong said, in part:

So far, in the Korean affair more than 121,000 persons have been evacuated by air within Korea and Japan, including many patients transported more than once. There have not been that many casualties. In the next phase, the Military Air Transport Service has transported more than 22,000 patients from Korea to the United States. Not all of them are combat casualties. All of these patients have been evacuated by air and without a single death due to mishandling or aircraft failure.

Mr. Speaker, this particular program of Battle Report, Washington is so full of human interest and contains so much that is pertinent to our fighting men in foreign lands that I particularly commend it to the reading of my every colleague in this House.

That they might have an opportunity of reading the same, I now ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the thirty-fourth Battle Report, Washington as broadcast by Dr. John R. Steelman and his guests a week ago last Sunday.

That program was as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK. As this hero's welcome Washington gave MacArthur continues to echo throughout the Nation—once again NBC Television turns its cameras on the Nation's Capital for a report on the battle that continues in Korea.

Washington, which called upon Gen. Matthew Ridgway to take command in the Far East, and Korea, where the troops he led advanced farther north against the slowly yielding Reds.

Today, Battle Report focuses on an exclusive film report of our jet bomber-patrol in Germany, then on the Surgeon General of our Air Force. But, first, a word from the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Ever since the dawn of history, the return of military heroes has been an occasion for rejoicing and celebration. We are no different from our ancestors in this respect. And rightly so. Men who have dedicated their lives to the defense of their homelands have earned the homage of the people.

I wish it were possible, this afternoon, to tell you that the days of struggle are ended and our celebrations of the past week marked the dawn of peace. But, this is not the case. The vicious, warmongering propaganda of the Soviet still goes on. Hundreds of millions of persons are being taught to hate the United States, and thus, are being conditioned for war. The Soviet repeatedly has blocked all efforts to reach a just and enduring peace through honorable negotiation.

And every hour of every day they hang the threat of war over our heads like the sword of Damocles. Let me give you some cold, hard facts.

Under the hammer and sickle of the Soviet Union itself there are at least 4,100,000 men, armed with the newest and most formidable weapons. Of these, at least 300,000 are in Germany and 100,000 in Manchuria, which borders Korea.

The subservient satellite nations also are armed to the teeth. According to the latest reports, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Albania now have at least 795,000 men under arms. And, in China, there is an almost inexhaustible reservoir of manpower.

These vast armies are poised to strike. They are like daggers at the heart of the free world—and their ultimate target is the United States.

Obviously, this is no time for complacency.

Obviously, our defense program must continue at an ever-increasing tempo.

Obviously, it is time for every citizen to put his shoulder to the wheel and do his part.

This afternoon we will see how one of the borders of the free world is being patroled night and day by the Eighty-sixth Fighter Bomber Wing of our Air Force. Robert McCormick saw it when he was in Europe last month and ordered it recorded on film by the NBC camera team, Charles and Eugene Jones.

With us in the studio is a distinguished officer, Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong, Surgeon General of the Air Force. He is here to tell us how the lives of our airmen are being saved.

And now let us continue with this week's Battle Report, Washington.

VOICE. This is NBC Cameraman Gene Jones, all dressed up with some place to go. On assignment to document Europe with his brother Charlie, here Gene prepares to film the sixth of our exclusive teledocumentaries—eighty-sixth fighter-bomber wing in Germany—America's jet patrol along the border of the iron curtain. Stand by for another NBC first-voiced by our narrator, not long returned from Germany, Robert McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Every daylight hour of the day, every day of the week, American jets like these, fully armed and ready for action, patrol the entire United States zone of occupied Germany. The nearest Russian-dominated border—only 6 minutes away by air. The story of these men of the United States Air Force who daily fly along the boundaries of the iron curtain is one of the most dramatic and least-known stories of the American defense of Western Europe.

We invite you now to start upon this story as we did, at the home of the Eighty-sixth, the Neubiberg Air Base, once the home base of Nazi combat air units that flew on bombing missions in World War II against France and other allied countries. We ask you to begin by listening, as we did, to the commander of our Atlantic Pact air forces, Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad.

Lieutenant General NORSTAD. I am pleased to participate in this program which has for its purpose bringing to the American people first-hand knowledge of their interests and activities overseas. This part of the program focuses attention on one element of our Armed Forces overseas, the United States Air Forces in Europe. This command has responsibilities in the United Kingdom, in Europe proper, and in north Africa. At the typical Air Force base pictured here, you will see some of our most modern aircraft and the men and facilities which support them. These forces, joined with those of the other western nations form the nucleus around which will be built the strength and alert essential to the preservation of peace.

Mr. MCCORMICK. The story of our Eighty-sixth fighter-bomber wing in Europe is first the story of efficiency. Radar, constantly screening the border, keeps our squadrons on a 24-hour ready alert. And this truck houses the base's GCA equipment that helps guide planes to a safe landing in bad weather.

While these electronic eyes are at work, careful attention is paid to every detail designed to keep our planes armed and ready. The loading of these heavy bombs, for instance.

Each plane carries two 1,000-pound bombs, or up to 32 rockets.

Belts of ammunition are prepared, too, for the jets' 50-caliber machine guns. All these installations are checked and double-checked. No plane goes on patrol without being combat-loaded.

Meanwhile, the pilots who fly these F-84-E jets prepare to take to the air for their stint on the border patrol.

Not without their mascot, of course.

Take a good look at them, America. Average age 26. Many of them are veterans of combat in World War II. One out of seven has his family with him in Europe. As these selected men—proud of their esprit de corps—get ready to board their planes, let us now take a look at some of the men behind them. You are in the base's weather station. Listen.

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. They have now cleared at 3,000 and they will hold that way, keep 3,000 to 4,000 with occasional ceiling at 3,500, but they should break up by tonight.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. Will that hold up to 1,800?

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. Oh, yes; the weather is very nice up there for flying.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. Well, Warren, that looks like a good forecast for today.

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. I think we traced that area for that bad weather very well for today.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. How long have you been forecasting here?

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. About 5 years.

UNITED STATES CAPTAIN. Were you with the German air force previously?

GERMAN WEATHERMAN. Yes; I was a forecaster. Quite some years ago I volunteered to have a forecaster's position here with the American Air Force, and I like it very well because the operation is about the same as it was before.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Here is a former member of the German Navy now working at the base as radio operator.

GERMAN RADIO OPERATOR. I am only one of the typical Germans who like to do my job, and I like to work together with the Americans, and not only the Americans, but the French and English people, and you know what a war can do. And I feel that it is now a time of crisis and we have to stand all together, and I will do my part of the work here in the Air Force. (Excuse me, I have to take now a message.)

Mr. MCCORMICK. Yes; we found carefully screened German civilians at work through-

out the base on hundreds of jobs—from responsible weather-communications posts to building this new runway.

Back now to the pilots who have this team behind them.

Before taking off, they go over the last-minute details on the day's patrol. And now, each to his own Thunderjet.

Here comes the signal from the tower, and one by one the jets pull out of line to taxi into position. Here's the takeoff.

They buzz the radar truck on the outskirts of the field and off they go.

You are now flying along the borders of the iron curtain countries at 600 miles an hour in a plane with a cruising range of over a thousand miles.

Sometimes you fly high above the clouds. Sometimes you skim the rolling fields below. Windows open on the ground below as people scan the sky to see you roar by. Men pause in their daily tasks to mark your passing, and children playing some German folk game are suddenly excited by the sight of you.

High up in the air, you go about your business, your eyes searching the heavens for some plane that might be trying to sneak across the border. Could it be an enemy bomber? Or is it some friendly aircraft off course? You decide "let's take a look."

The bigger plane seems to stand still as you dive in upon it. It's a friendly plane unknowingly off its course, so you continue on.

Hours go by, just this way. But before returning to your base, you receive orders by radio. For a test of your marksmanship ability, you are ordered to proceed at once to the rocket range for three low-level strafing approaches. You say, "Roger" and do just that.

Suddenly, unknown to you—a tragedy. A jet fighter on routine patrol crashes several miles from the field. The field ambulance and fire-fighting truck rush to the scene of the wreckage. With the latest fire-fighting equipment, men go to work on the flames. But it is too late to do anything at all for the pilot.

Thus, even though there is not yet combat in Europe, the hazard of death constantly faces these airmen on patrol to keep the peace.

And now, to close "Border Patrol, Germany," let's join the son of the famed Flying Tigers of China. Yes; Col. John S. Chennault, commander of this Eighty-sixth Fighter-Bomber Wing since World War II.

Colonel CHENNAULT. This unit, like other Air Force units in Europe, has been assigned certain specific missions. We are all keenly aware of our responsibilities as America's first line of defense in Europe. We are prepared and ready to go.

Mr. MCCORMICK. As U. N. ground forces battle to the hills beyond the Hwachon Reservoir, from the Eighth Army's new commander comes word that the Communists' next move is anybody's guess. Says Lieutenant General Van Fleet, "There's a definite build-up. I imagine the enemy would like to take another shot at us. We're ready for him if he does." Meanwhile, the air war grows hotter. More and more, our strafing jets—shown at work here—and our bombers, too, are meeting swarms of Russian-made Migs itching for combat. Just back from a first-hand survey of the medical needs of our pilots, and other Air Force personnel in the Pacific, comes our next guest. For the first public report on his trip, the Surgeon-General of the Air Force, Maj. Gen. Harry G. Armstrong.

Major General ARMSTRONG. Our trip was extensive in that we visited most of the Air Force medical installations in the Pacific theater and Alaska. Our party included six outstanding civilian medical consultants to the United States Air Force, among whom was Dr. Elmer Henderson, an eminent surgeon and president of the American Medical Association.

One of the things that particularly impressed us is the very high morale of all Air Force personnel, both line and medical. The closer we approached the battle lines, the higher the morale. The best of all is with the advanced fighter units and the medical air evacuation squadron flying from forward airstrips in Korea.

The high morale of medical personnel can be attributed to several things. Young doctors in the service are better trained than ever before, and our present medical organization makes it possible to assign them to fields within their chosen specialties. By utilizing these men in their specialties and keeping them busy, we require fewer medical personnel in proportion to troop strength. They are doing a wonderful job, working hard, and each one is making a definite contribution to the total effort. These young doctors are gaining valuable experience, though sometimes practicing under adverse conditions.

All in all, our military personnel are now getting the best medical care in the history of military medicine. A concrete evidence of this superior medical care is the very low mortality rate among combat casualties, which is less than one-half that in World War II. There are several specific factors contributing to this achievement: better and quicker medical treatment in the front lines including the use of blood and blood plasma derivatives; the extensive use of antibiotics, and so-called miracle drugs which drastically reduce the dangers of infection; and we are exploiting the concept of air evacuation of sick and wounded. The concept of air evacuation is roughly divided into two phases. The first carries the casualty from the aid station to a forward surgical hospital and then to a fixed hospital in an area further to the rear or to Japan. Helicopters are proving invaluable in the forward areas for this work, frequently going behind enemy lines for crash casualties or wounded ground troops.

An example of the service being rendered is the case of a young ground force Negro lieutenant. We met aboard an air evacuation flight from Korea to Japan and he told me this: "Five minutes after I was wounded I was back in the battalion first-aid station where my wounds were dressed; and within 50 minutes I was on an airplane being evacuated to a hospital. When we know that such quick care is available we don't mind fighting."

Air evacuation of medical patients is one of the Air Forces' most satisfying operations and we of the Air Force Medical Service contribute to this operation by training and supplying the medical personnel, doctors, nurses, and technicians, who support and fly with every evacuation flight.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "teledocumentary," this, then, against the background of Battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your Thirty-fourth Battle Report, Washington.

Britain-United States—No Agreement on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. SMITH OF Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reports that Britain and the United States are in agreement on China policy are not true. As part of my remarks I am including an article by Ludwell Denny that appeared in the Washington News apropos this subject:

DESPITE ALL THE AMICABLE TALK, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN ARE STILL POLES APART ON CHINA POLICY

(By Ludwell Denny)

LONDON, May 16.—Serious disagreements between Britain and America over a China policy continue despite a shift in the British position and Foreign Secretary Herbert Morrison's assurance to Parliament that there is no friction.

These disagreements cover the arms embargo recommended by the United Nations committee to the General Assembly, as well as differences over a total embargo, Formosa, diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Reds and their demand for a U. N. seat.

Though London has modified its pro-Peiping policy under American pressure, at the same time Washington policy has stiffened. So it is still a wide breach.

Frightened by the possible effects of that breach on the North Atlantic Pact and on the British-American alliance, both governments are trying to publicize points of agreement and postpone—rather than settle—their serious China disputes.

RELUCTANT "YES"

For the moment the United States is unwillingly accepting the British-imposed limits on the pending U. N. arms and strategic materials ban because the British Commonwealth, France and a large U. N. majority are on the British side. The British switch permitting this weak measure to pass in the U. N. is not as significant as advertised. Rather it is virtually automatic after Britain's own belated ban on rubber had been forced by Washington's and Winston Churchill's protests and British public opinion.

But London has no intention of extending that limited U. N. ban to a total embargo as the United States has. A provision in the pending U. N. resolution "to continue its consideration of additional measures to meet aggression in Korea and report thereon" is sop to American public opinion. But it is vetoed in advance by British refusal to consider a complete embargo much less naval blockade or political sanctions.

Another grave flaw in the U. N. resolution is the failure to ban rubber by name as it does petroleum. Though rubber obviously is a strategic material, Britain didn't include it in her strategic embargo until recently and justifies what she calls shipments for normal peaceful purposes.

Also, there's a hole in the U. N. clause to prevent evasion of the embargo by shipping and transshipments. It's limited to preventing "circumvention of control on shipments applied by other states pursuant to this resolution." If Indonesia, Burma, India or Ceylon sell rubber or other strategic materials to China, British ships can deliver those goods—unless London rules otherwise.

The biggest hole of all is that British Empire rubber shipments to Russia, which can be reshipped to China, are not banned.

So a strict economic blockade which Defense Secretary George C. Marshall as well as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, says is essential is not imposed by Britain or by the U. N. proposal even in the limited field of arms and strategic materials.

WHY THEY OBJECT

As for the American-type embargo on all goods, London objects on the following grounds:

It would be ineffective because other China traders, including Russia, wouldn't join.

It is enforceable only by a naval blockade which would invite a general war.

Britain and others would lose essential imports from China including tungsten.

It would destroy Hong Kong which is important for the Allies as well as Britain.

POSTPONE DISPUTE

On Formosa, the dispute hasn't been settled, only postponed.

Mr. Morrison's unsolicited statement on this subject to Parliament before its recess last week was double talk. Bowing to America, he said a discussion of Formosa's future would be premature so long as operations continue in Korea, and that decision should be made by the U. N. after consultation with the inhabitants. But for the benefit of the leftists particularly, he specified the policy was the same as that laid down by Prime Minister Clement Attlee last December.

The Labor government, now as then, favors giving Formosa to the Reds with some safeguards for the inhabitants as soon as Peiping ceases aggression. Neither Mr. Attlee nor Mr. Churchill agrees with General Marshall that the island never should fall into Red hands. And, of course, Britain won't support Chiang Kai-shek even to the present limited American extent—unless Hong Kong is attacked by the Reds and Chiang could fight a diversionary action.

Similarly, regarding Red China's membership in the U. N., the British-American dispute is only postponed. Since Peiping's direct participation in the Korean war, London has temporarily withheld support of Peiping's membership until the fighting stops, but only temporarily. That's still the policy here. The question of whether U. N. membership is part of a written bargain for stopping the war or an unwritten understanding is a matter of technique and expediency on which Britain has changed and may change again without willingly altering the basic policy—unless there is a general war.

Educational Responsibilities of Life Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith for insertion therein an article by Dr. Ernest H. Hahne, president of Miami University at Oxford, Ohio, and chairman of the board of the Cincinnati branch of the Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank.

Dr. Hahne is a graduate of the University of Nebraska, with a bachelor of arts degree in 1911 and a law degree in 1913. He subsequently won his master of arts degree at Harvard and a doctor of philosophy from Chicago University. He taught sociology at Chicago University, economics and sociology at Dakota Wesleyan, economics at Northwestern as professor of economics, and served as assistant dean of the liberal arts college and director of the summer session at Northwestern. An authority on special assessments and Federal taxes, he has served many governmental agencies, particularly just preceding and during World War II. As a research expert, he has served as director of research for Midwest Institute on Fair Trade Practices, United States Office of Education, Illinois State Tax Commission and School of Office Workers, and has been associated with many other important research projects.

EDUCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF LIFE UNDERWRITERS

Representatives of life-insurance companies are engaged in the great social task of education. If their work were to be departmentalized along the lines of the colleges and universities then more specifically they are engaged in the field of economic education. The place of individual and corporate saving, the relation of saving to the creation of capital, and the importance of capital in a capitalistic democracy are among the most significant lessons to be taught.

Not many years ago the life underwriters emphasized, as a part of policy selling, agruments that insurance would enable the buyer to gain a certain amount of independence; that he would gain security for his old age; that he would be buying a first-class investment; and that he would be engaged in the supremely important responsibility of family building.

Today personal independence is in danger of giving way to the state-owes-me-a-living idea. Provision for old age has been taken from the shoulders of the individual and placed in the hands of State and Federal social-security programs, which have followed the Townsend mathematical rhyme—$50–55; 60–65; 70–75, and so on up to $135 per month when Government and private pensions have been combined. The first-class investment argument has been vitiated by rampant inflation. As for family building how often nowadays do we hear about one's responsibility for his grandchildren? Family disorganization has become so common that the moral and spiritual foundations of the family as the cornerstone of democratic institutions are crumbling. Yes, indeed; these are the days when life underwriters must enlarge their scope of economic education as a matter of financial survival and national responsibility.

Whatever menaces a stabilized economy becomes a menace to life underwriting. Today many erroneous dogmas are extant. Some of them undermine national stability. Americans need to be alerted to five of the most widely announced fallacies that are gnawing at the groundsills of the structure of our economy.

First, one of the most common fallacies is that taxation will prevent inflation. I am assuming, of course, that further inflation is considered a menace to life insurance and the credit system. Too frequently, advocates of higher tax rates forget that the money taken from individuals by the force pump of the Internal Revenue Department is collected merely to be respent by those holding positions of strategic power in Government. Behind this may be found the implied assumption that if an individual spends his own income the effect is more inflationary than if the Government spends it, but only 15 years ago we heard that if the Government spends the money then deflation would be stopped and reflation would be started. The same naive persons continue to sponsor these inconsistent conclusions.

Whenever the tax enters into the cost of production, it may be shifted in the form of higher prices for consumers; thus taxes may raise prices. Or if the tax is such that it discourages production and decreases supply as a price factor, it may also raise price. It has been said that the excess-profits tax is not shifted since it falls upon profits computed after costs, but this short-sighted conclusion ignores the fact that corporate management looks to the future on the basis of past experience, and resorts to liberal allowances for advertising, bonuses, pensions, higher wages, lower prices for old customers, consolidations, and mergers that raise costs and lower taxable profits, and general relaxation of efforts toward efficiency and economy in management.

MEASURING TAX LIABILITY

Today we hear that corporate income taxes are not shifted because, like the excess-profits tax, the tax is levied on net income, supposedly the income as made taxable by law. But the fact is, of course, that net income is the measure of tax liability. It is easy to confuse the measure of tax liability and the source of a tax. An income tax may fall on capital. Not a few corporations have found it necesary to set up tax reserves taken from current income in order to pay the exorbitant tax burden that management anticipates from current operations, but because these reserves cannot impair wage agreements, customary dividends, and other drains on income, it becomes necessary to raise prices of goods sold.

One aspect of the income tax that is too frequently by tax analysts develops from increased Government spending because the income tax has proved to be very productive in raising revenue. Thus, public expenditures directly maintain support prices not because the economy needs such a fictitious price system, but because political considerations take highest rank in the minds of those disposing of income-tax revenues. It is nothing but a figment of imagination that the support prices are preponderantly recouped by the Treasury the following year by income taxes, since the primary purposes of such programs, is to raise, not lower prices.

During the depression Washington bureaucrats were vociferously advocating the pump-priming theory that the Government must spend to raise prices, contending at that time that the more the administration spent the more readily would America overcome the depression. But today these same persons not only favor heavier taxation to check inflation, but also favor greater borrowing to conduct the present war.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT SPENDING

If taxes are to become an effective check upon inflation they must be accompanied by a reduction in Government spending, because Government consumption decreases supplies and raises prices just as effectively as though those same supplies were taken from the market by individual purchases. At present I see no signs of the administration's taxing more than it spends, and therefore question the effectiveness of taxation as a means of checking inflation.

Nor will taxation to repay debt prove to be of much help since the dollars paid into the Treasury go into the hands of bondholders who in turn may respend and merely change the channel of spending. If however, the bondholder converts his payments into capital and increases that factor of production, and larger supplies of goods eventually are placed on market counters, these increased supplies may lower prices. The important fact remains that when the Treasury gains the dollars, it does not destroy them, thereby diminishing buying power, but it taxes to spend and spending raises prices.

Life underwriters by converting consumers' spending power into savings tend to check inflation. Two qualifications need to be made, however. First, if the insurance company becomes a lending institution, then little absorption of purchasing power occurs, and second, if the company uses these savings to buy Government bonds, it merely rechannels the flow of savings. Since the companies for the most part assume the duty of converting savings into capital, thereby increasing national product, their activities become anti-inflationary, and much more effective than increased rates of income taxes now being proposed. The conclusion then becomes obvious. Threats of higher income taxes menace savings, stimulates Government spending and borrowing, and impairs the future of life underwriting.

EXPLODING A FALLACY

In the second place, another common fallacy is that no tax is a good tax which is not based upon ability to pay. This fallacy needs to be exploded by life underwriters.

Historically, from the beginnings of the National Government until the Civil War, the

Treasury operated upon the revenue derived from commodity taxes called customs duties, or tariffs, supplemented slightly by revenues from the sales of lands belonging to the public domain. It was a commodity-tax period. Although the Civil War caused a sharp increase in the national debt, the Federal Government continued to tax commodities, but then added what was called the internal-revenue duties on domestically produced goods to correspond with the customs duties on foreign-made goods. They were levied upon the sale of enumerated commodities. From 1862 until the coming of the income tax in 1913 America seems to have managed to muddle through by becoming the most powerful nation on earth. The commodity tax is indisputably the historical basis of American fiscal policy.

Our forefathers seemed to regard this system as equitable and sound, because they considered it the responsibility of all citizens who benefit from Government to help pay for the support of that Government. The excise system was justified before the Supreme Court, as based upon the idea that commodity taxes were a reasonable measure of benefit received.

What has become of the benefit theory of taxation? It has been displaced by the ability-to-pay theory. Today no tax is fair, say many well-intentioned citizens, unless it is founded upon ability to pay. This idea came to America by way of the school of economics, known as the French Socialists, and also through the channels of what in Germany were known as the Socialists-of-the-Chair. Adolph Wagner was the brain-truster for Bismarck, the Iron Duke of Prussia, and he set forth the idea that ability to pay was the soundest socio-politico basis for taxation—that taxes may well be used to redistribute wealth, as well as raise revenues. It was the entering wedge of socialism under the guise of taxation. It is now found in the U. S. S. R. constitution which lays down the Socialist principle that taxes must conform to alibity to pay, and that constitution announces that it is a fundamental part of Communist policy. But I do not propose to give a course in the history of tax thought, only to indicate the Socialist origins of the ability-to-pay doctrine.

Since 1913, the World Wars I and II and the Korean war have left America so much in debt that any means of raising revenue seemed to be desirable, and we have acquiesced too readily in the abandonment of the historic principle of benefit received, and accepted too readily the idea that the only good tax is the tax based upon ability to pay. Fees, special assessments, the gasoline tax when used for roads, and to some extent the license system, still retain elements of the benefit theory. Some contend that the personal income tax measures benefits since those with greater incomes receive the greater benefits from the administration. The reasonableness of which I leave to your imagination.

With the Korean war steadily and progressively imposing its burden upon all Americans the present income tax has become fiscally inadequate. This was pointed out in the report of the Senate Finance Committee on the Revenue Act of 1950 showing that the number of taxable returns would approximate 38,000,000, or only 63 percent of the 60,000,000 gainfully employed Americans. Whenever employed, a person receives a public benefit if no more than in the form of law and order, and should be expected to pay for it. According to this report the income of the 38,000,000 reached $131,000,000,000, or 58 percent of the total personal income of $225,000,000,000. In short, 63 percent of the people employed receiving 58 percent of the income pay the personal income tax.

Through tax exemptions much of the lower incomes remain tax-exempt unless reached by commodity taxes. Exemptions are a necessary element if taxes are to be based solely upon ability to pay, but when ability is combined with benefits received then exempted incomes should be reached through commodity taxes. This means a kind of tax that everybody pays. It does not mean taxing luxuries only. In this atomic age protection of life is as necessary as bread, and it is conceivable that taxes upon bread may be necessary to produce atomic bombs and maintain the benefits of a sound government.

A third fallacy widely accepted today that needs to be emphasized by life underwriters seeking to prevent inflation is that the interest rates must be kept down so that the Treasury will not require higher taxes to pay higher interest to bondholders. Insurance companies are lenders. They are in a real sense credit agencies. As credit expands prices rise, and whatever affects the totality of credit affects inflationary causes. There exists a close relation between interest rates and credit trends.

Russian writers have concluded that American capitalistic democracy can be destroyed by the use of two economic weapons. First it is contended that American capitalistic democracy cannot withstand regimentation for a decade. Second, that Americans identify capitalism with dollars, and the destruction of the dollar will lead to the overthrow eventually of American democracy by revolution.

Two ideas of price control are now popular, one that inflation can be controlled by the fixing of prices or ceilings for specific commodities, the second, that inflation can be checked by the use of devices that control the supply of credit. If we use the type of controls formerly employed by the Office of Price Administration, and attempt to regiment American capital, management, and labor, we seem to accept the first Russian objective, that of regimentation for a decade. If we use credit controls, however, we protect the dollar and upset the aims of Russian plotters and planners. Therefore, we need to be cautious in the extent, type, and duration of specific price controls, and courageous in the use of credit controls. Specific price controls do not reach the causes of inflation. For this reason the Office of Price Stabilization has been assigned an exceptionally obnoxious task.

Recently we witnessed within the administration a struggle over the use of these inflationary controls. About 6 months ago the Federal Reserve System announced that it would use the powers at its disposal to check abnormal credit expansion. Regulation W relates to the extension of consumer credit, installment loans, down payments, exempt credits for business and agricultural loans, loans to pay fire and casualty insurance premiums, and in general limits overextended business credit. Regulation X relates to residential real estate credit and applies to banks, insurance companies, mortgage, loan, finance, and real-estate companies. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System began tightening these types of credit last year, and there is not much doubt but that these credit controls have proved somewhat helpful.

Late in the fall the New York Federal Reserve bank announced that it would use the powers at its disposal to check abnormal credit expansion, and imposed an increase in the rediscount rate. But that very day the Treasury announced a refunding issue priced above the existing market, which was designed to force the Federal Reserve bank to renounce its action or be held responsible for impairing the flotation of the refunding issue. By this action the Treasury seems to have taken the position that the Federal Reserve System shall not use its power to tighten credit and raise interest rates, as a general policy checking inflation. More than a dramatic struggle has occurred because the Treasury seems to have taken the position that makes it necessary for the administration to favor specific price controls, concomitantly requiring all the regimentation of American enterprise that perpetuates some of the bitter memories of the last war.

A BANKERS' BANKING SYSTEM

Nevertheless, the Federal Reserve System is still a bankers' banking system. It is not owned by the Federal Government. It is not a tool of any administration. In my opinion, its powers must never be so emasculated that member or nonmember banks cannot test objectively the quality of the national credit. The ominous growth in bond holdings of the Federal Reserve System, plus the tendency of member banks for deposits to exceed loans and bond absorption to increase, accentuates the importance of interest rate control. Whenever the quantity of national credit becomes overexpanded that fact must be reflected in the quality of that credit, and that in turn should be reflected in interest rates, national emergency or not. The excellent report of the Douglas committee also concluded that the responsibility of regulating the supply and cost of credit belonged not to the Treasury but to the Federal Reserve System.

Being lending agencies, insurance companies are intimately affected by movements in the interest rates. As a rank outsider in the business of life insurance, I have heard that certain actuaries have found that a one-fourth of 1 percent drop in interest rates offsets about a 15-percent gain in mortality. If this be true then from the viewpoint of life underwriters it will take very substantial further medical progress to compensate for a change of 1 percent in the interest rates. Twenty years ago life underwriters were getting an investment return of 5 percent; today it has dropped to about 2.7 percent, according to some estimates. Recently some companies have discovered that it takes a return of 3.2 percent to cover cost of losses. In short, this control of interest rates is an essential matter to life underwriters.

The general controls that lie within the power of the Federal Reserve System, such as change in reserve requirements, in rediscount rates, open-market operations, and credit regulations, still remain powerful economic weapons with which to fight dangerous inflationary trends. It is my opinion that the time has come when they should be used, despite the fact that the American people need to be informed by their so-called leaders in Washington about what is behind all this frantic preparation for war on a world-wide front. The American people are beginning to find out that what they need is stable dollars, and not cheap dollars.

Another aspect of this problem looms on the horizon of fiscal thinking. Some advocate the establishment of a department of fiscal affairs that would absorb the Treasury, the home-loan bank, the farm-credit system, and the savings and loan system, as well as the Federal Reserve System. Nothing could be more dangerous than such concentration of monetary power that might be placed at the disposal of ruthless and incompetent office holders. If such action were taken, then I would predict that it would take only one more step to absorb life-insurance companies as well. Life underwriter leaders need to be alert now to the potentialities of this plot.

ANOTHER FALLACY

A fourth fallacy that leaders in life underwriting should closely study is that Government seizure is the solution for the operating difficulties confronted by public utilities and industries essential to the public interest. Recently we observed Government seizure of the railroads, and heard about threats to seize coal mines, steel mills, telephone companies, and power companies. No limitations worthy of American intelligence have been placed upon either the duration, or wage adjustments, or type of controls imposed by Government seizures. Here again political policy comes dangerously near the ultimate

American regimentation envisioned in Russian circles. Americans have paid more attention to the technical weapons of warfare than they have to the economic weapons our enemies may use. We all need to follow the ancient admonition: "Know your enemy."

A PALLIATIVE BUT NOT A SOLUTION

Government seizure has become an accepted national policy as a palliative but not a solution for some of our economic troubles. If the time comes when life underwriters are considered as competitors with the social security program of the national Government the ground work for Government seizure of life insurance companies will have been already laid. This policy needs critical watching, especially by the life underwriters, but also by all thoroughgoing Americans.

In the fifth place, another fallacy that looms in the background is the idea previously called the compensatory economy, whereby the Government will borrow during depressions and during the following period of prosperity will tax and repay the depression loans. Today we hear much from Washington about the heights which the American standards of living have reached, and this must be understood to constitute prosperity. Figures of national income are very attractive in terms of dollars, as well as output, but we do not hear much about using taxes during this period to repay depression loans. The fact is that the spenders of the depression period still are spenders in a period of prosperity, and that they have either intentionally misled us into accepting a vicious fallacy or they are planning to take us into the dangerous inflation that our Russian enemies have planned for us.

As we now enter a garrison state with universal military training for all citizens over 18, it is said that further borrowing is necessary unless we pay as we go. But who is there today sufficiently cognizant of military planning that he is competent to exercise a sound judgment concerning the extent to which future borrowing becomes necessary? The compensatory economy of the Kenesian period in fiscal policy has become a delusion and snare. We borrow in prosperity, just as we borrowed during the depression, and hence must find some answer to those who seek to dominate America by the threats of a constant emergency or state of fear. Again, we need freedom from fear.

A credit system is founded upon man's faith in men. We have been told that through sufficient faith we could move mountains, but that kind of a faith is founded upon truth and not fallacies. Life underwriters attempt to instill faith of buyers in their companies, and to a large extent, therefore, become bulwarks of the credit economy. But there is also a moral obligation on the part of the leaders in life insurance to see to it that the values which policyholders are told that they purchase are realized in fact, and it is clear that by taking dollars that are worth a dollar, and paying back in dollars worth 50 cents, the moral obligation of the company, as well as the agent, is eluded or shirked; man's faith in man is impaired, and the credit economy endangered. There is an inevitable and close relationship between moral obligations and the strength of the credit economy.

IMPORTANCE OF THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

The time has arrived when colleges and universities must enlist not only the life underwriters, but bankers, professional and businessmen, as well as labor leaders, in the cause of adult education. We are engaged in an active military and economic warfare, and there is danger that the importance of the economic struggle be overlooked because of the dramatic aspects of the military battles and the overwhelming confusion growing out of what seems now to be a drastic changeover toward a garrison state for perhaps the next decade. The social responsibilities of the leaders in life insurance include this necessity of aiding in adult education. I have not completed the discussion of the more common or widely held fallacies, nor do I imply this list to be complete. But life agency leaders with their faith in the future are obligated to help shape that future by destroying contemporary economic fallacies and building foundations of truth upon which a sound future will be constructed for Americans.

Hysteria? Ah, No, Mr. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. T. A. Stevenson, editor and publisher of the Rosemead Review, of Rosemead, Calif., has written an excellent editorial analyzing the tremendous public reaction in favor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The editorial appeared in the May 3, 1951, issue of the Review.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Stevenson, a distinguished journalist of wide experience, answers one of the various charges made by a prominent radio commentator who calls the MacArthur popularity "mere hysteria." It is unfortunate that so many of our radio and television commentators constantly support the left-wing line of political philosophy and are ever ready to defend the Truman administration. By their acts, such commentators are preventing the American people from obtaining the truth through our radio and television facilities.

I hope that all of the Members of the Congress will have an opportunity to read Mr. Stevenson's editorial:

HYSTERIA? AH, NO, MR. MURROW

We think the columnists and commentators missed the salient point in trying to find the answer to the MacArthur reception which has passed anything in history.

These chaps spend most of their time in big cities and face their typewriters a long, long way from the quiet firesides of the Nation where public opinion is formed. They tend to grow away from the people and, in a situation like this, have to grope for the answer. It is not to be found in the cocktail lounge of the Statler.

Edward R. Murrow spoke as if he wanted to weep at our emotion and loss of perspective. He called it hysteria. What Murrow needs is to go back to the Palouse Hills of eastern Washington, from whence he came, and talk to the folks he once knew. There he would find himself.

The people stormed the great cities to see General MacArthur because they saw in him the antithesis of what they have been feeding upon for too long. They are sick at heart reading so much of O'Dwyer, Dawson, Vaughn, Maragon, Remington, Lattimore, Pressman and of Hiss, Costello, Cohen, Coplan, Fuchs, Gold, Greenglass, Gusick, and Wadleigh.

General MacArthur richly deserves the applause he has received. His address to Congress was the work of 52 years in the field and worth every minute of it. But the millions who saw him, read his speech and filed it away for rereading, were saying, without being conscious of it; here is a great general, a great leader, a man of genuine integrity and intelligence, a devoted husband, an ideal father, a man of sympathy and understanding, a man who knows where he is going and how to get there. The crowd was cheering both a man and a type—a type they would like to see in many important posts in Washington.

No, Mr. Murrow, this was no idle hysteria, and you need not weep because the people cheered. They were speaking a language all their own and folks along Pennsylvania Avenue would do well to listen.

Scientific Research Fills Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent article by my friend, Miss Florence Birmingham, celebrated Massachusetts civic and political leader, author, and lecturer, which recently appeared in the Boston Traveler under the caption "United States Seeks Best Administrators." It is an admirable analysis and treatment by the distinguished Miss Birmingham of some of the current problems and work of the United States Civil Service Commission. It follows:

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FILLS JOBS—UNITED STATES SEEKS BEST ADMINISTRATORS—NEW TECHNIQUES USED TO DISCOVER BEST TALENT FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM

(By Florence Birmingham)

In this atomic energy era, with scientific research and development being carried on in many different directions, such as astronomical, industrial, underwater, aeronautical, the pressure of manpower in today's emergency is a distinct challenge to the United States Civil Service Commission.

This is met, according to William A. Foley, New England Regional Director of Civil Service, by resorting to modern, high-speed techniques that today's emergency demands.

In his office in the Federal Building, in Boston, Mr. Foley explained:

"One of the great needs of the Government is for top level administrators to direct and coordinate the numerous intricate programs of mobilizing manpower, materials, and industrial skills in the defense effort, simultaneously attempting to maintain as stable a civilian economy as possible.

I am often asked where and how we can find administrative and technical talent for these vast tasks of the civilian government at the very time the military services and private industry are calling for identical proficiency and skill.

"One of the most interesting and novel answers to this question is the current executive placement program of the United States Civil Service Commission, designed to bring to light within the Government itself the exceptionally qualified experts being sought in the present emergency."

All Federal agencies, Mr. Foley pointed out, are designated by the Bureau of the Budget as either defense agencies or non-defense agencies, depending on how closely their activities are related to defense work.

Therefore, the problem, in part, is to discover the best administrative talent in the nondefense group in order to make available and fully utilize their skills in more vital defense work. And also to uncover in like manner the same, perhaps only partially utilized, abilities of persons within the defense agencies.

The executive placement program is aimed at providing the solution to this problem through giving Federal employees throughout the country, who have served at least a year in grade GS–12, carrying a salary of $6,400 a year, an opportunity to compete in an examination of unusual character, the first of its kind in the history of the civil service.

"For a 3-week period," said Mr. Foley, "beginning March 20, applications are being received by the Commission in Washington, D. C., from such Federal employees. Later in April written tests covering administrative problems and public affairs will be given to the employees filing under this program.

"Federal workers residing in New England who wish to take the test right in this area will be given the opportunity to do so, at whatever examination point is most convenient to them.

"It is noteworthy that the administrative judgment tests, as developed by the Commission, have been successfully used by several agencies in the past 5 years for the upgrading of personnel to administrative positions. These tests have also been used by the Commission in open competitive examinations for administrative positions up through grade GS–13.

"In short, this type of written examination, as a measure of top administrative abilities, has already been proven, but its application on this large scale, is something new.

"As a result of the written examinations, the names of these Federal employees demonstrating the highest aptitudes as top-level administrators and technical directors will be placed on lists which will be made available to agency heads in filling key defense positions ranging from grades GS–13, with a salary of $7,600 a year, to GS–18, the highest grade in the Federal service.

"An employee whose name is on these lists may be referred for key positions only in Washington, D. C., only in a regional area, if he so chooses, or in both. The names of any employees already in defense agencies will be referred to their own agencies.

"The whole program is an entirely voluntary one which has the backing of the agencies themselves through the Federal Personnel Council in Washington, D. C., which worked closely with the Commission in developing the plan."

The executive-placement program, Mr. Foley pointed out, is intended merely to supplement other intensive efforts of the Government to locate and recruit highly qualified administrative and technical personnel for the urgent needs of the defense program.

For example, the Civil Service Commission in Washington, D. C., has a continuously open recruiting circular under which applications are at all times invited and accepted from persons interested in working for the Government as administrative or executive officers, grades GS–13, with $7,600 a year salary, through GS–15 with a $10,500 yearly salary.

These are top-level administrative positions chiefly in the Capital, and involve the direction and coordination of many phases of the Government's activity, from staff administrative positions on through procurement, communications, price regulation, international information activities, and others.

"Similarly in the first region," Mr. Foley stated, "intensive efforts are being made to recruit highly qualified persons from the outside for administrative, technical, and scientific positions representing a wide range of staffing needs for the Government's work in the New England area.

"For instance, there is open continuously at the present time an announcement under which applications are being sought from persons with strong industrial or business backgrounds who can qualify as industrial specialists, business or commodity analysts, contract negotiators, and the like.

"These positions are located in such agencies as the Office of Price Stabilization, the National Production Authority, the ordnance procurement agencies of the Department of Defense, and others.

"While the majority of positions are in the salary levels $4,600 to $6,400 a year, the announcement includes grades up to GS–14, $8,800 a year, and the higher-grade positions involving top-level administrative duties.

"Likewise, in the scientific field announcements are open in the first region for accepting applications as professional engineers of almost every type, physicists, chemists, meteorologists, electronic scientists, and other scientific and technical positions.

"Professionally trained or experienced people appointed to these positions are engaged in a wide range of activities concerned with scientific research or development in such Federal laboratories as the United States Naval Underwater Sound Laboratory in New London, Conn., and the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories; or in Federal industrial establishments, such as Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Boston Naval Shipyard, Watertown Arsenal, or Springfield Armory.

"The positions begin at the entrance professional level of GS–5, $3,100 annually. Some are as high as GS–15, $10,500 a year as top research directors."

In all of these efforts, Mr. Foley emphasized, whether through the executive placement program or the recruiting programs to secure personnel not already in the service, the common denominator is the earnest desire to place in key Government positions the very best personnel available to help carry out the Nation's defense measures.

Backing up the administrative and technical personnel directing and coordinating the work of Federal establishments, it is necessary, of course, to have a substantial force of employees performing more routine, but, nevertheless, essential tasks—draftsmen, office-machine operators, stenographers, typists, and many others.

In fact, the current need for stenographers and typists is so urgent that special recruiting methods are now being resorted to.

Mr. Foley explained that the central office of the United States Civil Service Commission is constantly accepting applications for these positions and holds written tests at frequent intervals throughout the region for persons interested in working in the Capital.

Agency recruiting teams constantly visit New England cities for the purpose of hiring stenographers and typists to work in Washington, D. C.

Because of the great demand for stenographers and typists in Federal agencies in New England, the first regional office and its boards of examiners have continuously open examinations in the Boston area and many other areas such as Portsmouth, N. H., and Springfield, Mass., where there are concentrations of Federal workers.

A streamlined method of qualifying for these positions in New England makes it possible for a person to apply directly to the local civil-service secretary at the post office where the applicant desires to take the test, appear for the examination within a few days and, if eligible, find that his or her name is certified to an agency within a short time after applying.

Problems and Needs of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the speech of Col. Joseph K. Carson, Jr., executive vice president of the Propeller Club of the United States, made before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1951. The speech is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you and to lay before you some vital truths about our oldest major industry, the American merchant marine, and also to say a word about the need for aid to our rivers and harbors.

I shall discuss briefly some reasons why American shipping is a perennial problem; why an adequate American merchant marine is indispensable to the United States in war; why it is essential to our peacetime economy; who is responsible for the muddled state of affairs in shipping; our present world status; shipping and our foreign policy; and why we must have preparedness instead of appeasement.

AMERICAN SHIPPING A PERENNIAL PROBLEM

Why is the American merchant marine, our oldest industry, a perennial problem? Why is this industry indispensable to national security, a political scapegoat.

There are many reasons for this state of affairs but before we discuss some of them, let us ask ourselves if the United States has a merchant marine policy. We do have and it is a clear one. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 states that policy clearly but it is not being implemented. Let me give you some of the reasons why it is not being carried out.

1. There are people on the Government payroll who do not believe in the American merchant marine. Some of these fuzzy brained planners, holding fat jobs in Washington have, within the last year, proposed that American ships no longer participate in the movement of ECA cargo and that foreigners haul all of it; that we sell more of our ships to foreign buyers; that all financial aid to the American merchant marine be discontinued and that foreign flag vessels be permitted in our coastwise and intercoastal trades. Only the Korean war caused these marplots to scurry for cover. But they'll be back in sight when the shooting is over.

2. Foreign lobbies are busy day and night and are persuading some of our diplomats to urge that we stay out of the shipping business.

3. Another reason for the present condition of shipping is the lack of knowledge on the part of the general public of what the American merchant marine means to the Nation's welfare and security. The Propeller Club is working to remedy that situation. In fact, we are determined that everyone in the maritime industry, whether shipowner, shipbuilder, management or employee receives the public recognition which is justly due for the unfailing support each has given our forces in the Korean war.

I could cite many other reasons for the financial and political headaches of the American merchant marine, but I must hurry on.

INDISPENSABILITY IN WAR

We cannot fight a war away from our own shores, or indeed anywhere for that matter, and win it, without a fleet of merchant vessels sufficiently in tonnage and types to meet the logistical requirements of a modern military operation. This is axiomatic in military circles but usually forgotten by many of our national legislators and the people in peacetime.

Battle commitments in the Asiatic and Atlantic theaters were limited to the tanker, dry-cargo and troop-carrying tonnage available. To assure victory, we had to spend over 15 billion dollars to build a "bridge of ships" across two oceans.

All of our military leaders whether Army, Navy or Air Force, tell us that the merchant marine is an indispensable member of the national defense team. Indeed, the ships which supply the aircraft carriers, battle wagons and other strictly military naval vessels, are in war—actually men o'war.

What is the use of building tanks, airplanes, guns and other fighting weapons unless we can transport them to the men who use them? Why send troops to foreign lands unless we can supply them with food and other essentials? These questions answer themselves.

The American merchant marine is an indispensable member of our national defense team—ground, naval, and air forces must have the logistical support of their fellow member of that team—the merchantman.

MOST ESSENTIAL TO OUR PEACETIME ECONOMY

If we do not have an American merchant marine in peacetime, we will be without one to serve our Armed Forces in war. Ships cannot be built in a day nor can crews be trained to man them overnight. And, if we do not have a merchant marine of our own in peacetime, we would have to rent one in wartime. From whom would we get such a fleet and at what price? Nobody knows for sure and, not knowing, we are culpable if we leave national defense to guesswork.

We do not have sufficient raw materials to support our internal economy. The list of things we have to import is most impressive. Let us suppose something essential to our standard of living is in short world supply. Are we childlike enough to believe that foreign vessels would supply our needs of a particular material, if their own nations wanted delivery of the same thing? If we do not have a merchant fleet of our own, shipping cartels are certain to be formed against us. We can't begin to carry out any substantial part of the point 4 program without American flag ships of the right kind and number to insure success.

If we do not have an American merchant marine in peacetime, we will lose all of our shipbuilding skills and our merchant sailors will be without jobs. We sometimes forget that if foreigners do all of our ocean hauling, it will simply be another means by which they can export their cheap labor into the country tax free, while the foreign shipowners will be able to reap huge profits through monopoly.

Finally, our national prestige will suffer greatly if ships flying the Stars and Stripes no longer ply the great trade lanes of the world. Then, too, a merchant ship is essentially an ambassador of good will. One seldom trades with one's foes, although the reports about our allies trading with Red China are disquieting.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MUDDLED STATE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE?

If what I have said about the necessity for an adequate American merchant marine is true, why then is it a perennial problem? That is easy to answer.

A combination of foreign lobbies, misguided American diplomats, bureaucratic bunglers and hare-brained theorists are the culprits. They are not necessarily working in concert but they are as effective as if they were. Add to the damage which these mischief makers conjure up, the lack of knowledge on the part of the public and we find we really have a problem. It can and will be solved. But we must first break up this un-American combination and have a good old-fashioned house cleaning.

OUR PRESENT WORLD STATUS

World Wars I and II have caused great changes to appear on the face of our harried old world. From out of those maelstroms of human strife there emerged the giant of the West, the United States of America. We find ourselves in a position of world primacy which we never planned or consciously sought. A combination of private initiative and vast resources had wrought a miracle. We became the world's banker. We have become the world's industrial colossus. We lead the world in communications, agriculture, and in all forms of transport—except shipping. In the field of shipping, we are faced with block obsolescence, and nothing much is being done about it. There is no plan for replacement of our fleet. We plan for this and we plan for that but hysteria, prejudice and ignorance pervade the atmosphere of merchant shipping.

Yes, we are the world's greatest Nation and we must recognize the fact that we have left our cocoon of isolation and have responsibilities coequal with our inherent power. One of our responsibilities is to become and remain strong in every phase of national defense.

SHIPPING AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

We are far from realistic in our foreign policy. A foreign policy, if it works, is a military policy. When diplomacy falls on its face, the military has to take over. An effective military policy is one which insures execution of a foreign policy. The military must be prepared in all respects if it is to accomplish its mission. It is unprepared unless it has a merchant marine sufficient to furnish logistical support in every theater of operations.

In spite of this, some of our diplomats want us to scuttle our merchant marine and allow foreigners to reap all the profits in world shipping. Some of these fellows advocate that if the present war spreads that we rent foreign ships to supply our battle lines.

Certainly the foreign shipowners want all the shipping business. We can't blame them for that. But it ill behooves people on Uncle Sam's payroll to help them get it. I care not what others may call this sort of business—I call it appeasement of a blushing red variety.

This trying to please the other fellow reminds me of the story of the young lieutenant just out of West Point who reported to a tough old commander of a remote western post. The old man received the young man very cordially, which greatly assured the lieutenant. Upon leaving the young man said, "Colonel, I am sure we'll get along fine." The colonel said, "Mr. Smith, we will, that is providing you do all of the getting along."

I believe in getting along but I am not the least bit ashamed of being an American and I don't propose that we shall be the world's good provider and a knightly protector only to receive as our reward the derisive title of Uncle Sap.

As most of you know, one of the principal objectives of the Propeller Club is: "To aid worthy and economically justifiable river, inland waterway, and harbor improvements."

At our last national convention we mentioned by name specific river, inland waterway, and harbor improvements and promised to do all possible to bring about their speedy completion. Since the convention we have written to our national vice presidents to assure them of our interest in the problems faced by those engaged in transportation on our rivers and inland waterways and have requested their views and comments.

It is not our purpose to try to tell you how to go about solving problems with which you have labored for years. Quite on the contrary, we want you to tell us what you believe we should do to help you and suggest to us the ways to do it.

During the last few years we have been sending billions to nations abroad, while worthy river and harbor projects for which you have been fighting for decades, have never been started—or remain incomplete.

What is the reason for this? Have the meager appropriations for river and harbor improvement and maintenance work been the result of governmental economy?

Let us take a look at the record. How much money has Congress appropriated for river and harbor improvement and maintenance work? The first appropriation for this purpose was made in 1802. Since that time a total of $3,951,000,000 has been appropriated.

How does that figure compare with lend-lease? Well, lend-lease has cost over $50,000,000,000. Russia got $11,000,000,000 of it but now refuses to return several hundred ships we loaned her. What about ECA? Through June 1950 we had dished out $9,254,000,000 for ECA, or more than twice the amount expended for the improvement and maintenance of our own rivers and harbors in 148 years. Army relief in occupied areas has already cost over $3,700,000,000. UNRRA appropriations amount to almost $3,000,000,000. Who said "pork barrel?"

Unfortunately, while we have been ladling out billions to help nations across the seas, some of those who were engaged in that costly business were trying to scuttle our merchant marine. As this was going on, others were putting our rivers, inland waterways and harbors on a starvation diet.

It is our intention to do all we can to make sure that our river, inland waterway and harbor facilities receive the support and financial backing their importance demands.

CONCLUSION

We of the Propeller Club respectfully submit that an adequate American merchant marine is indispensable to national security and essential to our peacetime economy. We are in a battle for survival. In this conflict we welcome the cooperation of other nations which embrace the same philosophy of life as do we. But self preservation is our goal and we must be sure we have all the means at hand for attaining it. A strong American merchant marine is one of those means. Development of our rivers, inland waterways and harbors is another. As long as we can prevent it, we don't intend that either become an expendable item.

We do not propose that appeasement and neglect shall become a substitute for preparedness and prudence.

Windsors' Brooklyn Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 3, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct my colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of April 16, 1951, and which reflects credit upon the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital and its

director of public relations, Max Abelman:

WINDSORS' BROOKLYN VISIT

Two more notable world figures—the Duke and Duchess of Windsor—have come to Brooklyn to affix their signatures to the famous mural which grace the wall of the children's ward in Brooklyn Jewish Hospital. Escorting the man who renounced the British throne and his American duchess were a number of high officials of the hospital headed by its president, Supreme Court Justice Emil N. Baar.

Brooklyn may well take pride in this great institution whose strikingly decorated children's ward has attracted such notables as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Gen. George Marshall, Gen. Omar Bradley, Lord Halifax, former British Ambassador to the United States, General Romulo of the Philippines, the late Wendell Willkie, and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

The Duke and Duchess were obviously thrilled by their experience and were most gracious in all their contacts during their visit. A word of praise is also due the well-known Brooklynite who is responsible for bringing these famous people here—Max Abelman, director of public relations at the hospital.

Our Purpose Is Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 21, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 19, at the annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Oklahoma, an eloquent and important address was delivered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Oklahomans, certain facts stand out bold and clear before the American people and before the Government of the United States:

First. We are in the midst of the most critical period in our history.

Second. Our purpose is peace.

Third. Our primary and principal enemy is Red Russia.

Fourth. We must keep all the friends and allies we now have and make every effort to secure new ones.

Fifth. We must continue to mobilize our manpower, physical resources, and productive capacity.

Sixth. We must continue to work through the United Nations to stop aggression, prevent its spread if we are able to, and keep it as far removed from our own shores as is humanly possible.

In all these things we must work at home and with our allies for that abiding peace which is the ultimate goal of all our aims and all our efforts.

I am opposed to any political, diplomatic, or military policy on the part of my Government which assumes fatalistically that an all-out war with either Soviet Russia or Red China is inevitable; and I am opposed to any act on the part of any responsible Government official calculated to permit or provoke such an all-out struggle.

We are not in Korea today to start a world war; we are there to prevent such a war.

General Bradley made this very clear in his opening statement to the joint committees of the Senate last Tuesday. He said:

"As long as we keep the conflict within its present scope, we are holding to a minimum the forces we must commit and tie down.

"Enlargement of the war in Korea to include Red China, would probably delight the Kremlin more than anything else we could do. It would necessarily tie down additional forces, especially our sea power and our Air Force, while the Soviet Union would not be obliged to put a single man into the conflict.

"Red China is not the powerful nation seeking to dominate the world. Frankly, in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, this strategy would involve us in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy.

"Statements have been made that the President, as Commander in Chief, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense have a policy all their own, and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been overridden.

"This is just not so.

"There are also those who deplore the present military situation in Korea and urge us to engage Red China in a larger war to solve this problem. Taking on Red China is not a decisive move, does not guarantee the end of the war in Korea, and may not bring China to her knees. We have only to look back to the five long years when the Japanese, one of the greatest military powers of that time, moved into China and had almost full control of a large part of China, and yet were never able to conclude that war successfully. I would say that from past history one would only jump from a smaller conflict to a larger deadlock at greater expense."

My friends, General Bradley in these brief quotes makes a complete but simple answer to MacArthur's proposals and charges. I knew Bradley was the GI's general but I never knew how clear a talker he was.

Now, we all know that Oklahoma has about as high a percentage of her sons in Korea as any State. We have suffered about as high a rate of casualties. No words of mine are adequate to pay the tribute deserved by those brave men and their families. They are fighting for the security of their country. They are fighting for American freedom. Some will not come back. Most of them will return to help build a greater America.

And while they and their comrades are holding the hordes of aggression at bay, there is a great effort being made here at home to mobilize our manpower and our industrial and productive capacities—to insure that this Nation and her allies will be in a position of impregnable security.

My part in the MacArthur controversy came without warning. There are those who seek to discredit me—who charge that I was acting for others when I spoke out against the general. That charge is entirely false. There was no suggestion either from the White House or the State Department that I do what I did. As a matter of fact, I was the first official that I know of who publicly expressed a lack of confidence in General MacArthur and his effort to expand the war.

I was the first to make a public issue of the possibility that what he recommended would do more harm than good. I was the first to warn the American people that what he was saying and proposing could get us deeper into war instead of successfully ending the one we are already in. It was my deep concern for the immediate safety and welfare of Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division which prompted my first outspoken opposition to MacArthur and his policies. This concern was shared by practically every member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress. We knew the Forty-fifth had been ordered to Japan.

We went to the Department of the Army to find out the purpose for which Oklahoma's National Guard Division was being sent to Japan. We knew they were in the Armed Forces, we knew they were available for their country's call. We also knew the grave concern in the hearts of the fathers and mothers, the wives and the children of those men when that magnificent division started the long trek yonder across the Pacific to Japan.

We were advised by the Secretary of the Army that they were going to Japan for occupational duty. We inquired specifically and were advised that their training would be completed before they were assigned to any duty.

At about this time, just as we were feeling some degree of comfort from the assurances given us, we read in the paper where the War Department had worked out a well-deserved program of rotation for the fighting men in Korea, whereby certain numbers would be sent home each month and replaced with other soldiers. The thought came to me that possibly the Forty-fifth Division was to be used as replacements.

I went to the office of the Secretary of the Army and I asked him if there was such a possibility. He told me, "No." He said the rotation program would go into effect, but that replacements would come from training centers in this country direct to the units in Korea. I said, "Will the Forty-fifth Division be broken up?" He replied, "No." I then said, "Mr. Secretary, we are mighty happy to get these assurances, that the Forty-fifth Division will not be broken up, and that the men in it will not be used as replacement troops in Korea—but can we depend on this program being carried out?" The Secretary replied, "Senator KERR, this is the program and the plan and it will be carried out so far as we here in Washington are concerned." I then asked, "Is there anybody who can change this plan?" And he said, "Nobody but the theater commander."

I knew who he meant—General MacArthur, and right then I became more keenly interested than ever in General MacArthur and his policies. Of course, I was aware of the argument that had been going on between General MacArthur out yonder in Japan and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, and I had been greatly concerned about it. I knew that it was the purpose of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to stop aggression, punish the aggressor, and in doing so to limit the conflict to the narrowest possible confines and prevent its spread.

I had read with great concern the published views of the general that a second front should be opened up on the mainland of China by sending in the forces of Chiang Kai-shek, and I had been uneasy about that. I got to thinking about how he was going to get Chiang Kai-shek's army back to the mainland of China. I remembered how they had been driven off the mainland when they had 10 times as many troops as they now have in Formosa, and how they had abandoned their guns and tanks—most of which we had furnished them.

As I studied and learned more about the situation, it became apparent to me that the only way they could be placed back on the mainland of China was for the United States Navy to transport them, and this would have to be done with the protection of the United States Air Force, and the support of United States ground forces. General MacArthur himself said we would have to give logistical support, and that means transportation and the furnishing of supplies and food and military equipment wherever the fighting forces are. He further said we would have to furnish the officers and men needed as technicans and specialists.

And as I thought about that and realized that Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division and California's Fortieth Division were on their way over there, and that they would be the only troops in Japan, I became more uneasy. Could it be that if the general had his way and was permitted to open up a second front that it would fall the lot of these two divisions to become the shock troops to open up the way to put Chiang Kai-shek's forces on to the mainland?

Then it was that I sounded off regarding MacArthur's policies. Then when it became apparent that in violation of orders, in spite of the directives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander in Chief, MacArthur was threatening to force his program through, the only solution I could see was to replace him.

You know, my fellow Oklahomans, thank God we've got a democracy in which the civilian authority is in control of the military. And under no circumstances must we ever permit that to change.

Let me read you some words placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just a few weeks ago:

"The national strategy of any war, that is, the selection of national objectives and the determination of the general means and methods to be applied in attaining them, as well as the development of the broad policies applicable to the prosecution of war, are decisions that must be made by the head of the state acting in conformity with the expressed will of Congress. No single departmental head, no matter what his particular function or title, could, or should be responsible for the formulation of such decisions. The issues involved were so far-reaching in their effect, and so vital to the life of the Nation, that this phase of coordinating Army and Navy effort could not be delegated by the Commander in Chief to any subordinate authority. Any such attempt would not constitute delegation, but rather, abdication."

That's a pretty clear declaration of the principle of the superiority of the civilian over the military, isn't it?

Who do you think made that statement? Who do you think wrote the words I just read? Was it Bradley? Was it Marshall? Was it Eisenhower? No. The man who wrote those words back in 1932 when he was Chief of Staff was none other than Douglas MacArthur.

He was right when he said this in 1932, and the Commander in Chief was right when he applied that very same principle to General MacArthur in 1951.

Let me say, my fellow Oklahomans, that no one respects more than I, the distinguished military career of the general. I glory in a country such as ours whose sons can achieve the distinction that Douglas MacArthur has gained. But I am more proud of the fact that no matter who they are, or how high they go, they still are a part of the military team, and they are still subject to the orders of the Commander in Chief who is elected by the people. And the fact is, as great as MacArthur was, he has made many, many mistakes.

John Gunther, in his recent book, The Riddle of MacArthur, said:

"General MacArthur was severely embarrassed by the destruction of his planes on Clark Field on Pearl Harbor Day. The Japanese caught him in exactly the same naked and exposed state as they caught the Americans in Hawaii, though he had ample warning since the Pearl Harbor attack had come 10 hours before."

Reading further, Gunther says, "General MacArthur has several times made serious blunders in judgment, based on faulty information. The attack on South Korea on June 25 apparently took him by complete surprise, and he thought that the Korean war was won after the landing at Inchon on September 15. He told Mr. Truman at their meeting on Wake Island a month later that the danger of Chinese intervention had passed, but the Chinese drastically fooled him. Then (though he tried to wriggle out of this by saying that the remark had only been 'jocular') he predicted flatly that the American troops would be home by Christmas—only 3 or 4 days before they were caught by surprise and hammered back. General MacArthur, having scouted the ground personally for what was to have been his final advance, crashed into a colossal trap—moreover a trap about which he was fully aware."

The United States News and World Report is probably the most pro-MacArthur publication in America. But in its issue of May 4, 1951, is the following quote:

"1939—General Douglas MacArthur:

"A successful invasion of the Philippines would take a half million men, $10,000,000,000, tremendous casualties, and 3 years' time." But the magazine goes on to say it took the Japanese only 5 months to complete the capture of the Philippines.

The New York Herald Tribune is one of America's greatest Republican newspapers. Its Pulitzer-prize-winning correspondent, Homer Bigart, in a special article in a January issue of Look magazine, made the following statement with reference to Korea:

"Unsound deployment of the United Nations forces and a momentous blunder by General MacArthur helped insure the success of the enemy's strategy. MacArthur grossly miscalculated the intentions, strength, and capabilities of the forces against him. And no nation in the spot we are in can string along with a leader whose ill-considered decision to launch the offensive of November 24 precipitated and magnified the swift disaster."

I do not recite these mistakes he has made to cast doubt upon his patriotism, or reflect upon his reputation. I do so only to remind you that he, also, is human; that he, like all of us, has made mistakes in the past and some of them have been tragic and costly.

He admits that Russia has a mutual assistance treaty to join Red China if Red China is attacked. Yet, he says we should ignore that treaty and launch an all-out attack against Red China. With a wave of the hand he tells us that Russia would not come to China's aid.

I say this to you, that if we followed him in his proposal to carry an expanded war to China and then found out that he had made another mistake, and that Russia did come in, all of the mistakes that he has made rolled into one would be as nothing compared to the tragedy that would befall us.

We must not risk the survival of this Nation upon the unsupported judgment of one man who has been so wrong so often. Instead, we must be guided by the combined and unanimous judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff who are set up for the specific purpose of making just such decisions.

In this critical hour we must never for one instant lose sight of the most important objective of our lifetime—achieving and keeping peace. The No. 1 enemy who threatens that peace is Russia. It is Red Russia that has loosed the tempest of evil purposes and deeds that has lashed into violent upheaval the waters of that deep ocean which we must cross to reach the harbor of the peace we seek.

My fellow Oklahomans, we alone cannot win and keep the peace. No one nation in this world can accomplish that single-handedly. And for that reason, with high ideals, and inspired vision, we helped create the United Nations.

To do this we laid aside partisan politics. Under the leadership of the ablest men in both parties we resolved that insofar as our national security and peace were concerned, politics must stop at the water's edge. In that spirit we have fashioned an alliance with most of the nations in this world whose people and whose governments want peace.

When Red Russia sent her puppet on a mission of naked aggression into South Korea last June, she threatened the peace of the entire world, and the security of every free nation. That aggression had to be stopped and the aggressor punished or the United Nations would have ceased to exist except as an empty shell. The United Nations moved into Korea to halt that aggression and restore peace. That action was approved by an overwhelming majority of the American people, regardless of political party.

It was a bitter struggle but the North Korean aggression was stopped and thrown back, and we stood at the threshold of victory and peace. Then one of the saddest events in all history took place. Red Russia moved again. She sent another, and far more dangerous, puppet into action to prevent the United Nations from winning either victory or peace. We and our allies have checked that aggression, at least for the time being.

Our forces are now locked with the hordes of Red China in a desperate battle. The first drive of this much-touted spring offensive fell back under the relentless pounding of our guns and tanks and planes. Never have American forces performed more valiantly and heroically.

Now, our heroic men and those of our allies are giving their all to stop and turn back another thrust on the part of the enemy aggressor. Our hearts are heavy at this critical hour. We hope and pray and we believe that our successes will be repeated. We hope this will be the climax. We hope that then a defeated enemy will seek an honorable peace.

But if that enemy forces us to continue the struggle we will still strive to limit it as much as possible.

We do not know how long we will be able to limit this conflict but, unless Russia herself comes in, we believe we can prevent Red China from ever being victorious on the peninsula of Korea. Meanwhile the united strength of the free world is growing by leaps and bounds.

During these past 11 months we have more than doubled our Armed Forces. We have traveled far toward the goal of an adequate mobilization of our manpower, our industrial resources and our productive capacities.

Some of our allies are weak—and I want to say right here, my fellow Oklahomans—that no one is more aware of those weaknesses than I. No one is more aware of the hesitancy of some of the nations who sit in the shadow of the iron curtain to join us in a united effort to fight this aggression.

There are those who complain of our allies because of their meager help in Korea. I understand that complaint, and I join in it. That is just one of the reasons I am so bitterly opposed to MacArthur's effort to expand the war into China. It wouldn't be meager help we would then be complaining of if we did that. In that bigger, harder struggle we would have no help at all.

We would have to send more and more troops into Asia. Red China, however, would be fighting Russia's battles, while Russia, our number one enemy, would be free to pounce on Europe which is the real strategic prize. In defense of this threat, our European allies would have to save their own manpower. So, if we get bogged down in Asia, we could not help our own allies and they could not help us. By default, we would have lost on both fronts to the common enemy.

If we are forced into a bigger war we should never permit the men in the Kremlin to

forget that our fighting power will be hurled against them and not at their stooges.

Our allies can never make themselves very effective in Korea or China, nor is there interest primarily in either. Russia's strongest ally is China. However, that ally is only partially committed in Korea. What MacArthur proposes would unite the Chinese, now divided and becoming more divided all the time. Vast numbers of the Chinese people hate their Communist masters and even now seek to throw off their yoke of tyranny. But what MacArthur proposes would drive all of China into Russia's corner and crystallize her opposition to us. Thus, we would be committing more and more of our strength against Russia's ally and fighting where we would have the least possible help from our own allies.

In Europe it would be just the opposite. If war comes there, Russia would have to commit her own manpower and military strength. If war comes there our allies would have the primary interest. They must be prepared to fight if war comes in Europe. They now conserve their manpower for just such an eventuality. But if and when Russia uses her manpower then they will use theirs.

In Europe our allies will fight with all their power and all their men. Our contribution would then be more in naval power, air power, and equipment rather than in men. In China we would have to furnish the munitions of war and the manpower.

We do not want war anywhere. We will do all within our power to prevent it occurring at any place at any time. But if it must come, we would have our greatest advantage over Russia fighting in Europe. Russia would have her greatest advantage over us if the war were in China.

What folly to contemplate such a tragedy if it could be avoided. There is no other war that would or could gain as much for Russia or cost her as little as an all-out war between the United States of America and Red China. There is no other war that would or could cost us so much and gain us so little.

Therefore, we would be stupid to permit such a war if we could avoid it; we would be insane to provoke it. I repeat what General Bradley said: "This strategy would involve us in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy."

Russia is still the No. 1 enemy and threat to peace, and we need time—time during which we must limit the conflict to the smallest possible area. If we are given this time, we and our allies will build a united strength that will constitute our best insurance against another world war, and provide us with that which will enable us to win, if we are forced into it.

It was with these plain and simple facts before me that I sounded my unalterable opposition to the policies advocated by General MacArthur. I did not oppose him because of any personal resentment. I appreciate his many years of service to his country. I did not oppose him at the request of anyone. I opposed him because I thought he was wrong.

When he refused to accept the policies of his Government; when he declined to follow the orders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander in Chief; when he told, not only his own superiors but, in violation of orders, told the whole world that he could not and would not play as a member of the team, he just simply had to be removed from that team.

The general made a great speech before the Members of Congress. He said, "there is no substitute for victory," and I do not contest that statement. But we must ask ourselves: What constitutes victory? The general's objective and concept of this is a military victory over China.

But, as General Marshall and General Bradley pointed out, the aggressive moves advocated by General MacArthur, would not be decisive in Korea. They would just make peace and victory and peace a lot further off, and would greatly multiply our casualties over what our forces are now suffering in the limited engagement.

I say to you that we did not go to Korea to become engaged in that kind of a conflict, and I say further that the greatest defeat we could suffer in Korea would come if we permitted ourselves, through any fault of ours, to become engaged in an all-out military struggle with Red China.

Oh, you say, but aren't we at war with China? We are engaged with only a small part of the forces of Red China. Red China doesn't have 10 percent of her military power in Korea. If we were to open up that second front, which General MacArthur says is so necessary for victory over China, we would be taking on a fight 10 times more terrible than the one we now have in Korea. Our casualties would be 10 times what they now are.

And I ask you, "Who would win?" We wouldn't. Red China wouldn't. But you and I know who would, and it doesn't take a military strategist to figure that out. Red Russia would win.

If Russia could entice us, or seduce us, or compel us to become engaged in an all-out war with China it would give the men in the Kremlin the greatest satisfaction on earth, for Russia would be the ultimate winner—the only winner.

Therefore, I submit to you that victory in Korea can be won only if we avoid an all-out war with Red China. Of course, they may force it upon us, and in that event we would have no choice. But I say to you that at this time we do have a choice, and it is the purpose of our Government, our Chiefs of Staff—our Commander in Chief, and of our allies, to do these things: Stop the aggression in Korea and punish the aggressor until he seeks an honorable peace; limit the conflict to the smallest possible area; and in the meantime continue the mobilization of our manpower, mobilization of our resources, development of our cooperative effort with other nations, and thus, through collective effort and strength, achieve that impregnable security that will enable us to win and keep the peace.

I am not one of those who believe that another world war is inevitable. I would be unfair to my trust as one of your representatives if I did not join others of like purpose and do all within my power to avoid world war III. We must make the greatest effort of which we are capable to prevent it. If, in spite of this, Russia should provoke that war and force it upon us, then the blood we spill in that greater conflict, as well as in Korea, would be on her hands. She would have to answer for it before God and before the bar of world opinion.

But—and carefully note and long remember these words—if we permit that war to develop when we might have prevented it, or if—and God forbid—we should provoke it, then that blood would be on our hands and we would stand convicted before the world.

I am convinced that we yet have a chance, a clear chance, to avoid another world war. It may be the last clear chance, but we must develop it to the greatest extent of which we are capable. We must succeed in this effort if it is humanly possible.

I am convinced that under God we can succeed. I believe that with Divine guidance we can achieve that strength and unity at home and with our allies abroad whereby we may avoid that awful war or, with God's help, win it if it is forced upon us.

The Fruits of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 10, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended profound editorial from the New York Times of May 17 deserves the attention of every Member. Totalitarianism, red, brown, or black, is equally a mortal danger to us. It is for this reason that so many of us have been urging that the struggle will be long and our efforts must be heroic, that military means alone will not conquer totalitarianism, but that it will take economic, ideological, and, beyond all, spiritual means as well.

THE FRUITS OF FASCISM

It would be a lack of proportion to take the International Fascist Congress at Malmoe, Sweden, too seriously, but it would be even greater folly to ignore it. The delegates who met there were few and unimportant but they called attention to something we must never forget—that fascism is still very much alive although we fought the bloodiest war in history to kill it. We killed Mussolini and Hitler and a lot of Italian, German, and Japanese Fascists and we devastated their countries, but we did not destroy fascism.

The first and most obvious conclusion to draw is that we could today destroy Stalin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, their politburos, and every Communist leader everywhere and we could virtually destroy their countries with atom bombs—but we could not destroy communism. One could go further and say that if in some miraculous way we could wipe out every Communist Party and every individual Communist on the face of the earth, something like communism would rise instantaneously from the ashes. The totalitarians are a response to a situation, a dusty answer to the problems of our times. So long as the conditions remain that gave birth to fascism and communism, so long will those or similar doctrines last.

We must never fool ourselves that the ideas of the totalitarians can be killed by anything but better ideas that win universal acceptance. We must never indulge in the foolish hope that fascism and communism can destroy each other. The conflict between the two is nothing but a struggle for power. It is not an ideological conflict; both use almost similar methods and—most important of all—both have a common enemy in democracy. The classic proof of this thesis will forever lie in the Hitler-Stalin pact of August 1939.

Therefore, this is not an academic proposition, but one closely tied to reality. Just as it warns us to be cautious in our links to Tito, so it warns us to be careful in dealing with rulers like Franco, Peron, and Malan. The men who founded a neo-Nazi international movement in Malmoe on Monday may have come from the lunatic fringe of European politics, but their roots go down deeply, roots that have never been eradicated and that can bear evil fruits in the months to come.

Kyle Palmer Discusses MacArthur Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress a recent article by Mr. Kyle Palmer which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 13, 1951. Mr. Palmer is the distinguished political editor of the Los Angeles Times.

This article discusses clearly and concisely the great issue of our far eastern foreign policy which was so graphically brought home to the American people by the President's tragic dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur last month.

I feel that Mr. Palmer's discussion of this issue is worthy of serious consideration. The article follows:

EXPLANATIONS NOT IMPRESSIVE

(By Kyle Palmer, political editor)

The Truman administration's case against General MacArthur can be likened to that of a man who, having done another a great injury, sets out to justify the offense by further outrage and abuse.

For the record, the general now is portrayed as a rash and reckless swashbuckler who wanted to play so rough with the enemy that he not only succeeded in knocking his foes around, but scared his friends!

President Truman's decision—without consulting MacArthur—to launch a war in Korea against Red China and its Soviet boss is described as a peaceful move; whereas MacArthur's determination to win the war the President started is set forth in all seriousness as an out-and-out invitation to the Reds to start a rain of atom bombs on American cities.

According to the Truman administration's formula for war with communism, you can fight a little bit, kill and get killed on a sort of retail basis, but you really must not tempt the enemy beyond all forbearance.

If we have the bad luck or the ill grace to make the Russians really mad they may try to get tough. Instead of sending guns, tanks, bombs, rifles, ammunition, airplanes, military advisers and all other appurtenances to warring on us in Korea, why, if MacArthur were allowed to have his way, the Russians might start something somewhere else.

The Truman administration spokesmen are not sure the Russians won't grow tired of being beaten in Korea even with General MacArthur out of their hair.

But the administration indulges the prayerful and pious hope that our Red enemies will continue to be patient while, right under their noses, we build a war potential adequate to keep them peacefully in their place.

The picture, as painted by Secretary of Defense George Marshall—who told his Senatorial inquisitors last week that he "reacts more quickly" when called "general"—is dreary and grim.

One gains an impression from the general's testimony that MacArthur was snatched away just in time; had he won a few more battles and carried the war more rapidly to a victorious conclusion almost anything might have happened.

President Truman in his radio address to the country last Monday went even further in what seemed to me a most shoddy effort to scare the country to a point of hysteria—and all under the plain implication that his wise, impersonal, and courageous removal of MacArthur had saved us from the terrible consequences of all-out war.

General MacArthur himself told the inquiring Senators that he believes Russia will attack us where and when the Reds decide it is to their advantage to do so. He does not believe they are any more prepared to attack us than we are disposed to attack them.

But he still insists that the attack, if and when it comes, will be a matter of decision by the Communists.

According to the Truman-Marshall-Acheson theory, the free world is not strong enough to prevent a third world war at this time and, hence, faces a foe whose strength is at its peak.

Nevertheless, say Messrs. Truman, Marshall, and Acheson, by watching our diplomatic step in Korea, by keeping one hand tied behind us at the Manchurian border, by looking in another direction as the Russian-supplied and Russian-advised Chinese Reds organize their armies and accumulate their supplies in the Manchurian sanctuary, the Soviet will sit quietly at home until we have the weapons to knock them silly.

It does not make sense, even to those who know very little of the art of war and next to nothing of the ways of diplomacy.

And the attempt to picture Douglas MacArthur as a military commander willing to precipitate a world conflict by ill-considered and impulsive action in a limited theater of war, can have little damaging effect upon the people's confidence in their old soldier.

It seems quite doubtful that current or future discussion of the Truman-MacArthur controversy will materially modify the opinions and conclusions which most of us have developed, but all of us, regardless of opinion, should keep steadfastly in mind the fact that the country's security is involved.

General Marshall in his defense of the Truman removal order is merely carrying out a hard and, in all probability, a most distasteful chore. He has not done a very good job because he hasn't a very good case, but he has done his best.

Admirers of Marshall who know of his great services during World War II have had renewed evidence of the fact that his return to public responsibility after retiring as the Army's Chief of Staff has not added to his stature nor greatly advanced the announced objectives of the national administration.

Marshall is the administration's more important witness and he commands more respect in the Congress and in the country itself than any administration spokesman.

But in no important instance has he been able to shake the over-all position taken by General MarArthur.

The President, his Secretary of Defense, his Secretary of State and, it must be presumed, his Chiefs of Staff have challenged or will in one way or another dispute with MacArthur.

The collective assumptions and conclusions of the MacArthur critics, however, remain more in the category of a weak defense than of a convincing counterattack.

Meanwhile, the outside world composed of our apprehensive and critical friends and of our derisive and watchful foes is witnessing the rare spectacle of a nation caught in the meshes of confusion, indecision and rancorous debate.

Let us concede that much of the confusion and some of the indecision may be eliminated if the debate is kept within reasonable bounds and does not become a mere vehicle for personal and partisan bickering, but one basic fact continues to stand:

That is to say, the colossal folly of the manner in which the President dismissed the General. Secretary Marshall's lame explanation was, under the kindest of interpretations, unfortunate. And nothing Mr. Truman has said mitigates in any way the raw and reckless procedure he followed.

Alone and, so we're told, virtually single-handed, the President made an almost unprecedented contribution to national disunity and international uncertainty.

Had his victim been a lesser man or one less devoted to the welfare of the Nation, Mr. Truman might have plunged the country into a political debacle. Fortunately, General MacArthur set aside his natural feelings of resentment and pride and adhered strictly to an objective appraisal of the entire matter.

When the passions and prejudices of this generation have been forgotten by a posterity that will have its own emotional stresses and strains to resolve, the undeserved slights put upon a great man by a small one will remain fresh in the Nation's memory.

And what justification the future may hold for the act of removal itself is not only a subject for current conjecture, but may be one of interminable argument.

For those living in the contemporary world the all-important question is which side in the Truman-MacArthur episode is fundamentally right; which side fundamentally sound in its approach to ways and means for meeting and subduing communism's march.

In all probability, we shall discover in the hard way whether MacArthur's formula of strength or the Truman administration's program of pussyfooting offers, or eventually will offer, the best course to pursue.

Rest assured, if General MacArthur is correct in his view we face a long period of harassment and humiliation, to be followed inescapably by a formidable challenge to our very existence. And even under the Truman-Marshall-Acheson procedure we shall suffer the harassment and the humiliation with no assurance that the final challenge, after all, won't be there waiting for us.

My money remains on MacArthur.